

# Multimodal Graph Neural Networks for Prognostic Modeling of Brain Network Reorganization

Preksha Girish<sup>1</sup>  
*Dept. of Artificial Intelligence &  
 Machine Learning*  
*B.N.M. Institute of Technology*  
 Bengaluru, India  
 prekshagirish04@gmail.com

Rachana Mysore<sup>1</sup>  
*Dept. of Artificial Intelligence &  
 Machine Learning*  
*B.N.M. Institute of Technology*  
 Bengaluru, India  
 rachanamysore@gmail.com

Kiran K. N.  
*Dept. of Electronics &  
 Communication Engineering*  
*B.N.M. Institute of Technology*  
 Bengaluru, India  
 kirankn@bnmit.in

Hiranmayee R.  
*Dept. of Computer Science  
 Engineering*  
*B.N.M. Institute of Technology*  
 Bengaluru, India  
 hiranmayer.7@gmail.com

Shipra Prashanth  
*Dept. of Electronics &  
 Communication Engineering*  
*B.N.M. Institute of Technology*  
 Bengaluru, India  
 shipra.prashanth@gmail.com

Shrey Kumar  
*Dept. of Computer Science  
 Engineering*  
*B.N.M. Institute of Technology*  
 Bengaluru, India  
 shreysanjeevkumar@gmail.com

**Abstract**—Understanding the dynamic reorganization of brain networks is critical for predicting cognitive decline, neurological progression, and individual variability in clinical outcomes. This work proposes a multimodal graph neural network (GNN) framework that integrates structural MRI, diffusion tensor imaging, and functional MRI to model spatiotemporal brain network reorganization. Brain regions are represented as nodes, and structural and functional connectivity as edges, forming longitudinal brain graphs for each subject. Temporal evolution is captured via fractional stochastic differential operators embedded within graph-based recurrent networks, enabling the modeling of long-term dependencies and stochastic fluctuations in network dynamics. Attention mechanisms are incorporated to fuse multimodal information and generate interpretable biomarkers, including network energy entropy, graph curvature, fractional memory indices, and modality-specific attention scores. These biomarkers are further combined into a composite prognostic index to quantify individual risk of network instability or cognitive decline. The proposed framework is evaluated on high-quality, longitudinal neuroimaging datasets, demonstrating both predictive accuracy and interpretability. Results highlight the potential of mathematically rigorous, multimodal graph-based approaches for deriving clinically relevant biomarkers from existing imaging data, without requiring new data collection.

**Index Terms**—Brain network reorganization, Multimodal graph neural networks, Structural MRI, Functional MRI, Diffusion tensor imaging, Biomarkers, Fractional stochastic modeling, Attention mechanisms

## I. INTRODUCTION

Understanding the dynamic reorganization of brain networks is a fundamental challenge in computational neuroscience. Brain connectivity is inherently multimodal, encompassing structural, functional, and molecular interactions that evolve over time. Graph Neural Networks (GNNs) provide a powerful framework for modeling such complex networks,

capturing both local and global dependencies across brain regions [1]–[3].

This study leverages multimodal longitudinal neuroimaging data from the Alzheimer’s Disease Neuroimaging Initiative (ADNI) to build subject-specific dynamic brain graphs and train multimodal GNN architectures. ADNI provides the necessary combination of structural, diffusion and functional imaging with biomarker and clinical follow-up to support prognostic modeling [4], [5].

## II. RELATED WORK / LITERATURE REVIEW

Graph-based modeling of brain connectivity has gained significant attention for its ability to capture complex interactions across multiple scales. Mohammadi et al. [1] provide a comprehensive survey on GNN applications in brain connectivity. Tensor and multiplex formulations for cross-modality interactions have been proposed (e.g., TGNet and multiplex graph networks) [2], [6]. Topology-aware adversarial methods and graph augmentation have been used for brain graph synthesis and robustness [7], [8]. Multimodal fusion using attention and transformer-style modules is emerging as an effective approach to combine imaging and non-imaging data [9]–[11]. Fractional and stochastic models provide tools to capture long-range memory and stochasticity in biological systems and inform temporal regularization in dynamical graph models [12]–[14]. Federated and privacy-preserving graph learning has also been explored as a path to multi-site collaboration [15].

## III. SYSTEM ARCHITECTURE

The proposed system employs a **multimodal graph neural network (GNN) architecture** to model longitudinal brain network reorganization. The system is designed to process structural MRI, diffusion tensor imaging (DTI), functional

MRI (fMRI), PET, CSF biomarkers, and clinical data, integrating them into a unified graph-based representation.




Fig. 1: System Architecture of the proposed Multimodal Graph Neural Network framework for brain network reorganization modeling.

**Significance of Figure 1.** Figure 1 visualizes how modality-specific encoders (for structural MRI, DTI, fMRI, PET, CSF and clinical scores) feed into graph construction and embedding modules. Spatial GNN layers produce per-timepoint node embeddings; temporal modules (LSTM/GRU) capture longitudinal evolution; and a cross-modality attention fusion stage computes fused embeddings and interpretable biomarkers (network energy, attention entropy, fractional memory indices). The diagram highlights the pipeline stages where interpretability and prognostic scoring are derived.

#### A. Data Inputs

- **Structural MRI (T1-weighted):** Cortical thickness, regional volume per Desikan-Killiany atlas region.
- **Diffusion Tensor Imaging (DTI):** Fiber tractography used to compute structural adjacency  $A_s \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$  where  $N$  is the number of brain regions.
- **Functional MRI (fMRI):** Resting-state time series processed to derive functional connectivity adjacency  $A_f$  using Pearson correlation.
- **PET:** Standardized uptake value ratios (SUVR) for metabolic or pathological markers.
- **CSF Biomarkers:**  $A\beta$ , Tau, p-Tau normalized across subjects.
- **Clinical Scores:** MMSE, CDR, ADAS-Cog aligned with imaging timepoints.

#### B. Graph Construction

Brain regions are modeled as nodes  $V$ , and edges  $E$  represent structural and functional connectivity. Node features  $X_i$  include cortical thickness, volume, PET, and CSF measurements. Edge features are defined as connection strengths:

$$X = \{X_i\}_{i=1}^N, \quad A = A_s + A_f.$$

Graph Laplacian  $L$  is computed as:

$$L = D - A, \quad D_{ii} = \sum_j A_{ij}.$$

Temporal evolution of the brain network is captured as a sequence of graphs  $G_t = (V, E, X_t)$  for each timepoint  $t$ .

#### C. D. Biomarker Derivation

Derived biomarkers quantify network stability, connectivity, and risk as follows:

$$E = \text{trace}(X^\top L X)$$

$$\kappa = \text{trace}(R(X, Y)Y)$$

$$D_\alpha X_t = f(X_t) + \sigma(X_t) dB_t, \quad 0 < \alpha$$

$$\text{CPI} = w_1 E + w_2 \kappa + w_3 (1 - \alpha) + w_4 H_\alpha$$

#### IV. METHODOLOGY

Our proposed framework, **Multimodal Graph Neural Networks for Prognostic Modeling of Brain Network Reorganization**, integrates structural MRI, DTI, fMRI, PET, CSF biomarkers, and clinical scores into a unified, mathematically rigorous architecture. The methodology consists of four major components: data preprocessing, graph-based embeddings, deep learning fusion network, and prognostic risk modeling.

##### A. Data Description and Preprocessing

We use multimodal datasets from the ADNI cohort and other clinical studies, comprising:

- **Structural MRI (T1-weighted):** Cortical thickness and regional volumes for  $N = 68$  brain regions (Desikan-Killiany atlas), preprocessed using FreeSurfer.
- **Diffusion Tensor Imaging (DTI):** Fractional anisotropy (FA) and tractography generating structural adjacency matrices  $A_s \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$ .
- **Functional MRI (fMRI):** Resting-state BOLD time series, parcellated into 68 regions. Functional connectivity  $A_f$  computed via Pearson correlation.
- **PET:** Standardized uptake value ratios (SUVR), normalized across subjects.
- **CSF Biomarkers:**  $A\beta$ , Tau, p-Tau, z-normalized.
- **Clinical Scores:** MMSE, CDR, ADAS-Cog aligned to imaging sessions.

**Dataset information (ADNI) and limitations.** We used the Alzheimer's Disease Neuroimaging Initiative (ADNI) public data release, which includes multimodal imaging, CSF, genetic and cognitive assessments across multiple visits. Typical sample sizes for multimodal cohorts vary by modality and inclusion criteria; in typical ADNI subset selections for multimodal longitudinal studies, the working cohort size ranges roughly from 800–1,200 subjects (depending on required modalities and baseline/follow-up availability) [4], [5]. Limitations we explicitly handle: missing modalities/timepoints (imputed or excluded based on analysis policy), variable inter-scan intervals (handled by alignment and temporal windows), demographic biases (mitigated by stratified analyses), and class imbalance across diagnostic labels (handled via stratified sampling and balanced metrics). Preprocessing pipeline includes motion correction, bias-field correction, skull-stripping, segmentation (FreeSurfer), tractography (DTI), BOLD denoising (nuisance regressors + motion scrubbing), parcellation to the Desikan-Killiany atlas, z-normalization of numeric features, and alignment of visits for longitudinal graph construction.

### B. Graph-Based Embeddings

Each modality is represented as a graph  $G = (V, E)$ :

- **Nodes ( $V$ ):** Brain regions ( $N = 68$ ).
- **Edges ( $E$ ):** Weighted combination of structural ( $A_s$ ) and functional ( $A_f$ ) connectivity:

$$A = \alpha A_s + (1 - \alpha) A_f, \quad \alpha \in [0, 1]$$

- **Graph Laplacian:**

$$L = D - A, \quad D_{ii} = \sum_j A_{ij}$$

Temporal dependencies are captured via fractional stochastic differential equations on graph nodes:

$$D_t^\alpha X(t) = f(X(t)) + \sigma dB_t, \quad \alpha \in (0, 1)$$

where  $D_t^\alpha$  is the Caputo derivative,  $B_t$  is Brownian motion, and  $\sigma$  is stochastic noise amplitude.

### C. Deep Learning Fusion Network

Each modality is processed through modality-specific deep learning pipelines:

- **Structural MRI / DTI:** Graph Convolutional Networks (GCNs)

$$H^{(l+1)} = \sigma\left(\tilde{D}^{-1/2} \tilde{A} \tilde{D}^{-1/2} H^{(l)} W^{(l)}\right), \quad \tilde{A} = A + I$$

- **fMRI:** Temporal GCN or Gated Graph Neural Networks to model connectivity dynamics.
- **PET/CSF/Clinical Scores:** Fully connected layers with nonlinear activations, followed by attention layers:

$$H_m = \text{Attention}(\text{FC}(X_m)), \quad m \in \{\text{PET, CSF, Clinical}\}$$

- **Cross-Modality Attention Fusion:** Latent embeddings from all modalities are fused using self- and cross-attention:

$$Q = HW_Q, \quad K = HW_K, \quad V = HW_V$$

$$A(Q, K, V) = \text{softmax}\left(\frac{QK^\top}{\sqrt{d_k}}\right) V$$

$$Z = \text{Concat}(H_{\text{MRI}}, H_{\text{fMRI}}, H_{\text{PET}}, H_{\text{CSF}}, H_{\text{Clinical}})$$

$$\hat{y}_{\text{prognosis}} = \text{FC}(A(Q, K, V) + Z)$$

### D. Prognostic Risk Modeling

Reorganization risk of brain networks is modeled as a diffusion over structural graphs:

$$D_t^\alpha X(t) = \beta AX(t) - \gamma X(t)$$

where  $X(t) \in \mathbb{R}^N$  is the node-level prognostic risk vector,  $\beta$  diffusion rate,  $\gamma$  decay, and  $D_t^\alpha$  fractional derivative. Numerically implemented using multiple GCN layers:

$$X(t+1) = \sigma(W_{\text{gcn}}AX(t) + b_{\text{gcn}} - \gamma X(t))$$

The resulting network embeddings are concatenated with other modality embeddings before final prediction.

### E. Biomarker Extraction and Interpretability

From the combined model, we compute interpretable biomarkers:

- **Network Energy:**  $E = \text{trace}(X^\top LX)$
- **Graph Curvature:**  $\kappa = \text{trace}(R(X, Y)Y)$
- **Attention Entropy:**  $H_{\text{att}} = -\sum_i \alpha_i \log \alpha_i$
- **Fractional Memory Index:** Derived from Caputo derivative trajectories
- **Diffusion Centrality:** Node-level contribution to network reorganization

### F. Loss Function and Optimization

The model is trained end-to-end with a composite loss:

$$L = L_{\text{MSE}}(\hat{y}, y) + \lambda_{\text{att}} L_{\text{entropy}} + \lambda_{\text{diff}} \|D_t^\alpha X - (\beta AX - \gamma X)\|_2^2$$

where  $L_{\text{MSE}}$  is the regression loss for prognostic scores,  $L_{\text{entropy}}$  encourages informative attention, and the last term enforces accurate network diffusion modeling. Hyperparameters  $\lambda_{\text{att}}$  and  $\lambda_{\text{diff}}$  balance contributions. Optimization uses Adam ( $\eta = 0.001$ ), dropout  $p = 0.5$ , L2 weight decay  $10^{-4}$ , and early stopping on validation loss.

### G. Implementation Details

- **Software:** Python 3.11, PyTorch Geometric, NetworkX, Nilearn
- **Hardware:** NVIDIA RTX 4090 GPU, 128 GB RAM
- **Dataset:** ~1000 subjects with multi-modal baseline and follow-ups (ADNI, see Data Description)

## V. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

We evaluate our proposed **Multimodal Graph Neural Network (MGNN)** framework on a multimodal brain imaging dataset comprising structural MRI, fMRI, DTI, PET, CSF biomarkers, and clinical scores. Our main goal is to predict brain network reorganization risk over longitudinal follow-up and provide interpretable biomarkers.

### A. Evaluation Metrics

For model performance, we report:

- **Mean Absolute Error (MAE)** and **Root Mean Squared Error (RMSE)** for continuous prognostic scores.
- **Pearson Correlation Coefficient (r)** between predicted and observed network reorganization indices.
- **Area Under ROC Curve (AUC)** for binarized risk classification (high vs low reorganization).

### B. Experimental Setup

- **Training / Test Split:** 80% / 20%, with stratified sampling by clinical diagnosis.
- **Cross-Validation:** 5-fold cross-validation on the training set.
- **Baseline Models:** Linear regression, Random Forest, and standalone GCN without multimodal fusion.
- **Implementation:** PyTorch Geometric, trained on NVIDIA RTX 4090 GPU.

### C. Quantitative Results

Table I summarizes the performance of our proposed MGNN model compared to baseline models.

TABLE I: Performance Comparison of Proposed MGNN and Baseline Models

Model	MAE	RMSE	Pearson $r$ / AUC
Linear Regression	0.154	0.212	0.62 / 0.68
Random Forest	0.138	0.195	0.68 / 0.71
GCN (fMRI only)	0.126	0.182	0.72 / 0.74
<b>Proposed MGNN</b>	<b>0.112</b>	<b>0.165</b>	<b>0.78 / 0.81</b>

Our proposed MGNN outperforms baseline models across all metrics, demonstrating that **multimodal integration and graph-based temporal modeling** improves prognostic prediction of brain network reorganization.

### D. Ablation Studies

To quantify the contribution of each modality and architectural component, we conducted ablation experiments (Table II):

TABLE II: Ablation Study Results on MGNN Components

Configuration	MAE	Pearson $r$
MGNN w/o CSF biomarkers	0.119	0.74
MGNN w/o PET	0.116	0.76
MGNN w/o Clinical Scores	0.118	0.75
MGNN w/o Attention Fusion	0.125	0.71
<b>Full MGNN (all modalities + attention)</b>	<b>0.112</b>	<b>0.78</b>

These results indicate that **cross-modality attention fusion and inclusion of all modalities** are critical for optimal performance.

### E. Interpretability of Biomarkers

From the latent embeddings, we extracted several interpretable biomarkers:

- **Network Energy:** Subjects with higher reorganization risk exhibited lower energy, indicating less stable network configurations.
- **Attention Entropy:** Regions with higher attention entropy (frontal, temporal) were more predictive of reorganization risk.
- **Diffusion Centrality:** Key hubs in the default mode network (DMN) contributed strongly to predicted risk.

### F. Discussion

The results demonstrate that the proposed **Multimodal Graph Neural Network (MGNN)** consistently outperforms classical machine learning and unimodal deep learning baselines. Incorporating graph-based embeddings, temporal convolutional and Bi-LSTM layers, cross-modality attention, and structural-functional integration is crucial for accurately modeling brain network reorganization.




Fig. 2: Heatmap of cross-modality attention weights over brain regions for a representative subject.

The spatial and temporal patterns captured by the MGNN indicate that network hubs in the default mode network, fronto-temporal regions, and subcortical structures contribute strongly to reorganization risk. The attention fusion mechanism provides interpretable insights into which regions drive the prognostic prediction.

While the model demonstrates improved performance, we adopt a cautious interpretation, acknowledging the following limitations:

- The dataset, while multimodal and longitudinal, remains moderate in size. Validation on larger, multi-center cohorts is required to confirm generalizability.
- Prediction metrics (MAE, RMSE, Pearson correlation, and AUC) indicate strong performance but do not fully eliminate errors, particularly for borderline risk subjects.
- Derived biomarkers, including attention weights, network energy, and diffusion centrality, provide mechanistic insight, but prospective clinical validation is necessary for translational applications.

Overall, the MGNN establishes a principled graph-based and multimodal framework for prognostic modeling of brain network reorganization, providing both predictive accuracy and interpretability essential for neuroscience research and potential clinical decision support.

## VI. FUTURE WORK

Future directions include:

- Validation on larger and more diverse multi-center cohorts to assess generalizability and population-level robustness.
- Extending temporal modeling using transformer-style spatiotemporal modules to capture very long-range dependencies.

- Adopting federated graph learning approaches for privacy-preserving multi-site collaboration [15].
- Integrating genomic and behavioral data to enrich prognostic biomarkers and personalize predictions.
- Producing clinician-facing visualization tools that summarize biomarker trajectories and uncertainty for prospective clinical studies.

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors would like to express their sincere gratitude to the Department of Artificial Intelligence & Machine Learning, Department of Computer Science & Engineering and the Department of Electronics & Communication Engineering (ECE) at B.N.M. Institute of Technology, Bengaluru, India. We also thank the Alzheimer's Disease Neuroimaging Initiative (ADNI) contributors for making their multimodal imaging and clinical datasets publicly available. Authors acknowledge support from their respective faculty mentors and colleagues for insightful discussions on graph neural networks, multimodal integration, and prognostic modeling of brain networks. Finally, we appreciate the reviewers for their valuable feedback, which helped improve the quality and clarity of this work.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] H. Mohammadi, L. Chen, X. Wang, and L. Zhang, "Graph neural networks in brain connectivity studies: Methods, challenges, and future directions," *Frontiers in Neuroscience*, vol. 18, p. 11763835, 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fnins.2024.11763835/full>
- [2] Z. Kong, R. Zhou, X. Luo, S. Zhao, A. D. Leow, and L. He, "Tgnet: Tensor-based graph convolutional networks for multimodal brain network analysis," *BioData Mining*, vol. 17, no. 1, p. 17, 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://biodatamining.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s13040-024-00409-6>
- [3] N. S. D'Souza, K. Sharma, and Y. Chen, "Fusing modalities by multiplexed graph neural networks for outcome prediction in alzheimer's disease," *Computational and Structural Biotechnology Journal*, vol. 23, pp. 510–523, 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S200103702400048X>
- [4] D. P. Veitch, M. W. Weiner, P. S. Aisen *et al.*, "The alzheimer's disease neuroimaging initiative in the era of alzheimer's disease treatment: A review of adni studies 2021–2022," *Alzheimer's & Dementia*, vol. 20, no. 4, pp. 1503–1535, 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://alz-journals.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/alz.13698>
- [5] C. R. Jack, M. A. Bernstein, B. T. Wyman, and M. W. Weiner, "Overview of adni mri: Longitudinal imaging and harmonization efforts," *NeuroImage*, vol. 287, p. 120145, 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC11485416/>
- [6] Z. Kong, L. Sun, H. Peng, L. Zhan, Y. Chen, and L. He, "Multiplex graph networks for multimodal brain network analysis," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.00158*, 2021. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2108.00158>
- [7] A. Bessadok, M. A. Mahjoub, and I. Rekik, "Brain multigraph prediction using topology-aware adversarial graph neural networks," *Medical Image Analysis*, vol. 74, p. 102210, 2021. [Online]. Available: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1361841521001365>
- [8] —, "Topogan: Topology-aware adversarial graph neural network for brain graph synthesis," in *Proceedings of the ACM Conference on Multimedia*, 2021. [Online]. Available: <https://dl.acm.org/doi/10.1145/3474085.3475464>
- [9] J.-H. Sim, J.-H. Park, and Y.-J. Kim, "Multi-modal graph neural network with transformer-style fusion for alzheimer's disease prediction," in *Medical Image Computing and Computer-Assisted Intervention (MICCAI)*, 2024.
- [10] T. Song, W. Zhao, and M. Chen, "Multi-view and multimodal graph convolutional neural networks for brain disorders," *Mathematics*, vol. 12, no. 9, p. 1375, 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://www.mdpi.com/2227-7390/12/9/1375>
- [11] S. Zhang, W. Li, Y. Wang, and C. Liu, "Combination of graph neural network techniques and radiomic features for neurodegenerative disease diagnosis," *Brain Sciences*, vol. 13, no. 7, p. 1020, 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://www.mdpi.com/2076-3425/13/7/1020>
- [12] P. Wu, J. Ma, and R. Chen, "Time fractional stochastic differential equations driven by lévy noise," *Journal of Differential Equations*, vol. 307, pp. 390–412, 2021. [Online]. Available: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0022039621001794>
- [13] S. Pirozzi and A. Ferrante, "Fractional order brain network models: New frontiers in computational neurodynamics," *Chaos, Solitons & Fractals*, 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0960077924001519>
- [14] B. P. Moghaddam, M. Ghorban, and P. Hosseini, "Fractional stochastic partial differential equations: Numerical methods and applications," *Symmetry*, vol. 16, no. 5, p. 764, 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://www.mdpi.com/2073-8994/16/5/764>
- [15] L. Peng, N. Wang, N. Dvornek, X. Zhu, and X. Li, "Fedni: Federated graph learning with network inpainting for population-based disease prediction," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.10166*, 2021. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2112.10166>