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## Motivation

Differential alternative splicing
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## Section 2 Method Overview of the algorithm

## Algorithmic workflow

Sample support for junctions

Reduced data structure

Reduced data structure without zeros
$\sqrt{ }$
Compositional data

- Core algorithm is based on splice junction supports per sample
- Scanning routine for standard format (e.g. TCGA)
- Pre-calculation procedure for BAM files (segemehl)
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## Pre-calculation procedure for BAM files (segemehl)



## Intersecting with gene annotation



## Matrix reduction

Sample support for junctions

Per gene sample support for junctions

Reduced data structure

Reduced data structure without zeros

Compositional data


- minimum splice junction support value (J)
- minimum samples amount (S)
- Removing samples not showing (J) in at least one splice junction
- Removing junctions with less than (S) samples showing (J)
- Removing genes not containing at least 2 junctions and (S) samples per condition


## Zero-replacement

Sample support for junctions

Per gene sample support for junctions

Reduced data structure

Reduced data structure without zeros

Compositional data


- Accounting for technical and biological variance
- Sampling junction supports from a negative binomial distribution
- Tracking junctions where more than $50 \%$ of a condition are replaced



## Compositional data approach

Sample support for junctions

Per gene sample support for junctions

## Reduced data structure

$$
C_{1}=[0.5,0.375,0.125]
$$

$$
C_{2}=[0.5,0.125,0.375]
$$

## Reduced data structure without zeros

Compositional data
■ Normalizing raw counts to ratios per gene


$$
\begin{aligned}
& C_{1}=[40,30,10] \\
& C_{2}=[120,30,90]
\end{aligned}
$$

■ Simplex as the appropriate sample space:

$$
\mathcal{S}^{D}=\left\{\left[x_{1}, \ldots, x_{D}\right]: x_{i} \geq 0 \text { for } i=1, \ldots, D \text { and } \sum_{i=1}^{D} x_{i}=1\right\}
$$

## Compositional data approach
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Per gene sample support for junctions


Reduced data structure

Reduced data structure without zeros



$$
\begin{aligned}
& C_{1}=[0.5,0.375,0.125] \\
& C_{2}=[0.5,0.125,0.375]
\end{aligned}
$$



Ternary Diagram

## Compositional data approach

## Sample support for junctions

Per gene sample support for junctions


Reduced data structure

Reduced data structure without zeros


- Aitchison distance

$$
d\left(x_{a}, x_{b}\right)=\left[\sum_{i=1}^{D}\left(\log \left(\frac{x_{a i}}{g\left(x_{a}\right)}\right)-\log \left(\frac{x_{b i}}{g\left(x_{b}\right)}\right)\right)^{2}\right]^{\frac{1}{2}}
$$

$$
\text { with } g(x)=\left(\prod_{i=1}^{D} x_{i}\right)^{\frac{1}{D}}
$$



## Compositional data approach

Sample support for junctions

Per gene sample support for junctions


Reduced data structure

Reduced data structure without zeros

Compositional data


- Central tendency

Let $C=\left(x_{i j}, \ldots, x_{N D}\right)$ be a set of N compositional vectors with D components:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \qquad \operatorname{cen}(C)=\left[\frac{g\left(x_{i 1}\right)}{\sum_{j=1}^{D} g\left(x_{i j}\right)}, \ldots, \frac{g\left(x_{i D}\right)}{\sum_{j=1}^{D} g\left(x_{i j}\right)}\right] \\
& \text { with } g\left(x_{i j}\right)=\left(\prod_{i=1}^{N} x_{i j}\right)^{\frac{1}{N}}
\end{aligned}
$$



## Compositional data approach

## Sample support for junctions

$\downarrow$
Per gene sample support for junctions

Reduced data structure without zeros

- Abundance change

$$
a b c\left(x_{i}\right)=d\left(\operatorname{cen}\left(C_{\text {base }}\right)_{i}, \operatorname{cen}\left(C_{\text {compare }}\right)_{i}\right)
$$



$$
\begin{aligned}
& C_{1}=[0.5,0.375,0.125] \\
& C_{2}=[0.5,0.125,0.375]
\end{aligned}
$$

## Detection of differential alternative splicing

## Sample support for junctions

Per gene sample support for junctions

Reduced data structure

Reduced data structure without zeros

Compositional data

- For all components with $|a b c| \geq 1$ :
- Centered log-ratio transformation (clr):

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \qquad \operatorname{clr}(x)=\left[\log \frac{x_{1}}{g(x)}, \ldots, \log \frac{x_{D}}{g(x)}\right] \\
& \text { with } g(x)=\left(\prod_{i=1}^{D} x_{i}\right)^{\frac{1}{D}} \\
& \text { non parametric test statistic } \\
& \text { (Wilcoxon rank-sum) }
\end{aligned}
$$

- Multiple testing correction (Benjamini Hochberg)


## Clustering and outlier detection

Sample support for junctions

- Finding upper quartil of all genes in regard to average distance between the centre and each of the n compositional vectors



## Clustering and outlier detection

Sample support for junctions

Per gene sample support for junctions

Reduced data structure without zeros

Compositional data

- Finding upper quartil of all genes in regard to average distance between the centre and each of the n compositional vectors
- Calculating all $\binom{n}{2}$ pairwise sample combinations averaged over this set of genes



## Clustering and outlier detection

Sample support for junctions

Per gene sample support for junctions

Reduced data structure without zeros

Compositional data

- Finding upper quartil of all genes in regard to average distance between the centre and each of the n compositional vectors
- Calculating all $\binom{n}{2}$ pairwise sample combinations averaged over this set of genes
- Hierarchical agglomerative clustering


## Section 3

## Results

First glimpse at the hidden treasures within the ICGC RNA-seq data

## ICGC data set: Germinal Center B-cell Derived Lymphomas

- 6 comparisons ( 4 conditions: GCB, BL, FL, DLBCL)
- 126 samples ( $5 \mathrm{GCB}, 18 \mathrm{BL}, 46 \mathrm{FL}, 47 \mathrm{DLBCL}$ )


## Outlier detection



## Outlier detection



Distance distribution for BL samples

## Outlier detection



Outlier

- BL 4166151
- Age 74 (median $\approx 10$ )

■ DLBCL 4193638

- Also an outlier in terms of expression

■ FL 4199996 and DLBCL 4181460

- not conspicuous in terms of methylation or expression


Expression correlation

## Subgroup detection



## Differential Alternative Splicing - a statistical overview

- 6 comparisons (4 conditions: GCB, BL, FL, DLBCL)
- 126 samples ( $5 \mathrm{GCB}, 18 \mathrm{BL}, 46 \mathrm{FL}, 47 \mathrm{DLBCL}$ )
- 442,738 supported splice junctions
- 18,700 supported genes ( 16,208 protein coding, 2,492 lincRNA)
- Significant if |abundance change| $\geq 1$ and $q$-value $<0.01$
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|  | GCB-BL | GCB-FL | GCB-DLBCL | BL-FL | BL-DLBCL | FL-DLBCL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | splice junctions |  |  |  |  |  |
| tested | 100,315 | 106,890 | 107,498 | 126,667 | 127,919 | 138,212 |
| sig. | 1,012 | 1,629 | 1,499 | 1,089 | 610 | 132 |
| percent | 1.01 | 1.52 | $1.39$ | 0.86 | 0.48 | 0.10 |
| tested | 8,229 | 8,419 | 8,450 | 10,304 | 10,426 | 11,418 |
| sig. | 756 | 1,077 | 1,016 | 738 | 424 | 108 |
| percent | 9.19 | 12.79 | 12.02 | 7.16 | 4.07 | 0.95 |
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- Randomizing group info $\Rightarrow$ no significant results


## Lymphoma common genes

GCB vs. BL


Overlap of sig. genes


Network of overlap

## Lymphoma common genes

- High protein expression in lymph nodes and other immune related tissues



## Lymphoma common genes

- Plays a role in the invasiveness of cancer cells, and the formation of metastases



## Enriched pathways (GCB vs BL)



## Apoptosis pathway (GCB vs. BL)




## Validation by qPCR



## Validation by qPCR

qPCR Ratio PRDM10 Expression


## Connection between diff. alt. splicing and diff. expression



Intersection with sig. genes based on DESeq

## Connection between diff. alt. splicing and RNA editing

- Calling sig. differentially RNA editing sites between conditions (with Methylene)
- Intersected with both splice sites of all sig. diff. alt. splice junctions


RNA editing at position chr19:17,691,052

## Connection between diff. alt. splicing and DMRs

- Building $2 \times 2$ contingency tables of gene counts in regard to diff. alt. splicing and DMR overlap.
- Odds ratios and p-values from Fisher's exact test:

|  | GCB-BL | GCB-FL | BL-FL |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| odds ratio | 1.3 | 1.48 | 1.84 |
| p-value | 0.00075 | $6.273 \mathrm{e}-09$ | $1.719 \mathrm{e}-15$ |
| genes yes yes | 336 | 449 | 400 |

## Abundance changes



Abundance change as a measure for biological relevance

## Junctions per gene



Natural bias towards genes with more junctions

## Zero-replacement portion



Tested instances vs. significant instances

## Summary

- Simple and robust method
- Based only on direct splice evidence
- Not restricted to current annotations
- Fast core algorithm (3h for 419 samples)
- Plausible results


## Thanks to

- Peter F. Stadler
- Steve Hoffmann
- Stephan Bernhart

■ Helene Kretzmer

- Reiner Siebert
- Rabea Wagener


Thank you for your attention!

## Questions?!

## Thank you for your attention!

## Questions?!

Thank you for your attention!

## Questions?!

