

Methodologies for Structural Variant detection

Fritz Sedlazeck

May,17, 2023



Sedlazeck lab: Overview



Algorithms

Sniffles2 (in review)
TRGT (in review)
Read2Tree (2023)
Truvari (2022)

STIX (2022)
Parliament2 (2020)
Paragraph (2019)
NextGenMap-LR +Sniffles (2018)



Benchmarking

Tandem Repeats (in work)

Medical genes (2022)

SNV Benchmarks (2022)

SV diversity (2021)

SV Benchmark (2020)



Comprehensive genomics

LPA diversity (in review)

Rapid ONT (2022)

Human Genome (2022)

Forensic STR (2022)




Population


ADSP
CCDG
Topmed

Han Chinese
AllOfUs
CARD
SMAHT
UAE

Early 2000s dogma: SNPs account for most human genetic variation




Segmental duplications (a.k.a. Low copy repeats)



Self Dotplot:
10 megabases of Chr 15
(dot = 1 kb exact match)


~5% of the human genome is duplicated!

Variation in genome structure. So-called "structural variation" (SV)




SV is a superset of copy number variation (CNV). Not all structural changes affect copy number (e.g., inversions)!

Our understanding of structural variation is driven by technology




1940s - 1980s

Cytogenetics / Karyotyping



1990s

CGH / FISH /
SKY / COBRA



2000s

Genomic microarrays
BAC-aCGH / oligo-aCGH


Today
High throughput
DNA sequencing




Why are structural variations relevant / important?

- They are common and affect a large fraction of the genome
- They are a major driver of genome evolution

Evolution





Genomic Disorders




Why are structural variations relevant / important?

- Genetic basis of traits




Outline


1. CNV analysis
2. SVs analysis
 1. Assembly based
 2. Short reads
 3. Long reads




Humans differ by roughly 3,000 deletions
($\geq 500\text{bp}$)



Humans differ by a few hundred duplications



Copy-number Profiles



Ginkgo

<http://qb.cshl.edu/ginkgo>



Interactive Single Cell CNV analysis & clustering


- Easy-to-use, web interface, parameterized for binning, segmentation, clustering, etc
- Per cell through project-wide analysis in any species

Compare MDA, DOP-PCR, and MALBAC

- DOP-PCR shows superior resolution and consistency

Available for collaboration

- Analyzing CNVs with respect to different clinical outcomes
- Extending clustering methods, prototyping scRNA




Interactive analysis and assessment of single-cell copy-number variations.

Garvin T, Aboukhalil R, Kendall J, Baslan T, Atwal GS, Hicks J, Wigler M, Schatz MC

(2015) Nature Methods doi:10.1038/nmeth.3578

Data are noisy




Potential for biases at every step

- WGA: Non-uniform amplification
- Library Preparation: Low complexity, read duplications, barcoding
- Sequencing: GC artifacts, short reads
- Computation: mappability, GC correction, segmentation, tree building

Coverage is too sparse and noisy for SNP analysis

-> Requires special processing

1. Binning




CNV analysis

- Divide the genome into “bins” with $\sim 50 - 100$ reads / bin
- Map the reads and count reads per bin

Use uniquely mappable bases to establish bins

1. Binning




CNV analysis

- Divide the genome into “bins” with $\sim 50 - 100$ reads / bin
- Map the reads and count reads per bin

Use uniquely mappable bases to establish bins

1. Binning




CNV analysis

- Divide the genome into “bins” with ~50 – 100 reads / bin
- Map the reads and count reads per bin


Use uniquely mappable bases to establish bins

2. Normalization




Also correct for mappability, GC content, amplification biases


3. Segmentation



Circular Binary Segmentation (CBS)



4. Estimating Copy Number




$$CN = \operatorname{argmin} \left\{ \sum_{i,j} (\hat{Y}_{i,j} - Y_{i,j})^2 \right\}$$



Using Nanopore MinION: CNV karyotyping.




Nanopore sequencing for CNV detection




SKBR3 cell line CNV Analysis




SID97277 - partial chromosomal deletions



SID97277 karyotype




SID97279 – trisomy 6, 15, 22 and deletions in chr11



CNV detection summary

- Advantages
 - Less coverage is required
 - -> Applications such as single cell sequencing
- Disadvantages
 - Resolution of events
 - usually in the multi kbp
 - Only deletions and duplications
 - Coverage biases in short reads




Assembly based

1. De novo assembly
2. Genomic alignment (WGA)
3. Detangle the genomic alignment to identify variants.

Ingredients for a good assembly


Coverage



High coverage is required

- Oversample the genome to ensure every base is sequenced with long overlaps between reads
- Biased coverage will also fragment assembly


Read Length



Reads & mates must be longer than the repeats

- Short reads will have **false overlaps** forming hairball assembly graphs
- With long enough reads, assemble entire chromosomes into contigs

Quality



Errors obscure overlaps

- Reads are assembled by finding kmers shared in pair of reads
- High error rate requires very short seeds, increasing complexity and forming assembly hairballs


Current challenges in *de novo* plant genome sequencing and assembly

Schatz MC, Witkowski, McCombie, WR (2012) *Genome Biology*. 12:243

Goal of WGA

- For two genomes, A and B , find a mapping from each position in A to its corresponding position in B


CCGGTAGGCTATTAAACGGGGTGAGGAGCGTTGGCATAGCA



CCGGTAGGCTATTAAACGGGGTGAGGAGCGTTGGCATAGCA

Not so fast...

- Genome A may have insertions, deletions, translocations, inversions, duplications or SNPs with respect to B (sometimes all of the above)




WGA visualization

- How can we visualize *whole* genome alignments?



- With an alignment dot plot

- $N \times M$ matrix

- Let i = position in genome A
 - Let j = position in genome B
 - Fill cell (i,j) if A_i shows similarity to B_j




- A perfect alignment between A and B would completely fill the positive diagonal




Insertion into Reference

R: AIB
Q: AB




Insertion into Query

R: AB
Q: AIB




Collapse Query

R: ARRB
Q: ARB



Collapse Reference


R: ARB
Q: ARRB



Collapse Query
w/ Insertion

R: ARIRB
Q: ARB


Exact tandem
alignment if I=R



Collapse Reference
w/ Insertion


R: ARB
Q: ARIRB

Exact tandem
alignment if I=R




Collapse Query

R: ARRRB
Q: ARRB




Collapse Reference

R: ARRB
Q: ARRRB




Inversion

R: ABC
Q: AB'C



Rearrangement
w/ Disagreement

R: ABCDE
Q: AFCBE



- Different structural variation types / misassemblies will be apparent by their pattern of breakpoints
- Most breakpoints will be at or near repeats
- Things quickly get complicated in real genomes


Question: 1

Can an assembly detect all SVs in a diploid genome?




Assembly based detection summary

- Advantages
 - Enables the detection of every event
 - Good quality for insertions
- Disadvantages
 - Genomic alignment is challenging.
 - Heterozygous events are likely missed.



Exercise Part1: Fun with assembly

- *Cryptosporidium parvum*: Interesting parasite infect ~7.6%.
 - 8 chromosomes
 - ~9.2 Mbp genome size
- Sequenced with Illumina & ONT
- Go to **Part 1**:
https://github.com/fritzsedlazeck/teaching_material




Fully resolved assembly of *Cryptosporidium parvum*



Vipin K. Menon^{1,*,} Pablo C. Okhuysen^{2,} Cynthia L. Chappell^{3,} Medhat Mahmoud^{1,} Medhat Mahmoud^{1,} Qingchang Meng^{1,} Harsha Doddapaneni^{1,} Vanesa Vee^{1,} Yi Han^{1,} Sejal Salvi^{1,} Sravya Bhamidipati^{1,} Kavya Kottapalli^{1,} George Weissenberger^{1,} Hua Shen^{1,} Matthew C. Ross^{4,} Kristi L. Hoffman^{4,} Sara Javornik Cregeen^{4,} Donna M. Muzny^{1,} Ginger A. Metcalf^{1,} Richard A. Gibbs^{1,} Joseph F. Petrosino⁴ and Fritz J. Sedlazeck^{1,*}

GigaScience, 2022, 11, 1–8
DOI: 10.1093/gigascience/giac010
DATANOTE

How to detect Structural Variations




Looking for "discordant" paired-end fragments



Sequence alignment “signals” for structural variation


1. Align DNA sequences from sample to human reference genome

2. Look for evidence of structural differences





A probabilistic framework for SV discovery



Lumpy integrates paired-end mapping, split-read mapping, and depth of coverage for better SV discovery accuracy

Problem #1: Often many false positives

- Short reads + heuristic alignment + rep. genome = **systematic alignment artifacts (false calls)**
- Chimeras and duplicate molecules
- Ref. genome errors (e.g., gaps, mis-assemblies)
- **ALL SV mapping studies use strict filters for above**

Problem #2: The false negative rate is also typically high

- Most current datasets have low to moderate ***physical*** coverage due to small insert size (~10-20X)
- Breakpoints are enriched in repetitive genomic regions that pose problems for sensitive read alignment
- FILTERING!
- The false negative rate is usually hard to measure, but is thought to be extremely high for most paired-end mapping studies (>30%)
- When searching for spontaneous mutations in a family or a tumor/normal comparison, a false negative call in one sample can be a false positive somatic or de novo call in another.

How to filter / choose the SV caller?

- Each method applies its own heuristics.

Method	# Sim. SV	avg FDR	avg Sensitivity
DELLY	33-198	0.13	0.75
LUMPY	33-198	0.06	0.62
Pindel	33-198	0.04	0.55
SURVIVOR	33-198	0.01	0.70

Question: 2

What is the difference between a CNV and SV duplication?



Exercise Part 2: Short read based

- Utilize short read mapping to call SV
 - We will use Manta
- Go to: Part 2
https://github.com/fritzsedlazeck/teaching_material
 - Remember files are also available locally

PacBio / ONT sequencer



Advantage:

- Long reads,

Disadvantage:

- Throughput/yield
- Costs
- High error rates

Long Read Technologies

- (+) SVs in repetitive regions
 - (+) Span SVs
 - (+) Uniform coverage
 - (+) Can identify more complex SVs
-
- (-) Higher seq. error rate
 - (-) Hard to align




Mapping challenges

BWA-MEM:



NGMLR:



Mapping challenges

BWA-MEM:



NGMLR:



3.2 NA12878


- Healthy female
- Gold standard in genomics
- Sequenced with many technologies independently:
 - Illumina, PacBio, Oxford Nanopore

3.2 NA12878: Deletion calling


Tech.	Cov.	Avg len	SVs	DEL	DUP	INV	INS	TRA
PacBio	55x	4,334	22,877	9,933	162	611	12,052	119
Oxford Nanopore	28x	6,432	32,409	27,147	87	323	4,809	43
Oxford Nanopore @Baylor	34x	4,982	12,596	7,102	169	113	5,166	46
Illumina	50x	2 x 101	7,275	3,744	731	553	0	2,247

3.2 NA12878: check 2,247 vs 119 TRA

Overlap	Illumina TRA(%)
Translocations	7.74
Insertions	53.05
Deletions	12.06
Duplications	0.57
Nested	0.31
High coverage	1.87
Low complexity	9.79
Explained	85.40




NA12878: check 2,247 TRA



Illumina data


PacBio data

ONT data



Question: 3


What are the problems of long reads?



Exercise Part 3: Long read based

- Utilize Oxford Nanopore Technology to identify SV
 - We will use Sniffles v2
- Go to: part 3&4
https://github.com/fritzsedlazeck/teaching_material
 - Files are also available locally. If you don't find a file I have included download links.

Sniffles2: Genome in a Bottle (GIAB) Benchmark








- Sniffles2 outperforms current methods in accuracy & speed
- Coverage-adaptive: Stable performance across sequencing coverages



Sniffles2: GIAB benchmark

A. Default parameters:
Sniffles2 strongly outperforms at low & medium coverages

A. Optimized parameters for other callers:
Sniffles2 default remains most accurate & fastest



Challenging Medical Genes



For the CMRG benchmark, Sniffles2 was the **most accurate and fastest** caller. In comparison:

- ... to the 2nd most accurate (*cuteSV*), Sniffles2 was **~10x** as fast (CPU time)
- ... to the 2nd fastest (*svim*), Sniffles2 was **>15%** more accurate (genotype F1)

New Applications in SV detection

1. Germline SV
2. **Population scale**

[nature](#) > [nature reviews genetics](#) > [review articles](#) > [article](#)


Review Article | [Published: 28 May 2021](#)

Towards population-scale long-read sequencing

[Wouter De Coster](#), [Matthias H. Weissensteiner](#) & [Fritz J. Sedlazeck](#) 

→ Population-level SV detection studies?

Fig. 1: Overview of population-scale studies using long-read sequencing.



New Applications in SV detection

1. Germline SV
2. Population scale


1. Somatic SVs and human disease:

- Cancer drivers (subclonal level)
- Neurodegenerative disorders -
accounting for missing heritability?

Review

Somatic mutations in neurodegeneration: An update


Christos Proukakis




Somatic SVs in Multiple System Atrophy (MSA)

- **MSA:** Rare neurodegenerative disorder (Synucleinopathy) → progressive Autonomic dysfunction, Parkinsonism-like symptoms
- **Data:** Deep long-read sequencing (>55x) of regional brain sample
- **Sniffles2 Non-germline mode** → capture rare SVs missed by both Illumina (too large) and optical mapping/Bionano (too small).

in collaboration with Christos Proukakis (UCL)



*Sniffles2 recovered mosaic deletion in KCNIP4
(Interactor of neuronal voltage gated potassium channels)*



Thank you

- SV calling is SNP calling of 2009/10
 - Reads are typically shorter than the allele
 - Lot of noise in the data
-
- Contact me if you are interested:
Fritz.Sedlazeck@bcm.edu

