

A photograph showing several people in a computer lab or training room. They are seated at desks with multiple computer monitors. Some are looking at the screens, while others are looking towards the camera. The room has a casual, educational atmosphere.

GTPB

The Gulbenkian Training Programme in Bioinformatics
(Since 1999)

Pedro Fernandes, Organiser



ELB17S

Entry Level Bioinformatics

06-10 November 2017

(Second 2017 run of this Course)

Basic Bioinformatics Sessions

Practical 3: Database Searching

Tuesday 24 October 2017

Searching for sequence similarities in databases.

The most popular way to investigate a sequence has always been to compare it with one of the sequence databases now accessible from sites all over the world. When sequence databases were more sparsely populated than now, the objective was to search hopefully, not always with success, for any convincingly similar sequence(s). When such a match was discovered, it could be supposed that known properties of the “similar” database sequence might provide insight to the properties of the query sequence. Now, the databases are full of sequences representative of most interesting conditions. Similarity searches are conducted in the expectation of finding many close “hits” for almost any sequence. Fewer database searches are conducted in complete ignorance of what the query sequence might be.

Here, take the **PAX6** genomic DNA sequence retrieved from **Ensembl** and conduct two searches analogous to those run in the **Ensembl** pipeline (or the equivalent **NCBI** pipeline for **Map Viewer**). Results should confirm that which has already been discovered using other sources.

blast is not the only sequence database searching program available, but it is the most popular by a very long way. **blast** searches are offered in many forms by many servers all over the world, but the most comprehensive and reliable service has to be that offered by the **NCBI**.

Go to the **NCBI** homepage at:

<http://ncbi.nlm.nih.gov>

Select the **BLAST** option (from the **Popular Resources** list). In the **Basic BLAST** section, select **nucleotide blast**. Use the **Enter Query Sequence** **Browse** (or **Choose File**) button to upload the file:

pax6_genomic.fasta.

For results like those used by **Ensembl** to predict **PAX6** transcripts, you must compare your genomic sequence to a reliable set of human mRNA/cDNA (or similar) sequences.

In the **Choose Search Set** section, set the **Database** to **Reference RNA sequences (refseq_rna)**.

You are now able to specify an **Organism**, choose **human (taxid:9606)**.

blast is now set to compare the **PAX6** genomic region with all **Human** mRNA sequences in **RefSeq**.

The screenshot shows the NCBI BLAST Basic BLAST interface. The 'Enter Query Sequence' section has a text box for the accession number or FASTA sequence, and a 'Browse...' button next to 'pax6_genomic.fasta'. The 'Choose Search Set' section has a 'Database' dropdown set to 'Reference RNA sequences (refseq_rna)' and an 'Organism' dropdown set to 'human (taxid:9606)'. The 'Program Selection' section has 'Optimize for' set to 'Highly similar sequences (megablast)'. The 'BLAST' button is visible at the bottom.

Note that the default **Program Selection** is **Highly similar sequences (megablast¹)**, which seems appropriate here as all the mRNA that correctly match should surely do so almost perfectly.

¹ **megablast** is a less sensitive but even faster version of **blast** only suitable when, as now, almost identical matches are sought.

Click on the **Algorithm Parameters** button. The defaults are fine here, but before starting your search, try changing the **Program Selection** and observing the different **Algorithm Parameters**.

General Parameters

Max target sequences: 100
Select the maximum number of aligned sequences to display

Short queries: ☒ Automatically adjust parameters for short input sequences

Expect threshold: 10

Word size: 28

Max matches in a query range: 0

Scoring Parameters

Match/Mismatch Scores: 1,-2

Gap Costs: Linear

Filters and Masking

Filter: ☒ Low complexity regions
☐ Species-specific repeats for: Homo sapiens (Human)

Mask: ☒ Mask for lookup table only
☐ Mask lower case letters

The default settings of all shared parameters are identical for the two slower more sensitive **Program Selections**.

There are differences for **megablast**, where speed is of the essence and sensitivity can be sacrificed.

Smaller **Word sizes** slow searches but increase sensitivity. For **megablast** the default **Word size** is 28 otherwise it is 11.

Gapped alignment is time consuming and, by default, considered more crudely by **megablast** than the other two algorithms².

Filtering and Masking matches with organism specific repeats and/or low complexity regions takes time, and so only avoiding **Low complexity regions**³ is on by default for all **Program Selections**.

When **discontinuous megablast** is selected, an extra options section appears. Discussing how this flavour of **blast** works is a little beyond the scope of these notes, but briefly. Unlike the other **Program Selections**, **discontinuous megablast** does not just look for exactly matching “words” of given size as a first step towards identifying matching regions between sequences. It looks for a pattern of matching bases within a word. For example, the default choice assumes your query is **coding** and looks for 11 matching bases within a word of 18. Approximately, every third base is allowed not to match. Biologically, this can be justified as allowing for third codon position wobble. For more detail, use the appropriate button. Notice there are buttons by every parameter selection. Try one or two. In the process, discover:

Discontiguous Word Options

Template length: 18

Template type: Coding

When would **Mask lower case letters** be a useful thing to do?


Automatically adjust parameters for short input sequences is independent of **Program selection**, and so remains unaltered.

Which parameters would **blast** need to **automatically adjust** to cater for short input sequences (such as primers being tested for uniqueness), and why?

² By default, **megablast** uses **Linear Gap Costs**. That is, it just multiplies the size of the gap with the **Mismatch** penalty. The other two algorithms employ the more common **Affine** strategy, using **Existence** and **Extension** penalties. For more about **Gap Penalties**, go [here](#).

³ This filter avoids finding “hits” supported only by matches in regions not specific to the query. For example, a polyA tail cannot help to identify a specific mRNA as it is present in all mRNAs. The use of this filter will be evident when we look at the **blast** output.

Finally, ensure all the parameter defaults are back in place⁴ and that **megablast** is the **Program Selection**, ask **blast** to **Show results in a new window** and then click on the **BLAST** button. Impressively swiftly, you will have results. At the top of which will be a graphical overview.



This graphic implies that there are **11** full length matches between the genomic sequence and mRNAs in **RefSeq**. The **RefSeq** entries had to be “gapped” in order to compensate for the introns that are represented in the genomic sequence but not in the mRNA sequences. The **red blocks** therefore represent very closely matching (score **>=200** brownie points) exons, the lines joining the **red blocks** represent introns that have been spliced out. All **11** full length hits match reasonably uniformly except for the first few exons, implying significant variation in the **5' UTR**.

Why do you suppose that a few of the exons of the first 11 matches do not achieve the maximum score?

Explain why one exon in the reasonably consistent region, does not appear in all of the transcript matches?

In a previous Practical, you discovered directly that there were **11** high quality “**NM_**” **PAX6** transcripts in **RefSeq**.

Until recently, there was a further **9** “**XM_**” **PREDICTED** transcripts. However, in the last release of **RefSeq**, the **9** less reliable **XM_** transcripts were removed and so were not detected by **blast**. **Ensembl** claimed to have used most, if not all, the high quality **NM_ RefSeq** sequences to aid its transcript predictions. **Ensembl** would have ignored the **XM_ PREDICTED RefSeq** sequences even if they still existed.

blast just sees sequences and, by default, will not be influenced by the quality of the support for their existence. Run as in this exercise, **blast** would always report all **RefSeq PAX6** mRNAs matching the **PAX6** genomic region convincingly, independently of how questionably they are evidenced. However, you could have filtered the target database(s) in various ways, including choosing to **Exclude** all **Modules(XM/XP)** (that is all the more questionable mRNA sequences and their amino acid translations). This would not be appropriate here as we wish to mimic the approach of the **NCBI** genome databases which **DO** consider **XM/XP** sequences should they exist.

There is a point to pursuing all this detail. You reference a collection of interdependent databases, all of which are updated regularly. More often than not you will notice inconsistencies due to asynchronous updates and differences in database management/interpretation policy. A small price to pay for such a rich source of information, but one of which I suggest it is wise to be aware.

The message of the particular **blast** search here is that it is so easy to predict the same **PAX6** transcripts as you discovered in **MapViewer**, just with a simple **blast** search. That is, you can look things up, or work most of it out for yourself.

⁴ If you have any non-default settings, they should be highlighted in yellow.

If you hover over the graphical hits, their origin will be displayed above the graphic⁵.

Below the **Graphic Summary** are the **Descriptions**, a simple list of the **15** matches represented in the graphic.

	Description	Max score	Total score	Query cover	E value	Ident
<input type="checkbox"/>	Homo sapiens paired box 6 (PAX6), transcript variant 11, mRNA	9659	12484	19%	0.0	99%
<input type="checkbox"/>	Homo sapiens paired box 6 (PAX6), transcript variant 10, mRNA	9659	15161	23%	0.0	99%
<input type="checkbox"/>	Homo sapiens paired box 6 (PAX6), transcript variant 8, mRNA	9659	12929	20%	0.0	99%
<input type="checkbox"/>	Homo sapiens paired box 6 (PAX6), transcript variant 7, mRNA	9659	12729	20%	0.0	99%
<input type="checkbox"/>	Homo sapiens paired box 6 (PAX6), transcript variant 6, mRNA	9659	12761	20%	0.0	99%
<input type="checkbox"/>	Homo sapiens paired box 6 (PAX6), transcript variant 5, mRNA	9659	12737	20%	0.0	99%
<input type="checkbox"/>	Homo sapiens paired box 6 (PAX6), transcript variant 4, mRNA	9659	12862	20%	0.0	99%
<input type="checkbox"/>	Homo sapiens paired box 6 (PAX6), transcript variant 2, mRNA	9659	12833	20%	0.0	99%
<input type="checkbox"/>	Homo sapiens paired box 6 (PAX6), transcript variant 1, mRNA	9659	12942	20%	0.0	99%
<input type="checkbox"/>	Homo sapiens paired box 6 (PAX6), transcript variant 3, mRNA	9659	12791	20%	0.0	99%
<input type="checkbox"/>	Homo sapiens paired box 6 (PAX6), transcript variant 9, mRNA	647	2630	4%	0.0	100%
<input type="checkbox"/>	Homo sapiens elongator acetyltransferase complex subunit 4 (ELP4), transcript variant 3,	641	641	1%	0.0	100%
<input type="checkbox"/>	Homo sapiens elongator acetyltransferase complex subunit 4 (ELP4), transcript variant 2,	641	641	1%	0.0	100%
<input type="checkbox"/>	Homo sapiens elongator acetyltransferase complex subunit 4 (ELP4), transcript variant 1,	641	641	1%	0.0	100%
<input type="checkbox"/>	Homo sapiens PAX6 antisense RNA 1 (PAX6-AS1), long non-coding RNA	141	141	0%	2e-30	100%

These are such that:

- The top **11** hits, corresponding to the **11** full length hits of the **Graphic Summary**, are the quality (i.e. NM_ entries with good supporting evidence) **RefSeq** transcripts.
- There follows, corresponding to the **3** small **red blobs** in the extreme bottom right of the **Graphic Summary**, **3** hits that are the ends of **mRNAs** for the **ELP4** gene. They are exactly where you should expect them to be, assuming you paid full attention to the **ELP4** transcript predictions shown in both the **Ensembl** and **Map Viewer** displays of the **Genomic** region around **PAX6**. Reject these contemptuously, they do not pertain to our investigation of **PAX6**.
- The **15th** match, corresponding to the barely visible tiny smudge match to the left of the top **Graphic Summary** hit, is recorded as “**uncharacterized**” and fails to fit in with my story, so I ignore it!⁶

So, this **blast** search suggests the existence of **11 PAX6** transcripts supported by **RefSeq** data, as is reported by **Map Viewer**. Also, the results are broadly consistent with the information discovered in **Ensembl**.

Which of the **Refseq PAX6** transcripts corresponds to **isoform 5a**?

⁵ Or you could just read the textual list that follows the graphic if you wish to insist on the simplistic.

⁶ Actually, I see now it is a single exon of the **PAX6-AS1** entity pursued so vigorously in the last exercise. Those of you foolish enough to read all the ramble of my answers to questions will recall **PAX6-AS1** with glee! Yep ... ignore it.

Moving further down the results you will come to the alignments between the **PAX6** genomic sequence and the matching database entries. All similarity searches use local alignment strategies⁷, so you should not be surprised to see a number of alignments for each “hit” in the list. Here we have a genomic query sequence aligned exclusively with mRNA sequences from **RefSeq**. The expectation is therefore to find an alignments corresponding to exons. The alignments are ordered by quality, though you are provided with a **Sort by:** menu to alter the order to taste⁸.

Look at the first alignment for the best matching **PAX6** transcript. It is the alignment of the very last exon of a **RefSeq** transcript with the end of the gene you exported from **Ensembl**.

Notice the lower case string of 'a's. The case indicates that they were ignored (**filtered**) as a **Low complexity region** whilst **megablast** was looking for identically matching words that might suggest matching regions. By themselves, the 'a's are not sufficient evidence that a biological match exists. Only because the surrounding sequence is compellingly similar, can it be assumed that such a match does exist. The 'a's are replaced (lower case to indicate they were filtered) when the final alignment is computed. If you look a little further down the same alignment, you will see several other runs of 'a's and 't's for which the same explanation applies.


	Score	Expect	Identities	Gaps	Strand
	9659 bits(5230)	0.0	5237/5240(99%)	2/5240(0%)	Plus/Plus
Query	28634	CCACTTC--TAGGACTCATTTCCTGGTGTGTCAGTTCAGTTCAGTTCCTCCGGAAGTG	28691		
Sbjct	1490	CCACTTCAACAGGACTCATTTCCTGGTGTGTCAGTTCAGTTCAGTTCCTCCGGAAGTG	1549		
Query	28692	AACCTGATATGTCTCAATACTGGCCAAGATTACAGTaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaaG	28751		
Sbjct	1550	AACCTGATATGTCTCAATACTGGCCAAGATTACAGTAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAAG	1609		
Query	28752	GAAAGGAAATATTGTGTTAATTCAGTCAGTGACTATGGGGACACAACAGTTGAGCTTTCA	28811		
Sbjct	1610	GAAAGGAAATATTGTGTTAATTCAGTCAGTGACTATGGGGACACAACAGTTGAGCTTTCA	1669		

⁷ To use a global approach would be to imply that you were only interested in database entries that matched your query sequence from end to end. Generally, this is not true. You would usually be interested in a database sequence that was similar over any significant region.

⁸ Why not try them? End up with the alignments for the top hit in **E value** order.

Now use a version of **blast** (called **blastx**) to compare your genomic sequence with a protein database. **blastx** will translate a DNA query sequence in all six reading frames and compare each translation with a protein sequence database. Thus, in a similar fashion to that employed by the **Ensembl** pipeline, protein coding regions of the genomic DNA can be identified. For clarity, we will use only the well annotated human proteins of the **SwissProt** section of **Uniprot**. First go to the home of **blast** at:

<http://blast.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/Blast.cgi>


Select . Use the **Enter Query Sequence Browse (or Choose File)** button to **upload** file **pax6_genomic.fasta**.

In the **Choose Search Set** section, set the **Database** to **UniProtKB/Swiss-prot prot(swissprot)**. Specify the **Organism** as **human (taxid:9606)**.


Take a look at the **Algorithm parameters**⁹.

The **Word size** choice is **2, 3 or 6**. The default is **6**. We seek very close matches here, so the largest **Word size** would seem appropriate.

The default scoring matrix is **BLOSUM62**, but choices from both the **BLOSUM** and **PAM** families are offered.

The **Compositional adjustments** parameter offers the opportunity to refine the chosen scoring matrix to reflect the residue composition of the sequences being compared in one of a number of ways. Click on the relevant  button for further enlightenment. I must admit, I was left with questions after reading the **Help**, but some attempt to customise the evaluation of an alignment to reflect sequence composition does seem like an excellent idea.

Low complexity regions will be filtered by default.




The screenshot shows the NCBI BLAST web interface. The **General Parameters** section includes: **Max target sequences** (100), **Expect threshold** (10), **Word size** (6), and **Max matches in a query range** (0). The **Scoring Parameters** section includes: **Matrix** (BLOSUM62), **Gap Costs** (Existence: 11 Extension: 1), and **Compositional adjustments** (Conditional compositional score matrix adjustment). The **Filters and Masking** section includes: **Filter** (Low complexity regions checked) and **Mask** (Mask for lookup table only and Mask lower case letters unchecked).

Change nothing other than to ask **blast** to **Show results in a new window** and click the **BLAST** button.

After minimal thought, **blastx** will thrust its conclusions before you. Hover over the graphical hits for identification.

⁹ Here I will assume we have talked about these parameter and you are reasonably well informed of the issues.



What are the **9** strongest matches around base position **16,750**?

Why would you expect exactly **9** matches around this point?

What do you make of the plethora of matches around **24,000**?

Move down to the textual list of the matches. Hopefully as you fully expected you will find the expected number of **Paired box** matches at the top of the list followed by many many **Homeobox** matches.

Alignments Download GenPept Graphics						
	Description	Max score	Total score	Query cover	E value	Ident
<input type="checkbox"/>	RecName: Full=Paired box protein Pax-6; AltName: Full=Aniridia type II protein; AltName: Full=Ocul	160	767	3%	3e-41	97%
<input type="checkbox"/>	RecName: Full=Paired box protein Pax-2	131	214	1%	2e-31	74%
<input type="checkbox"/>	RecName: Full=Paired box protein Pax-8	131	208	1%	5e-31	76%
<input type="checkbox"/>	RecName: Full=Paired box protein Pax-5; AltName: Full=B-cell-specific transcription factor; Short=B	128	211	1%	1e-30	74%
<input type="checkbox"/>	RecName: Full=Paired box protein Pax-4	117	258	1%	5e-27	67%
<input type="checkbox"/>	RecName: Full=Paired box protein Pax-9	112	179	1%	1e-25	69%
<input type="checkbox"/>	RecName: Full=Paired box protein Pax-1; AltName: Full=HuP48	111	177	1%	5e-24	69%
<input type="checkbox"/>	RecName: Full=Paired box protein Pax-3; AltName: Full=HuP2	107	219	1%	7e-23	65%
<input type="checkbox"/>	RecName: Full=Paired box protein Pax-7; AltName: Full=HuP1	105	217	1%	3e-22	68%
<input type="checkbox"/>	RecName: Full=Retinal homeobox protein Rx; AltName: Full=Retina and anterior neural fold homeo	48.9	84.7	0%	1e-04	46%
<input type="checkbox"/>	RecName: Full=Retina and anterior neural fold homeobox protein 2; AltName: Full=Q50-type retinal	46.2	80.5	0%	3e-04	48%
<input type="checkbox"/>	RecName: Full=Homeobox protein aristaless-like 4	47.4	47.4	0%	4e-04	68%
<input type="checkbox"/>	RecName: Full=Paired mesoderm homeobox protein 1; AltName: Full=Homeobox protein PHOX1; /	45.8	45.8	0%	7e-04	68%
<input type="checkbox"/>	RecName: Full=Paired mesoderm homeobox protein 2; AltName: Full=Paired-related homeobox pr	45.8	45.8	0%	7e-04	68%
<input type="checkbox"/>	RecName: Full=Dorsal root ganglia homeobox protein; AltName: Full=Paired-related homeobox pro	45.8	45.8	0%	8e-04	71%

Why do you suppose the **Paired box** matches precede the **Homeobox** matches?

How do you suppose the **Max matches in a query range** parameter might be of value if this order was reversed?

Take a look at the alignments. You will see many places where regions have been filtered as non-informative. I suggest the one illustrated was filtered because it would match anywhere that was sufficiently **Serine** rich.

Score	Expect	Method	Identities	Positives	Gaps	Frame
81.3 bits(199)	5e-29	Compositional matrix adjust.	51/52(98%)	51/52(98%)	0/52(0%)	+3
Query	24855	FQVWFSNRRRAKWRREEKLRNQRRQASN	tpshipisssfst	VYQPIPQPTTP	25010	
		QVWFSNRRRAKWRREEKLRNQRRQASNT	PSHIPISSSFSTSVYQPIPQPTTP			
Sbjct	254	IQVWFSNRRRAKWRREEKLRNQRRQASNT	PSHIPISSSFSTSVYQPIPQPTTP	305		

How does this “non-informative” region match expectations suggested by **SMART** and the **Feature table** of **UniprotKB** for **PAX6_HUMAN**?

PSI-BLAST

This program is used to find a comprehensive set of relatives of a protein. First, **BLAST** is used to find closely related proteins. From an alignment of these proteins a general "profile" (a **Position Specific Scoring Matrix - PSSM**) is computed. A **PSSM** is very similar in concept and purpose to an **HMM** profile in that it summarises significant features present in the sequences it represents.

A further search of the protein database is then run using the **PSSM** as a query, and a larger more widely associated group of proteins is found. This larger group is aligned and used to construct another **PSSM**, and the process is repeated until no more significantly matching new sequences can be detected, or the user tires of the whole process.

PSI-BLAST is integrated into the **Secondary Structure Prediction** system **Jpred**. Whenever **Jpred** is asked to compute structure from a single protein sequence, it will use **PSI-BLAST** to construct an aligned family of protein sequences to enable an improved prediction. An aligned family of proteins is a much better starting point than any single protein sequence.

Similar ideas are used by the domain database **PFAM** to create large alignments of domain regions.

Here we will use **PSI-BLAST** directly from the **NCBI** on the **Paired DOMAIN** of the **PAX6** protein that you saved in a file earlier. It should be possible to detect a large family of **PAX** domains and to eventually multiply align them generating something like the alignment from the **PFAM** database.

To investigate **PSI-BLAST** go first to the **NCBI** Home page at:


<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/>


Click on the **BLAST** option from the **Popular Resources** menu.

Select  from the **Web BLAST** section.

Upload the **PAX6** paired box domain sequence (stored in the file **pax_domain.fasta**) using the appropriate **Browse** button.

Select **PSI-BLAST** from the **Program Selection** section. Leave all the others options at their default settings, particularly the option to search all the proteins available.




Before you set **PSI-BLAST** going, click on the **Algorithm parameters** link and take a look at the **PSI/PHI/DELTA BLAST** section. Note the option to use a **PSSM** from a previous run of **PSI-BLAST**, potentially on a different database (but with the same query sequence). Accept the default that database entries scoring better than an **Expect Threshold** of **0.005** be offered for inclusion into the **PSSM** of each successive **PSI-BLAST** iteration. Remember the  buttons.

What do you suppose the choice of **Pseudocount** might influence?

Select to **Show results in a new window** and then click on the **BLAST** button.

After several moments of deep thought, **PSI-BLAST** will come back with its first set of results, at the top of which is a report that (unsurprisingly) matches have been detected between the query sequence and several domain databases.

Putative conserved domains have been detected, click on the image below for detailed results.



For more detail, click on the **Conserved Domains** graphic.

Conserved domains on [sp|P26367]

View Standard Results ?


4-130

Protein Classification

PAX domain-containing protein (domain architecture ID 10646818)

PAX domain-containing protein

Graphical summary ☐ Zoom to residue level show extra options »



Search for similar domain architectures ?

Refine search ?

List of domain hits

Name	Accession	Description	Interval	E-value
[+] PAX	smart00351	Paired Box domain;	1-125	1.38e-82
[+] PAX	cd00131	Paired Box domain	2-127	3.08e-81
[+] PAX	pfam00292	'Paired box' domain;	1-125	5.09e-80

Blast search parameters

Data Source: Live blast search RID = GE8GSSKG015

User Options: Database: CDSEARCH/cdd v3.16 Low complexity filter: no Composition Based Adjustment: yes E-value threshold: 0.01 Maximum number of hits: 500

References:

- Marchler-Bauer A et al. (2017), "CDD/SPARCLE: functional classification of proteins via subfamily domain architectures.", **Nucleic Acids Res.**45(D)200-3.
- Marchler-Bauer A et al. (2015), "CDD: NCBI's conserved domain database.", **Nucleic Acids Res.**43(D)222-6.
- Marchler-Bauer A et al. (2011), "CDD: a Conserved Domain Database for the functional annotation of proteins.", **Nucleic Acids Res.**39(D)225-9.
- Marchler-Bauer A, Bryant SH (2004), "CD-Search: protein domain annotations on the fly.", **Nucleic Acids Res.**32(W)327-331.


Hover over the **Specific / Non-specific hits** and you will see that **SMART**, **Pfam** and the **NCBI Conserved Domains** database matches for a **PAX** domain are all reported. No surprise here.

There is also a **Superfamilies** (derived from **SCOP** as briefly mentioned previously) hit recognising that a **PAX** domain, in common with many other domains, includes **Helix-Turn-Helices**.

cl21459

[Superfamily, eval = 5.09e-80]cl21459, Helix-turn-helix domains ;A large family of mostly alpha-helical protein domains with a characteristic fold; most members function as sequence-specific DNA binding domains, such as in transcription regulators. This superfamily also includes the winged helix-turn-helix domains.

Moving back to the main **PSI-BLAST** results, you will see that there are many high quality hits covering the whole length of the query sequence.



The best **500** of these are listed.

All the listed hits are selected for inclusion into the **PSSM** for the next iteration. Unless you feel strongly about any particular entry, leave them all selected.

Note the **Accession Codes** that begin **XP_**. As mentioned previously, these are less well evidenced protein sequences from the **NCBI** databases.

Sequences producing significant alignments with E-value BETTER than threshold

Select: [All](#) [None](#) Selected:0

[Alignments](#) [Download](#) [GenPept](#) [Graphics](#) [Distance tree of results](#) [Multiple alignment](#)

	Description	Max score	Total score	Query cover	E value	Ident	Accession	Select for PSI blast	Used to build PSSM
<input type="checkbox"/>	hypothetical protein A6R68_04829 [Neotoma lepida]	257	257	99%	3e-86	100%	QBS66634.1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	PREDICTED: paired box protein Pax-6 isoform X2 [Felis catus]	258	258	100%	3e-86	100%	XP_019667790.1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	PREDICTED: paired box protein Pax-6 isoform X7 [Protobothrops mucrosquamatus]	262	262	100%	9e-86	100%	XP_015678414.1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	PREDICTED: paired box protein Pax-6 isoform X4 [Papio anubis]	262	262	100%	4e-85	100%	XP_017804011.1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	PREDICTED: paired box protein Pax-6 isoform X4 [Nanorana parkeri]	262	262	100%	5e-85	100%	XP_018423452.1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	PREDICTED: paired box protein Pax-6 isoform X4 [Macaca nemestrina]	262	262	100%	5e-85	100%	XP_011722295.1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	PREDICTED: paired box protein Pax-6 isoform X4 [Macaca mulatta]	262	262	100%	5e-85	100%	XP_014969998.1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	PREDICTED: paired box protein Pax-6 isoform X2 [Acinonyx jubatus]	263	263	100%	5e-85	100%	XP_014922398.1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	PREDICTED: paired box protein Pax-6 isoform X4 [Macaca fascicularis]	262	262	100%	5e-85	100%	XP_015289636.1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	PREDICTED: paired box protein Pax-6 isoform X2 [Ursus maritimus]	263	263	100%	5e-85	100%	XP_008685073.1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	PREDICTED: paired box protein Pax-6 isoform X7 [Pseudopodoces humilis]	262	262	100%	5e-85	100%	XP_014114466.1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	PREDICTED: paired box protein Pax-6 isoform X2 [Manis javanica]	263	263	100%	6e-85	100%	XP_017519499.1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Download ▾ GenPept Graphics

hypothetical protein A6R68_04829, partial [Neotoma lepida]
Sequence ID: [OBS66634.1](#) Length: 170 Number of Matches: 1

Range 1: 15 to 140 [GenPept](#) [Graphics](#) ▾ Next Match ▲ Previous Match

Score	Expect	Method	Identities	Positives	Gaps
257 bits(656)	3e-86	Compositional matrix adjust.	126/126(100%)	126/126(100%)	0/126(0%)
Query 2	HSGVNQLGGVFNVRPLPDSTRQKIVELAHSGARPCDISRILQVSNCGVSKILGRYYETG				61
Sbjct 15	HSGVNQLGGVFNVRPLPDSTRQKIVELAHSGARPCDISRILQVSNCGVSKILGRYYETG				74
Query 62	SIRPRAIGGSKPRVATPEVVSKIAQYKRECPISFAWEIRDRLLESGVCTNDNIPSVSSIN				121
Sbjct 75	SIRPRAIGGSKPRVATPEVVSKIAQYKRECPISFAWEIRDRLLESGVCTNDNIPSVSSIN				134
Query 122	RVLRLN 127				
Sbjct 135	RVLRLN 140				

Move down to the **Alignments** section of the results and you will see that many of the top hits match the query exactly.

Download ▾ GenPept Graphics

PREDICTED: paired box protein Pax-6 isoform X2 [Felis catus]
Sequence ID: [XP_019667790.1](#) Length: 206 Number of Matches: 1

Range 1: 4 to 130 [GenPept](#) [Graphics](#) ▾ Next Match ▲ Previous Match

Score	Expect	Method	Identities	Positives	Gaps
258 bits(660)	3e-86	Compositional matrix adjust.	127/127(100%)	127/127(100%)	0/127(0%)
Query 1	SHSGVNQLGGVFNVRPLPDSTRQKIVELAHSGARPCDISRILQVSNCGVSKILGRYYET				60
Sbjct 4	SHSGVNQLGGVFNVRPLPDSTRQKIVELAHSGARPCDISRILQVSNCGVSKILGRYYET				63
Query 61	GSIRPRAIGGSKPRVATPEVVSKIAQYKRECPISFAWEIRDRLLESGVCTNDNIPSVSSI				120
Sbjct 64	GSIRPRAIGGSKPRVATPEVVSKIAQYKRECPISFAWEIRDRLLESGVCTNDNIPSVSSI				123
Query 121	NRVLRNL 127				
Sbjct 124	NRVLRNL 130				

Note that many of the top hits come from the **GenPept** database (roughly equivalent to the **TrEMBL** section of **UniProtKB**).

How might the inclusion of poor quality and duplicated sequences have been minimised?

Download ▾ GenPept Graphics

Pax-6 variant form1 [Idiosepius paradoxus]
Sequence ID: [BAM74251.1](#) Length: 408 Number of Matches: 1

Range 1: 12 to 137 [GenPept](#) [Graphics](#) ▾ Next Match ▲ Previous Match

Score	Expect	Method	Identities	Positives	Gaps
252 bits(643)	5e-81	Compositional matrix adjust.	121/126(96%)	124/126(98%)	0/126(0%)
Query 2	HSGVNQLGGVFNVRPLPDSTRQKIVELAHSGARPCDISRILQVSNCGVSKILGRYYETG				61
Sbjct 12	HSGVNQLGGVFNVRPLPDSTRQKIVELAHSGARPCDISRILQVSNCGVSKILGRYYETG				71
Query 62	SIRPRAIGGSKPRVATPEVVSKIAQYKRECPISFAWEIRDRLLESGVCTNDNIPSVSSIN				121
Sbjct 72	SIRPRAIGGSKPRVATPEVV KIAQ+KRECPISFAWE+RDRLLESGVCT DNIPSVSSIN				131
Query 122	RVLRLN 127				
Sbjct 132	RVLRLN 137				

Download ▾ GenPept Graphics

PREDICTED: LOW QUALITY PROTEIN: paired box protein Pax-6 [Xiphophorus maculatus]
Sequence ID: [XP_014326183.1](#) Length: 437 Number of Matches: 1

Range 1: 4 to 142 [GenPept](#) [Graphics](#) ▾ Next Match ▲ Previous Match

Score	Expect	Method	Identities	Positives	Gaps
253 bits(646)	5e-81	Compositional matrix adjust.	125/139(90%)	127/139(91%)	12/139(8%)
Query 1	SHSGVNQLGGVFNVRPLPDSTRQKIVELAHSGARPCDISRILQ-----VSN				48
Sbjct 4	SHSGVNQLGGVFNVRPLPDSTRQKIVELAHSGARPCDISRILQ VSN				63
Query 49	CVSKILGRYYETGSIRPRAIGGSKPRVATPEVVSKIAQYKRECPISFAWEIRDRLLESGV				108
Sbjct 64	CVSKILGRYYETGSIRPRAIGGSKPRVATPEVV+KIAQYKRECPISFAWEIRDRLLESG+				123
Query 109	CTNDNIPSVSSINRVLRLN 127				
Sbjct 124	CTNDNIPSVSSINRVLRLN 142				

Move down far enough and you will see less perfect matches, some of which involve proteins with the extra **14** amino acids of **isoform 5a** of **PAX6_HUMAN**.

Having browsed your results sufficiently, click on the **Go** button to **Run PSI-Blast iteration 2**. It is at the bottom of the hit list.

Run PSI-Blast iteration 2 with max

<input type="checkbox"/>	PREDICTED: paired box protein Pax-6-like [Notothenia coriiceps]	250	250	99%	3e-80	96%	XP_010768697.1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	PREDICTED: paired box protein Pax-6-like isoform X1 [Trichogramma pretiosum]	254	254	99%	3e-80	93%	XP_014229927.1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Paired box protein Pax-6 [Chelonia mydas]	252	252	99%	3e-80	90%	EMP28095.1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	PREDICTED: paired box protein Pax-6 isoform X2 [Crassostrea gigas]	252	252	99%	3e-80	96%	XP_011433289.1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	Paired box protein Pax-6 [Eufriesea mexicana]	249	249	99%	3e-80	94%	QAD62380.1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	XLPAX6 [Xenopus laevis]	250	250	100%	3e-80	89%	AAB07733.1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	PREDICTED: paired box protein Pax-6 isoform X5 [Haplochromis burtoni]	250	250	100%	3e-80	90%	XP_014195922.1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	PREDICTED: paired box protein Pax-6 isoform X4 [Drosophila suzukii]	247	247	99%	4e-80	92%	XP_016944157.1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	PREDICTED: paired box protein Pax-6-like isoform X2 [Trichogramma pretiosum]	254	254	99%	4e-80	93%	XP_014229933.1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Paired box protein Pax-6 [Eufriesea mexicana]	254	254	99%	4e-80	95%	QAD53021.1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	pax6 [Leptochilton asellus]	252	252	99%	4e-80	94%	AMB26739.1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

After a few moments, **PSI-BLAST** will return with the results of searching through the database again using the **PSSM** derived from the hits of the first iteration(☒ed). This time the top of the list will be predominantly filled with hits that have already been incorporated into the **PSI-BLAST PSSM**. However, look far enough down the list and you will find some new ones, highlighted yellow.

Once more, click on the **Go** button to **Run PSI-Blast iteration 3**. That is probably enough! As dear **Eddie** oft advised, there are typically but **three steps to ultimate fulfilment**. Recently I took just **8** iterations before there were no more new sequences suggested for inclusion into the **PSMM**. Recently, I was not so lucky, I got to iteration **21** before I realised that **PSI-Blast** was playing tricks on me! I was oscillating between two minutely different, perfectly acceptable solutions! Having vented my spleen in shame filled fashion I accepted iteration **21**. I advise that you stop here on “*good enough*” iteration **3**, as I will do this time!

PSI blast Iteration 3			
Job title: sp P26367 4-130 (127 letters)			
RID	GEPUROWU015 (Expires on 05-02 23:59 pm)	Database Name	nr
Query ID	Id Query_247955	Description	All non-redundant GenBank CDS translations+PDB+SwissProt+PIR+PRF excluding environmental samples from WGS projects
Description	sp P26367 4-130	Program	BLASTP 2.6.1+ Citation
Molecule type	amino acid		
Query Length	127		

Next, move to the just above the **Graphic Summary** and click on the **Multiple alignment** link. You have elected to use the **NCBI** multiple alignment program **Cobalt** to align the **PAX** domain sequences of your final **PSI-BLAST** iteration.

Alignment Parameters	
Gap penalties	-11,-1
End-Gap penalties	-5,-1
CDD Parameters	
Use RPS BLAST	on
Blast E-value	0.003
Find Conserved columns and Recompute	on
Query Clustering Parameters	
Use query clusters	on
Word Size	4
Max cluster distance	0.8
Alphabet	Regular

This can take quite a while. **Cobalt** might even complain wearily and give up occasionally. If it does, tell it not to be silly!! It will get there eventually. When it is done, click on the **Alignment parameters** link at the top of the results.

Cobalt reports the parameters it used to make the alignment. It is possible to recompute the alignment with different parameters by using the **Edit and Resubmit** link at the top of the page and then choosing to set **Advanced parameters**. But, maybe not today?

Recording the parameters chosen for any computation is surely extremely important. How else can published computer generated results be reproducible? Feel free to disagree, but I feel strongly this is a point not sufficiently appreciated by software engineers in this field and often entirely ignored by service providers (e.g. the “*we have chosen the best parameter settings for you and feel you do not need to even know what they are*” approach for the **EBI MSA** options).

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	AAB07733	5	---HSGVNQLGGVFVNGRPLPDS--TRQKIVELAHSGARPCDISRILQSHADAKVPVLDSONVSNCGVSKILG---RYY	75
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	XP_014853331	29	DEGHSGVNQLGGVFVNGRPLPDS--TRQKIVELAHSGARPCDISRILQTHDE--VQVLDSEKVSNGCVSKILG---RYY	100
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	XP_015229805	29	DEGHSGVNQLGGVFVNGRPLPDS--TRQKIVELAHSGARPCDISRILQTHDE--VQVLDSEKVSNGCVSKILG---RYY	100
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	XP_015193792	5	---HSGVNQLGGVFVNGRPLPDS--TRQKIVELAHSGARPCDISRILQTHADAKVQVLDNONVSNCGVSKILG---RYY	75
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	XP_012546782	30	G--HSGVNQLGGVFVNGRPLPDS--TRQKIVELAHSGARPCDISRILQ-----VSNGCVSKILG---RYY	87
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	XP_003376863	44	-LGHTGVNQLGGVFVNGRPLPDS--TRQKIIELAHQGARPCDISRILQ-----VSNGCVSKILC---RYY	102
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	XP_015364286	72	G--HSGVNQLGGVFVNGRPLPDS--TRQKIVELAHSGARPCDISRILQ-----VSNGCVSKILG---RYY	129
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	XP_018423443	5	---HSGVNQLGGVFVNGRPLPDS--TRQKIVELAHSGARPCDISRILQSHADAKVQVLDSONVSNCGVSKILG---RYY	75
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CAJ40659	42	---HSGVNQLGGVFVNGRPLPDS--TRQKIVELAHSGARPCDISRILQ-----VSNGCVSKILG---RYY	98
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CAC80515	5	---HSGVNQLGGVFVNGRPLPDS--TRQKIVELAHSGARPCDISRILQTHADAKVQVLDNONVSNCGVSKILG---RYY	75
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	XP_015364293	53	G--HSGVNQLGGVFVNGRPLPDS--TRQKIVELAHSGARPCDISRILQ-----VSNGCVSKILG---RYY	110
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	XP_003777840	5	---HSGVNQLGGVFVNGRPLPDS--TRQKIVELAHSGARPCDISRILQTHADAKVQVLDNONVSNCGVSKILG---RYY	75
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CEH19759	6	---HSGINQLGGVYVNGRPLPDS--TRQKIVELAHSGARPCDISRILQ-----VSNGCVSKILG---RYY	62
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	ACD88758	5	G--HSGVNQLGGVYVNGRPLPDS--TRQKIVELAHSGARPCDISRILQ-----VSNGCVSKILG---RYY	62
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	XP_014969997	5	---HSGVNQLGGVFVNGRPLPDS--TRQKIVELAHSGARPCDISRILQTHADAKVQVLDNONVSNCGVSKILG---RYY	75
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	XP_016844277	33	---HSGVNQLGGVYVNGRPLPDS--TRQKIVELAHSGARPCDISRILQ-----VSNGCVSKILG---RYY	89
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	XP_003246860	72	G--HSGVNQLGGVFVNGRPLPDS--TRQKIVELAHSGARPCDISRILQ-----VSNGCVSKILG---RYY	129
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	AAB40616	10	PNGHSGVNQLGGVFVNGRPLPDS--TRQKIVELAHSGARPCDISRILQ-----VSNGCVSKILG---RYY	69
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	XP_011722290	5	---HSGVNQLGGVFVNGRPLPDS--TRQKIVELAHSGARPCDISRILQTHADAKVQVLDNONVSNCGVSKILG---RYY	75
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	CBX88047	5	---HSGVNQLGGVFVNGRPLPDT--TRQKIVELAHSGARPCDISRILQ-----VSNGCVSKILG---RYY	61
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	XP_015289635	5	---HSGVNQLGGVFVNGRPLPDS--TRQKIVELAHSGARPCDISRILQTHADAKVQVLDNONVSNCGVSKILG---RYY	75
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	XP_003246859	53	G--HSGVNQLGGVFVNGRPLPDS--TRQKIVELAHSGARPCDISRILQ-----VSNGCVSKILG---RYY	110

Move past the long list of aligned proteins (the easiest way is to hide the **Descriptions** view).

At the top of the actual alignment, set **View Format to Plain Text** (.... and then hide the **Descriptions** again??), this being the easiest format to understand in a hurry. This might take a while also. I am not sure why? Be patient, it will get therein the end. The alignment will have very ragged ends, but the important region of **120** or so amino acids representing the **PAX** domain is really quite impressive. In particular, the **isoform 5a** insertion is very convincing.

THE END

DPJ – 2017.10.24

Model Answers to Questions in the Instructions Text.

Notes:

For the most part, these “**Model Answers**” just provide the reactions/solutions I hoped you would work out for yourselves. However, sometime I have tried to offer a bit more background and material for thought? Occasionally, I have rambled off into some rather self indulgent investigations that even I would not want to try and justify as pertinent to the objective of these exercises. I like to keep these meanders, as they help and entertain me, but I wish to warn you to only take regard of them if you are feeling particularly strong and have time to burn. Certainly not a good idea to indulge here during a time constrained course event!

Where things have got extreme, I am going to make two versions of the answer. One starting:

Summary:

Which has the answer with only a reasonably digestible volume of deep thought. Read this one.

The other will start:

Full Answer:

Beware of entering here! I do not hold back. Nothing complicated, but it will be long and full of pedantry.

This makes the Model answers section very big. **BUT**, it is not intended for printing or for reading serially, so I submit, being long and wordy does not matter. Feel free to disagree.

From your investigations of Searching for sequence similarities in databasesWhen would **Mask lower case letters** be a useful thing to do?

Generally, whenever one might suspect the automatic masking algorithms of **blast** might miss a non informative region in a specific query sequence, obviously.

A specific example might be when a query sequence contained a significant informative region that was known to be common amongst the sequences being searched. If this region was left unmasked, **blast** would pick up so many similar matches to this one region that other interesting similarities might be obscured. By manually masking such a region by changing it to lower case, its matches would not be seen by **blast** and matches with other regions of the query sequence should be more apparent.

Which parameters would **blast** need to **automatically adjust** to cater for short input sequences (such as primers being tested for uniqueness), and why?

The **word size**: Clearly, if you are trying to find matches for a primer (for example) of around **20** base pairs, it would be pretty silly to use a **word size** of **28** (default for **megablast**). A **word** the same size as the primer would find only exact matches. A **word** of about **7** would allow a couple of mismatches and would probably be most generally appropriate.

The **expect score**: As good chance matches between between a short query sequence and a large database will be abundant, it would not be sensible to choose a demanding (i.e. small) **expect score** to represent the limit of significance. In particular, a primer sized query sequence of around **20** base pairs might easily exactly match more than **10** times (generally the default maximum expect score for a significant match) just by chance. After all, there are only **4** bases, a string of **20** is not that long and the databases can be huge! Typically **blast** chooses very high **expect score** cut off for short query sequences, effectively removing the **expect score** filter altogether.

Earlier versions of **blast** did not automatically adjust these parameters. When a short query sequences were selected, suitable adjustment was left to the user. Without sensible parameter adjustment, results could be greatly confusing. For example, a **21** base pair primer could easily match perfectly more than **10** times against a large DNA sequence database. **blast** is set to ignore matches that are expected to occur more than **10** times by chance. Thus even exact matches with such a small sequences would be ignored! Now automatic parameter adjustment is undertaken by **blast**, the user does not really have to think too hard. However, it does seem to be a good idea to know what **blast** is doing and why.

Why do you suppose that a few of the exons of the first 11 matches do not achieve the maximum score?


Summary:

Each local region of significant alignment between a database entry and a query sequence is scored independently. The scoring method that governs the alignment score colour in this graphic, reflects both the quality of the match **and** its length. Unless a particular region is of sufficient length, it cannot achieve the **200 bit** threshold even if the alignment is perfect. Note that it is the shorter regions that fail to reach the **>=200** status. All of the illustrated local alignments associated with **PAX6** transcripts are essentially perfect.

Full Answer:

In common with most database searching programs, **blast** compares query sequences with database entries using a local strategy. The overall evaluation of a particular query sequence is taken to be the highest local score.

Individual local matches are coloured according to individual quality. In this query, all true matches should be perfect, or very nearly so. Scores might therefore be expected to be maximal (**>=200**). However, they are not? Some only score in the range **80-200**.



The score referenced for this purpose is the **bit score**. For a full, no holds barred definition of this score, try [here](#). I prefer this somewhat gentler version:

“The **bit score** gives an indication of how good the alignment is; the higher the score, the better the alignment. In general terms, this score is calculated from a formula that takes into account the alignment of similar or identical residues, as well as any gaps introduced to align the sequences. A key element in this calculation is the “substitution matrix”, which assigns a score for aligning any possible pair of residues. The **BLOSUM62** matrix is the default for most **BLAST** programs, the exceptions being **blastn** and **MegaBLAST** (programs that perform **nucleotide–nucleotide** comparisons and hence do not use protein-specific matrices). Bit scores are normalized, which means that the bit scores from different alignments can be compared, even if different scoring matrices have been used.”

Still too scary? The important things to note are that:

- These scores are based on a simple DNA scoring matrix (1 for a match, -2 for a mismatch by default for **megablast**), plus penalties for gaps. So scores will be limited by the length of the alignment, ignoring gaps.
- The scores reflect penalties for **indels** (insertions or deletions).
- The scores are normalised so that they do not depend on the chosen scoring matrix. This allows bits scores from searches using different scoring matrices to be compared.

Both the scoring matrix dependant **raw scores** and the **bit scores** reflect both the length of an alignment and its quality. **blast** presents the local high scoring regions it discovers ranked by **bit score**. In general, this corresponds to length order. However, a shorter high quality alignment can occasionally outscore a longer less perfect alignment (as illustrated).

To obtain this illustration I had to use the more sensitive **blastn** algorithm to find more distant alignments (**megablast** is only going to notice really obvious matches) and remove the organism filter to insure that there were less obvious matches to find (all significant matches between any part of the human genome and any human mRNA will be too uniformly near exact).

Range 8: 1216 to 1367 GenBank Graphics					
Score	Expect	Identities	Gaps	Strand	
197 bits(218)	5e-45	135/152(89%)	0/152(0%)	Plus/Plus	
Query 24858	CAGGTATGGTTTTCTAATCGAAGGGCCAAATGGAGAGAGAGAAAACTGAGGAATCAG	24917			
Sbjct 1216	CAGGTGTGGTTTTCTAATCGAAGGGCCAAATGGAGAGAGAGAGAGCTGCGGAACACAG	1275			
Query 24918	AGAAGACAGGCCAGCAACACACCTAGTCATATTCCTATCAGCAGTAGTTTCAGCACCAGT	24977			
Sbjct 1276	AGGAGACAGGCCAGCAACACACCTAGTCATATTCCTATCAGCAGTAGTTTCAGCACCAGC	1335			
Query 24978	GTCTACCAACCAATTCCCAACCCACCAACCC	25009			
Sbjct 1336	GTCTACCAACCAATTCCCAACCCACCAACCC	1367			

Range 9: 140 to 327 GenBank Graphics					
Score	Expect	Identities	Gaps	Strand	
185 bits(204)	3e-41	156/191(82%)	3/191(1%)	Plus/Plus	
Query 7646	AGGAATCTGAGAATTGCTCTACACACCAACCCAGCAACATCCGTTGGAGAAAACTCTCAC	7785			
Sbjct 140	AGGGAATCTGAGCAGCGCTCGACACACCAACCCAGCAGCTCCGCGGAGAAAACTCTCGC	199			
Query 7786	CAGCAACTCTTTAAACACCGTCATTTCAAACCAATTGGGCTTCAAGCAACCAACAGCA	7765			
Sbjct 208	CAGCAACTCTCTAAAGCAGCGCTTTTCAACCCCTGGTGGGCTTCAAGAGCAACAGCG	259			
Query 7766	GCACAAAAACCCCAACCAACCAAACTCTTGACAGAGAGCTGTGACAAACAGAAAGGATG	7825			
Sbjct 260	GCCAGAGAAACCCCAACCAACCAAACTCTTGACAGAGAGCTGTG---CCAGGGGAGGATG	316			
Query 7826	CCTCATAAAGG	7836			
Sbjct 317	CCTCATAAAGG	327			

Range 10: 1369 to 1485 GenBank Graphics					
Score	Expect	Identities	Gaps	Strand	
170 bits(188)	6e-37	108/117(92%)	0/117(0%)	Plus/Plus	
Query 25109	GTTCCTCTCTTACATCTGGCTCATGTTGGGCGAAGACAGACAGCCCTCACAACACC	25168			
Sbjct 1369	GTGTCCTCTCTTACCTCTGGGCTCATGTTGGGCGAAGACAGACAGCCCTCAGGAATCC	1428			
Query 25169	TACAGCGCTCTGGCGCTATGCGCAGCTTCAACATGGCAATAACCTGCCTATGCAA	25225			
Sbjct 1429	TACAGCGCTCTGGCGCTATGCGCAGCTTCAACATGGCAATAACCTGCCTATGCAA	1485			

You can see evidence of what is occurring in the alignments further down your results. Here is illustrated one of the **80-200** exons that occur in all transcripts at position **24,547**. The match is perfect, but the length of the exon is consistently just too short to get to the heady **>=200** level. To make this illustration represent alignments from a particular region, I set **Sort by:** (top of the alignments) to **Query start position**. If you look back at the **blast** graphic, you should be able to easily spot the region of these aligned regions including the one that is **80-200**.

Note how imperfectly **blast** finds exon/intron boundaries. If the start of an intron happens to match the start of the next exon, **blast** will include the bases in two alignments¹⁰. It is not looking for exons and introns as was **spline**, it just mindlessly seeks matches.

Range 6: 840 to 1000 GenBank Graphics					
Score	Expect	Identities	Gaps	Strand	
291 bits(322)	3e-75	161/161(100%)	0/161(0%)	Plus/Plus	
Query 23873	AGATGGCTGCCAGCAACAGGAAGGGGGAGAGAATACCAACTCCATCAGTTTCAACGG				23932
Sbjct 840	AGATGGCTGCCAGCAACAGGAAGGGGGAGAGAATACCAACTCCATCAGTTTCAACGG				899
Query 23933	AGAAGATTGAGAGGCTCAAATGCGACTTCAGCTGAAGCGGAAGCTGCAAGAAATAG				23992
Sbjct 900	AGAAGATTGAGAGGCTCAAATGCGACTTCAGCTGAAGCGGAAGCTGCAAGAAATAG				959
Query 23993	AACATCCTTTACCAAGAGCAAAATTGAGGCCCTGGAGAAAG		24033		
Sbjct 960	AACATCCTTTACCAAGAGCAAAATTGAGGCCCTGGAGAAAG		1000		

Range 7: 999 to 1086 GenBank Graphics					
Score	Expect	Identities	Gaps	Strand	
159 bits(176)	1e-35	88/88(100%)	0/88(0%)	Plus/Plus	
Query 24547	AGAGTTTGAGAGAACCCATTATCCAGATGTGTTTGCCTCCGAGAAAGCTAGCAGCCAAAT				24606
Sbjct 999	AGAGTTTGAGAGAACCCATTATCCAGATGTGTTTGCCTCCGAGAAAGCTAGCAGCCAAAT				1058
Query 24607	AGATCTACCTGAAGCAAGAAATACAGGTA		24634		
Sbjct 1059	AGATCTACCTGAAGCAAGAAATACAGGTA		1086		

Range 8: 1081 to 1234 GenBank Graphics					
Score	Expect	Identities	Gaps	Strand	
279 bits(308)	2e-71	154/154(100%)	0/154(0%)	Plus/Plus	
Query 24858	CAGGTATGGTTTCTTAATCGAAGGGCCAAATGGAGAAGAGAAAGAACTGAGGAATCAG				24917
Sbjct 1081	CAGGTATGGTTTCTTAATCGAAGGGCCAAATGGAGAAGAGAAAGAACTGAGGAATCAG				1140
Query 24918	AGAAGACAGGCGAGCAACACCTAGTCATATTCCTATCAGCAGTAGTTTCAGCACCAGT				24977
Sbjct 1141	AGAAGACAGGCGAGCAACACCTAGTCATATTCCTATCAGCAGTAGTTTCAGCACCAGT				1200
Query 24978	GTCTACCAACCAATTCCACAACCCACACACCGG		25011		
Sbjct 1201	GTCTACCAACCAATTCCACAACCCACACACCGG		1234		

Query	15946	CCCGAATTCTGCAG	15959
Sbjct	404	CCCGAATTCTGCAG	417

Range 3: 416 to 461 GenBank Graphics						▼ Next Match	▲ Previous Match	⬇ First Match
Score	Expect	Identities	Gaps	Strand				
84.2 bits(92)	9e-13	46/46(100%)	0/46(0%)	Plus/Plus				
Query	16749	AGACCCATGCGAGATGCAAAAGTCCAAGTGTGGACAATCAAAACGT	16794					
Sbjct	416	AGACCCATGCGAGATGCAAAAGTCCAAGTGTGGACAATCAAAACGT	461					


Range 4: 460 to 677 GenBank Graphics						▼ Next Match	▲ Previous Match	⬇ First Match
Score	Expect	Identities	Gaps	Strand				
394 bits(436)	4e-106	218/218(100%)	0/218(0%)	Plus/Plus				
Query	16887	GTGTCCAACGGATGTGTGAGTAAAACTTGGGACAGGTATTACGAGACTGGCTCATCAGA	16946					
Sbjct	460	GTGTCCAACGGATGTGTGAGTAAAACTTGGGACAGGTATTACGAGACTGGCTCATCAGA	519					

For a further example, look at the exon that is found only in the **isoform 5a** transcripts. It is tiny (**42** base pairs) and scores well below **>=200** even though it is a perfect match.

Note that the alignment is **46** base pairs long due to **blast** adding on two bases either side that are actually the highly conserved intron start and end base pairs. As you can see, these extra base pairs occur in the preceding and succeeding alignment also.

Explain why one exon in the reasonably consistent region, does not appear in all of the transcript matches?

Well I refer to the **isoform 5a** exon, of course. The tiny inconsistent one about **9** exons in from the right (when it exists). This will, clearly, only occur in **isoform 5a** transcripts.



¹⁰ 2 base pairs (Sbjct: 999-1000, AG) occur in both the first two matches illustrated. 6 base pairs are shared between the 2nd and 3rd matches (Sbjct: 1081-1086, CAGGTA).

Which of the Refseq PAX6 transcripts corresponds to isoform 5a?

Summary:

As I am sure you are tired of noting by now, all the transcripts with the extra tiny exon around position **16,750** in the genomic sequence are **isoform 5a** transcripts. See the illustration for the previous answer.

Full Answer:

The **isoform 5a** transcripts can be spotted most easily from the graphic. They are the ones with the extra small exon slightly to the left of middle (around base position **16,750**). For example, the **first, second** and **third blast** matches displayed. If you hover over all the full length matches with your mouse, you will see that they are **transcript variants 11, 10, 8, 7, 6, 5, 4, 2, 1, 3** and **9** (in the vertical order of the graphic).

Stated with the unequalled poetry of **RefSeq Accession Code** and lyrical **Title** Line, the list of those with the extra exon becomes:

<u>TITLE</u>	<u>ACCESSION CODE</u>
Homo sapiens paired box 6 (PAX6), transcript variant 11, mRNA	NM_001310161.1
Homo sapiens paired box 6 (PAX6), transcript variant 10, mRNA	NM_001310160.1
Homo sapiens paired box 6 (PAX6), transcript variant 8, mRNA	NM_001310158.1
Homo sapiens paired box 6 (PAX6), transcript variant 5, mRNA	NM_001258463.1
Homo sapiens paired box 6 (PAX6), transcript variant 4, mRNA	NM_001258462.1
Homo sapiens paired box 6 (PAX6), transcript variant 2, mRNA	NM_001604.5

Yes well, that was fun? The message of the question was to ensure you could see how to spot the **isoform 5a** transcripts (again!), not to list them! But, never mind, doing so was in fine tune with the ennui of the moment.

What are the **9** strongest matches around base position **16,750**?

Summary:

Matches between the regions of the **PAX6** genomic region encoding the **PAX6 Paired Box** domain and **SwissProt** protein sequences representing human proteins including a **Paired Box** domain.

Why would you expect exactly **9** matches around this point?

Summary:

Because that is how many human proteins including a **Paired Box** domain are suggested to exist according to **Interpro** (as shown in a previous Practical). There is **PAX6** plus its **8** paralogues, imaginatively all named:

PAX1, PAX2, PAX3, PAX4, PAX5, PAX6, PAX7, PAX8 & PAX9

What do you make of the plethora of matches around **24,000**?

Summary:

These are matches between the regions of the **PAX6** genomic region encoding the **PAX6 Homeobox** domain and **SwissProt** protein sequences representing human proteins including a **Homeobox** domain. As you discovered earlier from **Interpro**, there are lots of such proteins.

The thin line joining features implies that those features relate to the same database entry. Notice that **4** of the **9** proteins including a **Paired box** domain near the beginning, also include a **Homeobox** domain further along. This is exactly as was suggested by the **SMART** annotation you examined earlier.

Full Answer:

Well, a couple of graphics to reinforce what has already been claimed and make life more precise and colourful.

First, recall from **UniProtKB** the positions of the two domains in **PAX6**

Feature key	Position(s)	Description	Actions	Graphical view	Length
Domain ¹	4 – 130	Paired PROSITE-ProRule annotation			127

Feature key	Position(s)	Description	Actions	Graphical view	Length
DNA binding ¹	210 – 260	Homeobox PROSITE-ProRule annotation			51

Next, order the **blastx** alignments by **Subject start position**.

Then see, from the first of the **blastx** alignments, it is the first **2** and a bit aligned regions that correspond to the **Paired Box** coding region.

The next **3** matching sections cover the whole of the **HomeoBox** coding region (with a fair overlap each side)

The final **2** matching sections are not involved in either domain.

Sequence ID: [P26367.2](#) Length: 422 Number of Matches: 8

Range 1: 5 to 48

[GenPept](#) [Graphics](#)

▼ Next Match ▲ Previous Match

Score	Expect	Method	Identities	Positives	Gaps	Frame
95.9 bits(237)	2e-19	Compositional matrix adjust.	44/44(100%)	44/44(100%)	0/44(0%)	+3
Query	15831	HSGVNQLGGVFNVRPLPDSTRQKIVELAHSGARPCDISRIQLV	15962			
		HSGVNQLGGVFNVRPLPDSTRQKIVELAHSGARPCDISRIQLV				
Score	Expect	Method	Identities	Positives	Gaps	Frame
160 bits(406)	3e-41	Compositional matrix adjust.	76/78(97%)	78/78(100%)	0/78(0%)	+3
Query	16881	MQVSMGCVSKILGRYYETGSRPRAIGGSKPRVATPEVSKIAQYKRECPISFAWEIRDR	17068			
		+QVSMGCVSKILGRYYETGSRPRAIGGSKPRVATPEVSKIAQYKRECPISFAWEIRDR				
Score	Expect	Method	Identities	Positives	Gaps	Frame
160 bits(406)	3e-41	Compositional matrix adjust.	76/78(97%)	78/78(100%)	0/78(0%)	+3
Query	17061	LLSEGVCTNDNIPSVSSL 17114				
		LLSEGVCTNDNIPSVSS+ 123				
Score	Expect	Method	Identities	Positives	Gaps	Frame
117 bits(294)	9e-27	Compositional matrix adjust.	56/59(95%)	56/59(94%)	0/59(0%)	+2
Query	17887	VSSINRVLRLNLASEQKQMGADGMYDKLRLNLGOTGSMGTRPGWYPGTSPVGQPTQGTQ	17983			
		VSSINRVLRLNLASEQKQMGADGMYDKLRLNLGOTGSMGTRPGWYPGTSPVGQPTQGTQ	0			
Score	Expect	Method	Identities	Positives	Gaps	Frame
117 bits(294)	9e-27	Compositional matrix adjust.	56/59(95%)	56/59(94%)	0/59(0%)	+2
Query	17887	VSSINRVLRLNLASEQKQMGADGMYDKLRLNLGOTGSMGTRPGWYPGTSPVGQPTQGTQ	17983			
		VSSINRVLRLNLASEQKQMGADGMYDKLRLNLGOTGSMGTRPGWYPGTSPVGQPTQGTQ	178			

Range 2: 46 to 123

[GenPept](#) [Graphics](#)

▼ Next Match ▲ Previous Match ▲ First Match

Score	Expect	Method	Identities	Positives	Gaps	Frame
160 bits(406)	3e-41	Compositional matrix adjust.	76/78(97%)	78/78(100%)	0/78(0%)	+3
Query	16881	MQVSMGCVSKILGRYYETGSRPRAIGGSKPRVATPEVSKIAQYKRECPISFAWEIRDR	17068			
		+QVSMGCVSKILGRYYETGSRPRAIGGSKPRVATPEVSKIAQYKRECPISFAWEIRDR				
Score	Expect	Method	Identities	Positives	Gaps	Frame
160 bits(406)	3e-41	Compositional matrix adjust.	76/78(97%)	78/78(100%)	0/78(0%)	+3
Query	17061	LLSEGVCTNDNIPSVSSL 17114				
		LLSEGVCTNDNIPSVSS+ 123				
Score	Expect	Method	Identities	Positives	Gaps	Frame
117 bits(294)	9e-27	Compositional matrix adjust.	56/59(95%)	56/59(94%)	0/59(0%)	+2
Query	17887	VSSINRVLRLNLASEQKQMGADGMYDKLRLNLGOTGSMGTRPGWYPGTSPVGQPTQGTQ	17983			
		VSSINRVLRLNLASEQKQMGADGMYDKLRLNLGOTGSMGTRPGWYPGTSPVGQPTQGTQ	0			
Score	Expect	Method	Identities	Positives	Gaps	Frame
117 bits(294)	9e-27	Compositional matrix adjust.	56/59(95%)	56/59(94%)	0/59(0%)	+2
Query	17887	VSSINRVLRLNLASEQKQMGADGMYDKLRLNLGOTGSMGTRPGWYPGTSPVGQPTQGTQ	17983			
		VSSINRVLRLNLASEQKQMGADGMYDKLRLNLGOTGSMGTRPGWYPGTSPVGQPTQGTQ	178			

Range 3: 120 to 178

[GenPept](#) [Graphics](#)

▼ Next Match ▲ Previous Match ▲ First Match

Score	Expect	Method	Identities	Positives	Gaps	Frame
117 bits(294)	9e-27	Compositional matrix adjust.	56/59(95%)	56/59(94%)	0/59(0%)	+2
Query	17887	VSSINRVLRLNLASEQKQMGADGMYDKLRLNLGOTGSMGTRPGWYPGTSPVGQPTQGTQ	17983			
		VSSINRVLRLNLASEQKQMGADGMYDKLRLNLGOTGSMGTRPGWYPGTSPVGQPTQGTQ	0			
Score	Expect	Method	Identities	Positives	Gaps	Frame
117 bits(294)	9e-27	Compositional matrix adjust.	56/59(95%)	56/59(94%)	0/59(0%)	+2
Query	17887	VSSINRVLRLNLASEQKQMGADGMYDKLRLNLGOTGSMGTRPGWYPGTSPVGQPTQGTQ	17983			
		VSSINRVLRLNLASEQKQMGADGMYDKLRLNLGOTGSMGTRPGWYPGTSPVGQPTQGTQ	178			

Range 4: 162 to 227

[GenPept](#) [Graphics](#)

▼ Next Match ▲ Previous Match ▲ First Match

Score	Expect	Method	Identities	Positives	Gaps	Frame
85.9 bits(211)	3e-16	Compositional matrix adjust.	56/66(85%)	58/66(87%)	5/66(7%)	+3
Query	23850	YHPLFVFP----DGCQQQEGGGENTNTSSNGEDSDEAQMRLQLKRLQNRNRTSFTQEQ	24014			
		++P VP DGCQQQEGGGENTNTSSNGEDSDEAQMRLQLKRLQNRNRTSFTQEQ				
Score	Expect	Method	Identities <td>Positives</td> <td>Gaps</td> <td>Frame</td>	Positives	Gaps	Frame
85.9 bits(211)	3e-16	Compositional matrix adjust.	56/66(85%)	58/66(87%)	5/66(7%)	+3
Query	24015	IEALEK 24832				
		IEALEK 24832				
Score	Expect	Method	Identities	Positives	Gaps	Frame
85.9 bits(211)	3e-16	Compositional matrix adjust.	56/66(85%)	58/66(87%)	5/66(7%)	+3
Query	24015	IEALEK 24832				
		IEALEK 24832				

Range 5: 227 to 256

[GenPept](#) [Graphics](#)

▼ Next Match ▲ Previous Match ▲ First Match

Score	Expect	Method	Identities	Positives	Gaps	Frame
67.4 bits(163)	2e-10	Compositional matrix adjust.	29/30(97%)	29/30(96%)	0/30(0%)	+2
Query	24545	SEFERTHYPOVFARERLAAKIDLPEARIV	24634			
		EFERTHYPOVFARERLAAKIDLPEARIV				
Score	Expect	Method	Identities	Positives	Gaps	Frame
67.4 bits(163)	2e-10	Compositional matrix adjust.	29/30(97%)	29/30(96%)	0/30(0%)	+2
Query	24545	SEFERTHYPOVFARERLAAKIDLPEARIV	24634			
		EFERTHYPOVFARERLAAKIDLPEARIV				

Range 6: 254 to 305

[GenPept](#) [Graphics](#)

▼ Next Match ▲ Previous Match ▲ First Match

Score	Expect	Method	Identities	Positives	Gaps	Frame
81.3 bits(199)	5e-29	Compositional matrix adjust.	51/52(98%)	51/52(98%)	0/52(0%)	+3
Query	24855	FQWFSNRRAKWRREEKLRNQRROASNTpshipissssfstsvYQPIPOPTTP	25010			
		QWFSNRRAKWRREEKLRNQRROASNTPSHITSSSFSSTSVYQPIPOPTTP				
Score	Expect	Method	Identities	Positives	Gaps	Frame
81.3 bits(199)	5e-29	Compositional matrix adjust.	51/52(98%)	51/52(98%)	0/52(0%)	+3
Query	24855	FQWFSNRRAKWRREEKLRNQRROASNTpshipissssfstsvYQPIPOPTTP	25010			
		QWFSNRRAKWRREEKLRNQRROASNTPSHITSSSFSSTSVYQPIPOPTTP				

Range 7: 312 to 344

[GenPept](#) [Graphics](#)

▼ Next Match ▲ Previous Match ▲ First Match

Score	Expect	Method	Identities	Positives	Gaps	Frame
70.5 bits(171)	5e-29	Compositional matrix adjust.	33/33(100%)	33/33(100%)	0/33(0%)	+2
Query	25127	GSMLGRDTALTNTYSALPPMPFSFTMANNLPMQ	25225			
		GSMLGRDTALTNTYSALPPMPFSFTMANNLPMQ				
Score	Expect	Method	Identities	Positives	Gaps	Frame
70.5 bits(171)	5e-29	Compositional matrix adjust.	33/33(100%)	33/33(100%)	0/33(0%)	+2
Query	25127	GSMLGRDTALTNTYSALPPMPFSFTMANNLPMQ	25225			
		GSMLGRDTALTNTYSALPPMPFSFTMANNLPMQ				


Range 8: 356 to 407

[GenPept](#) [Graphics](#)

▼ Next Match ▲ Previous Match ▲ First Match

Score	Expect	Method	Identities	Positives	Gaps	Frame
88.2 bits(217)	5e-17	Compositional matrix adjust.	43/54(80%)	47/54(87%)	2/54(3%)	+2
Query	27836	CMPLTPSPVNGRSYDITYTPPHMOTHMNSOPMGTSGLTSGEPLLSAGCTEATSL	27997			
		CMPLTPSPVNGRSYDITYTPPHMOTHMNSOPMGTSGLTSG L+5 G + + +				
Score	Expect	Method	Identities	Positives	Gaps	Frame
88.2 bits(217)	5e-17	Compositional matrix adjust.	43/54(80%)	47/54(87%)	2/54(3%)	+2
Query	27836	CMPLTPSPVNGRSYDITYTPPHMOTHMNSOPMGTSGLTSG L+5 G + + +	27997			
		CMPLTPSPVNGRSYDITYTPPHMOTHMNSOPMGTSGLTSG -LTS5PVPVQV				

With this understanding, one can decorate the **blastx** graphic in a fashion that makes the entirely obvious even **MORE** apparent than it was in the first place?



Well, I think it is a nice picture anyway.

Why do you suppose the Paired box matches precede the Homeobox matches?

Because they score more highly and so, in the opinion of **blast**, are more worthy. Primarily, they score more highly because they are longer. The list is ranked by **E Value**. Good matches with long sequence are less likely to occur by chance than equally good matches with shorter sequences.

Possibly a more interesting question¹¹ might have been: “Why are not all the hits which include both domains at the top of the list?”. Surely they should be, as they match over a longer proportion of the query sequence and so must, in general at least, be of the greatest significance.

They do not always come at the top of the list because **blast** scores each matching region individually and uses the ranking scores associated with the single region with the highest **E Value** to evaluate the similarity of the entire database entry with the query. This has to be a dubious practice surely? But, it appears to work, so why complain.

Description	Max score	Total score	Query cover	E value	Ident	Accession
RecName: Full=Paired box protein Pax-6; AltName: Full=Aniridia type II protein; AltName: Full=Oculorhombin	160	767	3%	3e-41	97%	P26367.2

To justify this last assertion, Look at your top hit.

E Val = 3e-41, Max score = 160, Total score 767 associated with the whole of **P26367.2**

Now look at the first few individual regional alignments for this hit.

RecName: Full=Paired box protein Pax-6; AltName: Full=Aniridia type II protein; AltName: Full=Oculorhombin

Sequence ID: [P26367.2](#) Length: 422 Number of Matches: 8

Range 1: 46 to 123 [GenPept](#) [Graphics](#) ▼ Next Match ▲ Previous Match

Score	Expect	Method	Identities	Positives	Gaps	Frame
160 bits(406)	3e-41	Compositional matrix adjust.	76/78(97%)	78/78(100%)	0/78(0%)	+3
Query 16881	MOVSNCGVSKILGRYYETGSIRPRAIGGSKPRVATPEVVS KIAQYKRECPSIFAW EIRDR 17060					
Sbjct 46	+QVSNCGVSKILGRYYETGSIRPRAIGGSKPRVATPEVVS KIAQYKRECPSIFAW EIRDR 105					
Query 17061	LLSEGVCTNDNIPSVSSL 17114					
Sbjct 106	LLSEGVCTNDNIPSVSS+ 123					

Range 2: 254 to 305 [GenPept](#) [Graphics](#) ▼ Next Match ▲ Previous Match ▲ First Match

Score	Expect	Method	Identities	Positives	Gaps	Frame
81.3 bits(199)	5e-29	Compositional matrix adjust.	51/52(98%)	51/52(98%)	0/52(0%)	+3
Query 24855	FQVWFSNRRRAKWRREEKLRNQRROASNTPSHIPISSSFSTSVYQIPQPTTP 25010					
Sbjct 254	IQVWFSNRRRAKWRREEKLRNQRROASNTPSHIPISSSFSTSVYQIPQPTTP 305					

Range 3: 312 to 344 [GenPept](#) [Graphics](#) ▼ Next Match ▲ Previous Match ▲ First Match

Score	Expect	Method	Identities	Positives	Gaps	Frame
70.5 bits(171)	5e-29	Compositional matrix adjust.	33/33(100%)	33/33(100%)	0/33(0%)	+2
Query 25127	GSMLGRDTDALTNTYSALPPMPSTMANNLPMQ 25225					
Sbjct 312	GSMLGRDTDALTNTYSALPPMPSTMANNLPMQ 344					

As you can see, the **E Value** and **Max score** values used to evaluate the whole protein were computed from just the best (ranked by **E Value**) local alignment! Crude, but never mind.

The **Total score** for the entire protein is the sum (rounded up to the nearest integer) of all the bit scores for all **8** local alignments computed for this protein (I suggest you just trust me on this assertion).

¹¹ That I did not ask, because I only just thought of it.

How do you suppose the **Max matches in a query range** parameter might be of value if this order was reversed?

If **Paired boxes** had been more prolific, then the number of **Paired box** matches might have filled the **blast** hit list before the highest scoring **Homeo box** hit was registered.

If **Homeo boxes** were longer, and so justified a better **E value**, then the number of **Homeo box** matches might have filled the **blast** hit list before the highest scoring **Paired box** hit was registered.

Either of these situations would be very unfortunate, but easily avoided by setting the **Max matches in a query range** parameter to something sensible (**50** say). This would ensure that only the top **50** items in the **blast** hit list would be dominated by the strongest hit.

UNFORTUNATELY ... although that is the intention of this parameter, it currently simply will not work, except in very particular circumstances, because of the way it is implemented. This is a great pity, because it is a very good idea, in principle.

I will spare you the details as, despite energetic debate, the **NCBI** people appear to have no intention of changing things, although they do appear to accept my arguments? Or maybe they just humour me?

How does this “non-informative” region match expectations suggested by **SMART** and the **Feature table** of **UniprotKB** for **PAX6_HUMAN**?

blast identifies two non-informative regions. I only discussed the prettiest one above. The region discussed is comprised largely of **Serines**, **Prolines**, **Threonines** & **Isoleucines** the **15** residues between **294-308**.

Score	Expect	Method	Identities	Positives	Gaps	Frame
81.3 bits(199)	5e-29	Compositional matrix adjust.	51/52(98%)	51/52(98%)	0/52(0%)	+3
Query 24855	FQVWFSNNRAKWRREEKLRNRRQASNTpshiplsssfstSVYQPIPOPTTP 25010					
Sbjct 254	QVWFSNNRAKWRREEKLRNRRQASNTPSHIPISSSFSSTSVYQPIPOPTTP 305					

The second (to be found much further down your **blast Alignments** output) is comprised entirely of **Arginines**, **Luecines** and **Lysines** and **Glutamines**, the **10** residues between **203 - 212**.

Score	Expect	Method	Identities	Positives	Gaps	Frame
85.9 bits(211)	3e-16	Compositional matrix adjust.	56/66(85%)	58/66(87%)	5/66(7%)	+3
Query 23850	YHPILFVP----DGCQQQEGGGENTNMISSNGEDSDEAQMrlqlkrklqNRTSFTQEQ 24014					
Sbjct 162	WYPGTSVPGQPTQDGCQQQEGGGENTNMISSNGEDSDEAQMRLQLKRKLQRNRTSFTQEQ 221					
Query 24015	IEALEK 24032					
Sbjct 222	IEALEK 227					

UniprotKB also suggests there are two **compositionally biased regions**.

Compositional bias	131 – 209	79	Gln/Gly-rich
Compositional bias	279 – 422	144	Pro/Ser/Thr-rich

Well, hardly an exact match, but there is approximate agreement? One would certainly suppose that **blast** is only willing to mask fairly severe cases of **compositional bias**. It is also probable that **blast** has a rather more mechanistic (i.e. non-biological) interpretation of what **computational bias** is?

SMART also predicts the more obvious region of **computational bias**, rather more generally:

“An octapeptide and/or a homeodomain can occur C-terminal to the paired domain, as well as a Pro-Ser-Thr-rich C-terminus”

Not important points in themselves of course, the real message of the exercise is that you can discover so much by either:

Looking things up in databases


or:

Using the simple analytical software tools yourself.

From your investigations of PSI-Blast

What do you suppose the choice of **Pseudocount** might influence?

I clicked with confidences upon the link to the help. It opined as illustrated.

Pseudocount	0	
Pseduocount parameter. If zero is specified, then the parameter is automatically determined through a minimum length description principle (PMID 19088134). A value of 30 is suggested in order to obtain the approximate behavior before the minimum length principle was implemented.		

I suppose the next step is to read **PMID 19088134**? There is most certainly no elucidation amongst the strangle of words offered here?

The article **Abstract** says:

“Position specific score matrices (**PSSMs**) are derived from multiple sequence alignments to aid in the recognition of distant protein sequence relationships. The **PSI-BLAST** protein database search program derives the column scores of its **PSSMs** with the aid of **pseudocounts**, added to the observed amino acid counts in a multiple alignment column. In the absence of theory, the number of **pseudocounts** used has been a completely empirical parameter. This article argues that the minimum description length principle can motivate the choice of this parameter. Specifically, for realistic alignments, the principle supports the practice of using a number of **pseudocounts** essentially independent of alignment size. However, it also implies that more highly conserved columns should use fewer **pseudocounts**, increasing the inter-column contrast of the implied **PSSMs**. A new method for calculating **pseudocounts** that significantly improves **PSI-BLAST**'s; retrieval accuracy is now employed by default.”

The article itself, continues in like vein how about we close our eyes and accept the defaults? I would just wonder why the whole thing does not commence with, at least an attempt, to answer the question in the forefront of my inquiry, which is .. “**WHAT, in the current context, IS a pseudocount?**”. I do not believe it is as tricky as they appear to wish us to believe. I will try again later, when my view of the world is less storm infested.

In the meantime I will take comfort in the claim that:

“A new method for calculating **pseudocounts** that significantly improves **PSI-BLAST**'s; retrieval accuracy is now employed by default.”

Jolly good!

2016.12.04: Aha! **Wikipedia** to the rescues once more. Maybe I will donate again? Wonderful service.

One can forgive the **NCBI** people for not explaining what a **pseudocount** is, as they did not, as I first thought, invent the term. It is an idea/strategy of far wider and general application as **wikipedia** explains.

My interpretation of this article (feel free to disagree/correct) in the current context is:

PSSMs are computed from the amino acid composition of regions of a protein sequence. Their purpose is to identify other protein regions of the same size that might be homologous. If a given amino acid is not represented at all in the region from which the **PSSM** is computed, the probability of any other region including that missing amino acid will be consider to be **0** (i.e. impossible!) even if the rest of the region matches extremely well.

Generally speaking, that would be a nonsense! Solution? Add a tiny bit (a **pseudocount** even) to all amino acid counts that come to **0**. Then “*impossible*” becomes “*extremely unlikely*”, which makes a bit more sense. A trifle more poetry than science here, but I think I follow the logic.

A popular way of implementing pseudocounts is due to **Pierre-Simon Laplace**. A French chap who was pretty famous for having good ideas. His strategy, nattily known as **Laplace's Rule of Succession**, was to add a **psuedocount** of **1** to **ALL** the real counts and so pervert the message of the data uniformly. Nice one **Pierre**.

I am not entirely sure why, but this all reminds me of one of the many dubious culinary practices of my dear mother (when not in the kitchen, an unsurpassed example of the human female condition!). To-whit, when confronted with a spice or condiment with which she was unfamiliar, she would avoid the unacceptable **zero condition** by adding a swift **pseudocount** (sometimes **two**!) into whatever she was brewing at the time. The principle being that of “*just in case*” and the avoidance of the horror filled possibilities of “*missing an exciting new flavour*”.

She used to protect the family from any ill effects by assiduously, testing the **psuedocount** side effects upon its most dispensable member ... the youngest son, say? If he still frisked after a given period, she would let loose the potion upon the rest of the family. Happily, I survive! But repeated **pseudocount** experimentations may well explain much of the condition of what remains.

How might the inclusion of poor quality and duplicated sequences have been minimised?

At the top of your output is recorded some details of the conditions under which your database search was undertaken. This is a very important step towards making your results reproducible. Not sufficient I would opine. Surely the database versions and a complete record of the parameters used by **blast** are required in order to be able to exactly reproduce a search?

Database Name	nr
Description	All non-redundant GenBank CDS translations+PDB+SwissProt+PIR+PRF excluding environmental samples from WGS projects
Program	BLASTP 2.6.1+ ► Citation

But at least the version of **blast** and the databases that were searched are recorded. The collection of databases searched is rather optimistically called “**nr**”, for non-redundant. A bit of an exaggeration I would think. Surely **PDB** and **SwissProt** overlap a trifle? But let us not be too picky, in fact, surely a noble attempt to remove duplication between these databases has been made, understandably, imperfectly.

The collection of databases that is **nr** includes “*All non-redundant **GenBank CDS translations***” (aka **GenPept**) which, like its European broad equivalent **TrEMBL**, includes some pretty dubious sequences.

I would think that if one wanted to maximise quality and minimise duplication, it would be best to pick just one good quality database. **SwissProt** is the obvious choice. **blast**, in general, and **PSI-BLAST** in particular, allows such a selection.

However, today the objective is not refinement!!! Bloat is good! More the merrier! Never mind the quality, just admire the volume.

DPJ – 2017.10.24