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## String kernels

Recall the $k$-mer kernel on strings

- Basic idea: count the number of common contiguous substrings of length $k$
This is equivalent to:
- count the number of occurrences of all $k$-mers in strings $s_{1}$ and $s_{2}$ separately,
- compute the inner product between these counts.


$$
\begin{gathered}
\mathrm{s}_{1} \longrightarrow \mathrm{f}\left(\mathrm{~s}_{1}\right)=(\ldots, 1, \ldots, 1, \ldots, 0, \ldots, 1, \ldots, 1, \ldots, 0, \ldots, 0, \ldots, 1, \ldots, 1, \ldots) \\
\mathrm{s}_{2} \longrightarrow \mathrm{f}\left(\mathrm{~s}_{2}\right)=(\ldots, 0, \ldots, 1, \ldots, 1, \ldots, 0, \ldots, 0, \ldots, 1, \ldots, 1, \ldots, 1, \ldots, 0, \ldots) \\
\mathrm{K}\left(\mathrm{~s}_{1}, \mathrm{~s}_{2}\right)=\mathrm{f}\left(\mathrm{~s}_{1}\right) \mathrm{f}\left(\mathrm{~s}_{2}\right)^{\prime}
\end{gathered}
$$

## Graph comparison



Not Mutagenetic


## Graph kernels

Graph kernels have traditionally been based on different ideas

- Random walk kernel
- Shortest path kernel
- Subtree kernel
- Cycle kernel
- All possible subgraphs kernel
$\left(O\left(n^{3}\right)\right)$
( $O\left(n^{4}\right)$ )
(NP-hard)
(NP-hard)
(NP-hard)


## Graphlet kernel

We call graphlets subgraphs of size $\{3,4,5\}$.
Let $\mathcal{G}=\left\{\operatorname{graphlet}(1), \ldots, \operatorname{graphlet}\left(N_{k}\right)\right\}$ be the set of size- $k$ graphlets and $G$ be a graph of size $n$.
Define a vector $f_{G}$ of length $N_{k}$ such that

$$
f_{G i}=\#(\operatorname{graphlet}(i) \sqsubseteq G) .
$$

We call $f_{G}$ the $k$-spectrum of $G$.


In this figure $n=5, k=3, f_{G}=(1,3,6,0)$.

## Graphlet kernel

Given two graphs $G$ and $G^{\prime}$ of size $n \geq k$, the graphlet kernel $k_{g}$ is defined as

$$
k_{g}\left(G, G^{\prime}\right):=f_{G}^{\top} f_{G^{\prime}} .
$$

Problem: if $G$ and $G^{\prime}$ have different sizes, this will greatly skew the counts $f_{G}$
Solution: normalize the counts to frequency vectors:

$$
D_{G}=\frac{1}{\# \text { all graphlets in } G} f_{G}
$$

and work with the normalized variant of $k_{g}$

$$
k_{g}\left(G, G^{\prime}\right)=D_{G}^{\top} D_{G^{\prime}} .
$$

## Link to graph reconstruction

Isomorphism of graphs $\rightarrow$ equality of their $k$-spectra.
Equality of their $k$-spectra $\rightarrow$ isomorphism?
Yes, when $n=k+1$ and $n \leq 11 \ldots$
Graph reconstruction conjecture

- Let $G_{v}$ denote a subgraph of $G$, obtained by deleting node $v$ and all the edges incident to it.
- Let $G$ and $G^{\prime}$ be graphs of size greater than 2 and $g$ : $V \rightarrow V^{\prime}$ be an isomorphism function such that $G_{v}$ is isomorphic to $G_{g(v)}^{\prime}$ for all $v \in V$. Then $G$ is isomorphic to $G^{\prime}$.



## Link to graph reconstruction

Recursive definition of the graphlet kernel
Given two graphs $G$ and $G^{\prime}$ of size $n \geq k$, let $\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{M}^{\prime}$ denote the set of size-n-1 subgraphs of $G$ and $G^{\prime}$ respectively.


The recursive graph kernel based on these subgraphs is defined as

$$
k_{n}\left(G, G^{\prime}\right)= \begin{cases}\frac{1}{(n-k)^{2}} \sum_{S \in \mathcal{M}, S^{\prime} \in \mathcal{M}^{\prime}} k_{n-1}\left(S, S^{\prime}\right) & \text { if } n>k \\ \delta\left(G \cong G^{\prime}\right) & \text { if } n=k\end{cases}
$$

where $\delta\left(G \cong G^{\prime}\right)$ is 1 if $G$ and $G^{\prime}$ are isomorphic, 0 otherwise.
The graphlet kernel is defined as $k_{g}\left(G, G^{\prime}\right):=k_{n}\left(G, G^{\prime}\right)$.

## How to reduce runtime?

The kernel is defined, but how to compute graphlet distributions?
Counting size- $k$ graphlets by exhaustive enumeration takes $O\left(n^{k}\right)$.
This is too expensive.
We propose 2 schemes to speed up the computation. We show that

- sampling a fixed number of graphlets suffices to bound the $l_{1}$ deviation of the empirical estimates of the graphlet distribution from the true distribution.
- for graphs of degree bounded by $d$, the exact number of all graphlets of size $k$ can be determined in time $O\left(n d^{k-1}\right)$. Large real world graphs are often sparse with $d \ll n$.


## Sampling from graphs

Given a multiset $X:=\left\{X_{j}\right\}_{j=1}^{m}$ of independent identically distributed (iid) random variables $X_{j} \sim D$, the empirical estimate of $D$ is defined as

$$
\hat{D}^{m}(i)=\frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^{m} \delta\left(X_{j}=i\right),
$$

where $i \in \mathcal{A}$, and $\delta$ is an indicator function.
Let $D$ be a probability distribution on the finite set $\mathcal{A}=$ $\{1, \ldots, a\}$. Let $X:=\left\{X_{j}\right\}_{j=1}^{m}$, with $X_{j} \sim D$. For a given $\epsilon>0$ and $\delta>0$,

$$
m=\left\lceil\frac{2\left(\log 2 \cdot a+\log \left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right)\right)}{\epsilon^{2}}\right\rceil
$$

samples suffice to ensure that $P\left\{\left\|D-\hat{D}^{m}\right\|_{1} \geq \epsilon\right\} \leq \delta$.

## Sampling from graphs

## Example

- Consider size- 5 graphlets with $\epsilon=0.05, \delta=0.05$
- $a=34$, as there are 34 pairwise non-isomorphic graphlets of size 5

- We obtain $m=21251$ independent from the size of graphs we want to compare
- $21251 \ll n^{5}, \forall n>9$.


## Bounded degree graphs

There is a large fraction of graphs on which complete counting of graphlets can be performed efficiently: graphs of bounded degree $d$.
We present 2 algorithms which exploit the low degree:

- one for enumerating all connected graphlets,
- one for counting all graphlets.

Both have $O\left(n d^{k-1}\right)$ runtime complexity, but the first one is faster in practice

## Bounded degree graphs

## Count connected graphlets of size $k, k \in\{3,4,5\}$

Notice that most connected graphlets contain size- $k$ simple paths
Provided this, the idea is simple:

- enumerate simple paths of $k$ nodes $\left(O\left(n d^{k-1}\right)\right)$
- for each path, look up adjacencies among these $k$ nodes to decide which graphlet we obtain $(O(1)$ provided that we have a data structure allowing for this)
- each graphlet will be counted as many times, as the number of $k$-node paths it contains $\rightarrow$ divide counts by these numbers



## Bounded degree graphs

Problem: while for size-3 graphlets all connected graphlets contain simple paths of $k$ nodes, this is no more the case for size-4 and 5 graphlets.


I



III


IV

## Solution:

- To count I, we look up the $\binom{d_{i}}{3}$ neighbor triplets of each $v_{i}$, and check if they induce the graphlet we are interested in $\left(O\left(n d^{3}\right)\right)$
- II, III and IV contain I. So we first enumerate all occurrences of $I$, and then check the neighbors of each node in I to see if they induce the graphlets in question $\left(O\left(n d^{4}\right)\right)$


## Bounded degree graphs

Count all graphlets of size $k, k \in\{3,4,5\}$
The basic idea:

- enumerate all connected graphlets
- obtain counts of disconnected graphlets by subtracting previously obtained quantities from precomputed quantities


## Bounded degree graphs

Count all graphlets of size $k, k \in\{3,4,5\}$ (continued)
Example: 3-node graphlets
There are 4 types of 3 -node graphlets: denote them $F_{i}, i \in$ $\{0,1,2,3\}, F_{i}$ contains $i$ edges

First count graphlets containing at least one edge $\left|F_{1}\right|=\left|F_{2}\right|=\left|F_{3}\right|=0$


$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left|F_{3}\right|=\left|F_{3}\right| / 6, \quad\left|F_{2}\right|=\left|F_{2}\right| / 4, \quad\left|F_{1}\right|=\left|F_{1}\right| / 2 \\
& \left|F_{0}\right|=\binom{n}{3}-\left(\left|F_{1}\right|+\left|F_{2}\right|+\left|F_{3}\right|\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

## Experiments

## Statistics on datasets

| dataset | size | classes | \# nodes | \# edges | d |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| MUTAG | 188 | 2 (125 vs. 63) | 17.7 | 38.9 | 4 |
| PTC | 344 | 2 (192 vs. 152) | 26.7 | 50.7 | 4 |
| Enzyme | 600 | 6 (100 each) | 32.6 | 124.3 | 9 |
| D \& D | 1178 | 2 (691 vs. 587$)$ | 284.4 | 1921.6 | 52 |

MUTAG, PTC - chemicals
Enzyme, D \& D - biological datasets
We did not consider node labels

## Experiments

## Classification accuracy for $k=4$



## Experiments

## Runtime

| Kernel | MUTAG | PTC | Enzymes | D \& D |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RW | 42.3 " | 2'39" | 10' $45^{\prime \prime}$ | $>1$ day |
| SP | 23.2 " | 2'35" | 5'1" | $>1$ day |
| GK A3 1016 | 21.5 " | 29.7 " | 39" | 2' 9" |
| GK A3 1154 | 23.1 " | 42.6" | 48.7" | 2'19" |
| GK A3 4061 | 1' 18" | 2'39" | 1'51" | 6' 35 " |
| GK A3 4615 | 1'38" | 3'1" | 2'51" | 5' 58" |
| GK A3 all | 0.35 " | 0.9" | 3.34 " | 2' 34" |
| GK C3 | 0.14 " | $0.36 "$ | 1.3 " | 2'14" |
| GK A4 1986 | 1'39' | 3' ${ }^{\prime \prime}$ | 4'20" | 11'35" |
| GK A4 2125 | 1' 46 " | 3' 16" | 4'36" | 12' 21" |
| GK A4 7942 | 6' 33 " | 12' 3" | 16'35" | 42' 45 " |
| GK A4 8497 | 6' 57" | 12' 49" | 17'38' | 45' 36" |
| GK A4 all | 4.38 " | 10.8" | 49.3" | 2h 44' 59 " |
| GK C4 | 0.26 " | 0.9" | 4.1" | 35' 22" |
| GK A5 5174 | 3' 14 " | 8' ${ }^{\prime \prime}$ | 16' 57" | 1h 29' $54{ }^{\prime \prime}$ |
| GK A5 5313 | 3' 18" | 8' 6" | $17{ }^{\prime \prime}$ " | 1h 1' 54 " |
| GK A5 20696 | 8' 56 " | 18' $28^{\prime \prime}$ | 42' ${ }^{\prime \prime}$ | 1h 30' $18{ }^{\prime \prime}$ |
| GK A5 21251 | 9' 5" | 18' 4" | 27 | 2h 6' $45^{\prime \prime}$ |
| GK A5 all | 7' 17" | 16h 2' 16" | 20h 26' ${ }^{\prime \prime}$ | $>1$ day |
| GK C5 | 0.79" | 2.1" | 40.7" | > 1 day |

## Conclusion

- We have proposed efficient graph kernels based on counting or sampling limited size subgraphs in a graph
- Our methods for efficient counting of graph features are not limited to being used in graph kernels
- Future research: take node labels into account

