

# Fast Directed $q$ -Analysis for Brain Graphs

Felix Windisch\*, Florian Unger†

December 31, 2024

## Abstract

Recent innovations in reconstructing large scale, full-precision, neuron-synapse-scale connectomes demand subsequent improvements to graph analysis methods to keep up with the growing complexity and size of the data. One such tool is the recently introduced *directed  $q$ -analysis*. We present numerous improvements, theoretical and applied, to this technique: on the theoretical side, we introduce modified definitions for key elements of directed  $q$ -analysis, which remedy a well-hidden and previously undetected bias. This also leads to new, beneficial perspectives to the associated computational challenges. Most importantly, we present a high-speed, publicly available, low-level implementation that provides speed-ups of several orders of magnitude on *C. Elegans*. Furthermore, the speed gains grow with the size of the considered graph. This is made possible due to the mathematical and algorithmic improvements as well as a carefully crafted implementation. These speed-ups enable, for the first time, the analysis of full-sized connectomes such as those obtained by recent reconstructive methods.

Additionally, the speed-ups allow comparative analysis to corresponding null models, appropriately designed randomly structured artificial graphs that do not correspond to actual brains. This, in turn, allows for assessing the efficacy and usefulness of directed  $q$ -analysis for studying the brain. We report on the results in this paper.

Keywords: Q-Analysis, Algebraic Topology, Network Science, Connectomes

## 1 Introduction

### 1.1 Why Directed $q$ -Analysis?

Even a mere decade ago, structural neuroscience, namely the quest to explain brains extraordinary computational power through the *structure* of its network of neurons and synapses, was a field almost entirely devoid of biological data. The most prominent objects of study were *C. Elegans* and artificial, statistical reconstructions on the basis of select sparse biological facts like neuron-type dependent connectivity probabilities.

This changed enormously in recent years, as advancements in data processing allowed for scans of entire brain hemispheres of — compared to *C. Elegans* — frighteningly intelligent fruit flies. [7, 4].

Data alone is not insight, though. It must be analysed, which requires the development of tools, one of which we study here: *directed  $q$ -analysis*. To motivate this particular approach, one must first motivate connectomic graphs and simplices, upon which it is built. Here we merely present an intuition, Section 2 contains the mathematically rigorous exposition.

**Connectomes.** The classical paradigm in neuroscience attributes most of the brain’s computational power to neurons and synapses. Viewed from a network science perspective, a neuron is simply a point, and (chemical) synapses are directed connections from one point to another. Ignoring autapses, this results in a simple directed graph called the (neuron-synapse level) *connectome*.

---

\*Technische Universität Graz, Austria, felix.windisch@tugraz.at, Corresponding Author, Inffeldgasse 16, 8010 Graz

†Technische Universität Graz, Austria, florian.unger@tugraz.at

**Simplices.** A certain motif or subgraph is both elementary and prevalent: (directed) *simplices*. These are dense, acyclic subgraphs, where everything connects to everything, but where there exists a clear unique direction of flow from a *source* neuron to a *sink* neuron. The maximum simplex size ranges typically from 7 (*C. Elegans*) to 25 (*Drosophila*) neurons.

Studying simplices in isolation, or merely counting their occurrences would be a missed opportunity, as they form quite interesting structures. Natural questions to ask are:

- How do the flows from two distinct, but connected simplices interact?
- Are there long, robust highways in the graph, comprised of chains of simplices connected in specific ways?

**Directed  $q$ -Analysis** strives to answer these questions. It takes as input a connectomic graph and a triplet of integer parameters  $(q, i, j)$ , and outputs a directed graph where simplices become vertices and the presence of a directed edge indicates that the two incident simplices interact in the particular way described by  $(q, i, j)$ . Specifically,  $q$  encodes the strength of the connection, and  $(i, j)$  indicate where (with reference to the simplex flow of the two connected simplices, as it is found in the connectomic graph) the interacting section is located. Applied to all simplices in the original connectome, we obtain the output  $(q, i, j)$ -digraph  $\mathcal{Q}$  with simplices as nodes and  $(q, i, j)$ -relations between simplices as edges.  $\mathcal{Q}$  is typically much larger, but also much more sparse than the original input graph. It can then be analysed for e.g. the number of connected components, the longest path present, the maximal vertex degree or any other tool from Network Science.

## 1.2 Contributions

**Mathematical.** We propose a novel definition of directed  $q$ -nearness that fixes a previously undiscovered hidden bias while remaining equivalent in important edge-cases and near-equal everywhere else.

**Algorithmic.** We introduce new algorithms that significantly accelerate the computation of the novel and original definition, enabling application on larger networks that was previously infeasible.

**Implementation and Accessibility.** We provide a heavily optimized open-source Rust implementation for a suite of  $q$ -analysis algorithms. They include new features and exhibit major gains in accessibility owing to a GUI application and python bindings. In benchmarks, our implementation outperforms the previous state of the art by a factor of at least  $10^6$  on large graphs thanks to mathematical and programming optimizations. This factor only becomes bigger as the graphs grow, since the new algorithm lies in another asymptotic complexity class.

**Suggestions for Application.** We propose and demonstrate that constraining maximal and minimal simplex dimension refine the results and lead to easier interpretability.

**Comparison to Null Models.** As a consequence of this newfound efficiency, we demonstrate the usefulness of  $q$ -analysis techniques by analysing connectomes at a finer level than previously possible. We also assess  $q$ -analysis' ability to detect features in connectomic graphs by comparing them to closely matching null models.

## 1.3 Related Work

In [6], Riihimäki extended the ideas of undirected  $q$ -analysis, which were previously developed in the 1970s by Atkin (see e.g. [1]), to the directed version directly extended upon in this work.

Directed  $q$ -analysis can be understood to be part of the greater field of Topological Data Analysis, being a hybrid of topological and network approaches. Reimann et al. [5] were the first to take the topological viewpoint in the context of connectomes, or even to just extend the notion of clique complexes to directed flag complexes. Further important contributions, especially on the computational side, were made in [2]; our work and implementation were much inspired by the algorithmic ideas introduced there.

Section 2, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4 and Appendix A of this work present a highly condensed version of a 2024 Master Thesis by one of the authors [10]. More exhaustive details can be found there, as

well as a more historically motivated way to introduce directed  $q$ -analysis and many alternative algorithmic approaches.

## 2 Theory

In this section, we formally introduce the definitions required for directed  $q$ -analysis.

**Definition 2.1** (Graphs, Simplices).

- A *simple directed graph* is a pair  $G = (V, E)$  of a finite set of vertices  $V$  and a relation  $E \subseteq (V \times V) \setminus d_V$ , where  $d_V = \{(v, v) \mid v \in V\}$ .
- A  $d$ -dimensional (directed) *simplex* is an acyclic clique, i.e. a subset  $(v_0 v_1 \dots v_d)$  of  $V$  such that  $(v_i, v_j) \in E \forall i < j$ . Note that there is a strict order on the vertices in a simplex.
- We call  $\mu_\sigma$  a *face* of  $\sigma$  if its vertices are a subset of the vertices of  $\sigma$  and the vertices occur in the same order. We write  $\mu_\sigma \hookrightarrow \sigma$  or  $\sigma$  *includes*  $\mu_\sigma$ .


In undirected graphs, edges denote mutual connection and cliques are sets of vertices that share a strong mutual connection. In a directed graph, edges define both connection and direction and a simplex constitutes a set of vertices that are both connected and define a unique (cycle-free) direction.

One potentially surprising side-effect is the possibility to have multiple simplices over the same set of vertices. Indeed,  $n$  vertices with bidirectional edges between each other contain one clique, but up to  $n!$  simplices (one for each possible order on the vertices).

**Definition 2.2** (Flag Complexes). Let  $G = (V, E)$  be a simple directed graph and  $D$  the dimension of the highest-dimensional simplex in  $G$ . The *directed flag complex*  $\Sigma$  of  $G$  is a tuple  $(\Sigma_0, \Sigma_1, \dots, \Sigma_D)$ , where  $\Sigma_d$  is the set of all  $d$ -dimensional simplices in the graph. Observe that  $\Sigma_0 = V$  and  $\Sigma_1 = E$ . We write  $\Sigma_{>q}$  to denote the subset  $(\Sigma_q, \Sigma_{q+1}, \dots, \Sigma_D)$ .

**Definition 2.3** (Face Maps). Let  $\sigma \in \Sigma_n$ . The  $i$ th *face map*  $\hat{d}_i(\sigma)$  maps  $\sigma$  to its  $i$ th face that is obtained by removing the  $i$ th vertex from  $\sigma$ . If  $i > n$ , the last vertex of  $\sigma$  is removed. Whenever  $i \leq n$  can be guaranteed, we omit the hat and use  $d_i(\sigma)$ . If the size of the simplex is not explicitly given, we use  $d_\infty$  to denote the face map that always removes the last (sink-) vertex.

**Example 2.4.** Consider the following directed graph:



The associated flag complex is described by  $\Sigma = (\Sigma_0, \Sigma_1, \Sigma_2)$ :

$$\begin{aligned}
 \Sigma_2 &= \{(abc), (bcd)\} \\
 \Sigma_1 = E &= \{(ab), (bc), (ac), (cd), (bd)\} \\
 \Sigma_0 = V &= \{(a), (b), (c), (d)\}
 \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

The three faces of  $(abc)$  are  $\hat{d}_0(abc) = (bc)$ ,  $\hat{d}_1(abc) = (ac)$  and  $\hat{d}_2(abc) = (ab)$  (note that  $\hat{d}_2(abc) = \hat{d}_i(abc)$  for  $i > 2$ ).

The directed generalisation of  $q$ -connectedness was first explored in [6] with the following definition:

**Definition 2.5** ( $(\widehat{q, i, j})$ -nearness). Let  $\Sigma$  be a directed flag complex and  $(\sigma, \tau)$  be an ordered pair of simplices  $\sigma, \tau \in \Sigma_{>q}$ . Let  $(\hat{d}_i, \hat{d}_j)$  be an ordered pair of face maps. Then  $\sigma$  is  $(\widehat{q, i, j})$ -near to  $\tau$  if either of the following conditions is true:

[I]  $\sigma \hookrightarrow \tau$ ,

[II]  $\widehat{d}_i(\sigma) \hookrightarrow \alpha \hookrightarrow \widehat{d}_j(\tau)$  for some  $\alpha \in \Sigma_q$ .

We introduce a novel, slightly modified version of this definition. The difference is in where the face maps are applied — for the original one, right at the top at the level of  $\sigma$  and  $\tau$ , for the novel one it is always applied to faces of dimension  $q + 1$ .

**Definition 2.6** ( $(q, i, j)$ -nearness). Let  $\Sigma$  be a directed flag complex and  $(\sigma, \tau)$  be an ordered pair of simplices  $\sigma, \tau \in \Sigma_{>q}$ . Let  $(d_i, d_j)$  be an ordered pair of face maps with  $i, j \in \{0, \dots, q + 1\}$ . Then  $\sigma$  is  $(q, i, j)$ -near to  $\tau$  if either of the following conditions is true:

[I]  $\sigma \hookrightarrow \tau$ ,

[II] There exist a  $q$ -simplex  $\alpha \in \Sigma_q$  and two  $(q+1)$ -simplices  $\mu_\sigma \hookrightarrow \sigma, \mu_\tau \hookrightarrow \tau$  such that  $d_i(\mu_\sigma) = \alpha = d_j(\mu_\tau)$ .

Figure 1 gives a graphical overview of the difference in definition. While these two definitions




Figure 1: Condition for two simplices  $\sigma, \tau$  to be  $(\widehat{q}, i, j)$ -near (left) or  $(q, i, j)$ -near (right) by criterion [II] with dimension indicator in the middle. Recall that  $\hookrightarrow$  denotes inclusion and  $\dashrightarrow$  denotes  $(q, i, j)$ -nearness.

presented are subtly different, they agree both in the  $(0, \infty)$ -direction and when  $\sigma, \tau$  are of dimension  $q + 1$ . While there are examples where  $\sigma$  and  $\tau$  are  $(q, i, j)$ -near but not  $(\widehat{q}, i, j)$ -near and vice versa, neither of these definitions is more strict or more lenient, they simply differ in which direction they attribute  $q$ -nearness to.

**Proposition 2.7.** 1. Two simplices  $\sigma, \tau$  are  $(q, 0, \infty)$ -near iff they are  $(\widehat{q}, 0, \infty)$ -near. The same holds true for the directions  $(0, 0)$ ,  $(\infty, \infty)$  and  $(\infty, 0)$ .

2. If  $\sigma, \tau \in \Sigma_{q+1}$  are  $(q, i, j)$ -near, they are also  $(\widehat{q}, i, j)$ -near and vice versa.

3. If two simplices  $\sigma$  and  $\tau$  are  $(q, i, j)$ -near, they are also  $(\widehat{q}, k, l)$ -near for some  $k, l \in \mathbb{N}$  and vice versa.

Proofs to Proposition 2.7 and a much more exhaustive exploration of the similarities and slight differences of the definitions can be found in [10].

As one is usually not only interested in the  $(q, i, j)$ -nearness of two simplices, but the set of all  $(q, i, j)$ -nearness relations, they are collected in the  $(q, i, j)$ -digraph:

**Definition 2.8** ( $(q, i, j)$ -Digraphs). Let  $G$  be a simple, directed graph with directed flag complex  $\Sigma$ . The  $(q, i, j)$ -digraph  $\mathcal{Q} = \{\Sigma_{\geq q}, E^{\mathcal{Q}}\}$  of  $G$  contains an edge  $(\sigma, \tau)$  if  $\sigma \in \Sigma_{\geq q}$  is  $(q, i, j)$ -near to  $\tau \in \Sigma_{\geq q}$ . Analogously,  $\widehat{\mathcal{Q}} = \{\Sigma_{\geq q}, E^{\widehat{\mathcal{Q}}}\}$  contains connections between  $(\widehat{q}, i, j)$ -near simplices.

As  $q$  represents the size of the shared simplex, increased values lead to a sparser  $(q, i, j)$ -digraph, where only high-dimensional simplices with very strong connections are included. The values of  $i$  and  $j$  determine the type of connection that is included in the  $(q, i, j)$ -digraph: In the extreme case  $i = 0$  and  $j = \infty$ , the  $(q, i, j)$ -digraph will contain connections from simplices to any other simplex that continues its direction (e.g. if one simplices' sink is the source of the other). This is illustrated in Figure 2. Conversely, similar values for  $i$  and  $j$  would lead to connections of simplices whose edge direction runs in parallel.




Figure 2: Important structures of graphs become apparent in the  $(q, i, j)$ -digraph.

### 3 Proposed Enhancements to Directed $q$ -Analysis

#### 3.1 Bottom-Up Definition

We see the novel definition of  $(q, i, j)$ -nearness as an improvement over the original one on two accounts:

**Avoiding  $\hat{d}$ .** With the original definition, the only reasonable upper bound of  $i, j$  is the maximal simplex dimension in the graph. The face maps are applied to all  $\sigma, \tau$  of potentially smaller dimension, which raises the need to introduce  $\hat{d}$ . This cut-off method seems like a harmless technicality at first, but introduces a bias on the indices. If they are clamped to the range of  $[0, q + 1]$ , later faces of higher-dimensional simplices in the graph will not contribute to the analysis. Whereas without limiting the range, connections will be over-counted for high indices.

We admit that finding a better normalization method is tricky, but luckily, the novel definition introduced simply does not require normalization by default. As the face maps are only ever applied to  $(q+1)$ -simplices, the values are straightforwardly bounded:  $0 \leq i, j \leq q + 1$ . This also allows setting reasonable ranges for  $i, j$  in cases where the maximal simplex dimension is not known a priori.

**Upward Closure.** Another neat feature of the novel definition is the property of upward-closure: If  $\sigma, \tau$  are  $(q, i, j)$ -near, then every simplex containing  $\sigma$  is also  $(q, i, j)$ -near to every simplex containing  $\tau$ . This property not only helps with theoretical reasoning, but also reduces the computational effort needed to calculate the  $(q, i, j)$ -digraph.

#### 3.2 Algorithmic Improvements

**Calculating the Flag Complex.** The problem of computing directed flag complexes from graphs has been thoroughly explored in [2] and [5]. As such, we will not describe the process and will consider the flag complex as given.

**Top-Down Approach.** Computing whether two simplices  $\sigma, \tau$  are  $(\widehat{q, i, j})$ -near is algorithmically quite straightforward:

Removing the  $i$ th index from  $\sigma$  and the  $j$ th from  $\tau$  are both trivial operations and checking for an order-preserving subset  $\alpha$  is computationally also not demanding.

We call this approach the top-bottom approach and it is perfectly valid (and the best) approach to check  $(\widehat{q, i, j})$ -nearness for two single simplices.

By iterating this procedure over all pairs of  $\sigma, \tau$ , the  $\widehat{Q}$ -digraph can be computed in a very simple manner. This is exactly the approach used in [6]. Generously assuming that calculating a single check is done in constant time, this approach has an asymptotic runtime of  $\mathcal{O}(|\Sigma_q|^2)$ , the size of the adjacency matrix of  $\widehat{Q}$ .

The problem lies in the extreme sparsity of  $\widehat{Q}$ : For any naturally occurring connectome, most simplices don't even share a single vertex! Yet, we have to perform checks for every pair of them.

**Bottom-Up Approach.** Instead of checking every simplex pair, we start at the shared  $q$ -simplex  $\alpha$ . We compute the set of all  $\mu_\sigma, \mu_\tau \in \Sigma_{q+1}$  such that  $d_i(\mu_\sigma) = d_j(\mu_\tau) = \alpha$  for all  $\alpha \in \Sigma_q$  and then find all pairs of simplices  $\sigma, \tau$  that include  $\mu_\sigma, \mu_\tau$  (which are also  $(q, i, j)$ -near by the principle of upward closure in the new definition).

Finding  $\mu_\sigma, \mu_\tau, \sigma, \tau$  would be very costly when starting from  $\alpha \in \Sigma_q$ , as we would have to find these higher-dimensional simplices by adding the correct vertices to  $\alpha$  (which would have to be checked exhaustively). Instead, we precompute all inclusion relations  $\hookrightarrow$  in the flag complex (which are also required due to condition [I]) first in a top down pass while also caching the sets of potential  $\mu_\sigma, \mu_\tau$ . This is done from the highest dimension of the computed flag complex downwards, making it more efficient as we can remove vertices instead of adding them.

This approach is ideal for enumerating *all*  $(q, i, j)$ -nearness relations, as it never has iterate over any pairs that are not  $(q, i, j)$ -near. Indeed, under mild assumptions it is asymptotically time-optimal.

Note to the reviewer: The proof and many more details to the algorithm will be submitted to SEA 2025, as they are out of scope for this journal. A reference will be added in time.

### 3.3 Implementation and Accessibility

We improved accessibility by providing a high-performance, highly parallelized, memory-friendly implementation of both top-down and bottom-up algorithms<sup>1</sup>, which also supports the original definition from [6]. It is written in `Rust`, offering additional speed-up as a fully compiled language like `C/C++`, while `python` bindings allow users to reap all the benefits of higher-level languages. For `x86-64 linux`, the package can be comfortably installed using `PyPI` with the command `pip install directed_q`.

We demonstrate the efficiency of the bottom-up algorithm using benchmarks performed on an AMD EPYC 7543 32-Core processor and 512 GB of DDR4 RAM. The resulting computation times on various test graphs can be seen in Table 1. We observe up to 300.000x speedup of for bigger networks like `BBP`[3] and consistently faster times for the novel definition.

Graph	Nodes	Edges	$q$	Top-Down		Bottom-Up (ours)	
				$\widehat{(q, i, j)}$	$(q, i, j)$	$\widehat{(q, i, j)}$	$(q, i, j)$
<i>C. Elegans</i> [9]	279	2194	3	10.68s	11.16s	27.93ms	25.72ms
Erdős-Rényi	1000	50k	3	16.98s	17.34s	765.64 $\mu$ s	455.97 $\mu$ s
BBP [3]	31k	7.6M	4	2062.22s	2054.21s	14.60ms	5.57ms
BBP [3]	31k	7.6M	3	> 48h	> 48h	45.85s	36.18s

Table 1: Benchmark results for the `Rust` implementation of the bottom-up and top-down algorithm. Top-down runtimes were measured using our own optimised implementation, already 10x faster than the original `python` implementation in [6].

### 3.4 Limiting Simplex Dimension in Practice

By limiting the minimal and maximal simplex dimension in the  $q$ -digraph we not only save on computation time, but also avoid problems in the definition of directed  $q$ -nearness.

**Upper Limit.** In a theoretical investigation of directed  $q$ -analysis we found adverse effects to including simplices with dimension higher than twice the value of  $q$ .

A disproportionately large simplex can act as a kind of “hub” that can connect, through the inclusion property, smaller simplices even against its own direction. This allows small simplices to “jump against” the direction of the flow given by  $(i, j)$ , severely hindering interpretability. We thus recommend a cut-off of the flag complex dimension at some value between  $q + 1 \leq D_{\text{MAX}} \leq 2q$ .

A detailed, thorough example (with figure) of this unintuitive effect is given in Appendix A.

<sup>1</sup><https://github.com/FelixWindisch/DirQ>

**Lower Limit.** Conversely, we also propose to exclude all simplices of lowest dimension  $q$  from the  $q$ -digraph. If any simplex  $\sigma \in \Sigma_q$  is  $(q, i, j)$ -near to any simplex  $\tau$ , then  $\sigma \hookrightarrow \tau$ . Therefore, the more interesting condition 2 involving face maps never applies to  $q$ -dimensional simplices. Additionally, this “bottom layer” of inclusion connections is identical for all values of  $i, j$  and leads to certain graph properties (such as the number of connected components) to be identical for all  $i, j$ .

## 4 Applying and Evaluating $q$ -Analysis techniques

It is often difficult to tell if particular results from directed  $q$ -analysis are simply an ingrained part of the method or significant structural differences. Thus, in order to test hypotheses empirically, we need to compare the results on connectomes to a set of null models. Standard null models used in network science such as Erdős–Rényi graphs or configuration models do not make sense in the context of directed  $q$ -analysis, as they would lead to drastically reduced numbers of simplices. As we are interested in the interaction of the simplices, our null model should contain the same amount and dimension of simplices as the original graph, but shuffle their configuration.

We test the proposed improvements on the reconstruction of *C. Elegans* (in the version found in [9]) and layer 1-4 of the stochastic reconstruction of a somatosensory cortex of a rodent (BBP, see [3]) These graphs were chosen since they are the only ones for which strict null models are available: [8] provides roughly 300 of them for both *C. Elegans* and BBP.

**Degree Centrality.** When examining strong, redundant connections in connectome networks, one interesting question to ask is if there are certain central simplices that act as important hubs for connections. One measure for the importance of a node is *degree centrality*, which is defined as the ratio of connected nodes to the total number of nodes in the graph. A graph that contains singular nodes of very high importance would thus have an increased *maximal degree centrality*. Indeed, as can be seen in Figure 3, for  $i = 0$  and  $j = q + 1$  (and vice versa), we find that the *maximal degree centrality* of the *C. Elegans* graph exceeds the mean of the null models by 5.6 standard deviations. This is particularly illuminating, as the directions  $(0, q + 1)$  and  $(q + 1, 0)$  correspond to forward-directed flow (compare Figure 2). We find that this is a result of particularly high in-/out-degree centrality for minimal and maximal values of  $i$  and  $j$  respectively.




Figure 3: Resulting  $z$ -scores (from the mean of null models) of various degree centralities of the  $(2, i, j)$ -digraph for *C. Elegans* with  $q = 2$ ,  $D_{\text{MAX}} = 3$  for varying values of  $i$  and  $j$ . High  $z$ -scores indicates the presence of well-connected *hubs* featuring in the brain graph, but not the null model.

**Longest Path.** The initial question on the presence of long, robust highways was already discussed in [6], where the  $(q, i, j)$ -digraphs were analysed using an approximation for the longest path length. While this analysis was conducted at a coarse level of  $q = 4$ , the efficiency gains from the new algorithm allow us to conduct this same experiment at a much finer scale of  $q = 2$  (and omitting  $q$ -level simplices as proposed before). The results in Figure 4 show even more pronounced effects than the original work. We also find that the extreme  $(0, 3)$  and  $(3, 0)$

directions exceed the mean of the null models by 6.5 and 7.6 standard deviations respectively (not shown).




Figure 4: **Left:** Approximated longest path lengths on the  $(2, i, j)$ -digraph of *C. Elegans* with  $D_{MAX} = 4$ . **Middle:** Histogram of the number of weakly connected components on the  $(3, 0, 4)$ -digraph of BBP layer 1-4 with  $D_{MAX} = 6$ . **Right:**  $z$ -scores of number of strongly connected components on the  $(2, i, j)$ -digraph of *C. Elegans* with  $D_{MAX} = 5$ .

**Connected Components.** An obvious question that presents itself when working with  $(q, i, j)$ -digraphs is how well-connected they are. This can be described by the number of *weakly* and *strongly connected components*. All nodes within the same weakly connected component are reachable by at least one node of that component, whereas in a strongly connected component *all* nodes fulfil this criteria. A higher number of connected components implies that the graph is better locally connected than globally. Indeed, we observe in Figure 4 a significantly ( $z$ -score = 13.5) increased number of weakly connected components in the BBP graph as opposed to the null model and also a significantly increased number of strongly connected components for *C. Elegans*, particularly for high values of  $j$ .

## 5 Summary and Outlook

**Summary.** We believe that our efforts help a previously borderline esoteric method become practical and useable. Furthermore, the results demonstrate that directed  $q$ -analysis is able to distinguish between biological graphs and null models, in certain tests even with remarkably high certainty of more than 13 standard deviations. This leads to the conclusion that directed  $q$ -analysis now *can* be used and *should* be used if interest lies in analysing simple, directed graphs.

**Discussion.** Directed  $q$ -analysis can show interesting results that have solid interpretations as presented in Section 4. Clearly, it does have capability to explain some aspects of the simplicial structure of these networks. At the same time, one has to be very careful about the choice of parameters, as choosing values that are even slightly off may lead to degenerate outputs like empty graphs or outputs that exceed reasonable storage capacity.

Additionally,  $q$ -analysis is only applicable where flag complexes exhibit sufficient simplicial structure, but computing the entire flag complex is still feasible.

Despite significant time invested, some results such as spikes at particular parameter settings leave us occasionally puzzled. The analysis is picking up on something, but due to the complexity of  $q$ -analysis the root cause is often difficult to grasp.

**Outlook.** While sufficient for all current datasets, future datasets might require revisiting the algorithmic approaches for more parallelized approaches. Some potential approaches are already discussed in [10]. Another cause to revisit is the natural extension of  $q$ -analysis with a filtering approach, filtering over synapse weights for more refined insights.

*Acknowledgements.* We would like to express our gratitude for their time, ideas and general help (alphabetic order): Olga Diamanti, Robert Legenstein, Michael Kerber, Henri Riihimäki, Markus Steinberger.



*Competing Interest Statement.* On behalf of all authors, the corresponding author states that there is no conflict of interest.

*Funding.* This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

*Author Contribution.* Conceptualisation: FU. Data Curation: FU. Formal Analysis: FW, FU. Investigation: FW. Software: FW. Resources: FU, FW. Visualisation: FW. Writing - original draft: FW, FU. Writing - review & editing: FU, FW.


## References

- [1] R. H. Atkin. “An algebra for patterns on a complex. I”. In: *International Journal of Man-Machine Studies* 6 (1974), pp. 285–307. ISSN: 0020-7373. DOI: 10.1016/S0020-7373(74)80024-6.
- [2] Daniel Lütgehetmann et al. “Computing persistent homology of directed flag complexes”. In: *Algorithms (Basel)* 13.1 (2020), Paper No. 19, 18. DOI: 10.3390/a13010019.
- [3] Henry Markram et al. “Reconstruction and simulation of neocortical microcircuitry”. In: *Cell* 163.2 (2015), pp. 456–492.
- [4] Jasper S. Phelps et al. “Reconstruction of motor control circuits in adult *Drosophila* using automated transmission electron microscopy”. In: *Cell* 184.3 (2021), 759–774.e18. ISSN: 0092-8674. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2020.12.013>. URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0092867420316834>.
- [5] Michael W. Reimann et al. “Cliques of Neurons Bound into Cavities Provide a Missing Link between Structure and Function.” In: *Frontiers Comput. Neurosci.* 11 (2017), p. 48. URL: <http://dblp.uni-trier.de/db/journals/ficn/ficn11.html#ReimannNSTPCDLH17>.
- [6] Henri Riihimäki. “Simplicial  $q$ -Connectivity of Directed Graphs with Applications to Network Analysis”. In: *SIAM Journal on Mathematics of Data Science* 5.3 (2023), pp. 800–828. DOI: 10.1137/22M1480021. eprint: <https://doi.org/10.1137/22M1480021>. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1137/22M1480021>.
- [7] Louis K Scheffer et al. “A connectome and analysis of the adult *Drosophila* central brain”. In: *Elife* 9 (2020), e57443.
- [8] Florian Unger and Jonathan Krebs. “MCMC sampling of directed flag complexes with fixed undirected graphs.” In: *J. Appl. Comput. Topol.* 8.6 (Oct. 2024), pp. 1881–1916. URL: <http://dblp.uni-trier.de/db/journals/jact/jact8.html#UngerK24>.
- [9] Lav R Varshney et al. “Structural properties of the *Caenorhabditis elegans* neuronal network”. In: *PLoS Comput Biol* 7.2 (2011), e1001066.
- [10] Felix Windisch. “A novel definition of directed  $q$ -nearness : comparative analysis and algorithms”. MA thesis. Technical University Graz, 2024. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3217/z7ys0-gcj46>.

## A Maximal Simplex Dimension

Whenever simplices of a dimension significantly higher than  $q$  occur, both definitions for directed  $q$ -nearness can lead to unintuitive results.

**Example A.1.** One such case is depicted in the following graph:



The graph is composed of two smaller simplices that are connected on either sides to a large, central simplex. The direction of flow of the central simplex points from the intersection with  $(abc)$  towards the intersection with simplex  $(xyz)$ . As seen in previous examples, the direction  $i = 0, j = \infty$  is typically characterized by continued forward flow. Unintuitively, the  $(1, 0, \infty)$ -digraph in this example contains the following path from  $(xyz)$  to  $(abc)$  for both definitions, seemingly traversing the central simplex against the direction of flow:

$$(xyz) \dashrightarrow (yz6) \dashrightarrow (z67) \dashrightarrow (678) \hookrightarrow (12345678) \dashrightarrow (23a) \dashrightarrow (3ab) \dashrightarrow (abc)$$

The surprising result originates specifically from the inclusion edge  $(678) \hookrightarrow (12345678)$ . As criterion [I] is not concerned with the direction of simplices, it enables paths that traverse against the direction of the underlying graph through sufficiently large simplices.