

Unbiased Online Curvature Approximation for Regularized Graph Continual Learning

Jie Yin¹, Ke Sun², Han Wu³

¹The University of Sydney, Australia

²Data61, CSIRO, Australia

³Peking University, China

jie.yin@sydney.edu.au, ke.sun@data61.csiro.au, han.wu@pku.edu.cn

Abstract

Graph continual learning (GCL) aims to learn from a continuous sequence of graph-based tasks. Regularization methods are vital for preventing catastrophic forgetting in GCL, particularly in the challenging replay-free, class-incremental setting, where each task consists of a set of unique classes. In this work, we first establish a general regularization framework for GCL based on the curved parameter space induced by the Fisher information matrix (FIM). We show that the dominant Elastic Weight Consolidation (EWC) and its variants are a special case within this framework, using a diagonal approximation of the empirical FIM based on parameters from previous tasks. To overcome their limitations, we propose a new unbiased online curvature approximation of the full FIM based on the model’s current learning state. Our method directly estimates the regularization term in an online manner without explicitly evaluating and storing the FIM itself. This enables the model to better capture the loss landscape during learning new tasks while retaining the knowledge learned from previous tasks. Extensive experiments on three graph datasets demonstrate that our method significantly outperforms existing regularization-based methods, achieving a superior trade-off between stability (retaining old knowledge) and plasticity (acquiring new knowledge).

Introduction

Continual learning (CL), also known as lifelong learning or incremental learning, enables models to learn sequentially from a series of tasks to acquire new knowledge. A fundamental challenge inherent to CL is the plasticity-stability dilemma: a crucial trade-off between adapting to new information (plasticity) and preserving previously acquired knowledge (stability). The most prominent consequence is catastrophic forgetting, where a model, upon learning new tasks, suffers from rapid performance degradation on tasks learned earlier. This challenge is coupled with the issue of loss of plasticity (sometimes termed intransigence), indicating the model’s diminished capacity to effectively learn new tasks. These difficulties are rooted in the general optimization procedures of neural networks. During training on a specific task, model parameters are optimized to map the task’s input distribution to its target outputs. When learning a new task, gradient-based optimization methods, without any constraints, would naturally adjust the learned parameters to minimize the loss with respect to the new task, often

overwriting the knowledge critical for previous tasks.

To address these inherent challenges, several lines of research have been explored in the last decade. These broadly include: (i) *replay-based methods*, which store and replay old data (or synthetically generated proxy data) from a memory buffer (Caccia et al. 2020; Chrysakis and Moens 2020; Knoblauch, Husain, and Diethe 2020; Lopez-Paz and Ranzato 2017; Shin et al. 2017); (ii) *architecture-based methods*, which dynamically increase network capacity or isolate parameters for new tasks (Rusu et al. 2016; Wortsman et al. 2020; Wu et al. 2019; Yoon et al. 2019, 2018); and (iii) *regularization-based methods*, which impose constraints on parameter updates to preserve knowledge crucial for previous tasks (Aljundi et al. 2018; Kirkpatrick et al. 2017; Li and Hoiem 2018; Ritter, Botev, and Barber 2018a; Saha, Garg, and Roy 2021; Zenke, Poole, and Ganguli 2017). While each offers advantages, they also present trade-offs, such as memory overhead for replay, potentially unbounded model growth for architecture-based approaches, or known limitations of regularization methods in balancing stability and plasticity in class-incremental settings (van de Ven, Tuytelaars, and Tolias 2022).

In this paper, we investigate the challenging **replay-free, class-incremental** setting of graph continual learning (GCL), where a model with a fixed capacity must learn from a new set of classes in each task without replaying from previous tasks. Although recent GCL research has predominantly focused on replay-based methods, which store and replay raw graph nodes (Zhou and Cao 2021), subgraphs (Zhang, Song, and Tao 2022b), or class prototypes (Niu et al. 2024), regularization-based GCL remains a significantly under-explored area. Our work directly address this critical gap. Our contributions are as follows. First, we establish a general regularization framework for GCL grounded in the geometry of the parameter space induced by the Fisher information matrix (FIM). We provide a principled way to estimate parameter importance and constrain their updates, balancing the tradeoff between stability (retaining old knowledge) and plasticity (acquiring new knowledge). We show that the widely used Elastic Weight Consolidation (EWC) (Kirkpatrick et al. 2017) and its variants are a special case of our proposed framework, by taking a diagonal approximation of the empirical FIM based on parameters from previous tasks. Second, we propose a novel method

that performs an unbiased online approximation of the FIM based on the current learning state, allowing the model to more accurately capture the loss landscape during learning a new task. Our proposed method directly estimates the FIM-based regularizer in an online manner without the need to explicitly evaluate and store the FIM itself. Third, through extensive experiments on three large-scale graph datasets, we demonstrate that our method achieves a more effective balance between stability and plasticity, outperforming existing regularization techniques.

Related Work

Continual learning originated in the field of computer vision to address catastrophic forgetting, where a neural network forgets previously learned knowledge upon training on new tasks. CL methods can be broadly grouped into three categories. *Replay-based methods* address catastrophic forgetting by allowing the model to revisit data information from previous tasks stored in a memory buffer. This is achieved by storing a subset of raw data (experience replay) (Aljundi et al. 2019; Caccia et al. 2020; Chrysakis and Moens 2020; Knoblauch, Husain, and Diethe 2020; Lopez-Paz and Ranzato 2017), or data representations from a generative model (generative replay) (Shin et al. 2017). The loss on replayed data is either directly added to the loss on the current data or used as a constraint to guide gradient updates (Lopez-Paz and Ranzato 2017). *Architecture-based methods* dynamically modify the model’s architecture to accommodate the learning of new tasks. They typically expand the network by adding new units or modules for each new task (Rusu et al. 2016; Wortsman et al. 2020; Wu et al. 2019; Yoon et al. 2019, 2018). This ensures that the knowledge from previous tasks is stored in dedicated parts of the model, preventing it from being overwritten. *Regularization-based methods* introduce a regularizer to the loss during learning a new task, which penalizes significant changes to parameters deemed important for previous tasks. These methods differ in how they estimate parameter importance.

Elastic Weight Consolidation (EWC) (Kirkpatrick et al. 2017) is a well-known regularization-based method that estimates the importance of parameters for previous tasks using a diagonal approximation of the empirical FIM. While the original paper does not specify implementation details for computing the diagonal FIM, subsequent works have adopted different implementations (van de Ven 2025). For example, some methods compute the squared gradients for each sample’s true label with respect to old parameters (Chaudhry et al. 2019), while others use a randomly sampled label to provide a better approximation (Kao et al. 2021; van de Ven, Tuytelaars, and Tolias 2022). Despite its prominence, EWC has several limitations. First, by taking a diagonal approximation of the empirical FIM, it ignores important correlations between parameters. Second, EWC requires to store a separate FIM for each previous task, resulting in memory overhead. Third, EWC calculates its diagonal FIM based on the model’s parameters from a previous task, which might not be the optimal point when drifts occur during the learning of new tasks.

To improve memory efficiency and scalability,

EWC++ (Chaudhry et al. 2019) and online EWC (Schwarz et al. 2018) maintains a decaying moving average of the diagonal FIM as training over tasks progresses, instead of calculating a separate FIM for each task. However, they still rely on a diagonal approximation of the empirical FIM to remain computationally tractable. Synaptic Intelligence (SI) (Zenke, Poole, and Ganguli 2017) estimates parameter importance during training on a task by accumulating a per-parameter contribution to the decrease in the loss function and uses a first-order approximation to obtain the importance. It is not directly FIM-based but shares the spirit of importance weighting. Memory Aware Synapses (MAS) (Aljundi et al. 2018) estimates parameter importance by measuring the sensitivity of the output function (the gradients of the squared l_2 norm of the output) to changes in a parameter. Similar to EWC, both methods also compute per-parameter importance and overlook the correlations between parameters. LwF (Li and Hoiem 2018) is a functional regularization method that encourages the outputs of the new network to approximate those of the old one. A major limitation of LwF is its efficacy is diminished when tasks are dissimilar, making it inapplicable to class-incremental setting. Other studies (Ritter, Botev, and Barber 2018a) use more structured approximations of the FIM (or the Hessian) rather than just the diagonal, such as Kronecker-factored Approximate Curvature (K-FAC), which captures parameter interactions within a same network layer via a block-diagonal approximation of the FIM. However, it leads to significant computational overheads in terms of calculating and inverting two factor matrices and intensive memory cost. While K-FAC is used in optimization (Ritter, Botev, and Barber 2018b), its direct application to CL involving many tasks is limited due to these overheads.

Graph Continual Learning Graph continual learning (GCL) is a growing field that seeks to learn from a sequence of graph-based tasks (e.g., node classification). Replay-based methods are the most dominant strategy in GCL, using a memory buffer to revisit historical data when learning a new task. These methods differ in what they store and replay in the memory buffer. ERGNN (Zhou and Cao 2021) stores a selection of representative nodes from previous tasks. SSM (Zhang, Song, and Tao 2022b) replays sparsified subgraphs to better preserve structural information of previous graphs. To mitigate data imbalance between old and new tasks, Cat (Liu, Qiu, and Huang 2023) condenses each new graph into a smaller, structurally informative graph before adding it to the memory buffer. For privacy concerns, recent work like TPP (Niu et al. 2024) has shifted to replaying abstract class prototypes instead of raw graph data.

Architecture-based methods continually alter the model’s architecture to accommodate new graph information. For example, FGN (Wang et al. 2022) modifies the GCN architecture to handle the increasing number of nodes in a streaming graph. PI-GNN (Zhang et al. 2023) expands model parameters to learn new patterns within unstable subgraphs while preventing stable parameters from being rewritten.

In contrast, regularization-based GCL remains a relatively under-explored area. Most efforts directly apply clas-

sic CL regularization methods like EWC (Kirkpatrick et al. 2017) and LwF (Li and Hoiem 2018) without careful scrutiny (Zhang, Song, and Tao 2022a). TWP (Liu, Yang, and Wang 2021) extends EWC by further penalizing updates to parameters important for preserving the topological structure learned from previous tasks. However, its use of global gradients for calculating parameter importance fails to capture the localized topological information. Our work focuses on developing a novel principled regularization framework for GCL. It can be orthogonally combined with methods from other GCL categories to further mitigate forgetting.

Problem Formulation

We denote an undirected graph by $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}, \mathbf{X})$, where \mathcal{V} denotes a set of nodes, and \mathcal{E} denotes a set of edges that connect pairs of nodes. $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{V}| \times d}$ denotes the node feature matrix, where each node v is associated with a feature vector $\mathbf{x}_v \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Let $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{V}| \times |\mathcal{V}|}$ denote the graph adjacent matrix, where $\mathbf{A}(i, j) \in \{0, 1\}$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{A}}$ denote a normalized graph adjacency matrix with self-loops.

Graph continual learning (GCL) addresses the problem of learning from a sequence of continually incoming graph-based tasks $\{\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2, \dots, \mathcal{T}_T\}$. Each task $\mathcal{T}_t = (\mathcal{G}_t, \mathcal{Y}_t)$ in the sequence is defined as a semi-supervised node classification task, where $\mathcal{G}_t = (\mathcal{V}_t, \mathcal{E}_t, \mathbf{X}_t)$ denotes a newly emerging subgraph with the node set \mathcal{V}_t , the edge set \mathcal{E}_t , and the node feature matrix $\mathbf{X}_t \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{V}_t| \times d}$. Formally, each task is associated with a set of labeled training nodes $\mathcal{V}_t^{\text{train}}$ and a set of unlabeled test nodes $\mathcal{V}_t^{\text{test}}$. Each training node $v \in \mathcal{V}_t^{\text{train}}$ has a corresponding class label $y_v \in \mathcal{Y}_t$, where \mathcal{Y}_t is the set of classes for task \mathcal{T}_t . We consider the class-incremental learning setting, where the class sets of different tasks are disjoint, i.e., $\mathcal{Y}_t \cap \mathcal{Y}_{t'} = \emptyset$ for all $t \neq t'$. The model must learn to classify nodes from a growing set of total classes $\mathcal{Y} = \bigcup_{t=1}^T \mathcal{Y}_t$. The goal is to train a single continual learning model \mathcal{M} parameterized by θ that can perform node classification on all tasks seen so far. At each step t , the model \mathcal{M}_t is updated sequentially during learning the current task \mathcal{T}_t . After training on task \mathcal{T}_t , the performance of the model is evaluated on the test sets from all observed tasks up to the point t : $\bigcup_{i=1}^t \mathcal{V}_i^{\text{test}}$. In this work, we focus on the challenging setting of class-incremental learning in a fixed-capacity model, without relying on replaying raw graph data or representations from previous tasks.

FIM-based Regularization Framework

Consider a graph convolutional network (GCN) (Kipf and Welling 2017) as the backbone for node classification, its network architecture is specified by the following layer-wise equations:

$$\mathbf{X}^0 = [\mathbf{X} \ \mathbf{1}]; \quad \mathbf{X}^l = [\sigma(\mathbf{H}^l) \ \mathbf{1}] \quad (l = 1, \dots, L-1);$$

$$\mathbf{H}^{l+1} = \tilde{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{X}^l \tilde{\mathbf{W}}^l,$$

where \mathbf{X} is the input node feature matrix, $\mathbf{1}$ is a vector of 1's, \mathbf{H}^l is the pre-activation in the l 'th layer, σ is a non-linear activation function, \mathbf{X}^l is the extended activation, which is the activation of the hidden layer outputs augmented by the

scalar 1, and $\tilde{\mathbf{W}}^l$ is the concatenation of the weight matrix \mathbf{W}^l with the bias vector \mathbf{b}^l . Given the input features \mathbf{X} and the corresponding labels \mathbf{Y} , the conditional likelihood is given by $p(\mathbf{Y} | \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{A}, \theta) = \text{Categorical}(\text{SoftMax}(\mathbf{H}^L))$, where $\theta = \{\tilde{\mathbf{W}}^l\}_{l=1}^{L-1}$ denotes all learnable parameters of the GCN, $\text{SoftMax}(\mathbf{H}^L)$ applies softmax row-wise to the last layer's pre-activation \mathbf{H}^L , $\text{Categorical}(\cdot)$ means categorical probability masses given by each row of the parameter matrix. For a node classification task, the model is trained by maximizing the conditional likelihood, which is equivalent to minimizing a loss function $\ell(\theta)$ between the predicted probabilities and the true labels.

We formulate a general regularization framework for continual learning, which aims to minimize the regularized loss on the LHS of

$$\ell(\theta) + \lambda \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} D_f(\theta_t; \theta) \approx \ell(\theta) + \lambda \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} (\theta_t - \theta)^\top \mathcal{I}(\bar{\theta}) (\theta_t - \theta), \quad (1)$$

where ℓ is the classification loss (in our case the cross entropy loss), $\lambda > 0$ is the regularization strength, and D_f is the f -divergence between two GCN parameter distributions, θ_t from a previous task and θ locally at the current task. Under regularity conditions (Blyth 1994), regardless of the choice of D_f , the regularizer can be written as the RHS, where $\bar{\theta}$ is a point in between θ and θ_t , and $\mathcal{I}(\theta)$ is the FIM given by

$$\mathcal{I}_{ij}(\theta) := \mathbb{E}_p \left(\frac{\partial \Lambda}{\partial \theta_i} \frac{\partial \Lambda}{\partial \theta_j} \right) = \sum_{v \in \mathcal{V}} \mathbb{E}_p \left(\frac{\partial \Lambda_v}{\partial \theta_i} \frac{\partial \Lambda_v}{\partial \theta_j} \right), \quad (2)$$

with $\Lambda(\theta) := \log p(\mathbf{Y} | \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{A}, \theta)$ and $\Lambda_v(\theta) := \log p(\mathbf{y}_v | \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{A}, \theta)$. The FIM $\mathcal{I}(\theta)$ measures the local curvature of the log-likelihood Λ with respect to infinitesimal variations in the parameter space. For all $v \in \mathcal{V}$, \mathbf{y}_v and Λ_v only depend on a subgraph \mathcal{R}_v that is the receptive field of node v , and \mathbf{y}_v is conditional independent given all input features \mathbf{X} and the graph \mathbf{A} . The approximation in eq. (1) is only accurate when θ and θ_t are close enough. In practice, θ and θ_t are distant especially for old tasks learned long time ago, and higher order terms of D_f come into play making the approximation inaccurate.

Elastic Weight Consolidation (EWC)

In eq. (1), choosing $\bar{\theta} = \theta_t$ and taking the diagonal of the empirical FIM leads to Elastic Weight Consolidation (EWC) (Kirkpatrick et al. 2017; Huszár 2018). EWC mitigates catastrophic forgetting by selectively penalizing changes to parameters that are important to previous tasks. This is achieved by adding a quadratic regularizer to the loss function of the current task, where the penalty for changing each parameter is weighted by its corresponding diagonal element of the empirical FIM estimated from a previous task.

In EWC, the diagonal of the empirical FIM, denoted as $\mathcal{I}_{ii}(\theta)$, is calculated and stored after completing each task and before starting a new task. A common method is to compute the expected squared gradients using each node's true

label with respect to parameters θ_t :

$$\mathcal{I}_{ii}(\theta) = \sum_{v \in \mathcal{V}_t} \left(\frac{\partial \Lambda_v}{\partial \theta_i} \Big|_{\theta=\theta_t} \right)^2. \quad (\text{EWC})$$

This method is advocated by Chaudhry et al. (2019) to implement EWC for computational efficiency. An alternative is to use a label randomly sampled from predicted probabilities to compute the squared gradients with respect to the parameters θ_t (Liu et al. 2018; Kao et al. 2021).

Motivation

It is important to investigate the rank of the FIM $\mathcal{I}(\theta)$, which quantifies the amount of information captured by the classifier θ : Specifically, it measures how many independent ways of local parameter variations can lead to different models.

Proposition 1. *Given \mathbf{X} and \mathbf{A} , $\text{rank}(\mathcal{I}(\theta))$ is monotonically non-decreasing as \mathcal{V} grows.*

In consequence, as new tasks are learned, $\text{rank}(\mathcal{I}(\theta))$ with respect to all nodes that the classifier has seen is monotonic, meaning that the classifier captures more and more information to distinguish nodes of different classes — which makes intuitive sense.

Based on our regularization framework, we propose to set $\bar{\theta} = \theta$, i.e., the model parameters that are being updated in the current task, and correspondingly, to use $\mathcal{I}(\theta)$ to measure the squared distance between θ and θ_t in eq. (1). This is because θ is more recently learned and $\mathcal{I}(\theta)$ has higher rank by theorem 1 — it thus incorporates more information, enabling a more accurate modeling of the regularizer.

Choosing $\bar{\theta} = \theta$ is more reasonable through theoretical lens of information geometry (Amari 2016). Consider a simplified scenario of class-incremental learning, where the first task is associated with classes 1 and 2, and the second task is associated with classes 3 and 4. The prediction $p(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x}, \theta_1)$ after learning the first task is either class 1 or class 2. The learning result denoted as θ_1 is on the edge of the probability simplex $\{(p_1, p_2, p_3, p_4)\}$, where p_1, p_2, p_3 and p_4 denote probabilities of class 1 to 4, respectively. During training the second task, the parameter θ has information regarding all 4 classes and is therefore *inside* the probability simplex. To compute the distance between θ and θ_1 , it is more reasonable to use $\mathcal{I}(\theta)$ (FIM at the interior point) which is less singular and more informative.

This is also due to the settings of continual learning: we have access to more information regarding the loss landscape at the current task rather than from the historical tasks, where training nodes and graph structure are no longer accessible. We can therefore more accurately model $\mathcal{I}(\theta)$ and consider its non-diagonal entries.

Besides its theoretical advantages, our method offers practical benefits. Unlike EWC, which requires storing historical FIMs from previous tasks, we only need to store the learned parameter θ_t from each previous task. Practically, we recompute the FIM $\mathcal{I}(\theta)$ in an *online* manner based on the most recent θ in the current task.

Our Proposed Method

As it is costly to compute the sum over $v \in \mathcal{V}$ with a full-batch training of GCNs on large graphs, our method is built upon sampling-based GCNs (Hamilton, Ying, and Leskovec 2017), which are optimized using stochastic gradient descent (SGD). For each batch \mathcal{B} , the FIM can be approximated by the random matrix: $\hat{\mathcal{I}}_{ij}^{\mathcal{B}}(\theta) = \sum_{v \in \mathcal{B}} \left(\frac{\partial \hat{\Lambda}_v}{\partial \theta_i} \frac{\partial \hat{\Lambda}_v}{\partial \theta_j} \right)$, where $\hat{\Lambda}_v = \log p(\hat{y}_v | \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{A}, \theta)$ is the log-likelihood of $\hat{y}_v \sim p(y_v | \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{A}, \theta)$, a random sample of node v 's label based on the current predictive model and node features (\hat{y}_v is independent to node v 's given label), and \mathcal{B} is a random batch of nodes. It is straightforward to verify that $\mathbb{E}(\hat{\mathcal{I}}_{ij}^{\mathcal{B}}(\theta)) = \mathcal{I}_{ij}(\theta)$ and the random matrix gives an unbiased estimate of the FIM. If the batch size $|\mathcal{B}|$ is large enough, $\hat{\mathcal{I}}^{\mathcal{B}}(\theta)$ is close to $\mathcal{I}(\theta)$. Using this approximation, we propose to directly compute the regularizer without explicitly evaluating the FIM:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}(\theta) &= \frac{\lambda}{2} \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} (\theta - \theta_t)^\top \hat{\mathcal{I}}^{\mathcal{B}}(\theta) (\theta - \theta_t), \\ &= \frac{\lambda}{2} \sum_{v \in \mathcal{B}} \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} \left(\left(\frac{\partial \hat{\Lambda}_v}{\partial \theta} \right)^\top (\theta - \theta_t) \right)^2. \quad (\text{Ours}) \end{aligned}$$

The regularizer is *not* quadratic because $\frac{\partial \hat{\Lambda}_v}{\partial \theta}$ is a function of θ . The gradient of $\frac{\partial \hat{\Lambda}_v}{\partial \theta}$ depends on the Hessian of $\hat{\Lambda}_v$. However, for the ease of implementation, we can consider $\frac{\partial \hat{\Lambda}_v}{\partial \theta}$ at the current learning step, denoted as $\theta = \theta_\tau$, as constant and still apply a quadratic regularizer.

Hence, the loss of the current batch \mathcal{B} is $\ell_{\mathcal{B}}(\theta) = \sum_{v \in \mathcal{B}} \ell_v(\theta) + \mathcal{R}(\theta)$, where ℓ_v is the classification loss of node v . By a slight abuse of notation, we use $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_{\tau-1}$ to denote the learned parameter values from previous tasks, but use θ_τ to denote the parameter that is still being updated in the current task. By the definition of \mathcal{R} , the gradient of $\ell_{\mathcal{B}}$ with respect to θ is

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_{\theta} &= \sum_{v \in \mathcal{B}} \left[\frac{\partial \ell_v}{\partial \theta} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \lambda \sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} \left(\frac{\partial \hat{\Lambda}_v}{\partial \theta} \Big|_{\theta=\theta_t} \right)^\top (\theta - \theta_t) \frac{\partial \hat{\Lambda}_v}{\partial \theta} \Big|_{\theta=\theta_\tau} \right], \quad (3) \end{aligned}$$

which is usually evaluated at $\theta = \theta_\tau$, the current parameter value, depending on the optimizer.

Proposition 2. *The regularizer \mathcal{R} is an unbiased estimate of the regularizer (the second term) on the RHS of eq. (1) up to scaling.*

Remark. *As an unbiased estimate, \mathcal{R} utilizes the full FIM $\mathcal{I}(\theta)$ rather than its (block-)diagonal approximations. This is a key theoretical advantage over EWC, which is limited to the diagonal FIM. The computational and storage complexity of the full FIM is effectively circumvented based on its low-rank random approximation.*

The proposed regularizer makes intuitive sense. Observe that the gradient is a linear combination of $\frac{\partial \Lambda_v}{\partial \theta}$ and $\frac{\partial \hat{\Lambda}_v}{\partial \theta}$,

where $\frac{\partial \hat{\Lambda}_v}{\partial \theta}$ is the gradient of the nodes in the batch \mathcal{B} , and $\frac{\partial \hat{\Lambda}_v}{\partial \theta}$ is the gradient of node $v \in \mathcal{B}$ with an ‘‘imaginary’’ label \hat{y}_v (which could be different from y_v for multi-modal prediction associated with ambiguous nodes). Therefore, the regularization essentially augments the current batch of nodes with imaginary labels. One advantage of this ∇_{θ} is that it fully respects the gradient of an augmented batch of nodes, which may not be true for alternative regularizers.

The weights of these augmented nodes can be distinct for different $v \in \mathcal{B}$. There are two following cases:

1)

$$\left(\frac{\partial \hat{\Lambda}_v}{\partial \theta} \Big|_{\theta=\theta_\tau} \right)^\top (\theta_\tau - \theta_t) \geq 0,$$

which means the negative gradient w.r.t. the imaginary sample $-\frac{\partial \hat{\Lambda}_v}{\partial \theta} \Big|_{\theta=\theta_\tau}$ has an accurate angle with $\theta_t - \theta_\tau$, the vector pointing from θ_τ to the previous task t . The coefficient of $\frac{\partial \hat{\Lambda}_v}{\partial \theta}$ is positive, meaning that the imaginary sample contributes positively to the gradient computation, and learning encourages to going towards the previous parameter value θ_t ;

2)

$$\left(\frac{\partial \hat{\Lambda}_v}{\partial \theta} \Big|_{\theta=\theta_\tau} \right)^\top (\theta_\tau - \theta_t) < 0.$$

In this case, the coefficient of $\frac{\partial \hat{\Lambda}_v}{\partial \theta}$ is negative, meaning that the imaginary sample is a negative sample. Learning discourages to going away from the previous parameter value θ_t . This makes intuitive sense.

Algorithm Implementation

For implementation, we first perform a forward pass of the current batch of nodes to compute the classification loss $\ell_{\mathcal{B}} = \sum_{v \in \mathcal{B}} \ell_v$, which is the sum of the per-sample loss. We then run a backward pass to calculate the gradient of the loss $\frac{\partial \ell_{\mathcal{B}}}{\partial \theta} = \sum_{v \in \mathcal{B}} \frac{\partial \ell_v}{\partial \theta}$. To compute the gradient of the regularizer, we sample a label $\hat{y}_v \sim \text{Multinomial}(\text{softmax}(c_v^L))$ independently for each $v \in \mathcal{B}$, where c_v^L is the output logits before applying softmax. Then, we run a second backward pass to compute the gradient $\frac{\partial \hat{\Lambda}_v}{\partial \theta}$, which is a $|\mathcal{B}| \times \dim(\theta)$ matrix, or the Jacobian matrix of the mapping $\theta \rightarrow \hat{\Lambda}_v$ (the vector by concatenating all $\hat{\Lambda}_v$ for $v \in \mathcal{B}$), given by

$$\frac{\partial \Lambda_{\mathcal{B}}'}{\partial \theta} = \sum_{v \in \mathcal{B}} \left[\sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} \left(\frac{\partial \hat{\Lambda}_v}{\partial \theta} \right)^\top (\theta - \theta_t) \right] \cdot \frac{\partial \hat{\Lambda}_v}{\partial \theta},$$

where we get $|\mathcal{B}|$ coefficients to linearly combine the rows of the matrix $\frac{\partial \hat{\Lambda}_v}{\partial \theta}$. Finally, the gradient of the loss plus the regularizer is

$$\nabla_{\theta} = \frac{\partial \ell_{\mathcal{B}}}{\partial \theta} + \lambda \frac{\partial \Lambda_{\mathcal{B}}'}{\partial \theta}.$$

The above gradient ∇_{θ} can then be fed into the optimizer to update model parameters θ . Therefore, two backward passes are required to compute the gradient of the regularized loss.

Algorithm 1 Unbiased Online Curvature Approximation

Input: A sequence of tasks $\mathcal{T} = \{\mathcal{T}_1, \dots, \mathcal{T}_T\}$, a queue \mathcal{Q} of size M , learning rate α , hyperparameter β

Output: A GNN $f_{\theta_\tau}(\cdot)$

```

1: for  $t = 1, \dots, T$  do
2:    $\mathcal{Q} = \emptyset$ ,
3:   for epoch = 1, ...,  $K$  do
4:     if  $t = 1$  then
5:       // initial training on  $\mathcal{T}_1$ 
6:       Compute the loss  $\ell_{\mathcal{B}} = \sum_{v \in \mathcal{B}} \ell_v$ 
7:     else
8:       // Incremental training on  $\mathcal{T}_{t>1}$ 
9:       Randomly sample one node  $v \in \mathcal{B}$ 
10:      Randomly sample  $\hat{y}_v$  and compute  $\hat{\Lambda}_v$ 
11:      Compute the gradient  $\frac{\partial \hat{\Lambda}_v}{\partial \theta}$ 
12:      if  $|\mathcal{Q}| > M$  then
13:         $\mathcal{Q}.\text{pop}()$ 
14:      end if
15:       $\mathcal{Q}.\text{push}(\frac{\partial \hat{\Lambda}_v}{\partial \theta})$ 
16:      Compute the regularized loss  $\ell_{\mathcal{B}}$  using eq. (4)
17:    end if
18:     $\ell_{\mathcal{B}}.\text{backward}()$ 
19:     $\theta \leftarrow \theta - \alpha \frac{\partial \ell_{\mathcal{B}}}{\partial \theta}$ 
20:  end for
21:  // exponential moving average
22:   $\theta_t \leftarrow \beta \theta_{t-1} + (1 - \beta) \theta$ 
23: end for

```

The primary computational overhead is the additional backward pass required to compute the gradient of the regularizer $\frac{\partial \hat{\Lambda}_v}{\partial \theta}$ for each batch. To improve efficiency, we propose a gradient caching strategy, which maintains a queue \mathcal{Q} to store M gradient vectors, representing $\frac{\partial \hat{\Lambda}_v}{\partial \theta}$ in the recent optimization steps (‘‘near’’ the current θ). The queue is initialized as empty at the start of each new task and is updated throughout the model’s training process. For each batch \mathcal{B} , we first perform a forward pass for all nodes in the batch. We then randomly sample a node $v \in \mathcal{B}$ and accordingly sample a label \hat{y} . A backward pass is thereafter executed to compute the gradient $\frac{\partial \hat{\Lambda}_v}{\partial \theta}$. This new gradient is pushed to the end of the queue. If the queue reaches its maximum size M , the front element is popped before enqueueing the new gradient vector. This method allows the model to reuse previously computed gradients stored in the queue across batches and avoid a full second backward pass on every batch, thus significantly improving computational efficiency.

Based on the GCN and gradient vectors stored in \mathcal{Q} , the total loss for each batch can be computed as:

$$\ell_{\mathcal{B}} = \sum_{v \in \mathcal{B}} \ell_v + \frac{\lambda}{2|\mathcal{Q}|} \sum_{v \in \mathcal{Q}} \left[\sum_{t=1}^{\tau-1} \left(\frac{\partial \hat{\Lambda}_v}{\partial \theta} \right)^\top (\theta - \theta_{t-1}) \right]^2. \quad (4)$$

Then, the gradients $\frac{\partial \hat{\Lambda}_v}{\partial \theta}$ are obtained via $\ell_{\mathcal{B}}.\text{backward}()$, and fed to the optimizer to update model parameters.

Table 1: Performance comparison with baseline methods on CoraFull, Arxiv, and Coauthor-CS.

Methods	CoraFull		Arxiv		Coauthor-CS	
	AP↑	AF↑	AP↑	AF↑	AP↑	AF↑
EWC _{empirical}	18.19	-86.91	11.01	-72.44	19.84	-95.72
EWC _{sample}	17.78	-85.02	12.48	-76.88	20.05	-95.29
EWC _{pred}	18.10	-84.89	12.21	-75.89	23.64	-91.13
Online EWC ($\gamma = 1$)	18.07	-84.68	12.50	-74.52	19.72	-95.92
Online EWC ($\gamma = 0.95$)	17.80	-85.16	12.30	-76.02	19.69	-95.94
MAS	18.27	-84.01	10.81	-70.16	46.30	-61.73
LwF	18.38	-87.53	11.67	-76.31	31.92	-80.11
TWP	18.04	-87.27	11.06	-72.54	21.26	-93.80
Ours	46.93	-8.70	12.46	-1.94	34.55	-60.18
Ours (w/o EMA)	45.59	-43.01	11.63	-6.04	27.16	-78.2

After completing training on each task, we also apply an exponential moving average (EMA) to further mitigate catastrophic forgetting. The parameters are updated as:

$$\theta_t \leftarrow \beta \theta_{t-1} + (1 - \beta) \theta,$$

where θ denotes the newly learned parameters for the current task, θ_{t-1} denotes the parameters stored from the previous task, and β is a hyperparameter. The resulting parameter θ_t is stored to initialize the next task. The training procedure of our proposed algorithm is summarized in Algorithm 1.

Experiments

Experimental Setup

Datasets Three large graph datasets are used: CoraFull (Andrew Kachites McCallum and Seymore 2000), Arxiv¹ (Weihua Hu and Leskovec 2020), and Coauthor-CS (Shchur et al. 2018), for the task of node classification. For all datasets, the model is trained sequentially on all tasks and evaluated on test sets for all learned tasks. For each class, we allocate 60% of the nodes for training, 20% for validation, and 20% for testing. Please see supplementary material for task configuration tasks.

Table 2: Statistics of three benchmark datasets.

Datasets	CoraFull	Arxiv	Coauthor-CS
# Nodes	17,407	168,391	18,333
# Edges	92,221	972,962	154,837
# Classes	45	36	15
# Tasks	5	6	5
# Classes per task	9	6	3
Avg # nodes per task	3,481	28,065	3,667
Avg # edges per task	18,444	162,160	30,967

Baselines For a fair comparison, we mainly compare our method against other regularization-based CL methods. All baselines operate under the same setting: using a fixed-capacity model without any form of replay. The detailed descriptions of these baselines are as follows:

- **EWC** (Kirkpatrick et al. 2017): We compare three implementations of EWC, which differ in how the loglikelihood is calculated: **EWC_{empirical}** uses each node’s true label (Liu et al. 2018), **EWC_{sample}** uses a label randomly sampled from predicted probabilities (Kao et al. 2021; van de Ven, Tuytelaars, and Tolias 2022), and **EWC_{pred}** uses the predicted label (van de Ven 2025).
- **Online EWC** (Schwarz et al. 2018; Chaudhry et al. 2019) as an additional baseline. Unlike EWC (Kirkpatrick et al. 2017), which stores a separate FIM for each previous task, Online EWC maintains a single decaying moving average of the diagonal FIM as training progresses over tasks. This process is controlled by a decay rate hyperparameter γ , where a larger value of γ places more weight on the FIM from previous tasks.
- **MAS** (Aljundi et al. 2018) measures the importance of parameters by the sensitivity of the learned function output to a parameter change.
- **LwF** (Li and Hoiem 2018) is minimizes the discrepancy between the logits of the old and new models.
- **TWP** (Liu, Yang, and Wang 2021) is a regularization method tailored to graph data that penalizes updates to parameters critical for preserving topological structure.

Evaluation Metrics For evaluation, we use two widely used metrics, average performance (AP) and average forgetting (AF) (Lopez-Paz and Ranzato 2017), measuring the plasticity and stability of the model. The definitions are given as follows:

$$AP_t = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^t M_{t,i}}{t}, \quad AF_t = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{t-1} (M_{t,i} - M_{i,i})}{t-1},$$

where $M_{t,i}$ denotes the prediction accuracy on task \mathcal{T}_i after the model has been trained on task \mathcal{T}_t ($t = 1, \dots, T$). For both metrics, the higher the better. Due to the inherent trade-off between AP and AF, both metrics should be taken into account in performance evaluation.

Implementation Details For all methods, we use a two-layer GCN as the backbone, with a hidden dimension of 256. Following the settings reported in the original papers,

¹<https://ogb.stanford.edu/docs/nodeprop/#ogbn-arxiv>




Figure 1: Performance heatmaps of the final model evaluated on all previous tasks for (a) CoraFull and (b) Author-CS.

the regularization strength λ is set to 10^9 , while λ_1 and λ_2 are both set to 10^4 with β set to 0.01 for TWP. For LwF, the lambda distance λ_{dist} is set to a range of $[1.0, 10.0]$, and temperature parameter T is specified as a range of $[2.0, 20.0]$. EWC and MAS both uses a memory strength of 10^4 . For Online EWC, We report the results using two γ values: $\gamma = 1$ and $\gamma = 0.95$ (the value suggested in the original work (Schwarz et al. 2018)). The regularization strength λ is set to 10^4 , the same as for EWC. These hyperparameters were carefully chosen to match the configurations from the respective original methods, ensuring consistency across experiments.

For our method, the hyperparameter β for EMA is set to 0.5. Adam is used as the optimizer with a learning rate of 0.00001 with a weight decay $5e-4$ and a batch size of 128. The queue size M is tuned in $\{32, 64, 128\}$ and the optimal value is found to be 128. All of the reported results are averaged over 3 runs with different random seeds. All models are implemented in PyTorch and trained on a single Tesla V100 GPU.

Main Results and Analyses

In Table 1, we compare our proposed method with existing regularization-based CL methods for node classification on three graph datasets. Our method outperforms three EWC variants by a large margin, especially on CoraFull and Coauthor-CS. This affirms that our method provides a more accurate approximation of the full FIM compared to EWC’s diagonal approximation of the empirical FIM. Our method also significantly surpasses Online EWC on all datasets in terms of both AP and AF. We attribute this substantial performance gap to the limitations of the diagonal FIM approximation inherited by Online EWC, which fails to account for parameter correlations. Consequently, Online EWC is insufficient to accurately capture the true loss landscape, resulting in severe catastrophic forgetting despite its online design.

These empirical results support the theoretical advantage of our method in providing a more accurate and unbiased on-line FIM approximation (Proposition 2), thereby more effectively mitigating forgetting in a continual learning setting.

Furthermore, while TWP was specifically designed for graph data, its performance is comparable to traditional CL methods and substantially worse than our method. The ablation of the exponential moving average (**Ours (w/o EMA)**) leads a modest drop on AP but a significant drop on AF, highlighting its crucial role in mitigating catastrophic forgetting.

Figure 1 presents heatmap plots to compare the performance of a final model evaluated on all previous tasks on CoraFull and Coauthor-CS. These plots reveal two key observations: (1) The results clearly show the limitations of EWC. As seen across all datasets, EWC achieves near-zero accuracy on most previous tasks, indicating its ineffectiveness in mitigating catastrophic forgetting. This poor performance is due to its simplified approximation of the FIM, failing to adequately capture the true importance of model parameters. This finding resonates with the conclusions from (van de Ven, Tuytelaars, and Tolias 2022), which noted the inapplicability of existing regularization-based CL methods to class-incremental setting. (2) Our method demonstrates a significantly better ability to handle catastrophic forgetting. Built upon its theoretical advantages, our approach empirically retains high performance on previous tasks while maintaining strong accuracy on the current task. This indicates a more effective stability-plasticity balance under the challenging class-incremental setting, which is a significant improvement over existing regularization-based CL methods.

Effect of Regularization Strength

Figure 2 shows the performance of our method with varying regularization strengths λ . In contrast to methods like EWC and TWP, which typically require a large regulariza-

tion strength, our method performs optimally with a smaller value for λ . we tune the values of λ within $\{0.01, 0.1, 0.5\}$, and find that our method consistently achieves the best AP and AF when $\lambda = 0.1$ on all three datasets.




Figure 2: Effect of regularization strength λ .

Conclusion

We established a general FIM-based regularization framework for graph continual learning, addressing the challenging replay-free, class-incremental setting with a fixed model capacity. We theoretically show that our method improves upon classic regularization methods like EWC by using an unbiased, online FIM approximation that more accurately models the loss landscape without the memory overhead of storing historical FIMs. Experiments on three graph datasets demonstrated that our method outperforms existing regularization-based CL methods. Future work will investigate how our regularization method could be integrated with GCL methods from other categories.

References

Aljundi, R.; Babiloni, F.; Elhoseiny, M.; Rohrbach, M.; and Tuytelaars, T. 2018. Memory Aware Synapses: Learning What (not) to Forget. In *ECCV*, 144–161.

Aljundi, R.; Lin, M.; Goujaud, B.; and Bengio, Y. 2019. Gradient based Sample Selection for Online Continual Learning. In *NeurIPS*, volume 32, 11816–11825.

Amari, S. 2016. *Information Geometry and Its Applications*, volume 194 of *Applied Mathematical Sciences*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin.

Andrew Kachites McCallum, J. R., Kamal Nigam; and Seymore, K. 2000. Automating the construction of internet portals with machine learning. volume 3, 127–163.

Blyth, S. 1994. Local Divergence and Association. *Biometrika*, 81(3): 579–584.

Caccia, L.; Belilovsky, E.; Caccia, M.; and Pineau, J. 2020. Online Learned Continual Compression with Adaptive Quantization Modules. In *ICML*, 1240–1250. PMLR.

Chaudhry, A.; Dokania, P. K.; Ajanthan, T.; and Torr, P. H. S. 2019. Riemannian Walk for Incremental Learning: Understanding Forgetting and Intransigence. In *ECCV*, 532–547.

Chrysakis, A.; and Moens, M.-F. 2020. Online Continual Learning from Imbalanced Data. In *ICML*, 1952–1961. PMLR.

Hamilton, W. L.; Ying, R.; and Leskovec, J. 2017. Inductive Representation Learning on Large Graphs. In *NeurIPS*, 1025–1035.

Huszár, F. 2018. On Quadratic Penalties in Elastic Weight Consolidation. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 115(11).

Kao, T.-C.; Jensen, K. T.; van de Ven, G. M.; Bernacchia, A.; and Hennequin, G. 2021. Natural Continual Learning: Success is a Journey, not (just) a Destination. In *NeurIPS*, 28067–28079.

Kipf, T. N.; and Welling, M. 2017. Semi-Supervised Classification with Graph Convolutional Networks. In *ICLR*.

Kirkpatrick, J.; Pascanu, R.; Rabinowitz, N.; Veness, J.; Desjardins, G.; Rusu, A. A.; Milan, K.; Quan, J.; Ramalho, T.; Grabska-Barwinska, A.; Hassabis, D.; Clopath, C.; Kumaran, D.; and Hadsell, R. 2017. Overcoming Catastrophic Forgetting in Neural Networks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 114(13): 3521–3526.

Knoblauch, J.; Husain, H.; and Diethe, T. 2020. Optimal Continual Learning has Perfect Memory and is NP-hard. In *ICML*, 5327–5337. PMLR.

Li, Z.; and Hoiem, D. 2018. Learning without Forgetting.

Liu, H.; Yang, Y.; and Wang, X. 2021. Overcoming Catastrophic Forgetting in Graph Neural Networks. In *AAAI*, 8653–8661.

Liu, X.; Masana, M.; Herranz, L.; Van de Weijer, J.; López, A. M.; and Bagdanov, A. D. 2018. Rotate your Networks: Better Weight Consolidation and Less Catastrophic Forgetting. In *ICPR*, 2262–2268.

Liu, Y.; Qiu, R.; and Huang, Z. 2023. CaT: Balanced Continual Graph Learning with Graph Condensation. In *ICDM*, 1157–1162.

Lopez-Paz, D.; and Ranzato, M. 2017. Gradient Episodic Memory for Continual Learning. In *NeurIPS*, 6467–6476.

Niu, C.; Pang, G.; Chen, L.; and Liu, B. 2024. Replay-and-forget-free graph class-incremental learning: a task profiling and prompting approach. In *NeurIPS*, 87978–88002.

Ritter, H.; Botev, A.; and Barber, D. 2018a. Online Structured Laplace Approximations For Overcoming Catastrophic Forgetting. In *NeurIPS*, 3742–3752.

Ritter, H.; Botev, A.; and Barber, D. 2018b. A Scalable Laplace Approximation for Neural Networks. In *ICLR*.

Rusu, A. A.; Rabinowitz, N. C.; Desjardins, G.; Soyer, H.; Kirkpatrick, J.; Kavukcuoglu, K.; Pascanu, R.; and Hadsell, R. 2016. Progressive Neural Networks. In *arXiv preprint arXiv:1606.04671*.

Saha, G.; Garg, I.; and Roy, K. 2021. Gradient Projection Memory for Continual Learning. In *ICLR*.

Schwarz, J.; Czarnecki, W. M.; Luketina, J.; Grabska-Barwinska, A.; Teh, Y. W.; Pascanu, R.; and Hadsell, R. 2018. Progress & Compress: A Scalable Framework for Continual Learning. In *ICML*, 4528–4537. PMLR.

Shchur, O.; Mumme, M.; Bojchevski, A.; and Günnemann, S. 2018. Pitfalls of Graph Neural Network Evaluation. *arXiv preprint*, arXiv: 1811.05868.

Shin, H.; Lee, J. K.; Kim, J.; and Kim, J. 2017. Continual Learning with Deep Generative Replay. In *NeurIPS*, volume 30, 2990–2999.

van de Ven, G. M. 2025. On the Computation of the Fisher Information in Continual Learning. *arXiv:2502.11756*.

van de Ven, G. M.; Tuytelaars, T.; and Tolias, A. S. 2022. Three Types of Incremental Learning. *Nature Machine Intelligence*, 4(11): 1185–1197.

Wang, C.; Qiu, Y.; Gao, D.; and Scherer, S. 2022. Lifelong Graph Learning. In *CVPR*, 13719–13728.

Weihua Hu, M. Z. Y. D. H. R. B. L. M. C., Matthias Fey; and Leskovec, J. 2020. Open graph benchmark: Datasets for machine learning on graphs. In *NeurIPS*, volume 33, 22118–22133.

Wortsman, M.; Ramanujan, V.; Liu, R.; Kembhavi, A.; Rastegari, M.; Yosinski, J.; and Farhadi, A. 2020. Supermasks in Superposition. volume 33, 15173–15184.

Wu, Y.; Chen, Y.; Wang, L.; Ye, Y.; Liu, Z.; Guo, Y.; and Fu, Y. 2019. Large Scale Incremental Learning. In *CVPR*, 374–382.

Yoon, J.; Kim, S.; Yang, E.; and Hwang, S. J. 2019. Scalable and Order-robust Continual Learning with Additive Parameter Decomposition. In *ICLR*.

Yoon, J.; Yang, E.; Lee, J.; and Hwang, S. J. 2018. Lifelong Learning with Dynamically Expandable Networks. In *ICLR*.

Zenke, F.; Poole, B.; and Ganguli, S. 2017. Continual Learning through Synaptic Intelligence. In *ICML*, 3987–3995.

Zhang, P.; Yan, Y.; Li, C.; Wang, S.; Xie, X.; Song, G.; and Kim, S. 2023. Continual Learning on Dynamic Graphs via Parameter Isolation. In *SIGIR*, 601–611. ACM.

Zhang, X.; Song, D.; and Tao, D. 2022a. CGLB: Benchmark Tasks for Continual Graph Learning. In *NeurIPS*, volume 35, 13006–13021.

Zhang, X.; Song, D.; and Tao, D. 2022b. Sparsified Subgraph Memory for Continual Graph Representation Learning. In *ICDM*, 1335–1340.

Zhou, F.; and Cao, C. 2021. Overcoming Catastrophic Forgetting in Graph Neural Networks with Experience Replay. In *AAAI*, 4714–4722.