Title page

Quartz-Seq2: a high-throughput single-cell RNA-sequencing method that effectively uses limited

sequence reads

Yohei Sasagawa[1†], Hiroki Danno[1†], Hitomi Takada[2†], Masashi Ebisawa[1], Kaori Tanaka[1],

Tetsutaro Hayashi[1], Akira Kurisaki[2*], and Itoshi Nikaido[1,3*]

[†]These authors contributed equally to this work.

*Corresponding author

[1]Bioinformatics Research Unit, Advanced Center for Computing and Communication, RIKEN,

Hirosawa 2-1, Wako, Saitama, Japan

[2]Laboratory of Stem Cell Technology, Graduate School of Biological Sciences, Nara Institute of

Science and Technology, Takayama-cho 8916-5, Ikoma, Nara, Japan

[3]Single-cell Omics Research Unit, RIKEN Center for Developmental Biology, 2-2-3

Minatojima-minamimachi, Chuo-ku, Kobe, Japan

Yohei Sasagawa: youhei.sasagawa@riken.jp

Hiroki Danno: hiroki.danno@riken.jp, redgrapefruit@mac.com

Hitomi Takada: htakada@bs.naist.jp

Masashi Ebisawa: support-bit@riken.jp, masashi.ebisawa@riken.jp

Kaori Tanaka: kaori.tanaka@riken.jp

Tetsutaro Hayashi: tetsutaro.hayashi@riken.jp

Akira Kurisaki: akikuri@bs.naist.jp

Itoshi Nikaido: itoshi.nikaido@riken.jp

Abstract

High-throughput single-cell RNA-seq methods assign limited unique molecular identifier (UMI)

counts as gene expression values to single cells from shallow sequence reads and detect limited

gene counts. We thus developed a high-throughput single-cell RNA-seq method, Quartz-Seq2,

to overcome these issues. Our improvements in the reaction steps make it possible to effectively

convert initial reads to UMI counts (at a rate of 30%–50%) and detect more genes. To

demonstrate the power of Quartz-Seq2, we analyzed approximately 10,000 transcriptomes in

total from *in vitro* embryonic stem cells and an *in vivo* stromal vascular fraction with a limited

number of reads.

Keywords

High-throughput single-cell RNA-seq

Flow cytometry

Cell sorter

Quartz-Seq

Poly-A tagging

Stromal vascular fraction

Mesenchymal stem cell

Background

Single-cell transcriptome analysis is a powerful tool to identify nongenetic cellular heterogeneity, which includes differences in cell type due to differentiation and differences in cell state within a cell population. In previous studies, various methods for single-cell RNA-seq were developed [1-19]. Some of these that generate read coverage across all transcripts have been exploited to detect alternative transcription splicing isoforms [14,17], and others using a unique molecular identifier (UMI) have been applied to quantify the number of transcripts expressed in a cell [1-3,6,7,9,11-13,20]. To extract substantial information on a cell population, such as the composition of different cell types or the distribution of cell states, it is necessary to analyze hundreds or thousands of cells. Cell barcoding is a key technology for this, which enables us to deal with samples from numerous cells in a single tube. Cell barcoding technology, which tags nucleotides unique to each cell to target RNA molecules from that cell, is a key technology for increasing the throughput of single-cell RNA-seq [16,18]. Mixing cDNA tagged with cell barcodes before whole-transcript amplification decreases the cost of reaction reagents and the laboriousness of experimental steps. There are two types of cell barcoding technology according to the method of cell sampling used. One method involves single cells being selectively sorted to multi-well plates using flow cytometry, which allows us to remove dead or aggregated cells. Besides, transcriptome data can be linked to cellular information obtained by flow cytometry. The other method involves single cells and barcoded beads being captured in water-in-oil droplets using droplet-generation microfluidic devices [6,7]. In this latter method, thousands of cells can probabilistically be captured in half an hour. However, the total number of sequence reads generated by a deep sequencer is still limited. To increase the number of analyzed cells, each cell is assigned a limited number of initial sequence reads. For example, approximately 400 million initial fastq reads were sequenced for 3,000–4,000 cells in several previous studies [6,7]. In this case, the input data size for a single cell involves shallow initial reads (100,000 fastq reads) (Figure 1b). UMI counts were converted from shallow initial sequence reads for each cell, and the conversion ratio of that was limited to approximately one-tenth [21]. Ideally, greater UMI counts should be generated from limited sequence reads because the increase in UMI count

assigned to each cell leads to the detection of low-copy genes and the identification of

cell-type-specific genes using statistical tests.

In this study, we developed a novel high-throughput single-cell RNA-seq method,

Quartz-Seq2. As Quartz-Seq is a sensitive and reproducible single-cell RNA-seq method,

Quartz-Seq2 was developed based on it [15]. Quartz-Seq is based on a poly-A tagging strategy.

By the combination of molecular biological improvements including major improvement of poly-A

tagging, Quartz-Seq2 resulted in an increase in the effectiveness with which the initial sequence

reads were converted to the expression UMI counts (UMI conversion efficiency: 30%–50%). To

demonstrate the highly effective use of initial reads in Quartz-Seq2, we analyzed a population of

approximately 9,000 mouse embryonic stem (ES) cells as *in vitro* cells and approximately 1,000

cells from the stromal vascular fraction (SVF) as *in vivo* cells.

Results

Outline of Quartz-Seq2 experiment

To increase the UMI conversion efficiency (Figure 1), we improved several steps in the

preparation of the single-cell RNA-seq library (Additional file 1: Figure S1), resulting in the

development of Quartz-Seq2. Below, we explain the five steps of the Quartz-Seq2 procedure

(Figure 1).

(1) The first step is single-cell collection using a cell sorter. We selectively sort living single

cells into lysis buffer in a 384-well PCR plate without dead cells. In cell sorting, various types of

channel information, such as the intensity of fluorescence, are obtained for each cell. This

enables us to link the transcriptome to cellular information from a cell sorter for each cell.

(2) The second step is cell barcoding. Each well contains lysis buffer and

reverse-transcription (RT) primer, which includes a cell barcode sequence (14- or 15-mer), a

UMI sequence (8-mer), and an oligo-dT sequence (24-mer). Using these RT primers, respective

RNA from single cells is converted to cDNA with unique cell barcodes. Note that a long RT

primer resulted in a severe problem regarding the synthesis of byproducts at the downstream

reaction in our system (Additional file 1: Figure S2 and Supplemental Note). Therefore, we use a

relatively short RT primer (73- or 74-mer), which allows us to skip the step of removing

byproducts using exonuclease I. We design two types of RT primer set (v3.1: 384 barcodes;

v3.2: 1536 barcodes). Within each primer set, barcode sequences are designed such that the

minimum Sequence–Levenshtein distance between two sequences should be greater than 5,

which leads to the correction of mutations of two nucleotides, including substitution, insertion, or

deletion in sequence reads [22]. We also optimize the buffer and temperature in the RT reaction,

leading to an improvement of RT efficiency from that of the original Quartz-Seq (Additional file 1:

Figure S3 and Supplemental Note). We apply a low enzyme concentration in reverse

transcription to Quartz-Seq2. These conditions reduce the cost and technical variability of

Quartz-Seq2. We describe the details of this in the subsection entitled "Reduction of enzyme

concentration in reverse transcription decreased the experimental cost of Quartz-Seq2".

(3) The third step involves the pooling of cell-barcoded cDNA. By cell barcoding,

Quartz-Seq2 can pool cDNA of up to 1,536 individual cells into one mixture. We developed a

174	rapid and high-throughput method for collecting small volumes of cDNA in multiwell plates. This
175	method also achieved higher efficiency of collection than dispensing with pipettes and tips
176	(Additional file 1: Figure S4 and Supplemental Note). As the efficiency of cDNA purification after
177	pooling was 93.77%, we estimated that approximately 80% of cell-barcoded cDNA could be
178	used for subsequent whole-transcript amplification in our system (Additional file 1: Figure S3a
179	and Supplemental Note).
180	(4) The fourth step is whole-transcript amplification based on an improved poly-A tagging
181	strategy. Poly-A tagging is one of the methods of converting first-strand cDNA to amplifiable
182	cDNA. First-strand cDNA is extended with a poly-A tail by the terminal transferase. Subsequently,
183	second-strand cDNA is synthesized with tagging primers that contain a poly-dT sequence,
184	followed by PCR amplification. Here, we improve the efficiency of poly-A tagging by 3.6-fold.
185	This improvement is a crucial point in the development of Quartz-Seq2. We describe the details
186	of this in the next subsection.
187	(5) The fifth step is library preparation for deep sequencing. Amplified cDNA is fragmented,
188	ligated with the sequence adapter, and amplified by PCR. In sequencing using Illumina
189	sequencers, a sequence for a cell barcode and a UMI is read in Read1, while a sequence for a
190	region of a transcript (mRNA) is read in Read2.
191	

Improvement of poly-A tagging efficiency

193	We previously reported Quartz-Seq based on the poly-A tagging strategy, which has significant
194	potential for detecting a large number of genes expressed in a cell [15]. However, the efficiency
195	of poly-A tagging itself for single-cell RNA-seq has not been improved. We hypothesized that the
196	improvement of poly-A tagging would lead to high UMI conversion efficiency. Therefore, we
197	attempted to improve the efficiency of this tagging step. Poly-A tagging is composed of two
198	processes: (1) The first-strand cDNA is modified with a poly-A tail by terminal deoxynucleotidyl
199	transferase. (2) Next, the poly-A-tailed cDNA is annealed with a tagging primer, which has a
200	poly-dT sequence. Then, the second-strand cDNA is extended. The resulting second-strand
201	cDNA is amplifiable cDNA, which has a PCR primer sequence at both ends of it.

It is known that the DNA yield of amplified cDNA generally reflects the quantitative

performance of single-cell RNA-seq methods [3,13,14]. Thus, we determined the effects of

various buffers for the poly-A tailing step on the amplified cDNA yield. We performed the poly-A

tailing reaction with various buffers using purified first-strand cDNA from 1 ng of total RNA

(Figure 2a, Additional file 1: Figure S5). Finally, we obtained amplified cDNA. We found that the

use of T55 buffer in the poly-A tailing reaction efficiently improved the cDNA yield (Figure 2a).

The amount of amplified cDNA increased 2.88-fold using T55 buffer compared with the level

using Quartz-Seq buffer (Figure 2a). In these buffer conditions, we did not observe any obvious

byproducts derived from the RT primer (Figure 2a, Additional file 1: Figures S2 and S5, and

Supplemental Note).

Next, we added an "Increment" temperature condition for the tagging and second-strand

synthesis steps (see Methods). In this condition, the reaction temperature of these steps was

gradually increased. As a result, the amount of cDNA tended to increase, by approximately

1.2-fold (Figure 2a). Moreover, upon combining T55 buffer and the Increment condition, the

amount of cDNA increased approximately 3.6-fold. We also confirmed the reproducibility of this

phenomenon of cDNA increment in additional experiments (Additional file 1: Figure S5).

Moreover, we confirmed the amplified cDNA yield of various genes by qPCR analysis as another

assay. Specifically, we determined the qPCR scores of eight genes from amplified cDNA and

nonamplified cDNA (Additional file 1: Figure S5c). Spearman's rank correlation coefficients

(SCCs) between amplification and nonamplification were approximately 0.79 in the condition

(T55+Increment). The SCC was approximately 0.66 in Quartz-Seq-like conditions. We also

observed clear increments of qPCR scores for almost all genes. These results show that the

combination of T55 buffer and this temperature condition improved the efficiency of the poly-A

tagging step. We also found that other conditions (NBF40+Increment) improved the cDNA yield.

However, under these conditions, byproducts were clearly synthesized (Additional file 1: Figures

S2c and S5b). Moreover, the amount of cDNA with T55 buffer was slightly greater than that with

RH55 (Figure 2 and Additional file 1: Figure S5a). Therefore, we used the combination of T55

buffer and the "Increment" temperature condition for the poly-A tagging strategy for

Quartz-Seq2.

Reduction of enzyme concentration in reverse transcription decreased the experimental

cost of Quartz-Seq2

The cost of experiments for the single-cell RNA-seq method is one of the most important

benchmarks regarding high-throughput performance. The cost of experimental preparation per

cell was approximately ¥2,600 ($23) for our previously reported Quartz-Seq, which does not use

cell barcoding (Additional file 1: Figure S6a). To improve on this value, we first applied the

"RT100" enzyme condition in reverse transcription to Quartz-Seq2. In this condition, we used

approximately 20U reverse transcriptase in 2 μL of solution for reverse transcription. This

enzyme concentration in the RT reaction is broadly used for various molecular biological

applications including single-cell RNA-seq methods [3,14,15]. By using the cell barcoding

strategy, the cost of experimental preparation for Quartz-Seq2 under the "RT100" condition was

reduced (¥122 or $1.08 per cell) (Additional file 1: Figure S6a).

We found that 65% of the cost of experimental steps is derived from reverse transcription

in Quartz-Seq2 under the "RT100" condition (Additional file 1: Figure S7a). To further reduce the

cost of experimental preparation of sequence libraries on a large scale, we investigated the

effect of a low enzyme concentration in reverse transcription in Quartz-Seq2. In the assessment

assay, we noticed that a low enzyme concentration did not markedly affect the efficiency of

reverse transcription in T100 buffer (Additional file 1: Figure S7b). We performed a similar

experiment with a broader range of concentrations of enzymes in reverse transcription under

conditions with T100 buffer (Figure 2b and Additional file 1: Figure S7c). We found that the RT25

condition maintained the efficiency of reverse transcription at the 99% level on average, which

was comparable to that in the RT100 condition. Therefore, we prepared three technical

replicates of a 384-well PCR plate with 10 pg of total RNA with the "RT100" condition or the

"RT25" low-enzyme condition. In the "RT25" condition, the cDNA yield showed a tendency for a

slight increase of approximately 1.17-fold, which although not being a major improvement did at

least not involve a decrease (Additional file 1: Figure 7d). The cost of experimental preparation

per cell became approximately ¥46–¥63 ($0.40–$0.56) in the "RT25" condition (Figure S6a). We

thus mainly used the "RT25" condition for Quartz-Seq2.

Evaluation of the quantitative performance of Quartz-Seq2 using 10 pg of purified total

RNA

Finally, we adopted three molecular biological improvements [poly-A tailing buffers (T55), the

"Increment" temperature condition, and low-enzyme concentration (RT25) in reverse

transcription] for Quartz-Seq2 (Additional file 1: Figure S1). To determine the technical variability

and specificity of Quartz-Seq2, we performed whole-transcript amplification using 10 pg of

diluted mouse total RNA as a single-cell-like averaged sample with the v3.1 384 cell-barcode RT

primer in a 384-well plate (Figure 2). In this experiment, we used the "RT25" enzyme

concentration for Quartz-Seq2. The effect of RT enzyme concentration on the quantitative

performance is specifically described in the last paragraph in this subsection of the paper. We

analyzed 10 pg of total RNA in all wells at approximately 0.19 M fastq reads on average per well.

In the case of the Quartz-Seq-like conditions, we detected 18,407±4,040 UMI counts and

5,728±604 gene counts (n=768 wells from two 384-well plates). In the case of Quartz-Seq2, we

achieved a UMI count of 44,100±7,521 and a gene count of 7,442±484 (n=1,152 wells from three

384-well plates)(Figure 2c). We observed similar results at the level of individual 384-well plates

(Additional file 1: Figure S8a). We also calculated the UMI conversion efficiency for the

respective protocol at approximately 0.19 million initial fastq reads on average per well. We

defined the formula for calculating the "UMI conversion efficiency," which indicates how

effectively initial fastq reads can be converted to UMI counts (Figure 1c and Additional file 1:

Figure S9). The UMI conversion efficiency levels of Quartz-Seq2 and Quartz-Seq-like were

about 22.88% and 9.55%, respectively. The UMI conversion efficiency was reproducible among

individual 384-well plates (Additional file 1: Figure S8a). In addition, the UMI conversion

efficiency depended on the Read2 length and the number of initial fastq reads (Additional file 1:

Figure S8b). These results indicated that the combination of the molecular biological

improvements for Quartz-Seq2 clearly improved the conversion ratio from target RNA to

sequence library DNA.

We also validated the technical reproducibility of gene expression. In the mean-CV

(coefficient of variation) plot, technical gene expression variability of Quartz-Seq2 became fairly

close to the theoretical variability of a Poisson distribution (Figure 2d). The mean of gene

expression variability for Quartz-Seq2 was lower than that for the Quartz-Seq-like method

(Figure 2f). To quantify the technical reproducibility of internal gene expression and external

gene (ERCC spike-in RNA) expression, we used a pairwise comparison of technical replicates

for each protocol. Regarding the reproducibility of internal gene expression, the SCCs of

Quartz-Seq2 and Quartz-Seq-like were 0.71±0.01 and 0.59±0.02, respectively. Regarding the

reproducibility of external gene expression, the SCCs of Quartz-Seq2 and Quartz-Seq-like were

0.90±0.02 and 0.83±0.04, respectively. Subsequently, we validated the accuracy of

internal/external gene expression. We observed that the average internal gene expression of

Quartz-Seq2 highly correlated with the internal gene expression of conventional RNA-seq

(Figure 2e). We calculated all combinations of pairwise correlation between the internal gene

expression of Quartz-Seq2 with 10 pg of total RNA and that of conventional RNA-seq with 1 µg

of total RNA. Moreover, we calculated the pairwise correlation between the external gene

expression of Quartz-Seq2 and the input molecule count of external genes (ERCC spike-in RNA).

Regarding the accuracy of internal gene expression, the SCCs of Quartz-Seq2 and

Quartz-Seq-like were 0.70±0.01 and 0.60±0.02, respectively. Regarding the accuracy of external

gene expression, the SCCs of Quartz-Seq2 and Quartz-Seq-like were 0.90±0.01 and 0.74±0.03,

respectively. These results indicate that the combination of the molecular biological

improvements for Quartz-Seq2 clearly improved the technical reproducibility and accuracy of

gene expression.

We noted that a low enzyme concentration improved the quantitative performance of

Quartz-Seq2. We validated the quantitative performance with 10 pg of total RNA in the "RT100"

and "RT25" conditions at various input data sizes. Unexpectedly, we found that the "RT25"

condition improved the quantitative performance (Additional file 1: Figure S8a). We compared

RT25 with RT100 at approximately 0.096 M fastq reads on average per well. In the case of

Quartz-Seq2 in the "RT25" condition, we achieved a UMI count of 30,117±789 and a gene count

of 6,320±35 (three 384-well plates). In the case of Quartz-Seq2 in the "RT100" condition, we

achieved a UMI count of 25,671±1020 and a gene count of 5,889±35 (three 384-well plates). We

also observed that the well-to-well technical variability for the UMI count and gene count clearly

decreased in the "RT25" condition (Additional file 1: Figure S8a). These results showed that the

"RT25" low-enzyme condition clearly reduced the experimental cost and improved the

quantitative performance. We thus applied the "RT25" condition in subsequent experiments

using real single cells. Note that, in the RT1.5625-RT6.25 condition, reverse-transcription

efficiency was maintained at an average level of over 90% (Figure 2b). The average

reverse-transcription efficiency rapidly decreased below the RT1.56 low enzyme concentration.

In addition, in actual experiments (not serially diluted experiments) at conditions below RT3.12, it

was not guaranteed that enzymes could be collected given the viscosity and low volume of the

mixture. Therefore, we validated the RT6.25 condition for subsequent analysis. It seems that

UMI counts, gene counts, and ERCC capture efficiency (also called as "ERCC spike-in RNA

detection efficiency") slightly increased in the RT6.25 condition, which although not being a

major improvement did at least not involve a decrease (Additional file 1: Figure S10). The cost of

experimental preparation per cell became approximately ¥31–¥48 ($0.27–$0.43) in the "RT6.25"

condition (Additional file 4: Table S3, Additional file 1: Figure S6a). The "RT6.25" low-enzyme

condition thus further reduced the experimental cost and slightly improved the quantitative

performance.

Quartz-Seq2 shows higher efficiency of UMI conversion and detects more biological

pathways than Drop-seq

In the high-throughput single-cell RNA-seq methods, the total number of sequence reads

generated by a deep sequencer is limited. Ideally, greater UMI counts should be generated from

limited sequence reads because the increase in UMI count assigned to each cell leads to the

detection of low-copy genes and the identification of cell-type-specific genes using statistical

tests. We compared Quartz-Seq2 to the high-throughput single-cell RNA-seq method using two

distinct cell types. To prepare these two distinct cell types, we cultured G6GR ES cells and

Dex-treated G6GR cells because it has been reported that almost all G6GR ES cells

differentiated into primitive endoderm-like cells upon dexamethasone treatment [15,23].

Drop-seq is one of the high-throughput single-cell RNA-seq methods, which can capture

thousands of cells and barcoded beads in half an hour [6]. We performed Drop-seq experiments,

which were validated by species-mixing analysis (Figure S11a, b). We performed Quartz-Seq2

and Drop-seq on a mixture of mouse ES cells and Dex-treated mouse ES cells [primitive

endoderm (PrE) cells] and calculated the UMI conversion efficiency (Figure 3a and Additional file

1: Figure S11c). The effectiveness of Quartz-Seq2 ranged from 25% to 35% depending on the

initial fastq read depth (Figure 3), which was higher than that of Drop-seq.

As Figure 3a shows, Quartz-Seq2 detected more genes with high UMI conversion

efficiency. To examine the power for identifying differentially expressed genes, we performed

principal component analysis (PCA) and clustering. We randomly selected single cells from ES

cluster cells and PrE cluster cells. The number of genes differentially expressed between two

distinct cell types was calculated (ES and PrE cells) (Additional file 1: Figure S11h). We also

identified differentially expressed genes (DEGs) between bulk ES cells and that PrE cells by

using conventional bulk RNA-seq. We then counted the number of overlapping DEGs between

single-cell RNA-seq methods and bulk RNA-seq. We observed that this number linearly

correlated with the cell number (Figure 3b). Quartz-Seq required fewer cells for the detection of

overlapping DEGs. These results showed that more genes that were differentially expressed

between the two cell types were identified with Quartz-Seq2 (Figure 3b, c). In addition, more

biological pathways particularly associated with the differentially expressed genes were detected

in Quartz-Seq2 (Figure 3c). Furthermore, we calculated the highly variable expression of genes

in Quartz-Seq2 and Drop-seq, which potentially include not only genes that are differentially

expressed between cell types but also genes of which the expression changes depending on the

cell state in a cell type. Terms related to the cell cycle state were only enriched for the genes

calculated with Quartz-Seq2 (Figure 3d). Note that simulation-based power analysis also

showed that Quartz-Seq2 detected more DEGs than Drop-seq (Additional file 1: Figure S12a,

see Methods). These results suggest that high UMI conversion efficiency with limited initial reads

leads to more biological information being revealed, such as functional terms and biological

pathways.

Superiority of Quartz-Seq2 regarding quantitative performance in the same experimental

design compared with other methods

To obtain additional evidence for the superiority of Quartz-Seq2 in terms of the UMI conversion

efficiency and gene count, we compared it to other methods. Using mouse J1 ES cells,

Ziegenhain et al. systematically compared the quantitative performance of several single-cell

RNA sequencing (RNA-seq) methods [CEL-seq2(C1), SCRB-seq, MARS-seq, and Drop-seq]

that use the UMI technique [21]. Therefore, we cultured J1 ES cells under 2i/LIF conditions in

accordance with the procedure described in this previous paper [21]. We sorted J1 ES cells into

five 384-well plates. Subsequently, we prepared sequence library DNA of Quartz-Seq2 (RT25)

with 1,152 wells (three 384-well plates) or 768 wells (two 384-well plates) on different days. For

comparison between our data and those obtained in the previous study mentioned above, we

used the same analytical conditions as previously applied, such as a HiSeq sequencer platform,

Read2 length, the same genome file, and the same transcript annotation file.

First, we compared the quantitative performance between Quartz-Seq2 and other

methods at 0.1 million initial fastq reads on average per cell (Figure 4). The results indicate that

the UMI conversion efficiency levels of Quartz-Seq2 were approximately 32.55% (Day 1) and

32.25% (Day 2); the UMI conversion efficiency of the other methods ranged from 7.11% to

22.45%. The average gene counts using Quartz-Seq2 were approximately 6,636 (Day 1) and

6,584 (Day 2), while the average gene counts for the other methods ranged from 2,738 to 5,164.

We also validated the quantitative performance for external control RNA. The levels of ERCC

capture efficiency for Quartz-Seq2 were approximately 6.12% (Day 1) and 6.38% (Day 2), while

the ERCC capture efficiencies for the other methods ranged from 0.76% to 3.22% (Figure 4a

and Additional file 1: Figure S13d). We also calculated the copy number of the detection limit of

ERCC spike-in RNA. The detection limits for Quartz-Seq2 were approximately 6.82 (Day 1) and

6.57 (Day 2), while those for the other methods ranged from 13.26 to 710.24 (Additional file 1:

Figure S13d).

We also performed simulation-based power analysis to estimate the power for identifying

differentially expressed genes (Additional file 1: Figure S12b, see Methods). The true positive

ratio (TPR) at the data point of 256 cells ranged from 0.93 and 0.95, and the false discovery rate

(FDR) at the data point of 256 cells ranged from 0.07 to 0.09. Therefore, TPR and FDR for each

method were comparable to each other. We found that Quartz-Seq2 detected more simulated

DEGs than the different methods.

In particular, the UMI conversion efficiency and gene count of the Quartz-Seq2 method

were significantly better than those of the other methods at approximately 0.1 million initial reads.

We also estimated the UMI and gene counts and the UMI conversion efficiency at various

numbers of initial fastq reads (Figure 4a). We found that Quartz-Seq2 is greatly advantageous

for detecting the UMI and gene counts from limited initial amounts of data (under 0.2 million fastq

reads). These results showed that the quantitative performance of Quartz-Seq2 was almost

always better than that of other methods under conditions with a limited number of initial fastq

reads.

Quartz-Seq2 achieves high UMI conversion efficiency at relatively low cost

The experimental cost for sequence library preparation is an important benchmark for single-cell

RNA-seq methods because it is highly correlated with the throughput of single-cell RNA-seq

methods within a limited budget. In the case of using 384 indexes, the library preparation cost of

Quartz-Seq2 (RT25) is ¥63 ($0.56) (Additional file 1: Figure S6a). For Quartz-Seq2 with 384

indexes, we used three purification columns per 384-well plate at the step of cDNA purification.

To reduce the amount of enzyme solution in the downstream reaction after cDNA purification, we

used one purification column per 384-well plate (Additional file 4: Table 3). In the previous

subsection, we also described that the "RT6.25" low-enzyme condition improved the

experimental cost of Quartz-Seq2. The combination of the "RT6.25" low-enzyme condition and

reduction of the number of purification columns thus further improved the library preparation cost

of Quartz-Seq2 (RT6.25+column1) to ¥37 ($0.32) (Additional file 1: Figure S6a). For comparison,

the library preparation costs of other methods that use a cell sorter range from ¥146 ($1.30) to

¥372 ($3.29) (Figure S6a). Regarding the cost, Quartz-Seq2 is thus highly competitive with other

single-cell RNA-seq methods that use a cell sorter.

To show the potential of Quartz-Seq2 for high-throughput performance, we additionally

carried out Quartz-Seq2 (RT6.25+column1) and Quartz-Seq2 (RT6.25) using J1 ES cells (Figure

4b). We estimated that the number of processable single cells per 1,000 US dollars spent on

Quartz-Seq2 ranges from 1,785 to 3,058 (Figure 4b). We also calculated the total cost, including

the sequencing and library preparation costs, for each method. The total cost per cell is

extremely low (approximately ¥71–¥131, or $0.63–$1.16) for Drop-seq. The total cost per cell is

¥97–¥183 ($0.85–$1.62) for Quartz-Seq2. Thus, the total cost of Quartz-Seq2, a

cell-sorter-based method, approaches that typical of droplet-based methods (Additional file 1:

Figure S6b). In summary, the Quartz-Seq2 method achieves the highest UMI conversion

efficiency and high-sensitivity detection of genes under conditions with limited numbers of initial

reads, providing single-cell RNA-seq data in a high-throughput manner.

Demonstration of high-throughput Quartz-Seq2 analysis on 4,484 mouse embryonic stem

cells and differentiated conditions

To demonstrate the capability of Quartz-Seq2 for quantifying the transcriptome of a large

number of cells and identifying rare cell populations, we analyzed approximately 4,484 cells from

a mixture of mouse ES cells and differentiation-induced cells. Cells were prestained with

Hoechst 33342 and/or Calcein-AM as an indicator of DNA content and culture condition (ES or

PrE cells), respectively (Figure 5a). Calcein-AM-positive and -negative cells were sorted to

twelve 384-well plates (4,608 well in total) in a checkered pattern (Figure 5a). These conditions

maximize the likelihood of detecting the cell doublets caused by mis-sorting. In this analysis, as

an average for cells, 0.1 M initial fastq reads were effectively converted to 35,915±1,188 UMI

counts in a final gene expression matrix. The UMI conversion efficiency was 35.91±1.18%.

Dimensionality reduction of the expression UMI matrix resulting from Quartz-Seq2 showed

clear separation of six clusters, including the main populations of ES cells and PrE cells, as well

as four small populations. We did not observe a clear batch effect among the twelve 384-well

plates (Additional file 1: Figure S15). One cluster contained a relatively high proportion of

mitochondrial RNA (Additional file 1: Figure S16), which was judged to reflect low-quality cells

[24]. Another cluster showed high values of detected UMI counts and gene counts, and

expressed both ES and PrE marker genes, which were judged to represent doublets of an ES

cell and a PrE cell (Additional file 1: Figure S16). To characterize the identified populations, we

determined the genes that were specific or enriched for each cluster using binomial tests (Figure

5c). Although cells in cluster 3 shared gene expression with the main population of ES cells

(cluster 1), some genes including *Stmn2* and *Rhox5* were additionally expressed, suggesting

that cluster 1 and cluster 3 shared the same cell type but had different cell states. Cluster 5 was

a small population (0.17%, Figure 6b), but was characterized by many specific marker genes

(Figure 5c), including *Zscan4c* and *Zscan4d*, which are known to be expressed in a

subpopulation of mouse ES cells [25]. However, among our culture conditions, these genes were

more expressed in the Dex-treatment condition than in the ES-maintenance condition. Flow

cytometry information on cells in cluster 5 also showed no fluorescence of Calcein-AM,

indicating that these cells were from the suspension of Dex-treated cells (Figure 5d). These

observations were consistent with a previous study demonstrating that *Zscan4* was more

expressed in a differentiation condition induced by the withdrawal of leukemia inhibitory factor

[7].

In the sampling of cells using a cell sorter, flow cytometry information including the

intensity of Hoechst 33342 staining for each cell was collected. Using this information, we

reconstructed the distribution of Hoechst 33342 staining intensity for each cluster (Figure 5e).

The main population of ES cells (cluster 1) showed an embryonic pattern of distribution of DNA

content, which is characterized by a high ratio of cells in G_2 and M phases to cells in the G_1

phase. In contrast, the main population of PrE cells (cluster 4) showed a somatic pattern of

distribution of DNA content. This was consistent with PrE cells being differentiated from ES cells.

The cells in cluster 3, the gene expression of which was similar to that of the ES main population

(cluster 1), showed an embryonic pattern rather than a somatic one. As the number of cells in

cluster 5 that expressed *Zscan4c/d* was small, it was difficult to classify the observed pattern as

the embryonic or somatic type. These findings indicated the usefulness of single-cell RNA-seq

using flow cytometry for the reconstruction of population information after transcriptome-based

clustering. For good interpretation of the distribution, a large number of cells for each cluster are

required.

Quartz-Seq2 classified genes with variable expression within a cell type

When cells were plotted on t-SNE (t-distributed stochastic neighbor embedding) space using

transcriptome analysis and the intensity of Hoechst 33342 staining was depicted using a

color-based scale, the gradient pattern was easily observed for clusters 1, 3, and 4 (Figure 6a),

suggesting that Quartz-Seq2 was highly sensitive for detection of the cell cycle state. To

examine this, we plotted the gene expression of several cell cycle markers against the intensity

of Hoechst 33342 staining. We observed a strong relationship between the gene expression of

several cell cycle markers and DNA content (Figure 6b). Using the intensity of Hoechst 33342

staining as reference of the cell cycle phase, we calculated the relationship between the cell

cycle phase and all genes detected in Quartz-Seq2 experiments (see Methods). The results

enabled us to identify numerous genes for which the expression level changed in relation to the

DNA content (Figure 6c, d and Additional file 1: Figure S17). We called these genes "cell cycle

associated variable genes". These genes included cell cycle markers. Again, it was confirmed

that the ratio of cells in G_1 and S phases to those in G_2 and M phases differed between ES and

PrE cells (Figure 6c). As we showed that the efficiency of UMI conversion was high in the

Quartz-Seq2 method, we examined whether 10,000 initial reads are sufficient for cell cycle

analysis (Additional file 1: Figure S18). In this analysis, the final UMI count was 4,774±62 and the

UMI conversion efficiency was 47.74±0.66% (n=3, 1,536 wells). Plotting cells on t-SNE space

while using color to depict the intensity of Hoechst 33342 staining revealed a gradient pattern,

which was positively correlated with the expression of G_2/M-phase marker genes including

Ccnb1 and *Top2a* and negatively correlated with the expression of G_1-phase marker genes such

as *Ccne1* (Additional file 1: Figure S18). These observations demonstrated that Quartz-Seq2

with few initial sequence reads could analyze the cell cycle due to the high UMI conversion

efficiency.

Within a single cell type, there are two types of cell state categories. One is the different

stages of the cell cycle as mentioned above, and the other refers to cellular heterogeneity, which

is only remotely related to the cell cycle phases. This means that genes with variable expression

in a cell type include "cell cycle associated variable genes" and "variable genes the expression of

which is less associated with the cell cycle phase" (Additional file 1: Figure S24). We determined

the number of the latter group of genes by subtracting the former group from the genes with

variable expression (Figure 6e). For the main population of ES cells (cluster 1), we identified tens

of variable genes the expression of which is less associated with the cell cycle phase. These

genes included *Spp1*, *Rhox5*, and *S100a6*, which were previously identified as genes with highly

variable expression by scRNA-seq (Figure 6) [7,13,15]. We also identified *Stmn2*, *Dnmt3l*,

Tmsb4x, and several other genes as novel variable genes the expression of which is less

associated with the cell cycle phase. Single-cell RT-qPCR also showed high variability for *Stmn2*

and *Rhox5* compared with that for *Nanog* (Figure 6f). In previous studies, *Sgk1* and *Actb* were

identified as genes with variable expression by scRNA-seq, which analyzed cells only in the G_1

phase or cells without measuring the intensity of Hoechst 33342 [7,15]. In this study, these were

classified as cell cycle associated variable genes (Additional file 1: Figure S17).

These results show that Quartz-Seq2 globally classified genes with variable expression

within a cell type into "cell cycle associated variable genes" and "variable genes the expression

of which is less associated with the cell cycle phase" by using Hoechst 33342 staining intensity

data obtained by flow cytometry.

The global picture of cell-type composition in the stromal vascular fraction as revealed

by Quartz-Seq2

Compared with cultured cells, fresh tissue samples tend to be composed of multiple cell types,

whose sizes are highly variable. The use of fresh samples is one promising strategy to assess

the robustness of high-throughput single-cell RNA-seq for various samples. Therefore,

Quartz-Seq2 was applied to cells from the mouse stromal vascular fraction (SVF), which was

taken from adipose tissue (Figure 7a). SVF is thought to be one of the most important sources of

mesenchymal stem cells (MSCs) due to its potential for use in cell therapies and the stimulation

of endogenous repair [26-29]. However, the global picture of cell-type composition in SVF has

not been clarified. To achieve this, we first observed the distribution of cell size in the SVF

population and found it to be broad (5–13 µm, average 6.43±1.35 µm; n=200) (Figure 7a). This

was confirmed by flow cytometry data that were obtained using a cell sorter. It is known that the

typical amount of total RNA in a mammalian cell is approximately 10 pg [15,17]. Thus, the

average amount of total RNA in the SVF population of approximately 1.7 pg is relatively small.

We collected cells in multiple 384-well PCR plates and analyzed their transcriptome using

Quartz-Seq2. In this analysis, 38,450±3513 initial fastq reads were converted to UMI counts in

the final digital expression matrix. The UMI conversion efficiency was 26.85±2.70% (n=3). We

observed broader distributions of UMI counts and gene counts in SVF than in ES and 10 pg of

total RNA. The gene counts correlated well with side scatter (SSC) values, which were

associated with cell size (Additional file 1: Figure S19).

Dimensionality reduction and clustering of single-cell transcriptome data showed the clear

separation of 11 clusters (Figure 7b). To annotate the cell type for each cluster, we identified

differentially expressed genes and functional terms that were either specific or enriched for each

cluster (Figure 7c, d and Additional file 1: Figure S20). As Figure 7c shows, clusters 1, 2, 5, and

8–11 expressed cluster-specific genes, and clusters 3, 4, 6, 7, and 9 shared expressed genes

(marker class C) as well as differentially expressed genes of classes D–G. Taking these markers

and functional terms as well as previous knowledge together, each cluster was identified as

follows: two types of *Cd34*-positive MSC (cluster 1: 7.8% of cells from SVF population, cluster 8:

6.4%), two types of *Cd4*-positive T cells (cluster 3: 45.0%, cluster 4: 1.0%), *Cxcr6*-positive T cells

(cluster 9: 1.71%), B cells (cluster 5: 15.9%), killer T cells (cluster 6: 11.0%), natural killer cells

(cluster 7: 3.0%), macrophages (cluster 2: 5.5%), dendritic cells (cluster 10: 0.86%), and

plasmacytoid dendritic cells (cluster 11: 0.57%). We noted that the sizes of the T cells and B

cells from clusters 3–5, which were measured using a cell sorter, were smaller than those of

MSCs and macrophages from clusters 1, 2, and 8 (Additional file 1: Figure S19). Using

immunofluorescence observation, we confirmed that the sizes of CD4-positive T cells and

CD79-positive B cells were smaller in SVF (Additional file 1: Figure S19). These results show

that Quartz-Seq2 with flow cytometry data is useful for defining respective cell clusters with cell

size information.

Subsequently, we investigated the gene expression of receptors and ligands in cells from

the SVF. The variety of receptors expressed in each cluster was similar (Additional file 1: Figure

S21). However, we found a wide variety of ligands expressed in clusters 1 and 8 (Additional file

1: Figure S21). It is known that MSCs secrete many paracrine mediators, which have a

therapeutic effect [30,31]. These results suggest that clusters 1 and 8 are MSCs, which secrete

many paracrine mediators.

We focused on these two potential MSC clusters (1 and 8) because the heterogeneity of

the MSC population has been discussed in many papers [32,33]. By using Quartz-Seq2, clusters

1 and 8 were shown to have the *Cd31−/Cd34+/Cd45−* phenotype (Additional file 1: Figure S22).

In a previous study, qPCR-based single-cell transcript analysis of the *Cd31−/Cd34+/Cd45−*

population of SVF was reported. By analyzing 140 genes, the authors identified the

Cd55+/Dpp4+/Cd31−/Cd34+/Cd45− cell population and showed that the administration of this

population was effective for normalizing diabetic wound healing in mice [32]. They identified 13

marker genes for the *Cd55+/Dpp4+/Cd31−/Cd34+/Cd45−* population in mouse SVF. We

compared the expression of those 13 genes between clusters 1 and 8 (Additional file 1: Figure

S23). The results showed that almost all of the genes were more highly expressed in cluster 1

than in cluster 8, suggesting that the cluster 1 population was similar to the

Cd55+/Dpp4+/Cd31−/Cd34+/Cd45− population. To further analyze the relationship between our

identified clusters and previously reported heterogeneity of the MSC population, we examined

the expression of typical MSC markers (*CD90*, *CD105, PDGFRa*, and *Sca-1*) [32,34] as well as

subpopulation-specific markers (*Pou5f1*, *Nanog*, *Sox2*, *Tnnt2*, and *Myog*) [35,36]. *PDGFRa*

(*Pdgfra*) and *Sca1* were expressed in both clusters 1 and 8, whereas *Cd90* was expressed at a

higher level in cluster 8 than in cluster 1, and *Cd105* was not strongly expressed in either cluster.

Cd90 and *Cd105* were, however, not specific to these MSC clusters. Neither pluripotent markers

(*Pou5f1*, *Nanog*, and *Sox2*) nor skeletal and cardiomyogenic markers (*Tnnt2* and *Myog*) were

detected in either cluster (Additional file 1: Figure S22). Collectively, our transcriptome analysis

showed that the MSC population is divided into two clusters, suggesting that there is less

heterogeneity of MSCs in the SVF than expected.

Next, we investigated the difference between the two MSC clusters in SVF. We detected

182 differentially expressed genes between clusters 1 and 8 (Additional file 5: Table S4). Cluster

8 was characterized by the enriched expression of genes that encode extracellular matrix

proteins, including collagens, *Hspg2*, and *Bgn*. By contrast, cluster 1 was characterized by the

expression of *IGFBPs* (*Igfbp4*, *Igfbp5*, *Igfbp6*), prostaglandin endoperoxidase synthases (*Ptgs2*),

and secreted factors *Fgf2* and Bmp2. Notably, the expression of stem-cell-characteristic genes

Aldh1a3, *Fgf2*, *Bmp2* and *Tgfbr2* were identified as important modules in cluster 1, suggesting

that this cluster included more stem-like phenotypes that secrete medicinal factors.

To leverage the power of the entire transcriptome analysis, we performed an enrichment

analysis of biological pathways using the 182 genes differentially expressed between the two

clusters (Figure 7e, Additional file 6: Table S5). Cluster 1 was characterized by elastic fiber

pathways and IGF transport pathways. Elastic fibers are constituents of various connective

tissues and are related to vascular function [37]. Growth factors including FGF2, BMP2, IGFBPs,

and PGE2 regulate growth and differentiation [38]. A tightly linked network of collagen

metabolism pathways was found to be highly enriched in cluster 8. These results suggest that

two MSC clusters of SVF have different functions. Cluster 1 could feature medicinal cells

characterized by the expression of growth and development-related genes. In contrast, cluster 8

may be characterized by the production of extracellular matrix.

Taking the obtained findings together, our transcriptome analysis by Quartz-Seq2

successfully identified cell populations that consisted of various types of both large and small

cells, which were isolated from *in vivo* tissue, and demonstrated that fresh SVF contains two

closely related types of MSCs that have distinct characteristics.

Discussion

The rate of conversion from initial reads to UMI counts was low, especially in high-throughput

single-cell RNA-seq. Ideally, greater UMI counts should be generated from limited sequence

reads because the increase in UMI count assigned to each cell leads to the detection of low-copy

genes and the identification of cell-type-specific genes using statistical tests. To overcome these

issues, we developed a novel high-throughput single-cell RNA-seq method, Quartz-Seq2. We

calculated the UMI conversion efficiency, which indicated how effectively initial reads can be

converted to UMI counts. The UMI conversion efficiency of Quartz-Seq2 was 1.44–4.55-fold

higher than those of other single-cell RNA-seq methods (Figure 4). Quartz-Seq2 could detect

1.28–2.41-fold more genes from limited fastq reads and for a lower cost (Figure 4). Moreover, we

decreased the cDNA preparation cost per cell of Quartz-Seq2 by 97.5%–98.5% compared with

that of Quartz-Seq (Figure S6a). The total cost (cDNA preparation cost and sequence cost per

cell) of Quartz-Seq2 as a cell-sorter-based method approached that of a droplet-based method

(Additional file 1: Figure S6b). Furthermore, the use of evaporation-preventing oil might reduce

the cDNA preparation cost of Quartz-Seq2 by 75% [2]. By cell barcoding, Quartz-Seq2 can pool

cDNA of up to 1,536 individual cells into one mixture. Streamlined and simplified experimental

processes of Quartz-Seq2 allowed us to handle thousands of single cells within a few days.

Quartz-Seq2 also showed high accuracy and high reproducibility, leading to precise

measurement of the transcriptome from single cells (Figure 2d and e). We demonstrated

Quartz-Seq2 analyses on a total of approximately 9,000 mouse ES cells as an *in vitro* sample,

and approximately 1,000 cells from mouse SVF samples including MSCs as an *in vivo* sample.

655   We proposed that UMI conversion efficiency could be a useful variable for evaluating

performance for the further development of high-throughput single-cell RNA-seq methods with

shallow reads. The increase of initial sequence reads by additional sequencing does not cancel

out the low efficiency of UMI conversion at an equal rate. For example, approximately 24,000

fastq reads were converted to approximately 11,000 UMI counts in Quartz-Seq2, while Drop-seq

required approximately 169,000 fastq reads to generate the same UMI counts. Under these

conditions, the difference of UMI conversion efficiency was 2.5-fold but the difference of required

fastq reads to generate the same UMI count was 7-fold. This is because UMI counts do not

increase linearly with an increase of initial sequence reads due to UMI filtering. Unfortunately,

the rate of increase of sequence throughput was lower than that of the processing ability for

single cells. It will thus continue to be important to utilize limited initial fastq reads for

high-throughput single-cell RNA-seq methods.

Quartz-Seq2 is based on poly-A tagging, which is one of the strategies of converting

first-strand cDNA to amplified cDNA [19,39]. However, the poly-A tagging efficiency itself has not

been improved for single-cell RNA-seq. In this study, three molecular biological improvements of

Quartz-Seq2 contributed to the increase of amplified cDNA, which led to high UMI conversion

efficiency (Figure 2 and Additional file 1: Figure S1). In addition, the improvement of poly-A

tagging steps was the most efficient approach to increase amplified cDNA for Quartz-Seq2 (up

360%, Additional file 1: Figure S1). Several previous studies improved the efficiency of

conversion from an mRNA molecule to amplifiable cDNA, and showed that the increase of

amplified cDNA is a good guidepost to improve UMI counts or quantitative performance for

single-cell RNA-seq [3,14,15]. These results suggest that improved poly-A tagging was the most

important feature for the high UMI conversion efficiency of Quartz-Seq2.

Several improvements proposed in this study could contribute to the further

development of other single-cell RNA-seq methods, as follows. (1) We showed that a decrease

of enzyme concentration in RT solution led to decreases in technical error and cDNA preparation

cost. (2) We applied the Sequence–Levenshtein distance for the design of cell barcodes

containing RT primer sets. The use of primer sets designed in this study allows the user to

correct mutations of at most two nucleotides of a cell barcode, including substitution, insertion, or

deletion; the correction capability of these primer sets is higher than that of barcode sets used in

previous studies [1,3]. Such correction of the cell barcode increased the average UMI count by

3%–5%. (3) We hope that the spin-down collection system developed in this study can be

applied to other cell-sorter-based single-cell RNA-seq methods [2,3,11,12]. (4) In Quartz-Seq2,

we improved the efficiency of poly-A tagging itself (Figure 2). Several single-cell RNA-seq

methods including Quartz-Seq were based on poly-A tagging [4,5,10,15,19,40]. Such

improvement may directly contribute to these methods having increased quantitative

performance.

We achieved a marked improvement in UMI conversion efficiency at a low cost from

initial reads to UMI counts, allowing us to analyze 3- to 10-fold more single cells in limited

sequence experiments. However, it is difficult to sort more than 20,000 single cells in a day when

using one cell sorter. While there is greater scalability for cell sampling in droplet-based

single-cell RNA-seq methods than in cell-sorter-based methods, these latter methods can utilize

additional information obtained in flow cytometry [41,42], which cannot be determined from

transcriptome data alone. These two types of method provide complementary approaches for

investigating complex biological phenomena. C1 Single-Cell Auto Prep System (Fluidigm) is

another widely used platform for single-cell RNA-seq methods [43]. CEL-seq2 shows high UMI

conversion efficiency, so it is a very convenient method for users of the C1 platform as a

single-cell RNA-seq method based on UMI count [3]. Quartz-Seq2 cannot be performed with the

C1 platform, but it can assimilate 1,536 cell barcodes in a cell sorter in a high-throughput manner.

We think that both methods can be effective as long as the most appropriate one is selected for

each situation.

In this study, we showed that Quartz-Seq2 has advantages in gene detection and the

identification of biological pathways via high UMI conversion efficiency (Figure 3). Moreover, we

analyzed thousands of single cells from all cell cycle phases within a cell type (Figure 6). These

specifications with Quartz-Seq2 allow us to perform the global classification of genes with

variable expression in a cell type into "cell cycle associated variable genes" and "variable genes

the expression of which is less associated with the cell cycle phase".

While Hoechst 33342 is used as an indicator of DNA content, FUCCI reporter systems

monitor the ratio of activities for two different cell-cycle-associated proteins. Therefore, the latter

has an advantage in cell cycle analysis via providing more detailed resolution, although the

introduction of reporter constructs into the cells cannot be applied for all purposes, especially for

the analysis of human samples. A previous study utilizing the FUCCI fluorescent reporter system

reported that competence to respond to specific differentiation signaling was limited to only an

early or a late window of the G_1 phase in human ES cells [44]. In the future, combining

Quartz-Seq2 and FUCCI/FUCCI2 or other fluorescent reporter systems should lead to an

understanding of the global picture of differentiation dynamics regarding competence, response,

transition, and commitment because Quartz-Seq2 can analyze changes of cell state for

thousands of cells.

In summary, Quartz-Seq2 can be used to obtain continuous data on cell states because of

the large number of cells with which it deals and the high efficiency of use of initial sequence

reads. Quartz-Seq2 can facilitate investigation of the cell state within a cell type, such as

gradated or stochastic changes of the cell population in organism development and disease

progression.

Conclusions

In this study, we developed a high-throughput single-cell RNA-seq method, Quartz-Seq2, which

can analyze cells numbering up to 1,536 that are pooled together in a single sample.

Quartz-Seq2 allows us to effectively utilize initial sequence reads from a next-generation

sequencer. The UMI conversion efficiency in Quartz-Seq2 ranged from 32% to 35%, which is

much higher than for other single-cell RNA-seq methods (7%–22%). This was caused by the

improvements in several molecular biological steps including poly-A tagging. The technical gene

expression variability of Quartz-Seq2 was close to the theoretical variability of a Poisson

distribution. As we showed in the analysis of SVF and the ES/PrE mixture, cell types in the

population were identified with marker genes and functional terms that characterized each cell

type. We identified two types of *Cd34*-positive MSCs in SVF, namely, those that express

numerous transcription-factor-encoding and secreted-protein-encoding genes specific to each.

Quartz-Seq2 can also be used to provide continuous data on cell states because of the large

number of cells with which it deals and the high efficiency in the use of initial sequence reads.

Quartz-Seq2 should facilitate investigations of the cell state within a cell type, such as gradated

or stochastic changes of cell populations in organism development and disease progression.

Methods

Cell culture

Mouse embryonic stem cells were cultured as described previously [15]. Briefly, 1.0 x 10^5 cells

were seeded on a 60-mm dish coated with gelatin (0.1%). Cells were maintained in

GMEM-based medium containing 10% FBS and 1000 units/ml leukemia inhibitory factor

(Millipore ESGRO). The cell line used in this study was G6GRGFP, which was established in a

previous study [23]. It has been reported that almost all G6GRGFP differentiated into primitive

endoderm-like cells upon dexamethasone treatment [15,23]. To differentiate ES cells into

primitive endoderm-like cells, 1.0 x 10^5 cells were seeded on a 60-mm dish coated with gelatin

and cultured in GMEM-based medium containing 10% FBS, 1000 units/ml LIF, and 100 mM

dexamethasone for 72 h. We confirmed that almost all of the Dex-treated G6GR ES cells

differentiated into primitive endoderm-like cells. Moreover, we cultured J1 ES cells in accordance

with a procedure described in a previous report [21].

Cell staining

To identify dead or damaged cells, propidium iodide (PI) was added to the cell suspension (final

concentration 1–2 µg/ml). As an indicator of an undifferentiated state in a suspension containing

a mixture of cells, Calcein-AM was used. Suspensions for cells cultured under maintenance and

differentiation conditions were prepared independently, and cells in the maintenance condition

were treated with 1 µg/ml Calcein-AM for 10 min on ice. After washing with PBS, cell

suspensions of ES cells and PrE cells at the same concentration were mixed. Hoechst 33342

was used as an indicator of the DNA content in a cell. The procedures were performed as

described previously [15].

Single-cell preparation for stromal vascular fraction

These experiments were carried out in accordance with the protocol approved by the National

Institute of Advanced Industrial Science and Technology (AIST) Animal Care and Use

Committee and the RIKEN Animal Experiment Committee. Subcutaneous fat tissues from three-

to four-month-old ICR male mice (n=3 per sample, two biological replicate samples) were

minced into small pieces and incubated with 0.4 U/mL collagenase NB4G (Serva) at 37°C for 35

min in a shaking water bath. The digested solution was sequentially filtered through 100-μm and

40-μm cell strainers (Corning), followed by centrifugation at 250 × g for 5 min to remove mature

adipocytes. The pellet was treated with erythrocyte lysis buffer (BD Biosciences) and centrifuged

at 180 × g for 5 min. The nucleated cells were suspended in HBSS with 0.1% BSA, filtered

through a 20-μm cell strainer (pluriSelect), and then kept on ice (Cell solution A). The cell

aggregates that did not pass through the 20-μm strainer were further treated with Accutase

(Thermo Fisher Scientific) at 37°C for 15 min to dissociate them into single cells, centrifuged at

180 × g for 5 min, and suspended in HBSS with 0.1% BSA (Cell solution B). Cell solutions A and

B were mixed and again filtered through the 20-μm cell strainer, followed by centrifugation at 180

× g for 5 min. The pellet was resuspended with HBSS with 0.1% BSA, stained with PI, and used

for single-cell analysis.

RNA preparation

Total RNA was purified from cultured cells using Direct-zol RNA MiniPrep kit (Zymo Research)

with TRIzol RNA Isolation Reagents (Thermo). We measured the concentration of purified total

RNA using a NanoDrop 1000 Spectrophotometer (Thermo). We confirmed that the RNA integrity

number of total RNA was over 9.5 using an Agilent RNA 6000 Nano Kit (Agilent). Estimation of

the average amount of total RNA per single cell for respective samples was performed in

accordance with our previous study [15]. For high-throughput single-cell RNA-seq, we prepared

total RNA from a single cell with ERCC spike-in RNA. First, we diluted the ERCC spike-in RNA

tenfold. We then added 6 μL of 1:10 diluted ERCC spike-in RNA per 10 μg of total RNA. We

used diluted 10 pg of total RNA with ERCC spike-in RNA for the technical validation of

Quartz-Seq2. For single cells, we used the same concentration of ERCC spike-in RNA.

Bulk RNA-seq methods for populations of cells

We prepared sequence library DNA with 1 μg of total RNA using NEBNext Poly(A) mRNA

Magnetic Isolation Module and NEBNext Ultra Directional RNA Library Prep Kit. The total RNA

did not contain ERCC spin-in mix I. In addition, we used SuperScript III instead of ProtoScript in

the reverse-transcription step and KAPA HiFi DNA polymerase instead of NEBNext High-Fidelity

PCR DNA polymerase in the PCR step. The resulting sequence library DNA was analyzed by

HiSeq2500.

Design of cell barcodes

The selection of 384 or 1,536 sequences for v3.1 and v3.2 barcode primer sets was performed

as described below. First, 1,582 or 4,714 candidate sequences were created using the

DNABarcodes package of R Bioconductor for the v3.1 set with 14-mer and the v3.2 set with

15-mer, respectively (version: 1.0.0). To reduce the loss of reads converted into UMI counts, we

applied the Sequence–Levenshtein distance as an edit distance in order to maximize the ability

to correct errors that occur during the synthesis of oligonucleotides or sequencing [22]. The

minimum distance between any two sequences was controlled to 5, leading to the correction of a

maximum of two errors of substitution, insertion, or deletion. As the base composition of the

created sequences was not uniform, we selected 384 or 1,536 sequences from among 1,582 or

4,714 created sequences so that the variance of base composition decreased. These sequences

are listed in Additional file 3: Table S2.

Single-cell collection using flow cytometry

Stained cells were analyzed using flow cytometry SH800 (Sony) or MoFlo Astrios EQ (Beckman

Coulter). For SH800, we used 130-μm microfluidic sorting chips. For MoFlo Astrios EQ, we used

100-μm nozzle sizes. Each cell sorter was equipped with a custom-made splash-guard to

prevent contamination from unexpected droplets between the target well and neighboring wells.

We used two sets of RT primer for Quartz-Seq2. The set of v3.1 RT primers has 384 kinds of

unique cell barcodes, with a length of 14 nucleotides (OPC purification, FASMAC). The set of

v3.2 RT primers has 1,536 kinds of unique cell barcodes, with a length of 15 nucleotides (OPC

purification, Sigma). The set of v3.1 RT primers corresponds to one set of the 384-well PCR

plate with lysis buffer, the wells of which have unique barcodes. The set of v3.2 RT primers

corresponds to four sets of the 384-well PCR plate with lysis buffer. The RT primer position in the

384-well plate and the sequence were as described in Additional file 3: Table S2. Single cells

were isolated in the 384-well PCR plate with 1 μL of lysis buffer (0.1111 μM respective RT

primers, 0.12 mM dNTP mix, 0.3% NP-40, 1 unit/μL RNasin plus) containing ERCC spike-in RNA.

During single-cell sorting, the 384-well PCR plate was kept on a 384 aluminum stand at 4ºC. For

Moflo Astrios EQ, we used G5498B-060 Insert 384 Eppendorf twin.tec PCR as a 384 aluminum

stand (Agilent). For SH800, we used an SH800 384 aluminum stand (Sony). Immediately after

the cell collection, the plate was temporarily sealed with LightCycler 480 Sealing Foil (Roche)

and the sealed 384-well PCR plate was centrifuged at 10,000 g and 4ºC for 1 min using TOMY

MX307, equipped with a Rack-in-Rotor and centrifugation rack PCR96-02. These steps were

very important to collect the droplet with a single cell in lysis buffer in an efficient manner. By

altering the volume of lysis buffer from 0.4 μL (as described in the original Quartz-Seq paper) to

1 μL (Quartz-Seq2), bubbling of lysis buffer was not required before single-cell sorting and the

lysis buffer could easily be handled. We then peeled open the temporary seal and re-sealed it

with Agilent PlateLoc Thermal Microplate Sealer (Agilent). We agitated the plate at 2,600 rpm

and 4ºC for 1 min using ThermoMixer C (Eppendorf), after which we centrifuged the plate again.

The resulting 384-well plate was then immediately cryopreserved at −80ºC and maintained

under such conditions until subsequent reverse transcription for cell barcoding. After

cryopreservation, we performed subsequent whole-transcript amplification using the

cryopreserved 384-well PCR plate within a few months.

Whole-transcript amplification of Quartz-Seq2

Cryopreserved 384-well plates with single-cell lysate were centrifuged at 10,000 g and 4ºC for 1

min. Subsequently, we denatured total RNA in each 384 plate at 70ºC for 90 s and hybridized the

RT primer to poly-adenylated RNA at 35ºC for 15 s using the C1000/S1000 thermal cycler. The

resulting plates were again centrifuged at 10,000 g and 4ºC for 1 min. Next, the plates were

placed on the 384 aluminum plate at 0ºC. We peeled away the seal and added 1 μL of RT

premix (2x Thermopol buffer, 5 units/μL SuperScript III, 0.55 units/μL RNasin plus) to 1 μL of

lysis buffer for each well using a Mantis microfluidic dispensing system (Formulatrix) or a 384

Transfer Plate system (1859-384S, Watson). The above RT solution was used for the RT25

condition. For the RT100 condition, we used the following RT solution: 2x Thermopol buffer, 20

units/µL SuperScript III, and 2.2 units/µL RNasin plus. We sealed the plates again and agitated

them at 2,600 rpm and 4ºC for 1 min. The plates were then centrifuged at 10,000 g and 4ºC for 1

min. We then performed reverse transcription at 35ºC for 5 min and 50ºC for 50 min. The reverse

transcription was stopped at 70ºC for 15 min. Then, the plates were placed on a prechilled

aluminum block, after which we peeled off their seals. Subsequently, we turned the plates upside

down on the assembled collector type A or type B (supplemental figure). We mainly used type A.

We centrifuged the plates with an assemble collector at 3,010 g and 4ºC for 3 min with

swing-bucket rotors. Subsequently, we collected the cDNA solution into a disposable reservoir.

Typically, we obtained 650–700 µL of cDNA solution from one 384-well PCR plate. We purified

and concentrated the cDNA solution using the DNA Clean & Concentrator™-5 kit (Zymo

Research). We used three purification columns for one 384-well PCR plate in the case of the

v3.1 RT primer system (384-cell barcode). Purified cDNA was extracted into 20 µL of

nuclease-free water from one column purification and transferred into an eight-linked PCR tube

(TaKaRa). The PCR tubes were placed on an aluminum PCR stand at 0ºC. We added 25 µL of

TdT solution [1x Thermopol buffer, 2.4 mM dATP, 0.0384 units/µL RNase H (Invitrogen), 26.88

units/µL terminal transferase (Roche)] into 20 µL of extracted cDNA using a pipette at 0ºC. The

resulting 45 µL of TdT solution was mixed with a pipette at 0ºC or ThermoMixer at 2,000 g and

0ºC for 1 min. Immediately thereafter, the PCR tubes were centrifuged at 10,000 g and 0ºC for 1

min. We used a C1000/S1000 thermal cycler equipped with the 96-Deep Well Reaction Module

for the following steps. The PCR tubes were placed on the block of the thermal cycler, which had

been prechilled to 0ºC. We then performed a poly-A tailing reaction at 37ºC for 75 s. The solution

was inactivated at 65ºC for 10 min. The PCR tubes were placed on an aluminum PCR stand at

0ºC. We then dispensed approximately 11 µL of solution into four wells from 45 µL of TdT

solution. We added 46.16 µL of PCR I premix (1.08492x MightyAmp Buffer version 2, 0.06932

µM Tagging primer, 0.05415 units/µL MightyAmp DNA polymerase) to 11 µL of TdT solution for

the respective wells of the PCR tube. MightyAmp DNA polymerase, which used in Quartz-Seq

and Quartz-Seq2, are marketed as Terra PCR Direct polymerase [15]. We performed gentle

inversion mixing on the resulting solution in the PCR tube. The tubes were then centrifuged at

10,000 g and 4ºC for 1 min. Subsequently, the solution was mixed with ThermoMixer at 2,000

rpm and 4ºC for 2 min. Then, we spun down the tube again. Next, we denatured the solution at

98ºC for 130 s and hybridized Tagging primer to poly-A-tailed cDNA at 40ºC for 1 min. After that,

we performed the "Increment step" by heating to 68ºC at 0.2ºC every second and performed

second-strand synthesis at 68ºC for 5 min. The tubes were placed on an aluminum PCR stand at

0ºC. We added 50.232 µL of PCR II premix (0.99697x MightyAmp Buffer version.2, 1.8952 µM

gM primer) to 56.16 µL of PCR I solution. We performed gentle inversion mixing on the resulting

solution in the PCR tube. The tubes were then centrifuged at 10,000 g and 4ºC for 1 min.

Subsequently, the solution was mixed with ThermoMixer at 2,000 rpm and 4ºC for 2 min, after

which we spun down the tube again. We then placed it on the block of the thermal cycler at 68ºC.

Subsequently, we amplified the cDNA for 11 cycles under the following conditions: 98ºC for 10 s,

65ºC for 15 s, and 68ºC 5 min. We then incubated the tube at 68ºC for an additional 5 min.

Finally, we transferred all of the PCR solution, derived from one 384-well PCR plate, to a 50-mL

Polypropylene Centrifuge Tube (Watson). Typically, we obtained approximately 1.2 mL of PCR

solution per 384-well PCR plate. We added 32 µL of 3 M sodium acetate (pH 5.2) and 6420 µL

PB-Buffer (Qiagen) to the PCR solution. The mixture was then purified using a MinElute Spin

Column (Qiagen). Purified cDNA was extracted into 40 µL of nuclease-free water. We

additionally purified the cDNA with 32 µL of Ampure XP beads. Finally, we obtained 32 µL of

purified cDNA. We checked the length distribution of amplified cDNA with an Agilent High

Sensitivity DNA Kit (Agilent). The typical average size of the amplified cDNA in Quartz-Seq2 was

approximately 1,400 bp (Additional file 1: Figure S2c). Primer sequences are listed in Additional

file 2: Table S1.

In the case of the usage of the v3.2 RT primer in Quartz-Seq2, we modified the above

steps as follows. After reverse transcription, we collected cDNA solution into a disposable

reservoir from four sets of 384-well plates, which corresponded to 1,536 wells. We purified and

concentrated the cDNA solution using eight purification columns for four 384-well PCR plates in

the case of the v3.2 RT primer system. In the PCR step, we amplified cDNA for nine cycles with

the following conditions: 98ºC for 10 s, 65ºC for 15 s, and 68ºC for 5 min. Finally, we transferred

all of the PCR solution derived from four 384-well plates to a 50-mL Polypropylene Centrifuge

Tube (Watson). Typically, we obtained approximately 3.5 mL of PCR solution per four 384-well

PCR plates. We added 88 μL of 3 M sodium acetate (pH 5.2) and 17.6 mL of PB-Buffer (Qiagen)

to the PCR solution. The mixture was purified using the MinElute Spin Column (Qiagen).

Subsequently, cDNA was again purified using Ampure XP magnetic beads.

For the Quartz-Seq1-like reaction, we performed the following procedure in

accordance with our previous study. We added 1 μL of RT premix (2x PCR buffer, 5 units/μL

SuperScript III, 0.55 units/μL RNasin plus) to 1 μL of lysis buffer. We then performed reverse

transcription at 35ºC for 5 min and 45ºC for 20 min. This reverse transcription was stopped at

70ºC for 15 min. We added 5 μL of ExoIB solution (1.6x Exonuclease I buffer, 3.2x PCR buffer,

16 mM DTT) and 20 μL of TdT solution [1x PCR buffer, 3 mM dATP, 0.0384 units/μL RNase H

(Invitrogen), 33.6 units/μL terminal transferase (Roche)] into 20 μL of extracted cDNA using a

pipette at 0ºC. The PCR tubes were placed on the block of the thermal cycler that had been

prechilled to 0ºC. We performed a poly-A tailing reaction at 37ºC for 75 s. We then denatured the

solution at 98ºC for 130 s and hybridized Tagging primer to poly-A-tailed cDNA at 40ºC for 1 min.

After that, we performed second-strand synthesis at 68ºC for 5 min. Subsequently, we amplified

the cDNA via a PCR reaction for 12 cycles.

Preparation of truncated sequence adaptor

The truncated sequence adaptor was composed of an rYshapeP5 primer (HPLC-purified) and

rYshapeP7LT primers (HPLC-purified), which had a TruSeqLT-compatible pool barcode. We

prepared 100 μM respective primers with adaptor buffer (10 mM Tris-HCl pH7.8, 0.1 mM EDTA

pH8.0, 50 mM NaCl). We added 5 μL of 100 μM rYshapeP5 primer and rYshapeP7LTxx primer

into a single PCR tube. We denatured the solution at 90ºC for 90 s. After that, we achieved

annealing by cooling to 10ºC by 0.5ºC every 30 s and then maintaining the sample at 4ºC. We

then placed the tube on an aluminum PCR stand at 0ºC. Subsequently, we added adaptor buffer,

which was prechilled at 0ºC, to 10 μL of 50 μM truncated adaptor. Finally, we obtained about 50

μL of 10 μM truncated adaptor. We cryopreserved 1 μL of 10 μM truncated adaptor in a PCR

tube at −80ºC until usage in the adaptor ligation step. Primer sequences are listed in Additional

file 2: Table S1.

Sequence library preparation of Quartz-Seq2

We added 130 µL of nuclease-free water including 5–10 ng of amplified cDNA into a Crimp-Cap

microTUBE with AFA Fiber. We then performed cDNA fragmentation using an LE220

Focused-ultrasonicator (Covaris) under the following conditions: duty factor 15%, peak incident

power 450 W, cycles per burst 200, and treatment time 80 s. We purified and concentrated the

cDNA solution using the DNA Clean & Concentrator™-5 kit. Purified cDNA was extracted into 10

µL of nuclease-free water from one column purification and transferred into an eight-linked PCR

tube (TaKaRa).

We then added 2 µL of End-Repair premix [1.4 µL of End repair & A-tailing buffer and

0.6 µL of End repair & A-tailing Enzyme (KAPA Biosystems)] to 10 µL of fragmented cDNA

solution. Subsequently, we mixed the solution by pipetting on an aluminum PCR stand at 0ºC.

The PCR tubes were placed on the block of the thermal cycler, which had been prechilled to

20ºC. We then incubated the tubes at 37ºC for 60 min and 65ºC for 30 min. After this, we added

2 µL of adaptor buffer (1.5 µM truncated adaptor, 10 mM Tris-HCl pH7.8, 0.1 mM EDTA pH8.0,

50 mM NaCl) and 8 µL of ligation premix [6 µL of ligation buffer, 2 µL of DNA ligase (KAPA

Biosystems)] at 4ºC. The 22 µL of ligation solution was well mixed by pipetting at 4ºC. Then, we

performed adaptor ligation at 20ºC for 15 min. After ligation, we added 18 µL of Ampure XP

beads to 22 µL of adaptor ligation solution and mixed them well. Adaptor-ligated cDNA was

extracted into 20 µL of nuclease-free water. We added 32 µL of PCR premix [25 µL of 2xKAPA

HiFi ready mix, 1.75 µL of 10 µM TPC2 primer (HPLC-purified), 10 µM P5-gMac hybrid primer

(HPLC-purified)] to 18 µL of adaptor-ligated cDNA. We denatured the solution at 98ºC for 45 s.

Subsequently, we amplified cDNA for eight cycles under the following conditions: 98ºC for 15 s,

60ºC for 30 s, and 72ºC for 1 min. Finally, we additionally incubated the tube at 72ºC for 5 min.

We added 40 µL of Ampure XP beads to 50 µL of PCR solution. Purified

sequence-library DNA was eluted into 20–30 µL of nuclease-free water. We checked the DNA

concentration and DNA size of sequence library DNA using the Agilent High Sensitivity DNA Kit

(Agilent) and QuantiFluor® dsDNA System (Promega). We also prepared sequence library DNA

with Tn5 transposase, in accordance with a modified version of a procedure used in a previous

study [6]. Specifically, the modifications were as follows. We used 0.75 ng of amplified cDNA for

1011   the Nextera XT library preparation kit. We amplified sequence library DNA with the P5-gMac

1012   hybrid primer and the Nextera XT primer, which has the P7 sequence.

1013

Deep sequencing for Quartz-Seq2

We analyzed the sequence library DNA from Quartz-Seq2 using NextSeq500 (Illumina) and

HiSeq2500 (Illumina). For the Read1 sequence, we used a custom sequence primer named

Read1DropQuartz primer (HPLC-purified). In the case of the v3.1 RT primer, sequence

specification was as follows (Read1: 22 cycles, Index1: 6 cycles, Read2: 64–118 cycles). In the

case of the v3.2 RT primer, sequence specification was as follows (Read1: 23 cycles, Index1: 6

cycles, Read2: 63 cycles). When Read1 length was within 64 nt we mainly used the NextSeq

500/550 High Output v2 Kit (75 cycles), which can be used for sequencing up to 92 nt. For long

sequences (over 64 nt), we analyzed sequence library DNA using the HiSeq Rapid SBS Kit v2.

Sequence analysis with HiSeq2500 was supported by the Genomic Network Analysis Support

facility (GeNAS) in RIKEN and Phyloinformatics Unit of RIKEN Center for Life Science

Technologies (formerly GRAS) in RIKEN.

1026

Amplification-free single-cell qPCR analysis

Amplification-free single-cell qPCR was performed in accordance with our previous study with

the following modifications [15]. We collected a single cell into 1 µL of lysis buffer (2.5 µM

random hexamer, 1 mM dNTP mix, 0.3% NP40, 2 units/µL RNasin plus) of a 384-well PCR plate

(Eppendorf) using SH800. The resulting 384-well PCR plate was cryopreserved at −80ºC. We

denatured total RNA in the 384-well PCR plate at 70ºC for 1.5 min using a C1000/S1000 thermal

cycler and hybridized the random primer to RNA at 0ºC for 2 min. We added 1 µL of

reverse-transcription solution (2x SSIV buffer, 10 mM DTT, 2 units/µL RNasin plus, 20 units/µL

SuperScript IV) to the lysis buffer. Subsequently, we performed reverse transcription at 23ºC for

10 min and 50ºC for 10 min. The reverse transcription was stopped at 80ºC for 10 min. The

resulting solution was diluted with qPCR solution (10 mM Tris-HCl pH 8.0, 0.05% Tween-20).

The obtained diluted solution was then used for qPCR detection with QuantiTect SYBR Green

PCR Master Mix and the LightCycler480 system. For primer sets for each gene, see Additional

file 3: Table S2.

1041

Drop-seq experiments and data analysis

Drop-seq was performed as reported previously [6] and in line with an online protocol

(http://mccarrolllab.com/dropseq/), but with the following modifications: flow rates for oil and

aqueous suspensions were 14,000 μl/h and 4,000 μl/h, respectively. The diameter of droplets

was 95–100 μm. Microfluidic devices were fabricated by Fluidware Technologies (Japan). The

lot number of barcoded beads was 051415 (ChemGenes). Data analysis for Drop-seq was

performed as described online (http://mccarrolllab.com/dropseq/). The versions of the software

and databases were as follows: STAR: v2.5.1b; mouse genome: GRCm38/mm10; genome

annotation: gencode GRCm38.p4 vM9; and Drop-seq tools: v1.11.

1051

Quartz-Seq2 read alignment and generation of digital expression data

The structure of the sequence library and data processing was designed based on those of

Drop-seq ([6] and online as referenced above). BCL files generated by Illumina NextSeq500

were converted to fastq files by bcl2fastq2 (v2.17.1.14) with demultiplexing pool barcodes. The

--mask-short-adapter-reads parameter was set to 20. If needed, fastq reads were randomly

downsampled by seqtk software (version: sgdp). We mainly trimmed read2 length to 62 nt for

Quartz-Seq2 by using FASTX-Toolkit (version: 0.0.14). Fastq files for Read1 and Read2 were

converted to a bam file by FastqToSam of Picard tools (version: 1.134). Extracting cell barcodes

and UMI (also called as molecular barcode) and filtering out of reads with low barcode quality

were performed using Drop-seq tools (version: 1.11). The resulting bam files were re-converted

to fastq files by SamToFastq of Picard tools, and mapped to the mouse genome

(GRCm38/mm10) using STAR (version: 2.5.1b). After sorting the resulting bam files using

SortSam of Picard tools, the unaligned bam and aligned bam were merged by

MergeBamAlignment of Picard tools. Then, gene names were assigned to each record using

TagReadWithGeneExon of Drop-seq tools and gtf file (version: gencode GRCm38.p4 vM9). For

the correction of errors of cell barcodes considering the Sequence–Levenshtein distance, a

custom-made Python program (correct_bacode.py) was used, which enabled the correction of

up to two nucleotide errors of substitution, insertion, or deletion. This program used Python2

(version: 2.7.11+), PypeR (version: 1.1.2), R (version: 3.2.3), Bioconductor (version: 3.2), and

the Bioconductor package DNABarcodes (version: 1.0.0). Finally, the UMI for each gene for

each cell was counted using DigitalExpression of Drop-seq tools, which generated the digital

expression matrix. To generate a non-UMI-filtered matrix, a custom-made Python program that

counts reads for each gene for each cell was used. To compare the quantitative performance

between Quartz-Seq2 and reported data in Figure 4, we used Ensembl75 as a reference

transcript. Moreover, we trimmed the read2 length to 45 nt for the comparison.

1077

Dimensionality reduction, clustering, and term analysis

Cells with low detected gene counts were removed for further analysis (Quartz-Seq2 on ES/PrE

mixture: 4,000 genes; Quartz-Seq2 on SVF: 500 genes). Total counts of each cell were

normalized to 10,000 or the mean of total UMI counts for cells. UMI counts had 1 added to them

and were then log-transformed (natural logarithm), after which they were scaled to have mean

and variance for each gene of 0 and 1, respectively. For PCA, UMI counts for all detected genes

(for ES/PrE mixture) or genes with highly variable expression (for SVF) were used. For t-SNE,

the top 10 to 40 principal components of matrices produced by PCA were used. For clustering,

the DBSCAN algorithm was used. The values of the parameter epsilon were 0.69 for

Quartz-Seq2 on the 4,500 mouse ES/PrE mixture, 5 for Quartz-Seq2 on the 384 mouse ES/PrE

mixture, 3 for Drop-seq on the 500 mouse ES/PrE mixture, and 2.2 for SVF analysis.

Significantly enriched GO terms with the top principal components were calculated using the

GO-PCA package [45].

1091

Identification of differentially expressed genes for each cluster

Marker genes for each cluster were identified based on a generalized linear model. The

difference in deviance between two models, in which the gene was or was not differentially

expressed between two clusters, was calculated for the genes. To filter out noise, pseudocount 1

was added to the averaged gene expression in clusters and only genes with fold change of 2 or

more between two clusters were further analyzed. P-values were calculated as 1 − cumulative

density function of a chi-squared continuous random variable for difference in deviance. After

corrections for multiple testing, genes with FDR of less than 0.05 were identified as differentially

expressed genes for the cluster. For comparison between differentially expressed genes

identified by scRNA-seq methods and those identified by bulk RNA-seq, this pseudocount was

not added.

1103

Identification of variable genes in same cell-type

To identify genes for which the expression changes depending on the phase of the cell cycle, we

used the intensity of Hoechst 33342 staining measured using a cell sorter. First, cells were

discretized into 40 equal-sized buckets based on the rank of Hoechst 33342 staining intensity.

Then, the CV of averaged UMI counts for a gene in each bin was calculated. After z-scaling of

this, genes with high z-scores were identified. To identify genes whose expression fluctuates in a

manner not relating to the cell cycle phase, we calculated the CV of UMI counts for a gene in

each cell and the CV of averaged UMI counts for a gene in each bin. After z-scaling of such data,

the genes for which the difference between two scaled CVs was large were identified as

"variable genes the expression of which is less associated with the cell cycle phase".

1114

Enrichment analysis on pathway and Gene Ontology (GO) terms

Pathways that were particularly enriched for the differentially expressed genes were calculated

using the ReactomePA package of R Bioconductor (version: 1.14.4, [46]) and Metascape

(http://metascape.org/ [47]). The cut-off parameter for the q value was 0.05. Terms that were

enriched for genes with highly variable expression were calculated using DAVID, the Database

for Annotation, Visualization and Integrated Discovery (version: 6.8, [48,49]). Ontology used for

calculation was GOTERM_BP_FAT, GOTERM_MF_FAT, and GOTERM_CC_FAT. The terms

with FDR < 0.05 were identified as enriched terms.

1123

Quantitative analysis for external RNA molecules

To calculate the ERCC capture efficiency, we determined the slope of regression between the

input ERCC molecules and detected UMI counts for each ERCC. We tested our calculation

using digital expression matrix (GSM1599501) of the inDrop single-cell sequence method as a

control, and confirmed that our calculated ERCC capture efficiency (7.2%) approximately

matched their reported ERCC capture efficiency (7.1%). To calculate the detection limit of ERCC

molecules, the method of Svensson et al. was used [50]. We confirmed that our calculated

results and those in the paper by Svensson et al. were approximately similar. For calculation of

ERCC capture efficiency and detection limit for previous data, we used the concentration of

ERCC spike-in RNA, which reported by original authors. For the paper by Ziegenhain et al., we

confirmed the concentration by personal communication.

1135

Simulation-based power analysis

PowsimR was used to perform power analysis [51]. The parameters of the negative binomial

distribution, namely, mean, dispersion, and dropout probability, were estimated by the function

estimateParam with the following parameters: sigma = 1.96, distribution = "NB," RNAseq =

"singlecell," and normalization = "scran." To simulate differential expression between two groups

using these parameters, the number of genes is represented by the number of detected genes

(count > 0) in each method. Differentially expressed genes set up simulations with number of

detected genes, 23.6% genes being DE, log fold change sample from a narrow gamma

distribution (shape: 1.02, rate: 0.78). That parameter was derived from parameter estimates

based on bulk RNA-seq data from mouse ES and PE cells (n = 3). The function simulateDE was

used to run power analysis with the following parameters: DEmethod = MAST and normalization

= scran. The results of power simulation were plotted using R with ggplot2 packages.

1148

1149 **Data resources**

1150 Raw and processed data files for Quartz-Seq2 and Drop-seq experiments are available under

1151 GEO: GSE99866 (https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/geo/query/acc.cgi?acc=GSE99866) for

1152 single-cell RNA-seq data and DRA002954 for bulk-RNA-seq data. A custom-made python

program (correct_bacode.py) has been deposited under GitHub (DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.1118151,

https://github.com/rikenbit/correct_barcode/).

List of abbreviations

UMI: unique molecular identifier

PCR: polymerase chain reaction

PCC: Pearson's correlation coefficient

SCC: Spearman's rank correlation coefficient

CV: coefficient of variation

ES cell: embryonic stem cell

PrE cell: primitive endoderm cell

SVF: stromal vascular fraction

RT: reverse transcription

Dex: dexamethasone

PCA: principal component analysis

MSC: mesenchymal stem cell

TdT: terminal deoxynucleotidyl transferase

GO: Gene Ontology

FDR: false discovery rate

t-SNE: t-distributed stochastic neighbor embedding

nt: nucleotide

bp: base pair

SSC: side scatter

TPR: true positive rate

DEG: differentially expressed gene

1204

1205

1206

1207

1208

1209

1210

Declarations

Ethics approval and consent to participate

Mouse experiments were carried out in accordance with the protocol approved by the National Institute of Advanced Industrial Science and Technology (AIST) Animal Care and Use Committee and the RIKEN Animal Experiment Committee.

Consent for publication

Not applicable.

Availability of data and material

The data have been deposited under GEO accession number GSE99866 and DRA accession number: DRA002954. A custom-made python program (correct_bacode.py) has been deposited under GitHub (DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.1118151, https://github.com/rikenbit/correct_barcode/).

Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Funding

This work was supported by the Projects for Technological Development, Research Center Network for Realization of Regenerative Medicine by Japan, the Japan Agency for Medical Research and Development (AMED), and the Japan Science and Technology Agency (JST). The sequence analyses of bulk RNA-seq were supported by MEXT KAKENHI (No. 221S0002) and JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number JP24651218 and JSPS KAKENHI Grant number JP15K16329. The sequence operations of Quartz-Seq2 using HiSeq2500 were supported by the Platform Project for Supporting Drug Discovery and Life Science Research (Platform for Drug Discovery, Informatics, and Structural Life Science) from AMED. This work was partially supported by JST CREST Grant Number JPMJCR16G3, Japan.

Authors' contributions

YS, HD, and IN designed the study. YS designed and developed the Quartz-Seq2 reaction. YS

and KT performed experiments of single-cell RNA-seq. HD, YS, and IN designed and performed

data analysis. HT and AK designed and performed experiments on the mouse stromal vascular

fraction. ME and KT assisted with the experiments. TH assisted with the development of the

spin-down collection system. YS, HD, HT, AK, and IN wrote the manuscript. All authors read and

approved the final manuscript.

Acknowledgements

We greatly appreciate the Drop-seq team's useful comments about our technical introduction to

Drop-seq. We thank Mr. Akihiro Matsushima and Mr. Manabu Ishii for their assistance with the

infrastructure for the data analysis. We are also grateful to Dr. Christoph Ziegenhain and Dr.

Wolfgang Enard for giving us their quantitative data from single-cell RNA-seq methods. We also

thank Dr. Rudolf Jaenisch and Dr. Yoichi Shinkai for giving us the J1 ES cell line. Advice and

comments from Dr. Tempei Sato were also of great help in the culture of J1 ES cells. We thank

Dr. Yutaka Suzuki for his assistance with the bulk RNA-seq. We are also grateful to Dr. Mika

Yoshimura and Dr. Haruka Ozaki (RIKEN) for their assistance with the bulk RNA-seq analysis.

Moreover, we thank the staff at the Phyloinformatics Unit of RIKEN Center for Life Science

Technologies (formerly GRAS) for their assistance with the HiSeq2500 sequencer. Our thanks

also go to Sony's cell sorter team for specially customizing the 384-well sorting mode of the

SH800. Finally, we thank Edanz Group (www.edanzediting.com/ac) for editing a draft of this

manuscript.

References

1269

1. Zheng GXY, Terry JM, Belgrader P, Ryvkin P, Bent ZW, Wilson R, et al. Massively parallel

digital transcriptional profiling of single cells. Nat Commun. 2017;8:14049.

2. Muraro MJ, Dharmadhikari G, Grün D, Groen N, Dielen T, Jansen E, et al. A Single-Cell

Transcriptome Atlas of the Human Pancreas. Cell Syst. 2016;3:385–394.e3.

3. Hashimshony T, Senderovich N, Avital G, Klochendler A, de Leeuw Y, Anavy L, et al.

CEL-Seq2: sensitive highly-multiplexed single-cell RNA-Seq. Genome Biol. 2016;17:892.

4. Fan X, Zhang X, Wu X, Guo H, Hu Y, Tang F, et al. Single-cell RNA-seq transcriptome

analysis of linear and circular RNAs in mouse preimplantation embryos. Genome Biol.

2015;16:236.

5. Nakamura T, Yabuta Y, Okamoto I, Aramaki S, Yokobayashi S, Kurimoto K, et al. SC3-seq: a

method for highly parallel and quantitative measurement of single-cell gene expression. Nucleic

Acids Res. 2015;43:e60–0.

6. Macosko EZ, Basu A, Satija R, Nemesh J, Shekhar K, Goldman M, et al. Highly Parallel

Genome-wide Expression Profiling of Individual Cells Using Nanoliter Droplets. Cell.

2015;161:1202–14.

7. Klein AM, Mazutis L, Akartuna I, Tallapragada N, Veres A, Li V, et al. Droplet Barcoding for

Single-Cell Transcriptomics Applied to Embryonic Stem Cells. Cell. 2015;161:1187–201.

8. Fan HC, Fu GK, Fodor SPA. Combinatorial labeling of single cells for gene expression

cytometry. Science. 2015;347:1258367–7.

9. Bose S, Wan Z, Carr A, Rizvi A, Vieira G, Pe'er D, et al. Scalable microfluidics for single-cell

RNA printing and sequencing. Genome Biol. 2015;16:120.

10. Streets AM, Zhang X, Cao C, Pang Y, Wu X, Xiong L, et al. Microfluidic single-cell

whole-transcriptome sequencing. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. 2014;111:7048–53.

11. Jaitin DA, Kenigsberg E, Keren-Shaul H, Elefant N, Paul F, Zaretsky I, et al. Massively

Parallel Single-Cell RNA-Seq for Marker-Free Decomposition of Tissues into Cell Types.

Science. 2014;343:776–9.

12. Soumillon M, Cacchiarelli D, Semrau S, van Oudenaarden A, Mikkelsen TS. Characterization

of directed differentiation by high-throughput single-cell RNA-Seq. 2014.

13. Islam S, Zeisel A, Joost S, La Manno G, Zajac P, Kasper M, et al. Quantitative single-cell

RNA-seq with unique molecular identifiers. Nat. Methods. 2013;11:163–6.

14. Picelli S, Björklund ÅK, Faridani OR, Sagasser S, Winberg G, Sandberg R. Smart-seq2 for

sensitive full-length transcriptome profiling in single cells. Nat. Methods. 2013;10:1096–8.

15. Sasagawa Y, Nikaido I, Hayashi T, Danno H, Uno KD, Imai T, et al. Quartz-Seq: a highly

reproducible and sensitive single-cell RNA sequencing method, reveals non-genetic

gene-expression heterogeneity. Genome Biol. 2013;14:R31.

16. Hashimshony T, Wagner F, Sher N, Yanai I. CEL-Seq: Single-Cell RNA-Seq by Multiplexed

Linear Amplification. Cell Rep. 2012;2:666–73.

17. Ramsköld D, Luo S, Wang Y-C, Li R, Deng Q, Faridani OR, et al. Full-length mRNA-Seq

from single-cell levels of RNA and individual circulating tumor cells. Nat. Biotechnol.

2012;30:777–82.

18. Islam S, Kjallquist U, Moliner A, Zajac P, Fan JB, Lonnerberg P, et al. Characterization of the

single-cell transcriptional landscape by highly multiplex RNA-seq. Genome Res. 2011;21:1160–

7.

19. Tang F, Barbacioru C, Wang Y, Nordman E, Lee C, Xu N, et al. mRNA-Seq

whole-transcriptome analysis of a single cell. Nat. Methods. 2009;6:377–82.

20. Grün D, Kester L, van Oudenaarden A. Validation of noise models for single-cell

transcriptomics. Nat. Methods. 2014;11:637–40.

21. Ziegenhain C, Vieth B, Parekh S, Reinius B, Guillaumet-Adkins A, Smets M, et al.

Comparative Analysis of Single-Cell RNA Sequencing Methods. Mol. Cell. 2017;65:631–4.

22. Buschmann T. DNABarcodes: an R package for the systematic construction of DNA sample

tags. Bioinformatics. 2017;:btw759.

23. Shimosato D, Shiki M, Niwa H. Extra-embryonic endoderm cells derived from ES cells

induced by GATA Factors acquire the character of XEN cells. BMC Dev. Biol. 2007;7:80.

24. Ilicic T, Kim JK, Kolodziejczyk AA, Bagger FO, McCarthy DJ, Marioni JC, et al. Classification

of low quality cells from single-cell RNA-seq data. Genome Biol. 2016;17:57.

25. Zalzman M, Falco G, Sharova LV, Nishiyama A, Thomas M, Lee S-L, et al. Zscan4 regulates

telomere elongation and genomic stability in ES cells. Nature. 2010;464:858–63.

26. Pak J, Lee JH, Park KS, Park M, Kang L-W, Lee SH. Current use of autologous adipose

tissue-derived stromal vascular fraction cells for orthopedic applications. J. Biomed. Sci.

2017;24:1496.

27. Trounson A, McDonald C. Stem Cell Therapies in Clinical Trials: Progress and Challenges.

Cell Stem Cell. 2015;17:11–22.

28. Baer PC, Geiger H. Adipose-Derived Mesenchymal Stromal/Stem Cells: Tissue Localization,

Characterization, and Heterogeneity. Stem Cells Int. 2012;2012:1–11.

29. Lindroos B, Suuronen R, Miettinen S. The Potential of Adipose Stem Cells in Regenerative

Medicine. Stem Cell Rev. 2010;7:269–91.

30. Kwon HM, Hur S-M, Park K-Y, Kim C-K, Kim Y-M, Kim H-S, et al. Multiple paracrine factors

secreted by mesenchymal stem cells contribute to angiogenesis. Vascular Pharmacology.

2014;63:19–28.

31. Madrigal M, Rao KS, Riordan NH. A review of therapeutic effects of mesenchymal stem cell

secretions and induction of secretory modification by different culture methods. J Transl Med.

2014;12:71.

32. Rennert RC, Januszyk M, Sorkin M, Rodrigues M, Maan ZN, Duscher D, et al. Microfluidic

single-cell transcriptional analysis rationally identifies novel surface marker profiles to enhance

cell-based therapies. Nat Commun. 2016;7:11945.

33. Baer PC. Adipose-derived mesenchymal stromal/stem cells: An update on their phenotype in

vivo and in vitro. World J Stem Cells. 2014;6:256.

34. Mabuchi Y, Houlihan DD, Akazawa C, Okano H, Matsuzaki Y. Prospective Isolation of

Murine and Human Bone Marrow Mesenchymal Stem Cells Based on Surface Markers. Stem

Cells Int. 2013;2013:1–7.

35. Dromard CC, Barreau C, Andr M, Berger-M ller S, Casteilla L, Planat-Benard V. Mouse

adipose tissue stromal cells give rise to skeletal and cardiomyogenic cell sub-populations. Front

Cell Dev Biol. 2014;2:697.

36. Heneidi S, Simerman AA, Keller E, Singh P, Li X, Dumesic DA, et al. Awakened by Cellular

Stress: Isolation and Characterization of a Novel Population of Pluripotent Stem Cells Derived

from Human Adipose Tissue. Ljubimov AV, editor. PLoS ONE. 2013;8:e64752.

37. Wachi H. Role of Elastic Fibers on Cardiovascular Disease. J. Health Sci. 2011;57:449–57.

38. Hughes-Fulford M, Li C-F. The role of FGF-2 and BMP-2 in regulation of gene induction, cell

proliferation and mineralization. J Orthop Surg Res. 2011;6:8.

39. Kurimoto K. An improved single-cell cDNA amplification method for efficient high-density

oligonucleotide microarray analysis. Nucleic Acids Res. 2006;34:e42–2.

40. Yang L, Ma Z, Cao C, Zhang Y, Wu X, Lee R, et al. MR-Seq: measuring a single cell's

transcriptome repeatedly by RNA-seq. Science Bulletin. 2017.

41. Velten L, Haas SF, Raffel S, Blaszkiewicz S, Islam S, Hennig BP, et al. Human

haematopoietic stem cell lineage commitment is a continuous process. Nat. Cell Biol.

2017;Complex Sy:1695.

42. Kowalczyk MS, Tirosh I, Heckl D, Rao TN, Dixit A, Haas BJ, et al. Single-cell RNA-seq

reveals changes in cell cycle and differentiation programs upon aging of hematopoietic stem

cells. Genome Res. 2015;25:1860–72.

43. Wu AR, Neff NF, Kalisky T, Dalerba P, Treutlein B, Rothenberg ME, et al. Quantitative

assessment of single-cell RNA-sequencing methods. Nat. Methods. 2013;11:41–6.

44. Pauklin S, Vallier L. The Cell-Cycle State of Stem Cells Determines Cell Fate Propensity.

Cell. 2013;155:135–47.

45. Wagner F. GO-PCA: An Unsupervised Method to Explore Gene Expression Data Using Prior

Knowledge. Li X, editor. PLoS ONE. 2015;10:e0143196.

46. Yu G, He Q-Y. ReactomePA: an R/Bioconductor package for reactome pathway analysis

and visualization. Mol. BioSyst. 2016;12:477–9.

47. Tripathi S, Pohl MO, Zhou Y, Rodriguez-Frandsen A, Wang G, Stein DA, et al. Meta- and

Orthogonal Integration of Influenza "OMICs" Data Defines a Role for UBR4 in Virus Budding.

Cell Host Microbe. 2015;18:723–35.

48. Huang DW, Sherman BT, Lempicki RA. Systematic and integrative analysis of large gene

lists using DAVID bioinformatics resources. Nat Protoc. 2008;4:44–57.

49. Huang DW, Sherman BT, Lempicki RA. Bioinformatics enrichment tools: paths toward the

comprehensive functional analysis of large gene lists. Nucleic Acids Res. 2008;37:1–13.

50. Svensson V, Natarajan KN, Ly L-H, Miragaia RJ, Labalette C, Macaulay IC, et al. Power

analysis of single-cell RNA-sequencing experiments. Nat. Methods. 2017;6:150.

51. Vieth B, Ziegenhain C, Parekh S, Enard W, Hellmann I. powsimR: power analysis for bulk

and single cell RNA-seq experiments. Bioinformatics. 2017;33:3486–8.

1388

1389

1390

1391

1392

1393

1394

1395

1396

1397

1398

1399

1400

1401

1402

1403

1404

1405

1406

1407

1408

1409

1410

1411

1412

Figure legends

Figure 1. Overview of Quartz-Seq2 experimental processes

a) Quartz-Seq2 consisted of five steps. (1) Each single cell in a droplet was sorted into lysis

buffer in each well of a 384-well PCR plate using flow cytometry analysis data. (2)

Poly-adenylated RNA in each well was reverse-transcribed into first-strand cDNA with reverse

transcription primer, which had a unique cell barcode. We prepared 384 or 1,536 kinds of cell

barcode (CB) with a unique sequence based on the Sequence–Levenshtein distance (SeqLv).

The edit distance of SeqLv was 5. RT primer also had a UMI sequence for reduction of PCR bias

(MB) and a poly-dT sequence for binding to poly-A RNA. (3) Cell-barcode-labeled cDNAs from

all 384 wells were promptly collected by centrifugation using assembled collectors. (4) Collected

first-strand cDNAs were purified and concentrated for subsequent whole-transcript amplification.

In the poly-A tailing step, purified cDNA was extended with a poly-A tail by terminal

deoxynucleotidyl transferase (TdT). Subsequently, second-strand cDNA was synthesized with a

tagging primer, which had a poly-dT sequence. The resulting second-strand cDNA had a PCR

primer sequence (M) at both ends of it. The cDNA was amplifiable in subsequent PCR

amplification. (5) For conversion from amplified cDNA to sequence library DNA, we fragmented

the amplified cDNA using the ultrasonicator Covaris. Such fragmented cDNA was ligated with a

truncated Y-shaped sequence adaptor, which had an Illumina flow-cell binding sequence (P7)

and a pool barcode sequence (PB). PB made it possible to mix different sets of

cell-barcode-labeled cDNA. Ligated cDNA, which had CB and MB sequences, was enriched by

PCR amplification. The resulting sequence library DNA contained P7 and P5 flow-cell binding

sequences at respective ends of the DNA. We sequenced the cell-barcode site and the UMI site

at Read1, the pool-barcode site at Index1, and the transcript sequence at Read2. b) The

relationship between initial fastq reads and the number of single cells for sequence analysis in

NextSeq500 runs. Typically, one sequence run with NextSeq 500/550 High Output v2 Kit reads

out 400–450 M fastq reads. The x-axis represents the input cell number for one sequence run.

The y-axis represents the initial data size (fastq reads) on average per cell. Red circle represents

the typical range of shallow input read depth for a single cell. c) We define the formula for

calculating the UMI conversion efficiency. Each parameter is defined as follows: UMI_{sc}: the

number of UMI count, assigned to a single-cell sample, $fastq_{sc}$: the number of fastq reads

derived from each single-cell sample, $fastq_{non\text{-}sc}$: the number of fastq reads derived from

non-single-cell samples, which include experimental byproducts such as WTA adaptors, WTA

byproducts, and non-STAMPs. Initial fastq reads are composed of $fastq_{sc}$ and $fastq_{non\text{-}sc}$.

1446

Figure 2. Sequence performance of Quartz-Seq2 with molecular biological improvements

a) Improvement of poly-A tagging efficiency. Bar plot represents the relative DNA yield in various

poly-A tagging conditions using purified first-strand cDNA from 1 ng of total RNA. T55 buffer as

the terminal deoxynucleotidyl transferase (TdT) buffer and the temperature condition "Increment"

for the poly-A tagging step improved the cDNA yield of whole-transcript amplification. Buffer

compositions are indicated in Additional file 3: Table S2. QuartzB represents use of a

Quartz-Seq-like buffer as a positive control, in accordance with the approach described in the

original Quartz-Seq paper. Finally, we quantified cDNA yield (300–9,000 bp) and byproduct DNA

yield (50–300 bp) using Bioanalyzer (Agilent). The presented p-value was obtained using

two-tailed Welch's t-test. b) Reverse transcription efficiency with serially diluted RT enzymes.

The x-axis represents the average relative RT qPCR score from 10 genes. Detailed

concentrations of RT enzymes are presented in Additional file 1: Figure S7. c,f–h) Comparison

between Quartz-Seq2 in the RT25 condition and Quartz-Seq-like conditions regarding sequence

performance. c) We analyzed 384 wells with 10 pg of total RNA and used approximately 0.19 M

fastq reads on average per well. We show the UMI count and gene count in box plots. d) The

panel shows a scatter plot between the mean of gene expression and the variability of gene

expression with 10 pg of total RNA in 384 wells. Red lines represent the theoretical variability of

gene expression in the form of a Poisson distribution. e) Gene expression reproducibility

between bulk poly-A-RNA-seq (1 μg of total RNA) and Quartz-Seq2 (10 pg of total RNA,

averaged over 384 wells). f) Dispersion of gene expression. The x-axis represents gene

expression variability. g) Reproducibility of gene expression for internal gene and external

control RNA. h) Accuracy of gene expression for internal gene and external control RNA.

1469

Figure 3. Quartz-Seq2 with high UMI conversion efficiency identified more differentially

expressed genes and biological pathways

a) UMI counts, gene counts, and UMI conversion efficiency for Quartz-Seq2 and Drop-seq

experiments. These values depended on the initial fastq reads on average per cell. b) We

calculated overlapping differentially expressed genes between bulk RNA-seq data and

single-cell RNA-seq data. We randomly picked up the indicated number of single cells and

calculated differentially expressed genes 20 times. c,d) We randomly selected 100 ES cells and

100 PrE cells for each method. c) Venn diagram of genes that were differentially expressed

between the ES cluster and the Dex-treated ES (PrE) cluster, as identified by Quartz-Seq2,

Drop-seq, and bulk RNA-seq (left). The number of genes that differed in expression level

between ES and PrE cells by at least twofold was determined (FDR < 0.05). We also present a

Venn diagram of the Reactome pathway (right). d) Venn diagram of GO terms for genes with

highly variable expression, as identified by Quartz-Seq2 and Drop-seq.

1483

Figure 4. Quantitative comparison among Quartz-Seq2 and previously reported methods

using embryonic stem cells

a) We determined the UMI and gene counts with Quartz-Seq2 in the "RT25" condition using J1

ES cells. We performed Quartz-Seq2 (RT25) with three sets of 384-well plates and two sets of

384-well plates on different days. We also estimated the UMI conversion efficiency of other

single-cell RNA-seq methods [CEL-seq2(C1), SCRB-seq, MARS-seq, and Drop-seq] from a

previous study that used mouse ES cells [21]. In our comparison, the Read2 length for transcript

mapping was 45 nt for all of the methods, including Quartz-Seq2. We estimated the average UMI

and gene counts and the UMI conversion efficiency with various numbers of initial fastq reads for

each method. The findings indicate that, compared with the other methods, Quartz-Seq2 has a

superior ability to detect UMI and gene counts from limited initial amounts of data (under 0.2

million fastq reads). b) To investigate the throughput capacity for establishing sequence library

DNA, we estimated the number of processable single cells per $1,000 spent on each method:

Quartz-Seq2 (384 indexes, RT25) yielded 1,785 cells, Quartz-Seq2 (384 indexes, RT6.25)

yielded 2,325 cells, Quartz-Seq2 (384 indexes, RT6.25+column1) yielded 3,058 cells,

Quartz-Seq2 (1,536 indexes, RT25) yielded 2,500 cells, CEL-seq2(C1) yielded 111 cells,

SCRB-seq yielded 500 cells, MARS-seq yielded 769 cells, and Drop-seq yielded 10,000 cells.

The UMI conversion efficiency was approximately 32.55% (n = 1,152), 32.25% (n = 768) and

32.12% (n = 192) for Quartz-Seq2 (384 indexes, RT25), 35.48% (n = 2,304) for Quartz-Seq2

(1,536 indexes, RT25), 34.04% (n = 768) for Quartz-Seq2 (384 indexes, RT6.25), 35.51% (n =

768) for Quartz-Seq2 (384 indexes, RT6.25+column1), 22.4% for CEL-seq2(C1), 13.3% for

SCRB-seq, 10.6% for MARS-seq, and 7.1% for Drop-seq. The average gene count was

approximately 6,636 (n = 1,152), 6,584 (n = 768) and 6,529 (n = 192) for Quartz-Seq2 (384

indexes, RT25), 6,712 (n = 2,304) for Quartz-Seq2 (1,536 indexes, RT25), 6,753 (n = 768) for

Quartz-Seq2 (384 indexes, RT6.25), 6,794 (n = 768) for Quartz-Seq2 (384 indexes,

RT6.25+column1), 5,164 for CEL-seq2(C1), 4,044 for SCRB-seq, 3,252 for MARS-seq, and

2,738 for Drop-seq.

1511

Figure 5. High-throughput Quartz-Seq2 analysis of 4,484 cells from mouse embryonic

stem cells and differentiated cells

a) We successfully analyzed 97.3% of 4,608 wells. The procedures for cell suspension as used

in this assay are shown. Cells cultured under ES-maintenance and Dex-treatment conditions

were separately dissociated into single cells, stained with Hoechst 33342 and/or Calcein-AM,

and mixed evenly. Calcein-AM-positive and -negative cells were sorted to 384-well plates in a

checkered pattern. White scale bars represent 100 μm. b) Clustering of 4,484 single cells

according to the transcriptome. Plotting of cells on t-SNE space with color labeling for each

cluster. The percentage indicates the proportion of cells for each cluster relative to all cells

analyzed. Numbers in parentheses indicate the numbers of cells making up the cluster. c)

Marker genes for each cluster identified by Quartz-Seq2. Cluster-specific or cluster-enriched

genes were calculated for each cluster, and their expression is displayed as a color in a heatmap.

No more than 50 cells are shown for simplicity. d) Reconstructed distribution of Calcein-AM

intensity for each cluster. The x-axis represents the intensity of Calcein-AM dye staining. e)

Reconstructed distribution of Hoechst 33342 intensity for each cluster. The y-axis represents the

density of cells. The x-axis represents the intensity of Hoechst 33342 dye staining.

1528

Figure 6 Quartz-Seq2 classified genes with variable expression within a cell type

a) Plotting cells on t-SNE space with the colors representing the intensity of Hoechst 33342

staining. b) Dependence of expression of several genes on the intensity of Hoechst 33342

staining [G_2/M phase: *Ccnb1*; G_1 phase: *Ccne1*; housekeeping gene: *Gnb2l1*; upper panels: ES

main population (cluster 1); lower panels: PrE main population (cluster 4)]. c) Identification of

cell-cycle-associated genes. Average gene expression of cells in a bin is depicted by color in the

heatmap. Bins are arranged in order of Hoechst 33342 staining intensity. d) The number of

cell-cycle-associated genes identified for each z-threshold. CV values from which the z-score

was calculated were as follows. ES cells (z=4: 1.17, z=3: 0.91, z=2, 0.68, z=1: 0.4). PrE cells

(z=4: 1.1, z=3: 0.88, z=2: 0.64, z=1: 0.39). e) Several examples for genes whose expression was

variable, but not associated with the phase of the cell cycle. f) Single-cell qPCR detection of

genes with variable expression.

1541

Figure 7 Quartz-Seq2 analysis of stromal vascular fraction (SVF) from mouse adipose

tissue

a) Morphology of SVF cells. Adipose tissue from a cell suspension of SVF was prepared. Upper

panels present a photograph of adipose tissues and dissociated SVF samples. Yellow scale bar

represents 1 cm. White scale bar represents 10 μm. Lower panels represent the distribution of

cell size information with different platforms (left: diameter of cell size using photography, right:

flow cytometry information using a cell sorter). The diameter of cell size for SVF samples was

6.43±1.35 μm (n=200). b) Clustering of cells included in SVF. The transcriptome of

approximately 1,000 cells was quantified by Quartz-Seq2 and clustering on t-SNE space was

performed. In accordance with the genes and functional terms enriched in each cluster, the cell

type was annotated. The percentage indicates the proportion of cells for each cluster relative to

all cells analyzed. Numbers in parentheses indicate the numbers of cells constituting the cluster.

c) Marker genes for each cluster were identified by Quartz-Seq2. Cluster-specific or

cluster-enriched genes were calculated for each cluster, with their expression being displayed as

color in a heatmap. No more than 50 cells are shown for simplicity. d) The results of GO-PCA

analysis. Functional terms enriched in the genes with high factor loadings of PCA were

calculated and the enrichment is displayed as color in the heatmap. No more than 50 cells are

shown for simplicity. e) Reactome pathway with genes differentially expressed between cluster 1

and cluster 8.

a)

1. Single-cell collection (Cell sorter)

1 cell

Single-cell sorting

Flow-cytometry data

Link

1 cell transcriptome

Quartz-Seq2

384-well PCR plate

2. Cell barcoding

Reverse-transcription with low enzyme concentration (improved)

AAAAA
TTTTT MB CB0001 caM

AAAAA
TTTTT MB CB0002 caM

AAAAA
TTTTT MB CB0003 caM

Cell barcodes
14mer, 1-384 SeqLv(5)
15mer, 1-1536 SeqLv(5)

AAAAA
TTTTT MB CB1536 caM

3. Spindown collection

384-well PCR plate   Paraffin film

3,010g

Metal frame   1 well reservoir   Assembled collector

4. Whole transcript amplification based on poly-A tagging

5. Sequence library preparation

b)

c)

$$UMI\ conversion\ efficiency = \frac{\sum UMI_{sc}}{\sum fastq_{sc} + fastq_{non\text{-}sc}}$$

Initial fastq reads
$\begin{pmatrix} fastq_{sc}\ x\ n \\ fastq_{non\text{-}sc} \end{pmatrix}$

In

Reads processing

Out

UMI counts for single-cells
$(UMI_{sc}\ x\ n)$

Loss   Loss

Unmapped reads, multi-mapped reads, PCR duplicate reads, unassigned reads for cell-barcode sequence

a)

b)

Our data

Cell line	Method name	Conditions	Index type
J1 ES cell	⊙ Quartz-Seq2 default (n=1,152)*	RT25	384 indexes
J1 ES cell	⊙ Quartz-Seq2 default 2 (n=768)*	RT25	384 indexes
J1 ES cell	⊙ Quartz-Seq2 RT6.25 (n=768)**	RT6.25	384 indexes
J1 ES cell	⊙ Quartz-Seq2 cheapest (n=768)**	RT6.25+Column1	384 indexes
G6GR ES cell	⊙ Quartz-Seq2 default (n=192)**	RT25	384 indexes
G6GR ES cell	✕ Quartz-Seq2 default (n=2,304)**	RT25	1,536 indexes

Data from *Ziegenhain et al. 2017*

Cell line	Method name
J1 ES cell	◇ CEL-seq2(C1) (n=71)*
J1 ES cell	△ SCRB-seq (n=84)*
J1 ES cell	☐ MARS-seq (n=65)*
J1 ES cell	▽ Drop-seq (n=76)*

* HiSeq platform   ** NextSeq platform

a)

Diameter of cell (um)

Density (Cell)

488-SSC-Height

488-FSC1-Height

L

S

b)

91.31% (1,052 cells / 1,152 wells)

unclassified, 1.33% (14)
1: *Cd34*+/*Efemp1*+ mesenchymal stem cell, 7.79% (82)
2: Macrophage, 5.51% (58)
3: *Cd4*+ T-cell, 44.96% (473)
4: *Cd4*+ T-cell (proliferation), 0.95% (10)
5: B-cell, 15.87% (167)
6: Killer T-cell, 11.02% (116)
7: Natural killer cell, 3.04% (32)
8: *Cd34*+/*Col15a1*+ mesenchymal stem cell, 6.36% (67)
9: *Cxcr6*+ T-cell, 1.71% (18)
10: Dendritic cell, 0.85% (9)
11: Plasmacytoide dendritic cell, 0.57% (6)

c)

Cell-clusters

Genes

Class A
Class B
Class C
Class D
Class E
Class F
Class G
Class H
Class I
Class J
Class K

d)

Cell-clusters

GO terms

EMT regulation
Organ formation
Embryonic pattern specification
Collagen trimer
Osteoblast differentiation
Cell-cell junction
Angiogenesis
Mesenchymal cell differentiation
Ribosome biogenesis
T cell receptor signal. pathway
MHC class I complex
Response to IFN-gamma
snoRNA binding
Lamellipodium organization
Dendritic cell differentiation
Mast cell activation
Chemokine production
VEGF pathway
Antigen processing and presentation
Mitochondrial repiratory chain
Cell division
DNA replication

e)

-Log(P-value)

[Reactome pathways]

[Differentially expressed genes]

Cluster 1: *Cd34*+/*Efemp1*+

Extracellular matrix organization	*Bmp2,Col14a1,Fbn1,Fgf2,Fn1,Itgb7,Mfap5,Ntn4,Pcolce2,Efemp1*
Molecules associated with elastic fibres	*Bmp2,Fbn1,Fn1,Mfap5,Efemp1*
Elastic fibre formation	*Bmp2,Fbn1,Fn1,Mfap5,Efemp1*
IGF transport	*Igfbp4,Igfbp5,Igfbp6*
Non-integrin membrane-ECM interactions	*Fgf2,Fn1,Ntn4*

-Log(P-value)

[Reactome pathways]

[Differentially expressed genes]

Cluster 8: *Cd34*+/*Col15a1*+

Extracellular matrix organization	*Bgn,Serpinh1,Col15a1,Col3a1,Col4a1,Col4a2,Col4a4,Col5a1,Col5a2,Col6a1,Col6a2,Col1a1,Col1a2,Ctsk,Lama2,Lamb1,Lox,Lum,Mmp2,Nid2,Pcolce,Sparc,Jam2*
Collagen formation	*Serpinh1,Col15a1,Col3a1,Col4a1,Col4a2,Col4a4,Col5a1,Col5a2,Col6a1,Col6a2,Col1a1,Col1a2,Lox,Pcolce*
Collagen degradation	*Col15a1,Col3a1,Col4a1,Col4a2,Col4a4,Col5a1,Col5a2,Col6a1,Col6a2,Col1a1,Col1a2,Ctsk,Mmp2*
Collagen biosynthesis and modifying enzymes	*Serpinh1,Col15a1,Col3a1,Col4a1,Col4a2,Col4a4,Col5a1,Col5a2,Col6a1,Col6a2,Col1a1,Col1a2,Pcolce*
Collagen chain trimerization	*Col15a1,Col3a1,Col4a1,Col4a2,Col4a4,Col5a1,Col5a2,Col6a1,Col6a2,Col1a1,Col1a2*
Assembly of collagen fibrils and other multimeric structures	*Col3a1,Col4a1,Col4a2,Col4a4,Col5a1,Col5a2,Col6a1,Col6a2,Col1a1,Col1a2,Lox*
Degradation of the extracellular matrix	*Col15a1,Col3a1,Col4a1,Col4a2,Col4a4,Col5a1,Col5a2,Col6a1,Col6a2,Col1a1,Col1a2,Ctsk,Lamb1,Mmp2*
Integrin cell surface interactions	*Col3a1,Col4a1,Col4a2,Col4a4,Col5a1,Col5a2,Col6a1,Col6a2,Col1a1,Col1a2,Lum,Jam2*
Non-integrin membrane-ECM interactions	*Col3a1,Col4a1,Col4a2,Col4a4,Col5a1,Col5a2,Col1a1,Col1a2,Lama2,Lamb1*
ECM proteoglycans	*Bgn,Col3a1,Col5a1,Col5a2,Col6a1,Col6a2,Col1a1,Col1a2,Sparc*