
Exploring General Intelligence via Gated Graph Transformer in Functional Connectivity Studies

Gang Qu

Department of Biomedical Engineering
Tulane University
gqu1@tulane.edu

Anton Orlichenko

Tulane University
aorlichenko@tulane.edu

Junqi Wang

Department of Radiology
Cincinnati Children’s Hospital Medical Center
junqi.wang@cchmc.org

Gemeng Zhang

Department of Neurology
Mayo Clinic
zhang.gemeng@mayo.edu

Li Xiao

School of Information Science and Technology
University of Science and Technology of China and Institute of Artificial Intelligence
xiaoli11@ustc.edu.cn

Aiying Zhang

School of Data Science
University of Virginia
aiying.zhang@virginia.edu

Zhengming Ding

Department of Computer Science
Tulane University
zding1@tulane.edu

Yu-Ping Wang

Department of Biomedical Engineering
Tulane University
wyp@tulane.edu

Abstract

Functional connectivity (FC) as derived from fMRI has emerged as a pivotal tool in elucidating the intricacies of various psychiatric disorders and delineating the neural pathways that underpin cognitive and behavioral dynamics inherent to the human brain. While Graph Neural Networks (GNNs) offer a structured approach to represent neuroimaging data, they are limited by their need for a predefined graph structure to depict associations between brain regions, a detail not solely provided by FCs. To bridge this gap, we introduce the Gated Graph Transformer (GGT) framework, designed to predict cognitive metrics based on FCs. Empirical validation on the Philadelphia Neurodevelopmental Cohort (PNC) underscores the superior predictive prowess of our model, further accentuating its potential in identifying pivotal neural connectivities that correlate with human cognitive processes.

1 Introduction

Functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI) is a powerful, non-invasive tool that detects changes in the brain’s blood-oxygenation-level-dependent (BOLD) signal, offering insights into the functional

organization of the brain. This technique has proven instrumental in studying neurological and psychiatric disorders like autism, Alzheimer’s disease, and schizophrenia[1, 2, 3, 4]. The concept of functional connectivity (FC) has emerged as a potential fingerprint for cognitive and behavioral traits, spurring interest in modeling and extracting these connectivity patterns to propel neuroscience research forward.

Graph Neural Networks (GNNs)[5] are at the forefront of analyzing brain FC, effectively distilling meaningful information from complex neuroimaging connectivity patterns. They have been pivotal in tasks like forecasting cognitive abilities and detecting brain disorders[6, 7]. However, the challenge lies in pinpointing the appropriate graph structure that illustrates connections between brain regions. While transformer GNNs[8, 9, 10] have been suggested to overcome this, they face intrinsic limitations, including model interpretability issues and reduced performance in scenarios with weak connectivity between brain regions.

Addressing these challenges, we introduce a novel framework based on the Gated Graph Transformer (GGT) to predict individual cognitive abilities using FCs. This model employs a refined random-walk diffusion strategy, learnable structural and positional encodings, and a gating mechanism to enhance the learning process[11]. Crucially, the self-attention mechanism in our framework discerns intricate relationships between brain regions while maintaining computational efficiency. We validate our model on the Philadelphia Neurodevelopmental Cohort (PNC)[12] to predict the Wide Range Achievement Test (WRAT) score, a measure of general intelligence[13], with results surpassing various baseline models. This research underscores the importance of blending spatial brain network knowledge with advanced neural network techniques, laying the groundwork for future neuroscience research.

2 Methods

We propose an end-to-end GGT model, combining a learnable position encoding[11, 14] with brain network structure to boost the predictive performance. Let $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ be a graph, in which nodes and edges represent the brain regions of interest (ROIs) and the associated connections between ROIs, respectively. We assume $\mathbf{E}^l \in \mathbb{R}^{n_{\mathcal{E}} \times d_{\mathcal{E}}}$ to be the edge features, $\mathbf{H}^l \in \mathbb{R}^{n_{\mathcal{V}} \times d_{\mathcal{V}}}$ to be the node features, and $\mathbf{P}^l \in \mathbb{R}^{n_{\mathcal{V}} \times d_p}$ to be the node position embeddings on at the l_{th} layer of GGT, where $n_{\mathcal{V}}$ and $n_{\mathcal{E}}$ are the number of nodes and edges on the graph, and $d_{\mathcal{V}}$, $d_{\mathcal{E}}$, and d_p are the feature dimensions. We first learn 3 embedding weights $\mathbf{Q}^l, \mathbf{K}^l, \mathbf{V}^l \in \mathbb{R}^{d^l \times d^{l+1}}$, where d^l and d^{l+1} are the input and output feature dimensions, respectively. GGT propagates the connection information using the attention mechanism, as defined in Eq.1, to focus on important neighbors, enabling the model to learn complex relationships between nodes.

$$\alpha_{ij}^l = \frac{\exp(\tanh(\mathbf{Q}^l \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{H}_i^l \\ \mathbf{P}_i^l \end{bmatrix}) \cdot \text{sig}(\mathbf{K}^l \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{H}_j^l \\ \mathbf{P}_j^l \end{bmatrix}))}{\sum_{i \in N_j} \exp(\tanh(\mathbf{Q}^l \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{H}_i^l \\ \mathbf{P}_i^l \end{bmatrix}) \cdot \text{sig}(\mathbf{K}^l \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{H}_k^l \\ \mathbf{P}_k^l \end{bmatrix}))}, \quad (1)$$

where $\text{sig}(\cdot)$ and $\tanh(\cdot)$ are the sigmoid and hyperbolic tangent activation functions, respectively. Specifically, the attention score is computed to measure the similarity of the query(\mathbf{Q}) and key(\mathbf{K}) mappings, indicating how much attention is given to a particular neighbor of each node. The GGT, as formulated in Eq.2, utilizes a framework analogous to the gated control system. This framework combines edge features with position encoding, operates directly on the edges, and thereby modulates the importance of the messages being propagated across the graph..

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{H}_i^{l+1} &= \mathbf{H}_i^l + \text{ReLU}(\mathbf{V}^l \left[\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{H}_k^l \\ \mathbf{P}_k^l \end{bmatrix} + \sum_{j \in N_i} \eta_{ij}^l \odot (\alpha_{ij}^l \mathbf{V}^l \left[\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{H}_j^l \\ \mathbf{P}_j^l \end{bmatrix} \right]) \right]), \\ \mathbf{P}_i^{l+1} &= \mathbf{P}_i^l + \tanh(\mathbf{C}_1^l \mathbf{P}_i^l + \sum_{j \in N_i} \eta_{ij}^l \odot \mathbf{C}_2^l \mathbf{P}_j^l), \quad \mathbf{E}_{ij}^{l+1} = \mathbf{E}_{ij}^l + \text{ReLU}(\hat{\eta}_{ij}^l), \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where $\eta_{ij}^l = \frac{\text{sig}(\hat{\eta}_{ij}^l)}{\sum_{j' \in N_j} \text{sig}(\hat{\eta}_{ij'}^l) + \epsilon}$ and $\hat{\eta}_{ij}^l = \mathbf{B}_1^l \mathbf{H}_i^l + \mathbf{B}_2^l \mathbf{H}_j^l + \mathbf{B}_3^l \mathbf{E}_{ij}^l$; $\mathbf{C}_1^l, \mathbf{C}_2^l, \mathbf{B}_1^l, \mathbf{B}_2^l \in \mathbb{R}^{d_{\mathcal{V}} \times d_{\mathcal{V}}}$, $\mathbf{B}_3^l \in \mathbb{R}^{d_{\mathcal{E}} \times d_{\mathcal{E}}}$ are the learnable weights. The position encoding \mathbf{P}^0 is initialized based on the random

walk (RW) diffusion process, which incorporates both the spatial information of MNI (Montreal Neurological Institute) coordinates and frequency information of the FC graph.

$P^0 = [RW, RW^2, \dots, RW^{d_p-3}, MNI_x, MNI_y, MNI_z]$, where $RW = AD^{-1}$, and MNI_x, MNI_y, MNI_z represent the MNI coordinates. The matrices $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n_v \times n_v}$ and $D \in \mathbb{R}^{n_v \times n_v}$ are the adjacency matrix and the degree matrix, respectively. Next, a multilayer perceptron (MLP) uses the mean graph pooling as the input for the label prediction. The loss function can be written as $\text{Loss} = \text{MSE}(\hat{y}, y) + \lambda_1 \text{trace}(P^T L P) + \lambda_2 \|P P^T - I\|_F^2$, where \hat{y} and y are the prediction and label, $L = D^{-\frac{1}{2}} A D^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ is the graph Laplacian, and $\lambda_{1,2} > 0$ are hyperparameters controlling the relative importance of position encoding, which balance smoothness and orthonormality of the learned PE vectors at the final GGT layer.

3 Experiments

We evaluate our method using two paradigms of fMRI (emotion identification (emoid) task and working memory task (nback)) from PNC. All BOLD scans are acquired on a single 3T Siemens TIM Trio whole-body scanner with a single-shot, interleaved multi-slice, gradient-echo, echo-planar imaging sequence. The total scanning time is 50 minutes, 32 seconds (TR = 3000 ms, TE = 32 ms, and flip angle = 90 degrees), with a voxel resolution of 3 mm and 46 slices. Gradient performance is 45 mT/m, with a maximum slew rate of 200 T/m/s. SPM12¹ is used to conduct motion correction,

Table 1: The performance of prediction on WRAT scores with different models.

Model	Emoid RMSE(mean \pm std)	Nback RMSE(mean \pm std)
LR	22.9844 \pm 1.4313	22.9632 \pm 1.1070
GCN	15.6924 \pm 0.9912	15.4335 \pm 0.5867
MTL	16.1742 \pm 0.9283	16.2187 \pm 0.9576
M2TL	15.9967 \pm 0.8947	15.0807 \pm 0.8902
NM2TL	15.0320 \pm 0.7965	15.0310 \pm 0.7955
GGT	14.5530 \pm 0.7454	14.7961 \pm 0.5284

spatial normalization, and smoothing with a 3mm Gaussian kernel. Subject fMRI scans are parcellated according to the Power264 atlas[15]. We use the FCs derived from Pearson’s correlation of the fMRI as the initial node features and combine the sparse FC matrix (i.e., only keep the $K = 30$ largest neighbors of each node) with the MNI distance matrix as the edge features.

We randomly split the data into training, validation, and test sets with the ratio of 70%, 10%, and 20%, respectively. The model is trained on the training set with the hyperparameters tuned on the validation set using random search. We compare our model with linear regression (LR), Multi-task learning model (MTL)[16], Manifold regularized multi-task learning (M2TL)[17], and New Manifold regularized multi-task learning (NM2TL)[18]. The predictive performance is evaluated using bootstrap analysis on 10 repeated experiments, as shown in Table.1. The results show that the proposed GGT model achieves better predictive performance than other methods on both fMRI paradigms.

Additionally, our model can be interpreted through the heatmap produced by the attention scores. It’s worth noting that the transposed attention score matrix is added to achieve symmetric results. As shown in Fig.1, the WRAT score related brain regions can be identified for two paradigms. Without prior clustering knowledge, several brain functional networks (BFN)[19] can be identified from the heatmap, including the auditory network (AUD)[20], visual network (VIS)[21], and memory retrieval network (MEM)[22] in a purely data-driven way. In addition, subsets of FCs in the somatomotor network (SM), default mode network (DFN), and subcortical (SUB) have higher attention scores than other FCs. Moreover, the results are consistent for both paradigms, demonstrating the reliability of our method in identifying significant ROIs.

¹<http://www.fil.ion.ucl.ac.uk/spm/software/spm12/>




Figure 1: Average heatmap generated using the attention scores (left) and brain functional networks with high attention scores (right). SUB: Subcortical, VIS: Visual, MEM: Memory Retrieval, DFN: Default Mode, AUD: Auditory, SM: Sensory/somatomotor.

4 Conclusion

In this paper, we propose a novel end-to-end interpretable GGT framework to conduct brain functional connectivity studies. GGT explores both functional and spatial relations between individual brain regions and combines the learnable position encoding in brain network structure to boost predictive performance. We further investigate the model explainability with the attention mechanism by identifying the significant biomarkers underlying general intelligence. The proposed model shows great potential for understanding and predicting the variance in human cognitive function.

5 Potential Negative Societal Impact

The authors do not identify any potential negative societal impact for this work on the society.

6 Acknowledgements

This work was supported in part by NIH under Grants R01 GM109068, R01 MH104680, R01 MH107354, P20 GM103472, R01 REB020407, R01 EB006841, and 2U54MD007595, in part by NSF under Grant #1539067, and in part by National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant No. 62202442 and Anhui Provincial Natural Science Foundation under Grant No. 2208085QF188

References

- [1] Vladimir L Cherkassky et al. Functional connectivity in a baseline resting-state network in autism. *Neuroreport*, 17(16):1687–1690, 2006.
- [2] Yvette I Sheline et al. Resting state functional connectivity in preclinical alzheimer’s disease. *Biological psychiatry*, 74(5):340–347, 2013.
- [3] Gang Qu et al. Ensemble manifold regularized multi-modal graph convolutional network for cognitive ability prediction. *IEEE Transactions on Biomedical Engineering*, 68(12):3564–3573, 2021. doi: 10.1109/TBME.2021.3077875.
- [4] Anton Orlichenko et al. Latent similarity identifies important functional connections for phenotype prediction. *IEEE Transactions on Biomedical Engineering*, 70(6):1979–1989, 2023. doi: 10.1109/TBME.2022.3232964.
- [5] Thomas N. Kipf and Max Welling. Semi-supervised classification with graph convolutional networks. *international conference on learning representations*, 2017.
- [6] Weizheng Yan et al. Deep learning in neuroimaging: Promises and challenges. *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, 39(2):87–98, 2022. doi: 10.1109/MSP.2021.3128348.

- [7] Gang Qu et al. Brain functional connectivity analysis via graphical deep learning. *IEEE Transactions on Biomedical Engineering*, 69(5):1696–1706, 2022. doi: 10.1109/TBME.2021.3127173.
- [8] Vijay Prakash Dwivedi and Xavier Bresson. A generalization of transformer networks to graphs. *AAAI Workshop on Deep Learning on Graphs: Methods and Applications*, 2021.
- [9] Devin Kreuzer et al. Rethinking graph transformers with spectral attention. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:21618–21629, 2021.
- [10] Chengxuan Ying et al. Do transformers really perform badly for graph representation? *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:28877–28888, 2021.
- [11] Vijay Prakash Dwivedi et al. Graph neural networks with learnable structural and positional representations. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021.
- [12] Theodore D Satterthwaite et al. Neuroimaging of the philadelphia neurodevelopmental cohort. *Neuroimage*, 86:544–553, 2014.
- [13] David A Kareken et al. Reading on the wide range achievement test-revised and parental education as predictors of iq: comparison with the barona formula. *Archives of Clinical Neuropsychology*, 10(2):147–157, 1995.
- [14] Gang Qu et al. Interpretable cognitive ability prediction: A comprehensive gated graph transformer framework for analyzing functional brain networks. *IEEE Transactions on Medical Imaging*, pages 1–1, 2023. doi: 10.1109/TMI.2023.3343365.
- [15] Jonathan D Power et al. Functional network organization of the human brain. *Neuron*, 72(4):665–678, 2011.
- [16] Daoqiang Zhang, Dinggang Shen, Alzheimer’s Disease Neuroimaging Initiative, et al. Multi-modal multi-task learning for joint prediction of multiple regression and classification variables in alzheimer’s disease. *NeuroImage*, 59(2):895–907, 2012.
- [17] Biao Jie, Daoqiang Zhang, Bo Cheng, Dinggang Shen, and Alzheimer’s Disease Neuroimaging Initiative. Manifold regularized multitask feature learning for multimodality disease classification. *Human brain mapping*, 36(2):489–507, 2015.
- [18] Li Xiao et al. Distance correlation-based brain functional connectivity estimation and non-convex multi-task learning for developmental fmri studies. *IEEE Transactions on Biomedical Engineering*, 69(10):3039–3050, 2022. doi: 10.1109/TBME.2022.3160447.
- [19] Simon B Eickhoff et al. Imaging-based parcellations of the human brain. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, 19(11):672–686, 2018.
- [20] René Westerhausen et al. Identification of attention and cognitive control networks in a parametric auditory fmri study. *Neuropsychologia*, 48(7):2075–2081, 2010.
- [21] Theodore D Satterthwaite et al. The philadelphia neurodevelopmental cohort: A publicly available resource for the study of normal and abnormal brain development in youth. *Neuroimage*, 124:1115–1119, 2016.
- [22] Nash Unsworth et al. Working memory and fluid intelligence: Capacity, attention control, and secondary memory retrieval. *Cognitive psychology*, 71:1–26, 2014.