

GNNPipe: Scaling Deep GNN Training with Pipelined Model Parallelism

Jingji Chen
Purdue University

Zhuoming Chen
Carnegie Mellon University

Xuehai Qian
Purdue University

Abstract

Communication is a key bottleneck for distributed graph neural network (GNN) training. This paper proposes *GNNPipe*, a new approach that scales the distributed full-graph deep GNN training. Being the first to use layer-level model parallelism for GNN training, GNNPipe partitions GNN layers among GPUs, each device performs the computation for a disjoint subset of consecutive GNN layers on the whole graph. Compared to graph parallelism with each GPU handling a graph partition, GNNPipe reduces the communication volume by a factor of the number of GNN layers. GNNPipe overcomes the unique challenges for pipelined layer-level model parallelism on the whole graph by partitioning it into dependent chunks, allowing the use of historical vertex embeddings, and applying specific training techniques to ensure convergence. We also propose a hybrid approach by combining GNNPipe with graph parallelism to handle large graphs, achieve better computer resource utilization and ensure model convergence. We build a general GNN training system supporting all three parallelism setting. Extensive experiments show that our method reduces the per-epoch training time by up to $2.45\times$ (on average $1.58\times$) and reduces the communication volume and overhead by up to $22.89\times$ and $27.21\times$ (on average $8.69\times$ and $11.60\times$), respectively, while achieving a comparable level of model accuracy and convergence speed compared to graph parallelism.

1 Introduction

The past few years have witnessed the great success of graph neural networks (GNN), one of the fastest-growing subareas in neural network research community [18], in learning relational information from non-euclidean graph-structure data for various tasks by combining message passing with traditional neural network layers [5, 7, 17, 27, 31, 53, 61, 65]. Inspired by the success of the deep neural network models like convolution neural networks [20, 21, 48, 50, 51] in deep learning, tremendous research efforts have been devoted to *making GNN models deeper* [5, 7, 19, 24, 31, 32, 44, 62, 69]. Based on recent studies, with sophisticated model architectural designs, deep GNN models with far more than two layers, e.g., *64 layers*, are able to achieve new state-of-the-art results on various

tasks [5, 24, 30–32], such as point cloud segmentation [59], graph inductive learning [17], and node classification [27]. In particular, deep GNN models are required for tasks that require large receptive fields. An important example is neural subgraph matching [36], which discovers whether a subgraph structure exists in a large graph. In this application, the number of GNN layers should be at least the diameter of the subgraph to ensure a sufficiently large receptive field [36].

To realize the potential of deep GNNs, it is crucial to *scale deep GNN training* since it demands prohibitively large amount of memory and computation resources that are beyond the capacity of a single GPU. Unfortunately, *no existing GNN training methods can scale with and efficiently support deep GNN training*, which is the key motivation of this work. The goal of the paper is to propose *the first high performance deep GNN training system*.

There are currently two GNN training methods. The *sampling-based* methods aim to reduce the amount of computation and memory resources required for training by using graph samples as the training data. Instead of processing the full graph data, in each training iteration, the sampling-based methods randomly sample a number of subgraphs that fits into a single GPU [3, 4, 7, 17, 64, 65, 72]. In general, for a L -layer GNN, each subgraph contains the sampled L -hop subgraph from a vertex, in which each hop chooses a subset of neighbors. The sampling-based methods can be naturally implemented with mini-batch approach, where each batch contains a number of sampled subgraphs that can fit into the GPU memory.

The mini-batch approach suffers from two inherent drawbacks, one of them is particularly relevant to deep GNNs. With multiple GPUs, the graph can be partitioned among them. Sampling the k -hop graph will incur inter-GPU communications when a sampled vertex resides in a remote GPU. First, the method introduces *redundant computation and communication*. Intuitively, it is caused by the fact that the two L -hop subgraphs from two vertices v_1 and v_2 can overlap, and the overlapped vertices and edges increase quickly with L . We will explain the problem with a concrete example in Section 2.2. Second, for a L -layer deep GNN, the L -hop subgraph from a vertex v can be prohibitively large, e.g., a 7-hop subgraph in Flickr [65] can contain all vertices. With fixed memory budget for each subgraph, the sample rate needs to be

exceedingly small, otherwise, the subgraph size will be large and may not fit into the GPU memory. It makes the subgraph fail to capture the property of the original graph. While the mini-batch approach is used in several popular GNN training systems such as DGL [58], P3 [13], Legion [49], and many other recent systems [35, 43, 63, 66, 67], these systems can only support shallow GNNs with a small number of layers.

The second GNN training method is the *full-graph* training, which iteratively processes the entire input graph. This approach resembles the traditional graph processing, which propagates the information in the graph incrementally between directly connected vertices. For GNNs, the property of a vertex is its *embedding*, the forward process of an *epoch* processes the entire graph data on the \mathcal{L} -layer GNN through \mathcal{L} iterations, propagating the embeddings to \mathcal{L} -hop neighbors of each vertex. The backward process is similar. For a deep GNN, the number of layers determines the number of iterations, however, the full-graph training fails to scale with the number of GPUs due to the *severe communication bottleneck*.

With multiple GPUs, the full-graph training can be parallelized with *graph parallelism* [24, 37, 39, 52, 55, 56] to distribute the workload across GPUs: the full graph is partitioned into multiple subgraphs, each GPU keeps one partition and the whole model (i.e., weights). The GPUs collaboratively train the GNN by training the model on the local graph partition. The performance of graph parallel execution is heavily affected by the amount of communication between GPUs, which is a function of graph partition. The graph communication is the main source of communication caused by the *neural message passing* [14] for *each layer* to pass message—the embedding vectors of remote vertices—across the boundaries among the subgraphs in different GPUs. In Section 2.3, we demonstrate that the worst-case aggregated communication volume to train a \mathcal{L} -layer GNN with \mathcal{H} hidden units using \mathcal{M} GPUs on a graph with \mathcal{N} vertices is $O(\mathcal{L}\mathcal{M}\mathcal{N}\mathcal{H})$. Our experiments confirm the high communication overhead of distributed GNN training with graph parallelism. Table 1 indicates that the communication can take up to 86.26% of the total training time.

The analysis results explain why the graph parallel GNN training is *fundamentally not scalable*, particularly for deep GNNs. In general, multiple GPUs increases not only the aggregated computation capability but also the aggregated communication bandwidth, roughly linear with the number of GPUs. If the computation and communication amount of an application increases (almost) linearly with the number of GPUs, then the application is scalable. However, the above communication complexity indicates that the communication volume for GNN training increases with *both* the number of GPUs and the number of GNN layers. Figure 1 experimentally confirms our analysis by showing the performance of graph parallel GNN training with increase number of layers.

To enable efficient distributed deep GNN training, we propose *GNNPipe*, a new full-graph training method based on




Figure 1: GNN training with graph parallelism exhibits poor scalability. When increasing both the number of GPUs and the workload size (number of layers) concurrently, the training time gets slower and the per-GPU communication volume gets higher (model: GCN, datasets: Reddit [17], Flickr [65]).

layer-level model parallelism [28]. GNNPipe partitions GNN layers among GPUs, each device is responsible for performing the computation for a *disjoint subset of consecutive GNN layers* on the *whole* graph. During training, each of the \mathcal{M} GPUs only executes *one* iteration and communicates with *one* remote GPU with the updated embeddings of all vertices. Thus, the total communication volume increase linearly with \mathcal{M} , and the communication complexity is $O(\mathcal{M}\mathcal{N}\mathcal{H})$, reducing $O(\mathcal{L}\mathcal{M}\mathcal{N}\mathcal{H})$ of graph parallelism by a factor of \mathcal{L} .

Using pipeline in machine learning model training is not a new idea, why has this idea not been adopted for GNN training? The fundamental challenge is: each iteration on the whole graph needs to be executed *sequentially* according to GNN’s layer structure by different GPUs. Thus, at any point in time, only *one* GPU is utilized. In non-GNN model training, the training samples in a batch are *independent*, thus, a batch can be divided into multiple independent “micro-batches” [22]. The pipeline stages can achieve parallelism for the batch by processing different micro-batches concurrently. For GNN training, vertices in the graph is connected and they are *dependent*.

To tackle the challenge, we propose to partition the whole graph into *chunks* and allow the *stale* historical embedding during GNNPipe’s pipelined layer-level model parallelism training. The chunks are similar to micro-batches in GPipe [22] except that they are *dependent*. When we achieve parallelism among chunks, depending on the graph partition and the order of processing all chunks, some may contain the stale historical vertex embedding, which may affect the training efficiency or even lead to non-convergence. To “recover” the training efficiency when pipelining dependent chunks, we propose three techniques: (1) chunk shuffling to avoid systematical bias; (2) fixing historical embeddings to ensure

Table 1: Communication overhead (the ratio between the communication time and the overall training time) of our graph-parallel baseline. Evaluated on the Reddit dataset [17] with NVIDIA A100 GPUs interconnected by a 100Gbps InfiniBand network. The GNN model is a 3-layer GCN with 256 hidden units.

Num.GPU	4	8	12
Comm.Time/Runtime	69.13%	79.29%	86.26%

training stability; (3) avoid using historical gradients which tend to incur large errors. With the three training techniques, GNNPipe is able to successfully train deep GNN models without accuracy loss. Fundamentally, our solution co-designs training algorithm with system and slightly trades statistical efficiency for execution efficiency.

As a step further, we develop a general *hybrid* training method by combining layer-level model parallelism and graph parallelism, in which they can be considered as special cases. Specifically, each GPU can be assigned to process a subset of consecutive layers on a graph partition, instead of the whole graph. The hybrid parallelism addresses three practical issues: (1) the large graphs may not fit into a single GPU’s memory; (2) the number of layers can be less than the number of available GPUs; and (3) for some deep GNNs, using deep pipeline may affect convergence. Section 3.5 also analyzes the trade-offs of communication volume with different parallelism settings.

To the best of our knowledge, GNNPipe is the *first* GNN training method that exploits layer-level model parallelism and achieves performance superiority over solutions based on graph parallelism. The hybrid approach enables a general GNN training system that can efficiently work with both shallow and deep GNNs, explore the trade-off between training and execution efficiency, and utilize all available GPU computing resources.

One can argue that, the advanced NVLink [1] with up to 900 GBps bandwidth can largely mitigate such communication bottleneck. However, we must at the same time consider *high cost* of the advanced machines with NV-Link. For example, NVIDIA’s DGX A100 server with 8 NVLink-connected A100 GPUs costs 200K. Thus, it is important to support deep GNN training (and machine learning in general) in a *cost-effective* manner with affordable solutions whenever possible. This paper is an important step toward such goal.

We extensively evaluated GNNPipe with four 32-layer GNN models on a 8-GPU cluster with a fast 200Gbps InfiniBand network. The experiments show that, comparing with our graph-parallel baseline, GNNPipe significantly reduces the communication volume and overhead to up to $22.89\times$ and $27.21\times$ (on average $8.69\times$ and $11.60\times$), and improves the per-epoch training time by up to $2.45\times$ (on average $1.58\times$). It also outperforms DGL [58], a state-of-the-art mini-batch-based distributed system, by up to $61.0\times$.

2 Background

2.1 Graph Neural Networks Basics

Given a graph $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$, the goal of an \mathcal{L} -layer graph neural network (GNN) is to learn an embedding vector representation $\mathbf{h}_v = \mathbf{h}_v^{(\mathcal{L})}$ for each $v \in \mathcal{V}$. The embedding $\mathbf{h}_v^{(\ell)}$ at layer ℓ can be obtained by $\mathbf{h}_v^{(\ell-1)}$ with the differentiable $\text{AGGREGATE}^{(\ell)}(\cdot)$ and $\text{UPDATE}^{(\ell)}(\cdot)$ functions. We describe the process mathematically as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{z}_v^{(\ell)} &= \text{AGGREGATE}^{(\ell)}(\{\mathbf{h}_u^{(\ell-1)} | u \in \mathcal{N}(v)\}) \\ \mathbf{h}_v^{(\ell)} &= \text{UPDATE}^{(\ell)}(\mathbf{h}_v^{(\ell-1)}, \mathbf{z}_v^{(\ell)}) \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where $\mathcal{N}(v)$ contains the neighbor vertices of v and the input to the first layer $\mathbf{h}_v^{(0)}$ equals the feature vector of vertex v . As an example, for the GCN model [27], the aggregation operation is a weighted sum of the neighbor embeddings, which is $\text{AGGREGATE}^{(\ell)} = \sum_{u \in \mathcal{N}(v)} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\mathcal{D}_v \mathcal{D}_u}} \mathbf{h}_u^{(\ell-1)}$ (\mathcal{D}_v and \mathcal{D}_u is the degree of v and u), while $\text{UPDATE}^{(\ell)}(\cdot)$ is a fully-connected neural network layer.

2.2 Distributed Mini-batch GNN Training

Mini-batch based distributed GNN training is inherited from traditional machine learning systems. This method first divides the vertices \mathcal{V} into a large number of fine-grained vertex sets called mini-batches (denoted as $\mathcal{M}_1, \mathcal{M}_2, \dots$). During each training iteration, each GPU will be responsible for generating the final-layer embeddings of a different mini-batch \mathcal{M}_i concurrently (i.e., calculating all $\mathbf{h}_v^{(\mathcal{L})}$ s.t. $v \in \mathcal{M}_i$). Recall that $\mathbf{h}_v^{(\ell)}$ depends on all $\mathbf{h}^{(\ell-1)}$ of v ’s one-hop neighbors, which, similarly, depend on the $\mathbf{h}^{(\ell-2)}$ of all v ’s two-hop neighbors. Due to the recursive dependency, to calculate $\mathbf{h}_v^{(\mathcal{L})}$ s.t. $v \in \mathcal{M}_i$, the GPU needs to load the vertex data (i.e., $\mathbf{h}^{(0)}$) of the \mathcal{L} -hop subgraph of v , and then calculate $\mathbf{h}^{(1)}, \mathbf{h}^{(2)}, \dots, \mathbf{h}^{(\mathcal{L})}$ sequentially. For an example, assume that 2 GPUs are used to process the graph shown in Figure 2, and there are two GNN layers ($\mathcal{L} = 2$). GPU 1 is responsible for calculating mini-batch $\mathcal{M}_1 = \{v_0, v_2\}$ while GPU 2 processes mini-batch $\mathcal{M}_2 = \{v_1, v_3\}$. GPU 1 will need to load the 2-hop subgraph of v_0 and v_2 , which is $\{v_0, v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4\}$, while GPU 2 will load the 2-hop subgraph of v_1 and v_3 that consists of $\{v_0, v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4, v_5, v_6\}$. Both GPUs will use the loaded data to calculate their own mini-batches independently. It is important to note that the \mathcal{L} -hop subgraphs of the mini-batches processed by different GPUs are likely to overlap (e.g., the \mathcal{L} -hop subgraph of \mathcal{M}_1 and \mathcal{M}_2 have five overlapped vertices), which fundamentally causes redundant data loading and computation in the mini-batch based training method.




Figure 2: Distributed full-graph GNN training with graph parallelism (the backward pass omitted for simplicity).

2.3 Distributed Full-Graph GNN Training with Graph Parallelism

A more natural and efficient way to implement full-graph training is to explore graph parallelism. In this approach, the graph is partitioned and stored in the memory of each GPU, which is only responsible for processing the local partition. It provides a way to leverage the increasing amount of memory and compute resource.

With \mathcal{M} GPUs, the set of all vertices \mathcal{V} is divided into \mathcal{M} non-overlapping vertices partitions $\mathcal{V}_1, \mathcal{V}_2, \dots, \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{M}}$ such that $\bigcup_{i=1}^{\mathcal{M}} \mathcal{V}_i = \mathcal{V}$. \mathcal{V}_i is called the *inner vertices* [46] of GPU i . Each GPU is responsible for calculating the embeddings and corresponding gradients of its own inner vertices. We define the *boundary vertices* [46] of GPU i as $\mathcal{B}_i = \bigcup_{v \in \mathcal{V}_i} \mathcal{N}(v) - \mathcal{V}_i$, which are the vertices outside \mathcal{V}_i that are \mathcal{V}_i 's directed neighbors. The embeddings of boundary vertices \mathcal{B}_i are necessary to calculate the embeddings of \mathcal{V}_i . Since \mathcal{B}_i 's embeddings are produced by a GPU other than i , they have to be moved from

the remote producer GPU to GPU i , which incurs *cross-GPU communication*.

Figure 2 illustrates the process using an example with three GPUs and a 4-layer GNN. The full graph is divided into three partitions $\mathcal{V}_1 = \{v_0, v_1, v_2\}$, $\mathcal{V}_2 = \{v_3, v_4\}$ and $\mathcal{V}_3 = \{v_5, v_6, v_7\}$. The boundary vertices of each GPU are $\mathcal{B}_1 = \{v_3, v_4\}$, $\mathcal{B}_2 = \{v_1, v_2, v_5, v_6\}$, $\mathcal{B}_3 = \{v_4\}$, respectively. At the beginning of each layer ℓ , GPU i needs to retrieve the previous-layer embeddings of \mathcal{B}_i from other GPUs (i.e., GPU 3 fetches the embeddings $\mathbf{h}_4^{(\ell-1)}$ from GPU 2). Once the cross-GPU communication is completed, each GPU can start calculating $\mathbf{h}_v^{(\ell)}$ locally with $\text{AGGREGATE}^\ell(\cdot)$ and $\text{UPDATE}^\ell(\cdot)$.

Unlike the mini-batch approach, the large number of GNN layers do not make graph parallelism obviously infeasible, since each layer corresponds to an iteration similar to the one in graph processing. However, it is the exceedingly high communication cost that makes graph parallelism fundamentally not scalable for deep GNNs. We will explain the analysis in the next section before introducing the layer-level model parallelism.

3 GNNPipe Approach

3.1 Motivation

The key motivation of this work is the high communication complexity of graph parallelism. According to the discussion earlier, at the beginning of each layer ℓ , GPU i needs to fetch all $\mathbf{h}_v^{(\ell-1)}$ for $v \in \mathcal{B}_i$ from other GPUs. Hence, the total communication cost per layer is $\mathcal{H} \sum_{i=1}^{\mathcal{M}} |\mathcal{B}_i|$ floating points where \mathcal{H} is the hidden dimension. For simplicity, we assumed that the hidden dimensions across all layers are the same. The total communication volume of a forward pass is thus $\mathcal{L} \mathcal{H} \sum_{i=1}^{\mathcal{M}} |\mathcal{B}_i|$ for an \mathcal{L} -layer GNN. The communication cost of the backward pass is the same. The worst case is reached when each vertex outside \mathcal{V}_i is adjacent to at least one vertex in \mathcal{V}_i , i.e., $\mathcal{B}_i = \mathcal{V} - \mathcal{V}_i$, and the communication volume can be as high as $O(\mathcal{L} \mathcal{H} \sum_{i=1}^{\mathcal{M}} (|\mathcal{V}| - |\mathcal{V}_i|)) = O(\mathcal{L} \mathcal{H} |\mathcal{V}| (\mathcal{M} - 1)) = O(\mathcal{L} \mathcal{H} \mathcal{N} \mathcal{M})$ assuming $|\mathcal{V}| = \mathcal{N}$. It means that, *at each layer, all embeddings* produced by a GPU needs to be sent to *all other GPUs*, introducing exceedingly high communication overhead.

Most importantly, while the above communication complexity analysis is based on worst-case scenario, it is not difficult to achieve that in practical setting. In the following, we explain that, even with a *perfect* partitioner, distributed training on a *highly sparse* graph can incur communication cost close to the worst-case complexity. We define the perfect partitioner as one that can partition \mathcal{V} into \mathcal{M} partitions $\mathcal{V}_1, \mathcal{V}_2, \dots, \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{M}}$ with a minimum communication cost while ensuring load balancing (i.e., $|\mathcal{V}_i| \approx \mathcal{N}/\mathcal{M}$ for each i). Consider a random sparse graph model $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ with \mathcal{N} vertices. We assume that, given any pair of vertices $u, v \in \mathcal{V}$, they are directly




Figure 3: Distributed training a 6-layer GNN with model parallelism (the backward pass is omitted for simplicity). The graph is the same as Figure 2.

connected by a probability p independently. Hence, given a vertex $w \notin \mathcal{V}_i$, the probability that it is directly connected to at least one vertex in \mathcal{V}_i is $1 - (1 - p)^{|\mathcal{V}_i|}$. As a result, the expected number of boundary vertices in GPU i is $E[|\mathcal{B}_i|] = (|\mathcal{V}| - |\mathcal{V}_i|)(1 - (1 - p)^{|\mathcal{V}_i|}) \approx (|\mathcal{V}| - |\mathcal{V}_i|)(1 - (1 - p)^{\mathcal{N}/\mathcal{M}})$. With $\mathcal{N} = 10^6$, $\mathcal{M} = 8$, and $p = 2 \times 10^{-5}$ (the average degree is 20), $E[|\mathcal{B}_i|] \approx 0.92(|\mathcal{V}| - |\mathcal{V}_i|)$, which is very close to $|\mathcal{V}| - |\mathcal{V}_i|$ in the worst-case.

3.2 Solution: Layer-Level Model Parallelism

To avoid the large communication overhead in graph parallelism, we propose to exploit layer-level model parallelism [28] for distributed GNN training. Unlike graph parallelism, the model parallelism partitions layers rather than the graph, and each GPU is responsible to train a subset of consecutive layers. Figure 3 illustrates the idea with an example. The 6-layer GNN is partitioned and distributed among three GPUs; and GPU 1, GPU 2 and GPU 3 train layers 1-2, 3-4, and 5-6, respectively. In this organization, the inter-GPU com-

munication occurs at the layer boundaries: since layer 3 takes the embeddings of all vertices produced by layer 2 as its input, these embeddings will be transferred from GPU 1 to GPU 2 with cross-GPU communication. For deep GNNs [5, 31] with large number of layers, the layer-level model parallelism can naturally expose abundant parallelism in the layer dimension.

This new approach provides two major advantages: *less* communication volume and more *balanced and predictable* communication pattern. In layer-level model parallelism, since the communication occurs at layer boundaries, only embeddings produced by a boundary layer, e.g., layer-2/4 embeddings in Figure 3, need to be transferred, only to *one* remote GPU. The data sent across each layer boundary is $\mathcal{N}\mathcal{H}$ floating point values. Since there are $\mathcal{M} - 1$ layer boundaries, the total communication volume for layer-level model parallelism is $O((\mathcal{M} - 1)\mathcal{N}\mathcal{H}) = O(\mathcal{M}\mathcal{N}\mathcal{H})$, which reduces that of graph parallelism ($O(\mathcal{L}\mathcal{H}\mathcal{N}\mathcal{M})$) by a factor of $O(\mathcal{L})$. Not only that the communication volume is lower for model parallelism, but also the communication pattern is more balanced and predictable, which makes the above complexity precisely capture the worst-case. In comparison, for graph parallelism, in the worst case, all embeddings produced by each layer need to be sent to *all* other GPUs.

The idea of model and pipeline parallelism has been recently proposed and extensively studied in distributed machine learning model training [22, 40]. However, we are not simply applying the idea to yet another scenario since the nature of GNN training inherently brings a unique challenge despite its low communication cost. The key difficulty is the *sequential* execution nature of full-graph GNN training. Specifically, the embeddings need to be calculated in a layer-by-layer manner with the entire graph data: before start calculating the embeddings at the ℓ -th layer, one needs to calculate the $(\ell - 1)$ -layer embeddings first. At the same time, calculating the embeddings for a layer involves performing one-hop information propagation in the whole graph. Thus, based on the sequential execution paradigm, model parallelism will suffer from the resource under-utilization. For the example in Figure 3, GPU 3 cannot start calculating the embeddings of layer 5-6 until the embeddings after the first four layers are produced. As a result, the utilization of GPU 3 is only 33%. In a nutshell, there is no true parallelism due to the layer-by-layer paradigm—none of the GPUs are performing the computation concurrently.




Figure 4: The Pipelining Method

The readers may wonder why it is not an issue in recent

work. For non-GNN neural network models, the training samples are *independent*, thanks to this property, the resource under-utilization problem can be avoided by letting each GPU concurrently processing different layers on different training samples with delicate scheduling [22, 34, 40, 41]. For example, in GPipe [22], the training samples are split into multiple “micro-batches” (e.g., $B1 - B5$ in Figure 4) and fed to the GPUs in a pipelined fashion. As a result, after the pipeline is filled—preferably during most of the execution time—the GPUs can concurrently process different layers on different micro-batches, leading to a higher GPU utilization and parallelism. For example, in Figure 4, at time interval $T3$, GPU 1, 2, and 3 concurrently processes micro-batches $B3$, $B2$ and $B1$, respectively.

Algorithm 1 The chunk-based pipelining algorithm with embedding staleness on GPU i .

```

1: Input: The graph  $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ , the number of epochs  $\mathcal{T}$ , the layers
   assigned to the current GPU  $\ell_i^{begin} - \ell_i^{end}$ , the number of chunks  $\mathcal{K}$ , the
   learning rate  $\eta$ , the initial weights  $\mathbf{W}^{(\ell_i^{begin}, 0)}$ ,  $\mathbf{W}^{(\ell_i^{begin} + 1, 0)}$ ,  $\mathbf{W}^{(\ell_i^{begin} + 2, 0)}$ ,
   ...,  $\mathbf{W}^{(\ell_i^{end}, 0)}$ .
2: Output: The trained model parameters  $\mathbf{W}^{(\ell_i^{begin}, \mathcal{T})}$ ,  $\mathbf{W}^{(\ell_i^{begin} + 1, \mathcal{T})}$ ,
    $\mathbf{W}^{(\ell_i^{begin} + 2, \mathcal{T})}$ , ...,  $\mathbf{W}^{(\ell_i^{end}, \mathcal{T})}$ 
3: partition  $\mathcal{V}$  into  $\mathcal{K}$  chunks, denoted as  $C_1, C_2, \dots, C_{\mathcal{K}}$ 
4: for  $t \leftarrow 1 \dots \mathcal{T}$  do
5:   SyncAllGPUs() // wait until all other GPUs enter the same epoch
6:   // start the forward pass pipeline
7:    $\mathcal{V}_{processed} \leftarrow \emptyset$ 
8:   for  $k \leftarrow 1 \dots \mathcal{K}$  do
9:      $\mathcal{V}_{processed} \leftarrow \mathcal{V}_{processed} \cup C_k$ 
10:    if  $i > 1$  then
11:      receive all embeddings  $\mathbf{h}_v^{(\ell_i^{begin} - 1, t)}$  ( $v \in C_k$ ) from GPU  $i - 1$ 
12:    end if
13:    for  $\ell \leftarrow \ell_i^{begin} \dots \ell_i^{end}$  do
14:      for  $v \in C_k$  do
15:         $\mathbf{z}_v^{(\ell, t)} \leftarrow \text{AGGREGATE}^{(\ell)}(\{\mathbf{h}_u^{(\ell-1, t)} \mid u \in \mathcal{N}(v) \cap \mathcal{V}_{processed}\} \cup$ 
           $\{\mathbf{h}_u^{(\ell-1, t-1)} \mid u \in \mathcal{N}(v) - \mathcal{V}_{processed}\})$ 
16:         $\mathbf{h}_v^{(\ell, t)} \leftarrow \text{UPDATE}^{(\ell)}(\mathbf{h}_v^{(\ell-1, t)}, \mathbf{z}_v^{(\ell, t)})$ 
17:      end for
18:    end for
19:    if  $i < \mathcal{K}$  then
20:      send all embeddings  $\mathbf{h}_v^{(\ell_i^{end}, t)}$  ( $v \in C_k$ ) to GPU  $i + 1$ 
21:    end if
22:  end for
23:  // start the backward pass pipeline to calculate gradients  $\nabla \mathbf{W}^{(\ell_i^{begin}, t-1)}$ ,
   ...,  $\nabla \mathbf{W}^{(\ell_i^{end}, t-1)}$ ; similar to the forward pass; omitted for simplicity
24:   $\mathbf{W}^{(\ell, t)} \leftarrow \mathbf{W}^{(\ell, t-1)} - \eta \nabla \mathbf{W}^{(\ell, t-1)}$  for  $\ell \in [\ell_i^{begin}, \ell_i^{end}]$  // update the
   model weights
25: end for

```

This challenge is unique for GNNs because the training data is inherently *dependent*—the vertices are connected to each other in the graph. Assume we take the similar approach as GPipe and split the graph vertices into 5 micro-batches and schedule them as in Figure 4, a vertex in $B1$ may have some neighbors in different micro-batches among $B3$, $B4$, and $B5$. Thus, calculating the layer-2 embeddings of $B1$ may require some layer-1 embeddings of $B3 - B5$ of the current epoch.

However, when GPU 2 schedules the calculation of $B1$'s layer-2 embeddings at time interval $T2$, the layer-1 embeddings of $B3 - B5$ have not been produced yet. In the following two sections, we present our solution to achieve parallelism and training efficiency at the same time.

3.3 Graph Chunks with Embedding Staleness

To tackle the challenge, we propose to slightly trade the training (statistical) efficiency for high execution efficiency by allowing the use of *stale* historical embeddings—embeddings from a previous epoch [3, 11]—for pipelined model parallelism. During the execution, if the calculation of an embedding $\mathbf{h}_v^{(\ell)}$ (ℓ is the GNN layer) requires some embeddings $\mathbf{h}_u^{(\ell-1)}$ ($u \in \mathcal{N}(v)$) (u is a neighbor of v) that have not been produced, we use $\mathbf{h}_u^{(\ell-1)}$'s value from the previous epoch to calculate $\mathbf{h}_v^{(\ell)}$, rather than stalling the pipeline to wait for the value of $\mathbf{h}_u^{(\ell-1)}$ to be produced in the current epoch.

By introducing stale historical embeddings in pipelined execution we derive a new GNN distributed training algorithm shown in Algorithm 1 based on layer-level model parallelism. For clarity, we denote the layer- ℓ embedding of vertex v produced in the t -th epoch as $\mathbf{h}_v^{(\ell, t)}$; and the ℓ -layer model weights at the end of epoch t as $\mathbf{W}^{(\ell, t)}$. At the beginning (line 3), we partition the vertex set \mathcal{V} into \mathcal{K} chunks, which are similar to the micro-batches in GPipe. We use a locality-aware partitioner based on METIS [25] for chunk partitioning, and have $\mathcal{K} = 4\mathcal{M}$. In each epoch, among all GPUs, we schedule the execution of the \mathcal{K} chunks in a pipelined manner. Once a GPU i (except for the last GPU) finishes processing a chunk C_k for its assigned layers ($\ell_i^{begin} - \ell_i^{end}$), it immediately sends the boundary embeddings of this chunk to the next GPU $i + 1$ (line 19-21). Once GPU $i + 1$ receives (line 10-12) the embeddings of C_k , it can start processing C_k (line 13-18) while GPU i continues to process C_{k+1} concurrently. In this way, all GPUs can be fully utilized when the pipelined is filled. We track the processed vertices in a variable $\mathcal{V}_{processed}$ (line 9) so that we can determine whether to use historical embeddings. For the calculation of the AGGREGATE function (line 15), if the current-epoch value of a neighbor-vertex embedding $\mathbf{h}_u^{(\ell-1, t)}$ has not been produced, i.e., $u \notin \mathcal{V}_{processed}$, we will use its historical version $\mathbf{h}_u^{(\ell-1, t-1)}$ instead as an approximation.

3.4 Training Techniques

The staleness of historical embeddings may slow down the convergence speed or negatively affect the final model accuracy. To mitigate the negative effects of the staleness of the historical embeddings, we propose three training techniques.

The first technique is *chunk shuffling*, which randomly shuffle the processing order of the chunks at the beginning of each epoch. By shuffling, we can avoid the *systematical asymmetry* across the chunks, e.g., C_1 always suffers from more staleness

compared to $C_{\mathcal{X}}$. As a result, each chunk will get more or less the same staleness during training.

The second technique is *fixing historical embeddings* to improve training consistency. Specifically, in the current epoch, we do not use the most recent previous epoch’s historical embeddings, i.e., $\mathbf{h}_v^{(\ell-1, t-1)}$. Instead, we want to let the chunks in a *range of epochs* to use the *same* stale version of historical embeddings. We can express the technique concisely by introducing a multiplier of α . In epoch t , we use the historical embeddings from epoch $\alpha \lfloor (t-1)/\alpha \rfloor$. For example, if $\alpha = 10$, during epoch 11 – 20, we always use the historical embeddings from epoch 10. Although doing that would seemingly increase the staleness since we used historical embeddings that are not the most recent, in practice, it improves both the convergence speed and the final model accuracy because it allows the chunks to use more consistent historical embeddings.

The last technique is to simply *avoid using historical gradients*. The gradients are accessed in the backward pass similar to how the embeddings are accessed in the forward pass. In the forward pass, the embeddings are propagated from a vertex v ’s neighbor u to v ; while in the backward pass, the gradients are back propagated from v to u . Despite the similarity, we observe that the historical gradients incurred a much larger error than historical embeddings. Thus, we simply omit the historical embedding gradients in the backward pass. When calculating the gradients of a vertex u , if its neighbor vertex v has not been processed yet due to the pipelined execution, we simply replace the gradients flowing from v back to u with zeros.

3.5 Hybrid Parallelism

The cautious readers likely have the lingering concern that with the layer-level model parallelism, while the communication volume is reduced, it cannot support the large graph when the memory of a single GPU cannot accommodate the whole graph. The graph parallelism can naturally handle this scenario. We address this real issue by combining the pipelined model parallelism with graph parallelism, providing a general *hybrid* training approaching that can reduce to layer-level model parallelism as a special case.

The hybrid approach can be supported with the *grouping* mechanism illustrated in Figure 5. The GPUs are grouped into multiple size- G groups with graph parallelism used within each group. To combine with pipeline parallelism, the number of such groups is the same as the number of desired pipeline stages. In this setting, each group handles a single pipeline stage while the GPUs within the same group will process each graph partition with graph parallelism. A given GPU still processes the graph at chunk granularity as described in Section 3.3. Specifically, we can assign the rank to the GPUs in each group, for the GPUs with the *same rank* in all groups, they hold the *same* graph partition, and among these GPUs,

they essentially form a pure layer-level model parallelism pipeline to process that graph partition. Thus, if each group just contains one GPU, the hybrid parallelism degenerates into the layer-level model parallelism. Considering the graph chunks, when a chunk C_k is fed to a pipeline stage, the G GPUs within the corresponding group first partition the chunk into G sub-chunks (the partitioning can be done as a preprocessing step to reduce cost), and each GPU processes a sub-chunk in parallel. Because the GPUs in the same group leverage graph parallelism, they will exchange the boundary vertex embeddings for each layer and hence incur additional graph communication.

In fact, the hybrid parallelism is useful for two other reasons. First, it is needed when we have more GPUs than the number of layers in a shallow GNN—a good GNN training system should work efficiently for both deep and shallow GNNs. Second, it is also needed for the ultra-deep GNNs for two reasons, either we have less number of GPUs than the number of GNN layers, or, in a more subtle case, even with the same number of GPUs as the GNN layers, we may want to use hybrid parallelism if the deep pipeline still affects convergence after applying the aforementioned training techniques.

The hybrid parallelism allows exploiting the trade-offs of the two types of communication. We analyze the actual amount of both communication and show that it depends on both various factors. For the very sparse graphs, the communication volume is far from the worse-case complexity shown before. To perform the analysis, we introduce *replication factor* α , indicating the average number of replicas for a vertex, which captures the number of vertices in the partition boundaries. The replication factor is related to how the graph is partitioned and the number of partitions.

For hybrid parallelism, assume we have S pipeline stages ($S > 1$), all stages have \mathcal{W} graph partitions, the graph has \mathcal{N} vertices, the GNN has \mathcal{H} hidden units, and \mathcal{L} layers. For a system with \mathcal{M} GPUs devoted to GNN training, we assume $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{W}S$. We denote the replication factor in hybrid, graph, and layer-level model parallelism as α_h , α_g , and α_p , respectively. We also denote the number of pipeline stages in hybrid and layer-level model parallelism as S_g and S_p , respectively. For hybrid parallelism, the total cross-GPU communication volume is $2\alpha_h\mathcal{L}\mathcal{N}\mathcal{H} + 2(S_h - 1)\mathcal{N}\mathcal{H}$. The first term captures graph communication, α is determined by graph partition and \mathcal{W} , larger \mathcal{W} leads to larger α . The second term indicates the inter-layer communication. The coefficient 2 counts both forward and backward pass. The communication for graph and layer-level model parallelism is $2\alpha_g\mathcal{L}\mathcal{N}\mathcal{H}$ and $2(S_p - 1)\mathcal{N}\mathcal{H}$, respectively. We can see that they are simply the individual term of the communication volume for hybrid parallelism, indicating that they are both special cases.

We can see that, if $\alpha_g\mathcal{L} < (S_p - 1)$, graph parallelism is better than layer-level model parallelism, it can happen when the graph is very sparse (α_g is very small). The relation be-

tween hybrid parallelism and the other two is more subtle, because the change of setting will affect α . Based on the calculation, if $\alpha_h \mathcal{L} + (\mathcal{S}_h - 1) < \alpha_g \mathcal{L}$, then hybrid is better than graph parallelism. It is possible since the larger number partition in graph parallelism may lead to a larger α_g , making the right-hand side larger even if it just has one term. Similarly, if $\alpha_h \mathcal{L} + (\mathcal{S}_h - 1) < (\mathcal{S}_p - 1)$, hybrid is better than layer-level model parallelism. It is possible because \mathcal{S}_p is larger than \mathcal{S}_g , with certain α_g , it is possible that the right-hand side becomes larger. Based on the above analysis, theoretically, the hybrid parallelism may incur the least communication.

In our experimental results, we indeed see for certain very sparse graphs, graph parallelism is the best, otherwise, layer-level model parallelism wins. We did not encounter a case where hybrid is the best, as we see from the above, it is based on the complex interactions among multiple factors. It is certainly *not* to say that the hybrid is useless, because with new graph data sets with different characteristics and different graph partitioner, such case is indeed possible. Nevertheless, it is important that the system can efficiently support all the three settings for two reasons: (1) when all settings are possible, it allows the trade-offs to be exploited; and more importantly, (2) when the hybrid parallelism is *required* (e.g., graph is too large, more GPUs than layers, or cannot have too deep pipeline), the system can indeed support such execution.




Figure 5: Hybrid parallelism between graph parallel and layer-level model parallelism.

4 Implementation

Mapping computation to GPUs. After the parallelism setting is determined, the system needs to map the computation to the GPUs. Typically, a compute node contains multiple GPUs, and the communication between them tends to be faster than inter-node communication, especially with NVLink. For graph or layer-level model parallelism, the communication pattern between different partitions or pipeline stages is symmetry, thus there is no special considerations when they are mapped to certain GPUs.

For the hybrid parallelism, the GPU grouping policy is




Figure 6: GPU grouping policies for hybrid parallelism.

performance-critical because the communication between graph partitions is usually more intensive and irregular compared to the static and predictable communication pattern of inter-layer communication. To accommodate this observation, a key principle is to maximize the GPU locality within the same group. For example, in Figure 6, to group 8 GPUs from 2 nodes into 2 groups, grouping choice $\{\{1, 2, 3, 4\}, \{5, 6, 7, 8\}\}$ is more preferable than $\{\{1, 3, 5, 7\}, \{2, 4, 6, 8\}\}$. The first grouping choice assign the GPUs from the same node to the same group, which allows the intensive intra-group graph communication go through the much faster intra-node links like PCIe or NVLink.

Implementation details. GNNPipe is implemented in C++ on top of CUDA, cuDNN and cuBLAS with roughly 16K lines of code. We use roughly 5K lines of code to implement different neural network operators needed by GNNs (e.g., Layer Normalization [2]) and SGD-based model optimizers like Adam Optimizer [26], roughly 2K lines of code to implement graph data management, and 8K lines of code to implement the scheduler and the communication subsystem that support three types of parallelism. We use NCCL [23] for inter-GPU communication and use MPI for process management.

5 Experiments

5.1 Experiment Settings

By default, the experiments are evaluated on a testbed with two GPU nodes, each of which contains four NVIDIA A5000 GPUs, two AMD EPYC 7302 16-core CPUs and 256GB DDR4 RAM. The GPUs within the same node are connected with PCIe 4.0x16 while a 200Gbps InfiniBand network is used for cross-node communication.

We use four datasets shown in Table 2, including Squirrel [45], Physics [47], Flickr [65] and Reddit [17]. We also show the replication factors of the datasets (8 partitions with METIS [25]). Squirrel, Flickr and Reddit are rela-

tively densely-connected datasets—their replication factors are more than 2. In contrast, Physics is easier to partition, so its replication factor is small than 1. We choose datasets with various replication factors to analyze the effect of graph properties on our methods. We evaluate GNNPipe with four models: GCN [27], GraphSage [17], GCNII [5], and ResGCN+ [29, 33]. Unless otherwise mentioned, the model depths are set to 32 layers as our approach mostly focuses on deep GNNs. Note that GCN and GraphSage are not originally designed to be deep, thus they do not converge well to a reasonable accuracy with 32 layers. Hence, we only use these two models for performance analysis. GCNII and ResGCN+ are GNN models designed to be deep. Hence we use them for both performance and training accuracy analysis. The numbers of hidden units are 1000 for small graphs (Squirrel) and reduced to 100 for larger datasets (Physics, Flickr and Reddit). We use Adam optimizer [26] to train the models and the learning rate is set to the default value (0.001). The dropout rate is 0.5 and the number of training epoches is 5000. For comparison purpose, we also implemented a baseline with graph parallelism on top of the same software stack. For the baseline and hybrid parallelism, the graphs are partitioned by the METIS partitioner [25] to minimize inter-partition communication. For GNNPipe, we use two settings throughout the evaluation: 1) pure pipelined layer-level model parallelism: the model is divided into 8 pipeline stages with 4 layers in each stage, and each GPU handles one stage; 2) hybrid parallelism: the model is divided into 4 pipeline stages and each stage is handle by two GPUs. The GPUs within the same stages leverage graph parallelism.

Dataset	#Vertices	#Edges	#Features	#Classes	α	Avg.Degree
Squirrel	5.2K	396.7K	2089	5	2.22	76.3
Physics	34.5K	495.9K	8415	5	0.99	14.4
Flickr	89.3K	899.8K	500	7	2.15	10.1
Reddit	233.0K	114.6M	602	41	2.61	491.8

Table 2: Graph datasets, α is the replication factor with 8 partitions.

5.2 Training Efficiencies

Comparing with graph parallelism baseline. We evaluate the training efficiency of GNNPipe by comparing its per-epoch training time with the baseline using graph parallelism in Table 3. On Squirrel, Flickr, and Reddit, GNNPipe (indicated as Pipeline) is able to significantly reduce the per-epoch training time by up to $2.45\times$. The speedups are attributed to the reduction in communication volume thanks to GNNPipe’s lower communication complexity. It is worth noting that the performance of the hybrid parallelism is also better than graph parallelism, but slightly worse than pure pipeline parallelism. It is because of the additional graph-level communication within each size-2 graph parallel group. However, as those additional communication only go through the fast intra-node

links (PCIe 4.0x16) rather than the slower network adapters, the additional communication overhead is not significant.

We also note that on Physics, GNNPipe is slower than the baseline using graph parallelism. It is because the computation workload on the Physics dataset is very lightweight. GNNPipe adopts the chunk-based pipelining method, i.e., it cuts the lightweight workload into multiple small chunks and executes them one by one on GPU. The workload of each chunk is too small (usually less than 10ms), which hurts the GPU utilization and degrade the performance.

Dataset	Model	Graph	Pipeline	Hybrid
Squirrel	GCN	0.19	0.08	0.11
	GraphSage	0.27	0.15	0.19
	GCNII	0.20	0.11	0.14
	ResGCN+	0.27	0.19	0.24
Physics	GCN	0.05	0.07	0.08
	GraphSage	0.07	0.13	0.12
	GCNII	0.06	0.11	0.10
	ResGCN+	0.08	0.14	0.15
Flickr	GCN	0.16	0.06	0.09
	GraphSage	0.17	0.10	0.13
	GCNII	0.17	0.09	0.12
	ResGCN+	0.19	0.16	0.19
Reddit	GCN	0.87	0.36	0.39
	GraphSage	1.08	0.53	0.57
	GCNII	0.90	0.41	0.45
	ResGCN+	0.93	0.51	0.55

Table 3: Comparing the per-epoch training time (unit: s) between the baseline using graph parallelism and GNNPipe (Graph: graph parallelism; Pipeline: layer-level model parallelism with 8 pipeline stages; Hybrid: hybrid parallelism of graph parallel and pipeline parallel with 2 graph parallel ways and 4 pipeline stages).

Comparing with DGL. We also compares GNNPipe (pipelined layer-level model parallel) with DGL [58], a state-of-the-art system supporting mini-batch-based distributed training. We choose two datasets (Squirrel and Flickr) and two models (GCN and GraphSage) for the comparison. Since the evaluated datasets can entirely fit into the GPU memory, we configure DGL so that each GPU has a complete copy of the graph data to eliminate the communication overhead caused by unnecessary graph partitioning. We use the full neighbor sampler to construct the mini-batch so that all edges will be used for each epoch. The batch size is set to 256. We show the results in Table 4. GNNPipe is able to significantly outperform DGL by one order of magnitude. Since we disable graph partitioning for DGL, its performance inferiority is mostly due to the computation redundancy: as discussed earlier in the paper, for deep models, each mini-batch largely overlaps with each other, and hence the computation due to such overlap is performed multiple times.

Communication analysis. We further confirm the communi-

Dataset	Model	DGL	GNNPipe	Speedup
Squirrel	GCN	1.52	0.08	19.0
	GraphSage	1.57	0.15	10.5
Flickr	GCN	3.66	0.06	61.0
	GraphSage	3.98	0.10	39.8

Table 4: Comparing with DGL (unit: s).

cation superiority of GNNPipe by the communication analysis shown in Table 5 and Table 6. GNNPipe with pure pipelined layer-level model parallelism is able to significantly reduce the communication volume and communication overhead by up to $22.89\times$ and $27.21\times$ (on average $8.69\times$ and $11.60\times$), respectively.

Dataset	Model	Graph	Pipeline	Hybrid
Squirrel	GCN	4.43	0.27	1.38
	GraphSage	6.10	0.27	1.61
	GCNII	4.53	0.54	1.51
	ResGCN+	6.20	0.27	1.63
Physics	GCN	0.88	0.18	0.62
	GraphSage	0.94	0.18	0.63
	GCNII	0.88	0.36	0.70
	ResGCN+	0.89	0.18	0.62
Flickr	GCN	4.60	0.47	2.00
	GraphSage	4.62	0.47	2.00
	GCNII	4.60	0.93	2.19
	ResGCN+	4.62	0.47	2.00
Reddit	GCN	14.50	1.22	5.87
	GraphSage	14.52	1.22	5.87
	GCNII	14.50	2.43	6.39
	ResGCN+	14.52	1.22	5.87

Table 5: Comparing the per-epoch communication volume (unit: GB) between the baseline using graph parallelism and GNNPipe.

It is worth noting that sometimes the reduction in communication time is even more significant than the reduction in communication volume. For example, for GCN on Reddit, GNNPipe with pipeline parallelism reduces the communication overhead by $24.7\times$ while the communication volume is only reduced by $11.9\times$. This indicates that the communication pattern of the pipelined layer-level model parallelism is more efficient and simpler than graph parallelism: each GPU only needs to send the data to one other GPU. By comparison, for graph parallelism, one GPU usually needs to send data to all other GPUs concurrently, which can easily over-utilize some slow bottleneck links (e.g., inter-node links) and hence hurt the overall communication efficiency.

5.3 Scalability

We analyze the scalability of GNNPipe by using various numbers of GPUs to train the 32-layer models on Reddit, and

show the results in Figure 7. The missing data points (e.g., the 2-GPU result of ResGCN+ with graph parallelism) are due to out-of-GPU-memory errors. For all evaluated models, GNNPipe with pipelined layer-level model parallelism exhibits better scalability than the graph-parallel baseline. For example, for GCN, with graph parallelism, using 16 GPUs (0.85s) is only $1.43\times$ faster than using 2 GPUs (1.22s). In contrast, with GNNPipe, scaling from 2 GPUs (1.11s) to 16 GPUs (0.26s) leads to a speedup of $4.3\times$.

Dataset	Model	Graph	Pipeline	Hybrid
Squirrel	GCN	113.75	7.54	26.03
	GraphSage	123.11	7.82	31.05
	GCNII	113.36	12.02	30.78
	ResGCN+	115.16	8.00	32.14
Flickr	GCN	124.32	8.13	33.38
	GraphSage	123.52	9.60	33.69
	GCNII	123.90	14.79	38.39
	ResGCN+	124.38	11.11	35.73
Reddit	GCN	634.01	25.66	78.86
	GraphSage	714.09	26.24	82.21
	GCNII	636.00	42.12	96.77
	ResGCN+	637.51	26.41	85.53
Physics	GCN	36.04	5.96	21.47
	GraphSage	36.93	6.13	23.58
	GCNII	36.47	10.95	25.98
	ResGCN+	37.40	6.19	24.63

Table 6: Comparing the per-epoch communication overhead (unit: ms) between the baseline using graph parallelism and GNNPipe.

5.4 Execution Time Breakdown

We also present the execution time breakdown of GNNPipe and the baseline in Figure 8. We use three datasets (Squirrel, Flickr, and Reddit) and three models (GCNII, GCN, and GraphSage) for the analysis. Compared to the baseline using graph parallelism, whose training time is dominated by the communication overhead (on average 66.5%), GNNPipe only spends 9.5% on average on communication while its training time is dominated by actual computation (on average 62.5%), indicating a better resource utilization. We also note that the pipelining introduces a bubble overhead of 26.5% (on average). The bubble overhead may be reduced by adopting a more advanced pipelining technique [34, 40] other than GPipe. We leave reducing the bubble overhead as our future work.

5.5 Sensitivity Study on Model Depth

We also conducted sensitivity tests on the model depth to see how it affects the communication volume of GNNPipe (layer-level model parallelism) and the baseline using graph




Figure 7: Scalability Analysis.




Figure 8: Training time breakdown analysis.

parallelism. The results are shown in Table 7. The communication of the baseline increase almost linearly with the model depth while that of GNNPipe stays unchanged. For example, on the Physics dataset, when the model depth is 8, the communication volume of the baseline is less than GNNPipe. However, as the model depth increases to 128, the communication volume increases to 3.38GB, which is 9.4x larger than our system. This observation is consistent with our analysis in Section 3.2: the communication complexity of layer-level model parallelism is independent of the model depth.

Dataset	Model Depth	8	16	32	64	128
Squirrel	Graph Comm. (GB)	1.22	2.32	4.53	8.95	17.80
	Pipeline Comm. (GB)	0.54				
Physics	Graph Comm. (GB)	0.25	0.46	0.88	1.71	3.38
	Pipeline Comm. (GB)	0.36				

Table 7: GNNPipe’s per-epoch communication volume with various model depth (model: GCNII).

5.6 GNN Convergence and Accuracy Analysis

Comparing with graph parallelism. We analyze the model convergence speed and the model accuracy in Figure 9 for GCNII and ResGCN+ on all datasets. We omit GCN and GraphSage since they usually cannot converge to a reasonable accuracy with 32 layers, as they are not designed to be deep at the algorithm level. We note that in spite of the staleness introduced among chunks in the pipeline, the model

can converge with a similar number of epochs to the baseline using graph parallelism (or even fewer epochs at times), and achieve a comparable level of final model accuracy across all dataset-model combinations. This indicates that, in practice, GNNPipe does not hurt the model convergence while achieving a better training efficiency.

Analyzing the training techniques. We further analyze the three training techniques in Section 3.4 that aim to improve training stability. We compare the training curve of GNNPipe with four of its variants with one or all training techniques disabled. We perform the analysis on Squirrel, Flickr and Reddit with the GCNII model and the results are presented in Figure 10. The version with all training techniques always outperforms all other variants. It converges at the fastest speed, exhibits the best training stability (i.e., less fluctuation), and achieves the highest final model accuracy. We find out that the third training technique (avoiding using historical gradients) is the most helpful one. In practice, we observe that the gradients of vertex embeddings vary significantly across epochs. Hence, using the historical gradients in the backward pipelining incurs non-negligible staleness, which causes significant accuracy drop periodically and prevents the model from convergence.

Model	Graph Parallel		Hybrid Parallel	
	Time (ms)	Comm. (GB)	Time (ms)	Comm. (GB)
GCN	107	1.815	86	1.530
GraphSage	112	1.819	94	1.532
GCNII	112	1.816	99	1.704
ResGCN+	117	1.818	104	1.532

Table 8: Comparing the per-epoch training time (unit: ms) and communication volume (unit: GB) of hybrid parallelism (with 2 pipeline stages) with graph parallelism on shallow models (4-layer models, dataset: Reddit).

5.7 Hybrid Parallelism on Shallow GNNs

We also analyze the performance of hybrid parallelism on shallow GNNs, for which pure pipelined layer-level model parallelism does not apply since the number of layers is smaller than the number of GPUs. We choose to evaluate 4-layer models on the Reddit dataset, and report the results in Table 8. Hybrid parallelism outperforms graph parallelism for all models on Reddit by 1.17x on average since it incurs less communication cost. It is because although introducing extra layer-level communication, hybrid parallelism partitions the graph into fewer parts, and hence reduces the replication factor and the graph communication. This may leads to a lower overall communication cost.




Figure 9: Compared to the baseline using graph parallelism, GNNPipe with layer-level model parallelism can converge at a similar or faster speed and achieve a comparable (sometimes even higher) level of model accuracy.




Figure 10: Effect of training techniques (GCNII).

6 Related Works

Distributed Graph Processing. Distributed graph processing systems [6, 8, 9, 15, 16, 38, 70, 71] are designed for traditional message-propagation graph analytics workloads like BFS and PageRank in a graph-parallel manner. Although these systems usually provide a flexible programming interface, it is hard to implement GNN-based graph workloads on them since they in general lack neural network supports, e.g., support to tensor operations and automatic differentiation.

Distributed GNN Training. Distributed systems and libraries tailored for GNN workloads can be roughly classified into two categories. The first category includes those leverage graph-level parallelism for *full-graph* training. NeuGraph [37] is one of the earliest distributed GNN systems. ROC [24] attempts to improve the training scalability. G3 [57] and Dorylus [52] also divide the GNN workload into small chunks for training and exploits pipeline parallelism. How-

ever, they *pipeline the communication and computation* of these chunks to hide communication cost, which is different from the pipelining among chunks at layer-level in our approach. Each GPU (in G3) or graph server (in Dorylus) still focuses on *all layers* of one graph partition, and hence suffers from the communication issue of the graph parallelism. A lot of recent works also try to reduce or hide the massive graph-level communication cost [39, 42, 54–56, 60]. Compared to these systems or methods, GNNPipe proposes to exploit a *new dimension* of parallelism for GNN training with a lower worst-case communication complexity. The second category includes distributed variants of the sampling-based method [12, 13, 35, 43, 49, 63, 66–68]: each GPU processes small randomly sampled subgraphs concurrently. These works mostly focus on improving the efficiency of subgraph sampling.

Pipelined Model Parallelism. GPipe [22] and PipeDream [40] are the first two works that apply pipelining to improve GPU utilization for model parallelism distributed training. GPipe [22] proposes to divide a mini-batch into multiple micro-batches and execute the micro-batches in a pipelined manner. More sophisticated pipelining methods are proposed later to reduce pipeline bubbles [34, 40], reduce memory consumption [41], and improves system efficiency [10]. However, these existing works apply to non-GNN models like CNN, which do not have complicated inter-sample dependencies (i.e., inter-sample edges for GNN models). To the best of our knowledge, GNNPipe is the *first* approach that points out the advantage of pipelined model parallelism in terms of communication complexity for distributed GNN training, and provides an effective method using pipelined layer-level model parallelism training method that outperforms graph parallelism.

7 Conclusion

This paper proposes *GNNPipe*, a new approach that scales the distributed full-graph *deep* GNN training. Being the first to adopt layer-level model parallelism for GNN training, *GNNPipe* partitions GNN layers among GPUs, each device is responsible for performing the computation for a disjoint subset of consecutive GNN layers on the whole graph. Compared to graph parallelism with each GPU handling a graph partition, *GNNPipe* reduces the communication volume by a factor of the number of GNN layers. *GNNPipe* overcomes the unique challenges for pipelined layer-level model parallelism on the whole graph by partitioning it into potentially dependent chunks, allowing the use of historical vertex embeddings, and specific training techniques to ensure convergence. Extensive experiments show that our approach significantly speedups distributed GNN training compared to graph parallelism while achieving a comparable level of model accuracy and convergence speed.

References

- [1] NVLink and NVSwitch for Advanced Multi-GPU Communication. <https://www.nvidia.com/en-us/data-center/nvlink/>.
- [2] Jimmy Lei Ba, Jamie Ryan Kiros, and Geoffrey E Hinton. Layer normalization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1607.06450*, 2016.
- [3] Jianfei Chen, Jun Zhu, and Le Song. Stochastic training of graph convolutional networks with variance reduction. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 942–950. PMLR, 2018.
- [4] Jie Chen, Tengfei Ma, and Cao Xiao. Fastgcn: Fast learning with graph convolutional networks via importance sampling. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2018.
- [5] Ming Chen, Zhewei Wei, Zengfeng Huang, Bolin Ding, and Yaliang Li. Simple and deep graph convolutional networks. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 1725–1735. PMLR, 2020.
- [6] Rong Chen, Jiaxin Shi, Yanzhe Chen, Binyu Zang, Haibing Guan, and Haibo Chen. Powerlyra: Differentiated graph computation and partitioning on skewed graphs. *ACM Transactions on Parallel Computing (TOPC)*, 5(3):1–39, 2019.
- [7] Wei-Lin Chiang, Xuanqing Liu, Si Si, Yang Li, Samy Bengio, and Cho-Jui Hsieh. Cluster-gcn: An efficient algorithm for training deep and large graph convolutional networks. In *Proceedings of the 25th ACM SIGKDD international conference on knowledge discovery & data mining*, pages 257–266, 2019.
- [8] Roshan Dathathri, Gurbinder Gill, Loc Hoang, Hoang-Vu Dang, Alex Brooks, Nikoli Dryden, Marc Snir, and Keshav Pingali. Gluon: A communication-optimizing substrate for distributed heterogeneous graph analytics. In *Proceedings of the 39th ACM SIGPLAN conference on programming language design and implementation*, pages 752–768, 2018.
- [9] Roshan Dathathri, Gurbinder Gill, Loc Hoang, Vishwesh Jatala, Keshav Pingali, V Krishna Nandivada, Hoang-Vu Dang, and Marc Snir. Gluon-async: A bulk-asynchronous system for distributed and heterogeneous graph analytics. In *2019 28th International Conference on Parallel Architectures and Compilation Techniques (PACT)*, pages 15–28. IEEE, 2019.
- [10] Shiqing Fan, Yi Rong, Chen Meng, Zongyan Cao, Siyu Wang, Zhen Zheng, Chuan Wu, Guoping Long, Jun Yang, Lixue Xia, et al. Dapple: A pipelined data parallel approach for training large models. In *Proceedings of the 26th ACM SIGPLAN Symposium on Principles and Practice of Parallel Programming*, pages 431–445, 2021.
- [11] Matthias Fey, Jan E Lenssen, Frank Weichert, and Jure Leskovec. Gnnautoscale: Scalable and expressive graph neural networks via historical embeddings. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 3294–3304. PMLR, 2021.
- [12] Matthias Fey and Jan Eric Lenssen. Fast graph representation learning with pytorch geometric. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1903.02428*, 2019.
- [13] Swapnil Gandhi and Anand Padmanabha Iyer. P3: Distributed deep graph learning at scale. In *OSDI*, pages 551–568, 2021.
- [14] Justin Gilmer, Samuel S Schoenholz, Patrick F Riley, Oriol Vinyals, and George E Dahl. Neural message passing for quantum chemistry. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 1263–1272. PMLR, 2017.
- [15] Joseph E Gonzalez, Yucheng Low, Haijie Gu, Danny Bickson, and Carlos Guestrin. Powergraph: Distributed graph-parallel computation on natural graphs. In *10th USENIX symposium on operating systems design and implementation (OSDI 12)*, pages 17–30, 2012.
- [16] Joseph E Gonzalez, Reynold S Xin, Ankur Dave, Daniel Crankshaw, Michael J Franklin, and Ion Stoica. GraphX: Graph processing in a distributed dataflow framework. In *11th USENIX symposium on operating systems design and implementation (OSDI 14)*, pages 599–613, 2014.

- [17] Will Hamilton, Zhitao Ying, and Jure Leskovec. Inductive representation learning on large graphs. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30, 2017.
- [18] William L Hamilton. Graph representation learning. *Synthesis Lectures on Artificial Intelligence and Machine Learning*, 14(3):1–159, 2020.
- [19] Arman Hasanzadeh, Ehsan Hajiramezani, Shahin Boluki, Mingyuan Zhou, Nick Duffield, Krishna Narayanan, and Xiaoning Qian. Bayesian graph neural networks with adaptive connection sampling. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 4094–4104. PMLR, 2020.
- [20] Kaiming He, Xiangyu Zhang, Shaoqing Ren, and Jian Sun. Deep residual learning for image recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 770–778, 2016.
- [21] Gao Huang, Zhuang Liu, Laurens Van Der Maaten, and Kilian Q Weinberger. Densely connected convolutional networks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 4700–4708, 2017.
- [22] Yanping Huang, Youlong Cheng, Ankur Bapna, Orhan Firat, Dehao Chen, Mia Chen, HyoukJoong Lee, Jiquan Ngiam, Quoc V Le, Yonghui Wu, et al. Gpipe: Efficient training of giant neural networks using pipeline parallelism. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 32, 2019.
- [23] Sylvain Jeaugey. Nccl 2.0. In *GPU Technology Conference (GTC)*, volume 2, 2017.
- [24] Zhihao Jia, Sina Lin, Mingyu Gao, Matei Zaharia, and Alex Aiken. Improving the accuracy, scalability, and performance of graph neural networks with roc. *Proceedings of Machine Learning and Systems*, 2:187–198, 2020.
- [25] George Karypis and Vipin Kumar. Metis: A software package for partitioning unstructured graphs, partitioning meshes, and computing fill-reducing orderings of sparse matrices. 1997.
- [26] Diederik P Kingma and Jimmy Ba. Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6980*, 2014.
- [27] Thomas N Kipf and Max Welling. Semi-supervised classification with graph convolutional networks. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2017.
- [28] Alex Krizhevsky. One weird trick for parallelizing convolutional neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1404.5997*, 2014.
- [29] Guohao Li, Matthias Müller, Bernard Ghanem, and Vladlen Koltun. Training graph neural networks with 1000 layers. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 6437–6449. PMLR, 2021.
- [30] Guohao Li, Matthias Müller, Guocheng Qian, Itzel Carolina Delgadillo Perez, Abdulellah Abualshour, Ali Kassem Thabet, and Bernard Ghanem. Deepgcns: Making gcns go as deep as cnns. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 2021.
- [31] Guohao Li, Matthias Müller, Ali Thabet, and Bernard Ghanem. Deepgcns: Can gcns go as deep as cnns? In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, pages 9267–9276, 2019.
- [32] Guohao Li, Matthias Müller, Bernard Ghanem, and Vladlen Koltun. Training graph neural networks with 1000 layers. In *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*, 2021.
- [33] Guohao Li, Chenxin Xiong, Ali Thabet, and Bernard Ghanem. Deeppergn: All you need to train deeper gcns. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.07739*, 2020.
- [34] Shigang Li and Torsten Hoefler. Chimera: efficiently training large-scale neural networks with bidirectional pipelines. In *Proceedings of the International Conference for High Performance Computing, Networking, Storage and Analysis*, pages 1–14, 2021.
- [35] Tianfeng Liu, Yangrui Chen, Dan Li, Chuan Wu, Yibo Zhu, Jun He, Yanghua Peng, Hongzheng Chen, Hongzhi Chen, and Chuanxiong Guo. 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)*, pages 103–118, 2023.
- [36] Zhaoyu Lou, Jiaxuan You, Chengtao Wen, Arquimedes Canedo, Jure Leskovec, et al. Neural subgraph matching. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.03092*, 2020.
- [37] Lingxiao Ma, Zhi Yang, Youshan Miao, Jilong Xue, Ming Wu, Lidong Zhou, and Yafei Dai. Neugraph: Parallel deep neural network computation on large graphs. In *USENIX Annual Technical Conference*, pages 443–458, 2019.
- [38] Grzegorz Malewicz, Matthew H Austern, Aart JC Bik, James C Dehnert, Ian Horn, Naty Leiser, and Grzegorz Czajkowski. Pregel: a system for large-scale graph processing. In *Proceedings of the 2010 ACM SIGMOD International Conference on Management of data*, pages 135–146, 2010.

- [39] Hesham Mostafa. Sequential aggregation and rematerialization: Distributed full-batch training of graph neural networks on large graphs. *Proceedings of Machine Learning and Systems*, 4:265–275, 2022.
- [40] Deepak Narayanan, Aaron Harlap, Amar Phanishayee, Vivek Seshadri, Nikhil R Devanur, Gregory R Ganger, Phillip B Gibbons, and Matei Zaharia. Pipedream: Generalized pipeline parallelism for dnn training. In *Proceedings of the 27th ACM Symposium on Operating Systems Principles*, pages 1–15, 2019.
- [41] Deepak Narayanan, Amar Phanishayee, Kaiyu Shi, Xie Chen, and Matei Zaharia. Memory-efficient pipeline-parallel dnn training. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 7937–7947. PMLR, 2021.
- [42] Jingshu Peng, Zhao Chen, Yingxia Shao, Yanyan Shen, Lei Chen, and Jiannong Cao. Sancus: staleness-aware communication-avoiding full-graph decentralized training in large-scale graph neural networks. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment*, 15(9):1937–1950, 2022.
- [43] Sandeep Polisetty, Juelin Liu, Kobi Falus, Yi Ren Fung, Seung-Hwan Lim, Hui Guan, and Marco Serafini. Gsplit: Scaling graph neural network training on large graphs via split-parallelism. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.13775*, 2023.
- [44] Yu Rong, Wenbing Huang, Tingyang Xu, and Junzhou Huang. Dropedge: Towards deep graph convolutional networks on node classification. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.10903*, 2019.
- [45] Benedek Rozemberczki, Carl Allen, and Rik Sarkar. Multi-scale attributed node embedding. *Journal of Complex Networks*, 9(2):cnab014, 2021.
- [46] Yingxia Shao, Hongzheng Li, Xizhi Gu, Hongbo Yin, Yawen Li, Xupeng Miao, Wentao Zhang, Bin Cui, and Lei Chen. Distributed graph neural network training: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.00216*, 2022.
- [47] Oleksandr Shchur, Maximilian Mumme, Aleksandar Bojchevski, and Stephan Günnemann. Pitfalls of graph neural network evaluation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1811.05868*, 2018.
- [48] Karen Simonyan and Andrew Zisserman. Very deep convolutional networks for large-scale image recognition. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1409.1556*, 2014.
- [49] Jie Sun, Li Su, Zuocheng Shi, Wenting Shen, Zeke Wang, Lei Wang, Jie Zhang, Yong Li, Wenyuan Yu, Jingren Zhou, and Fei Wu. Legion: Automatically pushing the envelope of Multi-GPU system for Billion-Scale GNN training. In *2023 USENIX Annual Technical Conference (USENIX ATC 23)*, pages 165–179, Boston, MA, July 2023. USENIX Association.
- [50] Christian Szegedy, Wei Liu, Yangqing Jia, Pierre Sermanet, Scott Reed, Dragomir Anguelov, Dumitru Erhan, Vincent Vanhoucke, and Andrew Rabinovich. Going deeper with convolutions. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 1–9, 2015.
- [51] Christian Szegedy, Vincent Vanhoucke, Sergey Ioffe, Jon Shlens, and Zbigniew Wojna. Rethinking the inception architecture for computer vision. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 2818–2826, 2016.
- [52] John Thorpe, Yifan Qiao, Jonathan Eyolfson, Shen Teng, Guanzhou Hu, Zhihao Jia, Jinliang Wei, Keval Vora, Ravi Netravali, Miryung Kim, et al. 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)*, pages 495–514, 2021.
- [53] Petar Veličković, Guillem Cucurull, Arantxa Casanova, Adriana Romero, Pietro Liò, and Yoshua Bengio. Graph attention networks. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2018.
- [54] Borui Wan, Juntao Zhao, and Chuan Wu. Adaptive message quantization and parallelization for distributed full-graph gnn training. *Proceedings of Machine Learning and Systems*, 5, 2023.
- [55] Cheng Wan, Youjie Li, Ang Li, Nam Sung Kim, and Yingyan Lin. Bns-gcn: Efficient full-graph training of graph convolutional networks with partition-parallelism and random boundary node sampling. *Proceedings of Machine Learning and Systems*, 4:673–693, 2022.
- [56] Cheng Wan, Youjie Li, Cameron R Wolfe, Anastasios Kyriillidis, Nam Sung Kim, and Yingyan Lin. Pipegcn: Efficient full-graph training of graph convolutional networks with pipelined feature communication. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022.
- [57] Xinchun Wan, Kaiqiang Xu, Xudong Liao, Yilun Jin, Kai Chen, and Xin Jin. Scalable and efficient full-graph gnn training for large graphs. *Proceedings of the ACM on Management of Data*, 1(2):1–23, 2023.
- [58] Minjie Wang, Da Zheng, Zihao Ye, Quan Gan, Mufei Li, Xiang Song, Jinjing Zhou, Chao Ma, Lingfan Yu, Yu Gai, et al. Deep graph library: A graph-centric, highly-performant package for graph neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.01315*, 2019.
- [59] Yue Wang, Yongbin Sun, Ziwei Liu, Sanjay E Sarma, Michael M Bronstein, and Justin M Solomon. Dynamic

- graph cnn for learning on point clouds. *Acm Transactions On Graphics (tog)*, 38(5):1–12, 2019.
- [60] Yuke Wang, Boyuan Feng, Zheng Wang, Tong Geng, Kevin Barker, Ang Li, and Yufei Ding. {MGG}: Accelerating graph neural networks with {Fine-Grained}{Intra-Kernel}{Communication-Computation} pipelining on {Multi-GPU} platforms. In *17th USENIX Symposium on Operating Systems Design and Implementation (OSDI 23)*, pages 779–795, 2023.
- [61] Keyulu Xu, Weihua Hu, Jure Leskovec, and Stefanie Jegelka. How powerful are graph neural networks? In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2019.
- [62] Keyulu Xu, Chengtao Li, Yonglong Tian, Tomohiro Sonobe, Ken-ichi Kawarabayashi, and Stefanie Jegelka. Representation learning on graphs with jumping knowledge networks. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 5453–5462. PMLR, 2018.
- [63] Jianbang Yang, Dahai Tang, Xiaoni Song, Lei Wang, Qiang Yin, Rong Chen, Wenyuan Yu, and Jingren Zhou. Gnnlab: a factored system for sample-based gnn training over gpus. In *Proceedings of the Seventeenth European Conference on Computer Systems*, pages 417–434, 2022.
- [64] Hanqing Zeng, Muhan Zhang, Yinglong Xia, Ajitesh Srivastava, Andrey Malevich, Rajgopal Kannan, Viktor Prasanna, Long Jin, and Ren Chen. Decoupling the depth and scope of graph neural networks. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:19665–19679, 2021.
- [65] Hanqing Zeng, Hongkuan Zhou, Ajitesh Srivastava, Rajgopal Kannan, and Viktor Prasanna. Graphsaint: Graph sampling based inductive learning method. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2020.
- [66] Xin Zhang, Yanyan Shen, Yingxia Shao, and Lei Chen. Ducati: A dual-cache training system for graph neural networks on giant graphs with the gpu. *Proceedings of the ACM on Management of Data*, 1(2):1–24, 2023.
- [67] Chenguang Zheng, Hongzhi Chen, Yuxuan Cheng, Zhezhen Song, Yifan Wu, Changji Li, James Cheng, Hao Yang, and Shuai Zhang. Bytegenn: efficient graph neural network training at large scale. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment*, 15(6):1228–1242, 2022.
- [68] Da Zheng, Chao Ma, Minjie Wang, Jinjing Zhou, Qidong Su, Xiang Song, Quan Gan, Zheng Zhang, and George Karypis. Distdgl: distributed graph neural network training for billion-scale graphs. In *2020 IEEE/ACM 10th Workshop on Irregular Applications: Architectures and Algorithms (IA3)*, pages 36–44. IEEE, 2020.
- [69] Kaixiong Zhou, Xiao Huang, Yuening Li, Daochen Zha, Rui Chen, and Xia Hu. Towards deeper graph neural networks with differentiable group normalization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.06972*, 2020.
- [70] Xiaowei Zhu, Wenguang Chen, Weimin Zheng, and Xiaosong Ma. Gemini: A computation-centric distributed graph processing system. In *12th USENIX Symposium on Operating Systems Design and Implementation (OSDI 16)*, pages 301–316, 2016.
- [71] Youwei Zhuo, Jingji Chen, Gengyu Rao, Qinyi Luo, Yanzhi Wang, Hailong Yang, Depei Qian, and Xuehai Qian. Distributed graph processing system and processing-in-memory architecture with precise loop-carried dependency guarantee. *ACM Transactions on Computer Systems (TOCS)*, 37(1-4):1–37, 2021.
- [72] Difan Zou, Ziniu Hu, Yewen Wang, Song Jiang, Yizhou Sun, and Quanquan Gu. Layer-dependent importance sampling for training deep and large graph convolutional networks. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 32, 2019.