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Protein interaction networks

- Proteins come together & interact
- The collection of these interactions forms a Protein-Protein Interaction Network or PPIN
Detection & analysis of protein complexes in PPIN

Space-time info is lost

Individual complexes (Some might share proteins)

 Entire module might be involved in the same function/process

Identifying embedded complexes

Space-time info is "recovered"

Embedded complexes identified from PPIN

PPIN derived from several high-throughput experiments
A challenge in protein complex prediction

- It is difficult for protein complex prediction algorithms to identify the overlapping complexes’ boundaries

J. Bloom et al. (2007)

C.H. Yong et al. (2015)
Date and party hubs

• **Party hub**
  – Interacts with its partners at the same time

• **Date hub**
  – Participates in different complexes at different times or at different locations

What roles do date hubs play in complexes? Can we use them to deconvolute overlapping complexes?

Han et al. (2004)
Date hubs and overlapping complexes

If two reference complexes overlap, then the proteins within their intersection should correspond to the date hubs.

Let’s test this on 66 overlapping yeast protein complex pairs...

Date & party hubs from Pritykin et al. 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Date hubs</th>
<th>Party hubs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not contain</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contain</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Network decomposition by (date) hub removal
Experiments setup

• Data sources
  – PPI networks: yeast, human
  – Reference Complexes
    • Yeast: 149 big complexes (size ≥ 4) from CYC2008
      – 68 reference complexes are overlapping
    • Human: 659 big complexes CORUM (2013)
      – 90% reference complexes are overlapping

• Protein complex prediction approaches
  – CMC
  – COACH
  – ClusterONE
  – IPCA
How do we evaluate predictions?

- **A predicted complex is said to match a reference complex when their jaccard coefficient exceeds a threshold**
  - 0.75 for yeast complexes
  - 0.5 for human complexes

- **An effective approach would be characterized by:**
  - High recall and precision values
    - \( \text{Precision} = \frac{\text{matched predictions}}{\text{total predictions}} \)
    - \( \text{Recall} = \frac{\text{matched complexes}}{\text{total reference complexes}} \)
  - High a best-match cluster score distribution

\[ \text{Copyright 2018 © Limsoon Wong} \]
Network decomposition by date-hub removal, in yeast

- **Observations**
  - Higher precision and F-measure
  - Why do we get lower median best-match cluster score?
    - CMC is not able to recover some reference complexes after date-hub removal
Further investigation

- 7 complexes consist of 4 proteins with at least one predicted date hub protein
- Once we decompose the network, CMC is not able to generate clusters of size 3 to predict those complexes
- 6 new complexes were predicted after network decomposition
Possible solution: Combine the two sets of predicted clusters to improve the performance of CMC.
Results of this “double-barrel” approach, in yeast.
Observation, in yeast

- Taking the union increases the recall substantially: CMC+CMC_DH_predicted, CMC+CMC_DH_reference

- Many predicted clusters may correspond to novel complexes, because the set of reference complexes is incomplete
Quality of novel complexes predicted

- **Novel yeast complexes** are predicted complexes which do not match any reference complex at match-thresh = 0.75
Summary

1. We confirmed that the date hubs from reference dataset tend to occur within the intersection of real overlapping protein complexes.

2. We observed that CMC benefits much from date hub removal.

3. The distribution of the best match cluster score has the lowest median score.

4. We proposed a simple strategy to combine the clusters predicted by CMC before and after we remove date hubs to improve the overall CMC performance.