

# Bayes Optimal Graph Classification: Applications in Statistical Connectomics

Joshua T. Vogelstein and Carey E. Priebe

**Abstract**—Graph classification algorithms often do not incorporate vertex label information in their classifiers. In this work, we investigate the extent to which discarding vertex labels can hinder classification performance, and for which random graph models one might expect this invariance to be impactful. Via theory we demonstrate a collection of results. Specifically, if one “shuffles” the graphs prior to classification, the vertex label information is irretrievably lost, which can degrade misclassification performance (and often does). A specific graph-invariant classifier is shown to be Bayes optimal. Moreover, this classifier may be induced by training data in a consistent and efficient fashion. Unfortunately, both computational and sample size burdens make this “plugin” classifier impractical. A graph-matched Frobenius norm  $k_n$  nearest neighbor (GM- $k$ NN) classifier, however, is also universally consistent, and expected to converge faster whenever “nearness” implies same class. Finally, we apply this approach to a connectome classification problem (a connectome is brain-graph where vertices correspond to (groups of) neurons and edges correspond to connections between them). The GM- $k$ NN classifier on the shuffled graphs performs better than a more standard graph-invariant based  $k$ NN strategy, but not quite as well as the standard  $k$ NN on the labeled graphs. Thus, we demonstrate the practical utility of the theoretical derivations herein. Extending these results to weighted and (certain) attributed random graph models is straightforward.

**Index Terms**—statistical inference, graph theory, network theory, structural pattern recognition, connectome.



## 1 INTRODUCTION

REPRESENTING data as graphs is becoming increasingly popular, as technological progress facilitates measuring “connectedness” in a variety of domains, including social networks, trade-alliance networks, and brain networks. While the theory of pattern recognition is deep [?], previous theoretical efforts regarding pattern recognition almost invariably assume data are collections of vectors. Here, we assume data are collections of graphs (where each graph is a set of vertices and a set of edges connecting the vertices). For some data sets, the vertices of the graphs are *labeled*, that is, one can identify the vertex of one graph with a vertex of the others. For others, the labels are either unobserved or assume to not exist. We investigate the theoretical and practical implications of the absence of vertex labels.

These implications are especially important in the emerging field of “connectomics”, the study of connections of the brain [?], [?]. In connectomics, one represents the brain as a graph (a brain-graph), where vertices correspond to (groups of) neurons and edges correspond to connections between them. In the lower part of the evolutionary hierarchy (e.g., worms and flies), many neurons have been assigned labels [?]. However, for even the simplest vertebrates, vertex labels are mostly unavailable when vertices correspond to neurons. A common strategy for dealing with this “unmatchedness” is to operate in a quotient space of graphs. In the quo-

tient space, a vertex represents a collection of neurons, and this collection is assigned a label. Edges become multi-edges, although they are commonly binarized to obtain simple graphs [5]. Operating in the quotient space of labeled vertices eases graph comparison, as the “graph-matching” sticky-wicket is avoided. Embedding the unlabeled graphs in this quotient space will likely be advantageous for some exploitation tasks, and disastrous for others (for instance, whenever the vertex labels contain all the signal for the specified task). We aim to understand under what circumstances one could expect a classification performance degradation, and to what extent we can recover from losing the vertex label information.

## 2 GRAPH CLASSIFICATION MODELS

### 2.1 A labeled graph classification model

A (labeled) graph  $G = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$  consists of a vertex set,  $\mathcal{V} = [n]$ , where  $n < \infty$  is the number of vertices and  $[n] = \{1, \dots, n\}$ , and an edge set  $\mathcal{E} \subseteq \binom{[n]}{2}$ . Let  $\mathbb{G}: \Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{G}_n$  be a graph-valued random variable taking values  $G \in \mathcal{G}_n$ , where  $\mathcal{G}_n$  is the set of graphs on  $n$  vertices, and  $|\mathcal{G}_n| = 2^{\binom{n}{2}} = d_n$ . Let  $Y$  be a categorical random variable,  $Y: \Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{Y} = \{y_1, \dots, y_c\}$ , where  $c < \infty$ . Assume the existence of a joint distribution,  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{G}, Y}$  which can be decomposed into the product of a class-conditional distribution (likelihood)  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{G}|Y}$  and a class prior  $\pi_Y$ . Because  $n$  is finite, the class-conditional distributions  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{G}|Y=y} = \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{G}|y}$  can be considered discrete distributions  $\text{Discrete}(G; \theta_y)$ , where  $\theta_y$  is an element of the  $d_n$ -dimensional unit simplex  $\Delta_{d_n}$  (satisfying  $\theta_{G|y} \geq 0 \forall G \in \mathcal{G}_n$  and  $\sum_{G \in \mathcal{G}_n} \theta_{G|y} = 1$ ).

• J.T. Vogelstein and C.E. Priebe are with the Department of Applied Mathematics and Statistics, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD 21218. E-mail: {joshuav, cep}@jhu.edu

## 2.2 A shuffled graph classification model

In the above, it was implicitly assumed that the vertex labels were observed. However, in certain situations (such as the motivating connectomics example presented in Section 1), this assumption is unwarranted. To proceed, we define two graphs  $G, G' \in \mathcal{G}_n$  to be isomorphic if and only if there exists a vertex permutation (shuffle) function  $Q: \mathcal{G}_n \rightarrow \mathcal{G}_n$  such that  $Q(G) = G'$ . Let  $\mathbb{Q}$  be a permutation-valued random variable,  $\mathbb{Q}: \Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}_n$ , where  $\mathcal{Q}_n$  is the space of vertex permutation functions on  $n$  vertices so that  $|\mathcal{Q}_n| = n!$ . Extending the model to include this vertex shuffling distribution yields  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{Q}, \mathcal{G}, Y}$ . We assume throughout this work (with loss of generality) that the shuffling distribution is both *class independent* and *graph independent*; therefore, this joint model can be decomposed as

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{Q}, \mathcal{G}, Y} = \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{Q}} \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{G}, Y} = \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{Q}} \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{G}|Y} \pi_Y. \quad (1)$$

As in the labeled case, the shuffled graph class-conditional distributions  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{Q}(\mathcal{G})|y}$  can be represented by discrete distributions  $\text{Discrete}(G; \theta'_y)$ , where again  $\theta'_y \in \Delta_{d_n}$ . When  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{Q}}$  is uniform on  $\mathcal{Q}_n$ , all shuffled graphs within the same isomorphism set are equally likely; that is  $\{\theta'_{G_i|y} = \theta'_{G_j|y} \forall G_i, G_j: Q(G_i) = G_j \text{ for some } Q \in \mathcal{Q}_n\}$ .

## 2.3 An unlabeled graph classification model

Let  $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_n$  be the collection of isomorphism sets. An *unlabeled graph*  $\tilde{G}$  is an element of  $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_n$ . The number of unlabeled graphs on  $n$  vertices is  $|\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_n| = \tilde{d}_n \approx d/n!$  (see [1] and references therein). An *isomorphism function*  $U: \mathcal{G}_n \rightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_n$  is a function that takes as input a graph and outputs the corresponding unlabeled graph. Let  $\tilde{\mathbb{G}}: \Omega \rightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_n$  be an unlabeled graph-valued random variable taking values  $\tilde{G} \in \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_n$ . The joint distribution over unlabeled graphs and classes is therefore  $\mathbb{P}_{\tilde{\mathbb{G}}, Y} = \mathbb{P}_{U(\mathcal{G}), Y} = \mathbb{P}_{U(\mathbb{Q}(\mathcal{G})), Y}$ , which decomposes as  $\mathbb{P}_{\tilde{\mathbb{G}}|Y} \pi_Y$ . The class-conditional distributions  $\mathbb{P}_{\tilde{\mathbb{G}}|y}$  over isomorphism sets (unlabeled graphs) can also be thought of as discrete distributions  $\text{Discrete}(\tilde{G}; \tilde{\theta}_y)$  where  $\tilde{\theta}_y \in \Delta_{\tilde{d}_n}$  are vectors in the  $\tilde{d}_n$ -dimensional unit simplex. Comparing shuffling and unlabeled for the independent and uniform shuffle distribution  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{Q}}$ , we have  $\{\theta'_{G|y} = \tilde{\theta}_{\tilde{G}|y}/|\tilde{G}| \text{ for all } G \in \tilde{G}\}$ .

## 3 BAYES OPTIMAL GRAPH CLASSIFIERS

We consider graph classification in the three scenarios described above: labeled, shuffled, and unlabeled. To proceed, in each scenario we define three mathematical objects: (i) a classifier, (ii) the Bayes optimal classifier, and (iii) the Bayes risk.

### 3.1 Bayes Optimal Labeled Graph Classifiers

A *labeled graph classifier*  $h: \mathcal{G}_n \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$  is any function that maps from labeled graph space to class space. The risk of a labeled graph classifier under 0 – 1 loss is the expected

misclassification rate  $L(h) = \mathbb{E}[h(\mathcal{G}) \neq Y]$ , where the expectation is taken against  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{G}, Y}$ .

The *labeled graph Bayes optimal classifier* is given by

$$h_* = \operatorname{argmin}_{h \in \mathcal{H}} L(h), \quad (2)$$

where  $\mathcal{H}$  is the set of possible labeled graph classifiers.

The *labeled graph Bayes risk* is given by

$$L_* = \min_{h \in \mathcal{H}} L(h), \quad (3)$$

where  $L_*$  implicitly depends on  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{G}, Y}$ .

### 3.2 Bayes Optimal Shuffled Graph Classifiers

A *shuffled graph classifier* is also any function  $h: \mathcal{G}_n \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$  (note that the set of shuffled graphs is the same as the set of labeled graphs). However, by virtue of the input being a shuffled graph as opposed to a labeled graph, the shuffled risk under 0 – 1 loss is given by  $L'(h) = \mathbb{E}[h(\mathbb{Q}(\mathcal{G})) \neq Y]$ , where the expectation is taken against  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{Q}(\mathcal{G}), Y}$ .

The *shuffled graph Bayes optimal classifier* is given by

$$h'_* = \operatorname{argmin}_{h \in \mathcal{H}} L'(h), \quad (4)$$

where  $\mathcal{H}$  is again the set of possible labeled (or shuffled) graph classifiers. The *shuffled Bayes risk* is given by

$$L'_* = \min_{h \in \mathcal{H}} L'(h), \quad (5)$$

where  $L'_*$  implicitly depends on  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{Q}(\mathcal{G}), Y}$ .

### 3.3 Bayes Optimal Unlabeled Graph Classifiers

An *unlabeled graph classifier*  $\tilde{h}: \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_n \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$  is any function that maps from unlabeled graph space to class space. The risk under 0 – 1 loss is given by  $\tilde{L}(\tilde{h}) = \mathbb{E}[\tilde{h}(\tilde{\mathbb{G}}) \neq Y]$ , where the expectation is taken against  $\mathbb{P}_{\tilde{\mathbb{G}}, Y}$ .

The *unlabeled graph Bayes optimal classifier* is given by

$$\tilde{h}_* = \operatorname{argmin}_{\tilde{h} \in \tilde{\mathcal{H}}} \tilde{L}(\tilde{h}), \quad (6)$$

The *unlabeled Bayes risk* is given by

$$\tilde{L}_* = \min_{\tilde{h} \in \tilde{\mathcal{H}}} \tilde{L}(\tilde{h}), \quad (7)$$

where  $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}$  is the set of possible unlabeled graph classifiers and  $\tilde{L}_*$  implicitly depends on  $\mathbb{P}_{\tilde{\mathbb{G}}, Y}$ .

### 3.4 Parametric Classifiers

The three Bayes optimal graph classifiers can be written explicitly in terms of their model parameters:

$$h_*(G) = \operatorname{argmax}_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \theta_{G|y} \pi_y, \quad (8)$$

$$h'_*(G) = \operatorname{argmax}_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \theta'_{G|y} \pi_y, \quad (9)$$

$$\tilde{h}_*(\tilde{G}) = \operatorname{argmax}_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \tilde{\theta}_{\tilde{G}|y} \pi_y. \quad (10)$$

## 4 SHUFFLING CAN DEGRADE OPTIMAL PERFORMANCE

The result of either shuffling or unlabeled a graph can only degrade, but not improve Bayes risk. This is a restatement of the data processing lemma for this scenario. Specifically, [2] shows that the data processing lemma indicates that in the classification domain  $L_X^* \leq L_{T(X)}^*$  for any transformation  $T$  and data  $X$ . In our setting, this becomes:

**Theorem 1.**  $L_* \leq \tilde{L}_* = L'_*$ .

*Proof:* Assume for simplicity  $|\mathcal{Y}| = 2$  and  $\pi_0 = \pi_1 = 1/2$ .

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{L}_* &= \sum_{\tilde{G} \in \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_n} \min_y \tilde{\theta}_{\tilde{G}|y} = \sum_{\tilde{G} \in \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_n} \min_y \sum_{G \in \tilde{G}} \theta'_{G|y} = L'_* \\ &= \sum_{\tilde{G} \in \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_n} \min_y \sum_{G \in \tilde{G}} \theta_{G|y} \geq \sum_{\tilde{G} \in \tilde{\mathcal{G}}_n} \sum_{G \in \tilde{G}} \min_y \theta_{G|y} = L_*. \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

□

An immediate consequence of the above proof is that the inequality in the statement of Theorem 1 strict whenever the inequality in Eq. (11) is strict:

**Theorem 2.**  $L_* < \tilde{L}_* = L'_*$  if and only if there exists  $\tilde{G}$  such that

$$\min_y \tilde{\theta}_{\tilde{G}|y} > \sum_{G \in \tilde{G}} \min_y \theta_{G|y}.$$

The above result demonstrates that even when the labels *do* carry some class-conditional signal, it may be the case that shuffling or unlabeled does not degrade performance. In other words, to state that labels contain information is equivalent to stating that some graphs within an isomorphism set are class-conditionally more likely than others:  $\exists \theta_{G_i|y} \neq \theta_{G_j|y}$  where  $Q(G_i) = G_j$  for some  $G_i, G_j \in \mathcal{G}_n$ ,  $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_n$ , and  $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ . Shuffling has the effect of “flattening” likelihoods within isomorphism sets, from  $\theta_y$  to  $\theta'_y$ , so that  $\theta'_y$  satisfies  $\{\theta'_{G|y} = \tilde{\theta}_{\tilde{G}|y}/|\tilde{G}| \forall G \in \tilde{G}\}$ . But just because the shuffling changes class-conditional likelihoods does *not* mean that Bayes risk must also change. This result follows immediately upon realizing that posteriors can change without classification performance changing. The above results are easily extended to consider non-equal class priors and  $c$ -class classification problems. To see this, ignoring ties, simply replace each minimum likelihood with a sum over all non-maximum posteriors:

$$\min_y \theta_{G|y} \pi_y \mapsto \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}'} \theta_{G|y} \pi_y \text{ where } \mathcal{Y}' = \{y: y \neq \arg\max_y \theta_{G|y}\}.$$

## 5 BAYES OPTIMAL GRAPH INVARIANT CLASSIFICATION AFTER SHUFFLING

A graph invariant on  $\mathcal{G}_n$  is any function  $\psi$  such that  $\psi(G) = \psi(Q(G))$  for all  $G \in \mathcal{G}_n$  and  $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_n$ . A graph invariant classifier is a composition of a classifier with an

invariant function,  $h^\psi = f^\psi \circ \psi$ . The Bayes optimal graph invariant classifier minimizes risk over all invariants:

$$h_*^\psi = \operatorname{argmin}_{\psi \in \Psi, f^\psi \in \mathcal{F}^\psi} \mathbb{E}[f(\psi(\mathbb{G})) \neq Y], \quad (12)$$

where  $\Psi$  is the space of all possible invariants and  $\mathcal{F}^\psi$  is the space of classifiers composable with invariant  $\psi$ . The expectation in Eq. (12) is taken against  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{G}, Y}$  or equivalently  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{Q}(\mathbb{G}), Y}$ , since invariants are invariant. Let  $L_*^\psi$  denote the Bayes invariant risk.

**Theorem 3.**  $\tilde{L}_* = L_*^\psi$ .

*Proof:* Let  $\psi$  indicate in which equivalence set  $G$  resides; that is,  $\psi(G) = \tilde{G}$  if and only if  $G \in \tilde{G}$ . Then

$$h_*^\psi(G) = \operatorname{argmax}_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \tilde{\theta}_{\psi(G)|y} \pi_y = \operatorname{argmax}_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \tilde{\theta}_{\tilde{G}|y} \pi_y = \tilde{h}_*(G). \quad (13)$$

□

## 6 A CONSISTENT AND EFFICIENT UNSHUFFLING CLASSIFIER

Section 4 shows that one cannot fruitfully “unshuffle” graphs: once they have been shuffled by a uniform shuffler, the label information is lost. Section 5 shows that if graphs have been uniformly shuffled, there is a relatively straightforward algorithm for optimal classification. However, that classifier depends on knowing the parameters,  $\tilde{\theta} = \{\tilde{\theta}_y\}_{y \in \mathcal{Y}}$  and  $\pi = \{\pi_y\}_{y \in \mathcal{Y}}$ . Instead we consider the data are sampled identically and independently from some joint distribution.  $(Q_i, \mathbb{G}_i, Y_i) \stackrel{iid}{\sim} \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{Q}, \mathbb{G}, Y}$ . For shuffled graph classification we observe only the *training data*  $\mathcal{T}_s = \{\mathbb{G}'_i, Y_i\}_{i \in [s]}$ , where  $\mathbb{G}'_i = Q_i(\mathbb{G}_i)$ , and are thusly unable to observe useful vertex labels. Moreover,  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{Q}}$  is uniform, so that all label information is both unavailable and irrecoverable. Our task is to utilize training data to induce a classifier  $\hat{h}_s: \mathcal{G}_n \times (\mathcal{G}_n \times \mathcal{Y})^s \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$  that approximates  $\tilde{h}_*$  as closely as possible.

An unlabeled graph Bayes *plugin* classifier estimates the likelihood and prior terms and plugs them in to Eq. (10):

$$\hat{h}_s(\tilde{G}) = \operatorname{argmax}_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \hat{\tilde{\theta}}_{\tilde{G}|y} \hat{\pi}_y. \quad (14)$$

Let  $\hat{L}_s = L(\hat{h}_s)$  be the risk of the induced classifier using maximum likelihood to obtain the plugin estimate for Eq. (14).

**Theorem 4.**  $\hat{L}_s \rightarrow \tilde{L}^*$  as  $s \rightarrow \infty$ .

*Proof:* Because  $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_n$  and  $\mathcal{Y}$  are both finite, their respective maximum likelihood estimates are guaranteed consistent by the law of large numbers. Hence, the unlabeled graph Bayes plugin classifier is also consistent to  $\tilde{L}_*$  [2]. □

## 7 A PRACTICAL APPROACH TO SHUFFLED GRAPH CLASSIFICATION

Although Eq. (14) yields consistency from Theorem 4, utilizing this is practically hopeless as it requires solving  $s$  computationally difficult graph isomorphism problems, and acceptable performance will typically require  $s \gg \tilde{d}_n$ . Specifically, using Eq. (14) requires first enumerating all  $\tilde{d}_n$  isomorphism sets, then determining in which isomorphism set the to-be-classified graph and each of the training graphs reside. There are no known polynomial time solvers for graph isomorphism [?]. This approach is therefore, in general, impractical on two levels: (i) the number of parameters to estimate,  $\tilde{d}_n$ , is too large, and (ii) exact graph isomorphism is too computationally taxing. We therefore consider a modified approach.

A  $k_s$  nearest-neighbor ( $k$ NN) classifier using Frobenius norm is universally consistent to  $L_*$  for labeled graph classification as long as  $k_s \rightarrow \infty$  with  $k_s/s \rightarrow 0$  as  $s \rightarrow \infty$  [3]. This non-parametric approach circumvents the need to estimate  $\tilde{d}_n$  parameters. For shuffled graphs, we use a graph-matched Frobenius norm as the distance function,

$$\delta(G_i, G_j) = \operatorname{argmin}_{Q \in \mathcal{Q}_n} \|Q(G_i) - G_j\|_F^2. \quad (15)$$

Eq. (15) requires solving a graph matching problem, which is NP-hard. Therefore, we instead use an inexact graph matching approach based on the quadratic assignment formulation described in [4], which is only cubic in  $n$ . Note that while the  $k$ NN approach with exact matching maintains universal consistency to  $L'_*$ ,  $k$ NN with inexact graph matching approximation may not be consistent.

The  $k$ NN classifier for shuffled graphs proceeds as follows. First, compute the graph-matched Frobenius norm distance between the test graph  $G$  and all training graphs,  $\{\delta_i = \delta(G, G_i)\}_{i \in [s]}$ . Second, order the graph/class pairs according to their distances,  $\delta_{(1)} \leq \dots \leq \delta_{(s)}$ . Finally, let the estimated class be the plurality class of the  $k_s$  closest graphs; that is,  $\hat{y} = \operatorname{argmax}_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \sum_{i \in [k_s]} \mathbb{I}\{y(i) = y\}$ . Collectively, we refer to this classification strategy as *graph-matched  $k$ NN* (GM- $k$ NN).

Because the number of possible graphs is finite given finite  $n$ , GM- $k$ NN is universally consistent, leading to our final theorem:

**Theorem 5.**  $\hat{L}_{kNN} \rightarrow \tilde{L}^*$  as  $s \rightarrow \infty$ .

The proof follows immediately from the extension of Stone’s proof to the graph domain [?].

## 8 UNLABELED CONNECTOME CLASSIFICATION

A “connectome” is a brain-graph in which vertices correspond to (groups of) neurons, and edges correspond

to connections between them. Diffusion Magnetic Resonance (MR) Imaging and related technologies are making the acquisition of MR connectomes routine [5]. 49 subjects from the Baltimore Longitudinal Study on Aging comprise this data, with acquisition and connectome inference details as reported in [6]. Each connectome yields a 70 vertex simple graph (binary, symmetric, and hollow adjacency matrix). Associated with each graph is class label based on the gender of the individual (24 males, 25 females). Because the vertices are labeled, we can compare the results of having the labels and not having the labels. The performance of a 1NN algorithm is reported in Table 1. When using the vertex labels, a “labeled-1NN” achieves 37% misclassification rate. Chance performance (only using the estimated prior) on this data is 49%. These two numbers provide bounds on performance. We then pass all the graphs through a shuffle channel, and implement GM-1NN using the graph-matched Frobenius norm in Eq. (15). This approach yields 41% misclassification rate, slightly worse than the labeled graph case. Finally, we compare the performance of our graph-matched 1NN algorithm with a more “standard” graph-invariant based algorithm, referred to as  $\phi(G)$ -1NN. In particular, we compute the following 4 graph invariants for each graph: size, max-degree, a greedy approximation to maximum-average-degree, and scan-statistic (see [8] for details). Thus, we obtain a  $4 \times 49$  element matrix. We linearly squash each row such that all the elements are in  $(0, 1)$ . Then, we implement a 1NN classifier on this representation of the data, using the Euclidean norm as the distance. This results in 43% misclassification rate, slightly worse than the performance of our graph-matched 1NN.

TABLE 1: MR Connectome Leave-One-Out Misclassification Rates. Labeled-1NN refers to the 1NN classifier using Frobenius norm distance on the labeled graph adjacency matrices. GM- $k$ NN refers to the graph-matched Frobenius norm  $k$ NN on the shuffled graphs.  $\phi(G)$ -1NN refers to using the Euclidean norm distance  $k$ NN on the four graph-invariants described in the main text.

labeled-1NN	GM-1NN	$\phi(G)$ -1NN	chance
37%	41%	43%	49%

## 9 DISCUSSION

In this work, we have address both the theoretical and practical limitations of classifying graphs with and without vertex labels. Specifically, we show that shuffling the vertex labels results in an irretrievable situation, with a possible degradation of classification performance (Theorem 1), though not necessarily, even if the vertex labels contained class-conditional signal (Theorem 2). Moreover, although one cannot hope to recover the vertex labels, one can obtain a Bayes optimal classifier by solving a large number of graph isomorphism problems

(Theorem 3). When the distribution is unavailable, one can induce a consistent and efficient “unshuffling” classifier by using a graph-matching strategy (Theorem 4). Unfortunately, this is intractable in practice due to the difficulty of graph matching and the large number of isomorphism sets. Instead, we propose a graph-matched  $k$ NN classifier, which is also proven to be universally consistent (Theorem 5). Applying this  $k$ NN classifier to a problem of considerable scientific interest—classifying human MR connectomes—we find that even with a relatively small sample ( $s = 49$ ), the graph-matched  $k$ NN algorithm performs nearly as well as the  $k$ NN algorithm *using* vertex labels, and slightly better than a  $k$ NN algorithm applied to a set of graph invariants proposed previously. Thus, this theoretical insight has led to improved practical classification performance. Extensions to weighted or (certain) attributed graphs are trivial.

PLACE  
PHOTO  
HERE

**Carey E. Priebe** Buddha in training.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

## REFERENCES

- [1] “The On-Line Encyclopedia of Integer Sequences — A000088.” [Online]. Available: <http://oeis.org/A000088>
- [2] L. Devroye, L. Györfi, and G. Lugosi, *A probabilistic theory of pattern recognition*. New York: Springer-Verlag, 1996.
- [3] J. T. Vogelstein, R. J. Vogelstein, and C. E. Priebe, “Are mental properties supervenient on brain properties?” p. 11. [Online]. Available: <http://arxiv.org/abs/0912.1672>
- [4] J. T. Vogelstein, J. C. Conroy, L. J. Podrazik, S. G. Kratzer, R. J. Vogelstein, and C. E. Priebe, “A Quadratic Assignment Problem Approach to Graph Matching: Applications in Statistical Connectomics,” *Submitted for publication*, 2011.
- [5] P. Hagmann, L. Cammoun, X. Gigandet, S. Gerhard, P. Ellen Grant, V. Wedeen, R. Meuli, J. P. Thiran, C. J. Honey, and O. Sporns, “MR connectomics: Principles and challenges,” *J Neurosci Methods*, vol. 194, no. 1, pp. 34–45, 2010. [Online]. Available: [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=20096730](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=20096730)
- [6] W. R. Gray, J. T. Vogelstein, and R. J. Vogelstein, “Mr. Cap,” *Submitted for publication*, 2011.
- [7] C. J. Stone, “Consistent Nonparametric Regression,” *The Annals of Statistics*, vol. 5, no. 4, pp. 595–620, Jul. 1977. [Online]. Available: <http://projecteuclid.org/euclid.aos/1176343886>
- [8] H. Pao, G. Coppersmith, and C. Priebe, “Statistical inference on random graphs: Comparative power analyses via Monte Carlo,” *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, pp. 1–22, 2010. [Online]. Available: <http://pubs.amstat.org/doi/abs/10.1198/jcgs.2010.09004>
- [9] K. Crammer, M. Dredze, and F. Pereira, “Exact Convex Confidence-Weighted Learning,” *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, vol. 99, no. 5, pp. 1–8, 2008. [Online]. Available: <http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0047259X07000784>

PLACE  
PHOTO  
HERE

**Joshua T. Vogelstein** is a spritely young man, engorged in a novel post-buddhist metaphor.