Model merging with semanticSBML

Wolfram Liebermeister, MPI-MG Berlin Computational Systems Biology

> SBML composition meeting UCHC, September 9-10 2007

What is semanticSBML?

Tool for handling SBML models;

focus on "semantic" aspects (annotations!!)



SBMLcheck

SBMLmerge

SBMLannotate

check, add, and modify annotations ("MIRIAM" style annotation tags)

SBMLcheck

apply model checks based on annotations (e.g., balances of atom numbers)

SBMLmerge

- combine (=fuse) two SBML models
- detect conflicts between them
- resolve conflicts or produce a warning

Current state of semanticSBML



semanticSBML

- written in python, based on libSBML
- GUI + command line tool



latest version

- semanticSBML-0.9.3 at http://sysbio.molgen.mpg.de/semanticsbml/
- requires python2.4, some python packages, libSBML 2.3.4, QT4, graphviz

next version (November??)

- uses libSBML 3.0
- new internal data structures
- support qualifiers in annotations ("version of",...)

online semanticSBML

update to new version -> access currently blocked

Our view of model merging



Our view of model merging

DIFFICULTIES and solutions

- Incompatible names compare elements by annotations, not by model IDs
- Comparing the elements use database for comparing annotations; find duplicates and conflicting elements
- Conflicting elements must not appear together in a model -> abandon merging
- Incompatible statements for duplicates user chooses between conflicting statements
- Computational cycles

do not allow algebraic rules; constrain the choice between statements



Semantic models: statements and semantics

Biological entities



Mathematical elements



	Model			
	ATP conc. [mM]	C _{ATP}	$C_{ATP} = 0.5$	
	F6P conc. [mM]	C _{F6P}	$C_{_{F6P}} = 0.1$	
	FBP conc. [mM]	C _{FBP}	$dc_{FBP}/dt = v_{PFK-} v_{FBA}$ $c_{FBP}(0) = c_{F6P}$	
	PFK vel.[mM/s]	V _{PFK}	$v_{_{PFK}} = v_{_{PFK}}(c_{_{F6P}}, c_{_{ATP}})$	
	FBA vel. [mM/s]	V _{FBA}	$v_{_{FBA}} = v_{_{FBA}}(c_{_{FBP}})$	
Biochemical quantity = element semantics determined by "MIRIAM style" annotations Mathematical statement "algebraic rules" 0=f(a,b,c,) not allowed!!				
Mathematical variable				

represents one or several SBML tags

Semantic comparison of elements

Relations between element pairs:

- independent -> no conflict
- identical -> **conflict;** choose between statements
- interconvertible -> conflict; need to be converted in advance
- semantic overlap -> severe conflict; models cannot be merged



Main steps in SBMLmerge





2. Choice of statements



Model composition (Andrew's proposal)



What's the semantics of a composed model?

1. Multiple submodel instances represent "different things" (??)

Requires annotations for the submodel instances

- an annotation for spatial regions
- attributes or convention saying "no semantic overlap between instances"
- -> if there is dependence, links must be set!!!

2. Links represent "identical things" (!!)

Sensible constraints for links

- No cycles of links
- No converging links Linked elements should have compatible semantics (... by annotations...)

Overloading by links should affect ...

- ... MIRIAM annotations
- ... other semantics-related annotations (CellDesigner???)
- ... assignment rules, rate rules, etc. belonging to species



A future SBMLmerge could use links and model aggregation

Core SemanticSBML:

Semantic comparison of input models

- overlap -> stop merging
- identity -> count as duplicate

User chooses between duplicates (avoid computational cycles)

Current flat merging

- Build **flat SBML file** with all elements
- **Remove** discarded elements from duplicate pairs.

Alternative: aggregation

- Include input models as instances of submodels into SBML file
- For each duplicate pair, overload discarded element by chosen element

A future SBMLmerge for composed models ??



Modularity can save time in semantic comparison

- element comparison for main/submodels, **not for instances**
- no comparison necessary for common submodels

To be specified by annotations:

- are instances of submodel B identical/overlapping or not?? (... depends on the intended location ...)
- If overlaps are found between submodel A and C: are their instances a1, a2 <-> c1 overlapping or not?

How could a future SBMLmerge handle links ??



Disregard overloaded objects

- in semantic comparison
- in statement choice

Will link constraints be violated during merging?

- If cycles appear -> flatten some of the linked elements
- convergent links -> user has to choose

Acknowledgements

MPI für molekulare Genetik

Edda Klipp Falko Krause Jannis Uhlendorf Marvin Schulz Anselm Helbig

EML Heidelberg

Isabel Rojas, Martin Golebiewski, Ralph Gauges

Humboldt-Universität Berlin

Ulf Leser

Universität Heidelberg Ursula Kummer



Funding by European integrated project BaSysBio

semanticSBML

				seman	nticSBML				
File	File Help								
-									
Mai	in ID -> !	SBML Config	Checked Models	Annotate					
				1	1	I			
<u>A</u>	Annotate	SBML Model		Check Errors	Missing Annotations	Modified			
	Display	eco00260	a2 appetated	0	3 0				
	Display	chassagnol	ez_annotated	0	0				
	Check								
	Merge								
		1							
		Add/Remove M	odels			Modify Selection			
		Open	Remove			Select All Invert Clea	r		
							1		

semanticSBML

	semanticSBML	1
File	semanticSBML	ht
File Main	File Help Main ID -> SBML Config Checked Models Annotate Chassagnole2_annotated eco00260 Model chassagnole2_annotated Current Annotations Model chassagnole2_annotated Cas 56-65-5 delete Model chassagnole2_annotated PubChem 3304 delete Model chassagnole2_annotated PubChem 3304 delete Model chassagnole2_annotated Cas 56-65-5 delete Model Chassagnole2_annotated PubChem 3304 delete Model Chassagnole2_annotated Cas 56-65-5 delete Model Chassagnole2_annotated PubChem 3304 delete Model Chassagnole2_annotated Cas 56-65-5 delete Model Chassagnole2_annotated Chaspartate 4-se PubChem 3304 delete Model Chaspartate (=> ADP + 4-Phosphol-1-asp KEGG C00002 delete atp Model Chaspartate (=> ADP + 4-Phosphol-1-asp Search by Name Search by Name Search Model Chaspartate (ID:adp) Search by Name search Add Add	
	Image: second processing (process) Image: second processing (processing processing processin	

semanticSBML

		semanticSBML 📃 🗖 🖉					
<u>F</u> ile		semanticSBML	1				
Mai]semanticSBML • • • •					
		Main ID -> SBML Config Checked Models Annotate chassagnole2_annotated eco00260 Message					
		Image Image Im					
		Image: Second and contains elements which annotations are missing of could not be recognized. Please use SBMLannotate to annotate the model. SBMLcheck depends on annotations for the elements Image: Second and S					
		close					
			,				

Harmless conflicts during model merging

INCOMPATIBLE STATEMENTS (about the same quantity)

Model 1 says	FBP conc. [mM]	C _{FBP}	$dc_{FBP}/dt = v_{PFK} - v_{FBA}$ $c_{FBP}(0) = c_{F6P}$
Model 2 says	FBP conc. [mM]	C FBP	$C_{_{FBP}} = 0.5$

Choose one of them (or choose a third, alternative one)

COMPUTATIONAL CYCLES

Problem: algebraic equations refer to variables that have not been evaluated before; -> model is not computable

Computational cycles are forbidden! Can they always be avoided? Yes; choose all statements from model 1



SBMLmerge: current features

- the output model describes all elements of the input models
- for each element, a statement is chosen from an input model
- no conflicting statements are made
- the solution is not unique; choices are made based on rules or by the user
- the output model is computable (no cycles)
- several models can be merged subsequently

SBMLmerge: future features

To be supported in coming versions:

- events, species types, SBO terms
- more database identifiers
- qualifiers in annotations ("version of" etc) -> detection of overlap
- annotations for things implicitly described by the model
- SBML standards for model composition (???)

Not supported (...or with big warning signs ...)

- algebraic rules, such as "f(a,b,c,d)=0"
- constraints
- incompletely annotated models
- semantically overlapping elements