


Quantification

RNA-seq data analysis


Johan Reimegård | 15-November-2021

Count the reads


- Read counts = gene expression
- Reads can be quantified on any feature (gene, transcript, exon etc)
- Intersection on gene models
- Gene/Transcript level




[featureCounts](#), [HTSeq](#)



Different paths to get a count table




Good news is that they are all working very well!!



Gene expression estimates

- Expression estimates on gene level
- Expression estimates on transcript level

Gene level analysis



OPEN

Benchmarking of RNA-sequencing analysis workflows using whole-transcriptome RT-qPCR expression data

Received: 18 July 2016

Accepted: 3 April 2017

Published online: 08 May 2017

Celine Everaert^{1,2,3}, Manuel Luypaert⁴, Jesper L. V. Maag ⁵, Quek Xiu Cheng⁵, Marcel E. Dinger ⁵, Jan Hellemans⁴ & Pieter Mestdagh^{1,2,3}

Expression levels are similar between RT-qPCR and RNA-seq data






Figure 1. Gene expression correlation between RT-qPCR and RNA-seq data. The Pearson correlation coefficients and linear regression line are indicated. Results are based on RNA-seq data from dataset 1.

Lowly expressed genes are more problematic to identify using RNA seq



Most problems are consistent so they disappear when you do diff-exp analysis



Transcript level analysis

Zhang *et al.* BMC Genomics (2017) 18:583
DOI 10.1186/s12864-017-4002-1

BMC Genomics

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Open Access


Evaluation and comparison of computational tools for RNA-seq isoform quantification



CrossMark

Chi Zhang¹, Baohong Zhang¹, Lih-Ling Lin² and Shanrong Zhao^{1*}

Transcript level analysis



Methods used in paper





Table 1 Run time metrics of each method on 50 million paired-end reads of length 76 bp in an high performance computing cluster

	Memory (Gb)	Run time (min)	Algorithm	Multi-thread
Cufflinks	3.5	117	ML	Yes
RSEM	5.6	154	ML	Yes
eXpress	<u>0.55</u>	30	ML	No
TIGAR2	28.3	1045	VB	Yes
kallisto	3.8	7	ML	Yes
Salmon	6.6	6	VB/ML	Yes
Salmon_aln	3	7	VB/ML	Yes
Sailfish	6.3	<u>5</u>	VB/ML	Yes

For methods that support multi-threading, eight threads were used. For alignment-free methods (Kallisto, Salmon and Sailfish), a mapping step was included. The best performer in each category is underlined and the worst performer is in bold
ML Maximum Likelihood, VB Variational Bayes

Isoform quantification problematic for genes with many isoforms



Results are very similar between methods





Fig. 5 Pairwise correlation of estimated TPM values for all transcripts between methods for the HBRR-C4 sample. The distribution of transcripts' TPMs from each method was plotted on the diagonal panels. Pairwise density plots and R^2 values are shown in the lower and upper triangular panels, respectively. R^2 values over 0.9 are in *bold*. Methods are grouped using hierarchical clustering

The background of the slide features a complex, abstract network graph. It consists of numerous small, dark brown dots representing nodes, connected by a dense web of thin, translucent blue lines representing edges. The graph is highly interconnected, with many cycles and dead ends, creating a sense of organic complexity.

Thank you. Questions?

Johan Reimegård | 30-November-2020