

# The Function of Communities in Protein Interaction Networks

Anna C. F. Lewis<sup>1</sup>, Nick S. Jones<sup>2,3,4,5</sup>, Mason A. Porter<sup>6</sup> and Charlotte M. Deane<sup>1,5\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Statistics, University of Oxford

<sup>2</sup>Department of Physics, University of Oxford

<sup>3</sup>CABDyN Complexity Centre, University of Oxford

<sup>4</sup>Department of Biochemistry, University of Oxford

<sup>5</sup>Oxford Centre for Integrative Systems Biology, University of Oxford

<sup>6</sup>Oxford Centre for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, Mathematical Institute, University of Oxford

## ABSTRACT

**Motivation:** If biology is modular then clusters, or communities, of proteins derived using only protein-protein interaction network structure might define protein modules with similar biological roles. We investigate the connection between biological modules and network communities in yeast and ask how the functional similarity of the communities that we find depends on the scales at which we probe the network.

**Results:** We find many proteins lie in functionally homogeneous communities (a maximum of 2777 out of 4028 proteins) which suggests that network structure does indeed help identify sets of proteins with similar functions. The homogeneity of the communities depends on the scale selected. We use a novel test and two independent characterizations of protein function to determine the functional homogeneity of communities. We exploit the connection between network structure and biological function to select groups of proteins which are likely to participate in similar biological functions. We show that high mean clustering coefficient and low mean node betweenness centrality can be used to predict functionally homogeneous communities.

**Availability:** All the data sets and the community detection algorithm are available online.

**Contact:** deane@stats.ox.ac.uk

## 1 INTRODUCTION

There is a large and expanding amount of protein-protein interaction data available, especially in yeast (Shoemaker and Panchenko (2007); Tarassov *et al.* (2008); Yu *et al.* (2008)). Considered together, such data give access to the protein interaction network (PIN) of a cell. By probing such networks, we can hope to learn about the underlying relationships between their structure and the way in which they bring about biological function.

There have been numerous attempts to connect PIN structure with biological function. Prominent examples include the connection between the evolutionary rate of a protein and its number of interacting partners (Fraser *et al.* (2002)), the effect of a gene when knocked out versus the number of interacting partners of the protein it encodes

(Jeong *et al.* (2001)), and the relationship between gene expression and the position of the encoded protein in the PIN (Han *et al.* (2004)). The outcomes of such studies are far from clear, with data quality and other confounding factors bringing some initial conclusions under question (Bader and Hogue (2002); Bloom and Adami (2003); Bader *et al.* (2004); Saeed and Deane (2006); Batada *et al.* (2007); Hakes *et al.* (2008); Cusick *et al.* (2008)).

In addition to structural properties that can be calculated for each node of a network, or for the whole network, there has been much recent interest in the middle scale structure of networks — in particular the location of dense regions within the network. Such regions, which consist of groups of nodes that are much more connected to themselves than they are to the rest of the network, are often called *communities* (Porter *et al.* (2009); Fortunato (2009)). In this paper we will attempt to answer the following question: What is the functional significance of such middle-scale PIN structural organisation within the cell?

Much recent attention has been given to the modularity of the cell's functional organisation (Hartwell *et al.* (1999); Ravasz *et al.* (2002); Han *et al.* (2004)). A module is loosely defined as a group of components that carry out a functional task fairly independently from the rest of the system. It is thought that such modules yield robust and adaptable systems (Alon (2007)). Communities of proteins, which are determined solely from network structure, might be good candidates for functional modules. If this is the case, we would expect proteins within a community to be functionally homogeneous.

Previous studies have reported the results of running one of the myriad algorithms for detecting community structure on PINs (Bu *et al.* (2003); Pereira-Leal *et al.* (2004); Dunn *et al.* (2005); Luo *et al.* (2007); Mete *et al.* (2008); Li *et al.* (2008)). Having located communities, such studies then attempt to assess their functional homogeneity by searching for terms in a structured vocabulary —usually the Gene Ontology (GO, Ashburner *et al.* (2000)) or Munich Information Centre for Protein Sequences categories (MIPS, Mewes *et al.* (2002))—that are significantly over-represented within communities. If such terms exist, the identified communities are said to be 'enriched' for biological function.

There has been a recent appreciation within the network community structure literature that there is no single middle scale

\*to whom correspondence should be addressed

of interest in networks. One might instead observe smaller communities embedded inside progressively larger ones (Porter *et al.* (2009)). Many of these algorithms are known to impose a resolution limit on the identified communities (Fortunato and Barthelemy (2007)). There are now algorithms available that include a ‘resolution parameter’, which allows one to uncover structure at many different resolutions (Reichardt and Bornholdt (2006); Kumpula *et al.* (2007); Heimo *et al.* (2008); Arenas *et al.* (2008); Blondel *et al.* (2008)). To our knowledge, such an algorithm has yet to be applied to protein interaction networks.

In this study, we probe the functional relevance of communities at multiple resolutions (scales). To do so, we employ two different protein functional characterizations: One uses the GO (Ashburner *et al.* (2000)), and the other uses the correlations of growth rates of gene knock-outs under different conditions (using data from Hillenmeyer *et al.* (2008)). We develop a new test of functional significance using both of these measures. Unlike those commonly used, our test controls for the number of interacting proteins within a community, which is crucial to have a fair test of the biological relevance of community structure.

As the functional knowledge of proteins is far from complete, even for well-characterised organisms such as yeast, we then search for structural properties of communities that are correlated with functional homogeneity. Any such properties can then be used to predict communities that are functionally homogeneous.

We find many functionally homogeneous communities at multiple network resolutions. However, we find few such communities at the resolution typically investigated in the literature. At the resolution that places the most proteins in functionally homogeneous communities, 2777 out of 4028 proteins are in functionally homogeneous communities according to our GO similarity measure. Communities at this resolution have mean size 72, compared to mean size 237 at the standard resolution. The communities judged to be functionally homogeneous using the correlated growth rates measure are largely a subset of these GO communities, giving us confidence in our GO-derived measure of functional similarity.

We further characterized the communities using 27 topological properties and identify that the mean clustering coefficient of communities is a good predictor of functional homogeneity, with a true positive rate of 73% achievable with a false positive rate of 25%. This indicates a connection between network structure and biological function, and that this connection can be useful in the prediction of protein functionality.

## 2 METHODS

### Datasets

The protein interaction network is constructed from the data deposited in the BioGRID database (Stark *et al.* (2006), July 2009 download), which contains interactions determined from many separate experiments. The majority of the interactions arise from yeast-two-hybrid (Y2H) and tandem affinity purification followed by mass-spectrometry (TAP) experimental methodologies (see Table 1 in the Supplementary Information). There are 34633 interactions between 4028 proteins.

The GO annotations to yeast proteins are taken from the GO website, which is maintained by the SGD consortium (Cherry *et al.* (1998)). The cheminformatics screen of growth rates under 418 different conditions following gene knock-out are reported in Hillenmeyer *et al.* (2008). We use the results from the homozygous strains.

### Potts community detection

The community detection method we apply to the PIN is known as the Potts method (Reichardt and Bornholdt (2006)). It partitions the proteins into communities at many different values of a resolution parameter, thus finding communities at different scales within the network. The method finds the partition of nodes into communities that minimises a quality function (‘energy’):

$$H = - \sum_{ij} J_{ij} \delta(\sigma_i, \sigma_j), \quad (1)$$

where  $\sigma_i$  is the community of node  $i$ ,  $\delta$  is the Kronecker delta, and the interaction matrix  $J_{ij}$  gives an indication of how much more connected two nodes are than one would expect at random (i.e. in comparison to some null hypothesis). The energy  $H$  is thus given by a sum of elements of  $J$  for which the two nodes are in the same community. Optimising  $H$  is known to be an NP-complete problem (Hastings (2006); Brandes *et al.* (2008)), so one must use a computational heuristic. Here we use the greedy algorithm discussed in Blondel *et al.* (2008), which performs well against various benchmark tests (Lancichinetti and Fortunato (2009)).

The interaction matrix  $J$  has elements

$$J_{ij} = A_{ij} - \lambda P_{ij}, \quad (2)$$

where the matrix  $A$  with elements  $A_{ij}$  is the adjacency matrix. In this case  $A_{ij} = 1$  if proteins  $i$  and  $j$  interact according to the BioGRID database, and  $A_{ij} = 0$  otherwise. The matrix  $P$  with elements  $P_{ij}$  defines a null model, against which we are comparing the network of interest. Here we choose the standard *Newman-Girvan* null model (Newman (2006)), which has the property that it preserves the node degree sequence. That is,

$$P_{ij} = \frac{k_i k_j}{2W}, \quad (3)$$

where  $k_i = \sum_j A_{ij}$  is the degree of node  $i$ , and  $W = \sum_{ij} A_{ij}/2$  is the number of edges in the network. The parameter  $\lambda$  is the resolution parameter.

We investigate partitions of the network in the range  $0.1 \leq \lambda \leq 1000$ , which we sample at intervals of 0.01 on a logarithmic scale. The ‘standard’ resolution is  $\lambda = 1$ . At  $\lambda = 0$ , all nodes that are connected to each other will be assigned to the same community. As we increase  $\lambda$ , communities split and become smaller. If we allow  $\lambda$  to increase until all of the entries in  $J_{ij}$  are negative, then each node will be assigned to its own community.

### Quantification of functional similarity

It is impossible to uniquely quantify similarity in biological function. Here we rely on the GO, which provides the most comprehensive available database of functional annotations, and use terms annotated to the biological process subontology. Terms are related to each other through a directed acyclic graph (DAG) (see the Supplementary Information). Proteins are annotated with the most specific terms that are known about them. It is then possible to add to this set their parent terms by following the structure of the DAG, up to the root node. Well-characterised proteins are those annotated with terms far from the root node. Of the 4028 proteins in our protein interaction network, 999 of them are only annotated to the root node.

Following Pandey *et al.* (2008), we quantify the functional similarity between two proteins  $i$  and  $j$  by finding the set of GO terms annotated to both proteins and counting the total number of proteins,  $n_{ij}$ , that share that set of terms. We then define a similarity measure between proteins  $i$  and  $j$  as

$$G_{ij} = 1 - \log(n_{ij}) / \log(N), \quad (4)$$

where  $N$  is the total number of proteins. If both proteins are annotated with a set of terms that few proteins share, then they will be judged as functionally similar under this measure. Unlike many other measures,  $G_{ij}$  does not penalise proteins for lack of annotation when judging their similarity. This is desirable, as we know that the GO annotations (even for the well-characterised *S. cerevisiae*) are far from complete.  $G_{ij}$  is not a perfect measure of similarity, as large sets of proteins that all have nearly identical annotations will have a low similarity score to each other; proteins that

are so annotated will not be recognised as being functionally similar. This is problematic for proteins in large complexes, where the annotations to all of the subunits are nearly identical. In this dataset we have found this to be the case for the ribosome, where the similarity between ribosomal proteins that interact is 0.34 compared to a network average for interacting proteins of 0.35. The measure is therefore underestimating our intuitive notion of similarity in this case.

The GO is subjective by its nature, both in the definition of the ontology itself and in the process of annotation of terms to proteins. It should be noted that the GO annotations are not entirely independent of the process by which the PIN is discovered. Proteins of interest, due to their role in particular processes, might well be annotated more fully. It is also more likely that experiments that determine protein interactions are performed on these proteins. We thus additionally use another quantification of the functional similarity between two proteins. This one is based on the growth rates of knock-out strains under a range of different conditions. Using the data in Hillenmeyer *et al.* (2008), we define  $C_{ij}$ , the correlation in growth rates of the strain with gene  $i$  knocked out to the strain with gene  $j$  knocked out under 418 different conditions:

$$C_{ij} = \text{corr}(L_i, L_j), \quad (5)$$

where the elements of the vector  $L_i$  are

$$L_i^t = \log(\mu_i^c / \mu_i^t), \quad (6)$$

the parameter  $\mu_i^c$  is the mean growth rate of strain  $i$  under different control conditions, and  $\mu_i^t$  is the growth rate under one of the 418 treatment conditions. There are 1010 proteins for which we have protein interaction data but which are lethal when the gene that encodes them is knocked out. Where either  $i$  or  $j$  is a lethal gene,  $C_{ij}$  is undefined.

### Assessment of a community's functional homogeneity

As mentioned in the introduction, the predominant test of the functional homogeneity of a community in the literature is to ask if any annotated terms are enriched for that set of proteins. In general, this is not a fair test when the group of proteins consists of a community, which by design will contain a large number of interacting pairs, and we expect the functional similarity of two proteins  $i$  and  $j$  to be higher if they interact. (This does indeed hold for both the GO similarity measure and the correlated growth measure; see Results.) We thus construct our test to compare the functional similarity of the interacting pairs within an identified community to the functional similarity of a randomly selected set of interacting pairs. As one of our aims is to be able to compare the functional homogeneity of communities at multiple resolutions, it is important to select a test that has a minimal dependence on the size of the selected community. We thus use a bootstrap test, and judge a community to be functionally homogeneous if the mean of the functional similarity of its interacting proteins is higher than the mean of the corresponding value for one hundred randomly chosen sets of interacting proteins (this corresponds to a  $p$ -value of 0.01).

### Topological properties that correlate with functional homogeneity

We investigate 27 topological properties of the identified communities (see Supplementary Information) and assess whether any of these can be used to identify functionally homogeneous communities. Representative examples include mean clustering coefficient, betweenness measures, and network diameter. Any topological properties that correlate well with functional homogeneity can then be used to predict functionally homogeneous communities. We use each topological property as a classifier, by predicting communities as functionally homogeneous when the value of that property is above a threshold, which we vary to construct a Receiver Operating Characteristic (ROC) curve. An ROC curve plots the number of communities correctly predicted as functionally homogeneous versus the number falsely predicted (Fawcett (2006)).

## 3 RESULTS

### Communities found


Figure 1 shows the communities that we find in yeast as the resolution parameter  $\lambda$  is varied. At small values of  $\lambda$  we find large communities, which fragment as we increase  $\lambda$ . At  $\lambda = 1$ , which corresponds to standard Newman-Girvan modularity (Newman (2006)), most communities contain a few hundred proteins. At  $\lambda = 1000$  (the largest value we investigate) almost all nodes are in communities of size three or less. As shown in Figure 1, some sets of nodes stick together through large changes in the resolution parameter and hence represent particularly well-connected parts of the network.

To give an example of the communities that we find at changing resolution parameter, consider the community at  $\lambda = 1$  that is marked as the blue block in Figure 1 (over node labels approximately 100 to 500). This contains 391 proteins and consists largely of proteins with some relationship to the ribosome (based on short protein descriptions found on the SGD website). Figure 2 shows this community, where nodes are coloured using the community partition at  $\lambda = 3$ . The colours – red, yellow, and blue – are the same as in Figure 1, where most of the community present at  $\lambda = 1$  has split into three communities at  $\lambda = 3$ . The blue community consists of 106 proteins, which are largely precursors to and processors of the large ribosomal unit. The red community consists of 62 proteins, which have a similar function but for the small ribosomal subunit. The yellow community has 97 proteins, 84 of which are constituents of the ribosome and the remainder of which are either of unknown function or associate to the ribosome. We give short descriptions of the proteins in these communities in the Supplementary Information.

### Functional similarity of communities

We find using our GO similarity measure that interacting proteins have a higher mean similarity than a randomly selected pair of proteins (0.35 versus 0.17). This is also the case for the similarity measure based on correlated growth rates (0.16 versus 0.04). If the aim is to assess the additional information given by the community structure of the network gives, then it is clearly important to control for the number of interacting proteins in a community when assessing their functional homogeneity. Our test compares the functional homogeneity of the interacting pairs in a community to that of a random set of interacting pairs.

Figure 3 illustrates the number of proteins in communities of size four or more (overall and under different tests of functional homogeneity). Using our GO similarity measure, we find that the large communities present at small values of the resolution parameter  $\lambda$  are not judged to be functionally homogeneous. As  $\lambda$  is increased, larger numbers of proteins occur in functionally homogeneous communities, peaking at around  $\lambda = 3$ . At  $\lambda = 3$ , the mean community size is 72 proteins, and the majority of proteins (2777 of 4028 in the PIN) are in functionally homogeneous communities as judged by our GO similarity measure. The shape of the graph for the correlated growth similarity measure is similar, despite the fact that there are over 1000 proteins that are lethal on deletion (and hence cannot be included in the assessment of functional homogeneity). In addition, this measure does not cover as comprehensive a set of functions as the GO annotations, as its only input is growth rates under different conditions of gene knock-outs. Figure 3 also



**Fig. 1.** Communities identified in the yeast protein interaction network. When the resolution parameter  $\lambda$  is very small, all nodes are assigned to the same community (which is analogous to viewing the network at a great distance). As  $\lambda$  is increased (viewing the network at progressively closer distances), more structure is revealed. The figures on the left hand side show visualisations of the network's partition into communities at four different values of  $\lambda$ . The size of each circle is proportional to the number of proteins in a community, and the mean of the position of the nodes is determined via a standard force directed network layout algorithm (Kamada and Kawai (1989)). The shade of the connecting lines is proportional to the number of links between two communities. The main figure shows the communities that we find as we vary the resolution. We identify communities as the same through changing resolution parameter, and hence colour them the same, according to a convention described in the Supplementary Information (only communities of size 50 or more are shown).

shows the number of proteins that we found in functionally enriched communities, where functional enrichment is judged in the standard way (Boyle *et al.* (2004)): A community is judged to be functionally homogeneous if any term is enriched in the community, where enrichment is determined in a comparison between the subset of proteins in a community compared to all proteins in the dataset using a cumulative hyper-geometric distribution (Boyle *et al.* (2004)). After controlling for multiple testing using the Bonferroni correction, we apply a  $p$ -value of 0.01 (the same as for our tests). As can be seen from Figure 3, at low values of  $\lambda$ , when most proteins are in one or very few communities, this measure of functional similarity always judges the community to be functionally homogeneous (for example the largest community identified, which contains 3941 proteins, is found to be enriched). The opposite property is seen for small communities, where this measure does not judge any proteins to be in homogeneous communities. There is little relationship to the communities judged significant under our significance tests and the standard enrichment tests at any value of  $\lambda$ .


Figure 4 shows the partition of the network into communities at  $\lambda = 3$ , illustrating the communities judged to be functionally homogeneous under (A) our GO similarity measure and (B) the correlated growth rates similarity measure. For all values of  $\lambda$ , almost all of the communities judged to be functionally homogeneous using the correlated growth similarity measure are also judged to be homogeneous using the GO measure. Indeed, at  $\lambda = 3$ , the only two

exceptions are the ribosome and the mitochondrial ribosome, which are not judged to be homogeneous under our GO similarity measure (see the discussion in the Methods). This overlap between communities judged to be homogeneous using both measures supports the biological significance of the extracted groups, particularly as there is no correlation between the two similarity measures at the pairwise level (Spearman correlation of 0.022 for all pairs).


A recent proposal posits that the distribution of essential proteins is such that some identified modules have a predominance of these proteins (Zotenko *et al.* (2008)). In our case, although the distribution of essential proteins is not random, the modular structure that we identify does not seem to capture that much of the distribution of essential proteins (see Supplementary Information).

### Use of topological properties to select functionally homogeneous communities

Of the 27 topological property measures that we tested (see Supplementary Information), we found high clustering coefficient and low node betweenness centrality to be the most useful in the prediction of functional homogeneity. The clustering coefficient of a network is a measure of the mean local clustering around nodes: A node has a high clustering coefficient if its neighbours are also neighbours of each other (Watts and Strogatz (1998), see Supplementary Information for formula). A node has high betweenness




**Fig. 2.** A representation of a community at  $\lambda = 1$ , with nodes (proteins) coloured according to the partition of this community at  $\lambda = 3$ . The colours are the same as for Figure 1, where this group of proteins has labels roughly in the range 100–400. Almost all of the nodes have some relationship to the ribosome. The proteins in the yellow community are mostly ribosomal subunits, those in the red community are mostly pre-cursors to and processors of the small ribosomal subunit, and those in the blue community have similar roles to those in the red community, but for the large subunit. There is no significance to the shade of the connecting links in this visualisation. Purple nodes are not located in one of the three largest communities discussed in the text.



**Fig. 3.** The number of proteins  $q$  in communities of size four or more in total (black solid curve) and in communities judged to be functionally homogeneous according to the GO similarity measure ( $q_G$ , green dashed curve) and the correlated growth similarity measure ( $q_C$ , red open squares). For comparison, we also show the same quantity as judged under the standard tests in the literature (Boyle *et al.* (2004)) ( $q_E$ , blue open circles). There is a peak in  $q_G$  at about  $\lambda = 3$ . The shape of  $q_C$  is similar to that for  $q_G$ , whereas the shape of  $q_E$  is distinct.

centrality if it occurs on many shortest paths between other vertices (Freeman (1979); see Supplementary Information for formula). Previous work has suggested that proteins of high betweenness probably play a role connecting groups of proteins, lying at the edge of




**Fig. 4.** The communities identified at  $\lambda = 3$ , visualised as in Figure 1. In (A), communities are coloured dark red if judged to be homogeneous under the GO similarity measure and light blue if not. (B) is the same but for the correlated growth similarity measure.

functional modules (Joy *et al.* (2005)). This is consistent with our result that functionally homogeneous communities tend to have few such proteins. The density of a community (defined in the Supplementary Information), which one might have expected to correlate well with functional homogeneity as we expect dense regions to be involved in similar processes, is not a good predictor (see Figure 5). See the Supplementary Information for examples of communities identified at  $\lambda = 10$  that are not judged to be functionally homogeneous using our GO measure but which have either high mean clustering coefficient or low mean betweenness centrality. As can be seen from the short descriptions of the proteins given by the SGD website (Cherry *et al.* (1998)) listed, these are plausible candidates for functional modules.

### Different evidence types

The protein interactions in the dataset that we use are largely from TAP and Y2H, two interaction types that are known to have very different properties (Shoemaker and Panchenko (2007)). Does the predominance of either sort of interaction correlate with any other



**Fig. 5.** The Receiver Operating Characteristic (ROC) curve for using mean clustering coefficient  $c$  (dashed curve), density of interactions  $\rho$  (dotted curve), and mean node betweenness centrality  $b$  (dash-dotted curve), as predictors of functional homogeneity using our GO measure. The false positive rate (FPR) is plotted against the true positive rate (TPR). A high mean clustering coefficient and a low mean betweenness centrality of a community are good predictors of the functional homogeneity of that community. In contrast, the density of a community is not a good predictor.

properties of communities? TAP proteins (i.e. those with interactions determined via TAP) have a much higher degree than Y2H proteins (with a mean of 14.1 compared to 5.3) and a much higher clustering coefficient (with a mean of 0.24 compared to 0.11). However, according to our two measures, there is no difference between the biological similarity of a pair known to interact via TAP and via Y2H. TAP-dominated communities tend to have a higher functional homogeneity, but this is not the case when their higher clustering is taken into account. To check that the connection between functional homogeneity and high clustering is not due simply to high TAP content, we computed the partial correlation and found the strength of the connection to be little changed, indicating that it is the high clustering rather than the evidence type that is selecting the most functionally homogeneous communities.

## 4 DISCUSSION

If protein interaction networks are to aid understanding of how biological function emerges from the concerted action of many proteins, then we need to explore connections between network structure and biological function. Here we investigated whether we can learn about the function of sets of proteins by studying the network community structure of the yeast PIN.

We found that community structure does indeed help identify sets of proteins which act together, and that this connection between network structure and biological function depends on the network scales probed. We do not expect there to be any single scale of interest at this middle-scale structure of the PIN, but although previous studies have applied community detection algorithms to PINs, no study to our knowledge has investigated this structure at multiple resolutions. We find that, up to a resolution of about  $\lambda = 3$ , which

is beyond the literature standard of  $\lambda = 1$ , not many communities are judged to be functionally homogeneous. However, at  $\lambda = 3$ , the majority of proteins (2777 of 4028 in the dataset we use) are in functionally homogeneous communities.

Having a good measure of functional homogeneity is central for this analysis. We approach this by using both the GO and also an independent and objective characterization of biological function: the growth rates of gene knock-out strains under different chemical conditions (Hillenmeyer *et al.* (2008)). The prevalent method in the literature for assessing functional homogeneity of a group of proteins is inappropriate for communities, as the number of interacting pairs in a group must be taken into consideration. Our test of functional homogeneity based on GO selects very different communities to the standard tests, notably finding many functionally homogeneous communities of small size. Using objective high-throughput data (Hillenmeyer *et al.* (2008)) with similar tests, we again find that many communities are judged to be functionally homogeneous. Importantly, these communities are largely a subset of those judged to be homogeneous using our GO measure. The only exceptions arise for communities dominated by ribosomal proteins, which are not judged significant under our GO measure because of the way large complexes are annotated.

Since we have found a connection between network communities and biological function, we can use observed community structure to predict aspects of biological function. We find that communities with a higher mean clustering coefficient and lower mean node betweenness centrality than average are far more likely to be functionally homogeneous. These measures can therefore be used to predict that a group of proteins is functionally homogeneous, even if our current knowledge does not allow us to infer this on the basis of functional annotations alone.

In conclusion, we have linked the middle-scale, or community structure, of a protein interaction network with biological function by probing different scales of network structure. The identified communities are candidates for biological modules within the cell. We have also illustrated how this connection can be used to select groups of proteins that likely participate in similar biological functions.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS


We thank Sumeet Agarwal, Dan Fenn, and Peter Mucha for useful discussions. We also thank Gabriel Villar for implementing the network measures, and Amanda Traud for implementation the Kamada-kawai visualisation code (which we modified for use here), which can be found at <http://netwiki.amath.unc.edu/VisComms/VisComms>.

*Funding:* A. C. F. L. acknowledges funding from the Systems Biology DTC. M. A. P. acknowledges a research award (#220020177) from the James S. McDonnell Foundation.

## SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

### Structure of the Gene Ontology

See Figure 6 for an illustration of the structure of the GO subontologies.



**Fig. 6.** Terms in each subontology of the GO are related to each other via a directed acyclic graph.

### Yeast BioGRID data

	Interactions	Proteins
All	34633	4028
TAP	23524	3308
Y2H	7704	2821
TAP and Y2H	1035	1053
Other	4440	2123

The yeast BioGRID database by evidence source (Stark *et al.* (2006)). Tandem Affinity Purification followed by mass spectroscopy (TAP) and yeast-two-hybrid screens (Y2H) are the predominant experimental sources. There is little overlap between these two.

### Topological measures tested

These were derived from code developed by Gabriel Villar.

1. Mean degree
2. Maximum degree
3. Degree assortativity coefficient (Newman (2002))
4. Clustering coefficient (Costa *et al.* (2007))
5. Global mean Soffer clustering coefficient (Soffer and Vázquez (2005))
6. Local mean Soffer clustering coefficient (Soffer and Vázquez (2005))
7. Mean geodesic node betweenness centrality (Wasserman and Faust (1994))
8. Mean closeness centrality (Wasserman and Faust (1994))
9. Mean eigenvector centrality (Wasserman and Faust (1994))
10. Mean information centrality (Wasserman and Faust (1994))
11. Mean geodesic distance (Costa *et al.* (2007))
12. Diameter (Wasserman and Faust (1994))
13. Mean harmonic geodesic distance (Costa *et al.* (2007))
14. Energy (Costa *et al.* (2007))
15. Entropy (Costa *et al.* (2007))

16. Off-diagonal complexity (Kim and Wilhelm (2008))
17. Cyclomatic number (Kim and Wilhelm (2008))
18. Connectivity (Kim and Wilhelm (2008))
19. Number of spanning trees (Kim and Wilhelm (2008))
20. Medium articulation (Kim and Wilhelm (2008))
21. Efficiency complexity (Kim and Wilhelm (2008))
22. Graph index complexity (Kim and Wilhelm (2008))
23. Density
24. Efficiency (Latora and Marchiori (2001))
25. Fraction of articulation vertices (Tsukiyama *et al.* (1980))
26. Largest eigenvalue
27. Rich club coefficient (Colizza *et al.* (2006))

### Definitions of topological properties used

The clustering coefficient of a network,  $c$ , is defined as

$$c = \frac{3N_{\text{triangle}}}{N_{\text{triple}}} \quad (7)$$

where  $N_{\text{triangle}}$  is the number of triangles in the network and  $N_{\text{triple}}$  is the number of connected triples in the network (a connected triple is a single node with edges running to an unordered pair of other nodes). A clustering coefficient can also be defined for each node.

The node betweenness centrality,  $b$  is defined using the number of geodesic paths between pairs of nodes in a network. For node  $v$ ,  $b(v)$  is defined by:

$$b(v) = \sum_{\substack{s \neq v \neq t \\ s \neq t}} \frac{\sigma_{st}(v)}{\sigma_{st}} \quad (8)$$

where  $\sigma_{st}$  is the total number of shortest paths from node  $s$  to node  $t$ , and  $\sigma_{st}(v)$  is the number of shortest paths from  $s$  to  $t$  that pass through  $v$ .

The density of a network  $\rho$  is the number of edges present in the network divided by the fraction of all possible edges:

$$\rho = \frac{\sum_i \sum_j A_{ij}}{V^2}, \quad (9)$$

where  $A$  is the adjacency matrix of the network and  $V$  is the number of nodes in the network.

### Convention for identifying communities at different partitions

To relate the partition at one value of  $\lambda$  to that at another (which is useful for visualisation), we require a convention for labelling communities. Here we use a method based on the overlap of shared nodes (Palla *et al.* (2007)). A convention based on links rather than nodes gives nearly identical results.

Let the communities in the first partition (which here is that at the highest resolution) be labelled  $K_1, \dots, K_s$ , and those in the next partition be labelled  $L_1, \dots, L_t$ . Then for each pair of communities,  $\{K_i, L_j\}$ , we have


$$M_{ij} = \frac{|K_i \cup L_j|}{|K_i \cap L_j|}, \quad (10)$$

where  $|B|$  denotes the cardinality (number of elements) of the set  $B$ . Starting with the largest value of  $M_{ij}$ , we relabel community

$i$  as community  $j$ . Relabelling proceeds with the next largest  $M_{ij}$ , as long as community  $i$  is not yet relabelled, until all communities have been relabelled. If  $s > t$  we introduce a new label.

### Example of distribution of essential proteins in communities

A proposal was put forward in Zotenko *et al.* (2008) to explain the so called centrality-lethality rule (Jeong *et al.* (2001)), whereby proteins that are essential have a higher mean degree than those that are not. (Where a protein is termed essential if the knock-out strain for the gene which encodes it is non-viable, the list of essential genes is given in Giaever *et al.* (2002).) This rule holds true in the PIN dataset we use. The proposed explanation for this rule in Zotenko *et al.* (2008) was that some modules are largely dominated by essential proteins. The methods of identification of modules in that paper is not just based on network structure, but also functional properties of the proteins. As can be seen from Figure 7, although the distribution is not random, the community structure does not seem to capture much of the distribution of essential proteins. The same is true for other values of  $\lambda$ .



**Fig. 7.** The partition at  $\lambda = 3$ , visualised in the same way as in Figure 4. The proportion of a circle that is dark green is equal to the proportion of the proteins that are essential.

### Examples of communities

Tables listing protein SGD numbers and short descriptions for 1) the communities in Figure 2 and 2) for the communities at  $\lambda = 10$  with high mean clustering and/or low mean node betweenness centrality can be found at <http://www.stats.ox.ac.uk/research/bioinfo/resources>.

## REFERENCES

Alon, U. (2007). *An Introduction to Systems Biology: Design Principles of Biological Circuits*. Chapman & Hall/CRC.

- Arenas, A., Fernández, A., and Gómez, S. (2008). Analysis of the structure of complex networks at different resolution levels. *New Journal of Physics*, **10**, 053039.
- Ashburner, M., Ball, C.A., Blake, J.A., Botstein, D., Butler, H., Cherry, J.M., Davis, A.P., Dolinski, K., Dwight, S.S., Eppig, J.T., *et al.* (2000). Gene Ontology: Tool for the unification of biology. *Nature Genetics*, **25**(1), 25–29.
- Bader, G.D. and Hogue, C.W.V. (2002). Analyzing yeast protein-protein interaction data obtained from different sources. *Nature Biotechnology*, **20**(10), 991–997.
- Bader, J.S., Chaudhuri, A., Rothberg, J.M., and Chant, J. (2004). Gaining confidence in high-throughput protein interaction networks. *Nat Biotechnology*, **22**(1), 78–85.
- Batada, N.N., Reguluy, T., Breitkreutz, A., Boucher, L., Breitkreutz, B.J., Hurst, L.D., and Tyers, M. (2007). Still stratus not altocumulus: further evidence against the date/party hub distinction. *PLoS Biology*, **5**(6), 1202–1206.
- Blondel, V.D., Guillaume, J.L., and Lambiotte, R. (2008). Fast unfolding of communities in large networks. *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment*, page P10008.
- Bloom, J.D., and Adami, C. (2003). Apparent dependence of protein evolutionary rate on number of interactions is linked to biases in protein-protein interactions data sets. *BMC Evolutionary Biology*, **3**, 21.
- Boyle, E.I., Weng, S., Gollub, J., Jin, H., Botstein, D., Cherry, J.M., and Sherlock, G. (2004). GO::TermFinder—open source software for accessing Gene Ontology information and finding significantly enriched Gene Ontology terms associated with a list of genes. *Bioinformatics*, **20**(18), 3710.
- Brandes, U., Delling, D., Gaertler, M., Goerke, R., Hofer, M., Nikoloski, Z., and Wagner, D. (2008). On modularity clustering. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, **20**(2), 172–188.
- Bu, D., Zhao, Y., Cai, L., Xue, H., Zhu, X., Lu, H., Zhang, J., Sun, S., Ling, L., Zhang, N., *et al.* (2003). Topological structure analysis of the protein-protein interaction network in budding yeast. *Nucleic Acids Research*, **31**(9), 2443–2450.
- Cherry, J.M., Adler, C., Ball, C., Chervitz, S.A., Dwight, S.S., Hester, E.T., Jia, Y., Juvik, G., Roe, T., Schroeder, M., *et al.* (1998). SGD: Saccharomyces genome database. *Nucleic Acids Research*, **26**(1), 73.
- Colizza, V., Flammini, A., Serrano, M.A., and Vespignani, A. (2006). Detecting rich-club ordering in complex networks. *Nature Physics*, **2**, 110–115.
- Costa, L.D., Rodrigues, F.A., Travieso, G., and Boas, P.R.V. (2007). Characterization of complex networks: A survey of measurements. *Advances in Physics*, **56**(1), 167–242.
- Cusick, M.E., Yu, H., Smolyar, A., Venkatesan, K., Carvunis, A.-R., Simonis, N., Rual, J.-F., Borick, H., Braun, P., Dreze, M., Vandenhoute, J., Galli, M., Yazaki, J., Hill, D.E., Ecker, J.R., Roth, F.P., and Vidal, M. (2008). Literature-curated protein interaction datasets. *Nature Methods*, **6**(1), 39–46.
- Dunn, R., Dudbridge, F., and Sanderson, C.M. (2005). The use of edge-betweenness clustering to investigate biological function in protein interaction networks. *BMC Bioinformatics*, **6**, 39.
- Fawcett, T. (2006). An introduction to ROC analysis. *Pattern recognition letters*, **27**(8), 861–874.
- Fortunato, S. (2009). Community detection in graphs. *Physics Reports*.



- Fortunato, S. and Barthelemy, M. (2007). Resolution limit in community detection. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, **104**(1), 36–41.
- Fraser, H.B., Hirsh, A.E., Steinmetz, L.M., Scharfe, C., and Feldman, M.W. (2002). Evolutionary rate in the protein interaction network. *Science*, **296**(5568), 750–752.
- Freeman, L.C. (1979). Centrality in social networks conceptual clarification. *Social networks*, **1**(3), 215–239.
- Giaever, G., Chu, A.M., Ni, L., Connelly, C., Riles, L., Véronneau, S., Dow, S., Lucau-Danila, A., Anderson, K., André, B., *et al.* (2002). Functional profiling of the *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* genome. *Nature*, **418**(6896), 387–391.
- Hakes, L., Pinney, J.W., Robertson, D.L., and Lovell, S.C. (2008). Protein-protein interaction networks and biology – what’s the connection? *Nature Biotechnology*, **26**(1), 69–72.
- Han, J.D.J., Bertin, N., Hao, T., Goldberg, D.S., Berriz, G.F., Zhang, L.V., Dupuy, D., Walhout, A.J.M., Cusick, M.E., Roth, F.P., *et al.* (2004). Evidence for dynamically organized modularity in the yeast protein-protein interaction network. *Nature*, **430**(6995), 88–93.
- Hartwell, L.H., Hopfield, J.J., Leibler, S., and Murray, A.W. (1999). From molecular to modular cell biology. *Nature*, **402**(6761), C4–C52.
- Hastings, M.B. (2006). Community detection as an inference problem. *Physical Review E*, **74**(3), 35102.
- Heimo, T., Kumpula, J., Kaski, K., and Saramaki, J. (2008). Detecting modules in dense weighted networks with the Potts method. *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment*, (P08007).
- Hillenmeyer, M.E., Fung, E., Wildenhain, J., Pierce, S.E., Hoon, S., Lee, W., Proctor, M., St Onge, R.P., Tyers, M., Koller, D., *et al.* (2008). The chemical genomic portrait of yeast: uncovering a phenotype for all genes. *Science*, **320**(5874), 362.
- Jeong, H., Mason, S., Barabási, A.-L., and Oltvai, Z.N. (2001). Lethality and centrality in protein networks. *Nature*, **411**(6833), 41–42.
- Joy, M.P., Brock, A., Ingber, D.E., and Huang, S. (2005). High-betweenness proteins in the yeast protein interaction network. *Journal of Biomedicine and Biotechnology*, **2005**(2), 96–103.
- Kamada, T. and Kawai, S. (1989). An algorithm for drawing general undirected graphs. *Information processing letters*, **31**(1), 7–15.
- Kim, J. and Wilhelm, T. (2008). What is a complex graph? *Physica A Statistical Mechanics and its Applications*, **387**, 2637–2652.
- Kumpula, J.M., Saramäki, J., Kaski, K., and Kertész, J. (2007). Limited resolution and multiresolution methods in complex network community detection. **7**(3), L209–L214.
- Lancichinetti, A. and Fortunato, S. (2009). Community detection algorithms: a comparative analysis. *arXiv:0908.1062*.
- Latora, V. and Marchiori, M. (2001). Efficient behavior of small-world networks. *Physical Review Letters*, **87**(19), 198701.
- Li, M., Wang, J., and Chen, J. (2008). A graph-theoretic method for mining overlapping functional modules in protein interaction networks. *Lecture Notes in Bioinformatics*, **4983**, 208–219.
- Luo, F., Yang, Y., Chen, C.F., Chang, R., Zhou, J., and Scheuermann, R.H. (2007). Modular organization of protein interaction networks. *Bioinformatics*, **23**(2), 207–214.
- Mete, M., Tang, F., Xu, X., and Yuruk, N. (2008). A structural approach for finding functional modules from large biological networks. *BMC Bioinformatics*, **9**, S19.
- Mewes, H.W., Frishman, D., Guldener, U., Mannhaupt, G., Mayer, K., Mokrejs, M., Morgenstern, B., Munsterkotter, M., Rudd, S. and Weil, B. (2002). MIPS: A database for genomes and protein sequences. *Nucleic Acids Research*, **30**(1), 31–34.
- Newman, M.E.J. (2002). Assortative mixing in networks. *Physical Review Letters*, **89**(20), 208701.
- Newman, M.E.J. (2006). Finding community structure in networks using the eigenvectors of matrices. *Physical Review E*, **74**(3), 36104.
- Palla, G., Barabási, A.-L., and Vicsek, T. (2007). Quantifying social group evolution. *Nature*, **446**(7136), 664–667.
- Pandey, J., Koyuturk, M., Subramaniam, S., *et al.* (2008). Functional coherence in domain interaction networks. *Bioinformatics*, **24**, 128–134.
- Pereira-Leal, J.B., Enright, A.J., and Ouzounis, C.A. (2004). Detection of functional modules from protein interaction networks. *Proteins: Structure, Function and Genetics*, **54**(1), 49–57.
- Porter, M.A., Onnela, J.-P., and Mucha, P.J. (2009). Communities in networks. *Notices of the American Mathematical Society*, **56**(9), 1082–1097, 1164–1166.
- Ravasz, E., Somera, A.L., Mongru, D.A., Oltvai, Z.N., and Barabási, A.-L. (2002). Hierarchical organization of modularity in metabolic networks. *Science*, **297**(5586), 1551–1555.
- Reichardt, J. and Bornholdt, S. (2006). Statistical mechanics of community detection. *Physical Review E*, **74**(1), 16110.
- Saeed, R. and Deane, C.M. (2006). Protein protein interactions, evolutionary rate, abundance and age. *BMC bioinformatics*, **7**(1), 128.
- Shoemaker, B.A. and Panchenko, A.R. (2007). Deciphering protein-protein interactions. part i. experimental techniques and databases. *PLoS Computational Biology*, **3**(3), e42.
- Soffer, S.N. and Vázquez, A. (2005). Network clustering coefficient without degree-correlation biases. *Physical Review E*, **71**(5), 57101.
- Stark, C., Breitkreutz, B.J., Reguly, T., Boucher, L., Breitkreutz, A., and Tyers, M. BioGRID: a general repository for interaction datasets *Nucleic acids research*, **34**(Database Issue), D535
- Tarassov, K., Messier, V., Landry, C.R., Radinovic, S., Molina, M.M., Shames, I., Malitskaya, Y., Vogel, J., Bussey, H. and Michnick, S.W. (2008). An in vivo map of the yeast protein interactome. *Science*, **320**(5882), 1465–1470.
- Tsukiyama, S., Shirakawa, I., Ozaki, H., and Ariyoshi, H. (1980). An algorithm to enumerate all cutsets of a graph in linear time per cutset. *Journal of the ACM*, **27**(4), 619–632
- Wasserman, S. and Faust, K. (1994). *Social network analysis: Methods and applications*. Cambridge University Press.
- Watts, D.J. and Strogatz, S.H. (1998). Collective dynamics of small-world networks. *Nature*, **393**(6684), 440–442.
- Yu, H., Braun, P., Yildirim, M.A., Lemmens, I., Venkatesan, K., Sahalie, J., Hirozane-Kishikawa, T., Gebreab, F., Li, N., Simonis, N., *et al.* (2008). High-quality binary protein interaction map of the yeast interactome network. *Science*, **322**(5898), 104–110.
- Zotenko, E., Mestre, J., O’Leary, D.P., and Przytycka, T.M. (2008). Why do hubs in the yeast protein interaction network tend to be essential: reexamining the connection between the network topology and essentiality. *PLoS Computational Biology*, **4**(8), e1000140.