# A PAC-Learning Algorithm for Conformation Rules and its Experiments

Osamu Maruyama<sup>1</sup> Erika Tateishi<sup>1</sup> Emiko Furuichi<sup>2</sup> maruyama@ims.u-tokyo.ac.jp erika@ims.u-tokyo.ac.jp emiko@grt.kyushu-u.ac.jp Satoru Kuhara<sup>3</sup> Satoru Miyano<sup>1</sup> kuhara@grt.kyushu-u.ac.jp miyano@ims.u-tokyo.ac.jp

- <sup>1</sup> Human Genome Center, Institute of Medical Science, University of Tokyo 4-6-1 Shirokanedai, Minato-ku, Tokyo 108, Japan
- <sup>2</sup> Fukuoka Women's Junior College, Gojo, Dazaifu, Fukuoka 818-01, Japan
- <sup>3</sup> Graduate School of Genetic Resources Technology, Kyushu University Hakozaki, Higashi-ku, Fukuoka 812, Japan

### 1 Introduction

Computational methods for protein conformation have been extensively developed for searching minimal free-energy conformations. A recursive method is developed to identify a large number of low energy conformations and genetic algorithms are also applied to this problem. Another interesting heuristic method is the hydrophobic zipper method in [1, 2]. Based on the fact many hydrophobic contacts are topologically local, the hydrophobic zipper method randomly selects hydrophobic contacts among neighbors in a sequence and zips up other hydrophobic contacts.

Inspired by this hydrophobic zipper method, but apart from the free-energy minimization problem, we define a conformation rule as a rewriting rule of hypergraphs. Then we develop a PAC-learning algorithm for conformation rules and present some experimental results on amino acid sequences of proteins.

## 2 PAC-Learning of Conformation Rules

A protein P with a tertiary structure  $(p_1, A_1), \dots, (p_n, A_n)$ , where  $p_i = (x_i, y_i, z_i)$  is the position of the amino acid residue  $A_i$  for  $1 \le i \le n$ , is loosely represented by a node-labeled hypergraph  $G = (V, F, \varphi)$  in the following way: The node set is  $V = \{1, \dots, n\}$ , where the number icorresponds to the position of the *i*th amino acid residue. The nodes are labeled with an alphabet  $\Delta$  of "colors" by a mapping  $\varphi$ . It is often used to classify the amino acid residues into several categories (e.g., hydrophobicity).  $\varphi$  and  $\Delta$  represent such a classification of amino acid residues. A hyperedge e in F describes that the nodes in e are within some distance. We assume that  $\{i, i+1\}$  is in F for  $1 \le i \le n-1$ . Thus there are many variations for representing the structure of a protein by a hypergraph.

A bundle rule is a pair  $\rho = (B, U)$  of a hypergraph  $B = (V, F, \psi)$  and a subset U of V such that  $|U| \ge 2$ ,  $U \notin F$  and  $e \cap U \neq \emptyset$  for any hyperedge e in F. This bundle rule creates a new hyperedge U if the neighborhood of U is in the form of B.

A conformation unit is a finite set  $\gamma = \{(B_1, U_1), \dots, (B_t, U_t)\}$  of bundle rules and a conformation rule is defined as a sequence  $\sigma = (\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_m)$  of conformation units. A conformation rule is applied to a sequence from local toward global as shown in Fig. 1, and finally produces a hypergraph.

We have shown that some class of conformation rules is polynomial-time PAClearnable in the sense of [3] and have developed a PAC-learning algorithm which produces a conformation rule from a collection of sequences.

```
Input: a conformation rule (\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_m) and s = x_1 \cdots x_n in \Delta^+
Outputa hyper graph H_s = (V_s, F_s, \psi_s)
procedure Conform((\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_m), s)
 \mathbf{begin}
      \begin{array}{l} \underset{i}{\overset{\text{gen}}{\underset{s}}} \\ \forall _{s}:=\{1,\ldots,n\}; \\ \text{let } \psi_{s} \text{ be a mapping defined by } \psi_{s}(i)=x_{i} \text{ for } 1\leq i\leq n; \\ F:=\{\underbrace{\{i,i+1\}}_{i}\mid 1\leq i\leq n-1\}; \end{array} 
      \tau := \min\{n, m\};
for \ell \leftarrow 1 to \tau do
      begin
           w := \ell + 2; /* w is the window size */
           TEMP := \emptyset:
           for each i: 1 \leq i \leq n - w + 1 do
           begin
                    := i + w - 1;
                 for each e: e \subseteq \{i, \ldots, j\} with |e| \leq k do
                begin
                      \widetilde{\tilde{F}} := \bigcup_{l \in e} N_H(l), \text{ where } H = (V_s, F, \psi_s);
                      \tilde{V} := \{ u \mid u \in e' \text{ for some } e' \in \tilde{F} \};
                      \tilde{\psi} := \psi_s |_{\tilde{V}}; /* the restriction of \psi_s to \tilde{V} */
                      \begin{split} & \text{if } \tilde{B} = (\tilde{H}, e) \thickapprox B \text{ for some } B \text{ in } \gamma_{\ell}, \text{ where } \tilde{H} = (\tilde{V}, \tilde{F}, \tilde{\psi}); \\ & \text{ then add a hyperedge } e \text{ to } TEMP; \end{split} 
                end:
           end;
           F := F \cup TEMP;
     end;
F_s := F
end
```

Fig. 1: Conformation algorithm

#### 3 Method of Experiments

We have implemented the PAC-learning algorithm with Common Lisp and chosen 153 proteins from PDB for our experiments. Each protein file is expressed as a distance matrix  $\mathcal{M}$  of positions of amino acid residues, where the (i, j)-entry of  $\mathcal{M}$  is 1 if the distance between the *i*th and *j*th amino acid residues is at most 6Å and 0 otherwise.

The size of a hyperedge is restricted to be two, three and four because of the difficulty arising from time and space complexity. The alphabet  $\Delta$  is set to be the collection of the three symbols, H (hydrophobic), P (hydrophilic) and N (neutral).

The first step is to learn a conformation rule from  $5 \sim 20$  proteins. The second step is to apply the conformation rule to a sequence for prediction. The comparison between the prediction and the original structure shows that, for some part of a sequence, the corresponding structure is correctly predicted.

#### References

- Dill, K.A., Fiebig, K.M. and Chan, H.S., Cooperatively protein-folding kinetics, Proc. National Academy of Science, U.S.A. 90, 1942–1946, 1993.
- [2] Hart, W.E. and Istrail, S.C., Fast protein folding in the hydrophobic-hydrophilic model within three-eights of optimal, J. Computational Biology 3, No. 1, 53-96, 1996.
- [3] Natarajan, B.K., Machine Learning: A Theoretical Approach, Morgan Kaufmann, 1991.