

Subs Paper Things to Do:

- why are the lin reg of dN , dS and ω NS but the subs graphs are...explain!
- mol clock for my analysis?
- GC content? COG? where do these fit?

Inversions and Gene Expression Letter Things to Do:

- ~~create latex template for paper~~
- confirm inversions with dot plot
- make dot plot of just gene presence and absence matrix (instead of each site) to see if this will go better
- look up inversions and small RNA's paper Marie was talking about at Committee meeting
- write outline for letter
- write Abstract
- ~~write intro~~
- write methods
- compile tables (supplementary)
- write results
- write discussion
- write conclusion
- do same ancestral/phylogenetic analysis that I did in the subs paper

General Things to Do:

- summarize references 40 and 56 from Committee meeting report (Brian was asking)

Last Week

Substitutions Paper: ✓ looked over reviewers comments

✓ started the “leave one out” analysis

Inversions + Gene Expression:

- ✓ Queenie finished final dataframes!
 - ✓ wrote code to get non-coding positions
 - ✓ obtain new inversion combos for DESeq
 - ✓ final aesthetic inversions and expression graph
- General:
- ✓ Wrote 3pages for conclusion of Dissertation

Inversions + Gene Expression:

Final dataframes: Queenie has finished the final dataframes for this analysis for both the raw data (for DESeq) and normalized expression values (for other analysis). I am in the process of looking these over to double check that everything is correct. So far it looks like we had about 1000 genes that were aligned with PARSNP but were not reciprocal best BLAST hits, leaving us with a total of just over 2000 genes to analyze.

Non-coding H-NS data: I started to combine information from the coding and non-coding H-NS binding data and had to write some code to obtain the genomic position for one datasets as it only told me the flanking genes. I am still working on combining all non-coding information with the coding information for all H-NS binding datasets.

Inversion Combos: DESeq requires “treatment” information for each sample so I have obtained all of the different inversion combinations that exist in our raw data frame (i.e. inversion in only ATCC, or ATCC and DH, ...etc).

Inversions and Expression Graph: I have finished tweaking the final aesthetics for Figure 3. Let me know if you think there is anything I should add or change. I still need to run this through using Queenie’s final dataframes. In this graph I chose to only use the genomic position for K12 MG1655 to represent the singular position for each block. Trying to account for varying positions in each taxa was too messy graphically. **Do you think it is appropriate to use only K12 MG1655 positions? My thought was that this would be sort of the “reference” and then I could do regressions on each strain separately to see if/how inversions vary with distance from the origin of replication. Thoughts?**

Inversion Visualization: I did not get a chance to look into the output from the two inversion visualization figures (with and without ATCC reverse complemented) (Figures 1 and 2). I will look into these more this week.

Substitutions Paper:

I started to run the “leave one out” analysis on *E. coli* and I will let you know the results once they come in!

I looked at the reviewers comments once again and I agree that Reviewer 2 is concerned about how robust our analysis is. They want to know if the differences in sign for the substitution

correlation is due to i) the small sample size, ii) actual differences/the rearrangements and what we are claiming, or iii) differences between the datasets, I think meaning we see negative in *E. coli* because rather than *Streptomyces* because of those particular sequences we chose. It seems as though they want one of the following things to be done:

1. do my analysis (and pipeline) on the same genomes that previous papers used. to show that with our pipeline we get varying signs in our correlations
2. somehow do my analysis without accounting for rearrangements. This way we can show that without rearrangements we get the same increasing trend as previous studies, but with rearrangements we do not.

We have discussed option 1) a few times and concluded that it just does not make sense to re-do my analysis when the genome annotation has likely changed on these previous datasets since they were published. I was thinking about option 2) a bit more and I thought of maybe just cutting out the ancestral reconstruction part of my analysis and only looking at the substitutions we see in the extant taxa and their associated genomic positions. However, since I did my alignment with progressiveMauve the genomic positions of these extant sequences already has some component of genomic rearrangement accounted for. So I am wondering if I should re-do the whole genome alignments with a different alignment program? **What do you think about all this? Do you think I should do this analysis? If so, do I need to align the genomes with another program?**

This Week

- double check Queenie's final dataframes
- double check new inversion combos with Queenie's new data frames
- get previous code working with Queenie's new dataframes
- combine/read in all data from all H-NS coding and non-coding datasets
- write code to compare all H-NS datasets to inversions
- summarize ↑ results
- look into differences between inversion visualization with and without ATCC reverse complemented
- continue to run the “leave one out” analysis on subst data

Next Week

- actual analysis on DESeq data

- visualizations/results for ↑
- read papers on H-NS proteins
- think about how to visualize H-NS and inversions info
- continue to run the “leave one out” analysis on subst data




Figure 1: Visualization of rearrangements and inversions in all *E. coli* strains. ATCC is in the GenBank listed orientation.




Figure 2: Visualization of rearrangements and inversions in all *E. coli* strains. ATCC is reverse complemented from the GenBank listed orientation.




Figure 3: Visualization of the difference in gene expression between inverted and non-inverted sequences within alignment blocks. Each alignment block represents homologous sequences between the *Escherichia coli* strains [insert table ref here](#). Each alignment block has one point on the graph to represent the average expression value in Counts Per Million (CPM) for all inverted (circles) and non-inverted (triangles) sequences within the block. Blocks that had a significant difference in gene expression (using a Wilcoxon sign-ranked test, see Materials and Methods) have the inverted and non-inverted gene expression averages highlighted in pink circles and purple triangles respectively. A smoothing line (`loewss`) was added to link the average gene expression values for the inverted (pink solid) and non-inverted (purple dashed) sequences within block that had a significant difference in gene expression (using a Wilcoxon sign-ranked test, see Materials and Methods). All blocks that did not have a significant difference in average gene expression between inverted and non-inverted sequences within alignment blocks have the average inversion (circles) and non-inversion (triangles) gene expression values coloured in light grey.

H-NS Binding Study	All Inversions and H-NS Binding	Significant Inversions and H-NS Binding
Grainger 2006	NS	NS
Ueda 2013	NS	NS
Higashi 2016: coding criteria 1	0.102*	0.101***
Higashi 2016: coding criteria 1 and non-coding criteria 1	0.101*	0.089***
Higashi 2016: coding criteria 1 and non-coding criteria 2	0.101*	0.089***
Higashi 2016: coding criteria 1 and non-coding criteria 3	0.101*	0.089***
Higashi 2016: coding criteria 2	0.104*	0.090***
Higashi 2016: coding criteria 3	0.104*	0.090***

Table 1: Pearson correlation between H-NS binding sites and inverted regions of the *E. coli* K-12 MG1655 genome. A genomic region was considered inverted if this sequence was inverted in any of the following four taxa: *E. coli* K-12 MG1655, *E. coli* K-12 DH10B, *E. coli* BW25113, and *E. coli* ATCC. The genomic positions of these inversions in *E. coli* K-12 MG1655 was used for reference. The binding sites for the H-NS protein are in the genomic coordinates of *E. coli* K-12 MG1655, chosen as a reference. The second column “All Inversions and H-NS Binding” represents the correlation coefficient between inverted regions and H-NS binding sites. The third column “Significant Inversions and H-NS Binding” represents the correlation coefficient between inverted regions with significant differences in normalized gene expression between inverted and non-inverted taxa (via a Wilcoxon signed-rank test) and H-NS binding sites. All results are marked with significance codes as followed: $< 0.001 = \text{***}$, $0.001 < 0.01 = \text{**}$, $0.01 < 0.05 = \text{*}$, $> 0.05 = \text{NS}$.

Datasets:	Correlation Coefficient (W)
Inverted Blocks	15218699**
Inverted Sequences	11436344***

Table 2: Correlation coefficients for Wilcoxon signed-rank test on various datasets to determine the correlation between an inversion and difference in normalized gene expression. The “Inverted Blocks” dataset represents alignment blocks that have at least one taxa with an inverted sequence. The “Inverted Sequences” dataset represents all individual sequences from all alignment blocks that were inverted. The correlation between both datasets was computed using a Wilcoxon signed-rank test. All results are marked with significance codes as followed: $< 0.001 = \text{***}$, $0.001 < 0.01 = \text{**}$, $0.01 < 0.05 = \text{*}$, $> 0.05 = \text{NS}$.

% of Blocks that are		
Inverted	Inverted with Differences in Gene Expression	Increased in Gene Expression in Inverted Sequences
68.29	8.22	58.06

Table 3: Percent of blocks in categories for various datasets (blocks with all 4 taxa, at least 3 taxa, or at least 2 taxa). The second column is any block that had at least one sequences that was inverted. The last column only deals with blocks that had at least one inverted sequence and had a significant difference in gene expression (column 3).