



HAL
open science

Characteristic and Counting Polynomials: Modelling Nonane Isomers Properties

Lorentz Jäntschi, Sorana D. Bolboaca, Cristina Maria Furdui

► **To cite this version:**

Lorentz Jäntschi, Sorana D. Bolboaca, Cristina Maria Furdui. Characteristic and Counting Polynomials: Modelling Nonane Isomers Properties. *Molecular Simulation*, 2009, 35 (03), pp.220-227. 10.1080/08927020802398892 . hal-00515054

HAL Id: hal-00515054

<https://hal.science/hal-00515054>

Submitted on 4 Sep 2010

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Characteristic and Counting Polynomials: Modelling Nonane Isomers Properties

Journal:	<i>Molecular Simulation/Journal of Experimental Nanoscience</i>
Manuscript ID:	GMOS-2008-0105.R1
Journal:	Molecular Simulation
Date Submitted by the Author:	27-Jul-2008
Complete List of Authors:	JÄNTSCHI, Lorentz; Technical University of Cluj-Napoca, Chemistry BOLBOACA, Sorana; Technical University of Cluj-Napoca, Chemistry; Iuliu Hatieganu University of Medicine and Pharmacy Cluj-Napoca, Medical Informatics and Biostatistics FURDUI, Cristina; Wake Forest University Health Sciences, Department of Molecular Medicine
Keywords:	Characteristic polynomial, Counting polynomials, Nonane isomers, Henry's law constant (solubility)

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Characteristic and Counting Polynomials: Modelling Nonane Isomers Properties

Running Head: Polynomials on Modelling Properties

Lorentz JÄNTSCHI¹, Sorana D. BOLBOACĂ^{1,2,*}, Cristina M. FURDUI³

¹ Technical University of Cluj-Napoca, [Department of Chemistry](#), 103-105 Muncii Bvd., 400641 Cluj-Napoca, Romania. Email: lori@chimie.utcluj.ro

² „Iuliu Hațieganu“ University of Medicine and Pharmacy Cluj-Napoca, [Department of Medical Informatics and Biostatistics](#), 6 Louis Pasteur, 400349 Cluj-Napoca, Romania. Email: sbolboaca@umfcluj.ro

³ Wake Forest University Health Sciences, Department of Molecular Medicine, Medical Center Boulevard, Winston-Salem, NC 27157. Email: cfurdui@wfubmc.edu

* Corresponding author. „Iuliu Hațieganu“ University of Medicine and Pharmacy Cluj-Napoca, Department of Medical Informatics and Biostatistics, 6 Louis Pasteur, 400349 Cluj-Napoca, Cluj, Romania. Phone: +4-0264-431697. Fax: +4-0264-593847. E-mail: sbolboaca@umfcluj.ro. URL: <http://sorana.academicdirect.ro/>.

Characteristic and Counting Polynomials: Modelling Nonane Isomers Properties

Abstract

The major goal of this study was to investigate the broad application of graph polynomials to the analysis of Henry's law constants (solubility) of nonane isomers. In this context, Henry's law constants of nonane isomers were modelled using characteristic and counting polynomials. The characteristic and counting polynomials on the distance matrix, on the maximal fragments matrix, on the complement of maximal fragments matrix, and on the Szeged matrix were calculated for each compound. One of nonane isomers, 4-methyloctane, was identified as an outlier and was withdrawn from further analysis. This report describes the performance and characteristics of most significant models. The results showed that Henry's law constants of nonane isomers could be modelled by using characteristic polynomial and counting polynomial on the distance matrix.

Keywords: Characteristic polynomial; Counting polynomials; Nonane isomers; Henry's law constant (solubility)

INTRODUCTION

Computational methods are being used today for the characterization of chemical compounds and to get a better understanding of the relationships between their structure and physical, chemical and/or biological properties.

The characteristic polynomial is defined in algebra as one associate a polynomial to any square matrix [1]. The characteristic polynomial encodes several properties of a matrix, the most important being the matrix eigenvalues, its determinant and its trace [2]. A characteristic polynomial can be defined as:

$$\varphi(G,X) = \det[XI - A(G)] \quad (1)$$

where $A(G)$ is the adjacency matrix of a pertinently constructed skeleton graph and I is the identity matrix [3].

Many studies were reported on the application of characteristic polynomials in different research fields such as mathematics [4,5], computer science [6-8], engineering [9], chemistry [10-12], physics [13,14], and management [15]. The characteristic polynomial is the most popular and the most extensively studied graph polynomial in chemical graph theory [3]. The characteristic polynomials proved its performances in correlations as molecular descriptors in the characterization of the properties of chemical compounds [16].

Counting polynomials are also used in chemical graph theory. The general formula of a counting polynomial is:

$$\sum_{k \geq 0} a_k X^k, \text{ where } a_k = |\{M_{i,j} \mid M_{i,j} = k\}| \quad (2)$$

a_k being the polynomial-count and $i, j = 1, \dots, n$.

Some methods that use the distance matrix, the Szeged matrix or the Cluj matrix were reported in literature as methods for counting polynomials [3].

Solvation is extremely important, because large majority of (bio)chemical processes takes place in the liquid phase. Solvation free energies (free energies for the transfer of solute from the gas phase to solution) can be calculated by quantum chemical methods in conjunction with implicit solvent models like solvent reaction field [17,18] and Langevin dipoles [19,20] or by molecular dynamics simulations in conjunction with explicit solvent and free energy perturbation [21]. However, since such calculations are extremely time consuming, there exists an urgent need for development of simpler approaches to accurately predict solvation free energies.

The aim of this study was to analyze the Henry's law constant (solubility) of nonane isomers by using characteristic and counting polynomials and to prove that characteristic and counting polynomials can be used to characterize the relationship between structure and chemical properties for this class of compounds.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Alkanes are acyclic saturated hydrocarbon structures that normally have a linear configuration. The general chemical formula is C_nH_{2n+2} . It is well known that the number of isomers increases with the number of carbon atoms, for the alkanes with 1 to 10 carbons, the number of isomers being equal with 1, 1, 1, 2, 3, 5, 9, 18, 35, and 75, respectively.

This study focuses on nonane isomers with the general chemical structure C_9H_{20} . The systematic names of the compounds studied are: 4-methyloctane (a_01), 3-ethyl-2,3-dimethylpentane (a_02), 3,3-diethylpentane (a_03), 2,2,3,3-tetramethyl-pentane (a_04), 2,3,3,4-tetramethylpentane (a_05), nonane (a_06), 2,3,3-trimethylhexane (a_07), 3,3,4-trimethylhexane (a_08), 3-ethyl-3-methylhexane (a_09), 2,2,3,4-tetra-methylpentane (a_10), 3,4-dimethylheptane (a_11), 2,3,4-trimethylhexane (a_12), 3-ethyl-4-methylhexane (a_13), 3-ethyl-2,2-dimethylpentane (a_14), 3-ethyl-2,4-dimethylpentane (a_15), 2,3-dimethylheptane (a_16), 3,3-dimethylheptane (a_17), 4,4-dimethylheptane (a_18), 3-ethylheptane (a_19), 4-ethyl-heptane (a_20), 2,2,3-trimethylhexane

(a_21), 2,2,5-trimethylhexane (a_22), 2,4,4-trimethylhexane (a_23), 3-ethyl-2-methylhexane (a_24), 2,2,4,4-tetramethylpentane (a_25), 3-methyloctane (a_26), 2,5-dimethylheptane (a_27), 3,5-dimethyl-heptane (a_28), 2,3,5-trimethylhexane (a_29), 2-methyloctane (a_30), 2,2-dimethylheptane (a_31), 2,4-dimethylheptane (a_32), 2,6-dimethylheptane (a_33), 2,2,4-trimethylhexane (a_34), and 4-ethyl-2-methyl-hexane (a_35), respectively.

The Henry's law constant (solubility of a gas in water) of alkanes expressed as trace gases of potential importance in environmental chemistry was the property of interest. The measured values were taken from a previously reported research [22] (kH, Table 1) and were given as M/atm unit measurements ($M/\text{atm} = [\text{mol}_{\text{aq}}/\text{dm}^3_{\text{aq}}]/\text{atm}$).

The Henry's law constant was modelled by using characteristic and counting polynomials (Eq.(1) and Eq.(2), respectively). Five matrices were used for counting polynomials: the distance matrix (CDi), the maximal fragments matrix (CMx), the complement of the maximal fragments matrix (CcM), and the Szeged matrix (CSz) [23,24].

A monovariate model based on characteristic polynomials was constructed in order to identify the outliers.

The correlation coefficient between measured and estimated values by the model greater than 0.2 (even if it is well known that a value less than 0.25 indicate the absence of a linear relationship [25]) was the criterion imposed in identification of the characteristic and counting polynomials models was. The multi-varied models were obtained by using homemade software that implemented a systematic search using rational numbers (p/q) as roots based on the imposed criterion: $-100 \leq p, q \leq 100$. For the models with good estimated ability ($r > 0.75$ [26], $r =$ correlation coefficient) a systematic search was applied for $0 < p, q \leq 50$ considering the whole sample of 35 and sampled obtained by excluding the outliers (if any exists).

The methodology applied to assess the validity and reliability of the identified polynomials models was as follows:

- ÷ Step 1: leave-one-out cross-validation analysis. The techniques employed a number of training sets equal to the number of investigated molecules minus one, and from each of these samples one compound is excluded. A model is obtained and it is used to predict the property of excluded compound for each training set.
- ÷ Step 2: leave-n%-out cross-validation as internal validation analysis ($n =$ valid sample size). A number of 1/3 from the total number of compound in the sample was randomly chosen to be included into test set. The remained compounds were used to build the model; the model was applied on training set. The model obtained in training set was considered valid and stable when the correlation coefficient on training set is not statistically different by the correlation coefficient on test set.
- ÷ Step 3: leave-n%-out cross-validation as external validation analysis. The sample of valid compounds (excluding the outliers if any exists) was randomly split into training and test set. One third of compounds were included into test set. The training set compound were used in order to identify the characteristics and counting polynomial on different matrixes according with the abilities obtained when all compounds were investigated. The criterion used in roots search was $-100 \leq p, q \leq 100$. The obtained model with higher abilities in estimation was used in order to predict the property on test set. The correlation coefficient and associated 95% confidence interval, the Fisher parameter and associated significance were used in order to validate the model, on both training and test set.
- ÷ Step 4: correlation coefficient comparison analysis between and within models. The correlation coefficients obtained by different models were then analyzed and compared using the Steiger's Z test [27] at a significance level of 5%.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The characteristic and counting polynomials on the distance matrix (CDi), on the maximal fragments matrix (CMx), on the complementary of the maximal fragments matrix (CcM), and on the Szeged matrix (CSz) for each nonane were calculated.

To determine the irreducible or primer factors, the characteristic and counting polynomials obtained as described above were factorized. The generic formulas are described below:

- Characteristic polynomial:

$$P(X)_{\text{ChP}} = X^7 \cdot (X^2 - 8) + X \cdot Q(X)_{\text{ChP}} \quad (3)$$

- Counting polynomial on the distance matrix:

$$P(X)_{\text{CDi}} = 2 \cdot X^2 \cdot Q(X)_{\text{CDi}} + 16 \cdot X + 9 \quad (4)$$

- Counting polynomial on the maximal fragments matrix:

$$P(X)_{\text{CMx}} = 16 \cdot X^8 + X \cdot Q(X)_{\text{CMx}} + 2 \cdot X + 9 \quad (5)$$

- Counting polynomial on the complement of the maximal fragments matrix:

$$P(X)_{\text{CcM}} = 2 \cdot X^8 + X \cdot Q(X)_{\text{CcM}} + 16 \cdot X + 9 \quad (6)$$

- Counting polynomial on the Szeged matrix:

$$P(X)_{\text{CSz}} = 2 \cdot X^8 + X \cdot Q(X)_{\text{CSz}} + 4 \cdot X + 9 \quad (7)$$

where $P(X)_{\text{ChP}}$, $P(X)_{\text{CDi}}$, $P(X)_{\text{CMx}}$, $P(X)_{\text{CcM}}$, $P(X)_{\text{CSz}}$ are the characteristic polynomial and counting polynomials on the: distance matrix, maximal fragments matrix, complementary of the maximal fragments matrix, and on the Szeged matrix, respectively. The $Q(X)$ values for each type of polynomial are presented in Table 1.

By analyzing the polynomials described above, it can be observed that the characteristic polynomial (Eq.(3)) can be easily factorized while the counting polynomials (Eq.(4)-Eq.(7)) are not. The characteristic polynomial includes other invariants called characteristic solutions and this could explain the observation above.

Regarding the formulas obtained for counting polynomials (Eq.(4)-Eq.(7)) the following similarities can be observed:

1. All formulas contain the “ $a_1 \cdot X + 9$ ”, where a_1 varies from two to sixteen, but is always an even number; The generic formula for counting polynomials on the maximal fragments matrix, on the complement of maximal fragments matrix, and on Szeged matrix, respectively is: $P(X) = a_0 X^8 + X Q(X) + a_1 X + 9$, where a_0 and a_1 are even integers with values from two to sixteen;
2. The term $Q(X)$ could be factorized in limited cases (see Table 1).

The monovariate model obtained using the characteristic polynomial was:

$$\hat{Y}_{\text{ChP-mono}} = 19.54 + 0.17 \cdot P(2923/1725) \quad (8)$$

where $\hat{Y}_{\text{ChP-mono}}$ is the characteristic polynomial. A square correlation coefficient of 0.2968 was obtained for model (8) when all compounds were included and 0.6301 when the compound 4-methyloctane was withdrawn. Therefore, compound 4-methyloctane was considered an outlier and was excluded from further analysis.

There could not be identified any valid model by using neither counting polynomial on the maximal fragments matrix (CMx) nor the counting polynomial on the complement of the maximal fragments matrix (CcM).

A number of valid models were obtained using the characteristic polynomial and the counting polynomials on the distance matrix and on the Szeged matrix on the sample of thirty-four compounds (more than one model with the same value of determination coefficient). As justified above, the 4-methyloctane was considered outlier and was not included in analysis. The measured value of the Henry's law constant of the excluded compound had a lower value comparing with the rest of compounds (see Table 1); this means that an error could have occurred during the experimental process.

- Characteristic polynomial:

$$\hat{Y}_{\text{ChP}} = -58.11 - 329.00 \cdot P(1/100) + 8.39 \cdot P(35/97) + 7.81 \cdot 10^{-3} \cdot P(72/23) \quad (9)$$

where $P(X_i)$ are the characteristic polynomials.

- Counting polynomial on the distance matrix:

$$\hat{Y}_{CDi} = 142.20 + 5.70 \cdot P(-23/71) - 10.00 \cdot P(5/18) - 2.11 \cdot 10^{-8} \cdot P(99/10) \quad (10)$$

where $P(X_i)$ are the counting polynomials on the distance matrix.

- Counting polynomial on the Szeged matrix

$$\hat{Y}_{CSz} = -34.39 + 0.04 \cdot P(-29/39) + 1.19 \cdot P(11/9) - 0.64 \cdot P(59/45) \quad (11)$$

where $P(X_i)$ are counting polynomials on the Szeged matrix.

The analysis of the models described above was performed by calculating the correlation coefficient (r) and the associated 95% confidence intervals (95% CI_r), the standard error of the estimated (SErr), and the Fisher parameter of the model (F) and its significance for the sample size of 34 compounds. The above parameters and the confidence intervals for intercept and polynomial coefficients used by Eq(9)-Eq(11) are presented in Table 2.

All models described by Eq.(9)-Eq.(11) were statistically significant (the probability associated to the wrong model less than 0.001, see Table 2). The analysis of the correlation coefficients and associated 95% confidence intervals leads to the conclusion that the best model is the one described by the counting polynomial on the distance matrix presented in Eq.(10). Eighty-five percent of the Henry's law constant variation of the nonane isomers included in this study can be explained by its linear relationship with the variation of counting polynomial on the distance matrix used in the model.

Two counting polynomials models revealed to have estimated abilities, counting polynomial on the distance matrix and on the Szeged matrix. The difference between the correlation coefficient obtained by Eq.(10) and Eq.(11) was of 0.2051. Almost fifty-three percent of the Henry's law constant variation of studied nonane isomers can be explained by its linear relationship with the variation of counting polynomial on the Szeged matrix.

The analysis of the correlation coefficients and their associated 95% confidence intervals showed that there are not significant differences between models from Eq.(9) and Eq.(10) or between models in Eq.(9) and Eq.(11), respectively due to the existence of the overlap of those intervals.

The results obtained in leave-one-out internal validation analysis (see Table 3) showed a difference between correlation coefficient of the model and correlation coefficient obtained in leave-one-out analysis of 0.5 for the models from Eq.(9) and Eq.(10), and of 0.12 for the model from Eq.(11). These results sustain the stability of the models from Eq.(9)-Eq.(11) [25].

Steiger's Z test was then used to test the hypothesis that there were not significant differences between correlation coefficients obtained by models from Eq.(9) - Eq.(11). The matrix of p-values associated to the Z parameters is presented in Table 4. The results revealed that the models from Eq.(9) and Eq.(10) had the same ability in estimates of the relationship between nonane isomers structure and property of interest.

The ability of the models from Eq.(9) and Eq.(10) was investigated by applying the following systematic search $0 < p, q \leq 50$. Three sample sizes were considered: 35 (all compounds), 34 (excluding the 4-methyloctane compound that proved to be an outlier) and 33 (excluding the 4-methyloctane and nonane, nonane seems to be an outlier if the distribution of the measured property is analyzed), respectively.

The models from Eq.(12) - Eq.(14) were obtained when characteristic polynomial was investigated:

$$\hat{Y}_{ChP} = -7828.32 - 435.57 \cdot P(1/50) + 33.31 \cdot P(12/47) + 7.75 \cdot 10^{-4} \cdot P(34/7) \quad (12)$$

where $P(X_i)$ are the characteristic polynomials. Statistical characteristics of the models are as follows: $r = 0.5884$, 95% CI_r [0.3173-0.7705], SErr = 1.89, F = 5, $p = 3.89 \cdot 10^{-3}$; $r_{100} = 0.4692$ (correlation coefficient obtained in leave-one-out cross-validation analysis), $F_{100} = 3$ (Fisher parameter obtained in leave-one-out cross-validation analysis), $p_{100} = 7.51 \cdot 10^{-2}$ (significance of the model obtained in leave-one out analysis).

$$\hat{Y}_{ChP} = -1683.73 - 441.75 \cdot P(1/50) + 33.65 \cdot P(12/47) + 4.46 \cdot 10^{-4} \cdot P(50/9) \quad (13)$$

where $P(X_i)$ are the characteristic polynomials. Statistical characteristics of the models are as follows: $r = 0.8690$, 95% CI_r [0.7517-0.9329], SErr = 0.89, F = 31, $p = 2.68 \cdot 10^{-9}$; $r_{100} = 0.8206$ (correlation coefficient obtained in leave-one-out cross-validation analysis), $F_{100} = 20$ (Fisher parameter obtained in leave-one-out cross-validation analysis), $p_{100} = 2.43 \cdot 10^{-7}$ (significance of the

model obtained in leave-one out analysis). Note that, there were identified a number of one-thousand two-hundred and fifty-two models that has a determination coefficient of 0.755.

$$\hat{Y}_{\text{ChP}} = 20.21 - 117.95 \cdot P(1/50) + 8.40 \cdot P(1/4) + 5.28 \cdot 10^{-2} \cdot P(50/23) \quad (14)$$

where $P(X_i)$ are the characteristic polynomials. Statistical characteristics of the models are as follows: $r = 0.9194$, 95% CI_r [0.8417-0.9597], $SE_{\text{err}} = 0.71$, $F = 53$, $p = 7.16 \cdot 10^{-12}$; $r_{100} = 0.8958$ (correlation coefficient obtained in leave-one-out cross-validation analysis), $F_{100} = 39$ (Fisher parameter obtained in leave-one-out cross-validation analysis), $p_{100} = 2.74 \cdot 10^{-10}$ (significance of the model obtained in leave-one out analysis). Note that, a number of one-thousand three-hundred and fifty-two models that has a determination coefficient of 0.845.

The analysis of Eq.(12) -Eq.(14) revealed the followings:

- ÷ Even if the model from Eq.(12) is statistically significant and the correlation coefficient in test set is included into the 95% confidence interval of the correlation coefficient obtained in training set, the model in test set is not statistically significant;
- ÷ A significant increase of correlation coefficient is observed when the 4-methyloctane compound is excluded, proving that it is an outlier;
- ÷ a determination of eighty-five percent is obtained when both 4-methyloctane and nonane are excluded from the sample when the best model is search. This suggested that the nonane compound could be also an outlier.

The following models were obtained by investigation of counting polynomial on the distance matrix:

$$\hat{Y}_{\text{CDi}} = -19.74 - 0.15 \cdot P(-35/36) + 0.29 \cdot P(19/13) + 6.53 \cdot 10^{-2} \cdot P(43/24) \quad (15)$$

where $P(X_i)$ are the counting polynomial on the distance matrix. Statistical characteristics of the models are as follows: $r = 0.5912$, 95% CI_r [0.3212-0.7722], $SE_{\text{err}} = 1.89$, $F = 6$, $p = 3.61 \cdot 10^{-3}$; $r_{100} = 0.4512$ (correlation coefficient obtained in leave-one-out cross-validation analysis), $F_{100} = 2$ (Fisher parameter obtained in leave-one-out cross-validation analysis), $p_{100} = 1.74 \cdot 10^{-1}$ (significance of the model obtained in leave-one out analysis).

$$\hat{Y}_{\text{CDi}} = 152.42 - 6.28 \cdot P(-11/35) - 11.16 \cdot P(4/15) + 2.28 \cdot 10^{-8} \cdot P(49/5) \quad (16)$$

where $P(X_i)$ are the counting polynomial on the distance matrix. Statistical characteristics of the models are as follows: $r = 0.9239$, 95% CI_r [0.8518-0.9616], $SE_{\text{err}} = 0.69$, $F = 58$, $p = 1.27 \cdot 10^{-12}$; $r_{100} = 0.8844$ (correlation coefficient obtained in leave-one-out cross-validation analysis), $F_{100} = 35$ (Fisher parameter obtained in leave-one-out cross-validation analysis), $p_{100} = 6.05 \cdot 10^{-10}$ (significance of the model obtained in leave-one out analysis). Note that, there were identified a number five-hundred and sixty-three models that has a determination coefficient of 0.854.

$$\hat{Y}_{\text{CDi}} = 39.33 + 13.19 \cdot P(-11/47) - 9.80 \cdot P(15/32) + 3.31 \cdot P(24/35) \quad (17)$$

where $P(X_i)$ are the counting polynomial on the distance matrix. Statistical characteristics of the models are as follows: $r = 0.9234$, 95% CI_r [0.8493-0.9617], $SE_{\text{err}} = 0.70$, $F = 56$, $p = 3.54 \cdot 10^{-12}$; $r_{100} = 0.8873$ (correlation coefficient obtained in leave-one-out cross-validation analysis), $F_{100} = 34$ (Fisher parameter obtained in leave-one-out cross-validation analysis), $p_{100} = 9.34 \cdot 10^{-10}$ (significance of the model obtained in leave-one out analysis). Note that, a number of six-thousand ninety-five models that has a determination coefficient of 0.853.

The analysis of the models from Eq.(15) - Eq.(17) revealed the followings:

- ÷ The model obtained by Eq.(15) for test set is not statistically significant;
- ÷ The models from Eq.(16) and Eq.(17) are almost identical in terms of correlation coefficients in both training and test sets, standard error of estimated, Fisher parameters and associated significances;
- ÷ A determination of eighty-five percent is obtained both when 4-methyloctane, respectively 4-methyloctane and nonane are excluded from the sample. The last observation suggested that the nonane compound could be also an outlier. In these conditions, the nonane could not be considered as an outlier.

The external validation analysis was performed in order to validate the contribution of the characteristic and counting polynomial on the distance matrix in characterization of the relationship between nonane isomers' structure and Henry's law constant. The following compounds were

assigned randomly into test set: 3-ethyl-2,3-dimethylpentane (a_02), 3-methyloctane (a_26), 2,3,3-trimethylhexane (a_07), 3,3-dimethylheptane (a_17), 3,3-diethylpentane (a_03), 2-methyloctane (a_30), 2,5-dimethylheptane (a_27), nonane (a_06), 4-ethyl-heptane (a_20), 2,2,3,4-tetramethylpentane (a_10), and 2,3,3,4-tetramethylpentane (a_05).

A characteristic polynomial model obtained in external validation analysis is presented in Eq.(18):

$$\hat{Y}_{ChP} = -63.06 - 218.52 \cdot P(1/100) + 4.72 \cdot P(2/5) + 6.18 \cdot 10^{-3} \cdot P(77/24) \quad (18)$$

where $P(X_i)$ are the characteristic polynomials. Statistical characteristics of the models are as follows: $r_{tr} = 0.9092$ (correlation coefficient in training set), $95\%CI_{tr} [0.7948-0.9611]$, $SErr_{tr} = 0.63$ (standard error of estimated), $F_{tr} = 30$ (Fisher parameter in training set), $p = 1.95 \cdot 10^{-7}$; $r_{ts} = 0.8042$ (correlation coefficient in test set), $F_{ts} = 16$ (Fisher parameter in test set), $p_{ts} = 2.84 \cdot 10^{-3}$ (significance of the F_{ts}). A number of two-thousand forty-five models that have a determination coefficient of 0.853 were obtained. The external validation analysis revealed that the characteristic polynomial leads to a valid and reliable solution in characterization of the relationship between the structure of nonane isomers and property of interest providing good models with abilities in estimation as well as in prediction. The correlation coefficient obtained in external validation on both training and test set is not statistically significant different by the one provided by Eq.(9) (both correlation coefficients are included into the 95% confidence interval of correlation coefficient of model from Eq.(9))

A counting polynomial on distance matrix model is presented in Eq.(19):

$$\hat{Y}_{CDi} = 95.07 + 1.76 \cdot P(-49/97) - 4.94 \cdot P(32/99) + 1.77 \cdot 10^{-7} \cdot P(22/5) \quad (19)$$

where $P(X_i)$ are the counting polynomial on the distance matrix. Statistical characteristics of the models are as follows: $r = 0.9058$, $95\%CI_r [0.7876-0.9596]$, $SErr = 0.64$, $F = 29$, $p = 2.70 \cdot 10^{-7}$; $r_{ts} = 0.7429$ (correlation coefficient in test set), $F_{ts} = 11$ (Fisher parameter for test set), $p_{ts} = 8.80 \cdot 10^{-3}$ (significance of the model in test set). Note that, a number of five-thousand and one models that has a determination coefficient of 0.821. The analysis of the results obtained by counting polynomial on distance matrix revealed that the correlation coefficient obtained in test set is not contained into the 95% confidence interval of the correlation coefficient in training set. This suggested that there is a statistically significant difference between estimated and prediction ability of the model from Eq.(19). The comparison of those correlation coefficients leads to a probability of a type I error of 0.096 ($Z = 1.307$), sustaining that there is not statistically significant differences between them.

The Steiger Z test was applied in order to identify if there is a significant difference between correlation coefficient obtained by Eq.(18) and the one obtained by Eq.(19). The obtained Z score of 0.1211 ($p = 4.52 \cdot 10^{-1}$) leads to the conclusion that both characteristic polynomial and counting polynomial on distance matrix had good abilities in characterization of the link between nonane isomers structure and property of interest.

No significant differences were identified between correlation coefficients obtained by the characteristic polynomial (Eq.(9) and Eq.(18)) and by the counting polynomial on the distance matrix (Eq.(10) and Eq.(19)). Thus, it can be concluded that there are no differences between characteristic polynomial model and counting polynomial on the distance matrix model, these two polynomials being considered useful in characterization of the relationship between structure and property of interest on the investigated sample. There could not be identified any model with estimated ability when counting polynomial on the maximal fragments matrix and on the complement of the maximal fragments matrix were investigated. The model obtained by using the counting polynomial on the Szeged matrix proved to have significantly lower performances compared with characteristic polynomial and counting polynomials on the distance matrix in characterization of the link between structure of nonane isomers and investigated property.

The aim of the research was to model the Henry's law constant by using characteristic and counting polynomials and the results showed that this is a feasible approach when characteristic polynomial or counting polynomial on distance matrix are used. The results of this study constitute a novel direction in the analysis and characterization of chemical compounds by using mathematical models. The broad application of characteristic and counting polynomials in modelling nonane

isomers properties will be investigated by modelling other physical and chemical properties of these compounds.

CONCLUSIONS

The Henry's law constant of the nonane isomers can be modelled using characteristic polynomial and counting polynomial on the distance matrix. These polynomials provided reliable and valid models, opening a new venue for the characterization of chemical compounds.

Current research in our laboratory is focused on the characterization of other properties and/or other chemical compounds to test the usefulness of the characteristic and counting polynomials in investigation of the structure-property/activity relationships.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS. The research was partly supported by UEFISCSU Romania through project ET108/2006.

REFERENCES

1. N. Trinajstić, *Chemical Graph Theory*, CRC Press, Boca Raton, 2nd edn. Revised, 1983.
2. N. Trinajstić, *The Characteristic Polynomial of a Chemical Graph*, J. Math. Chem. 2 (1988), pp. 197-215.
3. M.V. Diudea, I. Gutman, and L. Jäntschi, *Molecular Topology*, 2nd edn, Nova Science, Huntington, New York, 2002, pp. 53-100.
4. E. Strahov, Y.V. Fyodorov, *Universal Results for Correlations of Characteristic Polynomials: Riemann-Hilbert Approach*, Commun. Math. Phys. 241 (2003), pp. 343382.
5. V.N. Kublanovskaya, *Solution of spectral problems for polynomial matrices*, J. Math. Sci. 127 (2005), pp. 2024-2032.
6. J. Abdeljaoued, and G.I. Malaschonok, *Efficient algorithms for computing the characteristic polynomial in a domain*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra 156 (2001), pp. 127-145.
7. G.J. Lastman, and N.K. Sinha, *Robust stability of discrete-time systems*, Int. J. Syst. Sci. 30 (1999), pp. 451-453.
8. E. Kaltofen, and G. Villard, *On the complexity of computing determinants*. Comput. Complexity 13 (2005), pp. 91-130.
9. W. Tang, and J. Kang, *Characteristic polynomial assignment in F-M model II of 2-D systems*, J. Syst. Eng. Electron. 15 (2004), pp. 533-536.
10. A.T. Balaban, and F. Harary, *The Characteristic Polynomial does not Uniquely Determine the Topology of a Molecule*, J. Chem. Docum. 11 (1971), pp. 258-259.
11. M. Kunz, *A note on Cluj weighted adjacency matrices*, J. Serb. Chem. Soc. 63 (1998), pp. 647-652.
12. J.R. Dias, *Properties and relationships of conjugated polyenes having a reciprocal eigenvalue spectrum - Dendralene and radialene hydrocarbons*, Croat. Chem. Acta 77 (2004), pp. 325-330.
13. E. Brézin, S. Hikami, *Characteristic polynomials of random matrices at edge singularities*, Physical Review E - Statistical Physics, Plasmas, Fluids, and Related Interdisciplinary Topics 62 (2000), pp. 3558-3567.
14. E.N. Gryazina, *The D-decomposition theory*, Automat. Rem. Contr. 65 (2004), pp. 1872-1884.
15. H. Zhang, G. Huang, and W. Zhou, *Condition of applying the fourth order of characteristic equation to the dynamic stability of wing-in-ground effect vehicles*, J. Shanghai Jiaotong Univ. 34 (2000), pp. 80-82.
16. S.D. Bolboacă, and L. Jäntschi, *How Good the Characteristic Polynomial Can Be for Correlations?*, Int. J. Mol. Sci. 8 (2007), pp. 335-345.
17. U. Bren, M. Zupan, F.P. Guengerich, and J. Mavri, *Chemical Reactivity as a Tool to Study Carcinogenicity: Reaction between Chloroethylene Oxide and Guanine*, J. Org. Chem. 71 (2006), pp. 4078-4084.

18. S. Mierts, E. Scrocco, and J. Tomasi, *Electrostatic interaction of a solute with a continuum. A direct utilizaion of AB initio molecular potentials for the prevision of solvent effects*, Chem. Phys. 55 (1981), pp. 117-129.
19. J. Florián, and A. Warshel, *Langevin Dipoles Model for ab Initio Calculations of Chemical Processes in Solution: Parametrization and Application to Hydration Free Energies of Neutral and Ionic Solutes and Conformational Analysis in Aqueous Solution*, J. Phys. Chem. B 101 (1997), pp. 5583-5595.
20. U. Bren, F.P. Guengerich, and J. Mavri, *Guanine Alkylation by the Potent Carcinogen Aflatoxin B1: Quantum Chemical Calculations*, Chem. Res. Toxicol. 20 (2007), pp. 1134-1140.
21. U. Bren, V. Martínek, and J. Florián, *Decomposition of the Solvation Free Energies of Deoxyribonucleoside Triphosphates Using the Free Energy Perturbation Method*, J. Phys. Chem. B 110 (2006), pp. 12782-12788.
22. C.L. Yaws, and H.-C. Yang, *Henry's law constant for compound in water*. In: C.L. Yaws, *Thermodynamic and Physical Property Data*, Gulf Publishing Company, Houston, TX, 1992, pp. 181-206.
23. L. Jäntschi, and S.D. Bolboacă. *Counting Polynomials on Regular Iterative Structures*. Entropy. Sent for publication.
24. L. Jäntschi, and M.V. Diudea, *Subgraphs of Pair Vertices*, Journal of Mathematical Chemistry. Accepted.
25. S.D. Bolboacă, and L. Jäntschi, *Modelling the property of compounds from structure: statistical methods for models validation*, Environ. Chem. Letters 6 (2008), pp. 175-181.
26. T. Colton, *Statistics in Medicine*. Little Brown and Company, New York, NY, 1974.
27. J.H. Steiger, *Tests for comparing elements of a correlation matrix*, Psychol. Bull. 87 (1980), pp. 245-251.

Table 1. Characteristic and counting polynomials for nonane isomers: the values of the Q(X) terms

No.	$k_H(\cdot 10^5)$ [M/atm]	$Q(X)_{ChP}$	$Q(X)_{CDi}$	$Q(X)_{CMx}$
a_01	1.0	$(2X-1)(2X+1)(5X^2-3)$	$X^5+2X^4+4X^3+6X^2+7X+8$	$8X^7+14X^6+12X^5+5X^4+4X^3+6X^2+4X+1$
a_02	1.5	$17X^4-12X^2+2$	$5X^2+12X+11$	$24X^7+14X^6+6X^5+3X^2+4X+3$
a_03	1.5	$18X^4-16X^2+5$	$2(3X^2+6X+5)$	$2(8X^7+14X^6+4X+1)$
a_04	1.6	$3X^2(5X^2-2)$	$3X^2+12X+13$	$32X^7+7X^6+5X^4+4X^3+2X+4$
a_05	1.6	$8X^2(2X^2-1)$	$4(X^2+3X+3)$	$2(16X^7+6X^5+3X^2+2)$
a_06	1.7	$21X^4-20X^2+5$	$X^6+2X^5+3X^4+4X^3+5X^2+6X+7$	$2X(7X^5+6X^4+5X^3+4X^2+3X+2)$
a_07	1.7	$X^2(17X^2-10)$	$2X^3+5X^2+10X+11$	$24X^7+7X^6+12X^5+6X^2+2X+3$
a_08	1.7	$17X^4-11X^2+2$	$X^3+5X^2+11X+11$	$24X^7+14X^6+5X^4+4X^3+4X+3$
a_09	1.7	$18X^4-14X^2+3$	$2(X^3+3X^2+5X+5)$	$16X^7+21X^6+6X^5+3X^2+6X+2$
a_10	1.7	$2X^2(8X^2-3)$	$2(3X^2+5X+6)$	$32X^7+6X^5+5X^4+4X^3+3X^2+4$
a_11	1.8	$19X^4-15X^2+3$	$(X^2+3)(X^2+3X+3)$	$16X^7+14X^6+6X^5+5X^4+4X^3+3X^2+4X+2$
a_12	1.8	$2(3X^2-1)^2$	$2(X^3+3X^2+5X+5)$	$24X^7+7X^6+6X^5+5X^4+4X^3+3X^2+2X+3$
a_13	1.8	$19X^4-16X^2+4$	$2X^3+7X^2+10X+9$	$16X^7+21X^6+5X^4+4X^3+6X+2$
a_14	1.8	$X^2(17X^2-10)$	$7X^2+10+11$	$24X^7+14X^6+5X^4+4X^3+4X+3$
a_15	1.8	$6X^2(3X^2-2)$	$2(4X^2+5X+5)$	$24X^7+7X^6+12X^5+6X^2+2X+3$
a_16	1.9	$19X^4-14X^2+2$	$2X^4+4X^3+5X^2+8X+9$	$16X^7+7X^6+12X^5+5X^4+4X^3+6X^2+2X+2$
a_17	1.9	$2(3X^2-1)^2$	$X^4+4X^3+5X^2+8X+10$	$16X^7+14X^6+6X^5+5X^4+4X^3+3X^2+4X+2$
a_18	1.9	$6X^2(3X^2-2)$	$X^4+2X^3+7X^2+8X+10$	$2(8X^7+7X^6+6X^5+3X^2+2X+1)$
a_19	1.9	$20X^4-18X^2+5$	$2(X^4+2X^3+3X^2+4X+4)$	$8X^7+21X^6+6X^5+5X^4+4X^3+3X^2+6X+1$
a_20	1.9	$2(2X^2-1)(5X^2-2)$	$X^4+4X^3+7X^2+8X+8$	$8X^7+21X^6+12X^5+6X^2+6X+1$
a_21	1.9	$X^2(17X^2-9)$	$3X^3+5X^2+9X+11$	$24X^7+7X^6+6X^5+5X^4+4X^3+3X^2+2X+3$
a_22	1.9	$X^2(17X^2-6)$	$6X^3+5X^2+6X+11$	$24X^7+6X^5+10X^4+8X^3+3X^2+3$
a_23	1.9	$X^2(17X^2-8)$	$2X^3+7X^2+8X+11$	$24X^7+7X^6+6X^5+5X^4+4X^3+3X^2+2X+3$
a_24	1.9	$19X^4-15X^2+2$	$3X^3+7X^2+9X+9$	$2(8X^7+7X^6+6X^5+3X^2+2X+1)$
a_25	1.9	$15X^4$	$9X^2+6X+13$	$2(16X^7+5X^4+4X^3+2)$
a_26	2.0	$20X^4-17X^2+4$	$X^5+3X^4+4X^3+5X^2+7X+8$	$8X^7+14X^6+6X^5+10X^4+8X^3+3X^2+4X+1$
a_27	2.0	$19X^4-13X^2+2$	$2X^4+5X^3+5X^2+7X+9$	$16X^7+7X^6+6X^5+10X^4+8X^3+3X^2+2X+2$
a_28	2.0	$19X^4-14X^2+3$	$X^4+4X^3+6X^2+8X+9$	$2(8X^7+7X^6+5X^4+4X^3+2X+1)$
a_29	2.0	$2X^2(9X^2-5)$	$2(2X^3+3X^2+4X+5)$	$24X^7+12X^5+5X^4+4X^3+6X^2+3$
a_30	2.1	$2(10X^4-8X^2+1)$	$2X^5+3X^4+4X^3+5X^2+6X+8$	$8X^7+7X^6+12X^5+10X^4+8X^3+6X^2+2X+1$
a_31	2.1	$2X^2(9X^2-5)$	$3X^4+4X^3+5X^2+6X+10$	$16X^7+7X^6+6X^5+10X^4+8X^3+3X^2+2X+2$
a_32	2.1	$X^2(19X^2-13)$	$2X^4+3X^3+7X^2+7X+9$	$16X^7+7X^6+12X^5+5X^4+4X^3+6X^2+2X+2$
a_33	2.1	$X^2(19X^2-12)$	$4X^4+4X^3+5X^2+6X+9$	$2(X^2-X+1)(8X^5+8X^4+6X^3+3X^2+X+1)$
a_34	2.1	$X^1(17X^2-7)$	$3X^3+7X^2+7X+11$	$24X^7+7X^6+10X^4+8X^3+2X+3$
a_35	2.1	$19X^4-14X^2+2$	$4X^3+7X^2+8X+9$	$16X^7+14X^6+6X^5+5X^4+4X^3+3X^2+4X+2$

a_01 = 4-methyloctane; a_02 = 3-ethyl-2,3-dimethylpentane; a_03 = 3,3-diethylpentane; a_04 = 2,2,3,3-tetramethyl-pentane; a_05 = 2,3,3,4-tetramethylpentane; a_06 = nonane; a_07 = 2,3,3-trimethylhexane; a_08 = 3,3,4-trimethylhexane; a_09 = 3-ethyl-3-methylhexane; a_10 = 2,2,3,4-tetra-methylpentane; a_11 = 3,4-dimethylheptane; a_12 = 2,3,4-trimethylhexane; a_13 = 3-ethyl-4-methylhexane; a_14 = 3-ethyl-2,2-dimethylpentane; a_15 = 3-ethyl-2,4-dimethylpentane; a_16 = 2,3-dimethylheptane; a_17 = 3,3-dimethylheptane; a_18 = 4,4-dimethylheptane; a_19 = 3-ethylheptane; a_20 = 4-ethyl-heptane; a_21 = 2,2,3-trimethylhexane; a_22 = 2,2,5-trimethylhexane; a_23 = 2,4,4-trimethylhexane; a_24 = 3-ethyl-2-methylhexane; a_25 = 2,2,4,4-tetramethylpentane; a_26 = 3-methyloctane; a_27 = 2,5-dimethylheptane; a_28 = 3,5-dimethyl-heptane; a_29 = 2,3,5-trimethylhexane; a_30 = 2-methyloctane; a_31 = 2,2-dimethylheptane; a_32 = 2,4-dimethylheptane; a_33 = 2,6-dimethylheptane; a_34 = 2,2,4-trimethyl-hexane; a_35 = 4-ethyl-2-methyl-hexane.

Table 1. (continuation)

No.	$k_H(\cdot 10^5)$ [M/atm]	$Q(X)_{C_{6M}}$	$Q(X)_{C_{5Z}}$
a_01	1.0	$X^7+4X^6+6X^5+4X^4+5X^3+12X^2+14X+8$	$X^7+6X^6+13X^5+9X^4+9X^3+16X^2+9X+3$
a_02	1.5	$3X^7+4X^6+3X^5+6X^2+14X+24$	$3X^7+10X^6+9X^5+14X^2+20X+10$
a_03	1.5	$2(X^7+4X^6+14X+8)$	$2(X^7+10X^6+20X+2)$
a_04	1.6	$4X^7+2X^6+4X^4+5X^3+7X+32$	$4X^7+5X^6+13X^4+16X^3+10X+18$
a_05	1.6	$2(2X^7+3X^5+6X^2+16)$	$2(2X^7+9X^5+14X^2+8)$
a_06	1.7	$2X(2X^5+3X^4+4X^3+5X^2+6X+7)$	$2X(X^2+X+1)(3X^3+2X^2+2X+4)$
a_07	1.7	$3X^7+2X^6+6X^5+12X^2+7X+24$	$3X^7+3X^6+19X^5+23X^2+6X+12$
a_08	1.7	$3X^7+4X^6+4X^4+5X^3+14X+24$	$(X+1)(3X^6+6X^5-6X^4+19X^3-6X^2+6X+11)$
a_09	1.7	$2X^7+6X^6+3X^5+6X^2+21X+16$	$2X^7+13X^6+10X^5+11X^2+24X+6$
a_10	1.7	$4X^7+3X^5+4X^4+5X^3+6X^2+32$	$4X^7+7X^5+10X^4+15X^3+13X^2+17$
a_11	1.8	$2X^7+4X^6+3X^5+4X^4+5X^3+6X^2+14X+16$	$(X+1)(2X^6+5X^5+3X^4+7X^3+4X^2+6X+6)$
a_12	1.8	$3X^7+2X^6+3X^5+4X^4+5X^3+6X^2+7X+24$	$3X^7+4X^6+7X^5+11X^4+13X^3+11X^2+7X+10$
a_13	1.8	$2X^7+6X^6+4X^4+5X^3+21X+16$	$2X^7+12X^6+11X^4+13X^3+23X+5$
a_14	1.8	$3X^7+4X^6+4X^4+5X^3+14X+24$	$3X^7+8X^6+10X^4+15X^3+18X+12$
a_15	1.8	$3X^7+2X^6+6X^5+12X^2+7X+24$	$3X^7+4X^6+14X^5+26X^2+9X+10$
a_16	1.9	$2X^7+2X^6+6X^5+4X^4+5X^3+12X^2+7X+16$	$2X^7+3X^6+13X^5+10X^4+9X^3+18X^2+4X+7$
a_17	1.9	$2X^7+4X^6+3X^5+4X^4+5X^3+6X^2+14X+16$	$2X^7+8X^6+7X^5+10X^4+9X^3+10X^2+12X+8$
a_18	1.9	$2(X^7+2X^6+3X^5+6X^2+7X+8)$	$2(X^7+3X^6+9X^5+10X^2+6X+4)$
a_19	1.9	$X^7+6X^6+3X^5+4X^4+5X^3+6X^2+21X+8$	$X^7+11X^6+6X^5+10X^4+9X^3+9X^2+18X+2$
a_20	1.9	$X^7+6X^6+6X^5+12X^2+21X+8$	$X^7+10X^6+16X^5+20X^2+17X+2$
a_21	1.9	$3X^7+2X^6+3X^5+4X^4+5X^3+6X^2+7X+24$	$3X^7+3X^6+9X^5+10X^4+12X^3+11X^2+5X+13$
a_22	1.9	$3X^7+3X^5+8X^4+10X^3+6X^2+24$	$3X^7+5X^5+18X^4+20X^3+6X^2+14$
a_23	1.9	$3X^7+2X^6+3X^5+4X^4+5X^3+6X^2+7X+24$	$3X^7+5X^6+5X^5+13X^4+10X^3+10X^2+8X+12$
a_24	1.9	$2\cdot(X^7+2\cdot X^6+3\cdot X^5+6\cdot X^2+7\cdot X+8)$	$2X^7+7X^6+16X^5+22X^2+13X+6$
a_25	1.9	$2(2X^7+4X^4+5X^3+16)$	$2(2X^7+7X^4+14X^3+10)$
a_26	2.0	$X^7+4X^6+3X^5+8X^4+10X^3+6X^2+14X+8$	$(X+1)(X^6+6X^5-X^4+17X^3+7X+3)$
a_27	2.0	$2X^7+2X^6+3X^5+8X^4+10X^3+6X^2+7X+16$	$(X+1)(2X^6+2X^5+3X^4+13X^3+7X^2-X+7)$
a_28	2.0	$2(X^7+2X^6+4X^4+5X^3+7X+8)$	$2(X^7+4X^6+8X^4+11X^3+6X+3)$
a_29	2.0	$3X^7+6X^5+4X^4+5X^3+12X^2+24$	$3X^7+12X^5+12X^4+11X^3+17X^2+11$
a_30	2.1	$X^7+2X^6+6X^5+8X^4+10X^3+12X^2+7X+8$	$X^7+3X^6+10X^5+15X^4+17X^3+12X^2+4X+4$
a_31	2.1	$2X^7+2X^6+3X^5+8X^4+10X^3+6X^2+7X+16$	$2X^7+3X^6+5X^5+17X^4+17X^3+8X^2+4X+10$
a_32	2.1	$2X^7+2X^6+6X^5+4X^4+5X^3+12X^2+7X+16$	$2X^7+3X^6+12X^5+10X^4+10X^3+17X^2+5X+7$
a_33	2.1	$2(X^2-X+1)(X^5+X^4+3X^3+6X^2+8X+8)$	$2(X^7+5X^5+7X^4+10X^3+6X^2+4)$
a_34	2.1	$3X^7+2X^6+8X^4+10X^3+7X+24$	$(X+1)(3X^6+X^5-X^4+17X^3+7X^2-7X+13)$
a_35	2.1	$2X^7+4X^6+3X^5+4X^4+5X^3+6X^2+14X+16$	$2X^7+8X^6+5X^5+12X^4+11X^3+8X^2+14X+6$

a_01 = 4-methyloctane; a_02 = 3-ethyl-2,3-dimethylpentane; a_03 = 3,3-diethylpentane; a_04 = 2,2,3,3-tetramethyl-pentane; a_05 = 2,3,3,4-tetramethylpentane; a_06 = nonane; a_07 = 2,3,3-trimethylhexane; a_08 = 3,3,4-trimethylhexane; a_09 = 3-ethyl-3-methylhexane; a_10 = 2,2,3,4-tetra-methylpentane; a_11 = 3,4-dimethylheptane; a_12 = 2,3,4-trimethylhexane; a_13 = 3-ethyl-4-methylhexane; a_14 = 3-ethyl-2,2-dimethylpentane; a_15 = 3-ethyl-2,4-dimethylpentane; a_16 = 2,3-dimethylheptane; a_17 = 3,3-dimethylheptane; a_18 = 4,4-dimethylheptane; a_19 = 3-ethylheptane; a_20 = 4-ethyl-heptane; a_21 = 2,2,3-trimethylhexane; a_22 = 2,2,5-trimethylhexane; a_23 = 2,4,4-trimethylhexane; a_24 = 3-ethyl-2-methylhexane; a_25 = 2,2,4,4-tetramethylpentane; a_26 = 3-methyloctane; a_27 = 2,5-dimethylheptane; a_28 = 3,5-dimethyl-heptane; a_29 = 2,3,5-trimethylhexane; a_30 = 2-methyloctane; a_31 = 2,2-dimethylheptane; a_32 = 2,4-dimethylheptane; a_33 = 2,6-dimethylheptane; a_34 = 2,2,4-trimethyl-hexane; a_35 = 4-ethyl-2-methyl-hexane.

Table 2. Statistical characteristics of the models from Eq.(9) to Eq.(11) (n = 34)

Model	Pol	Parameter			Model coefficients			
		r [95%CI _r]	SErr	F (p)	Intercept lower Intercept upper	Desc1 lower Desc1 upper	Desc2 lower Desc2 upper	Desc3 lower Desc3 upper
Eq.(9)	ChP	0.8690 [0.7517-0.9329]	0.89	31 $2.68 \cdot 10^{-9}$	-75.6 -40.55	-462.44 -195.56	4.10 12.67	$5.99 \cdot 10^{-3}$ $9.62 \cdot 10^{-3}$
Eq.(10)	CDi	0.9239 [0.8518-0.9616]	0.69	58 $1.28 \cdot 10^{-12}$	122.83 161.57	4.31 7.08	-11.56 -8.44	$-2.82 \cdot 10^{-8}$ $-1.39 \cdot 10^{-8}$
Eq.(11)	CSz	0.7188 [0.5028-0.8502]	1.26	11 $6.08 \cdot 10^{-5}$	-55.94 -12.84	-0.04 0.13	0.73 1.65	-0.92 -0.36

r = correlation coefficient;

95%CI_r = 95% confidence intervals for correlation coefficient;

SErr = standard error of estimated;

F = Fisher parameter;

Intercept lower = the lower border of the 95% confidence interval for intercept;

Intercept upper = the upper border of the 95% confidence interval for intercept;

Desc1 = ChP(1/100) - Eq(9); CDi(-23/71) - Eq(10); CDi(-29/39) - Eq(11);

Desc2 = ChP(35/97) - Eq(9); CDi(5/18) - Eq(10); CDi(11/9) - Eq(11);

Desc3 = ChP(89/18) - Eq(9); CDi(99/10) - Eq(10); CDi(59/45) - Eq(11);

Table 3. Leave-one-out cross validation results

Model	r_{pred} [95%CI]	$\text{SErr}_{\text{pred}}$	F_{pred} (p_{pred})
Eq.(9)	0.8206 [0.6644-0.9080]	1.04	21 ($2.43 \cdot 10^{-7}$)
Eq.(10)	0.8714 [0.7534-0.9349]	0.89	31 ($2.70 \cdot 10^{-9}$)
Eq.(11)	0.6008 [0.3243-0.7826]	1.47	5 ($5.15 \cdot 10^{-3}$)

r = correlation coefficient;

95%CI = 95% confidence interval of r ;

SErr = standard error of predicted;

F_{pred} = Fisher parameter in leave-one-out analysis

p_{pred} = probability associated to F_{pred}

For Peer Review Only

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 4. Correlated correlation analysis: Steiger’s Z test applied on Eq.(9)-Eq.(11)

Models	Steiger Z parameter	p-value
Eq.(9) - Eq.(10)	-1.6794	$9.53 \cdot 10^{-1}$
Eq.(9) - Eq.(11)	2.84439	$2.22 \cdot 10^{-3}$
Eq.(10) - Eq.(11)	3.53456	$2.04 \cdot 10^{-4}$

For Peer Review Only