



Outline

- · reproducible research
- · annotation and meta-data
- GO more advanced usage

CONDUCTO

Reproducible Research

- A publication about scientific computing is not scholarship, it is merely an advertisement of scholarship, the scholarship lies elsewhere (Claerbout)
- Electronic journals are largely electronic only in their delivery mechanism. A few trees survive but for the author and the reader little has changed.

CONDUCTOR

Reproducible Research

- most recipients of electronic documents have a computational engine available
- this suggests that we could in fact move (in a structured way) to navigable documents with dynamic content
- these documents would allow the reader to recreate (and modify) the results being reported

Early Work · Claerbout's lab at Duncan Temple Lang Stanford - Literate programming - use of Makefiles - extensible dynamic docs Buckheit and Donoho Tony Rossini (1995)- plots should be - Literate Data Analsysis reproducible Fritz Leisch Vince Carey Sweave - Literate Programming

CONDUCTOR

Compendiums

- we need to provide an entity that contains
 - text: the written content of the article(s)
 - code: computer code that will execute to provide outputs such as tables and graphics
 - data: on which the code operates and about which the text is reporting

Compendiums

- · an amalgam of code, data, and text
- delivered as a single object that the user can transform into different outputs
- · some outputs

5

- papers suitable for publication
- interim reports
- long and short versions of articles
- reports for clients etc.



Compendiums: Proof of Concept

- Sweave is a system for combining text and R code in alternating chunks
- the document looks like LaTeX but with code insterted in a special (but easy to use way)
- the document can be woven to produce a LaTeX document with all code chunks replaced by their outputs

Sweave				
<pre>\section{Data} We see an interesting pattern in Figure~\ref{F1} <<f1, fig="TRUE">>= plot(data.x,data.y) @ And so we like it.</f1,></pre>	 on the left we see a section of an Sweave document first, standard LaTeX and then a small code chunk that is R code after weaving the code chunk will be replaced by the code to include the plot (which is in eps or pdf) 			

CONDUCTOR

Compendiums: An Implementation

- the R package system provides a mechanism for both packaging together, data, code and Sweave documents and for distributing these
- with these two tools we have a proof of concept – one can carry out reproducible research with these tools
- I can give you a package that represents a paper and you can run it on your machine to reproduce that paper

5

Compendiums

- · the concept is completely general
- given infrastructural tools (packages, distribution and transformation) any language (ie. Perl or Python) can provide these services

CONDUCTOR

Annotation

- One of the largest challenges in analyzing genomic data is associating the experimental data with the available biological metadata, e.g., sequence, gene annotation, chromosomal maps, literature.
- AND MAKING THAT DATA AVAILABLE FOR COMPUTATION
- Bioconductor provides three main packages for this purpose:
 - annotate (end-user);
 - AnnBuilder (developer)
 - annaffy (end-user will see a name change)

WWW resources

- Nucleotide databases: e.g. GenBank.
- Gene databases: e.g. LocusLink, UniGene.
- Protein sequence and structure databases: e.g. SwissProt, Protein DataBank (PDB).
- Literature databases: e.g. PubMed, OMIM.
- Chromosome maps: e.g. NCBI Map Viewer.
- Pathways: e.g. KEGG.
- Entrez is a search and retrieval system that integrates information from databases at NCBI (National Center for Biotechnology Information).
- if you know of some we should be using please let us know

CONDUCTO

annotate: matching IDs

Important tasks

- Associate manufacturers or in-house probe identifiers to other available identifiers.
- E.g.

Affymetrix IDs \rightarrow LocusLink LocusID Affymetrix IDs \rightarrow GenBank accession number.

- Associate probes with biological data such as chromosomal position, pathways.
- Associate probes with published literature data via PubMed (need PMID).



Ø

5

annotate: Versioning

- it is import to keep all version information together with the mappings
- it is important to allow for new mappings to be used when they become available
- there are some interesting challenges and concerns that arise when comparing the strategies of on-line mappings versus compiled mappings

CONDUCTOR

annotate: matching IDs

Affymetrix identifier HGU95A chips	"41046_s_at"
LocusLink, LocusID	``9203 ″
GenBank accession #	``X95808″
Gene symbol	"ZNF261"
PubMed, PMID	"10486218" "9205841" "8817323"
Chromosomal location	"X", "Xq13.1"

Annotation data packages

- The Bioconductor project provides annotation data packages, that contain many different mappings to interesting data
 - Mappings between Affy IDs and other probe IDs: hgu95av2 for HGU95Av2 GeneChip series, also, hgu133a, hu6800, mgu74a, rgu34a, YG.
 - Affy CDF data packages.
 - Probe sequence data packages.
 - These packages are updated and expanded
- regularly as new data become available. They can be downloaded from the Bioconductor
- website and also using installDataPackage.
 DPExplorer: a widget for interacting with data
- packages.
- AnnBuilder: tools for building annotation data packages.

NDUCTOR 2

annotate: matching IDs

- Much of what annotate does relies on matching symbols.
- This is basically the role of a hash table in most programming languages.
- In R, we rely on environments.
- The annotation data packages provide R environment objects containing key and value pairs for the mappings between two sets of probe identifiers.
- Keys can be accessed using the R 1s function.
- Matching values in different environments can be accessed using the get or multiget functions.

annotate: matching IDs
> library(hgu95av2)
<pre>> get("41046_s_at", env = hgu95av2ACCNUM) [1] "X95808"</pre>
<pre>> get("41046_s_at", env = hgu95av2LOCUSID) [1] "9203"</pre>
> get("41046_s_at", env = hgu95av2SYMBOL) [1] "ZNF261"
> get("41046_s_at", env = hgu95av2GENENAME) [1] "zinc finger protein 261"
> get("41046 s at", env = hgu95av2SUMFUNC)
[1] "Contains a putative zinc-binding motif (MYM) Proteome"
> get("41046_s_at", env = hgu95av2UNIGENE) [1] "Hs.9568"





a l

annotate: matching IDs

- Instead of relying on the general R functions for environments, new userfriendly functions have been written for accessing and working with specific identifiers.
- E.g. getGO, getGOdesc, getLL, getPMID, getSYMBOL.





annotate: querying databases

notata packago providos tools f

- The annotate package provides tools forSearching and processing information from
- various WWW biological databases
 - GenBank,
 - LocusLink,
 - PubMed.
- Regular expression searching of PubMed abstracts.
- Generating nice HTML reports of analyses, with links to biological databases.

annotate: WWW queries

 Functions for querying WWW databases from R rely on the browseURL function

browseURL("www.r-project.org")

a s

Other tools: HTMLPage class, getTDRows, getQueryLink, getQuery4UG, getQuery4LL, makeAnchor.

• The XML package is used to parse query results.









annotate: high-level tools for querying PubMed

- pm.getabst: download the specified PubMed abstracts (stored in XML) and create a list of pubMedAbst objects.
- pm.titles: extract the titles from a list of PubMed abstracts.
- pm.abstGrep: regular expression matching on the abstracts.

5

interval annotate: PubMed example pmid <-get("41046_s_at", env=hgu95aPMID) pubmed(pmid, disp="browser") http://www.ncbi.nlh.gov/entrez/guery.fcgi?tool=bioconductor&cmd=Retrieve&de b=PubMed&list uids=10486218%2c9205841%2c8817323 absts <- pm.getabst("41046_s_at", base="hgu95a") pm.titles(absts) pm.abstGrep("retardation",absts[[1]])









• Entries can include various gene identifiers and statistics.



What is GO?	
 The Gene Ontology Consortium coordinates the development and refinement of GO 	
 GO is a set of three ontologies for gene products molecular function cellular component biological process 	

S

GO

- the relationship between gene products and BP, CC, MF are all many to many
- a child term may have one or more parent terms
- *transmembrane receptor protein-tyrosine kinase* is child of both *transmembrane receptor* and *protein tyrosine kinase*

CONDUCTOR

GO Parent-Child

- the relationship between a parent and a child term can be either an *is-a* relationship or a *part-of* relationship
- a mitotic chromosome is a chromosome
- a telomere is a part-of a chromosome
- the child term is more specific than the parent term



GO Graphs

- · GO itself has no reference to genes
- GO specifies a terminology and the relationships between terms
- each GO term is associated with a single node (so I will use the words term and node interchangeably) in the DAG



GO and Genes

- so GO as described above is a set of terms
- as such it can be used as the basis for searching relevant literature (McCray et al)
- but its real power comes from the annotation of specific genes and gene products at the different terms
- this is carried out by many organizations using criteria proposed by GO

GO and Genes a gene is annotated at one or more terms for each term the annotation must be supported by evidence and the evidence code is available (e.g) TAS: traceable author statement IEP: inferred from expression pattern ISS: inferred from sequence similarity and many others

CONDUCTOR

Data

- as part of Bioconductor we proved a GO package which has all the GO specific data
 - terms and relationships
 - some whole species data
- for each instrument (chip) we provide chip specific data
 - maps from the probes to GO terms
 - counts of probes per GO term + children
- · constantly evolving and being updated

5

GO Data

- for any gene obtain the most specific GO labels that gene is annotated at
- using these terms and the GO structure obtain the graph that has nodes representing those terms and all parents and edges for all child parent relationships
- this is called the *induced GO graph* or just the *GO graph*
- BP, CC and MF all induce different graphs





Analysis: What Can We Do?

- we can use GO to provide annotations for lists or clusters of genes
- we can use GO to provide sets of genes with specific properties (or relationships)
- We can define distances between GO terms using the graph structure
- we can define distances between genes using GO and other data

5

ALL Example

- ALL experiment, 93 patients (courtesy Ritz, Foa, Chiaretti)
- selected genes that could differentiate three groups, ALL1/AF4, BCR/ABL, NEG
- this yielded 136 probes and 129 unique LocusLink ids of these 90 have GO MF annotation
- are there MF terms that are over represented in this list of genes?



CONDUCTOR

ALL Example

- for each GO node the set of probes annotated at that node was determined
- for each probe the group (ALL1/AF4, BCR/ABL, NEG) with the highest mean was determined
- finally the group that had the most "highest means" was determined







Relating Terms to Gene Lists

- suppose that we have a list of n interesting genes (derived in any old way)
- for each GO term (in each ontology) we can ask whether the genes in the list are over-represented at that node
- this question can also be phrased in terms of a test of homogeneity (2-way table)



Terms to Gene Lists

- consider all genes assayed (or all genes expressed may be more relevant), N
- we have an urn with N balls, n of them are white (the interesting ones) and N-n are black
- for a GO term we have k genes annotated at that term
- this is like k draws from the Urn and we ask whether we got more white balls than expected (x=number of white balls)



Terms to Gene Lists

- this is simply a Hypergeometric calculation
- issues:
 - multiple testing
 - lack of independence: genes are annotated at parents and children
 - can we (should we) take account of the GO hierarchy?
 - GO terms with too many genes (not specific)
 - GO terms with too few genes (not interesting)
 - shouldn't the genes all be interesting in the same way?

CONDUCTOR

ALL Example

- for each MF category a Hypergeometric test was performed
- N=6422, n=90, for each term we found the number of unique LocusLink Ids annotated at that term were determined (this was k)
- 8 nodes with p< 0.01 and 30 nodes with p<0.05
- · we will explore the 8 nodes

ALL: 8 GO Terms				
TERM	DESCRIPTION	k	x	p-value
GO:0005515	protein binding	800	22	0.0012
GO:0003821	class II major histocompatibility complex antigen	9	5	6e-8
GO:0003779	actin binding	111	7	9e-4
GO:0008092	cytoskeletal protein	155	8	0.0014
GO:0004601	peroxidase	20	3	0.0026
GO:0016684	oxidoreductase, acting on peroxide as acceptor	20	3	0.0026
GO:0045012	MHC class II receptor	4	2	0.0011
GO:0005095	GTPase inhibitor	6	2	0.0028



Using the GO Structure

- notice that the sequence 3779->8092->5515
- has decreasing p-values
 .001 -> .002 -> .009
- evidence: 7/111; 8/155; 22/800
- · how do we interpret this?
- set up as a series of nested 2 by 2 tables we might make some progress (log-rank)



Clustering and GO

 another way to view the previous test is as a two-way table and a test of homogeneity

Node\Interesting	YES	NO	Total
YES	5	4	9
NO	85	6328	6413
Total	90	6332	6422

• p-value=5e-8





Using the GO Structure

- do we take that as stronger evidence in favor of an interesting effect than if there was no gradient?
- what about the child-parent relationships, are *is-a* and *has-a* important?
- are we happier if at least one of the *is-a* children show a similar effect?

5

Issues

- it will be important in some contexts to account for and adjust for the evidence on which an annotation was based
- for example if exploring sequence similarity as it relates to function all ISS based annotations should be excluded

CONDUCTOR

Conclusions

- GO and the various collaborators have provided a very rich data set which has the potential to add meaning to data analyses
- there are a number of ways of using this data and it is not yet clear which will be most beneficial
- it is clear that we need better tools for working with the data

