Bioinformatics and Data analysis ¹

Software used

Δ ligning $\frac{33}{33}$

Rsubread featureCounts 49 and 200 and

rRNA subtraction of read libraries for genes and DoGs 57

Input RNA was rRNA depleted before sequencing. However, due to low RNA yields, J2 immunoprecipitated RNA was $\frac{58}{100}$ not rRNA depleted before sequencing. To account for differences in Input-RNA rRNA depletion efficiency, we used the following subtraction procedure. Reads were mapped to a rRNA WS258.fasta genome created in biomart ⁶⁰ (http://uswest.ensembl.org/biomart/martview/). Genes and DoGs were normalized using the Ribosomal subtraction ratio ⁶¹ α derived from the equation below α

> $L = I - (U + M)$ $\mu = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} L}{\sum_{i=1}^{n} L}$ n $RSR = \frac{L}{A}$ μ $G=\frac{g}{R}$ RSR

rRNA subtracted Library size for a sample (L) was calculated by taking input reads (I) minus the sum of the number of \sim uniquely mapped reads to the rRNA fasta (U) and the number of multi-mapped reads to the rRNA fasta (M) . The $\qquad 64$ average library size (μ) is the sum of all the rRNA subtracted libraries divided by the amount of samples (n). The per 65 sample ribosomal subtraction ratio (RSR) is calculated by dividing L by (μ) . The rRNA normalized gene or DoG (G) is 66 found by dividing the gene or DoG (g) by the RSR. Finally, we round g up to get an integer input for DESeq2. It is σ important to note that this equation was applied separately for Heatshock vs WT and tdp-1(α k803) vs WT, as well as α within these groups separating input and $J2$ samples. $\qquad \qquad$ 69

Ratio of ratios differential expression for genes and $DoGs$ We used the likelihood ratio test (LRT) option in DESeq2 for all analysis of J2 enrichment from input RNA. The LRT is π used to find the difference between a full and reduced model. $\frac{72}{2}$ full model $=$ assay $+$ condition $+$ assay: condition 73 $reduced = assay + condition$ 74 using the heat shock analysis as an example, the interaction term 'assay:condition' represents the ratio of the ratios: $\frac{75}{15}$ $(12$ for HS $/$ Input for HS) $/$ (J2 for NOHS $/$ Input for NOHS) 76 or equivalently $\overline{77}$ $(12 \text{ for HS } / \text{ J2 for NOHS }) / (\text{Input for HS } / \text{ Input for NOHS })$ The model will then show which genes are J2 enriched in heat shock compared to no heat shock. We did the same for $\frac{79}{20}$ $\text{tdp-1(ok803)}.$ In this study, all enrichment differential expression was done with the following commands where the assay is enrichment $\frac{1}{81}$ and condition is heat shock, $tdp-1(ok803)$, or wild type worms. $dds = DESeqDataSetFromMatrix(countData = cst, colData = coldata, design = assay + condition + assay:condition)$ 83 dds\$condition = factor(dds\$condition, levels= $c("C", "T")$) $dds = DESeq(dds, test="LRT", reduced= assay + condition, parallel = TRUE)$ 85 For more information visit this post by DESeq2 creator Michael Love 86 https://support.bioconductor.org/p/61509/ $\frac{87}{20}$ Analysis of Brunquell 2016 888 889 888 889 888 889 888 889 888 889 888 889 888 889 888 889 888 889 88

Four samples were used in the analysis. Two heat shock (SRX1932621, SRX1932622) and two with no heat shock 89 $(SRX1932620, SRX1932619)$. All samples were processed similarly to our samples except for the DESeq2 step. Since there \sim was no enrichment procedure we used the standard Dogcatcher algorithm and additional differential expression pipeline 91 using the DESeq2 commands below. $\frac{92}{2}$

 $dds = DESeqDataSetFromMatrix(countData = cst, colData = coldata, design = condition)$ dds \$condition = factor(dds\$condition, levels=c("Heat shock", "Control")) $\qquad \qquad$ 94 $\text{dds} = \text{DESeq}(\text{dds})$

${\bf Dogcatcher} \hspace{2cm} \bullet$

Dogcatcher uses a sliding window approach to calculate coverage. Bedgraph sense or antisense reads are assigned to these $\frac{97}{20}$ coverage windows and if coverage is above a set percentage threshold they will continue (meta read-through) or stop at the next gene on the same strand (local read-through). Downstream of gene transcripts (DoGs) use sense reads to the $\frac{99}{2}$ gene and slide 5' to 3' starting from the 3' annotated end. Antisense downstream of gene transcripts (ADoGs) use ¹⁰⁰ antisense reads to the gene and slide 5' to 3' starting from the 3' annotated end. Previous of gene transcripts (PoGs) use ¹⁰¹ sense reads to the gene and slide 3' to 5' starting from the 5' annotated end. Antisense previous of gene transcripts 102 (APoGs) use antisense reads to the gene and slide 3' to 5' starting from the 5' annotated end. PoGs are removed if they ¹⁰³ overlap a DoG. APoGs are removed if they overlap any ADoGs. ADoGs and APoGs are removed if they overlap DoGs, ¹⁰⁴ PoGs, or genes on the opposite strand. For improved normalization in DESeq2, non-significant genes are added when $_{105}$ calculating differential expression. These non-significant genes are then removed directly after. ¹⁰⁶ The J2 enriched version of Dogcatcher performs the Ribosomal Subtraction Ratio normalization on counts for RSubread 107 as well as the LRT method from DESeq2 on normalized counts. 108

Antisense ratio for treatment over wildtype in input $\text{RNA}(\text{Fig3})$

Counts were generated using RSubread. All genes were filtered to have a base mean over 20 in sense and antisense counts ¹¹⁰ and log transformed. An antisense over sense ratio was then made for each condition. After this, a ratio was made of $\frac{111}{111}$ treatment over wild type. 112

Hyper-geometric distribution of gene overlaps for GO terms 113

The HYPGEOM.DIST equation was used in excel with the following parameters and the cumulative distribution set to $_{114}$ false. Base mean, FDR, and log2 fold change is from the output of DESeq2 from sense and antisense for treatment over 115 $\text{while type.} \tag{16}$

 $ppulation = all genes$ 118 $overlap =$ significant genes (FDR $\lt 0.05$) only in both comparisons 119 treatment $1 =$ significant genes only in heat shock 120 treatment $2 =$ significant genes only in $tdp-1(ok803)$

The hyper-geometric equations are in the supplemental HS_OK_HYPERGEODIST_and_overlap_LIST.xlsx 123

Removing DoGs or ADoGs overlapping with Operons 124

Operons were obtained from wormbase WS258.gff3 by writing out lines that contained "operon" and not ¹²⁵ "deprecated operon". 1388 operons were then matched to the longest DOGs and DOGs were removed if they had any ¹²⁶ overlap with operons on the same strand. Overlap was found by comparing the start or end coordinates of operons to the ¹²⁷ start or end of the longest DOG and removing if they were on the same strand. This filtering removed 67 and 36 Runon 128 or operon overlaps from Heatshock and tdp-1(ok803) vs Wildtype comparisons. Similarly, ADOGs were removed if they ¹²⁹ had an operon overlapping on the opposite strand, none of the ADOGs in this study had operons on the opposite strand. 130

Terminal Inverted Repeats in DoGs 131

Terminal inverted repeats (TIR) were obtained from the WS258 tandem and inverted repeats gff. We first counted the ¹³² amount of TIRs with any overlap to a DoG on the positive strand and divided by the length of the DoG. Next, we generated a background of downstream intergenic sequences for every gene on the positive strand. For the size of our ¹³⁴ random downstream intervals, we sampled without replacement from the length distribution of our significantly J2 enriched or depleted heat shock DoGs. If a random interval was larger than the distance to the next downstream gene the 136 random interval was stopped at the next gene. We next sampled 50 of our random intervals and computed the mean 137 10,000 times. Finally, we used a student's T-test and found significant differences (Padj < 0.016) comparing J2 enriched, ¹³⁸ J2 depleted, and non-significant percent coverage to random downstream intervals. We also found the T-test significant 139 when comparing non-significant DoGs to J2 enriched and J2 depleted DoGs.

GO term analysis with mygene and goatools 141

The python package mygene was used to get entrez id's for each gene or DoG for input into goatools. For obtaining genes $_{142}$ inside of significant (fdr $\langle 0.05 \rangle$ GO terms related to translation we first obtained every significant GO term that contained the word "translation", "ribosomal", and "ribosome". We then took all of the significant genes and removed 144 duplicates that belonged to multiple GO terms. Since goatools does not provide a background gene list for worms, one was created by downloading all genes with the taxid 6239 and creating a dictionary similar to the ones made in the goatools ¹⁴⁶ test data folder. You can download the list from NCBI with the link in genes NCBI 6239 marko ALL.py and it will create 147 the dictionary when imported into another python script. Genes with overlap from DoGs on the opposite strand were $_{148}$ obtained from the "combined DOG with biotypes UNPACKED.csv" output from Dogcatcher. These were then combined ¹⁴⁹ with ADoGs to find all genes that could have significant antisense transcription starting from outside of the gene region. 150 All genes, DoGs, PoGs, ADoGs, and APoGs, were filtered for a significance of padj < 0.05 and were considered "up" in 151 treatment vs control if they had a LFC > 0 and "down" in treatment vs control if they had a LFC < 0 .

117

122