CLASSIFICATION OF TEMPORAL GRAPHS USING PERSISTENT HOMOLOGY

Siddharth Pritam Chennai Mathematical Institute, India spritam@cmi.ac.in Rohit Roy Chennai Mathematical Institute, India rohitroy@cmi.ac.in

Madhav Cherupilil Sajeev Institut Polytechnique de Paris, France madhav.cherupilil-sajeev@polytechnique.edu

ABSTRACT

Temporal graphs effectively model dynamic systems by representing interactions as timestamped edges. However, analytical tools for temporal graphs are limited compared to static graphs. We propose a novel method for analyzing temporal graphs using Persistent Homology. Our approach leverages δ -temporal motifs (recurrent subgraphs) to capture temporal dynamics . By evolving these motifs, we define the *average filtration* and compute PH on the associated clique complex. This method captures both local and global temporal structures and is stable with respect to reference models. We demonstrate the applicability of our approach to the temporal graph classification task. Experiments verify the effectiveness of our approach, achieving over 92% accuracy, with some cases reaching 100%. Unlike existing methods that require node classes, our approach is node class free, offering flexibility for a wide range of temporal graph analysis.

Keywords Temporal graph · Persistent Homology.

1 Introduction

Graphs or networks provide a versatile framework for analyzing complex systems, representing entities as nodes and their relationships as edges. They capture the structural connectivity or topology of a network, characterized by measures such as degree distribution, motifs (recurring subgraphs), connected components and cycles (*homology classes*). These metrics form the basis for understanding the underlying system. Since many real-world systems are dynamic, *temporal graphs* [12] are well-suited for modeling such systems, representing interactions as timestamped edges. Applications range from ecological networks to human close-range interactions, collaboration networks, biological signaling networks [3–5, 9, 12, 22].

The analysis of static graph topology is well-developed, with various metrics and tools designed to assess key properties. While some of these metrics, such as path-length, centrality, and betweenness, have been extended to temporal graphs [12], fewer tools exist for analyzing temporal graphs. Existing methods often aggregate temporal data into discrete time-window snapshots [2, 8, 16, 21, 23], failing to capture the full complexity of temporal information. To address this, we propose a novel method for computing the 'temporal' topology of temporal graphs without requiring aggregation through discrete snapshots. Our approach leverages *Persistent Homology* (PH) (see Section 2 for precise definitions), a prominent tool in Topological Data Analysis (TDA) that captures global topology across multiple scales [10].

Our Approach: We use δ -temporal motifs, a concept introduced in [18], to extend the idea of motifs from static to temporal graphs (see Section 2 for details). This approach captures the evolving structure of a graph over time without requiring aggregation into discrete time-window snapshots.

To analyze the temporal structure of a graph, we track how small patterns (fixed-size δ -temporal motifs) evolve as δ (a temporal parameter) increases. This process defines what we call the *average filtration* (see Section 3 for definition), a method that scales the graph based on how frequently and quickly interactions occur. We then apply *persistent homology* to study topological features such as cycles and connectivity, observing how they emerge and disappear across different scales. This process yields a general-purpose topological descriptor (formally a *persistence diagram*, defined in Section 2) for a temporal graph.

We explore temporal graph classification as a key application of our approach. Extensive experiments demonstrate the efficacy of our method, achieving over 92% accuracy across all cases and 100% accuracy in some instances. Details of the experimental methodology are provided in Section 5. Unlike current state-of-the-art methods [15, 17], which rely on node classes (e.g. infected or not infected) for the temporal graph classification, our approach operates without node classes, a crucial advantage when such information is unavailable or simulation-generated. With our approach, we would be able to classify temporal graphs of varying sizes, making it more general and suitable for a wide range of tasks in temporal graph analysis.

On theoretical side, we demonstrate that our filtration framework is stable with respect to *reference (null) models* of temporal graphs, ensuring robustness in practical applications (see Section 4). Additionally, we present a simple algorithm for computing the average filtration, which operates efficiently with a time complexity of $O(|E| \times d_{\max})$, where |E| is the number of temporal edges and d_{\max} is the maximum *temporal degree* of the graph. The space required to store the filtered graph is comparable to that of an *aggregated graph*, making it significantly more space-efficient than storing the full temporal graph, particularly in scenarios with multiple temporal interactions between node pairs.

Related work: Tinarrage et al. [23] utilized zigzag persistent homology (PH) to analyze temporal networks, proposing resolutions (discrete time-windows) for visualizations. Myers et al. [16] applied zigzag PH for the direct analysis of temporal graphs. While these methods are effective, they are computationally expensive due to the zigzag persistence, and they highlight the challenge of retaining temporal complexity without aggregation. Additionally, they face the difficulty of selecting non-trivial temporal resolutions [23].

The work by Ye et al. [26] shares similarities with ours, as they define a filtration for dynamic graphs and use the corresponding persistence diagrams in classification tasks. However, their dynamic graph model incorporates a time-varying weight function over the edges, which is used to define the filtration values. Despite this, most of their experiments use unweighted graphs. This approach significantly differs from the standard temporal networks, which are modeled as a contact sequence.

Classification of temporal graphs is one of the most active areas of research, with several approaches being explored, broadly categorized into kernel methods, embedding distances, temporal motifs, and deep neural networks. The work by Oettershagen et al. [17] introduces three distinct techniques for mapping temporal graphs to static graphs, thereby enabling the application of conventional static graph kernels. Wang [25] explore the classification of temporal graphs where both vertex and edge sets evolve over time. Tu et al. [24] leverage temporal motifs [24], while Dall'Amico et al. [7] propose an embedding-based distance that can be used for classification tasks.

2 Preliminaries

In this section, we briefly recall basic notions related to temporal networks, persistent homology and kernel methods. Readers may refer to [10–12, 20] for more details.

2.1 Temporal Network

A temporal network is a dynamic variant of the static networks in which the edges (interactions or connections) are associated with time stamps (labels). These dynamic edges can change over time, which is essential for modeling systems where the timing of interactions is crucial. Below, we recall useful definitions, for more details readers can refer to [12].

Temporal Graphs: A temporal graph is defined as a tuple T = (V, E), where V represents a set of vertices (nodes), and E is a set of directed or undirected *temporal edges*. Each temporal edge e := (u, v, t) connects vertices u and v and is active only at a specific time t. Alternatively, a temporal graph is as a sequence of contacts (interactions), where each temporal edge is represented as a contact (u, v, t). If there is only a single temporal edge between any two nodes, the graph is referred to as a **single-labeled temporal graph**. When multiple temporal edges exist between two nodes, such as (u, v, t_1) and (u, v, t_2) etc., the graph is called a **multi-labeled temporal graph**. Collectively, these temporal

edges are referred to as the edges between u and v. Furthermore, if all the edges (interactions) have a time duration $[t_1, t_2]$, the graph is known as an **interval temporal graph** and the temporal edge is denoted as $e = (u, v, [t_1, t_2])$. The **temporal degree** of a vertex u is the number of temporal edges connected to it, denoted by td_u . See Figure 1 for an example of multi-labeled temporal graph.



Figure 1: Example of a multi-labeled temporal graph. Multiple time labels are separated by commas.

For simplicity, this article focuses on undirected temporal graphs; however, all concepts and methods can naturally extend to directed temporal graphs. When the context is clear, a temporal edge is referred to simply as an *edge*. By ignoring timestamps and duplicate edges, a temporal graph induces a simple static graph, commonly referred to as the **aggregate graph** G of T. In G, a pair (u, v) is an edge if and only if there exists a temporal edge (u, v, t) in T.

δ-Temporal Motifs: δ-Temporal motifs, introduced in [18], extend the concept of motifs (recurring subgraphs) from static to temporal graphs. This concept is central to our work. We recall the definition of δ-temporal motifs from [18] in the context of undirected temporal graphs. A k-node, l-edge, δ-temporal motif is a sequence of l edges, $M = \{(u_1, v_1, t_1), (u_2, v_2, t_2), \ldots, (u_l, v_l, t_l)\}$ such that the edges are time-ordered within a δ duration, i.e., $t_1 < t_2 < \cdots < t_l$ and $t_l - t_1 \le \delta$, and the induced aggregate graph from the edges is connected and has k nodes. Note that with this general definition, multiple edges between the same pair of nodes may appear in the motif M. However, we restrict our attention to the case where for any pair of temporal edges $(u_i, v_i, t_i), (u_j, v_j, t_j)$ in M, it is not true that $u_i = u_j$ and $v_i = v_j^{-1}$. See Figure 2 for examples.



Figure 2: All four possible 3-node 3-edge motifs of Figure 1 are depicted here. Note that the temporal edges between B and C and B and F differ in their respective timestamps. The two left motifs satisfy $\delta = 6$, while the two right motifs satisfy $\delta = 5$.

2.2 Topological Data Analysis

Simplicial Complex: A geometric k-simplex is the convex hull of k + 1 affinely independent points in \mathbb{R}^d . For example, a point is a 0-simplex, an edge is a 1-simplex, a triangle is a 2-simplex, and a tetrahedron is a 3-simplex. A subset simplex is called a **face** of the original simplex. A **geometric simplicial complex** K is a collection of geometric simplices that intersect only at their common faces and are closed under the *face* relation. See Figure 3 for an example. We will refer to a *geometric simplicial complex* as simply a *simplicial complex* or just a *complex*. A subcollection L of K is called a **subcomplex** if it is also a simplicial complex.

A complex K is a **flag** or **clique** complex if, whenever a subset of its vertices forms a clique (i.e., any pair of vertices is connected by an edge), they span a simplex. It follows that the full structure of K is determined by its 1-skeleton (or graph), which we denote by G.

¹This restriction is necessary to define a filtration of simplicial complexes.



Figure 3: Example of a simplicial complex

Homology: Homology is a tool from algebraic topology to quantify the number of k-dimensional topological features (or holes) in a topological space, such as a simplicial complex. For instance, H_0 the zero degree homology class describes the number of connected components, H_1 the one degree homology class describes the number of loops, and H_2 , the two dimensional homology class quantifies voids or cavities. The ranks of these homology groups are referred to as **Betti numbers**. In particular, the Betti number β_k corresponds to the number of k-dimensional holes. In Figure 3 the Betti numbers are as follows, $\beta_0 = 1, \beta_1 = 1$, and $\forall k \ge 2, \beta_k = 0$.

Filtration: A sequence of simplicial complexes \mathcal{F} : { $K_1 \hookrightarrow K_2 \hookrightarrow \cdots \hookrightarrow K_m$ } connected through inclusion maps is called a **filtration**. A filtration is called a **flag filtration** if all the simplicial complexes K_i are flag complexes. Given a weighted graph $G = (V, E, w : E \to \mathbb{R})$, a flag filtration F_G can be defined by assigning the maximum weight of edges in a simplex (clique) as its filtration value. Flag filtrations are among the most common types of filtrations used in TDA applications. The concept of filtration is used to analyze data across multiple scales. As the filtration *parameter* increases, new simplices are added, allowing us to track topological features, such as Betti numbers, emerge and disappear across different scales. The next paragraph formalizes this intuition.

Persistent Homology: If we compute the homology groups of all the K_i , we obtain the sequence $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{F})$: $\{H_p(K_1) \xrightarrow{*} H_p(K_2) \xrightarrow{*} \cdots \xrightarrow{*} H_p(K_m)\}$. Here $H_p()$ denotes the homology group of dimension p with coefficients from a field \mathbb{F} , and $\xrightarrow{*}$ is the homomorphism induced by the inclusion map. $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{F})$ forms a sequence of vector spaces connected through the homomorphisms, called a **persistence module**.

Any persistence module can be *decomposed* into a collection of simpler interval modules of the form [i, j) [27]. The multiset of all intervals [i, j) in this decomposition is called the **persistence diagram** of the persistence module. An interval of the form [i, j) in the persistence diagram of $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{F})$ corresponds to a homological feature (a 'cycle') that appears at *i* and disappears at *j*. The persistence diagram (PD) completely characterizes the persistence module, providing a bijective correspondence between the PD and the equivalence class (isomorphic) of the persistence module [10, 27].

2.3 Kernel and Support Vector Machine

Kernel for Persistence Diagrams: A kernel for persistence diagrams quantifies the similarity between diagrams by computing a weighted sum of inner products of feature points². A commonly used kernel for PDs is the Persistence Scale Space (PSS) Kernel. The **Persistence Scale Space (PSS) Kernel** [19] is defined for two persistence diagrams D and D' as follows:

$$K_{PSS}(D,D') = \frac{1}{8\pi\sigma^2} \sum_{(p\in D)} \sum_{(q\in D')} e^{\left(-\frac{1}{8\sigma} \left(\|p-q\|^2\right)\right)} - e^{\left(-\frac{1}{8\sigma} \left(\|p-\bar{q}\|^2\right)\right)},$$

where σ is a bandwidth parameter and $\bar{q} = (b, a)$ is q = (a, b) mirrored at the diagonal. The PSS Kernel is stable under small perturbations of the input, ensuring that small changes in the diagram do not result in drastic kernel value changes, which is essential for robust applications in noisy data. The PSS Kernel enables the analysis and comparison of persistence diagrams using a continuous and differentiable kernel function, making it suitable for integration with machine learning tasks, especially in non-Euclidean data settings [19].

²A direct measure of distance between persistence diagrams is the *bottleneck distance* [6]. However, since the space of persistence diagrams is non-linear, kernel-based distances are more suitable for machine learning applications.

3 Temporal Filtrations

In this section, we introduce a simple method and an algorithm for constructing filtered (weighted) graphs from singlelabeled, and multi-labeled temporal graphs. The filtered graph captures the evolution of fixed-size (3-node, 2-edge) δ -temporal motifs.

3.1 Single Labeled Temporal Graphs

The Average Filtration: Let T = (V, E) be a single-labeled temporal graph, we construct a filtered simple graph $G_f = (V_f, E_f, f_{avg} : (V_f \cup E_f) \to \mathbb{R})$ derived from T. The vertex set V_f of G_f is identical to V, and the edge set E_f of G_f corresponds to the edges in the aggregate graph G of T. Specifically, for each temporal edge $(u, v, t) \in E$ in T, there exists a corresponding edge $(u, v) \in E_f$ in G_f . Notably, G_f is a simple graph, meaning that no multiple edges exist between any pair of vertices. The filtration $f_{avg} : (V_f \cup E_f) \to \mathbb{R}$ is referred to as the **average filtration**.

To motivate the definition of the average filtration f_{avg} , we first introduce the concept of the **minimum filtration** $f_{\min}: (V_f \cup E_f) \to \mathbb{R}$. We begin by assigning a filtration value of 0 to all vertices in V_f , i.e., $f_{\text{avg}}(V_f) = 0$. We then describe the method for computing the filtration values of the edges in G_f .

Let $\mathcal{N}_T(u, v) := \{(u', v', t) \mid u = u' \text{ or } v = v'\} \setminus \{(u, v, t)\}$ represent the set of adjacent temporal edges of (u, v, t) in T, where each interaction (u, v, t) belongs to T. Additionally, let $\tau(u, v) := t$ denote the time label of the edge (u, v) in T. The filtration value of each edge (u, v) in G_f is computed using the minimum of the difference in time stamps between the edge (u, v) and its adjacent interactions in T:

$$f_{\min}(e) := \min_{e' \in \mathcal{N}_T(e)} |\tau(e) - \tau(e')|.$$

As previously mentioned, we aim to capture the evolution of δ -temporal motifs within a temporal graph through temporal filtrations. By fixing the values of k (number of nodes) and l (number of edges), one can canonically define a filtration over the temporal graph by varying the parameter δ . Specifically, for each edge (u, v) in a temporal graph, its filtration value is assigned as the smallest δ for which it belongs to a fixed k and l δ -temporal motif. For k = 3 and l = 2, this canonical filtration corresponds to the minimum filtration f_{\min} , as defined above.

The minimum filtration f_{\min} is highly sensitive to changes in interactions, particularly those corresponding to the minimum value, and it often fails to robustly capture the relational and global 'temporal connectivity' of the graph. To address this limitation, we redefine the filtration value of an edge as the average of all δ -values in the smallest (w.r.t to the parameter δ) δ -temporal motifs that include the edge. Specifically, the *average filtration* of the edges in G_f is defined as:

$$f_{\text{avg}}(e) := \frac{\sum_{e' \in \mathcal{N}_T(e)} |\tau(e) - \tau(e')|}{|\mathcal{N}_T(e)|}$$

The average filtration reflects the relative temporal importance of an edge: a smaller filtration value indicates that more and faster temporal paths pass through the edge.

The examples in Figure 4 illustrate the distinction between the average and minimum filtrations. The temporal loop ABCDEA in the original temporal graph (left of Figure 4) has a temporal length of 9 and can be constructed from smaller δ -temporal motifs with 3 nodes and 2 edges for $\delta = 9$. However, in the minimum filtration, the cycle appears at $\delta = 2$, while in the average filtration, it emerges at $\delta = 5.5$. Additionally, the average filtration produces more widely distributed filtration values. This difference suggests that the average filtration takes into account a broader neighborhood around each edge, assigning values that more accurately reflect the relative 'temporal position' of the edges. This characteristic makes the average filtration more stable and discriminative compared to the minimum filtration. Experimental results further validate this observation.

We fix the size of the δ -temporal motifs to be 3-node, 2-edge, as it is the smallest (and perhaps only) motif that captures the complete global connectivity of the temporal graph. The example in Figure 2 clearly illustrates this; all possible 3-node, 3-edge δ -temporal motifs in the figure would fail to cover the entire temporal graph.

Algorithm: We present an efficient algorithm for computing the average filtration of a temporal graph T = (V, E). The main idea of the algorithm is as follows: we first iterate over the vertices V of the graph. For each vertex $v \in V$, we examine the set of edges $E_v \subset E$ incident to v. Any two such incident edges e and e' will be adjacent and will contribute to each other's filtration values. Specifically, for each pair of incident edges, we compute the timestamp difference |t - t'|, where t and t' are the respective timestamps of e and e'. Classification of Temporal Graphs using Persistent Homology



Figure 4: The first figure on the left shows a single-labeled temporal graph, followed by the corresponding average and minimum filtrations derived from it in the next two figures.

To efficiently track these contributions, we maintain a sum variable S_e for each edge e. After calculating |t - t'|, we update the sum variables for both edges as follows: $S_e \leftarrow S_e + |t - t'|$ and $S_{e'} \leftarrow S_{e'} + |t - t'|$. This process is repeated for all possible pairs of incident edges on v, and the vertex v is then marked as visited. Once both boundary vertices of an edge e = uv are marked as visited, we compute its filtration value: $f_{avg}(e) = \frac{S_e}{td_u + td_v}$, where td_u and td_v are the temporal degrees of the vertices u and v, respectively. See the pseudocode (Algorithm 1) for more details.

To optimize the computation of incident temporal edges at each vertex, the graph is stored as an adjacency linked list of edges incident to each vertex v. This representation allows the retrieval of E_v in constant $\mathcal{O}(1)$ time. For each vertex, we compare $\mathcal{O}(d_{\max}^2)$ pairs of incident edges, where d_{\max} is the maximum temporal degree of the graph. Consequently, the overall time complexity of the algorithm is: $\mathcal{O}(|V| \times d_{\max}^2) = \mathcal{O}(|E| \times d_{\max})$, where |V| is the total number of vertices and |E| is the total number of temporal edges in the graph.

Algorithm 1 ComputeAverageFiltration

1: Initialize $S_e \leftarrow 0$ for each $e \in E$ and visited $v \leftarrow$ False for each $v \in V$ 2: Initialize an empty filtration value map f_{avg} 3: for each vertex $v \in V$ do Retrieve all incident edges $E_v = \{e = (v, u, t)\}$ 4: 5: Initialize a stack stack with all edges $e \in E_v$ 6: while stack is not empty do 7: Pop an edge e = (v, u, t) from stack for each remaining edge e' = (v, w, t') in stack do 8: Compute $\Delta \leftarrow |t - t'|$ 9: Update $S_e \leftarrow S_e + \Delta$ 10: Update $S_{e'} \leftarrow S_{e'} + \Delta$ 11: end for 12: $\begin{aligned} \textbf{if visited}_u &= \text{True then} \\ \text{Compute } f_{\text{avg}}(e) \leftarrow \frac{\mathsf{S}_e}{td_v + td_u} \end{aligned}$ $\triangleright v$ being visited is not required 13: 14: 15: end if end while 16: Mark visited_v \leftarrow True 17: 18: end for 19: return $f_{avg}(e)$ for all $e \in E$

3.2 Multi-labeled Temporal Graphs

We now extend the average filtration of single-labeled temporal graphs to multi-labeled temporal graphs. Our approach for multi-labeled graphs follows a similar methodology as the single-labeled case. In this context, we average the time differences across multiple interactions and assign a single edge to represent the interactions.

Given a multi-labeled temporal graph T = (V, E), we construct a filtered simple graph $G_f = (V_f, E_f, f_{avg}^{mlt} : (V_f \cup E_f) \to \mathbb{R})$ derived from T. Similar to the single-labeled case, the vertex set V_f and the edge set E_f of G_f correspond to the vertices and edges in the aggregate graph G of T. Here, $\tau(u, v) = \{t \mid (u, v, t) \in E\}$ represents the set of all time labels associated with the edge (u, v). As in the single-labeled case, the filtration value of vertices is set to 0. The filtration value of the edges in G_f is computed as follows:

$$f_{\text{avg}}^{\text{mlt}}(e) = \frac{\sum_{e' \in \mathcal{N}_T(e)} \sum_{t \in \tau(e), t' \in \tau(e')} |t - t'|}{|\mathcal{N}_T(e)|}.$$

4 Stability

In this section, we examine the stability of the temporal filtrations defined earlier in the context of *randomized reference models* of temporal graphs. To provide a foundation, we first briefly review the concept of randomized reference models and introduce some commonly used models, as outlined in [12, 13]. These models form the basis for defining the various classification classes used in our experiments.

4.1 Randomized Reference Model

The *configuration model* is a randomized reference model, commonly used in the study of static networks to compare the empirical network's features (such as clustering, path length, or other topological characteristics) with those of a randomized network. The configuration model is created by randomly shuffling the edges of a given graph while preserving some of its structural properties, most notably the degree distribution.

For temporal graphs, a similar approach involves randomizing or reshuffling event sequences (interactions) to remove time-domain structures and correlations. Unlike static networks, temporal graphs exhibit diverse temporal correlations (structures) across varying scales, making it challenging to design a single, universal null model. Karsai et.al. [13] identify five of these temporal correlations, namely: community structure (C), weight-topology correlations (W), bursty event dynamics on single links (B), and event-event correlations between links (E) and a daily pattern (D). They also provide tailored null models that selectively remove specific correlations to analyze their influence on the observed temporal features or dynamical processes like spreading. Below, we recall three temporal null models from Karsai et al. [13] and Holme [12].

- Equal-Weight Link-Sequence Shuffle (EWLSS): In this method, two interaction pairs $(u_1, v_1), (u_2, v_2) \in V \times V$ are randomly selected such that $|\tau(u_1, v_1)| = |\tau(u_2, v_2)|$. Then the time labels of these selected pairs (u_1, v_1) and (u_2, v_2) are swapped. Note that, $\tau(u, v)$ represents the set of time labels associated with the pair (u, v). This process can be repeated multiple times to construct a new randomized temporal graph.
- Randomized Edges (RE): Algorithmically this method could be described as follows: iterate over all edges and for each edge (u, v), select another edge (u', v'). With 50% probability, replace (u, v) and (u', v') with (u, v') and (u', v); otherwise, replace them with (u, u') and (v, v'). The times of contact for each edge remain constant and we further make sure that there are no self loops or multiple edges.
- **Configuration Model (CM):** The aggregated graph of the temporal graph is rewired using the configuration model of the static graph, which preserves the degree distribution and overall connectivity of nodes while removing topological correlations. Then the original single-edge interaction time labels are randomly assigned to the edge, followed by time shuffling. This method destroys all correlations except broad seasonal patterns, such as daily cycles.

In addition to these three model we introduce a new null model that is suitable for some of our specific experiments.

Time Perturbation (TP): In this method, a fraction of interactions e = (u, v, t) ∈ E in the original temporal graph is replaced with e' = (u, v, t'), where |t − t'| < ε for some ε > 0. This procedure only perturbs the time stamps of the edges, preserving most of the temporal and structural features of the original temporal graph.

The first model, EWLSS, preserves the daily pattern (D), the community structure (C), weight-topology correlations (W), and bursty event dynamics on individual edges (B). In contrast, the configuration model loses all temporal correlations (structures) except for the daily pattern (D). This distinction has been experimentally verified by Karsai et al. [13], where graphs generated using EWLSS procedures exhibit spreading dynamics closely resembling those of the original graph. On the other hand, graphs generated using the configuration model deviate significantly from the original dynamics.

We leverage these models to define and populate distinct classes for classification tasks. The configuration model generates temporal graphs with diverse dynamics, while the other three models (EWLSS, RE and TP) are used to produce graphs with similar dynamics, forming a single class. The similarity within each class depends on the model used; TP and EWLSS create more homogeneous classes compared to the RE model. Originally designed for studying

spreading dynamics with the SI model [14], these null models eliminate the need for direct SI simulations, enhancing both the efficiency and flexibility of our method without requiring labeled nodes.

4.2 Stability

We now discuss the stability of our temporal filtration with respect to the above null models. In particular, we calculate the difference in the average filtrations values of the edges that are , shuffled, swapped or changed during each step of the above reference modes.

TP Procedure : Let T be a single-labeled temporal graph and e = (u, v, t) is an interaction in T. Suppose the time label $\tau(e) = t$ is replaced by $t + \epsilon$. The change in $f_{avg}(e)$, denoted by $\Delta f_{avg}(e)$, can be upper bounded as follows:

$$\Delta f_{\text{avg}}(e) = f_{\text{avg}}(e)_{\text{new}} - f_{\text{avg}}(e)_{\text{old}}$$

= $\frac{1}{|\mathcal{N}_T(e)|} \sum_{e' \in \mathcal{N}_T(e)} \left(|(t+\epsilon) - \tau(e')| - |t-\tau(e')| \right).$

Let $\tau(e') = t'$, then for each $e' \in \mathcal{N}_T(e)$ the inner term is $|(t + \epsilon) - t'| - |t - t'| \le \epsilon$. we therefore obtain: $|\Delta f_{avg}(e)| \le \epsilon$. The filtration values of edges in the neighborhood of e also change. Using a similar computation and the fact that $\tau(e'')$ does not change for all $e'' \in \mathcal{N}_T(e') \setminus \{e\}$, for each $e' \in \mathcal{N}_T(e)$, we can express the change as:

$$\Delta f_{\text{avg}}(e') = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{N}_T(e')|} (|(t+\epsilon) - \tau(e')| - |t-\tau(e')|) = \frac{\epsilon}{|\mathcal{N}_T(e')|} \le \epsilon.$$

We use the L_{∞} norm to measure the distance between filtrations [6]. The overall distance between the new (shifted) and the original average filtration of the temporal graph G is bounded above as follows: $|\Delta_{\infty} f_{\text{avg}}(G)| \leq \epsilon$. Note that this bound holds even after time stamp shifts of multiple edges.

For simplicity, we have assumed that T is a single-labeled temporal graph. However, through a similar calculation, it can be shown that the same bound applies to multi-labeled temporal graphs and cases where multiple time labels of an edge are shifted. Since the underlying aggregate graph remains unchanged after a TP procedure, the stability theorem [6] guarantees stability in the resulting persistence diagrams.

EWLSS Procedure: To upper bound the differences in the average filtration when swapping time labels t_1 and t_2 for the edges $e_1 = (u_1, v_1, t_1)$ and $e_2 = (u_2, v_2, t_2)$, we proceed as follows:

For
$$e_1 : \Delta f_{\text{avg}}(e_1) = \frac{\sum_{e' \in \mathcal{N}_T(e_1)} \left(|t_2 - \tau(e')| - |t_1 - \tau(e')| \right)}{|\mathcal{N}_T(e_1)|}$$

Again we can bound the inner term, $\left||t_2 - \tau(e')| - |t_1 - \tau(e')|\right| \le |t_2 - t_1|$, Thus:

$$|\Delta f_{\text{avg}}(e_1)| \le \frac{|\mathcal{N}_T(e_1)| \cdot |t_2 - t_1|}{|\mathcal{N}_T(e_1)|} = |t_2 - t_1|.$$

By symmetry, $|\Delta f_{\text{avg}}(e_2)| \le |t_2 - t_1|$. The filtration values of the edges in the neighborhoods $\mathcal{N}_T(e_1)$ and $\mathcal{N}_T(e_2)$ of e_1 and e_2 , respectively, will also change. However, these changes will be bounded above by $|t_2 - t_1|$.

For a single pair swap, the absolute distance between the average filtration of the swapped graph and the original graph is bounded as: $|\Delta_{\infty} f_{\text{avg}}(G)| \leq |t_2 - t_1|$. For multiple pair swaps, the distance is bounded above by the maximum time label difference among the pairs: $|\Delta_{\infty} f_{\text{avg}}(G)| \leq \max |t_2 - t_1|$. As in the previous case, the underlying aggregate graph remains unchanged after an EWLSS procedure. Consequently, the persistence diagrams remain stable as well.

RE and CM Procedure: The average filtration does not exhibit theoretical stability for the remaining two procedures, RE and configuration models. This behavior is expected, primarily because the underlying aggregate graphs could change at each step of these procedures. Such changes result in an infinite difference between the filtration

values of previously non-existent interactions and those of newly added interactions or vice-versa. We illustrate this change for the RE procedure in Figure 5. Among the RE and configuration models, RE generates more similar temporal graphs. Therefore, to design a relatively heterogeneous class, we still use the RE procedure to populate a single class.



Figure 5: An example of a single step in the RE procedure involves shuffling the edges BC and FE to BF and CE, respectively, while maintaining their original time stamps.

5 Experiments

In this section, we present experiments to evaluate the effectiveness of our method in classifying temporal graphs.

Method: We compute the average filtration for each temporal graph, from which we derive the persistence diagram (up to degree 2) based on the associated flag filtration. The Persistence Scale Space (PSS) kernel [19] is then used to compute the kernel distance matrix for each degree of the diagram, resulting in three matrices corresponding to degrees 0, 1, and 2. These matrices are combined with equal weights ³ to produce a unified kernel matrix.

The combined kernel matrix is then utilized to train an SVM model for class prediction. All experiments were implemented in Python, with C++ used to compute the kernel matrices and the f_{avg}^{mlt} filtration for multi-labeled temporal graphs. The experiments were conducted on a server equipped with an Intel(R) Core(TM) i7-6950X CPU and dual NVIDIA GeForce RTX 2080 Ti GPUs to ensure consistent runtime and accuracy comparisons.

The datasets were divided into training and testing sets with an 80-20 split ratio, and accuracy was recorded on the testing set for each experiment. The accuracy score was calculated as the ratio of correctly predicted data points to the total number of data points. The source code is publicly available⁴.

Datasets: The datasets used in the first two experiments are contact sequence datasets. The first dataset is a realworld dataset from the SocioPatterns dataset repository [1]. The second dataset is synthetic and is generated using the model described in [12]. In the last two experiments (Pure and Mixed Classes), graphs are randomly generated and do not model any specific phenomena. For real datasets, typically, only a single temporal graph is available, whereas synthetic datasets can provide one or more initial graphs, termed **root graphs**. Classes are created as described in Section 4. The TP, EWLSS, and RE procedures generate loosely similar graphs, while the CM procedure produces distinct ones. With a single root graph, two classes are formed: one with loose copies of the root graph and another with multiple CM-generated graphs. For multiple root graphs, classes are formed by loosely copying each root graph.

We begin with experiments on contact sequence datasets, followed by additional tests on randomly generated temporal graphs.

5.1 Contact Sequence Datasets

All temporal graphs in the following experiments (Table 1 and Table 4) are multi-labeled and we use f_{avg}^{mlt} filtration as described in Section 3.

³Different weights would allow for controlling the importance of each degree.

⁴Source Code Repository Link.

Real Datasets: All experiments involve two classes. In the *Class Generation* column (Table 1), RE+CM denotes that the first class of similar temporal graphs is generated via the RE procedure, while the second, dissimilar class is created using the CM procedure. Other symbols follow the same convention. Except for the Hospital (Working/Non-Working) and HighSchool (2011/2012) experiments, all use a single root graph. In the Hospital experiment, the root graph is split into working and non-working hours, while in the HighSchool experiment, the split is based on contact years (2011 and 2012). For two-root datasets, the RE procedure is used to populate the two classes. Experiments on Hospital, MIT, and Workplace data (the first six experiments) employ different population methods, namely RE and EWLS for the similar classes. However, no significant difference in accuracy is observed. The general statistics for each dataset are provided in Table 2.

Dataset	Class Generation	Accuracy	Stdev
Hospital Combined	RE+CM	0.98625	0.01450
Hospital Combined	EWLS+CM	0.98625	0.01575
MIT	RE+CM	0.94375	0.02990
MIT	EWLS+ CM	0.93875	0.04000
Workplace v2	RE+CM	1	0
Workplace v2	EWLS+ CM	1	0
Hospital (Working/Non-Working)	RE+RE	0.925	0.02500
HighSchool 2011	RE + CM	1	0.
HighSchool 2012	RE + CM	1	0
HighSchool (2011/2012)	RE+RE	0.9866	0.04604

Table 1: Combined averages of accuracy and standard deviation across different datasets.

Dataset	V	$ E_s $	E	E_{avg}	E_{max}	d_{avg}	d_{max}
Highschool 2011	126	1710	28540	16.69	1185	27.14	55
Highschool 2012	180	2220	45047	20.29	1280	24.67	56
Hospital Combined	75	1139	32424	28.47	1059	30.37	61
MIT	96	2539	234757	92.46	4387	52.9	92
Workplace v2	217	4274	78249	18.31	1302	39.39	84

Table 2: |V| is the number of vertices, $|E_s|$ is the number of aggregate graph edges, |E| is the number of temporal edges, E_{avg} and E_{max} are the average and maximum number of time labels per graph edge, and d_{avg} and d_{max} are the average and maximum temporal degree of the nodes.

When classes are defined using the RE and EWLS procedures, they represent highly similar temporal graphs, making them inherently challenging to separate. This observation is confirmed in the following experiments (Table 3), validating our approach of defining classes based on reference models.

Dataset	Class Generation	Accuracy	Stdev
Hospital Combined	RE + RE	0.5075	0.08419
Hospital Combined	EWLS + EWLS	0.5325	0.06934
HighSchool 2011	RE + RE	0.45875	0.05338
HighSchool 2011	EWLS + EWLS	0.505	0.07068
HighSchool 2012	RE + RE	0.50625	0.05741
HighSchool 2012	EWLS + EWLS	0.49625	0.05016

Table 3: Combined averages of accuracy and standard deviation across different datasets using same root graph for both classes.

Synthetic Dataset: We generate three root temporal graphs with varying parameters using both *disassortative* and *assortative* mixing strategies, as described in [12]. These multi-labeled temporal graphs model contact and disease transmission dynamics. The last two experiments use the same set of graphs: in the third experiment, we include all points from the persistence diagram, while in the fourth, we use a pruned persistence diagram, removing low-persistence points. We observed a minimal drop in accuracy, while the runtime decreased by nearly half.

Classification of Temporal Graphs using Persistent Homology

Class	IVI/IEI	Threshold	Average Accuracy	Average Stdev
3	100/200	0	0.9733	0.0235
3	250/500	0	1.0000	0.0000
3	100/1000	0	0.9681 (104s)	0.0283
3	100/1000	300	0.9385 (49s)	0.0396

Table 4: In the first two experiments, we use 18 distinct parameter sets, while in the last two, we use 6. For each parameter set, the average result is reported over 5 runs. On average, 20 RE steps were performed to generate a new class member in the first two experiments, compared to 32.5 RE steps in the last two. The runtime for the third and fourth experiments is 104 seconds and 49 seconds, respectively.

5.2 Random Temporal Graphs

Figures 6 and 7 show the results of experiments on random temporal graphs using single-labeled graphs and the f_{avg} filtration described in Section 3. These experiments evaluate our method's effectiveness with a large number of similar classes and mixed classes and its performance under varying temporal graph sparsity. Class generation employs the TP procedure from Section 4, applied to a fraction of interactions (*out shifts*), while *in shifts* apply TP to a smaller fraction of edges within a single class. Details of this strategy are provided for each experiment.

Pure Classes: To create a homogeneous pool of classes, we generated a single-labeled temporal graph G with 100 vertices and varying sparsity (0.05 to 0.8), with time stamps in the range (0, 100]. For each experiment, the original root graph was used to create 3, 5, 7, or 9 new root graphs (classes) by shifting the time stamps (out-shifts) of an average of 4.75% of interactions by $1 \le \epsilon \le 5$. To populate graphs within the same class, time stamps of an average of 1.6% of interactions were shifted (in-shifts) by $1 \le \epsilon \le 5$.



For each class and sparsity pair, we ran four experiments with different out- and in-shift combinations, and the results for each combination were averaged over 5 runs. As the sparsity increases, the accuracy remains stable around 1.0 for all classes, with only minor drops at higher sparsity values. This indicates that the classification models maintain high performance even with lower data density.

Figure 6: Accuracy vs. sparsity for different number of pure classes.

Mixed Classes: For mixed sets of classes, we used two single-labeled temporal graphs G, each with 100 vertices and varying sparsity (0.05 to 0.8) and time stamps in the range (0, 100]. This setup enabled the creation of both similar and distinct class sets. For instance, Class 2-2 consists of two classes from one root graph and its out-shifted variant, and two classes from a second root graph and its out-shifted variant. Similarly, Classes 2-3 and 3-3 were generated. Out-shifts affected an average of 4.75% of interactions by $1 \le \epsilon \le 5$, while in-shifts altered an average of 1.88% of interactions within the same range.

Note: As noted in the Introduction, most temporal graph classification methods rely on node classes for classification [15, 17], whereas our approach does not. This difference prevents direct comparisons, as graph classes vary across studies.



For each class and sparsity pair, we conducted four experiments with different out- and in-shift combinations, averaging the results over five runs. The observed trends were consistent with the previous experiment (Figure 6), indicating that our classification model performs effectively in the mixed setup as well.

Figure 7: Accuracy vs. sparsity for different number of mixed classes.

However, to assess the inherent complexity of temporal graph classification and our pipeline's effectiveness, we experimented with the alternative minimum filtration and compared it to the average filtration. The results show that the average filtration performs better, leading us to select it for classification.

5.3 Future Work

Our framework has the potential to be extended to higher-order motifs, weighted edges, interval temporal graphs, and probabilistic interactions, opening new research directions in dynamic systems. As shown, the resulting persistence diagrams can be kernelized or vectorized, enabling integration with standard machine learning tasks. This advances the role of temporal graphs in Topological Machine Learning (TML), enhancing scalability and predictive power in domains such as epidemic modeling, social networks, and financial systems.

Acknowledgement

We thank Priyavrat Deshpande, Writika Sarkar, Mohit Upmanyu, and Shubhankar Varshney for their valuable input during the early discussions of the project.

Funding

All three authors received partial support from a grant provided by Fujitsu Limited. Part of this work was carried out during the first author's visit to The University of Newcastle, NSW, Australia, and was partially funded by an ARC Discovery Grant (Grant Number: G2000134).

References

- [1] Sociopatterns datasets, 2024. Accessed: 2024-12-02.
- [2] M. Araujo, S. Papadimitriou, S. Günnemann, C. Faloutsos, P. Basu, A. Swami, E. E. Papalexakis, and D. Koutra. Com2: Fast automatic discovery of temporal ('comet') communities. In *Proceedings of the Pacific-Asia Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining (PAKDD)*, 2014.
- [3] Alain Barrat, Ciro Cattuto, Jameson L. Toole, and Lorenzo Isella. Empirical temporal networks of face-to-face human interactions. *European Physical Journal Special Topics*, 222(6):1295–1309, 2013.
- [4] Benjamin Blonder, Tina W. Wey, Anna Dornhaus, Richard James, and Andrew Sih. Temporal dynamics and network analysis. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*.

- [5] Ciro Cattuto, Wouter Van den Broeck, Alain Barrat, Vittoria Colizza, Jean-François Pinton, and Alessandro Vespignani. Dynamics of person-to-person interactions from distributed rfid sensor networks. *PLoS ONE*, 2010.
- [6] David Cohen-Steiner, Herbert Edelsbrunner, and John Harer. Stability of persistence diagrams. *Discrete & Computational Geometry*, 37(1):103–120, 2007.
- [7] Lorenzo Dall'Amico, Alain Barrat, and Ciro Cattuto. An embedding-based distance for temporal graphs. *Nature Communications*, 15(1):9954, 2024.
- [8] D. M. Dunlavy, T. G. Kolda, and E. Acar. Temporal link prediction using matrix and tensor factorizations. ACM *Transactions on Knowledge Discovery from Data (TKDD)*, 2011.
- [9] Nathan Eagle, Alex Pentland, and David Lazer. Inferring friendship network structure by using mobile phone data. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 2009.
- [10] Herbert Edelsbrunner and John Harer. *Computational Topology: An Introduction*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2010.
- [11] Allen Hatcher. Algebraic Topology. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 2002.
- [12] Petter Holme and Jari Saramäki. Temporal networks. *Physics Reports*, 519:97–125, 2012.
- [13] M. Karsai, M. Kivelä, R. K. Pan, K. Kaski, J. Kertész, A.-L. Barabási, and J. Saramäki. Small but slow world: How network topology and burstiness slow down spreading. *Physical Review E*, 83, 2011.
- [14] William Ogilvy Kermack and Anderson G. McKendrick. A contribution to the mathematical theory of epidemics. Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series A, Containing Papers of a Mathematical and Physical Character, 115(772):700–721, 1927.
- [15] Alessio Micheli and Domenico Tortorella. Discrete-time dynamic graph echo state networks. *Neurocomputing*, 2022.
- [16] Audun Myers, David Munoz, Firas A Khasawneh, and Elizabeth Munch. Temporal network analysis using zigzag persistence. EPJ Data Science, 12:45, 2023.
- [17] Lutz Oettershagen, Nils M. Kriege, Christopher Morris, and Petra Mutzel. Temporal Graph Kernels for Classifying Dissemination Processes. 2020.
- [18] Ashwin Paranjape, Austin R Benson, and Jure Leskovec. Motifs in temporal networks. *Proceedings of the Tenth* ACM International Conference on Web Search and Data Mining, 2017.
- [19] Jan Reininghaus, Stefan Huber, Ulrich Bauer, and Roland Kwitt. A stable multi-scale kernel for topological machine learning. In *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 4741–4748, 2015.
- [20] Bernhard Schölkopf and Alexander J. Smola. *Learning with Kernels: Support Vector Machines, Regularization, Optimization, and Beyond.* MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, 2002.
- [21] Kiarash Shamsi, Farimah Poursafaei, Shenyang Huang, Bao Tran Gia Ngo, Baris Coskunuzer, and Cuneyt Gurcan Akcora. Graphpulse: Topological representations for temporal graph property prediction. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024.
- [22] Arkadiusz Stopczynski, Vedran Sekara, Piotr Sapiezynski, Andrea Cuttone, Mikko M. Madsen, and Sune Lehmann. Measuring large-scale social networks with high resolution. *PLoS ONE*, 2014.
- [23] Raphaël Tinarrage, Jean R. Ponciano, Claudio D. G. Linhares, Agma J. M. Traina, and Jorge Poco. Tdanetvis: Suggesting temporal resolutions for graph visualization using zigzag persistent homology. 2023.
- [24] Kun Tu, Jian Li, Don Towsley, Dave Braines, and Liam D. Turner. Network classification in temporal networks using motifs. 2018.
- [25] Haishuai Wang. Time-variant graph classification. 2017.
- [26] Dongsheng Ye, Hao Jiang, Ying Jiang, and Hao Li. Stable distance of persistent homology for dynamic graph comparison. *Knowledge-Based Systems*, 278:110855, 07 2023.
- [27] Afra Zomorodian and Gunnar Carlsson. Computing persistent homology. *Discrete & Computational Geometry*, 33(2):249–274, 2005.