

# A large-scale and fault-tolerant approach of subgraph mining using density-based partitioning

Sabeur Aridhi # \*, Laurent d’Orazio # \*, Mondher Maddouri # \* and Engelbert Mephu Nguifo # \*

#LIMOS - Blaise Pascal University, University, BP 10448, Clermont-Fd 63000, France.

\* CNRS, UMR 6158, LIMOS, Aubiere F-63173, France.

**Abstract**—Recently, graph mining approaches have become very popular, especially in domains such as bioinformatics, chemoinformatics and social networks. In this scope, one of the most challenging tasks is frequent subgraph discovery. This task has been motivated by the tremendously increasing size of existing graph databases. Since then, an important problem of designing efficient and scaling approaches for frequent subgraph discovery in large clusters, has taken place. However, failures are a norm rather than being an exception in large clusters. In this context, the MapReduce framework was designed so that node failures are automatically handled by the framework. In this paper, we propose a large-scale and fault-tolerant approach of subgraph mining by means of a density-based partitioning technique, using MapReduce. Our partitioning aims to balance computation load on a collection of machines. We experimentally show that our approach decreases significantly the execution time and scales the subgraph discovery process to large graph databases.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Graphs show up in diverse set of disciplines, ranging from computer networks, social networks to bioinformatics, chemoinformatics and others. These fields exploit the representation power of graph format to describe their associated data, e.g., social networks consist of individuals and their relationships. In bioinformatics, the graph representing a protein interaction network is composed of a set of linked proteins where an edge links each couple of proteins that participate in a particular biological function. In fact, the protein structure itself can be considered as a graph where nodes represent the amino acids of the structure and edges represent the interactions between them. Finding recurrent and frequent substructures may give important insights on the data under consideration. These substructures may correspond to active sites in proteins or to important links between proteins in a protein interaction network [14]. Moreover, in a social network, frequent substructures can help to identify the few most likely paths of transmission for a rumor or joke from one person to another [1]. Mining these substructures from data in a graph perspective falls in the field of graph mining and more specifically in frequent subgraph mining.

Frequent subgraph mining is a main task in the area of graph mining and it has attracted much interest. Consequently, several subgraph mining algorithms have been developed. To the list of subgraph mining algorithms belong FSG [2], Gaston [3] and gSpan [4]. However, these existing approaches have been mainly used on centralized computing systems and

evaluated on relatively small databases [5]. Nowadays, there is an exponential growth in both the graph size and the number of graphs in databases, which make the above cited approaches face the scalability problem.

Several parallel or distributed solutions have been proposed for frequent subgraph mining on a single large graph [6] [7] [8] [9]. However, the problem of subgraph mining from large-scale graph databases is still challenging. In addition, failures are not the exception in parallel or distributed environments especially with large cluster of cheap commodity machines. Machines are subject to operating system bugs, hardware failures or malware attacks. In this context, the MapReduce framework [10] was designed to be fault-tolerant especially at scales of cheap commodity machines or nodes where failures are a norm rather than being an exception. However, the arbitrary partitioning technique proposed by MapReduce generates skew originating from the characteristics of the used data [11].

In this paper, we propose a scalable and fault-tolerant approach for large-scale frequent subgraph mining based on MapReduce. To propose a partitioning allowing efficient large-scale subgraph mining, we propose a density-based partitioning scheme of the input data. The experimental results show that the proposed solution is reliable and scalable in the case of huge graph datasets.

This paper is organized as follows. In the next section, we define the problem of large-scale subgraph mining. In Section 3, we present our approach of large-scale subgraph mining with MapReduce. Then, we describe our experimental study and we discuss the obtained results in Section 4. Finally, in Section 5, we present an overview of some related works dealing with the concept of large-scale subgraph mining.

## II. PRELIMINARIES AND PROBLEM FORMULATION

In this section, we present definitions and notations used in this paper. Then, we present the MapReduce framework. Finally, we define the problem we are addressing and specify our assumptions.

### A. Definitions

A graph is a collection of objects denoted as  $G = (V, E)$ , where  $V$  is a set of vertices and  $E \subseteq V \times V$  is a set of edges. A graph  $G'$  is a subgraph of another graph  $G$ , if there exists a subgraph isomorphism from  $G'$  to  $G$ , denoted as  $G' \subseteq G$ . The

definitions of subgraph, subgraph isomorphism and subgraph support are given as follows.

*Definition 1 (Subgraph):* A graph  $G' = (V', E')$  is a subgraph of another graph  $G = (V, E)$  iff  $V' \subseteq V$  and  $E' \subseteq E$ .

*Definition 2 (Graph and subgraph isomorphism):* An isomorphism of graphs  $G$  and  $H$  is a bijection  $f : V(G) \rightarrow V(H)$  such that any two vertices  $u$  and  $v$  of  $G$  are adjacent in  $G$  if and only if  $f(u)$  and  $f(v)$  are adjacent in  $H$ . A graph  $G'$  has a subgraph isomorphism with  $G$  if:

- $G'$  is a subgraph of  $G$ , and
- there exists an isomorphism between  $G'$  and  $G$ .

*Definition 3 (Subgraph support):* Given a graph database  $DB = \{G_1, \dots, G_n\}$ , the support of a subgraph  $G'$  is defined by

$$\text{support}(G', DB) = \sum_{i=1}^n \sigma(G', G_i),$$

where

$$\sigma(G', G_i) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } G_i \text{ has a subgraph isomorphism with } G', \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

A task of major interest in this setting is finding the frequent subgraph mining with respect to a minimum support threshold.

*Definition 4 (Frequent subgraph mining):* Given a minimum support threshold  $\theta \in [0, 1]$ , the frequent subgraph mining task with respect to  $\theta$  is finding all subgraphs with a support greater than  $\theta$ , i.e., the set  $SG(DB, \theta) = \{(A, \text{support}(A)) : A \text{ is a subgraph of } DB \text{ and } \text{support}(A) \geq \theta \cdot |DB|\}$ .

## B. MapReduce

MapReduce is a framework for processing highly distributable problems across huge datasets using a large number of computers [10]. It was developed within Google as a mechanism for processing large amounts of raw data, for example, crawled documents or web request logs. This data is so large, it must be distributed across thousands of machines in order to be processed in a reasonable amount of time. This distribution implies parallel computing since the same computations are performed on each CPU, but with a different dataset. We notice that the data distribution technique of MapReduce consists on the decomposition of the input data into equal-size partitions called chunks. The only criterion required in this partitioning method is the size of the partition, which corresponds to the size of chunk in the MapReduce configuration.

MapReduce is an abstraction that allows Google engineers to perform simple computations while hiding the details of parallelization, data distribution, load balancing and fault tolerance. The central features of the MapReduce framework are two functions, written by a user: *Map* and *Reduce*. The *Map function* processes a *key/value* pair to generate a set of intermediate *key/value* pairs. The MapReduce library groups together all intermediate values associated with the same intermediate key and passes them to the Reduce function. The Reduce function accepts an intermediate key and a set

of values for that key. It merges these values together to form a smaller set of values.

## C. Problem formulation

In this work, we are interested in frequent subgraph mining in large-scale graph databases.

Let  $DB = \{G_1, \dots, G_K\}$  be a large-scale graph database with  $K$  graphs,  $SM = \{M_1, \dots, M_N\}$  a set of distributed machines,  $\theta \in [0, 1]$  is a minimum support threshold. For  $1 \leq j \leq N$ , let  $Part_j(DB) \subseteq DB$  be a non-empty subset of  $DB$ . We define a partitioning of the database over  $SM$  by the following:  $Part(DB) = \{Part_1(DB), \dots, Part_N(DB)\}$  such that

- $\bigcup_{i=1}^N \{Part_i(DB)\} = DB$ , and
- $\forall i \neq j, Part_i(DB) \cap Part_j(DB) = \emptyset$ .

We denote by  $Size_i$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, N$  the number of graphs in the partition  $Part_i(DB)$ . Let  $GlobalSupport(g)$  and  $LocalSupport_i(g)$  be the support of the subgraph  $g$  in  $DB$  and  $Part_i(DB)$ , respectively.

In the context of distributed frequent subgraph mining, we propose the following definitions.

*Definition 5 (Globally frequent subgraph):* For a given minimum support threshold  $\theta \in [0, 1]$ ,  $g$  is *globally frequent subgraph* if  $GlobalSupport(g) \geq \theta \cdot K$ . Here,  $\theta$  is called global support threshold (GS).

*Definition 6 (Locally frequent subgraph):* For a given minimum support threshold  $\theta \in [0, 1]$  and a tolerance rate  $\tau \in [0, 1]$ ,  $g$  is *locally frequent subgraph* at site  $i$  if  $LocalSupport_i(g) \geq ((1 - \tau) \cdot \theta) \cdot Size_i$ . Here,  $((1 - \tau) \cdot \theta)$  is called local support threshold (LS).

*Definition 7 (Loss Rate):* Given  $S_1$  and  $S_2$  two sets with  $S_2 \subseteq S_1$  and  $S_1 \neq \emptyset$ , we define the loss rate in  $S_2$  compared to  $S_1$  by

$$\text{LossRate}(S_1, S_2) = \frac{|S_1 \Delta S_2|}{|S_1 \cup S_2|},$$

where  $\Delta$  is the symmetric difference, i.e.,  $S_1 \Delta S_2 = (S_1 \setminus S_2) \cup (S_2 \setminus S_1)$ .

We define the problem of distributed subgraph mining by finding a good partitioning of the database over  $SM$  and by minimizing well defined approximation of  $SG(DB, \theta)$ .

*Definition 8 (an  $\epsilon$ -approximation of a set of subgraphs):* Given a parameter  $\epsilon \in [0, 1]$  and  $SG(DB, \theta)$ . An  $\epsilon$ -approximation of  $SG(DB, \theta)$  is a subset  $S \subseteq SG(DB, \theta)$  such that

$$\text{LossRate}(SG, S) \leq \epsilon.$$

We measure the cost of computing an  $\epsilon$ -approximation of  $SG(DB, \theta)$  with a given partitioning method  $PM(DB)$  by the standard deviation of the set of runtime values in mapper machines.

*Definition 9 (Cost of a partitioning method):*

Let  $R = \{Runtime_1(PM), \dots, Runtime_N(PM)\}$  be a set of runtime values.  $Runtime_j(PM)$  represent the runtime of computing frequent subgraphs in the partition  $j$  ( $Part_j$ ) of the database.

The operator  $E$  denotes the average or expected value of  $R$ . Let  $\mu$  be the mean value of  $R$ :

$$\mu = E[R].$$

The cost measure of a partitioning technique is:

$$Cost(PM) = \sqrt{E[(R - \mu)^2]}.$$

A large cost value indicates that the runtime values are far from the mean value and a small cost value indicates that the runtime values are near the mean value. The smaller the value of the cost is, the more efficient the partitioning is.

### III. PROPOSED APPROACH

In this section, we present the proposed solution for large-scale frequent subgraph mining with MapReduce. As shown in Figure 1, our method works as follows:




Fig. 1: A system overview of our approach. In this figure, ellipses represent data, squares represent computations on the data and arrows show the flow of data.

- 1) Input graph database is partitioned into  $N$  partitions. Each partition will be processed by a mapper machine.
- 2) The mapper  $i$  reads the assigned data partition and generates the corresponding locally frequent subgraphs according to local support. Mapper  $i$  outputs *key/value* pairs of locally frequent subgraphs  $\langle subgraph, LocalSupport_i(subgraph) \rangle$ .
- 3) For each unique intermediate key, the reducer passes the key and the corresponding set of intermediate values to the defined Reduce function. According to these *key/value* pairs, the reducer outputs the final list of *key/value* pairs after filtering according to the global support  $\langle subgraph, GlobalSupport(subgraph) \rangle$ .

Individual steps of our solution are described in detail in the following subsections.

#### A. Distributed storage

Our approach is based on MapReduce paradigm [10] which provides a distributed storage and a framework for the analysis and transformation of very large datasets.

The graph database is stored as textual files in a specific format [2] where each graph is described as follows:

- "t # N" means the  $N$ th graph,
- "v M L" means that the  $M$ th vertex in this graph has label  $L$ ,
- "e P Q L" means that there is an edge connecting the  $P$ th vertex with the  $Q$ th vertex. The edge has label  $L$  (The edge label and the node label are independent).

The graph database files are stored in the GFS-based distributed file system of MapReduce [12]. It provides high-throughput access to application data. Each file stored in this file system is divided into blocks and distributed on nodes of the used cluster.

#### B. The density-based partitioning method

The motivation behind dividing the input data into partitions is to reduce effectively the computation space by dealing with smaller graph databases to be processed in parallel. However, we need to combine the overall result. Using this approach, we can decrease the subgraph mining complexity knowing that the time complexity of the subgraph mining process is proportional to the size of the input data. However, this data decomposition is the origin of a loss of the global vision in terms of support computing. In addition, the arbitrary partitioning method of MapReduce that we called MRGP (which stands for **MapReduce Graph Partitioning**) may be the origin of *map-skew* which refers to imbalanced computational load among map tasks [11].

Considering the fact that the task of frequent subgraph mining is depending on the density of graphs [13] [14], we propose a density-based partitioning method that we called DGP (which stands for **Density-based Graph Partitioning**) which consists of constructing balanced partitions (chunks) according to the density of graphs in the database. The goal behind this partitioning is to ensure balanced computation loads and to limit the impact of parallelism and the bias of the tolerance rate. Figure 2 gives an overview of the proposed partitioning method.

The proposed partitioning method can be resumed into two MapReduce passes. In the Map step of the first pass, the density of all instances in the database are computed. In the Map step of the second pass, a density-based decomposition which divides the database into two partitions according to the average density value of the database. The first partition contains the densest graphs and the second contains the sparsest graphs. The Reduce function of the two MapReduce passes is an identity function.

For dividing the database into two partitions, we make use of the following definitions.




Fig. 2: The density-based partitioning method. In this figure, ellipses represent data, squares represent computations on the data and arrows show the flow of data.

**Definition 10 (Graph density):** The density of a graph  $G = (V, E)$  is calculated by

$$\text{density}(G) = 2 * \frac{|E|}{(|V| * (|V| - 1))}.$$

**Definition 11 (Graph density according to the average density):** Given a graph databases  $DB$ . Let  $\delta$  be the average density of  $DB$ . A graph  $G$  is considered as dense according to  $\delta$  if  $\text{density}(G) \geq \delta$ .

We perceive that considering a graph  $G$  as dense in one dataset does not mean that  $G$  is dense in other datasets.

### C. Distributed subgraph mining

In this phase, we use a frequent subgraph mining technique that we run on each partition in parallel. The algorithms 1 and 2 present our Map and Reduce functions:

---

#### Algorithm 1 Map Function

---

**Require:** A partitioned graph database  $DB = \{Part_1(DB), \dots, Part_N(DB)\}$ , support threshold  $\theta$ , tolerance rate  $\tau$ , key, value= graph partition  $Part_i(DB)$

**Ensure:** key=subgraph, value= $LocalSupport_i(DB)$

- 1:  $S_i \leftarrow SubgraphExtractor(Part_i(DB), \theta, \tau)$
  - 2: **for all**  $s$  in  $S_i$  **do**
  - 3:  $EmitIntermediate(s, LocalSupport_i(s))$
  - 4: **end for**
- 

In the Map function, the input pair would be like  $\langle key, Part_i(DB) \rangle$  where  $Part_i(DB)$  is the graph partition number  $i$ . The *SubgraphExtractor* function applies the subgraph mining algorithm to  $Part_i(DB)$  with a tolerance rate value and produces a set  $S_i$  of locally frequent subgraphs. Each mapper outputs pairs like  $\langle s, LocalSupport_i(s) \rangle$  where  $s$  is a subgraph of  $S_i$  and  $LocalSupport_i(s)$  is the local support of  $s$  in  $Part_i$ .

---

#### Algorithm 2 Reduce Function

---

**Require:** A partitioned graph database  $DB = Part_1(DB), \dots, Part_N(DB)$ , support threshold  $\theta$ , key=a subgraph  $s$ , values=local supports of  $s$

**Ensure:** key=a subgraph  $s$ , value= $GlobalSupport(s)$

- 1:  $GlobalSupport \leftarrow 0$
  - 2: **for all**  $v$  in values **do**
  - 3:  $GlobalSupport \leftarrow GlobalSupport + v$
  - 4: **end for**
  - 5: **if**  $GlobalSupport \geq \theta$  **then**
  - 6:  $Emit(s, GlobalSupport(s))$
  - 7: **end if**
- 

The Reduce function receives a set of pairs  $\langle s, LocalSupport_i(s) \rangle$  and computes for each key (a subgraph), the global support  $GlobalSupport(s)$ . Only globally frequent subgraphs will be kept.

We notice that Algorithms 1 and 2 are finite-state. Otherwise, they do not offer a complete result since there are frequent subgraphs that can not be extracted. The decrease of the number of ignored frequent subgraphs can be addressed by a good choice of tolerance rate for the extraction of locally frequent subgraphs.

It has to be noted that such a distributed subgraph mining is fault tolerant. Indeed, relying on MapReduce, in case of failure a task is reexecuted.

## IV. EXPERIMENTAL EVALUATION

This section presents an experimental study of our approach on synthetic and real datasets. It first describes the datasets to be used. Then it details the implementation. Finally, it presents a discussion of the obtained results.

### A. Experimental setup

1) *Datasets:* The datasets used in our experimental study are described in Table I.

TABLE I: Experimental data

Dataset	Type	Number of graphs	Size on disk	Average size
DS1	Synthetic	20,000	18 MB	[50-100]
DS2	Synthetic	100,000	81 MB	[50-70]
DS3	Real	274,860	97 MB	[40-50]
DS4	Synthetic	500,000	402 MB	[60-70]
DS5	Synthetic	1,500,000	1.2 GB	[60-70]
DS6	Synthetic	100,000,000	69 GB	[20-100]

The synthetic datasets are generated by the synthetic data generator "GraphGen" provided by Kuramochi and Karypis [2]. For our tests, we generate various synthetic datasets according to different parameters such as: the number of graphs in the dataset, the average size of graphs in terms of edges and the size on disk. Varying datasets allows us to avoid specific outcomes to data and to have better interpretations.

The real dataset we tested is a chemical compound dataset which is available from the Developmental Therapeutics Program (DTP) at National Cancer Institute (NCI)<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>1</sup><http://dtp.nci.nih.gov/branches/npb/repository.html>

2) *Implementation platform*: We implemented our approach in Perl language and we used Hadoop, (version 0.20.1), an open source version of MapReduce. The databases files are stored in the Hadoop Distributed File System (HDFS).

All the experiments of our approach were carried out using a local cluster with seven nodes. The processing nodes used in our tests are equipped with a dual core Intel(R) Xeon(R) E5645 2.40 GHz CPU and 2 GB of memory for each node.

## B. Experimental results

1) *Speedup and accuracy*: Three existing subgraph miners were used in our experiments: gSpan [4], FSG [2] and Gaston [3]. Table II shows the results we obtained with the sequential version of the used subgraph extractors. Table III shows the experimental results we obtained using our proposed approach with the default MapReduce partitioning method and those obtained with the density-based partitioning method. For each dataset and support value, we note the results of the classic subgraph mining algorithm and those of the proposed method.

TABLE II: Experimental results of classic subgraph extractors

Dataset	Support $\theta$ (%)	gSpan		FSG		Gaston	
		Number of sub-graphs	Runtime (s)	Number of sub-graphs	Runtime (s)	Number of sub-graphs	Runtime (s)
DS1	30	372	31	352	9	352	5
	50	41	6	23	5	23	7
DS2	30	156	171	136	235	136	17
	50	26	9	9	165	9	4
DS3	30	98	138	93	111	94	17
	50	38	106	35	61	35	9

We mention that we could not conduct our experiment with the sequential algorithms in the case of *DS4*, *DS5* and *DS6* due to the lack of memory. However, with the distributed algorithm we were able to handle those datasets.

We notice that the number of subgraphs generated by the distributed solution is, in general, smaller than the number generated by the sequential version of the algorithm. This is related to the application of subgraph mining process on each partition separately with a local support. Similarly, in the reduce phase, we ignore subgraphs which are frequent in the whole dataset but infrequent in the partitions. This loss can be decreased by the use of a maximal value of tolerance rate, i.e., which means a minimal value of local support (see Table III). For example, in Table III, for *DS1* and with  $\theta = 0.3$ , we generate 372 subgraphs with the sequential algorithm gSpan, but we just generate 198 subgraphs with the distributed solution (with the density-based graph partitioning and a tolerance rate  $\tau = 0$ ). By increasing the tolerance rate to  $\tau = 0.6$ , we restore 173 of previously ignored subgraphs and we practically reach the number of subgraphs generated by the sequential algorithm.

As shown in Table III, we note that the density-based partitioning method allows a decreasing number of lost subgraphs compared to the default MapReduce partitioning method, in almost all cases. For example, with *DS4* and *DS5*, we obtain more lost subgraphs with the density-based partitioning method with  $\tau = 0$  and  $\tau = 0.3$ , but with  $\tau = 0.6$  we reach the same result as the MapReduce partitioning method. We

illustrate in Figure 3 the effect of the proposed partitioning method to the rate of lost subgraphs.




Fig. 3: Effect of density-based partitioning method to the rate of lost subgraphs.

We can easily see in Figure 3 that the density-based graph partitioning allows low values of loss rate especially with low values of tolerance rate. We also notice that FSG and Gaston present a higher loss rate than gSpan.

We note that the use of the proposed density-based partitioning method significantly improves the performance of our approach. This improvement is expressed by the diminution of the runtime in comparison with results given by the default MapReduce partitioning method. This result can be explained by the fact that each partition of the database contains a balanced set of graphs in term of density. Consequently, this balanced distribution of the data provides an effective load balancing scheme for distributed computations over worker nodes. Figure 4 shows the effect of our density-based partitioning method to the distribution of workload across the used worker nodes in comparison with the default MapReduce partitioning method.




Fig. 4: Effect of density-based partitioning method to the distribution of computations.

In order to evaluate the capability of the density-based partitioning method to balance the computations over the used nodes, we show in Figure 5 the cost of this partitioning method in comparison with the MapReduce-based partitioning method.

TABLE III: Experimental results of the proposed approach

Dataset	Support $\theta$ (%)	Tolerance rate $\tau$	Number of subgraphs					
			MRGP			DGP		
			gSpan	FSG	Gaston	gSpan	FSG	Gaston
DS1	30	0	82	61	39	198	179	69
		0.3	227	207	68	364	344	79
		0.6	312	352	79	371	351	79
	50	0	17	0	0	23	6	1
		0.3	41	23	7	41	23	7
		0.6	41	23	7	41	23	7
DS2	30	0	145	124	31	146	125	38
		0.3	156	136	31	156	136	39
		0.6	156	136	31	156	136	39
	50	0	25	7	0	25	7	2
		0.3	26	9	0	26	9	3
		0.6	26	9	0	26	9	3
DS3	30	0	77	70	70	80	77	42
		0.3	97	92	80	88	93	42
		0.6	97	93	72	97	93	69
	50	0	36	31	29	37	32	29
		0.4	38	35	29	38	35	29
		0.6	38	35	29	38	35	29
DS4	30	0	137	116	19	78	117	19
		0.3	155	135	19	78	135	19
		0.6	155	135	19	155	135	20
	50	0	24	6	0	24	6	0
		0.3	26	9	0	26	9	0
		0.6	26	9	0	26	9	0
DS5	30	0	131	121	9	104	118	0
		0.3	155	135	9	104	135	0
		0.6	155	135	9	155	135	0
	50	0	24	7	0	18	6	0
		0.3	26	9	0	18	9	0
		0.6	26	9	0	18	9	0
DS6	30	0	15	0	0	104	3	3
		0.3	15	0	0	104	3	3
		0.6	15	0	0	104	3	3
	50	0	4	0	0	17	0	0
		0.3	4	0	0	17	0	0
		0.6	4	0	0	17	0	0

For each partitioning method and for each dataset, we present the mean value of the set of runtime values in the used set of machines and the cost bar which corresponds to the error bar. This cost bar gives a general idea of how accurate the partitioning method is.

In order to study the scalability of our approach and to show the impact of the number of used machines to the large-scale subgraph mining runtime, we present in Figure 6 the subgraph mining runtime for each number of mappers.




Fig. 5: Cost of partitioning methods.

We can see in Figure 5 that the density-based partitioning method allows a minimal cost value in almost all datasets and all thresholds setting. It is also clear that FSG and Gaston present a smaller runtime than gSpan.




Fig. 6: Effect of the number of workers on the runtime. MRGP represents the MapReduce-based partitioning method and DGP represents the proposed density-based partitioning method.

As illustrated in Figure 6, our approach scales with the number of machines. In fact, the execution time of our

approach is proportional to the number of nodes or machines.

2) *Fault tolerance*: One of the main characteristics of MapReduce framework is fault tolerance. In this scope, we tried to show the influence of task failures to the runtime and the obtained results.

TABLE IV: Effect of task failures to the distributed subgraph mining process

Job	Number of tasks	Number of failed tasks	Runtime [mn, s]		Number of subgraphs	
			w/o faults	With faults	w/o faults	With faults
Job 1	61	18	21'11"	42'23"	135	135
Job 2	61	12	51'12"	59'44"	9	9
Job 3	20	5	12'50"	15'14"	155	155

As shown in Table IV, task failures in our approach increase the runtime but conserve the number of generated subgraphs. This is explicated by the fact that MapReduce framework deals with task failures by re-executing failed tasks.

3) *Chunk size and replication factor*: In order to evaluate the influence of some MapReduce parameters on the performance of our implementation, we conducted two types of experiments. Firstly, we varied the block size and we calculated the runtime of the distributed subgraph mining process of our system. In this experiment, we used two datasets and we varied the chunk size from 5Mb to 100MB. Secondly, we varied the number of replications and we calculated the runtime of the distributed subgraph mining process.




Fig. 7: Effect of MapReduce parameters to the distributed subgraph mining runtime

The experimentations presented in Figure 7a show that with small values of chunk size and with big datasets, the runtime of our approach is very important. Otherwise, the other values of chunk size do not notably affect the results.

As shown in Figure 7b, the runtime of our approach is inversely proportional to the replication factor (number of copies of data). This is explained by the high availability of data to MapReduce tasks. Also, a high replication factor helps ensure that the data can survive the failure or nonavailability of a node.

## V. RELATED WORK

The problem of frequent subgraph mining is a fundamental task in graph mining, with applications in several domains such as bioinformatics and social networks. Subgraph mining algorithms consist of two groups, the Apriori-based algorithms and the non-Apriori-based algorithms (or pattern growth approaches). The Apriori approach shares similar characteristics

with the Apriori-based itemset mining [15]. AGM [16] and FSG [2] are two frequent substructures mining algorithms that use the Apriori approach. Non-Apriori-based or pattern growth algorithms such as gSpan [4], MoFa [17], FFSM [18] and Gaston [3] and ORIGAMI [19] have been developed to avoid the overheads of the Apriori-based algorithms. All these algorithms adopt the pattern growth methodology [20], which intends to extend patterns from a single pattern directly.

The use of parallel and/or distributed algorithms for frequent subgraph mining comes from the impossibility to handle large graph and large graph databases on single machine. In this scope, several parallel and/or distributed solutions have been proposed to alleviate this problem [8] [21] [9] [22] [23].

In [21], the authors propose a MapReduce-based algorithm for frequent subgraph mining. The algorithm takes a large graph as input and finds all the subgraphs that match a given motif. The input large graph is represented as Personal Centre Network of every vertex in the graph [21]. For each vertex in the graph, the algorithm calculates the candidate subgraph according to graph isomorphism algorithms. It outputs the candidate subgraphs if they are isomorphic with the motif.

In [9], the authors propose the MRPF algorithm for finding patterns from a complex and large network. The algorithm is divided into four steps: distributed storage of the graph, neighbor vertices finding and pattern initialization, pattern extension, and frequency computing. Each step is implemented by a MapReduce pass. In each MapReduce pass, the task is divided into a number of sub-tasks of the same size and each sub-task is distributed to a node of the cluster. MRPF uses an extended mode to find the target size pattern. That is trying to add one more vertex to the matches of  $i$ -size patterns to create patterns of size  $i+1$ . The extension does not stop until patterns reach the target size. The proposed algorithm is applied to prescription network motifs that provide the possibility to discover the law of prescription compatibility.

In [22], the authors propose an approach to subgraph search over a graph database under the MapReduce framework. The main idea of the proposed approach is first to build inverted edge indexes for graphs in the database, and then to retrieve data only related to the query subgraph by using the built indexes to answer the query.

Another attention was carried to the discovery and the study of dense subgraphs from massive graphs. In [8], an algorithm for finding the densest subgraph in a massive graph is proposed. The algorithm is based on the streaming model of MapReduce. In the work presented in [23], the authors propose a statistical significance measure that compares the structural correlation of attribute sets against their expected values using null models. The authors define a structural correlation pattern as a dense subgraph induced by a particular attribute set.

The above-cited solutions deal with large-scale subgraph mining in the case of one large graph as input. Otherwise, they do not include the subgraph mining process from large graph databases which is the addressed issue in this work.

## VI. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we addressed the issue of distributing the frequent subgraph mining process. We have described our scalable and fault-tolerant approach for large-scale subgraph mining from large graph databases. The proposed approach relies on a density-based partitioning to build balanced partitions of a graph database over a set of machines. By running experiments on a variety of datasets, we have shown that the proposed method is interesting in the case of largescale databases. The performance and scalability of our approach are satisfying for large-scale databases.

In the future work, we will further conduct system analysis and performance study of the proposed approach to improve its efficiency. For example, we will study the use of other topological graph properties instead of the density in the partitioning step. Also, we will study the relation between database characteristics and the choice of the partitioning technique.

A notable interest will be dedicated to study the impact of chunk size to the accuracy of our approach. The idea here is to increase parallelism. For this, a possible plan is to reduce the chunk size.

## REFERENCES

- [1] C. Faloutsos, K. S. Mccurley, and A. Tomkins, "Connection subgraphs in social networks," in *In Workshop on Link Analysis, Counterterrorism, and Privacy, SIAM International Conference on Data Mining*, 2004.
- [2] M. Kuramochi and G. Karypis, "Frequent Subgraph Discovery," in *Proceedings of the 2001 IEEE International Conference on Data Mining*, ser. ICDM '01. Washington, DC, USA: IEEE Computer Society, 2001, pp. 313–320.
- [3] S. Nijssen and J. N. Kok, "A quickstart in frequent structure mining can make a difference," in *Proceedings of the tenth ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining*, ser. KDD '04. New York, NY, USA: ACM, 2004, pp. 647–652.
- [4] X. Yan and J. Han, "gSpan: Graph-Based Substructure Pattern Mining," in *Proceedings of the 2002 IEEE International Conference on Data Mining*, ser. ICDM '02. Washington, DC, USA: IEEE Computer Society, 2002, pp. 721–724.
- [5] M. Wörlein, T. Meinel, I. Fischer, and M. Philippsen, "A quantitative comparison of the subgraph miners mofa, gspan, ffsm, and gaston," in *Proceedings of the 9th European conference on Principles and Practice of Knowledge Discovery in Databases*, ser. PKDD'05. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag, 2005, pp. 392–403.
- [6] G. Malewicz, M. H. Austern, A. J. Bik, J. C. Dehnert, I. Horn, N. Leiser, and G. Czajkowski, "Pregel: a system for large-scale graph processing," in *Proceedings of the 2010 international conference on Management of data*, ser. SIGMOD '10. New York, NY, USA: ACM, 2010, pp. 135–146.
- [7] S. Tatikonda and S. Parthasarathy, "Mining tree-structured data on multicore systems," *Proc. VLDB Endow.*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 694–705, Aug. 2009.
- [8] B. Bahmani, R. Kumar, and S. Vassilvitskii, "Densest subgraph in streaming and mapreduce," *Proc. VLDB Endow.*, vol. 5, no. 5, pp. 454–465, Jan. 2012.
- [9] Y. Liu, X. Jiang, H. Chen, J. Ma, and X. Zhang, "Mapreduce-based pattern finding algorithm applied in motif detection for prescription compatibility network," in *Proceedings of the 8th International Symposium on Advanced Parallel Processing Technologies*, ser. APPT '09. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag, 2009, pp. 341–355.
- [10] J. Dean and S. Ghemawat, "MapReduce: simplified data processing on large clusters," *Commun. ACM*, vol. 51, no. 1, pp. 107–113, Jan. 2008.
- [11] Y. Kwon, M. Balazinska, B. Howe, and J. A. Rolia, "Skewtune: mitigating skew in mapreduce applications," in *SIGMOD Conference*, 2012, pp. 25–36.
- [12] S. Ghemawat, H. Gobioff, and S. T. Leung, "The Google file system," in *Proceedings of the nineteenth ACM symposium on Operating systems principles*, ser. SOSP '03, no. 5. New York, NY, USA: ACM, Oct., pp. 29–43.
- [13] J. Huan, W. Wang, and J. Prins, "Efficient mining of frequent subgraphs in the presence of isomorphism," in *Proceedings of the Third IEEE International Conference on Data Mining*, ser. ICDM '03. Washington, DC, USA: IEEE Computer Society, 2003, pp. 549–.
- [14] J. Huan, W. Wang, D. Bandyopadhyay, J. Snoeyink, J. Prins, and A. Tropsha, "Mining protein family specific residue packing patterns from protein structure graphs," in *Proceedings of the eighth annual international conference on Resaerch in computational molecular biology*, ser. RECOMB '04. New York, NY, USA: ACM, 2004, pp. 308–315.
- [15] R. Agrawal and R. Srikant, "Fast Algorithms for Mining Association Rules in Large Databases," in *Proceedings of the 20th International Conference on Very Large Data Bases*, ser. VLDB '94. San Francisco, CA, USA: Morgan Kaufmann Publishers Inc., 1994, pp. 487–499.
- [16] A. Inokuchi, T. Washio, and H. Motoda, "An Apriori-Based Algorithm for Mining Frequent Substructures from Graph Data," in *Proceedings of the 4th European Conference on Principles of Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery*, ser. PKDD '00. London, UK, UK: Springer-Verlag, 2000, pp. 13–23.
- [17] C. Borgelt and M. R. Berthold, "Mining Molecular Fragments: Finding Relevant Substructures of Molecules," in *Proceedings of the 2002 IEEE International Conference on Data Mining*, ser. ICDM '02. Washington, DC, USA: IEEE Computer Society, 2002, pp. 51–58.
- [18] J. Huan, W. Wang, and J. Prins, "Efficient Mining of Frequent Subgraphs in the Presence of Isomorphism," in *Proceedings of the Third IEEE International Conference on Data Mining*, ser. ICDM '03. Washington, DC, USA: IEEE Computer Society, 2003, pp. 549–552.
- [19] V. Chaoji, M. Al Hasan, S. Salem, J. Besson, and M. J. Zaki, "ORIGAMI: A Novel and Effective Approach for Mining Representative Orthogonal Graph Patterns," *Stat. Anal. Data Min.*, vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 67–84, June 2008.
- [20] J. Han, J. Pei, and Y. Yin, "Mining frequent patterns without candidate generation," *SIGMOD Rec.*, vol. 29, no. 2, pp. 1–12, May 2000.
- [21] B. Wu and Y. Bai, "An efficient distributed subgraph mining algorithm in extreme large graphs," in *Proceedings of the 2010 international conference on Artificial intelligence and computational intelligence: Part I*, ser. AICI'10. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag, 2010, pp. 107–115.
- [22] Y. Luo, J. Guan, and S. Zhou, "Towards efficient subgraph search in cloud computing environments," in *Proceedings of the 16th international conference on Database systems for advanced applications*, ser. DASFAA'11. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag, 2011, pp. 2–13.
- [23] A. Silva, W. Meira, Jr., and M. J. Zaki, "Mining attribute-structure correlated patterns in large attributed graphs," *Proc. VLDB Endow.*, vol. 5, no. 5, pp. 466–477, Jan. 2012.