

Fast Approximate Quadratic Programming for Large (Brain) Graph Matching

Joshua T. Vogelstein*, John M. Conroy, Louis J. Podrazik,
Steven G. Kratzer, Eric T. Harley, Donniell E. Fishkind,
R. Jacob Vogelstein and Carey E. Priebe

J.T. Vogelstein, E.T. Harley, D.E. Fishkind, and C.E. Priebe are with the Department of Applied Mathematics and Statistics, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD 21218.

J.M. Conroy, L.J. Podrazik and S.G. Kratzer are with Institute for Defense Analyses, Center for Computing Sciences, Bowie, MD 20708.

R.J. Vogelstein is with the Johns Hopkins University Applied Physics Laboratory, Laurel, MD, 20723.

** corresponding author; current address: Department of Statistical Science, Duke University, Durham, NC 27708; current phone number: +1-443-858-9911; current email address: jovo@stat.duke.edu*

Abstract

Quadratic assignment problems (QAPs) arise in a wide variety of domains, ranging from operations research to graph theory to computer vision to neuroscience. In the age of big data, graph valued data is becoming more prominent, and with it, a desire to run algorithms on ever larger graphs. Because QAP is **NP**-hard, exact algorithms are intractable. Approximate algorithms necessarily employ an accuracy/efficiency trade-off. We developed a fast approximate quadratic assignment algorithm (**FAQ**). **FAQ** finds a local optima in (worst case) time cubic in the number of vertices, similar to other approximate QAP algorithms. We demonstrate empirically that our algorithm is faster and achieves a lower objective value on over 80% of the suite of QAP benchmarks, compared with the previous state-of-the-art. Applying the algorithms to our motivating example, matching *C. elegans* connectomes (brain-graphs), we find that **FAQ** achieves the optimal performance in record time, whereas none of the others even find the optimum.

Keywords:

graph theory, neuroscience, nonlinear optimization

Pseudocode 1 FAQ for finding a local optimum of rQAP

Input: graphs A and B as well as stopping criteria

Output: \hat{P} , an estimated permutation matrix

- 1: Choose an initialization, $P^{(0)} = \mathbf{1}\mathbf{1}^\top/n$
 - 2: **while** stopping criteria not met **do**
 - 3: Compute the gradient of $f(P) = -\text{tr}(B^\top P^\top AP)$ at the current point:
 $\nabla f(P^{(i)}) = -AP^{(i)}B^\top - A^\top P^{(i)}B$.
 - 4: Compute the direction $Q^{(i)}$ by solving
 $\min_{P \in \mathcal{D}} f(P^{(i)}) + \nabla f(P^{(i)})^\top (P - P^{(i)})$ via the Hungarian algorithm.
 - 5: Compute the step size $\alpha^{(i)}$ by solving $\min_{\alpha \in [0,1]} f(P^{(i)} + \alpha^{(i)}Q^{(i)})$
 - 6: Update $P^{(i)}$ according to $P^{(i+1)} = P^{(i)} + \alpha^{(i)}Q^{(i)}$.
 - 7: **end while**
 - 8: Obtain \hat{P} by solving $\min_{P \in \mathcal{P}} -\langle P^{(i_{max})}, P \rangle$ via the Hungarian algorithm.
-