

PATTERN RECOGNITION ON RANDOM TREES ASSOCIATED TO FUNCTIONALITY FAMILIES OF PROTEINS

ANA GEORGINA FLESIA, RICARDO FRAIMAN, AND FLORENCIA G. LEONARDI

ABSTRACT. In this paper, we address the problem of identifying protein functionality using the information contained in its aminoacid sequence. We propose a method to define sequence similarity relationships that can be used as input for classification and clustering via well known metric based statistical methods. To obtain our measure of sequence similarity, we first fit a Variable Length Markov model to each sequence of our database, generating estimated context trees, and then we compute the BFFS distance in tree space between each pair of trees. The BFFS distance takes into account the structure of each tree, that is directly related to the most relevant motifs of the sequence, and indirectly, to the probability of occurrence of each motif. This approach is motivated by the idea that proteins having the same functionality could be modelled with the same VLMC, so their estimated context trees are observations of the same random variable, and should be close together in tree space. In our examples, we specifically address two problems of supervised and unsupervised learning in structural genomics via simple metric based techniques on the space of trees

- (1) Unsupervised detection of functionality families via K means clustering in the space of trees,
- (2) Classification of new proteins into known families via k nearest neighbor trees.

We found evidence that the similarity measure induced by our approach concentrates information for discrimination. Classification has the same high performance than others VLMC approaches. Clustering is a harder task, though, but our approach for clustering is alignment free and automatic, and may lead to many interesting variations by choosing other clustering or classification procedures that are based on pre-computed similarity information, as the ones that performs clustering using flow simulation, see (Yona et al 2000 , Enright et al, 2003) .

1. INTRODUCTION

A central problem in functional genomics is to determine the function of a protein using only the information contained in its aminoacid chain, Karp (2002). It is well known that a protein functionality family is formed by proteins that perform the same function on different organisms and by proteins that come from the same organism that have been derived by genetic duplication or rearrangements, Dayhoff (1976), Hegyi (1999). Well characterized proteins within a family may help enhance the process of classification of family members whose functions are not well known or not well understood, Eisenberg (2000). Also, the features characterizing each functionality family may give information about common evolutionary history, Sasson et al (2003).

Most used methods for proposing hypothesis over protein functionality are based on sequence alignment, Smith (1981). Exact sequence alignment has a quadratic computational complexity, which make them unfeasible for large databases. Heuristic methods like BLAST, (Altschul et al 1997) or FASTA, (Pearson et al 2000) are between the most common choices for comparing sequences in large data sets. Recently, this problem has been addressed also with non alignment methods, that look for family models with parameters or characteristics that determine its functionality. An example of such body of work is the fitting with different markovian models, like Hidden Markov Models (Rabiner et al 1986), Hidden Markov Transducers, and Variable Length Markov Chains (Bejerano 2001, Apostolico et al, 2000). Hidden Markov Models are very powerful tools for this task, but have the disadvantage

Key words and phrases. random trees, protein functionality.

AGF was partially supported by PICT 2005-31659. AGF is corresponding author.

FGL is supported by FAPESP (grant 06/56980-0). We would like to thank Pablo Ferrari and Antonio Galves for many interesting discussions about metrics in the space of trees and modelling protein functionality.

of having too many parameters to fit, and even though, in practice, they do not guarantee an optimal choice of model. Recently, Bejerano et al (2001) proposed to apply Variable Length Markov Chains to the problem of classification of proteins into families. Some advantages of this model are the following: it does not depend of alignment, it has not as many parameters as HMM, and there are algorithms that can fit the model in linear time, (Apostolico et al, 2000).

We are going to address two specific problems here:

- (1) Detection of functionality families via sequence clustering,
- (2) Classification of new proteins into known families

These problems are directly related to the problem of detecting protein functionality, so they can be addressed by the same methods, but with great variations in performance.

From the mathematical point of view, clustering is an ill posed problem. The definition of functionality family is quite ambiguous, so it is very difficult to quantify it mathematically to obtain a unique objective function to optimize. As a result, computational clustering approaches differ in the representations of the proteins to be clustered, the definition of the optimization goals and also in the resulting partitions of the known protein space. Stability and heterogeneity of the resulting clusters are known problems that are shared for most methods, but still they help to build a big picture of the on going experimental structure which represents super-families. The goal of fully automated clustering methods becomes to give partial answers with respect to global organization of all protein sequences. Sequence classification into families is a simpler task than unsupervised learning, but still has delicate problems as the one introduced by multi-domain proteins, and the accuracy of the labelling of the training set. A related problem is to classify sequences belonging to a family into subfamilies that are in most cases, defined by their evolutionary history. Most tailored methods rely on a multiple alignment of the family sequences as well as the phylogeny tree inferred from it. Indeed, when the resulting evolutionary tree can be reconstructed accurately, functional subtypes can often be identified with subtrees within it.

There are many clustering techniques that rely in pairwise similarity measures of protein sequences. ProtoMap, (Yona et al 2000) ProtoNet, (Sasson et al 2003), BioSpace (Yona and Levitt 2000), use a combination of the three most common measures of pairwise similarity, (Smith-Waterman, Fasta and Blast) followed by the construction of a weighted graph that has the resulting clusters as the most strong connected components. The evolution of the graph differs in each algorithm. Tribe-MCL (Enright et al, 2003) uses also BLAST to build up a dissimilarity matrix, converting it into a probability matrix which is used to simulate a flow that leads to the final graph. Each algorithm has evolved into complicated learning machines, to avoid the multi domain protein problem, and to generate a hierarchical view of protein space. In this paper we will work with a very simple clustering machine that also relies in pairwise similarity, the K means algorithm, which is well suited to detect generative clusters when the underlying distributions are concentrated.

In the case of the non alignment methods, most of them rely in modelling protein functionality, so the more accurate the fit of the model, the better the results in clustering and classification. In this paper, we explore a hybrid approach for protein classification and clustering. We fit a Variable Length Markov Model to each protein sequence, and we use the architecture of their associated context trees to perform classification and clustering, considering a metric on the space of trees. The BFFS distance (Balding et al, 2007) takes into account the structure of each tree, that is directly related to the most relevant motifs of the sequence, and indirectly, to the transition probabilities associated to these motifs. This approach is motivated by the idea that proteins that have the same functionality could be modelled with the same VLMC. In consequence, their estimated context trees are observations of the same random element, and should be close together in tree space. We are combining a model based technique with the classical similarity based statistical learning.

2. MATERIAL AND METHODS

Data handling. A FASTA file containing all sequences that are to be clustered or classified into families is assembled. The labels are only visible for evaluation and training purposes. This file is transformed via PST algorithm (Bejerano et al, 2001) in trees of fixed depth 4.

Algorithm. The file containing all trees is compared against itself using the BFFS distance for trees. The all against all sequence similarities generated by this analysis are stored in a square matrix. The labels are reserved for evaluation and training purposes.

- (1) **Unsupervised Clustering** We have chosen a very simple clustering technique that rely on distances, and that optimizes the within sum of distances in each cluster. The distance between two sequences is in fact the distance between two trees estimated via the PST algorithm, so we can obtain the partition C with an alternating optimization procedure that first compute the cluster mean centroid trees of a given partition and then reassign the observations to the closest centroid tree, until the objective function is no longer decreased. This can be done because there is a notion of average tree or mean centroid tree that shares properties of the average in Euclidean space. We have adapted a Matlab code for K means in order to handle trees in BFS format, and computing the BFFS distance and the mean centroid tree as needed.
- (2) **Supervised Learning** We have approached classification also with one of the simple schemes that rely on distance. Given a new sequence, we classify it in the family that has more members between the k closest members of the database, with a standard code in MATLAB.

Availability. The original PST algorithm for Variable Length Markov Chain modelling can be adapted from (Bejerano, 2003). The additional modules for computing distances and mean trees, necessities for protein sequence clustering and classification can be obtained from the authors upon request.

3. VARIABLE LENGTH MARKOV CHAIN MODELING OF PROTEIN FUNCTIONALITY

The starting point of our approach to supervised and unsupervised learning is to learn the structure of the Variable Length Markov Chain that models each family. We claim in this paper that the estimator of the context tree that characterize the VLMC of each family is a random tree, a random object that produces trees following a distribution that also characterize the family. Classification and clustering is then carried out in a metric space of trees, and as it is well known, the success of it depends strongly in the concentration of the distribution of the family in tree space. We compute estimates of the VLMC context tree of each family using the Probabilistic Suffix Trees algorithm.

VLMC and the BFFS space of trees. A Variable Length Markov Chain is a stochastic process introduced by Rissanen (1983) in information theory; see also Bhlmann and Wyner (1999). In this model the probability of occurrence of each symbol at a given time depends on a finite number of precedent symbols. The number of relevant precedent symbols may be variable and depends on each specific sub-sequence. More precisely, a VLMC is a stochastic process $(X_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$, with values on a finite alphabet \mathcal{A} , such that

$$(1) \quad P[X_n = \cdot | X_{-\infty}^{n-1} = x_{-\infty}^{n-1}] = P[X_n = \cdot | X_{n-k}^{n-1} = x_{n-k}^{n-1}],$$

where x_s^r represents the sequence x_s, x_{s+1}, \dots, x_r and k is a stopping time that depends on the sequence x_{n-k}, \dots, x_{n-1} . As the process is homogeneous the relevant past sequences $(x_{n-k}, \dots, x_{n-1})$ do not depend on n and are denoted by (x_{-k}, \dots, x_{-1}) . Each relevant past (x_{-k}, \dots, x_{-1}) is called a *context*. The set of contexts τ can be represented as a rooted tree t , where each complete path from the leaves to the root in t represents a context. Calling p the transition probabilities associated to each context in τ given by (1), the pair (τ, p) , called *probabilistic context tree*, has all information relevant to the model, see Rissanen (1983) and Bhlmann et al (1999).




FIGURE 1. An example of two probabilistic context trees over the alphabet $\mathcal{A} = \{1, 2\}$. (a) The tree t represents the pair (τ, p) , where $\tau = \{11, 21, 2\}$ is the set of contexts and p are the transition probabilities given by (2). (b) The tree y represents the pair (η, q) , where $\eta = \{12, 22, 1\}$ is the set of contexts and q are the transition probabilities given by (3).

As an example, take a binary alphabet $\mathcal{A} = \{1, 2\}$ and transition probabilities

$$(2) \quad P[X_n = x_n | X_{-\infty}^{n-1} = x_{-\infty}^{n-1}] = \begin{cases} P[X_n = 1 | X_{n-2}^{n-1} = 1 \ 1] &= 0.7, \\ P[X_n = 1 | X_{n-2}^{n-1} = 2 \ 1] &= 0.4, \\ P[X_n = 1 | X_{n-1} = 2] &= 0.2. \end{cases}$$

so that, if $x_{n-1} = 2$, then the stopping time $k = 1$ and $X_n = 1$ with probability 0.2; otherwise the stopping time is $k = 2$ and $X_n = 1$ with probability 0.7 if both $x_{n-1} = x_{n-2} = 1$ or with probability 0.4 if $x_{n-1} = 1$ and $x_{n-2} = 2$. The set of contexts is $\tau = \{11, 21, 2\}$, when the set of all active nodes of the rooted tree t is $\tilde{V}_t = \{11, 21, 2, 1\}$, since 1 is an internal node in the path of the context 11 and 21. Another example over the same alphabet is given by the transition probabilities

$$(3) \quad P[Y_n = y_n | Y_{-\infty}^{n-1} = y_{-\infty}^{n-1}] = \begin{cases} P[Y_n = 1 | Y_{n-1} = 1] &= 0.6, \\ P[Y_n = 1 | Y_{n-2}^{n-1} = 2 \ 2] &= 0.4, \\ P[Y_n = 1 | Y_{n-2}^{n-1} = 1 \ 2] &= 0.2. \end{cases}$$

The set of contexts is $\eta = \{1, 12, 22\}$, when the set of all active nodes of the rooted tree y is $\tilde{V}_y = \{1, 12, 2, 22\}$, since 2 is an internal node in the path of the context 12 and 22. The corresponding probabilistic context trees are represented in Figure 1.

We are going now to embed the set of all possible context trees that can be constructed given a fixed alphabet \mathcal{A} , into the compact metric space of rooted trees, \mathcal{T} , defined by Balding et al (2004). The relationship is very simple, since a rooted tree can be thought as a subset of the nodes satisfying the condition “son present implies father present”. In this kind of space, the natural sigma algebra \mathcal{B} is the minimal one containing cylinders, this is, the sets of trees defined by the presence/absence of a finite number of nodes. The natural topology is the one generated by the cylinders as open sets. We can associate to this topology a family of distances that take values depending on matched presence/absence of nodes in the trees, but not only the leaves, but also the internal ones too.

So let define \tilde{V} as the set of all possible sequences (x_{-k}, \dots, x_{-1}) over the alphabet \mathcal{A} , with all possible stopping time k , and define a tree t as a function $t : \tilde{V} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ such that t only give value one to the set of contexts of the

tree and the set of internal nodes of these contexts. With this definition, it is easy to define our distance as

$$(4) \quad d(t, y) = \sum_{v \in \tilde{V}} \phi(v)(t(v) - y(v))^2$$

where $\phi : \tilde{V} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ is a strictly positive function such that $\sum_{v \in \tilde{V}} \phi(v) < \infty$. In particular we use the function

$$(5) \quad \phi(v) = z^{\text{gen}(v)},$$

with $z = 0.1$ and $\text{gen}(v)$ stands for the generation of the node, the number of symbols to reach the root. Let compute the distance between the two trees given in the preceding example,

$$\begin{aligned} d(t, y) &= \sum_{v \in \tilde{V}} \phi(v)(t(v) - y(v))^2 \\ &= \phi(\lambda)(t(\lambda) - y(\lambda))^2 + \phi(1)(t(1) - y(1))^2 + \phi(2)(t(2) - y(2))^2 + \phi(11)(t(11) - y(11))^2 \\ &\quad + \phi(12)(t(12) - y(12))^2 + \phi(21)(t(21) - y(21))^2 + \phi(22)(t(22) - y(22))^2 \\ &= 0 + 0 + 0 + \phi(11) + \phi(12) + \phi(21) + \phi(22) \\ &= 4 \times 0.1^3 = 0.004 \end{aligned}$$

With this distance (\mathcal{T}, d) becomes a compact metric space, see details in Balding et al(2004). The computation of the distance is not as fast as the computation of the Euclidean distance but it may be devised a code that search for coincidences by contexts, that means, going from root to leaves.

Random trees. A *random tree* with distribution ν is a measurable function

$$(6) \quad T : \Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{T} \text{ such that } \mathbb{P}(T \in A) = \int_A \nu(dt).$$

for any Borel set $A \in \mathcal{B}$, where $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ is a probability space and ν a probability on $(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{B})$.

Given a sample of independent random trees T_1, \dots, T_n with identical distribution ν on our compact metric space (\mathcal{T}, d) , a measure of central tendency is a *sample centroid* defined as a tree (or set of trees) $\bar{\mathbf{T}}_n$ in \mathcal{T} satisfying

$$(7) \quad \bar{\mathbf{T}}_n := \arg \min_{t \in \mathcal{T}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n d(T_i, t).$$

This formula may show the problem as more difficult than it is, since it is calling for a search over the whole set of trees, that grows exponentially in the number of nodes. But it is easy to prove that the sample centroid (or mean tree) of a set of trees can be built by majority vote over the nodes. That means, at least one of the sample centroids (it does not need to be unique) can be defined as the tree whose nodes are present only if they are present in at least half of the sample.

4. SUPERVISED AND UNSUPERVISED LEARNING ON THE SPACE OF TREES

In cluster analysis, the goal is to find an optimal partition for which observations or objects within each cluster are similar, but the clusters are dissimilar to each other. It differs fundamentally from classification analysis, where the observations are allocated to a known number of predefined groups or populations. Many techniques are based on a certain measure of similarity between pairs of observations.

K means clustering. We are concerned with a particular cluster technique, called K means clustering procedure, which generates the class labels through the minimization of the "within cluster" point scatter, a dissimilarity based loss function defined by

$$W(C) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{C(i)=k} \sum_{C(i')=k} \|x_i - x_{i'}\|^2$$

This rule characterizes the extent to which observations assigned to the same cluster tend to be close to each other. It was initially intended for real valued quantitative variables, and the squared Euclidean distance was chosen as a measure of dissimilarity. In our case, we have objects belonging to a space of trees, so we choose the distance d as the dissimilarity measure, and the within-point scatter may be redefined as

$$W(C) = \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{C(i)=k} d(t_i, \bar{\mathbf{t}}_k)$$

where $\bar{\mathbf{t}}_k$ is the sample centroid associated to the k th cluster. As in the case of the Euclidean space, an iterative descent algorithm for solving

$$C^* = \arg \min_C \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{C(i)=k} d(t_i, \bar{\mathbf{t}}_k)$$

may be obtained by noting that for any set of observed trees S

$$\bar{\mathbf{t}}_S = \arg \min_t \sum_{t_i \in S} d(t_i, t)$$

by definition. Hence we can obtain C^* with an alternating optimization procedure that first compute the cluster mean centroid trees and then reassign the observations to the closest centroid tree, until the objective function is no longer decreased. This is one of the most popular iterative descent algorithms that go by the name of K means, and the one we use in our examples. It is not difficult to prove, following Pollard(1981), for example, that in the case of locally compact metric spaces the sample centroid trees converge to the population centroid tree when the sample increases. This is a great result that ensures that if there is a partition of the population into K clusters, and if we have enough data, with the proper initialization to avoid local minima, the K-means algorithm will give an accurate outline of the clusters.

As a final note we state that K means algorithm could be used for classification purposes, following the next steps

- apply K means clustering to the training data in each of the K classes separately, using R prototypes per class
- assign a class label to each of the $K \times R$ prototypes
- classify a new feature t to the class of the closest prototype.

This is an example of the prototype methods of classification that can be also adapted to work on spaces of trees. The difference between this method and k-Nearest Neighbors is the fact that the prototypes are not part of the training samples, but the centers of the partition of each training sample class.

k-nearest neighbors classification. Given a family of proteins \mathcal{F} and a new sequence of amino acids s , the goal is to determine if s belongs to \mathcal{F} or not. To answer that question, Bejerano (2003) and Leonardi (2007) estimate first a model for the family \mathcal{F} , using sequences classified inside the family. To determine the label of a new protein, they search for the family whose model has higher probability of having produced that sequence. The model constructed for the family \mathcal{F} is a Variable Length Markov Chain, obtained estimating the probabilistic tree that matches the chain by means of the PST algorithm as in Bejerano (2003). In this paper we fit the simplest model for classification, we consider that proteins from the same family are clustered tightly, measuring it with the BFS

distance for context trees, and we score the new protein with the rule of the k -nearest neighbours. We label the protein as belonging to the family that has more neighbours in this k -subjects neighbourhood. The k -nearest neighbour rule is a very simple, distance based method for pattern recognition or data classification. This method relies on the intuitive concept that data points of the same class should have neighbours in the class (in distance) with high probability. As a result, for a given data point of an unknown class, we can simply compute the distance of this point to the training data, and assign the class determined using majority vote among the k neighbours of this data point. The algorithm is straightforward:

- Given a new observation t we find the k training points $S = \{t_{(1)}, \dots, t_{(k)}\}$ closest in distance to t .
- Classification is made using majority vote among the k neighbors in S .
- Ties are broken at random.

The simplicity of the rule is extreme, and its success depend only in the ability of the measure to cluster families, and the ability of the VLMC modelling to successfully detect all the differences between the protein chains of the same family and resume them into its context tree.

5. COMPUTATIONAL EXAMPLES

In this section we would like to assess the capability of VLMC methods to capture the essential structure of the family that would help the discrimination problem. Traditional PST classification methods choose a training set of sequences of a given family and estimates the context tree of the family concatenating all the sequences in that training set. Then classification is performed computing the probability that a given sequence would be produced by that context tree. The motivation of such approach is related to biological understanding of the evolution and composition of protein families. We suppose that a group of evolutionary related protein sequences should exhibit many identical short segments which have been either preserved by selection or have not diverged long enough from their common single ancestral sequence. The variable memory model is well equipped to pick up these locally conserved segments, showing them in the architecture of the context tree, (Bejerano, 2003). Our approach diverges from the classical approach of VLMC methods since we do not use for classification the empirical probabilities associated to each context but the architecture of the context tree that is computed for each protein sequence in the family. Also, we do not collect all the samples to generate an estimation of the model, but we compute an estimate per sample sequence and look how they cluster together in tree space. The context tree built with all the collected sequences will show segments that are consistently repeated in most of the sequences, but context trees built with each sequence will show patterns inside each particular sequence, and the family bond will emerge as a relationship in tree space. The definition of the distance is thus fundamental for our approach. We have illustrated these ideas with some small examples, following the methodology of Bejerano (2003), since we want to compare our approach with the traditionally PST approach, and indirectly, with other classification methods. Our reference is the Pfam database that is based on Hidden Markov Models trained in a smaller database of manually curated well known proteins.

K means. Clustering is a very hard problem, since there is no help of ground truth to shape the families. Most databases have been constructed clustering sequences with statistical methods, but with the help of a core of manually curated well known proteins. We do not aim to show a method that would accurately cluster the whole Pfam database in seconds, but to discuss the potential that our model could have for checking coherence and relationships among families. We should notice too that K means is an algorithm that considers similarities in a pairwise fashion, methods that consider global similarities could help cluster assignment. In order to assess the ability of the K means procedure to cluster proteins in tree space using the BFFS distance, we have started transforming 5 families of proteins selected from the Pfam database, labelled 'ATP-synt-A', 'beta-lactamase', 'cox2', 'cpn10', 'DNA-pol'. The overall performance is 90.5 %. In Figure 5 we have plot two matrices, one of counts and other with percentage of well classified and misplaced proteins. We notice that the two families that are correctly




FIGURE 2. Confusion matrices of data counts and percentage of well classified and misplaced proteins over 5 families of proteins

clustered, showing a high degree of coherence, also attract members from other families, as it is shown in Figure 5. In our second example we added 6 more families, '7tm-1', 'actin', 'adh-short', 'adh-zinc', 'ank', and 'efhand', and the overall recognition rate drop to 64 %, but the confusion matrix plot in Figure 5 show us that proteins are not scattered around but are misplaced in specific families. This feature could be very interesting at the time to determine the coherence of the family and the relationships between different families. For example, from the ten proteins of the beta lactamase family that have been incorrectly assigned to the 'Dna-pol' family, 9 of them have been reassigned now to the 'ank' family, but 50% of the ank proteins have been assigned to the 'Dna-pol' family, showing that these three families are close in tree space.




FIGURE 3. Confusion matrices of data counts and percentage of well classified and misplaced proteins over 11 families of proteins




FIGURE 4. In blue, we plot the overall recognition rates of k nearest neighbors rule as a function of k , considering a training set of 80% of the total of proteins, classifying the 100%. In red, we plot the overall recognition rates computed classifying only the 20% set aside from the training set.

k nearest neighbors. Now we consider the same 11 families from the previous example, '7tm-1', 'actin', 'adh-short', 'adh-zinc', 'ank', 'ATP-synt-A', 'beta lactamase', 'cox2', 'cpn10', 'DNA-pol', 'efhand' but we ease the difficulty of the clustering problem allowing the help of a training set. We selected randomly 80% of the whole set of proteins, and set it aside as training set. We could refine later the example, choosing randomly 80% of each family as a training set. Then we classify the whole set of 1700 proteins using the training set to generate neighborhoods of different sizes, and plot in blue the percentage of true positives detected as a function of the number of neighbors considered. Secondly, we compute the percentage of true positives detected but considering only the 20% of proteins that are not included in the training set, and plot it in red as a function of the number of neighbors considered, see Figure 5. The last rate computed is a better indicator of the performance of the rule, since any rule should do well in the train set. In fact, usually, one nearest neighbor achieves 100% detection in the train set. Even though, we want to compare with the PST classification rule itself, and the first rate is the one reported in Bejerano (2003).

Our report will start stating that the 98% of the whole set (counting the training set) has been well classified using the one nearest neighbour rule, against a 60% of true positives given by K means. If we do not count the training set, the 92% of the test set is well classified with one nearest neighbour rule. It is interesting to notice that if we allow more than three points in the neighbourhood, we have less accuracy in the classification, giving evidence to the idea that the differences between the trees are very subtle. We have written in Table 5 the percentage of true positives per family as reported in Bejerano (2003). We should point out that we are using very short trees, and still we achieve the same rates of classification. The first three columns KNN1, KNN2 y KNN3 are the percentage of good classification training with 1, 2 and 3 neighbours, computed using a training set of 80% random proteins and scoring 100%. The last three columns show the same variables, but computed only over the 20% of samples that are not part of the training set. The percentages are reduced in some cases, but not very much, but the interpretability of the results and credibility of the experiment has been reinforced. We only compute these first three columns to compare with PST values, which are computed in this fashion.

6. FINAL REMARKS

Pattern recognition is an active field of research within engineering and computer science communities. Its main goal is to develop automatic methods for recognizing patterns in data. It encloses sub disciplines like discriminant analysis, feature extraction, error estimation and cluster analysis, among others. There are two specific methods that are well known in the literature of statistical pattern recognition that we have refereed here. They are

- (1) K means clustering
- (2) k nearest neighbors classification

We have addressed these two methods not in the conventional setting of a Euclidean space, but when the databases we have to classify and cluster consist of finite trees. We have considered a compact metric space of trees as the natural space where our database lies, and we have shown extensions of the two aforementioned procedures that apply in this new space. An interesting example of such database of trees is the one obtained when a general set of codified strings is modelled with a Variable Length Markov Chain. The VLMC is represented by its context tree, which can be estimated from each string using an algorithm like PST (Bejerano, 2003) or Context (Rissanen, 1983) leading to the final database of estimated trees. If the codification is correct, we claim that the context tree of the chain will have all the information that is needed for discrimination by metric based methods. In functional genomics, proteins are codified as strings of amino acids, and VLMC models are naturally fitted to functional families of such strings. Amino Acid chains are natural candidates for this type of modelling, but any suitable codification of an object with a finite alphabet will make this model arise, so other problems besides functional genomics could make profit of this type of approach. In classification of written reports, codification of the reports is usually made in order to reduce dimensionality or to extract features, leading to a database of strings, see Jeske and Liu (2004) and Jeske and Liu (2006). In these papers, the codification is derived carefully to ensure discrimination into "bad reports" or "good reports". But also, the codification could represent a conjecture made over style or prosody of speech or written text as it has been done by Veilleux et al (1990) in a general setting, and Dorea et al (1997), and Frota et al (2001) for the case of detecting differences between Brazilian and European Portuguese. In this case, successful discrimination may give evidence to support the linguistic conjecture. We believe that our context can be of great importance for addressing several problems of Computational Linguistics, Natural Language Modelling and Speech Processing.

REFERENCES

- [1] Altschul, S.F., Madden, T.L., Schaeffer, A.A., Zhang, J., Zhang, Z., Miller, W. and Lipman, D.J. (1997) Gapped BLAST and PSI-BLAST: a new generation of protein database search programs. *Nucleic Acids Research*, 25, 3389–3402.
- [2] Apostolico and Bejerano, G. (2000) Optimal amnesic probabilistic automata or how to learn and classify proteins in linear time and space, *Proc. Int'l Conf. Computational Molecular Biology*, 4, 25–32.
- [3] Bejerano, G. (2003) Automata learning and stochastic modelling for bio sequence analysis, PhD thesis. Hebrew University.
- [4] Bejerano, G. and Yona, G. (2001) Variations on probabilistic suffix trees: statistical modelling and prediction of protein families. *Bioinformatics*, vol.17:1, 2001, 23–43.
- [5] Balding, D., Ferrari, P., Fraiman, R., Sued, M. Limit theorems for sequences of random trees. *ArXiv: math.PR/0406280*.
- [6] Bateman, A. and Coin, L. and Durbin, R. and Finn, R.D. and Hollich, V. and Griffiths-Jones, S. and Khanna, A. and Marshall, M. and Moxon, S. and Sonnhammer, E.L. and Studholme, D.J. and Yeats, C. and Eddy, S.R. (2004) The Pfam protein families database. *Nucl. Acids Res.* 32, 90001, D138–141.
- [7] Dayhoff, M.O. (1976) The origin and evolution of protein superfamilies. *Fed. Proc.* 35, 2132–2138.
- [8] Dorea, C., Galves, A., Kira, E., Alencar, P. (1997) Markovian Modeling of the Stress Contours of Brazilian and European Portuguese, *Brazilian Journal in Probability and Statistics*, vol 11:2, 161–175.
- [9] Eisenberg, D., Marcotte, E.M., Xenarios, I. and Yeates, T.O. (2000) Protein function in the post genomic era. *Nature*, 405, 823–826.
- [10] Frota, S. and Vigario, M. (2001), On the correlates of rhythmic distinctions: The European/Brazilian Portuguese case. *Probus*, vol 13:2, 247–266.
- [11] Hefyi, H. and Gerstein, M (1999) The relationship between protein structure and function: a comprehensive survey with application to the yeast genome. *J. Mol. Biol.* 288, 147–164.
- [12] Jeske, D. Liu, R. (2004), Mining massive text data and developing tracking statistics, *Classification, Clustering and Data Mining Applications*, ed. D. Banks, et al., Springer, pp. 495–510.
- [13] Jeske, D. R. and Liu, R. Y. (2006), Mining and Tracking Useful Features in Massive Text Data with Applications to Risk Management, To Appear in *Technometrics*.
- [14] Karp, R.M. (2002) Mathematical challenges from genomics and molecular biology, *Notices Amer. Math. Soc.*, 49(5), 544–553. 15.
Krause, Stoye, Vingron (2000) The SYSTERS protein sequence cluster set. *Nucleic Acids Res.* 28(1)270:272.

- [15] Leonardi, F.G. (2007) Sparse Stochastic Chains with application to classification and phylogeny of protein sequences. PhD thesis Bioinformatics program. Universidade de Sao Paulo.
- [16] . Leonardi, F.G. (2006) A generalization of the PST algorithm: modelling the sparse nature of protein sequences, Bioinformatics, vol 22:11, 1302-1307.
- [17] Enright, A.J., Van Dongen, S. and Ouzonis, C.A. (2002) An efficient algorithm for large scale detection of protein families. Nucleic Acids Res. vol.30,7,1575–1584.
- [18] Pearson, W.R. (2000) Flexible sequence similarity searching with FASTA 3 program package. Methods. Mol. Biol. 132:185–219.
- [19] Rabiner, L.R. Tutorial on Hidden Markov Models and selected applications in speech recognition. Proc. IEEE, 77:257–286.
- [20] Rissanen, J. (1983). A universal data compression system. IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory Vol. 29(5), 656–664.
- [21] Pollard, D. (1981) Strong Consistency of k-means clustering. Annals of Statistics Vol. 9 No. 1 135-140.
- [22] Sverdrup-Thygeson, H. (1981) Strong law of large numbers for measures of central tendency and dispersion of random variables in compact metric spaces. Annals of Statistics Vol. 9 No. 141-143.
- [23] Sasson, O, Vaakin, , Fleischer H, Portugaly, E. Bilu, Y, Lineal, N and Linial, M (2003) ProtoNet: Hierarchical classification of protein space. Nucleic acid res. 31(1):348–352.
- [24] Smith, O., Annau, T.M. and Chandrasegaran. S, (1990) Finding Sequence Motifs in Groups of Functionally Related Proteins, PNAS, 87, (2), 826-830.
- [25] Van Dongen, S. (2000) Graph Clustering by Flow Simulation. PhD thesis, University of Utrecht.
- [26] Yona, G. Lineal, N and Lineal, M. (2000), ProtoMap: automatic classification of protein sequences and hierarchy of protein families. Nucleic Acid Res. 28(1):49–55.
- [27] Yona G. and Levitt, M. (2000). Towards a complete map of protein space based on a unified sequence and structure analysis of all known proteins. In Proc. Int. Conf. Intell.Sys.Mol. Biol, Vol 8, 395–406.

ANA GEORGINA FLESIA, FAMAF-UNC, ING. MEDINA ALLENDE S/N, CIUDAD UNIVERSITARIA, CP 5000, CÓRDOBA, ARGENTINA.

E-mail address: `flesia@mate.uncor.edu`

URL: `http://www.famaf.unc.edu.ar/~flesia`

RICARDO FRAIMAN, UNIVERSIDAD DE SAN ANDRS, ARGENTINA Y UNIVERSIDAD DE LA REPUBLICA, URUGUAY

E-mail address: `rfraciman@udesa.edu.ar`

FLORENCIA G. LEONARDI, INSTITUTO DE MATEMÁTICA E ESTATÍSTICA, UNIVERSIDADE DE SÃO PAULO., SÃO PAULO, BRAZIL.

E-mail address: `leonardi@ime.usp.br`

Family	Size	Coverage	%PST	%KNN1	%KNN2	% KNN3	%KNN1	%KNN2	% KNN3
7tm_1	515	0.707	93.0	99.8	99.4	98.8	99.0	99.0	100.0
7tm_2	36	0.735	94.4	100	100	94.2	100	100.0	100.0
7tm_3	12	0.805	83.3	100	100	100	100	100.0	100.0
AAA	66	0.378	87.9	98.4	90.7	89.2	92.3	100.0	100.0
ABC_tran	269	0.518	83.6	95.5	87.6	88.4	77.7	74.0	74.0
actin	142	0.965	97.2	100	98.5	98.5	100.0	100.0	100.0
adh_short	180	0.661	88.9	95.5	87.1	89.9	77.7	75.0	80.5
adh_zinc	129	0.970	95.3	97.6	90.6	91.4	92.3	92.3	88.4
aldehyd	69	0.907	87.0	98.5	95.5	92.6	92.8	85.7	92.8
alpha-amylase	114	0.750	87.7	98.2	92.9	92.0	91.3	78.2	86.9
aminotran	63	0.942	88.9	95.1	74.1	77.4	76.9	46.1	69.2
ank	83	0.151	88.0	92.6	74.3	63.4	64.7	58.8	47.0
arf	43	0.951	90.7	100	97.6	100	100.0	100.0	100.0
asp	72	0.771	83.3	97.1	97.1	94.3	86.6	93.3	86.6
ATP-synt_A	79	0.649	92.4	100	96.1	96.1	100.0	100.0	100.0
ATP-synt_ab	180	0.694	96.7	100	97.7	99.4	100.0	100.0	100.0
ATP-synt_C	62	0.855	91.9	100	96.7	98.3	100.0	100.0	100.0
beta-lactamase	51	0.863	86.3	98	92	90	90.0	90.0	90.0
bZIP	95	0.217	89.5	96.8	86.1	85.1	84.2	78.9	78.9
C2	78	0.175	92.3	94.8	66.2	83.1	75.0	75.0	68.7
cadherin	31	0.503	87.1	100	93.3	100	100.0	100.0	100.0
cellulase	40	0.584	85.0	92.3	76.9	76.9	62.5	50.0	62.5
cNMP_binding	42	0.466	92.9	100	90.2	87.8	100.0	100.0	100.0
COesterase	60	0.900	91.7	98.3	93.2	93.2	91.6	83.3	75.0
connexin	40	0.687	97.5	100	100	100	100.0	100.0	100.0
copper-bind	61	0.835	95.1	100	98.3	100	100.0	100.0	100.0
COX1	80	0.214	83.8	100	100	96.2	100.0	100.0	100.0
COX2	109	0.897	98.2	99.0	97.2	96.3	95.4	90.9	90.9
cpn10	57	0.953	93.0	100	98.2	98.2	100.0	100.0	100.0
cpn60	84	0.948	94.0	100	100	100	100.0	100.0	100.0
crystall	53	0.851	98.1	100	100	100	100.0	100.0	100.0
cyclin	80	0.635	88.8	94.9	89.8	87.3	75.0	75.0	68.7
Cys_knot	61	0.502	93.4	96.6	98.3	95	83.3	83.3	91.6
Cys-protease	91	0.682	87.9	95.5	94.4	91.1	77.7	77.7	77.7
cystatin	53	0.742	92.5	98.0	90.3	82.7	90.9	81.8	72.7
cytochrome_b_C	130	0.313	79.2	85.2	65.8	74.4	26.9	50.0	46.1
cytochrome_b_N	170	0.658	98.2	45.5	62.7	53.8	26.4	32.3	29.4
cytochrome_c	175	0.891	93.7	96.5	95.4	95.4	88.5	85.7	88.5
DAG_PE-bind	68	0.112	89.7	58.2	70.1	62.6	42.8	57.1	50.0
DNA_methylase	48	0.846	83.3	93.6	85.1	87.2	70.0	60.0	80.0
DNA_pol	46	0.650	80.4	97.7	91.1	91.1	88.8	77.7	77.7
dsrm	14	0.226	85.7	92.3	69.2	76.9	66.6	33.3	33.3
E1-E2_ATPase	102	0.636	93.1	96.0	90.0	87.1	80.9	76.1	76.1
efhand	320	0.401	92.2	95.9	94.6	92.7	92.1	92.1	92.1
EGF	169	0.133	89.3	92.8	84.5	85.7	85.2	85.2	70.5
enolase	40	0.983	100	97.4	97.4	97.4	87.5	87.5	87.5
fer2	88	0.785	94.5	97.7	93.1	90.8	88.8	88.8	94.4
fer4	152	0.559	88.2	97.3	90.7	90.7	87.0	70.9	83.8
fer4_NifH	49	0.928	95.9	100	97.9	97.9	100	100	100
FGF	39	0.691	97.4	100	97.3	100	100	100	100

TABLE 1. Family name, size: number of proteins in it, percentage of correct classification of PST method, percentage of classification of KNN1, KNN2 and KNN3 using 80% of the samples as a training test, and 100% as a test set, and 20% aside from training as test set.