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## Overview

1. Brief mathematical introduction
2. Theoretical observations and conjectures
3. Application Domains
a. Basketball (with ML)
b. Space with NASA


A simple graph


A dynamic graph

## Definition: Dynamic Graph

Dynamic graph $\mathcal{G}=\left(G_{t}\right)_{t \in \mathbb{T}}$ where

1. totally ordered indexing set $\mathbb{T}$
2. fixed finite vertex set $V$
3. edge set sequence $\left(E_{t} \subseteq V \times V\right)_{t \in \mathbb{T}}$
4. $G_{t}=\left(V, E_{t}\right)$

## Dynamic Graphs

are Everywhere

- Commute networks
- Animal interaction networks
- Opinion dynamics
- Cell-cell signaling
- Social networks
- Satellite communication networks
- Basketball, sports
- Bird flocking



## NYC Metro Area Commute Network

Dabke, Karntikoon, Aluru, Singh, Chazelle. Network-augmented compartmental models to track asymp. disease spread. (pre-print)


## Transit Networks (GTFS)

Dabke, Green. Analyzing transit networks with ideal routing machines. (pre-print)

Animal herding networks
Dorabiala, Dabke, et al. Spatiotemporal k-means. (pre-print)


Embryos: spatial and chemical connectivity

## Basketball

Dabke, Chazelle. Extracting semantic information from dynamic graphs of geometric data.
Dabke, Taylor. Play classification in basketball networks. (internal publication; pre-print)

## CLASSIFIED

NASA: Satellites


## NASA: Satellites

Cleveland, Dabke, et al. Introducing tropical geometric approaches to delay tolerant networking optimization.
Hylton, Dabke, et al. A survey of mathematical structures for lunar networks.

## Some Problems

## Problem

Local $\neq$ Global


The alternating cycle: a discrete-time sequence


Dynamical system: move one edge at each time step


Fact: max diameter is number of vertices (if connected)







Dynamically disconnected


Idea: time-expanded graph



Observation: disconnected => dynamically disconnected?


This one?


Disconnected again


Time-expanded fixed cycle

$t=1,2,3,4, \ldots$



$$
t=2
$$



$$
00
$$



Problem
$\boldsymbol{v}=\mathbf{n} * \mathrm{t}$

too many nodes


## Many Problems Don’t "Just Work"

- Can we relate static and dynamic properties?
- How do we recover classical algorithms?
- Is there an efficient way to do all this?


## Two Orthogonal Dichotomies

## Length

finite vs. infinite

Discretization
discrete-time vs. continuous-time

## Three Results

I. Define dynamic analogs of static properties and relate them [2]
II. Graph summarization: make representations more efficient [1]
III. Connect to algebraic topology [1, 2]

1. Cleveland, Dabke, et al. Introducing tropical geometric approaches to delay tolerant networking optimization.
2. Hylton, Dabke, et al. A survey of mathematical structures for lunar networks.

Dynamic
Connectivity

Fourneys are Dynamic Paths



$$
t=2
$$
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00
$$



## Definition: Dynamic Diameter

- discrete-time (infinite or finite)
- defined at each timestep
- it's a sequence, not a number
- max of
- shortest journey between all vertex pairs


## Definition: Dynamically Connected

- Connected if diameter is always finite
- Uniformly connected if bounded


## Proposition (We Didn’t Mess Up I)

If at any time a vertex has no outbound edges, the graph is dynamically disconnected.

## Proposition (We Didn’t Mess Up II)

For a fixed dynamic sequence: diameter equals that of base graph.



$$
t=2
$$



$$
00
$$



## Ouestion

When does static imply dynamic?

## Result: Self-Loops are Sufficient

Static connectivity implies dynamic connectivity if self-loops.

Other notes:

- Stronger (but more technical): weak monotonicity is sufficient.
- Uniform bound: number of vertices




$$
\because \bullet
$$

$$
\bullet 0
$$




Recall






Dynamic diameter is $\infty$

Fixed with Self-Loops
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\bullet 0
$$



$$
0
$$




## Dynamic diameter is finite

Bound Achieved





## Observation

 Finding Conditions is Difficult
## Idea

Stochastic Case

## Observation: Force Edges to Move

- A particle can get pathologically "stuck"
- Require edges to change around
- Ensure that each possible edge appears infinitely often?


## Model: Dynamic Erdős-Rényi

- Fix edge probability $p \in(0,1)$
- At every time step for every edge, flip a (biased) coin:
- If heads, put the edge in
- Otherwise, leave the edge out
- Note: edges across time are i.i.d. Bernoulli


## Observation

Independence
does not work

## Proof: Independence => Disconnected

For each vertex at each timestep: probability of no outbound edges is $(1-p)^{n}$, which is non-zero.

## However ...

- Tweak: reflip all coins for a vertex if it has no outbound edges
- Lose independence (a bit subtle)
- Based on simulations, conjecture: diameter is
- constant if p constant
- $\log n$ if $p$ is $(\log n) / n$


## Observation

Self-loops are overpowered

## Model: Dynamic Erdős-Rényi with Self-Loops

- Put in all self-loops
- Generate other edges ( $u, v$ ) where $u \neq v$
- Fix edge probability $\mathrm{p}_{\mathrm{u}, \mathrm{v}} \in(0,1)$
- At every time step, flip a (biased) coin:
- if heads, put in edge
- otherwise, no edge


## Proposition: Almost Surely Connected

1. Observation: every edge occurs infinitely often
2. By weak monotonicity, almost surely connected
3. Once connected, can never disconnect
4. Based on simulations, conjecture: diameter is
a. constant if $p$ constant
b. $\quad \log n$ if $p$ is $(\log n) / n$

## Remaining Work

1. More rigorous treatment of non-self-loop case
2. Proof of proposed bounds
3. Additional models

## Three Results

†. Define dynamic analegs ofstatic properties and relate them
II. Graph summarization: make representations more efficient
III. Connect to algebraic topology

## Graph

Summarization

## Idea

$\boldsymbol{v}=\mathrm{n} * \mathrm{t}$ is bad n is okay

## Conversion



## Strategies: Depends on Context

- Idea: each edge has time-based weight function
- Weight can represent
- Capacity
- Traversal time
- Traversal speed
- Bandwidth
- etc.
- Inspired by centrality, take some "summary" of these functions


## Shortest Path/Journey Participation

how often an edge appear in shortest paths or journeys

## ex 1: Instant Path Summarization

1. Each edge has a (possibly infinite) cost as a function of time
2. Frozen in time, each path has a cost
3. Frozen in time, we can pick optimal paths if
a. they have finite cost AND
b. they have least cost

## ex 1: Path Participation Function

$$
\begin{gathered}
\omega(P)=\lim _{\tau \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\tau} \int_{0}^{\tau} \mathbf{1}_{P}(t) \mathrm{d} t \\
\bar{\omega}(e)=\sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}: e \in P} \omega(P)
\end{gathered}
$$

## ex 1. Weighted Static Graph

1. Started with: graph with time-dependent edge weight cost function
2. Ended with: graph with static edge weights
a. Related to edge centrality measures
3. We can perform further analysis
a. Katz centrality, etc.

## ex 2. Traversal-Time Journey Summarization

1. Each edge has a (possibly infinite) traversal time as function of time a. If you start at time $t$, you will take $w(t)$ units of time to traverse
2. Compute shortest journeys
3. Compute shortest-path participation for edges

## ex 2. Traversal Time

$$
\nu_{e}(t)=\frac{1}{w_{e}(t)}
$$

The velocity across an edge

$$
\operatorname{tcs}^{s}(e)=\left\{x: \int_{s}^{x} \nu_{e}(t) \mathrm{d} t \geq 1\right\}
$$

The traversal completion set: at what time will we be done?

$$
\operatorname{tt}^{s}(e)=\inf \left\{\operatorname{tcs}^{s}(e)\right\}-s
$$

The traversal time: how long does it take to traverse the edge?

## ex 2. Path Length



## ex 2. Path Length



## ex 2. Path Length



## ex 2. Path Length



## ex 2. Path Length

## ex 2. Path Length

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{tt}^{s}(P)_{1} & =\mathrm{tt}^{s}\left(e_{1}\right) \\
\operatorname{tet}^{s}(P)_{1} & =\mathrm{tet}^{s}\left(e_{1}\right) \\
\mathrm{tt}^{s}(P)_{2} & =\mathrm{tt}^{\mathrm{tet}^{s}(P)_{1}}\left(e_{2}\right) \\
\operatorname{tet}^{s}(P)_{2} & =\operatorname{tet}^{s}(P)_{1}+\mathrm{tt}^{s}(P)_{2} \\
& \vdots \\
\mathrm{tt}^{s}(P)_{k} & =\mathrm{tt}^{\mathrm{tet}^{s}(P)_{k-1}}\left(e_{k}\right) \\
\operatorname{tet}^{s}(P)_{k} & =\operatorname{tet}^{s}(P)_{k-1}+\mathrm{tt}^{s}(P)_{k}
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\mathrm{tt}^{s}(P)=\mathrm{tt}^{s}(P)_{k}
$$

The path traversal time: how long does it take to traverse a path starting at time s?

## ex 2. Final Step

1. We can define shortest paths at each time step if
a. they have finite traversal time
b. they have least traversal time
2. Then compute path participation as before

## Summarization

Pros

- Do expensive computation upfront
- Compressed representation
- Extract relevant and meaningful information for application
- Creates a static graph, which we know more about than dynamic ones


## Cons

- Inherently lossy
- Potentially expensive to compute
- Very specific to application
- Numerical issues


## Extensions

1. Introduce additional summarization methods
2. Create a general (categorical?) framework for:
a. Defining edge functions
b. Summarization methods
c. Analysis of summary graphs

## Three Results

1. Define dynamic analogs of static properties and relate them
H. Graph summarization: make representations more efficient
III. Connect to algebraic topology

Algebraic Topology

## Three Results

1. Define dynamic analogs of static properties and relate them
H. Graph summarization: make representations more efficient
II. Connect to algebraic topology

## 3y Applications Abound

## Dynamic Graph Projects

1. Viral spread across connected populations
a. Rumors
b. COVID-19
2. Basketball
a. Using TDA
b. Using ML
3. Space!
a. Contact graph routing
b. Tropical geometry
4. Others: animal clustering, transit, embryos, opinion dynamics

## $\ldots$ Machine Learning



Duke v. UNC (booooo!)
Multi-agent system (invasion sport)


Raw Trajectory Data

## Dataset

- ( $x, y$ )-coordinates of offense, defense, basketball
- 25 frames per second (40ms per frame)


## Model Goals

1. Formation discovery: a semantic understanding of the functional roles of players
2. Compression and dimension reduction: an efficient representation of a game, as player trajectory data is large and difficult to interpret
3. Predictive power: a mechanism for predicting trajectories of players
4. Synthetic generation: a tool for creating synthetic, but "realistic," data

## Prior Work

1. Trajectory Prediction: related to predictive power and synthetic generation
2. Role Discovery: related to formation discovery
3. Network Analysis: related to high compression and dimension reduction


Model Pipeline


Step 1: Dynamic Passing Network

## Observation

218 Graphs to Isomorphism

## Step 2: Networks to Labels

1. Compute library of graphs seen in data
2. Assign each a unique label (frequency-based?)
3. Convert networks to labels


Passing Graphy Library

## Interlude: Jump Markov

$$
X(t)=E_{N(t)}
$$

## Interlude: Jump Markov

$$
X(t)=E_{N(t)}
$$

continuous-time jump
Markov process

## Interlude: Jump Markov

$$
X(t)=E_{N(t)}
$$

Poisson counting process

## Interlude: Jump Markov

discrete-time Markov
chain

$$
X(t)=E_{N(t)}
$$

## Interlude: Jump Markov

$$
X(t)=E_{N(t)}
$$

## Idea: Semantic "Extraction"

1. Take library of passing graphs as tokens
2. Use NLP model to learn as a "language"
3. Good model: Transformer


## Transformer Architecture

## Experiment

- 40-10 prediction task
- Feed in graph data, along with base position data
- Predict trajectories
- Compare against true trajectories with MSE


## 66\%

reduction in loss against benchmark (40-10 trajectory prediction task)

2 Space


Satellites


More Satellites


Even More Satellites

## Contact Graph Routing

1. Satellites, ground stations, etc. moving in space
a. Data tells us when two will make "contact" with each other
b. Format is a "contact graph"
c. Graph is dynamic and periodic (idealized)
2. Task: route information across network
a. High latency
b. Changing bandwidth + speed
c. Low storage
d. High error rate

## Current Approach

Send information in packets and repeat 10 times based on known orbit schedule.

Goal
Can we do better?

## Defining "Better"

1. Increase bandwidth (worst case is 2 kbps )
2. Decrease latency (limited by speed of light)
a. 1.3 seconds to Moon
b. $\sim 25$ minutes to Mars
c. 5.5 hours to Pluto
3. Decrease error rate
4. Add features
a. Packet prioritization
b. Broadcasting

## Defining "Better"

1. Increase bandwidth (worst case is 2 kbps )
2. Decrease latency (limited by speed of light)
a. 1.3 seconds to Moon
b. $\sim 25$ minutes to Mars
c. 5.5 hours to Pluto
3. Decrease error rate
4. Add features
a. Packet prioritization
b. Broadcasting

## Generalization of Jowsig

1. Start with weighted digraph
2. Perform Dijkstra's repeatedly
3. Generate shortest path trees
4. Repeat until we reach fixed point

Future Work

## Theory

1. Further extensions of static properties and their relationship to their dynamic counterparts
2. Analysis of the stochastic setting
3. General framework for summarization
4. Clustering (spatiotemporal $k$-means)
5. Generalized optimal routing
6. Periodic systems

## Applications

1. Animal herding behavior
2. General Transit Feed Specification (GTFS)
3. Twitter data
4. Additional satellite data


THE BEST THESIS DEFENSE IS A GOOD THESIS OFFENSE.
In conclusion ...
https://xkcd.com/1403/
(3) Q\&A ©

