Genome Skimming of Symbiotic Communities – an *in silico* Evaluation of Assembly Approaches

Bastian Greshake†, Simonida Zehr†, Francesco Dal Grande*,
Anjuli Meiser*, Imke Schmitt*, Ingo Ebersberger†

† Department for Applied Bioinformatics, Institute for Cell Biology and Neuroscience, Goethe University, Frankfurt am Main, Germany

* Biodiversity and Climate Research Centre, Senckenberg Gesellschaft für Naturforschung, Frankfurt am Main, Germany

Motivation

Lichens, an association of a filamentous fungus and one to several algal or cyanobacterial photobionts, are a hallmark for the success of mutualistic symbioses involving eukaryotes. They can colonize extreme ecological niches, frequently act as pioneering organisms, and are a promising resource for novel bioactive substances of medical and economical relevance. Still, the full potential of lichens for evolutionary and biotechnological studies has not been tapped, mainly since comprehensive genomic data are lacking. Extending the collection of lichen genomes is not trivial as a separate sequencing of the closely interacting symbionts is often not possible. Genome skimming of the lichen metagenome is an obvious and cost-effective solution to rapidly broaden the data basis for genomic research on lichens. Here we address the questions how to best assemble genome skimming data from a eukaryotic species mixture, what pitfalls can occur, and at what quality one can expect to reconstruct the individual genome sequences from a given experiment.

1. *in silico* Generation of Simulated Twin Sets

Our analysis takes its start from a real world metagenome skimming using DNA extracted from a thallus of the lichen *Lasallia pustulata*. We generated 15 million Whole Genome Shotgun read pairs of length 250 bp using the Illumina MiSeq technology. To estimate the insert size distribution we merged overlapping read pairs using FLASH and fitted the parameters of a censored Weibull distribution to the observed insert sizes (Figure 1).



Figure 1: Insert Size distribution of the *L. pustulata* whole genome shotgun library (black: observed, blue: fitted Weibull distribution)

The draft genomes of the lichenized fungus *Cladonia grayi* and its photobiont *Asterochloris sp.* served as basis for the simulations. For each organism we created a pseudogenome, consisting of a single chromosome, by concatenating all scaffolds and removing ambiguous positions. A RepeatMasker analysis (Box I), together with a dot plot analysis to display self similarities (Figure 2), revealed a markedly higher genomic repeat content for *Cladonia grayi* compared to *Asterochloris sp.*

We simulated Whole Genome Shotgun reads with ART, using the two pseudogenomes as template. Read number, length and insert size distribution resembled that of the *Lasallia pustulata* genome skimming. From the simulated reads we compiled 11 twin sets (Table 1).

Cladonia grayi	*Asterochloris sp.*
Number of Scaffolds	
1506	153
Total Length	
38 Mbp	55 Mbp
GC content	
44 %	58 %
% Repetitive	
5 %	2.8 %

Box I Reference Genomes



Figure 2: Self-similarity of the pseudo-genomes of *C. grayi* and *Asterochloris sp.* visualized in a dot plot.

To investigate the influence of different extents of data mixture on the genome reconstructions, we varied the coverage ratios for the fungus and the alga, respectively from 0:10 to 10:0 in steps of one.

Table 1: Relative and Absolute coverages for each organism per data set

Coverage Ratio *C. grayi* : *Asterochloris sp.*	Coverage *C. grayi*	Coverage *Asterochloris sp.*
10:0	182x	0x
9:1	157x	17x
8:2	134x	33x
7:3	112x	48x
6:4	92x	61x
5:5	74x	74x
4:6	56x	86x
3:7	40x	97x
2:8	26x	107x
1:9	13x	116x
0:10	0x	125x

2. Assembler Selection & Optimisation

***De Bruijn Graph* based**	**Velvet** Standard de Bruijn Graph	**MetaVelvet** Metagenome DBG Assembler	**SPAdes** Multisized de Bruijn Graph
***Overlap Layout Consensus* based**	**MIRA** Overlap Layout Graph Based	**Omega** Metagenome OLC Assembler	**sga** String Graph Assembler

Box II Assembler Choice

For Omega, sga, Velvet & MetaVelvet we explored the parameter space (overlap size and k-mer size respectively), using the maximization of the N50 size as the acceptance criterion.

3. Assembly Results



Figure 3: Assembly results over the 11 data sets. Bars are centered at total assembly length (red lines mark the reference lengths). Height of the bars represents the NG50 size. The asterisk marks assemblies covering less than 50% of the reference length. A default height was used in these instances.

For the single species data sets almost all assemblers reconstruct the two genomes over their full length (Figure 3, column 0:10 & 10:0), although the NG50 sizes vary substantially. In general the repeat-poor alga yielded much larger NG50 sizes compared to the repeat-rich fungus. For the alga many assemblers were able to exceed the NG50 size of the original draft genome. In case of the fungus, repeats hindered such an extension with the present WGS library layout (Figure 4).



Figure 4: NGx distributions for *Asterochloris sp.* & *C. grayi*

For the the mixed species data, completeness of the genome reconstructions depends heavily on assembler choice and coverage ratios. *MIRA* and *SPAdes* perform best across all data sets, without suffering from assembly errors (Fig. 5). In contrast, *Omega*, *Velvet* and in particular *MetaVelvet* fail to assemble large parts of the low coverage genome once coverage ratios become extreme (Fig. 3, 1:9 - 3:7, 9:1).



Figure 5: NG50 vs NGA50 for the assemblies from the simulated twin sets.

The k-mer coverage plots provide an explanation for the sensitivity of some assemblers to biased coverage ratios. By optimizing for the N50 size, we ended up choosing a k-mer size which reduces the frequency of the fungal k-mers to an extent that they are no longer considered during assembly (Fig. 5). This exclusion of k-mers prevents the formation of short contigs, increasing up the N50 size.



Figure 6: kmer-coverage frequencies for the 1:9 data set.

At the same time, this exclusion hinders the prediction of genes, as large parts of the fungal genome are not reconstructed. While nearly all genes predicted for the reference can be found in the *SPAdes* and *MIRA* assemblies, only a very limited number are found in case of *MetaVelvet*, *Velvet* and *Omega* (Table 2).

Table 2: Number of fungal gene predictions mapping to the fungal reference genes.

Assembler	**1:9**	**2:8**	**3:7**
Reference	*10740*	*10740*	*10740*
MIRA	10348	10715	10718
Omega	72	5825	10302
SPAdes	10656	10666	10683
sga	10100	10674	10675
Velvet	2845	8817	10530
MetaVelvet	4	66	1657

Summary

- Twin sets are a valuable tool for generating expectations prior to performing sequencing & *de novo* assembly.
- Already in single species data we see large differences in assembler performance
- In mixed species data sets the coverage distribution further inflates differences between the assemblers.
- Assembler performance in our data is not driven by misassemblies.
- Optimizing the N50 can lead to the preclusion of sequences representing the low-coverage genome
- Assembler choice has a large impact on the quality of gene predictions

doi:10.6084/m9.figshare.1046678

Contact

Bastian Greshake
bgreshake@gmail.com
Goethe University, Frankfurt am Main, Germany
Max-von-Laue-Straße 13, 60438 Frankfurt am Main

References

[1] Huang W, Li L, Myers JR, and Marth GT. Bioinformatics (2012) 28 (4): 593-594
[2] http://sourceforge.net/projects/mira-assembler/
[3] Zerbino DR and Birney E. Genome Research (2008) 18:821-829.
[4] Simpson JT and Durbin R. Bioinformatics (2010) 26 (12): i367-i373
[5] Namiki T, Hachiya T, Tanaka H, Sakakibara Y. Nucleic Acids Res, (2012) 40(20), e155
[6] Huson DH, Auch AF, Qi J, et al. Genome Research (2007) 17: 000
[7] Stanke M, Steinkamp R, Waack S and Morgenstern B (2004) Nucleic Acids Research, Vol. 32, W309-W312
[8] Genis Parra, Keith Bradnam and Ian Korf (2007) Bioinformatics, 23: 1061-1067
[9] Trapnell C, Pachter L, Salzberg SL. Bioinformatics (2009) 25 (9): 1105-1111.
[10] http://sourceforge.net/projects/hamstr/
[11] Ebersberger I, de Matos Simoes R, Kupczok A, Gube M, Kothe E, Voigt K, and von Haeseler A. Mol Biol Evol (2012) 29 (5): 1319-1334
[12] Katoh, Standley (2013) Molecular Biology and Evolution 30:772-780
[13] Stamatakis A. Bioinformatics (2006) 22 (21): 2688-2690
[14] Conesa A, Götz S, Garcia-Gomez JM, Terol J, Talon M and Robles M. Bioinformatics, (2005) 21: 3674-3676.