

Rotation Report

Winter 2015

Kanishk Asthana kasthana@eng.ucsd.edu

Project Links: [GitHub](#), [Google Drive](#)

Introduction:

[HOMER](#) is a motif discovery and Next-generation sequence analysis software package which was originally created in the Glass Lab. HOMER is used for multiple types of analysis in the lab including for calling peaks in Chip-Seq data. There are multiple programs currently available for calling Chip-Seq peaks, however it is not known how HOMER performs relative to these other programs.

The objective of this rotation was to compare HOMER to other popular Chip-Seq calling programs. Another objective was to assess whether the lab should continue using HOMER or switch to another program which performs better. The most comprehensive study done for comparing Chip-Seq programs was by [Wilbanks et. al.](#) and I have used many of the metrics introduced in that study to judge performance.

Chip-Seq Candidate Programs Chosen:

Given that there are so many Chip-seq calling programs available, the main limitation for choosing candidate programs became the availability (or lack of) of documentation for these program. Almost all other [programs](#) that I looked at lacked enough documentation to start using them. Given these limitations I chose the following two programs to compare with HOMER:

1. The most popular Chip-seq program so far is [MACS](#). MACS was chosen for its popularity and wide adoption. I suspect it is this popular because it is very simple to use and requires only a single line command to generate an output. However, this comes at the cost of lesser flexibility and options as compared to HOMER. Moreover, MACS does not provide information about the strand the peak lies on +/- . This lack of information might hinder downstream analysis.
2. [SISSRS](#) is another candidate program that was chosen. I found it easy to install and use, however it does not provide information such as strand direction, a unique ID for each peak and a score for each peak found. This lack of information might hinder downstream analysis.

Pair wise comparison of shared peaks

For the pair wise comparison two datasets were initially chosen. The first was a PU.1 Chip-seq dataset generated in the Glass Lab (this dataset can be found at /data/home/kasthana/ mm10-C57BL7-ThioMac-PU1-notx.sam on the Glass Lab server). The second was an [ENCODE data set](#) ([replicate no 2 was chosen](#)).

Table 1: Comparison of HOMER vs MACS.

Data Set	HOMER (% of Peaks shared with MACS)	MACS (% of Peaks shared with HOMER)
PU.1	93.24609	90.06348
ENCODE	74.55422	89.26311

Table 2: Comparison of HOMER vs SISSRS

Data Set	HOMER (% of Peaks shared with SISSRS)	SISSRS (% of Peaks shared with HOMER)
PU.1	93.24609	90.06348
ENCODE	74.55422	89.26311

NOTES:

Another, potential limitation of MACS is that it does not give information about which strand +/- the peaks lie on in its output. HOMER's motif analysis functionality requires strand direction index for detecting motifs. Moreover, to check whether the Chip-Seq worked correctly the lab often does a motif analysis on the detected peaks using HOMER. If the known motif for a transcription factor being ChiP-ed occurs in the region around the detected peaks then it is seen as a indicator that the ChiP worked as planned. One way to get around the problem that MACS does not provide strand direction information is to artificially introduce a column for the strand direction "+" in the output for MACS

Explain choice of chip-seq programs and what made you narrow down to the ones you did narrow down to. Introduce the paper in the references. Compare results with the paper. Introduce the different datasets you used dude. This is interesting.

Analysis methods: Check overlap: top 500, top percentile, overall. Metric, choose the one with better representation, not clear at all.

Next show the true positives stuff and explain the analysis and hg18 to hg19 conversion that you did. Next explain the true positives curve. And how they compare. Macs might just be better. Make table.

Next show motifs analysis results for the intersection of the two data sets. That is a lot of writing to do my friend lets begin.