[WGS & SVs](#page-65-0)

Peter N. Robinson

[Structural](#page-2-0) variants [Array CGH](#page-13-0) [SV Discovery](#page-18-0) [Poisson](#page-35-0) [GC Content](#page-46-0)

[Read depth](#page-49-0)

[CNV Calling](#page-52-0)

Genome Sequencing and Structural Variation

Peter N. Robinson

Institut für Medizinische Genetik und Humangenetik Charité Universitätsmedizin Berlin

Genomics: Lecture #10

KORK STRATER STRAKER

Today

[WGS & SVs](#page-0-0)

Peter N. Robinson

- [Structural](#page-2-0) variants
- [Array CGH](#page-13-0)
- [SV Discovery](#page-18-0)
- [Poisson](#page-35-0)
- [GC Content](#page-46-0)
- [Read depth](#page-49-0)
- [CNV Calling](#page-52-0)
- **•** Structural Variation
	- **a** Deletions
	- **•** Duplications
	- **a** Inversions
	- Other
- Array CGH
- Algorithms for detecting structural variations from WGS data (Introduction)

KORK STRATER STRAKER

- Read-depth
- Split reads etc
- Read-depth Algorithm: Detailed Example

Outline

[WGS & SVs](#page-0-0)

Peter N. Robinson

1 [Structural variants](#page-2-0)

[Array CGH](#page-13-0)

[Structural](#page-2-0) variants [Array CGH](#page-13-0)

[SV Discovery](#page-18-0)

[Poisson](#page-35-0)

[GC Content](#page-46-0)

[Read depth](#page-49-0)

[CNV Calling](#page-52-0)

[Bioinformatics Approaches for Structural Variant](#page-18-0) [Discovery](#page-18-0)

K ロ ▶ K @ ▶ K 할 > K 할 > 1 할 > 1 이익어

[Poisson](#page-35-0)

[GC Content](#page-46-0)

[Read depth](#page-49-0)

[CNV Calling](#page-52-0)

CNVs vs. SNVs

[WGS & SVs](#page-0-0)

Peter N. Robinson

[Structural](#page-2-0) variants [Array CGH](#page-13-0)

[SV Discovery](#page-18-0)

[Poisson](#page-35-0)

[GC Content](#page-46-0)

[Read depth](#page-49-0)

[CNV Calling](#page-52-0)

Single-nucleotide variants

CNV

- **Several thousand SNVs in** typical exome (1% des Genoms)
- ca. 3–4 million SNVs in typical genome
- Hundreds/Thousands of CNVs per Genome
- average size 250,000 nt

(n.b.: avg. gene is ca. 60,000 nt)

 $\mathbf{E} = \mathbf{A} \oplus \mathbf{A} + \mathbf{A$

 $2Q$

CNVs vs. SNVs

[WGS & SVs](#page-0-0)

Peter N. Robinson

[Structural](#page-2-0) variants [Array CGH](#page-13-0)

[SV Discovery](#page-18-0)

[Poisson](#page-35-0)

[GC Content](#page-46-0)

[Read depth](#page-49-0)

[CNV Calling](#page-52-0)

Single-Nucleotide Variants (SNV)

- Most missense, nonsense mutations, class also includes synonymous subsitutions and intergenic subsitutions
- Previously thought to be main source of interindividual genomic variability

Copy-Number Variants (CNV)

- Major class of genomic structural variation
- Alteration in normal number of copies of a genomic segment

KORK STRATER STRAKER

(Normal: 2 copies; Deletion: 1 copy; Duplication 3 copies.)

Structural Variation: Definition

[WGS & SVs](#page-0-0)

Peter N. Robinson

[Structural](#page-2-0) variants [Array CGH](#page-13-0) [SV Discovery](#page-18-0) [Poisson](#page-35-0) [GC Content](#page-46-0) [Read depth](#page-49-0)

[CNV Calling](#page-52-0)

Structural variations (SV) are Genomic rearrangements that effect more than 1 Kb 1

- Duplication and Amplification
- Deletion (often called Loss of heterozygosity if deletion occurs somatically, e.g., cancer)

K ロ ▶ K @ ▶ K 할 ▶ K 할 ▶ 이 할 → 9 Q @

- **Translocation and Fusion**
- **o** Inversion
- Breakpoints at SV edges

 $¹$ Yes, this definition is arbitrary!</sup>

Inversion

Peter N. Robinson

[Structural](#page-2-0) variants [Array CGH](#page-13-0) [SV Discovery](#page-18-0) [Poisson](#page-35-0) [GC Content](#page-46-0) [Read depth](#page-49-0)

[CNV Calling](#page-52-0)

A balanced structural variation (no loss/gain of genomic segment)

KOD KARD KED KED E YORA

- **Can be a neutral variation**
- Can disrupt a coding sequence
- Can interrupt regulatory interactions

Intrachromosomal translocation

• A balanced structural variation (no loss/gain of genomic segment)

KOD KARD KED KED E YORA

Can be a neutral variation

[CNV Calling](#page-52-0)

- Can disrupt a coding sequence
- • Can interrupt regulatory interactions

Interchromosomal translocation

- A balanced structural variation (no loss/gain of genomic segment)
- **•** Translocation between two different chromosomes
- Like other balanced SVs, can be neutral of disrupt coding sequences or regulatory interacti[ons](#page-7-0)

• results in dosage abnormality of genes contained in deletion

KORK STRATER STRAKER

• Indirect regulatory imbalances also possible

Duplication

- An unbalanced structural variation (gain of genomic segment)
- **•** results in dosage abnormality of genes contained in deletion
- **Indirect regulatory imbalances al[so](#page-9-0) [po](#page-11-0)[s](#page-9-0)[sib](#page-10-0)[l](#page-11-0)[e](#page-1-0)**
 Indirect regulatory imbalances also possible

Structural Variation: Distribution in Genome

∼ 1000 SVs >2.5kb per Person

Korbel JO et al (2007) Paired-end mapping reveals extensive structural variation in the human genome. Science 318:420–6.**KOD KARD KED KED E YORA**

Detection of Structural Variants

[WGS & SVs](#page-0-0)

Peter N. Robinson

[Structural](#page-2-0) variants

[Array CGH](#page-13-0)

[SV Discovery](#page-18-0)

[Poisson](#page-35-0)

[GC Content](#page-46-0)

[Read depth](#page-49-0)

[CNV Calling](#page-52-0)

Abbreviations: BAC, bacterial artificial chromosome; CGH, comparative genomic hybridisation; COBRA, combined binary ratio labelling; FISH, fluorescence in situ hybridisation; LOH, loss of heterozyogosity; M-FISH, multiplex FISH; NGS, next-generation sequencing; RxFISH, Rainbow cross-species FISH or cross-species colour banding; SNP, single-nucleotide polymorphism; SKY, spectral karyotyping; UPD, uniparental disomy

Methods in the grey-shaded area are discussed in this review

• Still no method to reliably detect all SVs Array CGH currently the gold standard for CNVs

Le Scouarnec S, Gribble SM (2012) Characterising chromosome rearrangements: recent technical advances in molecular cytogenetics. Heredity (Edinb) 108:75-85. **KOD KARD KED KED E YORA**

Array-CGH

A small heterozygous deletion in the β -globin locus.

Urban AE et al. (2006) High-resolution mapping of DNA copy alterations in human chromosome 22 using high-density tiling oligonucleotide arrays. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 103:4534-9.

KORK ERKER ADE YOUR

DNA Hybridization

Peter N. Robinson

[Structural](#page-2-0) variants

[Array CGH](#page-13-0)

[SV Discovery](#page-18-0)

[Poisson](#page-35-0)

[GC Content](#page-46-0)

[Read depth](#page-49-0)

[CNV Calling](#page-52-0)

DNA Hybridization:

- If two DNA strands are separated, they still "recognize" their opposite (reverse complementary) strand.
- **o** denaturation: Heat DNA until strands separate
- renaturation (hybridization): cool slowly and allow reverse complementary to anneal to one another

Array-CGH

[Structural](#page-2-0) variants

[Array CGH](#page-13-0)

[SV Discovery](#page-18-0) [Poisson](#page-35-0)

[GC Content](#page-46-0)

[Read depth](#page-49-0)

[CNV Calling](#page-52-0)

• Ratio of 2 fluorescent signals indications loss or gain of DNA segment

Array-CGH

[WGS & SVs](#page-0-0)

Peter N. Robinson

[Structural](#page-2-0) variants

[Array CGH](#page-13-0)

[SV Discovery](#page-18-0)

[Poisson](#page-35-0)

[GC Content](#page-46-0)

[Read depth](#page-49-0)

[CNV Calling](#page-52-0)

Array CGH can detect

- **o** Deletions
- Duplications (& and other gains in copy number)
- More complex copy number changes (e.g., mixed)

KORK STRATER STRAKER

Urban AE et al. (2006) High-resolution mapping of DNA copy alterations in human chromosome 22 using

high-density tiling oligonucleotide arrays. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 103:4534-9.

Array-CGH: Indications in Human Genetics

[WGS & SVs](#page-0-0)

Peter N. Robinson

[Structural](#page-2-0) variants

[Array CGH](#page-13-0)

- [SV Discovery](#page-18-0)
- [Poisson](#page-35-0)
- [GC Content](#page-46-0)
- [Read depth](#page-49-0)
- [CNV Calling](#page-52-0)
- **•** Intellectual disability or developmental delay of unknown cause
- **Congenital malformation or facial dysmorphism**
- Autism or suspicion of a specific chromosomal disorder

Array-CGH is a screening investigation to investigate nearly the entire genome for CNVs in an un targeted fashion. Many findings are "new" and may be difficult to interpret: cause of a disease or neutral polymorphism?

KORK STRATER STRAKER

Outline

[WGS & SVs](#page-0-0)

Peter N. Robinson

[Structural variants](#page-2-0)

[Array CGH](#page-13-0)

[Structural](#page-2-0) variants

[Array CGH](#page-13-0)

[SV Discovery](#page-18-0)

[Poisson](#page-35-0) [GC Content](#page-46-0) [Read depth](#page-49-0)

[CNV Calling](#page-52-0)

3 [Bioinformatics Approaches for Structural Variant](#page-18-0) **[Discovery](#page-18-0)**

KOD KARD KED KED E YORA

[Poisson](#page-35-0)

[GC Content](#page-46-0)

[Read depth](#page-49-0)

[CNV Calling](#page-52-0)

Bioinformatics Approaches for SV Discovery with WGS data

[WGS & SVs](#page-0-0)

Peter N. Robinson

[Structural](#page-2-0) variants

[Array CGH](#page-13-0)

[SV Discovery](#page-18-0)

[Poisson](#page-35-0)

[GC Content](#page-46-0)

[Read depth](#page-49-0)

[CNV Calling](#page-52-0)

Several characteristics of NGS data can be exploited for identification of different kinds of structural variants

- Read depth
- Read pairs
	- **4** Orientation of mates
	- 2 Distance of aligned mates to one another
- Split reads
- Fine mapping of breakpoints by local assembly

KORK STRAIN A BAR SHOP

Paired NGS Reads

[WGS & SVs](#page-0-0)

Peter N. Robinson

[Structural](#page-2-0) variants [Array CGH](#page-13-0) [SV Discovery](#page-18-0) [Poisson](#page-35-0) [GC Content](#page-46-0) [Read depth](#page-49-0) [CNV Calling](#page-52-0)

Paired sequences are extremely useful for read mapping in whole genome sequencing because we not only have the information about the DNA sequences but also the distance and orientation of the two mapped reads to one another. There are two major classes of paired sequences.

- \textbf{D} Paired end. Fragment libraries 2 are sequenced from both ends. The sequencing direction is from the ends towards the middle.
- 2 Mate-pair libraries. We will review this today

 2 As discussed in the very first lecture. KOX KOX KEX KEX E 1990

Mate pair

[WGS & SVs](#page-0-0)

Peter N. Robinson

[Structural](#page-2-0) variants

[Array CGH](#page-13-0)

[SV Discovery](#page-18-0)

- [Poisson](#page-35-0)
- [GC Content](#page-46-0)
- [Read depth](#page-49-0)
- [CNV Calling](#page-52-0)

Construction of Illumina mate-pair sequencing libraries.

- After circularization, the two fragment ends (green and red) become located adjacent to each other
- The circularized DNA is fragmented, and biotinylated fragments are purified by affinity capture. Sequencing adapters (A1 and A2) are ligated to the ends of the captured fragments

the fragments are hybridized to a flow cell, in which they are bridge amplified. The first sequence read is obtained with adapter A2 bound to the flow cell

- The complementary strand is synthesized and linearized with adapter A1 bound to the flow cell, and the second sequence read is obtained
-
- The two sequence reads (arrows) will be directed outwards from the original fragment.

 Ω

 4 ロ) 4 \overline{r}) 4 \overline{z}) 4 \overline{z})

Paired-end vs. Mate pair

If we have two 75 bp paired-end reads with a 100bp middle piece, the insert size is calculated as $2 \times 75 + 100 = 250$ nt. The fragment size is insert size plus length of both adapters (≈ 120 nt extra).

[WGS & SVs](#page-0-0) Peter N. Robinson [Structural](#page-2-0) variants [Array CGH](#page-13-0) [SV Discovery](#page-18-0) [Poisson](#page-35-0) [GC Content](#page-46-0) [Read depth](#page-49-0) [CNV Calling](#page-52-0) Read depth Analysis of read depth can identify deletion/duplications Heterozygous Deletion? Mappability Issue? Poor "sequencability"?

Read depth

Peter N. Robinson

[Structural](#page-2-0) variants [Array CGH](#page-13-0)

[SV Discovery](#page-18-0)

[Poisson](#page-35-0)

[GC Content](#page-46-0)

[Read depth](#page-49-0)

[CNV Calling](#page-52-0)

Characteristic signatures of paired-end sequences

graphic credit: Victor Guryev

 2990

 $\mathbf{E} = \mathbf{A} \oplus \mathbf{A} + \mathbf{A$

Deletions in WGS Data

KORK STRATER STRAKER

Deletions in WGS Data

KOD KARD KED KED E YORA

Insertions in WGS Data

KORK STRATER STRAKER

Insertions in WGS Data

[WGS & SVs](#page-0-0)

Peter N. Robinson

[Structural](#page-2-0) variants [Array CGH](#page-13-0) [SV Discovery](#page-18-0) [Poisson](#page-35-0) [GC Content](#page-46-0) [Read depth](#page-49-0)

[CNV Calling](#page-52-0)

Read pair decreased interpair mapping distance Read depth not applicable³ Split read single read is split into two segments surrounding novel insertion sequence Assembly assembled sequence with inserted novel sequence

³ Novel sequence will not map to genome

Inversions in WGS Data

KORK STRATER STRAKER

Inversions in WGS Data

[WGS & SVs](#page-0-0)

Peter N. Robinson

[Structural](#page-2-0) variants [Array CGH](#page-13-0) [SV Discovery](#page-18-0)

[Poisson](#page-35-0)

[GC Content](#page-46-0)

[Read depth](#page-49-0)

[CNV Calling](#page-52-0)

Duplications in WGS Data

Duplications in WGS Data

Peter N. Robinson

- [Structural](#page-2-0) variants [Array CGH](#page-13-0)
- [SV Discovery](#page-18-0)
- [Poisson](#page-35-0)
- [GC Content](#page-46-0)
- [Read depth](#page-49-0)
- [CNV Calling](#page-52-0)

Graphics credit: Le Scouarnec and Gribble SM Heredity (Edinb). 2012; 108:75-85.

Translocations in WGS Data

• In sum: There are many different signals that are used for SV detecction. Different read types have distinct attributes

K ロ ▶ K @ ▶ K 할 ▶ K 할 ▶ 이 할 → 9 Q @

Read depth

[WGS & SVs](#page-0-0)

Peter N. Robinson

[Structural](#page-2-0) variants [Array CGH](#page-13-0) [SV Discovery](#page-18-0)

[Poisson](#page-35-0)

[GC Content](#page-46-0)

[Read depth](#page-49-0)

[CNV Calling](#page-52-0)

In the remainder of this lecture, we will examine how read depth analysis can be used to search for CNVs. We will concentrate on three topics.

- **Poisson distribution: Review**
- \bullet G/C dependence
- \bullet Simplified version of algorithm in Yoon et al.⁵

5
Sensitive and accurate detection of copy number variants using read depth of coverage. *Genome Res.* 2009;19:1586–92. $\mathbf{E} = \mathbf{A} \oplus \mathbf{A} + \mathbf{A$ $2Q$

Poisson

[WGS & SVs](#page-0-0)

Peter N. Robinson

[Structural](#page-2-0) variants

[Array CGH](#page-13-0)

[SV Discovery](#page-18-0)

[Poisson](#page-35-0)

[GC Content](#page-46-0)

[Read depth](#page-49-0)

[CNV Calling](#page-52-0)

A Poisson experiment is a statistical experiment that has the following properties:

1 The experiment results in outcomes that can be classified as successes or failures.

2 The average number of successes (μ) that occurs in a specified region is known.

3 The probability that a success will occur is proportional to the size of the region.

4 The probability that a success will occur in an extremely small region is virtually zero.

The "region" can be a length, an area, a volume, a period of time, etc.

Early use of Poisson distribution: Ladislaus Bortkiewicz (1898): investigation of the number of soldiers in the Prussian army killed accidentally by horse kick.

 $2Q$

K ロ ⊁ K 伊 ⊁ K

Poisson

[WGS & SVs](#page-0-0)

Peter N. Robinson

[Structural](#page-2-0) variants [Array CGH](#page-13-0)

[SV Discovery](#page-18-0)

[Poisson](#page-35-0)

[GC Content](#page-46-0) [Read depth](#page-49-0) [CNV Calling](#page-52-0)

$$
P(X = k) = \frac{\lambda^k e^{-\lambda}}{k!}
$$
 (1)

- $k =$ number of occurrences
- λ = average occurrences/time interval

For example, if the average number of soldiers killed by being kicked by a horse each year in each of 14 cavalry corps is 1.7, what is the probability of 4 soldiers being killed in one year?

$$
P(X = 4) = \frac{(1.7)^4 e^{-(1.7)}}{4!} = 0.063
$$
 (2)

KORK ERKER ER AGA

In R,

> dpois(4,1.7) [1] 0.06357463

Poisson

• For $X \sim \text{Poisson}(\lambda)$, both the mean and the variance are equal to λ

K ロ ▶ K @ ▶ K 할 > K 할 > 1 할 > 1 이익어

Poisson and Read counts

[WGS & SVs](#page-0-0)

Peter N. Robinson

[Structural](#page-2-0) variants

[Array CGH](#page-13-0)

[SV Discovery](#page-18-0)

[Poisson](#page-35-0)

[GC Content](#page-46-0) [Read depth](#page-49-0)

[CNV Calling](#page-52-0)

Many NGS algorithms model read counts as a Poisson distribution

- Segment the genome into Windows (e.g., 1000 bp).
- **Count number of reads in each Window**
- All else equal, we expect half as many reads as normal in the case of a deletion, and 1.5 times as many reads as normal in the case of a duplication

$$
\lambda = \frac{NW}{G}
$$

where

 \int \int $\overline{\mathcal{L}}$ N Total number of reads W size of window G Size of genome (3)

4 D > 4 P + 4 B + 4 B + B + 9 Q O

[WGS & SVs](#page-0-0)

Peter N. Robinson

[Structural](#page-2-0) variants [Array CGH](#page-13-0) [SV Discovery](#page-18-0) [Poisson](#page-35-0) [GC Content](#page-46-0) [Read depth](#page-49-0)

[CNV Calling](#page-52-0)

The Poisson distribution can be derived as a limiting form of the binomial distribution in which n is increased without limit as the product $\lambda = np$ is kept constant.

- This corresponds to conducting a very large number of Bernoulli trials with the probability p of success on any one trial being very small.
- This suggests we can approximate the Poisson distribution by the Normal distribution

KORKA SERKER ORA

The central limit theorem: the mean of a sufficiently large number of independent random variables, each with finite mean and variance, is approximately normally distributed

[WGS & SVs](#page-0-0)

Peter N. Robinson

[Structural](#page-2-0) variants [Array CGH](#page-13-0) [SV Discovery](#page-18-0)

[Poisson](#page-35-0)

[GC Content](#page-46-0) [Read depth](#page-49-0)

[CNV Calling](#page-52-0)

For sufficiently large values of λ , (say $\lambda > 1,000$), the Normal $(\mu=\lambda,\sigma=\sqrt{\lambda})$ Distribution is an excellent approximation to the Poisson(λ) Distribution.

If λ is greater than about 10, then the Normal Distribution is a good approximation if an appropriate continuity correction is performed.

 2990

Þ

[WGS & SVs](#page-0-0)

Peter N. Robinson

[Structural](#page-2-0) variants [Array CGH](#page-13-0) [SV Discovery](#page-18-0)

```
Poisson
```
[GC Content](#page-46-0) [Read depth](#page-49-0) [CNV Calling](#page-52-0) Finally, we can check in R that the Normal is a reasonable approximation to the Poisson (it is not an extremely close approximation for λ in this range yet) 6 .

```
> pnorm(25,mean=20,sd=sqrt(20),lower.tail=FALSE)
[1] 0.1317762
> ppois(25,20,lower.tail=FALSE)
[1] 0.112185
```
For this reason, we will see the Normal distribution (often a z-score) used to calculate read depth statistics.

 6 It would be better f[or](#page-43-0) $\lambda=50$ $\lambda=50$ $\lambda=50$ $\lambda=50$ and bette[r ye](#page-43-0)[t f](#page-45-0)[o](#page-35-0)[r](#page-45-0) $\lambda=1000$ or [a](#page-46-0)[bo](#page-0-0)[ve.](#page-65-0)

イロト イ部 トイ君 トイ君 トッ 君の

 2990

grapic: wikipedia

GC Content

grapic: wikipedia

The GC content $\frac{G+C}{A+C+G+T}$ of a sequence affects many properties, e.g., annealing temperature of PCR primers

GC Content in Bioinformatics

[WGS & SVs](#page-0-0)

Peter N. Robinson

[Structural](#page-2-0) variants [Array CGH](#page-13-0) [SV Discovery](#page-18-0) [Poisson](#page-35-0) [GC Content](#page-46-0)

[Read depth](#page-49-0) [CNV Calling](#page-52-0) GC content is correlated with multiple other parameters, and bioinformatics analysis often needs to take this into account

- $\bullet \uparrow$ GC content $\Leftrightarrow \uparrow$ mRNA stability
- Giemsa dark bands (cytogenetics) ⇔ locally GC-poor regions compared with light bands
- Housekeeping (ubiquitously expressed) genes in the mammal genome \Leftrightarrow on average slightly GC-richer than tissue-specific genes.
- Silent-site GC content correlates with gene expression efficiency in mammalian cells.

KORKA SERKER ORA

for instance...

GC Content in Genomics

[WGS & SVs](#page-0-0)

Peter N. Robinson

[Structural](#page-2-0) variants [Array CGH](#page-13-0) [SV Discovery](#page-18-0) [Poisson](#page-35-0)

- [GC Content](#page-46-0) [Read depth](#page-49-0)
- [CNV Calling](#page-52-0)

GC content is can confound the results of a number of genomics experiments

- Dependence between fragment count (read coverage) and GC content found in Illumina sequencing data.
- The GC effect is unimodal: both GC-rich fragments and AT-rich fragments \Leftrightarrow underrepresented.
- RNA-seq: GC-rich and GC-poor fragments tend to be under-represented in RNA-Seq, so that, within a lane, read counts are not directly comparable between genes
	- ChIP-seq: Peaks (profiles) correlate positively with genomic GC content
	- Whole genome sequencing: GC content may correlate positively with read depth

See for instance: Benjamini Y, Speed TP (2012) Summarizing and correcting the GC content bias in high-throughput sequencing. Nucleic Acids Res 40:e72. **KORK STRAIN A BAR SHOP**

Read Depth

[WGS & SVs](#page-0-0)

Peter N. Robinson

[Structural](#page-2-0) variants [Array CGH](#page-13-0) [SV Discovery](#page-18-0) [Poisson](#page-35-0) [GC Content](#page-46-0) [Read depth](#page-49-0)

[CNV Calling](#page-52-0)

We can get a simple picture of the distribution of reads acrosss a chromosome by counting how many reads start in a given chromosomal window.

Basic workflow

- Align reads from high or low coverage genome sequencing
- Count the number of reads that begin in each window of size N^7
- Plot (eyeball-o-metrics)

There is a tutorial on how to do the next few analysis steps on the website.

⁷The best size for N will depend on the questions, the coverage, and the algorithm, but might be between 1[000](#page-48-0)-100,000. A serve that the serve of the serve

Read Depth

[WGS & SVs](#page-0-0)

Peter N. Robinson

[Structural](#page-2-0) variants [Array CGH](#page-13-0) [SV Discovery](#page-18-0) [Poisson](#page-35-0) [GC Content](#page-46-0) [Read depth](#page-49-0)

[CNV Calling](#page-52-0)

This is a typical plot showing the raw read depth following genome sequencing.

Thousand genomes project, individual HG00155, chromosome 11, low-coverage

GC content vs. Read Depth

[WGS & SVs](#page-0-0) Here, we have plotted read count vs. GC content Peter N. loess-smoothed regression line is shown Robinson [Structural](#page-2-0) variants [Array CGH](#page-13-0) [SV Discovery](#page-18-0) $1000 -$ [Poisson](#page-35-0) [GC Content](#page-46-0) count 1000 [Read depth](#page-49-0) [CNV Calling](#page-52-0) $500 0,0$ 0.2 $0²$ 0.8 0.4 gc

There is a clear, if complicated, relationship between GC-conten[t an](#page-50-0)d [rea](#page-52-0)[d](#page-50-0) [dep](#page-51-0)[th](#page-52-0) [in](#page-48-0) [t](#page-49-0)[hi](#page-51-0)[s s](#page-52-0)[a](#page-48-0)[mp](#page-49-0)[le](#page-51-0)

 Ω

[WGS & SVs](#page-0-0)

Peter N. Robinson

[Structural](#page-2-0) variants [Array CGH](#page-13-0) [SV Discovery](#page-18-0) [Poisson](#page-35-0) [GC Content](#page-46-0)

[Read depth](#page-49-0) [CNV Calling](#page-52-0) With all of this in hand, we now will examine how to call CNVs from whole genome data. We will present a simplified version of Yoon S et al (2009) Sensitive and accurate detection of copy number variants using read depth of coverage. Genome Res 9:1586-92.

- **1** Align whole-genome sequences (high-coverage)
- **2** Filter out reads with low mapping quality (PHRED $<$ 30)

- **3** Count read depth in windows (100bp)
- ⁴ adjust read-depth according to GC content of window
- **6** calculate z-score for each window
- ⁶ combine neighboring windows to maximize score

[WGS & SVs](#page-0-0)

Peter N. Robinson

[Structural](#page-2-0) variants [Array CGH](#page-13-0)

[SV Discovery](#page-18-0)

[Poisson](#page-35-0)

[GC Content](#page-46-0)

[Read depth](#page-49-0)

[CNV Calling](#page-52-0)

Step 1-3. Alignment and raw read depth

- Align sequence reads to genome
- In the Yoon et al. paper, the MAQ aligner was used with default settings
- Filter out low quality reads (PHRED $<$ 30)
- Segment genome into 100bp windows and count reads (by start position)

イロメ 不優 メイ君メ イ君メー 君

 $2Q$

[WGS & SVs](#page-0-0)

Peter N. Robinson

[Structural](#page-2-0) variants [Array CGH](#page-13-0) [SV Discovery](#page-18-0) [Poisson](#page-35-0) [GC Content](#page-46-0)

-
- [Read depth](#page-49-0)
- [CNV Calling](#page-52-0)

Step 4. GC adjustment

 $\mathbf{E} = \mathbf{A} \oplus \mathbf{A} + \mathbf{A$

 $2Q$

o overall median count per window

[WGS & SVs](#page-0-0)

Peter N. Robinson

[Structural](#page-2-0) variants [Array CGH](#page-13-0) [SV Discovery](#page-18-0) [Poisson](#page-35-0) [GC Content](#page-46-0)

[Read depth](#page-49-0) [CNV Calling](#page-52-0)

Step 5a. Event detection.

A deletion or duplication is evident as a decrease or increase across multiple consecutive windows

 4 ロ) 4 \overline{r}) 4 \overline{z}) 4 \overline{z}) 299

[WGS & SVs](#page-0-0)

Peter N. Robinson

[Structural](#page-2-0) variants [Array CGH](#page-13-0) [SV Discovery](#page-18-0) [Poisson](#page-35-0)

- [GC Content](#page-46-0)
- [Read depth](#page-49-0)
- [CNV Calling](#page-52-0)

Step 5a. Event detection. The authors developed a heuristic they call Event-wise testing (EWT)

- Rapidly search across all windows for windows that meet criteria of statistical significance
- Clusters of small events are grouped into larger events
- **•** Basic idea: Identify regions of consecutive 100-bp windows with significantly increased or decreased read depth (\bar{r}_i) .

[WGS & SVs](#page-0-0)

Peter N. Robinson

[Structural](#page-2-0) variants [Array CGH](#page-13-0) [SV Discovery](#page-18-0) [Poisson](#page-35-0) [GC Content](#page-46-0)

[Read depth](#page-49-0)

[CNV Calling](#page-52-0)

Step 5b. Convert to Z-Score

- Calculate mean (μ) and standard deviation (σ) of \hat{r}_i (adjusted read depth) across genome
- **•** transform the adjusted read depth into the corresponding Z-score

$$
z_i = \frac{\bar{r}_i - \mu}{\sigma} \tag{5}
$$

[WGS & SVs](#page-0-0)

Peter N. Robinson

[Structural](#page-2-0) variants [Array CGH](#page-13-0) [SV Discovery](#page-18-0) [Poisson](#page-35-0) [GC Content](#page-46-0) [Read depth](#page-49-0)

[CNV Calling](#page-52-0)

Step 5b. Convert to upper and low tail probabilities

• Convert the Z-score to its upper-tail probability $P_i^{\text{Upper}} = \Pr(Z > z_i)$ (6)

- This is simply the probability that the read count in window i is at least as high as observed
- Analogously, we calculate a lower-tail probability

$$
P_i^{\text{Lower}} = \Pr(Z < z_i) \tag{7}
$$

[WGS & SVs](#page-0-0)

Peter N. Robinson

- [Structural](#page-2-0) variants [Array CGH](#page-13-0) [SV Discovery](#page-18-0) [Poisson](#page-35-0) [GC Content](#page-46-0)
- [Read depth](#page-49-0) [CNV Calling](#page-52-0)

Step 5c. Evaluate intervals of consecutive windows

• For an interval A of ℓ consecutive windows, we call it an unusual event if (for duplications)

$$
\max_{i} \left\{ P_i^{\text{Upper}} | i \in \mathcal{A} \right\} < \left(\frac{\ell}{L} \times \text{FPR} \right)^{\frac{1}{\ell}} \tag{8}
$$

- \bullet Here, L is the length in windows of the entire chromosome
- Thus $\frac{\ell}{L}$ is the proportion of the chromosome that is taken up by the candidate CNV
- If all p-values for the windows of A are less (more significant) than the term on the right side, we call the interval an "unusual event"

[WGS & SVs](#page-0-0)

Peter N. Robinson

[Structural](#page-2-0) variants [Array CGH](#page-13-0) [SV Discovery](#page-18-0) [Poisson](#page-35-0) [GC Content](#page-46-0) [Read depth](#page-49-0)

[CNV Calling](#page-52-0)

Step 5c. The EWT score $\Big(\frac{\ell}{t}\Big)$ $\displaystyle{\frac{\ell}{L}} \times \mathrm{FPR} \bigg)^{\frac{1}{\ell}}$ increases as the number of windows, ℓ , increases

[WGS & SVs](#page-0-0)

Peter N. Robinson

[Structural](#page-2-0) variants [Array CGH](#page-13-0) [SV Discovery](#page-18-0) [Poisson](#page-35-0) [GC Content](#page-46-0) [Read depth](#page-49-0) [CNV Calling](#page-52-0)

Step 5c. Iteration

- The initial analysis calculates the p-values for each single window
	- **The EWT procedure then searches for two-window** intervals (i.e., $\ell = 2$) such that

$$
\mathsf{max}_{i} \left\{ P_{i}^{\mathrm{Upper}} | i \in \mathcal{A} \right\} < \left(\frac{\ell}{L} \times \mathrm{FPR} \right)^{\frac{1}{\ell}}.
$$

• Continue iterating (increasing the size of ℓ by 1) as long as this condition is fulfilled.

KORK STRAIN A BAR SHOP

[CNV Calling](#page-52-0)

[WGS & SVs](#page-0-0)

Peter N. Robinson

[Structural](#page-2-0) variants [Array CGH](#page-13-0) [SV Discovery](#page-18-0) [Poisson](#page-35-0)

[GC Content](#page-46-0)

[Read depth](#page-49-0)

[CNV Calling](#page-52-0)

Correction for multiple testing

We are making millions of tests across the genome . . .

[WGS & SVs](#page-0-0)

Peter N. Robinson

[Structural](#page-2-0) variants [Array CGH](#page-13-0) [SV Discovery](#page-18-0) [Poisson](#page-35-0) [GC Content](#page-46-0) [Read depth](#page-49-0)

[CNV Calling](#page-52-0)

The *p*-value is the probability, under the null hypothesis, that the test statistic assumes the observed or a more extreme value. It is important to realize that if we go on testing long enough, we will inevitably find something which is "significant" by chance alone.

- If we test a null hypothesis that is true using a significance level of $\alpha = 0.05$, then there is a probability of $1 - \alpha = 0.95$ of arriving at a correct conclusion of
	- non-significance.
- **If** we now test two independent true null hypotheses, the probability that neither test is significant is $0.95 \times 0.95 = 0.90$

[WGS & SVs](#page-0-0)

Peter N. Robinson

[Structural](#page-2-0) variants [Array CGH](#page-13-0) [SV Discovery](#page-18-0) [Poisson](#page-35-0) [GC Content](#page-46-0) [Read depth](#page-49-0)

[CNV Calling](#page-52-0)

You can see where this is leading...

- If we test 20 independent null hypotheses, the probability that none will be significant is then $(0.95)^{20} = 0.36$.
- This corresponds to a probability of $1 0.36 = 0.64$ of getting at least one spurious significant result, and the expected number of spurious significant results in 20 tests is $20 \times 0.05 = 1$