

Efficient Reachability Ratio Computation for 2-hop Labeling Scheme

Junfeng Zhou, Xian Tang, Ming Du

Abstract—As one of the fundamental graph operations, reachability queries processing has been extensively studied during the past decades. Many approaches followed the line of designing 2-hop labels to make acceleration. Considering that the index size cannot be bounded when using all nodes to construct 2-hop labels, researchers proposed to use a part of important nodes to construct 2-hop labels (partial 2-hop labels) to cover as much reachability information as possible. Then, we may achieve better query performance with limited index size and index construction time. However, partial 2-hop labels do not always perform well on different graphs.

In this paper, we focus on the problem of how to efficiently compute reachability ratio, such that to help users determine whether partial 2-hop labels should be used to answer reachability queries for the given graph. Intuitively, reachability ratio denotes the ratio of the number of reachable queries that can be answered by partial 2-hop labels over the total number of reachable queries involved in the given graph. We discuss the difficulties of reachability ratio computation, and propose an incremental-partition algorithm for reachability ratio computation. We show by rich experimental results that our algorithm can efficiently get the result of reachability ratio, and show how the overall query performance is affected by different partial 2-hop labels. Based on the experimental results, we give out our findings on whether partial 2-hop labels should be used to the given graph for reachability queries processing.

Index Terms—Reachability Queries Processing, 2-hop Labeling Scheme, Reachability Ratio



1 INTRODUCTION

Reachability queries processing is one of the fundamental graph operations and has been extensively studied in the literature [1]–[26]. Given a directed graph, a reachability query $u? \rightsquigarrow v$ asks whether there exists a directed path from node u to v . It can be used to Semantic Web (RDF), online social networks, biological networks, ontology, transportation networks, etc, to answer whether two nodes have a certain connection. It can also be used as a building brick in structured queries answering, such as XQuery¹ or SPARQL².

To answer a given reachability query, researchers have proposed many efficient labeling schemes [1]–[26] to make acceleration, among which 2-hop labeling scheme has been widely adopted and was shown to be better than others in many cases [3], [4], [7], [9], [19], [20], [26]. Existing approaches that adopt 2-hop labels can be classified into two categories. The first kind of approaches [3], [4], [7], [19], [20] generate 2-hop labels based on all nodes, i.e., the 2-hop labels maintain the whole transitive closure (TC). For these approaches, a reachability query $u? \rightsquigarrow v$ can be answered by comparing the 2-hop labels of u and v without graph traversal. However, the index size cannot be bounded w.r.t. the size of the input graph, and minimizing the size of 2-hop labels is NP-hard [4].

Different with [3], [4], [7], [19], [20], the second kind of approaches [9], [26] do not generate 2-hop labels based on all nodes, but based on a few nodes with large degree. We call these nodes as hop-nodes, and call 2-hop labels based on these hop-nodes

as partial 2-hop labels. Compared with the first kind of approaches, the index size of partial 2-hop labels can be bounded, and is usually much smaller than that of the first kind of approaches. Even though partial 2-hop labels cannot answer all reachable queries in the whole TC , it was shown in [9], [26] that partial 2-hop labels can help improve the query performance significantly by answering most reachable queries for some graphs.

However, for some other graphs, the query performance may degenerate when using partial 2-hop labels [9], [26]. The reason lies in that the reachability ratio of partial 2-hop labels changes violently for different graphs. Here, reachability ratio means the ratio of the number of reachable queries that can be answered by partial 2-hop labels over the size of the TC . Figure 1 shows the reachability ratio of partial 2-hop labels on three graphs, from which we know that if we construct partial 2-hop labels using four hop-nodes with large degree, then the reachability ratio is greater than 90% on *human* and *web-uk*, meaning that the probability that a given reachable query q can be answered by partial 2-hop labels is greater than 90%, and is close to 0 on *patent* meaning that the probability that q can be answered by partial 2-hop labels is close to 0. In this case, using partial 2-hop labels brings us nothing but additional cost, which may degenerate the overall performance.

Therefore, before using partial 2-hop labels, a key problem that needs to be solved is: how to efficiently compute the reachability ratio of partial 2-hop labels w.r.t. the given graph? Because only if we know the reachability ratio, we can determine whether we should use it. For example, given the reachability ratio shown in Figure 1, we may decide to use partial 2-hop labels on *human* and *web-uk*, but not on *patent*, due to that using more hop-nodes on *patent* cannot increase the reachability ratio significantly. Furthermore, we can determine how many hop-nodes should be chosen to construct the partial 2-hop labels, if we decide to use partial 2-hop labels to accelerate the query performance. For example, according to the reachability ratio in Figure 1, we may decide to use four hop-nodes to

• Junfeng Zhou and Ming Du were with the School of Computer Science and Technology, Donghua University, Shanghai, China 201620.
E-mail: {zhoujf, duming}@dhu.edu.cn.

• Xian Tang was with Shanghai University of Engineering Science, Shanghai, China 201620.
E-mail: tangxian@sues.edu.cn.

1. <https://www.w3.org/TR/2017/REC-xquery-31-20170321>

2. <https://www.w3.org/TR/rdf-sparql-query>




Fig. 1: Reachability ratio of partial 2-hop labels based on k nodes with large degree.

construct partial 2-hop labels on human, but for web-uk, reachability ratio changes little with the increase of hop-nodes and one hop-node is good enough, which means a larger reachability ratio and smaller index size.

To the best of our knowledge, this is the first work that addresses the problem of reachability ratio computation, which is not a trivial task and involves two operations. One is computing the size of TC , the other is computing the exact number of reachable queries that can be answered by the partial 2-hop labels, which we call as the coverage size. Considering that TC size computation can be efficiently solved by existing works [27], the difficulty of reachability ratio computation lies in how to efficiently compute the coverage size. The naive way is first generating partial 2-hop labels based on k selected hop-nodes, then getting the coverage size by checking all node pairs using the partial 2-hop labels. In this way, the cost of coverage size computation is $O(k|V|^2)$ and cannot scale to large graphs, where V is the set of nodes in the input graph. Further, if the reachability ratio is too small to meet the requirement, we may need to increase k 's value and repeat the above operation, which makes reachability ratio computation more difficult to be solved.

We propose to compute the coverage size incrementally, such that when the value of k changes, we can avoid the costly coverage size recomputation, such that to support efficient reachability ratio computation. The basic idea is, given the coverage size w.r.t. k nodes, when we decide to compute the coverage size w.r.t. $k + 1$ hop-nodes, we do not compute the coverage size from scratch, but only compute the increased coverage size. However, the increased coverage size cannot be easily computed. To know the increased coverage size w.r.t. the $(k + 1)^{th}$ hop-node u , we need to firstly traverse from u to get a set of nodes D_u that u can reach, then traverse from u backwardly to get the second set of nodes A_u that can reach u . Given A_u and D_u , we need to check for each pair of nodes (a, d) , whether a can reach d can be determined by the current partial 2-hop labels without u , where $a \in A_u, d \in D_u$. If the answer is YES, then we know that a can reach d can be answered by the partial 2-hop labels without u , and should not be considered when computing the increased coverage size w.r.t. u . The cost of processing one hop-node u is as high as $O(k|A_u||D_u|)$. Obviously, with the increase of the number of hop-nodes for partial 2-hop labels construction, the cost could be unaffordable. To this problem, we propose to divide both A_u and D_u into a set of disjoint subsets based on equivalence relationship (defined later), such that for each pair of subsets $A_1 \subseteq A_u$ and $D_1 \subseteq D_u$, we only need to test one reachability query, rather than $|A_1| \times |D_1|$ queries. The cost of reachability ratio computation is, therefore, reduced significantly even when processing large graphs. We make the following contributions.

1) To the best of our knowledge, this is the first work to address the problem of reachability ratio computation.

- 2) We propose a set of algorithms for reachability ratio computation. We show that according to the properties of 2-hop labels, the two sets of nodes that can reach and be reached by a certain hop-node can be divided into a set of disjoint subsets, such that the computation cost can be reduced significantly. We prove the correctness and efficiency of our approach.
- 3) We conduct rich experiments on real datasets. The experimental results show that compared with the baseline approach, our algorithm works much more efficiently on reachability ratio computation. We also show how the overall query performance is affected by partial 2-hop labels with different number of hop-nodes, based on which we give out our findings on whether partial 2-hop labels should be used to the given graph for reachability queries processing.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. We discuss the preliminaries and the related work in Section 2. In Section 3, we give out the baseline algorithm for reachability ratio computation, and propose the first incremental algorithm in Section 4. After that, we propose the optimized incremental algorithm in Section 5. We report our experimental studies in Section 6, and conclude our paper in Section 7.

2 BACKGROUND AND RELATED WORK

2.1 Preliminaries

Given a directed graph \mathcal{G} , we can construct a directed acyclic graph (DAG) G from \mathcal{G} in linear time [28] by coalescing each strongly connected component (SCC) of \mathcal{G} into a node in G . Then, the reachability query on \mathcal{G} can be answered equivalently on G . We follow the tradition and assume that the input graph is a DAG.

Given a DAG $G = (V, E)$, where V is the set of nodes and E the set of edges. We define $in(u) = \{v | (v, u) \in E\}$ as the set of in-neighbor nodes of u in G , and $out(u) = \{v | (u, v) \in E\}$ the set of out-neighbor nodes of u . Similarly, we use $in^*(u)$ to denote the set of nodes in G that can reach u , and $out^*(u)$ the set of nodes in G that u can reach. We say u can reach v ($u \rightsquigarrow v$), if $v \in out^*(u)$.

The transitive closure (TC) of G is $G^* = (V, E^*)$, where $E^* = \{(u, v) | u, v \in V, v \in out^*(u), v \neq u\}$. We define $TC(u) = out^*(u) \setminus \{u\}$ as the transitive closure of u , and define $TC^{-1}(u) = in^*(u) \setminus \{u\}$ as the reverse TC of u . The TC size of G is denoted as $TC(G) = \sum_{u \in V} |TC(u)|$. In [27], the authors proposed an efficient algorithm for TC size computation with time complexity $O(r|E|)$, where r is the number of distinct paths decomposed from the input graph. In this paper, we assume that the TC size is given in advance, which can be got by executing the algorithm in [27] as an offline activity. Note that TC size computation is different with TC computation. The former computes $|TC(v)|$ for all nodes, while the latter computes $TC(v)$ for all nodes with time complexity $O(|V| \times |E|)$.

Given a set of k nodes $S_k \subseteq V$, we use \mathcal{L}_k to denote 2-hop labels constructed based on nodes of S_k , where each node in S_k is called a hop-node. If $v \in TC(u)$ and \mathcal{L}_k can correctly tell that $u \rightsquigarrow v$, we say \mathcal{L}_k (or S_k) can cover the reachable query $u \rightsquigarrow v$. Let N_k be the number of distinct reachable queries that can be covered by \mathcal{L}_k , the reachability ratio of S_k is defined as Equation 1.

$$\alpha = N_k / TC(G) \quad (1)$$

Problem Statement: Given a DAG $G = (V, E)$, its TC size and a hop-node set $S_k \subseteq V$, return the reachability ratio of S_k .

TABLE 1: Notations

Notation	Description
$G = (V, E)$	a DAG with a node set V and an edge set E
$in(v)(out(v))$	the set of in-neighbors (out-neighbors) of v
$in^*(v)(out^*(v))$	the set of nodes that can reach (be reached by) v
$TC(v)(TC^{-1}(v))$	$out^*(v) \setminus \{v\}(in^*(v) \setminus \{v\})$
$TC(G)$	the TC size of G
S_k	a set of k hop nodes
$L_{out}^k(v)(L_{in}^k(v))$	the 2-hop out (in) label of v w.r.t. S_k
\mathcal{L}_k	the partial 2-hop labels w.r.t. S_k
N_k	the number of reachable queries covered by \mathcal{L}_k
A_k	ancestor set containing nodes that can reach v_k
D_k	descendant set containing nodes that v_k can reach

2.2 Related Work

As no existing works has addressed reachability ratio computation, we only discuss existing works on reachability queries processing. We discuss these approaches according to whether they use 2-hop labels to answer reachability queries.

2-hop based Approaches: Cohen et al. proposed to use 2-hop label [4] to answer reachability queries, where each node u is assigned two labels, one is in-label $L_{in}(u)$, and the other is out-label $L_{out}(u)$. $L_{in}(u)(L_{out}(u))$ consists of a set of nodes v that can reach (be reached by) u . Given the 2-hop label, the answering of a reachability query $u? \rightsquigarrow v$ can be done by a set intersection operation on two labels, as indicated by Formula 2.

$$u? \rightsquigarrow v = \begin{cases} \text{TRUE}, & L_{out}(u) \cap L_{in}(v) \neq \emptyset, \\ \text{FALSE}, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

Existing works involving 2-hop labeling scheme can be classified into two categories. The approaches in the first category construct 2-hop labels based on all nodes [3], [4], [7], [19], [20]. Considering that minimizing 2-hop label size is NP-hard [4], Cohen et al. proposed a $(\log |V|)$ -approximate solution. However, the index construction cost is $O(|V||E| \log(|V|^2/|E|))$, which makes it difficult to scale to large graphs. Motivated by this, the following works [3], [7], [19], [20] have to discard the approximation guarantee and focused on finding better ordering strategy to rank nodes, such that to improve the efficiency of 2-hop label construction. Even though, the index size still cannot be bounded w.r.t. the size of the input graph.

Different with the above approaches, approaches in the second category [9], [26] generate partial 2-hop labels based on a few hop-nodes to cover as more reachability relationships as possible. It was shown in [9], [26] that partial 2-hop labels can work very efficiently in answering reachability queries for some graphs, due to that the partial 2-hop labels can cover most reachability relationships for these graphs. Moreover, the index size of partial 2-hop labels can be bounded, and is usually much smaller than that of the first kind of approaches in practice. However, for some other graphs, they cannot work efficiently [9], [26]. The query performance may degenerate due to small reachability ratio for these graphs, as shown by Fig. 1. Therefore when considering partial 2-hop labels for reachability queries processing, its necessary that we can quickly know what is the reachability ratio w.r.t. a set of hop-nodes for the underlying graphs, such that we can correctly decide whether we should use partial 2-hop labels, and further, we can decide how many hop-nodes should be chosen to construct partial 2-hop labels.

Other Reachability Approaches: Besides approaches that use (partial) 2-hop labels, researchers also proposed other approaches that do not involve 2-hop labels, including [9], [12], [14]–[16], [18],

[21]. These approaches assign each node u a label that maintains partial TC. For a given reachability query $u? \rightsquigarrow v$, we may need to conduct depth-first search (DFS) or breadth-first search (BFS) from u to check whether u can reach v , if we cannot get the result by comparing labels of u and v .

3 THE BASELINE ALGORITHM

To get the reachability ratio of S_k , we need to solve two tasks. One is constructing partial 2-hop labels, the other is computing the reachability ratio. In this section, we first analyze the construction of 2-hop labels and the computation of reachability ratio, then give out the baseline algorithm for reachability ratio computation.

Step-1: 2-hop Labels Construction. To construct 2-hop labels, existing approaches need to sort all nodes based on a certain rank value, such as degree [7], [20] or closeness [29]. The result of the sorting operation is $v_1, v_2, \dots, \dots, v_{|V|}$, where the first (last) node has the largest (smallest) rank value. Based on the sorting result, we select the first k nodes as hop-nodes to get the hop-node set $S_k = \{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_k\}$. We have the following result w.r.t. the hop-node sets (Equations 3 and 4).

$$\emptyset = S_0 \subset S_1 \subset S_2 \subset \dots \subset S_{|V|} = V \quad (3)$$

$$S_i \setminus S_{i-1} = \{v_i\}, \text{ where } 0 < i \leq |V| \quad (4)$$

Given a set S_i of i hop-nodes, its 2-hop labels \mathcal{L}_i can be generated by processing v_i based on \mathcal{L}_{i-1} according to Equations 3 and 4. Specifically, we first perform forward BFS from v_i to get a set D_i of nodes that v_i can reach. Second, we perform backward BFS from v_i to get a set A_i of nodes that can reach v_i , as denoted by Figure 2(a). We call A_i the ancestor set of v_i , and D_i the descendant set of v_i . For each node $a \in A_i$, we add v_i to a 's out-label, i.e., $L_{out}^i(a) = L_{out}^{i-1}(a) \cup \{v_i\}$, denoting that a can reach v_i . For each node $d \in D_i$, we add v_i to d 's in-label, i.e., $L_{in}^i(d) = L_{in}^{i-1}(d) \cup \{v_i\}$, denoting that v_i can reach d . After processing v_i , we get 2-hop labels \mathcal{L}_i . The superscript i in $L_{out}^i(a)(L_{in}^i(a))$ denotes that both 2-hop labels $L_{out}^i(a)$ and $L_{in}^i(a)$ w.r.t. node a are subsets of S_i , i.e., they contain only nodes of S_i . When $i = |V|$, then $S_i = V$, the 2-hop labels of a are subsets of V . In this case, all nodes are hop-nodes and we do not use superscript in 2-hop labels for simplicity, i.e., $L_{out}^{|V|}(a) = L_{out}(a)$ and $L_{in}^{|V|}(a) = L_{in}(a)$.

It is worth noting that we can use 2-hop labels \mathcal{L}_{i-1} to reduce the size of both A_i and D_i by checking whether we can terminate the BFS traversal from v_i in advance. For example, consider Figure 2(c), where both v_{i-1} and v_i are hop-nodes and v_i is processed after v_{i-1} . After processing v_{i-1} , we have \mathcal{L}_{i-1} . When processing v_i , the backward BFS traversal from v_i can be terminated at v_{i-1} , due to that v_{i-1} can reach v_i can be answered by \mathcal{L}_{i-1} , and $\forall a \in TC^{-1}(v_{i-1})$ that can reach v_i through v_{i-1} can also be answered by \mathcal{L}_{i-1} . Therefore in practice, $A_i \subseteq in^*(v_i) \wedge D_i \subseteq out^*(v_i)$.

Example 1. Consider G in Figure 3. Assume that we want to construct partial 2-hop labels \mathcal{L}_2 . The first thing we need to do is to sort all nodes by a certain rank value. In this paper, we follow the tradition [7], [20] and take $(|out(v)| + 1) \times (|in(v)| + 1)$ as v 's rank value for sorting. The sorting result is $v_1, v_2, v_3, \dots, v_{15}$. To get \mathcal{L}_2 , we first process v_1 by performing both forward and backward BFS from v_1 to get $A_1 = \{v_1, v_4, v_6, v_{11}\}$ and $D_1 = \{v_1, v_2, v_7, v_9, v_{10}, v_{13}, v_{15}\}$. After that, we add 1 to out label of nodes in A_1 and in label of nodes in D_1 . Then, we get \mathcal{L}_1 .




Fig. 2: The relationship between different hop-nodes.



 Fig. 3: A sample DAG G .

 TABLE 2: The partial 2-hop labels $\mathcal{L}_1, \mathcal{L}_2, \mathcal{L}_3$ constructed based on $S_1 = \{v_1\}, S_2 = \{v_1, v_2\}$ and $S_3 = \{v_1, v_2, v_3\}$, respectively.

Node	\mathcal{L}_1		\mathcal{L}_2		\mathcal{L}_3	
	$L_{out}^1(v)$	$L_{in}^1(v)$	$L_{out}^2(v)$	$L_{in}^2(v)$	$L_{out}^3(v)$	$L_{in}^3(v)$
v_1	1	1	1	1	1	1
v_2		1	2	1,2	2	1,2
v_3			2		2,3	3
v_4	1		1		1,3	
v_5			2		2,3	
v_6	1		1		1,3	
v_7		1		1		1,3
v_8						3
v_9		1		1		1,3
v_{10}		1		1,2		1,2
v_{11}	1		1		1,3	
v_{12}			2		2	
v_{13}		1		1,2		1,2
v_{14}						3
v_{15}		1		1,2		1,2

The next processed node is v_2 . Similarly, we perform forward and backward *BFS* from v_2 to get $A_2 = \{v_2, v_3, v_5, v_{12}\}$ and $D_2 = \{v_2, v_{10}, v_{13}, v_{15}\}$. Note that all nodes in A_1 can reach v_2 , but some of them are not included in A_2 , due to that for nodes that are in A_1 but not included in A_2 , they can reach v_2 can be answered by \mathcal{L}_1 . Then, we add 2 to out and in label of nodes in A_2 and D_2 , as shown by Table 2. \square

Step-2: Reachability Ratio Computation. Given 2-hop labels \mathcal{L}_k w.r.t. S_k , the baseline approach computes the reachability ratio of S_k as follow. First, it computes the set of nodes that can reach either one of the set of hop-nodes, as shown by Equation 5. Second, it computes the set of nodes that can be reached by either one of the set of hop-nodes, as shown by Equation 6. It computes the number of reachable queries that can be answered by \mathcal{L}_k , as shown by Equation 7. At last, we return the reachability ratio of 2-hop labels w.r.t. S_k based on Equation 1.

$$A = \bigcup_{i \in [1, k]} A_i \quad (5)$$

$$D = \bigcup_{i \in [1, k]} D_i \quad (6)$$

$$N_k = |\{(a, d) | a \in A, d \in D, a \neq d, L_{out}^k(a) \cap L_{in}^k(d) \neq \emptyset\}| \quad (7)$$

Example 2. Continue Example 1. To compute the reachability ratio of $S_2 = \{v_1, v_2\}$, we first compute $A = A_1 \cup A_2 = \{v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4, v_5, v_6, v_{11}, v_{12}\}$, $D = D_1 \cup D_2 = \{v_1, v_2, v_7, v_9, v_{10}, v_{13}, v_{15}\}$ according to Equations 5 and 6, respectively. At last, we check for each pair of nodes $a \in A$ and $d \in D (a \neq d)$, whether a can reach d can be answered by \mathcal{L}_2 . And compute the number of answered reachable queries according to Equation 7, which is 42 for G in Figure 3 and \mathcal{L}_2 in Table 2. Given $TC(G) = 70$, we know that the reachability ratio of S_2 is $42/70 = 60\%$. \square

The Algorithm: The baseline algorithm to compute reachability ratio is shown in Algorithm 1, which works in two steps. Step-1 (lines 1-17) constructs 2-hop labels \mathcal{L}_k of k hop-nodes and gets the two set of nodes A and D . Specifically, it first sorts all nodes in certain order in line 2, then selects k hop-nodes in line 3. In lines 4-15, it performs forward and backward *BFS* from each hop-node v_i to construct 2-hop labels \mathcal{L}_i . During the processing, only if the reachability relationship between v_i and the visited node v cannot be answered by 2-hop labels \mathcal{L}_{i-1} , it adds v_i to v 's in-label (line 8) or out-label (line 13), and adds v to D_i (line 9) or A_i (line 14); otherwise, it terminates the processing due to that the reachability relationship has already been covered by \mathcal{L}_{i-1} . In lines 16-17, it gets the two sets A and D according to Equations 5 and 6. Step-2 (lines 18-20) computes the number of covered reachable queries by \mathcal{L}_k according to Equation 7. Finally, it computes and returns the reachability ratio in line 21.

Algorithm 1: blRR($G = (V, E), k, TC(G)$)

```

1  $N_k \leftarrow 0, S_k \leftarrow \emptyset, A \leftarrow \emptyset, D \leftarrow \emptyset$ 
2 rank nodes in  $G$  in a certain order
3 put the first  $k$  nodes into  $S_k$  as hop-nodes
4 foreach ( $v_i \in S_k$ ) do
5    $A_i \leftarrow \emptyset; D_i \leftarrow \emptyset$ 
6   perform forward BFS from  $v_i$ , and for each visited  $v$ 
7     if ( $L_{out}^{i-1}(v_i) \cap L_{in}^{i-1}(v) = \emptyset$ ) then /* $\mathcal{L}_{i-1}$ */
8        $L_{in}^i(v) \leftarrow L_{in}^{i-1}(v) \cup \{v_i\}$  /*compute  $\mathcal{L}_i$ */
9        $D_i \leftarrow D_i \cup \{v\}$ 
10    else stop expansion from  $v$ 
11    perform backward BFS from  $v_i$ , and for each visited  $v$ 
12      if ( $L_{out}^{i-1}(v) \cap L_{in}^{i-1}(v_i) = \emptyset$ ) then /* $\mathcal{L}_{i-1}$ */
13         $L_{out}^i(v) \leftarrow L_{out}^{i-1}(v) \cup \{v_i\}$  /*compute  $\mathcal{L}_i$ */
14         $A_i \leftarrow A_i \cup \{v\}$ 
15      else stop expansion from  $v$ 
16   $A = \bigcup_{i \in [1, k]} A_i$ 
17   $D = \bigcup_{i \in [1, k]} D_i$ 
18 foreach ( $a \in A, d \in D, a \neq d$ ) do
19   if ( $L_{out}^k(a) \cap L_{in}^k(d) \neq \emptyset$ ) then /* $\mathcal{L}_k$ */
20      $N_k \leftarrow N_k + 1$ 
21 return  $\alpha \leftarrow N_k / TC(G)$  as reachability ratio of  $S_k$ 

```

Analysis: For Step-1 (lines 1-17), the time cost of line 2 is $O(|V|)$ by counting sort. The time cost of performing *BFS* from each hop-node v_i is $O(|V| + |E|)$ (lines 5-15). During the two *BFS* traversals, the time cost of processing every visited node v is $O(k)$ (lines 7 and 12). Thus the time cost of 2-hop labels construction for each hop-node is $O(k(|V| + |E|))$, and the time cost of processing k hop-nodes, i.e., the time cost of Step-1 is $O(k^2(|V| + |E|))$. For Step-2, the time cost is $O(k|A||D|)$. Therefore, the time complexity of Algorithm 1 is $O(k^2(|V| + |E|) + k|A||D|)$.

During the processing, we do not need to actually maintain every A_i and D_i , instead, we only need to maintain A and D . Further, we need to maintain the 2-hop labels w.r.t. k hop-nodes, the space cost is $O(k|V|)$. As S_k, A and D are bounded by V , the space complexity of Algorithm 1 is $O(k|V|)$.

In practice, if the reachability ratio is too small to meet the requirement, we may need to use more hop-nodes, and therefore Algorithm 1 will be called once more to compute the new reachability ratio, for which all reachability relationships tested for S_k will be tested again for the new hop-node set.

Example 3. Continue Example 2. After getting $A = \{v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4, v_5, v_6, v_{11}, v_{12}\}$ and $D = \{v_1, v_2, v_7, v_9, v_{10}, v_{13}, v_{15}\}$ during constructing partial 2-hop labels, in lines 18-20, we need to test 56 reachability queries, due to $|A| = 8$ and $|D| = 7$. By line 21, we know that the reachability ratio is 60%. If we set the threshold of the reachability ratio to be equal or greater than 80%, then we need to enlarge the hop-node set and recompute the reachability ratio from scratch. As a result, the 56 queries tested for S_2 will be tested again for the new hop-node set. \square

4 THE INCREMENTAL APPROACH

Considering that when the hop-node set is enlarged, Algorithm 1 will be called once more, and the set of reachability relationships tested for the first call will be tested again for the second call, a natural

question is: can we compute the reachability ratio incrementally? That is, given the reachability ratio w.r.t. S_{i-1} , when we decide to compute the reachability ratio w.r.t. i hop-nodes, i.e., $S_i = S_{i-1} \cup \{v_i\}$, we do not compute the number of covered reachable queries from scratch, instead, we only compute the number of increased reachable queries that cannot be covered by \mathcal{L}_{i-1} , but can be covered by \mathcal{L}_i .

However, the increased reachability ratio cannot be easily computed. On one hand, by constructing 2-hop labels using hop-node v_i , we capture three kinds of reachability relationships: (1) v_i can reach every node in $D_i \setminus \{v_i\}$ can be determined by 2-hop labels w.r.t. v_i , and the number of covered reachable queries is $|D_i| - 1$; (2) every node in $A_i \setminus \{v_i\}$ can reach v_i can be determined by 2-hop labels w.r.t. v_i , and the number of covered reachable queries is $|A_i| - 1$; and (3) each node in $A_i \setminus \{v_i\}$ can reach every node in $D_i \setminus \{v_i\}$ can be determined by 2-hop labels w.r.t. v_i , and the number of covered reachable queries is $(|A_i| - 1) \times (|D_i| - 1)$. Thus the number of covered reachable queries by 2-hop labels w.r.t. v_i can be computed as $(|A_i| - 1) \times (|D_i| - 1) + (|A_i| - 1) + (|D_i| - 1) = |A_i| \times |D_i| - 1$.

On the other hand, 2-hop labels w.r.t. different hop-nodes may cover the same reachable queries. For example, consider Figure 2(b), where v_{i-1} and v_i are two hop-nodes, and v_i is processed after v_{i-1} . After processing v_{i-1} , every node $a_1 \in A_{i1}$ can reach every node $d_1 \in D_{i1}$ can be covered by 2-hop labels w.r.t. v_{i-1} , due to that $v_{i-1} \in L_{out}^{i-1}(a_1) \cap L_{in}^{i-1}(d_1)$. After processing v_i , we also know that a_1 can reach d_1 can also be covered by 2-hop labels w.r.t. v_i , due to that $v_i \in L_{out}^i(a_1) \cap L_{in}^i(d_1)$. Therefore, the increased number of reachable queries w.r.t. v_i can be computed as Equations 8 and 9, and the total number of reachable queries N_k covered by \mathcal{L}_k can be computed as Equation 10.

$$n_i = |A_i| \times |D_i| - 1 - \lambda \quad (8)$$

$$\lambda = |\{(a, d) | a \in A_i, d \in D_i, a \neq d, L_{out}^{i-1}(a) \cap L_{in}^{i-1}(d) \neq \emptyset\}| \quad (9)$$

$$N_k = \sum_{i \in [1, k]} n_i \quad (10)$$

Therefore, to compute the number of reachable queries that cannot be covered by \mathcal{L}_{i-1} but can be covered by \mathcal{L}_i , the intuitive way is firstly getting the two sets of nodes A_i and D_i , then testing for each pair of nodes $a \in A_i$ and $d \in D_i$, whether a can reach d can be answered by \mathcal{L}_{i-1} . If a can reach d can be answered by \mathcal{L}_{i-1} , it means that $a \rightsquigarrow d$ has already been covered by S_{i-1} ; otherwise, it is a new covered reachable query and needs to be counted in, as shown by Algorithm 2.

In Algorithm 2, we compute reachability ratio for each S_i when v_i ($i \in [1, k]$) is added into S_{i-1} . For each processed v_i (lines 4-24), we first perform forward and backward *BFS* from v_i to get the two set of nodes A_i and D_i (lines 5-13). In lines 14-17, we compute the number of reachable queries that can be covered by \mathcal{L}_{i-1} . After that, we get the increased number of reachable queries that can be covered by \mathcal{L}_i but cannot be covered by \mathcal{L}_{i-1} in line 18 according to Equation 8. In line 19, we get the total number of reachable queries covered by \mathcal{L}_i , and get the reachability ratio of S_i in line 20. We compute \mathcal{L}_i based on \mathcal{L}_{i-1} in lines 21-24. At last, we return the reachability ratio of S_k in line 25.

It is worth noting that for Algorithm 2, when processing the first hop-node v_1 , we do not need to actually execute lines 15-17, due

Algorithm 2: incRR($G = (V, E), k, TC(G)$)

```

1   $N_0 \leftarrow 0$ 
2  rank nodes in  $G$  in a certain order
3  put the first  $k$  nodes into  $S_k$  as hop-nodes
4  foreach ( $v_i \in S_k$ ) do
5     $A_i \leftarrow \emptyset, D_i \leftarrow \emptyset$ 
6    perform forward BFS from  $v_i$ , and for each visited  $v$ 
7      if ( $L_{out}^{i-1}(v_i) \cap L_{in}^{i-1}(v) = \emptyset$ ) then    /* $\mathcal{L}_{i-1}$ */
8         $D_i \leftarrow D_i \cup \{v\}$ 
9      else stop expansion from  $v$ 
10   perform backward BFS from  $v_i$ , and for each visited  $v$ 
11     if ( $L_{out}^{i-1}(v) \cap L_{in}^{i-1}(v_i) = \emptyset$ ) then    /* $\mathcal{L}_{i-1}$ */
12        $A_i \leftarrow A_i \cup \{v\}$ 
13     else stop expansion from  $v$ 
14    $\lambda \leftarrow 0$ 
15   foreach ( $a \in A_i, d \in D_i, a \neq d$ ) do
16     if ( $L_{out}^{i-1}(a) \cap L_{in}^{i-1}(d) \neq \emptyset$ ) then    /* $\mathcal{L}_{i-1}$ */
17        $\lambda \leftarrow \lambda + 1$ 
18    $n_i \leftarrow |A_i| \times |D_i| - 1 - \lambda$ 
19    $N_i \leftarrow N_{i-1} + n_i$ 
20    $\alpha \leftarrow N_i / TC(G)$     /*reachability ratio of  $S_i$ */
21   foreach ( $a \in A_i$ ) do    /*compute  $\mathcal{L}_i$ */
22      $L_{out}^i(a) \leftarrow L_{out}^{i-1}(a) \cup \{v_i\}$ 
23   foreach ( $d \in D_i$ ) do    /*compute  $\mathcal{L}_i$ */
24      $L_{in}^i(d) \leftarrow L_{in}^{i-1}(d) \cup \{v_i\}$ 
25 return  $\alpha$  as reachability ratio of  $S_k$ 
    
```

to that for v_1 , $A_1 = in^*(v_1)$ and $D_1 = out^*(v_1)$, we can directly get $n_1 = |A_1| \times |D_1| - 1$ and the corresponding reachability ratio.

Analysis: Different with Algorithm 1, Algorithm 2 performs Step-1 by first computing the two sets A_i and D_i in lines 1-13, then computing \mathcal{L}_i in lines 21-24. The overall cost is same as that of Algorithm 1, i.e., $O(k^2(|V| + |E|))$.

The difference between Algorithm 1 and Algorithm 2 lies in Step-2 (lines 14-20), i.e., how to compute the increased number of reachable queries that cannot be covered by \mathcal{L}_{i-1} but can be covered by \mathcal{L}_i based on Equation 8. The cost of Step-2 for each hop-node is $O(i|A_i||D_i|)$. For k hop-node, the cost is therefore $O(\sum_{i \in [1, k]} i|A_i||D_i|)$.

Therefore, the time complexity of Algorithm 2 is $O(k^2(|V| + |E|) + \sum_{i \in [1, k]} i|A_i||D_i|)$.

Similar to Algorithm 1, we need to maintain the 2-hop labels w.r.t. at most k hop-nodes during the processing. As A_i and D_i are bounded by V , and $A_i(D_i)$ can be used to store nodes of $A_{i+1}(D_{i+1})$, the space complexity of Algorithm 2 is $O(k|V|)$.

Example 4. Consider G in Figure 3. Assume that we want to construct partial 2-hop labels \mathcal{L}_3 .

The first node to be processed is v_1 , and the partial 2-hop labels are shown in Table 2. As $A_1 = \{v_1, v_4, v_6, v_{11}\}$, $D_1 = \{v_1, v_2, v_7, v_9, v_{10}, v_{13}, v_{15}\}$, thus we know that $N_1 = n_1 = |A_1| \times |D_1| - 1 = 27$. The second processed node is v_2 and the partial 2-hop labels are shown in Table 2. By lines 5-13, we have that $A_2 = \{v_2, v_3, v_5, v_{12}\}$, $D_2 = \{v_2, v_{10}, v_{13}, v_{14}\}$. Then, in lines 15-17, we need to test $|A_2| \times |D_2| = 16$ reachability queries. The result is $\lambda = 0$, thus $n_2 = |A_2| \times |D_2| - 1 - 0 = 15$, and $N_2 = n_1 + n_2 = 27 + 15 = 42$. The third processed node is v_3 . By lines 5-13, we have that $A_3 = \{v_3, v_4, v_5, v_6, v_{11}\}$, $D_3 = \{v_3, v_7, v_8, v_9, v_{14}\}$. Then, in lines 15-17, we need

to test $|A_3| \times |D_3| = 25$ reachability queries. The result is $\lambda = 6$, thus $n_3 = |A_3| \times |D_3| - 1 - 6 = 18$, and $N_3 = N_2 + n_3 = 42 + 18 = 60$. After processing v_1, v_2 and v_3 , we have \mathcal{L}_3 shown in Table 2, and the reachability ratio is $60/70 = 85.7\%$ by testing $16 + 25 = 41$ reachability queries for Algorithm 2.

As a comparison, when using Algorithm 1, $|A_3| = 8$, $|D_3| = 10$, and we need to test 80 reachability queries to get the reachability ratio. \square

Note that, since a reachable query $a \rightsquigarrow d$ may be covered by 2-hop labels w.r.t. different hop-nodes, compared with Algorithm 1, Algorithm 2 may test the reachability relationship between a and d in line 16 more than once. However, it is still valuable due to that (1) only a part of reachable queries, rather than all, need to be tested more than once, and (2) we can terminate the computation whenever we find that reachability ratio of S_i is good enough in line 20. As a comparison, Algorithm 1 may be called more than once before getting a reachability ratio meeting the requirement. When it is called again due to the enlarged hop-node set, all previously tested queries will be tested once more.

5 THE INCREMENTAL-PARTITION APPROACH

5.1 The Equivalence Relationship

By comparing Algorithm 1 and Algorithm 2, we know that the key factor that affects the overall performance is the total number of tested reachability queries, which dominates the cost of Step-2, as indicated by their time complexities. Even though Algorithm 2 does not need to compute reachability ratio from scratch when the hop-node set becomes large by adding one more hop-node v_i , it still needs to test $|A_i| \times |D_i|$ reachability queries in line 16 with cost $O(i|A_i||D_i|)$. Given a large hop-node set, the cost could be unaffordable.

Definition 1. [Equivalence Relationship] Given a hop-node v_i , its ancestor set A_i and descendant set D_i . We say two nodes $a_1, a_2 (a_1 \neq a_2)$ of A_i are forward equivalent to each other, denoted as $a_1 \equiv_F a_2$, if they have the same out-label, i.e., $L_{out}^i(a_1) = L_{out}^i(a_2)$. Similarly, we say two nodes $d_1, d_2 (d_1 \neq d_2)$ of D_i are backward equivalent to each other, denoted as $d_1 \equiv_B d_2$, if they have the same in-label, i.e., $L_{in}^i(d_1) = L_{in}^i(d_2)$.

By Definition 1, we can get, for A_i , a partition $\mathcal{A}(i) = \{A_{i1}, A_{i2}, \dots, A_{im}\}$, which consists of a set of m disjoint subsets satisfying that (1) $\forall l, j \in [1, m], l \neq j, A_{il} \cap A_{ij} = \emptyset$ and $\cup_{l \in [1, m]} A_{il} = A_i$; and (2) $\forall a_l, a_j$ belonging to the same subset, $a_l \equiv_F a_j$.

Theorem 1. Let a_1 and a_2 be two nodes satisfying that a_1 and a_2 are forward equivalent to each other ($a_1 \equiv_F a_2$). For $\forall d \in V$, we have that $L_{out}^i(a_1) \cap L_{in}^i(d) = L_{out}^i(a_2) \cap L_{in}^i(d)$.

Proof: The correctness is obvious, due to that a_1 and a_2 are forward equivalent to each other, which means that they have the same out-label. \square

Based on this result, for each subset $A_{ij} \in \mathcal{A}(i)$, to know the reachability relationship from all nodes of A_{ij} to $\forall d \in V$, we do not need to test $|A_{ij}|$ reachability queries, instead, we only need to

test one reachability query, due to that all nodes of A_{ij} are forward equivalent to each other.

For D_i , we also have a partition $\mathcal{D}(i) = \{D_{i1}, D_{i2}, \dots, D_{in}\}$ satisfying that (1) $\forall l, j \in [1, n], l \neq j, D_{il} \cap D_{ij} = \emptyset$ and $\cup_{j \in [1, n]} D_{ij} = D_i$; and (2) $\forall d_l, d_j$ belonging to the same subset, $d_l \equiv_B d_j$. And similarly, for each subset $D_{ij} \in \mathcal{D}(i)$, to know the reachability relationship from any node to all nodes of D_{ij} , we do not need to test $|D_{ij}|$ reachability queries, instead, the number of tested reachability queries can be reduced to one, due to that all nodes of D_{ij} are backward equivalent to each other.

Theorem 2. Given a hop-node v_i , its ancestor set A_i and descendant set D_i , the number of tested reachability queries for reachability ratio computation is $|\mathcal{A}(i)| \times |\mathcal{D}(i)|$, which is bounded by $\min\{|A_i| \times |D_i|, 4^{i-1}\}$.

Proof: Let $\mathcal{A}(i)(\mathcal{D}(i))$ be the partition of $A_i(D_i)$ based on the equivalence relationship, $\mathcal{P}_A(i)(\mathcal{P}_D(i))$ the partition of V w.r.t. hop-node set S_i and forward (backward) equivalence relationship, i.e., all nodes in each subset have the same out-label (in-label), which is a subset of S_i . Initially, $\mathcal{A}(1) = \{A_1\}(\mathcal{D}(1) = \{D_1\})$, $\mathcal{P}_A(1) = \{A_1, V \setminus A_1\}(\mathcal{P}_D(1) = \{D_1, V \setminus D_1\})$.

On one hand, according to Theorem 1, for each subset $A_{il} \in \mathcal{A}(i)$, the result of testing all the reachability relationships from nodes of A_{il} to any other node is same to each other, thus we only need to randomly pick a node and take it as the representative node of A_{il} to perform the testing of reachability relationship. Similarly, for each subset $D_{ij} \in \mathcal{D}(i)$ based on backward equivalence relationship, we can also randomly pick a node and take it as the representative node of D_{ij} to test the reachability relationships from any node to all nodes of D_{ij} . As a result, the number of tested reachability queries from nodes of A_i to nodes of D_i is $|\mathcal{A}(i)| \times |\mathcal{D}(i)|$. Since $\mathcal{A}(i)(\mathcal{D}(i))$ is the partition of $A_i(D_i)$, we know that $|\mathcal{A}(i)| \times |\mathcal{D}(i)| \leq |A_i| \times |D_i|$.

On the other hand, given the partition $\mathcal{P}_A(i-1)(\mathcal{P}_D(i-1))$ of V , the size of $\mathcal{P}_A(i)(\mathcal{P}_D(i))$ is at most twice bigger than that of $\mathcal{P}_A(i-1)(\mathcal{P}_D(i-1))$. The reason lies in that all nodes in each subset of $\mathcal{P}_A(i-1)(\mathcal{P}_D(i-1))$ can be further divided into at most two disjoint subsets. One consists of nodes that can reach (be reached by) v_i , and the other contains nodes that cannot reach (be reached by) v_i . Then, the size of $\mathcal{P}_A(i)(\mathcal{P}_D(i))$ is bounded by 2^i , and the size of $\mathcal{A}(i)(\mathcal{D}(i))$ is bounded by 2^{i-1} , thus the number of tested reachability queries is bounded by $2^{i-1} \times 2^{i-1} = 4^{i-1}$.

In summary, we know that the number of tested reachability queries for reachability ratio computation w.r.t. hop-node v_i is bounded by $\min\{|A_i| \times |D_i|, 4^{i-1}\}$. \square

According to Theorem 2, we can reduce the number of tested reachability queries when processing hop-node v_i .

As shown by Equation 11, for each pair of subsets ($A_{il} \in \mathcal{A}(i), D_{ij} \in \mathcal{D}(i)$), we only need to check the reachability relationship between their representative nodes $a \in A_{il}$ and $d \in D_{ij}$. If a can reach d can be answered by \mathcal{L}_{i-1} , it means that all the reachable relationships from each node of A_{il} to every node of D_{ij} can be answered by \mathcal{L}_{i-1} . To do that, the first thing we need to do is getting the partitions of both A_i and D_i according to equivalence relationship.

$$\lambda = \sum_{\substack{a \in A_{il} \in \mathcal{A}(i) \\ d \in D_{ij} \in \mathcal{D}(i) \\ L_{out}^{i-1}(a) \cap L_{in}^{i-1}(d) \neq \emptyset}} |A_{il}| \times |D_{ij}| \quad (11)$$

5.2 Partitions Computation

To get the partitions of both A_i and D_i , we need to compare the labels of nodes in A_i and D_i , such that nodes with same labels can be clustered together. The naive way to do this is based on pairwise comparing node labels, which is expensive in practice. It is worth noting that the out-label and in-label of a node are sorted in advance, this actually can be done without additional cost, due to that these labels are used to check whether their set-intersection is empty, which means that we can store the processing order of hop-nodes, rather than their IDs, in these labels. In this way, the integers in both out-label and in-label of any node are naturally sorted, as shown by Table 2. With this result, we can sort all nodes in $A_i(D_i)$ by comparing their out-labels (in-labels) in lexicographic order. After the sorting operation, all equivalent nodes are clustered together. As the size of each label is bounded by i , the cost of computing the partition $\mathcal{A}(i)(\mathcal{D}(i))$ of $A_i(D_i)$ is $O(i \times |A_i| \times \log |A_i|)(O(i \times |D_i| \times \log |D_i|))$.

Let $\mathcal{P}_A(i)$ be the partition of V w.r.t. hop-node set S_i and forward equivalence relationship, i.e., all nodes in each subset have the same out-label, which is a subset of S_i , $\mathcal{P}_D(i)$ the partition of V w.r.t. S_i and backward equivalence relationship, i.e., all nodes in each subset have the same in-label, which is also a subset of S_i . We have the following result.

Theorem 3. Given the hop-node v_i and its ancestor (descendant) set $A_i(D_i)$, for $\forall v_1, v_2 \in A_i(D_i)$, $v_1 \equiv_F v_2 (v_1 \equiv_B v_2)$, iff they belong to the same subset of $\mathcal{P}_A(i-1)(\mathcal{P}_D(i-1))$.

Proof: We prove this result from two aspects. First, we prove the correctness when both v_1 and v_2 belong to A_i (Case-1), then we prove the correctness when both v_1 and v_2 belong to D_i (Case-2).

Case-1 where $v_1, v_2 \in A_i$ and $v_i \in L_{out}^i(v_1) \cap L_{out}^i(v_2)$.

On one hand, if $v_1 \equiv_F v_2$, it means that $L_{out}^i(v_1) = L_{out}^i(v_2)$ according to Definition 1. Hence, $L_{out}^i(v_1) \setminus \{v_i\} = L_{out}^i(v_2) \setminus \{v_i\}$, i.e., they belong to the same subset of $\mathcal{P}_A(i-1)$.

On the other hand, if both v_1 and v_2 belong to the same subset of $\mathcal{P}_A(i-1)$, it means that before processing hop-node v_i , $L_{out}^{i-1}(v_1) = L_{out}^{i-1}(v_2)$ according to the definition of $\mathcal{P}_A(i-1)$. As $v_1, v_2 \in A_i$, we know that after processing v_i , $v_i \in L_{out}^i(v_1) \cap L_{out}^i(v_2)$ and $L_{out}^i(v_1) = L_{out}^i(v_2)$ still holds. According to Definition 1, $v_1 \equiv_F v_2$.

Therefore we have that $v_1 \equiv_F v_2$, iff they belong to the same subset of $\mathcal{P}_A(i-1)$.

Case-2 where $v_1, v_2 \in D_i$ and $v_i \in L_{in}^i(v_1) \cap L_{in}^i(v_2)$.

Similar to the proof of Case-1, we know that $v_1 \equiv_B v_2$, iff they belong to the same subset of $\mathcal{P}_D(i-1)$.

By considering both the two cases, we know that for $\forall v_1, v_2 \in A_i(D_i)$, $v_1 \equiv_F v_2 (v_1 \equiv_B v_2)$, iff they belong to the same subset of $\mathcal{P}_A(i-1)(\mathcal{P}_D(i-1))$. \square

According to Theorem 3, we assign each node v two set IDs, denoted as $id_A(v)$ and $id_D(v)$, which are used to check which subset it belongs to in $\mathcal{P}_A(i)$ and $\mathcal{P}_D(i)$, respectively. Then, given the ancestor (descendant) set $A_i(D_i)$ of v_i , we only need to scan all nodes of $A_i(D_i)$ once, and know immediately that for two nodes v_1 and v_2 , if $id_A(v_1) = id_A(v_2) (id_D(v_1) = id_D(v_2))$ in $\mathcal{P}_A(i-1)(\mathcal{P}_D(i-1))$, then $v_1 \equiv_F v_2 (v_1 \equiv_B v_2)$ and will definitely belong to the same subset of $\mathcal{P}_A(i)(\mathcal{P}_D(i))$. Therefore, $\mathcal{P}_A(i)(\mathcal{P}_D(i))$ is a refinement of $\mathcal{P}_A(i-1)(\mathcal{P}_D(i-1))$, i.e., each element of $\mathcal{P}_A(i)(\mathcal{P}_D(i))$ is a subset of a unique element of $\mathcal{P}_A(i-1)(\mathcal{P}_D(i-1))$.

Recall that when processing the hop-node v_i , we first have its ancestor (descendant) set $A_i(D_i)$, then get the partition $\mathcal{A}(i)(\mathcal{D}(i))$ of $A_i(D_i)$ based on equivalence relationship. Since $\mathcal{P}_A(i)(\mathcal{P}_D(i))$ is the partition of V w.r.t. equivalence relationship, we know that $\mathcal{A}(i) \subset \mathcal{P}_A(i)(\mathcal{D}(i) \subset \mathcal{P}_D(i))$, and the relationship between $\mathcal{P}_A(i)(\mathcal{P}_D(i))$, $\mathcal{P}_A(i-1)(\mathcal{P}_D(i-1))$ and $\mathcal{A}(i)(\mathcal{D}(i))$ are shown as Equations 12-13.

$$\mathcal{P}_A(i) = \{P \setminus A_i | P \in \mathcal{P}_A(i-1)\} \cup \mathcal{A}(i) \quad (12)$$

$$\mathcal{P}_D(i) = \{P \setminus D_i | P \in \mathcal{P}_D(i-1)\} \cup \mathcal{D}(i) \quad (13)$$

When processing hop-node v_i , since we only need to check the reachability relationships from nodes of A_i to D_i , we choose to maintain the information of both $\mathcal{P}_A(i)(\mathcal{P}_D(i))$ and $\mathcal{A}(i)(\mathcal{D}(i))$ using the set ID of each node to facilitate partitions computation. Specifically, we use a hash table $H_A(H_D)$ to help achieve linear-time complexity. Each element of $H_A(H_D)$ is a tuple (id_o, e_n) denoting a subset $A_{il}(D_{il})$ of $\mathcal{A}(i)(\mathcal{D}(i))$, where id_o is, for all nodes of $A_{il}(D_{il})$, their old set ID in $\mathcal{P}_A(i-1)(\mathcal{P}_D(i-1))$, $e_n = (id_n, v_1, s)$ is a triple denoting the new set ID for all nodes of $A_{il}(D_{il})$, the representative node of $A_{il}(D_{il})$, and the size of $A_{il}(D_{il})$, respectively.

Example 5. Consider G in Figure 3. Before processing v_1 , $\mathcal{P}_A(0) = \mathcal{P}_D(0) = \{V\}$, $\mathcal{A}(0) = \mathcal{D}(0) = \emptyset$, and for all nodes v , $id_A(v) = id_D(v) = 0$.

For the first node v_1 , $A_1 = \{v_1, v_4, v_6, v_{11}\}$, $D_1 = \{v_1, v_2, v_7, v_9, v_{10}, v_{13}, v_{15}\}$. Since all nodes in $A_1(D_1)$ have the same $id_A(v)(id_D(v))$, we know that $\mathcal{A}(1) = \{A_1\}$ and $\mathcal{D}(1) = \{D_1\}$. $\mathcal{P}_A(1) = \{A_1, V \setminus A_1\}$ and $\mathcal{P}_D(1) = \{D_1, V \setminus D_1\}$. In Table 3, the two columns under v_1 denote $\mathcal{P}_A(1)$ and $\mathcal{P}_D(1)$, where each 1 in the second (third) column corresponds a node in $A_1(D_1)$. Figure 4(a) shows the two hash tables denoting $\mathcal{A}(1)$ and $\mathcal{D}(1)$, respectively. For H_A , there is one (key, value) pair, denoting that $\mathcal{A}(1)$ contains one subset A_1 , and for all nodes in A_1 , their set ID is 0 in $\mathcal{P}_A(0)$, thus they all belong to the same subset in $\mathcal{A}(1)$, i.e., $\mathcal{A}(1) = \{A_1\}$. By H_A in Figure 4(a), we know that all nodes in A_1 now have the new set ID 1, the representative node of A_1 is v_4 , and $|A_1| = 4$.


For the second processed node v_2 , $A_2 = \{v_2, v_3, v_5, v_{12}\}$, $D_2 = \{v_2, v_{10}, v_{13}, v_{14}\}$. As all nodes in A_2 have the same set ID 0 in $\mathcal{P}_A(1)$, $\mathcal{A}(2)$ contains a unique subset A_2 , i.e., $\mathcal{A}(2) = \{A_2\}$. As shown by Figure 4(b), the key is 0, and the triple $(2, v_3, 4)$ denotes that the new set ID for all nodes in A_2 is 2, the representative node of A_2 is v_3 , and $|A_2| = 4$. Similarly, all nodes in D_2 have the same set ID 1 in $\mathcal{P}_D(1)$, $\mathcal{D}(2)$ contains a unique subset D_2 , i.e., $\mathcal{D}(2) = \{D_2\}$, which is denoted as H_D in Figure 4(b).

For the third processed node v_3 , $A_3 = \{v_3, v_4, v_5, v_6, v_{11}\}$, $D_3 = \{v_3, v_7, v_8, v_9, v_{14}\}$. For A_3 , v_3 and v_5 have the same set ID 2 in $\mathcal{P}_A(2)$, thus they form the subset in $\mathcal{A}(3)$. Further, v_4, v_6, v_{11} have the same set ID 1 in $\mathcal{P}_A(2)$, they form the second subset in $\mathcal{A}(3)$. Therefore $\mathcal{A}(3) = \{\{v_3, v_5\}, \{v_4, v_6, v_{11}\}\}$. Similarly, we know that $\mathcal{D}(3) = \{\{v_3, v_8, v_{14}\}, \{v_7, v_9\}\}$. Both $\mathcal{A}(3)$ and $\mathcal{D}(3)$ are denoted by H_A and H_D in Figure 4(c), respectively. \square

The Algorithm: As shown by Algorithm 3, for each hop-node v_i , we first perform forward and backward *BFS* to get D_i (lines 6-15)

TABLE 3: The status of set IDs for all nodes.

Node	v_1		v_2		v_3	
	$id_A(v)$	$id_D(v)$	$id_A(v)$	$id_D(v)$	$id_A(v)$	$id_D(v)$
v_1	1	1	1	1	1	1
v_2		1	2	2		2
v_3			2		3	3
v_4	1		1		4	
v_5			2		3	
v_6	1		1		4	
v_7		1		1		4
v_8						3
v_9		1		1		4
v_{10}		1		2		2
v_{11}	1		1		4	
v_{12}			2		2	
v_{13}		1		2		2
v_{14}						3
v_{15}		1		2		2


 Fig. 4: Running status of the two hash tables H_A and H_D .

and A_i (lines 16-25). At the same time, we generate their partitions $\mathcal{D}(i)$ and $\mathcal{A}(i)$, for which each subset is recorded in H_D and H_A , respectively. In lines 26-29, we compute λ according to Equation 11, which is the number of reachable queries that are covered by \mathcal{L}_{i-1} . In line 30, we get the number of reachable queries that can be covered by \mathcal{L}_i but cannot be covered by \mathcal{L}_{i-1} . After that, we have the total number of covered reachable queries in line 31, and the reachability ratio in line 32. At last, we generate \mathcal{L}_i in lines 33-36, and return the reachability ratio of S_k in line 37.

Analysis: Same as Algorithm 1 and Algorithm 2, Algorithm 3 completes Step-1 by performing both forward and backward *BFS* from each hop-node, during which it first computes the two sets A_i and D_i in lines 1-25, and at the same time computes H_A and H_D . Then, it computes the new partial 2-hop labels \mathcal{L}_i in lines 33-36. The time cost is $O(k^2(|V| + |E|))$. Different with Algorithm 1 and Algorithm 2, the benefits of Algorithm 3 lies in Step-2. The cost of Step-2 for each hop-node is $O(i|\mathcal{A}(i)||\mathcal{D}(i)|)$. For k hop-node, the cost is $O(\sum_{i \in [1, k]} i|\mathcal{A}(i)||\mathcal{D}(i)|)$. Therefore, the time complexity of Algorithm 3 is $O(k^2(|V| + |E|) + \sum_{i \in [1, k]} i|\mathcal{A}(i)||\mathcal{D}(i)|)$.

Similar to Algorithm 1, we need to maintain the 2-hop labels w.r.t. at most k hop-nodes during the processing. As A_i , D_i , H_A and H_D are bounded by V , and $A_i(D_i)$ can be used to store nodes of $A_{i+1}(D_{i+1})$, the space complexity of Algorithm 2 is $O(k|V|)$.

By comparing Algorithm 1, Algorithm 2 and Algorithm 3, we know that the difference of the three algorithms lies in how to compute the reachability ratio, i.e., Step-2. In Table 4, we show the

Algorithm 3: $\text{incRR}^+(G = (V, E), k, TC(G))$

```

1   $N_0 \leftarrow 0; n_A \leftarrow 0; n_D \leftarrow 0;$ 
2  rank nodes in  $G$  in a certain order
3  put the first  $k$  nodes into  $S_k$  as hop-nodes
4  foreach ( $v_i \in S_k$ ) do
5     $A_i \leftarrow \emptyset; D_i \leftarrow \emptyset; H_A \leftarrow \emptyset; H_D \leftarrow \emptyset$ 
6    perform forward BFS from  $v_i$ , and for each visited  $v$ 
7      if ( $L_{out}^{i-1}(v_i) \cap L_{in}^{i-1}(v) = \emptyset$ ) then /* $\mathcal{L}_{i-1}$ */
8        if ( $id_A(v) \notin H_D$ ) then
9           $n_A \leftarrow n_A + 1$ 
10          $H_D[id_A(v)] \leftarrow (n_A, v, 1)$ 
11        else
12          $H_D[id_A(v)].s \leftarrow H_D[id_A(v)].s + 1$ 
13          $D_i \leftarrow D_i \cup \{v\}$ 
14          $id_A(v) \leftarrow n_A$ 
15        else stop expansion from  $v$ 
16        perform backward BFS from  $v_i$ , and for each visited  $v$ 
17          if ( $L_{out}^{i-1}(v) \cap L_{in}^{i-1}(v_i) = \emptyset$ ) then /* $\mathcal{L}_{i-1}$ */
18            if ( $id_D(v) \notin H_A$ ) then
19               $n_D \leftarrow n_D + 1$ 
20               $H_A[id_D(v)] \leftarrow (n_D, v, 1)$ 
21            else
22               $H_A[id_D(v)].s \leftarrow H_A[id_D(v)].s + 1$ 
23               $A_i \leftarrow A_i \cup \{v\}$ 
24               $id_D(v) \leftarrow n_D$ 
25            else stop expansion from  $v$ 
26           $\lambda \leftarrow 0$ 
27          foreach ( $(id, a, s_A) \in H_A, (id, d, s_D) \in H_D$ ) do
28            if ( $L_{out}^{i-1}(a) \cap L_{in}^{i-1}(d) \neq \emptyset$ ) then /* $\mathcal{L}_{i-1}$ */
29               $\lambda \leftarrow \lambda + |s_A| \times |s_D|$ 
30             $n_i \leftarrow |A_i| \times |D_i| - 1 - \lambda$ 
31             $N_i \leftarrow N_{i-1} + n_i$ 
32             $\alpha \leftarrow N_i / TC(G)$  /*reachability ratio of  $S_i$ */
33          foreach ( $a \in A_i$ ) do /*compute  $\mathcal{L}_i$ */
34             $L_{out}^i(a) \leftarrow L_{out}^{i-1}(a) \cup \{v_i\}$ 
35          foreach ( $d \in D_i$ ) do /*compute  $\mathcal{L}_i$ */
36             $L_{in}^i(d) \leftarrow L_{in}^{i-1}(d) \cup \{v_i\}$ 
37  return  $\alpha$  as reachability ratio of  $S_k$ 
    
```

 TABLE 4: Comparison of time and space complexities, where $A = \cup_{i \in [1, k]} A_i$, $D = \cup_{i \in [1, k]} D_i$, and $\mathcal{A}(i)(\mathcal{D}(i))$ is the partition of $A_i(D_i)$.

Algorithm	Time Complexity of Step-2	Space Complexity
bIRR	$O(k A D)$	$O(k V)$
incRR	$O(\sum_{i \in [1, k]} i A_i D_i)$	$O(k V)$
incRR ⁺	$O(\sum_{i \in [1, k]} i A(i) \mathcal{D}(i))$	$O(k V)$

comparison of their time and space complexities. For time complexity, we do not show the cost of Step-1, due to that for Step-1, the cost is same for all three algorithms. We will show in Experiment that the incRR⁺ algorithm works much more efficiently than the bIRR and incRR algorithms.

Example 6. Consider G in Figure 3. Assume that we want to compute the reachability ratio of $S_3 = \{v_1, v_2, v_3\}$.

For v_1 , as it is the first processed node, there is no covered reachability relationship, thus we do not need to test any reachability relationship in lines 28. As $|A_1| = 4$, $|D_1| = 7$, thus $n_1 = |A_1| \times |D_1| - 1 = 27$ in line 30 of Algorithm 3.

 TABLE 5: Statistics of datasets, where $d = 2|E|/|V|$ is the average degree of G , $TC(\cdot)$ is the average number of reachable nodes for nodes of G , and n_t is the number of topological levels (the length of the longest path) of G .

Dataset	$ V $	$ E $	d	$TC(\cdot)$	n_t
amaze	3,710	3,600	1.94	639	16
human	38,811	39,576	2.04	9	18
anthra	12,499	13,104	2.10	12	16
agrocyc	12,684	13,408	2.11	13	16
ecoo	12,620	13,350	2.12	14	22
vchocyc	9,491	10,143	2.14	14	21
kegg	3,617	3,908	2.16	729	26
arxiv	6,000	66,707	22.24	928	167
email	231,000	223,004	1.93	11,698	7
LJ	971,232	1,024,140	2.11	206,907	24
web	371,764	517,805	2.79	55,055	34
10cit-Patent	1,097,775	1,651,894	3.01	3	7
10citeseerx	770,539	1,501,126	3.90	70	36
05cit-Patent	1,671,488	3,303,789	3.95	8	12
05citeseerx	1,457,057	3,002,252	4.12	116	36
citeseerx	6,540,401	15,011,260	4.59	15,510	59
dbpedia	3,365,623	7,989,191	4.75	83,659	146
patent	3,774,768	16,518,947	8.75	1,544	32
twitter	18,121,168	18,359,487	2.03	1,346,820	22
web-uk	22,753,644	38,184,039	3.36	3,417,930	2793

For v_2 , as both $|\mathcal{A}(2)| = |\mathcal{D}(2)| = 1$, we only need to test one reachable query, i.e., whether $v_3? \rightsquigarrow v_{10}$ can be answered by \mathcal{L}_1 . As $L_{out}^1(v_3) \cap L_{in}^1(v_{10}) = \emptyset$, we know that $n_2 = |A_2| \times |D_2| - 1 = 15$ in line 30 of Algorithm 3.

For v_3 , as shown by Figure 4(c), we know that $\mathcal{A}(3) = \{\{v_3, v_5\}, \{v_4, v_6, v_{11}\}\}$ and $\mathcal{D}(3) = \{\{v_3, v_8, v_{14}\}, \{v_7, v_9\}\}$. In line 28, we only need to test $|\mathcal{A}(3)| \times |\mathcal{D}(3)| = 2 \times 2 = 4$ reachable queries. As v_4 can reach v_7 can be answered by \mathcal{L}_2 , we know that all nodes in $\{v_4, v_6, v_{11}\}$ can reach every node in $\{v_7, v_9\}$ can be answered by \mathcal{L}_2 , thus $\lambda = 6$ for v_3 . In line 30, we know that $n_3 = |A_3| \times |D_3| - 1 - \lambda = 5 \times 5 - 1 - 6 = 18$.

Then, we know that $N_3 = n_1 + n_2 + n_3 = 27 + 15 + 18 = 60$, and the reachability ratio is $\alpha = N_3 / TC(G) = 60 / 70 = 85.7\%$. And during the processing, the total number of tested reachability queries by Algorithm 3 is 5.

As a comparison, Algorithm 2 needs to test 16 reachability queries for v_2 , due to that $|A_2| = |D_2| = 4$. For v_3 , Algorithm 2 needs to test 25 reachability queries, due to that $|A_3| = |D_3| = 5$. The total number of tested reachability queries for Algorithm 2 is 41. Consider Algorithm 1, $|A_1 \cup A_2 \cup A_3| = 8$, $|D_1 \cup D_2 \cup D_3| = 10$, thus the total number of tested reachability queries for Algorithm 1 is 80 to get the reachability ratio. \square

6 EXPERIMENT

In this section, we show experimental results on reachability ratio computation. The compared algorithms include *bIRR*, *incRR*, and *incRR⁺*. Moreover, we show the impacts of partial 2-hop labels on reachability queries processing based on the state-of-the-art algorithm *FL* [12] in terms of index size, index construction time, and query time. We implemented all algorithms using C++ and compiled by G++ 6.2.0. All experiments were run on a PC with Intel(R) Core(TM) i5-3230M CPU @ 3.0 GHz CPU, 16 GB memory, and Ubuntu 18.04.1 Linux OS. For algorithms that run ≥ 24 hours or exceed the memory limit (16GB), we will show their results as “—” in the tables.

Datasets: Table 5 shows the statistics of 20 real datasets, where the first eight are small datasets ($|V| \leq 100,000$) downloaded from the same web page³. The following 12 datasets are large ones ($|V| > 100,000$). These datasets are usually used in the recent works w.r.t. reachability queries processing [3], [7], [9], [12], [14], [16], [19]–[22]. Among these datasets, *amaze* and *kegg* are metabolic networks, *human*, *anthra*, *agrocyc*, *ecoo*, *vchocyc* are graphs describing the genome and biochemical machinery of *E. coli* K-12 MG1655. *email*⁴ is an email network. *LJ* is an online social network *soc-LiveJournal1*⁴. *web* is a web graph *web-Google*⁵. *arxiv*, *10cit-Patent*⁶, *10citeseerx*⁶, *05cit-Patent*⁶, *05citeseerx*⁶, *citeseerx*³ and *patent*³ (*cit-Patents*) are all citation networks. *dbpedia*⁷ is a knowledge graph *Dbpedia*. *twitter*⁵ is a *DAG* transformed from a large-scale social network obtained from a crawl of *twitter.com* [30]. *web-uk*⁵ is a *DAG* of a web graph dataset. For these datasets, *email*, *LJ*, *web*, and the first seven small graphs are directed graphs initially. We transform each of them into a *DAG* by coalescing each strongly connected component into a node. Note that this can be done in linear time [28]. All other datasets are *DAGs* initially. The statistics in Table 5 are that of *DAGs*.

6.1 Reachability Ratio Computation

Reachability Ratio and Index Size: We show the reachability ratio (RR) and the index size ratio (ISR) of the 20 real datasets in Figure 5, where ISR denotes the ratio of the size of partial 2-hop labels w.r.t. k hop-nodes over the size of the 2-hop labels w.r.t. all nodes. From Figure 5 we have the following observation.

First, we can classify all datasets into three categories according to the value of their reachability ratio. The first kind of datasets (**D1**) include *amaze*, *kegg*, *email*, *LJ*, *web*, *citeseerx*, *dbpedia*, *twitter*, and *web-uk*, for which the RR is more than 99% even when $k = 1$, and both the RR and ISR almost do not change with the increase of k . The second kind of datasets (**D2**) includes *human*, *anthra*, *agrocyc*, *ecoo*, *vchocyc*, and *arxiv*, for which both RR and ISR will become larger with the increase of k . The third kind of datasets (**D3**) includes *10cit-Patent*, *10citeseerx*, *05cit-Patent*, *05citeseerx*, and *patent*, for which both RR and ISR are very small or even approach zero; and with the increase of k , both RR and ISR almost do not change. The value of k , therefore, only affects the second kind of datasets, and the reachability ratio is more than 80% when $k \geq 16$ for all datasets of the second kind, which indicates that we may benefit from using partial 2-hop labels on datasets of both the first and second kinds.

Second, the storage space used to maintain partial 2-hop labels is small compared with the reachability ratio value. For example, for the first kind of datasets, we can use about 1/4 storage space (ISR \approx 25%) to maintain more than 99% (RR $>$ 99%) reachability information.

Running Time: We show in Figure 6 the comparison of running time for reachability ratio computation, from which we have the following observations.

First, *incRR*⁺ is much faster than both *bIRR* and *incRR* on all datasets, and *incRR* works faster than *bIRR* on most datasets. For instance, *incRR*⁺ is faster than *bIRR* by more than two or three

orders of magnitude on most datasets, and *incRR* is ten times faster than *bIRR* on *amaze*, *email*, *LJ*, *web*, *citeseerx*, and *dbpedia*. The reason can be explained as follows. On one hand, Figure 5 shows the reachability ratio of different graphs w.r.t. different k . From Figure 5 we know that for *amaze*, *human*, *anthra*, *agrocyc*, *ecoo*, *vchocyc*, *kegg*, *arxiv*, *email*, *LJ*, *web*, *citeseerx*, *dbpedia*, *twitter* and *web-uk*, the reachability ratio is more than 80% when $k = 32$ for all datasets. On the other hand, according to the last to the second column of Table 5, we know that the average number of reachable nodes for nodes of each graph is usually big. Therefore, the number of tested reachability queries by *bIRR* is significantly large. Even though *incRR* can reduce the number of tested reachability queries, it still needs to test much more reachability queries than *incRR*⁺ for some datasets. For example, consider the number of tested reachability queries on *kegg* dataset when $k = 32$. The tested number of reachability queries of *bIRR* (*incRR*) is 100 (10) times more than that of *incRR*⁺. Moreover, *bIRR* and *incRR* cannot get the value of reachability ratio on both *twitter* and *web-uk* for $k \geq 2$ in limited time (24 hours), due to testing too many reachability queries.

Second, both *bIRR* and *incRR* work efficiently on datasets where the reachability ratio is small. For instance, from Figure 6 we know that *incRR*⁺ is faster than *bIRR* and *incRR* by less than ten times on *10cit-Patent*, *10citeseerx*, *05cit-Patent*, *05citeseerx*, and *patent*. The reason lies in that for these datasets, the reachability ratio is very small according to Figure 5, which means that for all algorithms, the number of tested reachability queries is much less than other datasets, therefore does not need to consume more time.

It is worth noting that when $k = 1$, the three algorithms consume similar time. The reason is that when $k = 1$, for the first hop-node v_1 , after we get A_{v_1} and D_{v_1} , we immediately know the number of reachability queries covered by \mathcal{L}_1 is $|A_{v_1}| \times |D_{v_1}| - 1$, and therefore do not need to actually test any reachability queries.

By the above experimental results, we know that our *incRR*⁺ algorithm can be used to efficiently compute the reachability ratio for a given dataset, which brings us a chance to determine whether we should use partial 2-hop labels to facilitate reachability queries processing.

6.2 Reachability Queries Processing

In this section, we combine partial 2-hop labels with the state-of-the-art algorithm, namely *FELINE* [12] (abbreviated as *FL*), to show the impact of partial 2-hop labels on reachability queries processing, in terms of index size, index construction time and query time. The experimental results are shown, respectively, in Table 6, Table 7 and Table 8, where *FL-k* denotes the *FL* algorithm combined with partial 2-hop labels that are generated based on k hop-nodes. Hence, *FL-0* is the *FL* algorithm without partial 2-hop labels. Note that for reachability queries processing, we do not set $k = 1, 2, 4, 8$, due to that when $k = 16$, we only need to use one integer as a bit-vector for each node v to represent both $L_{out}^{16}(v)$ and $L_{in}^{16}(v)$.

Index Size: Table 6 shows the impacts of k on index size, from which we know that with the increase of k , the index size will increase accordingly. For example, for *web-uk* dataset, the index size of *FL-128* is more than two times bigger than that of *FL-0* on all datasets. The reason is obvious. The larger the value of k , the more the space we need to maintain the partial 2-hop labels.

Index Construction Time: Figure 7 shows the impacts of k on index construction time, from which we know that with the increase of k , we need more time for index construction. Note that partial 2-hop labels can be constructed efficiently, and the increased time for

3. <https://code.google.com/archive/p/grail/downloads>

4. <http://snap.stanford.edu/data/index.html>

5. <https://code.google.com/p/ferrari-index/downloads/list>

6. <http://pan.baidu.com/s/1bpHkFJx>

7. <http://pan.baidu.com/s/1c00Jq5E>




Fig. 5: Comparison of Reachability Ratio (RR) and Index Size Ratio (ISR), where ISR is ratio of the index size of partial 2-hop labels w.r.t. k hop nodes over that of the total 2-hop label size w.r.t. all nodes.




Fig. 6: Running Time of different algorithms on reachability ratio computation (ms).

index construction could be omitted, due to that index construction is a one-time activity performed off-line for reachability queries processing.

Query Time: We report the query time about equal workload, which contains 1,000,000 reachability queries for each dataset. The equal workload consists of 50% reachable queries and 50% unreachable queries. The reason that we use equal workload is: using completely random queries is heavily skewed towards unreachable queries [15], [16], which is highly unlikely for the real workload as the node pair in a query tends to have a certain connection [5]. Here, unreachable queries are generated by sampling node pairs with the same probability until we reach the required number of unreachable queries by testing each query using the *FL* algorithm. For reachable queries, we cannot choose them randomly by sampling the *TC*, because *TC* computation suffers from high time and space complexity, we cannot get it within limited time and memory size for large graphs. To this problem, we randomly pick a node u in each iteration, then randomly select an out-neighbor v recursively until v has no out-neighbor. Then, we have a path p from u . At last, we randomly select a node $v \neq u$ from p to get a reachable query $u \rightsquigarrow v$. This operation will be continued until we reach the required number of reachable queries.

We show the comparison of query time for *FL-0* to *FL-128* in Table 8, from which we have the following observations.

First, *FL-16* and *FL-32* usually need the least time on the first kind of datasets **D1**, including *amaze*, *kegg*, *email*, *LJ*, *web*, *citeseerx*, *dbpedia*, *twitter* and *web-uk*, where the reachability ratio is more than 99% even when $k = 1$. For these datasets, although the index size becomes larger and the index construction time becomes longer than that of *FL-0*, we use the least cost to achieve significant improvements. For example, compared with *FL-0*, *FL-16* and *FL-32* use about 1.5 times index size and 1.2 times index construction time to achieve more than 1,000 times improvements on query time.

Second, *FL-128* suffers from the largest index size (about 3 times bigger than *FL-0*) and longest index construction time (about 1.3 times longer than *FL-0*), but achieves the best query performance on the second kind of datasets **D2**, due to that on these datasets, the reachability ratio will become larger with the increase of k . These datasets include *human*, *anthra*, *agrocyc*, *ecoo*, *vchocyc* and *arxiv*.

Third, for the third kind of datasets **D3**, including *10cit-Patent*, *10citeseerx*, *05cit-Patent*, *05citeseerx*, and *patent*, the reachability ratio is very small or even approach zero, and almost does not change with the increase of k . For these datasets, *FL-0* works best and the use of partial 2-hop labels cannot bring us any positive results. For example, compared with *FL-0* on *05cit-Patent*, the index size of *FL-128* is 2.6 times bigger than *FL-0*, and the index construction time and query time of *FL-128* are 1.04 and 1.5 times longer than that of *FL-0*.

At last, we choose one dataset from each kind and show the trend of its query time w.r.t. k in Figure 7, from which we can give out the suggestions on how to use partial 2-hop labels: (1) For the first kind of datasets **D1**, we highly recommend using partial 2-hop labels with $k = 16$ to process reachability queries, due to that we can speed up reachability queries answering significantly by affording only a little more index size and index construction time. (2) For the second kind of datasets **D2**, we also recommend using partial 2-hop labels, due to that we can speed up reachability queries answering by partial 2-hop labels. But for the value of k , it depends on your concerns on how much you could and would like to afford for the increased index size

TABLE 6: Comparison of the index size (MB).

Dataset	<i>FL-0</i>	<i>FL-16</i>	<i>FL-32</i>	<i>FL-64</i>	<i>FL-128</i>
<i>amaze</i>	0.07	0.08	0.10	0.13	0.18
<i>human</i>	0.74	0.89	1.04	1.33	1.92
<i>anthra</i>	0.24	0.29	0.33	0.43	0.62
<i>agrocyc</i>	0.24	0.29	0.34	0.43	0.63
<i>ecoo</i>	0.24	0.29	0.34	0.43	0.62
<i>vchocyc</i>	0.18	0.22	0.25	0.32	0.47
<i>kegg</i>	0.07	0.08	0.10	0.12	0.18
<i>arxiv</i>	0.11	0.14	0.16	0.20	0.30
<i>email</i>	4.4	5.3	6.2	7.9	11.5
<i>LJ</i>	18.5	22.2	25.9	33.3	48.2
<i>web</i>	7.1	8.5	9.9	12.8	18.4
<i>10cit-Patent</i>	20.9	25.1	29.3	37.7	54.4
<i>10citeseerx</i>	14.7	17.6	20.6	26.5	38.2
<i>05cit-Patent</i>	31.9	38.3	44.6	57.4	82.9
<i>05citeseerx</i>	27.8	33.3	38.9	50.0	72.3
<i>citeseerx</i>	124.7	149.7	174.6	224.5	324.3
<i>dbpedia</i>	64.2	77.0	89.9	115.5	166.9
<i>patent</i>	72.0	86.4	100.8	129.6	187.2
<i>twitter</i>	345.6	414.8	483.9	622.1	898.6
<i>web-uk</i>	434.0	520.8	607.6	781.2	1,128.4

TABLE 7: Comparison of the index construction time (ms).

Dataset	<i>FL-0</i>	<i>FL-16</i>	<i>FL-32</i>	<i>FL-64</i>	<i>FL-128</i>
<i>amaze</i>	1.03	1.10	1.35	1.41	1.49
<i>human</i>	9.01	10.01	11.50	11.65	11.67
<i>anthra</i>	2.89	2.99	3.67	3.72	3.85
<i>agrocyc</i>	2.96	3.27	3.63	4.19	3.96
<i>ecoo</i>	3.08	3.27	3.91	6.05	4.00
<i>vchocyc</i>	2.22	2.37	3.16	3.47	3.65
<i>kegg</i>	1.11	1.20	1.62	1.65	1.39
<i>arxiv</i>	4.71	4.61	6.34	7.25	8.44
<i>email</i>	81.3	77.2	91.0	86.5	87.1
<i>LJ</i>	325.1	327.3	383.9	376.3	387.8
<i>web</i>	178.5	177.9	203.8	202.7	207.6
<i>10cit-Patent</i>	801.3	803.3	862.0	832.0	862.1
<i>10citeseerx</i>	376.3	385.3	415.5	419.1	437.6
<i>05cit-Patent</i>	1,517.8	1,495.2	1,518.4	1,566.9	1,577.2
<i>05citeseerx</i>	775.6	784.8	840.0	828.8	899.1
<i>citeseerx</i>	4,063.9	4,053.7	4,500.5	4,441.1	4,562.0
<i>dbpedia</i>	2,264.3	2,371.0	2,588.6	2,607.1	2,598.4
<i>patent</i>	5,022.8	5,152.1	5,328.3	5,400.1	5,372.3
<i>twitter</i>	6,287.6	6,446.3	7,236.2	7,233.9	7,719.2
<i>web-uk</i>	8,689.7	8,774.7	9,945.0	9,991.6	10,366.0

and index construction time. In general, the larger the value of k , the less the query time, but the more the index construction time and the bigger the index size. (3) For the third kind of datasets **D3**, we do not recommend using partial 2-hop labels to process reachability queries.

7 CONCLUSION

Partial 2-hop label is a useful pruning technique for reachability queries processing. In practice, it may be powerful to answer most queries by a larger reachability ratio for some graphs, but for other graphs, its pruning ability may not be as powerful as expected, or even makes query performance degenerated on some graphs, due to small reachability ratio. In this paper, we aim at figuring out an important problem: whether we should use partial 2-hop labels for reachability queries processing for a given graph. To solve this problem, we formally defined the reachability ratio problem and proposed a set of algorithms for efficient reachability ratio computation. Our first experimental results show that compared with the baseline algorithm, our optimized algorithm can efficiently compute the reachability

TABLE 8: Comparison of the query time (ms).

Dataset	FL-0	FL-16	FL-32	FL-64	FL-128
amaze	592	30	28	30	30
human	190	37	36	35	33
anthra	133	32	32	31	32
agrocyc	137	33	31	31	31
ecoo	143	35	36	36	30
vchocyc	126	33	31	32	28
kegg	533	45	39	40	36
arxiv	1,105	594	566	554	511
email	8,091	21	24	26	40
LJ	50,811	37	42	55	83
web	39,902	58	59	71	96
10cit-Patent	248	277	285	304	412
10citeseerx	347	377	409	427	509
05cit-Patent	405	475	482	528	605
05citeseerx	452	485	489	533	633
citeseerx	162,696	575	544	554	587
dbpedia	25,344	99	104	128	176
patent	13,180	13,493	13,566	13,752	13,898
twitter	—	88	91	117	176
web-uk	—	3,197	3,230	3,478	3,701




Fig. 7: Impacts of k on query time (ms) over different datasets.

ratio for a given graph. Our second experimental results show that by combining partial 2-hop labels with an existing reachability algorithm, the query performance has different trends with the increase of the number of hop-nodes k . And based on the second experimental results, we finally give out our findings on whether we should use partial 2-hop labels for reachability queries processing. Specifically, (1) for datasets with large reachability ratio, partial 2-hop labels should be used with $k = 16$; (2) for datasets with small reachability ratio, we do not recommend using partial 2-hop labels; and (3) for the remaining datasets, partial 2-hop labels can be used, and users can determine k 's value themselves according to their requirements on index size, index construction time and query time.

8 ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was partly supported by the grants from the Natural Science Foundation of Shanghai (No. 20ZR1402700), and from the Natural Science Foundation of China (No.: 61472339, 61572421, 61272124). The authors would like to thank the anonymous referees for their insightful and valuable comments.

REFERENCES

[1] R. Agrawal, A. Borgida, and H. V. Jagadish, "Efficient management of transitive relationships in large data and knowledge bases," in *SIGMOD*, pp. 253–262, 1989.

[2] Y. Chen and Y. Chen, "An efficient algorithm for answering graph reachability queries," in *ICDE*, pp. 893–902, 2008.

[3] J. Cheng, S. Huang, H. Wu, and A. W. Fu, "Tf-label: a topological-folding labeling scheme for reachability querying in a large graph," in *SIGMOD*, pp. 193–204, 2013.

[4] E. Cohen, E. Halperin, H. Kaplan, and U. Zwick, "Reachability and distance queries via 2-hop labels," in *ACM-SIAM*, pp. 937–946, 2002.

[5] R. Jin, N. Ruan, S. Dey, and J. X. Yu, "SCARAB: scaling reachability computation on large graphs," in *SIGMOD*, pp. 169–180, 2012.

[6] R. Jin, N. Ruan, Y. Xiang, and H. Wang, "Path-tree: An efficient reachability indexing scheme for large directed graphs," *ACM Trans. Database Syst.*, vol. 36, no. 1, p. 7, 2011.

[7] R. Jin and G. Wang, "Simple, fast, and scalable reachability oracle," *PVLDB*, vol. 6, no. 14, pp. 1978–1989, 2013.

[8] R. Jin, Y. Xiang, N. Ruan, and D. Fuhry, "3-hop: a high-compression indexing scheme for reachability query," in *SIGMOD*, pp. 813–826, 2009.

[9] S. Seufert, A. Anand, S. J. Bedathur, and G. Weikum, "FERRARI: flexible and efficient reachability range assignment for graph indexing," in *ICDE*, pp. 1009–1020, 2013.

[10] S. Trißl and U. Leser, "Fast and practical indexing and querying of very large graphs," in *SIGMOD*, pp. 845–856, 2007.

[11] S. J. van Schaik and O. de Moor, "A memory efficient reachability data structure through bit vector compression," in *SIGMOD*, pp. 913–924, 2011.

[12] R. R. Veloso, L. Cerf, W. M. Junior, and M. J. Zaki, "Reachability queries in very large graphs: A fast refined online search approach," in *EDBT*, pp. 511–522, 2014.

[13] H. Wang, H. He, J. Yang, P. S. Yu, and J. X. Yu, "Dual labeling: Answering graph reachability queries in constant time," in *ICDE*, p. 75, 2006.

[14] H. Wei, J. X. Yu, C. Lu, and R. Jin, "Reachability querying: An independent permutation labeling approach," *PVLDB*, vol. 7, no. 12, pp. 1191–1202, 2014.

[15] H. Yildirim, V. Chaoji, and M. J. Zaki, "GRAIL: scalable reachability index for large graphs," *PVLDB*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 276–284, 2010.

[16] H. Yildirim, V. Chaoji, and M. J. Zaki, "GRAIL: a scalable index for reachability queries in very large graphs," *VLDB J.*, vol. 21, no. 4, pp. 509–534, 2012.

[17] J. X. Yu and J. Cheng, "Graph reachability queries: A survey," in *Managing and Mining Graph Data*, pp. 181–215, 2010.

[18] Z. Zhang, J. X. Yu, L. Qin, Q. Zhu, and X. Zhou, "I/O cost minimization: reachability queries processing over massive graphs," in *EDBT*, pp. 468–479, 2012.

[19] A. D. Zhu, W. Lin, S. Wang, and X. Xiao, "Reachability queries on large dynamic graphs: a total order approach," in *SIGMOD*, pp. 1323–1334, 2014.

[20] Y. Yano, T. Akiba, Y. Iwata, and Y. Yoshida, "Fast and scalable reachability queries on graphs by pruned labeling with landmarks and paths," in *CIKM*, pp. 1601–1606, 2013.

[21] J. Su, Q. Zhu, H. Wei, and J. X. Yu, "Reachability querying: Can it be even faster?," *IEEE Trans. Knowl. Data Eng.*, vol. 29, no. 3, pp. 683–697, 2017.

[22] J. Zhou, S. Zhou, J. X. Yu, H. Wei, Z. Chen, and X. Tang, "DAG reduction: Fast answering reachability queries," in *SIGMOD*, pp. 375–390, 2017.

[23] J. Zhou, J. X. Yu, N. Li, H. Wei, Z. Chen, and X. Tang, "Accelerating reachability query processing based on DAG reduction," *VLDB J.*, vol. 27, no. 2, pp. 271–296, 2018.

[24] N. Sengupta, A. Bagchi, M. Ramanath, and S. Bedathur, "ARROW: approximating reachability using random walks over web-scale graphs," in *35th IEEE International Conference on Data Engineering, ICDE 2019, Macao, China, April 8-11, 2019*, pp. 470–481, 2019.

[25] S. Wadhwa, A. Prasad, S. Ranu, A. Bagchi, and S. Bedathur, "Efficiently answering regular simple path queries on large labeled networks," in *SIGMOD 2019*, 2019.

[26] M. Du, A. Yang, J. Zhou, X. Tang, Z. Chen, and Y. Zuo, "HT: A novel labeling scheme for k-hop reachability queries on dags," *IEEE Access*, vol. 7, pp. 172110–172122, 2019.

[27] X. Tang, Z. Chen, K. Li, and X. Liu, "Efficient computation of the transitive closure size," *Clust. Comput.*, vol. 22, no. Supplement, pp. 6517–6527, 2019.

[28] R. E. Tarjan, "Depth-first search and linear graph algorithms," *SIAM J. Comput.*, vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 146–160, 1972.

[29] T. Akiba, Y. Iwata, and Y. Yoshida, "Fast exact shortest-path distance queries on large networks by pruned landmark labeling," in *Proceedings of the ACM SIGMOD International Conference on Management of Data, SIGMOD 2013, New York, NY, USA, June 22-27, 2013*, pp. 349–360, 2013.

[30] M. Cha, H. Haddadi, F. Benevenuto, and P. K. Gummadi, "Measuring user influence in twitter: The million follower fallacy," in *ICWSM*, 2010.