

# Efficient and Effective Similarity Search over Bipartite Graphs

Renchi Yang\*

renchi@hkbu.edu.hk

Hong Kong Baptist University

## ABSTRACT

Similarity search over a bipartite graph aims to retrieve from the graph the nodes that are similar to each other, which finds applications in various fields such as online advertising, recommender systems etc. Existing similarity measures either (i) overlook the unique properties of bipartite graphs, or (ii) fail to capture high-order information between nodes accurately, leading to suboptimal result quality. Recently, *Hidden Personalized PageRank* (HPP) is applied to this problem and found to be more effective compared with prior similarity measures. However, existing solutions for HPP computation incur significant computational costs, rendering it inefficient especially on large graphs.

In this paper, we first identify an inherent drawback of HPP and overcome it by proposing bidirectional HPP (BHPP). Then, we formulate similarity search over bipartite graphs as the problem of approximate BHPP computation, and present an efficient solution APPROX-BHPP. Specifically, APPROX-BHPP offers rigorous theoretical accuracy guarantees with optimal computational complexity by combining deterministic graph traversal with matrix operations in an optimized and non-trivial way. Moreover, our solution achieves significant gain in practical efficiency due to several carefully-designed optimizations. Extensive experiments, comparing BHPP against 8 existing similarity measures over 7 real bipartite graphs, demonstrate the effectiveness of BHPP on query rewriting and item recommendation. Moreover, APPROX-BHPP outperforms baseline solutions often by up to orders of magnitude in terms of computational time on both small and large datasets.

## CCS CONCEPTS

• **Theory of computation** → **Graph algorithms analysis**; • **Information systems** → **Similarity measures**.

## KEYWORDS

Bipartite Graphs; Similarity Search; Approximate Algorithms

## ACM Reference Format:

Renchi Yang. 2022. Efficient and Effective Similarity Search over Bipartite Graphs. In *Proceedings of the ACM Web Conference 2022 (WWW '22)*, April 25–29, 2022, Virtual Event, Lyon, France. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 11 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3485447.3511959>

\*This work was done while at National University of Singapore.

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

WWW '22, April 25–29, 2022, Virtual Event, Lyon, France

© 2022 Association for Computing Machinery.

ACM ISBN 978-1-4503-9096-5/22/04...\$15.00

<https://doi.org/10.1145/3485447.3511959>

## 1 INTRODUCTION

The bipartite graph is a ubiquitous data structure used to model the relationships between two sets of heterogeneous objects, such as query-webpage, customer-product, and author-paper. Similarity search over bipartite graphs is a fundamental task in data mining and finds numerous real-world applications in online advertising [8, 11, 22], recommender systems [33, 43, 44], biomedical analysis [20, 61], and other domains [58, 63, 70]. Given a bipartite graph  $G$  with two node partitions  $U$  and  $V$ , and a node  $u$  in  $U$ , the goal of similarity search over  $G$  is to retrieve from  $U$  the nodes that are similar to  $u$  based on a pre-defined similarity measure. Ideally, a favorable similarity measure can not only quantify direct and indirect interactions between nodes with the consideration of the bipartite structures, but also is computationally-friendly; in other words, the similarity measure can capture complex topological information surrounding a node cost-effectively.

In the literature, a plethora of similarity measures [7, 30, 35, 38, 41, 42, 62, 74, 75] are introduced for general graphs or sets. These measures either overlook the special properties of bipartite graphs or fail to incorporate high-order information between nodes, and hence, result in sub-par performance in bipartite graph mining tasks. In [37], Jeh and Widom propose the well-known similarity measure, *i.e.*, SimRank, for bipartite graphs, which is based on the recursive definition: two nodes are similar if they are related to similar nodes. SimRank is further enhanced in the subsequent work [11, 22] by incorporating the *evidence* metric and *scale-free* property into its definition. Although such SimRank-based similarity measures obtain encouraging results, they entail tremendous computational overheads due to their recursive definitions. Besides, they produce sub-optimal similarity scores in scale-free bipartite graphs [22]. Recent studies [19, 23] present a promising similarity measure, HPP, which is shown to achieve high result quality in various applications of bipartite graphs. Specifically, HPP is defined as the *Personalized PageRank* (PPR) [30, 38] on the graph  $\hat{G}$  constructed based on bipartite graph  $G$  with only nodes in  $U$ . Prior methods for HPP computation require up to  $O(|U|^2)$  space cost for the materialization of  $\hat{G}$ , which is prohibitive for large graphs. As such, existing techniques for PPR computation on general graphs can not be applied to solve the problem efficiently, posing a great technical challenge. In addition, HPP value  $\pi(u, u_i)$  is *biased* as it describes the relevance of  $u_i$  from the perspective of source node  $u$  regardless of the perspective of target node  $u_i$ . To address this problem, we propose to measure the similarity between nodes  $u$  and  $u_i$  via their bidirectional HPP (BHPP), namely,  $\pi(u, u_i) + \pi(u_i, u)$ , which raises additional challenges in efficiency.

In this paper, we present an in-depth study on BHPP computation, and make the following contributions. First, we formalize the similarity search over bipartite graphs as the problem of approximate BHPP query with absolute error guarantees, and pinpoint

none of the existing techniques for PPR computations could be trivially applied to solve the problem efficiently. Moreover, we propose APPROX-BHPP, which takes as input a query node  $u$  and an absolute error threshold  $\epsilon$ , and returns an approximate BHPP value  $\beta'(u, u_i)$  with at most  $\epsilon$  absolute error for each node  $u_i$  in  $U$ , with a near linear time complexity of  $O(|E| \cdot \log \frac{1}{\epsilon})$ , where  $|E|$  represents the number of edges in the input graph. Last but not least, we conduct extensive experiments to evaluate the effectiveness of BHPP on two important graph mining tasks, and the query efficiency of APPROX-BHPP, using 7 real datasets. Our experimental results reveal that BHPP achieves superior performance compared to existing similarity measures, and our proposed APPROX-BHPP is up to orders of magnitude faster than baseline solutions.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Related work is reviewed in Section 2. Section 3 defines the notations and problem. In Section 4, we present the algorithmic design of APPROX-BHPP with several efficiency techniques. Our solution and the competitors are evaluated in Section 5. Finally, Section 6 concludes the paper. Proofs of lemmas and theorems appear in Appendix A.

## 2 RELATED WORK

### 2.1 Similarity Search over Bipartite Graphs

In the literature [7, 30, 38, 41, 42, 62, 67, 84], a plethora of similarity measures are proposed towards similarity search on graphs. These measures are mainly designed for general graphs and overlook bipartite structures. In Ref. [37], Jeh and Widom propose bipartite SimRank for similarity search over bipartite graphs. Despite its effectiveness, SimRank suffers from a high time complexity of  $O(n^4)$ , where  $n$  is the number of nodes in the graph. In subsequent work [11], Antonellis *et al.* design an improved version of SimRank, referred to as SimRank++, and have shown an effective application of SimRank++ in the query rewriting problem of sponsored search. Recently, P-SimRank is introduced in Ref. [22], which optimizes SimRank and SimRank++ by incorporating the scale-free property of bipartite graphs. Unfortunately, these SimRank-based measures are all computationally expensive, especially for large graphs, and suffer from some inherent drawbacks [22]. In a recent work [19], Deng *et al.* propose HPP, extending PPR [30, 38] to bipartite graphs in a generalized iterative framework. To enable on-the-fly similarity search on massive bipartite graphs, Epasto *et al.* [23] present a MapReduce framework, which supports the real-time computation of several popular similarity measures such as neighbor intersection, Jaccard's coefficient, Katz index [41], and HPP. In addition, in Ref. [54], the authors employ hitting time-based similarity measures to identify related queries from search logs. Tong *et al.* [73] studies tracking node similarities in dynamic bipartite graphs.

### 2.2 PPR Computation

This work is also highly related to PPR computation, as HPP is the PPR on the graph constructed from a bipartite graph. In the past years, PPR has been extensively studied in the literature, as surveyed in [59]. There exists a large body of literature [10, 12, 18, 24, 38–40, 45, 47, 52, 57, 64, 65, 69, 81, 83, 85, 88] for single-source PPR queries. Among them, [10, 38–40, 52, 57, 69, 85, 88] rely on expensive matrix operations, [12, 24, 47, 65] estimate PPR values using a large number of random walks, and several recent studies [45, 81, 83] combine

deterministic graph traversal with random walks for improved efficiency. Particularly, in Ref. [83], Wu *et al.* combine the *forward push* [10] with *power iterations* [57], which is similar in spirit to our proposed SS-PUSH in Section 4.1. However, their method is devised for general graphs and employs push strategies that are totally different from ours. Another popular line of research focuses on single-source top- $k$  PPR queries [25, 48, 49, 51, 52, 71, 81, 82, 88], which return nodes with top- $k$  highest approximate/exact PPR values. Several studies [9, 16, 48, 50, 77, 79] investigate PPR queries w.r.t. single node pairs or target nodes. Recent studies focus on dynamic graphs [13, 18, 56, 86–88] and parallel/distributed settings [27, 28, 34, 46, 68, 78, 80], which are beyond the scope of this paper.

## 3 PRELIMINARIES

### 3.1 Notations

Let  $G = (U \cup V, E)$  be a bipartite graph<sup>1</sup>, where nodes can be partitioned into two disjoint sets:  $U = \{u_1, u_2, \dots, u_{|U|}\}$  with cardinality  $|U|$  and  $V = \{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_{|V|}\}$  with cardinality  $|V|$ . Each edge  $(u_i, v_j, w(u_i, v_j))$  in  $E$  connects a node  $u_i$  in  $U$  and a node  $v_j$  in  $V$  with weight  $w(u_i, v_j)$ . Note that each edge  $(u_i, v_j, w(u_i, v_j))$  is undirected; hence  $w(u_i, v_j) = w(v_j, u_i)$  and  $(v_j, u_i, w(v_j, u_i)) \in E$ . We denote by  $N(u)$  (resp.  $N(v)$ ) the set of neighbors of node  $u$  (resp.  $v$ ), and by  $d(u)$  (resp.  $d(v)$ ) the degree of node  $u$  (resp.  $v$ ).

Matrices and vectors are denoted in bold uppercase and lowercase, e.g.,  $\mathbf{M}$  and  $\mathbf{x}$ , respectively. We denote by  $\mathbf{M}(i)$  (resp.  $\mathbf{M}(\cdot, i)$ ) the  $i$ -th row (resp. column) vector of  $\mathbf{M}$ , and by  $\mathbf{M}(i, j)$  the element at  $i$ -th row and  $j$ -th column. We use  $\mathbf{U} \in \mathbb{R}^{|U| \times |V|}$  (resp.  $\mathbf{V} \in \mathbb{R}^{|V| \times |U|}$ ) to represent the forward (resp. backward) transition matrix of  $G$ . Specifically, for each node  $u_i \in U$  and each node  $v_j \in V$ , we have

$$\mathbf{U}(u_i, v_j) = \frac{w(u_i, v_j)}{ws(u_i)}, \text{ and } \mathbf{V}(v_j, u_i) = \frac{w(v_j, u_i)}{ws(v_j)},$$

where  $ws(u_i)$  (resp.  $ws(v_j)$ ) is the sum of weights of edges connecting node  $u_i$  (resp.  $v_j$ ), i.e.,

$$ws(u_i) = \sum_{v_l \in N(u_i)} w(u_i, v_l), \quad ws(v_j) = \sum_{u_l \in N(v_j)} w(v_j, u_l) \quad (1)$$

The *hidden transition matrix* [19]  $\mathbf{P}$  for node set  $U$  is defined as  $\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{U} \cdot \mathbf{V} \in \mathbb{R}^{|U| \times |U|}$ , where each  $(u_i, v_j)$  entry is calculated by

$$\mathbf{P}(u_i, u_j) = \sum_{v_l \in N(u_i) \cap N(u_j)} \mathbf{U}(u_i, v_l) \cdot \mathbf{V}(v_l, u_j). \quad (2)$$

The number of non-zero entries in  $\mathbf{P}$  can be up to  $O(|U|^2)$  in the case where at least a node  $v \in V$  has  $O(|U|)$  neighbors in  $U$ .

### 3.2 Problem Definition

Given a bipartite graph  $G$ , two nodes  $u, u_i$  in  $U$ , and restart probability  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ , the *Hidden Personalized PageRank* (HPP) [19, 23]  $\pi(u, u_i)$  w.r.t.  $u$  is defined as the probability that a *random walk with restart* (RWR) [72] starting from  $u$  would end at  $u_i$ . More precisely, at each step, an RWR originating from  $u$  either (i) terminates at the current node  $u_l$  with  $\alpha$  probability, or (ii) navigates to a node  $u_j$  based on the transition probability  $\mathbf{P}(u_l, u_j)$ . Mathematically, the HPP value  $\pi(u, u_i)$  is formulated as follows [12]:

$$\pi(u, u_i) = \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} \alpha (1 - \alpha)^\ell \cdot \mathbf{P}^\ell(u, u_i). \quad (3)$$

In essence, HPP is the *Personalized PageRank* (PPR) [30, 38] on the weighted graph  $\hat{G}$  constructed based on  $G$ , where the node set

<sup>1</sup>Following convention, we consider undirected bipartite graphs.

**Algorithm 1: POWERITERATION**

**Input:** Bipartite graph  $G$ , initial vector  $\mathbf{e}$ , restart probability  $\alpha$ , and the number of iterations  $t$ .

**Output:**  $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ .

```

1  $\boldsymbol{\pi} \leftarrow \mathbf{e}$ ;
2 for  $i \leftarrow 1$  to  $t$  do  $\boldsymbol{\pi} \leftarrow \mathbf{e} + (1 - \alpha) \cdot (\boldsymbol{\pi} \cdot \mathbf{U}) \cdot \mathbf{V}$ ;
3  $\boldsymbol{\pi} \leftarrow \alpha \cdot \boldsymbol{\pi}$ ;
4 return  $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ ;
```

of  $\widehat{G}$  is  $U$  and weights of edges are defined as  $\mathbf{P}(u, u_i) \forall u, u_i \in U$  [19, 23]. In this paper, we refer to the PPR on  $\widehat{G}$  as HPP so as to distinguish between it and the naive PPR on  $G$ . Recall that PPR only measures the relevance of node  $u_i$  from the perspective of node  $u$  and  $\pi(u, u_i) \neq \pi(u_i, u)$  in general. Consequently, HPP is a *biased* similarity measure with limited effectiveness. To remedy this, we propose to model the similarity between node  $u$  and  $u_i$  by their *Bidirectional Hidden Personalized PageRank* (BHPP), viz.,

$$\beta(u, u_i) = \pi(u, u_i) + \pi(u_i, u). \quad (4)$$

This paper focuses on computing *approximate* BHPP values. We consider  $\epsilon$ -*approximate* BHPP queries, as defined in Definition 3.1.

**Definition 3.1 ( $\epsilon$ -Approximate BHPP Query).** Given a bipartite graph  $G = (U \cup V, E)$ , a query node  $u \in U$  and an error threshold  $\epsilon$ , an  $\epsilon$ -approximate BHPP query returns an approximate BHPP value  $\beta'_u(u_i)$  for each node  $u_i \in U$ , which satisfies

$$|\beta(u, u_i) - \beta'(u, u_i)| \leq \epsilon. \quad (5)$$

### 3.3 Basic Techniques

Existing solutions [19, 23] for HPP computation on a bipartite graph  $G$  first construct hidden transition matrix  $\mathbf{P}$ , and then directly apply PPR computation techniques [57] with  $\mathbf{P}$ . These solutions cannot deal with large graphs efficiently as they require the materialization of  $\mathbf{P}$ , which is prohibitively expensive due to colossal construction time and storage space (up to  $O(|U|^2)$  in the worst case). Epasto *et al.* proposed a MapReduce framework in Ref. [23] for scalable HPP computation, which relies on large amounts of computational resources. In addition, prior methods are mainly geared towards computing roughly-estimated HPP values instead of answering  $\epsilon$ -approximate BHPP queries. In what follows, we first introduce three fundamental techniques that are tailored to HPP computation while averting the materialization of matrix  $\mathbf{P}$ , and then explain how to utilize them to answer  $\epsilon$ -approximate BHPP queries.

**3.3.1 MONTECARLO [24].** Recall that the HPP value  $\pi(u, u_i)$  is defined as the probability that an RWR starting from  $u$  terminates at  $u_i$ . Hence, a simple and straightforward way is to simulate a number of random walks from  $u$ , and then use the fraction of random walks that end at  $u_i$  as an estimation of  $\pi(u, u_i)$ . According to [24], we need to conduct  $O\left(\frac{2(1+\epsilon_f/3) \cdot \ln(|U|/p_f)}{\epsilon_f^2}\right)$  random walks in total to ensure that for every  $u_i \in U$

$$|\pi'(u, u_i) - \pi(u, u_i)| < \epsilon_f \quad (6)$$

holds with probability at least  $1 - p_f$ . As shown in prior work [49, 81], MONTECARLO is rather inefficient as it requires sampling a large number of random walks. Additionally, to facilitate random walk

**Algorithm 2: SELECTIVEPUSH**

**Input:** Bipartite graph  $G$ , target node  $u$ , restart probability  $\alpha$  and an error threshold  $\epsilon_b$ .

**Output:**  $\{\overleftarrow{\pi}(u_i, u) | u_i \in U\}, \overleftarrow{\Gamma}_u(\cdot)$ .

```

1  $\overleftarrow{\Gamma}_u(u) \leftarrow 1; \overleftarrow{\Gamma}_u(x) \leftarrow 0 \forall x \in U \cup V$  and  $x \neq u$ ;
2  $\overleftarrow{\pi}(u_i, u) \leftarrow 0 \forall u_i \in U$ ;
3 while true do
4   for  $u_i \in U$  s.t.  $\overleftarrow{\Gamma}_u(u_i) > \epsilon_b$  do
5     for  $v_j \in N(u_i)$  do
6        $\overleftarrow{\Gamma}_u(v_j) \leftarrow \overleftarrow{\Gamma}_u(v_j) + (1 - \alpha) \cdot \frac{w(v_j, u_i)}{ws(v_j)} \cdot \overleftarrow{\Gamma}_u(u_i)$ ;
7        $\overleftarrow{\pi}(u_i, u) \leftarrow \overleftarrow{\pi}(u_i, u) + \alpha \cdot \overleftarrow{\Gamma}_u(u_i)$ ;
8        $\overleftarrow{\Gamma}_u(u_i) \leftarrow 0$ ;
9   for  $v_i \in V$  s.t.  $\overleftarrow{\Gamma}_u(v_i) > 0$  do
10    for  $u_j \in N(v_i)$  do
11       $\overleftarrow{\Gamma}_u(u_j) \leftarrow \overleftarrow{\Gamma}_u(u_j) + \frac{w(u_j, v_i)}{ws(u_j)} \cdot \overleftarrow{\Gamma}_u(v_i)$ ;
12       $\overleftarrow{\Gamma}_u(v_i) \leftarrow 0$ ;
13   if  $\forall u_i \in U$  s.t.  $\overleftarrow{\Gamma}_u(u_i) \leq \epsilon_b$  then break;
14 return  $\{\overleftarrow{\pi}(u_i, u) | u_i \in U\}$ ;
```

sampling on weighted graphs, MONTECARLO requires constructing *alias structures* [76] the neighborhood of each node in the pre-processing phase, leading to an immense overhead.

**3.3.2 POWERITERATION [57].** POWERITERATION estimates HPP values by iteratively solving the following linear equation system [57], a variant of Eq. (3):

$$\boldsymbol{\pi}_u = \alpha \cdot \mathbf{e}_u + (1 - \alpha) \cdot \boldsymbol{\pi}_u \cdot \mathbf{P}, \quad (7)$$

where  $\mathbf{e}_u \in \mathbb{R}^{1 \times |U|}$  is a one-hot vector which has value 1 at entry  $u$  and 0 everywhere else,  $\boldsymbol{\pi}_u(u_i) = \pi(u, u_i) \forall u_i \in U$ , and  $\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{U} \cdot \mathbf{V}$ . Algorithm 1 shows the pseudo-code of POWERITERATION for approximating  $\boldsymbol{\pi}_u$  when inputting graph  $G$  and  $\mathbf{e} = \mathbf{e}_u$ . Note that Algorithm 1 eliminates the need to materialize  $\mathbf{P}$  by decoupling and reordering the matrix multiplication  $\boldsymbol{\pi} \cdot \mathbf{P}$  to  $(\boldsymbol{\pi} \cdot \mathbf{U}) \cdot \mathbf{V}$  (Line 2), reducing the cost of the matrix-vector multiplications in each iteration to  $O(|E|)$ . To obtain an estimation of  $\pi(u, u_i)$  with at most  $\epsilon_f$  absolute error, Algorithm 1 requires at least  $t = \log_{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}} \frac{1}{\epsilon_f} - 1$  [15] iterations of matrix multiplications, which results in total time complexity of  $O(|E| \cdot \log(1/\epsilon_f))$ . Given a large error threshold, e.g.,  $\epsilon_f = 0.1$ , POWERITERATION still needs around 14 iterations of matrix-vector multiplications, which is considerably expensive.

**3.3.3 SELECTIVEPUSH [9].** Unlike MONTECARLO and POWERITERATION approaches, which return approximate HPP values w.r.t. a source node  $u$ , SELECTIVEPUSH estimates HPP values to a target node  $u$ , i.e.,  $\pi(u_i, u) \forall u_i \in U$ . Algorithm 2 illustrates the pseudo-code of SELECTIVEPUSH. In brief, SELECTIVEPUSH is a deterministic version of MONTECARLO, which recursively pushes *residues* (i.e., the portion of RWRs that are not stopped yet) along edges during a graph traversal of  $G$  from  $u$ . Initially, Algorithm 2 sets residue  $\overleftarrow{\Gamma}_u(u) = 1$  for source node  $u$  and 0 for other nodes in  $G$ , as well as approximate HPP values  $\overleftarrow{\pi}(u_i, u) = 0 \forall u_i \in U$  (Lines 1-2). Next, it iteratively pushes the residues of the selected nodes to their neighbors. In each iteration, given an absolute error threshold  $\epsilon_b$ , if there is any node  $u_i \in U$  with residue  $\overleftarrow{\Gamma}_u(u_i) > \epsilon_b$  (Line 4), for

each neighbor  $v_j$  of  $u_i$ , SELECTIVEPUSH increases  $v_j$ 's residue by  $(1 - \alpha) \cdot \frac{w(v_j, u_i)}{ws(v_j)} \cdot \overleftarrow{\Gamma}_u(u_i)$ , and transfers  $\alpha$  portion of  $\overleftarrow{\Gamma}_u(u_i)$  to  $u_i$ 's approximate HPP  $\overleftarrow{\pi}(u_i, u)$  (Lines 5-7). The residue  $\overleftarrow{\Gamma}_u(u_i)$  is set to 0 when  $u_i$ 's neighbors are all processed (Line 8). Subsequently, Algorithm 2 pushes residues of nodes in  $V$  back to nodes in  $U$ . More specifically, if any node  $v_i$  in  $V$  has a non-zero residue (Line 9), for  $v_i$ 's each neighbor  $u_j$ , Algorithm 2 increases  $u_j$ 's residue by  $(1 - \alpha) \cdot \frac{w(u_j, v_i)}{ws(u_j)} \cdot \overleftarrow{\Gamma}_u(v_i)$  (Lines 10-11). After that, Algorithm 2 resets  $\overleftarrow{\Gamma}_u(v_i)$  to 0 (Line 12). SELECTIVEPUSH repeats the above procedures until residues of nodes in  $U$  are all less than  $\epsilon_b$  and none of the nodes in  $V$  have positive residues (Line 13). Notice that Algorithm 2 differs from the original SELECTIVEPUSH for PPR computation. Particularly, in Algorithm 2, we push residues between  $U$  and  $V$  alternatively, so as to avoid the materialization of matrix  $P$ . Lemma 3.2 shows a crucial property of Algorithm 2.

LEMMA 3.2. *Consider any iteration in Algorithm 2 (Lines 4-13). At the end of the iteration, the following equation holds.*

$$\pi(u_i, u) = \overleftarrow{\pi}(u_i, u) + \sum_{u_j \in U} \pi(u_i, u_j) \cdot \overleftarrow{\Gamma}_u(u_j). \quad (8)$$

Since Algorithm 2 terminates when the residue  $\overleftarrow{\Gamma}_u(u_i) \leq \epsilon_b$  for each node  $u_i$  in  $U$ , Lemma 3.2 implies that each HPP value  $\overleftarrow{\pi}(u_i, u)$  returned by Algorithm 2 satisfies

$$|\pi(u_i, u) - \overleftarrow{\pi}(u_i, u)| < \epsilon_b. \quad (9)$$

LEMMA 3.3. *Algorithm 2 runs in  $O\left(\frac{\sum_{v_i \in V} d(v_i)^2}{|U| \cdot \alpha \cdot \epsilon_b}\right)$  amortized time.*

Lemma 3.3 provides the amortized cost of SELECTIVEPUSH. SELECTIVEPUSH runs fast in practice due to its consideration of the residue at each node adaptively. However, it fails to calculate high-precision HPP values for graphs with large average degrees efficiently. In the worst case, the time complexity is  $O\left(\frac{|E|}{\alpha \cdot \epsilon_b}\right)$ , worse than the  $O(|E| \cdot \log(1/\epsilon_f))$ -bound of POWERITERATION.

**3.3.4 Baselines and Challenges.** An  $\epsilon$ -approximate BHPP query (see Definition 3.1) of node  $u$  asks for an approximation of exact BHPP value  $\beta(u, u_i) = \pi(u, u_i) + \pi(u_i, u)$  for each node  $u_i$  in  $U$  with at most  $\epsilon$  absolute error. A straightforward way to answer the  $\epsilon$ -approximate BHPP query of node  $u$  in a probabilistic fashion is to compute  $\pi'(u, u_i)$  by letting  $\epsilon_f = \frac{\epsilon}{2}$  in MONTECARLO and get  $\overleftarrow{\pi}(u_i, u)$  by SELECTIVEPUSH with  $\epsilon_b = \frac{\epsilon}{2}$  for each node  $u_i$  in  $U$ . According to Eq. (6) and Eq. (9), the summed value  $\pi'(u, u_i) + \overleftarrow{\pi}(u_i, u)$  satisfies Eq. (8) with a high probability. Similarly, another approach for  $\epsilon$ -approximate BHPP queries is to invoke POWERITERATION and SELECTIVEPUSH with  $t = \log \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \frac{2}{\epsilon} - 1$  and  $\epsilon_b = \frac{\epsilon}{2}$ , respectively. However, due to the inefficiency of the MONTECARLO and POWERITERATION approaches, as well as the deficiency of SELECTIVEPUSH, both two aforementioned solutions for  $\epsilon$ -approximate BHPP queries incur vast costs, especially for large graphs. Towards this end, there are three technical challenges that we need to address:

- (1) How to overcome the inherent drawback of SELECTIVEPUSH and reduce its cost to  $O(|E| \cdot \log(1/\epsilon_f))$ ?
- (2) How to devise an algorithm that improves over POWERITERATION in terms of practical efficiency without degrading its theoretical guarantees?

---

### Algorithm 3: SS-PUSH

---

**Input:** Bipartite graph  $G$ , target node  $u$ , restart probability  $\alpha$  and an error threshold  $\epsilon_b$ .  
**Output:**  $\{\overleftarrow{\pi}(u_i, u) | u_i \in U\}$ ,  $\overleftarrow{\Gamma}_u$ .  
 Lines 1-2 are the same as Lines 1-2 in Algorithm 2;  
 3  $n_p \leftarrow 0$ ;  
 /\* Selective pushes \*/  
 4 **while true do**  
   Lines 5-9 are the same as Lines 4-8 in Algorithm 2;  
 10  $n_p \leftarrow n_p + N(u_i)$ ;  
   Lines 11-14 are the same as Lines 9-12 in Algorithm 2;  
 15  $n_p \leftarrow n_p + N(v_i)$ ;  
 16 **if**  $\forall u_i \in U$  s.t.  $\overleftarrow{\Gamma}_u(u_i) \leq \epsilon_b$  **or then**  
 17   **return**  $\{\overleftarrow{\pi}(u_i, u) | u_i \in U\}$ ,  $\overleftarrow{\Gamma}_u$ ;  
 18 **if** Inequality (10) holds **then break** ;  
 /\* Sequential pushes \*/  
 19 **while**  $\exists u_i \in U$  s.t.  $\overleftarrow{\Gamma}_u(u_i) > \epsilon_b$  and  $\sum_{u_i \in U} \overleftarrow{\Gamma}_u(u_i) > \epsilon_b$  **do**  
 20   **for**  $\exists u_i \in U$  s.t.  $\overleftarrow{\Gamma}_u(u_i) > 0$  **do**  
   Lines 21-28 are the same as Lines 5-12 in Algorithm 2;  
 29 **return**  $\{\overleftarrow{\pi}(u_i, u) | u_i \in U\}$ ,  $\overleftarrow{\Gamma}_u$ ;

---

- (3) How to integrate the above two algorithms in an optimized way for improved efficiency?

## 4 THE APPROX-BHPP ALGORITHM

To circumvent these challenges, we first propose an optimized version of SELECTIVEPUSH, called Selective and Sequential Push (hereafter SS-PUSH), in Section 4.1; after that, we present Power Iterations-based Push (short for Power Iterations-based Push) to mitigate the efficiency issue of POWERITERATION in Section 4.2, and then elaborate the integration of SS-PUSH and PI-PUSH to obtain our main proposal solution, APPROX-BHPP, for answering  $\epsilon$ -approximate BHPP queries.

### 4.1 SS-PUSH

Before diving into the algorithmic details of SS-PUSH, we give a high-level idea of SS-PUSH. SS-PUSH suffers from severe efficiency issues in some cases. To explain, consider a node  $v \in V$  of input bipartite graph  $G$ , which connects to 100 neighbors  $u_1 - u_{100}$  in node set  $U$ . According to Lines 4-12 in Algorithm 2, in each iteration,  $v$  first (i) receives residues from the selected neighbors, and then (ii) conducts 100 push operations to  $u_1 - u_{100}$ . After a few iterations, only few neighbors of  $v$  would be selected as the residues of majority nodes are slightly less than  $\epsilon_b$ . As a consequence, to deplete a certain amount of  $v$ 's residue, SELECTIVEPUSH requires numerous iterations, each of which involves at least 100 push operations and random access to adjacent nodes. A promising option to alleviate this problem is to leverage *sequential* pushes in each iteration, which aggregate residues from  $v$ 's neighbors in one batch before pushing back to  $u_1 - u_{100}$ . However, the sequential strategy performs push operations regardless of the residue at each node, leading to a large number of redundant push operations. To overcome the limitations of both strategies, we resort to combining them in a greedy and adaptive manner. Specifically, we execute selective pushes while recording its actual cost, and switch to sequential pushes once the recorded cost of the former exceeds the estimated computational



cost using the latter. The switch is dynamically controlled by a carefully designed threshold. Below we present the details.

**4.1.1 Details.** Algorithm 3 displays the pseudo-code of SS-PUSH. Given a bipartite graph  $G$ , a target node  $u$ , restart probability  $\alpha$  and an absolute error threshold  $\epsilon_b$  as inputs, SS-PUSH begins by initializing residue vector  $\overleftarrow{\Gamma}_u$  and approximate HPP  $\overleftarrow{\pi}(u_i, u)$  for  $u_i \in U$  as Lines 1-2 in Algorithm 2, and the number of performed push operations  $n_p = 0$  (Lines 1-3). After that, Algorithm 3 starts the iterative process of selective pushes as Lines 4-12 in Algorithm 2, during which the recorded cost  $n_p$  of selective pushes is increased by  $N(u_i)$  (resp.  $N(v_i)$ ) if the neighboring nodes of  $u_i \in U$  (resp.  $v_i \in V$ ) are accessed (Lines 5-14). Algorithm 3 terminates the iterative process and returns  $\{\overleftarrow{\pi}(u_i, u) | u_i \in U\}$  with  $\overleftarrow{\Gamma}_u$  when every residue  $\overleftarrow{\Gamma}_u(u_i)$  is not greater than  $\epsilon_b$  (Lines 16-17).

$$n_p \geq 2|E| \cdot \left( \log_{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}} \frac{1}{\sum_{u_i \in U} \overleftarrow{\Gamma}_u(u_i)} \right) \quad (10)$$

Additionally, at Line 18, if Algorithm 3 depletes its computation budget for selective pushes (*i.e.*, Eq. (10) holds) before it satisfies termination condition at Lines 16-17, it judiciously switches to iterative sequential pushes (Lines 19-28). In each iteration of sequential pushes, SS-PUSH performs push operations for all nodes  $u_i \in U$  and  $v_i \in V$  with positive residues as Lines 4-12 in Algorithm 2 except that  $\epsilon_b$  at Line 4 is replaced by 0 (Lines 20-28). The iterative process stops and returns  $\{\overleftarrow{\pi}(u_i, u) | u_i \in U\}$  with  $\overleftarrow{\Gamma}_u$  (Line 29) when  $\overleftarrow{\Gamma}_u(u_i) \leq \epsilon_b \forall u_i \in U$  or  $\sum_{u_i \in U} \overleftarrow{\Gamma}_u(u_i) \leq \epsilon_b$  (Line 19). In particular, Algorithm 3 returns the residue vector  $\overleftarrow{\Gamma}_u$  to facilitate its combination with PI-PUSH, as detailed in follow-up sections.

**4.1.2 Analysis.** Theorem 4.1 indicates that Algorithm 3 ensures at most  $\epsilon_b$  absolute error in each approximate HPP  $\overleftarrow{\pi}(u_i, u)$ .

**THEOREM 4.1 (CORRECTNESS OF SS-PUSH).** *Given a target node  $u$ , SS-PUSH returns an approximate HPP value  $\pi'(u_i, u)$  for each node  $u_i \in U$  such that*

$$\pi(u_i, u) - \pi'(u_i, u) \leq \epsilon_b.$$

Selective pushes terminate when Eq. (10) holds, the cost incurred by this phase is hence  $O\left(|E| \cdot \left(\log_{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}} \frac{1}{\sum_{u_i \in U} \overleftarrow{\Gamma}_u(u_i)}\right)\right)$ . In the course of sequential pushes, each iteration converts  $\alpha$  portion of  $\overleftarrow{\Gamma}_u(u_i) \forall u_i \in U$  into the HPP. Assume that the number of iterations for sequential pushes is  $t$ . Note that in the worst case, the sequential pushes stops when  $\sum_{u_i \in U} \overleftarrow{\Gamma}_u^{(t)}(u_i) \leq \epsilon_b$ , where  $\overleftarrow{\Gamma}_u^{(t)}(u_i)$  signifies the residue after  $t$  iterations of sequential pushes. Thus, we have

$$\sum_{u_i \in U} \overleftarrow{\Gamma}_u^{(t)}(u_i) = \sum_{u_j \in U} (1 - \sum_{\ell=0}^t \alpha(1-\alpha)^\ell) \cdot \overleftarrow{\Gamma}_u(u_j) \leq \epsilon_b,$$

which derives  $t = \log_{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}} \frac{\sum_{u_i \in U} \overleftarrow{\Gamma}_u(u_i)}{\epsilon_b} - 1$ . Each iteration (Lines 20-28) of sequential pushes involves a traversal of  $G$ ; therefore the time cost is bounded by  $O(|E|)$ . Overall, the time complexity of SS-PUSH is  $O(n_p + |E| \cdot t)$ , which equals  $O(|E| \cdot \log(1/\epsilon_b))$ .

## 4.2 PI-PUSH

**LEMMA 4.2.** *For any two nodes  $u_i, u_j \in U$ ,  $\frac{\pi(u, u_i)}{ws(u_i)} = \frac{\pi(u_i, u)}{ws(u)}$ .*

### Algorithm 4: PI-PUSH

---

**Input:** Bipartite graph  $G$ , source node  $u$ , restart probability  $\alpha$ , parameter  $\lambda$ , error threshold  $\epsilon_f$ ,  $\{\overleftarrow{\pi}(u_i, u) | u_i \in U\}$ ,  $\overleftarrow{\Gamma}_u$ .  
**Output:**  $\{\overrightarrow{\pi}(u, u_i) | u_i \in U\}$ .  
 /\* Selective pushes \*/  
 1 Compute  $\gamma$  by Eq. (14);  
 Lines 2-14 are the same as Lines 3-15 in Algorithm 3 by replacing  $\epsilon_b$  by  $\frac{ws(u)}{ws(u_i)} \cdot \frac{\epsilon_f}{\lambda}$ ;  
 15 **if** *Inequality (12) holds*  $\forall u_i \in U$  **then return**  $\{\overrightarrow{\pi}(u, u_i) | u_i \in U\}$  according to Eq. (15);  
 16 **if** *Inequality (13) holds* **then break**;  
 /\* Power iterations \*/  
 17 **for**  $u_i \in U$  **do**  
 18   Compute  $\overrightarrow{\Gamma}_u(u_i)$  according to Eq. (16);  
 19   Compute  $\overrightarrow{\pi}(u, u_i)$  according to Eq. (15);  
 20 Compute  $t$  according to Eq. (17);  
 21  $\mathbf{p}_u \leftarrow \text{POWERITERATION}(U, V, \overrightarrow{\Gamma}_u(U), \alpha, t)$ ;  
 22 **for**  $u_i \in U$  **do**  $\overrightarrow{\pi}(u, u_i) \leftarrow \overrightarrow{\pi}(u, u_i) + \mathbf{p}_u(u_i)$ ;  
 23 **return**  $\{\overrightarrow{\pi}(u, u_i) | u_i \in U\}$ ;

---

PI-PUSH capitalizes on the idea inspired by the following observation. Specifically, plugging Lemma 4.2 into Lemma 3.2 yields

$$\begin{aligned} \pi(u, u_i) &= \frac{ws(u_i)}{ws(u)} \overleftarrow{\pi}(u_i, u) + \sum_{u_j \in U} \pi(u_i, u_j) \overleftarrow{\Gamma}_u(u_j) \frac{ws(u_i)}{ws(u)} \\ &= \frac{ws(u_i)}{ws(u)} \overleftarrow{\pi}(u_i, u) + \sum_{u_j \in U} \pi(u_j, u_i) \frac{ws(u_j)}{ws(u)} \overleftarrow{\Gamma}_u(u_j). \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

Given an error threshold  $\frac{\epsilon_f}{\lambda}$ , if we ensure  $\frac{ws(u_j)}{ws(u)} \cdot \overleftarrow{\Gamma}_u(u_j) \leq \frac{\epsilon_f}{\lambda}$ , Eq. (11) becomes  $\pi(u, u_i) \leq \frac{ws(u_i)}{ws(u)} \cdot \overleftarrow{\pi}(u_i, u) + \frac{\epsilon_f \cdot \sum_{u_j \in U} \pi(u_j, u_i)}{\lambda}$ , which implies that  $\frac{ws(u_i)}{ws(u)} \cdot \overleftarrow{\pi}(u_i, u)$  can be regarded as an underestimate of  $\pi(u, u_i)$ . In this regard, instead of employing POWERITERATION to compute the HPP values w.r.t. a source node  $u$  from scratch, we can transform the residues and the approximate HPP values returned by SS-PUSH to obtain a rough approximation, and further refine it in PI-PUSH using a few selective pushes and power iterations. Along this line, we summarize the pseudo-code of PI-PUSH in Algorithm 4 and explain its details in the sequel.

**4.2.1 Details.** The input parameters of PI-PUSH are identical to those of SS-PUSH, except that it accepts absolute error threshold  $\epsilon_f$  instead of  $\epsilon_b$ , an additional parameter  $\lambda$ , as well as the initial approximate HPP values  $\{\overleftarrow{\pi}(u_i, u) | u_i \in U\}$  and residue vector  $\overleftarrow{\Gamma}_u$  returned by SS-PUSH. In analogy to SS-PUSH, PI-PUSH consists of two phases: selective pushes (Lines 1-16) and power iterations (Lines 17-22), where power iterations are used to mitigate the efficiency issue of selective pushes when excessive push operations occur, as done in Section 4.1. First, PI-PUSH iteratively executes selective pushes as Lines 3-15 in Algorithm 3. Distinct from SS-PUSH, the selective threshold  $\epsilon_b$  is replaced by  $\frac{ws(u)}{ws(u_i)} \cdot \frac{\epsilon_f}{\lambda}$ . In addition, the termination conditions of selective pushes in Algorithm 4 are changed as follows: (i) for each node  $u_i \in U$ ,

$$\overleftarrow{\Gamma}_u(u_i) \leq \frac{ws(u)}{ws(u_i)} \cdot \frac{\epsilon_f}{\lambda} \quad (12)$$

**Algorithm 5: APPROX-BHPP**

**Input:** Bipartite graph  $G$ , query node  $u$ , restart probability  $\alpha$ , parameter  $\lambda$ , and error thresholds  $\epsilon$ ,  $\epsilon_b$ .

**Output:**  $\{\beta'(u, u_i) | u_i \in U\}$ .

- 1  $\{\overleftarrow{\pi}(u_i, u) | u_i \in U\}, \overleftarrow{\Gamma}_u \leftarrow \text{SS-PUSH}(G, \alpha, u, \epsilon_b)$ ;
- 2  $\epsilon_f \leftarrow \epsilon - \epsilon_b$ ;
- 3  $\{\overrightarrow{\pi}(u, u_i) | u_i \in U\} \leftarrow \text{PI-PUSH}(G, \alpha, u, \epsilon_f, \lambda, \{\overleftarrow{\pi}(u_i, u) | u_i \in U\}, \overleftarrow{\Gamma}_u)$ ;
- 4 **for**  $u_i \in U$  **do**  $\beta'(u, u_i) \leftarrow \overrightarrow{\pi}(u, u_i) + \overleftarrow{\pi}(u_i, u)$ ;
- 5 **return**  $\{\beta'(u, u_i) | u_i \in U\}$ ;

holds, or (ii) the actual cost incurred by selective pushes  $n_p$  exceeds a pre-defined computation budget, *viz.*,

$$n_p \geq 2|E| \cdot \left( \log_{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}} \frac{\gamma}{\sum_{u_i \in U} \frac{ws(u_i)}{ws(u)} \cdot \overleftarrow{\Gamma}_u(u_i)} \right), \quad (13)$$

where  $\gamma$  is computed at Line 1 based on Equation 14.

$$\gamma \leftarrow \sum_{u_i \in U} \frac{ws(u_i)}{ws(u)} \cdot \overleftarrow{\Gamma}_u(u_i). \quad (14)$$

If the first condition holds, Algorithm 4 returns

$$\overrightarrow{\pi}(u, u_i) = \frac{ws(u_i)}{ws(u)} \cdot \overleftarrow{\pi}(u_i, u) \quad (15)$$

as an estimation of  $\pi(u, u_i)$  for each node  $u_i \in U$  (Line 15). On the other hand, if Inequality (13) (*i.e.*, the second condition) is satisfied (Line 16), PI-PUSH proceeds to refine the result with a few power iterations. More specifically, we first transform the approximate HPP values  $\overleftarrow{\pi}(u_i, u)$  and residues  $\overleftarrow{\Gamma}_u(u_i)$  into the approximate HPP values  $\overrightarrow{\pi}(u, u_i)$  and residues  $\overrightarrow{\Gamma}_u(u_i)$  according to Eq. (15) and Eq. (16), respectively (Lines 17-19).

$$\overrightarrow{\Gamma}_u(u_i) = \frac{ws(u_i)}{ws(u)} \cdot \overleftarrow{\Gamma}_u(u_i) \quad (16)$$

Subsequently, Algorithm 4 computes  $\mathbf{p}_u(u_i)$  as an additional estimation part of  $\pi(u, u_i)$  by invoking POWERITERATION with input parameters including graph  $G$ , a length- $|U|$  residue vector  $\overrightarrow{\Gamma}_u(U)$ , restart probability  $\alpha$ , and the number of iterations  $t$  defined in Eq. (17) (Line 21).

$$t = \log_{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}} \frac{\sum_{u_i \in U} \overrightarrow{\Gamma}_u(u_i)}{\epsilon_f} - 1 \quad (17)$$

Eventually, PI-PUSH gives each  $\overrightarrow{\pi}(u, u_i)$  a final touch by adding  $\mathbf{p}_u(u_i)$  to it and returns it as an estimation of  $\pi(u, u_i)$  (Lines 22-23).

**4.2.2 Analysis.** Theorem 4.3 establishes the accuracy guarantees of PI-PUSH.

**THEOREM 4.3 (CORRECTNESS OF PI-PUSH).** *Algorithm 4 returns an approximate HPP  $\pi'(u, u_i)$  for each node  $u_i \in U$  such that  $\pi(u, u_i) - \pi'(u, u_i) \leq \epsilon_f$ , when the input parameter  $\lambda$  satisfies*

$$\lambda \geq \max_{u_i \in U} \sum_{u_j \in U} \pi(u_j, u_i). \quad (18)$$

Next, we analyse the time complexity of PI-PUSH. First, according to Line 16 in Algorithm 4, the selective pushes in PI-PUSH take  $O\left(|E| \cdot \left(\log_{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}} \frac{\gamma}{\sum_{u_i \in U} \overrightarrow{\Gamma}_u(u_i)}\right)\right)$  time. Moreover, each iteration in POWERITERATION consumes  $O(|E|)$  time and PI-PUSH performs  $t$  (see Eq. (17)) power iterations in total (Line 21 in Algorithm 4). Consequently, the overall time complexity of PI-PUSH is  $O\left(|E| \cdot \left(\log_{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}} \frac{\gamma}{\epsilon_f}\right)\right)$ .




Figure 1:  $\gamma$  vs.  $\epsilon_b$ .

### 4.3 Complete Algorithm and Analysis

Algorithm 5 summarizes the pseudo-code of APPROX-BHPP, which takes as input a bipartite graph  $G$ , query node  $u$ , restart probability  $\alpha$ , two error thresholds  $\epsilon$ ,  $\epsilon_b$  ( $\epsilon_b < \epsilon$ ), as well as a parameter  $\lambda$  (see Eq. (18)). In particular,  $\lambda$  can be efficiently estimated in the preprocessing step based on Eq. (19) and is guaranteed to be a tight upper bound of  $\max_{u_i \in U} \sum_{u_j \in U} \pi(u_j, u_i)$  based on Lemma 4.4.

**LEMMA 4.4.** *Suppose that  $\rho$  be the result of POWERITERATION when the input parameters  $\mathbf{e} = 1$  and  $t = \tau$ . Then, we have  $\lambda \geq \max_{u_i \in U} \sum_{u_j \in U} \pi(u_j, u_i)$  holds, where*

$$\lambda = \min \left\{ \max_{u_i \in U} \rho(u_i) + |U| \cdot (1 - \alpha)^{\tau+1}, \frac{\max_{u_i \in U} ws(u_i)}{\min_{u_j \in U} ws(u_j)} \right\}. \quad (19)$$

In online phase, Algorithm 5 first invokes SS-PUSH with absolute error threshold  $\epsilon_b$  to compute  $\{\overleftarrow{\pi}(u_i, u) | u_i \in U\}$  and  $\overleftarrow{\Gamma}_u$  (Line 1). Then, these intermediate results together with  $\epsilon_f = \epsilon - \epsilon_b$  are passed over to PI-PUSH. After the invocation of PI-PUSH, we obtain  $\{\overrightarrow{\pi}(u, u_i) | u_i \in U\}$ . Finally, the approximate BHPP value for each node  $u_i$  in  $U$  can be calculated by  $\beta'(u, u_i) = \overrightarrow{\pi}(u, u_i) + \overleftarrow{\pi}(u_i, u)$ , which is ensured to be  $\epsilon$ -approximate, as shown in Theorem 4.5.

**THEOREM 4.5 (CORRECTNESS OF APPROX-BHPP).** *Algorithm 5 returns  $\beta'(u, u_i)$  for every  $u_i \in U$  that satisfies Eq. (5).*

**4.3.1 Choosing  $\epsilon_b$  and Time Complexity.** In the following, we discuss how to pick  $\epsilon_b$  reasonably such that APPROX-BHPP runs in optimal time. Since  $\epsilon_f + \epsilon_b = \epsilon$ , the total computational time of APPROX-BHPP can be formulated as the following function:

$$f(\epsilon_b) = O\left(|E| \cdot \left(\log \frac{1}{\epsilon_b} + \log \frac{\gamma}{\epsilon - \epsilon_b}\right)\right) = O\left(|E| \cdot \left(\log \frac{\gamma}{\epsilon_b \cdot (\epsilon - \epsilon_b)}\right)\right).$$

Thus, APPROX-BHPP's time complexity is bounded by  $O\left(|E| \cdot \log \frac{1}{\epsilon_b}\right)$  since  $\gamma \leq 1$ . According to  $f(\epsilon_b)$ , as  $\epsilon_b$  decreases and SS-PUSH progresses,  $\gamma$  monotonically decreases and the cost of PI-PUSH reduces. To strike a balance between the costs incurred by SS-PUSH and PI-PUSH, we need to choose an appropriate  $\epsilon_b$ . For this purpose, we first quantify the relationship between  $\gamma$  and  $\epsilon_b$  based on the following empirical finding. Figure 1 plots the  $\gamma$  values when varying  $\epsilon_b$  from  $10^{-6}$  to 0.1 on three real datasets used in our experiments in Section 5. It can be observed that  $\gamma \propto \epsilon_b^\mu$  ( $0 < \mu \leq 1$ ), where  $\mu$  is roughly  $\sqrt{|U| \cdot |V| / |E|}$ . Consequently, the computational time of APPROX-BHPP can be minimized by

$$\epsilon_b = \epsilon \cdot \frac{1-\mu}{2-\mu} = \epsilon \cdot \frac{|E| - \sqrt{|U| \cdot |V|}}{2|E| - \sqrt{|U| \cdot |V|}}. \quad (20)$$

## 5 EXPERIMENTS

This section experimentally evaluates the effectiveness of BHPP and other eight similarity measures on query rewriting and item recommendation on 7 real datasets, and compares APPROX-BHPP against two baseline solutions for  $\epsilon$ -approximate BHPP queries in

**Table 1: Statistics of click graphs.**

Name	$ U $	$ V $	$ E $	#clicks	#impressions
<i>Avito</i> [6]	27,736	16,589	67,028	278,960	18,121,561
<i>KDDCup</i> [4]	255,170	1,848,114	2,766,393	8,217,633	121,232,353
<i>AOL</i> [2]	4,811,647	1,632,788	10,741,953	19,442,625	69,745,428,949

**Table 2: Statistics of user-item graphs.**

Name	$ V $	$ U $	$ E $	weight
<i>DBLP</i> [26]	6,001	1,308	29,256	#papers
<i>MovieLens</i> [1]	6,040	3,706	1,000,209	ratings
<i>Last.fm</i> [3]	359,349	160,168	17,559,530	#plays
<i>Amazon-Games</i> [5]	826,767	50,210	1,324,753	ratings

terms of efficiency. For a fair comparison, all algorithms are implemented in C++ and compiled by g++ 7.5 with `-O3` optimization, and all experiments are conducted on a Linux machine with an Intel Xeon(R) E7-8880 v4@2.20GHz CPU and 1TB RAM.

## 5.1 Datasets


We experiment with 7 real bipartite graphs that are used in previous work [17, 19, 23, 29, 31, 53, 60], including 3 click graphs and 4 user-item graphs, which will be used in query rewriting and item recommendation in Sections 5.2 and 5.3, respectively.

**5.1.1 Click graphs.** Table 1 lists the statistics of the 3 click graphs: *Avito*, *KDDCup*, and *AOL*, each of which is a bipartite graph containing a set of queries in  $U$  and a set of ads/URLs in  $V$ . Each edge in them connects a query with an ad/URL if and only if the ad/URL was clicked at least once by a user who issued the query. Additionally, each edge is associated with two numbers, *i.e.*, #clicks and #impressions, which signify the number of clicks that the ad/URL received and the displayed times of the ad/URL, respectively. The weight of each edge is the ratio of its #clicks to its #impressions.

**5.1.2 User-item graphs.** The statistics of 4 user-item graphs including *DBLP*, *MovieLens*, *Last.fm*, and *Amazon-Games* are reported in Table 2, where  $U$  (resp.  $V$ ) contains items (resp. users) and  $E$  is the set of interactions between users and items. The weight of an edge in the publication network *DBLP* indicates the number of papers published on a venue by an author. *MovieLens* is a well-known dataset for recommender systems, in which each edge weight denotes a user’s rating on a movie. In *Last.fm*, each edge is associated with a weight representing the play count of a song by a user. *Amazon-Games* is extracted from the Amazon review data, in which each edge weight is a rating of a game assigned by a user. To ensure the dataset quality, we apply the 10-core setting [32] on the graphs, *i.e.*, removing users and items with less than ten edges.

## 5.2 Query Rewriting

**Settings.** Given a click graph and a query  $q_i$  in the graph, query rewriting aims to transform  $q_i$  into equivalent queries based on their similarities. First, following prior work [11], we calculate the *desirability* of query  $q_j$  w.r.t. query  $q_i$  on the original click graph as  $des(q_i, q_j) = \sum_{q_k \in N(q_i) \cap N(q_j)} \frac{w(q_j, q_k)}{d(q_j)}$ . To evaluate the effectiveness of BHPP and competing similarity measures on query rewriting, we remove 20% edges from the original click graph and on the remaining graph compute similarity scores between queries based on the definition of each similarity measure. As in previous

**Figure 2: Query rewriting performance ( $k = 10$ ).**

work [11, 19], we test whether the top- $k$  (typically,  $k = 10$  and 5) ordering of queries yielded by the similarity scores is consistent with the one derived from the desirability scores, using the classic evaluation metric *Normalized Discounted Cumulative Gain* (NDCG) [36]. The competing similarity measures include Pearson’s correlation coefficient [11], Jaccard’s coefficient [35], SimRank [37], naive PPR [30, 38], CoSimRank [62], SimRank++ [11], P-SimRank [22] and HPP [19, 23]. For each dataset, we carry out query rewriting tasks for 100 randomly selected queries, and report the average performance, *i.e.*, NDCG scores.

**Results.** Figure 2 shows the NDCG results of BHPP and other eight similarity measures on *Avito*, *KDDCup*, and *AOL* datasets when  $k = 10$ . We can see that BHPP consistently outperforms other similarity measures on three datasets. In particular, on *Avito*, BHPP achieves a remarkable improvement of at least 2% over state-of-the-art results. On *KDDCup*, BHPP is superior to competing similarity measures with a considerable gain of up to 0.4%. From Figure 2(c), we can see that BHPP is slightly better than the best competitor HPP on *AOL*. Similar observations can be made from the experimental outcomes when  $k = 5$ . For the interest of space, we refer interested readers to Appendix for the detailed results.

## 5.3 Item Recommendation


**Settings.** Given a user-item graph  $G$  and a user  $v$ , the goal of item recommendation is to recommend a list of interesting items to  $u$ . To assess the recommendation performance of BHPP and other similarity measures compared in Section 5.2, we adopt the evaluation methodology described in [14]. Specifically, we split the original graph  $G$  into a training set  $\bar{G}$  and a test set  $\underline{G}$  such that for each user 80% of its edges are in  $\bar{G}$  and the remaining edges are in  $\underline{G}$ . After that, for each user  $v$ , we generate a list  $L_v$  containing user-item pairs  $(v, u_i)$  in  $\underline{G}$  as well as user-item pairs  $(v, u_j)$  satisfying  $u_j \in \underline{G}$  and  $(v, u_j) \notin \underline{G}$ . Following previous work [55], we find a set  $S(u_i)$  containing the items  $u_j$  that are most similar to a given item  $u_i$  according to the similarity  $s(u_i, u_j)$  computed on  $\bar{G}$ .

$$p(v, u_j) = \frac{\sum_{u_i \in S(u_i) \cup N(v)} s(u_i, u_j) \cdot w(v, u_j)}{\sum_{u_j \in S(u_i) \cup N(v)} s(u_i, u_j)}. \quad (21)$$

Based on the similarities, the prediction score  $p(v, u_i)$  for each user-item pair  $(v, u_i)$  in  $L_v$  is then calculated by Eq. (21) [66]. Let the items with top- $k$  largest prediction scores in  $L_v$  be the recommendations for user  $v$ , and the items that are connected with  $v$  in  $\underline{G}$  be the ground-truth list. The recommendation quality can be measured using two classical metrics: precision ( $precision@k$ ) and

**Table 3: Item recommendation performance ( $k = 10$ ).**

Similarity	DBLP		MovieLens		Last.fm		Amazon-Games	
	precision@k	recall@k	precision@k	recall@k	precision@k	recall@k	precision@k	recall@k
BHPP	<b>0.167</b>	<b>0.164</b>	<b>0.405</b>	<b>0.289</b>	<b>0.313</b>	<b>0.231</b>	<b>0.248</b>	<b>0.187</b>
HPP	0.14	0.138	0.224	0.161	0.305	0.223	0.194	0.15
Pearson	0.037	0.037	0.106	0.074	0.126	0.095	0.056	0.044
Jaccard	0.158	0.157	0.272	0.194	0.287	0.213	0.08	0.062
SimRank	0.151	0.15	0.245	0.177	0.239	0.169	0.127	0.084
CoSimRank	0.115	0.113	0.186	0.137	0.304	0.216	0.156	0.121
PPR	0.149	0.146	0.342	0.245	0.28	0.206	0.188	0.143
SimRank++	0.127	0.126	0.243	0.176	0.241	0.171	0.171	0.118
P-SimRank	0.127	0.127	0.221	0.164	0.226	0.159	0.14	0.088

**Figure 3: Query time with varying  $\epsilon$ .**

recall ( $recall@k$ ). The former is defined as the fraction of the top- $k$  predicted items relevant to user  $v$  and the latter as the fraction of relevant items from  $\underline{G}$  that appear in the  $k$  recommended items.

**Results.** Table 3 reports the recommendation performance of BHPP and eight competing similarity measures on four user-item graphs: *DBLP*, *MovieLens*, *Last.fm*, and *Amazon-Games* with the typical setting  $k = 10$  [21]. BHPP consistently yields the best performance on four datasets. More specifically, on *DBLP*, BHPP achieves an impressive improvement of at least 0.9% (resp. 0.7%) in precision (resp. recall) over existing similarity measures, and a significant margin of at least 6.3% (resp. 4.4%) in terms of precision (resp. recall) on *MovieLens* compared to the state-of-the-art results. On large graphs *Last.fm* and *Amazon-Games*, BHPP still outperforms the competing similarity measures, by a considerable gain of about 0.9% (resp. 1.5%) and a substantial margin of around 5.4% (resp. 3.7%) in terms of precision (resp. recall). The results on  $k = 5$  are quantitatively similar, and, thus, are included in Appendix.

## 5.4 Query Efficiency

In this section, we evaluate the efficiency of our APPROX-BHPP against two baseline solutions for  $\epsilon$ -approximate BHPP queries mentioned in Section 3.3.4, dubbed as MCSP and PISP, respectively.

**Settings.** We test the query performance on six datasets including *DBLP*, *MovieLens*, *KDDCup*, *Last.fm*, *Amazon-Games*, and *AOL*. For each dataset, we choose 100 query nodes from  $U$  uniformly at random. Following previous work [19, 23], we set  $\alpha = 0.15$ . For the MCSP approach, we set the failure probability to  $p_f = 10^{-6}$ . In APPROX-BHPP, parameters  $\lambda$ ,  $\epsilon_b$  are computed according to Eq. (19) and Eq. (20) in the pre-processing step, respectively. The error threshold  $\epsilon$  is varied in the range  $\{10^{-2}, 10^{-3}, 10^{-4}, 10^{-5}, 10^{-6}, 10^{-7}\}$ . We report the average query times (measured in wall-clock time) of each method on each dataset with various  $\epsilon$ .

**Results.** Figure 3 plots the average query time required by each method on each dataset, when varying  $\epsilon$  from  $10^{-2}$  to  $10^{-7}$ . Note that the  $y$ -axis is in log-scale and the measurement unit for query time is millisecond (ms). We exclude a method if it fails to answer the query within one hour on average. We observe that APPROX-BHPP outperforms all competitors, often by an order of magnitude when  $10^{-2} \leq \epsilon \leq 10^{-5}$ . Notably, when  $\epsilon = 10^{-2}$ , APPROX-BHPP is two orders of magnitude faster than the best competitors on all datasets except *AOL*, where it has comparable performance to MCSP. Note that MCSP is unable to answer high-precision (e.g.,  $\epsilon \in \{10^{-6}, 10^{-7}\}$ ) queries efficiently, whereas APPROX-BHPP achieves 3-7.6 $\times$  speedup compared to PISP, demonstrating the power of our optimization techniques developed in Section 4.

## 6 CONCLUSION

In this paper, we formulate similarity search over bipartite graphs as the novel problem of approximate BHPP queries, and present an efficient and theoretically-grounded solution, APPROX-BHPP. Our APPROX-BHPP combines deterministic graph traversal and matrix power iterations in an optimized way, thereby overcoming the deficiencies of both. In addition, APPROX-BHPP offers rigorous theoretical guarantees in terms of accuracy and time complexity, and achieves significant gain in efficiency due to several technical optimizations. Our experimental results show the superior effectiveness of BHPP compared to existing similarity measures, and demonstrate that our APPROX-BHPP outperforms baseline solutions by up to orders of magnitude in terms of computational time. For future work, we intend to study how to extend APPROX-BHPP to handle temporal/dynamic bipartite graphs.



## REFERENCES

- [1] 2003. MovieLens 1M Dataset. Retrieved Oct, 2021 from <https://grouplens.org/datasets/movielens>
- [2] 2006. AOL Query Logs. Retrieved Oct, 2021 from <http://www.cim.mcgill.ca/~dudek/206/Logs/AOL-user-ct-collection>
- [3] 2010. Last.fm Dataset Version 1.2. Retrieved Oct, 2021 from <http://ocelma.net/MusicRecommendationDataset/lastfm-360K.html>
- [4] 2012. KDD Cup 2012, Track 2. Retrieved Oct, 2021 from <https://www.kaggle.com/c/kddcup2012-track2>
- [5] 2014. Amazon product data. Retrieved Oct, 2021 from <https://jmcauley.ucsd.edu/data/amazon>
- [6] 2015. Avito Context Ad Clicks. Retrieved Oct, 2021 from <https://www.kaggle.com/c/avito-context-ad-clicks/data>
- [7] Lada A Adamic and Eytan Adar. 2003. Friends and neighbors on the web. *Social networks* (2003), 211–230.
- [8] Tasos Anastasakos, Dustin Hillard, Sanjay Kshetramade, and Hema Raghavan. 2009. A collaborative filtering approach to ad recommendation using the query-ad click graph. In *CIKM*. 1927–1930.
- [9] Reid Andersen, Christian Borgs, Jennifer Chayes, John Hopcroft, Vahab Mirrokni, and Shang-Hua Teng. 2008. Local computation of pagerank contributions. *Internet Mathematics* (2008), 23–45.
- [10] Reid Andersen, Fan Chung, and Kevin Lang. 2006. Local graph partitioning using pagerank vectors. In *FOCS*. 475–486.
- [11] Ioannis Antonellis, Hector Garcia Molina, and Chi Chao Chang. 2008. Simrank++: Query Rewriting through Link Analysis of the Click Graph. In *PVLDB*. 408–421.
- [12] Konstantin Avrachenkov, Nelly Litvak, Danil Nemirovsky, and Natalia Osipova. 2007. Monte Carlo methods in PageRank computation: When one iteration is sufficient. *SINUM* (2007), 890–904.
- [13] Bahman Bahmani, Abdur Chowdhury, and Ashish Goel. 2010. Fast Incremental and Personalized PageRank. *PVLDB* (2010).
- [14] Alejandro Bellogin, Pablo Castells, and Ivan Cantador. 2011. Precision-oriented evaluation of recommender systems: an algorithmic comparison. In *RecSys*. 333–336.
- [15] Pavel Berkhin. 2005. A survey on PageRank computing. *Internet mathematics* (2005), 73–120.
- [16] Pavel Berkhin. 2006. Bookmark-coloring algorithm for personalized pagerank computing. *Internet Mathematics* (2006), 41–62.
- [17] O. Celma. 2010. *Music Recommendation and Discovery in the Long Tail*. Springer.
- [18] Soumen Chakrabarti. 2007. Dynamic personalized pagerank in entity-relation graphs. In *WWW*. 571–580.
- [19] Hongbo Deng, Michael R Lyu, and Irwin King. 2009. A generalized co-hits algorithm and its application to bipartite graphs. In *SIGKDD*. 239–248.
- [20] Todd Z DeSantis, Keith Keller, Ulas Karaoz, Alexander V Alekseyenko, Navjeet NS Singh, Eoin L Brodie, Zhiheng Pei, Gary L Andersen, and Niels Larsen. 2011. Simrank: Rapid and sensitive general-purpose k-mer search tool. *BMC ecology* (2011), 1–8.
- [21] Mukund Deshpande and George Karypis. 2004. Item-based top-n recommendation algorithms. *TOIS* (2004), 143–177.
- [22] Prasenjit Dey, Kunal Goel, and Rahul Agrawal. 2020. P-Simrank: Extending Simrank to Scale-free bipartite networks. In *The Web Conference*. 3084–3090.
- [23] Alessandro Epasto, Jon Feldman, Silvio Lattanzi, Stefano Leonardi, and Vahab Mirrokni. 2014. Reduce and aggregate: similarity ranking in multi-categorical bipartite graphs. In *WWW*. 349–360.
- [24] Dániel Fogaras, Balázs Rác, Károly Csalogány, and Tamás Sarlós. 2005. Towards scaling fully personalized pagerank: Algorithms, lower bounds, and experiments. *Internet Mathematics* (2005), 333–358.
- [25] Yasuhiro Fujiwara, Makoto Nakatsuji, Makoto Onizuka, and Masaru Kitsuregawa. 2012. Fast and exact top-k search for random walk with restart. *PVLDB* (2012), 442–453.
- [26] Ming Gao, Leihui Chen, Xiangnan He, and Aoying Zhou. 2018. BiNE: Bipartite Network Embedding. 715–724.
- [27] Tao Guo, Xin Cao, Gao Cong, Jiaheng Lu, and Xuemin Lin. 2017. Distributed algorithms on exact personalized pagerank. In *SIGMOD*. 479–494.
- [28] Wentian Guo, Yuchen Li, Mo Sha, and Kian-Lee Tan. 2017. Parallel personalized pagerank on dynamic graphs. *PVLDB* (2017), 93–106.
- [29] F Maxwell Harper and Joseph A Konstan. 2015. The movielens datasets: History and context. *TIIS* 5, 4 (2015), 1–19.
- [30] Taher H Haveliwala. 2002. Topic-sensitive PageRank. In *WWW*.
- [31] Ruining He and Julian McAuley. 2016. Ups and downs: Modeling the visual evolution of fashion trends with one-class collaborative filtering. In *The WebConf*. 507–517.
- [32] Ruining He and Julian McAuley. 2016. VBPR: visual Bayesian Personalized Ranking from implicit feedback. In *AAAI*. 144–150.
- [33] Jonathan L Herlocker, Joseph A Konstan, Loren G Terveen, and John T Riedl. 2004. Evaluating collaborative filtering recommender systems. *TOIS* 22, 1 (2004), 5–53.
- [34] Guanhuo Hou, Xingguang Chen, Sibao Wang, and Zhewei Wei. 2021. Massively Parallel Algorithms for Personalized PageRank. *PVLDB* (2021), 1668–1680.
- [35] Paul Jaccard. 1912. The distribution of the flora in the alpine zone. 1. *New phytologist* (1912), 37–50.
- [36] Kalervo Järvelin and Jaana Kekäläinen. 2017. IR evaluation methods for retrieving highly relevant documents. In *SIGIR*. 243–250.
- [37] Glen Jeh and Jennifer Widom. 2002. Simrank: a measure of structural-context similarity. In *SIGKDD*. 538–543.
- [38] Glen Jeh and Jennifer Widom. 2003. Scaling personalized web search. In *WWW*. 271–279.
- [39] Jinhong Jung, Namyong Park, Sael Lee, and U Kang. 2017. Bepi: Fast and memory-efficient method for billion-scale random walk with restart. In *SIGMOD*. 789–804.
- [40] Sepandar D Kamvar, Taher H Haveliwala, Christopher D Manning, and Gene H Golub. 2003. Extrapolation methods for accelerating PageRank computations. In *WWW*. 261–270.
- [41] Leo Katz. 1953. A new status index derived from sociometric analysis. *Psychometrika* (1953), 39–43.
- [42] Jon M Kleinberg et al. 1998. Authoritative sources in a hyperlinked environment. In *SODA*. 668–677.
- [43] Yehuda Koren. 2008. Factorization meets the neighborhood: a multifaceted collaborative filtering model. In *SIGKDD*. 426–434.
- [44] Lina Li, Cuiping Li, Hong Chen, and Xiaoyong Du. 2013. Mapreduce-based SimRank computation and its application in social recommender system. In *BigData Congress*. 133–140.
- [45] Dandan Lin, Raymond Chi-Wing Wong, Min Xie, and Victor Junqiu Wei. 2020. Index-Free Approach with Theoretical Guarantee for Efficient Random Walk with Restart Query. In *ICDE*. 913–924.
- [46] Wenqing Lin. 2019. Distributed algorithms for fully personalized pagerank on large graphs. In *WWW*. 1084–1094.
- [47] Qin Liu, Zhenguo Li, John CS Lui, and Jiefeng Cheng. 2016. Powerwalk: Scalable personalized pagerank via random walks with vertex-centric decomposition. In *CIKM*. 195–204.
- [48] Peter Lofgren, Siddhartha Banerjee, and Ashish Goel. 2015. Bidirectional PageRank Estimation: From Average-Case to Worst-Case. In *WAW*. 164–176.
- [49] Peter Lofgren, Siddhartha Banerjee, and Ashish Goel. 2016. Personalized pagerank estimation and search: A bidirectional approach. In *WSDM*. 163–172.
- [50] Peter Lofgren and Ashish Goel. 2013. Personalized pagerank to a target node. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1304.4658* (2013).
- [51] Peter A Lofgren, Siddhartha Banerjee, Ashish Goel, and C Seshadhri. 2014. Fast-ppr: Scaling personalized pagerank estimation for large graphs. In *SIGKDD*. 1436–1445.
- [52] Takanori Maehara, Takuya Akiba, Yoichi Iwata, and Ken-ichi Kawarabayashi. 2014. Computing personalized pagerank quickly by exploiting graph structures. *PVLDB* (2014), 1023–1034.
- [53] Julian McAuley, Christopher Targett, Qinfeng Shi, and Anton Van Den Hengel. 2015. Image-based recommendations on styles and substitutes. In *SIGIR*. 43–52.
- [54] Qiaozhu Mei, Dengyong Zhou, and Kenneth Church. 2008. Query suggestion using hitting time. In *CIKM*. 469–478.
- [55] Phung Nguyen, Paolo Tomeo, Tommaso Di Noia, and Eugenio Di Sciascio. 2015. An evaluation of SimRank and Personalized PageRank to build a recommender system for the Web of Data. In *WWW*. 1477–1482.
- [56] Naoto Ohsaka, Takanori Maehara, and Ken-ichi Kawarabayashi. 2015. Efficient pagerank tracking in evolving networks. In *SIGKDD*. 875–884.
- [57] Lawrence Page, Sergey Brin, Rajeev Motwani, and Terry Winograd. 1999. *The PageRank citation ranking: Bringing order to the web*. Technical Report. Stanford InfoLab.
- [58] Jia-Yu Pan, Hyung-Jeong Yang, Christos Faloutsos, and Pinar Duygulu. 2004. Automatic multimedia cross-modal correlation discovery. In *SIGKDD*. 653–658.
- [59] Sungchan Park, Wonseok Lee, Byeongseo Choe, and Sang-Goo Lee. 2019. A survey on personalized PageRank computation algorithms. *IEEE Access* (2019), 163049–163062.
- [60] Greg Pass, Abdur Chowdhury, and Cayley Torgeson. 2006. A picture of search. In *InfoScale*.
- [61] Georgios A Pavlopoulos, Panagiota I Kontou, Athanasia Pavlopoulou, Costas Bouyioukos, Evripides Markou, and Pantelis G Bagos. 2018. Bipartite graphs in systems biology and medicine: a survey of methods and applications. *GigaScience* (2018), 1–31.
- [62] Sascha Rothe and Hinrich Schütze. 2014. Cosimrank: A flexible & efficient graph-theoretic similarity measure. In *ACL*. 1392–1402.
- [63] Gerard Salton, James Allan, and Chris Buckley. 1993. Approaches to passage retrieval in full text information systems. In *SIGIR*. 49–58.
- [64] Purnamrita Sarkar and Andrew W Moore. 2010. Fast nearest-neighbor search in disk-resident graphs. In *SIGKDD*. 513–522.
- [65] Tamás Sarlós, Adrás A Benczúr, Károly Csalogány, Dániel Fogaras, and Balázs Rác. 2006. To randomize or not to randomize: space optimal summaries for hyperlink analysis. In *WWW*. 297–306.
- [66] Badrul Sarwar, George Karypis, Joseph Konstan, and John Riedl. 2001. Item-based collaborative filtering recommendation algorithms. In *WWW*. 285–295.

- [67] Jieming Shi, Tianyuan Jin, Renchi Yang, Xiaokui Xiao, and Yin Yang. 2020. Real-time index-free single source SimRank processing on web-scale graphs. *PVLDB* 13, 7 (2020), 966–980.
- [68] Jieming Shi, Renchi Yang, Tianyuan Jin, Xiaokui Xiao, and Yin Yang. 2019. Real-time top-k personalized pagerank over large graphs on gpus. *PVLDB* (2019), 15–28.
- [69] Kijung Shin, Jinhong Jung, Sael Lee, and U Kang. 2015. Bear: Block elimination approach for random walk with restart on large graphs. In *SIGMOD*. 1571–1585.
- [70] Jimeng Sun, Huiming Qu, Deepayan Chakrabarti, and Christos Faloutsos. 2005. Neighborhood Formation and Anomaly Detection in Bipartite Graphs. In *ICDM*. 418–425.
- [71] Liwen Sun, Reynold Cheng, Xiang Li, David W Cheung, and Jiawei Han. 2011. On link-based similarity join. *PVLDB* (2011), 714–725.
- [72] Hanghang Tong, Christos Faloutsos, and Jia-Yu Pan. 2006. Fast random walk with restart and its applications. In *ICDM*. IEEE, 613–622.
- [73] Hanghang Tong, Spiros Papadimitriou, Philip S Yu, and Christos Faloutsos. 2008. Proximity tracking on time-evolving bipartite graphs. In *SDM*. 704–715.
- [74] Amos Tversky. 1977. Features of similarity. *Psychological review* (1977), 327.
- [75] MK Vijaymeena and K Kavitha. 2016. A survey on similarity measures in text mining. *MLAIJ* (2016), 19–28.
- [76] Alastair J Walker. 1974. New fast method for generating discrete random numbers with arbitrary frequency distributions. *Electronics Letters* (1974), 127–128.
- [77] Hanzhi Wang, Zhewei Wei, Junhao Gan, Sibowang, and Zengfeng Huang. 2020. Personalized PageRank to a Target Node, Revisited. In *SIGKDD*. 657–667.
- [78] Runhui Wang, Sibowang, and Xiaofang Zhou. 2019. Parallelizing approximate single-source personalized pagerank queries on shared memory. *VLDBJ* (2019), 923–940.
- [79] Sibowang, Youze Tang, Xiaokui Xiao, Yin Yang, and Zengxiang Li. 2016. Hubppr: effective indexing for approximate personalized pagerank. *PVLDB* (2016), 205–216.
- [80] Sibowang, Renchi Yang, Runhui Wang, Xiaokui Xiao, Zhewei Wei, Wenqing Lin, Yin Yang, and Nan Tang. 2019. Efficient algorithms for approximate single-source personalized pagerank queries. *TODS* (2019), 1–37.
- [81] Sibowang, Renchi Yang, Xiaokui Xiao, Zhewei Wei, and Yin Yang. 2017. FORA: simple and effective approximate single-source personalized pagerank. In *SIGKDD*. 505–514.
- [82] Zhewei Wei, Xiaodong He, Xiaokui Xiao, Sibowang, Shuo Shang, and Ji-Rong Wen. 2018. Topppr: top-k personalized pagerank queries with precision guarantees on large graphs. In *SIGMOD*. 441–456.
- [83] Hao Wu, Junhao Gan, Zhewei Wei, and Rui Zhang. 2021. Unifying the Global and Local Approaches: An Efficient Power Iteration with Forward Push. In *SIGMOD*.
- [84] Renchi Yang and Xiaokui Xiao. 2021. Fast Approximate All Pairwise CoSimRanks via Random Projection. In *WISE*. 438–452.
- [85] Minji Yoon, Jinhong Jung, and U Kang. 2018. Tpa: Fast, scalable, and accurate method for approximate random walk with restart on billion scale graphs. In *ICDE*. 1132–1143.
- [86] Weiren Yu and Xuemin Lin. 2013. IRWR: incremental random walk with restart. In *SIGIR*. 1017–1020.
- [87] Hongyang Zhang, Peter Lofgren, and Ashish Goel. 2016. Approximate personalized pagerank on dynamic graphs. In *SIGKDD*. 1315–1324.
- [88] Fanwei Zhu, Yuan Fang, Kevin Chen-Chuan Chang, and Jing Ying. 2013. Incremental and accuracy-aware personalized pagerank through scheduled approximation. *PVLDB* (2013), 481–492.

## A PROOFS





Figure 4: Query rewriting performance ( $k = 5$ ).

**Proof of Lemma 3.2.** We prove this lemma based on induction. First, consider the initial case, where all entries in  $\overleftarrow{\Gamma}_u$  are zero

except  $\overleftarrow{\Gamma}_u(u) = 1$ , and  $\pi_b(u_i, u) = 0$  for each node  $u_i \in U$ . Hence, we have  $\pi(u_i, u) = \pi(u_i, u) \cdot \overleftarrow{\Gamma}_u(u) \forall u_i \in U$ , implying Eq. (8) holds in the initial case.

Next, we assume that after  $\ell$ -th iterations (Lines 4-12), the approximate HPP values  $\overleftarrow{\pi}^{(\ell)}(u_i, u) \forall u_i \in U$  and residue vector  $\overleftarrow{\Gamma}_u^{(\ell)}$  at the end of this iteration satisfy Eq. (8), i.e.,  $\pi(u_i, u) = \overleftarrow{\pi}^{(\ell)}(u_i, u) + \sum_{u_j \in U} \pi(u_i, u_j) \cdot \overleftarrow{\Gamma}_u^{(\ell)}(u_j)$ . Let  $\overleftarrow{\pi}^{(\ell+1)}(u_i, u) \forall u_i \in U$  be the approximate HPP values and  $\overleftarrow{\Gamma}_u^{(\ell+1)}$  be residue vector by the end of  $(\ell + 1)$ -th iteration. For any node  $u_i \in U$ , we define  $\Delta(u_i)$  as follows:

$$\Delta(u_i) = \overleftarrow{\pi}^{(\ell+1)}(u_i, u) - \overleftarrow{\pi}^{(\ell)}(u_i, u) + \sum_{u_j \in U} \left( \overleftarrow{\Gamma}_u^{(\ell+1)}(u_j) - \overleftarrow{\Gamma}_u^{(\ell)}(u_j) \right) \cdot \pi(u_i, u_j). \quad (22)$$

If  $\Delta(u_i) = 0$  holds for each  $u_i \in U$ , the lemma is established. According to Lines 4-12, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \overleftarrow{\Gamma}_u^{(\ell+1)}(u_j) - \overleftarrow{\Gamma}_u^{(\ell)}(u_j) \\ &= -\overleftarrow{\Gamma}_u^{(\ell)}(u_j) + \sum_{\substack{u_x \in U \\ \overleftarrow{\Gamma}_u(u_x) \geq \epsilon_b}} (1 - \alpha) \cdot \overleftarrow{\Gamma}_u(u_x) \cdot \mathbf{P}(u_j, u_x) \end{aligned}$$

for node  $u_j$  with  $\overleftarrow{\Gamma}_u^{(\ell)}(u_j) \geq \epsilon_b$ . Note that  $\overleftarrow{\Gamma}_u^{(\ell+1)}(u_j) - \overleftarrow{\Gamma}_u^{(\ell)}(u_j) = \sum_{u_x \in U \& \overleftarrow{\Gamma}_u(u_x) \geq \epsilon_b} (1 - \alpha) \cdot \overleftarrow{\Gamma}_u(u_x) \cdot \mathbf{P}(u_j, u_x)$  holds for node  $u_j$  with  $\overleftarrow{\Gamma}_u^{(\ell)}(u_j) < \epsilon_b$ . Thus, Eq. (22) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta(u_i) &= \overleftarrow{\pi}^{(\ell+1)}(u_i, u) - \overleftarrow{\pi}^{(\ell)}(u_i, u) - \sum_{\substack{u_j \in U \\ \overleftarrow{\Gamma}_u(u_j) \geq \epsilon_b}} \overleftarrow{\Gamma}_u^{(\ell)}(u_j) \pi(u_i, u_j) \\ &+ \sum_{u_j \in U} \sum_{\substack{u_x \in U \\ \overleftarrow{\Gamma}_u(u_x) \geq \epsilon_b}} (1 - \alpha) \cdot \mathbf{P}(u_j, u_x) \cdot \pi(u_i, u_x). \end{aligned}$$

If  $\overleftarrow{\Gamma}_u(u_i) < \epsilon_b$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta(u_i) &= \sum_{\substack{u_j \in U \\ \overleftarrow{\Gamma}_u(u_j) \geq \epsilon_b}} \overleftarrow{\Gamma}_u^{(\ell)}(u_j) \cdot \pi(u_i, u_j) \\ &+ \sum_{u_j \in U} \sum_{\substack{u_x \in U \\ \overleftarrow{\Gamma}_u(u_x) \geq \epsilon_b}} \overleftarrow{\Gamma}_u^{(\ell)}(u_j) \cdot \pi(u_i, u_x) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Otherwise, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta(u_i) &= \alpha \cdot \overleftarrow{\Gamma}_u(u_i) - \sum_{\substack{u_j \in U \\ \overleftarrow{\Gamma}_u(u_j) \geq \epsilon_b}} \overleftarrow{\Gamma}_u^{(\ell)}(u_j) \cdot \pi(u_i, u_j) \\ &+ \sum_{\substack{u_x \in U, u_x \neq u_j \\ \overleftarrow{\Gamma}_u(u_x) \geq \epsilon_b}} \left( \overleftarrow{\Gamma}_u^{(\ell)}(u_j) \cdot \pi(u_i, u_x) \right) \\ &+ \overleftarrow{\Gamma}_u^{(\ell)}(u_i) \cdot (\pi(u_i, u_i) - \alpha) = 0, \end{aligned}$$

which seals the proof.  $\square$

**Proof of Theorem 3.3.** According to Lines 4-12 in Algorithm 2, in each round, each node  $u_i$  involves converting  $\alpha$  portion of  $\overleftarrow{\Gamma}_u(u_i) > \epsilon_b$  to its approximate HPP  $\overleftarrow{\pi}(u_i, u)$ , and distributing the remaining residue to its neighbors  $N(u_i)$  as well as neighbors' neighbors. Due to  $\overleftarrow{\pi}(u_i, u) \leq \pi(u_i, u)$ ,  $u_i$  requires at most  $\frac{\pi(u_i, u)}{\alpha \cdot \epsilon_b}$  iterations to convert its residue into the HPP. As a result, the cost for a node  $u_i$  is  $\frac{\pi(u_i, u)}{\alpha \cdot \epsilon_b} \cdot \sum_{v_j \in N(u_i)} d(v_j)$ . When considering all nodes  $u_i \in U$ , the total time complexity is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{u \in U} \sum_{u_i \in U} \frac{\pi(u_i, u)}{\alpha \cdot \epsilon_b} \cdot \sum_{v_j \in N(u_i)} d(v_j) \\ &= \frac{1}{\alpha \cdot \epsilon_b} \sum_{u_i \in U} \sum_{u \in U} \pi(u_i, u) \cdot \sum_{v_j \in N(u_i)} d(v_j) \\ &= \frac{1}{\alpha \cdot \epsilon_b} \sum_{u_i \in U} \cdot \sum_{v_j \in N(u_i)} d(v_j) = \frac{1}{\alpha \cdot \epsilon_b} \cdot \sum_{v_j \in V} d(v_j)^2. \end{aligned}$$

**Table 4: Item recommendation performance ( $k = 5$ ).**

Similarity	DBLP		Movielens		Last.fm		Amazon-Games	
	precision@k	recall@k	precision@k	recall@k	precision@k	recall@k	precision@k	recall@k
BHPP	<b>0.165</b>	<b>0.115</b>	<b>0.609</b>	<b>0.22</b>	<b>0.441</b>	<b>0.163</b>	<b>0.36</b>	<b>0.136</b>
HPP	0.15	0.097	0.291	0.105	0.416	0.15	0.28	0.108
Pearson	0.095	0.064	0.091	0.031	0.178	0.067	0.104	0.039
Jaccard	0.139	0.095	0.322	0.114	0.307	0.093	0.112	0.041
SimRank	0.157	0.109	0.325	0.118	0.356	0.112	0.209	0.088
CoSimRank	0.152	0.102	0.322	0.108	0.415	0.152	0.243	0.098
PPR	0.127	0.098	0.475	0.17	0.393	0.145	0.272	0.104
SimRank++	0.15	0.101	0.325	0.118	0.367	0.12	0.277	0.103
P-SimRank	0.15	0.1	0.32	0.112	0.343	0.108	0.226	0.094

Therefore, the amortized cost of Algorithm 2 is  $O\left(\frac{\sum_{v_j \in V} d(v_j)^2}{|U| \cdot \alpha \cdot \epsilon_b}\right)$ .  $\square$

**Proof of Theorem 4.1.** If SS-PUSH returns  $\overleftarrow{\pi}(u_i, u)$  for each node  $u_i \in U$  at Line 17, we have  $\forall u_i \in U$  such that  $\overleftarrow{\Gamma}_u(u_i) \leq \epsilon_b$ . By Lemma 3.2, we obtain  $\pi(u_i, u) - \overleftarrow{\pi}(u_i, u) \leq \epsilon_b$ , which holds for each node  $u_i \in U$ .

If Algorithm 3 breaks at Line 18, SS-PUSH will conduct sequential push operations (Lines 19-28). This procedure can be regarded as the SELECTIVEPUSH when  $\epsilon_b$  is set to 0. According to Lemma 3.2, at the end of each iteration in sequential pushes, Eq. (8) still holds. By Line 19, Algorithm 3 returns  $\{\overleftarrow{\pi}(u_i, u) | u_i \in U\}$  when either (i)  $\overleftarrow{\Gamma}_u(u_i) \leq \epsilon_b$  for each node  $u_i$  in  $U$  or (ii)  $\sum_{u_i \in U} \overleftarrow{\Gamma}_u(u_i) \leq \epsilon_b$ . Based on Eq. (8), we derive

$$\pi(u, u) - \overleftarrow{\pi}(u, u) \leq \epsilon_b \sum_{u_i \in U} \pi(u_i, u) = \epsilon_b \text{ and}$$

$$\pi(u_i, u) - \overleftarrow{\pi}(u_i, u) \leq \sum_{u_i \in U} \overleftarrow{\Gamma}_u(u_i) \leq \epsilon_b,$$

respectively, which complete our proof.  $\square$

**Proof of Lemma 4.2.** According to Eq. (3),

$$\pi(u, u_i) = \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} \alpha(1-\alpha)^\ell \cdot \mathbf{P}^\ell(u, u_i),$$

which suggests that if we can prove for any  $t \geq 1$ ,

$$\frac{\mathbf{P}^t(u, u_i)}{ws(u_i)} = \frac{\mathbf{P}^t(u_i, u)}{ws(u)}, \quad (23)$$

we establish the lemma. Next, we prove Eq. (23) by induction. For the based case, i.e.,  $t = 1$ , Eq. (2) implies

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\mathbf{P}(u_i, u_j)}{ws(u_j)} &= \frac{1}{ws(u_j)} \sum_{v_l \in N(u_i) \cap N(u_j)} \frac{w(u_i, v_l)}{ws(u_i)} \cdot \frac{w(v_l, u_j)}{ws(v_l)} \\ &= \frac{1}{ws(u_i)} \sum_{v_l \in N(u_i) \cap N(u_j)} \frac{w(u_j, v_l)}{ws(u_j)} \cdot \frac{w(v_l, u_i)}{ws(v_l)} = \frac{\mathbf{P}(u_j, u_i)}{ws(u_i)}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, Eq. (23) holds when  $t = 1$ . Assume that we have Eq. (23) for any  $u_j \in U$  when  $t = \ell$ . Then we consider the case for  $t = \ell + 1$ , which satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\mathbf{P}^{\ell+1}(u, u_i)}{ws(u_i)} &= \sum_{u_j \in N(u_i)} \frac{\mathbf{P}^\ell(u, u_j) \cdot \mathbf{P}(u_j, u_i)}{ws(u_i)} \\ &= \sum_{u_j \in N(u_i)} \frac{\mathbf{P}^\ell(u, u_j) \cdot \mathbf{P}(u_i, u_j)}{ws(u_j)} \\ &= \sum_{u_j \in N(u_i)} \frac{\mathbf{P}^\ell(u_j, u) \cdot \mathbf{P}(u_i, u_j)}{ws(u)} = \frac{\mathbf{P}^{\ell+1}(u_i, u)}{ws(u)}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the lemma is proved.  $\square$

**Proof of Theorem 4.3.** First, let  $\overrightarrow{\pi}_u(u_i) = \overleftarrow{\pi}_u(u_i) \cdot \frac{ws(u_i)}{ws(u)}$  and  $\overrightarrow{\Gamma}_u(u_j) = \overleftarrow{\Gamma}_u(u_j) \cdot \frac{ws(u_j)}{ws(u)}$  (Lines 13-15). By Eq. (11), we have

$$\pi(u, u_i) = \overrightarrow{\pi}(u, u_i) + \sum_{u_j \in U} \overrightarrow{\Gamma}_u(u_j) \cdot \pi(u_j, u_i) \quad (24)$$

holds for each node  $u_i \in U$ .

If  $\forall u_j \in U \overrightarrow{\Gamma}_u(u_j) \leq \frac{\epsilon_f}{\lambda}$ , plugging Eq. (18) into Eq. (24), we get for each node  $u_i \in U$ ,

$$\pi(u, u_i) - \overrightarrow{\pi}(u, u_i) \leq \epsilon_f \cdot \frac{\sum_{u_j \in U} \pi(u_j, u_i)}{\lambda} \leq \epsilon_f.$$

Next, consider the case where  $\forall u_i \in U$  such that  $\overrightarrow{\Gamma}_u(u_i) \leq \frac{\epsilon_f}{\lambda}$ . According to Algorithm 1 and Eq. (3), the  $\mathbf{p}_u$  returned at Line 21 in Algorithm 4 satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{p}_u(u_i) &= \sum_{u_j \in U} \sum_{\ell=0}^t \overrightarrow{\Gamma}_u(u_j) \cdot \alpha(1-\alpha)^\ell \cdot (\mathbf{U} \cdot \mathbf{V})^\ell(u_j, u_i) \\ &= \sum_{u_j \in U} \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} \overrightarrow{\Gamma}_u(u_j) \cdot \alpha(1-\alpha)^\ell \cdot \mathbf{P}^\ell(u_j, u_i) \\ &\quad - \sum_{u_j \in U} \sum_{\ell=t+1}^{\infty} \overrightarrow{\Gamma}_u(u_j) \cdot \alpha(1-\alpha)^\ell \cdot \mathbf{P}^\ell(u_j, u_i) \\ &\geq \sum_{u_j \in U} \overrightarrow{\Gamma}_u(u_j) \pi(u_j, u_i) - \sum_{u_j \in U} \sum_{\ell=t+1}^{\infty} \overrightarrow{\Gamma}_u(u_j) \alpha(1-\alpha)^\ell \end{aligned}$$

For convenience, let  $\overrightarrow{\pi}'(u, u_i)$  denote the approximate HPP obtained at Line 22. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \overrightarrow{\pi}(u, u_i) &= \overrightarrow{\pi}'(u, u_i) + \mathbf{p}_u(u_i) \\ &\geq \overrightarrow{\pi}'(u, u_i) + \sum_{u_j \in U} \overrightarrow{\Gamma}_u(u_j) \pi(u_j, u_i) \\ &\quad - \sum_{u_j \in U} \sum_{\ell=t+1}^{\infty} \overrightarrow{\Gamma}_u(u_j) \alpha(1-\alpha)^\ell \\ &= \pi(u, u_i) - \sum_{u_j \in U} \sum_{\ell=t+1}^{\infty} \overrightarrow{\Gamma}_u(u_j) \cdot \alpha(1-\alpha)^\ell \end{aligned}$$

Since  $t = \log_{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}} \frac{\sum_{u_i \in U} \overrightarrow{\Gamma}_u(u_i)}{\epsilon_f} - 1$ , we have

$$\sum_{u_j \in U} \sum_{\ell=t+1}^{\infty} \overrightarrow{\Gamma}_u(u_j) \cdot \alpha(1-\alpha)^\ell \leq \epsilon_f,$$

which yields  $\overrightarrow{\pi}(u, u_i) \geq \pi(u, u_i) - \epsilon_f$  and completes our proof.  $\square$

**Proof of Lemma 4.4.** According to Algorithm 1, we have

$$\boldsymbol{\rho} = \mathbf{1} \cdot \sum_{\ell=0}^{\tau} \alpha(1-\alpha)^\ell \cdot \mathbf{P}^\ell, \quad (25)$$

when inputting  $\mathbf{e} = \mathbf{1}$  and  $t = \tau$ . Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{u_j \in U} \pi(u_j, u_i) &= \boldsymbol{\rho}(u_i) + (\mathbf{1} \cdot \sum_{\ell=\tau+1}^{\infty} \alpha(1-\alpha)^\ell \cdot \mathbf{P}^\ell)(u_i) \\ &\leq \boldsymbol{\rho}(u_i) + |U| \cdot (1 - \sum_{\ell=0}^{\tau} \alpha(1-\alpha)^\ell) \\ &= \boldsymbol{\rho}(u_i) + |U| \cdot (1-\alpha)^{\tau+1}, \end{aligned}$$

implying that  $\max_{u_i \in U} \sum_{u_j \in U} \pi(u_j, u_i) \leq \max_{u_i \in U} \boldsymbol{\rho}(u_i) + |U| \cdot (1-\alpha)^{\tau+1}$ . Besides, according to Lemma 4.2,

$$\sum_{u_j \in U} \pi(u_j, u_i) = \sum_{u_j \in U} \pi(u_i, u_j) \cdot \frac{ws(u_i)}{ws(u_j)},$$

leading to  $\max_{u_i \in U} \sum_{u_j \in U} \pi(u_j, u_i) \leq \frac{\max_{u_i \in U} ws(u_i)}{\min_{u_j \in U} ws(u_j)}$ . This completes our proof.  $\square$

**Proof of Theorem 4.5.** Since  $\epsilon_f = \epsilon - \epsilon_b$ , combining Theorems 4.3 and 4.1 proves the theorem.  $\square$