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## Definitions

- $G=(V, E)$ is a simple undirected graph which consists of a finite set of vertices $V=\left\{v_{1}, v_{2}, \cdots, v_{n}\right\}$ and edges $E \subseteq V \times V$ that pair distinct vertices.
- A clique $Q$ is a subset of $V$ where all vertices are pairwise adjacent.
- A maximum clique is a clique of the maximum cardinality.


## Maximum Clique Problem

- The maximum clique problem (MCP) is the problem of finding the maximum clique in a given graph $G$.



## Exact algorithms

1957 - Harary and Ross
1973 - Bron and Kerbosch
1977 - Tarjan and Trojanowski
1990 - Carraghan and Pardalos
1986, 2001 - Robson

- •••

2010 - MaxCLQ (Li and Quan)
2010 - MCS (Tomita et al.)
2011 - BBMCI (Segundo et al.)
2013 - IncMaxCLQ (Li et al.)
2015 - BBMCX (Segundo et al.)

## Modern review

Wu, Q., Hao, J.K.: A review on algorithms for maximum clique problems. European Journal of Operational Research 242, 693-709 (2015)

## Motivation

## Computational time (in milliseconds)

| Instance | Algorithm 1 | Algorithm 2 | Algorithm 3 | Algorithm 4 | Algorithm 5 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| C250.9 | 344516 | 1361335 | 1041168 | 987836 | 971229 |
| brock400_1 | 259708 | 284586 | 244209 | 234715 | 235103 |
| dsjc500.5 | 3532 | 1555 | 1412 | 1426 | 1487 |
| Total | 607756 | 1647476 | 1286789 | 1223977 | 1207819 |

## Research purpose

- The purpose of the research is developing the algorithm that predicts the fastest algorithm from several algorithms for a given graph. Then the chosen algorithm is applied for solving the maximum clique problem in the graph.


## Algorithm Selection Problem

- The algorithm selection problem consists of choosing the best algorithm from a predefined set to solve a problem instance.


## Algorithm Selection Problem

## Model for the Algorithm Selection Problem with problem

 features (Rice*)

* Rice, J. R. (1976). The algorithm selection problem. Advances in Computers, 15, 65118.


## Algorithm Selectors*

- Case-based reasoning
k-NN
- Classification

SVM, decision tree, random forest

- Regression


## linear regression, nonlinear regression

* Kotthoff, L., Gent, I., Miguel, I.: A Preliminary Evaluation of Machine Learning in Algorithm Selection for Search Problems. In Borrajo, D., Likhachev, M., Lopez, C., eds.: Procs. SoCS'11, AAAI Press (2011) 84-91


## Our approach

## Algorithm portfolio:

- RPC ( $\delta \geq 0$ )

Nikolaev A., Batsyn M., San Segundo P. Reusing the same coloring in the child nodes of the search tree for the maximum clique problem. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, 8994, 2015, 275-280

- MaxCLQ

Li C.M., Quan Z. Combining graph structure exploitation and propositional reasoning for the maximum clique problem. Proceedings of the 2010 22nd IEEE International

Conference on Tools with Artificial Intelligence, Volume 01 (ICTAI'10), 2010, 344-351

## Training set (947 instances)

| $n$ | $p$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 150 | $0.05-0.95$ |
| 200 | $0.05-0.95$ |
| 300 | $0.05-0.85$ |
| 400 | $0.05-0.6$ |
| 500 | $0.05-0.6$ |
| 1000 | $0.05-0.4$ |
| 1500 | $0.05-0.4$ |

## Training set



## Features

## Graph size features:

| 1 | Number of vertices |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2 | Number of edges |
| 3 | Density |

## Vertices degree statistics:

| $\mathbf{4}$ | Min |
| :--- | :--- |
| 5 | Max |
| 6 | Mean |
| 7 | Standard deviation |

## Features

## Sum of the degrees of the neighboring vertices

 statistics:| $\mathbf{8}$ | Min |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\mathbf{9}$ | Max |
| $\mathbf{1 0}$ | Mean |
| $\mathbf{1 1}$ | Standard deviation |

## Lower and Upper Bound:

| 12 | Lower bound (greedy heuristic) |
| :--- | :--- |
| 13 | Upper bound (greedy vertex coloring) |

## Features

## Search tree features:

| 14 | The number of vertices to be considered on the first level of the search <br> tree |
| :--- | :--- |
| 15 | Ratio of the number of vertices to be considered on the first level of the <br> search tree (Feature 14) to the number of vertices (Feature 1) |

## Decision trees

- The strategy "one against all" was used to apply decision trees for multiclass classification.
- The strategy "one against all" is training $M$ binary classifiers (where $M$ is the number of classes). Classifier $i$ separates class $i$ from the other classes.
- It is believed that object $\boldsymbol{x}$ belongs to the class

$$
j^{*}=\underset{j=1, M}{\arg \max } P(j \mid x)
$$

where $P(i \mid x)$ is a probability that object $x$ belongs to class $i$.

## Decision trees



Trained classifiers use only the following features for classification: 2, 3, 6, 8, 10, 12, 13, 14.

## Computational results (DIMACS)

Confusion matrix

|  | true 1 | true 3 | true 4 | true 5 | true 2 | class <br> precision |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| pred. 1 | $\mathbf{2}$ | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $66.67 \%$ |
| pred. 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $100.00 \%$ |
| pred. 4 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 8 | 0 | $61.90 \%$ |
| pred. 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| pred. 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| class recall | $100.00 \%$ | $50.00 \%$ | $100.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ |  |

The total prediction accuracy is 64\% (16 out of 25)

## Computational results (DIMACS)

| Instances | MaxCLQ | RPC, $\delta=0$ | RPC, $\delta=1$ | RPC, $\boldsymbol{\delta}=2$ | RPC, $\delta=3$ | Perfect Algorithm Selector | Our approach |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| C250.9 | 344516 | 1361335 | 1041168 | 987836 | 971229 | 344516 | 344517 |
| MANN_a45 | 34148 | 43230 | 31159 | 34574 | 85558 | 31159 | 34154 |
| brock400_1 | 259708 | 284586 | 244209 | 234715 | 235103 | 234715 | 234716 |
| brock400_2 | 118908 | 125398 | 107746 | 103844 | 103952 | 103844 | 103845 |
| brock400_3 | 204222 | 193386 | 164518 | 158995 | 159121 | 158995 | 158996 |
| brock400_4 | 130754 | 92893 | 79692 | 76856 | 77071 | 76856 | 76858 |
| brock800_1 | 5606592 | 3914626 | 3430660 | 3294158 | 3300223 | 3294158 | 3294165 |
| brock800_2 | 4889039 | 3395345 | 2971610 | 2845765 | 2842208 | 2842208 | 2845772 |
| brock800_3 | 3222601 | 3461488 | 3020965 | 2899545 | 2898460 | 2898460 | 2899552 |
| brock800_4 | 2438408 | 1602096 | 1405760 | 1341436 | 1333342 | 1333342 | 1341442 |
| dsjc500.5 | 3532 | 1555 | 1412 | 1426 | 1487 | 1412 | 1415 |
| dsjc1000.5 | 317877 | 140509 | 127070 | 123663 | 127732 | 123663 | 123675 |
| frb30-15-1 | 655244 | 721617 | 440375 | 339713 | 289979 | 289979 | 339715 |
| frb30-15-2 | 951654 | 533285 | 296789 | 208696 | 160926 | 160926 | 208698 |
| frb30-15-3 | 580959 | 473354 | 278528 | 210579 | 176525 | 176525 | 210581 |

## Computational results (DIMACS)

| Instances | MaxCLQ | RPC, $\delta=0$ | RPC, $\delta=1$ | RPC, $\delta=2$ | RPC, $\delta=3$ | Perfect <br> Algorithm Selector | Our approach |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| frb30-15-4 | 1155555 | 1327562 | 765939 | 574914 | 481628 | 481628 | 574915 |
| frb30-15-5 | 873662 | 489109 | 266500 | 187442 | 147959 | 147959 | 187443 |
| p_hat300-3 | 1387 | 1245 | 1051 | 1044 | 1089 | 1044 | 1045 |
| p_hat500-3 | 49829 | 60698 | 51642 | 49310 | 49779 | 49310 | 49313 |
| p_hat700-2 | 3586 | 2726 | 2319 | 2250 | 2371 | 2250 | 2255 |
| p_hat700-3 | 1082242 | 1063763 | 894519 | 841329 | 854369 | 841329 | 841333 |
| p_hat1000-2 | 117828 | 106392 | 87986 | 82428 | 83927 | 82428 | 82439 |
| p_hat1500-1 | 11408 | 2257 | 1993 | 1916 | 1922 | 1916 | 1936 |
| sanr200_0.9 | 5604 | 13855 | 10712 | 10107 | 10122 | 5604 | 5604 |
| sanr400_0.7 | 97663 | 79299 | 68261 | 66440 | 68368 | 66440 | 66442 |
| Total | 23156926 | 19491609 | 15792583 | 14678981 | 14464450 | 13750666 | 14030826 |

## Computational results (DIMACS)

The average time reduction of the proposed approach with respect to each of considered algorithm

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MaxCLQ | RPC, $\boldsymbol{\delta = 0}$ | RPC, $\boldsymbol{\delta = 1}$ | RPC, $\boldsymbol{\delta = 2}$ | RPC, $\boldsymbol{\delta = 3}$ | Perfect <br> Algorithm <br> Selector | Our |
| approach |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathbf{3 5 , 7 4 \%}$ | $28,97 \%$ | $11,83 \%$ | $4,41 \%$ | $3,21 \%$ | $-4,97 \%$ | $0,00 \%$ |

## Computational results (protein alignment graphs)

## Confusion matrix

|  | true 5 | true 4 | true 3 | true 2 | true 1 | class <br> precision |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| pred. 5 | 382 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $97.20 \%$ |
| pred. 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| pred. 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| pred. 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| pred. 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $0.00 \%$ |
| class recall | $100.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ | $0.00 \%$ |  |

The total prediction accuracy is $\mathbf{9 7 . 2 \%}$ (382 out of 393)

## Computational results (protein alignment graphs)

The average time reduction of the proposed approach with respect to each of considered algorithm

| MaxCLQ | RPC, $\delta=0$ | RPC, $\delta=1$ | RPC, $\delta=2$ | RPC, $\delta=3$ | Perfect Algorithm Selector | Our approach |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 96,08\% | 32,69\% | 13,18\% | 0,56\% | -4,46\% | -4,47\% | 0,00\% |

## Conclusion

- In this research decision trees were used to predict the fastest algorithm from a set of algorithms.
- For this purpose some features were proposed for the MCP.
- Computational results show that the considered approach is effective.

Thank you for your attention!

