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1. Introduction

The understanding of interactions among proteins is an essential domain of research in systems biology, with applications in protein engineering and drug design. Proteins are bio-polymers that consist of chains of amino acid residues. Proteins play fundamental roles in cellular functions. For example, approximately, 50% of the cell dry weight of the human body is protein [2]. An amino acid is a small molecule that consists of an amine (NH2) and carboxyl (COOH) functional groups with an organic substituent, called the R-group which determines the unique characteristics of each amino acid. A peptide is short linear chain of an amino acid sequence which contains two or more amino acids linked by peptide bonds. Polypeptides consist of a series of amino acid units and residues linked by peptide bonds [3]. A protein is a biological macromolecule composed of one or more polypeptides. Consequently, the building blocks of both peptide and protein molecules are amino acids, and thereby peptides can be exploited as a secondary structure of proteins to modulate protein-protein interactions [4] [5] [6].
However, the empirical determination of PPIs is not amendable, and thereby, to increase the understanding of PPIs, computational methods such as classification, regression and feature selection can be used.

Feature selection can be described as the process of identifying most relevant features or eliminating redundant ones according to a certain criteria [7]. Based on the availability of the target variables, feature selection can mainly be divided into two different categories: supervised and unsupervised feature selection. Supervised methods tend to identify relevant features as well as noisy variables whereas unsupervised methods do not tend to identify features that can act as noise [8] [9]. In this study, therefore, unsupervised feature selection methods are used to predict binding affinity values for peptides using amino acid descriptors. Amino acid descriptors quantitatively describe the physicochemical properties of the peptides [10]. Affinity refers to the strength of binding. The difficulty of the peptide binding affinity prediction problems when building a prediction model is that the number of features is very large (in this study, around 5000) whereas the number of peptides in the training dataset is relatively small (in this study <150).

This paper presents a comparative analysis of six different USFSMs along with the entire feature set. The USFSMs are Laplacian Score for Feature Selection (LSFS) [11], Spectral Feature Selection (SPFS), [12], Embedded Unsupervised Feature Selection (EUFS) [13], Infinite Feature Selection (InFS) [14] and our K-means based feature selection (KBFS) method. In order to evaluate the robustness of USFSMs, support vector regression (SVR) method is utilised since SVR has proven its effectiveness by providing better generalisation and performance in wide range of bioinformatics applications [9] [15]. The prediction results of predictive models are calculated and averaged with five-fold cross validation method. Therefore, four out of five samples are used for training and the rest of the samples are utilised for testing purposes. The five-fold cross-validation is repeated 200 times in order to gain more unbiased results. Then, the mean performance and its corresponding standard deviation (std) values are obtained for each of the predictive models.

2. Methods and Material

2.1. The Dataset

In this study, three different high-dimensional peptide data sets provided at the Comparative Evaluation of Prediction Algorithms CoEPrA modelling competition [16] are used in order to further improve the predictivity of the affinity of peptides and, in particular, to test the predictive capability of the proposed KBFS framework for the given data sets. Each data set contains training
and test data sets and physicochemical descriptors have been provided for each small peptide for both training and test data sets. Each amino acid in a peptide is described by 643 descriptors. Tasks 1 and 3 contain nona-peptides that have a total of 5787 descriptors (=643x9) whereas Task 2 consists of octa-peptides that are characterised using a total of 5144 descriptors (=643x8). The characteristics of the peptide binding affinity data sets are given in Table 1.

Table 1: General Characteristics of the CoEPrA Data sets Used for the Prediction of Peptide Binding Affinity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Datasets</th>
<th>Number of Peptide Sequences</th>
<th>Number of Peptide Sequence Descriptors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training</td>
<td>Testing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 1</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 2</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 3</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2. Feature Selection Methods

In addition to the baseline, six different feature selection methods are utilised in order to predict peptide binding affinity values. We first present our proposed framework the other USFSMs will briefly be explained.

2.2.1. K Means Based Feature Selection (KBFS)

The proposed K-means based unsupervised feature selection framework, KBFS, begins by transposing the data so that features become instances and samples become features. Then, the data is divided into k-clusters where k is a user defined integer. The K-means algorithm ranks features based on their distances to centroids, and it generally utilises Euclidean or squared Euclidean distance measure. In KBFS, the centroids are identified via the K-means algorithm, however, instead of using one centroid points, three centroid points are utilised in the final stage. The distances of all features to the all centroids are calculated and the closest two features to a centroid are selected as other centroids. In other words, three centre points are identified based on their distance to the centre of each cluster. Then, in order to calculate the distances among features and centroids, the most commonly used metric, which is euclidean distance, is utilised. Euclidean distance can be calculated by:
where \( x_i \) is a set of features to be partitioned to \( K \) clusters and \( C_j \) are the centroid points.

Normalisation is the process of scaling the inputs so that the values of inputs lie between set limits. This enables numerical calculations to be performed rapidly and easily [18]. Therefore, the proposed feature selection framework starts by normalising the raw data set. Normalisation of the input features can be achieved by:

\[
x' = a + \frac{(x - x_{\text{min}}) \times (b - a)}{(x_{\text{max}} - x_{\text{min}})}
\]

where \( x \) is the original value of the input, and \( x' \) is normalised value. The \( a \) and \( b \) are the arbitrary points which present the limits of the values. In this study, input data is normalised into the range \([0, 1]\) (\(a=0\) and \(b=1\)).

In KBFS, three centroid points are exploited for each cluster and features are ranked based on their absolute distance values to those centroids. A feature with the lowest distance to the any of three centroid points in a cluster is considered as the most important one. In KBFS, distance measure is calculated by:
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\[ J_{i1} = \sum_{j=1}^{K} \sum_{i=1}^{n} ||x_i - C_{j1}||^2 \]

\[ J_{i2} = \sum_{j=1}^{K} \sum_{i=1}^{n} ||x_i - C_{j2}||^2 \]

\[ J_{i3} = \sum_{j=1}^{K} \sum_{i=1}^{n} ||x_i - C_{j3}||^2 \]

The weight of a feature is then calculated by:

\[ WX_i = \frac{1}{\min(J_{i1}, J_{i2}, J_{i3})} \]

The purposes of identifying three centre points are minimising the randomisation error, dealing with outliers and getting a handle on upcoming features. In K-means algorithm, the distances between two features is not influenced by upcoming features [19]. On the other hand, in KBFS, ranking error for upcoming features is minimised since three centroids are used to calculate feature weights. In KBFS, even though euclidean distance measure is utilised, at the final stage, a feature can be considered to belong to another cluster according to its distance measure to the centroids.

As mentioned above, the K-means method randomly initialises the centroids and this might profoundly affect the clustering results. Therefore, the process of KBFS is repeated 100 times to minimise the randomisation error. At the end, the mean of the distances between the centroids and the features are calculated in order to rank features. Therefore,

\[ \frac{1}{WX_i} = \frac{1}{p} \sum_{t=1}^{p} \min(\sum_{j=1}^{K} \sum_{i=1}^{n} ||x_i - C_{j1}||^2, \sum_{j=1}^{K} \sum_{i=1}^{n} ||x_i - C_{j2}||^2, \sum_{j=1}^{K} \sum_{i=1}^{n} ||x_i - C_{j3}||^2) \]

where \( p = 1, 2, \ldots, 100 \), C represents clusters, \( x_is \) are features where \( i = 1, 2, \ldots, n \), K is the number of clusters, \( WX_i \) is the weight of \( i - th \) feature, and \( C_j{\text{s}} \) are centroids.

A complete flowchart of the proposed unsupervised feature selection frame-work is presented in Figure 1. As mentioned above, the proposed framework begins by normalising the input data so that the values of the input data stay between set limits. Then, the input data is transposed so
that features become samples and samples become variables. The transposition of data enables the predictive model to cluster features rather than instances and to use the features as part of the feature selection process. Therefore, feature-feature dissimilarities are revealed. Then, the transposed data is used by KBFS method to determine the weights of each feature, and features are ranked based on their weights. The ranked features are then forwarded to the regression model, which uses SVR to generate a model and exploits evaluation metrics to evaluate the performance of the predictive model. Finally, prediction results are generated as the final output of the proposed framework.

The pseudo code of KBFS unsupervised feature selection algorithm is shown below:

Input: dxn data matrix A(d features n samples), number of clusters (K), for i=1:100 Randomly initialise centroids Generate K cluster centroids randomly within the range of the data or select K objects randomly as initial cluster centroids. Let the centroids be C1, C2,…,CK Compute distance of all features to these initial centroids Identify 2 more centroids (features) which are closest to initial centroids Calculate the distance measure by exploiting Equation 3 Calculate the weight of features by using Equation 4 Calculate the final weights of the features by Equation 5 end Calculate the mean of the final weights of features to decide their weights. Output: The cluster indices of each point, the distance of each feature to each centroid, the final weights of each feature.
The advantages and disadvantages of the proposed unsupervised feature selection framework are listed below. The advantages are that:

• The framework is also capable of dealing with upcoming features since it utilises three centroid points including features.
• The proposed method can better deal with outliers than the K-means method since it exploits three centroids, rather than utilising only one centroid which is even not a feature
• By applying the normalisation process as a initial step of clustering, the proposed framework performs numerical calculations rapidly and easily, therefore, the proposed method is computationally fast.
• Since the clustering is repeated 100 hundred times, the proposed method produces more robust and reliable results than the K-means method.

Disadvantages:

• Since the proposed framework repeats clustering algorithm 100 times, it might be slower than K-Means algorithm.
• The number of clusters, K, is user defined and different numbers of clusters might produce different results.
2.2.2. Multi-Cluster Feature Selection (MCFS)

Multi-Cluster Feature Selection (MCFS) [20] is an unsupervised and embedded feature selection algorithm that selects a set of features by utilising spectral regression and l1 norm regularisation. The correlation between features are evaluated using spectral analysis. MCFS consists of three main steps. First step is spectral clustering that is utilised to disclose cluster structure of the input data. Second step is sparse coefficient learning, and the final step is feature selection. MCFS exploits the eigen vectors of the graph Laplacian to appropriately cluster samples in an unsupervised manner.

2.2.3. KCEN

KCEN [9] is a K-means clustering based unsupervised feature selection method where the number of clusters equals the number of selected features. Given a data set $X = x_1, \ldots, x_j, \ldots, x_n$ in which $x_j = (x_{j1}, \ldots, x_{jd})^T \in \mathbb{R}^d$, K-Means algorithm attempts to find $K$ clusters of $X$, $C = C_1, \ldots, C_j, \ldots, C_k$, such that

$$C_i \neq \emptyset, i = 1, \ldots, k$$

$$\bigcup_{i=1}^k C_i = X$$

$$C_i \cap C_j = \emptyset, \quad i, j = 1, \ldots, k \quad \text{and} \quad i \neq j$$

(6)

where $k$ is a user-defined integer. It is shown above that a pattern can only be allowed to belong one cluster. After determination of the cluster centroids, a feature which is the closest to the cluster centroid is selected as a representative feature for the cluster. Therefore, the number of clusters determines the number of selected features in KCEN algorithm.

2.2.4. Laplacian Score Feature Selection (LapFS)

Laplacian Score Feature Selection (LapFS) [11] is a graph based, unsupervised and univariate filter feature selection algorithm that ranks features according to their locality preserving power.

2.2.5. Spectral Regression Feature Selection (SPEC)

Spectral Regression Feature Selection (SPEC) [12] can be considered as an extension of LapFS. LapFS is an unsupervised feature selection method which exploits data variance and separability to assess feature relevance [21]. The goal of the SPEC is to investigate some intrinsic properties of both supervised and unsupervised feature selection and to develop a unified framework which is built
on spectral graph theory. Likewise LapFS, SPEC cannot handle feature redundancy because it evaluates each feature independently.

2.2.6. **Infinite Feature Selection (InFS)**

Infinite Feature Selection (InFS) [14] is a filter and unsupervised feature selection method. In InFS, each feature is represented with a node in a graph and features are selected according to their centrality score. All possible subsets of features are considered as paths on a graph and each feature is ranked.

2.2.7. **Embedded Unsupervised Feature Selection (EUFS)**


2.3. **Support Vector Regression as an Independent Predictor**

Support Vector Machines search for a function, \( h(x) \) which shows the relationship between the features and target. SVR utilises \( s \)-intensive loss function which means that any residue of regression less than \( s \) is ignored. Therefore, only features out of the \( s \)-band are penalized given by

\[
C \sum_{i=1}^{n} \xi_i^t
\]

where \( t \) is positive integers and \( \xi \) is the orthogonal distance away from the \( s \)-region. The regression function \( h(x) \) is represented as:

\[
h(x) = \langle w, x \rangle + b
\]

where \( b \) stands for bias, and \( w \) is the weight vector. By minimizing the weight vector and fixing the margin, the optimization problem can be defined as

\[
\min_{\xi, \xi^*, \omega} \frac{1}{2} \| \omega \|^2 + C \sum \xi^2 + \xi^{2*}
\]

subject to

\[
y_i - \langle w, x_i \rangle - b \leq \epsilon + \xi_i
\]

\[
\langle w, x_i \rangle + b - y_i \leq \epsilon + \xi^*_i
\]

\[
\xi_i, \xi^*_i \geq 0
\]
is the model and
\[ Y = (y_1, y_2, \ldots, y_n) \]  
(12)
is the target.

In this study, SVR part is implemented by using LIBSVM library with radial basis kernel [22].

2.4. Performance Evaluation Metrics

In this section, the performance evaluation metrics which are used to evaluate the effectiveness of unsupervised feature selection methods are presented. Five different evaluation metrics are utilised to access the effectiveness of the USFSMs.

2.4.1. Root Mean Square Error (RMSE)

The Root Mean Square Error (RMSE) [23] has been utilised as a standard statistical metric to evaluate the performance of models in different research areas [24]. It provides a complete picture of the distribution of error. The RMSE can be expressed as:

\[ RMSE = \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} (y_i - y^{'i})^2}{n}} \]  
(13)

where \( n \) is the number of samples, and \( y_i \) and \( y^{'i} \) are the expected and predicted output respectively.

2.4.2. Mean Absolute Deviation (MAD)

The Mean Absolute Deviation, MAD, is an average estimator of the absolute error of the predictive model. The MAD can be calculated from the following formula:

\[ MAD = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} |y_i - y^{'i}|}{n} \]  
(14)

where \( y_i \) is the actual and \( y^{'i} \) is the predicted value and \( n \) represents the number of samples.
2.4.3. Mean Absolute Percentage Error (MAPE)

Mean Absolute Percentage Error, MAPE, estimates the average of absolute percentage error of the predictive model. The MAPE is formulated as:

\[
MAPE = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i}^{n} \left| \frac{y_i - y_i'}{y_i} \right| \times 100
\]  

(15)

where \( y_i \) is the actual and \( y_i' \) is the predicted value and \( n \) represents the number of samples.

2.4.4. Coefficient of Determination (\( q^2 \))

The Coefficient of Determination (\( q^2 \)) is a statistical metric based on the proportion of variability in a data set. If the value of \( q^2 \) is close to 1, is means that a model has been successfully constructed; on the other hand, negative \( q^2 \) values suggest that a model ineffectively approximates the predicted values. The \( q^2 \) metric can be calculated from the following formula:

\[
q^2 = 1 - \frac{\sum_{i}^{n} (y_i - y_i')^2}{\sum_{i}^{n} (y_i - \bar{y})^2}
\]  

(16)

where \( y_i \) and \( y_i' \) are actual and corresponding forecasted values respectively, \( n \) is the number of samples and \( \bar{y} \) is the mean of all actual values in the prediction data set.

2.4.5. Mean Square Error (MSE)

The Mean Square Error (MSE) represents the average of predictive model estimation errors, therefore, it measures the prediction performance of the model. The MSE can be expressed as:

\[
MSE = \frac{\sum_{i}^{n} (y_i - y_i')^2}{n}
\]  

(17)

where \( n \) is the number of samples, and \( y_i \) and \( y_i' \) are the expected and the predicted values respectively. The MSE can also be calculated from the RMSE since \( \text{RMSE} = \sqrt{\text{MSE}} \).

3. Results and Discussion

Three different high dimensional peptide data sets, provided in the Co-EPRA modelling competition [16], are used. Each data set consists of training and test data sets, therefore, there is no need for cross validation. Tasks 1 and 3 contain
nona-peptides that contain a total of 5787 amino acid descriptors. Task 1 consists of 89 training and 88 testing samples, whereas Task 3

Table 2: Regression Results of the Unsupervised Feature Selection Methods for Task 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metrics</th>
<th>MAD</th>
<th>MSE</th>
<th>RMSE</th>
<th>MAPE</th>
<th>q2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KBFS(300)</td>
<td>0.48±0.03</td>
<td>0.34±0.05</td>
<td>0.59±0.04</td>
<td>9.65±0.8</td>
<td>0.61±0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUFS(300)</td>
<td>0.49±0.0</td>
<td>0.53±0.0</td>
<td>0.73±0.0</td>
<td>9.86±0.0</td>
<td>0.46±0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KCEN(200)</td>
<td>0.51±0.04</td>
<td>0.48±0.07</td>
<td>0.69±0.05</td>
<td>10.1±0.76</td>
<td>0.44±0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCFS(50)</td>
<td>0.57±0.0</td>
<td>0.54±0.0</td>
<td>0.74±0.0</td>
<td>11.4±0.0</td>
<td>0.37±0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LapFS(300)</td>
<td>0.58±0.0</td>
<td>0.61±0.0</td>
<td>0.78±0.0</td>
<td>11.3±0.0</td>
<td>0.30±0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPFS(300)</td>
<td>0.50±0.0</td>
<td>0.37±0.0</td>
<td>0.61±0.0</td>
<td>9.7±0.0</td>
<td>0.57±0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>1.07±0.0</td>
<td>1.82±0.0</td>
<td>1.35±0.0</td>
<td>21±0.0</td>
<td>-1.0±0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 demonstrates the performance of the USFSMs for Task 1. The results suggest that KBFS produces the best results for MAD, MSE, RMSE, MAPE, U and q2 metrics with 100 selected features. Other methods produce average results.

A comparative analysis of USFSMs for Task 2 is shown in Table 3. The results of the experiment with the Task 2 data set confirm that KBFS generally yields the best results for all metrics, yielding 0.28 MAD, 0.17 MSE, 0.41 RMSE, 4.05 MAPE and 0.70 q2 with 300 features. SPFS produces the second-best results, with 0.28 MAD, 0.17 MSE, 0.41 RMSE, 3.9 MAPE and 0.68 q2 with 300 features.

The results for SPFS are very similar to those for KBFS, but the latter achieves the best results using 200 features while SPFS produces the second-best results with 300 features. Other USFSMs produce average results.
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Table 3: Regression Results of the Unsupervised Feature Selection Methods for Task 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metrics</th>
<th>MAD</th>
<th>MSE</th>
<th>RMSE</th>
<th>MAPE</th>
<th>q2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KBFS(200)</td>
<td>0.28±0.03</td>
<td>0.17±0.04</td>
<td>0.41±0.02</td>
<td>4.05±0.4</td>
<td>0.7±0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUFS(100)</td>
<td>0.39±0.0</td>
<td>0.43±0.0</td>
<td>0.65±0.0</td>
<td>5.98±0.0</td>
<td>0.2±0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KCEN(200)</td>
<td>0.35 ±0.0</td>
<td>0.27±0.0</td>
<td>0.52±0.0</td>
<td>5±0.0</td>
<td>0.49±0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCFS(300)</td>
<td>0.32 ±0.0</td>
<td>0.2±0.0</td>
<td>0.45±0.0</td>
<td>4.6±0.0</td>
<td>0.62±0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LapFS(300)</td>
<td>0.35 ±0.0</td>
<td>0.29±0.0</td>
<td>0.54±0.0</td>
<td>5.1±0.0</td>
<td>0.45±0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPFS(300)</td>
<td>0.28 ±0.0</td>
<td>0.17±0.0</td>
<td>0.41±0.0</td>
<td>3.9±0.0</td>
<td>0.69±0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>0.29±0.0</td>
<td>0.16±0.0</td>
<td>0.4±0.0</td>
<td>4.02±0.0</td>
<td>0.7±0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A comparative analysis of USFSMs for Task 3 is shown in Table 4. The proposed approach clearly generates the best results, yielding 0.58 MAD, 0.52 MSE, 0.72 RMSE, 8.59 MAPE and 0.19 q2. The results for EUFS and LapFS are similar. They both produce 0.6 MAD, 0.58 MSE, 0.76 RMSE; however, EUFS yields 9 MAPE and 0.079 q2 whereas LapFS achieves 8.6 MAPE, 0.081 and q2.

Table 4: Regression Results of the Unsupervised Feature Selection Methods for Task 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metrics</th>
<th>MAD</th>
<th>MSE</th>
<th>RMSE</th>
<th>MAPE</th>
<th>q2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KBFS(150)</td>
<td>0.58±0.02</td>
<td>0.52±0.03</td>
<td>0.72±0.03</td>
<td>8.59±0.8</td>
<td>0.19±0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUFS(150)</td>
<td>0.61 ±0.0</td>
<td>0.58 ±0.0</td>
<td>0.76 ±0.0</td>
<td>9 ±0.0</td>
<td>0.07 ±0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KCEN(300)</td>
<td>0.66 ± 0.0</td>
<td>0.67 ± 0.0</td>
<td>0.81 ± 0.0</td>
<td>9.7 ± 0.0</td>
<td>−0.06 ±0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCFS(50)</td>
<td>0.7 ± 0.0</td>
<td>0.76 ± 0.0</td>
<td>0.87 ± 0.0</td>
<td>10.1 ± 0.0</td>
<td>−0.20 ±0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LapFS(50)</td>
<td>0.6 ± 0.0</td>
<td>0.58 ± 0.0</td>
<td>0.76 ± 0.0</td>
<td>8.6 ± 0.0</td>
<td>0.08 ±0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPFS(300)</td>
<td>0.67 ± 0.0</td>
<td>0.75 ± 0.0</td>
<td>0.86 ± 0.0</td>
<td>9.9 ± 0.0</td>
<td>−0.18 ±0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>1.17 ± 0.0</td>
<td>2.51 ± 0.0</td>
<td>1.58 ± 0.0</td>
<td>17 ± 0.0</td>
<td>−2.97 ±0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given these analyses, all the results present a clear message that the SVR-based predictive model with all the features fails. This outcome suggests the necessity of feature selection. It is also observed that the performance of the USFSMs is relatively sensitive to the number of selected features. The number of selected features is provided in parenthesis located just next to the USFSM results in the tables.
The experimental studies conducted on three different high dimensional peptide binding affinity data sets. These data sets generally contain over 5000 descriptors for each peptide and they are used to evaluate the prediction performance of the proposed KBFS framework for the given data sets.

The purpose of the study is to predict peptide binding affinity values by using amino acid descriptors. As mentioned previously, affinity refers to the strength of binding or interaction. Identification of peptide binding affinity values is important due to the fact that protein-protein interactions (PPIs) play a role in mediating signal transactions, sensing the environment, triggering immunological responses, and monitoring gene expression [25].

4. **Conclusion and Future Work**

In this paper, a support vector-based predictive model is used to predict binding affinity values of peptides by utilising amino acid descriptors. The outcomes of the experiments clearly emphasise the strengths of KBFS compared with the state-of-the-art unsupervised feature selection methods as well as the approaches used in a previous study [26] which were conducted on the same peptide data sets. KBFS produces better performance than the state-of-the-art feature selection methods for all three tasks. Five different metrics, namely MAD, MSE, RMSE, MAPE, and q2, are used to examine the robustness of USFSMs. KBFS achieves the best performance on all different tasks over different metrics. Furthermore, KBFS dramatically reduces the number of features for all tasks: for Task 1 from 5787 to 300; for Task 2 from 5144 to 200; and for Task 3 from 5787 to 150. In this study, KBFS method is utilised to predict peptide binding affinity values by using amino acid descriptors.

As a future work, KBFS can be applied to different biomedical datasets. For example, KBFS can be used to reveal the relationships among Human Immunodeficiency Virus (HIV) and antibody features.
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Peptid bağlayıcı əlaqəni haqqında proqnozu üçün dəstək Vektor əsaslı maşınlar və K- xüsusiyyətli çərçivə

Ferdi Sarac
Süleyman Dəmirəl Universiteti, İsparta, Türkiyə

Zülallar arasında əlaqənin əlaqəni anlamaq, protein mühəndisliyi və dərman dizaynında tətbiqlərə sistem biologiyasında tədqiqatların vacib bir sahəsidir. Protein-protein əlaqəsi (PPI) siqnal proseslərinin vasitaçılıyində, ətraf mühitin hiss edilməsinə, immunoloji reaksiyaların başlamasına və gen ifadəsinin izlənilməsində rol oynayır. Üstəlik, PPIlər viral infeksiyaların inkişafında çox vacib bir rol oynayır. Buna görə PPI-nin əsas prinsipləri haqqında biliklərin artırılması son nəticədə müxtəlif xastəliklərin spesifik biokimyasını və dərman dizaynının inkişafını aşkar edə bilər.


Açar sözlər: Xüsusiyyət seçimi, Peptid bağlayıcı, Vektor Reqressiya, çərçivə, nisbi dəyərlər
РЕЗЮМЕ

Поддержка для более ближим прогнозированием пептидных связующих, машин на основе векторов с и K-специфичная структура

Фарди Сарак
Университет Сулеймана Демиреля, Испарта, Турция

Понимание белковых взаимодействий является важной областью исследований в системной биологии с применением в разработке белка и изготовлении лекарств. Взаимодействие белок-белок (PPI) играет роль в последовательности сигнальных процессов, чувствительности к окружающей среде, инициировании иммунологических реакций и отслеживании экспрессии генов. Кроме того, ИПП играют очень важную роль в развитии у человека таких заболеваний как вирусные инфекции. Таким образом, расширенные знания об основных принципах ИПП могут в конечном итоге выявить специфическую биохимию различных заболеваний и разработку дизайна для лекарственного препарата. Белки состоят из пептидов, которые действуют как структурные компоненты клеток.

Однако экспериментальное определение ИПП не является решающим, и, следовательно, для улучшения понимания ИПП и для создания количественных моделей взаимоотношений пептидного связывания могут быть использованы вычислительные методы, такие как агрегация, регрессия и выбор признаков. Целью данного исследования было оценить значения связывания для пептидов с использованием идентификаторов аминокислот. По сравнению с неконтролируемыми методами методы выбора непроверенных признаков (USFSM) могут рассматриваться как более объективный подход, поскольку они не склонны выбирать более поведенческие признаки.
Это исследование может рассматриваться как наше предыдущее исследование и применяться к нашей обширной методологии в крупномасштабной пептидной базе данных. Шесть различных USFSM, включая предложенную структуру, используются для оценки значений схожести связывания пептида с целым набором признаков. С учетом наборов данных трех различных по схожести связывания пептидов, экспериментальные результаты продемонстрировали эффективность предложенного каркаса в отношении статуса USFSM.

**Ключевые слова:** выбор признаков, пептидные соединители, векторная регрессия, каркас, относительные значения