Using normalization to resolve RNA-Seq biases caused by amplification from minimal input
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RNA-SEQ HAS BECOME THE LEADING TOOL for transcriptomics and has advantages over microarrays that make it possible to discover new genes and transcripts and reveal alternative splice isoforms, in addition to providing information about gene expression (6, 22, 23). The number of sequencing reads produced is a function of the abundance of each transcript, and thus the read density is used to quantify gene expression (6, 17, 23). RNA-Seq obtained from small cell populations, rare tissue samples, or even single cells is becoming increasingly feasible. However, there is usually a need to amplify the material obtained from such samples due to very small amounts of RNA available for sequencing. Different amplification protocols exist (3, 26, 30, 35), which could conceivably affect the downstream gene expression results. To improve the reliability of RNA-Seq data obtained from such amplified material, data processing methods may need to be optimized.

Different features may be of importance depending on the specific research project; some might be important for all studies, while others only apply to certain settings. For instance, metrics related to accuracy and biases in gene expression measurements are of great importance for expression profiling projects. Samples with low input for an RNA-Seq analysis may result in unexpected biases in the data, for instance due to differences in library complexity. If not noticed and left untreated, this could have substantial effects on the subsequent biological interpretation.

Here, we investigate whether postsequencing computational procedures could be applied to resolve bias associated with amplification. In every RNA-Seq experiment, normalization is required to make the gene expression values comparable between samples (5, 25). Usually, the only experimental effect that is removed is the difference in sequencing depth between samples, although methods have been developed to remove additional, transcript-specific effects (8).

Using a transgenic line of the model fish medaka (*Oryzias latipes*) where expression of green fluorescent protein (Gfp) is under control of the endogenous luteinizing hormone beta (*lhb*) promoter (9), we have isolated the *lhb*-expressing gonadotrope cells and focused exclusively on the gene expression in these cells as analyzed by RNA-Seq. This procedure results in very small amounts of cell material, necessitating presequencing amplification of mRNA. In the resulting sequencing data, we detected biases that were conceivably the result of this amplification. In this study, we have attempted to reproduce these effects by data simulation and demonstrate how computational normalization procedures can ameliorate or worsen the amplification bias. This has resulted in a comprehensive and general strategy that yields accurate and reproducible gene expression results starting from minimal amounts of material.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

**Animals.** Japanese medaka (*O. latipes*) of the d-rR strain were used for all experiments. The *lhb-Gfp* transgenic line used in this study is homozygous for a Gfp cassette under the control of the endogenous medaka *lhb* promoter (9). Medaka were housed in recirculating systems with water temperature at 27–28°C and a light (L)-dark (D) cycle of L14:D10. Fish were fed a combination of dry feed SDS 300–400 (Special Diets Services) and live brine shrimp (*Artemia franciscana*) nauplii (Argent Chemical lab, Redmond, WA). All fish used in these experiments were synchronized at the embryo stage, such that all the fish in a sample were the same age. Handling and use of fish were in accordance with approved regulations for the care and welfare of research animals at the University of Oslo.

**Genetic sex determination.** We initially identified Juvenile and adult female medaka on the basis of secondary sex characteristics (14) and then anesthetized them in benzocaine (0.5 mg/ml) before cutting off a small piece of the caudal fin. DNA was extracted from the fin clip with the Wizard Genomic DNA Purification Kit (Promega, Madison, WI). All samples were analyzed by PCR using Platinum Taq polymerase (Invitrogen, Carlsbad, CA) according to product specifications. The same primers were used for the autosomal gene *dmrt1a* and the male sex-specific gene *dmrt1bY* (dmv): forward 5′–CGGGTGCCCAAAGTGCTCCGGTG–3′ and reverse 5′–GA-TGTCCTCCACAGAGAAGAGA–3′ primer (Eurofins MWG Operon), as has been described previously (21). The cycling parameters included an initial step at 94°C for 2 min, followed by 40 cycles comprising denaturation at 94°C for 15 s, annealing at 53°C for 15 s,
and extension at 72°C for 70 s, followed by a final elongation step at 72°C for 5 min. Female and male control samples were included in each run. Agarose gel electrophoresis of the PCR was run to evaluate the initially phenotyped female medaka. Transverse sections of the ovaries of approximately five juvenile and adult genotyped female medaka from each sampling group were prepared and subjected to standard hematoxylin-eosin staining to verify that the juvenile fish were sexually immature and adult fish were sexually mature before sampling.

**Dispersed pituitary cell culture.** The procedure for isolating individual cells from the pituitary of medaka was established (32) and optimized based on primary culture conditions for Atlantic cod (10). Genotyped female medaka were anesthetized in benzocaine (0.5 mg/ml) prior to dissection. The spinal cord was quickly severed before sampling.

Following sampling, the pituitaries were spun down in a tabletop centrifuge and EC solution was removed. Before cell dispersion, a solution comprising 0.1% trypsin type II-S (Sigma, St. Louis, MO) and 1% BSA dissolved in dH2O. The EC solution was adjusted to pH 7.75 with NaOH and osmolality to 280 mOsm/kg with mannitol prior to sterile filtration. Pituitaries from ~30 animals were pooled for each sample, except for juvenile sample 1, which was pooled from a larger amount of pituitaries (for details see Table 1).

Following sampling, the pituitaries were spun down in a tabletop centrifuge and EC solution was removed. Before cell dispersion, a solution comprising 0.1% trypsin type II-S (Sigma, St. Louis, MO) and 0.2% collagenase type I (Merck, Darmstadt, Germany) freshly prepared in ice-cold artificial extracellular (EC) solution. The EC solution comprised 134 mM NaCl, 2.9 mM KCl, 1.2 mM CaCl2, 1.2 mM MgCl2, 1.8 mM glucose, 10 mM HEPES, and 1% BSA dissolved in dH2O. The EC solution was adjusted to pH 7.75 with NaOH and osmolality to 280 mOsm/kg with mannitol prior to sterile filtration. Pituitaries from ~30 animals were pooled for each sample, except for juvenile sample 1, which was pooled from a larger amount of pituitaries (for details see Table 1).

Following sampling, the pituitaries were spun down in a tabletop centrifuge and EC solution was removed. Before cell dispersion, a solution comprising 0.1% trypsin type II-S (Sigma, St. Louis, MO) and 0.2% collagenase type I (Merck, Darmstadt, Germany) freshly prepared in ice-cold (Ca2+- and Mg2+-free) phosphate-buffered saline (PBS) (Invitrogen), adjusted to pH 7.75 with NaOH and osmolality to 280 mOsm/kg with NaCl, was added twice to wash the pituitaries. After removal of the wash solution the pituitaries were enzymatically digested with the trypsin-collagenase solution while gently shaken in a water bath at 26°C for 30 min. The trypsin-collagenase solution was replaced by 0.1% trypsin inhibitor type I-S (Sigma) in modified PBS, supplemented with ~2 μg/ml DNase I (Sigma), and incubated for another 20 min at 26°C. Subsequently, the tissue pieces were mechanically dissociated in ice-cold EC solution by gentle pipetting with a glass pipette. Cells were centrifuged at 200 g for 10 min, and the supernatant was replaced by 100 μl ice-cold EC solution, wherein the samples were resuspended. The samples were kept on ice until sorting, ~30 min after dissociation.

**Fluorescence-activated cell sorting of lhβ-expressing gonadotropes.** Gfp-positive lhβ-expressing gonadotropes of female medaka were sorted from the dissociated pituitary cell suspension by fluorescence-activated cell sorting (FACS) on a FAC.S Aria Cell Sorter (BD Pharmingen, San Jose, CA) and further analyzed with the BD FACS DiVa Software v.5.0.2 (BD Pharmingen). Prior to sorting the instrument was cleaned and calibrated with fluorescent beads to ensure that the accuracy of sorting was >99%. To maintain the most optimal and stable conditions for the dispersed pituitary cells, FACS sorting was performed in EC solution (described in the previous section). To exclude cells entering apoptosis as a result of the cell isolation procedure, the cell suspension was incubated for 30 min with 5 μl alliphophycocyanin (APC) conjugated Annexin V (BD Pharmingen), which has the advantage of marking both early and late apoptotic cells. The cell solution was filtrated through a 70 μm filter before sorting to remove potential cell clusters.

The pulse of forward scatter (FSC) and side scatter (SSC) was detected and used to gate cells such that debris and dead cells, as well as healthy doublet cells (two or more cells that stick together), were excluded from all samples. The cells exhibiting strong Gfp fluorescence (fluorescein isothiocyanate channel, FITC) upon excitation with 488 nm laser and low APC (Annexin V) fluorescence upon excitation with 633 nm laser were collected in EC solution at 4°C. After being sorted, the cells were centrifuged at 200 g for 10 min, followed by careful removal of the supernatant. Cells were then lysed by vortexing for 1 min in 500 μl Trizol (Invitrogen) and snap-frozen in liquid nitrogen.

**RNA isolation and cDNA synthesis.** Different methods of RNA isolation were tested to obtain as much RNA as possible from the sorted lhβ-expressing cells, including Trizol and different commercial column-based protocols. Trizol was chosen as the method of RNA isolation as it resulted in a higher yield and similar RNA integrity compared with the column based protocols.

Total RNA was extracted from the Trizol lysed cells in line with the manufacturer’s guidelines, with the exception of the use of smaller volumes in all steps during Trizol isolation, as this was found to improve the yield. The snap-freezing of the FACS sorted cells in liquid nitrogen prior to RNA isolation resulted in considerably higher amounts of RNA compared with direct isolation without including this step. The RNA concentration was measured with the Qubit RNA assay kit on a Qubit fluorometer (Invitrogen). RNA integrity was assessed by Agilent 2100 Bioanalyzer on an RNA 6000 Pico chip (Agilent Technologies, Santa Clara, CA) where all samples had an RNA integrity number > 8. RNA was DNase-treated with TURBO DNA-free (Ambion, Austin, TX) according to product specifications and stored at −80°C until cDNA synthesis.

**cDNA synthesis.** cDNA was synthesized and amplified from total RNA using the Ovation RNA-Seq System V2 (NuGEN Technologies, San Carlos, CA), according to the manufacturer’s instructions. After amplification the cDNA was purified with MinElute Reaction Cleanup Kit (Qiagen), and the yield was measured by NanoDrop (Thermo Fisher Scientific, Waltham, MA). The purified cDNA was stored at −20°C until sequencing.

**Illumina library preparation and sequencing.** Library preparation and sequencing were performed at the Norwegian Sequencing Centre, University of Oslo. The amplified cDNA produced by Ovation RNA-Seq System V2 was fragmented on a Biouptor sonicator (Diagenode, Den- ville, NJ) for 12 min on low power to yield a modal fragment size of ~300 bp before continuing with Illumina’s protocol for library generation. Fragmented cDNA (500 ng) was then used as input on a SPRINTWorks automated system (Beckman Coulter, Brea, CA), employing 10 cycles of PCR with Phusion polymerase. Adapters and primers were sourced from Bio Scientific (Austin, TX). The RNA-Seq paired-
end libraries were subjected to paired-end sequencing with a read length of 100 nucleotides on an Illumina HiSeq2000 instrument according to the manufacturer’s protocol. The image analysis and base calling were performed by RTA (version 1.13: http://support.illumina.com/sequencing/sequencing_software/real-time_analysis/rta/downloads.ilmn), and the fastq files were generated and demultiplexed by CASAVA (version 1.8.2: http://support.illumina.com/sequencing/sequencing_software/casava.ilmn).

Read alignment and quantification. The quality of all sequencing samples was examined with FASTQC (version 0.10.1: http://www.bioinformatics.babraham.ac.uk/projects/fastqc/). We trimmed 10 nucleotides from the start of every read with the FASTX-toolkit (version 0.0.13, http://hannonlab.cshl.edu/fastx_toolkit/download.html). Reference sequences and annotations for the medaka genome [MEDAKA1, (12)] were obtained from Ensembl (release 67). This reference was supplemented with the sequence of the Gfp cassette, as well as the part of the fshb (follicle-stimulating hormone beta-subunit) transcript (GenBank AB541981) missing from the assembly (11). The tshb (thyroid-stimulating hormone beta-subunit) gene was annotated based on its known transcript sequence (GenBank XM_004068796). Library insert sizes were determined from alignments of subsets of data to medaka cDNA sequences using Bowtie2 (version 2.0.0-beta6). Read pairs were aligned to the medaka genome sequence using TopHat2 (version 2.0.4) (13), using Bowtie2 as the short read aligner at “very sensitive” settings. The resulting BAM alignment files were inspected with SAMtools version 0.1.18 (18), Picard tools (version 1.73: http://picard.sourceforge.net/), and the Integrative Genomics Viewer version 2.3 (27).

Secondary alignments, i.e., alignments that meet Tophat’s criteria but are less likely to be correct than simultaneously reported primary alignments, were removed from the BAM files. Global statistics of these alignments were gathered using the Picard tools programs CollectRnaSeqMetrics, EstimateLibraryComplexity, and CollectGcBiasMetrics. Fragment (read pair) alignment counts per transcript were determined from SAM alignment files using the Python package HTSeq-count (version 0.5.3p9: http://www-huber.embld.de/users/anders/HTSeq/doc/overview.html), using the “strict” settings to exclude reads aligning ambiguously with respect to annotated gene structures. Counts were summarized at the level of Ensembl-annotated genes.

As an alternative quantification procedure, we used RSEM (version 1.2.15) (16) using Bowtie2 as the short read aligner. The reference was prepared from cDNAs predicted by Ensembl, using the no-polyA option. Counts and fragments per kilobase per million mapped fragments (FPKM)-normalized expression were summarized at the polyA option. Counts and fragments per kilobase per million mapped reads (FPKM)-normalized expression were summarized at the level of Ensembl genes.

The commands used for alignment and quantification are available as Supplemental Material.1

Simulated data. Synthetic count datasets of different complexities were generated based on the count data of the three adult samples. These values were scaled to fragments per 10 million, pooled, and divided by 3. This way, all rare transcripts detected in only one of the samples are included in the synthetic transcriptome, albeit at very low “concentrations” (all artificial concentrations can be interpreted as transcript molecules per volume). Of this initial sample, a series of serial dilutions was made by dividing by the square root of 10, resulting in 10-fold dilution every second step. Artificial concentrations in the most complex sample (undiluted) ranged from 0.28 to 133900, summing up to a total of 10\(^6\); in the least complex sample (1,000× diluted) concentrations ranged from 0.00028 to 133.9, summing up to 10,000.

Prior to simulated sequencing, these samples were amplified to a uniform artificial RNA amount of 10\(^7\) (i.e., no amplification was performed for the undiluted sample). Transcripts were amplified at rates depending on their concentration. The rates (\(v\)) were approximated by assuming Michaelis-Menten kinetics for the rate-limiting steps:

\[
v_i = \frac{[\text{transcript } x_i]}{[\text{transcript } x_j] + K_m}
\]

Amplification was either linear or exponential. In linear amplification, the same template is used iteratively to produce new strands that can themselves not act as new templates. The reaction rates are then dependent only on the initial concentration of each transcript. In exponential amplification (PCR), new templates are formed at every cycle, affecting the reaction rates in the next cycle.

Finally, amplified samples were converted to counts by sampling a specified number of fragments from the concentrations assuming a Poisson process. For each transcript, this yields an integer value from a distribution with mean and variance equal to its concentration. This adds an amount of sampling noise to the amplified samples that is consistent with perfect technical replication (20) [but much lower than is usually observed for biological replicates (5, 25, 31)].

The effects of normalization procedures on the simulated data were quantified by taking the mean of the relative deviation for each gene expression value \(x_{ij}\) from the overall mean for that gene:

\[
\text{deviation}(x_{ij}) = \frac{|x_{ij} - \text{mean}(x_{ij})|}{\text{mean}(x_{ij})}
\]

 overall deviation

\[
= \frac{\sum_{n=1}^{m} \sum_{j=0}^{m} \text{deviation}(x_{ij})}{nm}
\]

for \(n\) genes and \(m\) samples

Data analysis. Raw read data per gene were transformed to normalized gene expression values using scaling by the (estimated) library size and the annotated mean transcript length in kilobases (22). For library size calculation, the number of aligned fragments counted by HTSeq, as well as estimates [DESeq-like robust scaling factor, trimmed mean of M-values (TMM), and upper quartile (UQ)] from the R package edgeR (version 3.2.4) (28) were used.

Alternative normalization was performed with the R package cqn (conditional quantile normalization, version 1.6.0) (8), using the mean length of annotated transcripts per gene, and the GC% of these, as explanatory variables. In cases where quantile normalization assigned a small non-zero expression value to genes without aligning reads, the expression value was reset to zero. Quantile normalization replaces the original expression values by a common value for each expression rank (4). It may therefore occur that genes with the same expression rank in multiple samples are assigned exactly the same normalized expression value. To avoid these ties, the expression values of genes with the same rank \(r\) in two samples were adjusted upward or downward based on original fragment alignment counts per million, to values belonging to the ranks \(r - 0.33\) and \(r + 0.33\. Expression values belonging to partial ranks were calculated by interpolation along a spline curve connecting all expression values and ranks. If more than two samples were affected, the expression values were distributed evenly along the \(x \pm 0.33\) interval.

Differential expression between juvenile and adult samples was determined using the R packages edgeR and NOISeq (version 2.0.0) (33, 34) with the NOISeq/BIO option of handling biological replicates. As an expression threshold for testing, a gene was required to have at least 10 aligning fragments per million read pairs in at least two samples.

All analyses on count data were performed in R (version 3.0.1) with Bioconductor (version 2.12). The R code used for normalization and simulated amplification is available as Supplemental Material. All diagnostic plots were generated using the R package ggplot2 (version 0.9.3.1) (38).

Data availability. The data used in this study are publicly available at Sequence Read Archive at the National Center for Biotechnology Information with Bioconductor (version 2.12). The R code used for normalization and simulated amplification is available as Supplemental Material. All diagnostic plots were generated using the R package ggplot2 (version 0.9.3.1) (38).

1The online version of this article contains supplemental material.
Information with the following accession numbers: SRX641220, SRX641221, SRX641222, SRX641223, SRX641225, and SRX641226.

RESULTS

Cell selection, RNA isolation, and sequencing. Specific lhb-expressing gonadotrope cells were isolated for RNA-Seq utilizing a transgenic line of medaka (lhb:Gfp), and only female fish were included in this study. Females were selected based on phenotypic characteristics and subsequently subjected to a genotypic sex verification assay. The presence or absence of the male sex-determining gene, a DM-domain gene on the Y chromosome named dmrt1bY (dmy), determines the testicular or ovarian pathway of gonad development, respectively (21, 24). While 100% of the adult fish that were sorted as females based on phenotypic differences were genotyped as females, the number decreased to \( \frac{80}{100} \) for the juveniles.

The dissection of pituitaries exhibiting Gfp fluorescence in the lhb-expressing gonadotropes was performed as depicted in Fig. 1. FACS was employed to isolate populations of lhb-expressing gonadotrope cells. Intact cells were separated from debris based on the FSC, a measure of cell size (Fig. 2A). SSC gauges cell granularity or intracellular complexity and was used to separate single cells from doublets and clumps of cells (Fig. 2B). Finally, cells exhibiting high Gfp fluorescence and low Annexin V APC fluorescence were selected (Fig. 2C). Gfp fluorescence was very intense, possibly indicating very high levels of gfp gene expression. In adult medaka, 17–28% of the of the total number of single pituitary cells were healthy singlet Gfp-expressing lhb-gonadotropes and were thus sorted and used for further analysis. The number was dramatically decreased for juveniles, where 4–14% of the cells were sorted (Table 1).

The limited amount of total RNA isolated from the samples (especially from juvenile medaka pituitaries) was insufficient to meet Illumina’s recommendations for library preparation and sequencing. We therefore decided to use the Ovation RNA-Seq System V2 as an alternative method for preparing cDNA libraries. The Ovation system is based on Ribo-SPIA technology and provides a fast and simple method for preparing linearly amplified cDNA from total RNA. Single primer

---

**Fig. 1.** Pituitary dissection from adult lhb:Gfp transgenic medaka. Fish were anaesthetized prior to dissection. A: head of medaka exposing the top of the brain after removal of skull roof. B: the brain flipped over after severing the medulla oblongata, exposing the pituitary (white arrowhead). C: the pituitary displaying Gfp fluorescence from the lhb-expressing gonadotropes can be collected using fine forceps (overlay of light- and fluorescent micrographs). Scale bars represent 500 \( \mu \)m.

**Fig. 2.** Fluorescence-activated cell sorting (FACS) of individual lhb-expressing gonadotrope cells following enzymatic dispersion of pituitaries from adult lhb:Gfp transgenic medaka. A: gating was performed to remove dead cells and debris prior to sorting (defined as cells appearing on the left side of the red dotted line). Forward scatter A (area) measures cell size; side scatter A detects intracellular complexity. B: of the proportion selected as live cells, gating was further used to remove doublets [2 or more cells sticking together, defined as cells appearing above the red dotted line, as measured by side scatter W (width), such that only single cells were selected]. C: parameters for sorting were adjusted such that cells exhibiting strong FITC (Gfp) fluorescence (>700) and low APC (Annexin V) fluorescence (<200), i.e., healthy, individual, lhb-expressing gonadotropes, were selected for further studies (green cell population in the bottom right corner of the dot plot). In all panels, green dots represent the Gfp-positive lhb-expressing gonadotropes. Marginal gradients indicate the relative density of cells in the plot along the axes, with dark colors indicating more cells.
isothermal amplification (SPIA) is a DNA amplification process that uses a DNA/RNA chimeric primer, DNA polymerase, and RNase H in a homogeneous isothermal assay, providing highly efficient amplification of DNA sequences (15). The amplified samples were sequenced at 100 nt paired end and generated between 69 and 91 million read pairs (see Table 1). Analysis using FASTQC did not reveal any problems with sequencing in specific samples; however, the first 10 nucleotides of reads displayed reduced quality in all samples and were therefore not included in further analyses.

### Quantification and structural biases.

The long read pairs obtained in this work are suitable for RNA-Seq quantification with a reference genome, using a splicing-aware alignment program such as Tophat (36). This approach yields rich information on the transcript composition (e.g., transcript isoforms). Spliced alignment of the 11–100 bp parts of the reads to the entire medaka genome resulted in alignment efficiencies of 67–79% for the different samples (Table 2). Of the aligned bases, 15.7–19.5% mapped to annotated transcripts (coding sequences and untranslated regions). All samples exhibited a distinct coverage bias towards the 3′-ends of transcripts (Table 2). A detailed analysis of the average coverage along the 1,000 most highly expressed transcripts revealed that this effect is not identical for all samples, with especially adult sample 2 showing higher coverage at the 3′-ends of these transcripts and less at the 5′-ends (Fig. 3A).

For each sample and each annotated gene, the number of fragments (read pairs) aligning to that gene was counted. Of 20,425 annotated genes in the medaka genome, 17,617 had at least one aligning read in at least one sample. The number of detected genes (at least one read per gene) varied considerably between samples, ranging from 11,855 in juvenile sample 3 to 16,812 in adult sample 1 but was generally higher in the adult samples (Table 2). If a small threshold is added to exclude sequencing and alignment noise, the pattern remains the same (the set of genes in which 99% of fragments aligns, Table 2). The distributions of count values also vary considerably between samples (Fig. 3B), indicating the need for a computational normalization procedure to make samples comparable.

As in every RNA-Seq experiment, raw counts need to be corrected for the total sequencing depth (i.e., the total number of aligning fragments) (22), which may differ between samples (Tables 1 and 2). In addition, juvenile samples 2 and 3 deviate from the common distribution pattern, which could be an indication of intrinsically noncomparable samples.

In addition to spliced alignment with Tophat, we also quantified fragment counts per gene with RSEM, using predicted cDNAs instead of the annotated genome as a reference. Count patterns were very similar (Pearson correlation 0.96–0.97 for the same samples quantified by either method), including the deviation of juvenile samples 2 and 3 (data not shown).

Amplification bias reproduction in synthetic data. Since the deviation is limited to the samples that were generated from the lowest amounts of input RNA (Table 1) and exhibit the lowest transcriptome complexity (Table 2), we suspected that it could be an artifact of RNA amplification. At extremely low RNA concentrations, amplification has been found to be less efficient than at moderate to high concentrations (3). Such a bias could conceivably lead to the patterns observed in Fig. 3B: highly

---

### Table 2. Alignment information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Juvenile 1</th>
<th>Juvenile 2</th>
<th>Juvenile 3</th>
<th>Adult 1</th>
<th>Adult 2</th>
<th>Adult 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reads aligned to genome, %</td>
<td>77.0</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>79.2</td>
<td>69.5</td>
<td>71.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of these, aligned to coding regions, %</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... aligned to UTRs, %</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... aligned to introns, %</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>... aligned to intergenic regions, %</td>
<td>65.4</td>
<td>60.1</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td>60.4</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>62.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read pairs counted, %</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3′/5′ coverage bias, ×</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median GC content % (IQR%)</td>
<td>45 (11)</td>
<td>46 (14)</td>
<td>46 (13)</td>
<td>45 (11)</td>
<td>43 (12)</td>
<td>45 (13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detected genes</td>
<td>14364</td>
<td>12424</td>
<td>11855</td>
<td>16812</td>
<td>15618</td>
<td>16176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genes in which 99% of fragments align</td>
<td>8876</td>
<td>7596</td>
<td>7146</td>
<td>10144</td>
<td>9157</td>
<td>9657</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

UTR, untranslated regions; IQR, interquartile range.
abundant transcripts are unaffected, but moderately to lowly expressed genes are depleted.

To test this hypothesis, we generated simulated data based on the adult medaka samples (see MATERIALS AND METHODS). We used both in silico linear amplification (Fig. 4, A and B) and exponential amplification (Fig. 4B) to mimic the bias observed in the real samples (Fig. 3B). A number of artificial concentrations of the synthetic data were generated by serial dilutions, and the two methods produced very different distribution patterns of the simulated count values at different levels of severity (Fig. 4B). Both the “mild linear” and “mild exponential” protocols produced count value distributions similar to those observed for the affected juvenile medaka samples. For further analysis, we used a combination of mild linear simulated samples (Fig. 4C) that includes random variation in sequencing depth and to a large degree resembles the pattern we observed in the real samples (Fig. 3B).

Normalization and bias correction in synthetic data. We subsequently investigated whether postsequencing computational procedures, specifically, normalization procedures intended to make samples comparable, are still valid in the presence of amplification bias. The most straightforward normalization procedure scales all fragment counts by the exact determined sequencing depth. In addition, we evaluated several estimators by which to scale the counts. These approximations of the effective sequencing depth are less affected by the high expression of just a few genes than the actual quantified total number of fragments (5, 25). Subsequently, fragment counts are often divided by gene length, such that final quantifications reflect transcript numbers rather than transcript weight (nucleotide numbers). In addition to dividing by sequencing depth and transcript length, we also evaluated quantile normalization, which forces the count distributions for each sample towards a common averaged distribution (4, 8).

The effects of the different normalization procedures on the simulated data of Fig. 4C are shown in Fig. 5, A–F. In the distribution plots in Fig. 5A raw counts have been divided by the empirically determined number of aligning fragments per sample (in millions), as well as by the transcript length (in kilobases), yielding FPKM normalized values. At high expression levels, this results in better alignment of the distributions than in the realistic simulated data (Fig. 4C). Using a robust estimator of the sequencing depth (in this case, the DESeq library size estimate), similarly shaped distributions overlap slightly worse than with FPKM, especially at the highest dilutions (Fig. 5B). Finally, quantile normalization dramatically alters the distributions to yield almost perfect alignment at high expression values, but poor alignment at low expression (Fig. 5C).

Figure 5, D–F, offers an alternative view of the effects of normalization on the simulated data, showing that some bias still remains in the data after normalization. The magnitude of this bias can be quantified by taking the mean absolute deviation for all samples and genes (see MATERIALS AND METHODS). Since the simulated data are intended to reflect perfect technical replicates, the theoretical lower limit and desired result of this measure is 0 (corresponding to horizontal straight lines at deviation 0 in Fig. 5, D–F). If all detected transcripts are taken into consideration, the mean overall deviation is 0.21, 0.19, or 0.10 for FPKM, robust, and quantile normalization, respectively. If only the top 1,000 genes by expression are considered, the overall deviations are 0.02, 0.19, and 0.03, respectively, reflecting the good alignment of FPKM and quantile trend curves with the deviation = 0 line at high expression and

---

Fig. 4. Replication of distribution bias using synthetic data. A: in silico linear amplification and sequencing of samples diluted up to 1,000× recapitulates the count distribution pattern observed for the real data (Fig. 3B). These samples were processed assuming a mild bias (K_m = 1). B: exponential amplification with a mild bias, as well as linear amplification with a stronger bias (K_m = 10) produced similarly shaped distributions. Exponential amplification assuming a strong bias (K_m = 10) produces a very different distribution pattern (yellow dotted line). C: realistic counts, based on linear amplification with a mild bias, for 6 samples: 2 undiluted, 2 diluted 10×, and 2 diluted 100×. In addition, the sequencing depth was varied randomly between 0.8 and 1.2 × 10^7 fragments.
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We quantified the effects of normalization for several additional combinations of samples (Fig. 6), ranging from no amplification bias at all to a scenario involving extreme exponential amplification bias (see Fig. 4B). If no bias is present, only the effects of sequencing depth need to be mitigated by normalization, and the residual deviation is very low for every procedure (it is not zero because of the Poisson sampling noise added to each sample). If moderate to severe bias is present, the five methods evaluated produce very different results, with FPKM generally very poor at low expression levels (all genes) but surprisingly best if only the highest expressed genes are considered. In contrast, robust estimators (DESeq-like, TMM, and UQ) perform poorly especially for the most abundant transcripts. Quantile normalization results in the least overall residual bias, and only slightly more bias than FPKM at high expression levels.

Normalization and bias correction on real data. Figure 7 illustrates the effects of the different normalization procedures on the real samples. The distribution plots of Fig. 7A demonstrate better alignment of FPKM normalized samples at high expression levels than we observed in the raw data (Fig. 3B), similar to the situation observed for the simulated data (Fig. 5A). Using a robust estimator of the sequencing depth results in similarly shaped distributions (Fig. 7B). However, the alignment of juvenile samples 2 and 3 with the other samples is poor. As well as for the synthetic data, quantile normalization dramatically alters the distributions to yield perfect alignment at high expression values for the real samples, but no alignment at low expression (Fig. 7C). Two additional normalization procedures, scaling by the TMM and UQ estimates of library size, yielded results very similar to robust normalization (data not shown). Figure 7, D–F, provides an alternative view of the effects of normalization and resembles the bias pattern observed for the simulated data (Fig. 5, D–F). We obtained essentially the same results when using the alternative (RSEM) fragment counts as input for normalization (not shown).

The variation in expression values between FPKM and quantile normalization can largely be explained by the different methods of correcting for transcript length (Fig. 8).
rection was applied to the NOISeqBIO data, as it is not clear whether this is possible or necessary (7, 33).

Testing correction was applied to the NOISeqBIO data, as it is not clear whether this is possible or necessary (7, 33).

DISCUSSION

In the current study, we have utilized a transgenic line of medaka where expression of Gfp is under control of the lhb promoter (9) to isolate pure and healthy populations of lhb-expressing gonadotropes for RNA-Seq. In all samples, the expression levels for gfp and lhb rank firmly among the most highly expressed genes, indicating that cell selection was invariably successful (shown in Fig. 8A). The very high gfp expression is consistent with the excessive levels of fluorescence observed for selected cells (Fig. 2C). In turn, lhb also exhibits similarly high expression levels and demonstrates that this cell population does indeed allocate considerable resources to hormone production.

The samples studied here are atypical input for an RNA-Seq analysis. Both the low amounts of RNA and the nature of endocrine tissue (certain hormone encoding transcripts are assumed to be overrepresented) may result in unexpected biases in the data, which, if not noticed, may have substantial effects on the subsequent biological interpretation. We therefore analyzed the resulting data in detail and attempted to correct any technical artifacts and biological biases with careful application of bioinformatics normalization procedures. These are intended to make expression values comparable both between samples and between genes (within samples).
amplification method, the Ovation RNA-Seq amplification system, has been shown to perform equally well or even better than other amplification systems (1). Although the Ovation system provides high reproducibility and generates relatively few ribosomal RNA reads (1, 19, 35, 37), it does still yield substantially larger fractions of reads of nongenic origin (~60% of total aligned reads, (19, 35) and Table 2). This is presumably caused by the Ovation RNA-Seq protocol that does not select for polyadenylated RNA, and consequently the majority of the reads originate from other sources than mRNA. However, the “intergenic” fraction of the transcriptome may also be exaggerated by expression from nonannotated parts of the genome. For instance, 7.0–16.1% of all aligned reads map to a single scaffold (scaffold2480), predominantly next to annotated mitochondrial genes. The effect of “extragenic” read alignment is compensated for by the vast amounts of reads produced by Illumina sequencing (Table 1).

Observations of reduced quality encountered in the first 10 nucleotides of the reads are also likely to have been introduced by the Ovation RNA-Seq amplification procedure and were removed from further analysis. Similar observations have also been reported by others that described the presence of Ovation RNA-Seq SPIA primer in the beginning of the reads (19).

Examination of the average coverage along the transcripts revealed that the samples showed a higher coverage toward the 3'-end of the transcript (Fig. 3A). Other studies have also reported that the Ovation RNA-Seq system produces a bias toward an increased coverage at the 3'-end, and it has been suggested that this bias could be due to the use of oligo(dT) primers in addition to random primers during first-strand cDNA synthesis (1, 29, 35). In an earlier pilot experiment with regular Illumina library preparation without amplification, we did not observe this effect (data not shown), suggesting that the bias is a technical artifact associated with the Ovation system, rather than the product of biological influences or sample handling procedures. In addition, the magnitude of the effect differs between samples, while no straightforward correlation can be observed with other sequencing or alignment statistics (Tables 1 and 2), with the possible exception of GC nucleotide content of aligned sequences. If left uncorrected, this bias will lead to overestimation of the abundance of very short transcripts and underestimation of the abundance of long transcripts. We have applied a procedure (R package cqn) that attempts to correct for this bias by establishing an empirical relationship between annotated transcript length and expression level. Compared with noncorrected data, this results in

Fig. 7. The effects of normalization on juvenile and adult medaka pituitary samples. Postnormalization density distributions (A–C) and deviation plots (D–F) are analogous to Fig. 5, with the effects of FPKM (A, D), robust (B, E) and quantile (C, F) shown. In D–F, deviation is plotted relative to the condition mean (juvenile or adult), rather than to the overall mean.
higher expression levels for longer transcripts (Fig. 8, B–D), although a structural bias toward lower expression remains (Fig. 8D). More importantly, however, the magnitude of the bias appears to be equalized between samples. Depending on downstream normalization procedures, in noncorrected data, the outlier sample (adult) 2 receives consistently deviating expression values (Fig. 7). The cqn procedure always includes quantile normalization (8), and therefore the correction was not applied in combination with scaling normalization.

A possible concern when sequencing from very small amounts of RNA is the uniqueness of the resulting amplified fragments. If the original RNA pool contained a small number of molecules relative to the number that have eventually been sequenced, this will distort expression values. Final library complexity may be further impaired by preferential amplification of highly abundant species. As a result, at low input complexity, rare transcripts (from genes with low expression) may be missing from the amplified library altogether. As a measure of this complexity, we have counted the number of genes that was detected in every sample (Table 2). Especially juvenile samples 2 and 3 appear to be less complex than the adult samples. This is likely caused by the extremely low amounts of input RNA in these two samples, which also show an aberrant distribution of fragment counts (Fig. 3B).

To exclude that these patterns are the result of the particular bioinformatics procedures used up to this point, we performed the alignment and quantification in duplicate, using two independent methods: alignment to a genomic reference using Tophat followed by counting using HTSeq, as well as alignment to a reference transcriptome and subsequent counting using RSEM. In both cases, we counted fragments (read pairs) rather than reads and used the total fragment count as the library size during all subsequent normalization procedures. This choice results in expression values that are robust in the presence of low-quality second reads. Both quantification methods yielded very similar results, demonstrating that the choice of quantification method did not have a major influence.

It is not immediately clear that juvenile samples 2 and 3 can actually be compared with the other samples. We therefore investigated whether residual structural bias exists at the gene level after each normalization procedure. If samples are intrinsically comparable, it is expected that on average this bias is close to zero (i.e., expression of specific genes will differ little between replicates). The effects of the different normalization procedures on the simulated data (Fig. 5) displays a similar expression pattern to the observed pattern in the real samples (Fig. 7). FPKM normalization results in better alignment of the distributions than in the synthetic and real raw count data (Fig. 7). FPKM normalization results in better alignment of the distributions than in the synthetic and real raw count data. While robust normalization has a slightly worse effect on the distributions than FPKM, Quantile normalization outperforms all other normalization methods both for the simulated and the real data. Here, the distributions are dramatically altered to yield close to perfect alignment at high expression values, at the expense of poor alignment at low expression (Figs. 5C and 7C). In Fig. 7, D–F, for each sample, the local regression line illustrates the trend of deviation of gene expression values from the condition mean. Except at very low expression values, variation is not higher for juvenile samples 2 and 3, demon-
Demonstrating that all juvenile samples are indeed bona fide biological replicates and do not reflect fundamentally different transcriptomic states.

Interestingly, the scaling normalization procedures that make the explicit assumption that samples are comparable (robust DESeq-like, Fig. 7, B and E) result in the strongest residual biases. TMM and UQ scaling estimates yielded results very similar to robust scaling (Fig. 6). FPKM is vulnerable to the presence of a few very highly expressed genes (5, 25), which may be expected in endocrine tissue (2), but it outperforms all other scaling estimates (Fig. 6). On the real data, quantile normalization performs best at medium to high expression values, but worst at low expression (Fig. 7, C and F).

Fig. 9. The effect of biases on differential expression. Every normalization procedure handles sample biases differently, which ultimately affects differential expression. From left to right, the effect of FPKM, robust, and quantile normalization are shown. All plots share a common x-axis (expression values). A: deviation plots indicate that sample-specific biases result in reduced reproducibility. For both conditions, the deviation trend from the mean expression value is shown (computed by loess local regression). Here, deviation is defined as the mean expression for a gene in a condition divided by its mean expression over all samples. Shaded areas indicate 95% confidence intervals. Differential expression between juveniles and adults, as determined by edgeR (B) or NOISeq (C). Shaded areas represent the fraction on genes at a certain expression level called differentially expressed at P < 0.05. In red, genes significantly higher expressed in juvenile; in cyan, genes significantly higher expressed in adults. Venn diagrams showing differentially expressed genes found by edgeR (D) and NOISeq (E) for the 3 different normalization methods (FPKM, robust, and quantile). Genes exhibiting higher expression in adults than in juveniles are upregulated (cyan), while lower expressed genes in adults than in juveniles are considered downregulated (red).
find that quantile normalization often performs much better than any other procedure, with the exception of FPKM for high expression levels (Fig. 6). The resulting expression values after each procedure are analogous to FPKM, where an FPKM of 1–3 has been shown to very approximately correspond to one transcript per cell for specific cell types (22).

The good performance of quantile normalization on simulated biased data can be explained by the nature of the amplification bias. If the bias is assumed to be the result of lower amplification efficiencies for rare transcript species (3), the net effect will be lower count values for these species, but no change in expression rank. Quantile normalization, in turn, acts on these ranks and assumes that the same rank belongs to the same expression level for every sample. In the case of amplification bias, the net result is similar to scaling by a different factor for every expression level, instead of by a single factor for all transcripts.

Finally, we evaluated two fundamentally different methods of determining whether genes are differentially expressed between conditions (Fig. 9). We only tested the 8,501 genes with expression levels above a threshold (see MATERIALS AND METHODS), which approximately translates to the set of genes in which 99% of fragments align (Table 2). This threshold is still too liberal, as differential gene expression is strongly influenced by structural biases that emerge below expression levels of ~5–10 (Fig. 9). Below these levels, therefore, quantified gene expression should be interpreted with caution, and qualitative rather than quantitative (e.g., “detected” instead of “higher than”). At higher expression levels, both differential expression methods find modest amounts of differential expression. edgeR appears less affected by the expression level, whereas NOISeq clearly detects more differential expression at high expression levels (Fig. 9C). The juvenile/adult symmetry in differential expression is more even with NOISeq, as edgeR has a strong preference for either stage at different expression levels (Fig. 9, B–E). Due to very limited sample availability it was not yet possible for us to verify any differentially expressed genes by qPCR. Care should therefore be taken when interpreting biological significance of the differentially expressed genes between the different methods.

In summary, this study reveals that the biases associated with low amounts of input RNA can have a strong and detrimental effect on downstream analyses. A very common RNA-Seq pipeline includes robust normalization and edgeR differential expression analysis, a combination that on our data yields improbable results (Fig. 9B, middle panel). However, using both synthetic and real data we demonstrate that quantile normalization, a procedure standard for microarrays but not common for RNA-Seq, is an effective remedy that compensates for the effects of large differences in sequencing library complexity. Following normalization, we found that differential expression testing was most optimal with NOISeq. The strategy outlined here to examine specific cells by RNA-Seq data from low input yields highly reproducible results, which is essential for their use in differential expression studies. These technical optimizations provide a solid basis for further detailed study focusing on the regulatory processes in these cells. Furthermore, this specific computational pipeline will be beneficial for other researchers working with low input material for RNA-Seq.
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