

Modeling of protein interaction networks

Alexei Vazquez¹, Alessandro Flammini¹, Amos Maritan^{1,2} and Alessandro Vespignani²

¹*INFM-International School for Advanced Studies, via Beirut 4, 34014 Trieste, Italy*

²*The Abdus Salam International Centre for Theoretical Physics (ICTP), P.O. Box 586, 34100 Trieste, Italy*

(October 26, 2018)

Abstract

We introduce a graph generating model aimed at representing the evolution of protein interaction networks. The model is based on the hypothesis of evolution by duplications and divergence of the genes which produce proteins. The obtained graphs shows multifractal properties recovering the absence of a characteristic connectivity as found in real data of protein interaction networks. The error tolerance of the model to random or targeted damage is in very good agreement with the behavior obtained in real protein networks analysis. The proposed model is a first step in the identification of the evolutionary dynamics leading to the development of protein functions and interactions.

PACS numbers: 89.75.-k, 87.15.Kg, 87.23.Kg

The complete genome sequencing gives for the first time the means to analyze organisms on a genomic scale. This implies the understanding of the role of a huge number of gene products and their interactions. For instance, it becomes a fundamental task to assign functions to uncharacterized proteins, which are traditionally identified on the basis of their biochemical role. The functional assignment has progressed considerably by partnering proteins of similar functions, leading eventually to the drawing of proteins interaction networks (PIN). This has been accomplished in the case of the yeast *Saccharomices Cerevisiae* where two hybrid analyses and biochemical protein interaction data have been used to generate a web-like view of the protein-protein interaction network [1]. The topology of the obtained graph has been recently studied in order to identify and characterize its intricate architecture [2,3]. Surprisingly, the *S. Cerevisiae* PIN resulted in a very highly heterogeneous network with scale-free connectivity properties.

Scale-free (SF) networks opposes to regular (local or non-local) networks for the small average link distance between any two nodes (small-world property) [4] and a statistically significant probability that nodes possess a large number of connections k compared to the average connectivity $\langle k \rangle$ [5]. This reflects in a power-law connectivity distribution $P(k) \sim k^{-\gamma}$ for the probability that a node has k links pointing to other nodes. These topological properties, that appear to be realized in many natural and technological networks (for a review see Ref. [6]), are due to the interplay of the network growth and the “preferential attachment” rule. In other words, new appearing nodes have a higher probability to get connected to another node already counting a large number of links. These ingredients encompassed in the Barabaşı and Albert (BA) model [5] are present in all the successive scale-free network models [7–9] and are fundamental for the spontaneous evolution of networks in a scale-free architecture. In this perspective it is natural to ask about the microscopic process that drives the placement of nodes and links in the case of the protein network.

In the present Letter we study a growing network model whose microscopic mechanisms are inspired by the duplication and the functional complementation of genes [2,10]. In this evolutive model all proteins in a family evolved from a common ancestor through gene duplications and mutations (divergence), and the protein network is the blueprint of the entire history of the genome evolution. This duplication-divergence (DD) model is analyzed by analytical calculations and numerical simulations in order to characterize the topological and large scaling properties of the generated networks. We find that the networks show the absence of any characteristic connectivity and exhibit a connectivity distribution with multifractal properties. The n -th moment of the distribution behaves as a power law of the network size N with an exponent that has a nonlinear dependency with n . In addition, all moments crosses from a divergent behavior with the network size to a finite asymptotic value at a given value of the mutation parameters. The generated networks can be directly compared with the *Saccharomices Cerevisiae* PIN data reported in [11], composed by 1,825 proteins (nodes) connected by 2238 identified interactions (links). In agreement with the PIN analysis we find that the connectivity distribution can be approximately fitted by a single apparent power-law behavior, and the model’s parameter can be optimized in order to reproduce quantitatively magnitudes such as the average connectivity or the clustering coefficient. Further, we compare the stimulated tolerance of the DD network to random deletion of individual nodes with that obtained with deletion of the most connected ones. While the DD network proves to be fragile in the latter case, it results extremely resistant

to random damages, in agreement with the behavior recently observed for the PIN [3]. The analogous topological properties found in the proposed model and the experimental PIN represent a first step towards a possible understanding of protein-protein interactions in terms of genes evolution.

Proteins are divided in families according to their sequence and functional similarities [12]. The existence of these families can be explained using the evolutive hypothesis that all proteins in a family evolved from a common ancestor [13]. This evolution is thought to take place through gene or entire genome duplications, gaining redundant genes. After the duplication redundant genes diverge evolving to perform different biological functions, losing or gaining new interactions in the metabolic pathways. According to the classical model [13] after duplication the duplicate genes have fully overlapping functions. Later on, one of the copies may either become nonfunctional due to degenerative mutations or it can acquire a novel beneficial function and become preserved by natural selection. In a more recent framework [10] it is proposed that both duplicate genes are subject to degenerative mutations losing some functions but jointly retaining the full set of functions present in the ancestral gene. The outcome of this evolution results in the complex network of protein interactions. This process can be easily translated in a growing network model. We can consider each node of the network as the protein expressed by a gene. After gene duplication both the expressed proteins will have the same interaction map. This corresponds to the addition of a new node in the network with the same links of its ancestor. Moreover, if the ancestor is a self-interacting protein the copy will have also an interaction with it [2]. Eventually, some of the common links will be removed because of the divergence process. We can formalize this process by defining an evolving network in which at each time step a node is added according to the following rules

- *Duplication*: a node i is selected at random. A new node i' with a link to all the neighbors of i is created. With probability p a link between i and i' is established (self-interacting proteins).
- *Divergence*: for each of the node j linked to i and i' we choose one of the two links and remove it with probability q .

For practical purposes the duplication-divergence (DD) algorithm starts with two connected nodes and repeat the duplication-divergence rules N times. Since genome evolution analysis [2,14] supports the idea that the divergence of duplicate genes takes place shortly after the duplication, we can assume that the divergence process always occurs before any new duplication takes place; i.e., we are in presence of a time scale separation between duplication and mutation rates. This allows us to consider the number of nodes in the network, N , as a measure of time (in arbitrary units). It is worth remarking that the algorithm does not include the creations of new links; i.e. the developing of new biochemical interactions between gene products. This process has been argued to have a probability much smaller than the divergence one [2]. However, we have tested that the introduction in the DD algorithm of a probability to develop new random connections does not change the network topology.

In order to provide a general analytical understanding of the model, we use a mean-field approach for the moments distribution behavior. Let us define $\langle k \rangle_N$ the average connectivity

of the network with N nodes. After a duplication event $N \rightarrow N + 1$ we have that the average connectivity is given by

$$\langle k \rangle_{N+1} = \frac{(N) \langle k \rangle_N + 2p + (1 - 2q) \langle k \rangle_N}{N + 1}, \quad (1)$$

where the r.h.s represents the average number of links gained/lost after the DD process. On average, in fact, there will be a gain proportional to $2p$ because of self-interaction wiring and a loss of links proportional to $2q \langle k \rangle_N$ due to the divergence process. For large N , taking the continuum limit, we obtain a differential equation for $\langle k \rangle$. For $q > 1/2$, $\langle k \rangle$ grows with N but saturates to the stationary value $k_\infty = 2p/(2q - 1) + \mathcal{O}(N^{1-2q})$. On the contrary, for $q < 1/2$, $\langle k \rangle$ grows with N as N^{1-2q} . At $q = q_1 = 1/2$ there is a dramatic change of behavior in the large scale connectivity properties. Analogous equations can be written for higher order moments $\langle k^n \rangle$, and for all n we find a value q_n at which the moments crosses from a divergent behavior to a finite value for $N \rightarrow \infty$. More interestingly, it is possible to write the generalized exponents $\sigma_n(q)$ characterizing the moments divergence as $\langle k^n \rangle \sim N^{\sigma_n(q)}$. The lengthy calculation that will be reported elsewhere [17], gives the mean-field (MF) estimate

$$\sigma_n(q) = n(1 - q) - 2 + 2(1 - q/2)^n. \quad (2)$$

The nonlinear behavior with n is indicative of a multifractal connectivity distribution. In order to support the analytical calculations, we performed numerical simulations generating DD networks with size ranging from $N = 10^3$ to 10^6 . In Fig. 1 we report the generalized exponents $\sigma_n(q)$ as a function of the divergence parameter q . As predicted by the analytical calculations, $\sigma_n = 0$ at a critical value q_n . The general phase diagrams obtained is in good agreement with the MF predictions and the multifractal picture.

Noticeably, multifractal features are present also in a recently introduced model of growing networks [15] where, in analogy with the duplication process, newly added nodes inherit the network connectivity properties from parent nodes. Multifractality, thus, appears related to local inheritance mechanisms. Multifractal distribution have a rich scaling structure where the scale-free behavior is characterized by a continuum of exponents. This behavior is, however, opposite to usual exponentially bounded distribution and it is interesting to understand why in the DD model we generate the large connectivity fluctuation needed for a scale-free behavior. A given node with connectivity k receives, with probability k/N , a new link if one of its neighbors is chosen in the duplication processes. In this case the new added node will establish a new link to it with probability $(1 - q)$. Hence, the probability that the degree of a node increases by one is

$$w_{kN} \sim (1 - q)k/N \quad (3)$$

where we have neglected the constant contribution given by the self-interaction probability. This shows that even if the evolution rules of the DD model are local they introduce an effective linear preferential attachment, that is known to be at the origin of scale-free connectivity distribution [16,18]. However, because the degree and link deletion of duplicate nodes introduce additional heterogeneity in the problem we obtain a multifractal behavior.

The peculiarities of the duplication and divergence process manifest quantitatively in other features characterizing the topology of the network. Among these the tendency to




FIG. 1. The exponent $\sigma_n(q)$ as a function of q for different values of n . The symbols were obtained from numerical simulations of the model. The moments $\langle k^n \rangle$ were computed as a function of N in networks with size ranging from $N = 10^3$ to $N = 10^6$. The exponents $\sigma_n(q)$ are obtained from the power law fit of the plot $\langle k^n \rangle$ vs. N . In the inset we show the corresponding MF behavior, as obtained from Eq. (2), which are in qualitative agreement with the numerical results.

generate biconnected triplets and quadruples of nodes. These are sets of nodes connected by a simple cycle of links, thus forming a triangle or a square. In the DD model triangle formation is a pronounced effect since with probability $p(1-q)$ the duplicating genes and any neighbor of the parent gene will form a new triangle. Analogously, duplicating genes and any couple of neighbors of the parent gene will form a new square with probability $(1-q)^2$. An indication of triangles formation in networks is given by the clustering coefficient $C_\Delta = 3N_\Delta/N_\wedge$ [19] where N_Δ is the number of biconnected triplets (triangles) and N_\wedge is the total number of simply connected triplets. Similarly it is possible to define the square coefficient $C_\square = 4N_\square/N_\square$, with N_\square the number of squares in the network and N_\square the number of simply connected quadruples. By measuring these quantities in the yeast *Saccharomyces Cerevisiae* in [11] PIN, we obtain $C_\Delta = 0.23$ and $C_\square = 0.11$. These values are particularly large and difficult to obtain with other growing networks model, for which it has been shown that the clustering coefficient is algebraically decaying with the network size. On the contrary, the DD model shows clustering coefficients saturating at a finite value, and it is possible to tune the parameters p and q in order to recover the real data estimates. A reasonable agreement with the values obtained for the real PIN is found when $p \simeq 0.1$ and $q \simeq 0.7$, which yield networks with $C_\Delta = 0.10(5)$ and $C_\square = 0.10(2)$. Noticeably, for these values of the parameters the DD model generates networks where other quantities, such as the average degree, are in good agreement with those obtained from experimental data.




FIG. 2. Connectivity distribution for the PIN and the DD model with $p = 0.1$, $q = 0.7$ with $N = 1825$. Errors bars represent standard deviation on a single network realization. The straight line is a power law with exponent 2.5.

A pictorial representation of this agreement is provided in Fig. 2, where we compare the connectivity distribution obtained from 10^3 realizations of the DD model with optimized p and q and that of the yeast *Saccharomices Cerevisiae* PIN. The DD networks are composed by $N = 1825$ nodes as for the yeast PIN. The agreement is very good, considering the relatively large statistical fluctuations we have for this network size. Error bars on the DD model refers to statistical fluctuations on single realizations. It is worth noticing, that despite the evident multifractal nature of the DD model, for a single realization of size consistent with that of the PIN, the intermediate k behavior can be approximated by an effective algebraic decay with exponent $\gamma \simeq 2.5$ as found in Ref. [3].

Finally, we examine the behavior of the DD model under random and selective deletion of nodes and compare it with those obtained for the yeast PIN [3]. Resilience to damage is indeed considered an extremely relevant property for a network. From an applicative point of view it gives a measure of how robust a network is against disruptive modifications and how far one can go in altering it without destroying its connectivity and therefore functionality. In the random deletion process of a fraction f of nodes and the relative links, it has been observed that the network fragments in several disconnected components with a largest connected one of size $N(f)$. For random graphs it is known that the fraction of nodes $P(f) = N(f)/N$ belonging to the largest remaining network undergoes an inverse percolation transition [20]. In the thermodynamic limit ($N \rightarrow \infty$), above a fraction f_c of deleted nodes, the density P drops to zero; i.e. no dominant network (giant component) is left. On the contrary, in scale free networks the density of the largest cluster drops to zero




FIG. 3. Fraction of nodes $P(f) = N(f)/N$ in the largest network after a fraction f of the nodes have been removed. $N(f)$ is defined as the size of the largest network of connected sites. Two different removal strategies have been used, random and selective (see text). In both cases, the DD model curves were obtained after an average over 100 network realizations.

only in the limit $f_c \rightarrow 1$, denoting an high resilience to random damages. Associated with this property, it has been observed that scale-free networks are very fragile with respect to targeted removal of the highest connected nodes. In this case a small fraction of removed sites fragments completely the network ($P \rightarrow 0$). A similar behavior has been pointed out to occur also in the yeast PIN [3]. Fig. 3 shows the density of the largest remaining network versus the fraction of removed nodes both for PIN and DD model for random and selective nodes removal. The latter case consists in systematically removing nodes with the highest degree. The DD network tolerance to damage is determined by the scale-free nature of its multifractal distribution and the obtained curves are in very good agreement with the corresponding ones for the yeast PIN. It is worth noticing again that the parameters used for the DD network have not been independently estimated, but are those obtained from the previous optimization of the clustering coefficients. The striking analogies in the tolerance behavior are an important test to assess the efficacy of the DD model in reproducing the PIN topology.

In conclusion we presented a physically motivated dynamical model for the network of protein interactions in biological systems. The model is based on a simple process of gene duplication and differentiation, which is believed to be the main mechanisms beyond the evolution of PIN. Although the resulting networks share common features with other scale free networks, they present novel and intriguing properties, both in the degree distribution (multifractality) and in their topology. The model reproduces with noticeable accuracy the

topological properties of the real PIN of yeast *S. Cerevisiae*.

A. M. and A. F. acknowledge funding from Murst Gfin'99. AV has been partially supported by the European Network Contract No. ERBFMRXCT980183.

REFERENCES

- [1] P. L. Uetz *et al*, Nature **403**, 623 (2000).
- [2] A. Wagner, Santa Fe Institute Working Papers 01-04-022.
- [3] H. Jeong, S. P. Mason, A.-L. Barabási, and Z. W. Oltvai, Nature **411**, 41 (2001).
- [4] D. J. Watts and S. H. Strogatz, Nature **393**, 440 (1998).
- [5] A.-L. Barabási and R. Albert, Science **286**, 509 (1999).
- [6] S.H. Strogatz, Nature, **410** , 268 (2001).
- [7] R. Albert and A.-L. Barabási, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 5234 (2000).
- [8] P.L. Krapivsky, S. Redner and F. Leyvraz, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 4629 (2000).
- [9] S. N. Dorogovtsev and J. F. F. Mendes, Europhys. Lett. **52**, 33 (2000).
- [10] A. Force, M. Lynch, F. B. Pickett, A. Amores, Y.-l. Yan and J. Postlethwait, Genetics **151**, 1531 (1999); M. Lynch and A. Force, Genetics **154**, 459 (2000).
- [11] [http : //www.biotech.nature.com/web_extras](http://www.biotech.nature.com/web_extras).
- [12] S. Henikoff, E. A. Greene, S. Pietrokovski, P. Bork, T. K. Attwood, and L. Hood, Science **278**, 609 (1997); R. L. Tatusov, E. V. Koonin, and D. J. Lipman, Science **278**, 631 (1997).
- [13] S. Ohono, in *Evolution by gene duplication* (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1970).
- [14] M. A. Huynen and P. Bork, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. (USA) **95**, 5849 (1998).
- [15] S. N. Dorogovtsev, J. F. F. Mendes, and A. N. Samukhin, cond-mat/0106142.
- [16] R. Albert and A.-L. Barabási, cond-mat/0106096; S. N. Dorogovtsev and J. F. F. Mendes, cond-mat/0106144.
- [17] A. Vázquez, A. Flammini, A. Maritan, and A. Vespignani, in preparation.
- [18] S. N. Dorogovtsev and J. F. F. Mendes, Phys. Rev. E **62**, 1842 (2000); P. L. Krapivsky and S. Redner. Phys. Rev. E **63**, 066123 (2001).
- [19] M. E. J. Newman, S. H. Strogatz, and D. J. Watts, Phys. Rev. E **64**, 06118 (2001).
- [20] R. A. Albert, H. Jeong, and A.-L. Barabási, Nature **406**, 378 (2000); D. S. Callaway, M. E. J. Newman, S. H. Strogatz, and D. J. Watts, Phys.Rev. Lett. **85**, 5468 (2000); R. Cohen, K. Erez, D. ben-Avraham, and S. Havlin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 3682 (2001).