# AN APPLICATION OF NEIGHBOURHOODS IN DIGRAPHS TO THE CLASSIFICATION OF BINARY DYNAMICS

# PEDRO CONCEIÇÃO, DEJAN GOVC, JĀNIS LAZOVSKIS, RAN LEVI, HENRI RIIHIMÄKI, AND JASON P. SMITH

ABSTRACT. A binary state on a graph means an assignment of binary values to its vertices. For example, if one encodes a network of spiking neurons as a directed graph, then the spikes produced by the neurons at an instant of time is a binary state on the encoding graph. Allowing time to vary and recording the spiking patterns of the neurons in the network produces an example of binary dynamics on the encoding graph, namely a one-parameter family of binary states on it. The central object of study in this article is the closed neighbourhood of a vertex v in a graph  $\mathcal{G}$ , namely the subgraph of  $\mathcal{G}$  that is induced by v and all its neighbours in  $\mathcal{G}$ . We present a topological/graph theoretic method for extracting information out of binary dynamics on a graph, based on a selection of a relatively small number of vertices and their neighbourhoods. As a test case we demonstrate an application of the method to binary dynamics that arises from sample activity on the Blue Brain Project reconstruction of cortical tissue of a rat.

A *binary state* on a graph means an assignment of binary values to its vertices. A motivating example in this article appears in the context of neuroscience. If one encodes a network of neurons as a directed graph, then the spikes produced by the neurons at an instant of time is a binary state on the encoding graph. Allowing time to vary and recording the spiking patterns of the neurons in the network produces an example of a *binary dynamics* on the encoding graph, namely a one-parameter family of binary states on it. A network of neurons that receives external signals and responds to those signals thus generates a binary dynamics. Binary dynamics appear in other contexts as well, but in this paper we use networks of spiking neurons as a primary example.

The task of correctly pairing a signal injected into a neuronal network with the response of the network, or in other words, identifying the incoming signal from the response, is generally very challenging. This paper proposes a methodology by which this task can be approached.

Considering raw binary states on a large graph is generally quite problematic for a number of reasons. First, the sheer number of theoretically possible states makes analysing a collection of them a daunting task. Moreover, natural systems such as neuronal networks tend to be very noisy, in the sense that the emerging dynamics from the same stimulus may take a rather large variety of forms. Finally, it is a general working hypothesis in studying network dynamics that the network structure affects its function (see for instance [20]), and therefore instead of considering individual vertices in the network, it makes sense to examine ensembles of vertices and the way that they behave as dynamical sub-units.

In previous studies we considered cliques in a directed graph, with various orientations of the connections between nodes, as basic units from which one could extract information about binary dynamics [18, 8]. However, the results in these papers fell short of suggesting an efficient classifier of binary dynamics (see [8, Sections 4.1-4.2]). Indeed, when we applied

the methods of these papers to the main dataset we consider in the current paper, we obtained highly unsatisfactory classification accuracy. This suggests that cliques in a graph that models a natural system may be too small to carry the amount of information required for classification of a noisy signal.

Taking this hypothesis as a guideline, we searched for a candidate structure to replace cliques. To begin with, we introduce a very flexible feature generation methodology that takes as input binary dynamics on a digraph  $\mathcal{G}$  induced on a preselected collection of subgraphs of  $\mathcal{G}$ , and turns it into a feature vector, which can then be used in machine learning classification. Details are given in Section 2.1.

The neighbourhood of a vertex v in the graph  $\mathcal{G}$ , namely the subgraph of  $\mathcal{G}$  that is induced by v and all its neighbours in  $\mathcal{G}$ , suggests itself naturally as a type of subgraph to be considered in this procedure, and is a central object of study in this paper. Vertex neighbourhoods have been studied extensively in graph theory and its applications (see [14] for instance). Our definitions and setup are described in detail in Section 1.

The way we apply the method can be summarised as follows. Given a directed graph  $\mathcal{G}$  we use a variety of real valued vertex functions that we refer to as *parameters* and are derived from the neighbourhood of each vertex, to create a sorted list of the vertices. With respect to each such parameter, we pick the "top performing" vertices and select their neighbourhoods. To that collection of subgraphs we apply the method described above. For more detail see Section 2.

To test our methods, we apply them to data generated by the Blue Brain Project team [3] that was used in [19] for signal classification by established neuroscience methodology. The data consists of eight families of neuronal stimuli that are injected in a random sequence to the digital reconstruction of the neocortical column of a young rat. This reconstructed microcircuit, which was developed by the Blue Brain Project [10], consists of approximately 31,000 neurons and 8,000,000 synaptic connections, and is capable of receiving neuronal signals and responding to them in a biologically accurate manner. We used 60% of the data to train a support vector machine algorithm, and the remaining 40% for classification testing. Using this approach we are able to achieve classification accuracy of up to 88%. A further test was run on a model created on the NEST Simulator [12]. This software package simulates network models of spiking neurons using very simplified neuron models and as such allows great flexibility and processing speed. We created a collection of eight families of stimuli again, but this time on random graphs, with varying densities, and applied our machinery to that dataset. Here again we obtained classification accuracy of up to 76%.

In [19] the same dataset is studied by standard techniques of computational neuroscience combined with the ideas presented in this paper. In particular it is shown there that an informed choice of neighbourhood improves predictability when compared to traditional methods. Interestingly, selection of neighbourhoods that improved performance with the technique presented in [19], show reduced performance with the techniques presented in this article, and vice versa. In both projects a classification accuracy of nearly 90% was achievable, but with different sorting parameters. This suggests that considering vertex neighbourhoods as computational units can be beneficial in more than one way.

The paper is organised as follows. In Section 1 we set up our definitions and terminology. In Section 2 we describe the principles of our methodology for extracting vector summaries

out of binary dynamics functions. In Section 2 we specialise the methods to vertex neighbourhoods as computational units. Section 3 is dedicated to the experiments we conducted and description of our results. In Section 4 we describe certain experiments designed to test the validity of our methods. In Section 5 we describe the main vertex functions we worked with, and in Section 6 we discuss the size, distribution and structure of the corresponding vertex neighbourhoods in the Blue Brain Project graph used in our classification experiments. Finally, Section 7 contains a summary of the results and further observations. Further vertex parameters and the respective results are collected in Section 8.1. The data used in this work and the software developed specifically in its context are linked in 8.2. Further results and visualisations can be found at [1].

Important work on (open) vertex neighbourhoods was reported recently in [14]. Our approach is independent of this work and is different from it in a number of ways. Most significantly, we do not study the structure of the entire graph and its dynamical properties by means of its full neighbourhood structure. Instead, we aim to infer dynamical properties of the graph from a relatively small collection of vertices, selected by certain graph theoretic and topological properties, and their neighbourhoods.

The authors wish to extend special thanks to Michael Reimann of the Blue Brain Project for supporting this project and sharing his wisdom and knowledge with us. The authors acknowledge support from EPSRC, grant EP/P025072/ - "Topological Analysis of Neural Systems", and from École Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne via a collaboration agreement with the University of Aberdeen. Dejan Govc acknowledges partial support from the Slovenian Research Agency programme P1-0292 and grant N1-0083.

## 1. Definitions and preliminaries

We introduce the basic concepts and notation that will be used throughout this article. By a *digraph* we will always mean a *finite*, *directed simple graph*, that is, where reciprocal edges between a pair of vertices are allowed, but multiple edges in the same orientation between a fixed pair of vertices and self-loops are not allowed.

We start by describing a very general setup that associates a family of topological objects with a digraph. A particular case of this setup is the main object of study in this paper.

**Definition 1.1.** A topological operator on digraphs is an algorithm that associates with a digraph  $\mathcal{G}$  a topological space  $\Gamma(\mathcal{G})$ , such that if  $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathcal{G}$  is a subgraph then  $\Gamma(\mathcal{H}) \subseteq \Gamma(\mathcal{G})$  as a closed subspace.

Another way of saying the same is that a topological operator on digraphs is a functor from the category of digraphs and digraph inclusions to the category of topological spaces and inclusions. The flag complex of  $\mathcal{G}$  (ignoring orientation), the directed flag complex [15], and the flag tournaplex [8] are examples of such operators.

**Definition 1.2.** Let  $\mathcal{G} = (V, E)$  be a digraph, and let  $v_0 \in V$  be any vertex.

- The neighbours of  $v_0$  in  $\mathcal{G}$  are all vertices  $v_0 \neq v \in V$  that are incident to  $v_0$ .
- The open neighbourhood of  $v_0$  is the subgraph of  $\mathcal{G}$  induced by the neighbours of  $v_0$ in  $\mathcal{G}$ . The closed neighbourhood of  $v_0$  in  $\mathcal{G}$  is the subgraph induced by the neighbours of  $v_0$  and  $v_0$  itself.



**Figure 1.** An open neighbourhood (left) and a closed neighbourhood (right) in a digraph, marked in red, with its central vertex marked solid colour.

We denote the open and closed neighbourhoods of  $v_0$  in  $\mathcal{G}$  by  $N^{\circ}_{\mathcal{G}}(v_0)$  and  $N_{\mathcal{G}}(v_0)$  respectively. More generally:

• Let  $S \subseteq V$  be a subset of vertices. Then  $N^{\circ}_{\mathcal{G}}(S)$  is defined to be the union of open neighbourhoods of all  $v \in S$ . Similarly  $N_{\mathcal{G}}(S)$  is the union of all closed neighbourhoods of vertices  $v \in S$ .

Notice that if  $S = \{v_0, v_1\}$ , and  $v_0$  and  $v_1$  are incident in  $\mathcal{G}$ , then  $N^{\circ}_{\mathcal{G}}(S) = N_{\mathcal{G}}(S)$ . In this paper we will consider particularly closed neighbourhoods, and for the sake of lighter nomenclature we introduce the term S-tribe. The same terminology is used in the paper [19], which is closely related to this article.

**Terminology 1.3.** Let  $\mathcal{G}$  be a digraph and let S be a subset of vertices in  $\mathcal{G}$ . We shall from now on refer to the closed neighbourhood of S in  $\mathcal{G}$  as the tribe of S in  $\mathcal{G}$ . In the case where S contains a single vertex  $v_0$ , we will refer to  $v_0$  as the chief of its tribe in  $\mathcal{G}$ .

If S is the entire vertex set of  $\mathcal{G}$ , then  $N_{\mathcal{G}}(S) = \mathcal{G}$ , but S may be much smaller than the full vertex set and still satisfy this condition. Subsets of vertices whose tribes are the entire graph are well studied in graph theory [5, Section 12.4].

**Definition 1.4.** Let  $\mathcal{G}$  be a finite digraph with vertex set V. A subset  $S \subseteq V$  is a dominating set if  $N_{\mathcal{G}}(S) = \mathcal{G}$ . The minimum cardinality of a dominating set for  $\mathcal{G}$  is called the domination number and is denoted by  $\gamma(\mathcal{G})$ . A dominating set of cardinality  $\gamma(\mathcal{G})$  is said to be a minimum dominating set.

Computing a minimal dominating set is known to be an NP hard problem, though there exist good approximation algorithms. A good summary of the problem and common approaches appears in [17]. In Section 6 we present some computations that include, in particular, the size of tribes and the number of tribes from a sorted list that it takes to cover 90% of the Blue Brain Project microcircuit. Depending on the sorting parameter used, the results are quite different. This suggests that a choice of tribes informed by certain vertex parameters may give ways of producing more efficient approximation algorithms for the domination number of graphs.

**Definition 1.5.** Let  $\mathcal{G} = (V, E)$  be a digraph, and let  $\Gamma$  be a topological operator on digraphs. For a vertex  $v \in V$ , let  $\Gamma_{\mathcal{G}}(v)$  denote  $\Gamma(N_{\mathcal{G}}(v))$ . If  $S \subseteq V$  is any subset, let

$$\Gamma_{\mathcal{G}}(S) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \Gamma(N_{\mathcal{G}}(S)) = \bigcup_{v \in S} \Gamma_{\mathcal{G}}(v).$$

Topological operators on digraphs, by our definition, respect inclusions and therefore transform a digraph that is filtered by subgraphs into a space that is filtered by closed subspaces.

**Definition 1.6.** Let  $\mathcal{G} = (V, E)$  be a digraph and let  $\Gamma$  be a topological operator on digraphs. Fix a linear ordering  $\omega: v_1 < v_2 < \cdots < v_M$  on V, where |V| = M. For any integer  $n \ge 0$ , let  $S_n^{\omega} = \{v \in V \mid v \ge v_{M-n}\}$ . Define an increasing filtration of the space  $\Gamma(\mathcal{G})$  by

$$F_n^{\omega}(\Gamma(\mathcal{G})) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \Gamma_{\mathcal{G}}(S_n^{\omega})$$

The subspace  $F_n^{\omega}(\Gamma(\mathcal{G}))$  will be referred to as the n-th  $\omega$ -filtration layer of  $\Gamma(\mathcal{G})$ .

From a data analysis point of view filtering  $\Gamma(\mathcal{G})$ , as proposed in Definition 1.6, can be applied in several ways. In particular, persistent homology can be used to extract information from the topology in a way that is sensitive to the ordering chosen. In this article we restrict to using a top (or bottom) layer of filtrations. The details are the subject of Section 2.

The topological operator we consider in this article is the directed flag complex of a digraph which we recall next. See Figure 2 for an example.

**Definition 1.7.** A directed *n*-clique is a digraph, whose underlying undirected graph is an *n*-clique, and such that the orientation of its edges determines a linear order on its vertices. An ordered simplicial complex is a collection X of finite ordered sets that is closed under subsets. The *n*-simplices of an ordered simplicial complex X are the sets of cardinality n+1. If  $\mathcal{G}$  is a digraph, then the directed flag complex associated to  $\mathcal{G}$  is the ordered simplicial complex whose *n*-simplices are the directed (n+1)-cliques in  $\mathcal{G}$ . We denote the directed flag complex of a digraph  $\mathcal{G}$  by  $|\mathcal{G}|$ .



**Figure 2.** A digraph  $\mathcal{G}$  (left), the associated directed flag complex  $|\mathcal{G}|$  as a topological space (center), and the maximal sets of  $|\mathcal{G}|$  (right).

We end this section by fixing one more item of notation that will be used throughout the paper. Let  $\mathcal{G}$  be a digraph with vertex set V, and let  $S \subseteq V$  be any subset. Then the directed flag complex of the tribe of S in  $\mathcal{G}$  will be denoted by  $\operatorname{Tr}(S)$ .

### 2. Encoding binary dynamics on tribes

We now describe our approach to classification of binary dynamics on a graph in very general terms. In Section 3 we specialise to our primary example.

Let  $\mathcal{G} = (V, E)$  be a graph (directed or undirected). A *binary state* on  $\mathcal{G}$  is defined to be a function  $\beta: V \to \{0, 1\}$ . Equivalently, a binary state on  $\mathcal{G}$  can be thought of as a partition of V into two disjoint subsets  $\beta^{-1}(0)$  and  $\beta^{-1}(1)$ , or alternatively as a choice of an element of the power set  $\mathcal{P}(V)$  of V. A *binary dynamics* on  $\mathcal{G}$  is a function  $B: \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \to \mathcal{P}(V)$  that satisfies the following condition:

• There is a partition of  $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  into finitely many half open intervals  $\{[a_i, b_i)\}_{i=1}^P$  for some  $P \geq 1$ , such that B is constant on  $[a_i, b_i)$ , for all  $i = 1, \ldots, P$ .

Activity in a network of neurons, both natural and artificial, is a canonical example of a binary dynamics on a directed network.

The task we address in this section is a general classification methodology for binary dynamics functions. Namely, suppose one is given

- a set of binary dynamics functions  $\{B_i \mid i \geq 1\}$  on a fixed ambient graph  $\mathcal{G}$ ,
- a set of labels  $\mathcal{L} = \{L_1, L_2, \dots, L_n\}$ , and
- a labelling function  $L: \{B_i \mid i \geq 1\} \to \mathcal{L}.$

In addition, we operate under the assumption that functions labeled by the same label are variants of the same event (without specifying what the event is, or in what way its variants are similar). The aim is to produce a topological summary for each  $B_i$  in a way that will make the outcome applicable to standard machine learning algorithms. We next describe our proposed mechanism.

2.1. A vector summary of binary dynamics. Fix a graph  $\mathcal{G}$  and a real valued graph invariant Q. Suppose that a set of labeled binary dynamics functions  $\{B^n\}_{n=1}^N$  on  $\mathcal{G}$  is given. Select an M-tuple  $(\mathcal{H}_1, \mathcal{H}_2, \ldots, \mathcal{H}_M)$  of subgraphs of  $\mathcal{G}$ , for some fixed positive integer M.

Fix a time interval and divide it into time bins. In each bin, record the vertex set that showed the value 1 at some point during that time bin. For each  $1 \leq m \leq M$ , restrict that set to  $\mathcal{H}_m$  and record the subgraph induced by the active vertices. Apply Q to obtain a numerical M-tuple, and concatenate the vectors into a long vector, which encodes all time bins corresponding to the given dynamics.

We now describe the procedure more accurately in three steps.

I. Interval partition uniformising. Fix an interval  $I = [a, b] \subset \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$  and a positive integer  $\overline{K}$ . Let  $\Delta = \frac{b-a}{K}$ . For  $1 \leq k \leq K$ , let  $I_k$  denote the sub-interval

$$I_k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} [a + (k-1)\Delta, a + k\Delta] \subseteq [a, b].$$

II. Subgraph extraction. For  $1 \leq n \leq N$  and each  $1 \leq m \leq M$ , let  $\beta_{m,k}^n$  denote the binary state on  $\mathcal{H}_m$  defined by

$$\beta_{m,k}^n \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{ v \in \mathcal{H}_m \mid \exists t \in I_k, \text{ such that } v \in B^n(t) \}.$$

Let  $\mathcal{H}_{m,k}^n \subseteq \mathcal{H}_m$  be the subgraph induced by all vertices in the set  $\beta_{m,k}^n$ . We refer to  $\mathcal{H}_{m,k}^n$  as the *active subgraph* of  $\mathcal{H}_m$  with respect to the binary dynamics function  $B^n$ .

III. <u>Numerical featurisation</u>. For each  $1 \le n \le N$ , let  $q_{m,k}^n$  denote the value of Q applied to  $\mathcal{H}_{m,k}^n$ . Let  $F^n$  denote the  $M \times K$  matrix corresponding to the binary dynamics function  $B^n$ , that is  $(F^n)_{m,k} = q_{m,k}^n$ .

For use in standard machine learning technology such as support vector machines, we turn the output of the procedure into a single vector by column concatenation. The output of this procedure is what we refer to as a vector summary of the collection  $\{B^n\}_{n=1}^N$ . It allows great flexibility as its outcome depends on a number of important choices:

- the ambient graph  $\mathcal{G}$ ,
- the selection procedure of subgraphs,

- the interval I and the binning factor K, and
- the graph invariant Q.

All these choices may be critical to the task of classifying binary dynamics functions, as our use case shows, and have to be determined by experimentation with the data.

#### 3. Classification of binary dynamics on brain networks

We now demonstrate the methodology described above with a specific example. Our source of data is a simulation that was run on a Blue Brain Project [3] reconstruction of the neocortical column of a rat [10]. The connectivity of a microcircuit in the somatosensory cortex in the brain of a rat is modelled by the Blue Brain Project on a digraph whose vertices correspond to neurons, and with an edge from v to u if there is a synaptic connection from the neuron corresponding to v to the one corresponding to u.

Our task is to apply the procedure described in Section 2 and analyse its performance. To do so, we applied a collection of graph parameters to the data in two ways. The first is as a means of selecting a collection of subgraphs of the ambient graph, and the second as a feature parameter. A short summary of the main parameters we used with their code names is in Table 1. A detailed description of the parameters is given in Section 5.

Abbreviation	Short description	Section
fcc	Clustering Coefficient (Fagiolo)	5.1.1
tcc	Transitive clustering coefficient	5.1.2
ec	Euler characteristic	5.2.1
nbc	Normalised Betti coefficient	5.2.2
tribe size	Number of (active) vertices in tribe	5.3
asg	Adjacency spectral gap	5.4.1
asr	Adjacency spectral radius	5.4.1
blsg	Bauer Laplacian spectral gap	5.4.3
blsr	Bauer Laplacian spectral radius	5.4.3
clsg	Chung Laplacian spectral gap	5.4.2
clsr	Chung Laplacian spectral radius	5.4.2
$\mathrm{tpsg}$	Transition probability spectral gap	5.4.1
tpsr	Transition probability spectral radius	5.4.1

**Table 1.** A partial list of the sorting and feature parameters examined in this project. See Section 8.1 for additional parameters.

Below we refer to the procedure described in Section 2.1, with the appropriate detail for our specific implementation.

3.1. Setup. We denote the Blue Brain Project digraph by  $\mathcal{G}$ . The digraph consists of approximately 31,346 vertices and 7,803,528 edges. The connectivity matrix of this specific circuit as well as 41 other instantiations of the reconstruction can be downloaded from [4]. Eight different stimuli were injected into the circuit in a random sequence of 200 milliseconds per stimulus, and 557 repeats for each stimulus type. The dataset thus consists of 4456 binary dynamics functions, each defined on an interval of 200ms. More detail on the source of data, biological analysis and an alternative approach to classification of the same data is in [19].

We computed all the graph parameters described in Section 5 as well as additional parameters listed in Section 8.1, for all tribes in the digraph. We fixed a positive integer M, and for each graph parameter P we considered the tribes  $\{N_{\mathcal{G}}^{P}(v_{1}), \ldots, N_{\mathcal{G}}^{P}(v_{M})\}$  that obtained the top M values. This facilitated the selection of subgraphs as in Section 2.1. In practice we experimented with M = 20, 50, 100 and 200. Here we report on the results we obtained for M = 50, which provided the highest classification accuracy, although already for M = 20we obtained rather strong performance. For M = 100 and 200 the improvement compared to M = 50 was relatively minor.

3.2. Vector summaries. Each binary dynamics function in our dataset has time parameter t between 0 and 200 milliseconds. Examining the data, we observed that the subinterval [0, 60] is where almost all the activity is concentrated across the entire set. Furthermore, the bulk of the stimulus being inputted in the first 10ms. Since we aimed to classify the response to the stimulus rather than the stimulus itself, we chose  $\Delta = [10, 60]$  and set K = 2, as experimentation showed that these choices provide the highest classification accuracy.

Thus we have for each binary dynamics function  $B^n$  two 25ms time bins. For each parameter P, the corresponding binary states  $\beta_{m,k}^n$  on  $N_{\mathcal{G}}^P(v_m)$ ,  $1 \le k \le 2$ ,  $1 \le m \le M$  were computed as in Section 2.1 Step I. The sub-graphs  $N_{m,k}^n \subseteq N_{\mathcal{G}}^P(v_m)$  generated by the  $\beta_{m,k}^n$  were then computed as in Section 2.1 Step 2.1.

For each binary dynamics function  $B^n$ , and for each graph parameter P, this procedure results in a 2 × 50 matrix  $U_n^P$  of subgraphs of  $\mathcal{G}$ , whose (m, k) entry is  $N_{m,k}^n$ . Next, for each graph parameter Q (from the same list of parameters) we applied Q to the matrix  $U_n^P$  to obtain a numerical feature matrix  $U_n^{P,Q}$  corresponding to the binary dynamics function  $B^n$ , the sorting parameter P and the feature parameter Q.

3.3. Classification results. For each pair of graph parameters (P, Q) the vector summaries  $\{U_i^{P,Q}\}$  were then fed into a Support Vector Machine (SVM) algorithm. Our classification pipeline was implemented in Python using the scikit-learn package. The SVM was initialised with default settings and we used a 60/40 train/test split. For cross-validation we used standard 5-fold cross-validation in scikit-learn. The results are presented in Figure 3.

For each of the parameters we tested, we considered both the top 50 vertices and the bottom 50 vertices in the list sorted by that parameter. In all the experiments, three parameters gave markedly better performance when used as feature parameters than all other parameters: Euler characteristic (ec), normalised Betti coefficient (nbc) and tribe size. The Bauer Laplacian spectral radius (blsr) also performed well, particularly with respect to bottom value selection parameters. The tribes selected by top values of selection parameters gave best results when the selection parameter was one of the spectral graph invariants,



Figure 3. Results of classification experiments. Left: Classification accuracy with respect to 50 top value vertices by selection parameter. Right: Classification accuracy with respect to 50 bottom value vertices by selection parameter.

while selecting by bottom value selection parameters, the two types of clustering coefficients and Euler characteristic performed best.

Interestingly, the two best performing feature parameters, Euler characteristic and tribe size, gave good results across all selections parameters, and performed almost equally well, regardless of whether the tribes were selected by top or bottom selection parameter value. This suggests that, at least in this particular network, the choice of feature parameter plays a much more important role in classification accuracy than any specific selection parameter. On the other hand, examining the rows of the best performing feature parameters, in Figure 3, we see a difference of up to 27% (top ec), 40% (top nbc) and 18% (top tribe size) in classification accuracy, depending on which selection parameter is used, suggesting that the selection parameter may play an important role in the capability of the respective tribes to encode binary dynamics.

3.4. Testing the method on an artificial neuronal network. To test our methods in a non-biological binary state dynamics setting, we conducted a set of experiments with the NEST simulator [12]. The NEST software simulates spiking neuronal network models. It offers a vast simplification of neuronal networks that are based on the exact morphology of neurons (such as the Blue Brain Project reconstructions). It also provides great flexibility in the sense that it allows any connectivity graph to be implemented in it and any initial stimulation to be injected into the system with the response modulated by various flexible parameters.

To move as far as possible from a strict biological setup, we generated a number of Erdős– Rényi random digraphs on 1000 vertices, which we implemented on NEST. We then created 8 distinct stimuli, each enervating a random selection of 100 vertices of the graph. A random sequence of stimuli was then created, with each stimulus type repeated 500 times. Our experiment consisted of injecting the sequence of stimuli into the simulator, one every 200ms.

To introduce some randomness the start time of each stimulus is randomly selected from the first 10ms, the strength of each stimulus is multiplied by a random number between 1 and 2, and background noise is included (using NEST's noise\_generator device with strength 3). The code used to create these experiments is available at [13]. The spikes from this simulation were then extracted and were run through the same pipeline as the Blue Brain Project data. We experimented with graph densities of 0.08, 0.01 and 0.005, and with selections of 50, 20 and 10 tribes. Figure 4 shows the performance by the selection parameters from Table 1. Tribe size was used in all cases as a feature parameter. The best performance was obtained with graph density of 0.08 and 50 tribes, but since such a selection could in theory cover the entire graph, we did not consider it as reliable evidence to the strength of the method. The results of all those experiments can be seen in Figure 16.



Figure 4. Classification of eight random signals on an Erdős–Rényi random digraph on 1000 vertices and connection probabilities of 8%, 1% and 0.5% and selection of 10 and 20 tribes, modelled on a NEST simulator. Selection parameters are the same as in the main example and feature parameter is always tribe size. Graph  $\mathcal{G}$  means the BBP graph and its performance with respect to tribe size as feature parameter is given for comparison. Compare with Figure 16.

Interestingly, the lower graph density of 0.005 consistently performed better than 0.01 across all feature parameters, except normalised Betti coefficient (**nbc**). Another interesting observation is that the strongest selection parameter in this experiment turns out to be Euler characteristic (**ec**), which in the Blue Brain Project experiments exhibited rather mediocre performance (see Figure 3, left). This suggests that different networks and binary dynamics on them may require experimentation with a collection of selection (and feature) parameters, in order to optimise the classification accuracy.

## 4. VALIDATION

Our approach to the classification of binary dynamics functions on a digraph associates with each binary state forming a part of a binary dynamics function a collection of subgraphs, that summarise that state. The subgraphs are selected by the procedure described in the preceding sections. We then use these subgraphs to generate feature vectors corresponding to binary states. In order to validate our methods, we created five extra experiments, the results of which we then compared to a subset of the original tests, as described in Section 3.3. In each case we retrained the SVM algorithm and then retested.

A motivating idea in neuroscience in general, and in this work in particular, is that structure is strongly related to function. Our approach, using tribes sorted by graph invariants and using the same graph invariants as feature parameters is proposed in this article as a useful way of achieving good classification results of binary dynamics functions. To test the validity of this proposal, we challenged our assumptions in five different ways, as described below.

4.1. **Random selection.** In this simple control experiment we test the significance of the sorting parameter by comparing the results to a random choice of 50 vertices and performing the same vector summary procedure on them. Twenty iterations of this experiment were performed, and then the results for each feature parameter were compared to the outcome for the same feature parameter and the selection parameter with respect to which this feature parameter performed best. The results are described in Figure 5.



Figure 5. Comparison of the classification performance of 50 randomly selected tribes to the performance of tribes selected by graph invariants with respect to several feature parameters. Errors bars indicate range over 20 iterations. Labelled error bars indicate best performing selection parameter. Compare with Figure 13.

We observe that in almost all cases reported here a choice of neurons determined by a selection parameter outperforms a random choice (in some cases marginally). We also note that in all those cases the performance of a choice informed by one of these sorting parameters exhibits a more consistent behaviour in terms of classification accuracy. This can be seen from the considerably larger error bars in the case tribes are selected at random. On the other hand, for some feature parameters a random choice does not seem to be a disadvantage, even compared to the best sorting parameter with respect to this feature parameter (Figure 13). This suggests that while selection and generation of vector summary by objective parameters are advantageous, experimentation is generally necessary in order to decide which parameters best fit the classification task.

4.2. Tribe vs. chief. A working hypothesis in this paper is that the ensembles of vertices we call tribes carry more information about a binary dynamics than individual vertices. We examined for each selection of 50 tribes by a graph parameter, as described above, the

classification capability of the chiefs of these tribes. Specifically, this experiment is identical to the original classification experiment, as described in Sections 3.1 - 3.3, except for each sorting parameter P, the three rows of the corresponding feature matrix  $U_i(P)$ , have binary values, where the *j*-th entry in row *i* is set to be 1 if the *j*-th neuron in the sorted list fired in the *i*-th time bin at least once. These feature vectors were then used in the classification task using the same train and test methodology. For each of the parameters we tested, we considered both the top 50 and the bottom 50 neurons in the list sorted by each selection parameter.

The results of this experiment were compared with the original experiments, and are shown in Figure 6. We note that in all cases a very significant drop in performance occurs. Interestingly, some chiefs in the top 50 of a sorted list show classification accuracy that is far better than random, while the bottom 50 give performance comparable to random (for example, **fcc**). In some cases however, the bottom 50 chiefs give better performance than the top 50. This suggests that the sorting parameters play a role in classification accuracy even before considering the activity in the tribe of a vertex.



Figure 6. Classification results by binary vectors using only the chiefs of each of the top and bottom 50 tribes for each parameter. For comparison, the performance for each selection parameter classified by the highest performing feature parameter is included.

4.3. Why tribes? For each selection parameter we considered the degrees of the 50 selected chiefs. For a chief  $v_i$  of degree  $d_i$  we then selected at random  $d_i$  vertices in the ambient graph and considered the subgraph induced by those vertices and the chief  $v_i$ . We used these 50 subgraphs in place of the original tribes. In this way we create for each chief a new subgraph with the same vertex count as the original tribes that is unrelated to the chiefs in any other controllable way. We extracted feature vectors using these subgraphs for each of the sorting parameters and repeated the classification experiment. The results were compared to the original results with respect to the strongest performing feature parameter. Notice that these are always either Euler characteristic or tribe size (vertex count), both of which can be applied to an arbitrary subgraph, not necessarily a tribe.

The results of this experiment were compared with the original experiments, and are shown in Figure 7. There is a clear drop in performance for all selection parameters except **fcc** (Fagiolo's clustering coefficient). Furthermore, classification using these subgraphs shows



Figure 7. Classification by subgraphs of the same vertex count as the tribes selected by the specified selection parameters. The results of classification by the highest performing feature parameters are above each of the columns.

considerably larger error bars. This suggests that using tribes with our methodology is advantageous. One explanation for this may be the tighter correlation of activity among neurons in a tribe, compared to an arbitrary subgraph of the same size in the network, but we did not attempt to verify this hypothesis.

4.4. Fake tribes. This experiment is very close to the one described in Section 4.3. Again we considered for each chief its degree and selected at random the corresponding number of vertices from the ambient graph. We then modified the adjacency matrix of the ambient graph so that the chief is connected to each of the vertices selected in the appropriate direction, so as to preserve the chief's in- and out-degree. Computationally, this amounts to applying a random permutation to the row and the column of each of the chiefs. The result is a new ambient graph, where the old chiefs are now commanding new tribes. We extracted feature vectors using these "fake tribes" and repeated the classification experiment. The results were compared with the original as in Section 4.3. The outcome is illustrated in Figure 8.



Figure 8. Classification by "fake tribes": Original classification with respect to best performing feature parameter is given for comparison.

We note that with respect to almost all selection parameters there is a significant drop in performance resulting from this modification. The one exception is fcc, where Euler characteristic as a feature parameter actually sometimes gives slightly better results, but with a large error bar. It is interesting that the results are similar for some of the parameters to those observed in Section 4.3, but quite different for others. However, the drop in performance is similar in both cases.

4.5. Shuffled activity. In this experiment we chose a random permutation  $\sigma$  of the neuron indices in the Blue Brain Project microcircuit. We then applied that permutation to neuron indices, so that neuron  $\sigma(i)$  now receives the spike train (sequence of spikes) of neuron *i* for each stimulus. In that way we obtained a new collection of binary dynamics functions, which still appear in eight varieties, since the operation of permuting the neuron indices is bijective. In other words, we can reconstruct the original activity from the shuffled activity by applying the inverse permutation. The same selection and feature parameters were used and the resulting data was used for training and testing. The results are shown in Figure 9.



Figure 9. Classification of shuffled binary dynamics functions and comparison to the top results for the original dynamics.

We observe again that there is a significant drop in performance resulting from this shuffling. This is quite surprising since the shuffled activity spike train should give eight families of stimuli that carry some sort of internal resemblance, and since we retrained and tested with these stimuli, one could expect that the classification results will be comparable to those of the original experiments. That not being the case suggests that structure and function in the Blue Brain Project reconstruction are indeed tightly related.

# 5. Sorting and feature parameters

In this section we describe the graph parameters used in this article. Some of these parameters are well known in the literature. All of them are invariant under digraph isomorphism. The parameters presented in this section are the primary parameters, which were used for both selection and generation of vector summaries. We chose these particular parameters either because of their prevalence in the literature, or for their strong performance as either sorting or feature parameters in classification tasks. Other parameters we examined as sorting parameters will be mentioned in Section 8.1. Throughout this section, we let  $\mathcal{G} = (V, E)$  denote a locally finite digraph (that is, such that every vertex is of finite degree). For  $k \geq 1$  and  $v_0 \in V$ , we let  $S_k(v_0)$  denote the number of directed (k + 1)-cliques that contain  $v_0$ . In particular  $S_1(v_0) = \deg(v_0)$ .

5.1. Clustering Coefficients. In [21] Watts and Strogatz introduced an invariant for undirected graphs they called *clustering coefficient*. For each vertex  $v_0$  in the graph  $\mathcal{G}$ , one considers the quotient of the number  $t_{v_0}$  of triangles in  $\mathcal{G}$  that contain  $v_0$  as a vertex by the number  $\binom{\deg(v_0)}{2}$  of triangles in the complete graph on  $v_0$  and its neighbourhood in  $\mathcal{G}$ . The clustering coefficient of  $\mathcal{G}$  is then defined as the average across all  $v \in \mathcal{G}$  of that number. Clustering coefficients are used in applied graph theory as measures of segregation [20].

5.1.1. Clustering coefficient for digraphs. The Watts-Strogatz clustering coefficient was generalised by Fagiolo [7] to the case of directed graphs. Fagiolo considers for a vertex  $v_0$  every possible 3-clique that contains  $v_0$ , and then identifies pairs of them according to the role played by  $v_0$ , as a source, a sink, or an intermediate vertex (see Figure 10, (A), (B) and (C)). Fagiolo also considers cyclical triangles at  $v_0$  and identifies the two possible cases of such triangles (see Figure 10, (D)). The Fagiolo clustering coefficient at  $v_0$  is thus the quotient of the number of equivalence classes of directed triangles at  $v_0$ , denoted by  $\vec{t}_{v_0}$ , by the number of such classes in the complete graph on  $v_0$  and all its neighbours in  $\mathcal{G}$ . Thus, if  $v_0$  is the *i*-th vertex in  $\mathcal{G}$  with respect to some fixed ordering on the vertices, and  $A = (a_{i,j})$  is the adjacency matrix for  $\mathcal{G}$ , then

$$\vec{t}_{v_0} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j,k} (a_{i,j} + a_{j,i}) (a_{i,k} + a_{k,i}) (a_{j,k} + a_{k,j}),$$

and the clustering coefficient at  $v_0$  is defined by

$$C_F(v_0) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{\vec{t}_{v_0}}{\deg(v_0)(\deg(v_0) - 1) - 2\sum_j a_{i,j}a_{j,i}}.$$

5.1.2. Transitive clustering coefficient. A directed 3-clique is also known in the literature as a transitive 3-tournament. Our variation on the clustering coefficient, the transitive clustering coefficient of a vertex  $v_0$  in a digraph  $\mathcal{G}$ , is the quotient of the number of directed 3-cliques in  $\mathcal{G}$  that contain  $v_0$  as a vertex by the number of theoretically possible such 3-cliques.

Let  $\operatorname{ind}(v_0)$  and  $\operatorname{oud}(v_0)$  denote the in-degree and out-degree of  $v_0$ . Let  $I_{v_0}$ ,  $O_{v_0}$  and  $R_{v_0}$  denote the number of in-neighbours (that are not out-neighbours), out-neighbours (that are not in-neighbours) and reciprocal neighbours of  $v_0$ , respectively. Notice that

(1) 
$$\operatorname{ind}(v_0) = I_{v_0} + R_{v_0}$$
 and  $\operatorname{oud}(v_0) = O_{v_0} + R_{v_0}$ .

We introduce our variation on Fagiolo's clustering coefficient.

**Definition 5.1.** Define the transitive clustering coefficient at  $v_0$  by

$$C_T(v_0) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{S_2(v_0)}{\deg(v_0)(\deg(v_0) - 1) - (\operatorname{ind}(v_0)\operatorname{oud}(v_0) + R_{v_0})}.$$

A justification for the denominator in the definition is needed and is the content of the following lemma.



Figure 10. Eight possible directed triangles on the same three vertices. The pairs correspond to the identifications made by Fagiolo, with changes highlighted in red. In the definition of the transitive clustering coefficient, the triangles in (A), (B) and (C) are counted individually, and those in (D) are ignored.

**Lemma 5.2.** Let  $\mathcal{G}$  be a digraph and let  $v_0 \in \mathcal{G}$  be a vertex. Then the number of possible directed 3-cliques containing  $v_0$  is given by

(2) 
$$\deg(v_0)(\deg(v_0) - 1) - (\operatorname{ind}(v_0)\operatorname{oud}(v_0) + R_{v_0}).$$

*Proof.* The set of in-neighbours of  $v_0$  give rise to  $2\binom{I_{v_0}}{2} = I_{v_0}(I_{v_0} - 1)$  directed 3-cliques containing  $v_0$ . Similarly the out-neighbours of  $v_0$  give rise to  $O_{v_0}(O_{v_0}-1)$  directed 3-cliques containing  $v_0$ . A choice of each gives an extra  $I_{v_0}O_{v_0}$  directed 3-cliques. Next, each reciprocal neighbour together with either an in-neighbour or an out-neighbour gives rise to three directed 3-cliques at  $v_0$ . The total number of those is  $3R_{v_0}(I_{v_0} + O_{v_0})$ . Finally, pairs of reciprocal neighbours give rise to six directed 3-cliques at  $v_0$ , and the total number of those is  $6\binom{R_{v_0}}{2} = 3R_{v_0}(R_{v_0}-1)$ . Let  $\mathsf{P}(v_0)$  denote the total number of transitive 3-tournaments that can be formed by  $v_0$  and its neighbours. Summing up we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathsf{P}(v_0) &= I_{v_0}(I_{v_0} - 1) + O_{v_0}(O_{v_0} - 1) + I_{v_0}O_{v_0} + 3R_{v_0}(I_{v_0} + O_{v_0}) + 3R_{v_0}(R_{v_0} - 1) \\ &= (I_{v_0} - O_{v_0})^2 + 3(I_{v_0}O_{v_0} + R_{v_0}I_{v_0} + R_{v_0}O_{v_0} + R_{v_0}^2) - (3R_{v_0} + I_{v_0} + O_{v_0}) \\ &= (\mathrm{ind}(v_0) - \mathrm{oud}(v_0))^2 + 3\mathrm{ind}(v_0)\mathrm{oud}(v_0) - (\mathrm{ind}(v_0) + \mathrm{oud}(v_0)) - R_{v_0} \\ &= (\mathrm{ind}(v_0) + \mathrm{oud}(v_0))^2 - \mathrm{ind}(v_0)\mathrm{oud}(v_0) - \mathrm{deg}(v_0) - R_{v_0} \\ &= \mathrm{deg}(v_0)(\mathrm{deg}(v_0) - 1) - (\mathrm{ind}(v_0)\mathrm{oud}(v_0) + R_{v_0}) \end{aligned}$$

as claimed.

Let  $A = (a_{i,j})$  denote the adjacency matrix for  $\mathcal{G}$  with respect to some fixed ordering on its vertices. Then for each vertex  $v_0 \in \mathcal{G}$  that is the *i*-th vertex in this ordering,  $S_2(v_0)$  can be computed by the formula

(3) 
$$\mathsf{S}_{2}(v_{0}) = \sum_{j,k} (a_{i,j} + a_{j,i})(a_{i,k} + a_{k,i})(a_{j,k} + a_{k,j}) - a_{i,j}a_{j,k}a_{k,i} = 2\vec{t}_{v_{0}} - \sum_{j,k} a_{i,j}a_{j,k}a_{k,i}.$$

5.2. Euler characteristic and normalised Betti coefficient. The Betti numbers of the various topological constructions one can associate to a digraph have been shown in many works to give information about structure and function in a graph. A particular example, using Blue Brain Project data is [18].

5.2.1. *Euler Characteristic.* The Euler characteristic of a complex is possibly the oldest and most useful topological invariant, and has been proven to be useful to theory and applications. In the setup of a directed flag complex (or any finite semi-simplicial set) the Euler characteristic is given as the alternating sum of simplex counts across all dimensions:

$$EC(X) = \sum_{n \ge 0} (-1)^n |X_n|,$$

where  $|X_n|$  is the number of *n*-simplices in X. Alternatively, the Euler characteristic can be defined using the homology of X by

$$EC(X) = \sum_{n \ge 0} (-1)^n \dim_{\mathbb{F}}(H_n(X, \mathbb{F})),$$

where  $\mathbb{F}$  is any field of coefficients. The Euler characteristic is a homotopy invariant, and can take positive or negative values according to the dominance of odd- or even-dimensional cells in the complex in question.

5.2.2. Normalised Betti Coefficient. The normalised Betti coefficient is based on a similar idea to the Euler characteristic. It is invariant under graph isomorphism, but is not a homotopy invariant. Also, unlike the Euler characteristic, it is not independent of the chosen field of coefficients. We view the normalised Betti coefficient as a measure of how "efficient" a digraph is in generating homology, without reference to any particular dimension, but with giving increasing weight to higher dimensional Betti numbers.

Let  $\mathcal{G}$  be a digraph, and for each  $k \geq 0$ , let  $s_k(\mathcal{G})$  denote the number of k-simplices in the directed flag complex  $|\mathcal{G}|$ . Fix some field  $\mathbb{F}$ . By the *Betti numbers*  $\beta_i$  of  $\mathcal{G}$  we mean the dimension of the homology vector space  $H_i(|\mathcal{G}|, \mathbb{F})$ .

**Definition 5.3.** Let  $\mathcal{G}$  be a locally finite digraph. Define the normalised Betti coefficient of  $\mathcal{G}$  to be

$$\mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{G}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{(i+1)\beta_i(\mathcal{G})}{s_i(\mathcal{G})}$$

Normalised Betti coefficients can be defined by any linear combination of Betti numbers, and also in a much more general context (simplicial posets), which we did not explore. Both the Euler characteristic and the normalised Betti coefficients are invariants of digraphs, and to use them as vertex functions we consider their value on the tribe of a vertex.

5.3. **Tribe size**. The *size* of a digraph can be interpreted in a number of ways. One standard way to do so is for a fixed simplicial object associated to a digraph, one counts the number of simplices in each dimension. This will typically produce a vector of positive integers, the (euclidean) size of which one can consider as the size of the digraph. Alternatively, the simplex count in any dimension can also be considered as a measure of size. In this article we interpret size as the number of vertices in the digraph. Thus by *tribe size* of a vertex

 $v_0 \in \mathcal{G}$  we mean the vertex count in  $N_{\mathcal{G}}(v_0)$ . When working with binary states on a digraph, tribe size means the number of vertices that obtain the value 1 in  $N_{\mathcal{G}}(v_0)$ .

5.4. Spectral invariants. The *spectrum* of a (real valued) square matrix or a linear operator A is the collection of its eigenvalues. *Spectral graph theory* is the study of spectra of matrices associated to graphs. It is a well developed part of combinatorial graph theory and one that finds many applications in network theory, computer science, chemistry and many other subjects. The various versions of the Laplacian matrix associated to a graph plays a particularly important role. An interesting work relating neuroscience and the Laplacian spectrum is [16].

The *spectral gap* is generally defined as the difference between the two largest moduli of eigenvalues of A. In some situations, for instance in the case of the Laplacian matrix, the spectral gap is defined to be the (modulus of the) minimal nonzero eigenvalue. Given a matrix and its spectrum, either number can be computed. As a standard in this article spectral gaps are considered as the first type described above, except for the Chung Laplacian spectrum, where the spectral gap is defined to be the value of the minimal nonzero eigenvalue. However, in several cases we considered both options. To emphasise which option is taken we decorated the parameter codes from Table 1 with a subscript "high" (referring to the difference between the two largest moduli) or "low" (referring to the smallest modulus of a nonzero eigenvalue). For example, Figures 7, 8, 9 have **bls<sub>low</sub>** as a parameter, indicating the lowest nonzero value in the Bauer Laplacian spectrum (that is, the minimal nonzero eigenvalue of the Bauer Laplacian matrix). Another variant of the standard concepts of spectra is what we call the *reversed* spectral gap. See Sections 5.4.1 and 5.4.3 for details.

Yet another common invariant we considered is the *spectral radius* which is the largest eigenvalue modulus of the matrix in question. We consider here four matrices associated to digraphs: The adjacency matrix, the transition probability matrix, the Chung Laplacian and the Bauer Laplacian, with details to follow.

5.4.1. The Adjacency and Transition Probability matrices. Let  $\mathcal{G} = (V, E)$  be a weighted directed graph with weights  $w_{u,v}$  on the edge (u, v) in  $\mathcal{G}$ , where  $w_{u,v} = 0$  if (u, v) is not an edge in  $\mathcal{G}$ . Let  $W_{\mathcal{G}} = (w_{u,v})$  denote the weighted adjacency matrix of  $\mathcal{G}$ . Let oud(u) denote the out-degree of a vertex u. The transition probability matrix for  $\mathcal{G}$  is defined, up to an ordering of the vertex set V, to be the matrix  $P_{\mathcal{G}}$ , with

(4) 
$$P_{\mathcal{G}} = D_{\text{out}}^{-1}(\mathcal{G}) \cdot W_{\mathcal{G}}$$

where  $D_{\text{out}}^{-1}(\mathcal{G})$  is the diagonal matrix with the reciprocal out-degree 1/out(u) as the (u, u) entry, if  $\text{out}(u) \neq 0$ , else the (u, u) entry is 0.

**Definition 5.4.** Let  $\mathcal{G}$  be a digraph with adjacency matrix  $A_{\mathcal{G}}$  and transition probability matrix  $P_{\mathcal{G}}$ . The adjacency spectral gap and the transition probability spectral gap of  $\mathcal{G}$  are defined in each case to be the difference between the two largest moduli of its eigenvalues.

If we replace in the definition of  $P_{\mathcal{G}}$  the matrix  $D_{\text{out}}(\mathcal{G})$  by  $D_{\text{in}}(\mathcal{G})$  of in-degrees, we obtain a variant of the transition probability matrix, which we denote by  $P_{\mathcal{G}}^{\text{rev}}$ , and its spectral gap is referred to as the reversed transition probability spectral gap.

For our specific application we considered the ordinary (as opposed to weighted) adjacency matrix, namely where all weights  $w_{u,v}$  are binary. We considered as parameters the spectral radius of the adjacency and transition probability matrices.

5.4.2. The Chung Laplacian. Chung defined the directed Laplacian for a weighted directed graph in [6]. The Perron–Frobenius theorem [9] states that any real valued irreducible square matrix M with non-negative entries admits a unique eigenvector, all of whose entries are positive. The eigenvalue for this eigenvector is routinely denoted by  $\rho$ , and it is an upper bound for any other eigenvalue of M.

If  $\mathcal{G}$  is strongly connected (that is, when there is a directed path between any two vertices in  $\mathcal{G}$ ), then its transition probability matrix is irreducible, and hence satisfies the conditions of the Perron–Frobenius theorem. Thus  $P_{\mathcal{G}}$  has an eigenvector, all of whose entries are positive. The *Perron vector* is such an eigenvector  $\phi$  that is normalised in the sense that  $\sum_{v \in V} \phi(v) = 1$ . Let  $\Phi$  denote the diagonal matrix with the v-th diagonal entry given by  $\phi(v)$ , and let P denote the transition probability matrix  $P_{\mathcal{G}}$ .

**Definition 5.5.** Let  $\mathcal{G}$  be a strongly connected digraph. The Chung Laplacian matrix for  $\mathcal{G}$  is defined by

(5) 
$$\mathcal{L} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} I - \frac{\Phi^{\frac{1}{2}} P \Phi^{-\frac{1}{2}} + \Phi^{-\frac{1}{2}} P^* \Phi^{\frac{1}{2}}}{2},$$

where  $P^*$  denotes the Hermitian transpose of a matrix P. The Chung Laplacian spectral gap  $\lambda$  for a digraph  $\mathcal{G}$  is defined to be the smallest nonzero eigenvalue of the Laplacian matrix.

The Chung Laplacian spectral gap  $\lambda$  of a strongly connected digraph  $\mathcal{G}$  is related to the spectrum of its transition probability matrix P by [6, Theorem 4.3], which states that the inequalities

(6) 
$$\min_{i \neq 0} \left\{ 1 - |\rho_i| \right\} \le \lambda \le \min_{i \neq 0} \left\{ 1 - \operatorname{Re}(\rho_i) \right\}$$

hold, where the minima are taken over all eigenvalues of P. The theory in [6] applies for strongly connected graphs and we therefore defined the Laplacian spectral gap of a tribe to be that of its largest strongly connected component.

We use the spectral gap of the Chung Laplacian for the largest strongly connected component of a tribe as a sorting parameter. When used as a feature parameter we consider the spectral gap of the largest strongly connected component of the active subgraph of the tribe. We also use the spectral radius of the Chung Laplacian, both as sorting and feature parameter.

5.4.3. The Bauer Laplacian. The requirement that  $\mathcal{G}$  is strongly connected is a nontrivial restriction, but it is required in order to guarantee that the eigenvalues are real. An alternative definition of a Laplacian matrix for directed graphs that does not require strong connectivity was introduced by Bauer [2]. Let C(V) denote the vector space of complex valued functions on V. The Bauer Laplacian for  $\mathcal{G}$  is the transformation  $\Delta_{\mathcal{G}}: C(V) \to C(V)$  defined by

(7) 
$$\Delta_{\mathcal{G}}(f)(v) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \begin{cases} f(v) - \frac{1}{\operatorname{ind}(v)} \Sigma_{v} w_{v,u} f(u), \text{ if } \operatorname{ind}(v) \neq 0, \\ 0, \text{ otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

If  $\operatorname{ind}(v) \neq 0$  for all  $v \in V$ , then  $\Delta_{\mathcal{G}}$  corresponds to the matrix  $\Delta_{\mathcal{G}} = I - D_{\operatorname{ind}}^{-1}(\mathcal{G}) \cdot W_{\mathcal{G}}$ , where  $D_{\operatorname{in}}^{-1}(\mathcal{G})$  is defined by analogy to  $D_{\operatorname{out}}^{-1}(\mathcal{G})$  in Section 5.4.1, and  $W_{\mathcal{G}}$  is the weighted adjacency matrix. In our case W is again taken to be the ordinary binary adjacency matrix. **Definition 5.6.** The Bauer Laplacian spectral gap is the difference between the two largest moduli of eigenvalues in the spectrum.

We also considered the spectral radius of the Bauer Laplacian. Both are used as sorting as well as feature parameters. If we replace in the definition  $D_{in}(\mathcal{G})$  by  $D_{out}(\mathcal{G})$  we obtain a matrix  $\Delta_{\mathcal{G}}^{rev}$ , whose spectral gap we refer to as the *reversed Bauer Laplacian spectral gap*.

### 6. Size, distribution and structure of tribes in a sample digraph

We compare tribes in a sample digraph sorted by the parameters listed in Table 1 in terms of some structural features. The digraph  $\mathcal{G}$  we use is the connectivity graph of the Blue Brain Project reconstruction of the cortical microcircuitry in a young rat brain [10]. The data we used is available at [4]. Our classification experiments reported on in Section 3 are done on the same microcircuit. We also applied the same measurements to other collections of digraphs and obtained different results. Since our aim is primarily to examine possible relationship between structure and function, we do not report those results here. These extended results are presented at [1].

We considered the top 50 vertices in the graph sorted by the parameters listed in Table 1. For each parameter we computed the size in terms of number of vertices in each tribe and the pairwise intersections, again in terms of the number of vertices in each intersection. In Table 11 we report the minimum, maximum and average of these numbers among the 50 tribes for each parameter. We also computed the first 4 Betti numbers of each tribe and report the average of these numbers for each parameter. Finally, we considered the union of tribes in decreasing order, sorted by each parameter, and computed the number of neurons required for their tribes to cover 90% of the neurons in entire microcircuit (that is, 28,310 neurons).

We notice that the top 50 chiefs with respect to the last six invariants listed in Table 11 tend to generate tribes of size close or below the average, with relatively very small intersection. This correlates well with their capacity as selection parameters in our experiments (see Figure 3). However, the two types of clustering coefficients, **fcc** and **tcc**, also generate small top tribes with small intersection, but are not exceptional as selection parameters.

We also examined the distribution of values for each parameter across the entire graph. The outcome is given in Figure 12. We did not find a correlation between the distribution of parameter values and their performance as selection or feature parameters.

We are therefore led to the conclusion that the performance of graph parameters as selection and/or feature parameters cannot be explained by the structural features we examined. This compares well with the conclusion drawn in [19], in which similar experiments using the same dataset but with a different methodology yield results that cannot be explained by structural features such as size and mutual intersection.

Parameter	tribe size			intersection size			Betti numbers						90% cover
	min	max	avg	min	max	avg	$b_0$	$b_1$	$b_2$	$b_3$	$b_4$	$b_5$	vertex count
fcc	3	181	87.9	0	22	0.8	1	11	55	6	0	0	1591
tcc	3	170	86.2	0	22	0.6	1	10	49	5	0	0	1280
ec	1184	1633	1456.3	30	241	132.0	1	288	13237	2463	21	0	204
nbc	2	1184	589.9	0	132	21.6	1	142	3047	634	11	1	555
tribe size	1417	1633	1509.7	44	241	130.3	1	287	11734	2310	19	0	179
asg	945	1604	1257.0	19	226	116.3	1	190	10362	3108	43	0	270
asr	1120	1622	1406.9	42	241	146.9	1	243	12603	3127	38	0	249
blsg	20	1344	555.2	0	96	12.9	1	111	1444	162	1	0	239
blsr	79	974	398.3	0	67	7.4	1	63	431	56	0	0	318
clsg	8	98	40.8	0	5	0.2	1	0	0	0	0	0	560
clsr	69	814	229.3	0	35	2.9	1	28	81	7	0	0	1297
$_{\mathrm{tpsg}}$	8	939	368.8	0	65	7.5	1	62	1077	131	1	0	445
$\mathbf{tpsr}$	84	1166	524.4	0	98	11.3	1	101	1105	167	1	0	209
all vertices	2	1633	492.9	0	241	9.9	1	94	1032	146	1	0	212

P. Conceição, D. Govc, J. Lazovskis, R. Levi, H. Riihimäki, J.P. Smith

Figure 11. Tribe size, pairwise intersections, average Betti numbers for the top 50 tribes of each parameter, and 90% coverage of the graph by tribes. The last row is the same among all vertices, with the last entry on the right giving the average number required for 90% coverage over 50 random permutations.



Figure 12. Distribution of parameter values across the entire Blue Brain Project microcircuit. The numbers on the right are minimum to maximum values. The values on the *x*-axis are the relative parameter values, rescaled from 0 to 1.

# 7. Summary

In this paper we examined the concept of a closed vertex neighbourhood in relation to the classification of binary dynamics on a digraph. We proposed an algorithm that will take a binary dynamics function on a digraph and produce a vector summary of that function by means of numerical and/or topological invariants of a relatively small number of neighbourhoods. Using this algorithm we experimented with a dataset implemented on the Blue Brain Project reconstruction of the neocortical column of a rat, and on an artificial neural network with random underlying graph implemented on the NEST simulator. In both cases the vector summaries were then run through a support vector machine algorithm that was able to achieve a classification accuracy of up to 88% for the Blue Brain Project data and up to 76% for the NEST data.

We used the same parameters both for selecting neighbourhoods and for the creation of feature vectors. We saw that certain spectral graph parameters used as selection parameters perform significantly better than more classical parameters such as degree and clustering coefficients. We also observed that the parameters that performed best as feature parameters were the simplest ones, namely *tribe size* and *Euler characteristic*. Comparison to randomly selected neighbourhoods showed that the methodology works reasonably well even without selecting the neighbourhoods in an informed way, but that neighbourhoods selected in a way informed by graph parameters gives in general a better performance with much smaller error bars.

#### References

- [1] Aberdeen Neurotopology Group, https://homepages.abdn.ac.uk/neurotopology/neighbourhoods.
- [2] F. Bauer, Normalized graph Laplacians for directed graphs, Linear Algebra and its Applications, Vol. 436, (2012). pp. 4193-4222.
- [3] Blue Brain Project, https://www.epfl.ch/research/domains/bluebrain.
- [4] Blue Brain Project, Digital Reconstruction of Neocortical Microcircuitry, https://bbp.epfl.ch/ nmc-portal/downloads.
- [5] G. Chartrand, L. Lesniak, P. Zhang, *Graphs and Digraphs*, Sixth Edition, Textbooks in Mathematics, CRC Press (2016), xii + 628pp.
- [6] F. Chung, Laplacians and the Cheeger Inequality for Directed Graphs, Annals of Combinatorics, Vol. 9 (2005), pp. 1-19.
- [7] G. Fagiolo, Clustering in complex directed networks, Phys. Rev. E, Vol. 76, No. 2 (2007), https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevE.76.026107
- [8] R. Levi, D. Govc, J. P. Smith, Complexes of Tournaments, Directionality Filtrations and Persistent Homology, to appear in Journal of Applied and Computational Topology.
- [9] R.A. Horn, C.R. Johnson, *Matrix Analysis*, Second Edition, Cambridge University Press (1990), xviii + 643pp.
- [10] H. Markram et al, Reconstruction and Simulation of Neocortical Microcircuitry, Cell, Vol. 163 (2015), pp. 456-492.
- [11] S. Jukna, *Extremal Combinatorics*,
- [12] J. Jordan et al, NEST Neural Simulation Tool, Version 2.18.0, (2019), Zenodo: http://10.5281/ zenodo.2605422.
- [13] NEST code, https://github.com/jlazovskis/neurotop-nest/
- [14] A. Kartun-Giles and G. Bianconi, Beyond the clustering coefficient: A topological analysis of node neighbourhoods in complex networks, Chaos, Solitons & Fractals: X, Vol. 1 (2019)
- [15] D. Lütgehetmann, D. Govc, J. P. Smith, and R. Levi. Computing persistent homology of directed flag complexes. *Algorithms*, 13(1):19, 2020.

- [16] S. C. de Lange, M. A. de Reus, M. P. van den Heuvel The Laplacian spectrum of neural networks, Front. Comput. Neurosci. 7:189. (2014) http://doi.org/10.3389/fncom.2013.00189
- [17] Li J, Potru R, Shahrokhi F. A Performance Study of Some Approximation Algorithms for Computing a Small Dominating Set in a Graph, Algorithms 2020, 13(12):339. https://doi.org/10.3390/a13120339
- [18] M. W. Reimann, M. Nolte, M. Scolamiero, K. Turner, R. Perin, G. Chindemi, P. Dłotko, R. Levi, K. Hess, and H. Markram. *Cliques of neurons bound into cavities provide a missing link between structure* and function, Frontiers in computational neuroscience, 11:48, 2017.
- [19] M. Reimann, H. Riihimäki, J. P. Smith, J. Lazovskis, C Pokorny and R. Levi, Topology of synaptic connectivity constrains neuronal stimulus representation, predicting two complementary coding strategies, BioArxiv doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.11.02.363929.
- [20] M. Rubinov, O. Sporns, Complex network measures of brain connectivity: Uses and interpretations, Neuroimage, Vol. 52 (2010), pp 1059-1069.
- [21] D. Watts, S. Strogatz, Collective dynamics of 'small-world' networks, Nature, Vol. 393 (1998), pp. 440-442.

### 8. Supplementary Material

8.1. Further Graph parameters. We describe here further graph and topological parameters we examined.

8.1.1. Degrees. For each vertex v in a graph  $\mathcal{G}$ , its (total) degree deg(v) is the number of vertices in the open neighbourhood of v. The *in- and out-degree* of v, denoted ind(v)and oud(v) respectively, mean the number of in- and out-neighbours of v respectively. These invariants were examined as graph parameters in our classification algorithm and were found inefficient, except in the case of *tribe size*, which is very closely related to degree and turns out to be the strongest feature parameter we found.

8.1.2. Reciprocal degree. By the reciprocal degree of a vertex v we mean the number of neighbours that are both in-neighbours and out-neighbours. We used reciprocal degree in this work in two ways. The sum of all reciprocal degrees in a tribe (abbreviated **rc**), and the reciprocal degree of the chief (**rc-chief**).

8.1.3. Density coefficients. Every (k + 1)-clique contains k + 1 k-cliques. But no number of k-cliques in a graph is guaranteed to form any (k + 1)-cliques. The density coefficient is a ratio of the number of (k + 1)-cliques by that of k-cliques, normalised in its ambient graph.

**Definition 8.1.** Let  $\mathcal{G}$  be a digraph with n vertices. For  $k \geq 2$  define the k-th density coefficient of  $\mathcal{G}$  at  $v_0$  by the formula

$$D_k(v_0) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{k}{(k+1)(n-k)} \cdot \frac{\mathsf{S}_k(v_0)}{\mathsf{S}_{k-1}(v_0)}.$$

The factor k/(k+1)(n-k) normalises the invariant, so that  $D_k(v_0) = 1$  for every 1 < k < n if  $v_0$  is a vertex in  $\mathcal{G}$  that is a complete digraph on n vertices. This is explained in the next lemma.

**Lemma 8.2.** For each pair of natural numbers 0 < k < n, any digraph  $\mathcal{G}$  on n vertices, and any vertex  $v_0$  in it,

$$\frac{\mathsf{S}_k(v_0)}{\mathsf{S}_{k-1}(v_0)} \le \frac{(k+1)(n-k)}{k}$$

with equality obtained if and only if  $\mathcal{G}$  is a complete digraph on n vertices.

*Proof.* We prove the statement by a double counting argument closely following the one given in [11, Section 10.4]. Let U be the set of all pairs  $(\tau, \sigma)$  where  $\sigma$  is a directed (k + 1)-clique containing  $v_0$  and  $\tau \subseteq \sigma$  is a directed k-clique containing  $v_0$ . Then one can count the number of elements of U in two ways. First, the number of k-sub-cliques  $\tau$  of a fixed (k + 1)-clique  $\sigma$  containing  $v_0$  is exactly k, therefore

$$|U| = k \mathbf{S}_k(v_0).$$

On the other hand, a fixed k-clique  $\tau$  is a subclique of at most (n-k)(k+1) distinct (k+1)cliques  $\sigma$ , because there are (n-k) different choices for a vertex that together with  $\tau$  will form a k+1 clique, and once a vertex was chosen there are (k+1) distinct orientations on the extra k edges, so that the outcome is a directed (k+1)-clique. Therefore,

$$|U| \le (n-k)(k+1)S_{k-1}(v_0).$$

Comparing the two expressions, we have:

$$k\mathbf{S}_{k}(v_{0}) \leq (n-k)(k+1)\mathbf{S}_{k-1}(v_{0}),$$

which, upon reordering gives the claimed upper bound. Computing the ratio for a complete digraph on n vertices shows that this upper bound is sharp.

We remark that, while we use the density coefficients as vertex parameters, one can define a global density coefficient on a digraph  $\mathcal{G}$  with vertex set V by

$$D_k(\mathcal{G}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{|V|} \sum_{v \in V} D_k(v).$$

By Lemma 8.2, for any  $2 \le k \le |V| - 1$ ,  $D_k(\mathcal{G}) = 1$  if and only if  $\mathcal{G}$  is a complete digraph on V. Since any digraph on V is a subgraph of the complete digraph on V,  $D_k(\mathcal{G})$  provides a set of numerical invariants for digraphs, parameterised by dimension (size of clique), which measure a notion of size of the digraph in comparison to the complete digraph on the same vertex set. In our specific application, density coefficients did not prove efficient as selection or feature parameters.

8.2. Data and code. The data used is available at https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo. 4290212. The entire analysis code can be obtained from https://github.com/JasonPSmith/ TriDy.



selected tribes, compared with accuracy of tribes selected by invariants with respect to the same feature Figure 13. Classification accuracy of signals on the Blue Brain Project microcircuit using 50 randomly parameter. Compare with Figure 5.







numbers on the right are minimum to maximum values. The values on the x-axis are the relative parameter Figure 15. Distribution of all parameter values across the entire Blue Brain Project microcircuit. The values, rescaled from 0 to 1. Compare with Figure 12.



parameter is always tribe size. Graph  $\mathcal{G}$  means the Blue Brain Project graph and its performance with simulator. Selection parameters from Figure 4 are included, along with additional parameters. Feature connection probabilities of 8%, 1% and 0.5% and selection of 10 and 20 tribes, modelled on a NEST respect to **tribe size** as feature parameter is given for comparison.

INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF ABERDEEN *Email address*: p.rodriguesdaconceicao.19@abdn.ac.uk

FACULTY OF MATHEMATICS AND PHYSICS, UNIVERSITY OF LJUBLJANA *Email address:* dejan.govc@fmf.uni-lj.si

RIGA BUSINESS SCHOOL, RIGA TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY *Email address*: janis.lazovskis@rbs.lv

INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF ABERDEEN *Email address:* r.levi@abdn.ac.uk

INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF ABERDEEN *Email address*: henri.riihimaki@abdn.ac.uk

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND PHYSICS, NOTTINGHAM TRENT UNIVERSITY *Email address*: jason.smith@ntu.ac.uk