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#### Abstract

Numerous quantitative graph invariant-based topological indices have been developed in the literature and employed for correlation analysis in chemical graph theory. Among them, the degree-based topological indices are the most investigated molecular descriptors and have proven their usability in this area. Here, we focus on testing the structural properties and prediction potential of some novel degree-based topological indices. At the outset, computer testing for the considered topological indices is performed to calibrate their structure sensitivity and abruptness. After that, the correlation among the topological indices is also executed. In addition, QSPR analysis is performed for the octane isomers molecular database to investigate the physical and chemical significance of the considered topological indices.


## 1 Introduction

Let $G=(V(G), E(G))$ be an ordered pair that denotes a simple, connected and undirected graph where $V(G)$ and $E(G)$ represent the non-empty vertex set and edge set of the graph $G$, respectively. For a vertex $u \in V(G)$,

[^0]the degree $d_{G}(u)$ is the total number of edges incident to vertex $u$ [1]. An edge joining two distinct vertices $u$ and $v$ that belong to the set $E(G)$ is represented as $e=u v$ or $v u$.

Chemical graph theory (CGT) is a significant branch of mathematical chemistry that employs graph theory and chemistry. CGT constitutes the mathematical models (known as QSPR $^{\dagger}$ and QSAR $^{\ddagger}$ ) to predict the physico-chemical properties and biological activities of the chemical networks/compounds. Topological indices/descriptors are numeric quantities obtained from the molecular graph of a chemical structure and perform the imperative character in the development of QSPR and QSAR studies [2]. These descriptors are availed significantly to study the topology of an underlying graph in various fields of network science and mathematical chemistry. Mathematically, a topological index $T I$ is the function $T I: \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $T I\left(G_{1}\right)=T I\left(G_{2}\right)$ for every pair of two isomorphic graphs $G_{1}$ and $G_{2}$ where $\Omega$ is the set of all simple, connected and undirected graphs with $n$ vertices and $\mathbb{R}$ is the set of real numbers.

The first most theoretically studied topological index from an application point of view is the Wiener index which was proposed by H. Wiener in 1947 [3]. It is a distance-based topological index which is defined as the sum of the distances between all pairs of vertices of a graph and has applicability to predict the boiling points of paraffin. Later, several other distance-based topological indices such as hyper-Wiener [4], Szeged [5] and Mostar [6] indices were proposed and have extended this class.

Another important class of topological index is the degree-based topological index. These indices are one of the most employable topological descriptors in QSPR/QSAR studies. In general terms, a degree-based topological index [7] is defined as

$$
\begin{equation*}
T I(G)=\sum_{u v \in E(G)} f\left(d_{G}(u), d_{G}(v)\right) \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where function $f(x, y) \geq 0$ with symmetric property $f(x, y)=f(y, x)$.
Now, we discuss some well-known degree-based topological indices in

[^1]detail. In 1972, I. Gutman and N. Trinajstic proposed one of the oldest degree-based topological indices, namely the Zagreb indices. The first Zagreb index is the sum of degrees of all the vertices of a graph, that is
$$
M_{1}(G)=\sum_{v \in V(G)} d_{G}(v)^{2}=\sum_{u v \in E(G)}\left(d_{G}(u)+d_{G}(v)\right)
$$
whereas the second Zagreb index is mathematically expressed as
$$
M_{2}(G)=\sum_{u v \in E(G)}\left(d_{G}(u) d_{G}(v)\right)
$$

Gutman and Trinajstić investigated the expressions associated with the first and second Zagreb indices while working on the total $\pi$-electron energy of the conjugated system [8]. The second modified Zagreb index $\left({ }^{m} M_{2}\right)$ was proposed by Miličević et al. in 2004 [9]. The function associated with the ${ }^{m} M_{2}$ index is reversed to the second Zagreb index. It is defined as

$$
{ }^{m} M_{2}(G)=\sum_{u v \in E(G)} \frac{1}{d_{G}(u) d_{G}(v)}
$$

The elements in the contribution of the Zagreb indices $\left(M_{1}\right.$ and $\left.M_{2}\right)$ prioritize the internal (interior) vertices and edges based on their weights in comparison to the terminal (outer) edges and vertices of the graph. However, the ${ }^{m} M_{2}$ index reports higher weights to outer vertices and edges than to internal edges and vertices of the molecular graph [9]. The same article reported the forgotten index [7] as the cubic sum of the degrees of all the vertices of the graph. But, it was not noticed for almost 40 years. In the year 2015, B. Furtula and I. Gutman reconsidered the forgotten index [10] and proposed it as

$$
F(G)=\sum_{v \in V(G)} d_{G}(v)^{3}=\sum_{u v \in E(G)}\left(d_{G}(u)^{2}+d_{G}(v)^{2}\right)
$$

Milan Randić proposed the branch connectivity index in 1975 to estimate the degree of branching in the carbon-atom skeleton of saturated hydrocarbons [11]. It was named the Randić index or branching/connectivity
index and defined as

$$
R_{-1 / 2}(G)=\sum_{u v \in E(G)} \frac{1}{\sqrt{d_{G}(u) d_{G}(v)}}
$$

The $R_{-1 / 2}$ index has countless applications in drug design and discovery perspective. The reciprocal (or inverse) Randić index ( $R R_{-1 / 2}$ ) first appeared in the paper [12], where the relation between maximum eigenvalue of the graph and $R R_{-1 / 2}$ was shown. It disappeared from the attention of chemists and mathematicians for almost 20 years. Later, Gutman et al. proposed the reciprocal (or inverse) Randić index in 2014 [13], and it is mathematically formulated as

$$
R R_{-1 / 2}(G)=\sum_{u v \in E(G)} \sqrt{d_{G}(u) d_{G}(v)}
$$

It is a special case for $\alpha=1 / 2$ of the very famous general Randić index $\sum_{u v \in E(G)}\left(d_{G}(u) d_{G}(v)\right)^{\alpha}$, where $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ (see $\left.[14,15]\right)$. Being motivated by the advancement and applicability of the Randić index in various areas of science and technology, B. Zhou and N. Trinajstić proposed the sumconnectivity index (SCI) in 2009 [16]. It is defined as

$$
S C I(G)=\sum_{u v \in E(G)} \frac{1}{\sqrt{d_{G}(u)+d_{G}(v)}}
$$

Several research articles on mathematical properties and chemical applicability of $S C I$ index are reported in the literature $[16,17]$.

Among 148 discrete Adriatic indices, the symmetric division deg index $(S D D)$ is one of the most important bond-additive descriptor [18]. It was commenced by D. Vukičević in 2010 and defined as

$$
S D D(G)=\sum_{u v \in E(G)}\left(\frac{d_{G}(u)}{d_{G}(v)}+\frac{d_{G}(v)}{d_{G}(u)}\right) .
$$

The $S D D$ index has proved to be a good predictor of the total surface area of polychlorobiphenyls (PCB) [18]. It has shown a dominating nature over several other degree-based topological indices in the QSPR study [19].

Favron et al. introduced the harmonic index in 1993 [12], and it is defined as

$$
H(G)=\sum_{u v \in E(G)} \frac{2}{d_{G}(u)+d_{G}(v)}
$$

Some relations of the harmonic index with the eigenvalues of a graph were reported in the article [12]. Generalization of the harmonic index and some associated mathematical results were discussed in [20,21].

In the year 2010, D. Vukičević proposed the inverse sum (indeg) index (ISI) in the same article where the $S D D$ index was introduced [18]. The $I S I$ index is mathematically described as

$$
\operatorname{ISI}(G)=\sum_{u v \in E(G)} \frac{d_{G}(u) d_{G}(v)}{d_{G}(u)+d_{G}(v)}
$$

It is a bond-additive descriptor that belongs to the class of the Adriatic indices and predicts the total surface area of octane isomers [18].

A graph theoretical descriptor based on the connectivity between atoms and bounds of the molecule was introduced by Estrada et al. in 1998 [22] and named the atom-bond connectivity index. It is defined as

$$
A B C(G)=\sum_{u v \in E(G)} \sqrt{\frac{d_{G}(u)+d_{G}(v)-2}{d_{G}(u) d_{G}(v)}}
$$

The $A B C$ index has performed good correlation with the enthalpy of formations of alkanes [22].

The augmented Zagreb index ( $A Z I$ ) was put forward by Furtula et al. in 2010 [23] while investigating the applicability of the generalized atom-bond connectivity index. The $A Z I$ index is defined as

$$
A Z I(G)=\sum_{u v \in E(G)}\left(\frac{d_{G}(u) d_{G}(v)}{d_{G}(u)+d_{G}(v)-2}\right)^{3}
$$

It was claimed in this article that the $A Z I$ index demonstrates a good correlation with the heat of formation of octane $[23,24]$.

The hyper-Zagreb indices are a generalization of the Zagreb indices.

The definition of the first hyper-Zagreb index [25] is expressed as

$$
H M_{1}(G)=\sum_{u v \in E(G)}\left(d_{G}(u)+d_{G}(v)\right)^{2}
$$

and the second hyper-Zagreb index [26] is mathematically formulated as

$$
H M_{2}(G)=\sum_{u v \in E(G)}\left(d_{G}(u) d_{G}(v)\right)^{2}
$$

In the year 2009, D. Vukičević and B. Furtula introduced a novel topological index based on the geometric and arithmetic means of the endvertex degrees of an edge [27]. They named it as geometric-arithmetic index $(G A)$ and defined it as

$$
G A(G)=\sum_{u v \in E(G)} \frac{2 \sqrt{d_{G}(u) d_{G}(v)}}{d_{G}(u)+d_{G}(v)} .
$$

The QSPR analysis of the $G A$ index with the physico-chemical properties of octane isomers was performed in the article [27] to assess the usability of the index.

Being inspired by the competency of the geometric-arithmetic index, an alternate form of the $G A$ index by reciprocating its numerator and denominator was proposed by Shegehalli and Kanabur in 2015 [28]. They called it the arithmetic-geometric index $(A G)$ and described it as

$$
A G(G)=\sum_{u v \in E(G)} \frac{d_{G}(u)+d_{G}(v)}{2 \sqrt{d_{G}(u) d_{G}(v)}}
$$

I. Gutman recently introduced the Sombor index [29] to provide a geometrical approach to degree-based topological indices, and mathematically defined it as

$$
S O(G)=\sum_{u v \in E(G)} \sqrt{d_{G}(u)^{2}+d_{G}(v)^{2}}
$$

The function corresponding to the Sombor index is the distance of the $\left(d_{G}(u), d_{G}(v)\right)$ from the origin $(0,0)$ in the 2D-Cartesian plane where $u$ and
$v$ are two distinct vertices and there is an edge $e=u v$ or $v u$ associated with them in the graph $G$. The investigations of mathematical and theoretical properties and chemical applicability of the Sombor index can be seen in articles $[30,31]$.

The modified Sombor index was proposed by V.R. Kulli [32] in 2021. It is symbolized by ${ }^{m} S O$ and described as follows

$$
{ }^{m} S O(G)=\sum_{u v \in E(G)} \frac{1}{\sqrt{d_{G}(u)^{2}+d_{G}(v)^{2}}}
$$

Inspired by the advancement and applicability of the Sombor index, V.R. Kulli recently proposed the Nirmala index [33] and defined it as

$$
N(G)=\sum_{u v \in E(G)} \sqrt{d_{G}(u)+d_{G}(v)}
$$

Further, Kulli et al. [34] introduced the first inverse Nirmala index $\left(I N_{1}\right)$ and second inverse Nirmala index $\left(I N_{2}\right)$ in 2021, and defined them as follows

$$
I N_{1}(G)=\sum_{u v \in E(G)} \sqrt{\frac{1}{d_{G}(u)}+\frac{1}{d_{G}(v)}}
$$

and

$$
I N_{2}(G)=\sum_{u v \in E(G)} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\frac{1}{d_{G}(u)}+\frac{1}{d_{G}(v)}}}
$$

Motivated by the work and progress of the $G A$ index, V.R. Kulli introduced two degree-based indices namely, Geometric-Quadratic $(G Q)$ and Quadratic-Geometric $(Q G)$ indices in 2022 [35], and they are defined as follows

$$
G Q(G)=\sum_{u v \in E(G)} \frac{\sqrt{2 d_{G}(u) d_{G}(v)}}{\sqrt{d_{G}(u)^{2}+d_{G}(v)^{2}}}
$$

and

$$
Q G(G)=\sum_{u v \in E(G)} \frac{\sqrt{d_{G}(u)^{2}+d_{G}(v)^{2}}}{\sqrt{2 d_{G}(u) d_{G}(v)}}
$$

The M-polynomial-based derivation formulas to compute the different Nirmala-
type indices and $G Q-Q G$ indices are proposed in articles [36, 37]. Very recently, the chemical applicability of the $G Q$ and $Q G$ indices and the Nirmala indices-based entropy measures are reported in the articles [38,39].

## Methodology

Our primary objective of this research article is to investigate the smoothness (structure sensitivity and abruptness) and chemical applicability of some novel degree-based topological indices. In particular, we focus our investigation on degree-based topological indices namely $N, I N_{1}, I N_{2},{ }^{m} M_{2}$, $F, R R_{-1 / 2}, S D D, I S I, H M_{1}, H M_{2}, A G, S O,{ }^{m} S O, G Q$ and $Q G$. Section 2 comprises the computation of the two measures of smoothness such as structure sensitivity and abruptness of the considered degree-based topological indices for the data set of trees having $n=4$ to 10 vertices. The obtained numerical results are tabulated in a table and their comparison is demonstrated using the bar graphs. The correlation among the considered topological indices is presented for 106 trees with 10 vertices in Section 3. The outcomes are shown using a correlation graph and the obtained correlation coefficients are listed in a table. Furthermore, in Section 4, the QSPR analysis for the eleven physico-chemical properties of octane isomers is executed to check the applicability of the considered topological indices with the help of linear regression models. At last, Section 5 is reserved for the conclusion.

## 2 Smoothness of the topological indices

Several parameters were propounded to diminish the randomness in the construction of a new topological index [19, 40]. Those are essential to satisfy such a molecular descriptor. Smoothness is one of them which states that the value of a molecular descriptor should uniformly change with gradual changes in molecular structure. But, an inspection of this property is hard to accomplish, therefore researchers disregard it very often. In this section, we investigate the smoothness of some novel degreebased topological indices and perform the comparison with the exiting
results of some well-known topological indices. Two novel graph structural measures namely structure sensitivity (denoted as $S S$ ) and abruptness (symbolized as $A b r$ ) were proposed in [41] to inspect the smoothness of a molecular descriptor. In recent literature, the structure sensitivity $(S S)$ of eigenvalue-based topological indices and smoothness of graph energy in chemical graphs were investigated in the articles [42] and [43], respectively. We now sketch an exiting algorithm to calculate the $S S$ and $A b r$ of a topological index of a given class of connected graphs [41]. The steps are

Step-1 Consider a graph $G$ in the class of connected graphs $\Omega$ and calculate its topological index $T I(G)$.

Step-2 Construct the set $S(G)=\{\Gamma \in \Omega \mid G E D(\Gamma, G)=2\}$, where $G E D$ is the graph edit distance between two graphs. Readers may see references [19, 41, 44] for more details about the graph edit distance and construction of set $S(G)$.

Step-3 For all $H \in S(G)$, calculate the topological index $T I(H)$. Then, the structure sensitivity and abruptness of topological index (TI) for the graph $G$ is computed by the following mathematical expressions:

$$
S S(T I, G)=\frac{1}{|S(G)|} \sum_{H \in S(G)}\left|\frac{T I(H)-T I(G)}{T I(G)}\right|
$$

and

$$
\operatorname{Abr}(T I, G)=\max _{H \in S(G)}\left|\frac{T I(H)-T I(G)}{T I(G)}\right|
$$

where $|S(G)|$ is the total number of graphs in the set $S(G)$.
Step-4 Average of $S S$ and $A b r$ values of a topological index calculated $\forall G \in$ $\Omega$ is the total structure sensitivity and abruptness of a topological index $(T I)$ in a class of connected graphs $\Omega$. That is

$$
S S(T I)=\frac{1}{|\Omega|} \sum_{G \in \Omega} S S(T I, G)
$$

and

$$
\operatorname{Abr}(T I)=\frac{1}{|\Omega|} \sum_{G \in \Omega} \operatorname{Abr}(T I, G)
$$

where $|\Omega|$ is the total number of graphs in the set $\Omega$.
For the goodness of a topological index, it is important that the $S S$ value should be as high as possible, and simultaneously the $A b r$ value should be as small as possible. More details on these two measures could be explored in $[41,44,45]$ where the computer testing of the smoothness of some distance-based and degree-based indices was examined on the data sets of trees of different vertex sizes. Next, we design a pseudocode mentioned in Algorithm 1 of the Supplementary Information Section ${ }^{\S}$ to compute the $S S$ and $A b r$ values efficiently using the above-mentioned 4step algorithm. For that, the computation of the considered degree-based topological indices is performed using Python 3.11. And, the graph edit distance $(G E D)$ between two graphs $G_{1}$ and $G_{2}$ is obtained by implementing the function $n x . g r a p h \_e d i t \_d i s t a n c e\left(G_{1}, G_{2}\right)$ using import networkx as nx command available in NetworkX package in Python. At last, Algorithm 1 is implemented in MATLAB R2029a software to compute the structure sensitivity and abruptness of the degree-based topological indices $N, I N_{1}, I N_{2},{ }^{m} M_{2}, F, R R_{-1 / 2}, S D D, I S I, H M_{1}, H M_{2}, A G, S O,{ }^{m} S O, G Q$ and $Q G$ on the data sets of trees having $n=4$ to 10 vertices. For a comparative perspective, the $S S$ and $A b r$ values for the $M_{1}, M_{2}, R_{-1 / 2}, S C I$, $H, A Z I, A B C$ and $G A$ indices are comprised from reference [41] and are listed in Table 3 of the Supplementary Information Section. Our obtained computational values of structure sensitivity and abruptness are cataloged in Table 1. The comparisons among the results of $S S$ and $A b r$ values of topological indices cataloged in Tables 1 and 3 are demonstrated in Figures 1-3 and Figures 7-9 (Please see Supplementary Information Section) through bar graphs for the class of trees with $n=4$ to 10 vertices.

Table 1 and Figures 1-3 stimulate us to arrive at the following observations. The second hyper-Zagreb, forgotten and first hyper-Zagreb indices have the maximum, second maximum and third maximum structure sensitivity values, respectively. One can observe from Tables 1 and 3, and Figure 9 that for $n=10$ vertices trees, $S S\left(H M_{2}\right)=0.285, S S(F)=0.192$

[^2]Table 1. Structure sensitivity ( $S S$ ) and abruptness ( $A b r$ ) of different topological indices of trees from $n=4$ to 10 vertices.

| Topological Indices |  | $n=4$ | $n=5$ | $n=6$ | $n=7$ | $n=8$ | $n=9$ | $n=10$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $N$ | SS | 0.0937 | 0.0898 | 0.0701 | 0.0579 | 0.0480 | 0.0413 | 0.0356 |
|  | $A b r$ | 0.0937 | 0.0997 | 0.1037 | 0.0945 | 0.0884 | 0.0823 | 0.0776 |
| $I N_{1}$ | SS | 0.0042 | 0.0031 | 0.0028 | 0.0028 | 0.0026 | 0.0025 | 0.0024 |
|  | $A b r$ | 0.0042 | 0.0039 | 0.0041 | 0.0047 | 0.0051 | 0.0055 | 0.0058 |
| $I N_{2}$ | SS | 0.0134 | 0.0107 | 0.0098 | 0.0206 | 0.0091 | 0.0086 | 0.0083 |
|  | $A b r$ | 0.0134 | 0.0132 | 0.0142 | 0.0938 | 0.0181 | 0.0196 | 0.021 |
| ${ }^{m} M_{2}$ | SS | 0.225 | 0.2106 | 0.1627 | 0.1278 | 0.1005 | 0.0817 | 0.0671 |
|  | $A b r$ | 0.225 | 0.2315 | 0.2234 | 0.1967 | 0.1741 | 0.1580 | 0.1429 |
| F | SS | 0.5333 | 0.4851 | 0.3653 | 0.3044 | 0.2533 | 0.2205 | 0.1918 |
|  | Abr | 0.5333 | 0.5641 | 0.5917 | 0.5527 | 0.5166 | 0.4888 | 0.4675 |
| $R R_{-1 / 2}$ | SS | 0.0735 | 0.0790 | 0.0689 | 0.0605 | 0.0563 | 0.0480 | 0.0434 |
|  | Abr | 0.0735 | 0.0830 | 0.0986 | 0.7166 | 0.1336 | 0.1063 | 0.1061 |
| $S D D$ | SS | 0.3643 | 0.3152 | 0.2359 | 0.1913 | 0.1546 | 0.1319 | 0.112 |
|  | Abr | 0.3643 | 0.3642 | 0.3652 | 0.3266 | 0.2995 | 0.2773 | 0.256 |
| ISI | SS | 0.0364 | 0.0306 | 0.0284 | 0.0269 | 0.0261 | 0.0246 | 0.0237 |
|  | Abr | 0.0364 | 0.0372 | 0.0414 | 0.0454 | 0.0523 | 0.0568 | 0.0604 |
| $\boldsymbol{H M} \mathbf{1}_{1}$ | SS | 0.3517 | 0.3463 | 0.2762 | 0.2364 | 0.2017 | 0.1775 | 0.1565 |
|  | Abr | 0.3517 | 0.3917 | 0.4301 | 0.4147 | 0.4002 | 0.3885 | 0.3782 |
| HM ${ }_{2}$ | SS | 0.1181 | 0.2502 | 0.3135 | 0.31702 | 0.3163 | 0.2990 | 0.2847 |
|  | Abr | 0.1181 | 0.2847 | 0.4994 | 0.6256 | 0.7323 | 0.8113 | 0.8599 |
| $A G$ | SS | 0.1044 | 0.0958 | 0.0727 | 0.0591 | 0.0477 | 0.0403 | 0.0339 |
|  | Abr | 0.1044 | 0.1087 | 0.1077 | 0.0958 | 0.0876 | 0.0805 | 0.0738 |
| SO | $S S$ | 0.2649 | 0.2417 | 0.1835 | 0.1569 | 0.1246 | 0.1073 | 0.0926 |
|  | Abr | 0.2649 | 0.2730 | 0.2803 | 0.2875 | 0.2362 | 0.2204 | 0.2075 |
| ${ }^{m} S O$ | SS | 0.2777 | 0.2614 | 0.2013 | 0.0095 | 0.1261 | 0.1035 | 0.0861 |
|  | Abr | 0.2777 | 0.2789 | 0.2751 | 0.2383 | 0.2187 | 0.1962 | 0.1779 |
| $G Q$ | SS | 0.1834 | 0.1652 | 0.1221 | 0.0955 | 0.0751 | 0.0619 | 0.0513 |
|  | $A b r$ | 0.1834 | 0.1787 | 0.1693 | 0.1430 | 0.1296 | 0.1159 | 0.1042 |
| $Q G$ | SS | 0.1806 | 0.1581 | 0.1181 | 0.0949 | 0.0763 | 0.0645 | 0.0544 |
|  | Abr | 0.1806 | 0.1787 | 0.1762 | 0.1547 | 0.1408 | 0.1293 | 0.1184 |

and $S S\left(H M_{1}\right)=0.157$, followed by $S S(A Z I)=0.118 S S(S D D)=0.112$ $S S\left(M_{2}\right)=0.103, S S(S O)=0.093, S S\left({ }^{m} S O\right)=0.086, S S\left(M_{1}\right)=0.073$, $S S\left({ }^{m} M_{2}\right)=0.067$ and $S S(H)=0.067$, etc. The considered degree-based indices maintain the following inequality relation:
$S S\left(H M_{2}\right)>S S(F)>S S\left(H M_{1}\right)>S S(A Z I)>S S(S D D)>S S\left(M_{2}\right)>S S(S O)$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& >S S\left({ }^{m} S O\right)>S S\left(M_{1}\right)>S S\left({ }^{m} M_{2}\right)>S S(H)>S S(Q G)>S S(G Q) \\
& >S S\left(R R_{-1 / 2}\right)>S S(N)>S S(S C I)>S S\left(R_{-1 / 2}\right) \approx S S(A G)>S S(G A) \\
& >S S(A B C)>S S(I S I)>S S\left(I N_{2}\right)>S S\left(I N_{1}\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Similar results can be obtained from Tables 1, 3 and Figures 1, 7 and 8 for the cases when $4 \leq n \leq 9$. In this context, $H M_{1}$ and $F$ indices display their supremacy over other considered topological indices.

On the other hand, the topological indices with the minimum abruptness are the first and second inverse Nirmala indices. For instance $n=10$, Table 1 and Figure 9 quantify that $\operatorname{Abr}\left(I N_{1}\right)=0.006, \operatorname{Abr}\left(I N_{2}\right)=0.021$, followed by $\operatorname{Abr}(A B C)=0.057, \operatorname{Abr}(I S I)=0.0604, \operatorname{Abr}(G A)=0.0671$, $\operatorname{Abr}\left(R_{-1 / 2}\right)=0.071$ and $\operatorname{Abr}(S C I)=0.0714$, etc. Abruptness of the degree-based topological indices under investigation preserves the following inequality relationship:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& A b r\left(I N_{1}\right)<A b r\left(I N_{2}\right)<A b r(A B C)<A b r(I S I)<A b r(G A)<A b r\left(R_{-1 / 2}\right) \\
& <A b r(S C I)<\operatorname{Abr}(A G)<\operatorname{Abr}(N)<A b r\left(R R_{-1 / 2}\right)<\operatorname{Abr}(G Q)<\operatorname{Abr}(Q G) \\
& <A b r(H)<A b r\left({ }^{m} M_{2}\right)<\operatorname{Abr}\left(M_{1}\right)<\operatorname{Abr}\left({ }^{m} S O\right)<\operatorname{Abr}(A b r)<A b r(A Z I) \\
& <A b r(S D D)<\operatorname{Abr}\left(M_{2}\right)<\operatorname{Abr}\left(H M_{1}\right)<\operatorname{Abr}(F)<\operatorname{Abr}\left(H M_{2}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

Further, Figures 1 and 2 show that the structure sensitivity of the topo-


Figure 1. Comparison of structure sensitivity ( $S S$ )
logical indices apart from $H M_{2}$, decreases as we increase the value of $n$ but it does not hold for the case of abruptness.

Unfortunately, the topological indices which have the greatest structure sensitivity attain the highest abruptness which leads to a contradiction to


Figure 2. Comparison of abruptness (Abr).


Figure 3. Comparison of structure sensitivity and abruptness for $I N_{1}$ and $I N_{2}$.
the fact that the $S S$ value of topological indices should be as large as possible and simultaneously their $A b r$ value should be as small as possible [41]. Apart from the $I N_{1}$ and $I N_{2}$, the results for the considered novel degreebased indices (such as $N,{ }^{m} M_{2}, F, R R_{-1 / 2}, S D D, I S I, H M_{1}, H M_{2}, A G$, $S O,{ }^{m} S O, G Q$ and $Q G$ indices) are average and comparable than that of the exiting outcomes [41] of the well-known degree-based indices, namely $M_{1}, M_{2}, R_{-1 / 2}, S C I, H, A Z, A B C$ and $G A$ indices.

## 3 Correlation among the topological indices

Performing the correlation among the topological indices reveals their degree of independence from each other and it can determine the existence of any relationships between them. Here, we test the correlation among the considered degree-based topological indices on the data set of all trees with 10 vertices (106 trees). The obtained values of correlation coefficients are listed in Table 4 of the Supplementary Information Section. Figure 4 designates the correlation graph which depicts the strong correlation between the topological indices. In Figure 4, the correlation graph shows that the vertices representing the considered topological indices and there is an edge between two vertices if the obtained higher correlation coefficient between the associated topological indices is $0.9900 \leq|R|<1$. From Figure 4, It is evident that the first inverse Nirmala $\left(I N_{1}\right)$, augmented Zagreb (AZI) and first hyper-Zagreb $\left(H M_{2}\right)$ indices do not correlate with any other topological index while the rest of the topological indices correlate with one or more topological indices. The topological indices that are strongly correlated with each other may convey the same graph structural information and can function similarly in this context.


Figure 4. Correlation graph for the degree-based topological indices.

## 4 QSPR analysis: Applicability of the topological indices

In this segment, we perform the QSPR analysis of considered degreebased topological indices with the physico-chemical properties of octane isomers and compare the obtained results. The tested values of the eleven physico-chemical properties, such as boiling points (BP), critical temperature (CT), critical pressure (CP), heats of vaporization (HV), molar refraction (MR), molar volume (MV), surface tension, melting point (MP), standard heats of formations (DHFORM), density (DENS) and total surface area (TSA) of octane isomers are listed in Table 2. The values of the physico-chemical properties are comprised from the following web source https://web.archive.org/web/20180912171255if_/http: //www.moleculardescriptors.eu/index.htm and reference [46]. The topological indices of the octane isomers are computed using a Python script. We catalog the estimated values of the topological indices (namely, $N, I N_{1}, I N_{2},{ }^{m} M_{2}, S D D, I S I, H M_{1}, H M_{2}, A G, S O,{ }^{m} S O, G Q$ and $\left.Q G\right)$ in Table 5 of the Supplementary Information Section, and the rest of the other indices are incorporated from the article [46].

The linear regression model

$$
\begin{equation*}
P=a T I+b \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

is executed to investigate the prediction power of the topological indices. In Equation 2, the dependent variable $P$ represents the physico-chemical property, the independent variable $T I$ denotes the topological index, and the constants $a$ and $b$ are the slope and intercept of the fitting line, respectively. Next, we perform the linear regression model among the physicochemical properties and the considered different degree-based topological indices using MATLAB R2019a software. The obtained best-fit linear regression models and associated statistical parameters are defined as follows:

Table 2. Physical properties of octane isomers

| Physical properties $\rightarrow$ | BP | CT | CP | HV | MR | MV | ST | MP | DHFORM | DENS | TSA |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Octane isomers $\downarrow$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| n-Octane | 125.6650 | 296.2000 | 24.6400 | 41.4800 | 39.1922 | 162.6050 | 21.7600 | 216.3000 | 4.1400 | 0.7025 | 415.3000 |
| 2-Methyl heptane | 117.6470 | 288.0000 | 24.8000 | 39.6800 | 39.2316 | 163.6530 | 20.6000 | 164.1600 | 3.0600 | 0.6980 | 407.8500 |
| 3-Methyl heptane | 118.9250 | 292.0000 | 25.6000 | 39.8300 | 39.1001 | 161.8450 | 21.1700 | 152.6000 | 3.2900 | 0.7058 | 397.3400 |
| 4-Methyl heptane | 117.7090 | 290.0000 | 25.6000 | 39.6700 | 39.1174 | 162.1200 | 21.0000 | 152.0000 | 4.0000 | 0.7046 | 396.0400 |
| 3-Ethyl hexane | 118.5340 | 292.0000 | 25.7400 | 39.4000 | 38.9400 | 160.0760 | 21.5100 | - | 3.5900 | 0.7136 | 379.0400 |
| 2,2-Dimethyl hexane | 106.8400 | 279.0000 | 25.6000 | 37.2900 | 39.2500 | 164.2890 | 19.6000 | 151.9700 | 2.5600 | 0.6953 | 405.1100 |
| 2,3-Dimethyl hexane | 115.6070 | 293.0000 | 26.6000 | 38.7900 | 38.9800 | 160.4130 | 20.9900 | - | 4.2300 | 0.7121 | 384.9300 |
| 2,4-Dimethyl hexane | 109.4290 | 282.0000 | 25.8000 | 37.7600 | 39.1300 | 163.0930 | 20.0500 | - | 2.8000 | 0.7004 | 388.1100 |
| 2,5-Dimethyl hexane | 109.1030 | 279.0000 | 25.0000 | 37.8600 | 39.2500 | 164.7150 | 19.7300 | 182.0000 | 2.5000 | 0.6935 | 395.0800 |
| 3,3-Dimethyl hexane | 111.9690 | 290.8400 | 27.2000 | 37.9300 | 39.0000 | 160.8870 | 20.6300 | 147.0000 | 3.1700 | 0.7100 | 389.7900 |
| 3,4-Dimethyl hexane | 117.7250 | 298.0000 | 27.4000 | 39.0200 | 38.8400 | 158.6530 | 21.6400 | - | 4.9700 | 0.7200 | 376.9100 |
| 3-Ethyl-2-methyl pentane | 115.4500 | 295.0000 | 27.4000 | 38.5200 | 38.8300 | 158.8070 | 21.5200 | 158.2000 | 5.0800 | 0.7193 | 368.1000 |
| 3-Ethyl-3-methyl pentane | 118.2590 | 305.0000 | 28.9000 | 37.9900 | 38.7100 | 157.0390 | 21.9900 | 182.2000 | 4.7600 | 0.7274 | 366.9900 |
| 2,2,3-Trimethyl pentane | 109.841 | 294.0000 | 28.2000 | 36.9100 | 38.9200 | 159.51700 | 20.6700 | 160.8900 | 4.0900 | 0.7161 | 371.7500 |
| 2,2,4-Trimethyl pentane | 99.2380 | 271.1500 | 25.5000 | 35.1300 | 39.2600 | 165.0960 | 18.7700 | 165.8000 | 3.1300 | 0.6919 | 392.1900 |
| 2,3,3-Trimethyl pentane | 114.7600 | 303.0000 | 29.0000 | 37.2200 | 38.7600 | 157.2980 | 21.5600 | 172.2200 | 4.5200 | 0.7262 | 377.4000 |
| 2,3,4-Trimethyl pentane | 113.467 | 295.0000 | 27.6000 | 37.6100 | 38.8600 | 158.8510 | 21.1400 | 163.9000 | 4.3200 | 0.7191 | 368.9300 |

(i) Linear regression model for boiling point (BP):

$$
B P=0.7829 \times A Z I+78.5600, R=0.9176, R^{2}=0.8421
$$

$A d j-R^{2}=0.8315, R M S E=2.4730, S S E=91.7100$.
(ii) Linear regression model for critical temperature (CT):

$$
\begin{aligned}
& C T=-339.3000 \times I N_{1}+2809.0000, R=-0.7378, R^{2}=0.5443 \\
& A d j-R^{2}=0.5140, R M S E=6.1260, S S E=562.8000
\end{aligned}
$$

(iii) Linear regression model for critical pressure (CP):

$$
\begin{aligned}
& C P=8.2400 \times I S I-27.6800, R=0.9532, R^{2}=0.9086 \\
& A d j-R^{2}=0.9025, R M S E=0.4368, S S E=2.8620
\end{aligned}
$$

(iv) Linear regression model for heats of vaporization (HV):

$$
\begin{aligned}
& H V=3.9210 \times G Q+14.3500, R=0.9661, R^{2}=0.9334 \\
& A d j-R^{2}=0.9290, R M S E=0.3859, S S E=2.2340
\end{aligned}
$$

(v) Linear regression model for molar refraction (MR):

$$
\begin{aligned}
& M R=9.4650 \times I N_{1}-31.2200, R=0.9824, R^{2}=0.9652 \\
& A d j-R^{2}=0.9628, \quad R M S E=0.0355, S S E=0.0189
\end{aligned}
$$

(vi) Linear regression model for molar volume (MV):

$$
\begin{aligned}
& M V=127.4000 \times I N_{1}-784.1000, R=0.9503, R^{2}=0.9031 \\
& A d j-R^{2}=0.8967, \quad R M S E=0.8230, S S E=10.1600
\end{aligned}
$$

(vii) Linear regression model for surface tension (ST):

$$
\begin{aligned}
& S T=0.1001 \times A Z I+16.3000, \quad R=0.8064, R^{2}=0.6503 \\
& A d j-R^{2}=0.6270, \quad R M S E=0.5354, \quad S S E=4.2990
\end{aligned}
$$

(viii) Linear regression model for melting point (MP):

$$
\begin{aligned}
& M P=43.1100 \times S C I+20.1600, R=0.3206, R^{2}=0.1028 \\
& A d j-R^{2}=0.0212, \quad R M S E=18.3000, S S E=3684.0000
\end{aligned}
$$

(ix) Linear regression model for standard enthalpy of formation (DHFORM):

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { DHFORM }=-33.2600 \times I N_{1}+250.6000, R=0.7642 \\
& R^{2}=0.5842, A d j-R^{2}=0.5564, \quad R M S E=0.5537, S S E=4.599
\end{aligned}
$$

(x) Linear regression model for density (DENS):

$$
\begin{aligned}
& D E N S=-0.5612 \times I N_{1}-779.8000, \quad R=-0.9512, R^{2}=0.9047 \\
& A d j-R^{2}=0.8984, R M S E=0.0036, S S E=0.0002
\end{aligned}
$$

(xi) Linear regression model for total surface area (TSA):

$$
\begin{aligned}
& T S A=-233.1000 \times I N_{2}+1954.0000, \quad R=-0.9369, \quad R^{2}=0.8778 \\
& A d j-R^{2}=0.8696, \quad R M S E=5.2880, \quad S S E=419.4000
\end{aligned}
$$

The above-mentioned statistical parameters $R, R^{2}, \operatorname{Adj}-R^{2}, R M S E$ and $S S E$ represent the correlation between the dependent and independent variables, the square of the correlation coefficient, adjusted $R^{2}$, the root mean squared error and the sum of squared error, respectively. For more details, readers may see the reference [47]. The higher value of $R^{2}$ (close to 1 ) together with the lower $R M S E$ (close to 0 ) value depict the goodness of the regression model. The best-fit linear regression models defined above corresponding to the topological indices that have higher prediction power to forecast the physico-chemical properties of the octane isomers are demonstrated in Figures 5 and 6. The rest of the others performed linear regression models and corresponding statistical parameters for all the considered indices are cataloged in Tables 6-16 of the Supplementary Information Section.


Figure 5. Plots of linear regression models having strong correlation between physico-chemical properties and topological indices of octane isomers: (a) BP vs. $A Z I$ (b) CT vs. $I N_{1}$ (c) CP vs. $I S I(\mathrm{~d}) \mathrm{HV}$ vs. $G Q(\mathrm{e}) \mathrm{MR}$ vs. $I N_{1}(\mathrm{f}) \mathrm{MV}$ vs. $I N_{1}$.

Now, we present the comparative study of the considered degree-based topological indices depending on the correlation coefficient $(R)$ obtained from the linear regression models, as shown in Tables 6-16 of Supplementary Information Section. The topological indices preserve the following ordering relations corresponding to $R$-values with each physico-chemical


Figure 6. Graphical representation of linear regression models those obtain strong correlation between physico-chemical properties and topological indices of octane isomers: (a) ST vs. $A Z I$ (b) MP vs. $S C I$ (c) DHFORM vs $I N_{1}$ (d) DENS vs $I N_{1}$ (e) TSA vs. $I N_{2}$.
property.
(i) Boiling point (BP):

$$
I S I<I N_{2}<I N_{1}<H M_{2}<M_{2}<R R_{-1 / 2}<H M_{1}<F<M_{1}<N
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& <S O<S C I<{ }^{m} S O<G Q<H<R_{-1 / 2}<G A<S D D<Q G \\
& <A G<{ }^{m} M_{2}<A B C<A Z I
\end{aligned}
$$

(ii) Critical temperature (CT):

$$
\begin{aligned}
& H M_{1}<F<M_{1}<N<S O<R R_{-1 / 2}<S C I<G Q<{ }^{m} S O \\
& <H<G A<M_{2}<R_{-1 / 2}<Q G<A G<S D D<H M_{2}<{ }^{m} M_{2} \\
& <A B C<A Z I<I S I<I N_{2}<I N_{1}
\end{aligned}
$$

(iii) Critical pressure (CP):

$$
\begin{aligned}
& A Z I<M_{2}<A B C<{ }^{m} M_{2}<S D D<A G<Q G<R_{-1 / 2}<H \\
& <G A<{ }^{m} S O<G Q<S C I<S O<N<F<M_{1}<H M_{1} \\
& <R R_{-1 / 2}<M_{2}<I N_{1}<I N_{2}<H M_{2}<I S I
\end{aligned}
$$

(iv) Heats of vaporization (HV):

$$
\begin{aligned}
& I N_{1}<I N_{2}<I S I<S D D<H M_{2}<M_{2}<R R_{-1 / 2}<H M_{1}<A Z I \\
& <F<A B C<{ }^{m} M_{2}<M_{1}<S O<N<A G<R_{-1 / 2}<H<Q G \\
& <S C I<{ }^{m} S O<G A<G Q
\end{aligned}
$$

(v) Molar refraction (MR):

$$
\begin{aligned}
& S D D<A G<Q G<R_{-1 / 2}<G A<H<G Q<{ }^{m} S O<{ }^{m} M_{2} \\
& <A B C<S C I<S O<N<A Z I<F<M_{1}<H M_{1}<R R_{-1 / 2} \\
& <M_{2}<H M_{2}<I S I<I N_{2}<I N_{1}
\end{aligned}
$$

(vi) Molar volume (MV):

$$
\begin{aligned}
& Q G<A G<R_{-1 / 2}<G A<S D D<H<G Q<{ }^{m} S O<S C I \\
& <S O<N<{ }^{m} M_{2}<A B C<F<M_{1}<H M_{1}<A Z I<R R_{-1 / 2} \\
& <M_{2}<H M_{2}<I S I<I N_{2}<I N_{1}
\end{aligned}
$$

(vii) Surface tension (ST):

$$
\begin{aligned}
& M_{2}<R R_{-1 / 2}<H M_{2}<H M_{1}<F<M_{1}<N<S O<S C I \\
& <{ }^{m} S O<G Q<I S I<H<G A<R_{-1 / 2}<Q G<A G<S D D \\
& <I N_{2}<I N_{1}<{ }^{m} M_{2}<A B C<A Z I
\end{aligned}
$$

(viii) Standard enthalpy of formation (DHFORM):

$$
\begin{aligned}
& S O<N<F<M_{1}<S C I<{ }^{m} S O<H<G Q<R_{-1 / 2}<G A \\
& <H M_{1}<Q G<A G<S D D<R R_{-1 / 2}<{ }^{m} M_{2}<A B C<M_{2} \\
& <A Z I<H M_{2}<I S I<I N_{2}<I N_{1}
\end{aligned}
$$

(ix) Density (DENS):

$$
\begin{aligned}
& A G<S D D<Q G<R_{-1 / 2}<G A<H<G Q<{ }^{m} S O<S C I \\
& <S O<{ }^{m} M_{2}<N<A B C<F<M_{1}<A Z I<H M_{1}<R R_{-1 / 2} \\
& <M_{2}<H M_{2}<I S I<I N_{2}<I N_{1}
\end{aligned}
$$

(x) Total surface area (TSA):

$$
\begin{aligned}
& A Z I<A B C<{ }^{m} M_{2}<S D D<A G<Q G<G A<R_{-1 / 2}<H \\
& <G Q<{ }^{m} S O<S C I<S O<F<N<M_{1}<H M_{1}<R R_{-1 / 2} \\
& <M_{2}<H M_{2}<I N_{1}<I S I<I N_{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

Above obtained (i)-(x) ordering relations, Tables 6-16 and Figures 5 and 6 stimulate us to make the following intriguing observations related to the prediction capability of the topological indices. The observations are discussed as follows:
(i) Augmented Zagreb index $(A Z I)$ index shows a good correlation with the boiling points (BP) and surface tension (ST) of octane isomers and obtains the $R$-values 0.9127 and 0.8064 , respectively.
(ii) First inverse Nirmala index $\left(I N_{1}\right)$ observes the higher correlation
with the critical temperature (CT), molar refraction (MR), molar volume (MV), standard heats of formation (DHFORM) and density (DENS) of octane isomers and have correlation coefficients ( $R$ ) $-0.7378,0.9824,0.9503,0.7642$ and -0.9512 , respectively.
(iii) Inverse sum (indeg) index (ISI) demonstrates good prediction power to forecast the critical pressure ( CP ) with $R$-value 0.9532 .
(iv) Geometric-quadratic index $(G Q)$ obtains the high correlation with the heats of vaporization (HV) and have $R$-value 0.9661 .
(v) Second Nirmala index $\left(I N_{1}\right)$ shows a strong correlation to predict the total surface area (TSA) with $R$-value -0.9369 .
(vi) No topological index performs a good correlation with melting point (MP). Therefore in this case, we may not assert any conclusion about it.

Given the above discussion, among all the considered degree-based topological indices, the novel indices such as $I N_{1}, I N_{2}, I S I$ and $G Q$ indices are better predictors and show their domination nature over other degreebased topological indices for most of the considered physico-chemical properties of octane isomers.

## 5 Conclusion

This article aimed to investigate the smoothness and chemical applicability of some novel degree-based topological indices and their inter-correlation among each other.

In the context of smoothness, among all the considered topological indices, the second hyper Zagreb index $\left(H M_{2}\right)$ obtained the higher $S S$ value followed by $F, H M_{1}$ and $A Z I$ indices, and the first Zagreb index $\left(I N_{1}\right)$ showed the lower $S S$-value. However, the same observation was observed reverse in the case of abruptness. The obtained results concerning the $(S S)$ and $(A b r)$ of most of the considered novel degree-based topological indices are almost average and comparable with the existing results of the article [41].

The executed correlation analysis among the degree-based topological indices shows that the indices having a correlation coefficient $0.9900 \leq$ $R<1$ among each other are strongly correlated. It suggests that two well-correlated indices are dependent on each other and possess the same structural features and chemical applicability. Therefore, one should carry forward the topological index among them which shows a good prediction power and structural features.

The performed QSPR analysis for the physico-chemical properties of octane isomers calibrate that among the considered novel topological indices the $I N_{1}$ index predicts the CT, MR, MV, DHFORM and DENS properties of the octane isomers significantly. Further, the GQ, ISI and $I N_{2}$ indices obtain a good correlation with HV, CP and TSA properties, respectively. The augmented Zagreb index $(A Z I)$ somewhat performs a better correlation with BP and ST properties. Furthermore, apart from BP for all the considered properties, the obtained results for the $S O, S D D$, and $N$ indices are fable in comparison to the $I N_{1}, I N_{2}$, and $I S I$ indices.

Given the results associated with the discussed properties of the novel topological indices, one may consider these indices as strong contenders for future experimentation in this area.
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On Structure Sensitivity and Chemical Applicability of Some Novel Degree-based Topological Indices

Table 3. Structure sensitivity ( $S S$ ) and abruptness ( $A b r$ ) of different topological indices of trees from $n=4$ to 10 vertices.

| Topological Indices |  | $\boldsymbol{n}=\mathbf{4}$ | $\boldsymbol{n}=\mathbf{5}$ | $\boldsymbol{n}=\mathbf{6}$ | $\boldsymbol{n}=\mathbf{7}$ | $\boldsymbol{n}=\mathbf{8}$ | $\boldsymbol{n}=\mathbf{9}$ | $\boldsymbol{n}=\mathbf{1 0}$ |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\boldsymbol{M}_{\mathbf{1}}$ | $S S$ | 0.1833 | 0.1768 | 0.1381 | 0.1151 | 0.0964 | 0.0835 | 0.0726 |
|  | $A b r$ | 0.1833 | 0.19762 | 0.2090 | 0.1934 | 0.1815 | 0.1708 | 0.1623 |
| $\boldsymbol{M}_{\mathbf{2}}$ | $S S$ | 0.1181 | 0.1448 | 0.1403 | 0.1296 | 0.1209 | 0.1111 | 0.1032 |
|  | $A b r$ | 0.1181 | 0.1448 | 0.2054 | 0.2308 | 0.2546 | 0.2642 | 0.2706 |
| $\boldsymbol{R}_{-\mathbf{- 1 / 2}}$ | $S S$ | 0.1002 | 0.0953 | 0.0744 | 0.0599 | 0.0484 | 0.0404 | 0.0339 |
|  | $A b r$ | 0.1002 | 0.1046 | 0.1053 | 0.0919 | 0.0855 | 0.0779 | 0.0709 |
| $\boldsymbol{S C I}$ | $S S$ | 0.0983 | 0.0942 | 0.0734 | 0.0594 | 0.0482 | 0.0404 | 0.0341 |
|  | $A b r$ | 0.0983 | 0.1028 | 0.1039 | 0.0915 | 0.0849 | 0.0776 | 0.0714 |
| $\boldsymbol{H}$ | $S S$ | 0.2020 | 0.1945 | 0.1519 | 0.1214 | 0.0972 | 0.0803 | 0.0669 |
|  | $A b r$ | 0.2020 | 0.2106 | 0.2101 | 0.1829 | 0.1691 | 0.1524 | 0.1381 |
| $\boldsymbol{A} \boldsymbol{Z I}$ | $S S$ | 0.9742 | 0.7278 | 0.4616 | 0.3029 | 0.2017 | 0.1515 | 0.1182 |
|  | $A b r$ | 0.9742 | 0.7572 | 0.5960 | 0.4378 | 0.3384 | 0.2878 | 0.2506 |
| $\boldsymbol{A B C}$ | $S S$ | 0.1443 | 0.1007 | 0.0691 | 0.0501 | 0.0382 | 0.0309 | 0.0255 |
|  | $A b r$ | 0.1443 | 0.1115 | 0.1000 | 0.08274 | 0.0704 | 0.0634 | 0.0569 |
| $\boldsymbol{G A}$ | $S S$ | 0.1052 | 0.0984 | 0.0746 | 0.0596 | 0.0474 | 0.0393 | 0.0326 |
|  | $A b r$ | 0.1052 | 0.1086 | 0.1051 | 0.0908 | 0.0823 | 0.0743 | 0.0671 |



Figure 7. Comparison of $S S$ and $A b r$ of different topological indices for the data set of 23 trees with 8 vertices.

```
Algorithm 1 A pseudocode, implemented in MATLAB R2019a, to com-
pute the structure sensitivity \((S S)\) and abruptness ( \(A b r\) ) of topological
indices (TIs) for a data set of trees of given vertex.
Require: \(\Omega=\{\) Set of all trees with given number of vertices \(\}\)
    \(A=Z \operatorname{eroes}(|\Omega|, 23)\)
    \(B=Z \operatorname{eroes}(|\Omega|, 23)\)
    \(C=Z \operatorname{eroes}(1,23)\)
    \(D=\operatorname{Zeroes}(1,23)\)
    for \(i=1:|\Omega|\) (for a tree \(T_{i}\) in \(n\)-vertex trees data set \(\Omega\) ) do
        \(S=\left\{\right.\) Trees with \(G E D=2\) from tree \(\left.T_{i}\right\} \quad \triangleright\) use Python networkx package to
    compute GED
        \(E=\left[23 \text { TIs of tree } T_{i}\right]_{1 \times 23} \quad \triangleright\) calculate TIs of tree \(T_{i}\)
        \(F=[23 \text { TIs of the trees in set } S]_{23 \times|S|} \quad \triangleright\) compute topological indices
        \(G=\operatorname{Zeroes}(23,|S|)\)
        \(H=Z\) eroes \((1,23)\)
        \(I=\operatorname{Zeroes}(1,23)\)
        for \(j=1: 23\) do \(\quad \triangleright\) Implementation of Step-3
            \(p=0\)
                for \(k=1:|S|\) do
                    \(q=\left|\frac{F(j, k)-E(j)}{E(j)}\right|\)
                    \(p=q+p\)
                    \(G(j, k)=q\)
                end for
                \(S S\left(T_{i}, T I s\right)=\frac{p}{|S|}\)
                \(\operatorname{Abr}\left(T_{i}, T I s\right)=\max (G(j) ;:)\)
                \(H(j)=S S\left(T_{i}, T I s\right) \quad \triangleright\) Give all \(23 S S\)-values of each \(T I s\) for a tree \(T_{i}\)
                \(I(j)=\operatorname{Abr}\left(T_{i}, T I s\right) \quad \triangleright\) Give all 23 Abr -values of each \(T I s\) for a tree \(T_{i}\)
        end for
        \(\operatorname{disp}(H)\)
        \(\operatorname{disp}(I)\)
        \(A(i,:)=H(1,:)\)
        \(B(i,:)=I(1,:)\)
    end for
    \(\operatorname{disp}(A)\)
    \(\operatorname{disp}(B)\)
    for \(l=1: 23\) do \(\quad \triangleright\) Implementation of Step-4
        \(r=0\)
        \(t=0\)
        for \(m=1:|\Omega|\) do
            \(r=A(l, m)+r\)
            \(t=B(l, m)+t\)
        end for
                                \(\triangleright\) To obtain the average of \(S S\) and \(A b r\) values of all the \(T_{i}\)
    \(S S(\Omega, T I s)=\frac{r}{|\Omega|}\)
        \(\operatorname{Abr}(\Omega, T I s)=\frac{t}{|\Omega|}\)
        \(C(l)=S S(\Omega, T I s)\)
        \(D(l)=A b r(\Omega, T I s)\)
    end for
    \(\operatorname{disp}(C)\)
    \(\triangleright\) Give all \(23 S S\)-values of each \(T I s\) for data set \(\Omega\)
    \(\operatorname{disp}(D)\)
\(\triangleright\) Give all \(23 A b r\)-values of each TIs for data set \(\Omega\)
```



Figure 8. Comparison of $S S$ and $A b r$ of different topological indices for the data set of 47 trees with 9 vertices.


Figure 9. Comparison of $S S$ and $A b r$ of different topological indices for the data set of 106 trees with 10 vertices.

Table 4．Correlation coefficient among the different degree－based topo－ logical indices of decane isomers．

| \％ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | － |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 앙 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | － | 営 |
| 0 0 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | － | 另 | 发 |
| 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | － | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l} \hline \text { 僉 } \\ i \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 筸 } \\ & i \end{aligned}$ | \％${ }_{\text {\％}}^{\text {\％}}$ |
| \％ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | － |  | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { 홍 } \\ i \end{array}$ | 害 | 呂 |
| E |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | － | 跡 | $\begin{array}{\|c\|c} \hline \text { og } \\ \vdots \\ \vdots \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 总 } \\ & \text { 。 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\omega} \\ \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\omega} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 弇 |
| $\sum_{\mathbb{Z}}^{N}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | － |  | $\begin{aligned} & 8.8 \\ & \text { gix } \\ & \hline 0 \end{aligned}$ | $$ |  |  | － |
| E |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | － | 部 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 算 } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 管 |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { 萑 } \end{gathered}$ | 幾 |
| U |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | － | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 悥 } \\ & \text { O } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { 虜 } \end{aligned}$ | 朐 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \frac{8}{9} \\ \hline 0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { 䇷 } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { 突 } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 呂 |
| － |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | － | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { 黄 } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 昼 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { 墙 } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 菏 } \\ & \stackrel{y}{c} \end{aligned}$ | 曷 |  | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l\|l} \hline \text { 苞 } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l\|l\|l}  \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | 㖪 |
| 䒺 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | － | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \stackrel{y y}{c} \\ \text { dig } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { 首 } \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | 훙 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l} \hline 8_{8}^{8} \\ \hline 8 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \frac{8}{6} \\ & \text { ¢ } \\ & \hline 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Fex } \\ & \text { 感 } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \\ \hline \\ 3 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \stackrel{9}{0} \\ 0 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 気 |
| \＃ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | － | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l} \hline \stackrel{8}{6} \\ 0 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { 気 } \\ \text { 㤩 } \end{array}$ |  |  | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l} \hline \text { 璚 } \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { did } \\ & \text { o. } \end{aligned}$ | 简 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { ? } \\ \text { 品 } \end{array}$ |  |  | 晰 |
| 会 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | － |  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { ⿹ㅏㅇ } \\ & i \\ & i \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \stackrel{0}{6} \\ \substack{0 \\ i} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 7 \\ \text { 营 } \end{array}$ | 事 | 気 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l\|} \hline \text { 密 } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 为 |  | $\begin{array}{\|c\|c} \hline \text { 喿 } \\ c \\ i \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | 㔛 |
| U |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | － |  | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\mathrm{o}} \\ \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{g} \\ & \stackrel{y}{6} \\ & i \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \\ \text { 弇 } \\ \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 荷 } \\ & i \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 骨 } \\ & \stackrel{y}{i} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l\|l\|l\|l\|l\|} \hline \text { • } \end{array}$ | 賩 |  | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline \text { 魚 } \\ \vdots \\ i \end{array}$ |  |  | 茦 |
| $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \\ \text { a } \\ \text { a } \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | － | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{2} \\ 0 \\ i \\ i \end{array}$ | 蒿 | $\begin{array}{\|c} \left\lvert\, \begin{array}{c} \text { 管 } \\ i \end{array}\right. \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l} \hline 8 \\ \substack{0 \\ \hline} \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \mathscr{Z} \\ & \mathbb{Z} \\ & \mathscr{8} \end{aligned}$ | 吉 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 骎 } \\ & \text { in } \end{aligned}$ | 䙲 | 暿\| |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { 䁶 } \\ \end{gathered}$ | 営 |
| $\begin{array}{\|c\|c\|c\|c\|c\|} \hline \\ \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | － | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 0 \\ \hline ⿱ 丷 ⿱ ⿻ ⿴ 囗 丨 丷 日 心 \\ \vdots \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \ddot{\alpha} \\ \dot{\alpha} \\ \dot{\alpha} \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline 8 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 量 } \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 笴 } \\ 0 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline \infty \\ \stackrel{\infty}{\otimes} \\ i \\ i \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l\|} \hline \stackrel{y}{干} \\ 0 \\ i \end{array}$ |  |  | $\begin{array}{\|c\|c} \hline 0 . \\ 0 \\ i \end{array}$ | 敬。 | $\begin{array}{\|c\|:} \hline \stackrel{\circ}{0} \\ \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{0} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 営 |
| \＆ |  |  |  |  |  |  | － |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l\|} \hline \text { 영 } \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { F } \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{8} \\ & 0 . \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 8 \\ & 0.8 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { N} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\circ} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l\|} \hline \text { 莫 } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 兴 } \\ i \\ i \end{gathered}$ | $$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { 若 } \\ 0 \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \stackrel{g}{a} \\ & \stackrel{a}{i} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 㞗 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { In } \\ & \text { En } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  | － | $\begin{array}{\|c\|c} \hline 9 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{array}{\|c\|c\|c\|c\|c\|c\|c\|c\|c\|c\|} \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|c\|c\|c\|c\|c\|} \hline \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \frac{9}{2} \\ i \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 0 \\ \text { od } \\ \hline 0 \end{array}$ | 薄 | $$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \stackrel{\circ}{0} \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 苞 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l\|l\|l\|l\|} \hline 0 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 导 | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline \% \\ \hline 8 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { 品 } \\ \dot{c} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 荡 | 㤟 | 㰴 |
| 8 |  |  |  |  | － | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \frac{\vec{b}}{0} \\ 0 \\ i \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { 漕 } \\ 0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { I } \\ \text { a } \\ \text { co } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline \hat{\mathrm{y}} \\ \text { on } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { 㗊 } \\ & i \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l\|} \hline \text { O} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|c} \hline \\ \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{d} \\ d \\ i \end{array}$ | $\stackrel{8}{[8}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l} \hline \text { 曼 } \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  | 筑 | 骂 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { 呑 } \\ \text { a } \end{array}$ | $\stackrel{r}{9}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { 僉 } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l\|} \hline \text { b } \\ \text { a } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \frac{t}{6} \\ x_{0} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 器 |
| E |  |  |  | － |  | $\begin{array}{\|c\|c\|c\|c\|c\|c\|} \hline \text { in } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { 弇 } \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  | \| |  | $\begin{aligned} & \hat{W} \\ & \dot{\omega} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  | 䒻 |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { a } \\ \text { g } \\ d \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Ï } \\ & \text { © } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l\|} \hline y_{2} \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l} \hline \text { 鬼 } \\ i \end{array}$ | 韨 |  | $$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | \％${ }_{\text {\％}}^{\text {¢ }}$ |
| za |  |  | － | $$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { 莺 } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \stackrel{\circ}{\text { did }} \\ \hline 0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { 算 } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline ⿳ ⿱ 卄 一 ⿻ 口 ⿰ 口 口 木 斤 ~ \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\stackrel{\stackrel{y}{\otimes}}{\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{d}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { ⿳亠丷厂犬} \\ & 0 \\ & \vdots \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \frac{0}{0} \\ & 0.0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \frac{0}{0} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 管 } \\ \text { 。 } \end{gathered}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 羃 } \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{a}{7}$ | 哭 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { 券 } \\ 0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { 器 } \\ \dot{c} \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 萹 } \\ & \stackrel{y}{c} \end{aligned}$ | 礝 | 突 |
| z |  | － |  | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l} \text { 吕 } \\ 0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { 准 } \\ \text { O } \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \stackrel{g}{g} \\ \text { gi } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \frac{9}{C} \\ \dot{c} \\ i \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline 9 \\ \substack{9 \\ i \\ i} \end{array}$ | $$ |  | $$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0 \\ & \text { 导 } \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 筩 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l\|l\|l\|l\|} \hline 0 \\ \text { id } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { 产 } \\ i \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{array}{\|c} \substack{8 \\ 8 ⿰ 氵 ⿹ 𠄎 ⿰ 丿 丿 心 夊 \\ \hline} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l} \hline \text { an } \\ \text { din } \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l} \hline \text { 易 } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 発 |
| 2 | － |  | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline 0 \\ \frac{3}{3} \\ 0 \\ i \end{array}$ | $$ |  | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \frac{9}{4} \\ 0 \\ i \\ i \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { g } \\ \text { 䯩 } \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 0 \\ \text { B } \\ \hline 0 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 응 } \\ & \text { ab } \end{aligned}$ |  | 䨐 | $\begin{gathered} \text { 箇 } \\ i \\ i \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l} \hline \text { oif } \\ \text { ono } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 菏 |  | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l\|} \hline 0 \\ \text {. } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 器 |  | $$ | 总 | 哭 |
|  | 2 | z | z | $\vec{z}$ | ż | $\stackrel{n}{2}$ | $\stackrel{4}{4}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \\ 2 \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ | $$ | U | 动 | $\pm$ | 匀 | V | － | 3 | Eี | J | \％ | $\bigcirc$ | \％ | O | $\stackrel{8}{8}$ |

Table 5. Topological indices of octane isomers

| Topological indices $\rightarrow$ <br> Octane isomers | $N$ | ${ }^{\prime} N_{1}$ | IN ${ }_{2}$ | ${ }^{m} M_{2}$ | SDD | ISI | $H M_{1}$ | $\mathrm{HM}_{2}$ | ${ }^{\prime} G$ | so | ${ }^{m} \mathrm{SO}$ | $G Q$ | $Q G$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Octane | 13.4641 | 7.4495 | 6.63 | 2.25 | 15.0000 | 6.33 | 98.0000 | 88.0000 | 7.12 | 18.6143 | 2.662 | 6.78 | 7.236 |
| 2-Methyl heptane | 13.9681 | 7.4470 | 6.6439 | 2.0833 | 17.3333 | 6.3667 | 114.0000 | 106.0000 | 7.3907 | 20.6515 | 2.4177 | 6.4044 | 7.740 |
| 3-Methyl heptane | 13.9362 | 7.4299 | 6.6899 | 2.16667 | 16.6667 | 6.4833 | 116.0000 | 121.0000 | 7.3173 | 20.5024 | 2.4725 | 6.4850 | 7.608 |
| 4-Methyl heptane | 13.9362 | 4299 | 6.689 | 2.1667 | 16.666 | 6.4833 | 116.0000 | 121.0000 | 7.3173 | 20.5024 | 2.4725 | 6.4850 | 7.608 |
| 3-Ethyl hexane | 13.9043 | 7.4128 | 6.73 | 2.2500 | 16.0000 | 6.6000 | 118.0000 | 136.0000 | 7.2438 | 20.3533 | 2.5272 | 6.5656 | 7.476 |
| 2,2-Dimethyl hexane | 14.8897 | . 4448 | 6.6545 | 1.8750 | 21.7500 | 6.4000 | 152.0000 | 148.0000 | 7.8713 | 24.7344 | 2.1055 | 5.8468 | 8.609 |
| 2,3-Dimethyl hexane | 14.4176 | 7.4182 | 6.734 | 2.0278 | 18.6667 | 6.6167 | 134.0000 | 164.0000 | 7.5454 | 22.3995 | 2.2625 | 6.1789 | 8.031 |
| 2,4-Dimethyl hexane | 14.4402 | 7.4274 | 6.700 | 2.0000 | 19.0000 | 6.5167 | 132.0000 | 139.000 | 7.5866 | 22.5395 | 2.2279 | 6.1005 | 8.1135 |
| 2,5-Dimethyl hexane | 14.4721 | 7.4445 | 6.655 | 1.9167 | 19.6667 | 6.4000 | 130.0000 | 124.0000 | 7.6600 | 22.6886 | 2.1732 | 6.0199 | 8.2456 |
| 3,3-Dimethyl hexane | 14.8352 | 7.4176 | 6.7312 | 2.0000 | 20.5000 | 6.6000 | 156.0000 | 184.0000 | 7.7 | 24.4914 | 2.1803 | 5.9497 | 8.3 |
| 3,4-Dimethyl hexane | 14.3857 | 40 | 6.78 | 2.1111 | 18.0000 | 6.7333 | 136.0000 | 179.00 | 7.4719 | 22.2504 | 2.3173 | 6.2596 | 7.89 |
| 3-Ethyl-2-methyl pentane | 14.3857 | 7.4011 | 6.78 | 2.1111 | 18.0000 | 6.7333 | 136.0000 | 179.000 | 7.4719 | 22.2504 | 2.3173 | 6.2596 | 7.899 |
| 3-Ethyl-3-methyl pentane | 14.7807 | 7.3903 | 6.808 | 2.1250 | 19.250 | 6.800 | 160.0000 | 220.0000 | 7.6139 | 24.2477 | 2.2550 | 6.0526 | 8.165 |
| 2,2,3-Trimethyl pentane | 15.3221 | 7.4102 | 6.770 | 1.8333 | 22.8333 | 6.7309 | 174.0000 | 241.0000 | 7.9963 | 26.3732 | 1.9684 | 5.6676 | 8.843 |
| 2,2,4-Trimethyl pentane | 15.3937 | 7.4424 | 6.6655 | 1.7083 | 24.0833 | 6.4333 | 168.0000 | 166.0000 | 8.1407 | 26.7716 | 1.8610 | 5.4624 | 9.114 |
| 2,3,3-Trimethyl pentane | 15.2994 | 7.4000 | 6.8014 | 1.8750 | 22.2500 | 6.8143 | 176.0000 | 262.0000 | 7.9411 | 26.2789 | 1.9883 | 5.6898 | 8.754 |
| 2,3,4-Trimethyl pentane | 14.8989 | 7.4065 | 6.7796 | 1.8889 | 20.6667 | 6.7500 | 152.0000 | 207.0000 | 7.7735 | 24.2967 | 2.0525 | 5.8730 | 8.4550 |

Table 6. Statistical parameters of linear QSPR model for boiling point (BP) of octane isomers.

| Linear Models | $\boldsymbol{R}$ | $\boldsymbol{R}^{\mathbf{2}}$ | Adjusted- $\boldsymbol{R}^{\mathbf{2}}$ | $\boldsymbol{R M S E}$ | $\boldsymbol{S S E}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $B P=-8.0910 \times N+231.6000$ | -0.7506 | 0.5633 | 0.5342 | 4.112 | 253.6000 |
| $B P=-61.7500 \times I N_{1}+572.5000$ | -0.1958 | 0.0384 | -0.0258 | 6.1020 | 558.4000 |
| $B P=12.7500 \times I N_{2}+28.4200$ | 0.1246 | 0.0155 | -0.0501 | 6.1740 | 571.7000 |
| $B P=-1.7880 \times M_{1}+168.6000$ | -0.7124 | 0.5076 | 0.4748 | 4.3660 | 286.0000 |
| $B P=-0.7725 \times M_{2}+137.4000$ | -0.4234 | 0.1793 | 0.1246 | 5.6370 | 476.6000 |
| $B P=34.3600 \times{ }^{m} M_{2}+44.6300$ | 0.8824 | 0.7786 | 0.7639 | 2.9270 | 128.5000 |
| $B P=-0.2487 \times F+133.8000$ | -0.6965 | 0.4851 | 0.4507 | 4.465 | 299.0000 |
| $B P=36.9200 \times R-1 / 2-21.3300$ | 0.84063 | 0.7067 | 0.6871 | 3.3700 | 170.3000 |
| $B P=-5.2110 \times R R_{-1 / 2}+187.7000$ | -0.5622 | 0.3160 | 0.2704 | 5.1460 | 397.2000 |
| $B P=38.8200 \times S C I-18.6100$ | 0.8151 | 0.6643 | 0.6419 | 3.6050 | 194.9000 |
| $B P=-1.9840 \times S D D+152.2000$ | -0.8409 | 0.7071 | 0.6875 | 3.3680 | 170.1000 |
| $B P=20.5100 \times H+44.7500$ | 0.8387 | 0.7034 | 0.6837 | 3.3880 | 172.2000 |
| $B P=3.4400 \times I S I+91.5100$ | 0.0924 | 0.0085 | -0.0576 | 6.1950 | 575.7000 |
| $B P=0.7829 \times A Z I+78.5600$ | $\mathbf{0 . 9 1 7 6}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 8 4 2 1}$ | 0.8315 | 2.4730 | 91.7100 |
| $B P=-27.0200 \times A B C+255.8000$ | -0.8859 | 0.7849 | 0.7706 | 2.8860 | 124.9000 |
| $B P=-0.1653 \times H M_{1}+137.2000$ | -0.6318 | 0.3992 | 0.3591 | 4.8230 | 348.9000 |
| $B P=-0.0319 \times H M_{2}+119.3000$ | -0.2559 | 0.0655 | 0.0032 | 6.0150 | 542.7000 |
| $B P=22.2800 \times G A-30.2700$ | 0.8408 | 0.7069 | 0.6874 | 3.3680 | 170.2000 |
| $B P=-17.8600 \times A G+249.9000$ | -0.8414 | 0.7080 | 0.6885 | 3.3620 | 169.6000 |
| $B P=-1.899 \times S O+157.7000$ | -0.7509 | 0.5638 | 0.5347 | 4.1090 | 253.3000 |
| $B P=23.1800 \times{ }^{m} S O+61.9600$ | 0.8347 | 0.6968 | 0.6766 | 3.4260 | 176.1000 |
| $B P=14.1400 \times G Q+27.5400$ | 0.8376 | 0.7016 | 0.6817 | 3.3990 | 173.3000 |
| $B P=-9.75405 \times Q G+193.4000$ | -0.8414 | 0.7079 | 0.6884 | 3.3630 | 169.6000 |

Table 7. Statistical parameters of linear QSPR model for critical temperature (CT) of octane isomers.

| Linear Models | $\boldsymbol{R}$ | $\boldsymbol{R}^{\mathbf{2}}$ | Adjusted- $\boldsymbol{R}^{2}$ | $\boldsymbol{R M S E}$ | $\boldsymbol{S S E}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $C T=-1.9560 \times N+319.2000$ | -0.1244 | 0.0155 | -0.0502 | 9.004 | 1216.0000 |
| $C T=-339.3000 \times I N_{1}+2809.0000$ | $\mathbf{- 0 . 7 3 7 8}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 5 4 4 3}$ | 0.5140 | 6.1260 | 562.8000 |
| $C T=106.6000 \times I N_{2}-425.6000$ | 0.7141 | 0.5100 | 0.4773 | 6.3520 | 605.3000 |
| $C T=-0.2464 \times M_{1}+298.3000$ | -0.0673 | 0.0045 | -0.0618 | 9.0540 | 1230.0000 |
| $C T=0.7936 \times M_{2}+266.8000$ | 0.2982 | 0.0889 | 0.0282 | 8.6620 | 1125.0000 |
| $C T=26.7800 \times{ }^{m} M_{2}+236.6000$ | 0.4717 | 0.2225 | 0.1706 | 8.0020 | 960.4000 |
| $C T=-0.0321 \times F+293.3000$ | -0.0617 | 0.0038 | -0.0626 | 9.0570 | 1231.0000 |
| $C T=19.2000 \times R_{-1 / 2}+220.3000$ | 0.2997 | 0.0898 | 0.0292 | 8.6570 | 1124.0000 |
| $C T=1.9200 \times R R_{-1 / 2}+263.7000$ | 0.1420 | 0.02016 | -0.0452 | 8.9830 | 1210.0000 |
| $C T=16.5900 \times S C I+234.1000$ | 0.2388 | 0.0570 | -0.0058 | 8.8120 | 1165.0000 |
| $C T=-1.0660 \times S D D+311.2000$ | -0.3098 | 0.0959 | 0.0357 | 8.6280 | 1117.0000 |
| $C T=10.4500 \times H+255.4000$ | 0.2931 | 0.0859 | 0.0249 | 8.6760 | 1129.0000 |
| $C T=38.0300 \times I S I+40.6700$ | 0.7007 | 0.4909 | 0.4570 | 6.4750 | 628.8000 |
| $C T=0.7581 \times A Z I+256.3000$ | 0.6092 | 0.3712 | 0.3292 | 7.1960 | 776.8000 |
| $C T=-21.5100 \times A B C+403.5000$ | -0.4836 | 0.2338 | 0.1828 | 7.9430 | 946.4000 |
| $C T=0.0154 \times H M_{1}+288.6000$ | 0.0403 | 0.0016 | -0.0649 | 9.0670 | 1233.0000 |
| $C T=0.0836 \times H M_{2}+277.1000$ | 0.4604 | 0.2119 | 0.1594 | 8.0560 | 973.4000 |
| $C T=11.3600 \times G A+217.1000$ | 0.2940 | 0.0864 | 0.0255 | 8.6740 | 1128.0000 |
| $C T=-9.4420 \times A G+362.5000$ | -0.3051 | 0.0931 | 0.0326 | 8.6420 | 1120.0000 |
| $C T=-0.4847 \times S O+301.9000$ | -0.1314 | 0.0173 | -0.0483 | 8.9960 | 1214.0000 |
| $C T=11.3700 \times{ }^{m} S O+265.2000$ | 0.2809 | 0.0789 | 0.0175 | 8.7090 | 1138.0000 |
| $C T=6.8810 \times G Q+248.6000$ | 0.2794 | 0.0781 | 0.0166 | 8.7130 | 1139.000 |
| $C T=-5.0920 \times Q G+332.2000$ | -0.3011 | 0.0907 | 0.0301 | 8.6530 | 1123.0000 |

Table 8. Statistical parameters of linear QSPR model for critical pressure (CP) of octane isomers.

| Linear Models | $\boldsymbol{R}$ | $\boldsymbol{R}^{\mathbf{2}}$ | Adjusted- $\boldsymbol{R}^{2}$ | $\boldsymbol{R M S E}$ | $\boldsymbol{S S E}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $C P=1.5340 \times N+4.2380$ | 0.6127 | 0.3754 | 0.3338 | 1.1420 | 19.5700 |
| $C P=-66.5700 \times I N_{1}+520.6000$ | -0.9089 | 0.8261 | 0.8145 | 0.6026 | 5.4480 |
| $C P=22.4100 \times I N_{2}-124.1000$ | 0.9427 | 0.8886 | 0.8812 | 0.4823 | 3.4900 |
| $C P=0.3830 \times M_{1}+14.8400$ | 0.6571 | 0.4318 | 0.3939 | 1.0890 | 17.8000 |
| $C P=0.3792 \times M_{2}+15.0600$ | 0.8950 | 0.8010 | 0.7877 | 0.6447 | 6.2340 |
| $C P=-2.0480 \times{ }^{m} M_{2}+30.6500$ | -0.2265 | 0.0513 | -0.0119 | 1.4080 | 29.7200 |
| $C P=-0.0536 \times F+22.2700$ | 0.6465 | 0.4180 | 0.3792 | 1.1030 | 18.2300 |
| $C P=-4.5330 \times R_{-1 / 2}+43.1400$ | -0.4443 | 0.1974 | 0.1439 | 1.2950 | 25.1400 |
| $C P=1.7490 \times R R-1 / 2+1.8210$ | 0.8121 | 0.6595 | 0.6369 | 0.8432 | 10.6700 |
| $C P=-5.6400 \times S C I+45.7900$ | -0.5098 | 0.2599 | 0.2106 | 1.2430 | 23.1800 |
| $C P=0.2346 \times S D D+22.0000$ | 0.4281 | 0.1832 | 0.1288 | 1.3060 | 25.5900 |
| $C P=-2.5740 \times H+35.2100$ | -0.4531 | 0.2053 | 0.1523 | 1.2880 | 24.8900 |
| $C P=8.2400 \times I S I-27.6800$ | $\mathbf{0 . 9 5 3 2}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 9 0 8 6}$ | 0.9025 | 0.4368 | 2.8620 |
| $C P=-0.0134 \times A Z I+27.1100$ | -0.0674 | 0.0045 | -0.0618 | 1.4420 | 31.1800 |
| $C P=1.5100 \times A B C+18.5900$ | 0.2132 | 0.0455 | -0.0182 | 1.4120 | 29.9000 |
| $C P=0.0444 \times H M_{1}+20.3200$ | 0.7305 | 0.5336 | 0.5025 | 0.9869 | 14.6100 |
| $C P=0.0274 \times H M_{2}+22.0100$ | 0.9480 | 0.8987 | 0.8920 | 0.4599 | 3.1730 |
| $C P=-2.7970 \times G A+44.6300$ | -0.4545 | 0.2065 | 0.1536 | 1.287 | 24.8600 |
| $C P=2.1520 \times A G+10.1500$ | 0.4366 | 0.1907 | 0.1367 | 1.3000 | 25.3500 |
| $C P=0.3537 \times S O+18.3900$ | 0.6020 | 0.3625 | 0.3200 | 1.1540 | 19.9700 |
| $C P=-3.0240 \times{ }^{m} S O+33.3100$ | -0.4689 | 0.2199 | 0.1678 | 1.2760 | 24.4400 |
| $C P=-1.8630 \times G Q+37.9100$ | -0.4752 | 0.2258 | 0.1742 | 1.272 | 24.25 |
| $C P=1.1930 \times Q G+16.8100$ | 0.4431 | 0.1964 | 0.1428 | 1.2960 | 25.1800 |

Table 9. Statistical parameters of linear QSPR model for heats of vaporization (HV) of octane isomers.

| Linear Models | $\boldsymbol{R}$ | $\boldsymbol{R}^{\mathbf{2}}$ | Adjusted- $\boldsymbol{R}^{\mathbf{2}}$ | $\boldsymbol{R} \boldsymbol{M S E}$ | $\boldsymbol{S S E}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $H V=-2.4330 \times N+73.6600$ | -0.9387 | 0.8811 | 0.8732 | 0.5157 | 3.9900 |
| $H V=12.8600 \times I N_{1}-57.1100$ | 0.1697 | 0.0288 | -0.0359 | 32.5900 | 1.4740 |
| $H V=-6.1490 \times I N_{2}+79.6800$ | -0.2499 | 0.0625 | $-3.359 e-05$ | 1.448 | 31.4600 |
| $H V=-0.5558 \times M_{1}+55.2900$ | -0.9215 | 0.8492 | 0.8391 | 0.5809 | 5.0610 |
| $H V=-0.3275 \times M_{2}+48.2400$ | -0.7467 | 0.5576 | 0.5281 | 0.9948 | 14.8500 |
| $H V=8.4990 \times{ }^{m} M_{2}+21.1700$ | 0.9081 | 0.8246 | 0.8130 | 0.6263 | 5.8840 |
| $H V=-0.0777 \times F+44.4900$ | -0.9048 | 0.8187 | 0.8067 | 0.6368 | 6.082 |
| $H V=10.0800 \times R-1 / 2+1.3860$ | 0.9545 | 0.9110 | 0.9051 | 0.4462 | 2.9860 |
| $H V=-1.8750 \times R R_{-1 / 2}+64.8300$ | -0.8417 | 0.7084 | 0.6889 | 0.8077 | 9.7850 |
| $H V=10.9600 \times S C I+0.8975$ | 0.9569 | 0.9157 | 0.9101 | 0.4343 | 2.83 |
| $H V=-0.5386 \times S D D+48.700$ | -0.9497 | 0.9020 | 0.8954 | 0.4683 | 3.2900 |
| $H V=5.6210 \times H+19.3500$ | 0.9562 | 0.9143 | 0.9086 | 0.4378 | 2.8760 |
| $H V=-2.5450 \times I S I+55.0900$ | -0.2844 | 0.0809 | 0.0196 | 1.4340 | 30.8400 |
| $H V=0.1806 \times A Z I+30.1600$ | 0.8804 | 0.7752 | 0.7602 | 0.7092 | 7.5440 |
| $H V=-6.6460 \times A B C+73.1900$ | -0.9064 | 0.8215 | 0.8096 | 0.6319 | 5.9900 |
| $H V=-0.0552 \times H M_{1}+46.0500$ | -0.8772 | 0.7696 | 0.7542 | 0.7180 | 7.7320 |
| $H V=-0.0184 \times H M_{2}+41.3700$ | -0.6147 | 0.3779 | 0.3364 | 1.1800 | 20.8800 |
| $H V=6.1180 \times G A-1.2970$ | 0.9606 | 0.9228 | 0.9176 | 0.4157 | 2.5920 |
| $H V=-4.8660 \times A G+75.3400$ | -0.9538 | 0.9097 | 0.9037 | 0.4493 | 3.0280 |
| $H V=-0.5691 \times S O+51.4100$ | -0.9361 | 0.8762 | 0.8680 | 0.5262 | 4.1530 |
| $H V=6.3990 \times{ }^{m} S O+23.9600$ | 0.9588 | 0.9192 | 0.9138 | 0.4251 | 2.7110 |
| $H V=3.9210 \times G Q+14.3500$ | $\mathbf{0 . 9 6 6 1}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 9 3 3 4}$ | 0.9290 | 0.3859 | 2.2340 |
| $H V=-2.6650 \times Q G+60.0300$ | -0.9564 | 0.9147 | 0.9091 | 0.4367 | 2.8610 |

Table 10. Statistical parameters of linear QSPR model for molar refraction (MR) of octane isomers.

| Linear Models | $\boldsymbol{R}$ | $\boldsymbol{R}^{\mathbf{2}}$ | Adjusted- $\boldsymbol{R}^{\mathbf{2}}$ | $\boldsymbol{R} \boldsymbol{M S E}$ | $\boldsymbol{S S E}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $M R=-0.0909 \times N+40.3400$ | -0.2763 | 0.0763 | 0.0147 | 0.1827 | 0.5006 |
| $M R=9.4650 \times I N_{1}-31.2200$ | $\mathbf{0 . 9 8 2 4}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 9 6 5 2}$ | 0.9628 | 0.0355 | 0.0189 |
| $M R=-3.0520 \times I N_{2}+59.5300$ | -0.9762 | 0.9530 | 0.9498 | 0.0412 | 0.0255 |
| $M R=-0.0252 \times M_{1}+39.7900$ | -0.3284 | 0.1078 | 0.0484 | 0.1795 | 0.4835 |
| $M R=-0.0375 \times M_{2}+40.1500$ | -0.6723 | 0.4520 | 0.4155 | 0.1407 | 0.2970 |
| $M R=-0.1629 \times{ }^{m} M_{2}+39.3500$ | -0.1369 | 0.0188 | -0.0467 | 0.1883 | 0.5318 |
| $M R=-0.0034 \times F+39.2900$ | -0.3083 | 0.0951 | 0.0347 | 0.1808 | 0.4904 |
| $M R=0.1207 \times R_{-1 / 2}+38.5800$ | 0.0899 | 0.0081 | -0.0580 | 0.1893 | 0.5376 |
| $M R=-0.1548 \times R R_{-1}+2+41.2100$ | -0.5465 | 0.2987 | 0.2519 | 0.1592 | 0.3801 |
| $M R=0.2357 \times S C I+38.2200$ | 0.1620 | 0.0263 | -0.0387 | 0.1876 | 0.5277 |
| $M R=-0.0042 \times S D D+39.1000$ | -0.0579 | 0.0033 | -0.0631 | 0.1898 | 0.5402 |
| $M R=0.0765 \times H+38.7600$ | 0.1024 | 0.0105 | -0.0555 | 0.1891 | 0.5363 |
| $M R=-1.1000 \times I S I+46.2600$ | -0.9676 | 0.9362 | 0.9320 | 0.0480 | 0.0346 |
| $M R=-0.0073 \times A Z I+39.3500$ | -0.2802 | 0.0785 | 0.0171 | 0.1825 | 0.4994 |
| $M R=0.1382 \times A B C+38.3000$ | 0.1483 | 0.0219 | -0.0432 | 0.1880 | 0.5301 |
| $M R=-0.0033 \times H M_{1}+39.4900$ | -0.4188 | 0.1754 | 0.1204 | 0.1726 | 0.4469 |
| $M R=-0.0029 \times H M_{2}+39.5000$ | -0.7667 | 0.5878 | 0.5604 | 0.1220 | 0.2234 |
| $M R=0.0747 \times G A+38.5400$ | 0.0923 | 0.0085 | -0.0576 | 0.1893 | 0.5374 |
| $M R=-0.0447 \times A G+39.3600$ | -0.0689 | 0.0048 | -0.0616 | 0.1896 | 0.5394 |
| $M R=-0.0199 \times S O+39.4800$ | -0.2584 | 0.06677 | 0.0046 | 0.1836 | 0.5058 |
| $M R=0.1053 \times{ }^{m} S O+38.7800$ | 0.1241 | 0.0154 | -0.0502 | 0.1886 | 0.5336 |
| $M R=0.0616 \times G Q+38.6400$ | 0.1194 | 0.0143 | -0.0515 | 0.1887 | 0.5342 |
| $M R=-0.0273 \times Q G+39.2400$ | -0.0772 | 0.0059 | -0.0603 | 0.1895 | 0.5387 |

Table 11. Statistical parameters of linear QSPR model for molar volume (MV) of octane isomers.

| Linear Models | $\boldsymbol{R}$ | $\boldsymbol{R}^{\mathbf{2}}$ | Adjusted- $\boldsymbol{R}^{\mathbf{2}}$ | $\boldsymbol{R M S E}$ | $\boldsymbol{S S E}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $M V=-0.9130 \times N+174.4000$ | -0.1993 | 0.0397 | -0.0243 | 2.591 | 100.7000 |
| $M V=127.4000 \times I N_{1}-784.1000$ | $\mathbf{0 . 9 5 0 3}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 9 0 3 1}$ | 0.8967 | 0.8230 | 10.1600 |
| $M V=-41.0400 \times I N_{2}+437.0000$ | -0.9437 | 0.8906 | 0.8833 | 0.8746 | 11.4700 |
| $M V=-0.2705 \times M_{1}+169.4000$ | -0.2537 | 0.0644 | 0.0019 | 2.5580 | 98.1200 |
| $M V=-0.4737 \times M_{2}+175.4000$ | -0.6110 | 0.3733 | 0.3315 | 2.0930 | 65.7200 |
| $M V=-3.4160 \times{ }^{m} M_{2}+168.0000$ | -0.2064 | 0.0426 | -0.0212 | 2.5870 | 100.4000 |
| $M V=-0.0363 \times F+164.0000$ | -0.2389 | 0.0571 | -0.0058 | 2.5680 | 98.8900 |
| $M V=0.2273 \times R-1 / 2+160.3000$ | 0.0122 | 0.0001 | -0.0665 | 2.6440 | 104.9000 |
| $M V=-1.8700 \times R R_{-1 / 2}+187.5000$ | -0.4746 | 0.2253 | 0.1736 | 2.3270 | 81.2500 |
| $M V=1.6710 \times S C I+155.4000$ | 0.0825 | 0.0068 | -0.0594 | 2.6350 | 104.2000 |
| $M V=0.0152 \times S D D+160.8000$ | 0.0151 | 0.0002 | -0.0664 | 2.6440 | 104.9000 |
| $M V=0.2384 \times H+160.3000$ | 0.0229 | 0.0005 | -0.0661 | 2.6430 | 104.8000 |
| $M V=-14.8000 \times I S I+258.4000$ | -0.9357 | 0.8756 | 0.8673 | 0.9327 | 13.0500 |
| $M V=-0.1307 \times A Z I+167.1000$ | -0.3604 | 0.1299 | 0.0719 | 2.4670 | 91.2500 |
| $M V=2.8380 \times A B C+146.2000$ | 0.2190 | 0.0479 | -0.0155 | 2.5800 | 99.8500 |
| $M V=-0.0389 \times H M_{1}+166.5000$ | -0.3504 | 0.1228 | 0.0643 | 2.4770 | 92.0000 |
| $M V=-0.0385 \times H M_{2}+167.4000$ | -0.7269 | 0.5284 | 0.4970 | 1.8160 | 49.4600 |
| $M V=0.1521 \times G A+160.1000$ | 0.0135 | 0.0002 | -0.0665 | 2.6440 | 104.9000 |
| $M V=0.0542 \times A G+160.7000$ | 0.0060 | $3.614 e-05$ | -0.0666 | 2.6440 | 104.9000 |
| $M V=-0.1967 \times S O+165.6000$ | -0.1831 | 0.0335 | -0.0309 | 2.5990 | 101.4000 |
| $M V=0.4938 \times{ }^{m} S O+160.0000$ | 0.0418 | 0.0018 | -0.0648 | 2.6420 | 104.7000 |
| $M V=0.2628 \times G Q+159.5000$ | 0.0366 | 0.0013 | -0.0652 | 2.6420 | 104.7000 |
| $M V=-0.0044 \times Q G+161.2000$ | -0.0009 | $8.07 e-07$ | -0.0667 | 2.6440 | 104.9000 |

Table 12. Statistical parameters of linear QSPR model for surface tension (ST) of octane isomers.

| Linear Models | $\boldsymbol{R}$ | $\boldsymbol{R}^{\mathbf{2}}$ | Adjusted- $\boldsymbol{R}^{\mathbf{2}}$ | $\boldsymbol{R} \boldsymbol{M S E}$ | $\boldsymbol{S S E}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $S T=-0.6265 \times N+29.9400$ | -0.3994 | 0.1595 | 0.1035 | 0.8300 | 10.3300 |
| $S T=-28.8200 \times I N_{1}+234.8000$ | -0.6281 | 0.3945 | 0.3542 | 0.7045 | 7.4440 |
| $S T=8.5520 \times I N_{2}-36.6300$ | 0.5743 | 0.3298 | 0.2851 | 0.7412 | 8.2400 |
| $S T=-0.1260 \times M_{1}+24.6800$ | -0.3452 | 0.1191 | 0.0604 | 0.8497 | 10.8300 |
| $S T=0.0087 \times M_{2}+20.5800$ | 0.0328 | 0.0011 | -0.0655 | 0.9049 | 12.2800 |
| $S T=3.9850 \times{ }^{m} M_{2}+12.7800$ | 0.7034 | 0.4948 | 0.4612 | 0.6435 | 6.2110 |
| $S T=-0.0177 \times F+22.2400$ | -0.3414 | 0.1165 | 0.0576 | 0.8510 | 10.8600 |
| $S T=3.5730 \times R_{-1 / 2}+7.7320$ | 0.5592 | 0.3127 | 0.2668 | 0.7506 | 8.4510 |
| $S T=-0.1754 \times R R_{-1 / 2}+23.3200$ | -0.1300 | 0.0169 | -0.0486 | 0.8977 | 12.0900 |
| $S T=3.4970 \times S C I+8.8850$ | 0.5046 | 0.2546 | 0.2049 | 0.7816 | 9.1640 |
| $S T=-0.1964 \times S D D+24.6100$ | -0.5720 | 0.3272 | 0.2823 | 0.7426 | 8.2720 |
| $S T=1.9650 \times H+14.1900$ | 0.5524 | 0.3051 | 0.2588 | 0.7547 | 8.5430 |
| $S T=2.9630 \times I S I+1.3560$ | 0.5472 | 0.2994 | 0.2527 | 0.7578 | 8.6130 |
| $S T=0.1001 \times A Z I+16.3000$ | $\mathbf{0 . 8 0 6 4}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 6 5 0 3}$ | 0.6270 | 0.5354 | 4.2990 |
| $S T=-3.1620 \times A B C+37.4200$ | -0.7125 | 0.5076 | 0.4748 | 0.6353 | 6.0540 |
| $S T=-0.0092 \times H M_{1}+22.1200$ | -0.2407 | 0.0579 | -0.0049 | 0.8787 | 11.5800 |
| $S T=0.0037 \times H M_{2}+20.2400$ | 0.2015 | 0.0406 | -0.0233 | 0.8868 | 11.8000 |
| $S T=2.1480 \times G A+6.9170$ | 0.5573 | 0.3106 | 0.2646 | 0.7517 | 8.4760 |
| $S T=-1.7530 \times A G+34.1700$ | -0.5677 | 0.3223 | 0.2772 | 0.7453 | 8.3320 |
| $S T=-0.1500 \times S O+24.2800$ | -0.4075 | 0.1661 | 0.1105 | 0.8268 | 10.2500 |
| $S T=2.1810 \times{ }^{m} S O+15.9300$ | 0.5398 | 0.2914 | 0.2442 | 0.7621 | 8.7120 |
| $S T=1.3340 \times G Q+12.6800$ | 0.5429 | 0.2948 | 0.2478 | 0.7603 | 8.6700 |
| $S T=-0.9516 \times Q G+28.5800$ | -0.5641 | 0.3182 | 0.2728 | 0.7475 | 8.3820 |

Table 13. Statistical parameters of linear QSPR model for melting point (MP) of octane isomers.

| Linear Models | $\boldsymbol{R}$ | $\boldsymbol{R}^{\mathbf{2}}$ | Adjusted- $\boldsymbol{R}^{\mathbf{2}}$ | $\boldsymbol{R M S E}$ | $\boldsymbol{S S E}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $M P=-9.6450 \times N+307.5000$ | -0.3204 | 0.1027 | 0.0211 | 18.3 | 3684 |
| $M P=157.3000 \times I N_{1}-1001.0000$ | 0.1773 | 0.0314 | -0.0566 | 19.0100 | 3977.0000 |
| $M P=-51.5100 \times I N_{2}+512.8000$ | -0.1810 | 0.03276 | -0.0552 | 19.0000 | 3971.0000 |
| $M P=-2.2010 \times M_{1}+234.6000$ | -0.3154 | 0.0995 | 0.0176 | 18.3300 | 3697.0000 |
| $M P=-1.3440 \times M_{2}+207.7000$ | -0.2711 | 0.0735 | -0.0108 | 18.6000 | 3804.0000 |
| $M P=30.9800 \times{ }^{m} M_{2}+104.9000$ | 0.2719 | 0.0739 | -0.0103 | 18.5900 | 3802.0000 |
| $M P=-0.3014 \times F+191.4000$ | -0.3017 | 0.0910 | 0.0084 | 18.4200 | 3732.0000 |
| $M P=39.2700 \times R-1 / 2+23.4900$ | 0.3142 | 0.0987 | 0.0168 | 18.3400 | 3700.0000 |
| $M P=-7.7220 \times R R_{-1 / 2}+276.3000$ | -0.3052 | 0.0932 | 0.0107 | 18.4000 | 3723.0000 |
| $M P=43.1100 \times S C I+20.1600$ | $\mathbf{0 . 3 2 0 6}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 1 0 2 8}$ | 0.0212 | 18.3000 | 3684.0000 |
| $M P=-2.0950 \times S D D+207.9000$ | -0.3108 | 0.0966 | 0.0145 | 18.3600 | 3709.0000 |
| $M P=21.9100 \times H+93.4300$ | 0.3153 | 0.0994 | 0.0176 | 18.3300 | 3697.0000 |
| $M P=-18.5900 \times I S I+288.9000$ | -0.1805 | 0.0326 | -0.0554 | 19.0000 | 3972.0000 |
| $M P=0.6401 \times A Z I+138.4000$ | 0.2531 | 0.0640 | -0.0210 | 18.6900 | 3843.0000 |
| $M P=-24.1100 \times A B C+293.9000$ | -0.2697 | 0.0728 | -0.0115 | 18.6000 | 3807.0000 |
| $M P=-0.2158 \times H M_{1}+197.5000$ | -0.2979 | 0.0888 | 0.0059 | 18.4400 | 3741.0000 |
| $M P=-0.0685 \times H M_{2}+178.3000$ | -0.2021 | 0.0408 | -0.0464 | 18.9200 | 3938.0000 |
| $M P=23.6800 \times G A+14.1200$ | 0.3139 | 0.0986 | 0.0166 | 18.3400 | 3701.0000 |
| $M P=-18.8900 \times A G+311.2000$ | -0.3118 | 0.0972 | 0.0152 | 18.3600 | 3706.0000 |
| $M P=-2.2330 \times S O+218.8000$ | -0.3152 | 0.0994 | 0.0175 | 18.3300 | 3698.0000 |
| $M P=25.0200 \times{ }^{m} S O+111.2000$ | 0.3179 | 0.1011 | 0.0194 | 18.3200 | 3691.0000 |
| $M P=15.1900 \times G Q+74.5800$ | 0.3171 | 0.1006 | 0.0188 | 18.3200 | 3693.0000 |
| $M P=-10.3400 \times Q G+251.7000$ | -0.3128 | 0.0978 | 0.0158 | 18.3500 | 3704.0000 |

Table 14. Statistical parameters of linear QSPR model for standard enthalpy of formation (DHFORM) of octane isomers.

| Linear Models | $\boldsymbol{R}$ | $\boldsymbol{R}^{2}$ | Adjusted- $\boldsymbol{R}^{2}$ | $\boldsymbol{R M S E}$ | $\boldsymbol{S S E}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DHFORM $=0.0249 \times N+3.4150$ | 0.0168 | 0.0003 | -0.0664 | 0.8585 | 11.0600 |
| DHFORM $=-33.2600 \times I N_{1}+250.6000$ | $\mathbf{0 . 7 6 4 2}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 5 8 4 2}$ | 0.5564 | 0.5537 | 4.599 |
| DHFORM $=10.6600 \times I N_{2}-67.8800$ | 0.7549 | 0.5699 | 0.5412 | 0.5631 | 4.7570 |
| DHFORM $=0.0209 \times M_{1}+3.1420$ | 0.0602 | 0.0036 | -0.0628 | 0.8571 | 11.0200 |
| DHFORM $=0.0972 \times M_{2} 0.8439$ | 0.3861 | 0.1491 | 0.09233 | 0.7920 | 9.4100 |
| DHFORM $=1.5530 \times{ }^{m} M_{2} 0.6357$ | 0.2890 | 0.0835 | 0.0224 | 0.8220 | 10.1300 |
| DHFORM $=0.0019 \times F+3.6220$ | 0.0399 | 0.0016 | -0.0649 | 0.8579 | 11.0400 |
| DHFORM $=0.7610 \times R_{-1 / 2}+0.9849$ | 0.1256 | 0.0158 | -0.0499 | 0.8518 | 10.8800 |
| DHFORM $=0.3326 \times R R_{-1 / 2}-0.9179$ | 0.2599 | 0.0676 | 0.0054 | 0.8291 | 10.3100 |
| DHFORM $=0.4802 \times S C I+2.1350$ | 0.0731 | 0.0053 | -0.0609 | 0.8563 | 11.0000 |
| DHFORM $=-0.0514 \times S D D+4.7630$ | -0.1578 | 0.0249 | -0.0401 | 0.8479 | 104.0000 |
| DHFORM $=0.3952 \times H+2.4400$ | 0.1171 | 0.0137 | -0.0520 | 0.8527 | 10.9100 |
| DHFORM $=3.8350 \times I S I+-21.4400$ | 0.7468 | 0.5577 | 0.5282 | 0.5711 | 4.8920 |
| DHFORM $=0.0498 \times A Z I+1.5140$ | 0.4231 | 0.1790 | 0.1243 | 0.778 | 9.0790 |
| DHFORM $=-1.2600 \times A B C+10.3800$ | -0.2994 | 0.0897 | 0.0289 | 0.8192 | 10.0700 |
| DHFORM $=0.0051 \times H M_{1}+3.0730$ | 0.1399 | 0.0196 | -0.0458 | 0.8502 | 10.8400 |
| DHFORM $=0.0087 \times H M_{2}+2.3570$ | 0.5047 | 0.2547 | 0.2050 | 0.7413 | 8.2420 |
| DHFORM $=0.5037 \times G A+0.5123$ | 0.1378 | 0.0189 | -0.0464 | 0.8504 | 10.8500 |
| DHFORM $=-0.4433 \times A G+7.1460$ | -0.1514 | 0.0229 | -0.0422 | 0.8487 | 10.8100 |
| DHFORM $=-0.0009 \times S O+3.7980$ | -0.0026 | $6.783 e-06$ | -0.0667 | 0.8586 | 11.0600 |
| DHFORM $=0.3944 \times{ }^{m} S O+2.8900$ | 0.1029 | 0.0106 | -0.0554 | 0.8541 | 10.9400 |
| DHFORM $=0.2851 \times G Q+2.0320$ | 0.1224 | 0.0149 | -0.0507 | 0.8522 | 10.8900 |
| DHFORM $=-0.2347 \times Q G+5.6850$ | -0.1467 | 0.0215 | -0.0437 | 0.8493 | 10.8200 |

Table 15. Statistical parameters of linear QSPR model for density (DENS) of octane isomers.

| Linear Models | $\boldsymbol{R}$ | $\boldsymbol{R}^{\mathbf{2}}$ | Adjusted- $\boldsymbol{R}^{\mathbf{2}}$ | $\boldsymbol{R M S E}$ | $\boldsymbol{S S E}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $D E N S=0.0042 \times N+0.6486$ | 0.2068 | 0.0428 | -0.0210 | 0.0114 | 0.0019 |
| $D E N S=-0.5612 \times I N_{1}-779.8000$ | $-\mathbf{0 . 9 5 1 2}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 9 0 4 7}$ | 0.8984 | 0.0036 | 0.0002 |
| $D E N S=0.1810 \times I N_{2}-0.5070$ | 0.9451 | 0.8933 | 0.8861 | 0.0038 | 0.0002 |
| $D E N S=0.0012 \times M_{1}+0.6718$ | 0.2612 | 0.0682 | 0.0061 | 0.0112 | 0.0019 |
| $D E N S=0.0021 \times M_{2}+0.6456$ | 0.6170 | 0.3807 | 0.3394 | 0.0092 | 0.0013 |
| $D E N S=0.0145 \times{ }^{m} M_{2}+0.6798$ | 0.1995 | 0.0398 | -0.0242 | 0.0114 | 0.0019 |
| $D E N S=0.0002 \times F+0.6962$ | 0.2465 | 0.0608 | -0.0018 | 0.0113 | 0.0019 |
| $D E N S=-0.0016 \times R_{-1 / 2}+0.7151$ | -0.0196 | 0.0004 | -0.0663 | 0.0116 | 0.0020 |
| $D E N S=0.0083 \times R R_{-1 / 2}+0.5913$ | 0.4813 | 0.2316 | 0.1804 | 0.0102 | 0.0016 |
| $D E N S=-0.0080 \times S C I+0.7366$ | -0.0900 | 0.0081 | -0.0580 | 0.0116 | 0.0020 |
| $D E N S=-3.354 e-05 \times S D D+0.7098$ | -0.0076 | $5.775 e-05$ | -0.0665 | 0.0116 | 0.0020 |
| $D E N S=-0.0014 \times H+0.7139$ | -0.0304 | 0.0009 | -0.0657 | 0.0116 | 0.0020 |
| $D E N S=0.0653 \times I S I+0.2800$ | 0.9374 | 0.8786 | 0.8705 | 0.0041 | 0.0002 |
| $D E N S=0.0006 \times A Z I+0.6836$ | 0.3532 | 0.1247 | 0.0664 | 0.0109 | 0.0018 |
| $D E N S=-0.0121 \times A B C+0.7726$ | -0.2120 | 0.0449 | -0.0187 | 0.01138 | 0.0019 |
| $D E N S=0.0002 \times H M_{1}+0.6848$ | 0.3577 | 0.1279 | 0.0698 | 0.0109 | 0.0018 |
| $D E N S=0.0002 \times H M_{2}+0.6812$ | 0.7319 | 0.5356 | 0.5047 | 0.0079 | 0.0009 |
| $D E N S=-0.0011 \times G A+0.7160$ | -0.0212 | 0.0005 | -0.0662 | 0.01164 | 0.0020 |
| $D E N S=6.293 e-05 \times A G+0.7087$ | 0.0016 | $2.512 e-06$ | -0.0667 | 0.0116 | 0.0020 |
| $D E N S=0.0009 \times S O+0.6885$ | 0.1907 | 0.0342 | -0.0302 | 2.5880 | 100.5000 |
| $D E N S=-0.0026 \times{ }^{m} S O+0.7149$ | -0.0493 | 0.0024 | -0.0641 | 0.0116 | 0.0020 |
| $D E N S=-0.0014 \times G Q+0.7178$ | -0.0445 | 0.0019 | -0.0646 | 0.0116 | 0.0020 |
| $D E N S=0.0002 \times Q G+0.7077$ | 0.0085 | $7.297 e-05$ | -0.0666 | 0.0116 | 0.0020 |

Table 16. Statistical parameters of linear QSPR model for total surface area (TSA) of octane isomers.

| Linear Models | $\boldsymbol{R}$ | $\boldsymbol{R}^{\mathbf{2}}$ | Adjusted- $\boldsymbol{R}^{\mathbf{2}}$ | $\boldsymbol{R M S E}$ | $\boldsymbol{S S E}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $T S A=-12.7700 \times N+572.5000$ | -0.4875 | 0.2376 | 0.1868 | 13.2100 | 2616.0000 |
| $T S A=709.0000 \times I N_{1}-4875.0000$ | 0.9249 | 0.8554 | 0.8458 | 5.7510 | 5.7510 |
| $T S A=-233.1000 \times I N_{2}+1954.0000$ | $-\mathbf{0 . 9 3 6 9}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 8 7 7 8}$ | 0.8696 | 5.2880 | 419.4000 |
| $T S A=-3.1620 \times M_{1}+483.4000$ | -0.5183 | 0.2687 | 0.2199 | 12.9300 | 2510.0000 |
| $T S A=-3.4050 \times M_{2}+489.9000$ | -0.7679 | 0.5896 | 0.5623 | 9.6890 | 1408.0000 |
| $T S A=14.4300 \times{ }^{m} M_{2}+357.9000$ | 0.1525 | 0.0233 | -0.0419 | 14.9500 | 3352.0000 |
| $T S A=-0.4099 \times F+419.5000$ | -0.4721 | 0.2229 | 0.1711 | 13.3300 | 2667.0000 |
| $T S A=37.8000 \times R-1 / 2+248.4000$ | 0.3541 | 0.1254 | 0.0671 | 14.1500 | 3001.0000 |
| $T S A=-15.6900 \times R R_{-1 / 2}+608.6000$ | -0.6962 | 0.4848 | 0.4504 | 10.8600 | 1768.0000 |
| $T S A=47.7600 \times S C I+223.8000$ | 0.4124 | 0.1701 | 0.1148 | 13.7800 | 2848.0000 |
| $T S A=1.7160 \times S D D+420.0000$ | -0.2992 | 0.0895 | 0.0288 | 14.4300 | 3124.0000 |
| $T S A=21.9700 \times H+312.8000$ | 0.3696 | 0.1366 | 0.0791 | 14.0500 | 2963.0000 |
| $T S A=-84.6500 \times I S I+943.8000$ | -0.9357 | 0.8755 | 0.8672 | 5.3370 | 427.3000 |
| $T S A=0.0992 \times A Z I+382.6000$ | 0.0478 | 0.0023 | -0.0642 | 15.1100 | 3424.0000 |
| $T S A=-10.8300 \times A B C+443.9000$ | -0.1460 | 0.0213 | -0.0439 | 14.9600 | 3358.0000 |
| $T S A=-0.3602 \times H M_{1}+437.3000$ | -0.5663 | 0.3206 | 0.2754 | 12.4700 | 2331.0000 |
| $T S A=-0.2400 \times H M_{2}+426.4000$ | -0.7929 | 0.6288 | 0.6040 | 9.2150 | 1274.0000 |
| $T S A=22.1300 \times G A+243.7000$ | 0.3436 | 0.1180 | 0.0592 | 14.2000 | 3027.0000 |
| $T S A=-16.1900 \times A G+510.2000$ | -0.3139 | 0.0985 | 0.0384 | 14.3600 | 3094.0000 |
| $T S A=-2.8260 \times S O+451.9000$ | -0.4596 | 0.2112 | 0.1587 | 13.4300 | 2707.0000 |
| $T S A=26.6700 \times{ }^{m} S O+327.1000$ | 0.3951 | 0.1561 | 0.0998 | 13.8900 | 2896.0000 |
| $T S A=15.4100 \times G Q+292.8000$ | 0.3754 | 0.1409 | 0.0836 | 14.0200 | 2948.0000 |
| $T S A=-9.1370 \times Q G+461.4000$ | -0.3242 | 0.1051 | 0.0455 | 14.3100 | 3071.0000 |


[^0]:    * Corresponding author.

[^1]:    ${ }^{\dagger}$ Quantitative structure-property relationship
    ${ }^{\ddagger}$ Quantitative structure-activity relationship

[^2]:    ${ }^{\text {§ Supplementary Information Section, associated MATLAB script files and input }}$ data sets may be found at https://github.com/1267Virendra/Structure-Sensitivity-and-Chemical-Applicability.

[^3]:    [1] D. B. West, Introduction to Graph Theory, Prentice Hall, 2000.

