



**HAL**  
open science

## Functional Annotation of Proteins using Domain Embedding based Sequence Classification

Bishnu Sarker, David W. Ritchie, Sabeur Aridhi

► **To cite this version:**

Bishnu Sarker, David W. Ritchie, Sabeur Aridhi. Functional Annotation of Proteins using Domain Embedding based Sequence Classification. KDIR 2019 - 11th International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Information Retrieval, Sep 2019, Vienna, Austria. pp.163-170, 10.5220/0008353401630170 . hal-02283430

**HAL Id: hal-02283430**

**<https://inria.hal.science/hal-02283430>**

Submitted on 10 Sep 2019

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

# Functional Annotation of Proteins Using Domain Embedding Based Sequence Classification

Bishnu Sarker<sup>a</sup>, David W. Ritchie and Sabeur Aridhi

<sup>1</sup> *University of Lorraine, Inria, Loria, CNRS, F-54000, Nancy, France*  
{bishnu.sarker, dave.ritchie}@inria.fr, sabeur.aridhi@loria.fr

**Keywords:** Machine Learning, Representation Learning, Protein Function Annotation, Bioinformatics, Domain Embedding.

**Abstract:** Due to the recent advancement in genomic sequencing technologies, the number of protein sequences in public databases is growing exponentially. The UniProt Knowledgebase (UniProtKB) is currently the largest and most comprehensive resource for protein sequence and annotation data. The May 2019 release of the UniProt Knowledge base (UniProtKB) contains around 158 million protein sequences. For the complete exploitation of this huge knowledge base, protein sequences need to be annotated with functional properties such as Enzyme Commission (EC) numbers and Gene Ontology terms. However, there is only about half a million sequences (UniProtKB/SwissProt) are reviewed and functionally annotated by expert curators using information extracted from the published literature and computational analyses. The manual annotation by experts are expensive, slow and insufficient to fill the gap between the annotated and unannotated protein sequences. In this paper, we present an automatic functional annotation technique using neural network based word embedding exploiting domain and family information of proteins. Domains are the most conserved regions in protein sequences and constitute the building blocks of 3D protein structures. To do the experiment, we used fastText<sup>a</sup>, a library for learning of word embeddings and text classification developed by Facebook's AI Research lab. The experimental results show that domain embeddings perform much better than k-mer based word embeddings.

<sup>a</sup><https://github.com/facebookresearch/fasttext>


## 1 Introduction

### 1.1 Protein Function Annotation

Proteins are important components of all biological systems. Understanding protein function is one of the keys to understanding life at the molecular level, and is central to understanding disease processes and guiding drug discovery efforts (Bakheet and Doig, 2009). In this age of rapid and affordable amino-acid sequencing technologies, the number of protein sequences accumulating in public databases is rising at an increasing rate (Berger et al., 2016). In order to enrich and exploit this huge quantity of data, these sequences should be annotated with functional properties. The UniProt knowledge base (UniProtKB) (The UniProt Consortium, 2015) is currently the largest public sequence database. It consists of two components: (i) the UniProtKB/Swiss-Prot database which

contains protein sequences with reliable information that has been reviewed by expert bio-curators, and (ii) the UniProtKB/TrEMBL database that stores unannotated sequences. Thus, for all proteins in UniProtKB, we have the primary amino acid sequences as well as some further information such as InterPro domain definitions which may have been identified from families of similar sequences or 3D protein structures.

Enzymes are usually labelled following the Enzyme Commission (EC) system (Cornish-Bowden, 2014), the widely used numerical enzyme classification scheme. The EC System assigns each enzyme a four digits number. The challenge, therefore, is to annotate the un-annotated protein sequences automatically with appropriate EC number. The EC classification system has a hierarchical structure. The first level consists of the six main enzyme classes: (i) oxidoreductases, (ii) transferases, (iii) hydrolases, (iv) lyases, (v) isomerases and (vi) ligases, represented by the first digit. Each main class node further extends out several subclass nodes, specifying sub classes of

<sup>a</sup>  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9716-4989>

the enzymes, represented by the second digit. Similarly, the third digit indicates the sub-subclass and the fourth digit denotes the sub-sub-sub classes. Let us consider as an example a Type II restriction enzyme, which is annotated as EC 3.1.21.4. The first digit, 3, denotes that it is a hydrolase. The second digit, 1, indicates that it acts on ester bonds. The third digit, 21, shows that it is an endodeoxyribonuclease producing 5-phosphomonoesters. The last digit, 4, specifies that it is a Type II site-specific deoxyribonuclease.

## 1.2 Text Classification

One of the important tasks in natural language processing is to classify text into classes such as tags, categories, labels, and so on. Text classification is widely used in web search, information retrieval, ranking and document classification. Due to recent successes, neural network based models are prevalent in text classifications. Although the representation capability of neural networks is higher, training neural network based deep learning models are computationally expensive due to the presence of non-linear hidden layer (Mikolov et al., 2013; Joulin et al., 2017). On the other hand, linear classifiers are simple and efficient, yet achieve better performance in the context of text classification. However, linear classifier like SVM does not share parameters among features and classes (Joulin et al., 2017), which eventually limits the generalization power of linear classifier. The fast-Text(Joulin et al., 2016) text classification tool uses log-linear model with a shallow neural network to build a simple, fast, and efficient text classifier with word embedding.

## 1.3 Text Classification for Protein Function Annotation

Natural language text possesses a defined linguistic structure containing an array of words delimited by various punctuation marks. Whereas biological texts such as protein sequences are strings of letters selected from an alphabet consisting of 20 letters, each representing an amino acid (Kimothi et al., 2016). Essentially one string stands for a single protein. Unlike natural texts, there is no way of formally defining words or phrases in protein sequences. Therefore, using a text classification model requires further pre-processing of protein sequences. The most common way of pre-processing is to break the sequences into biological words commonly known as K-mers that are smaller units of size  $k$  composed of consecutive alphabets. The pre-processing can be done in two different ways: 1) Overlapping  $k$ -mers achieved by mov-

ing a  $k$ -size window over the sequence. For example, let us break "MAPPSVFSEV" into overlapping 3-mers. The corresponding 3-mers are *MAP*, *APP*, *PPS*, *PSV*, *SVF*, *VFS*, *FSE*, and *SEV*. Therefore, the biological sequence "MAPPSVFSEV" is transformed into following space delimited text: *MAP APP PPS PSV SVF VFS FSE SEV*; (2) Using non-overlapping  $k$ -mers,  $k$  numbers of sequences are generated by splitting the original sequences into non-overlapping words of  $k$  consecutive letters with a starting position moved by one letter for each newly generated sequence (Asgari and Mofrad, 2015; Kimothi et al., 2016). For example, for the sequence "MAPPSVFSEV", considering 3-mers, the 3 newly generated space delimited sequences are as follows:

1. *MAP PSV FSE*
2. *APP SVF SEV*
3. *PPS VFS*

Non-overlapping  $K$ -mers have been used for learning word embedding tasks and have been shown to have better prediction accuracy when applied to family classification task (Asgari and Mofrad, 2015). Overlapping  $K$ -mers are widely used in homology based sequence search in large databases of protein sequences like (Altschul et al., 1997).

This paper presents a novel way to tokenize the protein sequences for the purpose of functional annotation. Instead of  $k$ -mers, we use domain and family information of protein in order to learn protein domain embeddings. The rationale behind using domain information is that the domains are the meaningful units of protein sequence conserved across similar sequences. Domains may be considered as natural building blocks of proteins. Due to evolution, protein domains may have gone through changes such as duplication, fusion, recombination to produce proteins with distinct structures and functions (Kummerfeld and Teichmann, 2009). On the other hand,  $k$ -mer words do not carry any biologically significant meaning by themselves. Thus, tokenizing a protein sequence into sentence of domains is more informative than sentence of  $k$ -mer words. The experimental results presented in experimental section verify the higher performance of domain embeddings.

Two steps are necessary to prepare a training corpus using domain information:

(1) Firstly, for each of the sequences, identify domain signatures using InterProScan (Jones et al., 2014; Quevillon et al., 2005; Mitchell et al., 2018), which is a sequence analysis software that integrates different protein signature recognition methods into one resource. InterProScan provides domain signatures along with their location of appearance in the sequence.

(2) Secondly, InterProScan output is processed to collect the domain signatures and sorting them according to their location of appearance. The domains are organized in ascending order of their starting position in the sequence to form the domain-sentence. Thus each line of the final corpus is a list of domains found by InterProScan for a given protein sequence along with true EC labels.

In this paper, we propose an automatic protein function annotation technique that uses a shallow neural network based text classification method based on domain embeddings. To accomplish the task, We have used *fastText* developed by Facebook Artificial Intelligence Research team to train a supervised sequence classification model as well as domain embeddings. We show a comparative analysis of overlapping 3-mers, non-overlapping k-mers and domain embeddings for protein function annotation with enzyme commission number.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 presents a brief summary of the previous works. Section 3 describes the proposed domain embedding based method for automatic protein function annotation. Section 4 describes our experimental setup and the obtained results.

## 2 Previous work

To annotate the protein sequences, the UniProt curators use two systems: (1) UniRule, uses a manually designed if-then rules (Gattiker et al., 2003), and (2) the Statistical Automatic Annotation System (SAAS) (Kretschmann et al., 2001), which uses decision tree based algorithm to automatically generate UniRule rules. Several approaches for predicting Enzyme Commission (EC) numbers that exploit structural and sequence similarities of proteins have been described previously (Dobson and Doig, 2005; Yang et al., 2015; Nagao Chioko and Kenji, 2014; Rahman et al., 2014; Kumar and Skolnick, 2012; Quester and Schomburg, 2011; Yu et al., 2009). Additionally, machine learning methods have also been used extensively in (des Jardins et al., 1997; Nagao Chioko and Kenji, 2014; Li et al., 2016; Huang et al., 2007; Lu et al., 2007; Nasibov and Kandemir-Cavas, 2009; Li et al., 2018; Shen and Chou, 2007). For example, DEEPre (Li et al., 2018) predicts EC numbers combining multiple tools and techniques including PSI-Blast (Altschul et al., 1997), HMMER (Finn et al., 2011), Convolutional and Recurrent Neural Networks, and sequence encoding using position specific scoring matrix (PSSM) to perform dimensionality uniformization, feature selection, and clas-

sification model training. EzyPred (Shen and Chou, 2007) predicts enzyme functional classes and subclasses using a top-down approach. EzyPred exploits functional and evolutionary information of proteins using pseudo amino acid composition (Chou, 2009) and functional encoding. Based on two features, EzyPred uses a modified K-Nearest Neighbor Classifier called OET-KNN (Optimized Evidence-Theoretic K-Nearest Neighbour).

SVM-Prot is a support vector machine (SVM) based classification method detailed in (Cai et al., 2003; Cai et al., 2004; Cai and Chou, 2005) and later updated by adding two more classifiers, K-Nearest Neighbor (KNN) and Probabilistic Neural Networks (PNN) for improved performance in 2016 (Li et al., 2016). This approach transforms protein sequences to numerical representations based on various physico-chemical properties such as polarity, hydrophobicity, surface tension, charge, normalized van der Waals volume, polarizability, secondary structure, solvent accessibility, molecular weight, solubility, and the numbers of hydrogen bond donors and acceptors in side chain atoms.

ECPred (Dalkiran et al., 2018) is a hierarchical prediction approach that starts by assigning the query sequence as either an enzyme or non-enzyme. If the query sequence is predicted to be an enzyme, ECPred predictions follow the hierarchy of the EC numbering system. Recently published high performing machine learning based approaches like DEEPre, ECPred trains many models to accomplish the hierarchical predictions. They train one model for each class. For example, in DEEPre, one model to distinguish enzyme and non-enzyme, then if enzyme, another model to predict the main class and 6 models to predict the second digit of the EC and so on. The works in (Kimothi et al., 2016; Asgari and Mofrad, 2015; Matsuda et al., 2005) presents unsupervised word embedding based protein classification techniques using continuous bag of words (CBOW) and Skip-gram model proposed by (Mikolov et al., 2013). (Asgari and Mofrad, 2015) explores non-overlapping 3-mer embeddings and applied the method for protein family classification. Although, they show an improved performance for protein domain classification, they have not explored the functional annotation of proteins. In this article, we explore the protein domain embedding for functional classification of proteins. We show that the proposed method performs with higher accuracy than 3-mer embeddings in functional annotation of protein using EC Number. Here we learn single model to predict the complete EC annotation thus the proposed method does not incur the overhead of learning many class-based hierarchical models.




Figure 1: Continuous Bag of Words Model Architecture (Mikolov et al., 2013).

### 3 Methods

Our proposed enzyme classification technique is based on supervised text classification model for natural language processing. The supervised classification model is designed in a similar way to Continuous Bag of Words (CBOW) described in (Mikolov et al., 2013) architecture, where the middle word is replaced by the label. The typical CBOW model architecture is shown in Fig. 1. CBOW employs very simple neural network with single hidden layer for learning the projection of individual word. In supervised mode, for  $N$  textual documents or sentences, the following negative log-likelihood is optimized over the classes as described in (Joulin et al., 2017):

$$-\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N y_n \log(f(W'Wx_n)),$$

Where  $W$  is a weight matrix that serves as a look-up table over the words connecting input to the hidden layer,  $W'$  is a weight matrix that connects hidden layer with output layer where softmax function  $f$  is applied to compute the probability distribution of the labels.  $x_n$  is the normalized bag of words of the  $n$ -th document.  $y_n$  is the label under consideration.

The discretely learned word representations are averaged to learn the text representation which is then fed into a linear classifier. The model uses stochastic gradient descent based back propagation for optimizing the loss function.

To apply this model to enzyme classification, we have used domain and family signatures of proteins as discrete words. The individual domain signatures found by running InterProScan against each protein

sequence serves the purpose of words. While preparing the training corpus, the domains are arranged in ascending order of their location of appearance in the sequence. For the comparison purposes, we have also used overlapping and non-overlapping k-mer based biological words processed from sequence data. The Enzyme Commission (EC) numbers are used as labels without any further processing.

After pre-processing the protein sequences to generate domains and K-mers and associating appropriate EC labels, we prepared a large corpus of biological texts for the purpose of learning embeddings and classification models. The work flow for the classification task is shown in Fig:2. This figure shows the steps involved in training a domain embedding model using fastText supervised learning. The raw sequence data is transformed into domain data using InterProScan (Jones et al., 2014) sequence analysis tool and then feed into a supervised learning model to learn the embeddings and classification model. Finally, the test data are feed into the model to predict the EC annotations.




Figure 2: Data preparation and training work-flow for Domain Embedding based Protein Function Annotation.

## 4 Experiments and Result Analysis

In this Section, we first present the used data. Then, we present our experimental protocol and we discuss the obtained results.

### 4.1 Dataset and Training

To evaluate the method, we have used a well defined dataset of enzyme and non-enzyme proteins curated

from UniprotKB (The UniProt Consortium, 2015). This dataset is called “NEW” and was published by (Li et al., 2018) and was constructed as follows:

1. The SWISS-PROT (released on September 7, 2016) database was separated into enzymes and non-enzymes based on their annotation.
2. To guarantee uniqueness and correctness, enzyme sequences with more than one set of EC numbers or incomplete EC number annotation were excluded.
3. To avoid fragment data, enzyme sequences annotated with fragment or with less than 50 amino acids were excluded. Enzyme sequences with more than 5000 amino acids were also excluded.
4. Redundancy bias is removed using CD-HIT (Fu et al., 2012) with 40% similarity threshold to sift the raw dataset, resulting in 22,168 low-homology enzyme sequences.
5. To construct the non-enzyme part, 22,168 non-enzyme protein sequences were randomly collected from the SWISS-PROT (released on September 7, 2016) non-enzyme part, which were also subject to the above (iiiiv) steps. Thus the original dataset contains 22,168 enzymes and an equal number of non-enzymes.

To build the corpus for learning the embeddings, each sequence has undergone three different pre-processing treatment for 3 different types of sequence tokenization described in the section 1.3. For overlapping k-mer, each sequence is split into overlapping K-mer words. We have chosen 3-mer for our experiment meaning a window of size 3 is moved over the sequence to split it into overlapping 3-mers.

For non-overlapping k-mer, each sequence was transformed into 3 sequences of non-overlapping 3-mers. And same label is associated with all of the 3 sequences as they are generated from the same sequence with single EC label.

In the last case, we used domain and family signatures of proteins as words to build the training corpus. Each sequence was transformed into a list of domains using InterProScan(Jones et al., 2014) software of Version 5.35-74.0. We built 3 large corpus using the 3-mers (overlapping and non-overlapping) and domains and each sentence is associated with EC labels to train the supervised classification model. For non-enzyme, we have labelled them with “\_label\_NANZ”.

For the implementation purpose, we used fast-Text(Joulin et al., 2016) which is library for learning of embeddings and text classification developed by facebook’s AI research.

## 4.2 Evaluation

To evaluate our method, we used 10-fold cross-validation on NEW Dataset. We split the text corpus into 10 parts, and considered one of them as a testing set with the remaining 9 parts composedly being used as the training set. The cross validation results show promising performance of the domain embedding based Enzyme classification. For each query sequence, we picked the top ranked annotation only. To validate the performance, we computed the accuracy, macro-precision, macro-recall, and macro-F1-measure at different levels of EC number. The following formulae (as used in (Li et al., 2018)) were used to compute the evaluation metrics:

$$accuracy(y, y') = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} 1(y_i = y'_i),$$

Here,  $y$  and  $y'$  are the list of ground truths and predicted annotations. The accuracy is computed for each level of EC annotation. As the problem is a multiclass classification problem, we computed macro-precision, macro-recall, and macro-F1 score as follows:

$$Macro - precision(y, y') = \frac{1}{|M|} \sum_{l \in M} precision(y_l, y'_l),$$

$$Macro - recall(y, y') = \frac{1}{|M|} \sum_{l \in M} recall(y_l, y'_l),$$

$$Macro - F1(y, y') = \frac{1}{|M|} \sum_{l \in M} F1\ measure(y_l, y'_l),$$

Here,  $y_l$  is the part of  $y$  with the label  $l$  and  $y'_l$  is the part of  $y'$  with label  $l$ . And  $M$  is the set of classes. In general the precision, recall, and F1-Measure are computed as follows when two sets A and P are given:

$$precision = \frac{|A \cap P|}{|P|},$$

$$recall = \frac{|A \cup P|}{|A|},$$

$$F1 - measure = \frac{2 \times precision \times recall}{precision + recall}.$$

Here, A is the set of ground truths and P is the set of predictions. As EC numbers are hierarchical with 4 levels, we report level-wise precision, recall and F1-measure. Level-1 denotes main class, level-2 denotes sub-class, level-3 denotes sub-sub-class and level-4 denotes sub-sub-sub class. We add level-0 to the step of identifying enzyme or non-enzyme. For each query sequence, we pick the top-most annotation. For evaluation purposes, we split the 4-digit EC annotation

into its constituent parts. Then, for level-1 we consider first digit, for level-2 we take first 2 digits, for level-3 we take first 3-digits and finally for level-4 we take all four digits together.

In our experiments, we have trained the model using 0.9 as learning rate, 150 hidden units, window size of 5 and trained for 200 epochs. We have used Hierarchical Softmax as loss function and word n-grams of 2. The cross validation result is shown in the table 1.

Table-1 shows the accuracy, precision, recall and F1 measure of the cross-validation performed over the NEW dataset. As EC numbers consist of four digits, we present the evaluation metrics for four levels (level-1, 2, 3, 4). To measure the efficiency in classifying enzymes and non-enzymes among the test sequences, we present level-0 accuracy, precision, recall and F1 measure. The result shows that the proposed domain embedding based classification can differentiate enzymes and non-enzymes with an accuracy of 94.3% which is better than k-mer based embeddings(73%-74%). Along with accuracy, we also report the macro precision, recall, and F1 score weighted over classes. Macro-{precision, recall and F1} scores give a reliable measure for unbalanced data. Domain embeddings perform with very high precision and recall of 97% for level-0 prediction task. It is interesting to see that the macro-F1 score confirms the higher accuracy shown by the proposed domain embeddings.

For level-1 predictions, we predict the main class if the protein is an enzyme. There are 6 different main classes. We measure the level-1 accuracy as how accurately it can identify the non-enzymes and enzymes with the correct main class. Similar to level-0, we also present the class based macro-{precision, recall, and F1} scores as the test data is class imbalanced. The performance measures show that domain embedding based classification performs better in all metrics.

In a similar fashion, we also report the accuracy, macro-{precision, recall and F1} scores for level-2, level-3 and level-4 predictions. For all of the levels, our proposed annotation technique outperforms K-mer based embeddings. However, as we go to higher EC levels, the accuracy falls off because a higher EC level is very specific. For example, a Level-4 EC number describes an enzyme that is specific for a particular type of substrate molecule. However, the domain embeddings based classification shows promising performance for level-4 prediction also.

In summary, from the results shown in Table 1, it is evident that domain based embeddings perform noticeably better than k-mer based word embeddings in all evaluation metrics and also for all levels of EC

hierarchy.

## 5 Conclusion

In this paper, we propose a novel protein function annotation approach using domain embedding based sequence classification instead of k-mer based word embedding. To show the superior performance of the proposed method, we used 10-fold cross-validation on benchmark dataset. We measured the annotation performance using accuracy and we also report the macro precision, macro-recall, and macro-F1 measure to reduce the effect of class imbalance in the test dataset. According to all the evaluation metrics we considered, the proposed approach show better performance. One of the strengths of the proposed method lies in its simplicity. The method learns domain embeddings using a single layer neural network. Due to the use of shallow neural network, the training is faster than other multi-layer deep networks. We have used hierarchical softmax loss function to make training even faster. Unlike other hierarchical classification models like ECPred(Dalkiran et al., 2018) and DEEPred(Li et al., 2018), the proposed method learns single model instead of learning many models each for every class. The method is scalable for larger dataset using CUDA based GPU units. Although the proposed method performs well, there is still scope of improvement specially for level-3 and level-4 predictions. As a future plan, we envision to improve the method for more precise predictions and also to apply the similar approach for protein function annotation using Gene Ontology Terms.

## REFERENCES

- Altschul, S. F., Madden, T. L., Schffer, A. A., Zhang, J., Zhang, Z., Miller, W., and Lipman, D. J. (1997). Gapped blast and psi-blast: a new generation of protein database search programs. *Nucleic Acids Research*, 25(17):3389–3402.
- Asgari, E. and Mofrad, M. R. (2015). Continuous distributed representation of biological sequences for deep proteomics and genomics. *PloS one*, 10(11):e0141287.
- Bakheet, T. M. and Doig, A. J. (2009). Properties and identification of human protein drug targets. *Bioinformatics*, 25(4):451–457.
- Berger, B., Daniels, N. M., and Yu, Y. W. (2016). Computational biology in the 21st century: Scaling with compressive algorithms. *Commun. ACM*, 59(8):72–80.

Table 1: The experimental results of 10-fold Cross-Validation on "NEW" dataset

LEVEL	EMBEDDINGS	ACCURACY	MACRO-PRECISION	MACRO-RECALL	MACRO-F1
LEVEL-0	3-MER NON-OVERLAP	0.741	0.768	0.776	0.772
	3-MER OVERLAP	0.738	0.816	0.825	0.82
	<b>DOMAIN</b>	<b>0.943</b>	<b>0.968</b>	<b>0.97</b>	<b>0.969</b>
LEVEL-1	3-MER NON-OVERLAP	0.523	0.243	0.24	0.241
	3-MER OVERLAP	0.529	0.251	0.245	0.248
	<b>DOMAIN</b>	<b>0.929</b>	<b>0.918</b>	<b>0.913</b>	<b>0.916</b>
LEVEL-2	3-MER NON-OVERLAP	0.467	0.09	0.089	0.089
	3-MER OVERLAP	0.47	0.101	0.097	0.099
	<b>DOMAIN</b>	<b>0.918</b>	<b>0.823</b>	<b>0.812</b>	<b>0.817</b>
LEVEL-3	3-MER NON-OVERLAP	0.452	0.062	0.06	0.061
	3-MER OVERLAP	0.455	0.073	0.07	0.071
	<b>DOMAIN</b>	<b>0.909</b>	<b>0.757</b>	<b>0.757</b>	<b>0.757</b>
LEVEL-4	3-MER NON-OVERLAP	0.434	0.037	0.036	0.037
	3-MER OVERLAP	0.439	0.052	0.05	0.051
	<b>DOMAIN</b>	<b>0.851</b>	<b>0.62</b>	<b>0.633</b>	<b>0.626</b>

- Cai, C., Han, L., Ji, Z., and Chen, Y. (2004). Enzyme family classification by support vector machines. *Proteins: Structure, Function, and Bioinformatics*, 55(1):66–76.
- Cai, C., Han, L., Ji, Z. L., Chen, X., and Chen, Y. Z. (2003). Svm-prot: web-based support vector machine software for functional classification of a protein from its primary sequence. *Nucleic acids research*, 31(13):3692–3697.
- Cai, Y.-D. and Chou, K.-C. (2005). Predicting enzyme subclass by functional domain composition and pseudo amino acid composition. *Journal of Proteome Research*, 4(3):967–971.
- Chou, K.-C. (2009). Pseudo amino acid composition and its applications in bioinformatics, proteomics and system biology. *Current Proteomics*, 6(4):262–274.
- Cornish-Bowden, A. (2014). Current IUBMB recommendations on enzyme nomenclature and kinetics. *Perspectives in Science*, 1(1-6):74–87.
- Dalkiran, A., Rifaioglu, A. S., Martin, M. J., Cetin-Atalay, R., Atalay, V., and Doğan, T. (2018). ECPred: a tool for the prediction of the enzymatic functions of protein sequences based on the EC nomenclature. *BMC Bioinformatics*, 19(1):334.
- des Jardins, M., Karp, P. D., Krummenacker, M., Lee, T. J., and Ouzounis, C. A. (1997). Prediction of enzyme classification from protein sequence without the use of sequence similarity. In *Proc Int Conf Intell Syst Mol Biol*, volume 5, pages 92–99.
- Dobson, P. D. and Doig, A. J. (2005). Predicting enzyme class from protein structure without alignments. *Journal of molecular biology*, 345(1):187–199.
- Finn, R. D., Clements, J., and Eddy, S. R. (2011). HMMER web server: interactive sequence similarity searching. *Nucleic Acids Research*, 39(2):W29–W37.
- Fu, L., Niu, B., Zhu, Z., Wu, S., and Li, W. (2012). Cd-hit: accelerated for clustering the next-generation sequencing data. *Bioinformatics*, 28(23):3150–3152.
- Gattiker, A., Michoud, K., Rivoire, C., Auchincloss, A. H., Coudert, E., Lima, T., Kersey, P., Pagni, M., Sigrist, C. J., Lachaize, C., Veuthey, A.-L., Gasteiger, E., and Bairoch, A. (2003). Automated annotation of microbial proteomes in SWISS-PROT. *Computational Biology and Chemistry*, 27(1):49–58.
- Huang, W.-L., Chen, H.-M., Hwang, S.-F., and Ho, S.-Y. (2007). Accurate prediction of enzyme subfamily class using an adaptive fuzzy k-nearest neighbor method. *Biosystems*, 90(2):405–413.
- Jones, P., Binns, D., Chang, H.-Y., Fraser, M., Li, W., McAnulla, C., McWilliam, H., Maslen, J., Mitchell, A., Nuka, G., et al. (2014). Interproscan 5: genome-scale protein function classification. *Bioinformatics*, 30(9):1236–1240.
- Joulin, A., Grave, E., Bojanowski, P., Douze, M., Jégou, H., and Mikolov, T. (2016). Fasttext.zip: Compressing text classification models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1612.03651*.
- Joulin, A., Grave, E., Bojanowski, P., and Mikolov, T. (2017). Bag of tricks for efficient text classification. In *Proceedings of the 15th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Volume 2, Short Papers*, pages 427–431. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Kimothi, D., Soni, A., Biyani, P., and Hogan, J. M. (2016). Distributed representations for biological sequence analysis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1608.05949*.
- Kretschmann, E., Fleischmann, W., and Apweiler, R. (2001). Automatic rule generation for protein annotation with the C4.5 data mining algorithm applied on SWISS-PROT. *Bioinformatics*, 17 10:920–6.
- Kumar, N. and Skolnick, J. (2012). Efficaz2. 5: application of a high-precision enzyme function predictor to 396 proteomes. *Bioinformatics*, 28(20):2687–2688.
- Kummerfeld, S. K. and Teichmann, S. A. (2009). Protein domain organisation: adding order. *BMC Bioinformatics*, 10(1):39.
- Li, Y., Wang, S., Umarov, R., Xie, B., Fan, M., Li, L., and Gao, X. (2018). DEEPRe: sequence-based enzyme EC number prediction by deep learning. *Bioinformatics*, 34(5):760–769.
- Li, Y. H., Xu, J. Y., Tao, L., Li, X. F., Li, S., Zeng, X., Chen, S. Y., Zhang, P., Qin, C., Zhang, C.,



- et al. (2016). Svm-prot 2016: a web-server for machine learning prediction of protein functional families from sequence irrespective of similarity. *PLoS one*, 11(8):e0155290.
- Lu, L., Qian, Z., Cai, Y.-D., and Li, Y. (2007). ECS: an automatic enzyme classifier based on functional domain composition. *Computational Biology and Chemistry*, 31(3):226–232.
- Matsuda, S., Vert, J.-P., Saigo, H., Ueda, N., Toh, H., and Akutsu, T. (2005). A novel representation of protein sequences for prediction of subcellular location using support vector machines. *Protein Science*, 14(11):2804–2813.
- Mikolov, T., Sutskever, I., Chen, K., Corrado, G. S., and Dean, J. (2013). Distributed representations of words and phrases and their compositionality. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pages 3111–3119.
- Mitchell, A. L., Attwood, T. K., Babbitt, P. C., Blum, M., Bork, P., Bridge, A., Brown, S. D., Chang, H.-Y., El-Gebali, S., Fraser, M. I., et al. (2018). Interpro in 2019: improving coverage, classification and access to protein sequence annotations. *Nucleic acids research*, 47(D1):D351–D360.
- Nagao Chioko, N. N. and Kenji, M. (2014). Prediction of detailed enzyme functions and identification of specificity determining residues by random forests. *PLoS One*, 9(1).
- Nasibov, E. and Kandemir-Cavas, C. (2009). Efficiency analysis of KNN and minimum distance-based classifiers in enzyme family prediction. *Computational Biology and Chemistry*, 33(6):461–464.
- Quester, S. and Schomburg, D. (2011). EnzymeDetector: an integrated enzyme function prediction tool and database. *BMC Bioinformatics*, 12(1):376.
- Quevillon, E., Silventoinen, V., Pillai, S., Harte, N., Mulder, N., Apweiler, R., and Lopez, R. (2005). InterProScan: protein domains identifier. *Nucleic Acids Research*, 33(suppl\_2):W116–W120.
- Rahman, S. A., Cuesta, S. M., Furnham, N., Holliday, G. L., and Thornton, J. M. (2014). EC-BLAST: a tool to automatically search and compare enzyme reactions. *Nature Methods*, 11(2):171.
- Shen, H.-B. and Chou, K.-C. (2007). Ezympred: a top-down approach for predicting enzyme functional classes and subclasses. *Biochemical and biophysical research communications*, 364(1):53–59.
- The UniProt Consortium (2015). UniProt: a hub for protein information. *Nucleic Acids Research*, 43(D204–D212).
- Yang, J., Yan, R., Roy, A., Xu, D., Poisson, J., and Zhang, Y. (2015). The i-tasser suite: protein structure and function prediction. *Nature methods*, 12(1):7.
- Yu, C., Zavaljevski, N., Desai, V., and Reifman, J. (2009). Genome-wide enzyme annotation with precision control: Catalytic families (CatFam) databases. *Proteins: Structure, Function, and Bioinformatics*, 74(2):449–460.