Phenologs

A case study of using bioinformatics to find new genes for genetic traits

BCH394P/364C Systems Biology / Bioinformatics

Edward Marcotte, Univ of Texas at Austin



My opinion, FWIW, is that "research parasites" are

Independent and often highly rigorous scientists
Essential to the scientific process, especially when they
Independently test the original authors' analyses. Often,
They approach analyses with different starting biases, so
Can contribute entirely new interpretations of the original studies, and
Find entirely unanticipated uses for published data
IMO, the act of publishing data in a peer-reviewed journal commits you to release that data for public inspection, reproducibility studies, re-analysis, and many unanticipated new uses.

Science is improved when this happens.











<u>Orthologs</u> = genes from different species that derive from a single gene in the last common ancestor of the species

<u>Paralogs</u> = genes that derive from a single gene that was duplicated within a genome







Building & searching a collection of phenotypes	
Mining available databases +	
manual collection from the primary literature \downarrow	
	# gene-phenotype
<u>Organism</u>	associations
human	1,923
mouse	74,250
worm	27,065
yeast	86,383
Arabidopsis	22,921
Spanning ~300 human diseases,	
>7,000 model organism mutational phenotypes	
Computational can phonotypes for payal models of a disease of interact	
identify significant phenology using permutation tests	
McGary, Park et al. PNAS 107:6544-9 (2010)	













Sure enough, inactivating one of the genes predicted from plants—in a tadpole disrupts neural crest cells, consistent with Waardenburg syndrome









Let's step through this particular discovery process:

1. We had an idea, based on a puzzling observation:

Why do mutations in worm retinoblastoma genes induce ectopic vulva while a mutation in the human ortholog causes eye cancer?

We weren't interested in specific mechanism here, but rather the impact of organismal context on conserved systems. In particular, how do ever-more distant evolutionary models inform us about human disease?

Let's step through this particular discovery process:

- 2. We thought about how this might be part of a large trend—does it illustrate a general principle? Could we could look for new cases systematically?
- 3. We thought about other examples, mentally assembling what could serve as positive and negative control cases. i.e. how to we decide if a systematic approach is working?

Let's step through this particular discovery process:

4. A grad student (Kris McGary) started assembling relevant datasets. We took heavy advantage of existing resources: model organism databases that had already painstakingly curated relevant data, large-scale screens reporting easy-to-process data.

Let's step through this particular discovery process:

- 5. We started inventing/evaluating statistical models/algorithms, exploring the data and thinking about <u>how</u> to search for the relevant trends. We iterated steps 4/5 until we thought we understood the problem better.
- 6. At some point, the lab bet a 6 pack of beer on the outcome:

Can we discover plant models of human disease?

Let's step through this particular discovery process:

- 7. The algorithms predicted some remarkable and crazy results. We had no option but to test or reject the new predictions, so began testing, thanks to collaborators in the Wallingford lab willing to sink a few weeks into high-risk experiments.
- 8. Some tests worked, some didn't. We went back & thought about the ones that didn't and refined how we prioritized the results.
- 9. Iterate, iterate. Jackpot! A plant model of deafness! Shouting in the halls...





















