

Graphitron: A Domain Specific Language for FPGA-based Graph Processing Accelerator Generation

Xinmiao Zhang^{1,2}, Zheng Feng^{1,2}, Shengwen Liang^{1,2}, Xinyu Chen³, Cheng Liu^{1,2*}, Huawei Li^{1,2}, Xiaowei Li^{1,2}
¹SKLP, Institute of Computing Technology, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, China
²Dept. of Computer Science, University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, China
³Microelectronics Thrust, Hong Kong University of Science and Technology (Guangzhou), Guangzhou, China

Abstract—FPGA-based graph processing accelerators, enabling extensive customization, have demonstrated significant energy efficiency over general computing engines like CPUs and GPUs. Nonetheless, customizing accelerators to diverse graph processing algorithms with distinct computational patterns remains challenging and error-prone for high-level application users. To this end, template-based approaches following established graph processing frameworks have been developed to automate the graph processing accelerator generation. Although these frameworks significantly enhance the design productivity, the templates often result in closely coupled algorithms, programming models, and architectures, severely limiting the versatility of the targeted graph processing algorithms and their applicability to high-level users. Furthermore, the limitations of the frameworks are usually ambiguous due to the absence of a rigorous grammar definition.

To overcome these challenges, we introduce Graphitron, a domain-specific language (DSL), which allows users to generate customized accelerators for a wide range of graph processing algorithms on FPGAs without engaging with the complexities of low-level FPGA designs. Graphitron, by defining vertices and edges as primitive data types, naturally facilitates the description of graph algorithms using edge-centric or vertex-centric programming models. The Graphitron back-end employs a suite of hardware optimization techniques including pipelining, data shuffling, and memory access optimization that are independent with the specific algorithms, supporting the creation of versatile graph processing accelerators. Our experiments indicate that accelerators crafted using Graphitron achieve comparable performance to that generated with template-based design framework. Moreover, it exhibits exceptional flexibility in algorithm expression and significantly enhance accelerator design productivity.

Index Terms—Graph Processing Acceleration, Domain-Specific Language, Agile Accelerator Design, High-Level Synthesis.

I. INTRODUCTION

Graphs have become increasingly important for representing real-world network data in critical fields, such as big data analytics, web search, social networks, bioinformatics, and artificial intelligence [1]. To address the growing demand for processing large-scale graph data, major Internet giants have invested in and developed their own graph processing engines, such as Amazon’s Neptune [2] graph database, Google’s Pregel [3] graph processing system, Alibaba’s MaxCompute

[4], Oracle’s PGX [5], and others. Graph processing systems have become one of the core foundational computing engines.

Despite extensive research efforts [6] [7] [8] [9] that have optimized these software-based solutions for high performance, scalability, and programmability, they are ultimately limited by poor hardware utilization due to the mismatch between architecture and irregularity of graph processing. For example, GPUs manage their threads in warp granularity, leading to several workload imbalance problems when traveling irregular and sparse graph structures [10] [11].

FPGAs, instead, allow customized hardware architecture for specific applications and have demonstrated high efficiency on graph processing problems [12] [13] [14]. Existing works usually leverage optimized code templates [15], [16] or hardware overlays [17] that inherit memory access and pipeline optimizations tailored for graph processing domain to generate effective FPGA-based hardware accelerators for various graph algorithms. Although these graph processing frameworks have shown significant efficiency improvement on certain graph algorithms, their fixed optimizations or templates are often unsuitable for a wider range of graph algorithms. For example, an edge-centric graph processing framework could efficiently process all vertex active algorithms, such as PageRank, but struggles with traversal graph algorithms, such as Breadth First Search (BFS) and Single Source Shortest Path (SSSP), due to a large number of useless edges traversed. Furthermore, developers have to grasp the intricacies of the framework to express the graph task and generate high-performance hardware accelerators. These limitations have driven us to design a more flexible graph algorithm representation that necessitates a small learning curve and flexible design space exploration that composes hardware modules/optimizations adaptively for a wide range of graph algorithms on FPGAs.

In this paper, we introduce Graphitron, a domain-specific language for agile development of FPGA-based graph processing accelerators. Graphitron allows software users to flexibly describe graph processing tasks without engaging with the complexities of low-level FPGA designs. More importantly, the compiler of Graphitron can select and compose memory access optimizations or pipeline optimizations for the target graph algorithm during the compilation time. This capability expands the design space beyond that offered by existing approaches, allowing Graphitron to produce efficient hardware

* Corresponding author.

This work is supported by the National Key R&D Program of China under Grant (2022YFB4500405), and the National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant 62174162.

architectures for a wide array of graph algorithms.

Specifically, our work makes the following contributions:

- We introduce Graphitron, a domain-specific language tailored for the rapid development of FPGA-based graph processing accelerators for the first time. Graphitron allows for the flexible description of graph processing algorithms and accommodate various programming models without engaging with the complexities of low-level FPGA designs.
- We have developed a compiler that automatically generates high-performance and end-to-end graph processing accelerators for FPGAs from graph tasks described in Graphitron. To augment the performance of these accelerators, the compiler integrates a set of hardware optimization techniques including pipelining, shuffling, and caching autonomously. Consequently, users can concentrate on algorithm design without the necessity to engage in hardware-specific optimizations.
- According to our experiments on an Xilinx FPGA platform with five prevalent real-world graph algorithms, Graphitron significantly advances both the computing efficiency and the accelerator design productivity. Notably, it achieves comparable performance to the leading template-based framework ThunderGP and manages to implement algorithms beyond the scope of ThunderGP.

II. RELATED WORK

A. FPGA-based Graph Processing Accelerator

Graph has emerged as a critical data structure in a variety of big data applications, driving progresses in the hardware acceleration of graph processing [6] [9] [16] [18] [17] [19] [20] [21] [22] [23]. Among them, FPGA-based graph processing accelerators exhibit both superior performance and energy efficiency compared to general-purpose processors through algorithm-specific customization, thus attracting increasing research attention [13] [16] [18] [17] [19] [24] [25] [26] [27] [28]. Since the performance of graph processing is severely constrained by its low compute-to-I/O ratio and irregular data accesses, extensive FPGA-based customization has been explored in previous works to mitigate these issues. FPGP [25] and ForeGraph [13] employed fine-grained partitioning with a tailored data placement to harness the high bandwidth and low latency of on-chip BRAMs for improving the efficiency of random accesses in graph processing. Cygraph [26] customized the CSR format of graph and reconstructed the conventional BFS algorithm to maximize available memory bandwidth. Kapre et al. [28] developed a graph-specific ISA based on abstracted sparse graph operations, and implemented specialized soft processors across multiple FPGAs. Zhou et al. [27] explored the potential of CPU-FPGA heterogeneous architecture through mapping the vertex-centric processing and edge-centric processing onto the CPU side and the FPGA side, respectively, to accelerate graph processing algorithms with different processing paradigms. Lee et al. [24] utilized FPGAs near storage to offload the generic graph processing operations,

aiming to reduce the I/O overhead and optimize the efficiency of out-of-core graph processing. However, despite the high energy efficiency and performance, developing the FPGA-based graph processing accelerators remains a challenging task compared to implementing parallel graph processing engines with GPUs or multi-core CPUs.

B. Design Productivity Challenges

Over the years, design productivity challenges has been alleviated from distinct angles through efforts from both industry [29] [30] and academia [31] [32] [33]. High-level synthesis (HLS) [29] encapsulates abstractions of hardware details into the grammar of high-level language to bridge the programming gap between high-level language and HDL, greatly lowering the barriers of FPGA design. However, implementing complex algorithms with intensive control logic and irregular memory accesses, such as graph processing, remains non-trivial when utilizing HLS [15]. To this end, FPGA overlay [32] only exposes some specific functions or abstracts of the underlying configurable hardware accelerators to the high level language, allowing the application to fully exploit the high performance of FPGA conveniently [34]. Especially, when deployed on deep learning processors or CGRAs, FPGA overlay has been demonstrated to significantly accelerate deep learning workloads or data flow graphs, respectively, with little programming efforts. However, FPGA overlay does not work well for graph processing, in which even processing the same graph, there can be distinct types of operations to and various computing patterns to the graph. Inspired by various graph processing frameworks that enable efficient implementation of parallel graph processing algorithms on the general purpose computing systems, template-based graph accelerator designs are proposed [31] [17] to provide software-like programming interface to customize high-performance graph accelerators. To avoid programming with low-level HDL, ThunderGP [15] builds the templates with Xilinx HLS. Besides, ThunderGP enables the exploration to the design space, thus is more convenient to adapt to distinct graph processing algorithms. However, ThunderGP is closely coupled with gather-apply-scatter (GAS) graph processing model and edge-centric processing (ECP) paradigm, which can be sub-optimal for some graph processing algorithms. Additionally, users are required to modify the templates scattered across the different configuration files. Due to lack of rigorous definitions, this poses considerable challenges in formulation and verification of correctness.

GraphIt is a domain-specific language (DSL) for graph processing which generates efficient high-performance graph processing on multicore CPUs and GPUs [35] [36]. This DSL flattened the learning curve of parallel graph processing by abstracting the most basic elements of graph processing into the language grammar, and generated high-performance implementation of graph processing by incorporating considerable optimizations. Inspired by it, we propose Graphitron, a DSL to agilely generate the customized FPGA-based graph accelerators without descriptions of any low-level hardware ar-

TABLE I
PRIMITIVE APIS OF GENERIC GRAPH PROCESSING ALGORITHMS.

Vertexset operators	Return Type	Description
size()	int	Returns the size of the vertexset.
init(func vp_func)	none	Applies vp_func(vertex) to each vertex to initialize vertex-related graph properties.
process(func vp_func)	none	Applies vp_func(vertex) to each vertex to process vertex-related graph operations.
Edgeset operators		
size()	int	Returns the size of the edgeset.
init(func ep_func)	none	Applies ep_func(edge) to each edge to initialize edge-related graph properties.
process(func ep_func)	none	Applies ep_func(edge) to each edge to process edge-related graph operations.

chitectural designs. To ensure the performance of the generated accelerators, Graphitron integrated typical FPGA-based graph acceleration optimizations into the backend of the compiler, such as data shuffling, hub vertex caching, and pipelining.

III. DSL FOR FPGA-BASED GRAPH PROCESSING ACCELERATOR GENERATION

In this section, we will introduce the domain specific language, Graphitron, proposed for FPGA-based graph processing accelerator generation. The primary design principle is to allow users to focus on the description of graph processing algorithms without being aware of the underlying hardware architectural details. On the other hand, the compiler needs to address the hardware specific optimizations appropriately such that the resulting accelerators can still achieve competitive performance. We will start with the syntax definition, and then illustrate the overall compiler. Afterwards, we will introduce the major hardware optimization techniques that can be incorporated into the backend of the compiler. Finally, we will also explain the system integration work that is required to deploy the generated accelerators on a specific CPU-FPGA platform.

A. Syntax Definition

Graphitron mainly employs graph data and properties to depict generic graph processing algorithms. The fundamental graph data types are vertex and edge, where edges can be either weighted or unweighted. An unweighted edge, containing a source and destination vertex, is represented by "(Vertex, Vertex)"; a weighted edge, which includes an additional weight parameter, is denoted as "(Vertex, Vertex, int)". Both vertices and edges can be aggregated to form a complete graph i.e. vertexsets and edgesets, which utilize curly braces "{}" to denote the data type of each element. Beyond these primitives, Graphitron includes a suite of basic graph processing algorithm description APIs, as listed in Table I, derived from the computational methodology in [37]. For instance, there are computing functions *process()* defined on top of both vertices and edges, which can be applied for various graph processing models including vertex-centric programming model (VCP) and edge-centric programming model (ECP).

To illustrate the use of Graphitron, we take BFS as an example and present the code in Fig. 1. BFS starts with an initialization operation with *init* operator (Line 29) through *reset()* function (Lines 10-13). It sets an initial value for each vertex's property in the vertex set. The *process* operator defines

```

1 element Vertex end
2 element Edge end
3 const edges: edgeset{Edge}(Vertex, Vertex) =
  load(argv[1]);
4 const vertices: vertexset{Vertex} = edges.
  getVertices();
5 const old_level: vector{Vertex}(int);
6 const new_level: vector{Vertex}(int);
7 const tuple: vector{Vertex}(int);
8 const level: int = 1;
9 const activeVertex: vector{Vertex}(int);
10 func reset(v: Vertex)
11     old_level[v] = -1;
12     new_level[v] = -1;
13 end
14 func EdgeTraversal(src: Vertex, dst: Vertex)
15     if (old_level[src] == level)
16         tuple[dst] min= level+1;
17     end
18 end
19 func VertexUpdate(v: Vertex)
20     if (tuple[v]==(level+1)&(old_level[v]
21         ]== -1))
22         new_level[v] = tuple[v];
23         activeVertex[0] = activeVertex[0]+1;
24     end
25 end
26 func VertexApply(v: Vertex)
27     old_level[v] = new_level[v];
28 end
29 func main()
30     vertices.init(reset);% Initialization
31     old_level[1] = 1;
32     new_level[1] = 1;
33     var frontier_size: int = 1;
34     while(frontier_size)
35         edges.process(EdgeTraversal);
36         vertices.process(VertexUpdate);
37         vertices.process(VertexApply);
38         frontier_size = activeVertex[0];
39         activeVertex[0] = 0;
40         level += 1;
41     end

```

Fig. 1. Top-down BFS with ECP programming model

the actions executed on each vertex or edge per iteration of graph processing, which are then executed on FPGAs for hardware acceleration. The compiler automatically forms the corresponding hardware kernels using Xilinx OpenCL. Multiple functions can apply to vertices and edges and execute in sequence, as demonstrated by Lines 34-36 in Fig. 1. Function implementation details, such as *VertexUpdate()*, *VertexApply()*,

and *EdgeTraversal()*, are explicated in Lines 14-27. Graphitron accommodates both the ECP and VCP programming models simply by applying the corresponding functions on edges and vertices respectively. For instance, a VCP-based direction-oriented BFS example is shown in Fig. 2, which facilitates seamless transition between top-down and bottom-up BFS based on the frontier size (Line 10).

```

1 func VertexTraversal(v: Vertex)
2     if (old_level[v] == level)
3         for ngh in v.getNeighbors()
4             tuple[ngh] min= level + 1;
5         end
6     end
7 end
8 func main()
9     ...
10    if (frontier_size < 0.05 * vertices.size())
11        vertices.process(VertexTraversal);
12    else
13        edges.process(EdgeTraversal);
14    end
15    ...
16 end

```

Fig. 2. Direction based BFS with VCP programming model

B. Graphitron Compiler

The compiler is crucial for supporting the syntax outlined in the preceding section. The architecture of Graphitron compiler is presented in Fig. 3. It accepts graph data and algorithm descriptions as inputs and fabricates high-performance FPGA accelerators via the classical compilation pipeline, including front-end, middle-end, and back-end stages. Particularly, rather than directly producing RTL code, it outputs Xilinx OpenCL code, thereby resolving low-level platform-specific details and simplifying the compilation process. The compiler's details are illustrated in the remainder of this section.

1) *Front-end*: The front-end of the compiler performs lexical analysis and syntax parsing on the Graphitron code, subsequently constructs an Abstract Syntax Tree (AST), and generates the Front-End Intermediate Representation (FIR). Specifically, it scans the input file to generate a token stream based on recognized keywords. If the scanning process detects illegal expressions such as an unclosed string constant, it will throw an exception to signal the error. The front-end then parses the token stream and constructs FIRNodes of varying granularity, which comprise related tokens according to syntax rules. Finally, the front-end constructs the AST by assembling FIRNodes and exposes a pointer to the root node (*Program*) within the FIR context, facilitating subsequent phases of the entire compilation.

2) *Middle-end*: The middle-end of the compiler conducts semantic analysis on the FIR to create the Middle-End Intermediate Representation (MIR). It then lowers the MIR to more closely align with the form of the target hardware code. The AST produced by the front-end is limited as each node accesses only its direct children's information. To overcome this, the middle-end traverses the syntax tree from a global perspective to perform semantic analysis and establish enriched

MIR contexts such as graph property mappings, symbol tables, and function mappings. These processes allow the compiler to interpret the developer's intent more comprehensively. For instance, from the statement "*edges.process(update);*" the compiler identifies only the referral to the *update* function via the *process* operator. MIR, however, provides additional details like parameters, function body, or return type.

Additionally, to bridge the software-hardware gap, the middle-end further adapts MIR for the target hardware, abstracting extraneous details outside of the developer's purview. For example, while software developers need not specify variable allocations to hardware kernels, such distinctions are vital for FPGA deployments. The middle-end employs a *Property Detector* to determine the element and data types of graph properties within algorithms, aiding in the assessment of necessary memory allocation and designating where memory units are housed (either on the host or FPGA). It also automatically establishes memory unit IDs and indices for respective memory channels. These functions enable the FPGA to allocate memory and pointers for graph property transfers to the hardware kernel seamlessly, facilitating read and write operations on graph properties.

3) *Back-end*: The back-end of the compiler mainly generates the hardware accelerators based on the MIR context and deploys the accelerators on the target hardware platforms. Fig. 4 reveals the overall framework required to bridge the gap between MIR and hardware platforms. It has a generic architecture to cover various graph processing algorithms, which is similar to a graph processing framework including all kinds of graph processing operations. These operations are then converted to hardware components implemented on top of Xilinx OpenCL. The components are categorized into four groups, each marked by a different color in Fig. 4. Blue represents user-specified hardware modules, reconstructed by the compiler according to middle-end MIR. Gray signifies static hardware modules that form essential components of the framework. Yellow denotes on-chip FPGA resources such as URAM, utilized for caching purposes. Finally, red signifies modules focused on optimizing memory access, leveraging various hardware techniques to enhance data access efficiency. Commonly shared by both edge and vertex processes, these operations aim to ensure efficient hardware implementation and versatile accelerator generation for diverse graph processing algorithms.

The overall architecture as shown in Fig. 4 functions as follows. Graph data and properties are streamed into the *Burst Read* module and then flow into the cache module for edge or vertex processing based on *process* operator (step ①). In edge processing, graph data is read in the form of *EdgeList*, and edge properties are selectively read through the *EdgeProp Read* module based on whether there are edge weights. Then, *Edge Operation* module outputs an updating stream containing vertex indices and update values based on the specific ECP graph operation (step ②). In vertex processing, graph data is read in the form of *CSR*, and frontier are detected through the *Frontier Check* module based on conditional statements of the




Fig. 3. Overview of Graphitron Compiler.




Fig. 4. Back-end Framework

graph operation. Then, the Vertex Operation module outputs updating streams based on the specific VCP graph operation (step ②). If the indices of the updating stream are sequential, the stream is written back to HBM using the *Burst Write* module (step ③). Conversely, if the indices are unordered, the stream flows into *Stream Duplicate* module (step ④). Then, the stream is duplicated and sent to different processing element (PE) units (step ⑤). In each PE unit, *Shuffle* module reorders the update streams and filters out unnecessary data. Following the user defined reduction operations, data is written to the destination vertex properties in on-chip URAM cache without conflicts, facilitated by the *RAW* resolver and *Reduce* module (step ⑥). Finally, graph properties in URAM are written back to HBM using the *Burst Write* module (step ⑦).

The major hardware optimization techniques such as pipelining and unrolling are mostly incorporated automatically, but they are critical to the performance of the generated accelerators and will be illustrated in Section III-C. In addition, Graphitron provides an end-to-end graph processing acceleration system on a hybrid CPU-FPGA architecture, so

there are also additional system integration requirements such as accelerator management, data transfer between CPU and FPGA, and graph preprocessing. This part is not part of the graph processing algorithm, so it is also made transparent to users and will be illustrated in III-D

C. Hardware Optimization Techniques

Since the graph processing algorithms to be accelerated are unknown at compilation time, algorithm specific optimizations will limit the description of Graphitron and undermine its flexibility. Therefore, we mainly explore generic hardware optimization techniques such as pipelining, unrolling, and memory optimizations in the compiler back-end to enhance the performance of the generated accelerators without compromising the flexibility of Graphitron.

1) *Pipelining*: Pipelining is a prevalent hardware optimization technique that can significantly reduce memory accesses. However, it is limited to a single producer-consumer model. High-level code often contains write conflicts that impede pipelining. To overcome this challenge, the compiler resolves data dependencies through the introduction of temporary variables. Fig. 5 illustrates a common read-write conflict of *SP* in the *sssp* function, while Fig. 6 presents the corresponding rectified code.

```

1 func sssp(src:Vertex,dst:Vertex,weight:int)
2   SP[dst] min= (SP[src]+weight);
3 end

```

Fig. 5. The original *sssp* function

```

1 func sssp0(v:Vertex)
2   tmp[v] = SP[v];
3 end
4 func sssp1(src:Vertex,dst:Vertex,weight:int)
5   SP[dst] min= (tmp[src]+weight);
6 end

```

Fig. 6. The decoupled *sssp* function

2) *Loop Unrolling*: Loop unrolling is another widely used hardware optimization technique that enhances spatial parallelism. Nonetheless, high-level code frequently encompasses write conflicts across loop iterations. The *VertexUpdate* function within BFS, exemplified in Fig. 1, serves as a typical case. Similar to the pipelining optimization, we introduce independent temporary variables for each iteration and implement a reduce operation to yield an equivalent output.




Fig. 7. Memory access optimizations

3) *Memory Access Optimizations*: We have implemented a suite of optimizations to improve the efficiency of both on-chip and off-chip memory access, which is critical to the performance of graph processing accelerators. A burst read/write module enhances the utilization of memory bandwidth for off-chip sequential access, as depicted in Fig 7(a). For random access to off-chip memory, we have introduced an optimized cache module, shown in Fig 7(b), that amalgamates repeated vertex accesses and supports prefetching to augment data reuse. For the on-chip memory access, as illustrated in Fig 7(c), we utilize a data shuffling [38] module to distribute data across multiple on-chip memory banks, enabling conflict-free parallel computation and read/write operations.

D. System Integration

Graphitron offers an end-to-end system for graph processing acceleration on a hybrid CPU-FPGA architecture, necessitating considerable efforts to manage the accelerator, coordinate data transfer between CPU and FPGA, and preprocess graphs. Given the complexity of a pure hardware controller, we utilize the OpenCL framework for system integration. Specifically, we leverage Xilinx runtime (XRT) APIs such as *clEnqueueMigrateMemObjects*, *clSetKernelArg* and *clEnqueueTask* to manage the data transfers and kernel execution on the CPU side. In addition, We also devised some implicit programming interfaces, for instances like graph loading, partitioning, and data migration between CPU and FPGA, that are demanded for system-wide integration yet remain obscured from developers. For example, before graph processing via FPGA kernels, graph data must be moved to the FPGA with a process transparent to developers. Additionally, to partition large-scale graph data, the compiler calculates the partition size U based on URAM resources and organizes edges (src, dst) into subgraphs with ascending src values within each subpartition. In summary, with the supporting interfaces, diverse hardware accelerators can be deployed conveniently, contributing to Graphitron’s adaptability and flexibility.

IV. EVALUATION

In this section, we compare the performance of Graphitron to that of the state-of-the-art template-based graph accelerator framework ThunderGP. Additionally, we analyze the effects of different performance optimization strategies and evaluate the design productivity of Graphitron.

A. Experiment Setup

1) *Hardware Platforms*: We implement the graph accelerators on the AMD Xilinx Alveo U280 FPGA board, which is equipped with 8 GiB of HBM2 capable of accessing 32 HBM

pseudo channels via AXI3 interfaces. The synthesis, placement and routing, and simulation of the graph accelerators are performed using the AMD Xilinx Vitis 2019.2 suite, operating on a CentOS Linux 7 system. This host server is powered by an Intel Xeon E5-2680 V2 CPU and is equipped with 128 GiB of DDR3 memory.

2) *Graph Datasets and Algorithms*: We utilize both synthetic and real-world graph datasets as benchmarks. Table II lists the details of all the graph datasets in the evaluation.

TABLE II
THE GRAPH DATASETS.

Graph Dataset	V	E	Deg_{avg}	Graph Type
rmat-19-32(R19) [39]	524K	16.8M	32	Sythetic
HiggsTwitter(HT) [40]	457K	14.9M	32.5	Social
wiki-topcats(TC) [40]	1.8M	28.5M	15.9	Web
Amazon2003(AM) [40]	403K	3.4M	8.4	Social
pokec-relationships(PK) [40]	1.6M	30.6M	18.8	Social

We implement a variety of graph algorithms for evaluation, which composed of three classical graph processing algorithms including PageRank, Breadth-First Search (BFS) and Single Source Shortest Path (SSSP), as well as two state-of-the-art graph algorithms including Personalized PageRank (PPR) for network analysis and Calculate Graph Attention Weights (CGAW) for graph attention neural network. To avoid error-prone, PPR and CGWA are depicted in Algorithm 1 and Algorithm 2, respectively.

Algorithm 1: Personalized PageRank (PPR)

```

1  $PR_{old} \leftarrow \{0, score_{init}, 0, \dots, 0\}$ ;
2  $map \leftarrow \{0, 1, 0, \dots, 0\}$ ;
3  $m \leftarrow 0.85$ ;
4  $\epsilon \leftarrow 0.001$ ;
5 while not all  $v$  have Converged do
6   for  $s, d \in E$  do
7      $contrib[d] \leftarrow contrib[d] + \frac{PR_{old}[s]}{deg[s]}$ ;
8   for  $v \in V$  do
9      $PR_{new}[v] \leftarrow (1-m) \times map[v] + m \times contrib[v]$ ;
10    if  $|PR_{new}[v] - PR_{old}[v]| < \epsilon$  then
11       $Converge(v)$ ;
12   $Swap(PR_{new}, PR_{old})$ ;
```

Algorithm 2: Graph Attention Weights(CGAW)

```

1 for  $s, d \in E$  do
2    $accum[s] \leftarrow accum[s] + w_{s,d}$ ;
3 for  $s, d \in E$  do
4    $attention_{s,d} \leftarrow \frac{w_{s,d}}{accum[s]}$ ;
```

3) *The State-of-art Utilized in Evaluation*: ReGraph [16], GraFlex [18], and ThunderGP [15] are considered as three leading FPGA-based solutions for graph acceleration. Among




Fig. 8. Speedups to the baseline of ThunderGP and Graphitron when running different graph algorithms.

them, ReGraph combines the characteristics of algorithms and the architecture designs to accelerate both sparse and dense graph algorithms through a co-design approach. GraFlex mainly investigates scalable interconnection networks to support parallel high-performance graph processing among FPGA cores. At present, while Graphitron prioritizes generic memory access optimization in its back-end optimization, it lacks flexible network design interconnecting FPGA cores and comprehensive analysis to the characteristics of graph algorithm. Therefore, it is meaningless to compare Graphitron with ReGraph and GraFlex. Nevertheless, Graphitron aims to integrate these optimization techniques into its backend in the future.

On the other hand, ThunderGP, as a framework for graph accelerator generation, investigates optimizing memory access from both on-chip and off-chip perspectives. In this way, we implement ThunderGP on Xilinx U280 as the state-of-the-art design to evaluate the performance of Graphitron. Additionally, we also handcrafted HLS-based FPGA graph accelerator through software code without any HLS optimizations as the baseline.

B. Performance

1) *Comparisons with the State-of-arts:* As shown in Fig. 8 which illustrates the speed-ups of Graphitron and ThunderGP to the baseline, both Graphitron and ThunderGP demonstrate notable performance acceleration. This is attributed to the integration of various FPGA hardware optimization strategies. Thanks to the flexibility of DSL which could switch between vertex-centric and edge-centric processing paradigms, Graphitron consistently surpasses ThunderGP on all datasets in BFS, with a maximum speedup of $1.09\times$. However, the performance of Graphitron is lower than that of ThunderGP in PageRank and SSSP with consistently over 90% of the speedups of ThunderGP. This performance gap arises from that Graphitron implements end-to-end graph accelerator purely based on user-defined input, while ThunderGP utilizes encapsulated high-performance hardware interfaces with predefined functions. For instance, in PageRank, ThunderGP only supports returning the cumulative sum of differences between old and new PageRank values, but Graphitron enables developers to customize vertex properties to record these differences individually. This difference introduces optimization challenges in specific details, which degrades the performance slightly

compared to ThunderGP. However, as for PPR and CGAW, Graphitron could effortlessly generate end-to-end graph processing accelerators based on its flexible descriptions and compilers, while ThunderGP which relies on the fixed interfaces in the template cannot accommodate these applications because of lacks support for additional graph properties required by PPR and the writing operations to the edge weights in CGAW. Graphitron accelerates the baseline by up to $86\times$ and $226\times$ in PPR and CGAW, respectively.

2) *Performance of Different Memory Access Optimizations:* In this section, we evaluate the impact of different memory access optimizations implemented in the back-end of Graphitron. Specifically, we implemented different versions of Graphitron by incorporating distinct single memory access optimizations. In this way, we denote Graphitron which integrates only burst optimization, hot vertex caching and exclusive shuffling in the backend as Graphitron-withBurst, Graphitron-withCache, and Graphitron-withShuffle, respectively. The speedups to the baseline of different versions of Graphitron when running BFS are shown in the Figure 9. It demonstrates that incomplete




Fig. 9. Speedups to the baseline with different memory access optimizations when running BFS.

Graphitron which integrates only individual memory access optimization exhibits only limited speed-ups to the baseline. This is because the performance of graph processing is bottlenecked by different irregular memory access patterns, thus optimizing only an individual memory access pattern still leaves other memory access patterns as the performance bottleneck. It can also be confirmed by that since the combination of all three optimizations mitigates the memory access issues from multiple perspectives, Graphitron leads to a substantial average performance acceleration of up to $69.5\times$ to the

baseline. Among all memory access optimizations, caching the hub vertices exhibits the highest performance enhancement with $3.8\times$ average speed-up to the baseline, indicating that optimization which combines the characteristics of data with architectural designs can effectively enhance the performance of graph accelerator.

C. Design Productivity Comparison

1) *Code Length Comparison:* Graphitron typically demands fewer lines of code in comparison to ThunderGP due to several factors. In ThunderGP, developers are required to abstract their graph algorithms into a push-based GAS model and then complete at least five application files based on templates. In contrast, Graphitron allows expressing a graph algorithm within a single file. Furthermore, encapsulating all graph algorithms within the constraints of a graph framework and various parameters in the GAS model poses challenges, necessitating a profound understanding of graph algorithms and processing frameworks. Moreover, template-based configuration files of ThunderGP often entail comprehending underlying details of the FPGA and script construction methods for precise completion. Conversely, Graphitron empowers developers to precisely articulate their graph algorithm requirements using a concise and adaptable language, thus lowering the barrier to designing graph processing accelerators. For example, if a proficient user aims to describe a design in Graphitron by modifying templates of ThunderGP, it would entail adjustments to at least 14 files. Worse, altering certain files in ThunderGP, such as implementing a new hardware kernel, necessitates extensive manual debugging, leading to more complexity and difficulty in implementation.

2) *Algorithm Design Comparison:* Graphitron offers more agile algorithm design capabilities compared to ThunderGP. As shown in Table III, Graphitron supports VCP, ECP and their hybrid models as graph processing programming models. In contrast, ThunderGP solely supports ECP, which traverses all edges irrespective of the frontier size. This could potentially lead to substantial bandwidth waste and computational overhead in algorithms with small frontiers, such as BFS.

TABLE III
SUPPORT OF ALGORITHMS DESIGN.

Systems	vcp	ecp	hybrid	weight	kernels	properties
ThunderGP	✗	✓	✗	✗	-	-
Graphitron	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

Furthermore, in the template of ThunderGP, edge weights are assigned pseudo weights of random values, and it lacks support for loading weighted graphs. Besides, weights are treated as constants which cannot be assigned or modified by the accelerator. In contrast, Graphitron not only supports loading weighted graphs, but also empowers developers to dynamically modify edge weights during the runtime with algorithm description. This capability is crucial in algorithms related to graph neural networks, such as CGAW.

Moreover, template in ThunderGP also imposes fixed constraints on both hardware kernels and graph properties, making

it challenging to modify their numbers and types. While ThunderGP introduces an additional property of vertex out-degree to loose the constraints, it still remains inadequate for algorithms which requires multiple graph attributes, such as PPR. In contrast, Graphitron generates synthesizable code end-to-end based on developer input, allowing flexibility in the number and parameters of hardware kernels. Graph properties can also be freely defined based on global variables within the memory constraints of underlying FPGA, significantly enhancing freedom in accelerator design.

3) *Compilation Time Comparison:* As shown in Figure 10, the compilation time of Graphitron exceeds that of ThunderGP by 17 minutes, accounting for additional 5.9% of the compilation time of ThunderGP. This slight increased overhead of Graphitron is mainly attributed to the supports for custom hardware modules based on developers' flexible design descriptions. For instance, introducing multiple graph properties adds memory pointers and memory access operations to the generated hardware modules, thereby slightly increasing complexity and resulting in additional software synthesis time overhead. Besides, in contrast to ThunderGP, Graphitron incurs additional code generation time caused by compiler. However, the code generation time of Graphitron is only 0.115 seconds which takes only a very small fraction of the overall compilation time, which is negligible.




Fig. 10. Compilation time when implementing a BFS accelerator.

V. CONCLUSION

In this work, we present Graphitron, a DSL for flexible graph processing accelerator generation on FPGAs without engaging with the complexities of low-level FPGA designs. Graphitron has vertices and edges defined as primitive data types and allows convenient graph processing algorithm description using with edge-centric programming models and vertex-centric programming models. In addition, Graphitron incorporates a suite of hardware optimization techniques such as pipelining, caching, and shuffling in the compiler backend, thereby yielding autonomous accelerator optimization. According to our experiments on a set of representative graph processing algorithms, the accelerators generated with Graphitron achieve comparable to the state-of-the-art template-based graph processing accelerator design framework. Meanwhile, it also demonstrates exceptional algorithmic expressiveness and flexibility.

REFERENCES

- [1] S. Sahu, A. Mhedhbi, S. Salihoglu, J. Lin, and M. T. Özsu, "The ubiquity of large graphs and surprising challenges of graph processing: extended survey," *The VLDB journal*, vol. 29, pp. 595–618, 2020.
- [2] Amazon, "Amazon neptune," <https://aws.amazon.com/cn/neptune>, Accessed Feb. 25, 2024.
- [3] G. Malewicz, M. H. Austern, A. J. Bik, J. C. Dehnert, I. Horn, N. Leiser, and G. Czajkowski, "Pregel: a system for large-scale graph processing," in *Proceedings of the 2010 ACM SIGMOD International Conference on Management of data*, 2010, pp. 135–146.
- [4] Alibaba Cloud, "Maxcompute," <https://www.alibabacloud.com/product/maxcompute>, Accessed Feb. 25, 2024.
- [5] Oracle, "PGX - property graph analytics," <https://www.oracle.com/database/technologies/spatialandgraph/property-graph-analytics.html>, Accessed Feb. 25, 2024.
- [6] Y. Chi, G. Dai, Y. Wang, G. Sun, G. Li, and H. Yang, "Nxgraph: An efficient graph processing system on a single machine," in *2016 IEEE 32nd International Conference on Data Engineering (ICDE)*. IEEE, 2016, pp. 409–420.
- [7] T. Ben-Nun, M. Sutton, S. Pai, and K. Pingali, "Groute: An asynchronous multi-gpu programming model for irregular computations," *ACM SIGPLAN Notices*, vol. 52, no. 8, pp. 235–248, 2017.
- [8] S. Beamer, K. Asanović, and D. Patterson, "The gap benchmark suite," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1508.03619*, 2015.
- [9] J. E. Gonzalez, R. S. Xin, A. Dave, D. Crankshaw, M. J. Franklin, and I. Stoica, "{GraphX}: Graph processing in a distributed dataflow framework," in *11th USENIX symposium on operating systems design and implementation (OSDI 14)*, 2014, pp. 599–613.
- [10] C.-Y. Gui, L. Zheng, B. He, C. Liu, X.-Y. Chen, X.-F. Liao, and H. Jin, "A survey on graph processing accelerators: Challenges and opportunities," *Journal of Computer Science and Technology*, vol. 34, pp. 339–371, 2019.
- [11] L. Ceze, M. D. Hill, K. Sankaralingam, and T. F. Wenisch, "Democratizing design for future computing platforms," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1706.08597*, 2017.
- [12] T. J. Ham, L. Wu, N. Sundaram, N. Satish, and M. Martonosi, "Graphicionado: A high-performance and energy-efficient accelerator for graph analytics," in *2016 49th Annual IEEE/ACM International Symposium on Microarchitecture (MICRO)*. IEEE, 2016, pp. 1–13.
- [13] G. Dai, T. Huang, Y. Chi, N. Xu, Y. Wang, and H. Yang, "Foregraph: Exploring large-scale graph processing on multi-fpga architecture," in *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM/SIGDA International Symposium on Field-Programmable Gate Arrays*, 2017, pp. 217–226.
- [14] J. Ahn, S. Hong, S. Yoo, O. Mutlu, and K. Choi, "A scalable processing-in-memory accelerator for parallel graph processing," in *Proceedings of the 42nd Annual International Symposium on Computer Architecture*, 2015, pp. 105–117.
- [15] X. Chen, F. Cheng, H. Tan, Y. Chen, B. He, W.-F. Wong, and D. Chen, "Thundergp: resource-efficient graph processing framework on fpgas with hls," *ACM Transactions on Reconfigurable Technology and Systems*, vol. 15, no. 4, pp. 1–31, 2022.
- [16] X. Chen, Y. Chen, F. Cheng, H. Tan, B. He, and W.-F. Wong, "Regraph: Scaling graph processing on hbm-enabled fpgas with heterogeneous pipelines," in *2022 55th IEEE/ACM International Symposium on Microarchitecture (MICRO)*. IEEE, 2022, pp. 1342–1358.
- [17] Y. Hu, Y. Du, E. Ustun, and Z. Zhang, "Graphlily: Accelerating graph linear algebra on hbm-equipped fpgas," in *2021 IEEE/ACM International Conference On Computer Aided Design (ICCAD)*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 1–9.
- [18] C. Su, L. Du, T. Liang, Z. Lin, M. Wang, S. Sinha, and W. Zhang, "Graflex: Flexible graph processing on fpgas through customized scalable interconnection network," in *Proceedings of the 2024 ACM/SIGDA International Symposium on Field Programmable Gate Arrays*, 2024, pp. 143–153.
- [19] S. Zhou, R. Kannan, V. K. Prasanna, G. Seetharaman, and Q. Wu, "Hitgraph: High-throughput graph processing framework on fpga," *IEEE Transactions on Parallel and Distributed Systems*, vol. 30, no. 10, pp. 2249–2264, 2019.
- [20] N. Sundaram, N. R. Satish, M. M. A. Patwary, S. R. Dullloor, S. G. Vadlamudi, D. Das, and P. Dubey, "Graphmat: High performance graph analytics made productive," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1503.07241*, 2015.
- [21] N. Corporation, "nvgraph: Fast graph analytics on gpu," *NVIDIA Developer*, 2019. [Online]. Available: <https://developer.nvidia.com/nvgraph>
- [22] F. Khorasani, K. Vora, R. Gupta, and L. N. Bhuyan, "Cusha: vertex-centric graph processing on gpus," in *Proceedings of the 23rd international symposium on High-performance parallel and distributed computing*, 2014, pp. 239–252.
- [23] Y. Wang, A. Davidson, Y. Pan, Y. Wu, A. Riffel, and J. D. Owens, "Gunrock: A high-performance graph processing library on the gpu," in *Proceedings of the 21st ACM SIGPLAN symposium on principles and practice of parallel programming*, 2016, pp. 1–12.
- [24] J. Lee, H. Kim, S. Yoo, K. Choi, H. P. Hofstee, G.-J. Nam, M. R. Nutter, and D. Jamsek, "Extrav: boosting graph processing near storage with a coherent accelerator," *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment*, vol. 10, no. 12, pp. 1706–1717, 2017.
- [25] G. Dai, Y. Chi, Y. Wang, and H. Yang, "Fpgp: Graph processing framework on fpga a case study of breadth-first search," in *Proceedings of the 2016 ACM/SIGDA International Symposium on Field-Programmable Gate Arrays*, 2016, pp. 105–110.
- [26] O. G. Attia, T. Johnson, K. Townsend, P. Jones, and J. Zambreno, "Cygraph: A reconfigurable architecture for parallel breadth-first search," in *2014 IEEE International Parallel & Distributed Processing Symposium Workshops*. IEEE, 2014, pp. 228–235.
- [27] S. Zhou and V. K. Prasanna, "Accelerating graph analytics on cpu-fpga heterogeneous platform," in *2017 29th International Symposium on Computer Architecture and High Performance Computing (SBAC-PAD)*. IEEE, 2017, pp. 137–144.
- [28] N. Kapre, "Custom fpga-based soft-processors for sparse graph acceleration," in *2015 IEEE 26th International Conference on Application-specific Systems, Architectures and Processors (ASAP)*. IEEE, 2015, pp. 9–16.
- [29] Xilinx Inc., "Xilinx High-Level Synthesis (HLS)," <https://www.xilinx.com/products/design-tools/vivado/integration/esl-design.html>, Accessed Feb. 25, 2024.
- [30] Mentor, "Catapult High-Level Synthesis," <https://www.mentor.com/hls-lp/catapult-high-level-synthesis/>, Accessed Feb. 25, 2024.
- [31] T. Oguntebi and K. Olukotun, "Graphops: A dataflow library for graph analytics acceleration," in *Proceedings of the 2016 ACM/SIGDA International Symposium on Field-Programmable Gate Arrays*, 2016, pp. 111–117.
- [32] R. Shi, Y. Ding, X. Wei, H. Li, H. Liu, H. K.-H. So, and C. Ding, "Ftdl: a tailored fpga-overlay for deep learning with high scalability," in *2020 57th ACM/IEEE Design Automation Conference (DAC)*. IEEE, 2020, pp. 1–6.
- [33] X. Wei, C. H. Yu, P. Zhang, Y. Chen, Y. Wang, H. Hu, Y. Liang, and J. Cong, "Automated systolic array architecture synthesis for high throughput cnn inference on fpgas," in *Proceedings of the 54th Annual Design Automation Conference 2017*, 2017, pp. 1–6.
- [34] Y. Lee, A. Waterman, H. Cook, B. Zimmer, B. Keller, A. Puggelli, J. Kwak, R. Jevtic, S. Bailey, M. Blagojevic *et al.*, "An agile approach to building risc-v microprocessors," *IEEE Micro*, vol. 36, no. 2, pp. 8–20, 2016.
- [35] Y. Zhang, M. Yang, R. Baghdadi, S. Kamil, J. Shun, and S. Amarasinghe, "Graphit: A high-performance graph dsl," *Proceedings of the ACM on Programming Languages*, vol. 2, no. OOPSLA, pp. 1–30, 2018.
- [36] A. Brahmakshatriya, E. Furst, V. A. Ying, C. Hsu, C. Hong, M. Rutenber, Y. Zhang, D. C. Jung, D. Richmond, M. B. Taylor *et al.*, "Taming the zoo: The unified graphit compiler framework for novel architectures," in *2021 ACM/IEEE 48th Annual International Symposium on Computer Architecture (ISCA)*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 429–442.
- [37] R. R. McCune, T. Weninger, and G. Madey, "Thinking like a vertex: a survey of vertex-centric frameworks for large-scale distributed graph processing," *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)*, vol. 48, no. 2, pp. 1–39, 2015.
- [38] X. Chen, R. Bajaj, Y. Chen, J. He, B. He, W.-F. Wong, and D. Chen, "On-the-fly parallel data shuffling for graph processing on openccl-based fpgas," in *2019 29th International Conference on Field Programmable Logic and Applications (FPL)*. IEEE, 2019, pp. 67–73.
- [39] J. Leskovec, D. Chakrabarti, J. Kleinberg, C. Faloutsos, and Z. Ghahramani, "Kronecker graphs: an approach to modeling networks," *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, vol. 11, no. 2, 2010.
- [40] J. Leskovec and A. Krevl, "SNAP Datasets: Stanford Large Network Dataset Collection," <http://snap.stanford.edu/data>, Accessed Feb. 25, 2024.