

Learning Computation Bounds for Branch-and-Bound Algorithms to k-plex Extraction

Yun-Ya Huang
National Tsing Hua University
Hsinchu, Taiwan
ilcile1975@gmail.com

Chih-Ya Shen
National Tsing Hua University
Hsinchu, Taiwan
shenchihya@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

k-plex is a representative definition of communities in networks. While the cliques is too stiff to applicate to real cases, the k-plex relaxes the notion of the clique, allowing each node to miss up to k connections. Although k-plexes are more flexible than cliques, finding them is more challenging as their number is greater. In this paper, we aim to detect the k-plex under the size and time constraints, leveraging the new vision of automated learning bounding strategy. We introduce the constraint learning concept to learn the bound strategy from the branch and bound process and develop it into a Mixed Integer Programming framework. While most of the work is dedicated on learn the branch strategy in branch and bound-based algorithms, we focus on the learn to bound strategy which needs to handle the problem that learned strategy might not examine the feasible solution. We adopted the MILP framework and design a set of variables relative to the k-plex property as our constraint space to learn the strategy. The learn to bound strategy learning the original strategy function also reduces the computation load of the bound process to accelerate the branch and bound algorithm. Note that the learn to bound concept can apply to any branch and bound based algorithm with the appropriate framework. We conduct the experiment on different networks, the results show that our learn to branch and bound method does accelerate the original branch and bound method and outperforms other baselines, while also being able to generalize on different graph properties.

CCS CONCEPTS

• **Mathematics of computing** → **Graph algorithms; Combinatorial optimization**; • **Theory of computation** → **Constraint and logic programming; Graph algorithms analysis**.

KEYWORDS

k-plex, constraint Learning, branch and bound, mixed integer linear programming

ACM Reference Format:

Yun-Ya Huang and Chih-Ya Shen. 2022. Learning Computation Bounds for Branch-and-Bound Algorithms to k-plex Extraction. In *Proceedings of*

ACM Conference (Conference'17). ACM, New York, NY, USA, 14 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/nnnnnnn.nnnnnnn>

1 INTRODUCTION

Most of the real-world networks represent the relationship in different scenarios. The edge distribution of these networks is not uniform, and it is obvious that the set of nodes highly connected to each other, often called *communities*, is quite different from the other nodes in the network. Detecting the *communities* can help to explore the fundamental properties of the large networks, thus the automated detecting communities is an important issue and has been largely investigated [7].

A clique is a set of nodes in a network that every two distinct vertices in the set are connected to each other. Since the property of clique is too stiff to apply in practice [20], a more appropriate property k-plex is able to represent communities and also suitable for real scenarios. k-plex is each vertex of the induced subgraph is connected to at least m-k other vertices, where m is the number of vertices in the induced subgraph. In other words, each vertex has edges with all the others, with the possible exception of up to k missing neighbors (including itself). Thus, k-plexes are a simple and intuitive generalization of cliques.

The problem of finding k-plex has emerged in social network analysis [1], and it also be applied to some important fields such as employing graph-based data mining [4], [20], [28]. Unfortunately, detecting k-plexes in a network is more difficult than detecting k-cliques since the maximal k-plexes are much more numerous than maximal cliques, and most of the efficient algorithms for computing maximal k-plexes can only be used on small-size graphs and also required a lot of computation. Thus we want to develop an effective algorithm for detecting k-plex with certain quality in a short time.

There are lots of works dedicated to detecting k-plex problem [4], [6], [29], [16], [10], [25]. Part of them use the branch and bound technique and achieves a good performance on finding maximum k-plex [29], [16], [25]. Although the branch and bound based algorithm successfully work on detecting k-plex, the common issue of the branch and bound algorithm is that it requires a lot of effort to design the heuristic strategy and the bound strategy, and it is annoying to build a strategy that improves the power of the bound conditions also reduces the computation time by handcrafting. In this work, we make the first attempt to use the concept of constraint learning to automated learning bound strategy from the branch and bound process which helps the branch and bound algorithm work effectively and detect the k-plex quickly.

Using constraint learning to effectively detect k-plex needs to due with the following difficulty: 1) it is required to propose the overall framework and learning flow including deciding which kind

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than ACM must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from permissions@acm.org.

Conference'17, July 2017, Washington, DC, USA

© 2022 Association for Computing Machinery.

ACM ISBN 978-x-xxxx-xxxx-x/YY/MM...\$15.00

<https://doi.org/10.1145/nnnnnnn.nnnnnnn>

of information as an example data and the features (variable) of the examples and what we want the constraint learning to distinguish; 2) the variable chosen need to be relative to the target problem and can be generalized on it; 3) the computation load of the variable need to take into the consideration; 4) the complexity of the process function of variables needs to be moderate that able to distinguish the examples data also not complicate to increase the MILP solvers loading. We design a complete framework that considers all the conditions mentioned above which lead to mining bounding strategy to efficiently detect the k-plex.

Although our work is dedicated to using the learn to bound idea to accelerate the process of k-plex extraction, the concept of constraint learning can apply to different problems with branch and bound based algorithms. Given the target problem and any basic bound strategy, we can perform the same framework we proposed on it with a suitable set of variables. In the branch and bound based algorithm, we want the bound can discard the exploration of infeasible solution precisely, this may require the complex variables that are able to describe the bound behavior well; on the other hand, we want to reduce the computation load of bound strategy, this required the achieving of the variable do not cost a lot of computation. For example, to calculate the neighbor of each vertex in the set need to traverse each vertex and edge, while the size of the set needs no computation. There seems to be a trade-off between the expressive power and the computation load of variables. Although the constraint learning framework can perform the learn to bound technique on different problems also different bound strategies, it requires the observation of the features of the target problem and corresponding bound strategy to design a suitable set of variables, leading to the efficient and powerful learned strategy.

Recently, machine learning has been adopted to solve the combinatorial optimization problems that have been mainly solved by algorithm approaches for the past few decades. Several works tackle the combinatorial optimization problems as a sequence transformation problem, [15], [9]. And several works demonstrated the problem can solve in by Reinforcement learning(RL) approach, [12], [3], [14]. They demonstrated RL can effectively solve graph optimization problems, learns to explore the potential combination, and exploit the experience without the requirement of the optimal solution as supervision. Different from the works that put their effort into designing the appropriate machine learning framework and then building the solution with lots of training and computation load. Our method applies constraint learning automatically learning to prevent the branch and bound based algorithm from examining the infeasible solution. We develop a framework that learns to bound for the branch and bound algorithm to accelerate it.

There are also some works using machine learning to help accelerate the branch and bound algorithm, [2], [27], [22] they put their effort into learning the branch strategy through different machine learning frameworks, and design the architecture of the learning process from MILP solver. The problem of learning branch strategy is relatively simple than learning to bound. The learning to branch reduces the size of the search tree most of the time, it may also fail in some conditions, but it is not a big issue because it only affects the efficiency but does not influence if the algorithm can find a feasible solution. In contrast, the problem of learning to bound

needs to be due carefully in case of filtering out feasible solutions, which makes the whole algorithm end up generating solutions with low quality. Although learn to bound are a challenging issue, we consider that an effective bound process has a great potential of reducing the overall search process. If we can correctly bound the infeasible solution at an early stage, it may reduce a large amount of computation of branch and bound decision. This effect might be much more powerful than learn to branch since learn to branch only deal with the problem of clever select strategy, it might lead to a high quality of local solution but not powerful to reduce the overall search space. Thus, we provide a new framework to improve the efficiency of the bound strategy, expecting to accelerate the branch and bound search process.

In this work, we tackle the core problem of the branch and bound algorithm: the bound strategy for efficiently detecting k-plex in the networks. First, we introduce the simple branch and bound algorithm. Then we propose a framework in constraint learning concept to learn the bound strategy with the basic branch and bound algorithm searching process. Then learn to bound algorithm can learn the behavior of the original bound strategy with the branch and bound searching process on the small graphs in a short time, and the learned strategy does accelerate the algorithm with the low computation load in deciding whether examine the current searching states.

The contributions are summarized as follows.

- We present techniques to detect the k-plex of a network under the detecting size and time constraints. Our approach is based on the branch and bound algorithm and accelerates its efficiency with a complete framework of learning the bound strategy.
- We propose a constraint learning framework that automatically learns the bound strategy with the designing variable to reduce the computation load of deciding whether examine the current states. The learning framework in MILP successfully constructs the bound strategy with the searching process on the small graphs and then able to generalize on the real networks, which leads to improving the efficiency of the branch and bound algorithm.
- Experimental results on multiple benchmark datasets show that our proposed approaches outperform the state-of-the-art baselines. Our method is able to generalize on networks with different properties and perform stable with various parameters.

The rest of this dissertation is organized as follows. Section 2 will discuss related work on several related field. Section 3 is the algorithm design. We will introduce the proposed algorithm of learning to bound. Section 4 is the experimental result and Section 5 is the conclusion.

2 RELATED WORKS

2.1 K-plex Detection

The problem of detecting k-plex can be expressed in finding the maximum k-plex and enumerating the k-plex in graphs. Recent work like Berlowitz, Cohen, and Kimelfeld et al. produce efficient algorithms for the enumeration of maximal k-plexes and maximal

connected k-plexes, the algorithm reduces the problem of enumerating k-plex for an arbitrary graph G to enumerating k-plex for the graph that almost satisfies k-plex [4]. Conte et al. are dedicated to reducing the large graph to a relatively small graph by the *coreness* and the *cliqueness* property, which makes the existing k-plex enumerating algorithms possible to execute on large graphs [6]. Zhou et al. develop a branch and bound algorithm Maplex, which efficiently removes redundant vertices and edges, and used the graph color heuristic to obtain a tight upper bound for the exact branch-and-bound [29]. Miao et al. propose a greedy randomized adaptive search procedure (GRASP) to overcome the drawbacks of existing construction heuristics found for smaller values of parameter k are sometimes not found for larger k even though they are feasible. And the propose algorithm is able to detect a maximum k-plex in various networks [19]. Chen et al. inspired by the multi-armed bandit (MAB) problem in reinforcement learning (RL) to proposed two heuristics, BLP and DTCC, for the maximum k-plex problem. Then develop a local search algorithm named BDCC and improve it by a hyper heuristic strategy [5]. Although these works provide the method for searching k-plex from different perspectives, detecting k-plex problem still need a tremendous of time. Hence, we concentrated on detecting k-plex in a short time with the lower bound constraints to provide the real-time requirement.

2.2 Combinatorial Optimization Problems

In recent years, machine learning has improved the field of solving combinatorial optimization problems. Khalil et al. automate the process of learning heuristics for the combinatorial optimization problems by a combination of reinforcement learning and graph embedding, successfully applied to optimization problems over graphs [12]. Li et al. propose the framework combines deep learning and algorithmic ideas, the graph convolution network is trained to estimate if the vertex in the graph is part of the optimal solution, and able to produce multiple solutions following the procedure to explore it [15]. Barrett et al. propose ECO-DQN, a reinforcement learning based algorithm for the Max-Cut problem. Instead of the previous work that earlier decisions are not revisable, their agent seeks to continuously improve the solution by learning to explore at test time and generalizes well to unseen graph sizes and structures [3]. Karalias et al. presented an unsupervised learning framework for solving constrained combinatorial problems on graphs that utilizes a neural network to parametrize a probability distribution over sets to guarantee the quality of its solutions. They demonstrate this approach is able to obtain valid solutions to the maximum clique problem and local graph clustering [11]. Li et al. propose a deep learning approach to approximately solves the covering salesman problem(CSP). The model captures the structural patterns and forms a dynamic embedding to handle the dynamic patterns of the problem. The model is trained using the reinforce algorithm and shows desirable properties of fast solving speed and the ability to generalize to unseen instances [14]. Unlike the machine learning approaches, Our method uses the constraint learning concept for learning bound strategy which gives a new perspective on solving combinatorial optimization problems.

2.3 Constraint Learning

Recent work for mining constraints from data inherited the structure of the inductive logic programming and further expressed the problem to the mixed integer linear problem form, also performing their different synthesis strategy. Pawlak and Krawiec et al. propose a method that mining constraints from examples labeled feasible and infeasible, and formulates it as mixed-integer linear programming (MILP) to produce constraints in symbolic, human-readable form [21]. Kolb et al. extend the inductive logic programming with the numerical variables to the CNF form, which is conjunctions of clauses over Boolean literals and linear inequalities, the problem learns the SMT(LRA) constraint from the feasible and infeasible set of the example and further proposed the algorithm INACL that can solve the problem by existing SMT solver [13]. Sched, Kolb, and Teso et al. propose INCALP, an algorithm to learn the hard constraints from data, by encoding constraint learning as a mixed-integer linear program. And if further extend from the work before by considering gradually larger subsets of examples, and terminating as soon as the suitable constraints are found [24]. Meng et al. present the framework mining constraint from data via the given coefficients of the objective function and the corresponding solution, the proposed outer and inner properties successfully identify the constraint from the feasible set of example [18].

Based on these studies, we use the concept of constraint learning and take the mixed integer linear programming as our constraint framework to develop the learn to bound strategy.

2.4 Learning to Branch and Bound

The recent works of learning strategy for branch and bound algorithms mostly focus on learning to branch. Balcan et al. aim to learn the branch strategy for branch and bound algorithms, they show how to use machine learning to determine an optimal weighting of any set of partitioning procedures for the instance distribution at a small number of samples [2]. Zarpellon et al. propose a framework of Learn Branching Policies by introducing new input features and the imitation learning framework to generalize on the different problems in MILP architecture [27]. Qu et al. propose a reinforcement learning-based branch and bound algorithm, with the demonstration data collected by strong branch rule, the RL agent interacts with the solver with its learned policy that is significantly effective in performance improvement of branch and bound algorithm [22]. Rather than learning to branch, we use the learning to bound technique which is much more complicated since it might filter out feasible solutions, and successfully apply it to detecting k-plex.

3 PROBLEM DEFINITION

Our work combines constraint learning to learn the bound strategy for detecting k-plex. The problem definition includes detecting k-plex and mining bounding constraints from the search process.

3.1 k-plex Detecting Problem

Given a Graph $G = (V, E)$, a k-plex is set of vertices $\{v_1, v_2, v_3, \dots, v_m\} \subseteq S$, ($S \subseteq V$), such that each of them has edges with all the others, and with the possible exception of up to k missing neighbors (including itself). If there exist a k-plex size is m , each of the nodes in S has at least $m-k$ neighbors in S .

Finding maximum k-plex or enumerating all the maximal k-plex in a large network is time consuming. In this work, we define the k-plex detection problem as given the time threshold t and the lower bound lb of k-plex size, detecting the k-plex larger or equal than the lower bound within the time threshold. We evaluate the quality by judging if the algorithm can find out the k-plex that satisfied time and size constraints and how large the k-plex it can detect.

3.2 Constraint Learning

We first introduce the definition of constraint learning, then illustrate the Constraint Learning in Mixed Integer Programming (MILP) form and introduce the problem of finding constraints of bounding strategy in the branch and bound algorithm.

3.2.1 Definition. Given a space of possible instances X , and instances are assignments to a set of variable Var belonging to the unknown constraint theory; a space of possible constraints C ; an unknown target constraint theory $T \subseteq C$; a set of training instances E , whereof positive instances satisfy T , and negatives instances do not satisfy T . Find a constraint theory $H (H \subseteq C)$ such that all instances in E are consistence with H . A constraint theory H is consistent with an example e if $H(e) = label(e)$, here the constraint theory H can be seen as a function process on example e which classifies it to positive or negative. If the constraint theory H classifies the example e same as the original label of e , then H is consistent with an example e .

3.2.2 MILP Constraint Learning Problem. Recent works use the Mixed Integer Linear Programming framework as the constraint space. Let the example in examples set E is e , the example set E consists of the positive instances set e^+ and the negative set e^- . The example $e = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n\}$, the x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n are process variables. The term t_j is the function of process variables. Constraint C_i is expressed in Equation 1. The $w_{ij} \in \mathbb{R}$ is weight of term t_j of constraint C_i , and the $c_i \in \mathbb{R}$ is a free term.

$$\sum_j w_{ij} t_j \leq c_i \quad (1)$$

The MILP Constraint Learning Problem is built from the example set E , and the constraint space C . The solution to the problem is to find out a set of constraints C build from the weight w_{ij} and free term c_i such that the example set E consistence with it. Expressed in equation form, the constraints should satisfied the Equation 2 and Equation 3, where ϵ is a small positive constant.

$$\sum_j w_{ij} t_j(e) \leq c_i \quad \forall e \in e^+, \quad \forall C_i \in C \quad (2)$$

$$\sum_j w_{ij} t_j(e) > c_i + \epsilon \quad \forall e \in e^-, \quad \exists C_i \in C \quad (3)$$

3.3 Learning constraints of Bound Strategy

Based on the above constraint learning definition, we propose a problem of learning bounding constraints in branch and bound algorithm for searching k-plex. Given the searching states in the branch and bound process, each state consists of the features of the intermediate solution set V_S and the remaining set of candidate vertices V_A , and each state is labeled with stop examine (negative instances) or not keep examine (positive instances) according to the

original branch and bound algorithm decide to explore it or not, we aim to find out a constraint theory H of with the specific variable Var such that the given searching states (instances) are consist with H . In Proposition 1, we prove that we can always learned the constraints exactly distinguishes all the possible example. For applying to the detecting k-plex problem, it is not reasonable to use lots of variables to find the exact constraint, our goal is to learn the bound strategy to be efficient. We expect the learned constraint has the power of the original bound strategy with a lower computation cost. This is done by design variables that have the certain power to express the bound instances without heavy computation cost, which leads to accelerating the branch and bound algorithm with a light constraint computation.

PROPOSITION 1. *Given the target constraint in the linear program formula $\sum_j a_{ij} t_j(e) \leq b_i$, it is always possible to find the leaned constraints such that correctly distinguish every example generate from target constraint under the the constraints space include the constraint space of target constraint.*

PROOF. By the definition that the linear program problem is infeasible if the feasible region is empty (there's no point satisfy all the constraints in the linear program problem) [8], [17]. Proof by contradiction, if there does not exist the solution correctly distinguishes every example generated from the target constraint, the linear program problem formed by the encoding of example generate from target constraints is infeasible, which means there does not exist a linear program formula $\sum_j a_{ij} t_j(e) \leq b_i$ satisfy the encoding of examples, which arrive to a contradiction. \square

4 METHODOLOGY

Our approach aims to find a k-plex that satisfied the size constraints in a short time, to accomplish the goal, we want to let the computation of bound decision in the branch and bound process efficient and still retain the bound effect. We introduce the approach of learning bound strategy by constraint learning to accelerate the bound process. Note that our learn to bound mechanism can be applied to any bound strategy with the appropriate learning variables.

Our framework consists of the preprocessing of the input graph, the basic branch and bound algorithm, the learning process of learning constraints of bound strategy, and the overall learn to branch and bound algorithm.

4.1 Preprocessing

We adopt the pruning technique according to the *Coreness* property and the *Cliqueness* property of k-plex from [6]. The *Coreness* property indicated that for any k-plex size larger than m , the neighbors of each vertex in the k-plex should larger than $m - k$. Hence, before searching the k-plex larger than lb in the input Graph G , we can discard the vertex whose degree is less than $lb - k$ and also discard the edge connect to it. After the *Coreness* pruning, we can move on to the *Cliqueness* property. The *Cliqueness* property indicated that for any vertex in the k-plex whose size is larger than m , the vertex should exist in the clique whose size is larger or equal than $\lceil m/k \rceil$, so we can discard the vertex not exist in a clique which size is larger or equal than $\lceil lb/k \rceil$. According to the given value of lb , we use

these two pruning techniques to produce a new graph G' as the preprocessing for the following search.

4.2 Basic Branch and Bound Algorithm

Here we use the simple branch and bound algorithm as our agent for collecting each search state for learning the bound strategy.

We apply a simple heuristic for the branch strategy, here the V_S and V_A are the intermediate solution set and the remaining set of candidate vertices, respectively. As shown in Algorithm 1, if the intermediate solution set V_S is null, we choose the vertex u to branch which the value of Equation 4 is max in the V_A ; if the V_S is not null, we choose the vertex u in V_A which u has the most neighbor in the V_S to branch.

$$\frac{1}{|u's\ neighbor|} \sum_v |v's\ neighbor| \quad \forall v \in u's\ neighbor \quad (4)$$

We adopt the idea of familiarity pruning strategy from [26], this work is aim to find out the group with exact size p , and each vertex on average can share no edge with at most k other vertices in query vertex F . Therefore the familiarity pruning calculates the upper bound of every possible solution growing from V_S , if the upper bound indicated that on average each vertex cannot have the neighbor at least $p - k$, this state will be bound (Equation 5). To adopt the equation calculating for the fixed p to our k-plex searching, we test the equation for $p = [\min(lb, |V_S|), ub]$ (ub is the max size of the solution can achieved), if for any p in this scope can not achieve a possible solution, the search of this state will be terminated. Here the $N_v^{V_S}$ is the neighbors of v which the neighbor is in set V_S ; $N_v^{V_A}$ is the neighbors of v which the neighbor is in set V_A ; $InterEdge$ is the set of edges connect two vertexes in V_S and V_A .

$$\frac{1}{p} \left[\sum_{v \in V_S} |N_v^{V_S}| + (p - |V_S|) \max_{v \in V_A} |N_v^{V_A}| + 2 \sum_{v \in V_S} |InterEdge(v)| \right] < (p - k - 1) \quad (5)$$

4.3 Learning Constraints of Bound Strategy

Constraint Learning learns the constraints from the given examples, we employ the idea of mining constraints from data to mining the bound strategy of the branch and bound process, hence we take each search state and its corresponding features as examples, and try to figure out the effective new bound strategy.

4.3.1 Variable Chosen. According to the equation in the familiarity pruning in the basic branch and bound algorithm, the calculation required the computation of the set of edges connecting any two vertices in V_S , the set of edges connecting any two vertices selected from V_A , and the set of edges connecting any two vertices in V_S and the vertices selected from V_A . The edge computation is required to visit all the vertex and its neighbors both V_S and V_A . We want to reduce these computations and retain the power of familiarity bound. We design a set of variables Var to learn the constraints, described in Table 1, and these Var generalize the original bounding strategy well and also reduce computation cost.

Algorithm 1 Basic Branch and Bound Algorithm

Input: Graph G , k , lb

Output: a k-plex solution

- 1: $G' \leftarrow \text{Preprocessing}(G, k, lb)$
- 2: $V_S = \emptyset, V_A = G'(V), Sol = \emptyset$
- 3: $\text{Basic Branch-and-Bound}(G', V_S, V_A, k, lb)$
- 4: **return** largest solution in Sol

Basic Branch-and-Bound (G', V_S, V_A, k, lb)

- 1: **if** $|V_S| \geq lb$ and V_S is k-plex **then**
 - 2: Add V_S to solution set Sol
 - 3: **end if**
 - 4: **while** $V_A \neq \emptyset$ **do**
 - 5: **if** $V_S = \emptyset$ **then**
 - 6: $u \leftarrow$ vertex has max value of Equation 4 in V_A
 - 7: **else**
 - 8: $u \leftarrow$ vertex has most neighbors in V_S
 - 9: **end if**
 - 10: $V_S = V_S \cup u$
 - 11: $V_A = V_A \setminus u$
 - 12: **if** $\text{PruningBasic}(V_S, V_A)$ is true **then**
 - 13: Record the pruning data:
 {Current state's features, False}
 - 14: **return**
 - 15: **else**
 - 16: Record the not pruning data:
 {Current state's features, True}
 - 17: Basic Branch-and-Bound(G, V_S, V_A, k, lb)
 - 18: **end if**
 - 19: **end while**
 - 20: **return**
-

At the beginning of the search process, the size of V_A tends to be large, to calculate the edges connecting any two vertices in V_A is time consuming, we come up with using the variable of the average degree of the graph G' and the maximum degree of the vertex in the Graph G' to replace the V_A 's edges computation. These two variables only need to calculate one time in the whole algorithm, if we can construct the bounding strategy using these set of variables, the computation cost of each state can be significantly reduced.

4.3.2 MILP Framework. Recall the MILP problem definition in Equation 2 and Equation 3, the Figure 1 is the illustrate example of the MILP Constraint Learning. For all the example $e \in e^+$ should satisfy all the constraints in constraints model. While the example $e \in e^-$ should at least violate one constraint in the constraint model. In the examples set in Figure 1, the two feasible examples satisfy all constraints in the constraint model; the first infeasible example violates the second constraint only, the second infeasible example violates the first and third constraints, the third infeasible example violates all three constraints. So, the constraint model in the figure is consistent with the examples set.

For the application of learn the bound strategy, we set the constraint space has only one MILP formula, so the MILP constraint

Table 1: Variable for Learning Bounding Constraints

Variable	Description
lb	lower bound lb of k -plex.
ub	size of Graph G' after preprocessing.
k	the k of k -plex
$ V_S $	size of the intermediate solution V_S .
$N_{V_S}^{Max}$	max neighbors number of vertex in V_S .
$\sum N_{V_S}$	summation of vertex neighbors in V_S .
$ V_A $	size of candidate vertices in V_A .
$ InterEdge $	size of edges connect between V_S, V_A .
Avg. deg of G'	average degree of the vertices in G' .
Max deg of G'	max degree of the vertex in G' .

Examples	x_1	x_2	Label
e^+	0	1	Feasible
	-1	2	Feasible
e^-	0	0	Infeasible
	2	2	Infeasible
	8	1	Infeasible

Constraint Learning

Constraints Model

$2x_1 + x_2 \leq 5$

$0.5x_1 - 3x_2 \leq -1$

$5x_1 + 2x_2 \leq 9$

Figure 1: Example of Constraint Learning

consistency equation can be simplify to Equation 6 and Equation 7.

$$\sum_j w_j t_j(e) \leq c_0 \quad \forall e \in e^+ \quad (6)$$

$$\sum_j w_j t_j(e) > c_0 + \epsilon \quad \forall e \in e^- \quad (7)$$

term t is the function of the process variable, here we set the process function term t is *quadratic* function, which means the t_j is build from the each variable itself and the product of the two variable in the set of variables. For the instances $x = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n\}$, the $t(x)$ is Equation 8

$$t(x) = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n, \\ x_1x_1, x_1x_2, \dots, x_1x_n, \\ x_2x_2, x_2x_3, \dots, x_2x_n, \\ \dots, \\ x_nx_n\} \quad (8)$$

4.3.3 Examples Extraction and Encoding. Since the variable of our constraint learning is already decided, we compute and record the features (variable) of each search state, (the state is consist of current V_S and V_A), and record its label. If the familiarity pruning of basic branch and bound algorithm decide to keep searching from the state, the state is labeled with positive; otherwise, the state is labeled with negatives.

To learn the constraints from the data we extract from the basic branch and bound process, we need to encode these examples to a MILP formula so that the MILP solver can solve the problem. The

encoding technique is adopted from [21], here we list the essential part of the encoding below, where l is an index of example. Equation 11 indicated that the negative example should violate at least one constraint in constraint space, M is a large positive integer set to 10^6 , ϵ is a small positive value set to 10^{-6} .

$$\sum_j w_{ij} t_j(e) \leq c_i \quad \forall e \in e^+, \quad \forall i \quad (9)$$

$$\sum_j w_{ij} t_j(e) > M * S_{li} - M + c_i + \epsilon \quad \forall e \in e^-, \quad \forall i \quad (10)$$

$$\sum_i S_{li} \geq 1 \quad \forall e \in e^- \quad (11)$$

$$\begin{aligned} w_{ij} &\in [-1000, 1000] \\ c_i &\in [-1000, 1000] \\ S_{li} &\in \{0, 1\} \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

4.4 Learn to Branch and Bound Algorithm

Using the mechanism described above, our learn-to-bound algorithm is illustrated in Algorithm 2. First, we use the basic branch and bound algorithm to find k -plex on the random graph. During the searching process, we record each searching state with its corresponding feature and label. Then we use the MILP Constraint learning to find out the bounding strategy according to our design variable. While we obtain the constraint term from the constraint learning. We use this constraints term as our new decision strategy to decide whether keep searching from the current state.

5 EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

5.1 Experiment Setting

All algorithms are written in C++, except the constraint learning framework is written in python and solved by MILP solver Gurobi; **S2V-DQN** written in python. All the experiments are conducted on a desktop with an operating system in Intel(R) Core(TM) i9-10900F CPU @ 2.80GHz.

5.1.1 Baseline. For the comparing to our method, we use the recent baseline algorithm **EnumFast** [6], **Enum** [4], **Maplex** [29], **S2V-DQN** [12], **Basic BnB**: our basic branch and bound algorithm, compare to **Learn BnB**: our learn to bound algorithm.

The Enum algorithm first extends the subset from the first input node by scanning all the nodes once and adding the vertices if the subset remains k -plex. Then it extends the possible combination from the first k -plex by reducing the problem of enumerating k -plex for an arbitrary graph G to enumerating k -plex for the graph that almost satisfies k -plex. The FastEnum adopted the same strategy as Enum but propose two preprocessing techniques to prune the infeasible vertices which make the searching more efficient. The Maplex is the branch and bound based algorithm, it proposes the graph color bound to and other reduction techniques to detecting k -plex. We also take a representative reinforcement learning method S2V-DQN framework and modify its termination condition as if the subset still a k -plex or not for detecting k -plex.

Algorithm 2 Learn to Branch and Bound

Input: Graph G , k , lb
Output: a k -plex solution

```

1: Prepare other training graph  $G_t$  different
   from the target Graph  $G$ 
2:  $Data = \emptyset$ 
3: for different  $lb$ ,  $k$  do
4:    $G'_t \leftarrow \text{Preprocessing}(G_t, k, lb)$ 
5:    $V_S = \emptyset, V_A = G'_t(V)$ 
6:    $Data \leftarrow Data \cup$ 
     Basic Branch-and-Bound ( $G'_t, V_S, V_A, k, lb$ )
7: end for
8:  $BoundStrategy \leftarrow$ 
   Learn Constraints( $Data$ ,  $Var$ ,  $Constraint\ Space$ )

9:  $G' \leftarrow \text{Preprocessing}(G, k, lb)$ 
10:  $V_S = \emptyset, V_A = G'(V), Sol = \emptyset$ 
11: Learn-to-Bound( $G', V_S, V_A, k, lb$ )

   Learn-to-Bound ( $G', V_S, V_A, k, lb$ )
1: if  $|V_S| \geq lb$  and  $V_S$  is  $k$ -plex then
2:   Add  $V_S$  to solution set  $Sol$ 
3: end if
4: while  $V_A \neq \emptyset$  do
5:   if  $V_S = \emptyset$  then
6:      $u \leftarrow$  vertex has max value of Equation 4 in  $V_A$ 
7:   else
8:      $u \leftarrow$  vertex has most neighbors in  $V_S$ 
9:   end if
10:   $V_S = V_S \cup u$ 
11:   $V_A = V_A \setminus u$ 
12:  if  $BoundStrategy(State'sFeatures)$  is true then
13:    return
14:  else
15:    Learn-to-Bound( $G, V_S, V_A, k, lb$ )
16:  end if
17: end while
18: return

```

Table 2: Properties of the collaboration networks.

Dataset	$ V $	$ E $	avg. degree	max degree
ca-Erdos992	6100	7515	2	61
ca-GrQc	5242	28980	5	81
ca-Condmat	23133	186936	8	279
ca-AstroPh	18772	396160	21	504

5.1.2 Datasets. We conduct the experiment on *DBLP*, *web-arabic-2005* and four collaboration networks: *ca-Erdos992*, *ca-GrQc*, *ca-Condmat* and *ca-AstroPh* to test the algorithm performance with the different graph properties. The properties of these four graphs are shown in table 2. We also test the Basic BnB and Learn BnB on several small networks [23].

5.1.3 Constraint Learning Detail. Here we illustrate the detail of the learning constraint algorithm. Since learning the bound strategy can process offline. We only need to learn the bound strategy ones and we can use the constraints we learn to perform the branch and bound algorithm on all the datasets.

To make the learning constraints can be generalized on different graph properties, it would be better to prepare the multiple graph data with different parameters for the constraint learning. But considering our first intention of accelerating the search process of detecting k -plex, we wonder if we can only use the light datasets and the small number of parameters to build the constraints. Under this intention we only use the random graph whose size is $\{100, 150, 200, 250\}$, and each size has two graphs, and the k is set to $\{2, 4\}$, the lower bound lb is set to 5 only. For each graph with the corresponding k , we only run the basic branch and bound algorithm in 60 seconds, and collect the example during these training processes. After the example extraction, we encode the examples to MILP format to formulate a MILP problem, then use the solver Gurobi to solve the problem in 300 seconds. The solution that comes up by the MILP solver is our learn to bound strategy. The total time for the learning constraints of the bound strategy is in 21 minutes. Note that we only need to learn the bound strategy once, then it can apply to the experiment of different networks.

5.1.4 Setting. For all the baseline algorithms (except the **Enum**) and our **Basic BnB**, **Learn BnB**, we first conduct the preprocessing on the original graph according to the input lb ; for the **Maplex**, we further let it conduct its preprocessing algorithm after it, and we do not count this extra preprocessing time.

For the experiment on the collaboration networks, since the network size is small, we only test the timeout in 10 seconds and 60 seconds. Corresponding to the size of the k -plex each graph can detect, we set the size lower bound lb in $[5, 10, 20, 30, 40]$ and test on $k = \{2, 4\}$. For the experiment on the *DBLP* and *web-arabic-2005*, we set the k in $\{2, 4, 8, 16, 32\}$, to see how the different values of k influence the algorithm performance; the lower bound lb is set to $\{30, 50, 75, 100\}$ to evaluate if the algorithm can detect k -plex within the time limit. The time limit is set to 10 seconds, 60 seconds, and 300 seconds.

5.2 Performance Evaluation

First, we conduct the experiment on *DBLP* network, *DBLP* has 317,080 vertices, 1,049,866 edges. the result is in Table 3. The results show our Learn BnB algorithm can detect the k -plex satisfy the lower bound constraints in the time limit with any hyper parameter, while the other baseline can not produce the k -plex in some cases. The Enum algorithm can not produce any solution since the algorithm without preprocessing is hard to perform on large networks. The FastEnum algorithm only has solutions in $k=2$ and $lb=75, 100$. It seems that the enumeration-based algorithm struggles to generate the combination of possible solutions when the value of k grows. The Maplex, Basic BnB and Learn BnB are branch and bound based algorithms. These methods seem to work better than the enumeration algorithm in this network. But the Maplex and Basic BnB performance also decrease when k is large and lb is small. Our Learn BnB still extracts the k -plex in this situation. We thought the value of lb and k have a different impact on the baseline

algorithm. The S2V-DQN work well under some parameters, but it has the obstacle that we can not load the whole graph into memory, so the RL method only can work on the case that the graph after preprocessing are small enough it also implies RL bases method are resource consuming and our Learn BnB are an more generalized method for solving k-plex. Next, we conduct the experiment on *web-arabic-2005* networks for confirming our thoughts. The *web-arabic-2005* has 163598 vertices and 1747269 edges. The result is in Table 4. The results seem similar to the result of *DBLP* that our Learn BnB outperforms other baselines in most of the cases. But there's a difference in the enumeration method FastEnum when the *lb* is small. The first step of the FastEnum is to extend the subset from the first vertex and scan the whole vertices, if adding the current visit vertex can make the subset still retain a k-plex, then it keeps adding the node into the subset. This naive technique is relatively easy to detect k-plex in a short time if the density of graphs is high, and it also depends on the input vertices order. Although FastEnum detects the k-plex in 10 seconds, it is hard to further extend the solution even execute to 300 seconds. In contrast, our Learn BnB did not detect the k-plex in 10 seconds but was able to expand the k-plex to a large size with the time limit growing. The S2V-DQN can not work in more case in *web-arabic-2005* then *DBLP*, since the *web-arabic-2005* has high graph density and thus the graph after preprocessing are larger than *DBLP*. Although our goal is to extract k-plex in a short time, we further conduct the experiment on *DBLP* and *web-arabic-2005* in a long time to see can each algorithm perform better in the large time scope. We test each algorithm in 10,20,30 minute and show in Table 5 and Table 6. We can see all algorithm has some improvements with giving a long time. But none of the baselines outperforms our approach and thus the learn to bound efficiently and correctly extract the k-plex even in large time scope.

5.2.1 Comparison of Basic and Learn Branch and Bound. To examine the accuracy of the Learn BnB and compare the efficiency between Learn BnB and Basic BnB, we let the two algorithms finish all the searches and then measure their performance. In Table 7, we conduct the experiment on 5 small graphs, the maximize k-plex size detect by the two algorithms are the same, but the Learn BnB can shrink the search time to at least 4 times and up to 80 times compare to Basic BnB. We also measure the accuracy of the bound by Learn BnB decisions. The accuracy means the percent of the bound by Learn BnB do the right deicion(do not bound the feasible solution). The experiment shows that the Learn BnB bound much more than the Basic BnB but did not affect the detecting k-plex size. Since the Basic BnB bound strategy is not a strong bound strategy, the Learn BnB might learn the new bound pattern on the difference constraint space, which perform efficiently.

5.2.2 Sensitivity Analysis. After the experiment on the above networks, we want to analyze how algorithms perform under the different values of *k* and *lb*. Figure 2 and Figure 3 show the average size of detecting k-plex in time limit 300 seconds with different value of *k* and *lb*. In Figure 2(a), we can find that by the value of *k* growing, FastEnum and Basic BnB become hard to detect k-plex. For FastEnum, the big value of *k* enhances the number of possible k-plex, thus FastEnum spends lots of time enumerating the combination extends from the current k-plex with the select vertices,

which prevents it from detecting a large k-plex in a short time. For Basic BnB, the growth of *k* indicated the graph after preprocessing step becomes larger, then increases the computation load of the bound decision. Maplex performance also decreases in *k*=2 to 16, it might be the same reason as Basic BnB. In Figure 2(b), here only FastEnum decrease with *k* growing. The two branch and bound based methods seem not influence by *k* until *k*=32, but these two methods perform worse than those performed in *DBLP* networks. We surmise that the graph density also influences the performance. If the graph density is high, the impact of *k* might be diluted. Thus we conduct the experiment to compare graph density following. In contrast, Learn BnB is also influenced by *k* in Figure 2(b) but only to a small extent. The experiment shows our Learn BnB perform more stable in different value of *k*.

Figure 3 show all the methods tend to detect a larger k-plex while *lb* growing. One reason is that if the network does exist the k-plex is larger or equal than *lb*, the preprocessing step can efficiently discard the vertices not satisfy the k-lex property, thus the remaining graph G' is small to make the searching easier. But in the real scenario, we can not assume we can always guess the *lb* correctly, the high *lb* might make the algorithms can not find a solution at all. So it is important to see if the algorithm works in different *lb*. All baselines performance drops while *lb* becomes smaller. It seems that no matter the enumeration strategy or the branch and bound strategy both hard to extract the node to extend in the large set of vertices. In contrast, Learn BnB still can find the large k-plex when *lb* is low.




Figure 2: The average size of k-plex with different *k* at *t*=300s

5.2.3 Graph Properties. We conduct the experiment on the four collaboration networks to see how graph density affect the algorithms' performance. The result of the collaboration networks is shown in Table 8,9,10,11. Values in table represent the size of k-plex detected by algorithms under the different parameters.

See Figure 2, the size of *erdos992* and *GrQc* are closed but density of the *GrQc* is 2.5times of *erdos992*. The baselines seems work better in the high density graph *GrQc* while hard to find the solution in *erdos992*. Basic BnB and our Learn BnB finds the k-plex when *k*=4, *lb*=10 in *erdos992* while others can not. Than Learn BnB van find the large k-plex even *lb* is small in *GrQc*, it seems Learn work stable in these networks.

Graph *Condmatt* and *AstroPh* node size are both around 20 thousands, but the average degree of *AstroPh* is 2 to 3 times of *Condmatt*.

Table 3: The experimental results of DBLP. The value is the maximize k-plex size found by each methods under different value of k , lb and t . Larger values represent better performance.

method	k-plex size												
	lb	30			50			75			100		
	time limit	10(s)	60(s)	300(s)	10(s)	60(s)	300(s)	10(s)	60(s)	300(s)	10(s)	60(s)	300(s)
	k												
FastEnum (KDD'17)	2	43	43	43	0	0	0	114	114	114	114	114	114
Enum (SIGMOD'15)		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Maplex (AAAI'21)		0	0	62	0	0	84	114	114	114	114	114	114
S2V-DQN (NIPS'17)		29	114	114	114	114	114	114	114	114	114	114	114
Base BnB (Ours)		0	0	114	0	114	114	114	114	114	114	114	114
Learn BnB (Ours)		114	114	114	114	114	114	114	114	114	114	114	114
FastEnum (KDD'17)	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Enum (SIGMOD'15)		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Maplex (AAAI'21)		0	0	39	0	0	84	0	0	114	0	0	114
S2V-DQN (NIPS'17)		22	114	114	114	114	114	114	114	114	114	114	114
Base BnB (Ours)		0	0	94	0	114	114	114	114	114	114	114	114
Learn BnB (Ours)		78	114	114	114	114	114	114	114	114	114	114	114
FastEnum (KDD'17)	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Enum (SIGMOD'15)		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Maplex (AAAI'21)		0	0	0	0	0	84	0	0	114	0	0	114
S2V-DQN (NIPS'17)		13	114	114	114	114	114	114	114	114	114	114	114
Base BnB (Ours)		0	0	50	0	114	114	114	114	114	114	114	114
Learn BnB (Ours)		73	114	114	114	114	114	114	114	114	114	114	114
FastEnum (KDD'17)	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Enum (SIGMOD'15)		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Maplex (AAAI'21)		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	114
S2V-DQN (NIPS'17)		-	-	-	114	114	114	114	114	114	114	114	114
Base BnB (Ours)		0	0	0	0	67	114	114	114	114	114	114	114
Learn BnB (Ours)		112	114	114	114	114	114	114	114	114	114	114	114
FastEnum (KDD'17)	32	-	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Enum (SIGMOD'15)		-	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Maplex (AAAI'21)		-	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	114
S2V-DQN (NIPS'17)		-	-	-	-	-	-	114	114	114	114	114	114
Base BnB (Ours)		-	-	-	0	0	0	0	114	114	114	114	114
Learn BnB (Ours)		-	-	-	63	114	114	114	114	114	114	114	114

*Since when $k=32$, finding k -plex of $lb=30$ is trivial, we do not conduct experiments under these parameters.

*For the method *S2V-DQN*, we can not load the whole graph into memory if the graph after preprocessing is too large, so there's no result under certain lb and t .

In the sparse graph *Condmat* at $k=2$, only our Learn BnB finds out the solution on each possible lb ; the Basic BnB still has the obstacle of computing load. EnumFast detects the k -plex whose size is 23 at $lb=20$, but it cannot detect any k -plex at $lb=10$, it shows that the algorithm does not have stable performance at all parameter, the same as the Maplex algorithm.

The result of graph *AstroPh* is different from others. When $k=2$, the FastEnum and Learn BnB are lead and perform better than each other at different parameters. Here we again surmise the key point is the first step of the FastEnum can generate the k -plex quickly while the graph has high density. Although the Enum has the same step, it takes the input graph without pruning, so the average degree is small and makes it difficult to extend the subset with this naive

approach. The branch and bound base algorithms Maplex and Basic BnB do not perform well on this network, it can prove again when the graph is large enough and has a high density, it will aggravate the computing load of the bound process. Under this situation, our Learn BnB can still find a solution under size and time constraints. At $k=4$, the EnumFast loses its advantage and only the Learn BnB generates a good solution.

Based on the observation above, we infer that FastEnum performs well on the high-density graph with a small value of k , but hard to perform its effect on the sparse graph; the Enum is hard to build a solution for the large graph without preprocessing; Maplex performance is not stable and its performance has a relation with different lb and k ; Basic BnB performance decline when the graph

Table 4: The experimental results of web-arabic-2005. The value is the maximize k-plex size found by each methods under different value of k , lb and t . Larger values represent better performance.

<i>method</i>		<i>k-plex size</i>												
		<i>lb</i>	30			50			75			100		
		<i>time limit</i>	10(s)	60(s)	300(s)	10(s)	60(s)	300(s)	10(s)	60(s)	300(s)	10(s)	60(s)	300(s)
		<i>k</i>												
FastEnum	2		39	39	39	0	0	50	88	88	88	102	102	102
Enum			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Maplex			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	102
S2V-DQN			-	-	-	-	-	-	102	102	102	102	102	102
Base BnB			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	102	102	102	102	102
Learn BnB			0	45	102	0	64	102	102	102	102	102	102	102
FastEnum	4		39	39	39	0	0	0	88	88	88	102	102	102
Enum			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Maplex			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	102	0	102	102
S2V-DQN			-	-	-	-	-	-	102	102	102	102	102	102
Base BnB			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	102	102	102	102	102
Learn BnB			0	44	101	0	55	102	102	102	102	102	102	102
FastEnum	8		39	39	39	0	0	0	88	88	88	102	102	102
Enum			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Maplex			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	102	0	0	102
S2V-DQN			-	-	-	-	-	-	102	102	102	102	102	102
Base BnB			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	102	102	102	102	102
Learn BnB			0	43	98	0	51	102	102	102	102	102	102	102
FastEnum	16		37	37	37	0	0	0	88	88	88	0	0	0
Enum			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Maplex			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	102	102	0	102	102
S2V-DQN			-	-	-	-	-	-	102	102	102	102	102	102
Base BnB			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	102	102	102	102	102
Learn BnB			0	41	94	102	102	102	102	102	102	102	102	102
FastEnum	32		-	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Enum			-	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Maplex			-	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	102
S2V-DQN			-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	102	102	102
Base BnB			-	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	102	102
Learn BnB			-	-	-	0	0	96	0	0	102	102	102	102

*Since when $k=32$, finding k -plex of $lb=30$ is trivial, we do not conduct experiments under these parameters.

*For the method *S2V-DQN*, we can not load the whole graph into memory if the graph after preprocessing is too large, so there's no result under certain lb and t .

size become larger and average degree growing because of the computation load; ours Learn BnB is affected little by the parameters and graph properties, which perform stable than others. It can say that the Learn BnB successfully downgrades the computation load of each bound process and also perform the effect of bound, which makes it can generalize to different properties and conditions.

6 CONCLUSION

In this paper, we propose the learn to bound framework for detecting k -plex in a short time, we take the concept of constraint learning automated learning the bound strategy, which successfully accelerates the branch and bound algorithm. The experiments show our method generalizes on networks with different properties

and also works well under different conditions. The learn to bound strategy can be applied to any branch and bound algorithm with the appropriate framework, which provides a new version of solving the combinatorial optimization problems.

REFERENCES


- [1] Balabhaskar Balasundaram, Sergiy Butenko, and Illya V Hicks. 2011. Clique relaxations in social network analysis: The maximum k -plex problem. *Operations Research* 59, 1 (2011), 133–142.
- [2] Maria-Florina Balcan, Travis Dick, Tuomas Sandholm, and Ellen Vitercik. 2018. Learning to branch. In *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 344–353.
- [3] Thomas Barrett, William Clements, Jakob Foerster, and Alex Lvovsky. 2020. Exploratory combinatorial optimization with reinforcement learning. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, Vol. 34. 3243–3250.

Table 5: The experimental results of DBLP under long time limit. The value is the maximize k-plex size found by each methods under different value of k , lb and t . Larger values represent better performance.

<i>method</i>	<i>k-plex size</i>												
	<i>lb</i>	30			50			75			100		
	<i>time limit</i>	10(min)	20(min)	30(min)	10(min)	20(min)	30(min)	10(min)	20(min)	30(min)	10(min)	20(min)	30(min)
	<i>k</i>												
FastEnum	2	43	43	43	0	0	0	114	114	114	114	114	114
Enum		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Maplex		64	80	80	84	84	84	114	114	114	114	114	114
Base BnB (Ours)		114	114	114	114	114	114	114	114	114	114	114	114
Learn BnB (Ours)		114	114	114	114	114	114	114	114	114	114	114	114
FastEnum	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Enum		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Maplex		0	80	80	84	84	84	114	114	114	114	114	114
Base BnB (Ours)		0	102	114	114	114	114	114	114	114	114	114	114
Learn BnB (Ours)		114	114	114	114	114	114	114	114	114	114	114	114
FastEnum	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Enum		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Maplex		0	63	63	84	84	84	114	114	114	114	114	114
Base BnB (Ours)		103	114	114	114	114	114	114	114	114	114	114	114
Learn BnB (Ours)		114	114	114	114	114	114	114	114	114	114	114	114
FastEnum	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Enum		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Maplex		63	63	63	0	0	62	0	0	0	114	114	114
Base BnB (Ours)		0	0	47	114	114	114	114	114	114	114	114	114
Learn BnB (Ours)		114	114	114	114	114	114	114	114	114	114	114	114
FastEnum	32	-	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Enum		-	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MaPlex		-	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	114	114	114
Base BnB (Ours)		-	-	-	0	100	114	114	114	114	114	114	114
Learn BnB (Ours)		-	-	-	114	114	114	114	114	114	114	114	114

*Since when $k=32$, finding k -plex of $lb=30$ is trivial, we do not conduct experiments under these parameters.

*For the method *S2V-DQN*, we can not load the whole graph into memory if the graph after preprocessing is too large, so there's no result under certain lb and t .

**Figure 3: The average size of k-plex with different lb**

- [4] Devora Berlowitz, Sara Cohen, and Benny Kimelfeld. 2015. Efficient enumeration of maximal k -plexes. In *Proceedings of the 2015 ACM SIGMOD International*

- Conference on Management of Data*. 431–444.
- [5] Peilin Chen, Hai Wan, Shaowei Cai, Weilin Luo, and Jia Li. 2019. Combining Reinforcement Learning and Configuration Checking for Maximum k -plex Problem. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.02578* (2019).
- [6] Alessio Conte, Donatella Firmani, Caterina Mordente, Maurizio Patrignani, and Riccardo Torlone. 2017. Fast enumeration of large k -plexes. In *Proceedings of the 23rd ACM SIGKDD international conference on knowledge discovery and data mining*. 115–124.
- [7] Santo Fortunato. 2010. Community detection in graphs. *Physics reports* 486, 3–5 (2010), 75–174.
- [8] Michel Goemans. 1994. Linear programming. *Course Notes, Octobre* (1994), 50.
- [9] Shenshen Gu, Tao Hao, and Hanmei Yao. 2020. A pointer network based deep learning algorithm for unconstrained binary quadratic programming problem. *Neurocomputing* 390 (2020), 1–11.
- [10] Hua Jiang, Dongming Zhu, Zhichao Xie, Shaowen Yao, and Zhang-Hua Fu. 2021. A New Upper Bound Based on Vertex Partitioning for the Maximum K -plex Problem.. In *IJCAI*. 1689–1696.
- [11] Nikolaos Karalias and Andreas Loukas. 2020. Erdos goes neural: an unsupervised learning framework for combinatorial optimization on graphs. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 33 (2020), 6659–6672.
- [12] Elias Khalil, Hanjun Dai, Yuyu Zhang, Bistra Dilkina, and Le Song. 2017. Learning combinatorial optimization algorithms over graphs. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 30 (2017).

Table 6: The experimental results of web-arabic-2005 under long time limit. The value is the maximize k-plex size found by each methods under different value of k , lb and t . Larger values represent better performance.

<i>method</i>	<i>k-plex size</i>												
	<i>lb</i>	30			50			75			100		
	<i>time limit</i>	10(min)	20(min)	30(min)	10(min)	20(min)	30(min)	10(min)	20(min)	30(min)	10(min)	20(min)	30(min)
	<i>k</i>												
FastEnum	2	39	39	39	0	0	0	88	88	88	102	102	102
Enum		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Maplex		0	0	0	0	102	102	102	102	102	102	102	102
Base BnB		0	0	0	0	0	0	102	102	102	102	102	102
Learn BnB		102	102	102	102	102	102	102	102	102	102	102	102
FastEnum	4	39	39	39	0	0	0	88	88	88	102	102	102
Enum		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Maplex		0	0	0	0	0	0	102	102	102	102	102	102
Base BnB		0	0	0	0	0	0	102	102	102	102	102	102
Learn BnB		102	102	102	102	102	102	102	102	102	102	102	102
FastEnum	8	39	39	39	0	0	0	88	88	88	102	102	102
Enum		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Maplex		0	0	0	0	0	0	102	102	102	102	102	102
Base BnB		0	0	0	0	0	0	102	102	102	102	102	102
Learn BnB		102	102	102	102	102	102	102	102	102	102	102	102
FastEnum	16	37	37	37	0	0	0	88	88	88	0	0	0
Enum		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Maplex		0	0	0	0	0	0	102	102	102	102	102	102
Base BnB		0	0	0	0	0	0	102	102	102	102	102	102
Learn BnB		102	102	102	102	102	102	102	102	102	102	102	102
FastEnum	32	-	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Enum		-	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MaPlex		-	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	102	102	102
Base BnB		-	-	-	0	0	0	0	0	0	102	102	102
Learn BnB		-	-	-	102	102	102	102	102	102	102	102	102

*Since when $k=32$, finding k -plex of $lb=30$ is trivial, we do not conduct experiments under these parameters.

*For the method *S2V-DQN*, we can not load the whole graph into memory if the graph after preprocessing is too large, so there's no result under certain lb and t .

Table 7: Comparison of Basic and Learn Branch and Bound

Graph	$ V $	$ E $	method	time	k -plex size	accuracy
aves-sparrowlyon-flock-season3	27	164	Basic BnB	395(s)	11	-
			Learn BnB	15(s)	11	0.83
aves-weaver-social-03	42	152	Basic BnB	2399(s)	10	-
			Learn BnB	31(s)	10	0.99
johnson 8-2-4	28	210	Basic BnB	3412(s)	5	-
			Learn BnB	744(s)	5	0.978
aves-sparrow-social-2009	31	211	Basic BnB	2971(s)	11	-
			Learn BnB	149(s)	11	0.901
insecta-beetle-group-c1-period-1	30	185	Basic BnB	2101(s)	7	-
			Learn BnB	190(s)	7	0.993

- [13] Samuel Kolb, Stefano Teso, Andrea Passerini, and Luc De Raedt. 2018. Learning SMT (LRA) constraints using SMT solvers. In *IJCAI International Joint Conference*

- on Artificial Intelligence, Vol. 2018. ijcai. org, 2333–2340.
- [14] Kaiwen Li, Tao Zhang, Rui Wang, Yuheng Wang, Yi Han, and Ling Wang. 2021. Deep reinforcement learning for combinatorial optimization: Covering salesman problems. *IEEE Transactions on Cybernetics* (2021).
- [15] Zhuwen Li, Qifeng Chen, and Vladlen Koltun. 2018. Combinatorial optimization with graph convolutional networks and guided tree search. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 31 (2018).
- [16] Benjamin McClosky and Illya V Hicks. 2012. Combinatorial algorithms for the maximum k -plex problem. *Journal of combinatorial optimization* 23, 1 (2012), 29–49.
- [17] Kurt Mehlhorn. 2013. Linear Programming and Integer Linear Programming. (2013).
- [18] Tao Meng and Kai-Wei Chang. 2021. An Integer Linear Programming Framework for Mining Constraints from Data. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 7619–7631.
- [19] Zhuqi Miao and Balabhaskar Balasundaram. 2017. Approaches for finding cohesive subgroups in large-scale social networks via maximum k -plex detection. *Networks* 69, 4 (2017), 388–407.
- [20] Jeffrey Pattillo, Nataly Youssef, and Sergiy Butenko. 2012. Clique relaxation models in social network analysis. In *Handbook of Optimization in Complex*

Table 8: The experimental results of collaboration network Erdos992. The value is the maximize k-plex size found by each methods under different value of k , lb and t . Larger values represent better performance.

method	k-plex size																						
	k				2								4										
	lb		5		10		20		30		40		5		10		20		30		40		
	time limit	10(s)	60(s)	10(s)	60(s)	10(s)	60(s)	10(s)	60(s)	10(s)	60(s)	10(s)	60(s)	10(s)	60(s)	10(s)	60(s)	10(s)	60(s)	10(s)	60(s)		
FastEnum		5	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	
Enum		5	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	
Maplex		8	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Basic BnB		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	5	10	0	0	0	
Learn BnB		5	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	5	10	0	0	0	0	5	10	0	0	0

Table 9: The experimental results of collaboration network GrQc. The value is the maximize k-plex size found by each methods under different value of k , lb and t . Larger values represent better performance.

method	k-plex size																					
	k				2								4									
	lb		5		10		20		30		40		5		10		20		30		40	
	time limit	10(s)	60(s)	10(s)	60(s)	10(s)	60(s)	10(s)	60(s)	10(s)	60(s)	10(s)	60(s)	10(s)	60(s)	10(s)	60(s)	10(s)	60(s)	10(s)	60(s)	
FastEnum		0	44	44	44	44	0	44	44	44	44	46	0	0	0	0	46	0	0	0	0	
Enum		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Maplex		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	46	46	46	46	46	46	46	46	46	
Basic BnB		7	44	44	44	44	42	44	44	44	44	0	46	46	46	46	16	46	46	46	46	
Learn BnB		44	44	44	44	44	44	44	44	44	44	46	46	46	46	46	46	46	46	46	46	

Table 10: The experimental results of collaboration network Condmat. The value is the maximize k-plex size found by each methods under different value of k , lb and t . Larger values represent better performance.

method	k-plex size																					
	k				2								4									
	lb		5		10		20		30		40		5		10		20		30		40	
	time limit	10(s)	60(s)	10(s)	60(s)	10(s)	60(s)	10(s)	60(s)	10(s)	60(s)	10(s)	60(s)	10(s)	60(s)	10(s)	60(s)	10(s)	60(s)	10(s)	60(s)	
FastEnum		0	0	23	0	0	7	0	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Enum		0	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Maplex		0	0	0	0	0	0	14	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	0	0	0	
Basic BnB		0	0	26	0	0	0	0	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Learn BnB		5	23	26	0	0	5	23	26	0	0	6	11	0	0	0	6	11	0	0	0	

Table 11: The experimental results of collaboration network AstroPh. The value is the maximize k-plex size found by each methods under different value of k , lb and t . Larger values represent better performance.

method	k-plex size																					
	k				2								4									
	lb		5		10		20		30		40		5		10		20		30		40	
	time limit	10(s)	60(s)	10(s)	60(s)	10(s)	60(s)	10(s)	60(s)	10(s)	60(s)	10(s)	60(s)	10(s)	60(s)	10(s)	60(s)	10(s)	60(s)	10(s)	60(s)	
FastEnum		20	20	21	44	56	20	20	21	44	56	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Enum		0	0	0	0	0	20	20	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Maplex		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38	0	
Basic BnB		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Learn BnB		16	22	50	56	53	16	22	48	56	53	39	16	56	41	53	53	16	56	41	53	

- Networks*. Springer, 143–162.
- [21] Tomasz P Pawlak and Krzysztof Krawiec. 2017. Automatic synthesis of constraints from examples using mixed integer linear programming. *European Journal of Operational Research* 261, 3 (2017), 1141–1157.
 - [22] Qingyu Qu, Xijun Li, Yunfan Zhou, Jia Zeng, Mingxuan Yuan, Jie Wang, Jinhu Lv, Kexin Liu, and Kun Mao. 2022. An Improved Reinforcement Learning Algorithm for Learning to Branch. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.06213* (2022).
 - [23] Ryan A. Rossi and Nesreen K. Ahmed. 2015. The Network Data Repository with Interactive Graph Analytics and Visualization. In *AAAI*. <https://networkrepository.com>
 - [24] Elias Arnold Schede, Samuel Kolb, and Stefano Teso. 2019. Learning linear programs from data. In *2019 IEEE 31st International Conference on Tools with Artificial Intelligence (ICTAI)*. IEEE, 1019–1026.
 - [25] Yue Wang, Xun Jian, Zhenhua Yang, and Jia Li. 2017. Query optimal k-plex based community in graphs. *Data Science and Engineering* 2, 4 (2017), 257–273.
 - [26] De-Nian Yang, Chih-Ya Shen, Wang-Chien Lee, and Ming-Syan Chen. 2012. On socio-spatial group query for location-based social networks. In *Proceedings of the 18th ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining*. 949–957.
 - [27] Giulia Zarpellon, Jason Jo, Andrea Lodi, and Yoshua Bengio. 2021. Parameterizing branch-and-bound search trees to learn branching policies. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, Vol. 35. 3931–3939.
 - [28] Hongjie Zhai, Makoto Haraguchi, Yoshiaki Okubo, and Etsuji Tomita. 2016. A fast and complete algorithm for enumerating pseudo-cliques in large graphs. *International Journal of Data Science and Analytics* 2, 3 (2016), 145–158.
 - [29] Yi Zhou, Shan Hu, Mingyu Xiao, and Zhang-Hua Fu. 2021. Improving maximum k-plex solver via second-order reduction and graph color bounding. In *Thirty-Fifth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, AAAI*. 2–9.