Ensembl gene annotation project (*e!77*)
Chlorocebus sabaeus (vervet-AGM)

This document describes the annotation process of the high-coverage Vervet-AGM assembly, described in Figure 1. The first stage is Assembly Loading where databases are prepared and the assembly loaded into the database.

Assembly Loading

Repeat Finding

Raw Computes

Model Building

Filtering

Creating The Final Geneset

Figure 1: The Gene Annotation Pipeline

Repeat Finding

After loading into a database the genomic sequence was screened for sequence patterns including repeats using RepeatMasker [1] (version 3.2.8

with parameters '`-nolow -species mammal -s`'), RepeatModeler [2] (version open-1.0.5, to obtain a repeats library, then filtered for an additional RepeatMasker run), Dust [3] and TRF [4]. Both executions of RepeatMasker and Dust combined masked 49.5% of the species genome.

Raw Computes

Transcription start sites were predicted using Eponine–scan [5] and FirstEF [6]. CpG islands [Micklem, G.] longer than 400 bases and tRNAs [7] were also predicted. The results of Eponine-scan, FirstEF, CpG, and tRNAscan are for display purposes only; they are not used in the gene annotation process.

Genscan [8] was run across RepeatMasked sequence and the results were used as input for UniProt [9], UniGene [10] and Vertebrate RNA [11] alignments by WU-BLAST [12]. Passing only Genscan results to BLAST is an effective way of reducing the search space and therefore the computational resources required. This resulted in 8824056 UniProt, 7035813 UniGene and 11921155 Vertebrate RNA sequences aligning to the genome.

cDNA and EST Alignments

Vervet-AGM cDNAs and ESTs were downloaded from ENA/Genbank/DDBJ, clipped to remove polyA tails, and aligned to the genome using Exonerate. These alignments provide supporting evidence for models.

Species	cDNA/EST	Sequences Downloaded	Sequences Aligned
Vervet-AGM	cDNA	61887	100
Vervet-AGM	EST	37787	33809

Table 1: cDNA/EST alignments

All alignments were at a cut-off of 90% coverage and 80% identity.

Model Generation

Various sources of transcript and protein data were investigated and used to develop gene models using a variety of techniques. The numbers of gene models generated is described in Table 2. At this stage, many of the models may overlap. The data and techniques employed to generate models are outlined below.

Pipeline	Source	Number of Models
Similarity	193452 Uniprot PE level 1,2 proteins	90436
RNASeq	Washington University RNASeq data	11041
Ensembl Longest Translations	20721 Ensembl Release 73 proteins for human	20134

Table 2: Gene Model Generation Overview

Similarity Pipeline: Generating coding models using proteins from related species

Coding models were generated using data from related species. The UniProt alignments from the Raw Computes step were filtered and only those sequences belonging to UniProt's Protein Existence (PE) classification level 1 and 2 for primates and mammals (TrEMBL only) were kept. WU-BLAST was rerun for these sequences and the results were passed to Genewise [14] to build coding models.

RNA-Seq Pipeline

RNA-Seq data provided by Washington University was used in the annotation. The available reads were aligned to the genome using BWA. The Ensembl RNA-Seq pipeline was used to process the BWA alignments and create further split read alignments using Exonerate.

The split reads and the processed BWA alignments were combined. The predicted open reading frames were compared to Uniprot Protein Existence (PE) classification level 1 and 2 proteins using WU-BLAST. Models with poorly scoring or no BLAST alignments were split into a seperate class.

Ensembl Longest Translations

The longest translation for each protein coding gene in Ensembl proteins release 73 for human were downloaded. These proteins were aligned against the Vervet-AGM genome using Exonerate [13] to produce a set of coding models. The coding models were then clustered against other gene sets to filter out those overlapping gene models created from other pipelines. The remaining genes were filtered against cDNA and EST alignments to filter out those with no cDNA or EST exon support.

Filtering the Models

The filtering phase decided the subset of protein-coding transcript models, generated from the model-building pipelines, that comprise the final protein-coding gene set.

Models were filtered using the TranscriptConsensus, LayerAnnotation and GeneBuilder modules.

Apollo software [15] was used to visualise the results of filtering.

LayerAnnotation

The LayerAnnotation module was used to define a hierarchy of input data sets, from most preferred to least preferred. The output of this pipeline included all transcript models from the highest ranked input set. Models from lower ranked input sets are included only if their exons do not overlap a model from an input set higher in the hierarchy.

The top layer contained the top rated RNASeq models. The remaining model sets were used in the following order:
- Similarity models
- Lower rated RNASeq models
- Ensembl Longest Translation models

Addition of UTR to coding models

The set of coding models not generated from RNASeq was extended into the untranslated regions (UTRs) using RNASeq, cDNA and EST sequences. At the UTR addition stage 13688 gene models out of total of 61085 non-RNASeq pipeline generated gene models had UTR added.

Generating multi-transcript genes

The above steps generated a large set of potential transcript models, many of which overlapped one another. Redundant transcript models were collapsed and the remaining unique set of transcript models were clustered into multi-transcript genes where each transcript in a gene has at least one coding

exon that overlaps a coding exon from another transcript within the same gene.

At this stage the gene set comprised of 19746 genes with 19840 transcripts.

Pseudogenes

The Pseudogene module was run to identify processed pseudogenes from within the set of gene models – these were labelled as pseudogenes.

Creating The Final Gene Set

ncRNAs

Small structured non-coding genes were added using annotations taken from RFAM [16] and miRBase [17]. WU-BLAST was run for these sequences and models built using the Infernal software suite 19.

Cross-referencing

Before public release the transcripts and translations were given external references (cross-references to external databases), while translations were searched for domains/signatures of interest and labelled where appropriate. Translations were searched for signatures of interest and labelled where appropriate. Databases searched include: Seg, SignalP, Ncoils, Tmhmm, Prints, Pfscan, Pfam, Tigrfam, Superfamily, Smart and Pirsf.

Stable Identifiers

Stable identifiers were assigned to each gene, transcript, exon and translation. When annotating a species for the first time, these identifiers are auto-generated. In all subsequent annotations for a species, the stable identifiers are propagated based on comparison of the new gene set to the previous gene set. As vervet-AGM has not been previously released in Ensembl a new set of stable identifiers were generated.

Final Gene Set Summary

The final gene set consists of 19165 protein coding genes, including 37 mitochondrial genes. These contain 28072 transcripts. A total of 505 pseudogenes were identified. 8218 ncRNAs were added by the ncRNA pipeline.

Figure 2: Supporting evidence for vervet-AGM protein coding gene set

Further information

The Ensembl gene set is generated automatically, meaning that gene models are annotated using the Ensembl gene annotation pipeline. The main focus of this pipeline is to generate a conservative set of protein-coding gene models, although non-coding genes and pseudogenes may also annotated.

Every gene model produced by the Ensembl gene annotation pipeline is supported by biological sequence evidence (see the "Supporting evidence" link on the left-hand menu of a Gene page or Transcript page); *ab initio* models are not included in our gene set. *Ab initio* predictions and the full set of cDNA and EST alignments to the genome are available on our website.

The quality of a gene set is dependent on the quality of the genome assembly. Genome assembly can be assessed in a number of ways, including:

1. Coverage estimate

    o A higher coverage usually indicates a more complete assembly.

    o Using Sanger sequencing only, a coverage of at least 2x is preferred.

2. N50 of contigs and scaffolds

    o A longer N50 usually indicates a more complete genome assembly.

    o Bearing in mind that an average human gene may be 10-15 kb in length, contigs shorter than this length will be unlikely to hold full-length gene models.

3. Number of contigs and scaffolds

    o A lower number toplevel sequences usually indicates a more complete genome assembly.

4. Alignment of cDNAs and ESTs to the genome

o A higher number of alignments, using stringent thresholds, usually indicates a more complete genome assembly.

More information on the Ensembl automatic gene annotation process can be found at:

- Curwen V, Eyras E, Andrews TD, Clarke L, Mongin E, Searle SM, Clamp M: **The Ensembl automatic gene annotation system.** *Genome Res.* 2004, **14(5):**942-50. [PMID: 15123590]

- Potter SC, Clarke L, Curwen V, Keenan S, Mongin E, Searle SM, Stabenau A, Storey R, Clamp M: **The Ensembl analysis pipeline.** *Genome Res.* 2004, **14(5):**934-41. [PMID: 15123589]

- http://www.ensembl.org/info/docs/genebuild/genome_annotation.html

- http://cvs.sanger.ac.uk/cgi-bin/viewvc.cgi/-doc/pipeline_docs/the_gene build_process.txt?root=ensembl&view=co

References

1   Smit, AFA, Hubley, R & Green, P: **RepeatMasker Open-3.0.** 1996-2010. www.repeatmasker.org

2   Smit, AFA, Hubley, R. **RepeatModeler Open-1.0.** 2008-2010. www.repeatmasker.org

3   Kuzio J, Tatusov R, and Lipman DJ: **Dust.** Unpublished but briefly described in: Morgulis A, Gertz EM, Schäffer AA, Agarwala R. A Fast and Symmetric DUST Implementation to Mask Low-Complexity DNA Sequences. *Journal of Computational Biology* 2006, **13(5):**1028-1040.

4   Benson G: **Tandem repeats finder: a program to analyze DNA sequences.** *Nucleic Acids Res.* 1999, **27(2):**573-580. [PMID: 9862982] http://tandem.bu.edu/trf/trf.html

5   Down TA, Hubbard TJ: **Computational detection and location of transcription start sites in mammalian genomic DNA.** *Genome Res.* 2002 **12(3):**458-461. http://www.sanger.ac.uk/resources/software/eponine/ [PMID: 11875034]

6   Davuluri RV, Grosse I, Zhang MQ: **Computational identification of promoters and first exons in the human genome.** *Nat Genet.* 2001, **29(4):**412-417. [PMID: 11726928]

7   Lowe TM, Eddy SR: **tRNAscan-SE: a program for improved detection of transfer**

RNA genes in genomic sequence. *Nucleic Acids Res.* 1997, **25(5):**955-64. [PMID: 9023104]

8   Burge C, Karlin S: **Prediction of complete gene structures in human genomic DNA.** *J Mol Biol.* 1997, **268(1):**78-94. [PMID: 9149143]

9   Goujon M, McWilliam H, Li W, Valentin F, Squizzato S, Paern J, Lopez R: **A new bioinformatics analysis tools framework at EMBL-EBI. Nucleic Acids Res.** 2010, **38 Suppl:**W695-699. http://www.uniprot.org/downloads [PMID: 20439314]

10   Sayers EW, Barrett T, Benson DA, Bolton E, Bryant SH, Canese K, Chetvernin V, Church DM, Dicuccio M, Federhen S, Feolo M, Geer LY, Helmberg W, Kapustin Y, Landsman D, Lipman DJ, Lu Z, Madden TL, Madej T, Maglott DR, Marchler-Bauer A, Miller V, Mizrachi I, Ostell J, Panchenko A, Pruitt KD, Schuler GD, Sequeira E, Sherry ST, Shumway M, Sirotkin K, Slotta D, Souvorov A, Starchenko G, Tatusova TA, Wagner L, Wang Y, John Wilbur W, Yaschenko E, Ye J: **Database resources of the National Center for Biotechnology Information.** *Nucleic Acids Res.* 2010, **38(Database issue):D5-16.** [PMID: 19910364]

11   http://www.ebi.ac.uk/ena/

12   Altschul SF, Gish W, Miller W, Myers EW, Lipman DJ: **Basic local alignment search tool.** *J Mol Biol.* 1990, **215(3):**403-410. [PMID: 2231712]

13   Slater GS, Birney E: **Automated generation of heuristics for biological sequence comparison.** *BMC Bioinformatic*s 2005, **6:**31. [PMID: 15713233]

14   Birney E, Clamp M, Durbin R: **GeneWise and Genomewise.** *Genome Res.* 2004, **14(5):**988-995. [PMID: 15123596]

15   Lewis SE, Searle SM, Harris N, Gibson M, Lyer V, Richter J, Wiel C, Bayraktaroglir L, Birney E, Crosby MA, Kaminker JS, Matthews BB, Prochnik SE, Smithy CD, Tupy JL, Rubin GM, Misra S, Mungall CJ, Clamp ME: **Apollo: a sequence annotation editor.** *Genome Biol.* 2002, **3(12):**RESEARCH0082. [PMID: 12537571]

16   Griffiths-Jones S., Bateman A., Marshall M., Khanna A., Eddy S.R: **Rfam: an RNA family database.** Nucleic Acids Research (2003) **31(1):**p439-441. [PMID: 12520045]

17   Griffiths-Jones S, Grocock RJ, van Dongen S, Bateman A, Enright AJ: **miRBase: microRNA sequences, targets and gene nomenclature.** NAR 2006 **34(Database Issue):**D140-D144 [PMID: 16381832]

18   Wilming L. G., Gilbert J. G. R., Howe K., Trevanion S., Hubbard T. and Harrow J. L: **The vertebrate genome annotation (Vega) database.** Nucleic Acid Res. 2008 Jan; Advance Access published on November 14, 2007; doi:10.1093/nar/gkm987 [PMID: 18003653]

19   Eddy, SR: **A memory-efficient dynamic programming algorithm for optimal alignment of a sequence to an RNA secondary structure**. BMC Bioinformatics 2002, 3:18. [PMID:12095421]