

Scaling Up Graph Propagation Computation on Large Graphs: A Local Chebyshev Approximation Approach

Yichun Yang
Beijing Institute of Technology
Beijing, China
3120241475@bit.edu.cn

Rong-Hua Li
Beijing Institute of Technology
Beijing, China
lironghuabit@126.com

Meihao Liao
Beijing Institute of Technology
Beijing, China
mhliao@bit.edu.cn

Longlong Lin
Southwest University
Chongqing, China
longlonglin@swu.edu.cn

Guoren Wang
Beijing Institute of Technology
Beijing, China
wanggrbit@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Graph propagation (GP) computation plays a crucial role in graph data analysis, supporting various applications such as graph node similarity queries, graph node ranking, graph clustering, and graph neural networks. Existing methods, mainly relying on power iteration or push computation frameworks, often face challenges with slow convergence rates when applied to large-scale graphs. To address this issue, we propose a novel and powerful approach that accelerates power iteration and push methods using Chebyshev polynomials. Specifically, we first present a novel Chebyshev expansion formula for general GP functions, offering a new perspective on GP computation and achieving accelerated convergence. Building on these theoretical insights, we develop a novel Chebyshev power iteration method (ChebyPower) and a novel Chebyshev push method (ChebyPush). Our ChebyPower method demonstrates an approximate acceleration of $O(\sqrt{N})$ compared to existing power iteration techniques for both personalized PageRank and heat kernel PageRank computations, which are well-studied GP problems. For ChebyPush, we propose an innovative subset Chebyshev recurrence technique, enabling the design of a push-style local algorithm with provable error guarantee and reduced time complexity compared to existing push methods. We conduct extensive experiments using 5 large real-world datasets to evaluate our proposed algorithms, demonstrating their superior efficiency compared to state-of-the-art approaches.

1 INTRODUCTION

Graph propagation (GP) computation is a fundamental operation in graph data analysis with diverse applications, such as graph node similarity queries [22, 23, 27, 28, 41, 42, 45], graph node ranking [14, 32], graph clustering [1, 7, 20, 25, 26], and graph neural networks [3, 4, 15, 16, 18, 36, 44, 49]. Consequently, numerous GP

computation problems have been extensively studied in the literature [46]. Among them, two representative and well-investigated GP models are single-source Personalized PageRank (SSPPR) [1] and heat kernel PageRank (HKPR) [7]. Informally, these two GP models are defined as concise summaries of an infinite number of random walks, featuring elegant structural properties and strong interpretability for the aforementioned graph tasks.

In an undirected graph $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ with n nodes and m edges, state-of-the-art (SOTA) GP computation algorithms generally fall into two categories: Power-iteration based method and Push-based approaches (details in Section 2). Perhaps the most fundamental and representative power-iteration based method is PwMethod [32]. However, due to its slow convergence rate and the $O(m+n)$ number of operations required for each iteration, PwMethod faces significant efficiency challenges when handling large graphs. To illustrate, when the parameter α is small or t is large (i.e. the case when PwMethod is hard to converge), the running time for an SSPPR/HKPR query using PwMethod may exceed 10^3 seconds even on moderately sized graphs. While subsequent studies [6, 45] have enhanced the efficiency of PwMethod, their approaches are heavily dependent on the structure of SSPPR and cannot be used for general GP computation (e.g., HKPR), thus limiting their applicability.

In contrast, push-based algorithms (such as Push [21, 47]) implement PwMethod locally on the graph. The most notable characteristic of push-based algorithms is their local time complexity (i.e., independent of n and m), making them highly scalable for massive graphs. However, push-based algorithms are primarily effective for low-precision GP computation. When high-precision GP computation is necessary, similar to PwMethod, push-based approaches also face challenges with slow convergence rates. Moreover, as reported in [6, 45], push-based algorithms perform even worse than PwMethod in practice for high-precision SSPPR computation. Therefore, developing efficient and provable algorithms for GP computation remains a challenging task.

To overcome these challenges, we propose several novel approaches to accelerate the computation of general GP using Chebyshev polynomials. Specifically, we observe that the core of both PwMethod and push-based algorithms lies in expanding the GP function using the Taylor series. However, since the polynomial series $\{x^k\}$ from Taylor expansion lacks orthogonality, it often fails to provide the optimal approximation for GP functions, as

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than ACM must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from permissions@acm.org.

Conference'17, July 2017, Washington, DC, USA

© 2024 Association for Computing Machinery.

ACM ISBN 978-x-xxxx-xxxx-x/YY/MM... \$15.00

<https://doi.org/10.1145/nnnnnnn.nnnnnnn>

established in approximation theory [33]. Consequently, this results in poor convergence rates when computing the GP function via Taylor expansion. In contrast, approximation theory demonstrates that Chebyshev polynomials, which are orthogonal, offer the best approximations [33]. This leads to a natural question: can we leverage Chebyshev polynomials to accelerate the convergence rates of PwMethod or push-based algorithms? In this paper, we answer this question affirmatively. Specifically, we present a novel Chebyshev expansion formula for general GP functions, providing a new perspective on GP computation. Theoretically, we prove that this new Chebyshev expansion achieves faster convergence rates compared to traditional Taylor expansion methods. For instance, for both SSPPR and HKPR computations, we prove that the convergence rate is accelerated by roughly $O(\sqrt{N})$ times compared to that achievable through Taylor expansion (details in Lemma 3.5).

Based on our Chebyshev expansion technique, we propose two efficient algorithms: ChebyPower and ChebyPush, tailored to accelerate PwMethod and Push methods, respectively. ChebyPower utilizes a new Chebyshev power-iteration principle to enhance the convergence rate of PwMethod, while ChebyPush leverages a novel subset Chebyshev recurrence technique to obtain a local algorithm. ChebyPush works similarly to Push but converges faster than Push. Theoretically, we conduct a thorough analysis of the time complexity and error bounds of our proposed algorithms, demonstrating that ChebyPush achieves faster convergence compared to existing methods. Extensive experiments on 5 large real-world graphs confirm the high efficiency of the proposed approaches for both SSPPR and HKPR computations. In summary, the main contributions of this paper are as follows:

New theoretical results. We establish a new Chebyshev expansion formula for approximating general graph propagation functions, demonstrating a faster convergence rate compared to the traditional Taylor expansion. Based on this, we also derive exact Chebyshev coefficients for both SSPPR and HKPR, which provide new interpretations of SSPPR and HKPR. We also propose a novel subset Chebyshev recurrence technique and establish theoretical connections between subset Chebyshev recurrence and the standard Chebyshev method. We believe that our subset Chebyshev recurrence technique may prove beneficial for solving other numerical computation problems, thereby may attract independent interests.

Novel algorithms. Based on the Chebyshev expansion, we propose a novel Chebyshev power-iteration algorithm, named ChebyPower. We show that ChebyPower achieves an approximate acceleration of $O(\sqrt{N})$ over existing power iteration methods for both SSPPR and HKPR computations. Together with our subset Chebyshev recurrence, we develop a new push-style algorithm, called ChebyPush, with time complexity independent of the graph size. We conduct a comprehensive theoretical analysis of ChebyPush regarding its accuracy and running time. Our results show that, compared to the SOTA Push algorithm for general graph propagation computations, ChebyPush generally exhibits lower time complexity while maintaining similar error bounds.

Extensive experiments. We conduct extensive experiments on 5 real-world graphs. The results show that: (1) For SSPPR computation, our ChebyPush algorithm achieves superior performance across all methods in large graphs, while in relatively small graphs, both ChebyPower and ChebyPush perform comparably to SOTA baselines; (2) For HKPR computation, ChebyPush substantially outperforms all other algorithms over all datasets, and ChebyPower surpass all SOTA baselines on most datasets. In particular, ChebyPush often achieves 3 ~ 8 times faster speeds than other methods while maintaining the same approximation accuracy.

2 PRELIMINARIES

2.1 Notations

Consider an undirected graph $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$, where \mathcal{V} denotes the set of nodes with $|\mathcal{V}| = n$ and \mathcal{E} represents the set of edges with $|\mathcal{E}| = m$. For any node $u \in \mathcal{V}$, we denote $\mathcal{N}(u) = \{v | (u, v) \in \mathcal{E}\}$ as the neighbor set of u and $d_u = |\mathcal{N}(u)|$ is the degree of u . Let $\mathbf{d} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be the degree vector with $d(u) = d_u$. Let $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ be the adjacency matrix, where $\mathbf{A}_{i,j} = \mathbf{A}_{j,i} = 1$ if $(i, j) \in \mathcal{E}$, otherwise $\mathbf{A}_{i,j} = 0$. Denote by $\mathbf{D} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ the diagonal degree matrix, where the diagonal element $\mathbf{D}_{i,i} = d_i$, and the off-diagonal elements are 0. The classic random walk matrix is defined as $\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{D}^{-1}$, where each element represents the transition probability of a random walk on the graph. Let $\mathbf{e}_s \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be a one-hot vector, which has a value of 1 at node s and 0 elsewhere. Then, the random-walk related GP vector can be defined as follows. Before we define the GP vector, we first define the matrix function.

Definition 2.1 (Matrix Function [17]). Given a matrix $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ with eigenvalues $\lambda(\mathbf{X}) \in [-a, a]$, and an infinitely-differentiable (or smooth) function f on the interval $[-a, a]$ (denote by $f \in C_\infty[-a, a]$ for short) with Taylor expansion $f(x) = \sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} \zeta_k x^k$ (ζ_k denotes the Taylor expansion coefficient). Suppose the Taylor expansion of f converges in the range $[-a, a]$. Then, the matrix function $f(\mathbf{X})$ is defined as $f(\mathbf{X}) \triangleq \sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} \zeta_k \mathbf{X}^k$.

By Definition 2.1, the random-walk related GP function [37] (GP function for short) can be defined as follows.

Definition 2.2 (Graph Propagation (GP) Function). Given a function $f \in C_\infty[-1, 1]$ for $x \in [-1, 1]$, the Taylor expansion coefficient $\{\zeta_k\}$, the GP function is defined as $f(\mathbf{P}) \triangleq \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \zeta_k \mathbf{P}^k$.

Given a one-hot vector \mathbf{e}_s , the GP vector w.r.t. \mathbf{e}_s is defined as

$$\mathbf{y} = f(\mathbf{P}) \mathbf{e}_s = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \zeta_k \mathbf{P}^k \mathbf{e}_s. \quad (1)$$

Based on Eq. (1), the well-known single-source personalized PageRank (SSPPR) vector [1] and Heat Kernel PageRank (HKPR) vector [7, 21] can be represented as the GP vector.

Definition 2.3 (Single-source Personalized PageRank (SSPPR) vector [1]). Given a parameter $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and a source node s , let $\zeta_k = \alpha(1 - \alpha)^k$, an SSPPR vector is defined as

$$\boldsymbol{\pi}_s = \alpha(\mathbf{I} - (1 - \alpha)\mathbf{P})^{-1} \mathbf{e}_s = \alpha \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (1 - \alpha)^k \mathbf{P}^k \mathbf{e}_s. \quad (2)$$

Definition 2.4 (Heat Kernel PageRank (HKPR) vector [7]). Given a parameter $t \in (1, \infty)$ and a source node s , let $\zeta_k = e^{-t} \frac{t^k}{k!}$, an HKPR vector is defined as

$$\rho_s = e^{-t(1-P)} \mathbf{e}_s = e^{-t} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{t^k}{k!} \mathbf{P}^k \mathbf{e}_s. \quad (3)$$

The two GP vectors mentioned above are extensively employed in graph analysis tasks [1, 21, 37, 41]. However, computing these GP vectors on large graphs can be costly. Therefore, similar to previous studies [1, 21, 37, 41], we primarily focus on approximate computation of these vectors. To evaluate the approximation quality, we use several widely adopted error metrics [37, 46].

Definition 2.5. Consider a positive real-number vector $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with its estimate $\hat{\mathbf{y}}$, several commonly-used error measures are defined as follows:

- l_1 -error: $\|\mathbf{y} - \hat{\mathbf{y}}\|_1 = \sum_{u \in \mathcal{V}} |\mathbf{y}(u) - \hat{\mathbf{y}}(u)|$;
- l_2 -error: $\|\mathbf{y} - \hat{\mathbf{y}}\|_2 = \sqrt{\sum_{u \in \mathcal{V}} (\mathbf{y}(u) - \hat{\mathbf{y}}(u))^2}$;
- degree-normalized error: $\|\mathbf{D}^{-1}(\mathbf{y} - \hat{\mathbf{y}})\|_{\infty} = \max_{u \in \mathcal{V}} \frac{|\mathbf{y}(u) - \hat{\mathbf{y}}(u)|}{d_u}$;

While our focus is on computing the SSPPR and HKPR vectors, it is worth noting that the proposed techniques can be used to compute more general GP vectors (see Section 5.1).

2.2 Existing Solutions and Their Limitations

The state-of-the-art (SOTA) algorithms for approximately computing GP vectors can be roughly categorized into two types: Power-iteration based methods and Push-based approaches.

Power-iteration based method (PwMethod) is a fundamental method for GP computation [32]. Specifically, the PwMethod procedure (Algorithm 1) is stated as follows: First, it sets the initial estimate $\hat{\mathbf{y}} = \mathbf{0}$ and $\mathbf{r}_0 = \mathbf{e}_s$ (Line 1). Then, in each iteration (Lines 2-6), it performs the following updates: (i) $\hat{\mathbf{y}} \leftarrow \hat{\mathbf{y}} + \zeta_k \mathbf{r}_k$ (Line 3), (ii) $\mathbf{r}_{k+1} \leftarrow \mathbf{P} \mathbf{r}_k$ (Line 4), until the procedure stops after the N -th iteration (Lines 2 and 6). Finally, it outputs $\hat{\mathbf{y}}$ as the approximation of $\mathbf{y} = f(\mathbf{P})\mathbf{e}_s$. It is easy to show that by setting N (the truncation step of Taylor expansion) sufficiently large, PwMethod can always produce a high-accurate approximation vector [32, 37]. The time complexity of PwMethod is $O(N(m+n))$ since it necessitates exploring the entire graph in each iteration. A significant limitation of PwMethod is its slow convergence to the exact solution, with a convergence speed of $O(N)$. Therefore, to achieve a highly accurate GP vector, often a large truncation step N is required [32, 37], rendering PwMethod very costly for large graphs.

Push-based method (Push) is a *local* algorithm (Algorithm 2) that can asynchronously prune the “unimportant” propagation of PwMethod [1]. The key feature of this algorithm is that it only needs to explore a small portion of the graph when computing approximate SSPPR [1] or HKPR [47] vectors. Specifically, Push first sets the initial approximate solution $\hat{\mathbf{y}} = \mathbf{0}$ and the residual $\mathbf{r}_0 = \mathbf{e}_s$ (Line 1). Then, in each iteration (Lines 2-10), it only performs the matrix-vector multiplication $\mathbf{P} \mathbf{r}_k$ on “important” nodes. That is, if there exists a node u such that $\mathbf{r}_k(u) > \epsilon_k d_u$ (such u is regarded as an “important” node), it performs the following *push* operation: (i) adds $\zeta_k \mathbf{r}_k(u)$ to $\hat{\mathbf{y}}(u)$, (ii) uniformly distributes $\mathbf{r}_k(u)$

Algorithm 1: PwMethod [32]

Input: A graph $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$, GP function f with its Taylor expansion coefficients $\{\zeta_k\}$, a source node s , and the truncation step N

```

1  $\hat{\mathbf{y}} = \mathbf{0}; \mathbf{r}_0 = \mathbf{e}_s; k = 0;$ 
2 while  $k < N$  do
3    $\hat{\mathbf{y}} \leftarrow \hat{\mathbf{y}} + \zeta_k \mathbf{r}_k;$ 
4    $\mathbf{r}_{k+1} \leftarrow \mathbf{P} \mathbf{r}_k;$ 
5    $k \leftarrow k + 1;$ 
6 end
```

Output: $\hat{\mathbf{y}}$ as the approximation of $\mathbf{y} = f(\mathbf{P})\mathbf{e}_s$

to each neighbor of u , namely, $\mathbf{r}_{k+1}(v) \leftarrow \mathbf{r}_{k+1}(v) + \mathbf{r}_k(u)/d_u$ for all u 's neighbor v , and (iii) sets $\mathbf{r}_k(u)$ to 0. When the iteration stops (i.e., the number of iterations reached N in Line 2 or there is no “important” node to *push* in Line 3), it outputs $\hat{\mathbf{y}}$ as an approximate solution. Although Push can significantly accelerate PwMethod, its convergence speed remains the same when aiming for a highly accurate GP vector. Indeed, as shown in [45], PwMethod is equivalent to Push for achieving high-accuracy SSPPR vector computations.

In addition, it is worth mentioning that several randomized techniques have also been proposed to speed up PwMethod and Push for *specific* GP vector computations. Most of these randomized algorithms are based on a bidirectional framework that combines Push (or PwMethod [22]) with a Monte Carlo sampling technique [22, 23, 41, 43, 45–47]. The core idea of these bidirectional randomized algorithms is to use PwMethod or Push to reduce the variance of the Monte Carlo estimator. Although these algorithms can theoretically achieve relative error guarantees, they often perform worse than Push when high accuracy is required. Furthermore, these bidirectional algorithms are generally designed for computing either SSPPR or HKPR, and typically cannot handle the general GP vectors. A more versatile approach is the randomized push algorithm [37, 38], which can approximate the computation of general GP vectors. However, similar to Push, this randomized push algorithm still faces the challenge of low convergence speed. For instance, for GP vector computation, the time complexity of AGP [37] is $O(\frac{N^3}{\epsilon^2 \delta})$ to achieve an ϵ -relative error guarantee, where N denotes the truncation step in the Taylor expansion (typically requiring a large value for accurate GP vector computation).

To overcome the limitations of existing SOTA methods, in this work, we propose a novel approach based on Chebyshev polynomials to compute general GP vectors, which can significantly boost the convergence speed of both PwMethod and Push. Similar to Push, we devise a local and more efficient algorithm using a newly developed subset Chebyshev technique. Moreover, our solution can also be integrated into the bidirectional framework [23, 41, 45, 47] (see Section 5.2). Below, we will first introduce a new power iteration method accelerated by Chebyshev polynomials. This method relies on a novel Chebyshev expansion of the GP function. Then, we propose the subset Chebyshev technique, utilizing which we will develop a novel push-style local algorithm.

Algorithm 2: Push [21, 47]

Input: A graph $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$, GP function f with its Taylor expansion coefficients $\{\zeta_k\}$, a source node s , the truncation step N , a set of thresholds $\{\epsilon_k\}$

- 1 $\hat{y} = \mathbf{0}; \mathbf{r}_0 = \mathbf{e}_s; k = 0;$
- 2 **while** $k < N$ **do**
- 3 **for** $u \in \mathcal{V}$ with $\mathbf{r}_k(u) > \epsilon_k d_u$ **do**
- 4 $\hat{y}(u) \leftarrow \hat{y}(u) + \zeta_k \mathbf{r}_k(u);$
- 5 **for** $v \in \mathcal{N}(u)$ **do**
- 6 $\mathbf{r}_{k+1}(v) \leftarrow \mathbf{r}_{k+1}(v) + \mathbf{r}_k(u)/d_u;$
- 7 **end**
- 8 $\mathbf{r}_k(u) \leftarrow \mathbf{0};$
- 9 **end**
- 10 $k \leftarrow k + 1;$
- 11 **end**

Output: \hat{y} as the approximation of $\mathbf{y} = f(\mathbf{P})\mathbf{e}_s$

3 A CHEBYSHEV POWER METHOD

In this section, we first introduce a new concept called Chebyshev expansion of GP function and then give an interpretation of why Chebyshev expansion can boost the convergence speed. Finally, we will develop a new Chebyshev power iteration method based on the Chebyshev expansion, namely ChebyPower.

3.1 Chebyshev Expansion of GP Function

Unlike existing methods for computing GP vectors, which are based on Taylor expansions of the GP function, we introduce a novel technique called Chebyshev expansion, leveraging Chebyshev polynomials. Below, we first define Chebyshev polynomials [29].

Definition 3.1 (Chebyshev polynomials). For any $x \in \mathbb{R}$, the (first kind of) Chebyshev polynomials $\{T_k(x)\}$ is defined as the following recurrence: (i) $T_0(x) = 1, T_1(x) = x$; (ii) $T_{k+1}(x) = 2xT_k(x) - T_{k-1}(x)$ for $k \geq 1$.

Since Chebyshev polynomials $\{T_k(x)\}$ form an orthogonal polynomial basis, they are capable of representing any real-valued function [29]. Therefore, rather than employing Taylor expansion to represent the GP function, we utilize Chebyshev polynomials for this purpose. This representation of the GP function using Chebyshev polynomials is termed as Chebyshev expansion. The advantage of employing Chebyshev expansion is that it can derive a new power iteration method with a faster convergence speed. Since the GP function is a matrix function (not a traditional real-valued function), deriving the Chebyshev expansion is non-trivial. Below, we address this challenge by employing the eigen-decomposition technique. Due to space limits, all the missing proofs can be found in the full version of this paper [48].

LEMMA 3.2 (CHEBYSHEV EXPANSION FOR GENERAL GP FUNCTION). *The following Chebyshev expansion holds for any graph propagation function f :*

$$f(\mathbf{P}) = \sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} c_k T_k(\mathbf{P}), \quad (4)$$

where $c_k = \langle f, T_k \rangle = \frac{2}{\pi} \int_{-1}^1 \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-x^2}} f(x) T_k(x) dx$ if $k \geq 1$; $c_0 = \langle f, T_0 \rangle = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{-1}^1 \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-x^2}} f(x) T_0(x) dx$.

PROOF. By the definition of Chebyshev expansion of any function $g \in L_2[-1, 1]$ [29] (where $g \in L_2[-1, 1]$ means $\int_{-1}^1 |g|^2 < +\infty$), we have:

$$g(x) \sim \sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} c_k T_k(x).$$

Note that the graph propagation function f is infinitely differentiable and continuous. Since f is a continuous function, by Weierstrass approximation theorem (e.g. see Theorem 3.2 in [29]), f can be arbitrarily approximated by polynomials. Therefore, the equality holds: $f(x) = \sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} c_k T_k(x)$. By the property of random-walk matrix, we have $\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{D}^{-1} = \mathbf{D}^{1/2} \tilde{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{D}^{-1/2}$, where $\tilde{\mathbf{A}} = \mathbf{D}^{-1/2} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{D}^{-1/2}$. Further, by the property of matrix function, we have $f(\mathbf{P}) = \mathbf{D}^{1/2} f(\tilde{\mathbf{A}}) \mathbf{D}^{-1/2}$.

Since $\tilde{\mathbf{A}}$ is a real symmetric matrix, it has eigen-decomposition $\tilde{\mathbf{A}} = \mathbf{U}\mathbf{A}\mathbf{U}^T$ with orthogonal matrix \mathbf{U} and diagonal matrix \mathbf{A} . Thus, by the property of matrix function, we have $f(\tilde{\mathbf{A}}) = \mathbf{U}f(\mathbf{A})\mathbf{U}^T$. As a consequence, we only need to focus on the expansion of $f(\mathbf{A})$. Since the eigenvalues $\lambda(\mathbf{P}) \in [-1, 1]$ for undirected graphs, the Chebyshev expansion holds: $f(\mathbf{A}) = \sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} c_k T_k(\mathbf{A})$. Therefore, the following equation holds:

$$\begin{aligned} f(\mathbf{P}) &= \mathbf{D}^{1/2} \mathbf{U} f(\mathbf{A}) \mathbf{U}^T \mathbf{D}^{-1/2} \\ &= \mathbf{D}^{1/2} \mathbf{U} \left(\sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} c_k T_k(\mathbf{A}) \right) \mathbf{U}^T \mathbf{D}^{-1/2} = \sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} c_k T_k(\mathbf{P}). \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. \square

Based on Lemma 3.2, we are able to derive the Chebyshev expansions for both SSPPR and HKPR vectors. Specifically, by setting $f(x) = \alpha(1 - (1 - \alpha)x)^{-1}$ ($f(x) = e^{-t(1-x)}$), we can obtain the Chebyshev expansion of the SSPPR (HKPR) vector.

LEMMA 3.3 (CHEBYSHEV EXPANSION FOR SSPPR). *Let $\gamma = \frac{\alpha}{\sqrt{2\alpha - \alpha^2}}$, $\beta = \frac{1 - \sqrt{2\alpha - \alpha^2}}{1 - \alpha}$. Then, the SSPPR vector can be represented as follows:*

$$\boldsymbol{\pi}_s = \alpha[\mathbf{I} - (1 - \alpha)\mathbf{P}]^{-1} \mathbf{e}_s = \gamma \mathbf{e}_s + 2\gamma \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \beta^k T_k(\mathbf{P}) \mathbf{e}_s. \quad (5)$$

PROOF. Since the PageRank function follows $f(x) = \alpha(1 - (1 - \alpha)x)^{-1}$ and Chebyshev polynomials follows $T_n(x) = \cos(n \arccos(x))$, by definition 3.2, we can express the coefficients c_n as follows:

$$\frac{\pi}{2} c_n = \int_{-1}^1 \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-x^2}} T_n(x) f(x) dx = \alpha \int_0^\pi \frac{\cos(n\theta)}{1 - (1 - \alpha) \cos \theta} d\theta, n \geq 1$$

with $x = \cos \theta$. For $n = 0$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha \int_0^\pi \frac{1}{1 - (1 - \alpha) \cos \theta} d\theta &= \alpha \int_0^\pi \frac{1}{\alpha + 2(1 - \alpha) \sin^2(\frac{\theta}{2})} d\theta \\ &= \frac{\alpha\pi}{\sqrt{2\alpha - \alpha^2}} = \pi c_0. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\int_0^\pi \frac{1}{p+\sin^2(\frac{\theta}{2})} d\theta = \frac{\pi}{\sqrt{p(p+1)}}$ by basic calculus. For $n = 1$, similarly, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha \int_0^\pi \frac{\cos \theta}{1 - (1-\alpha) \cos \theta} d\theta &= \alpha \int_0^\pi \frac{1 - \sin^2(\frac{\theta}{2})}{\alpha + 2(1-\alpha) \sin^2(\frac{\theta}{2})} d\theta \\ &= -\frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha} \pi + \alpha \int_0^\pi \frac{1 + \alpha/(1-\alpha)}{\alpha + 2(1-\alpha) \sin^2(\frac{\theta}{2})} d\theta \\ &= \frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha} \pi \left[-1 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\alpha - \alpha^2}} \right] = \frac{\pi}{2} c_1. \end{aligned}$$

We use the induction argument to prove the case of $n \geq 2$. Suppose that for $n = k$ we have

$$\alpha \int_0^\pi \frac{\cos(k\theta)}{1 - (1-\alpha) \cos \theta} d\theta = \frac{\alpha\pi}{\sqrt{2\alpha - \alpha^2}} \left(\frac{1 - \sqrt{2\alpha - \alpha^2}}{1-\alpha} \right)^k = \frac{\pi}{2} c_k.$$

Then, for $n = k + 1$, by the Chebyshev recurrence, we have

$$\alpha \int_0^\pi \frac{\cos((k+1)\theta)}{1 - (1-\alpha) \cos \theta} d\theta = \alpha \int_0^\pi \frac{2 \cos \theta \cos(k\theta) - \cos((k-1)\theta)}{1 - (1-\alpha) \cos \theta} d\theta.$$

We consider the following integral:

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_0^\pi \frac{\cos \theta \cos(k\theta)}{1 - (1-\alpha) \cos \theta} d\theta \\ &= -\frac{1}{1-\alpha} \int_0^\pi \cos(k\theta) d\theta + \left(1 + \frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha}\right) \int_0^\pi \frac{\cos(k\theta)}{1 - (1-\alpha) \cos \theta} d\theta \\ &= \left(1 + \frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha}\right) \frac{\pi}{\sqrt{2\alpha - \alpha^2}} \left(\frac{1 - \sqrt{2\alpha - \alpha^2}}{1-\alpha} \right)^k. \end{aligned}$$

Based on this, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} &\alpha \int_0^\pi \frac{\cos((k+1)\theta)}{1 - (1-\alpha) \cos \theta} d\theta \\ &= \frac{\alpha\pi}{\sqrt{2\alpha - \alpha^2}} \left(\frac{1 - \sqrt{2\alpha - \alpha^2}}{1-\alpha} \right)^{k-1} \left(\frac{2}{1-\alpha} \frac{1 - \sqrt{2\alpha - \alpha^2}}{1-\alpha} - 1 \right) \\ &= \frac{\alpha\pi}{\sqrt{2\alpha - \alpha^2}} \left(\frac{1 - \sqrt{2\alpha - \alpha^2}}{1-\alpha} \right)^{k+1} = \frac{\pi}{2} c_{k+1}. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. \square

LEMMA 3.4 (CHEBYSHEV EXPANSION FOR HKPR). Let $I_n(t)$ be the first type of modified Bessel functions [31], namely, $I_n(t) = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_0^\pi e^{t \cos \theta} \cos(n\theta) d\theta$, $n \geq 0$. Then, HKPR can be expanded as follows:

$$\rho_s = e^{-t(\mathbf{I}-\mathbf{P})} \mathbf{e}_s = e^{-t} I_0(t) \mathbf{e}_s + 2e^{-t} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} I_k(t) T_k(\mathbf{P}) \mathbf{e}_s. \quad (6)$$

PROOF. See the full version of this paper. Since the HKPR function is $f(x) = e^{-t(1-x)}$, so the coefficients of the Chebyshev expansion satisfy:

$$\begin{aligned} c_n &= \frac{2}{\pi} \int_{-1}^1 \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-x^2}} T_n(x) f(x) dx \\ &= \frac{2}{\pi} e^{-t} \int_0^\pi e^{t \cos \theta} \cos(n\theta) d\theta, n \geq 1. \end{aligned}$$

with $x = \cos \theta$. By the definition of the first type of modified Bessel function, we have:

$$I_n(t) = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_0^\pi e^{t \cos \theta} \cos(n\theta) d\theta, n \geq 0.$$

Therefore, the coefficients of Chebyshev expansion for HKPR is just $c_n = 2e^{-t} I_n(t)$ for $n \geq 1$ and $c_0 = e^{-t} I_0(t)$. \square

Note that Lemma 3.3 and Lemma 3.4 explicitly provide the Chebyshev coefficients for representing both SSPPR and HKPR vectors, respectively. These coefficients will be useful in designing our algorithms. It is worth mentioning that we are the first to derive such Chebyshev coefficients for both SSPPR and HKPR vectors. Below, we give a theoretical interpretation of why Chebyshev expansion can enhance the convergence speed of the algorithm.

3.2 Why Chebyshev Expansion

Here we prove that by utilizing Chebyshev expansion to represent the GP function, the polynomial degree is lower compared to traditional Taylor expansion methods. This indicates that power iteration and push-style algorithms will achieve faster convergence speeds by using Chebyshev expansion. Below, we first present a useful property of Chebyshev polynomials. Specifically, this property asserts that the l_2 -norm of $T_k(\mathbf{P})$ is bounded by 1, and the element-wise summation of $T_k(\mathbf{P}) \mathbf{e}_s$ equals 1.

PROPERTY 1. $\|T_k(\mathbf{P})\|_2 \leq 1$, and $\sum_{u \in \mathcal{V}} T_k(\mathbf{P}) \mathbf{e}_s(u) = 1$.

PROOF. First, we prove $\|T_k(\mathbf{P})\|_2 \leq 1$. By the classical properties of Chebyshev polynomials [29], we have $\max_{x \in [-1, 1]} |T_k(x)| = 1$.

Since \mathbf{P} is a random-walk matrix for undirected graph \mathcal{G} , we have $\lambda(\mathbf{P}) = \lambda(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{D}^{-1}) = \lambda(\tilde{\mathbf{A}}) \in [-1, 1]$, where $\tilde{\mathbf{A}} = \mathbf{D}^{-1/2} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{D}^{-1/2}$ is the normalized Adjacency matrix, and $\lambda(\tilde{\mathbf{A}})$ is the set of eigen-values of $\tilde{\mathbf{A}}$. Therefore, $\|T_k(\mathbf{P})\|_2 = \|T_k(\tilde{\mathbf{A}})\|_2 = \max_{\lambda_i \in \lambda(\tilde{\mathbf{A}})} |T_k(\lambda_i)| \leq 1$.

For $\sum_{u \in \mathcal{V}} T_k(\mathbf{P}) \mathbf{e}_s(u) = 1$, we prove this by induction. Since $T_0(\mathbf{P}) \mathbf{e}_s = \mathbf{e}_s$, $T_1(\mathbf{P}) \mathbf{e}_s = \mathbf{P} \mathbf{e}_s$, the property is clearly true for $k = 0$ and 1. We suppose that the property is true for every $l \leq k$. Then, for $l = k + 1$, by the Chebyshev recurrence, we have

$$T_{k+1}(\mathbf{P}) \mathbf{e}_s = 2\mathbf{P} T_k(\mathbf{P}) \mathbf{e}_s - T_{k-1}(\mathbf{P}) \mathbf{e}_s.$$

Since \mathbf{P} is a random-walk matrix, $\mathbf{P} T_k(\mathbf{P}) \mathbf{e}_s$ does not change the element-wise summation of $T_k(\mathbf{P}) \mathbf{e}_s$:

$$\sum_{u \in \mathcal{V}} T_k(\mathbf{P}) \mathbf{e}_s(u) = \sum_{u \in \mathcal{V}} [\mathbf{P} T_k(\mathbf{P}) \mathbf{e}_s](u).$$

Therefore, for $l = k + 1$, we still have $\sum_{u \in \mathcal{V}} T_{k+1}(\mathbf{P}) \mathbf{e}_s(u) = 1$. This completes the proof. \square

Let N denote the truncation step of the Taylor expansion of the GP function, and K be the truncation step of the Chebyshev expansion. For a general GP function f , since Chebyshev expansion is the best l_2 -approximation of f (e.g., see Theorem 4.1 in [29]), K is strictly smaller than N . For both SSPPR and HKPR, we prove that K is approximately $O(\sqrt{N})$.

Note that for traditional Taylor expansion, we need to set $N = O(\frac{1}{\alpha} \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$ to achieve $\|\hat{\pi}_s - \pi_s\|_1 < \epsilon$ for the SSPPR vector [6, 45], and set $N = O(2t \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$ to achieve $\|\hat{\rho}_s - \rho_s\|_1 < \epsilon$ for the HKPR vector [21]. The following lemma shows that K is approximately $O(\sqrt{N})$ for SSPPR and HKPR to achieve a comparable error bound.

LEMMA 3.5. Let $K = O\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha}} \log \frac{1}{\epsilon}\right)$, we define the K step truncation of the Chebyshev expansion of SSPPR vector as follows:

$$\hat{\pi}_s = \gamma \mathbf{e}_s + 2\gamma \sum_{k=1}^K \beta^k T_k(\mathbf{P}) \mathbf{e}_s. \quad (7)$$

Then, we have $\|\hat{\pi}_s - \pi_s\|_2 < \epsilon$.

Similarly, let $K = O\left(\sqrt{t} \log \frac{1}{\epsilon}\right)$, we define the K step truncation of the Chebyshev expansion of HKPR vector as follows:

$$\hat{\rho}_s = e^{-t} I_0(t) \mathbf{e}_s + 2e^{-t} \sum_{k=1}^K I_k(t) T_k(\mathbf{P}) \mathbf{e}_s. \quad (8)$$

Then, we have $\|\hat{\rho}_s - \rho_s\|_2 < \epsilon$.

PROOF. First, we prove the case for SSPPR. By Property 1, we have $\sum_{u \in \mathcal{V}} T_k(\mathbf{P}) \mathbf{e}_s(u) = 1$ for every $k \geq 0$. By the property of SSPPR, we have $\|\pi_s\|_1 = 1$ and $\pi_s(u) \geq 0$ for $u \in \mathcal{V}$. Thus, the coefficients of the Chebyshev expansion sum to 1:

$$\gamma + 2\gamma \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \beta^k = 1.$$

Hence, to achieve $\|\hat{\pi}_s - \pi_s\|_2 < \epsilon$, we just need $2\gamma \sum_{k=K+1}^{\infty} \beta^k < \epsilon$. Note that $2\gamma \sum_{k=K+1}^{\infty} \beta^k = \beta^{K+1} \frac{2\gamma}{1-\beta}$. When α is sufficiently small, we have :

$$\frac{2\gamma}{1-\beta} = \frac{\frac{\alpha}{\sqrt{2\alpha-\alpha^2}}}{1 - \frac{1-\sqrt{2\alpha-\alpha^2}}{1-\alpha}} = \frac{\alpha(1-\alpha)}{\sqrt{2\alpha-\alpha^2}(-\alpha + \sqrt{2\alpha-\alpha^2})} \sim \frac{1}{2}.$$

Therefore, we just need to determine K such that $\beta^{K+1} < 2\epsilon$. We take the logarithm on both sides. By the fact that $1 - \beta = \frac{\sqrt{2\alpha-\alpha^2}-\alpha}{1-\alpha} \sim \sqrt{2\alpha}$ when α is sufficiently small, we have $K = O\left(\frac{\log \epsilon}{\log \beta}\right) = O\left(\frac{1}{1-\beta} \log \frac{1}{\epsilon}\right) = O\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha}} \log \frac{1}{\epsilon}\right)$.

The proof for the case of HKPR is similar. Similar to SSPPR, by Property 1 and the definition of HKPR, the coefficients of Chebyshev expansion for HKPR sums to 1: $e^{-t} [I_0(t) + 2 \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} I_k(t)] = 1$. Therefore, to determine the order of the truncation step K , we just need the partial sum of the coefficients $e^{-t} [I_0(t) + 2 \sum_{k=1}^K I_k(t)] \geq 1 - \epsilon$. On the other hand, by the asymptotic property of the Bessel function [31], we have $e^{-t} I_n(t) \sim \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi t}}$ when $n \ll t$. Therefore, for $t \gg 1$, set the truncation step $K = O\left(\sqrt{2\pi t}\right)$ is enough. This completes the proof. \square

Note that since $\log \frac{1}{\epsilon}$ is often a small constant, Lemma 3.5 indicates that K is roughly $O(\sqrt{N})$. These findings suggest that we can achieve an approximately $O(\sqrt{N})$ acceleration of convergence for the computation of SSPPR and HKPR by Chebyshev expansion.

3.3 The Proposed ChebyPower Algorithm

In this subsection, we develop a new power iteration algorithm based on Chebyshev expansion, called ChebyPower. Specifically, consider the GP vector with the following Chebyshev expansion:

$$\mathbf{y} = f(\mathbf{P}) \mathbf{e}_s = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} c_k T_k(\mathbf{P}) \mathbf{e}_s. \quad (9)$$

Algorithm 3: ChebyPower

Input: A graph $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$, a GP function f with its Chebyshev expansion coefficients $\{c_k\}$, a node s , truncation step K

- 1 $\hat{\mathbf{y}} = c_0 \mathbf{e}_s; \mathbf{r}_0 = \mathbf{e}_s; \mathbf{r}_1 = \mathbf{P} \mathbf{e}_s; k = 1;$
- 2 **while** $k < K$ **do**
- 3 $\hat{\mathbf{y}} \leftarrow \hat{\mathbf{y}} + c_k \mathbf{r}_k; \mathbf{r}_{k+1} \leftarrow 2\mathbf{P} \mathbf{r}_k - \mathbf{r}_{k-1}; k \leftarrow k + 1;$
- 4 **end**
- 5 $\hat{\mathbf{y}} \leftarrow \hat{\mathbf{y}} + c_K \mathbf{r}_K;$

Output: $\hat{\mathbf{y}}$ as the approximation of $\mathbf{y} = f(\mathbf{P}) \mathbf{e}_s$

Suppose there exists a truncation step K such that $\|\mathbf{y} - \hat{\mathbf{y}}\|_2 < \epsilon$, where $\hat{\mathbf{y}}$ is the K step truncated Chebyshev expansion. We define $\mathbf{r}_k = T_k(\mathbf{P}) \mathbf{e}_s$, then the recurrence of \mathbf{r}_k follows the *three-term recurrence* of Chebyshev polynomials:

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{r}_0 = \mathbf{e}_s; \mathbf{r}_1 = \mathbf{P} \mathbf{e}_s; \\ \mathbf{r}_{k+1} = 2\mathbf{P} \mathbf{r}_k - \mathbf{r}_{k-1}, \quad k \geq 1. \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

As a result, we can devise a power-iteration style algorithm to compute the approximate vector $\hat{\mathbf{y}}$ of $\mathbf{y} = f(\mathbf{P}) \mathbf{e}_s$ based on Eq. (10). Specifically, in each iteration, we do the following two steps: (i) compute the new \mathbf{r}_{k+1} according to Eq. (10); (ii) Update $\hat{\mathbf{y}} \leftarrow \hat{\mathbf{y}} + c_k \mathbf{r}_k$ until the algorithm stops at step K . The detailed pseudocode is shown in Algorithm 3.

Analysis of Algorithm 3. The error bound of Algorithm 3 is analyzed in the following theorem.

THEOREM 3.6. Let K be the truncation step of Chebyshev expansion such that $\sum_{k=K+1}^{+\infty} |c_k| < \epsilon$, then the approximation $\hat{\mathbf{y}}$ calculated by Algorithm 3 satisfy the l_2 -error bound: $\|\mathbf{y} - \hat{\mathbf{y}}\|_2 < \epsilon$.

PROOF. Since $\mathbf{r}_k = T_k(\mathbf{P}) \mathbf{e}_s$ by our definition, the approximation $\hat{\mathbf{y}} = \sum_{k=0}^K c_k \mathbf{r}_k = \sum_{k=0}^K c_k T_k(\mathbf{P}) \mathbf{e}_s$ is the K step truncation of Chebyshev expansion. Since $\|T_k(\mathbf{P}) \mathbf{e}_s\|_2 \leq 1$ by Property 1, we have:

$$\|\mathbf{y} - \hat{\mathbf{y}}\|_2 = \left\| \sum_{k=K+1}^{+\infty} c_k T_k(\mathbf{P}) \mathbf{e}_s \right\|_2 \leq \sum_{k=K+1}^{+\infty} |c_k| < \epsilon.$$

Thus, the l_2 -error bound $\|\mathbf{y} - \hat{\mathbf{y}}\|_2 < \epsilon$ is established. \square

According to Theorem 3.6, we can easily derive the time complexity of Algorithm 3.

THEOREM 3.7. To achieve $\|\mathbf{y} - \hat{\mathbf{y}}\|_2 < \epsilon$, the time overhead of Algorithm 3 is $O(K(m+n))$, where K satisfies $\sum_{k=K+1}^{+\infty} |c_k| < \epsilon$.

PROOF. In each iteration, Algorithm 3 performs the three-term recurrence $\mathbf{r}_{k+1} \leftarrow 2\mathbf{P} \mathbf{r}_k - \mathbf{r}_{k-1}$ which takes $O(m+n)$ time. There are K iterations in total, thus the time overhead of Algorithm 3 is $O(K(m+n))$. Note that by Theorem 3.6, K must satisfy $\sum_{k=K+1}^{+\infty} |c_k| < \epsilon$ to achieve the desired l_2 -error. \square

For SSPPR, according to Lemma 3.5, the truncation step K is set to $O\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha}} \log \frac{1}{\epsilon}\right)$, thus the time complexity of ChebyPower is $O\left(\frac{m+n}{\sqrt{\alpha}} \log \frac{1}{\epsilon}\right)$. Similarly, for HKPR, the truncation step K is set to $O\left(\sqrt{t} \log \frac{1}{\epsilon}\right)$, thus the time complexity of ChebyPower is $O\left(\sqrt{t}(m+n) \log \frac{1}{\epsilon}\right)$. Compared to the traditional power iteration

methods [45], our ChebyPower algorithm improves the time complexity by a factor $\sqrt{\alpha}$ and \sqrt{t} for SSPPR and HKPR respectively.

Compared to other Chebyshev-polynomial Methods. We note that Chebyshev polynomial methods have been previously employed to accelerate the computation of “random walk with restart” based proximity measures in graphs [11, 12]. However, our techniques differ fundamentally from these studies in several aspects. First, the methods proposed in [11, 12] are primarily designed for top- k proximity queries. These methods cannot be applied to general GP vector computation (e.g., HKPR), and also lack detailed theoretical analysis of an $O(\sqrt{N})$ faster convergence speed. Second, our Chebyshev power method differs from those in [11, 12]; specifically, their methods require iterative computation of Chebyshev polynomial coefficients. In contrast, our approach, as detailed in Lemma 3.3, allows for explicit coefficient expressions without iteration. These explicit coefficients facilitate the implementation of power iteration or push-style algorithms for general GP vector computation. Third, the algorithms in [11, 12] are not local, whereas based on our Chebyshev expansion technique, we can devise a push-style local algorithm that significantly accelerates computation compared to power iteration methods (see Section 4).

4 A NOVEL CHEBYSHEV PUSH METHOD

In this section, we propose a novel push-style local algorithm, called ChebyPush, based on a newly-developed subset Chebyshev recurrence technique. Before introducing our techniques, let us closely examine the time complexity of ChebyPower. Note that the primary time complexity arises from the matrix-vector multiplication in each iteration: computing \mathbf{Pr}_k takes $O(m)$ operations, and updating $\mathbf{r}_{k+1} = 2\mathbf{Pr}_k - \mathbf{r}_{k-1}$ along with $\hat{\mathbf{y}} \leftarrow \hat{\mathbf{y}} + c_k \mathbf{r}_k$ takes $O(n)$ operations. Thus, ChebyPower is inherently a *global* algorithm since it necessitates exploring the entire graph in every iteration.

To transform ChebyPower into a local algorithm, a natural question arises: can we execute the Chebyshev recurrence $\mathbf{r}_{k+1} = 2\mathbf{Pr}_k - \mathbf{r}_{k-1}$ *partially*? Alternatively, can we implement the Chebyshev recurrence with fewer than $O(m+n)$ operations while maintaining rapid convergence? One potential approach involves mimicking the structure of Push by truncating certain “less significant” nodes during the matrix-vector multiplication \mathbf{Pr}_k . However, due to the inherent structural differences between $\mathbf{P}^k \mathbf{e}_s$ and $T_k(\mathbf{P})\mathbf{e}_s$, achieving a local implementation of ChebyPower appears considerably more challenging than that of PwMethod. To address these challenges, we develop a novel and powerful technique termed subset Chebyshev recurrence, demonstrating how to locally implement Chebyshev recurrence on graphs.

4.1 Subset Chebyshev Recurrence

As discussed previously, executing the following Chebyshev recurrence takes $O(m+n)$ time:

$$\mathbf{r}_{k+1} = 2\mathbf{Pr}_k - \mathbf{r}_{k-1}. \quad (11)$$

To derive a local algorithm, we aim for the operations of the three-term recurrence to be independent of m and n while ensuring that the vector \mathbf{r}_k remains sparse at each iteration. To achieve this objective, we propose the following subset Chebyshev recurrence.




Figure 1: Illustration of the deviation propagation

Definition 4.1. (Subset Chebyshev Recurrence) Given a source node s , the random walk matrix \mathbf{P} , a series of node sets $\{S_k\}_k$ with $S_k \subseteq \mathcal{V}$. The subset Chebyshev recurrence is defined as follows:

$$\begin{cases} \hat{\mathbf{r}}_0 = \mathbf{e}_s; \hat{\mathbf{r}}_1 = \mathbf{P}\mathbf{e}_s; \\ \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{k+1} = 2\mathbf{P}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}_k|_{S_k}) - \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{k-1}|_{S_{k-1}} + \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{k-1}|_{\mathcal{V}-S_{k-1}}, \quad k \geq 1, \end{cases} \quad (12)$$

where $\hat{\mathbf{r}}_k|_{S_k} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ represents the vector $\hat{\mathbf{r}}_k$ constrained to the node subset S_k . That is, for any $u \in S_k$, $\hat{\mathbf{r}}_k|_{S_k}(u) = \hat{\mathbf{r}}_k(u)$; for any $u \in \mathcal{V} - S_k$, $\hat{\mathbf{r}}_k|_{S_k}(u) = 0$.

Note that by Definition 4.1, the computation of the Subset Chebyshev Recurrence is constrained to the node subsets S_k , enabling its local implementation (see Section 4.2). Compared to the Chebyshev recurrence (Eq. (11)), the subset Chebyshev recurrence includes an additional term $\hat{\mathbf{r}}_{k-1}|_{\mathcal{V}-S_{k-1}}$, which plays a crucial role in bounding the approximation error of our algorithm. Clearly, when $S_k = \mathcal{V}$ for all k , the subset Chebyshev recurrence is equivalent to the exact Chebyshev recurrence.

Analysis of the subset Chebyshev recurrence. Here, we establish a connection between $\{\hat{\mathbf{r}}_k\}$ derived from the subset Chebyshev recurrence and $\{\mathbf{r}_k\}$ obtained from the exact Chebyshev recurrence. For our analysis, we define the *deviation* produced at step k as $\delta_k \triangleq \hat{\mathbf{r}}_k - \mathbf{r}_k|_{S_k} = \hat{\mathbf{r}}_k|_{\mathcal{V}-S_k}$. Then, the three-term subset Chebyshev recurrence can be reformulated as:

$$\hat{\mathbf{r}}_{k+1} = 2\mathbf{P}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}_k - \delta_k) - \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{k-1} + 2\delta_{k-1}. \quad (13)$$

Note that by Eq. (13), the deviation can propagate across different iterations. Figure 1 illustrates the deviation propagation of Eq. (13). More specifically, the first two terms of the subset Chebyshev recurrence are defined as $\hat{\mathbf{r}}_0 = \mathbf{e}_s$ and $\hat{\mathbf{r}}_1 = \mathbf{P}\mathbf{e}_s$. For $k=2$, we obtain the three-term recurrence: $\hat{\mathbf{r}}_2 = 2\mathbf{P}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}_1 - \delta_1) - \hat{\mathbf{r}}_0$ due to $\delta_0 = 0$. This means that for the deviation δ_1 , there are $-2\mathbf{P}\delta_1$ propagated from $\hat{\mathbf{r}}_1$ to $\hat{\mathbf{r}}_2$. For $k=3$, we derive the three-term recurrence: $\hat{\mathbf{r}}_3 = 2\mathbf{P}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}_2 - \delta_2) - \hat{\mathbf{r}}_1 + 2\delta_1$. This indicates that for the deviation δ_2 , $-2\mathbf{P}\delta_2$ is propagated from $\hat{\mathbf{r}}_2$ to $\hat{\mathbf{r}}_3$, and at the same time we “**compensate**” $2\delta_1$ from $\hat{\mathbf{r}}_1$ to $\hat{\mathbf{r}}_3$. Note that this “compensate” operation is important to establish the connection between $\{\hat{\mathbf{r}}_k\}$ and $\{\mathbf{r}_k\}$. The following lemma demonstrates that after performing this step, the difference between $\{\hat{\mathbf{r}}_k\}$ and $\{\mathbf{r}_k\}$ can be characterized by using Chebyshev polynomials.

LEMMA 4.2. Let $\{\hat{\mathbf{r}}_k\}$ be derived by the subset Chebyshev recurrence (Definition 4.1) and $\{\mathbf{r}_k\}$ be obtained by exact Chebyshev recurrence. Then, the relationship between \mathbf{r}_k and $\hat{\mathbf{r}}_k$ is:

$$\mathbf{r}_k = \hat{\mathbf{r}}_k + 2 \sum_{l=1}^{k-1} T_{k-l}(\mathbf{P})\delta_l, \quad (14)$$

where $\delta_l := \hat{\mathbf{r}}_l|_{\mathcal{V}-S_l}$ is the deviation produced at step l with $l < k$.

PROOF. We prove this lemma by induction. For the basic case $n=1$, by Definition 4.1, $\mathbf{r}_1 = \hat{\mathbf{r}}_1 = \mathbf{P}\mathbf{e}_s$, the lemma clearly holds. For

$n = 2$, by the three-term subset Chebyshev recurrence, we have:

$$\hat{\mathbf{r}}_2 = 2\mathbf{P}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}_1 - \delta_1) - \hat{\mathbf{r}}_0 = \mathbf{r}_2 - 2\mathbf{P}\delta_1 = \mathbf{r}_2 - 2T_1(\mathbf{P})\delta_1. \quad (15)$$

Thus, the lemma also holds. Similarly, for $n = 3$, by the three-term subset Chebyshev recurrence, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mathbf{r}}_3 &= 2\mathbf{P}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}_2 - \delta_2) - \hat{\mathbf{r}}_1 + 2\delta_1 \\ &= 2\mathbf{P}(\mathbf{r}_2 - 2T_1(\mathbf{P})\delta_1 - \delta_2) - \mathbf{r}_1 + 2\delta_1 \\ &= \mathbf{r}_3 - (2\mathbf{P}(2T_1(\mathbf{P})) - 2\mathbf{I})\delta_1 - 2\mathbf{P}\delta_2 \\ &= \mathbf{r}_3 - 2T_2(\mathbf{P})\delta_1 - 2T_1(\mathbf{P})\delta_2. \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

Thus, the lemma also holds for $n = 3$. Suppose for $n \leq k$ with $k \geq 4$, the following equation holds: $\mathbf{r}_k = \hat{\mathbf{r}}_k + 2 \sum_{l=1}^{k-1} T_{k-l}(\mathbf{P})\delta_l$. Then, for $n = k+1$, according to the Chebyshev recurrence $\mathbf{r}_{k+1} = 2\mathbf{P}\mathbf{r}_k - \mathbf{r}_{k-1}$, we have

$$\mathbf{r}_{k+1} = 2\mathbf{P} \left[\hat{\mathbf{r}}_k + 2 \sum_{l=1}^{k-1} T_{k-l}(\mathbf{P})\delta_l \right] - \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{k-1} - 2 \sum_{l=1}^{k-2} T_{k-l-1}(\mathbf{P})\delta_l. \quad (17)$$

We use the subset Chebyshev recurrence $\hat{\mathbf{r}}_{k+1} = 2\mathbf{P}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}_k - \delta_k) - \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{k-1} + 2\delta_{k-1}$ to replace the term $\{\hat{\mathbf{r}}_k\}$ in the right hand side of Eq. (17). Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{r}_{k+1} &= \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{k+1} + 2\mathbf{P} \left[\delta_k + 2 \sum_{l=1}^{k-1} T_{k-l}(\mathbf{P})\delta_l \right] - 2 \sum_{l=1}^{k-2} T_{k-l-1}(\mathbf{P})\delta_l - 2\delta_{k-1} \\ &= \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{k+1} + 2\mathbf{P}\delta_k + (2\mathbf{P}(2T_1(\mathbf{P})) - 2\mathbf{I})\delta_{k-1} \\ &\quad + 2 \sum_{l=1}^{k-2} (2\mathbf{P}T_{k-l}(\mathbf{P}) - T_{k-l-1}(\mathbf{P}))\delta_l \\ &= \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{k+1} + 2T_1(\mathbf{P})\delta_k + 2T_2(\mathbf{P})\delta_{k-1} + 2 \sum_{l=1}^{k-2} T_{k+1-l}(\mathbf{P})\delta_l \\ &= \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{k+1} + 2 \sum_{l=1}^k T_{k+1-l}(\mathbf{P})\delta_l, \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

where the third equality holds due to $T_1(\mathbf{P}) = \mathbf{P}$ and $T_2(\mathbf{P}) = 2\mathbf{P}T_1(\mathbf{P}) - \mathbf{I}$. This completes the proof. \square

Lemma 4.2 provides a useful theoretical result for analyzing the error introduced by the subset Chebyshev recurrence. If the deviation δ_l is bounded for every l , the difference between $\{\hat{\mathbf{r}}_k\}$ and $\{\mathbf{r}_k\}$ can also be bounded, as the norm of the Chebyshev polynomial over the random-walk matrix \mathbf{P} (i.e., $T_{k-l}(\mathbf{P})$) is bounded.

4.2 ChebyPush: Chebyshev Push Method

Recall that for the subset Chebyshev recurrence (Definition 4.1), it performs $\hat{\mathbf{r}}_{k+1} = 2\mathbf{P}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}_k|_{S_k}) - \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{k-1}|_{S_{k-1}} + \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{k-1}|_{\mathcal{V}-S_{k-1}}$ in the k^{th} iteration. During this iterative process, it seems that we need to explore every node $u \in \mathcal{V}$. However, as we will show below, it suffices to explore only the nodes $u \in S_k$ (no need to traverse the nodes in $\mathcal{V} - S_{k-1}$). To achieve this, we maintain two vectors: \mathbf{r}_{cur} and \mathbf{r}_{new} . Initially, we set $\mathbf{r}_{cur} = \mathbf{P}\mathbf{e}_s$ and $\mathbf{r}_{new} = -\mathbf{e}_s$. For the k^{th} iteration, we perform the following operations:

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{r}_{new} = \mathbf{r}_{new} + 2\mathbf{P}(\mathbf{r}_{cur}|_{S_k}), \\ \mathbf{r}_{cur}|_{S_k} = -\mathbf{r}_{cur}|_{S_k}, \\ \mathbf{r}_{cur}.swap(\mathbf{r}_{new}), \end{cases} \quad (19)$$

where $\mathbf{r}_{cur}.swap(\mathbf{r}_{new})$ denotes swapping the values between \mathbf{r}_{cur} and \mathbf{r}_{new} . By Eq. (19), the algorithm only needs to traverse nodes $u \in S_k$ in each iteration, allowing us to implement the subset Chebyshev recurrence locally without the need to search the entire graph. We prove that Eq. (19) exactly follows the subset Chebyshev recurrence (i.e., Eq. (12)) in each iteration.

LEMMA 4.3. *Initially, set $\mathbf{r}_{cur} = \mathbf{P}\mathbf{e}_s$ and $\mathbf{r}_{new} = -\mathbf{e}_s$. After the k^{th} iteration of Eq. (19), the following equation holds: $\mathbf{r}_{cur} = \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{k+1}$ and $\mathbf{r}_{new} = -\hat{\mathbf{r}}_k|_{S_k} + \hat{\mathbf{r}}_k|_{\mathcal{V}-S_k}$, where $\{\hat{\mathbf{r}}_k\}$ is obtained by the subset Chebyshev recurrence.*

PROOF. We prove this lemma by an induction argument. First, for the initial case, since $\mathbf{r}_{cur} = \mathbf{P}\mathbf{e}_s = \hat{\mathbf{r}}_1$, $\mathbf{r}_{new} = -\mathbf{e}_s = -\hat{\mathbf{r}}_0$, the lemma clearly holds. Assume that $\mathbf{r}_{cur} = \hat{\mathbf{r}}_k$ and $\mathbf{r}_{new} = -\hat{\mathbf{r}}_k|_{S_{k-1}} + \hat{\mathbf{r}}_k|_{\mathcal{V}-S_{k-1}}$ hold after the $(k-1)^{\text{th}}$ iteration. Then, by Eq. (19), we perform $\mathbf{r}_{new} = \mathbf{r}_{new} + 2\mathbf{P}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}_k|_{S_k})$ and $\mathbf{r}_{cur}|_{S_k} = -\mathbf{r}_{cur}|_{S_k}$ which can obtain $\mathbf{r}_{new} = \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{k+1}$ (by Eq. (12)) and $\mathbf{r}_{cur} = -\hat{\mathbf{r}}_k|_{S_k} + \hat{\mathbf{r}}_k|_{\mathcal{V}-S_k}$. Subsequently, we swap \mathbf{r}_{cur} and \mathbf{r}_{new} . As a result, after the k^{th} iteration, the following equation holds: $\mathbf{r}_{cur} = \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{k+1}$ and $\mathbf{r}_{new} = -\hat{\mathbf{r}}_k|_{S_k} + \hat{\mathbf{r}}_k|_{\mathcal{V}-S_k}$. This completes the proof. \square

Based on Eq. (19) and Lemma 4.3, we are ready to design a local algorithm to implement the subset Chebyshev recurrence. Our algorithm, namely ChebyPush, is detailed in Algorithm 4. Specifically, Algorithm 4 first sets a small threshold $\epsilon_a \ll 1$ and sets a k -step threshold $\epsilon_k = \frac{1}{\sum_{l=k}^K |c_l|} \frac{\epsilon_a}{4K}$ for each iteration k (Line 4). For the subset Chebyshev recurrence, the algorithm sets each node subset as $S_k = \{u \in \mathcal{V} : |\hat{\mathbf{r}}_k(u)| > \epsilon_k d_u\}$ for every k (Line 5), and iteratively performs the operations defined in Eq. (19) until the truncation step equals K (Lines 3-14). Initially, by Lemma 4.3, the algorithm sets $\hat{\mathbf{y}} = c_0 \mathbf{e}_s$, and $\mathbf{r}_{cur} = \mathbf{P}\mathbf{e}_s$, $\mathbf{r}_{new} = -\mathbf{e}_s$ corresponding to $\hat{\mathbf{r}}_1$, $-\hat{\mathbf{r}}_0$ respectively (Line 2). Then, in each iteration k , for every $u \in \mathcal{V}$ with $|\mathbf{r}_{cur}(u)|^2 > \epsilon_k d_u$ (i.e., $u \in S_k$), the algorithm performs the following *push* operation based on Eq. (19): (i) adds $c_k \mathbf{r}_{cur}(u)$ to $\hat{\mathbf{y}}$ (Line 6); (ii) distributes $2\mathbf{r}_{cur}(u)$ to each u 's neighbor v , i.e., adding $\mathbf{r}_{new}(v) \leftarrow \mathbf{r}_{new}(v) + 2 \frac{\mathbf{r}_{cur}(u)}{d_u}$ for $v \in \mathcal{N}(u)$ (Lines 7-9); (iii) converts $\mathbf{r}_{cur}(u)$ to $-\mathbf{r}_{cur}(u)$ (Line 10). After that, the algorithm swaps \mathbf{r}_{cur} and \mathbf{r}_{new} (Line 12) following Eq. (19). Finally, the algorithm terminates after executing K iterations and outputs $\hat{\mathbf{y}}$ as the approximation of the GP vector $\mathbf{y} = f(\mathbf{P})\mathbf{e}_s$. Note that by Lemma 4.3, \mathbf{r}_{cur} consistently equals $\hat{\mathbf{r}}_k$ across all iterations. This guarantees that ChebyPush correctly implements the subset Chebyshev recurrence to approximate the GP vector.



An illustrative example. Consider a toy graph shown in Figure 2 with $\mathcal{V} = \{v_0, v_1, v_2, v_3\}$, $\mathcal{E} = \{(v_0, v_1), (v_0, v_2), (v_0, v_3)\}$. Suppose that our goal is to compute $f(\mathbf{P})\mathbf{e}_s = T_3(\mathbf{P})\mathbf{e}_{v_1}$, we set the threshold $\epsilon_k = 1/3$ for $k \geq 1$. Initially, we have $\mathbf{r}_{cur} = \mathbf{P}\mathbf{e}_{v_1} = [1, 0, 0, 0]$ and $\mathbf{r}_{new} = -\mathbf{e}_{v_1} = [0, -1, 0, 0]$. For the first iteration $k = 1$, we perform a *push* operation on v_0 . That is, for each v_0 's neighbor: v_1, v_2, v_3 , we update \mathbf{r}_{new} as: $\mathbf{r}_{new}(v_i) \leftarrow \mathbf{r}_{new}(v_i) + 2 \frac{\mathbf{r}_{cur}(v_0)}{d_{v_0}}$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$. Then, we convert $\mathbf{r}_{cur}(v_0)$ to $-\mathbf{r}_{cur}(v_0)$. After the *push* operation, we have $\mathbf{r}_{cur} = [-1, 0, 0, 0]$ and $\mathbf{r}_{new} = [0, -\frac{1}{3}, \frac{2}{3}, \frac{2}{3}]$. Then, we swap \mathbf{r}_{cur} and \mathbf{r}_{new} , and turn to the next iteration. For the next iteration $k = 2$, initially we have $\mathbf{r}_{cur} = [0, -\frac{1}{3}, \frac{2}{3}, \frac{2}{3}]$ and $\mathbf{r}_{new} = [-1, 0, 0, 0]$. Since $\epsilon_k = 1/3$, we only perform *push* operation on v_2 and v_3 . Similarly,

Algorithm 4: ChebyPush

Input: A graph $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$, a GP function f with its Chebyshev expansion coefficients $\{c_k\}$, a node s , truncation step K , threshold ϵ_a

- 1 $k = 1$;
- 2 $\hat{y} = c_0 \mathbf{e}_s$; $\mathbf{r}_{cur} = \mathbf{P} \mathbf{e}_s$; $\mathbf{r}_{new} = -\mathbf{e}_s$;
- 3 **while** $k < K$ **do**
- 4 $\epsilon_k = \frac{1}{\sum_{l=k}^K |c_l|} \frac{\epsilon_a}{4K}$;
- 5 **for** $u \in \mathcal{V}$ with $|\mathbf{r}_{cur}(u)| > \epsilon_k d_u$ **do**
- 6 $\hat{y}(u) \leftarrow \hat{y}(u) + c_k \mathbf{r}_{cur}(u)$;
- 7 **for** $v \in N(u)$ **do**
- 8 $\mathbf{r}_{new}(v) \leftarrow \mathbf{r}_{new}(v) + 2 \frac{\mathbf{r}_{cur}(u)}{d_u}$;
- 9 **end**
- 10 $\mathbf{r}_{cur}(u) \leftarrow -\mathbf{r}_{cur}(u)$
- 11 **end**
- 12 $\mathbf{r}_{cur} \cdot \text{swap}(\mathbf{r}_{new})$;
- 13 $k \leftarrow k + 1$;
- 14 **end**

Output: \hat{y} as the approximation of $y = f(\mathbf{P}) \mathbf{e}_s$

**Figure 2: Illustration of ChebyPush to compute $T_3(\mathbf{P})\mathbf{e}_{v_1}$** **Figure 3: The difference between Push v.s. ChebyPush**

after the *push* operation, we have $\mathbf{r}_{cur} = [0, -\frac{1}{3}, -\frac{2}{3}, -\frac{2}{3}]$ and $\mathbf{r}_{new} = [\frac{5}{3}, 0, 0, 0]$. Then, we swap \mathbf{r}_{cur} and \mathbf{r}_{new} , and turn to the next iteration $k = 3$. Thus, $\mathbf{r}_{cur} = [\frac{5}{3}, 0, 0, 0]$ is $\hat{\mathbf{r}}_3$ obtained by the subset Chebyshev recurrence, which is an approximation of $\mathbf{r}_3 = T_3(\mathbf{P})\mathbf{e}_{v_1}$. Note that the exact value is $T_3(\mathbf{P})\mathbf{e}_{v_1} = [1, 0, 0, 0]$, suggesting that ChebyPush obtains a reasonable approximate solution.

Comparison between Push and ChebyPush. Similar to traditional Push [1], ChebyPush is also a local algorithm that explores only a small portion of the graph. However, the key mechanism of ChebyPush is fundamentally different from that of Push. As illustrated in Figure 3, the traditional Push operation on a node u distributes $\mathbf{r}_{cur}(u)$ uniformly to u 's neighbors, and sets $\mathbf{r}_{cur}(u)$ to 0. In contrast, ChebyPush distributes $2\mathbf{r}_{cur}(u)$ uniformly to u 's neighbors, and updates $\mathbf{r}_{cur}(u)$ to $-\mathbf{r}_{cur}(u)$. Besides, traditional Push can be viewed as a local and asynchronous variant of PwMethod [45], whereas ChebyPush implements ChebyPower locally on the graph using a novel subset Chebyshev recurrence technique and also shares its rapid convergence properties.

4.3 Theoretical Analysis of ChebyPush

To analyze the time complexity of ChebyPush, it is essential to determine the number of operations required to execute Lines 5-11 of Algorithm 4 in each iteration. Our analysis is based on the following stability assumption.

ASSUMPTION 1. (Stability assumption) For any $k \in \mathbb{N}^+$, $\|T_k(\mathbf{P}^T)\|_\infty = \|T_k(\mathbf{P})\|_1 \leq C$ for some universal constant C .

The rationale for assumption 1 is as follows: recall that by the k step truncation of the Chebyshev expansion, we have $\hat{y} = \sum_{k=0}^K c_k T_k(\mathbf{P})\mathbf{e}_s$. So assumption 1 gives us that from k step truncation to $k+1$ step truncation, the value \hat{y} does not produce much perturbation under l_1 error, which is often true in practice. Let $\text{supp}\{x\} \triangleq \{u : x(u) \neq 0\}$ be the support of the vector x . Denote by $\hat{\mathbf{r}}_k$ a vector obtained by the subset Chebyshev recurrence. We define $S_k \triangleq \text{supp}\{\hat{\mathbf{r}}_k | |\hat{\mathbf{r}}_k(u)| > \epsilon_k d_u\}$ (i.e., S_k denotes the node set such that each node $u \in S_k$ has $|\hat{\mathbf{r}}_k(u)| > \epsilon_k d_u$ and $\text{vol}(S_k) = \sum_{v \in S_k} d_v$). Then, to bound the number of operations executed in Lines 5-11, it is equivalent to bound $\text{vol}(S_k)$. Below, we derive an upper bound of $\text{vol}(S_k)$.

LEMMA 4.4. $\text{vol}(S_k) \leq O\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon_k}\right)$.

PROOF. By the definition of $\mathbf{r}_k = T_k(\mathbf{P})\mathbf{e}_s$ and Assumption 1, we have $\|\mathbf{r}_k\|_1 \leq O(1)$. By Assumption 1 and Lemma 4.2, we have: $\|\hat{\mathbf{r}}_k\|_1 = \|\mathbf{r}_k + 2 \sum_{l=1}^{k-1} T_{k-l}(\mathbf{P})\delta_l\|_1 \leq O(1)$ by setting the threshold ϵ_l sufficiently small (i.e., $\epsilon_l < \frac{1}{K}$). Therefore, we have:

$$\sum_{u \in S_k} \epsilon_k d_u \leq \sum_{u \in S_k} \hat{\mathbf{r}}_k(u)^2 \leq \sum_{u \in \mathcal{V}} \hat{\mathbf{r}}_k(u)^2 = \|\hat{\mathbf{r}}_k\|_2^2 \leq O(1).$$

As a result, we have $\text{vol}(S_k) \leq O\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon_k}\right)$. \square

Based on Lemma 4.2 and Lemma 4.4, we can derive the following error bound and time complexity of ChebyPush.

THEOREM 4.5. *The approximation vector \hat{y} obtained by ChebyPush satisfies the degree-normalized error, that is $\max_{u \in \mathcal{V}} \frac{|y(u) - \hat{y}(u)|}{d_u} < \epsilon_a$. Besides, the time complexity of ChebyPush is $O\left(\min\left\{\frac{K^2}{\epsilon_a}, Km\right\}\right)$, where K is the truncation step of the Chebyshev expansion.*

PROOF. First, we prove $\max_{u \in \mathcal{V}} \frac{|y(u) - \hat{y}(u)|}{d_u} < \epsilon_a$. To this end, we define another vector \tilde{y} as the K -step truncation of the Chebyshev expansion: $\tilde{y} = \sum_{k=0}^K c_k T_k(\mathbf{P})\mathbf{e}_s$, such that $\|\tilde{y} - y\|_2 < \epsilon_a/2$. By the definition of \mathbf{r}_k , \tilde{y} can also be reformulated as $\tilde{y} = \sum_{k=0}^K c_k \mathbf{r}_k$.

Since the approximation \hat{y} output by ChebyPush satisfy: $\hat{y} = \sum_{k=0}^K c_k (\hat{\mathbf{r}}_k |_{|\hat{\mathbf{r}}_k(u)| > \epsilon_k d_u})$. Therefore, by Lemma 4.2 and the definition of $\delta_k = \hat{\mathbf{r}}_k |_{|\hat{\mathbf{r}}_k(u)| \leq \epsilon_k d_u}$, we can derive the relationship between

$\hat{\mathbf{y}}$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{y}}$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{D}^{-1/2}(\tilde{\mathbf{y}} - \hat{\mathbf{y}})\|_\infty &= \left\| \mathbf{D}^{-1/2} \left(\sum_{k=1}^K c_k (\mathbf{r}_k - \hat{\mathbf{r}}_k + \delta_k) \right) \right\|_\infty \\ &\leq \left\| \mathbf{D}^{-1/2} \left(\sum_{k=1}^K 2c_k \left(\sum_{l=1}^k T_{k-l}(\mathbf{P}) \delta_l \right) \right) \right\|_\infty \\ &\leq \sum_{k=1}^K 2|c_k| \left(\sum_{l=1}^k \epsilon_l \right) = \sum_{l=1}^K \left(\sum_{k=l}^K 2|c_k| \right) \epsilon_l. \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

The reason for the second inequality is as follows. Since $\delta_l \leq \epsilon_l \mathbf{D} \mathbf{1}_{\text{supp}\{\delta_l\}}$, where $\mathbf{1}_{\text{supp}\{\delta_l\}}$ is the indicator vector takes value 1 for $u \in \text{supp}\{\delta_l\}$ and 0 otherwise, we have:

$$\|\mathbf{D}^{-1} T_{k-l}(\mathbf{P}) \delta_l\|_\infty \leq \epsilon_l \|\mathbf{D}^{-1} T_{k-l}(\mathbf{P}) \mathbf{D} \mathbf{1}_{\text{supp}\{\delta_l\}}\|_\infty.$$

Note that $\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{A} \mathbf{D}^{-1} = \mathbf{D} \mathbf{P}^T \mathbf{D}^{-1}$ holds for undirected graph. By the assumption that $\|T_k(\mathbf{P}^T)\|_\infty \leq 1$, we have: $\epsilon_l \|\mathbf{D}^{-1} T_{k-l}(\mathbf{P}) \mathbf{D} \mathbf{1}_{\text{supp}\{\delta_l\}}\|_\infty \leq \epsilon_l \|T_{k-l}(\mathbf{P}^T)\|_\infty \leq \epsilon_l$. Thus, the second inequality holds. Since $\epsilon_k = \frac{1}{\sum_{l=k}^K |c_l|} \frac{\epsilon_a}{4K}$ (Line 4 of Algorithm 4), the last step of Eq. (20) can be scaled as follows:

$$\sum_{l=1}^K \left(\sum_{k=l}^K 2|c_k| \right) \epsilon_l \leq \sum_{l=1}^K \frac{\epsilon_a}{2K} < \epsilon_a/2.$$

Let \mathbf{y} be the exact GP vector. Then, the relationship between \mathbf{y} and $\hat{\mathbf{y}}$ is as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{D}^{-1}(\mathbf{y} - \hat{\mathbf{y}})\|_\infty &\leq \|\mathbf{D}^{-1}(\mathbf{y} - \tilde{\mathbf{y}})\|_\infty + \|\mathbf{D}^{-1}(\tilde{\mathbf{y}} - \hat{\mathbf{y}})\|_\infty \\ &\leq \|\mathbf{y} - \tilde{\mathbf{y}}\|_2 + \|\mathbf{D}^{-1}(\tilde{\mathbf{y}} - \hat{\mathbf{y}})\|_\infty \\ &< \epsilon_a/2 + \epsilon_a/2 = \epsilon_a. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $|\mathbf{y}(u) - \hat{\mathbf{y}}(u)| < \epsilon_d u$ holds for any $u \in \mathcal{V}$. Therefore $\hat{\mathbf{y}}$ achieves the l_2 degree-normalized error.

For the time complexity of ChebyPush, recall that in each iteration of ChebyPush, we do the following subset Chebyshev recurrence:

$$\hat{\mathbf{r}}_{k+1} = 2\mathbf{P}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}_k - \delta_k) - \hat{\mathbf{r}}_{k-1} + 2\delta_{k-1}.$$

At the k^{th} iteration, the operations for the matrix-vector multiplication $\mathbf{P}(\hat{\mathbf{r}}_k |_{\hat{\mathbf{r}}_k(u) > \epsilon_k d_u})$ is at most $O(\text{vol}(S_k)) \leq O\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon_k}\right)$. Since ChebyPush executes K iterations, the total operations is no more than $O\left(\sum_{k=1}^K \frac{1}{\epsilon_k}\right) \leq O\left(\frac{K}{\epsilon} \left(\sum_{k=1}^K \left(\sum_{l=k}^K |c_l|\right)\right)\right)$. By $\sum_{l=k}^K |c_l| < 1$ ($\sum_{l=0}^{+\infty} |c_l| = 1$ for GP function f), the total operations is $O\left(\frac{K^2}{\epsilon_a}\right)$. On the other hand, when we set $\epsilon_a = 0$, ChebyPush is equivalent to ChebyPower. Therefore, the time complexity of ChebyPush can also be bounded by the time complexity of ChebyPower $O(Km)$. Putting it all together, the time complexity of ChebyPush can be bounded by $O\left(\min\left\{\frac{K^2}{\epsilon_a}, Km\right\}\right)$. \square

Theorem 4.5 shows that our ChebyPush algorithm can achieve a degree normalized error guarantee while using computation time independent of the graph size to compute general GP vectors. Note that the state-of-the-art algorithm for computing general GP vectors is the randomized push algorithm AGP [37], which has a time complexity of $O\left(\frac{N^3}{\epsilon_a}\right)$, where N denotes the truncation step of the Taylor expansion. In comparison, ChebyPush has a time complexity

of $O\left(\frac{K^2}{\epsilon_a}\right)$, with K denoting the truncation step of the Chebyshev expansion. Given that K is roughly $O(\sqrt{N})$ (see Lemma 3.5), the computational complexity of ChebyPush is lower than AGP. It is worth mentioning that for general GP vectors, such as HKPR, N often needs to be set to a large value to achieve a good accuracy, making ChebyPush significantly faster than AGP, as evidenced by our experimental results.

5 GENERALIZATIONS

In this section, we first show that our ChebyPush algorithm can be further extended to compute a more general graph propagation matrix. Then, similar to traditional Push, we show that ChebyPush can also be combined with simple Monte Carlo sampling techniques to obtain a bidirectional algorithm. Moreover, compared to the state-of-the-art Push-based bidirectional algorithm for SSPPR vector computation [45], our solution achieves a complexity reduction by a factor of $O(1/\sqrt{\alpha})$.

5.1 Computing More General GP Matrix

Instead of using the random-walk matrix $\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{A} \mathbf{D}^{-1}$ to define the graph propagation function, in the graph machine learning community, a more general graph propagation function is frequently utilized [37], defined as follows.

Definition 5.1. Given a feature matrix $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times k}$ and a graph propagation function f , the generalized graph propagation is defined as: $\mathbf{Z} = f(\mathbf{D}^{-a} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{D}^{-b}) \mathbf{X}$ with $a + b = 1$.

Clearly, when $a = 0$ and $b = 1$, the graph propagation (GP) function $f(\mathbf{D}^{-a} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{D}^{-b})$ defined in Definition 5.1 is equivalent to $f(\mathbf{P})$. Therefore, Definition 5.1 represents a more generalized form compared to our previous GP vector. This generalized GP model is commonly used in graph machine learning [4, 16, 44].

To compute the generalized GP matrix \mathbf{Z} , we first focus on a simple *vector-based* version: $\mathbf{z} = f(\mathbf{D}^{-a} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{D}^{-b}) \mathbf{x}$ with $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n$. The following theorem suggests that *vector-based* GP vector \mathbf{z} can be computed by our ChebyPush algorithm.

THEOREM 5.2. Given a GP function f , the generalized GP vector $\mathbf{z} = f(\mathbf{D}^{-a} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{D}^{-b}) \mathbf{x}$ can be expressed as: $\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{D}^{-a} \mathbf{y}$ with $\mathbf{y} = f(\mathbf{P}) \mathbf{D}^a \mathbf{x}$.

PROOF. By the definition of the random-walk matrix $\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{A} \mathbf{D}^{-1}$ and $a+b = 1$, we derive that $(\mathbf{D}^{-a} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{D}^{-b})^k \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{D}^{-a} (\mathbf{A} \mathbf{D}^{-1})^k \mathbf{D}^{1-b} \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{D}^{-a} (\mathbf{P}^k \mathbf{D}^a \mathbf{x})$. By the Taylor expansion

$$\mathbf{z} = f(\mathbf{D}^{-a} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{D}^{-b}) \mathbf{x} = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \zeta_k (\mathbf{D}^{-a} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{D}^{-b})^k \mathbf{x}$$

we have:

$$\mathbf{z} = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \zeta_k (\mathbf{D}^{-a} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{D}^{-b})^k \mathbf{x} = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \zeta_k \mathbf{D}^{-a} \mathbf{P}^k \mathbf{D}^a \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{D}^{-a} f(\mathbf{P}) \mathbf{D}^a \mathbf{x}$$

\square

Based on Theorem 5.2, we can first use ChebyPush ($\mathcal{G}, f, \mathbf{D}^a \mathbf{x}, K, \epsilon_a$) to approximately compute $\mathbf{y} = f(\mathbf{P}) \mathbf{D}^a \mathbf{x}$ and then obtain the generalized GP vector by $\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{D}^{-a} \mathbf{y}$. Furthermore, to compute the generalized GP matrix \mathbf{Z} , we can express $\mathbf{Z} = [\mathbf{z}_1, \dots, \mathbf{z}_k]$ and $\mathbf{X} = [\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_k]$. For each $i \in [k]$, we compute the approximation

$\hat{z}_k = \mathbf{D}^{-a} \hat{y}_k$ with \hat{y}_k computed by ChebyPush $(\mathcal{G}, f, \mathbf{D}^a \mathbf{x}_k, K, \epsilon_a)$. We repeat this vector GP vector computation procedure $O(k)$ times to obtain an approximation $\hat{\mathbf{Z}} = [\hat{z}_1, \dots, \hat{z}_k]$.

5.2 Generalizing to a Bidirectional Method

As we discussed in Section 2, Push is a very basic operator in many tasks. Especially, for SSPPR, many existing algorithms [23, 41, 45] follow a bidirectional framework: (i) use Push to obtain a rough approximation; (ii) refine this approximation through random walks (RW) sampling. Our proposed algorithm can also fit within this framework by simply replacing Push with ChebyPush. For completeness, we will first briefly introduce random walk sampling and then present the bidirectional algorithm that combines ChebyPush with RW.

The basic idea of RW sampling is to generate α -random walks to estimate the SSPPR vector π_s [41]. Specifically, we set the estimate vector $\hat{\pi}_s = 0$, and generate W α -random walks. Here the α -random walk performs as follows: (i) we start the random walk from node s ; (ii) suppose that the current node of the random walk is u ; In each step, with probability $(1 - \alpha)$ we uniformly choose a neighbor of u , with probability α we stop the random walk; (iii) when the random walk stops, we output the terminate node t and update the approximation $\hat{\pi}_s(t) = \hat{\pi}_s(t) + \frac{1}{W}$. By the Chernoff bound [8], we can obtain that by setting $W = O(\frac{\log n}{\epsilon_r^2 \delta})$, the approximate SSPPR vector satisfies an $(\epsilon_r, \delta, 1/n)$ -approximation. That is, for each $\pi_s(v) > \delta$, the approximation follows $|\pi_s(v) - \hat{\pi}_s(v)| < \epsilon_r \pi_s(v)$ with probability at least $1 - \frac{1}{n}$. Below, we show how to combine ChebyPush with RW. Denote by $\mathbf{r} = \alpha^{-1}[\mathbf{I} - (1 - \alpha)\mathbf{P}](\pi_s - \hat{\pi}_s)$ the residual vector. Similar to Push, we first discuss the residual bound for ChebyPush. The following lemma shows that after performing ChebyPush, the residual is bounded by $|\mathbf{r}(u)| \leq \epsilon_a d_u$ for all $u \in \mathcal{V}$, which is consistent with Push.

LEMMA 5.3. *Let π_s be the accurate SSPPR vector with source s , and $\hat{\pi}_s$ be the approximation vector. Then, after performing $\hat{\pi}_s \leftarrow$ ChebyPush $(\mathcal{G}, f, s, K, \epsilon_a^2)$, the residual vector \mathbf{r} satisfies $|\mathbf{r}(u)| \leq \epsilon_a d_u$ for all $u \in \mathcal{V}$.*

PROOF. According to Theorem 4.5, the approximation vector $\hat{\pi}_s$ returned by ChebyPush satisfies the l_2 degree normalized relative error $\|\mathbf{D}^{-1}(\pi_s - \hat{\pi}_s)\|_\infty < \epsilon_a$. Let \mathbf{d} be the degree vector, then $|\pi_s - \hat{\pi}_s| < \epsilon_a \mathbf{d}$. By the definition of residual, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbf{r}| &= \alpha^{-1}[\mathbf{I} - (1 - \alpha)\mathbf{P}]|\pi_s - \hat{\pi}_s| \\ &\leq \alpha^{-1}[\mathbf{I} - (1 - \alpha)\mathbf{P}]\epsilon_a \mathbf{d} \\ &= \alpha^{-1}[\epsilon_a \mathbf{d} - \epsilon_a(1 - \alpha)\mathbf{P}\mathbf{d}] \\ &= \alpha^{-1}[\epsilon_a \mathbf{d} - \epsilon_a(1 - \alpha)\mathbf{d}] = \epsilon_a \mathbf{d}. \end{aligned}$$

□

On top of that, the following lemma shows that the residual maintains an invariant, a crucial aspect in the design of bidirectional methods [1, 46].

LEMMA 5.4. *Let \mathbf{r} be the residual vector along with the approximation $\hat{\pi}_s$. Then, the following equation holds:*

$$\pi_s(u) = \hat{\pi}_s(u) + \sum_{v \in \mathcal{V}} \mathbf{r}(v) \pi_v(u), \forall u \in \mathcal{V}. \quad (21)$$

Algorithm 5: ChebyPush +RW

Input: $\mathcal{G}, \alpha, s, K, \epsilon_r, \delta$

- 1 $W \leftarrow \frac{2(2\epsilon_r/3+2) \log n}{\epsilon_r^2 \delta}$;
- 2 $r_{max} \leftarrow \frac{\sqrt{\alpha}}{W}$;
- 3 $\hat{\pi}_s \leftarrow$ ChebyPush $(\mathcal{G}, f = \alpha(1 - (1 - \alpha)x)^{-1}, s, K, r_{max})$;
- 4 $\mathbf{r} \leftarrow \mathbf{e}_s - \alpha^{-1}[\mathbf{I} - (1 - \alpha)\mathbf{P}]\hat{\pi}_s$;
- 5 **for** $v \in \mathcal{V}$ with $|\mathbf{r}(v)| > 0$ **do**
- 6 $W_v \leftarrow \lceil |\mathbf{r}(v)|W \rceil$;
- 7 Perform W_v α -random walks from the node v ;
- 8 **for each random walk terminates at node u do**
- 9 $\hat{\pi}_s(u) \leftarrow \hat{\pi}_s(u) + \frac{\mathbf{r}(v)}{W_v}$;
- 10 **end**
- 11 **end**

Output: $\hat{\pi}_s$ as the approximation of π_s

Table 1: Statistics of datasets

Datasets	n	m	m/n	type
Dblp	317,080	1,049,866	3.31	Undirected
Youtube	1,134,890	2,987,624	2.63	Undirected
LiveJournal	4,846,609	42,851,237	8.84	Undirected
Orkut	3,072,626	11,718,5083	38.13	Undirected
Friendster	65,608,366	1,806,067,135	27.53	Undirected

Based on Lemma 5.4, we present our bidirectional method for computing SSPPR in Algorithm 5. The detailed procedure is as follows: (i) in the first phase, performing ChebyPush with threshold r_{max} to get a rough approximation $\hat{\pi}_s$ along with its residual \mathbf{r} ; (ii) in the second phase, for each $v \in \mathcal{V}$, we perform $W_v = \lceil |\mathbf{r}(v)|W \rceil$ α -random walks, and updating $\hat{\pi}_s(u) \leftarrow \hat{\pi}_s(u) + \frac{\mathbf{r}(v)}{W_v}$ if the random walk stops at u .

Analysis of Algorithm 5. Since the runtime and error analysis of Algorithm 5 is similar to those of the traditional bidirectional methods [41, 45], we simplify the discussions here. For the runtime bound, we consider the time complexity for the ChebyPush phase and the RW phase respectively. For ChebyPush, since the threshold r_{max} is often set to a very small number for bidirectional methods (Line 2 of Algorithm 5), and the truncation step for Chebyshev expansion is $K = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha}} \log(\frac{1}{r_{max}})$, we use Theorem 4.5 with upper bound $O(Km) = O(\frac{m}{\sqrt{\alpha}} \log(\frac{1}{r_{max}}))$ to bound the time cost for ChebyPush. The time cost for RW is $O(\frac{1}{\alpha} \sum_{v \in \mathcal{V}} W_v)$, because the expected time cost for each α -random walk is $\frac{1}{\alpha}$ and we perform W_v times for each $v \in \mathcal{V}$. Additionally, since $W_v = \lceil |\mathbf{r}(v)|W \rceil$ and $|\mathbf{r}(u)| \leq r_{max} d_u$ by Lemma 5.2, we can obtain $O(\frac{1}{\alpha} \sum_{v \in \mathcal{V}} W_v) \leq O(\frac{1}{\alpha} m r_{max} W)$. Putting it together, the total runtime is $O(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha}} (m \log(\frac{1}{r_{max}}) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha}} m r_{max} W))$. By setting $r_{max} = \frac{\sqrt{\alpha}}{W}$, $W = \frac{2(2\epsilon_r/3+2) \log n}{\epsilon_r^2 \delta}$, this runtime bound is simplified by $\tilde{O}(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha}} m)$, which improves SpeedPPR [45] by a factor $\frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha}}$. Since $W = \frac{2(2\epsilon_r/3+2) \log n}{\epsilon_r^2 \delta}$, the error bound of $\hat{\pi}_s$ output by algorithm 5 is the same as those of traditional bidirectional algorithms [41, 45]: $|\pi_s(u) - \hat{\pi}_s(u)| < \epsilon_r \pi_s(u)$ for any $\pi_s(u) > \delta$ with high probability. The case is similar when using loop-erased random walk (LV) to substitute RW [23], thereby we omit the details for brevity.




Figure 4: Query time of different SSPPR algorithms under l_1 -error. The lower (resp., upper) bar of each figure represents the query time of each algorithm to reach low-precision (resp., high-precision) l_1 -error.




Figure 5: Query time of different SSPPR algorithms under Normalized RelErr. The lower (resp., upper) bar of each figure represents the query time of each algorithm to reach low-precision (resp., high-precision) Normalized RelErr.




Figure 6: Comparison of various bidirectional methods

6 EXPERIMENTS

We use 5 publicly-available datasets¹ with varying sizes (Table 1), including a graph (i.e., Friendster) with billions of edges, which are popular benchmarks for graph propagation (GP) computation [37, 38]. To evaluate the approximation errors of different algorithms, we compute *ground-truth* GP vectors using PwMethod with a sufficiently large truncation step N . Specifically, to compute the *ground-truth* GP vector, following previous studies [1, 21, 37, 41], we set the truncation step $N = \frac{1}{\alpha} \log(10^{20})$ for SSPPR and $N = 2t \log(10^{20})$ for HKPR. Following [37, 38], we randomly generate 10 source nodes as query sets and report the average performance over them for different algorithms. We will study the effect of different source node selection strategies in Section 6.3. By Definition 2.5, we use the l_1 -error and degree-normalized l_∞ -error (denoted as Normalized RelErr) to evaluate the estimation error of different algorithms. Following [40], we evaluate all algorithms under two different cases: low-precision and high-precision cases. For the low-precision (resp., high-precision) case, we set the error threshold as Normalized RelErr= 10^{-5} or l_1 -error= 10^{-1} (resp., Normalized RelErr= 10^{-10} or l_1 -error= 10^{-5}). We conduct all experiments on a Linux 20.04 server with an Intel 2.0 GHz CPU and 128GB memory. All algorithms are implemented in C++ and compiled using

¹All datasets can be downloaded from <http://snap.stanford.edu/>

GCC 9.3.0 with -O3 optimization. the source code of this paper is available at <https://anonymous.4open.science/r/Chebypush-2E94>.

6.1 Results of SSPPR Vector Computation

Comparison of various power-iteration and push algorithms. In this experiment, we compare the proposed ChebyPower and ChebyPush algorithms with four SOTA baselines for SSPPR vector computation, including PwMethod [32], Push [1], PwPush [45], and PwPushSOR [6]. Note that both PwPush and PwPushSOR are two highly-optimized *push-style* algorithms designed for SSPPR computation. For PwMethod and ChebyPower, by Lemma 3.5, we set their truncation steps as $N = \frac{1}{\alpha} \log(\frac{1}{\epsilon})$ and $K = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha}} \log(\frac{1}{\epsilon})$, respectively, with varying $\epsilon \in [10^{-1}, 10^{-9}]$ to achieve different error value. For ChebyPush, we set the truncation step $K = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha}} \log(10^5)$ and vary the threshold $\epsilon_a \in [10^{-3}, 10^{-11}]$ to achieve different error values. For Push, PwPush, and PwPushSOR, we adopt the same parameter settings in their original studies [6, 45]. Unless specified otherwise, the damping factor α in SSPPR is set to 0.2, a value widely employed in previous studies [6, 32, 45].

Figure 4 and Figure 5 report the query time of various algorithms for SSPPR vector computation, under the l_1 -error and Normalized RelErr metrics respectively. In Figure 4 and Figure 5, the lower bar of each figure represents the query time of each algorithm to reach the low-precision approximation, while the upper bar represents the query time to reach the high-precision approximation. From these figures, we have the following observations: (i) For the l_1 -error, ChebyPush performs much better than all competitors on most datasets under the low-precision case. On the other hand, under the high precision case, ChebyPush consistently outperforms all competitors except PwPushSOR. Note that ChebyPush is slightly worse than PwPushSOR at high precision on small-sized graphs, but it significantly outperforms PwPushSOR on the largest dataset Friendster. (ii) For the Normalized RelErr, ChebyPush is significantly faster than all baseline methods on large graphs under both high precision and low precision scenarios. On relatively-small graphs, it still demonstrates comparable performance to the

baseline methods. (iii) For both l_1 -error and Normalized RelErr, ChebyPower is consistently faster than its counterpart PwMethod under both high and low precision cases. These results demonstrate the high efficiency of the proposed algorithms, and also confirm our theoretical analysis in Sections 3 and 4.

Additionally, the results of Figure 4 and Figure 5 also suggest that ChebyPush is very suitable for applications where the required estimation error is not excessively high, as ChebyPush is extremely fast under the low-precision case. Therefore, ChebyPush can be highly effective and efficient for designing bidirectional algorithms, because bidirectional algorithms often do not necessitate achieving high accuracy in SSPPR estimation during the push phase (Section 5.2). Besides, we also observe that PwPushSOR performs well for high-precision SSPPR vector computation. However, unlike our ChebyPower and ChebyPush algorithm, PwPushSOR is limited to computing SSPPR vector and cannot be used for general GP vector computations (e.g., HKPR), resulting in limited applications.

Comparison of various bidirectional algorithms. As discussed in Section 5.2, our ChebyPush algorithm can also be combined with Monte-Carlo methods to generalize into bidirectional algorithms. We apply the following widely used methods for the Monte-Carlo phase of bidirectional algorithms: random walk (RW) based methods [41, 45] and loop-erased random walk (LV) based methods [23]. We use the SOTA variance reduction version for LV-based algorithms [23]. We compare our bidirectional methods ChebyPush +RW and ChebyPush +LV (ChebyPush for the first phase, RW or LV for the second phase) with four SOTA competitors FORA (Push +RW) [41], SpeedPPR (PowerPush +RW) [45], SpeedLV (PowerPush + LV) [23], FORALV (Push +LV). For ChebyPush based bidirectional algorithms (i.e., ChebyPush +RW and ChebyPush +LV), we set $K = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha}} \log(10^5)$. The parameter settings of the other bidirectional algorithms follow their original studies [23, 41, 45]. Note that all bidirectional algorithms are designed to achieve an ϵ_r -relative error guarantee. Thus, we evaluate the query time of different bidirectional algorithms to achieve the given ϵ_r -relative errors with varying ϵ_r from 0.1 to 0.5.

The results on Dblp and LiveJournal are shown in Figure 6. Similar results can also be observed on the other datasets. As can be seen, ChebyPush +RW performs better than FORA and similarly to SpeedPPR, while ChebyPush +LV significantly outperforms all bidirectional algorithms. For instance, ChebyPush +LV achieves query times $2\times$ to $6\times$ better than the best baseline algorithm (SpeedLV) to reach the same ϵ_r -relative error. This is because LV is designed to accelerate RW computation, whereas our ChebyPush accelerates Push and PwMethod computations. Thus, it is unsurprising that ChebyPush +LV achieves the best results. We also note that the query time of each algorithm decreases with an increasing ϵ_r . The reason is as follows. The results obtained by bidirectional algorithms are more accurate as ϵ_r decreases. This increased accuracy comes at the cost of longer query costs for various bidirectional algorithms. These results further demonstrate the high efficiency of the proposed algorithms.

6.2 Results of HKPR Vector Computation

In this experiment, we compare our algorithms ChebyPower and ChebyPush with the state-of-the-art competitors AGP [37] and

TEA+ [47] for computing HKPR vectors. It is important to note that both AGP and TEA+ have shown significant performance improvements over Hk Relax [21] and ClusterHKPR [9], as reported in [37] and [47]. Therefore, in this experiment, we exclude Hk Relax and ClusterHKPR from comparison. Similar to SSPPR, for ChebyPower we set $K = \sqrt{t} \log(\frac{1}{\epsilon})$ with ϵ in $[10^{-1}, 10^{-9}]$. For ChebyPush, we set $K = \sqrt{t} \log(10^5)$, and vary the threshold $\epsilon_a \in [10^{-3}, 10^{-11}]$. The parameter settings of AGP and TEA+ follow their original papers [37, 47]. Unless specified otherwise, we set $t = 5$ following previous studies [21, 37, 47].

Figure 7 and Figure 8 show the query time of various algorithms for HKPR vector computation under the l_1 -error and Normalized RelErr metrics, respectively. Similar to Figure 4 and Figure 5, the lower bar of each figure represents the query time for low-precision computation and the upper bar represents the query time for high-precision computation. We have the following important observations: (i) For the l_1 -error metric, our ChebyPush algorithm substantially outperforms all other methods under the low-precision case. Under the high-precision case, both of our ChebyPower and ChebyPush consistently outperform the baselines on all datasets. In general, ChebyPush is $3\times$ to $8\times$ faster than the best baseline algorithm. Note that for Friendster with billions of edges, none of the existing algorithms can output the results within a few seconds under the high-precision case. (ii) For the Normalized RelErr metric, our ChebyPush algorithm performs much better than the baseline methods under the low-precision case. For the high-precision case, both ChebyPower and ChebyPush are better than baselines on most datasets (on Friendster, ChebyPush is the champion algorithm and ChebyPower is slightly worse than baselines). These results indicate that our algorithms are indeed significantly accelerating existing algorithms for HKPR vector computation, which is consistent with our theoretical analysis.

6.3 Results with Various Query Distributions

In this experiment, we explore two strategies for selecting source nodes: (1) choosing the 10 nodes with the highest degrees, and (2) randomly selecting 10 nodes from the graph. We set the parameter $\alpha = 0.2, 0.02$ and $t = 5, 20$ for SSPPR and HKPR respectively. For our ChebyPower and ChebyPush algorithms, we fix $\epsilon, \epsilon_a = 10^{-5}$. We present the results using box plots to depict the distribution of query times, as shown in Figure 9.

From Figure 9, we observe the following: (i) ChebyPower exhibits insensitivity to different source node selections; the query costs for various source nodes are nearly identical. This behavior stems from ChebyPower being a *global* algorithm, where its runtime remains consistent regardless of the source node. (ii) ChebyPush demonstrates greater sensitivity to the choice of source nodes. Generally, the query costs for ChebyPush are higher when using high-degree source nodes compared to randomly selected ones. This disparity arises because ChebyPush operates as a *local* algorithm, where its time complexity depends on the local graph structure. High-degree nodes involve numerous neighbors contributing significant SSPPR and HKPR values thus often cannot be pruned in the ChebyPush procedure, resulting in higher computational costs. These findings align with the theoretical properties of our algorithms.




Figure 7: Query time of different HKPR algorithms under l_1 -error. The lower (resp., upper) bar of each figure represents the query time of each algorithm to reach low-precision (resp., high-precision) l_1 -error.




Figure 8: Query time of different HKPR algorithms under Normalized RelErr. The lower (resp., upper) bar of each figure represents the query time of each algorithm to reach low-precision (resp., high-precision) Normalized RelErr.




Figure 9: Query time distribution for our ChebyPower and ChebyPush algorithms in computing SSPPR and HKPR vectors. Pw – PRU and Pw – HKU denote ChebyPower selecting source nodes uniformly for SSPPR and HKPR, respectively. Pw – PRH and Pw – HKH represent ChebyPower selecting source nodes with the highest degree for SSPPR and HKPR, respectively. Similar naming conventions apply to ChebyPush.

7 FURTHER RELATED WORK

Personalized PageRank (PPR) Computation. There are roughly four different PPR computation problems [46]: single-source PPR, single-target PPR, single-pair PPR, and top- k PPR. The primary techniques for computing PPR include Monte-Carlo sampling (MC), PwMethod (PM), Forward Push (FP), and Reverse Push (RP), which form the foundation of most existing PPR solutions. For single-source PPR, which involves determining the PPR value from a given source vertex s to every target vertex $t \in V$, state-of-the-art practical algorithms [22–24, 41, 45] often utilize the FP+MC or PM+MC frameworks. Notably, Wei et al. [43] theoretically prove

that single-source PPR can be computed in sublinear time with a relative error guarantee using the MC+RP+MC framework. Wang et al. [38, 39] propose the randomized push technique specifically for addressing single-target PPR, which calculates the PPR value from every node $s \in V$ to a given target node t . Liao et al. [23] and Lofgren et al. [27] employed the RP+MC framework to tackle single-pair PPR, determining the PPR value between a specific source node s and a specific target node t . For top- k PPR, which identifies the top- k PPR values between a specific source nodes and all nodes in V , Wei et al. [42] use FP+BP+MC to achieve a ρ -precision guarantee. As our objective is to enhance the efficiency of push operations (FP and BP) and power method (PI), our solutions complement these existing works.

Chebyshev Polynomial Methods. Chebyshev Polynomials are powerful tools that are widely used to accelerate function approximation in numerical analysis. For example, Bautista and Latapy [2] employ Chebyshev polynomials to design distributed Personalized PageRank algorithms. Shuman et al. [34, 35] apply Chebyshev polynomials to approximate the distributed graph signal processing. Defferrard et al. [13] and He et al. [19] decompose graph signals into linear combinations of Chebyshev polynomials. Braverman et al. [5] utilize the stability of Chebyshev polynomials [10, 30] to design fast algorithms for spectral density approximation of the transition matrix P . However, since their problem differs from ours, their techniques are fundamentally distinct from ours and cannot be directly applied to our GP vectors computation problem.

8 CONCLUSION

In this paper, we propose two innovative and efficient algorithms for general GP computation based on Chebyshev polynomials. Specifically, we first propose a novel Chebyshev expansion formula for general GP functions, based on which new power-iteration and push-style algorithms are proposed. We prove that our new power-iteration method, namely ChebyPower, can achieve roughly $O(\sqrt{N})$ acceleration over the state-of-the-art power iteration methods for two well-studied GP computation problems (SSPPR and

HKPR). For the push-style algorithm, we develop a novel subset Chebyshev recurrence technique to achieve a local algorithm with lower time complexity compared to the state-of-the-art push algorithms for general GP computation. Extensive experimental results demonstrate that our algorithms significantly outperform existing state-of-the-art methods for both SSPPR and HKPR computations in large graphs.

REFERENCES

- [1] Reid Andersen, Fan Chung, and Kevin Lang. Local graph partitioning using pagerank vectors. In *FOCS*, 2006.
- [2] Esteban Bautista and Matthieu Latapy. A local updating algorithm for personalized pagerank via chebyshev polynomials. *Social Network Analysis and Mining*, 12(1), 2022.
- [3] Aleksandar Bojchevski, Johannes Gasteiger, Bryan Perozzi, Amol Kapoor, Martin Blais, Benedek Rózemberczki, Michal Lukasik, and Stephan Günnemann. Scaling graph neural networks with approximate pagerank. In *KDD*, 2020.
- [4] Aleksandar Bojchevski, Johannes Klicpera, Bryan Perozzi, Martin Blais, Amol Kapoor, Michal Lukasik, and Stephan Günnemann. Is pagerank all you need for scalable graph neural networks. In *KDD*, 2019.
- [5] Vladimir Braverman, Aditya Krishnan, and Christopher Musco. Sublinear time spectral density estimation. In *STOC*, 2022.
- [6] Zhen Chen, Xingzhi Guo, Baojian Zhou, Deqing Yang, and Steven Skiena. Accelerating personalized pagerank vector computation. In *KDD*, 2023.
- [7] Fan Chung. The heat kernel as the pagerank of a graph. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 104(50), 2007.
- [8] Fan Chung and Linyuan Lu. Concentration inequalities and martingale inequalities: a survey. *Internet mathematics*, 3(1), 2006.
- [9] Fan Chung and Olivia Simpson. Computing heat kernel pagerank and a local clustering algorithm. *European Journal of Combinatorics*, 68, 2018.
- [10] Charles W Clenshaw. A note on the summation of chebyshev series. *Mathematics of Computation*, 9(51), 1955.
- [11] Mustafa Coskun, Ananth Grama, and Mehmet Koyuturk. Efficient processing of network proximity queries via chebyshev acceleration. In *KDD*, 2016.
- [12] Mustafa Coskun, Ananth Grama, and Mehmet Koyuturk. Indexed fast network proximity querying. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment*, 11(8), 2018.
- [13] Michaël Defferrard, Xavier Bresson, and Pierre Vandergheynst. Convolutional neural networks on graphs with fast localized spectral filtering. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 2016.
- [14] Ying Ding, Erjia Yan, Arthur Frazho, and James Caverlee. Pagerank for ranking authors in co-citation networks. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 60(11), 2009.
- [15] Johannes Gasteiger, Aleksandar Bojchevski, and Stephan Günnemann. Predict then propagate: Graph neural networks meet personalized pagerank. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.05997*, 2018.
- [16] Johannes Gasteiger, Stefan Weisberger, and Stephan Günnemann. Diffusion improves graph learning. *NeurIPS*, 2019.
- [17] Gene H. Golub and Charles F. Van Loan. *Matrix Computations, Third Edition*. Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996.
- [18] Xingzhi Guo, Baojian Zhou, and Steven Skiena. Subset node representation learning over large dynamic graphs. In *KDD*, 2021.
- [19] Mingguo He, Zhewei Wei, and Ji-Rong Wen. Convolutional neural networks on graphs with chebyshev approximation, revisited. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 2022.
- [20] Yue He, Longlong Lin, Pingpeng Yuan, Ronghua Li, Tao Jia, and Zeli Wang. CCSS: towards conductance-based community search with size constraints. *Expert Syst. Appl.*, 250, 2024.
- [21] Kyle Kloster and David F Gleich. Heat kernel based community detection. In *KDD*, 2014.
- [22] Meihao Liao, Rong-Hua Li, Qiangqiang Dai, Hongyang Chen, Hongchao Qin, and Guoren Wang. Efficient personalized pagerank computation: The power of variance-reduced monte carlo approaches. *Proc. ACM Manag. Data*, 1(2):160:1–160:26, 2023.
- [23] Meihao Liao, Rong-Hua Li, Qiangqiang Dai, and Guoren Wang. Efficient personalized pagerank computation: A spanning forests sampling based approach. In *SIGMOD*, 2022.
- [24] Dandan Lin, Raymond Chi-Wing Wong, Min Xie, and Victor Junqiu Wei. Index-free approach with theoretical guarantee for efficient random walk with restart query. In *ICDE*. IEEE, 2020.
- [25] Longlong Lin, Ronghua Li, and Tao Jia. Scalable and effective conductance-based graph clustering. In *AAAI*, 2023.
- [26] Longlong Lin, Pingpeng Yuan, Rong-Hua Li, Chun-Xue Zhu, Hongchao Qin, Hai Jin, and Tao Jia. QTCS: efficient query-centered temporal community search. *Proc. VLDB Endow.*, 17(6), 2024.
- [27] Peter Lofgren, Siddhartha Banerjee, and Ashish Goel. Personalized pagerank estimation and search: A bidirectional approach. In *WSDM*, 2016.
- [28] Peter Lofgren and Ashish Goel. Personalized pagerank to a target node. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1304.4658*, 2013.
- [29] John C Mason and David C Handscomb. *Chebyshev polynomials*. Chapman and Hall/CRC, 2002.
- [30] Cameron Musco, Christopher Musco, and Aaron Sidford. Stability of the lanczos method for matrix function approximation. In *SODA*. SIAM, 2018.
- [31] Frank WJ Olver and Leonard C Maximon. Bessel functions., 2010.
- [32] Lawrence Page, Sergey Brin, Rajeev Motwani, and Terry Winograd. The pagerank citation ranking: Bringing order to the web. Technical report, Stanford infolab, 1999.
- [33] Sushant Sachdeva, Nisheeth K Vishnoi, et al. Faster algorithms via approximation theory. *Foundations and Trends® in Theoretical Computer Science*. 9(2), 2014.
- [34] David I Shuman, Pierre Vandergheynst, and Pascal Frossard. Chebyshev polynomial approximation for distributed signal processing. In *DCOSS*. IEEE, 2011.
- [35] David I Shuman, Pierre Vandergheynst, Daniel Kressner, and Pascal Frossard. Distributed signal processing via chebyshev polynomial approximation. *IEEE Transactions on Signal and Information Processing over Networks*, 4(4), 2018.
- [36] Anton Tsitsulin, Davide Mottin, Panagiotis Karras, and Emmanuel Müller. Verse: Versatile graph embeddings from similarity measures. In *WWW*, 2018.
- [37] Hanzhi Wang, Mingguo He, Zhewei Wei, Sibowang, Ye Yuan, Xiaoyong Du, and Ji-Rong Wen. Approximate graph propagation. In *KDD*, 2021.
- [38] Hanzhi Wang and Zhewei Wei. Estimating single-node pagerank in $\mathcal{O}(\text{mindt}, \sqrt{m})$ time. *Proc. VLDB Endow.*, 2023.
- [39] Hanzhi Wang, Zhewei Wei, Junhao Gan, Sibowang, and Zengfeng Huang. Personalized pagerank to a target node, revisited. In *KDD*, 2020.
- [40] Hanzhi Wang, Zhewei Wei, Junhao Gan, Ye Yuan, Xiaoyong Du, and Ji-Rong Wen. Edge-based local push for personalized pagerank. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.07937*, 2022.
- [41] Sibowang, Renchi Yang, Xiaokui Xiao, Zhewei Wei, and Yin Yang. Fora: simple and effective approximate single-source personalized pagerank. In *KDD*, pages 505–514, 2017.
- [42] Zhewei Wei, Xiaodong He, Xiaokui Xiao, Sibowang, Shuo Shang, and Ji-Rong Wen. Toppr: top-k personalized pagerank queries with precision guarantees on large graphs. In *SIGMOD*, 2018.
- [43] Zhewei Wei, Ji-Rong Wen, and Mingji Yang. Approximating single-source personalized pagerank with absolute error guarantees. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.01019*, 2024.
- [44] Felix Wu, Amauri Souza, Tianyi Zhang, Christopher Fifty, Tao Yu, and Kilian Weinberger. Simplifying graph convolutional networks. In *ICML*, 2019.
- [45] Hao Wu, Junhao Gan, Zhewei Wei, and Rui Zhang. Unifying the global and local approaches: an efficient power iteration with forward push. In *SIGMOD*, 2021.
- [46] Mingji Yang, Hanzhi Wang, Zhewei Wei, Sibowang, and Ji-Rong Wen. Efficient algorithms for personalized pagerank computation: A survey. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, 2024.
- [47] Renchi Yang, Xiaokui Xiao, Zhewei Wei, Sourav S Bhowmick, Jun Zhao, and Rong-Hua Li. Efficient estimation of heat kernel pagerank for local clustering. In *SIGMOD*, 2019.
- [48] Yichun Yang, Rong-Hua Li, Meihao Liao, Longlong Lin, and Guoren Wang. Chebyshev meets push: Efficient and provable graph propagation computation. <https://anonymous.4open.science/r/ChebyPush-2E94>, 2024.
- [49] Yunfeng Yu, Longlong Lin, Qiyu Liu, Zeli Wang, Xi Ou, and Tao Jia. GSD-GNN: generalizable and scalable algorithms for decoupled graph neural networks. In *ICMR*, 2024.