

G-thinker: Big Graph Mining Made Easier and Faster

Da Yan^{§†1}, Hongzhi Chen^{§2}, James Cheng^{§3}, M. Tamer Özsu^{‡4}, Qizhen Zhang^{§5}, John C. S. Lui^{§6}

[§]*Department of Computer Science and Engineering, The Chinese University of Hong Kong*

{¹yanda, ²hzchen, ³jcheng, ⁵qzzhang, ⁶cslui}@cse.cuhk.edu.hk

[†]*Department of Computer and Information Sciences, The University of Alabama at Birmingham*

¹yanda@uab.edu

[‡]*David R. Cheriton School of Computer Science, University of Waterloo*

⁴tozsu@uwaterloo.ca

Abstract

This paper proposes a general system for computation-intensive graph mining tasks that find from a big graph all subgraphs that satisfy certain requirements (e.g., graph matching and community detection). Due to the broad range of applications of such tasks, many single-threaded algorithms have been proposed. However, graphs such as online social networks and knowledge graphs often have billions of vertices and edges, which requires distributed processing in order to scale. Unfortunately, existing distributed graph processing systems such as Pregel and GraphLab are designed for data-intensive analytics, and are inefficient for computation-intensive graph mining tasks since computation over any data is coupled with the data's access that involves network transmission. We propose a distributed graph mining framework, called *G-thinker*, which is designed for computation-intensive graph mining workloads. *G-thinker* provides an intuitive graph-exploration API for the convenient implementation of various graph mining algorithms, and the runtime engine provides efficient execution with bounded memory consumption, light network communication, and parallelism between computation and communication. Extensive experiments were conducted, which demonstrate that *G-thinker* is orders of magnitude faster than existing solution, and can scale to graphs that are two orders of magnitude larger given the same hardware resources.

1 Introduction

We focus on a class of graph mining problems, namely subgraph finding problems, which aim to find all subgraphs in a graph that satisfy certain requirements. It may enumerate (or count) all of the subgraphs, or find only those subgraphs with top- k highest scores, or simply output the largest subgraph. Examples of subgraph finding problems include *graph matching* [12], *maximum clique finding* [26], *maximal clique enumer-*

ation [1], *quasi-clique enumeration* [13], *triangle listing and counting* [9], and *densest subgraph finding* [11]. These problems have a wide range of applications including social network analysis [17, 20], searching knowledge bases [10, 27] and biological network investigation [8, 33]. Although many serial algorithms have been proposed to solve these problems, they cannot scale to big graphs such as social networks and knowledge graphs. Moreover, it is non-trivial to extend these algorithms for parallel processing, because (1) the input graph itself may be too big to fit in the memory of one machine, (2) a serial algorithm checks subgraphs using backtracking, where only one candidate subgraph is constructed (incrementally from the previous candidate subgraph) and examined at a time; a parallel algorithm that checks many subgraphs simultaneously in memory many cause memory overflow. The issue is further complicated in the distributed setting due to the high cost of accessing large amounts of remote data.

A plethora of distributed systems have been developed recently for processing big graphs [29], but most of them adopt a think-like-a-vertex style (or, vertex-centric) computation model [3, 7, 22, 31] which is pioneered by Google's Pregel [15]. These systems only require a programmer to specify the behavior of one generic vertex (e.g., sending messages to other vertices) when developing distributed graph algorithms, but the resulting programs are usually data-intensive. Specifically, the processing of each vertex is triggered by incoming messages sent (mostly) from other machines, and the CPU cost of vertex processing is negligible compared with the communication cost of message transmission. Moreover, subgraph finding problems operate on subgraphs rather than individual vertices, and it is unnatural to translate a subgraph finding problem into a vertex-centric program.

As a result, big graph analytics research mostly focuses on problems that naturally have a vertex-program implementation, such as PageRank and shortest path, and few work has been devoted to large-scale subgraph

finding. To our knowledge, only two existing systems, NScale [19] and Arabesque [24], attempted to attack large-scale subgraph finding with a subgraph-centric programming model. Unfortunately, their execution engines still mine subgraphs in a data-intensive manner. Specifically, they construct all candidate subgraphs in a synchronous manner (i.e., large subgraphs are constructed from small ones), before the actual computation that examines these subgraphs. Materializing candidate subgraphs incurs large network and storage overhead (while CPU is under-utilized), and the actual computation-intensive mining process is delayed until the costly subgraph materialization is completed.

Another critical drawback of existing distributed frameworks is that they process each individual subgraph as an independent task, which loses many optimization opportunities. For example, if multiple subgraphs on a machine contain a common vertex v , their tasks may share v 's information (e.g., adjacent edges). But in existing systems, each subgraph will maintain its own copy of v 's information (likely received from another machine), leading to redundant communication and storage. The synchronous execution model of existing systems is also prone to the straggler problem, due to imbalanced workload distribution among different machines.

In this paper, we identify the following five requirements that a distributed system for subgraph finding should satisfy in order to be efficient and user-friendly:

- The programming interface should be **subgraph-centric**.
- **Computation-intensive** processing should be native to the programming model. For example, a programmer should be able to backtrack a portion of graph to examine candidate subgraphs like in a serial algorithm, without materializing and transmitting any subgraph.
- There should exist **no global synchronization** among the machines, i.e., the processing of different portions of a graph should not block each other.
- Since a subgraph finding algorithm checks many (possibly overlapping) subgraphs whose cumulative volume can be much larger than the input graph itself, it is important to schedule the subgraph-tasks properly to keep the **memory usage bounded** at any point of time.

Obviously, each machine should stream and process its subgraphs on its local disk (if memory is not sufficient), to minimize network and disk IO overhead.

- Subgraphs on a machine that contain a common vertex v should be able to share v 's information (e.g.,

adjacent edges), to **avoid redundant data transmission and storage**.

Based on these criteria, we designed a novel subgraph-centric system, called *G-thinker*, as a unified framework for developing scalable algorithms for various subgraph finding problems. To write a *G-thinker* program, a user only needs to specify how to grow a portion of the input graph g by pulling g 's surrounding vertices, and how to process g (e.g., by backtracking). Communication and execution details in *G-thinker* are transparent to end users. In *G-thinker*, each machine only keeps and processes a small batch of tasks in memory at any time (to achieve high throughput through task batching while keeping memory usage bounded). Subgraphs that are waiting to be processed (e.g., to grow its frontier by pulling remote vertices) are buffered in a disk-based priority queue. The priority queue is organized by a min-hashing based task scheduling strategy, in order to maximize the opportunity that the processing of different subgraphs share common vertices (including their adjacent edges) that are cached in the local machine.

We have used *G-thinker* to develop significantly more efficient and scalable solutions for a number of subgraph finding problems, including triangle counting, maximum clique finding, and graph matching. Compared with existing systems, *G-thinker* is up to hundreds of times faster and scales to graphs that are two orders of magnitude larger given the same hardware resources.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. We motivate the need of a computation-intensive subgraph finding framework with the problem of maximal clique enumeration in Section 2, and then explain why existing systems are inefficient in Section 3. Section 4 provides an overview of the design of *G-thinker*, Section 5 introduces the programming interface of *G-thinker*, and Section 6 illustrates how to write application programs in *G-thinker*. We present the implementation of *G-thinker* in Section 7, and report experimental results in Section 8. Finally, we conclude the paper in Section 9.

2 A Motivating Example

A common feature of subgraph finding problems is that, the computation over a graph G can be decomposed into that over subgraphs of G that are often much smaller (called **decomposed subgraphs**), such that each result subgraph is found in exactly one decomposed subgraph. In other words, the decomposed subgraphs partition the search space and there is no redundant computation. We illustrate by considering maximal clique enumeration, which serves as our running example. Table 1 summarizes the notations used throughout this paper.

Table 1: Notation Table

Notation	Meaning
$G = (V, E)$	G is the input graph, with vertex (edge) set $V(E)$
v_i	The i -th vertex of G
G_i	A decomposed subgraph of G seeded from v_i
$\Gamma(v)$	The set of neighboring vertices of v
$\Gamma_{gr}(v)$	Neighbors of v whose vertex IDs are larger than v 's
\mathbb{W}	The set of all workers
$ \mathbb{W} $	The total number of workers
W_i	The i -th worker
T_{local}	The local vertex table of a worker
v_i^j	The i -th vertex in T_{local} of worker W_j
T_{cache}	LRU cache of a worker to keep remote vertices
$\max_t(v)$	The vertex in $\Gamma(v)$ with the largest ID
$P(t)$	Vertices that task t needs to pull from remote machines

Example: Maximal Clique Enumeration. We decompose a graph $G = (V, E)$ into a set of G 's subgraphs $\{G_1, G_2, \dots, G_n\}$, where G_i is constructed by expanding from a vertex $v_i \in V$. Let us denote the neighbors of a vertex v by $\Gamma(v)$. If we construct G_i as the subgraph induced by $\{v_i\} \cup \Gamma(v_i)$ (G_i is called v_i 's 1-ego network), then we can find all cliques from these 1-ego networks since any two vertices in a clique must be neighbors of each other. However, a clique could be double-counted.

Let us define $\Gamma_{gr}(v) = \{u \in \Gamma(v) \mid u > v\}$ where vertices are compared according to their IDs. To avoid redundant computation, we redefine G_i as induced by $\{v_i\} \cup \Gamma_{gr}(v_i)$, i.e., G_i does not contain any neighbor $v_j < v_i$. This is because any clique containing both v_i and v_j has already been computed when processing G_j . Obviously, any clique C (let the smallest vertex in C be v_i) is only computed once, i.e., when G_i is processed. \square

We can distribute these decomposed subgraphs to different machines, so that each decomposed subgraph is processed using a serial backtracking algorithm to find cliques without network communication. Since the computation complexity of maximal clique enumeration is exponential to graph size, the computation cost of processing G_i is super-linear (to G_i 's size) with a small constant (i.e., computation-intensive), while the transmission cost of creating G_i is linear with a large constant (due to limited network transmission rate). Thus, the computation cost and communication cost strike a balance when G_i is sufficiently large, and overlapping computation and communication over decomposed subgraphs significantly improves the overall performance.

However, since real graphs often follow power-law degree distribution, there may exist some vertex v_i with a very high degree, thus generating a large G_i . Due to high computational complexity, the machine processing G_i may become the straggler that keeps processing G_i while other machines finish their tasks and become idle. To tackle this problem, a system should allow G_i to be further decomposed, so that the resulting decomposed subgraphs can be distributed to different machines

for processing. In maximal clique enumeration, we can decompose G_i exactly as how we decompose G , conditioned on that v_i is already in any clique found therein. The decomposition may recurse by looking at more vertices until the resulting subgraphs are small enough for balanced workload distribution.

As we shall see in Section 6, the above ideas generalize to numerous subgraph finding problems.

3 Limitations of Related Work

In this section, we review existing distributed solutions to subgraph finding, and explain their weaknesses.

Vertex-Centric In-Memory Solutions. Most vertex-centric systems are in-memory systems, where vertices (along with their adjacency lists) are partitioned among different machines in a cluster and kept in memory [3, 14, 6, 7, 22, 31]. Vertices communicate with each other by message passing, and messages are also buffered in memory to avoid slow disk access.

However, the vertex-centric API is not suitable for subgraph finding, and each vertex v_i needs to communicate with its surrounding vertices in a breadth-first manner (one more hop per iteration) to get their information for constructing G_i . The solution cannot scale to large graphs since the total volume of (possibly overlapping) decomposed subgraphs may easily exceed the memory capacity of a cluster. Vertex-centric systems also do not provide any mechanism for decomposed subgraphs to share common vertex's information¹.

The key problem is, nevertheless, that vertex-centric computation is mainly for data-intensive computation, and generates a large number of messages to transmit for subgraph finding (e.g., for pulling vertices to construct decomposed subgraphs). We call the problem as **communication-in-the-chain**. In fact, [32] indicates that a vertex-centric program is most scalable if each iteration requires linear computation and communication cost, and it runs for a small number of iterations. This essentially implies that vertex-centric systems are for graph problems with a low computational complexity.

Vertex-Centric Disk-Based Solutions. The prohibitive memory requirement can be eliminated using a disk-based system. For example, MapReduce [4] can be used to simulate vertex-centric graph computation (e.g., message sending & receiving) [18], and Pregel [2] translates a vertex-centric program into a dataflow execution plan for out-of-memory processing. However, the large amount of intermediate data (including messages and subgraphs) need to be dumped to disk and then

¹Pregel's message combiner [15] does not help, since it is to aggregate messages towards the same target vertex, while we consider getting information from the same source vertex.

loaded back for each iteration of synchronous computation, making the running time prohibitive. We call the problem as **disk-in-the-chain**, which adds upon the communication-in-the-chain problem already suffered by a vertex-centric model. In fact, MapReduce even writes intermediate data to Hadoop Distributed File System (HDFS), which is much slower than local disk writes since HDFS replicates each data block on three machines for fault tolerance (termed the **remote write problem**).

These synchronous frameworks also prevent the computation-intensive processing of decomposed subgraphs from beginning until all decomposed subgraphs are synchronously constructed, leading to CPU underutilization. Data sharing among subgraphs is also not possible since a subgraph is processed by a reducer.

Systems with Subgraph-Based API. Recently, NScale [19] and Arabesque [24] attempted to attack subgraph finding problems through a subgraph-based API rather than a vertex-centric one. Albeit becoming more user-friendly, the execution engines of these systems still perform data-intensive processing like vertex-centric solutions mentioned before, and they actually introduce new performance issues.

NScale [19] uses the MapReduce solution we mentioned above, and it brings additional overheads. NScale only supports the top-level decomposed subgraphs, and there is no mechanism to balance workload through recursive decomposition. Assuming that each G_i spans the k -hop neighborhood around v_i , then NScale first constructs all decomposed subgraphs using k rounds of MapReduce. The large number of decomposed subgraphs are then packed into larger compact subgraphs, each of which can fit in the memory of a reducer. Vertices common to multiple decomposed subgraphs are stored only once in their packed subgraph. Finally, each compact subgraph is distributed to a reducer, which processes all decomposed subgraphs packed in the compact subgraph in memory. Obviously, NScale suffers from all the performance issues of a MapReduce-based vertex-centric solution; moreover, NScale further packs decomposed subgraphs through expensive disk-based computation, and it is very likely that the cost of packing G_i already surpasses that of processing G_i right after it is constructed in memory.

Arabesque [24] proposed an embedding-centric model where an embedding is a subgraph of the input graph G . Arabesque requires the entire G to reside in the memory of every machine, and constructs and processes subgraphs iteratively. In the i -th iteration, it grows the set of embeddings with i edges/vertices by one adjacent edge/vertex, to construct embeddings with $(i + 1)$ edges/vertices for processing. New embeddings that pass a filtering condition are further processed and then passed to the next iteration. For example, to find cliques,

the filtering condition checks whether an embedding e is a clique; if so, e is reported and passed to the next iteration to grow larger clique candidates.

Unfortunately, Arabesque suffers from new performance and scalability issues. Firstly, while previous solutions still permit efficient backtracking within each decomposed subgraph, Arabesque materializes and transmits every single candidate subgraph it examines. Arabesque also compresses/decompresses the large number of materialized embeddings using a data structure called ODAG to save space, which consumes additional CPU cycles. To additionally support frequent subgraph pattern mining, automorphism checking is performed for every newly-expanded embedding to avoid generating duplicate embeddings, which adds unnecessary overhead for subgraph finding. Finally, since G resides in the memory of every machine, scalability is limited by the memory space of a single machine.

Other Systems. Blogel [30] and Giraph++ [25] proposed a block-centric model which partitions a graph into **disjoint** subgraphs called blocks to be distributed among machines for iterative processing, eliminating the need of communication inside each block. However, these systems do not target subgraph finding problems, but rather the acceleration of vertex-centric models.

4 System Overview

We now overview the design of *G-thinker*, including its programming model and system components.

Programming Model. *G-thinker* performs computation on subgraphs. Each subgraph g is associated with a *task*, which performs computation on g and grows g when needed. *G-thinker* grows subgraphs starting from a set of seed vertices in V . For example, in clique enumeration, one may create a task from each vertex $v_i \in V$, which forms the initial subgraph g containing only v_i ; the task grows g into G_i by *pulling* vertices in $\Gamma_{gt}(v_i)$ along with their adjacent edges, and then enumerates cliques in G_i . In case G_i is too big, users may instead further decompose G_i and create new tasks associated with the newly decomposed subgraphs, which can then be distributed to different machines to improve load balancing.

***G-thinker* Components.** A *G-thinker* program runs on a cluster of workers, $\mathbb{W} = \{W_1, W_2, \dots\}$, where each worker is a basic computing unit that processes its assigned tasks in serial, and a machine may run multiple workers. Each worker alternates between subgraph-centric task computation and vertex pulling (into subgraphs), both are processed in batches. To be memory efficient, we keep the memory requirement of each worker at approximately $O(d_{avg} \cdot \frac{|V|}{|\mathbb{W}|})$, where d_{avg} is the average vertex degree.




Figure 1: Components of Worker W_1

G -thinker partitions the vertices in V (along with their adjacency lists) among different workers, and each worker maintains its assigned vertices in a local table T_{local} . Let us denote the i -th vertex maintained in T_{local} of worker W_j by v_i^j . Figure 1 shows the components of W_1 , where we can see that T_{local} maintains vertices $v_1^1, v_2^1, v_3^1, \dots$; each vertex also keeps its neighbors in its adjacency list, so that it can pull its neighbors (along with their adjacency lists) from T_{local} of other workers, by providing the neighbor IDs. The local tables of all workers collectively constitute a distributed key-value store where key is the ID of a vertex v and value is v 's adjacency list $\Gamma(v)$.

When a vertex is pulled (along with its adjacency list) from another worker, it is not directly added to the subgraph of the requesting task; instead, it is put in an *LRU cache* T_{cache} . The cache keeps the non-local vertices (i.e., not in T_{local}) that are previously received, so that a non-local vertex can be shared by all the tasks that pull it. It is up to the user to decide whether the task's subgraph should be updated, and if so, what information of that vertex should be added to the subgraph.

As Figure 1 shows, W_1 's T_{cache} keeps non-local vertices v_2^1, v_3^1, \dots (along with their adjacency lists), which are pulled by local tasks previously executed at W_1 . Note that the adjacency list of a non-local vertex may contain a local vertex, such as v_2^1 in the adjacency list of vertex v_3^1 in T_{cache} in Figure 1.

During subgraph-centric computation, when a task requires the adjacency list of a vertex u , if u is in T_{local} or T_{cache} , the task can directly obtain $\Gamma(u)$ by table lookup. Otherwise, the task needs to first pull u from T_{local} of u 's worker into the cache table T_{cache} , before accessing it.

As Figure 1 shows, each worker also maintains an *in-memory task buffer* for keeping tasks that are currently being processed, and a *disk-based task queue* for keeping tasks that are waiting to be processed. This design allows tasks to be processed with high throughput and less redundant communication, as we shall discuss next.

Batch Processing & Communication Reduction. A task usually only generates a small number of pull-requests at a time, and sending small messages wastes network bandwidth. Therefore, in G -thinker, a worker fetches a batch of tasks from the disk-based task queue

at each time, sends their pull-requests together, receives all the requested vertices, and then processes these tasks. Tasks that need to pull more vertices are then added to the task queue for further processing.

Batch processing hides the round-trip delay of each task's pull-requests, since if tasks are processed one at a time, each task needs to wait for its requested vertices to arrive, which wastes CPU cycles. Batch processing also reduces redundancy in communication. Specifically, if many tasks in a batch pull a remote vertex u , only one pull-request needs to be sent, and $\langle u, \Gamma(u) \rangle$ will be received only once and cached in T_{cache} for access by all these tasks. This is in contrast to existing solutions like NScale, where $\langle u, \Gamma(u) \rangle$ needs to be transmitted to every subgraph g that requires it. We organize the task queue Q using locality sensitive hashing (detailed in Section 7), to increase the probability that tasks fetched from Q share common vertices to pull.

To further reduce communication, G -thinker allows a user to prune useless items in $\Gamma(v)$ before responding $\langle v, \Gamma(v) \rangle$ to a worker that pulls v . For example, in clique enumeration, a vertex v only needs to respond to a pull-request with $\Gamma_{gt}(v)$ instead of the entire $\Gamma(v)$.

Memory Cost Analysis. Since G -thinker partitions the vertices evenly among the workers, T_{local} of each worker contains around $O(|V|/|\mathbb{W}|)$ vertices. To keep the memory consumption bounded by $O(d_{avg} \cdot |V|/|\mathbb{W}|)$, we also set the capacity of T_{cache} to cache at most $O(|V|/|\mathbb{W}|)$ vertices at any time, and vertex eviction is based on the LRU (Least Recently Used) policy. As for the memory requirement of tasks, since each task keeps a subgraph g , one cannot afford to keep all tasks in memory (e.g., consider all maximal cliques of a graph). Our solution is to keep only a small number (e.g., 1000) of active tasks in memory for batch processing, so that their small subgraphs consume $O(d_{avg} \cdot |V|/|\mathbb{W}|)$ memory space.

Computation & Communication Cost Analysis. Each task in G -thinker (1) pulls required vertices to its subgraph (linear communication cost, and pull requests can further be shared with other tasks) and (2) then performs higher-complexity computation on the subgraph in local machine. Step (2) is computation-intensive and avoids any communication when exploring the large search space by backtracking.

To overlap communication (i.e., Step (1)) with computation (i.e., Step (2)), G -thinker treats tasks independently. Different tasks can have different progress, and no synchronization among all machines is required. G -thinker proceeds the computation of a task as long as all its requested vertices are locally accessible, and the only communication type in G -thinker is point-to-point communication between two workers for vertex pulling, and dynamic task (or decomposed subgraph) reassignment if

<i>Task</i> < <i>I</i> , <i>C</i> , <i>V</i> , <i>E</i> >	<i>Worker</i> < <i>Task</i> >
Fields: <i>Subgraph</i> <i>g</i> <i>C</i> <i>context</i> Functions: <i>pull</i> (<i>neighbor</i>) <i>add_task</i> (<i>task</i>) //UDF: <i>bool</i> <i>compute</i> (<i>vertex_frontier</i>)	Functions: <i>run</i> (<i>config_info</i>) <i>add_task</i> (<i>task</i>) //UDF: <i>seedTask_gene</i> (<i>vertex</i>) <i>Vertex</i> <i>respond</i> (<i>vertex</i>)

Figure 2: Programming Interface of *G-thinker*




Figure 3: Data Types in *G-thinker*

load balancing is enabled.

5 Programming Interface

G-thinker is written in C++, and it defines two important base classes, *Task* and *Worker*, as sketched in Figure 2. To write a *G-thinker* program, a user needs to subclass *Task* and *Worker* with their template arguments properly specified, and implement their abstract functions according to the application logic; these functions are called *user-defined functions* (UDFs). We remark that although we use C++ terminology here such as “template”, the API is general enough to be implemented in any object-oriented language (e.g., “generic types” in Java).

Data Types. As Figure 2 shows, the *Task* class takes four template arguments <*I*>, <*C*>, <*V*> and <*E*>. Among them, <*I*>, <*V*> and <*E*> specify the data types of vertices and edges: (1) <*I*>: the type of vertex ID; (2) <*V*>: the type of vertex attribute; (3) <*E*>: the type of the attribute of an adjacency list item. Other system-defined types (e.g., those for subgraph, vertex, and adjacency list) are automatically derived by *G-thinker* from them, and can be directly used in the UDFs once a user specifies these three template arguments.

Figure 3 illustrates the inferred system-defined types. Specifically, a subgraph is shown on the left, which consists of a table of vertices (stored with their adjacency lists). The structure of Vertex 3 is shown on the right, where the vertex is stored with its ID (of type <*I*>) and a vertex label “c” (of type <*V*>), and an adjacency list. Each item in the adjacency list is stored with a neighbor ID (of type <*I*>) and an attribute (of type <*E*>) indicating the label of the neighbor and the edge label. For example, the first item corresponds to Vertex 1 with label “a”, and the edge label of (3, 1) is “B”. Attributes (i.e., <*V*> and <*E*>) are optional and are not needed for finding subgraphs with only topology constraints (e.g., triangles, cliques, and quasi-cliques).

The Task class. The *Task* class has another template argument <*C*> that specifies the type of context information for a task *t*, which can be, for example, *t*’s iteration number (a task in *G-thinker* proceeds its computation in iterations). Each *Task* object *t* maintains a subgraph *g* and the user-specified *context* object (of type <*C*>). The *Task* class has only one UDF, *t.compute(frontier)*, where the input *frontier* keeps the set of vertices requested by *t* in its previous iteration. Each element of *frontier* is actually a pointer to a vertex object in T_{local} or T_{cache} . Of course, users may also access *t*’s subgraph and context object in *compute(frontier)*.

UDF *compute(frontier)* specifies how a task computes for one iteration. If *t.compute(.)* returns *true*, *t* needs to be processed by more iterations; otherwise, *t*’s computation is finished after the current iteration. In *G-thinker*, when *t* is fetched from the task queue for processing, *t.compute(.)* is executed repeatedly until either *t* is complete, or *t* needs a non-local vertex *v* that is not cached in T_{cache} , in which case *t* is added to the task queue waiting for all *t*’s requested vertices to be pulled. When a task is completed or queued to disk, *G-thinker* automatically garbage collects the memory space of the task to make room for the processing of other tasks.

Inside *t.compute(.)*, a user may access and update *g* and *context*, and call *pull(u)* to request vertex *u* for use in *t*’s next iteration. Here, *u* is usually in the adjacency list of a previously pulled vertex, and *pull(u)* expands the frontier of *g*. To improve network utilization, *g* is usually expanded in a breadth-first manner, so that each call of *compute(.)* generates pull-requests for all relevant vertices adjacent to *g*’s growing frontier. A user may also call *add_task(task)* in *t.compute(.)* to add a newly-created task to the task queue.

The Worker Class. Each object of the *Worker* class corresponds to a worker that processes its assigned tasks in serial. Figure 2 shows the key functions of the *Worker* class, including two important UDFs.

UDF *seedTask_gene(v)* specifies how to create tasks according to a seed vertex $v \in T_{local}$. A worker of *G-thinker* starts by calling *seedTask_gene(v)* on every $v \in T_{local}$, to generate seed tasks and to add them to the disk-based task queue. Inside *seedTask_gene(v)*, users may examine the adjacency list of *v*, create tasks accordingly (and may let each task pull neighbors of *v*), and add these tasks to the task queue by calling *add_task(.)*.

UDF *respond(v)* is used to prune $\Gamma(v)$ before sending it back to requesting workers. By default, *respond(v)* returns *NULL* and *G-thinker* directly uses the vertex object of *v* in T_{local} to respond. Users may overload *respond(v)* to return a newly created copy of *v*, with items in $\Gamma(v)$ properly pruned to save communication (e.g., $\Gamma_{gr}(v)$ for clique enumeration). In this case, *G-thinker* will respond by sending the new object and then garbage-collect it.

The *worker* class also contains formatting UDFs, e.g., for users to define how to parse a line in the input file on HDFS into a vertex object in T_{local} , which will be used during graph loading.

To run a *G-thinker* program, one may subclass *Worker* with all UDFs properly implemented, and then call $run(config_info)$ to start the job, where $config_info$ contains job configuration parameters such as the HDFS file path of the input graph.

The Aggregator Class. The *Worker* class optionally admits a second template argument $\langle aggT \rangle$, which needs to be specified if aggregator is used to collect some statistics such as triangle count or maximum clique size. Each task can aggregate a value to its worker’s local aggregator when it finishes. These locally aggregated values can either be globally aggregated at last when all workers finish computing their tasks (which is the default setting), or be periodically synchronized (e.g., every 10 seconds) to make the globally aggregated value available to all workers (and thus all tasks) timely for use (e.g., in $compute(.)$ to prune search space). In the latter case, users need to provide a frequency parameter.

6 Applications

We consider two categories of applications: (1) finding dense subgraph structures such as triangles, cliques and quasi-cliques, which is useful in social network analysis and community detection; (2) graph matching, which is useful in applications such as querying semantic networks and pattern recognition.

For simplicity, we only consider top-level task decomposition, i.e., we grow each vertex $v_i \in V$ into *exactly one* decomposed subgraph G_i , and every qualified subgraph will be found in *exactly one* decomposed subgraph.

Triangle Counting. Assume that for any vertex v , neighbors in $\Gamma(v)$ are already sorted in increasing order of vertex ID (e.g., during graph loading). We also denote the largest (i.e., last) vertex in $\Gamma(v)$ by $\max_{\Gamma}(v)$.

We want each triangle $\Delta_{v_1 v_2 v_3}$ (w.l.o.g., $v_1 < v_2 < v_3$) to be counted exactly once, i.e., in v_1 ’s decomposed subgraph. We let v_1 count $\Delta_{v_1 v_2 v_3}$ by checking whether $v_3 \in \Gamma(v_2)$. Since v_1 only examines $\Gamma(v_2)$ for every neighbor v_2 with $v_1 < v_2 < v_3$, v_1 only needs to pull the adjacency list of every neighbor in $(\Gamma_{gr}(v_1) - \{\max_{\Gamma}(v_1)\})$. Also, since $\Gamma(v_2)$ is only checked against $v_3 > v_2$, v_2 only needs to respond $\Gamma_{gr}(v_2)$ to v_1 .

According to the above discussion, among the UDFs of *Worker*, $respond(v_2)$ creates a copy of v_2 with adjacency list $\Gamma_{gr}(v_2)$ for responding; if $|\Gamma_{gr}(v_1)| \geq 2$, $seedTask_gene(v_1)$ creates a task t for v_1 and let t pull every vertex in $(\Gamma_{gr}(v_1) - \{\max_{\Gamma}(v_1)\})$. The context of t keeps $\max_{\Gamma}(v_1)$ and a triangle counter $count$ (initialized as 0).




Figure 4: An Example of Graph Matching

In $t.compute(frontier)$, $frontier$ contains all the pulled vertices (i.e., v_2) in increasing order of their IDs as they were requested in $seedTask_gene(v_1)$. We check every $v_2 \in frontier$ as follows. For each v_2 , we loop through all vertices $v_3 > v_2$ in $\Gamma_{gr}(v_1)$ ($\Gamma_{gr}(v_1)$ is obtained by appending $\max_{\Gamma}(v_1)$ in t ’s context to $frontier$), and increment t ’s counter if $v_3 \in \Gamma(v_2)$. Finally, $compute(.)$ returns *false* since we have checked all (v_2, v_3) pairs and the task is finished.

Whenever a task t is finished, its counter (in t ’s context) is added to the locally aggregated value, and when all workers finish computation, these local counts are sent to the master to get the total triangle count.

Maximum Clique. We adapt the serial backtracking algorithm of [26] to *G-thinker*. The original algorithm maintains the size of the maximum clique currently found, denoted by $|Q_{max}|$, to prune the search space.

To allow timely pruning, each worker in our *G-thinker* program maintains $|Q_{max}|$ and keeps it relatively up to date by periodic aggregator synchronization, so that if a worker discovers a larger clique and updates $|Q_{max}|$, the value can be synchronized to other workers timely to improve their pruning effectiveness. In $seedTask_gene(v_i)$, we create a task t whose graph g contains v_i , and we let t pull all vertices in $\Gamma_{gr}(v_i)$. Then in $t.compute(frontier)$, we collect vertices in $frontier$ (i.e., $\Gamma_{gr}(v_i)$), add them to g but filter those adjacency list items that are not in $\{v_i\} \cup \Gamma_{gr}(v_i)$, to form the decomposed subgraph G_i , and then run the algorithm of [26] on G_i .

This solution can be easily extended to find quasi-cliques, where in a quasi-clique, every vertex is adjacent to at least $\gamma (\geq 0.5)$ fraction of other vertices. In such a quasi-clique, two vertices are at most 2 hops away [13]. The *G-thinker* algorithm is similar to that for finding maximum clique, except that (1) for each local seeding vertex v_i , $compute(frontier)$ runs for 2 iterations to pull vertices (larger than v_i) within 2 hops of v_i ; (2) $compute(frontier)$ then constructs G_i as the 2-hop ego-network of v_i and runs the quasi-clique algorithm of [13] on G_i to compute the quasi-cliques.

Graph Matching. Graph matching finds all subgraph instances in a data graph that match the query graph.

Consider the problem of finding all occurrences of the query graph pattern given by Figure 4(a) in the data graph shown in Figure 4(b). In this example, each vertex in the query graph (and the data graph) has a unique integer ID and a label. We define $k_1k_2k_3k_4k_5$ as a mapping where vertex with ID k_i in the data graph is mapped to vertex ① in the query graph. A mapping is a matching if vertex k_i and vertex ① have the same label (for any i), and for any edge (①, ①) in the query graph, the corresponding edge (k_i, k_j) exists in the data graph. For example, 25478 is a matching, while 25178 is not since the data graph does not have edge (1, 5) that corresponds to (③, ②).

Existing works on distributed graph matching combine vertex-centric graph exploration with subgraph join. Note that when a query graph contains cycles, vertex-centric graph exploration alone is not sufficient. For example, in Figure 4(b), suppose that we perform vertex-centric exploration on the data graph along query graph path ③-①-②, we will explore from Vertex 1 (or 4) to 2 and then to 5 simply according to neighbors’ labels. Then, we need to check all b -labeled neighbors of Vertex 5 to find Vertex 1 (or 4), which is essentially an equi-join on the ID of k_3 rather than a simple label-based exploration. [23] and [5] first decompose a query graph into small acyclic subgraphs called twigs (see Figure 4(c) for an example), and then use graph exploration to find subgraph instances that match those twigs, and join twigs on joint vertices (e.g., k_2 and k_3 for Figure 4(c)) to obtain the subgraphs that match the query graph.

Our algorithm avoids materializing matched subgraphs and performing distributed subgraph join as required by existing solutions. Instead, we pull required vertices to construct each decomposed subgraph G_i , and then simply enumerate the matched subgraph instances in the decomposed graph using backtracking without generating any communication.

We illustrate how to write a *G-thinker* program for the query graph of Figure 4(a). Assume that each adjacency list item contains vertex label². We start the matching from vertex ① with label “ a ”, and grow G_i from each vertex v_i in the data graph with label “ a ”. Note that every matched subgraph instance will be found since it must contain an a -labeled vertex v_i , and it will only be found in v_i ’s decomposed subgraph G_i .

We now present our algorithm, which can be safely skipped if you are not interested in reading the details.

The Algorithm: in $seedTask_gene(v)$, we only create a task t for v if v ’s label is “ a ”, and $\Gamma(v)$ contains neighbors with both labels “ b ” and “ c ”. If this is the case, we add vertex v to g , and pull all vertices in $\Gamma(v)$ with labels “ b ” and “ c ”.

²If this is not the case, one may use the Pregel algorithm of [31] for attribute broadcast to preprocess the graph data in linear cost.

Then, in iteration 1 of $t.compute(frontier)$, we split $frontier$ into two vertex sets: V_b (resp. V_c) consists of vertices with label “ b ” (resp. “ c ”). However, while a vertex in V_c definitely matches vertex ② in Figure 4(a), a vertex in V_b may match either Vertex ③ or Vertex ④. For each vertex $v_c \in V_c$, we split all vertices in $\Gamma(v_c)$ with label “ b ” into two sets: U_1 consisting of those vertices that are also in V_b (i.e., they can match Vertex ③ or Vertex ④), and U_2 consisting of the rest (i.e., they can only match Vertex ④ since they are not neighbors of v_c). We prune v_c , (i) if $U_1 = \emptyset$ since v_c does not have a neighbor matching Vertex ③, or (ii) if $|U_1| = 1$ and $U_2 = \emptyset$, since v_c does not have two neighbors with label “ b ”. Otherwise, (iii) if $|U_1| = 1$ and $U_2 \neq \emptyset$, then the vertex in U_1 has to match Vertex ③, and the vertex matching Vertex ④ has to be from U_2 , and thus we pull all vertices of U_2 ; while (iv) if $|U_1| > 1$, the vertex matching Vertex ④ can be from either U_1 or U_2 , and thus we pull all vertices from both U_1 and U_2 . Let the only vertex (with label “ a ”) currently in g be v_a , then in both Cases (iii) and (iv), we add v_c and edge (v_a, v_c) to g , and for each vertex $v_b \in U_1$ (i.e., v_b can match Vertex ③), we add v_b and edge (v_a, v_b) to g .

Then in iteration 2 of $t.compute(frontier)$, $frontier$ contains all pulled vertices with label “ b ” that can match Vertex ④. Let the set of all vertices with label “ c ” in g (i.e., matching Vertex ②) be V_c . Then, for each vertex $v_b \in frontier$, we denote the set of all vertices of $\Gamma(v_b)$ with label “ d ” (i.e., matching Vertex ⑤) be V_d ; if $V_d \neq \emptyset$, (1) we add v_b to g , (2) for every vertex $v_c \in V_c \cap \Gamma(v_b)$, we add edge (v_c, v_b) (i.e., matching (②, ④)) to g , (3) for every vertex $v_d \in V_d$, we add v_d and edge (v_b, v_d) to g . Finally, we run a backtracking algorithm on g to enumerate all subgraphs that match the query graph.

Lastly, we can let UDF $respond(v)$ return a copy of v by pruning items in $\Gamma(v)$ whose labels do not fall into $\{a, b, c, d\}$ to save communication. \square

We remark that only top-level subgraphs decomposed by Vertex ① in the query graph have been considered. If a resulting decomposed subgraph G_i is still too big, one may continue to decompose G_i by looking at one more vertex in the query graph (given that Vertex ① is already matched to v_i).

7 System Implementation

Task Queue & Task Buffers. Since tasks contain subgraphs that may overlap with each other, it is impractical to keep all tasks in memory. Thus, each worker of *G-thinker* maintains a disk-based queue Q to keep those tasks waiting to be processed. Figure 5 shows the procedure of task computation on a worker of *G-thinker*. Specifically, tasks are fetched from the task queue Q one at a time and added to a task buffer B_n^T for batch process-




Figure 5: Computation Framework of a Worker

ing, while the processed tasks (and those newly-created by $add_task(.)$) are appended to buffer B_{out}^T and then merged to Q in batches.

One baseline approach to organize Q is to treat it as a local-disk stream of tasks, which allows tasks to be sequentially read from (and appended to) Q . To support two-sided streaming, we organize tasks in Q with files each containing C tasks, where C is a user-defined parameter (100 by default) to amortize the random IO cost of reading (and writing) a task file. We call this queue organization as *stream-queue*, which does not consider whether tasks fetched into B_{in}^T share common vertices to pull. To increase the probability that tasks in B_{in}^T share common vertices to pull, we designed another queue organization called *LSH-queue* based on min-hashing.

Specifically, assume that a task t has called $compute(.)$, and let us denote the set of vertices that t needs to pull from remote machines by $\mathbf{P}(t)$. Before adding t to Q , we append a key $k(t)$ to t , which consists of a sequence of ℓ ($= 4$ by default) MinHash signatures [21] of $P(t)$. Due to the locality sensitivity of min-hashing, for two tasks t_1 and t_2 , the more similar $k(t_1)$ and $k(t_2)$ are, the more likely $P(t_1)$ and $P(t_2)$ overlap [21]. Therefore, we keep tasks in Q ordered by their keys (in alphabetic order), so that tasks fetched from the head of Q have similar keys (e.g., see B_{out}^Q in Figure 5) and are likely to share more common vertices to pull. Reducing redundancy by ordering data according to min-hashing keys has been shown to be effective by previous works [19, 16].

To avoid random disk IOs, we organize Q as depicted in Figure 5. We maintain an in-memory buffer B_{in}^Q to receive incoming tasks (from B_{out}^T), and an in-memory buffer B_{out}^Q to buffer ordered tasks to be fetched. The waiting tasks on local disk are grouped into files, where each file contains $[C/2, C]$ tasks ordered by their keys and C is a user-defined parameter. The ranges of keys in different files are disjoint (except at boundaries where keys may be equal), and all task files are linked in the order of key ranges by an in-memory doubly-linked list L^Q . Each element in L^Q points to a task file and records its key

range. Here, L^Q is like the leaf level of a B^+ -tree, but it is small enough to be memory-resident since only meta-data of files are kept. When B_{in}^Q overflows, we merge all its tasks to the list of task files efficiently by utilizing L^Q while guaranteeing that each file still contains $[C/2, C]$ tasks after merging, using a B^+ -tree style algorithm.

A computing thread fetches tasks one by one from B_{out}^Q for computation, and when B_{out}^Q becomes empty, we load to B_{out}^Q those tasks in the first file of L^Q if L^Q is not empty; otherwise, we fill B_{out}^Q with tasks obtained from the head of B_{in}^Q . Since tasks in a file are clustered by their keys, tasks in B_{out}^Q tend to share common vertices to pull.

Task Computation. A worker of G -thinker processes its tasks in rounds, where each round consists of three steps, (1) *task fetching*, (2) *vertex pulling*, and (3) *task computing*. Figure 5 illustrates these three steps.

The first step fetches tasks from Q into B_{in}^T until either (i) B_{in}^T becomes full, or (ii) there is no more room in T_{cache} to accommodate more vertices to pull. The second step then pulls all requested vertices that are not already hit in T_{cache} . Note that the pulling frequency is influenced by the capacity of B_{in}^T and T_{cache} . Now, for every task $t \in B_{in}^T$, its requested vertices in *frontier* are either in T_{local} or T_{cache} , and thus we start the third step to process the tasks in B_{in}^T . We compute each task t iteratively until either t is complete, or there exists a newly-requested vertex that is neither in T_{local} nor in T_{cache} . In the latter case, we compute t 's key using $P(t)$, and then add t to B_{out}^T . If new tasks are created by t , they are also added to B_{out}^T . Whenever B_{out}^T is full, it merges its tasks to Q .

Since a machine runs multiple workers, and the independence of their execution allows computation and communication to overlap.

Other Issues. Real graphs may contain some high-degree vertex v , and the task seeded from v may have $|P(t)|$ larger than the capacity of T_{cache} . To allow such a task to proceed, we treat t as a singleton task batch to perform vertex pulling, by temporarily increase the capacity of T_{cache} . After $t.compute(.)$ returns, we recover the original capacity of T_{cache} by evicting overflowed vertices, before starting the next round.

A worker initially seeds the tasks from all vertices in T_{local} into Q , to maximize the opportunity of finding tasks that share common vertices to pull. The seeded tasks are merge-sorted by their min-hashing key to efficiently create the file list of Q .

There exists some work that uses heuristics to estimate the computation cost of a task t from its decomposed subgraph [28], and an online regressor may also be trained to improve the cost estimation after each task is finished. Since estimating the cost of t from a partially grown subgraph is difficult, we only estimate t 's cost when its decomposed subgraph is fully constructed.

Table 2: Graph Datasets ($M = 1,000,000$)

Dataset	$ V $	$ E $	Triangle #	$ Q_{max} $	# Matched
Youtube	1.13M	2.99 M	3.06 M	17	235 M
Skitter	1.70 M	11.1 M	28.8 M	51	3,995 M
Orkut	3.07 M	117 M	628 M	67	101,282 M
Friendster	65.6 M	1,806 M	4,174 M	129	425,808 M

To allow task prefetching, each worker buffers a small set of tasks with estimated costs, and if all other tasks are exhausted, the work requests tasks from a coordinating master while continuing to process the buffered tasks. The master collects task summary from all workers to decide which tasks to be redistributed when some worker requests more tasks. We remark that task stealing strategies are still under development and are thus not reported in this paper.

8 Experiments

We evaluate the performance of *G-thinker*, which is implemented in C++ and communicates with HDFS (Hadoop 2.6.0) using libhdfs. All our experiments were run on a cluster of 15 machines, each with 12 cores (two Intel Xeon E5-2620 CPUs) and 48GB RAM. The connectivity between any pair of nodes in the cluster is 1Gbps. All system and application codes are released in *G-thinker*'s website³. We report end-to-end processing time, from graph loading to when the slowest worker finishes its processing, for all the following experiments.

Table 2 shows the four real-world graph datasets used in our experiments. We chose these graphs to be undirected since our applications described in Section 6 are for undirected graphs, while *G-thinker* can also handle directed graphs. These graphs are also chosen to have different sizes: *Youtube*⁴, *Skitter*⁵, *Orkut*⁶, and *Friendster*⁷ have 2.99 M, 11.1 M, 117 M and 1,806 M undirected edges, respectively.

We ran the algorithms described in Section 6, and list the triangle count, maximum clique size (denoted by $|Q_{max}|$), and number of matched subgraph instances in Table 2. For graph matching, we used the query graph of Figure 4(a) and randomly generated a label for each vertex in the data graph among $\{a, b, c, d, e, f, g\}$ (following a uniform distribution). We can see that the job is highly computation-intensive; e.g., the number of matched subgraphs is in the order of 10^{11} for *Orkut* and *Friendster*.

Recall from Table 5 that each worker in *G-thinker* maintains four task buffers, B_{in}^T , B_{out}^T , B_{in}^Q and B_{out}^Q . We set the capacity of B_{in}^T , B_{out}^T and B_{in}^Q to be the same, which

³<http://yanda.cis.uab.edu/gthinker/>

⁴<https://snap.stanford.edu/data/com-Youtube.html>

⁵<http://konect.uni-koblenz.de/networks/as-skitter>

⁶<http://konect.uni-koblenz.de/networks/orkut-links>

⁷<http://snap.stanford.edu/data/com-Friendster.html>

Table 3: Comparison with Serial Algorithms

	(a) Triangle Counting		(b) Graph Matching	
	Serial	G-thinker	Serial	G-thinker
Youtube	4s	9s	2m14s	19s
Skitter	38s	25s	10m10s	5m56s
Orkut	3m33s	1m18s	199m33s	10m56s
Friendster	104m25s	48m43s	2348m25s	91m15s

(m = minutes, s = seconds)

Table 4: System Comparison (Triangle Counting)

	G-thinker	Arabesque	Pregelix
Youtube	9s	1m59s	6m59s
Skitter	25s	5m45s	22m15s
Orkut	1m18s	Memory Overflow	41m41s
Friendster	48m43s	Memory Overflow	No Disk Space

is the maximum number of tasks that are processed in each round. We call this capacity as *buffer capacity*. We also set the capacity of B_{out}^Q to be the *file capacity* C , since it loads a file of tasks from disk each time.

Unless otherwise stated, the default setting is as follows. Each machine runs 8 workers (i.e., 120 workers in total). The buffer capacity is set as 1000 tasks, and the file capacity C is set to be 100 tasks. Moreover, we set T_{cache} to accommodate up to 1 M non-local vertices.

Comparison with Serial Algorithms. We first compare the performance of the serial algorithms for subgraph finding with their distributed *G-thinker* counterparts. Since serial algorithms need to hold an entire input graph in memory, we run them in a high-end machine with 1TB DDR3 RAM and 2.2GHz CPUs. Table 3 reports the comparison results for triangle counting (with relatively low computation intensity) and graph matching (which is highly computation-intensive). We see that *G-thinker* is orders of magnitude faster than the serial algorithm for graph matching, but only several times faster for triangle counting. This is because the light computation workload of triangle counting cannot offset the communication cost of vertex-pulling.

Comparison with Other Systems. We also compare *G-thinker* with Arabesque [24] and Pregelix (version 0.2.12) [2]. Both Arabesque and Pregelix have already implemented triangle counting and maximal clique enumeration, and we used these programs directly for comparison. Unfortunately, neither Arabesque nor Pregelix could successfully finish maximal clique enumeration on even the smallest graph *Youtube* in our cluster. Arabesque failed after running for 1.5 hours due to memory overflow, while Pregelix reported a frame size error since the 1-ego network of some vertex cannot fit in a frame as required by Pregelix. In contrast, *G-thinker* found the maximum clique (of size 17) in *Youtube* in just around 20 seconds.

Table 4 reports the results for triangle counting. We

Table 5: Scalability

Triangle Counting: (a) Vertical Scalability					(b) Horizontal Scalability		
Worker #	15	30	60	120	20	40	60
Youtube	7s	7s	7s	9s	7s	7s	7s
Skitter	44s	32s	34s	25s	26s	44s	24s
Orkut	2m56s	1m43s	1m19s	1m18s	1m59s	1m32s	1m12s
Friendster	106m41s	75m39s	58m06s	48m43s	129m54s	79m07s	57m54s

Maximum Clique: (c) Vertical Scalability					(d) Horizontal Scalability		
Worker #	15	30	60	120	20	40	60
Youtube	19s	19s	15s	20s	19s	14s	19s
Skitter	2m31s	2m05s	1m54s	2m01s	2m45s	1m49s	1m49s
Orkut	6m58s	6m07s	3m01s	2m05s	5m33s	3m35s	5m30s
Friendster	142m34s	81m57s	58m40s	51m01s	143m39s	73m54s	57m56s

Graph Matching: (e) Vertical Scalability					(f) Horizontal Scalability		
Worker #	15	30	60	120	20	40	60
Youtube	28s	17s	13s	19s	17s	11s	14s
Skitter	2m46s	3m44s	2m33s	2m56s	3m13s	5m56s	3m47s
Orkut	16m16s	15m31s	11m13s	7m56s	17m52s	9m02s	13m32s
Friendster	481m34s	248m25s	134m59s	91m15s	441m06s	200m11s	143m43s

can see that *G-thinker* is orders of magnitude faster than both Arabesque and Pregelix, while memory-based Arabesque is a few times faster than disk-based Pregelix. However, Arabesque failed to process *Orkut* and *Friendster* due to insufficient memory space. Pregelix failed to process *Friendster* because it used up the disk space, probably due to its space-consuming B-tree structure for storing vertex data.

Finally, although NScale [19] is not public, [19] reported that it takes 1986 seconds to count the triangles of *Orkut* (not including the expensive subgraph construction & packing) on a 16-node cluster, while *G-thinker* takes only 78 seconds on our 15-node cluster.

Scalability. We tested the vertical scalability of *G-thinker* by running various applications with all 15 machines, where each machine runs 1, 2, 4 and 8 workers, respectively. We also tested the horizontal scalability of *G-thinker* by running various applications with 5, 10 and 15 machines, where each machine runs 4 workers. The results are reported in Table 5, where we can see that *G-thinker* scales well with the number of workers per machine, and the total number of machines, especially for highly computation-intensive problems like graph matching.

Effect of System Parameters. We conducted extensive experiments to study the impact of various parameters on system performance, and find that the performance is mainly sensitive to *buffer capacity* and the capacity of *T_{cache}*; the impact of other parameters such as the file capacity *C* is minor. Due to space limit, we only report the results for triangle counting over *Friendster* here. Table 6(a) shows the results when we change the buffer capacity while keeping all other parameters as default. We can see that the runtime decreases as the capacity of task buffers increase, but increasing the capacity be-

Table 6: Effect of System Parameters

Buffer Capacity		Time		Cache Capacity		Time	
100	54m53s	100,000	69m03s	500,000	55m54s	1,000,000	48m43s
1,000	48m43s						
10,000	38m21s						

(a) Effect of Task Buffer (b) Effect of Vertex Cache

Table 7: # of Random IO by LSH-Queue

Worker #	15	30	60	120
Youtube	3184	3194	3284	3230
Skitter	10996	11348	11760	11346
Orkut	55050	55244	55374	55482
Friendster	765326	768762	770570	771528

Table 8: Results with Stream-Queue

Worker #	15	30	60	120
Youtube	8s	7s	7s	10s
Skitter	30s	36s	27s	25s
Orkut	3m06s	3m36s	2m21s	1m58s
Friendster	118m32s	82m08s	65m09s	60m56s

yond 10^4 does not lead to much improvement. Table 6(b) shows the results when we change the capacity of *T_{cache}* while keeping all other parameters as default. We can see an obvious reduction in runtime as the capacity of vertex cache increases. Overall, the performance difference is not significantly influenced by the system parameters (e.g., less than doubled), and thus *G-thinker* is expected to perform well even when the memory space is limited.

Stream-Queue v.s. LSH-Queue. Due to space limit, we only report results for triangle counting; the results for maximum clique and graph matching are similar. Table 7 reports the total number of random disk reads and writes incurred by LSH-queue during the whole period of job execution, for the vertical scalability experiments we reported in Table 5(a). We can see that the number of random IO is small, which demonstrates that LSH-Queue exhibits near-sequential disk IO. We also repeated the experiments using stream-queue instead of LSH-queue, and Table 8 reports the results. Comparing Table 5(a) to Table 8, we can see that LSH-Queue improves the performance of most jobs, especially those with heavy computation workload. For some jobs with relatively light workload, the overhead incurred by LSH-Queue (e.g., key computation and random IO) stands out and stream-queue is more efficient.

9 Conclusions and Future Work

We presented a new framework called *G-thinker* for scalable subgraph finding, whose computation-intensive execution engine beats existing data-intensive systems by orders of magnitude, and scales to graphs with size two orders of magnitude larger given the same hardware resources. Future work of *G-thinker* include designing effective task stealing strategy for load balancing, and acceleration through new hardware (e.g., SSD and GPU).

References

- [1] C. Bron and J. Kerbosch. Finding all cliques of an undirected graph (algorithm 457). *Commun. ACM*, 16(9):575–576, 1973.
- [2] Y. Bu, V. R. Borkar, J. Jia, M. J. Carey, and T. Condie. Pregelix: Big(ger) graph analytics on a dataflow engine. *PVLDB*, 8(2):161–172, 2014.
- [3] A. Ching, S. Edunov, M. Kabiljo, D. Logothetis, and S. Muthukrishnan. One trillion edges: Graph processing at facebook-scale. *PVLDB*, 8(12):1804–1815, 2015.
- [4] J. Dean and S. Ghemawat. Mapreduce: Simplified data processing on large clusters. In *OSDI*, pages 137–150, 2004.
- [5] J. Gao, C. Zhou, J. Zhou, and J. X. Yu. Continuous pattern detection over billion-edge graph using distributed framework. In *ICDE*, pages 556–567, 2014.
- [6] J. E. Gonzalez, Y. Low, H. Gu, D. Bickson, and C. Guestrin. Powergraph: Distributed graph-parallel computation on natural graphs. In *OSDI*, pages 17–30, 2012.
- [7] J. E. Gonzalez, R. S. Xin, A. Dave, D. Crankshaw, M. J. Franklin, and I. Stoica. Graphx: Graph processing in a distributed dataflow framework. In *OSDI*, pages 599–613, 2014.
- [8] H. He and A. K. Singh. Graphs-at-a-time: query language and access methods for graph databases. In *SIGMOD*, pages 405–418, 2008.
- [9] X. Hu, Y. Tao, and C. Chung. I/o-efficient algorithms on triangle listing and counting. *ACM Trans. Database Syst.*, 39(4):27:1–27:30, 2014.
- [10] G. Kasneci, F. M. Suchanek, G. Iffrim, M. Ramanath, and G. Weikum. NAGA: searching and ranking knowledge. In *ICDE*, pages 953–962, 2008.
- [11] S. Khuller and B. Saha. On finding dense subgraphs. In *ICALP*, pages 597–608, 2009.
- [12] J. Lee, W. Han, R. Kasperovics, and J. Lee. An in-depth comparison of subgraph isomorphism algorithms in graph databases. *PVLDB*, 6(2):133–144, 2012.
- [13] G. Liu and L. Wong. Effective pruning techniques for mining quasi-cliques. In *PKDD*, pages 33–49, 2008.
- [14] Y. Low, J. Gonzalez, A. Kyrola, D. Bickson, C. Guestrin, and J. M. Hellerstein. Distributed GraphLab: A framework for machine learning in the cloud. *PVLDB*, 5(8):716–727, 2012.
- [15] G. Malewicz, M. H. Austern, A. J. C. Bik, J. C. Dehnert, I. Horn, N. Leiser, and G. Czajkowski. Pregel: a system for large-scale graph processing. In *SIGMOD Conference*, pages 135–146, 2010.
- [16] J. Mondal and A. Deshpande. Eagr: supporting continuous ego-centric aggregate queries over large dynamic graphs. In *SIGMOD*, pages 1335–1346, 2014.
- [17] J. Pattillo, N. Youssef, and S. Butenko. On clique relaxation models in network analysis. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 226(1):9–18, 2013.
- [18] L. Qin, J. X. Yu, L. Chang, H. Cheng, C. Zhang, and X. Lin. Scalable big graph processing in mapreduce. In *International Conference on Management of Data, SIGMOD 2014, Snowbird, UT, USA, June 22-27, 2014*, pages 827–838, 2014.
- [19] A. Quamar, A. Deshpande, and J. Lin. Nscale: neighborhood-centric large-scale graph analytics in the cloud. *The VLDB Journal*, pages 1–26, 2014.
- [20] L. Quick, P. Wilkinson, and D. Hardcastle. Using pregel-like large scale graph processing frameworks for social network analysis. In *ASONAM*, pages 457–463, 2012.
- [21] A. Rajaraman, J. D. Ullman, J. D. Ullman, and J. D. Ullman. *Mining of massive datasets*, volume 1. Cambridge University Press Cambridge, 2012.
- [22] S. Salihoglu and J. Widom. GPS: a graph processing system. In *SSDBM*, page 22, 2013.
- [23] Y. Shao, B. Cui, L. Chen, L. Ma, J. Yao, and N. Xu. Parallel subgraph listing in a large-scale graph. In *SIGMOD*, pages 625–636, 2014.
- [24] C. H. C. Teixeira, A. J. Fonseca, M. Serafini, G. Siganos, M. J. Zaki, and A. Aboulnaga. Arabesque: a system for distributed graph mining. In *SOSP*, pages 425–440, 2015.
- [25] Y. Tian, A. Balmin, S. A. Corsten, S. Tatikonda, and J. McPherson. From “think like a vertex” to “think like a graph”. *PVLDB*, 7(3):193–204, 2013.
- [26] E. Tomita and T. Seki. An efficient branch-and-bound algorithm for finding a maximum clique. In *DMTCS*, pages 278–289, 2003.

- [27] W. Wu, H. Li, H. Wang, and K. Q. Zhu. Probbase: a probabilistic taxonomy for text understanding. In *SIGMOD*, pages 481–492, 2012.
- [28] J. Xiang, C. Guo, and A. Aboulnaga. Scalable maximum clique computation using mapreduce. In *ICDE*, pages 74–85, 2013.
- [29] D. Yan, Y. Bu, Y. Tian, and A. Deshpande. Big graph analytics platforms. *Foundations and Trends in Databases*, 7(1-2):1–195, 2017.
- [30] D. Yan, J. Cheng, Y. Lu, and W. Ng. Blogel: A block-centric framework for distributed computation on real-world graphs. *PVLDB*, 7(14):1981–1992, 2014.
- [31] D. Yan, J. Cheng, Y. Lu, and W. Ng. Effective techniques for message reduction and load balancing in distributed graph computation. In *WWW*, pages 1307–1317, 2015.
- [32] D. Yan, J. Cheng, K. Xing, Y. Lu, W. Ng, and Y. Bu. Pregel algorithms for graph connectivity problems with performance guarantees. *PVLDB*, 7(14):1821–1832, 2014.
- [33] L. Zou, L. Chen, and M. T. Özsu. Distancejoin: Pattern match query in a large graph database. *PVLDB*, 2(1):886–897, 2009.