CSE 527
Lecture 10

More on the Gibbs Sampler

Projects – see web

- Implementation or literature review

- Small (interdisciplinary) groups preferred

- Suggestion:

  - make a schedule

  - bite-size-pieces

- Some ideas on web/by email & I'm happy to talk/listen/give (bad?) advice - send email

AlignAce (Roth, et al. 1998)

- Lawrence et al.: protein motifs

- Roth et al.: DNA regulatory motifs

- Differences:

  - Genomic background model,
    e.g. yeast Saccharomyces cerevisiae is 62% A-T
  - both strands used
  - overlapping sites prohibited
  - Multiple motifs: find best & mask
  - "MAP" scoring; "specificity" scoring

Rocke & Tompa (Recomb '98)

- Gibbs, adapted for gapped motifs

- single "genomic" DNA sequence

Why Gaps

- Biology often tolerates diversity

- 2 similar TFs bind 2 similar sites

- Same TF binds 2 sites (perhaps one better than the other)

- Dimeric TFs often "don't care" in middle & flexible

- TF and/or DNA may twist/bulge

A Gapped Motif

```
0 TAT < CCCCCCTCA  C CTTCG G CAGCTCCCCCCATAA
1 ATC < CCCCCCTCA  C  TTCG G CAGCTCCCCCCATAA
2 GTA <  CCCCCTCAGTCACTTCGCG CAGCTCCCCCCATAA
3 AAT < CCCCCCTCAGTC  TTCGCG CAGCTCCCC  TAA
```

Why gaps are hard

- Alignment

    - Pairwise -- $O(n^2)$

    - Multiple -- $O(n^k)$

    > dynamic programming

    - Gibbs/MEME/... require *many* alignments

- Scoring

R/T Approach - Scores

- WMM

- Relative entropy, aka expected LLR

- Score gaps like background, "minus a small penalty"

R/T Approach - Alignment

- Gibbs replaces 1 string per iteration

- Use pairwise alignment between new string and *previously computed alignment* of remaining k-1

- Actually align motif against whole genome - Time O(genome length x motif width)

R/T Approach- "Gibbs"

- discard 0-2 random strings at each iteration

- pick replacement greedily, not by sampling; avoid local max by random restarts (see Rocke's thesis for more on this)

Test Data

- Haemophilus influenzae

- ~1.8 megabases

- Delete all protein-coding, leaves ~ 350 kb

- Concatenate, separated with markers

- Plus reverse complement, total ~ 700 kb

Figure 2: 160 trials of the basic algorithm on the noncoding genome vs. a random sequence

Motif width=10

A Motif + Context

```
0 [     ]  < CGCCCTTTCA >  [    ]      at position 118666.
1 [     ]  < CGCCCTTTCA >  [    ]      at position 642660.
2  AAT   < CGCCTTTTCA >  AAA         at position 425287.
3  ATC   < CGCCC-TTCA >  TGA         at position 330462.
4  TTG   < CGCCC-TTCA >  CTA         at position 558509.
5  AAC   < CGCCCATTCA >  ATC         at position 237890.
6 [     ]  < CGCCC-TTCA >  CGT        at position 495353.
7  TCT   < CGCCTTTTCA >  TTG         at position 34553.
8 [     ]  < CGCCCTTTCA >  [    ]      at position 677174.
9 [     ]  < CGCCC-TTCA >  GGG        at position 222102.
```

Figure 1: A sample motif (score 16.6) produced by the basic algorit

Rewindowing

- After convergence, "rewindow" -- choose subset of rows and adjust left/right boundaries to maximize score.

- NP-hard? Use another greedy heuristic

Rewindowing

```
0 GGA < [   ] CGCCCTTTCA[ ] > CGG    at position 118663.
1 GGA < [   ] CGCCCTTTCA[ ] > CGG    at position 642657.
2 GCT < [   ] CGCCC-TTCAGGG > TTC    at position 222099.
3 GGA < [   ] CGCCCTTTCA[ ] > CGG    at position 677171.
4 AAA < [   ] CGCCC-TTCACGT > AAT    at position 495350.
```

Figure 3: The motif of Figure 1 after rewindowing (score 20.8)

Figure 4: 160 trials of the two-phase algorithm on the noncoding genome vs. a random sequence

A closer look at 35

- 6 almost perfectly identical regions of 5.3 kb, each 3 rRNA genes plus some tRNA genes

- 9% of genome but 50% of high-scoring motifs

- removed 80kb containing them & re-ran

Figure 5: 160 trials of the two-phase algorithm on the noncoding genome with long repeats removed vs. a random sequence

After Removal

```
0 TCG < GCAGCTCCCCCCATAAATGG > GTG    at position 449120.
1 TCG < GCAGCTCCCCCCATAAATGG > GTG    at position 448927.
2 GCG < ACAGCTCCCCCCATAAATGG > GTG    at position 232857.
3 GCG < CCAGCTCCC-CCGTAAACGG > GTG    at position 88280.
```

Figure 6: A sample motif (score 25) produced by two phases

More rewindowing

```
0 TCG < GCAGCTCCCCCCATAAATGG > GTG    at position 449120.
1 TCG < GCAGCTCCCCCCATAAATGG > GTG    at position 448927.
2 GCG < ACAGCTCCCCCCATAAATGG > GTG    at position 232857.
3 GCG < CCAGCTCCC     TAAACGG > GTG    at position 88280.
```

```
0 TAT < CCCCCCTCA--C-CTTCG-G-CAGCTCCCCCCATAAATGGGTGGAGCCAAGAT > TAG    at position 449105.
1 ATC < CCCCCCTCA--C--TTCG-G-CAGCTCCCCCCATAAATGGGTGGAGCCAAGAT > TAG    at position 448913.
2 GTA < TCCCCCTCAGTCACTTCGCGACAGCTCCCCCCATAAATGGGTGGAGCAAAGTT > AAT    at position 232837.
3 AAT < CCCCCCTCAGTC--TTCGCGCCAGCTCCC     TAAACGGGTGGAGCCAAGGG > ATC    at position 88262.
```

Figure 7: The motif of Figure 6 after seven phases (score 62)

0 & 1 identical for another 55 bases;
5 differences in next 44.
Probably not a TFBS, but not "random"

Summary

- handles gaps
- greedy "sampling" / random restarts
- avoids full multiple alignment by exploiting good partial alignment
- validation - null model for comparison
- look at data -
  - rewindowing
  - rRNA cluster