MNetClass: A Control-Free Microbial Network Clustering Framework for Identifying Central Subcommunities Across Ecological Niches

Yihua Wang[a,1], Qingzhen Hou[b,1], Fulan Wei[c,*], Bingqiang Liu[a,*] and Qiang Feng[c,d*]

a. School of Mathematics, Shandong University, Jinan, 250100, China

b. Department of Biostatistics, School of Public Health, Cheeloo College of Medicine, Shandong University, Jinan, 250012, China

c. Department of Human Microbiome & Orthodontics, School and Hospital of Stomatology, Cheeloo College of Medicine, Shandong University & Shandong Key Laboratory of Oral Tissue Regeneration & Shandong Engineering Laboratory for Dental Materials and Oral Tissue Regeneration & Shandong Provincial Clinical Research Center for Oral Diseases, Jinan 250012, China

d. Shandong University-BOP Joint Oral Microbiome Laboratory, Jinan 250012, China

[1] These authors contributed equally to this work as the first authors.

[*] These authors contributed equally as the co-corresponding authors.

Correspondence

Qiang Feng, Shandong University-BOP Joint Oral Microbiome Laboratory, Shandong University, Jinan, 250012, China. Email: fengqiang@sdu.edu.cn. Bingqiang Liu, School of Mathematics, Shandong University, Jinan, 250100, China. Email: bingqiang@sdu.edu.cn. Fulan Wei, Department of Orthodontics, School and Hospital of Stomatology, Shandong University, Jinan, 250012, China. Email: weifl@sdu.edu.cn.

Abstract

Investigating microbiome subnetworks and identifying central microbes in specific ecological niches is a critical issue in human microbiome studies. Traditional methods typically require control samples, limiting the ability to study microbiomes at distinct body sites without matched controls. Moreover, some clustering methods are not well-suited for microbial data and fail to identify central subcommunities across ecological niches after clustering.

In this study, we present MNetClass, a novel microbial network clustering analysis framework. It utilizes a random walk algorithm and a rank-sum ratio-entropy weight evaluation model to classify key subnetworks and identify central microbes at any body site without the need for control samples. By applying MNetClass to microbiome data from five distinct oral sites, we successfully uncovered site-specific microbial subgroups and their central microbes. Additionally, simulations and Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD) cohort datasets demonstrated that MNetClass outperforms existing unsupervised microbial clustering methods in terms of both accuracy and predictive power. In case studies, MNetClass identified age-related microbial communities across different oral sites, highlighting its broad applicability in microbiome research.

IMPORTANCE

MNetClass provides a valuable tool for microbiome network analysis, enabling the identification of key microbial subcommunities across diverse ecological niches. Implemented as an R package (https://github.com/YihuaWWW/MNetClass), it offers broad accessibility for researchers. Here, we systematically benchmarked MNetClass against existing microbial clustering methods across multiple datasets using various performance metrics, demonstrating its superior efficacy. Notably, MNetClass operates without the need for control groups and effectively identifies central microbes, highlighting its potential as a robust framework for advancing microbiome research.

KEYWORDS

microbiome, network analysis, clustering, random walk algorithm, rank-sum ratio-entropy weight evaluation model.

INTRODUCTION

Microbes are widely distributed in the human body, and together with our tissues and organs, they form an organic component of the human body, playing an important role in maintaining human health[1,2]. Due to the diverse physiological characteristics and microenvironments, the composition of microorganisms differs in each body site, with some differences being significant[3]. Similarly, microbes have preferences for body sites, and ectopic colonization of certain microbes is a risk factor for many major diseases[4]. For example, *Fusobacterium nucleatum* is a common bacterium in the oral cavity and is an important pathogenic bacterium of colon cancer after it colonizes the intestine[5]. *Porphyromonas gingivalis* is another prevalent oral bacterium that can induce periodontitis in the oral cavity and could serve as a promoter of esophageal cancer when it colonizes the esophagus[6]. Therefore, illuminating the composition and ecological characteristics of microbes in each body site is of great significance for understanding the relationships between human health and symbiotic microbes.

Currently, identifying microbes closely related to specific human diseases is an important discussion in the study of disease causality[7]. Previous studies have mainly relied on statistical methods, which help to identify microbes with significant differences by comparing microbial abundance across different groups of study cohorts and control groups. However, no microbe exists in isolation; each is intricately linked with others and forms a well-balanced ecological network[8], which creates better living conditions through mutual symbiosis and cooperative metabolism or enables the microbes to evade host immune surveillance[9]. The microbiome-wide association study (MWAS)[10] primarily employs differential abundance analysis of each single microbe to identify characteristic microbes that are significantly differently distributed in disease groups. This ignores the interactions among microbes, resulting in a relatively low alignment with actual inter-microbial relationships within the ecological network.

To address this issue, multiple network-based approaches have been developed for exploring the composition and interactions within the microbial ecosystem[11,12]. For example, NetShift[13] introduces a neighbor shift score (NESH) to analyze the variability of node neighbors in the network, incorporating node betweenness to quantify the driving force of species in the network and thus identifying the "drivers" of microbial network change. NetMoss[14] is used to evaluate the changes in microbial network modules to identify biomarkers related to various diseases, exhibiting superior performance in removing batch effects during data integration. Manta[15] is a network clustering algorithm that leverages negative edges and distinguishes between weak and strong cluster assignments, offering superior robustness to noise and better performance in identifying biologically relevant groups. However, most of these network analysis methods either require control groups or fail to accurately identify central subcommunities within the microbial interaction network after clustering.

In this paper, we develop a microbial network clustering framework named MNetClass. By accounting for interactions between microbes, MNetClass can classify unique subgroups for each location while also exploring the network's characteristic microbes and their intermicrobial relationships using a Walktrap[16-19] algorithm and rank-sum ratio-entropy weight evaluation model[14,20]. Unlike other methods, MNetClass operates without the need for control samples and directly analyzes microbial features based on their abundance and interactions within the ecological niche. After network partitioning, it effectively identifies central subcommunities, providing deeper insights into microbiome organization and structure. We demonstrate the capabilities and versatility of MNetClass on both simulated and real microbiome datasets, where it outperforms seven other unsupervised microbial clustering algorithms. MNetClass reliably identifies site-specific microbial communities in oral datasets and shows superior predictive performance in cross-cohort Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD) data. In case study, it can classify age-related microbial communities across oral sites. MNetClass is implemented in an open-source R package and is freely available at https://github.com/YihuaWWW/MNetClass, providing a novel all-in-one network

analysis service for microbiome research.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Overview of MNetClass

In general, our MNetClass framework mainly contains 3 steps: (1) constructing a microbial association network from a microbial abundance matrix; (2) partitioning the network into subnetworks using a random walk algorithm; and (3) evaluating subnetworks and network nodes (microbes) based on topological properties, followed by scoring and ranking them through an integrated rank-sum ratio–entropy weight evaluation model.

For the microbial association network, we utilize the classic Spearman's correlation method. The microbial correlation network is characterized as a weighted graph $G = (V, E, W)$. In the network, nodes (V) represent bacteria, with the weight of a node denoting the average relative abundance of that bacteria in the ecological niche; and edges (E) represent interbacterial interactions, with their weights (W) being measured by Spearman's correlation coefficient between microbial taxa. Within a network, communities are subgraphs (or subnetworks) containing more internal connections than external connections, representing microbial subpopulations with strong interaction relationships in the microbial ecosystem[21].

Next, a community partitioning algorithm based on random walks is employed to explore specific, highly interactive microbiota subpopulations within a particular microbial ecosystem. For specificity, scoring models are utilized to compare the topological properties of subnetworks, including network local properties such as degree centrality[22], betweenness centrality[23,24], closeness centrality[23,25], and eigenvector centrality[26,27], as well as global network properties, such as graph diameter[28], modularity[29-31], density[32], and clustering coefficient[33].

To mitigate the influences of magnitude differences among various indicators on the assessment of network topological properties, the integrated rank-sum ratio–entropy weight evaluation model is leveraged to holistically evaluate the composite topological properties of the microbial network in a given niche. The subnetworks or

nodes (microbes) with the highest composite score are then selected as the characteristic subgroup and network node bacteria for that particular niche.

1. Data Pre-processing: Normalization and Filtration of Low-Abundance, Low-Frequency Microorganisms

Microbiome data processing begins with a nonnegative matrix containing the abundant data of all annotated microbial species in each sample. The data include the total read counts $\omega^{(k)} = [\omega_1^{(k)}, \cdots, \omega_p^k]$ for p taxa in sample k. Here, $\omega_i^{(k)}, i = 1, \cdots, p$ represents the read counts of taxa i in sample k. Due to variations in sequencing depth across samples and the influence of sequencing technologies, the abundance matrix is often sparse, containing a large proportion of zeros. Therefore, we performed preprocessing on the data.

First, to make the read counts comparable across samples, the microbial sequence counts are normalized into relative abundance using the total sum scaling (TSS) normalization technique[34,35] (step a in Figure 1). However, proportions are typically compositional, even if the raw data are not. Aitchison recommended the application of the centered log-ratio (clr) transformation to convert compositional data from the simplex to real space[34]. Then, the taxa with low abundance or low frequency (step b in Figure 1) are filtered out to reduce the sparsity of the relative abundance matrix.

2. Constructing a microbial association network

2.1 Correlation analysis among all microbes in a given niche

To ensure wide applicability of MNetClass, the classical Spearman's rank correlation coefficient[36,37] is used to measure interactions between microbial taxa (step 1a in Figure 1) to obtain the association matrix for microbial interactions in a given niche. Correlation-based techniques remain one of the most popular approaches for analyzing microbial networks in human gut, oral, and soil microbiomes due to their low computational complexity, simplicity, flexibility, and ease of operation[38,39]. These methods have led to significant research discoveries in understanding microbial interactions[40-43].

For a given set of n samples with paired relative abundance data for taxa X and taxa Y, $\{(x_1, y_1), (x_2, y_2), \cdots, (x_n, y_n)\}$, the Spearman correlation coefficient r_s is

defined as[44] $r_s = \frac{cov(rg_X, rg_Y)}{\sigma_{rg_X}\sigma_{rg_Y}}$, where rg_X and rg_Y represent the ranks of the relative abundance data for taxa X and Y, respectively. $\mathrm{cov}(*,*)$ denotes the covariance of the rank variables, and σ_{rg_x} and σ_{rg_Y} represent the standard deviations of the rank variables rg_X and rg_Y.

2.2 Construction of the Microbial Adjacency Matrix

Since the estimated correlations are generally nonzero, directly using them as the adjacency matrix results in a densely connected network. Therefore, the matrix A of the Spearman correlation coefficient is processed through two sparsification steps. First, we introduce a defining threshold and keep the pairs of microbes with absolute correlation coefficients above this threshold[24,45]. Second, Student's t test[46] is employed to identify correlations that are significantly different from zero. Then, we generate a sparse adjacency matrix $A^{p\times p}$ (step 1b of Figure 1). In this matrix, the entries a_{ij} represent the correlation coefficients between species i and j, and these values serve as the weights for the edges of the microbial network, with the nodes representing the microbial taxa. The diagonal elements, a_{ii}, are set to zero, as they represent self-correlations, which are not relevant in this context.

We selected a biologically motivated approach suitable for scale-free networks to determine the optimal correlation coefficient threshold, rather than relying on an entirely arbitrary choice. Scale-free networks exhibit a degree distribution that follows a power-law pattern, characterized by a small number of highly connected nodes (hubs) and a large number of sparsely connected nodes. This distribution has been observed in various biological networks, including microbial co-occurrence networks [43,47-50]. It is also commonly used as a threshold criterion in the widely adopted WGCNA package [51].

To identify the optimal threshold that ensures the resulting network aligns with the scale-free property, we tested a range of correlation thresholds (0-1, in increments of 0.1). For each threshold, the degree distribution of the network was calculated using the igraph package[52]. We then fitted the degree distribution to a power-law model using the nonlinear regression function nls in R, based on the frequency distribution

of node degrees. The fitted power-law equation was used to predict the response variable (degree frequency) as a function of the predictor variable (degree). The goodness-of-fit was evaluated by calculating R^2 , and the significance of the R^2 value was tested using a permutation test to obtain the associated p-value[53]. Finally, the threshold corresponding to the maximum R^2 value with $p \leq 0.05$ was selected as the optimal correlation coefficient threshold.

3. Partitioning the network into subnetworks

Previous studies have demonstrated that subnetworks frequently identify functionally coherent microbial groups[54,55]. Community detection methods are instrumental in identifying subgroups within microbial communities that exhibit strong associations. The Walktrap algorithm[18,19,56] is employed to partition the sparse weighted network into multiple relatively independent subnetworks. For an undirected network $G = (V,\ E,\ W)$ consisting of $n = |V|$ nodes and $m = |E|$ edges, this algorithm can calculate a community structure with a time complexity of $O(mnH)$, where H is the height of the corresponding dendrogram. The primary advantage of this algorithm is that it can produce robust results rapidly without requiring the number and size of the communities as parameters[17]. Walktrap algorithm is based on the general idea that, if one performs random walks on a network, then the walks are more likely to stay within the same cluster due to the assumed higher level of interconnectedness within clusters. Walktrap is slightly slower than fast greedy approach, but it is shown to be more accurate[18]. Other algorithms for community detection can also be used in this method; these algorithms are presented in Supplementary Material 1.

The measure of similarity between nodes is based on the distance values obtained from the random walk algorithm. Walktrap utilizes certain characteristics of random walks on graphs to define a measure of structural similarity between nodes and communities, thereby defining a distance r[18,57], as shown in Equations 1 and 2. Here, the distance is used in hierarchical clustering algorithms to merge nodes (microbes) into communities.

Definition 1 Let i and j be two nodes in the graph,

$$r_{ij} = \sqrt{\sum_{k=1}^{n} \frac{(P_{ik}^{t} - P_{jk}^{t})^2}{d(k)}} = \left\| D^{-\frac{1}{2}} P_{i\cdot}^{t} - D^{-\frac{1}{2}} P_{j\cdot}^{t} \right\| \quad (1)$$

where $\|\cdot\|$ denotes the Euclidean norm on $\mathbb{R}^{n}$. r_{ij} represents the distance between nodes i and j. Let P_{ij}^{t} represent the probability of a random walk of length t from node i to node j. Furthermore, P denotes the transition matrix of the random walk process. Specifically, P is defined as $P = D^{-1}A$, where A is the adjacency matrix of graph G, and D is the degree matrix ($\forall i, D_{ii} = d(i)$ and $D_{ij} = 0$ for $i \neq j$).

Definition 2 Let $C_1, C_2 \subset V$ be two communities of the graph. We define the distance between the two communities, denoted as $r_{C_1C_2}$, as

$$r_{C_1C_2} = \left\| D^{-\frac{1}{2}} P_{C_1\cdot}^{t} - D^{-\frac{1}{2}} P_{C_2\cdot}^{t} \right\| = \sqrt{\sum_{k=1}^{n} \frac{(P_{C_1k}^{t} - P_{C_2k}^{t})^2}{d(k)}} \quad (2)$$

Here, $P_{C_j}^{t} \left(P_{C_j}^{t} = \frac{1}{|C|} \sum_{i \in C} P_{ij}^{t} \right)$ represents the probability of reaching node j from community C within t steps. $P_{C\cdot}^{t}$ is a probability vector. D denotes the degree matrix.

4. Evaluating and scoring microbial topological properties of subnetworks and central node microbes

4.1 Evaluating and scoring microbial subnetworks

In microbial community network analysis, the topological properties of subnetworks can be leveraged to identify key microbial taxa. Studies have indicated that microorganisms with higher topological centrality are more likely to play pivotal roles within the community[42,58]. Therefore, we conducted a topological analysis of the subnetworks derived from community detection, calculating their respective network properties. In each niche, the different subnetworks ranked in the top k percentile by node count (k=20) are selected and evaluated by ten same network topological property indicators, including the graph diameter[28], graph density[32], average path length[28], average degree[59], edge and vertex connectivity[32], clustering coefficient[33], and modularity[29]; these are described in Supplementary Material 2.

Next, we identified key subnetworks based on their topological properties. According to previous studies[60-62], selecting subnetworks using multiple topological properties is more reliable than relying on a single property, as the resulting microbial

communities are more likely to represent keystone species. Inspired by this approach, we incorporated all the aforementioned topological properties as selection criteria. However, the scales and relative importance of these properties vary. To address this, an integrated rank-sum ratio–entropy weight (RSR-EWM) evaluation model[14] is used to assess the composite topological properties of each subnetwork. The subnetwork with a topological property score of "1" is chosen to represent the characteristic subgroups in this niche. Since the topological property values used in the process are rank-ordered, representing the relative magnitudes of the data rather than the data itself, there are no special requirements for indicator selection. This makes the rank-sum ratio (RSR) applicable to various evaluation subjects and capable of identifying minor changes in the objects of study[20]. We introduce the entropy weight method (EWM) to perform weighted analysis of evaluation indicators[63]. The EWM is an objective evaluation method following the principle that the greater the dispersion of an indicator is, the lower its information entropy and the more information it contains.

The specific evaluation process of the RSR-EWM is as follows:

(i) Compiling the topological property evaluation data into a matrix

Assuming m subnetworks require comprehensive topological property assessment and n evaluative indicators are used, an m by n data matrix can be generated, $X = (X_{ij})_{m\times n}$. Here, X_{ij} represents the numerical value of the jth topological property indicator of the ith subnetwork.

(ii) Standardizing the subnetwork topological property metrics

For the positive network topological property, where larger values correspond to better network topological properties, the standardization process is expressed as Equation (3). For the negative indicators, the standardization process is expressed as Equation (4).

$$Z_{ij} = \frac{X_{ij} - min\,(X_{1j}, X_{2j}, \cdots, X_{mj})}{max(X_{1j}, X_{2j}, \cdots, X_{mj}) - min\,(X_{1j}, X_{2j}, \cdots, X_{mj})} \tag{3}$$

$$Z_{ij} = \frac{max(X_{1j}, X_{2j}, \cdots, X_{mj}) - X_{ij}}{max(X_{1j}, X_{2j}, \cdots, X_{mj}) - min\,(X_{1j}, X_{2j}, \cdots, X_{mj})} \tag{4}$$

(iii) Computing the rank of each indicator

From the m by n data matrix $X = (X_{ij})_{m\times n}$, generated from the m subnetworks and n evaluative indicators, we compile the ranks for each evaluation object for every indicator. The positive network topological property indicators are ranked in ascending order. When identical data are observed for the same indicator, an average rank is assigned, resulting in the rank matrix, R.

(iv) Weighting of each indicator by EWM

Step 1: Calculation of the proportion, p_{ij}, that the ith evaluation object holds for the jth indicator. This proportion, p_{ij}, is utilized as the probability in the calculation of relative entropy, as described in Equation (5).

$$p_{ij} = Z_{ij} \,/\, \sum_{i=1}^{m} Z_{ij} \tag{5}$$

Step 2: Calculation of the information entropy, e_j, for each indicator, as detailed in Equation (6).

$$e_j = -\frac{1}{Inm}\sum_{i=1}^{m} p_{ij} In(p_{ij}), j = 1,2,3,\cdots,n \tag{6}$$

Step 3: Normalization of the information entropy to ascertain the entropy weight, W_j, of each indicator, as described in Equation (7).

$$W_j = (1 - e_j) \,/\, \sum_{j=1}^{n}(1 - e_j) \tag{7}$$

(v) Computing and ordering the weighted rank-sum ratio (WRSR)

Calculation of the WRSR as described in Equation (8).

$$WRSR_i = \frac{1}{mn}\sum_{j=1}^{n} W_j R_{ij} \tag{8}$$

(vi) Converting the distribution of $WRSR_i$ into probability units

The $WRSR_i$ distribution is represented by the cumulative frequency in the probit unit table.

Step 1: Arrange the values of $WRSR_i$ in ascending order.

Step 2: List the frequency f of each group and calculate the cumulative frequency $\sum f$.

Step 3: Determine the average rank $\bar{R_i}$ of each evaluation object. For $WRSR_i$ with a frequency equal to 1, the value of $\bar{R_i}$ is the rank of $WRSR_i$. For $WRSR_i$ with a frequency not equal to 1, the value of $\bar{R_i}$ is the average of each rank.

Step 4: Calculate the downward cumulative frequency as $\bar{R}/m \times 100\%$ and

correct the final item with $(1 - 1/4m) \times 100\%$.

Step 5: Convert the downward cumulative frequency to the $Probit$ probability unit. The $Probit$ is the standard normal deviation μ plus 5 corresponding to the cumulative frequencies, as referenced in the "comparison table of percentages and probability units"[64].

(vii) Computing the value of $\widehat{WRSR}$

Taking the $Probit$ probability unit corresponding to the cumulative frequency as the independent variable and $WRSR_i$ as the dependent variable, we compute the linear regression equation as depicted in Equation (8). This regression equation is then subjected to rigorous statistical testing.

$$\widehat{WRSR} = a + b \times Probit \tag{8}$$

(viii) Ranking and Binning

In accordance with the probabilistic unit $Probit$ and the adjusted rank-sum ratio value $\widehat{WRSR}$, binning is conducted.

Based on the scores derived from the RSR-EWM model, the top-scoring subnetworks are selected for each respective group in the study.

4.2 Evaluating and scoring central node microbes

Furthermore, within the selected subnetworks, we identified nodes with favorable composite topological properties, which we refer to as "central node microbes". This approach is analogous to selecting hub microbes, as described in previous studies, which are characterized by having the highest degree of connectivity [65]. These central node microbes are likely to play significant physiological roles within the selected subnetworks[60].

The pipeline of central node microbes is similar to that of subnetwork analysis. We assess the topological attributes of the chosen subnetwork nodes (microbes) using five network centrality measures: degree[23], weighted degree[23], betweenness[23,24], closeness[23], and eigenvector centrality[26,27], as provided in Supplementary Material 2. Next, a node's composite score is determined using an RSR-EWM evaluation model. Nodes highly ranked by composite topological property indicators are selected as the core microbes within this characteristic subgroup[66].

5. Implementation of the MNetClass as a R package

The MNetClass methodology has been implemented as an R package for assisting easy analysis of microbial association networks obtained from distinct body sites of human microbiome studies available at https://github.com/YihuaWWW/MNetClass. The input data for this R package consist of two components: a microbial abundance and the corresponding "species-phylum" or "genus-phylum" relationship. MNetClass comprises three functions: "comm", "netscore" and "nodescore". The "comm" function enables the construction of correlation networks, partition of networks, calculation of network and node topological properties, as well as visualization of association networks and network partitioning results. The "netscore" and "nodescore" functions, respectively, facilitate the comprehensive scoring and ranking of subnetworks and node topological properties using RSR-EWM.

6. Datasets

16S rRNA sequencing data from distinct oral sites

We collected samples from the gingival crevicular fluid (GCF), dental plaque (P), buccal mucosa (B), saliva (S), and tongue coating (T), of 21 volunteers and all samples were analyzed by 16S rRNA sequencing. After primary sequencing data quality control and clean read clustering, we annotated the operational taxonomic units (OTUs) by the Ribosomal Database Project (RDP version 11.5) and obtained a total of 420 species, 517 genera, and 31 phyla, as described in Supplementary Material 3 and Supplementary Table 1.

Synthetic data sets

We utilized a modified version of the FABIA R package[67] to simulate microbial abundance matrices, which is designed for generating synthetic data to evaluate biclustering algorithms. The makeFabiaDatablocksPos function was adapted to generate biclusters at predefined locations, which were designated as true-positive clusters. The simulation was repeated 50 times to produce 50 sets of synthetic microbial abundance data. The constructed matrices were subsequently used to infer correlation networks.

Gut microbiome data across Autism Spectrum Disorder cohorts

In this study, we analyzed gut microbiome data and metadata from individuals with Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD) sourced from publicly available datasets described in Xu et al. (2022)[68]. The data comprise 1019 samples (569ASD and 450 healthy controls) from 10 cohorts, with detailed metadata including age, country, sequencing region and platform. Sequencing was performed using 16S rRNA gene sequencing, and taxonomic profiling was conducted using the RDP taxonomy outline (version 14). To ensure comparability across cohorts, sequences were normalized to relative abundances. This dataset provides a robust resource for studying gut microbial patterns in ASD and enables cross-cohort comparisons to assess the consistency of microbial signatures.

Oral microbiome data stratified by age

In this study, we utilized oral microbiome datasets from the work of Liu et al. (2020)[69], which examined microbial community changes across five age groups (age 11-15, 18-20, 28-32, 38-45, 50–65) and three oral sites of healthy people (gingival crevicular fluid (GCF), saliva (SAL) and tongue back (TB)). The dataset includes 179 samples, with detailed metadata describing participant age, gender and sampling sites. Sequencing was performed using 16S rRNA gene sequencing on the Illumina MiSeq platform, targeting the V3–V4 region. The original study revealed significant shifts in microbial composition both with increasing age and across different oral sites. Our study leveraged this dataset to show the real-world applicability of MNetClass and performed case analyses.

RESULTS

Application of MNetClass framework on 16S rRNA sequencing data from distinct oral sites

To test the efficacy of MNetClass, we implemented our pipeline on collected samples from the gingival crevicular fluid (GCF), dental plaque (P), buccal mucosa (B), saliva (S), and tongue coating (T) of 21 volunteers.

1. Data Pre-processing: Data filtering, normalization, and zero handling

362, 401, 385, 346, and 345 species were obtained in the oral site GCF, P, B, S, and T, respectively. We normalized the microbial species counts into relative abundance at each oral site and filtered out the species with a relative abundance <0.0002 or an occurrence < 30%.

2. Construction of microbial association networks

For the selection of the Spearman correlation coefficient threshold, we constructed microbial association networks for five different oral sites at various thresholds, and calculated the R^2 and P-values for the fit to a scale-free network (Figure 2(a)). We found that, for all five sites, the network constructed with a threshold of 0.8 yielded the highest R^2, indicating the best fit to a scale-free network. Therefore, we set the Spearman correlation coefficient threshold to 0.8 for network construction using the microbial datasets from these oral sites.

Additionally, using the dorsum of the tongue data as an example, we tested the modularity of subnetworks formed at different correlation coefficient thresholds (Figure 2(b)). We observed that a threshold of 0.8 resulted in higher modularity, facilitating better network partitioning.

Spearman correlation coefficients were applied and filtered at each oral site with a correlation coefficient > 0.8 and corrected P value < 0.05. The retained pairs of species were used to construct the adjacency matrices. For each oral site, "GCF", "P", "B", "S", and "T" obtained 2360, 2577, 3179, 2470, and 3333 pairs of correlated species, respectively, as described in Supplementary Table 2.

3. Variation of network partition in five oral sites

The correlation networks for each oral site were constructed based on the adjacency matrices (Figure 2(a)). Subnetwork partitioning was then performed using the Walktrap community partition algorithm, with the random walk step length set to four. Additionally, we tested five other community detection algorithms and compared the modularity of the subnetworks they generated. As shown in Figure 2(c), the Walktrap community partition algorithm resulted in higher modularity compared to the other algorithms, although the difference was not statistically significant. The partitioning networks of five oral sites are shown in Figure 2(b) and Supplementary Table 3.

Specifically, "GCF" is divided into 43 subnetworks, with three encompassing more than ten nodes (Supplementary Table 3-1). "P" is partitioned into 46 subnetworks, with four encompassing more than ten nodes (Supplementary Table 3-2). "B" is partitioned into 49 subnetworks, with four encompassing more than ten nodes (Supplementary Table 3-3). "S" is divided into 45 subnetworks, with six encompassing more than ten nodes (Supplementary Table 3-4). "T" is partitioned into 39 subnetworks, with five encompassing more than ten nodes (Supplementary Table 3-5).

4. Identification of subnetworks and central node microbes

For each oral site, the top 20% of subnetworks (k=20) in terms of node count were selected and evaluated by ten kinds of network topological property indicators, which are shown in Supplementary Table 4. Next, the comprehensive topological properties of each subnetwork were evaluated, and a score-based ranking order was obtained, as shown in Supplementary Material 5. The subnetworks with the highest scores were selected as the dominant subgroups in each group, as shown in Figure 3(a) and Supplementary Figure 1-4.

Here, the analysis of subnetworks and central microbes at the niche of the tongue is detailed as an example.

4.1 Evaluating and scoring of microbial subnetworks

(i) The original evaluation matrix is constructed based on the scores of the ten indicators for the eight subnetworks, as shown in Supplementary Table 4-5. The matrix is presented below:

$$X = \begin{bmatrix} 26 & 52 & 5.177 & 0.16 & 4 & 1 & 1 & 0.555 & 0.488 & 2.491 \\ 25 & 50 & 4.914 & 0.167 & 4 & 1 & 1 & 0.366 & 0.357 & 2.094 \\ 19 & 171 & 1 & 1 & 18 & 18 & 18 & 1 & -0.006 & 1 \\ 12 & 21 & 4.167 & 0.318 & 3.5 & 1 & 1 & 0.699 & 0.299 & 1.910 \\ 12 & 66 & 1 & 1 & 11 & 11 & 11 & 1 & -0.014 & 1 \\ 9 & 36 & 1 & 1 & 8 & 8 & 8 & 1 & -0.025 & 1 \\ 8 & 28 & 1 & 1 & 7 & 7 & 7 & 1 & -0.031 & 1 \\ 7 & 21 & 1 & 1 & 6 & 6 & 6 & 1 & -0.041 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

(ii) The subnetwork topological property metrics are standardized using Equation (1). The detailed results are presented below:

$$Z = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0.207 & 1 & 0 & 0.034 & 0 & 0 & 0.298 & 1 & 0 \\ 0.947 & 0.193 & 0.937 & 0.008 & 0.034 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0.754 & 0.266 \\ 0.632 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0.067 & 1 \\ 0.263 & 0 & 0.758 & 0.188 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0.525 & 0.644 & 0.390 \\ 0.263 & 0.3 & 0 & 1 & 0.517 & 0.588 & 0.588 & 1 & 0.051 & 1 \\ 0.105 & 0.1 & 0 & 1 & 0.310 & 0.412 & 0.412 & 1 & 0.031 & 1 \\ 0.053 & 0.047 & 0 & 1 & 0.241 & 0.353 & 0.353 & 1 & 0.018 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0.172 & 0.294 & 0.294 & 1 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

(iii) The Rank R_{ij} of each metric of subnetwork topological properties is calculated. Among the ten network topological property indicators, nine positive metrics are arranged in ascending order. The final indicator, "average path length," is a negative metric and arranged in descending order. Identical values for the same metric are given average ranks, producing the rank matrix R. The results are provided below:

$$R = \begin{bmatrix} 7 & 5 & 4 & 2 & 3 & 2 & 1 & 3 & 2 & 1 \\ 6 & 4 & 3 & 4 & 1 & 4 & 2 & 1 & 2 & 2 \\ 5 & 7 & 1 & 3 & 2 & 3 & 2 & 2 & 7 & 4 \\ 4 & 1 & 2 & 1 & 4 & 1 & 3 & 4 & 1 & 3 \\ 4 & 6 & 1 & 1 & 4 & 1 & 4 & 4 & 6 & 4 \\ 3 & 3 & 1 & 1 & 4 & 1 & 5 & 4 & 5 & 4 \\ 2 & 2 & 1 & 1 & 4 & 1 & 6 & 4 & 4 & 4 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 4 & 1 & 7 & 4 & 3 & 4 \end{bmatrix}$$

(iv) Weights are determined using EWM. Based on Equation (4), the information entropy e_j and entropy weight W_j for ten evaluation metrics are calculated. The results are presented in Table 1.

(v) The $WRSR$ values for the eight subnetworks are computed using Equation (5), with the results provided below:

$$WRSR = [0.370, 0.323, 0.481, 0.242, 0.414, 0.320, 0.253, 0.185]$$

(vi) Distribution statistics of $WRSR$ are identified. In this step, the frequency, cumulative frequency, average rank, downward cumulative rating, and probability unit are tabulated in Table 2. A higher rank indicates a better evaluation of the subject.

(vii) With the $Probit$ values corresponding to cumulative frequencies as the independent variable and $WRSR$ values as the dependent variable, the regression equation is computed using the least squares method: $W\hat{R}SR = -0.1779 + 0.0956 \times Probit$, $R^2 = 0.987, F = 444.1, P = 7.44e-7, df = 6$.

(viii) The topological properties of the subnetworks are ranked based on $Probit$ and $W\hat{R}SR$, with the results presented in Table 3.

4.2 Evaluating and scoring of central node microbes at Dorsal Tongue site

Similar to the evaluation of subnetwork composite topological properties, we employ an integrated rank-sum ratio–entropy weight evaluation model to evaluate the comprehensive topological attributes of all nodes within subnetworks 22, 31 and 2. This decision is based on the scores of five indicators for nodes within the excellent subnetworks 22, 31 and 2, as outlined in Supplementary Material 2. Subnetworks 22 and 31 are regular graphs, in which all nodes have the same degree, and each node has the same five topological properties, so we use the evaluation model to evaluate only the combined scores of these five topological properties for all nodes in subnetwork 2. Since the five topological properties of the nodes also serve as positive indicators, they are ranked in ascending order. Employing the same computation method, the information entropy and weight for the five topological properties of nodes are calculated. These results are provided in Table 4. The final graded comprehensive topological properties for nodes in subnetwork 2 are presented in Table 5.

At site T, the Walktrap algorithm divided the correlation network into 39 subnetworks. The top eight subnetworks with the highest number of nodes (microbes) are subnetworks “2”, “3”, “22”, “1”, “31”, “20”, “19” and “21”. Then, the RSR-EWM evaluation algorithm is used to score the comprehensive topological properties of these subnetworks, with the highest ranking being “2”, which contains 26 nodes, 52 edges, a graph diameter of 5.177, a graph density of 0.160, etc. (Table 6). Next, we comprehensively scored five topological property indicators for each of the 26 nodes in subnetwork "2" and found that *Treponema bryantii*, *Desulfovibrio piger*, *Maritalea myrionectae*, and *Flavonifractor plautii* were the top four highest scoring bacteria (Table 7 and Figure 3(a)), which were the central bacteria in subnetwork “2”. Using the same pipeline, the central bacteria of other subnetworks at the site of T and other oral sites could also be determined, as shown in Supplementary Material 4.

5. The microbial communities identified by MNetClass have high biological relevance to 5 oral sites.

To enhance the credibility and interpretability of the experimental results, we will elucidate the reliability and biological significance of the key microbial subnetworks

517 identified by MNetClass framework.

518 **5.1 Reliability evaluation of microbial community identification**

519 We evaluated the reliability of the MNetClass framework in identifying key
520 microbial communities across different oral sites, based on previous studies[70]. To
521 enhance the robustness of our evaluation, we employed two assessment standards.
522 The first standard utilized the expanded Human Oral Microbiome Database
523 (eHOMD)[71], which provides comprehensive data on microbial presence across
524 various oral sites, including the core taxa for each site. The second approach involved
525 a meta-analysis of the literature, using predefined keywords to identify core and
526 "keystone" microbial communities from five oral sites, as reported in past
527 studies[68,72,73]. These were summarized and used as a reference benchmark (details of
528 the literature search methodology are provided in the Supplementary materials 4, with
529 the benchmark summary in Supplementary Table 7). This approach is supported by
530 recent reviews[74-76] on oral microbiomes, which emphasize the significance of core and
531 "keystone" taxa across different oral sites, an area of growing interest. Given the
532 varying taxonomic levels (e.g., species, genus, or phylum) used in different studies,
533 we mapped species and genus-level taxa to the phylum level using the Ribosomal
534 Database Project47 (RDP version 11.5) to expand the scope of comparison. The
535 microbial communities identified by different methods were also mapped to the
536 phylum level for consistent comparison.

537 We compared the identified microbial communities with both benchmarks and
538 calculated Precision, Recall, and F1-score metrics[77]. MNetClass was compared with
539 five other community detection algorithms—edge betweenness[30], label propagation[78],
540 leading eigenvector[79], fast greedy[29], Louvain[80], as well as the manta clustering
541 algorithm for weighted ecological networks[15], and weighted gene co-expression
542 network analysis (WGCNA)[49]. The results, shown in Figure 3(b) and Supplementary
543 Table 6, indicate that, based on benchmark 1, MNetClass achieved the highest
544 F1-score across all five oral sites, with the best performance in Precision and Recall in
545 four sites. In benchmark 2, MNetClass achieved the highest F1-score in four oral sites,
546 and the best performance in Precision and Recall in three sites. These results suggest

547 that MNetClass outperforms the other seven algorithms by identifying a greater
548 number of taxa that have been validated in databases or prior literature, making them
549 more likely to play important physiological roles across different oral sites.

550 **5.2 Biological significance of identified central bacteria**

551 *Treponema bryantii*, a rumen spirochete that interacts with cellulolytic bacteria[81,82].
552 *Maritalea myrionectae*, isolated from a culture of the marine ciliate Myrionecta
553 rubra[83]. This suggests that these two central bacteria in subnetwork "2" of T may be
554 associated with diet. *Desulfomonas pigra* is a type of sulfate-reducing bacteria
555 (SRB)[84]. Emerging evidence indicates that SRB may play a significant role in human
556 diseases, notably in relation to the clinical severity of human periodontitis[85].
557 *Flavonifractor plautii,* a gut probiotic[86], has been documented to be involved in the
558 metabolism of catechins in the human gastrointestinal tract, with its abundance
559 positively correlated with green tea consumption[87]. Oral administration of
560 *Flavonifractor plautii* has shown potential in alleviating inflammation in adipose
561 tissue associated with obesity[88], preventing arterial stiffness[89], and exhibiting potential
562 inhibitory effects on inflammatory bowel disease (IBD)[90] and colorectal cancer[91]. The
563 identification of central bacteria using MNetClass holds significant importance in
564 understanding human health and interpreting physiological functions in different body
565 sites. However, these central bacteria were not detected in the conventional
566 differential analysis[92] of microbial communities, as shown in Supplementary Material
567 S5. This is because differential analysis is based on differences in the relative
568 abundance of microbes in different body sites, and certain bacteria that play crucial
569 roles may not exhibit significant differences in relative abundance across different
570 sites. Consequently, this further underscores the contribution of MNetClass as a novel
571 network analysis solution for microbiome studies.

572

573 **MNetClass equals or outperforms other algorithms on synthetic data sets**

574 To evaluate the performance of MNetClass relative to other methods, we generated
575 50 synthetic datasets using FABIA[67]. Originally designed for evaluating biclustering
576 of gene expression data, FABIA was selected for its ability to provide true labels,

which serve as ground truth for performance assessment. Furthermore, it has been widely used in previous microbial network analysis studies[15] to generate synthetic datasets for algorithm evaluation.

The accuracy of the identified microbial clusters was assessed using three metrics: complex-wise sensitivity (Sn), cluster-wise positive predictive value (PPV), and geometrical accuracy (Acc)[93]. Sn represents the proportion of correctly identified positive samples, reflecting how many of the true positives were accurately detected. PPV indicates the proportion of identified microbial clusters that are true positives. Acc, which combines Sn and PPV using their geometric mean, provides a balanced evaluation of both metrics. We compared MNetClass with five other community detection algorithms edge betweenness, label propagation, leading eigenvector, fast greedy, and Louvain as well as the biological weighted network clustering algorithm manta and weighted gene co-expression network analysis (WGCNA) using these evaluation metrics.

After partitioning the subnetworks using community detection methods, the most likely subnetworks to perform physiological functions were identified based on network topology analysis[60]. Previous studies typically used a single optimal topological property to extract subnetworks[94,95]; however, different topological properties yield different optimal subnetworks. As noted in recent literature, selecting subnetworks based on multiple topological properties is a more reasonable approach[96]. Therefore, we developed an integrated rank-sum ratio–entropy weight (RSR-EWM) evaluation model to provide a comprehensive score for network topological properties. We compared the performance of various community detection algorithms and the subnetworks selected based on single topological properties versus those selected using the RSR-EWM score across 50 synthetic datasets (Figure 4(a)). Except for the edge betweenness algorithm, where the subnetwork selected using a single topological property showed a higher ACC score than the RSR-EWM method, with no significant difference, all other algorithms performed better or equally well when combined with the RSR-EWM scoring. Notably, the Walktrap algorithm, when coupled with RSR-EWM, significantly outperformed the single topological property

method across all three metrics. Furthermore, when generating box plots for these metrics, we excluded outliers and observed that MNetClass retained the highest number of points, indicating its stability and robustness across the 50 synthetic datasets.

We compared MNetClass with seven other similar algorithms across 50 synthetic microbial datasets. For the microbial network construction step, edge betweenness, label propagation, leading eigenvector, fast greedy, Louvain, and the biological weighted network clustering algorithm manta did not specify a particular method for network construction, so we used the same approach as MNetClass. After network clustering, edge betweenness, label propagation, leading eigenvector, fast greedy, and Louvain selected key subnetworks based on the RSR-EWM topology scoring method, while manta selected the cluster with the highest proportion of strong nodes from the clustered groups as the key subnetwork. For WGCNA, originally designed for gene expression data, we adapted it for microbial co-occurrence network construction and module identification. We used default parameters to automatically construct the network and identify the modules most strongly associated with phenotype as the key subnetworks. The identified key subnetwork nodes were treated as predicted positives, and the Sn, PPV, and ACC were calculated by comparing these predicted positives with the true labels, as shown in Figure 3(b). MNetClass significantly outperformed the other six algorithms in Sn and ACC, and was significantly better than five other community detection algorithms in PPV, with no significant difference when compared to manta and WGCNA.

Performance evaluation of MNetClass for identifying microbial key subnetwork and ASD prediction

1. Identifying microbial key subnetworks across multiple cohorts

We applied our algorithm, MNetClass, to identify key microbial subnetworks across 10 independent ASD cohorts, following the workflow outlined in Figure 1. The identified microbial clusters are visualized in Figure 5(a). Compared to the original method, MNetClass revealed higher overlap in microbial clusters between the ASD

637 and Healthy groups across all 10 cohorts, indicating greater consistency and
638 reproducibility (Figures 5(f) and 5(g)). These results suggest that MNetClass
639 effectively captures robust and shared microbial community structures.

640 **2. Predictive performance using identified subnetworks**

641 To evaluate the predictive utility of the identified microbial key subnetworks, we
642 utilized Project S1 as the training set and applied five-fold cross-validation to
643 construct a random forest model. Feature selection was performed using recursive
644 feature elimination (RFE) to determine the optimal number of features. Subsequently,
645 we validated the model using external datasets, testing four configurations of features
646 derived from the identified subnetworks: all taxa, the optimal number of taxa, and the
647 top 6 and top 15 taxa ranked by feature importance (Figure 5(b)).

648 The ROC curves for these configurations are shown in Figure 5(c). Notably, using
649 the optimal number of taxa, all taxa, and the top 15 taxa yielded superior predictive
650 performance compared to the original method, with AUC scores of 0.85, 0.84, and
651 0.81, respectively. These results underscore the effectiveness of MNetClass in
652 identifying predictive features and constructing robust classification models.

653 **3. Comparative performance with other algorithms**

654 We compared the performance of microbial cluster identification by MNetClass
655 with seven other algorithms for ASD prediction. Using Project S1 as the training set
656 and the remaining datasets as validation sets, random forest models were constructed
657 following the same pipeline. Five evaluation metrics were used: ROC-AUC, accuracy,
658 recall, precision, and F1-score (Figures 5(d) and 5(e)).

659 MNetClass outperformed all other methods in ROC-AUC, accuracy, recall, and
660 F1-score, while slightly underperforming Louvain in precision. These results
661 demonstrate that MNetClass delivers superior performance in identifying meaningful
662 microbial clusters for ASD prediction.

663

664 **Case study of MNetClass on oral microbial communities across age groups**

665 **1. Subnetwork-related phenotypes as main drivers of sample grouping in oral**
666 **microbiome data**

We ran MNetClass on species-level oral microbiome data from all samples and performed a correlation analysis between the relative abundance of microbes in the identified key subnetwork and various phenotypes. Since the phenotypes-part, gender, and age group-are categorical variables, we conducted one-way ANOVA to assess whether the relative abundances of microbes significantly differed across categories ($p \leq 0.05$). The results are shown in Figure 6(a) and in "Supplementary Table 8"

The analysis revealed that the proportions of microbes with significant abundance differences across the phenotypes part, gender, and age in the identified subnetwork were 0.762, 0, and 0.524, respectively (Figure 6(b)). Additionally, we performed ANOVA on the relative abundance of all microbes with respect to the phenotypes, as detailed in "Supplementary Table 9" Here, the proportions of microbes with significant differences across the phenotypes were 0.290, 0.310, and 0.078 (Figure 6(b)).

These findings suggest that the subnetwork identified by MNetClass are more strongly correlated with the phenotype "part." This is consistent with the original study's findings, where Permutational Multivariate Analysis of Variance (PERMANOVA) indicated that "part" and "age" were the major drivers of sample classification. Furthermore, we performed PERMANOVA tests on the identified microbial community relative to different phenotypes. The p-values for "part," "gender," and "age" were 0.001, 0.886, and 0.001, respectively. These results demonstrate that our identified subnetwork enhances the significance of "part" and "age" as factors influencing groupings, while reducing the influence of "gender," rendering it statistically insignificant. This confirms the need to study age-related oral microbiomes by separate anatomical sites, as suggested by the original analysis.

2. MNetClass identifies age-related microbial communities across different oral sites

We used the GCF samples as an example for principal coordinates analysis (PCoA), as shown in Figure 6(c). A PERMANOVA test was performed to assess the influence of age on the sample grouping, with a significant p-value of 0.001. We then applied MNetClass to identify subnetworks (Figure 6(d)). Spearman correlation analysis was

conducted between age and each species in the rank-1, rank-2, and rank-3 subnetworks, as well as in the time-varying microbial communities identified in the original study. The average correlation values are shown in Figure 6(e). The rank-1 subnetwork exhibited the highest average absolute Spearman correlation coefficient with age (0.2153, 0.1468, 0.1455, and 0.1705), indicating that the key subnetworks we selected are highly correlated with age. This may be due to the fact that, unlike in the original study, no predefined age groups were required, potentially reducing grouping-related biases and errors.

The phyla of the microbes identified in the key subnetworks by MNetClass include *Actinobacteria, Bacteroidetes, Firmicutes, Fusobacteria, Proteobacteria, and Verrucomicrobia.* In comparison, the phyla identified in the original study were *Actinobacteria, Bacteroidetes, Firmicutes, Proteobacteria, and Spirochaetes,* with only one microbial species not overlapping. This suggests that the microbial communities identified by MNetClass are consistent with those found in the original study.

Furthermore, we performed a topological analysis of the microbes in the identified subnetwork. Using RSR-EWM, we calculated the integrated topological scores of the nodes and selected those with the highest scores as the core microbes in the subnetwork. These microbes are more likely to play a physiological role in these subgroups. Notably, the central species identified in key subnetwork by MNetClass, *Bifidobacterium longum subsp. infantis* and *Pseudomonas beteli*, were also found in the original study's key microbial species. Moreover, other species highly correlated with these two microbes may have significant biological relevance. For example, the increased abundance of *Dialister succinatiphilus* in periodontitis can serve as a biomarker, aiding in early diagnosis and monitoring disease progression[97]. *Lactobacillus mucosae*[98,99] regulates the acidic environment of the oral cavity by producing lactic acid, inhibiting the growth of cariogenic bacteria and periodontal pathogens.

DISCUSSION

Currently, most microbiome studies typically rely on statistical methods, such as the metagenomic wide association study (MWAS)[10], and are not based on the principle of ecological theory[100]. Microbial network-based methods, such as NetShift[13], NetMoss[14] and manta[15], are thus becoming powerful tools for elucidating the characteristics of microbiome ecosystems. However, most of these methods require a control group and are only suitable for measuring changes in microbial networks under healthy and diseased states. Moreover, very few methods exist for identifying subcommunities after clustering across ecological niches and defining the microorganisms that play an important role in these subpopulations. To address this issue, we established a control-independent microbial network clustering analysis framework, MNetClass, which expands the research methods on microbial interrelationships and ecological characteristics.

In MNetClass, we used the random walk community partition algorithm[18] to divide the constructed association network into different subnetworks. This method is appropriate for the microbial network analysis constructed under different habitats because it does not require providing the number and size of partitions as parameters[19]. Additionally, the random walk algorithm can yield satisfactory results within a relatively small time complexity, ensuring the efficiency of our overall network analysis[56]. When evaluating the properties of subnetworks and their nodes, we use various topological property measurement indicators, such as network centrality. Nodes with the following properties can be discovered: a higher degree of connectivity to neighboring nodes, connections to a greater number of paths, closer proximity to other nodes in the network, or higher centrality among adjacent nodes. Therefore, with these indicators, we can identify the central species (or hubs)[28,66,101] that may play important roles in maintaining the stability of the ecosystem. This step may garner significant interest among researchers because few methods focus on this topic.

To assess the topological properties of subnetworks and nodes of several different magnitudes, we used an integrated rank-sum ratio–entropy weight evaluation model[14]. This model mitigates the impacts of different indicators and different magnitudes on

the comprehensive evaluation of multiple topological properties[102]. Furthermore, this model is an objective evaluation method that follows the principle that the greater the disparity in an indicator is, the lower its information entropy and the greater the amount of information it contains[63]. If all evaluation objects' values for a particular indicator are equal, that indicator does not play a role in the comprehensive evaluation[103]. This method comprehensively scores and ranks the evaluation objects, facilitating the selection of dominant microbial communities at each site.

The focus of this study was to demonstrate an analytical workflow for microbial network clustering and central subcommunities identification, so the Spearman correlation coefficient, which is widely recognized as a classic measure for assessing the interactions between microbes, was employed to construct the microbial correlation network. Additionally, several other measurement methods, such as SparCC[45], CCLasso[104], and SPIEC-EASI[105], can also be selected and utilized for network construction. Scientists can choose the appropriate method for measuring the interactions of microbes based on their research purpose. Our "MNetClass" R package will continue to be improved and updated in the future, such as by incorporating more interaction measurement options.

ETHICS APPROVAL AND CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE

The studies involving human participants were reviewed and approved by the Medical Ethical Committee of School of Stomatology, Shandong University. The patients/participants provided their written informed consent to participate in this study.

FUNDING

This work was funded by operating grants from the National Natural Science Foundation of China (No. 82071122, 82270980), the National Young Scientist Support Foundation (2019), Excellent Young Scientist Foundation of Shandong Province (No. ZR2021JQ29), Taishan Young Scientist Project of Shandong Province (2019), Periodontitis innovation team of Jinan City (2021GXRC021), Major

Innovation Projects in Shandong Province (No. 2021SFGC0502), Oral Microbiome Innovation Team of Shandong Province (No. 2020KJK001), Shandong Province Key Research and Development Program (No. 2021ZDSYS18), Shandong Province Major Scientifc and Technical Innovation Project (No. 2021SFGC0502).

DATA AVAILABILITY

The raw sequence data reported in this paper have been deposited in the Genome Sequence Archive in National Genomics Data Center, China National Center for Bioinformation / Beijing Institute of Genomics, Chinese Academy of Sciences (GSA: CRA013444) that are publicly accessible at https://bigd.big.ac.cn/gsa/browse/CRA013444.

SOFTWARE AVAILABILITY

The open-source MNetClass R package and tutorial are available at GitHub: https://github.com/YihuaWWW/MNetClass.

COMPETING INTERESTS

The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

AUTHORS' CONTRIBUTIONS

All authors contributed to the pipeline development and workflow of analyses. The initial idea and framework were conceived by Qiang Feng and Yihua Wang. The pipeline was built and maintained by Yihua Wang, Qingzhen Hou and Bingqiang Liu. Yihua Wang, Qingzhen Hou and Fulan Wei contributed to the pipeline test and usage for network analyses. This protocol was written by Yihua Wang and Qiang Feng, and revised with from other authors' suggestions.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We sincerely thank all colleagues in Shandong University-BOP Joint Oral Microbiome Laboratory for all of the kindly advices and support.

REFERENCES

1 Schupack, D. A., Mars, R. A., Voelker, D. H., Abeykoon, J. P. & Kashyap, P. C. The promise of the gut microbiome as part of individualized treatment strategies. *Nature Reviews Gastroenterology & Hepatology* **19**, 7-25 (2022).

2 Fan, Y. & Pedersen, O. Gut microbiota in human metabolic health and disease. *Nature Reviews Microbiology* **19**, 55-71 (2021).

3 Proctor, D. M. *et al.* A spatial gradient of bacterial diversity in the human oral cavity shaped by salivary flow. *Nature communications* **9**, 681 (2018).

4 Hajishengallis, G., Lamont, R. J. & Koo, H. Oral polymicrobial communities: assembly, function, and impact on diseases. *Cell Host & Microbe* (2023).

5 Wang, N. & Fang, J.-Y. Fusobacterium nucleatum, a key pathogenic factor and microbial biomarker for colorectal cancer. *Trends Microbiol.* **31**, 159-172 (2023).

6 Li, R. *et al.* Clinical Significance of Porphyromonas gingivalis Enriching Cancer Stem Cells by Inhibiting Programmed Cell Death Factor 4 in Esophageal Squamous Cell Carcinoma. *ACS Infectious Diseases* (2023).

7 Strimbu, K. & Tavel, J. A. What are biomarkers? *Current Opinion in HIV and AIDS* **5**, 463 (2010).

8 Rao, C. *et al.* Multi-kingdom ecological drivers of microbiota assembly in preterm infants. *Nature* **591**, 633-638 (2021).

9 Belenguer, A. *et al.* Two routes of metabolic cross-feeding between Bifidobacterium adolescentis and butyrate-producing anaerobes from the human gut. *Appl. Environ. Microbiol.* **72**, 3593-3599 (2006).

10 Wang, J. & Jia, H. Metagenome-wide association studies: fine-mining the microbiome. *Nature Reviews Microbiology* **14**, 508-522 (2016).

11 Yilmaz, B. *et al.* Microbial network disturbances in relapsing refractory Crohn's disease. *Nat. Med.* **25**, 323-336 (2019).

12 Mac Aogáin, M. *et al.* Integrative microbiomics in bronchiectasis exacerbations. *Nat. Med.* **27**, 688-699 (2021).

13 Kuntal, B. K., Chandrakar, P., Sadhu, S. & Mande, S. S. 'NetShift': a methodology for understanding 'driver microbes' from healthy and disease microbiome datasets. *The ISME journal* **13**, 442-454 (2019).

14 Lu, H., Zhu, C., Cao, X. & Hsu, Y. The sustainability evaluation of masks based on the integrated rank sum ratio and entropy weight method. *Sustainability* **14**, 5706 (2022).

15 Röttjers, L. & Faust, K. Manta: A clustering algorithm for weighted ecological networks. *Msystems* **5**, 10.1128/msystems. 00903-00919 (2020).

16 Aldous, D. & Fill, J. (Berkeley, 1995).

17 Lovász, L. Random walks on graphs. *Combinatorics, Paul erdos is eighty* **2**, 4 (1993).

18 Pons, P. & Latapy, M. in *Computer and Information Sciences-ISCIS 2005: 20th International Symposium, Istanbul, Turkey, October 26-28, 2005. Proceedings 20.* 284-293 (Springer).

19 Rosvall, M. & Bergstrom, C. T. Maps of random walks on complex networks reveal community structure. *Proceedings of the national academy of sciences* **105**, 1118-1123 (2008).

20 Lieberson, S. Rank-sum comparisons between groups. *Soc. Method.* **7**, 276-291 (1976).

21 Liu, F. *et al.* Deep learning for community detection: progress, challenges and opportunities. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.08225* (2020).

22 Koschützki, D. *et al.* Centrality indices. *Network analysis: methodological foundations*, 16-61 (2005).

23 Freeman, L. C. A set of measures of centrality based on betweenness. *Sociometry*, 35-41 (1977).

24 Poudel, R. *et al.* Microbiome networks: a systems framework for identifying candidate microbial assemblages for disease management. *Phytopathology* **106**, 1083-1096 (2016).

25 Freeman, L. C. Centrality in social networks: Conceptual clarification. *Social network: critical concepts in sociology. Londres: Routledge* **1**, 238-263 (2002).

26 Bonacich, P. Power and centrality: A family of measures. *American journal of sociology* **92**, 1170-1182 (1987).

27 Ruhnau, B. Eigenvector-centrality—a node-centrality? *Social networks* **22**, 357-365 (2000).

28 Junker, B. H. & Schreiber, F. *Analysis of biological networks*. (John Wiley & Sons, 2011).

29 Clauset, A., Newman, M. E. & Moore, C. Finding community structure in very large networks. *Physical review E* **70**, 066111 (2004).

30 Newman, M. E. & Girvan, M. Finding and evaluating community structure in networks. *Physical review E* **69**, 026113 (2004).

31 Guimera, R. & Nunes Amaral, L. A. Functional cartography of complex metabolic networks. *Nature* **433**, 895-900 (2005).

32 White, D. R. & Harary, F. The cohesiveness of blocks in social networks: Node connectivity and conditional density. *Soc. Method.* **31**, 305-359 (2001).

33 Watts, D. J. & Strogatz, S. H. Collective dynamics of 'small-world'networks. *Nature* **393**, 440-442 (1998).

34 Badri, M., Kurtz, Z. D., Bonneau, R. & Müller, C. L. Shrinkage improves estimation of microbial associations under different normalization methods. *NAR Genomics and Bioinformatics* **2**, lqaa100 (2020).

35 McMurdie, P. J. & Holmes, S. Waste not, want not: why rarefying microbiome data is inadmissible. *PLoS Comp. Biol.* **10**, e1003531 (2014).

36 Daniels, H. E. The relation between measures of correlation in the universe of sample permutations. *Biometrika* **33**, 129-135 (1944).

37 Spearman, C. The proof and measurement of association between two things. *The American journal of psychology* **100**, 441-471 (1987).

38 Layeghifard, M., Hwang, D. M. & Guttman, D. S. Disentangling interactions in the microbiome: a network perspective. *Trends Microbiol.* **25**, 217-228 (2017).

39 Matchado, M. S. *et al.* Network analysis methods for studying microbial communities: A mini review. *Computational and structural biotechnology journal* **19**, 2687-2698 (2021).

40 Guo, B. *et al.* Microbial co-occurrence network topological properties link with reactor parameters and reveal importance of low-abundance genera. *npj Biofilms and Microbiomes* **8**, 3 (2022).

41 Gao, C. *et al.* Co-occurrence networks reveal more complexity than community composition

in resistance and resilience of microbial communities. *Nature communications* **13**, 3867 (2022).

42 Barberán, A., Bates, S. T., Casamayor, E. O. & Fierer, N. Using network analysis to explore co-occurrence patterns in soil microbial communities. *The ISME journal* **6**, 343-351 (2012).

43 Faust, K. *et al.* Microbial co-occurrence relationships in the human microbiome. *PLoS Comp. Biol.* **8**, e1002606 (2012).

44 Myers, J. L., Well, A. & Lorch, R. F. *Research design and statistical analysis*. (Routledge, 2010).

45 Friedman, J. & Alm, E. J. Inferring correlation networks from genomic survey data. *PLoS Comp. Biol.* **8**, e1002687 (2012).

46 Horvath, S. *Weighted network analysis: applications in genomics and systems biology*. (Springer Science & Business Media, 2011).

47 Jeong, H., Tombor, B., Albert, R., Oltvai, Z. N. & Barabási, A.-L. The large-scale organization of metabolic networks. *Nature* **407**, 651-654 (2000).

48 Albert, R. Scale-free networks in cell biology. *J. Cell Sci.* **118**, 4947-4957 (2005).

49 Zhang, B. & Horvath, S. A general framework for weighted gene co-expression network analysis. *Statistical applications in genetics and molecular biology* **4** (2005).

50 Tong, M. *et al.* A modular organization of the human intestinal mucosal microbiota and its association with inflammatory bowel disease. *PloS one* **8**, e80702 (2013).

51 Langfelder, P. & Horvath, S. WGCNA: an R package for weighted correlation network analysis. *BMC Bioinformatics* **9**, 1-13 (2008).

52 Csardi, G. & Nepusz, T. The igraph software. *Complex syst* **1695**, 1-9 (2006).

53 Clauset, A., Shalizi, C. R. & Newman, M. E. Power-law distributions in empirical data. *SIAM review* **51**, 661-703 (2009).

54 Girvan, M. & Newman, M. E. Community structure in social and biological networks. *Proceedings of the national academy of sciences* **99**, 7821-7826 (2002).

55 Faust, K. & Raes, J. Microbial interactions: from networks to models. *Nature Reviews Microbiology* **10**, 538-550 (2012).

56 Bhatia, V. & Rani, R. Dfuzzy: a deep learning-based fuzzy clustering model for large graphs. *Knowledge and Information Systems* **57**, 159-181 (2018).

57 Aldous, D. & Fill, J. Reversible Markov chains and random walks on graphs. (2002).

58 Meng, Q. *et al.* The co-occurrence network patterns and keystone species of microbial communities in cattle manure-corn straw composting. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research* **30**, 20265-20276 (2023).

59 Dasgupta, A., Kumar, R. & Sarlos, T. in *Proceedings of the 23rd international conference on World wide web.* 795-806.

60 Banerjee, S., Schlaeppi, K. & van der Heijden, M. G. Keystone taxa as drivers of microbiome structure and functioning. *Nature Reviews Microbiology* **16**, 567-576 (2018).

61 Bohannan, B. J. & Relman, D. A. The Application of Ecological Theory Toward an Understanding of the Human Microbiome.

62 Li, F., Chen, L., Zhang, J., Yin, J. & Huang, S. Bacterial community structure after long-term organic and inorganic fertilization reveals important associations between soil nutrients and specific taxa involved in nutrient transformations. *Frontiers in microbiology* **8**, 187 (2017).

63 Zhu, Y., Tian, D. & Yan, F. Effectiveness of entropy weight method in decision-making.

Mathematical Problems in Engineering **2020**, 1-5 (2020).

64 Johnson, R. A., Miller, I. & Freund, J. E. Probability and statistics for engineers. (2000).

65 Strogatz, S. H. Exploring complex networks. *Nature* **410**, 268-276 (2001).

66 Agler, M. T. *et al.* Microbial hub taxa link host and abiotic factors to plant microbiome variation. *PLoS Biol.* **14**, e1002352 (2016).

67 Hochreiter, S. *et al.* FABIA: factor analysis for bicluster acquisition. *Bioinformatics* **26**, 1520-1527 (2010).

68 Xu, Y. *et al.* Leveraging existing 16SrRNA microbial data to define a composite biomarker for autism spectrum disorder. *Microbiology spectrum* **10**, e00331-00322 (2022).

69 Liu, S., Wang, Y., Zhao, L., Sun, X. & Feng, Q. Microbiome succession with increasing age in three oral sites. *Aging (albany NY)* **12**, 7874 (2020).

70 Liu, Z. *et al.* An Explainable Graph Neural Framework to Identify Cancer‐Associated Intratumoral Microbial Communities. *Advanced Science*, 2403393 (2024).

71 Dewhirst, F. E. *et al.* The human oral microbiome. *J. Bacteriol.* **192**, 5002-5017 (2010).

72 Abbas-Egbariya, H. *et al.* Meta-analysis defines predominant shared microbial responses in various diseases and a specific inflammatory bowel disease signal. *Genome Biology* **23**, 61 (2022).

73 Shah, M. S. *et al.* Leveraging sequence-based faecal microbial community survey data to identify a composite biomarker for colorectal cancer. *Gut* **67**, 882-891 (2018).

74 Mark Welch, J. L., Dewhirst, F. E. & Borisy, G. G. Biogeography of the oral microbiome: the site-specialist hypothesis. *Annu. Rev. Microbiol.* **73**, 335-358 (2019).

75 Mosaddad, S. A. *et al.* Oral microbial biofilms: an update. *Eur. J. Clin. Microbiol. Infect. Dis.* **38**, 2005-2019 (2019).

76 Kunath, B. J., De Rudder, C., Laczny, C. C., Letellier, E. & Wilmes, P. The oral–gut microbiome axis in health and disease. *Nature Reviews Microbiology*, 1-15 (2024).

77 Grandini, M., Bagli, E. & Visani, G. Metrics for multi-class classification: an overview. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2008.05756* (2020).

78 Raghavan, U. N., Albert, R. & Kumara, S. Near linear time algorithm to detect community structures in large-scale networks. *Physical Review E—Statistical, Nonlinear, and Soft Matter Physics* **76**, 036106 (2007).

79 Newman, M. E. Finding community structure in networks using the eigenvectors of matrices. *Physical Review E—Statistical, Nonlinear, and Soft Matter Physics* **74**, 036104 (2006).

80 Blondel, V. D., Guillaume, J.-L., Lambiotte, R. & Lefebvre, E. Fast unfolding of communities in large networks. *Journal of statistical mechanics: theory and experiment* **2008**, P10008 (2008).

81 Stanton, T. & Canale-Parola, E. Treponema bryantii sp. nov., a rumen spirochete that interacts with cellulolytic bacteria. *Arch. Microbiol.* **127**, 145-156 (1980).

82 Kudo, H., Cheng, K.-J. & Costerton, J. Interactions between Treponema bryantii and cellulolytic bacteria in the in vitro degradation of straw cellulose. *Canadian Journal of Microbiology* **33**, 244-248 (1987).

83 Hwang, C. Y., Cho, K. D., Yih, W. & Cho, B. C. Maritalea myrionectae gen. nov., sp. nov., isolated from a culture of the marine ciliate Myrionecta rubra. *Int. J. Syst. Evol. Microbiol.* **59**, 609-614 (2009).

84 Loubinoux, J., Bronowicki, J.-P., Pereira, I. A., Mougenel, J.-L. & Le Faou, A. E. Sulfate-reducing bacteria in human feces and their association with inflammatory bowel diseases. *FEMS*

Microbiol. Ecol. **40**, 107-112 (2002).

85 Langendijk, P., Hanssen, J. & Van der Hoeven, J. Sulfate‐reducing bacteria in association with human periodontitis. *Journal of Clinical Periodontology* **27**, 943-950 (2000).

86 Qiu, T. Y. *et al.* A carbon-carbon hydrolase from human gut probiotics Flavonifractor plautii catalyzes phloretin conversion. *Food Bioscience* **50**, 102178 (2022).

87 Mikami, A. *et al.* Oral administration of Flavonifractor plautii, a bacteria increased with green tea consumption, promotes recovery from acute colitis in mice via suppression of IL-17. *Frontiers in Nutrition* **7**, 610946 (2021).

88 Mikami, A. *et al.* Oral administration of Flavonifractor plautii attenuates inflammatory responses in obese adipose tissue. *Mol. Biol. Rep.* **47**, 6717-6725 (2020).

89 Luo, S. *et al.* Flavonifractor plautii Protects Against Elevated Arterial Stiffness. *Circul. Res.* **132**, 167-181 (2023).

90 Pisani, A. *et al.* P675 Flavonoid-degrading bacteria have central positions in correlation network analysis in patients with Inflammatory Bowel Disease. *Journal of Crohn's and Colitis* **15**, S595-S597 (2021).

91 Gupta, A. *et al.* Association of Flavonifractor plautii, a flavonoid-degrading bacterium, with the gut microbiome of colorectal cancer patients in India. *MSystems* **4**, 10.1128/msystems. 00438-00419 (2019).

92 Camargo, A., Azuaje, F., Wang, H. & Zheng, H. Permutation–based statistical tests for multiple hypotheses. *Source code for biology and medicine* **3**, 1-8 (2008).

93 Brohee, S. & Van Helden, J. Evaluation of clustering algorithms for protein-protein interaction networks. *BMC Bioinformatics* **7**, 1-19 (2006).

94 Banerjee, S. *et al.* Network analysis reveals functional redundancy and keystone taxa amongst bacterial and fungal communities during organic matter decomposition in an arable soil. *Soil Biol. Biochem.* **97**, 188-198 (2016).

95 Jiang, Y. *et al.* Plant cultivars imprint the rhizosphere bacterial community composition and association networks. *Soil Biol. Biochem.* **109**, 145-155 (2017).

96 Berry, D. & Widder, S. Deciphering microbial interactions and detecting keystone species with co-occurrence networks. *Frontiers in microbiology* **5**, 219 (2014).

97 Yay, E. *et al.* Oral and gut microbial profiling in periodontitis and Parkinson's disease. *Journal of Oral Microbiology* **16**, 2331264 (2024).

98 Caufield, P., Schön, C., Saraithong, P., Li, Y. & Argimón, S. Oral lactobacilli and dental caries: a model for niche adaptation in humans. *J. Dent. Res.* **94**, 110S-118S (2015).

99 Kõll‐Klais, P. *et al.* Oral lactobacilli in chronic periodontitis and periodontal health: species composition and antimicrobial activity. *Oral Microbiol. Immunol.* **20**, 354-361 (2005).

100 Çömlekcioğlu, U., Jezierska, S., Opsomer, G. & Pascottini, O. B. Uterine microbial ecology and disease in cattle: A review. *Theriogenology* (2023).

101 Csardi, G. & Nepusz, T. The igraph software package for complex network research. *InterJournal, complex systems* **1695**, 1-9 (2006).

102 Wen, S. *et al.* Comprehensive evaluation of hydrological models for climate change impact assessment in the Upper Yangtze River Basin, China. *Clim. Change* **163**, 1207-1226 (2020).

103 Liu, L., Zhou, J., An, X., Zhang, Y. & Yang, L. Using fuzzy theory and information entropy for water quality assessment in Three Gorges region, China. *Expert Systems with Applications* **37**, 2517-2521 (2010).

104 Fang, H., Huang, C., Zhao, H. & Deng, M. CCLasso: correlation inference for compositional data through Lasso. *Bioinformatics* **31**, 3172-3180 (2015).

105 Kurtz, Z., Mueller, C., Miraldi, E. & Bonneau, R. SpiecEasi: Sparse inverse covariance for ecological statistical inference. *R package version* **1** (2017).

TABLES

Table 1. EWM of topological property evaluation of each subnetwork.

	Vertex number	Edge number	Graph diameter	Graph density	Average degree	Edges connectivity	Nodes connectivity	Clustering coefficient	Modularity	Average path length
e_j	0.780	0.654	0.525	0.825	0.732	0.723	0.723	0.905	0.642	0.894
W_j	0.085	0.133	0.183	0.067	0.103	0.107	0.107	0.037	0.138	0.041

Table 2. Distribution condition of statistical WRSR.

Sub-network ID	WRSR	f	$\sum f$	$\overline{R_t}$	$\frac{\overline{R}}{m} \times 100\%$	Probit
2	0.370	1	6	6	0.750	5.674
3	0.323	1	5	5	0.625	5.319
22	0.481	1	8	8	0.975	6.960
1	0.242	1	2	2	0.250	4.326
31	0.414	1	7	7	0.875	6.150
20	0.320	1	4	4	0.500	5.000
19	0.253	1	3	3	0.375	4.681
21	0.185	1	1	1	0.125	3.850

Table 3. Topological properties ranking results for eight subnetworks.

Grade	Probit	$\widehat{WRSR}$	Sub-network Number
Excellent	≥ 5.5	≥ 0.348	22, 31, 2
Moderate	$4 \sim 5.5$	$0.204 \sim 0.348$	3, 20, 19, 1
Poor	< 4	≤ 0.204	21

Table 4. Information entropy and weights of the five indexes in topological property evaluation of nodes in subnetwork 2.

	Degree Centrality	Weighted Degree Centrality	Betweenness Centrality	Closeness Centrality	Eigenvector Centrality
e_j	0.876	0.880	0.667	0.946	0.843
W_j	0.158	0.153	0.423	0.068	0.199

Table 5. Topological properties ranking results for nodes of subnetwork 2.

Grade	Probit	$W\widehat{RSR}$	Node Index
Excellent	≥ 6	≥ 1.057	25, 10, 16, 13
Moderate	$4 \sim 6$	$0.597 \sim 1.057$	8, 20, 9, 5, 19, 21, 14, 11, 6, 3, 4, 24, 22, 7, 18, 23, 2, 17
Poor	< 4	≤ 0.597	15, 1, 12, 0

Table 6. Topological properties of selected subnetworks.

Subnetwork ID	Node number	Edge number	Graph diameter	Graph density	Average degree	Edges connectivity	Nodes connectivity	Clustering coefficient	Modularity	Average path length
2	26	52	5.177	0.160	4	1	1	0.555	0.488	2.491
3	25	50	4.914	0.167	4	1	1	0.366	0.357	2.094
22	19	171	1	1	18	18	18	1	-0.006	1
1	12	21	4.167	0.318	3.5	1	1	0.699	0.299	1.910
31	12	66	1	1	11	11	11	1	-0.014	1
20	9	36	1	1	8	8	8	1	-0.025	1
19	8	28	1	1	7	7	7	1	-0.031	1
21	7	21	1	1	6	6	6	1	-0.041	1

Table 7. Topological properties of selected nodes in subnetwork 2.

Nodes	Degree Centrality	Weighted Degree Centrality	Betweenness Centrality	Closeness Centrality	Eigenvector Centrality	RSR	Rank
Treponema_bryantii	9	7.815	119	0.023	1	3.111	1
Desulfovibrio_piger	7	6.067	155	0.025	0.517	2.822	2
Maritalea_myrionectae	7	6.163	53	0.022	0.638	2.747	3
Flavonifractor_plautii	7	6.164	19	0.022	0.638	2.712	4

FIGURES



Figure 1. The simplified diagram of MNetClass's analysis pipeline. Data pre-processing to normalize and filter low-abundance & low-frequency microorganisms. 1. Constructing a microbial association network. 2. Partitioning the network into subnetworks. 3. Evaluating and scoring microbial topological properties of subnetworks and central node microbes



Figure 2. Construction and partitioning of correlation networks. (a) Distribution of R^2 values for the scale-free network fit at different correlation coefficient thresholds. Different colors represent five oral sites: gingival crevicular fluid (GCF), dental plaque (P), buccal mucosa (B), saliva (S), and tongue coating (T). (b) Modularity of subnetworks after partitioning based Walktrap at different Spearman coefficient thresholds. (c) Modularity of subnetworks after partitioning using six community detection algorithms. (d) Visualization of correlation networks constructed for the five oral sites. Nodes represent bacteria, with node size corresponding to relative bacterial abundance. Node color indicates distinct phylum, and edges between nodes signify interactions between bacteria. (e) Visualization of the partitioned subnetworks. Node color represents the bacteria belonging to different clusters. Black edges indicate positively weighted interactions, signifying positive correlations between the connected bacteria, while red edges represent negatively weighted interactions, indicating negative correlations.



Figure 3. Identification and evaluation of key subnetworks and central microbes. (a) Key subnetworks and central microbes at the tongue coating (T) identified using

the Walktrap algorithm and the integrated rank-sum ratio entropy weight evaluation model (RSR-EWM). The left panel shows a visualization of the subnetwork partitioning results. The middle panel highlights the important subnetworks selected from the left panel. The right panel displays the key microbial nodes and their associated bacteria selected from the middle panel. Red labels denote key microbial nodes, while black labels indicate bacteria associated with them. (b) Radar plot comparing the performance of MNetClass with seven other algorithms on two benchmarks, evaluated using Precision, Recall, and F1-score. Benchmark1 is based on EHOMD. Benchmark2 is based on meta-analysis.



Figure 4. Performance of network clustering tools on 50 synthetic data sets generated with FABIA. (a) Evaluation of subnetwork selection using six methods, comparing the performance of individual topological properties versus the RSR-EWM scoring method, based on Sensitivity (Sn), Positive Predictive Value (PPV), and Accuracy (Acc). Sensitivity, PPV, Accuracy, and Separation (Sep) were calculated as previously described. "Single" in the legend denotes the use of a single topological property scoring method, while the absence of "single" indicates the use of the RSR-EWM scoring method by default. (b) Comparison of the microbial clusters identified by MNetClass and seven other algorithms, based on Sn, PPV, and

ACC.



Figure 5. Benchmarking ASD prediction across multiple cohorts. (a) Visualization of the network construction, subnetwork partitioning, and subnetwork selection processes for ASD datasets using MNetClass. In the right panel, nodes with blue labels represent the top 10 genera ranked by importance in the random forest model

shown in (b), while nodes with red labels represent genera previously validated as ASD-associated in the literature. (b) Importance ranking of microbial genera identified by MNetClass in the S1ASD cohort, based on the random forest model. (c) Receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curves for ASD prediction using the random forest model on cohorts S2 to S10. (d-e) ROC curves (d) and bar plots (e) comparing the Accuracy, Recall, Precision, and F1-score of random forest models constructed using microbial communities identified by MNetClass and seven other methods. (f-g) UpSet plots showing the microbial communities identified by MNetClass in the ASD and Healthy group across 10 cohorts.



Figure 6. Application of MNetClass for indentifying age-associated oral bacteria. (a) Heatmap of p-values from ANOVA analysis comparing species in the key subnetworks identified by MNetClass across different phenotypes. In the heatmap, $p \leq 0.05$ is marked with "*", $p \leq 0.01$ with "**", $p \leq 0.001$ with "***", and $p \geq 0.05$ with the corresponding p-value. (b) Proportions of species in the overall microbiome and those identified by MNetClass in the subnetworks that show significant correlation with different phenotypes, based on ANOVA analysis. Species with $p \leq 0.05$ are considered significantly correlated. (c) Principal coordinate analysis (PCoA) of Bray-Curtis dissimilarities for sample compositions, with different colors representing different age groups: A (age 11–15), B (age 18–20), C (age 28–32), D (age 38–45), and E (age 50–65). (d) Visualization of network analysis results for GCF samples using MNetClass. Subnetworks 1–3 are ranked by the RSR-EWM scoring model, corresponding to rank-1, rank-2, and rank-3 subnetworks. (e) Average

Spearman correlation coefficients between microbial relative abundances and age. "Subnetwork 1–3" represents the species within each subnetwork, while "Community" refers to the overall microbiome. Phyla identified by MNetClass, including *Actinobacteria, Bacteroidetes, Firmicutes, Fusobacteria, Proteobacteria,* and *Verrucomicrobia,* are also shown along with the species they contain.


Data preparation
Tax
Sample
a
Normalization
Total sum scaling(TSS)
b
Sample and taxa filtering
User-defined adjacency matrix
Tax
Tax
Network construction
1
1a
Estimating associations
Spearman correlation
1b
Constructing the adjacency matrix
Scale independence
R2
Soft Threshold
Visualization
2
Subnetwork partition
Community detection
Random walks
subnet 1
subnet 2
subnet 3
Phylum
Subnetwork and Central nodes mining
3
Subnetworks
Property evaluation
graph diameter
graph density
...
modularity
Score and Rank
RSR-EWM
Visualization
Rank 1
Rank 2
Rank n
Nodes
Property evaluation
Degree centrality
Betweenness centrality
Closeness centrality
Eigenvector centrality
Score and Rank
RSR-EWM


(a)
T
S
B
GCF
P
Group
R2 (Scaled)
Correlation (Transformed)
(b)
Modularity
Threshold
0.28
0.28
0.28
0.28
0.28
0.33
0.51
0.67
0.83
0.75
(c)
Modularity
Walktrap
Edge.betweenness
Label.propagation
Leading.eigenvector
Fast.greedy
Louvain
(d)
(e)
T
S
B
GCF
P


(a)
(T)
Coprothermobacter_proteolyticus
Desulfovibrio_piger
Coprococcus_eutactus
Flavonifractor_plautii
Chryseolinea_serpens
Helicobacter_typhlonius
Butyricicoccus_pullicaecorum
Maritalea_myrionectae
Treponema_bryantii
Mycoplasma_pneumoniae
Thermicanus_aegyptius
Propionibacterium_granulosum
Treponema bryantii
Maritalea myrionectae
Flavonifractor plautii
Desulfovibrio piger
Dialister_succinatiphilus
Flavonifractor_plautii
Desulfovibrio_piger
Chryseolinea_serpens
Maritalea_myrionectae
Butyricicoccus_pullicaecorum
Negativicoccus_succinicivorans
Treponema_bryantii
Thermicanus_aegyptius
Propionibacterium_granulosum
Desulfovibrio_piger
Flavonifractor_plautii
Butyricicoccus_pullicaecorum
Maritalea_myrionectae
Bifidobacterium_breve
Methylophilus_leisingeri
Treponema_bryantii
Mucispirillum_schaedleri
Dialister_succinatiphilus
Desulfovibrio_piger
Flavonifractor_plautii
Chryseolinea_serpens
Maritalea_myrionectae
Butyricicoccus_pullicaecorum
Negativicoccus_succinicivorans
Treponema_bryantii
Propionibacterium_granulosum
Thermicanus_aegyptius
Phylum
Actinobacteria
Bacteroidetes
Deferribacteres
Firmicutes
Proteobacteria
Synergistetes
Tenericutes


(b)
Benchmark 1
Benchmark 2
100%
50%
0%
MNetClass
Edge betweeness
Label prop
Leading eigen
Fast greedy
Louvain
WGCNA
MANTA
Precision
Recall
F1 Score
T
S
B
GCF
P


(a)
Sn
PPV
ACC
Walktrap
Walktrap_single
Edge_betweeness
Edge_betweeness_single
Label_prop
Label_prop_single
Leading_eigen
Leading_eigen_single
Fast_greedy
Fast_greedy_single
Louvain
Louvain_single
0.25 0.50 0.75 1.00
0.4 0.6 0.8 1.0
0.0 0.1 0.2 0.3 0.4 0.5
Louvain_single
Louvain
Fast_greedy_single
Fast_greedy
Leading_eigen_single
Leading_eigen
Label_prop_single
Label_prop
Edge_betweeness_single
Edge_betweeness
Walktrap_single
Walktrap


(b)
Sn
PPV
ACC
MNetClass
Edge_betweeness
Label_prop
Leading_eigen
Fast_greedy
Louvain
manta
WGCNA
0.4 0.8 1.2 1.6
0.5 1.0 1.5
0.0 0.2 0.4 0.6 0.8
WGCNA
manta
Louvain
Fast_greedy
Leading_eigen
Label_prop
Edge_betweeness
MNetClass


(a)
Phylum
Actinobacteria
Bacteroidetes
Candidatus_Saccharibacteria
Cyanobacteria
Firmicutes
Fusobacteria
Lentisphaerae
Proteobacteria
Synergistetes
Verrucomicrobia
Clostridium_XIVa
Intestinimonas
Bacteroides
Streptococcus
Ruminococcus2
Eubacterium
Faecalibacterium
Bifidobacterium
Clostridium_IV
Intestinibacter
Prevotella
Blautia
(b)
Intestinimonas
Intestinibacter
Blautia
Faecalibacterium
Eubacterium
Prevotella
Clostridium_IV
Bacteroides
Bifidobacterium
Clostridium_XIVa
Dorea
Parasutterella
Coprococcus
Lactobacillus
Streptococcus
Ruminococcus2
Roseburia
Ruminococcus
Flavonifractor
Oscillibacter
Alistipes
Haemophilus
Veillonella
Eisenbergiella
Gemmiger
Odoribacter
Eggerthella
Holdemania
Phascolarctobacterium
Bilophila
E. incertae sedis
Anaerotruncus
Akkermansia
Megamonas
Barnesiella
Fusobacterium
Hungatella
Allisonella
Coprobacillus
Butyricimonas
Subdoligranulum
Gordonibacter
Desulfovibrio
Anaerofilum
Parvimonas
Christensenella
Lactonifactor
Oxalobacter
Faecalicoccus
Anaerofustis
Catabacter
Olsenella
Cloacibacillus
0.0
2.5
5.0
7.5
10.0
Mean Decrease in Gini
(c)
Sensitivity
Specificity
All tax (AUC = 0.84)
Best tax (AUC = 0.85)
Top6 tax (AUC = 0.74)
Top15 (AUC = 0.81)
(d)
Specificity
MNetClass (AUC = 0.84)
Edge betw (AUC = 0.81)
Label prop (AUC = 0.72)
Fast greedy (AUC = 0.8)
Louvain (AUC = 0.77)
WGCNA (AUC = 0.62)
manta (AUC = 0.7)
(e)
Accuracy
Recall
Precision
F1
Value
MNetClass
Edge_betweeness
Label_prop
Fast_greedy
Louvain
WGCNA
manta
(f)
Intersection Size
Set Size
S3
S2
S7
S4
S5
S8
S1
All
S6
S10
S9
(g)
Intersection Size
Set Size
S7
All
S2
S3
S5
S9
S4
S8
S6
S1
S10


(a)
Bacteroides coprosuis 0.691 0.551 0.638
Bacteroides luti 0.571 0.086 0.404
Mariniphaga anaerophila 0.799 ** *
Petrimonas sulfuriphila 0.542 0.066 0.173
Proteiniphilum acetatigenes 0.622 * 0.122
Clostridium bornimense 0.378 *** **
Clostridium cochlearium 0.901 ** *
Clostridium ramosum 0.168 ** *
Gracilibacter thermotolerans 0.404 * 0.171
Lactobacillus dextrinicus 0.270 * 0.071
Oscillibacter ruminantium 0.103 ** 0.085
Peptoniphilus stercorisuis 0.145 ** *
Sedimentibacter saalensis 0.500 ** *
Sporanaerobacter acetigenes 0.540 *** **
Tepidimicrobium xylanilyticum 0.629 ** *
Ureibacillus defluvii 0.745 * 0.215
Advenella faeciporci 0.309 ** *
Aquicella siphonis 0.856 0.173 0.443
Desulfovibrio piger 0.506 0.557 0.144
Sphaerochaeta globosa 0.945 *** **
Aminobacterium thunnarium 0.646 ** *
Gender Part Age
P value
0.8 0.6 0.4 0.2
Phylum
Bacteroidetes
Firmicutes
Proteobacteria
Spirochaetes
Synergistetes
(b)
Proportion
0.8 0.6 0.4 0.2 0.0
0.29 0.762 0.31 0 0.078 0.524
part gender age
Phenotype
community
subnetwork
(c)
Bray curtis
PCOA2(15%)
0.50 0.25 0.00 −0.25
−0.50 −0.25 0.00 0.25 0.50
PCOA1(22.4%)
A
B
C
D
E
(d)
subnetwork1
subnetwork2
subnetwork3
Blautia wexlerae
Clostridium viride
Blautia luti
Dialister succinatiphilus
Blautia faecis
Dorea longicatena
B. infantis
Eubacterium coprostanoligenes
Ruminococcus gnavus
Faecalibacterium prausnitzii
Prevotella copri
Fusicatenibacter saccharivorans
Lactobacillus mucosae
Blautia luti
Propionibacterium acnes
Blautia faecis
Pseudomonas beteli
Ruminococcus gnavus
Phylum
Actinobacteria
Bacteroidetes
Firmicutes
Fusobacteria
Proteobacteria
Verrucomicrobia
(e)
Actinobacteria
Bacteroidetes
Firmicutes
Fusobacteria
Proteobacteria
Verrucomicrobia
subnetwork1
subnetwork2
subnetwork3
cummunity
B. infantis
Pseudomonas beteli
−0.4 −0.2 0.0 0.2
Correlation Coefficient