# **Biology and Bias in Cell Type-Specific RNAseq**

**of Nucleus Accumbens Medium Spiny Neurons** Kronman, Hope<sup>1</sup>\* & Richter, Felix<sup>2,3</sup>\*, Labonté, Benoit<sup>1</sup>, Chandra, Ramesh<sup>4</sup>, Zhao, Shan<sup>5</sup>, Hoffman, Gabriel<sup>3</sup>, Lobo, Mary Kay<sup>4</sup>, Schadt, Eric E.<sup>3</sup>, Nestler, Eric J.<sup>1#</sup>

- \* These authors contributed equally to this work
- # Corresponding author, e-mail: eric.nestler@mssm.edu
- 1 Dept of Neuroscience and Friedman Brain Institute, Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai
- 2 Dept of Pediatrics, Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai
- 3 Dept of Genetics and Genomic Sciences, Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai
- Dept of Anatomy and Neurobiology, University of Maryland School of Medicine 5
- Dept of Anesthesiology, Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai

### Supplementary figure legends

## Supplementary Figure 1. Differences in genomic distribution and differential expression across methods.

- (A) Percent of intronic reads across samples for each gene, median indicated as a line in method color
- (B) Differential expression overlap using lenient filters on all (1 FPM in at least two samples)
- (C) Differential expression overlap using strict filters on all (FPKM  $\ge$  1 in at least one sample and all samples with FPKM < 5.0 x 10<sup>4</sup>)
- (D) Differential expression overlap using strict filter for whole cell and nuclear and a less strict filter for RiboTag (FPKM  $\ge$  0.1 in at least two samples and all samples with FPKM < 5.0 x 10<sup>4</sup>)
- (E) Density plots of gene lengths for all genes, protein-coding genes, and non-coding genes for each method (whole cell = black, nuclear = blue, RiboTag = red)

#### Supplementary Figure 2. Hub network overlaps and nuclear DET-predicted TFBSs

- (A) Overlap of hub network genes for D1- and D2-correlated modules across method
- (B) Overlap of genes showing regulation by transcription, cytosolic mechanisms, or translation in D1- and D2-MSNs. 0 overlaps are not labeled.
- (C) List of 27 miRNAs predicted upstream of the (Transcription D1) / (Cytosol D2) overlap (overlap p-value < 0.05) and FPKM values of the 4 miRNAs from this list that are differentially expressed in D2-nuclei (but not in D2-whole cells)

#### Supplementary Figure 3. Variance in just genes detected in all three methods.

- (A) PCA of combined data showing separation of samples by cell type on PC5/PC6. Key is shown in figure
- (B) PCA of nuclear, whole cell, and RiboTag datasets from this study along with RiboTag RNA-sequencing from Song et al, 2018. Key is shown in figure
- (C) Variance explained by method, cell type and residuals across the transcriptome. Central bars represent median

#### Supplementary Figure 4. Hub network overlaps and nuclear DET-predicted TFBSs

- (D) Overlap of hub network genes for D1- and D2-correlated modules across method
- (E) Overlap of predicted TFBSs for D2 whole cell and RiboTag hub networks with predicted TFBSs for nuclear D2-DEGs
- (F) Overlap of predicted TFBSs for D1 whole cell and RiboTag hub networks with predicted TFBSs for nuclear D1-DEGs

#### Supplementary Figure 5. Variance distributions for D1- and D2-DETs across methods.

(A) Variance distribution for nuclear D1- and D2-DEGs (top of the box =  $3^{rd}$  quartile, midline = median, bottom of the box =  $1^{st}$  quartile)

- (B) Variance distribution for RiboTag D1- and D2-DEGs (top of the box = 3<sup>rd</sup> quartile, midline = median, bottom of the box = 1<sup>st</sup> quartile)
- (C) Variance distribution for whole cell D1- and D2-DEGs (top of the box =  $3^{rd}$  quartile, midline = median, bottom of the box =  $1^{st}$  quartile)

#### Supplementary Figure 6. FACS plots demonstrating gating strategy.

- (A) Gating strategy for D1-whole cells. From the left, selecting whole neurons (SSC vs. FSC), selecting live neurons (DAPI vs. FSC), selecting GFP-negative, tdTomato-positive whole neurons (GFP vs. Texas Red)
- (B) Gating strategy for D2-whole cells. From the left, selecting whole neurons (SSC vs. FSC), selecting live neurons (DAPI vs. FSC), selecting GFP-positive, tdTomato-negative whole neurons (GFP vs. Texas Red)
- (C) Gating strategy for D1-nuclei. From the left, selecting nuclei (SSC vs. FSC), selecting GFPpositive nuclei (GFP vs. FSC)
- (D) Gating strategy for D2-nuclei. From the left, selecting nuclei (SSC vs. FSC), selecting GFPpositive nuclei (GFP vs. FSC)

#### Supplementary table list

Supplementary Table 1: Nuclear DEG logistic regression Supplementary Table 2: Differential expression by method

Supplementary Table 3: FPKM by method

Supplementary Table 4: FPKM and variance correlations across methods

Supplementary Table 5: Variance explained by gene

Supplementary Table 6: Biotypes of genes from variance partitioning analysis

Supplementary Table 7: gProfiler enrichments

Supplementary Table 8: Genes enriched in each method

Supplementary Table 9: GWAS risk loci overlaps









$$y_{expr} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_{d2} + \beta_2 x_{ribo} + \beta_3 x_{wc} + \beta_4 x_{wc} \cdot x_{d2} + \beta_5 x_{ribo} \cdot x_{d2}$$

Sequencing method	Measures changes in	Relevant independent variables are			Coefficients being solved for are	
			x <sub>d2</sub>	X <sub>ribo</sub>	X <sub>wc</sub>	
Nuclear	Transcription		0 and 1	0	0	β <sub>1</sub>
WC	Transcription + Post-transcriptional p	processes	0 and 1	0	1	$\beta_1 + \beta_4$
RiboSeq	Transcription + Post-transcriptional p Translation	Transcription + Post-transcriptional processes+ Translation		1	0	β <sub>1</sub> + β <sub>5</sub>
Therefore, g	enes with significant	Have different	ial			
β <sub>1</sub>		Transcription				
$(\beta_1 + \beta_4) - \beta_1$	$= \beta_4$	Post-tra	nscriptiona	al proce	sses	
$(\beta_1 + \beta_5) - (\beta_1 + \beta_4) = \beta_5 - \beta_4$		Translation				









- Nuclear\_brain
- RiboTag\_brain
- Whole cell\_brain
- RiboTag\_liver





а









0.15**7** 

0.10-

0.05<del>-</del>

0.00

D1 RiboTas











D2 RiboTas



а

b

С

d