

# Gene ologs: a categorical framework for Gene Ontology

Yanying Wu<sup>\*1,2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Centre for Neural Circuits and Behaviour, University of Oxford, UK

<sup>2</sup>Department of Physiology, Anatomy and Genetics, University of Oxford, UK

Sept 26, 2019

## Abstract

Gene Ontology (GO) is the most important resource for gene function annotation. It provides a way to unify biological knowledge across different species via a dynamic and controlled vocabulary. GO is now widely represented in the Semantic Web standard Web Ontology Language (OWL). OWL renders a rich logic constructs to GO but also has its limitations. On the other hand, olog is a different language for ontology and it is based on category theory. Due to its solid mathematical background, olog can be rigorously formulated yet considerably expressive. These advantages make ologs complementary, if not better than, OWL. We therefore think it worthwhile to adopt ologs for GO and took an initial step in this work.

---

\*yanying.wu@cncb.ox.ac.uk

# 1 Introduction

Despite the amazing diversity of life forms on earth, genomic sequencing revealed that many genes are actually conserved among different species. Therefore our knowledge of gene functions for one species can be transformed to another. However, using natural language to describe gene function causes misunderstanding and thus is unsuitable for such knowledge transferring. Gene Ontology (GO) was created to fill in the gap. GO produces a set of dynamic controlled vocabulary for the annotation of gene functions, so that our understanding of different biological systems can be shared and communicated. GO was invented in year 1998, and has evolved into the most important tool for the unification of biology [Ashburner et al., 2000, TheGeneOntologyConsortium, 2019].

Once represented in the Open Biomedical Ontology (OBO) language, GO has been trending towards using the Web Ontology Language (OWL) in the recent years [Hastings, 2017]. OWL was build by the World Wide Web Consortium (W3C) for their Semantic Web implementation in 2002. Since then, OWL has attracted a wide community and therefore possesses an intensive tool support [Hastings, 2017, Hitzler et al., 2010]. OWL is based on logic, and the logical axioms provide OWL the necessary constrains on classes and properties. Therefore, OWL is a relatively rigorous language with decent expressive capacity for ontology [Hastings, 2017, Spivak et al., 2011]. Nevertheless, OWL is insufficient in representing knowledge that is not binary (true or false). Also, its scalability is limited [Hastings, 2017]. Therefore, exploring other ontology languages for GO is reasonable.

Olog was created in 2011 by David Spivak and Robert Kent as a new framework for ontology [Spivak et al., 2011]. Olog is grounded in a branch of mathematics called category theory. The mathematical foundation ensures olog a rigorous formulation while at the same time a strong expressive power for knowledge representation. It is very hopeful that if we use ologs for Gene Ontology, we will be able to obtain novel perspectives on our understanding of gene functions. This work serves an preliminary attempt to materialize the belief.

## 2 Gene ontology and its OWL representation

### 2.1 GO and OWL basics

There are three main classes of GO: biological process, molecular function and cellular component.

A biological process describes a particular process that a gene or its product participates. For example, “cellular ion homeostasis” refers to any process involved in the maintenance of an internal steady state of ions at the level of a cell. The *Drosophila* gene DAT which encodes a dopamine transporter has its biological process denoted as “cellular ion homeostasis”.

On the other side, a molecular function refers to the biochemical activity a gene product carries out. The DAT gene we just mentioned has its controlled vocabulary (CV) term (or GO term) “dopamine:sodium symporter activity” for its molecular function.

Finally, the cellular component defines the location inside a cell where a gene product performs its function. Again, take the DAT gene as an example,

it has several GO terms for cellular component, and one of them is “integral component of plasma membrane”.

Together, these three types of GO give us a relatively complete picture of a gene’s function. For DAT, we now know that it is a dopamine:sodium symporter which normally locates on the plasma membrane, and it is involved in maintaining cellular ion homeostasis.

GO is now primarily represented in the Web Ontology Language (OWL). OWL is a Semantic Web standard established by the World Wide Web Consortium (W3C), and it is expressive, flexible and efficient [Hastings, 2017, Hitzler et al., 2010]. The main components of OWL include classes, properties, individuals and restrictions. Concretely, classes define concepts, properties describe the relations between concepts, individuals represent the instances of classes, and restrictions provide logical meanings or constrains on the class definitions. As OWL is a logic based language, it supports a rich spectrum of logical constructs including quantification (universal or existential), cardinality (exact, minimum or maximum), logical connectives (intersection or union), negation (not), as well as disjointness and equivalence of classes. A great advantage of these logic rules is that OWL enables automated reasoning and inferencing through computer programs. Moreover, the consistency of knowledge in the GO can be verified and implicit knowledge be made explicit [Hastings, 2017, Hitzler et al., 2010].

In practice, GO terms can be organized in a hierarchical graph using OWL. For example, the GO term “negative regulation of transcription” may have a graph view (simplified version) in Figure 1. In this graph, each box represents a class (GO term), and each arrow between two boxes (specified in the legend) denotes the property or relation between them [Binns et al., 2009, Carbon et al., 2009].




Figure 1: A GO example (based on AmiGO/QuickGO)

For a particular gene product, such as Foxp1, we can annotate it with this GO term ”negative regulation of transcription” according to experimental ev-

idences [Li et al., 2004]. At this moment (Sept. 2019), there are 44,945 GO terms, 6,408,283 annotations for 1,155,213 gene products covering 4,467 species collected on the Gene Ontology database (<http://geneontology.org/>) [Ashburner et al., 2000, TheGeneOntologyConsortium, 2019, Carbon et al., 2009, Binns et al., 2009].

## 2.2 Standard GO annotation and GO-CAM model

In a standard GO annotation, a gene product is associated with a GO term as illustrated above. Apparently, multiple GO terms can be assigned to one gene product, and conversely one GO term has many associated gene products. In both cases, the GO terms and the gene products actually contain biologically meaningful relationships among them. For example, several gene products having the same GO term may work together in a common pathway. On the other hand, for a single gene product, its molecular function is mostly related to other aspects of GO such as the cellular component. In order to capture this layer of understanding, the Causal Activity Models for Gene Ontology (GO-CAM) was created. A GO-CAM model combines standard GO annotations to produce an annotation network that could better reveal the semantic connections among different aspects of a gene or among different gene products [TheGeneOntologyConsortium, 2019].

As an example, we show the individual GO annotations for the gene product Foxp1 in Figure 2. Note that this is not a complete list of GO annotations for Foxp1.




Figure 2: The individual GO annotations of Foxp1

And the corresponding GO-CAM models are displayed in Figure 3 (an illustration) and Figure 4 (the actual model). The GO-CAM model is based on the scientific report [Araujo et al., 2015], and the graph in Figure 4 is rendered by the GO-CAM website (<http://noctua.geneontology.org>).

From Figure 2, we know several aspects of Foxp1, but they are isolated. From Figure 3 and Figure 4, our knowledge of the functions and properties of Foxp1 gets connected together in a sensible way. Therefore, we obtain a better understanding of Foxp1 through the GO-CAM model.




Figure 3: The GO-CAM model for Foxp1 (illustration)





Figure 4: The GO-CAM model for Foxp1 (from geneontology.org)

### 3 Ologs for knowledge representation

Olog (Ontology log) is a very different ontology language from OWL. It was invented by David Spivak in 2011 [Spivak and Kent, 2012, Spivak et al., 2011]. The central idea of olog is to set up a category theoretic framework for knowledge representation. Category theory is a branch of mathematics originally created to connect different fields such as abstract algebra and geometric topology [Samuel Eilenberg and MacLANE, 1945]. Since its birth, category theory has shown an surprising power to unify seemingly separate disciplines and to re-


veal the connections and similarities among them. Importantly, this abstraction and unification capability has extended far beyond pure mathematics, as category theory has found its successful applications in physics, computer science, and linguistics [Spivak, 2014, Awodey, 2010, Sica, 2006]. Further, it is promising that category theory may become a universal language for qualitative modelling throughout science [Spivak et al., 2011]. At the core of category theory is the art of composition, i.e. how simple building blocks could compose together in a meaningful way to achieve a complex, which possesses functions that surpass the sum of its components. As olog is based on category theory, it therefore fits perfectly to the general feature of an ontology language for knowledge representation, which essentially is a way to combine various knowledge together.

Olog uses a linguistic version of category theory. Each olog is treated as a category in which objects and arrows are called types and aspects, respectively. A type in an olog is drawn as a text box containing an abstract concept such as “a gene”, and as aspect of a type  $X$  is denoted as an arrow  $X \rightarrow Y$ , where  $Y$  is another type that represents a way of viewing  $X$ . For example, a way to view a gene is that it is a fragment of DNA, so we can draw an olog to reflect this piece of knowledge:



In order for the aspects to be composable, olog requires that aspects must be functional relationships. Basically, suppose two type  $A$  and  $B$  are sets, then an aspect  $f : A \rightarrow B$  between them should be a functional map, which means that each element in  $A$  must have one and only one corresponding element in  $B$  [Spivak and Kent, 2012]. Here,  $A$  is called the domain of aspect  $f$ , and  $B$  is named the set of result values for  $f$ . If we have another aspect  $g : B \rightarrow C$ , then we are able to compose the two aspects and get  $g \circ f : A \rightarrow C$ . The types, aspects and compositions are the elementary units of an olog as a category. It is surprising that such a simple system can generate super rich forms for ontology expression [Spivak et al., 2011].

Moreover, in ologs, we are able to declare the equivalent of two paths as a fact. For example, in the olog (2) depicted below, we have one aspect of a gene



saying it encodes a protein. Also, there is another path composed of two individual aspects, which states that a gene can be transcribed into a mRNA, which can be translated into a protein. As the protein in the path refers to the same protein in the first aspect, we have a fact in this olog: a gene can be transcribed into a mRNA which can be translated into a protein that the gene encodes. Actually, being able to declare that two paths from type  $A$  to type  $B$  in an olog are identical is the key difference between a category and a normal graph [Spivak and Kent, 2012]. (Note that in the example, we assume that a

gene encodes a unique mRNA and a unique protein, while this is only true for some of the genes.)

Further, for the three basic constructions mentioned above, i.e. types, aspects and facts, olog also defines the instances of them. In fact, an olog can be treated like a database schema, and instances are just real data organized accordingly [Spivak and Kent, 2012].


Most importantly, what makes olog really powerful is the rich repertoire of layouts, i.e. ways to describe and organize the relationships at multiple layers of the system. This merit comes along with the category theory background of olog. A peek of the gems gives us pullbacks, products, pushouts and coproducts, which we will describe in detail in the next section.

## 4 Gene ologs – an initial draft


### 4.1 Basic components

In this section we will draft an initial version of the Gene ologs. We will introduce definitions from the original ologs framework [Spivak and Kent, 2012] and adapt them to Gene Ontology. In addition, we will accompany each definition with some examples to illustrate it, when necessary.


**Types.** A type is an concept, which is represented as a box containing a singular indefinite noun phrase. In Gene ologs, most of the GO terms are types, and we just need to put “a” or “an” in front of the term, or slightly reorganize the words to convert the term description into a noun phrase. In the Gene olog language, a type is also viewed as a set (of objects with that type). Typical examples of types are:




**Aspects.** An aspect describes a property of a type or a relationship between two types. In a Gene olog, an aspect is denoted as an arrow between two types, with text descriptions along the arrow. As aspect also represents a function between the two types (sets) it connects, we name the source type “domain” and the target type “codomain”. Examples for aspects include:



When the codomain of an aspect is the same as the domain of a second aspect, we can connect these two aspects together and form a path in an olog. Here is an example:



**Facts.** A fact is a declaration of equivalence between two paths. In Gene ologs, we can draw a “communicative diagram” with a check-mark “√” to indicate the equivalence of two paths. A fact often reflects that we can view a GO term from two different ways. For example, in the following Gene olog, we know that a GTPase activator is a GTPase regulator, and it could also be viewed as an enzyme activator. After all, it is an enzyme regulator.



**Instances.** As a type represents a set of objects, an instance refers to a concrete object of that type. When we annotate a gene product with a GO term, we say that the gene is an instance of that type (GO term).

**Products.** We define the product of two types (or sets) A and B, denoted  $A \times B$ , as a set containing pairs of objects coming from A and B, respectively:

$$A \times B = \{(a, b) \mid a \in A \text{ and } b \in B\}.$$

Conversely, we have two projection maps  $A \times B \rightarrow A$  and  $A \times B \rightarrow B$ , sending the pair (a, b) back to A and B respectively.

**Coproducts.** The coproduct of two sets A and B, denoted  $A \amalg B$ , is the disjoint union of A and B:




$$A \amalg B = \{(a, 'A') \mid a \in A\} \cup \{(b, 'B') \mid b \in B\}.$$

Also, we have a pair of inclusive maps  $A \rightarrow A \amalg B$  and  $B \rightarrow A \amalg B$ , sending a to (a, 'A') and b to (b, 'B') respectively.

**Pullbacks.** The definition of a pullback carries more category theory flavours. As depicted in olog (7), the right-hand olog (a communicative square) is the pullback for the left-hand olog. Basically, it means that the pullback of type B and C along D is a type that makes the two paths in the right-hand olog equivalent. Following the norm, we use symbol  $B \times_D C$  to denote the pullback type of type B and type C along D. In addition, the symbol  $a_{IJ}$  represents the aspect from type I to type J.


Pullbacks can easily describe the “and” relationship between two types, such as in the following example:







Olog (9) is the pullback of olog (8), where we have the type “a carbohydrate transmembrane transport” representing a gene product that is both “a carbohydrate” and “a transmembrane” transport. Moreover, pullbacks can signify many other interesting relationships [Spivak and Kent, 2012].

**Pushouts.** The definition of a pushout is displayed in the following diagram (olog (10)), where the right-hand olog (a communicative square) is the pushout for the left-hand olog. We write  $B \amalg_A C$  to stand for the pushout of type B and C along A, and it is a type that makes the two paths in the right-hand olog equivalent.



Pushouts can also express many relationships including “or”, which is illustrated in the example below:





Olog (12) is the pushout of olog (11), and the meaning is obvious from the text description of the types.

## 4.2 Comparison between two Gene ologs

Similar to ologs, we can connect two Gene ologs with a functor, which is a structure preserving mapping from one category to another. As shown in Figure 5,  $F$  is a functor that maps types to types (such as  $A$  to  $F(A)$ ), aspects to aspects (such as  $f$  to  $F(f)$ ), and paths to paths (such as  $g \circ f$  to  $F(g \circ f)$ ).




Figure 5: A functor between two Gene ologs

The concept of a functor enables us to compare two Gene ologs and to better observe their semantic similarities. For example, in Figure 6, we can see a clear equivalence of TOR signalling and cAMP-mediated signalling, both of which are intracellular signalling transductions.




Figure 6: A simple functor example

## 4.3 Merging two Gene ologs

When two Gene ologs have a common ground, i.e., a part that is same in both, we can glue the two Gene ologs together. Apparently, the two Gene ologs in Figure 6 can be merged into one which is depicted in Figure 7




Figure 7: A merge of two Gene ologs

To ask for the command ground to be the same is an extreme case. More generally, a command ground of two Gene ologs  $C$  and  $D$  refers to a third Gene olog  $B$ , which sends meaningful functors to  $C$  ( $F_C : B \rightarrow C$ ) and  $D$  ( $F_D : B \rightarrow D$ ), respectively. Therefore, two different Gene ologs  $C$  and  $D$  could be connected through common ground  $C \leftarrow B \rightarrow D$ , and communications between  $C$  and  $D$  beyond a simply sticking could happen [Spivak and Kent, 2012].

## 5 Conclusion and future work

Category theory is believed to be the closest thing to a universal language of thought, and arguably the most appropriate language for forming connections [Spivak, 2014]. Rooted in category theory, olog provides a flexible yet rigorous framework to codify knowledge. Tempted by its great potential, we decide to exploit the application of olog for Gene ontology, one of the largest treasure houses of biological knowledge. In this work, we introduce Gene olog, which simply means olog for Gene. Following the original olog design, we lay out the components of Gene olog. As an initial step, we only cover the most basic settings such as types, aspects, facts and so on. A more comprehensive and advanced construction should be considered in the future work, together with more sophisticated examples, particularly for the GO-CAM models.

## References

- [Araujo et al., 2015] Araujo, D. J., Anderson, A. G., Berto, S., Runnels, W., Harper, M., Ammanuel, S., Rieger, M. A., Huang, H.-C., Rajkovich, K., Loerwald, K. W., Dekker, J. D., Tucker, H. O., Dougherty, J. D., Gibson, J. R., and Konopka, G. (2015). FoxP1 orchestration of ASD-relevant signaling pathways in the striatum. *Genes & Development*, 29(20):2081–2096.
- [Ashburner et al., 2000] Ashburner, M., Ball, C. A., Blake, J. A., Botstein, D., Butler, H., Cherry, J. M., Davis, A. P., Dolinski, K., Dwight, S. S., Eppig, J. T., and Others (2000). Gene ontology: tool for the unification of biology. *Nature genetics*, 25(1):25.
- [Awodey, 2010] Awodey, S. (2010). *Category theory*. Oxford University Press.

- [Binns et al., 2009] Binns, D., Dimmer, E., Huntley, R., Barrell, D., O’Donovan, C., and Apweiler, R. (2009). QuickGO: a web-based tool for Gene Ontology searching. *Bioinformatics (Oxford, England)*, 25(22):3045–6.
- [Carbon et al., 2009] Carbon, S., Ireland, A., Mungall, C. J., Shu, S., Marshall, B., Lewis, S., AmiGO Hub, t. A., and Web Presence Working Group, t. W. P. W. (2009). AmiGO: online access to ontology and annotation data. *Bioinformatics (Oxford, England)*, 25(2):288–9.
- [Hastings, 2017] Hastings, J. (2017). Primer on Ontologies. pages 3–13.
- [Hitzler et al., 2010] Hitzler, P., Krotzsch, M., and scientist) Rudolph, S. C. (2010). *Foundations of Semantic Web technologies*. CRC Press.
- [Li et al., 2004] Li, S., Weidenfeld, J., and Morrisey, E. E. (2004). Transcriptional and DNA binding activity of the Foxp1/2/4 family is modulated by heterotypic and homotypic protein interactions. *Molecular and cellular biology*, 24(2):809–22.
- [Samuel Eilenberg and MacLANE, 1945] Samuel Eilenberg, B. and MacLANE, S. (1945). GENERAL THEORY OF NATURAL EQUIVALENCES. Technical report.
- [Sica, 2006] Sica, G. (2006). *What is category theory?*, volume 3. Polimetrica sas.
- [Spivak, 2014] Spivak, D. I. (2014). *Category theory for the sciences*. MIT Press.
- [Spivak et al., 2011] Spivak, D. I., Giesa, T., Wood, E., and Buehler, M. J. (2011). Category theoretic analysis of hierarchical protein materials and social networks. *PLoS ONE*, 6(9).
- [Spivak and Kent, 2012] Spivak, D. I. and Kent, R. E. (2012). Ologs: A categorical framework for knowledge representation. *PLoS ONE*, 7(1):1–52.
- [TheGeneOntologyConsortium, 2019] TheGeneOntologyConsortium (2019). The Gene Ontology Resource: 20 years and still GOing strong. *Nucleic Acids Research*, 47(D1):D330–D338.