Parallel Algorithms for Density-Based and Structural Clustering


Clustering

- Group “similar” objects together, and separate “dissimilar” objects
- Can be applied to spatial data and graph data
- Applications
  - Community detection, bioinformatics, parallel/distributed processing, visualization, image segmentation, anomaly detection, document analysis, machine learning, etc.
Clustering

- Very well-studied topic
  - Hundreds of textbooks on this topic
- No universally accepted definition for cluster quality, many metrics have been proposed
- At least thousands of different clustering algorithms
DBSCAN for Spatial Clustering

- DBSCAN (Density-Based Spatial Clustering of Applications with Noise)
  - Ester et al. [KDD’96]

- Areas of high density form clusters
- Does not require number of clusters beforehand
- Detects arbitrarily shaped clusters
- Robust to noise
SCAN for Graph Clustering

- SCAN (Structural Clustering Algorithm for Networks)
  - Xu et al. [KDD’07]
- DBSCAN, but on graphs
- Similarity of vertices based on their number of shared neighbors
- “Dense” areas contain many vertices who have many similar neighbors
- Can identify clusters and outliers
DBSCAN for Spatial Clustering
Problem Definition - DBSCAN
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- Parameters
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  - $\text{minPts}=3$
- Core point
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  - Connected if in $\epsilon$-circle
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- Noise point
Related Work

• Sequential
  • de Berg et al., ISAAC’17 (Exact algorithms)
  • Gan and Tao, SIGMOD’15 Best Paper Award (Approximate algorithm, hardness result)

• Parallel
  • Xu et al., HPDM’99 (PDBSCAN, distributed R-Tree)
  • Patwary et al., SC’12 (PDSDBSCAN, parallel lock-based union-find)
  • Gotz et al., MLHPC’15 (HPDBSCAN, data splitting and merging)
  • Song et al., SIGMOD’18 (RP-DBSCAN, random partitioning, Map-Reduce)
  • Many more

• Challenges
  • Lack of theoretical guarantees in parallel implementations
  • High scalability but low work-efficiency
Our Contributions

• Parallel algorithms with work matching best sequential bounds (work-efficient)
• Highly-optimized multicore implementations
• Comprehensive experimental study showing that our algorithms outperform state-of-the-art
### All of Our Algorithms are Theoretically Efficient

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2D Algorithms</th>
<th>Delaunay Triangulation</th>
<th>Unit-spherical Emptiness Checking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O(n log n) expected work; O(log n) span with high probability</td>
<td>O(n log n) expected work; O(log² n) span with high probability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3D Algorithm</th>
<th>O((n log n)^{4/3}) expected work; Polylogarithmic span with high probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Any Constant Dimension Algorithm</th>
<th>O(n^{2-(2/[(d/2)+1])+δ}) expected work; Polylogarithmic span with high probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approximate Algorithm</th>
<th>O(n) expected work; O(log n) span with high probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- Our work bounds match the best sequential bounds by de Berg et al. and Gan and Tao (work-efficient)
Experimental Results on 36 cores

Running Time (sec)
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- HPDBSCAN
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3D-GeoLife-24M
Naive Parallel Algorithm

- Points issue range queries in parallel
- Parallel connected components
- Quadratic work in the worst case
  - Worst-case linear work per point for range query
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- First used by de Berg et al. sequentially
- Sort based on cell ID
- Insert points into parallel hash table

\[ \varepsilon/\sqrt{2} \]
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- Loop through points in parallel
- Check 21-cell neighborhood
- Cell with \( \geq \text{minPts} \) points, all points are core
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- “Core cells” and “non-core cells”
Our Parallel DBSCAN Algorithm

1. Construct grid cells
2. Mark core points
3. Cell graph
4. Cluster border points

- Bichromatic closest pair (BCP) connectivity
  - Finds closest pair of points between two cells
  - Connect cells if distance $\leq \epsilon$
  - Used by Gan-Tao sequentially
- Run connected components on core cells to form clusters for core points
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- Differences for higher-dimensional exact and approximate algorithms
  - Grid size is $\epsilon/\sqrt{d}$ instead of $\epsilon/\sqrt{2}$
  - How BCP queries are computed
1. Construct grid cells
2. Mark core points
3. Cell graph
4. **Cluster border points**
   - Our work bound matches the sequential bounds of de Berg et al. and Gan and Tao
     - \(O(n \log n)\) for 2D, subquadratic for \(d > 2\), \(O(n)\) for approximate
     - BCP queries dominate work
   - Can implement all operations in polylogarithmic span
     - Parallel primitives: hashing, prefix sums, semisorting, merging, pointer jumping, Delaunay
Optimization - Spatial Tree

Maintain cells in a kd-tree

Higher dimensions
Optimization - Parallel Pruning of BCP Queries

No Pruning - 10 queries

Connectivity query
Optimization - Parallel Pruning of BCP Queries

- Parallel union-find keeps connectivity on-the-fly
  - First used by Gan and Tao sequentially
- Prunes query if already connected
- Prunes query if repeated
- Order in which cells are processed affects pruning quality
  - Bucket cells based on #points and process each bucket in parallel
Experimental Setup

- **AWS c5.18x Large**
  - 2 × Intel Xeon Platinum 8124M (3.00GHz) CPUs
  - 36 cores, 2-way hyperthreading
  - 144 GiB RAM

- **AWS r5.24x Large (only used for larger datasets)**
  - 2 × Intel Xeon Platinum 8175M (2.50 GHz) CPUs
  - 48 cores, 2-way hyperthreading
  - 768 GiB RAM
Good Work-Efficiency and Scalability

- 16-6102x faster than HPDBSCAN and PDSDBSCAN across all datasets and parameter settings
Good Speedup over State-of-art Parallel Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dataset</th>
<th>#Data Points</th>
<th>Dimension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GeoLife</td>
<td>24.9 M</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cosmo50</td>
<td>321 M</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OpenStreetMap</td>
<td>2770 M</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TeraClickLog</td>
<td>4373 M</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 18-577x faster than RP-DBSCAN

From their paper (same core count)
Varying Parameters

3D-SS-varden-10M (eps:2000)

3D-SS-varden-10M (minpts:100)
SCAN for Graph Clustering
SCANN Definition

- A pair of adjacent vertices is **similar** if they share many neighbors.
- Original SCAN algorithm uses cosine similarity:
  - for vertices $u$ and $v$ with neighborhoods $N(\cdot)$, 
  $$\frac{|N(u) \cap N(v)|}{\sqrt{|N(u)||N(v)|}}$$

![Graph](image)
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- A pair of adjacent vertices is similar if they share many neighbors
- Original SCAN algorithm uses cosine similarity
  - for vertices u and v with neighborhoods $N(\cdot)$,
    \[
    \text{similarity} = \frac{|N(u) \cap N(v)|}{\sqrt{|N(u)||N(v)|}}
    \]
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SCAN Definition

- A pair of adjacent vertices is similar if they share many neighbors.
- Original SCAN algorithm uses cosine similarity:
  \[ \frac{|N(u) \cap N(v)|}{\sqrt{|N(u)||N(v)|}} \]
  for vertices \( u \) and \( v \) with neighborhoods \( N(\cdot) \).
- Other similarity functions we consider:
  - Jaccard similarity
  - Weighted cosine similarity
SCAN Definition
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- Vertex is a **core** vertex if it has at least $\mu$ neighbors that are $\varepsilon$-similar
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Diagram:

- Green lines: similarity $\geq \varepsilon$
- Red lines: similarity $< \varepsilon$
SCAN Definition

- User-selected parameters: $\mu$, $\varepsilon$
- Vertex is a **core** vertex if it has at least $\mu$ neighbors that are $\varepsilon$-similar

$\mu = 3$
$\varepsilon = 0.6$

![Graph schematic showing vertex relations and similarity thresholds]
Clusters: connected component of core vertices along with any other \( \varepsilon \)-similar neighbors (border vertices)

- **Outliers** are vertices not belonging to any cluster

\[ \mu = 3 \]
\[ \varepsilon = 0.6 \]
SCAN Complexity

- Work of SCAN: $O(m\alpha) \leq O(m^{1.5})$
  - Arboricity ($\alpha$): a measure of graph sparsity
  - Computing similarities is the expensive part: $O(m\alpha)$
  - Finding clusters from similarities: $O(m)$

- SCAN is especially costly for dense graphs

- Furthermore, users often have to try many different parameters to obtain good clusters
GS-Index: precompute index to test parameters quickly

- SCAN variant GS-Index constructs index from which querying for clustering under arbitrary $\mu$ and $\epsilon$ is fast (Wen et al., VLDB 2017)

- Maintain **neighbor ordering** to quickly find similar neighbors
  - Vertices’ neighbor lists are sorted in decreasing order by similarity

- Maintain **core ordering** to quickly find core vertices
  - For each $\mu$, store list of vertices sorted in decreasing order by the maximum value of $\epsilon$ such that the vertex is a core vertex
GS-Index: precompute index to test parameters quickly

- **Neighbor ordering**: vertices’ neighbor lists sorted by similarity
- **Core ordering**: For each $\mu$, vertices sorted by max $\varepsilon$ at which vertex is a core

\[
\begin{align*}
\mu = 3, \varepsilon = .6
\end{align*}
\]

Get clusters by BFS on core vertices and $\varepsilon$-similar edges extracted from index
GS-Index gives fast queries but is still sequential

- Work to compute index: $O((\alpha + \log n)m)$
  - Cost for computing similarities and sorting
- Work to query for clusters: linear in the total sizes of clusters
  - No work done for non-$\varepsilon$-similar edges and unclustered vertices
- Queries are fast, but computing the index sequentially is slow
Our contributions

- Parallel index-based SCAN algorithm
  - Provably work-efficient with logarithmic span
- Approximate similarity computation via locality-sensitive hashing for even greater speedups
- Practical, optimized multicore implementations that empirically outperform state-of-the-art SCAN algorithms
Computing similarities

- Finding shared neighbors is counting triangles
  - This can be done in $O(\alpha m)$ work and $O(\log n)$ span with high probability using parallel hash tables
- Important to optimize similarity computation since it’s so costly
Computing similarities

- Count each triangle once instead of three times by directing the graph and counting directed triangles (Latapy 2008)
  - Direct each edge from lower-degree to higher-degree endpoint
- For better cache locality, instead of using parallel hash tables, intersect sorted neighbor lists with parallel merge (Shun and Tangwongsan 2015)
Computing neighbor and core orderings

- Use parallel comparison sort
- Additional observation: can integer sort on unweighted graphs to get better work bounds
  - Transform similarities monotonically into integers
    - \[ \frac{|N(u) \cap N(v)|}{\sqrt{|N(u)||N(v)|}} \rightarrow \left( \frac{|N(u) \cap N(v)|}{\sqrt{|N(u)||N(v)|}} \right)^2 n^4 \]
  - Reduces the \( \log n \) term in the \( O((\alpha + \log n)m) \) work bound
    - \( O(\alpha m) \) work with \( O(n^\beta) \) span, or
    - \( O((\alpha + \log \log n)m) \) work and \( O(\log n) \) span
Querying: doubling search on index

- Doubling search to find core vertices and $\varepsilon$-similar edges from index

$\mu = 3, \varepsilon = .6$
Querying: finding clusters

- Parallel connectivity on core vertices and $\varepsilon$-similar edges
- In theory, we use a linear work and $O(\log n)$ span connected components algorithm
- In practice, we use a parallel union-find data structure

$\mu = 3$
$\varepsilon = .6$
Our Work: Approximating similarities

- Similarity computation in index construction is still the computational bottleneck, especially on dense graphs.
- Locality-sensitive hashing (LSH) approximates similarity between vertices:
  - SimHash for cosine similarity
  - MinHash for Jaccard similarity
- LSH sample size $k$ trades accuracy vs. running time.
LSH increases speed on dense graphs

- For sample size $k$, further reduce the $O((\alpha + \log n)m)$ work bound to
  - $O(km)$ work with $O(n^\beta)$ span, or
  - $O((k + \log \log n)m)$ work and $O(\log n)$ span
LSH still maintains guarantees on resulting clusters

- We prove that if the number of samples $k$ is sufficiently large, we correctly "classify" all edges as above or below $\varepsilon$ in similarity, except inside a small interval around $\varepsilon$
LSH heuristic: only LSH on high-degree vertices

- If neighborhoods are small, better to just compute exact similarities
- Solution: use LSH on pairs of high-degree vertices, and use triangle counting elsewhere
Experimental Setup

- AWS machine
  - 48 cores, two-way hyperthreading (max 96 hyper-threads)
  - 192 GiB of RAM
Comparison against state-of-the-art

- ppSCAN: fastest parallel SCAN algorithm (Che et al., ICPP 2018)
- GS-Index: original (sequential) index-based SCAN algorithm (Wen et al., VLDB 2017)
Exact index construction: $50-151\times$ speedup vs. GS-Index

Friendster graph: large social network (65M vertices, 1.8B edges)

Cochlea graph: dense, weighted biological graph (26K vertices, 282M edges)

- Even sequentially, $1.4-2.2\times$ speedup over GS-Index
- $23-70\times$ self-relative parallel speedup
Query time: always faster than ppSCAN

- 1.26–12,070× speedup vs. ppSCAN
- 5–32× speedup vs. GS-Index

Fix $\mu=5$ and vary $\varepsilon$
LSH gives faster index construction with similar cluster quality

- Modularity: popular and standard clustering metric based on how many edges are within clusters
Conclusion

- Theoretically-efficient and practical parallel algorithms for density-based spatial clustering (DBSCAN) and structural graph clustering (SCAN)
- Code publicly available
  - DBSCAN: https://sites.google.com/view/yiqiuwang/dbscan
  - SCAN: https://github.com/ParAlg/gbbs/tree/master/benchmarks/SCAN/IndexBased