


# Cell Systems

## Translation of Genotype to Phenotype by a Hierarchy of Cell Subsystems

### Graphical Abstract



### Authors

Michael Ku Yu, Michael Kramer, Janusz Dutkowski, ..., Nevan Krogan, Roded Sharan, Trey Ideker

### Correspondence

tideker@ucsd.edu

### In Brief

The Gene Ontology has become the definitive description of hierarchical cell structure. Matching this hierarchy to functional states enables an exciting new model for interpreting complex genotypes.

### Highlights

- Strategy for genotype-phenotype prediction using a deep hierarchy of cell systems
- Structure of model seeded from the GO hierarchy or directly from data
- Convergence of genetic variation up the hierarchy enabling functional prediction
- Striking ability to translate combinatorial yeast genotypes to growth rate



# Translation of Genotype to Phenotype by a Hierarchy of Cell Subsystems

Michael Ku Yu,<sup>1,2</sup> Michael Kramer,<sup>2,3</sup> Janusz Dutkowski,<sup>2,4</sup> Rohith Srivas,<sup>2,5</sup> Katherine Licon,<sup>2</sup> Jason F. Kreisberg,<sup>2</sup> Cherie T. Ng,<sup>6</sup> Nevan Krogan,<sup>7</sup> Roded Sharan,<sup>8</sup> and Trey Ideker<sup>2,\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Bioinformatics and Systems Biology Program

<sup>2</sup>Department of Medicine

<sup>3</sup>Biomedical Sciences Program

University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA 92093, USA

<sup>4</sup>Data4Cure, La Jolla, CA 92037, USA

<sup>5</sup>Department of Bioengineering, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA 92093, USA

<sup>6</sup>aTyr Pharmaceuticals, San Diego, CA 92121, USA

<sup>7</sup>Department of Cellular and Molecular Pharmacology, University of California, San Francisco, San Francisco, CA 94143, USA

<sup>8</sup>Blavatnik School of Computer Science, Tel-Aviv University, Tel Aviv 69978, Israel

\*Correspondence: [tideker@ucsd.edu](mailto:tideker@ucsd.edu)

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.cels.2016.02.003>

## SUMMARY

Accurately translating genotype to phenotype requires accounting for the functional impact of genetic variation at many biological scales. Here, we present a strategy for genotype-phenotype reasoning based on existing knowledge of cellular subsystems. These subsystems and their hierarchical organization are defined by the Gene Ontology or a complementary ontology inferred directly from previously published datasets. Guided by the ontology's hierarchical structure, we organize genotype data into an "ontotype," that is, a hierarchy of perturbations representing the effects of genetic variation at multiple cellular scales. The ontotype is then interpreted using logical rules generated by machine learning to predict phenotype. This approach substantially outperforms previous non-hierarchical methods for translating yeast genotype to cell growth phenotype, and it accurately predicts the growth outcomes of two new screens of 2,503 double gene knockouts affecting DNA repair or nuclear lumen. Ontotypes also generalize to larger knockout combinations, setting the stage for interpreting the complex genetics of disease.

## INTRODUCTION

A central problem in genetics is to understand how different variations in DNA sequence, dispersed across a multitude of genes, can nonetheless elicit similar phenotypes (Waddington, 1942). In recent years, it has been repeatedly observed that different genetic drivers of a trait can be recognized by their aggregation in networks of pairwise protein or gene interactions (Califano et al., 2012; Greene et al., 2015; Hanahan and Weinberg, 2011; Kim and Przytycka, 2012; Ramanan et al., 2012; Wang et al., 2010). Rather than associating genotype with phenotype

directly, variations in genotype are first mapped onto knowledge of gene networks; affected subnetworks are then statistically associated with phenotype. This approach can greatly increase our power to identify relevant associations between genotype and phenotype. This principle of "network-based" or "pathway-based" association (Califano et al., 2012) is now being applied to effectively map the genetics underlying complex phenotypes, including cancer and other common diseases (Hofree et al., 2013; Lee et al., 2011; Leiserson et al., 2014; Ng et al., 2012; Pe'er and Hachohen, 2011; Skafidas et al., 2014; Sullivan, 2012; Willsey et al., 2013).

In these studies, network knowledge is represented as a set of genes and pairwise gene interactions. In reality, however, genotype is transmitted to phenotype not only through gene-gene interactions but through a rich hierarchy of biological subsystems at multiple scales: genotypic variations in nucleotides (1 nm scale) give rise to functional changes in proteins (1–10 nm), which in turn affect protein complexes (10–100 nm), cellular processes (100 nm), organelles (1  $\mu$ m), and, ultimately, phenotypic behaviors of cells (1–10  $\mu$ m), tissues (100  $\mu$ m to 100 mm), and complex organisms (>1 m). What has been less well studied in genotype-phenotype association is how to leverage our extensive pre-existing knowledge across these scales or how to identify the scales most relevant to a set of genetic variants (Deisboeck et al., 2011; Eissing et al., 2011; Walpole et al., 2013).

In many fields, knowledge across scales is modeled by ontologies: a factorization of prior knowledge about the world into a hierarchy of increasingly specific concepts (Brachman and Levnesque, 2004). For instance, intelligent systems like Apple's Siri and IBM's Watson carry out logical reasoning using a large collection of world knowledge represented by ontologies (Carvunis and Ideker, 2014). In molecular and cellular biology, extensive knowledge of the hierarchy of subsystems in a cell has been represented by the Gene Ontology (GO), a community standard reference database that documents interrelationships among thousands of intracellular components, processes, and functions in a large hierarchy of terms (Gene Ontology Consortium, 2015). Thus far, genotype-phenotype association methods have sometimes used prior knowledge in the GO by flattening the term hierarchy to a network, in which pairwise interactions

connect genes annotated with the same GO term (Pesquita et al., 2009). This flattening, however, may discard important information about the rich hierarchy of biological systems connecting genotype to phenotype. Moreover, a hierarchical model is highly complementary, and in some ways orthogonal, to flat networks: the GO is primarily concerned with “deep” connectivity up and down a hierarchy of cellular processes spanning dozens of scales, whereas network models typically focus on horizontal flow of signaling, transcriptional, or metabolic information among genes or reactions at the same scale (Lee et al., 2010, 2011). Another advantage of the GO is that it is continuously improved by a very large community of dozens of curators and editors, who update GO from new knowledge published in thousands of peer-reviewed papers each year (Balakrishnan et al., 2013; Huntley et al., 2014). To complement this process of manual curation, recently we and others have shown that a large hierarchy of cellular systems can be systematically assembled directly from analysis of genome-wide datasets, including molecular interactions and gene expression profiles; we call this assembly NeXO (Dutkowski et al., 2013; Gligorijević et al., 2014; Kramer et al., 2014). This “data-driven” ontology closely resembles, and in some cases greatly revises and expands, the literature-curated GO.

Here we report a general approach for using deep hierarchical knowledge of the cell, represented by an ontology, to translate genotype to phenotype. This approach recursively aggregates the effects of genetic variation upward through the hierarchy; in this way, genetic variants comprising genotype are converted to effects on the cell subsystems affected by those variants. We call the set of all such effects an “ontotype,” representing variation at intermediate scales between nanoscopic changes in genes and macroscopic changes in phenotype.

Here, we focus on yeast genetic interactions, in which the deletion of two or more genes results in an unexpectedly slow or fast cellular growth phenotype. Genetic interactions have previously been screened systematically using synthetic genetic arrays in yeast (Costanzo et al., 2010); these experiments comprise ~3 million different genetic backgrounds and are among the largest genotype-phenotype compendia in existence. We integrate these data with the GO to produce a multi-scale computational model, the functionalized ontology. The model accurately predicts growth phenotypes of 2,503 previously untested double-deletion genotypes, and it is also capable of predicting the phenotypes that result from larger combinations of gene disruptions. Similar predictive power is achieved by substituting the GO with NeXO, our data-driven ontology of cellular systems. In aggregate, this work suggests a strategy for building hierarchical models of the cell whose structure and function are learned completely from data.

## RESULTS

### Association between Genetic Interactions and Hierarchical Relations among Cellular Systems

As preparation for modeling, we identified patterns by which genetic interactions are associated with, and thus biologically explained by, the structure of gene ontologies. We observed that sets of genes assigned to the same GO term tended to be highly enriched for genetic interactions ( $p < 10^{-5}$ ), for both positive


genetic interactions (double gene disruptions with better than expected growth, e.g., epistasis) and negative genetic interactions (double gene disruptions with worse than expected growth, e.g., synthetic lethality) (Figure 1A). Such interaction enrichment within GO terms occurred over a wide range of term sizes—the number of genes annotated to a term—suggesting that genetic interactions emerge from both broad and specific cellular mechanisms at multiple scales.

Because of the hierarchical structure of the cell, genetic interactions among genes annotated to a term can potentially be re-interpreted as interactions between the genes of different terms at a lower scale in the GO. For example, the “parent” term “microtubule-associated complex” displays strong within-term interaction enrichment, which factors into strong between-term interaction enrichment across two of its “children” terms, kinesin and dynactin (Figure 1B). We found that such hierarchical relationships were widespread in the GO: approximately half of within-term enrichments could be factored into between-term enrichments among their descendants (Figure 1C). Occurrences of interactions within or between biological pathways have been previously investigated as separate biological interpretations (Bandyopadhyay et al., 2008; Bellay et al., 2011; Collins et al., 2010; Kelley and Ideker, 2005; Leiserson et al., 2011; Ma et al., 2008; Qi et al., 2008; Ulitsky et al., 2008). Here, both types of explanations can be applied to the same interaction, as they are related hierarchically within the unified structure of the cell. Overall, approximately 40,000 interactions were involved in 1,661 within- or between-term enrichments, representing a 24:1 compression of information (Figure 1D). Thus, the GO integrates genetic interactions in an overarching hierarchy capturing multiple scales of cell biology. As one moves upward in this hierarchy, separate disruptions to multiple systems converge to multiple disruptions to a single system, with the scale of this transition indicated naturally by the hierarchical structure.

### The Ontotype: An Intermediate between Genotype and Phenotype

Guided by this concordance between the GO hierarchy and genetic interactions, we developed a general system for ontology-based translation of genotype to phenotype that involves three general steps. First, the genotype is described according to convention by the set of genes that have been disrupted relative to wild-type (e.g.,  $b\Delta d\Delta$ ; Figure 2A). These disruptions are propagated recursively up the ontology, such that every term is assigned the disrupted genes annotated to that term plus all of those assigned to its children. For example, because the gene *KIP1* encodes a subunit of the kinesin complex (Figure 1B), its deletion in a *kip1* $\Delta$  strain propagates upward in the ontology to affect the parent term “kinesin complex” and continues to propagate upward to affect ancestor terms at higher scales such as “microtubule associated complex” and “cytoskeleton.”

Second, every term is assigned a functional state, representing the aggregate impact of gene disruptions on the activity of the component or process that term represents. Although it is possible to envisage many ways one might compute this functional impact, as proof of principle, we explored a simple and parameter-free computation, the number of disrupted genes associated with the term. This general approach is iterated across all terms; we call the profile of states across all terms



**Figure 1. Patterns of Genetic Interaction Reflect the Hierarchical Structure of the GO**

(A) Enrichment for negative (circle) or positive (triangle) genetic interactions among genes annotated to the same GO term as a function of term size, measured by the number of genes annotated to that term or its descendants.

the “ontotype.” In this way, the ontotype provides a complete picture of cell function and spans scales between genotype and phenotype. Whereas genotype describes the states of genes, and phenotype describes the states of observable traits, ontotype describes the states of all known biological objects. Many of these objects exist at scales bigger than genes but too small to be classically observable by eye, such as protein complexes and other subcellular structures, or too diffuse, such as signaling pathways (Figure 2A). In its most general definition, ontotype encompasses both genotype and phenotype, with genes and observable traits positioned at lower and higher levels of the hierarchy of objects encoding life.

### A Functionalized Gene Ontology Integrating Cell Structure and Functional Prediction


Third, once genotypes are transformed to ontotypes, a supervised learning approach based on the technique of random forests regression (Breiman, 2001) is used to learn rules by which term states predict phenotypes. Rules are organized as a collection, or “forest,” of decision trees (Experimental Procedures), with a typical decision tree describing a series of logical true-or-false tests to evaluate the states of several terms (e.g., T4, T5, and T7 in Figure 2A). Making decisions on the states of terms rather than nucleotide variants or genes enables machine learning across a range of scales, so that different genotypes converging on similar ontotypes (e.g., *aΔdΔ* and *bΔdΔ* in Figure 2B) can yield the same phenotype. Decision tree logic was trained to predict quantitative genetic interaction scores from ~3 million tests for pairwise genetic interactions (Costanzo et al., 2010) (Experimental Procedures). This hierarchical structure of the ontology, when coupled to the decision logic described above, forms a “functionalized” ontology, that is, a computational cell model that defines both the sub-structures of the cell and how these sub-structures hierarchically translate genotype to phenotype.

Separate functionalized ontologies were trained using either the GO curated from the *Saccharomyces* literature (Cherry et al., 2012) ( $F_{GO}$ ) or a data-driven ontology assembled from *Saccharomyces* datasets using the method of network-extracted ontologies (Dutkowski et al., 2013; Kramer et al., 2014) ( $F_{NeXO}$ ). Whereas the GO represents knowledge of published cell biology, application of NeXO yielded an ontology whose hierarchy of cell systems was learned directly from publicly available data,

Enrichment is normalized as the fold change over expected for randomized GO annotations.

(B) Genetic interactions are propagated up the GO hierarchy to support “between-term enrichment” between the dynactin and kinesin complexes and “within-term enrichment” within the parent “microtubule associated complex.”

(C) Number of within-term and between-term enrichments highlighted by current genetic interaction data. Approximately half of within-term enrichments can be factored into one or more between-term enrichments that occur lower in the GO hierarchy. Percentages are calculated with respect to the total possible tests for within-term (2,719) and between-term (36,210) enrichments. (D) Number of genetic interactions involved in a within-term, between-term, or either type of enrichment. Percentages are calculated with respect to the total number of genetic interactions (107,133). The expected numbers of enrichments (C) and supporting interactions (D) were also calculated over randomized GO annotations (dark gray bars).



**Figure 2. The Ontotype Method of Translating Genotype to Phenotype**

(A) The relationship between genotypic and phenotypic variation is modeled through an intermediate “ontotype,” defined as the profile of states corresponding to the effect of genotype on each cellular component, biological process, and molecular function represented as a term in GO. To generate an ontotype, perturbations to genes are propagated hierarchically through the ontology, altering term states. A random forest regresses to predict a phenotype using the ontotype as features. An example decision tree from the forest is shown.

(B) Example genotype, ontotype, and phenotype associations from the ontology in (A). Different genotypes (e.g., *bΔdΔ* and *aΔdΔ*) give rise to similar or identical phenotypes by influencing similar or identical combinations of terms.

including protein-protein interactions, gene expression profiles, and protein sequence properties, but excluding any prior information about genetic interactions (datasets taken from the YeastNet v3 study; Kim et al., 2014). NeXO (4,805 terms) was tuned so that the resulting ontology was approximately similar in size to the GO (5,125 terms). Alignment of these two ontologies revealed 1,614 significantly overlapping terms. Thus, NeXO represents a distinct hierarchy of cellular systems that provides an alternative to the hierarchy maintained by GO curators.

### Quantitative Assessment of Performance for Genotype-Phenotype Translation


$F_{GO}$  accurately predicted growth phenotypes across a range of genetic interaction scores (Figures 3A and 3B). The correlation between predicted and measured scores was highly significant (Figure 3C; Pearson’s  $r = 0.35$ ,  $p < 2.2 \times 10^{-16}$ ) and reduced substantially when a randomized version of the ontology was used ( $r = 0.04$ ); the maximum achievable correlation, as previously determined by experimental genetic interaction replicates (Barshnikova et al., 2010), was  $r = 0.67$ . Progressively removing either small or large terms from the model degraded the correlation (Figures 3D and 3E), indicating that all scales in the hierarchy aid in prediction.  $F_{NeXO}$  achieved nearly the same correlation (Figure 3C;  $r = 0.32$ ) and was also sensitive to randomization ( $r = 0.03$ ).

Both functionalized ontologies compared favorably with non-hierarchical approaches for predicting genetic interactions (Boucher and Jenna, 2013; Lehner, 2013). We evaluated three state-of-the-art methods: flux balance analysis (FBA), which uses a mechanistic model of yeast metabolic pathways to simulate the impact of gene deletions on cell growth (Szappanos et al., 2011); guilt by association (GBA), which predicts the phenotype of pairwise gene deletions on the basis of the phenotypes of their network neighbors (Lee et al., 2010); and the multi-network multi-classifier (MNMC), a “black box” supervised learning system that uses many different lines of experimental evidence as features to predict genetic interactions (Pandey et al., 2010) (Experimental Procedures). In comparison with all

of these approaches, the functionalized ontologies achieved substantially greater correlation between predicted and measured interaction scores (Figure 3C) as well as better trade-offs in precision versus recall (Figure 3F) in 4-fold cross-validation. We also assessed prediction performance in a challenging validation scenario in which the training set of genotypes does not disrupt any genes in the test set (Park and Marcotte, 2012) (Supplemental Experimental Procedures). In this scenario, any genotype-phenotype logic that applies to individual genes is no longer generalizable; for example, promiscuous genes with a high degree of genetic interactions (Gillis and Pavlidis, 2012; Mackay, 2014) could be used to explain training data but not test data. Despite this challenge,  $F_{GO}$  still outperformed predictions made with a randomized GO or with the non-hierarchical methods (Figure S1).

We found that the accuracy of growth phenotype prediction depends significantly on the degree to which cellular systems have been characterized in the GO.  $F_{GO}$  was especially accurate at modeling genotypes for which the disrupted genes are well characterized by GO annotations; conversely, it was far less able to model genotypes for which the genes are poorly characterized (Figure S2). Moreover, many genes that are poorly characterized in the GO are better characterized in NeXO, such that genotypes involving these genes lead to better phenotypic predictions by  $F_{NeXO}$  than by  $F_{GO}$  (Figures S2A–S2C). These differences demonstrate the utility of data-driven ontologies for translating genotype to phenotype, especially in species that are lacking in GO curation but have “omics” datasets from which a gene ontology can nonetheless be built.

Finally, we investigated whether hierarchical features (i.e., the ontotype) were essential or if equally good predictions could be made from “flat” features derived from the same ontologies. The GO was flattened by computing the semantic similarity (Resnik, 1995), which scores every pair of genes by their functional relatedness in GO. As a non-hierarchical representation of NeXO, we directly considered the data on which it had been based: pairwise gene-gene similarities derived from different types of experimental evidence in YeastNet. Use of these flat datasets derived



**Figure 3. Genome-wide Prediction of Pairwise Genetic Interactions in Yeast**

(A) Measured genetic interaction scores versus those predicted from ontotypes constructed from GO using 4-fold cross-validation. For each bin of predicted scores, box plots summarize the distribution of measured scores by its median (central horizontal line), interquartile range (box), and an additional  $1.5\sigma$  (whiskers).

(B) Number of gene pairs in each bin of predicted scores.

(C) Method performance, as represented by the correlation of measured versus predicted interaction scores across gene pairs that meet an interaction significance criterion of  $p < 0.05$  in Costanzo et al. (2010). Comparison is made with ontotypes constructed from a randomized gene ontology or NeXO and to previous non-hierarchical methods for predicting genetic interactions. FBA correlation is reported for the set of 104,826 gene pairs considered by this model and for which gene annotations are available in the GO. The ontotype correlations do not fluctuate greatly ( $<4\%$ ) whether computed over all gene pairs (shown) or the FBA gene pairs. See also Figures S1 and S2.

(D) Method performance when the ontotype is constructed from only GO terms that are no larger than (triangles) or no smaller than (circles) a size threshold.

(E) The number of GO terms that meet each size threshold criterion.


(F) Precision-recall curves for classification of negative genetic interactions.

from the two ontologies resulted in a substantial degradation in prediction performance ( $FLAT_{GO}$  and  $FLAT_{NeXO}$ ; Figure 3C), even though the same random-forests regression procedure was used as for the functionalized ontologies.

### Simulating Growth Phenotypes for “New” Genotypes Not Yet Observed or Examined

We next used  $F_{GO}$  to simulate growth for all 12,512,503 pairwise deletions of non-essential yeast genes, 73% of which

had not yet been tested in the laboratory (Figure 4A; Data S1). A total of 41,605 genetic interactions were predicted. These predictions were concentrated within and between particular terms and term pairs (Figures 4A and 4B), covering a total of 1,367 unique terms and indicating where in the ontology the logic of  $F_{GO}$  takes place. For example,  $F_{GO}$  predicted many genetic interactions within “oxidative phosphorylation” (Figure 4C), with negative interactions linking the sub-systems of electron and proton transport and positive



**Figure 4. The Functionalized GO**

(A) Visualization of  $F_{GO}$  structure and function. Terms and hierarchical parent-child relations are represented by nodes and black edges. Colored nodes and edges denote within- and between-term interaction enrichments, illustrating how terms and term combinations are used for prediction.

(B) Venn diagrams showing number of term enrichments identified for measured interactions, predicted interactions, or both.

(C) Example term “oxidative phosphorylation,” which factors into the transport of electrons (left child) versus protons (right child). Although both positive and negative genetic interactions are predicted within the oxidative phosphorylation genes (represented by a pie with both blue and red slices), positive interactions segregate within electron transport (blue pie) while negative interactions segregate between electron and proton transport (dotted red edge). See also Figure S3.

**Validation and Expansion of the Functionalized Ontology of DNA Repair and Nuclear Lumen**

Key terms in  $F_{GO}$  were “DNA repair” and “nuclear lumen,” which featured prominently in the decision tree logic, leading to a high concentration of predicted interactions (9.0 and 7.6 times the expected interaction density, respectively) according to particular patterns of disruption (Figures 5A and S4). Genetic perturbations within each term led to particularly accurate growth phenotypes in cross-validation, as the correlation between predicted interactions and those measured by Costanzo et al. (2010) was noticeably better for gene pairs in DNA repair or nuclear lumen (both  $r = 0.61$ ) than for gene pairs in other terms (average  $r = 0.35$ ; Figure S2G; Table S2). To test whether this

performance generalized to new data, we experimentally measured growth phenotypes for 1,218 pairwise deletions of DNA repair genes and 1,600 pairwise deletions of nuclear lumen genes and scored these mutants for genetic interactions (Table S3; Supplemental Experimental Procedures). Of these, 1,345 mutants had also been scored previously by Costanzo et al. (2010). Surprisingly, we observed that the new measurements were better predicted by  $F_{GO}$  than by the previous measurements of those same genotypes (i.e., experimental replicates; Figure 5B). Such improvement suggests that functionalized ontologies may be able to reduce experimental noise by learning the overarching patterns of cellular subsystems that translate genotype to phenotype.

interactions segregating entirely within electron transport. These distinct patterns of positive and negative segregation were observed broadly across  $F_{GO}$  (Figure S3). Of particular interest were predicted interactions between 71 term pairs, as these terms were only distantly related in the GO (Table 1; Table S1; Supplemental Experimental Procedures). For example, all ten genes in “intron homing” had negative interactions with all four genes in the “Phosphatidylinositol-3-kinase complex,” although neither these terms nor their parents shared any genes, and these terms were in entirely separate branches of the GO (biological process versus cellular component). Thus,  $F_{GO}$  makes predictions guided by, but not rigidly confined to, known hierarchical relations among cellular subsystems. The unexpected connections point to potential new cellular functions and functional relationships important for regulating cell growth.

We next tested  $F_{GO}$ ’s ability to generalize to unseen mutant genotypes. For this purpose we constructed a “limited”  $F_{GO}$ , trained only on those genotypes that had been tested earlier

**Table 1. Top New Functional Relationships in F<sub>GO</sub>**

	Term A (Number of Genes)	Term B (Number of Genes)	Interactions/Total (%)		
			Predicted	Measured	p Value <sup>a</sup>
Negative Interactions	intron homing (10)	phosphatidylinositol 3-kinase complex II (4)	40/40 (100.0%)	2/2 (100.0%)	6.74E-96
	negative regulation of chromatin silencing at silent mating-type cassette (8)	protein import into mitochondrial inner membrane (3)	24/24 (100.0%)	14/14 (100.0%)	3.56E-55
	pre-mRNA binding (5)	RNA pol II transcription coactivator activity in preinitiation complex assembly (3)	15/15 (100.0%)	2/2 (100.0%)	2.86E-32
	protein lipoylation (4)	carbon-oxygen lyase activity, acting on phosphates (3)	12/12 (100.0%)	9/9 (100.0%)	1.23E-24
	Swr1 complex (8)	U6 snRNP (3)	22/24 (91.7%)	6/6 (100.0%)	1.20E-47
	alpha-1,6-mannosyltransferase complex (6)	negative regulation of chromatin silencing involved in replicative cell aging (4)	21/24 (87.5%)	1/4 (25.0%)	3.08E-44
	tubulin complex assembly (5)	maintenance of DNA trinucleotide repeats (3)	13/15 (86.7%)	12/12 (100.0%)	3.67E-25
	inositol phosphate biosynthetic process (5)	minus-end-directed microtubule motor activity (3)	12/15 (80.0%)	5/6 (83.3%)	5.56E-22
	regulation of ARF GTPase activity (6)	phosphatidylinositol-3,5-bisphosphate 5-phosphatase activity (4)	19/24 (79.2%)	2/4 (50.0%)	7.92E-38
	positive regulation of RNA elongation from Pol I promoter (5)	HIR complex (4)	14/20 (70.0%)	8/10 (80.0%)	3.82E-25
Positive Interactions	negative regulation of chromatin silencing at silent mating-type cassette (8)	U6 snRNP (3)	19/24 (79.2%)	10/11 (90.9%)	7.92E-38
	tubulin complex assembly (5)	DNA-directed RNA polymerase I complex (4)	15/20 (75.0%)	8/8 (100.0%)	4.37E-28
	RSC complex (8)	inactivation of MAPK activity (4)	19/32 (59.4%)	3/4 (75.0%)	6.33E-34
	vacuolar proton-transporting V-type ATPase, V1 domain (8)	free ubiquitin chain polymerization (3)	14/24 (58.3%)	7/14 (50.0%)	1.91E-23
	alpha-1,6-mannosyltransferase complex (6)	dynactin complex (5)	16/30 (53.3%)	8/12 (66.7%)	1.14E-26
	vacuolar proton-transporting V-type ATPase, V0 domain (7)	AP-3 adaptor complex (4)	13/28 (46.4%)	7/16 (43.8%)	1.26E-19
	SLIK (SAGA-like) complex (14)	positive regulation of stress-activated MAPK cascade (3)	14/42 (33.3%)	12/21 (57.1%)	4.92E-19
	histone exchange (9)	minus-end-directed microtubule motor activity (3)	9/27 (33.3%)	7/22 (31.8%)	2.38E-10
	histone methyltransferase activity (H3-K4 specific) (7)	snoRNA transcription from an RNA polymerase II promoter (3)	7/21 (33.3%)	4/6 (66.7%)	7.33E-07
	glycerol transport (4)	transcription-coupled nucleotide-excision repair (4)	5/16 (31.3%)	1/4 (25.0%)	3.42E-03

See also [Table S1](#).


<sup>a</sup>Calculated with respect to predicted interactions. Bonferroni corrected for family wise error rate.

(Costanzo et al., 2010) but not by our new screens. This limited F<sub>GO</sub> achieved high sensitivity versus specificity (Figure 5C) and precision versus recall (Figure 5D) in predicting the new interactions measured for DNA repair and nuclear lumen genes. Given this validation, we combined the genetic interaction scores from both new screens with previous data (Costanzo et al., 2010) and re-trained the ontotype decision logic on this more complete dataset. The structure of this improved F<sub>GO</sub>, with the accompanying ontotype-phenotype logic, is available online on the Network Data Exchange (<http://goo.gl/cYIXWJ>; UUID: 01b46d52-c3a5-11e5-8fbc-06603eb7f303; Pratt et al., 2015) and as a Cytoscape file in [Data S2](#).

### Toward More Complex Genotypes

Although the ontotype had been trained using double-deletion genotypes, we hypothesized that once trained, it might be capable of predictions for genotypes involving mutations to larger numbers of genes. Although few studies have examined three-way or higher order genetic interactions, a recent study (Haber et al., 2013) showed proof of principle for a three-way gene deletion methodology, representing one of the few systematic screens for triple mutants to date. This work reported that deletion of *CAC1* in combination with any gene in the HIR complex (*HIR1*, *HIR2*, *HIR3*, and *HPC2*) results in a synthetic growth defect (negative genetic interaction); however, the





**Figure 5. Elucidating the Genetic Logic of DNA Repair and the Nuclear Lumen**

(A) DNA repair has a rich structure of predicted genetic interactions among specific repair processes. Coloring and visual style of panels follow the convention of Figure 4. See also Figure S4.


(B–D) Yeast growth was experimentally measured for double gene deletion strains in which both genes are involved in either DNA repair (green) or nuclear lumen (orange). See also Tables S2 and S3. (B) The new measurements are correlated with previous data by Costanzo et al. (2010) as well as predictions of a  $F_{GO}$  trained with all previous data or predictions of a “limited”  $F_{GO}$  trained with all previous data excluding genotypes tested in the new screen. In all cases, correlation is computed among the genotypes tested by both the new screen and Costanzo et al. (2010). Among all genotypes in the new screen, we calculated receiver-operating (C) and precision-recall curves (D) for predicting negative genetic interactions in DNA repair and the nuclear lumen using the limited  $F_{GO}$ . The corresponding curves across all gene pairs in the previous screen are reproduced for comparison (gray; see Figure 3F).

additional deletion of a third gene, *ASF1*, suppresses this phenotype. Consistent with these findings,  $F_{GO}$  predicted both the synthetic sickness of the double mutants and phenotypic suppression by the triple mutant (Figure 6A). Visual inspection of the model (Figure 6B) implicated decision logic on the basis of the functional activities of two related processes, DNA replication-independent nucleosome assembly and nucleosome organization. Deleting a single gene in DNA replication-independent nucleosome assembly leads to a state in which the deletion of another gene functioning elsewhere in nucleosome organization causes synthetic sickness. In contrast, the triple mutants include deletion of two genes in DNA replication-independent nucleosome assembly (*asf1*  $\Delta$ HIR $\Delta$ ), leading to a neutral phenotype. This effect probably occurs because the double mutant impairs growth to such an extent that additional perturbations have no detectable effect. Indeed, whereas *CAC1* is primarily involved in regulating DNA replication, *ASF1* and the HIR complex have been linked to other chromatin-related processes, including transcriptional elongation (Formosa et al., 2002; Schwabish and Struhl, 2006) and mRNA export (Pamblanco et al., 2014). This triple-mutant case study illustrates the complexity of logic in interpreting genetic interactions, underscoring the utility of a knowledge representation and reasoning system for unraveling such combinatorial genetic effects.

## DISCUSSION

Many years of work by the Gene Ontology Consortium have established an extensive description of cell structure spanning a hierarchy of biological scales. Here, we have shown that the ontology structure can also be used functionally for interpretation of genetic variants to make phenotypic predictions. The ability to systematically map and then integrate these two aspects, structure and function, outlines a general strategy for development of computational cell models. First, a knowledge base of the cell’s hierarchical structure is acquired, either through literature curation (GO) or data-driven methods (NeXO). In a second step, mathematical relations are learned by algorithms that translate how the functional states of these subsystems—the ontology—give rise to a phenotype of interest. Thus, cell structure is determined from physical information derived from literature or systematic data, and cell function is learned from genetic data such as synthetic lethal interactions and genome-wide association studies.

Functionalized ontologies substantially outperformed previous phenotypic predictors (Figures 3C and 3F), a notable finding given the simplicity of the ontology and its use as the sole feature set for learning. We believe this success follows from several key aspects of implementation. First and most important, the utility of hierarchical organization in genotype-phenotype translation cannot be overstated. Indeed, the functionalized ontologies also outperformed predictors based on non-hierarchical versions of the same information (Figure 3C) or truncated versions of the ontology (Figures 3D and 3E). From the perspective of the ontology, all mutations or variants in a genotype coalesce to the same cellular module, provided one looks at a high enough level (Figure 1B). A genotype may include some mutations that map to the same gene, others to



**Figure 6. Prediction of Triple Mutants**

(A) Measured versus predicted interaction scores for genotypes involving pairwise and three-way deletions involving *ASF1*, *CAC1*, and genes in the HIR complex (*HIR1*, *HIR2*, *HIR3*, and *HPC2*) (Haber et al., 2013).

(B) Relevant GO structure (left) and corresponding functional decision tree (right) for predicting the two- and three-way interactions in (A). At left, arrows represent parent-child relations and gene annotations in GO. At right, arrows represent decisions based on ontology: numbers on arrows are term states; arrows point to predicted interaction scores ( $\epsilon$ ).

the same protein complex, still others to the same broad process or organelle, with all mutations falling within the highest scale represented by the cell itself. Propagating mutations upward through terms of increasing scale enables subsequent selection of the “right” scale for accurate prediction. In this regard,  $F_{GO}$  sheds light on previous, partially discrepant, studies of genetic interaction networks. Some analyses have found that negative genetic interactions tend to connect between complementary modules, whereas positive interactions tend to occur within a single module (Bandyopadhyay et al., 2008; Collins et al., 2010; Kelley and Ideker, 2005; Leiserson et al., 2011; Ma et al., 2008; Qi et al., 2008; Ulitsky et al., 2008); a more recent report identified dense patterns of both positive and negative interactions between modules (Bellay et al., 2011). Analysis of  $F_{GO}$  suggests that both interpretations can be correct, depending on the scale of the module(s) within the cellular hierarchy.

The second factor in the success of functionalized ontologies is the sustained efforts of biologists at large. The GO is a rich resource of cellular knowledge that is both broad, in its extensive coverage of cell biology, and deep, in its resolution of cell sub-systems across many different scales. Although not perfect, this knowledge is continuously refined, updated, and expanded by the sustained efforts of a global community. Given the staggering complexity of the cell, such a collaborative approach incorporating diverse expertise and tools may be instrumental in establishing robust and complete prior knowledge for computational cell modeling. Previously, cellular modeling efforts have typically involved independent curation within a single laboratory or institute.

A last factor that may have worked in our favor is the fact that functionalized ontologies balance rigid modeling constraints imposed by prior knowledge with flexible statistical learning guided by experiments. Computing the ontology requires no parameters and instead leverages the topology of the ontology. Logical rules for predicting phenotype are based on the ontology, but their functional form (i.e., which terms are used and how their states are combined) is learned from data. In contrast, many previous efforts in mechanistic modeling (e.g., see Cahán et al., 2014; Carrera et al., 2014; Deutscher et al., 2006; Karr et al., 2012; Lerman et al., 2012; Machado et al., 2011; O’Brien et al., 2013; Orth et al., 2010; Segrè et al., 2005; Szappanos et al., 2011; Szczurek et al., 2009; Takahashi et al., 2003; Tomita et al., 1999) have been driven by low-level prior knowledge in the form of biophysical equations. Although naturally conferring a

mechanistic explanation when correct, these equations have a known challenge that they are often of preset form and have sensitive parameters (Apgar et al., 2010; Ashyraliyev et al., 2009; Gutenkunst et al., 2007), such that achieving accurate predictions within one dataset risks overfitting.

### Extending Functional Ontologies beyond Current Limits

$F_{GO}$  based its predictions principally on 1,367 terms, spread across various biological processes, cellular components, and molecular functions (Figure 4A). Although this coverage of cell biology is substantial (27% of the yeast GO), one might wonder whether it should be more complete. First, some term logic is likely missed because those terms are not frequently disrupted in the current set of genotypes. For example, genes annotated to 783 GO terms were never disrupted in any genotype tested (Costanzo et al., 2010). Second, some biological processes are likely not required for the phenotype tested—growth of cells in rich media—but instead may drive a wide variety of other phenotypes (Dowell et al., 2010; Hillenmeyer et al., 2008; Ideker and Krogan, 2012; Lee et al., 2014). Third, important processes or components may not yet have been curated in the GO, and some existing terms might have errors in gene annotations or relations to other terms. Such false-positive and false-negative information could obscure a term’s utility in prediction. We expect that testing additional genotypes, phenotypes, and environmental conditions will increase the functional coverage of terms and enhance  $F_{GO}$  with new and more robust logic.

Complex traits arise from a landscape of genetic variants and mutations, in which it is often challenging to interpret the effects of individual genes because of many multi-gene interactions (Kim and Przytycka, 2012; Zuk et al., 2012). Toward meeting this challenge, we have shown that gene ontologies can be transformed into multi-scale models capable of general genotype-phenotype reasoning. Although based on simple rules of propagation, the model substantially outperforms previous methods for predicting cellular growth phenotypes, whether based on mechanistic modeling of pathways or “black-box” machine learning methods. It also generalizes in ways that previous predictors are incapable of doing, including the ability to analyze genotypes of arbitrary complexity. These advances are important steps toward building intelligent systems that can one day interpret the complex genetics underlying human health and disease.

In moving forward, special consideration should be given to the mathematical functions that govern each term state. Here,

we found success with a surprisingly straightforward and parameter-free function that counts the disrupted genes assigned to a term and its sub-terms. More generally, this function might be tailored to each term according to specific knowledge about the inner workings of that cellular component or process. Defining the mathematical relationships between genes within a cellular process has been the focus of “bottom-up” systems biology (Bruggeman and Westerhoff, 2007; Chen et al., 2010). In contrast, defining the broad organization of genes into cellular processes has been the domain of “top-down” systems biology. With its hierarchy of terms and functions spanning many different biological scales, a functionalized ontology may offer a means to bridge this long-standing divide.

## EXPERIMENTAL PROCEDURES

### Genetic Interaction Data

Experimental genetic interaction scores for >6 million double mutants in yeast, measured using synthetic genetic arrays (SGAs) (Costanzo et al., 2010) (1,711 queries  $\times$  3,885 arrays), were downloaded from <http://drygin.cabr.utoronto.ca/~costanzo2009/>. Double gene deletion mutants affecting DNA repair and the nuclear lumen were generated on solid agar media using SGA technology as previously described (Collins et al., 2010; Tong and Boone, 2006). See also [Supplemental Experimental Procedures](#).

### Preparation of Ontologies

We used all three branches of the GO (biological process, cellular component, and molecular function) by joining them under an artificial root. We removed annotations with the evidence code “inferred by genetic interaction” (IGI) to avoid potential circularity in predicting genetic interactions. We also removed terms that were not annotated with any yeast genes or were redundant with respect to their children terms to construct a gene ontology relevant to yeast (Table S4), following a previously described procedure (Dutkowski et al., 2013; <http://mhk7.github.io/alignOntology/>).

To construct NeXO (Table S5), we integrated the YeastNet v3 networks (Kim et al., 2014), spanning 68 experimental studies across eight data types excluding genetic interactions, into a single network, and then applied the method of Clique Extracted Ontology (Kramer et al., 2014; [http://mhk7.github.io/clixo\\_0.3/](http://mhk7.github.io/clixo_0.3/)). Code for constructing ontotypes is available at <https://github.com/michaelkyu/ontotype>. See also [Supplemental Experimental Procedures](#).

### Random Forests Regression

Random forests (Breiman, 2001) were used to regress genetic interaction scores  $\epsilon_{ab}$ , as described in Results. Because of the very large size of the ontology feature matrix, we optimized the random forests library from the Python scikit-learn package (Pedregosa et al., 2011); the modified code is available at <https://github.com/michaelkyu/scikit-learn-fasterRF>. Although trees grown at approximately 29% (GO) or 37% (NeXO) of the maximal depth did improve performance slightly (<0.02 gain in correlation; Figure S5), we chose to grow trees to maximal depth because it is unclear how significant this gain is and whether it would be reproducible in different random partitions of the data for cross-validation or in different genotype-phenotype datasets. See also [Supplemental Experimental Procedures](#).

### Comparison of Methods for Predicting Genetic Interactions

We updated the MNMC method because the original implementation (Pandey et al., 2010) was trained on a set of literature-curated synthetic lethal interactions that was much smaller in size than the set of genetic interactions considered in our study, and because the set of features used by the method to score each gene pair had been updated since the 2010 publication. To train MNMC, we calculated five base features that were identified in the original MNMC as among the most informative for predicting synthetic lethality of a gene pair. This updated MNMC outperformed the original MNMC (Figure S6); this performance difference may have been due to calculating more recent versions of the base features. See also [Supplemental Experimental Procedures](#).

## SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

Supplemental Information includes Supplemental Experimental Procedures, six figures, five tables, and six data files and can be found with this article online at <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.cels.2016.02.003>.

## AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

M.K.Y., J.D., M.K., R. Sharan, and T.I. designed the study and developed the conceptual ideas. M.K. constructed NeXO. M.K.Y. implemented all other computational methods and analysis. M.K.Y. and T.I. wrote the manuscript with input from the other authors. R. Srivas and K.L. performed the DNA repair and nuclear lumen interaction screens.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We gratefully acknowledge helpful discussion and comments from Hannes Braberg, Anne-Ruxandra Carvunis, Manolis Kellis, Benjamin Kellman, Jianzhu Ma, Jenhan Tao, Alex Thomas, members of the Ideker laboratory, and the anonymous referees. This work was funded by the National Institute of General Medical Sciences (P41-GM103504, P50-GM085764) and the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences (R01-ES014811). M.Y. received first-year support from the University of California, San Diego, Graduate Training Program in Bioinformatics (T32-GM008806). R. Sharan was supported by a research grant from the Israel Science Foundation (grant 241/11). M.K. was supported by the National Human Genome Research Institute (F30-HG007618) and the University of California, San Diego, Medical Scientist Training Program (T32-GM007198). R. Srivas is a Damon Runyon Fellow supported by the Damon Runyon Cancer Research Foundation (DRG-2187-14). J.D. is a co-founder, CEO, and shareholder of Data4Cure, Inc.

Received: September 18, 2015

Revised: December 17, 2015

Accepted: February 1, 2016

Published: February 24, 2016

## REFERENCES

- Apgar, J.F., Witmer, D.K., White, F.M., and Tidor, B. (2010). Sloppy models, parameter uncertainty, and the role of experimental design. *Mol. Biosyst.* 6, 1890–1900.
- Ashyraliyev, M., Fomekong-Nanfack, Y., Kaandorp, J.A., and Blom, J.G. (2009). Systems biology: parameter estimation for biochemical models. *FEBS J.* 276, 886–902.
- Balakrishnan, R., Harris, M.A., Huntley, R., Van Auken, K., and Cherry, J.M. (2013). A guide to best practices for Gene Ontology (GO) manual annotation. *Database (Oxford)* 2013, bat054.
- Bandyopadhyay, S., Kelley, R., Krogan, N.J., and Ideker, T. (2008). Functional maps of protein complexes from quantitative genetic interaction data. *PLoS Comput. Biol.* 4, e1000065.
- Baryshnikova, A., Costanzo, M., Kim, Y., Ding, H., Koh, J., Toufighi, K., Youn, J.Y., Ou, J., San Luis, B.J., Bandyopadhyay, S., et al. (2010). Quantitative analysis of fitness and genetic interactions in yeast on a genome scale. *Nat. Methods* 7, 1017–1024.
- Bellay, J., Atluri, G., Sing, T.L., Toufighi, K., Costanzo, M., Ribeiro, P.S.M., Pandey, G., Baller, J., VanderSluis, B., Michaut, M., et al. (2011). Putting genetic interactions in context through a global modular decomposition. *Genome Res.* 21, 1375–1387.
- Boucher, B., and Jenna, S. (2013). Genetic interaction networks: better understand to better predict. *Front. Genet.* 4, 290.
- Brachman, R.J., and Levesque, H.J. (2004). *Knowledge Representation and Reasoning* (San Francisco: Morgan Kaufmann).
- Breiman, L. (2001). Random forests. *Mach. Learn.* 45, 5–32.
- Bruggeman, F.J., and Westerhoff, H.V. (2007). The nature of systems biology. *Trends Microbiol.* 15, 45–50.

- Cahan, P., Li, H., Morris, S.A., Lummertz da Rocha, E., Daley, G.Q., and Collins, J.J. (2014). CellNet: network biology applied to stem cell engineering. *Cell* 158, 903–915.
- Califano, A., Butte, A.J., Friend, S., Ideker, T., and Schadt, E. (2012). Leveraging models of cell regulation and GWAS data in integrative network-based association studies. *Nat. Genet.* 44, 841–847.
- Carrera, J., Estrela, R., Luo, J., Rai, N., Tsoukalas, A., and Tagkopoulos, I. (2014). An integrative, multi-scale, genome-wide model reveals the phenotypic landscape of *Escherichia coli*. *Mol. Syst. Biol.* 10, 735.
- Carvunis, A.-R., and Ideker, T. (2014). Siri of the cell: what biology could learn from the iPhone. *Cell* 157, 534–538.
- Chen, W.W., Niepel, M., and Sorger, P.K. (2010). Classic and contemporary approaches to modeling biochemical reactions. *Genes Dev.* 24, 1861–1875.
- Cherry, J.M., Hong, E.L., Amundsen, C., Balakrishnan, R., Binkley, G., Chan, E.T., Christie, K.R., Costanzo, M.C., Dwight, S.S., Engel, S.R., et al. (2012). Saccharomyces Genome Database: the genomics resource of budding yeast. *Nucleic Acids Res.* 40, D700–D705.
- Collins, S.R., Roguev, A., and Krogan, N.J. (2010). Quantitative genetic interaction mapping using the E-MAP approach. *Methods Enzymol.* 470, 205–231.
- Costanzo, M., Baryshnikova, A., Bellay, J., Kim, Y., Spear, E.D., Sevier, C.S., Ding, H., Koh, J.L.Y., Toufighi, K., Mostafavi, S., et al. (2010). The genetic landscape of a cell. *Science* 327, 425–431.
- Deisboeck, T.S., Wang, Z., Macklin, P., and Cristini, V. (2011). Multiscale cancer modeling. *Annu. Rev. Biomed. Eng.* 13, 127–155.
- Deutscher, D., Meilijson, I., Kupiec, M., and Ruppin, E. (2006). Multiple knockout analysis of genetic robustness in the yeast metabolic network. *Nat. Genet.* 38, 993–998.
- Dowell, R.D., Ryan, O., Jansen, A., Cheung, D., Agarwala, S., Danford, T., Bernstein, D.A., Rolfe, P.A., Heisler, L.E., Chin, B., et al. (2010). Genotype to phenotype: a complex problem. *Science* 328, 469.
- Dutkowski, J., Kramer, M., Surma, M.A., Balakrishnan, R., Cherry, J.M., Krogan, N.J., and Ideker, T. (2013). A gene ontology inferred from molecular networks. *Nat. Biotechnol.* 31, 38–45.
- Eissing, T., Kuepfer, L., Becker, C., Block, M., Coboecken, K., Gaub, T., Goerlitz, L., Jaeger, J., Loosen, R., Ludewig, B., et al. (2011). A computational systems biology software platform for multiscale modeling and simulation: integrating whole-body physiology, disease biology, and molecular reaction networks. *Front. Physiol.* 2, 4.
- Formosa, T., Ruone, S., Adams, M.D., Olsen, A.E., Eriksson, P., Yu, Y., Rhoades, A.R., Kaufman, P.D., and Stillman, D.J. (2002). Defects in SPT16 or POB3 (yFACT) in *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* cause dependence on the Hir/Hpc pathway: polymerase passage may degrade chromatin structure. *Genetics* 162, 1557–1571.
- Gene Ontology Consortium (2015). Gene Ontology Consortium: going forward. *Nucleic Acids Res.* 43, D1049–D1056.
- Gillis, J., and Pavlidis, P. (2012). “Guilt by association” is the exception rather than the rule in gene networks. *PLoS Comput. Biol.* 8, e1002444.
- Glorigorjević, V., Janjić, V., and Pržulj, N. (2014). Integration of molecular network data reconstructs Gene Ontology. *Bioinformatics* 30, i594–i600.
- Greene, C.S., Krishnan, A., Wong, A.K., Ricciotti, E., Zelaya, R.A., Himmelstein, D.S., Zhang, R., Hartmann, B.M., Zaslavsky, E., Sealfon, S.C., et al. (2015). Understanding multicellular function and disease with human tissue-specific networks. *Nat. Genet.* 47, 569–576.
- Gutenkunst, R.N., Waterfall, J.J., Casey, F.P., Brown, K.S., Myers, C.R., and Sethna, J.P. (2007). Universally sloppy parameter sensitivities in systems biology models. *PLoS Comput. Biol.* 3, 1871–1878.
- Haber, J.E., Braberg, H., Wu, Q., Alexander, R., Haase, J., Ryan, C., Lipkin-Moore, Z., Franks-Skiba, K.E., Johnson, T., Shales, M., et al. (2013). Systematic triple-mutant analysis uncovers functional connectivity between pathways involved in chromosome regulation. *Cell Rep.* 3, 2168–2178.
- Hanahan, D., and Weinberg, R.A. (2011). Hallmarks of cancer: the next generation. *Cell* 144, 646–674.
- Hillenmeyer, M.E., Fung, E., Wildenhain, J., Pierce, S.E., Hoon, S., Lee, W., Proctor, M., St Onge, R.P., Tyers, M., Koller, D., et al. (2008). The chemical genomic portrait of yeast: uncovering a phenotype for all genes. *Science* 320, 362–365.
- Hofree, M., Shen, J.P., Carter, H., Gross, A., and Ideker, T. (2013). Network-based stratification of tumor mutations. *Nat. Methods* 10, 1108–1115.
- Huntley, R.P., Sawford, T., Martin, M.J., and O’Donovan, C. (2014). Understanding how and why the Gene Ontology and its annotations evolve: the GO within UniProt. *Gigascience* 3, 4.
- Ideker, T., and Krogan, N.J. (2012). Differential network biology. *Mol. Syst. Biol.* 8, 565.
- Karr, J.R., Sanghvi, J.C., Macklin, D.N., Gutschow, M.V., Jacobs, J.M., Bolival, B., Jr., Assad-Garcia, N., Glass, J.L., and Covert, M.W. (2012). A whole-cell computational model predicts phenotype from genotype. *Cell* 150, 389–401.
- Kelley, R., and Ideker, T. (2005). Systematic interpretation of genetic interactions using protein networks. *Nat. Biotechnol.* 23, 561–566.
- Kim, Y.-A., and Przytycka, T.M. (2012). Bridging the Gap between Genotype and Phenotype via Network Approaches. *Front. Genet.* 3, 227.
- Kim, H., Shin, J., Kim, E., Kim, H., Hwang, S., Shim, J.E., and Lee, I. (2014). YeastNet v3: a public database of data-specific and integrated functional gene networks for *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*. *Nucleic Acids Res.* 42, D731–D736.
- Kramer, M., Dutkowski, J., Yu, M., Bafna, V., and Ideker, T. (2014). Inferring gene ontologies from pairwise similarity data. *Bioinformatics* 30, i34–i42.
- Lee, I., Lehner, B., Vavouri, T., Shin, J., Fraser, A.G., and Marcotte, E.M. (2010). Predicting genetic modifier loci using functional gene networks. *Genome Res.* 20, 1143–1153.
- Lee, I., Blom, U.M., Wang, P.I., Shim, J.E., and Marcotte, E.M. (2011). Prioritizing candidate disease genes by network-based boosting of genome-wide association data. *Genome Res.* 21, 1109–1121.
- Lee, A.Y., Onge, R.P.S., Proctor, M.J., Wallace, I.M., Nile, A.H., Spagnuolo, P.A., Jitkova, Y., Gronda, M., Wu, Y., Kim, M.K., et al. (2014). Mapping the cellular response to small molecules using chemogenomic fitness signatures. *Science* 344, 208–211.
- Lehner, B. (2013). Genotype to phenotype: lessons from model organisms for human genetics. *Nat. Rev. Genet.* 14, 168–178.
- Leiserson, M.D.M., Tatar, D., Cowen, L.J., and Hescott, B.J. (2011). Inferring mechanisms of compensation from E-MAP and SGA data using local search algorithms for max cut. *J. Comput. Biol.* 18, 1399–1409.
- Leiserson, M.D.M., Vandin, F., Wu, H.-T., Dobson, J.R., Eldridge, J.V., Thomas, J.L., Papoutsaki, A., Kim, Y., Niu, B., McLellan, M., et al. (2014). Pan-cancer network analysis identifies combinations of rare somatic mutations across pathways and protein complexes. *Nat. Genet.* 47, 106–114.
- Lerman, J.A., Hyduke, D.R., Latif, H., Portnoy, V.A., Lewis, N.E., Orth, J.D., Schrimpe-Rutledge, A.C., Smith, R.D., Adkins, J.N., Zengler, K., and Palsson, B.O. (2012). In silico method for modelling metabolism and gene product expression at genome scale. *Nat. Commun.* 3, 929.
- Ma, X., Tarone, A.M., and Li, W. (2008). Mapping genetically compensatory pathways from synthetic lethal interactions in yeast. *PLoS One* 3, e1922.
- Machado, D., Costa, R.S., Rocha, M., Ferreira, E.C., Tidor, B., and Rocha, I. (2011). Modeling formalisms in Systems Biology. *AMB Express* 1, 45.
- Mackay, T.F.C. (2014). Epistasis and quantitative traits: using model organisms to study gene-gene interactions. *Nat. Rev. Genet.* 15, 22–33.
- Ng, S., Collis, E.A., Sokolov, A., Goldstein, T., Gonzalez-Perez, A., Lopez-Bigas, N., Benz, C., Haussler, D., and Stuart, J.M. (2012). PARADIGM-SHIFT predicts the function of mutations in multiple cancers using pathway impact analysis. *Bioinformatics* 28, i640–i646.
- O’Brien, E.J., Lerman, J.A., Chang, R.L., Hyduke, D.R., and Palsson, B.O. (2013). Genome-scale models of metabolism and gene expression extend and refine growth phenotype prediction. *Mol. Syst. Biol.* 9, 693.
- Orth, J.D., Thiele, I., and Palsson, B.O. (2010). What is flux balance analysis? *Nat. Biotechnol.* 28, 245–248.

- Pamblanco, M., Oliete-Calvo, P., García-Oliver, E., Luz Valero, M., Sanchez del Pino, M.M., and Rodríguez-Navarro, S. (2014). Unveiling novel interactions of histone chaperone Asf1 linked to TREX-2 factors Sus1 and Thp1. *Nucleus* *5*, 247–259.
- Pandey, G., Zhang, B., Chang, A.N., Myers, C.L., Zhu, J., Kumar, V., and Schadt, E.E. (2010). An integrative multi-network and multi-classifier approach to predict genetic interactions. *PLoS Comput. Biol.* *6*, 6.
- Park, Y., and Marcotte, E.M. (2012). Flaws in evaluation schemes for pair-input computational predictions. *Nat. Methods* *9*, 1134–1136.
- Pe'er, D., and Hacohen, N. (2011). Principles and strategies for developing network models in cancer. *Cell* *144*, 864–873.
- Pedregosa, F., Varoquaux, G., Gramfort, A., Michel, V., Thirion, B., Grisel, O., Blondel, M., Prettenhofer, P., Weiss, R., Dubourg, V., et al. (2011). Scikit-learn: machine learning in Python. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.* *12*, 2825–2830.
- Pesquita, C., Faria, D., Falcão, A.O., Lord, P., and Couto, F.M. (2009). Semantic similarity in biomedical ontologies. *PLoS Comput. Biol.* *5*, e1000443.
- Pratt, D., Chen, J., Welker, D., Rivas, R., Pillich, R., Rynkov, V., Ono, K., Miello, C., Hicks, L., Szalma, S., et al. (2015). NDEX, the Network Data Exchange. *Cell Syst.* *1*, 302–305.
- Qi, Y., Suhail, Y., Lin, Y.Y., Boeke, J.D., and Bader, J.S. (2008). Finding friends and enemies in an enemies-only network: a graph diffusion kernel for predicting novel genetic interactions and co-complex membership from yeast genetic interactions. *Genome Res.* *18*, 1991–2004.
- Ramanan, V.K., Shen, L., Moore, J.H., and Saykin, A.J. (2012). Pathway analysis of genomic data: concepts, methods, and prospects for future development. *Trends Genet.* *28*, 323–332.
- Resnik, P. (1995). Using information content to evaluate semantic similarity in a taxonomy. In *IJCAI '95: Proceedings of the 14th International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence* (San Francisco: Morgan Kaufmann), pp. 448–453.
- Schwabish, M.A., and Struhl, K. (2006). Asf1 mediates histone eviction and deposition during elongation by RNA polymerase II. *Mol. Cell* *22*, 415–422.
- Segrè, D., Deluna, A., Church, G.M., and Kishony, R. (2005). Modular epistasis in yeast metabolism. *Nat. Genet.* *37*, 77–83.
- Skaftidas, E., Testa, R., Zantomio, D., Chana, G., Everall, I.P., and Pantelis, C. (2014). Predicting the diagnosis of autism spectrum disorder using gene pathway analysis. *Mol. Psychiatry* *19*, 504–510.
- Sullivan, P.F. (2012). Puzzling over schizophrenia: schizophrenia as a pathway disease. *Nat. Med.* *18*, 210–211.
- Szappanos, B., Kovács, K., Szamecz, B., Honti, F., Costanzo, M., Baryshnikova, A., Gelius-Dietrich, G., Lercher, M.J., Jelasity, M., Myers, C.L., et al. (2011). An integrated approach to characterize genetic interaction networks in yeast metabolism. *Nat. Genet.* *43*, 656–662.
- Szczurek, E., Gat-Viks, I., Tiuryn, J., and Vingron, M. (2009). Elucidating regulatory mechanisms downstream of a signaling pathway using informative experiments. *Mol. Syst. Biol.* *5*, 287.
- Takahashi, K., Ishikawa, N., Sadamoto, Y., Sasamoto, H., Ohta, S., Shiozawa, A., Miyoshi, F., Naito, Y., Nakayama, Y., and Tomita, M. (2003). E-Cell 2: multi-platform E-Cell simulation system. *Bioinformatics* *19*, 1727–1729.
- Tomita, M., Hashimoto, K., Takahashi, K., Shimizu, T.S., Matsuzaki, Y., Miyoshi, F., Saito, K., Tanida, S., Yugi, K., Venter, J.C., and Hutchison, C.A., 3rd (1999). E-CELL: software environment for whole-cell simulation. *Bioinformatics* *15*, 72–84.
- Tong, A.H.Y., and Boone, C. (2006). Synthetic genetic array analysis in *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*. *Methods Mol. Biol.* *313*, 171–192.
- Ulitsky, I., Shlomi, T., Kupiec, M., and Shamir, R. (2008). From E-MAPs to module maps: dissecting quantitative genetic interactions using physical interactions. *Mol. Syst. Biol.* *4*, 209.
- Waddington, C.H. (1942). Canalization of development and the inheritance of acquired characters. *Nature* *150*, 563–565.
- Walpole, J., Papin, J.A., and Peirce, S.M. (2013). Multiscale computational models of complex biological systems. *Annu. Rev. Biomed. Eng.* *15*, 137–154.
- Wang, K., Li, M., and Hakonarson, H. (2010). Analysing biological pathways in genome-wide association studies. *Nat. Rev. Genet.* *11*, 843–854.
- Willsey, A.J., Sanders, S.J., Li, M., Dong, S., Tebbenkamp, A.T., Muhle, R.A., Reilly, S.K., Lin, L., Fertuzinhos, S., Miller, J.A., et al. (2013). Coexpression networks implicate human midfetal deep cortical projection neurons in the pathogenesis of autism. *Cell* *155*, 997–1007.
- Zuk, O., Hechter, E., Sunyaev, S.R., and Lander, E.S. (2012). The mystery of missing heritability: Genetic interactions create phantom heritability. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U S A* *109*, 1193–1198.