Structure-Function Coupling in Brain: Subnet Communicability

Jonathan Parlett · Abhishek Jeyapratap · Ali Shokoufandeh Birkan Tunc · Yusuf Osmanlioglu







Communication in the Brain

- Functional interaction exists between anatomically unconnected brain regions
 - □ How does this indirect communication occur?
 - □ What is the correct communication model?
- Following previous literature, we propose a model of signal propagation in brain networks



Structure-Function Coupling (SFC)

Communication models

provide a framework to simulate function using structure

Structure-function coupling

- similarity between empirical and simulated functional connectivity
- commonly measured by Pearson's correlation coefficient (r)



Communication Models: Quality of Service

- □ Two competing factors: efficiency and robustness
- Efficiency: use the least amount of energy to propagate signal
 - Communicate through single shortest path
- Robustness: communication should withstand local connectivity failures by allowing redundancy
 - □ Communicate through multiple paths simultaneously

ervice	

Communication Models: Shortest Path

- Due to the brain's efficient wiring economy, the brain was assumed to utilize a very efficient communication model.
 - □ The de facto model has been **shortest path**
- Pros:
 - Very efficient as signal need only propagate over single optimal path
- **Cons:**
 - Not robust as it lacks redundancy in message passing, making it vulnerable to localized lesions
 - requires each region to have **global knowledge** of the network
 for optimal message passing



Shortest (strongest) Path

Communication Models: Communicability

- Diffusive communication models are shown to more accurately reflect the functional dynamics of the brain
 - propagate signal through multiple pathways between regions
 concurrently
- **Communicability** is the state of the art diffusive model
 - propagates signal through all possible pathways between regions
- **Pros**:
 - Very robust since local perturbations to connectivity has minimal consequences on communication due to high redundancy
- **Cons:**
 - Highly inefficient as more energy is required to propagate signal over multiple pathways



Proposed Model: Subnet Communicability

- Subnet Communicability: a balance between efficiency and redundancy in communication
 - pick a small subset of nodes to serve as backbone
 - propagate signal **diffusively** through paths utilizing these nodes
- Adjusting the subnetwork size
 - Fewer messages are sent in diffusion through a smaller subnetwork
 - Large subnetwork: more **redundancy**, less efficiency.
 - Small subnetwork: less redundancy, more **efficiency**.



Which subnetwork?

- Subnet communicability is parameterized by the set of nodes constituting the subnetwork
- □ Which subnetwork do we use as a communication backbone?
 - Determine the **optimal size** of subnetwork
 - Determine the set of nodes leading to best structure-function coupling







Dataset:

- 200 individuals from young adult dataset of HCP data
- □ Structural (DWI) and resting state functional (rs-fMRI) data
- □ Connectomes obtained using Schaefer atlas with 100 and 200 ROIs



Which Subnetwork?



 Structure function coupling is affected by:

- Size of the subnetwork
- The nodes that constitute the subnetwork



Which Nodes?





Comparison of Models



Conclusions

- □ Subnet communicability:
 - "communication in the brain diffuses through a small backbone subnetwork"
 - better explains the functional dynamics in the brain
 - □ balances efficiency and robustness of communication in the brain
- Questions?

