Gene Prediction using a configurable system for the integration of data by Dynamic Programming

Thesis by

Kevin Howe

submitted for the degree of **Doctor of Philosophy** University of Cambridge

St. John's College

and

The Wellcome Trust Sanger Institute Wellcome Trust Genome Campus Hinxton Cambridge

(Submitted on February 20, 2003)

Summary

A new approach to the computational identification of protein-coding gene structures in genomic DNA sequence is described. It overcomes rigidities inherent in most existing gene prediction methods, for example those based on Hidden Markov Models (HMMs), by supporting a flexible computational model of how sequence signal signals fit together into complete gene structures.

The primary result of the work is a gene prediction tool for the assembly of evidence for individual gene components (features) into complete gene structures. The system is completely configurable in that both the features themselves, and the model of gene structure against which candidate assemblies are validated and scored, are external to the system and supplied by the user. The gene prediction process is therefore tied neither to any specific techniques for the recognition of sequence signals, nor any specific underlying model of gene structure.

The methodology is implemented in a piece of software called "GAZE" which uses a dynamic programming algorithm to obtain (i) the highest scoring gene structure consistent with the user-supplied features and gene-structure model, and (ii) posterior probabilities that each feature is part of a gene. The algorithm includes a novel pruning strategy, ensuring that it has a run-time effectively linear in the length of the sequence without compromising accuracy. The effectiveness of the approach is explored by applying it to the prediction of gene structures in sequences of the nematode worm *C. elegans*.

GAZE allows the integration of gene prediction data from multiple, arbitrary sources. It is important for the accuracy of the system that the various pieces of evidence are weighted appropriately with respect to each other. A novel strategy for the automatic determination of optimal values for these weights is described. The method uses numerical analysis and dynamic programming to maximise a probabilistic accuracy function with respect to the weights. Its effectiveness is demonstrated in the context of the development a gene prediction system for vertebrate sequences using GAZE.

Contents

Preface			ix	
Introduction				
1	Met	thods for the computational identification of gene structures		
	1.1	Identifying the elements of gene structure	2	
		1.1.1 The recognition of gene structural elements \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots	3	
		1.1.2 The recognition of gene regions	5	
	1.2	Identifying complete gene structures	7	
		1.2.1 Gene fragment assembly methods	7	
		1.2.2 Hidden Markov models \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots	9	
	1.3	Using similarity to other sequences	1	
		1.3.1 Expressed sequences	l1	
		1.3.2 The sequences of other genomes $\ldots \ldots \ldots$	12	
	1.4	Assessing gene prediction accuracy		
		1.4.1 Gene prediction accuracy metrics	15	
	1.5	Other issues	Ι7	
2	GA	ZE 2	20	
	2.1	Introduction	20	
	2.2	From features and segments to gene structures	22	
	2.3	Elements of a GAZE configuration	25	

		2.3.1	Defining the validity of candidate gene structures	25
		2.3.2	Defining the scoring of valid gene structures	29
	2.4	Predic	tion with a GAZE gene structure model	31
		2.4.1	The GAZE scoring function	31
		2.4.2	Obtaining the highest scoring valid gene structure \ldots .	33
	2.5	A pro	bability distribution over gene structures	34
		2.5.1	Gene Structure probabilities	35
		2.5.2	Feature and Region posterior probabilities	37
		2.5.3	Stochastic traceback	38
	2.6	Practi	cal considerations	39
		2.6.1	Maintaining numerical stability	39
		2.6.2	Working within practical limits of space and time	41
		2.6.3	A novel pruning strategy	46
	2.7	Relati	onship to other similar systems	52
		2.7.1	Other gene prediction toolkits	52
		2.7.2	HMM methods	54
3	Usiı	ng GA	ZE for gene finding in <i>Caenorhabditis elegans</i>	56
3	Usin 3.1	n g GA Introd	ZE for gene finding in <i>Caenorhabditis elegans</i>	56 56
3	Usin 3.1 3.2	n g GA Introd Gene j	ZE for gene finding in <i>Caenorhabditis elegans</i> uction	56 56 57
3	Usin 3.1 3.2	ng GA Introd Gene j 3.2.1	ZE for gene finding in Caenorhabditis elegans uction	56 56 57 57
3	Usin 3.1 3.2	ng GA Introd Gene 1 3.2.1 3.2.2	ZE for gene finding in Caenorhabditis elegans uction uction materials for C.elegans WormBase and The WormSeq dataset A source of gene prediction data: GENEFINDER	56 56 57 57 60
3	Usin 3.1 3.2 3.3	ng GA Introd Gene 1 3.2.1 3.2.2 Defini	ZE for gene finding in Caenorhabditis elegans uction	56 56 57 57 60 62
3	Usin 3.1 3.2 3.3	ng GA Introd Gene 1 3.2.1 3.2.2 Defini 3.3.1	ZE for gene finding in Caenorhabditis elegans uction	56 56 57 57 60 62 63
3	Usin 3.1 3.2 3.3	ng GA Introd Gene 1 3.2.1 3.2.2 Defini 3.3.1 3.3.2	ZE for gene finding in Caenorhabditis elegans uction	56 57 57 60 62 63 64
3	Usin 3.1 3.2 3.3	ng GA Introd Gene 1 3.2.1 3.2.2 Defini 3.3.1 3.3.2 3.3.3	ZE for gene finding in Caenorhabditis elegans uction	56 56 57 57 60 62 63 64 64
3	Usin 3.1 3.2 3.3	ng GA Introd Gene 1 3.2.1 3.2.2 Defini 3.3.1 3.3.2 3.3.3 Apply	ZE for gene finding in Caenorhabditis elegans uction	56 56 57 57 60 62 63 64 66 68
3	Usin 3.1 3.2 3.3	ng GA Introd Gene 1 3.2.1 3.2.2 Defini 3.3.1 3.3.2 3.3.3 Apply 3.4.1	ZE for gene finding in Caenorhabditis elegans uction	56 56 57 57 60 62 63 64 66 68 68
3	Usin 3.1 3.2 3.3	ng GA Introd Gene (3.2.1 3.2.2 Defini 3.3.1 3.3.2 3.3.3 Apply 3.4.1 3.4.2	ZE for gene finding in Caenorhabditis elegans uction	56 56 57 57 60 62 63 64 66 68 68 68
3	Usin 3.1 3.2 3.3	ng GA Introd Gene (3.2.1 3.2.2 Defini 3.3.1 3.3.2 3.3.3 Apply 3.4.1 3.4.2 3.4.3	ZE for gene finding in Caenorhabditis elegans uction uction materials for C.elegans prediction materials for C.elegans WormBase and The WormSeq dataset A source of gene prediction data: GENEFINDER tion of a GAZE configuration in three steps A single, single-exon gene Extension to spliced structures Extending to multiple genes on both strands ing the model to C.elegans sequences Predicting genes in WormSeq Using feature-selection to refine the predictions Adjusting the score to refine the predictions	56 56 57 57 60 62 63 64 66 68 68 68 68 70

		3.4.4	A comparison with genefinder	72
	3.5	Towar	ds a $C.elegans$ -specific model of gene structure	73
		3.5.1	Splicing mechanisms in <i>C.elegans</i>	74
		3.5.2	Trans-splicing confuses gene prediction programs	75
		3.5.3	A GAZE model accounting for $trans$ -splicing \ldots \ldots \ldots	75
	3.6	Integr	ating similarity information	79
		3.6.1	ESTs and gene prediction	80
		3.6.2	A GAZE model for the use of EST alignments $\hfill \ldots \hfill \hfill \ldots \hfill \ldots \hfill \hfill \ldots \hfill \ldots \hfill \ldots \hfill \hfill \ldots \hfill \hfill \ldots \hfill \hfill \hfill \hfill \ldots \hfill \hfil$	82
	3.7	A clos	er look at the accuracy of GAZE	87
		3.7.1	Gene-level accuracy	88
		3.7.2	Accuracy at base-pair and exon-level	89
		3.7.3	Accuracy by exon-type	89
		3.7.4	Genome scale accuracy	91
	3.8	Exami	ining the probabilistic aspects of GAZE	93
		3.8.1	The reliability of GAZE predictions	93
		3.8.2	Feature probabilities can aid manual curation	95
		3.8.3	Feature probabilities could be used to identify alternative splic-	
			ing events	97
4	A n	nethod	for estimating optimal parameters for a GAZE model	100
	4.1	Introd	uction	100
	4.2	Evider	nce weighting in GAZE	101
		4.2.1	Optimally parsing a sequence according to weighted evidence	101
		4.2.2	Accommodating weights in the GAZE scoring function $% \mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}$	102
	4.3	Two a	pproaches to obtaining an optimal set of weights	105
		4.3.1	Maximum Likelihood	105
		4.3.2	Maximal Feature Discrimination	106
	4.4	Optim	ising the objective functions by gradient descent	108
		4.4.1	A conjugate gradient descent method	109
	4.5	Calcul	lating the gradient by dynamic programming	110

		4.5.1	The derivative of the ML function	110			
		4.5.2	The derivative of the MFD function	112			
		4.5.3	Computing the weighted average of the derivatives $\ . \ . \ .$	113			
	4.6	Imple	mentation issues	115			
		4.6.1	Numerical stability	115			
		4.6.2	Parameter tying	117			
		4.6.3	Time and memory usage	117			
	4.7	A con	nparison with other methods	119			
		4.7.1	Other methods based on weighted evidence $\ . \ . \ . \ . \ .$	119			
		4.7.2	Hidden Markov model methods	122			
	4.8	Optim	nising evidence weights for GAZE_EST	129			
		4.8.1	Choice of parameters and optimisation method $\ . \ . \ . \ .$	129			
		4.8.2	Accuracy of the trained model $\ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots$	130			
5	Application of CATE training to the development of a such last						
0	gen	e finde	ar	133			
	5 1	Introd	luction	133			
	5.2	Mater	ials for gene prediction in vertebrate sequences	134			
	0.2	5 2 1	Datasets for training and testing	134			
		522	Properties of the gene sets	136			
		5.2.3	A source of gene prediction features: GENEID	139			
	5.3	A GA	ZE configuration for human gene finding	141			
		5.3.1	A GAZE configuration based on GENEID	141			
		5.3.2	Accuracy of the model	143			
	5.4	Optim	nising the parameters of the model	143			
	-	5.4.1	Defining the parameters of the model	144			
		5.4.2	Accuracy of the trained model	145			
	5.5	Invest	igating three ways to improve accuracy	151			
		F F 1		159			
		0.0.1	Incorporating promoter prediction data	104			
		5.5.1 5.5.2	Using exon length distributions	152 158			

	5	5.5.3	Introducing C+G%-dependent model parameters \ldots \ldots	163
	5	5.5.4	Combining all three types of evidence	168
6	Conc	lusior	lS	170
Bi	bliogra	aphy		174
\mathbf{A}	Some	exan	nple GAZE configurations	187
	A.1 (GAZE	_std	187
	A.2 (GAZE.	EST	195
	A.3 (GAZE	GeneID	208

List of Tables

3.1	Gene level accuracy of standard model	70
3.2	Gene level accuracy of <i>trans</i> -splice model	78
3.3	Gene-level accuracy of the EST model	85
3.4	Comparative gene level accuracy of all configurations	88
3.5	Base-pair and exon-level accuracy	89
3.6	Accuracy by exon type	90
3.7	Accuracy in genome-scale assessment	92
4.1 4.2	Evidence weights determined by training	131 131
5.1	Properties of training and test datasets	136
5.2	Gene level accuracy of standard model	143
5.3	Comparative accuracy of ML and MFD training $\ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots$	146
5.4	Promoter predictions at different thresholds	153
5.5	Accuracy of the 5' UTR model	156
5.6	Accuracy of the exon-length model	161
5.7	C+G content of test and training sets $\hdots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots$	164
5.8	Accuracy of C+G%-specific model $\ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots \ldots$	166
5.9	Accuracy of model combining all evidence	168

List of Figures

1.1	Components of a eukaryotic protein-coding gene	2
2.1	Prediction of genes by GAZE	24
2.2	Problems with feature ordering	28
3.1	A simple GAZE configuration	63
3.2	Extensions to the configuration to model spliced genes	65
3.3	Extensions to the configuration to model multiple genes \ldots .	67
3.4	Pictorial representation of a GAZE configuration	69
3.5	Increased occurrence of wrong genes	71
3.6	Trans-splicing in C.elegans	74
3.7	Confusion of standard methods by <i>trans</i> -splicing	76
3.8	A GAZE configuration modelling <i>trans</i> -splicing	77
3.9	Pictorial representation of GAZE configuration for using ESTs $~$	86
3.10	Posterior feature probabilities for predicted genes	94
3.11	Posterior probabilities for all candidate features	96
3.12	Detecting alternative splicing with GAZE	98
5.1	A GAZE configuration for vertebrate gene finding	142
5.2	Accuracy in training set after each line minimisation	149
5.3	Accuracy in test set after each line minimisation	150
5.4	A GAZE configuration modelling the 5' UTR	155

Preface

Too many people have helped me during my time at the Sanger Centre to name individually. I feel it appropriate however to give some people a special mention.

I first came to the Sanger in October 1998 to work on the Pfam database, under the guidance of Alex Bateman and Ewan Birney. Being the young and impressionable newcomer to bioinformatics that I was, Alex and Ewan have to take a degree of credit/blame for the way I now approach problems in this field. Although my involvement with Pfam has diminished in recent years due to other commitments, Alex in particular has continued to to take an active interest in my scientific development, and for that I thank him.

This thesis represents the result of these other commitments, work which I began in October 1999. During this time, my primary source of guidance has been my supervisor, Richard Durbin. I thank him for ideas, direction, encouragement and not least for tolerating my (what must be sometimes infuriating) indecisiveness.

Declaration of originality

This dissertation is the result of my own work and includes nothing which is the outcome of work done in collaboration except where specifically indicated in the text.

Introduction

The working draft of the human genome is now nearly two years old [112], with announcement of the finished article expected later this year. The near-completion of this effort has seen a redirection of resources, resulting in an acceleration in the genome-sequencing of other organisms studied in experimental biology, such as mouse and zebrafish. According to the National Centre for Biotechnology Information, nearly 900 genomes are either finished or currently being sequenced¹. The fact that such large scale sequencing is possible represents an incredible achievement, both in technology/engineering, and sheer organisation. However, genomes only become useful resource for science through biological interpretation, i.e. *annotation* of the role of the different parts of the sequence in cellular processes. Without annotation, genome sequencing is, to paraphrase Ernest Rutherford, nothing more than stamp collecting.

The specific problem addressed by this thesis is that of the annotation of the *gene* structures in a genome. Annotation of a genome in terms of its constituent genes and their intron-exon structure allows us to infer a set of proteins for an organism. Furthermore, the genomic context of the genes can provide insight into the regulatory mechanisms that determine where and under what conditions the corresponding proteins are expressed, as well as being a useful resource for experimental biology.

Gene structure annotation of genomic sequence is still most accurately performed by trained experts, combining the results of a number of computational and experimental analyses with biological knowledge and heuristics. This is naturally a slow

¹http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/PMGifs/Genomes/allorg.html, 3rd February 2003

process, and the huge volume of sequence data being generated places an unrealistic demand on the number of experts required to perform this skilled activity. In addition, for the annotation of a large vertebrate genome to be completed in any reasonable amount of time, it is necessary to divide the sequence amongst up to a hundred annotators. This can have the undesirable result that different sections of a genome can be annotated with different standards and procedures. Reliable, completely automated methods for gene structure annotation would therefore firstly cope with the rate at which genome sequence data is being generated and secondly provide gene structure annotation that is *consistent*.

This thesis describes a new approach to the automated prediction of gene structures in genomic DNA sequences. Despite progressive improvement in the accuracy of computational methods in the last fifteen years, they remain imperfect. The problem therefore still attracts considerable research interest both into the biological processes of transcription, RNA processing and translation that determine the gene structure of a genome, and into methods for the recognition of the sequence signals involved in these processes. The integration of new knowledge and methods into complete gene prediction systems is however often inhibited by rigidities of design, such as a fixed assumed underlying model of the compositional and structural properties of genes.

The primary motivation for my research has been to accelerate the integration of new and possibly disparate knowledge and techniques into the gene prediction process. To this end, I have developed a structured framework for the assembly of gene prediction evidence from multiple, arbitrary sources into complete gene structure predictions. Careful design and certain assumptions allow the system to make probabilistic statements about its predictions, and this in turn facilitates a principled approach to the problem of determining an optimal weighting strategy for the various types of evidence employed.

The organisation of the dissertation is as follows. Chapter 1 discusses some of the issues and techniques of computational gene-structure prediction. The aim is to provide an introduction and broad survey, as many of the issues that are directly relevant to the work presented in the remainder of the thesis are expanded upon where appropriate.

After this short review, the dissertation can be viewed as comprising of two parts. The first part (chapters 2 and 3) describes a framework for the integration of arbitrary gene prediction data, and its application to the development of a gene finder for C. elegans sequences; the second part (chapters 4 and 5) describes a new approach to probabilistic parameter estimation and its application to the performance-tuning of a gene prediction system for vertebrate sequences.

Chapter 2 describes the details of the framework, implemented in a program called "GAZE". I briefly explain the elements of the system, with focus on the *configuration file* that controls the assembly of the external evidence into complete gene predictions. I then go on to describe the dynamic programming algorithms used by GAZE for the calculation of the optimal gene structure and posterior probabilities for parts of gene structures, including a novel search-space pruning strategy. To end, I contrast GAZE with other, similar approaches to computational gene prediction.

Chapter 3 describes the application of GAZE to gene prediction in *C. elegans* sequences. I outline the stepwise development of an initial configuration, and explore the effects of extending the model in two ways, first to account for a worm-specific peculiarity of gene structure, and second to make use of sequence similarity information. I also examine the probabilistic aspects of the system and explore some of their potential applications.

Chapter 4 addresses the problem of identifying an optimal weighting for the scores attached to the different types of evidence employed in an integrated gene prediction system. Two methods for estimating optimal weights for the elements of a GAZE configuration are described. The first is based on a classical maximum likelihood approach; the second is a novel method which I call *Maximal Feature Discrimination* (MFD). I contrast these with other similar techniques, particularly those used for Hidden Markov Models.

Chapter 5 describes the application of Maximal Feature Discrimination to the training of a simple GAZE model for gene finding in vertebrate sequences, and compares the results with those obtained using the classical maximum likelihood method. I extend the simple model with each of three types of additional evidence and demonstrate the effectiveness with which MFD is able to determine weights for the new model elements.

Finally chapter 6 concludes the dissertation by briefly summarising the important aspects of the work, and suggests possible areas for further research.