Body-wide landscape of cell type-specific total cellular transcriptome-size and its physiological

significance

Short Title:

Cell type-specific transcriptome-size

Kengo Tejima[*], Satoshi Kozawa[*], Thomas N. Sato[¶]

Karydo TherapeutiX, Inc., Kyoto, Japan; ERATO Sato Live Bio-Forecasting Project, Kyoto, Japan;

The Thomas N. Sato BioMEC-X Laboratories, Advanced Telecommunications Research Institute

International, Kyoto, Japan; V-iClinix Laboratory, Nara Medical University, Nara, Japan

[¶]Corresponding Authors:

Thomas N. Sato

Karydo TherapeutiX, Inc.

2-2-2 Hikaridai, Seika-cho, Soraku-gun, Kyoto, Japan 619-0288

Email: island1005@gmail.com

*These two authors contributed equally to this work

Abstract

Total cellular transcriptome-size varies from cell-to-cell. However, the degree of such variations among

diverse cell-types and their function in the body remains elusive. Moreover, such differential

transcriptome-size is mostly ignored in the widely used single-cell analyses, veiling its functional

importance. To overcome such limitations, currently available experimental approaches are insufficient.

Hence, we developed and report a computational method to determine its body-wide variations. Using

this method, we compute weighting-factors that account for the differences of the total cellular

transcriptome-size for 76 cell-types across 10 organs. We demonstrate their validity by accurate

reconstitution and deconvolution of the whole-organ transcriptomics using their composite single-cell

data weighted by these factors. Importantly, we also show such weighting-factors indeed recapitulate

experimentally-determined differential total cellular transcriptome-size. Furthermore, we show that

such body-wide variations accurately predict aging-progression. These results unveil the body-wide

landscape of the cell type-specific total cellular transcriptome-size and their physiological importance.

Teaser

Differential mRNA contents of 76 cell-types across 10 organs and their importance in aging are

computationally determined.

Introduction

The total cellular transcript-contents, also known as transcriptome-size, vary from cell-to-cell (*1-3*). Several studies indicate that the cell-size influences the overall cellular transcription (*4-7*). It is also reported that c-myc amplifies the global transcription in tumor cells (*2, 8*), lymphocytes and embryonic stem cells (*9*). Another study shows that the global transcription is repressed by the loss of MECP2, a methyl CpG binding protein, in embryonic stem cell-derived neurons (*10*). The genome structure, such as ploidy/gene-dosage and nucleosome state, affects the overall transcription (*11-13*). Failure to integrate such variations in the single-cell analyses could hide a potentially important cell-to-cell gene expression variation or could lead to finding a false cell-to-cell gene expression heterogeneity (*1, 2, 14*). Furthermore, it is shown that the total cellular transcriptome-size of tumor cells is shown to estimate the extent of the cancer progression (*15*), indicating its potential medical significance.

Despite such importance, little is known about the extent to which the total cellular transcriptome-size varies among different cell-types across diverse types of organs in the body. Furthermore, such apparent variations are mostly ignored in the current single-cell analyses, such as single-cell RNA sequencing (scRNA-seq) and other types of single cell transcriptomics methods (*16-20*). In such methods, the transcripts are sequenced in individual cells and their transcript-counts are normalized, allowing the comparison of the relative abundance of each transcript-species across individual cells/cell-types (*21-25*). This internal normalization process of the methods cancels out the putative total cellular transcriptome size-variations among different cells, hiding potentially important functional differences among the cells.

Such shortfalls are primarily caused by the lack of experimental methods to measure the total transcriptome-size of individual cells across diverse cell-types and organs in the body. The utilities of the currently available methods are limited to culture cells, immune cells and tumor cells (*2, 3, 14, 15, 26, 27*), and not applicable to diverse cell-types and organs of the body. This limitation is imposed by two factors: First, these experimental methods require dissociation and purification (e.g., cell-sorting) of each individual cell-types from the solid organs and the accurate quantification of the transcript-

counts per cell. This is a challenge for the solid organs consisting of highly heterogenous cell-types.

Second factor is an apparent cryptic gene expression induced by the cell-dissociation and purification

(*28*).

In this study, we overcome these challenges by developing a computational method, by exploiting a

growing body of multi-organ bulk RNA-seq and the corresponding composite scRNA-seq data, to

body-widely infer the relative differences of the total cellular transcriptome-size of individual single-

cells across diverse organs. Using this method, we determined and report cell type-specific "weighting-

factors" for 76 cell-types cells across 10 mouse organs that account for the quantitative differences of

their total cellular transcriptome-size. Furthermore, we show that such body-wide variations of the total

cellular transcriptome-size can predict aging-stages in the mouse model. These results together unveil

the landscape of the body-wide variations of the total cellular transcriptome-size and their possible

functional importance in physiological processes such as aging.

Results

The cell type-specific weighting factor (cWF)

First, we challenge the following conventional notion that the total cellular transcriptome-size is equal

across different cell-types:

Let all cells be assumed to contain the equal amounts of transcripts. Then, the whole-organ RNA-seq

should be the sum of gene expression of each composite cell-type weighted by cell-type ratios.

We evaluated this assumption as follows:

The synthetic whole-organ data were constructed from single-cell transcript counts combined according

to the experimentally determined fraction of each cell-type in the organ (Materials and Methods).

Briefly, the synthetic whole-organ RNAseq data are calculated as the sum of the normalized transcript

counts weighted by the known ratios of the composite cell-types of the organs, using the signature genes

for distinguishing the cell-types for each organ. These synthetic data for 10 organs (brain, fat, heart,

kidney, liver, lung, pancreas, skin, skeletal muscle, spleen) were then compared to the corresponding

real whole-organ RNA-seq data (Fig. 1, table S1). The comparisons were performed by calculating their

Pearson correlation coefficients.

Fig. 1. Incomplete reconstitution of the whole organ RNA-seq by the composite scRNA-seq.
The similarity is shown as violin plot of the Pearson correlation coefficient for each number of the
signature genes (100, 300, 500) for each organ (indicated above each plot). The corresponding raw
data are found in table S1. SkMuscle: skeletal muscle.

The result shows low Pearson correlation coefficients (< 0.75) for most of the organs (brain, heart,

kidney, liver, lung, pancreas, skin, skeletal muscle) regardless of the number (100, 300, 500) of the top-

ranked signature genes used. Particularly low coefficients are found with the brain (< 0.6 for 100, 300,

500 signature genes), the fat (< 0.5 for 300, 500 signature genes), the heart (< 0.4 for 300, 500 signature

genes), the pancreas (< 0.3 for 100, 300, 500 signature genes), the skin (< 0.2 for 100, 300, 500

signature genes), and the skeletal muscle (< 0.1 for 100, 300, 500 signature genes). These low Pearson

correlation coefficients suggest that the total cellular transcriptome-size of individual cell-types varies,

resulting in the large gaps between the real and synthetic whole-organ RNA-seq data.

To solve this apparent problem, we developed an algorithm to compute such variations and examined

whether they can correct the disagreement between the real and synthetic whole-organ RNA-seq data

(Fig. 2 and Materials and Methods). The concept of the algorithm is schematically described in Fig. 2

and as follows: In the real scRNA-seq data analyses, the total transcript counts per cell (i.e., the total

cellular transcriptome-size) of the real scRNA-seq data are normalized (i.e., the total counts per cell are

equal among all composite cell-types of the organs). This results in the loss of a factor representing the

putative differences of the total cellular transcriptome-size across various cell-types. This factor is

computed as the cell type-specific weighting-factor (cWF) (indicated as w_1, w_2, w_3, etc. in the Fig. 2).

Fig. 2. Graphical description of the overall concept of the cell type-specific weighting factors (cWFs). The top row describes the case without the cWFs, failing to reconstitute the real whole-organ RNAseq data by the synthetic whole-organ RNAseq data generated by assembling the composite scRNA-seq data without the cWFs. The bottom describes the case with the cWFs, accurately reconstitute the real whole-organ RNAseq data by the synthetic whole-organ RNAseq data generated by assembling the composite scRNA-seq data with the cWFs (w_1, w_2, w_3). The wiggling lines are cellular transcripts where different gene transcripts are in different colors. The ratios of the cellular transcript-counts in the synthetic and real whole-organ RNAseq are indicated by the numbers at the top of the colored transcripts.

Fig. 3. The cWFs for each cell-type in each organ. The values of the cWFs for each cell-type (bottom of each plot) for each number of the signature genes (indicated above each plot) for each organ (indicated at the top of the corresponding plots) are shown as box plots. The corresponding raw data are found table S2. The cell-types are indicated as abbreviations and their full names are found in table S2. SkMuscle: skeletal muscle.

Using this algorithm, we computed cWFs for 76 cell-types across 10 organs (Fig. 3, table S2). The

result shows significant variations of the cWFs among different cell-types in many of the organs,

uncovering the body-wide degree of such variations. In particular, the following cell-types show

significantly higher cWFs than the other cell-types within the same organ: astrocyte (AS) in the brain,

endothelial cell (EC) in the fat, muscle cell-types in the heart and the skeletal muscle (CM in the heart,

MC in the skeletal muscle), epithelial cell of proximal tubule (PTEC) in the kidney, epithelial cell (EP)

and neuroendocrine cell (NE) in the lung, fibroblast-like cell (FB-like) in the skin, and T-cell (T) in the

spleen. This result suggests that these cell-types contain larger amounts of transcripts (i.e., the larger

total cellular transcriptome-size) than the others in the corresponding organs. Furthermore, the results

show that such variable degrees of differences in the total cellular transcriptome-size are widespread

across diverse cell-types and organs in the body.

Validation of the cWFs

We demonstrate that the cWFs indeed account for the variations of the total cellular transcriptome-size

by three methods: Reconstitution (Fig. 4) and deconvolution (Figs. 5 and 6) of the whole-organ RNAseq

data using their composite scRNA-seq data, and their comparison to the experimentally measured

values (Fig. 7).

First, we validated the cWFs by the reconstitution (Fig. 4, table S3, Materials and Methods). Using the

mean value of cWFs for each cell-type, we weighted the transcript counts for each cell-type. We then

summed these weighted transcript counts for all composite cell-types of each organ according to their

ratios to construct the synthetic whole-organ RNAseq (syn-woRNAseq(+cWF)), data. Then, they are

compared to the corresponding real whole-organ RNAseq (r-woRNAseq) data. The result shows the

Pearson correlation coefficients of 0.8 – 1.0 between the syn-woRNAseq(+cWF) and r-woRNAseq for

all 10 organs with all or at least one of the 100, 300, 500 signature genes (Fig. 4). These are significant

improvements from the 0 – 0.75 of the Pearson correlation coefficients without the cWFs (Fig. 1). The

heart shows the Pearson correlation coefficients of almost 1.0 with the cWFs (Fig. 4), as compared to

those of 0.25 – 0.7 without the cWFs (Fig. 1). Even for the spleen where the Pearson correlation

coefficients are 0.75 – 0.8 without the cWF (Fig. 1), the cWF (i.e., syn-woRNAseq(+cWF)) improves

the Pearson correlation coefficients up to 0.9 – 1.0 (Fig. 4). The results demonstrate that the cWFs

correct the large gap between the synthetic whole-organ RNAseq without the cWFs (syn-woRNAseq(-

cWF)) and r-woRNAseq, supporting the notion that the cWFs reflect the total cellular transcriptome

size-variations of the cells and their requirement for the accurate single-cell analyses.

Fig. 4. Accurate reconstitution of the whole organ RNA-seq by the composite scRNA-seq and cWFs. The similarity is shown as violin plot of the Pearson correlation coefficient for each number of the signature genes (100, 300, 500) for each organ (indicated above each plot). The corresponding raw data are found in table S3. SkMuscle: skeletal muscle.

Next, the validation by the deconvolution (Fig. 5) was performed. Several deconvolution methods were

previously reported (*29-42*). However, they fail to account for the variations of the total cellular

transcriptome-size. Hence, we developed a deconvolution method that integrates the cWFs in a

Bayesian framework, which is schematically described in Fig. 5A. Briefly, it works as follows

(Materials and Methods): The mean of the cWF (w_1, w_2, w_3 in Fig. 5A, the lower case 1, 2, 3 indicate

cell-type 1, 2, 3) is used to compute virtual transcript counts ("x" in Fig. 5A) for each gene (indicated

as wiggling lines of different colors in Fig. 5A) and the ratio (indicated as "r" in Fig. 5A) of each cell-

type in each organ (painted in different colors in Fig. 5A). Using the signature-gene set, the computation

is iteratively performed by the sampling method of No-U-Turn Sampler (NUTS), in the Bayesian

framework with two hyperparameters, α and β, to account for the combinatorial influence of the cell-

type ratios and the gene expression patterns of each cell-type on the whole-organ-level transcriptome,

respectively. For the iteration (t = 1, …, T), the initial condition is set as $x_1^{(0)}$ and $r_1^{(0)}$ for the transcript

counts and the ratio of cell-type 1 (see the diagram labels as "Prediction" in Fig. 5A). Those for cell-

types 2 and 3 are indicated accordingly (see the diagram labels as "Prediction" in Fig. 5A). Such initial

conditions are the cWF-weighted transcript count for each gene and the reference cell-type ratio,

respectively. The iteration is repeated until all sampling variables converge with the signature-gene set.

The counts of the non-signature gene set are computed by an analytic approach in the Bayesian

framework with a hyperparameter, γ, which has the similar nature of β as above. The "r" is fixed as the

above-estimated value, and only "x" in the non-signature gene set is computed.

The deconvolution results for 10 organs using this method were compared to the real cell-composition

data of the corresponding organ (Fig. 5, B and C). The results were also compared to those of two

conventional deconvolution methods without the cWF, MuSiC and DWLS (*40, 41*). These two were

chosen as they have been applied to 1 – 4 organs and appear to outperform the other published methods.

The prediction of the cell-type ratios show that our method (V-scRNAseq) outperforms the methods

without the cWFs (MuSiC, DWLS) for 9 organs (brain, fat, heart, kidney, lung, pancreas, skin, skeletal

muscle, spleen). For these organs, the cell-type ratios predicted by our method are more similar to those

of the real data than those predicted by MuSiC or DWLS (Fig. 5B, table S4). Notably, our method

corrected the abnormally large ratios of cardiac muscle and muscles in the heart and the skeletal muscle,

respectively, estimated by MuSiC and DWLS (Fig. 5B, table S4). The lower root-mean-square error

(RMSE) for these 9 organs with our method (Fig. 5C, table S4) further confirms the better performance

of our method (Fig. 5C, table S4). For the liver, our method failed (Fig. 5, B and C, table S4), despite

the high performance in the reconstitution (Fig. 4). This may be due to the predominantly hepatocyte

composition of the liver. Our method assumes the symmetric Dirichlet distribution as prior distribution

which influences the posterior distribution – hence, the method is less suitable for the organ, such as

the liver, consisting of a single dominant cell-type.

Fig. 5. Accurate deconvolution of the whole organ RNA-seq by cWFs. (A) Graphical description of the overall concept of the deconvolution method with the cWFs. Shown is the case of an organ consisting of 3 cell-types (1, 2, 3) with 7 different genes (wiggling lines of different colors). The mean of the cWFs: w_1, w_2, w_3 for each cell-type 1, 2 and 3, respectively. The virtual transcript counts ($x_1^{(t)}$, $x_2^{(t)}$, $x_3^{(t)}$ where the different genes are indicated by the wiggling lines of different colors for each cell-type) and the ratio ($r_1^{(t)}$, $r_2^{(t)}$, $r_3^{(t)}$) of virtual cell-type 1, 2 and 3 at each iteration, t, are as indicated. Their initial conditions are $x_1^{(0)}$, $x_2^{(0)}$, $x_3^{(0)}$, $r_1^{(0)}$, $r_2^{(0)}$, $r_3^{(0)}$. The iteration (t= 1, …, T) is performed until both **X** and **r** converge (Materials and Methods). Upon completing the iterations, the sum of the virtual transcript counts weighted by the cWFs (indicated as "Virtual scRNAseq") weighted by the virtual cell-type ratios (indicated as "Predicted cell-type ratio) generates the synthetic whole-organ transcriptome (indicated as "syn-woRNAseq (+cWF)"), as shown at the far right of this panel. **(B)** Bar graph showing the cell type-ratios computed by our deconvolution method (V-scRNAseq) for each organ. The deconvolution was performed with the cWFs computed using the optimal number of the signature genes for each organ (indicated in the accompanying table S4). The reference cell-type ratios and the ratios estimated by the conventional deconvolution methods without cWFs, MuSiC and DWLS, are shown as comparisons. The bar graphs are composed of the cell-types computed to be present for each organ by our method. **(C)** The quantitative similarity of the computed ratios to the reference ratios is shown by heatmap of RMSE for our method with cWFs (V-scRNAseq), MuSiC, and DWLS. RMSE: Root Mean Squared Errors. The corresponding raw data are found in table S4. SkMuscle: skeletal muscle.

In addition to the cell-type ratios, we also computed the virtual transcriptome of 23,131 (Brain, Fat,
Heart, Lung, Spleen), 22,742 (Kidney), 23,104 (Liver), 15,682 (Pancreas), 21,233 (Skin) and 14,129
(the skeletal muscle) genes in each of the "virtual" cell-type and compared them to those of the real
cell-type for the 10 organs (Fig. 6 and Materials and Methods). Our approach computes a posterior
distribution and its Expected A Posteriori (EAP) for counts of each transcript for each cell-type. Hence,
we calculated Pearson correlation coefficients for each cell-type, using the EAPs of all genes in virtual

and real cell-types for each organ (Fig. 6, table S5). Their Pearson correlation coefficients indicate that the virtual transcriptomes are comparable to the real ones across all cell-types and organs. They also recapitulate the transcriptomics-relatedness of the same/related cell types across different organs (Fig. 6). For example, the similarity of endothelial cells in multiple organ such as brain, fat, heart, liver and lung is recapitulated in the virtual transcriptomes among these organs (Fig. 6). The relatedness of each of the immune system cells across multiple organs is also represented (Fig. 6).

Fig. 6. Computation of the complete transcriptome of the composite cell-types of 10 mouse organs. The heatmap of Pearson correlation coefficients for the transcriptome of all virtual and real cell-types across all 10 organs. The Pearson correlation coefficients are calculated for 23,131 (Brain, Fat, Heart, Lung, Spleen), 22,742 (Kidney), 23,104 (Liver), 15,682 (Pancreas), 21,233 (Skin) and 14,129 (the skeletal muscle) genes. The corresponding raw data are found in table S5. SkMuscle: skeletal muscle.

The reconstitution and deconvolution results demonstrate that the cWFs enable the accurate

representation of individual cells in the context of the whole-organs of highly heterogenous

compositions, presumably by weighting the variations of the total cellular transcriptome-size of

different cell-types. We further validate this account by directly comparing the cWFs variations to those

of the experimentally-determined total transcriptome-contents of the corresponding cell-types.

Currently, as described in Introduction, the accurate measurement of such variations for individual

single-cells of the solid organs are difficult and the methods to measure such variations are limited to

cultured cells and systemic/circulating cells such as immune cells, and tumor cells (*2, 14, 15, 26*).

Therefore, we used the experimentally-determined total cellular transcript-contents of the cell-types

composing human peripheral blood mononuclear cells (PBMCs) and compared them to the computed

cWFs of the corresponding cell-types (Fig. 7).

Fig. 7. Comparison of the cWFs to the experimentally-determined total cellular transcript-contents of human PBMC cell-types. The comparison is shown as bar graphs of the experimentally-determined transcript-contents per cell (mRNA amount per cell: empty bar) and the computed cWFs (cWFs: filled-bar) for each cell-type. The bars are shown as mean $\pm$ S.E. (standard error). B: B-cell, CD14Mono: CD14^{+} monocytes, Neu: Neutrophil, NK: Natural killer cell, T: T-cell. The validation of the cWFs by reconstitution and deconvolution are found in fig. S1 (raw data are in tables S6 – S8). The corresponding raw data for Fig. 7 are found in table S9.

We used bulk and single-cell RNA-seq data of human PBMCs (*43-45*) and computed the cWFs of B-

cells, CD14$^+$ monocytes, CD16$^+$ monocytes, dendritic cells, neutrophils, natural killer (NK) cells,

plasmablasts (PB), T-cells, and the others (e.g., red-blood-cells, platelets, etc.) (Materials and Methods).

The reconstitution and deconvolution analyses confirmed that they correct the biased gene-expression

in the scRNA-seq data caused by the total cellular transcriptome-size normalization, as indicated by the

higher Pearson correlation coefficients (fig. S1A, tables S6 and S7) and lower RMSE/higher Person

correlation coefficient (fig. S1B, table S8) with the cWFs in the reconstitution and deconvolution

analyses, respectively.

The total cellular RNA-contents are experimentally measured and determined for the B-cells, CD14$^+$

monocytes, neutrophils, NK cells, and T-cells of PBMCs (*27*). We made the side-by-side comparison

of the computed cWFs and their experimentally-measured total cellular transcriptome-size of the

corresponding cell-types (Fig. 7, table S9). The result shows that the computed cWFs accurately

recapitulate the 3.5 - 10.8-fold higher transcriptome-size of the CD14$^+$ monocytes compared to the B-,

T-, NK cells, or neutrophils, respectively (i.e., CD14$^+$ monocytes: 1.4 pg/cell vs. B-/T-/NK-cells: 0.4

pg/cell, Neutrophils: 0.13 pg/cell). It also recapitulates the 3-fold higher values of the B- and T-cells

than that of neutrophils (i.e., 0.4 vs. 0.13 pg/cell). The experimental values of the transcript-contents of

the B- and T-cells are approximately the same, which is also recapitulated by virtually the same cWFs

of these two cell-types. These side-by-side comparisons provide another layer of evidence supporting

the account that the cWFs indeed represent the total cellular transcriptome size-variations among

different cell-types.

Physiological significance of cWFs

The analyses described above demonstrate that the total cellular transcriptome-size significantly varies

across different cell-types and the cWFs account for such variations. Furthermore, we unveil their body-

wide landscape. We next addressed their possible physiological significance. In this regard, we set a

hypothesis that the total cellular transcriptome-size of each cell-type differentially change over aging

and that such a phenotype could underlie the aging mechanism and could also be exploited as a new

type of aging-indicator. To test this hypothesis, we examined whether the patterns of the cWFs change

over the course of aging. Furthermore, we examined whether such putative changes of the cWFs

actually indicate the progression of aging.

For this purpose, we used the *Tabula Muris Senis*, the atlas of the multiple-organ single-cell

transcriptomics across multiple aging stages of mouse (*46, 47*). This atlas provides both the whole-

organ RNA-seq data and their corresponding composite scRNA-seq data. Using these data, we

computed cWFs of the composite cell-types of 5 organs (brain, heart, kidney, lung, spleen) across 3

aging-stages (3, 18, and 24 months-old) of mice. The 3, 18, 24 months-old (mos.) in mouse correspond

to 25 - 26 years-old, 60 - 80 years-old, and $\geq$ 80 years-old in human, respectively (*48*). These 5 organs

were chosen for the following two reasons: 1) they performed well in both the reconstitution and

deconvolution validations (Fig. 4 and 5); 2) their equivalent whole-organ/single-cell data are also

present in our 10 organs-analysis described above.

Using these datasets, we computed the cWFs of all composite cell-types for each organ. The

reconstitution (fig. S2, tables S10 and S11) and deconvolution (table S12) analyses confirmed that they

correct the biased representations of the gene expression and cell-type compositions, respectively, in

the scRNA-seq data with one or more of the signature gene set(s) for each aging-stage. Based on these

results, we selected the best performing numbers of the signature genes for each organ and aging-stage

by omitting the conditions that failed to significantly improve the reconstitution (highlighted in pink in

table S12) and selecting the ones with the lowest RMSE and the highest Pearson correlation coefficients

in the deconvolution analysis (highlighted in light-green in table S12). This screening selected the cWFs

computed with the following conditions: Brain (3 mos. – 500 signature genes, 18 mos. – 300 signature

genes, 24 mos. – 300 signature genes), Heart (3 mos. – 100 signature genes, 18 mos. – 500 signature

genes, 24 mos. – 300 signature genes), Kidney (3 mos. – 300 signature genes, 18 mos. – 500 signature

genes, 24 mos. – 500 signature genes), Lung (3 mos. – 500 signature genes, 18 mos. – 300 signature

genes, 24 mos. – 300 signature genes), Spleen (3 mos. – 300 signature genes, 18 mos. – 100 signature

genes, 24 mos. – 500 signature genes).

With these selected cWFs, we examined whether their relative differences change over the course of

aging. For this purpose, we compared the ratios of the cWFs of a pair of two distinct cell-types in each

organ across three aging-stages (Fig. 8, table S13). The analysis detected their statistically significant

(p < 0.01 by U-test) changes of many of the cell type-pairs in all organs over the course of aging.

Fig. 8. Differential cWFs during aging of mouse. The changes of the ratios of cWFs of cell type-pairs across three aging-stages (3 months-old: 3 mos., 18 months-old: 18 mos., 24 months-old: 24 mos.) are shown as heatmap for each organ (Brain, Heart, Kidney, Lung, Spleen). The cell type-pairs are indicated at the left of each heatmap. The ratios are the pairwise ratios of the corresponding cell-types. For example, AS vs. EC indicates the ratio of the cWF for AS (numerator) and EC (denominator). The ratios are indicated as $\log_{10}$ of the medians. Shown are the pairs resulted in $p < 0.01$ by U-test in one or more of the three pairwise aging stage-comparisons (18 mos. vs. 3 mos., 24 mos. vs. 3 mos., 24mos. vs. 18 mos.). The analysis was conducted with those showing the significant improvements in the reconstitution (fig. S2, tables S10 and S11) and the best deconvolution results (table S12) for each organ. The full names of the cell type abbreviations and the raw data of the heatmap are found in table S13.

We next investigated whether such differential pairwise ratio-changes of the cWFs predict the

progression of aging. For this purpose, we applied a machine learning algorithm, LightGBM (*49*), to

the dataset of the pairwise cWF ratios between the cell type-pairs listed above (Materials and Methods).

First, each organ dataset was independently evaluated (Fig. 9). The result shows high predictability with

the pairwise cWF ratios between the brain, the lung, the heart, and the kidney cells, as indicated by their

high prediction index scores (i.e., accuracy, macro-recall, macro-precision, macro-F1 score) of 0.88 –

0.98 (Fig. 9A).

The feature importance analysis identified important cell type-pairs for the high prediction performance

in each organ (Fig. 9B, table S14). The following pairs are found especially important (the top 5 in each

organ): Brain - BG/OPC, MP/OPC, BG/PC, BG/AS, PC/OPC; Lung - CCE/NK, B/SC, B/Leu, B/CCE,

T/CCE; Heart - FB/SM, ECC/FB, ECC/MyoFB, ECC/EC, ECC/Leu; Kidney - B/CDPC, B/ALHEP,

B/T, B/FC, B/PTEC. This result suggests that the cWFs of the following cell-types are more important

contributors to the prediction, as indicated by their more frequent appearance in the top 5 ranked pairs:

Brain – Bergmann glial cells (BG) and oligodendrocyte precursor cells (OPC), Lung – B cells (B) and

ciliated columnar cells of tracheobronchial tree multiciliated cells (CCE), Heart – endocardial cells

(ECC), Kidney – B cells (B).

Fig. 9. Prediction of the aging-stage by the differential cWFs of each organ. (A) The prediction scores (accuracy, macro-precision, macro-recall, macro-F1 score) for each organ (Brain, Heart, Kidney, Lung, Spleen) are shown. **(B)** The top-ranked features (i.e., pairwise cell-types) important for the prediction are shown as bar graphs for each organ. The feature importance is indicated by gain. The corresponding raw data are found in table S14.

The LightGBM prediction with all organs combined also shows high performance as indicated by its

prediction index scores of 1 (Fig. 10A). The feature importance analysis shows the top-ranked cell type-

pairs are those of the lung and the brain, supporting the higher performance results with the cell-types

of these organs when they are independently analyzed (Fig. 9A). The cell-types indicated as important

contributors to the prediction listed above for the individual organ analyses also ranked higher in this

314 all-organ-combined analysis (Fig. 10B, table S14). Taken together, the results demonstrate that the

315 differential cWF ratios of the brain, the lung, the heart and the kidney accurately predict the progression

316 of aging, suggesting a possible role of the differential total cellular transcriptome-size among the cells

317 in these organs in the aging mechanism. The results also indicate a possibility of using these indices to

318 determine the progression of aging.

Fig. 10. Prediction of the aging-stage by the differential cWFs of all 5 organs combined. (A) The prediction scores (accuracy, macro-precision, macro-recall, macro-F1) by combining the cWF of all pairwise cell-types across all organs are shown. **(B)** The top 30 important features (i.e., the pairwise ratios of the cWFs) for the prediction are shown as bar graphs for each organ. The feature importance is indicated by gain. The cell type-pairs and their organs are indicated as organ-name_cell-type pair (e.g., Lung_CCE vs. NK: the CCE vs. NK pair of the lung). The corresponding raw data are found in table S14.

Discussion

In this study, we report a computational method to determine the relative variations of the total cellular

transcriptome-size of the cells in the solid organs (Fig. 2). Using this method, we computed and describe

such variations among 76 cell-types across 10 organs as cell type-specific weighting factors (cWFs)

(Fig. 3). We show that they indeed account for the relative variations of the total cellular transcriptome-

size of the cells by demonstrating their requisite role in accurately reconstituting and deconvolving the

whole-organ RNA-seq data using their composite scRNA-seq data weighted by the corresponding

cWFs (Figs. 4 – 6). We also show that they indeed recapitulate the real experimentally-determined total

cellular transcript content-differences, using PBMC data as a model (Fig. 7). Furthermore, we show

that they change over aging and can be used to effectively predict aging progression in the aging mouse

model (Figs. 8 – 10), suggesting their possible role in the aging mechanism and also their medical

applications such as diagnosis of aging progression and/or aging associated diseases.

We propose that the cWFs described here reflect the relative variations of the total cellular

transcriptome-size among the different cell-types in each organ. This is supported by not only the

reconstitution and deconvolution results (Figs. 4 – 6), but importantly also by the recapitulation of the

experimentally-measured total cellular transcript-contents of five cell-types of PBMCs (i.e., B-cells,

$CD14^+$ monocytes, neutrophils, NK cells, and T-cells) (Fig. 7). These results together indicate that the

cWFs indeed account for the relative variations of the total cellular transcriptome-size among the

different cell-types of the organs. Are there any additional factors contributing to the differential cWFs?

One such factor could be cell dissociation-associated aberrant gene expression (50). The scRNA-seq

analyses of the solid tissues and organs require enzymatic digesting and mechanical dissociation of

individual cells and such technical procedures induce cryptic gene expression. Another possible factor

is a bias introduced by differential RNA stability during the cell-dissociation and RNA-extraction

procedures in scRNA-seq. It is possible that distinct cell-types are differentially susceptible to overall

RNA-degradation, which could contribute to the biased scRNA-seq data. In these regards, the cWFs

may account for the total transcriptome size-variations of both biological and procedural origins.

What is the mechanism of the cell type-specific differential total transcriptome-size? Two molecular

pathways, c-myc and MECP2 pathways, are implicated for their roles in regulating the total cellular

transcriptome-size (2, 8-10). A physicochemical alteration of the genome appears to also contribute to

the overall cellular transcription(13). Cell-size is another regulator of the total cellular transcriptome-

size (4, 5, 7, 14). In this regard, we find larger cells such as cardiac muscle (CM) and skeletal muscle

(MC) cells exhibit significantly larger cWFs values as compared to those of the other smaller-sized cell-

types in the heart and the skeletal muscle, respectively (Fig. 3). In the heart, the volume of the cardiac

muscle cell is 20 – 25 times of that of non-muscle cells such as endothelial cells and fibroblasts (*51-*

55), supporting the notion that the larger cWF of the cardiac muscle cells reflects their larger cell-size.

In the brain, the astrocytes (AS), a larger cell-type than the microglial cells (MG), also show larger

cWFs than those of MG (Fig. 3). These results indicate that larger cell size is at least a contributor to

the larger cWFs.

Does the total cellular transcriptome-size regulate any physiological and/or disease processes? The

MECP2 mutation in Rett syndrome causes the global transcriptional repression via a defect in the

AKT/mTOR pathway activity (*10*). Recently, the utility of the tumor cell type-specific total cellular

transcriptome-size for predicting tumor phenotypes and clinical outcomes is reported (*15*). In our study,

we show the differential cWFs in organs can accurately predict aging progression in the mouse model

(Figs. 9A and 10A). Furthermore, we identified specific cell-types of which cWFs are major

contributors to the prediction (Figs. 9B and 10B). We also show that the cWFs of the lung and brain

cells are dominant determinants in the prediction (Figs. 9B and 10B), suggesting their differential organ

contributions to this phenotyping. Taken together, our results indicate a possibility that the cWFs, i.e.,

the total cellular transcriptome-size variations, are a part of the aging mechanism. The results also

demonstrate a utility of the cWFs to predict the aging-stages. Hence, our study provides evidence for

an important role of the total cellular transcriptome-size in regulating physiological processes such as

aging, and also indicate its possible utilities for the diagnosis of age-associated diseases.

Some limitations, in particular to the method itself, must be noted. One limitation is the requirement of

both bulk and single-cell RNA-seq data of the organs and the tissues of interest. Our method requires

both of these datasets for the target organs/tissues to infer the cWFs of the composing cell-types. As the

availability of such data is exponentially growing, this may become less of a limiting factor. Another

requirement is that the method needs at least a rough a priori knowledge about the cell-type

compositions (i.e., the ratio of cell-types) of the organs and the tissue of interest -i.e., the method works

only in a supervised framework. This limitation could also become less limiting as a growing body of

scRNA-seq data provides information on the cell-type compositions of previously less characterized

organs/tissues. There is also a computational limitation. When too many cell type-labels (e.g., hundreds

of distinct cell-types) are present in the data, the deconvolution fails to converge or the computational

cost becomes a rate-limiting factor. Despite such limitations, our method provides an important tool to

unveil previously less characterized cellular and molecular phenotypes, i.e., the differential cell type-

specific transcriptome-size, that appear to have significant physiological impacts.

Materials and Methods

Datasets

For the whole-organ RNA-seq data, two murine datasets are used: One from 11 weeks-old male

C57BL6/N Jcl mice and derived from 'iOrgans Atlas' (http://i-organs.atr.jp) (*56, 57*) and the other from

3, 18, and 24 months-old male C57BL6/N mice and derived from the *Tabula Muris Senis* (*46*). For the

scRNA-seq datasets, used are the brain, the fat, the heart, the liver, the lung, and the spleen data from

11 weeks-old male C57BL6/JN mice described in *Tabula Muris* (*20*). The kidney data are from 3

months-old male C57BL6/JN mice in *Tabula Muris Senis* (*47*). The skeletal muscle and the pancreas

data are from 8-10 weeks-old female C57BL6/J reported in Mouse Cell Atlas (*17*). The skin data are

from 9 weeks-old female C57BL6/J mice (*58*). The aging mouse scRNA-seq datasets in the brain, the

heart, the kidney, the lung and the spleen are from 3, 18, 24 months-old male C57BL6/JN mice in

Tabula Muris Senis (46, 47). The human PBMC datasets are GSM2871599 in GSE107572 (bulk RNA-

seq) (*43, 45*) and GSM4557334 in GSE150728 (scRNA-seq) (*44*), both are from healthy donors.

Data preprocessing

Cell-type labels of the organs used in this study are as described in each corresponding original single-

cell study, except for those of the skeletal muscle, the pancreas, and the heart (the *Tabula Muris Senis,*

but not the *Tabula Muris,* data) and the human PBMC. For the skeletal muscle and the pancreas, the

multiple labels of the cell-types of the similar gene expression patterns in the original study are

combined into the single label as follows (*** indicating arbitrary characters). For the skeletal muscle,

'B cell_***', 'Dendritic cell', and 'T cell' into 'Lymphatic cell', 'Erythroblast_***', 'Granulocyte

monocyte progenitor cell', 'Macrophage_***' and 'Neutrophil_***' into 'Myeloid cell', 'Muscle

cell_***' into 'Muscle cell'. For the pancreas, 'B cell' and 'T cell' into 'Lymphatic cell', 'Dendritic

cell', 'Erythroblast_***', 'Granulocyte', and 'Macrophage_***' into 'Myeloid cell', 'Endothelial

cell_***' into 'Endothelial cell', 'Smooth muscle cell_***' into 'Smooth muscle cell', 'Stromal

cell_***' into 'Stromal cell', 'Dividing cell' and 'Glial cell' into 'Others'. For the heart dataset in

Tabula Muris Senis (*47*), the labels were replaced with the ones in *Tabula Muris* (*20*) using single-cell

reference mapping by '*Seurat*' v4 (*59*), as follows. First, the reference scRNA-seq data in *Tabula Muris*

were preprocessed by '*Seurat*' analyses with the log-normalization (where the scale factor is 10^6), the

highly variable genes selection with default parameters, the scaling for all genes, and principal

component analysis (PCA) acquiring 200 principal components (PCs). The number of PCs used for the

downstream analysis was determined at p-value below 0.0001 in JackStraw analysis, resulting in 33

PCs. Using these 33 PCs reference data, the query heart scRNA-seq datasets from *Tabula Muris Senis*

(47) were annotated by the functions of 'FindTransferAnchors()' and 'TransferData()' in '*Seurat*'. For

the human PBMC, we combined cell-type labels as follows: 'Class-switched B' and 'B' into 'B',

'CD8m T', 'CD4m T', 'CD4n T', 'CD4 T', 'gd T' and 'CD8eff T' into 'T', 'IgG PB' and 'IgA PB'

into 'PB', 'pDC' and 'DC' into 'DC', 'RBC', 'Platelet', 'Activated Granulocyte' and 'SC & Eosinophil'

into 'Others'. The gene symbol-matching between the scRNA-seq and the whole-organ RNA-seq data

was conducted by using entrez gene IDs derived from 'org.Mm.egALIAS2EG' in an R package,

'*org.Mm.eg.db*'. ERCC-labelled genes were removed as they are spike-in genes. In addition, the counts

of the three genes (*Rn45s, Akap5, Lrrc17*) were removed as they are non-mRNA artifacts significantly

influencing the total counts. The normalization was performed by adjusting the total counts of each cell

in the scRNA-seq datasets to a million. The same normalization process was also applied to each of the

whole-organ RNA-seq data.

Calculation of reference cell-type ratios

The reference cell-type ratios were as described in each original single-cell study, except for the heart

and the brain. For the heart, the cell-type ratios described in *Tabula Muris* (*20*) were based on the

separate analysis of the cardiac muscles and the non-muscle cells, resulting in a large under-estimation

of the cardiac muscle ratio – 3.1% (*20*). In contrast, the ratio determined by multiple other methods and

considered as the gold-standard in the cardiovascular fields is 30 - 40% (*55, 60-65*). According to this

gold-standard ratios, we made the following modifications: We set the ratio of the cardiac-muscle cells

at 30% and the remaining at 70%. The latter, then, was divided by the non-muscle cell types by

maintaining their ratios the same to those in the *Tabula Muris* data. For the brain, the cell-type ratio

reported in the NIH database (https://www.nervenet.org/papers/brainrev99.html#Numbers) was used to

modify those in the *Tabula Muris* scRNA-seq data (*20*), as follows. First, we divided the brain cell-type

classes into four classes: 'neurons', 'glial cells', 'endothelial cells', 'others', and then set the ratio of

these classes at 75 : 23 : 7 : 4, respectively, accordingly to their estimated ratios in the NIH murine brain

database (https://www.nervenet.org/papers/brainrev99.html#Numbers). Second, we further divided

'neurons', 'glial cells', and 'others' into more cell-type classes according to *Tabula Muris* (*20*)*.* The

'neurons' were further divided into 'neuron-excitatory neurons and some neuronal stem cells' and

'neuron-inhibitory neurons'. The 'others' class was divided into 'brain pericyte-NA' and

'oligodendrocyte precursor cell-NA'. For the 'glial cells' class, we introduced three assumptions: 1) the

'glial cells' can be classified into four cell-types, 'microglial cell-NA', 'astrocyte-NA', 'Bergmann glial

cells-NA', and 'oligodendrocyte-NA', according to *Tabula Muris* (*20*); 2) the ratios of these four glial

cell types follow those of *Tabula Muris (20)* among them, and 3) the ratio of 'microglial cells-NA' in

the whole brain is 0.1, as it is reported that the 'microglial cells' account for 10 - 15 % of the whole

brain cells. On the basis of these assumptions, the ratios of each brain cell type was estimated as

'macrophage-NA' (ca. 0.2%), 'microglial cell-NA' (10.0%), 'astrocyte-NA' (ca. 2.2%), 'Bergmann

glial cell-NA' (ca. 2.1%), 'brain pericyte-NA' (ca. 1.5%), 'endothelial cell-NA' (ca. 6.4%), 'neuron-

excitatory neurons and some neuronal stem cells' (ca. 47.5%), 'neuron-inhibitory neurons' (ca. 21.3%),

oligodendrocyte-NA' (ca. 8.7%) and 'oligodendrocyte precursor cell-NA' (ca. 1.9%) and used as the

reference. For the human PBMC, the reference cell-type ratios are as described (*43, 45*), except for

those of "CD16$^+$ monocytes" and "PB and Others". The ratios of these cell-types are derived as follows:

The ratios of the cell-type label "the others" was divided to 'CD16$^+$ monocytes' (ca. 7.21%), 'PB' (ca.

0.24%), 'Others' (ca. 3.77%), according to their RNA-seq data-based ratios.

Selection of signature gene sets

Random Forest (RF) was performed to extract signature genes for distinguishing cell-types from one another in each organ using the scRNA-seq count data derived from the cell-type reference datasets described in the above section. In this study, the '*randomForest*' package in R was used for tuning and producing a classifier by RF. The scRNA-seq data were first divided by 8:2 into the training and the test data. Using the training data, we determined two parameters, 'mtry' and 'ntree' for producing an RF-model. The parameter 'mtry' means the number of features used for an RF-model and was tuned by a function 'tuneRF()', while the parameter 'ntree' means the number of trees generated in an RF-model and was set as 500, which is sufficient to converge error rate in cell-type classification. The produced RF-model was validated by using the test data and F1-score calculated by a function 'F1_Score()' in an R package '*MLmetrics*'. Then we confirmed the validity of the model by F1-score over 0.8. Following the classifier production, the important features in the classifier were extracted as the signature genes for each cell-type, where we used 'Mean Decrease in Gini' values as the importance indicator for each gene.

Computation of the cell type-specific weighting-factors (cWFs)

The overall concept for computing the cWFs is graphically described in Fig. 2 and is as follows: The observed scRNA-seq counts are normalized (i.e., the total counts per cell is the same for all individual cells). Hence, the putative differential total cellular transcriptome-size among various cell-types is lost from the count data. The cWFs (w_1, w_2, w_3, etc.) offset such loss. In their computation, we calculated at least 100 cWFs for each virtual-cell/cell-subject of each cell-type and made them follow Gaussian distribution, instead of one cWF per cell-type. Based on this concept, we developed a model as follows:

$$m\mathbf{y} = \sum_j w_j \mathbf{x}_j \ (j \in C^m) \tag{1}$$

where $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $w_j \geq 0$ and $\mathbf{x}_j \in \mathbb{R}^n$ denote the normalized whole-organ RNA-seq counts vector, the cWF for each cell subject j, and the normalized scRNA-seq counts vector for each cell subject j, respectively. The n is the total number of the signature genes for the organs. In this study, 100, 300,

and 500 signature genes were selected according to the ranking on the basis of 'Mean Decrease in Gini'

values calculated by the RF analyses. The numbers, 100, 300, and 500 were arbitrarily selected but the

smaller number of signature genes is computationally more cost-effective (see the details also in the

section below). The combination of cell subjects, C^m was selected at random while maintaining the

reference cell-type ratio described above with the total number of cell subjects, m, which is arbitrarily

set to 100. In addition, we set C^m containing at least 1 cell subject in each cell-type. With this model,

w_j was calculated by solving a quadratic problem under the constraint that the resulting value is non-

negative as follows:

$$504 \qquad \widetilde{w}_j = \text{argmin}_{w_j} \sum_i^S \left| m\mathbf{y}_i - \sum_j w_j \mathbf{x}_j \right|^2 s.t. \ w_j \geq 0 \qquad (2)$$

Here, S is the number of whole-organ RNA-seq count data. This quadratic problem was solved by using

'$osqp$' package in R. The process of both random-selection of the cell subject combination and $\widetilde{w}_j$

calculation was recursively performed until more than 100 w_j were generated for all selected cell

subjects. In every recursion, Pearson correlation coefficients were calculated between the real whole-

organ RNA-seq and the corresponding synthetic whole-organ RNA-seq generated with or without the

weighting-factors. Then, by assuming that the distribution of the weighting-factors follows Gaussian

distribution, we calculated the mean and variance of the weighted counts for each cell subject as

follows:

$$513 \qquad \widetilde{\mathbf{x}}_j \sim \mathcal{N}\left(\mu_{w_j}\mathbf{x}_j, \sigma_{w_j}^2 \text{diag}(\mathbf{x}_j \odot \mathbf{x}_j)\right) \qquad (3)$$

514 where, $\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}_j$, μ_{w_j}, and $\sigma_{w_j}^2$ denote the weighted count vector for the cell subject j, the mean of the cWFs

515 for the cell subject j, and the variance of the cWFs for the cell subject j, respectively. The operator $\odot$

516 represents the element-wise product between two vectors. On the basis of the computed mean and

517 variance of the weighting-factors for each cell subjects, the weighted count vector of cell-type k was

518 calculated by assuming that they follow Gaussian distribution as follows:

$$519 \qquad \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k \sim \mathcal{N}\left(\frac{1}{N_k}\sum_j \mu_{w_j}\mathbf{x}_j, \frac{1}{N_k}\sum_j \sigma_{w_j}^2 \text{diag}(\mathbf{x}_j \odot \mathbf{x}_j)\right) \ (j \in C^k) \qquad (4)$$

520   where, k, C^k, and N_k denote a cell-type, a set of subjects labelled with cell-type k, and the number of

521   subjects in C^k, respectively.

523   **Computing the cell-type ratios & gene expression patterns**

524   The overall concept is graphically described as Fig. 5A and the model is as follows:

$$\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{Xr} \tag{5}$$

526   where, $\mathbf{y}$, $\mathbf{X} = [\bar{\mathbf{x}}_1, \ldots, \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k, \ldots, \bar{\mathbf{x}}_K]$, and $\mathbf{r}$ are the whole-organ RNA-seq data vector, the matrix of the

527   virtual transcript counts where the columns are the weighted-counts for each cell-type calculated as

528   above, and the coefficient vector corresponding to the cell-type ratio, respectively. To compute $\mathbf{X}$ and

529     $\mathbf{r}$, we employed Bayes' theorem. To apply Bayes' theorem, Gaussian noise $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \beta\mathbf{I})$ was added to

530   Equation (5) and a probabilistic model was developed as follows:

$$P(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{r}) = \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{Xr}, \beta\mathbf{I}) \tag{6}$$

532   where, β denotes a hyperparameter. According to the Bayes' theorem, the posterior distribution of $\mathbf{X}$

533   and $\mathbf{r}$ was obtained as

$$P(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{r}|\mathbf{y}) \propto P(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{r})P(\mathbf{X})P(\mathbf{r}) \tag{7}$$

535   where, $P(\mathbf{X})$ and $P(\mathbf{r})$ denote prior distribution of $\mathbf{X}$ and $\mathbf{r}$, respectively. $P(\mathbf{X})$ and $P(\mathbf{r})$ are given as

536   follows:

$$P(\mathbf{X}) = \prod_{k=1}^{K} P(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k) = \prod_{k=1}^{K} \mathcal{N}\left(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k \middle| \boldsymbol{\mu}_k', \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_k^{-1}\right) \tag{8}$$

$$P(\mathbf{r}) = Dirichlet(\mathbf{r}|\alpha\mathbf{I}) \tag{9}$$

where, α and $\mathbf{1}_K$ denote a hyperparameter and the K-dimensional all-ones vector. In prior distribution

$P(\mathbf{X})$, $\mathcal{N}\left(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k \middle| \boldsymbol{\mu}_k', \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_k^{-1}\right)$ is the same as Equation (4). In other words, $\boldsymbol{\mu}_k' = \frac{1}{N_k}\sum_j \mu_{w_j}\mathbf{x}_j$ and $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_k^{-1} =$

$\frac{1}{N_k}\sum_j \sigma_{w_j}^2 \text{diag}\left(\mathbf{x}_j \odot \mathbf{x}_j\right)$. To maximize the posterior distribution, we employed an extension of

Hamiltonian Monte Carlo (HMC) sampler, the No-U-Turn Sampler (NUTS) by a software, 'stan',

which was performed on R program by an R package, '*rstan*', and used only signature gene sets for

sampling, as the running time is reduced. The probabilities of hyperparameters, α and β were set as

zero-truncated standard normal distribution. In addition, we set zero for the negative values in the

sampled elements of $\mathbf{X}$. The 'stan' sampling parameters, such as the number of iterations,

max_treedepth, adapt_delta, thin, etc., were appropriately chosen to converge well the sampled

distributions. The convergence was evaluated by R-hat values (Gelman-Rubin statistics) in all sampling

variables below 1.1, which is a generally accepted value for convergence evaluation. For the expression

pattern of non-signature genes, we set another noise parameter γ in Equation (6), instead of β and

estimated $\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k$ (the expression patterns in non-signature genes) by the following probability equation:

$$P(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k|\mathbf{y},\bar{\mathbf{r}},\{\bar{\mathbf{x}}_l\}_{l\neq k}) \propto P(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{X},\bar{\mathbf{r}})P(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k) \tag{10}$$

where, $\bar{\mathbf{r}}$ denotes the mean values of $\mathbf{r}$ determined by the sampled distribution above.

Then, $P(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k|\mathbf{y},\bar{\mathbf{r}},\{\bar{\mathbf{x}}_l\}_{l\neq k})$ follows Gaussian distribution and its mean and variance can be calculated by

the following equations:

$$\mathbb{E}[\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k] = \left(\gamma r_k^2 \mathbf{I} + \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_k^{-1}\right)^{-1} \left(\gamma r_k \mathbf{y} + \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_k^{-1}\boldsymbol{\mu}_k' - \gamma \sum_{l\neq k} r_k r_l \bar{\mathbf{x}}_l\right) \tag{11}$$

$$\mathrm{Var}[\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k] = \gamma r_k^2 \mathbf{I} + \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_k^{-1} \tag{12}$$

In the resulting $\mathbb{E}[\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k]$, all negative values were set to zero. The hyperparameter γ was set as either of

$10^{-5}, 10^{-4}, \dots, 10^5$. The estimating calculation was recursively performed until the root mean square

error (RMSE) of $\bar{\mathbf{x}}$ between iterations gets below 1 or until at most 100 times enough to converge, where

one iteration is the estimating calculations of Equation (11) and (12) for all k (i.e., all cell-types) and

for each iteration, $\bar{\mathbf{x}}_l$ is from the prior iteration. The optimal value of the hyperparameter γ was

determined by the least RMSE between the original whole-organ RNA-seq (i.e., $\mathbf{y}$) and the estimated

one (i.e., $\bar{\mathbf{y}}$).

Selection of the optimal number of the signature genes

The optimal number (100, 300, or 500) of the signature genes were determined based on the three

criteria as follows: 1) Improvement of the Pearson correlation coefficient between the r-woRNAseq and

the syn-woRNAseq(+cWF), 2) Convergence in the deconvolution, 3) Higher similarity to the reference

cell type composition (i.e., lower RMSE). The results with the selected optimal number of the signature

genes were used in the comparisons with those obtained by MuSiC and DWLS, and also for the analyses

with the aging data and for the cWFs analysis of the human PBMC data described below.

MuSiC and DWLS

MuSiC was conducted as described (*41*). DWLS was performed as described (*40*), except that a function, 'solve.QP()' (R package: '*quadprog*') was substituted by 'solve_osqp()' (R package: '*osqp*') for quadratic problem solver.

Comparison of the real and virtual scRNA-seq counts of 10 organs

The mean counts of each cell-type in each organ were compared by Pearson correlation coefficients. For the virtual scRNA-seq, the estimated mean count for each cell-type was normalized to a million. For the real scRNA-seq, the mean count for each individual cell was normalized to a million and averaged for each cell-type.

Analysis of differential cWFs in aging progression

The distribution of the pairwise cWF ratios was calculated for each aging-stage. The ratios of the pairwise cWFs in each cell-type, instead of the cWFs themselves, were used as the cWFs are relative values calculated from the normalized count datasets of the real whole-organ RNA-seq and thus the cWFs values themselves can be used only for their comparison among the cell-types within each organ at each aging-stage (i.e., the cWFs cannot be compared across the aging-stages). Hence, their pairwise ratios were used for the comparisons across the aging-stages. For each pairwise cell-type within an organ, the distribution of the cWF ratios was calculated for all pair combinations of the consisting cells. For example, assuming that cell-type X has 1,000 cells and cell-type Y has 500 cells with one cWF per cell, respectively, the distribution of the ratio of cWFs of cell-type X vs. Y consisting of 500,000 values of the ratios was calculated. When a cell-type contains zero value of cWF, we substituted the zero value for the second minimum cWF value in the cell-type to avoid the division by zero. Next, for each cell-types pair, we performed Mann-Whitney U-test to make statistical evaluations of the differences of their ratio-distributions between the aging-stages (i.e., 18 mos. vs. 3 mos., 24 mos. vs. 3 mos., 24 mos. vs. 18 mos.). Zeros were generated if the resulting values were below the lower bound of R program, 1e-308.

Machine learning prediction of the aging-stages by the differential cWF ratios

For this analysis, we omitted the data of the cell-types pairs of which statistical analysis described above resulted in $p \geq 0.01$ across all pairs of the aging-stages. Using the remaining data, we performed LightGBM classifier analysis (*49*). We first generated input data for LightGBM classifier analysis using the cWF ratio distributions obtained as described in the above section. The 100 cWF ratio distribution-values were randomly sampled for each cell-types pair for each aging-stage. The sampled values were at random combined with each other, resulting in the matrix of "the 100 cWFs ratio distribution values" x "the number of the cell-type pairs" for each aging-stage. Using these matrices for all three aging-stages as the input data, we generated a LightGBM classifier of aging-stages on Python, using the '*lightgbm*' package (*49*). The input data was divided by 8:2 into training data and test data. The training data was used for tuning the parameters of LightGBM. The tuning was performed by the '*optuna*' package (*66*), searching for the best parameters to maximize macro-F1 score. Specifically, the searched parameters are max_depth, num_leaves, subsample, subsample_freq, colsample_bytree, min_child_samples, ranging from 3 to 12, 2 to 256, 0.1 to 1.0, 1 to 7, 0.1 to 1.0, and 5 to 100, respectively. The model was generated using the best parameters and evaluated using test data by accuracy, macro-Precision, macro-Recall, and macro-F1_score. These evaluations were performed by a Python package, '*scikit-learn*' (*67*). In addition, we also extracted feature importance based on 'gain' from the model and confirmed the high-ranked contributors in the model (i.e., aging-stage classification).

References

1.   J. E. Coate, J. J. Doyle, Variation in transcriptome size: are we getting the message? *Chromosoma* **124**, 27-43 (2015).

2.   J. Loven *et al.*, Revisiting global gene expression analysis. *Cell* **151**, 476-482 (2012).

3.   G. K. Marinov *et al.*, From single-cell to cell-pool transcriptomes: stochasticity in gene expression and RNA splicing. *Genome Res* **24**, 496-510 (2014).

628   4.   S. Marguerat, J. Bahler, Coordinating genome expression with cell size. *Trends in genetics :*

629   *TIG* **28**, 560-565 (2012).

630   5.   T. P. Miettinen *et al.*, Identification of transcriptional and metabolic programs related to

631   mammalian cell size. *Current biology : CB* **24**, 598-608 (2014).

632   6.   J. Zhurinsky *et al.*, A coordinated global control over cellular transcription. *Current biology :*

633   *CB* **20**, 2010-2015 (2010).

634   7.   E. E. Schmidt, U. Schibler, Cell size regulation, a mechanism that controls cellular RNA

635   accumulation: consequences on regulation of the ubiquitous transcription factors Oct1 and NF-

636   Y and the liver-enriched transcription factor DBP. *The Journal of cell biology* **128**, 467-483

637   (1995).

638   8.   C. Y. Lin *et al.*, Transcriptional amplification in tumor cells with elevated c-Myc. *Cell* **151**, 56-

639   67 (2012).

640   9.   Z. Nie *et al.*, c-Myc is a universal amplifier of expressed genes in lymphocytes and embryonic

641   stem cells. *Cell* **151**, 68-79 (2012).

642   10.   Y. Li *et al.*, Global transcriptional and translational repression in human-embryonic-stem-cell-

643   derived Rett syndrome neurons. *Cell stem cell* **13**, 446-458 (2013).

644   11.   M. G. Chandler, R. H. Pritchard, The effect of gene concentration and relative gene dosage on

645   gene output in Escherichia coli. *Mol Gen Genet* **138**, 127-141 (1975).

646   12.   J. E. Coate, J. J. Doyle, Quantifying whole transcriptome size, a prerequisite for understanding

647   transcriptome evolution across species: an example from a plant allopolyploid. *Genome Biol*

648   *Evol* **2**, 534-546 (2010).

649   13.   Z. Hu *et al.*, Nucleosome loss leads to global transcriptional up-regulation and genomic

650   instability during yeast aging. *Genes Dev* **28**, 396-408 (2014).

651   14.   K. Zaitsev, M. Bambouskova, A. Swain, M. N. Artyomov, Complete deconvolution of cellular

652   mixtures based on linearity of transcriptional signatures. *Nat Commun* **10**, 2209 (2019).

653   15.   S. Cao *et al.*, Estimation of tumor cell total mRNA expression in 15 cancer types predicts

654   disease progression. *Nature biotechnology* **40**, 1624-1633 (2022).

16.   Q. Deng, D. Ramskold, B. Reinius, R. Sandberg, Single-cell RNA-seq reveals dynamic,
random monoallelic gene expression in mammalian cells. *Science* **343**, 193-196 (2014).

17.   X. Han *et al.*, Mapping the Mouse Cell Atlas by Microwell-Seq. *Cell* **172**, 1091-1107 e1017
(2018).

18.   A. Regev *et al.*, Science Forum: The Human Cell Atlas. *Elife* **6**, (2017).

19.   R. Sandberg, Entering the era of single-cell transcriptomics in biology and medicine. *Nature*
methods **11**, 22-24 (2014).

20.   C. Tabula Muris *et al.*, Single-cell transcriptomics of 20 mouse organs creates a Tabula Muris.
Nature **562**, 367-372 (2018).

21.   A. Adil, V. Kumar, A. T. Jan, M. Asger, Single-Cell Transcriptomics: Current Methods and
Challenges in Data Acquisition and Analysis. *Front Neurosci* **15**, 591122 (2021).

22.   A. Haque, J. Engel, S. A. Teichmann, T. Lonnberg, A practical guide to single-cell RNA-
sequencing for biomedical research and clinical applications. *Genome Med* **9**, 75 (2017).

23.   B. Hwang, J. H. Lee, D. Bang, Single-cell RNA sequencing technologies and bioinformatics
pipelines. *Exp Mol Med* **50**, 1-14 (2018).

24.   K. Vandereyken, A. Sifrim, B. Thienpont, T. Voet, Methods and applications for single-cell
and spatial multi-omics. *Nature reviews. Genetics*, 1-22 (2023).

25.   C. G. Williams, H. J. Lee, T. Asatsuma, R. Vento-Tormo, A. Haque, An introduction to spatial
transcriptomics for biomedical research. *Genome Med* **14**, 68 (2022).

26.   E. Jonasson *et al.*, Total mRNA Quantification in Single Cells: Sarcoma Cell Heterogeneity.
Cells **9**, (2020).

27.   J. Racle, K. de Jonge, P. Baumgaertner, D. E. Speiser, D. Gfeller, Simultaneous enumeration
of cancer and immune cell types from bulk tumor gene expression data. *Elife* **6**, (2017).

28.   A. Raj, S. A. Rifkin, E. Andersen, A. van Oudenaarden, Variability in gene expression underlies
incomplete penetrance. *Nature* **463**, 913-918 (2010).

29.   A. R. Abbas, K. Wolslegel, D. Seshasayee, Z. Modrusan, H. F. Clark, Deconvolution of blood
microarray data identifies cellular activation patterns in systemic lupus erythematosus. *PloS*
one **4**, e6098 (2009).

30.   F. Avila Cobos, J. Vandesompele, P. Mestdagh, K. De Preter, Computational deconvolution of

transcriptomics data from mixed cell populations. *Bioinformatics* **34**, 1969-1979 (2018).

31.   R. Gaujoux, C. Seoighe, Semi-supervised Nonnegative Matrix Factorization for gene

expression deconvolution: a case study. *Infect Genet Evol* **12**, 913-921 (2012).

32.   T. Gong *et al.*, Optimal deconvolution of transcriptional profiling data using quadratic

programming with application to complex clinical blood samples. *PloS one* **6**, e27156 (2011).

33.   T. Gong, J. D. Szustakowski, DeconRNASeq: a statistical framework for deconvolution of

heterogeneous tissue samples based on mRNA-Seq data. *Bioinformatics* **29**, 1083-1085 (2013).

34.   B. Li *et al.*, Comprehensive analyses of tumor immunity: implications for cancer

immunotherapy. *Genome biology* **17**, 174 (2016).

35.   A. M. Newman *et al.*, Robust enumeration of cell subsets from tissue expression profiles.

Nature methods **12**, 453-457 (2015).

36.   D. Repsilber *et al.*, Biomarker discovery in heterogeneous tissue samples -taking the in-silico

deconfounding approach. *BMC bioinformatics* **11**, 27 (2010).

37.   S. S. Shen-Orr, R. Gaujoux, Computational deconvolution: extracting cell type-specific

information from heterogeneous samples. *Curr Opin Immunol* **25**, 571-578 (2013).

38.   N. Wang *et al.*, UNDO: a Bioconductor R package for unsupervised deconvolution of mixed

gene expressions in tumor samples. *Bioinformatics* **31**, 137-139 (2015).

39.   Y. Zhong, Y. W. Wan, K. Pang, L. M. Chow, Z. Liu, Digital sorting of complex tissues for cell

type-specific gene expression profiles. *BMC bioinformatics* **14**, 89 (2013).

40.   D. Tsoucas *et al.*, Accurate estimation of cell-type composition from gene expression data. *Nat*

Commun **10**, 2975 (2019).

41.   X. Wang, J. Park, K. Susztak, N. R. Zhang, M. Li, Bulk tissue cell type deconvolution with

multi-subject single-cell expression reference. *Nat Commun* **10**, 380 (2019).

42.   K. Kang *et al.*, CDSeq: A novel complete deconvolution method for dissecting heterogeneous

samples using gene expression data. *PLoS computational biology* **15**, e1007510 (2019).

43.   F. Finotello *et al.*, Molecular and pharmacological modulators of the tumor immune contexture

revealed by deconvolution of RNA-seq data. *Genome Med* **11**, 34 (2019).

44.   A. J. Wilk *et al.*, A single-cell atlas of the peripheral immune response to severe COVID-19.

712   *medRxiv*, (2020).

713   45.   F. Finotello *et al.*, Correction to: Molecular and pharmacological modulators of the tumor

714   immune contexture revealed by deconvolution of RNA-seq data. *Genome Med* **11**, 50 (2019).

715   46.   N. Schaum *et al.*, Ageing hallmarks exhibit organ-specific temporal signatures. *Nature* **583**,

716   596-602 (2020).

717   47.   C. Tabula Muris, A single-cell transcriptomic atlas characterizes ageing tissues in the mouse.

718   *Nature* **583**, 590-595 (2020).

719   48.   S. Dutta, P. Sengupta, Men and mice: Relating their ages. *Life Sci* **152**, 244-248 (2016).

720   49.   G. Ke *et al.*, LightGBM: A Highly Efficient Gradient Boosting Decision Tree. *Advances in*

721   *Neural Information Processing Systems* **30**, (2017).

722   50.   S. C. van den Brink *et al.*, Single-cell sequencing reveals dissociation-induced gene expression

723   in tissue subpopulations. *Nature methods* **14**, 935-936 (2017).

724   51.   P. Anversa, G. Olivetti, M. Melissari, A. V. Loud, Stereological measurement of cellular and

725   subcellular hypertrophy and hyperplasia in the papillary muscle of adult rat. *Journal of*

726   *molecular and cellular cardiology* **12**, 781-795 (1980).

727   52.   J. Dammrich, U. Pfeifer, Cardiac hypertrophy in rats after supravalvular aortic constriction. I.

728   Size and number of cardiomyocytes, endothelial and interstitial cells. *Virchows Arch B Cell*

729   *Pathol Incl Mol Pathol* **43**, 265-286 (1983).

730   53.   T. Mattfeldt, K. L. Kramer, R. Zeitz, G. Mall, Stereology of myocardial hypertrophy induced

731   by physical exercise. *Virchows Arch A Pathol Anat Histopathol* **409**, 473-484 (1986).

732   54.   Y. Tang, J. R. Nyengaard, J. B. Andersen, U. Baandrup, H. J. Gundersen, The application of

733   stereological methods for estimating structural parameters in the human heart. *Anat Rec*

734   *(Hoboken)* **292**, 1630-1647 (2009).

735   55.   P. Zhou, W. T. Pu, Recounting Cardiac Cellular Composition. *Circulation research* **118**, 368-

736   370 (2016).

737   56.   S. Kozawa *et al.*, Predicting Human Clinical Outcomes using Mouse Multi-Organ

738   Transcriptome. *iScience* **In press**, (2019).

57. S. Kozawa *et al.*, The Body-wide Transcriptome Landscape of Disease Models. *iScience* **2**,
238-268 (2018).

58. S. Joost *et al.*, The Molecular Anatomy of Mouse Skin during Hair Growth and Rest. *Cell stem*
cell **26**, 441-457 e447 (2020).

59. Y. Hao *et al.*, Integrated analysis of multimodal single-cell data. *Cell* **184**, 3573-3587 e3529
(2021).

60. I. Banerjee, J. W. Fuseler, R. L. Price, T. K. Borg, T. A. Baudino, Determination of cell types
and numbers during cardiac development in the neonatal and adult rat and mouse. *American*
journal of physiology. Heart and circulatory physiology **293**, H1883-1891 (2007).

61. O. Bergmann *et al.*, Dynamics of Cell Generation and Turnover in the Human Heart. *Cell* **161**,
1566-1575 (2015).

62. A. C. Nag, Study of non-muscle cells of the adult mammalian heart: a fine structural analysis
and distribution. *Cytobios* **28**, 41-61 (1980).

63. A. R. Pinto *et al.*, Revisiting Cardiac Cellular Composition. *Circulation research* **118**, 400-409
(2016).

64. A. Raulf *et al.*, Transgenic systems for unequivocal identification of cardiac myocyte nuclei
and analysis of cardiomyocyte cell cycle status. *Basic Res Cardiol* **110**, 33 (2015).

65. S. Walsh, A. Ponten, B. K. Fleischmann, S. Jovinge, Cardiomyocyte cell cycle control and
growth estimation in vivo--an analysis based on cardiomyocyte nuclei. *Cardiovascular*
research **86**, 365-373 (2010).

66. T. Akiba, S. Sano, T. Yanase, T. Ohta, M. Koyama, Optuna: A Next-generation
Hyperparameter Optimization Framework. *Proceedings of the ACM SIGKDD International*
Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining, 2623-2631 (2019).

67. F. Pedregosa Fabianpedregosa *et al.*, Scikit-learn: Machine Learning in Python. *Journal of*
Machine Learning Research **12**, 2825-2830 (2011).

Acknowledgements

We thank K. Sugisaka, R. Takahashi, T. Ninomiya, R. Kitaura, R. Ishikawa, S. Taniyama for their administrative and laboratory management assistance. We are also grateful to the members of Karydo TherapeutiX, Inc. and Sato laboratory at ATR for advice and discussion throughout the course of this work. **Funding:** This work was funded by Innovative Science and Technology Initiative for Security Grant Number JPJ004596 ATLA Japan (T.N.S.), JST ERATO Grant Number JPMJER1303 Japan (T.N.S.), Nakatani Foundation (T.N.S.). **Author contributions:** Conceptualization: TNS, Methodology: KT, SK, Investigation: TNS, KT, SK, Visualization: KT, Supervision: TNS, Writing-original draft: TNS, KT, Writing-review & editing: TNS, KT, SK. **Completing interests:** T.N.S. is the inventor of the patents filed on the cell type-specific weighting-factors and holds shares of Karydo TherapeutiX, Inc., which owns the right to this patent. K.T. and S.K. are also employed by Karydo TherapeutiX, Inc. Correspondence and requests for materials should be addressed to T.N.S. (island1005@gmail.com). **Data and materials availability:** The public datasets are as indicated and the raw data are available as supplementary tables in this paper. The code for our algorithm is freely available (https://github.com/k-teji/VscRNAseq).