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Abstract

Video of nematodes/roundworms was analyzed using persistent homology to study locomotion and behavior. In each frame, an organism’s body posture was represented by a high-dimensional vector. By concatenating points in fixed-duration segments of this time series, we created a sliding window embedding (sometimes called a time delay embedding) where each point corresponds to a sequence of postures of an organism. Persistent homology on the points in this time series detected behaviors and comparisons of these persistent homology computations detected variation in their corresponding behaviors. We used average persistence landscapes and machine learning techniques to study changes in locomotion and behavior in varying environments.
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1 Introduction

Model organisms are indispensable in understanding basic principles of biology. Studies of model organisms have played a major role in discoveries of disease mechanisms, disease treatment, and neuroscience principles, to name a few. The behavior of these model organisms can illuminate responses and phenotypes important for understanding the effects of experimental conditions on subjects. Behavior can be affected by neuron activity, external stimuli, and past experiences (learning), so being able to adequately measure and compare behaviors is a useful evaluation tool for a wide range of experiments.

Persistent homology is a possible tool for assessing behavior of \textit{C. elegans}, which are a widely-used model organism. Persistence has been successfully used to study high-dimensional time series, especially those that exhibit some quasi-periodic behavior like the undulation of \textit{C. elegans} \cite{Tra16; TP18}. But to the authors’ knowledge, persistent homology has not been previously used to analyze \textit{C. elegans} behavior, though it and similar techniques have been used to study \textit{C. elegans} neural data \cite{PS+13; SP+19; HBB20; LG+20; BK+15}.

In this paper, we use persistent homology to study the locomotion of \textit{C. elegans} under two experimental conditions. In our initial study (section 3.1), the nematodes move on the surface of an agar plate. Under these experimental conditions there are no barriers to movement and the locomotion is both smooth and complex. We show that persistent homology is able to capture various characteristic movements. However, for the large-scale automated study of \textit{C. elegans} (section 3.2) a more controlled environment is required, in which the nematodes are confined to wells in micro-fluidic devices. Our main results study \textit{C. elegans}’ locomotion in these aqueous wells in which the solution has various levels of viscosity. We show that we are able to use persistent homology, and average persistence landscapes in particular, to summarize the locomotion in a way that allows the classification of the viscosity class with a high level of accuracy. Our results indicate that persistent homology is a promising tool for quantifying the impact of changes to genotype and environment on \textit{C. elegans} locomotion.

1.1 Related work

\textit{Caenorhabditis elegans} is a free-living soil nematode that has been a workhorse genetic model system. The nematode’s transparent tissue, simple anatomy, and fast reproduction contribute to both ease in culture and a literal window into the internal workings of a living organism. Its completely sequenced genome contains many genes that are homologous to human genes, and importantly the ability to manipulate genes with relative ease makes it an extremely attractive model system. For neuroscience in particular, \textit{C. elegans} presents a unique opportunity with its simple nervous system (just 302 neurons) that is complex
enough to exhibit many sensory modalities, including mechanosensation, chemosensation, and response to heat, osmolarity, and smell.

Behavior characterization in *C. elegans* was historically qualitative, mainly relying on experimentalists specifying end-point assessment (e.g. whether the worm chemotaxes to a particular source of odor within a certain amount of time), or experimentalists using heuristics to assess behavior (e.g. naming worms “unc” for uncoordinated). In the last decade, machine vision tools first replaced human identifications of worms from images and videos, which allows much larger dynamic datasets to be annotated and analyzed. In recent years, further development in quantitative behavior characterization tools such as tracking [YJ+13; SC+11; SG+11; HC+12; PG+19], eigenworms [SJ+08], behavior ‘dictionaries’ [BY+13], and t-sne [BBS16; LS+18] have moved the field away from merely describing the outcome to understanding the types of behavior the brain of this simple system can generate. While many of these techniques do well in quantitatively describing behavior and distinguishing differences in behavior, behavioral dynamics are rich and opportunities abound in exploring behavioral dynamics using other mathematical tools.

Persistent homology has been used to analyze time series data in many different settings. Some earlier work was theoretical and studied the interaction between persistence and sliding window embeddings — which we used in this research — as well as proposed possible applications [PH15; Per16; KM16]. Research into gene expression has used persistent homology to detect patterns or classify whether a signal is periodic [PD+15; DA+08]. Frequently, persistence has been used to study neural data [SHP17; PS+13; SP+19; HBB20; LG+20; BK+15], and in many cases neural data from *C. elegans*, but the analysis tends to rely on clique complexes as the topological space of interest instead of sliding window embeddings.

### 1.2 Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank the anonymous referees whose many comments considerably improved our manuscript. The first author would also like to thank Kim Le for helpful conversations.

This research was partially supported by the Southeast Center for Mathematics and Biology, an NSF-Simons Research Center for Mathematics of Complex Biological Systems, under National Science Foundation Grant No. DMS-1764406 and Simons Foundation Grant No. 594594. This material is based upon work supported by, or in part by, the Army Research Laboratory and the Army Research Office under contract/grant number W911NF-18-1-0307. Research reported in this publication was supported in part by the National Institutes of Health under award numbers R01NS096581, R01NS115484, and R01AG056436. The collection of the data used in this research was was partially supported by the National Institutes of Health’s Ruth L. Kirschstein NRSA award 1F31GM123662.
2 Materials and methods

In this section we describe the collection and preprocessing of experimental data (section 2.1), describe mathematical background (sections 2.2 and 2.3), and describe the pipeline for using topological data analysis on our

2.1 Description of data

*C. elegans* (N2 strain) were cultured at 20°C under standard conditions on agar plates seeded with OP50 *E. Coli*. Animals were age-synchronized via hatch-off and cultured on plate until they reached day 1 of adulthood. For behavior experiments on agar, animals were prepared, imaged, and tracked as previously described [PG+19]. For behavior experiments in methylcellulose media, synchronized populations were then washed off of culture plates with M9 buffer. Unless otherwise noted, video data was collected on a dissecting microscope (Leica MZ16) using a CMOS camera (Thorlabs DCC3240M), with a frame rate of 30 Hz and a magnification of 1.2x.

Behavior data was collected with animals confined with microfluidic devices. Importantly, cavities in which worms are loaded in these devices are only slightly greater depth than the width of an adult worm, which restricts worms to the focal plane of the microscope and almost entirely 2-dimensional behavior. Microfluidic devices were fabricated as described previously [CZ+11]. Methylcellulose solutions were prepared at concentrations of 0.5%, 1%, 2%, and 3% weight in volume of M9 buffer. To ensure that single animals could be isolated in single chambers of the unbonded microchamber microfluidic device, we first picked animals onto a room-temperature, unseeded plate. To ensure that animals were fully immersed in methylcellulose mixture, we used a glass pipet to aspirate a small amount of methylcellulose solution, and then aspirated animals from the unseeded plate one at a time into the methylcellulose solution. Then, single animals surrounded by methylcellulose mixture were pipetted into individual chambers of an unbonded PDMS chamber device. The device could then be flipped over onto a sterile 10cm Petri dish and gently pressed down until the individual chamber walls came into contact with the Petri dish, preventing animals from leaving their chambers. Animals were then imaged in devices for about 5 minutes.

To extract midline data from videos, we first found masks for each frame to isolate the worm from background using a combination of Otsu thresholding, image smoothing using a Gaussian kernel, and size filtration. We then broadly followed the method used in Stephens et al. [SJ+08] to represent the worm’s posture in ‘worm-centric’ coordinates. Briefly, we found the midline of the worm in each frame by thinning the mask to a single line and interpolating between pixels of this line such that the midline was represented by 101 evenly-spaced points. We then calculated the tangent angle between each pair of adjacent
points along the midline such that the animal’s posture was represented as a vector of angles, which we use to identify a low-dimensional vector space (using PCA) to express posture. We replaced frames in which worms were self-occluded with the data from the most recent non-self-occluded frame.

2.2 Sliding window embeddings

Sliding window embeddings turn time series data into a pointcloud in a way that does not forget the temporal information of the time series. There are some additional benefits to sliding window embeddings, including that they “separate” points that intersect each other in a time series, such as in examples 2.6 and 2.7.

For our application, we consider time series that take values in vector spaces.

**Definition 2.1.** A time series is a sequence of vectors \((x_t)_{t \in T} = (x_t, x_{t+1}, x_{t+2}, \ldots)\) where each \(x_t\) is in the same finite-dimensional vector space \(V\) and \(T\) is a totally ordered set.

**Remark 2.2.** The totally ordered set \(T\), which indexes the time series, can be \(\mathbb{Z}\), \(\mathbb{N}\), or a finite set like \([N] = \{1, 2, \ldots, N\}\). For many applications including the ones in this paper, the indexing set is finite and will be omitted in notation for brevity, as in \((x_t)_t\).

Given a time series we can construct a new time series called the sliding window embedding, also known as the time delay embedding.

**Definition 2.3.** Given a time series \(\tau = (x_t)_{t \in T}\) with vectors \(x_t \in V\), a sliding window embedding of window length \(l\) of \(\tau\) is a new time series, \(\tau^l = (\tilde{x}_t)_t\), with

\[
\tilde{x}_t = [x_t \ x_{t+1} \ \ldots \ x_{t+l-1}] \in V^l.
\]

That is, the \(t^{th}\) vector in the new time series is the concatenation of \(l\) consecutive vectors in the original time series.

**Remark 2.4.** If the original time series has \(N\) points, then the sliding window embedding of window length \(l\) has \(N - l + 1\) points, as you can see in example 2.5.

**Example 2.5.** Consider the time series \(\tau = ([1, 2], [3, 4], [5, 6], [7, 8], [9, 10])\). The sliding window embedding of \(\tau\) of window length \(l = 3\) is

\[
\tau^3 = ([1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6], [3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8], [5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10])
\]

which has \(5 - 3 + 1 = 3\) points.
We will use persistent homology (section 2.3) to detect behaviors, especially periodic or repeated behavior, in sliding window embeddings of *C. elegans* behavior data. Degree 1 persistent homology detects loops in these sliding window embeddings that loosely correspond to individual behaviors. Below we see two examples where persistence would fail to capture an entire period of a time series in one loop, and how sliding window embeddings can fix this behavior.

**Example 2.6.** In figure 1 (a) is one period of a 2-dimensional periodic time series with the property that if linear segments connect successive points, the path of the time series self-intersects.

One period of this function corresponds to traversing the self-intersecting loop traced by the time series once. To discover this loop, you might use persistent homology (section 2.3). But in the case of the figure-eight, persistent homology would detect two distinct loops, each comprising half of the period, and the true information that there is only one loop would be lost. If we create a sliding window embedding with window length \( l = 10 \), we get a 20-dimensional time series that we can project down to two dimensions using PCA. Pictured in (b) is this \( l = 10 \) sliding window embedding projected down into the 1\(^{st}\) and 3\(^{rd}\) principal components. (c) shows the sliding window embedding with window length of \( l = 20 \).

Notice that as the window length increases, the height of the loop increases. This increases the loop’s persistence and makes it easier for persistent homology to robustly detect.

**Figure 1.** (a) A time series in \( \mathbb{R}^2 \) determines a self-intersecting curve. (b) The sliding window embedding of window length 10 separates the previously intersecting segments of the curve. (c) A sliding window embedding with a higher window length separates the intersecting segments even further.

**Example 2.7.** Example 2.7 (a) shows a 1-dimensional time series that is a discretization of a sine wave. This periodic behavior creates no loops — in fact, because the points take values in \( \mathbb{R} \), there is no way for the time series to produce degree 1 homology. But a sliding window embedding, in this case of window length 4, creates a loop that can be detected by persistent homology. That loop in \( \mathbb{R}^4 \) is projected down into 2 dimensions in example 2.7 (b).
Figure 2. (a) A time series that has trivial first homology. (b) A sliding window embedding with $l = 4$ of the original time series has nontrivial first homology.

For our applications we will consider the vectors in the sliding window embeddings as points in a pointcloud, forgetting the time series structure. Fortunately this point of view does not forget the temporal information of the original time series since that information is encoded within the vectors themselves.

### 2.3 Persistent homology

Persistent homology detects loops and other topological information in a (filtered) topological space. We can construct a filtered topological space from a point cloud using a radius parameter (see definition 2.10 and example 2.12). In our applications, the point cloud we start with is the vectors of a sliding window embedding of an input time series. The output of persistent homology is a multiset of points in $\mathbb{R}^2$ called a persistence diagram (definition 2.16), where each point represents the birth and death radii of a topological feature in a filtered topological space. For persistence computations the topological space is usually a simplicial complex.

**Definition 2.8.** A simplicial complex on a set of vertices $V$ is a collection $K$ of subsets of $V$ such that if $\tau \in K$ and $\tau' \subset \tau$, then $\tau' \in K$. An element $\tau \in K$ is called a simplex. An $n$-simplex is a simplex $\tau \in K$ with $|\tau| = n + 1$.

**Definition 2.9.** A filtered simplicial complex $\mathcal{K}$ is a nested sequence of simplicial complexes

$$K_0 \subset K_1 \subset K_2 \subset \cdots \subset K_n.$$  

Each simplicial complex $K_i$ is referred to as a filtered piece.

There are many ways to constructed a filtered simplicial complex from a point cloud. In this paper we will use the following construction.

**Definition 2.10.** Let $X \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a finite set and let $r \geq 0$. The Vietoris-Rips complex of $X$ at scale $r$, denoted $\mathcal{R}_r(X)$, is the simplicial complex with vertex set $X$ and whose simplices are given as follows. A subset $\{x_0, \ldots, x_n\} \subset X$ is an $n$-simplex in $\mathcal{R}_r(X)$ if and only if $d(x_i, x_j) \leq r$ for all $i, j \in \{0, \ldots, n\}$.
Definition 2.11. The Vietoris-Rips complex of a finite set \( X \subset \mathbb{R}^d \) is the collection \( \mathcal{R}(X) := \{ \mathcal{R}_r(X) \}_{r \geq 0} \).

Note that while the Vietoris-Rips complex of \( X \) is parameterized by the non-negative reals, finiteness of \( X \) guarantees that \( \mathcal{R}(X) \) consists of only finitely many distinct simplicial complexes. Thus we view the Vietoris-Rips complex as a finite nested sequence of simplicial complexes, i.e., as a filtered simplicial complex as defined in Definition 2.9.

Example 2.12. Figure 3 shows four filtered pieces of a Vietoris-Rips complex of a point-cloud in \( \mathbb{R}^2 \). Notice that each simplicial complex can be included into the next.

![Image of filtered pieces](image)

Figure 3. Filtered pieces of the Vietoris-Rips filtered simplicial complex of a point-cloud in 2 dimensions.

Definition 2.13. Let \( \mathbb{F} \) be a field. A finite persistence module \( M \) is a finite sequence of \( \mathbb{F} \)-vector spaces \( \{ M_j \}_{j=0}^n \) together with a collection of \( \mathbb{F} \)-linear maps \( \{ \phi_{ij} \}_{0 \leq i \leq j \leq n} \) such that \( \phi_{jk} \circ \phi_{ij} = \phi_{ik} \) and \( \phi_{ii} = \text{id}_{M_i} \) for all \( 0 \leq i \leq j \leq k \leq n \).

Persistence modules arise when homology with coefficients in a field \( \mathbb{F} \) is applied to a filtered simplicial complex.

Example 2.14. In this case of example 2.12, the persistence module has a vector space for every distinct filtered piece (of which only four are shown), and those vector spaces have dimension equal to the number of minimal simple loops. Every linear map is either the zero map or the identity.

Definition 2.15. The \( p \)th persistent homology (or persistent homology in degree \( p \)) of a filtered simplicial complex \( \mathcal{K} \) is the persistence module \( H_p(\mathcal{K}, \mathbb{F}) = (\{ H_p(K_j, \mathbb{F}) \}_{j=0}^n, \{ \phi_j \}_{j=1}^n) \), where each \( H_p(K_j, \mathbb{F}) \) is the \( p \)th homology vector space with coefficients in \( \mathbb{F} \) and each \( \phi_j : H_p(K_{j-1}) \to H_p(K_j) \) is the linear map induced by inclusion \( K_{j-1} \hookrightarrow K_j \).

The fact that \( H_p(\mathcal{K}, \mathbb{F}) \) is a persistence module follows from the functoriality of homology. For computational purposes, the field \( \mathbb{F} \) is often chosen to be the field of two elements \( \mathbb{Z}/2 \). Throughout, we will assume this to be the case and use the shorthand \( H_p(\mathcal{K}) := H_p(\mathcal{K}, \mathbb{Z}/2) \).
By the structure theorem for persistence modules [Cra15], there exists a multiset $\text{Dgm}_p(K)$ of ordered pairs $(b, d)$, with $b, d \in \mathbb{N}$ and $b \leq d$, such that $\mathcal{H}_p(K)$ can be written as a direct sum

$$\mathcal{H}_p(K) = \bigoplus_{(b, d) \in \text{Dgm}_p(K)} \mathbb{I}[b, d].$$

Here, $\mathbb{I}[b, d]$ denotes the interval module supported on $[b, d]$, given by

$$\mathbb{I}[b, d]_j = \begin{cases} \mathbb{F} & \text{if } j \in [b, d], \\ 0 & \text{otherwise}, \end{cases}$$

and whose structure maps are given by $\phi_{ij} = \text{id}_F$ if $i, j \in [b, d]$ and $\phi_{ij} = 0$ otherwise.

The multiset $\text{Dgm}_p(K)$ is a fundamental invariant and is the output of a persistence homology computation, with which further analyses can be carried out.

**Definition 2.16.** The multiset $\text{Dgm}_p(K)$ is called the $p$th persistence diagram of $K$.

In the case of Vietoris-Rips complex of a pointcloud, persistence tries to find topology in a possibly finite set of points. If those points were sampled from, say, a manifold, persistence can be used to estimate the homology of the original manifold.

**Example 2.17.** Figure 4 shows the persistence in degree 1 of example 2.12. Notice that both (a) the persistence diagram and (b) the persistence landscape (see definition 2.18) show two cycles, but because they are born and die at exactly the same radius parameters they are plotted in the same place. The two cycles are shown in (c).

![Figure 4](image)

**Figure 4.** (a) The degree 1 persistence diagram of the figure eight in 2 dimensions. Notice that the point has multiplicity 2. (b) The corresponding degree 1 persistence landscape. Notice that the first and second landscapes are nonzero and identical and all other landscapes are trivial. (c) The two loops that generate the homology of the Vietoris-Rips complex on the figure eight.

Unfortunately, persistence diagrams have some undesirable properties. For example, while we can compute an average of a set of persistence diagrams, that average is not necessarily unique [MMH11]. A recourse is to map persistence diagrams into a Hilbert space where the tools of statistics and machine learning can be applied. One such mappings is the persistence landscape (see [Bub15] for the following definitions and results).
Definition 2.18. Let $a < b$ and $f_{a,b} : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ be the piecewise-linear function given by

$$f_{a,b}(t) = \begin{cases} 
  t - a, & \text{if } a \leq t \leq \frac{a+b}{2} \\
  b - t, & \text{if } \frac{a+b}{2} \leq t \leq b \\
  0, & \text{otherwise}.
\end{cases}$$

Given a persistence diagram $\text{Dgm}_\rho(K)$, the corresponding $k$th persistence landscape is the function $\lambda_k : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$, where $\lambda_k(t)$ is the $k$th largest value of $f_{a,b}(t)$ for all points $(a, b) \in \text{Dgm}_\rho(K)$. The persistence landscape is the sequence $(\lambda_k)_k$. The parameter $k$ is called the depth of the persistence landscape.

Persistence landscapes have unique averages, satisfy the law of large numbers and central limit theorems, and can be discretized for computations. Because the sequence of functions that make up a landscape are nested, they can all be graphed on the same plot as in example 2.17 (b).

A persistence landscape is a continuous object in an infinite-dimensional Hilbert space, but can be discretized and turned into a finite-dimensional vector. Through discretization, each depth of the landscape transforms from a continuous function on $\mathbb{R}$ to a vector where the $i$th entry in the vector corresponds to the function value at the $i$th point in the sample space. Once the vectors for each depth of the landscape are concatenated together, they form a single vector in a very high-dimensional vector space, which, equipped with the appropriate metric, is a Hilbert space.

The Hilbert space setting lets us use linear algebra-based machine learning techniques like principal component analysis (PCA). The principal components from PCA on discretized landscapes can be converted into a format much like a persistence landscape — a sequence of continuous functions on $\mathbb{R}$ — but the principal components are not themselves landscapes because the functions fail to be nonnegative.

### 2.4 Pipeline

In this section we give the details for the analysis that was done on *C. elegans* behavior data. The input to our system was piecewise linear midlines of nematodes from video recordings as described in section 2.1. These midlines were parameterized by the 100 angles between adjacent segments, so each sample input to our system was a time series $\tau$ of 100-dimensional vectors measured in radians. The time domain of this time series was divided into overlapping patches of a given size called the patch length, resulting in a collection $\{\tau_i\}_i$ of smaller time series. For our experiments, a patch length of 300 was chosen, with adjacent patches overlapping by half of the patch length. The sliding window embeddings of the $\tau_i$ were then computed, with window length parameter $l = 20$, resulting
in a new collection \( \{(\tau_i)^l\}_i \) of time series of length \( 300 - l + 1 = 381 \). For each \( (\tau_i)^l \), a persistence landscape \( \text{PL}( (\tau_i)^l ) \) was obtained by computing the persistent homology of the Vietoris-Rips complex \( \mathcal{R}( (\tau_i)^l ) \). The collection \( \{ \text{PL}( (\tau_i)^l ) \}_i \) of persistence landscapes was then assembled into a single summary for a given video by averaging the persistence landscapes across patches to result in a single average persistence landscape associated to each video. The average persistence landscapes were then discretized, resulting in a single topological summary in the form of a high-dimensional vector in Euclidean space. We refer to this summary as the **discretized average landscape** or **discretized landscape** of a sample.

For each environment viscosity, the sample discretized landscapes were averaged to give the discretized landscape of the class.

The discretized landscapes for each class were used for analysis of the movement space as follows. Distances between each class’ discretized landscapes were computed using the usual Euclidean distance. The pairwise distances were visualized using multidimensional scaling to give a 2-dimensional visualization of the similarities between the class.

Principal component analysis (PCA) was applied to the set of discretized landscapes for each sample and the first two principal components were plotted as sequences of piecewise linear functions to show their relationships to landscapes. The class discretized landscapes were projected onto this space as well. These plots visualized similarity between classes and some of the variation within classes.

The variation within classes was further studied using two tools: the standard deviations of each of the coordinates of the discretized landscapes and PCA on the sample discretized landscapes in each class. The standard deviations of each coordinate were computed for the samples in each class. For an individual sample, the standard deviations of each coordinate correspond to the square root of the diagonal of the covariance matrix of the corresponding discretized landscape. They are plotted as sequences of piecewise linear functions to show how each standard deviation corresponds to a certain point in each discretized landscape.

PCA on the sample discretized landscapes in each class were also computed, along with the cumulative variances explained by the first \( n \) principal components for \( n = 1 \ldots, 10 \) (10 is the number of samples in each class). The first three principal components were also computed.

We conducted a permutation test on the discretized landscapes for each pairs of classes. We used 10,000 permutations for each permutation test and found the percent of permutations that separated the samples by a larger distance than was obtained by separating according to their ground truth classes. These percents are reported as p-values.

We applied multiclass support vector machines (SVM) to classify samples according to viscosity of their environments. We use the ksvm function from the kernlab package in R on the discretized average persistence landscapes. Accuracy was estimated using 10-fold cross validation with cost set to 10. Cross validation was repeated 20 times and the results
were averaged. A confusion matrix for one instance of SVM with 10-fold cross validation was also computed.

Finally, as a proof of concept, we used support vector regression (SVR) to approximate viscosity of the worm environments. Viscosities were estimated by partitioning the dataset into 10 parts, building 10 SVR models, and using the leave-one-out approach to approximate the viscosities on each part. This process was repeated for 10 different partitions and the resulting viscosities estimates were averaged.

3 Results

In this section we summarize our work on two main projects: a case study of a single sample of behavior data and an experiment on the effects of viscosity of the surrounding environment on \textit{C. elegans} locomotion and behavior. The case study assesses a significantly smaller data set and directly links topological features to specific behaviors. The experimental results are more difficult to directly interpret in terms of specific behaviors but show the effectiveness of persistent homology in distinguishing variations in behaviors nonetheless. More explicit interpretation of persistence output in terms of specific behaviors is future work.

3.1 An illustrative case study

The following results were obtained by carefully analyzing a sample of \textit{C. elegans} behavior data from a video of a worm that is crawling on agar. Having a solid surface to provide friction forces slower but more complicated behavior than we would see in an aqueous environment, and we take advantage of the resulting clarity of the data.

The data we analyzed consists of a 20 second video where the subject exhibits following behaviors in chronological order:

1. crawl forward,
2. crawl backward,
3. pause, and
4. crawl backward again.

Below we analyze both the original time series $\tau$ from this data and the corresponding sliding window embedding of window length $l = 20$ to show the importance of the sliding window embedding to robust analysis.

To visualize the original data and its sliding window embedding, we apply PCA to each and project onto the first two principal components. Some of these projections are shown in the two left-most columns of figure 5. The original time series $\tau$ has a similar shape
to its sliding window embedding $\tau^{20}$, but note that the sliding window embedding has the effect of smoothing the data and making it more robust to noise. Though the two time series have similar shapes and corresponding similar persistence diagrams and landscapes, they do differ in one important feature: the pause.

![Figure 5](image)  

**Figure 5.** A (a) time series $\tau$ and its (b) sliding window embedding of window length $l = 20 \tau^{20}$, both projected onto 2-dimensional axes of principal components. The corresponding persistence diagrams and landscapes are to the right.

In figure 6 (a) the points in the sliding window embedding that correspond to frames where the worm is performing a specific behavior are highlighted. The points corresponding to the pause behavior deviate from the path of points corresponding to crawling backwards. This deviation is small compared to the noisiness of the original time series, so the pause deviation doesn’t create a topological feature in the graph of the original time series. This is reflected in the persistence diagrams and landscapes; the original time series diagram and landscape show only 3 significant topological features, while the diagram and landscape of the sliding window embedding show 4.

We computed representative cycles for persistent homology classes for each of the longest-persisting topological features in the two time series using Dionysus [Mor]. Those longest-persisting features for the sliding window embedding are shown in figure 6 (b). The homology classes that correspond to each of these representative cycles are highlighted in the diagrams in figure 6 (c).
Figure 6. (a) Points in the sliding window embedding $\tau^{20}$ that correspond to each of the labeled behaviors are highlighted. (b) The representative cycles with longest persistence from automated persistence software correspond to specific behaviors. (c) The persistence diagram with the homology class corresponding to the above cycle representative highlighted.

3.2 Experimental results

In this section we summarize analysis of an experiment where *C. elegans* are submerged in solutions with varying viscosities. The viscosity of the solution is correlated with how much methylcellulose is added and experimental conditions are labeled with their methylcellulose content, usually in order from low to high methylcellulose and viscosity.

Average persistence landscapes for each class are shown in figure 7. The lower viscosity conditions allow for larger depth 1 landscapes ($\lambda_1$) but have relatively few non-zero higher-depth landscapes, which means there were a smaller number of larger loops detected in the sliding window embeddings. This indicates that in lower-viscosity environments, *C. elegans* exhibit behaviors of higher amplitude but either do fewer distinct behaviors or have
much less variation between repetitions of behaviors. Conversely, the high-viscosity classes show many more cycles detected in the sliding window embeddings, with each cycle being small compared to the cycles found in the low-viscosity environments. These observations suggest that at high-viscosity, behaviors don’t involve large changes in posture and there is a much more varied set of behaviors in general. From observing the raw video data, it is apparent that in higher-viscosity environments *C. elegans* can make much smaller, tighter body bends, which is consistent with this evidence.

We also observed that as viscosity increases, the support of the landscapes stretch further to the right and cycles are born at lower radius parameters. The worms seemed to exhibit less varied behaviors in lower-viscosity environments, so perhaps in such environments they were continuously “retracing their steps” through the sliding window embedding space resulting in more densely-sampled curves and thus homology classes will form at lower radii.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0.5% methylcellulose</th>
<th>1% methylcellulose</th>
<th>2% methylcellulose</th>
<th>3% methylcellulose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Figure 7. Average landscapes for each class.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The normalized pairwise distances between the discretized average landscapes for each class are shown in table 8. We include the origin — the discretization of the zero landscape, i.e. the 0 vector — in these distance computations to complete the normalization. Normalization is such that the average distances between each class and the origin is 1. Multidimensional scaling on these distances visualizes the similarity between classes and is shown in figure 9. From the raw distances and the multidimensional scaling of the distances, we can see that the high-viscosity classes (2% and 3% methylcellulose) together as a pair, the 0.5% class, and the 1% class are roughly equidistant from one another.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0.5%</th>
<th>1%</th>
<th>2%</th>
<th>3%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>origin</td>
<td>1.1873106</td>
<td>1.5934976</td>
<td>0.6777196</td>
<td>0.5414722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.8330355</td>
<td>0.8380992</td>
<td>0.8809327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0.9972502</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.1255496</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.1758501</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 8.** Normalized pairwise distances between discretized landscapes of each class, where distance is Euclidean distance between vectors in $\mathbb{R}^{255069}$ and the normalization is such that the average distance to the origin is 1.
Figure 9. Multidimensional scaling of pairwise distances between classes and the origin.

Principal component analysis on the set of sample persistence landscapes gives the graphs in figure 10. In (a), projections of the discretized sample landscapes onto the first two principal components are hollow and projections of the discretized class landscapes are solid. Here we see results similar to those from the multidimensional scaling in figure 9: the low-viscosity class landscapes are far from each other and the high-viscosity classes, while the high-viscosity class landscapes are quite close. We can also see some of the variance within classes. The low-viscosity classes have much more variability than the high-viscosity classes, with the highest-viscosity class, 3% methylcellulose, seems to have comparatively very small variability, at least in these first two principal components.

These conclusions about variation in each of the classes are supported by the standard deviations of each coordinate corresponding to each class. In figure 11 the standard deviations of each coordinate are graphed as sequences of functions on $\mathbb{R}$ so that individual standard deviations can be easily matched up with their corresponding locations on the landscapes. We concluded that we saw very little variation in the 3% class, slightly more in the 2% class, and much more in the 0.5% and 1% classes. The 1% class showed more variation in higher-depth landscapes than the 0.5% class, suggesting that *C. elegans* can produce slightly more complex behaviors in a slightly higher viscosity environment. The variances of the 0.5% and 1% classes were also distinct; 0.5% samples varied more towards the lower radius parameters (the left side of the graph), whereas the set of 1% samples vary more towards higher (more to the right) radius parameters.
Figure 10. (a) Projection of discretized sample average persistence landscapes onto 2 principal components, with average persistence landscapes for each experimental condition in solid. (b) The first two principal components.

Figure 11. Standard deviations of each coordinate for each class.

The following analysis was an attempt to understand the complexity of behavior expressed in each class. Figure 12 shows results from using PCA on the samples in each class. The viscosity of the environment is negatively correlated with the percent of variance explained by the first principal component, which suggests that behaviors in low-viscosity environments are simpler than those in high-viscosity environments. Viscosity appears to be correlated with the number of nonzero landscapes, which also suggests that high-viscosity environments allow for more varied behaviors.
0.5% methylcellulose 1% methylcellulose 2% methylcellulose 3% methylcellulose

(a)

(b)

0.5% 86.9% 71.7% 41.5%

(c)

5.3% 7.4% 8.2% 19.3%

(d)

1.9% 4.5% 6.0% 10.6%

(e)

Figure 12. PCA on the samples in each class. For each class: (a) video frames showing representatively complex postures. (b) The cumulative variance of the first $n$ principal components. (c-e) The first 3 principal components, labeled with the percent of the variance described by that component. These results show increasing complexity of poses and behavior as environment becomes more viscous.

We conducted permutation tests between pairs of classes to determine how much persistence can distinguish between samples from different classes. The $p$-values for these computations are shown in table 13 (a). The permutation test gives strong evidence of statistical significance, i.e. that the topological summaries of samples from each class are
significantly different.

We then used multiclass support vector machines to build a classifier for the samples. The estimated accuracy of the classifier, computed by averaging accuracies across 20 instantiations of the multiclass SVM classifier, was 95.125%. This gives further strong evidence that persistent homology is detecting meaningful, distinguishing features from the *C. elegans* behavior samples. A sample confusion matrix for one instance of SVM is shown in table 13 (b). Finally, we used support vector regression to estimate the methylcellulose content in the environment for each sample. The results are graphed in figure 14. There are two outliers on this graph which are estimated as having negative methylcellulose content. The two worms in these samples moved much more quickly than their peers, so we believe that the SVR is picking up on the strong negative correlation between viscosity of the environment and speed, and based on these worms’ fast speed, assigning a methylcellulose content that is so low it is negative.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0.5%</th>
<th>1%</th>
<th>2%</th>
<th>3%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.0077</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13. (a) Permutation test results. (b) Confusion matrix for one instance of SVM with 10-fold cross validation.

---

**Figure 14.** SVR estimates of methylcellulose content for each sample. Horizontal lines are at 0.5%, 1%, 2%, and 3% methylcellulose.
4 Discussion

In this paper we analyzed *C. elegans* behavior data using persistent homology to study the effects of changes in the viscosity of the environment on behavior and locomotion. We constructed sliding window embeddings of time series of piecewise linear *C. elegans* skeletons and used degree 1 persistent homology to create topological summaries of each sample in the form of discretized persistence landscapes. Discretized average persistence landscapes for each viscosity level allowed for analysis based on distance between classes, permutation tests, and multiclass SVM.

Our analysis showed that persistent homology can detect the variation of behavior induced by changes in the viscosity of the environment. It also suggests that persistence can measure complexity of behavior, and furthermore is sufficiently interpretable to match individual behaviors to topological features. As far as we are aware, this is the first application of persistence to *C. elegans* behavior data.

Our analysis has implications for future experimental design. We observed that low-viscosity environments allow for the detection of variation between samples, while high-viscosity environments may allow animals to perform more complex and varying behaviors. Tuning the viscosity of the environment for an experiment or performing experiments in multiple fluid environments with varying viscosities could allow for more easily assessing results regarding variations within populations vs variations in behavior.

Our results indicate that a high level of viscosity, like that of the 3% methylcellulose environment, is good for studying the behaviour of *C. elegans* under other experimental perturbations (e.g. genotype or other environmental changes) for two reasons: 1. There is a greater complexity of locomotion. The data is higher-dimensional, as indicated by the lower percent variation explained by the initial principal components. Also, the principal components are more complicated. 2. There is less variation among the observations/worms. This suggests that fewer observations/worms are need to accurately estimate the average persistence landscape.

An interesting extension to this experiment would be to include samples from two new environmental conditions: buffer, which would correspond to 0% methylcellulose and a lower viscosity than appears in our current data; and agar, which provides a solid surface for the worms to crawl on and surrounding air as opposed to an aqueous environment to swim in. We expect a new buffer class to allows for only fast, simple behaviors in line with the experiments already done, but the agar environment may induce significantly different behaviors in the subjects. It would be interesting to see if there is a qualitative difference between behavior in aqueous solid environments, and whether persistence can detect such a difference.
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