

FAST: FPGA-based Subgraph Matching on Massive Graphs

Xin Jin[†], Zhengyi Yang[§], Xuemin Lin[§], Shiyu Yang[†], Lu Qin[‡], You Peng[§]

[†]East China Normal University, [§]University Of New South Wales, [‡]University of Technology Sydney
 xinjin@stu.ecnu.edu.cn, {zyang, lxue}@cse.unsw.edu.au,
 syyang@sei.stu.ecnu.edu.cn, lu.qin@uts.edu.au, you.peng@unsw.edu.au

We would like to thank the reviewers for their insightful and invaluable comments. We have revised the paper carefully according to the comments. A summary of major revisions is given below, followed by the point-to-point response to each reviewer.

- 1) Add additional comparison with GPU-based solutions.
- 2) Provide the statistics about the number and size of CST to show the scalability of the partition mechanism.
- 3) Conduct more experiments as suggested by reviewers for better comparison.
- 4) Strengthen the application of subgraph matching on FPGAs.
- 5) Beautify the figures, proof-read and improve presentation.

Please kindly find our point-to-point responses below.

RESPONSE TO REVIEWER #1

Comment 1.1 (R1) Compare with GPU based solutions

Response. Thanks for the suggestion. We have added experiments in the revised paper to compare FAST with two state-of-the-art GPU-based solutions GSI [40] and GpSM [36]. We do not compare PBE [17] because it is unable to handle labeled graphs. The results are illustrated in *Comparing with Existing Algorithms* (Section VII-C, Fig. 12). For demonstration, we extract the results of FAST compared with GSI and GpSM and present them here in Fig. 1 (q_0 - q_4 in DG03 and q_4 - q_8 in DG10 to save space). As shown, FAST outperforms GSI and GpSM for all the queries. Note that both GSI and GpSM fail to solve all the queries due to out of memory error.

Comment 1.2 (R2) Rewrite the text of the System Overview section including symbol tables in the Software Implementation subsection and making sure all terms are concretely defined when used.

Response: Thanks. We have carefully rewritten the text of the *Software Implementation* (Section V) in the revised paper. A symbol table (Table 1) is added at the beginning of Section V. Specifically, we have made the following changes with respect to W1:

- We modify the data graph G in the Fig. 1(b) and CST in the Fig. 3(b) in the revised paper so that the Example 2




Fig. 1. Elapsed time of FAST, GSI and GpSM

can be easier to understand.

- We define the unclear symbols (e.g. \mathcal{O}) and terms (e.g. "valid node") before used.
- CST is not a DAG nor a tree. It is an undirected graph as given in Definition 2. We abuse the term *tree* during naming to emphasize that CST is constructed based on the spanning tree of the query graph following conventions. A footnote has been added in Definition 2 to clarify.
- Each vertex in CST has a candidate set in which each candidate in it refers to a data vertex in the data graph. We have modified the definition of CST (Definition 2) to make it clear. In addition, we use the term 'candidate' to distinguish a candidate vertex from a CST vertex after Definition 2 to minimize confusion.
- $N_{u'}^u(v)$ is the adjacency list of $v \in C(u)$ regarding (u, u') in CST, i.e., $N_{u'}^u(v) = \{v' \in C(u') \mid (v, v') \in E(\text{CST})\}$. The explanation is added in the third paragraph in Section V-A.
- We have added CSTProcess (Algorithm 3) to clarify the scheduling process.

Comment 1.3 (R3) Record some statistics about the number of partitions that was used in each experiment as well as the total size of the CST.

Response. Thanks. We have added the statistics about the number of partitions and the total size of CST in the revised paper. The results are illustrated in *The Necessity of CST Partition* (Section VII-A, Fig. 8).

Our partition method demonstrate good scalability in the experiments. Let S_{CST} and S_G be the size of all CST partitions and data graph, respectively. In general, $\frac{S_{CST}}{S_G} < 60\%$ for all experiments and $\frac{S_{CST}}{S_G}$ keeps stable for the most of queries while the data graph grows. The rapid growth of $\frac{S_{CST}}{S_G}$ in q_7 from DG03 to DG10 is due to the rapid increase in the number of embeddings.

Moreover, we evaluate the partition time with respect to the embeddings as the data graph grows. The results are shown in Fig. 2. The average partition time increases only slightly as data graph grows (1.09×10^{-9} , 1.15×10^{-9} , 2.11×10^{-9} , and 2.15×10^{-9} seconds per embedding for DG01, DG03, DG10 and DG60, respectively), while the sizes of data graph increase a lot (the numbers of edges are 17.24M, 52.65M, 176.48M and 1.25B for DG01, DG03, DG10 and DG60, respectively). The results of memory cost and time cost proves the scalability of our partition mechanism when the data graph grows.

Subgraph matching on complex query in large data graphs is challenging for all algorithms. The queries we use are selected from the *Interactive Workload* in the LDBC-SNC benchmark which already includes complex queries in practical (e.g. the number of results of q_7 in DG60 exceeds 4 billion). The results show that our partition mechanism can handle complex real-world workloads.




Fig. 2. The partition time per embedding

Comment 1.4 (D4) The logarithmic scale used in the experiments is not ideal for acceleration ratios < 1 .

Response. Thanks. In the revised version, we label the actual acceleration ratio on the right side of the figures.

Comment 2.1 (D3) The claims of novelty of the CST data structure should be toned down. Transforming the query graph into a spanning tree and matching the edges in the tree first is a well-known technique used by many algorithms. CST might not be exactly the same as data structures used by previous work, but it is a minor variations. A tree partitioning technique seemingly similar to the one of this paper was already introduced by the QFrag algorithm.

Response. Thanks. We have revised the description in the first paragraph of *CST Structure* (Section V-A) to lower our tone. CST is similar to the auxiliary data structure in previous works, but with vital difference. The design choice is discussed at the end of Section V-A in the Remark. We refer to the main contribution as our CPU-FPGA co-designed framework with the help of CST structure and its partition mechanism, instead of solely the design of CST.

In addition, the partitioning technique of CST is different with the one of QFrag [30]: (1) QFrag partitions its tree-like structure only on the second query vertex in the matching order. In FAST, we partition CST from the first query vertex to the last one until CST meets the requirements. (2) QFrag partitions its tree-like structure for load-balancing, so the partition factor is fixed (equals to the number of workers). The partition factor of CST is dynamically determined each round. (3) QFrag does not partition the relationships between the non-tree neighbors like us.

Comment 2.2 (D5) Figure 11 has a lot of information and its y axis is in log-scale. It is difficult to understand the exact speedup for the different experiments, and the text only reports the best-case speedups. Please add numbers on top of each bar to make the figure more readable.

Response. Thanks. We have fixed Fig. 11 (now is Fig. 12) in the revised paper. Each query shows similar trend in different data graphs, so we choose to demonstrate the results of only five queries for each data graph to make the figure easy to read. The complete results will be included in our technical report.

Comment 3.1 (D1.1) While it is understood CST partitioning is necessary, the choice of k (Lines 2-3 of Algo. 2) requires some explanation or experiments. Is the acceleration sensitivity to k ?

Response. Thanks. The acceleration is not particularly sensitive to k when k is small (e.g. $k \leq 10$). The choice of k makes impact on the partition time, but when k is small, it is the matching process on FPGA not the partition process on CPU that dominates the total execution time. When k is large, the partition time will increase rapidly and harm the acceler-

ation. However, our greedy strategy can reduce the time for partitioning and the final number of CST partitions, so it can potentially make less impact on the whole subgraph matching process. We have added the k -Determination experiment as illustrated in Fig. 3. Besides our greedy strategy, we test FAST with fixed $k \in \{2, 4, 6, 8, 10\}$. The average number of CST and the average partition time are reported. It can be seen that our greedy approach does achieve the least number of CST and least time cost to partition CST.




Fig. 3. The average number of CST and average partition time varying k

Comment 3.2 (D1.2) The matching \mathcal{O} appears to play an important role in efficiency. It should be tested with some alternatives.

Response: Thanks for the suggestion. We have tested FAST with the following matching orders: (1) CFL’s order (order the root-to-leaf path of a spanning tree). (2) DAF’s order (a topological order of DAG). (3) CECI’s order (a breadth-first search order). (4) all random connected orders. The results are added in the revised paper (Section VII-C, Fig. 13).

For each query, we extract the minimum, average and maximum elapsed time in all random connected orders as the results of BEST, AVG and WORST matching orders, respectively. It can be seen from the figure that the average elapsed time of FAST with CFL’s, DAF’s and CECI’s orders is very close to each other. The FAST with WORST matching order (about $5\times$ slower than the best order in average) can still outperform CFL, CECI and DAF which further proves the effectiveness our CPU-FPGA co-designed framework. The results are also reported in the revised paper (Section VII-C, Fig. 13).

Note that it is practically infeasible to always compute an optimal order [34], so FAST is designed to accept any matching order. In the paper, we adopt the path-ordering matching order similar to CFL-Match which present good performance in most cases.

Comment 3.3 (D1.3) Similarly, the threshold δ should be backed up by experiments.

Response. Thanks. We add the δ experiments in *Effectiveness of Software Scheduler* (Section VII-B). The results are illustrated in Fig. 11 in the revised paper. According to the figure, *Software Scheduler* optimization achieves best improvements when $\delta = 0.1$.

Comment 3.4 (D2) Are the experiments on the existing work [13, 17, 12] run on a setup that only one thread is allowed? It makes more sense if the code is compiled with its best optimization options on the host machine.

Response. Thanks. CFL [14] is designed and implemented only for single thread. DAF [18] and CECI [13] provide the parallel version of their algorithms. We compare FAST with DAF-8 (i.e. DAF using 8 threads) and CECI-8 (i.e. CECI using 8 threads). However, DAF-8 encounters out of memory error when processing DG03 and DG10. So we only report the elapsed time of CECI-8 in Fig. 12 in the revised paper. We extract the elapsed time of FAST, CECI and CECI-8, as shown in the Fig. 4 here. FAST outperforms CECI-8 in all queries even when 8 threads are used, the average acceleration rate of FAST compared with CECI-8 is 5.79x, 8.51x and 9.31x for DG01, DG03 and DG10, respectively.




Fig. 4. The average elapsed time of CECI-8, CECI, FAST-8 and FAST

Comment 3.5 (R1) Discuss, analyze or show the parameters used in the experiments as detailed as possible (D1-D2).

Response. Thanks. We have given the corresponding response in Comment 3.1-3.4.

Comment 3.6 (R2) Strengthen the applications of the paper (D3).

Response. Thanks. Subgraph matching has a wide range of applications as mentioned in the first paragraph of the introduction. FPGA-based subgraph matching can speed up and benefit all applications of them. Moreover, subgraph matching is essentially the core operation of subgraph queries in graph databases (e.g. Neo4j) and RDF engines (e.g. gStore). FPGA-based subgraph matching can be integrated into existing graph databases and RDF engines to accelerate many real-world applications. Such attempts has already been made using GPUs but not FPGAs. We have added a short discussion in our revised paper (Section I).

Comment 3.7 (R3) Proofread the paper.

Response. Thanks for the suggestion. We have proofread the paper to fix the typos and mistakes we found in the paper.