

Central European Institute of Technology **BRNO | CZECH REPUBLIC** 



**Modern methods for genome analysis (PřF:Bi7420)**

# Lecture 5 : RNA-seq primary analysis

### NGS data analysis





## The RNA-Seq workflow





## Alignment

- Mapping to genome or transcriptome?
- Genome
	- Requires spliced alignment
	- Can find novel genes/isoforms/exons
	- Information about whole genome/transcriptome
- Transcriptome
	- No spliced alignments necessary
	- Many reads will map to multiple transcripts (shared exons)
	- Cannot find anything new
	- Difficult to determine origin of reads (multiple copies of transcripts)



## Alignment

- $\bullet$  Our choice is the  $STAR$  aligner
- It performs genome alignment
- Offers a lot of settings to support splicing, soft-clipping, chimeric alignments, ...
- Other techniques (Salmon or Kallisto) do not use alignment per se and can give you the gene count information right away
	- o They use only transcriptome as a reference and are very quick
	- Drawback is you see only what's in the transcriptome and nothing else



## Duplication removal - UMI

- PCR duplicates
- Optical duplicates
- How the tools recognize duplicates
	- Maps to the exact same place
- Problem is it could be identical fragment not PCR duplicate
- UMI helps
	- ‒ Maps to the exact same place
	- AND have identical UMI sequence



## Post-alignment QC

- Number of mapped reads unique + multi mapped
- Mapped locations intron, exon, intergenic
- Duplication rates
- Library strand specificity
- Captured biotypes
- Contamination (rRNA, non-self)
- 5' to 3' end coverage bias



## Post-alignment QC - Tools

#### ● Aligner report

○ STAR – most direct assesment

#### ● General QC tools

- RSeQC
- Picard
- Qualimap

#### • Feature counting tools

- featureCounts
- RSEM

#### ● Non-aligment tools

- FastQ screen
- Biobloom



## Note: Gene body coverage

- Often, libraries with high fragmentation (and low RIN numbers) combined with polyA selection might have strong 3' end bias
	- This is a result of polyA "pulled" fragments
- Some kits, however, target only the polyA tail or sequences close to it
	- An example is Lexogen QuantSeq which sequences only one read per mRNA molecule close to polyA tail



Source: Sigurgeirsson et al. PLoS ONE 2014



### Feature counting

- Now, when we know our alignments are solid we need to get the number of reads mapped to a gene (or other feature)
	- From there, we can calculate the differential expression
- The question is, how do we summarize the counts
	- Do we want only uniquely mapped reads
	- Do we want also multi mapped? And how do we assign them? All? One random? Somehow else?
	- And what if we have multiple genes which overlap each other?



### Strand specific library

- We can basically have three strand specificities
	- **Non stranded/Unstranded** not very common anymore
		- Direction of the read mapping is completely random (50/50)
	- **Forward (sense) stranded** common for target kits and "bacterial kits"
		- Direction of the read mapping is the **same** as the gene it originates from
	- **Reverse (antisense) stranded** "default" for Illumina and NEB kits
		- Direction of the read mapping is the **opposite** as the gene it originates from
- In case of paired-end sequencing it's measure by the first (R1) read orientation (FR, RF)



### Feature counting

- The regular settings are summarize reads mapping to exons (-t exon) and sum them up to gene id (-g gene\_id)
- Other possibilities:
	- Count per exons
	- Include introns
	- $\circ$  …



### Gene counts - Tools

- featureCounts is build around the "classic" read to gene assignment
	- By default, assigns only uniquely mapped reads an only reads uniquely assignable to a single gene (but both can be changed)
	- Gives you **raw read counts** per **gene**
- RSEM is efficient in counting also multi mapped reads and can estimate expression of individual gene isoforms
	- Tries to "weight" the probability a mapped position of a multi mapped read and assign it correctly to the real source
	- Gives you **estimated counts** per **gene** as well as per **isoform** and normalized **TPM** = **Transcripts per million transcripts**
- But, there is a **big differences** in the **minimal required** "good" aligned reads



### Minimal number of reads and expression I

- RSEM is less precise in low read counts (<40-50M reads) and for low expressed RNAs (difficult to estimate)
- For lower read counts it's safer to go for featureCounts
- Our best practices for a minimal read count for each tools:
	- Less than **40-50M aligned reads** (to the good stuff) -> featureCounts
	- More than **40-50M aligned reads** (to the good stuff) -> RSEM
- $\bullet$  But if you want isoforms!!! -> RSEM



## Feature count results





## Post-alignment QC - example



