## A Framework for Differentiable Discovery Of Graph Algorithms

Hanjun Dai, Xinshi Chen, Yu Li, Xin Gao and Le Song



**Google Research & Georgia Tech & KAUST** 

### Combinatorial optimization over graph



#### **GNN = Parametrized distributed local graph algorithm**

Distributed Local Graph Algorithm = Graph Representation + Iterative Update



#### Differentiable Algorithm Discovery (DAD) framework

**1.** Can we discover new algorithms?

2. How to learn these algorithms? Supervised, Unsupervised Reinforcement Learning 3. Can we interpret what's discovered?



## Search (Input) Space Design for GNN

#### Motivating example

- The best known algorithm for solving a general linear system takes time  $\mathcal{O}(n^{2.373})$
- Kelner et al. (2013) proposed an algorithm for solving Laplacian system:

Lx = b, where L is Laplacian matrix

in nearly-linear time.

Step 1: Find a low-stretch spanning tree and obtain an initial solution on the tree.



Step 2: Refine the initialized solution by iteratively operating on local cycles in the original graph.



#### **Cheap Solution as Global Features**



#### **Cheap Solution as Global Features**



#### **Cheap Solution as Global Features**



# Learning Local Iterative Algorithms with GNN

#### **Supervised**

- For each graph G, a solution  $y^*$  is obtained by running expensive solver
- Learn GNN-based algorithm which can imitate  $y^*$  but runs much faster



#### Unsupervised

• Many graph problems can be formulated as integer programming (IP) problems:

 $\min_{\mathbf{y} \in \{0,1\}^{|V|}} f(Y;G) \text{ subject to } g_i(y;G) \le 0 \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, l$ 

• Construct unsupervised training loss based on optimization objective f and constraints g  $L_U(p,G) \coloneqq E[f(Y;G)] + \beta \cdot P[g_i(Y;G) \le 0]$ where  $Y \sim \text{Bernoulli}(p)$ 



#### Better learned algorithms with global information

- Comparison of our features to other features
  - Random features
  - Random one-hot encoding
  - Port Numbering + Weak 2-coloring (CPNGNN)



Our approach is consistently better

#### A deeper understanding of the performance

- Extrapolation
  - train on small graphs
  - test on graphs up to 1024 nodes



Minimum Vertex Cover on Barabasi Albert random graphs

#### **Explain the Learned GNN Algorithms**

#### **Explainer**



#### **Explainer architecture**



#### Information theoretic learning



### Discovery of greedy-like behavior

#### Explanation setting:

Iimit to 5 nodes and 10 edges to explain each target node



#### Takeaway:

- Greedy heuristics are the best performing ones on these tasks
- GNN understands and learns the meaning of greedy algorithm features

#### **Discovery of anchor nodes**

#### What global features are effective?

#### Minimum Vertex Cover







## Q/A

#### **Discovery of anchor nodes**

Node color: the darker, the more frequent of being selected for explanation



Minimum Vertex Cover

- Observation
  - There exists a set of "anchor nodes"
  - Anchor nodes tends to be diverse

- Hypothesis
  - Anchor nodes are like "landmarks" in the graph
  - GNN compares the target node with anchor nodes to make prediction

Connections: GNN with anchor nodes: Position/distance aware GNNs (You et.al, 2018; Li et.al, 2020)

### What global features are effective?

- Explanation setting:
  - Max-cut problem
  - Iimit to 2 or 3 global features
- Budget=2
  - Greedy is always selected;
  - AKPW or max-spanning tree can be selected with equal chances;
  - Two max-spanning tree solutions will not be selected at the same time;





- feature selection is consistent across different target nodes;
- The {Greedy, AKPW, Max-Spanning} are the best performing three;
- Again, two Max-spanning trees solutions will not appear at the same time, even though itself performs better than AKPW;