

Estimating the stability number of a random graph using convolutional neural networks

Randy Davila^{1,2*}

^{1*}Research and Development, RelationalAI, 2120 University Avenue, Berkeley, 94704, California, USA.

²Department of Computational Applied Mathematics & Operations Research, Rice University, 6100 Main Street, Houston, 77005, Texas, USA.

Corresponding author(s). E-mail(s): randy.r.davila@rice.com;

Abstract

Graph combinatorial optimization problems are widely applicable and notoriously difficult to compute; for example, consider the traveling salesman or facility location problems. In this paper, we explore the feasibility of using convolutional neural networks (CNNs) on graph images to predict the cardinality of combinatorial properties of random graphs and networks. Specifically, we use image representations of modified adjacency matrices of random graphs as training samples for a CNN model to predict the stability number of random graphs; where the stability number is the cardinality of a maximum set of vertices containing no pairwise adjacency. Our approach demonstrates the potential for applying deep learning in combinatorial optimization problems.

Keywords: Convolutional neural networks, independent sets, independence number, stable sets, stability number.

1 Introduction

Combinatorial optimization (CO) is a heavily studied and widely applicable subfield of optimization that combines techniques in combinatorics, linear programming, and the theory of algorithms to solve discrete optimization problems; see, for example, the excellent text by Cook, Cunningham, Pulleyblank, and Schrijver [1]. Some of the most well-known problems in this field include the knapsack problem, the traveling

salesman problem, the graph coloring problem, matching problems, and the facility location problem. This paper considers the *maximum stable set problem* and how neural networks can be used in its solution. The maximum stable set problem concerns computing the largest set of independent vertices in a graph and is a well-known NP-complete problem [2]. The associated *stability number* of a graph G , denoted $\alpha(G)$, is the cardinality of a maximum stable set in G . Calculating this parameter is computationally expensive for large graphs, as it belongs to the class of NP-hard computable graph parameters [2].

In this paper, we propose a novel method to accurately estimate (predict) the stability number of a graph using *convolutional neural networks* (CNNs) by leveraging image representations of graphs via their adjacency matrices. This approach combines the strengths of CNNs in image recognition with graph theoretical concepts to provide a new perspective on graph parameter estimation. Our main contributions in this paper are as follows:

- (1) Introduce a graph representation suitable for training CNNs.
- (2) Provide a CNN model that accurately approximates the stability number for random graphs.
- (3) Provide computational comparisons of known stability number approximations to our trained CNN model.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 provides work related to approximating the independence number of a graph. Section 3 describes training data generation, CNN model architecture, and code used for these processes. Section 4 gives numerical results returned by our simulations and comparison with other independence number approximations. Section 5 concludes this paper with a short discussion and summary of the work presented in this paper.

2 Related Work

Throughout this paper, all graphs will be considered simple and undirected. Let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph with vertex set V and edge set E . A set $S \subseteq V$ of vertices is called a *stable set* (also commonly called an *independent set*) if no two vertices in S form an edge in E . The cardinality of a maximum stable set in G is called the *stability number* (also commonly called the *independence number*) of G and is denoted $\alpha(G)$. The stability number is one of the oldest and most heavily studied parameters in graph theory; for example, see [3] in the excellent graph theory textbook by Bondy and Murty [4]. Theoretically, the stability number is related to various set coverings in graphs and the largest cliques. From a practical standpoint, detecting maximum stable sets has many applications, such as transmitting messages and discovering stable genetic components. Furthermore, the computation of the stability number for a graph is known to be NP-hard, so much work has been put into approximating the number for a given graph.

The automatic analysis of image data is the focus of computer vision and represents one of the significant areas in machine learning. Convolutional neural networks (CNNs) have demonstrated the robust ability to interpret the structured information

contained in image data to a high degree of accuracy; see, for example, the comprehensive text on neural networks by Bishop and Bishop [5]. Unlike simple *multilayer perceptrons* (MLPs), CNNs make use of the spatial 2-dimensional structure of images by way of feature detectors – *convolutional filters* and *pooling operations*. As a consequence, CNNs are translational invariant, meaning that shifting and rotating an image will not change the interpretation of the trained CNN model. Recently, there have been many advancements in the study of deep neural networks applied to graph-structured data [6], a field that generally falls under the umbrella of *graph neural networks* (GNNs). *Graph Convolutional Networks* (GCNs) are a variant of GNNs and CNNs explicitly designed for analysis on graph-structured data that make use of the convolution operation becoming the *de facto* method for implementing neural networks on graphs [7].

To our knowledge, no published studies have attempted to approximate the stability number (or any other combinatorial optimization property) of a graph using only images of the graph. Moreover, our approach differs from those attempted by GNNs and GCNs as we interpret graphs as images instead of attempting to learn the representations directly from the graph relational structure with a neural network. Notably, this mimics machine learning techniques used in feature engineering before the success of neural networks. However, we demonstrate in the following sections that this technique seems suitable for some combinatorial optimization problems on graphs, specifically concerning computing a graph’s stability number.

3 Methodology

Our hypothesis is that a visual representation of a simple graph will allow a CNN to train sufficiently in order to predict the independence number of a graph. The steps for producing a predicted value for the stability number of a graph that we implement are shown in Fig 1, where a graph is first converted into an image, which is then fed into a CNN model.




Fig. 1 Our model for inputting a random graph into a CNN and predicting the stability number. (a) a random graph is presented. (b) a modified adjacency matrix image is constructed. (c) the image representation of the graph is filtered using convolutional layers in a CNN. (d) the resulting data produced from the convolutional layers is flattened and feed into a shallow MLP producing a numerical value $\hat{\alpha}$.

The computations and experiments performed were implemented in Python and are readily available at this Google Colab notebook [8]. More specifically, we generated a dataset of 2,000 random graphs with node sizes ranging from 10 to 64. The dataset was split into training and testing sets, with 80% used for training and 20% for testing. The images of the adjacency matrices were resized to 64×64 pixels and modified per our previous section. The model was trained for 30 epochs on a Google Colab GPU, though the size of our model and dataset is relatively small when compared with modern approaches. We further provide evaluation metrics and detailed analysis of the results after training.

3.1 Data Generation

To train our CNN, we first need to generate a dataset of graphs with known stability numbers. This process involves several steps to ensure a diverse and representative dataset for effective model training. Namely, the generation of random graphs, the mapping of each graph to our image representation, and finally labeling of each graph with their respective stability number.

The random graphs that we choose to use for our experiments are generated using the *Erdős–Rényi model* and notation $G(n, p)$, where n is the number of vertices and p is the probability of edge formation between any two vertices. The Erdős–Rényi model is a well-known method for generating random graphs and provides a straightforward mechanism for creating graphs with varying densities [9]. In our experiments, we make use of the NetworkX library in Python to generate these Erdős–Rényi random graphs [10]. For our dataset, we vary the number of vertices n up to a maximum of 64 and use different values of p to create graphs with different edge densities. This variation ensures that the training set includes a wide range of graph structures, while also leaving many unseen graph structures for testing.

To label our training and testing data we make use of an optimization technique for computing the stability number of a graph precisely. Even though computation of $\alpha(G)$ is intractable in general, we may still compute it exactly for graphs with small order by providing the following linear-integer optimization formulation to open source or commercial solvers:

Maximum Stable Set Linear-Integer Program Formulation. Given a graph $G = (V, E)$, we may find an optimal (maximum) stable set of G by solving the following linear-integer program.

$$\text{maximize } \sum_{i \in V} x_i \tag{1}$$

$$\text{subject to } x_i + x_j \leq 1 \quad \forall (i, j) \in E \tag{2}$$

$$x_i \in \{0, 1\} \quad \forall i \in V \tag{3}$$

where, x_i is a binary variable that indicates whether vertex i is included in the independent set. The objective function $\sum_{i \in V} x_i$ aims to maximize the number of vertices in the independent set. The constraint $x_i + x_j \leq 1$ ensures that no two adjacent vertices are included in the independent set, and $x_i \in \{0, 1\}$ enforces that the variables

are binary. Note, this optimization model is only feasible for relatively small order as the complexity of solving linear-integer programs is NP-hard.




Fig. 2 Image representations of random graphs with varying orders $n \in \{10, 25, 45, 65\}$. Note the dark shaded regions of the padded images for graphs with order $n < 65$.

Once the graphs are generated and labeled with their respective stability numbers, we next construct their adjacency matrices. Recall that the adjacency matrix, namely the matrix A , such that $A_{i,j} = 1$ when vertex i is adjacent to vertex j , and zero otherwise. This matrix can easily be converted to an image using matplotlib [11], and we do so, but also choose additional steps in our mapping of the graph to an image suitable for training a CNN for computing the stability number of a graph. First, to maintain consistency across different graphs of different orders, each adjacency

matrix is resized to a fixed dimension of 64×64 pixels. If the matrix is smaller than the target size, it is padded with zeros to reach the desired dimensions. Conversely, larger matrices are resized using *bilinear interpolation* to reduce their size. Second, we place on the diagonal of the adjacency matrix A , entries that map the degree of the associated vertex to a heat map for visualization; and so, provide an image that highlights the degree of each vertex of the graph explicitly; see Fig. 2.

3.2 CNN Architecture

Our CNN model is designed to process graph images like those shown in Fig 2, and predict the stability number given by the linear-integer program formulation presented prior; essentially a regression task given a graph as input. Our CNN consists a simple CNN architecture like one introduced in the text by Collet [12] (using *Tensorflow*). That is, our model consists of multiple convolutional layers that apply convolutional filters to extract features from the image representation of the graph.

The first convolutional layer has 32 filters of size 3×3 , followed by a ReLU activation function. This is followed by a max pooling layer of size 2×2 . Two more convolutional layers with 64 filters each of size 3×3 and ReLU activation functions are added, each followed by a max pooling layer of size 2×2 . The pooling layers are used to reduce the dimensionality of the feature maps, retaining the most important information. The pooling operation helps in reducing the spatial dimensions, thus minimizing the computational load and controlling overfitting. The output of the convolutional layers is flattened into a one-dimensional vector. This flattened vector serves as the input to the fully connected layers. The flattened vector is fed into a small MLP. We use a dense layer with 64 units and ReLU activation function, followed by an output layer with a single neuron to predict the stability number. The final layer does not use an activation function since this is a regression task.

3.3 Training Parameters

Our full set of data consists of 2,000 random graphs $G(n, p)$ with $5 \leq n \leq 64$ and p chosen uniformly and randomly; for which 20% we leave out for testing. The training of our model uses the Adam optimizer and mean squared error as the loss function. The model is compiled with these settings and trained on the training dataset for 15 epochs with a validation split of 20%. The performance metric used during training is the mean squared error (MSE): This metric measures the average of the squares of the errors. It is more sensitive to large errors and is given by

$$\text{MSE} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\alpha_i - \hat{\alpha}_i)^2,$$

where α_i is the true stability number and $\hat{\alpha}_i$ is the predicted stability number for the i -th graph G in the testing dataset.

4 Results

After training we observe a MSE of at most 1.3036, and at least 0.45, over many different training and testing runs. In all trained models, the CNN is able to accurately learn a good approximation to the stability number only using the image representation presented in the previous section. For example, see Fig. 3, which demonstrates the predictive properties of one of our trained neural networks on a sample random 30 random graphs $G(n, p)$, each with order $n = 30$ and edge probability p chosen randomly.




Fig. 3 A sample of 30 random graphs $G(n, p)$, with order $n = 30$ and edge probability p chosen randomly. Predicted stability numbers shown in blue. True stability numbers shown in red.

5 Discussion

Our model for approximating the stability number of a graph demonstrates strong predictive performance, with low MSE values on the test set. The visualizations indicate that the model's predictions closely follow the actual stability numbers, highlighting its potential for practical applications in computational graph theory and combinatorial optimization. Surprisingly, our approach, which leverages feature engineering and neural networks, achieves near-optimal results. Overall, our results show that CNNs can be a powerful tool for predicting combinatorial properties of graphs, providing a new (and perhaps old) approach to solving challenging graph theory problems with

deep learning on feature engineered images of graphs. We suspect that the modeling technique presented in this paper will generalize to many other combinatorial graph optimization problems.

References

- [1] Cook, W.J., Cunningham, W.H., Pulleyblank, W.R., Schrijver, A.: Combinatorial Optimization. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York (1998)
- [2] Jacobson, M.S., Peters, K.: Complexity questions for k -domination and related parameters. *Congr. Numer.* **68**, 7–22 (1989)
- [3] Bondy, J.A., Murty, U.S.R.: Stable sets and cliques. In: *Graph Theory*, pp. 295–331. Springer, New York (2008)
- [4] Bondy, J.A., Murty, U.S.R.: *Graph Theory*. Springer, New York (2008)
- [5] Bishop, C.M., Bishop, H.: *Deep Learning Foundations and Concepts*. Springer, New York (2024)
- [6] Zhang, S., Tong, H., Xu, J., Maciejewski, R.: Graph convolutional networks: a comprehensive review. *Comput. Soc. Netw.* **6** (11) (2019) <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40649-019-0069-y>
- [7] Wu, F., Souza, A., Zhang, T., Fifty, C., Yu, T., Weinberger, K.: Simplifying graph convolutional networks. In: *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Machine Learning*. *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, vol. 97, pp. 6861–6871 (2019)
- [8] Davila, R.R.: CNN-Combinatorial-Graph-Properties (2024). <https://colab.research.google.com/drive/1qLA62mTeS8eToLOqrsJwactfxuCEuaZ#scrollTo=tVsJi2wawtB5>
- [9] Erdős, P., Rényi, A.: On random graphs 1. *Publicationes Mathematicae* **6**(3–4), 290–297 (1959)
- [10] Hagberg, A.A., Schult, D.A., Swart, P.J.: Exploring network structure, dynamics, and function using networkx. In: *Proceedings of the 7th Python in Science Conference (SciPy2008)*, pp. 11–15 (2008)
- [11] Hunter, J.D.: Matplotlib: A 2D Graphics Environment. *Computing in Science & Engineering*, Volume 9, Number 3, pp. 90–95 (2007). <https://matplotlib.org/>
- [12] Chollet, F.: *Deep Learning with Python*, 2nd edn. Manning Publications, New York (2021)