



**HAL**  
open science

## Virtual screening of GPCRs: An in silico chemogenomics approach

Laurent Jacob, Brice Hoffmann, Véronique Stoven, Jean-Philippe Vert

► **To cite this version:**

Laurent Jacob, Brice Hoffmann, Véronique Stoven, Jean-Philippe Vert. Virtual screening of GPCRs: An in silico chemogenomics approach. *BMC Bioinformatics*, 2008, 9, pp.363. 10.1186/1471-2105-9-363 . hal-00220396v1

**HAL Id: hal-00220396**

**<https://hal.science/hal-00220396v1>**

Submitted on 28 Jan 2008 (v1), last revised 16 Mar 2012 (v2)

**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.

# Virtual screening of GPCRs: an *in silico* chemogenomics approach

Laurent Jacob\*

Institut Curie, Paris, F-75248 France  
INSERM, U900, Paris, F-75248 France  
Ecole des Mines de Paris F-77300 France  
laurent.jacob@ensmp.fr

Véronique Stoven

Institut Curie, Paris, F-75248 France  
INSERM, U900, Paris, F-75248 France  
Ecole des Mines de Paris F-77300 France  
veronique.stoven@ensmp.fr

Brice Hoffmann

Institut Curie, Paris, F-75248 France  
INSERM, U900, Paris, F-75248 France  
Ecole des Mines de Paris F-77300 France  
brice.hoffmann@ensmp.fr

Jean-Philippe Vert

Institut Curie, Paris, F-75248 France  
INSERM, U900, Paris, F-75248 France  
Ecole des Mines de Paris F-77300 France  
jean-philippe.vert@ensmp.fr

January 28, 2008

## Abstract

The G-protein coupled receptor (GPCR) superfamily is currently the largest class of therapeutic targets. *In silico* prediction of interactions between GPCRs and small molecules is therefore a crucial step in the drug discovery process, which remains a daunting task due to the difficulty to characterize the 3D structure of most GPCRs, and to the limited amount of known ligands for some members of the superfamily. Chemogenomics, which attempts to characterize interactions between all members of a target class and all small molecules simultaneously, has recently been proposed as an interesting alternative to traditional docking or ligand-based virtual screening strategies.

We propose new methods for *in silico* chemogenomics and validate them on the virtual screening of GPCRs. The methods represent an extension of a recently proposed machine learning strategy, based on support vector machines (SVM), which provides a flexible framework to incorporate various information sources on the biological space of targets and on the chemical space of small molecules. We investigate the use of 2D and 3D descriptors for small molecules, and test a variety of descriptors for GPCRs. We show for instance that incorporating information about the known hierarchical classification of the target family and about key residues in their inferred binding pockets significantly improves the prediction accuracy of our model. In particular we are able to predict ligands of orphan GPCRs with an estimated accuracy of 78.1%.

## 1 Introduction

The G-protein coupled receptor (GPCR) superfamily is comprised of an estimated 600-1,000 members and is the largest known class of molecular targets with proven therapeutic value. They are ubiquitous in our body, being involved in regulation of every major mammalian physiological system (Bockaert and Pin, 1999), and play a role in a wide range of disorders including allergies, cardiovascular dysfunction, depression, obesity, cancer, pain, diabetes, and a variety of central nervous

---

\*The first two authors contributed equally to this work

system disorders (Deshpande and Penn, 2006; Hill, 2006; Catapano and Manji, 2007). They are integral membrane proteins sharing a common global topology that consists of seven transmembrane alpha helices, an intracellular C-terminal, an extracellular N-terminal, three intracellular loops and three extracellular loops. There are four main classes of GPCRs (A, B, C and D) depending on their sequence similarity (Horn *et al.*, 2003). Their location on the cell surface makes them readily accessible to drugs, and 30 GPCRs are the targets for the majority of best-selling drugs, representing about 40% of all prescription pharmaceuticals on the market (Fredholm *et al.*, 2007). Besides, the human genome contains several hundred unique GPCRs which have yet to be assigned a clear cellular function, suggesting that they are likely to remain an important target class for new drugs in the future (Lin and Civelli, 2004).

Predicting interactions *in silico* between small molecules and GPCRs is not only of particular interest for the drug industry, but also a useful step for the elucidation of many biological processes. First, it may help to decipher the function of so-called *orphan* GPCRs, for which no natural ligand is known. Second, once a particular GPCR is selected as a target, it may help in the selection of promising molecule candidates to be screened *in vitro* against the target for lead identification.

*In silico* virtual screening of GPCRs with classical approaches is however a daunting task for at least two reasons. First, the 3D structures are currently known for only two GPCRs (bovine rhodopsin and human  $\beta_2$ -adrenergic receptor). Indeed, GPCRs, like other membrane proteins, are notoriously difficult to crystallize. As a result, docking strategies for screening small molecules against GPCRs are often limited by the difficulty to model correctly the 3D structure of the target. To circumvent the lack of experimental structures, various studies have used 3D structural models of GPCRs built by homology modeling using bovine rhodopsin as a template structure. Docking a library of molecules into these modeled structures allowed the recovery of known ligands (Evers and Klabunde, 2005), and even identification of new ligands (Cavasotto *et al.*, 2003). However, docking methods still suffer from docking and scoring inaccuracies, and homology models are not always reliable-enough to be employed in target-based virtual screening. Methods have been proposed to enhance the quality of the models by global optimization and flexible docking (Cavasotto *et al.*, 2003), or by using different sets of receptor models. Nevertheless, these methods are expected to show limited performances for GPCRs sharing low sequence similarity with rhodopsin, especially in the case of receptors belonging to classes B, C and D. Alternatively, ligand-based strategies, also known as quantitative structure-activity relationship (QSAR), attempt to predict new ligands from previously known ligands, often using statistical or machine learning approaches. Ligand-based approaches are interesting because they do not require the knowledge of the target 3D structure and can benefit from the discovery of new ligands. However, their accuracy is fundamentally limited by the amount of known ligands, and degrades when few ligands are known. Although these methods were successfully used to retrieve strong GPCR binders (Rolland *et al.*, 2005), they are efficient for lead optimization within a previously identified molecular scaffold, but are not appropriate to identify new families of ligands for a target. At the extreme, they cannot be pursued for the screening of orphan GPCRs.

Instead of focusing on each individual target independently from other proteins, a recent trend in the pharmaceutical industry, often referred to as *chemogenomics*, is to screen molecules against several targets of the same family simultaneously (Kubinyi *et al.*, 2004; Jaroch and Weinmann, 2006). This systematic screening of interactions between the chemical space of small molecules and the biological space of protein targets can be thought of as an attempt to fill a large 2D *interaction matrix*, where rows correspond to targets, columns to small molecules, and the  $(i, j)$ -th entry of the matrix indicates whether the  $j$ -th molecule can bind the  $i$ -th target. While in general the matrix may contain some description of the strength of the interaction, such as the association constant of the complex, we will focus in this paper on a simplified description that

only differentiates binding from non-binding molecules, which results in a binary matrix of target-molecule pairs. This matrix is already sparsely filled with our current knowledge of protein-ligand interactions, and chemogenomics attempts to fill the holes. While classical docking or ligand-based virtual screening strategies focus on each single row independently from the others in this matrix, i.e., treat each target independently from each others, the chemogenomics approach is motivated by the observation that similar molecules can bind similar proteins, and that information about a known interaction between a ligand and a GPCR could therefore be a useful hint to predict interaction between similar molecules and similar GPCRs. This can be of particular interest when, for example, a particular target has few or no known ligands, but similar proteins have many: in that case it is tempting to use the information about the known ligands of similar proteins for a ligand-based virtual screening of the target of interest. In this context, we can formally define *in silico* chemogenomics as the problem of predicting interactions between a molecule and a ligand (i.e., a hole in the matrix) from the knowledge of all other known interactions or non-interactions (i.e., the known entries of the matrix).

Recent reviews (Kubinyi *et al.*, 2004; Jaroch and Weinmann, 2006; Klabunde, 2007; Rognan, 2007) describe several strategies for *in silico* chemogenomics. A first class of approaches, called *ligand-based chemogenomics* by Rognan (2007), pool together targets at the level of families (such as GPCR) or subfamilies (such as purinergic GPCR) and learn a model for ligands at the level of the family (Balakin *et al.*, 2002; Klabunde, 2006). Other approaches, termed *target-based chemogenomic* approaches by Rognan (2007), cluster receptors based on ligand binding site similarity and again pool together known ligands for each cluster to infer shared ligands (Frimurer *et al.*, 2005). Finally, a third strategy termed *target-ligand* approach by Rognan (2007) attempts to predict ligands for a given target by leveraging binding information for other targets in a single step, that is, without first attempting to define a particular set of similar receptors. This strategy was pioneered by Bock and Gough (2005) to predict ligands of orphan GPCR. They merged descriptors of ligands and targets to describe putative ligand-receptor complexes, and used SVM to discriminate real complexes from ligand-receptors pairs that do not form complexes. Erhan *et al.* (2006) followed a similar idea with different descriptors, and showed in particular that the SVM formulation allows to generalize the use of vectors of descriptors to the use of positive definite kernels to describe the chemical and the biological space in a computationally efficient framework. Erhan *et al.* (2006) were not able to show, however, significant benefits with respect to the individual approach that learns a separate classifier for each GPCR (except in the case of orphan GPCRs, for which their approach performed better than the baseline random classifier). Recently, in the context of predicting interactions between peptides and different alleles of MHC-I molecules, Jacob and Vert (2008) followed a similar approach and highlighted the importance of choosing adequate descriptors for small molecules and targets. They obtained state-of-the-art prediction accuracy for most MHC-I allele, in particular for those with few known binding peptides.

In this paper we go one step further in this direction and present an *in silico* chemogenomics approach specifically tailored for the screening of GPCRs, although the method could in principle be adapted to other classes of therapeutic targets. We follow the idea of Bock and Gough (2005) and the algorithmic trick of Erhan *et al.* (2006), which allows us to systematically test a variety of descriptors for both the molecules and the GPCRs. We test two families of 2D and 3D descriptors to describe molecules, including a new 3D kernel, and six ways to describe GPCRs, including a description of their relative positions in current hierarchical classifications of the superfamily, and information about key residues likely to be in contact with the ligand. We test the approach on the data of the GLIDA database (Okuno *et al.*, 2006), which contains 34686 reported interactions between human GPCRs and small molecules, and observe that the choice of the descriptors has a significant impact on the accuracy of the models. In particular, the best results are reached when

using the description of GPCRs within the hierarchical classification of the superfamily, combined with a set of 2D descriptors of small molecules. This allows us to obtain dramatic improvements of the prediction accuracy with respect to the individual learning setting. In an experiment where we simulate the prediction of ligands for orphan GPCRs, we obtain accuracies of 78.1%, significantly above the 50% baseline accuracy of a random predictor.

## 2 Method

In this section, we first review the methods proposed by Bock and Gough (2005); Erhan *et al.* (2006) for *in silico* chemogenomics with SVM, before presenting the particular descriptors we propose to use for molecules and GPCRs within this framework.

### 2.1 *In silico* chemogenomics with machine learning

We consider the problem of predicting interactions between GPCRs and small molecules. For this purpose we assume that a list of target/small molecule pairs  $\{(t_1, m_1), \dots, (t_n, m_n)\}$ , known to interact or not, is given. Such information is often available as a result of systematic screening campaigns in the pharmaceutical industry, or on dedicated databases. Our goal is then to create a model to predict, for any new candidate pair  $(t, m)$ , whether the small molecule  $m$  is likely to bind the GPCR  $t$ .

A general method to create the predictive model is to follow these four steps:

1. Choose  $n_{tar}$  descriptors to represent each GPCR target  $t$  in the biological space by a  $n_{tar}$ -dimensional vector  $\Phi_{tar}(t) = (\Phi_{tar}^1(t), \dots, \Phi_{tar}^{n_{tar}}(t))$ ;
2. In parallel, choose  $n_{mol}$  descriptors to represent each molecule  $m$  in the chemical space by a  $n_{mol}$ -dimensional vector  $\Phi_{mol}(m) = (\Phi_{mol}^1(m), \dots, \Phi_{mol}^{n_{mol}}(m))$ ;
3. Derive a vector representation of a candidate target/molecule complex  $\Phi_{pair}(t, m)$  from the representations of the target  $\Phi_{tar}(t)$  and of the molecule  $\Phi_{mol}(m)$ ;
4. Use a statistical or machine learning method to train a classifier able to discriminate between binding and non-binding pairs, using the training set of binding and non-binding pairs  $\{\Phi_{pair}(t_1, m_1), \dots, \Phi_{pair}(t_n, m_n)\}$

While the first two steps (selection of descriptors) may be specific to each particular chemogenomics problem, the last two steps define the particular strategy used for *in silico* chemogenomics. For example, Bock and Gough (2001, 2005) proposed to concatenate the vectors  $\Phi_{tar}(t)$  and  $\Phi_{mol}(m)$  to obtain a  $(n_{tar} + n_{mol})$ -dimensional vector representation of the ligand-target complex  $\Phi_{pair}(t, m)$ , and to use a SVM as a machine learning engine. Erhan *et al.* (2006) followed a slightly different strategy for the third step, by forming descriptors for the pair  $(t, m)$  as *product* of small molecule and target descriptors. More precisely, given a molecule  $m$  described by a vector  $\Phi_{mol}(m)$  and a GPCR  $t$  described by a vector  $\Phi_{tar}(t)$ , the pair  $(t, m)$  is represented by the tensor product:

$$\Phi_{pair}(t, m) = \Phi_{tar}(t) \otimes \Phi_{mol}(m), \tag{1}$$

that is, a  $(n_{tar} \times n_{mol})$ -dimensional vector whose entries are products of the form  $\Phi_{tar}^i(t) \times \Phi_{mol}^j(m)$ , for  $1 \leq i \leq n_{tar}$  and  $1 \leq j \leq n_{mol}$ . A SVM is then used as an inference engine, to estimate a linear function  $f(t, m)$  in the vector space of target/molecule pairs, that takes positive values for interacting pairs and negative values for non-interacting ones.

The main motivation for using the tensor product (1) is that it provides a systematic way to encode correlations between small molecule and target features. For example, in the case of binary descriptors, the product of two features is 1 if both the molecule and the target descriptors are 1, and zero otherwise, which amounts to encode the simultaneous presence of particular features of the molecule and of the target that may be important for the formation of a complex. A potential issue with this approach, however, is that the size of the vector representation  $n_{tar} \times n_{mol}$  for a pair may be prohibitively large for practical computation and manipulation. For example, using a vector of molecular descriptors of size 1024 for molecules, and representing a protein by the vector of counts of all 2-mers of amino-acids in its sequence ( $d_t = 20 \times 20 = 400$ ) results in more than 400k dimensions for the representation of a pair. As pointed out by Erhan *et al.* (2006), this computational obstacle can however be overcome when a SVM is used to train the linear classifier, thanks to a trick often referred to as the *kernel trick*. Indeed, a SVM does not necessarily need the explicit computation of the vectors representing the complexes in the training set to train a model. What it needs, instead, is the inner products between these vectors, and a classical property of tensor products is that the inner product between two tensor products  $\Phi_{pair}(t, m)$  and  $\Phi_{pair}(t', m')$  is the product of the inner product between  $\Phi_{tar}(t)$  and  $\Phi_{tar}(t')$ , on the one hand, and the inner product between  $\Phi_{mol}(m)$  and  $\Phi_{mol}(m')$ , on the other hand. More formally, this property can be written as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & (\Phi_{tar}(t) \otimes \Phi_{mol}(m))^\top (\Phi_{tar}(t') \otimes \Phi_{mol}(m')) \\ &= \Phi_{tar}(t)^\top \Phi_{tar}(t') \times \Phi_{mol}(m)^\top \Phi_{mol}(m'), \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where  $u^\top v = u_1 v_1 + \dots + u_d v_d$  denotes the inner product between two  $d$ -dimensional vectors  $u$  and  $v$ . In other words, the SVM does not need to compute the  $n_{tar} \times n_{mol}$  vectors to describe each pair, it only computes the respective inner products in the target and ligand spaces, before taking the product of both numbers.

This flexibility to manipulate molecule and target descriptors separately can moreover be combined with other tricks that sometimes allow to compute efficiently the inner products in the target and ligand spaces, respectively. Many such inner products, also called *kernels*, have been developed recently both in computational biology (Schölkopf *et al.*, 2004) and chemistry (Kashima *et al.*, 2003; Gärtner *et al.*, 2003; Mahé *et al.*, 2005), and can be easily combined within the chemogenomics framework as follows: if two kernels for molecules and targets are given as:

$$\begin{aligned} K_{mol}(m, m') &= \Phi_{mol}(m)^\top \Phi_{mol}(m'), \\ K_{tar}(t, t') &= \Phi_{tar}(t)^\top \Phi_{tar}(t'), \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

then we obtain the inner product between tensor products, i.e., the kernel between pairs, by:

$$K((t, m), (t', m')) = K_{tar}(t, t') \times K_{mol}(m, m'). \quad (4)$$

In summary, as soon as two vectors of descriptors or kernels  $K_{lig}$  and  $K_{tar}$  are chosen, we can solve the *in silico* chemogenomics problem with an SVM using the product kernel (4) between pairs. The particular descriptors or kernels used should ideally encode properties related to the ability of similar molecules to bind similar targets or ligands respectively.

In the next two subsections, we present different possible choices of descriptors – or kernels – for small molecules and GPCRs, respectively.

## 2.2 Descriptors for small molecules

The problem of explicitly representing and storing small molecules as finite-dimensional vectors has a long history in chemoinformatics, and a multitude of molecular descriptors have been pro-

posed (Todeschini and Consonni, 2002). These descriptors include in particular physicochemical properties of the molecules, such as its solubility or logP, descriptors derived from the 2D structure of the molecule, such as fragment counts or structural fingerprints, or descriptors extracted from the 3D structure (Gasteiger and Engel, 2003). Each classical fingerprint vector and vector representation of molecules define an explicit “chemical space” in which each molecule is represented by a finite-dimensional vector, and these vector representations can obviously be used as such to define kernels between molecules (Azencott *et al.*, 2007). Alternatively, some authors have recently proposed some kernels that generalize some of these sets of descriptors and correspond to inner products between large- or even infinite-dimensional vectors of descriptors. These descriptors encode, for example, the counts of an infinite number of walks on the graph describing the 2D structure of the molecules (Kashima *et al.*, 2004; Gärtner *et al.*, 2003; Mahé *et al.*, 2005), or various features extracted from the 3D structures (Mahé *et al.*, 2006; Azencott *et al.*, 2007).

In this study we select two existing kernels, encoding respectively 2D and 3D structural information of the small molecules, and propose a new 3D kernel:

- *The 2D Tanimoto kernel.* Our first set of descriptors is meant to characterize the 2D structure of the molecules. For a small molecule  $m$ , we define the vector  $\Phi_{mol}(m)$  as the binary vector whose bits indicate the presence or absence of all linear graph of length  $u$  or less as subgraphs of the 2D structure of  $l$ . We chose  $u = 8$  in our experiment, i.e., characterize the molecules by the occurrences of linear subgraphs of length 8 or less, a value previously observed to give good results in several virtual screening tasks (Mahé *et al.*, 2005). Moreover, instead of directly taking the inner product between vectors as in (3), we use the Tanimoto kernel:

$$K_{ligand}(l, l') = \frac{\Phi_{lig}(l)^\top \Phi_{lig}(l')}{\Phi_{lig}(l)^\top \Phi_{lig}(l) + \Phi_{lig}(l')^\top \Phi_{lig}(l') - \Phi_{lig}(l)^\top \Phi_{lig}(l')}, \quad (5)$$

which was proven to be a valid inner product by Ralaivola *et al.* (2005), giving very competitive results on a variety of QSAR or toxicity prediction experiments.

- *3D pharmacophore kernel* While 2D structures are known to be very competitive in ligand-based virtual screening (Azencott *et al.*, 2007), we reasoned that some specific 3D conformations of a few atoms or functional groups may be responsible for the interaction with the target. Thus, we decided to test descriptors representing the presence of potential 3-point pharmacophores. For this, we used the 3D pharmacophore kernel proposed by Mahé *et al.* (2006), that generalizes 3D pharmacophore fingerprint descriptors. This approach implies the choice of a 3D conformer for each molecule. In absence of sufficient data available for bound ligands in GPCR structures, we chose to build a 3D version of the ligand base in which molecules are represented in an estimated minimum energy conformation. For each of the 2446 retained ligands, 25 conformers were generated with the Omega program (OpenEye Scientific Software) using standard parameters, except for a 1Å RMSD clustering of the conformers, instead of the 0.8 default value. A 3D ligand base was generated by keeping the conformer of lowest energy for each ligand. Partial charges were calculated for all atoms using the molcharge program (OpenEye Scientific Software) with standard parameters. This ligand base was then used to calculate a 3D pharmacophore kernel for molecules (Mahé *et al.*, 2006).

We used the freely and publicly available *ChemCPP*<sup>1</sup> software to compute the 2D and 3D pharmacophore kernel.

<sup>1</sup>Available at <http://chemcpp.sourceforge.net>.

### 2.3 Descriptors for GPCRs

SVM and kernel methods are also widely used in bioinformatics (Schölkopf *et al.*, 2004), and a variety of approaches have been proposed to design kernels between proteins, ranging from kernels based on the amino-acid sequence of a protein (Jaakkola *et al.*, 2000; Leslie *et al.*, 2002; Tsuda *et al.*, 2002; Leslie *et al.*, 2004; Vert *et al.*, 2004; Kuang *et al.*, 2005; Cuturi and Vert, 2005) to kernels based on the 3D structures of proteins (Dobson and Doig, 2005; Borgwardt *et al.*, 2005; Qiu *et al.*, 2007) or on the pattern of occurrences of proteins in multiple sequenced genomes (Vert, 2002). These kernels have been used in conjunction with SVM or other kernel methods for various tasks related to structural or functional classification of proteins. While any of these kernels can theoretically be used as a GPCR kernel in (4), we investigate in this paper a restricted list of specific kernels described below, aimed at illustrating the flexibility of our framework and test various hypothesis.

- The *Dirac* kernel between two targets  $t, t'$  is:

$$K_{Dirac}(t, t') = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } t = t', \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

This basic kernel simply represents different targets as orthonormal vectors. From (4) we see that orthogonality between two proteins  $t$  and  $t'$  implies orthogonality between all pairs  $(l, t)$  and  $(l', t')$  for any two small molecules  $c$  and  $c'$ . This means that a linear classifier for pairs  $(l, t)$  with this kernel decomposes as a set of independent linear classifiers for interactions between molecules and each target protein, which are trained without sharing any information of known ligands between different targets. In other words, using Dirac kernel for proteins amounts to performing classical learning independently for each target, which is our baseline approach.

- The *multitask* kernel between two targets  $t, t'$  is defined as:

$$K_{multitask}(t, t') = 1 + K_{Dirac}(t, t').$$

This kernel, originally proposed in the context of multitask learning Evgeniou *et al.* (2005), removes the orthogonality of different proteins to allow sharing of information. As explained in Evgeniou *et al.* (2005), plugging  $K_{multitask}$  in (4) amounts to decomposing the linear function used to predict interactions as a sum of a linear function common to all GPCRs and of a linear function specific to each GPCR:

$$f(l, t) = w^\top \Phi(l, t) = w_{general}^\top \Phi_{lig}(l) + w_t^\top \Phi_{lig}(l).$$

A consequence is that only data related to the target  $t$  are used to estimate the specific vector  $w_t$ , while all data are used to estimate the common vector  $w_{general}$ . In our framework this classifier is therefore the combination of a target-specific part accounting for target-specific properties of the ligands and a global part accounting for general properties of the ligands across the targets. The latter term allows to share information during the learning process, while the former ensures that specificities of the ligands for each target are not lost.

- The *hierarchy* kernel. Alternatively we could propose a new kernel aimed at encoding the similarity of proteins with respect to the ligands they bind. In the GLIDA database indeed, GPCRs are grouped into 4 classes based on sequence homology and functional similarity: the



*rhodopsin* family (class A), the *secretin* family (class B), the *metabotropic* family (class C) and some smaller classes containing other GPCRs. The GLIDA database further subdivides each class of targets by type of ligands, for example amine or peptide receptors or more specific families of ligands. This also defines a natural hierarchy that can be used to compare GPCRs.

The hierarchy kernel between two GPCRs was therefore defined as the number of common ancestors in the corresponding hierarchy plus one, that is,

$$K_{hierarchy}(t, t') = \langle \Phi_h(t), \Phi_h(t') \rangle,$$

where  $\Phi_h(t)$  contains as many features as there are nodes in the hierarchy, each being set to 1 if the corresponding node is part of  $t$ 's hierarchy and 0 otherwise, plus one feature constantly set to one that accounts for the "plus one" term of the kernel.

- The *binding pocket* kernel. Because the protein-ligand recognition process occurs in 3D space in a pocket involving a limited number of residues, we tried to describe the GPCR space using a representation of this pocket. The difficulty resides in the fact that although the GPCR sequences are known, the residues forming this pocket and its precise geometry are *a priori* unknown. However, the two available X-Ray structures, together with mutagenesis data showed that the binding pockets are situated in a similar region for all GPCRs (Kratohwil *et al.*, 2005). In order to identify residues potentially involved in the binding pocket of GPCRs of unknown structure studied in this work, we proceeded in several steps. (a) The two known structures (PDB entries 1U19 and 2RH1) were superimposed using the STAMP algorithm (Russell and Barton, 1992). In the superimposed structures, the retinal and 3-(isopropylamino)propan- 2-ol ligands are very close, which is in agreement with global conservation of binding pockets, as shown on Figure 1. (b) The structural alignment of bovine rhodopsin and of human  $\beta_2$ -adrenergic receptor was used to generate a sequence alignment of these two proteins. (c) For both structures, in order to identify residues potentially involved in stabilizing interactions with the ligand (residues of the pocket), we selected residues that presented at least one atom situated at less than 6Å from at least one atom of the ligand. Figure 2 shows that these two pockets clearly overlap, as expected. (d) Residues of the two pockets (as defined in (c)) were labeled in this structural sequence alignment. These residues were found to form small sequence clusters that were in correspondence in this alignment. These clusters were situated mainly in the apical region of transmembrane segments and included a few extracellular residues. (e) All studied GPCR sequences, including bovine rhodopsin and of human  $\beta_2$ -adrenergic receptor were aligned using CLUSTALW (Chenna *et al.*, 2003) with Blosum matrices (Henikoff and Henikoff, 1992). For each protein, residues in correspondence with a residue of the binding pocket (as defined above) of either bovine rhodopsin or human  $\beta_2$ -adrenergic receptor were retained. This lead to a different number of residues per protein, because of sequence variability. For example, in extracellular regions, some residues from bovine rhodopsin or human  $\beta_2$ -adrenergic receptor had a corresponding residue in some sequences but not in others. In order to provide a homogeneous description of all GPCRs, in the list of residues initially retained for each protein, only residues situated at positions conserved in almost all GPCRs were kept. (f) Each protein was then represented by a vector whose elements corresponded to a potential conserved pocket. This description, although appearing as a linear vector filled with amino acid residues, implicitly codes for a 3D information on the receptor pocket, as illustrated on Figure 2. These vectors were then used to build a kernel that allows comparison of binding pockets. The classical way to represent motifs of constant length as fixed length vectors is to encode the letter at each

position by a 20-dimensional binary vector indicating which amino acid is present, resulting in a 180-dimensional vector representations. In terms of kernel, the inner product between two binding pocket motifs in this representation is simply the number of letters they have in common at the same positions:

$$K_{pb}(x, x') = \sum_{i=1}^l \delta(x[i], x'[i]),$$

where  $l$  is the length of the binding pocket motifs (31 in our case),  $x[i]$  is the  $i$ -th residue in  $x$  and  $\delta(x[i], x'[i])$  is 1 if  $x[i] = x'[i]$ , 0 otherwise. This is the baseline pocket binding kernel. Alternatively, using a polynomial kernel of degree  $p$  over the baseline kernel is equivalent, in terms of feature space, to encoding  $p$ -order interactions between amino acids at different positions. In order to assess the relevance of such non-linear extensions we tested this polynomial pocket binding kernel,

$$K_{ppb}(x, x') = (K_{pb}(x, x') + 1)^p.$$

We only used a degree  $p = 2$ , although a more careful choice of this parameter could further improve the performances.

- The *binding pocket hierarchy* kernel. Because of the link between binding pockets and ligand recognition, we also defined a new hierarchy based on the sequence alignment of the binding pocket amino acid vectors without gaps. To do this, we used a PAM matrix with high values of gap insertion and extension to compare each couple of GPCR vectors. The obtained scores were used in UPGMA (Unweighted Pair Group Method with Arithmetic mean) to determine a binding pocket similarity based hierarchy. We obtained a tree comparable to phylogenetic trees, and that happens to be share many substructures with the GLIDA hierarchy.




Figure 1: Representation of the binding pocket of  $\beta_2$ -adrenergic receptor (in red) and bovine Rhodopsin (in black) viewed from the extracellular surface. On the center of the pocket, 3-(isopropylamino)propan-2-ol and cis-retinal have been represented to show the size and the position of the pocket around each ligand. Figure drawn with VMD (Humphrey *et al.*, 1996).




Figure 2: 3-(isopropylamino)propan-2-ol and the protein environment of  $\beta_2$ -adrenergic receptor as viewed from the extracellular surface. Amino acid side chains are represented for 6 of the 31 residues (in cyan, blue and red) of the binding pocket motif. Transmembranes helix and 3-(isopropylamino)propan-2-ol are colored in black and red respectively. Figure drawn with VMD (Humphrey *et al.*, 1996).

### 3 Data

We used the GLIDA GPCR-ligand database (Okuno *et al.*, 2006) which includes 22964 known ligands for and 3738 GPCRs from human, rat and mouse. The ligand base contains highly diverse molecules, from ions and very small molecules up to peptides. In order to eliminate unwanted molecules such as inorganic compounds and molecules with unsuitable molecular weights, we filtered the GLIDA ligand base using the filter program (OpenEye Scientific Software) with standard parameters. The most important filtering feature here was to keep molecules of molecular weights ranging from 150 Da to 450 Da. Overall, the GLIDA ligand base was filtered in order to retain molecules that had the physico-chemical characteristics of drugs. This filter retained 2688 molecules. Because the GLIDA ligand base contains a few duplicates, we eliminated these redundancies, which lead to 2446 different molecules, available under a 2D description files and giving 4051 interactions with the human GPCRs. Elimination of duplicates present in the GLIDA base was important here because it could have lead to overfitting in the learning step. For each positive interaction given by this restricted set, we generated a negative interaction involving the same receptor and one of the ligands that was in the database and was not indicated as one of its ligands. This probably generated some false negative points in our benchmark, and it would be interesting to use experimentally tested negative interactions. We loaded the sequences of all GPCRs that are able to bind any of these ligands, which lead to 80 sequences, all corresponding to human GPCRs. In the GLIDA database, GPCRs are classified in a hierarchy (as mentioned above) which was also loaded for use in the hierarchy kernel.

### 4 Results

We ran two different sets of experiments on this dataset in order to illustrate two important points. In a first set of experiments, for each GPCR, we 5-folded the data available, i.e. the line of the

$K_{tar} \setminus K_{lig}$	2D Tanimoto	3D pharmacophore
Dirac	$86.2 \pm 1.9$	$84.4 \pm 2.0$
multitask	$88.8 \pm 1.9$	$85.0 \pm 2.3$
hierarchy	$93.1 \pm 1.3$	$88.5 \pm 2.0$
binding pocket	$90.3 \pm 1.9$	$87.1 \pm 2.3$
poly binding pocket	$92.1 \pm 1.5$	$87.4 \pm 2.2$
binding pocket hierarchy	$93.0 \pm 1.4$	$90.0 \pm 2.1$

Table 1: Prediction accuracy for the first experiment with various ligand and target kernels.

interaction matrix corresponding to this GPCR. The classifier was trained with four folds and the whole data from the other GPCRs, *i.e.*, all other lines of the interaction matrix. The prediction accuracy for the GPCR under study was then tested on the remaining fold. The goal of these first experiments was to evaluate if using data from other GPCRs improved the prediction accuracy for a given GPCR. In a second set of experiments, for each GPCR we trained a classifier on the whole data from the other GPCRs, and tested on the data of the considered GPCR. The goal was to assess how efficient our chemogenomics approach would be to predict the ligands of orphan GPCRs. In both experiments, the  $C$  parameter of the SVM was selected by internal cross validation on the training set among  $2^i, i \in \{-8, -7, \dots, 5, 6\}$ .

For the first experiment, since learning an SVM with only one training point does not really make sense and can lead to "anti-learning" less than 0.5 performances, we set all results  $r$  involving the Dirac GPCR kernel on GPCRs with only 1 known ligand to  $\max(r, 0.5)$ . This is to avoid any artefactual penalization of the Dirac approach and make sure we measure the actual improvement brought by sharing information across GPCRs.




Figure 3: GPCR kernel Gram matrices ( $K_{tar}$ ) for the GLIDA GPCR data with multitask, hierarchy, binding pocket and binding pocket hierarchy kernels.

Table 1 shows the results of the first experiments with all the ligand and GPCR kernel combinations. For all the ligand kernels, one observes an improvement between the individual approach (Dirac GPCR kernel, 86.4%) and the baseline multitask approach (multitask GPCR kernel, 88.4%). The latter kernel is merely modeling the fact that each GPCR is uniformly similar to all other GPCRs, and twice more similar to itself. It does not use any prior information on the GPCRs, and yet, using it improves the global performance with respect to individual learning. Using more informative GPCR kernels further improves, sometimes considerably, the prediction accuracy. In particular, the hierarchy kernels add more than 4.5% of precision with respect to naive multitask approach. All the other informative GPCR kernels also improve the performance. The polynomial binding pocket kernel and the pocket binding hierarchy kernels are almost as efficient as the hierarchy kernel, which is an interesting result. Indeed, one could fear that using the hierarchy kernel, for the construction of which some knowledge of the ligands may have been used, could have intro-

duced bias in the results. Such bias is certainly absent in the binding pocket kernel. The fact that the same performance can be reached with kernels based on the mere sequence of GPCRs’ pockets is therefore an important result. Figure 3 shows four of the GPCR kernels. The baseline multitask is shown as a comparison. Interestingly, many of the subgroups defined in the hierarchy can be found in the binding pocket kernel, that is, they are retrieved from the simple information of the binding pocket sequence. This phenomenon is even more visible for the binding pocket hierarchy kernel that is based on the hierarchy built from the binding pocket alignment scores.




Figure 4: Improvement (as a performance ratio) of the hierarchy GPCR kernel against the Dirac GPCR kernel as a function of the number of training samples available. Restricted to [2 – 200] samples for the sake of readability.

The 3D kernel for the ligands, on the other hand, did not perform as well as the 2D kernel. This can be either explained by the fact the the pharmacophore kernel is not suited to this problem, or by the fact that choosing the conformer of the ligand is not a trivial task. This point is discussed below.

Figure 4 illustrates how the improvement brought by the chemogenomics approach varies with the number of available training points. As one could have expected, the strongest improvement is observed for the GPCRs with few (less than 20) training points (*i.e.*, less than 10 known ligands since for each known ligand an artificial non-ligand was generated). When more training points become available, the improvement is less important, and sharing the information across the GPCRs can even degrade the performances. This is an important point, first because, as showed on Figure 5, many GPCRs have few known ligands (in particular, 11 of them have only two training points), and second because it shows that when enough training points are available, individual learning will probably perform as well as or better than our chemogenomics approach.

Our second experiment intends to assess how our chemogenomics approach can perform when predicting ligands for orphan GPCRs, *i.e.*, with no training data available for the GPCR of interest. Table 2 shows that in this setting, individual learning performs random prediction. Naive multitask approach does not improve much the performance, but informative kernels such as hierarchical and




Figure 5: Distribution of the number of training points for a GPCR. Restricted to [2 – 200] samples for the sake of readability.

$K_{tar} \setminus K_{lig}$	2D Tanimoto	3D pharmacophore
Dirac	$50.0 \pm 0.0$	$50.0 \pm 0.0$
multitask	$56.8 \pm 2.5$	$58.2 \pm 2.2$
hierarchy	$77.4 \pm 2.4$	$76.2 \pm 2.2$
binding pocket	$78.1 \pm 2.3$	$76.6 \pm 2.2$
poly binding pocket	$76.4 \pm 2.4$	$74.9 \pm 2.3$
binding pocket hierarchy	$75.5 \pm 2.4$	$76.5 \pm 2.2$

Table 2: Prediction accuracy for the second experiment with various ligand and target kernels.

binding pocket kernels achieve 77.4% and 78.1% of precision respectively, that is, almost 30% better than the random approach one would get when no data is available. Here again, the fact that the binding pocket kernel that only uses the sequence of the receptor pocket performs as well as the hierarchy-based kernel is encouraging. It suggests that given a receptor for which nothing is known except its sequence, it is possible to make reasonable ligand predictions.

## 5 Discussion

We showed how sharing information across the GPCRs by considering a chemogenomics space of the GPCR-ligand interaction pairs could improve the prediction performances. In addition, we showed that using such a representation, it was possible to make reasonable predictions even when no ligand was known for a given GPCR, that is, to predict ligands for orphan GPCRs. Our approach is simply to apply well known machine learning methods in the constructed chemogenomics space. We used a systematic way to build such a space by combining a given representation of the ligands with a given representation of the GPCRs into a binding-prediction-oriented GPCR-ligand couple representation. This allows to use any ligand or GPCR descriptor or kernel existing in the

chemoinformatics or bioinformatics literature, or new ones containing other prior information as we tried to propose in this paper. Our experiments showed that the choice of the descriptors was crucial for the prediction, and more sophisticated features for either the ligands or the GPCRs could probably further improve the performances.

In all experiments, 3D pharmacophore kernels did not reach the performance of 2D kernels for the ligands. This is apparently in contradiction with the idea that protein-ligand interaction is a process occurring in the 3D space, and that introduction of 3D information should increase the performance. Different explanations can be proposed. The choice of the low energy conformer was guided by the following idea. Because only two ligand conformations bound to GPCR receptors are available, it was not possible to derive any general information that could be used to choose a potential bioactive 3D conformer for each molecule of the ligand base. In this context, the only possible reasonable assumption was that, while interaction with the receptor will certainly perturb the conformational energy surface of a flexible ligand, high affinity would be observed for ligands that bind in a conformation that is not exceptionally different from a local free state energy minimum (Boström, 2001). Although there exists a large number of methods for exploring the conformation space of a molecule, we used the Omega program that performs rapid systematic conformer search, because it has been showed to present good performances for retrieving bioactive conformations (Boström *et al.*, 2003). However, the set of parameters used to run Omega in this study (because of calculation time limitations) may not have allowed to reach a local energy minimum: generating a larger number of conformers, with a smaller RMSD clustering value may have helped to find better energy minima, and this could be further evaluated. Moreover, some studies report that the bioactive conformation of a molecule can differ from the minimum energy conformation, and that significant strain energies can indeed be found for molecules in complex with proteins (Perola and Charifson, 2004). We cannot rule out the possibility that this is the case for GPCR ligands. In the future, resolution of additional 3D structures in this family will help to clarify this point. One possible improvement of the method could be to use homology models for the GPCRs, dock the ligand base in the modeled binding pockets, and build a 3D ligand base using, for each molecule, the conformer associated to the best docking solution. In other families of proteins, enzymes for example, where many structures are available and can be used to define bioactive conformers, the 3D pharmacophore kernel is expected to improve performance, as observed in a previous pure ligand-based study involving ligands in a given series, for which the bioactive conformation can be inferred from a known 3D structure (Mahé *et al.*, 2006).

Various evidence suggest that, within a common global architecture, a generic binding pocket mainly involving transmembrane regions hosts agonists, antagonists and allosteric modulators. In order to identify this pocket automatically, other studies report the use of sequence alignment and the prediction of transmembrane helices. Kratochwil *et al.* (2005) detected hypervariable positions in transmembrane helices for identification of residues forming the binding pocket. The underlying idea was that conserved residues were probably important for structure stabilization, while variable positions were involved in ligand binding, in order to accommodate the wide spectrum of molecules that are GPCR substrates. Using this method, they proposed potential binding pockets for GPCRs, and found that the corresponding residues were frequently in the GRAP mutant database for GPCRs (Kristiansen *et al.*, 1996). Interestingly, these authors pointed that residues corresponding to these hypervariable positions were found within a distance of 6Å from retinal in the rhodopsin X-Ray structure. Therefore, although we used a different method to automatically extract binding pocket residues in the GPCR families, our results are in good agreement with this study.

Interesting developments of this method could include application to quantitative prediction of the binding affinities, that would be straightforward using regression algorithms in the same chemogenomics space. Another possibility is application to other important drug target families,

like enzymes or ion channels (Hopkins and Groom, 2002), for which most of the descriptors used for the GPCRs in this paper could directly be used, and other, more specific ones could be designed. From a methodological point of view, many recent developments in multitask learning (Vert *et al.*, 2006; Argyriou *et al.*, 2007; Bonilla *et al.*, 2008) could be applied to generalize this chemogenomics approach using, for example, other regularization methods.

## References

- Argyriou, A., Evgeniou, T., and Pontil, M. (2007). Multi-task feature learning. In B. Schölkopf, J. Platt, and T. Hoffman, editors, *Adv. Neural. Inform. Process Syst.* 19, pages 41–48, Cambridge, MA. MIT Press.
- Azencott, C.-A., Ksikes, A., Swamidass, S. J., Chen, J. H., Ralaivola, L., and Baldi, P. (2007). One- to four-dimensional kernels for virtual screening and the prediction of physical, chemical, and biological properties. *J Chem Inf Model*, **47**(3), 965–974.
- Balakin, K. V., Tkachenko, S. E., Lang, S. A., Okun, I., Ivashchenko, A. A., and Savchuk, N. P. (2002). Property-based design of gpcr-targeted library. *J Chem Inf Comput Sci*, **42**(6), 1332–1342.
- Bock, J. R. and Gough, D. A. (2001). Predicting protein-protein interactions from primary structure. *Bioinformatics*, **17**(5), 455–460.
- Bock, J. R. and Gough, D. A. (2005). Virtual screen for ligands of orphan g protein-coupled receptors. *J Chem Inf Model*, **45**(5), 1402–1414.
- Bockaert, J. and Pin, J. P. (1999). Molecular tinkering of g protein-coupled receptors: an evolutionary success. *EMBO J*, **18**(7), 1723–1729.
- Bonilla, E., Chai, K. M., and Williams, C. (2008). Multi-task gaussian process prediction. In J. Platt, D. Koller, Y. Singer, and S. Roweis, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 20*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Borgwardt, K., Ong, C., Schönauer, S., Vishwanathan, S., Smola, A., and Kriegel, H.-P. (2005). Protein function prediction via graph kernels. *Bioinformatics*, **21**(Suppl. 1), i47–i56.
- Boström, J. (2001). Reproducing the conformations of protein-bound ligands: a critical evaluation of several popular conformational searching tools. *J Comput Aided Mol Des*, **15**(12), 1137–1152.
- Boström, J., Greenwood, J. R., and Gottfries, J. (2003). Assessing the performance of omega with respect to retrieving bioactive conformations. *J Mol Graph Model*, **21**(5), 449–462.
- Catapano, L. A. and Manji, H. K. (2007). G protein-coupled receptors in major psychiatric disorders. *Biochim Biophys Acta*, **1768**(4), 976–993.
- Cavasotto, C. N., Orry, A. J. W., and Abagyan, R. A. (2003). Structure-based identification of binding sites, native ligands and potential inhibitors for g-protein coupled receptors. *Proteins*, **51**(3), 423–433.
- Chenna, R., Sugawara, H., Koike, T., Lopez, R., Gibson, T. J., Higgins, D. G., and Thompson, J. D. (2003). Multiple sequence alignment with the clustal series of programs. *Nucleic Acids Res*, **31**(13), 3497–3500.
- Cuturi, M. and Vert, J.-P. (2005). The context-tree kernel for strings. *Neural Network.*, **18**(4), 1111–1123.
- Deshpande, D. A. and Penn, R. B. (2006). Targeting g protein-coupled receptor signaling in asthma. *Cell Signal*, **18**(12), 2105–2120.
- Dobson, P. and Doig, A. (2005). Predicting enzyme class from protein structure without alignments. *J. Mol. Biol.*, **345**(1), 187–199.
- Erhan, D., L’heureux, P.-J., Yue, S. Y., and Bengio, Y. (2006). Collaborative filtering on a family of biological targets. *J Chem Inf Model*, **46**(2), 626–635.
- Evers, A. and Klabunde, T. (2005). Structure-based drug discovery using gpcr homology modeling: successful virtual screening for antagonists of the alpha1a adrenergic receptor. *J Med Chem*, **48**(4), 1088–1097.
- Evgeniou, T., Micchelli, C., and Pontil, M. (2005). Learning multiple tasks with kernel methods. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, **6**, 615–637.
- Fredholm, B. B., Häkfelt, T., and Milligan, G. (2007). G-protein-coupled receptors: an update. *Acta Physiol (Oxf)*, **190**(1), 3–7.
- Frimurer, T. M., Ulven, T., Elling, C. E., Gerlach, L.-O., Kostenis, E., and Högberg, T. (2005). A phylogenetic method to assign ligand-binding relationships between 7tm receptors. *Bioorg. Med. Chem. Lett.*, **15**(16), 3707–3712.
- Gärtner, T., Flach, P., and Wrobel, S. (2003). On graph kernels: hardness results and efficient alternatives. In B. Schölkopf and M. Warmuth, editors, *Proceedings of the Sixteenth Annual Conference on Computational Learning Theory and the Seventh Annual Workshop on Kernel Machines*, volume 2777 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 129–143, Heidelberg.



- Gasteiger, J. and Engel, T., editors (2003). *Chemoinformatics : a Textbook*. Wiley.
- Henikoff, S. and Henikoff, J. G. (1992). Amino acid substitution matrices from protein blocks. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*, **89**(22), 10915–10919.
- Hill, S. J. (2006). G-protein-coupled receptors: past, present and future. *Br J Pharmacol*, **147 Suppl 1**, S27–S37.
- Hopkins, A. L. and Groom, C. R. (2002). The druggable genome. *Nat Rev Drug Discov*, **1**(9), 727–730.
- Horn, F., Bettler, E., Oliveira, L., Campagne, F., Cohen, F. E., and Vriend, G. (2003). GPCRDB information system for G protein-coupled receptors. *Nucl. Acids Res.*, **31**(1), 294–297.
- Humphrey, W., Dalke, A., and Schulten, K. (1996). Vmd: visual molecular dynamics. *J Mol Graph*, **14**(1), 33–8, 27–8.
- Jaakkola, T., Diekhans, M., and Haussler, D. (2000). A Discriminative Framework for Detecting Remote Protein Homologies. *J. Comput. Biol.*, **7**(1,2), 95–114.
- Jacob, L. and Vert, J.-P. (2008). Efficient peptide-MHC-I binding prediction for alleles with few known binders. *Bioinformatics*. To appear.
- Jaroch, S. E. and Weinmann, H., editors (2006). *Chemical Genomics: Small Molecule Probes to Study Cellular Function*. Ernst Schering Research Foundation Workshop. Springer.
- Kashima, H., Tsuda, K., and Inokuchi, A. (2003). Marginalized Kernels between Labeled Graphs. In T. Faucett and N. Mishra, editors, *Proceedings of the Twentieth International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 321–328. AAAI Press.
- Kashima, H., Tsuda, K., and Inokuchi, A. (2004). Kernels for graphs. In B. Schölkopf, K. Tsuda, and J. Vert, editors, *Kernel Methods in Computational Biology*, pages 155–170. MIT Press.
- Klabunde, T. (2006). Chemogenomics approaches to ligand design. In *Ligand Design for G Protein-coupled Receptors*, chapter 7, pages 115–135. Wiley-VCH.
- Klabunde, T. (2007). Chemogenomic approaches to drug discovery: similar receptors bind similar ligands. *Br J Pharmacol*, **152**, 5–7.
- Kratochwil, N. A., Malherbe, P., Lindemann, L., Ebeling, M., Hoener, M. C., M $\ddot{A}$ hlmann, A., Porter, R. H. P., Stahl, M., and Gerber, P. R. (2005). An automated system for the analysis of g protein-coupled receptor transmembrane binding pockets: alignment, receptor-based pharmacophores, and their application. *J Chem Inf Model*, **45**(5), 1324–1336.
- Kristiansen, K., Dahl, S. G., and Edvardsen, O. (1996). A database of mutants and effects of site-directed mutagenesis experiments on g protein-coupled receptors. *Proteins*, **26**(1), 81–94.
- Kuang, R., Ie, E., Wang, K., Wang, K., Siddiqi, M., Freund, Y., and Leslie, C. (2005). Profile-based string kernels for remote homology detection and motif extraction. *J Bioinform Comput Biol*, **3**(3), 527–550.
- Kubinyi, H., Müller, G., Mannhold, R., and Folkers, G., editors (2004). *Chemogenomics in Drug Discovery: A Medicinal Chemistry Perspective*. Methods and Principles in Medicinal Chemistry. Wiley-VCH.
- Leslie, C., Eskin, E., and Noble, W. (2002). The spectrum kernel: a string kernel for SVM protein classification. In R. B. Altman, A. K. Dunker, L. Hunter, K. Lauerdale, and T. E. Klein, editors, *Proceedings of the Pacific Symposium on Biocomputing 2002*, pages 564–575. World Scientific.
- Leslie, C. S., Eskin, E., Cohen, A., Weston, J., and Noble, W. S. (2004). Mismatch string kernels for discriminative protein classification. *Bioinformatics*, **20**(4), 467–476.
- Lin, S. H. S. and Civelli, O. (2004). Orphan g protein-coupled receptors: targets for new therapeutic interventions. *Ann Med*, **36**(3), 204–214.
- Mahé, P., Ueda, N., Akutsu, T., Perret, J.-L., and Vert, J.-P. (2005). Graph kernels for molecular structure-activity relationship analysis with support vector machines. *J Chem Inf Model*, **45**(4), 939–51.
- Mahé, P., Ralaivola, L., Stoven, V., and Vert, J.-P. (2006). The pharmacophore kernel for virtual screening with support vector machines. *J Chem Inf Model*, **46**(5), 2003–2014.
- Okuno, Y., Yang, J., Taneishi, K., Yabuuchi, H., and Tsujimoto, G. (2006). Glida: GPCR-ligand database for chemical genomic drug discovery. *Nucleic Acids Res*, **34**(Database issue), D673–D677.
- Perola, E. and Charifson, P. S. (2004). Conformational analysis of drug-like molecules bound to proteins: an extensive study of ligand reorganization upon binding. *J Med Chem*, **47**(10), 2499–2510.
- Qiu, J., Hue, M., Ben-Hur, A., Vert, J.-P., and Noble, W. S. (2007). A structural alignment kernel for protein structures. *Bioinformatics*, **23**(9), 1090–1098.
- Ralaivola, L., Swamidass, S. J., Saigo, H., and Baldi, P. (2005). Graph kernels for chemical informatics. *Neural Netw.*, **18**(8), 1093–1110.

- Rognan, D. (2007). Chemogenomic approaches to rational drug design. *Br J Pharmacol*, **152**, 38–52.
- Rolland, C., Gozalbes, R., NicolaË, E., Paugam, M.-F., Coussy, L., Barbosa, F., Horvath, D., and Revah, F. (2005). G-protein-coupled receptor affinity prediction based on the use of a profiling dataset: Qsar design, synthesis, and experimental validation. *J Med Chem*, **48**(21), 6563–6574.
- Russell, R. B. and Barton, G. J. (1992). Multiple protein sequence alignment from tertiary structure comparison: assignment of global and residue confidence levels. *Proteins*, **14**(2), 309–323.
- Schölkopf, B., Tsuda, K., and Vert, J.-P. (2004). *Kernel Methods in Computational Biology*. MIT Press.
- Todeschini, R. and Consonni, V. (2002). *Handbook of Molecular Descriptors*. Wiley-VCH.
- Tsuda, K., Kin, T., and Asai, K. (2002). Marginalized Kernels for Biological Sequences. *Bioinformatics*, **18**, S268–S275.
- Vert, J.-P. (2002). A tree kernel to analyze phylogenetic profiles. *Bioinformatics*, **18**, S276–S284.
- Vert, J.-P., Saigo, H., and Akutsu, T. (2004). Local alignment kernels for biological sequences. In B. Schölkopf, K. Tsuda, and J. Vert, editors, *Kernel Methods in Computational Biology*, pages 131–154. MIT Press.
- Vert, J.-P., Bach, F., and Evgeniou, T. (2006). Low-rank matrix factorization with attributes.

positions on $\beta_2$ -adrenergic receptor	82	<b>109</b>	<b>110</b>	113	114	115	116	117	118	121	175	183	195	<b>199</b>	<b>200</b>	
$\beta_2$ -adrenergic receptor	M	<b>W</b>	<b>T</b>	D	V	L	C	V	T	I	R	N	T	<b>Y</b>	<b>A</b>	
5-hydroxytryptamine 5A receptor	V	<b>W</b>	<b>I</b>	D	V	L	C	C	T	I	I	E	S	<b>Y</b>	<b>A</b>	
Adenosine A2b receptor	V	<b>L</b>	<b>A</b>	V	L	V	L	T	Q	I	I	K	K	<b>M</b>	<b>V</b>	
Gamma-aminobutyric acid type B receptor	E	<b>D</b>	<b>E</b>	E	A	V	E	G	H	T	L	G	S	<b>F</b>	<b>D</b>	
Relaxin 3 receptor 2	L	<b>V</b>	<b>L</b>	T	V	L	N	V	Y	I	V	G	L	<b>Y</b>	<b>Q</b>	
positions on $\beta_2$ -adrenergic receptor	203	204	207	208	212	282	286	<b>289</b>	290	293	<b>308</b>	311	312	313	315	316
$\beta_2$ -adrenergic receptor	S	S	S	F	L	F	W	<b>F</b>	F	N	<b>Y</b>	L	N	W	G	Y
5-hydroxytryptamine 5A receptor	S	T	A	F	L	F	W	<b>F</b>	F	E	<b>K</b>	F	L	W	G	Y
Adenosine A2b receptor	N	F	C	V	L	F	W	<b>V</b>	H	N	<b>M</b>	A	I	L	S	H
Gamma-aminobutyric acid type B receptor	G	S	A	W	E	F	L	<b>Y</b>	H	R	<b>L</b>	T	V	G	L	V
Relaxin 3 receptor 2	R	V	A	F	L	F	W	<b>N</b>	H	T	<b>F</b>	T	T	C	A	H

Table 3: Residues of 5-hydroxytryptamine 5A receptor, Adenosine A2b receptor, Gamma-aminobutyric acid type B receptor and Relaxin 3 receptor 2 (shown as examples) aligned with  $\beta_2$ -adrenergic receptor binding site amino acids. the binding pocket motif of  $\beta_2$ -adrenergic receptor has been used as reference to determine residues involved in the formation of the binding site of the 79 other GPCRs. Bold columns correspond to the residues shown on Figure 2.