

Bigram-PGK: phosphoglycerlation prediction using the technique of bigram probabilities of position specific scoring matrix

Abel Chandra^{5,*}, Alok Sharma^{1,2,3,5,7,*}, Abdollah Dehzangi⁴, Daichi Shigemizu^{2,3,6,7}, and Tatsuhiko Tsunoda^{2,3,7}

¹ Institute for Integrated and Intelligent Systems, Griffith University, Brisbane, QLD-4111, Australia

² Department of Medical Science Mathematics, Medical Research Institute, Tokyo Medical and Dental University (TMDU), Tokyo, 113-8510, Japan

³ Laboratory for Medical Science Mathematics, RIKEN Center for Integrative Medical Sciences, Yokohama, 230-0045, Kanagawa, Japan

⁴ Department of Computer Science, Morgan State University, Baltimore, Maryland, USA

⁵ School of Engineering and Physics, Faculty of Science Technology and Environment, University of the South Pacific, Suva, Fiji

⁶ Medical Genome Center, National Center for Geriatrics and Gerontology, Obu, Aichi 474-8511, Japan

⁷ CREST, JST, Tokyo, 102-8666, Japan

* Corresponding authors

abelavit@gmail.com, alok.sharma@griffith.edu.au

Table 1. Comparison of Bigram-PGK predictor and Bigram-PGK predictor without the profile bigrams using 10-fold cross-validation scheme and **polynomial SVM kernel**. Highest values of the metrics are highlighted in bold.

Predictor	Sensitivity	Specificity	Precision	Accuracy	MCC	AUC
Bigram-PGK (without bigram)	0.1517	0.9562	NaN	0.6890	NaN	0.5543
Bigram-PGK	0.9642	0.8973	0.8253	0.9193	0.8330	0.9306

Table 2. Comparison of Bigram-PGK predictor and Bigram-PGK predictor without the profile bigrams using 10-fold cross-validation scheme and **linear SVM kernel**. Highest values of the metrics are highlighted in bold.

Predictor	Sensitivity	Specificity	Precision	Accuracy	MCC	AUC
Bigram-PGK (without bigram)	0.5914	0.8316	0.6381	0.7520	0.4346	0.7125
Bigram-PGK	0.8427	0.9239	0.8454	0.8984	0.7689	0.8855