PhosphoPICK: modelling cellular context to map kinase-substrate phosphorylation events
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ABSTRACT

Motivation: The determinants of kinase-substrate phosphorylation can be found both in the substrate sequence and the surrounding cellular context. Cell cycle progression, interactions with mediating proteins and even prior phosphorylation events are necessary for kinases to maintain substrate specificity. While much work has focussed on the use of sequence-based methods to predict phosphorylation sites, there has been very little work invested into the application of systems biology to understand phosphorylation. Lack of specificity in many kinase substrate binding motifs means that sequence methods for predicting kinase binding sites are susceptible to high false-positive rates.

Results: We present here a model that takes into account protein-protein interaction information, and protein abundance data across the cell cycle to predict kinase substrates for 59 human kinases that are representative of important biological pathways. The model shows high accuracy for substrate prediction (with an average AUC of 0.86) across the 59 kinases tested. When using the model to complement sequence-based kinase-specific phosphorylation site prediction, we found that the additional information increased prediction performance for most comparisons made, particularly on kinases from the CMGC family. We then used our model to identify functional overlaps between predicted CDK2 substrates and targets from the E2F family of transcription factors. Our results demonstrate that a model harnessing context data can account for the short-falls in sequence information and provide a robust description of the cellular events that regulate protein phosphorylation.

Availability and implementation: The method is freely available online as a web server at the website http://bioinf.scmb.uq.edu.au/phosphopick.

Contact: m.boden@uq.edu.au

Supplementary information: Supplementary data are available at Bioinformatics online.
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1 INTRODUCTION

Regulation of cellular processes occurs on multiple levels, with epigenetic modifiers and transcription factors (TFs) controlling gene expression, while various post-translational modifications regulate many protein functions (Blom et al., 2004; Choudhury et al., 2009; Hwang et al., 2010). The most ubiquitous of post-translational modifications is phosphorylation, with at least 70% of human proteins estimated to be phosphorylation substrates (Olsen et al., 2010). Phosphorylation is likely a significant factor in regulating the function of complex organisms, with a significant increase in the numbers of phosphorylation sites in eukaryotic compared with prokaryotic proteins (Gnad et al., 2011). Phosphorylation is known to have numerous regulatory roles across the cell cycle, and specific kinases have been implicated in the regulation of G1 phase (Harbour et al., 1999), the G1/S phase transition (Sherr and Roberts, 1999) and DNA replication and damage repair (Coverley et al., 2002). Phosphorylation is particularly ubiquitous during mitosis where many complex operations such as spindle formation, centrosome maturation/separation and chromosome attachment to the spindle are controlled by kinases (Johnson, 2011).

While advanced phosphoproteomic technologies have succeeded in identifying thousands of phosphorylation sites across multiple proteomes (Hutlin et al., 2010; Olsen et al., 2010), there has been an ever widening gap between known phosphorylation sites and the kinases responsible for those sites (Diella et al., 2004). Currently just over 10% of the phosphorylation sites recorded in the eukaryotic phosphorylation site database Phospho.ELM is annotated with a kinase. There have been examples of in vitro studies identifying kinase-substrate binding events (Mok et al., 2010), and while these studies offer interesting insights into the consensus motifs of kinase binding sites, it is unknown whether the binding events observed in vitro would occur in vivo. Determining kinase-substrates in vivo is non-trivial however, though there have been promising results from combining in vitro kinase detection assays with in vivo phosphoproteomics (Xue et al., 2012). As a result of the inherent difficulty in determining in vivo kinase substrates, there has been a great interest in developing computational tools to predict kinase-specific phosphorylation sites, with over 40 phosphorylation site-prediction methods published (Trost and Kusakli, 2011). While some methods aim only to predict phosphorylation sites (Blom et al., 1999; Ingrell et al., 2007), the majority predict kinase-specific phosphorylation sites.

Historically, phosphorylation site predictors have operated primarily on protein amino acid sequences, relying on the information contained in the sequence region surrounding phosphorylation sites. It has long been recognized that short sequence
motifs alone are insufficient for achieving respectable accuracy in predicting kinase-specific phosphorylation sites. As a result, prediction methods have often complemented sequence information with other types of data such as knowledge of 3D structure (Saunders et al., 2008; Durek et al., 2009), sequence disorder (Gao et al., 2010) and kinase family similarity (Xue et al., 2011). While such additional data typically improve prediction performance to an extent, they do not reflect the wider cellular regulatory mechanisms that cause kinases to target their correct substrates—a protein with an appropriate kinase binding site will not necessarily come into contact with that kinase (Zhu et al., 2005).

The phosphorylation of a target substrate by a kinase is not determined solely by its binding affinity, but by various context factors that determine how a kinase comes into contact with its substrates (Kobe et al., 2005). This is recognized by the NetworKIN predictor (Horn et al., 2014), which combines sequence-based scores with a score generated on the basis of a STRING network (Szklarczyk et al., 2011). Context factors can include cellular location (Scott and Pawson, 2009), mediating and activating proteins such as scaffold proteins (Good et al., 2011), cyclins (Lim and Kaldys, 2013) and cell cycle-specific expression of kinases and their substrates. Protein-protein interaction (PPI) data can certainly be used to represent such context factors; though while there is vast amounts of PPI data currently available in databases such as BioGRID (Chatr-aryamontri et al., 2013) and STRING, incomplete coverage and variable certainty means that the integration of context features into a model is non-trivial.

In this study, we explore a probabilistic model to accommodate missing values, seamless combination of protein interactions and cell-cycle expression, and to provide flexible options for querying potential kinase substrates. The model we present here, named PhosphoPICK (Phosphorylation in a Protein Interaction Context for Kinases), integrates known kinase-substrate relationships, PPI, and cell-cycle data to predict kinase substrates for 59 human kinases. PhosphoPICK shows high prediction accuracy, with a mean AUC of 0.86 across the 59 kinases. We then demonstrate how our method can boost the prediction accuracy of kinase-specific phosphorylation site prediction by combining PhosphoPICK predictions with the phosphorylation site predictions from three previously published methods. We find that PhosphoPICK improves kinase-specific phosphorylation site prediction for most comparisons made, though greater performance increases were noticed on CMGC kinases—in particular cyclin-dependant kinases (CDKs), where we observed substantial performance gains as measured by AUC50. We show that proteins predicted to be CDK2 substrates by PhosphoPICK have GO terms consistent with known CDK2 substrates, and investigate the functional overlap between known and predicted CDK2 substrates, and the targets of specific E2F TFs using ChIP-Seq data.

2 METHODS
2.1 Bayesian network model
We used a Bayesian network (BN) to design our model. BNs differ from machine learning tools that have previously been used for phosphorylation site prediction in several important ways. BNs are transparent, allowing for an understanding of how the variables in the model influence the final outcome (Patrick et al., 2012). Furthermore, the probabilistic nature of a BN means that even in the absence of missing data, the model can still infer the most likely value of the unknown variables on the basis of the known data (Bauer et al., 2011; Mehdi et al., 2011). We represent observations about protein interactions, kinase-specific phosphorylation events and cell-cycle profiles as Boolean variables in a BN model (Fig. 1). The model represents observations about a phosphorylation substrate—the kinases that bind to it, protein interactions, and whether it is upregulated during the cell-cycle phases. The kinase nodes are linked to PPI events that are believed to be relevant for the kinase to phosphorylate substrates. A latent variable is used to capture information from the cell-cycle data, and the kinase nodes are then conditioned on this latent variable.

2.2 Data resources
2.2.1 Known kinase-substrate relationships We obtained kinase substrates from PhosphoELM and HPRD, after converting HPRD IDs to Uniprot identifiers. To identify protein interactions between kinases and their substrates we selected kinases for which we found greater than 10 substrates. In total, we use 59 human kinases along with a total of 1210 substrates. Table 1 shows the numbers of substrates that were identified for each of the 59 kinases. The 1210 substrates contained 2964 unique phosphorylation sites that were annotated with at least one kinase.

2.2.2 PPI and association data To identify and model interaction networks of kinases and their substrates, we used PPI data. In cases where physical interaction data are unavailable, associations inferred on the basis of other sources such as gene coexpression or literature mining may be informative, and such information is available in the STRING database. PPI information was taken from the Biological General Repository for Interaction Datasets (BioGRID) (Chatr-aryamontri et al., 2013) by selecting entries that were of type ‘direct interaction’ or ‘physical association’. As PPIs are represented in binary
format, this information was incorporated into the model as a Boolean value. The STRING database scores an association probability between two proteins, with a score of 0.4 as defined medium confidence. To convert this probability into a Boolean value we defined cutoff probabilities, such that given some cutoff \( \theta \), any association with a probability \( \geq \theta \) was classified as true, and any association with a probability \( < \theta \) was classified as false. We tested three cutoff probabilities, starting at the medium confidence level of 0.4 and increasing in increments of 0.2. We found that a cutoff probability of 0.6 provided the best overall performance (Supplementary Table S1), and is the cutoff used in this work.

To identify relevant connections between kinases and PPI events, the following steps were taken. Substrates were first grouped according to their kinase (one substrate could be assigned to multiple kinases). BioGRID was then searched for proteins that interacted both with a substrate and with its kinase—these proteins were added to a pool of potential protein interaction connections. For each kinase, the proteins in the pool were ranked in descending order according to the number of interactions that were observed with the kinase’s substrates. An observation is defined as a substrate–protein interaction occurring in BioGRID and/or the STRING database. A count \( c \) was defined, so that for each kinase only the top \( c \) protein interactions were used to form connections. To ensure that there would be enough observations of substrate-protein interactions for setting model parameters, a lower bound of 10 was set such that for a given kinase, at least 10 substrate–protein observations were required for the protein to be considered as a connection to that kinase. We tested three different upper bounds of \( c \): 25, 40 and 50 to determine the effect of varying sized interaction networks on prediction performance.

### 2.2.3 Protein cell-cycle data
In order to model the availability of substrates during the cell cycle, we used data obtained from the experiments by Oben et al. (2010), who measured the abundance of proteins at six stages throughout the cell cycle—M phase, G1 phase, the transition between G1 and S phase (G1/S), early S phase, late S phase and G2 phase. An asynchronous population of cells was also measured, and the signal used to normalize the measurements from the cells arrested during the six stages. A protein with a value of 0 during a stage of the cell cycle has an abundance equivalent to the asynchronous population, whereas a negative value indicates downregulation and a positive value indicates upregulation. To avoid fitting the model too strongly to data generated from a single cell type, we represented proteins’ cell-cycle profiles in a simple binary format across four populations, whereas a negative value indicates downregulation and a positive value indicates upregulation.

### 2.3 Model parameters and training
The variables in the network were represented with two kinds of probability tables. A conditional probability table (CPT) represents all possible values that a variable \( X \) can take given the set of parents, \( pa(X) \), it is conditioned on. Parameters are set during training by calculating the frequency of occurrence of all possible configurations of \( pa(X) \). If \( X \) does not have parents, the CPT simply represents the observed frequency from training data of \( X \) being true.

For situations where a variable is conditioned on greater than six parents, we used a variation of the Noisy-OR approximation (Onisko et al., 2001). In order to set the parameters of the Noisy-OR table during training, each row (representing a parent variable) in the table was calculated as follows: each training sample where the parent is observed as being true was identified. A weighted frequency for each parent \( pa \) was calculated such that

\[
\text{freq}(pa) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left( \frac{t}{(1 + f) \text{freq}_i} \right)
\]

where \( n \) is the number of configurations of parent variables where \( pa \) is observed to be true, \( \text{freq}_i \) is the number of parents set to true in configuration \( i \), \( t \) is the count of the variable the Noisy-OR node is representing being true during the \( i \)th configuration of parents and \( f \) is the count of it being false.

For the latent variable, and variables that are conditioned on it, parameters are calculated using the expectation-maximization algorithm on a training set (Do and Batzoglou, 2008).

### 2.4 Evaluation and definition of negative test sets
A common problem to phosphorylation site prediction is that of defining a negative test set (Trost and Kusalik, 2011). However, as our model is not trained using sequence data, we were able to use a sequence scoring method to define negative test sets for each of the 59 kinases in the model. To score protein sequences for kinase binding sites, we used the Predikin web server (Ellis and Kobe, 2011) to obtain position weight matrices (PWMs) for 53 of the kinases in the model. For the remaining six we constructed PWMs using phosphorylation sites from curated data (Supplementary Methods S1.1). For a given kinase, we scored each substrate in the training data set by obtaining the highest scoring potential phosphorylation site. We then ranked the substrates based on the highest scoring site from lowest to highest, and assigned an equal number of positive and negative substrates for that kinase. As very low scores indicate a protein that the kinase cannot phosphorylate, this gives us a high-confidence negative test set for each of the kinases in the model.

We evaluated the model for each kinase for its ability to correctly predict known substrates compared with the negative set. To score the probability of a kinase phosphorylating a query protein, all nodes in the network were set according to the relevant data for the query protein except for the kinase that we were inferring. Model performance was evaluated using receiver operating characteristic (ROC) analysis by calculating the area under the ROC curve (AUC) (Baldi et al., 2000). We used 15-fold cross validation, and performed the cross validation 10 times with different data set splits. To avoid the possibility of the model gaining information about the test data during training, we ensured that each protein interaction variable was only connected to a kinase if, within the training fold, there were 10 (our previously defined lower bound) or more kinase substrates interacting with that protein.

The data sets used to train and test the model are available in the Supplementary material.

### 3 RESULTS

#### 3.1 Model performance for predicting kinase substrates
We generated five BN models by grouping kinases according to their family similarities (Manning et al., 2002): CMGC, AGC, TK, CAMK and a combined model that incorporated kinases from the CK1, STE, atypical and other families. We tested the ability of the model to classify kinase substrates with varying numbers of protein interaction connections, and under three conditions. To gauge the level of influence that substrate abundance during the cell cycle has on prediction performance, we evaluated a version of the model excluding the cell-cycle variables (PPI only model), and compared the performance to the full model. When making inferences about a kinase-substrate phosphorylation
event, the model relies on the knowledge of other potential kinases phosphorylating that substrate. However, for the majority of proteins there is little, if any, experimental information on any known kinase-specific phosphorylation events. Therefore, to determine whether the model could be reliably extended to the wider proteome, we tested model performance when setting non-query kinase nodes to false on the basis of their sequence binding motifs (Supplementary Methods S1.2).

The AUC results (Table 1) for 10 cross-validation runs evaluated on all 59 kinases in the model for the three different conditions demonstrate that the prediction accuracy of the full model is quite high, with most kinases having median AUCs surpassing 0.8. The average AUC over all of the kinases is 0.86. The generally low-standard deviation indicates that these results are consistent regardless of the breakdown of training/test data that is presented to the model. We tested three different values for maximum number of protein interactions that could be connected to a kinase variable (25, 40 and 50), but found that increasing the number of protein interaction events connected to the kinase variables had very little effect on the performance of the model (Supplementary Table S2), indicating the model’s ability to make classifications based on a relatively small number of connections to the individual kinase nodes.

When comparing the performance of the PPI only model to the full model, we found that on average the inclusion of protein abundance data collected across the cell cycle offered modest improvements to prediction performance. For some kinases there was a greater performance improvement—for example a 15% increase for PRKC kinases, a nearly 10% increase for the tyrosine kinase CSK—but for many other kinases the inclusion of cell-cycle data seemed to have little effect. This demonstrates that while the PPI data provide the main source of information for the model, the use of cell-cycle data can offer improved prediction performance for some kinases. This performance increase occurs despite the fact that we only have cell-cycle data for less than half of the substrates in our set: the model infers the cell-cycle profiles for the remaining proteins. This indicates that the model, when trained on cell-cycle data, can still be applied to query proteins that have no associated cell-cycle data.

Table 1 also shows a comparison between setting the kinase nodes with database (“Full model”) versus sequence information (“Seq. approx.”). We found that for many kinases, using sequence to set the kinase nodes actually resulted in an increase in performance. The median AUC for the CMGC kinases went from 0.87 using database information to 0.91 using sequence, and the median AUC for the tyrosine kinases increased from 0.88 to 0.94.

The possibility was raised that as the kinase-substrate data from HPRD and Phospho.ELM is sourced from the literature, and the STRING database also includes text mining from the literature, a system of circular logic could be inflating the performance values. To determine whether such an effect was occurring, we re-ran our simulations for each kinase with the text mining information for that kinase removed (Supplementary Methods S1.3). We found that while for some kinases this information appeared to have a large impact on prediction capability, it was not the case for the majority of kinases (Supplementary Table S3).
3.2 Improving sequence-based prediction of phosphorylation sites

For the remainder of this article, the results were generated using the full model, with a PPI count of 25, and setting non-query kinase nodes on the basis of their sequence binding motifs. We tested the ability of PhosphoPICK to complement two phosphorylation site predictors that operate on sequence data: Predikin (Ellis and Kobe, 2011) and GPS (Xue et al., 2011). We also tested NetworKIN (Horn et al., 2014), which combines sequence scores with a context score generated on the basis of STRING associations. Comparisons were made by normalizing the values of the methods being tested against, and summing the PhosphoPICK prediction (Supplementary Methods S1.4). Figure 2 shows the AUC50 (the AUC obtained when calculating ROC up to the fiftieth false positive) comparison for Predikin, GPS and NetworKIN across the five BNs, where the highest false-positive rate for serine/threonine kinases was 0.0005, and the highest for tyrosine kinases was 0.002. Individual results for each kinase are shown in Supplementary Tables S4–S6. The results show that across all kinase families, there is an average increase in performance when the Predikin and GPS scores are complemented with PhosphoPICK predictions, with largest performance increases observed with kinases from the CMGC family. We found that the performance of GPS improved by 2-fold for predicting CMGC sites when combined with PhosphoPICK, and that the performance of Predikin was improved by over 6-fold. The smallest performance increases were observed with tyrosine kinases, where we found a 15% performance increase for GPS and a 40% increase for Predikin.

We found that in most cases, PhosphoPICK was unable to improve the performance of the NetworKIN predictions. As Figure 2 shows, the differences in AUC50 between classifying phosphorylation sites with NetworKIN alone and NetworKIN + PhosphoPICK are minor. However, as the NetworKIN score is already a combination of a STRING and sequence-based score, it is possible that a simple summing of scores cannot yield further performance increases.

3.3 Understanding E2F and CDK2 regulation

To evaluate the ability of the predictions made by PhosphoPICK to provide biological insights, we used CDK2 as a case study for a proteome-wide analysis. To determine whether predictions were consistent with what is known about CDK2, several GO enrichment analyses were performed (Supplementary Methods S1.5), comparing significantly overrepresented GO terms (Fisher’s exact test, Bonferroni correction, E-value < 0.05) obtained for known CDK2 substrates with those obtained for the predicted substrates. We found that the known CDK2 substrates were enriched most strongly in various terms related to the G1/S transition of the cell cycle, such as DNA damage response and DNA repair (Supplementary Table S7). This is consistent with the role of CDK2 in the regulation of the transition from G1 to S phase in response to DNA damage (Coverley et al., 2002).

To investigate the agreement of PhosphoPICK predictions with known CDK2 substrates, we performed a proteome-wide scoring for CDK2 and took the top 300 novel predictions, excluding known CDK2 substrates from the set of predicted substrates. We again performed a GO enrichment analysis, and compared the values of the prediction terms with the significant terms that were found during the analysis on the known substrates. Supplementary Table S7 shows the GO terms found to be significantly overrepresented among known CDK2 substrates, ranked from most significant to least significant. Over half of the terms (31/59) were found to be significantly overrepresented among the novel substrates predicted by PhosphoPICK.

CDK2 is known to be a regulator of the TF E2F1 (Lorna Morris and Thangue, 2000), a member of the E2F family, that is known to play a role in the G1/S transition and DNA
replication during the S phase (Attwoll et al., 2004; Lammens et al., 2009; Biswas and Johnson, 2012). The E2F family is comprised of three classes of TFs: transcriptional activators, retinoblastoma (Rb)-dependent repressors, and Rb-independent repressors. What is currently lacking is an understanding of what specific roles in the S phase are controlled at transcriptional level by E2F, and at the post-translational level by CDK2.

In order to investigate what overlapping functions may exist between E2F-regulated transcription and CDK2-mediated phosphorylation, we took ChIP-Seq data (ENCODe Project Consortium, 2012) for E2F1 (activator), E2F4 (Rb-dependent repressor) and E2F6 (Rb-independent repressor). Supplementary Figure S1 shows a Venn diagram of the unique and overlapping gene targets that exist among the three TFs (Supplementary Methods S1.6). It has been shown previously that overlapping targets between E2F1 and E2F4 are enriched in DNA replication and repair GO terms (Lee et al., 2011). We found that the overlapping targets of all three TFs are also enriched in such GO terms.

We then combined our set of predicted CDK2 substrates with known CDK2 substrates and identified proteins from this combined set of substrates that were in the unique and overlapping groups of E2F targets. GO enrichment tests were performed with the CDK2 substrates as the foreground and the remainder of the TF target group as the background. This allowed us to detect what role CDK2 plays within these TF target groups. Supplementary Tables S8–S14 contain the GO terms found to be significantly overrepresented (E-value < 0.05) among CDK2 substrates in the TF target groups. While we found significantly overrepresented GO terms in all TF target groups, we noticed a larger number of process-specific terms among the unique E2F1 targets (Supplementary Table S8), unique E2F6 targets (Supplementary Table S9) and the overlapping targets among all three TFs (Supplementary Table S11). We found that CDK2 substrates among unique E2F1 targets and unique E2F6 targets were enriched in several terms relating to the regulation of apoptosis, as well as ubiquitination. Substrates in the overlapping group of targets of all three TFs were enriched in terms relating to DNA replication and DNA damage repair.

4 DISCUSSION

Protein phosphorylation is a highly regulated process, being controlled by the binding specificity to the protein kinase catalytic site, as well as various cellular processes that further enhance the kinase-substrate fidelity (Kobe et al., 2005; Zhu et al., 2005). We have demonstrated how a probabilistic model of PPIs and cell-cycle data can be used to accurately classify kinase substrates. Importantly, we found that our model, when combined with sequence-operating methods, was able to improve the accuracy of kinase-specific phosphorylation site prediction at false-positive levels below 0.002 for tyrosine kinases and below 0.0005 for serine/threonine kinases.

One potential point of concern in this approach is that we only had access to cell-cycle data for a single cell type, and whether this could result in a tissue-specific influence that impeded predictions in some cell types. However, as the phosphorylation site data we obtained from Phospho.ELM originates from multiple cell types [including, for example, HeLa cells (Wells and Hickson, 1995; Kraft et al., 2003), HFK 293T cells (Johnson et al., 1999), MELN cells (Medunjanin et al., 2005) and T98G glioma cells (Hansen et al., 2001)], the performance of the model across these varying cell types validates the appropriateness of the data we used. We attribute this largely to the simple representation of the cell-cycle data as four Boolean variables, which were unlikely to result in a cell type-specific bias. Somewhat counterintuitively, we found that the cell-cycle data did not improve prediction performance for the CDKs—kinases whose activity is strongly linked to cell-cycle progression—while offering performance increase to other kinases. Though this study focussed on the use of protein abundance data for representing protein cell-cycle profiles, we note that dynamic gene-expression data across the cell-cycle also exists for human proteins (Gauthier et al., 2010). Further study could investigate what influence dynamic gene-expression data can provide to kinase-substrate prediction.

We observed some variations among the performance evaluations for the individual kinases, indicating that the model works better on certain kinases. However, we found that the performance for prediction of kinase substrates (Table 1) was not necessarily an indicator of what improvement would be seen when applying the model to phosphorylation site prediction. For example, the PhosphoPICK algorithm had excellent performance when classifying tyrosine kinase substrates—in several cases with AUCs greater than 0.9. However, when predicting phosphorylation sites of tyrosine kinases using Predikin and GPS, we found that the prediction of tyrosine kinase phosphorylation sites benefitted the least from the addition of the PhosphoPICK score, and the score appeared to be detrimental to predictions made by NetworKIN.

The kinase family where PhosphoPICK consistently demonstrated the most powerful prediction performance was the CMGC family—principally CDK and MAPK kinases. We found that PhosphoPICK generally improved the prediction of phosphorylation sites for the CMGC kinases as tested across each of the three methods, though there were some cases where PhosphoPICK resulted in a decrease in the accuracy of NetworKIN predictions. As the kinases in these families have very similar binding patterns, it is likely that mediating proteins captured by the PhosphoPICK model make a greater contribution in the correct assignment of a kinase to a substrate. These results lend support to the intuitive notion that the addition of context information would support sequence-based predictions most powerfully when the kinase binding patterns are less specific, or are very similar among family members—or both, as is the case with CDK and MAPK kinases.

It was interesting to note that the putative CDK2 substrates within the overlapping E2F1, E2F4 and E2F6 targets groups were overrepresented with GO terms related to DNA replication and DNA damage repair. Considering this group of genes was itself already enriched in such terms (when compared with the proteome), this underscores the importance that CDK2 has in regulating DNA replication and DNA damage repair (Deans et al., 2006; Satyanarayana and Kaldis, 2009). There are several potential responses to DNA damage, but in some cases cells may undergo apoptosis (Zhou and Ellledge, 2000; Bakkenist and Kastan, 2004). We also noticed that putative CDK2 substrates within the unique E2F1 and E2F6 target groups were both overrepresented with terms relating to the regulation of
apoptosis and ubiquitination. These are both processes that CDK2 has previously been implicated in (Hayami et al., 2005; Huang et al., 2006), and ubiquitination is also known to play an important role in regulating apoptotic proteins (Zhang et al., 2004). E2F1 is known to be a regulator of apoptosis (DeGregori et al., 1997), and similarly E2F6 can negatively regulate apoptosis (Yang et al., 2006), so it was interesting to find that the putative CDK2 substrates within the unique E2F1 and E2F6 target groups were enriched in apoptosis and ubiquitination GO terms. These results seem to suggest a dynamic regulatory interplay between the E2F family at the transcriptional level, and the CDK2 kinase at the post-translational level.
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