

Parenclitic networks' representation of data sets

Massimiliano Zanin^{1,2,3}, Joaquín Medina Alcazar⁴, Jesus Vicente Carbajosa⁴, Pedro Sousa¹, David Papo², Ernestina Menasalvas² and Stefano Boccaletti⁵

¹*Faculdade de Ciências e Tecnologia, Departamento de Engenharia Electrotécnica, Universidade Nova de Lisboa, Lisboa, Portugal*

²*Center for Biomedical Technology, Universidad Politécnica de Madrid, 28223 Pozuelo de Alarcón, Madrid, Spain*

³*Innaxis Foundation & Research Institute, José Ortega y Gasset 20, 28006, Madrid, Spain*

⁴*Centro de Biotecnología y Genómica de Plantas, Universidad Politécnica de Madrid, 28223 Pozuelo de Alarcón, Madrid, Spain*

⁵*CNR- Institute of Complex Systems, Via Madonna del Piano 10, 50019 Sesto Fiorentino, Florence, Italy*

Summary paragraph:

Of the different ways of representing a multi-unit system, the one afforded by networks is among the most elegant and general. Endowing a system with a network representation requires defining nodes and links connecting them. Often physical or virtual relationships between the elements of the system, e.g. anatomic brain fibres or hyper-links between the pages of a web site, constrain the way a link is defined. When such relationships are not clearly apparent, yet functional links can be built as long as time evolving variables are associated to each node, as e.g. the time evolution of a stock price, or of brain activity in a given region.

We propose a third, novel, method which allows treating collections of isolated, possibly heterogeneous, scalars, e.g. sets of biomedical tests, as networked systems. The method builds a network where each node represents a feature, while each pairing quantifies the deviation between those two features and the corresponding typical relationship between them within a studied population. Topological characteristics can then be used to extract important information about the system. In particular, atypical or pathological conditions correspond to strongly heterogeneous networks, whereas typical or normative conditions are characterized by sparsely connected networks with homogeneous nodes. Insofar as a network representation of each instance or subject is constructed with reference to the population to which he is compared, this technique is by its very nature a difference seeker. We apply the method to unveil the importance of specific genes in the response of a plant, the *Arabidopsis thaliana*, to osmotic stress. The most important genes turned out to be the nodes with highest centrality in the reconstructed networks, such that, when they are knocked out, different phenotypes appear. We not only confirm known results, but also highlight important genes hitherto unrelated to the osmotic stress response of the plant.

Along the past years, complex networks ^{1,2} have provided a valuable framework for the analysis of a wealth of natural and man-made systems. Fields of application include genetics, proteomics and metabolomics ^{3,4}, the study of neurological diseases ⁵, transportation networks ⁶ and the World Wide Web ⁷. The success of this approach dwells on its capacity of eliminating all unnecessary details, while eliciting the relevant backbone of interactions in an elegant mathematical form.

So far, two have been the approaches used for the network representation of data sets. The first one, which we here call *structural network reconstruction*, requires one to hold explicit information on the connections between the system's constituting elements. An illustrative example is a transportation network: if, for instance, nodes represent airports, links between pairs of them are directly associated to flights operating the corresponding routes.

When such an explicit structure is missing, and yet knowledge on the temporal evolution of the system's elements is available, the alternative is the construction of *functional networks*. Here, a multivariate data set is mapped into a structured network, where nodes represent individual time series and links are established based on some metrics assessing a relationship between them. One example is the functional representations of the brain^{5,8,9}, obtained by sub-dividing the brain volume in different regions, by recording their activities, and by establishing connections with the use of different metrics, from simple linear correlations up to causality measures.

There are, however, drawbacks affecting the applicability of functional networks. A first is that individuating a significant function (among the vast set available) for the establishment of the links might involve a large degree of subjectivity¹⁰. A second is that a time series is generally required for each node in order for the functional relationships to be evaluated, and this precludes the use of such an approach when the system's elements are characterized by a single, static, value. Relevant examples include tissues and organic sample analysis, like blood analysis or spectrography; genetic expression levels of individuals, without evolution through time; biomedical analysis with neuro-imaging techniques; or social network analysis, when just a snapshot of the system

evolution is available.

We here introduce a third way of representing data sets as networks, that exploits information of a set of pre-labeled subjects to unveil the presence of reference relationships between nodes. The starting point is a multi-features description of subjects, e.g. a collection of medical measurements or of genetic expression levels, and their affiliation to one or multiple pre-defined groups. While working with the complete data set may result unfeasible, we consider the projection of the data into all possible plains created by pairs of features - see Fig. 1 b). In these plains, different methods (from simple linear correlations, up to more sophisticated data mining techniques) are used to extract reference models, one for each group, accounting for the characteristics of subjects in them. When a new, unlabeled, subject is considered, the deviation between its data and such reference models is used to weight the link between the corresponding nodes - see Fig. 1 c). The final result is therefore the creation of a network for each subject, where nodes represent features, and links are weighted according to the deviation from reference models. See Methods for a more detailed description of the whole procedure.

When just one class of subjects is available, the network topology is the result of the deviation (from the greek *παρέγκλισις*) of some features from the streams created by data associated to all other subjects. In analogy to the spirit of the doctrine from Democritus and Epicurus, we term such a technique the *parenclitic network representation* of a system.

As an application, we analyze the genetic expression of the plant *Arabidopsis thaliana* under osmotic stress, with the objective of identifying those genes orchestrating the response against

this specific condition. Expression levels have been obtained from the *AtGenExpress project*¹², including information about the 1,922 genes composing the transcription factors of Arabidopsis¹³ at six different moments of time (30 min, 1 h, 3 h, 6 h, 12 h and 24 h after the onset of the stress). While the classical approach considers co-expression networks¹⁴⁻¹⁶, the parenclitic approach, on the contrary, focuses on those pairs of genes whose expressions depart from a reference model. The two techniques are therefore strongly complementary: while the former focuses on similarities between the evolutions of expression levels through time, the latter centers on differences. Furthermore, the construction of a different network for each time step allows tracking the plant response through time.

Fig. 2 shows an example of the obtained parenclitic networks. Specifically, Fig. 2 (a) represents the giant component of the network corresponding to 3 h. The color of links symbolizes their weights, with green (red) shades indicating low (high) Z-Scores and the size of nodes being proportional to their α - *centrality* - see Methods for more details.

The resulting network topologies are characterized by a high heterogeneous structure, dominated by a small number of *hubs* - see Fig. 2 (b). Such highly central nodes indicate that the expression levels of the corresponding genes are in general correlated with the ones of their neighbors, except at 3 h., when this correlation is broken. This suggests that hubs are performing some specific task at this moment of time, and therefore that they are the main actors in regulating the overall plant response.

In order to confirm this hypothesis, an *in vivo* screening has been performed, in which genes

corresponding to the most central nodes of each network have been knocked out, and the appearance of some phenotype has been monitored by measuring the length of the root of each plant - see Methods for more details. As an example, Fig. 3 reports the results obtained with seven transgenic lines, i.e. seven groups of plants in which the expression of one gene has been artificially suppressed. Specifically, Fig. 3 (a) reports the mean length of roots for the seven lines, compared to the expected root length in the wild type (i.e., the plant without genetic modifications, black column). The Figure visualizes the fact that, in all the seven examples, knocking down the corresponding gene leads to a strongly abnormal development of the plant.

The complete results of the *in vivo* screening is reported in Fig. 4. For each one of the six networks analyzed, Fig. 4 reports the number of genes already known to be relevant for the osmotic response of the plant, and the number of previously unknown genes that have been successfully tested. Thanks to the parenclitic network representation, 15 new genes have been identified, previously unknown or considered unrelated to the response to osmotic stress - the full list is reported in Table 1.

In conclusion, the parenclitic approach allows a network representation of those data sets that do not have a physical background of connections, nor they correspond to a temporal evolution. Yet, by exploiting the data associated to a set of pre-labeled subjects, and by extracting a set of reference models, it is possible to construct networks whose links represent the presence of deviations from the expected relationships. The application of this methodology to *Arabidopsis thaliana* genetic expression levels has allowed the identification of genes regulating the response

of the plant to osmotic stress, that were previously unknown in the Literature. Besides its general applicability to systems for which functional representations are not possible, it has to be stressed that the parenclitic approach allows also merging different data sources into a single network, e.g. gene expression levels and blood tests. The creation of such heterogeneous individual networks can open new doors to the understanding of the interactions between different aspects of the system under study.

Methods

Parenclitic network reconstruction

Consider a set of n systems, or subjects, $\{s_1, s_2, \dots, s_n\}$, each one associated to one of n_c pre-defined classes - the class of each system will be denoted by $\{c_1, c_2, \dots, c_{n_c}\}$. For instance, each system may represent a person, classified as *healthy* (or *control*) or suffering from some disease. Each system i is in turn identified by a vector of n_f features $f_i = (f_1^i, f_2^i, \dots, f_{n_f}^i)$, so that each system is represented by a point in a n_f -dimensional space.

The fundamental ansatz is that each class can be associated to a constrain in the feature space. In other words, and following the previous example, we suppose that a relationship $\mathcal{F}^{healthy}(f_1, f_2, \dots, f_{n_f}) = 0$ defines the feature combination associated to a healthy subject, while another relationship $\mathcal{F}^{disease}(f_1, f_2, \dots, f_{n_f}) = 0$ defines the combination of features for the studied disease. More generally, there will be n_c different relationships of this type, one for each of the n_c classes.

In general, the exact expressions of the functions \mathcal{F} are not accessible, either because extracting them may be too complex (it may require a too high computational cost), or because not enough data are available. For each pairs of features i and j , the values corresponding to subjects of a given class c are used to create a projected constrain $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_{i,j}^c(f_i, f_j) = 0$, modeling the relationship expected in that plane for subjects belonging to that class (see Fig. 1 (b)). Such models can be obtained by several methods, like for instance a polynomial fit, or more generally by a data mining method like Support Vector Machine or Artificial Neural Networks. For each unlabeled subject, the distance between the position in that plane and the derived model is used to weight the corresponding link between nodes i and j of the parenclitic network representation - see the red dot and line in Fig. 1 (b) and the resulting topology illustrated in Fig. 1 (c). Notice that now we move from a feature representation (features of all subjects represented in a space) to a subject representation, where one network is constructed for each subject, and nodes represent features.

Representation of Arabidopsis stress response

The parenclitic network reconstruction method has been applied to the problem of the identification of genes responsible for the reaction of the *Arabidopsis thaliana* plant to external stresses. The original data set corresponds to the *AtGenExpress project*¹², including expression levels of 22,620 genes under 8 different abiotic stresses (i.e., cold, heat, drought, osmotic, salt, wounding and UV-B light) and at six different moments of time (30 min, 1 h, 3 h, 6 h, 12 h and 24 h after the onset of stress treatment). Of these, only the osmotic stress has been considered in this work, and the analysis has been limited to the $n_f = 1,922$ genes composing the transcription factors of

Arabidopsis¹³.

Each subject is the status of the plant at a given time step, and therefore we aim at creating a network representing the genes with an abnormal expression at each time step. In other words, when analyzing data at time τ , we create the $n_f(n_f - 1)$ reference models $\{\tilde{\mathcal{F}} = 0\}$ with the data corresponding to all other time steps, and we generate links according to the distance from that reference.

Mathematically, given two gene expression levels i and j , we define our reference model as:

$$\tilde{f}_j^\tau = \alpha_{ij} + \beta_{ij}f_i^\tau, \quad (1)$$

\tilde{f}_j^τ being the expected value of gene j at time τ , f_i^τ the known expression levels of gene i , and α_{ij} and β_{ij} two free model parameters. These two coefficients are calculated by means of a linear fit of all values corresponding to other time steps, i.e., minimizing the error of the relation:

$$f_j^{t \neq \tau} = \tilde{\mathcal{F}}(f_i^{t \neq \tau}) = \alpha_{ij} + \beta_{ij}f_i^{t \neq \tau}. \quad (2)$$

The distance between the expected (corresponding to the model $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}(f_i^{t \neq \tau})$) and the real value of gene j is then used to weight the link connecting nodes i and j in the network. More specifically, the weight of the link is the absolute value of the Z-Score of the distance $\left| \tilde{f}_j^\tau - f_j^\tau \right|$.

Arabidopsis network analysis

The aim of the analysis is the identification of the more central nodes (i.e., genes) within each of the six parenclitic networks. When a node is strongly central, indeed, it is highly connected, and therefore it belongs to many pairs of nodes deviating from the expected models.

Due to the characteristics of the network, we have opted for the α – *centrality* measure, according to which the centrality of a node is a linear combination of the centralities of those to whom it is connected ¹¹. If we define a vector \mathcal{X} of centralities such that its i^{th} component x_i is the centrality of the i -th node, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda x_i &= \sum_j x_j (W_{ij} + \alpha), \\ (W + \alpha)\mathcal{X} &= \lambda\mathcal{X}.\end{aligned}\tag{3}$$

Here, W is the weight matrix of the network, and its element $w_{i,j}$ codifies the weight of the link connecting nodes i and j . Notice that this is equivalent to an eigenvalue problem, with constant α defining weak connections between all the nodes of the network. In order to have meaningful results, α should be smaller than the spectral radius of W .

Osmotic stress tolerance test

For the screening of the transcription factors identified by the Parenclitic model, the *Arabidopsis thaliana* inducible lines from Transplanta collection ¹⁷ were used, with the ecotype Columbia

(Col-0) as the Wild Type. Each one of the transgenic Arabidopsis lines of the collection expresses a single Arabidopsis transcription factor under the control of the β -stradiol inducible promoter.

For osmotic stress screening, seeds from control plants (Col-0) and at least two independent T3 homozygous transgenic lines (Transplanta collection ¹⁷) of each transcription factor were sterilized, vernalized for 2 days at 4°C and plated onto Petri dishes containing $\frac{1}{2}$ MS medium ¹⁸ supplemented with 10 μ M β -Stradiol. After 5 days, seedlings were transferred to vertical plates containing $\frac{1}{2}$ MS medium supplemented with 300 mM Mannitol, 10 μ M β -stradiol and transferred to a growth chamber at 21°C under long-day growth conditions (16/8h light/darkness). After 12 days pictures were taken to record the phenotypes, and root elongation measurements were performed with ImageJ software ¹⁹.

References




1. Albert, R. & Barabási, A. L. Statistical mechanics of complex networks. *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **74**, 47–97 (2002).
2. Boccaletti, S., Latora, V., Moreno, Y., Chavez, M. & Hwang, D. Complex networks: Structure and dynamics. *Phys. Rep.* **424**, 175–308 (2006).
3. Barabási, A. L. & Oltvai, Z. N. Network biology: understanding the cell's functional organization. *Nat. Rev. Gen.* **5**, 101–113 (2004).
4. Guimera, R. & Amaral, L. A. N. Functional cartography of complex metabolic networks. *Nature* **433**, 895–900 (2005).

5. Bullmore, E. T. & Sporns, O. Complex brain networks: graph theoretical analysis of structural and functional systems. *Nat. Rev. Neurosci.* **10**, 186–198 (2009).
6. Zanin, M. & Lillo, F. Modelling the air transport with complex networks: A short review. *EPJ-ST* **215**, 5-21 (2013).
7. Albert, R., Jeong, H. & Barabási, A. L. Internet: Diameter of the world-wide web. *Nature* **401**, 103–131 (1999).
8. Bassett, D. S. & Bullmore, E. D. Small-world brain networks. *The neuroscientist* **12**, 512-523 (2006).
9. Rubinov, M. & Sporns, O. Complex network measures of brain connectivity: Uses and interpretations. *NeuroImage* **52**, 1059–1069 (2010).
10. Zanin, M., Sousa, P., Papo, D., Bajo, R., García-Prieto, J., del Pozo, F., Menasalvas, E. & Boccaletti, S. Optimizing functional network representation of multivariate time series. *Sci. Rep.* **2**, 630 (2012).
11. Bonacich, P. & Lloyd, P. Eigenvector-like measures of centrality for asymmetric relations. *Social Networks* **23**, 191–201 (2001).
12. Kilian, J., Whitehead, D., Horak, J., Wanke, D., Weinl, S., Batistic, O., D'Angelo, C., Bornberg-Bauer, E., Kudla, J. & Harter, K. The AtGenExpress global stress expression data set: protocols, evaluation and model data analysis of UV-B light, drought and cold stress responses. *Plant J.* **50**, 347–363 (2007).

13. Guo, A., He, K., Liu, D., Bai, S., Gu, X., Wei, L. & Luo, J. DATF: a Database of Arabidopsis Transcription Factors. *Bioinformatics* **21**, 2568–2569 (2005).
14. Clifton, R., Lister, R., Parker, K. L., Sappl, P. G., Elhafez, D., Millar, A. H., Day, D. A. & Whelan, J. Stress-induced co-expression of alternative respiratory chain components in *Arabidopsis thaliana*. *Plant Molecular Biology* **58**, 193–212 (2005).
15. Mao, L., Van Hemert, J. L., Dash, S. & Dickerson, J. A. Arabidopsis gene co-expression network and its functional modules. *BMC Bioinformatics* **10**, 346 (2009).
16. Less, H. & Angelovici, R. & Tzin, V. & Galili, G. Coordinated Gene Networks Regulating Arabidopsis Plant Metabolism in Response to Various Stresses and Nutritional Cues. *The Plant Cell* **23**, 1264-1271 (2011).
17. http://bioinfogp.cnb.csic.es/transplanta_dev/ .
18. Murashige, T., & Skoog, F. A revised medium for rapid growth and bio assays with tobacco tissue cultures. *Physiologia plantarum* **15**, 473–497 (1962).
19. Abràmoff, M. D., Magalhães, P. J. & Ram, S. J. Image processing with ImageJ. *Biophotonics International* **11**, 36–42 (2004).




Author Contributions M.Z. and S.B. conceived and elaborated the method for parenclitic network reconstruction. J.M.A. and J.V.C. performed the experiment on the *Arabidopsis thaliana*. M.Z., P.S., D.P., E.M. and S.B. analyzed the data and prepared the figures. M.Z., J.M.A., J.V.C., D.P. and S.B. wrote the main manuscript text. All authors reviewed the manuscript.

Competing Interests The authors have declared that no competing interests exist.



Time step	Gene	Name	Centrality
30 m.	AT1G13300	HRS1	0.88111
30 m.	AT5G51910	TCP family transcription factor	0.729679
30 m.	AT4G23750	CRF2, Cytokinin response factor 2	0.507826
1 h.	AT1G44830	DREB	1.0
1 h.	AT3G12820	MYB10	0.236686
3 h.	AT2G46830	ATCCA1, CCA1, Circadian clock associated 1	0.271497
3 h.	AT5G62320	MYB99	0.177404
3 h.	AT1G29160	COG1	0.148112
6 h.	AT4G16610	C2H2-like zinc finger protein	0.767785
6 h.	AT2G44910	ATHB-4	0.689358
12 h.	AT3G61910	NST2	0.264721
24 h.	AT1G09540	MYB61	0.709785
24 h.	AT2G40950	ATBZIP17, BZIP17	0.551008
24 h.	AT5G62320	MYB99	0.482752
24 h.	AT5G04410	ANAC078	0.438538

Table 1: Genes previously unknown in the Literature, discovered by the parenclitic representation, and that have been experimentally proven to develop a statistically significant phenotype. The right most column reports the corresponding α -centrality values.






Figure 1 Schematic representation of the parenclitic network reconstruction method. (a)

The initial data set, for a set of three feature, corresponds to a set of points (green spheres) in a 3-dimensional space. The constrain surface (gray wired surface) represents the overall standard relationship of the class. A generic unlabeled subject is represented by a red sphere. (b) Each one of the three possible planes are considered, and data are there projected. The green dashed lines represent the models extracted in each plane. The red points are the positions of the unlabeled subject, and the red lines indicate the distance of the subject from the models. (c) The resulting parenclitic representation is a network where nodes are associated to features, and links are weighted accordingly to the calculated distances (coded, in this Figure, into different line widths).

Figure 2 Parenclitic network for the response of *Arabidopsis thaliana* to osmotic stress after 3 h. (a)

Representation of the giant component of the network; for the sake of clarity, links with weight lower than 3 have been eliminated. (b) Magnification of the neighborhood of the most central node, *AT1G12610*. In both cases, color represent the link weight (from green to red), and node sizes is associated with the corresponding α -centrality.

Figure 3 In vivo experimental verification of the predictions from the parenclitic analysis. (a)

Mean root length corresponding to the wild type (black column) and to 7 other transgenic lines in which a specific gene has been knocked out. Whiskers represent the standard deviation corresponding to each group. Asterisks denote groups for which the distribution of root lengths is different with respect to the wild type with a 0.01 significance

level. (b) Photos of one plant of each of the 8 lines at the end of the full development process. (c) and (d) Photos of two vertical plates where plants are grown. In both cases, the left (right) photos refer to wild phenotypes (to phenotypes developed by the transgenic line).

Figure 4 Screening of the experimental results. Bars account for the 20 most central genes at each time step. For the six time steps considered, bar colors are coded accordingly to the following stipulations: (green) the number of previously unknown genes, that have been experimentally verified to develop a statistically significant phenotype; (red) the number of previously unknown genes, that, once tested, failed to develop a phenotype with significant difference with respect to the wild phenotype; (cyan) the number of genes predicted by the parenclitic analysis that were previously described in the Literature; and (gray) the number of previously unknown genes, which could not be tested experimentally.