

Algorithm and Complexity for a Network Assortativity Measure

Sarah J. Kunkler* M. Drew LaMar[†] Rex K. Kincaid[‡] David Phillips[§]

October 30, 2018

Abstract

We show that finding a graph realization with the minimum Randić index for a given degree sequence is solvable in polynomial time by formulating the problem as a minimum weight perfect b -matching problem. However, the realization found via this reduction is not guaranteed to be connected. Approximating the minimum weight b -matching problem subject to a connectivity constraint is shown to be NP-Hard. For instances in which the optimal solution to the minimum Randić index problem is not connected, we describe a heuristic to connect the graph using pairwise edge exchanges that preserves the degree sequence. In our computational experiments, the heuristic performs well and the Randić index of the realization after our heuristic is within 3% of the unconstrained optimal value on average. Although we focus on minimizing the Randić index, our results extend to maximizing the Randić index as well. Applications of the Randić index to synchronization of neuronal networks controlling respiration in mammals and to normalizing cortical thickness networks in diagnosing individuals with dementia are provided.

1 Introduction

Networks are pervasive in the sciences. For example, they are used in ecology to represent food webs and in engineering and computer science to design high quality internet router connections. Depending on the application, one particular graph property may be more important than another. Oftentimes, a desired property is to have a connected graph or to optimize a particular metric while constrained to connected graphs [20].

One of these measures, the Randić index of a graph, developed by Milan Randić, was originally used in chemistry [24]. The Randić index of a graph can be thought of as an assortativity measure. A network is described as disassortative if high-degree nodes are predominantly attached to low-degree nodes [21]. Minimizing the Randić index, in many instances, will produce a graph with disassortativity [21]. Why is this optimization problem of interest? Li et al. [21], in the design of an internet router network, found that networks that maximized throughput also had small values for the Randić index. In addition, the Randić index has been shown [19] to correlate with synchronization, an important property in many network applications. We explore this correlation for directed graphs in section 5.1. Optimizing the Randić index is also useful in analyzing imaging data of cortical thicknesses which we discuss in section 5.2. Our focus is to investigate algorithms that minimize the Randić index of a graph over all connected realizations while keeping the degrees of the nodes fixed. However, our complexity results and algorithms also extend to the case of maximizing the Randić index as well.

*Department of Mathematics, College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, VA 23187-8795, USA, sjkunkler@email.wm.edu

[†]Department of Biology, College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, VA 23187-8795, USA, mdlama@wm.edu

[‡]Department of Mathematics, College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, VA 23187-8795, USA, rrkinc@wm.edu

[§]Department of Mathematics, United States Naval Academy, Annapolis, MD 21401, USA, dphillip@usna.edu

1.1 Notation and Definitions

We assume the reader to have a knowledge of graph theory (see, e.g., [31]). We let \mathbb{R} and \mathbb{Z} denote the set of real numbers and integers, respectively. We consider an undirected graph, $G = (N, E)$, which consists of nodes, N , and edges, E . We assume that our graph is simple, i.e., there are no self-loops and no multi-edges. The degree of a node is defined as $d_i(G) := |\{j : (i, j) \in E\}|$. We denote the node-node adjacency matrix by $A(G)$. The *degree sequence* is the list of the degrees of all the nodes in a graph, which we represent as $d(G) = (d_1(G), d_2(G), \dots, d_n(G))$. A sequence of non-negative integers is considered *graphic* if it is the degree sequence of a graph. Degree sequences can correspond to more than one adjacency matrix or graph. We call these graphs different realizations of the degree sequence. When the particular graph is clear from context, we omit G in the previous definitions.

Let nodes $u, v \in N$. We say that u and v are *connected* if there exists a path from u to v . A graph is connected if for all $u \in N$ there exists a path to every other node.

Definition 1.1. *The Randić index of a graph $G = (N, E)$ is defined as*

$$R_\alpha(G) = \sum_{(v_i, v_j) \in E} (d_i \cdot d_j)^\alpha,$$

where $\alpha \in \mathbb{R} - \{0\}$.

We consider the case when $\alpha = 1$ which has received considerable attention in a variety of contexts [11, 21, 2]. For convenience, we define $R(G) = R_1(G)$. A natural optimization problem is:

Minimum Randić Index Problem. Given a graphic degree sequence what is a graph realization with the minimum Randić index with $\alpha = 1$?

We define the *connected minimum Randić index problem* as the minimum Randić index problem with the additional constraint of minimizing over all connected realizations.

Definition 1.2. *For a graph $G = (N, E)$ and a positive integer vector $b = (b_1, \dots, b_n) \in \mathbb{Z}^n$, a perfect b -matching is a subset of edges $M \subseteq E$ such that for node $v_i \in N$, the degree of v_i in the graph (N, M) is b_i .*

An associated optimization problem is:

Minimum Weight Perfect b -Matching Problem. Given a positive integer vector b , a graph $G = (N, E)$ and a set of edge weights $w : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, find a perfect b -matching with minimum weight.

In section 3, we will see that the minimum Randić index problem is equivalent to the minimum weight perfect b -matching problem on a complete graph G with an appropriate choice of weights. We will also show that, using an arbitrary graph G , by constraining the minimum weight perfect b -matching problem to connected perfect b -matchings, the problem becomes NP-Hard.

1.2 Network Measures of Assortativity

The Randić index of a graph was originally defined in chemistry. In 1975, the chemist Milan Randić [24] proposed the index $R_\alpha(N)$ for the cases $\alpha = -1$ and $\alpha = -1/2$ under the name *branching index*. He explained the utility of R in measuring the extent of branching of the carbon-atom skeleton of saturated hydrocarbons. His approach “reveals some inherent relationships between [structures] which can be traced to connectivity” [24]. It is sometimes referred to as the connectivity index by scholars in chemistry [13]. Bollobás and Erdős [4] generalized this index by allowing α to take on any non-zero real number. A survey of results for the Randić index can be found in [22].

The Randić index with $\alpha = 1$ is important enough to have been “discovered” several times in the literature. For example, the second Zagreb index, defined by Gutman [11] and also used in chemistry, is actually $R(G)$. In 2005, Li et al. [21] investigated what they called the s-metric of a graph which, seemingly unknown to them, is actually $R(G)$. They used $R(G)$ to differentiate between graph realizations of a given degree sequence following a power law distribution [21] in the design of internet router networks. For a fixed degree distribution they plotted $R(G)$ versus throughput for hundreds of graph realizations. They noted that $R(G)$ measures the “hub-like core” of a graph and is maximized when high-degree nodes are connected to other high degree nodes (assortative). Conversely, the minimum values of $R(G)$ were predominantly associated with networks that maximized throughput and were disassortative. In 2008, Beichl and Cloteaux investigated how well random networks generated with a chosen $R(G)$ can model the structure of real networks such as the Internet. The graphs produced by optimizing $R(G)$ resulted in better models than the ones that used simple uniform sampling [2].

1.3 Random Graph Classes

Our computational experiments require random graphs. We make use of three types of graphs: Erdős-Rényi, geometric and scale-free. The structure of these graphs depends on the parameters chosen.

Erdős-Rényi Graphs. A number of nodes n and a probability of connection p are chosen. A uniform random number on the interval $[0, 1]$ is generated for each possible edge. If the number generated for an edge is less than p then the edge is added.

Geometric Graphs. A number of nodes n and a radius r is chosen. Each node v_i is placed uniformly at random in the unit square, giving coordinates (x_i, y_i) . We connect nodes v_i and v_j if $(x_i - x_j)^2 + (y_i - y_j)^2 \leq r^2$ [29].

Scale-Free Graphs. A preferential attachment algorithm is used to create graphs whose degree sequences follow a power-law distribution. Following the convention in the literature we will refer to these graphs as “scale-free”. A number of nodes n is chosen. New nodes are added and connected to existing nodes, based on a probability proportional to the current degree of the nodes, until you reach n nodes, making it more likely that a new node will be connected to a higher degree node [29]. The algorithm allows a minimum node degree to be specified.

2 Formulation and Complexity


In this section, we formulate the minimum Randić index problem as a *minimum weight perfect b-matching problem*, which is solvable in polynomial time [27]. Note that this problem does not enforce connectivity. We then show that approximating the minimum Randić index problem with connectivity is NP-Hard.

2.1 The b-Matching Problem


Consider a graph $G = (N, E)$, a positive integer vector $b = (b_1, \dots, b_n) \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ and $M \subseteq E$, a perfect b-matching. For a given b-matching, M , the graph induced by M is (N, M) . We denote the set of perfect b-matchings of a graph G by $\mathcal{P}_b(G)$. For edge weights $w : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, the *minimum weight perfect b-matching problem* is finding the perfect b-matching with minimum weight, i.e., to calculate

$$M^*(G) := \arg \min \left\{ \sum_{e \in M} w(e) : M \in \mathcal{P}_b(G) \right\}. \quad (1)$$

For example, let G be the undirected, weighted graph below



and let $b = (2, 1, 1, 2)$ for nodes v_1, v_2, v_3 and v_4 respectively. We select b_i edges that will connect to the i th node and that will produce the minimum weight. Therefore, the matching induces the graph G' below.



Note that for this example the solution G' is the only perfect b -matching for G . Let an instance of the minimum Randić index problem be given with a positive integer vector $b \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ and graph $G = (N, E)$. Then the graphs induced by the matchings are feasible subgraph realizations for the minimum Randić index problem. Also, the edge sets of the feasible subgraph realizations of the minimum Randić index problem are perfect b -matchings. Thus, the set of feasible b -matchings on G is identical to the set of feasible subgraph realizations on G to the minimum Randić index problem on G . Thus, to formulate an instance of minimum Randić index problem as a minimum weight perfect b -matching problem, set

$$w_{ij} = b_i \cdot b_j. \quad (2)$$

Therefore, we can create an instance of a minimum weight perfect b -matching to solve the minimum Randić index problem. Since the b -matching problem can be solved in polynomial time, finding the minimum Randić index of a graph can also be done in polynomial time. Note that this method does not enforce connectivity.

We show that even approximating the connected minimum Randić index problem is NP-Hard. We first define approximation algorithms (see [30] for further details about approximation algorithms). Let $S \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ and $f : S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a given feasibility set and objective function, respectively. Define an α -approximation algorithm for the minimization problem $v^* = \min_{x \in S} f(x)$ as a polynomial time algorithm that finds a solution $y \in S$ with $f(y) \leq \alpha v^*$. We say that we can *approximate* a minimization problem if there exists an α such that an α -approximation algorithm exists. Note that $\alpha \geq 1$ is implicit with $\alpha = 1$ only if an exact algorithm exists.

Theorem 2.1. *Approximating the minimum Randić index subject to a connectivity constraint is NP-Hard.*

Proof. Recall that a Hamiltonian cycle on G is a tour (set of adjacent edges or, equivalently, nodes in G) that visits each node exactly once, except for the start node which is equal to the last node on the tour. We claim the existence of a Hamiltonian cycle on a given graph is equivalent to the feasibility of the minimum Randić index with connectivity on a related instance. Recall that an instance of Hamiltonian cycle consists of a graph, so let such an instance be given with $G = (N, E)$. Now define the vector $b \in \mathbb{R}^{|N|}$ by setting $b_i = 2$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, |N|\}$ and consider the resulting connected minimum Randić index instance using the graph G and vector b .

We first show that if the minimum Randić index instance (G, b) is feasible, then there is a Hamiltonian cycle on G . Suppose there is a feasible solution $H = (N, F)$, which means $F \subseteq E$, each node $u \in N$ has degree 2, and H is connected. As each node has even degree and H is connected, there is an Eulerian cycle, T , on H . We claim that T is a Hamiltonian cycle on G , which means each node is visited exactly once by T except the start node which is visited exactly twice. Choose $u \in N$ and note that two edges are adjacent to u . Then, because T traverses every arc, the node u is visited. Denote the start node of T by $s \in N$ and consider traversing T beginning at s . If the traversal visits a node $u \in N \setminus \{s\}$ more than once then an edge was traversed into u , a second distinct edge was traversed out of u , and a third distinct edge was traversed into u , a contradiction as there are exactly two distinct edges adjacent to u in H . The same argument applies if s is visited more than once before the traversal is complete. So each node is visited exactly once by T except the start node, which is returned to when the traversal is complete, i.e., T is a Hamiltonian cycle. Thus, if the instance (G, b) is feasible, then G possess a Hamiltonian cycle.

We now show that if there is a Hamiltonian cycle on G , then the minimum Randić index problem on (G, b) is feasible. Consider a Hamiltonian cycle, C on G and the subgraph induced by C . Such a subgraph is connected as each node is visited. Also, each node has degree 2 as each node $u \in N$ has one arc used to enter u and exactly one distinct arc u to exit. Thus, if G possess a Hamiltonian cycle, then (G, b) must be feasible to the given connected minimum Randić index instance.

Now suppose there were an α -approximation algorithm to the connected minimum Randić index problem for some $\alpha \geq 1$. If the algorithm returns a solution to the instance (G, b) then G possesses a Hamiltonian cycle. If it does not, then the instance (G, b) was not feasible and G does not possess a Hamiltonian cycle. Note that the argument does not rely on what value α is. ‡

The following corollaries are immediate.

Corollary 2.2. *Approximating b -matching when the graph induced by the matching must be connected is NP-Hard.*


Because the proof showed that finding a feasible solution to the minimum Randić index index is NP-Hard, we immediately can state the following corollary.

Corollary 2.3. *Approximating the maximum Randić index subject to a connectivity constraint is NP-Hard.*

Note that we have not shown what the complexity is when the input graph G is the complete graph. We leave this as an open problem.


2.2 Example Transformation

Given the degree sequence $d = (3, 2, 2, 2, 2, 1)$, what is a graph realization with the minimum Randić index? We let nodes $v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4, v_5, v_6 \in N$ with $b = (3, 2, 2, 2, 2, 1)$. Now we can form the complete graph G , with weights corresponding to $b_i \cdot b_j$ for every node $v_i, v_j \in N$.



v_1	v_2	v_3	v_4	v_5	v_6
0	6	6	6	6	3
6	0	4	4	4	2
6	4	0	4	4	2
6	4	4	0	4	2
6	4	4	4	0	2
3	2	2	2	2	0

Now we solve the minimum weight perfect b -matching for G and obtain G' :



$$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$R(G') = 6 + 6 + 4 + 4 + 4 + 3 = 27$$

G' is a solution for the minimum weight perfect b -matching. The sum of the weights is the minimum Randić index and the unweighted adjacency matrix is the corresponding graph realization. Note that there are other solutions to the matching that will produce the minimum Randić index and a different realization. That is, the solution is not unique.

3 Algorithms

Our primary goal is to devise an algorithm to solve the minimum Randić index problem. An algorithm that is useful when creating graphs with a specified degree sequence is the Havel-Hakimi algorithm. The Havel-Hakimi algorithm can be used to check if a degree sequence is graphic and to find a realization of that sequence.

3.1 Havel-Hakimi Algorithm

The Havel-Hakimi algorithm is useful when we have a non-negative integer sequence and we want to know if it is graphic, and if so, what is a realization of the sequence. Its algorithm is given below:

HAVEL-HAKIMI [14, 12]

Inputs: d , a non-negative integer sequence

Outputs: A , adjacency matrix of a graph realization of d (if graphic)

Initialize a $|d| \times |d|$ adjacency matrix A so that $A_{ij} = A_{ji} = 0$.

while d is not the 0 sequence

do

 Pick a random index i of d .

 Subtract 1 from the d_i nodes with largest degrees (not including d_i) and set d_i to 0.

 For the d_i nodes of largest degrees in the previous step (call them v_j), set

$A_{ij} = A_{ji} = 1$.

if $|d| == 1$


d is not graphic.

return null.

return A

3.2 Two-Switches and the Metagraph

One way to generate a collection of realizations for a degree sequence is to move from one realization to another by doing a two-switch, with an example as follows:



When doing a two-switch, we examine two edges, $(a, b), (c, d) \in E$. If $(a, d) \notin E$ and $(b, c) \notin E$ then we can remove edges (a, b) and (c, d) and create edges (a, d) and (b, c) . This is not a unique move, since we could also use (a, c) and (b, d) if $(a, c) \notin E$ and $(b, d) \notin E$. Two-switching is an easy way to obtain a different graph with the same degree sequence after a graph is created using the Havel-Hakimi algorithm. The two-switch pseudocode is given below:

TWO-SWITCH

Inputs: G , a graph with degree sequence d .

Outputs: G' , a new graph with degree sequence d .

Let $G' := G$.

Pick a random edge $(a, b) \in E(G')$.

Find a node $c \in N(G')$ that is not connected to b .

Find a node $d \in N(G')$ that is connected to c , but not to a .

Remove edges $(a, b), (c, d)$ from $E(G')$ and add $(a, d), (c, b)$ to $E(G')$.

return G'

We can construct a *metagraph* of a degree sequence, where the metagraph is an undirected graph with each node representing a graph realization of a degree sequence and each edge representing a two-switch. The following theorem shows that the metagraph is always a connected graph.

Theorem 3.1. (Ryser's Theorem [26].) *Given graphs G and G' such that $d(G) = d(G')$, there exists a sequence of two-switches going from G to G' .*

3.3 Heuristic for Disconnected Realizations

Since finding a connected graph realization with minimum Randić index is NP-Hard, we present a heuristic using two-switches to connect disconnected realizations. The heuristic sequentially performs a two-switch between pairs of connected components until all the components are connected:

TWO-SWITCH HEURISTIC

Inputs: G , a disconnected graph with degree sequence d

Outputs: G' , a connected graph with degree sequence d

Let $G' := G$.

while the number of connected components in G' is ≥ 2

do a two switch with two components to connect them using two randomly chosen edges from each component

return G'

Note that the method to connect the disconnected realizations may not produce graphs with the best structure since there is only 1 edge connecting one component to another. Also note that we do not need

to check whether the randomly chosen edges are adjacent or not since they are in separate connected components.

4 Solving the Minimum Randić index Problem

In this section, we focus on the case where the input graph G is the complete graph. To solve the minimum Randić index problem we used code that solves a minimum weight perfect b -matching problem. The code used is for generalized matching problems and was written by Vlad Schogolev, Bert Huang, and Stuart Andrews. Their code uses the GOBLIN graph library (<http://goblin2.sourceforge.net/>). Huang’s paper on loopy belief propagation for bipartite maximum weight b -matching uses this code [18]. The code solves a *maximum* weight perfect b -matching problem given the weight matrix, b vector and the exact solution algorithm choice. After transforming our minimum Randić index problem instance into a minimum weight perfect b -matching instance, the b vector will correspond to the degree constraints and the weight matrix to the possible degree products (see Section 2.2). However, since the code solves the *maximum* matching we transform our problem so that solving for the maximum yields the solution for the minimum.

Given a weight matrix H we transform these weights into a matrix H_2 such that the maximum matching using H_2 will yield the same solution as the minimum matching using H . To do this we take a matrix M with 1s in all positions except for the diagonal which has 0s. We then multiply every entry by one more than the maximum entry of H . H is then subtracted from M yielding H_2 . The following pseudocode implements this algorithm and will solve the minimum Randić index problem for a given degree sequence:

ALGORITHM TO SOLVE MINIMUM RANDIĆ INDEX WITH b -MATCHING

Inputs: A , an adjacency matrix with degree sequence d .
Outputs: A' , the new adjacency matrix with degree sequence d
and minimized Randic index r .

Create weight matrix H of degree products.
Let $b := d$.
Let $H_2 := (1 + \max H) \cdot M - H$, where M is the adjacency matrix of all 1s except along the diagonal.
Call b -match solver with b and H_2 to get adjacency matrix A' of optimal solution
Calculate $r = R(A')$
return A' and r

This algorithm returns the minimum Randić index of a graph and a realization. We know that the b -matching code runs in polynomial time ([27]). It is easy to see that the transformation steps are done in polynomial time as well. We used three types of randomly generated graphs to test the algorithm performance: Erdős-Rényi, geometric and scale-free. We limited our computational experiments to degree sequences for which connected realizations were known to exist. The Randić index before and after the optimization was recorded. After the optimization we check if the graph realization with the minimum Randić index is connected. We generated graphs with 25, 50 and 100 nodes. In addition, 100 of each graph type and size were generated. Tables 1, 2 and 3 present results from the runs. Note that the number of graphs connected after the run plus the number of graphs disconnected plus the number of graphs with no connected realizations is 100 for each graph type. The MATLAB functions used to generate the geometric and scale-free graphs are from CONTEST: A Controllable Test Matrix Toolbox for MATLAB [29]. In addition, the necessary and sufficient conditions for a non-negative integer sequence

Graph type	connected	disconnected	no connected realizations
Erdős-Rényi	67	1	32
Geometric	61	2	37
Scale-Free	93	7	0

Table 1: 25 node graphs

Graph type	connected	disconnected	no connected realizations
Erdős-Rényi	50	5	45
Geometric	57	3	40
Scale-Free	85	15	0

Table 2: 50 node graphs

Graph type	connected	disconnected	no connected realizations
Erdős-Rényi	16	2	82
Geometric	30	6	64
Scale-Free	91	8	1

Table 3: 100 node graphs

$\{a_i\}$ to be realizable as the degrees of the nodes of a connected graph are that $a_i \neq 0$ for all i and the sum of the integers a_i is even and not less than $2(n-1)$. This condition was used to discard graphs with a degree sequence that had no connected realizations [5].

In general from our runs, the realization of the minimum Randić index was connected. There are minimum Randić index graph realizations that are disconnected and we do not know if there are other realizations with this Randić index that are connected since the b -matching solver only produces one solution. But there were often a large proportion of graphs that had no connected realization at all. This largely depends on parameters chosen for the randomly generated graphs. If the random graph produced has most nodes with large degrees then it is unlikely that any graph realization would be disconnected. We were interested in generating graphs that have both connected and disconnected realizations and investigating whether the realization generated with the minimum Randić index was connected or not.

The following parameters were chosen after extensive experimentation so that the number of instances with no connected realizations was small. For the Erdős-Rényi graphs we used an average degree per node of 4.25. The corresponding p values used were calculated using $p = \frac{4.25}{n}$ where n is the number of nodes in the graph. Thus $p = .17$ for $n = 25$, $p = .085$ for $n = 50$, and $p = .043$ for $n = 100$. For the geometric graphs we used an average degree per node of 6. The radii were calculated using $r = \sqrt{\frac{6}{\pi n}}$. Our corresponding radii were $r = .276$ for $n = 25$, $r = .195$ for $n = 50$, and $r = .138$ for $n = 100$. We used scale-free graphs with a minimum node degree of 2.

The left box plots for each of 25, 50 and 100 node graphs in Figures 1, 2 and 3 show the percent difference between the graph's original Randić index and the minimum Randić index. The percent difference is calculated from $\frac{\text{original} - \text{minimum}}{\text{minimum}} \times 100$. The right box plots for each of 25, 50 and 100 node graphs in Figures 1, 2, and 3 show the percent difference between the minimum Randić index and the Randić index after the heuristic algorithm in Section 3.3 was applied. This percent difference is calculated with $\frac{\text{after heuristic} - \text{minimum}}{\text{minimum}} \times 100$. The number of graphs that used the heuristic depended on the number

of optimal graph realizations that were disconnected. Note that this is a different number for each graph type and size. See Tables 1, 2 and 3 for those numbers.




Figure 1: Comparing percent differences for Erdős-Rényi graphs.




Figure 2: Comparing percent differences for geometric graphs.




Figure 3: Comparing percent differences for scale-free graphs.

5 Applications

We will now show results for two applications where the effects of network connectivity measures have shown or are hypothesized to play an important role: neuronal synchronization and dementia.

5.1 Neuronal synchronization

The first example is exploring the effect of assortativity on the synchronous firing of neurons in the preBötzinger complex. This collection of neurons is responsible for the control of respiration in mammals [6]. As neuronal networks are inherently directed, we must first define a directed Randić index [33] and extend the b -matching algorithm to the directed case. The extension is similar to [23] in which the maximum matching problem is extended to directed graphs for a network controllability problem.

5.1.1 Extension to directed networks

Consider the directed graph $\vec{G} = (N, E)$ with vertex set $N = \{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$ and edge (or arc) set $E = \{(v_i, v_j) \mid v_i \rightarrow v_j\}$. The degree sequence for \vec{G} is a non-negative integer-pair sequence $d = \{(d_i^+, d_i^-) \mid i = 1, \dots, n\}$, where we denote the out-degree and in-degree sequences by d^+ and d^- , respectively. There are four different Randić index-type measures [33] given by

$$R^{pq}(G) = \sum_{(v_i, v_j) \in E} d_i^p d_j^q, \quad (3)$$

where $p, q \in \{-, +\}$. This can be seen as a natural extension of $R(G)$ to the directed case. In this context, we will now define an extension of perfect b -matching as follows.

Definition 5.1 (Perfect b -Matching for Directed Graphs). *For a directed graph $\vec{G} = (N, E)$ and positive integer-pair sequence $b = (b^+, b^-) = \{(b_i^+, b_i^-) \in \mathbb{Z}^n \times \mathbb{Z}^n \mid i = 1 \dots, n\}$, a perfect b -matching is a subset*




Figure 4: **Left:** Directed graph $\vec{G} = (N, E)$ with node set $N = \{v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4\}$ and degree sequence $\{(2, 1), (2, 1), (1, 2), (1, 2)\}$. **Right:** Bipartite representation $\vec{G}^* = (N^*, E^*)$, where $N^* = N^+ \cup N^-$, $N^+ = \{v_1^+, \dots, v_n^+\}$, $N^- = \{v_1^-, \dots, v_n^-\}$, and $e^* = (v_i^+, v_j^-) \in E^*$ if and only if $e = (v_i, v_j) \in E$.

of edges $M \subseteq E$ such that for node $v_i \in N$, the out and in-degree of v_i in the subgraph (N, M) is b_i^+ and b_i^- , respectively.

In an analogous way as the undirected case, we can define a minimum weight perfect b-matching problem as follows.

Minimum Weight Perfect b-Matching Problem. Given a positive integer-pair sequence b , a directed graph $\vec{G} = (N, E)$ and a set of edge weights $w : E \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, find a perfect b -matching with minimum weight.

In order to use the existing algorithm for undirected graphs, we consider the equivalent bipartite form of \vec{G} given by $\vec{G}^* = (N^*, E^*)$, where $N^* = N^+ \cup N^-$, $N^+ = \{v_1^+, \dots, v_n^+\}$, $N^- = \{v_1^-, \dots, v_n^-\}$, and $e^* = (v_i^+, v_j^-) \in E^*$ if and only if $e = (v_i, v_j) \in E$ (see Figure 4 for an example). We can define a perfect b -matching on the corresponding bipartite graph $\vec{G}^* = (N^*, E^*)$ as a subset of edges $M^* \subseteq E^*$ such that for node $v_i \in N^+$ or N^- , the degree of node v_i in (N^*, M^*) is b_i^+ or b_i^- , respectively. This modified definition is a special case of the undirected version in Definition 1.2 with node set $N = (v_1^+, \dots, v_n^+, v_1^-, \dots, v_n^-)$ and the positive vector $b = (b_1^+, \dots, b_n^+, b_1^-, \dots, b_n^-)$. Thus, to find a minimum weight perfect b -matching for a directed graph \vec{G} , we do the following (see Figure 5):

- Let B be the complete bipartite graph $K_{n,n}$ minus the edges $\{(v_i^+, v_i^-) \mid i = 1, \dots, n\}$.
- Let $b^+ = d^+$ and $b^- = d^-$.
- For $p, q \in \{+, -\}$, let edge weights $w_{ij} = d_i^p d_j^q$.

5.1.2 Neuronal networks

Using NeuronetExperimenter [15], we simulated 150 rhythmogenic neurons in the preBötzinger complex using the Rubin-Hayes neuron model [25] (<http://senselab.med.yale.edu/modeldb/ShowModel.asp?model=125649>). It is unknown what degree distribution and network connectivity arise in neuronal networks. However, it seems reasonable to expect that neurons closer to each other are more likely to be connected. Hence, we have chosen to model these networks with 3D geometric (directed) graphs. Raster plots of simulation results for two 3D geometric networks are displayed in Figures 6 and 7 (center columns), along with simulation results from realizations with the minimum and maximum directed Randić indices




Figure 5: Bipartite setup of the perfect b -matching problem for the directed graph given in Figure 4, with node set $N = (v_1^+, \dots, v_4^+, v_1^-, \dots, v_4^-)$ and the positive vector $b = (b_1^+, \dots, b_4^+, b_1^-, \dots, b_4^-) = (2, 2, 1, 1, 1, 1, 2, 2)$. For minimum weight perfect b -matching, we would set $w_{ij} = d_i^p d_j^q$, where $p, q \in \{+, -\}$.

in (3). These results display an overall tendency for the realization with minimum and maximum Randić index, regardless of type, to lead to a faster and slower breathing rhythm, respectively. This is not always the case, however, as can be seen with R^{+-} in Figure 7. There is also a tendency for more and less synchronous firing from realizations with respective minimum and maximum Randić index. These results warrant a more thorough quantitative analysis, which is beyond the scope of this work.




Figure 6: Raster plots for simulations of 150 preBötzinger complex neurons connected in a 3D geometric network (middle column, all rows the same), as well as network realizations with the minimum (left column) and maximum (right column) Randić index R^{pq} , where $pq = ++, +-, -+, \text{ and } --$ in rows 1, 2, 3 and 4, respectively.

5.2 Normalizing the Randić index index in cortical thickness networks

Recently, researchers have begun using graph measures of connectivity to investigate the difference between structural magnetic resonance images taken from healthy individuals and individuals diagnosed with dementia (for example, [1, 32, 17, 16]). Networks in these studies are formed by calculating correlations between the cortical thicknesses of different brain regions, a technique based on the correlation between cortical thickness loss and dementia [8, 10]. This method of network creation has been speculated to provide more insight on the functional relationships between brain regions [9]. Details of how the networks are formed can be found in [16, 28] and we present one such method below. After networks for each subject population (e.g., normal, subjects with dementia) are formed, network measures (e.g., Randić index) are calculated and evaluated for significance.

A particular challenge to using comparisons between the network measures is complicated by the varying number of edges in each of the networks. In particular, some kind of normalization is required for some of the measures used. In order to normalize, we propose the following scheme:

1. For each network, N , determine the underlying degree distribution, b .
2. Calculate U_b , the maximum Randić index index for b , respectively.




Figure 7: Setup same as in Figure 6 for a different 3D geometric network.

3. Use U_b to normalize the Randić index for N .

We use data from the Alzheimer’s Disease Neuroimaging Initiative (ADNI) and further analyzed by FreeSurfer, a technique developed by Fischl and Dale [7] to measure cortical thicknesses. When applied to the ADNI data, Fischl and Dale discretized the cortical layer into 68 different regions. Soldan, et al. [28] used the following steps to generate networks:

1. Subset the population into categories based on whether they were diagnosed as normal (NORMAL), diagnosed with mild cognitive impairment for three or more years without disease progression (MCI), diagnosed with mild cognitive impairment and then progressed to Alzheimer’s Disease within three years (MCIAD), or diagnosed with Alzheimer’s Disease.
2. Within each population, use regression to control for subject age, gender, education level, and interaction effects between age and gender.
3. Use either partial or Pearson’s correlations to calculate coefficients and p -values between each of the 68 regions.
4. Use False Discover Rate [3] calculations to determine significant correlation coefficients with an error rate of 5%.
5. Use one of the following schemes to determine edge weights:
 - (a) Use no weights: simply include edges or not.

Group	Original	Maximum (U_b)	Normalized
AD	172910.5	182773.6	94.6%
MCI-AD	182098.8	192005.4	94.84%
MCI	146719	155715.5	94.22%
Normal	231957.8	244387.6	94.91%

Table 4: Original, maximum, and normalized Randić index. CT and absolute correlation weighting used with Pierson’s correlations.

- (b) Use the absolute value of the correlation coefficients as the edge weight.
- (c) Use the product of the normalized cortical thicknesses (i.e., the cortical thicknesses divided by the maximum) between the two regions connected by the significant edge.
- (d) Use both 5b and 5c.

Given the four diagnostic categories, the two possibilities in step 3, and the four possibilities in step 5, there are a total of 8 different networks. After calculating the associated degree distributions, we calculated the maximum Randić index. As an example, we display the results for one network in Table 4. The results for all eight networks can be seen in Appendix A

By normalizing the Randić index, comparisons between the groups can more accurately determine whether the assortativity was due to the actual network topology versus other features, such as the total number of edges. Currently, studies instead arbitrarily delete edges in networks, which effectively ignore different brain regions in order to compare non-normalized graph measures [32, 17, 16]. Normalizing by dividing out by the optimized metric allows for comparisons without ignoring network features. To actually use the optimization in such a statistical study, we note that significance testing (e.g., permutation testing to determine whether the comparisons are valid) would be required.

6 Conclusions and Future Work

We have shown that the minimum Randić index problem can be solved in polynomial time. With use of available b -matching code we have developed an algorithm that produces a graph realization with the minimum Randić index for a given degree sequence. Not all optimal solutions are connected. A two-switch heuristic was developed to connect disconnected optimal solutions. Although the graph structure of these new connected graphs is fragile, the Randić index changed relatively little.

From our experiments, when generating Erdős-Rényi, geometric and scale-free graphs, the realization with the minimum Randić index is generally connected. Undoubtedly, this result is influenced by the parameters chosen for the randomly generated graphs, but many graphs that will have a disconnected minimum Randić index realization have no connected realizations at all.

There are a number of future topics to explore. We want to develop a better way to connect graphs using the two-switch heuristic so that the structure of the graph is less fragile. Further experiments with the parameters of randomly generated graphs are needed to understand the conditions under which the number of graphs that are disconnected or have no connected realizations changes. We also are interested in determining the complexity of the connected Randić index problem when the input graph is not the complete graph.

References

- [1] Feng Bai, Ni Shu, Yonggui Yuan, Yongmei Shi, Hui Yu, Di Wu, Jinhui Wang, Mingrui Xia, Yong He, and Zhijun Zhang. Topologically convergent and divergent structural connectivity patterns between patients with remitted geriatric depression and amnesic mild cognitive impairment. *The Journal of Neuroscience*, 32(12):4307–4318, 2012.
- [2] I. Beichl and B. Cloteaux. Measuring the effectiveness of the s-metric to produce better network models. In *Simulation Conference, 2008. WSC 2008. Winter*, pages 1020–1028. IEEE, 2008.
- [3] Yoav Benjamini and Yosef Hochberg. Controlling the false discovery rate: a practical and powerful approach to multiple testing. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Methodological)*, pages 289–300, 1995.
- [4] B. Bollobás, P. Erdős, and A. Sarkar. Extremal graphs for weights. *Discrete Mathematics*, 200(1-3):5–19, 1999.
- [5] W.K. Chen. *Graph theory and its engineering applications*. World Scientific Pub. Co. Inc., 1997.
- [6] Jack L Feldman and Christopher A del Negro. Looking for inspiration: new perspectives on respiratory rhythm. *Nat Rev Neurosci*, 7(3):232–242, February 2006.
- [7] Bruce Fischl and Anders M Dale. Measuring the thickness of the human cerebral cortex from magnetic resonance images. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 97(20):11050–11055, 2000.
- [8] Anders M Fjell, Kristine B Walhovd, Ivar Reinvang, Arvid Lundervold, David Salat, Brian T Quinn, Bruce Fischl, and Anders M Dale. Selective increase of cortical thickness in high-performing elderly structural indices of optimal cognitive aging. *Neuroimage*, 29(3):984–994, 2006.
- [9] Gaolang Gong, Yong He, Zhang J Chen, and Alan C Evans. Convergence and divergence of thickness correlations with diffusion connections across the human cerebral cortex. *Neuroimage*, 59(2):1239–1248, 2012.
- [10] Alden L Gross, Jennifer J Manly, Judy Pa, Julene K Johnson, Lovingly Quitania Park, Meghan B Mitchell, Rebecca J Melrose, Sharon K Inouye, and Donald G McLaren. Cortical signatures of cognition and their relationship to alzheimers disease. *Brain imaging and behavior*, 6(4):584–598, 2012.
- [11] I. Gutman and N. Trinajstić. Graph theory and molecular orbitals. total ϕ -electron energy of alternant hydrocarbons. *Chemical Physics Letters*, 20(3):257–260, 1973.
- [12] S.L. Hakimi. On realizability of a set of integers as degrees of the vertices of a linear graph. i. *Journal of the Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics*, pages 496–506, 1962.
- [13] P. Hansen and H. Mélot. Variable neighborhood search for extremal graphs. 6. analyzing bounds for the connectivity index. *Journal of Chemical Information and Computer Sciences*, 43(1):1–14, 2003.
- [14] V. Havel. A remark on the existence of finite graphs. *Casopis Pest. Mat*, 80:477–480, 1955.
- [15] John A Hayes and Jeffrey L Mendenhall. NeuronetExperimenter. <https://sourceforge.net/projects/neuronetexp/>, 2012.
- [16] Y. He, Z. Chen, and A. Evans. Structural insights into aberrant topological patterns of large-scale cortical networks in alzheimer’s disease. *The Journal of neuroscience*, 28(18):4756–4766, 2008.
- [17] Y. He, Z. Chen, G. Gong, A. Evans, et al. Neuronal networks in alzheimer’s disease. *The Neuroscientist*, 15(4):333–350, 2009.
- [18] B. Huang and T. Jebara. Loopy belief propagation for bipartite maximum weight b-matching. *Artificial Intelligence and Statistics (AISTATS)*, 2007.

- [19] R.K. Kincaid, N. Alexandrov, and M. Holroyd. An investigation of synchrony in transport networks. *Complexity*, 14(4):34–43, 2009.
- [20] R.K. Kincaid and D. Phillips. Network topology measures. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Computational Statistics-Operations*, 3(6):557–565, 2011.
- [21] L. Li, D. Alderson, J.C. Doyle, and W. Willinger. Towards a theory of scale-free graphs: Definition, properties, and implications. *Internet Mathematics*, 2(4):431–523, 2005.
- [22] X. Li, Y. Shi, and L. Wang. An updated survey on the Randić index. *Recent Results in the Theory of Randić index, Mathematical Chemistry Monographs*, 6, 2008.
- [23] Y.-Y. Lui, J.-J. Slotine, and A.-L. Barabasi. Controllability of complex networks. *Nature*, 473:167–173, 2011.
- [24] M. Randić. Characterization of molecular branching. *Journal of the American Chemical Society*, 97(23):6609–6615, 1975.
- [25] J E Rubin, J A Hayes, J L Mendenhall, and C A Del Negro. Calcium-activated nonspecific cation current and synaptic depression promote network-dependent burst oscillations. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA*, 106(8):2939–2944, February 2009.
- [26] H.J. Ryser. Combinatorial properties of matrices of zeros and ones. *Canad. J. Math*, 9(371-377):6, 1957.
- [27] A. Schrijver. *Combinatorial optimization*. Springer, 2003.
- [28] A Soldan, A McGlaughlin, D Ruth, L Jager, and D Phillips. Differentiation between cortical networks of normal, mild cognitive impairment, and alzheimer’s disease populations, 2014. In preparation.
- [29] A. Taylor and D.J. Higham. Contest: A controllable test matrix toolbox for matlab. *ACM Transactions on Mathematical Software (TOMS)*, 35(4), 2009.
- [30] V. V. Vazirani. *Approximation algorithms*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2001.
- [31] D.B. West. *Introduction to graph theory, 2nd ed.* Prentice Hall Upper Saddle River, NJ, 2001.
- [32] Zhijun Yao, Yuanchao Zhang, Lei Lin, Yuan Zhou, Cunlu Xu, Tianzi Jiang, et al. Abnormal cortical networks in mild cognitive impairment and alzheimer’s disease. *PLoS computational biology*, 6(11):e1001006, 2010.
- [33] Gorka Zamora-López, Changsong Zhou, Vinko Zlatić, and Jürgen Kurths. The generation of random directed networks with prescribed 1-node and 2-node degree correlations. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical*, 41(22):224006, 2008.

A Maximized assortativity in cortical thickness networks

We present the computational results from the different cortical thickness (CT) networks. Recall that there were eight different networks that were created based on the following three techniques:

1. **Abs. corr. wtd.**: Edges weighted by the absolute value of the correlation;
2. **CT wtd.**: Edges weighted by the product of the CT at each node; and
3. **Partials**: *Partial correlations* used to control for the effects of nodes not adjacent to each edge.

In the tables below, we use **Abs. corr. wtd.**, **CT wtd.**, and **Partials** to denote that the associated technique was involved in the data creation. Thus, the default method for network creation would involve no weighting and ordinary Pierson correlations calculated between different brain regions.

Group	Original Randić index	Maximum Randić index	Percentage
AD	6327146	6327662	99.99%
MCI-AD	6004728	6005871	99.98%
MCI	4354002	4366974	99.7%
Normal	5730156	5732158	99.97%

Table 5: Original and maximized Randić index.

Group	Original Randić index	Maximum Randić index	Percentage
AD	210683	226302	93.1%
MCI-AD	82102	89411	91.83%
MCI	54245	59447	91.25%
Normal	11329	13183	85.94%

Table 6: Original and maximized Randić index. **Partials** used.

Group	Original Randić index	Maximum Randić index	Percentage
AD	172910.5	182773.6	94.6%
MCI-AD	182098.8	192005.4	94.84%
MCI	146719	155715.5	94.22%
Normal	231957.8	244387.6	94.91%

Table 7: Original and maximized Randić index. **CT wtd.** used.

Group	Original Randić index	Maximum Randić index	Percentage
AD	826.0913	1056.366	78.2%
MCI-AD	966.2843	1295.196	74.61%
MCI	615.2327	809.9756	75.96%
Normal	157.3287	231.8221	67.87%

Table 8: Original and maximized Randić index. **CT wtd.** and **Partials** used.

Group	Original Randić index	Maximum Randić index	Percentage
AD	628898.9	653754.5	96.2%
MCI-AD	637520.3	664594.7	95.93%
MCI	305088.9	325998.4	93.59%
Normal	496892.5	526608.8	94.36%

Table 9: Original and maximized Randić index. **Abs. corr. wtd.** used.

Group	Original Randić index	Maximum Randić index	Percentage
AD	1293.972	1651.687	78.34%
MCI-AD	1491.38	1908.273	78.15%
MCI	615.0955	809.4072	75.99%
Normal	129.3011	193.4662	66.83%

Table 10: Original and maximized Randić index. **Abs. corr. wtd.** and **Partials** used.

Group	Original Randić index	Maximum Randić index	Percentage
AD	16741.64	18608.67	89.97%
MCI-AD	19398.13	21562.17	89.96%
MCI	10007.96	11262.25	88.86%
Normal	18109.99	20315.58	89.14%

Table 11: Original and maximized Randić index. **Abs. corr. wtd.** and **CT wtd.** used.

Group	Original Randić index	Maximum Randić index	Percentage
AD	33.39597	54.8791	60.85%
MCI-AD	40.12877	65.14792	61.6%
MCI	26.36858	45.19809	58.34%
Normal	5.027669	10.57358	47.55%

Table 12: Original and maximized Randić index. **Abs. corr. wtd.**, **CT wtd.**, and **Partials** used.