

## "Summary Assignment -1" (2022594)

Part A: Goal of this step is to preprocess the text file into a structured edge list, that can be used with graphframes...

data is first load to spark as raw text, it is filtered and cleaned. to remove whitespaces, and to retain only to and from info.

each valid line is then split to two tokens, first src, second destination, malformed rows are dropped.  
(empty or missing data)

Part B: This code first takes in all distinct ID's that appear in src, dst columns in part A.

It defines a graphframe g with the info. vertices  $\Rightarrow$  a column with distinct id's and edges src to dst info defining links..-  
↓  
maintains object info. for graph..-

the edges and vertices are counted using fnc's. available in graphframes...

groundtruth is same as values calculated / found

Parts C and D: the code finds wcc's and scc's in the graph formed in Part B...

It starts by creating a checkpoint file to ensure if failures occur they occur for jobs instead of entire task...

It then assigns a vertex ID label for its wcc, treating edges undirected.

then it counts how many vertices fall into each component and sorts by size then picks largest wcc. by querying.

finally it counts edges in wcc for this if joins with known path similar to a recursive job, then filters to edges that were given largest src id's and dest id's to give edges in largest wcc.

Same approach for SCC.

Part E: We first build on a simple undirected graph by removing loops and dropping duplicates.

degrees: number of neighbors per node

triangleCount: for each node how many triangles it belongs to.

We join all vertices as per degree and triangle count... ✓

if degree  $\leq 2$  : local clustering defined as 0.

else:

$$\frac{2t_i}{d_i(d_i-1)} = C_i$$

$d_i \rightarrow$  degree of  $i^{\text{th}}$  node  
 $t_i \Rightarrow$  triangle count of  $i^{\text{th}}$  node.

Avg clustering coeff.

$$\bar{C} = \frac{1}{|V|} \sum_{i \in V} C_i$$

total  $\Delta$  count:

$$T = \frac{1}{3} \sum_{i \in V} t_i$$

total wedges:

$$\begin{aligned} \tau &= \sum_{i \in V} w_i = \sum_{i \in V} \binom{d_i}{2} \\ &= \sum_{i \in V} \frac{d_i(d_i-1)}{2} \end{aligned}$$

finally o/p:  $T/\tau \Rightarrow$  answer.



$$d_{0.9} = \inf \{ d \mid \text{cof}(d) \geq 0.9 \}$$

explanation of results and diff. in results:

	Metric	GroundTruth	Computed	AbsDiff	RelDiff_%
0	Nodes	7115.00000	7115.000000	0.000000	0.000000
1	Edges	103689.00000	103689.000000	0.000000	0.000000
2	Largest WCC (nodes)	7066.00000	7066.000000	0.000000	0.000000
3	Largest WCC (edges)	103663.00000	103663.000000	0.000000	0.000000
4	Largest SCC (nodes)	1300.00000	1300.000000	0.000000	0.000000
5	Largest SCC (edges)	39456.00000	39456.000000	0.000000	0.000000
6	Avg. clustering coefficient	0.14090	0.140898	-0.000002	-0.001529
7	Number of triangles	608389.00000	608389.000000	0.000000	0.000000
8	Fraction of closed triangles	0.04564	0.041826	-0.003814	-8.355865
9	Diameter	7.00000	7.000000	0.000000	0.000000
10	Effective diameter (90-percentile)	3.80000	3.765724	-0.034276	-0.901990

in 6,

Reason: spark's  $\Delta$ count + degrees are aggregated in  $ll^M$ . Flop  $\Sigma$  order differs slightly from ref. implementation, causing rounding drift, numerical noise.

in 8, T matches so error in  $\Sigma$   
Code sums wedges in all nodes  
Ground truth typically only largest component.

including degree 1 and 0 inflates den. a little

in 10, using  $L = 256$ , approx. all shortest paths, sampling var can slightly over or undershoot  $\pm 1\%$ .

eff. diameter is sensitive around CDF threshold (90%), if one bin gets extra counts, interpolation might shift.

increasing  $L$  can reduce var. more.

