Probabilistic Graph Programming for Randomized and Evolutionary Algorithms

Timothy Atkinson Detlef Plump Susan Stepney

University of York

Introduction to GP 2



- Experimental language for graphs.
- Rule-based visual manipulation of graphs.
- Computationally complete.
- Non-deterministic.

A graph is *transitive* if for every directed path $v_1 \rightsquigarrow v_2$ where $v_1 \neq v_2$ there is an edge $v_1 \rightarrow v_2$.

Main := link!

link(a,b,c,d,e:list)



where not edge(1, 3)













P-GP 2: A Probabilistic Extension of GP 2 • Calling rule-set \mathcal{R} on graph G is non-deterministic in GP 2:

$$G \Rightarrow_{\mathcal{R}} H_i \in \{H \mid G \Rightarrow_{r_i,g} H \text{ and } r_i \in \mathcal{R}\}$$

- We extend GP 2's syntax to allow a programmer to specify a probability distribution over these outcomes.
- This allows a programmer to specify randomized algorithms, a powerful concept used in broader computer science (see [1]).

A rule-set is executed probabilistically by calling it within square brackets:

$$[r_1, r_2 \ldots r_n]$$

A rule-set called using conventional curly brackets is executed 'non-deterministically' as in GP 2:

$$\{r_1, r_2 \dots r_n\}$$

Our extension P-GP2 is conservative; all existing GP2 programs are valid and will be executed as before.

A rule-set \mathcal{R} called on host graph G is executed by:

- 1. Probabilistically pick a rule $r_i \in \mathcal{R}$ according to a weighted distribution.
- 2. Probabilistically pick a match g for rule r_i according to a uniform distribution.
- 3. Execute (r_i, g) on G:

$$G \Rightarrow_{r_i,g} H$$

Specifying Probabilities II

We choose a rule first, using a weighted distribution, from the set of rules with valid matches; \mathcal{R}^{G} . Each rule r_i has an associated real-valued positive weight given by $w(r_i)$ - specified in square brackets after the rule declaration:

```
grow_loop(n:int) [3.0]
```

$$(n_1 \implies n_1 \implies 1_2)$$

Then the probability of choosing r_i from \mathcal{R}^G is

$$\frac{w(r_i)}{\sum\limits_{r_x\in\mathcal{R}^G}w(r_x)}$$

Once rule r_i has been chosen, we choose a match for r_i with uniform probability from the set of valid matches G^{r_i} . Some match g is chosen with probability

 $\frac{1}{|G^{r_i}|}$

Yielding an overall definition of the probability distribution $P_{G^{\mathcal{R}}}$ over the set of all possible rule-match pairs $G^{\mathcal{R}}$:

$$P_{G^{\mathcal{R}}}(r_i,g) = \frac{w(r_i)}{\sum\limits_{r_x \in \mathcal{R}^G} w(r_x)} \times \frac{1}{|G^{r_i}|}$$

Other approaches look at *modeling* e.g. Probabilistic GTS (discrete) [2] and Stochastic GTS (continuous) [3]. These are single graph transformation systems with probability distributions over outcomes.

We look at *programming*; sequential graph transformation systems that *algorithmically* transform a graph.

Applications I: Karger's Algorithm

- Karger's algorithm [4] is a probabilistic algorithm for computing the minimum cut of a graph with a known lower bound probability of success.
- The minimum cut of a graph is a minimal set of edges to remove from a graph to produce two disconnected sub-graphs.
- General idea is to repeatedly contract (merge) adjacent nodes until only 2 nodes remain.

















Consider a global minimum cut of c edges of graph G with n nodes and e edges:

- The minimum degree of G must be at least c, and therefore $e \ge \frac{n.c}{2}$.
- The probability of contracting some edge in the minimum cut is therefore

$$\frac{c}{e} \le \frac{c}{\frac{n.c}{2}} = \frac{2}{n}$$

• The probability of producing the minimum cut (by *never* contracting some edge in the minimum cut) is bounded by:

$$p_n \ge \prod_{i=3}^n 1 - \frac{2}{i} = \frac{2}{n(n-1)}$$

Main := (three_node; [pick_pair]; delete_edge!; redirect!; cleanup)!



Karger: An Example



$$p_n \ge \frac{2}{8.(8-1)} = \frac{1}{28}$$

Applications II: G(n, p) Model for Random Graphs

The G(n, p) [5] model randomly generates graphs (V, E, s, t) such that:

- |V| = n.
- For each pair in $V \times V$, an edge exists with probability p.

Main := (pick_edge; [keep_edge, delete_edge])!; unmark_edge!

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{pick}_\text{edge}(a,b,c:\text{list}) \\ \hline (a)_1 \xrightarrow{b} (c)_2 \implies (a)_1 \xrightarrow{b} (c)_2 \\ \text{unmark}_\text{edge}(a,b,c:\text{list}) \\ \hline (a)_1 \xrightarrow{b} (c)_2 \implies (a)_1 \xrightarrow{b} (c)_2 \\ \hline (a)_1 \xrightarrow{b} (c)_2 \implies (a)_1 \xrightarrow{b} (c)_2 \\ \hline (a)_1 \xrightarrow{b} (c)_2 \implies (a)_1 \xrightarrow{b} (c)_2 \\ \hline (a)_1 \xrightarrow{b} (c)_2 \implies (a)_1 \xrightarrow{b} (c)_2 \\ \hline (a)_1 \xrightarrow{b} (c)_2 \implies (a)_1 \xrightarrow{b} (c)_2 \\ \hline (a)_1 \xrightarrow{b} (c)_2 \implies (a)_1 \xrightarrow{c} (c)_2 \\ \hline (a)_1 \xrightarrow{b} (c)_2 \implies (a)_1 \xrightarrow{c} (c)_2 \\ \hline (a)_1 \xrightarrow{b} (c)_2 \implies (a)_1 \xrightarrow{c} (c)_2 \\ \hline (a)_1 \xrightarrow{b} (c)_2 \implies (a)_1 \xrightarrow{c} (c)_2 \\ \hline (a)_1 \xrightarrow{b} (c)_2 \implies (a)_1 \xrightarrow{c} (c)_2 \\ \hline (a)_1 \xrightarrow{b} (c)_2 \implies (a)_1 \xrightarrow{c} (c)_2 \\ \hline (a)_1 \xrightarrow{b} (c)_2 \implies (a)_1 \xrightarrow{c} (c)_2 \\ \hline (a)_1 \xrightarrow{b} (c)_2 \implies (a)_1 \xrightarrow{c} (c)_2 \\ \hline (a)_1 \xrightarrow{b} (c)_2 \implies (a)_1 \xrightarrow{c} (c)_2 \\ \hline (a)_1 \xrightarrow{b} (c)_2 \implies (a)_1 \xrightarrow{c} (c)_2 \\ \hline (a)_1 \xrightarrow{b} (c)_2 \implies (a)_1 \xrightarrow{c} (c)_2 \\ \hline (a)_1 \xrightarrow{c} (c)_2 \implies (a)_1 \xrightarrow{c} (c)_2 \\ \hline (a)_1 \xrightarrow{c} (c)_2 \implies (a)_1 \xrightarrow{c} (c)_2 \\ \hline (a)_1 \xrightarrow{c} (c)_2 \implies (a)_1 \xrightarrow{c} (c)_2 \\ \hline (a)_1 \xrightarrow{c} (c)_2 \implies (a)_1 \xrightarrow{c} (c)_2 \\ \hline (a)_1 \xrightarrow{c} (c)_2 \implies (a)_1 \xrightarrow{c} (c)_2 \\ \hline (a)_1 \xrightarrow{c} (c)_2 \implies (a)_1 \xrightarrow{c} (c)_2 \\ \hline (a)_1 \xrightarrow{c} (c)_2 \implies (a)_1 \xrightarrow{c} (c)_2 \\ \hline (a)_1 \xrightarrow{c} (c)_2 \implies (a)_1 \xrightarrow{c} (c)_2 \\ \hline (a)_1 \xrightarrow{c} (c)_2 \implies (a)_1 \xrightarrow{c} (c)_2 \\ \hline (a)_1 \xrightarrow{c} (c)_2 \implies (a)_1 \xrightarrow{c} (c)_2 \\ \hline (a)_1 \xrightarrow{c} (c)_2 \implies (a)_1 \xrightarrow{c} (c)_2 \\ \hline (a)_1 \xrightarrow{c} (c)_2 \implies (a)_1 \xrightarrow{c} (c)_2 \\ \hline (a)_1 \xrightarrow{c} (c)_2 \implies (a)_1 \xrightarrow{c} (c)_2 \\ \hline (a)_1 \xrightarrow{c} (c)_2 \implies (a)_1 \xrightarrow{c} (c)_2 \xrightarrow{c} (c)_1 \xrightarrow{c} (c)_2 \\ \hline (a)_1 \xrightarrow{c} (c)_2 \xrightarrow{c} (c)_1 \xrightarrow{c} (c)_2 \xrightarrow{c} (c)_1 \xrightarrow{c} (c)_2 \xrightarrow{c} (c)_1 \xrightarrow{c} (c)_1 \xrightarrow{c} (c)_2 \xrightarrow{c} (c)_1 \xrightarrow{c} (c)_1 \xrightarrow{c} (c)_1 \xrightarrow{c} (c)_2 \xrightarrow{c} (c)_1 \xrightarrow{c} (c)_1 \xrightarrow{c} (c)_2 \xrightarrow{c} (c)_1 \xrightarrow{c} (c)_2 \xrightarrow{c} (c)_1 \xrightarrow{c} (c)$$

Expects, as input, a fully connected graph with n nodes.

• A graph with *M* edges occurs with probability

$$p^M(1-p)^{\binom{n}{2}-M}$$

• *G*(*n*, 0.4), with probability 0.0207:



Applications III: Evolving Graphs by Graph Programming

Why Evolve Graphs?

Graphs are ubiquitous:

(Neural/Bayesian) Networks, (Quantum) Circuits, Syntax Trees etc.

Evolutionary Algorithms iteratively explore poorly understood domains.



In this work we focus on digital circuit benchmarks.

EGGP

An Evolutionary Algorithm for learning graphs:



 $o_2 = (i_2 \downarrow i_1) \lor (i_2 \lor i_1)$

Main := try ([pick_edge]; mark_output!; [mutate_edge]; unmark!)

pick_edge(a,b,c:list) (a) mark_output(a,b,c:list) $c_{2} \Longrightarrow a_{2}$ (c) unmark(a:list) (a) _____>(a)

mutate_edge(a,b,c,d:list; s:string)



where s != "OUT"



Edge Mutations: [pick_edge]



Edge Mutations: mark_output!



Edge Mutations: [mutate_edge]



Edge Mutations: unmark!



CGP is a standard algorithm for evolving directed acyclic graphs, and was originally designed for evolving circuits [6].

	EGGP	CGP		
Problem	Median Evaluations	Median Evaluations	р	Α
5-Bit Odd Parity	38,790	96,372	10^{-18}	0.86
6-Bit Odd Parity	68,032	502,335	10^{-31}	0.97
7-Bit Odd Parity	158,852	1,722,377	10^{-33}	0.99
8-Bit Odd Parity	315,810	7,617,310	10^{-34}	0.99

Results from Digital Circuit benchmarks for CGP and EGGP. The *p* value is from the two-tailed Mann-Whitney *U* test. Where p < 0.05, the effect size from the Vargha-Delaney A test is shown; large effect sizes (A > 0.71) are shown in **bold**.

Conclusion

Contributions:

- Extended GP 2 to allow probabilistic rule-call execution.
- Implemented 3 distinct & previously impossible probabilistic graph programs using P-GP 2.

Future Work:

- What other randomized algorithms can we now implement?
- What other randomized algorithms *can't* we implement?
- Investigate efficiency of matching strategies e.g. incremental pattern matching.

P-GP 2: https://github.com/UoYCS-plasma/P-GP2 EGGP: https://github.com/UoYCS-plasma/EGGP Rajeev Motwani and Prabhakar Raghavan.
Randomized Algorithms. Cambridge University Press, 1995.

Christian Krause and Holger Giese.
Probabilistic graph transformation systems.
In Proc. International Conference on Graph Transformation (ICGT 2012), volume 7562, pages 311–325. Springer, 2012.

Reiko Heckel, Georgios Lajios, and Sebastian Menge. Stochastic graph transformation systems. Fundamenta Informaticae, 74(1):63–84, 2006.

References ii



David R. Karger.

Global min-cuts in RNC, and other ramifications of a simple min-cut algorithm.

In *Proc. 4th Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA 1993)*, pages 21–30. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 1993.



E. N. Gilbert.

Random graphs.

The Annals of Mathematical Statistics, 30(4):1141–1144, 1959.

Julian F. Miller, editor.

Cartesian Genetic Programming.

Springer, 2011.