Supplementary materials

Supplementary methods

Pseudocode of the MTB identification algorithms

Algorithm 1 Algorithm for identifying all type R MTBs from a miRNA-target interaction

Algorithm 2 Algorithm for identifying all maximal type Rmi MTBs from a miRNA-

Algorithm 3 Algorithm for identifying all maximal type Rm MTBs from a miRNA-target

Algorithm 4 Algorithm for identifying all maximal type Rgen MTBs from a miRNA-

Algorithm 5 Algorithm for identifying all type L MTBs from a miRNA-target interaction

Algorithm 6 Algorithm for identifying high-scoring type Lmi MTBs from a miRNA-

Algorithm 7 Algorithm for identifying high-scoring type Lm MTBs from a miRNA-

target interaction network 1: function TYPELGENMTB (R, C, A, d, ρ) $\qquad \qquad \triangleright R$: the set of all row indices, each representing an mRNA \triangleright C: the set of all column indices, each representing a miRNA \triangleright A: the adjacency matrix of the miRNA-mRNA network \triangleright d: minimum distance between two initial MTBs both of which are to be kept $\rhd \rho$: minimum density of an MTB 2: Define $MTBs := \text{TypeRgenMTB}(R, C, A)$ as the starting set of MTBs 3: for each pair of MTBs $M_1 = (r_1, c_1)$ and $M_2 = (r_2, c_2)$ in MTBs do \rhd Remove initial MTBs that are too similar to some others 4: if $dist(M_1, M_2) < d$ then \triangleright Remove the smaller one if the two initial MTBs are too similar, checked in the same way as in Algorithm 1 of Du et al., 2008 5: if $r_1 + c_1 < r_2 + c_2$ then 6: $MTBs := MTBs - M_1$ 7: else 8: $MTBs := MTBs - M_2$ 9: end if 10: end if 11: end for 12: Define R' as the set of mRNAs not participating in any MTBs in $MTBs$ 13: Define C' as the set of miRNAs not participating in any MTBs in $MTBs$ 14: while $R' \neq \emptyset$ or C' ▷ Try adding one of the rows not in any MTBs to one of the MTBs 15: Define $denR$ as the highest density of the resulting MTB after any of the additions, initialized to 0 16: **for** each $i \in R'$ do 17: **for** each $M = (r, c) \in MTBs$ do 18: if Density $((r \cup \{i\}, c)) > denR$ then $denR := \text{Density}((r \cup \{i\}, c))$ 19: end if 20: end for 21: end for 22: if $denR > \rho$ then \Rightarrow Perform the addition only if the resulting density is higher than the threshold 23: Add the row to the MTB 24: Remove the row from R' 25: if the resulting MTB is identical to another one in $MTBs$ then $26.$ Remove it from $MTBs$ 27: end if 28: end if \triangleright Try adding one of the columns not in any MTBs to one of the MTBs 29: Define $denC$ as the highest density of the resulting MTB after any of the additions, initialized to 0 30: **for** each $j \in C'$ do 31: **for** each $M = (r, c) \in MTBs$ do 32: if Density $((r, c \cup \{i\})) > denC$ then $denC := \text{Density}((r, c \cup \{i\}))$ 33: end if 34: end for 35: end for 36: if $denC > \rho$ then \Rightarrow Perform the addition only if the resulting density is higher than the threshold 37: Add the column to the MTB 38: Remove the column from C' 39: if the resulting MTB is identical to another one in $MTBs$ then 40: Remove it from $MTBs$ 41: end if 42: end if 43: if $den R \leq \rho$ and $den C \leq \rho$ then 44: Break the while loop 45: end if 46: end while 47: Return MTBs

Algorithm 8 Algorithm for identifying high-scoring type Lgen MTBs from a miRNA-

48: end function

A unified general model of MTB

It is possible to generalize all eight types of MTB by one single unified model. A general MTB is defined as a submatrix of the input matrix of miRNA-mRNA interactions. Each MTB is associated with a score indicating its proximity to the ideal case. Specifically, let R and C be respectively the sets of all rows (mRNAs) and all columns (miRNAs) in the input matrix, r and c be the rows and columns involved in an MTB, a_{ij} represents the element at row i and column j of the matrix, and k_0 , k_1 and k_2 are parameters with non-negative values. The score of an MTB (r, c) , $f(r, c)$, is defined by the following formula:

$$
f(r,c) = 1 - k_0 \frac{\sum_{i \in r, j \in c} (1 - a_{ij})}{|r||c|} - k_1 \frac{\sum_{p \in (R-r), j \in c} a_{pj}}{|R - r||c|} - k_2 \frac{\sum_{i \in r, q \in (C-c)} a_{iq}}{|r||C - c|}
$$

The scoring formula consists of four parts. The first part is the constant value 1, which represents the maximum score of an MTB. The other three parts are penalty terms for missing 1's in the MTB, extra 1's on the same columns outside the MTB, and extra 1's on the same rows outside the MTB, respectively. The three parameters determine which penalty terms to apply and their relative weights. For the eight MTB types defined, the algorithms we used to identify the corresponding MTBs can be considered as algorithms for finding top-scoring MTBs, defined as some specific instantiations of this general model with different sets of parameter values, as shown in Table S1.

Table S1 Relationships between the unified general model and the MTBs identified by our algorithms for the eight types of MTB. *: For the L, Lmi, Lm and Lgen types, we also have an additional connectedness requirement between the rows and columns.

MTB type	k_0	k ₁	k_2
R	∞	∞	∞
Rmi	∞	∞	0
Rm	∞	0	∞
Rgen	∞	0	0
L	$0*$	∞	∞
Lmi	$1*$	∞	0
Lm	$1*$	0	∞
Lgen	$1*$	0	0

For type R MTB, having any missing 1's in a submatrix or extra 1's on the same rows or columns outside the submatrix would result in a negative infinity score, which disqualifies it as a valid MTB. For type Rmi, the penalty terms for missing 1's in a submatrix and extra 1's on the same columns outside it still apply, but the penalty for extra 1's on the same rows outside the submatrix is waived. Similarly, for type Rm, extra 1's on the same rows are penalized, but extra 1's on the same columns are not. For type Rgen, both are not penalized and any submatrix having only 1's is qualified as a MTB. For type L, extra 1's on the same rows and columns outside a submatrix are penalized, but missing 1's within it is not. Similar arguments apply for types Lmi, Lm and Lgen, except that in these cases the within-MTB density of 1's is used to evaluate the quality of a MTB, but the allowed extra 1's on the same rows or columns are simply ignored.

In addition to the eight standard types, new types of MTB can be defined by using different combinations of values for the parameters k_0 , k_1 and k_2 . High-scoring MTBs can be found by heuristic optimization algorithms. In some special cases, as with some of the eight standard types, it is also possible to derive efficient algorithms to return all MTBs or all maximal MTBs.

The scoring formula can also be written in another way. Suppose now r is a binary vector with $|R|$ entries in total, where an entry is 1 if the corresponding row is a member of the MTB of interest and 0 if not. Similarly, we redefine c as the binary vector with $|C|$ entries in total, where an entry is 1 if the corresponding column is a member of the MTB and 0 if not. The scoring formula can then be written in terms of these vectors and the whole miRNA-mRNA interaction matrix A:

$$
f(r,c) = 1 - k_0 \frac{r^t r c^t c - r^t A c}{r^t r c^t c} - k_1 \frac{(1-r)^t A c}{(R-r)^t (R-r) c^t c} - k_2 \frac{r^t A (1-c)}{r^t r (C-c)^t (C-c)},
$$

where 1 represents the binary vector of all 1's (with a length depending on the context).

The main reason to write the scoring formula using the vector and matrix representations is that the general MTB model can then be extended to handle nonbinary interaction matrices, in which each element a_{ij} takes on a continuous value between 0 and 1 that represents the confidence of the miRNA targeting the mRNA. Correspondingly, one may also allow fractional values in the r and c vectors to represent fussy MTB memberships. With these changes, a whole series of other well-established optimization methods can be applied to identify MTBs of high scores.

Figure S1 Workflow for studying (a) expression correlations between members of same MTBs and (b) functional relationships between genes in same MTBs.

Figure S2 Statistical significance of the negative correlations between the expression levels of miRNAs and mRNAs in the same MTBs. The p-values were computed based on the expressed union sets without TarBase interactions, for (a) the high-confidence set and (b) the high-coverage set as compared to a random background sampled from all expressed mRNAs and miRNAs; and (c) the high-confidence set and (d) the high-coverage set as compared to a background consisting of miRNA-mRNA pairs with interactions in the input network but are not in same MTBs. In the figures, 1E-16 represents the smallest p-value that could be outputted by our program. MTB types with no identified MTBs are omitted.

Figure S3 Statistical significance of the negative correlations between the expression levels of miRNAs and mRNAs in the same MTBs, when related miRNAs were grouped. The p-values were computed based on the expressed union sets with TarBase interactions, for (a) the high-confidence set and (b) the high-coverage set as compared to a random background sampled from all expressed mRNAs and miRNAs; and (c) the high-confidence set and (d) the high-coverage set as compared to a background consisting of miRNA-mRNA pairs with interactions in the input network but are not in same MTBs. In the figures, 1E-16 represents the smallest p-value that could be outputted by our program. MTB types with no identified MTBs are omitted.

Figure S4 Statistical significance of the negative correlations between the expression levels of miRNAs and mRNAs in the same MTBs, when related miRNAs were grouped. The p-values were computed based on the expressed union sets without TarBase interactions, for (a) the high-confidence set and (b) the high-coverage set as compared to a random background sampled from all expressed mRNAs and miRNAs; and (c) the high-confidence set and (d) the high-coverage set as compared to a background consisting of miRNA-mRNA pairs with interactions in the input network but are not in same MTBs. In the figures, 1E-16 represents the smallest p-value that could be outputted by our program. MTB types with no identified MTBs are omitted.

Figure S5 Statistics of the MTBs identified from the high-confidence expressed union set without TarBase interactions. For each type of MTB, the average number of mRNAs per MTB, average number of miRNAs per MTB and the number of MTBs identified by our algorithm are shown.

Figure S6 Statistics of the MTBs identified from the high-coverage integrated expressed union set with TarBase interactions. For each type of MTB, the average number of mRNAs per MTB, average number of miRNAs per MTB and the number of MTBs identified by our algorithm are shown.

Figure S7 Statistics of the MTBs identified from the high-coverage integrated expressed union set without TarBase interactions. For each type of MTB, the average number of mRNAs per MTB, average number of miRNAs per MTB and the number of MTBs identified by our algorithm are shown.

Figure S8 Statistical significance of the functional enrichment scores of the genes from same type Lgen MTBs. The p-values were computed based on the expressed union sets without TarBase interactions, for (a) the high-confidence set and (b) the high-coverage set. In the figures, 1E-16 represents the smallest p-value that could be outputted by our program.