2^e édition des Journées Bioss-IA

Search of Therapeutic Targets on the Hepatocellular Carcinoma with Database Extraction and Graph Coloring Methods

Recherche de cibles thérapeutiques pour le carcinome hépatocellulaire à l'aide d'extraction de bases de données et de méthodes de coloration de graphes

Maxime FOLSCHETTE

Current occupation: CNRS & Institut Français de Bioinformatique (IFB) Laboratoire des Sciences du Numérique de Nantes (LS2N) groups: GDD & COMBI

Previous occupation:

Université de Rennes 1 IRISA & IRSET groups: Dyliss & Dymec

maxime.folschette@ls2n.fr
http://maxime.folschette.name/

2018-12-19

Context



Objective

- Gather data from ICGC [Hudson and The International Cancer Genome Consortium, 2010]
- Distinguish two tumor stages: early stage vs. late (invasive) stage
- Watch expression change (differential expression)



Maxime FOLSCHETTE

Journées Bioss-IA - 2018-12-19

Therapeutic Targets for Hepatocellular Carcinoma o Experimental Data

Endometrial Cancer Esophageal Cancer United States 🧮 China 📷 China 🔚 Esophageal Cancer Gastric Cancer Eye Cancer France 🚺 China 🔚 Gastric Cancer Gastric Cancer United States 💻 Japan 👅 Mexico 🚺 Liver Cancer United States 📕 United States 💶 China 🔚 France 🚺 France 🚺 Japan 👅 Liver Cancer Lung Cancer Lung Cancer United States 💶 China 🎦 South Korea 📧 Lung Cancer Lung Cancer Lymphoproliferative United States 💻 United States 💻 Syndrome France Malignant Lymphoma Melanoma Germany China 🔛

https://dcc.icgc.org/projects/LIHC-US

LIHC-US

LIHC-US in ICGC

Project for liver HCC (USA)

- 294 samples with gene expression data
- Primary tumor on solid tissue only
- 20502 genes
- 16282 genes when excluding low expression

But no tumor grade annotation!

 \Rightarrow We need a **criterion** to distinguish tumor stages

Objectives

- 1) Clustering on the criterion \Rightarrow Two groups
- 2) Differential analysis on the two groups

Epithelial-Mesenchymal Transition



Epithelial-Mesenchymal Transition



Epithelial-Mesenchymal Transition



http://software.broadinstitute.org/gsea/msigdb/cards/HALLMARK_ EPITHELIAL_MESENCHYMAL_TRANSITION.html



See MSigDB license terms here. Please note that certain gene sets have special access terms.

UC San Diego



Copyright (c) 2004-2017 Broad Institute, Inc., Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and Regents of the University of California. All rights reserved.

http://software.broadinstitute.org/gsea/msigdb/cards/HALLMARK_ EPITHELIAL MESENCHYMAL_TRANSITION.html

GSEA		
Gene Set Enrichment Analysis	GSEA Home Downloads	Molecular Signatures Database Documentation Contact
 MSigDB Home 		
 About Collections 	Gono Sot: HALLMARK	EDITUELIAL MESENCHYMAL TRANSITION
 Browse Gene Sets 	Gene Set. HALLMARK	IFTTTLLIAL_WESENCITTWAL_TRANSITION
 Search Gene Sets 		
Investigate Gene Sets	Standard name	HALLMARK_EPITHELIAL_MESENCHYMAL_TRANSITION
 View Gene Hamilies 	Systematic name	M5930
► neip	Brief description	Genes defining epithelial-mesenchymal transition, as in wound healing, fibrosis and metastasis.
	Full description or abstract	
	Collection	H: halmark gene sets
	Source publication	
	Exact source	falses 148 facely and a star facility ballwards area and
	Related gene sets	(show 105 founder gene sets for this nailmark gene set)
	Exciting mixe	(SHOW 2 Hallmark Validation dataSets)
Download gene set		format: grp text gmt gmx xml
Compute overlaps 🔽		(show collections to investigate for overlap with this gene set)
Compendia expression profiles 👔		Human tissue compendium (Novartis) NCI-60 cell lines (National Cancer Institute)
Advanced query		Further investigate these 200 genes
Gene families 🔽		Categorize these 200 genes by gene family
Show members		(show 200 members mapped to 200 genes)
Version history		5.0: Eirst introduced

See MSigDB license terms here. Please note that certain gene sets have special access terms.



Copyright (c) 2004-2017 Broad Institute, Inc., Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and Regents of the University of California. All rights reserved.

UC San Diego

Workflow of the Project



Therapeutic Targets for Hepatocellular Carcinoma o Clustering



294 samples (LIHC-US)

Group A = Low expression of the EMT signature Group C = High expression of the EMT signature

Workflow of the Project

2 groups



Maxime FOLSCHETTE

Differential Analysis

Fold-change definition

- Consider groups A (lowest expression of EMT) and C (resp. highest)
- For each gene g, compute mean value for group A (resp. C)
- Differential analysis:

 $fold-change(g) = mean_g(C) / mean_g(A)$







Selected genes

Criteria

- Adjusted P-value $< 10^{-5}$
- $\log_2(\text{fold-change}) > 2$ (up-regulated genes)
- $\log_2(\text{fold-change}) < -0,5$ (down-regulated genes)

Selected genes

- 821 up-regulated genes
- 1092 down-regulated genes
 - = 1913 genes

Objectives

- Extract a graph from Kegg [Kanehisa et al., 2017] using these genes, with the tool Stream
- 2) Coloring + predictions with lggy [Thiele et al., 2015]

Workflow of the Project



Pathway Commons + Bravo

Pathway Commons [Cerami et al., 2010] • A gathering of 25 pathway databases • Contains: PID, Kegg, Reactome, CTD, Panther, ... • Common ontology (BioPAX) • Freely available • SPARQL endpoint

- Interrogates Pathway Commons with SPARQL queries
- Search and fusion of synonyms, optimizations
- (Incomplete) visualization tool

Problems with Pathway Commons

Problems with Pathway Commons

- Very heterogeneous data, curation depends on the data sources
- The BioPAX ontology is big and difficult to use
- Unification must be done by the user, based on gene unames (fast) or identifies (slow)
- Updated without history (bad for reproducibility)

Problems with BRAvo

- Still in development, only regulation at the time (no signaling)
- Struggles with the heterogeneous content of Pathway Commons
- Unification was still incomplete

Kegg + Stream



Stream (Arnaud Poret)

- Ad-hoc program for upstream graph extraction
- Extract the part of the graph for which we have expression data (25%)

Graph content:

- 3'383 nodes
- 13'771 edges
 - 11'661 activations
 - 2'110 inhibitions

1913 genes from the differential expression Only 209 are found in Kegg:

- 138 up-regulated
- 71 down-regulated
- 3174 new nodes

Nodes with up to: 92 incoming influences 79 outgoing influences \rightarrow Nodes with a lot of impact on the network



Workflow of the Project



- Coloring = information attached to nodes about over- or under-expression X = over-expressed Y = under-expressed
- Provenance = experimental (expression data) & computational (inference)



- Coloring = information attached to nodes about over- or under-expression X = over-expressed Y = under-expressed
- Provenance = experimental (expression data) & computational (inference)



- Coloring = information attached to nodes about over- or under-expression X = over-expressed Y = under-expressed
- Provenance = experimental (expression data) & computational (inference)



Consistent

- Coloring = information attached to nodes about over- or under-expression X = over-expressed Y = under-expressed
- Provenance = experimental (expression data) & computational (inference)



- Coloring = information attached to nodes about over- or under-expression X = over-expressed Y = under-expressed
- Provenance = experimental (expression data) & computational (inference)



- Coloring = information attached to nodes about over- or under-expression X = over-expressed Y = under-expressed
- Provenance = experimental (expression data) & computational (inference)









Consistent

Consistent

Inconsistent

Inconsistent

- Coloring = information attached to nodes about over- or under-expression X = over-expressed Y = under-expressed
- Provenance = experimental (expression data) & computational (inference)



- Compute all colorings without inconsistencies
- **Prediction** = a node that is always colored the same

Here, only 1 prediction: D

• All computed by Iggy [Thiele et al., 2015] (Answer Set Programming)

Trivial Predictions



- · Protein predicted the same as its observed gene
- Rarely brings new information
- Useful for validation



Maxime FOLSCHETTE

Knowledge from experiments:

- 138 up-regulated
- 71 down-regulated

Computational predictions:

92 predicted (24 non-trivial 54 predicted — 33 non-trivial

70% more information compared to only knowledge from experiments



Computational predictions (results of Iggy)



log₂(fold-change)

Maxime FOLSCHETTE

Journées Bioss-IA - 2018-12-19

Workflow of the Project



209 inputs

Matching between comp^{al} predictions and ICGC expression data:

124 match

36 non-trivial

17 do not match

16 non-trivial

5 not found in ICGC data

88% matching 69% non-trivial

 \rightarrow Good overlap



Cross-Validation

Sampling Consider a range of samplings (10%, 15%, 20%, ... 95%) Randomly pick x% of under- and over-expressed genes (observations) Compute the predictions on this sample ; repeat 100 times Score compared to the original data Compare the predictions to the original ICGC data • Give a score to each set of predictions \rightarrow Scores converge to the final score at 100% Robustness of the prediction of each node Compare the predictions to the final sampling of 100% \rightarrow Not a lot of variability in the prediction types \rightarrow Robust



Maxime FOLSCHET E

40

27%/31

"Journées Bioss-IA - 2018-12-19

Prediction Results



Results conflicting with ICGC data

Computational predictions which are different from differential analysis:

 BAK1_gen, BMP4_gen, CREB1_prot, EIF4EBP2_prot, IGFBP3_gen, IGFBP3_prot, NR0B2_gen, NR0B2_prot, NR1H4_gen, NR1H4_prot, NR3C2_gen, NR3C2_prot, SESN3_gen, SESN3_prot, THBS1_gen, TNFRSF10A_gen, TP53_prot

Prediction Results



Results conflicting with ICGC data

Computational predictions which are different from differential analysis:

 BAK1_gen, BMP4_gen, CREB1_prot, EIF4EBP2_prot, IGFBP3_gen, IGFBP3_prot, NR0B2_gen, NR0B2_prot, NR1H4_gen, NR1H4_prot, NR3C2_gen, NR3C2_prot, SESN3_gen, SESN3_prot, THBS1_gen, TNFRSF10A_gen, TP53_prot

Hub example: TP53_prot



18 predictions directly depend of TP53_prot



log2(fold-change)

Journées Bioss-IA - 2018-12-19

Summary & Conclusion

Summary

- Clustering + diff analysis: 2 lists of over- and under-expressed genes
- Graph extracted from Kegg: regulation + signaling
- 146 computational predictions (57 non-trivial)
- Predictions seem robust

Objectives (to do)

- Explore survival curves compared to most robust genes
- Explore the literature regarding predicted complexes
 - \Rightarrow New proliferation signature?
- Try the same workflow on a different type of cancer (breast?)
- PUBLISH

Bibliography I

Cerami, E. G., Gross, B. E., Demir, E., Rodchenkov, I., Babur, Ö., Anwar, N., Schultz, N., Bader, G. D., and Sander, C. (2010).
 Pathway Commons, a web resource for biological pathway data.
 <u>Nucleic acids research</u>, 39.
 <u>http://www.pathwaycommons.org/</u>.



Hudson, T. J. and The International Cancer Genome Consortium (2010). International network of cancer genome projects.

Nature, 464. http://icgc.org/.



Kanehisa, M., Furumichi, M., Tanabe, M., Sato, Y., and Morishima, K. (2017).

KEGG: new perspectives on genomes, pathways, diseases and drugs. Nucleic Acids Research, 45(D1):D353–D361.

http://https://www.kegg.jp/.

Lefebvre, M., Bourdon, J., Guziolowski, C., and Gaignard, A. (2017). Regulatory and signaling network assembly through linked open data. In Journées Ouvertes en Biologie, Informatique et Mathématiques. Demo paper. https://github.com/symetric-group/bionets-demo.

Bibliography II

Subramanian, A., Tamayo, P., Mootha, V. K., Mukherjee, S., Ebert, B. L., Gillette, M. A., Paulovich, A., Pomeroy, S. L., Golub, T. R., Lander, E. S., and Mesirov, J. P. (2005). Gene Set Enrichment Analysis: A knowledge-based approach for interpreting genome-wide expression profiles. Proc. of the Nat. Ac. of Sci., 102(43). http://software.broadinstitute.org/gsea/. Thiele, S., Cerone, L., Saez-Rodriguez, J., Siegel, A., Guziołowski, C., and Klamt, S. (2015). Extended notions of sign consistency to relate experimental data to signaling and regulatory network topologies. BMC Bioinformatics, 16(1). http://bioasp.github.io/iggy/.

Initial ICGC data, EMT signature & genes found in Kegg



log₂(fold-change)

Boxplot of the scores for each sampling



Score

Maxime FOLSCHETTE

Journées Bioss-IA - 2018-12-19

Evolution of max, min, mean and median of good, bad and missing predictions compared to 100% sampling



Sampling (%)