

Distributed Graph-Parallel Computation on Natural Graphs

Joseph Gonzalez



Joint work with:



Yucheng Low



Haijie Gu



Danny Bickson



Carlos Guestrin

Carnegie Mellon University

Graphs are ubiquitous..



• Graphs encode relationships between:

People Products Ideas Facts Interests

• Big: billions of vertices and edges and rich metadata

Graphs are Essential to **Data-Mining** and **Machine Learning**

- Identify influential people and information
- Find communities
- Target ads and products
- Model complex data dependencies



Natural Graphs Graphs derived from natural phenomena

Problem:

Existing *distributed* graph computation systems perform poorly on **Natural Graphs**.

PageRank on Twitter Follower Graph Natural Graph with 40M Users, 1.4 Billion Links



Properties of Natural Graphs



Power-Law Degree Distribution

Power-Law Degree Distribution





Power-Law Graphs are Difficult to Partition



- Power-Law graphs do not have **low-cost** balanced cuts [Leskovec et al. 08, Lang 04]
- Traditional graph-partitioning algorithms perform poorly on Power-Law Graphs.
 [Abou-Rjeili et al. 06]

Properties of Natural Graphs



High-degreeower-Lawow Quality Vertibergree Distriburtion



- Split High-Degree vertices
- New Abstraction → <u>Equivalence</u> on Split Vertices

How do we *program* graph computation?

"Think like a Vertex."

-Malewicz et al. [SIGMOD'10]

The Graph-Parallel Abstraction

- A user-defined Vertex-Program runs on each vertex
- **Graph** constrains **interaction** along edges
 - Using messages (e.g. Pregel [PODC'09, SIGMOD'10])
 - Through shared state (e.g., GraphLab [UAI'10, VLDB'12])
- Parallelism: run multiple vertex programs simultaneously







- Update ranks in parallel
- Iterate until convergence

The Pregel Abstraction

Vertex-Programs interact by sending messages.

```
Pregel_PageRank(i, messages) :
  // Receive all the messages
  total = 0
  foreach( msg in messages) :
    total = total + msg
  // Update the rank of this vertex
  R[i] = 0.15 + total
  // Send new messages to neighbors
  foreach(j in out_neighbors[i]) :
    Send msg(R[i] * w<sub>ij</sub>) to vertex j
```



The GraphLab Abstraction

Vertex-Programs directly **read** the neighbors state

```
GraphLab_PageRank(i)
// Compute sum over neighbors
total = 0
foreach( j in in_neighbors(i)):
  total = total + R[j] * W<sub>ji</sub>
```

// Update the PageRank
R[i] = 0.15 + total





Challenges of High-Degree Vertices









Sequentially process edges

Sends many messages (Pregel)

Touches a large fraction of graph (GraphLab)

Edge meta-data too large for single machine



Asynchronous Execution requires heavy locking (GraphLab)



Synchronous Execution prone to stragglers (Pregel)

Communication Overhead for High-Degree Vertices

Fan-In vs. Fan-Out

Pregel Message Combiners on Fan-In



 User defined commutative associative (+) message operation:

Pregel Struggles with Fan-Out



• **Broadcast** sends many copies of the same message to the same machine!

Fan-In and Fan-Out Performance

- PageRank on synthetic Power-Law Graphs
 - Piccolo was used to simulate Pregel with combiners



GraphLab Ghosting



• Changes to master are synced to ghosts

GraphLab Ghosting



• Changes to **neighbors** of **high degree vertices** creates substantial network traffic

Fan-In and Fan-Out Performance

- PageRank on synthetic Power-Law Graphs
- GraphLab is undirected



Graph Partitioning

- Graph parallel abstractions rely on partitioning:
 - Minimize communication
 - Balance computation and storage



Random Partitioning

 Both GraphLab and Pregel resort to random (hashed) partitioning on natural graphs



In Summary

GraphLab and Pregel are not well suited for natural graphs

- Challenges of high-degree vertices
- Low quality partitioning

PowerGraph

- GAS Decomposition: distribute vertex-programs
 - Move computation to data
 - Parallelize **high-degree** vertices
- Vertex Partitioning:

Effectively distribute large power-law graphs

A Common Pattern for Vertex-Programs

<pre>GraphLab_PageRank(i)</pre>	
<pre>// Compute sum over neighbors total = 0 foreach(j in in_neighbors(i)): total = total + R[j] * W_{ji}</pre>	Gather Information About Neighborhood
<pre>// Update the PageRank R[i] = 0.1 + total</pre>	Update Vertex
<pre>// Trigger neighbors to run again if R[i] not converged then foreach(j in out_neighbors(i)) signal vertex-program on j</pre>	Signal Neighbors & Modify Edge Data

GAS Decomposition



PageRank in PowerGraph

$$R[i] = 0.15 + \sum_{j \in Nbrs(i)} w_{ji}R[j]$$
PowerGraph_PageRank(i)
Gather(j \rightarrow i): return $w_{ji} * R[j]$
sum(a, b): return a + b;

Apply (i, Σ) : R[i] = 0.15 + Σ

Scatter(
$$i \rightarrow j$$
):
if $R[i]$ changed then trigger j to be recomputed

Distributed Execution of a PowerGraph Vertex-Program



Minimizing Communication in PowerGraph



A vertex-cut minimizes machines each vertex spans

Percolation theory suggests that power law graphs have **good vertex cuts**. [Albert et al. 2000]

New Approach to Partitioning

• Rather than cut edges:

New Theorem: For any edge-cut we can directly construct a vertex-cut which requires strictly less communication and storage.



Must synchronize a **single** vertex

Constructing Vertex-Cuts

- Evenly assign edges to machines
 - Minimize machines spanned by each vertex
- Assign each edge as it is loaded
 - Touch each edge only once
- Propose three **distributed** approaches:
 - Random Edge Placement
 - Coordinated Greedy Edge Placement
 - Oblivious Greedy Edge Placement

Random Edge-Placement

Randomly assign edges to machines



Analysis Random Edge-Placement

Expected number of machines spanned by a vertex:

Twitter Follower Graph 41 Million Vertices 1.4 Billion Edges

Accurately Estimate Memory and Comm. Overhead



Random Vertex-Cuts vs. Edge-Cuts

• Expected improvement from vertex-cuts:



Greedy Vertex-Cuts

• Place edges on machines which already have the vertices in that edge.



Greedy Vertex-Cuts

- De-randomization → greedily minimizes the expected number of machines spanned
- **Coordinated** Edge Placement
 - Requires coordination to place each edge
 - Slower: higher quality cuts
- **Oblivious** Edge Placement
 - Approx. greedy objective without coordination
 - Faster: lower quality cuts

Partitioning Performance

Twitter Graph: 41M vertices, 1.4B edges



Oblivious balances cost and partitioning time.

Greedy Vertex-Cuts Improve Performance



Other Features (See Paper)

- Supports three execution modes:
 - Synchronous: Bulk-Synchronous GAS Phases
 - Asynchronous: Interleave GAS Phases
 - Asynchronous + Serializable: Neighboring vertices do not run simultaneously
- Delta Caching
 - Accelerate gather phase by caching partial sums for each vertex

System Evaluation

System Design



- Implemented as C++ API
- Uses HDFS for Graph Input and Output
- Fault-tolerance is achieved by check-pointing
 Snapshot time < 5 seconds for twitter network

Implemented Many Algorithms

- Collaborative Filtering
 - Alternating Least Squares
 - Stochastic Gradient
 Descent
 - SVD
 - Non-negative MF
- Statistical Inference
 - Loopy Belief Propagation
 - Max-Product Linear
 Programs
 - Gibbs Sampling

Graph Analytics

- PageRank
- Triangle Counting
- Shortest Path
- Graph Coloring
- K-core Decomposition
- Computer Vision
 - Image stitching
- Language Modeling
 LDA

Comparison with GraphLab & Pregel

• PageRank on Synthetic Power-Law Graphs:



PowerGraph is robust to **high-degree** vertices.

PageRank on the Twitter Follower Graph Natural Graph with 40M Users, 1.4 Billion Links Communication 40 35 30 Total Network (GB) 25 20 15 10 5 0 GraphLab Pregel PowerGraph (Piccolo) **Reduces Communication**

32 Nodes x 8 Cores (EC2 HPC cc1.4x)

PowerGraph is Scalable

Yahoo Altavista Web Graph (2002):

One of the largest publicly available web graphs

1.4 Billion Webpages, 6.6 Billion Links

7 Seconds per Iter. 1B links processed per second 30 lines of user code

Topic Modeling



English language Wikipedia

- 2.6M Documents, 8.3M Words, 500M Tokens
- Computationally intensive algorithm



Million Tokens Per Second

Triangle Counting on The Twitter Graph

Identify individuals with strong communities.



Broadcast O(degree²) messages per Vertex

S. Suri and S. Vassilvitskii, "Counting triangles and the curse of the last reducer," WWW'11

Summary

- *Problem*: Computation on **Natural Graphs** is challenging
 - High-degree vertices
 - Low-quality edge-cuts
- Solution: PowerGraph System
 - GAS Decomposition: split vertex programs
 - Vertex-partitioning: distribute natural graphs
- PowerGraph **theoretically** and **experimentally** outperforms existing graph-parallel systems.

Machine Learning and Data-Mining Toolkits



Future Work

• Time evolving graphs

- Support structural changes during computation

- Out-of-core storage (GraphChi)
 - Support graphs that don't fit in memory
- Improved Fault-Tolerance
 - Leverage **vertex replication** to reduce snapshots
 - Asynchronous recovery

PowerGraph is GraphLab Version 2.1 Apache 2 License

http://graphlab.org

Documentation... Code... Tutorials... (more on the way)