HYPERGRAPH REPRESENTATION IN BRAIN NETWORK ANALYSIS

Anagha P, Selvakumar R*

Department of Mathematics, Vellore Institute of Technology, Vellore 632014, India

Email: anuanagha01@gmail.com, rselvakumar@vit.ac.in*

Abstract

For the study of functional aspects of the brain network. This paper is a study on the hypergraph representation, based on the functional regions of the brain network. A new parameter that can measure how many multifunctioning regions each function contains and thereby the correlation of other functions with each function.

Keywords: Brain network; Hyperedge degree; Hyper Zagreb Indices; Small-world network.

1 Introduction

The human brain is the most intricately connected network ever discovered by mankind. The human brain is made up of approximately 10^{11} neurons that are connected by approximately 10^{14} synapses. In the light of graph theory, brain networks are made up of vertices (nodes) and edges, where vertices stand in for neurons or regions of the brain and edges stand in for the connections that are either structural or functional between vertices [1,2].

Studies on humans indicate that modular brain networks improve cognitive performance. The modularity of a network is a structural measure that evaluates how well the network can be partitioned into smaller sub-networks (also called groups, communities, or clusters). As higher modularity reflects a larger number of intra-module connections and fewer inter-module connections, it is commonly believed that a highly modular brain consists of highly specialized brain networks with less integration across networks. Recent research on both younger and elderly individuals has demonstrated that preexisting differences in the modularity of brain networks can predict post-intervention performance improvements [3,4].

The first step in creating a brain network is defining the nodes and edges of the network. The brain

network edges show the connectivity between brain areas. The connectivity of the brain network can be classified as structural, functional, or effective connectivity. Functional connectivity is a statistical association between brain regions and physiological or neurophysiological signals [5, 6]. Topological indices are important numerical quantities that reflect various connectivity properties of the brain network [7,8]. There are several topological indices that are based on different things like eccentricity, degree, distance, and so on [9-11].

The brain network can be modeled and analyzed using hypergraph representation. Hypergraphs, compared to standard graphs, can represent more complex relationships between vertices than just connections or edges [12]. Since hypergraphs are capable of reflecting complex relationships between nodes (brain regions), they can be used to model and analyse brain networks. The analysis of functional connectivity is a crucial use of hypergraphs in the study of brain networks [12,13]. Functional connectivity describes the relationships between the levels of activity in various brain regions. By enabling numerous brain regions to be connected at once by a hyperedge, rather than just pairings of brain regions as in standard graphs, hypergraphs can aid in the capturing of complex functional relationships.

For example: Assume that A, B, and C are neurons or brain regions, and that A, B, and C share the same function. If a standard graph were to depict this situation, only two of the three regions would have edges connecting them at once, resulting in a complete graph. But a hyperedge that represents the function includes all three in hypergraph representation.

Overall, hypergraphs provide a powerful tool for modeling and analyzing the intricate relationships between brain regions, allowing for a deeper understanding of neural activity and cognition.

2 Hypergraph Topological Indices

This section introduces a new parameter, hyperedge degree $d_h(\epsilon)$. It is a parameter that depends on the degree (connected to various functions) to which each vertex of this hyperedge. What is a region's involvement of different functions in the brain is more essential than what brain regions are connected to a function. Using this parameter, it is possible to determine which brain regions have an effect on brain function and to use this information for future brain research.

A brain network can be represented as a hypergraph with brain regions or neurons serving as vertices and brain functions as hyperedges. $d_h(\epsilon)$ will be high if certain brain areas or neurons involved in a given function ϵ involve more than one function or if there are more connections between ϵ and other hyperedges. Novel topological indices based on hypergraph degrees of some popular graphs are defined and discussed in this section. Also hypergraph degrees and new topological indices values for some family of graph with small-world organisation is studied. The fact that human brain networks prominently display small-world organisation is one of the most important results. This network architecture in the brain (the result of natural selection acting under the pressure of a cost-efficiency balance) enables the efficient segregation and integration of information with minimal wiring and energy costs. Additionally, the small-world organisation experiences ongoing modifications as part of normal growth and ageing and shows significant changes in neurological and mental illnesses [14].

For the study's convenience, each hyperedge was treated as a complete graph and its $d_h(\epsilon)$ values were computed.

Definition 2.1. Let $d_h(v_i)$ is the number of v contained hyperedges ϵ of H, then $d_h(\epsilon) = \sum_{v_i \in \epsilon} d_h(v_i) - |\epsilon|$ is the hyperedge degree of ϵ .

Definition 2.2. The hyper first zagreb index and hyper first general zagreb index are defined as, $HFGZI(H) = \sum_{\forall \epsilon \in E} d_h(\epsilon) \text{ and } HM_1(H) = \sum_{\forall \epsilon \in E} d_h^2(\epsilon) \text{ respectively.}$

Lemma 2.1. Here hyperedge is vertex subset $V(K_n)$, where K_n represents complete graph. The hypergraph topological indices of some popular graphs are:

- Let K_n be a complete graph with n vertices. Then $d_h(\epsilon) = (n-1)(n-2) \ \forall \epsilon \in K_n$ and therefore $HFGZI(K_n) = n(n-1)(n-2)$ and $HM_1(K_n) = n(n-1)^2(n-2)^2$.
- Let C_n be a cycle graph with n vertices. Then $n(\epsilon) = n$ and $d_h(\epsilon) = 2 \ \forall \epsilon \in C_n$. So, $HFGZI(C_n) = 2n$ and $HM_1(C_n) = 4n$.
- Let T be a tree, then $d_h(\epsilon) = N(u) + N(v) 2 \quad \forall \epsilon \in T$, where $u, v \in \epsilon$ and $u \neq v$. So, $HFGZI(T) = \sum_{uv \in E(T)} (N(u) + N(v) - 2)$ and $HM_1(T) = \sum_{uv \in E(T)} (N(u) + N(v) - 2)^2$. In particular,

$$- Let P_n be a path with n vertices, then d_h(\epsilon) = \begin{cases} 1 & ;if \epsilon is an end edge \\ 2 & ; otherwise \end{cases}$$

$$Therefore \ HFGZI(P_n) = 2(n-2) \ and \ HM_1(P_n) = 2 + 4(n-3).$$

$$- \ HFGZI(S_r) = r(r-1) \ and \ HM_1(S_r) = r(r-1)^2 \ where \ S_r \ is \ a \ star \ graph \ of \ r+1 \ vertices and \ d_h(\epsilon) = r-1.$$

1

Proof. In case of K_n , K_{n-1} is the hyperedge. In case of C_n and tree T, each edge K_2 is the hyperedge. So, the result is obvious.

The structural and functional networks of the human brain are organized in a small-world structure. The small-world model quantifies the separation and integration of information. Individual cognition is captured by the small-world paradigm, which also has a physiological basis. So now the new parameter value and indices for the graph with small-world organisation are going to be discussed here. This section simplifies calculation by treating complete subgraphs as hyperedges.

Lemma 2.2. Let $G \cong W_p^q$ (Windmill graph) then number of hyperedges in G, n(E) = q and $d_h(\epsilon) = q - 1 \quad \forall \epsilon \in G$.

Proof. The total number of hyperedges in W_p^q is q. So,

$$d_{h}(v) = \begin{cases} q & \text{;if } v \text{ is the center} \\ 1 & \text{; otherwise} \end{cases} \text{ and hence} \\ d_{h}(\epsilon) = \sum_{v \in \epsilon} d_{h}(v) - |\epsilon| = q - 1 \end{cases} \square$$

Theorem 2.3. If G be W_p^q then HFGZI(G) = q(q-1) and $HM_1(G) = q(q-1)^2$.

Proof. Result is obvious from lemma(2.2)

Lemma 2.3. Let $G \cong F_{r,s}$ then number of hyperedges in G, n(E) = r + s and $d_h(\epsilon) = r + s - 1 \quad \forall \epsilon \in G$

Proof. Since $F_{r,s}$ contains r triangles (means K_3) and s pendent edges (means K_2) and each complete graph is an hyperedge, the total number of hyperedges is r + s. So,

$$d_{h}(v) = \begin{cases} r+s & \text{;if } v \text{ is the center} \\ 1 & \text{; otherwise} \end{cases} \text{ and hence} \\ d_{h}(\epsilon) &= \sum_{v \in \epsilon} d_{h}(v) - |\epsilon| \\ &= \begin{cases} 1+1+(r+s)-3 & \text{;if } \epsilon \text{ is } K_{3} \\ 1+r+s-2 & \text{; if } \epsilon \text{ is } K_{2} \end{cases} \\ &= \begin{cases} r+s-1 & \text{;if } \epsilon \text{ is } K_{3} \\ r+s-1 & \text{; if } \epsilon \text{ is } K_{2} \end{cases}$$

Theorem 2.4. If G be $F_{r,s}$ then HFGZI(G) = (r+s)(r+s-1) and $HM_1(G) = (r+s)(r+s-1)^2$.

Proof. Result is obvious from lemma(2.3)

Lemma 2.4. Let $G \cong W_n$ (Wheel graph with n vertices) then number of hyperedges in G, n(E) = nand $d_h(\epsilon) = n + 1 \ \forall \epsilon \in G$.

Proof. Since wheel graph contains n triangles (means K_3) and each complete graph is an hyperedge, the total number of hyperedges is n. So,

$$d_h(v) = \begin{cases} n & \text{;if } v \text{ is the center} \\ 2 & \text{; otherwise} \end{cases}$$

$$d_h(\epsilon) = \sum_{v \in \epsilon} d_h(v) - |\epsilon| = 2 + 2 + n - 3 = n + 1$$

Theorem 2.5. If G be a Wheel graph W_n then HFGZI(G) = n(n+1) and $HM_1(G) = n(n+1)^2$.

Proof. Result is obvious from lemma(2.4)

3 Graph Operations

To construct a large network from small networks and viceversa, graph operations are helpful. Graph operations join, cartesian product, corona products and composition are defined as, the cartesian product $G_1 \times G_2$ of graphs G_1 and G_2 is a graph with vertex set $V(G_1 \times G_2) = V(G_1) \times V(G_2)$ and (a, x)(b, y)is an edge of $G_1 \times G_2$ if a = b and $xy \in G_2$, or $ab \in E(G_1)$ and x = y; the join $G_1 + G_2$ of graphs G_1 and G_2 is a graph with vertex set $V(G_1) \cup V(G_2)$ and edge set $E(G_1) \cup E(G_2) \cup \{uv; u \in V(G_1)$ and $v \in V(G_2)\}$; the composition $G_1 \circ G_2$ of graphs G_1 and G_2 with disjoint vertex sets $V(G_1)$ and $V(G_2)$ and edge sets $E(G_1)$ and $E(G_2)$ is the graph with vertex set $V(G_1) \times V(G_2)$ and $u = (u_1, v_1)$ is adjacent to $v = (u_2, v_2)$ whenever u_1 is adjacent to u_2 or $u_1 = u_2$ and v_1 is adjacent to v_2 ; The corona product $G_1 \odot G_2$ is defined as the graph obtained from G_1 and G_2 by taking one copy of G_1 and $|V(G_1)|$ copies of G_2 and then joining by an edge each vertex of the *i*th copy of G_2 is named (G_2, i) with the *i*th vertex of G_1 [18,19].

Cartesian product of any two complete graphs G_1 and G_2 results in a graph with hyperedges collection of G_1 and G_2 .

Lemma 3.1. Let $G_1 = K_n$ and $G_2 = K_m$ then cartesian product $G = G_1 \times G_2$ of hypergraphs G_1 and G_2 is a hypergraph with vertex set $V(G) = V(G_1) \times V(G_2)$ and edge set $E(G) = \{E(G_1)(m \text{ times}), E(G_2)(n \text{ times})\}.$

Proof. From definition of hypergraph and cartesian product of graphs

Theorem 3.1. Let $G = G_1 \times G_2$ be cartesian product of hypergraphs where $G_1 = K_n$ and $G_2 = K_m$

 $then \ G \ contains \ n+m \ hyperedges \ and \ d_h(\epsilon) = \begin{cases} n & ; if \ \epsilon \ is \ K_n \\ m & ; if \ \epsilon \ is \ K_m \end{cases} and \ HFGZI(G) = 2|V(G_1)||V(G_2)| \\ m & ; if \ \epsilon \ is \ K_m \end{cases} and \ HFGZI(G) = 2|V(G_1)||V(G_2)| \\ M & ; if \ \epsilon \ is \ K_m \end{cases}$

Proof. From lemma(3.1), clear that n(E) = n + m. Here $E(G) = \{K_n, ..., K_n(m \text{ times}), K_m, ..., K_m(n \text{ times})\}$, $d_h(v) = 2 \ \forall v \in G \text{ and } d_h(\epsilon) = \sum_{v \in \epsilon} d_h(v) - |\epsilon|$. Therefore $d_h(K_n) = 2 + 2 + ... + 2(n \text{ times}) - n = 2n - n = n \text{ and } d_h(K_m) = 2 + 2 + ... + 2(m \text{ times}) - m = 2m - m = m$. So,

$$\begin{aligned} d_h(\epsilon) &= \begin{cases} n & ; \text{if } \epsilon \text{ is } K_n \\ m & ; \text{if } \epsilon \text{ is } K_m \end{cases} \\ HFGZI(G) &= \sum_{\forall \epsilon \in G_1 \times G_2} d_h(\epsilon) \\ &= \sum_{\forall K_n} d_h(\epsilon) + \sum_{\forall K_m} d_h(\epsilon) \\ &= m(2n-n) + n(2m-m) \\ &= 2nm \\ &= 2|V(G_1)||V(G_2)| \\ HM_1(G) &= \sum_{\forall \epsilon \in G_1 \times G_2} d_h^2(\epsilon) \\ &= \sum_{\forall K_n} d_h^2(\epsilon) + \sum_{\forall K_m} d_h^2(\epsilon) \\ &= m(2n-n)^2 + n(2m-m)^2 \\ &= nm(n+m) \\ &= |V(G_1)||V(G_2)|(|V(G_1)| + |V(G_2)|) \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 3.2. Join product $G = G_1 + G_2$ of hypergraphs G_1 and G_2 is a hypergraph with vertex set $V(G) = V(G_1) \cup V(G_2)$ and edge set $E(G) = \{\epsilon + \epsilon^*; \forall \epsilon \in E(G_1) \text{ and } \epsilon^* \in E(G_2)\}.$

Theorem 3.2. Let the hypergraph $G = G_1 + G_2$ be join of G_1 and G_2 and $\epsilon = \epsilon' + \epsilon^*$ be a hyperedge of $G_1 + G_2$, then G contains n_1n_2 hyperedges where n_1 is the number of hyperedges in G_1 and n_2 is the number of hyperedges in G_2 and $d_h(\epsilon) = n_2(d_h(\epsilon') + |\epsilon'|) + n_1(d_h(\epsilon^* + |\epsilon^*|))$, where $\epsilon' \in E(G_1)$ and $\epsilon^* \in E(G_2)$ and $HFGZI(G) = n_2^2 HFGZI(G_1) + n_1^2 HFGZI(G_2) + n_2(n_2-1) \sum_{\forall \epsilon'} |\epsilon'| + n_1(n_1-1) \sum_{\forall \epsilon^*} |\epsilon^*|$.

Proof. Let G_1 contains n_1 hyperedges and G_2 contains n_2 hyperedges then number of hyperedges in G,

$$n(E(G)) = n(E(G_1 + G_2)) = n(E(G_1)) \times n(E(G_2)) = n_1 n_2 \text{ and } d_h(V) = \begin{cases} n_2 d_h(v) & \text{; if } v \in V(G_1) \\ n_1 d_h(v) & \text{; if } v \in V(G_2) \end{cases}$$

Let $\epsilon'_1, \epsilon'_2, \dots, \epsilon'_{n_1}$ are hyperedges of G_1 and $\epsilon^*_1, \epsilon^*_2, \dots, \epsilon^*_{n_2}$ are hyperedges of G_2 , then

 $E(G) = E(G_1 + G_2) = \{(\epsilon'_1 + \epsilon^*_1), (\epsilon'_1 + \epsilon^*_2), ..., (\epsilon'_1 + \epsilon^*_{n_2}), (\epsilon'_2 + \epsilon^*_1), (\epsilon'_2 + \epsilon^*_2), ..., (\epsilon'_2 + \epsilon^*_{n_2}), ..., (\epsilon'_{n_1} + \epsilon^*_{$

$$\begin{split} d_{h_{G_1+G_2}}(\epsilon) &= d_h(\epsilon' + \epsilon^*); \epsilon' \in G_1, \epsilon^* \in G_2 \\ &= \sum_{V \in V(\epsilon' + \epsilon^*)} d_h(V) - |\epsilon' + \epsilon^*| \\ &= n_2 \sum_{v \in V(\epsilon')} d_h(v) + n_1 \sum_{v^* \in V(\epsilon^*)} d_h(v^*) - |\epsilon'| - |\epsilon^*| \\ &= n_2 d_h(\epsilon') + n_1 d_h(\epsilon^*) + (n_2 - 1)|\epsilon'| + (n_1 - 1)|\epsilon^*| \\ HFGZI(G_1 + G_2) &= \sum_{e \in E(G_1 + G_2)} d_h(\epsilon) \\ &= \sum_{\forall \epsilon' \in E(G_1), \epsilon^* \in E(G_2)} d_h(\epsilon' + \epsilon^*) \\ &= n_2 (d_h(\epsilon'_1) + |\epsilon'_1|) + n_1 (d_h(\epsilon^*_1) + |\epsilon^*_1| - (|\epsilon'_1| + |\epsilon^*_1|)) + n_2 (d_h(\epsilon'_1) + |\epsilon'_1|) \\ &+ n_1 (d_h(\epsilon^*_2) + |\epsilon^*_2|) - (|\epsilon'_1| + |\epsilon^*_2|) + \dots + n_2 (d_h(\epsilon'_1) + |\epsilon'_1|) - (|\epsilon'_2| + |\epsilon^*_{n_2}|) \\ &- (|\epsilon'_1| + |\epsilon^*_{n_2}|) + n_2 (d_h(\epsilon'_2) + |\epsilon'_2|) - (|\epsilon'_2| + |\epsilon^*_{2}|) + \dots + n_2 (d_h(\epsilon'_2) + |\epsilon'_{2}|) \\ &+ n_1 (d_h(\epsilon^*_{n_2}) + |\epsilon^*_{n_2}|) - (|\epsilon'_2| + |\epsilon^*_{n_2}|) - (|\epsilon'_2| + |\epsilon^*_{2}|) + \dots + n_2 (d_h(\epsilon'_2) + |\epsilon'_{2}|) \\ &+ n_1 (d_h(\epsilon^*_{n_2}) + |\epsilon^*_{n_2}|) - (|\epsilon'_2| + |\epsilon^*_{n_2}|) - (|\epsilon'_{n_1}| + |\epsilon^*_{n_2}|) + n_1 (d_h(\epsilon^*_{1}) + |\epsilon^*_{1}|) \\ &- (|\epsilon'_{n_1}| + |\epsilon^*_{1}|) + n_2 (d_h(\epsilon'_{n_1}) + |\epsilon'_{n_1}|) + n_1 (d_h(\epsilon^*_{n_2}) + |\epsilon^*_{n_2}|) \\ &+ \dots + n_2 (d_h(\epsilon'_{n_1}) + |\epsilon'_{n_1}|) + n_1 (d_h(\epsilon^*_{n_2}) + |\epsilon^*_{n_2}|) - (|\epsilon'_{n_1}| + |\epsilon^*_{n_2}|) \\ &= n_2^2 \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} (d_h(\epsilon'_i) + |\epsilon'_{i}|) + n_1^2 \sum_{j=1}^{n_2} (d_h(\epsilon^*_j) + |\epsilon^*_{j}|) - (n_2 \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} |\epsilon^*_{j}| + n_1 \sum_{j=1}^{n_2} |\epsilon^*_{j}|) \\ &- (n_2 \sum_{\forall e' \in E(G_1)} |e'| + n_1 \sum_{\forall e^* \in E(G_2)} |e^*|) \\ &= n_2^2 HFGZI(G_1) + n_1^2 HFGZI(G_2) + n_2(n_2 - 1) \sum_{\forall e'} |e'| + n_1(n_1 - 1) \sum_{\forall e^*} |e^*| \epsilon^*| \\ \end{bmatrix}$$

Lemma 3.3. Let $G_1 = S_r$ and $G_2 = K_n$ then corona product $G = G_1 \odot G_2$ of G_1 and G_2 is a hypergraph with edge set $E(G) = \{K_{n+1}((r+1) \text{ times}), K_2(r \text{ times})\}$ and |V(G)| = (n+1)(r+1).

Theorem 3.3. Let $G = G_1 \odot G_2$ be corona product of $G_1 = S_r$ and $G_2 = K_n$. Then G contains 2r + 1 hyperedges and $d_h(\epsilon) = \begin{cases} r+1 & ; if \epsilon \text{ is } K_2 \text{ (the pendent edge of } S_r) \\ r & ; if \epsilon \text{ is the } K_{n+1} \text{ attached to the center and } HFGZI(G) = \\ 1 & ; otherwise \end{cases}$ $HFGZI(G_1) + 4r \text{ and } HM_1(G) = HM_1(G_1) + 5r^2 + r$

the center) = $(r+1) + 1 + 1 + \dots + 1(n \text{ times}) - (n+1) = r$ and $d_h(K_{n+1}; \text{except one attached to the center}) = 2 + 1 + 1 + \dots + 1(n \text{ times}) - (n+1) = 1$. So,

 $d_{h}(\epsilon) = \begin{cases} r+1 & \text{;if } \epsilon \text{ is } K_{2} \text{ (the pendent edge of } S_{r}) \\ r & \text{;if } \epsilon \text{ is the } K_{n+1} \text{ attached to the center} \\ 1 & \text{;otherwise} \end{cases}$ $HFGZI(G) = \sum_{\epsilon \in G} d_{h}(\epsilon) = r \times (r+1) + 1 \times r + r \times 1 = r^{2} + 3r = r(r-1) + 4r = HFGZI(G_{1}) + 4r$ $HM_{1}(G) = \sum_{\epsilon \in G} d_{h}^{2}(\epsilon) = r \times (r+1)^{2} + 1 \times r^{2} + r \times 1^{2} = r(r-1)^{2} + 5r^{2} + r = HM_{1}(G_{1}) + 5r^{2} + r$

Lemma 3.4. Let $G_1 = K_n$ and $G_2 = K_m$ then corona product $G = G_1 \odot G_2$ of hypergraphs G_1 and G_2 is a hypergraph with edge set $E(G) = \{K_{m+1}(n \text{ times}), K_n\}$ and |V(G)| = n(m+1).

Theorem 3.4. Let $G = G_1 \odot G_2$ be corona product of $G_1 = K_n$ and $G_2 = K_m$. Then G contains n+1 hyperedges and $d_h(\epsilon) = \begin{cases} 1 & ; if \epsilon \text{ is } K_{m+1} \\ n & ; if \epsilon \text{ is } K_n \end{cases}$ and $HFGZI(G) = 2n(G_1)$ and $HM_1(G) = n(G_1)[n(G_1) + 1] \end{cases}$

Proof. From lemma(3.5), clear that n(E) = n + 1. Here $E(G) = \{K_{m+1}(n \text{ times}), K_n\},\$

$$d_{h}(v) = \begin{cases} 2 & \text{;if } v \in V(K_{n}) \\ 1 & \text{;if } v \in V(K_{m}) \end{cases} \text{ and } d_{h}(\epsilon) = \sum_{v \in \epsilon} d_{h}(v) - |\epsilon|. \text{ Therefore } d_{h}(K_{n}) = 2 + 2 + \dots + 2(n + 1) \\ 1 & \text{;if } v \in V(K_{m}) \end{cases} \text{ times}) - n = n \text{ and } d_{h}(K_{m+1}) = 1. \text{ So,} \\ d_{h}(\epsilon) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{;if } \epsilon \text{ is } K_{m+1} \\ n & \text{;if } \epsilon \text{ is } K_{n} \end{cases} \text{ HFGZI}(G) = \sum_{\epsilon \in G} d_{h}(\epsilon) = n \times 1 + 1 \times n = 2n = 2n(G_{1}) \\ HM_{1}(G) = \sum_{\epsilon \in G} d_{h}^{2}(\epsilon) = n \times 1^{2} + 1 \times n^{2} = n + n^{2} = n(G_{1})[n(G_{1}) + 1] \end{cases}$$

4 Conclusion

The brain is the primary organ that regulates all body functions. Numerous functions are controlled by the brain. Each function is regulated by multiple regions, and each region contains multiple functions. In this context, hypergraphs are more useful than standard or conventional graphs. Normal graphs only indicate whether neurons or brain regions are functionally connected or not; it is uncertain which function links these neurons.

So that this study represented the brain as a hypergraph (brain regions as nodes, and each function as a hyperedge). $d_h(\epsilon)$ value indicate the intensity of interconnections therefore introduction of these parameter is useful in brain network analysis.

References

- A. Fornito, A. Zalesky, E. Bullmore, Fundamentals of Brain Network Analysis, Elsevier (2016), ISBN: 978-0-12-407908-3.
- [2] Jin Liu et.al, Complex brain network analysis and its applications to brain disorders: a survey, Hindawi Complexity, Article ID 8362741, 27 pages, 2017, https://doi.org/10.1155/2017/8362741.
- [3] Chaddock-Heyman L, Weng TB et.al, Brain network modularity predicts improvements in cognitive and scholastic performance in children involved in a physical activity intervention, Frontiers in Human Neuroscience, Vol.14, Article 346(2020), doi: 10.3389/fnsys.2021.733898.
- [4] Courtney L. Gallen and Mark D'Esposito, Brain modularity: a biomarker of intervention-related plasticity, Trends Cogn Sci. 2019 Apr; 23(4): 293–304, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2019.01.014.
- [5] Farzad V, Waldemar Karwowski et.al, Application of graph theory for identifying connectivity patterns in human brain networks: a systematic review, Frontiers IN Neuroscience, 13:585, 2019, doi: 103389/fnins.2019.00585.
- [6] Olaf Sporns, Structure and function of complex brain networks, Dialogues in Clinical Neuroscience- Vol 15, No.3, 2013.
- [7] Syed Ajaz K. Kirmani et.al, Topological indices and QSPR/QSAR analysis of some antiviral drugs being investigated for the treatment of COVID-19 patients, Int J Quantum Chem. 2021;121:e26594, https://doi.org/10.1002/qua.26594.
- [8] Jian-Feng Zhong et.al, Quantitative structure-property relationships (QSPR) of valency based topological indices with Covid-19 drugs and application, Arabian Journal of Chemistry (2021) 14,103240, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.arabjc.2021.103240.
- [9] Wei Gao, Zahid Iqbal et.al, On eccentricity-based topological indices study of a class of porphyrincored dendrimers, Biomolecules. 2018 Sep; 8(3): 71, https://doi.org/10.3390/biom8030071.
- [10] Zehui Shao, Muhammad Kamran Siddiqui et.al, Computing Zagreb indices and polynomials Zagreb for symmetrical nanotubes, Symmetry 2018,10(7),244;https://doi.org/10.3390/sym10070244.
- [11] H. M. Awais,1Muhammad Javaid et.al, First general Zagreb index of generalized F-sum graphs, Discrete Dynamics in Nature and Society, Volume 2020, Article ID 2954975, https://doi.org/10.1155/2020/2954975.

- [12] Sinan G. Aksoy1, Cliff Joslyn et.al, Hypernetwork science via high-order hypergraph walks, EPJ Data Science (2020) 9:16, https://doi.org/10.1140/epjds/s13688-020-00231-0.
- [13] Li Xiao, Junqi Wang et.al, Multi-hypergraph learning based brain functional connectivity analysis in fMRI data, IEEE Trans Med Imaging. 2020 May; 39(5): 1746–1758, https://doi.org/10.1109/TMI.2019.2957097.
- [14] Xuhong Liao , Athanasios V. Vasilakos et.al, Small-world human brain networks: Perspectives and challenges, Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews, Vol 77 (2017), Pages 286-300, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2017.03.018.
- [15] Andre Ebling Brondani et.al, A_{α} -Spectrum of a firefly graph, Electronic Notes in Theoretical Computer Science, Vol 346 (2019), Pages 209-219, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.entcs.2019.08.019.
- [16] Robert Kooij, On generalized windmill graphs, Linear Algebra and its Applications, Vol 565 (2019), Pages 25-46, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.laa.2018.11.025.
- [17] F. Harary, Graph Theory, Narosa Publishing House, New Delhi, 2001.
- [18] Domingos M. Cardoso et.al, Spectra of graphs obtained by a generalization of the join graph operation, Discrete Mathematics 313 (2013) 733–741, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.disc.2012.10.016.
- [19] G. H. Shirdel, H. Rezapour et.al, The hyper-Zagreb index of graph operations, Iranian Journal of Mathematical Chemistry, Vol.4, No.2 (2013), pp.213-220, doi.10.22052/ijmc.2013.5294.