

CENTER FOR EXPANDED DATA ANNOTATION AND RETRIEVAL



High Quality Metadata are and Biomedical Discovery for Large-Scale Reuse **Essential**

What is this colored picture about?



Minimum Information About a Microarray Experiment - MIAME

experiment. [Brazma et al., Nature Genetics] the interpretation of the results of the experiment unambiguously and potentially to reproduce the MIAME describes the Minimum Information About a Microarray Experiment that is needed to enable

The six most critical elements contributing towards MIAME are:

- . The raw data for each hybridisation (e.g., CEL or GPR files)
- The final processed (normalised) data for the set of hybridisations in the experiment (study) (e.g., the gene expression data matrix used to draw the conclusions from the study)
- The essential sample annotation including experimental factors and their values (e.g., compound and dose in a dose response experiment)
- The experimental design including sample data relationships (e.g., which raw biological replicates) data file relates to which sample, which hybridisations are technical, which are
- Sufficient annotation of the array (e.g., gene identifiers, genomic coordinates, probe oligonucleotide sequences or reference commercial array catalog number)
- <u>თ</u> The essential laboratory and data processing protocols (e.g., what normalisation method has been used to obtain the final processed data)

For more details, see MIAME 2.0.

encoded in a way that the essential information specified by MIAME can be accessed easily. FGED recommends the use of MAGE-TAB format, which is based on spreadsheets, or MAGE-ML MIAME does not specify a particular format, however, obviously the data are more usable, if it is

developed by the respective community for describing terms such as anatomy, disease, chemical of standard controlled vocabularies and ontologies are desirable. FGED recommends the use of MGED compounds etc (see OBO page for more detail). Ontology for the description of the key experimental concepts, and where possible ontologies MIAME also does not specify any particular terminology, however for automated data exchange the use



article discussion

MIBBI portal

- Registration form of for the MIBBI Portal (please return to christaylor[@]gmail.com)
- Summary spreadsheet of all registered projects
- = XML document do containing all registered projects (from this schema do same information as the Excel spreadsheet)

Bioscience projects registered with MIBBI

CIMR	Core Information for Metabolomics Reporting
GIATE	Guidelines for Information About Therapy Experiments
MIABE	Minimal Information About a Bioactive Entity
MIABIE	Minimum Information About a Biofilm Experiment
MIACA	Minimal Information About a Cellular Assay
MIAME	Minimum Information About a Microarray Experiment
MIAPA	Minimum Information About a Phylogenetic Analysis
MIAPAR	Minimum Information About a Protein Affinity Reagent
MIAPE	Minimum Information About a Proteomics Experiment
MIAPepAE	Minimum Information About a Peptide Array Experiment
MIARE	Minimum Information About a RNAi Experiment
MIASE	Minimum Information About a Simulation Experiment
MIASPPE	Minimum Information About Sample Preparation for a Phosphoproteomics Experiment
MIATA	Minimum Information About T Cell Assays
MICEE	Minimum Information about a Cardiac Electrophysiology Experiment



Dataset Descriptions: HCLS Community Profile

Editors working draft.

Contributors: Editors: Sarala M. Wimalaratne, EMBL-EBI, UK <<u>sarala@ebi.ac.uk</u>> Laurens Rietveld, VU University Amsterdam, The Netherlands <<u>laurens.rietveld@vu.nl</u>> Chris Mungall, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, USA <<u>cjm@berkeleybop.org</u>> Michael Miller, Institute for Systems Biology, USA <<u>mmiller@systemsbiology.org</u>> James Malone, EMBL-EBI, UK <<u>malone@ebi.ac.uk</u>> Simon Lin, Marshfield Clinic Research Foundation, USA <<u>lin.simon@mcrf.mfldclin.edu</u>> Nicolas Le Novère, Babraham Institute, UK <<u>n.lenovere@gmail.com</u>> Camille Laibe, EMBL-EBI, UK <<u>laibe@ebi.ac.uk</u>> Kalpana Krishnaswami, Metaome, USA <<u>kalpana@metaome.com</u>> Norio Kobyashi, RIKEN, Japan <<u>norio.kobayashi@riken.jp</u>> Nick Juty, EMBL-EBI, UK <juty@ebi.ac.uk> Simon Jupp, EMBL-EBI, UK <jupp@ebi.ac.uk> Maori Ito, NIBIO, Japan <<u>maori@nibio.go.jp</u>> Melissa Haendel, Oregon Health and Science University, USA <<u>haendel@ohsu.edu</u>> Paul Groth, VU University Amsterdam, The Netherlands < <u>p.t.groth@vu.nl</u>> Alejandra Gonzalez-Beltran, University of Oxford, UK <<u>alejandra.gonzalez.beltran@gmail.com</u>> Erich Gombocz, IO Informatics, USA < egombocz@io-informatics.com> Pascale Gaudet, SIB Swiss Institute of Bioinformatics, Switzerland pascale.gaudet@isb-sib.ch> José Cruz-Toledo, Carleton University, Canada <<u>josecruztoledo@cmail.carleton.ca</u>> Alison Callahan, Carleton University, Canada <<u>alison.callahan@carleton.ca</u>> Asuka Bando, NBDC, Japan <<u>bando@biosciencedbc.jp</u>> Gary D. Bader, The Donnelly Centre, University of Toronto, Canada <gary.bader@utoronto.ca> Peter Ansell, CSIRO, Australia peter.ansell@csiro.au> M. Scott Marshall, MAASTRO Clinic, The Netherlands <<u>m.scott.marshall@maastro.nl</u>> Joachim Baran, Stanford University, USA <<u>joachim.baran@stanford.edu</u>> Alasdair J.G. Gray, Heriott-Watt University, UK <<u>A.J.G.Gray@hw.ac.uk</u>> Atsuko Yamaguchi, Database Center for Life Sciences, Japan <<u>atsuko@dbcls.jp</u>> Toshiaki Katayama, Database Center for Life Sciences, Japan <<u>ktym@dbcls.jp</u>> Jerven Bolleman, SIB Swiss Institute of Bioinformatics, Switzerland <<u>jerven.bolleman@isb-sib.ch</u>> Vladimir Alexiev, Ontotext Corp, Bulgaria <<u>vladimir.alexiev@ontotext.com</u>> Michel Dumontier, Stanford University, USA <<u>michel.dumontier@stanford.edu</u>>

FAIR – Findable, Accessible, Interoperable, Reuseable –> Data Sharing Plans

To be Findable:

- F1. (meta)data are assigned a globally unique and eternally persistent identifier
- F2. data are described with rich metadata
- F3. (meta)data are registered or indexed in a searchable resource
- F4. metadata specify the data identifier

To be Accessible:

A1.1 the protocol is open, free, and universally implementable A1 (meta)data are retrievable by their identifier using a standardized communications protocol

A1.2 the protocol allows for an authentication and authorization procedure, where necessary

A2 metadata are eternally accessible, even when the data are no longer available

To be Interoperable:

11. (meta)data use a formal, accessible, shared, and broadly applicable language for knowledge representation.

- I2. (meta)data use vocabularies that follow FAIR principles
- l3. (meta)data include <u>qualified references</u> to other (meta)data

To be Re-usable:

R1. meta(data) have a plurality of accurate and relevant attributes

R1.1. (meta)data are released with a clear and accessible data usage license

R1.2. (meta)data are associated with their provenance

R1.3. (meta)data meet domain-relevant community standards





biosharing.org

STANDARDS

BioSharing standards have been partly compiled by linking to BioPortal, MIBBI and the Equator Network.

Or you can filter on MIBBI Foundry reporting guidelines or OBO Foundry terminology artifacts











ASSAY

RNA DNA

PROTEIN

BRAIN

STREET, STREET

information checklists, The Good News: Minimal

SITE MAP

such as MIAME, are being community of the biomedical advanced from all sectors

The Bad News:

requests for even burdensome "minimal" information as Investigators view

GEO help: Mouse ove
ope: Seir 🗧
Status
Title
Organism Experiment type
Summary
Overall design
Contributor(s) Citation(s)

Unguided Data Entry is Problematic

age of subjects	age, yrs	age (after birth)	Age (Years)	Age	age, years	Age of patient	Age (yrs)	Age, year	age of patient	age(yrs)	age (yr-old)	age.year	Age(yrs.)	age [years]	age [y]	age [year]	Age(years)	age (in years)	Age (years)	age (yr)	age (year)	age(years)	AGE	age_years	age in years	age (y)	age (years)	age (yrs)	Age	age
4	12	18	20	21	24	33	36	39	40	59	64	70	81	83	84	97	267	310	318	373	433	558	588	607	1387	6226	9272	9891	18089	207147



Research Questions

- What are the most effective approaches to maximize reuse of pre-defined metadata elements?
- How can we get metadata authors to generate more metadata in shorter time periods
- To what extent can we successfully predict metadata values from existing metadata?
- Can we use manuscripts, published work, user history, social media to improve prediction?
- fix metadata? To what extent can experts and crowds find, verify, and
- To what degree does ontology-based metadata improve the precision and recall of dataset search?

CEDAR technology will give us

Tools

- To author metadata templates that define a community standard while reusing previously defined elements
- To facilitate the capture of experimental metadata that conform to one or more community standards
- To discover datasets that meet a plurality of dataset and experimental requirements

Methods

- To learn metadata patterns from unstructured, semi-structured, and structured metadata
- To efficiently guide predictive entry of new metadata
- To index, query, and reason about ontology-based metadata
- To explore, verify, and collaboratively augment experimental metadata even when the data are located elsewhere

exceed the minimal metadata standards CEDAR will empower users to meet and

- Emphasis traditionally has been on development of simple checklists of metadata elements
- Little practical consideration for
- Using shared value sets (search, browse, query)
- Common knowledge representations (interoperable ecosystems of tools and data)
- Metadata validation against community standards (richness and quality)
- We need a more expressive—and computable framework for describing metadata

CEDAR Team

Stanford University

- Mark A. Musen (PI)
- Michel Dumontier (Co-I)
- Olivier Gevaert (Co-l)
- Purvesh Khatri (Co-l)
- John Graybeal
- Martin O'Connor
- Marcos Martinez Romero
- Mary Panahiazar
- Attila Egyedi
- Ravi Shankar

Stanford Library

Kim Durante

Oxford University

- Susanna Sansone
- Phillippe Rocca-Serra
- Alejandra Gonzalez-Beltran

Yale University

- Steven H. Kleinstein
- Kei Cheung

Northrop Grumman (HIPC/Immport)

Jeff Wiser



METADATA TEMPLATES

Search

ø

CREATE NEW

Ð

ılli

ıIII

CREATE NEW (+)	TEMPLATE ELEMENTS	
Objectives	Search	ImmPort: Experiment
Official title		ImmPort: Protocol
Sponsoring organization	SEE ALL	











Choose a Template

Template

.111			J
NEW TEMPLATE	IMMPORT: PROTOCOL	IMMPORT: EXPERIMENT	IMMPORT: BASIC STUDY DESIGN

* Brief title Susceptibility and Resistance to Common Encapsulated Bacteria Infections

0

Description

To map and isolate human host supergenes that confer general susceptibility and resistance to common encapsulated bacteria infections such as pneumococcus, meningococcus, and H. influenza

C

Study type

S

- Intervention longitudinal
- O Interventional
- O Longitudinal
- Observational

* Condition studied

Genetic factors confering susceptibility or resistance to common encapsulated bacteria infections

0

templates and auto-magically suggest We also want to help users compose metadata values

structured and semi-structured values? Can we use free text to predict

Sample GSM12306	98 Query DataSets for GSM1230698
Status	Public on Oct 02, 2014
Title	SNG-M_PTX_1
Sample type	RNA
Source name	SNG-M Paclitaxel 24h
Organism	Homo sapiens
Characteristics	cell line: SNG-M
Treatment protocol	Treated with eribulin and paclitaxel at 10xIC50 conc. for 24 hours. IC50 determinded in growth inhibitation assay for cell line separately.
Growth protocol	Cell lines were growing in growth media recommanded by ATCC.
Extracted molecule	total RNA
Extraction protocol	Total RNA was extracted using RNeasy Mini kit (Qiagen).
Label	biotin
Label protocol	Biotinylated fragmenetd cRNA was used.
Hybridization protocol	We used manufacture recommened protocol (Affymetrix). Arrays were washed and stained using Affymetrix Fluidics Station 450
Scan protocol	Arrays were scanned using Affymetrix GeneChip Scanner 3000
Description	drug
Data processing	Gene chips were analyzed using Affymetrix Microarray Analysis Suite (MAS) version 5. RMA normalization was performed using Affymetrix Power Tools version 1 12.0

Predicting structured metadata (accuracy)

Classifier	GPL	Туре	Organism	Molecule	Label
LDA => SVM	32.69%	88.98%	87.43%	94.87%	87.64%
LDA => DecisionTree	73.30%	95.45%	86.80%	95.01%	88.00%
Acc	curacy =	% correct	ly classified	samples	

Predicting semi-structured metadata

Using multi label tree Average precision 79% (for all keys) Average recall 82% (for all keys) Accuracy of 72% to predict 39 most-occurring keys

Metadata: The Next Frontier

We welcome new partners to

- Learn about your metadata authoring workflow
- Evaluate CEDAR technology
- Incorporate this technology into your curation workflows



http://metadatacenter.org

CENTER FOR EXPANDED DATA ANNOTATION AND RETRIEVAL

CEDAR

