# X-Stream: A Case Study in Building a Graph Processing System

Amitabha Roy (LABOS)



#### X-Stream

- Graph processing system
- Single Machine
- Works on graphs stored
  - Entirely in RAM
  - Entirely in SSD
  - Entirely on Magnetic Disk
- Generic
  - Can do all kinds of graph algorithms from BFS to triangle counting
- Paper, presentation slides and talk video from SOSP 2013 are online

### This talk ...

- A brief history of X-Stream
  - November 2012 to SOSP camera ready
- Cover the details not in the SOSP text
  - Including bad design decisions  $\ensuremath{\mathfrak{S}}$

- Toying with graph processing from an algorithms perspective
- Observed graph processing as an instance of SpMV

 $\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{X}^{\mathsf{T}} \mathbf{A}$ 

- X,Y are vertex state vectors. A is the adjacency matrix
- Operators are algorithm specific
  - Numerical operations for pagerank
  - Reachability (and tree parent assignment) for BFS
- Do we know how to do sparse matrix multiplication efficiently ?

- Yes ! Algorithms community had beaten the problem to death <sup>©</sup>
  Optimal Sparse Matrix Dense Vector Multiplication in the I/O-Model -Bender et. al.
- Regretted not paying attention in grad school to complexity theory
- Isolated the good ideas from that paper
  - <u>Cache the essentials (upper level of memory hierarchy, random access)</u>
  - <u>Stream everything else (lower level of memory hierarchy, block transfer)</u>
  - <u>Stream, don't sort the edge list</u>



Shard vertices to fit each chunk in cache

I/Os to memory: 
$$O(P) = O(\frac{V}{M})$$

#### Ε







Do shuffle

I/Os: 
$$O(\frac{U}{B}\log_{\frac{M}{B}}\frac{V}{M})$$







Total I/Os: 
$$\frac{V+E}{B} + \frac{E}{B}\log_{\frac{M}{B}}\frac{V}{M}$$

Bender et. al. tells us this is very close to the most efficient solution

## Preliminary Ideas (~ Dec 2012)

- Yes, but....
  - Algorithmic complexity theory ignores constants
- Systems Research
  - Hypothesize
  - Build
  - Measure
- Quickly prototyped an SpMV implementation in C++
- Compared to Graphchi

## Preliminary Ideas (~ Jan 2013)

- Results (BFS and pagerank) looked good
- Beat Graphchi by a huge margin 😳
- Often finished faster than Graphchi finished producing shards !
- Now what ?
- Write a "systems" paper from an "algorithms" idea

## Preliminary Ideas (~ Jan 2012)

- HotOS submission (Jan 10, 2013, 6 page paper)
- "Pitch" ?
- Graph processing systems spend a lot of time indexing data before processing it
- Here is a system that produces results from unordered "big-data"
- It works from main memory and disk
- Sketch of the system (minimal "complexity theory")
- Results: Beats Graphchi for graphs on disk
- Results: Beats sorting the edge list for graphs in memory

## The next stage (~February 2013)

- X-Stream seems like a good idea
- Lets try to build and evaluate the full system
  - Only thought about SOSP very vaguely
- Loads of code written that month (month of code  $\odot$ )
- Made some arbitrary decisions that (we hoped) would not impact end result

• I/O path to disk

Option	Buffers controlled by	Overhead
read()/write()	OS (pagecache)	Сору
mmap	OS (pagecache)	Minor fault
Direct I/O	You	None

- Chose direct I/O. Great performance, controlled mem footprint 🙂
- Nightmare to implement properly 🙁 (look at core/disk\_io.hpp)

- Shuffle entirely in memory
- Greatly simplifies implementation
  - However this means ....
- One buffer per partition should fit in memory (at least 16 MB)
- Number of partitions bounded
  - Below: Have to fit vertex data of a partition into memory
  - Above: Have to fit one buffer from each partition into memory
- Intersect covers large enough graphs (see sec 3.4 of SOSP paper)

- X-Stream targets any two level memory hierarchy
- 1. Disk/SSD + Main memory
- 2. Main memory + CPU cache
- Correct approach is to build two 'X-Streams' as independent pieces of software
- We instead decided to implicitly deal with a three level memory hierarchy in the code
- Disk/SSD + Main memory + CPU cache
- Does in-memory partitions of disk partitions !

- Why ?
  - Algorithmically elegant, same I/O complexity for any combination of two levels in the hierarchy
  - User does not need to worry about whether the graph fits in memory
  - In the distant future PCM cache connections would be handled gracefully
- Why not ?
  - HORRIBLY complex ☺ (look at x-lib.hpp)
  - Elegant complexity theory useless for a systems paper
  - PCM is yet to arrive

#### SOSP Submission ~ March 2013

- HotOS results arrived in March
  - Paper got rejected but ...
- Review and PC explicitly said
  - Great set of ideas
  - Almost got in
  - Felt it was mature enough for a full conference rather than HotOS
- Decided to submit to SOSP at that point
  - Code base was stable, experiments were running, results were good

### SOSP Submission ~ March 2013

- Reworked "pitch" for SOSP submission
- De-emphasized algorithmic contributions
- De-emphasized ability to process unordered data
- Emphasized difference between sequential and random access bandwidth
- Called the execution model "edge-centric"
- Justified saying that it results in more sequential access
- Paper became very evaluation heavy

#### SOSP Submission ~ March 2013

- Experimental evaluation critical to strength of a systems paper
- Carefully planned and executed experiments (~ 500 hours)
  - Figure placeholders in the paper with expected results
  - Tried to duplicate configurations in the cluster
    - ~ 4 machines with 2x3TB drives each
    - 1 machine with SSD
  - 4x experimental throughput for the magnetic disk experiments
  - SSD experiments slower as only one SSD
    - Hence more magnetic disk results than SSD results

#### April 2013

- Vacation
  - Burnt out
  - Zero work 🙂

## May 2013

- Started thinking about more algorithms over X-Stream
- SOSP submission had
  - BFS, CC, SSSP, MIS, Pagerank, ALS.
  - Could all be cast as SpMV and therefore fitted our execution model
- Wanted to go further: show that X-Stream model not limited
  - SCC
  - Belief propagation
- Solution was to allow algorithm to generate new sparse matrices

## May 2013

- X-Stream implemented Y=X<sup>T</sup>A efficiently
- A was static
  - for graph G=(V, E) A = E, X = V
- Allowed X-Stream to generate matrices instead of vectors

 $\mathsf{B} = \mathsf{X} \mathsf{I} \mathsf{A}$ 

- Very similar to SpMV
- Similar algorithmic complexity
- Equivalent to generating new edge list

## May 2013

- Divided algorithms on top of X-Stream into two categories
  - Standard : BFS, CC, SSSP, Pagerank
  - Special: BP, Triangle counting, SCC, MCST
- Special algorithms use a lower level interface that lets them create, manage and manipulate sparse matrices of O(E) non-zeros.
- Had to completely rewrite core X-Stream to support this 🟵

## June 2013

- Started preparing for possible resubmission to ASPLOS (July deadline)
- Added in more "systemsy" features
- Primarily compression
- Added zlib compression
- Bad idea in retrospect  $\ensuremath{\mathfrak{S}}$ 
  - Zlib too slow to keep up with streaming speeds from RAIDED magnetic disks !!
  - Software decompression < 200 MB/s
  - RAID array, sequential access > 300 MB/s

### July – August 2013

- SOSP paper accepted 😳
- SOSP camera ready deadline was September
- Diverted July and August to doing strategic extensions to X-Stream
- Worked with two summer interns
  - Intern 1: Added support to express algorithms in Python on X-Stream
  - Intern 2: Added more algorithms, Triangle counting, BC, K-Cores, HyperANF

## August 2013 - September 2013

- SOSP camera ready
- Re-ran experiments
- Completely re-wrote paper, made it far clearer
- Interesting points:
  - Yahoo webgraph did not work well, left it as such
  - Kept in complexity analysis (hat-tip to X-Stream's roots)
- Camera ready deadline 15 Sep
- Conference presentation Nov 3 (video online)

## Conclusion

- Overview of a large systems project from concept to publication
- Many mistakes made, not apparent from finished paper
- Lots of people contributed
  - Willy Zwaenepoel, Ivo Mihailovic, Mia Primorac, Aida Amini
- What next ?
  - X-Stream could get us to a billion plus edges
  - How about a trillion edges ?
- X-1: Scale out version

#### BACKUP (SOSP slides)

#### X-Stream

#### Process large graphs on a single machine



#### 1U server = 64 GB RAM + 2 x 200 GB SSD + 3 x 3TB drive

# Approach

- Problem: Graph traversal = random access
- Random access is inefficient for storage
  - Disk (500X slower)
  - SSD (20X slower)
  - RAM (2X slower)

Solution: X-Stream makes graph accesses sequential

## Contributions

- Edge-centric scatter gather model
- Streaming partitions
# Standard Scatter Gather

- Edge-centric scatter gather based on Standard Scatter gather
- Popular graph processing model Pregel [Google, SIGMOD 2010]

```
Powergraph [OSDI 2012]
```

...

# Standard Scatter Gather

- State stored in vertices
- Vertex operations
  - Scatter updates along outgoing edges
  - Gather updates from incoming edges



#### Standard Scatter Gather



BFS

## Vertex-Centric Scatter Gather

• Iterates over vertices

for each vertex v Scatter if v has update for each edge e from v scatter update along e

- Standard scatter gather is <u>vertex-centric</u>
- Does not work well with storage





## Transformation



**Vertex-Centric** 

#### **Edge-Centric**

### Edge-Centric Scatter Gather





SOURCE	DEST
1	3
1	5
2	7
2	4
3	2
3	8
4	3
4	7
4	8
5	6
6	1
8	5
8	<b>6</b> 43

		SOURCE	DEST
	П	1	3
	Ш	1	5
	Ш	2	7
	Ш	2	4
	Ш	3	2
	Ш	3	8
	Ш	4	3
	Ш	4	7
	Ш	4	8
	Ш	5	6
	Ш	6	1
		8	5
┝↓	<b>↓↓</b>	8	6



<u>No</u> index <u>No</u> clustering <u>No</u> sorting

# Tradeoff

**Vertex-centric Scatter-Gather:** 

Edge Data

**Random Access Bandwidth** 

**Edge-centric Scatter-Gather:** 

Scatters×Edge Data

Sequential Access Bandwidth

- Sequential Access Bandwidth >> Random Access Bandwidth
- Few scatter gather iterations for real world graphs
  - Well connected, variety of datasets covered in the paper

# Contributions

- Edge-centric scatter gather model
- Streaming partitions

# **Streaming Partitions**

• Problem: still have random access to vertex set





# **Streaming Partitions**

- A streaming partition is
  - A subset of the vertices that fits in RAM
  - All edges whose source vertex is in that subset
  - No requirement on quality of the partition

# Partitioning the Graph

			SOURCE	DEST
Subcot of vorticos		1	5	
JUDSE		vertices	4	7
	V1		2	7
	1		4	3
	2		4	8
	3		3	8
	Δ		2	4
	-+			
	4		1	3
	Ŧ		1 3	3 2
	4 V2		1 3 SOURCE	3 2 DEST
	V2 5		1 3 SOURCE 5	3 2 DEST 6
	V2 5 6		1 3 SOURCE 5 8	3 2 DEST 6 6
	V2 5 6 7		1 3 SOURCE 5 8 8	3 2 DEST 6 6 5

## **Random Accesses for Free**



	SOURCE	DEST
I	1	5
I	4	7
I	2	7
I	4	3
I	4	8
	3	8
	2	4
	1	3
♦	3	2



# Generalization



SOURCE	DEST
1	5
4	7
2	7
4	3
4	8
3	8
2	4
1	3
3	2



#### **Slow storage**

#### **Applies to any two level memory hierarchy**

# **Generally Applicable**



# Parallelism

- Simple Parallelism
- State is stored in vertex
- Streaming partitions have disjoint vertices
- Can process streaming partitions in parallel

# **Gathering Updates** Partition 1 Vertices Edges Partition 100 Vertices Shuffler

Minimize random access for large number of partitions Multi-round copying akin to merge sort but cheaper

## Performance

- Focus on SSD results in this talk
  - Similar results with in-memory graphs

# Baseline

- Graphchi [OSDI 2012]
- First to show that graph processing on a single machine
  - <u>Is viable</u>
  - <u>Is competitive</u>
- Also targets larger sequential bandwidth of SSD and Disk

# **Different Approaches**

- Fundamentally different approaches to same goal
- Graphchi uses "shards"
  - Partitions edges into **sorted** shards
- X-Stream uses sequential scans
  - Partitions edges into **unsorted** streaming partitions

# Baseline to Graphchi

• Replicated OSDI 2012 experiments on our SSD



# X-Stream Speedup over Graphchi



# Baseline to Graphchi

Replicated OSDI 2012 experiments on our SSD



# X-Stream Speedup over Graphchi (+ sharding)



### **Preprocessing Impact**

**X-Stream returns answers before Graphchi finishes sharding** 



# Sequential Access Bandwidth

- Graphchi shard
  - All vertices and edges must fit in memory
- X-Stream partition
  - Only vertices must fit in memory
- More Graphchi shards than X-Stream partitions
- Makes access more random for Graphchi

# SSD Read Bandwidth (Pagerank on Twitter)



# SSD Write Bandwidth (Pagerank on Twitter)



# Disk Transfers (Pagerank on Twitter)

Metric	X-Stream	Graphchi
Data moved	224 GB	322 GB
Time taken	398 seconds	2613 seconds
Transfer rate	578 MB/s	126 MB/s

SSD can sustain reads = 667 MB/s, writes = 576 MB/s X-Stream uses all available bandwidth from the storage device

# Scaling up

#### Weakly Connected Components



Input Edge Data

# Conclusion





Edge-centric processing

Big graphs

**Sequential Access** 

**Streaming Partitions** 

Good Performance RAM, SSD, Disk

Download from http://labos.epfl.ch/xstream



### **API** Restrictions

- Updates must be commutative
- Cannot access all edges from a vertex in single step

## Applications

• X-Stream can solve a variety of problems

BFS, SSSP, Weakly connected components, Strongly connected components, Maximal independent sets, Minimum cost spanning trees, Belief propagation, Alternating least squares, Pagerank, Betweenness centrality, Triangle counting, Approximate neighborhood function, Conductance, K-Cores

Q. Average distance between people on a social network ?

A. Use approximate neighborhood function.

### Edge-centric Scatter Gather

#### • Real world graphs have low diameter



D=3, BFS in 3 steps, Most real-world graphs


## X-Stream Main Memory Performance BFS (32M vertices/256M edges)



## Runtime impact of Graphchi Sharding

Graphchi Runtime Breakdown



## Pre-processing Overhead

- Low overhead for producing streaming partition
- Strictly cheaper than sorting edges by source vertex

