

---

# Asynchronous Algorithmic Alignment with Cocycles

---

Andrew Dudzik<sup>1</sup> Tamara von Glehn<sup>1</sup> Razvan Pascanu<sup>1</sup> Petar Veličković<sup>1</sup>

## Abstract

State-of-the-art neural algorithmic reasoners make use of message passing in graph neural networks (GNNs). But typical GNNs blur the distinction between the definition and invocation of the message function, forcing a node to send messages to its neighbours at every layer, synchronously. When applying GNNs to learn to execute dynamic programming algorithms, however, on most steps only a handful of the nodes would have meaningful updates to send. One, hence, runs the risk of inefficiencies by sending too much irrelevant data across the graph—with many intermediate GNN steps having to learn identity functions. In this work, we explicitly separate the concepts of node state update and message function invocation. With this separation, we obtain a mathematical formulation that allows us to reason about asynchronous computation in both algorithms and neural networks.

## 1. Introduction

The message passing primitive—performing computation by aggregating information sent between neighbouring entities (Gilmer et al., 2017; Battaglia et al., 2016)—is known to be remarkably powerful. All the neural network architectures discussed within the geometric deep learning blueprint (Bronstein et al., 2021) can be elegantly expressible using message passing. Under appropriate assumptions on available capacity, message passing is known to be Turing-complete (Loukas, 2019). Indeed, it has been argued that all of discrete deep learning could be phrased using message passing (Veličković, 2022)—and the optimality of message passing has recently been proved for the case of sparse graphs (Baranwal et al., 2023).

<sup>1</sup>Google DeepMind. Correspondence to: Andrew Dudzik <adudzik@deepmind.com>, Tamara von Glehn <tamaravg@deepmind.com>, Razvan Pascanu <razp@deepmind.com>, Petar Veličković <petarv@deepmind.com>.

Perhaps most importantly, message passing is the core primitive in *graph neural networks* (Veličković, 2023, GNNs), a prominent family of deep learning models. Owing to the ubiquity of graphs as an abstraction for describing the *structure* of systems—both natural and artificial—GNNs have recently enjoyed immense popularity across both scientific and industrial applications, including novel drug screening (Stokes et al., 2020; Liu et al., 2023), designing next-generation machine learning chips (Mirhoseini et al., 2021), serving travel-time estimates (Derrow-Pinion et al., 2021), particle physics (DeZoort et al., 2023), uncovering structure of glassy systems (Bapst et al., 2020), and to aid settling long-standing problems in pure mathematics (Davies et al., 2021; Blundell et al., 2021; Williamson, 2023).

Another active area of research for GNNs is *neural algorithmic reasoning* (Veličković & Blundell, 2021, NAR). NAR is an emerging area of machine learning that seeks to design neural network architectures that capture *classical computation*, largely by learning to execute it (Veličković et al., 2019). This is an important problem in the light of today’s large-scale models, as they tend to struggle in performing exactly the kinds of computations that classical algorithms can trivially capture (Lewkowycz et al., 2022).

The use of GNNs in NAR is largely due to the theory of *algorithmic alignment* (Xu et al., 2019): the observation that, as we increase the structural similarity between a neural network and an algorithm, it will be able to learn to execute this algorithm with improved sampled complexity. Specifically, recently there has been multiple theoretical works—leveraging various tools like neural tangent kernels (Xu et al., 2020) and category theory (Dudzik & Veličković, 2022)—demonstrating that message passing aligns well with the *dynamic programming* paradigm (Bellman, 1966). This observation has made GNNs attractive, as dynamic programming offers a generic framework for problem-solving: breaking problems down into simpler subproblems, recursively solving the subproblems, and recombining the results to obtain the final solution (De Moor, 1994).

## 2. Our contributions, at a glance

In this work, we make novel contributions to the theory of algorithmic alignment. Our approach “zooms in” on the theoretical analysis in (Dudzik & Veličković, 2022), which




Figure 1. The framework we establish here allows us to reason about how GNNs behave under various forms of *asynchronous computation*. While traditional GNNs send and receive all messages synchronously at every step, under our model, at any step the GNN may choose to execute any number of possible operations (here the possible operations are depicted as organised in a collection, to the right of the graph). Here we demonstrate a specific asynchronous GNN execution trace. **Left-to-right:** We first choose to update the features of node  $u$  using the message sent from node  $b$ . This triggers a request for messages to be generated to all of  $u$ 's neighbours ( $b, d, e$ ). In the next step, we choose to compute the message sent from  $u$  to  $d$ . As a result, a new update for  $d$  can be performed, using the just-computed message.

analysed computations—of both algorithms and GNNs—in a *graph-centric* view. Instead, we center our discussion on a *node-centric* view: analysing the computations happening around individual nodes in the graph, in isolation.

This node-centric perspective allows us to make an important observation: in all of the previously studied GNN architectures, it was implicitly assumed that all the messages in a given GNN layer were passed all-at-once and *synchronously* aggregated in each receiver node. This assumption also significantly influenced previous efforts to align GNNs and algorithms, including the currently popular NAR benchmark, CLRS-30 (Veličković et al., 2022). CLRS-30 comprises a diverse set of thirty classical algorithms from the Introduction to Algorithms textbook (Cormen et al., 2022), all of which have been expressed in such a synchronous format. But,

*Are all classical algorithms most easily described as synchronous parallel communication?*

The answer to this question is **no**. While some algorithms, such as Bellman-Ford (Bellman, 1958) or Floyd-Warshall (Floyd, 1962), may neatly fit within this paradigm,<sup>1</sup> it is well-known that many algorithms tend to modify only a *small fraction* of the nodes at each atomic step (Bevilacqua et al., 2023). For example, many sorting algorithms can only compare and swap a single pair of elements at once, with subsequent steps depending on the outcomes of these swaps. Clearly, for most forms of classical computation, it is unrealistic to expect us to be able to meaningfully update all of the nodes at once—in many cases, synchronised updates to individual nodes will mostly amount to identity functions. Fitting such sparse-update computation with (G)NNs has led to solutions that were either very brittle (Graves et al., 2014; 2016) or requiring vast amounts of strong supervision

<sup>1</sup>And note that even these examples can be implemented in distributed, asynchronous settings.

(Veličković et al., 2020; Strathmann et al., 2021). This problem gets even further exacerbated when GNNs are used to fit multiple algorithms at once (Xhonneux et al., 2021; Ibarz et al., 2022). Additionally, asynchrony can bring about different benefits, such as computations that are easier to parallelise or distribute, and the ability to deal with extremely large graphs. This naturally invites the question:

*Do we need full synchrony in graph neural networks?*

In this work we argue that the answer is **no**. Indeed, there is nothing about the message passing paradigm which requires all messages to be sent in parallel, or aggregated synchronously. We will demonstrate how studying message passing under various synchronisation regimes can help us identify choices of message functions that better align with target algorithms, in a manner that was not possible under previous frameworks—indeed, it allows us to theoretically justify the unreasonable effectiveness of architectures such as PathGNNs (Tang et al., 2020) at fitting algorithmic tasks. We refer to our new framework as *asynchronous algorithmic alignment*, and formalise it using the tools of category theory, monoid actions, and cocycles. To visualise how executing an asynchronous GNN might look like, please refer to Figure 1.


With regards to our contributions, we hence propose a framework that allows us to study the alignment of graph neural networks to algorithmic computation at a more fine-grained level, leveraging the concept of synchrony. While fully-synchronous GNNs are amenable to efficient implementation in tensor frameworks (Fey & Lenssen, 2019; Wang et al., 2019; Ferludin et al., 2022; Godwin\* et al., 2020), we argue that our analysis allows us to discover better-aligned message passing primitives. For now, we defer empirical exploration of these asynchronous GNNs and analysis of the benefits they might provide to future work.

### 3. Message passing

We will use the definition of GNNs based on Bronstein et al. (2021). Let a graph be a tuple of *nodes* and *edges*,  $G = (V, E)$ , with one-hop neighbourhoods defined as  $\mathcal{N}_u = \{v \in V \mid (v, u) \in E\}$ . Further, a node feature matrix  $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{|V| \times k}$  gives the features of node  $u$  as  $\mathbf{x}_u$ ; we omit edge- and graph-level features for clarity. A (*message passing*) GNN over this graph is then executed as:

$$\mathbf{x}'_u = \phi \left( \mathbf{x}_u, \bigoplus_{v \in \mathcal{N}_u} \psi(\mathbf{x}_u, \mathbf{x}_v) \right) \quad (1)$$

To put this equation in more abstract terms, we start by briefly reviewing the diagram of the message-passing framework of Dudzik & Veličković (2022), with the addition of the message function  $\psi$  to emphasise the symmetry:



First, sender features (*senders*) are duplicated along outgoing edges to form the arguments (*args*) to a message function  $\psi$ . These arguments are collected into a list using the  $\otimes$  operator—which is traditionally a concatenation operation, though as per Dudzik & Veličković (2022), it can be any operator with a monoidal structure. This list of arguments now lives on a new, transient, *edge* datatype. These two steps constitute a *gather* operation. In Equation 1, this corresponds to copying the node features in  $\mathbf{X}$ , considered as a  $V$ -indexed tensor, to obtain feature pairs  $(\mathbf{x}_u, \mathbf{x}_v)$ , considered as an  $E$ -indexed tensor.


Note that here, the *senders* do not necessarily correspond to the more established notion of “sender nodes” in graph representation learning (Battaglia et al., 2018)—rather, we consider a node to be a sender if its features are necessary to compute the message function  $\psi$ . Hence, in Equation 1, we consider both the features of nodes  $u$  and  $v$  to be “senders”, rather than assuming that only  $v$  is a sender node. This idea also allows us to easily extend this idea to messages spanning arbitrary numbers of inputs living on various places in the graph. For example, if edge features are present and used for  $\psi$ , we can include them as part of *senders* also.

Next, we perform a similar operation, a *scatter*, by first applying the message function  $\psi$  to the arguments, which computes the messages to be sent (*msgs*). Then, messages are copied to suitable receivers, which aggregate along their

incoming edges to form the final set of receiver node features (*receivers*). In Equation 1, this refers to the application of the message function  $\psi$ , and the aggregation  $\bigoplus$ .

This general gather-scatter paradigm can be seen throughout the literature on message passing, for example in the sheaf Laplacian of (Bodnar et al., 2023). However, we still need to clarify the role of the *update function*,  $\phi$ , which uses the aggregated receiver features  $\bigoplus_{v \in \mathcal{N}_u} \psi(\mathbf{x}_u, \mathbf{x}_v)$  to produce the next step’s senders. Hence, our main interest now is in the reverse process: How can a node convert received messages back into sendable arguments, so the overall computation steps can be chained?

Recall that we make the assumption that edge messages are *transient*<sup>2</sup>, meaning we do not need to store them across several iterations of Equation 1. Conversely, the nodes make use of a *persistent* state which gets updated at each iteration. It is the interaction with this state that allows nodes to perform nontrivial functions in interesting message passing schemes. We capture the stateful nature of this computation in the following complementary diagram:



We will make two assumptions: (1) the sender features should have the structure of a *commutative monoid*. This implies that we can think of the message function arguments being sent in chunks, which may be assembled in any order. And (2) the receiver features should have the structure of a *monoid*, not necessarily commutative. We can think of these received messages as being *instructions* which transform the state. The monoid operation corresponds to composition of these transformations.

### 4. Node-centric view on algorithmic alignment

For this section, we focus our attention on a single node, and explore the relationship between the message monoid, which we write as  $(M, \cdot, 1)$  using multiplicative notation, and the argument commutative monoid, which we write as  $(A, +, 0)$  using additive notation.

<sup>2</sup>We remark that there are several GNN variants which persist the edge messages over many steps, e.g. the Graph Network model (Battaglia et al., 2018). However, it should always be possible to redefine the set of edges and nodes such that this computation is equivalently represented, while enforcing edges to have transient states (Veličković, 2022).

Suppose that the internal state takes values in a set  $S$ . The process by which a received message updates the state and produces an argument is described by a function  $M \times S \rightarrow S \times A$ . This is equivalent, by currying, to a Kleisli arrow  $M \rightarrow [S, S \times A] = \text{state}_S(A)$  for the state monad.

Given a pair  $(m, s)$ , we denote the image under this function by  $(m \cdot s, \delta_m(s))$ , where  $\cdot : M \times S \rightarrow S$  is written as a binary operation and  $\delta : M \times S \rightarrow A$  is given by some argument function. First, we look into the properties of  $\cdot$ .

Each incoming message (an element of  $M$ ) transforms the state (an element of  $S$ ) in some way. We assume that the multiplication of  $M$  corresponds to a composition of these transformations. Specifically, we ask that  $\cdot$  satisfies the unit and associativity axioms:

$$\begin{aligned} 1 \cdot s &= s \\ (n \cdot m) \cdot s &= n \cdot (m \cdot s) \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

Next, we interpret Equation 2 in terms of the argument function  $\delta$ . In the first equation, the action  $1 \cdot s$  generates an argument  $\delta_1(s)$ . But on the right-hand side there is no action, so no argument is produced. In order to process both sides consistently,  $\delta_1(s)$  must be the zero argument.

Similarly, in the second equation, the left-hand side produces one argument  $\delta_{n \cdot m}(s)$ , while the right-hand side produces two,  $\delta_m(s)$  and  $\delta_n(m \cdot s)$ . Setting these equal, we have the following two argument axioms:

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_1(s) &= 0 \\ \delta_{n \cdot m}(s) &= \delta_m(s) + \delta_n(m \cdot s) \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

Equivalently, we could arrive at these equations by extending the action of  $M$  on  $S$  to an action of  $M$  on  $S \times A$ , as follows. Given a pair  $(s, a)$  of a state  $s$  together with an outgoing argument  $a$ , we act on the state, while generating a new argument that gets added to the old one:  $m \star (s, a) := (m \cdot s, a + \delta_m(s))$ . It is not hard to see that Equation 3 is exactly the unit and associativity axioms for the operator  $\star$ .

#### 4.1. Cocycles

Equation 3 can be rewritten in a more elegant mathematical form, but this requires a few preliminaries.

First, consider the set  $F = [S, A]$  of *readout functions*; functions mapping states to corresponding arguments.  $F$  inherits structure from both  $S$  and  $A$ . First,  $F$  is a commutative monoid because  $A$  is; we define a zero function  $0(s) := 0$  and function addition  $(f + g)(s) := f(s) + g(s)$ .

Second,  $F$  has an action of  $M$ , given by  $(f \cdot m)(s) := f(m \cdot s)$ . Importantly, this is a right action rather than a left action; the associativity axiom  $f \cdot (m \cdot n) = (f \cdot m) \cdot n$  holds but the reversed axiom fails unless  $M$  is commutative.

With these definitions, if we write  $\delta$  in its curried form  $D : M \rightarrow [S, A]$ , we can rewrite Equation 3 as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} D(1) &= 0 \\ D(n \cdot m) &= D(m) + D(n) \cdot m \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Equation 4 specifies that  $D$  is a *1-cocycle*, otherwise known as a *derivation*. To understand the latter term, consider the more general situation where  $F$  also has a left action of  $M$ . Then we may write  $D(n \cdot m) = n \cdot D(m) + D(n) \cdot m$ , which is just the Leibniz rule for the derivative. Our equation describes the special case where this left action is trivial.

Note that group cocycles are most commonly defined in terms of left actions. To convert between the two descriptions, we can replace  $M$  by its opposite  $M^{\text{op}}$ , defined to be the monoid with the same underlying set as  $M$ , but reversed multiplication. Since inversion gives an isomorphism of any group with its opposite, it's a standard technique to let a group act on the left on functions by  $(gf)(s) := f(g^{-1}s)$ . This technique is heavily leveraged in group convolutional neural networks (Cohen & Welling, 2016).

## 5. (A)synchrony in GNNs

With the mathematical preliminaries ironed out, we can now leverage the cocycle conditions to more rigorously discuss the synchronisation of GNN operations (such as gathers, scatters, and applications of  $\psi$  or  $\phi$ ). In the process of our discussion, we will show how our theory elegantly re-derives a well-known neural algorithmic reasoning model.

Before we begin, we prove a highly useful relationship between cocycles and idempotent commutative monoids.

### 5.1. Technical preliminaries

We say that  $A$  is *idempotent* if  $a + a = a$  for all  $a \in A$ .

**Proposition 5.1.** *Suppose that  $S = A$ . Define:*

$$\delta_m(s) := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } m = 1 \\ m \cdot s & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

*If  $\delta$  is a 1-cocycle, then  $A$  is idempotent. If  $M = S = A$  and  $\cdot = +$ , the converse holds.*

*Proof.* In this case, the second equation of Equation 3 becomes  $(n \cdot m) \cdot s = m \cdot s + n \cdot (m \cdot s)$ . Setting  $n = m = 1$  gives  $s = s + s$ .

If  $\cdot = +$  and  $A$  is idempotent, then the equation is  $n + m + s = m + s + n + m + s$ , which holds since  $m + s + n + m + s = (m + s) + n + (m + s) = m + s + n$ .  $\square$

## 5.2. Making $\phi$ a cocycle enables asynchrony

Now we can explicitly formalise the residual map  $\phi$  in Equation 1: it is just another description of what we have called an ‘‘action’’. That is, we have  $\phi(s, m) = m \cdot s$  for all node features  $s$  and (aggregated) non-null messages  $m$ .

**Message aggregation asynchrony**  $\oplus$  is usually taken, axiomatically, to be the operation of a commutative monoid (Ong & Veličković, 2022). This is to emphasise the importance of message aggregation that does not depend on the order in which the messages are received. That is, letting  $\oplus$  define a commutative monoid operation already allows us to support a certain form of asynchrony: we can aggregate messages online as we receive them, rather than waiting for all of them before triggering  $\oplus$ .

**Node update asynchrony** Similarly, the axiom that  $\phi$  defines an associative operation, as in Equation 2, corresponds to another type of asynchrony. When  $\phi$  satisfies the associativity equation:

$$\phi(s, m \oplus n) = \phi(\phi(s, m), n) \quad (5)$$

this tells us that  $\phi$  itself can be applied asynchronously. Put differently, after each message arrives into the receiver node, we can use it to update the node features by triggering  $\phi$ , without waiting for the messages to be fully aggregated.

One common way to enforce associativity is to take  $\phi = \oplus$ , in which case the associativity of  $\phi$  follows from the assumed associativity of  $\oplus$ .

**Argument generation asynchrony** While these two conditions allow us to reason about the asynchrony in how incoming messages are processed, and the asynchrony in how the node’s features are updated, what does the cocycle condition (Equation 3) mean for a GNN?

Recall, the cocycle condition concerns the argument function  $\delta$ , which determines which arguments are produced after a node update. Specifically, the cocycle condition allows us to express the arguments produced by receiving two messages together ( $\delta_{n \cdot m}$ ) as a combination of the arguments produced by receiving them in isolation ( $\delta_n$  and  $\delta_m$ ). Therefore, it gives us a mechanism that allows for each sender node to prepare their arguments to the message function,  $\psi$ , asynchronously, rather than waiting for all the relevant node updates to complete first.

Note that Equation 1 does not distinguish between node features and sent arguments. In other words, it implicitly defines the argument function  $\delta_m(s) = m \cdot s = \phi(s, m)$ .

Now we can leverage the converse direction of Proposition 5.1, to provide some conditions under which the update function  $\phi$  will satisfy the cocycle condition:

First, we require the state update (which we previously set to  $\phi = \oplus$ ) to be idempotent. Not all commutative monoids are idempotent;  $\oplus = \max$  is idempotent, while other aggregators, like sum, are not. Note that this aligns with the utility of the max aggregation in algorithmic tasks, as observed by several prior works (Veličković et al., 2019; Xu et al., 2020; Dudzik & Veličković, 2022).

Second, we require  $M = S = A$ , which means that the messages sent must come from the same set of values as the node features and the arguments to the message function. This means that the dimensionality of the node features, arguments and messages should be the same—or alternately, that invoking the message or update functions should not change this dimensionality. This can be related to the encode-process-decode paradigm (Hamrick et al., 2018): advocating for the use of a *processor module*, repeatedly applied to its inputs for a certain number of steps.

Note that this is only one possible way to enforce the cocycle condition in  $\phi$ ; we remark that there might be more approaches to achieving this, including approximating the cocycle condition by optimising relevant loss functions.

## 5.3. The rich asynchrony of max-max GNNs

It is worthwhile to take a brief pause and collect all of the constraints we have gathered so far:

- $\oplus$  is a commutative monoid;
- $\phi = \oplus$ ;
- $\oplus$  must be idempotent, e.g.,  $\oplus = \max$ ;
- The message function should output messages which have the same dimensionality as node features.

We can observe that Equation 1 now looks as follows:

$$\mathbf{x}'_u = \max \left( \mathbf{x}_u, \max_{v \in \mathcal{N}_u} \psi(\mathbf{x}_u, \mathbf{x}_v) \right) \quad (6)$$

Such a max-max GNN variant allows for a high level of *asynchrony*: messages can be sent, received and processed in an arbitrary order, arguments can be prepared in an on-line fashion, and it is mathematically guaranteed that the outcome will be identical as if we fully synchronise all of these steps, as is the case in typical GNN implementations.

The only remaining point of synchronisation is the invocation of the message function,  $\psi$ ; messages can only be generated once all of the arguments for the message function are fully prepared (i.e., no invocations of  $\phi$  are left to perform for the relevant sender nodes). Note that this is still a substantially weaker level of synchronisation compared to the typical GNN: it can be performed at the local level (per

each edge that transmits messages), and the idempotence condition allows us to not need to pay attention to what is happening in the rest of the graph.

However, remarkably, there is a way to enable *full asynchrony* in GNNs, but this requires imposing additional constraints on  $\psi$ . We explore a special case of this below.

#### 5.4. Rediscovering and extending PathGNNs

To start, we can remark that Equation 6 is almost exactly equal to the hard variant of the PathGNN model from Tang et al. (2020). The only missing aspect is to remove the dependence of  $\psi$  on the receiver node (i.e., to remove  $u$  from the sender $s$ ), as follows:

$$\mathbf{x}'_u = \max \left( \mathbf{x}_u, \max_{v \in \mathcal{N}_u} \psi(\mathbf{x}_v) \right) \quad (7)$$

This modelling choice is very useful—in fact, it will allow us to rigorously discuss when can such a model reach *full asynchrony*; that is, where we do not even need to wait on the argument to  $\psi$  to be fully prepared by previous steps.

Note that in many cases of interest, PathGNNs may have access to useful *edge features*. In these cases, they are assumed to be fixed and constant throughout execution, so we can consider them “embedded” within  $\psi$ ’s definition, to keep the exposition simpler.

**Message generation asynchrony** As previously mentioned, in general, we think of the message function  $\psi$  as being a point of synchronisation, which blocks until it has the final values for each of its arguments.

However, under certain conditions  $\psi$  may safely be invoked with only partially prepared arguments. PathGNNs give one example of *isotropic* message passing, where the message function for each edge,  $\psi_e$ , is a function of a single variable, the sender argument, and produces a single output, a receiver message. That is, we have a function  $\psi_e : (A_{s(e)}, +, 0) \rightarrow (M_{t(e)}, \cdot, 1)$ .

We say that  $\psi$  is a *monoid homomorphism* if it satisfies the following two properties:

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(0) &= 1 \\ \psi(a + b) &= \psi(a) \cdot \psi(b) \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

The first property of Equations 8 merely states that no message is produced (the “null message”, 1) if no argument is prepared (the “null argument”, 0). The second says exactly that, given two arguments, aggregating them and then applying  $\psi$  is the same as applying  $\psi$  on each of them first, then aggregating the corresponding produced messages.

This is exactly the condition needed for argument asynchrony and message asynchrony to be compatible. It means

that  $\psi$  can be called—and messages generated—even before its arguments are fully ready, so long as it is called again each time the arguments are updated.

Note that PathGNNs, in their default formulation, do not always satisfy this constraint. We have, therefore, used our analysis to find a way to extend PathGNNs to a *fully asynchronous* model. One way to obtain such a GNN is to make  $\psi$  be a *tropical linear* transformation. That is,  $\psi$  would be parametrised by a  $k \times k$  matrix, which is multiplied with  $\mathbf{x}_v$ , but replacing “+” with max and “ $\cdot$ ” with +.

In the non-isotropic case, where  $\psi$  may take multiple arguments, different properties of  $\psi$  may correspond to different forms of potential asynchrony. Since various DP algorithms can be parallelised in many different ways, we consider this case a promising avenue for future exploration.

Originally, PathGNN was designed to align with the Bellman-Ford algorithm (Bellman, 1958), due to its claimed structural similarity to the algorithm’s operation—though this claim was not rigorously established.

Now, using our mathematical framework, we can rigorously conclude where this alignment comes from: the choice of aggregator (max) and making  $\psi$  only dependent on one sender node is fully aligned with the Bellman-Ford algorithm (as in Xu et al. (2020)), and both PathGNNs and Bellman-Ford can be implemented fully asynchronously without any errors in the final output.

We have already showed that PathGNNs satisfy the cocycle condition; now we will prove the same statement about Bellman-Ford, in order to complete our argument.

## 6. Examples

We now present two worked examples of classical algorithms (Bellman-Ford and addition with carry) that naturally and provably lend themselves to corresponding cocycles.

### 6.1. Semilattices and Bellman-Ford

Let  $P$  be any join-semilattice, i.e. a poset with all finite joins, including the empty join, which we denote 0 as it is a lower bound for  $P$ . A standard result says that  $P$  is equivalently a commutative, idempotent monoid  $(P, \vee, 0)$ . When  $P$  is totally ordered, we usually write  $\vee = \sup$  or  $\max$ .

In Bellman-Ford,  $P$  will generally be either the set of all path lengths, (taken with a negative sign) or the set of all relevant paths ending at the current vertex, equipped with a total order that disambiguates between paths of equal length.

We set  $M = S = A = P$ , with action of  $M$  on  $S$  given by  $m \cdot s := m \vee s$ .

Since we want to inform our neighbors when our state improves, i.e. gets smaller, we could likewise define our argument function  $\delta$  by  $\delta_m(s) := m \vee s$ , as this in fact satisfies the cocycle equation due to Proposition 5.1. However, this will lead to an algorithm that never terminates, as new redundant arguments will continue to be generated at each step.

So we define the argument function a bit more delicately:<sup>3</sup>

$$\delta_m(s) := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } m \leq s \\ m \vee s & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

**Proposition 6.1.**  $\delta$  is a 1-cocycle  $M \rightarrow [S, A]$ .

*Proof.* Pick  $m, n \in M$ ,  $s \in S$ . We wish to show that  $\delta_{m \vee n}(s) = \delta_m(n \vee s) \vee \delta_n(s)$ .

If  $m, n \leq s$  then both sides equal 0. If  $m \leq s$  but  $n \not\leq s$  then the LHS is  $m \vee n \vee s = n \vee s$  while the RHS is  $0 \vee (n \vee s)$ . If  $n \leq s$  but  $m \not\leq s$  then the LHS is  $m \vee n \vee s = m \vee s$  while the RHS is  $(m \vee n \vee s) \vee 0 = m \vee s$ .  $\square$

Now, we can see that the definition of  $\delta$  prevents new arguments from being generated once the optimal value has been obtained, if we take the convention that zero arguments are ignored. In particular, if  $P$  is well-ordered, only finitely many arguments can be generated regardless of the input.

Lastly, note that Bellman-Ford is also a perfect example of message generation asynchrony; its  $\psi_e$ , for each edge, simply adds the edge length of  $e$  to the sender node distance.  $+$  is easily seen to distribute over  $\max$ , making  $\psi_e$  a monoid homomorphism. All conditions combined, Bellman-Ford can be indeed made fully asynchronous, without sacrificing the fidelity of the final output. This solidifies the algorithmic alignment of our PathGNN variant with Bellman-Ford.

## 6.2. The natural numbers and addition with carry

If  $M = (\mathbb{N}, +, 0)$  is the monoid of natural numbers under addition,<sup>4</sup> then an action of  $M$  on a set  $S$  is equivalently an endofunction  $\pi : S \rightarrow S$ , with  $m \cdot s := \pi^m(s)$ .

The following proposition gives a characterisation of all possibly cocycles  $M \rightarrow [S, A]$ .

**Proposition 6.2.** *Given any function  $\omega : S \rightarrow A$ , there is a unique 1-cocycle  $\delta$  with  $\delta_1 = \omega$ .*

*Proof.* If  $\delta$  is a cocycle and  $\omega = \delta_1$ , the cocycle condition gives us an inductive definition of  $\delta$ :

<sup>3</sup>If  $P$  has more structure, say if it is a lattice with relative complements, then we can improve on this equation further by sending the complement argument  $m \setminus s$ .

<sup>4</sup>Note that we are using additive notation here, so the identity element is denoted 0 instead of 1.

$$\delta_{n+1}(s) = \delta_n(s) + \delta_1(s + n)$$

On the other hand, given  $\omega$  we can define:

$$\delta_n(s) := \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \omega(s + i)$$

We note that  $\delta_{m+n} = \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} \omega(s + i) + \sum_{j=m}^{m+n-1} \omega(s + j) = \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} \omega(s + i) + \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \omega(m + s + j) = \delta_m(s) + \delta_n(m + s)$  so  $\delta$  is a 1-cocycle.  $\square$

Now, we consider the example of digit arithmetic with carries. Suppose that  $S = \{0, \dots, 9\}$  is the set of digits in base 10, and our action is given by the permutation  $\pi(s) = \overline{s + 1}$ , where the bar denotes reduction modulo 10.

If  $M = (\mathbb{N}, +)$ , we can define an argument function based on the number of carries produced when 1 is added to  $s$   $m$  times:

$$\delta_m(s) := \left\lfloor \frac{m + s}{10} \right\rfloor$$

**Proposition 6.3.**  $\delta$  is a 1-cocycle  $M \rightarrow [S, A]$ .

*Proof.* We directly verify that, for all  $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $s \in \{0, \dots, 9\}$ :<sup>5</sup>

$$\left\lfloor \frac{m + n + s}{10} \right\rfloor = \left\lfloor \frac{m + \overline{n + s}}{10} \right\rfloor + \left\lfloor \frac{n + s}{10} \right\rfloor$$

This follows quickly by induction on  $m$ : for  $m = 0$  the two sides are equal, and as  $m$  increments by 1, the LHS and RHS are both incremented if and only if  $m + n + s + 1 \equiv 0 \pmod{10}$ .  $\square$

## 7. Discussion

In this work we take a *node-centric* perspective on the computation of the message passing mechanism. We note that this allows us to reason about the asynchrony of the updates on the node *persistent* state, where the cocycle conditions are necessary in order to support asynchronous updates. We show that these conditions are respected for Bellman-Ford algorithm as well as an extension of the recently-proposed PathGNN (Tang et al., 2020), and can be used a principle to discover other GNN formulations that allow complete asynchronous execution.

Through our analysis we provide a complementary perspective on formally describing computations carried by both

<sup>5</sup>We could instead verify that  $\delta$  can be put in the form of the previous proposition, but this amounts to the same proof.

algorithms and graph neural networks, which we believe to be a step forward towards further formalising the concept of algorithmic alignment that is widely relied on by approaches for neural algorithmic reasoning. Note that our approach does not compel actual GNNs to be asynchronous—rather, it imposes mathematical constraints on the GNNs’ building blocks, such that, *if we were to execute it in a particular asynchronous regime, it would behave identically to the target algorithm*. Such a correspondence, naturally, improves the level of algorithmic alignment enjoyed by the GNN.

However, it should also be highlighted that here, we have studied mainly the maximally-asynchronous regime (and the corresponding algorithms having this property, such as Bellman-Ford (Bellman, 1958)). We expect the most interesting results, architectures and correspondences will emerge from our model once we study more intricate forms of synchronisation. Such forms might also necessitate a more formal treatment of the *scheduling mechanism* that decides which computations are performed and when. Establishing links to related computer science fields—like queueing theory—is also likely.

In order to provide just one strong motivation for modelling various forms of synchronisation, we chart a path for how we can use it to derive self-attention (Vaswani et al., 2017; Veličković et al., 2017), which has traditionally been difficult to reconcile with the form in Equation 1 due to the coordination required between neighbours to compute a normalising coefficient.

### 7.1. Attention as synchronised message passing

Consider message passing along edges whose weights are determined by a Transformer-style self-attention mechanism. For example, suppose that nodes  $a, b, c$  send to node  $u$ , where the values  $\mathbf{v}_a, \mathbf{v}_b, \mathbf{v}_c$  are multiplied by attention coefficients  $(\alpha_a, \alpha_b, \alpha_c) = \text{softmax}(\mathbf{q}_u^\top \mathbf{k}_a, \mathbf{q}_u^\top \mathbf{k}_b, \mathbf{q}_u^\top \mathbf{k}_c)$ , to give final messages of  $\alpha_a \mathbf{v}_a, \alpha_b \mathbf{v}_b, \alpha_c \mathbf{v}_c$ .

At first glance, this looks incompatible with the notion of asynchronous message aggregation, since the normalisation step of the softmax means we have to compute all the messages simultaneously.

To address this, we may introduce a synchronisation step via a multivariate message function:

$$\psi_u(\mathbf{q}_u, \mathbf{v}_a, \mathbf{k}_a, \mathbf{v}_b, \mathbf{k}_b, \mathbf{v}_c, \mathbf{k}_c) := \text{softmax}(\mathbf{q}_u^\top \mathbf{k}_a, \mathbf{q}_u^\top \mathbf{k}_b, \mathbf{q}_u^\top \mathbf{k}_c) \odot (\mathbf{v}_a, \mathbf{v}_b, \mathbf{v}_c) \quad (9)$$

where  $\odot$  is an elementwise product.

Hence, we have a single message function whose arguments come from all four nodes, and whose output maps to the three incoming edges. Since  $\psi$  blocks on waiting for the entire computation to finish, once the messages are produced we are free to aggregate them asynchronously as usual.

## References

- Bapst, V., Keck, T., Grabska-Barwińska, A., Donner, C., Cubuk, E. D., Schoenholz, S. S., Obika, A., Nelson, A. W., Back, T., Hassabis, D., et al. Unveiling the predictive power of static structure in glassy systems. *Nature Physics*, 16(4):448–454, 2020.
- Baranwal, A., Jagannath, A., and Fountoulakis, K. Optimality of message-passing architectures for sparse graphs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.10391*, 2023.
- Battaglia, P. W., Pascanu, R., Lai, M., Rezende, D. J., and Kavukcuoglu, K. Interaction networks for learning about objects, relations and physics. *NeurIPS*, abs/1612.00222, 2016.
- Battaglia, P. W., Hamrick, J. B., Bapst, V., Sanchez-Gonzalez, A., Zambaldi, V., Malinowski, M., Tacchetti, A., Raposo, D., Santoro, A., Faulkner, R., et al. Relational inductive biases, deep learning, and graph networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1806.01261*, 2018.
- Bellman, R. On a routing problem. *Quarterly of applied mathematics*, 16(1):87–90, 1958.
- Bellman, R. Dynamic programming. *Science*, 153(3731):34–37, 1966.
- Bevilacqua, B., Nikiforou, K., Ibarz, B., Bica, I., Paganini, M., Blundell, C., Mitrovic, J., and Veličković, P. Neural algorithmic reasoning with causal regularisation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.10258*, 2023.
- Blundell, C., Buesing, L., Davies, A., Veličković, P., and Williamson, G. Towards combinatorial invariance for kazhdan-lusztig polynomials. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2111.15161*, 2021.
- Bodnar, C., Giovanni, F. D., Chamberlain, B. P., Liò, P., and Bronstein, M. M. Neural sheaf diffusion: A topological perspective on heterophily and oversmoothing in gnn, 2023.
- Bronstein, M. M., Bruna, J., Cohen, T., and Veličković, P. Geometric deep learning: Grids, groups, graphs, geodesics, and gauges, 2021.
- Cohen, T. and Welling, M. Group equivariant convolutional networks. In *International conference on machine learning*, pp. 2990–2999. PMLR, 2016.
- Cormen, T. H., Leiserson, C. E., Rivest, R. L., and Stein, C. *Introduction to algorithms*. MIT press, 2022.
- Davies, A., Veličković, P., Buesing, L., Blackwell, S., Zheng, D., Tomašev, N., Tanburn, R., Battaglia, P., Blundell, C., Juhász, A., et al. Advancing mathematics by guiding human intuition with ai. *Nature*, 600(7887):70–74, 2021.



- De Moor, O. Categories, relations and dynamic programming. *Mathematical Structures in Computer Science*, 4 (1):33–69, 1994.
- Derrow-Pinion, A., She, J., Wong, D., Lange, O., Hester, T., Perez, L., Nunkesser, M., Lee, S., Guo, X., Wiltshire, B., et al. Eta prediction with graph neural networks in google maps. In *Proceedings of the 30th ACM International Conference on Information & Knowledge Management*, pp. 3767–3776, 2021.
- DeZoort, G., Battaglia, P. W., Biscarat, C., and Vlimant, J.-R. Graph neural networks at the large hadron collider. *Nature Reviews Physics*, pp. 1–23, 2023.
- Dudzik, A. and Veličković, P. Graph neural networks are dynamic programmers, 2022.
- Ferludin, O., Eigenwillig, A., Blais, M., Zelle, D., Pfeifer, J., Sanchez-Gonzalez, A., Li, S., Abu-El-Haija, S., Battaglia, P., Bulut, N., et al. Tf-gnn: graph neural networks in tensorflow. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.03522*, 2022.
- Fey, M. and Lenssen, J. E. Fast graph representation learning with pytorch geometric. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1903.02428*, 2019.
- Floyd, R. W. Algorithm 97: shortest path. *Communications of the ACM*, 5(6):345, 1962.
- Gilmer, J., Schoenholz, S. S., Riley, P. F., Vinyals, O., and Dahl, G. E. Neural message passing for quantum chemistry. In *International conference on machine learning*, pp. 1263–1272. PMLR, 2017.
- Godwin\*, J., Keck\*, T., Battaglia, P., Bapst, V., Kipf, T., Li, Y., Stachenfeld, K., Veličković, P., and Sanchez-Gonzalez, A. Jraph: A library for graph neural networks in jax., 2020. URL <http://github.com/deepmind/jraph>.
- Graves, A., Wayne, G., and Danihelka, I. Neural turing machines. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1410.5401*, 2014.
- Graves, A., Wayne, G., Reynolds, M., Harley, T., Danihelka, I., Grabska-Barwińska, A., Colmenarejo, S. G., Grefenstette, E., Ramalho, T., Agapiou, J., et al. Hybrid computing using a neural network with dynamic external memory. *Nature*, 538(7626):471–476, 2016.
- Hamrick, J. B., Allen, K. R., Bapst, V., Zhu, T., McKee, K. R., Tenenbaum, J. B., and Battaglia, P. W. Relational inductive bias for physical construction in humans and machines. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1806.01203*, 2018.
- Ibarz, B., Kurin, V., Papamakarios, G., Nikiforou, K., Benani, M., Csordás, R., Dudzik, A. J., Bošnjak, M., Vitvitskiy, A., Rubanova, Y., et al. A generalist neural algorithmic learner. In *Learning on Graphs Conference*, pp. 2–1. PMLR, 2022.
- Lewkowycz, A., Andreassen, A., Dohan, D., Dyer, E., Michalewski, H., Ramasesh, V., Slone, A., Anil, C., Schlag, I., Gutman-Solo, T., et al. Solving quantitative reasoning problems with language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.14858*, 2022.
- Liu, G., Catacutan, D. B., Rathod, K., Swanson, K., Jin, W., Mohammed, J. C., Chiappino-Pepe, A., Syed, S. A., Fragis, M., Rachwalski, K., Magolan, J., Surette, M. G., Coombes, B. K., Jaakkola, T., Barzilay, R., Collins, J. J., and Stokes, J. M. Deep learning-guided discovery of an antibiotic targeting acinetobacter baumannii. *Nature Chemical Biology*, May 2023. ISSN 1552-4469. doi: 10.1038/s41589-023-01349-8. URL <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41589-023-01349-8>.
- Loukas, A. What graph neural networks cannot learn: depth vs width. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.03199*, 2019.
- Mirhoseini, A., Goldie, A., Yazgan, M., Jiang, J. W., Songhori, E., Wang, S., Lee, Y.-J., Johnson, E., Pathak, O., Nazi, A., et al. A graph placement methodology for fast chip design. *Nature*, 594(7862):207–212, 2021.
- Ong, E. and Veličković, P. Learnable commutative monoids for graph neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.08541*, 2022.
- Stokes, J. M., Yang, K., Swanson, K., Jin, W., Cubillos-Ruiz, A., Donghia, N. M., MacNair, C. R., French, S., Carfrae, L. A., Bloom-Ackermann, Z., et al. A deep learning approach to antibiotic discovery. *Cell*, 180(4): 688–702, 2020.
- Strathmann, H., Barekatin, M., Blundell, C., and Veličković, P. Persistent message passing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.01043*, 2021.
- Tang, H., Huang, Z., Gu, J., Lu, B.-L., and Su, H. Towards scale-invariant graph-related problem solving by iterative homogeneous gnns. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:15811–15822, 2020.
- Vaswani, A., Shazeer, N., Parmar, N., Uszkoreit, J., Jones, L., Gomez, A. N., Kaiser, Ł., and Polosukhin, I. Attention is all you need. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30, 2017.
- Veličković, P. Message passing all the way up. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2202.11097*, 2022.
- Veličković, P. Everything is connected: Graph neural networks. *Current Opinion in Structural Biology*, 79:102538, 2023.
- Veličković, P. and Blundell, C. Neural algorithmic reasoning. *Patterns*, 2(7):100273, 2021.

- Veličković, P., Cucurull, G., Casanova, A., Romero, A., Lio, P., and Bengio, Y. Graph attention networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1710.10903*, 2017.
- Veličković, P., Ying, R., Padovano, M., Hadsell, R., and Blundell, C. Neural execution of graph algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.10593*, 2019.
- Veličković, P., Buesing, L., Overlan, M., Pascanu, R., Vinyals, O., and Blundell, C. Pointer graph networks. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33: 2232–2244, 2020.
- Veličković, P., Badia, A. P., Budden, D., Pascanu, R., Banino, A., Dashevskiy, M., Hadsell, R., and Blundell, C. The clsr algorithmic reasoning benchmark. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 22084–22102. PMLR, 2022.
- Wang, M., Zheng, D., Ye, Z., Gan, Q., Li, M., Song, X., Zhou, J., Ma, C., Yu, L., Gai, Y., et al. Deep graph library: A graph-centric, highly-performant package for graph neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.01315*, 2019.
- Williamson, G. Is deep learning a useful tool for the pure mathematician? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.12602*, 2023.
- Xhonneux, L.-P., Deac, A.-I., Veličković, P., and Tang, J. How to transfer algorithmic reasoning knowledge to learn new algorithms? *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:19500–19512, 2021.
- Xu, K., Li, J., Zhang, M., Du, S. S., Kawarabayashi, K.-i., and Jegelka, S. What can neural networks reason about? *arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.13211*, 2019.
- Xu, K., Zhang, M., Li, J., Du, S. S., Kawarabayashi, K.-i., and Jegelka, S. How neural networks extrapolate: From feedforward to graph neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.11848*, 2020.