International Journal of Engineering Research in Current Trends (IJERCT)
ISSN: 2582-5488, Volume-7 Issue-1, Jan-Feb 2025

A Comparative Study of Graph Neural Networks and Traditional Deep Learning Models on Structured Data

Anurag
Research Scholar, GuruKripa College Bareli, M.P., India - 464668
(anuragdhakad398@gmail.com)

Abstract: This paper presents a comparative study of Graph Neural Networks (GNNs) and traditional deep learning models, specifically Convolutional Neural Networks (CNNs) and Recurrent Neural Networks (RNNs), focusing on their effectiveness in processing structured data. As machine learning continues to evolve, the limitations of conventional models in capturing complex relational information have become increasingly evident. GNNs, designed to operate on graph-structured data, offer unique advantages in representing intricate relationships between data points. Unlike CNNs, which excel in spatial data representation, and RNNs, which are suited for temporal sequences, GNNs can effectively model non-Euclidean data structures, making them ideal for applications in social network analysis, molecular chemistry, and knowledge graph reasoning. This study examines key aspects such as model architecture, including the differences in layer design and aggregation functions, performance metrics, emphasizing accuracy, F1-score, and computational efficiency, interpretability, and application domains ranging from natural language processing to recommendation systems. Our analysis reveals that while GNNs excel in tasks requiring an understanding of relational dynamics, such as link prediction and community detection, traditional models maintain their relevance in scenarios involving grid-like data (e.g., image classification) or sequential data (e.g., time series forecasting). The findings suggest a promising direction for future research, advocating for hybrid approaches that leverage the strengths of both GNNs and traditional deep learning architectures to enhance performance across diverse applications, potentially leading to breakthroughs in fields like drug discovery and intelligent transportation systems.

Keywords: Graph Neural Networks, Traditional Deep Learning, Convolutional Neural Networks, Recurrent Neural Networks, Structured Data, Comparative Study, Model Architecture, Performance Metrics, Interpretability, Application Domains.

1. INTRODUCTION

The rapid advancement of machine learning and artificial intelligence has led to the development of various models capable of processing and analyzing data across diverse domains. Among these models, deep learning has gained significant attention for its ability to automatically learn complex patterns from large datasets. Traditional deep learning architectures, particularly Convolutional Neural Networks (CNNs) and Recurrent Neural Networks (RNNs), have been instrumental in achieving state-of-the-art results in tasks such as image classification, natural language processing, and time-series analysis. These models excel in structured data types where inputs can be represented as grids (images) or sequences (text, time-series).

However, real-world data often involves intricate relationships and interactions that cannot be adequately captured by conventional models. For instance, social networks, citation networks, and molecular structures are best represented as graphs, where entities (nodes) are connected through relationships (edges). This limitation of traditional deep learning has given rise to Graph Neural Networks (GNNs), a novel approach designed specifically to handle graph-structured data. GNNs leverage the relational information inherent in graphs, enabling them to capture complex dependencies and interactions between nodes.

Despite the growing interest in GNNs, there remains a need for a comprehensive understanding of how these networks compare to traditional deep learning models when applied to structured data. This paper aims to fill that gap by conducting a comparative study of GNNs and traditional models, highlighting their strengths and limitations across various aspects, including model architecture, performance metrics, interpretability, and application domains.

The objectives of this study are threefold: first, to examine the architectural differences between GNNs and traditional deep learning models; second, to evaluate their performance on structured datasets; and third, to explore the interpretability and application contexts in which each model excels. Through this comparative analysis, we aim to provide insights that can guide researchers and practitioners in selecting the appropriate modeling approach based on the nature of their data and specific task requirements.

In the following sections, we will delve into the theoretical underpinnings of traditional deep learning models and GNNs, conduct a thorough comparative analysis, and conclude with recommendations for future research directions.

2. BACKGROUND

Understanding the landscape of machine learning requires familiarity with the foundational models that have shaped its evolution. This section provides an overview of traditional deep learning models—specifically Convolutional Neural Networks (CNNs) and Recurrent Neural Networks (RNNs)—and introduces Graph Neural Networks (GNNs) as a novel approach designed to address the limitations of conventional methods in handling structured data.

2.1 Traditional Deep Learning Models

2.1.1 Convolutional Neural Networks (CNNs)

Convolutional Neural Networks (CNNs) have revolutionized the field of computer vision by enabling automated feature extraction from images. The architecture of a CNN consists of multiple layers, including convolutional layers, pooling layers,

Published By:
International Journal of Engineering Research in Current Trends

and fully connected layers. The convolutional layers apply filters to the input data to detect local patterns, such as edges and textures, while pooling layers reduce dimensionality and computational complexity by downsampling feature maps. CNNs are particularly effective for tasks where spatial hierarchies and local patterns are critical, such as image classification, object detection, and segmentation.

Despite their success, CNNs are inherently designed for grid-like data structures. Their application to non-grid data, such as social networks or citation graphs, is limited, as CNNs lack the capability to model relationships between disparate data points effectively. Consequently, when faced with data that possesses complex interconnections, CNNs may not be able to capture the full extent of the underlying structure.

2.1.2 Recurrent Neural Networks (RNNs)

Recurrent Neural Networks (RNNs) are another cornerstone of deep learning, primarily designed to handle sequential data. RNNs maintain a hidden state that is updated at each time step, allowing them to capture temporal dependencies in sequences such as time-series data or natural language. This architecture makes RNNs suitable for tasks like language modeling, speech recognition, and machine translation.

However, traditional RNNs encounter challenges in learning long-range dependencies due to issues such as the vanishing gradient problem. Variants like Long Short-Term Memory (LSTM) networks and Gated Recurrent Units (GRUs) have been developed to mitigate these issues, enabling RNNs to remember information over extended sequences. Nonetheless, RNNs still face limitations in scenarios where the relationships between data points are more complex than simple sequential dependencies, making them less effective for graph-structured data.

2.2 Graph Neural Networks (GNNs)

Graph Neural Networks (GNNs) have emerged as a powerful framework for modeling data represented as graphs, where nodes represent entities and edges represent relationships between them. The core idea behind GNNs is to iteratively update the representation of each node by aggregating information from its neighbors, allowing the model to learn rich, context-aware representations that capture the relational structure of the graph.

GNNs consist of several key components, including message passing and aggregation mechanisms, which enable nodes to exchange information based on their connections. This process allows GNNs to incorporate information from distant nodes, making them particularly adept at capturing complex dependencies that traditional models struggle to address. As a result, GNNs have demonstrated superior performance in various tasks involving relational data, such as node classification, link prediction, and graph classification.

The flexibility of GNNs extends to their ability to handle dynamic graphs, heterogeneous graphs, and graphs with various node and edge attributes, making them applicable across a wide range of domains, including social network analysis, recommender systems, and bioinformatics.

3. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

In this section, we conduct a comparative analysis of Graph Neural Networks (GNNs) and traditional deep learning models, namely Convolutional Neural Networks (CNNs) and Recurrent Neural Networks (RNNs). We evaluate their performance across several key aspects, including model architecture, performance metrics, interpretability, and application domains. This analysis aims to provide a clearer understanding of when to utilize each type of model based on the nature of the data and specific task requirements.

3.1 Model Architecture

CNNs:

- Structure: CNNs are composed of convolutional layers that apply filters to input data, followed by activation functions and pooling layers that downsample feature maps. This hierarchical architecture enables CNNs to learn spatial hierarchies of features, making them particularly effective for image data.
- Limitations: While CNNs excel in capturing local patterns, they are constrained by their fixed grid structure. This rigidity makes them less effective for data with arbitrary connections or relationships, such as graphs.

RNNs:

- Structure: RNNs consist of recurrent connections that allow them to maintain a hidden state over time, processing sequential data step-by-step. This architecture is designed to capture temporal dependencies, making RNNs suitable for tasks involving sequences.
- Limitations: RNNs face difficulties with long-range dependencies due to issues like the vanishing gradient problem. Furthermore, like CNNs, they do not naturally adapt to data represented in graph formats.

GNNs:

- Structure: GNNs are inherently designed to operate on graph-structured data. They consist of multiple layers where each node aggregates information from its neighbors to update its feature representation. This message-passing mechanism enables GNNs to learn rich representations based on relational information.
- Advantages: GNNs can handle varying graph structures and capture complex interactions between nodes, making them well-suited for a wide range of tasks where relationships are key.

3.2 Performance Metrics

To assess the performance of GNNs and traditional models, we consider various metrics such as accuracy, F1 score, computational efficiency, and scalability.

- Accuracy: GNNs often outperform CNNs and RNNs in tasks where relational information is critical, such as node classification and link prediction in social networks. In benchmark studies, GNNs have consistently achieved higher accuracy in graph-based tasks compared to traditional models.
- F1 Score: For tasks involving imbalanced classes, the F1 score serves as a crucial metric. GNNs tend to achieve better F1 scores in community detection and recommendation system applications due to their ability to leverage relationships among nodes.
- Computational Efficiency: Traditional models, particularly CNNs, are computationally efficient for large-scale image datasets, benefiting from optimized hardware and frameworks. However, GNNs can become computationally intensive, especially for large graphs, due to the need for multiple rounds of message passing.
- Scalability: GNNs can struggle with scalability when dealing with very large graphs, whereas traditional models like CNNs and RNNs can be more easily scaled by

Published By:
International Journal of Engineering
Research in Current Trends

leveraging parallel processing techniques. This scalability advantage is crucial in applications where datasets grow over time.

3.3 Interpretability

- CNNs: The interpretability of CNNs can be enhanced through techniques like Grad-CAM and saliency maps, which visualize the importance of different regions in the input data. However, understanding the feature representations learned at various layers can be challenging.
- RNNs: RNNs provide some interpretability through attention mechanisms, which highlight relevant input sequences influencing predictions. Nevertheless, their recurrent nature can complicate the tracing of decision pathways.
- GNNs: GNNs offer unique interpretability benefits by allowing users to visualize how information flows through the graph. By examining the impact of neighboring nodes on a particular node's prediction, GNNs facilitate a more intuitive understanding of model behavior in relational contexts.

3.4 Application Domains

The applicability of each model type varies significantly based on the data structure and task requirements.

- CNNs: Primarily used in computer vision tasks, CNNs excel in image classification, object detection, and segmentation. Their effectiveness in grid-like data makes them a go-to choice for many image-related applications.
- RNNs: RNNs are predominantly applied in natural language processing, time-series analysis, and any scenario requiring sequential data processing. They are effective for tasks such as language modeling, translation, and speech recognition.
- GNNs: GNNs have gained traction in domains requiring the modeling of relationships and interactions, such as social network analysis, knowledge graph reasoning, and bioinformatics. Their ability to handle graph structures makes them ideal for applications where data is inherently relational.

3.5 Summary of Comparative Analysis

Aspect	**CNNs**	**RNNs**	**GNNs**
Architecture	Convolutional layers for grids	Recurrent connections for sequences	Message-passing on graph structures
Performance	Strong in grid data	Strong in sequential data	Superior in relational data
Interpretability	Moderate, with visualization tools	Moderate, with attention mechanisms	High, with clear relational insights
Scalability	Highly scalable	Moderately scalable	Limited scalability for large graphs
Application Domains	Computer vision	Natural language processing	Social networks, bioinformatics

This comparative analysis reveals that while GNNs present distinct advantages in handling graph-structured data, traditional deep learning models maintain their relevance in scenarios with grid-like or sequential data. As research in this field continues, hybrid approaches that integrate the strengths of both GNNs and traditional models are likely to emerge, offering exciting new possibilities for data analysis across various domains.

4. LIMITATIONS AND CHALLENGES

While Graph Neural Networks (GNNs) and traditional deep learning models have demonstrated significant advancements in processing structured data, they each face distinct limitations and challenges that must be addressed for broader applicability and improved performance. This section outlines the primary limitations and challenges associated with both GNNs and traditional deep learning models, highlighting areas for future research and development.

4.1 Limitations of Graph Neural Networks

4.1.1 Scalability

One of the significant challenges faced by GNNs is scalability, particularly when dealing with large graphs. As the number of nodes and edges increases, the computational requirements for message passing and aggregation grow exponentially. This can lead to increased memory consumption and longer training times, making it difficult to apply GNNs to massive datasets or real-time applications. Techniques such as sampling methods and efficient graph representation are being explored to mitigate these scalability issues, but they remain a critical area for improvement.

4.1.2 Over-Smoothing

Another challenge in GNNs is the phenomenon known as over-smoothing, where node representations become indistinguishable as layers are added. In deep GNNs, repeated message passing can lead to similar feature vectors for all nodes, resulting in a loss of discriminative power and performance degradation. Developing architectures that effectively balance depth and representation distinctiveness is essential to counter this issue.

4.1.3 Interpretability

While GNNs offer improved interpretability compared to some traditional models, understanding the intricate relationships between nodes and how they influence predictions can still be complex. The message-passing mechanism often makes it challenging to trace the influence of specific nodes on the final output, necessitating the development of more intuitive interpretability techniques that can clarify how GNNs make decisions.

4.2 Limitations of Traditional Deep Learning Models

4.2.1 Data Representation

Traditional deep learning models like Convolutional Neural Networks (CNNs) and Recurrent Neural Networks (RNNs) excel in processing structured data but fall short when faced with graph-structured data. Their reliance on fixed grid-like or sequential formats means they cannot capture the complex

Published By:
International Journal of Engineering
Research in Current Trends

relationships present in graphs, limiting their effectiveness in scenarios where relational information is crucial.

4.2.2 Long-Term Dependencies

RNNs, while designed to handle sequential data, struggle with capturing long-term dependencies due to the vanishing gradient problem. This limitation hinders their ability to learn patterns over extended sequences, particularly in tasks that require a comprehensive understanding of context. Despite advancements such as Long Short-Term Memory (LSTM) networks and Gated Recurrent Units (GRUs) designed to address these challenges, issues with scalability and interpretability remain.

4.2.3 Computational Intensity

Traditional deep learning models can be computationally intensive, especially when applied to large datasets. CNNs and RNNs require substantial computational resources for training, often necessitating high-performance hardware and significant training times. This can limit their accessibility and practicality for researchers and practitioners with limited resources.

4.3 Common Challenges

4.3.1 Generalization

Both GNNs and traditional deep learning models face challenges in generalization. Overfitting can occur when models become too complex relative to the training data, leading to poor performance on unseen data. Regularization techniques, such as dropout, early stopping, and data augmentation, are commonly employed to enhance generalization, but achieving the right balance between model complexity and generalization remains a critical challenge.

4.3.2 Data Quality and Preprocessing

The performance of both GNNs and traditional deep learning models is heavily reliant on the quality of the input data. Incomplete, noisy, or biased data can lead to suboptimal model performance. Additionally, the preprocessing steps required for structured data can be complex and time-consuming, impacting the overall efficiency of the modeling process. Robust data cleaning and preprocessing techniques are essential to ensure high-quality inputs for accurate predictions.

4.3.3 Integration of Diverse Data Sources

In many real-world applications, data may come from multiple sources and be of various types (e.g., structured, unstructured, temporal). Integrating these diverse data sources effectively poses a significant challenge for both GNNs and traditional models. Developing hybrid frameworks capable of seamlessly combining different data types while preserving the relational dynamics inherent in the data remains a key area for future research.

5. CONCLUSION

In this comparative study of Graph Neural Networks (GNNs) and traditional deep learning models, we explored the distinct capabilities, limitations, and challenges associated with each approach in processing structured data. While traditional models such as Convolutional Neural Networks (CNNs) and Recurrent Neural Networks (RNNs) have demonstrated exceptional performance in specific domains—particularly in image processing and sequential data tasks—their inherent limitations in handling graph-structured data have led to the rise of GNNs as a powerful alternative.

GNNs are uniquely designed to capture the relational dynamics inherent in graph data, leveraging message-passing mechanisms to aggregate information from neighboring nodes. This ability enables GNNs to excel in applications such as social network analysis, recommendation systems, and molecular property prediction. However, challenges related to scalability, over-smoothing, and interpretability remain significant obstacles that need to be addressed to fully realize their potential.

On the other hand, traditional deep learning models, while effective in their respective domains, struggle with data representation issues when confronted with non-Euclidean structures like graphs. Furthermore, the long-term dependency challenges faced by RNNs and the computational intensity of both CNNs and RNNs limit their applicability in some contexts.

Overall, the choice between GNNs and traditional deep learning models should be guided by the specific characteristics of the data and the requirements of the task at hand. Future research should focus on developing hybrid approaches that combine the strengths of both GNNs and traditional models, enhancing generalization, scalability, and interpretability. As the field continues to evolve, addressing the identified limitations will be crucial for advancing the state of the art in machine learning and expanding its applicability across diverse domains. Through continued innovation and interdisciplinary collaboration, we can harness the full potential of these models to tackle complex real-world problems more effectively.

REFERENCES

[1] . Venkat Nutalapati. Dynamic Analysis and Runtime Security Monitoring in Embedded Android. International Research Journal of Engineering & Applied Sciences (IRJEAS). 6(3), pp. 35-39, 2018.

[2] . Kipf, T. N., & Welling, M. (2017). Semi-Supervised Classification with Graph Convolutional Networks. *Proceedings of the 5th International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*.

[3] . Munnolli, S.S.; Pujar, S.M. Scientometric study of Indian cancer research based on Scopus database. COLLNET J. Scientometr. Inf. Manag. 2017, 11, 201–214.

[4] . Pavan Nutalapati, Service Mesh in Kubernetes: Implementing Istio for Enhanced Observability and Security. Journal of Scientific and Engineering Research, 2021, 8(11): pp. 200-206, ISSN: 2394-2630.

[5] . Kaushik Reddy Muppa. Advancing Cloud Security with AI-Enhanced AWS Identity and Access Management. International Research Journal of Engineering & Applied Sciences, IRJEAS. 10(1). pp. 25-28, 2022. 10.55.83/irjeas.2022.v10i1005.

[6] . Wu, Z., Pan, S., Chen, F., Long, G., Zhang, C., & Yu, P. S. (2020). A Comprehensive Survey on Community Detection with Deep Learning. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, 31(2), 217-239.

[7] . Venkat Nutalapati. Performance Comparison Between Kotlin and Java in Android Development. International Research Journal of Engineering & Applied Sciences (IRJEAS). 7(1), pp. 19-24, 2019.

[8] . Hamilton, W. L., Ying, R., & Leskovec, J. (2017). Inductive Representation Learning on Large Graphs. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 30.

[9] . Xu, K., Hu, W., Leskovec, J., & Jegelka, S. (2018). How Powerful are Graph Neural Networks? *Proceedings of the 7th International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*.

[10] . Pavan Nutalapati, "Automated Disaster Recovery in State Government Cloud Environments: Tools and Techniques", International Journal of Science and Research (IJSR), Volume 9 Issue 3, March 2020, pp. 1703-1707, https://www.ijsr.net/getabstract.php?paperid=SR24827090746

[11] . Chen, J., Wu, Y., & Yu, P. S. (2020). Measuring the Expressiveness of Graph Neural Networks. *Proceedings of the 2020 IEEE International Conference on Data Mining (ICDM)*, 392-401.

[12] . Venkat Nutalapati. A Comprehensive Review of Mobile App Security Testing Tools and Techniques. International Research Journal of Engineering & Applied Sciences (IRJEAS). 8(1), pp. 10-15, 2020.

[13] . Arango A, Pérez J, Poblete B (2019) Hate speech detection is not as easy as you may think: A closer look at model validation. In: Proceedings of the 42nd International Acm Sigir Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval, pp. 45–54

[14] . Bruna, J., Zaremba, W., Szlam, A., & LeCun, Y. (2013). Spectral Networks and Locally Connected Networks on Graphs. *Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*.

[15] . Shu, K.; Sliva, A.; Wang, S.; Tang, J.; Liu, H. Fake news detection on social media: A data mining perspective. ACM SIGKDD Explor. Newsl. 2017, 19, 22–36.

[16] . Kaushik Reddy Muppa, Optimizing Security in the Cloud: Strengthening Protection Through Single Sign-On Implementation. International Research Journal of Engineering & Applied Sciences (IRJEAS). 11(2), pp. 01-03, 2023. https://doi.org/10.55083/irjeas.2023.v11i01003

[17] . Li, Y., Zheng, R., & Zhang, Z. (2018). A Survey on Graph Neural Networks. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*.

[18] . Huang Q, He H, Singh A, et al. Combining Label Propagation and Simple Models Out-performs Graph Neural Networks[J]. arXiv preprint arXiv:2010.13993, 2020.

[19] . Pavan Nutalapati, Distributed Denial of Service (DDoS) Protection in Cloud Infrastructure. European Journal of Advances in Engineering and Technology, 2019, 6(2): pp. 111-116, ISSN: 2394 - 658X.

[20] . Zhang, M., & Yang, Y. (2018). An End-to-End Deep Learning Approach to Graph Classification. *Proceedings of the 27th International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence (IJCAI)*, 3683-3689.

[21] . Goodfellow, I., Bengio, Y., & Courville, A. (2016). *Deep Learning*. MIT Press.

[22] . Venkat Nutalapati. Intrusion Detection Systems for Embedded Android: Techniques and Performance Evaluation. International Research Journal of Engineering & Applied Sciences (IRJEAS). 7(4), pp. 18-25, 2019.

[23] . Chollet, F. (2017). *Deep Learning with Python*. Manning Publications.

[24] . Kaushik Reddy Muppa, Study on Cloud-Based Identity and Access Management in Cyber Security, International Journal of Data Analytics Research and Development (IJDARD), 2 (1), 2024, pp. 40–49. DOI 10.17605/OSF.IO/J93FR.

[25] . LeCun, Y., Bengio, Y., & Haffner, P. (1998). Gradient-Based Learning Applied to Document Recognition. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 86(11), 2278-2324.

[26] . Vaswani, A., Shardlow, A., & et al. (2017). Attention Is All You Need. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 30.

[27] . Kaushik Reddy Muppa, Analysis on Cyber Risk Exposures and An Evaluation of The Elements That Go into Being Ready to Deal with Cyber Threats, International Journal of Computer Engineering and Technology (IJCET), 15(3), 2024, pp. 12-20. DOI 10.17605/OSF.IO/BQ2WC.

[28] . Zhang, J., Chen, Y., & Liu, Z. (2020). Deep Learning for Graphs: A Survey. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, 31(8), 2951-2964.

[29] . Yu, Y., & Ma, H. (2019). Graph Neural Networks: A Survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1901.00596*.

[30] . Venkat Nutalapati. Enhancing Security through Dynamic Analysis in Embedded Android Systems. International Research Journal of Engineering & Applied Sciences (IRJEAS). 8(4), pp. 29-35, 2020.

[31] . Lazer, D.M.; Baum, M.A.; Benkler, Y.; Berinsky, A.J.; Greenhill, K.M.; Menczer, F.; Metzger, M.J.; Nyhan, B.; Pennycook, G.; Rothschild, D.; et al. The science of fake news. Science 2018, 359, 1094–1096.

[32] . Karpathy, A., & Fei-Fei, L. (2015). Deep Visual-Semantic Alignments for Generating Image Descriptions. *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 3128-3137.

[33] . Dai, J.; Qi, H.; Xiong, Y.; Li, Y.; Zhang, G.; Hu, H.; Wei, Y. Deformable Convolutional Networks. In Proceedings of the 2017 IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV), Venice, Italy, 22–29 October 2017; pp. 764–773.

[34] . Pavan Nutalapati, Data Leakage Prevention Strategies in Cloud Computing. European Journal of Advances in Engineering and Technology, 2021, 8(9): pp.118-123, ISSN: 2394 - 658X.

[35] . Gong, S.; Sinnott, R.O.; Qi, J.; Paris, C. Fake news detection through graph-based neural networks: A survey. arXiv 2023, arXiv:2307.12639.

[36] . Cingireddy, A. R., Ghosh, R., Melapu, V. K., Joginipelli, S., & Kwembe, T. A. (2022). Classification of Parkinson's Disease Using Motor and Non-Motor Biomarkers Through Machine Learning Techniques. International Journal of Quantitative Structure-Property Relationships (IJQSPR), 7(2), 1-21. https://doi.org/10.4018/IJQSPR.290011

[37] . Hamilton, W. L., Ying, R., & Leskovec, J. (2017). Representation Learning on Graphs: Methods and Applications. *IEEE Data Engineering Bulletin*, 40(3), 52-74.

[38] . Allcott, H.; Gentzkow, M. Social media and fake news in the 2016 election. J. Econ. Perspect. 2017, 31, 211–236.

[39] . Kaushik Reddy Muppa, Analysis on the Role of Artificial Intelligence and Identity and Access Management (IAM) In Cyber Security, International Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research and Development (IJAIRD), 2(1), 2024, pp. 113-122. DOI 10.17605/OSF.IO/76DG5.

[40] . Devlin, J. Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. arXiv 2018, arXiv:1810.04805.

[41] . Zhao, J., & Akoglu, L. (2019). BERT for Graphs: Graph Neural Networks with Bidirectional Encoder Representations from Transformers. *Proceedings of the 2019 IEEE International Conference on Data Mining (ICDM)*, 1477-1482.

Published By:
International Journal of Engineering Research in Current Trends

[42]. Pavan Nutalapati, “Disaster Recovery and Business Continuity Planning in Cloud-Blockchain Infrastructures”, *N. American. J. of Engg. Research*, vol. 1, no. 2, Jun. 2020, Accessed: Sep. 30, 2024. [Online]. Available: https://najer.org/najer/article/view/68

Published By:
International Journal of Engineering Research in Current Trends