

# Analysis of SNP-Expression Association Matrices

Anya Tsalenko<sup>1</sup>, Roded Sharan<sup>2</sup>, Hege Edvardsen<sup>3</sup>, Vessela Kristensen<sup>3</sup>, Anne-Lise Børresen-Dale<sup>3</sup>,  
Amir Ben-Dor<sup>1</sup>, Zohar Yakhini<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Agilent Technologies, 3500 Deer Creek Road, Palo Alto CA 94304, USA*

<sup>2</sup> *School of Computer Science, Tel-Aviv University, Tel-Aviv 69978, Israel*

<sup>3</sup> *Department of Genetics, Institute for Cancer Research, Faculty Division, The Norwegian Radium Hospital, University of Oslo, Montebello 03190 Oslo 3, Norway*

anya\_tsalenko@agilent.com, roded@post.tau.ac.il, hege.edvardsen@medisin.uio.no,  
vessela@ulrik.uio.no, a.l.borresen-dale@medisin.uio.no, amir\_ben-dor@agilent.com,  
zohar\_yakhini@agilent.com

## ***Abstract***

*High throughput expression profiling and genotyping technologies provide the means to study the genetic determinants of population variation in gene expression variation. In this paper we present a general statistical framework for the simultaneous analysis of gene expression data and SNP genotype data measured for the same cohort. The framework consists of methods to associate transcripts with SNPs affecting their expression, algorithms to detect subsets of transcripts that share significantly many associations with a subset of SNPs, and methods to visualize the identified relations. We apply our framework to SNP-expression data collected from 49 breast cancer patients. Our results demonstrate an overabundance of transcript-SNP associations in this data, and pinpoint SNPs that are potential master regulators of transcription. We also identify several statistically significant transcript-subsets with common putative regulators that fall into well-defined functional categories.*

## **1. Introduction**

The development of high throughput techniques for expression profiling and genotyping enables the study of the genetic determinants of expression variation, both in humans and in other organisms. Expression levels are taken as quantitative phenotypes, of independent interest, as well as determinants or indications of endpoint clinical phenotypes. Much of our understanding of the genetic base of disease comes from identifying polymorphisms that affect protein structure or integrity. We know, however, that protein abundance and expression levels of mRNA also drive disease processes. It is therefore important to explore the genetic base of variation in gene expression, regarded as a quantitative phenotype.

Several studies that genetically analyzed expression phenotypes have been reported in the literature. In [3] the authors report the use of 3312 markers and genome wide linkage analysis to study the natural variation of

expression in yeast. The expression levels of 570 genes were linked to one or more different loci, with most transcripts showing complex inheritance patterns. Loci that are linked to expression phenotypes are either cis-acting modulators of single genes (the polymorphism that is linked to the transcript is in the coding sequence of the gene or very close to it) or trans-acting modulators (the polymorphism is in a different part of the genome) of many genes. The study reports eight such trans-acting loci, each potentially affecting the expression levels of a group of 7 to 94 genes of related function. In [9] Jin et al. investigated the genotypic contributions to transcriptional variance in *Drosophila*. They conclude that that gene expression in adult flies is affected most strongly by sex, less so by genotype and only weakly by age (for 1- and 6-week flies). They also find that chromosome X genotype interactions may be present for as much as 10% of the *Drosophila* transcriptome.

Schadt *et al* [16] describe genetic analysis of gene expression in three species, with an emphasis on mice. They produced a genetically diverse population of 111 mice by crossing two commonly used inbred strains and measured the expression levels of 23,574 mouse genes in blood samples from this population. They found that 7,861 are differentially expressed in the two original strains. These were further used in studying the genetics of gene expression in this population, using a panel of more than 100 microsatellite markers. The study reports *e-QTLs* (expression quantitative trait loci): genetic regions (loci) that can account for variation in the levels of gene expression. Many *e-QTLs* were found at the same chromosomal location as the gene they hypothetically affect (*in-cis*). They also identified genomic regions with *e-QTLs* for an exceptionally large number of transcripts, suggesting the presence of regulatory elements.

Another approach to the study of the relationship between genetics and expression regulation is to study the differential expression between genetic variants. Sandberg *et al* [15] studied genes that are differentially expressed between two inbred mouse strains at baseline and in response to seizure. They find that approximately 1% of expressed genes are differentially expressed between strains in at least one region of the brain and that the gene expression response to seizure is significantly different between the two strains. Hedenfalk *et al* [6] study expression differences in breast tumor samples collected from patients of different BRCA1 and BRCA2 status to discover significant differences that attest to the effect of genetic

differences on tumor expression patterns. In a related study [7] the authors suggest the use of differential expression and a class discovery process [1] to define more homogenous cohorts for genetic studies. A study of lymphoblastoid expression differences between carriers of ataxia telangiectasia, an autosomal recessive disease, and normal controls, further confirms the effect of genetic differences on the expression phenotype [21]. These results illustrate that heterozygous carriers, even of recessive conditions, can have a distinct phenotype.

In a recent report Morley et al [13] describe a broad study of the genetic determinants of normal expression variation in humans. The authors used microarrays to measure the baseline expression levels of roughly 8500 genes, or transcripts, in immortalized B cells from members of CEPH Utah pedigrees [21]. They selected 3554 genes that varied more between individuals than between replicates and used these as quantitative traits, to be mapped into genomic locations. They used public genotype information to carry out linkage analysis for these expression phenotypes in 14 CEPH families. They found high linkage signals for 984 of the transcripts (at  $p < 0.05$ , leading to an FDR of about 0.2). Interestingly, they identified regions that show linkage signals to many of the transcripts, and proposed that these can point towards master regulators of baseline expression levels.

In this paper we address the methodology of interpreting genetic linkage and association data for expression level phenotypes. We focus on the case of association studies involving single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs). It is possible to modify the methods to address other types of polymorphisms or of genetic analysis, such as linkage studies in pedigrees and LOD scores. The first step in analyzing SNP and gene expression data consists of computing the *association graph*  $G = (S, T, E)$ , a bipartite graph where  $S$  represents SNP loci (or genomic loci in general),  $T$  represents the transcripts measured in the expression profiling study and  $E$  is a set of edges that represent the genetic association. An edge  $e = (s, t) \in E$  can be labeled by the  $p$ -value (or other score) of the observed association between  $s$  and  $t$  or it can be binary, when using a threshold to determine edges and non-edges. An alternative mathematical representation of the graph is the *association matrix*  $P$ . The entries  $P_{st}$ , again, represent the level of association between the genotypes measured at SNP locus  $s$  and the expression levels of a gene or transcript  $t$ . Studying properties of the association graph enables the identification of meaningful biological signals, similar to the ones

described in some of the literature cited above. We describe methods and results related to the following structures in  $G$ :

- Overall overabundance of associated pairs: We assess the overall significance of the observed association between genotypes and expression phenotypes by comparing it to a null model.
- Potential master regulators: We seek vertices in  $S$  that have significantly high (or heavy, in the case of  $p$ -value labeled edges) degrees. Such structures represent the effect of this locus on many transcripts and suggest the presence of a regulation element. When several SNPs reside in the same gene these are lumped together for this analysis. We further study the transcripts that are potentially regulated by a gene or associated to a SNP locus, e.g., seeking functional enrichment.
- Biclusters: A *bicluster* is a subgraph of  $G$ . We adapt the methods of Tanay *et al* ([19]) to find significantly dense biclusters, in which the participating SNPs share significantly many common associations with the participating transcripts. When several SNP loci, especially when not in LD, associate with the same transcript, this may be evidence of this expression phenotype being a complex trait, affected by several genetic events. When the same set of loci commonly associate with a large number of transcripts we have cross-confirmation of the individual associations as well as a possible multi-locus effect on a pathway or a biological process.
- To further validate and better understand vertices of high degree and dense biclusters we test the sets of participating transcripts for functional enrichment.

We exemplify our methods by applying them to SNP-expression data collected from 49 breast cancer patients [11]. The data consist of 578 SNPs in selected genes from the reactive oxygen species (ROS) biochemical and signaling pathways, and expression levels of 3351 transcripts, in tumor biopsies ([17], [18]). We identified SNPs that are associated to a significantly large number of transcripts, such as *PPKCA* which was found to be associated with 85 transcripts at  $p < 0.001$ . Several significant biclusters were found in the data, one of them consisting of 4 SNPs (in *IL1B*, *IER3* and *NOX3*, which are related to stress response) and 82

transcripts. The GO term “cytosolic small ribosomal subunit” was significantly over-represented in this set of transcripts (Bonferroni corrected  $p$ -value 0.002) together with other related GO terms.

The purpose of this paper is to present and demonstrate analysis tools that can be used in identifying significant relationships between genetic variation and differential expression. To fully understand the biological meaning of significant structures more experiments or analysis need to be designed and performed.

## 2. Computational methods and statistical modeling

### 2.1. Computing the SNP-transcript association matrix

Let  $N$  and  $M$  denote the number of SNPs and transcripts, respectively. For each pair  $(s, t)$  of SNP and transcript, we compute an association score and a corresponding  $p$ -value  $P_{st}$  using one of the methods described below. The resulting matrix  $P$  is called the *association matrix*. Given a threshold  $p$ , we say that  $s$  is *associated* with  $t$  if  $P_{st} < p$ .

**Quantitative mutual information score.** For a SNP locus  $s$  and an expression vector  $q$  of transcript  $t$ , let  $G$  be a partition of samples induced by the genotypic values at locus  $s$ . For a threshold  $p$ , let  $C_p$  be a partition of samples defined by the  $q < p$  and  $q \geq p$ . The *mutual information score (MIS)* is the difference between the entropy of the partition  $C_p$  and the conditional entropy of  $C_p$  given  $G$ :  $MIS(C_p, G) = H(C_p) - H(C_p | G)$ , where  $H$  is the entropy function. We define the *quantitative mutual information score (QMIS)* to be the maximum possible MIS, i.e.,

$QMIS(C, G) = \max_{\min(q) \leq p \leq \max(q)} MIS(C_p, G)$ . A  $p$ -value for the mutual information score can be computed exactly by an exhaustive approach [19]. These  $p$ -values comprise the entries of the association matrix  $P$ .

**ANOVA analysis.** For each SNP locus and each transcript, we also computed one-way ANOVA  $p$ -value for the expression vector and grouping of the samples based on SNP locus genotypes [14]. These  $p$ -values comprised the entries of the association matrix  $P$ .

The two methods described above demonstrate possible parametric and non-parametric approaches to assess SNP-transcript association. ANOVA analysis

assumes normal distribution of underlying measurements that may be not true in expression data in general, but ANOVA analysis is computationally efficient. QMIS does not make any distribution assumptions, but its  $p$ -value computation is rather slow, which limits its use in some of the applications.

## 2.2. Bicluster identification

A *bicluster* is a submatrix of the association matrix, that is, a subset of SNPs and transcripts. In graph terms, a bicluster is a subgraph of the association graph. The goal of the bicluster analysis is to identify significantly dense biclusters, in which the participating SNPs share significantly many common associations with the participating transcripts.

Let  $S$  be the set of SNPs and let  $T$  be the set of transcripts. To find biclusters in the association matrix  $P$ , we first transform  $P$  into a weighted bipartite graph  $G=(S,T,E)$  as follows: For a given threshold  $p$  (e.g., 0.05) and any pair  $(s,t)$  of SNP-transcript, we define  $(s,t)$  to be an edge of weight +1 if  $P_{st} < p$  and to be a non-edge of weight -1 otherwise. We now apply the biclustering algorithm of Tanay *et al.* [19] to this graph, looking for the heaviest biclusters, where the weight of a bicluster is defined as the sum of the weights of its edges and non-edges. Briefly, the algorithm starts from small biclusters (complete bipartite subgraphs), serving as seeds, and expands them in a greedy fashion. The bicliques can be found efficiently using a hashing technique described in Tanay *et al.* [19]. Each such seed is expanded iteratively, adding or removing a SNP or a transcript that contributes the most to the weight of the resulting bicluster, as long as this contribution increases the overall weight of the bicluster. The resulting biclusters correspond to dense subgraphs of the association graph, with edge density exceeding 0.5 due to the particular choice of edge weights.

## 2.3. Assessment of statistical significance

To assess the statistical significance of our findings, we compared our analysis results to those obtained on random data sets. Those were generated by randomly permuting the expression data, while leaving the genotype data intact. More precisely, in each instance of the random data samples were randomly assigned to expression vectors. This randomization process ensures

that we keep the structure of dependencies between SNP loci that exist in the original data, as well as between expression vectors. These permuted data were used in assessing overabundance of significant SNP-transcripts association pairs as well as in the assessing the significance of more complex structures.

## 2.4. Visualization of biclusters

We developed a method for visualizing a set of possibly overlapping biclusters by permuting the rows and columns of the association matrix so that rows and columns that belong to the same bicluster are ordered close to one another. To describe the algorithm we first note that the problem of determining whether there exist permutations, for which all biclusters appear consecutively in their rows and columns, can be reduced to two consecutive ones problems, one in each dimension of the matrix. Even in the case of an imperfect solution (i.e., the consecutive property cannot be maintained) we shall assume that the two dimensions of the matrix are independent, and will optimize them separately.

For a given dimension  $d$  (rows or columns), our goal is to optimize over all biclusters the sum of their spreads, where the *spread* of a bicluster along dimension  $d$  is defined as the standard deviation of the locations of its elements along this dimension. We designed a greedy heuristic to this optimization problem that starts with a random permutation and iteratively tries to decrease its sum of spreads by exchanging pairs of elements.

## 2.5. Analysis of functional enrichment

Gene sets that were associated to one or more SNPs were subjected to analysis of their functional enrichment based on their Gene Ontology (GO) annotations. GO annotations for all genes were obtained using publicly available Biomolecule Naming Service (BNS) [10], <http://openbns.sourceforge.net/>, a high-speed directory service developed at Agilent Laboratories, which can resolve between alias and official gene symbols, and links to publicly available databases. We say that gene  $g$  is *linked* to a GO term  $t$ , if  $t$  annotates  $g$  or is an ancestor of some GO annotation for  $g$ . For each GO term  $t$ , we tested whether  $t$  is

overrepresented in the given set of genes using hypergeometric distribution [5], [12].


### 3. Results

We analyzed SNP-expression data collected in the study of the effects of single nucleotide polymorphisms on genome-wide expression in tumors from breast cancer patients [11]. This data consisted of 696 SNPs in selected genes from the reactive oxygen species (ROS) biochemical and signaling pathways, and 8000 transcripts whose expression was measured in genome-wide study of tumor biopsies [17], [18], [http://genome-www.stanford.edu/breast\\_cancer](http://genome-www.stanford.edu/breast_cancer). 696 SNPs were divided among 203 genes distributed along all chromosomes with a wide spread of 1 to 19 SNPs per gene. Gene expression levels were measured on arrays manufactured at the Stanford Microarray Core Facility. Prior to the analysis, the expression data was filtered for signal quality; namely, we retained only transcripts whose ratio of feature intensity over background exceeded 1.5 in at least 80 % of the experiments in each dye channel. 3351 transcripts passed this array signal filter. The analysis was also restricted to 578 SNPs that had different genotypes among studied individuals. SNP and expression data was available for 49 breast cancer patients.


#### 3.1. Overabundance analysis of the association matrix

We used the framework for computing associations between SNPs and genes to test whether the number of associations detected in real data is larger than the random expectation. This overabundance analysis was performed using two measures: false discovery rate (FDR) [2] and binomial surprise rate [1]. FDR measures the ratio of expected and observed numbers of SNP-transcript association pairs with a given score or better. Binomial surprise rate as defined in [1] measures the probability of seeing larger or equal number of pairs with a given score or better when uniformly drawing random permutations of genotype data and assuming transcript independence. The number of associations in both cases was determined by counting the number of entries in the association matrix less than or equal to a given threshold. The results of this analysis are depicted in Figure 1 and Figure 2. For QMIS, 769 SNP-transcript


association pairs with  $p$ -values  $\leq 1.0e-04$  were observed with FDR of 0.2 and binomial surprise of 9349. In random data you may expect to find only 150 such pairs. In this case the expected number of pairs is calculated based on QMIS  $p$ -value and size of the association matrix.



**Figure 1** Overabundance analysis for QMIS-based associations. The top plot shows comparison of distributions of observed and expected numbers of SNP-transcript pairs with a certain  $p$ -value or better. The bottom plot shows the corresponding  $-\log_{10}(\text{binomial surprise})$ , see text and [1]. Small insert plots show the same results restricted to  $p$ -values between  $1.0e-06$  and  $1.0e-04$ .



**Figure 2** Comparison of numbers of ANOVA-based association pairs in original and permuted data. The permuted data represents averages over 50 permuted data sets.



**Figure 3** Examples of SNP-transcript associations. **A.** Difference between expression values in *QDPR* transcripts in samples with different genotypes at SNP 861098 (located within the gene *PPP1R2*). This association receives an ANOVA  $p$ -value of  $2.1\text{e-}07$ . **B.** Difference between expression values of the *FANCA* transcript in samples with different genotypes at SNP 913059 (in the gene *TGFBR3*); this association has an ANOVA  $p$ -value of  $3.7\text{e-}06$ . **C.** Difference between expression values of the *NAP1L2* transcript in samples with different genotypes at SNP 1889740 (in the gene *ARNT*); the association has an ANOVA  $p$ -value of  $1.02\text{e-}06$ .

For ANOVA scores, 571 SNP-transcript association pairs with  $p$ -values  $\leq 1.0\text{e-}04$  were observed with FDR of 0.6 based on expected number of pairs estimated from permuted data. Figure 3 shows several examples of SNP-transcript pairs with significant associations.


Each graph shows a box-plot of expression data grouped by sample genotypes for each SNP. The boxes have lines at the lower quartile, median, and upper quartile values. The whiskers are lines extending from each end of the boxes to show the extent of the rest of the data. Outliers are data with values beyond the ends of the whiskers. For SNPs in *PPP1R2* and *TGFBR3*, the presence of G or C alleles increases expression of *QDPR* and *FANCA* respectively. AA genotype in *ARNT* is associated with increased expression of the *NAP1L2* transcript.

### 3.2. Master regulators

Figure 4 depicts the differences between the total edge weights observed at the high end of the actual data and the corresponding results, averaged over 50 sets of simulated data (see Methods for simulation methodology). The total edge weight of SNP locus  $s$  is computed as sum  $-\log(P_{sg})$  over all transcripts  $g$  such that  $P_{sg} < 0.001$ . SNP loci that have a set of edges with an exceptionally heavy weight are putative regulators of many transcripts. They potentially affect the expression levels or the mode of operation of transcription factors or of RNA binding proteins, directly or indirectly. Thus, these SNPs affect the transcription or degradation rates and hence expression levels of many transcripts. SNPs that had the highest weight belong to the genes *PRKCA*, *CYP2C19*, *IFG1R*, *IGF2R* and *XDN*.

To further understand the association of SNPs to sets of transcripts we are interested in common properties of the described above sets of transcripts. To this end we performed GO enrichment analysis of these sets as described in the Methods. We considered sets of transcripts associated to SNPs that belong to the same gene, and looked for overrepresented GO terms in these sets. Several examples of our findings: 70 transcripts associated with gene *GCLM* contained all 5 transcripts that belong to term “fibrillar collagen” (Bonferroni corrected  $p$ -value 0.0002). 90 transcripts associated with gene *PPP3CA* contained 6 out of 12 transcripts that belong to term “antigen processing” and “antigen presentation” (Bonferroni corrected  $p$ -value of 0.002 and 0.005 respectively). Transcripts associated with genes *IL1B*, *IER3* and *NOX3* included all 3 members of the term “cytosolic small ribosomal subunit” (Bonferroni corrected  $p$ -value of 0.008 and 0.004) as well as members of other groups related to ribosome functions Figure 6. As *IL1B*, *IER3* and *NOX3* are part of the stress response system our findings are consistent with stress response activation of protein synthesis and

how it may be affected by genetic variants in these 3 genes.




**Figure 4** Comparison of vertex weights in original and permuted data. For each SNP locus  $s$ , total edge weight was computed as sum  $-\log(P_{sg})$  over all transcripts  $g$  such that  $P_{sg} < 0.001$ . 50 instances of randomized expression data were used in the calculation of weighted vertex degree in permuted plot.

### 3.3. Bicluster analysis

In addition to the overabundance analyses described above, we conducted several bicluster analyses of the association matrix, searching for these more complex structures in the data. First, we analyzed the association graph obtained from a QMIS-based association matrix using a  $p$ -value threshold of 0.02. Our algorithm identified 28 biclusters in the graph whose size (product of number of SNPs and number of transcripts) exceeded 32. We analyzed the gene set contained in each bicluster for functional enrichment. One of the biclusters had 4 SNPs in genes *IL1B*, *IER3* and *NOX3* and 82 transcripts. The GO term “cytosolic small ribosomal subunit” was significantly overrepresented in this set of transcripts (Bonferroni corrected  $p$ -value of 0.002) together with other related GO terms. Figure 6 shows the part of the GO cellular component hierarchy connecting the term “cytosolic small ribosomal subunit” to the root of the hierarchy. Node sizes are proportional to the significance of the corresponding GO terms. Figure 7 shows a visualization of the biclusters that were identified in the QMIS analysis.


We also analyzed an ANOVA-based association matrix with a threshold of 0.01, which corresponds to the best 1% of scores observed in the data. In total, we identified 54 biclusters of size exceeding 32. Since ANOVA scores are efficient to compute, we were able to simulate association matrices for random data (see Methods) and evaluate the significance of the biclusters detected. To this end, we associated with each bicluster  $B$  a weight  $W(B)$  that measures the extent to which the SNPs in the bicluster are associated with the genes in the bicluster.  $W(B)$  is defined to be the sum over all pairs of SNP  $s$  and gene  $g$  in the bicluster of  $(m - \log(P_{sg}))$ , where  $m = \frac{1}{NM} \sum_{s,g} \log P_{sg}$ .




**Figure 5** Comparison of bicluster sizes and bicluster weights in original and permuted data. Biclusters in original and permuted data were identified using the corresponding association matrices computed using ANOVA  $p$ -values  $\leq 0.01$ . Results for the permuted data represent averages over 50 random data sets.

The significance of a bicluster is then estimated as the probability of observing a bicluster with score  $W(B)$  or better in the permuted data. For 22 of the 54

biclusters identified in the ANOVA-based association matrix, the probability of observing a bicluster of this weight in permuted data was less than 0.01. Figure 5 shows a comparison of bicluster sizes and weights in the original and permuted data.



**Figure 6** Part of the cellular component hierarchy connecting overrepresented terms in the set of transcripts associated with SNPs in genes *IL1B*, *IER3* and *NOX3* to the root of the hierarchy. Each node correspond to GO term, sizes of the nodes are proportional to term significance.



**Figure 7** Visualization of the association matrix computed using the QMIS-based analysis. Top plot shows a subset of SNPs and a subset of transcripts in their original order in the data. Each SNP and transcript shown belongs to one of the biclusters. Bottom plot shows the same subset of SNPs and transcripts reordered to highlight biclusters identified in the data.

## 4. Conclusions

We have presented a framework for the integrated analysis of genotype and expression data. The analysis relies on the computation of an association matrix whose entries represent the extent to which each SNP is correlated with each transcript. We devised methods for the overabundance analysis of the entire matrix and each of its rows or columns. We also adapted methods for identifying high-scoring biclusters in this matrix, representing a set of SNPs that share significantly many associations. We applied our framework to analyze SNP-expression data from breast cancer patients, discovering novel gene sets that may be associated with the disease. Possible extensions to our method include (1) improved weighting schemes to the entries of the association matrix; (2) a more refined bicluster analysis that does not require the discretization of the association data; and (3) methods for further evaluating the identified gene sets, e.g., by using additional expression data from independent sources.

## 5. Acknowledgements

Roded Sharan was supported by an Alon fellowship. Vessela Kristensen, Hege Edvardsen and Anne-Lise Børresen-Dale were supported by grant 222050 from the National Program for Research in Functional Genomics in Norway (FUGE) in the Research Council of Norway.

## 6. References

- [1] Ben-Dor, A, Friedman N, and Yakhini Z. (2001) "Class Discovery in Gene Expression Data." *Proceedings of the Fifth International Conference on Computational Biology RECOMB'01*: 31-38.
- [2] Benjamini Y, Hochberg Y (1995) "Controlling the false discovery rate- a practical and powerful approach to multiple testing", *J Roy Stat Soc B Met* 57(1), p289-300.
- [3] Brem RB, Yvert G, Clinton R, Kruglyak L. (2002) "Genetic dissection of transcriptional regulation in budding yeast". *Science*. 26;296(5568), p752-5.
- [4] Chen MM, Ashley EA, Deng DX, Tsalenko A, Deng A, Tabibiazar R, Ben-Dor A, Fenster B, Yang



- E, King JY, Fowler M, Robbins R, Johnson FL, Bruhn L, McDonagh T, Dargie H, Yakhini Z, Tsao PS, Quertermous T. (2003) "Novel role for the potent endogenous inotrope apelin in human cardiac dysfunction". *Circulation*. vol.108.
- [5] Gao F, Foat B, and Bussemaker H. "Defining transcriptional networks through integrative modeling of mRNA expression and transcriptional factor binding data" *BMC Bioinformatics* (2004), 5:31.
- [6] Hedenfalk I, Duggan D, Chen Y, Radmacher M, Bittner M, Simon R, Meltzer P, Gusterson B, Esteller M, Kallioniemi OP, Wilfond B, Borg A, Trent J. (2001) "Gene-expression profiles in hereditary breast cancer". *N Engl J Med*. 344(8):p539-48.
- [7] Hedenfalk I, Ringner M, Ben-Dor A, Yakhini Z, Chen Y, Chebil G, Ach R, Loman N, Olsson H, Meltzer P, Borg A, Trent J. (2003) "Molecular classification of familial non-BRCA1/BRCA2 breast cancer". *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA*. 100(5):p2532-7.
- [8] Ho M, Yang E, Matcuk G, Deng D, Sampas N, Tsalenko A, Tabibiazar R, Zhang Y, Chen M, Talbi S, Ho YD, Wang J, Tsao PS, Ben-Dor A, Yakhini Z, Bruhn L, Quertermous T. (2003) "Identification of endothelial cell genes by combined database mining and microarray analysis" *Physiol Genomics*. vol.13(3).
- [9] Jin W, Riley RM, Wolfinger RD, White KP, Passador-Gurgel G, Gibson G. (2001) "The contributions of sex, genotype and age to transcriptional variance in *Drosophila melanogaster*". *Nat Genet*. 29(4), p389-95.
- [10] Kincaid R, Kleusing, D, Vailaya, A (2002) "BNS: An LDAP-based Biomolecule Naming Service." *OIBC*. Washington DC.
- [11] Kristensen V, Edvardsen H, Nordgard S, Sørli T, Lønning PE, Lien S, Omholt S, Syvanen AC, Tsalenko A, Ben-Dor A, Yakhini Z and Borresen-Dale AL. "Potential master regulators of gene expression cancer related pathways", *in preparation to be submitted*.
- [12] Martin D, Brun C, Remy E, Mouren P, Thieffry D and Jacq B. (2004) "GOToolBox: functional analysis of gene datasets based on Gene Ontology" *Genome Biology*, 5:R101.
- [13] Morley M, Molony C, Weber T, Devlin J, Ewens K, Spielman R and Cheung V, (2004) "Genetic analysis of genome-wide variation in human gene expression", *Nature*, vol.430.
- [14] Rice J. (1995) *Mathematical Statistics and Data Analysis*. Duxbury Press.
- [15] Sandberg R, Yasuda R, Pankratz DG, Carter TA, Del Rio JA, Wodicka L, Mayford M, Lockhart DJ, & Barlow C. (2000) "Regional and strain-specific gene expression mapping in the adult mouse brain". *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* 97, 11038-43.
- [16] Schadt EE, Monks SA, Drake TA, Lusis AJ, Che N, Colinayo V, Ruff TG, Milligan SB, Lamb JR, Cavet G, Linsley PS, Mao M, Stoughton RB, Friend SH. (2003) "Genetics of gene expression surveyed in maize, mouse and man", *Nature*, 422(6929):p297-302.
- [17] Sorlie T, Perou CM, Tibshirani R, Aas T, Geisler S, Johnsen H, Hastie T, Eisen MB, van de Rijn M, Jeffrey SS, Thorsen T, Quist H, Matese JC, Brown PO, Botstein D, Eystein Lønning P, Borresen-Dale AL. (2001) "Gene expression patterns of breast carcinomas distinguish tumor subclasses with clinical implications" *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA*. 98: p10869-74.
- [18] Sorlie T, Tibshirani R, Parker J, Hastie T, Marron JS, Nobel A, Deng S, Johnsen H, Pesich R, Geisler S, Demeter J, Perou CM, Lønning PE, Brown PO, Borresen-Dale AL, Botstein D. (2003) "Repeated observation of breast tumor subtypes in independent gene expression data sets". *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 100: p8418-23.
- [19] Tanay A, Sharan R, Kupiec M and Shamir R. (2004) "Revealing Modularity and Organization in the Yeast Molecular Network by Integrated Analysis of Highly Heterogeneous Genome-wide Data", *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* 101:p2981-2986.
- [20] Tsalenko A, Ben-Dor A, Cox N, Yakhini Z. (2003) "Methods for analysis and visualization of SNP genotype data for complex diseases". *Pac Symp Biocomput.*; p548-61.
- [21] Watts JA, Morley M, Burdick JT, Fiori JL, Ewens WJ, Spielman RS, Cheung VG. (2002) "Gene expression phenotype in heterozygous carriers of ataxia telangiectasia", *Am J Hum Genet*. 71(4):p791-800.