

PICO: Accelerating All k -Core Paradigms on GPU

Chen Zhao[§], Ting Yu[†], Zhigao Zheng^{§,✉}, Song Jin[§], Jiawei Jiang[§], Bo Du[§], Dacheng Tao^{‡,✉}

[§]School of Computer Science, Wuhan University, Wuhan 430072, China

[§]National Engineering Research Center for Multimedia Software, Wuhan University, Wuhan 430072, China

[§]Institute of Artificial Intelligence, Wuhan University, Wuhan 430072, China

[§]Hubei Key Laboratory of Multimedia and Network Communication Engineering, Wuhan University, Wuhan 430072, China

[§]Hubei LuoJia Laboratory, Wuhan 430072, China

[†] Zhejiang Lab, Hangzhou, China

[‡] UBTECH Sydney Artificial Intelligence Center, University of Sydney, Australia

[‡] School of Information Technologies, University of Sydney, Australia

{zhaochen13,zhengzhigao,jinsong,jiawei.jiang,dubo}@whu.edu.cn, yuting@zhejianglab.com, dacheng.tao@gmail.com

Abstract—Core decomposition is a well-established graph mining problem with various applications that involves partitioning the graph into hierarchical subgraphs. Solutions to this problem have been developed using both bottom-up and top-down approaches from the perspective of vertex convergence dependency. However, existing algorithms have not effectively harnessed GPU performance to expedite core decomposition, despite the growing need for enhanced performance. Moreover, approaching performance limitations of core decomposition from two different directions within a parallel synchronization structure has not been thoroughly explored. This paper introduces an efficient GPU acceleration framework, PICO, for the *Peel* and *Index2core* paradigms of k -core decomposition. We propose *PeelOne*, a *Peel*-based algorithm designed to simplify the parallel logic and minimize atomic operations by eliminating vertices that are ‘under-core’. We also propose an *Index2core*-based algorithm, named *HistoCore*, which addresses the issue of extensive redundant computations across both vertices and edges. Extensive experiments on NVIDIA RTX 3090 GPU show that *PeelOne* outperforms all other *Peel*-based algorithms, and *HistoCore* outperforms all other *Index2core*-based algorithms. Furthermore, *HistoCore* even outperforms *PeelOne* by $1.1\times \sim 3.2\times$ speedup on six datasets, which breaks the stereotype that the *Index2core* paradigm performs much worse than the *Peel* in a shared memory parallel setting.

Index Terms—large-scale graph, core decomposition, graph computing, GPU

I. INTRODUCTION

Given a graph $G = (V, E)$, for an integer k , a k -core is a maximum subgraph of G with all the vertices degree $\geq k$. The coreness of vertex $v \in G$ is the maximum value of k for which there is a k -core that contains v . The target of core decomposition is to determine the coreness of each vertex $v \in G$. We illustrate core decomposition in Fig. 1. The entire graph is a 1-core, while vertices $\{v_2, v_3, v_4, v_5\}$ form the 2-core. No 3-core is present. Therefore, the coreness of vertices $\{v_0, v_1\}$, and $\{v_2, v_3, v_4, v_5\}$ are 1 and 2, respectively.

Due to the simple and elegant structure with linear complexity [1], the k -core is widely used in many applications. In social networks, researchers employ hierarchical subgraph processing to accelerate intensive graph clustering [2], clique finding [3], and community detection [4], [5] and search [6]. The coreness can help user engagement, prevent unraveling

and improve network stability in social network [7]–[10]. Furthermore, k -core is an effective tool to predict and visualize the functions of complex structures in biology or ecology [11], [12]. Numerous studies explore core decomposition in diverse networks with rich semantics, such as directed graphs, uncertain graphs, dynamic graphs and others [13]–[16].




Fig. 1: An illustration of k -cores and coreness resulted from core decomposition in the example graph G_1 .

There are many algorithmic techniques for core decomposition in different settings [17], originating from the initial proposal of the k -core concept by Seidman [1]. These techniques can be classified into two paradigms: *Peel* [1] and *Index2core* [18]. In the *Peel* paradigm, the algorithm iteratively removes vertices with the minimum degree until all the coreness values are obtained. In the *Index2core* paradigm, the h -index value of each vertex is computed iteratively until convergence to the coreness is achieved. From the perspective of vertex convergence dependency, the *Peel* paradigm is bottom-up, while the *Index2core* paradigm is top-down.

With the continuous growth of the data scale and the widespread application of k -core, the pursuit of optimal performance remains ongoing. Graphics Processing Units (GPUs) have gained significant popularity for accelerating graph processing algorithms and applications due to their excellent parallel computing capabilities and memory bandwidth. To explore core decomposition in a massively parallel setting, we have conducted research on various works that focus on

accelerating the k -core algorithm on GPU [19]–[22].

Though significant efforts have been made to improve the efficiency of the *Peel* paradigm on GPU, the existing works are implemented at different programming levels, including the latest work [21]. Therefore, they do not reveal the key optimal parallelization design of the core logic of the *Peel* algorithm. One observation is that the complete peeling process on the objective graph is overly redundant for calculating the coreness of vertices. For a vertex with a coreness value of k , the coreness can be identified when its degree is reduced to k . However, the peeling process aims to reduce every edge in the objective graph. During the reducing, the residual degree of some vertices might be different from the coreness value. This leads to some unnecessary atomic computational overhead and storage costs.

On the other hand, the parallelism potential of *Index2core* on GPU has not been thoroughly explored. *Index2core* gradually approximates the coreness value of each vertex by iteratively estimating its h -index. In each iteration, the h -index value change of a frontier is estimated based on the latest values of its neighbors from the previous iteration. Thus, existing *Index2core* methods regard its neighbors as new frontiers in the next iteration, once the h -index of current frontier is changed. However, only a small portion of neighbors will actually be affected by the changes in the h -index of frontiers, resulting in a large number of mistaken frontiers (the estimation remains unchanged) in the next iterations. Moreover, the computational cost of the h -index update operation for a frontier is positively correlated with the number of its edge accessing (i.e., degree), so that high-degree vertices incur heavier computational costs. Those high-degree vertices, potentially requiring more iterations to converge to their coreness, become ‘multi-changed’ vertices. Consequently, a small number of multi-changed vertices end up with a significantly larger computational workload, leading to an imbalance in the workload distribution and becoming a bottleneck for GPU parallel computing.

In real scenarios, the *Peel* paradigm is highly sensitive to the dependency order among nodes and is suitable for in-memory computation on static graphs, while the *Index2core* paradigm is suitable for computations on dynamic graphs and graph partition issues. Therefore, optimizing both paradigms on GPU holds significant importance. The *Peel* methods obtain the coreness of each vertex through a simple judgment of its residual degree, while the *Index2core* methods determine the coreness of each vertex via complex updates, which involve accesses and calculations of its neighbors, once or more. Therefore, the total computational overhead required by the *Peel* methods is lower, closer to the theoretical upper limit of computational complexity for core decomposition problems, and is easier to adapt for effective parallel computation using GPU. Improving the performance of *Index2core* on GPU to levels comparable to those of the optimized *Peel* method serves as an important indicator for assessing the optimization of the *Index2core* algorithm.

To address the issues mentioned above, we develop a

synchronous computing framework that integrates all the optimizations for core decomposition on GPU. This framework supports both the *Peel* and *Index2core* paradigms. We consolidate various existing optimization methods to abstract the optimal parallel *Peel* paradigm. Within this paradigm, we define the under-core vertex and analyze its impact on the performance. We devise a low-cost elimination method to reduce the redundant atomic operations on under-core vertices. We utilize a dynamic queue to manage frontiers within the same core hierarchy, thereby minimizing the number of iterations required. For the *Index2core* paradigm, we reduce the number of vertices involved in computing h -index by locating the frontiers. By decoupling the construction of the histogram array from the computation of the h -index for the multi-changed frontiers, we effectively reduce the number of redundant edge accesses.

In summary, the contributions of this paper are as follows.

- We propose a framework, called PICO, for all k -core paradigms on GPU, which includes the optimal *Peel*-based algorithm *PeelOne* and the *Index2core*-based algorithm *HistoCore* and incorporates the key optimization techniques.
- In the bottom-up pattern, *PeelOne* simplifies the parallel logic of peeling the objective graph and reduces the atomic operation by the proposed *assertion* method to eliminate the under-core vertex.
- In the top-down pattern, *HistoCore* locates the frontiers precisely and reduces redundant memory access on the edges of multi-changed frontiers by using the up-to-date histogram information.
- Experimental results demonstrate that in their respective paradigms, *PeelOne* and *HistoCore*, as facilitated by the framework, achieve optimal performance across 24 datasets. Furthermore, *HistoCore* outperforms *PeelOne* within the shared-memory parallel environment on six datasets, highlighting the great parallel potential of the *Index2core* paradigm as same with the *Peel* paradigm.

The remaining sections are organized as follows. Section II introduces the background of the two k -core decomposition paradigms and the motivation of this paper, which is supported by a set of experiments on GPU. The detailed techniques of the proposed *PeelOne* and *HistoCore* algorithms are presented in Section III and Section IV, respectively. Section V evaluates the performance of the proposed algorithms, and Section VI introduces the existing relevant work. Finally, the paper concludes in Section VII.

II. BACKGROUND AND MOTIVATION

In this section, we first analyze the features of the two widely used paradigms of the core decomposition algorithm. Then, we introduce the key concepts of graph algorithms on GPU. At last, by revisiting the existing k -core on GPU, we conduct a set of experiments on GPU to identify the key factors that limit the parallel efficiency of the two paradigms, which motivate us to design the new framework PICO to accelerate the core decomposition.

A. The k -core Decomposition Paradigms

The objective of k -core decomposition is to calculate the coreness value for all vertices in V . Table I lists the symbols frequently used in this paper.

Most of the existing k -core decomposition algorithms can be classified into two paradigms: *Peel* and *Index2core*. In the *Peel* paradigm, the vertices with degree $\leq k - 1$, along with their corresponding edges, are removed in each iteration until the k -core is located. Initially, vertices with degree 1 are removed and their coreness is set to 1. This process is iterated, increasing the value of k , until no vertices remain in the graph. In practice, a flag is used to mark the removed vertices and the degree of their neighbors is reduced to obtain the residual graph. The detailed execution procedure is shown in Algorithm 1. For the *Index2core* paradigm, every vertex estimates its coreness from the latest coreness estimation of all its neighbors by the computation of h -index until the estimation of every vertex is unchanged. For a given vertex v , the h -index is defined as the highest value of h for which v has at least h neighbors with a degree $\geq h$. The detailed execution procedure is shown in Algorithm 2. As a bottom-up execution model, *Peel* is simple and intuitive, but the inherently sequential processing requires the global graph information, leading to a fixed minimum number of iterations. As a top-down execution model, *Index2core* can be formulated using the vertex-centric parallel model, but the total computational overhead is heavier than the *Peel*-based algorithms in the shared-memory setting.

B. Graph On GPU

In 2001, NVIDIA designed the first graphics processing unit (GPU), deploying it to accelerate image and video processing applications. In 2006, NVIDIA released the first Tesla architecture-based GPU, extending support beyond visual processing to include scientific computing applications. Harish first introduced the Tesla architecture-based GPU to accelerate graph algorithms in 2007 [23]. Modern GPUs provide a massively parallel computing capability with thousands of

TABLE I: Frequently used symbols.

Symbols	Explanations
$G = (V, E)$	The object graph.
v_i	The vertex with id i .
$nbr(u, G)$	The neighbors of vertex u in G .
$deg(u, G)$	The degree of vertex u in G .
$V_k(G)$	The vertex set in the k -core of G , V_k for short.
$G_k(V_k)$	The induced subgraph of V_k in G , G_k for short.
$deg_r(u, k, G)$	The residual degree of vertex u when locating the k -core.
V_{res}	The residual vertices of G in <i>Peel</i> paradigm.
G_{res}	The residual graph of G in <i>Peel</i> paradigm.
$core(u, G)$	The coreness of vertex u in G , $core(u)$ for short.
h_u^t	The h -index of vertex u in the t -th iteration.
$cnt(u, t)$	The number of neighbors with an h -index value no smaller than vertex u in the $t - 1$ -th iteration in <i>Index2core</i> paradigm.

Algorithm 1: Peel paradigm

Input: $G_{res} \leftarrow G$; $k \leftarrow 0$; $core[v] \leftarrow 0$ for $v \in V(G)$;
1 while $G_{res} \neq \emptyset$ **do**
2 $k++$;
3 **while** $\exists v \in V(G_{res}) : deg(v, G_{res}) \leq k$ **do**
4 $core[v] \leftarrow k$;
5 $v \leftarrow$ removed;
6 **for** $u \in nbr(v, G_{res})$: $deg(u) - -$;
7 return $core$;

threads. The impressive computing power requirements of widely used applications have driven GPUs to be the general-purpose computing co-processors in heterogeneous computers. Researchers from both industry and academia have leveraged GPUs to accelerate a variety of graph algorithms and graph processing frameworks [22], [24]–[27].

However, there are still great challenges to unleashing the massive parallelism capability of modern GPUs due to the irregular structure and random memory access patterns of real-world graphs. The GPU-based k -core decomposition framework includes several hardware optimization strategies tailored specifically to leverage the architecture of GPUs.

1) *Graph Storage*: Dealing with large-scale graphs that encompass millions or even billions of vertices and edges is a significant challenge, particularly when considering the limited memory capacity of GPU accelerators. In order to solve this problem, most existing works have implemented the compressed sparse row (CSR) format to load the graph topology. A CSR compacts all the entities into two arrays. One is used to keep the sequential concatenation of the neighbors each vertex, while the second one is used to store the start location of the neighbor list of each vertex. While this format enables immediate neighbor identification for any specified vertex, it also leads to random memory access, thereby impeding GPU efficiency.

2) *Programming Models*: To navigate the challenges of aligning graph vertices or edges with GPU threads, researchers have pioneered the vertex-centric [28] and edge-centric [29] programming models to deploy the graph algorithms on GPUs. In the vertex-centric programming model, each vertex is

Algorithm 2: Index2core paradigm

Input: G ; $core[v] \leftarrow deg(v) \forall v \in V(G)$;
1 repeat
2 **for** $v \in V$ **do**
3 $core[v] \leftarrow$ HINDEX($nbr(v), core[]$);
4 until $core$ no longer changes;
5 Function HINDEX($nbr(v), core[]$):
6 Return an integer h :
7 $|u \in nbr(v) : core[u] \geq h| \geq h$
8 & $|u \in nbr(v) : core[u] \geq h + 1| \leq h$




Fig. 2: The commonly utilized parallel *Peel* method in parallel.

assigned to a GPU thread/warp, simplifying algorithm implementation for developers. However, this model will lead to load imbalance issues due to the irregular graph structure of the real-world graphs. In the edge-centric programming model, each edge but not vertex is assigned to a GPU thread/warp, offering a natural solution to load imbalance. Nevertheless, this approach increases the computational workload because there are many more edges than vertices in sparse graphs. In pursuit of fully exploiting GPU capabilities, an array of innovative programming models has been proposed, including the path-centric [30], sub-graph-centric [31], and data-centric [22] programming models, etc.

3) *Thread Mapping*: Thread mapping is a set of techniques that map the GPU thread/warp to a graph task. The basic method involves mapping a vertex or edge to a GPU thread/warp in conjunction with the vertex/edge-centric programming model. In order to improve GPU thread efficiency, the virtual warp and some other new techniques have been proposed in the state-of-the-art research [27], [32], which can allocate unfixed threads/warps to the vertex/edge according to the computing requirements of different tasks.

C. Motivation

In this subsection, we first analyze the major challenges of the *Peel*-based k -core decomposition paradigm, and then we conduct experiments on an RTX 3090 GPU to explore the performance bottlenecks of the *Index2core* paradigm.

When locating the k -core within the *Peel* paradigm, the removal of some vertices updates the degrees of residual vertices, which may fall below the specified coreness k . To facilitate subsequent iterations, these vertices must undergo additional processing to return to the correct coreness, which inevitably complicates the parallel logic of the entire algorithm and deteriorates performance. A commonly utilized method [19], [20], [22] employs two distinct property arrays to independently track the residual degree and coreness, recognizing that these values may diverge. As illustrated in Fig. 2,

Algorithm 3: General Parallel Peel on GPU

```

1  $k \leftarrow 0$ ;  $rem[v] \leftarrow 0 \forall v \in V(G)$ ;
2 while  $|V_{res}| > 0$  do
3   if  $\forall v \in V_{res}, !(deg(v) \leq k)$  then
4      $k++$ ;
5   Kernel  $scan(G, rem[], deg[], core[], k)$ :
6     Frontiers:
7      $V_f = \{v : !rem[v] \& deg[v] \leq k | v \in V(G)\}$ ;
8     set  $core[v] = k, v \in V_f$ ;
9     set  $rem[v] = true, v \in V_f$ ;
10  Kernel  $scatter(G, rem[], deg[])$ :
11  Graph Operator on the frontier:
12  for  $u \in nbr(v)$  do
13    if  $!rem[u]$  then
14       $atomicSub(deg[u], 1)$ ;

```

during the third iteration, the degree of v_3 and v_5 decrease to 1, which is below the coreness of 2. In Algorithm 3, the *Peel* algorithm consists of two parallel graph operations with complex judgment conditions: a *scan* operation to find frontiers, and a *scatter* operation to update the degrees of the neighbors of these frontiers. In the *scatter* kernel, the *atomicSub* function may update some residual vertices once the coreness is below k . Since both removed vertices and those that remain have coreness values less than k , discerning whether a vertex has been removed based solely on the residual degree property is infeasible. Thus, an additional flag, *rem*, is needed additionally to ensure that only the degrees of the residual vertices are updated. In the *scan* kernel, the criteria for identifying frontier nodes are multifaceted, requiring checks on both *rem* and *deg* variables. Another method [21] appends an increased number of atomic add operations on these vertices, which causes serious atomic competition.

To explore the bottlenecks of the *Index2core* paradigm on GPU, we designed an experiment on RTX 3090 GPU to collect the frontiers of the power-law graph *soc-twitter-2010* (the




Fig. 3: The proportion of vertices and edges that need multiple access in dataset *soc-twitter-2010*.

detailed experimental settings are the same as the experiments in Section V). The experimental result is shown in Fig. 3. From this experiment, we can first conclude that, for a fixed iteration, only a few neighbors of the frontier are required to participate in the next iteration. In the given example graph G_1 , when the h -index value of v_5 changes from 5 to 2, it is not necessary to re-estimate the coreness of v_0, v_1, v_2 and v_4 . Our experiment found that the h -index of an average of 94% of the frontiers' neighbors stays unchanged. Another observation is that some high-degree vertices may become the frontiers more than once so that the estimation changes multiple times. Thus, another time-consuming operation is that the neighbors of those multi-changed frontiers are accessed multiple times across different iterations. Fig. 3 shows that 18.9% of vertices can be the frontier more than 2 times, while as many as 88% of edges will be accessed more than 2 times and 60.9% will be accessed more than 5 times. Based on the two observations, many redundant computations exist in the parallelizing *Index2core* paradigm.

III. DESIGN OF THE PROPOSED PEELONE ALGORITHM

This section first introduces the definition of the under-core vertex and then proposes the *PeelOne* algorithm with a low-cost method to eliminate the under-core vertex.

A. The Under-Core Vertex

In the *Peel*-based k -core decomposition paradigm, neighbor vertices are removed iteratively, resulting in some active vertex with a degree lower than the coreness. We use $deg_r(u, k, G)$ to represent the residual degree of vertex u when locating the k -core. To effectively deal with these vertices, we introduce the concept of *under the coreness* and define *under-core*.

Definition 1 (Under-Core Vertex). *For a given graph $G = (V, E)$, $u \in V$ is a under-core vertex if and only if $deg_r(u, k, G) < core(u, G)$.*

According to Definition 1, we further express the under-core vertex set as $V_{<core}(G) = \{u : deg_r(u, k, G) < core(u, G) | u \in V(G)\}$.

We illustrate the *Peel* paradigm of k -core algorithm on the example graph G_1 in Fig. 2. Three iterations are needed to locate the coreness of all the vertices in G_1 . In the first two iterations, the degree of vertices v_0, v_1, v_2 , and v_4 are equal to their coreness. However, the degree of the residual vertices v_3 and v_5 are less than the coreness in the third iteration. Thus, v_3 and v_5 are the under-core vertices and we can conclude that $V_{<core}(G_1) = \{v_3, v_5\}$.

B. The *assertion* Method

When accelerating the *Peel* algorithm on GPU, the under-core vertices must undergo additional atomic processing to return the correct coreness, which inevitably complicates the parallel logic of the entire algorithm and reduces the performance. This subsection introduces a key theorem of under-core vertices that can avoid additional processing.




Fig. 4: The atomic operations involved in the reduction of the degree of under-core vertices.

Theorem 1. *When locating the k -core in the G , the coreness of the under-core vertex is k .*

Proof: When locating the k -core, the coreness of the removed vertices must be $\leq k$. Thus, the coreness of the residual vertices must be $\geq k$. If the degree of a vertex u of the residual vertices is less than k , the vertex can not belong to the $k+1$ -core of G . Thus, the coreness of u is k and u is an under-core vertex. ■

Theorem 1 shows that the coreness of the under-core vertex equals k while locating the k -core. Thus, when updating the degree of the frontiers' residual neighbors, we directly assign a coreness of k to an under-core vertex rather than reducing their coreness below k . We design the method named *assertion*, including a novel atomic operation $atomicSub_{\geq k}(*address, 1, k)$. This operation performs the following steps: it reads the old value old located at the address $address$ in global or shared memory, computes $(old > k) ? (old - 1) : k$, and then stores the result back in memory at the same address. These three steps are executed in a single atomic transaction.

We show the general situation of processing an under-core vertex using an extra atomic add function in Fig. 4a. Supposing the k -core is located, the residual degree of vertex A is $k+m$, and there are n ($n > m$) threads (neighbors) performing an atomic minus one operation on vertex A . There are $n-m$ threads that will reduce the degree below k , and then the $n-m$

threads will atomically add one on A to ensure that the residual degree is equal to the current k . Thus, a total of $2n - m$ atomic operations are performed to obtain the coreness of vertex A . Fig. 4b shows the workflow of our *assertion* method. Ideally, the degree of A is reduced to k , and then no more atomic operations are performed so that there are the additional $2(n - m)$ atomic operations avoided. In summary, our *assertion* method reduces the redundant atomic operations and improves the performance by avoiding more atomic competition.

C. The Proposed PeelOne Algorithm

With the *assertion* method, we can derive *Corollary 1*, which means that the degree of the residual vertices is not less than k while locating the k -core.

Corollary 1. *When locating k -core in Peel with the assertion method, $\forall u \in V_{res}$, we have $deg(u, G_{res}) \geq k$.*

Proof: When locating k -core in *Peel*, the coreness of the residual vertices is $\geq k$. Since we eliminate the under-core vertices, the degree of the residual vertices is $\geq k$. ■

Therefore, the parallel logic of *Peel* can be optimized in three steps as shown in *PeelOne* Algorithm 4.

(1) Asserting the frontiers as $\{u | degree[u] = k, u \in V_{res}\}$. Since the degree of the residual vertices is not less than k , the vertices with a degree value of k in the residual vertices can be asserted as the frontiers.

(2) The condition for a neighbor u to perform graph operator is indicated as $core[u] > k$ (Line 10). This condition ensures that atomic functions are not applied to vertices that have been removed. Given that the degrees of all residual vertices are not less than k , and those with a degree exactly equal to k are considered frontiers, the updating of degrees is restricted only to neighbors with degrees greater than k . Thus, the additional *delete* flag is no longer required. The condition indicator and the graph operator can access the residual degree ($core[u]$) in the same address, which has a better data locality.

(3) Asserting under-core vertices as the next frontiers in advance. While doing the graph operator in the *scatter*, the

Algorithm 4: PeelOne

```

1  $k \leftarrow 0$ ;  $core[v] \leftarrow deg[v] \forall v \in V(G)$ ;
2 while  $|V_{res}| > 0$  do
3    $k++$ ;
4   Kernel scan( $G, core[], k$ ):
5     Frontiers:  $V_f = \{v : core[v] = k | v \in V(G)\}$ ;
6   Kernel scatter( $G, core[]$ ):
7     For all frontiers, do Graph operator:
8     for  $u \in nbr(v)$  do
9       if  $core[u] > k$  then
10         $atomicSub_{\geq k}(core[u], 1, k)$ ;
11        // Dynamic Frontier
12        if  $core[u] = k$  then
13          add  $u$  to the frontier;
```




Fig. 5: The procedure of *PeelOne* method in parallel.

under-core vertices from the frontier's neighbors can be asserted the frontiers in the next iteration in advance. With the *assertion* method, the neighbor u with the $core[u]$ value of k is, in fact, an ensuing frontier. The vertex u with $core[u] = k$ can be accumulated in a dynamic frontier queue and processed within the current iteration. This approach eliminates the need for the synchronization overhead associated with the *scan* and *scatter* kernels in an additional iteration.

Fig. 5 shows the details of *PeelOne* on the example graph G_1 . v_2, v_4 are the frontiers in the second iteration. When performing the graph operator on v_2 and v_4 , the degree of v_3 and v_5 are large than k ($k = 2$) and then are updated to 2 by the function $atomicSub_{\geq k}$. Vertices v_3 and v_5 with a degree of 2 are added to the frontier queue to perform the graph operator in this iteration.

IV. DESIGN OF THE HISTOCORE ALGORITHM

This section describes our two proposed *Index2core*-based algorithms. To reduce the redundant computation on vertices, we propose the *CntCore* by precisely the frontiers in every iteration. Furthermore, to reduce the redundant computation on edges, we propose the *HistoCore* by maintaining the up-to-date histogram information for the multi-changed vertices that become the frontiers many times.

A. The Proposed CntCore

Considering the *Index2core* paradigm, since the coreness of some vertices can converge within a few iterations, it is important to determine the vertex set that participates in the next iteration of the computation. The existing method, in which the neighbors of the vertex that the h -index (coreness estimation value) is changed in the current iteration participate in the next iteration, has a large amount of redundant computation. Thus, we propose the *CntCore* only to estimate the frontiers' coreness.

We denote the number of neighbors with an h -index value no smaller than vertex u in the $t - 1$ -th iteration as $cnt(u, t) = |\{v : h_v^{t-1} \geq h_u^{t-1}, v \in nbr(u)\}|$. Thus, $cnt(u, t)$ represents

Algorithm 5: CntCore

```

1  $V_{active} \leftarrow V$ ;
2 while  $V_{active} \neq \emptyset$  do
3   Compute the  $cnt[v]$  in  $V_{active}$ ;
4   Frontiers:  $V_f = \{v : cnt[v] < core[v], v \in V_{active}\}$ ;
5    $V_{active} \leftarrow \emptyset$ ;
6   Graph Operator:
7   estimate the coreness by the call
   HINDEX( $nbr(v), core[v]$ );
8   add the  $nbr(v)$  set to the  $V_{active}$ ;

```

the number of neighbors that could potentially influence the h -index of u in the t -th iteration. The following theorem holds.

Theorem 2. For a vertex $u \in G$, $h_u^t < h_u^{t-1}$ if and only if $cnt(u, t) < h_u^{t-1}$.

Theorem 2 demonstrates the necessary condition for determining whether the h -index of u has changed ($h_u^t < h_u^{t-1}$) in the t -th iteration. Thus, in every iteration, only the h -index of the vertex set $V_{cnt}^t = \{cnt(u, t) < h_u^{t-1}, u \in V(G)\}$ are required to be estimated. In other words, the frontiers of every iteration in the *Index2core* procedure are the set V_{cnt}^t .

Based on the above observation, we design the **CntCore** as shown in the Algorithm 5. In the first iteration, compute the cnt value of all the vertices, locate the frontiers with the cnt value less than their degree (the initial coreness estimation value), and estimate the new value of the frontiers. To avoid computing the cnt of all vertices in the next iteration, a set V_{active} is used to store the union of all frontiers' neighbors. Then, in the next iteration, only the cnt value in the V_{active} are recomputed, and the frontiers are found from within V_{active} . In summary, the *CntCore* estimates only the frontiers' coreness and avoids the redundant computation of vertices whose estimation values remain unchanged.

B. The Proposed HistoCore

High-degree vertices might often become frontiers, meaning these vertices require calling the HINDEX function to estimate their coreness. To explore the redundant computations involved in the HINDEX function, we decouple the function into two steps: *Step I: Histogram* and *Step II: Sum*. As shown by the h -index example of vertex v_5 in Fig. 6, *Step I: Histogram* involves counting and storing the occurrences of each value among neighbors in the array *histo* i.e., $\{1 : \{v_0, v_1\}$




Fig. 6: An example of calculating $h_{v_5}^t$ of vertex v_5 .




Fig. 7: The *histo* array construction and maintenance of multi-changed vertices.

2 : $\{v_2, v_4\}$ 3 : $\{v_3\}$. *Step II Sum* involves computing the h -index value based on the cumulative sum in *histo* by performing a reverse summation. With these two steps, the h -index of v_5 is determined to be 2. It is obvious that *Step I: Histogram* leads to massive random memory access since it requires reading all neighbors' value and writing back to the *histo* array. The *Step II: Sum* operation only accesses a portion of the *histo* array sequentially.

Considering a high-degree vertex A in the procedure of *CntCore* as shown in Fig. 7a. In the 1st, 3rd, and 7th iterations, A becomes the frontier for estimating its coreness using the HINDEX function. Therefore, the neighbors of A are accessed a total of three times, and its *histo* array is also constructed three times correspondingly. To reduce the time spent performing *Step I: Histogram*, our approach is to maintain a global and up-to-date *histo* array for A so that A only needs to perform *Step II: Sum* when it becomes the frontier. Based on this idea, we propose the *HistoCore* algorithm. Fig. 7b shows the procedure of processing vertex A with *HistoCore*. A can estimate its coreness by only performing the *Step II: Sum* operation. Thus, the key issue of *HistoCore* is to maintain the up-to-date *histo* array.

1) *Maintain the Up-to-date histo Array:* We analyze the effects of the different types of changes to the neighbor's h -index on a vertex's h -index. Supposing that the current h -index value of vertex A is \mathbf{k} , and the value of neighbor N drops from x to y ($x > y$), we classify the neighbors with changed values into three types:

- Type N1: $\mathbf{k} > x > y$
- Type N2: $x > y \geq \mathbf{k}$
- Type N3: $x \geq \mathbf{k} > y$

We show an example that demonstrates the effect of these three types of neighbors on vertex A . We utilize n_i to denote the number of neighbors with the h -index value of i , and s_i to represent the sum of neighbors with a h -index no less than i , where $s_i = \sum_{i \leq d_{max}} n_i$. Given that the h -index of vertex





(a) Original *histo* array of vertex *A*(b) Type N1: $k > x > y$ (c) Type N2: $x > y \geq k$ (d) Type N3: $x \geq k > y$

Fig. 8: Three situations of neighbor degree changes.

A is denoted as **k**, we can infer that $k \leq s_k$ and $k + 1 > s_{k+1}$. As shown in Fig. 8, N1 and N2 change certain values in the *histo* and *sum* arrays, which are highlighted in blue and orange, respectively. But the value of s_k and s_{k+1} remains unaffected, resulting in the unchanged *h*-index of *A*. In the N3 situation in Fig. 8d, the change of neighbor degree from *y* to *x* causes a modification in s_k and s_{k+1} , potentially resulting in a change of the *h*-index. Based on these observations, we draw the following three conclusions:

- I. Type N2 does not affect the *h*-index of vertex *A*;
- II. If Type N3 does not exist, Type N1 does not affect the *h*-index of vertex *A*;
- III. If Type N3 exists, Type N3 and Type N1 both affect the *h*-index of vertex *A*;

Thus, once the Type N1 or Type N3 exists, we update the *histo* array of *A*. In conclusion, combining N1 and N3, **when the latest *h*-index value of a neighbor is less than that of *A*, we update the *histo* array of *A*.**

2) *Detailed Design of HistoCore* : We show the detailed pseudo-code in Algorithm 6. In the *init* kernel, we initialize a global *histo* array for each vertex according to the degree of its neighbors. Then start the iteration with the *SumHisto* kernel and the *UpdateHisto* kernel.

In the *SumHisto* kernel, we sum these up-to-date *histo* arrays to get the latest *h*-index values of the frontiers. In the

UpdateHisto kernel, we assign threads to these vertices (the frontiers), whose values have changed in the last *SumHisto* kernel, to update the *histo* arrays of their neighbors.

Notably, the *HistoCore* also finds the frontiers by the *cnt* value but in a different way. We found that the *cnt* value of a vertex can be included by the *histo* array. In the *SumHisto* kernel (Lines 10-15), there is a byproduct value, *sum*, in the procedure of calculating the *h*-index by summing the *histo*. This *sum* essentially represents the *cnt* value, so we store it in the address of the current value of the vertex in the *histo*. And in the *UpdateHisto* kernel (Lines 20, 22-23), the *cnt* value in the *histo* array may be updated and can naturally be used to obtain the frontiers for the next iteration.

In summary, *HistoCore* locates the frontiers to reduce invalid computations of the most active vertices and redundant access to their neighbors, thus *HistoCore* can show the optimal parallelism of *Index2core* paradigm.

Algorithm 6: HistoCore

```

1 core[v] ← deg[v] ∀v ∈ V(G);
2 Kernel InitHisto(deg[]):
3   for u ∈ nbr(v), v ∈ V do
4     [histo[v][min(core[u], core[v])]++;
5 while Vcnt ≠ ∅ do
6   Frontiers: v: same as CntCore
7   Graph operator on Frontiers :
8   sum and update the histo;
9   Kernel SumHisto(histo[], core[], oldcore[]):
10    coreold ← core[v]; sum ← 0;
11    for k ← coreold to 1 s.t. sum < k do
12      [sum ← sum + histo[v][k];
13      if coreold ≠ k then
14        [core[v] ← k; oldcore[v] ← coreold;
15        // cnt[v] == sum;
16        [histo[v][k] ← sum;
17      return;
18  Kernel UpdateHisto(histo[], core[],
19  oldcore[]):
20    for u ∈ nbr[v] do
21      if core[u] > core[v] then
22        [cnt_value ←
23        atomicSub(histo[u][min(oldcore[v], core[u]), 1);
24        atomicAdd(histo[u][core[v]], 1);
25        if oldcore[v] >= core[u] and
26        cnt_value = core[u] then
27          [add u to the Vcnt;

```

V. EXPERIMENTAL EVALUATIONS

In this section, we evaluate the performance of all the proposed algorithms. To avoid the overhead from high-level programming, the proposed algorithms and baselines are all implemented by the low-level programming language CUDA

TABLE II: Statistical properties of 24 datasets.

abridge	dataset	$ V $	$ E $	d_{avg}	std	d_{max}	k_{max}	Category
gow	loc-Gowalla	197K	1,901K	9.6681	53.5776	14730	51	Social Network
ama	amazon0601	403K	4,887K	12.1143	14.9456	2752	10	Co-purchasing
talk	wiki-Talk	2,394K	9,319K	3.8921	102.508	100029	131	Communication
goo	web-Google	916K	8,644K	9.4324	38.8326	6332	44	Web Graph
ber	web-BerkStan	685K	13,299K	19.4080	285.162	84230	201	Web Graph
ski	as-Skitter	1,696K	22,191K	13.0809	136.861	35455	111	Internet Topology
pat	cit-Patents	3,775K	33,038K	8.7523	10.4908	793	64	Citation Network
in	in-2004	1,383K	27,183K	19.6564	146.566	21869	488	Web Graph
dblp	dblp-author	5,624K	24,564K	4.3676	10.527	1389	14	Collaboration
woc	wikipedialink-oc	96K	29,273K	304.2076	858.598	40619	1252	Web Graph
lj	LiveJournal1	4,848K	85,702K	17.6795	52.0034	20333	372	Social Network
wde	wikipedialink-de	3,604K	155,094K	43.0371	497.892	434234	837	Web Graph
hol	hollywood-2009	1,140K	112,751K	98.9145	271.867	11467	2208	Collaboration
ork	com-Orkut	3,072K	234,370K	76.2814	154.781	33313	253	Social Network
tra	trackers	27,666K	281,227K	10.1652	2773.95	11571953	438	Web Graph
ind	indochina-2004	7,415K	301,970K	40.7249	390.704	256425	6869	Web Graph
uk	uk-2002	18,520K	523,575K	28.2702	144.861	194955	943	Web Graph
sina	soc-sinaweibo	58,656K	522,642K	8.9103	165.497	278489	193	Social Network
twi	soc-twitter-2010	21,298K	530,051K	24.8876	414.072	698112	1695	Social Network
wien	wikipedialink-en	13,593K	669,183K	49.2299	644.587	1052326	1114	Web Graph
ara	arabic-2005	22,744K	1,107,806K	48.7075	555.208	575628	3247	Web Graph
uk	uk-2005	39,460K	1,566,054K	39.6872	1655.12	1776858	588	Web Graph
wb	webbase-2001	118,142K	1,709,620K	14.4709	143.961	816127	1506	Web Graph
it	it-2004	41,291K	2,054,950K	49.7671	883.439	1326744	3224	Web Graph

C++. Furthermore, to reduce the load imbalance issues, we adopt a generally accepted technique [27] for our proposed algorithms.

A. Setup

1) *Environments*: All algorithms are implemented in CUDA C++ and evaluated on an NVIDIA GeForce RTX 3090 GPU with 24GB of global memory and 10496 CUDA Cores. The CUDA Driver Version used is 12.2. The detailed parameters of the RTX 3090 GPU are shown in Table III. For fairness, we run all the algorithms for 20 times and report the average time(millisecond).

2) *Datasets*: We conduct experiments using our GPU algorithms and other baselines on 24 publicly available datasets that vary in category, size, average vertex degree, maximum vertex degree and the max coreness, as shown in Table II. These datasets are sourced from different categories:

- Web graphs like *web-Google*, *web-BerkStan*, *trackers*, *webbase-2001*, *uk-2002*, *it-2004*, *in-2004*, *indochina-*

2004, *arabic-2005*, *uk-2005*, *wikipedia-link-oc*, *wikipedia-link-de*, *wikipedia-link-en*.

- Interaction networks such as communication network *wiki-Talk*, citation network *cit-Patents*, collaboration networks *dblp-author* and *hollywood-2009*, as well as social networks *com-Orkut*, *loc-Gowalla*, *soc-LiveJournal1*, *soc-sinaweibo* and *soc-twitter-2010*.
- Internet topology network *as-Skitter*.
- Co-purchasing network *amazon0601*.

These datasets have been widely used in previous related studies. As observed, the graphs demonstrate diverse characteristics. The number of vertices (respectively edges) reaches up to 118.14 million on *webbase-2001*) (respectively 2.05 billion on *it-2004*). The degree distribution exhibits a significant bias on *trackers*, with an average degree of only 10.17, yet boasting a maximum vertex degree as high as 1.16 million. The max coreness reaches up to 6,869 on *Indochina-2004*.

3) *Baselines*: The following shows the baselines and the proposed algorithms.

- *General Parallel Peel (GPP)*: This algorithm is implemented based on the work [19], [20] and the k -core implementation in GPU graph system Gunrock [22].
- *PeelOne*: The *PeelOne* is proposed in this paper.
- *Parallel Peel with the dynamic frontier (PP-dyn)*: This is the latest and SOTA work of *Peel* on GPU [21], which is implemented by low-level programming with a finely optimized block-level dynamic frontiers queue. They perform extra atomic operations to process the under-core vertices.
- *PeelOne with dynamic frontiers (PO-dyn)*: The proposed *PeelOne* algorithm combined with the dynamic frontier

TABLE III: The main performance parameters of GPU.

Device Name	GeForce RTX 3090
CUDA Driver Version	12.2
CUDA Capability	8.6
Global Memory:	24G
Multiprocessors:	82
CUDA Cores/SM:	128
Maximum threads per SM:	1536
GPU Max Clock rate:	1725 MHz
Memory Clock rate:	9751 Mhz
Memory Bus Width:	384-bit

method and the *assertion* method.

- *NbrCore*: This *Index2core*-based algorithm on GPU is implemented based on the work [19]. It recomputes all neighbors’ values of a vertex if the value of the vertex changes.
- *CntCore*: This *Index2core*-based algorithm is proposed in this paper. We locate the frontiers by the *cnt* value to reduce the redundant computation on vertices.
- *HistoCore*: This *Index2core*-based algorithm proposed in this paper. We maintain the up-to-date *histo* array for the vertex to reduce the redundant accessing on edges.

TABLE IV: The execution time of *GPP* and *PeelOne*.

Dataset	GPP	PeelOne	Speed Up	Gunrock	l_1
gow	25.2	21.0	1.2×	58.3772	647
ama	10.5	8.3	1.3×	21.4289	258
talk	67.8	40.8	1.7×	476.841	812
goo	27.4	18.7	1.5×	54.8884	428
ber	112.5	89.1	1.3×	439.928	2519
ski	97.2	63.3	1.5×	548.144	1306
pat	119.9	60.7	2.0×	421.405	1017
in	193.9	134.0	1.4×	2116.87	3351
dbl	27.2	12.7	2.1×	78.2909	183
woc	119.6	114.7	1.0×	5292.7	3084
lj	464.1	244.4	1.9×	3107.48	3851
wde	532.9	328.4	1.6×	11415.7	4386
hol	562.4	414.5	1.4×	25285.2	7462
ork	772.5	541.4	1.4×	5728.11	5919
tra	1581.2	417.6	3.8×	120380	3032
ind	3585.6	1825.5	2.0×	234218	20180
uk	3571.8	1782.1	2.0×	35607.9	9461
sina	3238.7	783.4	4.1×	9211.47	3103
twi	4965.7	1958.8	2.5×	106421	11436
wien	2985.7	1413.1	2.1×	52981	8514
ara	12773.6	6756.1	1.9×	312103	24951
uk	8355.0	4223.6	2.0×	OOM	10143
wb	47269.5	20279.5	2.3×	OOM	22814
it	36176.7	20330.9	1.8×	OOM	38813

B. Results and Discussion

Our experiment focuses on four main objectives, as follows:

- We aim to examine the performance of the *PeelOne* algorithm in comparison with the *General Parallel Peel* algorithm.
- We investigate whether the latest *Peel* on GPU can be further improved by following the guidelines of the *PeelOne* algorithm.
- We analyze the performance of *HistoCore* in the context of the *Index2core* paradigm and compare it with the performance of *NbrCore* and *CntCore*.
- We compare the performance of the optimal *Peel* paradigm and the optimal *Index2core* paradigm.

1) *Parallel Peel-based Algorithm Time*: ***PeelOne* achieves an average speedup of 1.9×** compared to *GPP*. As previously mentioned, *PeelOne* simplifies the logic of the frontiers and the graph operators with the *assertion* method. For the frontiers, *PeelOne* reduces the usage of the property array and merges the residual degree and the coreness of the vertex in

one array. For the graph operators, the residual degree can be used as the condition of the residual vertex so that the memory accesses are localized. Table V illustrates the advantages of the proposed *PeelOne*. The result shows that *PeelOne* achieves up to 4.1×

on the *soc-sinaweibo* and the average speedup is 1.9×

on the 24 datasets. In addition, we also show the execution time of the implementation in the graph-parallel GPU system *gunrock*. Due to system-level overheads, this implementation is clearly slower than *GPP* and *PeelOne*.

The *PeelOne* method can dramatically improve its performance by supporting dynamic frontiers and the *assertion* method. As shown in the Table V, l_1 is the number of iterations of the algorithms. By supporting dynamic frontiers, the l_1 equals the max coreness of the dataset, and the l_1 is significantly reduced ($2\times\sim 25.8\times$, average: $11\times$). As a result, the overhead of synchronization and locating the frontiers can be drastically reduced. Thus, *PP-dyn* achieves an average speedup of 5.2×. Furthermore, with the proposed *assertion* method, *PeelOne-dyn* achieves optimal performance by avoiding more atomic competition. In summary, *PeelOne* with the dynamic frontier can achieve the best performance in the *Peel*-based algorithms.

TABLE V: The performance of *PeelOne* with dynamic frontiers and assertion method.

Dataset	PeelOne (l_1)	PP-dyn (l_1)	Speed Up	PO-dyn (l_1)
gow	21(647)	3(51)	7×	3(51)
ama	8.3(258)	1(10)	8.3×	1(10)
talk	40.8(812)	25(131)	1.6×	24(131)
goo	18.7(428)	3(44)	6.2×	3(44)
ber	89.1(2519)	15.3(201)	5.8×	14.8(201)
ski	63.3(1306)	23.4(111)	2.7×	22.9(111)
pat	60.7(1017)	10(64)	6.1×	10(64)
in	134(3351)	25(488)	5.4×	22(488)
dbl	12.7(183)	7(14)	1.8×	7(14)
woc	114.7(3084)	54(1252)	2.1×	59.8(1252)
lj	244.4(3851)	58.9(372)	4.2×	56.7(372)
wde	328.4(4386)	216.1(837)	1.5×	211(837)
hol	414.5(7462)	150.9(2208)	2.7×	136.7(2208)
ork	541.4(5919)	107.9(253)	5×	104(253)
tra	417.6(3032)	1032.6(438)	0.4×	1030.8(438)
ind	1825.5(20180)	565.9(6869)	3.2×	514.7(6869)
uk	1782.1(9461)	213.1(943)	8.4×	207.3(943)
sina	783.4(3103)	471.7(193)	1.7×	467.6(193)
twi	1958.8(11436)	918.9(1695)	2.1×	914.2(1695)
wien	1413.1(8514)	693.3(1114)	2×	690.1(1114)
ara	6756.1(24951)	889.6(3247)	7.6×	869.2(3247)
uk	4223.6(10143)	449.7(588)	9.4×	437.7(588)
wb	20279.5(22814)	1396.7(1506)	14.5×	1387.2(1506)
it	20330.9(38813)	1311.1(3224)	15.5×	1294.8(3224)

2) *Parallel Index2core-based Algorithm Processing Time*: As shown in Table VI, using the *cnt* value to locate the frontiers, *CntCore* achieves an average speedup of 1.8×

compared to *NbrCore*. Additionally, by using the up-to-date *histo* array to minimize neighbor access, *HistoCore* achieves an average speedup of 8×

compared to *CntCore*. These results demonstrate the parallel potential of the *Index2Core* paradigm, particularly with the use of *HistoCore*. In summary, the

TABLE VI: The performance of *NbrCore*, *CntCore* and *HistoCore*.

dataset	NbrCore	CntCore	HistoCore	Speed Up	l_2
gow	57.6	28.5	3.1	9.2×	40
ama	26.2	17.2	3.0	5.7×	78
talk	323.5	139.0	14.0	9.9×	44
goo	18.1	13.7	4.2	3.2×	24
ber	640.0	361.8	31.0	11.7×	424
ski	370.1	169.7	19.1	8.9×	64
pat	84.1	98.4	16.2	6.1×	63
in	573.1	849.7	40.9	20.8×	976
dbl	48.1	59.7	17.8	3.4×	66
woc	304.5	111.8	18.5	6.0×	164
lj	502.3	344.9	115.2	3.0×	105
wde	2601.7	896.1	219.6	4.1×	131
hol	490.3	267.9	81.5	3.3×	59
ork	2860.9	1686.0	567.3	3.0×	192
tra	55480.3	14618.9	1425.6	10.3×	45
ind	5485.1	5122.7	327.7	15.6×	1253
uk	5697.0	3231.8	323.3	10.0×	588
sina	7059.9	6098.4	788.0	7.7×	110
twi	8348.7	5179.6	806.4	6.4×	84
wien	9453.2	3191.1	886.9	3.6×	93
ara	32193.1	15050.3	1226.2	12.3×	1739
uk	27204.4	8446.9	1083.6	7.8×	351
wb	43293.1	32613.0	4625.2	7.1×	2069
it	68607.8	49933.2	4066.0	12.3×	3525

TABLE VII: The parallel *Peel* paradigm vs. the *Index2core* paradigm.

dataset	PO-dyn	l_1	HistoCore	l_2
loc-Gowalla	3.0	51	3.1	40
amazon0601	1.0	10	3.0	78
wiki-Talk	24.0	131	14.0	44
web-Google	3.0	44	4.2	24
web-BerkStan	14.8	201	31.0	424
as-Skitter	22.9	111	19.1	64
cit-Patents	10.0	64	16.2	63
in-2004	22.0	488	40.9	976
dblp-author	7.0	14	17.8	66
wikipedialink-oc	59.8	1252	18.5	164
LiveJournal1	56.7	372	115.2	105
wikipedialink-de	211.0	837	219.6	131
hollywood-2009	136.7	2208	81.5	59
com-Orkut	104.0	253	567.3	192
trackers	1030.8	438	1425.6	45
indochina-2004	514.7	6869	327.7	1253
uk-2002	207.3	943	323.3	588
soc-sinaweibo	467.6	193	788.0	110
soc-twitter-2010	914.2	1695	806.4	84
wikipedialink-en	690.1	1114	886.9	93
arabic-2005	869.2	3247	1226.2	1739
uk-2005	437.7	588	1083.6	351
webbase-2001	1387.2	1506	4625.2	2069
it-2004	1294.8	3224	4066.0	3525

experiment demonstrates that *HistoCore* can achieve the best performance in the *Index2core*-based algorithms.

3) *Peel vs. Index2core*: The *PeelOne* method with the dynamic frontier represents the optimal GPU performance of the *Peel* paradigm, while *HistoCore* represents the optimal GPU performance of the *Index2Core* paradigm. We compare the performance of these two algorithms as shown in Table VII. The result shows that *PeelOne-dyn* outperforms *HistoCore* by $2\times$ speedup in 6 datasets and exhibits marginally better performance (less than $2\times$ speedup) on 12 datasets. However, on the remaining 6 datasets, *HistoCore* surpasses *PeelOne-dyn*, achieving a performance enhancement of $1.1\times\sim 3.2\times$ speedup. Through an in-depth study of these 6 datasets (with the fonts in bold in Table VII), we found that the value of l_2 is significantly smaller than that of l_1 . l_1 and l_2 represent the iteration number of the *Peel*-based and *Index2core*-based algorithms, respectively. This indicates that the primary performance advantage of *HistoCore* lies in processing graphs with a fewer number of iterations. The minimum value of iteration number for the *Peel*-based algorithms is fixed (to the max coreness k_{max} of a graph). From the perspective of vertex convergence dependency, the *Index2Core*-based algorithms compute the coreness in a top-down way so that the iteration may be smaller than the *Peel*-based algorithms. Furthermore, we can see that the value of l_1 (k_{max}) of the 6 datasets is relatively big, compared to graphs with a similar number of edges. Therefore, *HistoCore* shows the performance advantages in processing the graphs with deeper hierarchical structures. In summary, the experiment demonstrates that the *Index2core*-based algorithm *HistoCore* and the *Peel*-based

algorithm *PeelOne* have their own performance advantages on the datasets with different statistical properties. The parallel *Index2Core* paradigm is also competitive with the parallel *Peel* paradigm on GPU.

VI. RELATED WORK

A. Core Decomposition In Different Settings

1) *In-Memory Setting*: Seidman *et al.* [1] first proposed the concept of k -core and the *Peel* paradigm. In a subsequent advancement, Batagelj *et al.* [33] propose the state-of-the-art serial *Peel*-based algorithm (BZ) with a time complexity of $\mathcal{O}(M)$. Specifically, BZ employs three arrays: the *vertices* array to store the vertices in ascending order of degree, the *bin* array to store the starting position of each bin in the *vertices* array, the *position* array to store the position of each vertex in *vertices* array. By iterating in ascending order of bin numbers, the algorithm removes the vertices belonging to the same bin, updates the degrees of neighbors, and maintains the order of the *vertices* array by shifting the position of neighbors to smaller bins. The key contribution of the BZ algorithm is the reduction of the time complexity of the *Peel* paradigm through bin sorting.

2) *Out Of Memory and Distributed Setting*: To process large-scale graphs that may not reside entirely in the main memory, Cheng *et al.* [34] introduce the *Peel*-based EMCORE, which consists of three key components: an efficient strategy for graph partitioning, an effective mechanism for estimating the upper bound of the core number of the vertices, and a recursive top-down core decomposition procedure. However, EMCORE cannot bound the size of the memory for graph slices,

meaning that it still loads most edges of the graph into main memory. In response, Wen *et al.* [35] propose an *Index2core*-based semi-external algorithm for core decomposition with guaranteed memory bound. When the size of the graph exceeds the capacity of a single machine, existing works [15], [36] concentrate on optimizing the *Index2core* paradigm in a distributed setting, as it is well-suited for vertex-centric distributed computing frameworks.

3) *Multi-core Setting*: Two recent works are studying multi-core algorithms for core decomposition. Park [37] follows the *Peel* paradigm and adopts a two-phase method in each sub-level. To avoid the synchronization overhead within the same core at the sub-level, PKC [38] assigns a local dynamic work-list queue called *buff* to each thread.

4) *GPU Setting*: Zhang *et al.* [19] firstly implement *Peel* and *Index2core* on the GPU. They preliminarily study and compare the performance of *General Parallel Peel* and the *NbrCore* on GPU. The other work all focus on the *Peel* paradigm on GPU. VETGA [20] abstracts the *General Parallel Peel* in terms of vector primitives, leveraging highly optimized GPU vector operations such as PyTorch and GraphBLAS [39]. The GPU-hardwired work [21] is currently the state-of-the-art GPU implementation inspired by the fastest multicore implementation, PKC. They significantly improve performance by utilizing block-level dynamic frontier queues. Furthermore, the classic Graph-based GPU system Gunrock [22] has recently added the *General Parallel Peel* algorithm.

B. Core Decomposition in Different Graph Types

Core decomposition has been extended to various types of graphs, including signed graphs [40], weighted graphs [41], hypergraphs [16], [42], and others. In this paper, we focus on two highly regarded categories: directed graphs and uncertain graphs.

1) *Directed Graphs*: A (k, l) -core refers to a maximal subgraph in which each vertex has an in-degree and out-degree of at least k and l , respectively. This concept serves as a significant graph model. Giatsidis *et al.* [13] are the first to extend the concept of the k -core to directed graphs. They introduce a *Peel*-based D-core decomposition method for detecting and evaluating directed communities (subgraphs). Liao *et al.* [43] propose an *Index2core*-based algorithm for D-core decomposition to handle large-scale directed graphs efficiently in distributed settings.

2) *Uncertain Graphs*: A (k, η) -core refers to a maximal subgraph where each vertex has a probability of at least η to have a degree of at least k . Bonchi *et al.* [44] are the first to study the efficient computation of the k -core on uncertain graphs and proposed a *Peel*-based algorithm. Li *et al.* [45] later propose an improved *Peel*-based algorithm with a low time complexity. Yang *et al.* [46] further improved the scalability of the (k, η) -core and introduce an *Index2core*-based algorithm. Dai *et al.* [14] revisit the previous research and address the inaccuracy issues with the recursive floating-point number division operations involved in the *Peel*-based (k, η) -core algorithm.

C. The Variants of Core Decomposition

1) *Core Maintenance Problem*: The key problem is to maintain the coreness of each vertex and avoid recomputing the entire graph when new edges are inserted or removed. The basic idea is to determine the small induced subgraph based on the updated edges and recalculate the coreness of the vertices in this subgraph [47]. Wen *et al.* [35] further propose an I/O efficient core maintenance algorithm based on the *Index2core* paradigm. To explore the parallelism of core maintenance, Wang *et al.* [48], [49] propose an advanced edge set data structure for processing the updated edges in parallel. Weng *et al.* [15] investigate the scalability of core maintenance in distributed settings.

2) *Graph Structure Optimization and Personalized Query*: k -core is usually used as a network model to help analyze the robustness of the networks. To reinforce the networks, Core maximization aims to maximize the coreness gain of the whole or subgraph by anchoring a small number of vertices in the network [7], [8], [50]. Correspondingly, Liu *et al.* [9] explore the vulnerability of the k -core structure by deleting edges and Zhou *et al.* [10] further explore this problem in network-attacking scenarios. To query and search the personalized k -core, Li *et al.* [51] aim to find the smallest k -core subgraph containing every query vertex. Chu *et al.* [52] study how to find the best k -core set according to a personalized community scoring metric.

VII. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE

This paper proposes an efficient GPU acceleration framework, PICO, for all paradigms of k -core decomposition, including the optimal *Peel*-based algorithm *PeelOne* and the optimal *Index2core*-based algorithm *HistoCore*. The experiments show that *HistoCore* can outperform the further optimized *PeelOne*, which proves the great parallel potential of the *Index2core* paradigm as same with the *Peel* paradigm.

In the future, we aim to explore the hybrid core decomposition algorithm to achieve the best performance on all real-world networks. We will also extend our framework for real-world networks with rich semantics. Furthermore, to process super-big graphs, we intend to explore the performance of our framework in multi-GPU and out-of-GPU settings.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This work is supported in part by the National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant 62225113, 62372333, the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities under Grant 2042023kf0135, the Key Research and Development Program of Hubei Province under Grant 2023BAB078, the Project funded by China Postdoctoral Science Foundation under Grant 2022M722459, the Natural Science Foundation of Hubei Province under Grant 2022CFB795, the Knowledge Innovation Program of Wuhan - Basic Research under Grant 2023010201010063, and the Natural Science Foundation of Zhejiang Province under Grant LQ22F020033.

REFERENCES

- [1] S. B. Seidman, "Network structure and minimum degree," *Social Networks*, pp. 269–287, 1983.
- [2] C. Giatsidis, F. D. Malliaros, D. M. Thilikos, and M. Vazirgiannis, "Corecluster: A degeneracy based graph clustering framework," in *AAAI*, 2014.
- [3] T. Yu and M. Liu, "A linear time algorithm for maximal clique enumeration in large sparse graphs," *Information Processing Letters*, pp. 35–40, 2017.
- [4] Y. Wang, L. Xu, and B. Wu, "A community detection method based on k-shell," in *IEEE Big Data*, 2015, pp. 2314–2319.
- [5] C. Peng, T. G. Kolda, and A. Pinar, "Accelerating community detection by using k-core subgraphs," *ArXiv*, 2014.
- [6] R. Andersen and K. Chellapilla, "Finding dense subgraphs with size bounds," in *Algorithms and Models for the Web-Graph*, 2009.
- [7] Q. Linghu, F. Zhang, X. Lin, W. Zhang, and Y. Zhang, "Global reinforcement of social networks: The anchored coreness problem," in *SIGMOD*, New York, NY, USA, 2020, p. 2211–2226.
- [8] X. Sun, X. Huang, and D. Jin, "Fast algorithms for core maximization on large graphs," *Proc. VLDB Endow.*, p. 1350–1362, 2022.
- [9] K. Liu, S. Wang, Y. Zhang, and C. Xing, "An efficient algorithm for the anchored k-core budget minimization problem," in *ICDE*, 2021, pp. 1356–1367.
- [10] B. Zhou, Y. Lv, J. Wang, J. Zhang, and Q. Xuan, "Attacking the core structure of complex network," *IEEE Transactions on Computational Social Systems*, pp. 1428–1442, 2023.
- [11] M. Pellegrini, M. Baglioni, and F. Geraci, "Protein complex prediction for large protein protein interaction networks with the core and peel method," *BMC Bioinformatics*, 2016.
- [12] H. A. Filho, J. Machicao, and O. M. Bruno, "A hierarchical model of metabolic machinery based on the kcore decomposition of plant metabolic networks," *PLOS ONE*, 2018.
- [13] C. Giatsidis, D. M. Thilikos, and M. Vazirgiannis, "D-cores: measuring collaboration of directed graphs based on degeneracy," *Knowledge and Information Systems*, pp. 311–343, 2013.
- [14] Q. Dai, R.-H. Li, G. Wang, R. Mao, Z. Zhang, and Y. Yuan, "Core decomposition on uncertain graphs revisited," *TKDE*, pp. 196–210, 2023.
- [15] T. Weng, X. Zhou, K. Li, P. Peng, and K. Li, "Efficient distributed approaches to core maintenance on large dynamic graphs," *TPDS*, pp. 129–143, 2022.
- [16] K. Gabert, A. Pinar, and d. V. Çatalyürek, "Shared-memory scalable k-core maintenance on dynamic graphs and hypergraphs," in *IPDPSW*, 2021, pp. 998–1007.
- [17] F. D. Malliaros, C. Giatsidis, A. N. Papadopoulos, and M. Vazirgiannis, "The core decomposition of networks: theory, algorithms and applications," *VLDB*, pp. 61–92, 2020.
- [18] L. Lü, T. Zhou, Q.-M. Zhang, and H. E. Stanley, "The h-index of a network node and its relation to degree and coreness," *Nature Communications*, p. 10168, 2016.
- [19] H. Zhang, H. Hou, L. Zhang, H. Zhang, and Y. Wu, "Accelerating core decomposition in large temporal networks using gpus," in *Neural Information Processing*, 2017, pp. 893–903.
- [20] A. Mehrafza, S. Chester, and A. Thomo, "Vectorising k-core decomposition for gpu acceleration," in *Proceedings of the 32nd International Conference on Scientific and Statistical Database Management*, 2020.
- [21] A. Ahmad, L. Yuan, D. Yan, G. Guo, J. Chen, and C. Zhang, "Accelerating k-core decomposition by a gpu," in *ICDE*, 2023, pp. 1818–1831.
- [22] Y. Wang, A. Davidson, Y. Pan, Y. Wu, A. Riffel, and J. D. Owens, "Gunrock: A high-performance graph processing library on the gpu," in *PPoPP*, 2016.
- [23] P. Harish and P. J. Narayanan, "Accelerating large graph algorithms on the gpu using cuda," in *High Performance Computing*, 2007, pp. 197–208.
- [24] M. Sha, Y. Li, and K.-L. Tan, "Self-adaptive graph traversal on gpus," in *SIGMOD*, 2021, p. 1558–1570.
- [25] L. Hu, L. Zou, and Y. Liu, "Accelerating triangle counting on gpu," in *SIGMOD*, 2021, p. 736–748.
- [26] K. Wang, D. Fussell, and C. Lin, "A fast work-efficient sssp algorithm for gpu," in *PPoPP*, 2021, p. 133–146.
- [27] A. H. Nodehi Sabet, J. Qiu, and Z. Zhao, "Tigr: Transforming irregular graphs for gpu-friendly graph processing," in *ASPLOS*, New York, NY, USA, 2018, p. 622–636.
- [28] R. R. McCune, T. Weninger, and G. Madey, "Thinking like a vertex: A survey of vertex-centric frameworks for large-scale distributed graph processing," *ACM Comput. Surv.*, 2015.
- [29] A. Roy, I. Mihailovic, and W. Zwaenepoel, "X-stream: Edge-centric graph processing using streaming partitions," in *SOSP*, 2013, p. 472–488.
- [30] P. Yuan, W. Zhang, C. Xie, H. Jin, L. Liu, and K. Lee, "Fast iterative graph computation: A path centric approach," in *SC*, 2014, p. 401–412.
- [31] Y. Tian, A. Balmin, S. A. Corsten, S. Tatikonda, and J. McPherson, "From "think like a vertex" to "think like a graph"," *Proc. VLDB Endow.*, p. 193–204, 2013.
- [32] J. Anantpur and R. Govindarajan, "Taming warp divergence," in *International Symposium on Code Generation and Optimization*, 2017, p. 50–60.
- [33] V. Batagelj and M. Zaversnik, "An o(m) algorithm for cores decomposition of networks," *CoRR*, 2003.
- [34] J. Cheng, Y. Ke, S. Chu, and M. T. Özsu, "Efficient core decomposition in massive networks," in *ICDE*, 2011, pp. 51–62.
- [35] D. Wen, L. Qin, Y. Zhang, X. Lin, and J. X. Yu, "I/o efficient core graph decomposition: Application to degeneracy ordering," *TKDE*, pp. 75–90, 2019.
- [36] A. Montresor, F. De Pellegrini, and D. Miorandi, "Distributed k-core decomposition," *TPDS*, pp. 288–300, 2013.
- [37] N. S. Dasari, R. Desh, and M. Zubair, "Park: An efficient algorithm for k-core decomposition on multicore processors," in *IEEE Big Data*, 2014, pp. 9–16.
- [38] H. Kabir and K. Madduri, "Parallel k-core decomposition on multicore platforms," in *IPDPSW*, 2017, pp. 1482–1491.
- [39] B. Brock, A. Buluç, T. Mattson, S. McMillan, and J. Moreira, "The graphblas c api specification," *GraphBLAS.org, Tech. Rep.*, 2019.
- [40] J. Kim and S. Lim, "(p,n)-core: Core decomposition in signed networks," in *Database Systems for Advanced Applications*, 2022, pp. 543–551.
- [41] X. Wu, W. Wei, L. Tang, J. Lu, and J. Lü, "Coreness and h-index for weighted networks," *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems I: Regular Papers*, pp. 3113–3122, 2019.
- [42] N. A. Arafat, A. Khan, A. K. Rai, and B. Ghosh, "Neighborhood-based hypergraph core decomposition," *Proc. VLDB Endow.*, p. 2061–2074, may 2023.
- [43] X. Liao, Q. Liu, J. Jiang, X. Huang, J. Xu, and B. Choi, "Distributed d-core decomposition over large directed graphs," *Proc. VLDB Endow.*, p. 1546–1558, 2022.
- [44] F. Bonchi, F. Gullo, A. Kaltenbrunner, and Y. Volkovich, "Core decomposition of uncertain graphs," in *KDD*, New York, NY, USA, 2014, p. 1316–1325.
- [45] R.-H. Li, Q. Dai, G. Wang, Z. Ming, L. Qin, and J. X. Yu, "Improved algorithms for maximal clique search in uncertain networks," in *ICDE*, 2019, pp. 1178–1189.
- [46] B. Yang, D. Wen, L. Qin, Y. Zhang, L. Chang, and R.-H. Li, "Index-based optimal algorithm for computing k-cores in large uncertain graphs," in *ICDE*, 2019, pp. 64–75.
- [47] R.-H. Li, J. X. Yu, and R. Mao, "Efficient core maintenance in large dynamic graphs," *TKDE*, pp. 2453–2465, 2014.
- [48] N. Wang, D. Yu, H. Jin, C. Qian, X. Xie, and Q.-S. Hua, "Parallel algorithm for core maintenance in dynamic graphs," in *IEEE International Conference on Distributed Computing Systems*, 2017, pp. 2366–2371.
- [49] D. Yu, N. Wang, Q. Luo, F. Li, J. Yu, X. Cheng, and Z. Cai, "Fast core maintenance in dynamic graphs," *IEEE Transactions on Computational Social Systems*, pp. 710–723, 2022.
- [50] K. Bhawalkar, J. Kleinberg, K. Lewi, T. Roughgarden, and A. Sharma, "Preventing unraveling in social networks: The anchored k-core problem," in *Automata, Languages, and Programming*, 2012, pp. 440–451.
- [51] C. Li, F. Zhang, Y. Zhang, L. Qin, W. Zhang, and X. Lin, "Efficient progressive minimum k-core search," *Proc. VLDB Endow.*, p. 362–375, 2019.
- [52] D. Chu, F. Zhang, X. Lin, W. Zhang, Y. Zhang, Y. Xia, and C. Zhang, "Finding the best k in core decomposition: A time and space optimal solution," in *ICDE*, 2020, pp. 685–696.