Genome-wide discovery of modulators of transcriptional interactions in human B lymphocytes

> Ilya Nemenman (CCS-3/LANL) <u>Kai Wang</u>, Nilanjana Banerjee, Adam Margolin, <u>Andrea Califano</u> (JCSB/Columbia)

# Reconstructing cellular interactions



HG-U95A (approximately 12,600 probes)

- Over-, under- expression, diagnostics tools (since late 1990s)
- Clustering, pathways identification (since late 1990s)
- Interaction networks (since early 2000s)

# Reconstructing cellular interactions



#### Two major problems



#### Problem 1: ARACNE (Data Processing Inequality, DPI)





Performance: Few false positives

- No false positives for tree networks
- No false positives under very general conditions for networks with few strong loops
- No false negatives under stronger conditions
- Need to estimate MI reliably

#### Synthetic networks



#### B-cell dataset: cMYC network

- ~400 arrays (Dalla-Favera et al.)
- No dynamics
- ~250 naturally occurring, ~150 perturbed
- ~25 phenotypes (normal, tumors, experimental perturbations)



- Protooncogene,
- 12% background binding,
- one of top 5% hubs
- significant MI with 2000 genes

```
Total interactions: 56
Pre-known: 22
New Ch-IP validated: 11/12
```

# Problem 2: posttranslational modulation from mRNA data

- Much of regulation in higher eukaryotes is posttranscriptional (e.g., splicing), and post-translational (e.g., phosphorylation, complex formation).
- Many mRNA (e.g., p53) constitutively expressed.

Can these be observed from mRNA expressions only?

#### Solution:

Phenotypic and population variability (even in constitutively expressed genes) induces higher order dependencies between TFs, targets, and modulators.

#### Posttranslational modulation: a transistor model





### Posttranslational modulation: MI signature



## Phenotypic variability of constitutive modulators



#### Numerical case study: Transistor modulation



TF Interaction	Ι	$I_{PK}^{-}$	$I_{PK}^+$	$\Delta I_{PK}$	$I_{coTF}^{-}$	$I_{coTF}^+$	$\Delta I_{coTF}$
РК							
coTF							
Gene1	0.73	0.54	0.57		0.55	0.54	
Gene2						0.37	0.37
Gene3			0.35	0.34			

 $I_{PK}^+$ (gene1) = I(TF, gene1 | PK high)

### Enforcing irreducibility: ARACNE on a TF-hub









#### However: No solution yet for...



Modulators are not irreducible.

Any suggestions?

### Algorithm flowchart



- Focus on a hub (c-MYC).
- Select modulators with σ> microarray noise (Tu et al., 2002) -- many signaling genes, constitutively expressed genes.
- Find modulators whose expression inflicts significant conditional MI changes for an ARACNE target in at least one conditional topology.
- No guarantee of modulator irreducibility.
- Guarantee of target irreducibility (after multiple hypothesis correction).

$$\Delta I(g_{TF}, g_t | g_m) = = |I(g_{TF}, g_t | g_m^+) - I(g_{TF}, g_t | g_m^-)| > 0$$

#### c-MYC modulators

- 1117 candidate modulators
- 100 modulators, 130 targets, 205 interactions
- GO enrichment of the modulator set: kinases, acyltransferases, TFs (all p<5%)</li>
- Modulators in known MYC regulation pathways (e.g., BCR)
- TFs: 15/100, p=1e-6.
- 4/5 TF modulators (e.g., E2F5) with TRANSFAC signatures have binding sites in modulated targets promoter regions.
- Modulators with many (>=4) targets are not-specific (proteolisis, upstream signaling components, receptor signaling molecules).
- Modulators with few (1-2) effected targets are mostly co-TFs, interaction-specific.
- ~1/3 modulators are literature-validated.
- Biochemical validation of predictions in progress.

### Example: TF co-factor modulator



### BCR pathway: Reducibility



- predicted modulators
- not in the candidate list
- TF's not predicted
- Protein complex
- Targets