#### Αλγόριθμοι στη Μοριακή Βιολογία



George Vernikos – gvernikos@gmail.com

#### Αλγόριθμοι στη Μοριακή Βιολογία



George Vernikos – gvernikos@gmail.com

# Γιώργος Σ. Βερνίκος, PhD Comparative Genomics



http://www.sanger.ac.uk/

Ge\_\_\_\_\_\_



http://www.cam.ac.uk/



http://www.cam.ac.uk/







## **Bioinformatics Godfathers**



Sanger



Copenhagen Uni

EBI



**CNIO** Madrid







Memorial Sloan-Kettering cancer centre



Sanger



National Human Genome Research Institute

NCBI

#### EBI



Howard Hughes Medical Institute



Society: http://www.iscb.org/

## **Bioinformatics Godfathers**

NCBI



Sanger



EBI

Copenhagen Uni



**CNIO Madrid** 





Memorial Sloan-Kettering cancer centre



Howard Hughes Medical Institute



Sanger



National Human Genome Research Institute



of proteins and nucleic acids

R. Durbin S. Eddy A. Krogh G. Mitchison



## **Bioinformatics Godfathers**



Sanger



EBI



Copenhagen Uni



**CNIO Madrid** 







Memorial Sloan-Kettering cancer centre







**Biological** 

SECOND EDITION

BIOINFORMATICS A Practical Guide to the Analysis of Genes and Protein

hce

is

nodels



NCBI



Howard Hughes Medical Institute









B. F. FRANCIS OUELLETTE

EDITED BY ANDREAS D. BAXEVANIS



National Human Genome Research Institute

### **Biological Sequence Analysis**









- 1. Sequence Alignment
- 2. Markov Chains & Hidden Markov Models
- 3. Phylogenetic Trees
- 4. Sparse Bayesian Learning & The Relevance Vector Machine



http://eclass.di.uoa.gr/courses/D461/ Υλικό Μαθήματος/Βιβλιογραφία

## **Bioinformatics** ... at the high school level

A First Attempt to Bring Computational Biology into Advanced **High School** Biology Classrooms (<u>http://dx.doi.org/doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1002244</u>) Suzanne Gallagher, William Coon, Kristin Donley, Abby Scott, Debra Goldberg. PLoS Comput Biol, Vol. 7, No. 10. (27 October 2011), e1002244.

#### Ten Simple Rules for Teaching Bioinformatics at the **High** School Level

(http://dx.doi.org/doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1002243) David Form, Fran Lewitter. PLoS Comput Biol, Vol. 7, No. 10. (27 October 2011), e1002243.

Teaching Bioinformatics at the **Secondary School** Level (<u>http://dx.doi.org/doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1002242</u>) Fran Lewitter, Philip Bourne. PLoS Comput Biol, Vol. 7, No. 10. (27 October 2011), e1002242.



#### RBS

#### ABC transporter

ttg: Cytochrome c heme-binding site atom attaccattgccacaaatgtctttaccagtetegtacatcgcagcaatgatctcatcgagcgaaataca gggttcgcttacgcgactcatcgccatcgtcgccgcgtttatcgctttcacggcagag<sup>tRNA</sup>ttctctctatgcagggaatttgtaccgacccagttcagc gtatgcaggccgcgataaagcatccgtagctcagctggatagagtactcggctacgaaccgagcggtcggaggttcgaatcctcccggatgcaccagc tgcatcacgtcccatatttcaccacgataattetacacacgtetatacacgagtcacggcacagctcatttttcatcatcagcgccgccacggacaggccgtta cgccgacacagcgcc: 4Fe-4S ferredoxins, iron-sulfur binding region gtgcatcttctgcggtcgctgcgaagaggtgtgcccg</u>aacggaga tcgacattctccggctggcaacccagcagcccaagatacagggcggtatccacattgtggcacttgcggcttaacgataacgcgccatacagctcgatttt gatgggctgcaggccgagcgtgagcagggcattactattgacgtcgcggt GTP-binding elongation factor ttatgccttttcgaatacggttga aatacgcgataacattetqacqqataacattaccttqccqattatgaacgccgcaaacaaaaacagacgctggttgacctggctgcccggttaaatatt gccacggagaata Ribosomal protein L10 signature ctgattcccgtggcgtaactgtagataaaatgactgaactgcgtgccgatgttagaaca Transcription termination factor signature ggcgctatt<u>atcttcggtcgtgcgaccccggtagagctgtac</u> tggggcagtggcgtaacgacc cgacggaactggcccaggtcaaggccagcccggtcaacctgaacttctggcagatttttggaaaatatatcctgaccaatccactggtatggatcattattat atctttatcctggtggaaggggactccgcgggcgcgccc DNA topoisomerase II signature



Contribution

## Εισαγωγή – Πιθανότητες

#### What is a probabilistic model?

- A system that simulates the object under consideration.
- Produces different outcomes with different probabilities.
- A probabilistic model can therefore simulate a whole class of objects.
- In this context, the objects will be sequences, and a model might describe a family of related sequences.

### Εισαγωγή – Πιθανότητες

A probability gives the odds of an event, given any parameters: Given that the mean is zero and the variance one, what are the odds that the draw will be between 1.1 and 1.2?

A *likelihood* gives the odds of parameters given data: We drew a 1.3 from the distribution; what are the odds that the mean is zero?

Observed frequencies are estimates of probabilities.



### 6-αρες ...!

A familiar probabilistic system with a set of discrete outcomes is the roll of a six-sided die. A model of a roll of a (possibly loaded) die would have six parameters:

*p*<sub>1</sub> ... *p*<sub>6</sub>

and the probability of rolling i is p

The parameters p must satisfy the conditions:

 $p_i \ge 0 \quad \sum_{i=1}^6 p_i = 1$ 

A model of a sequence of three consecutive rolls of a die might be that they were all independent, so that the probability of sequence [1,6,3] would be the product of the individual probabilities:

 $p_1 p_6 p_3$ 

### <u>Maximum Likelihood Estimation</u>

#### What are biological sequences?

Strings from a finite alphabet of residues, generally either four nucleotides (DNA) or twenty amino acids (Proteins).

Assuming that a residue a occurs at random with probability  $q_a$  independent of all other residues in the sequence, and the (protein or DNA) sequence is denoted:

x<sub>1</sub> ... x<sub>n</sub>,

the probability of the whole sequence is :



What are biological sequences?

Strings from a finite alphabet of residues, generally either four nucleotides (DNA) or twenty amino acids (Proteins).

Assuming that a residue a occurs at random with probability  $q_a$  independent of all other residues in the sequence, and the (protein or DNA) sequence is denoted:

x<sub>1</sub> ... x<sub>n</sub>,

the probability of the whole sequence is :





## **Variable Secur at random?**

#### Salmonella enterica subsp. enterica serovar Typhi str. CT18 [gbbct]: 368 CDS's (89135 codons)

fields: [triplet] [amino acid] [fraction] [frequency: per thousand] ([number])

UUU H UUC H UUA I UUG I	0.51 0.49 0.11 0.13	20.3 19.7 10.7 12.5	( ( (	1811) 1759) 954) 1114)	UCU UCC UCA UCG	S S S	0.17 0.15 0.19 0.13	11.7 10.8 13.3 9.5	( ( (	1043) 964) 1186) 844)	UAU UAC UAA UAG	Y Y *	0.51 0.49 0.50 0.12	16.2 15.7 2.1 0.5	( ( (	1440) 1399) 184) 44)	UGU UGC UGA UGG	С С Ж	0.43 0.57 0.38 1.00	5.5 7.3 1.6 12.4	( ( (	491) 648) 140) 1105)
CUU I CUC I CUA I CUG I	0.16 0.14 0.06 0.39	15.2 12.8 5.4 36.6	( ( (	1356) 1144) 483) 3263)	CCU CCC CCA CCG	P P P	0.24 0.15 0.25 0.37	9.5 6.0 9.9 14.8	( ( (	849) 533) 880) 1316)	CAU CAC CAA CAG	H H Q Q	0.53 0.47 0.33 0.67	11.2 9.7 12.4 25.0	( ( (	994) 865) 1105) 2230)	CGU CGC CGA CGG	R R R R	0.26 0.31 0.12 0.14	14.7 17.1 6.7 7.8	( ( (	1310) 1523) 598) 696)
AUU I AUC I AUA I AUG M	0.43 0.43 0.14 1.00	24.8 24.5 8.0 27.4	( ( (	2212) 2182) 713) 2438)	ACU ACC ACA ACG	T T T T	0.23 0.31 0.21 0.26	13.1 17.8 12.1 15.2	( ( (	1171) 1591) 1078) 1351)	AAU AAC AAA AAG	K N N	0.48 0.52 0.59 0.41	21.4 23.1 34.5 23.7	( ( (	1910) 2060) 3074) 2116)	AGU AGC AGA AGG	S S R R	0.15 0.21 0.10 0.07	10.7 15.0 5.6 4.1	( ( (	951) 1333) 503) 363)
GUU V GUC V GUA V GUG V	7 0.31 7 0.24 7 0.17 7 0.28	20.7 16.2 11.6 18.6	( ( (	1847) 1447) 1033) 1657)	GCU GCC GCA GCG	A A A A	0.22 0.28 0.25 0.25	18.1 23.1 20.3 20.5	( ( (	1613) 2062) 1813) 1828)	GAU GAC GAA GAG	D D E E	0.56 0.44 0.57 0.43	31.1 24.8 37.7 28.0	() () ()	2772) 2214) 3356) 2497)	GGU GGC GGA GGG	G G G G	0.29 0.35 0.17 0.19	18.2 22.6 11.0 11.9	()()()	1625) 2012) 982) 1060)





The parameters for a probabilistic model are typically estimated from large sets of trusted examples, often called a *training set*. For instance, the probability  $q_a$  for amino acid a can be estimated as the observed frequency of residues in a database of known protein sequences, such as UNI-PROT:



The parameters for a probabilistic model are typically estimated from large sets of trusted examples, often called a *training set*. For instance, the probability  $q_a$  for amino acid a can be estimated as the observed frequency of residues in a database of known protein sequences, such as UNI-PROT:



Having so much data that, we expect the frequencies to be reasonable estimates of the underlying probabilities of our model. This way of estimating models is called *maximum likelihood estimation (MLE)*.

The parameters for a probabilistic model are typically estimated from large sets of trusted examples, often called a *training set*. For instance, the probability  $q_a$  for amino acid a can be estimated as the observed frequency of residues in a database of known protein sequences, such as UNI-PROT:



20 frequencies



Having so much data that, we expect the frequencies to be reasonable estimates of the underlying probabilities of our model. This way of estimating models is called *maximum likelihood estimation (MLE)*.

The parameters for a probabilistic model are typically estimated from large sets of trusted examples, often called a *training set*. For instance, the probability  $q_a$  for amino acid a can be estimated as the observed frequency of residues in a database of known protein sequences, such as UNI-PROT:



20 frequencies



Having so much data that, we expect the frequencies to be reasonable estimates of the underlying probabilities of our model. This way of estimating models is called *maximum likelihood estimation (MLE)*.

It can be shown that using the frequencies with which the amino acids occur in the database as the probabilities  $q_a$  maximizes the total probability of all the sequences given the model (the likelihood).

Given a model with parameters  $\theta$  and a set of data D, the maximum likelihood estimate for  $\theta$  is that value which maximizes  $P(D \mid \theta)$ .

#### Conditional, joint and marginal probabilities



The probability of rolling *i* with die  $D_1$  is called:

 $P(i \mid D_1)$ , the conditional probability of rolling *i* given die  $D_1$ .

#### Conditional, joint and marginal probabilities



The probability of rolling *i* with die  $D_1$  is called:

 $P(i \mid D_1)$ , the conditional probability of rolling *i* given die  $D_1$ .

Picking a die at random with probability  $P(D_i)$ , the probability of picking die *j* and rolling an *i* is:

 $P(i, \overline{D_i}) = P(\overline{D_i}) P(i \mid \overline{D_i})$ , the joint probability.

#### Conditional, joint and marginal probabilities



The probability of rolling *i* with die  $D_1$  is called:

 $P(i \mid D_1)$ , the conditional probability of rolling *i* given die  $D_1$ .

Picking a die at random with probability  $P(D_i)$ , the probability of picking die *j* and rolling an *i* is:

 $P(i, D_i) = P(D_i) P(i | D_i)$ , the joint probability.

More generally, we can write: P(X,Y) = P(X|Y) P(Y)

If we know the conditional and joint probabilities, we can calculate a marginal probability:

$$P(X) = \sum_{Y} P(X, Y) = \sum_{Y} P(X | Y) P(Y)$$

.....

"Consider an occasionally dishonest casino that uses two kinds of dice. Of the dice **99%** are **fair** but **1%** are **loaded** so that a **six** comes up **50%** of the time. We pick up a die from a table at random."



.....

"Consider an occasionally dishonest casino that uses two kinds of dice. Of the dice **99%** are **fair** but **1%** are **loaded** so that a **six** comes up **50%** of the time. We pick up a die from a table at random."



The probability that we are after, is:

 $P(D_{\text{loaded}} \mid 3 \text{ sixes})$ , the posterior probability of the hypothesis that the die is loaded, given the observed data.



"Consider an occasionally dishonest casino that uses two kinds of dice. Of the dice **99%** are **fair** but **1%** are **loaded** so that a **six** comes up **50%** of the time. We pick up a die from a table at random."



The probability that we are after, is:

 $P(D_{loaded} | 3 \text{ sixes})$ , the posterior probability of the hypothesis that the die is loaded, given the observed data.

However, what we can directly calculate is the probability of the data given the hypothesis:  $P(3 \text{ sixes } | D_{loaded})$ , the *likelihood* of the hypothesis.



"Consider an occasionally dishonest casino that uses two kinds of dice. Of the dice **99%** are **fair** but **1%** are **loaded** so that a **six** comes up **50%** of the time. We pick up a die from a table at random."



The probability that we are after, is:

 $P(D_{loaded} | 3 \text{ sixes})$ , the posterior probability of the hypothesis that the die is loaded, given the observed data.

However, what we can directly calculate is the probability of the data given the hypothesis:  $P(3 \text{ sixes } | D_{loaded})$ , the *likelihood* of the hypothesis.

Knowing the likelihood we can calculate the posterior probabilities, using the Baye's theorem:

$$P(X \mid Y) = \frac{P(Y \mid X)P(X)}{P(Y)}$$



In the case of our die, Baye's theorem can be written:

$$P(D_{loaded} | 3sixes) = \frac{P(3sixes | D_{loaded})P(D_{loaded})}{P(3sixes)}$$



"Consider an occasionally dishonest casino that uses two kinds of dice. Of the dice 99% are fair but 1% are loaded so that a six comes up **50%** of the time. We pick up a die from a table at random."

In the case of our die, Baye's theorem can be written:

$$P(D_{loaded} \mid 3sixes) = \frac{P(3sixes \mid D_{loaded})P(D_{loaded})}{P(3sixes)}$$

We have been told, that  $P(D_{\text{loaded}}) = 0.01$ and that  $P(3 \text{sixes} | D_{\text{loaded}}) = 0.5^3 = 0.125$ 



"Consider an occasionally dishonest casino that uses two kinds of dice. Of the dice 99% are fair but 1% are loaded so that a six comes up 50% of the time. We pick up a die from a table at random."

In the case of our die, Baye's theorem can be written:

$$P(D_{loaded} \mid 3sixes) = \frac{P(3sixes \mid D_{loaded})P(D_{loaded})}{P(3sixes)}$$

We have been told, that  $P(D_{\text{loaded}}) = 0.01$ and that  $P(3 \text{sixes} | D_{\text{loaded}}) = 0.5^3 = 0.125$ 

Thus:

$$P(D_{loaded} \mid 3sixes) = \frac{(0.5^3)(0.01)}{(0.5^3(0.01) + (\frac{1}{6}^3)(0.99)} = 0.21$$



"Consider an occasionally dishonest casino that uses of dice. Of the dice 99% are fair but 1% are loaded six comes up 50% of the time. We pick up a die fron random." Hmmm... is this a loaded die?

... most probably (79%) this is a fair die!

In the case of our die, Baye's theorem can be

$$P(D_{loaded} \mid 3sixes) = \frac{P(3sixes \mid D_{loaded})P(D_{loaded})}{P(3sixes)}$$

We have been told, that  $P(D_{\text{loaded}}) = 0.01$ and that  $P(3 \text{sixes} | D_{\text{loaded}}) = 0.5^3 = 0.125$ 

Thus:

$$P(D_{loaded} \mid 3sixes) = \frac{(0.5^3)(0.01)}{(0.5^3(0.01) + (\frac{1}{6}^3)(0.99)} = 0.21$$

"Assuming that, on average, extracellular proteins have a slightly different amino acid composition than *intracellular* proteins (e.g. *cysteine* is more common in extracellular than intracellular proteins), lets try to use this information to judge whether a new protein sequence  $x = x_1 \dots x_n$  is intracellular or extracellular."

"Assuming that, on average, extracellular proteins have a slightly different amino acid composition than *intracellular* proteins (e.g. *cysteine* is more common in extracellular than intracellular proteins), lets try to use this information to judge whether a new protein sequence  $x = x_1 \dots x_n$  is intracellular or extracellular."

1. We split our training examples from UNI-PROT into intracellular and extracellular proteins.

"Assuming that, on average, extracellular proteins have a slightly different amino acid composition than *intracellular* proteins (e.g. *cysteine* is more common in extracellular than intracellular proteins), lets try to use this information to judge whether a new protein sequence  $x = x_1 \dots x_n$  is intracellular or extracellular."

1. We split our training examples from UNI-PROT into intracellular and extracellular proteins.

2. We estimate a set of frequencies  $q_a^{int}$  for intracellular proteins, and a corresponding set of extracellular frequencies  $q_a^{ext}$ .

"Assuming that, on average, extracellular proteins have a slightly different amino acid composition than *intracellular* proteins (e.g. *cysteine* is more common in extracellular than intracellular proteins), lets try to use this information to judge whether a new protein sequence  $x = x_1 \dots x_n$  is intracellular or extracellular."

1. We split our training examples from UNI-PROT into intracellular and extracellular proteins.

2. We estimate a set of frequencies  $q_a^{int}$  for intracellular proteins, and a corresponding set of extracellular frequencies  $q_a^{ext}$ .

3. We estimate the probability that any new sequence is extracellular,  $p^{\text{ext}}$ , and the corresponding probability of being intracellular,  $p^{\text{int}}$ . Assuming that every sequence must be either entirely intracellular or entirely extracellular i.e.  $p^{\text{int}} = 1 - p^{\text{ext}}$ , we can write Bayes' theorem:

$$P(ext \mid x) = \frac{p^{ext} \prod_{i} q_{xi}^{ext}}{p^{ext} \prod_{i} q_{xi}^{ext} + p^{int} \prod_{i} q_{xi}^{int}}$$

"Assuming that, on average, extracellular proteins have a slightly different amino acid composition than *intracellular* proteins (e.g. *cysteine* is more common in extracellular than intracellular proteins), lets try to use this information to judge whether a new protein sequence  $x = x_1 \dots x_n$  is intracellular or extracellular."

1. We split our training examples from UNI-PROT into intracellular and extracellular proteins.

2. We estimate a set of frequencies  $q_a^{int}$  for intracellular proteins, and a corresponding set of extracellular frequencies  $q_a^{ext}$ .

3. We estimate the probability that any new sequence is extracellular,  $p^{\text{ext}}$ , and the corresponding probability of being intracellular,  $p^{\text{int}}$ . Assuming that every sequence must be either entirely intracellular or entirely extracellular i.e.  $p^{\text{int}} = 1 - p^{\text{ext}}$ , we can write Bayes' theorem:

$$P(ext \mid x) = \frac{p^{ext} \prod_{i} q^{ext}_{xi}}{p^{ext} \prod_{i} q^{ext}_{xi} + p^{int} \prod_{i} q^{int}_{xi}}$$

*p*<sup>ext</sup>, *p*<sup>int</sup> : prior probs

P(ext | x): posterior probs

Bayes' theorem can also be used to <u>estimate</u> the <u>parameters</u> **9** of a model:

$$P(\theta \mid D) = \frac{P(D \mid \theta)P(\theta)}{P(D)}$$

Bayes' theorem can also be used to <u>estimate</u> the <u>parameters</u>  $\theta$  of a model:

$$P(\theta \mid D) = \frac{P(D \mid \theta)P(\theta)}{P(D)}$$

One way of using Bayes' theorem to estimate good parameters, is to choose the parameter values for  $\theta$  that maximize  $P(\theta|D)$ , a process known as maximum a posteriori (MAP) estimation.

Bayes' theorem can also be used to <u>estimate</u> the <u>parameters</u>  $\theta$  of a model:

$$P(\theta \mid D) = \frac{P(D \mid \theta)P(\theta)}{P(D)}$$

One way of using Bayes' theorem to estimate good parameters, is to choose the parameter values for  $\theta$  that maximize  $P(\theta|D)$ , a process known as maximum a posteriori (MAP) estimation.

"We are given a die that we expect will be loaded, but we don't know in what way. We are allowed to roll it ten times, and we have to give our best estimates for the parameters  $p_i$ . We roll 1, 3, 4, 2, 4, 6, 2, 1, 2, 2."

Bayes' theorem can also be used to <u>estimate</u> the <u>parameters</u>  $\theta$  of a model:

$$P(\theta \mid D) = \frac{P(D \mid \theta)P(\theta)}{P(D)}$$

One way of using Bayes' theorem to estimate good parameters, is to choose the parameter values for  $\theta$  that maximize  $P(\theta|D)$ , a process known as maximum a posteriori (MAP) estimation.

"We are given a die that we expect will be loaded, but we don't know in what way. We are allowed to roll it ten times, and we have to give our best estimates for the parameters  $p_i$ . We roll 1, 3, 4, 2, 4, 6, 2, 1, 2, 2."

The ML estimate for  $p_5$ , based on the observed frequency, is 0. <u>Remember though</u> that we have not seen enough data to be sure that this die never rolls a five.

Bayes' theorem can also be used to <u>estimate</u> the <u>parameters</u>  $\theta$  of a model:

$$P(\theta \mid D) = \frac{P(D \mid \theta)P(\theta)}{P(D)}$$

One way of using Bayes' theorem to estimate good parameters, is to choose the parameter values for  $\theta$  that maximize  $P(\theta|D)$ , a process known as maximum a posteriori (MAP) estimation.

"We are given a die that we expect will be loaded, but we don't know in what way. We are allowed to roll it ten times, and we have to give our best estimates for the parameters  $p_i$ . We roll 1, 3, 4, 2, 4, 6, 2, 1, 2, 2. "

The ML estimate for  $p_5$ , based on the observed frequency, is 0. <u>Remember though</u> that we have not seen enough data to be sure that this die never rolls a five.

One well-known approach to this problem is to adjust the observed frequencies used to derive the probabilities by adding some fake extra *pseudocounts*.

#### MAP vs ML



#### MAP vs ML



Figure 1.2 Maximum likelihood estimation (ML) versus maximum a posteriori (MAP) estimation of the probability p5 (x axis) in Example 1.1 with five pseudocounts per category. The three curves are artificially normalised to have the same maximum value.



#### MAP vs ML

In this example what is our maximum likelihood estimate for  $p_3$ , the probability of rolling a three?

What is the Bayesian estimate if we add one pseudocount per category?

What if we add five pseudocounts per category?





Figure 1.2 Maximum likelihood estimation (ML) versus maximum a posteriori (MAP) estimation of the probability  $p_5$  (x axis) in Example 1.1 with five pseudocounts per category. The three curves are artificially normalised to have the same maximum value.

#### Artemis Demo



Source: <a href="http://www.sanger.ac.uk/resources/software/artemis/">http://www.sanger.ac.uk/resources/software/artemis/</a>

#### Further (Biological-Oriented) Reading







http://eclass.di.uoa.gr/courses/D461/ Υλικό Μαθήματος/Βιβλιογραφία