
DEEPPROPHET2

A DEEP LEARNING GENE RECOMMENDATION ENGINE

Daniele Brambilla
TheProphetAI
brambilla@theprophetai.com

Davide Maria Giacomini
TheProphetAI
giacomini@theprophetai.com

Luca Muscarnera
lucamuscarnera@gmail.com

Andrea Mazzoleni
TheProphetAI
mazzoleni@theprophetai.com

ABSTRACT

New powerful tools for tackling life science problems have been created by recent advances in machine learning. The purpose of the paper is to discuss the potential advantages of gene recommendation performed by artificial intelligence (AI). Indeed, gene recommendation engines try to solve this problem:

If the user is interested in a set of genes, which other genes are likely to be related to the starting set and should be investigated?

This task was solved with a custom deep learning recommendation engine, DeepProphet2 (DP2), which is freely available to researchers worldwide via www.generecommender.com. Hereafter, insights behind the algorithm and its practical applications are illustrated.

The gene recommendation problem can be addressed by mapping the genes to a metric space where a distance can be defined to represent the real semantic distance between them. To achieve this objective a transformer-based model has been trained on a well-curated freely available paper corpus, PubMed. The paper describes multiple optimization procedures that were employed to obtain the best bias-variance trade-off, focusing on embedding size and network depth. In this context, the model's ability to discover sets of genes implicated in diseases and pathways was assessed through cross-validation. A simple assumption guided the procedure: the network had no direct knowledge of pathways and diseases but learned genes' similarities and the interactions among them. Moreover, to further investigate the space where the neural network represents genes, the dimensionality of the embedding was reduced, and the results were projected onto a human-comprehensible space. In conclusion, a set of use cases illustrates the algorithm's potential applications in a real word setting.

1 Introduction

The task of target identification in life science research is a complex problem: high technical skills and solid expertise are essential to achieve useful results.

From a naive perspective, the results of a gene recommender can be seen as the product of the encoding of context-based knowledge in a way that a machine can use to understand the domain of interest [1], performing automated reasoning in order to reach meaningful conclusions.

Definition 1.1 (Knowledge). Knowledge is the ability to link disjoint bits of information and labels [2].

Considered from this particular point of view, some initial questions about the problem appear to be highlighted:

1. How to effectively encode knowledge in a model that can perform target identification?
2. How to understand which kind of reasoning has the system performed in order to achieve some result? Are these results coherent with the context?

Within this context, in order to solve the gene recommendation task, a custom deep learning algorithm has been designed and trained. The structure and the peculiarities of this model, namely, DeepProphet2 (DP2) will be detailed in this document with all the relevant aspects related to its validation. In order to make the system available to the research community, the machine learning model has been deployed through a web platform called GeneRecommender, available at www.generecommender.com, freely accessible by researchers worldwide. Furthermore, it is worth highlighting that DP2 should be considered as an evolution of the DeepProphet1 (DP1) that, for seek of conciseness, will not be detailed in the current article.

We will now introduce the idea that builds the fundamental structure of DP2. The gene recommendation algorithm must understand the subtle underlying relationships between statistical units, trying to mimic the mindset of a researcher, using the computational power of the machine as a tool to make the most unbiased predictions possible. This idea of mimicking a human task is paramount in defining the paradigm that DP2 implements, but it also raises an important new question:

3. How can this human-like reasoning be formalized in a language that a machine can understand?

Following the researcher analogy, the necessary condition for knowledge-based inference is the existence of some kind of structure able to encode this knowledge in an appropriate form. The goal, in fact, is to use this *a priori* information to draw conclusions.

Pursuing this path, a variation of the Transformer architecture [3] was developed. Transformers are a new class of deep neural network models that have emerged in recent years in the context of Natural Language Processing (NLP). They are based on the substructures of encoders and decoders, which are - from the point of view of information theory - the implementation of functions that contract and expand the information in order to extract meaning from the input. These functions have to be learned from data [4]. This type of information manipulation occurs in conjunction with the mechanism of attention, which aims to create a machine learning equivalent of the human ability to focus on concepts that are relevant in a particular context [5]. The ability of extracting meaningful information and, heuristically speaking, contextualizing it (both in the single “phrase” intended as the combination of genes in the query, both in the “vocabulary” intended as the whole pool of genes) produces powerful models, able to perform complex reasoning on input data.

However, from a technical perspective our network is not a Transformer in the strict sense. In fact, the decoder part in our network is substituted by a linear algebra manipulation of the output of the encoder. Following this methodology we are able to produce an information contraction of the input data which is clearly interpretable and explanatory of the output that we obtain, since the relationship between encoding and output is given (and not a function that has to be learned from data). Moreover this approach reduces the number of free parameters of the network, improving its ability to generalize and reducing the variance induced by over-parametrization[6].

This particular approach proved extremely useful in the hyper-parameter tuning phase: a suboptimal value for the dimension of the embedding space was determined in order to achieve a meaningful contraction of the information explaining the variance of the different phenomena.

2 Network topology: a brief discussion

In order to approach this task, a large part of the research activity has been devoted to the search for an optimal topology of the neural network. The role of an optimal topology can be decomposed into two subtasks:

1. Representation of genes and disease groups
2. Analysis of different representations of genes.

The latter is a non-trivial problem. The representation must capture information about the role of each element in the set and, using a data-driven approach, find the right way to extract the meaning of each gene or disease. To achieve this result, we used the mechanism of self-attention. As described in transformer’s original paper, self-attention provides a tool for the network to understand the links between different concepts (such as genes and diseases) that is fully learned as parameters of the network (and therefore provides a very versatile approach). In terms of analysing the different representations, we again used the transformer as the building block for the network. Using the block based on the transformer, the network (Fig. 1) is able to produce a ranked list of genes ordered by semantic distance from the input query. This ranking list is created using an attention mechanism based on the scalar product as a measure of similarity. This idea, analogue to the concept of cosine distance, provides a computationally efficient way to measure dissimilarities between entities. It is interesting to note that this ranking task fully pursues the goal of the network. In the following chapters, the correspondence between the ability to rank genes and the study of their interaction will be analysed in detail.




Figure 1: Visual representation of the topology of the network.

3 Mathematical and Heuristic assumptions on the Gene Recommendation Task

Our implementation of the transformer architecture is based on a simple assumption: since the scalar product produces a measure of similarity in a given space equipped with inner product, it is necessary to develop a function that manipulates our data projecting them in a certain space, such that the scalar product is also a measure of similarity among genes. Formally, the idea is to produce a network able to learn a function – more specifically an isomorphism [7] – able to map genes in a Hilbert space where the scalar product is consistent with the semantic distance among the genes [8][9].

Definition 3.1 (Hilbert Space). A Hilbert space is a vector space H equipped with a scalar product such that H is complete for the norm [10].

The notion of semantic distance, here introduced, finds its foundations in the assumption that it is possible to quantify the strength of the relationship between genes in terms of interaction in biological processes of the proteins they encode.

Definition 3.2 (Semantic Distance). We define *semantic distance* a function $\sigma : G \times G \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ such that the following conditions are satisfied:

$$\sigma(g_1, g_2) < \sigma(g_1, g_3) \iff g_2 \text{ relates with } g_1 \text{ more than } g_3 \forall \{g_1, g_2, g_3\} \in G \quad (1)$$

$$\sigma(g_1, g_2) = \sigma(g_2, g_1) \quad (2)$$

$$\sigma(g_1, g_1) = 0 \quad (3)$$

$$\sigma(g_1, g_2) + \sigma(g_2, g_3) \geq \sigma(g_1, g_3) \quad (4)$$

Assuming that such a function could exist and be well defined, it would induce an order relationship for every gene in the dataset (Fig. 2). Given a gene $g_j \in G$, it is indeed possible to define the following order relationship:

$$g_i \leq_j g_k \iff \sigma(g_i, g_j) \leq \sigma(g_k, g_j) \forall g_i, g_k \in G \quad (5)$$

The optimization problem that describes the training of the network can then be then formulated.

Definition 3.3 (Optimization Task). Let X be an Hilbert Space. Find $\phi : G \rightarrow X$ such that:

$$\langle \phi(g_i), \phi(g_j) \rangle \geq \langle \phi(g_k), \phi(g_j) \rangle \implies g_i \leq_j g_k \quad \forall g_i, g_j, g_k \in G \quad (6)$$

This method offers a different perspective on the task by generating a clear geometric representation of the relationship among genes: namely, it introduces the idea of orthogonality between genes, which results in genes with a larger semantic distance having a smaller inner product in the projection space [11] [12].




Figure 2: Visualization of order relationship induced by a distance. In this example, the order relationship is defined according to the euclidean distance from the point that in the figure is highlighted in orange. This is possible because distances are defined in the right semi-axis of the real numbers line, which is equipped with an order relationship.

Heuristically, the role of this geometrical approach is based on the idea of producing results that encode information in a certain shape. Indeed, the geometry of the map of genes in this new Hilbert space (that from now on we will denote with the term *embedding*) allows the user of the system not only to perform inference in the standard sense, but also to study the geometry and the topology of projected data. In fact, the system allows the researcher to have a visual representation of how genes behave opening to different kinds of analysis exploiting the structure of the embedding which, thanks to its low dimensionality, could be used as a refined source of data to perform statistical learning on genes (e.g. unsupervised learning algorithms such as clustering or supervised algorithms such as KNN, LDA...) [13]. For an easier understanding, in Fig. 3 we show an application of the procedure described in this chapter on a simpler toy model.

4 Training and Data Augmentation

In order to produce a robust model the team tried to capture the dynamics of gene behavior by creating statistical units containing diseases and genes (respectively from the NCBI [14] and MESH standard [15]). This process was performed using an NLP application optimized for medical research – the online service PubTator [16] [17] – analyzing portions of medical research papers. Moreover, due to the complex nature of the phenomena under study, data has been manipulated with a particular procedure of data augmentation[18], in order to maximize the quantity of information that the network could use to learn. Indeed, we enhanced the training producing a virtual expansion of the dataset, embracing the idea of inducing clear relationships between every single possible couple of genes, in a way that recalls the notion of semantic distance that we defined before. Following what proposed in the first paper relative to the GPT family of models [19], the following technique was applied [20].

Definition 4.1 (Data Augmentation Procedure). Let $G_a = \{g_1, g_2, \dots, g_p\} \subseteq G$ be genes with a known relationship. Then we define:

$$G_{a,i} := \{g_j \in G_a : j \leq i\} \forall i \in \{1, 2, \dots, p\} \quad (7)$$




Figure 3: A procedure similar to the one described in section 3 is applied on a random distance matrix. The product of the algorithm is the embedding (left-bottom) and the reconstructed distance matrix (right-up) which show the preservation of the inner structure of data in the projection space. We can imagine all the concepts described in this chapter as strictly related to this simple visualization, with the further task of learning what the original distance matrix is.

Heuristically, this kind of data augmentation allows the network to understand the role of every single gene, refining the granularity of the training data in order to understand genes as single entities and not only as part of sets, preserving also the cluster-like structure induced by the semantic distance.

This whole process was carried out taking inspiration from the philosophy of curriculum learning [21]: the aim was to extract information in the same way as a biomedical researcher, so that the system could learn the relationships between genes by managing the flow of information appropriately. Following this idea, the following information extraction strategy was developed:

1. Papers are subject to a threshold interval in terms of genes cardinality: papers that contain too much information are also associated with high variance data and could therefore lead to information quality pollution. On the other hand, papers that do not contain enough information are subject to a high risk of bias and are therefore not robust enough to be used.
2. Full-Text / Abstract mining strategy: Biomedical publications are considered reliable sources of information thanks to the rigorous quality control they have to pass in order to be published. Therefore, information is extracted from all available text areas of the article, using the full paper when possible or making the NLP engine focus on the abstracts when the full text is not available [22].

As the reader may have noticed, the strategy is intended to optimize the bias-variance tradeoff. Natural Language is a high noise data source [23], and our methods are built to produce high quality information from this kind of source [24].

Along with data generation constraints, we exploited the focus-like mechanism induced by self-attention: referring again to the previous analogy, the mechanism of attention is built in order to avoid the ideal researcher to merely memorize data, or, more technically, to avoid the over-fitting phenomenon. As for the hyper-parameter tuning phase,

the simple structure of the linear algebra decoder allowed us to produce better results, by reducing the variance of the model and optimizing the risk induced by the high noise of the data (since optimizing the hyper parameters is useful in reducing the risk of overfitting).

5 Optimization and Exploration in the Hyper-parameter space

Due to the complexity of the developed model and of the task it tries to solve, it was necessary to perform several optimization procedures in order to obtain a model which could be optimal in the framework of the bias-variance trade-off. In particular, hyper-parameter tuning was carried out considering as degrees of freedom the two parameters that had been observed to have a bigger impact on the results:

1. Embedding size (or network *width*)
2. Number of transformer layers (or network *Depth*)

The role played by these two properties of the network is crucial. The size of the embedding indeed describes the amount of information that can be preserved during the encoding process [25]. If too much information is preserved, the encoder is unable to perform a dimensionality reduction that explains the intrinsic properties of biological processes, making the network prone to overfitting. On the other hand, if too much information is destroyed, the model is unable to explore the connection between the statistical units that occur in the training set, leading to underfitted results [26].

The depth of the network instead controls the dimension of the hypothesis space in which the possible functions that solve the learning task are found. If the hypothesis space is too large, the network tends to overfit (as it becomes possible to “interpolate” the training set), while conversely, a hypothesis space that is too small leads to results that are not enough explanatory of the phenomena under investigation.

To overcome this optimization problem we designed a procedure based on this algorithm:

Algorithm 1 Hyperparameter Tuning

$W \leftarrow \{32, 64, 96, 128\}$	▷ Quantization of Width
$D \leftarrow \{3, 6, 9, 12\}$	▷ Quantization of Depth
$res[w, d] \leftarrow 0 \quad \forall w \in W, d \in D$	
for $w \in W$ do	
for $d \in D$ do	
$res[w, d] \leftarrow loss_{val}(network(w, d))$	▷ Filling the grid of results
end for	
end for	
$w_{best}, d_{best} \leftarrow argmin(res)$	▷ Selection of the best point according to the procedure

As can be seen in Fig. 4, following this algorithm sub-optimal solutions were obtained, hence the plan to define, in the next versions of the project, a more robust optimization procedure (e.g. using a grid search [27], genetic algorithms or Bayesian optimization [28]).

6 Validation

In order to measure the ability of the model to explore and process information from the training data, a cross-validation procedure was implemented. In the context of embedding-based networks, validation of results plays a key role: if by one hand it provides a powerful tool to quantify the efficiency of the network in effectively encoding knowledge, by the other hand, it allowed the team to test the behaviour of the system in the main contexts of use.

From a computational learning theory perspective, the notion of bias-variance trade-off in the context of embedding-based networks is opaque, but it can be considered, with an heuristic approach, as the optimal point between the model having a too shallow point of view on the phenomena of study (high bias) and the model simply memorizing the inner structure of the data (high variance).

For example, if the space where the genes are projected is too small the model still captures part of the dynamics of data, but it cannot have a detailed explanation of those dynamics. On the other hand, if the embedding space is too big, dimensions of the projection space start to become poor in terms of explained information.




Figure 4: Ratio between metrics in various hyper-parameters points and metrics in the used point of hyper-parameters space. This representation is intended to highlight the variation of performance from the point of view of the selected hyper-parameters space point. As it can be seen, the chosen point is a local maxima in the subspace induced by width.

In the context of DP2 the validation procedure was implemented testing two different cases: inference of pathways and diseases. Regarding the pathways validation phase, the procedure followed a simple assumption in order to perform an effective analysis of the bias-variance tradeoff: the network, in fact, has no direct knowledge relative to set of the pathways, but has learned to reason in terms of interaction among genes in the context of diseases and biological processes. Therefore, due to the lack of explicit information in the dataset, pathways can be used as a tool to perform validation of the model that we propose.

From a practical point of view, the validation phase exploited the previous assumption by treating pathways as sets of genes and producing different subsets for each pathway. The team attempted to reconstruct each pathway starting from the subsets and the knowledge encoded in the model, asking the model to return the genes that are nearest – according to ad-hoc metrics – to the subset of genes in input to the system. More formally, the procedure is described by the following algorithm

Algorithm 2 Cross Validation Procedure

```

p ← {g1, g2, ..., gn}
subsetp[i] ← p / {gi}
testres ← []
for i ∈ [1, n] do
    res ← predict(subsetp[i])
    testres ← [testres, res]
end for
return ← eval(testres)
    
```

▷ Pathway initialization
▷ Definition of the subset family
▷ Prediction of the i-th subset

Where with the function *eval* we denote a generic function that evaluates correctness of results (for example a ROC curve evaluation). The implications of this procedure are of paramount interest in the context of model building. Indeed, validation through pathways prediction introduces little or no variance in model evaluation because the prediction is made on pathways that are well known in the literature, but not explicitly included in the training set. In other words, the procedure aims to measure the model’s ability to build knowledge on information that is only partially inside the training domain.

In the analysis of diseases, on the other hand, the nature of the information is different. Diseases are indeed a data source that inherently has a higher variance, as the manifestation of diseases in terms of gene expression can vary due to many external factors (e.g. different human populations, age, sex...) along with the causality of diseases that can be the result of different gene expressions also in the context of same external factors, adding another layer of entropy in the validation of the model. The goal of this phase of the process was to obtain a measure of the model’s ability to extrapolate valuable information from noisy data, while also measuring the model’s ability to predict relationships between genes and diseases.

From an algorithmic perspective, the phase of disease validation was identical to the pathways ones, with the only difference of using as starting point sets of genes related to a certain disease instead of pathways. In both phases of the validation procedure, reliable and curated data sources were used. Pathways relative to the human species were

downloaded from the Reactome database [29], while disease-gene associations data was extracted from the DISEASES database [30].

Based on this collection of validation data, encouraging results have been obtained. In Fig. 5 We can observe a ROC curve of the different validation phases, which explains the relationship between false positive rate and true positive rate in validation [31].




Figure 5: The first thing that can be noticed from the plot is the consistency with the theoretical assumptions that motivated the validation procedure. The reader can observe in fact a less “good behavior” in diseases analysis, coherently with the assumption of “information entropy” in diseases-gene relationships.

Future analysis will be performed in order to overcome the natural barrier induced by variance in disease manifestation, with the objective of finding new paths in gene expression that could explain better the behavior of diseases.

The model, anyway, shows robustness toward noise in this information set: even if the quality of prediction is lower if compared to the pathways analysis, the ROC curve relative to diseases explains a clear understanding of the phenomena in the model.

Moreover, ROC curves provide a simple intuition to induce a metric in the evaluation of a validation procedure. Knowing that ROC curves are monotone, we can partially condensate their information in the *Area Under the Curve* (AUC) metric, which describes roughly the behavior of the model in a way conceptually similar to measuring the distance between a confusion matrix and the identity matrix.

In both cases AUC is interestingly high w.r.t the random model, showing that the network was able to extrapolate meaningful information from data and not only noise (like a random model does).

6.1 Coverage: A very special metric for result evaluation

In this section we will discuss Coverage [32], a metric that is of high relevance in the evaluation of the model.

Definition 6.1. (Coverage) Given a recommender system that is trained in order to treat K possible different recommendations, and given K_{test} as the number of different recommendations produced in testing we define coverage as

$$C = \frac{K_{test}}{K}. \quad (8)$$

This metric provides a very unique perspective on the behaviour of the system from the perspective of a recommender system based on embedding technology. Our system maps the data into a space that preserves the inner structure of the relationships and encodes the information in a particular geometry. The system’s query therefore works by taking into account neighbourhoods created by the distance from the point of interest (in this case, for example, a gene) in the projection space.

We can imagine that if neighborhoods are denser (in terms of contained genes) then more genes are recommended to the final user, since the probability of finding a certain gene in a neighborhood increases with its density [33].

Let us focus for a moment on the density of these neighbourhoods: since, according to the notion of semantic distance, the points in our embedding space have distances related to the semantic difference between the genes [34], we can assume that if the neighbourhoods of points are denser, the system was able to extrapolate a richer meaning from the difference between the genes.

Indeed, if points are more clustered while preserving distances that are semantically correct (in the sense that they show consistency with semantic distance), then the system was able to find ways to arrange points that highlight richer links between genes, enhancing the separation between genes with weaker relationships and encouraging the aggregation between the ones that are more correlated. As can be seen from the plot (Figure 6), this heuristic seems to be confirmed by the increase of coverage in function of the depth and width of the network, showing that if the function mapping genes in the embedding space is richer in terms of expressivity an increase in measured coverage is observed.




Figure 6: Dynamics of coverage metric in the space of hyperparameters. As it can be seen from the plots, the selected point offers an optimal level of coverage, especially in diseases curve where this point is also a local maxima in the subspace induced by the depth of the network.

7 Embedding Space Analysis

In Fig. 7 we analyze the two components projections (obtained with the UMAP algorithm [35]) of gene embedding vectors involved in two different pathways, one for protein methylation and one for keratinization.




Figure 7: Two dimensional representation of keratinization and protein methylation pathways.

On the left side of the plot (Fig. 8) we see a cluster of genes involved in keratinization, which are all involved in cell adhesion and in particular are part of desmosomes (DSG family, PKP family, DSC family, DSP, JUP) [36].

This cluster also contains a gene associated with protein methylation, CALM2. This gene belongs to the calmodulin family [37], a group of proteins that bind Ca^{2+} and play a role in signalling pathways, cell cycle progression, and proliferation. Many of the proteins encoded by the aforementioned genes, such as DSG1, DSG3, DSC1, DSC3, bind Ca^{2+} as well. Some cluster proteins, such as the one encoded by PKP2, do not directly bind Ca^{2+} , but rather maintain transcription of genes that control intracellular calcium cycling [38] (see Fig. 13 in Appendix A).




Figure 8: Zoom-in of the furthest to the left cluster of Fig. 7.

The network has learned to encode information about cell adhesion and Ca^{2+} dependent signalling pathways in the embedding of genes. This features, plus others unexplored, has been sufficient to represent a well defined cluster also after the reduction in two dimensions. In the original embedding space, with many more dimensions, the information encoded could be, in principle, much more.

Other pathways were investigated with different aims. For example, in Fig. 9 the reader can find a projection plot of a single pathway, with the purpose of checking if the clusters generated in the projected space contain some biological information. Fig. 10 instead investigates the separation between different pathways in the projected space.

Analysis of this kind are a clear proof that the DeepProphet2 transformer model is able to extract biological relationships between genes. By utilizing this approach, pathways previously unknown to the net are understood fully (without being included in the training process) by the system. As a result of these experiments, it is possible to conclude with sufficient confidence that the developed model can predict new candidates to be included in a particular pathway.

8 Use Cases

In this section, we will describe possible uses of the AI engine, considering some common tasks in various medical and biological research fields that make the recommender system optimal and also highlight possible situations where this system is less suitable. For the reader's convenience, we list below the main topics:

- [Insight](#)
- [Rare Diseases](#)
- [Grant](#)
- [Gene Selection Analysis](#)
- [Future Applications.](#)

Before explaining each use case, it is necessary to highlight the fact that, as said in previous paragraphs, the system was created in order to work by emulating a researcher in the life-science field, simulating the reasoning process that brings the researcher from a hypothesis to a discovery.




Figure 9: a: Group of tubulin α and β , they form the heterodimer constituting microtubules. b: This genes (*PPP2R1A*, *PPP2R5D*, *PPP2R5A* etc.) encode for subunits of the phosphatase 2A implicated in the negative control of cell division. c: This area contains genes involved in the formation of nuclear pore complex [39] like *NUP* family and *SEC13*, *SEH1L*. d: This area contains genes involved in the centromeric complex formation [40], essentials for proper kinetochore function (*CENPP*, *CENPN*, *CENPL*, *ZWILCH*, *MIS12*, *SPC25*, *NSL1*, *SGO2* etc.). e: In this cluster are present genes involved in the formation of spindle assembly checkpoint [41] (a control that prevents an uncorrected separation of chromosomes) and chromosome segregation (*NUF2*, *KNL1*, *DYNCH1H1*, *KIF2C*, *BUB1*, *KIF2A*, etc.).




Figure 10: In the above representation the reader can see a clear separation of 4 distinct pathways. The two of them with a similar biological function, organic anion transport and organic cation transport are on the same vertical line like, as if the information embedded in the $comp_0$ conveyed part of that information. Genes involved in mRNA editing otherwise are in a well separated area of the plot.

Insight The algorithm can be seen as an information enhancer: the system takes the knowledge in the genomic field as a starting point and uses it to perform its own discoveries that are then proposed to the final user to suggest new paths to follow in her or his research. Deadlocks are extremely common in a high-global-information research topic and usually are not related to a low knowledge of the researcher. Indeed, it may happen in fact that a high qualified researcher may face a deadlock in her or his work due to external factors or intrinsic limits of the human nature such as a restricted point of view on the problem. The system may be beneficial in this situation, that we define as an Insight Problem, since it could offer the point of view of the machine which is less subject to different kinds of biases that could make human work more difficult. The algorithm, in fact, tries to find the best point of view to observe every gene (in terms of relationships between other genes), since it has to perform a latent representation of all the genes that encode as much information as possible on the situations that see that gene as a participant. With a very abstract visualization, we can imagine that while the human point of view tends to be centered in the area of study or of research, the system tends to put its point of view in the center of the gene or the pathway or the disease that it's being requested.

Rare Diseases Secondly, this algorithm can be paramount to get insights where the amount of available information is limited. Therefore this model could be useful, for example, in the analysis of rare diseases. Rare diseases are usually characterized by sparsity of information, in terms of availability and in terms of nature of discoveries, and is therefore difficult for a human researcher to understand the link that connect this kind of diseases with one or more genes. This system tries to understand what are the logic connection between genes, giving the researcher its idea of the connections that a disease could have with genes. It is important to notice, anyway, that due to the nature of the model that we propose there is the necessity to have some (even little) global knowledge on the topic of research. The mechanism that regulates the system can be imagined as a multimedia recommender system. If a movie has not been reviewed or seen at least one time the recommender system cannot perform inference on our personal taste, since there is a lack of contextualization of the entity that is being proposed. In the same way, a profound lack of global information in a certain research (e.g. extremely rare diseases) are not an optimal context for doing inference with this system. The "researcher" still needs sources to study in order to transform information to knowledge. With some abstraction, we can model the case of study relative to rare diseases as a situation where there is little global information along with a deep knowledge of the domain in the researcher. This idealization of the problem opens up a spontaneous question: how would the system behave in the specular situation, where there is an average or high global knowledge of the subject paired with a lack of knowledge in the researcher?

Grant In this situation, which may happen when a researcher is willing to enter a new field, for example approaching the project definition related to a grant, we observe an high grade response of the system. In fact, due to the abundance of high quality content where the virtual researcher can build knowledge, inference tends to perform well since it is not difficult, for the technology adopted by the network, to understand distances in terms of meaning between genes when the number of genes is high. It's useful to notice that the system implements an ad hoc functionality to deal with scarcity of knowledge in the final user, suggesting to her or to him the genes that may be related to the problem that she or he is studying.

Gene Selection Analysis This ability offers the possibility to reduce the amount of unused information in the analysis of the problem, offering a final perspective on the use cases of the system: Gene Selection Analysis. The system in fact can optimize automatically, thanks to the notion of similarity among genes, the weight of every gene in terms of information that is related to the study case, allowing the researcher to focus on the most relevant to the problem. The most classical use case is to filter the output of a gene expression analysis related to a given disease by using the AI system to highlight the most promising genes. Indeed, over/under expressed genes that are also identified by the system as related to the study, might be the ones to focus on. In this way, the algorithm can reduce the amount of targets that are in need for further analysis.

Future Applications We would also like to describe briefly which will be the future optimizations that will lead to new applications of the system. In particular we will focus our future work in the direction of producing a Drug Discovery engine, based on a simple assumption [42][43]. The behavior of every drug is, in a certain amount, mediated by the behavior of the genes in the patient, therefore chemicals and genes can be bound through the same procedure that links pathways to different genes. Given this assumption, we can assume that if a certain chemical can be bound to a set of genes then that set identifies, uniquely, the chemical to which it is bound. Therefore, if there is a certain distance that describe the difference between two set of genes, could it be explanatory of the distance between two chemicals?

The system, due to the geometrical intuition where its idea relies, induces a very natural way to measure distances between genes, and this notion can be extended with rigorous mathematical proofs to the distance between sets of genes. Our future analysis will follow this path, in order analyze how chemicals can be replaced according to their behavior in the human environment, and also to analyze the opposite implication. In fact, if the distance between sets of genes

can be explanatory [44] of similarities in the behavior of two chemicals, then sets that are one near each other can be seen as partially bound to the same chemical. Can the same chemical be used to treat different diseases, having an undocumented effect on different sets of genes?

The system, exploiting the geometrical intuition where its foundation relies, induce a very natural way to measure similarity between genes (since genes in this framework are points and distance between points is a natural indicator of how much difference there is among points) it is intuitive to extend this notion of distance between genes to distance between sets of genes (for example, defining it as the distance between barycentres of the points, see Fig. 11). Our future analysis will follow this path, in order analyze how chemical can be replaced according to their behavior in the human environment, and also to analyze the opposite implication. In fact, if the distance between sets of genes can be explanatory of similarity in the behavior of two chemicals, then sets that are one near each other can be seen as partially bound to the same chemical.




Figure 11: Graphical point of view on the drug discovery problem. The objective is to associate at every drug a paired set of genes, and induce a measure of similarity between drugs based on the similarity of the sets of genes associated.

9 Conclusion

From a technological point of view, this system could offer a different perspective on the task of genetic (or more in general medical) recommendation. Transformer technology was not simply used to produce results, but was also adapted in a way to be an optimal instrument to deal with the task of interest. It is important to address the fact that the system is not meant to be a replacement of human researchers' activity: the objective of the work is to produce a system that works in synergy with the researcher, emulating their way of working in order to produce results that can be justified and understood in a proper way. We, as a team, hope that this way of approaching research problems can be a first step in producing a new way of making discoveries, which does not simply see the machine as an instruments to store and retrieve data but also as tool to discover new patterns that could be difficult to notice by a human observer. Like a human researcher, the system is able to study and learn in order to improve itself and its reasoning capabilities. Aside from this ability, future research will be performed in order to improve the algorithms that sustain the system, following the global improvement of machine learning techniques in order to always have state-of-the-art prediction quality levels.

Acknowledgments

We thank Dr. Luigi Bondurri, Dr. Alessandro Radaelli and Dr. Christian Lautenschläger for the useful discussions and support.

A Integrative Plots




Figure 12: Zoom-in of the clusters identified in Figure 9.




Figure 13: Clustergram of gene set enrichment GO molecular function, source: Enrichr.

References

- [1] S. Sangeetha Katikapalli Subramanyam Kalyan. Secnlp: A survey of embeddings in clinical natural language processing, 2020.
- [2] Amit Kumar Mishra. A dikw paradigm to cognitive engineering, 2017.
- [3] Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N. Gomez, Lukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. Attention is all you need, 2017.
- [4] Shujian Yu and Jose C. Principe. Understanding autoencoders with information theoretic concepts, 2018.
- [5] Qiuxia Lai, Salman Khan, Yongwei Nie, Jianbing Shen, Hanqiu Sun, and Ling Shao. Understanding more about human and machine attention in deep neural networks, 2019.
- [6] Luis Antonio Aguirre and S.A. Billings. Dynamical effects of overparametrization in nonlinear models. *Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena*, 80(1):26–40, 1995.
- [7] F. William Lawvere and Steven Schanuel. Conceptual mathematics: A first introduction to categories.
- [8] Ronen Basri and David Jacobs. Efficient representation of low-dimensional manifolds using deep networks, 2016.
- [9] Artan Sheshmani and Yi-Zhuang You. Categorical representation learning: morphism is all you need. *Machine Learning: Science and Technology*, 3(1):015016, dec 2021.
- [10] Brezis. Functional analysis sobolev spaces and partial differential equations.
- [11] Austin C. Kozlowski, Matt Taddy, and James A. Evans. The geometry of culture: Analyzing the meanings of class through word embeddings. *American Sociological Review*, 84(5):905–949, sep 2019.
- [12] Alina Arseniev-Koehler. Theoretical foundations and limits of word embeddings: what types of meaning can they capture?, 2021.
- [13] Quentin Fournier and Daniel Alose. Empirical comparison between autoencoders and traditional dimensionality reduction methods. In *2019 IEEE Second International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Knowledge Engineering (AIKE)*. IEEE, jun 2019.
- [14] NIH National Library of Medicine, national center for biotechnology information. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/gene>. Accessed: 2022-07-28.

- [15] NIH National Library of Medicine, national center for biotechnology information. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/mesh>. Accessed: 2022-07-28.
- [16] Chih-Hsuan Wei, Hung-Yu Kao, and Zhiyong Lu. PubTator: a web-based text mining tool for assisting biocuration. *Nucleic Acids Research*, 41(W1):W518–W522, 05 2013.
- [17] Robert Leaman and Zhiyong Lu. TaggerOne: joint named entity recognition and normalization with semi-Markov Models. *Bioinformatics*, 32(18):2839–2846, 06 2016.
- [18] C. Shorten, T.M. Khoshgoftaar, and B. Furht. Text data augmentation for deep learning. *Big Data*, 07 2021.
- [19] Alec Radford, Karthik Narasimhan, Tim Salimans, and Ilya Sutskever. Improving language understanding by generative pre-training.
- [20] Prajit Ramachandran, Peter Liu, and Quoc Le. Unsupervised pretraining for sequence to sequence learning. In *Proceedings of the 2017 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 383–391, Copenhagen, Denmark, September 2017. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [21] Paolo Rota Petru Soviany, Radu Tudor Ionescu and Nicu Sebe. Curriculum learning: A survey, 01 2021.
- [22] Ana Sabina Uban and Cornelia Caragea. Generating summaries for scientific paper review, 2021.
- [23] Shivani Gupta and Atul Gupta. Dealing with noise problem in machine learning data-sets: A systematic review. *Procedia Computer Science*, 161:466–474, 2019. The Fifth Information Systems International Conference, 23-24 July 2019, Surabaya, Indonesia.
- [24] Milad Moradi, Kathrin Blagec, and Matthias Samwald. Deep learning models are not robust against noise in clinical text, 2021.
- [25] Weiwei Gu, Aditya Tandon, Yong-Yeol Ahn, and Filippo Radicchi. Principled approach to the selection of the embedding dimension of networks. *Nature Communications*, 12(1), jun 2021.
- [26] Zi Yin. Understand functionality and dimensionality of vector embeddings: the distributional hypothesis, the pairwise inner product loss and its bias-variance trade-off, 2018.
- [27] Petro Liashchynskiy and Pavlo Liashchynskiy. Grid search, random search, genetic algorithm: A big comparison for nas, 07 2019.
- [28] Peter I. Frazier. A tutorial on bayesian optimization, 2018.
- [29] Esther Schmidt, Ewan Birney, David Croft, Bernard de Bono, Peter D’Eustachio, Marc Gillespie, Gopal Gopinath, Bijay Jassal, Suzanna Lewis, Lisa Matthews, Lincoln Stein, Imre Vastrik, and Guanming Wu. Reactome - a knowledgebase of biological pathways. pages 710–719, 01 2006.
- [30] Sune Pletscher-Frankild, Albert Pallejà, Kalliopi Tsfou, Janos X. Binder, and Lars Juhl Jensen. Diseases: Text mining and data integration of disease–gene associations. *Methods*, 74:83–89, 2015. Text mining of biomedical literature.
- [31] Luzia Gonçalves, Ana Subtil, M. Rosário Oliveira, and Patricia de Zea Bermudez. Roc curve estimation: An overview. *REVSTAT-Statistical Journal*, 12(1):1–20, Apr. 2014.
- [32] Mouzhi Ge, Carla Delgado, and Dietmar Jannach. Beyond accuracy: Evaluating recommender systems by coverage and serendipity, 01 2010.
- [33] Junyuan Xie, Ross Girshick, and Ali Farhadi. Unsupervised deep embedding for clustering analysis, 2015.
- [34] Eric P. Xing, Andrew Y. Ng, Michael I. Jordan, and Stuart Russell. Distance metric learning, with application to clustering with side-information. In *Proceedings of the 15th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, NIPS’02, page 521–528, Cambridge, MA, USA, 2002. MIT Press.
- [35] Leland McInnes, John Healy, and James Melville. Umap: Uniform manifold approximation and projection for dimension reduction, 2018.
- [36] David Garrod and Martyn Chidgey. Desmosome structure, composition and function. *Biochimica et Biophysica Acta (BBA) - Biomembranes*, 1778(3):572–587, 2008. Apical Junctional Complexes Part I.
- [37] Claude B. Klee and Thomas C. Vanaman. Calmodulin. volume 35 of *Advances in Protein Chemistry*, pages 213–321. Academic Press, 1982.
- [38] M. Cerrone, J. Montnach, and X. et al. Lin. Plakophilin-2 is required for transcription of genes that control calcium cycling and cardiac rhythm. *Nat Commun*, 106, 2017.
- [39] Greg Kabachinski and Thomas U. Schwartz. The nuclear pore complex – structure and function at a glance. *Journal of Cell Science*, 128(3):423–429, 02 2015.

- [40] Praveen Kumar Allu, Jennine M. Dawicki-McKenna, Trevor Van Eeuwen, Moriya Slavin, Merav Braitbard, Chen Xu, Nir Kalisman, Kenji Murakami, and Ben E. Black. Structure of the human core centromeric nucleosome complex. *Current Biology*, 29(16):2625–2639.e5, 2019.
- [41] Salmon E. Musacchio A. The spindle-assembly checkpoint in space and time. *Nature Review Molecular Cell Biology*, 8:379–393, 2017.
- [42] Jianyuan Deng, Zhibo Yang, Iwao Ojima, Dimitris Samaras, and Fusheng Wang. Artificial intelligence in drug discovery: applications and techniques. *Briefings in Bioinformatics*, 23(1), 11 2021. bbab430.
- [43] Suresh Dara, Swetha Dhamecherla, Surender Singh Jadav, CH Madhu Babu, and Mohamed Jawed Ahsan. Machine learning in drug discovery: A review. *Artif. Intell. Rev.*, 55(3):1947–1999, mar 2022.
- [44] José Jiménez-Luna, Francesca Grisoni, and Gisbert Schneider. Drug discovery with explainable artificial intelligence. *Nature Machine Intelligence*, 2:573–584, 10 2020.