

Machine intelligence and network science for complex systems big data analysis

## **Carlo Vittorio Cannistraci**

**Center for Complex Network Intelligence (CCNI)** Tsinghua Laboratory of Brain and Intelligence



Tsinghua Laboratory of Brain and Intelligence

#### **Center for Complex Network Intelligence (CCNI)**



**Carlo Vittorio Cannistraci** Chair Professor and Chief Scientist Period at THBI: 2020 - Now



#### **Research philosophy**

A transdisciplinary approach integrating <u>information theory</u>, <u>machine learning and network science</u> to investigate the physics of networked adaptive complex systems at different scales, from molecules to ecological and social systems, with a particular attention to <u>brain/bio-inspired computing and complex big data</u> (focus on: neuroscience, biomedicine and social science) pattern recognition analysis.

#### 1. Theoretical topics

1.1 Network Geometry

1.2. Network topology & network automata as models of network self-organization

1.3. Complex network intelligence and Brain inspired computing for AI

1.4. Geometric Machine Learning

#### **2.** Applied topics

2.1 Brain Networks & Network neuroscience

- 2.2 Omic data analysis & design of multiomic biomarkers for precision medicine
- 2.3 Neuromorphic and unconventional computing for AI
- 2.4 Social and Economical systems

### What is the difference between <u>graph</u> and <u>network</u>?



— Link



## **Complex Systems and Network Science**











Modular gateway-ness connectivity and structural core organization in maritime network science. Mengqiao Xu, Qian Pan, Alessandro Muscoloni, Haoxiang Xia and Carlo Vittorio Cannistraci. Nature Communications 2020

The modular gateway-ness connectivity of maritime networks follows a core organization paradigm similar to brain networks



(2020)

#### Nonlinear machine learning pattern recognition and bacteria-metabolite multilayer network

analysis of perturbed gastric microbiome. C Durán, S Ciucci, ... and <u>Carlo Vittorio Cannistraci</u> Nature communications 12 (1), 1-22, 2021

The discovered bacteria-metabolite network affected in gastric environment of dyspeptic patients.







#### Gastric microbiota



nature communications

#### 6

#### Article

https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-022-34634-6

#### Geometrical congruence, greedy navigability and myopic transfer in complex networks and brain connectomes

N	OV	er	n	be	er
	2	02	22	)	

Received: 6 July 2020	Carlo Vittorio Cannistraci 🕲 <sup>1,2,3,4,5,6</sup> 🖂 & Alessandro Muscoloni 🕲 <sup>1,4</sup>	
Accepted: 1 November 2022		
Published online: 27 November 2022	We introduce in network geometry a measure of <i>geometrical congruence (GC)</i>	
Check for updates	<ul> <li>to evaluate the extent a network topology follows an underlying geometry.</li> <li>This requires finding all topological shortest-paths for each nonadjacent node pair in the network: a nontrivial computational task. Hence, we propose an optimized algorithm that reduces 26 years of worst scenario computation to one week parallel computing. Analysing artificial networks with patent geo-</li> </ul>	
	metry we discover that, different from current belief, hyperbolic networks do not show in general high GC and efficient greedy navigability (GN) with respect to the geodesics. The myopic transfer which rules GN works best only when degree-distribution power-law exponent is strictly close to two. Analysing real	

Euclidean.

networks—whose geometry is often latent—GC overcomes GN as marker to differentiate phenotypical states in macroscale structural-MRI brain connectomes, suggesting connectomes might have a latent neurobiological geometry accounting for more information than the visible tridimensional

## OUTLINE of the talk

1. Introduction to network analysis and models

2. Network geometry, AI and applications

- 3. Tomorrow:
- 3.1 Network science for Sparse deep learning
- 3.2 Neuromorphic Computing

## Crisis: I was a Master student in 2002

#### Artificial Neural Network (ANN)





**Brain Connectivity** 

### *Crisis:* Why is brain connectivity sparse?

Vs.



Yingtao Zhang

EPITOPOLOGICAL LEARNING AND CANNISTRACI-HEBB NETWORK SHAPE INTELLIGENCE BRAIN-INSPIRED THEORY FOR ULTRA-SPARSE ADVANTAGE IN DEEP LEARNING

Yingtao Zhang<sup>1,2,3</sup>, Jialin Zhao<sup>1,2,3</sup>, Wenjing Wu<sup>1,2,3</sup>, Alessandro Muscoloni<sup>1,2,4</sup>, & Carlo Vittorio Cannistraci<sup>1,2,3,4 \*</sup> <sup>1</sup>Center for Complex Network Intelligence (CCNI) <sup>2</sup>Tsinghua Laboratory of Brain and Intelligence (THBI) <sup>3</sup>Department of Computer Science, <sup>4</sup>Department of Biomedical Engineering Tsinghua University, Beijing, China.

#### ICLR2024 evaluation: avg. score 7.33, ranks 326/2261 accepted (in the top 15%)

### How the topology evolves during the epochs

https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=b5lLpOhb3BI



## Crisis: I was a Master student in 2002



*Crisis:* Why is brain connectivity sparse (topology)? *Crisis:* What is the contribution of morphology?

preprints.org > computer science and mathematics > artificial intelligence and machine learning > doi: 10.20944/preprints2

Preprint Article Version 1 Preserved in Portico This version is not peer-reviewed

## Neuromorphic Dendritic Computation with Silent Synapses for Visual Motion Perception

#### 🚯 Eunhye Baek \* , 🚯 Sen Song , 🚯 Zhao Rong , 🚯 Luping Shi \* , 🌚 Carlo Vittorio Cannistraci \* 🔟

Version 1 : Received: 5 June 2023 / Approved: 6 June 2023 / Online: 6 June 2023 (10:04:05 CEST)

**How to cite:** Baek, E.; Song, S.; Rong, Z.; Shi, L.; Cannistraci, C.V. Neuromorphic Dendritic Computation with Silent Synapses for Visual Motion Perception. *Preprints* **2023**, 2023060438. https://doi.org/10.20944/preprints202306.0438.v1 Copy

Abstract

Most neuromorphic technologies use a point-neuron model, missing the spatiotemporal nature of neuronal computation performed in dendrites. Dendritic morphology and synaptic organization are structurally tailored for spatiotemporal information processing, enabling various computations like visual perception. Here, we report on a neuromorphic computational model termed 'dendristor', which integrates functional synaptic organization with dendritic tree-like morphology computation. The dendristor presents bioplausible nonlinear integration of excitatory and inhibitory synaptic inputs with silent synapses and diverse spatial distribution dependency. We show that the dendristor can emulate direction selectivity, which is the feature to react robustly to a preferred signal direction on the dendrite. We discover that silent synapses can remarkably enhance direction selectivity, turning out to be a crucial player in dendritic computation in processing. Finally, we develop neuromorphic dendritic neural circuits that can emulate a cognitive function such as motion perception in the retina. Using dendritic morphology, we achieve visual perception of motion in 3D space by various mapping of spatial information on different dendritic branches. This neuromorphic dendritic computation innovates beyond current neuromorphic computation and provides solutions to explore new skylines in artificial intelligence, neurocomputation, and brain-inspired computing.

#### **Nature Electronics 2024 Accepted**



Dr. E. Baek

## OUTLINE of the talk

1. Introduction to network analysis and models

2. Network geometry, AI and applications

- 3. Tomorrow:
- 3.1 Network science for Sparse deep learning3.2 Neuromorphic Computing

Artistic representation of the topics of today



https://menchelab.com/higher-order-networks-and-thetopology-of-data Artistic representation of the topics of today

## Understanding the rule of association generating the networks (direct problem)



#### (inverse problem)

Given the network can we reverse the rules of association

## **Generative models in Network Science**



## Three basic properties of real complex networks



## Average cluster coefficient



#### For a network with N nodes Average Clustrer Coefficinet = Σi C(i)/N

## **Average Shortest path length**



### $L=\Sigma SP(x,y)/N$

### Small wordness $\rightarrow$ L(N) ~ log (N)

## Average degree and degree distribution





## **Generative models**







	Erdős-Rényi	Watts-Strogatz	Barabási-Albert
Clustering			
Small-world			
Scale-free			



## **Generative models**







1959

1998

1999

	Erdős-Rényi	Watts-Strogatz	Barabási-Albert	
Clustering				
Small-world			$\checkmark$	
Scale-free			$\checkmark$	



**Problem** 





Power-law

degree

## OUTLINE of the talk

1. Introduction to network analysis and models

2. Network geometry, AI and applications

- 3. Tomorrow:
- 3.1 Network science for Sparse deep learning
- 3.2 Neuromorphic Computing

### LETTER 2012

#### Popularity versus similarity in growing networks

Fragkiskos Papadopoulos<sup>1</sup>, Maksim Kitsak<sup>2</sup>, M. Ángeles Serrano<sup>3</sup>, Marián Boguñá<sup>3</sup> & Dmitri Krioukov<sup>2</sup>

The principle<sup>1</sup> that 'popularity is attractive' underlies preferential attachment<sup>2</sup>, which is a common explanation for the emergence of scaling in growing networks. If new connections are made preferentially to more popular nodes, then the resulting distribution of the number of connections possessed by nodes follows power laws<sup>3,4</sup>, as observed in many real networks<sup>5,6</sup>. Preferential attachment has been directly validated for some real networks (including the Internet<sup>7,8</sup>), and can be a consequence of different underlying processes based on node fitness, ranking, optimization, random walks or duplication9-16. Here we show that popularity is just one dimension of attractiveness; another dimension is similarity<sup>17-24</sup>. We develop a framework in which new connections optimize certain trade-offs between popularity and similarity, instead of simply preferring popular nodes. The framework has a geometric interpretation in which popularity preference emerges from local optimization. As opposed to preferential attachment, our optimization framework accurately describes the large-scale evolution of technological (the Internet), social (trust relationships between people) and biological (Escherichia coli metabolic) networks, predicting the probability of new links with high precision. The framework that we have developed can thus be used for predicting new links in evolving networks, and provides a different perspective on preferential attachment as an emergent phenomenon.

Nodes that are similar have a higher chance of getting connected, even if they are not popular. This effect is known as homophily in social sciences<sup>17,18</sup>, and it has been observed in many real networks<sup>19–24</sup>. In the web<sup>23,24</sup>, for example, an individual creating her new homepage tends to link it not only to popular sites such as Google or Facebook, but also to not-so-popular sites that are close to her special interests—for example, sites devoted to the composer Tartini or to free solo climbing. These observations suggest the introduction of a measure of attractiveness that would somehow balance popularity and similarity.

The simplest proxy for popularity is the node birth time. All other things being equal, older nodes have more chances to become popular and attract connections<sup>34</sup>. If nodes join the network one by one, then the node birth time is simply the node number t = 1, 2, ... To model similarity, we randomly place nodes on a circle that represents the simplest similarity space. That is, the angular distances between nodes model their similarity distances, such as the cosine similarity or any

connect simply to the closest *m* nodes on the plane, except that distances are not Euclidean but hyperbolic<sup>25</sup>. The hyperbolic distance between two nodes at polar coordinates ( $r_{s}$ ,  $\theta_{s}$ ) and ( $r_{b}$ ,  $\theta_{t}$ ) is approximately  $x_{st} = r_s + r_t + \ln(\theta_{st}/2) = \ln(st\theta_{st}/2)$ . Therefore the sets of nodes *s* minimizing  $x_{st}$  or  $s\theta_{st}$  for each *t* are identical. The hyperbolic





H2 in polar coordinates

## **Generative model for realistic complex networks**





Topology



Synthetic network with:

- Clustering
- Small-word
- Scale-free

## **Generative models in geometric space** (soft random geometrical graph)





	Euclidean (soft)	??????
Clustering	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$
Small-world		
Scale-free		

## **Generative models in geometric space** (soft random geometrical graph)



	Euclidean (soft)	Hyperbolic
Clustering	$\checkmark$	$\checkmark$
Small-world		
Scale-free		

























# Popularity-Similarity-Optimization (PSO) model

Input parameters:

- N = number of nodes
- *m* = half of the average node degree
- T = temperature (inversely related to clustering)
- $\gamma$  = exponent of the power-law degree distribution



#### The model has four input parameters:

#### Generation of synthetic networks by the PSO model

m > 0, which defines the average node degree  $\overline{k} = 2m$ ,

 $\beta \in (0, 1]$  the exponent  $\gamma = 1 + 1/\beta$  of the power law degree distribution,

 $T \ge 0$ , which controls the network clustering,

 $\zeta = \sqrt{-K} > 0$ , where K is the curvature of the hyperbolic plane. K generally fixed to -1

(1) all existing nodes j < i increase their radial coordinates according to  $r_j(i) = \beta r_j + (1 - \beta)r_i$  in order to simulate popularity fading;

(2) The new node picks a randomly chosen existing node and connects to it with:

probability:  $p(h_{ij}) = 1/(1 + exp((h_{ij} - R_i)/T))$ 




## **Generative model for realistic complex networks**

# 



Topology



Synthetic network with:

- Clustering
- Small-word
- Scale-free

## Problem 1 (inverse problem)



## Given the network topology (just connectivity) can we reverse the location of its nodes on the manifold?

Geometry (Hyperbolic)

Network



## Given the network topology (just connectivity) can we reverse the location of its nodes on the manifold?

## **Inverse problem in real networks**

Geometry



Topology



? Angular coordinates = node similarity ?

**Radial coordinate ok!** 

real network

## HyperMap (2015) (Model-based)

Maximum likelihood estimation

198

• Infer the coordinates maximizing the likelihood that the network has been generated by the PSO model <u>(not</u> <u>community organization)</u>

#### IEEE/ACM TRANSACTION ON NETWORKING

IEEE/ACM TRANSACTIONS ON NETWORKING, VOL. 23, NO. 1, FEBRUARY 2015

Network Mapping by Replaying Hyperbolic Growth

Fragkiskos Papadopoulos, Constantinos Psomas, and Dmitri Krioukov

43

Many limitations:

 $\circ$ Time complexity  $O(N^3) - O(N^4)$ 

**OUnweighted networks** 

**Only 2D-space** 

**ONot community organization** 

#### IEEE/ACM TRANSACTION ON NETWORKING

198

IEEE/ACM TRANSACTIONS ON NETWORKING, VOL. 23, NO. 1, FEBRUARY 2015

### Network Mapping by Replaying Hyperbolic Growth

Fragkiskos Papadopoulos, Constantinos Psomas, and Dmitri Krioukov

## Intuition (2012)

using nonlinear dimension reduction unsupervised machine learning methods

### **Original Network**



Isomap (manifold embedding)







## Why did I generate this intuition?

Modeling interactome: scale-free or geometric?

Natasa Pržulj, DG Corneil, I Jurisica, Bioinformatics 20 (18), 2004

Fitting a geometric graph to a protein–protein interaction network DJ Higham, M Rašajski, <u>Natasa Pržulj,</u> Bioinformatics 24 (8), <u>2008</u>

Network Biology was already discussing about this issue

## How to address problems of data nonlinearity







## Nonlinear Dimension Reduction

• Kernel based {example: Gaussian-PCA}



**Issue 1:** difficulty to know the correct kernel

Issue 2: presence of free parameters to tune!!!

Manifold based
{example: Isomap}



Tenenbaum et al. – Science, 2000

**Issue 1:** Hypothesis of **local continuity** of the manifold

Issue 2: presence of free parameters to tune!!!

General principles of organization of complex system

## The inspiration (2008)

ARTICLES PUBLISHED ONLINE: 16 NOVEMBER 2008 DOI: 10.1038/NPHYS1130 nature physics

## Navigability of complex networks

Marián Boguñá<sup>1</sup>\*, Dmitri Krioukov<sup>2</sup> and K. C. Claffy<sup>2</sup>

Routing information through networks is a universal phenomenon in both natural and man-made complex systems. When each node has full knowledge of the global network connectivity, finding short communication paths is merely a matter of distributed computation. However, in many real networks, nodes communicate efficiently even without such global intelligence. Here, we show that the peculiar structural characteristics of many complex networks support efficient communication without global knowledge. We also describe a general mechanism that explains this connection between network structure and function. This mechanism relies on the presence of a metric space hidden behind an observable network. Our findings suggest that real networks in nature have underlying metric spaces that remain undiscovered. Their discovery should have practical applications in a wide range of areas where networks are used to model complex systems.

## The inspiration (greedy navigability)



The **observed topological** properties arise from a **hidden geometric space** underlying the network

**How MC works:** Navigating between the points with a greedy routing process: the minimum spanning tree (MST)!



The greedy routing navigability is a way to map the hidden nonlinear topology For MC: The global mapping and the local fitting are reciprocally dependent MC Minimize globally and fit locally!

## Nonlinear topological-based Dimension Reduction



### Isomap (manifold embedding)



#### Minimum Curvilinear embedding (MCE) (hierarchical embedding)

#### **Radar Signal Dataset**



## The crescent-moon obsession



**Similarity** ordering of the samples !

### Direction of maximum MC nonlinear similarity in the multidimensional space



\_\_\_\_\_\_

### ECCB 2010, Ghent, Belgium

#### BIOINFORMATICS

Vol. 26 ECCB 2010, pages i531–i539 doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/btq376

### Nonlinear dimension reduction and clustering by Minimum Curvilinearity unfold neuropathic pain and tissue embryological

#### classes

Carlo Vittorio Cannistraci<sup>1,2,3,4,5,\*</sup>, Timothy Ravasi<sup>1,5</sup>, Franco Maria Montevecchi<sup>3</sup>, Trey Ideker<sup>5</sup> and Massimo Alessio<sup>2,\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Red Sea Integrative Systems Biology Lab, Computational Bioscience Research Center, Division of Chemical and Life Sciences and Engineering, King Abdullah University for Science and Technology (KAUST), Jeddah, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, <sup>2</sup>Proteome Biochemistry, San Raffaele Scientific Institute, via Olgettina 58, 20132 Milan, <sup>3</sup>Department of Mechanics, <sup>4</sup>CMP Group, Microsoft Research, Politecnico di Torino, c/so Duca degli Abruzzi 24, 10129 Turin, Italy, <sup>5</sup>Department of Bioengineering and Department of Medicine, University of California, San Diego, 9500 Gilman Drive, La Jolla, CA 92093 USA

### ISMB/ECCB 2013, Berlin, Germany, July 2013

#### **BIOINFORMATICS**

Vol. 29 ISMB/ECCB 2013, pages i199–i209 doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/btt208

#### Minimum curvilinearity to enhance topological prediction of protein interactions by network embedding

Carlo Vittorio Cannistraci<sup>1,2,\*,†</sup>, Gregorio Alanis-Lobato<sup>1,2,†</sup> and Timothy Ravasi<sup>1,2,\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Integrative Systems Biology Laboratory, Biological and Environmental Sciences and Engineering Division, Computer Electrical and Mathematical Sciences and Engineering Division, Computational Bioscience Research Center, King Abdullah University of Science and Technology (KAUST), Thuwal 23955-6900, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia and <sup>2</sup>Division of Medical Genetics, Department of Medicine, University of California, San Diego, CA 92093-0688, USA

#### ABSTRACT

Motivation: Most functions within the cell emerge thanks to protein-protein interactions (PPIs), yet experimental determination of PPIs is both expensive and time-consuming. PPI networks present significant levels of noise and incompleteness. Predicting interactions using only PPI-network topology (topological prediction) is difficult but essential when prior biological knowledge is absent or unreliable.

#### 1 INTRODUCTION

Detection of new interactions between proteins is central to modern biology. Its application in protein function prediction, drug delivery control and disease diagnosis has developed alongside a deeper understanding of the processes that occur within the cell. One key task in systems biology is the experimental detection of new protein–protein interactions (PPIs). However, such experiments are time consuming and expensive. Because of

## Intuition (2012)

using nonlinear dimension reduction unsupervised machine learning methods

### **Original Network**



Isomap (manifold embedding)







## **Pre-weighting rules**



• Repulsion-Attraction (RA) - local

$$x_{ij}^{RA} = \frac{1 + e_i + e_j + e_i e_j}{1 + CN_{ij}}$$



**Coalescent embedding** 

## **Pre-weighting rules**



 $x_{ij}^{RA} = \frac{1 + e_i + e_j + e_i e_j}{1 + CN_{ij}}$ 





### **Coalescent Embedding (2017) - (Model-free)**





## **Testing on the benchmark**



## **Testing on the benchmark**



Compare to the reference

## **Evaluation on PSO networks**



### **Evaluation on PSO networks: embedding quality**



#### **Evaluation on PSO networks: computational time**



Time complexity ~  $O(N^2)$ 

## **Community detection**



## Community detection (hyperbolic Louvain)



Method	Karate	Opsahl 8	Opsahl 9	Opsahl 10	Opsahl 11	Polbooks	Football	Polblogs	Mean NMI
Coalescent Embedding	1.00	0.57	0.47	1.00	0.93	0.59	0.90	0.68	0.77
Original algorithm	0.46	0.55	0.41	1.00	0.96	0.50	0.93	0.64	0.68
HyperMap mapping	0.56	0.60	0.28	0.92	0.85	0.50	0.83	0.69	0.65

## Embedding in 3D



**Conclusions on Coalescent Embedding** 

- 'O(n<sup>3</sup>) or O(n<sup>4</sup>)'  $\rightarrow$  O(n<sup>2</sup>)
- Unweighted networks  $\rightarrow$  Weighted networks
- Only 2D embedding → also 3D or any dimensional space
- Community detection in the hyperbolic space algorithms
- Not hyperparameters to tune!
## November 2017



& Carlo Vittorio Cannistraci D<sup>1,4</sup>

Physicists recently observed that realistic complex networks emerge as discrete samples from a continuous hyperbolic geometry enclosed in a circle: the radius represents the node centrality and the angular displacement between two nodes resembles their topological proximity. The hyperbolic circle aims to become a universal space of representation and analysis of many real networks. Yet, inferring the angular coordinates to map a real network back to its latent geometry remains a challenging inverse problem. Here, we show that intelligent machines for unsupervised recognition and visualization of similarities in big data can also infer the network angular coordinates of the hyperbolic model according to a geometrical organization that we term "angular coalescence." Based on this phenomenon, we propose a class of algorithms that offers fast and accurate "coalescent embedding" in the hyperbolic circle even for large networks. This computational solution to an inverse problem in physics of complex systems favors the application of network latent geometry techniques in disciplines dealing with big network data analysis including biology, medicine, and social science.

## A question for you ?

## **Evaluation on PSO networks: embedding quality**







Article Open access Published: 06 August 2021

# The inherent community structure of hyperbolic networks

Bianka Kovács & Gergely Palla

Scientific Reports **11**, Article number: 16050 (2021) Cite this article

## Mechanism of similarity attachment

Initial step



## **Network automata solution**

#### Time complexity ~ O(E)



#### Minimum curvilinear automata with similarity attachment for network embedding and link prediction in the hyperbolic space

#### Alessandro Muscoloni, Carlo Vittorio Cannistraci

(Submitted on 4 Feb 2018)

The idea of minimum curvilinearity (MC) is that the hidden geometry of complex networks, in particular when they are sufficiently sparse, clustered, small-world and heterogeneous, can be efficiently navigated using the minimum spanning tree (MST), which is a greedy navigator. The local topological information drives the global geometrical navigation and the MST can be interpreted as a growing path that greedily maximizes local similarity between the nodes attached at each step by globally minimizing their overall distances in the network. This is also valid in absence of the network structure and in presence of only the nodes geometrically located over the network generative manifold in a high-dimensional space. We know that random geometric graphs in the hyperbolic space are an adequate model for realistic complex networks: the explanation of this connection is that complex networks exhibit hierarchical, tree-like organization, and in turn the hyperbolic geometry is the geometry of trees. Here we show that, according to a mechanism that we define similarity attachment, the visited node sequence of a network automaton can efficiently approximate the nodes' angular coordinates in the hyperbolic disk, that actually represent an ordering of their similarities. This is a consequence of the fact that the MST, during its greedy growing process, at each step sequentially attaches the node most similar (less distant) to its own cohort. Minimum curvilinear automata (MCA) displays embedding accuracy which seems superior to HyperMap-CN and inferior to coalescent embedding, however its link prediction performance on real networks is without precedent for methods based on the hyperbolic space. Finally, depending on the data structure used to build the MST, the MCA's time complexity can also approach a linear dependence from the number of edges.



## Video of Minimum Curvilinear automata

#### The trilogy

Probabilistic-model based	Model-free	Mechanistic-model based	
Maximum likelihood estimation	Nonlinear dimension reduction	Network Automata	
- Time complexity $O(N^3) - O(N^4)$	- Time complexity O(N <sup>2</sup> )	- Time complexity ~ O(E)	
<ul> <li>Unweighted networks</li> <li>Only 2D-space</li> </ul>	- Unweighted/weighted networks	- Unweighted/weighted networks	
	- Any dimension	- Only 2D-space	
	- Higher HD accuracy	- Higher LP accuracy	
- Higher GR accuracy			
Bogugna et al. 2010, Nat. com. Papadopulos et al. 2015 IEEE/ACM	Muscoloni et al. 2018, Nat. com.	Muscoloni et al. 2018, ArXiv.	

# Problem 2 (absence of community structure)

# Popularity-Similarity-Optimization (PSO) model (2012)

Real network properties:

 $\mathbf{\nabla}$  Clustering

 $\mathbf{V}$  Small-world

 $\blacksquare$  Scale-free





# **Community structure**



# **Community membership**



# Temperature



Temperature for tuning clustering and mixing between the communities

## **Implementation for links generation**



## **Implementation for links generation**



Time for 1 network

- Time complexity O(*EN*) •
- $N = 10000 \rightarrow 5 \text{ min}$ •

# **Generative procedure (with community)**

For each iteration  $t = 1 \dots N$ 

- 1) Update radial coordinates of existing nodes j < t:  $r_j = f(j, t, \gamma)$
- 2) Introduce new node
  - Radial coordinate: f(t)
  - Angular coordinate: sampled from distribution
- 3) Establish *m* links
  - Connection probability:  $p_{tj} = f(h_{tj}, \mathbf{T}, ...)$





## Solution to problem 2 published in 2018

1. The first article on the theoretical model

A nonuniform popularity-similarity optimization (nPSO) model to efficiently generate realistic complex networks with communities Alessandro Muscolini and Carlo Vittorio Cannistraci http://iopscience.iop.org/article/10.1088/1367-2630/aac06f/meta

2. The second article on the application

#### Leveraging the nonuniform PSO network model as a benchmark for performance evaluation in community detection and link prediction Alessandro Muscolini and Carlo Vittorio Cannistraci Nonuniform PSO 4 communities

http://iopscience.iop.org/article/10.1088/1367-2630/aac6f9



**Alessandro Muscoloni** 



#### **Generative models in Network Science**



91

# Problem 3 (Geometrical markers from brain diseases)

## Human brain diffusion weighted magnetic resonance imaging (DW-MRI) structural connectomes



## **Anatomical Brain Lobe Characterization**





Brain Informatics December 2015, Volume 2, Issue 4, pp 197–210

## 2015

#### The intrinsic geometry of the human brain connectome

AuthorsAuthors and affiliationsAllen Q. Ye, Olusola A. Ajilore, Giorgio Conte, Johnson GadElkarim, Galen Thomas-Ramos, Liang Zhan, Shaolin Yang,<br/>Anand Kumar, Richard L. Magin, Angus G. Forbes, Alex D. Leow Open AccessArticleFirst Online: 07 November 2015Cite this article as:<br/>Ye, A.Q., Ajilore, O.A., Conte, G. et al.<br/>Brain Inf. (2015) 2: 197.<br/>doi:10.1007/s40708-015-0022-2DOI: 10.1007/s40708-015-0022-2ith<br/>Downloads

#### "Intrinsic brain network geometry only minimally relates to neuroanatomy!"

## Open Problem to solve!

#### Coalescent Embedding

PRE F1 F20 F20 F30P F3T F30 R0 SMA OC F1M F1MO

GR IN ACIN PCIN HIP AMYG V1 Q LIN PHIP AMYG V1 Q LO1 02 03 FUST P1 PSMG PCL CAU PAL HES T1P T2P T3

		SMA ACIN SMA F1M	ат.
Precentral Frontal-Sup-Orb Frontal-Mid Frontal-Mid-Orb Frontal-Inf-Oper Frontal-Inf-Oper Frontal-Inf-Orb Rolandic-Oper Supp-Motor-Area Olfactory Frontal-Sup-Medial Frontal-Med-Orb Rectus Insula Cingulum-Ant Cingulum-Ant Cingulum-Mid Cingulum-Post Hippocampus ParaHippocampal Amygdala Calcarine Cuneus Lingual Occipital-Sup Occipital-Sup Occipital-Inf Fusiform Postcentral Parietal-Sup Parietal-Inf SupraMarginal Angular Precuneus Paracentralobule Caudata	F20 F30P CAU F10 PUT F20 F30 N PCL PRE R0 POST SMG AG P2 PCIN PQ P1 O1 LING Q V1	F3T F2 MCIN F1MO F1 O C F2 F3 MCIN	BT F3OP F3O F2O IN F10 PRE F1MO PCL PUT GR CAU OC POST PQ PCIN P1 P2 SMG AG O2 O1 O V1
Caudate Putamen Pallidum Thalamus Heschl Temporal-Sup Temporal-Pole-Sup Temporal-Mid Temporal-Pole-Mid Temporal-Inf	O3 O2 HES T2 T1 T2P	<ul> <li>FUSI HIP T3 PHIP</li> <li>HIP T1 T2F</li> <li>PHIP PAL THAL THAL HES</li> <li>Left Frontal Lobe</li> <li>Left Parietal Lobe</li> <li>Left Occipital Lobe</li> <li>Right Parietal Lobe</li> <li>Right Occipital Lobe</li> <li>Right Occipital Lobe</li> <li>Right Temporal Lobe</li> <li>Not assigned</li> </ul>	C LING FUSI O3 T2 T3 FHIP

## **Applied example**

Network-based markers for brain diseases: brain imaging quantification of disease state in psychiatric (depression) and neurodegenerative (Parkinson, Alzheimer, etc.) disorders.



#### Nodes are brain areas

#### Geometrical modifications of the brain in diseases

#### de novo drug naïve <u>Parkinson's Disease (PD)</u> patients *compared with* <u>Healthy Controls (HC)</u>

	mean marker (HC)	mean marker (PD)	MW p-value	AUC	AUPR
Coalescent embedding (MCE)	14.7	15.7	0.006	0.87	0.82
HyperMap	13.0	14.0	0.026	0.80	0.76
Original network	222.0	215.8	0.307	0.64	0.64

## Coalescent Embedding in the 3D

# Coalescent Embedding in the 3D



#### **Brain Network of an individual**







## **Real application Network Neuroscience**



Alberto Cacciola

Cornell University Library

arXiv.org > q-bio > arXiv:1705.04192

Quantitative Biology > Neurons and Cognition

#### Coalescent embedding in the hyperbolic space unsupervisedly discloses the hidden geometry of the brain

Alberto Cacciola, Alessandro Muscoloni, Vaibhav Narula, Alessandro Calamuneri, Salvatore Nigro, Emeran A. Mayer, Jennifer S. Labus, <u>Giuseppe Anastas</u>i, Aldo Quattrone, <u>Angelo</u> Quartarone, Demetrio Milardi, Carlo Vittorio Cannistraci

(Submitted on 10 May 2017)

The human brain displays a complex network topology, whose structural organization is widely studied using diffusion tensor imaging. The original geometry from which emerges the network topology is known, as well as the localization of the network nodes in respect to the brain morphology and anatomy. One of the most challenging problems of current network science is to infer the latent geometry from the mere topology of a complex network. The human brain structural connectome represents the perfect benchmark to test algorithms aimed to solve this problem. Coalescent embedding was recently designed to map a complex network in the hyperbolic space, inferring the node angular coordinates. Here we show that this methodology is able to unsupervisedly reconstruct the latent geometry of the brain with an incredible accuracy and that the intrinsic geometry of the brain networks strongly relates to the lobes organization known in neuroanatomy. Furthermore, coalescent embedding allowed the detection of geometrical pathological changes in the connectomes of Parkinson's Disease patients. The present study represents the first evidence of brain networks' angular coalescence in the hyperbolic space, opening a completely new perspective, possibly towards the realization of latent geometry network markers for evaluation of brain disorders and pathologies.

# Problem 4 (Geometrical congruence of a network)

nature communications

#### 6

#### Article

https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-022-34634-6

#### Geometrical congruence, greedy navigability and myopic transfer in complex networks and brain connectomes

November
2022

Received: 6 July 2020	Carlo Vittorio Cannistraci 🖲 <sup>1,2,3,4,5,6</sup> 🖂 & Alessandro Muscoloni 🖲 <sup>1,4</sup>	
Accepted: 1 November 2022	—	
Published online: 27 November 2022	We introduce in network geometry a measure of <i>geometrical congruence (GC)</i>	
Check for updates	This requires finding all topological shortest-paths for each nonadjacent node pair in the network: a nontrivial computational task. Hence, we propose an optimized algorithm that reduces 26 years of worst scenario computation to one week parallel computing. Analysing artificial networks with patent geometry we discover that, different from current belief, hyperbolic networks do not show in general high GC and efficient greedy navigability (GN) with respect to the geodesics. The myopic transfer which rules GN works best only when degree-distribution power-law exponent is strictly close to two. Analysing real	

Euclidean.

networks—whose geometry is often latent—GC overcomes GN as marker to differentiate phenotypical states in macroscale structural-MRI brain connectomes, suggesting connectomes might have a latent neurobiological geometry accounting for more information than the visible tridimensional Artistic representation of the topics of today



https://menchelab.com/higher-order-networks-and-thetopology-of-data
## Computational measure of the soft congruence of a topology with a geometry



Soft congruence : Measuring to which extent a topology of a network follows a generative geometry

Measuring how modifications of general network properties modifies soft congruence

### Network in a geometrical space



Krioukov, D. et al. Hyperbolic geometry of complex networks. Phys Rev E (2010).

# Previous literature

Boguñá, M. & Krioukov, D. Navigating ultrasmall worlds in ultrashort time. Phys Rev Lett 102, 058701 (2009).

Boguñá, M. et al. Network geometry. Nature Reviews Physics 2021 3:2 3, 114–135 (2021).

- It was considering success ratio and stretch separately therefore there was not a unique measure of navigability efficiency
- It was considering the 'congruency' of successful greedy paths only supporting the believe that hyperbolic networks are maximally congruent with their underlying geometry
- It was not considering the ensemble of shortest path but only the geometrical shortest path.

Boguñá, M. et al. Network geometry. Nature Reviews





Boguñá et al.8 proposed a theoretical demonstration that greedy navigation in networks with  $\gamma$ <3 and strong clustering (such as hyperbolic networks4) can **always** find these ultrashort paths which follow the geodesics1,8, and thus navigation in hyperbolic networks with  $\gamma$ <3 is believed maximally efficient because of their supposed geometrical congruence1,4.



Krioukov, D. et al. Hyperbolic geometry of complex networks. Phys Rev E (2010). Boguñá, M. & Krioukov, D. Navigating ultrasmall worlds in ultrashort time. Phys Rev Lett 102, 058701 (2009).

# Results





Navigability measure (previous) Muscoloni,…, Cannistraci et al. Nat. Com. 2017

$$GRE(pGRP, RD) = \left(\frac{1}{n \cdot (n-1) - 2 \cdot e}\right) \cdot \sum \frac{RD(i, j)}{pGRP(i, j)}; \text{ with } (i, j) \in \tilde{E}$$

Congruency measure (<u>New</u>) Cannistraci et al. Nat. Com. 2022

$$GC(\overline{pTSP}, RD) = \left(\frac{2}{n \cdot (n-1) - 2 \cdot e}\right) \cdot \sum_{i < j} \frac{RD(i, j)}{\overline{pTSP}(i, j)} ; \text{ with } (i, j) \in \tilde{E}$$

117

Navigability measure (previous) Muscoloni,…, Cannistraci et al. Nat. Com. 2017

$$GRE(pGRP, RD) = \left(\frac{1}{n \cdot (n-1) - 2 \cdot e}\right) \cdot \sum \frac{RD(i, j)}{pGRP(i, j)}; \text{ with } (i, j) \in \tilde{E}$$

Greedy (approximated) measure

Congruency measure (<u>New</u>) Cannistraci et al. Nat. Com. 2022

$$GC(\overline{pTSP}, RD) = \left(\frac{2}{n \cdot (n-1) - 2 \cdot e}\right) \cdot \sum_{i < j} \frac{RD(i, j)}{\overline{pTSP}(i, j)} ; \text{ with } (i, j) \in \tilde{E}$$
  
Exact measure

nPSO (C=4 T=0.1 N=100)

b

а		GC(pTSP,GEO)				
	(p) 4	0.79	0.67	0.59	0.54	0.50
	gree 8	0.85	0.74	0.66	0.60	0.55
	0 0 12	0.86	0.76	0.68	0.63	0.60
	16 Ig	0.84	0.76	0.70	0.65	0.62
	9 20	0.82	0.75	0.71	0.66	0.64

С

GC(pTSP,GSP)

(q	4	0.95	0.95	0.96	0.96	0.97
gree	8	0.93	0.92	0.92	0.93	0.93
e de	12	0.91	0.90	0.90	0.90	0.91
rage	16	0.89	0.88	0.88	0.89	0.90
ave	20	0.87	0.85	0.86	0.88	0.89
		2	2.25	2.5	2.75	3
			power-l	aw expoi	nent (γ)	

G

### GRE(pGRP,GEO)

0.74	0.62	0.53	0.47	0.45
0.82	0.71	0.64	0.56	0.51
0.86	0.76	0.67	0.61	0.57
0.86	0.78	0.70	0.65	0.61
0.87	0.79	0.75	0.68	0.64

d

### GRE(pGRP,GSP)

0.88	0.87	0.86	0.82	0.85
0.89	0.87	0.88	0.86	0.85
0.91	0.89	0.88	0.86	0.85
0.91	0.89	0.87	0.89	0.88
0.91	0.90	0.90	0.89	0.89
2	2.25	2.5	2.75	3

power-law exponent (γ)



### nPSO (C=4 N=10000)



### GRE(pGRP, GEO)

0.68	0.47	0.34	0.28	0.24
0.75	0.56	0.43	0.37	0.32
0.80	0.60	0.48	0.40	0.36
0.82	0.62	0.49	0.43	0.39
0.83	0.63	0.51	0.45	0.40

### GRE(pGRP, GSP)

0.86	0.82	0.80	0.81	0.80
0.84	0.83	0.82	0.83	0.82
0.85	0.82	0.82	0.82	0.83
0.86	0.82	0.82	0.83	0.83
0.87	0.82	0.82	0.82	0.82

	negligible	lc	w	medi	um	high	
0	(	).4	0	.6	0.8	3	1

## **Optimized algorithm to find all shortest paths**



## **Optimized algorithm to find all shortest paths**



## **Optimized algorithm to find all shortest paths**





#### Suppl. Note 2. Pseudocode to compute the $\overline{pTSP}$ between all node pairs.

N - number of nodes         A - adjacency list, containing for each node the list of neighbours;         A[1] is the list of neighbours of node 1, A[2] the same for node 2, and so on for N nodes.         G - NXN matrix of geodesics between all node pairs.         T - NxN matrix of <i>pTSP</i> between all node pairs. <b>0UTPUT</b> P = NxN matrix of <i>pTSP</i> between all node pairs.         1 <b>function</b> P = compute_pTSP(A, T, S, order)         2         # compute for each node the mean of the topological shortest paths to all other nodes         4       Tmean = numerical vector of N elements, initialized to zeros         5       for tin [s+1N]         0(N)         6       Tmean[s] = Tmean[s] + T[s,t]         8       Tmean[s] = Tmean[s] + T[s,t]         9       Tmean[s] = Tmean[s] / (N-1)         10       Tmean[s] = Tmean[s] / (N-1)         11       # sort nodes by decreasing mean of the topological shortest paths         12       order = numerical vector of N elements, initialized to zeros       0(N)         11       # sort nodes by decreasing mean of the topological shortest paths       11         12       order = numerical vector of N elements, initialized to zeros       0(N)         13       order = numerical vector of N elements, initialized to zeros       0(N)	INP	UT	
A - adjacency list, containing for each node the list of neighbours; A[1] is the list of neighbours of node 1, A[2] the same for node 2, and so on for N nodes. G - NxN matrix of geodesics between all node pairs. T - NxN matrix of topological shortest paths between all node pairs. OUTPUT P = NxN matrix of $\overline{pTSP}$ between all node pairs. function P = compute_pTSP(A, T, S, order) # compute for each node the mean of the topological shortest paths to all other nodes T mean = numerical vector of N elements, initialized to zeros for s in [1N] for s in [1N] T mean[s] = Tmean[s] + T[s,t] function = numerical vector of N elements, initialized to zeros for s in [1N] T mean[s] = Tmean[s] + T[s,t] function = numerical vector of N elements, initialized to zeros for s in [1N] for s in [1N] for timean[s] = Tmean[s] + T[s,t] function = numerical vector of N elements, initialized to zeros for defined to the source of N elements, initialized to zeros function = numerical vector of N elements, initialized to zeros for timean[s] = Tmean[s] / (N-1) function = numerical vector of N elements, initialized to zeros for defined topological shortest paths function = get_sort_indexes(Tmean, 'decreasing') function = get_sort_indexes(Tmean, 'decreasing') function = get_sort_indexes for each node the maximum path length to evaluate function = get_sort_indexes for each node the maximum path length to evaluate function = logical vector of N elements, initialized to zeros function = numerical vector of N elements, initialized to zeros function = numerical vector of N elements, initialized to zeros function = numerical vector of N elements, initialized to zeros function = numerical vector of N elements, initialized to zeros function = numerical vector of N elements, initialized to zeros function = numerical vector of N elements, initialized to zeros function = numerical vector of N elements, initialized to zeros function = numerical vector of N elements, initialized to zeros function = nu	N – 1	number of nodes	
A[1] is the list of neighbours of node 1, A[2] the same for node 2, and so on for N nodes. G - NxN matrix of geodesics between all node pairs. <b>OUTPUT</b> P = NxN matrix of $\overline{pTSP}$ between all node pairs. <b>1</b> function P = compute_pTSP(A, T, S, order) 2 3 # compute for each node the mean of the topological shortest paths to all other nodes 4 T mean = numerical vector of N elements, initialized to zeros 0(N) 7 T mean[s] = Tmean[s] + T[s,t] 0(1) 8 T mean[s] = Tmean[s] + T[s,t] 0(1) 9 T mean[s] = Tmean[s] / (N-1) 0(1) 10 11 12 13 14 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15 15	A – a	adjacency list, containing for each node the list of neighbours;	
G - NxN matrix of geodesics between all node pairs. T - NxN matrix of topological shortest paths between all node pairs. OUTPUT P = NxN matrix of $\overline{pTSP}$ between all node pairs. function P = compute_pTSP(A, T, S, order) 4 function P = compute_pTSP(A, T, S, order) 2 4 compute for each node the mean of the topological shortest paths to all other nodes 4 Tmean = numerical vector of N elements, initialized to zeros 5 for s in [1N] 6 for t in [s+1N] 7 Tmean[s] = Tmean[s] + T[s,t] 8 Tmean[t] = Tmean[s] + T[s,t] 9 Tmean[s] = Tmean[s] / (N-1) 10 11 # sort nodes by decreasing mean of the topological shortest paths 12 order = numerical vector of N elements, initialized to zeros 13 order = get_sort_indexes(Tmean, 'decreasing') 14 # the hypothetical function get_sort_indexes sorts the elements of Tmean 15 # by decreasing order and returns the indexes of the sorted elements 16 17 # compute L, which indicates for each node the maximum path length to evaluate 18 L = numerical vector of N elements, initialized to zeros 19 mask = logical vector of N elements, initialized to zeros 10 (N) 21 s = order[i] 22 o(N) 23 if (mask[t]==false) & (T[s,t]>L[s]) 24 U[s] = T[s,t] 25 O(N) 26 O(N)	A	[1] is the list of neighbours of node 1, A[2] the same for node 2, and so on for N nodes.	
T - NxN matrix of topological shortest paths between all node pairs.          OUTPUT         P = NxN matrix of $\overline{pTSP}$ between all node pairs.         1       function P = compute_pTSP(A, T, S, order)         2         3       # compute for each node the mean of the topological shortest paths to all other nodes         4       Tmean = numerical vector of N elements, initialized to zeros       0(N)         5       for s in [1N]       0(N)         7       Tmean[s] = Tmean[s] + T[s,t]       0(1)         8       Tmean[t] = Tmean[t] + T[s,t]       0(1)         9       Tmean[s] = Tmean[s] / (N-1)       0(1)         10       # sort nodes by decreasing mean of the topological shortest paths       0(NogN)         11       # sort nodes by decreasing mean of the topological shortest paths       0(NogN)         10       rmean[s] = Tmean[s] / (N-1)       0(1)         10       get_sort_indexes(Tmean, 'decreasing')       0(NogN)         14       # the hypothetical function get_sort_indexes sorts the elements of Tmean       #         15       # by decreasing order and returns the indexes of the sorted elements       0(N)         16       L = numerical vector of N elements, initialized to zeros       0(N)         17       # compute L, which indicates for each node the maximum path length to evaluate       1 <th>G – 1</th> <th>NxN matrix of geodesics between all node pairs.</th> <th></th>	G – 1	NxN matrix of geodesics between all node pairs.	
<b>OUTPUT</b> $P = NxN$ matrix of $\overline{pTSP}$ between all node pairs.         1 <b>function</b> $P = compute_pTSP(A, T, S, order)         2       # compute for each node the mean of the topological shortest paths to all other nodes         4       Tmean = numerical vector of N elements, initialized to zeros       O(N)         5       for s in [1N] O(N)         6       for t in [s+1N] O(1)         7       Tmean[s] = Tmean[s] + T[s,t]       O(1)         8       Tmean[t] = Tmean[t] + T[s,t]       O(1)         9       Tmean[s] = Tmean[s] / (N-1)       O(1)         10       # sort nodes by decreasing mean of the topological shortest paths       O(N)         10       # sort nodes by decreasing mean of the topological shortest paths       O(N)         10       # sort nodes by decreasing mean of the topological shortest paths       O(N)         10       # sort nodes by decreasing mean of the topological shortest paths       O(N)         10       # sort nodes by decreasing mean of the topological shortest paths       O(N)         11       # sort nodes by decreasing mean of the topological shortest paths       O(N)         12       order = numerical vector of N elements, initialized to zeros       O(N)         13       order = numerical vector of N el$	T – T	NxN matrix of topological shortest paths between all node pairs.	
<b>OUTPUT</b> $P = NxN$ matrix of $\overline{pTSP}$ between all node pairs.         1 <b>function</b> $P = compute_pTSP(A, T, S, order)         2       # compute for each node the mean of the topological shortest paths to all other nodes         4       Tmean = numerical vector of N elements, initialized to zeros       O(N)         5       for s in [1N] O(N)         6       for tin [s+1N] O(N)         7       Tmean[s] = Tmean[s] + T[s,t]       O(1)         8       Tmean[t] = Tmean[t] + T[s,t]       O(1)         9       Tmean[s] = Tmean[s] / (N-1)       O(1)         10       # sort nodes by decreasing mean of the topological shortest paths       O(N)         10       # sort nodes by decreasing mean of the topological shortest paths       O(N)         10       # sort nodes by decreasing mean of the topological shortest paths       O(N)         10       # sort nodes by decreasing mean of the topological shortest paths       O(N)         10       # sort nodes by decreasing mean of the topological shortest paths       O(N)         10       # sort nodes by decreasing mean of the topological shortest paths       O(N)         11       # sort nodes by decreasing mean of the topological shortest paths       O(N)         12       order = numerical vector of $	0.1.11		
P = NXN matrix of <i>p1SP</i> between all node pairs.         1       function P = compute_pTSP(A, T, S, order)         3       # compute for each node the mean of the topological shortest paths to all other nodes         4       Tmean = numerical vector of N elements, initialized to zeros       0(N)         5       for s in [1N]       0(N)         6       for t in [s+1N]       0(1)         7       Tmean[s] = Tmean[s] + T[s,t]       0(1)         8       Tmean[t] = Tmean[t] + T[s,t]       0(1)         9       Tmean[s] = Tmean[s] / (N-1)       0(1)         10       # sort nodes by decreasing mean of the topological shortest paths       0(N)         11       # sort nodes by decreasing mean of the topological shortest paths       0(N)         12       order = numerical vector of N elements, initialized to zeros       0(N)         13       order = get_sort_indexes(Tmean, 'decreasing')       0(NlogN)         14       # by decreasing order and returns the indexes of the sorted elements       1         16       # compute L, which indicates for each node the maximum path length to evaluate       1         17       # compute L, which indicates for each node the maximum path length to evaluate       1         18       L = numerical vector of N elements, initialized to zeros       0(N) <td< th=""><th>001</th><th></th><th></th></td<>	001		
1       function P = compute_pTSP(A, T, S, order)         2       # compute for each node the mean of the topological shortest paths to all other nodes         4       Tmean = numerical vector of N elements, initialized to zeros $O(N)$ 5       for s in [1N] $O(N)$ 6       for t in [s+1N] $O(N)$ 7       Tmean[s] = Tmean[s] + T[s,t] $O(1)$ 8       Tmean[t] = Tmean[t] + T[s,t] $O(1)$ 9       Tmean[s] = Tmean[s] / (N-1) $O(1)$ 10       10 $f$ sort nodes by decreasing mean of the topological shortest paths $O(N)$ 10       # sort nodes by decreasing mean of the topological shortest paths $O(N)$ 10       # sort nodes by decreasing mean of the topological shortest paths $O(N)$ 10       # sort nodes by decreasing mean of the topological shortest paths $O(N)$ 10       # sort nodes by decreasing mean of the topological shortest paths $O(N)$ 11       # sort nodes by decreasing mean of the topological shortest paths $O(N)$ 10 $requestrone (Compute L, which indicates (Compute L, which indicates for each node the maximum path length to evaluate       L = numerical vector of N elements, initialized to zeros       O(N)         10       max = logical vec$	P =	NxN matrix of <i>pTSP</i> between all node pairs.	
a minimum constraint of the product of the topological shortest paths to all other nodes3# compute for each node the mean of the topological shortest paths to all other nodes4Tmean = numerical vector of N elements, initialized to zeros $O(N)$ 5for s in [1N] $O(N)$ 6for t in [s+1N] $O(N)$ 7Tmean[s] = Tmean[s] + T[s,t] $O(1)$ 8Tmean[t] = Tmean[t] + T[s,t] $O(1)$ 9Tmean[s] = Tmean[s] / (N-1) $O(1)$ 10# sort nodes by decreasing mean of the topological shortest paths12order = numerical vector of N elements, initialized to zeros $O(N)$ 13order = get_sort_indexes(Tmean, 'decreasing') $O(NlogN)$ 14# the hypothetical function get_sort_indexes sorts the elements of Tmean15# by decreasing order and returns the indexes of the sorted elements16# compute L, which indicates for each node the maximum path length to evaluate16L = numerical vector of N elements, initialized to zeros $O(N)$ 19mask = logical vector of N elements, initialized to zeros $O(N)$ 20for t in [1N] $O(N)$ 21for t in [1N] $O(N)$ 22rot in [1N] $O(N)$ 23if (mask[t]==false) & (T[s,t]>L[s]) $O(1)$ 24L[s]=T[st] $O(1)$	1	<b>function</b> $P = compute pTSP(A, T, S, order)$	
3# compute for each node the mean of the topological shortest paths to all other nodes4Tmean = numerical vector of N elements, initialized to zeros $O(N)$ 5for s in [1N] $O(N)$ 6for t in [s+1N] $O(N)$ 7Tmean[s] = Tmean[s] + T[s,t] $O(1)$ 8Tmean[t] = Tmean[t] + T[s,t] $O(1)$ 9Tmean[s] = Tmean[s] / (N-1) $O(1)$ 10# sort nodes by decreasing mean of the topological shortest paths12order = numerical vector of N elements, initialized to zeros $O(N)$ 13order = get_sort_indexes(Tmean, 'decreasing') $O(NlogN)$ 14# the hypothetical function get_sort_indexes sorts the elements of Tmean15# by decreasing order and returns the indexes of the sorted elements16*17# compute L, which indicates for each node the maximum path length to evaluate18L = numerical vector of N elements, initialized to zeros $O(N)$ 19mask = logical vector of N elements, initialized to zeros $O(N)$ 20for i in [1N] $O(N)$ 21s = order[i] $O(1)$ 22if (mask[t]==false) & (T[s,t]>L[s]) $O(1)$ 23if (mask[t]==false) & (T[s,t]>L[s]) $O(1)$	2		
4Tmean = numerical vector of N elements, initialized to zeros $O(N)$ 5for s in $[1N]$ $O(N)$ 6for t in $[s+1N]$ $O(N)$ 7Tmean $[s] = Tmean[s] + T[s,t]$ $O(1)$ 8Tmean $[t] = Tmean[t] + T[s,t]$ $O(1)$ 9Tmean $[s] = Tmean[s] / (N-1)$ $O(1)$ 10# sort nodes by decreasing mean of the topological shortest paths $O(N)$ 11# sort nodes by decreasing mean of the topological shortest paths $O(N)$ 12order = numerical vector of N elements, initialized to zeros $O(N)$ 13order = get_sort_indexes(Tmean, 'decreasing') $O(NlogN)$ 14# the hypothetical function get_sort_indexes sorts the elements of Tmean15# by decreasing order and returns the indexes of the sorted elements16 $I$ 17# compute L, which indicates for each node the maximum path length to evaluate18L = numerical vector of N elements, initialized to zeros $O(N)$ 19mask = logical vector of N elements, initialized to false $O(N)$ 20for t in $[1N]$ $O(N)$ 21s = order[i] $O(1)$ 22if (mask[t]==false) & (T[s,t]>L[s]) $O(1)$ 24 $L[s] = T[s t]$ $O(1)$	3	# compute for each node the mean of the topological shortest paths to all other nodes	
5for s in $[1N]$ $0(N)$ 6for t in $[s+1N]$ $0(N)$ 7Tmean $[s] = Tmean[s] + T[s,t]$ $0(1)$ 8Tmean $[t] = Tmean[t] + T[s,t]$ $0(1)$ 9Tmean $[s] = Tmean[s] / (N-1)$ $0(1)$ 1011# sort nodes by decreasing mean of the topological shortest paths12order = numerical vector of N elements, initialized to zeros $0(N)$ 13order = get_sort_indexes(Tmean, 'decreasing') $0(NlogN)$ 14# the hypothetical function get_sort_indexes sorts the elements of Tmean15# by decreasing order and returns the indexes of the sorted elements161117# compute L, which indicates for each node the maximum path length to evaluate18L = numerical vector of N elements, initialized to zeros $0(N)$ 19mask = logical vector of N elements, initialized to false $0(N)$ 20for i in $[1N]$ $0(N)$ 21s = order[i] $0(1)$ 22if (mask[t]==false) & (T[s,t]>L[s]) $0(1)$ 24 $L[s] = T[s t]$ $0(1)$	4	Tmean = numerical vector of N elements, initialized to zeros	0(N)
6for t in $[s+1N]$ $0(N)$ 7Tmean $[s] = Tmean[s] + T[s,t]$ $0(1)$ 8Tmean $[t] = Tmean[t] + T[s,t]$ $0(1)$ 9Tmean $[s] = Tmean[s] / (N-1)$ $0(1)$ 10 $\#$ sort nodes by decreasing mean of the topological shortest paths12order = numerical vector of N elements, initialized to zeros $0(N)$ 13order = get_sort_indexes(Tmean, 'decreasing') $0(NlogN)$ 14 $\#$ the hypothetical function get_sort_indexes sorts the elements of Tmean15 $\#$ by decreasing order and returns the indexes of the sorted elements16 $1$ 17 $\#$ compute L, which indicates for each node the maximum path length to evaluate18L = numerical vector of N elements, initialized to zeros $0(N)$ 19mask = logical vector of N elements, initialized to false $0(N)$ 20for i in $[1N]$ $0(N)$ 21 $s = order[i]$ $0(1)$ 22for t in $[1N]$ $0(N)$ 23if (mask[t]==false) & (T[s,t]>L[s]) $0(1)$ 24 $L[s] = T[s,t]$ $0(1)$	5	for s in [1N]	0(N)
7Tmean[s] = Tmean[s] + T[s,t] $0(1)$ 8Tmean[t] = Tmean[t] + T[s,t] $0(1)$ 9Tmean[s] = Tmean[s] / (N-1) $0(1)$ 10101111# sort nodes by decreasing mean of the topological shortest paths12order = numerical vector of N elements, initialized to zeros $0(N)$ 13order = get_sort_indexes(Tmean, 'decreasing') $0(NlogN)$ 14# the hypothetical function get_sort_indexes sorts the elements of Tmean15# by decreasing order and returns the indexes of the sorted elements161117# compute L, which indicates for each node the maximum path length to evaluate18L = numerical vector of N elements, initialized to zeros $0(N)$ 19mask = logical vector of N elements, initialized to false $0(N)$ 20for t in [1N] $0(N)$ 21s = order[i] $0(1)$ 22for t in [1N] $0(N)$ 23if (mask[t]==false) & (T[s,t]>L[s]) $0(1)$ 24 $L[s] = T[s t]$ $0(1)$	6	for t in [s+1N]	0(N)
8Tmean[t] = Tmean[t] + T[s,t] $0(1)$ 9Tmean[s] = Tmean[s] / (N-1) $0(1)$ 101011# sort nodes by decreasing mean of the topological shortest paths12order = numerical vector of N elements, initialized to zeros $0(N)$ 13order = get_sort_indexes(Tmean, 'decreasing') $0(NlogN)$ 14# the hypothetical function get_sort_indexes sorts the elements of Tmean15# by decreasing order and returns the indexes of the sorted elements161717# compute L, which indicates for each node the maximum path length to evaluate18L = numerical vector of N elements, initialized to zeros $0(N)$ 19mask = logical vector of N elements, initialized to false $0(N)$ 20for i in [1N] $0(N)$ 21s = order[i] $0(1)$ 22for t in [1N] $0(N)$ 23if (mask[t]==false) & (T[s,t]>L[s]) $0(1)$ 24 $L[s] = T[s t]$ $0(1)$	7	Tmean[s] = Tmean[s] + T[s,t]	0(1)
9       Tmean[s] = Tmean[s] / (N-1)       0(1)         10       10         11       # sort nodes by decreasing mean of the topological shortest paths         12       order = numerical vector of N elements, initialized to zeros       0(N)         13       order = get_sort_indexes(Tmean, 'decreasing')       0(NlogN)         14       # the hypothetical function get_sort_indexes sorts the elements of Tmean       0(N)         15       # by decreasing order and returns the indexes of the sorted elements       0(N)         16       11       11       11         17       # compute L, which indicates for each node the maximum path length to evaluate       0(N)         18       L = numerical vector of N elements, initialized to zeros       0(N)         19       mask = logical vector of N elements, initialized to false       0(N)         20       for t in [1N]       0(N)         21       s = order[i]       0(1)         22       for t in [1N]       0(N)         23       if (mask[t]==false) & (T[s,t]>L[s])       0(1)         24       L[s] = T[s t]       0(1)	8	Tmean[t] = Tmean[t] + T[s,t]	0(1)
10       # sort nodes by decreasing mean of the topological shortest paths         12       order = numerical vector of N elements, initialized to zeros       0(N)         13       order = get_sort_indexes(Tmean, 'decreasing')       0(NlogN)         14       # the hypothetical function get_sort_indexes sorts the elements of Tmean       0(N)         15       # by decreasing order and returns the indexes of the sorted elements       0(N)         16       0(N)       0(N)         17       # compute L, which indicates for each node the maximum path length to evaluate       0(N)         18       L = numerical vector of N elements, initialized to zeros       0(N)         19       mask = logical vector of N elements, initialized to false       0(N)         20       for i in [1N]       0(N)         21       s = order[i]       0(1)         22       for t in [1N]       0(N)         23       if (mask[t]==false) & (T[s,t]>L[s])       0(1)         24       L[s] = T[s t]       0(1)	9	Tmean[s] = Tmean[s] / (N-1)	0(1)
11       # sort nodes by decreasing mean of the topological shortest paths         12       order = numerical vector of N elements, initialized to zeros       O(N)         13       order = get_sort_indexes(Tmean, 'decreasing')       O(NlogN)         14       # the hypothetical function get_sort_indexes sorts the elements of Tmean       0(N)         15       # by decreasing order and returns the indexes of the sorted elements       0(N)         16       17       # compute L, which indicates for each node the maximum path length to evaluate       0(N)         18       L = numerical vector of N elements, initialized to zeros       0(N)         19       mask = logical vector of N elements, initialized to false       0(N)         20       for i in [1N]       0(N)         21       s = order[i]       0(1)         22       for t in [1N]       0(N)         23       if (mask[t]==false) & (T[s,t]>L[s])       0(1)         24       L[s] = T[s t]       0(1)	10		
12order = numerical vector of N elements, initialized to zeros $O(N)$ 13order = get_sort_indexes(Tmean, 'decreasing') $O(NlogN)$ 14# the hypothetical function get_sort_indexes sorts the elements of Tmean15# by decreasing order and returns the indexes of the sorted elements161717# compute L, which indicates for each node the maximum path length to evaluate18L = numerical vector of N elements, initialized to zeros $O(N)$ 19mask = logical vector of N elements, initialized to false $O(N)$ 20for i in $[1N]$ $O(N)$ 21s = order[i] $O(1)$ 22for t in $[1N]$ $O(N)$ 23if (mask[t]==false) & (T[s,t]>L[s]) $O(1)$ 24 $L[s] = T[s t]$ $O(1)$	11	# sort nodes by decreasing mean of the topological shortest paths	
13order = get_sort_indexes(Tmean, 'decreasing') $0(NlogN)$ 14# the hypothetical function get_sort_indexes sorts the elements of Tmean15# by decreasing order and returns the indexes of the sorted elements1617# compute L, which indicates for each node the maximum path length to evaluate18L = numerical vector of N elements, initialized to zeros $0(N)$ 19mask = logical vector of N elements, initialized to false $0(N)$ 20for i in $[1N]$ $0(N)$ 21s = order[i] $0(1)$ 22for t in $[1N]$ $0(N)$ 23if (mask[t]==false) & (T[s,t]>L[s]) $0(1)$ 24 $L[s] = T[s,t]$ $0(1)$	12	order = numerical vector of N elements, initialized to zeros	0(N)
14       # the hypothetical function get_sort_indexes sorts the elements of Tmean         15       # by decreasing order and returns the indexes of the sorted elements         16         17       # compute L, which indicates for each node the maximum path length to evaluate         18       L = numerical vector of N elements, initialized to zeros       0(N)         19       mask = logical vector of N elements, initialized to false       0(N)         20       for i in [1N]       0(N)         21       s = order[i]       0(1)         22       for t in [1N]       0(N)         23       if (mask[t]==false) & (T[s,t]>L[s])       0(1)         24       L[s] = T[s t]       0(1)	13	order = get_sort_indexes(Tmean, 'decreasing')	O(NlogN)
15       # by decreasing order and returns the indexes of the sorted elements         16         17       # compute L, which indicates for each node the maximum path length to evaluate         18       L = numerical vector of N elements, initialized to zeros       0(N)         19       mask = logical vector of N elements, initialized to false       0(N)         20       for i in [1N]       0(N)         21       s = order[i]       0(1)         22       for t in [1N]       0(N)         23       if (mask[t]==false) & (T[s,t]>L[s])       0(1)         24       L[s] = T[s t]       0(1)	14	# the hypothetical function get_sort_indexes sorts the elements of Tmean	
16         17       # compute L, which indicates for each node the maximum path length to evaluate         18       L = numerical vector of N elements, initialized to zeros       0(N)         19       mask = logical vector of N elements, initialized to false       0(N)         20       for i in [1N]       0(N)         21       s = order[i]       0(1)         22       for t in [1N]       0(N)         23       if (mask[t]==false) & (T[s,t]>L[s])       0(1)         24       L[s] = T[s t]       0(1)	15	# by decreasing order and returns the indexes of the sorted elements	
17# compute L, which indicates for each node the maximum path length to evaluate18L = numerical vector of N elements, initialized to zeros $0(N)$ 19mask = logical vector of N elements, initialized to false $0(N)$ 20for i in $[1N]$ $0(N)$ 21 $s = order[i]$ $0(1)$ 22for t in $[1N]$ $0(N)$ 23if (mask[t]==false) & (T[s,t]>L[s]) $0(1)$ 24 $L[s] = T[s,t]$ $0(1)$	16		
18L = numerical vector of N elements, initialized to zeros $O(N)$ 19mask = logical vector of N elements, initialized to false $O(N)$ 20for i in [1N] $O(N)$ 21s = order[i] $O(1)$ 22for t in [1N] $O(N)$ 23if (mask[t]==false) & (T[s,t]>L[s]) $O(1)$ 24L[s] = T[s t] $O(1)$	17	# compute L, which indicates for each node the maximum path length to evaluate	
19mask = logical vector of N elements, initialized to faise $O(N)$ 20for i in $[1N]$ $O(N)$ 21s = order[i] $O(1)$ 22for t in $[1N]$ $O(N)$ 23if (mask[t]==false) & (T[s,t]>L[s]) $O(1)$ 24 $L[s] = T[s,t]$ $O(1)$	18	L = numerical vector of N elements, initialized to zeros	O(N)
20       for f in [1N] $O(N)$ 21       s = order[i] $O(1)$ 22       for t in [1N] $O(N)$ 23       if (mask[t]==false) & (T[s,t]>L[s]) $O(1)$ 24       L[s] = T[s t] $O(1)$	19	mask = logical vector of N elements, initialized to false	O(N)
21 $s = order[1]$ $O(1)$ 22       for t in [1N] $O(N)$ 23       if (mask[t]==false) & (T[s,t]>L[s]) $O(1)$ 24       L[s] = T[s t] $O(1)$	20		O(N)
22       Iof the [1N] $O(N)$ 23       if (mask[t]==false) & (T[s,t]>L[s]) $O(1)$ 24       L[s] = T[s t] $O(1)$	21	s = order[1]	O(1)
$\frac{1}{24} \qquad L[e] = T[et] \qquad 0(1)$	22	if (mach[t] false) & (T[ct] \[ [c])	O(1)
	24	$I[\mathbf{s}] = T[\mathbf{s} + 1]$	0(1)

 Supplit. Hote Z. P period of olde to compute the PTPP With whith all while pairs.

 KPUT

 N - number of nodes

 Ac- addreency list, containing for each node the list of neighbours;

 A[1] is the list of node for onde 1, A[2] the same for node 2, and so on for N nodes.

 G - NxW matrix of geodesize between all node pairs.

 T - NxW matrix of topological shortest paths between all node pairs.

 MUTPUT

 P = NxW matrix of FTSP between all node/pairs.

 1
 function P = compute\_pTSP(A,T,S,order)

### # compute for each node the mean of the topological shortest paths to all other nodes

X	for sir [zN]	Q(N)
1	førtin [s+1N]	0 (N)
X	Tmean[s] = Timean[s] + T[s,t]	0(1)
1	$\Re mean[t] = Tmean[t] + \Re[s,t]$	0(1)
X	Tmean[s] = Tmean[s] / (N-1)	0(1)

### # sort nodes by decreasing mean of the topological shortest paths

13	/order = get_sott_mdexes(nmean, 'decreasing')	Ø(NilogN)
14	# the My pathetical function get_sort indexes sorts the elements of A meth	
15	# by Reckeasing order and the the hiddeses of the softed dements	
16		
1.27	# compute L, which in liter tes for tach node the maximum path the for a last	
18	L =  fumerical vector of N elements, mitialized to zeros	0(N)
179	mask = logical vector of N elements, initialized to false	O(N)
20	for i in [2N]	Ø(N)
21	s = order[i]	0(1)
1 22	for tim [1N]	0(N)
23	f(mask[t] == fase) & (f(s,t) > L(s))	0(1)
24	$\mathcal{L}[\mathcal{S}] = \mathcal{R}[s, \mathcal{K}]$	0(1)



# Applications



Brain Network of an individual

Navigability measure (previous) Muscoloni,…, Cannistraci et al. Nat. Com. 2017

$$GRE(pGRP, RD) = \left(\frac{1}{n \cdot (n-1) - 2 \cdot e}\right) \cdot \sum \frac{RD(i, j)}{pGRP(i, j)}; \text{ with } (i, j) \in \tilde{E}$$



RESEARCH ARTICLE | BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES | 👌

### Navigation of brain networks

<u>Caio Seguin</u> <sup>™</sup>, <u>Martijn P. van den Heuvel</u>, and <u>Andrew Zalesky</u> <u>Authors Info & Affiliations</u>

Edited by Edward T. Bullmore, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, United Kingdom, and accepted by Editorial Gazzaniga May 7, 2018 (received for review January 24, 2018)

May 30, 2018 115 (24) 6297-6302 <u>https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1801351115</u>

Navigability measure (previous) Muscoloni,…, Cannistraci et al. Nat. Com. 2017

$$GRE(pGRP, RD) = \left(\frac{1}{n \cdot (n-1) - 2 \cdot e}\right) \cdot \sum \frac{RD(i, j)}{pGRP(i, j)}; \text{ with } (i, j) \in \tilde{E}$$

Congruency measure (<u>New</u>) Cannistraci et al. Nat. Com. 2022

$$GC(\overline{pTSP}, RD) = \left(\frac{2}{n \cdot (n-1) - 2 \cdot e}\right) \cdot \sum_{i < j} \frac{RD(i, j)}{\overline{pTSP}(i, j)} ; \text{ with } (i, j) \in \tilde{E}$$

131

## Testing GC as a phenotypic marker on Human brain connectomes



nature communications

### 9

#### Article

https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-022-34634-6

## Geometrical congruence, greedy navigability and myopic transfer in complex networks and brain connectomes

# November 2022

Received: 6 July 2020	Carlo Vittorio Cannistraci <sup>® 1,2,3,4,5,6</sup> ⊠ & Alessandro Muscoloni <sup>® 1,4</sup>
Accepted: 1 November 2022	
Published online: 27 November 2022	We introduce in network geometry a measure of <i>geometrical con</i>
Check for updates	<ul> <li>to evaluate the extent a network topology follows an underlying</li> <li>This requires finding all topological shortest-paths for each nonaction</li> </ul>
	pair in the network: a nontrivial computational task. Hence, we p optimized algorithm that reduces 26 years of worst scenario com

We introduce in network geometry a measure of *geometrical congruence (GC)* to evaluate the extent a network topology follows an underlying geometry. This requires finding all topological shortest-paths for each nonadjacent node pair in the network: a nontrivial computational task. Hence, we propose an optimized algorithm that reduces 26 years of worst scenario computation to one week parallel computing. Analysing artificial networks with patent geometry we discover that, different from current belief, hyperbolic networks do not show in general high GC and efficient greedy navigability (GN) with respect to the geodesics. The myopic transfer which rules GN works best only when degree-distribution power-law exponent is strictly close to two. Analysing real networks–whose geometry is often latent–GC overcomes GN as marker to differentiate phenotypical states in macroscale structural-MRI brain connectomes, suggesting connectomes might have a latent neurobiological geometry accounting for more information than the visible tridimensional Euclidean.



Alessandro Muscoloni

# Next direction

- Application of congruence to <u>spatial network in general</u> with any underlying geometry
- Application of congruence to design <u>markers for brain diseases</u>
- Application of navigability and congruency to <u>urban science and</u> <u>human mobility networks.</u>

# Problem 5 (De Novo single cell spatial reconstruction by Coalescence Embedding)





### Jing-Dong (Jackie) Han Peking University

## The idea of Jackie

< To leverage the general concept of network embedding angular coalescence and the methodology of coalescence embedding for De novo (landmark and marker free) reverseengineering the mesoscale spatial organization of single cell directly from their transcriptome. >>

# **ADVANCED SCIENCE**

Research Article 🔂 Open Access

## Spatial Reconstruction of Oligo and Single Cells by De Novo Coalescent Embedding of Transcriptomic Networks

Yuxuan Zhao, Shiqiang Zhang, Jian Xu, Yangyang Yu, Guangdun Peng, Carlo Vittorio Cannistraci 🔀, Jing-Dong J. Han 🔀

First published: 15 June 2023 | https://doi.org/10.1002/advs.202206307

# **Theoretical Background and Method**

### **Coalescent embedding (CE)**

This is a machine intelligence theory for nonlinear embedding of networks of complex interconnected systems in a geometrical space, which is called coalescent embedding (CE) because it relies on a phenomenon that in physics of complexity takes the name of angular coalescence. This phenomenon states that for a network that derives from a complex interconnected system, whose connections between its parts (nodes) emerge in a latent geometrical space, the network embedding in a 2D or 3D visualization space will display a typical pattern of node aggregation that respects the intrinsic geometry of the system in the latent geometrical space in terms of both congruence and navigability.

### **De Novo Coalescent Embedding (D-CE)**

Building upon this theory, we developed a novel algorithm called De Novo Coalescent Embedding (D-CE) which unveils single-cell mesoscale spatial organization, where densely interacting network neighborhoods or communities are associated with spatial domains.

### **D-CE algorithm**



#### **D-CE algorithm**

#### **De novo reconstruction**





#### 

# **Computational Results**
Reconstruction of spatial domain labels from oligo or single cell RNAseq data



Reconstruction of spatial domain labels from oligo or single cell RNAseq data



Reconstruction of spatial domain labels from oligo or single cell RNAseq data







Spatial reconstruction and spatial marker gene detection of cancerous prostate spatial transcriptomic dataset



Spatial reconstruction and spatial marker gene detection of cancerous prostate spatial transcriptomic dataset



1. We developed D-CE which is an effective **landmark free and model free** de novo 3D reconstruction method for oligo and single cell analysis.

2. The proposed algorithm for de novo coalescent embedding (D-CE) of oligo/single cell transcriptomic networks is based on the physics principle of angular coalescence and relies only on the spatial information encoded in the expression patterns of genes, without need of prior information.

3. We found that D-CE of cell–cell association transcriptomic networks, by preserving mesoscale network organization, **captures spatial domains**, identifies spatially expressed genes, reconstructs cell samples' 3D spatial distribution, and **uncovers spatial domains and markers necessary** for understanding the design principles on spatial organization and pattern formation.

4. Comparison to the novoSpaRC and CSOmap on **14 datasets and 497 reconstructions**, reveals a **significantly superior performance of D-CE**.

5. Angular coalescence: the same principle of organization of complex connected systems can be used to analyze systems at different scale from single-cell to brain to society.

## Scientific Institutions



San Raffaele Scientific Institute



- Lipotype (Germany)
- Politecnico di Torino and Milano (Italy)
- Italian Interpolytechnic School of Doctorate (SIPD, Italy)
- San Raffaele Scientific Institute, Hospital and University (Italy)
- King Abdullah University of Science and Technology (KAUST, Saudi Arabia)
- University of California San Diego/ Ideker Lab (USA)
- ISMB/ECCB generously provided me (International)
- Italian National Research Council (CNR) / Bioengineering (It
- Technical University Dresden (Germany)
- Klaus Tschira Foundation (Germany)
- FANTOM Consortium and RIKEN institute (Japan)















CENTRO NEUROLES BONINO PULEJO











## Carlo Vittorio Cannistraci

Center for Complex Network Intelligence

EMAIL: kalokagathos.agon@gmail.com

Thanks!





