FunPred 3.0: Improved Protein function prediction using protein interaction network: Supplementary Document

Sovan Saha¹, Piyali Chatterjee², Subhadip Basu³, Mita Nasipuri³, Dariusz Plewczynski ^{4,5}

Corresponding Author:

Dariusz Plewczynski 4,5

Banacha 2c Street, 02-097 Warsaw, Poland

Email address: d.plewczynski@cent.uw.edu.pl

¹ Department of Computer Science and Engineering, Dr. Sudhir Chandra Sur Degree Engineering College, DumDum, Kolkata, India

² Department of Computer Science and Engineering, Netaji Subhash Engineering College, Garia, Kolkata, India

³ Department of Computer Science and Engineering, Jadavpur University, Kolkata, West Bengal, India

⁴ Centre of New Technologies, University of Warsaw, Warsaw, Poland

⁵ Faculty of Mathematics and Information Science, Warsaw University of Technology, Warsaw, Poland

DEFINITIONS AND NOTATIONS

1 2

Before proceeding into the main section of our work, it is important to discuss the graphical properties as well as other relevant terms associated with our work.

5

34

Protein-protein interaction network: Protein-protein interactions occur when 6 two or more proteins bind together, often to carry out their biological function. 7 8 These protein interactions form a network like structure which is known as a 9 protein interaction network. Protein interaction network is generally represented as a graph consisting of a set of nodes connected by edges or links. Proteins are 10 11 represented as nodes in the graph and the edges signify interactions between two proteins. Here protein interaction network is represented as a graph G_nwhich 12 consists of a set of vertex V (nodes) connected by edges E (links). Thus G = 13 (V, E). 14

- Protein complex/cluster: It can be defined as group of proteins (usually in close proximity to one another) interconnected through a network to work as one centralized data processing resource. Here it is defined by C_i where i represent
- 18 cluster number.
- Sub graph: A graph G'_p is a sub graph of G_p if the vertex set of G'_p is a subset of the vertex set of G_p and if the edge set of G'_p is a subset of the edge set of G_p . That is, if $G'_p = (V', E')$ and $G_p = (V, E)$, then G'_p is called as sub graph of G_p if $V' \subseteq V$ and $E' \subseteq E$. G'_p may be defined as a set of $\{P_U | P_A\}$ where P_U represents the set of un-annotated proteins while P_A represents the set of annotated protein.
- Level 1 Neighbors: For any vertex v in G'_p , all those vertices in G'_p that are connected with v through an edge are deemed Level 1 neighbors of v.
- Edge weight (W_{uv}): The weight W_{uv} of edge (u, v) (Wang & Wu 2013) is defined 26 as the similarity between u and v. It is obvious that two nodes with an edge 27 between them belong to the same cluster if they have high similarity. The 28 29 similarity between u and v is measured by Jaccard's coefficient. Jaccard's 30 coefficient adopts the proportion of common neighbors of two nodes in all distinct neighbors of these nodes to measure node similarity in complex networks. 31 Obviously, the more common neighbors two nodes share, the higher similarity 32 33 these nodes have. Therefore, the edge weight W_{uv} is represented by

$$w_{w} = (\Gamma(\mathbf{u}) \cap \Gamma(\mathbf{v})) / (\Gamma(\mathbf{u}) \cup \Gamma(\mathbf{v})) \tag{1}$$

where, $\Gamma(u)$ and $\Gamma(v)$ are neighbors of u and v respectively. $\Gamma(u) \cap \Gamma(v)$ represents all common neighbors of u and v, and $\Gamma(u) \cup \Gamma(v)$ represents all distinct neighbors of u and v. In our algorithm, edge weight is used to guarantee that in the same

- cluster every pair of nodes with an edge between them should have relatively high 38
- 39 similarity.
- **Neighborhood graph** (G_v) : The neighborhood graph of $v \in V$ consists of v, all its 40
- neighbors and the edges among them. It is defined as $G_v = (V', E')$, in which V' =41
- $\{v\} \cup \{u|u \in V, (u, v) \in E\}, \text{ and } E' = \{(u_i, u_i)| (u_i, u_i) \in E, u_i, u_i \in V'\}.$ 42
- **Node weight** (W_v): In G_v , there are some nodes with degree 1 that only have 43
- connections with v and the connections among these nodes are often false positive 44
- 45 according to topological reliability measures (Wang & Wu 2013). So nodes with
- degree 1 and corresponding edges are removed from G_{ν} . The remaining sub graph 46
- 47 of G_v is marked as G'_v . The node weight wv of node $v \in V$ in PPI networks is the
- average degree of all nodes in G'_{v} . It is represented by 48

$$w_{v} = \sum_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{V}^{"}} \operatorname{deg}(\mathbf{u}) / |\mathbf{V}^{"}| \tag{2}$$

- 50
- where, V'' is the set of nodes in $G'_{v} | V''|$ is the number of nodes in G'_{v} . And deg(u) is the degree of a node $u \in V''$ in W_{v} . In our algorithm, the weight W_{v} of a node v51
- \in V is used in the step of seed chosen. Higher value of W_v of a graph indicates a 52
- 53 collection of nodes with maximum interactions among them and hence the graph
- 54 is densely connected region.
- Physico-Chemical Properties (PCP): Physico-Chemical Properties (Saha & 55
- Chatterjee 2014; Singh et al. 2008) of amino acids are the various features of 56
- protein which are used to predict protein class. These properties are very 57
- 58 important in protein class prediction. The various Physico-Chemical Properties
- used in this work are as given below: 59
- 1. Extinction Coefficient (E_{protein}): Extinction Coefficient (Singh et al. 2008) is a 60
- protein parameter that is commonly used in the laboratory for determining the 61
- protein concentration in a solution by spectrophotometry. It describes to what 62
- extent light is absorbed by the protein and depends upon the protein size and 63
- 64 composition as well as the wavelength of the light. For proteins measured in water
- 65 at wavelength of 280nm, the value of the Extinction coefficient can be determined
- from the composition of Tyrosine, Tryptophan and Cystine. 66
- Mathematically it can be defined as: 67

$$E_{\text{protein}} = (N_{\text{tyr}} \times E_{\text{tyr}}) + (N_{\text{trp}} \times E_{\text{trp}}) + (N_{\text{cys}} \times E_{\text{cys}})$$
(3)

- where E_{tyr} =1490, E_{trp} =5500, E_{cys} =125 are the Extinction coefficients of the 69
- individual amino acid residues. 70
- 2. Absorbance (Optical Density): For proteins measured in water at wavelength 71
- 72 of 280nm the absorbance can be determined by the ratio of Extinction coefficient
- 73 and the molecular weight of the protein. It is a representation of a material's light
- 74 blocking ability (Singh et al. 2008).

75 Mathematically absorbance is defined as:

3. Number of Negatively Charged Residues (N_{neg}): This can be calculated from 77 the composition of Aspartic acid and Glutamic acid (Singh et al. 2008). 78

79

80 4. Number of Positively Charged Residues (N_{pos}): This can be calculated from the composition of Arginine and Lysine (Singh et al. 2008). 81

82

- 83 5. Aliphatic Index (AI): The aliphatic index of a protein is defined as the relative volume occupied by aliphatic side chains (alanine, valine, isoleucine, and leucine). 84 It may be regarded as a positive factor for the increase of thermo stability of 85
- globular (Singh et al. 2008). 86
- 87 Mathematically aliphatic index is defined as:

88
$$AI = X_{ala} + a \times X_{val} + b \times (X_{ile} + X_{leu})$$
 (5)

- where X_{ala} , X_{val} , X_{ile} and X_{leu} are the mole percentages of alanine, valine, 89
- isoleucine and leucine respectively. Coefficients a and b are the relative volume of 90
- valine side chain and side chains to the side chain of alanine i.e. a = 2.9 and b =91
- 3.9. 92
- 6. Compute IP/Mol weight: It calculates the isoelectric point by molecular weight 93
- 94 (Singh et al. 2008) of the input amino acid sequence. IP stands for isoelectric point
- 95 of the input amino acid sequence. Mol weight stands for molecular weight of the
- input amino acid sequence. 96

97 98

99

100

101

7. Grand average of hydropathicity (GRAVY): The GRAVY value for a protein or a peptide (Kyte & Doolittle 1982) is calculated by adding the hydropathy values of each amino acid residues and dividing by the number of residues in the sequence or length of the sequence. Increasing positive score indicates a greater hydrophobicity.

102 103

- 8.Instability index: The instability index (Guruprasad et al. 1990) provides an 104 estimate of the stability of your protein in a test tube. A protein whose instability 105 index is smaller than 40 is predicted as stable, a value above 40 predicts that the 106 107
 - protein may be unstable.

108

9. Aromaticity: Aromaticity (Lobry & Gautier 1994) is simply the relative 109 110 frequency of phenylalanine (Phe), tryptophan (Trp), tyrosine (Tyr).

111

112 10. **Isoelectric point:** The isoelectric point (Bjellqvist et al. 1994) is the pH at which a molecule or surface carries no net electrical charge. 113

114

- 11. PCP_{score}: PCP_{score} is defined as scaling of the mean value obtained from
- top-ranked physico-chemical properties among the properties mentioned above
- which are obtained by the execution of four classifiers: XGBoost classifier,
- 118 Random Forest classifier, Extra Tree classifier and Recursive feature elimination
- 119 classifier.

120

- 121 **XGBoost Classifier:** XGBoost is a scalable end to end tree boosting system which proves to be highly effective and widely used machine learning method for
- feature selection .

124

Random forest Classifier: A random forest is defined to be a meta-estimator that fits a number of decision tree classifiers on various sub-samples of the dataset and use averaging to improve the predictive accuracy and control over-fitting (Breiman 2001).

128

Extra Tree Classifier: Extra Tree classifier is a new tree-based ensemble method for supervised classification of feature selection (Geurts et al. 2006; Pedregosa et al. 2011).

132

- 133 Recursive feature elimination (RFE) Classifier: RFE is used to select features by
- recursively considering smaller and smaller sets of features (Pedregosa et al. 2011).
- First, the estimator is trained on the initial set of features and the importance of each
- feature is obtained either through a *coef_* attribute or through a *feature_importances_*
- attribute. Then, the least important features are pruned from current set of features.

REFERENCES

138 139 140

141

142

Bjellqvist B, Basse B, Olsen E, and Celis JE. 1994. Reference points for comparisons of two-dimensional maps of proteins from different human cell types defined in a pH scale where isoelectric points correlate with polypeptide compositions. *ELECTROPHORESIS* 15(1):529-539.

143144145

Breiman L. 2001. Random Forests. Machine Learning 45(1):5-32.

146 147

Geurts P, Ernst D, and Wehenkel L. 2006. Extremely randomized trees. *Machine Learning* 63(1):3-42.

148149150

Guruprasad K, Reddy BVB, and Pandit MW. 1990. Correlation between stability of a protein and its dipeptide composition: a novel approach for predicting in vivo stability of a protein from its primary sequence. *Protein Engineering, Design and Selection* 4(2):155-161.

152 153 154

151

Kyte J, and Doolittle RF. 1982. A simple method for displaying the hydropathic character of a protein. *Journal of Molecular Biology* 157(1):105-132.

155 156 157

158

Lobry JR, and Gautier C. 1994. Hydrophobicity, expressivity and aromaticity are the major trends of amino-acid usage in 999 Escherichia coli chromosome-encoded genes. *Nucleic Acids Research* 22(15):3174-3180.

159 160 161

162	Pedregosa F, Varoquaux G, Gramfort A, Michel V, Thirion B, Grisel O, Blondel M, Prettenhofer
163	P, Weiss R, Dubourg V, Vanderplas J, Passos A, Cournapeau D, Brucher M, Perrot M
164	and Duchesnay E. 2011. Scikit-learn: Machine Learning in Python. J Mach Learn Re.
165	12:2825-2830.
166	
167	Saha S, and Chatterjee P. 2014. Protein Function Prediction from Protein Interaction Network
168	using Physico-Chemical Properties of Amino Acids. International journal of pharmacy
169	and biological sciences 4(2):55-65.
170	
171	Singh M, Wadhwa PK, and Kaur S. 2008. Predicting Protein Function using Decision Tree. World
172	Academy of Science, Engineering and Technology 2(3):300-303.
173	
174	Wang S, and Wu F. 2013. Detecting overlapping protein complexes in PPI networks based or
175	robustness. Proteome Science 11(Suppl 1):S18-S18.
176	