Protein-protein interaction probability landscapes for yeast
replicative aging

Hao-Bo Guo[1,2,*] , Weiwei Dang[4] , Hong Qin[1,2,3,*]

[1]Department of Computer Science and Engineering
[2]SimCenter
[3]Department of Biology, Geology and Environmental Science
The University of Tennessee at Chattanooga, Chattanooga, Tennessee 37405, USA
[4]Huffington Center on Aging, Baylor College of Medicine, Houston, Texas 77030, USA

*Correspondence: haobo-guo03@utc.edu and hong-qin@utc.edu

Abstract

We used probability landscapes to map the age-dependent protein-protein interaction

profiles during *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* replicative aging. We used quasi-potentials,

the negative logarithm of the probabilities, to visualize the downs and rises on the

landscapes with respect to the young cells. When the interaction probability is gauged by

protein abundance during aging, intra-essential protein interactions fell into a low-

potential basin. When the interaction probability is estimated from gene expression, we

observed that intra-essential protein interactions were located on a high-potential ridge.

These opposite patterns coincide with the previously reported uncoupling of the

transcriptome and proteome during yeast aging and were also observed in landscapes

on different parameter spaces. A proteome-wide probability landscape revealed that the

essential proteins favor the interactions with other essential proteins. The increases in

essential hub protein abundances may partly explain the opposite trends observed in the

landscapes.

Introduction

The replicative lifespan (RLS) studies in budding yeast, *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*, provided genetic basis of cellular aging from the single cellular organism (McCormick et al. 2015), and contributed to understanding of the aging mechanisms in other organisms including humans (Longo et al. 2012; Wasko and Kaeberlein 2014; Janssens and Veenhoff 2016; Crane and Kaeberlein 2018). Similar to other model organisms such as *Caenorhabditis elegans* (Friedman and Johnson 1988), deletion of a single gene, such as *fob1* in yeast, can significantly extend the lifespan (Defossez et al. 1999). Other factors that affect lifespan, such as caloric restriction (CR), were also found dependent on the genotypes (Schleit et al. 2013). Besides these presumable genetic cues, the individual aging phenotypes vary significantly, even in yeast single cells (Crane and Kaeberlein 2018; Crane et al. 2020). Moreover, the aging phenotypes are dependent on gene expressions. For instance, overexpression of the *sir2* gene could extend the RLS of yeast cells (Kaeberlein and Powers 2007; Guo et al. 2011). A recent work found overexpression of both *sir2* and *hap4* genes leads to a cell state with considerably long RLS (Li et al. 2020).

Whilst the randomness in gene expression, transcription and translation (Raj and van Oudenaarden 2008), enhanced transcriptional fidelity was associated with aging and longevity in yeast (Sen et al. 2015; Ke et al. 2017). The translational efficiencies of different proteins were observed to vary up to hundreds of folds in yeast, however, the variances in both protein and mRNA levels were highly correlated (Lahtvee et al. 2017). Increased noises in both transcriptome and proteome during aging could be part of the cascading events leading to replicative aging and eventual cell death. A recent work

reported the proteomics and transcriptomics at different time points along the yeast aging

trajectory and identified the "uncoupling" of protein levels to their transcript levels—most

notably, of those related to the biogenesis—may be causal of aging (Janssens et al. 2015).

It should be noted that the RLS is defined as the total number of daughter cells that a

mother cell produced during its life (Longo et al. 2012). In addition, the chronological

lifespan, or CLS, is defined as the length of viable time for the yeast cell after being

transited into the non-dividing, quiescent state (Longo et al. 2012). The age-dependent

data reported by Janssens et al. could be treated as that along the yeast replicative aging

(Janssens et al. 2015).

It had been widely observed that cell functions arose from the interactions of

functional modules (Hartwell et al. 1999). Modularity in interacting protein complexes in

the yeast proteome was suggested to be key in the genotype-to-phenotype relationships

(Gavin et al. 2006). Based on the age-dependent gene expressions in both fruit-fly and

human brain, it was proposed that aging may preferentially attack key regulatory nodes

important for the stability of the protein-protein interaction network (PIN) (Xue et al. 2007).

Moreover, despite aging does not alter the global and local topologies of the PIN, it is

crucial to use the age-specific (or "dynamic") PIN to identify key players in aging (Faisal

and Milenkovic 2014).

Here, using both the age-dependent transcriptome and proteome data (Janssens

et al. 2015), and based on a yeast PIN from a recent update of BioGRID (Oughtred et al.

2019) we constructed the Protein-protein Interaction Probability Landscapes (PIPLs).

These landscapes treat the young yeast cells (7.8 hr) as the reference, or the "ground

state", a term borrowed from the embryonic stem cell (Ying et al. 2008). The old yeast

cells ranged from 10.7 to 72.3 hr—i.e., if the ground state was treated as a 10-year-old

kid, the aging cells could be considered at ages of 14 to 93 years. In the PIPL, first, all

proteins from the PIN were classified into different groups, e.g., based on the RLSs of the

single-gene deletion mutants. Then the relative interaction probabilities between different

groups of proteins were calculated based on both the protein-protein interaction (PPI)

frequencies and the protein concentrations according to the law of mass action. The

protein concentrations used here were approximated from either the level of transcripts

or proteins in the cell. The interaction probability (p) was then converted to a quasi-

potential, $\Delta U = -\log p$, relative to the ground state. Because the relative quasi-potential is

additive, those of all protein-protein interactions can be summed up to infer the overall

relative quasi-potential between two groups of proteins. Using these relative quasi-

potentials, the PIPLs showed valleys and ridges reflecting the high interaction probability

basins and low interaction probability barriers, respectively. Note that ΔU is relative to the

ground state and the rugged PIPL is shaped by the aging process.

The yeast genome has 5,189 verified, 727 uncharacterized and 688 dubious ORFs

(as of 8/17/2020) on the *Saccharomyces* Genome Database (Cherry et al. 2012). These

ORFs encode ca. 1000 essential genes, with any one of which deleted the cell will not be

viable (Ohya et al. 2005; Dowell et al. 2010; Luo et al. 2013; Rancati et al. 2018). It had

been suggested that cell death is an emergent phenomenon arising from gradual decay

or loss of interactions to essential proteins in the protein-protein interaction network (PIN)

(Qin 2019). It had also been suggested that in PIN, the essential proteins are likely to

serve as the high-degree hub proteins and vice versa, the hub proteins are likely to be

essential, known as the centrality-lethality rule (Jeong et al. 2001). In addition, it had been

shown that the hub proteins (genes) tend to avoid interactions with other hubs, which

contribute to the stability of the network (Maslov and Sneppen 2002).

We noticed that gradual variations persisted on the PIPLs along the aging

trajectory. However, the PIPLs based on protein abundances differ significantly from

those based on the gene expressions, in line with the uncoupling proposed by the

previous report (Janssens et al. 2015). For example, whereas based on the proteome the

essential versus essential protein interactions fell into a deep basin in the PIPL of old age,

based on the transcriptome these interactions were located on a high ridge. To

understand the two opposite trends, another proteome-wide landscape was constructed

based on comparisons between the empirical PIN and random, null network models (Guo

and Qin 2020). In this landscape, we showed that unlike the hub proteins, the essential

proteins favor interactions with other essential proteins. We further showed that the

abundances of essential hub proteins were significantly increased in aging cells. It is likely

the essential hub proteins may account for the discrepancy between the PIPLs from

proteome and those from transcriptome.

Result

111   Aging is characterized by a time-dependent functional decline from birth to death

112   (Lopez-Otin et al. 2013). A recent work reported the proteomics and transcriptomics of

113   the yeast cells at 12 time points along aging, from 7.8 to 72.3 hours (Janssens et al. 2015).

114   Here, we used these age-dependent protein or transcript levels to construct the protein-

115   protein interaction probability landscapes (PIPLs) on dimensions of different parameters.

(a) Landscapes (left) and contours (right) from protein abundance

(b) Landscapes (left) and contours (right) from gene expression

Figure 1. Opposite trends of intra-essential protein interactions during replicative aging as shown by the age-dependent protein-protein interaction probability landscapes (PIPLs) on dimension of RLS ratios. (**a**) Landscapes (left) and contours (right) from protein abundance and (**b**) landscapes (left) and contours (right) from gene expression. The relative quasi potentials (ΔU) were calculated using the youngest cells at 7.8 hr as the reference (ground state). The state parameter of the landscapes is the RLS ratios (or normalized RLS) of the single-gene mutants compared to the WT at the same conditions. The essential genes have RLS ratios of 0. The landscape based on protein abundance shows that the essential-vs-essential interaction region gradually fell into a low-potential basin. However, in the landscape based on gene expression levels the essential-vs-essential interaction region gradually rose up to a high-potential ridge. The landscapes at different ages have been vertically shifted for a better visualization. The color bar shows the relative quasi potentials in the contour maps. A relative color scheme (blue for low and red for high) is applied in landscapes.

PIPL on RLS and uncoupling of protein abundance and mRNA expression

The age-dependent protein abundance and gene expression had criticized aging

as a consequence of uncoupling of protein levels of biogenesis-related genes from the

expression levels (Janssens et al. 2015). We constructed the age-dependent PIPLs on

dimension of replicative lifespan (RLS) to sample the protein-protein interaction changes

associated with the aging process. Here the parameters used are the RLS ratios (or

normalized RLS) between the RLS of single-gene deletion mutants and those of the wild

type cells cultivated under the same YPD (2% glucose) conditions. The RLS ratios of

essential proteins (genes) are 0, as the cell will not be viable after deletion of a single

essential gene.

Figure 1 shows the landscapes using relative quasi-potentials related to the young

cells (i.e., ground state) with the data collected at age of 7.8 hr. Consistent with the

observed uncoupling of protein and transcript levels (Janssens et al. 2015), from the

PIPLs based on the protein abundance (Figure 1a) and transcription levels (Figure 1b),

we also observed a tendency of uncoupling, especially related to the essential proteins.

Based on the protein abundances, at the old age, the intra-essential (RLS = 0)

interactions fell into a basin, i.e., high interaction probabilities compared to young cells.

However, using the expression levels, the intra-essential interactions were located on

ridges at the old age, which may be viewed as the potential of loss of interactions within

the essential proteins, based on gene expression levels.

(a) Landscapes using RLS and CellSys2017 protein turnover set

Protein abundance-based landscape

Gene expression-based landscape

(b) Landscapes using RLS and CellRep2014 protein turnover Set

Protein abundance-based landscape

Gene expression-based landscape

Figure 2. Interactions between essential proteins and short-lived proteins are noisy on the age-
dependent PIPLs on dimensions of RLS ratios and protein turnover rates. The protein turnover
data were taken from (**a**) the CellSys2017 set and (**b**) the CellRep2014 set, respectively. The
landscapes from both sets showed significant differences between the protein-abundance-based
(top panels) and gene-expression-based (bottom panels) PIPLs. The contour maps of the
landscapes of the aging cells at young (10.7 hr) and old (72.3 hr) are shown for comparisons. The
landscapes at different ages have been vertically shifted for a better visualization. The color bar

shows the relative quasi potentials in the contour maps. A relative color scheme (blue for low and
red for high) is applied in landscapes.

PIPL on dimensions of RLS versus protein turnover

Two independent protein turnover data sets, the CellSys2017 set (Martin-Perez

and Villen 2017) and the CellRep2014 set (Christiano et al. 2014) had been used to

construct the age-dependent PIPLs on the dimensions of RLS ratios versus protein

turnover rates. Considerable differences can be found between the results of both sets

(Figure 2). However, they both interpreted that the short-turnover proteins, which may

exhibit higher activities than the long-turnover proteins (Martin-Perez and Villen 2017),

had larger fluctuations on the PIPLs of aging cells, especially in interactions with essential

proteins. Note that $\log_{10}$-scales had been applied for the turnover rates, in consistent with

their distributions (Christiano et al. 2014).

Based on the gene expression levels (bottom panels), the landscapes using both

turnover sets showed elevated quasi-potentials, especially at old age (Figure 2). However,

based on protein abundances, fluctuations of both elevations and declines in the quasi-

potentials had been found (Figure 2), consistent with the uncoupling trend between

protein and mRNA levels (Janssens et al. 2015). Nevertheless, in all landscapes we

observed large fluctuations attributed to the essential genes (RLS ratio of 0) and their

interactions with the low-turnover proteins. The interactions between essential genes and

high-turnover proteins are relatively stable during aging, according to the protein-

abundance-based PIPLs, but not in the gene-expression-based PIPLs.

Using the above landscapes, we noted that aging has a higher impact to the gene

expressions than to the protein abundances, with respect to the protein-protein

interactions. For example, whereas based on the gene expressions for both turnover sets,

the interactions with essential genes from all gene groups with different turnovers were in

high potential, low probability states, in the protein abundance-based landscapes the

interactions between certain groups of genes and the essential genes were dropped to

low potential, high probability basins. Moreover, using the CellSys2017 set the low-

turnover proteins also showed dropped quasi-potentials or increased interaction

probabilities with the essential genes.

PIPL on dimensions of node degrees and RLS ratios

We constructed the PIPL based on the node degrees, as shown in Figure 3a.

Based on protein abundances, in the old cells at 72.3 hr, the hub versus hub protein

interactions also fell into a basin ($\Delta U = -31$), which was less than the essential versus

essential protein interactions ($\Delta U = -83$) shown in Figure 1. The relative quasi-potentials

for younger cells were even positive for younger cells from 10.7 to 22 hr (($\Delta U = 0.5$ to 1.8).

The extents of the quasi-potentials at other regions were also smaller than those in the

PIPL on RLS ratios. For the PIPL based on gene expressions, the interactions with hub

proteins, both from other hub and non-hub proteins, generally rose to ridges of the

landscape.

We also constructed the PIPL based on both the node degrees and RLS ratios

(Figure 3b). The interactions between hub and essential proteins of the old cells at 72.3

hr fell into a basin with low relative quasi-potential ($\Delta U = -94$). However, those at young

age from 10.7 to 26.8 hr were located in ridges, moreover, the hub versus essential

interactions in the PIPL at 22.0 hr were on a ridge of $\Delta U = 60$. This analysis indicated that

the hub proteins only partly overlap with the essential proteins and vice versa.

(a) Landscapes and contours using node degrees

Protein abundance-based landscape

(b) Landscapes and contours using node degree and RLS ratios

Protein abundance-based landscape

Figure 3. Dissimilarity between the essential and hub proteins from the PIPLs on dimensions of node degrees and RLS ratios. (**a**) PIPLs on node degrees, and (**b**) PIPLs on node degrees versus RLS ratios. The top panels show the PIPLs from protein abundances, and the bottom panels show the PIPLs from transcript abundances. The contour maps of the aging cells at young (10.7 hr) and old (72.3 hr) are shown for comparisons. The landscapes at different ages have been vertically shifted for a better visualization. The color bar shows the relative quasi-potentials in the contour maps. A relative color scheme (blue for low and red for high) is applied in landscapes.

PIPL on dimensions of RLS versus morphology

A recent work proposed a morphological landscape of yeast aging on which the

mother cells took two distinguishable aging paths: in the first path the mother cells

produced enlarged and elongated daughter cells, and in the second path the mother cells

produced small and round daughter cells (Jin et al. 2019). The mother cells went through

the first path had longer RLSs than the mother cells underwent the second path. Two

morphologies were used in this landscape to infer the aging paths including the daughter-

to-mother size ratios for daughter cell size and the axis ratios of the daughter cells for

daughter cell roundness, both at the late stages of cell growths (Jin et al. 2019; Li et al.

2020). Here, we combined the RLSs and took advantage of the Saccharomyces

Cerevisiae Morphological Database (SCMD2) which recorded 501 morphologies of

different yeast single-gene deletion mutants (Saito et al. 2004; Ohya et al. 2005). Figure

4 showed both the protein abundance-based and gene expression-based PIPLs of RLS

versus morphologies obtained from the SCMD2 including the daughter-to-mother size

ratios (C118_C) and daughter axis ratios (C114_C) at the late stages of cell growth from

the SCMD, both had been used in the construction of the morphological landscape (Jin

et al. 2019).

Figure 4. The PIPLs on dimensions of RLS and morphologies. The PIPLs were based on protein abundances (left) or gene expressions (right). The morphologies include (**a**) The daughter-to-mother cell size ratios, and (**b**) the daughter-to-mother cell size ratios. Both morphologies were measured at the late stage of the daughter cell growth, details could be found in the SCMD2 (Ohya et al. 2005). The landscapes at different ages have been vertically shifted for a better visualization. The color bar shows the relative quasi-potentials in the contour maps. A relative color scheme (blue for low and red for high) is applied in landscapes.

Obvious differences between the landscapes based on protein abundances and

those based on gene expressions could be found, similar to the landscapes shown above.

It should be noted that the morphologies selected from SCMD2 were based on high

resolution images of single-gene deletion mutations (Ohya et al. 2005) such that were

different than those in the recent morphological landscape (Jin et al. 2019; Li et al. 2020).

Moreover, the morphological differences in the early and late stages of the daughter cell

growth had also been considered (Ohya et al. 2005). We did observed differences of the

absolute values of the morphologies of cells at early growth stage versus those at late

growth stage, however, the orders of these genes were not necessarily conserved. These

landscapes could therefore be useful to interpret the general trends related to the

morphologies. For example, at the old age, the genes related to small daughter cells

(Figure 4) seem to have larger fluctuations in the interactions with other proteins.

The landscapes from present work described the protein-interaction probabilities

(or relative quasi-potentials) of single-gene deletion mutants, and they did not represent

cell states. Therefore, these landscapes did not predict how the morphological variations

affected the RLS of mother cells as the cell-state landscapes (Jin et al. 2019; Li et al.

2020). Instead, the landscapes of present work suggest that the PINs in the old cells had

been altered by aging. To rejuvenate to the young cell state, the old yeast cells needed

to redistribute the interactions in the PIN, especially from essential genes, to flatten the

above age-dependent landscapes.

A proteome-wide protein interaction probability landscape

To further understand why lower relative quasi-potential (or higher probability)

have been found in the essential versus essential interactions based on the proteomics,

despite the gene expression trend predicted the opposite direction, we constructed

another proteome-wide, global landscape model which calculates the probabilities of that

the empirical PIN having more interactions than the random null models. As for the age-

dependent landscape models, quasi-potentials were calculated as the negative logarithm

of the probabilities to infer basins and hills on this landscape. Similar method had been

previously applied to a smaller yeast PIN and observed that the high-degree, hub proteins

tend to avoid interactions with the other hub proteins, which was suggested to contribute

 to the stability of the PIN (Maslov and Sneppen 2002). This approach had been recently

applied to estimate the association strengths between different categories of proteins

using a human PIN (Guo and Qin 2020). Figure 5 shows the global landscape in the

variable spaces of node degrees and RLS ratios of single-gene deletion mutations.

Figure 5. The proteome-wide protein interaction probability landscapes reveal differences between hub and essential proteins. (**a**) The protein interaction landscape on space of the node degrees showed that the hub proteins avoid interactions with other hub proteins (p = 0). (**b**) The essential proteins favor interactions with other essential proteins (p = 1). (**c**) A moderate ratio of hub-essential interactions (p = 0.382) was observed. The hub-hub, essential-essential and hub-essential interaction regions are highlighted as squares on the landscapes and contour maps. The probabilities p indicates the ratio of null network models that showed less interactions than the empirical PIN: p = 1 (such as the essential-essential interactions) indicates the PIN has more interactions than all null models and p = 0 (such as the hub-hub interactions) indicates the PIN has less interactions than all null models, respectively. The quasi potential is calculated as U = $-\log p$, the base of the logarithm function is chosen such that U is in range of [0,1]. 22,188 null network models have been used in this work and the p = 0 (i.e., p < 1/22,188) ratios were converted to p = 1/22,189 for estimation of the quasi potential, U. Top panels show the landscapes and bottom panels show the 2D contour maps. The color bar for both the landscapes and contours are shown at right.

The global landscape on the node-degree space showed that the hub proteins

(high-degree proteins in the PIN) tend to avoid interactions with other hub proteins yet

favor the interactions with non-hub proteins (Figure 5a), in agree with previous reports

from a smaller yeast PIN (Maslov and Sneppen 2002). Originally observed in yeast PIN,

it had been proposed that the hub-proteins in the PIN tend to be essential proteins and

vice versa (Jeong et al. 2001). This centrality-lethality rule (or hypothesis) had been

confirmed in the PINs of other organisms (Raman et al. 2014) as well as the genetic

interaction network (GIN) of yeast (Costanzo et al. 2016). On the global landscape on the

RLS space, however, the global landscape indicated that the essential proteins strongly

favor the interactions with other essential proteins but tend to avoid the interactions with

non-essential proteins (Figure 5b). The probability of the interactions between essential

proteins and hub proteins were moderate (Figure 5c). Therefore, the essential proteins

and hub proteins should not be treated equally in these landscapes. The above

observation might be conflict with the well-known centrality-lethality rule (Jeong et al.

2001; Raman et al. 2014; Peng et al. 2015).

313
314 **Figure 6**. High interaction density was found between essential and hub proteins. The average
315 interaction density calculated on dimensions of node degree and RLS ratios are shown in (**a**)
316 landscape and (**b**) contour map. The interaction density between two sets of nodes is defined as
317 the total number of interactions divided by the by the product of the sizes of both sets.
318

It is worth noting that the essential genes did have higher degrees (average of 63.3)

than non-essential genes (average of 32.7). Based on the landscape on the node degree-

RLS space (Figure 5c), we also observed that the interaction densities between hub

proteins and essential proteins are significantly stronger than those between the hub

proteins and nonessential proteins, also as shown in Figure 6. However, despite of a

higher degree in the PIN, a hub protein is not necessarily essential. For example, the

most-connected hub protein *dhh1* (YDL160C) has 3,605 interactions in the PIN but is

nonessential and the Δ*dhh1* mutant has an RLS ratio of 0.825 compared to the wild type.

Essential hub genes have increased protein abundances in aging cells

We further compared the abundances of 4 categories of proteins (genes) including

essential hub, essential non-hub, nonessential hub and nonessential non-hub. The

protein or transcript abundances were referenced to the ground state, the young cells

with age of 7.8 hr, consistent with the PIPLs shown above. We used the node degree k $\geq$

100 as a cutoff (which covered the top 5.8% high connectivity proteins) to classify the hub

and non-hub proteins (Figure 7a). The yeast life cycle length of 100 minutes was used to

estimate the RLS (Herskowitz 1988). Consistent with the evaluation of the relative-quasi

potentials (Methods and Materials), the node degrees were weighted to the protein or

transcript abundance values in Figure 7b and 7c. We observed that both the abundances

of essential hub proteins increased considerably in the aging cells, however, those of the

essential non-hub proteins decreased (Figure 7b). The opposite trends of the average

essential protein abundances versus essential transcript abundances (Figure 1) may give

an explanation of the differences in the PIPL related to the essential proteins or transcripts.

The differences between the average hub proteins and hub transcripts (Figure 3) may

also be explained here. We also listed the numbers of proteins (Figure 7b) or transcripts

(Figure 7c) that were included in both the PIN the aging proteomics and transcriptomics

data set. These trends of protein and/or transcript abundances may partly explain the

basins and ridges observed in the protein-protein interaction probability landscapes. Note

that the absolute ages of the cells had been approximated to RLSs using an average

division time of 100 minutes. This conversion may not be accurate, for example, the actual

division time may increase during aging (Jo et al. 2015), and the long estimated RLS in

Figure 7 (>30) made it possible that some aging cells may have stopped division and

stayed in the post-diauxic, quiescent phase (Longo et al. 2012).

(a) Degree Distribution of yeast PIN

(b) Relative mean protein abundances

(c) Relative mean transcript abundances

352
Figure 7. Essential hub proteins (or genes) may account for the opposite trends on the aging
landscapes from proteomes and transcriptomes. All proteins (genes) were put in four categories
including essential hub (red), nonessential hub (blue), essential non-hub (yellow) and
nonessential non-hub proteins or genes. (**a**). Distribution of the node degrees in the yeast PIN. A

snapshot of the PIN was shown at left. The hub proteins (red bars) were selected as the node
degree $k \geq 100$, which were the top 5.8% high-connectivity proteins of the PIN. (**b**). Relative mean
protein abundances. (**c**). Relative mean gene expressions. Average values relative to the young
cells at 7.8 hr had been used. The cell ages were approximated to RLS using the dividing time of
100 minutes. The shade of each curve was calculated as the standard deviation from all proteins
(genes) of the ratios of aging cells to the ground state, multiplied by the mean differences. The
number of proteins (genes) used in the curves of each category had been listed.
364
365

Discussion

Present work constructed probability-based protein interaction landscape (PIPL)

models. In these age-dependent PIPLs, time-series protein abundance and gene

expression data have been adopted to calculate the interaction probabilities between

protein groups along aging, and the basins and ridges displayed on the rugged landscape

using the young state as the reference, i.e., the relative quasi-potentials, can be regarded

as the aging marks. The age-dependent landscapes showed the opposite trends by using

the protein abundances versus gene expressions: whereas in the landscapes based on

the protein abundances the essential-essential interactions fell into deep basins of low

potential or high probability, in the landscapes based on gene expression levels the

essential-essential interactions were located to a high potential ridge. The uncoupling

between protein abundances and gene expressions had been observed in the original

age-dependent proteomic and transcriptomic work and the loss of stoichiometry of protein

complexes was suggested to be the consequences of aging (Janssens et al. 2015). This

uncoupling may partly explain the opposite trends of the age-dependent landscapes

based on proteome versus transcriptome.

The inversed trends between using the protein abundances and gene expressions

may be associated with the protein aggregation during the aging process (David et al.

2010; Saarikangas and Barral 2015). It may also be owing to the fact that many proteins

in yeast have long half-lives (Christiano et al. 2014). A significant amount of proteins

underwent non-exponential degradations in the cells and that the protein degradation rate

seemed to be age-dependent (McShane et al. 2016). The protein turnover rates were

correlated protein functions and activities (Martin-Perez and Villen 2017), and the long-

lived proteins may accumulate to high abundances in old cells even though their

expression levels had been declined. Using two different protein turnover data sets we

further constructed the age-dependent protein interaction landscapes incorporate with the

RLS data. In both sets, we observed that based on the protein abundances, the long-

turnover proteins exhibited smaller variations than the short-turnover proteins in the old

cells referenced to the young cells. However, based on the gene expressions, all proteins

show higher quasi potentials for interacting with their partners in the old cells, because of

an overall decline of expressions of nearly all genes.

Moreover, using a proteome-wide protein interaction landscape, we showed that

although protein essentiality was highly associated with its connectivity (the lethality-

centrality rule), the high-degree hub proteins tend to avoid the interactions with other hub

proteins, whereas the essential proteins favor the interactions with other essential

proteins.

Loss of proteostasis is a hallmark or a pillar of aging (Lopez-Otin et al. 2013;

Kennedy et al. 2014; Sampaio-Marques and Ludovico 2018). The age-dependent protein-

interaction landscapes in present work indicate that aging may also cause or be caused

by the loss of conservation (or stability) in the protein-protein interaction network, or more

generally, in the interactome. We observed that the essential proteins, especially the hub-

essential proteins, had the most significant changes in the interacting profiles upon aging.

Significant differences had been observed between both the protein abundances and

gene expressions of the hub-essential versus hub-nonessential proteins or genes, which

may explain the basins at the hub-essential protein regions on the PIPLs based on the

protein abundances.

Many of the current interests in aging study from model organisms used

nonessential genes to understand the genetic basis of aging (Giaever and Nislow 2014;

McCormick et al. 2015). From the landscapes presented in present work, it seems that

the variations of the protein interaction network may be strongly associated with the

essential hub proteins and their interacting partners. If an essential gene had lost all its

connections in the PIN, the resulted phenotype may be the same as deletion of this

essential gene which would lead to the cell death. Cellular aging can be viewed as

emergent property at the gene network level, and the interactions with the essential genes

have been suggested to serve as the driver of the aging process (Qin 2019). Therefore,

we suggest that the connectivities of essential hub proteins in the PIN may be critical for

maintaining the active status of a young, healthy cell.

The protein-protein interaction probability landscapes of the budding yeast in

present work used the proteomic and transcriptomic data of aging cells mathematically

unmixed from bulk cell culture with young daughter cells and dead cells (Janssens et al.

2015). We understand that potential biases may persist in the data set and hence in our

interpretations. However, using these landscapes we showed that the aging dynamics

could be visualized to identify potential aging factors, such as the variations caused by

the essential hub proteins. The single cell protein and/or transcript abundance data along

aging could be combined with our approach to understand the aging landscape. Moreover,

the probability-based interaction landscapes can also be applied using other networks—

such as the genetic interaction networks—in understanding of the genotype-phenotype

relationships (Costanzo et al. 2016; Costanzo et al. 2019).

Methods and Materials

Protein-protein interaction network and random null network models

The empirical protein-protein interaction network (PIN) of S. cerevisiae was

obtained from a recent version BioGRID v3.5.177, downloaded on Oct. 1, 2019 (Oughtred

et al. 2019). Only the physical interactions related to proteins (excluding the self-

interactions) were selected from this PIN, which covers 110,291 edges (interactions)

among 5,784 vertices (proteins). The PIN used in present work is regarded as a simple

graph, i.e., undirected graph with no self-loops or multi-interactions. 22,188 null network

models were built in a way such that all vertices were randomly reshuffled, yet the node

degrees preserved as the original PIN. We term these null models the MS02 null models

(Maslov and Sneppen 2002; Qin et al. 2003; Guo and Qin 2020).

Replicative lifespan data

The replicative lifespans (RLSs) of 4,698 single-gene deletion strains of *S.*

cerevisiae under the YPD (2% glucose) culture had been reported (McCormick et al.

2015). In addition, the RLSs of single-gene deletion strains under dietary restriction (DR,

0.05% glucose) had been reported (Schleit et al. 2013). 3,939 genes with RLS data under

YPD and 342 genes with RLS data under DR were included in the yeast PIN used in

present work, providing the opportunity of constructing the protein interaction landscapes

of replicative aging.

Proteomics and transcriptomics data during aging

One set of proteomics and transcriptomics data of *S. cerevisiae* came from a

recent report, which comprises the abundances of 1,494 proteins and expression levels

of 4,904 genes collected at 12 different ages ranging from 7.8 to 72.3 hours (Janssens

et al. 2015). We used the young cells at 7.8 hours as the reference (ground state) to

evaluate the PIPLs of the older cells at the other 11 ages.

Protein turnover time

Two sets of in vivo protein turnover time or half-lives have been used. The

CellSys2017 set (Martin-Perez and Villen 2017) comprised of 3,160 proteins with 1,341

in the aging proteomics and 2,526 in the aging transcriptomics data sets. The

CellRep2014 set (Christiano et al. 2014) included 3,715 proteins with 1,331 in the aging

proteomics and 2,988 in the aging transcriptomics data sets.

Morphologies of single-gene deletion mutants

The morphology data of single-gene deletion mutants were taken from the SCMD2

(Saccharomyces cerevisiae morphological database 2) (Ohya et al. 2005). Specifically,

two morphologies related to a recent morphological landscape of yeast replicative aging

had been analyzed in the protein interaction landscapes (Jin et al. 2019; Li et al. 2020),

including the cell size ratio (C118_C) and bud axis ratio (C114_C) at the late stages.

Although the definitions of the axis ratio in SCMD2 is different than that used in the

morphological landscape, it could provide a rough identification of the roundness of the

cell shapes.

Essential genes of S. cerevisiae

The essential gene set of *S. cerevisiae* were taken from the SCMD2 (Ohya et al.

2005) that comprises 1,112 genes, 1,097 of which have interactions recorded in the PIN.

Selection of gene groups

We used quantiles to catalog the gene groups in the PIPLs. The budding yeast

PIN covered 3,939 genes that had the RLS records of the single-gene deletion

mutations—the ratios referenced to the control wide type strains had been adopted in the

landscapes. The PIN also covered 1,033 essential genes. Among these genes, there

were 926 non-essential and 403 essential genes had the age-dependent protein

abundance values, and 2,991 non-essential and 882 essential genes had the age-

dependent expression values, respectively. In both the age-dependent protein

abundance and gene expression sets, the non-essential genes were evenly classified

into 20 groups based on the quantiles of the RLS ratios, and the essential genes were

classified into one group with the RLS ratio of 0. For the protein node degrees, half-lives

and morphology data sets, all genes were classified into 20 quantiles based on the

measures. The same classification approach for the RLS groups were applied to the

global protein interaction landscape, and all genes included in the PIN and with RLS ratio

data had been used.

Evaluating the quasi-potentials from the landscapes

Age-dependent protein interaction probability landscape

Aging is a dynamic process reflected in the variations of both protein abundances

and gene expressions along the aging process. It had been suggested that a

configuration of the cell state could formalized as a vector

498
$$\mathbf{S_t} = [\mathrm{x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_N}]_t, \quad (1)$$

499 Where N is the total number of genes and x_i is the expression level of the i-th gene (Huang

500 2009)—we suggest x_i could also be the protein abundance of the i-th protein. Under this

501 definition, the aging process could be regarded as the vector variations along time.

502   For a simple organism that has two interacting proteins x and y:

503
$$x + y \xrightarrow{K} xy, \quad (2)$$

504 the concentration of the complex xy at time t can be calculated as

505
$$[x]_t[y]_t = K[xy]_t = Kp_t, \quad (3)$$

506 where K is the equilibrium constant and $[x]_t$ and $[y]_t$ is the concentration of free x and y at

507 time t; i.e., the probability of forming the complex xy at time t, p_t, is approximated as the

508 concentration of [xy] in the cell via equation (3). By using the young cell at time 0 as the

509 reference state or ground state, the equilibrium constant K is canceled out:

510
$$p_t/p_0 = [xy]_t/[xy]_0 = [x]_t[y]_t/([x]_0[y]_0). \quad (4)$$

For parameters of all categories of genes—such as the RLSs—a protein-protein

interaction probability landscape (PIPL) can be constructed similar to other probability-

based cell state Waddington landscapes, which used a quasi-potential, the negative

logarithm of the probabilities, to describe the barriers that the cells must overcome for the

transition from one attractor state to the other (Huang 2009; Wang et al. 2011). Because

all probabilities here are relative to the ground state, the relative quasi potential U_t using

U_0 as a reference can be calculated as

518
$$\Delta U_t = U_t - U_0 = -\log\left(\frac{[xy]_t}{[xy]_0}\right) = -\log\left(\frac{[x]_t}{[x]_0}\right) - \log\left(\frac{[y]_t}{[y]_0}\right). \quad (5)$$

Equation (5) provides a convenient way to estimate the relative quasi potentials at time t,

compared to the young cell ground state.

In this work, the relative quasi potential of interactions between two categories of

proteins (or genes) are evaluated. The probability is not additive—i.e., we cannot sum up

the probabilities of different interactions. However, the logarithm function and hence the

quasi potential U is additive. Therefore, it is straightforward to calculate the relative quasi

potential of interactions between two sets of genes X and Y based on equation (5). For

instance, assuming that there are W interactions between X and Y recorded as (x_i, y_i), $i =$

1, 2, …, W, the relative quasi-potential from all interactions between X and Y would be

528
$$\Delta U_t = -\sum_{i=1}^{W} \log\left(\frac{[x_i]_t}{[x_i]_0}\right) - \sum_{i=1}^{W} \log\left(\frac{[y_i]_t}{[y_i]_0}\right). \qquad (6)$$

The base of the logarithm function in equation (6) is 10 in present work. It should

be noted that in present work all quasi-potentials of every single interaction were relative

to the ground state and could therefore bear a value of any real number. The unit of the

protein abundances or gene expressions (such as FPKM) were canceled out and did not

affect the relative quasi-potentials in equations (4)-(6). In the landscapes of this work, we

observed high relative quasi-potentials especially when the interactions between two

categories of proteins were dense. However, a cutoff of ±50 was applied in the quasi-

potentials of all contour maps because it could capture the indispensable information yet

provides relatively good comparison among different landscapes.

Proteome-wide protein-interaction probability landscape

Here we calculated the protein-interaction quasi potentials based on the probability

(*p*) for more interactions between certain categories of genes in the PIN than in the null

models. The NetPAS method (Guo and Qin 2020) was used to calculate the *p*-values

using 22,188 null models. The protein-interaction quasi potential *U* is

543
$$U = -\log p. \quad (7)$$

544   The base of the logarithm function may vary for the conceptual barriers in equation (7).

545   As 22,188 null models were used, the occurring $p = 0$ cases could be interpreted as $p <$

546   1/22,188, which was converted to $p = 1/22,189$ in practice to avoid the infinite log0 values.

547   The resulted quasi-potentials were then normalized to [0,1] for the landscape.

Acknowledgments

550   This work is supported by NSF Career award #1453078 (transferred to #1720215),

551   BD Spoke #1761839, and internal funding of the University of Tennessee at Chattanooga.

552   All simulations are performed using the SimCenter computing resources of the University

553   of Tennessee at Chattanooga.

Competing Interests

556   The authors declare no competing interests of this work.

References

Cherry JM, Hong EL, Amundsen C, Balakrishnan R, Binkley G, Chan ET, Christie KR, Costanzo MC, Dwight SS, Engel SR et al. 2012. Saccharomyces Genome Database: the genomics resource of budding yeast. *Nucleic Acids Res* **40**: D700-705.

Christiano R, Nagaraj N, Frohlich F, Walther TC. 2014. Global Proteome Turnover Analyses of the Yeasts S-cerevisiae and S-pombe. *Cell Reports* **9**: 1959-1965.

Costanzo M, Kuzmin E, van Leeuwen J, Mair B, Moffat J, Boone C, Andrews B. 2019. Global Genetic Networks and the Genotype-to-Phenotype Relationship. *Cell* **177**: 85-100.

Costanzo M, VanderSluis B, Koch EN, Baryshnikova A, Pons C, Tan G, Wang W, Usaj M, Hanchard J, Lee SD. 2016. A global genetic interaction network maps a wiring diagram of cellular function. *Science* **353**: aaf1420.

Crane MM, Chen KL, Blue BW, Kaeberlein M. 2020. Trajectories of Aging: How Systems Biology in Yeast Can Illuminate Mechanisms of Personalized Aging. *Proteomics* **20**: 1800420.

Crane MM, Kaeberlein M. 2018. The paths of mortality: how understanding the biology of aging can help explain systems behavior of single cells. *Current opinion in systems biology* **8**: 25-31.

David DC, Ollikainen N, Trinidad JC, Cary MP, Burlingame AL, Kenyon C. 2010. Widespread Protein Aggregation as an Inherent Part of Aging in C. elegans. *Plos Biology* **8**.

Defossez PA, Prusty R, Kaeberlein M, Lin SJ, Ferrigno P, Silver PA, Keil RL, Guarente L. 1999. Elimination of replication block protein Fob1 extends the life span of yeast mother cells. *Mol Cell* **3**: 447-455.

Dowell RD, Ryan O, Jansen A, Cheung D, Agarwala S, Danford T, Bernstein DA, Rolfe PA, Heisler LE, Chin B et al. 2010. Genotype to Phenotype: A Complex Problem. *Science* **328**: 469-469.

Faisal FE, Milenkovic T. 2014. Dynamic networks reveal key players in aging. *Bioinformatics* **30**: 1721-1729.

Friedman DB, Johnson TE. 1988. A mutation in the age-1 gene in Caenorhabditis elegans lengthens life and reduces hermaphrodite fertility. *Genetics* **118**: 75-86.

Gavin AC, Aloy P, Grandi P, Krause R, Boesche M, Marzioch M, Rau C, Jensen LJ, Bastuck S, Dumpelfeld B et al. 2006. Proteome survey reveals modularity of the yeast cell machinery. *Nature* **440**: 631-636.

Giaever G, Nislow C. 2014. The yeast deletion collection: a decade of functional genomics. *Genetics* **197**: 451-465.

Guo HB, Qin H. 2020. Association study based on topological constraints of protein-protein interaction networks. *Sci Rep* **10**: 10797.

Guo ZH, Adomas AB, Jackson ED, Qin H, Townsend JP. 2011. SIR2 and other genes are abundantly expressed in long-lived natural segregants for replicative aging of the budding yeast Saccharomyces cerevisiae. *Fems Yeast Res* **11**: 345-355.

Hartwell LH, Hopfield JJ, Leibler S, Murray AW. 1999. From molecular to modular cell biology. *Nature* **402**: C47-C52.

Herskowitz I. 1988. Life-Cycle of the Budding Yeast Saccharomyces-Cerevisiae. *Microbiol Rev* **52**: 536-553.

Huang S. 2009. Reprogramming cell fates: reconciling rarity with robustness. *Bioessays* **31**: 546-560.

Janssens GE, Meinema AC, Gonzalez J, Wolters JC, Schmidt A, Guryev V, Bischoff R, Wit EC, Veenhoff LM, Heinemann M. 2015. Protein biogenesis machinery is a driver of replicative aging in yeast. *Elife* **4**: e08527.

Janssens GE, Veenhoff LM. 2016. Evidence for the hallmarks of human aging in replicatively aging yeast. *Microb Cell* **3**: 263-274.

Jeong H, Mason SP, Barabasi AL, Oltvai ZN. 2001. Lethality and centrality in protein networks. *Nature* **411**: 41-42.

Jin M, Li Y, O'Laughlin R, Bittihn P, Pillus L, Tsimring LS, Hasty J, Hao N. 2019. Divergent Aging of
Isogenic Yeast Cells Revealed through Single-Cell Phenotypic Dynamics. *Cell Systems* **8**: 242-253.
Jo MC, Liu W, Gu L, Dang WW, Qin LD. 2015. High-throughput analysis of yeast replicative aging
using a microfluidic system. *P Natl Acad Sci USA* **112**: 9364-9369.
Kaeberlein M, Powers RW. 2007. Sir2 and calorie restriction in yeast: A skeptical perspective. *Ageing
Res Rev* **6**: 128-140.
Ke Z, Mallik P, Johnson AB, Luna F, Nevo E, Zhang ZD, Gladyshev VN, Seluanov A, Gorbunova V.
2017. Translation fidelity coevolves with longevity. *Aging Cell* **16**: 988-993.
Kennedy BK, Berger SL, Brunet A, Campisi J, Cuervo AM, Epel ES, Franceschi C, Lithgow GJ,
Morimoto RI, Pessin JE et al. 2014. Geroscience: Linking Aging to Chronic Disease. *Cell* **159**: 708-
712.
Lahtvee PJ, Sanchez BJ, Smialowska A, Kasvandik S, Elsemman IE, Gatto F, Nielsen J. 2017. Absolute
Quantification of Protein and mRNA Abundances Demonstrate Variability in Gene-Specific
Translation Efficiency in Yeast. *Cell Systems* **4**: 495-+.
Li Y, Jiang Y, Paxman J, O'Laughlin R, Klepin S, Zhu Y, Pillus L, Tsimring LS, Hasty J, Hao N. 2020. A
programmable fate decision landscape underlies single-cell aging in yeast. *Science* **369**: 325-329.
Longo VD, Shadel GS, Kaeberlein M, Kennedy B. 2012. Replicative and Chronological Aging in
Saccharomyces cerevisiae. *Cell Metabolism* **16**: 18-31.
Lopez-Otin C, Blasco MA, Partridge L, Serrano M, Kroemer G. 2013. The Hallmarks of Aging. *Cell* **153**:
1194-1217.
Luo H, Lin Y, Gao F, Zhang C-T, Zhang R. 2013. DEG 10, an update of the database of essential genes
that includes both protein-coding genes and noncoding genomic elements. *Nucleic acids research* **42**:
D574-D580.
Martin-Perez M, Villen J. 2017. Determinants and Regulation of Protein Turnover in Yeast. *Cell Systems
5*: 283-+.
Maslov S, Sneppen K. 2002. Specificity and stability in topology of protein networks. *Science* **296**: 910-
913.
McCormick MA, Delaney JR, Tsuchiya M, Tsuchiyama S, Shemorry A, Sim S, Chou AC-Z, Ahmed U,
Carr D, Murakami CJ. 2015. A comprehensive analysis of replicative lifespan in 4,698 single-gene
deletion strains uncovers conserved mechanisms of aging. *Cell metabolism* **22**: 895-906.
McShane E, Sin C, Zauber H, Wells JN, Donnelly N, Wang X, Hou J, Chen W, Storchova Z, Marsh JA et
al. 2016. Kinetic Analysis of Protein Stability Reveals Age-Dependent Degradation. *Cell* **167**: 803-
815 e821.
Ohya Y, Sese J, Yukawa M, Sano F, Nakatani Y, Saito TL, Saka A, Fukuda T, Ishihara S, Oka S et al.
2005. High-dimensional and large-scale phenotyping of yeast mutants. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*
102: 19015-19020.
Oughtred R, Stark C, Breitkreutz B-J, Rust J, Boucher L, Chang C, Kolas N, O'Donnell L, Leung G,
McAdam R et al. 2019. The BioGRID interaction database: 2019 update. *Nucleic Acids Research* **47**:
D529-D541.
Peng XQ, Wang JX, Wang J, Wu FX, Pan Y. 2015. Rechecking the Centrality-Lethality Rule in the
Scope of Protein Subcellular Localization Interaction Networks. *Plos One* **10**.
Qin H. 2019. Estimating network changes from lifespan measurements using a parsimonious gene
network model of cellular aging. *Bmc Bioinformatics* **20**.
Qin H, Lu HH, Wu WB, Li W-H. 2003. Evolution of the yeast protein interaction network. *Proceedings
of the National Academy of Sciences* **100**: 12820-12824.
Raj A, van Oudenaarden A. 2008. Nature, Nurture, or Chance: Stochastic Gene Expression and Its
Consequences. *Cell* **135**: 216-226.
Raman K, Damaraju N, Joshi GK. 2014. The organisational structure of protein networks: revisiting the
centrality-lethality hypothesis. *Syst Synth Biol* **8**: 73-81.
Rancati G, Moffat J, Typas A, Pavelka N. 2018. Emerging and evolving concepts in gene essentiality.
Nature Reviews Genetics **19**: 34.

Saarikangas J, Barral Y. 2015. Protein aggregates are associated with replicative aging without
compromising protein quality control. *Elife* **4**.
Saito TL, Ohtani M, Sawai H, Sano F, Saka A, Watanabe D, Yukawa M, Ohya Y, Morishita S. 2004.
SCMD: Saccharomyces cerevisiae Morphological Database. *Nucleic Acids Research* **32**: D319-
D322.
Sampaio-Marques B, Ludovico P. 2018. Linking cellular proteostasis to yeast longevity. *Fems Yeast Res*
18.
Schleit J, Johnson SC, Bennett CF, Simko M, Trongtham N, Castanza A, Hsieh EJ, Moller RM, Wasko
BM, Delaney JR et al. 2013. Molecular mechanisms underlying genotype-dependent responses to
dietary restriction. *Aging Cell* **12**: 1050-1061.
Sen P, Dang W, Donahue G, Dai J, Dorsey J, Cao X, Liu W, Cao K, Perry R, Lee JY et al. 2015. H3K36
methylation promotes longevity by enhancing transcriptional fidelity. *Genes Dev* **29**: 1362-1376.
Wang J, Zhang K, Xu L, Wang E. 2011. Quantifying the Waddington landscape and biological paths for
development and differentiation. *P Natl Acad Sci USA* **108**: 8257-8262.
Wasko BM, Kaeberlein M. 2014. Yeast replicative aging: a paradigm for defining conserved longevity
interventions. *Fems Yeast Res* **14**: 148-159.
Xue HL, Xian B, Dong D, Xia K, Zhu SS, Zhang Z, Hou L, Zhang QP, Zhang Y, Han JDJ. 2007. A
modular network model of aging. *Molecular Systems Biology* **3**.
Ying QL, Wray J, Nichols J, Batlle-Morera L, Doble B, Woodgett J, Cohen P, Smith A. 2008. The
ground state of embryonic stem cell self-renewal. *Nature* **453**: 519-U515.
677