## Comp 555 - BioAlgorithms - Spring 2021

- WE'VE DISCUSSED SEQUENCINC DNA, BUT THERE'S ANOTHER SEQUENCE IN TOWN
- TO RECONSTRUCT IT, WE MUST FIRST BREAK IT INTO PIECES


Determining a Peptide's Sequence

## Molecular Weights are the Puzzle Peices

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \underset{99}{V}-\underset{128}{K}-\underset{113}{L}-\underset{147}{F}-\underset{97}{P}-\underset{188}{W}-\underset{147}{F}-\underset{114}{N}-\underset{128}{Q}-\underset{163}{Y} \\
& \underset{99}{V}-\underset{128}{K}-\underset{113}{L}-\underset{147}{\mathrm{~F}_{14}}-\underset{97}{P}-\underset{186}{\mathrm{P}}-\underset{147}{\mathrm{~F}_{1}}-\underset{114}{\mathrm{~N}}-\underset{128}{\mathrm{Q}}-\underset{163}{\mathrm{Y}}
\end{aligned}
$$



1322 known molecular weight


## Structure of a Peptide Chain

- Peptides are chains of amino acids that are joined by peptide bonds
- These bonds reduce the weight of each amino acid by one $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ molecule
- The result is called a residue
- A Mass Spectrograph can precisely measure the molecular weight (and charge and abundance) of any peptide chain
- Since the molecular weight of each of the possible 20 residues is known precisely, one can ask the question, which combination of residues would give a particular weight?
- The problem is ambiguous for the entire molecule
- Consider all permutations of 'PIT':

```
'PIT', 'PTI', 'ITP', 'IPT', 'TPI', and 'TIP' all weigh the same
```

- But they differ in their 2-peptide fragments:

```
'PIT' breaks into 'PI' and 'IT',
while 'PTI' breaks into 'PT' and 'TI'
```

- However, 'TIP' breaks into fragments 'TI' and 'IP', which have the same weights as 'PI' and 'TI' respectively. Thus, we can't tell 'PIT' from 'TIP'


## An Simplified Peptide Weight table

- The actual molecular weight of an amino acid is a real number.

This accounts for the relative abundances of atomic isotopes

- Today, we will use a simplified version that assumes only integer molecular weights

Example:
Molecular weight of Glycine Amino Acid

$$
\mathrm{W}\left(\mathrm{C}_{2} \mathrm{H}_{5} \mathrm{NO}_{2}\right)=12 \times 2+5 \times 1+14+16 \times 2=75
$$

Molecular weight of Glycine Residue (Minus the $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ lost forming the peptide bond)

$$
\mathrm{W}\left(\mathrm{C}_{2} \mathrm{H}_{5} \mathrm{NO}_{2}-\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}\right)=57
$$

- We can repeat this for all 20 Amino Acids to get a integer molecular weight table, which I name Daltons


## Table Definitions

In [1]: AminoAcid = \{
'A': 'Alanine', 'C': 'Cysteine', 'D': 'Aspartic acid', 'E': 'Glutamic acid',
'F': 'Phenylalanine', 'G': 'Glycine', 'H': 'Histidine', 'I': 'Isoleucine',
'K': 'Lysine', 'L': 'Leucine', 'M': 'Methionine', 'N': 'Asparagine',
'P': 'Proline', 'Q': 'Glutamine', 'R': 'Arginine', 'S': 'Serine',
'T': 'Theronine', 'V': 'Valine', 'W': 'Tryptophan', 'Y': 'Tyrosine',
'*': 'STOP'
\}
AminoAbbrv = \{
'A': 'Ala', 'C': 'Cys', 'D': 'Asp', 'E': 'Glu',
'F': 'Phe', 'G': 'Gly', 'H': 'His', 'I': 'Ile',
'K': 'Lys', 'L': 'Leu', 'M': 'Met', 'N': 'Asn',
'P': 'Pro', 'Q': 'Gln', 'R': 'Arg', 'S': 'Ser'
'T': 'Thr', 'V': 'Val', 'W': 'Trp', 'Y': 'Tyr'
'*': 'STP'
\}
\# Here's a new dictionary!
Daltons = \{
'A': 71, 'C': 103, 'D': 115, 'E': 129,
'F': 147, 'G': 57, 'H': 137, 'I': 113,
'K': 128, 'L': 113, 'M': 131, 'N': 114,
'P': 97, 'Q': 128, 'R': 156, 'S': 87,
'T': 101, 'V': 99, 'W': 186, 'Y': 163
\}

In [4]: averageMW = sum(Daltons.values())/20.0
typicalLen = 1322/int(averageMW)
print(averageMW, typicalLen, 20**typicalLen)
118.7511 .203389830508474376657155762813 .56

## Some Issues with our Table

- We can't distinguish between Leucine ( L ) and Isoleucine (I). They both weight 113d
- Nor can we distinguish Lysine (K) and Glutamine (Q), which weigh 128d
- For long peptide chains $>50$, our errors can build up
- In reality, peptides can lose or gain one or more small molecules from their side chains and fractured peptide bonds
- Gain Hydrogen ions (H, +1 Dalton)
- Lose Water (H2O, -18 Daltons)
- Lose Ammonia (NH3,-17 Daltons)
- This leads to measurements that vary around the ideal sums we assume
- Regardless of these caveats, let's keep going



## The total molecular weight of our target

In [5]: TyrocidineB1 = "VKLFPWFNQY"
\# The weight of Tyrocidine B1
print(sum([Daltons[res] for res in TyrocidineB1]))
1322

- Generally, we will assume that the peptide's total molecular weight is known
- We will use it as a terminating condition for many of our algorithms that attempt to reconstruct the peptide sequence from a measured set of weights


## What weights should we expect?

- We will make the optimistic assumption that we will fracture our given peptide chain into all of its constituent parts
- For a 10 peptide chain

| 10 single peptides | 9, 2-peptide chains | 8, 3-peptide chains |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 7, 4-peptide chains | 6,5-peptide chains | 5, 6-peptide chains |
| 4,7-peptide chains | 3,8-peptide chains | 2, 9-peptide chains |
| 1,10-peptide chain |  |  |

- This gives an upper bound of $\binom{11}{2}=55$ molecular weights
- In reality both the peptide chains and their weights may not be unique
- The collection of all possible sub-peptide molecular weights from a peptide is called the peptide's Theoretical Spectrum


## Code for computing a Theoretical Spectrum

In [7]: def TheoreticalSpectrum(peptide):
\# Generate every possible fragment of a peptide
spectrum $=$ set()
for fragLength in range(1,len(peptide)+1):
for start in range(0,len(peptide)-fragLength+1):
seq $=$ peptide[start:start+fragLength]
spectrum.add(sum([Daltons[res] for res in seq]))
return sorted(spectrum)
print(TyrocidineB1)
spectrum = TheoreticalSpectrum(TyrocidineB1)
print(len(spectrum))
print(spectrum)

## VKLFPWFNQY

51
[97, 99, 113, 114, 128, 147, 163, 186, 227, 241, 242, 244, 260, 261, 283, 291, 333, 340, 357, 388, 389, 405, 430, 44
$7,485,487,543,544,552,575,577,584,671,672,690,691,738,770,804,818,819,835,917,932,982,1031,106$
$0,1095,1159,1223,1322]$

- Notice there are distinct 51 weights, how many would you expect?


## Fragments and their Spectrums

```
In [11]: peptide = TyrocidineB1
fragList = []
for fragLength in range(1,len(peptide)+1):
    for start in range(0,len(peptide)-fragLength+1):
        seq = peptide[start:start+fragLength]
        fragList.append((sum([Daltons[res] for res in seq]), seq))
print(peptide)
print(len(fragList))
N = 0
lastWeight = 0
for weight, frag in sorted(fragList):
print("%12s: %4d%s" % (frag, weight, "*" if (weight == lastWeight) else " "), end='')
N += 1
if (N % 5 == 0)
    print()
    lastWeight = weight
```

```
VKLFPWFNQY
```

55

| P: | 97 | $\mathrm{~V}:$ | 99 |
| ---: | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Q: | $128^{*}$ | $\mathrm{~F}:$ | 147 |
| VK: | 227 | $\mathrm{KL}:$ | 241 |
| FN: | 261 | $\mathrm{PW}:$ | 283 |
| LFP: | 357 | KLF: | 388 |
| PWF: | $430^{*}$ | WFN: | 447 |
| PWFN: | 544 | FNQY: | 552 |
| KLFPW: | 671 | PWFNQ: | 672 |
| VKLFPW: | 770 | LFPWFN: | 804 |
| VKLFPWF: | 917 | KLFPWFN: | 932 |
| KLFPWFNQ: | 1060 | LFPWFNQY: 1095 |  |


| L: | 113 |
| ---: | :--- |
| F: | $147 *$ |
| NQ: | 242 |
| QY: | 291 |
| FNQ: | 389 |
| KLFP: | 485 |
| WFNQ: | 575 |
| LFPWF: | 690 |
| KLFPWF: | 818 |
| LFPWFNQ: | $932^{*}$ |
| VKLFPWFNQ: | 1159 |


| N: | 114 | K: | 128 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Y: | 163 | W: | 186 |
| FP: | 244 | LF: | 260 |
| WF: | 333 | VKL: | 340 |
| NQY: | 405 | FPW: | 430 |
| VKLF: | 487 | LFPW: | 543 |
| FPWF: | 577 | VKLFP: | 584 |
| FPWFN: | 691 | WFNQY: | 738 |
| FPWFNQ: | 819 | PWFNQY: | 835 |
| KPWFNQY: | 982 | VKLFPWFN: | 1031 |
| KLFPWFNQY: | 1223 | VKLFPWFNQY: | 1322 |

## What a Mass Spectrum looks like

- Peaks appear at frequently occurring mass locations
- $\quad$ Y-axis indicates the relative abundance, sometimes called relative intensity
- The peaks roughly correspond To our mass numbers
[97, 99, 113, 114, 128, 147, 163, 186, 227, 241, 242, 244, 260, 261, 283, 291, 333, 340, 357, 388, 389, 405, 430, 447, 485, 487, 543, 544, $552,575,577,584,671,672,690$, 691, 738, 770, 804, 818, 819, 835, 917, 932, 982, 1031, 1060, 1095, $1159,1223,1322$ ]



## Let's try a smaller example

```
In [13]: peptide = 'PLAY'
    spectrum = TheoreticalSpectrum(peptide)
print(len(spectrum), spectrum)
fragList = []
for fragLength in range(1,len(peptide)+1):
    for start in range(0,len(peptide)-fragLength+1):
        seq = peptide[start:start+fragLength]
        fragList.append((sum([Daltons[res] for res in seq]), seq))
print(len(fragList))
N = 0
lastWeight = 0
for weight, frag in sorted(fragList):
    print("%12s: %4d%s" % (frag, weight, "*" if (weight == lastWeight) else " "), end='')
    N += 1
    if (N % 5 == 0):
        print()
    lastWeight = weight
10 [71, 97, 113, 163, 184, 210, 234, 281, 347, 444]
10
\begin{tabular}{rrrrrrrr} 
A: & 71 & \(\mathrm{P}:\) & 97 & \(\mathrm{~L}:\) & 113 & \(\mathrm{Y}:\) & 163 \\
\(\mathrm{PL}:\) & 210 & AY: & 234 & PLA: & 281 & LAY: & 347
\end{tabular}
```


## Can we Invert the Process of creating a Spectrum?

- In essence, the problem of inferring a peptide chain from the set of mass values reported by a Mass Spectrometer is the inverse of the code we just wrote

Easy Problem: Peptide Sequence $\rightarrow$ Spectrum
Hard Problem: Spectrum $\rightarrow$ Peptide Sequence

- Why is computing a spectrum from a peptide sequence easy? $\mathrm{O}\left(\mathrm{N}^{2}\right)$ ?
- Why is computing a peptide sequence from a spectrum hard? $\mathrm{O}(?)$



## How might you approach this problem?

- Can you think of a Brute-Force way of solving this problem?
- Here's one:

1. For every peptide sequence with the target peptide's molecular weight
2. Compute the sequence's Theoretical Spectrum
3. If it matches the one given, report this peptide as a possible solution

- Which step in this algorithm is the hard part?
- How many peptides have a molecular weight of 1322 ?

1. How long is the longest peptide under 1322 daltons?
2. How short is the shortest peptide over 1322 daltons?


## A Brute-Force Attempt

```
In [16]: def PossiblePeptide(spectrum, prefix=''):
    """ Brute force method of generating all peptide sequences with a desired weight, the max of a given spectrum """
    global peptideList
    if (len(prefix) == 0):
        peptideList = []
    current = sum([Daltons[res] for res in prefix])
    target = max(spectrum) # our target
    if (current == target):
        peptideList.append(prefix)
    elif (current < target):
        for residue in Daltons.keys():
            PossiblePeptide(spectrum, prefix+residue)
def TestPeptides(candidateList, target):
    filteredList = []
    for peptide in candidateList:
        candidateSpectrum = TheoreticalSpectrum(peptide)
        if (candidateSpectrum == target)
            filteredList.append(peptide)
    return filteredList
spectrum = TheoreticalSpectrum('PLAY')
%time PossiblePeptide(spectrum)
print(len(peptideList), "candidates", "PLAY" in peptideList)
%time matches = TestPeptides(peptideList, spectrum)
print(matches, "PLAY" in matches)
```

CPU times: user 3.84 s , sys: 13 ms , total: 3.85 s
Wall time: 3.85 s
3687 candidates True
CPU times: user 80 ms , sys: 0 ns , total: 80 ms
Wall time: 79.8 ms
['PIAY', 'PLAY', 'YAIP', 'YALP'] True

## Impressions?

- Not so bad for a first attempt, but how will it perform for longer peptides?
- We are getting the expected answer as well as answers with the indistinguishable amino acids substituted
- We are also getting the sequence reversed? Is this a surprise?
- We could code around this, but for today we'll just include the reversed peptide chain as a possible answer


## Could we do better?

- The brute force method does not make good use of the spectrum it is given
- It only ever considers the largest mass value from this table
- How might we make use of the other values?


## Improving on Brute Force

- We could extend our prefix using only residues that appear in our spectrum
- The weight of every new prefix that we consider should also be in our spectrum

Actual fragments: P, L, A, Y, PL, LA, AY, PLA, LAY, PLAY

| A | I | L | P | Y |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{AI}=\mathrm{LA}$ | $\mathrm{IA}=\mathrm{LA}$ | $L A=L A$ | $\mathrm{PI}=\mathrm{PL}$ | $Y A=A Y$ |
| AIP = PLA | IAP $=$ PLA | LAP = PLA | PIA $=~ P L A$ | YAI $=$ LAY |
| AIPY = PLAY | IAPY = PLAY | LAPY = PLAY | PIAY $=$ PLAY | YAIP = PLAY |
| AIY $=$ LAY | IAY $=$ LAY | LAY = LAY |  | YAL $=$ LAY |
| AIYP = PLAY | IAYP = PLAY | LAYP = PLAY |  | YALP = PLAY |
| $\mathrm{AL}=\mathrm{LA}$ | $\mathrm{IP}=\mathrm{PL}$ | $\mathrm{LP}=\mathrm{PL}$ | $\mathrm{PL}=\mathrm{PL}$ |  |
| ALP $=$ PLA | IPA $=$ PLA | LPA = PLA | PLA $=$ PLA |  |
| ALPY = PLAY | IPAY $=$ PLAY | LPAY = PLAY | PLAY $=$ PLAY |  |
| ALY $=$ LAY |  |  |  |  |
| ALYP = PLAY |  |  |  |  |
| $A Y=A Y$ |  |  |  |  |
| AYI $=$ LAY |  |  |  |  |
| AYIP = PLAY |  |  |  |  |
| AYL $=$ LAY |  |  |  |  |
| AYLP = PLAY |  |  |  |  |

## Only a small change

In [19]: def ImprovedPossiblePeptide(spectrum, prefix=''):
global peptideList
if (len(prefix) $==0$ ):
peptideList = []
current $=$ sum([Daltons[res] for res in prefix])
target $=\max ($ spectrum $)$
if (current == target):
peptideList.append(prefix)
elif (current < target):
for residue in Daltons.keys():
\# make sure that this residue appears in our spectrum
if (Daltons[residue] not in spectrum):
continue
\# make sure that adding this residue to the sequence we have so far appears in our spectrum
extend = prefix + residue
if (sum([Daltons[res] for res in extend]) not in spectrum):
continue
ImprovedPossiblePeptide(spectrum, extend)
spectrum = TheoreticalSpectrum('PLAY')
\%time ImprovedPossiblePeptide(spectrum)
print(len(peptideList), "PLAY" in peptideList)
print (peptideList)
\%time matches = TestPeptides(peptideList, spectrum)
print(matches, "PLAY" in matches)
CPU times: user 1 ms , sys: 0 ns , total: 1 ms
Wall time: $708 \mu \mathrm{~s}$
16 True
['AIPY', 'AIYP', 'ALPY', 'ALYP', 'AYIP', 'AYLP', 'IAPY', 'IAYP', 'IPAY', 'LAPY', 'LAYP', 'LPAY', 'PIAY', 'PLAY', 'YAI
$P^{\prime}, \quad$ 'YALP']
CPU times: user 1 ms , sys: 0 ns , total: 1 ms
Wall time: $537 \mu \mathrm{~s}$
['PIAY', 'PLAY', 'YAIP', 'YALP'] True

## Impact of a small change

- Provides a HUGE performace difference
- Yet another example of Branch-and-Bound
- We improved both the enumeration and verification phases, but the difference was much more significant in the enumeration step

In [17]: print(', '.join([peptide for peptide in peptideList])) print(TheoreticalSpectrum('PLAY')) print(TheoreticalSpectrum('LAPY'))

AIPY, AIYP, ALPY, ALYP, AYIP, AYLP, IAPY, IAYP, IPAY, LAPY, LAYP, LPAY, PIAY, PLAY, YAIP, YALP
[71, 97, 113, 163, 184, 210, 234, 281, 347, 444] [71, 97, 113, 163, 168, 184, 260, 281, 331, 444]

In [18]: print(sum([Daltons[res] for res in 'AP'])) \# Suffix of 'LAP' prefix print(sum([Daltons[res] for res in 'APY'])) \# Suffix of 'LAPY' print(sum([Daltons[res] for res in 'PY'])) \# Suffix of 'LAPY'

168
331
260

- There are still differences in the spectrums, yet every prefix was in the spectrum when we added it. What are we missing?
- Suffixes!


## We can do Even Better

## All suffixes of each prefix that we consider should also be in our spectrum

```
In [21]: def UltimatePossiblePeptide(spectrum, prefix='')
    lobal peptideList
        if (len(prefix) == 0):
            peptideList = []
        current = sum([Daltons[res] for res in prefix])
    target = max(spectrum)
    if (current == target)
        peptideList.append(prefix)
    elif (current < target)
        for residue in Daltons.keys():
            extend = prefix + residue
            # test every new suffix created by adding this new reside
            # Note: this includes the residue itself as the length 1 suffix
            suffix = [extend[i:] for i in range(len(extend))]
            for fragment in suffix
                    if (sum([Daltons[res] for res in fragment]) not in spectrum):
                break
                else:
                    UltimatePossiblePeptide(spectrum, extend)
```

    spectrum = TheoreticalSpectrum('PLAY')
    \%time UltimatePossiblePeptide(spectrum)
    print(len(peptideList), peptideList, "PLAY" in peptideList)
    \%time matches = TestPeptides(peptideList, spectrum)
    print(matches, "PLAY" in matches)
    CPU times: user 1.1 ms , sys: \(4 \mu \mathrm{~s}\), total: 1.11 ms
    Wall time: 1.12 ms
    4 ['PIAY', 'PLAY', 'YAIP', 'YALP'] True
    CPU times': user \(113 \mu \mathrm{~s}\), sys: 0 ns, total: \(113 \mu \mathrm{~s}\)
    wall time: \(123 \mu \mathrm{~s}\)
    ['PIAY', 'PLAY', 'YAIP', 'YALP'] True
    - A little slower, but our list is pruned significantly
- All of theses have identical spectrums


## Now let's return to our Real peptide

```
In [23]: spectrum = TheoreticalSpectrum(TyrocidineB1)
%time UltimatePossiblePeptide(spectrum)
print(len(peptideList))
print(TyrocidineB1 in peptideList)
%time matches = TestPeptides(peptideList, spectrum)
print(len(matches))
print(TyrocidineB1 in matches)
CPU times: user 31.4 ms, sys: 2.2 ms, total: 33.6 ms
Wall time: 31.5 ms
['VKIFPWFNKY', 'VKIFPWFNQY', 'VKLFPWFNKY', 'VKLFPWFNQY', 'VQIFPWFNKY', 'VQIFPWFNQY', 'VQLFPWFNKY', 'VQLFPWFNQY', 'YKN
FWPFIKV', 'YKNFWPFIQV', 'YKNFWPFLKV', 'YKNFWPFLQV', 'YQNFWPFIKV', 'YQNFWPFIQV', 'YQNFWPFLKV', 'YQNFWPFLQV']
1 6
True
CPU times: user 1.11 ms, sys: 6 \mus, total: 1.12 ms
Wall time: 1.13 ms
16
True
In [24]: print(TyrocidineB1)
for i, peptide in enumerate(peptideList):
    print(peptide, end=',')
    if (i % 4 == 3)
        print()
```


## VKLFPWFNQY

VKIFPWFNKY, VKIFPWFNQY, VKLFPWFNKY, VKLFPWFNQY, VQIFPWFNKY, VQIFPWFNQY, VQLFPWFNKY, VQLFPWFNQY, YKNFWPFIKV, YKNFWPFIQV, YKNFWPFLKV, YKNFWPFLQV, YQNFWPFIKV, YQNFWPFIQV, YQNFWPFLKV, YQNFWPFLQV,

## Great, but our assumptions are a little Naïve

- In reality, Mass Spectometers don't report the Theoretical Spectrum of a peptide
- Instead they report a measured or Experimental Spectrum
- This spectrum might miss some fragments
- It might also report false fragments
- From Contaminants
- New peptides formed by unintended reactions between fragments
- The result is that some of the masses that appear may be misleading, and some that we want might be missing
- We need to develop algorithms for reporting candidate protein sequences that are robust to noise


## MORE NEXT TIME

