Comparative Network Analysis

BMI/CS 776
www.biostat.wisc.edu/bmi776/
Spring 2016
Anthony Gitter
gitter@biostat.wisc.edu

Protein-protein Interaction Networks



(Jeong et al., 2001, Nature)

- Yeast protein interactions from yeast two-hybrid experiments
- Largest cluster in network contains 78% of proteins

Knock-out phenotype

- lethal
- non-lethal
- slow growth
- unknown

Overview

- Experimental techniques for determining networks
- Comparative network tasks

Experimental techniques

- Yeast two-hybrid system
  - Protein-protein interactions
- Microarrays or RNA-Seq
  - Expression patterns of mRNAs
  - Similar patterns imply involvement in same regulatory or signaling network
- Knock-out or perturbation studies
  - Identify genes required for synthesis of certain molecules

Yeast two-hybrid system



(Stephens & Banting, 2000, Traffic)

Microarrays



(Eisen et al., 1998, PNAS)

Knock-out studies

Yeast with one gene deleted

Growth?



Rich media

His^{-} media

Network problems

- Network inference
  - Infer network structure
- Motif finding
  - Identify common subgraph topologies
- Pathway or module detection
  - Identify subgraphs of genes that perform the same function or active in same condition
- Network comparison, alignment, querying
- Conserved modules
  - Identify modules that are shared in networks of multiple species

Network motifs

- Problem: Find subgraph topologies that are statistically more frequent than expected
- Brute force approach
  - Count all topologies of subgraphs of size m
  - Randomize graph (retain degree distribution) and count again
  - Output topologies that are over/under represented



Feed-forward loop: over-represented in regulatory networks

not very common



Network modules

- Modules: dense (highly-connected) subgraphs (e.g., large cliques or partially incomplete cliques)
- Problem: Identify the component modules of a network
- Difficulty: definition of module is not precise
  - Hierarchical networks have modules at multiple scales
  - At what scale to define modules?

Comparative network analysis

- Compare or integrate networks from different...
  - Interaction detection methods
    - Yeast 2-hybrid, mass spectrometry, etc.
  - Conditions
    - Heat, media, other stresses
  - Time points
    - Development, cell cycle, stimulus response
  - Species

Comparative tasks

- Integration
  - Combine networks derived from different methods (e.g. experimental data types)
- Alignment
  - Identify nodes, edges, modules common to two networks (e.g., from different species)
- Database query
  - Identify subnetworks similar to query in database of networks

Conserved modules

- Identify *modules* in multiple species that have “conserved” topology
- Typical approach:
  - Use sequence alignment to identify homologous proteins and establish correspondence between networks
  - Using correspondence, output subsets of nodes with similar topology

Conserved interactions



- Network comparison between species also requires sequence comparison (typically)
- Protein sets compared to identify orthologs
- Common technique: highest scoring BLAST hits used for establishing correspondences

Conserved modules



- Conserved module: orthologous subnetwork with significantly similar edge presence/absence

Network alignment graph



network alignment graph

- Analogous to pairwise sequence alignment

Conserved module detection



(Sharan & Ideker, 2006)

Real module example

Three species alignment (Sharan et al., 2005, 2006)



Ras-mediated regulation of cell cycle

Cell proliferation

- Protein may have more than one ortholog in another network

Basic alignment strategy

- Define scoring function on subnetworks
  - High score ⇒ conserved module
- Use BLAST to infer orthologous proteins
- Identify “seeds” around each protein: small conserved subnetworks centered around the protein
- Grow seeds by adding proteins that increase alignment score

Scoring functions via subnetwork modeling

- We wish to calculate the likelihood of a certain subnetwork U under different models
  - Subnetwork model (M_s)
    - Connectivity of U given by target graph H, each edge in H appearing in U with probability β (large)
  - Null model (M_n)
    - Each edge appears with probability according to random graph distribution (but with degree distribution fixed)

(Sharan et al., 2005)

Noisy observations

- Typically weight edges in graph according to confidence in interaction (expressed as a probability)
- Let
  - T_{uv}: event that proteins u, v interact
  - F_{uv}: event that proteins u, v do not interact
  - O_{uv}: observations of possible interactions between proteins u and v

Subnetwork model probability

- Assume (for explanatory purposes) that subnetwork model is a clique:

$$
\begin{aligned}
Pr(O_U|M_s) &= \prod_{(u,v)\in U\times U} Pr(O_{uv}|M_s) \\
&= \prod_{(u,v)\in U\times U} [Pr(O_{uv}|T_{uv},M_s)Pr(T_{uv}|M_s) + Pr(O_{uv}|F_{uv},M_s)Pr(F_{uv}|M_s)] \\
&= \prod_{(u,v)\in U\times U} [\beta Pr(O_{uv}|T_{uv}) + (1-\beta)Pr(O_{uv}|F_{uv})]
\end{aligned}
$$

Null model probability

- Given values for p_{uv}: probability of edge (u,v) in random graph with same degrees

$$Pr(O_U|M_n) = \prod_{(u,v)\in U\times U} [p_{uv}Pr(O_{uv}|T_{uv}) + (1-p_{uv})Pr(O_{uv}|F_{uv})]$$

- How to get random graph if we don't know true degree distribution? Estimate them:

$$d_i = \sum_j Pr(T_{ij}|O_{ij})$$

$$Pr(T_{uv}|O_{uv}) = \frac{Pr(O_{uv}|T_{uv})Pr(T_{uv})}{Pr(O_{uv}|T_{uv})Pr(T_{uv}) + Pr(O_{uv}|F_{uv})(1-Pr(T_{uv}))}$$

Likelihood ratio

- Score subnetwork with (log) ratio of likelihoods under the two models

$$
\begin{aligned}
L(U) &= \log \frac{Pr(O_U|M_s)}{Pr(O_U|M_n)} \\
&= \sum_{(u,v)\in U\times U} \log \frac{\beta Pr(O_{uv}|T_{uv}) + (1-\beta) Pr(O_{uv}|F_{uv})}{p_{uv} Pr(O_{uv}|T_{uv}) + (1-p_{uv}) Pr(O_{uv}|F_{uv})}
\end{aligned}
$$

- Note the decomposition into sum of scores for each edge

Seed construction

- Finding “heavy induced subgraphs” is NP-hard (Sharan et al., 2004)
- Heuristic:
  - Find high-scoring subgraph “seeds”
  - Grow seeds greedily
- Seed techniques: for each node v:
  - Find heavy subgraph of size 4 including v
  - Find highest-scoring length 4 path with v

Randomizing graphs

- For statistical tests, need to keep degree distribution the same
- Shuffle step:
  - Choose two edges (a,b), (c,d) in the current graph
  - Remove those edges
  - Add edges (a,d), (c,b)



Predictions from alignments

- Conserved modules of proteins enriched for certain functions often indicate shared function of other proteins
  - Use to predict function of unannotated proteins
  - Sharan et al., 2005: annotated 4,645 proteins with estimated accuracy of 58-63%
- Predict missing interactions
  - Sharan et al., 2005: 2,609 predicted interactions
  - Test 60 in yeast, 40-52% accurate

Parallels to sequence analysis



(Sharan & Ideker, 2006)