Sunil Template

Contents

Chapter 1

Multi objective evolutionary algorithms applied to Protein Structure Prediction Problem

Author Name1

Affiliation text1

Author Name2

Affiliation text2

Author Name3

Affiliation text3

Author Name4

Affiliation text4

1.1 Introduction

1.2 Protein folding

We will briefly recall some of the main biological concepts related to the protein folding problem that are relevant to our discussion.

Proteins are macromolecules made out of twenty different amino acids, also referred to as residues. An amino acid has a peptide backbone and a distinctive side chain group. The peptide bond is defined by an amino group and a carboxyl group connected to an alpha carbon to which a hydrogen and side chain group are attached.

Amino acids are combined to form sequences which are considered the primary structure of the peptides or proteins. The secondary structure is the locally ordered structure brought about via hydrogen bounding mainly within the peptide backbone. The most common secondary structure elements in proteins are the alpha helix and the beta sheet. The tertiary structure is the global folding of a single polypeptide chain.

Under specific conditions, the protein sequence folds into a unique native 3-d structure. Each possible protein fold has associated energy. The *thermodynamic hypothesis* states that the native structure of a protein is the one for which the free energy achieves the global minimum. Based on this hypothesis, many methods that search for the protein native structure define an approximation of the protein energy and use optimization algorithms that look for the protein fold that minimizes this energy. These approaches mainly differ in the type of energy approximation employed and in the characteristics of the protein modeling.

The achievement of the protein native structure is the result of the so-called protein folding process. The laws that govern protein folding are unknown. Therefore a number of ideas have emerged that try to answer this question: how do amino acid sequences specify proteins 3-d structure?

There are two main approaches to protein folding, commonly referred as the "classical" and "new" views. The "classical" view considers folding as a defined sequence of states leading from the unfolded to the native state. This sequence is called the pathway [12]. In the "new" view approach, folding is seen as the progressive organization of an ensemble of partially folded structures through which the protein passes on its way to the folded structure [10]. This approach emphasizes the idea of each state being an ensemble of rapidly interconverting conformations. One of the main differences between both approaches is that the "new" view allows for a more heterogeneous transition state than the "classical" view, which concentrates on a single, well-defined folding pathway [1].

Figure 1.2 shows one schematic representation of the "classical" (left) and "new" (right) views of protein folding. In the figure, each possible protein configuration is represented as a circle, and arrows represent possible transitions between configurations. In both approaches, the native state (filled circle) is achieved when the energy is minimized.

FIGURE 1.1: Schematic representation of the classical (left) and new (right) views of protein folding.

1.3 Multi-objective Optimization

Evolutionary Algorithm (EA) is a optimization and search technique, highly parallel, inspired by the Darwinian principle of natural selection and genetic reproduction. The nature principles that inspire the EAs are simple. According to the theory of C, Darwin, the principle of natural selection favors individuals with high fitness, therefore, with high probability of reproduction. Individuals with more descendants have more chance to perpetuate their genetic code in future generations. The genetic codes is what gives the identity of each individual and are represented in the chromosomes. These principles are used in the construction of computational algorithms, that searches for better solutions given a specific problem by the evolution of a population of solutions coded in artificial chromosomes – data structures used to represent a feasible solution for a given problem in the algorithm execution [11].

Real world problems commonly have multiple objectives to minimized/maximized and are present in most knowledge areas. To optimize multi objective problems, are considered two or more objectives witch usually are conflicting. To these problems is impossible to find one unique solution. A set of solutions is reached evaluating the Pareto dominance relation [3] between the solutions. The main objective is to find the solutions that are non-dominated by any other. A solution dominates other, if and only if, it was

better in at least one of the objectives, without being worst in any of the objectives. The set of non-dominated solutions constitutes the Pareto Front. Finding the the real Pareto Front is a NP-hard problem [7], this way, the objective is to find a good approximation of this front.

Multi-Objective Evolutionary Algorithms (MOEAS) are extensions of EAs to multi objective problems that applies the concepts of Pareto dominance to create different strategies to evolve and diversify the solutions. In this work were used two MOEAs: NSGAII [5] and IBEA [18].

1.3.1   Non-dominated sorting Genetic Algorithm II

The main characteristic of this algorithm is a strong elitism mechanism, classifying at each generation every solution in different fronts according with the non-dominance relation (line 15 of Algorithm 1). After the classification, solutions from the first front, are non-dominated by any other solution. Solutions from the second front are dominated only by the solutions of the first front, and so on. For solutions of the same front, the algorithm uses a Crowding Distance operator to calculate how distant are the neighbors of a given solution (line 19 of Algorithm 1). Solutions with high values of Crowding Distance have priority, because they will contribute more to the population's diversity. The binary tournament selects solutions from the small front with the higher values of Crowding Distance. A new population is generated using the crossover and mutation operators (line 25 of Algorithm 1).

1.3.2   IBEA (Indicator-Based Evolutionary Algorithm)

In the multi-objective optimization context, optimizing consists in find a front with a good approximation to the true Pareto front. However, there is no general definition about what is the true Pareto front. This way, indicators have been used to evaluate the quality of a approximation front. The *hypervolume* is a example of indicator to the evaluation and comparison of fronts.

The IBEA is an algorithm that considers the optimization by the use of quality indicators. The indicator is the way used to evaluate the non-dominated set of solutions [6]. To use the IBEA it is necessary define which indicator will be used to associate each ordered pair of solutions to a scalar value. One of the most used indicators is the *hypervolume* due to its capacity of evaluate the convergence and diversity at the same time of the search process [8].

$$F(x_i) = \sum_{x_j \in (P-x_i)} -e^{\frac{-I_{Hy}(x_j,x_i)}{k}} \tag{1.1}$$

For the IBEA fitness calculation (Equation 1.1), k is a parameter commonly used with a value of 0.05. The value for $F(x_i)$ corresponds to a quality

---

Algorithm 1 NSGAII

1: $N \leftarrow$ Population Size
2: $T \leftarrow$ Max evaluations
3: $P_0 \leftarrow CreatePopulation(N)$;
4: $CalculateFitness(P_0)$;
5: $FastNonDominatedSort(P_0)$;
6: $Q_0 \leftarrow 0$
7: **while** $Q_0 < N$ **do**
8:     $Parents \leftarrow BinaryTournament(P_0)$;
9:     $Children \leftarrow CrossoverMutation(Parents)$;
10:     $Q_0 \leftarrow Children$
11: **end while**
12: $CalculateFitness(Q_0)$;
13: $t \leftarrow 0$
14: **while** $t < T$ **do**
15:     $R_t \leftarrow P_t \cup Q_t$;
16:     $Fronts \leftarrow FastNonDominatedSort(R_t)$;
17:     $P_{t+1} \leftarrow 0$
18:     $i \leftarrow 0$
19:     **while** $P_{t+1} + Front_i < N$ **do**
20:         $CrowdingDistanceAssignment(Front_i)$;
21:         $P_{t+1} \leftarrow P_{t+1} \cup Front_i$
22:         $i \leftarrow i + 1$
23:     **end while**
24:     $CrowdingDistanceSort(Front_i)$;
25:     $P_{t+1} \leftarrow P_{t+1} \cup Front_i[1 : (N - P_{t+1})]$
26:     $Parents \leftarrow BinaryTournament(P_{t+1})$;
27:     $Q_{t+1} \leftarrow CrossoverMutation(Parents)$;
28:     $t \leftarrow t + 1$
29: **end while**
30: **return** $P \leftarrow$ Set of non-dominated solutions.

---

loss measure of the approximation to the Pareto front if the solution x_i was removed of the population [6], based on the value of the quality indicator I_{Hy}, in this case, the *hypervolume*. Based on the fitness calculation described above, the basic IBEA algorithm consists in iteratively do the selection (line 10 of Algorithm 2), crossover, mutation (line 11 of Algorithm 2) and environment selection, removing the worst individual from the population and updating the values of fitness of the remaining individuals (lines 4 to 8 of Algorithm 2).

---

[1] *Hypervolume*: Proposed quality indicators used in the study of [19], denoted as the "size of the covered search space". This indicator has two important advantages in relation to others [17]: 1 - Sensitive to any kind of improvement in the approximation set in relation to other set. 2 - As result of 1, the indicator guarantee that for any approximation set A that has high values of hypervolume, also has all the solutions of the true Pareto front.

Algorithm 2 IBEA

 1: $N \leftarrow$ Population Size
 2: $T \leftarrow$ Max Evaluations
 3: $k \leftarrow$ Scale factor of Fitness
 4: $P \leftarrow$ CreatePopulation(N);
 5: $m \leftarrow 0$
 6: CalculateFitness(P);
 7: **while** $m \geq T$ or other stop criterion is reached **do**
 8:     $\overline{P} \leftarrow$ BinaryTournament(P);
 9:     $P \leftarrow$ CrossoverMutation($\overline{P}$);
10:     $m \leftarrow m + 1$
11:     **while** Size(P) > N **do**
12:         $x^* \leftarrow$ WorstIndividualByFitness();
13:         RemoveFromPopulation(x^*, P);
14:         CalculateFitness(P);
15:     **end while**
16: **end while**
17: **return** $P \leftarrow$ Set of non-dominated solutions

1.4   Proposed method

Two multi-objective approaches were designed in this paper and will be presented in this section. The first approach consisted on applying two well-known state of art multi-objective algorithms (IBEA and NSGAII) to the PSP using the HP-2D model. The genetic operators used by IBEA and NSGAII algorithms, in this approach, were only the single point crossover in the case of crossover and bit flip mutation for mutation operator. It was decided to use only single point crossover and bit flip mutation, in this approach, because this combination of operators presented better results in previous experiments within the PSP problem with HP-2D model.

In the case of the second approach the IBEA and NSGAII algorithms were modified in order to improve their results when compared with the first approach. The modifications will be described next:

- **Backtrack Initialization**: Traditionally the initial population of solutions are generated randomly in MOEAs. This have a great potential of generating a large number of invalid solutions for the PSP problem. Solutions that are not self-avoiding walk (SAW) are said to contain collisions. If the initial population is fully generated randomly the evolutionary algorithms will spend time processing invalid solutions until getting good results. In order to subdue this problem a backtrack strategy should be applied. In this approach 20 percent of the initial population were generated using the backtrack strategy.

- **Design of specialized genetic operators**: As mentioned in section X, the use of traditional operators usually does not guide the search to prominent regions of the search space of the HP-2D model. In order to supplement the MOEAs, a pool of operators were designed based on the literature and are presented on table X. For every mating the crossover and mutation operators are selected randomly from the pool of operators. Also the crossover and mutation operators are always applied differently from the first approach which uses a probability of occurence.

For both approaches the same objectives were used and will be explained at next:

- **Energy value**: This is the main objective and consist in the energy of given protein conformation. The goal is to minimize the energy value and it is calculated as described in section X. This objective guides the search progress towards regions that the energy associate to the protein conformations are minimal. Thus, achieving protein conformations which are closest to native structure of a protein.

- **Distance between the two farthest residues**: This is a secondary objective and it was inspired by the related work X. The motivation for this objective is that more compact conformations tend to have more hydrophobic contacts which means a lesser energy value. The distance between two residues is calculated using the Euclidean distance.

For representing the chromosomes integer vectors were used whereas the genes specifies which direction, relative to the previous residue, should be placed the next residue. The genes can assume only tree values (0,1,2), 0 indicates that next residue should be placed at right from the previous one, 1 indicates that the next residue should be placed at left from the previous and 2 indicates that the next residue should be placed in front of the previous one. Figure X shows an example of a hypothetical chromosome and the path generated by it in the 2D lattice.

1.5   Experiments

This section presents the set of experiments designed to evaluate the performance of the approaches introduced in section 1.4. The HP sequences used in the experiments are shown in table 1.1, those instances have been used in previously works such as [2, 14, 16, 4, 13, 15, 9]. The values presented in table 1.1 correspond to the sequence identifier, the size of aminoacid sequence, the best known solutions ($H(x*)$) for the HP-2D model and the sequence itself.

TABLE 1.1: HP instances used in the experiments. The search space of each instance is 2^n where n is the size of the instance.

inst.	size	$H(\mathbf{x}^*)$	sequence
$s1$	20	-9	$HPHPPHHPHHPHPHHPPHPH$
$s2$	24	-9	$HHPPHPPHPPHPPHPPHPPHPPHH$
$s3$	25	-8	$PPHPPHHP^4HHP^4HHP^4HH$
$s4$	36	-14	$P^3HHPPHHP^5H^7PPHHP^4HHPPHPP$
$s5$	48	-23	$PPHPPHHPPHHP^5H^{10}P^6$
			$HHPPHHPPHPPH^5$
$s6$	50	-21	$HHPHPHPHPH^4PHP^3HP^3HP^4$
			$HP^3HP^3HPH^4\{PH\}^4H$
$s7$	60	-36	$PPH^3PH^8P^3H^{10}PHP^3$
			$H^{12}P^4H^6PHHPHP$
$s8$	64	-42	$H^{12}PHPH\{PPHH\}^2PPH\{PPHH\}^2$
			$PPH\{PPHH\}^2PPHPHPH^{12}$
$s9$	85	-53	$H^4P^4H^{12}P^6H^{12}P^3H^{12}P^3$
			$H^{12}P^3HP^2H^2P^2H^2P^2HPH$
$s10$	100	-48	$P^6HPH^2P^5H^3PH^5PH^2P^4H^2$
			$P^2H^2PH^5PH^{10}PH^2PH^7$
			$P^{11}H^7P^2HPH^3P^6HPH$
$s11$	100	-50	$P^3H^2P^2H^4P^2H^3PH^2PH^2PH^4$
			$P^8H^6P^2H^6P^9HPH^2PH^{11}P^2$
			$H^3PH^2PHP^2HPH^3P^6H^3$

1.5.1 Results for the first approach using the MOEAs without modifications

The first experiment consists on executing the MOEAs (NSGAII and IBEA) without any modifications on each sequence.

1.6 Conclusion

Bibliography

[1] David Baker. A surprising simplicity to protein folding. *Nature*, 405:39–42, 2000.

[2] Ugo Bastolla, Helge Frauenkron, Erwin Gerstner, Peter Grassberger, and Walter Nadler. Testing a new monte carlo algorithm for protein folding. *arXiv preprint cond-mat/9710030*, 1997.

[3] Henri Joseph Léon Baudrillart. *Manuel d'économie politique*. Guillaumin et cie, 1872.

[4] Carlos Cotta. Protein structure prediction using evolutionary algorithms hybridized with backtracking. In *Artificial Neural Nets Problem Solving Methods*, pages 321–328. Springer, 2003.

[5] Kalyanmoy Deb, Amrit Pratap, Sameer Agarwal, and TAMT Meyarivan. A fast and elitist multiobjective genetic algorithm: Nsga-ii. *Evolutionary Computation, IEEE Transactions on*, 6(2):182–197, 2002.

[6] Elliackin Messias do Nascimento Figueiredo, Teresa Bernarda Orientadora Ludermir, and Carmelo José Albanez Coorientador Bastos Filho. Algoritmo baseado em enxame de partículas para otimização de problemas com muitos objetivos. 2013.

[7] Carlos M Fonseca, Joshua D Knowles, Lothar Thiele, and Eckart Zitzler. A tutorial on the performance assessment of stochastic multiobjective optimizers. In *Third International Conference on Evolutionary Multi-Criterion Optimization (EMO 2005)*, volume 216, page 240, 2005.

[8] Hisao Ishibuchi, Noritaka Tsukamoto, and Yusuke Nojima. Evolutionary many-objective optimization. In *Genetic and Evolving Systems, 2008. GEFS 2008. 3rd International Workshop on*, pages 47–52. IEEE, 2008.

[9] Neal Lesh, Michael Mitzenmacher, and Sue Whitesides. A complete and effective move set for simplified protein folding. In *Proceedings of the seventh annual international conference on Research in computational molecular biology*, pages 188–195. ACM, 2003.

[10] J. N. Onuchic and P. G. Wolynes. Theory of protein folding. *Current Opinion in Structural Biology*, 14:70–75, 2004.

[11] Marco Aurélio Cavalcanti Pacheco. Algoritmos genéticos: princípios e aplicações. *ICA: Laboratório de Inteligência Computacional Aplicada. Departamento de Engenharia Elétrica. Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio de Janeiro. Fonte desconhecida*, 1999.

[12] V. S. Pande, A. Y. Grosberg, T. Tanaka, and D. S. Rokhsar. Protein folding pathways: Is a 'new view' needed? *Current Opinion in Structural Biology*, 8(1):68–79, 1998.

[13] Roberto Santana, Pedro Larranaga, and José A Lozano. Protein folding in 2-dimensional lattices with estimation of distribution algorithms. In *Biological and Medical Data Analysis*, pages 388–398. Springer, 2004.

[14] Alena Shmygelska, Rosalia Aguirre-Hernandez, and Holger H Hoos. An ant colony optimization algorithm for the 2d hp protein folding problem. In *Ant Algorithms*, pages 40–52. Springer, 2002.

[15] Alena Shmygelska and Holger H Hoos. An improved ant colony optimisation algorithm for the 2d hp protein folding problem. In *Advances in Artificial Intelligence*, pages 400–417. Springer, 2003.

[16] Ron Unger and John Moult. Genetic algorithms for protein folding simulations. *Journal of molecular biology*, 231(1):75–81, 1993.

[17] Eckart Zitzler, Dimo Brockhoff, and Lothar Thiele. The hypervolume indicator revisited: On the design of pareto-compliant indicators via weighted integration. In *Evolutionary multi-criterion optimization*, pages 862–876. Springer, 2007.

[18] Eckart Zitzler and Simon Künzli. Indicator-based selection in multiobjective search. In *Parallel Problem Solving from Nature-PPSN VIII*, pages 832–842. Springer, 2004.

[19] Eckart Zitzler and Lothar Thiele. Multiobjective optimization using evolutionary algorithmsa comparative case study. In *Parallel problem solving from naturePPSN V*, pages 292–301. Springer, 1998.