

Task-Aware Adaptive Modulation: A Replay-Free and Resource-Efficient Approach For Continual Graph Learning

Jingtao Liu¹, Xinming Zhang^{1*}

¹ University of Science and Technology of China, China
jingt-liu@mail.ustc.edu.cn, xinming@ustc.edu.cn

Abstract

Continual Graph Learning (CGL) focuses on acquiring new knowledge while retaining previously learned information, essential for real-world graph applications. Current methods grapple with two main issues: 1) The Stability-Plasticity Dilemma: Replay-based methods often create an imbalance between the Dilemma, while incurring significant storage costs. 2) The Resource-Heavy Pre-training: Leading replay-free methods critically depend on extensively pre-trained backbones, this reliance imposes a substantial resource burden. In this paper, we argue that the key to overcoming these challenges lies not in replaying data or fine-tuning the entire network, but in dynamically modulating the internal computational flow of a frozen backbone. We posit that lightweight, task-specific modules can effectively steer a GNN’s reasoning process. Motivated by this insight, we propose **Task-Aware Adaptive Modulation (TAAM)**, a replay-free, resource-efficient approach that charts a new path for navigating the stability-plasticity dilemma. TAAM’s core is its **Neural Synapse Modulators (NSM)**, which are trained and then frozen for each task to store expert knowledge. A pivotal prototype-guided strategy governs these modulators: 1) For training, it initializes a new NSM by deep-copying from a similar past modulator to boost knowledge transfer. 2) For inference, it selects the most relevant frozen NSM for each task. These NSMs insert into a frozen GNN backbone to perform fine-grained, node-attentive modulation of its internal flow—different from the static perturbations of prior methods. Extensive experiments show that TAAM comprehensively outperforms state-of-the-art methods across six GCIL benchmark datasets. The code will be released upon acceptance of the paper.

Introduction

While Graph Neural Networks (GNNs) have demonstrated remarkable success on static graphs, real-world graph data is often dynamic and evolving. To address this, Continual Graph Learning (CGL) has become a key research field (Tian, Zhang, and Dai 2024), where models must learn from an evolving stream of tasks while retaining previously acquired knowledge (Figure 1, top). Among CGL paradigms, Graph Class-Incremental Learning (GCIL) presents a particularly challenging and practical frontier.

*Corresponding author




Figure 1: Top: A typical CGL scenario where a model must adapt to a stream of new tasks (indicated by new node colors) in an evolving graph. Bottom: An illustration of the Stability-Plasticity Dilemma on the Citeseer benchmark. While strong replay-based methods effectively mitigate the catastrophic forgetting of early tasks, they exhibit diminished plasticity.

Its core tenet is that task identifiers (IDs) are unavailable during inference, a scenario mirroring real-world applications like drug discovery, where new compound families emerge (Zhang, Song, and Tao 2022a), or social networks, where user communities evolve over time (Wang, Qiu, and Scherer 2020). This task-agnostic requirement introduces a dual challenge: first, overcoming catastrophic forgetting, and second, resolving the “inter-task class separation” problem—the difficulty of distinguishing between similar classes from different tasks without explicit context (Su et al. 2024).

To address these challenges, researchers have primarily explored three paradigms: regularization-based, replay-based, and parameter-isolation methods (Zhang, Song, and

Tao 2022a; Zhang et al. 2023). Replay-based approaches, which store and rehearse historical data, can effectively mitigate forgetting but introduce significant computational and storage overhead, along with potential data privacy risks. Critically, they face a fundamental trade-off between preserving old knowledge (stability) and acquiring new information (plasticity)(Figure 1, Bottom).In contrast, parameter-isolation methods offer a more direct path to overcoming forgetting. By dedicating distinct parameters to different tasks, these approaches structurally prevent knowledge interference (Zhang et al. 2023; Zhang, Song, and Tao 2021).

Recently, Prompt Learning has gained prominence as a parameter-efficient implementation of this idea, achieving great success in computer vision (Zhang, Song, and Tao 2022a; Zhang et al. 2023). This paradigm was quickly adapted to the graph domain (Liu et al. 2023b; Wang et al. 2025) with pioneering works like TPP inferring task IDs to condition a frozen GNN with small, learnable “graph prompts” (Niu et al. 2024). However, the success of this paradigm is underpinned by a significant cost—a “pre-training tax.” Its effectiveness critically hinges on a powerful, pre-trained GNN backbone to ensure knowledge transferability (Fang et al. 2022; Liu et al. 2023a). Furthermore, most graph prompting methods employ a single, universal prompt to modulate the model’s input or output, offering only coarse-grained control over the GNN’s internal computational flow and thus limiting its expressive and adaptive capacity (Niu et al. 2024). This dependency on pre-training is particularly burdensome in the graph domain. Unlike in NLP and vision, there is a lack of standardized, universal pre-trained GNNs, and aligning data across heterogeneous graph structures remains a formidable challenge (Hu et al. 2020; Tang et al. 2023).

This confluence of challenges motivates a fundamental research question: How can we design a CGL approach that effectively resolves the stability-plasticity dilemma without relying on data replay or an expensive, pre-trained model, thereby achieving truly resource-efficient graph continual learning?

In this paper, we tackle this challenge by rethinking how the stability-plasticity trade-off can be managed in a resource-efficient, repaly-free context. Our approach maintains stability by leveraging a frozen GNN backbone and encapsulating task-specific knowledge within lightweight modulators. The key to unlocking plasticity, we argue, lies not in expensive pre-training, but in intelligently recycling knowledge from the model’s own past experiences. We posit that new tasks can be learned far more effectively by building upon the foundations of the most relevant prior knowledge.

To this end, we introduce Task-Aware Adaptive Modulation (TAAM), a repaly-free and resource-efficient approach that it employs lightweight Neural Synapse Modulators (NSM), these modules inserted into a frozen GNN to steer a GNN’s reasoning process. These NSMs is governed by a pivotal prototype-guided strategy:For training,instead of initializing each new task’s modulator from a blank slate, TAAM facilitates targeted knowledge transfer, using parameters from the most analogous past task as a power-

ful “warm start.”Once initialized, these modulators perform fine-grained, node-attentive modulation of the GNN’s internal computational flow. For inference, it selects the most relevant frozen NSM for each task input and the modulated output are then handled by a unified linear classifier, which is kept frozen and can be extended with new class parameters, thereby preventing catastrophic forgetting at the decision layer. Ultimately, TAAM achieves a superior stability-plasticity balance.We summarize our main contributions as follows.

- We propose TAAM, a novel CGL approach that simultaneously eliminates the reliance on data replay and model Pre-training.Through a novel prototype-guided strategy to guide both the creation of new task modulators and the selection of existing experts, the forward transmission of knowledge can be achieved without forgetting.
- We design NSM, a dynamic and node-attentive mechanism. These adaptive modulators effectively encapsulate task-specific knowledge, offering a more fine-grained and expressive modulation of the GNN’s internal representations compared to static, general prompting techniques.
- We conduct extensive experiments on six GCIL benchmark datasets. Our results demonstrate that TAAM, even when using a randomly initialized GNN backbone, comprehensively and significantly outperforms existing state-of-the-art methods, validating the effectiveness and generalization capability of our approach.

Related Works

Replay-based Methods. A dominant paradigm in Continual Graph Learning (CGL) is the use of replay-based methods, which maintain a memory buffer of representative exemplars from past tasks. During training on a new task, these stored exemplars are rehearsed alongside the new data, mitigating catastrophic forgetting through joint optimization (Liu, Qiu, and Huang 2023; Liu et al. 2024; Zhang, Song, and Tao 2022b; Zhang et al. 2024). The sophistication of what is stored has evolved, from representative nodes (Zhou and Cao 2021a) to more complex structures. For instance, CaT (Liu, Qiu, and Huang 2023) and PUMA (Liu et al. 2024) focus on graph condensation techniques to create small, synthetic graphs for replay. Others compress topological information, either by storing sparsified computation subgraphs (SSM (Zhang, Song, and Tao 2022b)) or by decoupling the model from the graph via compressed topology-aware embeddings (PDGNNs (Zhang et al. 2024)). While these methods often demonstrate strong performance, their reliance on storing and re-processing historical data introduces significant computational and memory overhead, along with potential data privacy concerns.

Prompt Learning and Parameter-Efficient Methods. An alternative direction is rooted in Parameter-Efficient Transfer Learning (PETL), a paradigm where large pre-trained models are adapted to new tasks by updating only a small subset of parameters. Representative methods like Adapters achieve this by inserting lightweight modules be-




Figure 2: Overview of TAAM framework. TAAM is inserted the frozen GNN backbone, to steer a GNN’s reasoning process in stream of graph data. The diagram illustrates the prototype-guided strategy of TAAM. Training Phase: For a new graph task \mathcal{G}^k , a corresponding prototype P^k is extracted. This P^k is used to query the bank of existing frozen Neural Synapse Modulators (NSM) to find the most similar past task. The parameters from the selected modulator and the P^k are then used to initialize the new NSM_k . After training is complete, NSM_k is frozen and added to the TAAM module bank. Inference Phase: For test task \mathcal{G}_t^k , the prototype strategy used its prototype P_t^k selects the most relevant “expert” NSM from the bank.

tween the layers of a backbone network to reduce fine-tuning costs (Houlsby et al. 2019; Gao et al. 2024).

Building on this foundation, prompt learning has emerged as a leading PETL technique. It guides a model’s behavior for specific tasks by injecting learnable “prompts,” and is widely adopted for its excellent few-shot and transferability performance under the “pre-train, prompt, predict” framework (Liu et al. 2021). Inspired by its success, researchers have recently extended this paradigm to Graph Neural Networks (GNNs). For instance, UPT conditions a frozen GNN on structural prompts to enhance few-shot and cross-domain performance (Fang et al. 2022), while GraphPrompt unifies pre-training and downstream tasks through a shared interface to improve generalization (Liu et al. 2023b). Other works like TPP infers task IDs to select the appropriate task-specific prompt for conditioning the GNN (Niu et al. 2024).

Although these methods achieve impressive parameter-efficient knowledge transfer, their effectiveness critically hinges on the existence of a powerful, resource-heavy pre-trained backbone. This “pre-training tax” is particularly burdensome in the graph domain, where universal, foundational GNNs are not readily available. This limitation motivates our research into a new paradigm that delivers the efficiency of parameter isolation without the prerequisite of pre-training.

Preliminaries

Graph Neural Networks. A GNN computes the hidden representation for a node $h_i^{(l)}$ at a given layer l by aggregating features from its neighbors $\mathcal{N}(i)$. (Kipf and Welling 2016)

This process is generally defined by applying a transformation matrix $\mathbf{W}^{(l)}$ and a non-linear activation function $\sigma(\cdot)$:

$$h_i^{(l)} = \sigma \left(\sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}(i)} \mathcal{A}_{ij} h_j^{(l-1)} \mathbf{W}^{(l)} \right) \quad (1)$$

Here, \mathcal{A} is a matrix defining the aggregation strategy, and $h_i^{(0)}$ is the initial node feature.

SGC (Wu et al. 2019) streamlines the GNN architecture by removing intermediate non-linear activation functions. This decouples the model into two distinct stages:

1. *Linear Feature Propagation:* The initial node features \mathbf{X} are aggregated over a K -hop neighborhood by being multiplied by the K -th power of the normalized adjacency matrix \mathbf{S} . This creates a fixed, pre-processed feature matrix \mathbf{X}' :

$$\mathbf{X}' = \mathbf{S}^K \mathbf{X} \quad (2)$$

2. *Linear Classification:* A simple linear classifier with a trainable weight matrix \mathbf{W} is applied to the propagated features for the final prediction:

$$\hat{\mathbf{Y}} = \text{softmax}(\mathbf{S}^K \mathbf{X} \mathbf{W}) \quad (3)$$

GCIL Problems. The work of this paper is oriented towards Graph Class-Incremental Learning (GCIL), which is a more challenging setup than task-increment. The objective is, given a sequence of tasks $\{\tau_1, \dots, \tau_N\}$ with disjoint class sets $\{\mathcal{C}_1, \dots, \mathcal{C}_N\}$, to learn a unified model f capable of predicting a label $y \in \bigcup_{k=1}^N \mathcal{C}_k$ for any given node, its task IDs cannot be obtained during inference.

Methods

The foundation of TAAM is a standard GNN backbone, $f_{gnn}(\cdot)$, whose parameters, θ_{gnn} , are frozen to serve as a stable feature extractor. This frozen backbone acts as a stable, general-purpose feature extractor. To adapt this static model to a sequence of tasks $\mathcal{T} = \{\tau_1, \tau_2, \dots, \tau_N\}$, we introduce a set of lightweight, task-specific **Neural Synapse Modulators**(NSM), denoted as $\{\text{NSM}_1, \text{NSM}_2, \dots, \text{NSM}_N\}$, which general implementation can be seen from Figure 2. Architecturally, these modulators are inserted between the layers of the frozen GNN. Each NSM_τ , with parameters ϕ_τ , is designed to steer the computational flow of the frozen GNN for a specific task τ .

For a given node v with initial features \mathbf{x}_v from a graph G , the forward pass through the L -layer GNN is modulated at each intermediate layer l :

$$\mathbf{h}_v^{(l+1)} = f_{gnn}^{(l)}(\mathcal{M}^{(l)}(\mathbf{h}_v^{(l)}, \phi_\tau)) \quad (4)$$

where $\mathbf{h}_v^{(l)}$ is the node representation at layer l , and $\mathcal{M}^{(l)}$ is the modulation function performed by NSM_τ . The final node embeddings are passed to a unified, incrementally expanding linear classifier for prediction.

Neural Synapse Modulator

The NSM is the core adaptive component of TAAM. Instead of applying a single, static transformation for an entire task, the NSM generates node-specific modulation parameters, enabling node-attentive conditioning based on the features of each node.

For each GNN layer l being modulated, its corresponding NSM generates a pair of modulation parameters, $[\gamma_v^{(l)}, \beta_v^{(l)}]$, for every node v . This is achieved through a node-attentive mechanism. First, a learnable task embedding, $\mathbf{e}_\tau \in \mathbb{R}^{d_e}$, which is unique to NSM_τ , is linearly projected to form a set of K base modulation heads, $\mathbf{B}_\tau \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times 2d_h}$:

$$\mathbf{B}_\tau = \mathbf{W}_{base} \mathbf{e}_\tau + \mathbf{b}_{base} \quad (5)$$

where d_h is the hidden dimension of the node features $\mathbf{h}_v^{(l)}$. Concurrently, the input node features $\mathbf{h}_v^{(l)}$ are used to compute attention scores over these K heads:

$$\mathbf{a}_v = \mathbf{W}_{attn} \mathbf{h}_v^{(l)} + \mathbf{b}_{attn} \quad (6)$$

The scores are normalized via a softmax function to produce attention weights, $\alpha_v = \text{softmax}(\mathbf{a}_v) \in \mathbb{R}^K$. The final, node-specific modulation parameters are computed as a weighted sum of the base heads, steered by the node’s own features:

$$[\gamma_v^{(l)}, \beta_v^{(l)}] = \alpha_v \mathbf{B}_\tau \quad (7)$$

These parameters condition the GNN’s computation via a FiLM-style affine transformation. The modulated features $\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_v^{(l)}$ are then fed into the GNN layer:

$$\tilde{\mathbf{h}}_v^{(l)} = \gamma_v^{(l)} \odot \text{LayerNorm}(\mathbf{h}_v^{(l)}) + \beta_v^{(l)} \quad (8)$$

This node-attentive mechanism allows TAAM to adapt its internal computations with much greater expressivity than static prompting techniques.

Prototype-Guided strategy

TAAM’s ability to learn continually without pre-training or replay hinges on its prototype-guided strategy, which governs both knowledge transfer during training and knowledge retrieval during inference.

Task-Aware Initialization. During training, when a new task τ_{new} arrives, TAAM must create a new modulator, NSM_{new} , without catastrophically forgetting past tasks. To foster plasticity and accelerate learning, we facilitate knowledge transfer from previously learned tasks. This is guided by task-level prototypes.

First, we compute a representative prototype \mathbf{p}_{new} for the new task by averaging the initial aggregated features of its training nodes:

$$\mathbf{p}_{new} = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{V}_{train}|} \sum_{v \in \mathcal{V}_{train}} f_{agg}(G_{new}, \mathbf{X}_{new})_v \quad (9)$$

Next, we find the most similar past task, τ^* , by comparing this new prototype to the stored prototypes of all previous tasks, $\{\mathbf{p}_1, \dots, \mathbf{p}_{new-1}\}$, using Euclidean distance as the similarity metric:

$$\tau^* = \underset{\tau' \in \{1, \dots, new-1\}}{\text{argmin}} \|\mathbf{p}_{new} - \mathbf{p}_{\tau'}\|_2 \quad (10)$$

Instead of initializing NSM_{new} from scratch, we perform a selective knowledge transfer from the most similar past task, NSM_{τ^*} , to achieve a powerful “warm start”. Specifically, we copy the structural parameters of NSM_{τ^*} (i.e., the attention and base projection weights), thereby transferring its learned modulation mechanism.

$$\phi_{new}^{shared} \leftarrow \text{copy}(\phi_{\tau^*}^{shared}) \quad (11)$$

However, to ensure the new modulator can form a unique identity for the new task, its learnable task embedding, \mathbf{e}_{new} , is randomly re-initialized. This process, where the modulator’s parameters ϕ_τ are composed of shared weights ϕ_τ^{shared} and a task embedding \mathbf{e}_τ , is formalized as:

$$\mathbf{e}_{new} \leftarrow \text{RandomInit}() \quad (12)$$

This hybrid initialization strategy transfers relevant inductive biases while preserving the plasticity required to learn the specifics of the new task.

During the training for task τ_{new} , only the parameters ϕ_{new} of the newly created modulator are updated. All other modulators and the GNN backbone remain frozen. Furthermore, the final linear classifier, f_C , is incrementally extended. The weights corresponding to past classes are frozen, and a new output head is initialized for the classes in τ_{new} , structurally preventing catastrophic forgetting at the decision layer.

Training Objective. To address the common issue of class imbalance within graph datasets, we employ a weighted cross-entropy loss. For the current task τ_{new} , we first calculate the number of training instances N_c for each class c . The weight for each class is then determined by its inverse frequency: $w_c = 1/\max(N_c, 1)$. The final training objective is the weighted cross-entropy loss, computed over

the training nodes \mathcal{V}_{train} and the classes C_{new} belonging to the new task:

$$\mathcal{L}_{new} = - \sum_{v \in \mathcal{V}_{train}} w_{y_v} \log \left(\frac{\exp(\mathbf{z}_v, y'_v)}{\sum_{c' \in C_{new}} \exp(\mathbf{z}_v, c')} \right) \quad (13)$$

where \mathbf{z}_v are the logits for node v , and y_v and y'_v are its global and task-re-indexed labels, respectively.

Algorithm 1: Task-Aware Initialization

Input: $G_{new}, \mathbf{X}_{new}, \mathcal{V}_{train}, \{\text{NSM}_{\tau'}\}_{\tau'=1}^{new-1}, \{\mathbf{p}_{\tau'}\}_{\tau'=1}^{new-1}$
Output: trained NSM_{new} .

- 1: Compute prototype \mathbf{p}_{new} for the new task.
- 2: **if** it is the first task ($new = 1$) **then**
- 3: Initialize a new modulator NSM_{new} with random parameters.
- 4: **else**
- 5: Find the most similar past task τ^* by comparing \mathbf{p}_{new} with all stored prototypes $\{\mathbf{p}_{\tau'}\}$.
- 6: Initialize structural parameters of NSM_{new} by copying from NSM_{τ^*} . {Transfer knowledge}
- 7: Randomly re-initialize the task embedding \mathbf{e}_{new} of NSM_{new} . {Adapt to new task}
- 8: **end if**
- 9: Freeze the GNN backbone and all previously trained modulators $\{\text{NSM}_{\tau'}\}_{\tau'=1}^{new-1}$.
- 10: **for** each training epoch $e = 1$ to E **do**
- 11: Obtain logits \mathbf{Z} via a forward pass on G_{new} using the current NSM_{new} .
- 12: Compute the class-balanced cross-entropy loss \mathcal{L}_{new} .
- 13: Update only the parameters ϕ_{new} of NSM_{new} via backpropagation.
- 14: **end for**
- 15: Store the trained NSM_{new} and its prototype \mathbf{p}_{new} .
- 16: Return trained NSM_{new} .

Task-Aware Retrieval. During inference, the task ID for a given input graph is unknown. TAAM infers the most likely task ID, $\hat{\tau}$, by applying the same prototype-matching logic. A prototype is computed for the test batch, and its distance is measured against all stored task prototypes. The ID of the closest prototype is selected as the inferred task ID:

$$\hat{\tau} = \arg \min_{\tau' \in \{1, \dots, N\}} \|\mathbf{p}_{test} - \mathbf{p}_{\tau'}\|_2 \quad (14)$$

The forward pass is then executed using the corresponding frozen modulator, $\text{NSM}_{\hat{\tau}}$, ensuring that the correct specialized knowledge is retrieved and applied for the prediction. This entire process allows TAAM to dynamically adapt to a sequence of tasks in a scalable and parameter-efficient manner.

Experiments

Dateset. Following the GCL benchmark (Zhang, Song, and Tao 2022a), six large public graph datasets are employed, including Cora (Yang, Cohen, and Salakhutdinov 2016), Citeseer (Yang, Cohen, and Salakhutdinov

Table 1: The detailed statistics of datasets

Dataset	Nodes	Edges	Classes	Tasks
Cora	2,708	5,429	7	3
Citeseer	3,327	4,732	6	3
CoraFull	19,793	130,622	70	35
Arxiv	169,343	1,166,243	40	20
Reddit	232,965	114,615,892	40	20
Products	2,449,029	61,859,036	47	23

2016),CoraFull (McCallum et al. 2000), Arxiv (Hu et al. 2020), Reddit (Hamilton, Ying, and Leskovec 2017) and Products(Hu et al. 2020). The comprehensive descriptions are delineated in Table 1. For all datasets, each task is set to contain only two classes. Besides, for each class, the proportions of training, validation, and testing are set to be 0.6, 0.2, and 0.2 respectively.

Implementation Details. We employ a 2-layer Simplifying Graph Convolutional Network (SGC) (Wu et al. 2019) as our feature extractor. Its parameters are randomly initialized and then remain frozen.For each NSM, the dimension of the learnable task embedding, \mathbf{e}_{τ} , is set to 64. The internal node-attentive mechanism uses $K = 3$ heads to steer for each node.For each new task, only the parameters of the newly created NSM are trainable.

Evaluation Metrics. We evaluate performance using Average Accuracy (AA) and Average Forgetting (AF), where a higher AA indicates better overall accuracy and a lower AF indicates less catastrophic forgetting.

Main results

Performance Comparison. As shown in Table 2, our proposed method, **TAAM**, establishes a new state-of-the-art across six diverse GCIL benchmarks. Notably, TAAM significantly outperforms the strongest replay-based competitors on large-scale datasets like Reddit (99.5% vs. 96.9%) and Products (96.2% vs. 73.5%). Crucially, this is achieved without the substantial memory overhead, computational cost, and potential privacy risks inherent to replay-based approaches. Within the replay-free category, TAAM also demonstrates a clear advantage over TPP, the previous state-of-the-art, with a notable improvement of 4.0% and 7.3% in average accuracy on the Arxiv and Citeseer datasets, respectively. This performance gap stems from our method’s ability to operate effectively on randomly initialized backbones, eliminating the pre-training dependency required by methods like TPP.

A standout result is TAAM’s perfect management of catastrophic forgetting, achieving no forgetting on all datasets. This is a direct consequence of its architectural design, where task-specific knowledge is securely encapsulated within dedicated, frozen Neural Sub-Modules (NSMs). In contrast, regularization and even top-performing replay methods inevitably exhibit knowledge degradation (e.g., PDGNNs shows 12.7% forgetting on Arxiv). By virtually

Table 2: Comparison of different models on different data sets in GCIL setting. The bold results are the best performance excluding Joint and Oracle. ‘ \uparrow ’ denotes the greater value represents greater performance. ‘ \downarrow ’ the opposite. Joint can get access to the data of all tasks, Oracle can get access to the data of all tasks and task IDs.

Category	Model	Cora		Citeseer		CoraFull		Arxiv		Reddit		Products	
		AA%(\uparrow)	AF%(\downarrow)										
Lower bound	Finetuning	32.3 \pm 0.2	95.0 \pm 0.1	32.3 \pm 0.2	80.5 \pm 0.2	3.5 \pm 0.5	95.2 \pm 0.5	4.9 \pm 0.0	89.7 \pm 0.4	4.9 \pm 1.2	97.9 \pm 3.3	4.6 \pm 0.7	88.7 \pm 0.8
Regularisation	EWC (2017)	32.3 \pm 0.2	95.0 \pm 0.1	32.3 \pm 0.2	80.4 \pm 0.1	13.2 \pm 0.3	95.0 \pm 0.2	7.9 \pm 1.4	81.2 \pm 1.3	5.1 \pm 0.0	95.3 \pm 2.2	8.24 \pm 0.7	90.32 \pm 1.1
	LwF(2017)	32.2 \pm 0.2	94.8 \pm 0.1	32.7 \pm 0.0	80.1 \pm 0.3	4.0 \pm 0.6	93.1 \pm 0.8	5.9 \pm 0.1	90.1 \pm 0.2	7.0 \pm 1.0	97.0 \pm 1.1	4.92 \pm 0.4	50.19 \pm 0.3
	MAS(2018)	32.2 \pm 0.2	94.8 \pm 0.3	30.8 \pm 0.2	78.5 \pm 0.4	11.3 \pm 0.2	95.0 \pm 0.4	4.9 \pm 0.3	89.3 \pm 0.0	4.9 \pm 0.0	89.3 \pm 0.9	3.1 \pm 0.8	89.5 \pm 0.9
	TWP(2021)	32.5 \pm 0.1	94.7 \pm 0.2	32.9 \pm 0.2	65.5 \pm 0.7	19.8 \pm 3.9	73.3 \pm 4.2	4.9 \pm 0.4	89.8 \pm 0.4	6.9 \pm 0.4	97.1 \pm 0.4	3.0 \pm 0.7	89.7 \pm 1.0
Replay	ER-GN(2021)	86.2 \pm 1.6	4.5 \pm 1.9	73.5 \pm 0.4	9.1 \pm 1.4	28.5 \pm 0.2	15.4 \pm 0.2	46.8 \pm 1.1	16.4 \pm 1.3	73.9 \pm 3.3	5.7 \pm 2.5	25.3 \pm 1.9	65.6 \pm 1.9
	SSM(2022)	88.6 \pm 0.5	2.7 \pm 1.0	63.8 \pm 2.5	5.2 \pm 2.1	75.8 \pm 0.5	7.1 \pm 0.5	47.2 \pm 0.5	11.6 \pm 1.5	94.2 \pm 0.2	1.4 \pm 0.1	62.7 \pm 0.1	9.4 \pm 1.7
	PUMA(2023)	88.2 \pm 1.0	5.7 \pm 0.5	70.9 \pm 0.5	9.8 \pm 1.4	65.1 \pm 0.3	6.9 \pm 0.7	62.0 \pm 0.3	11.0 \pm 0.4	96.9 \pm 0.0	0.7 \pm 0.0	73.5 \pm 0.4	5.3 \pm 0.3
	PDGNNs(2024)	93.9 \pm 0.1	-2.8 \pm 0.3	79.9 \pm 0.5	5.0 \pm 0.3	81.2 \pm 0.1	3.5 \pm 0.1	53.2 \pm 0.3	12.7 \pm 0.2	94.8 \pm 0.0	3.2 \pm 0.0	72.3 \pm 0.2	11.3 \pm 0.5
Parameter isolation	TPP(2024)	97.5 \pm 0.7	0.0 \pm 0.0	80.4 \pm 0.9	0.0 \pm 0.0	93.4 \pm 0.2	0.0 \pm 0.0	85.4 \pm 0.3	0.0 \pm 0.0	99.5 \pm 0.0	0.0 \pm 0.0	94.0 \pm 0.5	0.0 \pm 0.0
	TAAM (Ours)	97.6\pm0.4	0.0\pm0.0	85.9\pm0.3	0.0\pm0.0	95.0\pm0.5	0.0\pm0.0	90.4\pm0.2	0.0\pm0.0	99.5\pm0.0	0.0\pm0.0	96.2\pm0.3	0.0\pm0.0
Upper bound	Joint	94.2 \pm 0.0	-	79.8 \pm 0.3	-	81.2 \pm 0.4	-	51.3 \pm 0.5	-	97.1 \pm 0.1	-	71.5 \pm 0.1	-
	Oracle	98.1 \pm 0.1	-	86.1 \pm 0.2	-	95.3 \pm 0.3	-	91.2 \pm 0.2	-	99.5 \pm 0.1	-	96.5 \pm 0.4	-

Table 3: Performance comparison in the GCIL setting under different task division protocols. The best results, excluding the Oracle upper bound, are highlighted in **bold**. "OOM" denotes an Out-of-Memory error.

Model	CoraFull						Arxiv					
	Unequally		Equally(10)		Equally(5)		Unequally		Equally(10)		Equally(5)	
	AA%(\uparrow)	AF%(\downarrow)										
SSM	69.1 \pm 0.1	2.8 \pm 0.2	70.5 \pm 0.1	4.2 \pm 0.3	62.2 \pm 0.2	5.8 \pm 0.2	41.5 \pm 0.4	7.3 \pm 0.1	37.4 \pm 0.5	7.5 \pm 0.4	41.7 \pm 0.5	11.3 \pm 0.5
PDGNNs	76.8 \pm 0.1	2.4 \pm 0.2	81.3 \pm 0.1	3.6 \pm 0.1	70.4 \pm 0.0	4.9 \pm 0.0	49.8 \pm 0.4	8.8 \pm 0.3	50.2 \pm 0.3	10.7 \pm 0.2	53.1 \pm 0.5	12.3 \pm 0.2
TPP	OOM	-	75.6 \pm 0.4	0.0 \pm 0.0	77.3 \pm 1.0	0.0 \pm 0.0	OOM	-	OOM	-	63.4 \pm 1.3	0.0 \pm 0.0
TAAM	82.3\pm0.5	0.0\pm0.0	84.0\pm0.3	0.0\pm0.0	90.0\pm0.3	0.0\pm0.0	77.2\pm0.4	0.0\pm0.0	64.1\pm0.6	0.0\pm0.0	79.6\pm0.2	0.0\pm0.0
Oracle	84.1 \pm 0.1	-	85.6 \pm 0.1	-	91.4 \pm 0.1	-	79.7 \pm 0.3	-	70.9 \pm 0.2	-	82.3 \pm 0.1	-

eliminating forgetting while simultaneously maximizing accuracy on new tasks, TAAM presents a more effective solution to the **stability-plasticity trade-off**.

Visualizing Knowledge Retention. As depicted in Figure 3, the heatmaps vividly illustrate our method’s superior knowledge retention. The heatmap for Ours method exhibits a consistently dark and uniform color across the lower triangle, signifying both excellent plasticity (a dark diagonal) and near-perfect stability, as there is no color degradation down each column. In stark contrast, the heatmaps for PDGNNs, PUMA, and ER-GNN reveal a clear pattern of knowledge decay. While their diagonals indicate an ability to learn new tasks, performance on past tasks clearly degrades, evidenced by the pronounced color fading down each column.

Analysis of Task Division Protocols. To comprehensively evaluate the robustness of our model under various incremental learning scenarios, we designed multiple task division protocols. As shown in Table 3, our experiments cover three settings: 1) Unequally: The model first learns from a large base task (20 classes on CoraFull, 10 on Arxiv) and subsequently learns from smaller incremental tasks (10 and 5 classes, respectively). 2) Equally(10) and 3) Equally(5): Each task contains a fixed number of 10 or 5 classes. Notably, these settings are more challenging than the standard 2-classes-per-task protocol used in other experiments throughout this paper.

Table 3 demonstrate TAAM’s consistent and superior performance. The comparison with the leading replay-free baseline, TPP, is particularly revealing. TPP fails with OOM

errors on the more demanding benchmarks, such as the "Unequally" split. As indicated in the table, TPP encounters OOM errors on the more challenging benchmarks, particularly under the 'Unequally' split which features a large base task. This is attributed to its resource-intensive pre-training phase on the initial task’s data, a requirement that is difficult to manage even with mini-batch strategies due to its substantial computational and memory overhead. In stark contrast, TAAM’s pre-training-free and resource-efficient architecture operates successfully across all settings. This validates its practical advantages over methods burdened by high computational demands.

Efficiency Analysis. As shown in Figure 4, the top-left quadrant of the plot represents the optimal profile of high accuracy and low computational cost. TAAM is clearly positioned in this quadrant, achieving both the highest average accuracy (\approx 95%) and the fastest execution time. In comparison, while TPP is competitive in accuracy, it is substantially slower. The replay-based methods, including PDGNNs, PUMA, and SSM, are not only less accurate but also significantly more computationally expensive.

Ablation Study

To validate the effectiveness of our proposed components, we conducted an ablation study on TAAM, with the results presented in Table 4. The first variant, which employs only the basic NSM adapters without either strategy, performs poorly, suffering from extremely low AA and catastrophic forgetting across all datasets. The introduction of Task-

Table 4: Ablation results of TAAM and its variants, excluding Cora and Reddit datasets for brevity.

NSM	Task-Aware Retrieval	Task-Aware Initialization	Citeseer		CoraFull		Arxiv		Products	
			AA(%)(\uparrow)	AF(%)(\downarrow)						
✓	×	×	31.2 \pm 0.2	82.0 \pm 1.0	2.8 \pm 0.3	95.3 \pm 0.3	4.8 \pm 0.1	90.7 \pm 0.4	3.6 \pm 1.0	95.7 \pm 0.6
✓	✓	×	85.5 \pm 0.4	0.0 \pm 0.0	94.7 \pm 0.4	0.0 \pm 0.0	90.1 \pm 0.3	0.0 \pm 0.0	94.9 \pm 1.1	0.0 \pm 0.0
✓	✓	✓	85.9 \pm 0.3	0.0 \pm 0.0	95.0 \pm 0.5	0.0 \pm 0.0	90.4 \pm 0.2	0.0 \pm 0.0	95.5 \pm 0.9	0.0 \pm 0.0




Figure 3: Performance matrices of different method on Arxiv dataset




Figure 4: Comparison of running time and AA on CoraFull

Aware Retrieval yields a dramatic performance leap. For instance, on Products, AA skyrockets from 3.6% to 94.9%, while AF plummets from 95.7% to a perfect 0.0%. This demonstrates that the ability to correctly identify and activate the relevant frozen modulator at inference time is fundamental to achieving stability and preventing knowledge interference. Building on this stable foundation, the addition of Task-Aware Initialization (third row, the full TAAM model) provides a further, consistent boost in accuracy across all benchmarks. On datasets like Arxiv and Products, the AA increases from 90.1% to 90.4% and 94.9% to 95.5%, respectively. This highlights the crucial role of our initialization strategy in enhancing model plasticity. While retrieval secures past knowledge, the intelligent initialization by copying parameters from a similar past task enables the model

to learn new concepts more effectively. Together, The empirical results verify that combining all the components can well balance the stability and plasticity of the model.

More supplementary experiments and details can be found in the Appendix.

Conclusion

In this paper, we propose a novel continual graph learning method, TAAM, that without relying on data replay or pre-training. It uses a prototype-guided strategy to dynamically initialize and select lightweight, task-aware modules that modulate a frozen GNN. Extensive experiments on benchmark datasets demonstrate this approach effectively prevents catastrophic forgetting while ensuring fine-grained, efficient knowledge transfer. Future work will explore more challenging scene Settings.

References

- Aljundi, R.; Babiloni, F.; Elhoseiny, M.; Rohrbach, M.; and Tuytelaars, T. 2017. Memory Aware Synapses: Learning what (not) to forget. *ArXiv*, abs/1711.09601.
- Fang, T.; Zhang, Y.; Yang, Y.; Wang, C.; and Chen, L. 2022. Universal Prompt Tuning for Graph Neural Networks. In *Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- Gao, X.; Dong, S.; He, Y.; Wang, Q.; and Gong, Y. 2024. Beyond Prompt Learning: Continual Adapter for Efficient Rehearsal-Free Continual Learning. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*.
- Hamilton, W. L.; Ying, Z.; and Leskovec, J. 2017. Inductive Representation Learning on Large Graphs. *ArXiv*, abs/1706.02216.
- Houlsby, N.; Giurgiu, A.; Jastrzebski, S.; Morrone, B.; de Laroussilhe, Q.; Gesmundo, A.; Attariyan, M.; and Gelly,

- S. 2019. Parameter-Efficient Transfer Learning for NLP. *arXiv:1902.00751*.
- Hu, W.; Fey, M.; Zitnik, M.; Dong, Y.; Ren, H.; Liu, B.; Catasta, M.; and Leskovec, J. 2020. Open Graph Benchmark: Datasets for Machine Learning on Graphs. *ArXiv*, abs/2005.00687.
- Kipf, T. N.; and Welling, M. 2016. Semi-Supervised Classification with Graph Convolutional Networks. *Arxiv*, abs/1609.02907.
- Kirkpatrick, J.; Pascanu, R.; Rabinowitz, N. C.; 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. 2016. Overcoming catastrophic forgetting in neural networks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 114: 3521 – 3526.
- Li, Z.; and Hoiem, D. 2016. Learning without Forgetting. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 40: 2935–2947.
- Liu, C.; Zhan, Y.; Ma, X.; Ding, L.; Tao, D.; Wu, J.; and Hu, W. 2023a. Gapformer: Graph Transformer with Graph Pooling for Node Classification. In *International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*.
- Liu, H.; Yang, Y.; and Wang, X. 2020. Overcoming Catastrophic Forgetting in Graph Neural Networks. In *AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*.
- Liu, P.; Yuan, W.; Fu, J.; Jiang, Z.; Hayashi, H.; and Neubig, G. 2021. Pre-train, Prompt, and Predict: A Systematic Survey of Prompting Methods in Natural Language Processing. *arXiv:2107.13586*.
- Liu, Y.; Qiu, R.; and Huang, Z. 2023. CaT: Balanced Continual Graph Learning with Graph Condensation. *Arxiv*, abs/2309.09455.
- Liu, Y.; Qiu, R.; Tang, Y.; Yin, H.; and Huang, Z. 2024. PUMA: Efficient Continual Graph Learning for Node Classification with Graph Condensation. *Arxiv*, abs/2312.14439.
- Liu, Z.; Yu, X.; Fang, Y.; and Zhang, X. 2023b. Graph-Prompt: Unifying Pre-Training and Downstream Tasks for Graph Neural Networks. *Proceedings of the ACM Web Conference 2023*.
- McCallum, A.; Nigam, K.; Rennie, J. D. M.; and Seymore, K. 2000. Automating the Construction of Internet Portals with Machine Learning. *Information Retrieval*, 3: 127–163.
- 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 *The Thirty-eighth Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- Sinha, A.; Shen, Z.; Song, Y.; Ma, H.; Eide, D.; Hsu, B.-J. P.; and Wang, K. 2015. An Overview of Microsoft Academic Service (MAS) and Applications. *Proceedings of the 24th International Conference on World Wide Web*.
- Su, J.; Zou, D.; Zhang, Z.; and Wu, C. 2024. Towards Robust Graph Incremental Learning on Evolving Graphs. *ArXiv*, abs/2402.12987.
- Tang, J.; Yang, Y.; Wei, W.; Shi, L.; Su, L.; Cheng, S.; Yin, D.; and Huang, C. 2023. GraphGPT: Graph Instruction Tuning for Large Language Models. *Proceedings of the 47th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*.
- Tian, Z.; Zhang, D.; and Dai, H.-N. 2024. Continual Learning on Graphs: A Survey. *ArXiv*, abs/2402.06330.
- Wang, C.; Qiu, Y.; and Scherer, S. A. 2020. Lifelong Graph Learning. *2022 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 13709–13718.
- Wang, Q.; Zhou, T.; Yuan, Y.; and Mao, R. 2025. Prompt-Driven Continual Graph Learning. *ArXiv*, abs/2502.06327.
- Wu, F.; Zhang, T.; de Souza, A. H.; Fifty, C.; Yu, T.; and Weinberger, K. Q. 2019. Simplifying Graph Convolutional Networks. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*.
- Yang, Z.; Cohen, W. W.; and Salakhutdinov, R. 2016. Revisiting Semi-Supervised Learning with Graph Embeddings. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*.
- Zhang, P.; Yan, Y.; Li, C.; Wang, S.; Xie, X.; Song, G.; and Kim, S. 2023. Continual Learning on Dynamic Graphs via Parameter Isolation. *Proceedings of the 46th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*.
- Zhang, X.; Song, D.; Chen, Y.; and Tao, D. 2024. Topology-aware Embedding Memory for Continual Learning on Expanding Networks. *Proceedings of the 30th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, 4326–4337.
- Zhang, X.; Song, D.; and Tao, D. 2021. Hierarchical Prototype Networks for Continual Graph Representation Learning. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 45: 4622–4636.
- Zhang, X.; Song, D.; and Tao, D. 2022a. CGLB: Benchmark Tasks for Continual Graph Learning. In *Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- Zhang, X.; Song, D.; and Tao, D. 2022b. Sparsified Subgraph Memory for Continual Graph Representation Learning. In *2022 IEEE International Conference on Data Mining (ICDM)*, 1335–1340.
- Zhang, X.; Song, D.; and Tao, D. 2022c. Sparsified Subgraph Memory for Continual Graph Representation Learning. *2022 IEEE International Conference on Data Mining (ICDM)*, 1335–1340.
- Zhou, F.; and Cao, C. 2021a. Overcoming Catastrophic Forgetting in Graph Neural Networks with Experience Replay. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 35(5), 4714–4722.
- Zhou, F.; and Cao, C. 2021b. Overcoming Catastrophic Forgetting in Graph Neural Networks with Experience Replay. In *AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*.

Appendix

In this supplementary material, we provide additional details regarding our experimental setup, methodology, and results. The appendix is organized as follows:

- In Section A, we detail the implementation specifics, including the hardware and software configurations.
- In Section B, we present the detailed algorithm of our proposed method, providing pseudocode for the Neural Synapse Modulator and the Task ID Retrieval processes.
- In Section C, we describe the suite of six benchmark datasets used for evaluation.
- In Section D, we elaborate on the baseline methods, categorized into replay-base, regularization, and parameter isolation approaches, against which our model is compared.
- In Section E, we formally define the evaluation metrics, Average Accuracy and Average Forgetting, based on the accuracy matrix $M \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times T}$.
- In Section F, we provide more extensive experimental results, including detailed performance comparison tables and a comprehensive hyperparameter analysis.

A. Implementation Details

All experiments are conducted on a server equipped with an Intel(R) Xeon(R) Platinum 8368Q CPU @ 2.60GHz, 256 GB of RAM, and a single NVIDIA L40 GPU. The software stack includes Python 3.8.16, PyTorch 1.10.1, DGL 0.9.0, OGB 1.3.6, and CUDA 12.4.

Our experimental setup follows the CGL benchmark (Zhang, Song, and Tao 2022a) to ensure a fair and rigorous evaluation. For all methods, we employ a unified two-layer GNN backbone with a 256-dimensional hidden layer, configured without batch normalization, dropout, or bias. We used the Adam optimizer for 200 epochs, with a learning rate of 0.005 and a weight decay of 5×10^{-4} . Hyperparameters for all baselines are set according to their original publications, and the same random seeds are used across all runs for reproducibility.

B. Algorithm

The Neural Synapse Modulator and Task ID Retrieval processes of the proposed method are summarized in below, respectively.

C. Details of Datasets

We evaluate our method on a suite of six benchmark datasets commonly used in graph machine learning and Continual Graph Learning (CGL).

- **Cora**(Yang, Cohen, and Salakhutdinov 2016): A standard citation network benchmark where nodes represent machine learning papers and edges represent citations. The task is to classify each paper into one of seven predefined subject categories. Node features are bag-of-words representations of the paper’s content.

Algorithm 2: Neural Synapse Modulator

Input: Node features $\mathbf{h}_v \in \mathbb{R}^{d_h}$, Task embedding $\mathbf{e}_\tau \in \mathbb{R}^{d_e}$.

Parameters: Base generator weights $\mathbf{W}_{base}, \mathbf{b}_{base}$, Attention network weights $\mathbf{W}_{attn}, \mathbf{b}_{attn}$.

Output: Parameters (γ_v, β_v) .

- 1: {Generate K base modulation heads from the task embedding}
 - 2: $\mathbf{B}_\tau \leftarrow \mathbf{W}_{base} \mathbf{e}_\tau + \mathbf{b}_{base}$ {Eq. (5)}
 - 3: {Compute attention scores based on node features}
 - 4: $\mathbf{a}_v \leftarrow \mathbf{W}_{attn} \mathbf{h}_v + \mathbf{b}_{attn} \in \mathbb{R}^K$ {Eq. (6)}
 - 5: $\alpha_v \leftarrow \text{Softmax}(\mathbf{a}_v) \in \mathbb{R}^K$
 - 6: $[\gamma_v, \beta_v] \leftarrow \alpha_v \mathbf{B}_\tau$ {Eq. (7)}
 - 7: Return (γ_v, β_v)
-

Algorithm 3: Prototype-Based Task ID Retrieval

Input: Graph \mathcal{G} , Node features \mathbf{X} , Test node IDs \mathcal{V}_{test} .

Given: Stored task prototypes $\mathcal{P} = \{\mathbf{p}_1, \dots, \mathbf{p}_N\}$; Aggregation function f_{agg} .

Output: Inferred task ID $\hat{\tau}$.

- 1: {Step 1: Compute prototype for the test batch}
 - 2: $\mathbf{p}_{test} \leftarrow \frac{1}{|\mathcal{V}_{test}|} \sum_{v \in \mathcal{V}_{test}} f_{agg}(\mathcal{G}, \mathbf{X})_v$ {Analogous to Eq. (9)}
 - 3: {Step 2: Find the closest prototype in the stored library}
 - 4: $\hat{\tau} \leftarrow \arg \min_{\tau' \in \{1, \dots, N\}} \|\mathbf{p}_{test} - \mathbf{p}_{\tau'}\|_2$ {Eq. (10)}
 - 5: Return $\hat{\tau}$
-

- **Citeseer**(Yang, Cohen, and Salakhutdinov 2016): Another widely-used citation network where nodes are scientific publications and edges are citations. The papers are classified into six categories. Similar to Cora, node features are based on the document’s textual content.
- **CoraFull**(McCallum et al. 2000): A larger citation network encompassing 70 classes. Nodes correspond to academic papers and edges denote citation links between them.
- **Arxiv**(Hu et al. 2020): This dataset is constructed from the collaboration network of Computer Science (CS) papers on the arXiv platform, indexed by MAG (Sinha et al. 2015). Nodes, which represent CS papers, are classified into 40 subject areas. Node features are generated by averaging the word embeddings of the titles and abstracts.
- **Reddit**(Hamilton, Ying, and Leskovec 2017): A social network dataset derived from Reddit posts made in September 2014. Here, nodes are individual posts, and an edge connects two posts if the same user has commented on both. The objective is to classify posts into their corresponding communities (subreddits). Node features are engineered from post attributes such as title, content, score, and comment count.
- **Products**(Hu et al. 2020): An Amazon product co-purchase network where nodes represent products and edges indicate that two products are frequently bought together. Node features are derived from dimensionality-reduced bag-of-words representations of the product descriptions.




Figure 5: Performance comparison of our method, **TAAM** (Ours, purple line), against leading CGL methods on four datasets.




Figure 6: The impact of hyperparameters on TAAM varies across different datasets

D. Details of baselines

We evaluate our method on a suite of leading CGL methods, including three mainstream categories based on Replay, regularization, and parameter isolation.

- **Finetuning** (Kipf and Welling 2016) denotes the backbone GNN without continual learning technique. Therefore, this can be viewed as the lower bound on the continual learning performance.
- **EWC** (Kirkpatrick et al. 2016) is a regularization-centric approach that penalizes changes to parameters deemed crucial for previous tasks. This is achieved by adding a quadratic penalty proportional to the parameter’s importance, thereby safeguarding performance on priorly learned tasks.
- **LwF** (Li and Hoiem 2016) employs knowledge distillation to maintain performance on old tasks. It minimizes the discrepancy between the output logits of the previous and current models, effectively transferring knowledge without retaining old data.
- **MAS** (Aljundi et al. 2017) also preserves vital parameters from past tasks, but bases the importance on the sensitivity of the model’s predictions to parameter shifts.
- **TWP** (Liu, Yang, and Wang 2020) focuses on preserving important parameters within a topological aggregation framework and introduces a loss minimization strat-

egy for previous tasks that relies on these preserved parameters.

- **ER-GNN** (Zhou and Cao 2021b) is a replay-based method that constructs a memory buffer by storing representative nodes selected from previous tasks.
- **SSM** (Zhang, Song, and Tao 2022c) enhances graph continual learning by explicitly incorporating topological information. It stores sparsified computation subgraphs of selected nodes in its memory.
- **PUMA** Based on CaT (Liu, Qiu, and Huang 2023), PUMA (Liu et al. 2024) enhances graph condensation coverage by incorporating both labeled and unlabeled nodes. It introduces a reinitialized optimization strategy that reconciles knowledge consolidation between historical and new graphs through balanced scratch training.
- **PDGNNs** (Zhang et al. 2024) decouple trainable parameters from computational subgraphs through topology-aware embeddings (TEs). These TEs are compressed representations of ego-subnetworks that significantly reduce memory overhead.
- **Joint** is base the backbone SGC can get access to the data of all tasks, representing a theoretical upper bound of graph class-incremental learning
- **Oracle** is base the backbone SGC can get access to the data of all tasks and task IDs, representing a stronger upper bound of graph class-incremental learning.

E. Evaluation Metrics

To comprehensively evaluate the model’s performance in a continual learning setting, we adopt two standard metrics: Average Accuracy and Average Forgetting . Our evaluation protocol is based on the accuracy matrix $M \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times T}$, where T represents the total number of tasks. An element $M_{t,j}$ of this matrix denotes the classification accuracy on task j after the model has been sequentially trained up to task t .

Average Accuracy (AA) measures the overall performance of the model across all tasks after the entire training sequence is complete. It is calculated by averaging the accuracies on all tasks j after the final task T has been learned. A higher AA signifies a better-performing model. The formula is:

$$\text{AA} = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^T M_{T,j}}{T}$$

Average Forgetting (AF) quantifies how much the model forgets previously learned tasks as it acquires new knowledge. It is computed by averaging the difference between the peak accuracy on a task (i.e., immediately after it was learned) and its accuracy after training on a subsequent task, averaged over all past tasks. The formula is given by:

$$\text{AF} = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{T-1} (M_{T,j} - M_{j,j})}{T - 1}$$

F. More Experiment Results

Performance Comparison

As shown in Figure 5, the Figure illustrate the evolution of Average Accuracy (y-axis) as the number of tasks (x-axis) increases. TAAM consistently maintains high accuracy, closely tracking the **Oracle** performance (red line), which represents the theoretical upper bound. This is a direct result of our architectural design, which isolates and preserves past knowledge in dedicated, frozen Neural Sub-Modules (NSMs).

In stark contrast, the accuracy of competing methods visibly degrades. Regularization-based approaches like EWC and LwF suffer a severe performance collapse, while even advanced replay methods, including PDGNNs, exhibit a clear downward trend. By maintaining the integrity of learned knowledge while adapting to new tasks, TAAM presents a more effective solution to the fundamental stability-plasticity dilemma.

Hyperparameter Analysis

We investigated the sensitivity of our model to two key hyperparameters: the number of attention heads (K) and the task embedding dimension (d_e). Figure 6 plots the Average Accuracy (AA) against variations in these parameters.

Number of Heads. The left panel of Figure 6 shows that model performance is largely robust to the number of heads. However, a modest improvement is observed on several datasets (e.g., Cora-CL, CoraFull-CL) when increasing the number of heads from one to two or three, after which performance tends to plateau. This suggests that while a single head is effective, a multi-head configuration can capture

more complex, task-specific feature modulations, confirming the utility of the attention mechanism.

Task Embedding Dimension. As shown in the right panel, the model is remarkably insensitive to the task embedding dimension. Performance remains stable across a wide range, from 8 to 256. Notably, a highly compact embedding (e.g., $d_e = 16$) achieves results on par with a much larger one. This finding underscores the parameter efficiency of our approach, as it can generate effective, specialized modulators from very low-dimensional task representations.