

High participation ratio genes in the interaction network structure

Nastaran Allahyari¹, Nima Abedpour², Ali Hosseiny¹, G. R. Jafari^{1,3*}

1 Department of Physics, Shahid Beheshti University, Evin, Tehran, Iran, **2** Department of Translational Genomics, University of Cologne, Weyertal, Cologne, Germany, **3** Institute of Information Technology and Data Science, Irkutsk National Research Technical University, Lermontova, Irkutsk, Russia

* g.jafari@sbu.ac.ir (G. R. J)

Abstract

Genes have specific functional roles, however, since they are dependent on each other, they can play a structural role within a network structure of their interactions. In this study, we analyze the structure of the gene interaction network and detect the most contributing genes through the random matrix theory. Specifically, we compare the interaction network of essential and nonessential genes of the yeast *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*. Most remarkably, this well-established combined framework by measuring the node participation ratio (*NPR*) index helps detect important genes, which control the insightful structural patterns in the underlying networks. Results indicate that the essential genes have higher values of *NPR* rather than the nonessential ones which means that they have the most contribution to the network structure. It is worth mentioning that among all essential genes, the *NPR* value of 5 significant ones is considerably higher than the other essential genes, and also the same is for 15 significant nonessential genes compared to the others. Thus, the significant essential genes strongly manage their network structure, while the significant nonessential genes, besides their global contributions, have weak effects on their network structure. Most strikingly, these genes existing in a limited number of structural patterns are responsible for the specific bioprocesses which are the signature of their networks.

Introduction

The abundance of available data at the genomic level and the considerable progress in high-tech methods in data collection, instead of gene-based biology, has resulted in network biology [1, 2]. When a gene interaction network is analyzed, the interaction between two genes is interestingly affected by the other interconnections they participate within [3–6]. Indeed, the dependency of interactions through a network can create a structure where the emergence of collective behavior may occur. Thus, uncovering the mechanism leading to collective behavior in networks is considered a significant subject in biology. To this aim, we explore the weighted, signed, and undirected networks of genetic interaction profile similarities of *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*. In this paper, to obtain a deeper understanding of the role and importance of interaction patterns in our networks, a time-efficient and cost-effective mathematical tool, random matrix theory (*RMT*) is applied. Through this study, the crucial questions are: Do the genetic interaction networks display specific evidence to deviate from randomness and clarify heterogeneous structures [7]? How to detect genes that

play a leading role in forming heterogeneities in the network? This work, by *RMT* techniques, not only deals with the importance of structural patterns in the networks but also helps in detecting genes, which are significant for the networks' identity.

There is a long history in which the non-randomness of gene interaction networks has been studied by considering motifs as the simplest units of network structure [8–13]. Here, we explore the genetic interaction networks compared to the shuffled ones in the context of *RMT*. This method was initially introduced by Eugene Wigner [14] to study the spectrum of the nuclei of heavy atoms where a large number of nucleons are interacting. It has recently demonstrated its outstanding success in analyzing complex systems in various fields such as quantum chaos [15], mobility [16], ecological [17–19], and financial [20–22] networks. Moreover, it has provided a valuable framework to study complex biological networks. One application of *RMT* in biological networks is to study the spectral fluctuation of interaction matrices indicating the Gaussian orthogonal ensemble (*GOE*) [23, 24] of *RMT*. Also, it helps the overall functioning of altered complex molecules and predicting the connections among the molecules as one of the main goals in modern biology [25]. Moreover, through *RMT*, the cellular roles of some unknown genes are predicted in terms of performance [26]. Besides, due to inadequacy in the theoretical study to analyze gene interaction networks in cancer cells, *RMT* plays a crucial role to predict the behavior of a large complex interaction network from the behavior of a finite size network [27]. Furthermore, as another application, information about the structure and dynamics of a network, through the localization properties of the gene network is achieved via the eigenvalues of its adjacency matrix [28–31]. Additionally, *RMT* has helped solve the challenge of revealing all of the gene-gene interactions that are large in number [32]. As a recent application, we can refer to [33], where eigenvalues and eigenvectors denoise single-cell data, which provides the opportunity to identify new cellular states. Margaliot et al. have developed a new theoretical framework using tools from *RMT* to analyze the steady-state production rate affected by many stochastic “local” factors [34], as well.

Accordingly, we are interested in determining the heterogeneities of our gene interaction networks and identifying the genes that play a significant role in this structure. In this work, we explore the genome of *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*, as a whole system to understand the involved complexity. Here, we focus on the gene interaction similarity networks of about 1000 essential genes and 4500 nonessential genes. Costanzo and his colleagues have produced the data. Thus, we lead our analysis in two groups of genes, namely, essential and nonessential. By considering the threshold taken in their study [35] to plot the networks, the essential gene similarity network is more densely connected compared to the corresponding nonessential network. Thus, it can be deduced that essential genes play the role of hubs in the global interaction network [36–39]. Moreover, functional relationships in the gene similarity network for essential genes are stronger and their power of function prediction provided higher accuracy [40–43].

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. First, we demonstrate through the structural parameters namely degree, clustering coefficient, and assortativity coefficient that the structure of both essential and nonessential gene networks is far from randomization. Second, we explore the genetic interaction networks via eigenvalue distributions in comparison with their corresponding shuffled versions to analyze the existence of heterogeneous structures. Since in random networks, the spectrum of eigenvalues fits a semi-circle, we discuss that the deviation from such behavior is a sign of structure in the pairwise interactions [44]. Next, we study the nearest neighbor spacing distribution for both networks to understand the universality and to check if we are allowed to apply *RMT* in case they follow the *GOE* of *RMT*. Then, we investigate the localization properties based on the participation of all genes in each eigenvector via calculating the inverse participation ratio in the gene networks. We discuss that the

analysis of the nodes with the top contributions in the localized eigenvectors demonstrates their importance in the structural patterns of the networks. Finally, as a novel index in *RMT*, we measure node participation ratio (*NPR*) of the important genes in all eigenvectors to separate significant genes which have higher *NPR* than the boundary of the shuffled networks. Interestingly, the selected significant genes leading to the structural patterns of each network have the most responsibility for the specific bioprocesses which are merely appointed to the same network.

Materials and methods

Data description

Essential and nonessential genes. *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* is known as a helpful yeast since nearly all bioprocesses in eukaryotes can exist in it [45]. This paper, to achieve a deeper understanding of the complexity of its genome, analyzes its interaction similarity networks. Costanzo and his colleagues have provided and published the data [35] as three gene interaction similarity matrices, for essential genes, nonessential genes, and the combination of them as the global form [41, 43]. What follows is the specific characteristics that based on them, the genes are categorized into two groups of essential and nonessential ones. The type of mutation generating these mutants for essential and nonessential genes are temperature-sensitive and deletion mutations, respectively. Besides, essential genes reveal a stronger functional connection and higher-accuracy gene function predictions for biological processes. Moreover, the biological processes specifically annotated by the essential genes are “cell polarity and morphogenesis”, “protein degradation”, and “ribosomal *rRNA* (*rRNA*) and non-coding *RNA* (*ncRNA*) processing”. While, the bioprocesses such as “nuclear-cytoplasmic transport”, “ribosome biogenesis”, “peroxisome”, “metabolism and fatty acid biosynthesis”, “respiration, oxidative phosphorylation, mitochondrial targeting”, “*MVB* sorting and *pH*–dependent signaling”, and “*tRNA* wobble modification” are identified by nonessential genes. In addition, there are six common bioprocesses between both essential and nonessential gene interaction networks that are presented in Table 1 beside specific bioprocesses in each network [35].

Table 1. Classification of bioprocesses in essential and nonessential gene networks.

GO biological process in :		
Essential network	Nonessential network	Both networks
<i>cell polarity and morphogenesis</i>	<i>respiration, oxidative phosphorylation, mitochondrial targeting</i>	<i>mitosis and chromosome segregation</i>
<i>protein degradation / turnover</i>	<i>MVB sorting and pH – dependent signaling</i>	<i>vesicle traffic</i>
<i>rRNA and ncRNA processing</i>	<i>tRNA wobble modification</i>	<i>transcription and chromatin organization</i>
–	<i>ribosome biogenesis</i>	<i>glycosylation, protein folding/targeting, cell wall biosynthesis</i>
–	<i>peroxisome</i>	<i>DNA replication and repair</i>
–	<i>nuclear – cytoplasmic transport</i>	<i>mRNA processing</i>
–	<i>metabolism and fatty acid biosynthesis</i>	–

Gene interaction matrices. The data analyzed during the current study comprehensively covers $\sim 90\%$ of all yeast genes and is publicly available at <http://boonelab.ccb.utoronto.ca/supplement/costanzo2016/>. We have worked

with data file *S3* titled “Genetic interaction profile similarity matrices”. The steps taken to create this data are as follows:

1. Based on the growth rate of a colony size including two specific mutated genes, the genetic interaction score (epsilon) of them has been obtained.
2. Each mutated gene is crossed to an ordered array of other mutated genes. Then, a genetic interaction profile for that gene is constructed.
3. By calculating the Pearson correlation coefficient, the similarity between each two genetic interaction profiles has been produced.

Furthermore, the preprocessing procedure on data to reach the gene interaction networks is algorithmically plotted in Fig1. To be more specific, in the genetic interaction matrix, the positive value for every two genes means how much their profiles are functionally similar to each other, and vice versa. Moreover, the larger the positive (negative) interaction value of the two genes, the more similarity (dissimilarity) between them. Also, elements with zero value indicate that there is no relation between those two genes functionally. Besides, the size of essential, nonessential, and global matrices are ~ 1000 , 4500, and 5500, respectively. Thus, all our matrices here are undirected, signed, and weighted adjacency matrices. To have a vision of the construction of the networks, in Fig1 they are graphed by using the spring-embedded layout algorithm in the Cytoscape software [46]. Only here, the same threshold taken previously by Costanzo et al. [35] has been used, i.e., if the interaction between two genes is more than 0.2, they are connected, otherwise, there is no connection between them. We then investigate the structural properties of these networks.

Structural measures

Degree k . Several statistical indicators are proposed to comprehend specific features of the network [47]. The most primary structural measure of a network is the degree of a node k_i , which is defined in a weighted and signed network as the sum over the absolute of links’ weights of a node ($k_i = \sum_j |w_{ij}|$). Besides, mean degree $\langle k \rangle$ shows the degree of nodes in a network on average.

Assortativity Coefficient. To understand that high-degree components tend to be connected with similar (different) counterparts, the assortativity (disassortativity) coefficient is calculated. If similar (different) counterparts are connected, then the sign of this coefficient is positive (negative).

Clustering Coefficient CC . Another significant parameter is the clustering coefficient CC of the network. The CC of a network characterizes the overall tendency of nodes to form clusters or groups. It is defined as the ratio of the number of closed triplets it has by the number of open triplets it has. These closed triplets are complete subgraphs in the network, which are also known as cliques-3. As proposed in [48], in a signed, undirected, and weighted network, the clustering coefficient of a node CC_i and of the network CC can be calculated, respectively as

$$CC_i = \frac{\sum_{j,k} (w_{ij}w_{jk}w_{ki})}{\sum_{j \neq k} |w_{ij}w_{ik}|}, \quad (1)$$

$$CC = \frac{\sum_i \sum_{j,k} (w_{ij}w_{jk}w_{ki})}{\sum_i \sum_{j \neq k} |w_{ij}w_{ik}| + \sum_{i,j} w_{ij}^2}, \quad (2)$$

where w stands for the weight of the link between every two genes in the network.

In the following, to obtain a deeper understanding of the complexity and importance of structural patterns in our networks, the use of random matrix theory (*RMT*) as a




Figure 1. Graphical abstract for the procedure of obtaining the genetic interaction similarity matrices.

time-efficient and cost-effective mathematical tool is explained. Moreover, *RMT* as a powerful and frequently used method can provide an approach to identify significant nodes implicated in each network structure. Therefore, the global properties such as spectral properties, local properties such as eigenvalue fluctuations, and detection of significant genes appearing in the localized eigenvectors are studied.

Spectral techniques

Spectral distribution of eigenvalues $P(\lambda)$. Our approach to studying the genetic interaction similarity networks is *RMT* that provides a framework to go beyond the assumption that pair interactions are independent of each other in networks. When a large number of elements interact, and a random relation mainly drives the interactions, and the distribution of the components of the interaction matrix is Gaussian, then the $P(\lambda)$ has a semi-circle shape. Specifically, in a random network with zero mean value of its eigenvalues, all eigenvalues are collected around zero. But in a random network with a nonzero mean value of its eigenvalues, there is an eigenvalue just out of the bulk. Similarly, in the shuffled network, the distribution of eigenvalues has the same form as the bulk [25]. In the shuffling process, two elements of the matrix are chosen randomly

and are exchanged. As a result, neither the value of links nor their distribution is modified, but the correlation between links dissolves. Therefore, when the process is complete, the shuffled network has random connections with no specific structure [49]. Despite the shuffled networks, the original networks have a large class of eigenvalues out of the bulk. To define the boundary of the bulk, we shuffle the matrix, then put the largest eigenvalue aside. This experiment is repeated 100 times. Then, the mean value of the borders and the standard deviations of them are worked out. Accordingly, all eigenvalues at least three standard deviations away from the border are considered as the eigenvalues outside of the bulk.

Nearest neighbor spacing distribution $P(s)$. There are three categories of *RMT* depending on their symmetries, the Gaussian orthogonal ensembles (*GOE*), the Gaussian unitary ensembles (*GUE*), and the Gaussian symplectic ensembles (*GSE*). Here, as we study the case that the gene interaction matrices are real symmetric, thus, *GOE* of *RMT* is analyzed. In *RMT*, besides the $P(\lambda)$ as a global property, eigenvalue fluctuation which is related to the symmetry of the system as local properties is considered. To this aim, one of the most powerful techniques in *RMT*, i.e., the nearest neighbor spacing distribution $P(s)$ is studied. In the large matrix size, the $P(s)$ becomes a universal function. Here, “universal” denotes that the distribution is independent of any detail of the systems and is only concerned with its symmetry. In the *GOE* case,

$$P(s) = \frac{\pi s}{2} \exp\left(-\frac{\pi s^2}{4}\right), \quad (3)$$

where s is the spacing between two adjacent eigenvalues normalized by the mean eigenvalue spacing. It is called the Wigner distribution. The Wigner distribution implies that the eigenvalues have mutual correlations and repel each other. Moreover, where the eigenvalues have no correlation and are randomly distributed, $P(s)$ becomes

$$P(s) = \exp(-s), \quad (4)$$

this is known as the Poisson distribution in *RMT*. Since in real systems the matrix size is finite, the method of rescaling of the eigenvalues called unfolding has to be applied. For details about the unfolding method, see [27]. Additionally, we tested the $P(s)$ obtained by the one-sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov test. Also, the significance level α is set at 0.05. When the p-value is larger than the significance level α , the null hypothesis is not rejected.

Inverse participation ratio (*IPR*). We used the inverse participation ratio (*IPR*) to analyze the localization properties of the eigenvectors, which has been introduced by Bell and Dean, and initially was applied in the context of atomic physics [50]. Specifically, *IPR* is one of the most frequently used techniques in *RMT* to identify nodes appearing in the localized eigenvectors. Throughout this study, we have calculated the eigenvalues and eigenvectors to determine the *IPR* which tries to provide a measure for participation rates of all nodes in each eigenvalue. *IPR* of each eigenvalue λ_k is given by

$$IPR_k = \sum_{n=1}^N (u_n^k)^4, \quad (5)$$

where the u_n^k stands for components of the related eigenvector, and N is the number of nodes. The summation is over all elements in each eigenvector. The IPR_k shows two extreme cases: (1) a vector with equal elements ($u_n^k = 1/\sqrt{N}$) has $IPR_k = 1/N$, (2) a vector with zero elements except one element ($u_n^k = 1$) has $IPR_k = 1$. Thus, the *IPR* expresses the reciprocal of the number of eigenvector elements that contribute remarkably [28]. Note that *IPR* defined as above separates the top contributing genes by keeping the threshold. The threshold is taken via the following steps. First, we shuffle the network for 100 iterations. Then, the eigenvalues that are out of the bulk of

the shuffled networks are selected. Finally, the mean value of IPR of shuffled versions plus three standard deviations is taken as the boundary. We additionally calculate the average IPR to measure an overall localization of the network as

$$\langle IPR \rangle = \frac{\sum_{k=1}^N IPR_k}{N}. \quad (6)$$

Node participation ratio (NPR). Despite IPR , which deals with each eigenvector, the node participation ratio (NPR) is a characteristic of each node. To calculate the NPR of each gene, we calculate the sum of its contributions in all eigenvectors as

$$NPR_n = \frac{\sum_{k=1}^N (u_n^k)^2}{N}. \quad (7)$$

The summation is over the participation of a node in all eigenvalues. If a node has a random performance in all eigenvalues, then its NPR is small, that is in extreme cases equal to $1/N$. If, however, a node has unique roles in a few numbers of eigenvectors, then the value of its NPR is high, i.e., at extreme it equals to one. Thus, the great value of NPR means that a node plays a critical role in a specific biological process. To identify genes with high NPR among those with top contributions in the localized eigenvectors, we performed the same procedure of taking the threshold for the IPR as mentioned above.

Results

Structural properties of the networks. The structural parameters of the networks, which are in line with our main research question, are presented in Table 2a. Besides, the clustering coefficient of each node CC_i , which is calculated through Eq (1), the clustering coefficient of the network CC is achieved through Eq (2). The point is that the higher value of CC , the more presence of functional modules in the network [51]. In other words, the higher value of CC means the presence of a high number of clique structures in a network [52], which as building blocks of a network make it more robust [53] and stable [54]. What follows is that the nonessential network has fewer cliques of order three compared to the essential one. This indicates that there is a deficiency of building blocks in the nonessential network, which may be leading to a more unstable system. It should be remarked that besides the aforementioned reason about the significance of CC , it is a deterministic indicator in defining the network's topology. Therefore, to obtain a deeper insight into our networks' topology, which unifies the mentioned results above, we examine our networks' structure within the analytical expression for CC of theoretical networks. The values of analytical expressions for CC of theoretical networks, and that of our real data are presented in Table 2b. The result indicates that the value of CC in our networks, as in the small-world networks, is between the values of that in the random and lattice versions.

Additionally, the essential and nonessential gene networks exhibit approximately similar statistics for the assortativity coefficient. That is, as exhibited by most of the biological systems investigated under the network theory framework, our gene networks are disassortative [56]. Specifically, components with high degrees tend to be connected with different ones. Moreover, the density of networks by summing over absolute magnitude values of links divided by all possible links shows high sparsity in our networks. Besides the analyzed structural features, the vital differences between them, are revealed through spectral analysis. In the following, the global spectral properties, eigenvalue fluctuations, and properties of genes appearing in the localized eigenvectors are analyzed. These are known as the most frequently used techniques in RMT to understand the underlying complex system comprehensively.

Table 2. Network analysis.

(a) Network parameters.

	Essential	Nonessential
Nodes	1,040	4,430
Density of links	0.006	0.005
$\langle k \rangle$	6.366	24.207
k_{\max}	28.120	78.333
Assortativity	-0.160	-0.139
Clustering Coefficient	0.025	0.007
$\langle \text{IPR} \rangle$	0.0031	0.0007
$\langle \text{NPR} \rangle_{\text{imp genes}}$	0.0040	0.0008
λ_{\max}	37.25	39.29

(b) Clustering Coefficient (CC) for canonical topologies.

Network type	Expression	Essential	Nonessential
Lattice	$\frac{3(k-2)}{4(k-1)}$	$CC_{ess} < 0.610$	$CC_{non} < 0.718$
Random	$\frac{k}{N}$	$0.006 < CC_{ess}$	$0.005 < CC_{non}$
Small – world	$\frac{3(k-2)}{4(k-1)}(1-p)^3$	$CC_R < 0.445 < CC_L$	$CC_R < 0.523 < CC_L$

(a) Number of nodes, mean degree, maximum degree, density of links, assortativity, clustering coefficient, mean IPR, mean NPR of important genes, and maximum eigenvalue in both essential and nonessential gene networks are presented.

(b) $CC_{ess} = 0.025$, $CC_{non} = 0.007$, CC_L , and CC_R indicate the clustering coefficient of essential, nonessential, lattice, and random networks, respectively. The value of CC_{ess} and CC_{non} are between the values of that in random and lattice versions as small-world networks. k = mean degree; N = number of nodes; p = the probability of rewiring in the small-world network, which is 0.1 here. Expressions have been adapted from [55].

Eigenvalue distribution $P(\lambda)$ and nearest neighbour spacing distribution $P(s)$. Now, a couple of questions arise: How do we evaluate the heterogeneities of the structures [57–59]? What happens if we analyze the nonessential gene interaction network? Are we left with a homogenous network with a random structure, then? To answer these questions, we can use spectral methods to look over the spectrum of eigenvalues [60, 61]. Indeed, if the pairwise interaction of genes does not have a higher level of structure, then its matrix should have properties of random matrices. From *RMT*, we know that for a system that consists of a large number of elements, if the structure is limited to the pairwise level without a higher scale structure and if the probability density function of the pairwise interactions comes from a Gaussian distribution, then the $P(\lambda)$ has a semi-circle shape that centers around zero. As the result, we end up with a distinct $P(\lambda)$ of the genetic interaction networks (in green bars) and their corresponding shuffled versions (in a nice purple semi-circle) in Fig2A and Fig2B. Despite the shuffled networks, the genetic interaction networks possess several eigenvalues that have large values which their related eigenvectors can carry meaningful information concerning the system [62]. The serious difference between the spectrum of the genetic interaction networks and their shuffled networks leads us to a clear conclusion that the genetic interaction networks have a structure with their communities and are far from randomness. Thus, significant information should be carried by the structure of the genetic interaction networks beyond the local pairwise

interactions. About the second question, we know that the role of essential genes is so important in the network that their sole annihilation leaves a phenotype footprint in the reproduction process. However, we are surprised that nonessential genes whose sole role is not so important compared to essential ones, which have a vital phenotype footprint, play a role in shaping the heterogeneities in their network from the *RMT* perspective.

Further, as depicted in Fig2C and Fig2D, both the essential and nonessential gene networks follow Gaussian orthogonal ensemble (*GOE*) statistics of *RMT*. The distribution of spacing of unfolded consecutive eigenvalues follows the Wigner distribution (Eq (3)), not the Poisson distribution (Eq (4)). This fitness reflects that there is a correlation between eigenvalues. Thus, they repel each other; otherwise, there was no correlation between them. Therefore, it can be noted that both networks have a minimal amount of randomness which is referred to as random connections between nodes [63]. The universal *GOE* statistics displayed by both networks lead to two main results. First, both networks, even the nonessential network have robustness. Second, it establishes that these networks can be modeled using the *GOE* of *RMT*. Therefore, we can apply all the techniques developed under the well-established framework of *RMT*. In the following, by analyzing the localization properties of eigenvectors, the set of genes that have the most contribution to the structure in each network is achieved.

Important genes through eigenvector localization. Based on the inverse participation ratio (*IPR*) values calculated using Eq (5), the eigenvectors can be categorized into two groups. Some of them follow *RMT* predictions of Porter-Thomas distribution which corresponds to random interactions [64]. The other ones deviate from this universality and show localization which gives the system-dependent information [65]. The deviating part reveals important genes as explained below. The essential (nonessential) gene network yields 26 (52) top contributing genes corresponding to the top 7 (11) most localized eigenvectors. The *IPR* of the eigenvalues of the networks compared to their corresponding shuffled versions have been depicted in Fig3A and Fig3B. Moreover, the average *IPR* calculated by using Eq (6) is higher for the essential network than for the nonessential one. It demonstrates that the nonessential network is more random than the essential network. In the following section, the functions of these selected genes are discussed briefly.

Functional properties of top contributing genes in the most localized eigenvectors. The most important outcome of the functional analysis of top contributing essential genes in the most localized eigenvectors is that most of them are involved in the specific bioprocesses which particularly exist in the essential gene network (first column in Table 1). The first localized eigenvector has five contributing genes, of which *YIL118W* and *YLR166C* are responsible for “cell polarity and morphogenesis” which occurs only in the essential gene network, *YGL116W* in the cell controls the “mitosis and chromosome segregation”, and *YLR129W*, *YER127W* help in “rRNA and ncRNA processing” in the essential network. Besides, the second localized eigenvector consists of four top contributing genes, among which *YFL005W* and *YGL233W* and *YLR166C* as above are responsible for “cell polarity and morphogenesis”, and *YER136W* is responsible for “glycosylation, protein folding/targeting, cell wall biosynthesis”. Also, among the top contributing genes in the third most localized eigenvector, *YKR086W* is generally involved in “mRNA and tRNA processing”, *YNL163C* is implicated in “ribosome biogenesis”. Similarly, *YPR103W* controls “protein degradation/turnover”, and *YMR005W*, is found to handle “transcription and chromatin organization”. Moreover, the fourth localized eigenvector has two top contributing genes of which *YBR198C* and *YDR145W* are responsible for “transcription and chromatin organization”. What follows is that all the top contributing genes, in the fifth most localized eigenvectors, i.e., *YIR010W* and *YMR117C* and *YGL093W* have a major contribution to “mitosis and chromosome




Figure 2. Eigenvalue distribution and nearest neighbour spacing distribution for both essential and nonessential gene networks. (A) $P(\lambda)$ for the essential gene network, (B) $P(\lambda)$ for the nonessential gene network. (The plots depict a clear difference between distribution for both networks (in green) and their corresponding shuffled versions (in purple).) (C) $P(s)$ for the essential gene network, (D) $P(s)$ for the nonessential gene network. (The spacing of unfolded eigenvalues follows *GOE* statistics of the Wigner distribution. The green bars represent data points, and the solid purple (black) line represents the Wigner (Poisson) distribution. Besides, the one-sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov test in each of the segments is applied which shows the p-values larger than the significance level $\alpha = 0.05$.)

segregation”. Among the top contributing genes of the sixth localized eigenvector, *YDR498C* and *YLR078C* have been found in “vesicle traffic”, *YHR036W* accounts for “nuclear-cytoplasmic transport”, besides “mitosis and chromosome segregation”, and *YBL097W* appear in “mitosis and chromosome segregation”. At last, all top contributing genes in the seventh localized eigenvalue contribute in “protein degradation/turnover”.

Regarding the functional analysis of the top contributing nonessential genes in the most localized eigenvectors, all of them interestingly are responsible for “respiration, oxidative phosphorylation, mitochondrial targeting”, bioprocess, which in particular exist in the nonessential gene network. Besides, most of the nonessential genes in the localized eigenvectors (33 of 52) take participate in one of the other specific bioprocesses in the nonessential gene network, which is “ribosome biogenesis”. At the third stage, 28 genes are responsible for “transcription and chromatin organization”, and “mitosis and chromosome segregation” which are common processes between essential and nonessential gene networks. What follows is the consecutive processes that have less number of responsible important genes, such as “vesicle traffic” (24 genes),

“glycosylation, protein folding/targeting, cell wall biosynthesis” (19 genes), “DNA replication and repair” (17 genes). Also, “peroxisome” as a specific process in the nonessential gene network is devoted to 16 genes. Moreover, “metabolism and fatty acid biosynthesis”, as another specific process is handled through 8 important genes in the nonessential gene network. The three remained bioprocesses which are “tRNA wobble modification” and “MVB sorting and pH-dependent signaling”, and “mRNA processing” are driven with 6, 5, and 2 important genes in the nonessential gene network, respectively. Also, on average, most of the genes in each eigenvector are helping to four processes, that half of them are specific for the nonessential gene network, and the other half of them are common between essential and nonessential gene networks.

Node participation ratio (NPR). As the last step, to indicate genes that have played a significant role in a small portion of eigenvectors among those who live in the structure, we calculate the node participation ratio (NPR) of each important gene through Eq (7). Indeed, NPR designates to identify if a gene has randomly taken part in a large number of eigenvectors or it has selected relatively a small portion of eigenvectors to take part. We calculate the NPR of important genes achieved from IPR analysis and depict the spectrums in Fig3C and Fig3D. As can be seen, the values of NPR of essential genes are higher than those of nonessential genes. This means that essential genes compared to nonessential genes are strongly managing their network’s structure. Moreover, this implies that besides a global contribution among those significant genes in nonessential genes, they weakly affect their structure. Particularly, 5 (15) specific essential (nonessential) genes indicate higher values of NPR than the boundary of the shuffled version, which is achieved via the mean value of NPR in the shuffled version after 100 iterations then added to three standard deviations.

Structural properties of localized genes with high value of NPR . The top contributing genes in the most localized eigenvectors with high values of NPR reveal interesting structural properties. Specifically, most of them in the essential gene network lie in the low degree regime compared to the mean degree, remarkably. But the importance of these genes based on the analysis of their interactions via CC strikingly exhibits the existence of robust local structural patterns against external perturbations. Unlike the significant essential genes, the significant nonessential genes have higher degrees than their mean degree on average. Though, they still indicate a robust structure within the clustering coefficient higher than the clustering coefficient of their network. Besides that their gene ontology has been checked through the data file $S5$ in the dataset. Interestingly these important genes imply information on handling more purely specific bioprocesses which are merely appointed to the same network (first and second columns in Table 1). All these significant genes, the specific bioprocesses handled by them, the values of their degrees, and the values of their clustering coefficients in both essential and nonessential networks are presented in Table 3a and Table3b, respectively.

DISCUSSION

This study has analyzed the undirected, weighted, and signed networks of essential and nonessential gene interaction networks of *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*. It is worth mentioning that to consider the whole story of a gene interaction system, both the functional relation and the containing structural patterns include beneficiary information. Besides the importance of this structure, detecting the significant genes with top contributions in the most localized eigenvectors is the second step to be taken. Therefore, our study has shown the following results:

There is a rich literature in the network theory in order to make us well acquainted with the structure and to distinguish non-random patterns through measuring many




Figure 3. Inverse participation ratio (IPR) of eigenvalues and node participation ratio (NPR) of genes for both essential and nonessential gene networks. (A) IPR for the essential gene network, (B) IPR for the nonessential gene network. (C) NPR for the essential gene network, (D) NPR for the nonessential gene network. (The green dots represent $IPR(NPR)$ of the real data, and the purple dots indicates that of shuffled versions.)

structural parameters such as clustering coefficients, mean degree, assortativity, modularity, etc. While the essential gene network has less number of nodes with less mean degree, it has a more robust and stable structure due to the higher clustering coefficient. But it doesn't mean that the nonessential gene network doesn't benefit from structure since the clustering coefficient of nonessential gene network follows the same behavior of small-world structure as being between random and lattice measures.

This paper, to achieve a deeper understanding of the global structural patterns in our gene interaction networks, under the RMT framework, focuses on the spectrum of eigenvalues. Specifically, the first major question in this paper is about the signs of structures, especially in the nonessential gene network. Our results interestingly suggest a clear difference between the spectrum of the eigenvalues of the interaction matrices for both essential and nonessential gene networks with their corresponding shuffled counterparts, which follow the semi-circle distribution of the random network. Moreover, the greatest eigenvalue in a larger (expectedly highly structural) network is bigger than that of a smaller one. While the greatest eigenvalue in the nonessential gene network has nearly the same value in the essential gene network. Thus, there is a weekly structure in the nonessential gene network, which takes it away from randomness. In addition, through the spectrum of eigenvalues, the fluctuation of them as a strong analysis in RMT is analyzed. The results indicate that both essential and nonessential gene networks follow GOE statistics of RMT . Thus, due to the universality, we are

allowed to apply the *RMT* method. On the other hand, this fitness with Wigner distribution reflects that both the networks have a minimal amount of randomness between their genes, which means there is a correlation between their eigenvalues so that they repel each other.

Another main goal is to identify genes that play a significant role in the structure of the networks. The genes that contribute to the heterogeneous structure are meaningful to us, and the value of their contribution is proportional to their eigenvector component. Inverse participation ratio (*IPR*) is a measurement for the participation rates of all nodes in each eigenvalue. Regarding the *IPR* of original networks, we have observed the following result: The average of *IPR* in both networks is higher than that of shuffled ones. This result supports the fact that the networks have a substructure. Additionally, the higher value of *IPR* in the essential gene network than the nonessential one indicates the existence of a stronger structure and more heterogeneities in this network. Furthermore, in Costanzo's study, besides all specific features of essential (nonessential) genes, they are responsible for three (seven) bioprocesses that are unique for themselves. In the analysis of the *IPR*, we observed that most of these top contributing genes in the most localized eigenvectors are responsible for those specific bioprocesses. Last but not least, this is the first time that node participation ratio (*NPR*) is utilized to calculate the participation of each gene in all eigenvectors. A high value of *NPR* identifies nodes that play a significant role in a small portion of the eigenvectors. Our result indicates that in both networks, the average value of *NPR* of important genes is larger than that of corresponding shuffled versions. Moreover, essential genes have a larger value of *NPR* than nonessential genes, which means that essential genes manage the structure strongly, while nonessential genes have a global role in their structure and weakly control it. Finally, in the essential (nonessential) gene network, we observed 5 (15) top contributing genes in the most localized eigenvectors with the highest value of *NPR* that despite lying at a low (high) degree regime, exhibit structural significance with high clustering coefficients. This interesting result turns out to be more fascinating in the light of the functional analysis of these important genes, which mostly are responsible for the specific bioprocesses appointed to their network.

Author contributions

Conceptualization: Nastaran Allahyari, Gholam Reza Jafari, Ali Hosseyni, Nima Abedpour.

Formal analysis: Nastaran Allahyari, Gholam Reza Jafari, Ali Hosseyni, Nima Abedpour.

Methodology: Nastaran Allahyari, Gholam Reza Jafari, Ali Hosseyni, Nima Abedpour.

Resources: Nastaran Allahyari, Nima Abedpour, Gholam Reza Jafari.

Software: Nastaran Allahyari.

Supervision: Gholam Reza Jafari, Ali Hosseyni.

Visualization: Nastaran Allahyari.

Writing: Nastaran Allahyari.

Acknowledgments

N.A. would like to express her appreciation to M. Ghanbarzadeh, A. Kargaran, and Z. Moradimanesh for constructive comments that improved the manuscript.

References

1. Battiston F., et al. Networks beyond pairwise interactions: Structure and dynamics. *Physics Reports*. 2021; 874:1-92. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physrep.2020.05.004>
2. Barabasi AL, Gulbahce N, Loscalzo J. Network medicine: a network-based approach to human disease. *Nat Rev Gen*. 2011; 12:56–68. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrg2918> PMID: PMC3140052
3. Szappanos B., et al. An integrated approach to characterize genetic interaction networks in yeast metabolism. *Nat Gen*. 2011; 43:656-662 <https://doi.org/10.1038/ng.846>
4. Cordell HJ. Detecting gene–gene interactions that underlie human diseases. *Nat Rev Gen*. 2009; 10:392-404. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrg2579>
5. Tong AHY., et al. Global mapping of the yeast genetic interaction network. *Sci*. 2004; 303(5659):808-813. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1091317>
6. Marbach D., et al. Wisdom of crowds for robust gene network inference. *Nat Meth*. 2012; 9:796-804. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nmeth.2016>
7. Orsini C., et al. Quantifying randomness in real networks. *Nat Com*. 2015; 6(8627). <https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms9627>
8. Shen-Orr SS, Milo R, Mangan S, Alon U. Network motifs in the transcriptional regulation network of *Escherichia coli*. *Nat Gen*. 2002; 31:64–68. <https://doi.org/10.1038/ng881>
9. Sanz J, Navarro J, Arbues A, Martin C, Marijuan PC, Moreno Y. The Transcriptional Regulatory Network of *Mycobacterium tuberculosis*. 2011; *PLOS ONE*. 6(7):e22178. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0022178>
10. Sanz J, Cozzo E, Borge-Holthoefer J, Moreno Y. Topological effects of data incompleteness of gene regulatory networks. *BMC Systems Biology*. 2012; 6(110). <https://doi.org/10.1186/1752-0509-6-110>
11. Lee TI., et al. Transcriptional Regulatory Networks in *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*. *Sci*. 2002; 298(5594):799-804. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1075090>
12. Allahyari N, Kargaran A, Hosseini A, Jafari GR. The structure of gene-gene networks beyond pairwise interactions. arXiv:2111.08436, [Preprint]. 2021 [cited 2021 Oct 14]. Available from: <https://arxiv.org/pdf/2111.08436.pdf>
13. Kargaran A, Jafari GR. Heider and coevolutionary balance: From discrete to continuous phase transition. *Phys Rev E*. 2020; 103(5):052302. <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevE.103.052302>
14. Wigner EP. On a class of analytic functions from the quantum theory of collisions. *Annals of mathematics*. 1951; 53(1):36-67. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1969342>
15. Papenbrock T, Weidenmüller HA. Random matrices and chaos in nuclear spectra. *Rev Mod Phys*. 2007; 79(3):997. <https://doi.org/10.1103/RevModPhys.79.997>
16. Louail T., et al. Uncovering the spatial structure of mobility networks. *Nat Com*. 2015; 6(6007). <https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms7007>

17. Stone L. The stability of mutualism. *Nat Com.* 2020; 11(2648).
<https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-020-16474-4>
18. Grilli J, Rogers T, Allesina S. Modularity and stability in ecological communities. *Nat Com.* 2016; 7(12031). <https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms12031>
19. Allesina S, Grilli J, Barabas G, Tang S, Aljadeff J, Maritan A. Predicting the stability of large structured food webs. *Nat Com.* 2015; 6(7842).
<https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms8842>
20. Urama TC, Ezepeue PO, Nnanwa CP. Analysis of cross-correlations in emerging markets using random matrix theory. *Mathematical Finance.* 2017; 7(2):291-307.
<https://doi.org/10.4236/jmf.2017.72015>
21. Saeedian M, Jamal T, Kamali MZ, Bayani H, Yasseri T, Jafari GR. Emergence of world-stock-market network. *Phys A.* 2019; 526(120792).
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physa.2019.04.028>
22. Jamali T, Jafari GR. Spectra of empirical autocorrelation matrices: A random-matrix-theory-inspired perspective. *Epl.* 2015; 111(1):10001
<https://doi.org/10.1209/0295-5075/111/10001>
23. Luo F, Srimani PK, Zhou J. *Application of Random Matrix Theory to Analyze Biological Data.* 2011; (Springer, New York, NY)
24. Luo F, Zhong J, Yang Y, Zhou J. Application of random matrix theory to microarray data for discovering functional gene modules. *Phys Rev E.* 2006; 73(3):031924. <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevE.73.031924>
25. Rai A, Pawar AK, Jalan S. Network spectra for drug-target identification in complex diseases: new guns against old foes. *Applied Network Science.* 2018; 3(51). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41109-018-0107-y>
26. Gibson SM, Ficklin SP, Isaacson S, Luo F, Feltus FA, Smith MC. Massive-Scale gene co-expression network construction and robustness testing using random matrix theory. *PLOS ONE.* 2013; 8(2):e55871.
<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0055871> PMID: PMC3567026
27. Kikkawa A. Random Matrix Analysis for Gene Interaction Networks in Cancer Cells. *Sci Rep.* 2018; 8(10607).
<https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-018-28954-1>
28. Jalan S, Solymosi N, Vattay G, Li B. Random matrix analysis of localization properties of gene coexpression network. *Phys Rev E.* 2010; 81(4):046118.
<https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevE.81.046118>
29. Rai A, Menon V, Jalan S. Randomness and preserved patterns in cancer network. *Sci Rep.* 2014; 4(6368). <https://doi.org/10.1038/srep06368>
30. Rai A, Shinde P, Jalan S. Prognostic interaction patterns in diabetes mellitus II: A random-matrix-theory relation. *Phys Rev E.* 2015; 92(2):022806.
<https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevE.92.022806>
31. Kikkawa A. Spectral analysis for gene communities in cancer cells. *Complex Networks.* 2020; 8(1):cnaa005. <https://doi.org/10.1093/comnet/cnaa005>
32. Frost HR, Amos CI, Moore JH. A global test for gene-gene interactions based on random matrix theory. *Genetic epidemiology.* 2016; 40(8):689-701.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/gepi.21990>

33. Aparicio L, Bordyuh M, Blumberg AJ, Rabadan R. A Random Matrix Theory Approach to Denoise Single-Cell Data. *Patterns*. 2020; 1(3):100035. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.patter.2020.100035>
34. Margaliot M, Huleihel W, Tuller T. Variability in mRNA translation: a random matrix theory approach. *Sci Rep*. 2021; 11(5300). <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-021-84738-0>
35. Costanzo M., et al. A global genetic interaction network maps a wiring diagram of cellular function. *Sci*. 2016; 353(6306). <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aaf1420>
36. Blomenand VA., et al. Gene essentiality and synthetic lethality in haploid human cells. *Sci*. 2015; 350(6264):1092-1096. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aac7557>
37. Winzeler EA., et al. Functional characterization of the *S. cerevisiae* genome by gene deletion and parallel analysis. *Sci*. 1999; 285(5429):901–906. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.285.5429.901>
38. Giaever G., et al. Functional profiling of the *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* genome. *Nat*. 2002; 418:387–391. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature00935>
39. Wang T., et al. Identification and characterization of essential genes in the human genome. *Sci*. 2015; 350(6264):1096-1101. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aac7041>
40. Costanzo M., et al. The Genetic Landscape of a Cell. *Sci*. 2010; 327(5964):425-431. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1180823>
41. Baryshnikova A., et al. Quantitative analysis of fitness and genetic interactions in yeast on a genome scale. *Nat Met*. 2010; 7:1017–1024. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nmeth.1534>
42. Deshpande R., et al. A comparative genomic approach for identifying synthetic lethal interactions in human cancer. *AACR*. 2013; 73(20). <https://doi.org/10.1158/0008-5472.CAN-12-3956>
43. Li Z., et al. Systematic exploration of essential yeast gene function with temperature-sensitive mutants. *Nat Bio*. 2011; 29:361-367. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nbt.1832>
44. Levine JM, Bascompte J, Adler PB, Allesina S. Beyond pairwise mechanisms of species coexistence in complex communities. *Nat*. 2017; 546:56–64. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature22898>
45. Parapouli M, Vasileiadis A, Afendra AS, Hatziloukas E. *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* and its industrial applications. *AIMS Microbiol*. 2020; 6(1):1-31. <https://doi.org/10.3934/microbiol.2020001>
46. Shannon P, Markiel A, Ozier O, Baliga NS, Wang JT, Ramage D, Amin N, Schwikowski B, Ideker T. Cytoscape: a software environment for integrated models of biomolecular interaction networks. *Genome Res*. 2003; 13:2498–2504. <https://doi.org/10.1101/gr.1239303>
47. Boccaletti S, Latora V, Moreno Y, Chavez M, Hwang DU. Complex networks: Structure and dynamics. *Physics Reports*. 2006; 424(4-5):175-308. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physrep.2005.10.009>

48. Costantini G, Perugini M. Generalization of Clustering Coefficients to Signed Correlation Networks. *PLOS ONE*. 2014; 9(2):e88669. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0088669>
49. Leskovec J, Huttenlocher D, Kleinberg J. Signed networks in social media. *Proc. SIGCHI Conf. Hum. Factors Comput. Syst.* 2010; 22:1361-1370. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1753326.1753532>
50. Bell R, Dean P. Atomic vibrations in vitreous silica. *Discussions of the Faraday society*. 1970; 50:55-61. <https://doi.org/10.1039/DF9705000055>
51. Barabasi AL, Oltavi ZN. Network biology: understanding the cell's functional organization. *Nat Rev Gen.* 2004; 5(2):101-113. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrg1272> PMID: 14735121
52. Watts DJ, Strogatz SH. Collective dynamics of 'small-world' networks. *Nat.* 1998; 393(6684):440-442. <https://doi.org/10.1038/30918> PMID: 9623998
53. Alon U. *An introduction to Systems Biology: Design principles of Biological Circuits*. Chapman and Hall/CRC, 2006; London.
54. Dwivedi SK, Jalan S. Emergence of clustering: Role of inhibition. *Phys Rev E*. 2014; 90(3):032803. <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevE.90.032803>
55. van Wijk BCM, Stam CJ, Daffertshofer A. Comparing brain networks of different size and connectivity density using graph theory. *PLOS ONE*. 2010; 5(10): e13701. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0013701> PMID: PMC2965659
56. Shinde P, Yadav A, Rai A., et al. Dissortativity and duplications in Oral cancer. *Eur. Phys J. B*. 2015; 88(197). <https://doi.org/10.1140/epjb/e2015-60426-5>
57. Cimini G, Squartini T, Saracco F, Garlaschelli D, Gabrielli A, Caldarelli G. The statistical physics of real-world networks. *Nat Rev Phys*. 2019; 1:58-71. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s42254-018-0002-6>
58. Moradimanesh Z, Khosrowabadi R, Eshaghi Gordji M, Jafari GR. Altered structural balance of resting-state networks in autism. *Sci Rep*. 2021; 11(1):1966. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-020-80330-0>
59. Kargaran A, Ebrahimi M, Riazi M, Hosseiny A, Jafari GR. Quartic balance theory: Global minimum with imbalanced triangles. *Phys Rev E*. 2020; 102(1):012310, <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevE.102.012310>
60. Rai A, Pradhan P, Nagraj J, Lohitesh K, Chowdhury R, Jalan S. Understanding cancer complexome using networks, spectral graph theory and multilayer framework. *Sci Rep*. 2017; 7(41676). <https://doi.org/10.1038/srep41676>
61. Chan THH, Louis A, Tang ZG, Zhang C. Spectral Properties of Hypergraph Laplacian and Approximation Algorithms. *ACM*. 2018; 65(3):1-48. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3178123>
62. Safavi Mobarhana NS, Saeedi A, Rahnamay Roodposhti F, Jafari GR. Network trending; leadership, followership and neutrality among companies: A random matrix approach. *Phys A*. 2016; 462:858-863. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physa.2016.06.067>

63. Jalan S, Bandyopadhyay JN. Randomness of random networks: A random matrix analysis. *EPL*. 2009; 87(4):48010. <https://doi.org/10.1209/0295-5075/87/48010>
64. Zyczkowski K. [Quantum mechanical eigenvector statistics of chaotic systems]. [153–168] *Quantum Chaos* [Cerderia, H. A., Ramaswami, R., Gutzwiller, M. C. and Casati, G. (ed.)] (World Scientific, Singapore, 1991).
65. Plerou V, Gopikrishnan P, Rosenow B, Nunes Amara, LA, Guhr T, Stanley HE. Random matrix approach to cross correlations in financial data. *Phys. Rev. E*. 2002; 65(6):066126. <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevE.65.066126>

Table 3. Classification of important genes with high NPR values.

(a) Essential genes.

Gene	Biological process	Degree	Clustering Coefficient
YGL116W	<i>protein degradation mitosis and chromosome segregation</i>	4.5	0.073
YLR166C	<i>cell polarity and morphogenesis protein degradation, vesicle traffic</i>	5.7	0.040
YGL233W	<i>cell polarity and morphogenesis, vesicle traffic</i>	7.0	0.042
YDR145W	<i>cell polarity and morphogenesis protein degradation transcription and chromatin organization</i>	3.4	0.023
YFR004W	<i>protein degradation/turnover cell polarity and morphogenesis</i>	1.5	0.051

(b) Nonessential genes.

Gene	Biological process	Degree	Clustering Coefficient
YEL018W	<i>Nuclear – cytoplasmic Transport, Mitosis and Chromosome Segregation, Ribosome Biogenesis, Respiration, DNA Replication and Repair</i>	32.9	0.009
YGL134W	<i>Peroxisome, Glycosylation, Transcription and Chromatin Organization, Respiration, tRNA Wobble Modification, Nuclear – cytoplasmic Transport, Vesicle Traffic, Ribosome Biogenesis MVB Sorting and pH – dependent Signaling</i>	45.1	0.009
YCL016C	<i>Respiration, DNA Replication and Repair, Mitosis and Chromosome Segregation</i>	35.8	0.008
YJL030W	<i>Mitosis and Chromosome Segregation, Respiration, Ribosome Biogenesis, Transcription and Chromatin Organization, DNA Replication and Repair</i>	40.3	0.010
YER016W	<i>Respiration, Ribosome Biogenesis, Vesicle Traffic Mitosis and Chromosome Segregation, Transcription and Chromatin Organization</i>	36.5	0.013
YEL062W	<i>Respiration, Vesicle Traffic Mitosis and Chromosome Segregation, Transcription and Chromatin Organization, Ribosome Biogenesis, DNA Replication and Repair</i>	22.7	0.013
YDR095C	<i>Respiration, Transcription and Chromatin Organization</i>	3.9	0.008
YBR164C	<i>Respiration, Vesicle Traffic Mitosis and Chromosome Segregation, Ribosome Biogenesis, DNA Replication and Repair</i>	23.4	0.007
YMR071C	<i>Ribosome Biogenesis, Mitosis and Chromosome Segregation, Respiration, Vesicle Traffic</i>	33.6	0.014
YHR012W	<i>Respiration, Vesicle Traffic, Peroxisome, Ribosome Biogenesis, Glycosylation, Mitosis and Chromosome Segregation, MVB Sorting and pH – dependent Signaling, Nuclear – cytoplasmic Transport, tRNA Wobble Modification</i>	24.1	0.011
YGL136C	<i>Respiration, tRNA Wobble Modification, Mitosis and Chromosome Segregation, Ribosome Biogenesis, Vesicle Traffic, DNA Replication and Repair</i>	13.4	0.010
YHR141C	<i>Ribosome Biogenesis, Respiration, Glycosylation, Transcription and Chromatin Organization, Metabolism and Fatty Acid Biosynthesis, DNA Replication and Repair</i>	22.0	0.011
YLL027W	<i>Respiration, Glycosylation, Transcription and Chromatin Organization, Metabolism and Fatty Acid Biosynthesis, Ribosome Biogenesis, DNA Replication and Repair</i>	20.6	0.013
YPL275W	<i>Respiration, Ribosome Biogenesis MVB Sorting and pH – dependent Signaling, DNA Replication and Repair, Metabolism and Fatty Acid Biosynthesis, tRNA Wobble Modification</i>	30.5	0.014
YJR159W	<i>Respiration, Glycosylation, tRNA Wobble Modification, Ribosome Biogenesis</i>	28.9	0.015