[Updating] : Quick Detection of Structural Variants in Haploid, Diploid and Tumor Genomes

Amirhossein Afshinfard, Damoun Nashta-ali, Seyed Abolfazl Motahari

February 7, 2018

Abstract

[updating - please contact a.afshinfard@gmail.com for slides and online presentation - we are updating the results and figures]

1   Introduction

Structural Variants (SVs) are generally defined as genetic variations in DNA sequence other than mutations which involve one or a few base pairs. SVs, despite single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs) or single nucleotide variants (SNVs), requires the disruption of the sugar-phosphate backbone of DNA and thus involve more base pairs [1]. In other words, Structural Variation (SV) refers to a variation that changes the structure of the genome. This variation may change the length of the chromosome (Unbalanced SV such as novel insertion, deletion, copy-number variation CNV) or only change the structure without affecting its length and content (balanced SV, including inversion and reciprocal translocation). Figure 1 shows three types of these variations.

Recent research in the last decade has revealed that SVs are much more frequent than previously thought [2, 3] and they build up a large fraction of the human genome variation, even more than SNPs [4, 5]. This opens a new field in genetic and genomic studies, and motivates lots of research on methods for detection of structural variants as a primary step for further investigations. The next desired steps are revealing phenotypic impacts of SVs (disorder and non-disorder impacts) as well as studying their population genetics [6], their formation mechanisms and genome evolution.

SVs, observed both as germ-line and as somatic variation, contribute to genomic disorders ranging from neurodevelopmental disorders (including schizophrenia [7] and autism [8, 9]) to childrens developmental disorders [10], blood diseases [11], diabetes [12], a wide range of cancers [13, 14, 15], etc. By influencing gene expression directly or indirectly [16], they revealed to involve not only genomic disorders but also other complex traits and phenotypes at various levels [17].

Structural variants are caused by different mutational mechanisms including DNA recombination, replication and repair-associated processes [1]. Investigating breakpoints of structural variants at base pair resolution is crucial for understanding their formation mechanisms [18]. As SVs are likely responsible for gene and genome evolution [19], the discovery of new structural variants will help to study formation mechanisms and their population genetics to yield a better understanding of genome evolution.

Figure 1: Structural Variation. a) a region on the target genome is deleted, b) an inverted region on the target genome (a balanced SV), and c) a novel sequence inserted.

2   Challenges

Detection of SVs is still a topic of concern, provided that there is an annual increase in the number of discovered alterations [20, 21] as there are biases in each method for detection of different types and various lengths. Many methods are limited to detection of longer SVs and some of them are able to search for specific types (e.g. many misses balanced SVs which are of great importance [22]) due to their nature. Some of these shortcomings are caused by fundamental biases in sequencing [23], reduced read mappability or poor Genome Mapability Score (GMS) [24], especially in repeat-rich regions and thus reduced signal-to-noise ratios. In Addition to these difficulties, it is more challenging should we consider complex SVs, diploid genomes, and sequencing reads from tumor samples containing somatic mutations. [Incomplete]

3   Current Approaches

There are four general approaches to detect structural variants each having specific advantages and limitations. We will review these methods quickly and list their Strengths and weaknesses.

Assembly-based methods theoretically can discover structural variants of all types. Having built the assembly of the targeted genome, these methods detect structural variants by aligning it to the reference genome. methods of these types are limited to read length, and are involved with other challenges of the assembly problem itself [25]. the computational cost is a case in point. A novel idea in

Figure 2: current approaches, [updating]

this regard is to use this approach locally (local assembly). using such approach to discover the sequence of novel insertions is inevitable.

Assuming an expected distribution for read depth, **Read-count** (RC or Read-Depth) methods search for SVs by checking the divergence of local estimated distributions from expected ones. The assumption itself is challenging due to non-uniform behavior of read depth; and some factors found to affect read counts. In example GC-content has been revealed to affect sequencing process [- -] and result in non-uniform read coverage which can somewhat be corrected and unbiased [- -]. Another challenge in this approach is to decide if a change caused due to noise or because of a variation; so theyre almost insensitive to small SVs. locating breakpoints with base pair resolution could be addressed hardly using RC. In addition, this approach is almost blind to balanced SVs especially for inversion. However, theyre really powerful to discover deletions and Copy Number Variations (CNVs). Methods based on RC can estimate exact copy number while others are weak or at least are faced with many challenges in this regard.

Read-pair (RP) methods utilize the capability of paired-end reads (or mate-pair reads) to detect SVs. Paired-end reads expected to have a specific orientation and a known insert-size distribution with respect to the reference genome, the sequencing technology and its parameters. Changes in orientation is a sign (an indication of) of inversion occurrence, while insertion and deletion events result in higher or lesser insert-size. Like RC, the breakpoint resolution is not exact and again it is difficult to decide if a change in insert-size distribution is caused by noise or by a variation event, especially in the case of small SVs. However, they are likely to have more information for such cases comparing with RC and also able to detect inversion. As a limitation, these methods are not sensitive to insertions longer than the insert-size and the detection needs more process steps on one-end aligned reads with using other methods like RC and SR. CNVs will be a big challenge for methods of this class.

Figure 3: informative vs. non-informative reads from the target genome an their mappings via the assumed ideal aligner to their corresponding locations on the reference. a) a non-informative read in a normal region, b) an informative read which is split for mapping, and c) a non-informative read inside an inversion event

(smaller SVs in comparison with RC?)

Split-Read (SR) methods can result in breakpoints detection with base pair resolution (precision). A breakpoint-spanning read (an informative read) is unlikely to be mapped, but split subsequences of that read are tend to map to distant locations of the reference genome. [Incomplete] better than others for small SVs. Not good for CNVs and poor in repeat regions. Limited to read length. Applicable to the case of paired-end reads, checking unmapped end of one-end anchored reads.

4   Proposed method in summary

Suppose some reads from a target genome containing SVs. Assume that we have an Ideal read mapper meaning that it can assign each part of a single read to its corresponding location on the reference genome. With this attention, reads are divided into two categories (figure 3). The first group reads which span a breakpoint become split into (at least) two parts each of which maps to a distinct region on the reference. Every read from the second category maps entirely to a specific location without any division. We call the first group informative reads since they captured a breakpoint and they can signal a Structural Variation. The latter group reads are virtually non-informative reads. Why virtually? Leave it for now, but lets say they only have information about the depth of their location.

In the first stage, our Idea is to remove non-informative reads expeditiously, and to approach that Ideal read mapper for informative reads at the same time. For this purpose, we have exploited and revised an existing read aligner, Meta-aligner [26], so it can detect non-informative reads very quickly and efficiently without reporting any informative read as non-informative. In the same Run, The revised version is able to split the informative reads into multiple segments and assign each segment to its original source on the reference genome. This way, almost all non-informative reads are identified and filtered, and the focus will be on split-mapped informative reads to detect SVs. Indeed, informative reads pile up a very small fraction of the total number of reads, resulting in an elbowroom for applying algorithms of high

complexity in the second stage without concerning about the computational cost.

As mentioned before, non-informative reads are not non-informative at all. Their contribution in local depths is useful specially for detecting some types of CNVs (like RC methods). Thus, without any extra computation, they account for depth before being removed. Additionally, they are saved in buckets for further investigations if needed.

4.1 Stage one in detail

The original version of the Meta-Aligner uses the genome statistics and suggests a minimal size for unique mapping of a subread, statistically sufficient to confidently assign the read to the location anchored by that subread. In the example of human genome the optimal size is approximately 50 bps. Excluding variants from consideration, It means that if we find a 50 bps long subread from the read uniquely in the reference, it is enough to be confident that this is the right location for that read. Another great idea of the Meta-Aligner is to divide this needed 50 bps unique mapping into two disjoint subreads of length 25.

In a nutshell, the algorithm searches for two disjoint subreads of length 25, mapped uniquely to the genome and concordantly to each other. Finding these two subreads, the algorithm skips the remaining basepairs of the read and assigns the read to the location. Searching for a sequence of length 25 for unique hits in the reference can be done very quickly, making the algorithm extremely fast. Not only does this approach eliminate the cost of mapping of a large portion of many reads, but it also overcomes the challenge of repeat regions when mapping reads with a minimal mapping size. + an example of a run by Meta-Aligner and proportion of read aligned after each iteration.

In a more detailed description, Metal-Aligner divides the reads into its disjoint comprising l-mers, with l bigger than half of the minimum required length for confident unique matches. Thereafter, it start to search for unique matches for each l-mer one by one. Finding a new l-mer uniquely, Meta-Aligner checks it with previous l-mers for concordant locations and should it find a concordant pair, it skips the remaining l-mers.

[updating]

4.2 Stage two in detail

will be available on the official preprint

5 Results

[updating - Results on Speed, Recall and Accuracy]

References

[1] C. M. Carvalho and J. R. Lupski. Mechanisms underlying structural variant formation in genomic disorders. *Nature Reviews Genetics*, 17(4):224–238, 2016.

[2] A. J. Iafrate, L. Feuk, M. L. Rivera, M. N.and Listewnik, P. K. Donahoe, Y. Qi, ..., and C. Lee. Detection of large-scale variation in the human genome. *Nature Genetics*, 36(9):949, 2004.

[3] J. Sebat, B. Lakshmi, J. Troge, J. Alexander, J. Young, P. Lundin, ..., and N. Navin. Large-scale copy number polymorphism in the human genome. *Science*, 305(5683):525–528, 2004.

[4] D. F. Conrad, D. Pinto, R. Redon, L. Feuk, O. Gokcumen, Y. Zhang, ..., and T. Fitzgerald. Origins and functional impact of copy number variation in the human genome. *Nature*, 464(7289):704, 2010.

[5] C. Alkan, B. P. Coe, and E. E. Eichler. Genome structural variation discovery and genotyping. *Nature Reviews Genetics*, 12(5):363, 2011.

[6] D. F. Conrad and M. E. Hurles. The population genetics of structural variation. *Nature genetics*, 39:s30–s36, 2007.

[7] A. Sekar, A. R. Bialas, H. de Rivera, A. Davis, T. R. Hammond, N. Kamitaki, ..., and G. Genovese. Schizophrenia risk from complex variation of complement component 4. *Nature*, 530(7589):177–183, 2016.

[8] C. R. Marshall, A. Noor, J. B. Vincent, A. C. Lionel, L. Feuk, J. Skaug, ..., and B. Thiruvahindrapduram. Structural variation of chromosomes in autism spectrum disorder. *The American Journal of Human Genetics*, 82(2):477–488, 2008.

[9] R. K. Yuen, B. Thiruvahindrapuram, D. Merico, S. Walker, K. Tammimies, N. Hoang, ..., and M. J. Gazzellone. Whole-genome sequencing of quartet families with autism spectrum disorder. *Nature medicine*, 21(2):185–191, 2015.

[10] D. A. King, W. D. Jones, Y. J. Crow, A. F. Dominiczak, N. A. Foster, T. R. Gaunt, ..., and E. A. Jones. Mosaic structural variation in children with developmental disorders. *Human molecular genetics*, 24(10):2733–2745, 2015.

[11] L. M. Boettger, R. M. Salem, R. E. Handsaker, G. M. Peloso, S. Kathiresan, J. N. Hirschhorn, and S. A. McCarroll. Recurring exon deletions in the hp (haptoglobin) gene contribute to lower blood cholesterol levels. *Nature genetics*, -(-):–, 2016.

[12] M. Zanda, S. Onengut-Gumuscu, N. Walker, C. Shtir, D. Gallo, C. Wallace, ..., and S. S. Rich. A genome-wide assessment of the role of untagged copy number variants in type 1 diabetes. *PLoS Genet*, 10(5):e1004367, 2014.

[13] J. M. Tubio. Somatic structural variation and cancer. *Briefings in functional genomics*, -(-):elv016, 2015.

[14] E. Papaemmanuil, I. Rapado, Y. Li, N. E. Potter, D. C. Wedge, J. Tubio, ..., and I. Martincorena. Rag-mediated recombination is the predominant driver of oncogenic rearrangement in etv6-runx1 acute lymphoblastic leukemia. *Nature genetics*, 46(2):116–125, 2014.

[15] N. Waddell, M. Pajic, A. M. Patch, D. K. Chang, K. S. Kassahn, Bailey P., ..., and M. C. Quinn. Whole genomes redefine the mutational landscape of pancreatic cancer. *Nature*, 518(7540):495–501, 2015.

[16] E. R. Gamazon and B. E. Stranger. The impact of human copy number variation on gene expression. *Briefings in functional genomics*, 14(5):352–357, 2015.

[17] K. A. Frazer, S. S. Murray, N. J. Schork, and E. J. Topol. Human genetic variation and its contribution to complex traits. *Nature Reviews Genetics*, 10(4):241–251, 2009.

[18] A. Abyzov, S. Li, D. R. Kim, M. Mohiyuddin, A. M. Sttz, N. F. Parrish, ..., and J. O. Korbel. Analysis of deletion breakpoints from 1,092 humans reveals details of mutation mechanisms. *Nature communications*, 6, 2015.

[19] H. H. Kazazian. Mobile elements: drivers of genome evolution. *science*, 303(5664):1626–1632, 2004.

[20] P. H. Sudmant, T. Rausch, E. J. Gardner, R. E. Handsaker, A. Abyzov, J. Huddleston, ..., and M. K. Konkel. An integrated map of structural variation in 2,504 human genomes. *Nature*, 526(7571):75, 2015.

[21] J. Huddleston, M. J. Chaisson, K. M. Steinberg, W. Warren, K. Hoekzema, D. Gordon, ..., and P Peluso. Discovery and genotyping of structural variation from long-read haploid genome sequence data. *Genome research*, 27(5):677–685, 2017.

[22] M. Puig, S. Casillas, S. Villatoro, and M. Cceres. Human inversions and their functional consequences. *Briefings in functional genomics*, 14(5):369–379, 2015.

[23] M. G. Ross, C. Russ, M. Costello, A. Hollinger, N. J. Lennon, R. Hegarty, ..., and D. B. . Jaffe. Characterizing and measuring bias in sequence data. *Genome biology*, 14(5):R51, 2013.

[24] H. Lee and M. C. Schatz. Genomic dark matter: the reliability of short read mapping illustrated by the genome mappability score. *Bioinformatics*, 28(16):2097–2105, 2012.

[25] C. Alkan, S. Sajjadian, and E. E. Eichler. Limitations of next-generation genome sequence assembly. *Nature methods*, 8(1):61–65, 2011.

[26] D. Nashta-ali, A. Aliyari, A. A. Moghadam, M. A. Edrisi, S. A. Motahari, and B. H. Khalaj. Meta-aligner: long-read alignment based on genome statistics. *BMC bioinformatics*, 18(1):126, 2017.