

Banyan: A Scoped Dataflow Engine for Graph Query Service

Li Su¹, Xiaoming Qin¹, Zichao Zhang¹, Rui Yang², Le Xu², Indranil Gupta²,
Wenyuan Yu¹, Kai Zeng¹, Jingren Zhou¹

¹Alibaba Group, ²University of Illinois at Urbana Champaign

¹{lisu.sl, xiaoming.qxm, houbai.zzc, wenyuan.ywy, zengkai.zk, jingren.zhou}@alibaba-inc.com
²{ry2, lexu1, indy}@illinois.edu

ABSTRACT

Graph query services (GQS) are widely used today to interactively answer graph traversal queries on large-scale graph data. Existing graph query engines focus largely on optimizing the latency of a single query. This ignores significant challenges posed by GQS, including fine-grained control and scheduling during query execution, as well as performance isolation and load balancing in various levels from across user to intra-query. To tackle these control and scheduling challenges, we propose a novel *scoped* dataflow for modeling graph traversal queries, which explicitly exposes concurrent execution and control of any subquery to the finest granularity. We implemented Banyan, an engine based on the scoped dataflow model for GQS. Banyan focuses on scaling up the performance on a single machine, and provides the ability to easily scale out. Extensive experiments on multiple benchmarks show that Banyan improves performance by up to three orders of magnitude over state-of-the-art graph query engines, while providing performance isolation and load balancing.

1 INTRODUCTION

Graph query service (GQS) is widely used in many Internet applications ranging from search engines, recommendation systems, to financial risk management. The global GQS market is estimated to reach 2.9 billion USD by 2024, with an annual growth rate of 22.2% [15]. In these applications, data are represented as large-scale graphs such as knowledge graphs and social networks, and the explorations on the data are usually expressed as graph traversal queries. GQS serves these large-scale graphs for interactive query access, allowing many users to submit concurrent graph traversal queries and obtain results in real-time.

Previous graph query engines [18, 29, 39, 42, 47, 50] mainly focus on optimizing the query latency from the perspective of computation efficiency, i.e., traversing more vertices/edges in a time unit. However, we observe that optimizing for computational efficiency *alone* is not sufficient to achieve short query latency. A multi-tenant GQS needs to address two key goals to fulfill stringent latency requirements: **(O1)** fine-grained control and scheduling, as well as **(O2)** performance isolation and load balancing during the query execution.

Fine-Grained Control and Scheduling (O1). A graph query usually performs many traversals starting from different source vertices in the graph. We observe two key techniques that can reduce query latencies, and in turn boost the system throughput: **(O1-1)** concurrently executing these traversals, and controlling them at a fine granularity; **(O1-2)** carefully choosing the traversal strategy.

Example 1 (A Graph Traversal Query in Gremlin).

```
g.V(123).repeat(out('knows'))
    .until(out('worksAt').is(eq('XYZ')))
    .or().loops().is(gt(5))
    .where(in('tweets').out('hasTag').is(eq('#ABC')))
    .limit(20)
```

Example 1 shows a graph traversal query intended to find 20 users who are within the 5-hop neighborhood of user 123, work at company 'XYZ', and have tweeted with hashtag '#ABC'. When executing this query, we need to start a traversal for every user entering the *where* subquery. This traversal can be canceled immediately if any tweet of the user is found to have the desired hashtag, without needing to check all of that user's tweets. Clearly, canceling this traversal should not affect the traversals for other users. More importantly, it should not be blocked by other traversals, e.g., by someone who tweets a lot but not with hashtag '#ABC'. This implies that a GQS needs to support concurrent execution as well as fine-grained control of subquery traversals **(O1-1)**.

Eagerly checking the hashtags tweeted by one user requires a DFS scheduling policy for the *where* subquery. The same scheduling policy holds within one loop iteration in the *repeat* subquery, as we would like to eagerly check if a neighbor works at company 'XYZ'. However, it would be preferable to use BFS when scheduling across loop iterations of the *repeat* subquery. This is because we do not want to blindly explore all neighbors within 5 hops if 20 candidates can be found in a much smaller neighborhood. This implies that GQS systems need to support customized traversal policies in subqueries **(O1-2)**.

Performance Isolation and Load Balancing (O2). It is challenging to fulfill the stringent latency requirement in a production environment. Due to the intrinsic skewness in graph data, graph traversal queries can vary dramatically in terms of the amount of computation. Therefore, GQS should be capable of enforcing performance isolation across queries to guarantee the latency SLO. In addition, as illustrated in Example 1, for better performance, the isolation granularity needs to be as small as subquery-level traversals. Existing graph databases [18, 29, 30] map concurrent queries to system threads and rely on the operating system for scheduling. This mechanism does not expose the internal query complexity and thus cannot support subquery-level isolation. The skewness in graph data can lead to dynamic workload skewness at run time, requiring GQS to provide dynamic load balancing.

Table 1 compares existing graph query engines on their supports for **O1** and **O2**. Many graph query engines [9, 25, 28, 37, 43, 44] use the dataflow model to execute graph traversal queries in languages such as Cypher [10], Gremlin [45] and GSQL [44]. Existing dataflow

	Neo4j	JanusGraph	Timely	GAIA	Banyan
O1-1: Control on Subquery Traversal	✗	✗	✗	✓	✓
O1-2: Subquery-level Scheduling Policy	✗	query-level only	✗	query-level only	✓
O2: Subquery-level Isolation	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓

Table 1: Comparing graph query engines on O1 and O2. TigerGraph [44] is not open-sourced and thus not listed.

models either a) support only static topologies (e.g., Timely [26] and GAIA [37]) or b) can only dynamically spawn tasks at coarse granularity (e.g., CIEL [27]). Specifically, Timely and GAIA attach a metadata (*timestamp* in Timely and *context* in GAIA) in every message to identify which subquery traversal it belongs to, but then these systems process messages belonging to different traversals of a subquery in the same static execution pipeline determined at compile time. Without physically isolating the execution of traversals inside a subquery, these systems cannot efficiently support both **O1** and **O2**. Achieving these goals requires flexibly controlling and scheduling the fine-grained subquery traversals spawned dynamically during query execution. We expand more in Section 2 to discuss the limitations of existing dataflow models, and evaluate this issue with experiments in Section 5.

In this paper, we propose a novel *scoped dataflow* to model graph traversal queries, which supports fine-grained control and scheduling during query execution. The scoped dataflow model introduces a key concept called *scope*. A scope marks a subgraph in the dataflow, which corresponds to a subquery. The scope can be dynamically replicated at runtime into physically isolated scope instances which correspond to independent traversals of the subquery. Scope instances can be concurrently executed and independently controlled. This way, traversals of a subquery can time-share the CPU and be independently canceled without blocking or affecting each other. Furthermore, a scope allows users to customize the scheduling policy between and inside scope instances, supporting diverse scheduling policies for different parts of a query.

We build the *Banyan* engine for a multi-tenant GQS, based on an efficient distributed implementation of scoped dataflow. Banyan parallelizes a scoped dataflow into a physical plan of operators, and cooperatively schedules these operators on executors pinned on physical cores. On each executor, Banyan dynamically creates and terminates operators to instantiate and cancel scope instances. Banyan manages operators hierarchically as an operator tree: operators are scheduled recursively by their parent scope operators. This hierarchy allows customized scheduling within each scope, and provides performance isolation both across queries and within a single query. Banyan partitions the graph into fine-grained *tablets* and distributes tablets across executors. To handle workload skewness, Banyan dynamically migrates tablets along with the operators accessing them between executors for load balancing. In summary, the contributions of this paper include:

- (1) We propose the scoped dataflow model, which introduces a novel scope construct to a dataflow. The scope explicitly exposes the concurrent execution and control of subgraphs in a dataflow to the finest granularity (Section 3).
- (2) We build Banyan, an engine for GQS based on a distributed implementation of the scoped dataflow model. Banyan can leverage the many-core parallelism in a modern server, and can easily scale out to a distributed cluster (Section 4).

- (3) We conduct extensive evaluations of Banyan on popular benchmarks. The results show that Banyan has 1-3 orders of magnitude performance improvement over the state-of-the-art graph query engines and provides performance isolation and load balancing.

2 LIMITATIONS OF EXISTING DATAFLOW MODELS

In the dataflow model, a graph traversal query is represented as a directed graph of operators as vertices, where each operator sends and receives messages along directed edges. Figure 1(a) presents a typical logical dataflow for Example 1, where the *repeat* subquery is translated into vertices v_2, v_3 and v_4 , the *where* subquery is translated into vertices v_5, v_6 and v_7 ¹. Other dataflow models such as Timely [26] and GAIA [37] share the same main structure demonstrated in Figure 1(a). A common characteristic of these dataflow models is that their topologies are fixed at compile time. We refer to such dataflow models as *topo-static* dataflows in the following discussions. Next, we use Example 1 on the data graph in Figure 1(b) to illustrate the limitations of using topo-static dataflows in a GQS. **Control on Concurrent Traversals (O1-1)**. A graph query usually has subqueries that can launch many independent traversals starting from different vertices in the graph. E.g., each sub-tree rooted at P_1, P_2, P_4 and so on in Figure 1(b) are independent traversals of the *where* subquery. Figure 1(c) demonstrates an example execution pipeline of the *where* subquery in the topo-static dataflow model in Figure 1(a), where messages of different traversals (marked in different colors) are mixed in the dataflow and sequentially processed. Although the traversal of P_1 can be immediately terminated when V_7 detects G_1 , other messages in the traversal of P_1 (messages in black rectangles) cannot be trivially canceled: To cancel a specific traversal, one has to annotate each message with extra metadata about which traversal it belongs to, and filter messages by their metadata at operator V_5 - V_7 . GAIA cancels subquery traversals in this way. Alternatively, simply isolating the traversals using different threads will not work. A large number of concurrent traversals can lead to an exploded number of threads, where the context switch overhead will set a hard bottleneck on the system performance. This impact becomes even worse in a multi-tenant environment.

Diverse Scheduling Policies (O1-2). Inside a graph query, different subqueries often have very diverse scheduling preferences. Consider the *repeat* subquery. Instead of blindly exploring all the 5-hop neighbors, we prefer to gradually expand the exploration radius, as closer neighbors (e.g., P_1 and P_2 in the first hop) are more likely to work at the same company with the start person. This corresponds to completing the traversals of earlier iterations first, i.e., in a BFS manner. Meanwhile, inside an iteration we prefer to finish

¹For simplicity, we omit projection operators in the dataflow, and annotate the schema of the message along each edge.




Figure 1: (a) The logical dataflow for Example 1. (b) An example data graph. (c)(d) Execution pipelines of the *where* and *repeat* subquery of the topo-static dataflow model in Figure 1(a), respectively. The execution pipelines depict snippets of all messages generated during query execution at the operators.

checking if a neighbor is a match before the next, i.e., scheduling operators V_2 - V_4 in a DFS manner. However, as depicted in Figure 1(d), in the topo-static dataflow model, messages of different iterations are mixed and may be disordered due to parallel execution, e.g., P_4 and P_5 are processed before P_1 in V_3 . To enforce inter-iteration BFS, one has to annotate each message with its belonging iteration, and sort every incoming message according to this metadata in V_2 - V_4 , incurring much overhead. As far as we know, no existing graph query engine allows configuring subquery-level scheduling policies.

Performance Isolation (O2). In a GQS, the scales of traversals could vary drastically between queries. Even with the same query, different inputs could lead to traversals of very different scales. E.g., on the LDBC benchmark [21], we observed up to three orders of magnitude difference in query latency for the same query with different starting persons. In addition, performance isolation is necessary for concurrent traversals inside subqueries to prevent a traversal with heavy computation from indefinitely blocking other traversals. E.g., in Figure 1(c) the traversal of P_2 (messages in red), who tweeted a lot without hashtag #ABC, blocks the traversal of P_4 (messages in black), even if P_4 can pass the predicate. This requires the execution framework to provide performance isolation in various granularities, from the level of inter-user in a multi-tenant environment, to the level of inter-traversal within a subquery.

3 SCOPED DATAFLOW

Scoped dataflow is a new computational model that extends the existing dataflow model, with the ability to explicitly expose concurrent execution and control of subgraphs in a dataflow to the finest granularity. In this section, we define the structure of scoped dataflow, introduce the programming model, and demonstrate scoped dataflow can tackle the problems in Sec 2.

3.1 Computation Model

Similar to the traditional dataflow model, a scoped dataflow is also based on a directed graph $G(V, E)$. Vertices in V send and receive messages along directed edges in E . The scoped dataflow introduces a new construct named *scope*. Formally, a scope is a sub-structure of the scoped dataflow $G(V, E)$, and has two system-provided vertices: an *ingress vertex* and an *egress vertex*. All the input messages entering a scope pass through its ingress vertex, and all the edges leaving a scope pass through its egress vertex.

Inside a scope S , vertices which are neither the ingress nor egress of S are referred to as *internal vertices* of S . An internal vertex of S can belong to an inner scope of S . If $G(V, E)$ is cyclic, every cycle in $G(V, E)$ must be contained entirely within a scope S , and the backward edge must be from a vertex v in S , to the ingress vertex of S . Since the edges leaving a scope must pass through its egress vertex, v cannot be in any inner scope of S . We categorize scopes into two types: a scope without backward edges is called a *branch scope*, and a scope with backward edges is called a *loop scope*. Figure 2(a) shows an example loop scope. Scopes can be well-nested. The nesting level of a scope is called its *depth*. The depth of a top-level scope is 1.

A scope marks a region inside a dataflow: the dataflow subgraph inside a scope can be dynamically replicated at runtime to create new subgraph instances, isolating the processing of different input data entering the scope. The newly instantiated dataflow subgraph of a scope is called a *scope instance*. The states of vertices in different scope instances are independent. In a scope S , scope instances are instantiated as follows:

- Every inner vertex of S and every edge connecting these inner vertices are copied in the new instance. Note that, the ingress/egress vertices of any inner scopes contained in S are also counted as S 's inner vertices. The state of each copied stateful vertex is initialized as the default value.
- Every edge connecting S 's ingress/egress vertex and an inner vertex, including backward edges, is copied by replacing the inner vertex with its corresponding copy in the new instance.

Figure 2(b) shows an example of instantiated scoped dataflow with three scope instances for Figure 2(a).

For a scoped dataflow $G(V, E)$, we denote its instantiated scoped dataflow as $\tilde{G}(\tilde{V}, \tilde{E})$. In \tilde{G} , each vertex (resp. edge) in a scope instance can be uniquely identified by the corresponding v (resp. e) in G , and a *scope tag* t of the containing scope instance. The *scope tag* is in the following format:

$$\text{ScopeTag} : \langle s_1, \dots, s_d \rangle \in \mathbb{N}^d$$

where an element s_k denotes the s_k -th scope instance in a scope of depth k . The vertex (resp. edge) in \tilde{G} identified by v (resp. e) and the scope tag t is denoted by \tilde{v}_t (resp. \tilde{e}_t). Vertices and edges not in any scope have an empty scope tag $\langle \rangle$.




Figure 2: (a) An example loop scope, and (b) an example of its instantiation. (c) The scoped dataflow for Example 1, and an instantiation of its (d) branch scope and (e) loop scope.

Programming Model. In a scoped dataflow, every message bears the scope tag of the edge it passes through. Every vertex implements the following APIs:

```

v.ReceiveMessage(msg : Message, e : Edge, t : ScopeTag)
v.OnCompletion(t : ScopeTag)

```

A vertex may invoke two system-provided methods in the context of the above callbacks:

```

this.SendMessage(msg : Message, e : Edge, t : ScopeTag)
this.NotifyCompletion(t : ScopeTag)

```

Users write their logics according to the scoped dataflow G , while at runtime the logics are executed by \tilde{G} . For instance, $v.ReceiveMessage(msg, e, t)$ defines the logics how \tilde{v}_t processes a message received along \tilde{e}_t . $v.OnCompletion(t)$ defines the logics executed when vertex \tilde{v}_t has no more input, e.g., an *aggregate* operator emits the final aggregation results when it sees all the inputs. $SendMessage(msg, e, t)$ sends a message along with edge \tilde{e}_t . $NotifyCompletion(t)$ can be called if an operator would like to terminate processing proactively, e.g., a *limit* operator terminates once it generates enough outputs.

Scope Instantiation. In a scope, the ingress vertex instantiates scope instances and routes the messages entering this scope to different scope instances. The egress vertex manages the termination of scope instances inside a scope. Scope instances can be terminated independently of each other. The ingress and egress vertices only act on the scope tags of messages passing through. In specific, for each message msg passing through:

- The ingress vertex routes msg to a destination scope instance SI and sets the scope tag of msg to that of SI . If SI does not exist, the ingress vertex instantiates it.
- The egress vertex removes the last element in the scope tag of msg . When $OnCompletion(t)$ is called in the egress, it terminates the scope instance with scope tag t .

Branch and loop scopes have different behaviors on how messages are mapped to scope instances. In a branch scope, every input message triggers the instantiation of a new scope instance. Whereas in a loop scope, messages from edges entering the scope with scope tag $\langle s_1, \dots, s_d \rangle$ are routed to the scope instance with scope tag $\langle s_1, \dots, s_d, 1 \rangle$; messages from backward edges with scope tag $\langle s_1, \dots, s_d, s_{d+1} \rangle$ are routed to scope instance with scope tag $\langle s_1, \dots, s_d, s_{d+1} + 1 \rangle$. A configurable threshold, Max_SI , can be set to constrain the maximal number of concurrent scope instances in a scope.

Scope Scheduling. Scoped dataflow supports customizing scheduling policies for scopes. The scheduling policy of a scope can be decoupled into two parts: *inter-scope-instances* (inter-SI) policy and *intra-scope-instance* (intra-SI) policy. The inter-SI policy specifies the scheduling priorities of scope instances inside a scope. The intra-SI policy specifies the scheduling priorities of inner vertices (an inner scope as a whole is treated as a virtual inner vertex) inside a scope instance. Users can customize the scheduling policies with the below comparators:

```

bool InterSI_Comparator(t1 : ScopeTag, t2 : ScopeTag)
bool IntraSI_Comparator(v1 : VertexID, v2 : VertexID)

```

The inter-SI comparator decides the priorities of scope instances. The intra-SI comparator decides the priorities of inner vertices in the same scope in $G(V, E)$.

For any two vertices \tilde{u}_{t_1} and \tilde{v}_{t_2} in \tilde{G} , their scheduling orders are decided iteratively according to the following rules. Without loss of generality, we denote the depths of t_1 and t_2 as d_1 and d_2 , and assume $d_1 \leq d_2$. We use $anc_d(\tilde{v}_t)$ to denote the ancestor scope instance of \tilde{v}_t at depth d .

- We start comparing the ancestor scope instances of \tilde{u}_{t_1} and \tilde{v}_{t_2} from depth 1 to depth d_1 .
- At depth d , if $anc_d(\tilde{u}_{t_1})$ and $anc_d(\tilde{v}_{t_2})$ are the same, we proceed to depth $d + 1$.
- At depth d , if $anc_d(\tilde{u}_{t_1})$ and $anc_d(\tilde{v}_{t_2})$ are different scope instances of the same scope S , the priority is determined by calling the inter-SI comparator of S on the scope tags of $anc_d(\tilde{u}_{t_1})$ and $anc_d(\tilde{v}_{t_2})$.
- At depth d , if $anc_d(\tilde{u}_{t_1})$ and $anc_d(\tilde{v}_{t_2})$ belong to different scopes in a common parent scope S , the priority is determined by calling the intra-SI comparator of S on the scopes of $anc_d(\tilde{u}_{t_1})$ and $anc_d(\tilde{v}_{t_2})$.

3.2 Progress Tracking

To correctly invoke $OnCompletion(t)$ for vertices, a scoped dataflow needs to track the processing progress of its vertices, i.e., when a vertex is guaranteed to have received all its inputs. The scoped dataflow model adopts an EOS-based progress tracking mechanism similar to the Chandy-Lampert algorithm [8]. After ingesting all the external inputs, the runtime automatically inserts an EOS message to the dataflow. EOS messages are propagated through the dataflow graph to facilitate the progress tracking. Once a vertex receives EOS messages from all its incoming edges, it calls $OnCompletion(t)$, and then emits an EOS message in all its outgoing edges.

However, as a scoped dataflow can dynamically instantiate scope instances and may contain cycles, we extend the aforementioned EOS-based progress tracking mechanism in order to support the scoped dataflow.

Hierarchical Progress Tracking. We track progress hierarchically in a scoped dataflow, i.e., progress tracking inside and outside a scope are conducted separately. Progress tracking outside a scope S simply treats S as a virtual vertex, denoted v_S . The runtime conducts progress tracking on the dataflow subgraph inside a scope S to decide the completion of v_S , which completes when the ingress vertex of S receives EOS from all its input edges, and all the scope instances inside S have completed. Once v_S reaches completion, the egress vertex of S emits EOS along all its outgoing edges.

Tracking inside a Scope. Next, we explain how the progress tracking is done inside the branch and loop scope, respectively.

In a branch scope, the runtime propagates EOS in each scope instance to track their progress independently. An ingress vertex reaches completion when it has received EOS from all its incoming edges. After completion, the ingress vertex sends the largest scope instance ID it has spawned to the egress vertex of the same scope. The egress decides the number of scope instances according to this ID. When the egress vertex has tracked that all the scope instances in this scope have completed, it reaches completion and emits EOS to the outgoing edges.

Progress tracking of loop scopes is extended from that of the branch scopes. To decide when the loop iteration reaches completion, the ingress vertex tracks the scope tags of data and EOS messages received from the backward edges. If an ingress vertex only receives EOS but no data messages for a specific scope instance, the ingress vertex can infer that this scope instance is the last loop iteration. This way, the ingress vertex can infer the number of spawned scope instances. With this information, the egress vertex tracks the progress of scope instances in the same way as the branch scope. This process is guaranteed to be able to stop due to the simple fact that if you remove the ingress vertex inside a loop scope (note that the ingress vertex only forwards messages) and directly connect the edges according to the forwarding behavior of the ingress vertex, the instantiated scope dataflow is a DAG without cycles.

3.3 Scoped Dataflow in Action

In this section, we discuss the applicability of scopes, followed by an example explaining how the scoped dataflow model can be used to solve the challenges discussed in Section 2.

Applicability of Scopes. The scoped dataflow model is designed to facilitate fine-grained control on subquery traversals and enforce scope-level customization of scheduling policies. In general, scopes can benefit graph queries with:

- *Where* subqueries which can be early canceled. As the instantiation of scope instance brings overhead (see E2 in Section 5.3). For *where* subqueries which cannot be early canceled, scopes should be turned off.
- *Loop* subqueries that can find matches more quickly following certain exploration strategy (e.g., BFS or DFS).

Note that, the benefit of scope is query/data-dependent (see E2 in Section 5.3). The best plan should be determined by the query compiler, which is beyond the scope of this paper.

Example 2 (Implementation of vertex V_7 in Figure 2(d)).

```
class V7Filter:Vertex {
    void ReceiveMessage(msg:Message, e:Edge, t:ScopeTag) {
        if (msg.GetTag() == "#ABC") {
            SendMessage(msg.getPersonId(), out_e, t);
            NotifyCompletion(t);
        }
    }
    void OnCompletion(t:Tag) { }
}
```

Example 3 (Implementations of the inter-SI BFS and intra-SI DFS policies).

```
bool InterSI_BFS:InterSI_Comparator(t_1:ScopeTag, t_2:ScopeTag) {
    return LexicalOrderCompare(t_1, t_2);
}
bool IntraSI_DFS:IntraSI_Comparator(v_1:VertexID, v_2:VertexID) {
    return v_1 < v_2;
}
```

Examples of Scopes. Figure 2(c) shows the scoped dataflow for Example 1. Figure 2(d) zooms in the *where* subquery of Figure 2(c), and demonstrates instantiations of scope 2. Traversals triggered by different users entering the *where* subquery are mapped to different scope instances, which can be executed concurrently and controlled independently. This way, a user (e.g., the blue one) who posts many tweets without the specified tag will not block the exploration of other users (e.g., the red and black ones) entering the *where* subquery.

Example 2 shows the implementation of the *filter* vertex v_7 in Figure 2(d), which enables early cancellation: On receiving a message msg , if the tag in msg is a match, the vertex notifies the completion of itself by calling *NotifyCompletion(t)* to trigger its cancellation. As a scope instance can be terminated independently, when a match (the red message marked in black box entering $v_{7,2}$) is found, the corresponding scope instance ($v_{5,2}, v_{6,2}, v_{7,2}$) can be canceled without impacting the other scope instances.

The scheduling policies of scopes can be flexibly configured to fulfill the diverse scheduling preferences of different parts in a graph query. Figure 2(e) shows that iterations of the *repeat* subquery in Figure 2(c) are mapped into different scope instances of the loop scope. We configure a **BFS** inter-SI scheduling policy such that the blue scope instance (the first iteration) is executed first, then the red one (the second iteration), and the black one (the third iteration) as the last. Meanwhile, by enforcing a **DFS** intra-SI policy, vertices inside the blue scope instance are scheduled in the order of $\tilde{v}_{4,1}$, $\tilde{v}_{3,1}$ and $\tilde{v}_{2,1}$. Implementations of the inter-SI BFS and intra-SI DFS policy are presented in Example 3.

4 BUILDING BANYAN ON SCOPED DATAFLOW

We build Banyan, an engine for GQS based on a distributed implementation of the scoped dataflow model. Banyan is designed to efficiently leverage the many-core parallelism in a modern server, and agilely balance the workloads across cores. Banyan can also easily scale out to a distributed cluster.




Figure 3: (a) The system architecture of Banyan. (b) An operator tree mapped from the dataflow in Figure 2(c) in an executor.

The overall system architecture of Banyan is presented in Figure 3(a). A Banyan cluster consists of a group of worker nodes, each of which manages multiple executors. An executor exclusively runs in a system thread pinned in a physical core, and is in charge of a partition of the graph data. Vertices in a scoped dataflow are parallelized into operators, and are mapped to executors. Executors communicate with each other through message queues inside the worker node and through TCP connections across worker nodes. In a worker node, executors schedule their own operators and are scheduled by the worker scheduler. The worker scheduler is responsible for balancing the workloads across executors in a worker node.

4.1 Parallelizing A Scoped Dataflow

Banyan parallelizes a dataflow G into a physical plan of operators in a data-parallel manner. Every vertex in G is parallelized into a set of operators, each encapsulating the processing logic of this vertex. Each edge in G has a partitioning function controlling the data exchange between the operators. In the physical plan, the vertices in G are replaced with the corresponding set of operators, and the edges in G are replaced with a set of edges connecting these operators. At runtime, when we instantiate a scope in G into scoped instances, every scope instance inherits the physical plan of the scope. That is, every scope instance has a complete copy of the corresponding operators and edges of its scope.

Banyan partitions the graph into tablets distributed across executors. A tablet contains an exclusive set of graph vertices and all their in/out edges, along with their properties. We refer to vertices in G that need to access graph data as *graph-accessing* vertices. To exploit data locality, a graph-accessing vertex is parallelized into as many operators as the number of tablets, and are mapped to the executors hosting the tablets.

This mechanism fits well with the NUMA architecture. As graph-accessing operations are often highly random, by collocating each

graph-accessing operator and the corresponding tablet in one executor, we can utilize the low-latency intra-node random memory access in NUMA servers [49]. Messages passing across executors are batched to utilize the high bandwidth of sequential memory access across NUMA nodes.

4.2 Executor Internals

In Banyan, executors are single-threaded and each one is pinned in a physical core. Executors schedule their operators cooperatively, allowing Banyan to concurrently process a large number of operators without facing the bottleneck caused by context switch. Cooperative scheduling is based on an asynchronous task-based programming interface. E.g., an operator blocked by an asynchronous I/O operation automatically yields CPU, and the corresponding executor schedules another operator ready for execution. This way, Banyan can overlap CPU computation with networking and I/O, and thus improve the resource utilization.

Scope Operator. The key difference between the scoped dataflow and the traditional dataflow is the introduction of the scope abstraction. To facilitate the scope-based scheduling in Banyan (see Section 3.1), we deliberately introduce *scope operators* to manage the creation, termination and scheduling for all the operators of a scope. In specific, on every executor containing operators of a scope S , we create a scope operator managing all the local operators of S in this executor. The scope operator of S is also managed by the scope operator of S 's parent scope (if existed). Therefore, all the operators in an executor can be managed as a forest of operator trees. In each tree, the leaf nodes are operators of vertices and the non-leaf nodes are the scope operators. The operators in an executor are scheduled hierarchically: (1) The executor schedules the root scope operators of queries. (2) When a scope operator of scope S is scheduled, it further schedules its child (scope) operators following S 's inter-SI and intra-SI scheduling policies.

Banyan enforces the performance isolation guarantee in each single executor. We take scope operator as the basic unit of resource allocation: resources allocated to scopes operators at the same depth are isolated, and an operator can only consume the resources allocated to its parent scope operator. Once being scheduled, an operator is assigned a *quota CPU time* by its parent, which constrains the maximum amount of CPU time this operator can use at this round of scheduling, and yields immediately after using up its quota. The vertex operator updates its quota after processing a message, and thus will not occupy an executor for a long time.

By modeling different queries or tenants as the top-level scopes, Banyan can naturally support performance isolation across queries or users. Figure 3(b) shows the operator tree mapped from the scoped dataflow in Figure 2(a).

4.3 Hierarchical Operator Management

In this subsection, we introduce how operators are addressed, created and terminated in Banyan.

Operator Addressing. In Banyan, each operator has a unique address, encoding the path from the executor to this operator in the operator tree. The address consists of three parts:

$$\langle exec_id, (sop_id_1, s_1), \dots, (sop_id_d, s_d), op_id \rangle$$

where $exec_id$ identifies the hosting executor of the operator; op_id represents the ID of the operator; $(sop_id_1, s_1), \dots, (sop_id_d, s_d)$ denotes the chain of ancestor scope operators (sop_id_k) and the corresponding scope instance IDs (s_k). Actually, $\langle s_1, \dots, s_d \rangle$ is the scope tag of the operator.

To facilitate hierarchical scheduling, each scope operator maintains a directory of its child operators as a prefix tree, using the addresses of child operators as the keys and the pointers to these operators as the values. In the prefix tree, the operators of a scope instance are naturally grouped together as they share the same prefix in their addresses, and thus can be quickly located.

Operator Creation and Termination. Banyan is event-driven, it dynamically creates operators on request. More specifically, sending a message to a non-existing operator triggers the creation of this operator and all its non-existing ancestor scope operators. A scope operator provides a system-level API $TerminateScope(scope_instance_id)$ to terminate a scope instance, i.e., all the operators in this scope instance. Terminating a scope operator will terminate all managed scope instances in cascade. Messages sent to terminated operators are ignored. Banyan recycles objects used for operators through memory management to avoid excessive memory allocations.

4.4 Parallelizing Progress Tracking

In the mechanism of hierarchical progress tracking in Section 3.2, tracking inside a scope requires the ingress vertex to notify the egress vertex of the total number of instantiated scope instances. When the ingress and egress vertices of a scope are parallelized, a single ingress operator may not be aware of all the scope instances in this scope.

To tackle this problem, in a branch scope, each ingress operator broadcasts to all the egress operators the largest ID of scope instances it has instantiated, and each egress operator takes the maximum among these IDs as the total number of scope instances to be tracked. In the case of loop scopes, every time an ingress operator only sees the EOS messages but no data message from a specific loop iteration, it broadcasts to all the egress operators the ID of the corresponding scope instance. If an egress operator receives a specific scope instance ID from all the ingress instances, it can conclude that this ID is the number of scope instances in this scope.

To reduce the number of operators created for a scoped dataflow, Banyan skips creating operators that only receive EOS messages in their entire lifetime. Instead, it handles EOS messages sent to these operators in their parent scope operator. EOS messages sent to non-existing operators are buffered in their parent scope operator. If the operator is created later, these buffered EOS messages are inserted into their mailboxes. Otherwise, the parent scope operator emits EOS messages on behalf of the non-existing child operator after receiving all the corresponding EOS messages.

4.5 Load Balancing

Many realistic graphs are often scale-free, which may lead to a skewed workload distribution among different tablets. And this skewness changes dynamically, as the graph accessing patterns of the incoming queries continuously change. In graph queries, graph-accessing operations are often the most costly part during

Dataset	# Vertices	# Edges	CSV Size
LDBC-1	3, 181, 364	17, 299, 165	882M
LDBC-100	282, 637, 871	1, 777, 459, 239	88G

Table 2: Dataset Statistics

the execution. To facilitate load balancing between executors, we deliberately partition the graph into more tablets, and migrate tablets together with their graph-accessing operators across executors. Upon migrating a tablet between hosts, we do not migrate the operators at execution (as graph traversal queries are usually short-lived), but only redirect the incoming queries.

5 EVALUATIONS

In this section, we evaluate the performance of Banyan in the following aspects:

- **(E1)** We study the overall performance of Banyan by comparing single-query latency with state-of-the-art graph query engines (Section 5.2).
- **(E2)** We study the effects and overheads of scopes on query performance, by comparing the scoped dataflow with the Timely dataflow model (Section 5.3).
- **(E3)** We study how well Banyan can scale up in a many-core server and scale out in a distributed cluster (Section 5.4).
- **(E4)** We study how well Banyan can enforce performance isolation and load balancing (Section 5.5).

5.1 Experiment Setup

Benchmarks. We use two benchmarks in the experiments: the LDBC Social Network Benchmark [2, 21] and the Complex Query(CQ) benchmark.

LDBC is a popular benchmark of graph traversal queries. We selected 12 queries ($IC_1 - IC_{12}$) from the 14 *Interactive Complex Read* queries in the LDBC benchmark, and exclude all the *Analysis* ($BI_1 - BI_{25}$), *Short Read* ($IS_1 - IS_7$), and *Update* queries ($IU_1 - IU_8$). IC_{13} and IC_{14} are excluded as they both have shortest-path subqueries, which are typical graph analytics queries. We use two LDBC datasets with scale factor 1 and 100, denoted as LDBC-1 and LDBC-100. Table 2 shows the statistics of these two datasets. For each query on both datasets we use the LDBC generator to generate 50 parameters.

Real-world service scenarios (e.g. search engines) often select the top-k results from a limited size of recalled candidates to guarantee interactive response. This is different from the query patterns in LDBC (all LDBC queries require sorting the entire results). To better study the effects of scopes, we compose the CQ benchmark with 6 queries ($CQ_1 - CQ_6$) by adjusting the LDBC queries (e.g. removing the *sort* operator) based on the two LDBC datasets. Each CQ query has 10 parameters generated by the LDBC benchmark for both datasets. The CQ queries are presented in Appendix A.

System Configurations. All the experiments are conducted on a cluster (up to 8 machines) where each machine has 755G memory and 2 Intel Xeon Platinum 8269CY CPUs (each with 26 physical cores and 52 hyper-threads).

We choose four baseline systems from the most popular or latest graph databases/engines: two single-machine ones—Neo4j 4.1.1 [29] and JanusGraph 0.5.0 [18], as well as two distributed ones—TigerGraph 3.1.0 [44] and GAIA [37]. We also compare scoped dataflow with Timely dataflow [26] to study the effects of scopes on




Figure 4: (a) The single-query performance of Banyan, Neo4j, JanusGraph, TigerGraph and GAIA on a single machine with 32 cores. (b) The single-query performance of Banyan, TigerGraph and GAIA in a 4-node cluster (each node has 8 cores).

query performance. For a fair comparison, we implement queries in the Timely dataflow model using Banyan with scopes turned off.

Unless explicitly explained, all the experiments are conducted in a container which has 32 cores and 700G memory. We configure a cache size (if available) large enough to store the entire datasets. We build the same set of indexes for all systems, i.e., a primary index on vertex ID for each type of vertices. In graph databases, we execute queries without transactions or as read-only transactions to minimize the transaction overhead. Configurations of the baseline systems are as follows:

- *Neo4j 4.1.1*. We use 32 worker threads and turn on query cache.
- *JanusGraph 0.5.0*. We use BerkeleyJE 7.5.11 [32] as the storage.
- *TigerGraph 3.1.0*. The distributed query mode is used in the distributed experiments. TigerGraph requires installing a query before execution, and the installation takes much more time (more than 1 min on average) than query execution. We exclude the installation time in the reported results.
- *GAIA*. GAIA is only experimented on a subset of the LDBC and CQ queries, as it does not support IC_4 , IC_{10} , CQ_2 , CQ_4 and CQ_5 ². The number of workers is set to 32 such that GAIA can use all the cores.
- *Banyan*. We use a C++ version of the backend storage used by JanusGraph (BerkeleyDB 18.1.32 [33]), and directly import the databases exported from JanusGraph. For each dataset, Banyan randomly partitions the graph into 64 tablets. We rely on the load balancing mechanism to uniformly distribute tablets on executors. We apply loop scope on all the *repeat* subqueries and branch scope on *where* subqueries whose branches can be early canceled. Unless otherwise specified, we use 32 executors for query execution.

Experiment Methodology. To flexibly control query submission, we extend the standard LDBC client to allow specifying the number of concurrent queries (W) a client can submit. Unless explicitly specified in E3 and E4, we use $W = 1$ throughout the experiments.

²The authors of GAIA confirmed that their compiler is still under development and cannot support some Gremlin operators like *sideEffect* and *store*.

As LDBC/CQ queries are templates, unless otherwise specified, we follow the LDBC benchmark convention and for each query report the average latency of all the generated parameters. Throughout this section, for each data point we run the corresponding experiment 10 times to warm up the system, and collect the results from the following 10 runs. We report the minimum, maximum, and average values of the 10 results in the figures. Queries run longer than 60 seconds are marked as timeout.

5.2 Overall System Performance

In this section, we study the performance of Banyan by comparing its single-query latencies on both the LDBC and CQ benchmarks with baseline systems.

Single-machine. In this experiment, we use the LDBC-1 dataset so that baselines like JanusGraph can finish most queries before timeout. The results are depicted in Figure 4(a).

On the LDBC queries, Banyan has 5X to three orders of magnitude latency improvement over all the baseline systems except for TigerGraph. Banyan outperforms TigerGraph by up to 14X for 10 out of the 12 LDBC queries (including all the large queries), and is slightly slower on IC_3 and IC_6 (both are small queries). As TigerGraph is not open-sourced, we cannot analyze how the query installation helps in speeding up query execution. This demonstrates that Banyan can well utilize the many-core parallelism.

On the CQ queries which can benefit more from the scoped dataflow, the advantage of Banyan further widens, e.g., up to 130X and 726X faster than TigerGraph and GAIA, respectively. This improvement is led by the fine-grained control and scheduling enabled by scoped dataflow: (1) subquery traversals (*where* subqueries in CQ_3 , CQ_4 , CQ_5 and CQ_6) can be early canceled, and (2) customized scope-level scheduling policies (e.g., DFS in the loop of CQ_1 and BFS in the loop of CQ_2) can trigger the (sub-)query cancellation earlier. Note that GAIA’s support for traversal-level early cancellation is less efficient. GAIA mixes messages with different ‘contexts’ in the same execution pipeline. Canceling a specific traversal requires




Figure 5: (a) The per-parameter latency speedups of scoped dataflow compared to Timely. (b) The per-parameter latency speedups of the *best-case* scheduling policy compared to the FIFO policy. (c) The overheads of scope instantiation when MAX_SI is set to 1 and unlimited. The (d) throughput and (e) latency of Banyan under different numbers of concurrent queries.

filtering all messages with the corresponding context at each operator inside a scope. This inefficiency is especially reflected by the performance of GAIA on CQ_1 and CQ_6 . Differently, Banyan can directly drop scope instances along with all related messages. Besides, GAIA cannot configure scope-level scheduling policies, which influences its performance on CQ_3 and CQ_6 .

Note that JanusGraph and Neo4j cannot parallelize queries whose traversal starts from a single vertex. To make a fair comparison, we also present the single-thread performance of Banyan, which outperforms both systems on all queries.

Distributed. For the distributed experiment, we use the LDBC-100 dataset and a cluster of 4 worker nodes each hosting a container of 8 cores. We compare only the distributed baseline systems. The results are presented in Figure 4(b). Banyan outperforms TigerGraph by 5X to 40X on the LDBC benchmark, and 2X to three orders of magnitude on the CQ benchmark. These results are consistent with the single-machine experiment, as the benefits of efficiently utilizing hardware parallelism and the scoped dataflow are still tenable in the distributed environment. Banyan is faster than GAIA on most of the LDBC queries and all the CQ queries, except for three small queries (IC_2 , IC_7 and IC_8). This is because the graph partitioning in Banyan can incur some overhead due to message passing between executors.

5.3 Benchmark on Scoped Dataflow

In this section, we use the CQ benchmark on the LDBC-100 dataset to study: (1) the effects of scoped dataflow, (2) the effects of scheduling policy and (3) the overhead of scope instantiation. We run each query with ten different parameters, compute the speedup(overhead) between different competitors on each parameter, and report the boxplot of all the per-parameter speedups(overheads) for each query.

Effects of Scoped Dataflow. We report the boxplots of speedups brought by scopes by comparing scoped dataflow against Timely in Figure 5(a). Note that, the Timely versions of queries are implemented using Banyan with scopes turned off to make a fair comparison. We can see the effects of scoped dataflow are:

- Query-dependent. E.g., the scoped dataflow brings 1.3X to 36X latency improvement compared to Timely on average. In particular, the speedup of scoped dataflow on CQ_1 is relatively small, as CQ_1 has no subquery which can be early canceled, and the speedup comes from customizing the scope-level scheduling policy, i.e., using DFS to prioritize the loop iteration which generates the

final outputs. On the other hand, as CQ_4 contains a *where* subquery nested with a loop subquery, canceling a *where* traversal can save a huge amount of computation.

- Data-dependent. The speedup of scoped dataflow varies on different parameters, e.g., 14X to 86X on CQ_4 . This is because different traversals of the *where* subquery in CQ_4 have very different computation cost.

Clearly, the optimal scoped dataflow plan should be determined by a query compiler according to the query structure and data statistics.

Effects of Scheduling Policy. In this experiment, we select CQ_6 (see Appendix A) and compare the latency of CQ_6 in Banyan between two cases: (1) the *best-policy* case where the intra-SI policy of the query and the *where* subquery are both set to DFS, and (2) the *FIFO* case where all the scheduling policies are set to FIFO in the query. We also vary n in CQ_6 's *limit(n)* clause from 1 to 10^4 . Figure 5(b) shows the boxplots of speedups brought by *best-policy* over *FIFO*. We can see that *best-policy* outperforms *FIFO* in all the settings. By increasing the value of n from 1 to 10^4 , the speedups of *best-policy* widen from 1.8X to 3.5X. This is because *FIFO* can result in more wasted traversals which have no contribution to the final outputs, and this wastage becomes worse with the increasing number of total traversals. Similar effects can be observed in other CQ queries and thus omitted. This experiment shows that customized scheduling policy is necessary for graph queries.

Overhead of Scope Instantiation. To quantify the overhead of scope instantiation, we turn off early cancellation in Banyan, use purely FIFO for scheduling, and compare its single query latencies with Timely. We experiment on CQ_3 , CQ_5 and CQ_6 , as these queries contains *where* subqueries that can instantiate a large number of scope instances. We remove the *limit* clause in these queries to make sure that both Banyan and Timely perform the same amount of traversals. We report the boxplots of overheads caused by scope instantiation in Figure 5(c).

We can see that without limiting MAX_SI, Banyan is on average 25% slower than Timely, as Banyan suffers from extra scheduling overheads among SIs and a high memory pressure in this case. While, setting MAX_SI in Banyan to 1 shrinks the performance differences to 13%. Note that, MAX_SI is an executor-local configuration. With 32 executors running in parallel, setting MAX_SI to 1 allows Banyan to instantiate at most 32 concurrent SIs of a scope, which is enough to saturate the multi-core parallelism. This

experiment shows that the overhead of scope instantiation is limited compared with the benefits of scopes as shown in the first experiment of E2.

5.4 Scalability of Banyan

Next we conduct experiments to evaluate the scalability of Banyan from three perspectives: (1) the scale-up performance on a many-core machine, (2) the scale-out performance in a cluster, and (3) the throughput and latency when scaling the number of concurrent queries. We use both the CQ and LDBC benchmarks with the LDBC-100 dataset in this experiment.

Scale-Up. In this experiment, we use a single container and vary the number of cores from 1 to 64. We report the query latency of Banyan in Figure 6(a). We can see that the query latency scales almost linearly up to 32 cores. This is because the architecture of Banyan can efficiently parallelize a query dataflow into fine-grained operators and evenly distribute them across executors. The performance improvement of Banyan stagnates when scaling up from 32 cores to 64. This is because per-executor workload becomes too small to fully utilize allocated computation resources. On the other hand, the hyper-threading has a negative impact on the cache locality when the 64 logical cores share 52 physical cores.

Scale-Out. In Figure 6(b), we study the scale-out performance of Banyan. We use a container of 8 cores as the worker node, and increase the number of worker nodes from 1 to 8. We can observe that by increasing the number of worker nodes, the latencies of large queries (e.g., IC_3 , IC_5 , IC_6 and IC_9) decrease in a nearly linear manner. This shows that the scoped dataflow can be well parallelized in a distributed environment, saturating the hardware parallelism. For small queries (e.g., IC_1 , IC_2 , IC_{10} , IC_{11} and CQ_4) with limited computation to distribute, increasing the number of worker nodes results in slightly worse query latency due to the network communication cost. Note that we randomly partition the graph data in Banyan, which is not optimized to reduce inter-machine communication. As graph partitioning is orthogonal to our work, we believe adopting advanced graph partitioning [16] can further improve the scale-out performance of Banyan.

Scalability with Concurrent Queries. In this experiment, we use IC_6 with a fixed parameter to isolate the latency difference caused by different queries and parameters. We vary the submission concurrency W of the client from 1 to 32, and report the throughput and latency of Banyan in Figure 5(d) and 5(e). As shown in Figure 5(d), by increasing the number of concurrent queries, Banyan can provide a stable throughput (less than 2% throughput decrease when $W = 32$). The query latency is increasing linearly with more concurrent queries executing in the system (Figure 5(e)), which clearly shows that Banyan can fairly time slice the CPU time among concurrent queries, but incur little overhead when running more queries at the same time. We can observe similar results on other queries.

5.5 Performance Isolation & Load Balancing

In this subsection, we study whether Banyan can enforce performance isolation and load balancing. In the following experiments we use a fixed parameter for each selected query as the effects

of performance isolation and load balancing are query/parameter-independent.

Performance Isolation. We conduct two experiments to study performance isolation in Banyan.

In the first experiment, we compare the performance isolation in Banyan, Neo4j, TigerGraph and GAIA using the LDBC benchmark with dataset LDBC-1. In Figure 7(a) and 7(b) we simulate a mixed workload of large queries (using IC_9) and small queries (using IC_1), and vary the submission concurrency W from 32 to 128.

For different W , Banyan provides on average 2X-23X better query latencies for small queries compared with all the baselines (Figure 7(a)), and 3X-30X performance boost on large queries compared with GAIA and Neo4j (Figure 7(b)). TigerGraph runs 50% faster than Banyan on the large queries, but sacrifices its performance on small queries (on average 3.3X worse than Banyan). Banyan also achieves a much more stable latency performance than TigerGraph. In Figure 7(a), when W is set to 128, the latency of TigerGraph fluctuates on small queries at a range of nearly 3000ms (2X of its average). In comparison, the latency of Banyan only fluctuates within 50ms (10% of its average). This shows that the hierarchical scheduling in scoped dataflow can guarantee performance isolation between queries.

In the second experiment, we conduct a controlled experiment on how background workload impacts a foreground query. We generate a background workload of different types of queries using the LDBC-100 dataset, i.e., of purely large queries (IC_9) or purely small queries (IC_{10}), and vary the concurrency W from 1 to 4. While the background queries are executing, we submit a small foreground query (IC_1) and collect its latency using another client with $W = 1$. For each background configuration, we submit the foreground query for 100 times and plot the CDF of the query latency in Figure 7(c). We also plot the foreground latency without any background workload (No-BG) as a baseline reference. We can see that when W is fixed, the latency of the foreground query is quite stable. Changing the background workload from small queries (BG-S) to large queries (BG-L) has negligible impact on the latency of the foreground query. E.g., the 95% percentile latency of the foreground query is only increased by 3.5% (resp. 9.5%) for $W = 1$ (resp. $W = 4$). This experiment shows that Banyan can enforce performance isolation so that large queries will not block small queries even when executed concurrently.

Load Balancing. We simulate a scenario with skewed workload to evaluate Banyan’s load balancing mechanism. In specific, we distribute the 64 tablets of LDBC-100 dataset among 8 executors in a skewed manner: evenly distributing 48 tablets on 4 executors and the rest on the others. We repeatedly submit IC_6 every 270ms. At t_1 (around 9,000ms), we re-balance the distribution of tablets such that each executor has 8 tablets. At t_2 (around 17,000ms), we set the submission interval to 210ms. The latency and throughput are reported in Figure 7(d). We can see the query latency continuously increases when the workload is skewed. After the re-balance (t_1), the query latency immediately drops, and restores to a stable level (around 200ms) after 3000ms. The throughput first bursts as Banyan is clearing the buffered work. After increasing the input rate at t_2 , the throughput increases to nearly 1.3X of the initial throughput, while the latency remains stable.




Figure 6: (a) The scale-up performance of Banyan with increasing number of executors on a single machine. (b) The scale-out performance of Banyan with increasing number of worker nodes in the cluster.




Figure 7: The latency of Banyan, TigerGraph, GAIA and Neo4j under different concurrent workloads: (a) the latency of small queries and (b) the latency of large queries. (c) The latency CDF of the foreground query under different background workloads. (d) The throughput and latency of Banyan before and after load balancing.

6 RELATED WORK

Graph Databases and Graph Engines Neo4j [29], Neptune [30], TinkerPop [45] and JanusGraph [18] are single-machine graph databases. TinkerPop, JanusGraph and Neptune only utilize multiple threads for inter-query parallelization [19, 31, 46]. Neo4j supports intra-query parallelization, but can only parallelize top-level traversals starting from different vertices. On the contrary, Banyan can parallelize fine-grained subquery-level traversals. Distributed graph databases such as TigerGraph [44], DGraph [11] and OrientDB [34] are mainly optimized for OLTP queries with both read and write operations. Differently, Banyan focuses on answering read-only graph traversal queries in a GQS. Grasper [9] proposes the Expert model to support adaptive operator parallelization. However, Grasper uses the same set of experts for concurrent queries, and thus cannot support fine-grained control and enforce performance isolation both inside and across queries as Banyan does. GAIA [37] introduces a virtual *scope* abstraction to facilitate data dependency tracking in graph queries, so that the Gremlin queries with nested subqueries can be correctly parallelized. Note that their scope is a logical concept used in compilation to annotate subquery traversals, and is different from our scoped dataflow. GAIA compiles Gremlin queries into topo-static dataflows, and thus suffer the limitations discussed in Section 2. Horton [40] and Horton+ [41] focus on static query plan optimization and are orthogonal to Banyan.

G-SPARQL [39], Trinity.RDF [48] and Wukong [43] target for SPARQL queries. G-SPARQL [39] uses a hybrid query execution engine that can push parts of the query plan into the relational database. Trinity.RDF [48] utilizes graph exploration to answer SPARQL queries. Wukong [43] supports concurrent execution with sub-query support. The subquery in Wukong [43] is generated *statically* and is of *coarser* granularity than scope instances, and thus cannot support goal **O1** (see Section 2) required by a GQS.

Graph processing systems like Pregel [24], PowerGraph [12, 23] and GraphX [13] focus on graph analysis workload, whereas Banyan focuses on interactive graph traversal queries.

Dataflow Engines. Dataflow systems such as [4, 5, 17] adopt BSP paradigm, and do not support cycles in the dataflow. Flink [3] supports cyclic dataflow but requires barrier synchronization between loop iterations. Naiad [26] proposes the Timely dataflow model for iterative and incremental computations, and cannot support branch scopes for *where* subqueries as Banyan does. All the above dataflows are topo-static dataflow models. Cilk [6] and CIEL [27] support dynamic modification of the dataflow, but at the level of coarse-grained tasks. This design may incur huge overhead to control nimble tasks like scope instances in scoped dataflow. Whiz [14], Dandelion [38] and Optimus [20] can modify execution plans dynamically, whereas their target workloads have no requirement on nimble, hierarchical management of computational resources

as a GQS does. Compared to existing dataflow models, the key difference of the scoped dataflow model is the introduction of the scope construct. A scope can dynamically replicate its containing dataflow subgraph at run time, creating a separate execution pipeline for different input data. This mechanism allows concurrent execution and independent control on the replicated execution pipelines. The scope construct also provides a new way to support loops in dataflow, allowing users to control the scheduling policy in cyclic computation.

Quickstep [36] and Morsel [22] decompose a query into some fine-grained tasks, and schedule tasks among multiple cores using a centralized flat task scheduler. While Banyan adopts a similar parallelization mechanism for graph-accessing operators, we adopt a novel hierarchical scheduling framework to recursively schedule operators by their parent scope operators. This allows Banyan to support performance isolation and customized scheduling policy in nimble granularities.

Actor-based Systems. Actor-based frameworks [1, 7, 35] use actors as the basic computation primitives to build distributed and concurrent systems. Orleans [7, 35] provides a virtual actor mechanism where actors are automatically instantiated when receiving a message, and reclaimed by the system when being unused. The mechanism of operator activation in Banyan is similar to the virtual actor mechanism in Orleans. The difference is that the lifetime of an operator in Banyan is determined by the dataflow semantics, and managed by its parent scope operator. Parent actors in Akka [1] manage the creation and termination of the actors they spawned. Different from Akka, the scope operator in Banyan is also a scheduler for its child operators. Furthermore, these systems mainly focus on the low-level programming framework, but do not have a high-level dataflow computation model as Banyan does.

7 CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE WORK

We present a novel scoped dataflow model, and a new engine named Banyan built on top of it for GQS. Scoped dataflow is targeted at solving the need for sophisticated fine-grained control and scheduling in order to fulfill stringent query latency and performance isolation in a GQS. We demonstrate through Banyan that the new dataflow model can be efficiently parallelized, showing its scale-up ability on modern many-core architectures and scale-out ability in a cluster. The comparison with the state-of-the-art graph query engines shows Banyan can provide at most 3 orders of magnitude query latency improvement, very stable system throughput and performance isolation.

Besides graph queries, the scoped dataflow model can also be applied to general service scenarios that involve complex processing pipelines and require delicate control of the pipeline execution. As the forthcoming work, we plan to generalize the scoped dataflow model and provide a high-level declarative language on top to help users compose processing pipelines.

A COMPLEX QUERIES

Complex Query 1.

```
g.V(person_id)
  .repeat(__.out('knows')).times(5)
  .dedup().limit(n)
```

CQ₁: Given a start Person, find Persons that the start Person is connected to by exactly 5 steps via the *knows* relationship. Return n distinct Person IDs.

Complex Query 2.

```
g.V(person_id)
  .sideEffect(out('workAt'))
  .store('companies')
  .repeat(__.out('knows'))
    .times(5)
    .emit(__.out('workAt'))
      .where(within('companies'))
        .count().is(gt(0)))
  .dedup().limit(n)
```

CQ₂: Given a start Person, find Persons that the start Person is connected to by at most 5 steps via the *knows* relationship. Only Persons that *workAt* the same Company with the start Person are considered. Return n distinct Person IDs.

Complex Query 3.

```
g.V(person_id)
  .out('knows').union(identity(), out('knows'))
  .dedup()
  .where(__.in('hasCreator').out('hasTag')
    .out('hasType').values('name')
    .filter(it.get().contains('Country'))))
  .order().by().limit(n)
```

CQ₃: Given a start Person, find Persons that are his/her friends and friends of friends. Only consider Persons that have created Messages with an attached Tag of TagClass 'Country'. Sort the Persons by their IDs and return the top-n Person IDs.

Complex Query 4.

```
g.V(person_id)
  .sideEffect(out('workAt'))
  .store('companies')
  .out('knows')
  .where(__.repeat(__.out('knows'))
    .times(4)
    .emit(__.out('workAt'))
      .where(within('companies'))
        .count().is(gt(0)))
  .dedup().count().is(gt(0)))
  .limit(n)
```

CQ₄: Given a start Person, find Persons that are his/her friends. Only Persons that meet the following constraints are considered: for each *S_Person* in Persons, find *S_Persons* that *S_Person* is connected to by at most 4 steps via the *knows* relationship; If any Person in *S_Persons* *workAt* the same Company as the start Person, *S_Person* is selected as a candidate result. Return n distinct Person IDs.

Complex Query 5.

```

g.V(person_id)
  .sideEffect(out('workAt')
  .store('companies'))
  .repeat(__.out('knows'))
    .times(5)
    .emit(__.out('workAt')
      .where(within('companies'))
      .count().is(gt(0)))
  .dedup()
  .where(__.in('hasCreator').out('hasTag')
    .out('hasType').values('name')
    .filter{it.get().contains('Country')})
  .limit(n)

```

CQ₅: Given a start Person, find Persons that the start Person is connected to by at most 5 steps via the *knows* relationship and *workAt* the same Company with the start Person. Only consider Persons that have created Messages with an attached Tag of Tag-Class 'Country'. Return n distinct Person IDs.

Complex Query 6.

```

g.V(person_id)
  .repeat(__.out('knows')
    .where(__.in('hasCreator')
      .out('hasTag').out('hasType')
      .values('name')
      .filter{it.get()
        .contains('Country')})
    .times(5).dedup().limit(n)

```

CQ₆: Given a start Person, find Persons that the start Person is connected to by exactly 5 steps via the *knows* relationship. Only Persons that meet the following constraints are considered: for each S_Person in Persons, if every I_Person in the path from the start Person to S_Person has created Messages with an attached Tag of TagClass 'Country', S_Person is selected as a candidate result. Return n distinct Person IDs.

REFERENCES

- [1] Akka 2021. Akka. <http://akka.io/>.
- [2] Renzo Angles, János Benjamin Antal, et al. 2020. The LDBC Social Network Benchmark. *CoRR* abs/2001.02299 (2020). arXiv:2001.02299 <http://arxiv.org/abs/2001.02299>
- [3] Apache Flink 2021. Apache Flink. <https://flink.apache.org/>.
- [4] Apache Hadoop 2021. Apache Hadoop. <https://github.com/apache/hadoop>.
- [5] Apache Spark 2021. Apache Spark. <https://spark.apache.org/>.
- [6] Robert D Blumofe, Christopher F Joerg, Bradley C Kuszmaul, Charles E Leiserson, Keith H Randall, and Yuli Zhou. 1995. Cilk: An efficient multithreaded runtime system. *ACM SigPlan Notices* 30, 8 (1995), 207–216.
- [7] Sergey Bykov, Alan Geller, Gabriel Kliot, James R Larus, Ravi Pandya, and Jorgen Thelin. 2011. Orleans: cloud computing for everyone. In *Proceedings of the 2nd ACM Symposium on Cloud Computing*. ACM, 16.
- [8] K. Mani Chandy and Leslie Lamport. 1985. Distributed Snapshots: Determining Global States of Distributed Systems. *ACM Trans. Comput. Syst.* (1985).
- [9] Hongzhi Chen, Changji Li, Juncheng Fang, Henghuan Huang, James Cheng, Jian Zhang, Yifan Hou, and Xiao Yan. 2019. Grasper: A High Performance Distributed System for OLAP on Property Graphs. In *Proceedings of the ACM Symposium on Cloud Computing*. 87–100.
- [10] Cypher 2021. *Cypher Query Language*. Retrieved Dec 20, 2021 from <https://neo4j.com/developer/cypher/>
- [11] DGraph 2021. DGraph: Not everything can fit in rows and columns. <https://dgraph.io/>.
- [12] Joseph E Gonzalez, Yucheng Low, Haijie Gu, Danny Bickson, and Carlos Guestrin. 2012. Powergraph: Distributed graph-parallel computation on natural graphs. In *Presented as part of the 10th USENIX Symposium on Operating Systems Design and Implementation (OSDI'12)*. 17–30.
- [13] Joseph E Gonzalez, Reynold S Xin, Ankur Dave, Daniel Crankshaw, Michael J Franklin, and Ion Stoica. 2014. Graphx: Graph processing in a distributed dataflow framework. In *11th USENIX Symposium on Operating Systems Design and Implementation (OSDI'14)*. 599–613.
- [14] Robert Grandl, Arjun Singhvi, Raajay Viswanathan, and Aditya Akella. 2021. Whiz: Data-Driven Analytics Execution. In *18th {USENIX} Symposium on Networked Systems Design and Implementation (NSDI'21)*. 407–423.
- [15] GraphDB Annual Growth [n.d.]. Graph Database Market Size, Share and Global Market Forecast to 2024. <https://www.marketsandmarkets.com/Market-Reports/graph-database-market-126230231.html>.
- [16] Bruce Hendrickson and Tamara G Kolda. 2000. Graph partitioning models for parallel computing. *Parallel computing* 26, 12 (2000), 1519–1534.
- [17] Michael Isard, Mihai Budiu, Yuan Yu, Andrew Birrell, and Dennis Fetterly. 2007. Dryad: distributed data-parallel programs from sequential building blocks. In *Proceedings of the 2nd ACM SIGOPS/EuroSys European Conference on Computer Systems 2007*. 59–72.
- [18] Janusgraph 2021. JanusGraph: Distributed, open source, massively scalable graph database. <https://janusgraph.org/>.
- [19] Janusgraph 2021. JanusGraph Transactions. <https://docs.janusgraph.org/basics/transactions/>.
- [20] Qifa Ke, Michael Isard, and Yuan Yu. 2013. Optimus: A Dynamic Rewriting Framework for Data-Parallel Execution Plans. In *Proceedings of the 8th ACM European Conference on Computer Systems (Prague, Czech Republic) (EuroSys '13)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 15–28. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2465351.2465354>
- [21] LDBC Benchmark 2021. LDBC. <http://ldbouncil.org>.
- [22] Viktor Leis, Peter Boncz, Alfons Kemper, and Thomas Neumann. 2014. Morsel-Driven Parallelism: A NUMA-Aware Query Evaluation Framework for the Many-Core Age (*SIGMOD '14*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 743–754.
- [23] Yucheng Low, Danny Bickson, Joseph Gonzalez, Carlos Guestrin, Aapo Kyrola, and Joseph M. Hellerstein. 2012. Distributed GraphLab: A Framework for Machine Learning and Data Mining in the Cloud. *Proc. VLDB Endow.* 5, 8 (April 2012), 716–727. <https://doi.org/10.14778/2212351.2212354>
- [24] Grzegorz Malewicz, Matthew H Austern, Aart JC Bik, James C Dehnert, Ilan Horn, Naty Leiser, and Grzegorz Czajkowski. 2010. Pregel: a system for large-scale graph processing. In *Proceedings of the 2010 ACM SIGMOD International Conference on Management of data*. 135–146.
- [25] Ragnar Mellbin and Felix Åkerlund. 2017. Multi-threaded execution of Cypher queries. <https://lup.lub.lu.se/student-papers/record/8926892/file/8926896.pdf>. (2017). Technical Report.
- [26] Derek G Murray, Frank McSherry, Rebecca Isaacs, Michael Isard, Paul Barham, and Martin Abadi. 2013. Naiad: a timely dataflow system. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fourth ACM Symposium on Operating Systems Principles*. 439–455.
- [27] Derek G Murray, Malte Schwarzkopf, Christopher Smowton, Steven Smith, Anil Madhavapeddy, and Steven Hand. 2011. Ciel: a universal execution engine for distributed data-flow computing. In *Proc. 8th ACM/USENIX Symposium on Networked Systems Design and Implementation*. 113–126.
- [28] Neo4j 2021. Neo4j Execution Plans. <https://neo4j.com/docs/developer-manual/3.0/cypher/execution-plans/>.
- [29] Neo4j 2021. Neo4j: The Fastest Path To Graph Success. <https://neo4j.com/>.
- [30] Neptune 2021. AWS Neptune. <https://aws.amazon.com/neptune/>.
- [31] Neptune 2021. Query queuing in Amazon Neptune. <https://docs.aws.amazon.com/neptune/latest/userguide/access-graph-queuing.html>.
- [32] Oracle Berkeley DB 2017. BerkeleyJE 7.5.11. Retrieved Dec 20, 2021 from https://docs.oracle.com/cd/E17277_02/html/index.html
- [33] Oracle Berkeley DB 2021. BerkeleyDB 18.1.32. <https://www.oracle.com/database/technologies/related/berkeleydb-downloads.html>.
- [34] OrientDB 2021. OrientDB. <https://www.orientdb.org>.
- [35] Orleans 2021. Microsoft Orleans. <https://dotnet.github.io/orleans/>.
- [36] Jignesh M. Patel, Harshad Deshmukh, Jianqiao Zhu, Navneet Potti, Zuyu Zhang, Marc Spehlmann, Hakan Memisoglu, and Saket Saurabh. 2018. Quickstep: A Data Platform Based on the Scaling-up Approach. *Proc. VLDB Endow.* 11, 6 (Feb. 2018), 663–676.
- [37] Zhengping Qian, Chenqiang Min, et al. 2021. GAIA: A System for Interactive Analysis on Distributed Graphs Using a High-Level Language. In *18th USENIX Symposium on Networked Systems Design and Implementation (NSDI'21)*. USENIX Association.
- [38] Christopher J. Rossbach, Yuan Yu, Jon Currey, Jean-Philippe Martin, and Dennis Fetterly. 2013. Dandelion: A Compiler and Runtime for Heterogeneous Systems. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fourth ACM Symposium on Operating Systems Principles (Farmington, Pennsylvania) (SOSP '13)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 49–68. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2517349.2522715>

- [39] Sherif Sakr, Sameh Elnikety, and Yuxiong He. 2012. G-SPARQL: a hybrid engine for querying large attributed graphs. In *Proceedings of the 21st ACM international conference on Information and knowledge management*. ACM, 335–344.
- [40] Mohamed Sarwat, Sameh Elnikety, Yuxiong He, and Gabriel Kliot. 2012. Horton: Online query execution engine for large distributed graphs. In *2012 IEEE 28th International Conference on Data Engineering*. IEEE, 1289–1292.
- [41] Mohamed Sarwat, Sameh Elnikety, Yuxiong He, and Mohamed F Mokbel. 2013. Horton+: A distributed system for processing declarative reachability queries over partitioned graphs. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment* 6, 14 (2013), 1918–1929.
- [42] Bin Shao, Haixun Wang, and Yatao Li. 2013. Trinity: A distributed graph engine on a memory cloud. In *Proceedings of the 2013 ACM SIGMOD International Conference on Management of Data*. ACM, 505–516.
- [43] Jiaxin Shi, Youyang Yao, Rong Chen, Haibo Chen, and Feifei Li. 2016. Fast and concurrent {RDF} queries with RDMA-based distributed graph exploration. In *12th {USENIX} Symposium on Operating Systems Design and Implementation ({OSDI} 16)*. 317–332.
- [44] TigerGraph 2021. TigerGraph 3.1.0. <https://www.tigergraph.com>.
- [45] Tinkerpop 2021. Apache Tinkerpop. <http://tinkerpop.apache.org/>.
- [46] Tinkerpopo 2021. Tinkerpopo Threaded Transactions. Retrieved Dec 20, 2021 from http://tinkerpop.apache.org/docs/current/reference/#_threaded_transactions
- [47] Da Yan, James Cheng, M Tamer Özsu, Fan Yang, Yi Lu, John Lui, Qizhen Zhang, and Wilfred Ng. 2016. A general-purpose query-centric framework for querying big graphs. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment* 9, 7 (2016), 564–575.
- [48] Kai Zeng, Jiacheng Yang, Haixun Wang, Bin Shao, and Zhongyuan Wang. 2013. A distributed graph engine for web scale RDF data. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment* 6, 4 (2013), 265–276.
- [49] Kaiyuan Zhang, Rong Chen, and Haibo Chen. 2015. NUMA-Aware Graph-Structured Analytics. *SIGPLAN Not.* (2015).
- [50] Peixiang Zhao and Jiawei Han. 2010. On graph query optimization in large networks. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment* 3, 1-2 (2010), 340–351.