Classifying Protein Sequences Using Convolutional Neural Network
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Abstract
One of the major challenges in bioinformatics is the classification and identification of protein structure and function. Large amounts of Ribonucleic Acid (RNA) data cannot be managed using traditional laboratory methods. For this, proteins should be separated according to their structure and families. Therefore, proteins need to be classified to define their biological families and functions. In traditional machine learning approaches, various feature extraction algorithms are used to classify proteins. In manual feature extraction, the selected features directly affect performance. Therefore, in the proposed method of this study, protein sequences were digitized by the amino acid composition technique. The digitized protein sequences were converted to spectrograms, and automatic feature extraction was performed using two-dimensional Convolutional Neural Network (CNN) models (VGG19, ResNet). The extracted features were classified with Support Vector Machine (SVM) and k-Nearest Neighbors (k-NN). As a result, the accuracy of 95.03% was achieved in the classification of protein sequences using ResNet.
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1. Introduction
Proteins that consist of a long chain of amino acids are important parts of biological processes. Proteins perform important functions, move molecules from one place to another, and increase Deoxyribonucleic Acid (DNA). The proteins have been classified into protein families and superfamilies. Recently, large scale experiments and projects cause a large increase in the number of biological data such as protein and DNA. Many new and unknown proteins are available. It is difficult to recognize a large number of protein families by traditional methods and to classify the new protein molecule [1]. A rapid growth in the number of protein sequences has increased efforts to find appropriate and reliable methods to analyze...
protein sequence data [2, 3]. Machine learning algorithms such as Naive Bayes, Decision Trees, Support Vector Machines, and Artificial Neural Networks are traditional methods that are used for the classification of protein molecules [4-6]. The most important thing in the problem of protein classification is feature selection. The protein properties are based on the protein surface, amino acid sequence, or functions. The used methods are aimed to classify the structural proteins. Therefore, it will be easier to understand the evolutionary and functional relationships between proteins. Various computational methods have been proposed to estimate structural classes from sequence information using some statistical methods [3, 7, 8]. Figure 1 shows four structures of the proteins.

![Protein Primary, Secondary, Tertiary and Quaternary Structure formation](image)

**Figure 1.** Protein Primary, Secondary, Tertiary and Quaternary Structure formation

Many researchers proposed some approaches to deal with the protein sequence classification problem [9]. Tsuda et al. [10] proposed an efficient method based on multiple protein networks to classify protein sequences. For selecting important features, it assigned weights to multiple networks. Huang, et al. [11] presented a new method for protein classification using the hydropathy blocks that occur in protein sequences. They generated a feature vector for each protein sequence using the frequency of the hydropathy blocks [10, 11]. In the study of Maqsood Hayat et al. [12] proteins were used for classification, and features were extracted using two different techniques. These feature extraction techniques were the PAAC method and Discrete Wavelet Analysis. They also used k-nearest neighbor, neural networks, support vector machine, random forest methods to classify proteins [13]. Mansoori et al. [14] proposed a classifier based on fuzzy-rule for protein classification and a method that is alignment-free. They used a different method to determine the best features for training. When their classifier was compared with a classifier based on a non-fuzzy rule, their classifier had better results [13]. Lacey et al. [15] proposed two methods aligned against the protein sequence using raw sequence data. They proposed two methods. One of them was the Hidden Markov Model. It was used to directly align protein sequences. The other one was the Random Forest model. It was used to extract metadata from protein sequences, divided data into user classes, and distinguished between two protein groups based on properties such as amino acid groups and Physico-chemical properties [13]. Iqbal et al. [16] proposed a feature selection method based on the statistical metric. In the proposed method, they used the n-gram method to extract features and then applied a statistical metric approach to discard insignificant features from the protein sequences. Their results showed that the feature selection method based on statistical metrics performed well [13].

In this study, we carried out a classification that separates supervised and semi-supervised protein sequences without hand-designed feature extraction and selection. We digitized protein sequences by amino acid composition technique and trained them as 2-dimensional spectrogram images in a 2D-CNN model, then classified them using Support Vector Machine and k-NN. For the classification of protein sequences, we achieved an average accuracy of 95.03% for k-NN and an average accuracy of 92.52% for SVM. The paper is organized as follows. In the material and method
section, the data set, convolutional neural networks were mentioned. In the experimental results section, the findings are discussed. In the conclusion, the general contributions of the study are presented.

2. Material and Method

2.1. Dataset

Protein sequences were taken from the NCBI dataset. The dataset, which belongs to the supervised dataset, categorizes three proteins such as superfamilies globin, trypsin, and ras [13]. Table 1 shows the dataset.

| Superfamily Name | Number of Protein Sequence |
|------------------|-----------------------------|
| Globin           | 395                         |
| Ras              | 337                         |
| Trypsin          | 254                         |

2.2. Amino acid composition

We digitized protein sequences with amino acid composition [17] that counts the frequency of number of amino acids occur in protein sequences. \( N \) represents 20 amino acids such as A, N, R, E, C, D, H, I, G, K, L, Q, M, P, F, W, S, T, V, Y in Equation 1.

\[
P_{lm} = \frac{\text{count}_l(m)}{\sum_{m=1}^{20} \text{count}_l(m)}
\]

(1)

Here, in \( P_{lm} \), \( m \) represent the number of times particular amino acid, and \( l \) shows protein sequence. This method digitized the protein sequence using the frequency of each amino acid.

2.3. Creating spectrogram images

Each protein sequence needs to be represented by a fixed number of features. We digitized RNA sequences using the amino acid composition technique. As shown in Table 1, the shortest sequence is trypsin. Globin and ras were taken in 254 lengths because of adjusting the data to be equal length. The digitized data were partitioned by the 50-unit and 80-unit sliding window method. The sliding window is moved forward one unit above on the data. While 174 sub-signal sets were obtained with an 80-unit sliding window, 204 signal sets were obtained with a 50-unit sliding window. Spectrogram images were then generated using these signal clusters. When creating spectrogram images, the window width was determined as 8ms (Hamming windowing), the overlap value was 4ms, and the number of Fourier transforms was 512. Spectrogram images were generated using the Viridis color map. Figure 2 shows the spectrogram images of the globin, trypsin, and ras protein sequences after protein sequence preprocessing.

![Figure 2. Spectrogram images of globin, trypsin, and ras protein sequences, respectively](image-url)
2.4. Convolutional neural network

As a result of the rapid development in the Graphics Processing Unit (GPU) technology, significant improvements have been implied in the field of computer vision. Starting with LeNet and then continuing with AlexNet, CNN model design is one of the most widely used deep learning methods today. CNN is used effectively in many areas such as signal/picture classification, object recognition, and tracking. In this study, VGG19 and ResNet models were used for the classification of protein families. Various pre-trained CNN models are available, such as VGG19 and ResNet. The advantage of pre-trained models is that they can effectively extract features in a small data set. This ability is provided to the pre-trained CNN models through training using millions of data. It is not always possible to find large data sets to train a CNN model designed from the beginning. Therefore, a classification process using the weights of pre-trained CNN models gives much better results. This process to be used is called transfer learning. Thus, a small data set in a different field can be classified successfully [18].

2.4.1. VGG19

After LeNet and AlexNet, the model developed by the Visual Geometry Group (VGG) of Oxford University is VGG16. This model consists of 13 convolution layers and 3 fully connected layers, whereas VGG19 has 16 convolution layers and 3 fully connected layers. VGG19 has five maximum pooling layers in 2x2 size. In the last layer, there is a softmax to classify incoming input data [18–20].

2.4.2. ResNet

In parallel with the developments in GPU technology, deep learning architectures have also progressed. With the developing hardware features, the number of layers of network architectures increased. Increasing the number of layers does not mean that the learning will increase. On the contrary, the growth of network architectures causes different problems such as training difficulties. This also causes a loss of input and vanishing gradients [21]. To solve this problem, instead of mapping using the nonlinear $F(x)$ function in classical CNN models, ResNet makes a shortcut connection from an input $(x)$ to output. As a result, it performs a more effective training process. Figure 3 shows ResNet connection example [22, 23].

![Figure 3. ResNet connection example](image)

2.5. Performance evaluation

Features extracted with ResNet and VGG19 are classified with SVM and k-NN [24, 25]. To evaluate the performance of the proposed method, the $k$-fold cross-validation method was used. $k$ value was chosen as 5. As shown in Figure 4, 80% of the data set was used for training, and 20% for testing. After the accuracy of each fold was found, the accuracy of the method was calculated by using the average of 5 folds. The flow diagram of the study is shown in Figure 5.
3. Results and Discussion

254 base-length protein sequences (globin, trypsin, ras) were used in the study. Protein sequences were digitized by the amino acid composition technique. The digitized sequences were partitioned using the 50-unit and 80-unit sliding window method. Each signal segment was converted into a spectrogram image. Spectrogram images are 875x656 pixels in size. These images have been resized to 224x224 pixels for VGG19 and ResNet models. Using the VGG19 and ResNet deep learning models, the characteristics of each spectrogram image were extracted. 4096 vectors with VGG19 and 2048 vectors with ResNet were obtained. Subsequently, the extracted feature vectors were classified with SVM and k-NN. 5-fold cross-validation method was used for the classification more objective. The results of the classification procedures are shown in Table 2.

| CNN Models         | SVM            | k-NN            |
|--------------------|----------------|-----------------|
| VGG19 (50 units)   | 84.17 ± 25.69  | 72.58 ± 10.10   |
| VGG19 (80 units)   | 87.96 ± 21.76  | 89.51 ± 11.24   |
| ResNet (50 units)  | 85.67 ± 16.95  | 82.02 ± 8.00    |
| ResNet (80 units)  | 92.52 ± 22.36  | 95.03 ± 6.69    |

Table 2. The accuracy values after feature extraction using VGG19 and ResNet
As shown in Table 2, the best classification results were obtained with the ResNet model. ResNet has a deeper network structure than VGG19. Thanks to this architectural structure, it was able to extract more effective features. Figure 6 gives the classification accuracy of both models.

![Figure 6. The classification results for 50-unit and 80-unit window width](image)

Increasing the size of the sliding window positively affected the classification accuracy. When both VGG19 and ResNet results are examined, it is seen that the 80-unit length sliding window gives better results. When SVM and k-NN classifiers are compared, it is seen that k-NN has achieved a better performance in the 80-unit sliding window. Also, the best results were obtained with k-NN when all classification results were examined. In Figure 7, the SVM and k-NN classification accuracy of the 80-unit sliding window of both CNN models is given as a comparison with the box graph.

![Figure 7. The box graph representation of classification results](image)

Besides, confusion matrices are given in Figure 8 to see which globin, trypsin, and ras protein sequences are correctly recognized by the method. In Figure 8, the classification accuracy that was obtained using the 80-unit sliding window method is given. While k-NN correctly recognized 168 trypsin and 166 ras data of 174 trypsin and ras data, SVM correctly classified 161 trypsin and 159 ras data. In the classification of globin data, while SVM correctly classified 163 globins, k-NN classified 162 data correctly.
Figure 8. Confusion matrices of k-NN (left) and SVM (right) classification results for feature extraction of the spectrogram images using 80-unit windowing in ResNet.

In the classification, the highest accuracy was achieved by the Radial Basis Function (RBF) kernel function of SVM, and the $C$ parameter was examined in the range $[10^{-3} \ldots 10^{3}]$. For the k-NN classifier, the $k$ parameter was examined in the range $[1 \ldots 5]$. The best classification result was obtained at $k = 1$. Table 3 shows the performance evaluations of different studies for protein classification.

| Authors               | Methods                                      | Dataset               | Results (Accuracy)                                      |
|-----------------------|----------------------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|
| Lina Yang et al. [2]  | Hybrid wavelet fractal method                | ND5 protein           | More accurate than the existing methods such as Su’s model, Zhang’s model, etc. |
| Bharti Chaturvedi et al [13] | Support vector machine                       | Supervised, semi-supervised protein | The accuracy with 93.20% for semi-supervised |
| Charalambos Chrysostomou et al.[26] | SVM in combination with Signal processing amino acid indices | BIOV880101, BIOV880102 | 88.01% with BIOV880101, 85.17% with BIOV880102 |
| Igbal M.J. et al. [27] | An optimized tree-classification algorithm   | Protein sequences of a specific superfamily | 97.98% accuracy |
| KM Showhat Zamil et al. [28] | Multi-scale local descriptor (MLD)           | Helicobacter pylori   | 55.70% with Decision tree, 65.74% with Random Forest, 66.67% with Bootstrap aggregation |
| **The proposed method** | **ResNet + k-NN**                           | **Three protein superfamilies globin, trypsin and ras** | **95.03%** |

Table 3. Classification results of various protein sequences

For the experimental applications, a computer with Intel Core i5-8400 CPU and 8 GB RAM was used. The spectrogram data was obtained in MATLAB. Other operations were performed using the Python Keras library.

4. Conclusion

In this study, a novel approach for the classification of RNA sequences is applied to convert the data into spectrogram images by digitizing. Three different protein sequences are classified. In practice, the manual property extraction method was not used as in the traditional methods. Instead, the spectrogram images of protein sequences were automatically extracted by CNN models. Thus, a more effective classification was carried out. It needs to prove that the validity and reliability of the proposed method using larger data sets. In future studies, it is planned to classify protein sequences with larger data sets and different CNN models and methods.
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