

Understanding and predicting genome-wide synthetic lethal genetic interactions in *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* using domain genetic interactions

Bo Li¹, Weiguo Cao², Jizhong Zhou³, Feng Luo^{1,*}

¹School of Computing, Clemson University, Clemson, SC 29634, USA

²Department of Genetics and Biochemistry, South Carolina Experiment Station, Clemson University, Clemson, SC 29634, USA

³Institute for Environmental Genomics, University of Oklahoma, Norman, OK, USA

* Corresponding author. Tel: +1 864 656 4793; Email: luofeng@clemson.edu

Keywords: domain genetic interactions/genetic interactions

Running title: Understand SLGIs using domain genetic interactions

Abstract

Genetic interactions have been widely used to define functional relationships between proteins and pathways. In this study, we demonstrate that yeast synthetic lethal genetic interactions can be explained by the genetic interactions between domains of those proteins. The domain genetic interactions rarely overlap with the domain physical interactions from iPfam database and provide a complementary view about domain relationships. Moreover, we find that domains in multidomain yeast proteins contribute to their genetic interactions differently. The domain genetic interactions help more precisely define the function related to the synthetic lethal genetic interactions, and then help understand how domains contribute to different functionalities of multidomain proteins. Using the probabilities of domain genetic interactions, we are able to achieve high precision and low false positive rate in predicting genome-wide yeast synthetic lethal genetic interactions. Furthermore, we have also identified novel compensatory pathways from the predicted synthetic lethal genetic interactions. Our study significantly improves the understanding of yeast multidomain proteins, the synthetic lethal genetic interactions and the global functional relationships between proteins and pathways.

Introduction

Defining the functional relationships between proteins is one of the important tasks in the post-genomic era. A classical approach to understand gene functional relationships is producing combination mutant in two genes to observe genetic interactions (Hartman *et al*, 2001). Genetic interaction refers to the phenomenon in which the combined effect of mutations of two genes differs from individual effects of each mutation (Mani *et al*, 2008). In the extreme cases, mutation of two nonessential genes could lead to lethal phenotype. This kind of genetic interactions is referred as synthetic lethal genetic interactions (SLGIs). The genome-wide SLGIs have attracted much attention as they are capable of defining the genome-wide functional relationships between proteins, pathways and complexes (Mani *et al*, 2008; Wong *et al*, 2005; Ye *et al*, 2005). The SLGIs also have potential for finding drug target or drug combinations (Kaelin, 2005).

Representing the structures and functions of proteins, protein domains are usually regarded as building blocks of proteins and are conserved during evolution. The mutation of a gene causes the loss of function of its protein product, which may accredit to the loss of protein domains in the protein product. Then, the effect of the mutation of two genes is caused by the loss of protein domain combinations in both protein products. We refer the phenomenon in which combined effect of mutations of two domains in two proteins differs from individual effects of mutation of each domain as domain genetic interactions. The domain genetic interactions may correlate to SLGIs. We may use the domain genetic interactions to explain and predict the SLGIs. Furthermore, in multidomain proteins, different domains may fulfill different functions independently or collaboratively. Although genetic interaction analysis provides a promising method to understand the functional relationship between proteins (Ooi *et al*, 2006), we cannot tell the contributions of different domains to certain functionality of multidomain proteins based

on their genetic interactions. Studying the domain genetic interactions may help elucidate the SLGIs between multidomain proteins at domain level.

Genetic interactions are usually identified by mutant screens (Winzeler *et al*, 1999). Recently, high throughput technologies, such as synthetic genetic arrays (SGA) (Tong *et al*, 2001) or synthetic lethal analysis by microarrays (SLAM) (Pan *et al*, 2007), have been developed for parallel and massive detection of genetic interactions. However, even with high throughput methods, experimental discovery of SLGIs is still overwhelming. Therefore, it is of interest to computationally predict SLGIs. Several computational approaches have been proposed for the prediction of SLGIs (Chipman and Singh, 2009; Paladugu *et al*, 2008; Qi *et al*, 2008; Wong *et al*, 2004; Zhong and Sternberg, 2006) and various features, such as, protein interactions, gene expression, functional annotation, gene location, protein network characteristics, and genetic phenotype, had been utilized by these methods. Many of those computation approaches used noisy protein-protein interaction data to predict SLGIs (Chipman *et al*, 2009; Paladugu *et al*, 2008; Wong *et al*, 2004) and thus jeopardize their performance of genome-wide SLGIs prediction.

In this study, we first establish the correlation between protein domains and yeast SLGIs by cross validation classification. Then, we apply the Maximum Likelihood estimation approach to estimate the probabilities of domain genetic interactions from yeast SLGIs. Finally, we use the probabilistic model to predict yeast SLGIs using the probabilities of domain genetic interactions. We show that there is a strong correlation between yeast SLGIs and domain genetic interactions. We identify significant domain genetic interactions, which rarely overlap with the domain physical interactions from iPfam database (Finn *et al*, 2005). We also show that domains in multidomain yeast proteins contribute to their genetic interactions differently. We achieve high

performance in predicting yeast SLGIs using probabilities of domain genetic interactions, which demonstrate the ability of protein domains in predicting SLGIs. We are also able to apply our predicted yeast SLGIs to understand the compensatory pathways. A complete description of our results and methods is given in the sections below.

Results

Classification of SLGIs Using Protein Domains

To demonstrate that we can characterize the yeast SLGIs using protein domains, we perform a cross validation classification study on the 7475 yeast SLGIs with both proteins having Pfam-A domains (Bateman *et al*, 2002). We formulate the prediction of yeast SLGIs as a two-class classification problem: a pair of proteins is either synthetic lethal or non synthetic lethal. We use support vector machine (SVM) (Cortes and Vapnik, 1995), a widely used method, for this binary classification problem. We train the SVM classifier using half of true genetic interactions as positive data and the same amount of randomly sampled protein pairs as negative data. Then, we test the learned SVM classifier on the second half of true genetic interactions and an identical amount of randomly sampled negative protein pairs. As shown in Table I, the SVM classifier achieve 85.83% in accuracy, 88.02% in sensitivity, 84.09% in specificity and 84.76% in precision based upon ten times two-fold cross validation experiments. Moreover, the standard deviations of evaluation measures are very low, indicating the robustness of classification performance. We also conduct the receiver-operating characteristic (ROC) analysis (Fawcett, 2006) on the SVM classifier based on the prediction results (see supplemental Figure 1). The area under the ROC curve (AUC) of the SVM classifier is 0.9272, which confirm the high performance of SVM

classification of genetic interactions using protein domains as features. These results suggest that using domain information alone can catch the genetic relationships between proteins.

Identification of Significant Domain Genetic Interactions Using Maximum Likelihood Estimation

By assuming the independences among domain genetic interactions, we estimate the probabilities of domain genetic interactions using the Maximum Likelihood estimation (MLE) method. The probability of a domain pair indicates its propensity to genetically interact. The high probability of a domain pair imply that number of SLGIs including the domain interactions is high comparing to the number of protein pairs including the domain interaction that are not genetically interacted. Then, we calculate an evidence score E (Riley *et al*, 2005) for each domain genetic interaction to estimate its relative significance. The E scores are not the standard likelihood ratio test as they are calculated using only the positive data (Riley *et al*, 2005). The E scores indicate the relative significances of the domain pairs in the SLGIs. The probability and the E score give different view about the significances of domain genetic interactions. The high probability does not always correlate to high E score. When there are a large number of protein pairs including a domain pair and very few of them are SLGIs, the probability of the domain pair will be low. However, if that domain pair is the only domain pair in those SLGIs, it will have high E score. On the other hand, if a large number of protein pairs including multiple domain pairs and most of the protein pairs are SLGIs, the probability of those domain pairs will be high. However, the E scores of those domain pairs will be relatively low as removing any of those domain pairs will have limited effect on the probabilities of SLGIs. Therefore, we will use both the probability and E score to select significant domain genetic interactions.

We first apply the MLE approach to the 7475 genetic interactions with both proteins having protein domains. We are able to assign probabilities and E scores to 11,189 domain pairs. Those domain genetic interactions are available on our website, www.genenetworks.net, for searching and downloading. We first select the significant domain genetic interactions with E scores greater than or equal to 2.0, which corresponding to an approximate seven fold drop of the probability of SLGIs if this domain genetic interactions is excluded. Then, we select the domain genetic interactions with probability greater than 0.5 even though they have low E score values. Totally, we obtain 3848 domain genetic interactions of 1020 domains. Table II lists top ten domain genetic interactions with the highest E scores. The probabilities of those ten domain genetic interactions vary from 0.013 to 0.8. The prefoldin domain dominates in the top ten domain genetic interactions (7 of 10). Our results are consistent with the findings of Mer and Gentleman (Le Meur and Gentleman, 2008), in which they showed that the prefoldin complex is in 9 of their top 10 pairs synthetic multi-protein complexes genetic interactions.

Domain Genetic Interactions Rarely Overlap Domain Physical Interactions

To investigate the relationship between domain genetic interactions and the domain physical interactions, we compare the 3848 significant domain genetic interactions with the domain physical interactions from the iPfam database (Finn *et al*, 2005). There are 4030 domain physical interactions of 1867 domains in iPfam database (2008 version). There are 430 domains in both the genetic and physical interactions. However, there are only 70 domain pairs overlapped between the 4030 domain physical interactions and 3848 domain genetic interactions. These results indicate that the domain genetic interactions significantly differ from the domain physical interactions. The domain genetic interactions can provide a complementary view about the relationships between domains.

The Properties of Domain Genetic Interaction Network

To obtain an overview of the domain genetic interactions, we model the domain genetic interactions as a network, in which each node represents a domain and each link represents a genetic interaction between domains. Then we examine the properties of this domain genetic interaction network. The average connectivity of the network is 7.392. The domain PF00022 (Actin) has the highest connections of 186. The average shortest path among all nodes is 3.31. Comparing the size of nodes, this number is very small. Furthermore, the average node clustering coefficient of the network is 0.159. These properties indicate that the domain genetic interaction network has the small world property (Watts and Strogatz, 1998). The analysis of the connectivity distribution of this network shows a power-law distribution with an exponent degree of 1.45 (Figure 1), which indicates that the domain genetic interaction network is a scale free network (Barabási and Albert, 1999). These results indicate that the domain genetic interaction network follows the common principles of biological networks (Barabasi and Oltvai, 2004).

Domain Genetic Interactions in the SLGIs between Multidomain Proteins

Most proteins are multidomain proteins, which are created as a result of different genetic events, such as insertions and duplications (Apic *et al*, 2001; Vogel *et al*, 2005). Multidomain proteins may have different functionalities due to different domains. Our identification of domain genetic interactions helps understand the domains that contribute to functionality defined by the SLGIs, and then help elucidate the functional relationships between proteins at domain level from their genetic interactions.

Figure 2 shows examples of domain genetic interactions in three SLGIs between yeast multidomain proteins. Figure 2A shows the domain genetic interactions between SGS1 and TOP1. The SGS1 has three domains and TOP1 has two domains. Only one of the three domains

of SGS1, PF00570 (HRDC domain), has high probabilities to interact with two domains of TOP1: PF01028 (Eukaryotic DNA topoisomerase I catalytic core domain) and PF02919 (Eukaryotic DNA topoisomerase I DNA binding domain). The other two domains: PF00270 (DEAD/DEAH domain) and PF00271 (Helicase conserved C-terminal domain) of SGS1 have no genetic interaction with two domains of TOP1 (very low probabilities). Figure 2B shows the domain genetic interactions between TOP3 and TOP1. Both domains of TOP3: PF01131 (DNA topoisomerase domain) and PF01751 (Toprim domain) show high probabilities of genetic interaction with two domains of TOP1. Figure 2C shows the domain genetic interactions between RAD5 and RAD50. The RAD5 has four domains and RAD50 has two domains. The genetic interaction between RAD5 and RAD50 is mainly due to a single domain genetic interaction between PF08797 (HIRAN domain) of RAD5 and PF04423 (zinc hook domain) of RAD50. The PF00097 (Zinc finger domain), PF00176 (SNF2 family N-terminal domain) and PF00271 (Helicase conserved C-terminal domain) of RAD5 and PF02463 (RecF/RecN/SMC N terminal domain) of RAD50 have low contribution to the genetic interaction between RAD5 and RAD50. Those examples show different domain genetic interaction architectures in SLGIs between yeast multidomain proteins. The domain genetic interactions may exist between all domains of two proteins (TOP3 and TOP1), or between part of domains of one protein and all domains of the other protein (SGS1 and TOP1), or between part of domains of one protein and part of domains of the other protein (RAD5 and RAD50). The domain genetic interactions are able to help understand functional relationships between multidomain proteins at domain level.

We also investigate the domain genetic interactions of SLGIs between SGS1 and other proteins. We find that only the PF00570 (HRDC domain) of SGS1 has significant genetic interactions with other domains. The results imply that certain functionality of SGS1 may be

only due to its HRDC domain, rather than its DEAD/DEAH domain and helicase conserved C-terminal domain. Previous study showed that the HRDC domain is required for cellular functions involving topoisomerases (Mullen *et al*, 2000). Thus, the domain genetic interaction analysis can help understand how domains contribute to the different functionalities of multidomain proteins.

Prediction and Validation of Genome-wide SLGIs Using Protein Domains

Having established that there is a strong correlation between domain genetic interactions and SLGIs, we explore two approaches to predict new SLGIs using protein domains. The first approach is predicting the probabilities of protein pairs to be SLGIs using probabilities of domain genetic interactions. We refer the first approach as MLE approach. We are able to assign 599752 protein pairs with probabilities greater than 0. Supplemental Table I lists the number of SLGIs predicted by MLE approach at different probability cutoff. The second approach is to predict the SLGIs using an ensemble of 3000 SVM classifiers. Supplemental Table II lists the number of SLGIs predicted by ensemble approach using different probability thresholds. The ensemble approach is able to predict 155607 protein pairs as SLGIs from all potential pairs using 0.5 as probability threshold. To evaluate these two methods, we compare the predicting results to the results of Wong *et al*. (Wong *et al*, 2004). We used 379117 pairs of experimental generated SLGIs (2217 pairs) and non-interactions (376954 pairs) with both members having protein domains from Wong *et al*. (Wong *et al*, 2004) for the evaluation. Supplemental Table I and II summarize the performances of both approaches at different thresholds. Figure 3 shows that the MLE approach dominates the performance in terms of both ROC and precision-recall curve. The ensemble approach has very low precision, which indicates that this approach has predicted a lot of false positive SLGIs. Meanwhile, the MLE approach achieved a sensitivity of 80% at a false positive rate of 4%, compared to the false positive rate of 18% of Wong *et al*. (Wong *et al*,

2004). These results suggest that using the prediction of MLE approach to guide large-scale screen could greatly reduce the false positives. Due to its high performance, we focused on our further studies on the predicted SLGIs by MLE approach only. All predicted SLGIs of MLE approach are hosted on our website for searching and downloading.

We then compare the correlation coefficients of gene expressions of predicted SLGIs to those of original SLGIs and those of all possible protein pairs. We use a yeast cell cycle gene expression data (Spellman *et al*, 1998), which contains 77 data points. We calculate the T-score and P-value for the null hypothesis that there is no difference between the means of predicted SLGIs and the means of original SLGIs and the null hypothesis that there is no difference between the means of predicted SLGIs and the means of all pairs. The results are shown in Supplemental Table III. The correlation coefficients of gene expression of predicted SLGIs with threshold greater than 0.3 are similar to those of original SLGIs. The gene expression correlation coefficients of predicted SLGIs using different thresholds significantly differ from those of all pairs except for SLGIs with probabilities greater than 0.85, which have only small numbers of SLGIs. Those results indicate that the correlation coefficients of gene expressions of predicted SLGIs are similar to those of original SLGIs, rather than to those of random pairs. Recently, it was reported that the SLGIs are likely to have similar GO annotations (Tong *et al*, 2004). We study the distribution of similarities of Gene Ontology (GO) annotations between predicted SLGIs and also compared them to those of original SLGIs and all possible protein pairs. As shown in Supplemental Table IV-VI, the mean similarities of GO annotations of predicted SLGIs always significantly differ from those of all pairs. At certain probability thresholds, the mean similarities of GO annotations of predicted SLGIs show no significant differences from those of original SLGIs. Those thresholds are 0.35 for biological process and cellular component and 0.25

for molecular function. As the probability thresholds increase, the mean similarities of GO annotations also increase, which will make them differ from those of original SLGIs. The studies of GO annotations similarities and expression correlation coefficients show that the predicted SLGIs at probability threshold around 0.3 are similar to experimentally obtained SLGIs.

Novel SLGIs predicted by MLE Approach

The MLE approach is able to predict novel SLGIs. Table III lists 17 novel SLGIs (not included in our training data) with probability >0.9 . We predict the MYO4/DYN1 pair to be SLGI with the highest probability of 0.9895. The MYO4 is one of two type V myosin motors. The other one is MYO2, which is known to genetically interact with DYN1 (Tong *et al*, 2004). Among 17 SLGIs, 12 SLGIs are between transcription initiation factor genes and genes from RNA polymerase complex. Previously, many SLGIs between transcription initiation factor genes and RNA polymerase genes have already been reported (Archambault *et al*, 1992; Malagon *et al*, 2004; Wilcox *et al*, 2004). We expect our novel SLGIs to help further elucidate the transcription machine. We then investigate genes involved in cellular response to stresses caused by DNA damage. We download a list of 116 DNA repair and recombination genes from Kyoto Encyclopedia of Genes and Genomes (KEGG) database (Kanehisa *et al*, 2004). Then, we extract SLGIs in which at least one protein of SLGI pair are related to DNA repair. Figure 4 shows the DNA repair related SLGIs with probability >0.7 . Of a total of 133 SLGIs, 22 SLGIs are novel. Some of new predicted SLGIs are supported by previous studies. For example, the TOP3 and RAD1 double mutant has shown extreme synergistic growth defects in a previous study (Shor *et al*, 2002). A recent study showed that the RTT109 and YKu70 double mutant exhibits synergistic defects under hydroxyurea treatment (Jessulat *et al*, 2008). The PAP2 and POL2 were also shown to genetically interact at high temperatures (Edwards *et al*, 2003).

Compensatory Pathways from Predicted SLGIs

Protein pathways are a part of gene network in the cell that can accomplish certain functionality. The SLGIs have been proposed to have high probability of occurrence in compensatory pathways (Kelley and Ideker, 2005). Thus, the SLGIs within the pathways are rare and the SLGIs between pathways are significantly abundant. Identification compensatory pathways from synthetic lethal genetic interactions can be a powerful way to understanding cellular functional relationships. We expect our new predictions will increase the ability of understanding compensatory pathways. We apply the algorithm of Ma (Ma *et al.*, 2008) to identify compensatory pathways from 7583 predicted SLGIs with probability higher than 0.3. Among 7583 SLGIs, 4497 SLGIs are novel predictions. Although Ma *et al.* have shown that physical interactions are enriched in discovered pathways (Ma *et al.*, 2008), there is no assumption that proteins in those pathways are physically interacting. Totally, we obtain 167 pairs of compensatory pathways, which include 638 proteins and 3535 SLGIs. All 167 pairs of compensatory pathways are listed on our www.genenetworks.net website.

Figure 5A and 4B lists two pairs of compensatory pathways related to DNA double strand break (DSB) repair. Among total 28 SLGIs between those two compensatory pathways, only 12 of them are known. The DSB is a kind of lethal DNA damage in which both strands of double helix are cleaved. The cell maintains multiple mechanisms to repair double strand breaks with the homologous recombination (HR) and non-homologous end joining (NHEJ) as two major mechanisms. Pathways involving those two mechanisms had shown to be compensatory to each other in *Drosophila* (Johnson-Schlitz *et al.*, 2007). The pathways on the left of two compensatory pairs involve in NHEJ. The KU complex (YKU80 and YKU70) is the damage detector of NHEJ (Pastwa and Blasiak, 2003). Mutation of nucleoporins NUP84 and NUP133

was reported to be hypersensitive to DNA damage (Therizols *et al*, 2006). Furthermore, the nucleoporins (NUP84 and NUP133) had been reported to colocalize and coimmunoprecipitate with Slx5/Slx8 (Nagai *et al*, 2008), which regulate a DNA repair pathway that counteract Rad5-independent HR (Burgess *et al*, 2007). Our discovery suggests that the nucleoporins (NUP84 and NUP133) may regulate the NHEJ pathway through Ku complex for double strand breaks repair. The RAD24 is a DNA damage checkpoint protein (de la Torre-Ruiz and Lowndes, 2000). Studies also have shown that the YKU80 and RAD24 are in the same NHEJ pathways (de la Torre-Ruiz *et al*, 2000) to repair irradiation and methylmethanesulphonate (MMS) damages. The CSM3 is a DNA replication checkpoint protein. Genetic interaction between RAD24 and CSM3 may indicate the pathway on the right side of Figure 5 A can actually become two pathways: one is YKU80, RAD24, NUP84; the other is YKU80, CSM3 and NUP84.

The pathways on the right of those two compensatory pairs of Figure 5 A and B involve in HR. On the right of Figure 5A, the pathway involves three proteins: RAD57, RAD51 and DMC1. The DMC1 and RAD51 are known to form a complex (Bishop, 1994) and have roles in recombination (Masson and West, 2001). RAD51 and RAD57 are in the same protein family and it has been shown that RAD57/RAD55 bind with RAD51 (Sung, 1997). On the right of Figure 5B, the pathway involves four proteins: SGS1, RRP6, MRE11 and RAD52. The MRE11 and SGS1 are part of a two-step mechanism to initial HR (Mimitou and Symington, 2008). The RAD52 plays a major role in the single strand annealing and strand exchange.

Figure 5C also shows two compensatory DNA repair pathways. Among 18 SLGIs between two pathways, 11 are novel predictions. Many previous studies have supported our prediction of compensatory functionalities of those two pathways. Guillet and Boiteus (Guillet and Boiteux, 2002) reported that the APN2 and MUS81/MMS4 have overlapping function to

repair 3'-blocked single strand breaks (SSBs). Vance and Wilson (Vance and Wilson, 2002) showed that TDP1 and RAD1 function as redundant pathways. SGS1/TOP3 had also been showed to overlap functionally with the MMS4/MUS81 (Kaliraman *et al*, 2001). Proteins in these compensatory pathways involve in many DNA-repair pathways, such as base excision repair (BER), nucleotide excision repair (NER) and HR. Studies already showed that BER, NER and HR pathways have overlapping specificities (Swanson *et al*, 1999). Our prediction of these compensatory pathways may help to understand the overlapping functionalities among BER, NER and HR pathways.

Another interesting compensatory pathway pair is related to hydroperoxides response in the cell. As shown in Figure 5D, 11 of 15 SLGIs connecting two pathways are novel predictions. The three proteins (TSA1, TSA2 and PRX1) on the right are all thioredoxin peroxidase. They play a role in reduction of hydroperoxides in cytoplasm (TSA1 and TSA2) and mitochondrion (PRX1). Meanwhile, the five proteins (RAD52, RAD5, MDM31, MDM32, and MRE11) in the left pathway are related to DNA repair. RAD52, RAD5 and MRE11 are known related to double strand break repair (D'Amours and Jackson, 2002; Johnson *et al*, 1994; Lisby *et al*, 2001). The MDM31 and MDM32 relate the stability of mitochondrial DNA (Dimmer *et al*, 2005). Those five proteins may relate to repair the damage created by the hydroperoxides. This compensatory pathway pair implies that removing hydroperoxides or repairing damage is alternative strategies for cells to survive from hydroperoxides.

Discussion

In this study, we demonstrate that the synthetic lethal genetic interactions between two proteins can be described by the genetic interactions between domains of those proteins. We apply a

probabilistic model to successfully identify significant domain genetic interactions. The significant domain genetic interactions rarely overlap with the domain physical interactions from iPfam (Finn *et al*, 2005), which suggests that the domain genetic interactions and domain physical interactions are complementary to each other. The domain genetic interactions help more completely understand the relationship among domains, and then among proteins. Furthermore, with the identified domain genetic interactions, we show that the contributions of domains in a multidomain protein to its genetic interactions are significantly different. The domain genetic interactions help to decipher the domains that perform the function related to the genetic interaction. For example, analyzing the domain genetic interactions confirms that only the PF00570 (HRDC domain) of SGS1 involve in the cellular functions that are compensatory to topoisomerases.

We apply two approaches to predict the protein genetic interactions using the protein domains. The SVM classifiers try to find global boundaries between SLGIs and non-SLGIs. Although we can obtain good performance on cross validation using the SVM, the prediction results using SVM ensemble have low precision. On the other hand, the MLE approach assigns the probabilities to protein pairs based on probabilities of domain genetic interactions, which is a local decision. The prediction of MLE approach archived high performance. Those results suggest that it may not be able to use just one model to describe all SLGIs. Furthermore, our results show that predictions using protein domains alone has outperformed the predictions by Wong (Wong *et al*, 2004), which used multiple features. Although, there are proteins without domain information, the protein domains are more complete, accuracy and have less false positive comparing to other features, such as protein interaction network. The MLE approach assumes the independence of domain genetic interactions. However, there may be dependence

between domain genetic interactions. An apparent extension of this work is to consider the dependences among cooperative domains in multidomain proteins.

Our identification of domain genetic interactions and prediction of genome-wide SLGIs is not complete. First, our training data is limited. It is believed that the available genetic interactions are just a small fraction of the whole genetic interactions (Boone *et al*, 2007). Second, the training data largely come from several high-throughput genetic interaction screens, which emphasized certain biological processes, such as DNA repair. Moreover, we should keep in mind that our predicted SLGIs require further validation to exclude false positives. However, the low false positive rate in our predictions is an advantage in comparison with previous studies.

In summary, our study significantly improves the understanding of different domains in multidomain proteins. The identification of domain genetic interactions helps the understanding of originality of functional relationship in SLGIs at domain level. Furthermore, our prediction of genome wide SLGIs expand the ability to elucidate the global functional relationships between proteins and pathways.

Methods

Source of Data

We collect the protein domain data from Pfam (Protein families database) (Bateman *et al*, 2002). The Pfam database provides two types of protein family data. Pfam-A domains are manually curated while Pfam-B domains are automatically generated. In our study, only Pfam-A domains are considered. The total number of selected Pfam-A domains for yeast is 2289. We download the genetic interactions of yeast from the *Saccharomyces* Genome Database (SGD) (Cherry *et al*, 1998). Then, we extract synthetic lethal interaction data set from the file containing all the

genetic interactions. Initially, there were totally 10977 pairs of synthetic lethal interactions. We removed protein pairs from study if either protein in the pair does not contain any domain. Eventually, we obtained 7475 synthetic lethal interactions among 2008 proteins.

Classification and prediction of synthetic lethal genetic interactions using SVM

We encode the protein pairs using the method proposed by Chen et al. (Chen and Liu, 2005). Each protein pair is represented by a protein domain feature vector that includes all 2289 unique Pfam-A domains. Each domain feature has a possible value of 0, 1 or 2 in the feature vector. The value is 0 if none of the proteins in the pair contains the domain. The value is 1 if one protein of the protein pair contains the domain. The value is 2 if both proteins of the protein pair contain the domain.

We use the LibSVM provided by Chang et al. (Chang and Lin, 2001). We chose the radial basis function kernel. We first estimated the parameters (cost and gamma) following the guide of LibSVM (Chih-Wei *et al.*, 2004). For two-fold cross validation study, we randomly select half (3737 pairs) of known genetic interactions for positive training data and rest half for testing. Then, we generated equal size of negative pairs for both training and testing. We randomly sample the negative pairs between those 2008 proteins in known genetic interactions and without overlapping to them. We repeat this procedure ten times to obtain the average and standard deviation of classification results.

We train 3000 SVM classifiers with posterior probability estimations on the Clemson Palmetto cluster computer. For each SVM classifier, we use all 7475 synthetic lethal interactions as positive training data and randomly sampled 7475 negative pairs from of 10032960 potential pairs of 4480 proteins with domains. Then, we predict the probability for all 10032960 potential

pairs. A pair of proteins will be predicted to be SLGI only if the probabilities predicted by all 3000 SVM classifiers are greater than a threshold.

Estimation of probabilities and significances of domain genetic interactions

We estimate the probabilities of potential domain interactions by maximizing the likelihood of observed genetic interactions using the Expectation-Maximization (EM) algorithm (Deng *et al*, 2002; Riley *et al*, 2005). Let $D_{i,j}$ denote the probability that domain i and domain j genetically interact to each other. Let $M_{i,j}$ be the number of genetic interacting pairs between domain i and j in all protein genetic interactions; $N_{i,j}$ be the number of non-interacting pairs between domain i and j in protein genetic interactions; and $K_{i,j}$ be the number of protein pairs including domain i in one protein and j in the other one that are not genetically interacted. Then, the total likelihood of observed protein genetic interactions based on domain genetic interactions is

$$L = \prod_{i,j} D_{i,j}^{M_{i,j}+a} (1 - D_{i,j})^{N_{i,j}+K_{i,j}+b} \quad (1)$$

Where a and b are pseudo counts to avoid the $P_{i,j}$ or $1 - P_{i,j}$ to be zero when instances of domains i and j are rare. We set both a and b to 1 in our calculation. In each Expectation step of EM algorithm, we first estimate the expected values of $E[M_{i,j}]$ and $E[N_{i,j}]$. Then, we calculate the $P_{i,j}$ as following (Maximization step):

$$D_{i,j} = \frac{E[M_{i,j}] + a}{E[M_{i,j}] + E[N_{i,j}] + K_{i,j} + a + b} \quad (2)$$

The EM algorithm will be iterated till the change of likelihood L is less than a pre-defined small value.

The evidence score $E_{i,j}$ (Riley *et al*, 2005) of domain pair i and j is defined as the ratio between the probability that a pair of proteins, m and n , genetically interact given that the pair of

domains, i and j , genetically interact and the probability that a pair of proteins, m and n , genetically interact given that the pair of domains, i and j , do not genetically interact:

$$E_{i,j} = \sum_{\substack{i \in D(m) \\ j \in D(n)}} \log \frac{\Pr(O_{m,n} = 1 | i, j \text{ interact})}{\Pr(O_{m,n} = 1 | i, j \text{ not interact})} = \sum_{\substack{i \in D(m) \\ j \in D(n)}} \log \frac{1 - \prod_{k \in D(m), l \in D(n)} (1 - D_{k,l})}{1 - \prod_{k \in D(m), l \in D(n)} (1 - \bar{D}_{k,l}^{i,j})} \quad (3)$$

The $\bar{D}_{k,l}^{i,j}$ denotes the probability of genetic interacting between domains k and l given that the domains i and j do not genetically interact.

Prediction of SLGIs using probabilities of domain genetic interactions

We assume that two proteins genetically interact ($P_{i,j} = 1$) if and only if at least one domain pair from the two proteins genetically interact ($D_{m,n} = 1$). Then, we have:

$$\Pr(P_{i,j} = 1) = 1.0 - \prod_{m,n \in P_i, P_j} (1 - \Pr(D_{m,n} = 1)) \quad (4)$$

A pair of proteins will be predicted to be SLGI only if its probability is higher than a predefined threshold.

Evaluation of classification and prediction results

We have employed multiple criteria to evaluate our classification and predicting results, which include sensitivity, specificity, precision, accuracy. We also use precision-recall curve and ROC (receiver operating characteristics) (Fawcett, 2006) to evaluate the performance of classification and predictions. The ROC evaluates the performance of classifiers based on the tradeoff between specificity and sensitivity. The area under the ROC curve (AUC) can be used to compare the prediction performance. While an area of 1 means perfect prediction, an area of 0.5 indicates random prediction. The recall-precision analysis is complementary to the ROC analysis because the ROC is sensitive to absolute numbers of false positives.

Conflict of interest

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

References

Apic G, Gough J, Teichmann SA (2001) Domain combinations in archaeal, eubacterial and eukaryotic proteomes. *J Mol Biol* **310**: 311-325.

Archambault J, Lacroute F, Ruet A, Friesen JD (1992) Genetic interaction between transcription elongation factor TFIIS and RNA polymerase II. *Mol Cell Biol* **12**: 4142-4152.

Barabási A-L, Albert R (1999) Emergence of Scaling in Random Networks. *Science* **286**: 509-512.

Barabasi AL, Oltvai ZN (2004) Network biology: understanding the cell's functional organization. *Nat Rev Genet* **5**: 101-113.

Bateman A, Birney E, Cerruti L, Durbin R, Ewinger L, Eddy SR, Griffiths-Jones S, Howe KL, Marshall M, Sonnhammer ELL (2002) The Pfam protein families database. *Nucleic acids research* **30**: 276-276.

Bishop DK (1994) RecA homologs Dmc1 and Rad51 interact to form multiple nuclear complexes prior to meiotic chromosome synapsis. *Cell* **79**: 1081-1092.

Boone C, Bussey H, Andrews BJ (2007) Exploring genetic interactions and networks with yeast. *Nature Reviews Genetics* **8**: 437-449.

Burgess RC, Rahman S, Lisby M, Rothstein R, Zhao X (2007) The Slx5-Slx8 Complex Affects Sumoylation of DNA Repair Proteins and Negatively Regulates Recombination. *Mol Cell Biol* **27**: 6153-6162.

Chang CC, Lin CJ (2001) LIBSVM: a library for support vector machines, 2001. *Software available at <http://www.csie.ntu.edu.tw/~cjlin/libsvm>*.

Chen XW, Liu M (2005) Prediction of protein-protein interactions using random decision forest framework. *Bioinformatics* **21**: 4394–4400-4394–4400.

Cherry JM, Adler C, Ball C, Chervitz SA, Dwight SS, Hester ET, Jia Y, Juvik G, Roe T, Schroeder M (1998) SGD: Saccharomyces genome database. *Nucleic Acids Research* **26**: 73-73.

Chih-Wei H, Chih-Chung C, Chih-Jen L (2004) A practical guide to support vector classification. *National Taiwan University*: 1-12.

Chipman KC, Singh AK (2009) Predicting genetic interactions with random walks on biological networks. *BMC Bioinformatics* **10**: 17.

Cortes C, Vapnik V (1995) Support-vector networks. *Machine Learning* **20**: 273-297.

D'Amours D, Jackson SP (2002) The Mre11 complex: at the crossroads of dna repair and checkpoint signalling. *Nat Rev Mol Cell Biol* **3**: 317-327.

de la Torre-Ruiz M-A, Lowndes NF (2000) The Saccharomyces cerevisiae DNA damage checkpoint is required for efficient repair of double strand breaks by non-homologous end joining. *FEBS Letters* **467**: 311-315.

Deng M, Mehta S, Sun F, Chen T (2002) Inferring domain-domain interactions from protein-protein interactions. In *Proceedings of the sixth annual international conference on Computational biology* pp 117-126. ACM, Washington, DC, USA.

Dimmer KS, Jakobs S, Vogel F, Altmann K, Westermann B (2005) Mdm31 and Mdm32 are inner membrane proteins required for maintenance of mitochondrial shape and stability of mitochondrial DNA nucleoids in yeast. *J Cell Biol* **168**: 103-115.

Edwards S, Li CM, Levy DL, Brown J, Snow PM, Campbell JL (2003) Saccharomyces cerevisiae DNA Polymerase {varepsilon} and Polymerase {sigma} Interact Physically and Functionally, Suggesting a Role for Polymerase {varepsilon} in Sister Chromatid Cohesion. *Mol Cell Biol* **23**: 2733-2748.

Fawcett T (2006) An introduction to ROC analysis. *Pattern Recogn Lett* **27**: 861-874.

Finn RD, Marshall M, Bateman A (2005) iPfam: visualization of protein-protein interactions in PDB at domain and amino acid resolutions. *Bioinformatics* **21**: 410-412.

Guillet M, Boiteux S (2002) Endogenous DNA abasic sites cause cell death in the absence of Apn1, Apn2 and Rad1/Rad10 in Saccharomyces cerevisiae. *EMBO J* **21**: 2833-2841.

Hartman J, Garvik B, Hartwell L (2001) Principles for the buffering of genetic variation. *Science* **291**: 1001 - 1004.

Jessulat M, Alamgir M, Salsali H, Greenblatt J, Xu J, Golshani A (2008) Interacting proteins Rtt109 and Vps75 affect the efficiency of non-homologous end-joining in Saccharomyces cerevisiae. *Arch Biochem Biophys* **469**: 157-164.

Johnson-Schlitz DM, Flores C, Engels WR (2007) Multiple-Pathway Analysis of Double-Strand Break Repair Mutations in Drosophila. *PLoS Genet* **3**: e50.

Johnson RE, Prakash S, Prakash L (1994) Yeast DNA repair protein RAD5 that promotes instability of simple repetitive sequences is a DNA-dependent ATPase. *J Biol Chem* **269**: 28259-28262.

Kaelin WG, Jr. (2005) The concept of synthetic lethality in the context of anticancer therapy. *Nat Rev Cancer* **5**: 689-698.

Kaliraman V, Mullen JR, Fricke WM, Bastin-Shanower SA, Brill SJ (2001) Functional overlap between Sgs1-Top3 and the Mms4-Mus81 endonuclease. *Genes & Development* **15**: 2730-2740.

Kanehisa M, Goto S, Kawashima S, Okuno Y, Hattori M (2004) The KEGG resource for deciphering the genome. *Nucleic Acids Res* **32**: D277-280.

Kelley R, Ideker T (2005) Systematic interpretation of genetic interactions using protein networks. *Nature biotechnology* **23**: 561-566.

Le Meur N, Gentleman R (2008) Modeling synthetic lethality. *Genome Biology* **9**: R135.

Lisby M, Rothstein R, Mortensen UH (2001) Rad52 forms DNA repair and recombination centers during S phase. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **98**: 8276-8282.

Ma X, Tarone AM, Li W (2008) Mapping Genetically Compensatory Pathways from Synthetic Lethal Interactions in Yeast. *PLoS ONE* **3**: e1922.

Malagon F, Tong AH, Shafer BK, Strathern JN (2004) Genetic interactions of DST1 in *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* suggest a role of TFIIS in the initiation-elongation transition. *Genetics* **166**: 1215-1227.

Mani R, St Onge RP, Hartman JL, Giaever G, Roth FP (2008) Defining genetic interaction. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **105**: 3461-3461.

Masson J-Y, West SC (2001) The Rad51 and Dmc1 recombinases: a non-identical twin relationship. *Trends in Biochemical Sciences* **26**: 131-136.

Mimitou EP, Symington LS (2008) Sae2, Exo1 and Sgs1 collaborate in DNA double-strand break processing. *Nature* **455**: 770-774.

Mullen JR, Kaliraman V, Brill SJ (2000) Bipartite structure of the SGS1 DNA helicase in *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*. *Genetics* **154**: 1101-1114.

Nagai S, Dubrana K, Tsai-Pflugfelder M, Davidson MB, Roberts TM, Brown GW, Varela E, Hediger F, Gasser SM, Krogan NJ (2008) Functional Targeting of DNA Damage to a Nuclear Pore-Associated SUMO-Dependent Ubiquitin Ligase. *Science* **322**: 597-602.

Ooi SL, Pan X, Peysers BD, Ye P, Meluh PB, Yuan DS, Irizarry RA, Bader JS, Spencer FA, Boeke JD (2006) Global synthetic-lethality analysis and yeast functional profiling. *Trends Genet* **22**: 56-63.

Paladugu S, Zhao S, Ray A, Raval A (2008) Mining protein networks for synthetic genetic interactions. *BMC Bioinformatics* **9**: 426-426.

Pan X, Yuan DS, Ooi SL, Wang X, Sookhai-Mahadeo S, Meluh P, Boeke JD (2007) dSLAM analysis of genome-wide genetic interactions in *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*. *Methods* **41**: 206-221.

Pastwa E, Blasiak J (2003) Non-homologous DNA end joining. *Acta Biochim Pol* **50**: 891 - 908.

Qi Y, Suhail Y, Lin YY, Boeke JD, Bader JS (2008) Finding friends and enemies in an enemies-only network: a graph diffusion kernel for predicting novel genetic interactions and co-complex membership from yeast genetic interactions. *Genome Res* **18**: 1991-2004.

Riley R, Lee C, Sabatti C, Eisenberg D (2005) Inferring protein domain interactions from databases of interacting proteins. *Genome Biology* **6**: R89-R89.

Shannon P, Markiel A, Ozier O, Baliga NS, Wang JT, Ramage D, Amin N, Schwikowski B, Ideker T (2003) Cytoscape: a software environment for integrated models of biomolecular interaction networks. *Genome Res* **13**: 2498-2504.

Shor E, Gangloff S, Wagner M, Weinstein J, Price G, Rothstein R (2002) Mutations in Homologous Recombination Genes Rescue top3 Slow Growth in *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*. *Genetics* **162**: 647-662.

Spellman PT, Sherlock G, Zhang MQ, Iyer VR, Anders K, Eisen MB, Brown PO, Botstein D, Futcher B (1998) Comprehensive identification of cell cycle-regulated genes of the yeast *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* by microarray hybridization. *Mol Biol Cell* **9**: 3273-3297.

Sung P (1997) Yeast Rad55 and Rad57 proteins form a heterodimer that functions with replication protein A to promote DNA strand exchange by Rad51 recombinase. *Genes & Development* **11**: 1111-1121.

Swanson RL, Morey NJ, Doetsch PW, Jinks-Robertson S (1999) Overlapping Specificities of Base Excision Repair, Nucleotide Excision Repair, Recombination, and Translesion Synthesis Pathways for DNA Base Damage in *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*. *Mol Cell Biol* **19**: 2929-2935.

Therizols P, Fairhead Cc, Cabal GG, Genovesio A, Olivo-Marin J-C, Dujon B, Fabre E (2006) Telomere tethering at the nuclear periphery is essential for efficient DNA double strand break repair in subtelomeric region. *The Journal of Cell Biology* **172**: 189-199.

Tong AH, Evangelista M, Parsons AB, Xu H, Bader GD, Page N, Robinson M, Raghibizadeh S, Hogue CW, Bussey H, Andrews B, Tyers M, Boone C (2001) Systematic genetic analysis with ordered arrays of yeast deletion mutants. *Science* **294**: 2364-2368.

Tong AHY, Lesage G, Bader GD, Ding H, Xu H, Xin X, Young J, Berriz GF, Brost RL, Chang M, others (2004) Global mapping of the yeast genetic interaction network. *Science* **303**: 808–813-808–813.

Vance JR, Wilson TE (2002) Yeast Tdp1 and Rad1-Rad10 function as redundant pathways for repairing Top1 replicative damage. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* **99**: 13669-13674.

Vogel C, Teichmann SA, Pereira-Leal J (2005) The relationship between domain duplication and recombination. *J Mol Biol* **346**: 355-365.

Watts DJ, Strogatz SH (1998) Collective dynamics of 'small-world' networks. *Nature* **393**: 440-442.

Wilcox CB, Rossetini A, Hanes SD (2004) Genetic Interactions With C-Terminal Domain (CTD) Kinases and the CTD of RNA Pol II Suggest a Role for ESS1 in Transcription Initiation and Elongation in *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*. *Genetics* **167**: 93-105.

Winzler EA, Shoemaker DD, Astromoff A, Liang H, Anderson K, Andre B, Bangham R, Benito R, Boeke JD, Bussey H, Chu AM, Connelly C, Davis K, Dietrich F, Dow SW, El Bakkoury M, Foury F, Friend SH, Gentalen E, Giaever G, Hegemann JH, Jones T, Laub M, Liao H, Liebundguth N, Lockhart DJ, Lucau-Danila A, Lussier M, M'Rabet N, Menard P, Mittmann M, Pai C, Rebischung C, Revuelta JL, Riles L, Roberts CJ, Ross-MacDonald P, Scherens B, Snyder M, Sookhai-Mahadeo S, Storms RK, Veronneau S, Voet M, Volckaert G, Ward TR, Wysocki R, Yen GS, Yu K, Zimmermann K, Philippsen P, Johnston M, Davis RW (1999) Functional characterization of the *S. cerevisiae* genome by gene deletion and parallel analysis. *Science* **285**: 901-906.

Wong SL, Zhang LV, Roth FP (2005) Discovering functional relationships: biochemistry versus genetics. *Trends Genet* **21**: 424-427.

Wong SL, Zhang LV, Tong AHY, Li Z, Goldberg DS, King OD, Lesage G, Vidal M, Andrews B, Bussey H (2004) Combining biological networks to predict genetic interactions. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **101**: 15682-15687.

Ye P, Peyser BD, Pan X, Boeke JD, Spencer FA, Bader JS (2005) Gene function prediction from congruent synthetic lethal interactions in yeast. *Molecular Systems Biology* **1**.

Zhong W, Sternberg PW (2006) Genome-wide prediction of *C. elegans* genetic interactions. *Science* **311**: 1481-1484.

Figure Legends

Figure 1. The log-log plot of degree distribution $P(K)$ of domain genetic interaction network. The linear characteristics indicated by red line ($y=x^{-1.45}$) imply that $P(K)$ follows a power law.

Figure 2. The domain genetic interactions in SLGIs between multidomain proteins. The thick lines indicate significant domain genetic interactions. The thin lines indicate the domain genetic interactions with low probability. The probabilities of domain genetic interactions are labeled besides the line.

Figure 3. Performance comparison of SLGIs predictions. A) The precision-recall curve. B) The ROC curve. The performances of Wong are taken from supplemental materials of their paper and are based on all 682865 protein pairs and the performances of MLE and Ensemble approaches are based on 376954 protein pairs with both members having protein domains.

Figure 4. The SLGIs (probabilities>0.7) related to DNA repair proteins. The cycles indicate DNA repair proteins and the triangle indicate non DNA repair proteins. Each genetic interaction involves at least one DNA repair protein. The wide links represent new genetic interactions. The figure was produced using Cytoscape (Shannon *et al*, 2003).

Figure 5. Compensatory pathways identified from predicted SLGIs. (A, B) two compensatory pathways related to DNA double strand breaks repairs. Pathways on the left of A and B belong to non-homologous end joining. Pathways on the right of A and B belong to homologous recombination. (C) A compensatory pathways related to DNA repairs. (D) A compensatory pathways related to hydroperoxides response in the cell. Dashed lines indicate original known SLGIs and solid lines indicated novel predicted SLGIs. The figure was produced using Cytoscape (Shannon *et al*, 2003).

Figure 1.




Figure 2.




Figure 5.




Table I. The classification results of SLGIs using protein domains as features. The average and standard deviation (Std.) are based on ten times two-fold cross validation experiments.

	Sensitivity	Specificity	Precision	Accuracy
Average (Std.)	0.8802 (0.0059)	0.8409 (0.0045)	0.8476 (0.0034)	0.8583 (0.0028)

Table II. Domain genetic interactions with top ten highest E scores.


E score	Prob.	Domain _a	Domain _a Pfam ID	# of Yeast proteins with domain _a	Domain _b	Domain _b Pfam ID	# of Yeast proteins with domain _b	# of GI
67.48	0.46	PF00225	Kinesin	6	PF01920	Prefoldin_2	4	11
65.59	0.72	PF01302	CAP_GLY	4	PF01920	Prefoldin_2	4	12
63.31	0.32	PF00022	Actin	9	PF01920	Prefoldin_2	4	11
41.73	0.025	PF00071	Ras	24	PF00071	Ras	24	13
39.53	0.036	PF00400	WD40	87	PF01920	Prefoldin_2	4	14
38.41	0.12	PF00071	Ras	24	PF04893	Yip1	3	8
36.53	0.027	PF00069	Pkinase	114	PF01920	Prefoldin_2	4	17
35.15	0.35	PF00225	Kinesin	6	PF02996	Prefoldin	3	6
33.16	0.80	PF01920	Prefoldin_2	4	PF03114	BAR	2	7
31.20	0.013	PF00022	Actin	9	PF00069	Pkinase	114	17

Table III. Predicted new synthetic lethal genetic interactions with probability greater than 0.9

Protein 1		Protein 2		Probability
Name	Annotation	Name	Annotation	
MYO4	type V myosin motors	DYN1	Cytoplasmic heavy chain dynein	0.9895
RPO21	RNA polymerase II largest subunit	BRF1	TFIIIB B-related factor	0.9816
DST1	General transcription elongation factor TFIIIS	RET1	Second-largest subunit of RNA polymerase III	0.9797
STO1	Large subunit of the nuclear mRNA cap-binding protein complex	RPA190	RNA polymerase I subunit	0.9586
STO1	Large subunit of the nuclear mRNA cap-binding protein complex	RPO21	RNA polymerase II largest subunit	0.9586
DST1	General transcription elongation factor TFIIIS	RPA135	RNA polymerase I subunit A135	0.9570
BNR1	Formin, nucleates the formation of linear actin filaments	DYN1	Cytoplasmic heavy chain dynein	0.9441
CEG1	Alpha (guanylyltransferase) subunit of the mRNA capping enzyme	RPA190	RNA polymerase I subunit	0.9437
CEG1	Alpha (guanylyltransferase) subunit of the mRNA capping enzyme	RPO31	RNA polymerase III subunit	0.9437
RPB5	RNA polymerase subunit	RPA190	RNA polymerase I subunit	0.9437
RPB5	RNA polymerase subunit	RPO31	RNA polymerase III subunit	0.9437
DST1	General transcription elongation factor TFIIIS	RPA190	RNA polymerase I subunit	0.9265
DST1	General transcription elongation factor TFIIIS	RPO31	RNA polymerase III subunit	0.9265
ARO1	Pentafunctional arom protein	SPT16	Subunit of the heterodimeric FACT complex	0.9198
RET1	Second-largest subunit of RNA polymerase III	SUA7	Transcription factor TFIIIB	0.9035
BRF1	TFIIIB B-related factor	RET1	Second-largest subunit of RNA polymerase III	0.9035
BRF1	TFIIIB B-related factor	RPB2	RNA polymerase II second largest subunit	0.9035

Supplemental Information

There are one supplemental Figure and six supplemental Tables. More Supplement data are available on website www.genenetworks.net.



Supplemental Figure 1. ROC curve of the SVM classifier for cross validation.

Supplemental Table I. Number of predicted SLGIs and prediction performance by MLE approach using different posterior probability threshold

Threshold	Number of SLGIs	False Positive Rate	Specificity	Sensitivity	Precision
0.9	82	5.31E-06	0.999995	0.005413	0.8571
0.8	383	9.02E-05	0.99991	0.03654	0.7043
0.7	792	2.55E-04	0.9997	0.07894	0.6458
0.6	1821	5.94E-04	0.9994	0.1967	0.6606
0.5	3267	1.12E-03	0.9989	0.2702	0.5873
0.4	5143	0.00213	0.9979	0.3356	0.4809
0.3	7767	0.00360	0.9964	0.4172	0.4053
0.2	14096	0.00733	0.9927	0.5332	0.2997
0.1	32881	0.01537	0.9846	0.6531	0.1999
0.09	35702	0.01666	0.9833	0.6649	0.1901
0.08	39785	0.01864	0.9814	0.6779	0.1762
0.07	44989	0.02031	0.9797	0.7068	0.1699
0.06	51564	0.02356	0.9764	0.7289	0.1540
0.05	60807	0.02677	0.9732	0.7524	0.1418
0.04	77050	0.03259	0.9674	0.7821	0.1237
0.03	94460	0.03994	0.9601	0.8092	0.1065
0.02	131199	0.05317	0.9468	0.8525	0.08618
0.01	205758	0.07535	0.9246	0.9093	0.06627
0	599752	0.1279	0.8721	0.9626	0.04237

Note: the performance is evaluated using the 379117 pairs of experimental generated SLGIs (2217 pairs) and non-interactions (376954 pairs) with both members having protein domains.

Supplemental Table II. Number of predicted SLGIs and prediction performance by ensemble approach using different posterior probability threshold

Threshold	Number of SLGIs	False Positive Rate	Specificity	Sensitivity	Precision
0.5	155607	0.0969	0.9031	0.6856	0.0098
0.55	132866	0.0855	0.9145	0.6653	0.0111
0.6	116459	0.0766	0.9234	0.6423	0.0122
0.65	102511	0.0678	0.9322	0.6180	0.0134
0.7	87392	0.0596	0.9404	0.5918	0.0150
0.75	71443	0.0505	0.9495	0.5625	0.0175
0.8	59529	0.0431	0.9570	0.5264	0.0196
0.85	47308	0.0346	0.9654	0.4826	0.0226
0.9	12048	0.0109	0.9891	0.1236	0.0227
0.95	4330	0.0041	0.9959	0.0681	0.0349

Note: the performance is evaluated using the 379117 pairs of experimental generated SLGIs (2217 pairs) and non-interactions (376954 pairs) with both members having protein domains.

Supplemental Table III. Summary statistics of distribution of the correlation coefficient between the cell cycle expression profiles of genetic interacting proteins

Threshold	T-score (vs. original GI)	P value (vs. original GI)	T-score (vs. All pairs)	P value (vs. All pairs)
0.95	-1.2311	0.2292	-0.0525	0.9586
0.9	-2.0549	0.0442	-0.3759	0.7083
0.85	-1.1770	0.2417	0.9884	0.3251
0.8	0.5674	0.5710	3.8704	1.32E-04
0.75	0.2503	0.8024	4.3109	1.94E-05
0.7	0.3446	0.7310	5.0998	4.35E-07
0.65	1.6739	0.0943	8.0533	1.79E-15
0.6	1.4894	0.1370	8.6120	1.63E-17
0.55	1.3339	0.1824	8.9319	9.58E-19
0.5	0.7308	0.4650	10.1916	5.34E-24
0.45	0.6319	0.5275	10.6774	3.35E-26
0.4	0.4825	0.6290	12.2157	8.43E-34
0.35	0.0290	0.9769	12.8720	2.16E-37
0.3	-0.7195	0.4720	13.4718	7.30E-41
0.25	-2.3167	0.0205	13.4981	3.80E-41
0.2	-3.6548	2.58E-04	14.1176	6.34E-45
0.15	-4.6716	3.01E-06	15.7401	1.85E-55
0.1	-7.2015	6.20E-13	15.9569	4.35E-57
0.05	-9.6593	5.26E-22	16.5797	1.36E-61
0	-13.9797	5.11E-44	24.3758	3.57E-131

Supplemental Table IV. Summary statistics of distribution of the similarities between the GO biological processes of genetic interacting proteins

Threshold	T-score (vs. original GI)	P value (vs. original GI)	T-score (vs. All pairs)	P value (vs. All pairs)
0.95	2.8616	8.18E-03	7.0986	1.54E-07
0.9	4.1388	1.09E-04	9.6944	6.83E-14
0.85	4.5079	1.58E-05	11.5580	7.19E-21
0.8	3.5569	4.27E-04	15.3384	1.62E-40
0.75	5.1504	3.51E-07	20.2872	6.66E-69
0.7	4.6786	3.36E-06	22.3357	5.43E-85
0.65	6.2352	5.66E-10	29.9002	4.46E-152
0.6	5.4971	4.28E-08	31.8686	9.99E-177
0.55	5.0716	4.21E-07	33.2063	1.48E-193
0.5	2.8398	4.53E-03	39.0308	5.67E-272
0.45	1.8511	0.064	40.8923	1.03E-300
0.4	0.5845	0.559	46.6709	0.00
0.35	-0.6147	0.539	50.3936	0.00
0.3	-3.5334	4.11E-04	53.5202	0.00
0.25	-6.3149	2.76E-10	60.1044	0.00
0.2	-11.6473	2.92E-31	63.5508	0.00
0.15	-16.2162	8.97E-59	70.9904	0.00
0.1	-23.2261	1.81E-117	82.4446	0.00
0.05	-31.1076	2.91E-205	99.6669	0.00
0	-49.0786	0.00	185.9402	0.00

Note: the Resnik method is used to calculate the similarity between the biological process terms

Supplemental Table V. Summary statistics of distribution of the similarities between the GO cellular component of genetic interacting proteins

Threshold	T-score (vs. original GI)	P value (vs. original GI)	T-score (vs. All pairs)	P value (vs. All pairs)
0.95	2.4239	0.0226	5.4338	1.07E-05
0.9	4.0408	1.53E-04	7.6053	2.31E-10
0.85	4.9111	3.03E-06	9.8846	5.60E-17
0.8	4.8803	1.62E-06	13.7995	1.64E-34
0.75	5.5758	3.74E-08	17.6206	1.89E-55
0.7	5.6365	2.39E-08	20.1136	5.25E-72
0.65	6.9807	4.23E-12	26.7665	3.22E-127
0.6	5.4308	6.21E-08	27.8059	2.90E-141
0.55	4.8200	1.52E-06	29.0693	2.93E-155
0.5	2.8470	4.43E-03	33.9117	1.57E-214
0.45	2.0025	0.0453	35.5617	3.54E-237
0.4	0.2845	0.7760	39.9349	3.08E-301
0.35	-1.7901	0.0735	41.7910	0.00
0.3	-4.7863	1.71E-06	44.2991	0.00
0.25	-8.2880	1.22E-16	48.8099	0.00
0.2	-12.9517	3.19E-38	53.1532	0.00
0.15	-16.7738	1.04E-62	59.9635	0.00
0.1	-24.262	1.07E-127	67.8925	0.00
0.05	-32.1225	6.40E-218	77.9517	0.00
0	-55.8164	0.00	43.4725	0.00

Note: the Resnik method is used to calculate the similarity between the cellular component terms

Supplemental Table VI. Summary statistics of distribution of the similarities between the GO molecular function of genetic interacting proteins

Threshold	T-score (vs. original GI)	P value (vs. original GI)	T-score (vs. All pairs)	P value (vs. All pairs)
0.95	2.4895	0.0204	3.7151	1.14E-03
0.9	4.1629	1.15E-04	5.8254	3.43E-07
0.85	2.7182	7.78E-03	5.2245	1.03E-06
0.8	3.3616	8.92E-04	7.5871	6.66E-13
0.75	3.9179	1.03E-04	9.3705	4.77E-19
0.7	4.6401	4.27E-06	10.8787	4.29E-25
0.65	7.5061	1.25E-13	15.3320	1.44E-47
0.6	7.7377	1.82E-14	16.9870	2.03E-58
0.55	7.1848	9.68E-13	17.4099	7.03E-62
0.5	5.4622	5.05E-08	18.8874	5.92E-74
0.45	4.7483	2.12E-06	19.5387	1.88E-79
0.4	2.9593	0.0031	21.2428	1.80E-94
0.35	3.0087	0.0026	23.4789	4.78E-115
0.3	2.1694	0.0301	25.6045	6.41E-137
0.25	-0.0979	0.9220	27.3813	1.31E-157
0.2	-2.4949	0.0126	28.9940	7.19E-178
0.15	-6.1706	6.99E-10	30.3384	3.11E-196
0.1	-9.5693	1.30E-21	35.3075	1.82E-266
0.05	-12.8642	1.49E-37	42.3348	0.00
0	-17.3589	2.94E-66	110.0738	0.00

Note: the Resnik method is used to calculate the similarity between the molecular function terms