

GTX: A Write-Optimized Latch-free Graph Data System with Transactional Support

Libin Zhou, Yeasir Rayhan, Lu Xing, Walid. G. Aref
Purdue University
{zhou822,yrayhan,xing,aref}@purdue.edu

ABSTRACT

This paper introduces GTX, a standalone main-memory write-optimized graph system that specializes in structural and graph property updates while maintaining concurrent reads and graph analytics with snapshot isolation-level transactional concurrency. Recent graph libraries target efficient concurrent read and write support while guaranteeing transactional consistency. However, their performance suffers for updates with strong temporal locality over the same vertexes and edges due to vertex-centric lock contentions. GTX introduces a new delta-chain-centric concurrency-control protocol that eliminates traditional mutually exclusive latches. GTX resolves the conflicts caused by vertex-level locking, and adapts to real-life workloads while maintaining sequential access to the graph’s adjacency lists storage. This combination of features has been demonstrated to provide good performance in graph analytical queries. GTX’s transactions support fast group commit, novel write-write conflict prevention, and lazy garbage collection. Based on extensive experimental and comparative studies, in addition to maintaining competitive concurrent read and analytical performance, GTX demonstrates high throughput over state-of-the-art techniques when handling concurrent transaction+analytics workloads. For write-heavy transactional workloads, GTX performs up to 11x better than the best-performing state-of-the-art systems in transaction throughput. At the same time, GTX does not sacrifice the performance of read-heavy analytical workloads, and has competitive performance similar to state-of-the-art systems.

PVLDB Reference Format:

Libin Zhou, Yeasir Rayhan, Lu Xing, Walid. G. Aref. GTX: A Write-Optimized Latch-free Graph Data System with Transactional Support. PVLDB, 18(1): XXX-XXX, 2025. doi:XX.XX/XXX.XX

PVLDB Artifact Availability:

The source code, data, and/or other artifacts have been made available at <https://github.com/Jiboxiake/GTX>.

1 INTRODUCTION

Managing and querying dynamic graph datasets have become increasingly important in many real-world applications, e.g., in recommendation systems, fraud detection, threat detection, geo-spatial

navigation, e-commerce, knowledge graph applications, and risk management [8–10, 37, 43, 51, 57, 58, 67]. Graphs continuously change [12, 36], where graph write operations can reach millions per second, e.g., as in social networks [1, 4, 18, 51, 56, 59]. Moreover, applications require transactional atomicity when updating multiple vertices and edges [51]. For instance, in ByteDance services [7], when a user creates an article, a transaction atomically inserts the 3 edges (user, article), (user, tag), (article, tag). Without transactional support, updates can lead to data corruption [23]. For example, they can violate the reciprocal consistency that requires atomically updating two edges between a pair of vertices [23, 66].

At the same time, dynamic graphs need to support graph analytics, e.g., [24, 26, 35, 51, 73]. ByteDance [7] detects fraud and manages risk via subgraph pattern matching operations that may traverse multiple hops while the graph is being updated concurrently [51]. Without transactional atomicity, consistency, and isolation, graph analytical algorithms, originally designed for static graphs, cannot be run [35], and may yield incorrect results [23, 26], and security vulnerabilities [23, 65]. In fraud detection, a customer may be flagged wrongly. In computer networks, a suspicious authentication may pass security checks without being noticed [26]. Also, an access control system needs to update access permissions of roles and entities atomically [23, 65]. Without transactional guarantees, users may obtain incorrect permissions, and malicious users can exploit race conditions to trigger vulnerabilities. Although applications can build concurrency control protocols to achieve transactional isolation, these solutions are inefficient and complicated [23]. Graph systems, e.g., [29, 45, 53] cannot run graph analytics concurrently with updates [35]. Several recent graph data systems, e.g., [26, 35, 73] support mixed transactions and analytics workloads.

Experiments [35] show that performance of state-of-the-art transactional graph systems [26, 35, 73] suffers significantly given write-heavy workloads when following real-world update patterns. Many real-world scenarios exhibit power-law graphs with vertex degrees following power-law distribution [21, 22, 30, 63, 73], and super-vertices (hub vertices) [35, 51]) having large fanout. Also, real-world graph workloads have hotspots and their edge updates have temporal locality [46]. These update patterns cause not only updates to the same vertex’s adjacency list to be temporally close to each other, but also create congestion of large amounts of concurrent updates at the same vertexes (i.e., hub vertices becoming hotspots [51]). Vertex-centric locking, and the lack of lock-free synchronization are believed to cause significant degradation in performance, especially in terms of transaction throughput [35].

Efforts have been dedicated into developing lock/latch-free data structures and indices, e.g., [13, 14, 47, 49, 50, 52, 64, 72] that allow for high concurrency. They rely on atomic hardware primitives, e.g., *fetch_add* and *compare_and_swap* (CAS) to serialize updates,

This work is licensed under the Creative Commons BY-NC-ND 4.0 International License. Visit <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/> to view a copy of this license. For any use beyond those covered by this license, obtain permission by emailing info@vldb.org. Copyright is held by the owner/author(s). Publication rights licensed to the VLDB Endowment.
Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment, Vol. 18, No. 1 ISSN 2150-8097.
doi:XX.XX/XXX.XX

but, by themselves, these primitives do not support the notion of transactions, but serve as building blocks to achieve that [49].

This paper studies how atomic primitives and multiversion concurrency control (*MVCC*) [71] can be applied to realize a transactional graph data system. We introduce GTX, a latch-free write-optimized main-memory transactional graph system to support highly concurrent update transactions and graph analytics.

Latch-free indexes, e.g., Bw-Tree [49], assume that a separate transaction layer handles the transactional concurrency control. Thus, Bw-Tree does not prevent write-write conflicts or provide transaction atomicity and consistency. Extending a latch-free index to be a standalone system requires designing an efficient transaction protocol. One could extend Bw-Tree as a key-value store with locks. However, locks may incur longer blocking, and would reduce the advantage of using non-blocking atomic operations. Having a lock per object induces high memory overhead. Alternatively, one can abort a transaction when it fails to execute a *CAS* (hence, a conflict). However, this would abort all transactions that write concurrently to the same memory blocks (although not necessarily updating the same object), and hence reducing concurrency and scalability.

To address these challenges, GTX has a cache-friendly latch-free *MVCC* dynamic graph storage. It is the first to combine pointer-based and sequential delta-chain storage for efficient edge lookup and adjacency list scans. It uses vector-based delta-chains indexes to locate target edges efficiently. GTX’s block allocation protocol is optimized for power-law edge distributions and hub vertices that are prominent in real-world graphs [35, 73]. Also, GTX offers an efficient transaction protocol that is well-suited for the underlying latch-free data structure and dynamic graph workload. GTX eliminates vertex- and edge-centric locks, and has an adaptive write-write conflict prevention protocol. GTX adapts to the temporal locality and hotspots of edge updates by increasing concurrency for “hot” adjacency lists with higher memory cost, and reducing concurrency for the “cold” blocks. To exploit the high concurrency provided by latch-free *MVCC* and adaptive concurrency control, GTX has a low-latency hybrid group commit protocol and a cache-friendly latch-free *MVCC* garbage collection protocol. GTX is also efficient in computing resources with a cooperative worker thread design. Except for a single commit manager thread, GTX has no other service threads. GTX worker threads perform garbage collection, failed transaction aborts, and commit other transactions’ updates while executing the thread’s own transactions.

Experiments demonstrate that GTX achieves up to 2x higher transaction throughput in random order power-law graph edge insertions, and up to 11x higher transaction throughput in real-world timestamp-ordered power-law graph edge insertions than the best competitor. For concurrent transaction and graph analytics workloads, GTX has up to 4.3x higher throughput in edge update transactions for write-heavy workloads, and 2.8x higher throughput for read-write balanced workloads than competitor systems. The trade-off is that GTX takes between 0.8x to 1.8x longer time to execute most of the concurrent graph analytics, but still performs reasonably well for the majority of the workloads.

The contributions of this paper are as follows. We introduce GTX, a write-optimized transactional graph system with up to 11x better write transaction throughput over its best competitor system. GTX has a latch-free graph storage that leverages existing techniques

of latch-free indexes, and is optimized for adjacency list storage of dynamic graphs. GTX combines pointer-based delta-chains storage and sequential storage to provide both efficient single edge lookup and adjacency list scans. GTX has a high-throughput transaction protocol suited for latch-free storage. For power-law graphs without temporal localities and hotspot, GTX transactions achieve up to 2.27 higher read-write transaction throughput than its competitors. GTX has a delta chains-based adaptive *MVCC*, hybrid commit protocol, and decentralized epoch-based garbage collector. GTX eliminates the need for vertex- or edge-centric locking commonly used in graph systems. GTX dynamically adapts to real-world update patterns, temporal localities, and hotspots, where GTX achieves up to 11x better read-write transaction throughput for these workloads. For mixed-workloads of read-write transactions and graph analytics, GTX achieves up to 4.3x higher read-write transactional throughput than the second best competitor while maintaining competitive graph analytics latency.

The rest of this paper proceeds as follows. Section 2 discusses related work for dynamic and transactional graph data systems. Section 3 introduces GTX and its components. Section 4 presents GTX’s storage layer including the delta chains architectures for handling vertex and edge updates. Section 5 presents GTX’s transaction protocol. Section 6 discusses GTX’s resource management and garbage collection. Section 7 presents an extensive experimental study. Finally, Section 8 concludes the paper.

2 RELATED WORK

Many graph data systems have been introduced over the years for graph data management and analytics, e.g., [2, 3, 6, 16, 17, 19, 20, 24, 27–29, 31–34, 38, 42, 45, 48, 51, 53, 54, 60–62, 68–70]. Standalone transactional graph systems execute read-write transactions and analytics on a dynamic graph concurrently, e.g., [26, 35, 73].

LiveGraph [73], a main-memory graph data system, supports graph analytics and read-write transactions. LiveGraph’s efficient analytics is due to the purely sequential adjacency list scan. It uses *MVCC* to store edge versions of the same source vertex consecutively in the same memory block. Read-write transactions acquire exclusive locks on vertexes to append a new update log to update an edge. Readers do not need locks, and directly scan the memory block utilizing transaction timestamps to read the visible edge versions. LiveGraph’s sequential storage of adjacency lists reduces random memory access, facilitates prefetching, and improves cache performance by eliminating cache misses from pointer chasing [26, 35, 73]. LiveGraph’s linear multi-versioned storage lacks indexes within each edge block, and scans the adjacency list for single edge lookups and updates (that need to “invalidate” old edge versions). Also, LiveGraph’s vertex-centric locks block concurrent transactions from writing to the same vertex’s adjacency list even if they may be updating different edges.

Teseo [26] stores dynamic large sparse arrays that represent a graph inside leaf nodes of a “fat” B⁺-tree to provide both efficient updates and adjacency list reads. Teseo has a clustered sparse index on keys of each sparse array segment to support fast point lookup of vertices and edges, and secondary indexes on vertex locations in the segments to initiate adjacency list scans. Teseo uses a hybrid latch that combines conventional and optimistic latches to support single-writer and multi-reader semantics, and reduces concurrency

control overhead in read-intensive workloads. Each read-only or read-write transaction can acquire a latch either conventionally or optimistically according to the desired operation and transaction type. However, when a segment inside a sparse array becomes full, Teseo requires a service thread to determine a rebalance window of multiple segments in the sparse array, lock them, and redistribute entries among these segments. Also, a sparse array resize either creates a new sparse array as the leaf or splits the leaf into two new sparse arrays. These operations require locking multiple memory blocks exclusively. Thus, transactions that do not conflict with normal operations may conflict in locking neighbor segments that may cause threads to block and stall. Also, multiple threads may compete in locking segments for rebalancing. GTX handles this issue by designating one worker thread to conduct garbage collection on each adjacency list via GTX’s state-based block protection protocol.

Sortledton [35] is a graph data structure that is optimized for the access patterns popular in graph analytics. It stores sorted adjacency lists in large memory blocks for better read performance at the expense of maintaining the sort during updates. Sortledton uses a concurrent unrolled skiplist [55] to store blocks of edges (versions) in sorted sets, where each skiplist element is an edge block. Sortledton supports fast scan and set operations on adjacency lists while concurrently updating edges. It uses a read-write latch per vertex, and restricts that transactions need to know their write sets and acquire all latches in advance. Its transactions reads have to be completed before starting any writes.

In contrast, GTX has an adaptive concurrency control protocol with evolving “locking” granularity based on the workload. Latch-free systems and structures, e.g., [14, 47, 49, 50, 52, 64, 72] focus mostly on atomic operations, e.g., atomic load, *CAS*, and *fetch_add* to serialize concurrent operations. GTX shares similar ideas with the Bw-Tree [49, 64]. GTX uses atomic operations to resolve conflicts, and delta-based multi-versioning to provide lock-free reads. GTX allocates consecutive memory blocks for adjacency lists. It amortizes the cost of single delta allocations, and ensures that deltas are stored sequentially to reduce random access.

3 OVERVIEW OF GTX

GTX addresses the problem of managing and querying dynamic labeled property graphs [40], where edges can contain labels, e.g., as in [73]. Graph operations and analytics are executed under read-write or read-only transactions with snapshot isolation [15, 71]. Transactions support vertex create and update, edge insert, delete and update, single vertex read, single edge read, and adjacency list scan. Graph analytics invoke adjacency list scans iteratively with a read-only transaction. GTX supports graphs with uniform and power-law edge distribution but is optimized for power-law graphs. GTX can run read-write transactions and analytics concurrently.

Fuchs et al. [35] have a microbenchmark to evaluate the most important access patterns in graph workloads. There are major take-aways from their experiments. (1) Storing neighbors of all vertices together (sequential vertex access) is beneficial but not necessary. (2) Sequential vertex access only makes up a small fraction of graph memory access. (3) Sequential access to a vertex’s adjacency list enables better performance. (4) A dense vertex identifier domain has better performance for graph analytics than a sparse domain.

(5) Some graph algorithms access vertices in random order. Thus, an index to locate the vertex entry is important.


Based on these findings, we make several design decisions. GTX uses an adjacency list-like structure and stores edges (versions) of a vertex sequentially in memory blocks. GTX uses a vertex index for fast access, and an atomic integer on a dense domain to manage vertices. For atomicity and consistency, graph updates and analytics workloads are executed as read-write or read-only transactions.

GTX’s graph storage has a vertex index. Each index entry has 2 pointers that point to the head of a *vertex delta chain*, and the first *edge label block* of this vertex, respectively. *Edge label block* stores pointers to *edge-deltas blocks* of different labels. *Vertex delta chain* is a linked list of vertex versions while an *edge-deltas block* stores all edge-deltas (versions) of the edges of the same source vertex with the same label. Figures 1a and 1b give GTX’s graph structure, a 2-level vertex index-based graph storage, and 1 vertex entry from the 2nd level vector with this vertex’s version and edge storage. This design is inspired by LiveGraph [73]. GTX manages the following tables that aid its transaction manager and garbage collector: The group commit array, the block access table, the timestamp table, and the distributed transaction table. These global tables allocate one entry per worker thread. Each worker thread has its own local garbage queue and all worker threads share a hybrid block manager.

4 GTX STORAGE

4.1 Vertex-centric Index

GTX uses a dense vertex domain and provides an efficient vertex index. Figure 1b illustrates GTX’s vertex-centric storage. Having a vector-based vertex table is beneficial in graph storage [35]. GTX has a latch-free two-level vector-based vertex index (Figures 1a 1 and 2). The 1st level stores pointers to the 2nd level in a fixed-size array. The 2nd level has vertex index vectors that are of the same size (but can be extended to be of growing sizes). A transaction atomically *fetch_adds* a global offset variable, and uses the return value as the ID of a new vertex, say v . The corresponding 2nd level entry of the vertex index points to v and its adjacency list versions. The initial vertex index has only 1 pointer in its 1st level and allocates 1 vector. When the vector runs out of entries, the transaction that creates the first vertex that should reside in the next vector allocates the next 2nd level vector, and claims the first entry of this vector. Other concurrent transactions that create vertices that need to be in the next vector will wait until the corresponding pointer in the 1st level becomes non-null. This allocation strategy amortizes the cost of allocating new vectors, and has $O(1)$ vertex lookup. Sortledton [35] has a similar strategy. To accommodate large numbers of vertices, we manage the reference to the 1st level array by an atomic pointer. When the 1st level array and all 2nd level vectors are full, the transactions that need to create new vertices will allocate a 2X larger 1st level array, copy all pointers to the new array, and allocates a new vector there. Then, it uses *CAS* to update the pointer to reference the new array. Failed *CAS* indicates that another transaction has allocated a new array, and thus other transactions should only reload the pointer. For simplicity we assume that the 1st level array is large and accommodates the 2nd level vectors of all vertices. Each vertex index entry stores an atomic pointer to the head of the vertex delta chain. Each vertex version is stored in a delta that points to the previous version, forming a delta chain. A



(a) GTX Highlevel Overview

(b) Vertex-centric Storage

Figure 1: GTX Storage (a) An overview of system structure. 1. 1st level array vertex index. 2. 2nd level vector vertex index (entry). 3. Vertex delta chain. 4. Edge label block. 5. Edge-deltas block. (b) Representation of (a)2-5 for one vertex, its versions (3) and its labeled adjacency list (4,5)




Figure 2: Edge-Deltas Block Layout

transaction uses *CAS* to install a new vertex version. While using a pointer-based delta chain is less efficient due to pointer chasing, random memory access and competing *CAS* [64], vertex updates are less frequent than edge updates [73]. Also, most transactions need access to only the latest version of a vertex, and will access it with a single pointer chase. Concurrent updates to the same vertex are less common. Thus, the negative effects of this design are minimal. In contrast, vertex delta chains is beneficial. Detecting write-write conflicts to the same vertex is simple. A failed *CAS* indicates a concurrent transaction has updated the vertex delta chain. Hence, the current transaction aborts.

4.2 Edge Label Block

The 2nd pointer in each vertex index entry points to an edge label block to guide search in the edge-deltas block of a certain label. More fields in the label block and label entries are added to support latch-free operations, delta-chains index and edge-deltas block state protection. Due to space limitation, we omit details of how to handle latch-free label blocks. Each edge-deltas block has a delta-chains index, a version number, and a state variable (Detailed in Section 5). For simplicity, we assume the graph only contains 1 label.

4.3 Edge-Deltas Block

Figure 2 illustrates an edge-deltas block and its delta-chains index. GTX’s edge-deltas block has 4 sections. At the lowest address, the header contains the block’s metadata. Then, a property data storage section stores each edge-delta’s variable-sized property data that grows after the header from lower to upper address. Fixed-size edge-deltas grow from the opposite end of the block. Edge-deltas are

logically linked in different edge-delta chains (Figure 2). Each block has a delta-chains index whose i^{th} entry stores the offset of the i^{th} edge-delta chain’s head. The middle section is free space. The *combined_offset* combines the addresses of the latest edge-deltas and property data in a 64-bit integer. Since 64-bit is the largest word that can be atomically updated by the hardware without a latch, the *combined_offset* enables atomically allocating memory for both the edge-delta and its property in a single operation. Its higher 32 bits store the offset of the property data region and the lower 32 bits store the offset of the edge-deltas region. Each edge-delta takes 1 cache line (64 bytes) to avoid false sharing among concurrent writers. It captures the operation the edge-delta stands for, and the creation and invalidation timestamps for multi-versioning. An edge-delta’s *previous_offset* is the key of the clustered edge-delta chains storage, and points to the previous edge-delta on the delta chain. At an edge-deltas block’s creation time, GTX determines its edge-delta chain number, where transactions append edge-deltas to different delta chains using a hash function. Each edge-delta also stores the offset of the same edge’s previous edge-delta to support efficient previous version lookup. Given a target edge e , a reader transaction locates e ’s edge-delta chain, and uses edge-deltas’ *previous_offset* and *previous_version* offset to locate e ’s visible version. Finally, GTX uses a *hybrid* storage scheme of each edge-delta’s variable-sized property, where if the property size is small, e.g., ≤ 16 bytes, it is stored in the cache line-aligned edge-delta to save space and reduce random memory access, else it is stored at the data region.

thread ID: 5	counter: 18		
transaction ID	status	op_count	padding
5<<56 + 15	2031	2	
5<<56 + 16	ABORT	0	
5<<56 + 17	IN_PROGRESS	3	

Figure 3: Transaction Table Partition of Thread 5

5 EPOCH-BASED TRANSACTION HANDLING

GTX has a fixed number of worker threads that execute transactions and perform garbage collection. Each thread executes its own transactions while being cooperative, i.e., performing work on behalf of other transactions. For analytical workloads, GTX supports using additional OpenMP [5] threads that collectively execute a single read-only transaction managed by an internal worker thread.

GTX supports *Snapshot Isolation* [15, 71] based on *MVCC* [71], and we find this sufficient for most graph workloads. GTX manages 2 global variables for transactions, a global read and a global write epochs. LiveGraph also manages those variables for *MVCC* [73]. To commit transactions, GTX uses a hybrid group commit [39] protocol. At creation, a transaction t fetches the global read epoch, and uses its value as t 's local read timestamp. t does not know its write timestamp: the time t 's updates logically get committed atomically until t commits via the group commit manager.

We use the following 3 latch-free fix-sized arrays for GTX's transactions to store objects that can be updated atomically.

1. The Distributed Transaction Table. In GTX, each worker thread executes transactions, and manages a horizontal partition of the transaction table. The worker thread maintains 2 attributes for every transaction, say t that it manages: *status* and *op_count*. *status* records t 's current state: *In_Progress*, *Abort* that are pre-defined 64-bit integers or a positive integer that represents a commit timestamp. *op_count* records the number of deltas created by t . Figure 3 illustrates the transaction table partition for Worker Thread 5. Thread 5 has created 17 transactions and the table contains its 15-17th transactions' information. Before a worker thread w executes a read-write transaction, w generates a 64-bit unsigned transaction ID from w 's local counter and w 's thread ID. w inserts t in the table at an entry determined by the ID with *In_Progress* status and 0 *op_count*. If t aborts, its *status* is set to *Abort*. If t commits, its *status* is set by the commit manager to the commit timestamp. Thus, any integer value other than the pre-defined *In_Progress* and *Abort* values reflects t 's commit timestamp. *op_count* captures how many writes (deltas) t has made and gets incremented as t creates deltas. When w commits or aborts a delta, it will decrement the *op_count* by 1. Thus, *op_count* records how many *In_Progress* deltas t has. More detail about *op_count* is explained in Sections 5.6, 5.7. Given GTX's transaction ID structure, a thread can find out the corresponding transaction table and transaction's status in constant time. Each transaction table partition functions as a circular array, and an entry can be reused if its *op_count* is 0.

2. Block Access and 3. Timestamp Tables. These tables capture information each thread wants the other concurrent threads to observe. Each thread is assigned an entry in both tables. When starting a new transaction, say t , a thread fetches the global read epoch, and stores it in t 's timestamp table entry. t can read all the latest versions of the vertices and edges that are created before and invalidated after t 's read timestamp. The timestamp table ensures no thread can garbage collect edge or vertex blocks that current transactions can read. When t accesses an edge-deltas block, t calculates a block ID from the source vertex and label, and stores the block ID into t 's entry in the block access table. This way, concurrent threads can learn that t is accessing that block, and hence the operations that require mutual exclusion on the block cannot be executed at this time. This design avoids writing to the shared memory object, and reduces cache invalidation across cores that using shared/exclusive locks would incur.

5.1 Block Protection Protocol

GTX supports mutual exclusion on edge-deltas blocks. Inspired by [52], GTX has a block version protection protocol that does not use shared locks, and enables customized concurrency levels of the

edge-deltas block. Each block has a state variable, and each worker thread registers block access in the block access table. The Block Protection protocol has 2 operations: *register_access* and *change_state*. When a transaction t accesses an edge-deltas block b , t calls *register_access(b)* to examine b 's state. If t 's operation is compatible with b 's state, t stores b 's ID in t 's entry in the block access table. Then, t rechecks b 's state. If it has not changed, t executes the operation. If b 's state is incompatible with t 's operation, t unregisters its block access to b by storing 0 in the table, and retries later. After finishing the operation, t unregisters t 's block access. A worker thread needing to change a block's state immediately changes the state to the new value. If the new state does not require mutual exclusion, the thread proceeds. Else, the thread scans the block access table. If it finds no other thread accessing the block, it executes the operations in the new state. Else, it continues scanning the block access table until b is "safe". The correctness of this protocol is guaranteed by checking the state twice when a thread registers the access. We define 4 states in GTX, namely, **normal**, **overflow**, **consolidation**, and **installation** to manage edge-deltas block concurrency. Most of the time, edge-deltas blocks are in State **normal** that allows almost unlimited concurrent reads and writes. The other 3 states are for consolidating edge-deltas block (Section 5.9).




Figure 4: Vertex Delta Chain

5.2 Transaction Vertex Operations

GTX supports vertex read, insert, and update. GTX manages a delta chain for every vertex using atomic operations. Figure 4 overviews the vertex delta chain structure. When a transaction t creates or updates a vertex v , t reads the pointer stored at v 's index entry that points to the head of v 's delta chain. If the pointer is null or is pointing to a committed vertex delta whose creation timestamp is $\leq t$'s read timestamp, t detects no write-write conflict so far, allocates a memory block, say b , as a delta, and fills the metadata and v 's properties into b . t stores its TID as the creation timestamp of b and the original delta chain head pointer as b 's *previous_version* pointer. Finally, t performs *CAS* to update the pointer in the vertex index to install the new delta chain head. If the current delta chain head has larger creation timestamp at the initial read or if the *CAS* fails, t aborts immediately due to the presence of a write-write conflict. Vertex deletions are rare [73]. We leave it for future work. To read a vertex v , t uses the pointer in the vertex index to locate the delta chain head. t compares t 's read timestamp with each delta's creation timestamp until it finds the first delta whose creation timestamp is smaller than or equal to t 's read timestamp.

5.3 Transaction Edge Updates

Transactions update edges by appending new edge-deltas in the edge-delta chains within the corresponding edge-deltas blocks. GTX supports edge inserts, deletes, and property updates, and manages

concurrency control at the **delta chain level**. It guarantees only one concurrent transaction can update a specific delta chain at a time. To update an edge $e(u, v)$, a transaction t , locates u 's edge-deltas block and registers the access. Assuming the state is compatible, t identifies the delta chain that e 's edge-delta belongs to. Then, t needs to lock the delta chain. t fetches the corresponding delta chain's index value (offset), and checks whether the offset's most significant bit is 1. The most significant bit of each entry in the delta-chains index serves as a locking bit for the delta chain. If the bit is 0, t checks the current delta chain head according to the offset. If no such head edge-delta exists or its creation timestamp is less than or equal to t 's read timestamp, t determines no concurrent writes have taken place. t invokes *CAS* to update the index entry to set the locking bit. If the *CAS* succeeds, t has locked this delta-chain. If any previous checks or *CAS* fail, t detects a write-write conflict and aborts. Otherwise, t checks if e already exists before appending an edge-delta. t uses the delta-chains index to lookup if an edge-delta already exists for e , and returns the edge-delta's offset. If no offset is found, an update operation for e is considered an insert, and a delete operation can end immediately. Otherwise, t caches this offset, and stores t 's TID as the invalidation timestamp of this *previous_version* delta. Next, t calculates the memory size needed for the edge-delta and data storage using the hybrid storage model (Section 4.3), and allocates space in the block by updating the *combined_offset*. Then, t installs the edge-delta by writing e 's destination vertex ID, the delta type, variable-sized property information, previous (version) offsets, and t 's TID as the creation timestamp in e 's edge-delta and writing e 's property in the corresponding address. An insert (resp. update, delete) edge-delta is created for edge insert (resp. property update, delete). Finally, t records the block ID, the block version number, and the edge and delta-chain t have updated.

5.4 Adjacency List Scan

GTX supports sequential adjacency list scan on a consistent snapshot based on Transaction t 's read timestamp. After locating the edge-deltas block, say b , and registering the access, t uses b 's creation time to determine the block version to read. If b 's creation time is greater than t 's read timestamp, t will use b 's previous pointer to find the visible block version. Block versioning and creation time are further studied in Section 5.9. After locating the visible version, t loads the *combined_offset* to locate the latest edge-delta. t scans from there until exhausting all edge-deltas in the current block. t reads all deltas whose creation timestamp is less than or equal to t 's read timestamp and is not invalidated or is invalidated in the future. t also reads all deltas created by but not invalidated by itself. When reading an edge property, t loads the property either in place or using the edge-delta's *data_offset* and *data_size* fields.

5.5 Transaction Edge Lookup

The delta-chains index supports fetching a single edge. When Transaction t needs Edge $e(u, v)$, t calculates/finds e 's edge-delta chain. Then, t searches the delta-chains index to get the edge-delta chain head that e belongs to. t examines the head edge-delta, and uses each edge-delta's *previous_offset* to locate the previous deltas in the edge-delta chain instead of performing a scan. t searches until it finds a visible edge-delta for e , or until the current delta chain is exhausted. If t finds e 's insert or update edge-delta, t returns e 's

corresponding version. If a delete edge-delta or no edge-delta is found, t reports that e does not exist.

5.6 Lazy Update

GTX uses *Lazy Update* to reduce latency of transaction commits, and enforce Snapshot Isolation [15, 71]. A transaction t may access an edge-deltas block but encounters another transaction, say q , with private *In_Progress* edge-deltas. As the next section shows, GTX's group-commit manager commits transactions by updating their status in the transaction table to a commit timestamp without updating the transactions' deltas. Using the transaction table, t checks on q 's status, and updates the delta's creation timestamp (and previous version's invalidation timestamp) to q 's commit timestamp if q has committed. Then, t subtracts 1 from q 's *op_count* entry.

5.7 Hybrid Transaction Commit and Abort

GTX has a hybrid group-commit protocol combining *Lazy Updates* and group commits to support fast transaction commit while maintaining Snapshot Isolation consistency [15, 71]. It manages a global commit array. A committing transaction t makes its edge-deltas the heads of their delta chains, and unlocks those edge-delta chains by updating the associated delta-chains index entries. Thus, future transactions can lookup t 's edge-deltas using the delta-chains index. Then, t writes its transaction table entry in its worker thread's commit array entry. The commit manager *fetch_adds* 1 to the global write epoch, uses the return value as the group commit timestamp, and scans the commit array. For each filled entry, the commit manager writes the group commit timestamp as the status of t 's transaction table entry, and nullifies this commit array entry. t has committed at this timestamp. After the commit manager scans the whole table, it increases the global read epoch by 1, atomically committing all transaction updates in this commit group. t eagerly updates and commits its deltas' timestamps while concurrent transactions can lazily update these deltas, making up the hybrid commit protocol. Correctness-wise, transactions starting after the commit manager increases the global read epoch see deltas of the just-committed transactions. Performance-wise, it allows a new read-write transaction to logically commit without updating all its deltas, and the new read global epoch to start immediately. This allows the commit manager to start a new commit group of transactions without waiting for the previous group to commit all its deltas. This decreases the amount of synchronization between the commit manager and the commit group, and reduces latency. Also, concurrent transactions cooperate (*Lazy Update*) to reduce the workload of heavy-write transactions.

Transaction Abort: When a read-write transaction t aborts, t iterates through its modified edge-deltas blocks, registers access, and eagerly aborts all of t 's deltas by writing *Abort* to their creation timestamp and unsets any "locking" bits the delta chains have.

5.8 Transaction Examples

Let ts , ts_c , ts_r , ts_{cr} , and ts_i be *timestamp*, *commit_timestamp*, *read_timestamp*, *creation_timestamp*, and *invalidation_timestamp*, respectively. Figure 5 illustrates how Transactions T_1 - T_3 insert, delete, and update edges. To illustrate, assume that transactions execute sequentially. The edge-deltas block for Vertex 1 stores Edges (1, 4), (1, 3), and (1, 5) using 3 edge-deltas and 2 delta-chains.




Figure 5: Transaction Examples

Example 1: T_1 inserts Edge (1, 10) with 32-byte property data. T_1 calculates Edge (1, 10)’s Delta-chain 0 as $10 \bmod 2 = 0$, where 2 is the number of delta-chains, locks the delta-chain, and uses the delta-chains index entry’s Offset 64 to locate the edge-delta chain, and to search for a previous version (if exists). Then, it allocates space in both the delta region and the data region by atomically updating *combined_offset*. It writes the insert edge-delta and its property into the allocated region. The new edge-delta has *previous_offset=64* and *previous_version=0* as it points to the previous edge-delta on the delta-chain, and Edge (1, 10) has no previous version. The delta-chains index stores the new edge-delta, and the commit manager commits T_1 at $ts_c = 10$. The edge-delta’s ts_{cr} is updated to 10. Then, T_2 deletes Edge (1, 4). T_2 locks the delta chain, finds the previous version of (1, 4) at Offset 64 using the delta-chains index, and allocates the space for its edge-delta by updating *combined_offset*. T_2 does not allocate space in the data region due to the delete. Instead, it creates a delete edge-delta, and stores Offset 64 as the new delta’s previous version. T_2 commits by updating the delta-chains index and registering with the commit manager to commit at $ts_c = 12$. The new edge-delta’s ts_{cr} and the previous version edge-delta’s ts_i are both updated to 12. Finally, T_3 updates Edge (1, 5) with a new 8 bytes property. The previous version is recorded as in deletion, but the new version’s property takes 8 bytes. T_3 directly stores this property within the edge-delta. T_3 creates an update edge-delta for (1, 5) and commits. The delta-chains index, the new edge-delta’s ts_{cr} , and the previous version’s ts_i get updated similarly.

Example 2: Figure 5 illustrates how transactions read edges, and scan adjacency lists. T_4 with $ts_r = 20$ tries to read Edge (1, 3). T_4 calculates that Edge (1, 3) is in Delta-chain 1, and reads the index entry with Offset 384. T_4 starts the search at Delta (1, 5) created at Time 14, and uses each edge-delta’s *previous_offset* to get the previous edge-delta in the delta-chain. T_4 locates Edge-delta (1, 3) of $ts_{cr} = 5$ at Offset 128. Since T_4 ’s $ts_r > 5$, it reads the edge-delta, and returns the edge’s property data. T_5 with $ts_r = 7$ tries to read Edge (1, 5). It uses the delta-chains index to locate the head of the delta-chain, and finds Edge-delta (1, 5) with $ts_{cr} = 14$. Although T_5 wants to read Edge (1, 5), its ts_r is smaller than the current edge-delta’s $ts_{cr} = 14$. Thus, T_5 uses this edge-delta’s *previous_version_offset* to locate the previous version of Edge (1, 5), and finds the visible version of Edge (1, 5) with $ts_{cr} = 6$ and $ts_i = 14$. T_5 reads Weight 32.6 instead of 40.1. T_6 and T_7 with $ts_r = 14$ and $ts_r = 7$, respectively,

try to read Edge (1, 4). T_6 and T_7 use the delta-chains index to locate the first edge-delta at Offset 320, and finds a delete edge-delta for (1, 4) with $ts_{cr} = 12$. T_7 determines that this edge-delta represents a future version of Edge (1, 4), and continues the search via *previous_version_offset* to find the insert edge-delta for (1, 4) with $ts_{cr} = 5$ and $ts_i = 12$ that is visible to T_7 . It reads this edge-delta’s associated data. T_6 sees the delete edge-delta for Edge (1, 4), determines it has been deleted, and returns. Finally, T_8 with $ts_r = 15$ scans the adjacency list. It determines the start offset 384 of the scan using *combined_offset*. T_8 scans all edge-deltas until end of block, and compares its ts_r with ts_{cr} and ts_i of each edge-delta. It reads Edges (1, 5) with $ts_{cr} = 14$, (1, 10), and (1, 3).

5.9 Consolidation of an Edge-Deltas Block

An edge-deltas block may overflow due to many edge-delta allocations. Consolidation refers to (1) Recycling the memory used by invalidated edge-deltas in an overflowing block, and (2) Allocating a new block according to workload history. To support better concurrency during consolidation, GTX uses the block protection protocol in Section 5.1. Each edge-deltas block is associated with a state variable that can be atomically read and updated. A **normal** state constitutes the majority of the lifetime of each delta block, where in this state, transactions’ reads and writes can proceed normally.

An edge-deltas block, say b , enters the **overflow** state when a transaction requests to allocate more memory than what b has. Due to the atomic *fetch_add*, only one transaction t causes b to **overflow**. t becomes the consolidation worker, and changes b ’s state to **overflow**, and waits till all current threads exit b . State **Overflow** prevents other threads from accessing b . t restores b ’s *combined_offset* to the value before the overflow. Then, t changes b ’s state to **consolidation**. State **Consolidation** allows concurrent readers to access b while t is identifying the latest versions of b ’s edges. t scans b , performs Lazy Updates, records the last committed delta for each edge, and records all *In_Progress* edge-deltas and their transactions. t allocates a new block b' according to the total size of latest committed and *In_Progress* edge-deltas in b . b' stores a previous pointer to b , has creation time equal to the largest edge-delta invalidation time in b , and creates a new delta-chains index with an updated size. Then, t inserts the latest versions of all un-deleted edge-deltas into b' , and updates the new delta-chains index accordingly. After the installation of the latest edge-deltas, t changes b' ’s state to **installation** to synchronize the

In_Progress edge-deltas. A block b 's **installation** state synchronizes *In_Progress* transactions that have deltas in b , and ensures the correctness of the transaction protocol. t checks those *In_Progress* transactions. Committing transactions need to update delta-chains indexes (Section 5.7), and consolidation may create a delta-chains index of a different size. To avoid creating inconsistency across edge-deltas chains, State **installation** stops transactions from updating the edge-delta chains. t can only proceed after all transactions that update b 's delta-chains index have committed or aborted. t uses the *In_Progress* edge-deltas observed during the analysis to determine which edge-delta chains may be updated, and checks these delta-chain heads until all their transactions terminate. t copies the newly committed edge-deltas to b' , and updates the delta chains and the index entries. b' may have a different delta-chains layout. Thus, a committed delta may be added into a different delta-chain than the corresponding one that it was assigned to in b . For the *In_Progress* edge-deltas, the consolidation worker copies them to b' without updating the delta-chains index. No "lock" bit is set for the new block's index. After all these deltas are installed in b' , t updates the block pointer and the delta-chains index, increases the block version by 1, and changes to the state **normal** in the block label entry. t marks b safe for garbage collection at b' 's create timestamp.

Example 3: Figure 6 gives an example block consolidation. Assume that Vertex 1's edge-deltas block of size 512 bytes is full with a 64-bytes header, 6 edge-deltas, and 64 bytes of property data. It has $combined_offset = (64 \ll 32 + 384)$. Two concurrent transactions T_1 and T_2 are updating edges. Later, T_1 will commit and T_2 will abort. Another transaction t wants to delete an edge by creating a delete edge-delta with no associated data. It invokes the delta allocation protocol and updates the combined offset as $(64 \ll 32 + 448)$. Since $448 + 64 = 512$ is greater than the total available space, a consolidation is triggered (Block Overflow). t becomes the consolidation worker and changes the block state to **overflow**. It restores $combined_offset$ to the non-overflow value $(64 \ll 32 + 384)$ (Block State Restoration). Next, t changes the state to **consolidation**, and scans the edge-deltas block to find all latest committed versions of edges, i.e., Edges (1, 3), (1, 5), and (1, 4) with $ts_{cr} = 5$, $ts_{cr} = 6$, and $ts_{cr} = 10$, respectively, and records T_1 and T_2 as *In_Progress*. t allocates a new edge-deltas block and a new delta-chains index according to edge-delta sizes, and copies the latest version edge-deltas there (Block Consolidation). t changes the state to **installation** and checks *In_Progress* transactions. t finds that T_1 has committed at $ts_{cr} = 18$ and T_2 has aborted. t copies the newest version of (1, 5) to the new block, and updates the delta-chains index entry (Block Installation). Finally, t updates the block pointer and delta-chains index to point to the new block and index, and changes the state back to **normal** (New Block Version). By now, t has finished the consolidation, and continues executing its transaction's work.

5.10 State-aware Transaction Operations

Transaction operations need to be modified to accommodate block versioning. The number of edge-delta chains of a block may change after consolidation. Thus, we need to revise the delta-chain-level locking between transactions. GTX introduces a version number for each edge-deltas block that increases by 1 per consolidation. Transaction t locally records which edge-delta chains (and edges) t has modified per edge-deltas block b . When t accesses b again,

either for a read, write, or commit, t checks if the block version has changed. If so, t relocks its edge-deltas chains to avoid causing write-write conflicts. t uses its updated-edges records to calculate the edge-delta chains that it needs to relock and tries to lock them (Section 5.3). If no concurrent transactions have locked or updated those edge-delta chains, t locks them, finds where its edge-deltas reside, and continues its normal operations, else t aborts.

6 RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

Memory Allocation. GTX adapts a hybrid memory allocator from LiveGraph [73] to balance concurrent memory allocation and space utilization. GTX allocates a large chunk of memory at system start via *mmap*, and divides memory into blocks of varying power-of-2 sizes (as in Buddy systems [44]). Each worker thread locally manages a pool of memory blocks smaller than a user-defined threshold. It can allocate memory blocks from this pool without synchronizing with the other threads. Larger memory blocks are managed by a memory manager that handles requests to allocate large memory blocks. Due to the power-law nature of real-world graphs, most vertices are not hub vertices, i.e., do not have many edges. Thus, most of the vertex delta and edge-deltas block's memory allocations only require smaller blocks from threads' private pools. Even when threads need to allocate a larger block, it is unlikely that multiple threads request that concurrently. Thus, GTX's memory allocation protocol is mostly contention-less, yet at times requires the memory manager to allocate large memory blocks.

Garbage Collection. GTX recycles the delta blocks no longer visible to transactions. GTX is cooperative and does not have a garbage collector thread. Instead, worker threads register memory blocks as candidates for garbage collection and periodically recycle the "safe" blocks. When a transaction commits or Lazy Updates a vertex delta, in effect it invalidates the vertex's previous version. GTX embeds a local priority queue per worker thread, and the worker thread registers the previous vertex delta block with its invalidation time in the local queue. The same operation takes place when a consolidation worker consolidates an edge-deltas block. It registers the old block invalidated at the new block's create time. After executing a certain amount of transactions, a worker thread w scans the timestamp table and finds the "safe" timestamp, the minimum timestamp in the table. w continuously checks its local garbage queue, dequeues an entry, and recycles the associated memory block until the queue is empty or the current queue head's timestamp becomes too large. If a recycled block b is small, w stores b in its local pool, else b is sent back to the memory manager. It ensures that small blocks are allocated contention-free while large blocks return to the global pool for reuse by other threads.

7 EVALUATION

The focus of this study is on supporting high throughput read-write transactions while supporting concurrent graph analytics.

Experiment Setup. Experiments run on a dual-socket machine with Intel(R) Xeon(R) Platinum 8368 @ 2.40GHz processors with 156 CPUs. It has 2 NUMA nodes and each node has 38 cores and 96GB RAM. We compile all systems with GCC 11.4.0 and O3 optimization flag and evaluate them over a single NUMA node with best effort, i.e., the evaluated system allocates memory locally, and uses remote memory only if its memory exceeds a single NUMA node. One




Figure 6: Consolidation Example

exception is for insert experiments of graph500-26 and Twitter with over 1 billion edges. This machine’s memory is not enough to evaluate all the systems. Thus, for these datasets, we evaluate all systems in a setup with Intel(R) Xeon(R) Platinum 8168 CPU @ 2.70GHz processors that has 24 cores and 387GB DRAM per NUMA node. To minimize NUMA effects, we run those experiments in a single NUMA node with up to 20 worker threads to avoid contention. We disable disk logging. We use the same evaluation software based on *LDBC* Graphalytics benchmark [11, 41] as used in Teseo [26] and Sortledton [35], and add additional experiments. Experiments include few instances for uniform graphs but the main focus is on power-law graphs as many real-world graphs exhibit such patterns [21, 22, 30, 63].



Figure 7: Bars Color Code in Experimental Results.

7.1 Insert Performance

Testing includes inserting uniform and power-law real-world and synthetic graphs with edges shuffled or according to timestamp order. We simulate undirected edge inserts by inserting 2 directed edges in a transaction. They execute “checked” operations so that every edge insert involves a read to check if the edge exists. Thus, each transaction internally executes 2 edge lookups and 2 edge writes atomically. Thus, having efficient edge reads can improve transactions’ write performance. Figure 7 gives the color codes we use in displaying results. Refer to Figure 8 for results.

Random-order Inserts. In this study, the evaluated systems insert edges from uniform and power-law real-world and synthetic graphs. The results include *graph500-24*, *26*, *uniform-24*, *dota-league* and *twitter*. *graph500-26* and *twitter* have over 1 billion edges. Thus, we evaluate them on the machine with larger DRAM up to 20 worker threads. We evaluate other power-law and uniform graph datasets but their results are similar to the ones presented, and are omitted for brevity. GTX has over 10x better throughput over LiveGraph and around 1.34x to 2x better throughput over the second-best Sortledton. We attribute GTX’s performance to GTX’s low-overhead concurrency control and its adaptive delta-chains index. GTX has only an exclusive lock that is embedded in the index with minimal overhead. GTX adjusts the number of delta-chains of each edge-deltas block as edge updates arrive, and enables concurrent writes to the same vertex. While Teseo can reduce the conflict in updating the

hub vertices by storing their neighborhoods into multiple segments, its sparse array segment-based storage has drawbacks - More discussion on this issue below. LiveGraph’s performance suffers due to vertex-centric locking and the absence of edge indexes. For each edge check, a LiveGraph transaction scans the edge block to check if the edge exists which is costly. For uniform graphs, Sortledton outperforms GTX for low parallelism degrees, but GTX’s performance catches up as the number of concurrent worker threads increases. Since the graph is uniform, each vertex has about the same number of edges. Concurrent transactions are **not** likely updating the same adjacency lists. Thus, GTX’s delta-chains index becomes under-utilized, and the drawbacks of vertex-centric locking are mitigated because transactions are less likely to conflict in this case.

Timestamp-ordered Inserts. In this experiment, we insert edges based on their real-world create timestamps. Real-life power-law graphs not only have hub vertices (dataset edit-wiki has vertices with millions of adjacent edges), but also have hotspots. Transactional graph systems have significant performance degradation when inserting edges in timestamp order [35]. Thus, we run the experiments in both random and timestamp order. Refer to Figures 8’s *yahoo* and *edit-wiki*. As baseline, first, we evaluate inserting edges in random order. For *yahoo-songs*, GTX has the best scalability with up to 70% better throughput over the second best system (Sortledton) at higher parallelism degree. For the edit-wiki workload, GTX overall ranks the second among the evaluated systems and performs the best with medium parallelism degree (1.2x better than the second best). GTX does not scale well here at high worker thread numbers because its adaptive delta-chains adjustment heuristic does not catch up well with large neighborhoods. GTX could have used a more aggressive heuristic to increase delta chain numbers eagerly when consolidations take place, so more concurrent writers would be allowed per edge-deltas block. However, this would increase the size of allocated blocks and memory used by indexes, and may incur wasted spaces for low-fanout vertices. We plan to explore more sophisticated heuristics in future work. In contrast, when inserting in the real timestamp order, GTX performs the best over all competitor systems. The second-best Sortledton’s throughput degrades to less than 11% of its random order insertion throughput. In contrast, GTX’s throughput only drops by around 30%. In the *yahoo-songs* workload, GTX has up to 11x better throughput than Sortledton and in *edit-wiki* workload, GTX has up to 9x better




Figure 8: Insertion Throughput

throughput. GTX achieves high performance in timestamp-ordered workload due to its better write concurrency provided by adaptive delta-chains. Sortedlton’s and LiveGraph’s worker threads block on concurrent updates during a hotspot. Ideally, Teseo should mitigate the high conflict when concurrently updating hub vertices by storing large neighborhoods in multiple segments. However, its sparse array segment rebalance exclusively locks multiple adjacent segments but segments of the same neighborhood are always adjacent. Thus, concurrent rebalance threads may conflict when locking the same adjacent segment in their rebalance window, or conflict with other concurrent transactions. Teseo’s segment locking may incur false positives among low-degree vertices by locking vertices in the same segment that the transaction does not intend to update. LiveGraph, Sortedlton, and Teseo suffer from temporal localities in edge update hotspot and power-law distributions. In contrast, GTX allows concurrent transactions to update the same vertex and adjusts the vertex’s concurrency level adaptively. This experiment demonstrates that GTX is the only transactional graph system that can handle these real-life workloads efficiently.

7.2 Concurrent Updates and Analytics

We study how systems support concurrent update transactions and graph analytics simultaneously. We adopt the graph update experiments from Teseo [26] and Sortedlton [35], but have additional workloads. We generate log files based on the edges of the power-law graph *graph500-24* using *graphlog* [25]. The source graph has around 260 million edges with 2.6 billion edge update logs. The first 10% of the edge logs are purely edge inserts that build the original graph. The next 90% of the logs are edge inserts and deletes. If a vertex has high fanout in the source graph, it has proportionally more edge update logs. The experiment ensures that the graph size during the experiment stays about the same as the initial size. As in the previous experiments, all systems execute check operations, edge inserts (deletes) only happen after checking the edge existence. We try to use one NUMA node. If one NUMA node’s memory is not enough, we allocate in a remote node. LiveGraph’s memory usage has been overly large, and could only process 20% of the logs. Also, we have evaluated each system’s transaction throughput

when running only updates. The results are mostly similar to the transaction throughput results of this experiment and are omitted for brevity (One exception is Teseo’s throughput increase due to its in-place updates and became the second best behind GTX). We design the mixed-workload experiment as follows: We allocate a fixed number of 50 thread resources, and control the read/write ratio by assigning the threads either as write or OpenMP [5] read threads, e.g., 25 write and 25 read threads form a 50% write workload. Write threads continuously run update transactions while read threads run graph analytics. We could not report the results of Teseo as it ran into deadlocks (the same problem is reported in Sortedlton’s evaluation [35]). Sortedlton has segmentation fault errors for only a few of the workloads, but we are still able to produce some results. For analytics, we evaluated 1-hop (1-HN) and 2-hop neighbors (2-HN) that find 1-hop and 1-2 hop neighbors of a set of vertices, and concurrent breadth first search (BFS), PageRank (PR), and single source shortest paths (SSSP) from Graphalytics [11, 41]. Similar experiments can be found in [35] but they use only BFS and PR under certain threads configurations. The results below use the same color code in Figure 7.

Normal Update Distribution. We generate edge update logs and place them randomly in the edge log stream. Write threads run transactions executing edge logs, and concurrent graph analytics start at 10% of the update workload (after the source graph is loaded). The results are in Figures 9 and 10. Sortedlton crashed for several workloads as discussed above. We redo those workloads many times and record the results for the successful runs, but this was not always possible. For 1-HN, PR, and SSSP, when the workload is read-heavy, e.g., 30% write, GTX’s concurrent analytics can take at most 2x longer time than the best performing Sortedlton. GTX and Sortedlton also have similar transaction throughput under those workloads. As the workload becomes more write-heavy, GTX’s graph analytics performance catches up, and it has the highest transaction throughput. Under write-heavy workloads, e.g., 90% write, GTX has 1.3x to 1.48x higher transaction throughput than the second best competitor Sortedlton, and performs the best and second best in SSSP and PR, respectively. Also, it has slightly worse




Figure 9: Concurrent Updates and Analytics: Transaction Throughput




Figure 10: Concurrent Updates and Analytics: Graph Analytics Latency

performance in 1-HN than the other systems. However, GTX has better write throughput when executing BFS, but Sortledton has significantly BFS lower latency under all workloads. GTX is 1.12x to 1.52x faster than Sortledton in 2-HN under all workloads while achieving better transaction throughput for most of the workloads (0.96x to 1.28x). LiveGraph exhibits strong performance for graph analytics (around 0.77x to 1.51x faster than GTX), but its transaction throughput is significantly lower than the other 2 systems (GTX has 4x to 9x higher transaction throughput than LiveGraph).

Temporal Locality and Hotspot Update Distribution. We generate another set of edge logs, and create temporal localities and hotspots to mimic real-world scenarios. Transactions are more likely updating the same vertex’s adjacency list concurrently. This experiment has the same setting as the previous mixed-workload experiment except for having different edge logs. We evaluate performance under concurrent reads and writes, and temporal localities. Sortledton’s segmentation error persists for this hotspots workload. Thus, we only report available results in Figures 11 and 12.

GTX, Sortledton, and LiveGraph graph analytics performance are not affected much by update hotspots. However, Sortledton and LiveGraph transaction throughputs have up to 64.3% and 41.2% drop in throughput, respectively, for workloads with temporal localities and hotspots in update patterns. Only GTX maintains its high transaction throughput and stays competitive in graph analytics.

Performance Analysis. GTX has the best transaction throughput while maintaining competitive performance for graph analytics across different workloads. We attribute this to the following reasons. GTX supports delta-based MVCC that prevents read transactions from conflicting with write transactions. Thus, the side effects of concurrent updates are mitigated for graph analytics, and vice versa. It outperforms vertex-centric locking and adapts to workload temporal localities and hotspots. GTX is the only system that can maintain high transaction throughput across all experiments. Also, it stores and manages edge-delta chains of each adjacency list sequentially in a memory block. This preserves cache locality,

eliminates pointer chasing, reduces random memory access and cache misses, and facilitates prefetch. Previous works [26, 35, 73] show that sequential adjacency list storage is beneficial to adjacency list scan; the backbone for graph analytics. GTX implements graph algorithms (e.g., BFS, PR, and SSSP) directly accessing edge delta blocks, and is compiled within the system. It saves the cost of using adjacency list iterators and associated functional calls. Our experiment (not shown due to space) shows that using an iterator is around 1.15x slower in graph analytics. Finally, GTX has several techniques in reducing the overhead of concurrent read-write transactions and graph analytics. Distributing the transaction table over worker threads enables latch-free $O(1)$ access to transaction status for Lazy Updates, and the Block Access Table allows each reader and writer thread to register block-level access in its own cache line-aligned entry without invalidating caches of other worker threads or modifying a shared lock. This greatly handles concurrency control overheads.

Sortledton exhibits different results across experiments. Sortledton has the second best transaction throughput. However, its performance degrades for workloads with temporal localities and hotspots. For analytics, it has the best performance in BFS. Sortledton uses exclusive lightweight latches for each adjacency list. BFS touches only a smaller portion of the graph. Thus, update and read transactions are less likely to conflict, bypassing the negative locking effects. BFS requires each vertex’s neighborhood size to initialize the algorithm. GTX and LiveGraph scan the vertex adjacency list to calculate this value. This dominates the graph analytics latency. Sortledton supports vertex neighborhood size versioning that allows transactions to get each vertex’s neighborhood size efficiently, thus supporting efficient BFS. PR and SSSP require finding each vertex’s neighborhood size, but they need to scan vertices’ adjacency list multiple times. The algorithm’s execution phase dominates graph analytics, and thus Sortledton’s advantages drop. As read threads scan the graph heavily, they are more likely to conflict with write




Figure 11: Concurrent Update with Hotspot and Temporal Localities and Analytics: Transaction Throughput




Figure 12: Concurrent Update with Hotspot and Temporal Localities and Analytics: Graph Analytics Latency




Figure 13: Memory Consumption

transactions, and hinder the performance. 1-HN and 2-HN only requires adjacency list scans. In 2-HN, each vertex’s 1-hop neighbors are not known a priori, causing Sortledton to have large locking overhead, and hence has similar or worse performance.

LiveGraph shows strong disparity between its transaction throughput and graph analytics. Its transaction throughput is several times worse than both GTX and Sortledton but its graph analytics perform better. LiveGraph uses a similar-styled *MVCC* as GTX’s but only optimizes for sequential adjacency list scans [73]. It provides the same level of guarantees that each vertex’s adjacency list is stored sequentially in memory and that transaction reads and writes never conflict. Moreover, LiveGraph has smaller edge log entries compared to GTX’s edge-deltas. The compact sequential adjacency list storage enables good read performance. But LiveGraph suffers from its simple vertex-centric locking and lack of edge lookup indexes (Section 7.1), thus having the worst transaction throughput.

7.3 Memory Consumption

GTX uses 64-byte edge-deltas, so it uses more memory to load and store a graph. For insert experiments, GTX uses around 2x to 3x more memory than Sortledton, 0.9x to 2.1x more than Teseo and 1.2x to 1.9x more memory than LiveGraph (Figures omitted for brevity). However, for workload with updates, concurrent analytics, and hotspots, GTX does not incur big memory overhead than storing a static graph (pure inserts), and memory consumption stays

stable across workloads (Figure 13). For these workloads, GTX is efficient in memory allocation and garbage collection. LiveGraph uses more memory if the workload involves updates and analytics, while Sortledton’s memory usage increases at most 6x in workloads with temporal localities and hotspots. GTX has the lowest memory consumption for these experiments.

8 CONCLUSIONS

GTX is a latch-free write-optimized transactional graph system that supports concurrent read-write transactions and graph analytics. It adopts an adjacency list format and a delta chain-based storage with delta-chains index. Its concurrency control combines both the traditional linked list-based delta store [49] and append-only delta updates [64, 73] to enable high update throughput, low-latency single edge lookup, and sequential adjacency list scan. GTX has high read and write concurrency using transactions, *MVCC*, delta updates, and Lazy Update hybrid commit under snapshot isolation. Extensive evaluation of GTX against state-of-the-art transactional graph systems shows that GTX has better performance for checked-write workloads, and is several times better in handling real-world write workload with temporal localities. GTX performs well under mixed workloads when the workload is at least 50% writes, in which case, GTX has better update throughput while its graph analytics latency stays competitive. For write-heavy workloads, e.g., 90%, GTX can outperform its competitors in graph analytics while significantly exceeds them in write throughput. In conclusion, GTX demonstrates that using latch-free techniques, avoiding vertex-centric locking, maintaining adjacency list-level edge indexes, and sequential adjacency list storage, and being adaptive to the workload can enable high transaction throughput and better read-write concurrency in transactional graph systems.

9 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Walid G. Aref acknowledges the support of the National Science Foundation under Grant Number IIS-1910216.

REFERENCES

- [1] [n.d.]. *China's Singles' Day shopping spree sees robust sales*. http://www.xinhuanet.com/english/2019-11/11/c_138546429.htm
- [2] [n.d.]. *JanusGraph*. <https://janusgraph.org/>
- [3] [n.d.]. *Neofj*. <https://neo4j.com/>
- [4] [n.d.]. *New Tweets per second record, and how!* https://blog.twitter.com/engineering/en_us/a/2013/new-tweets-per-second-record-and-how
- [5] [n.d.]. *OpenMP*. <https://www.openmp.org/>
- [6] [n.d.]. *OrientDB*. <https://orientdb.org/>
- [7] 2023. *ByteDance*. <https://www.bytedance.com/en/>
- [8] 2024. *Get Started with SAP HANA Graph*. <https://developers.sap.com/group.hana-aa-graph-overview.html>
- [9] 2024. *OQGRAPH Overview*. <https://mariadb.com/kb/en/oqgraph-overview/>
- [10] 2024. *Oracle Big Data Spatial and Graph*. <https://www.oracle.com/database/technologies/bigdata-spatialandgraph.html>
- [11] Wing Lung Ngai Stijn Heldens Arnau Prat-Pérez Thomas Manhardto Hassan Chafio Mihai Capotà Narayanan Sundaram Michael Anderson Ilie Gabriel Tănase Yinglong Xia Lifeng Nai Alexandru Iosup, Tim Hegeman and Peter Boncz. 2017. *LDBC Graphalytics Benchmark specification, v0.9.0*.
- [12] Timothy G. Armstrong, Vamsi Ponnkanti, Dhruba Borthakur, and Mark Callaghan. 2013. *LinkBench: A Database Benchmark Based on the Facebook Social Graph (SIGMOD '13)*. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2463676.2465296>
- [13] Joy Arulraj, Justin Levandoski, Umar Farooq Minhas, and Per-Ake Larson. 2018. *Bztree: A High-Performance Latch-Free Range Index for Non-Volatile Memory*. *Proc. VLDB Endow.* 11, 5 (2018). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3164135.3164147>
- [14] Greg Barnes. 1993. *A Method for Implementing Lock-Free Shared-Data Structures*. In *Proceedings of the Fifth Annual ACM Symposium on Parallel Algorithms and Architectures (Velen, Germany) (SPAA '93)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 261–270. <https://doi.org/10.1145/165231.165265>
- [15] Hal Berenson, Phil Bernstein, Jim Gray, Jim Melton, Elizabeth O'Neil, and Patrick O'Neil. 1995. *A critique of ANSI SQL isolation levels*. *SIGMOD Rec.* 24, 2 (may 1995), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1145/568271.223785>
- [16] Maciej Besta, Robert Gerstenberger, Marc Fischer, Michał Podstawski, Jürgen Müller, Nils Blach, Berke Egeli, George Mitenkov, Wojciech Chłapek, Marek Michalewicz, and Torsten Hoefler. 2023. *The Graph Database Interface: Scaling Online Transactional and Analytical Graph Workloads to Hundreds of Thousands of Cores*. arXiv:2305.11162 [cs.DB]
- [17] Maciej Besta, Robert Gerstenberger, Emanuel Peter, Marc Fischer, Michał Podstawski, Claude Barthels, Gustavo Alonso, and Torsten Hoefler. 2023. *Demystifying Graph Databases: Analysis and Taxonomy of Data Organization, System Designs, and Graph Queries*. *ACM Comput. Surv.* 56, 2, Article 31 (sep 2023), 40 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3604932>
- [18] Kai Zeng Bolin Ding and Wenyuan Yu. 2020. *Alibaba Sponsor Talk at VLDB*.
- [19] Chiranjeeb Buragohain, Knut Magne Risvik, Paul Brett, Miguel Castro, Wonhee Cho, Joshua Cowhig, Nikolas Gloy, Karthik Kalyanaraman, Richendra Khanna, John Pao, Matthew Renzelmann, Alex Shamis, Timothy Tan, and Shuheng Zheng. 2020. *A1: A Distributed In-Memory Graph Database*. In *Proceedings of the 2020 ACM SIGMOD International Conference on Management of Data (SIGMOD '20)*. 329–344. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3318464.3386135>
- [20] Hongzhi Chen, Changji Li, Chenguang Zheng, Chenghuan Huang, Juncheng Fang, James Cheng, and Jian Zhang. 2022. *G-Tran: A High Performance Distributed Graph Database with a Decentralized Architecture*. *Proc. VLDB Endow.* 15, 11 (jul 2022), 2545–2558. <https://doi.org/10.14778/3551793.3551813>
- [21] Rong Chen, Jiaxin Shi, Yanze Chen, Binyu Zang, Haibing Guan, and Haibo Chen. 2019. *PowerLyr: Differentiated Graph Computation and Partitioning on Skewed Graphs*. *ACM Trans. Parallel Comput.* (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3298989>
- [22] Audrey Cheng, Xiao Shi, Aaron Kabcenell, Shilpa Lawande, Hamza Qadeer, Jason Chan, Harrison Tin, Ryan Zhao, Peter Bailis, Mahesh Balakrishnan, Nathan Bronson, Natacha Crooks, and Ion Stoica. 2022. *TAOBench: an end-to-end benchmark for social network workloads*. *Proc. VLDB Endow.* 15, 9 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.14778/3538598.3538616>
- [23] Audrey Cheng, Jack Waudby, Hugo Firth, Natacha Crooks, and Ion Stoica. [n.d.]. *Mammoths Are Slow: The Overlooked Transactions of Graph Data*. ([n. d.]).
- [24] Miaomiao Cheng, Jiujian Chen, Cheng Zhao, Cheng Chen, Yongmin Hu, Xiaoliang Cong, Liang Qin, Hexiang Lin, Ronghua Li, Guoren Wang, Shuai Zhang, and Lei Zhang. 2023. *ByteGAP: A Non-continuous Distributed Graph Computing System using Persistent Memory (CEUR Workshop Proceedings)*. CEUR-WS.org. <https://ceur-ws.org/Vol-3462/ADMS7.pdf>
- [25] Dean De Leo. [n.d.]. *graphlog*. <https://github.com/whatsthecratic/graphlog>
- [26] Dean De Leo and Peter Boncz. 2021. *Teseo and the Analysis of Structural Dynamic Graphs*. 14, 6 (feb 2021), 1053–1066. <https://doi.org/10.14778/3447689.3447708>
- [27] Laxman Dhulipala, Guy E. Blelloch, and Julian Shun. 2019. *Low-Latency Graph Streaming Using Compressed Purely-Functional Trees*. In *Proceedings of the 40th ACM SIGPLAN Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation (PLDI 2019)*. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3314221.3314598>
- [28] Ayush Dubey, Greg D. Hill, Robert Escriva, and Emin Gün Sirer. 2016. *Weaver: A High-Performance, Transactional Graph Database Based on Refinable Time-stamps*. *Proc. VLDB Endow.* 9, 11 (jul 2016), 852–863. <https://doi.org/10.14778/2983200.2983202>
- [29] David Ediger, Rob McColl, Jason Riedy, and David A. Bader. 2012. *STINGER: High performance data structure for streaming graphs*. In *2012 IEEE Conference on High Performance Extreme Computing*. 1–5. <https://doi.org/10.1109/HPEC.2012.6408680>
- [30] Michalis Faloutsos, Petros Faloutsos, and Christos Faloutsos. 1999. *On Power-Law Relationships of the Internet Topology (SIGCOMM '99)*. <https://doi.org/10.1145/316188.316229>
- [31] Wenfei Fan, Tao He, Longbin Lai, Xue Li, Yong Li, Zhao Li, Zhengping Qian, Chao Tian, Lei Wang, Jingbo Xu, Youyang Yao, Qiang Yin, Wenyuan Yu, Jingren Zhou, Diwen Zhu, and Rong Zhu. 2021. *GraphScope: a unified engine for big graph processing*. 14, 12 (jul 2021), 2879–2892. <https://doi.org/10.14778/3476311.3476369>
- [32] Guanyu Feng, Zixuan Ma, Daixuan Li, Shengqi Chen, Xiaowei Zhu, Wentao Han, and Wenguang Chen. 2021. *RisGraph: A Real-Time Streaming System for Evolving Graphs to Support Sub-Millisecond Per-Update Analysis at Millions Ops/s (SIGMOD '21)*. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3448016.3457263>
- [33] Xiyang Feng, Guodong Jin, Ziyi Chen, Chang Liu, and Semih Salihoglu. 2023. *KÜZU Graph Database Management System*. CIDR.
- [34] Soukaina Firmli, Vasileios Trigonakis, Jean-Pierre Lozi, Iraklis Psaroudakis, Alexander Weld, Chiadmi Dalila, Sunpack Hong, and Hassan Chafi. 2020. *CSR++: A Fast, Scalable, Update-Friendly Graph Data Structure*. <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPICs.OPODIS.2020.17>
- [35] Per Fuchs, Domagoj Margan, and Jana Giceva. 2022. *Sortledton: A Universal, Transactional Graph Data Structure*. *Proc. VLDB Endow.* 15, 6 (feb 2022), 1173–1186. <https://doi.org/10.14778/3514061.3514065>
- [36] Sanchit Garg, Trinabh Gupta, Niklas Carlsson, and Anirban Mahanti. 2009. *Evolution of an Online Social Aggregation Network: An Empirical Study*. In *Proceedings of the 9th ACM SIGCOMM Conference on Internet Measurement (IMC '09)*. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1644893.1644931>
- [37] Pankaj Gupta, Venu Satuluri, Ajeet Grewal, Siva Gurumurthy, Volodymyr Zhabiyuk, Quannan Li, and Jimmy Lin. 2014. *Real-Time Twitter Recommendation: Online Motif Detection in Large Dynamic Graphs*. *Proc. VLDB Endow.* 7, 13 (aug 2014). <https://doi.org/10.14778/2733004.2733010>
- [38] Mohamed S. Hassan, Tatiana Kuznetsova, Hyun Chai Jeong, Walid G. Aref, and Mohammad Sadoghi. 2018. *Extending In-Memory Relational Database Engines with Native Graph Support*. In *International Conference on Extending Database Technology*. <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:11389988>
- [39] Pat Helland, Harald Sammer, Jim Lyon, Richard Carr, Phil Garrett, and Andreas Reuter. 1987. *Group Commit Timers and High Volume Transaction Systems*. 301–329. https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-51085-0_52
- [40] Jim Webber Ian Robinson and Emil Eifrem. 2015. *Graph Databases: New Opportunities for Connected Data (2nd ed.)*. O'Reilly Media, Inc.
- [41] Alexandru Iosup, Tim Hegeman, Wing Lung Ngai, Stijn Heldens, Arnau Prat-Pérez, Thomas Manhardto, Hassan Chafio, Mihai Capotà, Narayanan Sundaram, Michael Anderson, Ilie Gabriel Tănase, Yinglong Xia, Lifeng Nai, and Peter Boncz. 2016. *LDBC Graphalytics: A Benchmark for Large-Scale Graph Analysis on Parallel and Distributed Platforms*. 9, 13 (2016), 12. <https://doi.org/10.14778/3007263.3007270>
- [42] Muhammad Attahir Jibril, Hani Al-Sayeh, Alexander Baumstark, and Kai-Uwe Sattler. 2023. *Fast and Efficient Update Handling for Graph HZTAP*. In *Proceedings 26th International Conference on Extending Database Technology, EDBT 2023, Ioannina, Greece, March 28-31, 2023*. OpenProceedings.org, 723–736. <https://doi.org/10.48786/edbt.2023.60>
- [43] Alexander D. Kent, Lorie M. Liebrock, and Joshua C. Neil. 2015. *Authentication graphs: Analyzing user behavior within an enterprise network*. *Computers & Security* 48 (2015), 150–166. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cose.2014.09.001>
- [44] Kenneth C. Knowlton. 1965. *A Fast Storage Allocator*. *Commun. ACM* 8, 10 (oct 1965), 623–624. <https://doi.org/10.1145/365628.365655>
- [45] Pradeep Kumar and H. Howie Huang. 2020. *GraphOne: A Data Store for Real-Time Analytics on Evolving Graphs*. *ACM Trans. Storage* 15, 4 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3364180>
- [46] Jérôme Kunegis. [n.d.]. *The KONECT Project*. <http://konect.cc/>
- [47] Geof Langdale. [n.d.]. *Lock-Free Programming*. https://www.cs.cmu.edu/~410-s05/lectures/L31_LockFree.pdf
- [48] Jure Leskovec and Rok Sosič. 2016. *SNAP: A General-Purpose Network Analysis and Graph-Mining Library*. *ACM Trans. Intell. Syst. Technol.* 8, 1 (2016). <https://doi.org/10.1145/2898361>
- [49] Justin Levandoski, David Lomet, and Sudipta Sengupta. 2013. *The Bw-Tree: A B-tree for New Hardware Platforms*. In *2013 IEEE 29th International Conference on Data Engineering (ICDE) (2013 IEEE 29th international conference on data engineering (icde) ed.)*. IEEE. <https://www.microsoft.com/en-us/research/publication/the-bw-tree-a-b-tree-for-new-hardware/>

- [50] Justin Levandoski, David Lomet, Sudipta Sengupta, Ryan Stutsman, and Rui Wang. 2015. High Performance Transactions in Deuteronomy. In *Conference on Innovative Data Systems Research (CIDR 2015)*. <https://www.microsoft.com/en-us/research/publication/high-performance-transactions-in-deuteronomy/>
- [51] Changji Li, Hongzhi Chen, Shuai Zhang, Yingqian Hu, Chao Chen, Zhenjie Zhang, Meng Li, Xiangchen Li, Dongqing Han, Xiaohui Chen, Xudong Wang, Huiming Zhu, Xuwei Fu, Tingwei Wu, Hongfei Tan, Hengtian Ding, Mengjin Liu, Kangcheng Wang, Ting Ye, Lei Li, Xin Li, Yu Wang, Chenguang Zheng, Hao Yang, and James Cheng. 2022. ByteGraph: A High-Performance Distributed Graph Database in ByteDance. *Proc. VLDB Endow.* 15, 12 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.14778/3554821.3554824>
- [52] Tianyu Li, Badrish Chandramouli, and Samuel Madden. 2022. Performant Almost-Latch-Free Data Structures Using Epoch Protection. In *Data Management on New Hardware* (Philadelphia, PA, USA) (*DaMoN'22*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 1, 10 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3533737.3535091>
- [53] Peter Macko, Virendra J. Marathe, Daniel W. Margo, and Margo I. Seltzer. 2015. LLAMA: Efficient graph analytics using Large Multiversioned Arrays. In *2015 IEEE 31st International Conference on Data Engineering*. 363–374. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICDE.2015.7113298>
- [54] Prashant Pandey, Brian Wheatman, Helen Xu, and Aydin Buluc. 2021. Terrace: A Hierarchical Graph Container for Skewed Dynamic Graphs (*SIGMOD '21*). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3448016.3457313>
- [55] K. Platz, N. Mittal, and S. Venkatesan. 2019. Concurrent Unrolled Skiplist. In *2019 IEEE 39th International Conference on Distributed Computing Systems (ICDCS)*. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICDCS.2019.00157>
- [56] Xiafei Qiu, Wubin Cen, Zhengping Qian, You Peng, Ying Zhang, Xuemin Lin, and Jingren Zhou. 2018. Real-Time Constrained Cycle Detection in Large Dynamic Graphs. 11, 12 (2018). <https://doi.org/10.14778/3229863.3229874>
- [57] Siddhartha Sahu, Amine Mhedhbi, Semih Salihoglu, Jimmy Lin, and M. Tamer Özsu. 2017. The Ubiquity of Large Graphs and Surprising Challenges of Graph Processing. *Proc. VLDB Endow.* 11, 4 (2017). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3186728.3164139>
- [58] Aneesh Sharma, Jerry Jiang, Praveen Bommannavar, Brian Larson, and Jimmy Lin. 2016. GraphJet: Real-Time Content Recommendations at Twitter. *Proc. VLDB Endow.* 9, 13 (2016). <https://doi.org/10.14778/3007263.3007267>
- [59] Aneesh Sharma, Jerry Jiang, Praveen Bommannavar, Brian Larson, and Jimmy Lin. 2016. GraphJet: Real-Time Content Recommendations at Twitter. *Proc. VLDB Endow.* 9, 13 (2016). <https://doi.org/10.14778/3007263.3007267>
- [60] Sijie Shen, Rong Chen, Haibo Chen, and Binyu Zang. 2021. Retrofitting High Availability Mechanism to Tame Hybrid Transaction/Analytical Processing. In *15th USENIX Symposium on Operating Systems Design and Implementation (OSDI 21)*. USENIX Association, 219–238. <https://www.usenix.org/conference/osdi21/presentation/shen>
- [61] Sijie Shen, Zihang Yao, Lin Shi, Lei Wang, Longbin Lai, Qian Tao, Li Su, Rong Chen, Wenyuan Yu, Haibo Chen, Binyu Zang, and Jingren Zhou. 2023. Bridging the Gap between Relational OLTP and Graph-based OLAP. In *2023 USENIX Annual Technical Conference (USENIX ATC 23)*. USENIX Association. <https://www.usenix.org/conference/atc23/presentation/shen>
- [62] Jifan Shi, Biao Wang, and Yun Xu. 2024. Spruce: a Fast yet Space-saving Structure for Dynamic Graph Storage. *Proc. ACM Manag. Data* 2, 1, Article 27 (mar 2024), 26 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3639282>
- [63] Kimmo Soramäki, Morten L. Bech, Jeffrey Arnold, Robert J. Glass, and Walter E. Beyeler. 2007. The topology of interbank payment flows. *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications* (2007). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physa.2006.11.093>
- [64] Ziqi Wang, Andrew Pavlo, Hyeontaek Lim, Viktor Leis, Huanchen Zhang, Michael Kaminsky, and David G. Andersen. 2018. Building a Bw-Tree Takes More Than Just Buzz Words (*SIGMOD '18*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 473–488. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3183713.3196895>
- [65] Todd Warszawski and Peter Bailis. 2017. ACIDRain: Concurrency-Related Attacks on Database-Backed Web Applications. In *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM International Conference on Management of Data (Chicago, Illinois, USA) (SIGMOD '17)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 5–20. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3035918.3064037>
- [66] Jack Waudby, Paul Ezhilchelvan, Jim Webber, and Isi Mitrani. 2020. Preserving reciprocal consistency in distributed graph databases. In *Proceedings of the 7th Workshop on Principles and Practice of Consistency for Distributed Data (PaPoC '20)*. Association for Computing Machinery. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3380787.3393675>
- [67] Victor Junqiu Wei, Raymond Chi-Wing Wong, and Cheng Long. 2020. Architecture-Intact Oracle for Fastest Path and Time Queries on Dynamic Spatial Networks (*SIGMOD '20*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3318464.3389718>
- [68] Brian Wheatman and Randal Burns. 2021. Streaming Sparse Graphs using Efficient Dynamic Sets. In *2021 IEEE International Conference on Big Data (Big Data)*. 284–294. <https://doi.org/10.1109/BigData52589.2021.9671836>
- [69] Brian Wheatman and Helen Xu. 2018. Packed Compressed Sparse Row: A Dynamic Graph Representation. In *2018 IEEE High Performance Extreme Computing Conference (HPEC)*. 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.1109/HPEC.2018.8547566>
- [70] Daniel ten Wolde, Gábor Szárnyas, and Peter Boncz. 2023. DuckPGQ: Bringing SQL/PGQ to DuckDB. *Proc. VLDB Endow.* 16, 12 (aug 2023), 4034–4037. <https://doi.org/10.14778/3611540.3611614>
- [71] Yingjun Wu, Joy Arulraj, Jiexi Lin, Ran Xian, and Andrew Pavlo. 2017. An Empirical Evaluation of In-Memory Multi-Version Concurrency Control. *Proc. VLDB Endow.* 10, 7 (2017). <https://doi.org/10.14778/3067421.3067427>
- [72] K. Zhou, G. Tan, and W. Zhou. 2018. Quadboost: A Scalable Concurrent Quadtree. *IEEE Transactions on Parallel & Distributed Systems* 29, 03 (2018). <https://doi.org/10.1109/TPDS.2017.2762298>
- [73] Xiaowei Zhu, Guanyu Feng, Marco Serafini, Xiaosong Ma, Jiping Yu, Lei Xie, Ashraf Aboulnaga, and Wenguang Chen. 2020. LiveGraph: A Transactional Graph Storage System with Purely Sequential Adjacency List Scans. 13, 7 (mar 2020), 1020–1034. <https://doi.org/10.14778/3384345.3384351>