

Brief Announcement: Distributed Unconstrained Local Search for Multilevel Graph Partitioning

Peter Sanders
sanders@kit.edu

Karlsruhe Institute of Technology
Karlsruhe, Germany

Daniel Seemaier
daniel.seemaier@kit.edu

Karlsruhe Institute of Technology
Karlsruhe, Germany

ABSTRACT

Partitioning a graph into blocks of *roughly equal* weight while cutting only few edges is a fundamental problem in computer science with numerous practical applications. While shared-memory parallel partitioners have recently matured to achieve the same quality as widely used sequential partitioners, there is still a pronounced quality gap between distributed partitioners and their sequential counterparts. In this work, we shrink this gap considerably by describing the engineering of an unconstrained local search algorithm suitable for distributed partitioners. We integrate the proposed algorithm in a distributed multilevel partitioner. Our extensive experiments show that the resulting algorithm scales to thousands of PEs while computing cuts that are, on average, only 3.5% larger than those of a state-of-the-art high-quality shared-memory partitioner. Compared to previous distributed partitioners, we obtain on average 6.8% smaller cuts than the best-performing competitor while being more than 9 times faster.

CCS CONCEPTS

• **Theory of computation** → **Distributed algorithms; Parallel algorithms.**

KEYWORDS

graph partitioning, distributed algorithms, parallel algorithms

1 INTRODUCTION

Graphs are a central concept of computer science used whenever we need to model relations between objects. Consequently, handling *large* graphs is very important for parallel processing. This often requires to *partition* these graphs into blocks of roughly equal weight while cutting only few edges between the blocks (*balanced* graph partitioning).

More precisely, consider a graph $G = (V = 1..n, E, c, \omega)$ with positive vertex weights c and edge weights ω . We are looking for a partition Π of V into k non-overlapping blocks V_1, \dots, V_k . The *balance constraint* demands that for all blocks $c(V_i) \leq L_{\max} := (1 + \varepsilon) \frac{c(V)}{k}$ for some imbalance parameter ε . The objective is to minimize the *cut*, i.e., the total weight of all inter-block edges.

There has been a huge amount of research on graph partitioning, so we refer the reader to overview papers [1] for most of the general material. *Multilevel graph partitioners* (e.g., [5, 6, 8]) achieve high-quality partitions for a wide range of input graphs with a good trade-off between quality and partitioning cost. First, iteratively *coarsen* the graph G . The resulting small graph G' is a good representation of the input and an *initial partition* of G' already induces a good partition of G . This is further improved by *uncoarsening* the

graph and improving the partition on each level through refinement algorithms. Arguably the most successful refinement algorithm is the *Fiduccia-Mattheyses* local search algorithm [3] (FM).

However, parallelizing the refinement phase has proved challenging over several decades. Shared-memory partitioners have recently matured to achieve high quality and reasonable scalability [5] through an efficient parallelization of the FM algorithm, requiring fine-grained synchronization and communication, which is unsuitable for distributed memory. On the other hand, distributed partitioners [6, 8] rely on simpler local search algorithms such as label propagation, inducing a considerable quality penalty. Label propagation visits each vertex in parallel and moves the vertex to the block that minimizes the induced cut while preserving the balance constraint. This process is usually repeated for multiple rounds and terminated once no more vertices are moved during a round (i.e., the partition is in a local optimum) or a maximum number of rounds has been exceeded.

Recently, Gilbert et al. [4] introduced the refinement algorithm *Jet*, which they show to achieve similar partition quality to FM refinement while being suitable for GPU parallelism. The *Jet* algorithm first builds a set of *move candidates* M : for each vertex v in block V_i , let $\text{conn}(v, V')$ be the summed edge weight between v and vertices in block V' . Let $V_j = \arg \max_{V'} \text{conn}(v, V')$ be the block with the strongest connection to v . Then, v is included in M if $\text{conn}(v, V_j) - \text{conn}(v, V_i) \geq -\lfloor \tau \cdot \text{conn}(v, V_i) \rfloor$, where τ is a constant *temperature* parameter. For $\tau = 1$, all vertices are included, whereas $\tau = 0$ only considers vertices with positive gain. Note that in contrast to *standard* label propagation, M might also include moves that violate the balance constraint. The moves in M are then sorted by their gain value before positive gain moves are applied, locking them in the next round to avoid oscillation. If violated, an independent *rebalancing* algorithm fixes the balance constraint afterward.

Based on the idea of balance-violating moves with subsequent rebalancing, Maas et al. [7] developed an *unconstrained FM* adaptation as part of the shared-memory parallel partitioner Mt-KaHyPar. Their experimental evaluation shows that unconstrained FM achieves considerable improvements compared to regular FM (and also *Jet*) on real-world graphs with a power-law degree distribution.

Contributions. We achieve similar quality and much better scalability by porting *Jet* to a distributed-memory setting. Move generation is relatively easy to adapt but further improved by working with multiple temperatures. We develop an alternative highly scalable probabilistic algorithm for rebalancing, that can perform a large number of favorable balancing moves in parallel. We finish up using the slower but more controlled algorithm from dKaMinPar [9]. It remains to be seen whether this approach is more suitable

if k is large. Extensive experiments on real-world graphs and huge randomly generated networks indicate scalability to (at least) 8 192 cores and one trillion (directed) edges. Compared to state-of-the-art distributed partitioners we achieve considerably improved quality when partitioning into $k \in \{2, 4, \dots, 128\}$ blocks.

2 DISTRIBUTED JET REFINEMENT

We consider a graph G distributed across P processing elements (PEs) $1..P$, each containing a subgraph of consecutive vertices of G distributed s.t. each PE has roughly the same *number of edges*. Undirected edges $\{u, v\}$ are represented by two directed edges (u, v) and (v, u) , which are stored on the PEs owning the respective tail vertices. Vertices adjacent to vertices owned by other PEs are called *interface vertices* and replicated as *ghost vertices* (i.e., without outgoing edges). The partition $\Pi = \{V_1, \dots, V_k\}$ is distributed s.t. each PE stores the block IDs for its vertices, including its ghost vertices.

Jet Refinement. Implementing Jet [4] in this model requires only minor modifications. We restate the algorithm here in order to be self-contained. First, recall that each PE builds a set of local move candidates M by visiting its owned vertices, including a vertex v of block V_i in M if $g(v) := \max_{j \neq i} \text{conn}(v, V_j) - \text{conn}(v, V_i) \geq -[\tau \cdot \text{conn}(v, V_i)]$. The temperature τ controls the extent of move candidates with negative gain (i.e., that would increase the partition cut) included in M . Note that $\text{conn}(v, \cdot)$ can be computed without communication since it only depends on v 's neighborhood. Next, each interface vertex $v \in M$ sends its corresponding $g(v)$ value to its ghost replicates. With this information, PEs independently re-evaluate their move candidates, removing all vertices v that would increase the partition cut assuming that any neighbor u with $g(u) > g(v)$ is moved before v . The remaining vertices are moved to their target blocks, locked for the next round, and the block assignment of ghost replicates is updated accordingly.

Rebalancing. Rebalancing the partition afterwards while retaining most of its improved quality is crucial to the overall performance of the algorithm. Ref. [9] introduces a distributed rebalancing algorithm that can only move a few vertices per overloaded block in every centrally coordinated epoch. This induces a sequential bottleneck for partitions with highly overloaded blocks. To make rebalancing scalable, we extend the algorithm by the following highly parallel approach (summarized in Algorithm 1, Appendix A) whenever a single round reduces the total partition overload by less than 10%.

Following Ref. [9], we consider vertices $v \in V_o$ of overloaded blocks $V_o \in \Pi$ and look at the maximum reduction in edge cut g_v when moving v to any non-overloaded block. Then, each PE sorts its vertices into exponentially spaced buckets b_o^j based on their *maximum relative gain*, defined as $r_v := g_v \cdot c(v)$ if $g_v > 0$ and $r_v := g_v/c(v)$ otherwise. A vertex v with $r_v \geq 0$ is assigned to bucket $j = 0$, whereas the bucket of negative gain vertices is calculated as $j = 1 + \lceil \log_\alpha(1 - r_v) \rceil$. During early experimentation, we observed that the choice of α considerably impacts the resulting partition quality after rebalancing. Thus, we use $\alpha = 1.1$ to obtain our results. After constructing the PE-local buckets, we compute global bucket weights $c(B_o^i) := \sum_p c(b_o^i @ p)$ using an all-reduce operation, where $b_o^i @ p$ refers to the value of variable b_o^i on PE

p . The *cut-off buckets* $\hat{B}_o := \min \{j \mid \sum_{i < j} c(B_o^i) \geq c(V_o) - L_{\max}\}$ contain the lowest-rated vertices that must be moved to remove all excess weight from overloaded blocks. Since moving all vertices in buckets up to the cut-off buckets could introduce overloaded target blocks, we use a probabilistic approach that maintains balance (of non-overloaded blocks) in expectation.¹ To this end, let W_u be the total vertex weight of all move candidates in buckets up to the cut-off bucket with target block V_u . Then, move vertices to V_u with probability $p_u := (L_{\max} - c(V_u))/W_u$ (if $p_u \geq 1$, we always perform the move).

Integration. We perform $t = 4$ rounds of the proposed algorithm. Since we have observed that Jet is very sensitive to the temperature used in the construction of M , we perform multiple rounds of the algorithm to achieve more robust performance. During the i -th round, we set the temperature to $\tau_i = \tau_0 + \frac{i}{t}(\tau_1 - \tau_0)$, where $\tau_0 = 0.75$ and $\tau_1 = 0.25$. Following Ref. [4], a single round consists of repeating the described Jet refinement and rebalancing steps until 12 consecutive repetitions did not improve the partition.

3 EXPERIMENTS

We have integrated the proposed refinement algorithm into the distributed multilevel partitioner dKaMinPar [9], compiled all codes using g++-12.1 with flags `-O3 -march=native` and use OpenMPI 4.0 as parallelization library. We use the benchmark set of Ref. [9] (Appendix C) to evaluate the solution quality of the proposed refinement algorithm, partitioning each graph using $k \in \{2, 4, \dots, 128\}$ and $\varepsilon = 3\%$ on a single machine equipped with a 64-core AMD EPYC 7702P and 1 TB of main memory.

Looking at Fig. 1a, we observe that our strongest configuration with 4 rounds of Jet (denoted d4xJet) improves the partition cut by at least 10% on roughly 50% of all benchmark instances compared to plain dKaMinPar, which only uses label propagation for refinement. This is considered a lot in the context of multilevel graph partitioning, as most multilevel partitioners achieve average edge cuts within a few percentage points of each other.

Compared to the state-of-the-art shared-memory partitioner Mt-KaHyPar [7], we find that d4xJet computes partitions with at most 1% larger cuts on 50% of all instances, shrinking the quality gap between distributed and shared-memory partitioners considerably (Fig. 1b). On average, the cuts found by Mt-KaHyPar are 3.5% smaller than those of d4xJet, with roughly equal running times (Fig. 1d).

Fig. 1c compares against competing distributed partitioners. d4xJet finds at least $\approx 8\%$ lower cuts on roughly 50% of all instances than ParHIP-Eco, which obtained the best cuts in Ref. [9]. More, ParHIP-Eco is considerably slower than d4xJet due to its expensive evolutionary initial partitioning algorithm.

To evaluate the scalability of d4xJet, we perform additional weak- and strong-scaling experiments on $\{1, 2, \dots, 128\}$ nodes of

¹Note that a more straightforward adaptation of the rebalancing algorithm proposed by Ref. [4] to distributed memory could work as follows. As proposed in Ref. [4], only consider moves to target blocks with weights below the *dead zone* $L_{\max} - \delta \cdot (L_{\max} - c(V)/k)$, where $\delta \in [0, 1]$ is a tuning parameter. Then, for each overloaded block V_o , always apply all moves in buckets below the cut-off bucket \hat{B}_o . Additionally, let PE p move the highest rated vertices of the cut-off bucket \hat{B}_o with total weight proportional to the total weight of block V_o on PE p . While this process could introduce new overloaded blocks, it terminates in $\leq k$ iterations as at least one block per round is moved into the dead zone. It is open to see which approach gives better performance, especially for large k .




Figure 1: Solution quality comparison using performance profiles. Let \mathcal{A} be the set of algorithms, \mathcal{I} the set of instances, and $q_A(I)$ the edge cut of algorithm $A \in \mathcal{A}$ on instance $I \in \mathcal{I}$. For each algorithm A , we plot the fraction of instances $\frac{|\mathcal{I}_A(\delta)|}{|\mathcal{I}|}$ (y-axis) where $\mathcal{I}_A(\delta) := \{I \in \mathcal{I} \mid q_A \leq \delta \cdot \min_{A' \in \mathcal{A}} q_{A'}(I)\}$ and δ on the x-axis. (a) Solution quality of plain dKaMinPar (dLP) and with 1 resp. 4 rounds of Jet refinement (dJet resp. d4xJet). (b) Comparison against Mt-KaHyPar [7] (unconstrained FM refinement). (c) Comparison against distributed partitioners ParHIP [8] and ParMETIS [6]. (d) Per-instance running times with means across all instances that were solved by all algorithms or exceeded the time limit (1 h).




Figure 2: Results for d4xJet. (a) Weak scaling on random geometric (rgg) and hyperbolic (rhg, power-law exponent 3.0) graphs with 2^{21} vertices and 2^{27} (directed) edges per core. (b) Strong scaling on real-world graphs with low (kmer_V1r, nlpkkt240) and high (twitter-2010, uk-2007-05) max. degree.

the HoreKa high-performance cluster, setting $k = 16$ and $\epsilon = 3\%$. Each node is equipped with two 38-core Intel Xeon Platinum 8368 processors². The nodes are connected by an InfiniBand 4X HDR 200 Gbit/s network with approx. 1 μ s latency. Results are shown in Fig. 2, where we observe weak scalability up to (at least) 8192 cores on randomly generated graphs. On medium-sized real-world graphs, we generally observe scalability up to 1024–2048 cores. This is roughly in line with competing distributed partitioners (see, e.g., [9]), which we discuss briefly. ParMETIS is unable to partition the graphs with high maximum degree due to its matching-based coarsening strategy, does not scale on kmer_V1r, but scales up to 2048 cores on nlpkkt240 with speedup 8.7 (over 64 cores; d4xJet scales to 1024 cores with speedup 5.3). ParHIP(-Fast) fails to partition the twitter-2010 and kmer_V1r graphs regardless of the number of cores used and achieves a speedup of 2.1 on 2048 cores for uk-2007-05 (d4xJet achieves 3.9), and 4.5 on 512 cores on nlpkkt240. Interestingly, we note that the edge cuts improve slightly when increasing the number of cores (see Appendix B).

4 CONCLUSION

We have engineered a distributed implementation of the Jet algorithm [4], shrinking the quality gap between distributed and shared-memory partitioners considerably while scaling to thousands of

cores. Further improvements might be possible by using more sophisticated local search algorithms. For instance, Pt-Scotch [2] uses the FM algorithm on the *band graph* induced by the partition (local copies of the subgraph surrounding the cut), but this imposes a sequential bottleneck on graphs with large cuts. Another direction for future work could be a Jet-based partitioner for distributed GPUs.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This project has received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (grant agreement No. 882500). This work was performed on the HoreKa supercomputer funded by the Ministry of Science, Research and the Arts Baden-Württemberg and by the Federal Ministry of Education and Research.



REFERENCES

- [1] Ü. V. Çatalyürek et al. 2022. More Recent Advances in (Hyper)Graph Partitioning. *ACM Comput. Surv.* (2022).
- [2] C. Chevalier and F. Pellegrini. 2008. PT-Scotch: A Tool for Efficient Parallel Graph Ordering. *Parallel Comput.* 34, 6–8 (2008), 318–331.
- [3] C. M. Fiduccia and R. M. Mattheyses. 1982. A linear-time heuristic for improving network partitions. In *19th Design Automation Conf., (DAC)*. ACM/IEEE, 175–181.
- [4] M. S. Gilbert, K. Madduri, E. G. Boman, and S. Rajamanickam. 2023. Jet: Multilevel Graph Partitioning on GPUs. *CoRR* abs/2304.13194 (2023). arXiv:2304.13194
- [5] L. Gottesbüren, T. Heuer, P. Sanders, and S. Schlag. 2021. Scalable Shared-Memory Hypergraph Partitioning. In *ALENEX 2021*. SIAM, 16–30.
- [6] G. Karypis and V. Kumar. 1998. Multilevel k -way Partitioning Scheme for Irregular Graphs. *J. Parallel Distributed Comput.* 48, 1 (1998), 96–129.
- [7] Nikolai Maas, Lars Gottesbüren, and Daniel Seemaier. 2024. Parallel Unconstrained Local Search for Partitioning Irregular Graphs. In *ALENEX 2024*. SIAM, 32–45.
- [8] H. Meyerhenke, P. Sanders, and C. Schulz. 2017. Parallel Graph Partitioning for Complex Networks. *IEEE Trans. Parallel Distrib. Syst.* 28, 9 (2017), 2625–2638.
- [9] P. Sanders and D. Seemaier. 2023. Distributed Deep Multilevel Graph Partitioning. In *Euro-Par 2023: Parallel Processing*. Springer Nature Switzerland, 443–457.

²We only use 64 out of the available 76 cores because some of the graph generators require the number of cores to be a power of two.

A REFINEMENT ALGORITHM: PSEUDOCODE

Algorithm 1: Rebalance(G, Π)

Input: $G = (V, E, c, \omega)$, partition Π
// 1. Sort vertices into exponentially spaced buckets

- 1 **forall** overloaded blocks $V_o \in \Pi$ **do**
- 2 $b_o^i := \emptyset$ for all i
- 3 **forall** $v \in V_o$ **do**
- 4 $r_v := \max_{\{V_u \in \Pi \mid c(V_u) + c(v) \leq L_{\max}\}} \text{RelGain}(v, V_u)$
- 5 $j := \begin{cases} 0, & r_v \geq 0 \\ 1 + \lceil \log_\alpha(1 - r_v) \rceil, & r_v < 0 \end{cases}$
- 6 $b_o^j \cup = v$

// 2. Compute cut-offs, total weight to each block

- 7 **forall** overloaded block $V_o \in \Pi$ **do**
- 8 $c(B_o^i) := \sum_p c(b_o^i @ p)$ for i
- 9 $\hat{B}_o := \min \{j \mid \sum_{i < j} c(B_o^i) \geq c(V_o) - L_{\max}\}$
- 10 **forall** underloaded block $V_u \in \Pi$ **do**
- 11 $W_u := \sum_{V_o, p} c(\{v \in b_o^i @ p \mid i < \hat{B}_o, v \text{ moves to } V_u\})$
- 12 $p_u := (L_{\max} - c(V_u)) / W_u$

// 3. Move vertices

- 13 **forall** overloaded block $V_o \in \Pi, j < \hat{B}_o, v \in b_o^j$ **do**
- 14 $V_u := \arg \min_{\{V_u \in \Pi \mid c(V_u) + c(v) \leq L_{\max}\}} \text{RelGain}(v, V_u)$
- 15 Move v from V_o to V_u with prob. p_u
- 16 **return** Π

B STRONG SCALING: QUALITY RESULTS

Table 1: Edge cuts obtained by d4xJet on real-world graphs using varying numbers of cores.

P	kmer_V1r	nlpkkt240	twitter-2010	uk-2007-05
64	9 366	4 812	473 004	3 716
256	9 240	4 824	473 277	3 602
1 024	9 269	4 811	472 806	3 575
4 096	9 055	4 831	471 340	3 459
8 192	9 140	4 738	471 508	3 424

cut $\times 1\,000$

C BENCHMARK INSTANCES

Table 2: Basic properties of the benchmark set. Instances are roughly classified as *low degree* and *high degree* graphs based on their maximum degree Δ .

Graph	n	m	Δ	
Low-degree graphs	packing	2 145 839	34 976 486	18
	channel	4 802 000	85 362 744	18
	hugebubbles	19 458 087	58 359 528	3
	nlpkkt240	27 993 600	746 478 752	27
	europa.osm	50 912 018	108 109 320	13
	kmerU1a	64 678 340	132 787 258	35
	rgg _{3D} 26	67 106 449	755 904 090	34
	rgg _{2D} 26	67 108 858	1 149 107 290	45
	del _{3D} 26	67 108 864	1 042 545 824	40
	del _{2D} 26	67 108 864	402 653 086	26
	rgg _{3D} 27	134 214 672	1 575 628 350	36
	rgg _{2D} 27	134 217 728	2 386 714 970	46
	del _{2D} 27	134 217 728	606 413 354	14
	del _{3D} 27	134 217 728	2 085 147 648	40
	kmerP1a	138 896 082	296 930 692	40
	kmerA2a	170 372 459	359 883 478	40
	kmerV1r	214 004 392	465 409 664	8
High-degree graphs	amazon	400 727	4 699 738	2 747
	eu-2005	862 664	32 276 936	68 963
	youtube	1 134 890	5 975 246	28 754
	in-2004	1 382 867	27 182 946	21 869
	com-orkut	3 072 441	234 370 166	33 313
	enwiki-2013	4 203 323	183 879 456	432 260
	enwiki-2018	5 608 705	234 488 590	248 444
	uk-2002	18 483 186	523 574 516	194 955
	arabic-2005	22 743 881	1 107 806 146	575 628
	uk-2005	39 454 463	1 566 054 250	1 776 858
	it-2004	41 290 648	2 054 949 894	1 326 744
	twitter-2010	41 652 230	2 405 026 092	2 997 487
	sk-2005	50 636 059	3 620 126 660	8 563 816
uk-2007-05	105 153 952	6 603 753 128	975 419	
webbase-2001	115 554 441	1 709 619 522	816 127	