

A Maximum Edge-Weight Clique Extraction Algorithm Based on Branch-and-Bound

Satoshi Shimizu*, Kazuaki Yamaguchi† and Sumio Masuda‡

Graduate School of Engineering, Kobe University

October 25, 2018

Abstract

The maximum edge-weight clique problem is to find a clique whose sum of edge-weight is the maximum for a given edge-weighted undirected graph. The problem is NP-hard and some branch-and-bound algorithms have been proposed. In this paper, we propose a new exact algorithm based on branch-and-bound. It assigns edge-weights to vertices and calculates upper bounds using vertex coloring. By some computational experiments, we confirmed our algorithm is faster than previous algorithms.

1 Introduction

For a simple undirected graph $G = (V, E)$, a vertex subset $C \subseteq V$ is called a clique if any pair of vertices in C are adjacent. Given a simple undirected graph $G = (V, E)$, the maximum clique problem (MCP) is to find the clique of maximum cardinality. MCP has lots of practical applications: bioinformatics [2], coding theory [10, 4], economics [5] and more. MCP is known to be NP-hard [12], and the decision version is one of the Karp's 21 NP-complete problems [15]. Since it has theoretical importance, there have been a number of studies in decades [31].

Given a simple undirected graph $G = (V, E)$ and non-negative weight $w(\cdot, \cdot)$ for each edge, the maximum edge-weight clique problem (MEWCP) is to find the clique of maximum weight. Obviously, MEWCP is a generalization of MCP. Because of edge-weights, MEWCP has practical applications that cannot be handled by MCP: pattern recognition [19] protein side-chain packing [1, 6], market basket analysis [7], communication analysis [9] and so on.

To obtain exact solutions of MEWCP, there are two approaches in previous works. One approach is formulating MEWCP into mathematical programming

*ss81054@gmail.com

†ky@kobe-u.ac.jp

‡masuda@kobe-u.ac.jp

and solve it by existing solvers. Formulations based on integer programming (IP) [13] and mixed integer programming (MIP) [23] were proposed.

The other approach is based on branch-and-bound. Branch-and-bound algorithms recursively divide subproblems into smaller subproblems to search optimal solutions. For each subproblem, it calculates upper bounds of the weight of feasible solutions and prunes unnecessary subproblems that have no possibility to improve the incumbent (current best solution). Variety of algorithms adopt different strategies in *branching strategy*, *search strategy* and *pruning rule*. The branching strategy is how to divide a given problem into subproblems. The search strategy is the order in which subproblems are explored. The pruning rule is how to calculate upper bounds to prune unnecessary subproblems. A survey of branch-and-bound is shown in [18]. For MEWCP, CBQ proposed in [14] uses quadratic relaxation to obtain upper bounds. Our previous algorithm EWCLIQUE is also based on the branch-and-bound [24]. EWCLIQUE decomposes edge-weights of each subproblem into three components, and calculates an upper bound for each of them.

In this paper, we propose a new branch-and-bound algorithm MECQ for MEWCP. For each subproblem, our algorithm assigns weights of edges to vertices. To obtain upper bounds using the assigned vertex weights, our algorithm calculates vertex coloring that is a procedure to divide the vertex set into a collection of independent sets. By some computational experiments, we confirm our algorithm is faster than previous methods.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Our algorithm MECQ is described in Section 2. The results of computational experiments are in Section 3. We conclude the paper in Section 4.

2 Our algorithm MECQ

The proposed algorithm MECQ is based on the branch-and-bound. Hereafter let $P(C, S)$ be a subproblem of MEWCP, where C is a constructed clique and S is a set of candidate vertices to be added to C . Note that $C \subseteq N(v)$ must be satisfied for any element $v \in S$, where $N(v)$ is the set of adjacent vertices of v . $P(\emptyset, V)$ corresponds to the instance of MEWCP. In this section, we first describe pruning rules of our algorithm. Next, we show the branching strategy that divides $P(C, S)$ into subproblems, and the search strategy to determine the order of subproblems to be solved.

2.1 Pruning Rules

First, we describe an upper bound calculation for graphs where both vertices and edges are weighted. Then, we show that an upper bound of $P(C, S)$ can be calculated in the same way.

For a graph $G = (V, E)$, let $w(v)$ and $w(u, v)$ denote the weight of vertex v and the weight of edge (u, v) , respectively. Hereafter we define $w(u, v) = 0$ for any $(u, v) \notin E$ for simplicity. Let $G(S)$ be a subgraph of G induced by a




Figure 1: a graph example G_{ex}

		$\tau(\cdot)$	$\sigma[\cdot]$ of equation 1
I_1	v_1	1	2 = $w(v_1)$
	v_3		3 = $w(v_3)$
	v_6		3 = $w(v_6)$
I_2	v_2	2	8 = $w(v_2) + \max\{w(v_1, v_2), w(v_2, v_3)\}$
	v_4		12 = $w(v_4) + \max\{w(v_3, v_4), w(v_4, v_6)\}$
I_3	v_5	3	21 = $w(v_5) + \max\{w(v_1, v_5), w(v_5, v_6)\}$ + $\max\{w(v_2, v_5), w(v_4, v_5)\}$

Figure 2: $\sigma[\cdot]$ for G_{ex}

set of vertices $S \subseteq V$. $E(S)$ denotes the edge set of $G(S)$. For $S \subseteq V$, let $W(S) = \sum_{v \in S} w(v) + \sum_{(u,v) \in E(S)} w(u, v)$.

2.1.1 Upper bound of vertex-and-edge-weighted graph

Vertex coloring is to color vertices such that no adjacent vertices have the same color. A vertex set of each color forms an independent set. The smallest number of colors needed to color a graph G is called chromatic number $\chi(G)$. Let $\omega(G)$ be the clique number (the number of vertices in a maximum clique). Since at most one vertex can be included in a clique from each independent set, $\chi(G)$ is an upper bound of $\omega(G)$. Therefore heuristic vertex coloring is often used to obtain upper bounds for MCP [27, 29]. For the maximum weight clique problem (MWCP), the sum of the maximum vertex weight of each independent set is used as an upper bound [16, 25]. To calculate upper bounds of the MEWCP, we consider assigning edge weights to incident vertices. Let $\tau(v)$ be the index of the independent set including vertex v . Namely, $\tau(v) = i$ for all $v \in I_i$. Let $\sigma[v]$ be the total weight assigned to the vertex v as follows:

$$\sigma[v] = w(v) + \sum_{i < \tau(v)} \max\{w(u, v) \mid u \in I_i \cap N(v)\}. \quad (1)$$

An example G_{ex} of a vertex-and-edge-weighted graph is shown in Figure 1. Numbers in parentheses are the vertex weights. For G_{ex} , Figure 2 shows the

assignment of independent set indices $\tau(\cdot)$ and the weight $\sigma[\cdot]$ of equation 1. At most one vertex of $I_1 \cap N(v_5) = \{v_1, v_6\}$ can be included in a clique since I_1 is an independent set. Therefore we assign only the larger weight of edges (v_1, v_5) and (v_5, v_6) to v_5 for upper bound calculation. We can ignore smaller weights to tighten upper bounds.

The following lemma shows that an upper bound of the MEWCP can be calculated by using vertex coloring.

Lemma 1. *For a clique C in a vertex-and-edge-weighted graph, the following inequality holds where $k = \max\{\tau(v) \mid v \in V\}$:*

$$W(C) \leq \sum_{i=1}^k \max\{\sigma[v] \mid v \in I_i\}. \quad (2)$$

Proof. Since at most one vertex in I_i can be included in C , $|C \cap I_i| \leq 1$ holds. From the definition, $C \subseteq N(v)$ for all $v \in C$. Therefore following inequality is obtained:

$$W(C) = \sum_{v \in C} w(v) + \sum_{(u,v) \in E(C)} w(u,v) \quad (3)$$

$$= \sum_{v \in C} w(v) + \sum_{v \in C} \sum_{i < \tau(v)} \sum_{u \in C \cap I_i} w(u,v) \quad (4)$$

$$\leq \sum_{v \in C} w(v) + \sum_{v \in C} \sum_{i < \tau(v)} \max\{w(u,v) \mid u \in N(v) \cap I_i\} \quad (5)$$

$$= \sum_{v \in C} \sigma[v] \quad (6)$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^k \sum_{v \in C \cap I_i} \sigma[v] \quad (7)$$

$$\leq \sum_{i=1}^k \max\{\sigma[v] \mid v \in I_i\} \quad (8)$$

□

Our algorithm uses Lemma 1 to obtain upper bounds. In the example G_{ex} , the clique of maximum weight is $\{v_4, v_5, v_6\}$ and its weight is 35. Using $\sigma[\cdot]$ of Figure 2, an upper bound can be calculated by Lemma 1 as follows:

$$W(C) \leq \max\{\sigma[v_1], \sigma[v_3], \sigma[v_6]\} + \max\{\sigma[v_2], \sigma[v_4]\} \\ + \max\{\sigma[v_5]\} \quad (9)$$

$$= 36 \quad (10)$$

2.1.2 Upper bound calculation for MEWCP

Let F be any feasible solution of a subproblem $P(C, S)$ of MEWCP. F is a union of C and a subset of S . $W(F)$ can be calculated as follows:

$$W(F) = W(C) + \sum_{u \in C} \sum_{v \in S \cap F} w(u, v) + W(S \cap F). \quad (11)$$

In the branch-and-bound, our algorithm calculates upper bounds of $W(F)$ to prune unnecessary subproblems. Since the term $W(C)$ is obviously obtained in branching steps, we have to calculate an upper bound of $\sum_{u \in C} \sum_{v \in S \cap F} w(u, v) + W(S \cap F)$.

To obtain vertex-and-edge-weighted graphs, our algorithm assigns edge-weights of $\{(u, v) \mid u \in C, v \in S \cap F\}$ to vertices $v \in S \cap F$. Let $w_\rho(C, v)$ be the total edge-weight assigned to $v \in S \cap F$ as follows:

$$w_\rho(C, v) = \sum_{u \in C} w(u, v). \quad (12)$$

Hereafter $w_\rho(v)$ denotes $w_\rho(C, v)$ when C can be obviously identified. Using $w_\rho(v)$ and equation 11, following equation holds:

$$W(F) = W(C) + \sum_{v \in S \cap F} w_\rho(v) + W(S \cap F). \quad (13)$$

Note that the assigned weight $w_\rho(\cdot)$ and equation 13 is originally proposed in our previous work [24].

For the vertex induced subgraph $G(S)$ of $P(C, S)$, let $G(C, S)$ be the subgraph that can be obtained by assigning the weight $w_\rho(v)$ to each vertex in $G(S)$. The proposed algorithm uses the vertex-and-edge-weighted graph $G(C, S)$ to calculate an upper bound of $W(F)$. Equation 13 indicates that the sum of $W(C)$ and an upper bound of clique weight in $G(C, S)$ is an upper bound of $W(F)$. Hence the proposed algorithm calculates an upper bound of $W(F)$ for $P(C, S)$ as follows:

1. Obtain the vertex-and-edge-weighted graph $G(C, S)$ using $w_\rho(\cdot)$ of equation 12.
2. Divide S into mutually disjoint independent sets I_1, I_2, \dots, I_k by vertex coloring.
3. Calculate $\sigma[\cdot]$ for each vertex in $G(C, S)$ using equation 1.
4. Calculate an upper bound of $W(F)$ using Lemma 1.

2.2 Branch-and-bound

Algorithm 1 shows the main part of the proposed algorithm. The inputs are a graph $G = (V, E)$, edge-weights $w(\cdot, \cdot)$ and an initial solution $C_{initial}$. It searches

Algorithm 1 MECQ

INPUT: $G = (V, E)$, $w(\cdot, \cdot)$, $C_{initial}$ **OUTPUT:** a maximum edge-weight clique C_{max} **GLOBAL VARIABLES:** C_{max}

- 1: $C_{max} \leftarrow C_{initial}$
 - 2: EXPAND(\emptyset, V)
 - 3: **return** C_{max}
-

Algorithm 2 Solving a subproblem

INPUT: a subproblem $P(C, S)$ **OUTPUT:** Update C_{max} to a better clique if it exists.**GLOBAL VARIABLES:** C_{max}

- 1: **procedure** EXPAND(C, S)
 - 2: **if** $S = \emptyset$ **then**
 - 3: **if** $W(C) > W(C_{max})$ **then**
 - 4: $C_{max} \leftarrow C$
 - 5: **end if**
 - 6: **return**
 - 7: **end if**
 - 8: $\Pi, upper[\cdot] \leftarrow \text{CALC_SEQ_AND_UB}(C, S)$
 - 9: **for** each p_i in order of Π **do** $\triangleright \Pi = [p_1, p_2, \dots, p_{|S|}]$
 - 10: **if** $W(C) + upper[p_i] > W(C_{max})$ **then**
 - 11: EXPAND($C \cup \{p_i\}, (S \setminus \{p_j \mid j < i\}) \cap N(p_i)$)
 - 12: **end if**
 - 13: **end for**
 - 14: **end procedure**
-

for solutions by the recursive procedure EXPAND. Our algorithm accepts a feasible solution $C_{initial}$ as an initial incumbent. Although our algorithm works when $C_{initial}$ is empty, given non-empty $C_{initial}$, our algorithm can use it as a lower bound and can efficiently prune subproblems in some cases.

Algorithm 2 shows the recursive procedure EXPAND to update the best solution so far. When S is empty, it is the base case that updates the optimal solution C_{max} (lines from 2 to 7). Otherwise, at line 8, the function CALC_SEQ_AND_UB returns a sequence $\Pi = [p_1, p_2, \dots, p_{|S|}]$ of vertices in S and an array $upper[\cdot]$ of upper bounds using vertex coloring (described in 2.2.1). In the loop of lines from 9 to 13 in Algorithm 2, it recursively searches solutions at line 11. The branching strategy, pruning rules and search strategy of our algorithm are as follows:

Branching Strategy

For each p_i of Π , our algorithm generates a child subproblem $P(C \cup \{p_i\}, (S \setminus \{p_j \mid j < i\}) \cap N(p_i))$. Excepting the order of vertices in Π , this strategy is same as previous algorithm EWCLIQUE [24] and is widely

used in branch-and-bound algorithms of MCP and MWCP [22, 28, 26, 11].

Pruning Rules

For each $P(C \cup \{p_i\}, (S \setminus \{p_j \mid j < i\}) \cap N(p_i))$, an upper bound based on equation 2 is stored in the array $upper[p_i]$.

Search Strategy

In order of $\Pi = [p_1, p_2, \dots, p_{|S|}]$, our algorithm searches $P(C \cup \{p_i\}, (S \setminus \{p_j \mid j < i\}) \cap N(p_i))$. Since $\Pi = [p_1, p_2, \dots, p_{|S|}]$ is ordered in non-increasing of $upper[\cdot]$ (described in 2.2.1), this strategy is to find cliques of large weight early.

2.2.1 Subroutine CALC_SEQ_AND_UB

Algorithm 3 shows the function CALC_SEQ_AND_UB. It receives a subproblem $P(C, S)$ and returns a sequence $\Pi = [p_1, p_2, \dots, p_{|S|}]$ of vertices in S and an array $upper[\cdot]$ of upper bounds. The array $upper[p_i]$ contains an upper bound of $P(C \cup \{p_i\}, (S \setminus \{p_j \mid j < i\}) \cap N(p_i))$. It is used at line 10 of Algorithm 2. Π is ordered in non-increasing of $upper[\cdot]$ and is used in branching strategy and search strategy.

Here we describe the detail of Algorithm 3. At line 3, it initializes $\sigma[\cdot]$ to $w_\rho(\cdot)$. Each iteration of the while loop from line 7 to 22, it increments k and constructs a maximal independent set I_k , appends the vertices in I_k to Π , and updates $\sigma[\cdot]$. The loop terminates when all vertices are added to Π . In the loop of lines from 11 to 18, it constructs a maximal independent set. In line 15, it appends the vertices in I_k to the head of Π in order of assignment to independent sets. In the maximal independent set construction, X is the set of candidate vertices to be added to the independent set. At line 12, our algorithm picks vertices from X in non-decreasing order of $\sigma[\cdot]$. This makes Π non-increasing order of upper bounds. At line 20, our algorithm updates $\sigma[\cdot]$ for vertices that are not added to any independent set and are adjacent to vertices in the constructed independent set.

3 Computational experiments

We implemented our algorithm MECQ in C++ to compare with previous algorithms. In the experiments, our algorithm received an initial solution $C_{initial}$ calculated by phased local search (PLS) [20]. PLS is a heuristic based on local search. To avoid to be trapped into local optimums, it switches three phases that have different search policies. The one iteration of PLS consists of 50 searches of random phase, 50 searches of penalty phase and 100 searches of degree phase. Our algorithm used PLS with 10 iterations and used the best solution found by the PLS as an initial solution.

Algorithm 3 Calculate a vertex sequence and upper bounds

INPUT: a subproblem $P(C, S)$ **OUTPUT:** a vertex sequence Π and an array $upper[\cdot]$

```
1: procedure CALC_SEQ_AND_UB( $C, S$ )
2:   for  $v \in S$  do
3:      $\sigma[v] \leftarrow w_\rho(v)$ 
4:   end for
5:    $S' \leftarrow S$  ▷ uncolored vertex set
6:    $k \leftarrow 0$  ▷ number of independent sets
7:   while  $S' \neq \emptyset$  do
8:      $k \leftarrow k + 1$ 
9:      $I_k \leftarrow \emptyset$ 
10:     $X \leftarrow S'$  ▷ candidate vertex set to add to  $I_k$ 
11:    while  $X \neq \emptyset$  do
12:       $v \leftarrow$  a vertex of minimum  $\sigma[\cdot]$  in  $X$ 
13:       $upper[v] \leftarrow \sigma[v] + \sum_{i < k} \max\{\sigma[u] \mid u \in I_i\}$ 
14:       $I_k \leftarrow I_k \cup \{v\}$  ▷  $\tau(v) = k$ 
15:      Append  $v$  to the head of  $\Pi$ .
16:       $X \leftarrow X \setminus N(v)$ 
17:       $S' \leftarrow S' \setminus \{v\}$ 
18:    end while
19:    for  $v \in S'$  do
20:       $\sigma[v] \leftarrow \sigma[v] + \max\{w(u, v) \mid u \in N(v) \cap I_k\}$ 
21:    end for
22:  end while
23:  return  $\Pi, upper[\cdot]$ 
24: end procedure
```

3.1 Random graphs

We generated uniform random graphs. Edge-weights were uniform random integer values from 1 to 10. The compared algorithms are EWCLIQUE [24] and mathematical programming formulations of MIP proposed in [23]. We used the C++ implementation of EWCLIQUE that was used in our previous work [24]. For the formulations of MIP, we used the mathematical programming solver IBM CPLEX 12.5.

The compiler is g++ 5.4.0 with optimization option -O2. The OS is Linux 4.4.0. The CPU is Intel®Core™i7-6700 CPU 3.40 GHz. RAM is 16GB. Note that CPLEX is a multi-thread solver based on branch-and-cut, and our algorithm is a single-thread solver based on branch-and-bound.

Table 1 shows the CPU time for random graphs. The symbol ϵ shows that the CPU time is less than 0.01 sec. The column LB shows the weight of initial solutions given by PLS. For all conditions, our algorithm MECQ obtained optimal solutions in a shorter time than previous methods. For the random graphs, the initial solution given by PLS does not improve performance.

Table 1: CPU time for random graphs [sec]

V	d	optimal weight	MECQ + PLS				MECQ without PLS	EWCLIQUE [24]	MIP [23]
			LB	PLS	MECQ	Total			
300	0.1	60.7	60.7	0.01	ϵ	0.01	ϵ	ϵ	91.54
350	0.1	64.8	64.8	0.01	ϵ	0.01	ϵ	ϵ	190.96
15000	0.1	174.7	148.3	0.73	408.56	409.29	402.75	460.90	>1000
250	0.2	97.3	97.3	0.02	ϵ	0.02	ϵ	ϵ	64.26
280	0.2	102.4	102.4	0.02	ϵ	0.02	ϵ	ϵ	119.47
5500	0.2	254.8	212.2	0.37	319.27	319.64	319.93	440.29	>1000
200	0.3	150.0	150.0	0.02	ϵ	0.02	ϵ	ϵ	39.16
250	0.3	155.5	155.5	0.03	0.01	0.03	0.01	0.01	97.16
2500	0.3	332.8	291.1	0.26	227.70	227.96	232.99	459.05	>1000
160	0.4	185.5	185.5	0.02	0.01	0.03	0.01	0.01	21.98
200	0.4	224.0	224.0	0.03	0.01	0.04	0.01	0.02	57.54
1400	0.4	444.3	406.8	0.21	293.71	293.92	295.09	758.22	>1000
140	0.5	272.7	272.7	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.02	21.28
170	0.5	300.6	300.6	0.03	0.03	0.06	0.03	0.06	52.72
750	0.5	560.3	546.5	0.15	164.32	164.47	164.76	603.91	>1000
120	0.6	399.0	399.0	0.01	0.02	0.03	0.02	0.05	18.10
130	0.6	424.6	424.6	0.01	0.03	0.04	0.03	0.07	28.57
450	0.6	754.2	745.9	0.03	125.43	125.46	123.59	716.48	>1000
100	0.7	583.5	583.5	0.01	0.03	0.04	0.04	0.11	15.12
110	0.7	607.1	607.1	0.01	0.06	0.07	0.06	0.24	31.23
270	0.7	1049.7	1049.1	0.02	61.97	61.99	62.78	589.15	>1000
80	0.8	879.0	879.0	0.01	0.04	0.05	0.05	0.16	7.28
90	0.8	978.0	978.0	0.01	0.11	0.12	0.12	0.44	21.51
170	0.8	1580.2	1580.2	0.01	35.82	35.83	37.13	485.50	>1000
70	0.9	1708.4	1708.4	0.01	0.09	0.10	0.11	0.62	3.80
80	0.9	2059.2	2059.2	0.01	0.35	0.37	0.37	2.93	14.84
110	0.9	2666.4	2666.4	0.02	22.40	22.41	23.27	590.83	>1000

Table 2 shows the number of recursive iterations of MECQ and EWCLIQUE. The value of the time [μs] is calculated by CPU time per iteration. The value of the iteration ratio is the ratio of iterations of MECQ and EWCLIQUE. From the result, we confirm that although the computation time of upper bounds of MECQ is longer than EWCLIQUE, the iterations of MECQ is less than our previous algorithm EWCLIQUE. The difference of CPU time can be explained by this. One reason is MECQ calculates upper bounds of equation 13 at once. EWCLIQUE calculates upper bounds in two steps and calculates the sum of two upper bounds.

3.2 DIMACS benchmarks

DIMACS is a set of benchmarks for MCP [30]. We used them as benchmarks of MEWCP by giving weights to edges in the same way as [24, 20, 13, 14]. For each edge (v_i, v_j) , we gave the weight $w(v_i, v_j) = (i + j) \bmod 200 + 1$.

For the DIMACS benchmarks, the results of computational experiments for previous methods are shown in [14, 13]. Hence we also compared our algorithm with the branch-and-bound algorithm CBQ [14] and mathematical programming formulations proposed in [13]. We quote the results shown in [14, 13] to our

Table 2: Iterations for random graphs

V	d	MECQ			EWCLIQUE		MECQ
		with PLS iterations	without PLS iterations	time [μs]	iterations	time [μs]	EWCLIQUE iteration ratio
300	0.1	312.6	357.2	ϵ	1835.1	ϵ	19.46%
350	0.1	443.4	514.5	ϵ	2721.0	ϵ	18.91%
15000	0.1	56824211.6	56842808.1	7.09	702255007.1	0.66	8.09%
250	0.2	974.5	1043.8	ϵ	6412.8	ϵ	16.28%
280	0.2	1424.7	1515.2	ϵ	9862.9	ϵ	15.36%
5500	0.2	75843118.8	75882002.3	4.22	1537843711.0	0.29	4.93%
200	0.3	1547.8	1644.2	ϵ	14169.8	ϵ	11.60%
250	0.3	3449.5	3896.9	2.57	34844.2	0.29	11.18%
2500	0.3	65558818.2	65637225.6	3.55	1824084938.8	0.25	3.60%
160	0.4	2740.6	2895.5	3.45	31813.3	0.31	9.10%
200	0.4	5062.9	5868.7	1.70	70701.9	0.28	8.30%
1400	0.4	73127999.6	73361911.2	4.02	2993314273.1	0.25	2.45%
140	0.5	4541.5	5200.1	1.92	88105.7	0.23	5.90%
170	0.5	11374.6	11829.1	2.54	224608.1	0.27	5.27%
750	0.5	37702959.2	38847817.4	4.24	2342210511.1	0.26	1.66%
120	0.6	8166.3	8804.9	2.27	208388.4	0.24	4.23%
130	0.6	11338.8	13157.6	2.28	288494.1	0.24	4.56%
450	0.6	27505132.9	28469833.9	4.34	2725875895.6	0.26	1.04%
100	0.7	12737.1	13792.0	2.90	437892.1	0.25	3.15%
110	0.7	24203.6	26032.4	2.30	950029.7	0.25	2.74%
270	0.7	13547235.5	14604499.2	4.30	2141882035.0	0.28	0.68%
80	0.8	17659.5	20083.0	2.49	617626.3	0.26	3.25%
90	0.8	37616.7	45298.8	2.65	1578193.4	0.28	2.87%
170	0.8	7947844.6	8715999.5	4.26	1510657832.0	0.32	0.58%
70	0.9	30957.5	37263.2	2.95	2355972.7	0.26	1.58%
80	0.9	102852.5	111080.3	3.33	9974393.5	0.29	1.11%
110	0.9	5009165.9	5402618.4	4.31	1951189872.0	0.30	0.28%

result tables. The CPU used in [14] is Intel®Core™i7 2.90 GHz. The CPU used in [13] is Intel®Core™i7 3.40 GHz.

Table 3 shows the CPU time for DIMACS. Table 4 shows the number of recursive iterations of MECQ and EWCLIQUE. Except for hamming8-2 and san200_0.9_1, our algorithm MECQ obtained optimal solutions in a shorter time than others. For hamming8-2 and san200_0.9_1, MECQ has usable performance. Only the MECQ with PLS solved all instances in the table in 1000 sec. Although the initial solutions given by PLS did not improve performance in random graphs, they worked well in DIMACS. Especially for benchmark families gen and san, it reduced a lot of computation time.

Table 3: CPU time for DIMACS (sec)

	[V]	d	optimal weight	MECQ + PLS				MECQ without PLS	EWCLIQUE [24]	MIP [23]	CBQ [14]	G&M [13]	IP _{base} [13, 14]
				LB	PLS	MECQ	Total						
brock200_1	200	0.75	21230	21230	0.02	24.81	24.82	24.12	338.31	>1000	3047.565	>10800	>10800
brock200_2	200	0.50	6542	6542	0.04	0.04	0.08	0.06	0.10	109.66	7.436	9464.24	>10800
brock200_3	200	0.61	10303	10303	0.01	0.40	0.41	0.42	1.27	743.58	55.905	>10800	>10800
brock200_4	200	0.66	13967	13967	0.01	1.16	1.17	1.17	4.84	>1000	188.031	>10800	>10800
C125.9	125	0.90	66248	66248	0.02	24.21	24.23	24.83	>1000	>1000	4558.170	>10800	>10800
c-fat200-1	200	0.08	7734	7734	0.01	ε	0.01	ε	ε	4.80	0.483	3.870	31.296
c-fat200-2	200	0.16	26389	26389	0.02	ε	0.02	ε	ε	4.72	0.890	33.260	49.671
c-fat200-5	200	0.43	168200	168200	0.07	ε	0.07	ε	74.31	7.06	>10800	155.300	134.578
c-fat500-10	500	0.37	804000	804000	0.31	0.23	0.54	0.24	>1000	745.93			
c-fat500-1	500	0.04	10738	10738	0.01	ε	0.01	ε	ε	171.91			
c-fat500-2	500	0.07	38350	38350	0.02	ε	0.03	ε	ε	399.90			
c-fat500-5	500	0.19	205864	205864	0.10	0.01	0.11	0.01	0.43	264.44			
DSJC500_5	500	1.00	9626	9626	0.03	10.14	10.17	10.00	44.43	>1000			
gen200_p0.9_55	200	0.90	150839	150839	0.02	236.94	236.96	>1000	>1000	>1000			
hamming6-2	64	0.90	32736	32736	0.01	ε	0.01	ε	ε	0.07	4.437	0.300	17.000
hamming6-4	64	0.35	396	396	0.00	ε	ε	ε	ε	0.22	0.031	1.970	6.468
hamming8-2	256	0.97	800624	800624	0.05	20.63	20.67	20.34	0.23	7.80	>10800	>10800	>10800
hamming8-4	256	0.64	12360	12360	0.01	0.54	0.55	0.55	1.46	276.15	439.437	>10800	>10800
johnson16-2-4	120	0.76	3808	3766	ε	0.17	0.17	0.18	0.25	57.40	84.687	>10800	>10800
johnson8-2-4	28	0.56	192	192	ε	ε	ε	ε	ε	0.03	ε	0.140	0.421
johnson8-4-4	70	0.77	6552	6552	ε	ε	ε	ε	ε	0.40	0.687	2.340	65.171
keller4	171	0.65	6745	6745	0.02	0.20	0.22	0.21	0.70	167.84	42.218	>10800	>10800
MANN_a9	45	0.93	5460	5460	0.01	0.02	0.03	0.02	0.02	1.22	1.906	9.390	130.344
p_hat1000-1	1000	0.24	5436	5253	0.11	1.91	2.02	1.97	2.92	>1000			
p_hat1500-1	1500	0.25	7135	6875	0.18	19.28	19.46	19.65	32.73	>1000			
p_hat300-1	300	0.24	3321	3321	0.03	0.01	0.04	0.01	0.01	146.10	3.281	1273.05	8489.750
p_hat300-2	300	0.49	31564	31564	0.15	6.44	6.59	6.96	42.90	>1000	171.281	>10800	>10800
p_hat500-1	500	0.25	4764	4764	0.05	0.08	0.14	0.08	0.13	>1000			
p_hat700-1	700	0.25	5185	5185	0.08	0.37	0.45	0.38	0.52	>1000			
san1000	1000	0.50	10661	6588	2.94	17.18	20.11	19.46	>1000	>1000			
san200_0_7_1	200	0.70	45295	45295	0.05	0.09	0.14	1.95	54.88	28.72			
san200_0_7_2	200	0.70	15073	15073	0.12	2.34	2.46	4.02	17.86	>1000			
san200_0_9_1	200	0.90	242710	242710	0.04	38.58	38.62	>1000	12.56	206.01			
san200_0_9_2	200	0.90	178468	178468	0.03	88.84	88.88	378.96	833.49	>1000			
san400_0_5_1	400	0.50	7442	7442	0.37	0.14	0.51	0.63	60.36	>1000			
san400_0_7_1	400	0.70	77719	77719	0.31	15.55	15.86	645.24	>1000	>1000			
san400_0_7_2	400	0.70	44155	44155	0.24	52.55	52.78	497.74	>1000	>1000			
san400_0_7_3	400	0.70	24727	24727	0.11	211.11	211.22	325.71	>1000	>1000			
sanr200_0_7	200	0.70	16398	16398	0.01	4.14	4.16	4.34	18.67	>1000			

Table 4: Iterations for DIMACS

graph	V	d	MECQ			EWCLIQUE		$\frac{\text{EWCLIQUE}}{\text{MECQ}}$
			with PLS iterations	without PLS iterations	time [μ s]	iterations	time [μ s]	iteration ratio
brock200.1	200	0.75	6074449	6103600	3.95	1328614116	0.25	0.46%
brock200.2	200	0.50	14073	19906	3.01	345371	0.29	5.76%
brock200.3	200	0.61	114928	130560	3.22	4282305	0.30	3.05%
brock200.4	200	0.66	287037	310735	3.77	13814425	0.35	2.25%
C125.9	125	0.90	4329351	4551897	5.45			
c-fat200-1	200	0.08	28	38	€	632	€	6.01%
c-fat200-2	200	0.16	97	107	€	6780	€	1.58%
c-fat200-5	200	0.43	113	141	€	138193445	0.54	0.00%
c-fat500-10	500	0.37	3853	3947	60.81			
c-fat500-1	500	0.04	61	66	€	1605	€	4.11%
c-fat500-2	500	0.07	92	126	€	4679	€	2.69%
c-fat500-5	500	0.19	324	404	24.75	1227023	0.35	0.03%
DSJC500.5	500	1.00	2419493	2494606	4.01	200152687	0.22	1.25%
gen200.p0.9.55	200	0.90	13443080					
hamming6-2	64	0.90	32	48	€	896	€	5.36%
hamming6-4	64	0.35	265	265	€	340	€	77.94%
hamming8-2	256	0.97	479056	479125	42.45	65731	3.50	728.92%
hamming8-4	256	0.64	86597	88679	6.20	2475100	0.59	3.58%
johnson16-2-4	120	0.76	309697	309697	0.58	1905154	0.13	16.26%
johnson8-2-4	28	0.56	79	79	€	150	€	52.67%
johnson8-4-4	70	0.77	354	361	€	3953	€	9.13%
keller4	171	0.65	61141	63170	3.32	2158496	0.32	2.93%
MANN_a9	45	0.93	35116	35128	0.57	116041	0.17	30.27%
p_hat1000-1	1000	0.24	582124	591826	3.33	9890185	0.30	5.98%
p_hat1500-1	1500	0.25	4552934	4565892	4.30	106284583	0.31	4.30%
p_hat300-1	300	0.24	3975	4221	2.37	50151	0.20	8.42%
p_hat300-2	300	0.49	876123	1053858	6.60	134486327	0.32	0.78%
p_hat500-1	500	0.25	27485	27601	2.90	468371	0.28	5.89%
p_hat700-1	700	0.25	110426	113403	3.35	1678557	0.31	6.76%
san1000	1000	0.50	345909	383550	50.74			
san200.0.7.1	200	0.70	6694	425248	4.59	387149894	0.14	0.11%
san200.0.7.2	200	0.70	335623	680897	5.90	48732878	0.37	1.40%
san200.0.9.1	200	0.90	1637404			12731307	0.99	0.00%
san200.0.9.2	200	0.90	4463309	25206475	72.79	303169816	2.75	1.72%
san400.0.5.1	400	0.50	11065	68967	9.13	43132933	1.40	0.16%
san400.0.7.1	400	0.70	547682	53869639	166.74			
san400.0.7.2	400	0.70	2841349	57665379	64.93			
san400.0.7.3	400	0.70	20591310	39873392	32.99			
sanr200.0.7	200	0.70	1045157	1196523	3.63	55871909	0.33	2.14%

4 Conclusion

We proposed a branch-and-bound algorithm MECQ for MEWCP. Our algorithm calculates upper bounds using vertex coloring. In the vertex coloring procedure, our algorithm assigns edge weights to vertices to calculate upper bounds. By some computational experiments, we confirmed our algorithm is faster than previous ones.

Although modern techniques are proposed for MCP [17, 21], they cannot be directly applied to MEWCP because of edge weights. To apply such techniques to MEWCP, modifying them is a future work.

Recently, quantum annealer is studied to solve NP-hard problems including MCP [8, 3]. Quantum annealer can solve the quadratic unconstrained binary optimization (QUBO) problem. Since quantum annealer solvers are heuristic, efficient exact solvers are required to evaluate them. QUBO can be formulated as MEWCP by the vertex-and-edge-weighted complete graphs where negative weight is allowed. Hence handling negative weight is one future work.

References

- [1] Dukka Bahadur K.C, Tatsuya Akutsu, Etsuji Tomita, and Tomokazu Seki. Protein side-chain packing problem: a maximum edge-weight clique algorithmic approach. In *The second conference on Asia-Pacific bioinformatics-Volume 29*, pages 191–200. Australian Computer Society, Inc., 2004.
- [2] Dukka Bahadur K.C, Tatsuya Akutsu, Etsuji Tomita, Tomokazu Seki, and Asao Fujiyama. Point matching under non-uniform distortions and protein side chain packing based on efficient maximum clique algorithms. *Genome Informatics*, 13:143–152, 2002.
- [3] Zhengbing Bian, Fabian Chudak, William Macready, Aidan Roy, Roberto Sebastiani, and Stefano Varotti. Solving sat and maxsat with a quantum annealer: Foundations and a preliminary report. In *International Symposium on Frontiers of Combining Systems*, pages 153–171. Springer, 2017.
- [4] Galina T Bogdanova, Andries E Brouwer, Stoian N Kapralov, and Patric RJ Östergård. Error-correcting codes over an alphabet of four elements. *Designs, Codes and Cryptography*, 23(3):333–342, 2001.
- [5] Vladimir Boginski, Sergiy Butenko, and Panos M. Pardalos. Mining market data: A network approach. *Computers & Operations Research*, 33(11):3171–3184, 2006. Part Special Issue: Operations Research and Data Mining.
- [6] J.B Brown, Dukka Bahadur K.C, Etsuji Tomita, and Tatsuya Akutsu. Multiple methods for protein side chain packing using maximum weight cliques. *Genome Informatics*, 17(1):3–12, 2006.
- [7] Luís Cavique. A scalable algorithm for the market basket analysis. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 14(6):400–407, 2007.

- [8] Guillaume Chapuis, Hristo Djidjev, Georg Hahn, and Guillaume Rizk. Finding maximum cliques on the d-wave quantum annealer. *Journal of Signal Processing Systems*, 2018.
- [9] Steven R Corman, Timothy Kuhn, Robert D McPhee, and Kevin J Dooley. Studying complex discursive systems. *Human communication research*, 28(2):157–206, 2002.
- [10] Tuvi Etzion and Patric RJ Ostergard. Greedy and heuristic algorithms for codes and colorings. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 44(1):382–388, 1998.
- [11] Zhiwen Fang, Chu-Min Li, and Ke Xu. An exact algorithm based on maxsat reasoning for the maximum weight clique problem. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, 55:799–833, 2016.
- [12] Michael R Gary and David S Johnson. *Computers and Intractability - A Guide to the Theory of NP-completeness*. WH Freeman and Company, 1979.
- [13] Luis Gouveia and Pedro Martins. Solving the maximum edge-weight clique problem in sparse graphs with compact formulations. *EURO Journal on Computational Optimization*, 3(1):1–30, 2015.
- [14] Seyedmohammadhossein Hosseinian, Dalila B.M.M. Fontes, and Sergiy Butenko. A nonconvex quadratic optimization approach to the maximum edge weight clique problem. *Journal of Global Optimization*, 72(2):219–240, Mar 2018.
- [15] Richard M Karp. Reducibility among combinatorial problems. In *Complexity of computer computations*, pages 85–103. Springer, 1972.
- [16] Deniss Kumlander. A new exact algorithm for the maximum-weight clique problem based on a heuristic vertex-coloring and a backtrack search. In *Proceedings of the 5th International Conference on Modelling, Computation and Optimization in Information Systems and Management Sciences*, pages 202–208. Citeseer, 2004.
- [17] Chu-Min Li, Hua Jiang, and Felip Manyà. On minimization of the number of branches in branch-and-bound algorithms for the maximum clique problem. *Computers & Operations Research*, 84:1–15, 2017.
- [18] David R Morrison, Sheldon H Jacobson, Jason J Sauppe, and Edward C Sewell. Branch-and-bound algorithms: A survey of recent advances in searching, branching, and pruning. *Discrete Optimization*, 19:79–102, 2016.
- [19] Massimiliano Pavan and Marcello Pelillo. Generalizing the motzkin-strauss theorem to edge-weighted graphs, with applications to image segmentation. In *International Workshop on Energy Minimization Methods in Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 485–500. Springer, 2003.

- [20] Wayne Pullan. Approximating the maximum vertex/edge weighted clique using local search. *Journal of Heuristics*, 14(2):117–134, 2008.
- [21] Pablo San Segundo, Alexey Nikolaev, Mikhail Batsyn, and Panos M Pardalos. Improved infra-chromatic bound for exact maximum clique search. *Informatica*, 27(2):463–487, 2016.
- [22] Pablo San Segundo, Diego Rodríguez-Losada, and Agustín Jiménez. An exact bit-parallel algorithm for the maximum clique problem. *Computers & Operations Research*, 38(2):571–581, 2011.
- [23] Satoshi Shimizu, Kazuaki Yamaguchi, and Sumio Masuda. Mathematical programming formulation for the maximum edge-weight clique problem. *IEICE Transactions on Fundamentals of Electronics, Communications and Computer Sciences (in Japanese)*, J100-A(8):313–315, 2017.
- [24] Satoshi Shimizu, Kazuaki Yamaguchi, and Sumio Masuda. A branch-and-bound based exact algorithm for the maximum edge-weight clique problem. In *5th International Conference on Computational Science/Intelligence and Applied Informatics (CSII 2018)*. IEEE, 2018.
- [25] Satoshi Shimizu, Kazuaki Yamaguchi, Toshiki Saitoh, and Sumio Masuda. Some improvements on Kumlander’s maximum weight clique extraction algorithm. In *International Conference on Electrical, Computer, Electronics and Communication Engineering (ICECECE 2012)*, pages 307–311, 2012.
- [26] Satoshi Shimizu, Kazuaki Yamaguchi, Toshiki Saitoh, and Sumio Masuda. Fast maximum weight clique extraction algorithm: Optimal tables for branch-and-bound. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 223:120–134, 2017.
- [27] Etsuji Tomita, Yoichi Sutani, Takanori Higashi, Shinya Takahashi, and Mitsuo Wakatsuki. A simple and faster branch-and-bound algorithm for finding a maximum clique. In *WALCOM: Algorithms and computation*, pages 191–203. Springer, 2010.
- [28] Etsuji Tomita and Toshikatsu Kameda. An efficient branch-and-bound algorithm for finding a maximum clique with computational experiments. *Journal of Global optimization*, 37(1):95–111, 2007.
- [29] Etsuji Tomita, Kohei Yoshida, Takuro Hatta, Atsuki Nagao, Hiro Ito, and Mitsuo Wakatsuki. A much faster branch-and-bound algorithm for finding a maximum clique. In *International Workshop on Frontiers in Algorithmics*, pages 215–226. Springer, 2016.
- [30] Michael Trick, Vavsek Chvatal, Bill Cook, David Johnson, Cathy McGeoch, Bob Tarjan, et al. DIMACS implementation challenges. <http://dimacs.rutgers.edu/Challenges/>.
- [31] Qinghua Wu and Jin-Kao Hao. A review on algorithms for maximum clique problems. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 242(3):693–709, 2015.