

---

# Change Point Methods on a Sequence of Graphs

---

**Daniele Zambon**  
Faculty of Informatics  
Università della Svizzera italiana  
6900 Lugano, Switzerland  
daniele.zambon@usi.ch

**Cesare Alippi**  
Università della Svizzera italiana  
6900 Lugano, Switzerland  
Politecnico di Milano  
20133 Milano, Italy  
cesare.alippi@usi.ch

**Lorenzo Livi**  
Department of Computer Science  
University of Exeter  
Exeter EX4 4QF, United Kingdom  
l.livi@exeter.ac.uk

## Abstract

The present paper considers a finite sequence of graphs, e.g., coming from technological, biological, and social networks, each of which is modelled as a realization of a graph-valued random variable, and proposes a methodology to identify possible changes in stationarity in its generating stochastic process. In order to cover a large class of applications, we consider a general family of attributed graphs, characterized by a possible variable topology (edges and vertices) also in the stationary case. A Change Point Method (CPM) approach is proposed, that (i) maps graphs into a vector domain; (ii) applies a suitable statistical test; (iii) detects the change –if any– according to a confidence level and provides an estimate for its time of occurrence. Two specific CPMs are proposed: one detecting shifts in the distribution mean, the other addressing generic changes affecting the distribution. We ground our proposal with theoretical results showing how to relate the inference attained in the numerical vector space to the graph domain, and vice versa. Finally, simulations on epileptic-seizure detection problems are conducted on real-world data providing evidence for the CPMs effectiveness.

## 1 Introduction

Graph representations have shown to be effective in several fields, including physics, chemistry, neuroscience, and sociology [21], where phenomena under investigations can be described as a sequence of measurements represented as graphs [17]. In these scenarios, it is of particular interest the identification of a possible change in the system behavior, a situation associated with anomalies or events to be detected in the sequence; this is often the case, for instance, with functional brain networks [16] and power grids [24]. Further relevant applications cover cyber-physical systems and the internet of things [1].

We consider as general graph space  $\mathcal{G}$  the graph alignment space (GAS) [14]. GASs are metric spaces characterized by a kernel function evaluating the similarity between graphs. GASs describe graphs with generic attributes on vertices and edges, and the topology is not requested to be fixed. They also address the case where one-to-one correspondence among vertices of different graphs is unavailable or missing (this issue is managed by a graph alignment procedure, e.g., see [18]). Most of common graph spaces are GASs, e.g., the spaces of weighted graphs with Frobenius norm as distance, and the numeric vector-attributed graph spaces whose distance is based on Euclidean attribute kernels.

In this paper, we consider a given finite sequence  $G(1, T) = \{g_1, \dots, g_T\}$ ,  $g_t \in \mathcal{G}$ , of graphs generated by an unknown underlying stochastic process  $\mathcal{P}$ . In other terms, each graph is interpreted as the realization of a graph-valued random variable. Under the stationarity hypothesis, process  $\mathcal{P}$  generates  $T$  independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) graphs  $g_t$ ,  $t = 1, 2, \dots, T$  according to an unknown distribution  $Q_0$  [32]. Conversely, we say that process  $\mathcal{P}$  undergoes a change in stationarity if it exists a time  $t^*$  such that

$$\begin{cases} g_t \sim Q_0 & t < t^* \\ g_t \sim Q_1 & t \geq t^*, \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

with  $Q_1$  being a graph distribution different from  $Q_0$ , time  $t^*$  is said to be a change point. The type of change is said to be abrupt as  $\mathcal{P}$  commutes from  $Q_0$  to  $Q_1$  in a single time-step.

The present paper addresses the twofold problem of (i) identifying abrupt changes in stationarity of the driving process  $\mathcal{P}$  and (ii) estimating the change point  $t^*$ . As sequence  $G(1, T)$  is given, we propose to adopt a Change Point Method (CPM) [5, 13, 6, 7], which consists of a series of two-sample statistical tests applied to the  $T - 1$  pairs of subsets  $G(1, t) = \{g_1, \dots, g_t\}$  and  $G(t + 1, T) = \{g_{t+1}, \dots, g_T\}$ ,  $t = 1, \dots, T - 1$ . If at least a test yields a  $p$ -value lower than a significance level, then a change in stationarity is detected in the sequence  $G(1, T)$ ; the estimated change point is the one with the lowest  $p$ -value. The CPM framework can be implemented, in principle, by using any two-sample statistical test designed to assess differences between distribution functions.

In the literature, CPMs have been initially applied to scalar, normally distributed, sequences to monitor shifts in the mean [13] or variance [12]. Extensions have been introduced for nonparametric inference [11, 26], multivariate data [31, 19], and kernel-based inference [10, 9]. Further, Matteson and James [20] proposed a nonparametric CPM to detect multiple changes in the same, multivariate, sequence. Another relevant type of statistical test is the Change Detection Test (CDT) [3]. A CDT acts differently from a CPM as it is designed for a sequential monitoring. We report the related work by Barnett and Onnela [2], which monitors functional magnetic resonance recordings to identify changes. The recordings are modelled by correlation networks and a CPM is applied to detect changes in stationarity. The technique there proposed, however, is designed for weighted numerical graphs of fixed size. Few other works address changes in sequences of graphs/networks [23, 30], but none of them operates on the very generic family of graphs considered here.

To the best of our knowledge, our contribution is the first one proposing a CPM for sequences of generic attributed graphs. The novelty of what proposed resides in:

- A methodology for performing CPMs on a sequence of attributed graphs by relying on graph embeddings (i.e., mapping a graph onto a point in some vector space);
- Controlling the confidence level of the inference in the graph domain. In fact, in following Proposition 1 we prove that the statistical confidence of the CPM test attained in the embedding space is related to the confidence level that a change has taken place in the graph domain. Our theoretical results show how this relation holds true for a very large class of graph embeddings.

In addition, we propose here two different CPM tests for graphs. The first one operates by taking advantage of the Central Limit Theorem (CLT) as formulated by Zambon et al. [32] for CDTs, and removing the strong bi-Lipschitz assumption for the embedding map. The second test is based on the energy distance between probability distributions introduced by Székely and Rizzo [29], which was shown to be a metric distance between distributions in many scenarios. Subsequent Proposition 2 shows that the energy distance is a metric distance between distributions over the considered graph domain.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 introduces the proposed methodology for performing CPMs on graph sequences. Section 3 presents the theoretical results related to CPMs and graph embedding. Although our contribution is mostly theoretical, and as such application-independent, we report in Section 4 an experiment where the CPMs are applied to a relevant real application scenario involving the detection of the onset of epileptic seizures in functional brain connectivity networks. Section 5 concludes the paper and provides pointers to future research.

## 2 The proposed CPM on a graph sequence

### 2.1 Assumptions and problem formalization

Given graph space  $\mathcal{G}$ , we consider a distance measure  $\delta(g_i, g_j) \in \mathbb{R}_+$  defined for any pair  $g_i, g_j \in \mathcal{G}$ . As mentioned in the Introduction, we assume that:

(A1) Graph space  $(\mathcal{G}, \delta)$  is a graph alignment space [14]

Assumption (A1) is mild, yet grants space  $(\mathcal{G}, \delta)$  to be metric.

Under the stationarity hypothesis for process  $\mathcal{P}$ , sequence  $G(1, T)$  is composed of i.i.d.<sup>1</sup> graphs distributed according to the stationary probability function  $Q_0$ . Following (1), the statistical hypothesis test for detecting a single change in stationarity can be formulated as

$$\begin{aligned} H_0 : & \quad \forall t^* \in \{1, \dots, T-1\} \quad g_1, \dots, g_{t^*-1} \sim Q_0, \quad g_{t^*}, \dots, g_T \sim Q_1 = Q_0. \\ H_1 : & \quad \exists! t^* \in \{1, \dots, T-1\} \text{ s.t. } \quad g_1, \dots, g_{t^*-1} \sim Q_0, \quad g_{t^*}, \dots, g_T \sim Q_1 \neq Q_0. \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

The second assumption we make is:

(A2) Integrals  $\int_{\mathcal{G}} \delta(g, g')^2 dQ_i(g')$ ,  $i = 0, 1$ , are finite for at least one graph  $g \in \mathcal{G}$ .<sup>2</sup> Moreover, support of  $Q_0 \cup Q_1$  is bounded by a ball centered in a sufficiently asymmetric graph, as requested in [15].

Assumption (A2) grants that the Fréchet mean (see Eq. 8, Section 3.1) exists and is unique, hence making the mathematics more amenable. At the same time, this hypothesis enables Theorem 4.23 in [14] and, as such, the ball of graphs is proven isometric to an Euclidean space. We comment that a given GAS is entirely covered by such balls, as asymmetric graphs are spread over the entire space  $\mathcal{G}$  (Corollary 4.19, [15]); however, the radius of the ball is graph dependent.

### 2.2 Methodology

We consider a map  $\phi : \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  between the graph domain and the Euclidean space, which associates graph  $g \in \mathcal{G}$  with point  $x = \phi(g) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . By applying the mapping to each graph of the sequence  $G(1, T)$ , we generate a new sequence  $X(1, T) = \{x_1, \dots, x_T\}$  of vectors  $x_t = \phi(g_t)$ ,  $t = 1, \dots, T$ . A multivariate CPM test is then applied on  $X(1, T)$ .

A CPM performs multiple two-sample tests. For each time index  $t = 1, \dots, T-1$ , a statistic  $s_e(t) = s_e(X(1, t), X(t+1, T))$  is computed on sequences  $X(1, t), X(t+1, T)$ . Statistic  $s_e$  depends on the detection problem at hand, and two specific examples addressing changes in the distribution mean and generic changes in the distribution are discussed later in Sections 3.1 and 3.2, respectively. The pseudo-code describing the proposed CPM follows.

**Input:** A sequence of observed vectors  $X(1, T)$ ; a significance level  $\alpha_e$ .

```

1: for all  $t = 1, \dots, T-1$  do
2:   Compute statistic  $s_e(t) = s_e(X(1, t), X(t+1, T))$ ;
3:   Compute threshold  $\gamma_e(t)$  such that  $\mathbb{P}(s_e(t) > \gamma_e(t) | H_0) = \alpha_e$ ;
4: end for
5:  $\hat{t} \leftarrow \arg \max_t s_e(t)$ ;
6: if  $s_e(\hat{t}) > \gamma_e(\hat{t})$  then
7:   Null hypothesis  $H_0$  is rejected;
8:   return Change detected at time  $\hat{t} + 1$ .
9: else
10:  Null hypothesis  $H_0$  is not rejected;
11:  return 0 (no change detected).
12: end if

```

In detail, Line 5 estimates the candidate change point  $\hat{t} + 1$  and considers graph  $g_{\hat{t}}$  as the last one drawn by  $Q_0$ ; following (2), Line 6 infers the actual presence of a change with the rule:

$$\text{if } s_e(\hat{t}) > \gamma_e(\hat{t}) \Rightarrow \text{reject } H_0 \text{ at significance level } \alpha_e, \quad (3)$$

<sup>1</sup> Two graphs  $g_i, g_j$  are identically distributed if  $\mathbb{P}(g_i \in A) = \mathbb{P}(g_j \in A)$  for any set  $A \subseteq \mathcal{G}$ ; they are independent if  $\mathbb{P}(\{g_i \in A_1\} \cap \{g_j \in A_2\}) = \mathbb{P}(g_i \in A_1)\mathbb{P}(g_j \in A_2)$ , for any pair  $A_1, A_2 \subseteq \mathcal{G}$ .

<sup>2</sup>This implies the Fréchet variation to be finite.

The significance level  $\alpha_e$  is defined by the designer, as it coincides with the tolerated false positive rate (Line 3). If a change is detected in sequence  $X(1, T)$  with significance level  $\alpha_e$ , then we say that a change has taken place also in the graph sequence  $G(1, T)$  at time  $\hat{t} + 1$ . However, the significance level  $\alpha_g$  of the inference in the graph domain is, a priori, different from that in  $\mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $\alpha_e$ . Section 3, Proposition 1 shows how the confidence levels are related and, accordingly, how changes in embedding and graph domain are related to each other.

### 3 Theoretical results

Inferring whether a change in stationarity occurred in  $G(1, T)$  or not is a difficult problem given the fact we are facing attributed graphs. Moreover, as we do not constrain  $\phi(\cdot)$ , the resulting sequence  $X(1, T)$  does not necessarily encode the same information carried by  $G(1, T)$ . Here, we prove some theoretical results connecting changes in stationarity occurring in the graph sequence  $G(1, T)$  with those detected in vectorial and embedded sequence  $X(1, T)$ , and vice versa.

The core of our argument is that, if statistic  $s_e(t) = s_e(X(1, t), X(t+1, T))$  is related to the selected statistic  $s_g(t) = s_g(G(1, t), G(t+1, T))$  defined in graph domain, then also their distributions are related. By proving this, we can claim that a change occurring in one space can be detected in the other space as well, possibly with different confidence levels. Proposition 1 shows how to relate  $s_g(t)$  and  $s_e(t)$  in probabilistic terms. From Proposition 1 it follows that, when decision rule (3) is applied to  $X(1, T)$  with  $s_e(t)$  according to significance level  $\alpha_e$ , a decision rule of the form

$$\text{if } s_g(t) > \gamma_g \Rightarrow \text{reject } H_0 \text{ with significance level } \alpha_g,$$

holds in the graph domain, with respect to  $s_g(t)$ . In particular, we can bound the significance level  $\alpha_g$  by two significance levels  $\alpha'_e$  and  $\alpha''_e$  which, in turn, are associated with two thresholds  $\gamma'_e, \gamma''_e$ , hence permitting to obtain a hypothesis test in the graph space with a user-defined confidence level.

**Proposition 1.** *Consider a sequence  $G(1, T)$  of i.i.d. attributed graphs drawn according to probability function  $Q_0 = Q_1$ , and assume (A1), (A2) to hold. Let  $\Psi_g(\cdot)$  and  $\Psi_e(\cdot)$  be the cumulative density functions of statistics  $s_g(t)$  and  $s_e(t)$ , respectively. Chosen constants<sup>3</sup>  $\lambda > 0$  and  $q \in (0, 1]$  satisfying*

$$\mathbb{P}(|s_g(t) - s_e(t)| \leq \lambda) \geq q, \quad (4)$$

then, for any real value  $\gamma$ , we have that

$$q\Psi_e(\gamma - \lambda) \leq \Psi_g(\gamma) \leq q^{-1}\Psi_e(\gamma + \lambda). \quad (5)$$

The proof follows from Lemma 2 by Zamboni et al. [32] applied to Eq. 4 in the forms  $\mathbb{P}(s_g(t) \leq s_e(t) + \lambda) \geq q$  and  $\mathbb{P}(s_e(t) \leq s_g(t) + \lambda) \geq q$ .

As a consequence of Proposition 1, if we can compute statistic  $s_g(t)$ , then we can also estimate the associated  $p$ -value by means of the distribution of  $s_e(t)$ . In fact, let  $s_g^*$  be the statistic  $s_g(t)$  evaluated on sequence  $G(1, T)$  with  $p$ -value  $p_g = \mathbb{P}(s_g(t) > s_g^* | H_0) = 1 - \Psi_g(s_g^*)$ . Then, from Proposition 1, Eq. 5, it follows that

$$\alpha'_e := 1 - q^{-1}\Psi_e(s_g^* + \lambda) \leq p_g \leq 1 - q\Psi_e(s_g^* - \lambda) =: \alpha''_e. \quad (6)$$

Equation (6) states that if a change is detected in the embedding space with significance level  $\alpha_e = \alpha''_e$ , then it is also detected in the graph space with significance level  $\alpha_g$ . The opposite holds: selected a significance level  $\alpha_g$  for a change in the graph domain, the associated level for the change in embedding space is  $\alpha'_e$ .

More generally, by selecting a confidence level  $1 - \alpha_g$  for detecting a change in the graph domain, we can identify two thresholds  $\gamma'_e, \gamma''_e$  so that  $1 - \Psi_e(\gamma''_e) < \alpha_g < 1 - \Psi_e(\gamma'_e)$ . It follows that, if  $s_e(t)$  is larger than  $\gamma'_e$ , then a change is detected in the graph domain with *at least* required confidence level  $1 - \alpha_g$ . Likewise, if  $s_e(t)$  does not exceed  $\gamma''_e \leq \gamma'_e$  then, with confidence  $1 - \alpha_g$ , a change is not present in  $G(1, T)$ .

We comment that, if the embedding is isometric, then, for any  $\lambda > 0$ , Eq. 4 holds with probability  $q = 1$ . This means that (5) reduces to equality  $\Psi_e(\gamma) = \Psi_g(\gamma)$  for any  $\gamma$ . As final remark, we point

<sup>3</sup>Constants  $\lambda$  and  $q$  depend on distribution  $Q_0$ , but are independent from  $G(1, T)$ .

out that (4) always exists regardless of the embedding strategy; as such, the relation between statistics  $s_e(t)$  and  $s_g(t)$  is not an assumption made within this framework.

The following subsections propose two CPM tests based on relevant graph and vector distances for which (i) terms in (4) can be made explicit, and (ii) the distribution of  $s_e(t)$  can be determined. It follows that the distribution of  $s_g(t)$  can be estimated, together with the confidence level  $1 - \alpha_g$ .

### 3.1 A CPM test for a shift in the mean

The first CPM test addresses the detection of a shift in the mean of the graph distribution. The derived statistical hypotheses are  $H_0 : \mu_{Q_0} = \mu_{Q_1}$  against  $H_1 : \mu_{Q_0} \neq \mu_{Q_1}$ . As suitable statistic for the embedding space, we use:

$$s_e(t) = s_e(X(1, t), X(t + 1, T)) = T d_M^2(\mu_{X(1, t)}, \mu_{X(t+1, T)}),$$

based on the squared Mahalanobis distance

$$d_M^2(\mu_{X(1, t)}, \mu_{X(t+1, T)}) = (\mu_{X(1, t)} - \mu_{X(t+1, T)})^\top M^{-1} (\mu_{X(1, t)} - \mu_{X(t+1, T)}). \quad (7)$$

$\mu_{X(1, t)}$  and  $\mu_{X(t+1, T)}$  are the sample means and  $M$  is the pooled sampling covariance matrix. Under the stationarity hypothesis, the distribution of statistic  $s_e(t)$  can be determined; in fact, by applying the CLT,  $s_e(t)$  is asymptotically distributed as a  $\chi^2(d)$ , where  $d$  denotes of the embedding space dimension. As the distribution of  $s_e(t)$  is now available, a threshold  $\gamma_e$  can be set to control the false positive rate.

Accordingly, we select graph statistic  $s_g(t)$  as the squared GAS distance  $\delta^2(\cdot, \cdot)$  between the mean graphs  $\mu_{G(1, t)}$  and  $\mu_{G(t+1, T)}$ ,

$$s_g(t) = s_g(G(1, t), G(t + 1, T)) = T \delta^2(\mu_{G(1, t)}, \mu_{G(t+1, T)}).$$

We comment that, as we are considering attributed graphs, possibly with a variable number of vertices, the mean graph element must be intended according to Fréchet [8]. The Fréchet mean  $\mu_Q$  of a generic distribution  $Q$  and its empirical counterpart  $\mu_{G(t_1, t_2)}$  over  $G(t_1, t_2)$  are defined as

$$\mu_Q = \arg \min_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \int_{\mathcal{G}} \delta(g, g')^2 dQ(g'), \quad \mu_{G(t_1, t_2)} = \arg \min_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \sum_{t=t_1}^{t_2} \delta(g_t, g)^2. \quad (8)$$

We highlight that  $d_M(\mu_{X(1, t)}, \mu_{X(t+1, T)})$  and  $\delta(\mu_{G(1, t)}, \mu_{G(t+1, T)})$  are consistent estimators of  $d_M(\mu_{F_0}, \mu_{F_1})$  and  $\delta(\mu_{Q_0}, \mu_{Q_1})$ , respectively. In fact, the ordinary and Fréchet sample means are consistent estimators of their population counterparts [15].  $F_i$  is the distribution of random vector  $x = \phi(g)$  for  $g \sim Q_i$ ,  $i \in \{0, 1\}$ .

With the above selection for statistics  $s_g(t)$  and  $s_e(t)$ , Proposition 1 can be specialized. This is done by following Lemma 1, which explicitly provides a  $q$  for any positive  $\lambda$  (see Eq. 4).

**Lemma 1.** *Consider a sequence  $G(1, T)$  of i.i.d. attributed graphs drawn from distribution  $Q$ , and the associated embedding sequence  $X(1, T) = \phi(G(1, T))$ . There exists a positive constant  $V_1(t)$  depending on distribution  $Q$  and time  $t$ , such that,*

$$\mathbb{P}(|s_e(t) - s_g(t)| \leq \lambda) \geq 1 - \lambda^{-1} V_1(t), \quad \forall \lambda > 0,$$

with  $V_1(t) = \frac{2T^2}{t(T-t)} (\lambda_d(M)^{-1} V_f[F] + V_f[Q])$ .

$\lambda_d(M)$  is the smallest eigenvalue of matrix  $M$ , and  $V_f[\cdot]$  is the Fréchet variation; see the proof for detailed explanation. By above lemma follows that Proposition 1 holds for any positive value of  $\lambda$ , with  $q = q(\lambda) = 1 - \lambda^{-1} V_1(t)$ . We point out that the constant  $V_1(t)$  is proportional to the sum of Fréchet variation of  $Q_0$  and  $F_0$  and therefore it can be considered as a measure for the data spread.

*Proof.* The claim is proved by applying the Markov inequality [27] to  $|s_e(t) - s_g(t)|$ :

$$\mathbb{P}(|s_g(t) - s_e(t)| \geq \lambda) \leq \lambda^{-1} \mathbb{E}[|s_g(t) - s_e(t)|] \leq \lambda^{-1} (\mathbb{E}[s_g(t)] + \mathbb{E}[s_e(t)]), \quad \lambda > 0. \quad (9)$$

Let evaluate  $\mathbb{E}[s_e(t)]$  first. As the Mahalanobis distance (7) is bounded by the Euclidean one via the smallest<sup>4</sup> eigenvalue  $\lambda_d(M)$  of matrix  $M$ , then we have that

$$s_e(t) \leq \frac{T}{\lambda_d(M)} \|\mu_{X(1,t)} - \mu_{X(t+1,T)}\|_2^2 \leq \frac{2T}{\lambda_d(M)} \left( \|\mu_{X(1,t)} - \mu_F\|_2^2 + \|\mu_F - \mu_{X(t+1,T)}\|_2^2 \right).$$

Recall the notion of Fréchet variation  $V_f[F]$ , that is, the minimum attained by the mean element according to (8). We have  $V_f[F] = \mathbb{E}[\|x - \mu_F\|_2^2]$ , where the expectation is taken with respect to  $x \sim F$ . Moreover,  $\mathbb{E}[\|\mu_{X(1,t)} - \mu_F\|_2^2] = t^{-1} V_f[F]$ , which leads to

$$\mathbb{E}[s_e(t)] \leq 2T \left( \frac{1}{t} + \frac{1}{T-t} \right) \lambda_d(M)^{-1} V_f[F] = \frac{2T^2}{t(T-t)} \lambda_d(M)^{-1} V_f[F].$$

By (A2),  $(\mathcal{G}, \delta)$  is isometric to an Euclidean space and, similarly,  $\mathbb{E}[s_g(t)] \leq \frac{2T^2}{t(T-t)} V_f[Q]$ .  $\square$

### 3.2 A CPM test for a generic distribution change

The second CPM test we propose is designed to identify any type of change in stationarity impacting on the distribution. As such, the hypothesis test can be formalized as  $H_0 : Q_0 = Q_1$  against  $H_1 : Q_0 \neq Q_1$ . We select as statistic in the embedding space  $s_e(t) = s_e(X(1, t), X(t+1, T))$ ,

$$s_e(t) = \frac{t(T-t)}{T} \left\{ \frac{2 \sum_{i=1}^t \sum_{j=t}^T |x_i - x_j|_2}{t(T-t)} - \frac{\sum_{i,j=1}^t |x_i - x_j|_2}{t^2} - \frac{\sum_{i,j=t+1}^T |x_i - x_j|_2}{(T-t)^2} \right\}, \quad (10)$$

which asymptotically follows a weighted sum of  $\chi^2(1)$  distributions [28], provided the variance of  $x_i$  is finite. As such, associated  $p$ -values can be computed. Székely and Rizzo [28] showed also that tests based on  $s_e(t)$  are consistent when testing equality of distributions  $F_0$  and  $F_1$  against the  $F_0 \neq F_1$  hypothesis, implying that the test is able to detect any discrepancy between distributions. This comes from the fact that statistic  $s_e(t)$  is the empirical version of the energy distance  $E^2(F_0, F_1)$ , which is proven to be a metric distance between distribution pair  $F_0$  and  $F_1$  on Euclidean spaces,

$$E^2(F_0, F_1) := 2\mathbb{E}[\|x_0 - x_1\|_2] - \mathbb{E}[\|x_0 - x'_0\|_2] - \mathbb{E}[\|x_1 - x'_1\|_2], \quad (11)$$

with  $x_0, x'_0 \sim F_0$  and  $x_1, x'_1 \sim F_1$  independent random vectors. Such a property can be extended to more general metric spaces [29] by simply substituting in Eq. 11 the associated metric distance. In particular, as stated in Proposition 2, this holds for  $(\mathcal{G}, \delta)$  whenever the graph domain is a proper GAS.

**Proposition 2.** *Define set  $\mathcal{D}$  of all probability functions on a measurable space over  $(\mathcal{G}, \delta)$ , so that  $\bigcup_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} Q$  fulfills the support condition of (A2). Then, use in  $E^2(\cdot, \cdot)$  of (11) the metric distance between samples  $\delta(\cdot, \cdot)$ . It follows that  $(\mathcal{D}, E)$  is a metric space.*

*Proof.* Theorem 4.23 in Jain [14] defines a condition under which there is an isometric mapping to an Euclidean space. Such a condition limits the support of  $\bigcup_{Q \in \mathcal{D}} Q$  [Assumption (A1)]. Székely and Rizzo [29] proved the statement for the energy distance for an Euclidean space.  $\square$

Supported by this fact, we consider as graph statistic

$$s_g(t) = \frac{t(T-t)}{T} \left\{ \frac{2 \sum_{i=1}^t \sum_{j=t}^T \delta(g_i, g_j)}{t(T-t)} - \frac{\sum_{i,j=1}^t \delta(g_i, g_j)}{t^2} - \frac{\sum_{i,j=t+1}^T \delta(g_i, g_j)}{(T-t)^2} \right\}.$$

As done for Lemma 1, Lemma 2 connects statistics  $s_e(t)$  and  $s_g(t)$  in probability. This result will then be used in Proposition 1 to obtain an explicit relation between confidence levels for the test based on the energy distance.

<sup>4</sup>Any time  $M$  is singular,  $M$  can be made positive definite by reducing the embedding space dimension.




Figure 1: Two example graphs extracted from interictal and ictal classes, respectively. The graphs are represented by drawing only those edges whose attributes (Pearson correlation) are greater than 0.2. Isolated vertices have not been drawn.

**Lemma 2.** Consider a sequence  $G(1, T)$  of i.i.d. attributed graphs drawn from distribution  $Q$  and the associated embedding sequence  $X(1, T) = \phi(G(1, T))$ . There exists a non-negative constant  $V_2$  depending on distribution  $Q$ , such that,

$$\mathbb{P}(|s_e(t) - s_g(t)| \leq \lambda |H_0|) \geq 1 - \lambda^{-1} V_2, \quad \forall \lambda > 0,$$

with  $V_2 = 2(\mathbb{E}[\delta(g, \mu_Q)] + \mathbb{E}[\delta(x, \mu_F)])$ .

Lemma 2 provides, for any arbitrary  $\lambda > 0$ , a form for  $q$  in terms of  $V_2$ , i.e.,  $q = q(\lambda) = 1 - \lambda^{-1} V_2$ . In this sense, Lemma 2 is analogous to Lemma 1; moreover, quantities  $\mathbb{E}[\delta(g, \mu_Q)]$  and  $\mathbb{E}[\delta(x, \mu_F)]$  are measures of distribution spread and Lemma 2 can be interpreted in terms of the uncertainty of the data, as well.

*Proof.* The claim is again proved by considering the Markov inequality as done for (9). From Eq. 10,

$$\mathbb{E}[s_e(t)] = \frac{t(T-t)}{T} \left\{ 2 - \frac{t-1}{t} - \frac{T-t-1}{T-t} \right\} \mathbb{E}[|x - x'|_2] = \mathbb{E}[|x - x'|_2] \leq 2 \mathbb{E}[|x - \mu_F|_2]. \quad (12)$$

with  $x, x'$  independent random vectors whose distribution  $F$  derives from  $Q$  through mapping  $\phi(\cdot)$ . In the graph space, we obtain a similar bound:  $\mathbb{E}[s_g(t)] \leq 2 \mathbb{E}[\delta(g, \mu_Q)]$ , for  $g \sim Q$ .  $\square$

## 4 Experiment on iEEG data for detection of seizure onset

In this section, we apply the proposed CPM methodology to data related to the detection of epileptic seizures from intracranial electro-encephalogram (iEEG) recordings. We consider the ‘‘Detect seizures in intracranial EEG recordings’’ database by UPenn and Mayo Clinic.<sup>5</sup> The database contains different subjects. Here, we considered the dataset of the first human patient, consisting of 2224 one-second clips, at 500Hz, each one related to a multivariate signal recorded from 68 intracranial electrodes. Each clip of the training set is labelled either as ‘‘ictal’’ or ‘‘interictal’’; ‘‘ictal’’ clips are tracings recorded during an occurring seizure, whereas ‘‘interictal’’ clips describe non-seizure events recorded before the seizure onset. The test data are not labeled and, therefore, cannot be used in our simulations, leading to a dataset of 174 one-second clips of which 104 represent ‘‘interictal’’ behaviour. In order to model (statistical) coupling among the activity recorded in different brain regions, it is common to represent iEEG data as functional connectivity networks [4]. Functional connectivity networks are weighted graphs, where (usually) the vertices correspond with the signals recorded by the electrodes and the edge weights represent their coupling strength. Many connectivity measures have been proposed for this purpose: here we consider Pearson correlation computed in the high-theta band (70-100Hz). We also consider four wavelet coefficients of original signals as vertex attributes. Figure 1 provides a visual representation of two graphs associated with different regimes.

The adopted embedding technique is the dissimilarity representation [22], which considers  $d$  prototype graphs  $\{r_1, \dots, r_d\} \in \mathcal{G}$  and maps each graph  $g_i \in \mathcal{G}$  to vector  $x_i = (\delta(r_1, g_i), \dots, \delta(r_d, g_i))$ ; here, distance  $\delta(\cdot, \cdot)$  assesses discrepancy among attributes with the Euclidean norm.  $d = 3$  prototypes are selected from the training set according to the  $k$ -centers method [25]. Half of the resulting  $T = 174$

<sup>5</sup><https://www.kaggle.com/c/seizure-detection>




Figure 2: Standardized statistic  $s_e(t)$  (solid line) as function of time-step  $t$ , and related threshold  $\gamma_e(t)$  (dashed line) associated with 95% confidence level; the corresponding  $y$ -axis is placed to the left, whereas the right one is related to the  $p$ -value curve (dotted line). The top figure refers to the detection of changes in the distribution mean (Section 3.1); due to the necessity of estimating the covariance matrix  $M$  in Eq. 7, the analysis was actually conducted by considering time-steps  $t = 10, 11, \dots, T - 11$ . The figure in the bottom refers to the statistic designed to detect a generic distribution change based on the energy distance introduced in Section 3.2.

graphs are used to train the embedding map. The remaining graphs form a sequence  $G(1, 87)$ , where  $G(1, 52)$  and  $G(53, 87)$  are of interictal and ictal graphs, respectively. The ground-truth change point is  $t^* = 53$ , and represents the transition from interictal to ictal behavior.

In order to assess the performance of the proposed method, the two CPM tests described in Sections 3.1 and 3.2 are applied to sequence  $G(1, 87)$ ; the significance level is set to  $\alpha_e = 0.05$  and Figure 2 depicts the outcome. Inspired by (12), statistic  $s_e(t)$  is made more interpretable by reporting the standardized version  $s_e(t)/\mathbb{E}[|x - x'|_2]$ , where  $x, x' \sim F_0$  and  $\mathbb{E}[|x - x'|_2]$  is estimated on  $X(1, 52)$ . In both CPMs the change was detected with a 95% of confidence, as the statistics exceeded the corresponding thresholds. The change point estimated by the test on shift in the distribution mean is 63, and the statistic is rather peaked. The second test based on generic distribution change estimates the change point at time index 61. The time latency in detection is mostly related to the fact that we are considering a data sequence whose size is rather limited (87 data points), as the finiteness of the dataset impacts on the robustness of the statistic. The behaviour of the two statistics, qualitatively speaking, is similar. However, the second one exceeds the threshold in a wider range of time indices and, accordingly, the  $p$ -values are smaller; this fact may indicate that the change impacted more at the distribution level, affecting moments beyond the first one.

## 5 Conclusions

We proposed a methodology to determine the point in time where a change in stationarity occurred in a finite sequence of attributed graphs. The methodology takes into account a very large class of graphs and consists in mapping graphs to an Euclidean domain, where the mathematics is more amenable and multivariate change point methods can be applied. With Proposition 1, we proved that the statistical inference attained in the embedding space can be used to draw conclusions concerning the original problem in the graph domain, and vice versa; results extend those in [32] by removing the bi-Lipschitz assumption. Future research efforts will focus on weakening assumption (A2) regarding the support of the graph distribution, and, more importantly, on relaxing the constraint of using a metric distance between graphs.



The first CPM addresses the detection of shifts in the mean of the graph distribution, whereas the other detects more general changes in stationarity at the distribution level. For both of them, we derived explicit bounds to make Proposition 1 applicable in the practice. What proposed is theory-based and, as such, of general applicability. However, to evaluate the methods on a real application, we focused on detecting the onset of epileptic seizures from electro-encephalograms represented as functional connectivity networks. Results showed that both CPM tests were effective in this relevant application.

## Acknowledgments

Hidden.

## References

- [1] C. Alippi and M. Roveri. The (not) far-away path to smart cyber-physical systems: An information-centric framework. *Computer*, 50(4):38–47, 2017.
- [2] I. Barnett and J.-P. Onnela. Change point detection in correlation networks. *Scientific Reports*, 6, 2016.
- [3] M. Basseville and I. V. Nikiforov. *Detection of Abrupt Changes: Theory and Application*. Prentice-Hall, Inc., Upper Saddle River, NJ, USA, 1993.
- [4] A. M. Bastos and J.-M. Schoffelen. A tutorial review of functional connectivity analysis methods and their interpretational pitfalls. *Frontiers in Systems Neuroscience*, 9:175, 2016.
- [5] J. Cabrieto, F. Tuerlinckx, P. Kuppens, B. Hunyadi, and E. Ceulemans. Testing for the presence of correlation changes in a multivariate time series: A permutation based approach. *Scientific Reports*, 8(1):769, 2018.
- [6] J. Ding, Y. Xiang, L. Shen, and V. Tarokh. Multiple change point analysis: Fast implementation and strong consistency. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, 65(17):4495–4510, 2017.
- [7] Z. Fan, R. O. Dror, T. J. Mildorf, S. Piana, and D. E. Shaw. Identifying localized changes in large systems: Change-point detection for biomolecular simulations. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 112(24):7454–7459, 2015.
- [8] M. Fréchet. Les éléments aléatoires de nature quelconque dans un espace distancié. In *Annales de l’Institut Henri Poincaré*, volume 10, pages 215–310, 1948.
- [9] A. Gretton, D. Sejdinovic, H. Strathmann, S. Balakrishnan, M. Pontil, K. Fukumizu, and B. K. Sriperumbudur. Optimal kernel choice for large-scale two-sample tests. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pages 1205–1213, 2012.
- [10] Z. Harchaoui, E. Moulines, and F. R. Bach. Kernel change-point analysis. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 609–616. Curran Associates, Inc., 2009.
- [11] D. M. Hawkins and Q. Deng. A nonparametric change-point control chart. *Journal of Quality Technology*, 42(2):165, 2010.
- [12] D. M. Hawkins and K. Zamba. A change-point model for a shift in variance. *Journal of Quality Technology*, 37(1):21, 2005.
- [13] D. M. Hawkins, P. Qiu, and C. W. Kang. The changepoint model for statistical process control. *Journal of quality technology*, 35(4):355, 2003.
- [14] B. J. Jain. On the geometry of graph spaces. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 214:126–144, 2016.
- [15] B. J. Jain. Statistical graph space analysis. *Pattern Recognition*, 60:802–812, 2016.
- [16] A. N. Khambhati, K. A. Davis, T. H. Lucas, B. Litt, and D. S. Bassett. Virtual cortical resection reveals push-pull network control preceding seizure evolution. *Neuron*, 91(5):1170–1182, 2016.

- [17] A. Li, S. P. Cornelius, Y.-Y. Liu, L. Wang, and A.-L. Barabási. The fundamental advantages of temporal networks. *Science*, 358(6366):1042–1046, 2017.
- [18] L. Livi and A. Rizzi. The graph matching problem. *Pattern Analysis and Applications*, 16(3): 253–283, 2013.
- [19] E. M. Maboudou-Tchao and D. M. Hawkins. Detection of multiple change-points in multivariate data. *Journal of Applied Statistics*, 40(9):1979–1995, 2013.
- [20] D. S. Matteson and N. A. James. A nonparametric approach for multiple change point analysis of multivariate data. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 109(505):334–345, 2014.
- [21] M. E. J. Newman. *Networks: An Introduction*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK, 2010.
- [22] E. Peškalska and R. P. W. Duin. *The Dissimilarity Representation for Pattern Recognition: Foundations and Applications*. World Scientific, Singapore, 2005.
- [23] L. Peel and A. Clauset. Detecting change points in the large-scale structure of evolving networks. In *29th AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 2914–2920, 2015.
- [24] F. Possemato, M. Paschero, L. Livi, A. Sadeghian, and A. Rizzi. On the impact of topological properties of smart grids in power losses optimization problems. *International Journal of Electrical Power and Energy Systems*, 78:755–764, 2016.
- [25] K. Riesen, M. Neuhaus, and H. Bunke. Graph embedding in vector spaces by means of prototype selection. In *International Workshop on Graph-Based Representations in Pattern Recognition*, pages 383–393. Springer, 2007.
- [26] G. J. Ross and N. M. Adams. Two nonparametric control charts for detecting arbitrary distribution changes. *Journal of Quality Technology*, 44(2):102, 2012.
- [27] G. G. Roussas. *A Course in Mathematical Statistics*. Academic Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, US, 1997.
- [28] G. J. Székely and M. L. Rizzo. Testing for equal distributions in high dimension. *InterStat*, 5 (16.10):1249–1272, 2004.
- [29] G. J. Székely and M. L. Rizzo. Energy statistics: A class of statistics based on distances. *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference*, 143(8):1249–1272, 2013.
- [30] J. D. Wilson, N. T. Stevens, and W. H. Woodall. Modeling and estimating change in temporal networks via a dynamic degree corrected stochastic block model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1605.04049*, 2016.
- [31] K. D. Zamba and D. M. Hawkins. A multivariate change-point model for statistical process control. *Technometrics*, 48(4):539–549, 2006.
- [32] D. Zambon, C. Alippi, and L. Livi. Concept drift and anomaly detection in graph streams. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, pages 1–14, 2018.