15-min Review of: **GraphChi**

Large-Scale Graph Computation on Just a PC

Presented by Niko Stahl for R212

Context

• Familiar problem:

How to process a graph that does not fit into main memory?

• Previous solutions:

Distribute: Split data across machines. These approaches have to deal with fault tolerance and can be difficult to debug.

GraphChi's solution

Efficiently use disks (HDD or SDD) of a single machine.

The key problem with using disks:

Random Access is **slow** for disk-based computation. And naive implementations of graph algorithms require frequent random access.



The Model - Overview

Parallel Sliding Window (PSW) algorithm:

For each vertex v, optimize processing of the subgraph containing v and its neighbours (predecessor and successors) by **maximizing sequential memory access**.

The Model - Primitives

- Each vertex is mapped to an interval.
- Each interval stored on a shard, which can be loaded completely into memory (~ order of 10² MB).
- Edges mapped to intervals based on their target vertex.



The Model - An Example



(a) Execution interval (vertices 1-2)

(b) Execution interva (vertices 1-2)

- Vertices are accessed one shard at a time.
- For each shard s, the edges containing vertices on s must be accessed to construct the subgraph.
 - in-edges: already in interval i
 - out-edges: ordered by source on sliding shards. Therefore, they can be accessed sequentially.

The Model - An Example



(a) Execution interval (vertices 1-2)

(b) Execution interval(vertices 1-2)

(c) Execution interval (vertices 3-4)

(d) Execution interval (vertices 3-4)

Crux: Within each sliding shard access is sequential

The Model - Complexity

Let P be the number of intervals. PSW requires P sequential disk accesses to process each interval. $O(P^2)$ reads/writes at each iteration (P<1,000).



PSW Properties

Pros

+ Asynchronous model (not BSP).
More efficient because vertices can be processed in any order (this can be useful for some algorithms, e.g.
Dijkstra's shortest path).

- + Extends well to evolving graphs
- + Easier to debug because computation runs on a single machine.

Cons

- Standard vertex queries are not efficient (building neighborhood of a vertex require scan of a memory shard)

Evaluation

Mac Mini

- 8 GB RAM
- 256 GB SSD
- 1 TB HDD

- 2.5 GHz

Graph name	Vertices	Edges
live-journal [3]	4.8M	69M
netflix [6]	0.5M	99M
domain [47]	26M	0.37B
twitter-2010 [28]	42M	1.5B
uk-2007-05 [12]	106M	3.7B
uk-union [12]	133M	5.4B
yahoo-web [47]	1.4B	6.6B

Evaluation

PageRank

Twitter-2010 (1.5B edges)



Matrix Factorization (Alt. Least Sqr.)

Netflix (99B edges)



WebGraph Belief Propagation (U Kang et al.)



Triangle Counting



Comparing with GraphLab 2

GraphLab with 512 CPUs (64 machines).

Computation on Twitter Graph:

- PageRank: 40x faster than GraphChi
- **Triangle Counting**: 30x faster than GraphChi
- Note: In terms of CPU, GraphLab requires 256x the resources



vs.

GraphChi

Conclusion & Personal View

- Good for prototyping. Is support for evolving graphs necessary?
- The evaluation does not include setup time.
- The model is intuitive. But it is not clear how cumbersome the programming interface is.
- GraphChi introduces an alternative perspective on large scale graph computation. It relies on algorithms and data structures instead of greater resources.