
ARMADA: MEMORY-EFFICIENT DISTRIBUTED TRAINING OF LARGE-SCALE GRAPH NEURAL NETWORKS

Roger Waleffe¹ Devesh Sarda¹ Jason Mohoney¹ Emmanouil-Vasileios Vlatakis-Gkaragkounis¹
Theodoros Rekatsinas² Shivaram Venkataraman¹

ABSTRACT

We study distributed training of Graph Neural Networks (GNNs) on billion-scale graphs that are partitioned across machines. Efficient training in this setting relies on min-edge-cut partitioning algorithms, which minimize cross-machine communication due to GNN neighborhood sampling. Yet, min-edge-cut partitioning over large graphs remains a challenge: State-of-the-art (SoTA) offline methods (e.g., METIS) are effective, but they require orders of magnitude more memory and runtime than GNN training itself, while computationally efficient algorithms (e.g., streaming greedy approaches) suffer from increased edge cuts. Thus, in this work we introduce Armada, a new end-to-end system for distributed GNN training whose key contribution is GREM, a novel min-edge-cut partitioning algorithm that can efficiently scale to large graphs. GREM builds on streaming greedy approaches with one key addition: prior vertex assignments are continuously refined during streaming, rather than frozen after an initial greedy selection. Our theoretical analysis and experimental results show that this refinement is critical to minimizing edge cuts and enables GREM to reach partition quality comparable to METIS but with $8-65\times$ less memory and $8-46\times$ faster. Given a partitioned graph, Armada leverages a new disaggregated architecture for distributed GNN training to further improve efficiency; we find that on common cloud machines, even with zero communication, GNN neighborhood sampling and feature loading bottleneck training. Disaggregation allows Armada to independently allocate resources for these operations and ensure that expensive GPUs remain saturated with computation. We evaluate Armada against SoTA systems for distributed GNN training and find that the disaggregated architecture leads to runtime improvements up to $4.5\times$ and cost reductions up to $3.1\times$.

1 INTRODUCTION

Graph Neural Networks (GNNs) have emerged as the de-facto approach for machine learning over graph-structured inputs (Chami et al., 2021); GNN-based models are currently used in navigation apps (Derrow-Pinion et al., 2021), to predict protein structures (Jumper et al., 2021), and to create weather forecasts (GraphCast (Lam et al., 2022)). These impressive results, however, require training GNNs over massive amounts of graph data. For example, GraphCast was trained on 53TB over four weeks using 32 Cloud TPU v4 nodes (10/2024 est. cost: \$70K), limiting the development of such a model to those with sufficient resources.

Motivated by the above, this work focuses on scalable, cost-effective, distributed GNN training over large graphs using common cloud offerings. While recent works (Kaler et al., 2023; Zheng et al., 2020a; 2022) have sought to address this need, we find that existing pipelines face scalability challenges when graphs have billions of nodes or edges and

when training with multiple GPUs. These challenges arise from the unique properties of the GNN workload itself.

In particular, distributed GNN training necessitates that the graph is partitioned across machines; yet, the partitioning has a direct impact on the subsequent training efficiency, as GNN systems must communicate across machines to sample the neighborhood of graph nodes (Shao et al., 2024). This communication can be reduced using *min-edge-cut partitioning* algorithms that minimize the number of edges with endpoints in different partitions (machines) (called *cut edges*). Thus, min-edge-cut partitioning is widely used in GNN systems, and has been shown to lead to an order of magnitude faster training compared to random partitioning (Merkel et al., 2023; Zheng et al., 2022).

Min-edge-cut partitioning, however, becomes increasingly expensive with graph size. For instance, many systems utilize the offline algorithm METIS (Karypis & Kumar, 1997) due to its ability to effectively minimize edge cuts by iteratively refining partitions across the whole graph and its comparatively efficient implementation (Merkel et al., 2023; Shao et al., 2024; Lin et al., 2023); yet, METIS takes 8000s and requires a special machine with 630GB of memory

¹University of Wisconsin-Madison ²Apple. Correspondence to: Roger Waleffe <waleffe@wisc.edu>.

to partition a common benchmark graph (the 1.6B edge OGBN-Papers100M), whereas GNN training takes only 549s (10 epochs, one GPU) and can run on cloud machines with 244GB of memory (Waleffe et al., 2023) (details in Section 6). Although the partitioning overhead can be amortized across models, it still presents a bottleneck to GNN training. To address this issue, streaming algorithms iterate over the graph and assign vertices to partitions greedily (Abbas et al., 2018). While these algorithms offer improved scalability, they tend to result in more edge cuts than offline methods (Zhang et al., 2018); e.g., we find a streaming greedy approach cuts up to $4\times$ more edges than METIS.

In this work, we introduce Armada, a new end-to-end system for large-scale distributed GNN training that aims to address the bottleneck of partitioning in existing GNN pipelines. To overcome this challenge, Armada’s key contribution is a novel memory-efficient min-edge-cut partitioning algorithm called GREM (Greedy plus Refinement for Edge-cut Minimization). GREM can efficiently scale to massive graphs on common hardware by processing streaming chunks of graph edges, yet it still returns partitions with edge cuts comparable to METIS. For example, in the same setting in which METIS requires 8000s and 630GB, GREM can partition the graph with similar edge cuts in 175s using 9.3GB.

GREM’s partitioning algorithm builds on existing streaming greedy approaches. Specifically, GREM iterates over the graph edges in chunks and greedily assigns the vertices in each chunk to partitions. The key idea behind GREM, however, is that it allows prior vertex assignments to be modified throughout the process, rather than freezing them after an initial greedy selection (as in existing algorithms (Abbas et al., 2018)). This approach, inspired by offline algorithms, refines the partitioning by leveraging lightweight statistics accumulated during streaming (these statistics provide estimates of the number of neighbors per node in each partition).

We analyze theoretically GREM’s expected number of edge cuts versus chunk size, providing insight into its expected behavior. This analysis, confirmed by experiments, shows that refinement is critical for minimizing edge cuts when using small chunk sizes (e.g., $\leq 10\%$ of the edges) and thus for minimizing GREM’s computational requirements (which are proportional to chunk size): We show that GREM with a chunk size of 10% and METIS cut a similar number of edges, but GREM does so with $8\times$ less memory and runtime (see Section 6). GREM even achieves comparable results with a chunk size of 1%, leading to further reductions and enabling GREM to partition the largest public graphs (e.g., Hyperlink-2012 (Meusel et al., 2014); 3.5B nodes, 128B edges) with only 500GB of memory.

Given a partitioned graph, Armada’s second main contribution is the introduction of a new distributed architecture, that disaggregates the CPU resources used for neighborhood

sampling from the GPU resources used for model computation, in order to achieve scalable, memory-efficient, and cost-effective GNN training on common hardware. Concretely, Armada consists of: 1) A partitioning layer that implements GREM. 2) A storage layer to store the partitioned graph, implemented over cheap disk-based storage. 3) A distributed mini batch preparation layer consisting of a set of workers running on cheap CPU-only machines; workers read graph partitions from storage and prepare batches (i.e., perform neighborhood sampling) for training. 4) A distributed model computation layer that utilizes a set of GPU machines to perform training over the prepared batches.

We chose a disaggregated architecture to optimize resource utilization during training. On common cloud machines, we find that even with zero communication, mini batch preparation can be up to an order of magnitude slower than mini batch computation (Figure 1). Disaggregation allows Armada to overcome this imbalance. By independently scaling the batch preparation layer, we can ensure that GPUs in the computation layer remain saturated during training. In contrast, existing systems, which rely only on the fixed set of CPU resources attached to the GPU machines used for training to prepare batches, are unable to parallelize mini batch preparation and suffer from sublinear speedups as compute resources are scaled. For example, on a cloud GPU machine, we find that two SoTA systems (Kaler et al., 2023; Zheng et al., 2020a) yield only $4.3\times$ and $1.7\times$ speedup when using eight instead of one GPU (Table 1 left). Sublinear speedups lead to higher than necessary total training cost and runtime over massive graphs, as expensive compute resources sit idle. Yet in the same setting, Armada achieves a $7.5\times$ speedup with eight instead of one GPU.

Despite the flexibility of disaggregation, challenges arise due to the communication overhead between various components. Thus, we carefully design Armada with a focus on minimizing communication between and within layers. In particular, Armada includes two optimizations to reduce the data sent between batch preparation and compute workers: 1) batch workers group mini batches destined for different GPUs on the same compute worker and transfer them together, rather than independently, in order to enable greater compression (mini batch grouping), and 2) compute workers in Armada maintain a cache of frequently accessed data in their local CPU memory (feature caching). Together, these optimizations enable Armada to scale each layer in the architecture independently without communication bottlenecks.

We evaluate Armada’s disaggregated architecture for GNN training and compare against existing SoTA systems. Using popular GNN architectures, we show that while existing systems scale sublinearly, Armada does not, leading to runtime improvements up to $4.5\times$ and monetary cost reductions up to $3.1\times$ compared to existing systems.

2 PRELIMINARIES

We discuss necessary background on GNN training.

2.1 GNNs and GNN Mini Batch Training

GNNs achieve state-of-the-art (SoTA) accuracy by learning to combine information about graph nodes with information from their multi-hop neighborhood. The local information for each node is encoded in a *feature vector* that can be fixed or learned during training. All feature vectors are stored together in a lookup table indexed by node ID—For large graphs, the storage overhead for this table can require hundreds of GBs to TBs of memory (Waleffe et al., 2023).

As such, large-scale GNN training is typically performed in a mini batch fashion consisting of two distinct parts: *mini batch preparation* and *mini batch computation*. Mini batch preparation is uniquely challenging for GNNs (Chami et al., 2021; Thorpe et al., 2021; Gandhi & Iyer, 2021; Kaler et al., 2022); it requires sampling multi-hop neighborhoods (Hamilton et al., 2017) for a batch of nodes and loading the corresponding feature vectors from the graph. Given the storage overhead of the latter (above), mini batch preparation typically occurs on CPUs with access to ample DRAM. After a batch is prepared, mini batch computation (the GNN forward/backward pass) consists of matrix multiplies that call for GPU acceleration. Thus, batches prepared on CPUs are then transferred to GPUs for computation.

2.2 Distributed GNN Training

When the storage overhead of a graph exceeds the CPU memory capacity of a single machine, or when parallelization is desired to accelerate training, prior works propose to use distributed training (Shao et al., 2024). In this case, graph nodes (and their features) are split into disjoint *partitions* that are loaded into separate machines. In this setup, mini batch preparation is also distributed—Each machine is responsible for preparing batches in parallel and sampling the required multi-hop neighborhoods across the whole graph, by communicating with other machines as needed.

The Need for Scalable Min-Edge-Cut Partitioning Cross-machine neighborhood sampling and feature loading can lead to a communication bottleneck that fundamentally limits the scalability and throughput of batch preparation across the set of machines (Kaler et al., 2023). To mitigate this issue, existing systems rely on partitioning algorithms that minimize the number of cross-partition edges (Zheng et al., 2022). As highlighted in the introduction, however, current partitioning algorithms that minimize edge cuts are expensive—partitioning often dominates the overall GNN runtime and limits the maximum graph size that can be processed given certain resources.




Figure 1. Breakdown of the average runtime per training iteration in the SoTA system MariusGNN (GraphSage-Large on OGBN-Papers100M; details in Section 6). Neighborhood sampling plus feature loading on the CPU dominates GNN runtime.

The Need For Disaggregated Training We find that *even when there is zero communication*, mini batch preparation can bottleneck distributed GNN training in existing systems, leading to GPU underutilization and unnecessarily expensive training. This problem is exacerbated on common cloud machines with fast GPUs and fixed CPU resources.

For example, in Figure 1 we show the average time for mini batch preparation and computation across training iterations on a common GNN benchmark. Figure 1 shows that multi-hop sampling (even when optimized (Waleffe et al., 2023)) and feature loading—which together encompass mini batch preparation—dominate overall training time. Furthermore, this overhead increases with increasing GPUs (distributed data parallel training with weak scaling, commonly used for GNN training, requires preparing one mini batch per GPU).

Given the runtime discrepancy, it’s necessary to parallelize mini batch preparation across CPUs in order to keep GPUs busy with computation. Existing systems, however, rely only on the fixed set of CPU resources attached to GPU machines for this parallelization, fundamentally hindering their ability to prepare batches (Kaler et al., 2022; Zheng et al., 2022). To highlight this issue, in Figure 2, we show the CPU utilization of the SoTA system Salient++ (Kaler et al., 2023) during GNN training. Salient++ requires more than 80 percent of the CPU to prepare batches in parallel for one GPU. When training with four GPUs, the CPU is fully saturated, limiting the throughput of mini batch preparation, leading to sublinear scaling ($1.6\times$ instead of $4\times$; Table 1), and resulting in expensive GPUs sitting partially idle.

The above observations motivate a disaggregated system for large-scale GNN training that supports scaling each part of the workload independently. While disaggregation has improved resource efficiency in traditional ML settings (Graur et al., 2022; Jin et al., 2024), prior work on disaggregated GNN training (Dorylus (Thorpe et al., 2021)) has focused only on utilizing serverless functions and full multi-hop neighborhoods (i.e., no sampling). Full neighborhoods, however, lead to expensive communication for multi-layer GNNs and a serverless architecture limits the type of models that can be trained efficiently without GPUs. On a common GNN benchmark, we find that throughput in Dorylus plateaus at 89.6s/epoch (\$3.75/epoch); GPU-based systems can be $12\times$ faster and $53\times$ cheaper (see Table 1 left).




Figure 2. CPU utilization in the SoTA system Salient++ (details in Section 6; GraphSage-Small on OGBN-Papers100M). Nearly all CPU resources are used to parallelize mini batch preparation and minimize training time with one GPU; the CPU resources are insufficient for multi-GPU training, leading to sublinear speedups.

3 ARMADA: ARCHITECTURE OVERVIEW

Armada addresses the aforementioned challenges of large-scale distributed GNN training (Section 2) by introducing a min-edge-cut partitioning algorithm (GREM) and by employing a disaggregated architecture (Figure 3). Concretely, Armada consists of four components; we next discuss the responsibilities of each during training, before describing GREM in Section 4 and optimizations to reduce communication across the architecture in Section 5.

GREM Partitioning Layer Given an input graph (stored on disk) in the form of an edge list and a set of features for each node, Armada partitions the nodes into a set of p partitions using *GREM*. GREM returns a label for each node specifying its partition, and saves this information to disk.

Storage Layer The storage layer in Armada can store the partitioned graph using a variety of common backends (e.g., AWS S3, EBS, HDFS). We store the feature vectors for each node in a partition sequentially and group the graph edges into buckets: For a pair of node partitions (i, j) , edge bucket (i, j) contains all edges from nodes in i to nodes in j . All edges in each bucket are then stored sequentially as a list. This format allows sets of partitions and the edges between them to be accessed using only sequential file reads/writes.

Mini Batch Preparation Layer Armada uses a distributed set of workers running on cheap CPU-only machines to prepare mini batches for training. Each worker reads a set of partitions (and the edges between them) from the storage layer into memory. The specific partition assignment for each machine is made by a designated worker, called the *coordinator*, according to a *randomized algorithm* (Section 5). After loading their assigned partitions, workers construct batches for training. Armada supports both 1) local construction, where machines prepare batches using only the data in their own CPU memory, leading to zero communication across machines, and 2) distributed construction, where multi-hop neighborhoods are sampled across the whole graph in the aggregate CPU memory of the layer. To minimize communication between workers in the latter setting, Armada relies on the min-edge-cut partitioning returned by GREM and supports replicating high

degree nodes on each worker (Section 5). Once batches are prepared, each worker pushes them to a specified (when configuring Armada) worker in the compute layer. To minimize the data transferred to the compute workers for each batch, Armada uses *mini batch grouping*—batches destined for different GPUs on the same machine are grouped together for transmission to enable greater data compression (Section 5).

Because the mini batch preparation layer is disaggregated, the number of workers can be chosen independently from the other layers in Armada. In particular, for workloads bottlenecked by mini batch preparation, Armada can allocate enough CPU resources to ensure that all compute workers (GPUs) remain saturated with computation. Additionally, for massive graphs, Armada can rely on the storage layer for primary graph storage, rather than on the CPU memory of the batch preparation (or compute) layer, providing the option for lower cost, memory-efficient training deployments.

Compute Layer Armada’s compute layer consists of a set of machines with attached GPU(s) and is responsible for model computation. Compute workers listen for mini batches from specified worker(s) in the mini batch preparation layer and then perform the GNN forward/backward pass on received batches in parallel. To minimize the amount of data sent for each mini batch, compute workers in Armada also maintain a *feature cache* of frequently accessed features in their local CPU memory (Section 5). GNN model parameters are replicated across GPUs and model gradients are synchronized before each parameter update. If applicable, gradients for learnable feature vectors are transferred to the CPU memory of the compute worker and then sent back to the corresponding batch worker so it can update its partitions in memory.

4 SCALABLE GRAPH PARTITIONING

We now introduce GREM, a novel algorithm that enables efficient min-edge-cut graph partitioning over massive graphs on a commodity machine. We describe the optimization objective and algorithm, then analyze it theoretically below.

4.1 GREM: Min-Edge-Cut Partitioning

Optimization Objective Given a graph $G = (V, E)$, we assume as input an edge list (E) stored on disk in a random order. Our goal is to partition the nodes V into a set of p partitions, each of size $\lceil V/p \rceil$ (i.e., a balanced partitioning), according to an algorithm that 1) minimizes the number of cross-partition edges and 2) can scale to massive graphs given a fixed amount of CPU memory (but unlimited disk space) (the edge list for large graphs may not fit in memory on a single, or even multiple machines (e.g., Hyperlink-2012’s 128B edges require 2TB (Meusel et al., 2014))).

The above problem (balanced min-edge-cut partitioning) is




Figure 3. Armada system diagram. **A.** Graph data is partitioned using GREM (Section 4) and then **B.** stored on disk in the storage layer. **C.** A disaggregated mini batch preparation layer loads graph partitions into memory and prepares mini batches for workers in the compute layer. **D.** The compute workers process these mini batches on GPUs and periodically synchronize dense model parameters.

NP-Hard, even for $p = 2$; for $p > 2$, no finite approximation algorithm exists unless $P=NP$ (Andreev & Räcke, 2004). As such, existing algorithms rely on heuristics: As highlighted in the introduction, offline algorithms (e.g., METIS) operate over the whole graph and effectively minimize edge cuts through iterative partition refinement, but they face scalability challenges. On the other hand, streaming greedy approaches (Stanton, 2014; Alistarh et al., 2015; Patwary et al., 2019; Stanton & Kliot, 2012; Faraj & Schulz, 2022; Petroni et al., 2015; Jain et al., 1998; Tsourakakis et al., 2014) have better scalability, but often lead to partitionings with more edge cuts due to their use of fixed greedy decisions (e.g., $4\times$ more edge cuts than METIS).

Key Idea To combine the advantages of offline and streaming methods, GREM employs a streaming greedy approach, but with one key addition: Rather than freezing the partition assignment for a node after an initial greedy selection, GREM leverages running statistics accumulated during streaming to continuously reevaluate prior assignments and refine the result. Inspired by offline algorithms, this refinement is critical to minimizing edge cuts.

Detailed Algorithm GREM partitions an input graph into $p = 2$ partitions as described in Algorithm 1; we focus on $p = 2$ because GREM returns a partitioning for $p > 2$ by first partitioning the graph into two parts, and then recursively re-partitioning each part into two new parts as needed. We identify the two partitions by index *zero* and *one*. Each node starts unassigned (index *minus one*) and each partition starts with size zero (Line 1). We also initialize two numerical values for each node (`nbr_counts`, Line 2); the purpose of these values is to provide a running estimate of the number of neighbors each node has in each partition.

GREM then proceeds by iterating over the edge list in chunks (Line 3). For each chunk, the edges are loaded into memory (`c_edges`) and the set of unique nodes (`c_nodes`) contained in those edges is computed (Lines 4-5). For the first chunk (Line 6), as there are no existing partition assignments that can be used to make greedy decisions, we use a *seed* partitioning algorithm on the in-memory edges (e.g.,

Algorithm 1 GREM Bipartite Graph Partitioning

```

Require: num_nodes; edges; c_size: chunk size; seed_algo:
seed partition algorithm; P: max partition size (in nodes)
1: parts = minus_ones(num_nodes); sizes = zeros(2)
2: nbr_counts = zeros(num_nodes, 2)
3: for  $i = 0$  to  $\text{ceil}(\text{len}(\text{edges})/\text{c\_size}) - 1$  do
4:   c_edges = read(edges[i * c_size : (i + 1) * c_size])
5:   c_nodes = unique_nodes_in_edges(c_edges)
6:   if  $i == 0$  then
7:     parts[c_nodes] = seed_algo(c_edges, num=2)
8:     sizes = [num_zeros(parts), num_ones(parts)]
9:     nbrs0, nbrs1 = cnt_nbrs(c_nodes, c_edges, parts)
10:    nbr_counts[c_nodes] = [nbrs0, nbrs1]
11:  else
12:    for  $n \in \text{c\_nodes}$  do
13:      old_part = parts[n]
14:      nbrs0, nbrs1 = cnt_nbrs(n, c_edges, parts)
15:      if  $\text{old\_part} \neq -1$  then
16:        nbrs0, nbrs1 = (nbr_counts[n] + [nbrs0, nbrs1]) / 2
17:        parts[n] = assign(nbrs0, nbrs1, sizes, P)
18:        sizes = fix_sizes(parts[n], old_part, sizes)
19:        nbr_counts[n] = [nbrs0, nbrs1]

```

METIS) to assign all nodes in memory to one of the two partitions (Line 7). The partition sizes and the estimated number of neighbors per node in each partition (calculated based on the in-memory edges and existing partitioning; Algorithm 2 - `cnt_nbrs`) are then updated (Lines 8-10).

For the remaining chunks (Line 11), GREM assigns nodes to partitions greedily. For each node n (Line 12), we start by estimating the number of neighbors in each partition using the current chunk’s edges and most recent partition assignments (Line 14). If the node is unassigned (i.e., this is the first chunk containing the node), these neighbor estimates are used directly: To minimize edge cuts, we assign the node to the partition containing most of its neighbors, unless the partition is full (Line 17; Algorithm 2 - `assign`). The partition sizes are then updated (Line 18; Algorithm 2 - `fix_sizes`) and the neighbor estimates for the node are saved (Line 19). *The algorithm, as described so far, represents a streaming greedy approach with fixed assignments.*

Instead of fixing an initial greedy decision for each node,

Algorithm 2 GREM Helper Functions

```
1: cnt_nbrs(nodes, edges, parts):
2:   local_nbr_counts = zeros(len(nodes), 2)
3:   for n in nodes do
4:     for (src, dst) in edges do
5:       if src == n or dst == n then
6:         nbr = src if dst == n else dst
7:         if parts[nbr] != -1 then
8:           local_nbr_counts[n][parts[nbr]] += 1
9:   return local_nbr_counts
10: assign(nbrs0, nbrs1, sizes, P):
11:   if nbrs0 < nbrs1 and sizes[1] < P then return 1
12:   if nbrs1 < nbrs0 and sizes[0] < P then return 0
13:   return arg_min(sizes)
14: fix_sizes(new_part, old_part, sizes):
15:   sizes[new_part] += 1
16:   if old_part != -1 then sizes[old_part] -= 1
```

GREM reevaluates a node’s partition assignment each time it reappears in memory. Specifically, for a previously assigned node n (Line 15), we refresh our estimate of the number of neighbors in each partition using an average of the estimate from the current chunk and the estimates accumulated from prior chunks (Lines 16). Node n is then assigned to a partition greedily using these updated estimates (Line 17), which are then saved for future use (Line 19). We highlight that, by repeatedly averaging the accumulated neighbor estimates with the most recent ones, we are computing a weighted average of the estimates across all prior chunks containing the node, with the weight of each preceding chunk decreasing by a factor of two.

Updating prior greedy assignments based on the weighted average of neighbor estimates has the following advantages: First, nodes (which reappear) are not greedily assigned based on the estimates from only one chunk (as in existing algorithms)—these estimates can be noisy, particularly for small chunks when nodes have only a few neighbors in memory. Second, by weighting the average, more value is placed on recent estimates which are likely to be more accurate (as partition assignments may have changed since prior estimates were computed). The end result is a continuous refinement of greedy decisions throughout the algorithm.

4.2 Theoretical Analysis of GREM

We now analyze the number of edge cuts returned by GREM versus chunk size. We focus on chunk size as it directly affects the computational overhead of the algorithm. As chunk size decreases, so does GREM’s memory requirement and runtime; only the active chunk of edges needs to be in memory and the time for the initial seed partitioning algorithm on the first chunk dominates the time for the simple greedy processing of subsequent chunks. We compare the expected number of edge cuts when using fixed greedy assignments to that of the refined greedy assignments employed by GREM.

Fixed Greedy Assignments We focus on the assignment of a specific node n and assume all other nodes are assigned to partitions. Among all edges, let node n have k neighbors, with k_0 in partition zero, and k_1 in partition one. Without loss of generality, we assume $k_0 \geq k_1$. Observe that, with a chunk size of $|E|$ (i.e., all edges), our greedy algorithm will assign node n to partition zero to minimize edge cuts.

To analyze the effect of chunk size, we ask, what is the probability node n will be assigned to partition zero if only $|E| * x$ edges (sampled uniformly) are used to make the decision (i.e., if we use a chunk size of $|E| * x$)? Let k'_0 and k'_1 be the number of neighbors of node n in partition zero and one that are present in the sampled $|E| * x$ edges. Then we seek to calculate $Pr(k'_0 \geq k'_1 | k_0 \geq k_1, x)$. We assume that $k'_0 + k'_1 = x * k$ (i.e., sampling $|E| * x$ edges leads to sampling $k * x$ neighbors). Then k'_0 (or k'_1) is a random variable sampled from a Hypergeometric distribution describing the probability of sampling (without replacement) a specific number of neighbors in partition zero (one) from a finite population of size k , containing k_0 (k_1) total neighbors in partition zero (one), using $k * x$ draws. We also have that $k'_1 = k * x - k'_0$ and $Pr(k'_0 \geq k'_1) = Pr(k'_0 \geq k * x - k'_0) = Pr(k'_0 \geq 0.5 * k * x) = 1 - Pr(k'_0 < 0.5 * k * x)$. The latter can be calculated using the cumulative distribution function (CDF) of the Hypergeometric distribution and describes the probability of correctly assigning node n given a chunk size of $|E| * x$ (correct here means making the same greedy decision as the one made if all edges are available).

Given the probability of correctly assigning node n , we can calculate the expected number of correctly assigned nodes T in the whole graph. Assuming nodes are independent, we have: $E[T] = \sum_{i=1}^{|V|} (1 - Pr(k_0^{i'} < 0.5 * k^i * x))$ with $k_0^{i'} \sim \text{Hypergeometric}(k^i, k_0^i, x)$, k^i the number of neighbors (among all edges) of node i , and k_0^i the number of these neighbors in the partition containing more of node i ’s neighbors. Finally, the expected number of edge cuts C is:

$$E[C] = \sum_{i=1}^{|V|} (k^i - k_0^i) * (1 - Pr(k_0^{i'} < 0.5 * k^i * x)) + k_0^i * Pr(k_0^{i'} < 0.5 * k^i * x) \quad (1)$$

since $k^i - k_0^i$ edges are cut for node i if it is correctly assigned and k_0^i edges are cut otherwise. Equation 1 can be calculated given k^i and k_0^i for each node i (k_0^i can be estimated given an existing graph partitioning or by making assumptions about a graph’s connectivity).

The Benefit of Refinement We now ask how the expected number of edge cuts $E[C]$ changes if greedy decisions are updated (refined) based on a weighted average of neighbor estimates across chunks (as in GREM). We focus on the simplest case: We assume two chunks (α and β), each of size $|E| * x$ are used to assign a given node n to a partition.

Let $k'_{0,\alpha}$ and $k'_{0,\beta}$ be the number of neighbors of node n in partition zero among the sampled edges in chunk α and β respectively (and likewise for $k'_{1,\alpha}$, $k'_{1,\beta}$ and partition one). In the two chunk case, the weighted average simplifies to a regular average (which can be simplified to a sum): We seek to calculate $Pr(k'_{0,\alpha} + k'_{0,\beta} \geq k'_{1,\alpha} + k'_{1,\beta} | k_0 \geq k_1, x)$.

Observe that $k'_{0,\alpha} + k'_{0,\beta}$ is the number neighbors of node n in the $2 * (|E| * x)$ edges formed by the union of chunk α and β (each chunk is disjoint). Given this, the expected number of cut edges $E[C]$, when averaging over two chunks each of size $|E| * x$, can be calculated using Equation 1 with x replaced by $2x$. In other words, refinement across chunks increases the *effective chunk size* (but not actual chunk size) of the algorithm, leading to better neighbor estimates. Similar intuition applies when generalizing the analysis beyond two chunks, which we omit for brevity.

In Figure 6, based on the analysis in this section, we plot the expected number of edge cuts $E[C]$ versus chunk size with and without refinement. Figure 6 highlights that refining greedy assignments based on neighbor estimates averaged across multiple chunks leads to fewer edge cuts, particularly for small chunk sizes; in fact, with this refinement, GREM can partition the graph with near minimal edge cuts even with chunk sizes $\leq 10\%$. See Section 6.2 for more details.

5 DISAGGREGATED IMPLEMENTATION

Given a min-edge-cut partitioned graph, Armada employs a disaggregated architecture to enable cost-effective, distributed GNN training (Section 3). We now describe important design details that allow Armada to independently scale each layer and minimize communication in this architecture.

Partition Assignment to Batch Construction Workers

We first discuss the randomized algorithm used by Armada’s designated worker, called the *coordinator*, to assign partitions in the storage layer to machines in the mini batch preparation layer in order to complete one round of training. To support scaling each of these two layers independently, we require that the algorithm has the following guarantee: all partitions (and thus graph nodes used for training) must appear in memory at least once per epoch, regardless of whether the full graph (all partitions) fits in the aggregate CPU memory of the batch construction workers or not¹.

The coordinator assigns partitions to workers as follows: First, the partitions are randomly split into disjoint subsets, one for each worker. This split occurs without data movement (only a mapping is maintained on the coordinator). Given an assigned set of partitions, each worker can then

¹If the full graph does not fit in the aggregate CPU memory of the batch construction workers, then neighborhood sampling cannot be done over the full graph, but can instead be done over the entire subgraph in the aggregate CPU memory of the layer.

begin training by loading as many random partitions from its subset into memory as possible. After processing these partitions, any remaining partitions assigned to the worker are swapped in for training one by one in a random order.

Randomized assignment, while simple, satisfies two desired properties: 1) opportunities for parallelism are maximized, as each batch worker operates on a disjoint set of partitions, and 2) each partition is read from the storage layer exactly once, ensuring all nodes appear in memory with minimal I/O between the two layers. Armada, however, can easily support other partition assignment policies. In particular, to further minimize communication between workers due to cross-machine neighborhood sampling (in addition to min-edge-cut partitioning), Armada supports partial or even entire (memory permitting) feature replication across workers, as done in prior work (Cao et al., 2023; Kaler et al., 2023). In this case, the nodes to be replicated are placed in a special partition that is assigned to, and kept in memory, on *all* workers. Min-edge-cut partitioning and randomized partition assignment are then used on the remaining nodes.

Mini Batch Grouping We next discuss mini batch grouping, the first of two techniques used by Armada to minimize data transfer between batch preparation and compute workers.

Mini batch grouping applies when a batch construction worker is responsible for sending data to a compute worker that contains multiple GPUs. In this case, the batch construction worker must prepare and transfer one mini batch per GPU for each training iteration (such that each GPU can process a batch in parallel). Armada groups these mini batches into a global batch, as mini batches contained in a global batch may require the same nodes. This allows Armada to optimize feature loading and transfer: Armada loads and transfers the feature vectors for the unique nodes in a global batch only once and copies them between GPUs as needed. For compute workers with 8 GPUs, we find mini batch grouping reduces batch preparation time by $1.13\times$ and transfer time by $1.72\times$, increasing overall throughput by $1.15\times$ on the common OGBN-Papers100M graph used in the experiments (Section 6).

Compute Worker Feature Caching Finally, Armada can further minimize communication between the batch preparation and compute layers by caching feature vectors for frequently accessed nodes locally on compute workers (in CPU memory). In this case, Armada needs to send only the non-cached features for each (global) batch between layers. Mini batches are then augmented as needed with the additional feature vectors once they are received in CPU memory by compute workers, before being transferred to the GPU(s) for training. We keep batch construction workers informed of the cache contents by listening to and acknowledging messages from the compute workers that describe planned updates and we use a simple LRU caching policy.

6 EVALUATION

We evaluate GREM and Armada’s disaggregated architecture on common large-scale graphs and compare against METIS (Karypis & Kumar, 1997) and the popular SoTA GNN systems DGL (version 2.4) (Wang et al., 2019; Zheng et al., 2020a), Salient++ (Kaler et al., 2023), and Marius-GNN (Waleffe et al., 2023). Our experiments show that:

1. GREM can efficiently scale min-edge-cut partitioning to large graphs, leading to up to $45\times$ and $68\times$ reduction in runtime and memory overheads compared to METIS.
2. Disaggregation allows Armada to achieve scalable, cost-effective GNN training—Armada achieves a $7.5\times$ speedup when using eight instead of one GPU when existing SoTA systems yield $4.3\times$ speedup at best.

6.1 Experimental Setup

We start by discussing the setup used in our experiments.

Armada and Baseline Details MariusGNN supports only single-GPU training, thus we modify it to support multi-GPU training using a standard distributed data parallel architecture. We report results for two versions of Armada: 1) Armada and 2) Armada - Aggregated. The former uses the disaggregated architecture described throughout the paper, while the latter uses the CPUs on the GPU machine(s) used for training to prepare batches. The two versions allow us to directly evaluate the benefit of disaggregation. For partitioning, we use GREM with Armada and place one partition on each batch construction worker; for baselines, we use their default partitioning plus feature replication and caching (which are METIS-based).

Hardware Setup We partition and train all systems using AWS machines. To measure scalability, we use p3.16xlarge instances with eight NVIDIA V100 GPUs and vary how many GPUs are available to each system. These machines contain 64 vCPUs, 488 GiB of CPU memory, and 128 GiB of aggregate GPU memory. For Armada, we use additional m6a.16xlarge machines for mini batch preparation. These machines have 64 vCPUs and 256 GiB of CPU memory.

Datasets, Models, and Metrics We report results using Open Graph Benchmark (OGB) datasets (Hu et al., 2020; 2021); we use OGBN-Papers100M (111M nodes, 1.6B edges) and OGB-WikiKG90Mv2 (91M nodes, 601M edges) for large-scale studies, and OGBN-Products (2.5M nodes, 62M edges) plus FB15K-237 (Toutanova et al., 2015) (14.5K nodes, 272K edges) for microbenchmarks. We train a three-layer GraphSage GNN on these datasets with two different hidden sizes: 256 (*GraphSage-Small*) and 1024 (*GraphSage-Large*). The former allows us to run experiments using a data-bound model while the latter aims to represent a compute-bound model. In both cases, we use 30,




Figure 4. Percentage of edges cut when using GREM versus METIS on three common graphs. GREM achieves comparable edge cuts to METIS, even with a chunk size of just 10% or 1%.




Figure 5. Memory usage and runtime of GREM and METIS when partitioning subgraphs of OGBN-Papers100M of various size. GREM reduces the computational requirements of partitioning.

20, and 10 neighbors per layer sampled from both incoming and outgoing edges, as done in (Waleffe et al., 2023). For partitioning experiments, we measure the resulting number of edge cuts, runtime, and peak memory usage. For GNN training, we run for 10 epochs and measure runtime and monetary cost. We do not include the time to partition when reporting GNN training times (we report partitioning time independently). We average experiments over three runs.

Hyperparameters We use the same hyperparameters for GNN model architecture and training across systems (e.g., model hidden dimension, number of neighbors, batch size, etc.). These hyperparameters are chosen based on values from prior works (Hu et al., 2020; Waleffe et al., 2023). For hyperparameters specific to the throughput of each system (e.g., the number neighborhood sampling workers), we manually tune them and select the best configuration.

6.2 Evaluating GREM Partitioning

We now evaluate GREM and compare to METIS, the SoTA min-edge-cut algorithm used by existing GNN systems.

Partitioning Quality: Number of Edge Cuts In Figure 4, we show the number of edge cuts that result from running GREM and METIS on three common graphs. With a chunk size of 10%, GREM partitions the graph with similar quality to METIS. For example, in the most challenging case ($p = 128$ partitions), GREM cuts just 0.5% and 1% more of the graph than METIS on OGBN-Products and OGB-WikiKG90Mv2 respectively. GREM even achieves comparable results with a chunk size of 1%. Overall, Figure 4 shows that with small chunk sizes (e.g., $\leq 10\%$), GREM can partition graphs with comparable edge cuts to METIS.




Figure 6. Percentage of edges cut versus chunk size when using GREM on FB15K-237 (the hardest graph to partition in Figure 4) compared to standard streaming greedy approaches. We focus on chunk sizes $\leq 30\%$ where the computational benefit of these methods compared to METIS (which is shown for reference, but partitions using the full graph, rather than in chunks) is maximal.

Partitioning Overhead: Runtime and Memory Next, we evaluate the peak memory usage and runtime of GREM versus METIS. To do so, we use both algorithms to partition subgraphs of varying size (number of edges), taken from OGBN-Papers100M (1.6B edges total), into two parts ($p = 2$). Results are shown in Figure 5. We plot only $p = 2$ for simplicity; as p increases, peak memory remains constant and the runtime of each algorithm increases by the same factor (both GREM and METIS partition recursively for $p > 2$). Figure 5 (left) shows that METIS is able to partition 600M edges on the machine used for these experiments (250GB of memory). Based on the scaling of memory and runtime, we estimate that METIS needs 8000s and requires a machine with 630GB of memory to partition the entire OGBN-Papers100M graph; we confirmed this estimate on a special machine with 750GB. GREM, however, can partition the entire graph in just 976s with 73GB (8.2 and 8.3 \times reduction) or 175s with 9.3GB (46 and 65 \times reduction) when using a chunk size of 10% or 1% respectively.

The Benefit of Refinement Finally, we study the benefit of the refined greedy assignments used by GREM compared to the fixed greedy assignments of conventional streaming algorithms. For both approaches, we show in Figure 6 the number of edge cuts versus chunk size when partitioning FB15K-237 (the hardest graph to partition in Figure 4) into $p = 2$ partitions (given the recursive nature of GREM, similar results hold for $p > 2$). We include both the expected number of edge cuts from the theoretical analysis in Section 4.2, and the number of edge cuts measured in practice.

Figure 6 shows that for small chunk sizes (e.g., $\leq 10\%$), refinement is critical to minimizing edge cuts; we observe a reduction of up to 25% of the graph (at a chunk size of 1%). These improvements allow GREM to use smaller chunk sizes (e.g., 1-10%) without suffering a significant increase in edge cuts compared to METIS. For example, with a chunk size of 5%, GREM and METIS differ in edge cuts by $< 1\%$ of the graph; this difference would be 13% with fixed greedy assignments. The consequence of these additional edge cuts is slower and more expensive GNN training—We observe that training in Armada is up to 2.4 \times slower when using the




Figure 7. Epoch runtime versus number of GPUs for DGL, MariusGNN, Salient++, and Armada using two different GraphSage GNNs on the OGBN-Papers100M dataset. Disaggregation allows Armada to scale linearly with respect to the number of GPUs.

streaming greedy algorithm rather than GREM (for a chunk size of 1%). This confirms recent results which highlight that high quality partitioning algorithms (e.g., METIS), can lead to faster GNN training compared to streaming greedy approaches (e.g., LDG) (Merkel et al., 2023).

Summary GREM can partition large-scale graphs with comparable quality to METIS but with orders of magnitude less computational resources, helping to address the bottleneck of min-edge-cut partitioning for distributed GNN training.

6.3 GNN Training: System Comparisons

Given a partitioned graph, we now evaluate Armada’s disaggregated architecture for GNN training. Runtime and cost per epoch for two models on OGBN-Papers100M with Armada and existing systems is shown in Table 1. We plot the runtime versus the number of GPUs in Figure 7 to show the scaling of each system. For these experiments, all systems sample neighbors across the whole graph, and thus reach similar accuracy (e.g., see Table 1 right).

Key Takeaways Across experiments and GPU counts, Armada is the fastest and cheapest option; runtime and cost reductions are up to 4.5 \times and 3.1 \times versus existing systems.

Existing Systems We find that existing systems are unable to effectively scale GNN training across multiple GPUs. For GraphSage-Small, the most scalable system (DGL) achieves only a 4.3 \times speedup when moving from one to eight GPUs. With a more compute-intensive model (GraphSage-Large), baseline systems are able to scale better—e.g., Salient++ achieves a 3.1 \times speedup (rather than 1.7 \times)—but they still suffer from sublinear speedups as a result of CPU-based mini batch preparation bottlenecks (Section 2).

Armada: The Benefit of Disaggregation Armada, however, achieves near-perfect scalability. For GraphSage-Small and -Large respectively, Armada achieves a 7.5 \times and 8 \times speedup when moving from one to eight GPUs. The key reason Armada can scale linearly is because of its

Table 1. Runtime and cost of DGL, MariusGNN, Salient++, and Armada on OGBN-Papers100M using a GraphSage-Small (left) and -Large (right) GNN. With disaggregated mini batch preparation, Armada can scale training from one to eight GPUs while existing systems cannot. Moreover, the extra disaggregated machines are cheap compared to the GPU machines used for model computation and do not prevent reductions in total training cost. Armada uses 0, 1, 2, and 4 disaggregated batch construction workers for 1-, 2-, 4-, and 8-GPU training respectively. Relative improvement compared to single-GPU training for each system is shown in parentheses.

# GPUs	GraphSage-Small								GraphSage-Large								Avg. Acc.
	Epoch Runtime (s)				Epoch Cost (\$)				Epoch Runtime (s)				Epoch Cost (\$)				
	1	2	4	8	1	2	4	8	1	2	4	8	1	2	4	8	
DGL v2.4	143	142	93.4	33.0 (4.3×)	0.97	0.97	0.64	0.22 (4.4×)	151	146	101	41.0 (3.7×)	1.03	0.99	0.69	0.28 (3.6×)	67.35
MariusGNN	84.0	77.1	62.1	61.5(1.4×)	0.57	0.52	0.42	0.42 (1.4×)	124	92.3	83.9	88.3 (1.4×)	0.84	0.63	0.57	0.60 (1.4×)	67.14
Salient++	61.5	54.5	38.1	35.6 (1.7×)	0.42	0.37	0.26	0.24 (1.7×)	114	79.8	39.1	36.7 (3.1×)	0.78	0.54	0.27	0.25 (3.1×)	68.20
Armada	54.9	33.3	14.2	7.35 (7.5×)	0.37	0.25	0.12	0.07 (5.3×)	98.7	50.2	26.1	12.0 (8.2×)	0.67	0.38	0.22	0.12 (5.6×)	67.16




Figure 8. Epoch runtime in Armada when training GraphSage-Large on OGBN-Papers100M with eight GPUs and a varying number of disaggregated batch preparation workers; independently scaling these workers allows Armada to minimize runtime.

disaggregated architecture. The effect of disaggregation is evident by comparing Armada to Armada - Aggregated in Figure 7. We also show the benefit of disaggregation in Figure 8; we report the epoch runtime in Armada when training GraphSage-Large on OGBN-Papers100M with eight GPUs and a varying number of disaggregated batch construction workers. Figure 8 shows that as the number of CPU resources used for mini batch preparation increases, the runtime decreases until the accelerators are fully saturated and the epoch runtime plateaus.

Although the additional machines needed for batch preparation incur additional cost, these machines are cheaper than the GPU machines used for computation. Thus, Armada is still able to achieve total training cost reductions; we achieve a 5.3× and 5.6× reduction in cost when using eight instead of one GPU for GraphSage-Small and -Large respectively.

Summary Armada’s disaggregated architecture allows resource utilization to be optimized in the presence of GNN workload imbalance, leading to linear scaling and cost-effective distributed GNN training over large-scale graphs.

7 RELATED WORK

We highlight related works not previously discussed above.

Minimizing Mini Batch Preparation Overhead To reduce the overhead of mini batch preparation, many prior works seek to offload some of this work to the GPU, either by employing GPU-oriented communication, feature caching, or by directly sampling neighbors on the GPU when possible (Min et al., 2021a;b; Kaler et al., 2022; Lin et al., 2020;

Dong et al., 2021; Jangda et al., 2021). Other works seek to reduce the overhead of multi-hop neighborhood sampling itself (Hamilton et al., 2017; Chen et al., 2018; Zou et al., 2019; Ramezani et al., 2020; Zeng et al., 2020; Chiang et al., 2019). These improvements are orthogonal to our disaggregated architecture and could be incorporated in Armada.

Systems for Large-Scale ML over Graphs Many systems have been introduced for training machine learning models over large-scale graphs (Gandhi & Iyer, 2021; Jia et al., 2020; Fey & Lenssen, 2019; Zhu et al., 2019; Lin et al., 2020; Dong et al., 2021; Wu et al., 2021; Zheng et al., 2020b). Some works focus on scaling training using disk-based storage (Mohoney et al., 2021; Sun et al., 2021; Lerer et al., 2019). The most closely related works to Armada, however, are those that focus on scaling GNN training using distributed multi-GPU or multi-machine settings (Gandhi & Iyer, 2021; Jia et al., 2020; Zhu et al., 2019; Wang et al., 2021). Like Armada, several of these works aim to reduce cross-machine communication during multi-hop sampling, either by using min-edge-cut partitioning (Zheng et al., 2022) or by employing feature replication on each machine (Liu et al., 2023; Kaler et al., 2023). To address this challenge, Armada also supports replicating features and introduces GREM to scale min-edge-cut partitioning to large graphs. Among these systems, however, Armada is unique in its use of disaggregation to scale training.

8 CONCLUSION

This paper introduced Armada, a new system for scalable, cost-effective, distributed GNN training. Armada’s key contribution is GREM, a novel min-edge-cut partitioning algorithm that can efficiently scale to large graphs yet still achieve partition quality comparable to METIS. Armada also introduces a new architecture for GNN training that disaggregates the CPU resources used for GNN neighborhood sampling and feature loading from the GPU resources use for model computation, ensuring that the former can be scaled independently in order to saturate the latter. Overall, our results highlight the promise of new algorithms and systems to democratize large-scale GNN training.

REFERENCES

- Abbas, Z., Kalavri, V., Carbone, P., and Vlassov, V. Streaming graph partitioning: an experimental study. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment*, 11(11):1590–1603, 2018.
- Alistarh, D., Iglesias, J., and Vojnovic, M. Streaming min-max hypergraph partitioning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 28, 2015.
- Andreev, K. and Räcke, H. Balanced graph partitioning. In *Proceedings of the sixteenth annual ACM symposium on Parallelism in algorithms and architectures*, pp. 120–124, 2004.
- Cao, K., Deng, R., Wu, S., Huang, E. W., Subbian, K., and Leskovec, J. Communication-free distributed gnn training with vertex cut. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.03209*, 2023.
- Chami, I., Abu-El-Haija, S., Perozzi, B., Ré, C., and Murphy, K. Machine learning on graphs: A model and comprehensive taxonomy, 2021.
- Chen, J., Ma, T., and Xiao, C. Fastgcn: fast learning with graph convolutional networks via importance sampling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1801.10247*, 2018.
- Chiang, W.-L., Liu, X., Si, S., Li, Y., Bengio, S., and Hsieh, C.-J. Cluster-gcn. *Proceedings of the 25th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*, Jul 2019. doi: 10.1145/3292500.3330925. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1145/3292500.3330925>.
- Derrow-Pinion, A., She, J., Wong, D., Lange, O., Hester, T., Perez, L., Nunkesser, M., Lee, S., Guo, X., Wiltshire, B., et al. Eta prediction with graph neural networks in google maps. In *Proceedings of the 30th ACM International Conference on Information & Knowledge Management*, pp. 3767–3776, 2021.
- Dong, J., Zheng, D., Yang, L. F., and Karypis, G. Global neighbor sampling for mixed cpu-gpu training on giant graphs. In *27th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining, KDD 2021*, pp. 289–299. Association for Computing Machinery, 2021.
- Faraj, M. F. and Schulz, C. Buffered streaming graph partitioning. *ACM Journal of Experimental Algorithmics*, 27: 1–26, 2022.
- Fey, M. and Lenssen, J. E. Fast graph representation learning with pytorch geometric. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1903.02428*, 2019.
- Gandhi, S. and Iyer, A. P. P3: Distributed deep graph learning at scale. In *15th USENIX Symposium on Operating Systems Design and Implementation (OSDI 21)*, pp. 551–568. USENIX Association, July 2021. ISBN 978-1-939133-22-9. URL <https://www.usenix.org/conference/osdi21/presentation/gandhi>.
- Graur, D., Aymon, D., Kluser, D., Albrici, T., Thekkath, C. A., and Klimovic, A. Cachew: Machine learning input data processing as a service. In *2022 USENIX Annual Technical Conference (USENIX ATC 22)*, pp. 689–706, 2022.
- Hamilton, W., Ying, Z., and Leskovec, J. Inductive representation learning on large graphs. In Guyon, I., Luxburg, U. V., Bengio, S., Wallach, H., Fergus, R., Vishwanathan, S., and Garnett, R. (eds.), *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 30. Curran Associates, Inc., 2017. URL <https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2017/file/5dd9db5e033da9c6fb5ba83c7a7e9bea9-Paper.pdf>.
- Hu, W., Fey, M., Zitnik, M., Dong, Y., Ren, H., Liu, B., Catasta, M., and Leskovec, J. Open graph benchmark: Datasets for machine learning on graphs. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:22118–22133, 2020.
- Hu, W., Fey, M., Ren, H., Nakata, M., Dong, Y., and Leskovec, J. OGB-LSC: A large-scale challenge for machine learning on graphs. In *Thirty-fifth Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems Datasets and Benchmarks Track (Round 2)*, 2021. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=qkcLxoC52kL>.
- Jain, S., Swamy, C., and Balaji, K. Greedy algorithms for k-way graph partitioning. In *the 6th international conference on advanced computing*, pp. 100. Citeseer, 1998.
- Jangda, A., Polisetty, S., Guha, A., and Serafini, M. Accelerating graph sampling for graph machine learning using gpus. In *Proceedings of the Sixteenth European Conference on Computer Systems*, pp. 311–326, 2021.
- Jia, Z., Lin, S., Gao, M., Zaharia, M., and Aiken, A. Improving the accuracy, scalability, and performance of graph neural networks with roc. In Dhillon, I., Papailiopoulos, D., and Sze, V. (eds.), *Proceedings of Machine Learning and Systems*, volume 2, pp. 187–198, 2020. URL <https://proceedings.mlsys.org/paper/2020/file/fe9fc289c3ff0af142b6d3bead98a923-Paper.pdf>.
- Jin, X., Bai, Z., Zhang, Z., Zhu, Y., Zhong, Y., and Liu, X. Distmind: Efficient resource disaggregation for deep learning workloads. *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Networking*, 2024.

-
- Jumper, J., Evans, R., Pritzel, A., Green, T., Figurnov, M., Ronneberger, O., Tunyasuvunakool, K., Bates, R., Židek, A., Potapenko, A., et al. Highly accurate protein structure prediction with alphafold. *Nature*, 596(7873):583–589, 2021.
- Kaler, T., Stathas, N., Ouyang, A., Iliopoulos, A.-S., Schardl, T., Leiserson, C. E., and Chen, J. Accelerating training and inference of graph neural networks with fast sampling and pipelining. *Proceedings of Machine Learning and Systems*, 4:172–189, 2022.
- Kaler, T., Iliopoulos, A., Murzynowski, P., Schardl, T., Leiserson, C. E., and Chen, J. Communication-efficient graph neural networks with probabilistic neighborhood expansion analysis and caching. *Proceedings of Machine Learning and Systems*, 5, 2023.
- Karypis, G. and Kumar, V. Metis: A software package for partitioning unstructured graphs, partitioning meshes, and computing fill-reducing orderings of sparse matrices. 1997.
- Lam, R., Sanchez-Gonzalez, A., Willson, M., Wyrnsberger, P., Fortunato, M., Pritzel, A., Ravuri, S., Ewalds, T., Alet, F., Eaton-Rosen, Z., et al. Graphcast: Learning skillful medium-range global weather forecasting. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.12794*, 2022.
- Lerer, A., Wu, L., Shen, J., Lacroix, T., Wehrstedt, L., Bose, A., and Peysakhovich, A. Pytorch-biggraph: A large scale graph embedding system. *Proceedings of Machine Learning and Systems*, 1:120–131, 2019.
- Lin, H., Yan, M., Ye, X., Fan, D., Pan, S., Chen, W., and Xie, Y. A comprehensive survey on distributed training of graph neural networks. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 2023.
- Lin, Z., Li, C., Miao, Y., Liu, Y., and Xu, Y. Pagraph: Scaling gnn training on large graphs via computation-aware caching. In *Proceedings of the 11th ACM Symposium on Cloud Computing*, pp. 401–415, 2020.
- Liu, T., Chen, Y., Li, D., Wu, C., Zhu, Y., He, J., Peng, Y., Chen, H., Chen, H., and Guo, C. {BGL}:{GPU-Efficient}{GNN} training by optimizing graph data {I/O} and preprocessing. In *20th USENIX Symposium on Networked Systems Design and Implementation (NSDI 23)*, pp. 103–118, 2023.
- Merkel, N., Stoll, D., Mayer, R., and Jacobsen, H.-A. An experimental comparison of partitioning strategies for distributed graph neural network training. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.15602*, 2023.
- Meusel, R., Lehmeberg, O., Bizer, C., and Vigna, S. Web data commons - hyperlink graphs. <http://webdatacommons.org/hyperlinkgraph/>, 2014.
- Min, S. W., Wu, K., Huang, S., Hidayetoğlu, M., Xiong, J., Ebrahimi, E., Chen, D., and Hwu, W.-m. Large graph convolutional network training with gpu-oriented data communication architecture. *Proc. VLDB Endow.*, 14(11):2087–2100, jul 2021a. ISSN 2150-8097. doi: 10.14778/3476249.3476264. URL <https://doi.org/10.14778/3476249.3476264>.
- Min, S. W., Wu, K., Huang, S., Hidayetoğlu, M., Xiong, J., Ebrahimi, E., Chen, D., and Hwu, W. Pytorch-direct: Enabling gpu centric data access for very large graph neural network training with irregular accesses, 2021b.
- Mohoney, J., Waleffe, R., Xu, H., Rekatsinas, T., and Venkataraman, S. Marius: Learning massive graph embeddings on a single machine. In *15th USENIX Symposium on Operating Systems Design and Implementation (OSDI 21)*, pp. 533–549, 2021.
- Patwary, M. A. K., Garg, S., and Kang, B. Window-based streaming graph partitioning algorithm. In *Proceedings of the Australasian Computer Science Week Multiconference*, pp. 1–10, 2019.
- Petroni, F., Querzoni, L., Daudjee, K., Kamali, S., and Iacoboni, G. Hdrf: Stream-based partitioning for power-law graphs. In *Proceedings of the 24th ACM international on conference on information and knowledge management*, pp. 243–252, 2015.
- Ramezani, M., Cong, W., Mahdavi, M., Sivasubramaniam, A., and Kandemir, M. Gcn meets gpu: Decoupling “when to sample” from “how to sample”. In Larochelle, H., Ranzato, M., Hadsell, R., Balcan, M. F., and Lin, H. (eds.), *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 33, pp. 18482–18492. Curran Associates, Inc., 2020. URL <https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2020/file/d714d2c5a796d5814c565d78dd16188d-Paper.pdf>.
- Shao, Y., Li, H., Gu, X., Yin, H., Li, Y., Miao, X., Zhang, W., Cui, B., and Chen, L. Distributed graph neural network training: A survey. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 56(8):1–39, 2024.
- Stanton, I. Streaming balanced graph partitioning algorithms for random graphs. In *Proceedings of the twenty-fifth annual ACM-SIAM symposium on Discrete algorithms*, pp. 1287–1301. SIAM, 2014.
- Stanton, I. and Kliot, G. Streaming graph partitioning for large distributed graphs. In *Proceedings of the 18th ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining*, pp. 1222–1230, 2012.

-
- Sun, D., Huang, Z., Li, D., Ye, X., and Wang, Y. Improved partitioning graph embedding framework for small cluster. In Qiu, H., Zhang, C., Fei, Z., Qiu, M., and Kung, S.-Y. (eds.), *Knowledge Science, Engineering and Management*, pp. 203–215, Cham, 2021. Springer International Publishing. ISBN 978-3-030-82136-4.
- Thorpe, J., Qiao, Y., Eyolfson, J., Teng, S., Hu, G., Jia, Z., Wei, J., Vora, K., Netravali, R., Kim, M., and Xu, G. H. Dorylus: Affordable, scalable, and accurate GNN training with distributed CPU servers and serverless threads. In *15th USENIX Symposium on Operating Systems Design and Implementation (OSDI 21)*, pp. 495–514. USENIX Association, July 2021. ISBN 978-1-939133-22-9. URL <https://www.usenix.org/conference/osdi21/presentation/thorpe>.
- Toutanova, K., Chen, D., Pantel, P., Poon, H., Choudhury, P., and Gamon, M. Representing text for joint embedding of text and knowledge bases. In *Proceedings of the 2015 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pp. 1499–1509, Lisbon, Portugal, September 2015. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/D15-1174. URL <https://aclanthology.org/D15-1174>.
- Tsourakakis, C., Gkantsidis, C., Radunovic, B., and Vojnovic, M. Fennel: Streaming graph partitioning for massive scale graphs. In *Proceedings of the 7th ACM international conference on Web search and data mining*, pp. 333–342, 2014.
- Waleffe, R., Mohoney, J., Rekatsinas, T., and Venkataraman, S. Mariusgnn: Resource-efficient out-of-core training of graph neural networks. In *Proceedings of the Eighteenth European Conference on Computer Systems*, pp. 144–161, 2023.
- Wang, L., Yin, Q., Tian, C., Yang, J., Chen, R., Yu, W., Yao, Z., and Zhou, J. Flexgraph: a flexible and efficient distributed framework for gnn training. In *Proceedings of the Sixteenth European Conference on Computer Systems*, pp. 67–82, 2021.
- Wang, M., Yu, L., Zheng, D., Gan, Q., Gai, Y., Ye, Z., Li, M., Zhou, J., Huang, Q., Ma, C., Huang, Z., Guo, Q., Zhang, H., Lin, H., Zhao, J., Li, J., Smola, A. J., and Zhang, Z. Deep graph library: Towards efficient and scalable deep learning on graphs. *CoRR*, abs/1909.01315, 2019. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1909.01315>.
- Wu, Z., Pan, S., Chen, F., Long, G., Zhang, C., and Yu, P. S. A comprehensive survey on graph neural networks. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, 32(1):4–24, 2021. doi: 10.1109/TNNLS.2020.2978386.
- Zeng, H., Zhou, H., Srivastava, A., Kannan, R., and Prasanna, V. Graphsaint: Graph sampling based inductive learning method. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2020. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=BJe8pkHFwS>.
- Zhang, W., Chen, Y., and Dai, D. Akin: A streaming graph partitioning algorithm for distributed graph storage systems. In *2018 18th IEEE/ACM International Symposium on Cluster, Cloud and Grid Computing (CCGRID)*, pp. 183–192. IEEE, 2018.
- Zheng, D., Ma, C., Wang, M., Zhou, J., Su, Q., Song, X., Gan, Q., Zhang, Z., and Karypis, G. Distdgl: Distributed graph neural network training for billion-scale graphs. In *2020 IEEE/ACM 10th Workshop on Irregular Applications: Architectures and Algorithms (IA3)*, pp. 36–44, Los Alamitos, CA, USA, nov 2020a. IEEE Computer Society. URL <https://doi.ieeecomputersociety.org/10.1109/IA351965.2020.00011>.
- Zheng, D., Song, X., Ma, C., Tan, Z., Ye, Z., Dong, J., Xiong, H., Zhang, Z., and Karypis, G. Dgl-ke: Training knowledge graph embeddings at scale. In *Proceedings of the 43rd International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*, pp. 739–748, 2020b.
- Zheng, D., Song, X., Yang, C., LaSalle, D., and Karypis, G. Distributed hybrid cpu and gpu training for graph neural networks on billion-scale heterogeneous graphs. In *Proceedings of the 28th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, pp. 4582–4591, 2022.
- Zhu, R., Zhao, K., Yang, H., Lin, W., Zhou, C., Ai, B., Li, Y., and Zhou, J. Aligraph: A comprehensive graph neural network platform. *Proc. VLDB Endow.*, 12(12):2094–2105, aug 2019. ISSN 2150-8097. doi: 10.14778/3352063.3352127. URL <https://doi.org/10.14778/3352063.3352127>.
- Zou, D., Hu, Z., Wang, Y., Jiang, S., Sun, Y., and Gu, Q. Layer-dependent importance sampling for training deep and large graph convolutional networks. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 32, 2019.