

Evolutionary Time and Protein-Protein Interaction Networks

Preliminary Analysis

STA 596: Practical Data Science

Jesse Hautala

Shawn Houser

Angyalka Valcsics

November 26, 2021

Contents

I. Introduction

II. Background

III. Methods

IV. Preliminary Results

V. Conclusion

VI. Appendix

VII. References

I. Introduction

Proteins control all biological systems in a cell and, through various interactions with each other, enable cells to complete tasks such as: enzyme activation, gene regulation, and intercellular communication. Protein interactions can be modeled by an undirected network of protein-protein interactions (a PPI network, or PPIN), with nodes representing proteins and edges representing interactions. The complete set of such interactions for a species is called the protein interactome. When interaction relationships between proteins break, possibly due to environmental factors or random mutations, such breakage can cause disease and death, of the cell and of the organism. We hypothesize that the evolutionary time of a species, which is defined by the total branch length from the root to the leaf representing that species in the tree of life, is directly related to network statistics which describe the topological stability of the species' protein interactome.

II. Background

Advances in proteomics allow researchers to study the protein interactome, but limitations of experimental methods in practice prevent PPI networks from being comprehensive and free of noise. We regard extant PPIN data, including the data used in this project, as a noisy sample from the true protein interactome. For example, the yeast-two-hybrid method for mapping protein interactomes was first developed in 1989 by Fields and Song using *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* as a biological model. The accuracy of this experimental method is estimated to be less than 10 percent. Consequently, the population being studied is the true protein interactome for each species and the variables of interest are the network statistics.

Understanding how protein interactomes evolve and developing methods for analyzing PPI networks is a central goal of evolutionary systems biology (Maddamsetti (2021)). In a paper by Rohan Maddamsetti they provided evidence that protein interactomes in E-Coli appear to show a generational increase in network resilience. Marinka Zitnik (Zitnik *et al.* (2019)) defined network resilience as the measure of how quickly a network breaks down as edges between nodes are randomly removed. The current research identified a relationship between the resilience of an interactome and evolutionary time of the species.


III. Methods

III.I. Acquisition of Data

Our dataset comes from the Stanford Network Analysis Platform (or SNAP). This data was collected using the Search Tool for the Retrieval of Interacting Genes/Proteins (or STRING), from the European Molecular Biology Laboratory, EMBL and is organized in multiple text files, joined by species ID. It comprises taxonomy information, an edge set for each interactome, and a numerical variable for evolutionary time of the species.

How was the pickle made? After transforming the provided data into workable adjacency matrices, we selected an arbitrary subset of 75 species of Proteobacteria, a major phylum which includes a wide variety of pathogenic genera such as Salmonella. Our goal was to select a subset of net-

works of relatively small size to control for the computational time of our algorithms. On account of each PPI network supplied in the data being a noisy sample from the true species' protein interactome, we needed to use only the giant connected component for our analysis. That is, we ignored any nodes which were disconnected from the main network, assuming that they were included in the network or left disconnected from the giant component due to experimental error. To extract pertinent information about network stability from each network we used the concept of Exponential Random Graph Models. The basic assumption of these models is that the structure in an observed network can be explained by a vector of sufficient statistics which are a function of the observed network. To construct our models, we first need to find the vector of sufficient statistics for each network. Using internal functions of NetworkX, a Python library for network analysis, we found statistics for each PPIN. In particular for each PPIN, we found its average degree centrality, number of triangles, modularity, clique count, node count for the largest connected subgraph (lcs), size of the max clique, and much more as you can see in the appendix.



Average centrality for a network describes the average number of edges for all nodes. In other words, this statistic describes the average number of connections for all nodes. If a network has a high average degree centrality then we interpret this network as being dense with respect to the number of nodes in the network. The number of triangles statistic counts the number of triangles in the network—we sum up the number of triangles each node is a part of then divide this number by three. A triangle is a set of three nodes where each node has a relationship to the other two—this is sometimes referred to as a 3-clique. Networks that have a large number of triangles tend to be highly interconnected. However, networks that have a low number of triangles turn out to be poorly connected and may suffer from instability. The last network statistic we will describe here is modularity. Modularity is a measure of the structure of networks or graphs which measures the strength of division of a network into modules. Networks with high modularity have dense connections between the nodes within modules but sparse connections between nodes in different modules.

Additionally, we wrote a function which would find the number of k -stars in each PPIN from one to the maximum size star in the network. For example, a 1-star is the number of nodes in the network, a 2-star is the number of edges, a 3-star is the number of nodes with three edges, and so on. Finally, we combined all of these statistics into a data matrix for our models.

III.II. Models

Our research question aims to find network statistics, which measure topological stability of the species' protein interactome, that are significant predictors of the evolutionary time of a species. That is, we suspect that there is a relationship between some of these network statistics and the response—evolutionary time. The question is, which of the network statistics have the most influence

on the response variable? The nature of our data is that there are more variables than data points. For this reason we need models that work well with such data—we need models which perform feature selection, are interpretable, and highly accurate.

The first such model we chose is LASSO regression. The LASSO method regularizes model parameters by shrinking the regression coefficients, reducing some of them to zero. The feature selection phase occurs after the shrinkage, where every non-zero value is selected to be used in the model. Perhaps go into greater detail here.

Next we chose a random forest—describe how a random forest performs feature selection.

IV. Preliminary Results

The network statistics with the most influence on the evolutionary time of each species for the LASSO model were the number of triangles, clique count, LCSG clique count, node count, LCSG node count, LCSG Degree Max, and number of 1-stars (number of nodes). Explain what lcs degree max and clique count is. LASSO efficiency info: error was 0.05

The random forest model was consistent with the results from above but also included modularity, LCSG clique-size mean (explain what this is and how it describes network stability), GiantProportion (same here), a variety of k-star counts, and more. Random forest efficiency info

Can we make a nice plot of the common/uncommon statistics found to be important?

V. Conclusion

Need to talk about how we plan to fine-tune the above models over the next two weeks here. I.e. Adding CV to lasso and tuning hyperparameters of random forest using RandomizedSearchCV. There are many possible confounders which should be considered along with our preliminary results: investigative biases towards modeling common or popular organisms, network size, and genome size.

VI. Appendix

VI.I. Predictors Using NetworkX

Table 1: Predictors Using NetworkX Data Frame

Species_ID	882	883	36870	52598	56780	...
Average Centrality	0.013	0.019	0.023	0.030	0.020	...
Number of Triangles	12742.000	8017.000	689.000	49.000	11135.000	...
Modularity	0.679	0.559	0.674	0.741	0.556	...
Clique Count	1060.000	3580.000	209.000	823.000	547.000	...
Clique-Size Max	26.000	19.000	10.000	6.000	27.000	...
Clique-Size Mode	2.000	5.000	2.000	2.000	2.000	...
Clique-Size Mean	4.726	5.004	2.923	2.335	4.075	...
LCSG Clique Count	916.000	371.000	180.000	249.000	451.000	...
LCSG Clique-Size Max	26.000	19.000	10.000	5.000	27.000	...
LCSG Clique-Size Mode	2.000	2.000	2.000	2.000	2.000	...
LCSG Clique-Size Mean	5.102	4.647	3.039	2.116	4.237	...
Node Count	1023.000	809.000	262.000	495.000	757.000	...
LCSG Node Count	736.000	502.000	217.000	139.000	536.000	...
LCSG Degree Max	60.000	58.000	27.000	11.000	66.000	...
LCSG Degree Mode	1.000	3.000	2.000	2.000	2.000	...
LCSG Degree Mean	9.465	9.661	5.060	4.144	10.590	...

VI.II. K-Stars Algorithm

Below is pseudocode for how we constructed the data frame of stars counts for each network.

Algorithm 1 Get Stars Algorithm

```

giantC  $\leftarrow$  giant component for undirected network
A  $\leftarrow$  convert giantC to adjacency matrix
d  $\leftarrow$  sum row elements of A
values, counts  $\leftarrow$  find unique elements and counts for each
stars  $\leftarrow$  pandas DataFrame of counts with index names being values

```

Table 2: Count K-Stars Data Frame

Species_ID	882	883	36870	52598	56780	...
num_1stars	109.0	39.0	22.0	17.0	26.0	...
num_2stars	105.0	57.0	54.0	30.0	70.0	...
num_3stars	65.0	63.0	31.0	20.0	53.0	...
\vdots	\vdots	\vdots	\vdots	\vdots	\vdots	\ddots

It is important to note that the maximum star count is unique to each network so when we concatenate these smaller data frames together to form the data frame which holds all network statistics it must be dynamic. Additionally, this means that once we train the model—if we choose to include all star variables—then we cannot test the model on a new set of networks. A quick fix for this may be to only include the first ten rows of this data frame.

VII. References

- [1] Zitnik, M., Sosič, R., Feldman, M. W., Leskovec, J. (2019). Evolution of resilience in protein interactomes across the tree of life. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 116(10), 4426-4433. <https://doi.org/10.1101/454033>
- [2] Maddamsetti, R. (2021). Selection maintains protein interactome resilience in the long-term evolution experiment with *Escherichia coli*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/gbe/evab074>
- [3] Evolution of protein interactomes across the tree of life. (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://snap.stanford.edu/tree-of-life/>
- [4] Sumit Mukherjee. (2011). Exponential Random graph models. Retrieved from <https://artowen.su.domains/courses/319/smukherjee.pdf>