

Distributed Evolutionary k -way Node Separators*

Peter Sanders
Karlsruhe Institute of Technology
Karlsruhe, Germany
sanders@kit.edu

Darren Strash
Colgate University
Hamilton, USA
dstrash@colgate.edu

Christian Schulz
Karlsruhe Institute of Technology
Karlsruhe, Germany and University of Vienna
Vienna, Austria
christian.schulz@univie.ac.at

Robert Williger
Karlsruhe Institute of Technology
Karlsruhe, Germany
williger@ira.uka.de

ABSTRACT

Computing high quality node separators in large graphs is necessary for a variety of applications, ranging from divide-and-conquer algorithms to VLSI design. In this work, we present a novel distributed evolutionary algorithm tackling the k -way node separator problem. A key component of our contribution includes new k -way local search algorithms based on maximum flows. We combine our local search with a multilevel approach to compute an initial population for our evolutionary algorithm, and further show how to modify the coarsening stage of our multilevel algorithm to create effective combine and mutation operations. Lastly, we combine these techniques with a scalable communication protocol, producing a system that is able to compute high quality solutions in a short amount of time. Our experiments against competing algorithms show that our advanced evolutionary algorithm computes the best result on 94% of the chosen benchmark instances.

KEYWORDS

graph partitioning, node separators, max-flow min-cut

1 INTRODUCTION

Given a graph $G = (V, E)$, the k -way node separator problem is to find a small separator $S \subset V$, and k disjoint subsets of V , V_1, \dots, V_k called *blocks*, such that no edges exist between two different blocks V_i and V_j ($i \neq j$) and $V = \bigcup_i V_i \cup S$. The objective is to minimize the size of the separator S or, depending on the application, the cumulative weight of its nodes, while the blocks V_i are balanced. Note that removing the set S from the graph results in at least k connected components.

Many algorithms rely on small node separators. For example, small balanced separators are a popular tool in divide-and-conquer strategies [2, 18, 20], are useful to speed up the computations of shortest paths [7, 8, 28], are necessary in scientific computing to compute fill reducing orderings with nested dissection algorithms [13] or in VLSI design [2, 18].

Finding a *balanced* node separator is NP-hard for general graphs even if the maximum node degree is three [4, 12]. Therefore, heuristic and approximation algorithms are used in practice to find small node separators. The most commonly used method to solve the node separator problem on large graphs in practice is the *multilevel* approach. During a coarsening phase, a multilevel algorithm reduces the graph size by iteratively contracting the nodes and edges of G until the graph is small enough to compute a node separator by some other (presumably time consuming) algorithm. A node separator of the input graph is then constructed by iteratively uncontracting the graph, transferring the solution to this finer graph, and then applying local search algorithms to improve the solution.

Although current solvers are typically fast enough for most applications, they unfortunately produce separators of low solution quality. This may be acceptable in applications that use a separator just once, however, many applications first compute a separator as a preprocessing step, and then rely on a high-quality separator for speed in later stages. This is true in VLSI design [2, 18], where even small improvements in separator size can have a large impact on computation time and production costs. High-quality node separators can also speed up shortest path queries in road networks, for example, in customizable contraction hierarchies [8], where smaller node separators yield better node orderings that are repeatedly used to answer shortest path queries. The cost for computing one high quality node separator is then amortized over a many shortest path queries. Hence, our focus is on solution quality in this work.

1.1 Our Results

The main contribution of this paper is a technique that integrates an evolutionary search algorithm with a novel multilevel k -node separator algorithm and its scalable parallelization. We present novel mutation and combine operators for the problem which are based on the multilevel scheme. Due to the coarse-grained parallelization, our system is able to compute separators that have high quality *within a few minutes* for graphs of moderate size.

*This work was partially supported by DFG grants SA 933/11-1.

2 PRELIMINARIES

2.1 Basic Concepts

Throughout this paper, we consider an undirected graph $G = (V = \{0, \dots, n-1\}, E)$ with $n = |V|$, and $m = |E|$. $\Gamma(v) := \{u : \{v, u\} \in E\}$ denotes the *neighborhood* of a node v . A graph $S = (V', E')$ is said to be a *subgraph* of $G = (V, E)$ if $V' \subseteq V$ and $E' \subseteq E \cap (V' \times V')$. We call S an *induced subgraph* when $E' = E \cap (V' \times V')$. For a set of nodes $U \subseteq V$, $G[U]$ denotes the subgraph induced by U .

The *graph partitioning problem*, which is closely related to the node separator problem, asks for *blocks* of nodes V_1, \dots, V_k that partition V (i.e., $V_1 \cup \dots \cup V_k = V$ and $V_i \cap V_j = \emptyset$ for $i \neq j$). A *balancing constraint* demands that $\forall i \in \{1..k\} : |V_i| \leq L_{\max} := (1+\epsilon) \lceil |V|/k \rceil$ for some parameter ϵ . In this case, the objective is often to minimize the total *cut* $\sum_{i < j} |E_{ij}|$ where $E_{ij} := \{\{u, v\} \in E : u \in V_i, v \in V_j\}$. The set of cut edges is also called *edge separator*. An abstract view of the partitioned graph is the so called *quotient graph*, where nodes represent blocks and edges are induced by connectivity between blocks.

The *node separator problem* asks to find blocks, V_1, \dots, V_k and a separator S that partition V such that there are no edges between the blocks. Again, a balancing constraint demands $|V_i| \leq (1+\epsilon) \lceil |V|/k \rceil$. However, there is no balancing constraint on the separator S . The objective is to minimize the size of the separator $|S|$. Note that removing the set S from the graph results in at least k connected components and that the blocks V_i itself do not need to be connected components. Two blocks of V_i and V_j are *adjoint* if there exists a separator node $s \in S$ that connects both blocks. Note that s can separate more than two blocks. For the separator case, edges in the *quotient graph* are induced by adjoint blocks. By default, our initial inputs will have unit edge and node weights. However, the results in this paper are easily transferable to node and edge weighted problems.

A matching $M \subseteq E$ is a set of edges that do not share any common nodes, i.e. the graph (V, M) has maximum degree one. *Contracting* an edge $\{u, v\}$ replaces the nodes u and v by a new node x connected to the former neighbors of u and v . We set $c(x) = c(u) + c(v)$. If replacing edges of the form $\{u, w\}, \{v, w\}$ would generate two parallel edges $\{x, w\}$, we insert a single edge with $\omega(\{x, w\}) = \omega(\{u, w\}) + \omega(\{v, w\})$. *Uncontracting* an edge e “undoes” its contraction. In order to avoid tedious notation, G will denote the current state of the graph before and after a (un)contraction unless we explicitly want to refer to different states of the graph.

The multilevel approach consists of three main phases. In the *contraction* (coarsening) phase, we iteratively identify matchings $M \subseteq E$ and contract the edges in M . Contraction should quickly reduce the size of the input and each computed level should reflect the global structure of the input graph. Contraction is stopped when the graph is small enough so that the problem can be solved by some other potentially more expensive algorithm. In the *local search* (or uncoarsening) phase, matchings are iteratively uncontracted. After uncontracting a matching, a local search algorithm moves nodes to decrease the size of the separator or to improve

balance of the block while keeping the size of the separator. The intuition behind the approach is that a good solution at one level of the hierarchy will also be a good solution on the next finer level so that local search will quickly find a good solution.

2.2 Related Work

Here, we focus on results closely related to our main contributions, as well as previous work on the node separator problem. However, we briefly mention that there has been a *huge* amount of research on graph partitioning, which is closely related to the node separator problem. We refer the reader to [3, 5] for thorough reviews of the results in this area.

2-way Node Separators. In contrast to the NP-hardness of the problem in general, Lipton and Tarjan [19] showed that small 2-way balanced separators can always be found in linear time for planar graphs. Their *planar separator theorem* states that, for planar graphs, one can always find a 2-way separator S in linear time such that $|S| = O(\sqrt{|V|})$ and $|V_i| \leq 2|V|/3$. Note that, to achieve better balance, the problem remains NP-hard [11] even for planar graphs.

For general graphs there are several heuristics to compute small node separators. A common and simple method is to first compute an edge separator using a multilevel graph partitioning algorithm, and then compute a node separator by selecting nodes incident to the edge separator [24, 27]. A major drawback to this method is that the graph partitioning objective—to minimize the number of cut edges—differs from the objective of the node separator problem. This difference in combinatorial structure, unfortunately, means that graph partitioning approaches are unlikely to find high quality solutions.

The Metis [16] and Scotch [23] graph partitioners use a multilevel approach to obtain a 2-way node separator. After contraction, both tools compute a node separator on the coarsest graph using a greedy algorithm. This separator is then transferred level-by-level, dropping non-needed nodes on each level and applying Fiduccia-Mattheyses (FM) style local search. LaSalle and Karypis [17] further gave a shared-memory parallel algorithm and showed that a multilevel approach combining greedy local search with a segmented FM algorithm can outperform serial FM algorithms.

Other recent approaches look at variations of the node separator problem, such as Pareto solutions for edge cut versus balance [15], and enforcing both upper *and* lower bounds on block sizes [14].

k-way Node Separators. In the theoretical algorithms literature, a *multiway* separator is the generalization of separator to a higher number of blocks. Frederickson [10] first gave this generalization, and showed that planar graphs can be partitioned into $O(|V|/k)$ subsets of size at most k , where each subgraph shares $O(\sqrt{k})$ boundary vertices with other subgraphs. Frederickson’s generalization of a separator is different than what we consider here: we do not attempt to

minimize the number of nodes that separate pairs of blocks, instead we minimize the total number of nodes that collectively separate all blocks. In practice, the balance constraint on the block size may also implicitly minimize the number of separator nodes between blocks, but this is not strictly enforced.

We are currently unaware of any existing algorithm to compute a k -way node separator. However, we note that, similar to 2-way node separators, a k -way node separator may be computed by first computing a k -way *edge* separator, and then keeping some or all of the nodes incident to the edge separator as a node separator.

2.3 Detailed Related Work

Recently, we presented a new multilevel algorithm for the 2-way node separator problem [26]. We outline the details of the multilevel algorithm here since we modify this algorithm to compute k -way node separators and then use the modified algorithm to compute the initial population of the evolutionary algorithm.

During coarsening, they use a two-phase approach, which makes contraction more systematic by separating two issues: A *rating function* and a *matching* algorithm. Hence, the coarsening algorithm captures both *local* information and the *global* structure of the graph. While the rating function allows a flexible characterization of what a “good” contracted graph is, the simple, standard definition of the matching problem allows to reuse previously developed algorithms for weighted matching. Their method further uses the *Global Path Algorithm (GPA)* [21] to compute matchings, which runs in near-linear time. GPA scans the edges in order of decreasing weight (rating) but rather than immediately building a matching, it first constructs a collection of paths and even-length cycles. Afterwards, *optimal solutions* are computed for each of these paths and cycles using dynamic programming.

Coarsening is stopped as soon as the graph has less than ten thousand nodes. To compute an initial separator, Sanders and Schulz compute an edge separator, from which they derive a node separator. Conversion is done by using all boundary nodes as initial separator S and using the *flow-based technique* described below to select the smallest separator contained in the induced bipartite subgraph.

Two-way local search is based on localized local search and flow-based techniques. Localized local search algorithms for the node separator problem are initialized only with a subset of given separator instead of the whole separator set. In each iteration a separator node with the highest priority not violating the balance constraint is moved. The priority is based on the *gain* concept, i.e. the decrease in the objective when the separator node is moved into a block. More precisely, the gain of the node is the weight of v minus the weight of the nodes that have to be added to the separator once it is moved. Each node is moved at most once out of the separator within a single local search. After a node is moved, newly added separator nodes become eligible for movement.

The other local search algorithm contributed is based on maximum flows. More precisely, the authors solve a node-capacitated flow problem $\mathcal{F} = (V_{\mathcal{F}}, E_{\mathcal{F}})$ to improve a given node separator. We shortly outline the details. Given a set of nodes $A \subset V$, its *border* is defined as $\partial A := \{u \in A \mid \exists (u, v) \in E : v \notin A\}$. The set $\partial_1 A := \partial A \cap V_1$ is called *left border* of A and the set $\partial_2 A := \partial A \cap V_2$ is called *right border* of A . An A *induced flow problem* \mathcal{F} is the node induced subgraph $G[A]$ using ∞ as edge-capacities and the node weights of the graph as node-capacities. Additionally there are two nodes s, t that are connected to the border of A . More precisely, s is connected to all left border nodes $\partial_1 A$ and all right border nodes $\partial_2 A$ are connected to t . These new edges get capacity ∞ . Note that the additional edges are directed. \mathcal{F} has the *balance property* if each (s, t) -flow induces a balanced node separator in G , i.e. the blocks V_i fulfill the balancing constraint. The basic idea is to construct a flow problem \mathcal{F} having the balance property. Such a subgraph is found by performing breadth first searches (BFS) initialized with the separator nodes.

The algorithms starts by setting A to S and extending it by performing two BFS. The first BFS is initialized with the current separator nodes S and only looks at nodes in block V_1 . The same is done during the second BFS with the difference that now looks at nodes of block V_2 . Each node touched by any of the BFS is added to A . The BFSs are stopped in such a way that the final solution of the flow problem (which can be transformed into a separator of the original problem) yields a balanced separator in the original graph. To obtain even better solutions, larger flow-problems can be defined by dropping the requirement that each cut in the flow problem corresponds to a *balanced* node separator in the original graph. If the resulting node separator is not balanced, then the algorithms starts again with a smaller flow problems, i.e. stopping the BFS to define the flow problem earlier.

To improve solution quality, the notion of *iterated multilevel schemes* has been introduced to the node separator problem. Here, one transfers a solution of a previous multilevel cycle down the hierarchy and uses it as initial solution. More precisely, this can be done by not contracting any cut edge, i.e. an edge running between a block and the separator. This is achieved by modifying the matching algorithm to not match any edge that runs between V_i and S ($i = 1, 2, \dots, k$). Hence, when contraction is done, every edge leaving the separator will remain and one can transfer the node separator down in the hierarchy. Thus a given node separator can be used as initial node separator of the coarsest graph (having the same balance and size as the node separator of the finest graph). This ensures non-decreasing quality, if the local search algorithm guarantees no worsening.

3 LOCAL SEARCH AND BALANCING

Local search is used to improve a given solution to the node separator problem on each level of the multilevel hierarchy. As the term implies we locally search for a better separator

around the current separator in order to find a new locally optimal solution. In this section, we show how we can use the flow-based local improvement method described above to locally improve a k -way separator for $k > 2$ and describe algorithms that are able to balance solutions, e.g. solutions that contain blocks with too many vertices. These algorithms are used to create the initial population of our evolutionary algorithm as well as to provide the combine and mutation operations. Our algorithm is called *Adv* and the evolutionary algorithm that is introduced later *AdvEvo*.

3.1 k -way Local Search

Our k -way local search builds on top of the flow-based search which is intended for improving a separator with $k = 2$. The main idea is to find pairs of *adjoint blocks* and then perform local search on the subgraph induced by adjoint block pairs.

Preprocessing. In order to find pairs of adjoint blocks, we look at separator nodes which *directly separate* two different blocks, meaning these separator nodes are adjacent to nodes from at least two different blocks not including the separator. In general directly separating nodes do not have to exist (see Figure 1). In other words, it may be that a separator disconnects two blocks, but the shortest path distance between the blocks is greater or equal to two. Using a preprocessing step, we first make sure that each separator node is adjacent to at least two blocks, i.e. each separator node is directly separating.

The preprocessing step works as follows: we iterate over all separator nodes and try to remove them from the separator if they do not directly separate two blocks. The order in which we look at the separator nodes is given by the number of adjacent blocks (highest first). Let s be the current separator node under consideration. If it has two or more non-separator neighbors in different blocks, it already directly separates at least two blocks and we continue. If s only has neighbors in a single block in addition to the separator, we move it into that block. Lastly, if s only has other separator nodes as neighbors, we put it into a block having smallest overall weight. In each step, we update the priorities of adjacent neighboring separator nodes. Note that nodes are only removed from the separator and never added. Moreover, removing a node from the separator can increase the priority




Figure 1: Illustration of the preprocessing for a graph with blocks V_1 (green), V_2 (blue) and separator S (red).

of an adjacent separator node only by one. As soon as the priority of a node is larger than one, it is directly separating and we do not have to look at the vertex again. After the algorithm is done, each separator node is directly separating at least two blocks and we can build the quotient graph in order to find adjoint blocks. Our preprocessing can introduce imbalance to the solution. Hence, we run the balance routine defined below after preprocessing.

Pair-wise Local Search. Subsequent to the preprocessing step, we identify the set of all adjoint block pairs P by iterating through all separator nodes and their adjacent nodes. We iterate through all pairs $p = (A, B) \in P$ and build the subgraph \mathcal{G}_p . \mathcal{G}_p is induced by the set of nodes consisting of all nodes in A and B as well as all separator nodes that *directly separate* the blocks. After building \mathcal{G}_p , we run local search designed for 2-way separators on this subgraph. Note that an improvement in the separator size between A and B directly corresponds to an improvement to the overall separator size.

To gain even smaller separators and because the solution is potentially modified by local search, we repeat local search multiple times in the following way. The algorithm is organized in rounds. In each round, we iterate over the elements in P and perform local search on each induced subgraph. If local search has not been successful, we remove p from P . Otherwise, we keep p for the next round.

3.2 Balancing

To guarantee the balance constraint, we use a balance operation. Given an imbalanced separator of a graph, the algorithm returns a balanced node separator. Roughly speaking, we move nodes from imbalanced blocks towards the blocks that can take nodes without becoming overloaded (see Figure 2 for an illustrating example). As long as there are imbalanced blocks, we iteratively repeat the following steps:

First, we find a path p from the heaviest block \mathcal{H} to the lightest block \mathcal{L} in the quotient graph. If there is no such path, we directly move a node to the lightest block and make its neighbors separator nodes. Next, we iterate through the edges $(A, B) \in p$ and move nodes from A into B . In general, we move $\min(L_{\max} - |\mathcal{L}|, |\mathcal{H}| - L_{\max})$ nodes along the path, i.e. as many nodes as the lightest block can take without getting overloaded and as little nodes necessary so that the heaviest block is balanced. Moving nodes is based on gain of the movement as defined in Section 2.3. Basically, we use a priority queue of separator nodes that directly separate A and B with the key being set to the gain. Note that these movements create new separator nodes and can potentially worsen solution quality. We use the gain definition because our primary target is to minimize the increase of the separator size.

Then we dequeue nodes from the our priority queue until A is balanced. We move each dequeued node s to B and move its neighbors being in A into the separator and the priority queue. Also the priorities of the nodes in the queue are updated. After moving the nodes A will be balanced. If B is imbalanced, we continue with the next pair in the path,




Figure 2: Illustration of the quotient graph and the balancing path (blue) from an imbalanced block (red) to the lightest block (green).

i.e. sending the same amount of nodes. If B is also balanced, we are done with this path and do not move any more nodes. Our algorithm continues with the next imbalanced block.

4 EVOLUTIONARY K -WAY NODE SEPARATORS

Our EA starts with a population of individuals (in our case the node separator of the graph) and evolves the population into different populations over several rounds. In each round, the EA uses a selection rule based on the fitness of the individuals (in our case the size of the separator) of the population to select good individuals and combine them to obtain improved offspring. Note that we can use the size/weight of the separator as a fitness function since our algorithm always generates separators fulfilling the given balance constraint, i.e. there is no need to use a penalty function to ensure that the final separator is feasible. When an offspring is generated an eviction rule is used to select a member of the population and replace it with the new offspring. In general one has to take both into consideration, the fitness of an individual and the distance between individuals in the population [1]. Our algorithm generates only one offspring per generation.

4.1 Combine Operation

We now describe the combine operator. Our combine operator assures that the offspring has an objective *at least as good as the best of both parents*. Roughly speaking, the combine operator combines an individual/separator $\mathcal{P} = V_1^{\mathcal{P}}, \dots, V_k^{\mathcal{P}}, S^{\mathcal{P}}$ (which has to fulfill a balance constraint) with a second individual/separator $\mathcal{C} = V_1^{\mathcal{C}}, \dots, V_k^{\mathcal{C}}, S^{\mathcal{C}}$. Let \mathcal{P} be the individual with better fitness.

The algorithm begins with selecting two individuals from the population. The selection process is based on the tournament selection rule [22], i.e. P is the fittest out of two random individuals R_1, R_2 from the population and the same is done to select \mathcal{C} . Both node separators are used as input for our multi-level algorithm in the following sense. Let \mathcal{E} be the set of edges that are cut edges, i.e. edges that run between blocks and the separator, in either \mathcal{P} or \mathcal{C} . All edges in \mathcal{E} are blocked during the coarsening phase, i.e. they are *not contracted* during the coarsening phase. In other words

these edges are not eligible for the matching algorithm used during the coarsening phase and therefore are not part of any matching.

The stopping criterion of the multi-level algorithm is *modified* such that it stops when no contractable edge is left. As soon as the coarsening phase is stopped, we apply the separator \mathcal{P} to the coarsest graph and use this as initial separator. This is possible since we did not contract any edge running between the blocks and the separator in \mathcal{P} . Note that due to the specialized coarsening phase and this specialized initial phase we obtain a high quality initial solution on a very coarse graph which is usually not discovered by conventional algorithms that compute an initial solution. Since our local search algorithms guarantee no worsening of the input solution and we use random tie breaking we can assure non-decreasing quality. Note that the local search algorithms can effectively exchange good parts of the solution on the coarse levels by moving only a few vertices.

Also note that this combine operator can be extended to be a multi-point combine operator, i.e. the operator would use ℓ instead of two parents. However, during the course of the algorithm a sequence of two point combine steps is executed which somehow "emulates" a multi-point combine step. Therefore, we restrict ourselves to the case $\ell = 2$. When the offspring is generated we have to decide which solution should be evicted from the current population. We evict the solution that is *most similar* to the offspring among those individuals in the population that have an objective worse or equal than the offspring itself. Here, we define the similarity σ of two node separators S_1 and S_2 as the cardinality of the symmetric difference of both separators: $\sigma = |(S_1 \setminus S_2) \cup (S_2 \setminus S_1)|$. Therefore σ denotes the number of nodes contained in one separator but not in the other. This ensures some diversity in the population and hence makes the evolutionary algorithm more effective.

4.2 Mutation Operation

The mutation operation works similar to the combine operation. The main difference is that there is only one input individual to the multi-level algorithm and that the offspring can be less fit compared to the input individual. Hence, only edges that run between the blocks and the separator of that individual are not eligible for the matching algorithm. This way the input individual can be transferred downwards in the hierarchy. Additionally, the solution is not used as initial separator but the initial algorithm is performed to find an initial separator. Note however due to the way the coarsening process is defined the input separator is still contained in the coarsest graph.

5 PUTTING THINGS TOGETHER AND PARALLELIZATION

We now explain parallelization and describe how everything is put together to be our full evolutionary algorithm *AdvEvo*. We use a parallelization scheme that has been successfully used in graph partitioning [25]. Each processing element

(PE) basically performs the same operations using different random seeds (see Algorithm 1). First we estimate the population size \mathcal{S} : each PE creates an individual and measures the time \bar{t} spend. We then choose \mathcal{S} such that the time for creating \mathcal{S} node separators is approximately t_{total}/f where the fraction f is a tuning parameter and t_{total} is the total running time that the algorithm is given to produce a node separator of the graph. Each PE then builds its own population, i.e. our multi-level algorithm is called several times to create \mathcal{S} individuals/separators. Afterwards the algorithm proceeds in rounds as long as time is left. With corresponding probabilities, mutation or combine operations are performed and the new offspring is inserted into the population.

We choose a parallelization/communication protocol that is quite similar to *randomized rumor spreading* [9] which has shown to be scalable in an evolutionary algorithm for graph partitioning [25]. We follow their description closely. Let p denote the number of PEs used. A communication step is organized in rounds. In each round, a PE chooses a communication partner and sends her the currently best node separator P of the local population. The selection of the communication partner is done uniformly at random among those PEs to which P not already has been send to. Afterwards, a PE checks if there are incoming individuals and if so inserts them into the local population using the eviction strategy described above. If P is improved, all PEs are again eligible. This is repeated $\log p$ times. The algorithm is implemented *completely asynchronously*, i.e. there is no need for a global synchronization.

Algorithm 1 locallyEvolve

```

estimate population size  $S$ 
while time left
  if elapsed time  $< t_{\text{total}}/f$  then
    create individual, insert into local population
  else
    flip coin  $c$  with corresponding probabilities
    if  $c$  shows head then perform mutation
    else perform combine
    insert offspring into population if possible
  communicate according to comm. protocol
  
```

5.1 Miscellaneous

Besides *Adv* and *AdvEvo*, we also use two more algorithms to compare solution quality. The first one is a sequential algorithm that starts by computing a k -way partition using KaFFPa-Strong and derives a k -way separator by pair-wise decoupling by using the method of Pothen and Fan [24] on each adjacent pair of blocks. The main idea of Pothen and Fan is to compute a minimum vertex cover in the bipartite subgraph induced by the set of cut edges between two pairs of blocks. The union of the computed separators nodes is a k -way separator. In our experiments, the algorithm is called *Simple*. The second algorithm, is a modification of KaFFPaE [25] which is an evolutionary algorithm to compute graph partitions. We modify the fitness function to be the size of the separator that can be derived using the *Simple*

approach, but keep the rest of the algorithm. More precisely, this means that the population of the algorithm are still graph partitions instead of separators, but for example selection is based on the size of the derivable separator. Additionally, the combine operations in KaFFPaE still optimize for cuts instead of separators. This algorithm is called *SimpleEvo*.

6 EXPERIMENTS

Methodology. We have implemented the algorithm described above within the KaHIP framework using C++ and compiled all algorithms using gcc 4.8.3 with full optimization's turned on (-O3 flag). We integrated our algorithms in KaHIP v1.00. Our new codes will also be included into the KaHIP graph partitioning framework. Each run was made on a machine that has four Octa-Core Intel Xeon E5-2670 processors running at 2.6 GHz with 64 GB local memory. Our main objective is the cardinality of node separators on the input graph. In our experiments, we use the imbalance parameter $\epsilon = 3\%$ since this is one of the default values in the Metis graph partitioning framework. Our full algorithm is not too sensitive about the precise choice with most of the parameters. However, we performed a number of experiments to evaluate the influence and choose the parameters of our algorithms. We omit details here and refer the reader to [30]. We mark the instances that have been used for the parameter tuning in Table 1 with a * and exclude these graphs from our experiments.

We present multiple views on the data: average values (geometric mean) as well as convergence plots that show quality achieved by the algorithms over time and performance plots.

Graph	n	Graph	n
Walshaw Graphs		Walshaw Graphs	
add20	2 395	bcsstk32	44 609
data	2 851	fe_body*	45 087
3elt	4 720	t60k	60 005
uk	4 824	wing	62 032
add32	4 960	brack2	62 631
bcsstk33*	8 738	finan512	74 752
whitaker3	9 800	fe_tooth*	78 136
crack	10 240	fe_rotor	99 617
wing_nodal	10 937	UF Graphs	
fe_4elt2	11 143	cop20k_A	99 843
vibrobox*	12 328	2cubes_sphere*	101 492
bcsstk29	13 992	thermomech_TC	102 158
4elt	15 606	cfid2	123 440
fe_sphere	16 386	boneS01	127 224
cti	16 840	Dubcova3	146 689
memplus	17 758	bmwcra_1	148 770
cs4	22 499	G2_circuit*	150 102
bcsstk30	28 924	c-73	169 422
bcsstk31	35 588	shipsec5	179 860
fe_pwt	36 519	cont-300	180 895

Table 1: Walshaw graphs and florida sparse matrix graphs from [26]. Basic properties of the instances. Graphs with a * have been used for parameter tuning and are excluded from the evaluation.




Figure 3: Convergence plots for different values of k for different algorithms.

We now explain how we compute the *convergence plots*. We start explaining how we compute them for a single instance I : whenever a PE creates a separator it reports a pair $(t, \text{separator size})$, where the timestamp t is the currently elapsed time on the particular PE and separator size refers to the size of the separator that has been created. When performing multiple repetitions, we report average values (\bar{t} , avg. separator size) instead. After the completion of algorithm we are left with P sequences of pairs $(t, \text{separator size})$ which we now merge into one sequence. The merged sequence is sorted by the timestamp t . The resulting sequence is called T^I . Since we are interested in the evolution of the solution quality, we compute another sequence T_{\min}^I . For each entry (in sorted order) in T^I , we insert the entry $(t, \min_{t' \leq t} \text{separator size}(t'))$ into T_{\min}^I . Here, $\min_{t' \leq t} \text{separator size}(t')$ is the minimum separator size that occurred until time t . N_{\min}^I refers to the normalized sequence, i.e. each entry $(t, \text{separator size})$ in T_{\min}^I is replaced by $(t_n, \text{separator size})$ where $t_n = t/t_I$ and t_I is the average time that the sequential algorithm needs to compute a separator for the instance I . To obtain average values over *multiple instances* we do the following: for each instance we label all entries in N_{\min}^I , i.e. $(t_n, \text{separator size})$ is replaced by $(t_n, \text{separator size}, I)$. We then merge all sequences N_{\min}^I and sort by t_n . The resulting sequence is called S . The final sequence S_g presents *event based* geometric averages values. We start by computing the geometric mean value \mathcal{G} using the first value of all N_{\min}^I (over I). To obtain S_g , we basically sweep through S : for each entry (in sorted order) (t_n, c, I) in S , we update \mathcal{G} , i.e. the separator size of I that took part in the computation of \mathcal{G} is replaced by the new value c , and insert (t_n, \mathcal{G}) into S_g . Note, c can be only smaller than or equal to the old value of I .

Instances. We use the small and Florida Sparse Matrix graphs from [26] which are from various sources to test our algorithm. Small graphs have been obtained from Chris Walshaw’s benchmark archive [29]. Graphs derived from sparse matrices have been taken from the Florida Sparse Matrix Collection [6]. Basic properties of the instances can be found in Table 1.

6.1 Separator Quality

In this section we compare our algorithms in a setting where each one gets the same (fairly large) amount of time to compute a separator. We do this on the graphs from our benchmark set. We use all 16 cores per run of our machine (basically one node of the cluster) and two hours of time per instance when we use the evolutionary algorithm to create separators. We parallelized repeated executions of the sequential algorithms (embarrassingly parallel, different seeds) and also gave them 16 PEs and two hours of time to compute a separator. We look at $k \in \{2, 4, 8, 16, 32, 64\}$ and performed three repetitions per instance. To see how the solution quality of the different algorithms evolves over time, we use convergence plots. Figure 3 shows convergence plots for $k \in \{2, 4, 8, 16, 32, 64\}$. Additionally, Tables 2 and

k	AdvEvo	AdvReps	SimEvo	SimReps
2	159.4	0.0	+3.8%	+5.0%
4	373.9	+1.7%	+5.6%	+7.7%
8	664.4	+2.7%	+8.4%	+11.1%
16	1097.9	+5.1%	+10.4%	+13.4%
32	1694.2	+6.8%	+11.8%	+14.4%
64	2601.8	+8.1%	+15.3%	+17.8%
overall	+0%	4.1%	9.2%	11.6%

Table 2: Average of AdvEvo and average increase in separator size for different algorithms.

Algorithm	$\#\leq$	$\#\<$
AdvEvo	181	122
AdvReps	65	7
SimEvo	33	3
SimReps	29	0

Table 3: Number of instances where algorithm X is best w.r.t to \leq and $<$. The total number of instances is 192.

3 summarize final results. Tables in the Appendix present detailed per instance results.

First of all, the improvements of the evolutionary algorithms relative to repeated executions increase with growing k . This is due to the fact that the problems become more difficult when increasing the number of blocks k . For larger values of k , the quality gap between the evolutionary algorithm AdvEvo and SimEvo as well as the other algorithms increases with more time invested. On the other hand, for $k = 2$ there is almost no difference between the results produced by the evolutionary algorithm AdvEvo and the non-evolutionary version AdvReps. Overall, the experimental data indicates the AdvEvo is the best algorithm. Separators produced by AdvEvo are 4.1%, 9.2% and 11.6% smaller compared to AdvReps, SimEvo, and SimReps on average. Additionally, our advanced evolutionary algorithm computes the best result on 181 out of 192 instances.

Note that single executions of the simple algorithms are much faster. However, the results of our experiments performed in this section emphasize that one cannot simply use the best result out of multiple repetitions of a faster algorithm to obtain the same solution quality. Yet it is interesting to see that SimpleEvo, where only the fitness function of the evolutionary algorithm is modified and the combine operation still optimizes for edge cuts of partitions, computes better solutions than its non-evolutionary counterpart SimReps.

7 CONCLUSION

In this work, we derived a new approach to find small node separators in large graphs which combines an evolutionary search algorithm with a multilevel method. We combined these techniques with a scalable communication protocol and obtain a system that is able to compute high quality solutions in a short amount of time. Experiments show that our advanced evolutionary algorithm computes the best result on 94% of the benchmark instances. In future work, we aim to look at different types of applications, in particular those applications in which the running time may not be considered

a drawback when the node separator has the highest quality.

Acknowledgements. The authors acknowledge support by the state of Baden-Württemberg through bwHPC.

REFERENCES

- [1] T. Bäck. 1996. *Evolutionary Algorithms in Theory and Practice: Evolution Strategies, Evolutionary Programming, Genetic Algorithms*. Ph.D. Dissertation.
- [2] S. N. Bhatt and F. T. Leighton. 1984. A framework for solving VLSI graph layout problems. *J. Comput. System Sci.* 28, 2 (1984), 300–343. DOI:[http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0022-0000\(84\)90071-0](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0022-0000(84)90071-0)
- [3] C. Bichot and P. Siarry (Eds.). 2011. *Graph Partitioning*. Wiley.
- [4] T. N. Bui and C. Jones. 1992. Finding Good Approximate Vertex and Edge Partitions is NP-hard. *Inform. Process. Lett.* 42, 3 (1992), 153–159.
- [5] A. Buluç, H. Meyerhenke, I. Safro, P. Sanders, and C. Schulz. 2016. Recent Advances in Graph Partitioning. In *Algorithm Engineering – Selected Results (LNCS)*, Vol. 9920. Springer, 117–158.
- [6] T. Davis. 2017. The University of Florida Sparse Matrix Collection. (2017).
- [7] D. Delling, M. Holzer, K. Müller, F. Schulz, and D. Wagner. 2009. High-performance multi-level routing. *The Shortest Path Problem: Ninth DIMACS Implementation Challenge 74* (2009), 73–92.
- [8] J. Dibbelt, B. Strasser, and D. Wagner. 2014. Customizable contraction hierarchies. In *13th Int. Symp. on Exp. Algorithms (SEA’14)*. Springer, 271–282.
- [9] B. Doerr and M. Fouz. 2011. Asymptotically Optimal Randomized Rumor Spreading. In *Proceedings of the 38th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages and Programming, Proceedings, Part II (LNCS)*, Vol. 6756. Springer, 502–513.
- [10] G. N. Federickson. 1987. Fast Algorithms for Shortest Paths in Planar Graphs, with Applications. *SIAM J. Comput.* 16, 6 (1987), 1004–1022. DOI:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1137/0216064> arXiv:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1137/0216064>
- [11] J. Fukuyama. 2006. NP-Completeness of the Planar Separator Problems. *Journal of Graph Algorithms and Applications* 10, 2 (2006), 317–328.
- [12] M. R. Garey and D. S. Johnson. 2002. *Computers and Intractability*. Vol. 29. WH Freeman & Co., San Francisco.
- [13] A. George. 1973. Nested Dissection of a Regular Finite Element Mesh. *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.* 10, 2 (1973), 345–363.
- [14] W. W. Hager, J. T. Hungerford, and I. Safro. 2014. *A Multi-level Bilinear Programming Algorithm For the Vertex Separator Problem*. Technical Report.
- [15] M. Hamann and B. Strasser. 2016. Graph Bisection with Pareto-Optimization. In *Proc. of the Eighteenth Workshop on Algorithm Engineering and Experiments, ALENEX’16*. SIAM, 90–102. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1137/1.9781611974317.8>
- [16] G. Karypis and V. Kumar. 1998. A Fast and High Quality Multi-level Scheme for Partitioning Irregular Graphs. *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing* 20, 1 (1998), 359–392.
- [17] D. LaSalle and G. Karypis. 2015. Efficient Nested Dissection for Multicore Architectures. In *Euro-Par 2015: Parallel Processing*. Springer, 467–478.
- [18] C. E. Leiserson. 1980. Area-Efficient Graph Layouts. In *21st Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*. IEEE, 270–281.
- [19] R. J. Lipton and R. E. Tarjan. 1979. A Separator Theorem for Planar Graphs. *SIAM J. Appl. Math.* 36, 2 (1979), 177–189.
- [20] R. J. Lipton and R. E. Tarjan. 1980. Applications of a Planar Separator Theorem. *SIAM Journal On Computing* 9, 3 (1980), 615–627.
- [21] J. Maue and P. Sanders. 2007. Engineering Algorithms for Approximate Weighted Matching. In *Proceedings of the 6th Workshop on Experimental Algorithms (WEA’07) (LNCS)*, Vol. 4525. Springer, 242–255. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-72845-0_19
- [22] B. L. Miller and D. E. Goldberg. 1996. Genetic Algorithms, Tournament Selection, and the Effects of Noise. *Evolutionary Computation* 4, 2 (1996), 113–131.
- [23] F. Pellegrini. 2017. Scotch Home Page. (2017). <http://www.labri.fr/pellegrin/scotch>.
- [24] A. Pothén, H. D. Simon, and K. P. Liou. 1990. Partitioning Sparse Matrices with Eigenvectors of Graphs. *SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl.* 11, 3 (1990), 430–452.
- [25] P. Sanders and C. Schulz. 2012. Distributed Evolutionary Graph Partitioning. In *Proc. of the 12th Workshop on Algorithm Engineering and Experimentation (ALENEX’12)*. 16–29.
- [26] P. Sanders and C. Schulz. 2016. Advanced Multilevel Node Separator Algorithms. In *15th International Symposium on Experimental Algorithms, SEA 2016*, Vol. 9685. Springer, 294–309.
- [27] C. Schulz. 2013. *High Quality Graph Partitioning*. Ph.D. Dissertation. Karlsruhe Institute of Technology.
- [28] F. Schulz, D. Wagner, and C. Zaroliagis. 2002. Using multi-level graphs for timetable information in railway systems. In *Proceedings of Algorithm Engineering and Experiments (ALENEX)*. Springer, 43–59.
- [29] A. J. Soper, C. Walshaw, and M. Cross. 2004. A Combined Evolutionary Search and Multilevel Optimisation Approach to Graph-Partitioning. *Journal of Global Optimization* 29, 2 (2004), 225–241.
- [30] R. Williger. 2016. *Evolutionary k-way Node Separators*. Bachelor’s Thesis. Karlsruhe Institute of Technologie.

graph	k	AdvEvo		AdvReps		SimpleEvo		SimpleReps	
		min	avg	min	avg	min	avg	min	avg
3elt	2	43	43	43	43	43	43	43	43
3elt	4	97	97	97	97	97	97	97	97
3elt	8	158	158	159	159	159	159	160	160
3elt	16	269	269	270	270	271	271	272	272
3elt	32	452	452	455	456	458	459	466	466
3elt	64	706	710	720	721	733	734	746	747
4elt	2	68	68	68	68	68	68	68	68
4elt	4	157	157	157	157	157	157	157	157
4elt	8	253	253	254	254	256	256	254	255
4elt	16	438	439	443	445	443	445	442	444
4elt	32	737	743	755	757	744	746	749	750
4elt	64	1 221	1 227	1 257	1 259	1 234	1 238	1 253	1 253
add20	2	26	26	25	25	28	28	28	28
add20	4	37	37	37	37	45	47	49	49
add20	8	67	67	69	70	82	86	94	94
add20	16	95	96	106	108	116	119	133	133
add20	32	110	111	140	140	166	169	170	174
add20	64	138	138	161	164	219	225	218	221
add32	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
add32	4	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6
add32	8	11	11	11	11	12	12	12	12
add32	16	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20
add32	32	33	33	33	33	33	33	33	33
add32	64	114	115	118	119	127	128	131	131
bcsstk29	2	180	180	180	180	180	180	180	180
bcsstk29	4	528	528	528	528	534	536	534	534
bcsstk29	8	948	954	966	968	1 173	1 202	1 086	1 094
bcsstk29	16	1 512	1 530	1 578	1 578	2 120	2 127	2 019	2 062
bcsstk29	32	2 231	2 250	2 316	2 326	2 891	2 898	2 892	2 899
bcsstk29	64	3 130	3 157	3 361	3 371	4 073	4 089	4 065	4 096
bcsstk30	2	206	206	206	206	206	206	206	206
bcsstk30	4	549	549	549	549	573	573	573	573
bcsstk30	8	1 121	1 121	1 123	1 123	1 138	1 145	1 138	1 140
bcsstk30	16	2 128	2 146	2 183	2 201	2 446	2 455	2 430	2 452
bcsstk30	32	3 195	3 249	3 321	3 338	3 985	3 987	3 956	4 008
bcsstk30	64	4 709	4 836	5 045	5 111	5 846	5 940	5 994	6 013
bcsstk31	2	308	308	308	308	317	321	317	319
bcsstk31	4	767	767	767	767	802	803	798	800
bcsstk31	8	1 433	1 434	1 441	1 442	1 529	1 538	1 534	1 545
bcsstk31	16	2 353	2 399	2 437	2 446	2 592	2 630	2 624	2 633
bcsstk31	32	3 635	3 695	3 837	3 874	4 338	4 361	4 361	4 376
bcsstk31	64	5 102	5 167	5 323	5 394	6 090	6 136	6 169	6 205
bcsstk32	2	297	297	297	297	322	328	321	321
bcsstk32	4	569	569	569	569	633	637	627	627
bcsstk32	8	1 145	1 152	1 177	1 183	1 312	1 336	1 315	1 326
bcsstk32	16	2 080	2 102	2 122	2 131	2 391	2 434	2 443	2 468
bcsstk32	32	3 422	3 449	3 498	3 524	4 102	4 118	4 114	4 142
bcsstk32	64	5 386	5 469	5 621	5 677	6 293	6 321	6 348	6 412
bmwcra_1	2	657	657	657	657	684	684	683	683
bmwcra_1	4	1 668	1 673	1 656	1 659	1 683	1 685	1 659	1 666
bmwcra_1	8	3 918	3 970	4 002	4 013	4 080	4 126	4 112	4 133
bmwcra_1	16	10 011	10 037	9 846	9 921	10 099	10 199	10 190	10 250
bmwcra_1	32	16 089	16 300	16 798	16 979	16 863	16 947	16 725	16 775
bmwcra_1	64	23 586	24 279	25 707	25 809	24 979	25 087	24 885	25 042

Table 4: Detailed per instance results.

Distributed Evolutionary k -way Node Separators

graph	k	AdvEvo		AdvReps		SimpleEvo		SimpleReps	
		min	avg	min	avg	min	avg	min	avg
boneS01	2	1 524	1 524	1 524	1 524	1 563	1 563	1 563	1 565
boneS01	4	3 357	3 357	3 357	3 357	3 465	3 469	3 471	3 477
boneS01	8	5 112	5 128	5 139	5 148	5 316	5 351	5 358	5 371
boneS01	16	7 728	7 781	7 776	7 826	8 139	8 179	8 142	8 189
boneS01	32	11 082	11 127	11 400	11 440	11 619	11 670	11 758	11 770
boneS01	64	15 264	15 271	16 495	16 683	16 173	16 219	16 296	16 314
brack2	2	183	183	183	183	206	208	205	205
brack2	4	796	796	796	796	829	831	829	829
brack2	8	1 740	1 741	1 759	1 761	1 896	1 899	1 906	1 910
brack2	16	2 794	2 806	2 868	2 874	3 108	3 119	3 117	3 120
brack2	32	4 160	4 184	4 282	4 289	4 632	4 647	4 646	4 651
brack2	64	6 053	6 084	6 361	6 381	6 808	6 841	6 809	6 820
cfid2	2	1 030	1 030	1 030	1 030	1 036	1 036	1 036	1 036
cfid2	4	2 543	2 546	2 548	2 551	2 684	2 688	2 645	2 667
cfid2	8	4 304	4 313	4 304	4 312	4 569	4 581	4 551	4 591
cfid2	16	7 068	7 095	7 018	7 036	7 416	7 440	7 374	7 392
cfid2	32	10 723	10 873	11 165	11 272	12 066	12 088	11 924	11 956
cfid2	64	16 521	17 138	17 829	18 021	18 093	18 179	18 014	18 067
cont-300	2	598	598	598	598	598	598	598	598
cont-300	4	1 041	1 042	1 063	1 065	1 184	1 184	1 184	1 184
cont-300	8	1 786	1 814	1 807	1 825	2 188	2 192	2 188	2 194
cont-300	16	2 863	2 874	2 893	2 916	3 526	3 528	3 534	3 537
cont-300	32	4 299	4 340	4 413	4 450	5 466	5 483	5 504	5 506
cont-300	64	6 452	6 474	6 667	6 679	8 094	8 105	8 168	8 170
cop20k_A	2	620	620	620	620	620	620	620	620
cop20k_A	4	1 673	1 675	1 676	1 676	1 733	1 741	1 716	1 724
cop20k_A	8	2 919	2 934	2 939	2 942	2 997	2 999	2 993	2 996
cop20k_A	16	4 721	4 744	4 765	4 780	4 842	4 864	4 849	4 858
cop20k_A	32	7 241	7 333	7 525	7 645	7 481	7 502	7 423	7 465
cop20k_A	64	10 757	10 837	11 721	12 107	11 135	11 147	11 102	11 155
crack	2	73	73	73	73	75	75	74	74
crack	4	145	145	145	145	152	152	152	152
crack	8	257	257	258	258	280	282	285	286
crack	16	420	420	421	422	461	465	474	474
crack	32	636	639	648	648	722	724	735	738
crack	64	939	943	958	959	1 098	1 100	1 123	1 124
cs4	2	287	287	287	287	319	319	322	322
cs4	4	727	729	738	740	824	825	832	836
cs4	8	1 108	1 109	1 133	1 134	1 244	1 245	1 267	1 267
cs4	16	1 548	1 558	1 623	1 630	1 812	1 818	1 827	1 830
cs4	32	2 132	2 148	2 273	2 286	2 512	2 516	2 537	2 541
cs4	64	2 864	2 909	3 179	3 202	3 433	3 435	3 461	3 463
cti	2	266	266	266	266	266	266	266	266
cti	4	756	758	761	761	808	808	807	807
cti	8	1 243	1 270	1 311	1 315	1 537	1 539	1 539	1 539
cti	16	1 821	1 845	1 897	1 925	2 287	2 298	2 319	2 324
cti	32	2 426	2 457	2 646	2 647	3 257	3 267	3 258	3 267
cti	64	3 234	3 242	3 581	3 596	4 489	4 491	4 481	4 491
data	2	51	51	51	51	51	51	51	51
data	4	96	96	96	96	96	96	97	97
data	8	165	165	165	165	172	172	173	173
data	16	275	275	276	276	298	301	300	300
data	32	448	450	454	454	489	492	499	502
data	64	688	690	695	697	757	760	764	764

Table 5: Detailed per instance results.

graph	k	AdvEvo		AdvReps		SimpleEvo		SimpleReps	
		min	avg	min	avg	min	avg	min	avg
Dubcova3	2	383	383	383	383	383	383	383	383
Dubcova3	4	765	765	765	765	765	765	765	765
Dubcova3	8	1 433	1 437	1 436	1 437	1 463	1 475	1 463	1 464
Dubcova3	16	2 295	2 309	2 319	2 322	2 373	2 398	2 346	2 355
Dubcova3	32	3 581	3 621	3 707	3 711	3 887	3 893	3 821	3 856
Dubcova3	64	5 448	5 492	5 706	5 732	5 754	5 772	5 763	5 766
fe_4elt2	2	66	66	66	66	66	66	66	66
fe_4elt2	4	163	163	162	162	168	169	167	167
fe_4elt2	8	283	285	288	288	290	291	293	293
fe_4elt2	16	478	479	482	483	482	484	486	487
fe_4elt2	32	759	762	780	781	773	774	783	785
fe_4elt2	64	1 149	1 153	1 185	1 190	1 189	1 191	1 206	1 208
fe_pwt	2	116	116	116	116	116	116	116	116
fe_pwt	4	236	236	236	236	236	236	236	236
fe_pwt	8	473	473	473	473	474	474	476	476
fe_pwt	16	925	925	929	929	930	930	929	929
fe_pwt	32	1 834	1 839	1 909	1 910	1 862	1 864	1 872	1 873
fe_pwt	64	2 846	2 919	3 025	3 043	3 458	3 472	3 447	3 462
fe_rotor	2	460	460	460	460	464	464	464	464
fe_rotor	4	1 540	1 545	1 543	1 554	1 575	1 593	1 573	1 580
fe_rotor	8	2 833	2 838	2 844	2 848	2 891	2 891	2 898	2 899
fe_rotor	16	4 404	4 448	4 483	4 489	4 605	4 632	4 550	4 589
fe_rotor	32	6 809	6 898	6 943	7 013	7 024	7 065	7 037	7 062
fe_rotor	64	10 196	10 289	10 534	10 615	10 249	10 293	10 242	10 261
fe_sphere	2	192	192	192	192	192	192	192	192
fe_sphere	4	379	379	380	380	380	380	380	380
fe_sphere	8	570	570	575	577	570	570	570	570
fe_sphere	16	804	804	852	854	835	835	839	839
fe_sphere	32	1 177	1 184	1 262	1 264	1 208	1 213	1 216	1 218
fe_sphere	64	1 657	1 667	1 803	1 805	1 722	1 723	1 745	1 750
finan512	2	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	50
finan512	4	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
finan512	8	200	200	200	200	200	200	200	200
finan512	16	400	400	400	400	400	400	400	400
finan512	32	800	800	800	800	800	800	800	800
finan512	64	3 210	3 216	3 259	3 263	3 200	3 200	3 200	3 200
memplus	2	70	70	70	70	90	103	107	107
memplus	4	90	90	91	91	127	131	123	126
memplus	8	106	106	106	106	154	158	142	144
memplus	16	132	132	151	153	234	240	239	242
memplus	32	178	179	194	195	265	268	264	268
memplus	64	181	182	205	206	392	412	428	436
shipsec5	2	1 203	1 203	1 203	1 203	1 227	1 231	1 227	1 233
shipsec5	4	3 681	3 681	3 681	3 681	3 783	3 793	3 801	3 803
shipsec5	8	6 078	6 112	6 198	6 216	6 486	6 509	6 531	6 549
shipsec5	16	8 826	8 881	8 850	8 903	9 612	9 650	9 570	9 651
shipsec5	32	12 861	12 983	13 521	13 601	14 208	14 236	14 316	14 340
shipsec5	64	17 304	17 398	18 114	18 301	21 482	21 594	21 549	21 611
t60k	2	70	70	70	70	71	71	71	71
t60k	4	202	202	202	202	203	203	203	203
t60k	8	447	447	449	449	448	448	448	448
t60k	16	800	803	807	810	792	793	802	804
t60k	32	1 330	1 331	1 339	1 343	1 307	1 308	1 335	1 336
t60k	64	2 040	2 042	2 104	2 114	2 031	2 043	2 098	2 103

Table 6: Detailed per instance results.

Distributed Evolutionary k -way Node Separators

graph	k	AdvEvo		AdvReps		SimpleEvo		SimpleReps	
		min	avg	min	avg	min	avg	min	avg
thermomech_TC	2	128	128	128	128	129	129	129	129
thermomech_TC	4	390	390	389	389	394	394	394	394
thermomech_TC	8	837	839	838	838	843	844	848	848
thermomech_TC	16	1439	1440	1447	1450	1445	1447	1453	1456
thermomech_TC	32	2316	2323	2345	2349	2340	2347	2345	2353
thermomech_TC	64	3620	3627	3672	3680	3636	3645	3659	3663
uk	2	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18
uk	4	37	37	37	37	38	38	38	38
uk	8	73	73	73	73	77	77	76	76
uk	16	133	133	134	134	136	136	137	138
uk	32	223	224	225	226	233	236	240	241
uk	64	360	362	364	366	387	388	402	403
whitaker3	2	63	63	63	63	63	63	63	63
whitaker3	4	186	186	187	187	189	189	189	189
whitaker3	8	320	320	321	321	321	321	322	322
whitaker3	16	526	528	531	531	531	532	535	536
whitaker3	32	803	803	811	811	812	813	821	822
whitaker3	64	1183	1185	1198	1199	1213	1216	1233	1233
wing	2	626	626	628	628	700	702	704	704
wing	4	1288	1290	1296	1297	1432	1433	1453	1456
wing	8	1943	1949	1977	1980	2157	2170	2191	2191
wing	16	2963	2995	3085	3095	3378	3388	3398	3405
wing	32	4300	4315	4492	4513	4906	4917	4911	4921
wing	64	5736	5778	6267	6287	6622	6644	6673	6677
wing_nodal	2	410	410	410	410	415	415	415	415
wing_nodal	4	811	814	836	837	858	859	863	864
wing_nodal	8	1177	1184	1211	1216	1286	1287	1294	1294
wing_nodal	16	1793	1800	1841	1850	1965	1974	1985	1987
wing_nodal	32	2494	2500	2602	2625	2791	2800	2806	2807
wing_nodal	64	3243	3252	3460	3467	3683	3685	3696	3702

Table 7: Detailed per instance results.