

# UNDERSTANDING FUNCTIONAL PROTEIN-PROTEIN INTERACTIONS OF ABCB11 AND ADA IN HUMAN AND MOUSE

Antara Sengupta  
Dept. of MCA  
MCKV Institute of Engineering  
Howrah, India  
Antara.sngpt@gmail.com

Sk. Sarif Hassan  
Dept. of Mathematics  
University of Petroleum and Energy Studies  
Dehradun, India  
sarif.hassan@icts.res.in

Pabitra Pal Choudhury  
Applied Statistics Unit  
Indian Statistical Institute  
Kolkata, India  
pabitrapalchoudhury@gmail.com

**Abstract**— Proteins are macromolecules which hardly act alone; they need to make interactions with some other proteins to do so. Numerous factors are there which can regulate the interactions between proteins [4]. Here in this present study we aim to understand Protein-Protein Interactions (PPIs) of two proteins ABCB11 and ADA from quantitative point of view. One of our major aims also is to study the factors that regulate the PPIs and thus to distinguish these PPIs with proper quantification across the two species *Homo Sapiens* and *Mus Musculus* respectively to know how one protein interacts with different set of proteins in different species.

**Index Terms**— Quantitative Understanding, Protein properties, Molecular properties, Protein-Protein Interactions (PPIs), Fractal Dimension.

## INTRODUCTION

Proteins are the workhouses where most of the biological processes in a cell take place. Proteins are macromolecules and need associations of some other proteins to participate in various essential molecular processes within a cell and there is a talk about Protein-Protein Interactions (PPIs) [7]. Numerous factors are there which can regulate the PPIs. Abnormal PPIs can lead to develop the basis of diseases like cancers. Not only that but drugs also target PPIs for *interfacial inhibition*. As an example Brefeldin A (BFA) [1] acts as inhibitor and attacks macromolecular complexes when the complex is in a transition state (structurally and energetically unbalanced) and goes for drug binding [3]. Certain biological properties are there in gene as well as protein level which play significant role in transcriptions, protein structure formations, and gene expressions and can have significant role in protein network formation.

Moreover, proteins fold spontaneously into complicated three-dimensional structures which are essential for several biological activities. Mainly the driving energy for this folding process comes from the hydrophobic effect, Van der Waals forces, and salt bridges at specific binding domains on each protein [6]. The strength of the binding depends on the size of the binding domain. Leucine zipper is a common surface domain that can provide stable protein-protein interactions. It consists of  $\alpha$ -helices on each protein that bind to each other in a parallel fashion through the hydrophobic bonding of regularly-spaced leucine residues on each  $\alpha$ -helix that project between the adjacent helix peptide chains. Because of the tight molecular packing, leucine zippers provide stable binding for multi-protein complexes [7].

Quantitative understanding of genes/ proteins refers to its unique characterizations or a numeric vector corresponding to each sequence which would act as their signature by finding some quantitative attributes. The quantification essentially captures how the nucleotides or amino acids are arranged in the sequence [9]. Here in this paper it is tried to make quantitative analysis of the genes ABCB11 and ADA and the genes which are functionally attached with them across the two species *Homo Sapiens* and *Mus Musculus*. The analysis has been made with genes and Proteins at their sequence levels and as well as the physical properties of those protein to study the factors that regulate the PPIs and thus to distinguish these PPIs with proper quantification across the two species to know how one protein interacts with different set of proteins in different species.

### A. Model Representation

We code any given DNA sequence to numeric sequence for further analysis. There are various ways of doing so. Here we have coded as A=1, T=2, G=3 and C=4 and thus a DNA sequence would be transformed to a sequence of corresponding numeric sequence.

### B. Data Set Specification

In this paper as the PPIs of the proteins ABCB11 and ADA for the species Sapiens and *Mus Musculus* are taken from [String Database](#) which is shown below. It is to be noted that the associations of the proteins are purely functional associations. It can be observed that the proteins ABCB11 and ADA both have some proteins in the networks which are common for both the species, whereas some proteins are specifically participating in the specified species not in other.

TABLE I ABCB11 and ADA PPIs. Tick defines presence of the protein the species as mentioned.

Proteins in the Network of ABCB11	Homo Sapiens	<i>Mus Musculus</i>	Proteins in the Network of ADA	Homo Sapiens	<i>Mus Musculus</i>
Abcb11	√	√	Ada	√	√
Alb	√	√	ADK	√	√
ATP8B1	√		ADORA1	√	
Baat	√	√	DCK	√	√
Nr0b2	√	√	DPP4	√	
NR5A2	√	√	MYB	√	
NRIH4	√	√	NT5C	√	√
Slco10a1	√	√	NT5C1	√	
Slco1a1		√	Nt5c1a		√
SLCO1A2	√		NT5C2	√	√
Slco1a4		√	Nt5c3		√
Slco1a6		√	NT5E	√	√
SLCO1B1	√		Nt5m		√
Slco1b2		√	PNP	√	√
SLCO1B3	√		Pnp2		√

## II. METHODOLOGY

Factors that regulate the PPIs are known qualitatively. To model the regulatory factors mathematically it is necessary to characterize the PPIs in DNA and Protein sequence levels which are performed as follows:-

### A. Quantitative understanding of DNA sequence

Quantitative understanding of a gene in molecular level can be done by applying several mathematical parameters [13][9] which can derive some data and can verify some fact. In this paper, to build quantitative model it is tried to find out the underlying geometries of DNA structure and the hidden geometrical rules, that is to capture spatial ordering of bases across the DNA and Protein so that we can make a mapping between those geometrical rules with biological activities of those proteins.

Quantitative understanding of DNA sequence is taken place through following phases:-

#### 1) Generating Indicator Matrix and Calculating Fractal Dimension of the Indicator Matrices

In Mathematics the term ‘Indicator’ is a numerical measure of a quality or characteristic of some aspect of a program; evidence that something is occurring, that progress is being made. The notion of indicator matrix and its characterization through fractal dimension was proposed by Carlo Cattani [13][2]. DNA sequences have four basic components (A = adenine, C = cytosine, G = guanine, T = thymine) which is defined as four alphabets A, C, G, T respectively.

Let us consider  $D \cong \{A, C, G, T\}$  be the set of nucleotides and  $x \in D$  where, x is any alphabet of D. A DNA sequence is the finite symbolic string  $S = \mathbf{N} \times D$ , so that  $S \cong \{x_h\}_{h=1, \dots, N}, N < \infty$  being  $x_h \cong (h, x) = x(h)$  where  $h=1, 2, \dots, N$  and  $x \in D$  the value x at the position h. According to C. Cattani the Indicator Matrix can be characterized through fractal dimension as follows,

$$f: S \times S \rightarrow \{0,1\} \text{ such that } f(x_h, x_k) \cong \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x_h = x_k \\ 0 & \text{if } x_h \neq x_k \end{cases}$$

$$\text{where } x_h, x_k \in S$$

So now it is possible to easily describe a  $N \times N$  sparse binary matrix from an indicator matrix of N length, which may be written as,

$$M_{hk} = f(x_k)x_h, x_k \in S, h, k = 1, 2, 3, \dots, N$$

But it is not possible to differentiate between zeros formed by distinct base pairs. So slight modification is needed into it, which is given below [7],

$$f: S \times S \rightarrow \{1, 2, 3, 4\} \text{ such that}$$

$$(x_h, x_k) \cong \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x_h = x_k \\ 2 & \text{if } x_h \neq x_k \\ 3 & \text{if } x_h \neq x_k; x_h > x_k \\ 4 & \text{if } x_h \neq x_k; x_h < x_k \end{cases}$$

So the matrix  $M_{hk}$  will be decomposed into four binary matrices namely, A1, A2, A3, A4 and corresponding four binary images will be made for each DNA sequence.

The fractal dimensions of those indicator matrices have been calculated using ‘‘Box-Counting’’ method [17]. Box-Counting is a method of collection of data for analyzing complex pattern like dataset, images etc. and breaking them into smaller part or

pieces and analyze them individually. Fractal dimensions for each indicator matrix are derived using BENOIT software.

Indicator matrices for ABCB11 and ADA and the genes in their networks are made for both the species. Fractal Dimensions (FDs) of four indicator matrices are also calculated for each species which are shown in Supplementary file 1 and Supplementary file 2 respectively.

TABLE II. Interval of Fractal Dimensions and the names of genes which have similar characteristics to ABCB11 and ADA respectively

Species	Gene Name	A1	A2	A3	A4	Genes having similar characteristics
<i>Homo Sapiens</i>	ABCB11 and genes in network	(1.79542, 1.87851)	(1.79782, 1.87844)	(1.78368, 1.87196)	(1.78112, 1.87203)	SLCO1A2
<i>Mus Musculus</i>		(1.82043, 1.89552)	(1.81957, 1.89538)	(1.81734, 1.88822)	(1.8167, 1.88831)	Alb
<i>Homo Sapiens</i>	ADA and genes in network	(1.79542, 1.87851)	(1.79782, 1.87844)	(1.78368, 1.87196)	(1.78112, 1.87203)	NT5C
<i>Mus Musculus</i>		(1.81957, 1.89538)	(1.81957, 1.89538)	(1.81734, 1.88822)	(1.8222, 1.88831)	Nt5c3

1. The gene ‘SLCO1A2’ and ‘alb’ have similar characteristics of Abcb11 of *Homo Sapiens* and *Mus Musculus* respectively for FDs of all four indicator matrices.
2. The gene NT5C and Nt5c3 have similar characteristics of ADA of *Homo Sapiens* and *Mus Musculus* respectively for FDs of all four indicator matrices.

### 2) Fractal Dimension of DNA Walk

As defined in the [9][13], We can define DNA walk as,

$$a_n \sum_{i=1}^n f(A, x_i), t_n \sum_{i=1}^n f(T, x_i), g_n \sum_{i=1}^n f(C, x_i), c_n \sum_{i=1}^n f(G, x_i).$$

It has been resulted by plotting  $(W_n, V_n)$  as two functions  $W_n \sum \sin a_n^2 - \sin g_n^2$  and  $V_n \sum \sin t_n^2 - \sin c_n^2$  are defi

The Fractal Dimensions of all the genes are deduced using Box Counting method.

TABLE III. Interval of Fractal Dimensions of DNA Walk and the names of genes which have similar characteristics to ABCB11 and ADA respectively

Species	Gene Name	FD of DNA WALK	Genes having similar Characteristics
<i>Homo Sapiens</i>	ABCB11 and genes in network	(1.78266, 1.90321)	BAAT
<i>Mus Musculus</i>		(1.79281, 1.88461)	Slco1a1
<i>Homo Sapiens</i>	ADA and genes in network	(1.78487, 1.94016)	PNP
<i>Mus Musculus</i>		(1.79281, 1.88461)	Nt5e

The DNA walk for all the genes in the PPI of ABCB11 and ADA respectively are computed and then the fractal dimensions of the DNA are enumerated using Benoit. The detail result is given in Supplementary file 1 and 2.

1. The gene ‘BAAT’ and ‘Slco1a1’ have similar characteristics of Abcb11 of *Homo Sapiens* and *Mus Musculus* respectively for FDs of all four indicator matrices.
2. The gene PNP and Nt5e have similar characteristics of ADA of *Homo Sapiens* and *Mus Musculus* respectively for FDs of all four indicator matrices.

### 3) Poly-string Mean and Standard Deviation:-

A gene is a string constituting of different permutations of the base pairs A, C, T and G where repetition of a base pair is allowed. It is possible to classify the sequences based on the ordering of poly-string mean of A, C, T, and G in the string [12][13].

$$\text{Mean } N_{ui} = \frac{2(N_{u1} + N_{u2} + N_{u3} + \dots + N_{um})}{m} \cdot (m + 1) \quad (1)$$

Where,  $N_{ui} \in \{A, T, C, G\}$ ,  $i=1,2,3,\dots,m$  and  $m$  is the length of longest poly-string over the string.

The poly-string mean and SD are calculated for all the genes of the PPI of ABCB11 and ADA respectively and the detail result is given in the supplementary files 1 and 2.

TABLE IV. The poly-string mean and SD for all the genes of the PPI of ABCB11 and ADA

Species	Gene Name	Classifications based on poly-string mean	Classifications based on Poly-string SD
<i>Homo Sapiens</i>	ABCB11 and genes in network	5	5
<i>Mus Musculus</i>		7	8
<i>Homo Sapiens</i>	ADA and genes in network	6	8
<i>Mus Musculus</i>		7	7

There are 256 possible poly-strings of length four using four nucleotides A, T, C, G. It can be observed that the genes in PPIs of ABCB11 for *Homo Sapiens* and *Mus Musculus* have been classified into 5 and 7 classes respectively according to poly-string mean whereas, the genes in PPIs of ADA have been classified into 5 and 8 classes respectively.

In the case of poly-string SD the genes in the PPIs of ABCB11 for *Homo Sapiens* and *Mus Musculus* have been classified into 6 and 7 classes respectively. The genes in the PPIs of ADA for

*Homo Sapiens* and *Mus Musculus* have been classified into 8 and 7 classes respectively.

### B. Quantification of Bio-physical Properties

Followings are the properties of DNA sequences which are calculated by using Oligo Calc. These properties include the physical properties of oligonucleotides:-

#### 1) Physical Constants

- i. Length
- ii. Molecular weight
- iii. GC Contents

#### 2) Melting Temperature (TM) Calculations

- i. Basic
- ii. Salt Adjusted

3) Thermodynamic Contents Conditions : 1M NaCl at 25°C at pH 7

- i. Rlnk
- ii. DeltaH
- iii. DeltaG
- iv. DeltaS

The Bio-physical Properties are calculated for all the genes of the PPI of ABCB11 and ADA respectively are derived and the detail result is given in the supplementary files 1 and 2.

1. Overall observation for the species of *Homo sapiens* speaks that although the quantitative difference of the physical properties of the genes ABCB11 and SLCOA2 are small but GC count of Physical constants and Melting Temperature Calculations are same of ABCB11 and SLCO1B1 are same.
2. From the result it is observed for the species of *Homo sapiens* that majorly the quantitative differences of physical constants and Thermodynamic Contents Conditions of the genes ADA and NT5C2 are smaller but in the case of GC count and Melting Temperature (TM) Calculations the genes ADA and ADORA1 are having very less differences.
3. From the result it is observed for the species of *Mus Musculus* that quantitative differences of physical constants and Thermodynamic Contents Conditions of the genes ADA and NT5C2 are smallest and gene abcb11 have similarity of physical properties with Nr5a2.
4. The result as a whole enlightens that, physical properties of both of the species can't be equal.

### C. Quantification of Protein Structural Properties

Here, we extend our quantitative analysis to the protein structural level and which is given below.

The protein properties which are considered here are viz. Alpha Helix (Chou Fasman), Beta Strand (Chou Fasman), Parallel Beta Strand, Anti Parallel Beta Strand, Molecular Beta Strand , Total Beta Strand, Coil, Hydrophobicity

(Aboderin) and Polarity Grantham. The plotting of protein properties has been made using MATLAB (Bioinformatics Tools) and the fractal dimension has been deducted using BENOIT™ software.

TABLE IV. Ranges of protein properties of each species

Species	<i>Homo Sapiens</i>	<i>Mus Musculus</i>	<i>Homo Sapiens</i>	<i>Mus Musculus</i>
Protein Name	ABCB11 & proteins in network		ADA & proteins in network	
Alpha Helix	(1.93681, 1.94316)	(1.93031, 1.94357)	(1.93681, 1.94316)	(1.93957, 1.94348)
Antiparallel beta strand	(1.9361, 1.94326)	(1.93087, 1.94293)	(1.9361, 1.94326)	(1.93944, 1.94329)
Beta Sheet	(1.93688, 1.94354)	(1.93061, 1.94296)	(1.93688, 1.94354)	(1.93942, 1.94352)
Coil	(1.93972, 1.94426)	(1.93398, 1.94385)	(1.93972, 1.94426)	(1.94115, 1.94422)
Hydrophobicity	(1.93548, 1.94321)	(1.92922, 1.94312)	(1.93548, 1.94321)	(1.93924, 1.94322)
Molecular Beta Strand	(1.93906, 1.94411)	(1.93416, 1.94378)	(1.93906, 1.94411)	(1.93989, 1.9443)
Parallel Beta Strand	(1.93717, 1.94366)	(1.92921, 1.94295)	(1.93717, 1.94366)	(1.93832, 1.94368)
Polarity Grantham	(1.93577, 1.94368)	(1.93072, 1.94332)	(1.93577, 1.94368)	(1.94009, 1.94406)
Total Beta Strand	(1.9368, 1.94338)	(1.94271, 1.94273)	(1.9368, 1.94338)	(1.93908, 1.94345)

From the result we can get the range of FDs within which the Protein Properties of the proteins ABCB11 and ADA and the proteins in their networks are lying for the 2 species.

The Protein Properties of ABCB11 are more similar with the properties of the proteins ATP8B1 for the species of *Homo Sapiens* but in case of *Mus Musculus* it has similarity with 'alb'. Whereas, it is worth enough to say that for both the species the Protein Properties of ADA are more similar with the properties of the protein ADK except the properties of Molecular Beta Strand and Parallel Beta Strand, which are more similar with PNP. But as a whole the quantitative understanding of the protein properties reveal that the protein PNP can have a continuous mapping with the gene ADA.

### D. Quantitative comparisons of DNAs in terms of 2D graphical representations based on triplets

We know that Codon consists of three adjacent nucleotides which codes for a particular amino acid. Thus 64 codons are there which codes for 20 amino acids and 3 codons are there which cause termination of protein synthesis. Now each codons have their corresponding triplets of DNA which we can get from the DNA

sequences. If we define a mapping ‘ $\Psi$ ’ to map each triplet to different weight, for any two pairs of triplets ( $X_1, Y_1$ ) and ( $X_2, Y_2$ ), where  $X_1, Y_1, X_2, Y_2$ , all are triplets, if the corresponding codons of  $X_1$  and  $Y_1$  code for the same amino acid but corresponding codons of  $X_2$  and  $Y_2$  code for different amino acid, thae that satisfy the following rule:

$$|\Psi(X_1) - \Psi(Y_1)| < |\Psi(X_2) - \Psi(Y_2)|$$

The mapping has been illustrated below in the tables V and VI:-

TABLE V. Codons and their corresponding Amino Acids.

Codon	Corresponding Amino Acid	Codon	Corresponding Amino Acid
GCU, GCC, GCA, GCG	Alanine	UGG	Tryptophan
CUU, CUC, CUA, CUG, UUA, UUG	Leucine	CAU, CAC	Histidine
CGU, CGC, CGA, CCG, AGA, AGG	Arginine	UAU, UAC	Tyrosine
AAA, AAG	Lysine	AUU, AUC, AUA	Isoleucine
GAU, GAC	Aspartic acid	GUU, GUC, GUA, GUG	Valine
AUG	Methionine	UAA, UAG, UGA	Stop Codons
AAU, AAC	Asparagine	GAA, GAG	Glutamic acid
UUU, UUC	Phenylalanine	UCU, UCC, UCA, UCG, AGU, GC	Serine
UGU, UGC	Cysteine	CAA, CAG	Glutamine
CCU, CCC, CCA, CCG	Proline	ACU, ACC, ACA, ACG	Threonine
		GGU, GGC, GGA, GGG	Glycine

TABLE VI. Triplets and their corresponding weight ( $\Psi$ ).

Codon	Corresponding Triplet	Weight ( $\Psi$ )	Codon	Corresponding Triplet	Weight ( $\Psi$ )
GCU	GCT	1.1	CUU	CTT	11.1
GCC	GCC	1.2	CUC	CTC	11.2
GCA	GCA	1.3	CUA	CTA	11.3
GCG	GCG	1.4	CUG	CTG	11.4
CGU	CGT	2.1	UUA	TTA	11.5
CGC	CGC	2.2	UUG	TTG	11.6
CGA	CGA	2.3	AAA	AAA	12.3
CGG	CGG	2.4	AAG	AAG	12.4
AGA	AGA	2.5	UUU	TTT	13.1
AGG	AGG	2.6	UUC	TTC	13.2
GAU	GAT	3.3	CCU	CCT	14.1
GAC	GAC	3.4	CCC	CCC	14.2
AAU	AAT	4.1	CCA	CCA	14.3
AAC	AAC	4.2	CCG	CCG	14.4
UGU	TGT	5.1	UCU	TCT	15.1
UGC	TGC	5.2	UCC	TCC	15.2
GAA	GAA	6.1	UCA	TCA	15.3
GAG	GAG	6.2	UCG	TCG	15.4
CAA	CAA	7.1	AGU	AGT	15.5
CAG	CAG	7.2	AGC	AGC	15.6
GGU	GGT	8.1	ACU	ACT	16.1
GGC	GGC	8.2	ACC	ACC	16.2
GGA	GGA	8.3	ACA	ACA	16.3
GGG	GGG	8.4	ACG	ACG	16.4
CAU	CAT	9.1	UGG	TGG	17.3
CAC	CAC	9.2	UAU	TAT	18.1
AUU	ATT	10.1	UAC	TAC	18.2
AUC	ATC	10.2	GUU	GTT	19.1
AUA	ATA	10.3	GUC	GTC	19.2
UAA	TAA	21.1	GUA	GTA	19.3
UAG	TAG	21.2	GUG	GTG	19.4
UGA	TGA	21.3	AUG	ATG	20.1

Let  $G=g_1, g_2, g_3, \dots, g_n$  is a DNA primary sequence, where  $g_i=\{A, T, C, G\}$  for any  $i=1, 2, \dots, n$ , so that,  $G=t_1, t_2, \dots, t_m$  be the corresponding triplet, where  $m=\lceil n/3 \rceil$ . Then to plot  $G$  into a plot set, we can define mapping  $\Theta$  as follows[18],

$$\Theta(G)=\{(1, \Psi(t_1)), (2, \Psi(t_2)), \dots, (m, \Psi(t_m))\} \quad (2)$$

PPI Networks of ABCB11 and ADA for both the species reflects that some proteins are there, which are present in the networks of both species, like in case of ABCB11 (Abcb11, Alb, Baat, Nr0b2, NR5A2, NRIH4, Slco10a1) are common, whereas in case of ADA (ADA, ADK, DCK, NT5C, NT5C2, NT5E, PNP) are common. In this paper all DNA sequences of those genes are represented through 2D graph as graphical representation of DNA sequence provides viewing, sorting and even comparing various gene structures in simpler way. Thus quantitative comparisons of those DNAs are made possible in terms of 2D graphical representations.

One example of quantitative comparisons between DNAs of ABCB11 of *Homo Sapiens* and *Mus Musculus* in terms of 2D graph is shown below in figure 1:-




Fig 1: Quantitative comparisons of ABCB11 of *Homo sapiens* and *Mus musculus* of first 30 triplets

### III. CONCLUSION

In this paper, quantitative understanding and analysis of Functional Protein-Protein Interactions of ABCB11 and ADA in Human and Mouse has been taken place. Characterization and comparison of functionally associated PPIs through the light of different parameters have shown a statistical view of those factors which ultimately are responsible for network constructions of those two proteins for each species. Moreover, as PPI network of same protein may defer from species to species, the paper reflects a quantitative comparative view of PPI networks of same proteins but for different two species

### IV. APPENDIX

#### A. Supplementary file1 – *HOMO SAPIENS* DB.xls

#### B. Supplementary file2 – *MUS MUSCULUS*.xls

### REFERENCES

- [1] Robineau S., Chabre M., Antony B. Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA 2000;97:9913-9918.
- [2] Yu Zu-Guo, (2002) "Fractals in DNA sequence analysis", Chinese Physics, 11 (12), 1313-1318.
- [3] Pommier Y., Cherfils J. Trends Pharmacol. Sci. 2005;26: 138-145.
- [4] Javier De Las Rivas, Celia Fontanillo. "Protein-Protein Interactions Essentials: Key Concepts to Building and Analyzing Interactome Networks" PLoS Comput Biol. 2010 Jun; 6(6): e1000807.
- [5] <http://www.nlm.nih.gov/medlineplus/breastcancer.htm>
- [6] Hydrophobic Interactions in Proteins Brian W Matthews, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon, USA.
- [7] <https://www.lifetechnologies.com/in/en/home/life-science/protein-biology/protein-biology-learning-center/protein-biology-resource-library/pierce-protein-methods/overview-protein-protein-interaction-analysis.html>
- [8] <http://string-db.org>
- [9] Antara Sengupta, Sk. Sarif Hassan and Pabitra Pal Choudhury. Article: Quantitative Understanding of Breast Cancer Genes. *IJCA Proceedings on National Conference cum Workshop on Bioinformatics and Computational Biology* NCWBCB(1):15-17, May 2014.
- [10] Mandelbrot, "The Fractal Geometry of Nature." W.H. Freeman and Company. ISBN 0-7167-1186-9.
- [11] Avnir (1998) "Is the geometry of Nature fractal".
- [12] K Develi, T Babadagli (1998) "Quantification of natural fracture surfaces using fractal geometry" Math.
- [13] Carlo Cattani, "Fractals and Hidden Symmetries in DNA" *Mathematical Problems in Engineering* Volume 2010, Article ID 507056
- [14] Sk. S. Hassan, P. Pal Choudhury and A. Goswami, (2012), "Underlying Mathematics in Diversification of Human Olfactory Receptors in Different Loci ". *Under disciplinary Sciences:Life Sciences* December 2013, Volume 5, Issue 4, pp 270-273
- [15] R. H. C. de Melo and A. Conci, (2008) "Succolarity: Defining a Method to calculate this Fractal Measure," ISBN: 978-80-227-2856-0 291- 294.
- [16] PJ Deschavanne, A Giron, J Vilain, G Fagot (1999) "Genomic signature: characterization and classification of species assessed by chaos game representation of sequences" *Mol. Bio. Evo.* 16 (10), 1391-1399.
- [17] Sk. Sarif Hassan, Pabitra Pal Choudhury and Aritra Bose, (2011), "A Quantitative Model for Human Olfactory Receptors", *Nature Precedings*, npre20126967-2.