CPPpred: prediction of cell penetrating peptides
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ABSTRACT
Summary: Cell penetrating peptides (CPPs) are attracting much attention as a means of overcoming the inherently poor cellular uptake of various bioactive molecules. Here, we introduce CPPpred, a web server for the prediction of CPPs using a N-to-1 neural network. The server takes one or more peptide sequences, between 5 and 30 amino acids in length, as input and returns a prediction of how likely each peptide is to be cell penetrating. CPPpred was developed with redundancy reduced training and test sets, offering an advantage over the only other currently available CPP prediction method.
Availability and Implementation: CPPpred is freely available to non-commercial users at http://bioware.ucd.ie/cpppred.
Contact: Denis.Shields@ucd.ie
Supplementary Information: Supplementary data are available at Bioinformatics online.
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1 INTRODUCTION
Cell penetrating peptides (CPPs) demonstrate the ability to pass through cellular membranes. Accordingly, CPPs are emerging as potential tools for aiding the transport of therapeutic molecules that are not inherently bioavailable, and moreover as possible bioactive agents in their own right (Johansson et al., 2007). Although a number of broad classification systems for CPPs have been proposed (Heitz et al., 2009; Madani et al., 2011, Milletti, 2012), in general, CPPs are typified by a length of 5–30 amino acids, an enrichment in basic residues, therefore a net positive charge, and are hydrophobic in part (Lundberg and Langel, 2003). Several in silico CPP prediction algorithms have been developed to facilitate high-throughput screening of peptides. Initially, methods focused on the use of scales of chemical properties, known as z-descriptors (Sandberg et al., 1998), for the prediction of CPPs (Hällbrink et al., 2005). Other approaches applied to CPP prediction include quantitative structure–activity relationship models (Dobchev et al., 2010) and support vector machines (Gautam et al., 2013; Sanders et al., 2011), although only one of these methods, CellPPD (Gautam et al., 2013), is publicly available. Here, we present CPPpred, a CPP prediction method that uses a neural network (NN) approach. Although others have previously applied NN techniques to the prediction of CPPs (Dobchev et al., 2010), CPPpred represents the only publicly available NN-based method.

2 METHODS
2.1 Training and Test Datasets
We generated our training dataset using 111 CPPs and 34 experimentally validated non-CPPs from Sanders et al. (2011). We selected peptides 5–30 amino acids in length and internally redundancy reduced these sets independently to <80% sequence similarity using BLAST (Altschul et al., 1997), leaving 74 CPPs and 30 non-CPPs. We supplemented the negative set with 70 peptides randomly selected from a 30% internally redundancy reduced set of 1445 bioactive peptides of 5–30 amino acids in length retrieved from BIOPEP (Dziuba et al., 1999), PeptideDB (Liu et al., 2008), CAMP (Thomas et al., 2010) and APD2 (Wang et al., 2009). Only peptides that did not have the same sequence as a CPP in our training set and were not a subsequence of a CPP, or vice versa, were retained (Supplementary Table S1).

2.2 Independent Test Datasets
In all, 843 CPPs were retrieved from CPPsite (Gautam et al., 2012). From this set we selected peptides of 5–30 amino acids in length, labeled as having either ‘Greater’, ‘High’ or ‘Higher’ uptake efficiency (according to the classification of CPPsite) and redundancy reduced this set with respect to our training set to <80% sequence similarity. This left only 47 CPPs from the larger dataset, which we matched with 47 randomly selected bioactive peptides, as described previously, to create our negative set (Supplementary Table S1).

2.3 Predictive Architecture
N-to-1 neural networks, or N1-NNs, have been successfully used to predict the subcellular location of protein sequences (Mooney et al., 2011) and bioactive peptides (Mooney et al., 2012). Here, we apply this model to the prediction of CPPs. The aim of the model is to map a peptide sequence of variable length N into a single property i.e. CPP or non-CPP. Other models tackle this problem at the source, i.e. they transform/compress the sequence into a fixed number of descriptors (or into descriptors of pairwise relations between sequences) beforehand, and then map these descriptors into the property of interest. These descriptors are typically frequencies of residues or k-mers, sometimes computed separately on different parts of the sequence (Gautam et al., 2012; Sanders et al., 2011). In N1-NNs we do not compress the peptide in advance; instead, we decide beforehand only how many features we want to compress a peptide into.
N1-NNs are particularly suited to the problem of CPP prediction, as they do not rely on frequency counts, but look at whole motifs, and do so using a small number of free parameters. Therefore, they have an
advantage over frequency-based methods, in that they incorporate information about relative positions of amino acids in a sequence, whilst also minimizing the risk of overfitting. All possible overlapping motifs in a sequence are processed by the same basic unit, using the same parameters. For this reason, they are advantageous over algorithms that look at a fixed input window, as they overcome the problem of choosing an arbitrary reference frame for peptides of different sizes. They also have a potential advantage over methods that do not rely on fixed windows (e.g. support vector machines (SVM) based on spectral or alignment kernels), in that N1-NNs learn a transform of the sequence that is informative to predict the target property, rather than relying on any pre-defined transform or set thereof. If training is successful, the feature vector will retain what is useful in the input and discard what is not. This is subtly different from compressing the sequence into some code first (potentially erasing useful information) and then optimizing the map between the code and the target.

2.4 Training and Ensembling
Each training was conducted in 5-fold cross-validation, i.e. five different sets of training runs were performed in which a different fifth of the overall set was reserved for testing and another fifth was reserved for validating. During training the networks that performed best on the validation set were saved; these models were then averaged over the ensemble and evaluated on the corresponding test set. The final result for the 5-fold cross-validation is the average of the results on each test set. When testing on the independent test set, we ensemble-combined all the models from all cross-validation folds of the best architecture.

3 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION
The only other publicly available CPP predictor that we are aware of is CellPPD (Gautam et al., 2013). Owing to the short nature of CPPs and the impact that single residue changes can have on the efficiency of penetration, or non-penetration, the authors did not internally redundancy reduce their training set, or redundancy reduce their independent test sets with respect to their training set. We were concerned that this could have potentially led to overfitting of their models. Because the datasets of penetrating peptides are relatively dominated by cationic and amphiphilic peptides, we considered that the redundancy reduction to avoid overfitting would eliminate most of the data. However, we were pleased to note that training was still possible even after 80% redundancy reduction (i.e. no more than 80% identity between any two sequences) (see Table 1). The predictive power of CPPpred is demonstrated in Figure 1. We note that the performance is good on both the redundancy reduced training set (Fig. 1a) and independent test set (Fig. 1b), which was redundancy reduced with respect to the training set, indicating that our method is not showing very obvious signs of extensive overfitting, despite the relatively small training set of 74 CPPs.

More extensive redundancy reduction in the training set would be likely to reduce the ability to train a useful predictor (Supplementary Material). However, it is worth noting that after 30% redundancy reduction of the test set, CPPpred correctly predicted 17 of the 29 CPPs and 27 of the 29 non-CPPs ($Q = 75.86\%$).

3.1 Implementation
CPPpred has been implemented as a web server. The user submits a list of peptides, and CPPpred predicts the probability that each of these peptides will be cell penetrating. When the user is interpreting the results, it is important to note that the server predicts how likely the peptide is to be cell penetrating, and does not predict the degree of uptake efficiency. CPPpred was trained at a threshold of 0.5, i.e. any peptide predicted over a 0.5 threshold is labeled as cell penetrating. Roughly, one-fifth of peptides above 0.5 are false positives, whereas less than a tenth of peptides above 0.7 are false positives (Fig. 1a). However, the user may decide to choose a higher threshold to reduce the false-positive rate. Training and testing was performed using amino acid sequences without any modifications. After using CPPpred to discover CPPs in silico, various peptide modifications may be experimented with in vitro to increase the uptake efficiency of the peptide.

3.2 CPPpred—a worked example
CPPpred provides researchers interested in bioactive peptides and nutraceuticals with an important resource for evaluating the cell penetrating potential of candidate peptides of interest. To demonstrate the application of CPPpred to empirical data, we selected a known bioactive peptide, lactoferricin B, from bovine milk for analysis. Lactoferricin B, consisting of 25 amino acids, exhibits antimicrobial activity (Bellamy et al., 1993) and has been shown experimentally to be cell penetrating (Haukland et al., 2001). Importantly, this peptide (or any associated subsets) is not found in either our training or test sets. When CPPpred is applied to lactoferricin B, a prediction score of 0.725 is achieved, demonstrating the predictive power of CPPpred.

![Fig. 1. Receiver operating characteristic plot of CPP predictor performance on (a) the 80% redundancy reduced training set and (b) the independent test set that is 80% redundancy reduced with respect to the training set](image-url)

Table 1. Results for training and independent test sets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Training set</th>
<th>Independent test set</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spec</td>
<td>Sen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-CPP</td>
<td>81.02</td>
<td>81.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPP</td>
<td>73.82</td>
<td>72.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>77.60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Specificity (spec), sensitivity (sen), Matthews correlation coefficient (MCC) and false positive rate (FPR) (see Supplementary Material for more details).
Further to this, an 11 amino acid subsequence of lactoferricin B, also with known antimicrobial activity (Strøm et al., 2002), attains a CPPpred score of 0.815. Although the cell penetrating capabilities of this undecapeptide have not yet been validated experimentally, it is widely appreciated that cell penetration is a feature of antimicrobial peptides (Splith and Neundorf, 2011). We feel that this example highlights the potential utility of CPPpred in assisting researchers in the selection of peptides for chemical synthesis to experimentally verify their cell penetrating potential.
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