# Supplementary information



## **Supplementary section 1. Sample status definition**

<span id="page-1-0"></span>In this work, all described samples from stable-state or exacerbation visits correspond to samples classified as **ST**/**EX**, on the basis of the following information and definitions.

Sample status was defined as a function of the patient's chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD) status at stable-state or exacerbation visits (see Supplementary Fig. 1):

- **ST**: Sample collected at monthly visits when the patient had stable COPD symptoms. The patient had not experienced an exacerbation within at least 1 week after and 4 weeks before sample collection, and one stable visit after recovery.
- **EX**: Sample collected when the patient visited the hospital due to the onset of an acute exacerbation.
- **SR**: Sample collected at the first monthly visit after recovery from acute exacerbation.
- **SE**: Sample collected at monthly visits when the patient was stable and an acute exacerbation occurred within a week after the monthly visit.
- **NR**: Sample collected at monthly visits but patient has not yet recovered from exacerbation.

## **Supplementary Fig. 1: Sample status as function of collection time and COPD status at visit.**



<span id="page-1-1"></span>COPD, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease.

## **Supplementary section 2. Microarrays Quality Control (QC) metrics**

The following microarray quality assessment combined metrics were used during the QC step to accept microarrays:

- Scaling factor  $(SF) \le 11$
- 49.12  $\leq$  Percent of presence (PP)  $\leq$  60.04
- Glyceraldehyde 3-phosphate dehydrogenase ratio  $\leq 2.5$

Using those criteria, 585 microarrays, corresponding to 112 patients, passed the QC thresholds, while microarrays from 111 samples did not pass and where excluded from further analysis. A summary of the final set of microarrays passing QC is given in Supplementary Table 1.

**Supplementary Table 1. Number of patients and time points with whole blood samples and number of microarrays passing QC thresholds.**



QC, quality control.

# <span id="page-2-0"></span>**Supplementary section 3. Multi-network gene community detection (MNGCD) network layers modelling**

We considered in each of the five networks only the 2657 common nodes among all layers and applied the Infomap algorithm for a multiplex, using the default parameters<sup>[1](#page-30-1)</sup>. MNGCD was applied by modelling different layers of gene interactions. The layers integrated in a multi-network stack of layers were:

- A gene co-expression network by a weighted correlation network analysis method (WGCNA[\)2](#page-30-2) between genes among the samples in the selected group/condition. The edge weight between genes *i* and *j* was defined as:  $w_{ij} = |cor_{ij}|^t$  where cor<sub>*ij*</sub> is the Pearson correlation between the expression vectors of the genes *i* and *j*; *t* is a scale parameter chosen to reach a power-law distribution of the node degree of the network layer;
- A Gaussian radial basis function (RBF) kernel transformation as similarity measure derived as decreasing function of the Euclidean distance ("RBF expression similarity network"), where genes with a close level of expression had a high weight w of their edge:  $w_{ij} =$  $\exp(-\gamma ||x_i - x_j||^2)$ , where  $x_i$  and  $x_j$  were expressions of the genes *i* and *j* among the samples in the selected group/condition;  $\gamma$  is a scaling factor identified when the node degree of the network reaches a power law distribution (similar to the WGCNA approach). The number of edges in each of the two expression layers was around 7.0 million;
- A transcription factor co-targeting network, defined from ENCODE experimentally validated interactions<sup>[3](#page-30-3)</sup>. These data were assessed by chromatin immunoprecipitation and highthroughput sequencing (ChIP-seq) for data sets corresponding to 119 different transcription factors in five main cell lines (K562, GM12878, HeLa-S3, H1-hESC and HepG2). In these experiments available from ENCODE database, the largest portion of the transcription factors were canonical sequence-specific factors, a smaller portion gathered POL2 and other basal transcription factors, while the remaining was made up of factors manipulating chromatin. According to the ENCODE database design, the interactions between transcription factors and genes happened in regions of the genome proximal (within  $\pm 2.5$  kilobases) to the annotated gene transcription start site. We built our transcription factor co-regulating network: nodes were the genes and those regulated by at least one transcription factor were connected. The weight of the link between gene *i* and gene *j* was the number of regulators in common. The number of edges in the transcription factor co-targeting network layer was 6.8 million.
- A microRNA co-targeting network, where the weight of each edge between genes was the number of common microRNAs that regulated them. This information was inferred from experimentally-validated interactions by different assays and collected in miRTarBase database release  $7.0<sup>4</sup>$  $7.0<sup>4</sup>$  $7.0<sup>4</sup>$ . The number of edges in the microRNA co-targeting network layer was 2.1 million.

• A binary human protein-protein interaction network based only on experimentally validated interactions taken from the public database APID (Agile Proteins Interactomes DataServer)<sup>[5](#page-30-5)</sup>. The number of edges in the protein-protein interaction network layer was around 23,000.

With respect to the usual approach<sup>6</sup>[,](#page-30-6) in this integrative analysis, we introduced an innovative method defining two layers of interactions based on the gene expression levels to model two very distinct behaviors of genes across the samples. The first layer tends to cluster genes with correlated signals, the second with similar level of expression. The same network layers, moreover, did not introduce any filter on the weight of the links.

The community detection therefore aimed to detect the communities in each multi-network, defined as groups of vertices among which a random walker, with transition probability depending on the weight of their edges, circulated easily and rapidly<sup>7</sup>. The Infomap algorithm explores the multinetwork by a random walk through the multi-layers, allowing the detection of disjoint communities. Because of the stochasticity of the procedure, we introduced a robustness step assessment by repeating the algorithm for multiple seeds (100). We then computed a final consensus clustering<sup>8</sup>, made up of communities of genes out of a set of stochastic partitions. Therefore, we assessed if genes in each community over-represented specific biological functions, embodied in annotated gene sets; this evaluation was done by the hypergeometric test. The universe was made up of the 2657 common nodes among all layers while the foreground genes were those ones in each community. The p-values of the hypergeometric enrichment were corrected by Benjamini-Hochberg method (significance p<0.01). For multiple communities enriched with the same gene set, we considered the minimum pvalue. Moreover, for greater confidence in the detected communities, the only enrichments results kept were those detected in the consensus clustering with a rate higher than 80%, iterating the entire algorithm 20 times. Finally, p-values of all the iterations were then log averaged.

#### <span id="page-4-0"></span>**Scripts execution flow**

The execution environment is a Unix HPC with *slurm* parallel execution queue manager, Infomap and R are required. Here we report a description of the executed code to run Infomap and the enrichment analysis of the identified gene communities (scripts available at https://github.com/muzzial1/MNGCD for COPD).

1. Run the following bash scripts in the following order after changing in each script the line *for j in (ls -1d output\_\*vero)* replacing the term *output\_\*vero* with the name of the file to analyse:

a) ./*execallt.sh* generates 100 partitions using Infomap:

- it executes *perparcopy2.sh*, which in turn runs *stability\_sb2.R* 20 times in parallel.

- *stability* sb2.R calls *myscript* varifile copy cal.sh, which executes Infomap 100 times with different seeds for each iteration.

- Seeds also vary across the 20 invocations of *perparcopy2.sh*.

b) ./*execallt\_cons.sh* calculates the consensus on the 100 partitions:

- It executes *perparconsensi\_v2.sh*, which runs *stabilityperconsenso\_v2.R* 20 times in parallel.

- *stabilityperconsenso\_v2.R* calculates the consensus as follows:

- A for loop is executed, starting with the 100 partitions generated by Infomap.

- In each iteration, *generoperconsenso\_cal.sh* is called.

- The process continues until all generated partitions are identical, producing the consensus matrix.

c) *lexecallt arr.sh* (with argument h or c3 or c5 or BTM, depending on the gene-set collection to use for the enrichment of communities).

d) ./*execallt\_pval.sh* (with argument h or c3 or c5 or BTM, depending on the gene-set collection to use for the enrichment of communities).

e) ./*alltabs.sh* (with argument h or c3 or c5 or BTM, depending on the gene-set collection to use for the enrichment of communities).

2. In the folder final result in the folder prova nmi/output nameofthemultinetwork is the final result (functions enriched in each community with their rate) for the gene set collection selected.

#### <span id="page-6-0"></span>**Supplementary section 4. Differentially expressed genes (DEGs) analysis**

#### <span id="page-6-1"></span>**Gene expression analysis models**

DEGs were assessed using the Limma (Linear models for microarrays data) modelling approach<sup>9</sup> with False Discovery Rate (FDR) threshold of 0.05 and Fold Change (FC) threshold of 2 ( $|log_2 FC| >$ 1).

Different types of Limma models were applied according to the biological question and sample status.

#### **Model 1: Stability of gene expression profile with time in COPD stable conditions**

Gene expression  $\sim$  Group + Age + Gender + COPD status + BMI + Run

For seasonality Group, three models were considered with regards to associations to:

- $\circ$  High/low season, with *Group* = (High season, Low season)
- $\circ$  Season, with *Group* = (Summer, Fall, Winter, Spring)
- $\circ$  Month, with *Group* = (January, February, March, April, May, June, July, August, September, October, November, December)

*BMI* represents the subject body mass index (available only for this comparison at stable condition visits).

*Run* represents the experimental analysis batch, a variable that we considered in all the analyses. In fact, the samples were grouped in 3 sets and processed in consecutive batches.

#### **Model 2: Comparison of acute exacerbations of COPD (AECOPD) and stable COPD**

Gene expression  $\sim$  Group + High/Low season + Age + Gender + COPD status + Run

With  $Group = (ST, EX)$ 

#### **Model 3: Comparison of infections, pooling samples at stable and exacerbation visits**

Gene expression  $\sim$  Group + GRP + Season + Age + Gender + COPD status + Run

Where  $Group = (ST, EX)$  and

*GRP* indicates the type of infection in the studied group (e.g. if we compare the presence of a pathogen versus (vs) its absence, the variable GRP is 0 for absence and 1 for presence).

#### **Model 4: Comparison of infections, samples at stable or exacerbation visits only**

#### Gene expression  $\sim$  GRP + Season + Age + Gender + COPD status + Run

Where *GRP* indicates the type of infection in the studied group (e.g. if we compare the presence of a pathogen vs its absence, the variable GRP is 0 for absence and 1 for presence).

We also ran in parallel for each comparison the gene set enrichment analysis (GSEA) on all the transcripts overcoming the interquartile range (IQR) filtering (results not shown for contrasts without DEGs, the only GSEA results reported are in section [5](#page-14-0), Supplementary information).

#### <span id="page-7-0"></span>**Stability of gene expression profile with time in COPD stable conditions**

The aim of this analysis is to assess the evolution of gene expression over time on ST samples. A uniform profile implies a stable profile over time for all patients.

Regression modelling was used to find genes highly correlated with season/month. The global linear model used was Model 1.

From the contrast performed between high and low season as well as from the different associations to High/Low season, Season and Month, there is no gene for which the expression is significantly associated to the season/month in samples taken at stable visits. Therefore, one must consider gene expression profiles are uniform across seasons/month.

However, based on literature, we decided to include seasonality (high/low season) in the models used to compare samples taken at exacerbation vs stable visits.

#### <span id="page-7-1"></span>**Comparison of AECOPD and stable COPD**

The aim of these analyses is to find a set of DEGs that differentiate exacerbation state vs stable state of patients. The global linear model used was Model 2. In addition, samples were filtered depending of the comparison performed:

- No filter (all samples, pooled)
- Paired samples within patients
- Filter on the type of infection (Bacterial, Viral, Eosinophilic in blood, Eosinophilic in sputum)
- Filter on the pathogen bacteria in sputum (*Haemophilus influenzae*, *Streptococcus pneumoniae*, *Staphylococcus aureus*, *Moraxella catarrhalis,* and *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*).

#### <span id="page-8-0"></span>*All samples*

Gene expression was compared between samples taken at exacerbation visits and samples of the same patients at the last available stable visit (paired comparison).

As gene expression in stable COPD samples is considered uniform (see section above), the comparison of AECOPD and stable COPD was also performed by contrasting all exacerbation time points (EX) to all stable time points (ST).

The comparison between AECOPD vs stable visits shows there is no evidence for genes differentially expressed between the two conditions in: pooled comparison (all ST vs all EX samples) and paired comparison (pairs ST-EX within the same patient).

### <span id="page-8-1"></span>*According to type of infection*

Gene expression was compared between samples taken at exacerbation visits and samples of the same patients by contrasting all exacerbation time points (EX) to all stable time points (ST). Samples were filtered by type of infection for the comparison.

The comparison of gene expression profiles in whole blood samples taken at exacerbation vs stable visits shows there is no evidence for genes differentially expressed between these two conditions in:

- Bacterial infections;
- Viral infections;
- Eosinophilic infections (blood and sputum).

We should note that in the contrast involving eosinophils in sputum, while the gene FAM19A1 has a significant FDR, it does not have a fold change high enough to be considered.

#### <span id="page-8-2"></span>*According to pathogen*

Gene expression was compared between samples taken at exacerbation visits and samples of the same patients by contrasting all exacerbation time points (EX) to all stable time points (ST). Samples were filtered by bacterial pathogen for the comparison.

The comparison of gene expression profiles in whole blood samples taken at exacerbation vs stable visits shows there is no evidence for genes differentially expressed between these two conditions in bacterial infections where those pathogens are present:

- *H. influenzae;*
- *S. pneumoniae;*
- *S. aureus;*
- *M. catarrhalis;*
- *P. aeruginosa*.

#### <span id="page-9-0"></span>**Comparison of infection conditions**

The aim of these analyses is to find a set of DEGs that differentiate distinct types of infections detected by PCR in the sputum samples. For instance, we compared the whole blood gene expression in presence/absence of bacteria or viruses in sputum. We performed different analyses by further selecting samples with the absence of other bacteria and/or viruses.

Moreover, we compared the whole blood gene expression for samples with only bacteria in the sputum with specimens with only viruses or only eosinophils in the sputum.

To answer questions involving infection, we applied Models 3 and 4.

Moreover, we ran several analyses for DEG using the variable  $HL$  Season and separately the Season\_variable as Season variable. These comparisons involved presence vs absence of respectively bacteria, viruses and eosinophils*.* However, we are reporting in this document the outcomes using the variable  $HL$  Season in the model.

The results of the search for DEGs associated with type of infection (bacterial vs viral vs eosinophilic) are summarized in Supplementary Table 2.



#### **Supplementary Table 2: Number of DEGs associated with type of infection.**



AECOPD, acute exacerbations of COPD; B, bacterial infection; COPD, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease; DEG, differentially-expressed genes; E, eosinophilic; NED, not enough data to perform the analysis; NS, not significant; V, viral infection; vs, versus.

As shown in supplementary Table 3, there is no significant DEG in association to co-infection occurence.



#### **Supplementary Table 3: Number of DEGs associated with type of co-infection**

AECOPD, acute exacerbations of COPD; B, bacterial infection; BE, bacterial infection with eosinophils; BV, bacterial/viral co-infection; COPD, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease; DEG, differentially-expressed genes; NED, not enough data to perform the analysis; NS, not significant; V, viral infection; VE, viral infection with eosinophils; vs, versus.

#### <span id="page-11-0"></span>**Comparison between pathogen species**

The aim of these analyses is to find a set of DEGs that differentiate distinct types of infections detected by PCR in the sputum samples. For instance, we compared the whole blood gene expression in presence/absence of a specific pathogen in sputum (e.g. *H. influenzae*). We performed different analyses by further selecting samples with the absence of other bacteria and/or viruses.

To answer questions involving infection, we applied Models 3 and 4.

Moreover, we ran several analyses for DEG using the variable HL\_Season and separately the Season variable as Season variable. These comparisons involved presence and interplay between *M. catarrhalis* and *H. influenzae.* However, we are reporting in this document the outcomes using the variable HL\_Season in the model.

As shown in supplementary Table 4, there are significant DEG in two cases. The first one is the comparison between samples with *H. influenzae* and no *M. catarrhalis* and those in the opposite condition. There are significant DEG also when comparing co-infection with *H. influenzae* and *M. catarrhalis* and those samples with their absence.

**Supplementary Table 4: Number of DEGs (FDR < 0.05) using the variable high/low (HL)**  season. The analysis [IV] uses three age categories (< 54 years, 54 years to 69 years, ≥ 70 years). The analysis [V] uses two age categories for exacerbations ( $\leq 65$  and  $\geq 65$  years).





DEG, differentially-expressed genes; FDR, false discovery rate; Hi, *Haemophilus influenzae*; Mcat, *Moraxella catarrhalis*; NED, not enough data to perform the analysis; NS, not significant; vs, versus.

#### **Supplementary section 5. Gene set enrichment analysis (GSEA)**

<span id="page-14-0"></span>For each contrast, we performed the GSEA with the genes passing IQR filtering, comparing the samples grouped by the contrast condition. In case of identification of DEGs, we also applied GSEA with the list of significant genes. Here we report the GSEA analyses corresponding to the identification of DEGs when *H. influenzae* (Hi) and *M. catarrhalis* (Mcat) infections (Supplementary tables 5 and 6) have an alternate occurrence or when they are concomitant (Supplementay tables 7 and 8). Enrichment analyses were repeated by averaging expression level when multiple probes correspond to the same gene.

**Supplementary Table 5: Global gene-wise GSEA results for the interplay of Hi and Mcat.** The rows are the biological functions from the Hallmark gene-set collection (MSigDB), each column in the table embodies a different analysis.



# $Legend:$





GSEA, gene set enrichment analysis; FDR, false discovery rate; Hi, *Haemophilus influenzae*; Mcat, *Moraxella catarrhalis*; MSigDB, molecular signatures database; vs, versus.

## **Supplementary Table 6: Gene-wise GSEA results for DEG linked to the interplay of Hi and**

**Mcat.** The rows are the biological functions from the Hallmark gene-set collection (MSigDB), each column in the table embodies a different analysis.



# $Legend:$





DEG, differentially-expressed gene; GSEA, gene set enrichment analysis; FDR, false discovery rate; Hi, *Haemophilus influenzae*; Mcat, *Moraxella catarrhalis*; MSigDB, molecular signatures database; vs, versus.

## **Supplementary Table 7: Global gene-wise GSEA results for the co-occurrence of Hi and**

**Mcat.** The rows are the biological functions from the Hallmark gene-set collection (MSigDB), each column in the table embodies a different analysis.







GSEA, Gene set enrichment analysis; EX, exacerbation; FDR, false discovery rate; Hi, *Haemophilus influenzae*; Mcat, *Moraxella catarrhalis*; MSigDB, molecular signatures database; vs, versus.

**Supplementary Table 8: Gene-wise GSEA results for DEG linked to the co-occurrence of Hi and Mcat.** The rows are the biological functions from the Hallmark gene-set collection (MSigDB), each column in the table embodies a different analysis.



# $Legend:$







DEG, differentially-expressed gene; GSEA, gene set enrichment analysis; FDR, False discovery rate; Hi, *Haemophilus influenzae*; Mcat, *Moraxella catarrhalis*; MSigDB, molecular signatures database; vs, versus.

# <span id="page-24-0"></span>**Supplementary section 6. Content of the 17 gene communities identified by MNGCD for exacerbation and stable conditions**













## **Acronyms**

<span id="page-29-0"></span>AECOPD: Acute exacerbations of COPD

BMI: Body mass index

COPD: Chronic obstructive pulmonary disease

DEG: Differentially-expressed genes

EX: Exacerbation

FC: Fold change

FDR: False discovery rate

GSEA: Gene set enrichment analysis

IQR: Interquartile range

LIMMA: Linear models for microarrays data

MNGCD: Multi-network gene community detection

MSigDB: Molecular signatures database

QC: Quality control

ST: Stable

#### <span id="page-30-0"></span>**1. References**

<span id="page-30-1"></span>1 De Domenico, M., Lancichinetti, A., Arenas, A. & Rosvall, M. Identifying modular flows on multilayer networks reveals highly overlapping organization in interconnected systems. *Physical Review X* **5**, 011027 (2015).

<span id="page-30-2"></span>2 Langfelder, P. & Horvath, S. WGCNA: an R package for weighted correlation network analysis. *BMC Bioinformatics* **9**, 559 (2008).

<span id="page-30-3"></span>3 Gerstein, M. B. et al. Architecture of the human regulatory network derived from ENCODE data. *Nature* **489**, 91-100 (2012).

<span id="page-30-4"></span>4 Chou, C. H. et al. miRTarBase update 2018: a resource for experimentally validated microRNA-target interactions. *Nucleic Acids Res.* **46**, D296-D302 (2018).

<span id="page-30-5"></span>5 Alonso-López, D. et al. APID interactomes: providing proteome-based interactomes with controlled quality for multiple species and derived networks. *Nucleic Acids Res.* **44**, W529-535 (2016).

<span id="page-30-6"></span>6 Wani, N. & Raza, K. Integrative approaches to reconstruct regulatory networks from multiomics data: A review of state-of-the-art methods. *Comput. Biol. Chem.* **83**, 107120 (2019).

<span id="page-30-7"></span>7 Rosvall, M. & Bergstrom, C. T. Maps of random walks on complex networks reveal community structure. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **105**, 1118-1123 (2008).

<span id="page-30-8"></span>8 Lancichinetti, A. & Fortunato, S. Consensus clustering in complex networks. *Sci. Rep.* **2**, 336 (2012).

<span id="page-30-9"></span>9 Ritchie, M. E. et al. limma powers differential expression analyses for RNA-sequencing and microarray studies. *Nucleic Acids Res* **43**, e47 (2015).