

## Background and Motivation

It is becoming increasingly possible to compute genome-scale simulations of biological processes in both prokaryotic and eukaryotic systems (O'Brien and Palsson (2015), Thiele et al. (2013)). As these approaches become increasingly predictive of biological function, computational modeling will become highly useful in bioengineering and translational medicine (Zielinski et al. (2015)).

There are many approaches to reconstructing genome-scale cellular processes, and the scope of their techniques is expanding (O'Brien and Palsson (2015)). Among such approaches, a modeling approach (be it mechanistic, stoichiometric, constraint-based, etc.) that has the ability to incorporate high-throughput experimental data, to increase its predictive accuracy and to confer system specificity, would be most desirable. Such models are called metabolism and expression models, or ME-models, where the expression term refers to either protein or gene expression. ME-models that utilize gene expression data would be most useful due to the abundance of gene expression data and the higher throughput methods available for mRNA measurement.

However, a recent review of constraint-based ME-models that incorporate gene expression data found their predictive accuracy of metabolite levels were no better (and in some cases worse) than a stand-alone metabolic model (Machado and Herrgard (2014)). Although this performance may be due to the limitations of the modeling approaches, it is also well-known that gene expression is poorly correlated with protein expression in general. This presents a challenge to building computational models of biological function that incorporate experimental data at the mRNA level.

Here I attempt to replicate the findings of a recent paper that examined the relationship between gene and protein expression (Koussounadis et al. (2015)). The authors argue and demonstrate that although overall gene expression is poorly correlated with differential protein expression, differentially expressed genes show higher correlations with protein expression than non-differentially expressed genes. This result could provide practical insight into how gene expression data should be incorporated into ME-models.

In addition, I apply a weak causal measure, a time-series method called Granger causality, to the gene and protein expression data in an attempt to build upon the paper's correlation analyses. Using an analogy to neuroinformatics analyses, this methodology suggests an alternative approach to investigating the mRNA-protein relationship and to building mRNA-protein co-expression networks (Friston (2011)).

## Methods

For the experimental methods used to obtain the data, as per Koussounadis et al. (2015) Methods,

Briefly, two ovarian cancer tumour models, OV1002 and HOX42433, were implanted subcutaneously in the flanks of adult female nu/nu mice and allowed to grow to 4-6 mm in diameter. The mice received one of two drug treatments via intraperitoneal injection

on day 0, carboplatin (50mg/kg) only or carboplatin (50mg/ kg) + paclitaxel (10mg/kg), or were left untreated as controls. Xenografts were harvested from treated mice on days 1, 2, 4, 7, and 14, and from untreated controls on days 0, 1, 2, 7, and 14.

For the data-preprocessing methods used, again as per Koussounadis et al. (2015) Methods,

Raw mRNA expression data were background corrected, variance stabilised transformed (VST) and robust spline normalised (RSN) using Bioconductor’s *lumi* package. AQUA protein expression scores were log-transformed with base 2. For both mRNA and protein expression, log fold-change values for each time point in each drug treatment condition were calculated by comparing mean expression levels across biological replicates to pooled controls for that tumour model using the Bioconductor package *limma*. Both mRNA and protein expression exhibited similar dynamic ranges in log fold-change, from approximately  $-1$  to  $1$ . The output of *limma* was used to identify differentially expressed mRNAs, defined as those having FDR-adjusted p-values below 0.05. When evaluating varying FDR-cut offs, differentially expressed mRNAs were defined using FDR-adjusted p-values from 0.01 to 0.50 in steps of 0.01. The mRNA dataset has been deposited to Gene Expression Omnibus (GEO) with accession number GSE49577. The protein dataset (raw AQUA scores and *limma*-produced log-fold change values) is provided in Supplementary Data 1.

The major difference between my analysis and the authors’ (which likely somehow accounts for differences in results) is that, due to difficulties related to extracting the GSE/ GSMs as **R ExpressionSet** objects (via the **GEOquery** package), *lumi* log-2 rather than variance-stabilization transformation was applied during data processing. In addition, I also performed my analysis with and without *lumi* preprocessing to investigate its effects on my results.

For the Granger-causality analysis, I first apply the Augmented Dickey-Fuller test to assess for each expression time series’ stationarity, a property required for application of the Granger causality test; and then perform Granger causality tests between all mRNA-protein pairs for a given condition (e.g. “HOX424 CarboTax”, “OV1002 Carbo”, etc.). I use the **adf.test** and **grangertest** (from the **R lmtest** and **tseries** packages, respectively) for these tests.

## Results

The major results to replicate in Koussounadis et al. (2015) were Figures 2 and 4.

## Discussion

## Future Work

See Seth, Barrett, and Barnett (2015) and Amblard and Michel (2012) for review of the use of Granger causality in neuroinformatics.

## References

- Amblard, Pierre-Olivier, and Olivier J. J. Michel. 2012. "The Relation Between Granger Causality and Directed Information Theory: A Review." *CoRR* abs/1211.3169. <http://arxiv.org/abs/1211.3169>.
- Friston, Karl J. 2011. "Functional and Effective Connectivity: A Review." *Brain Connectivity* 1 (1): 13–36. doi:[10.1089/brain.2011.0008](https://doi.org/10.1089/brain.2011.0008).
- Gustafsson, Mika, Danuta R. Gawel, Lars Alfredsson, Sergio Baranzini, Janne Björkander, Robert Blomgran, Sandra Hellberg, et al. 2015. "A Validated Gene Regulatory Network and GWAS Identifies Early Regulators of T Cell-associated Diseases." *Science Translational Medicine* 7 (313): 313ra178–78. doi:[10.1126/scitranslmed.aad2722](https://doi.org/10.1126/scitranslmed.aad2722).
- Koussounadis, Antonis, Simon P. Langdon, In Hwa Um, David J. Harrison, and V. Anne Smith. 2015. "Relationship Between Differentially Expressed mRNA and mRNA-Protein Correlations in a Xenograft Model System." *Scientific Reports* 5 (June): 10775. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/srep10775>.
- Machado, Daniel, and Markus Herrgard. 2014. "Systematic Evaluation of Methods for Integration of Transcriptomic Data into Constraint-Based Models of Metabolism." *PLoS Comput Biol* 10 (4): e1003580. doi:[10.1371/journal.pcbi.1003580](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pcbi.1003580).
- O'Brien, Edward J, and Bernhard O Palsson. 2015. "Computing the Functional Proteome: Recent Progress and Future Prospects for Genome-Scale Models." *Current Opinion in Biotechnology, Systems biology • nanobiotechnology*, 34 (August): 125–34. doi:[10.1016/j.copbio.2014.12.017](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copbio.2014.12.017).
- Seth, Anil K., Adam B. Barrett, and Lionel Barnett. 2015. "Granger Causality Analysis in Neuroscience and Neuroimaging." *The Journal of Neuroscience* 35 (8): 3293–97. <http://www.jneurosci.org/content/35/8/3293.short>.
- Thiele, Ines, Neil Swainston, Ronan M T Fleming, Andreas Hoppe, Swagatika Sahoo, Maike K Aurich, Hulda Haraldsdottir, et al. 2013. "A Community-Driven Global Reconstruction of Human Metabolism." *Nat Biotech* 31 (5): 419–25. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/nbt.2488>.
- Zielinski, Daniel C., Fabian V. Filipp, Aarash Bordbar, Kasper Jensen, Jeffrey W. Smith, Markus J. Herrgard, Monica L. Mo, and Bernhard O. Palsson. 2015. "Pharmacogenomic and Clinical Data Link Non-Pharmacokinetic Metabolic Dysregulation to Drug Side Effect Pathogenesis." *Nature Communications* 6 (June): 7101. doi:[10.1038/ncomms8101](https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms8101).