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Abstract—In 2013, we released a position paper to launch a community effort to define a common set of building blocks for constructing graph algorithms in the language of linear algebra. This led to the GraphBLAS. We released a specification for the C programming language binding to the GraphBLAS in 2017. Since that release, multiple libraries that conform to the GraphBLAS C specification have been produced.

In this position paper, we launch the next phase of this ongoing community effort: a project to assemble a set of high level graph algorithms built on top of the GraphBLAS. While many of these algorithms are well-known with high quality implementations available, they have not been assembled in one place and integrated with the GraphBLAS. We call this project the LAGraph graph algorithms project and with this position paper, we put out a call for collaborators to join us. While the initial goal is to just assemble these algorithms into a single framework, the long term goal is a library of production-worthy code, with the LAGraph library serving as an open source repository of verified graph algorithms that use the GraphBLAS.

Index Terms—Graph Algorithms, Linear Algebra, GraphBLAS

I. INTRODUCTION

Graphs are an essential abstraction for a wide range of problems. There are many ways to represent graphs in graph analytics. One class of methods defines graphs in terms of adjacency matrices. Expressing graph algorithms as linear algebra expressions \cite{1} is a mature subject. Multiple high performance graph libraries based on sparse linear algebra \cite{2, 3, 4, 5, 6} have been developed. With this “Graphs as Linear Algebra” approach established, a community of researchers came together to define common building blocks for graphs expressed in the language of linear algebra. They launched this effort with a position paper \cite{7} in 2013 and formed the GraphBLAS Forum \cite{8}. After three years of steady work, the GraphBLAS forum completed the mathematical formalization of the GraphBLAS \cite{9}. With another one and a half years of work, the group completed the C language binding to the GraphBLAS \cite{10}.

Currently there are multiple implementations of the GraphBLAS C specification. We have learned a great deal about how to define the operations within the GraphBLAS and how to implement them efficiently. We are now ready to launch the next phase of the project: to produce a library of high-level graph algorithms implemented on top of the GraphBLAS. We call this library of algorithms LAGraph. Just as we launched the GraphBLAS project with a position paper, we are launching this next phase of the project with a position paper.

The goals of the LAGraph effort include, first and foremost, bringing together the full range of known graph algorithms that can be constructed with the GraphBLAS. From this collection we will be able to systematically assess the coverage of graph algorithms based on linear algebra. This will also serve as raw material in ongoing studies of the fundamental design patterns exploited by linear algebra-based graph algorithms.

The basic outline of the LAGraph project is summarized in Figure 1. The library of algorithms is the single box towards the middle of the figure. These algorithms use the GraphBLAS C API which exists as a separate implementation for a wide range of hardware targets at the bottom of the figure. To motivate our work and stay aligned with the way data scientists use graph algorithms, we need to appreciate that people will use a wide range of languages to access the graph algorithms. A good library must be able to work whether called directly from C or indirectly through a wrapper in Python. Furthermore, the developers of the graph algorithm libraries will need a test harness to validate the algorithms, I/O utilities, and a build system. All of these components must be addressed as part of the LAGraph project.

LAGraph may not be a production-worthy library in its first incarnation. However, we expect the LAGraph effort to produce such a library over time. Anticipating that goal, we are constructing the library “as if” it will be used by data analytics end-users; that is, by people who need the results from graph algorithms with little concern for how they are implemented. This requirement of building a library for end-users as opposed to a library for graph algorithm researchers has far reaching implications for the design of this software.

We start the paper with a brief summary of the objects and operations defined in the C specification of the GraphBLAS. We then summarize some of the early libraries that implement the GraphBLAS C specification. Next, we describe the repository where we will build LAGraph. This is important since the purpose of a position paper is to attract a community of researchers to join the effort, which in turn means we want people to understand how to work with and perhaps contribute algorithms to the repository. We then discuss the challenges...
we faced in writing the early version of LAGraph and what it suggests about future developments needed in the GraphBLAS themselves. We close with concluding remarks.

II. THE GRAPHBLAS

Consider a graph represented as an $n$-by-$n$ adjacency matrix $A$, where $A_{ij}$ is the weight of the edge from vertex $i$ to vertex $j$, and a second $k$-by-$n$ matrix $B$ representing a subset (of size $k$) of the vertices in the graph, such that $B_{ij}$ is 1 if the $j$th element of the subset is vertex $i$ (and all other elements of $B$ are 0). The traditional matrix product $B \times A$ over real arithmetic of these two matrices returns the cost based on the edge weights of reaching the set of vertices adjacent to the vertices in $B$. This fundamental operation can be used to construct a wide range of graph algorithms.

We extend the range of graph operations by keeping the basic pattern of a matrix-matrix multiplication, but varying the operators and the interpretation of the values in the matrices (the domain). By carefully choosing operators and the domain, we control the relation between matrix operations familiar in linear algebra and graph operations, thereby enabling composable graph algorithms.

In addition to matrix multiplication, the GraphBLAS math specification defines a range of additional operations over matrices and vectors. These are summarized in Table I.

In mapping the GraphBLAS as a set of mathematical operators onto the C programming language we made a number of fundamental choices [10]. First, the core data structures required to represent the objects defined by the GraphBLAS are opaque. The GraphBLAS API defines a contract with the programmer for how these objects will be used, but the implementations and underlying data structures are left to the implementation. This opaqueness is critical if the API is to serve diverse hardware ranging from CPUs to GPUs to specialized graph hardware. Second, we defined a non-blocking execution model that allows lazy evaluation. Ultimately, to optimize sparse linear algebra software we need to aggressively fuse operations and even restructure algorithms. This requirement meant that we had to carefully define when results from a sequence of GraphBLAS operations must be materialized.

Since the release of the GraphBLAS specification, several implementations of the GraphBLAS have been developed. These are briefly described below.

A. SuiteSparse:GraphBLAS

SuiteSparse:GraphBLAS is the first full implementation of the GraphBLAS standard, first released in November of 2017. It is available at [http://suitesparse.com][11].

The design of a GraphBLAS library is flexible, because its data structures are opaque to the user. SuiteSparse:GraphBLAS uses a compressed-sparse vector data structure, in four different forms. A matrix can be stored in row-major order (CSR), or column-major order (CSC). Each sparse vector consists of a sorted list of indices, and the corresponding numerical values. The sparse vectors are packed together into two arrays, and another “pointer array” (of size equal to the dimension of the matrix, say $n$) keeps track of where each row (or column) starts. The memory taken is $O(n + e)$ for a CSR matrix with $n$ rows or a CSC matrix with $n$ columns, and with $e$ entries. Most graphs have $e = O(n^2)$ entries, but some graphs (and in particular, subgraphs) can be hypersparse [12], with $e \ll n$. In the hypersparse form, the pointer array itself becomes sparse, and empty vectors take no space at all. The space is reduced to $O(e)$, so that matrices with enormous dimensions can be supported.

### Table I: A mathematical overview of the fundamental GraphBLAS operations supported in the specification.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operation name</th>
<th>Mathematical description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\text{mxm}$</td>
<td>$C \odot= A \oplus \odot B$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{mxv}$</td>
<td>$w \odot= A \odot v$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{vxm}$</td>
<td>$w^T \odot= v^T \odot \otimes A$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{eWiseMult}$</td>
<td>$C \odot= A \oplus B$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{eWiseAdd}$</td>
<td>$C \odot= A \odot B$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{reduce (row)}$</td>
<td>$w \odot= \bigoplus_i A(:,i)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{apply}$</td>
<td>$C \odot= F_a(A)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{transpose}$</td>
<td>$C \odot= A^T$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{extract}$</td>
<td>$C \odot= A(i,j)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{assign}$</td>
<td>$C(i,j) \odot= A$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$w(i) \odot= u(i)$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[1]: [http://suitesparse.com][11]
created, as long as \( e \ll n \). SuiteSparse:GraphBLAS exploits hypersparsity automatically, and all methods can operate on all four matrix formats in any combination.

The ability to incrementally modify a graph is critical in many applications. GraphBLAS includes two operations that can make small incremental changes to a graph/matrix: namely \texttt{GrB_setElement} and \texttt{GrB_assign}. It would be exceedingly slow to insert or delete a single entry in a CSR or CSC format, taking \( O(n + e) \) time per entry inserted or deleted. Instead, the non-blocking aspect of GraphBLAS is exploited. Fast deletion of entries is handled by creating zombies, which are entries tagged for later deletion. Fast insertion is handled with pending tuples, which is a separate unordered list of \((i, j, a_{ij})\) for each new entry. When a matrix operation occurs (such as matrix multiply), all zombies are killed and all pending tuples are assembled, in a single \( O(n + e + p \log p) \) step (for \( p \) pending tuples), or \( O(e + p \log p) \) in the hypersparse case. As a result, it is just as fast to use a sequence of \( e \) \texttt{GrB_Matrix_setElement} operations to build a matrix, as it is to create an array of \( e \) tuples and use \texttt{GrB_Matrix.build}.

Internally, SuiteSparse:GraphBLAS is building the list itself, for the user, and then does a \texttt{GrB_Matrix.build} when the matrix is completed.

To enable high-performance matrix-matrix multiply, a code generation mechanism is used to build functions for each semiring that can be created with built-in operators. The functions can rely on Gustavson’s method [13], a dot product method, and a heap-based method [14], all with masked variants. With this code generation mechanism, 6 functions containing 2 versions of Gustavson’s method (no mask / with mask), three versions of the dot product (no mask / with mask / with complemented mask) and one version of the heap method, automatically expand into the 960 unique semirings supported by the built-in operators in GraphBLAS. SuiteSparse:GraphBLAS adds a few extensions to the set of operators; Using the built-in types and operators from the GraphBLAS C API, 600 unique semirings can be constructed. All of them are as fast, or much faster, than \( C=A*B \) in MATLAB. Submatrix assignment (\( C(I,J) = A \)) can be 100× faster than in MATLAB, even when non-blocking mode is not exploited.

A current prototype of the package adds an early exit mechanism for the MIN, MAX, OR, and AND monoids, where a dot product can terminate as soon as a terminal value is found in the result (true for OR, for example). This will enable a fast direction-optimizing BFS [15] to be written in GraphBLAS. The “pull” is a dot product, and the “push” a saxpy-based operation (Gustavson’s or the heap method).

Since its creation was commissioned as the GraphBLAS reference implementation, testing is a vital component to the package. In SuiteSparse:GraphBLAS, each GraphBLAS operation was written twice: once in high-performance algorithms in C, and again in a very simple and short MATLAB script, using dense matrices with the required type. The pattern in the MATLAB version is held as a separate Boolean matrix. For example, \texttt{GrB_assign} requires about 3,908 lines of C (not counting comments), but only 161 lines in MATLAB. Of those 161 lines, 33 are for error-checking that do not need to be considered when determining conformance to the spec. The MATLAB functions are not intended to be fast. Instead, they exactly mimic the GraphBLAS API Specification, line by line, so they can be visually inspected for conformance to the spec. For example, matrix multiply is written with a brute-force triply-nested for loop. Then, to test the package, each computation is done both in SuiteSparse:GraphBLAS (via a MATLAB interface) and in the MATLAB mimic. The tests pass only if the results are identical in both value and pattern (even with identical floating-point roundoff error, in most cases).

The package is extremely robust and production-ready. It is fully compliant with the GraphBLAS C API. Excluding SuiteSparse-specific extensions and beta releases, there have been only 3 bugs in the entire package since its first release, two of which would be triggered in only rare cases. All three bugs are fixed, and the current version has no known bugs in any part of the code.

The current release is single-threaded, but an OpenMP implementation is in progress. SuiteSparse:GraphBLAS appears in Debian and Ubuntu Linux distros, and has been released as part of the RedisGraph database module of the Redis database systems, by RedisLabs, Inc. [10].

B. IBM GraphBLAS

The IBM GraphBLAS implementation was announced at IPDPS 2018 and made available at https://github.com/IBM/ibmgraphblas, fulfilling the GraphBLAS C API requirement of two conforming implementations, and promoting that specification from provisional to definitive. The approach adopted by the development team was heavily influenced by their experience with IBM’s Graph Programming Interface [41, 17].

Among the various objectives of the IBM implementation, we note the desire to experiment with an implementation that allows multiple data representations and a layered approach to algorithms, keeping a GraphBLAS API layer on top of a more fundamental back-end layer that performs the heavy computation.

Use and operation of the IBM GraphBLAS is straightforward. The application programmer has access to a C11-compliant include file (\texttt{GraphBLAS.h}) that defines the API according to the specification. This include file exposes nothing of the internals of the run-time. The run-time itself is written in C++ and packaged as a library (\texttt{libibmgraphblas.so}) with C language bindings. The choice of C++ as the implementation language has led to a simple and concise specification-compliant implementation.

One of the jobs of the \texttt{GraphBLAS.h} include file is to convert the polymorphic version of the API into the nonpolymorphic one. The nonpolymorphic methods are then directly supported by the library. Conversion of the polymorphic interface is accomplished through standard C preprocessor features, primarily in supporting number of arguments polymorphism,
in combination with the standard C11 language _Generic
construct to support type polymorphism.

As previously mentioned, the IBM GraphBLAS library is
implemented in C++. The API methods are declared to have a
C interface, so that C user programs can bind to them as
specified. Objects internal to the library are declared as C++
classes, with member methods doing the actual work. We want
to emphasize that this is a C++ implementation of a C API, and
not an API for GraphBLAS that exploits C++ features, as
other efforts are pursuing [18].

The contents of a GraphBLAS vector object are imple-
mented using standard C++ containers. An unordered set
of indices (uset<GrB_Index>) is used to represent the
structure of the vector, while an unordered map of indices
to pointers (umap<GrB_Index, void*> represents the ele-
ments. (Currently, uset and umap are just renames for the
std::unordered_set and std::unordered_map standard
containers of C++, but one could use more specialized
implementations.)

Similarly, the contents of a matrix are represented both
as a standard C++ container vector of rows and a standard
C++ container vector of columns. Accessor methods enforce
consistency of both representations.

In the current IBM GraphBLAS, all methods are fully
blocking. That is, the methods return only after all computations
are fully performed (or an error is detected). Since the
GraphBLAS nonblocking mode allows for deferred execution
but does not require it, this behavior complies with the
specification.

We finish this brief overview of the IBM GraphBLAS with
a discussion of error handling, as we believe it reflects an
important aspect of the interoperability between a C API and a
C++ implementation. The GraphBLAS C API defines two kinds
of errors: API errors and execution errors. API errors reflect
incorrect usage of the API (for example, passing parameters
that are not valid or consistent). Execution errors indicate
that something went wrong during the actual execution of a
method, and can be caused either by programmer error or by
environment issues (for example, not enough memory).

In the IBM GraphBLAS run-time, API errors are detected
through explicit checks in the implementation of each method
in the API layer (the front-end). Execution errors, on the
other hand, occur inside the member methods of the various
objects internal to the library (the back-end). Those methods,
following standard C++ practice, use exceptions to signal an
error. To transform those exceptions into proper GraphBLAS C
API return codes, the body of each GraphBLAS API method
is wrapped by a try/catch block, which then returns the
GraphBLAS execution error code corresponding to the caught
exception.

C. GBTL: GraphBLAS Template Library

The first version of the GraphBLAS Template Library
(GBTL) was written in C++ when the GraphBLAS C API
project was just beginning. It was used, in part, to study early
ideas under discussion in the specification process and was
released as a proof of concept prior to the finalization of the
GraphBLAS API Specification [19], [20]. With the release of
the GraphBLAS C API Specification [10] in 2017, GBTL was
updated to conform to the mathematical behavior defined by the
specification and released as version 2.0 [18]. Unlike the C API
Specification, GBTL is written in C++ and makes judicious use
of templates to make the generic aspects of the GraphBLAS
specification easier to implement and more natural for the
C++ programming language. When the GraphBLAS language
committee starts its work on the C++ language binding to the
GraphBLAS, GBTL will be submitted as a proposed starting
point for the discussion.

Central to GBTL’S design is the concept of a separation
of concerns between implementation of algorithms written in
terms of the GraphBLAS primitives and the implementation
of those primitives on a targeted hardware platform. This
separation of concerns is defined by the GraphBLAS API
Specification as illustrated in Figure 1. Above this API, GBTL
has developed and includes a collection of graph algorithms
written against its C++ API and has already been shown to be
easily translated to the C API (compare Figures 2(c) and 2(d)).
Below the separation/API, different implementations of the
GraphBLAS library can be supported for different hardware
architectures (referred to as “backends”). In this way we
verify that algorithms written once against the API can run on
different targeted hardware. One backend that is provided with
Version 2.0 of GBTL implements a mathematically correct
version of the C API specification and serves as a reference
implementation for verifying correctness. It runs in a single
thread on a CPU (an earlier version of GBTL also had a GPU
implementation). Other backend implementations are currently
under development to optimize performance, use multiple
threads, and to target specialized computer architectures.

D. PyGB: python DSL for GraphBLAS

Another development effort closely related to GBTL is a
DSL (domain-specific language) in Python called PyGB [21].
The goal for PyGB is to closely resemble the GraphBLAS
mathematical notation found in the GraphBLAS math spec [9].
PyGB is a framework designed and implemented to dispatch
dynamically generated and compiled templated classes that
make calls into native GBTL code. It demonstrates how
Python’s syntax and dynamic execution provides a high-level
abstraction with minimal performance penalty. While we leave
a detailed discussion of PyGB to elsewhere [21] we provide a
level-BFS function using PyGB in Figure 2.

Notice how the meaning of the code is straightforward since
the DSL closely tracks the notation from the GraphBLAS math
spec. We believe in the long run, the future of graph algorithms
will depend heavily on such DSLs.

E. GraphBLAST GraphBLAS

GraphBLAST [22] is the first high-performance GPU (graph-
ics processing unit) implementation of GraphBLAS. Inspired
by the design of GBTL, the architecture of GraphBLAST
is also C++ based and maintains a separation of concerns.
Fig. 2: Level-based BFS traversal in math pseudocode, PyGB, GBTL C++, and using the GraphBLAS C API.
Algorithm Ligra [23] GraphIt [26] GraphBLAS
Breadth-first-search 29 22 25
Single-source shortest-path 55 25 25
Local graph clustering 84 N/A 45

TABLE II: Comparison of lines of C++ application code counted by ‘cloc’ except for numbers of GraphIt, which come from the paper [26]. N/A means not implemented. The specific GraphBLAS implementation for this comparison is GraphBLAST [22].

III. LAGraph Repository

The hypothesis underlying the GraphBLAS is that algorithm designers can focus on expressing their algorithms in terms of the high level linear algebra operations defined in the GraphBLAS while leaving low level optimizations to any particular hardware platform to the implementation of the GraphBLAS. Ultimately, we want hardware vendors to be responsible for creating highly tuned versions of the GraphBLAS specialized to the features of their systems. Kumar et al. [27] show that mitigating the adverse impact of memory latency on performance of algorithms for large graph can lead to significant improvements. Such optimizations require detailed knowledge of the underlying system, and hence the low-level optimizations are best left to hardware vendors. Furthermore, a tuned linear algebra library delivers better performance than straight-forward textbook implementation on many basic graph algorithms [28].

Algorithm designers will naturally wonder how much performance is lost due to the use of a high level API such as the GraphBLAS. As shown in [28], a linear algebra implementation brings inherent efficiency advantages to graph algorithms due to the more structured access to data afforded by the linear algebra formulation [28]. The GraphBLAS API is more general, but we expect its implementations to retain or improve upon the efficiency advantages. This is an untested hypothesis, since until now, we have not had multiple implementations of the GraphBLAS API tuned to the features of a range of platforms.

Testing this hypothesis of the performance potential afforded by the GraphBLAS is a major outcome we anticipate from the LAGraph project. By collecting high level graph algorithms and validating them across an engaged community, we will produce the library of algorithms needed to evaluate the effectiveness of the GraphBLAS approach.

Before we can conduct such experiments, however, we need to collect graph algorithms implemented on top of the GraphBLAS. We have created a GitHub repository at https://github.com/GraphBLAS/LAGraph for members of the LAGraph community to use to contribute GraphBLAS algorithms. The basic elements of the repository include:

- A Build System for creating the LA Graph library and the test routines.
- A library of utilities including loading matrices from disk in Matrix Market format [29], evaluating results, and creating random test matrices.
- A directory of graph algorithms.
- A directory holding a test harness for each algorithm.

We will write documentation, a programmer’s reference guide and define procedures for how people can add new algorithms.

IV. DISCUSSION

We are early in the LAGraph project. At this point, we’ve defined the basic structure of the repository and the overall goals of the project. We have built an early framework for testing and core utility routines to support software development. Finally, we assembled a few algorithms which we are using to test the basic structure of the software system.

Even at this early phase of the project, we have learned a great deal about how the GraphBLAS will interact with end-users. The objects manipulated by the GraphBLAS are opaque. A GraphBLAS implementation is given complete freedom in how data structures underlying the GraphBLAS are implemented. A graph algorithm, however, uses GraphBLAS as part of a processing pipeline. For example, data may exist in data frames. A subset of the data is collected and filtered to produce relationships represented by a graph. Properties of the graph are computed and based on the result a new branch in the processing pipeline may be accessed.

The key here is that graphs inside the GraphBLAS are opaque, but externally they are anything but opaque. This suggests that we need to define functions to import and export data in standard sparse array formats into LAGraph. The initial thinking was that this import functionality would be part of LAGraph and not the GraphBLAS. The only way to do that, however, is if we repacked the input sparse format into separate arrays for column indices, row indices, and values.
and then use `GrB_Matrix_build` to construct the GraphBLAS matrix object. This is extremely inefficient. We need a way to directly import arrays in standard sparse formats, such as CSR/CSC (Compressed Sparse Row/Column) formats, into the GraphBLAS and since the GraphBLAS data types are opaque, this can only be done as a GraphBLAS routine.

Graph algorithms do not occur in isolation. The LAGraph library, therefore, needs to return a handle to an opaque GraphBLAS object so it can be used without incurring copy overhead in subsequent graph operations. Given the nonblocking execution model, this raises interesting design questions about how memory consistency between the library and the application is managed.

Graphs can be quite large. Hence, the default mode should avoid copying sparse arrays input to LAGraph into a separate memory region to hold the opaque GraphBLAS object. We believe it is important that the memory for the input array be reused to hold the GraphBLAS object as much as possible. This means the input array is often “destroyed” (from the perspective of LAGraph, another external library, or the user application) and “realloc”ed for the GraphBLAS opaque object. In the interest of performance and efficient use of memory resources, the above violates the separation of concerns between application and library code expected in well engineered software. There is also the question of communicating to the library routine how the input sparse array was allocated in the first place so the right deallocator can be used.

A draft of SuiteSparse:GraphBLAS includes a working and fully-tested implementation of the import/export feature, using a strategy much like the “move constructor” of C++. For the export of a CSC matrix, for example, three arrays are removed from the GraphBLAS matrix `A`: a pointer array `Ap` of size `n+1`, an index array `Ai` of size `e`, and a values array `Ax`. The row indices of the `j`th column of the matrix appear as the list `[Ai[Ap[j]]...Ai[Ap[j+1]]]`, and the values are in the same locations in `Ax`. This format is identical to the simple CSC sparse matrix data structure in CSparse [40], except that GraphBLAS allows for many built-in types and arbitrary user-defined types.

The remains of the GraphBLAS object `A` are then deleted, but all of its content is now “owned” by the external library (LAGraph, say), which is then responsible for freeing these three arrays. Assuming that the opaque GraphBLAS object `A` is already in the CSC format, the export takes just `O(1)` time, and no new memory is allocated. The external library (LAGraph, in particular) now has access to the graph. If the GraphBLAS implementation does not support the CSC format in its internal opaque data structure, it can allocate these arrays, populate them, and then free `A`. The effect is the same; only the performance differs. Opacity is maintained, while at the same time reducing time required for the export from `Ω(e)` (for `GrB_extractTuples`) to as little as `O(1)`.

The import is symmetric with the export: LAGraph (or any other external library) passes in the three arrays `Ap`, `Ai`, and `Ax`, which are then either incorporated as-is into the GraphBLAS object (taking `O(1)` time), or copied and freed (taking `O(e)` time and memory). Either way, the three arrays are now owned by GraphBLAS, not the external library, and would be freed at some point no later than `GrB_free(&A)`. Since the matrix `A` is opaque, the GraphBLAS library can select whatever method it chooses to take ownership of `Ap`, `Ai`, and `Ax`:

- A copy (in `O(e)` time, or a move construction in `O(1)` time. It may choose later to `realloc` these arrays if the number of entries needs to grow.
- After an export of `A`, and then an import of the same arrays, the GraphBLAS matrix `A` is perfectly reconstructed, ideally in a total of `O(1)` time. SuiteSparse:GraphBLAS supports the import/export of all four of its formats: CSR, CSC, and their hypersparse variants.
- A `malloc` of these `Ap`, `Ai`, and `Ax` arrays by an external library followed by freeing the same space inside GraphBLAS with `GrB_free(&A)` requires both libraries to agree on using the same `malloc`/`free` routines. To do this, the GraphBLAS API would need to be augmented to allow an external library to select which `malloc`/`free` routines should be used. This is essential for a MATLAB interface, since a MATLAB `mexFunction` must use `mxFree` and `malloc`/`free`. With the import/export feature, sparse matrices can be passed between MATLAB and GraphBLAS in `O(1)` time, unless typecasting is required. MATLAB supports all of the built-in types of GraphBLAS, plus `double complex`, but only for dense matrices. For sparse matrices in MATLAB, only `double` and `double complex` are available. A MATLAB interface to the GraphBLAS is in progress. If the import/export feature is added to the GraphBLAS C API (as is being considered), this MATLAB interface would interoperate with any GraphBLAS library that is compliant with the spec.

The point of these issues is that in designing an effective library, there are a host of complicated issues to resolve. A major part of the research contribution of this project will be how we solve these issues.

V. ALGORITHMS TARGETED BY LAGRAPH

Many graph algorithms have been successfully implemented in the language of linear algebra. The following is a list of key algorithms and representative implementations; emphasizing that this list is not exhaustive.

- Breadth-first search (BFS) [31], [19], [11], including the direction optimizing BFS [24].
- Shortest-path (both single-source [22], [32], [19] and all-pairs [33]) calculation.
- Centrality measures, such as Betweenness centrality [2].
- Triangle counting and enumeration [34], [35] as well as k-truss enumeration [36], [37].
- Connected components [38].
- PageRank [39].
- Graph coloring [40].
- Subgraph counting [41].
- Maximal [42] and maximum [43] cardinality matching on bipartite graphs.
- Maximal independent set [44], [22].
Machine learning algorithms are also implemented using libraries that are in the spirit of GraphBLAS:

- Clustering, such as Markov clustering [45] and peer-pressure clustering [46].
- Deep neural network inference [47].
- Collaborative filtering using Stochastic Gradient Descent [59].

Finally, there are algorithms we consider to be important but has so far not been implemented using a GraphBLAS-like library:

- A* search,
- Graph neural network training and inference,
- Branch and bound,
- Graph kernels for supervised learning.

VI. CONCLUSION

The GraphBLAS forum started its work in 2013 to standardize the building blocks for graph algorithms formulated from linear algebra expressions [7]. We now have a C specification for the GraphBLAS [10] and multiple implementations [11], [17], [18]. The next step in this journey is to define a library of high level graph algorithms that are based on the GraphBLAS.

The GraphBLAS was a community effort launched by a position paper. This is a position paper to launch LAGraph project, our community effort to collect and validate 1) a set of high quality basic graph algorithms that run on top of the GraphBLAS, and 2) support libraries for development of graph analytics applications. Example of support libraries are I/O, generation of scale-free graphs, basic measurements on graphs, and changing representation of graphs. We urge readers interested in joining us as we work on LAGraph to contact any of the authors of this position paper.
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