1    **Cell type-specific weighting-factors for accurate virtual single-cell RNA-sequencing of diverse**

2                                              **organs**

Kengo Tejima[1,2,3,*], Satoshi Kozawa[1,2,3,*], Thomas N. Sato[1,2,3,4,¶]

ERATO Sato Live Bio-Forecasting Project, Kyoto, Japan[1]; The Thomas N. Sato BioMEC-X

Laboratories, Advanced Telecommunications Research Institute International, Kyoto, Japan[2]; Karydo

TherapeutiX, Inc., Kyoto, Japan[3]; V-iClinix Laboratory, Nara Medical University, Nara, Japan[4]

¶Corresponding Authors:

Thomas N. Sato

The Thomas N. Sato BioMEC-X Laboratories

Advanced Telecommunications Research Institute International (ATR)

Karydo TherapeutiX, Inc.

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

Email: island1005@gmail.com

TEL: 81-774-95-2311

FAX: 81-774-95-2329

*These two authors contributed equally to this work

**Abstract**

Computational deconvolution of transcriptome data of organs/tissues uncovers their structural and

functional complexities at cellular resolution without performing single-cell RNA-sequencing

experiments. However, the deconvolution of highly heterogenous diverse organs/tissues remains a

challenge. Herein, we report "cell type-specific weighting-factors" that are essential for accurate

deconvolution, but critically lacking in the existing methods. We computed such weighting-factors for

97 cell-types across 10 mouse organs and demonstrate their effective usage in the Bayesian framework

to generate their virtual single-cell RNA-sequencing data, hence accurately estimating both cell-type

ratios and the complete transcriptome of each cell-type in these organs. The method also efficiently

detects the temporal changes of such cell type-profiles during organ pathogenesis in disease models.

Furthermore, we present its potential utility for human organ/bulk-tissue deconvolution. Taken together,

the weighting-factors reported herein and their computation for new cell-types and/or new species such

as human are essential tools/resources for studying high-resolution biology and disease.

## Introduction

Organs consist of ca. $1 \times 10^8 - 3 \times 10^{12}$ cells in human and their functional interactions are critical for organ structure and function. Changes of the cellular composition and/or the cellular phenotype of the organs are tightly linked to their dysfunction, remodeling and regeneration. Single-cell RNA-sequencing (scRNA-seq) analyzes comprehensive gene expression profiles of individual composite cells of organs, providing an opportunity to unveil such changes at single cell resolution (Deng et al., 2014; Han et al., 2018; Regev et al., 2017; Sandberg, 2014; Tabula Muris et al., 2018). Hence, scRNA-seq is a powerful method to generate unprecedentedly detailed molecular cell atlas of normal and pathological organs.

However, scRNA-seq has limitations. First, prior to subjecting to scRNA-seq, the organs must be dissociated to individual cells by enzymatic and physical means and the living cells must be individually collected. Hence, the major premise is the availability of fresh organs. This is often a problem in the case of studying clinical human organs. In many cases, they are stored frozen for months and years and that they cannot be subjected to scRNA-seq analyses.

Furthermore, rare pathological samples are difficult to be freshly obtained and that the analyses must be conducted with frozen samples of limited availability. In addition, clinical human samples, such as biopsies, are often small parts of the whole organ. Even in the case of autopsies, dissociating a large whole-organ such as the heart and the brain into individual cells for scRNA-seq analyses is a formidable task, if not an impossible one.

Another limitation is the difficulty of analyzing multiple organs from the identical individual subjects. Due to the cell-dissociation/-purification steps, it is a difficult, and often an impractical, task to conduct scRNA-seq of multiple organs from the identical experimental model organism. This is often necessary in many experimental situations such as the study of the drug effects and/or pathogenesis on/in multiple organs in the same subject (Kozawa et al., 2018).

Procedural artifacts in gene expression are also problems with scRNA-seq. It has been reported that cell dissociation steps induce aberrant gene expression in the cells (van den Brink et al., 2017). The cost and labor are also major hurdles. The scRNA-seq analyses of many organs and samples derived

from many disease subjects and disease-models of humans and experimental animal models,

respectively, are cost-/labor-intensive.

A solution to these limitations and problems is computational deconvolution of whole-organ

and bulk-tissue RNA datasets. The whole-organ/bulk-tissue RNA can be more easily purified from

fresh or frozen samples. Simultaneous purification of RNA from a large number of organs/tissues are

also possible. The cost and labor with whole-organ/bulk-tissue RNA analyses are much less than those

of scRNA-seq.

Several computational methods to deconvolve whole-organ/bulk-tissue RNA-seq data are

reported (Abbas et al., 2009; Avila Cobos et al., 2018; Gaujoux and Seoighe, 2012; Gong et al., 2011;

Gong and Szustakowski, 2013; Kang et al., 2019; Li et al., 2016; Newman et al., 2015; Repsilber et al.,

2010; Shen-Orr and Gaujoux, 2013; Tsoucas et al., 2019; Wang et al., 2015; Wang et al., 2019; Zhong

et al., 2013). They compute cell type compositions of the source tissues using the corresponding bulk-

tissues RNA-seq data. Three most recently reported methods claim that they outperform the other

methods published in previous years. They are MUlti-Subject Single Cell deconvolution (MuSiC),

Dampened Weighted Least Squares (DWLS) and Complete Deconvolution for Sequencing data

(CDSeq) methods (Kang et al., 2019; Tsoucas et al., 2019; Wang et al., 2019). However, their

validations are limited to synthetic datasets, RNA-seq data derived from cell cultures and/or the

mixtures of a few tissues, and/or $1 - 4$ real organs. Thus, their applicability to more diverse real-organs

remain unclear.

In this study, we examined these existing methods for deconvolving 14 mouse whole-organs.

We evaluated mouse organs, instead of human organs, as many organs and paired single-cell RNA-seq

datasets are readily available (Han et al., 2018; Kozawa et al., 2018; Tabula Muris et al., 2018).

Availability of such exactly paired datasets for human organs is limited. Our analyses of the existing

deconvolution methods with these paired mouse datasets found that they fail to recapitulate their known

composite cell-type ratios. Hence, we examined a cause/causes for their failure and found "cell type-

specific weighting-factors" that could overcome their defects. Hence, we computed 97 such wighting-

factors of 97 cell-types across 10 mouse organs. Using them in the Bayesian framework, we generate

virtual scRNA-seq data of these organs, accurately estimating their cell-type compositions and the

complete transcriptome profiles of their composite cell-types. Furthermore, we demonstrate that the

approach effectively detects the temporal changes of cell-type compositions and gene expression

patterns of the composite cell-types during the cardiac pathogenesis in the myocardial infarction model.

In addition to these studies with mouse datasets, we also show a potential usage of this approach for

human bulk-tissue deconvolution.

**Results**

**The existing deconvolution methods fail to accurately estimate the cell-type-ratios of mouse**

**organs**

Several deconvolution methods are reported (Abbas et al., 2009; Avila Cobos et al., 2018; Gaujoux and

Seoighe, 2012; Gong et al., 2011; Gong and Szustakowski, 2013; Kang et al., 2019; Li et al., 2016;

Newman et al., 2015; Repsilber et al., 2010; Shen-Orr and Gaujoux, 2013; Tsoucas et al., 2019; Wang

et al., 2015; Wang et al., 2019; Zhong et al., 2013). However, their applicability to whole-organs/bulk-

tissues deconvolution limited to only a few organs/tissues. Hence, we evaluated these previously

reported methods with 14 real mouse organs (Figure 1). We chose MuSiC and DWLS methods, as they

appear to outperform all the other methods in deconvoluting 1 – 4 organs/bulk-tissues (Tsoucas et al.,

2019; Wang et al., 2019). The result shows that the computed cell-type ratios significantly deviate from

the ones experimentally estimated by real scRNA-seq studies to various degrees in most of these organs

(Figure 1).

**Cell type-specific weighting-factors to offset the gap between the synthetic and real whole-organ**

**RNA-seq data**

To identify a cause/causes for the failed performance of the existing methods (Figure 1), we studied

their algorithm and computational framework. We found that they are built on the common assumption

that the whole-organ/bulk-tissue RNA-seq is the sum of gene expression of each composite cell-type

weighted by cell-type ratios. Based on this assumption, the synthetic whole-organ/bulk-tissue data

constructed from single-cell transcript counts combined according to the known fraction of each cell-

type in the organ/tissue (i.e., experimentally determined by real scRNA-seq) must be approximately

equal to the real whole-organ/bulk-tissue RNA-seq data. We evaluated this assumption by comparing

the gene expression profiles of the synthetic whole-organ RNA-seq data and the real whole-organ RNA-

seq data of the same organs (Figure 2A). The synthetic whole-organ RNA-seq data is calculated as the

sum of the normalized transcript counts weighted by the known ratios of the composite cell-types of

the organs (see Materials and methods). Shown are the results by using the indicated number of the top

ranked signature genes for distinguishing the cell-types for each organ as computed by random forest

(RF) (Figure 2A, see Materials and methods, the list of all signature genes can be found in Figure 2 -

Figure supplement 1 – Source data 1). The similarities/dissimilarities for the 14 organs are shown by

Pearson correlation coefficients (Figure 2A). The results show that the Pearson correlation coefficients

are less than 0.75 for 10 organs (aorta, brain, heart, large intestine, liver, lung, pancreas, skin, skeletal

muscle, thymus) (Figure 2A). Such large gaps are unlikely due to sex or strain differences, as both the

whole-organ and single-cell RNA-seq are derived from the same sex (male) and strain, C57BL6, (Han

et al., 2018; Kozawa et al., 2019; Kozawa et al., 2018; Tabula Muris et al., 2018), except for the skeletal

muscle where its scRNA-seq data are derived from female mice. This result suggests the common

assumption of the other methods that the whole-organ/bulk-tissue RNA-seq is the sum of the

normalized transcript counts of each composite cell-type weighted by cell-type ratios must be re-

evaluated.

On the basis of the apparent gap between the synthetic and real organ RNA-seq data (Figure

2A), we postulated the presence of a putative variation among different cell-types that are not reflected

on real single cell RNA-seq data. One such variation could be total cellular RNA contents. For cultured

cells, it is experimentally shown that the total RNA contents vary between $50,000 – 300,000$ transcripts

per cell (Marinov et al., 2014). While such cellular RNA content-variations in heterogenous solid

organs/tissues remain elusive, there are at least some evidence. It is reported that cell size regulates

cellular RNA abundance (Schmidt and Schibler, 1995). In this regard, 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

(Anversa et al., 1980; Dammrich and Pfeifer, 1983; Mattfeldt et al., 1986; Tang et al., 2009; Zhou and

Pu, 2016). Hence, it is possible that the total RNA content per cells may be significantly different

between muscle and non-muscle cell types. Interestingly, while the muscle cells consist of only 25%

and 10% of the heart and the skeletal muscle, respectively (reference bar plots in Figure 1)  (Banerjee

et al., 2007; Bergmann et al., 2015; Nag, 1980; Pinto et al., 2016; Raulf et al., 2015; Walsh et al., 2010;

Zhou and Pu, 2016), the existing deconvolution methods (MuSiC, DWLS) computed that the muscle

cell-type is the most abundant cell type consisting of 80-90% in the heart and the skeletal muscle

(MuSiC and DWLS bar plots in Figure 1).

157           To account for this and other possible variations among different cell-types, we computed and

determined the cell type-specific weighting-factors for each organ (Figure 2B, see also Materials and

methods). The concept is as follows: The total transcript counts per cell in scRNA-seq data are

normalized so that the total counts per cell become the same. This results in the loss of the putative

differences of total cellular RNA contents among various cell-types. Hence, the cell type-specific

weighting-factors ($w_1$, $w_2$, $w_3$, etc.) reflecting the relative differences of the total cellular RNA contents

among various cell-types compensate such loss, allows for more accurate deconvolution (Figure 2B,

see also Materials and methods). Based on this concept, we computed at least 100 weighting-factors for

each "virtual-cell/cell-subject". To introduce a Bayesian framework for the subsequent analyses, we

made them follow Gaussian distribution and calculated their mean and variance (see Materials and

methods for the detailed calculation method). The result is shown as boxplots of the means of individual

virtual-cells/cell-subjects for each cell-type in each organ (Figure 2 – Figure Supplement 1). The total

number of virtual-cells/cell-subjects is 100 or more and adjusted according to the cell-type ratios of the

reference data (i.e., the known real cell-type ratios) for each organ (e.g., 100 cell type As and 200 cell

type Bs when the ratio of A and B cell types is 1:2 in an organ). Using the mean weighting-factor value

for each cell-type (i.e., the mean of the means of all virtual-cells/cell-subjects for each cell-type), we

weighted the transcript counts for each cell-type (see Materials and methods). We then summed these

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

construct virtual organ RNA-seq data (Figure 2B, see Materials and methods). These updated virtual

organ RNA-seq are compared to the corresponding real organ RNA-seq data (Figure 2C). The results

show the significant improvement (Pearson correlation coefficients = 0.8 – 1.0) in the similarities of

gene expression profiles for all organs, except for the skin and the thymus (Compare Figure 2C to Figure

2A).

**Computation of the cell-type ratios and the complete transcriptomes of all composite cell-types**

Using these weighting-factors, we designed a Bayesian framework to simultaneously compute both cell-type ratios and their gene expression patterns (Figure 3A, see also Materials and methods). In this framework, using the mean of the cell type-specific weighting-factors ($w_1$, $w_2$, $w_3$ in Figure 3A) for each cell type (indicated as 1, 2, 3 in Figure 3A), we compute virtual transcript counts ("x" in Figure 3A) for each gene (indicated as wiggling lines of different colors in Figure 3A) in each cell-type and the ratio (indicated as "r" in Figure 3A) of each cell-type. The computation is iteratively performed in the Bayesian framework with two hyperparameters, $\alpha$ $(0.001 - 1,000)$ and $\beta$ $(0.001 - 1,000)$, to account for the combinatorial influence of the cell-type ratios and the gene expression patterns of each cell-type on the overall organ-level transcriptome, respectively (Figure 3A, see also Materials and methods). 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 Figure 3A). Those for cell-types 2 and 3 are indicated accordingly (see the diagram labels as "Prediction" in Figure 3A). Such initial conditions are the normalized transcript count for each gene and the reference cell-type ratio, respectively. The iteration is repeated up to 1,001 times so that the synthetic whole organ transcript counts calculated by the virtual counts (weighted by the cell type-specific weighting-factors) weighted by the virtual cell-type ratio (labeled as "Virtual Whole Organ RNAseq" in Figure 3A) is as close as those of the corresponding real organ (Figure 3A, see Materials and methods).

By this approach, we estimate the cell-type ratios of 10 real organs (aorta, fat, heart, kidney, large intestine, liver, lung, marrow, skeletal muscle, spleen) (Figure 3B). From the 14 organs evaluated in Figures 1 and 2, we omitted the brain, the pancreas, the skin and the thymus for the following reasons: 1) Their real cell-type ratios are not available – we used the synthetic ratios in Figures 1 and 2 (see the Materials and methods), 2) The real cell-type ratios of islet tissues are available, but not those of the real "whole pancreas"– the reference in Figures 1 and 2 is that of the islet (Tabula Muris et al., 2018), 3) For the skin or the thymus, the weighting-factors could not improve the Pearson correlation coefficients above 0.8 (Figure 2C).

The computed cell-type ratios of the 10 organs are similar to the reference ratios that are

experimentally determined by real scRNA-seq studies (Figure 3C). Notably, our method corrected the

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

that are estimated by MuSiC and DWLS (Figure 3B). Their mean squared errors (MSEs) in reference

to the experimentally determined ratios indicate that our method outperforms the others for 5 real organs

(fat, heart, large intestine, liver, skeletal muscle) (Figure 3C).

We also computed the virtual transcriptome of 23,131 (all organs, except the skeletal muscle)

and 14,323 (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 (Figure 4, see 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, Spearman correlation coefficients and MSE

for each cell-type, using the EAPs of all genes in virtual and real cell-types for each organ (Figure 4A

and Figure 4 – Source data 1). Their Pearson correlation coefficients indicate that the virtual

transcriptomes are comparable to the real ones for all cell-types and organs (Figure 4). They also show

similarities and relatedness of the same/related cell type annotations across different organs (Figure 4A).

For example, the similarity of endothelial cells in multiple organ such as aorta, fat, heart, liver and lung

is recapitulated in the virtual transcriptomes among these organs (Figure 4A). The relatedness of each

of the immune system cells across multiple organs are also represented (Figure 4A). The t-distributed

Stochastic Neighbor Embedding (t-SNE) analyses of all 10 virtual scRNAseq data show that all

composite cell-types in each organ can be classified according to their gene expression profiles (Figure

4B).

**Computing the changes of cell-type ratios and gene expression in disease**

We next evaluated whether our method can detect the temporal changes of cell-type ratios and gene

expression in each cell-type that accompany disease processes. Cardiovascular diseases are the number

one death cause worldwide (https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/cardiovascular-

diseases-(cvds)). In addition, extensive experimental studies characterizing the temporal changes in the

cell-type compositions during heart disease exist (Schirone et al., 2017; Shah and Brownlee, 2016).

Moreover, we have shown that the heart is an organ that our method, but not other previously published

methods, can effectively compute both the cell type ratios and their gene expression patterns of the

composite cell-types (Figures 3&4). Hence, we examined a mouse model for myocardial infarction

(MI) (Figure 5).

Using this model, we investigated whether our computational method can detect both the

known temporal changes of the cardiac cell type ratios and of the cardiac cell-dependent gene

expression (Figure 5). Three stages of myocardial infarction were studied (Kozawa et al., 2018;

Murakoshi et al., 2013): 1) one-day post coronary artery-ligation (E-MI, early myocardial infarction

stage), 2) 7-days post coronary artery-ligation (M-MI, early fibrosis stage), 3) 8-weeks post coronary

artery-ligation (L-MI, cardiac remodeling stage).

First, we evaluated whether the method detects the known changes of the cell-type ratio that

accompanies the pathological changes (Figure 5A). For this analysis, we used the cell type-specific

weighting-factors calculated by using the RNA-seq data of the sham controls (E-sham, M-sham, L-

sham) and the reference cell-type ratios of the normal mouse heart for each cell-type and each stage (E,

M, L). The result shows that the method can detect the expected two-major MI associated cell-type

composition changes (Leask, 2010; van den Borne et al., 2010): Decreased cardiac muscle cells and

increased fibroblasts (Figure 5A). The method also detected the increased myofibroblasts during M-MI

stage (early fibrosis stage) (Leask, 2010; van den Borne et al., 2010) (Figure 5A). This is also in

agreement with the published experimental observations (Leask, 2010; van den Borne et al., 2010).

Next, we studied whether the method finds the known gene expression changes in these cell-

types (Figure 5B). The result shows that the method identifies gene expression changes that are

previously reported in experimental studies (Cleutjens et al., 1995; Fraccarollo et al., 2002; McCurdy

et al., 2011; Nakao et al., 1997; Sergeeva and Christoffels, 2013) (Figure 5B). In the cardiac muscle

cells, the statistically significant (adjusted p values $< 0.001$) upregulation ($\log_2$fold changes $> 0.7$) of

Nppb, Nppa, Sparc, Col4a1 and downregulation ($\log_2$fold changes $< 0.7$) of Myh6 were detected (Figure

5B). In the fibroblasts, the statistically significant (adjusted p values $< 0.001$) upregulation ($\log_2$fold

changes $> 0.7$) of Col4a1, Col1a1 and Sparc were detected (Figure 5B). In addition to these previously

known landmark genes for MI pathogenesis, the computation found many other differentially regulated

genes in each cell type (Figure 5B).

**Application to human bulk-tissue deconvolution**

Unlike mouse organs, many of the human datasets are derived from different parts of the same

organs/tissues among different studies and even in the same studies. Furthermore, for technical and

ethical reasons, it would not be easy to obtain the exactly paired whole-organ/bulk-tissue RNA-seq and

scRNA-seq data from the same individual subjects. Hence, the evaluation of our method for human

bulk-tissue is conducted with the following limitations: 1) The human bulk-tissue RNA-seq and the

scRNA-seq data of the heart and the kidney are not paired. The human bulk-tissue data are from "The

Human Protein Atlas" (https://www.proteinatlas.org/) and the scRNA-seq data of the human heart and

kidney are derived from pieces of tissues excised from the human left ventricle (LV) and the left

auricle/left atrial appendages (LA) (Wang et al., 2020) and a small part of the human kidney (Liao et

al., 2020), respectively, 2) As the result of 1), we used the mouse weighting-factors (the paired bulk-

tissue and single-cell RNA-seq data are necessary to compute the human weighting-factors), 3) As the

result of 1), the reference cell-type ratios we used are those of the corresponding mouse organs modified

by the other published human data (see Materials and methods), 4) As the result of 1), the cell-type

classification of the virtual scRNA-seq data is related to, but not identical to that of these real scRNA-

seq data.

Despite these limitations, we computed the cell-type ratios and transcriptome profiles (Figure

6) of these bulk-tissues by using 16,144 human orthologs of mouse genes present in the human bulk-

tissue RNA-seq data. For the computation of the heart cell-type ratio, the ratio computed by our method

(V-scRNAseq in Figure 6A) is comparable to the reference (Reference in Figure 6A). In contrast, the

existing methods, MuSiC and DWLS, failed to recapitulate the reference value, resulting in the

abnormally large ratio of the cardiac muscle (MuSiC and DWLS in Figure 6A), as observed in the

mouse heart deconvolution (Figure 3B, C). For the kidney cell-type computation, the calculations by

all three methods resulted in the similar ratios that are comparable to the reference values (Figure 6A),

as observed in the mouse kidney deconvolution (Figure 3B, C). These results suggest an applicability

of our method to cell-type deconvolution of human tissues.

Next, the gene expression pattern of each virtual human cell-type was analyzed (Figure 6B).

This analysis was conducted by using the gene sets that are detected in both the virtual and the real cell-

types in each comparison for each organ (Figure 6B, see Materials and methods). The Spearman

analysis shows related transcriptome patterns between the virtual and the real cell-types in all the

comparisons (Figure 6B), with weaker correlation between the virtual and real collecting duct cells of

the kidney (R-hsCDI vs. V-CD and R-hsCDP vs. V-CD in Figure 6B). The Pearson analysis shows

weaker correlation, but the relative pattern is similar to that of the Spearman (Figure 6B). The MSEs

varied between 0.022 – 0.085 (Figure 6B). Despite the use of these unpaired datasets, the results show

utilities of our approach for estimating the gene expression pattern of each cell-type comprising the

bulk human tissues.

**Discussion**

In this study, we developed a computational method that allows for the cell-type and the gene-

expression deconvolution of 10 mouse whole-organs RNA-seq data. This is realized by computing and

utilizing 97 cell type-specific weighting-factors across these organs in the Bayesian framework to

correct the gap between the synthetic and real organ RNA-seq data (Figures 2 – 4). This approach

allowed us to more accurately estimate the ratios of the composite cell-types across 10 mouse whole-

organs and also compute their complete transcriptome (Figures 3B&C, 4).

One possible biological source of these weighting-factors is the relative differences of total

cellular RNA contents among various cell-types as described in Result section. Interestingly, the

importance of putative differential cellular RNA contents is recently implicated in deconvolving mixed

cell types in blood (Zaitsev et al., 2019). In their study, they suggest a "spike-in" approach using

"cultured cells of the same cell-types" in the experimental design to normalize such putative differential

cellular RNA contents (Zaitsev et al., 2019). However, this approach is not suitable for organ/bulk-

tissue deconvolution for the following reasons: 1) The cellular RNA contents of culture cells are not

necessarily the same as those of the real cells in the solid organs, 2) It is nearly impossible to gather all

cell-types that are present in the highly complex solid organs of interest as culture cells, 3) It is also

impractical to perform such "spike-in" experiments for many distinct cell-types of diverse cellular RNA

contents.

Hence, we propose to use the 97 cell type-specific weighting-factors presented in this paper

and also the method reported herein to compute additional ones to account for such putative differential

cellular RNA-contents among diverse cell-types in the organ/bulk-tissues for their deconvolution.

Furthermore, the cell type-specific weighting-factors may also be correcting other yet unknown factors

contributing to the gap between the real and virtual data. This cannot be dealt with by the spike-in

approach.

Another advantage of using our approach is its ability to simultaneously compute both the ratios

and the complete transcriptome of each cell-type across diverse real individual organs and also to detect

their disease-associated changes (Figures 3 – 5). Many of the previously reported deconvolution

methods are primarily specialized for estimating cell-type compositions, but not for computing cell

type-specific gene expression patterns. MuSiC and DWLS can estimate only the ratio changes of the

cell-types in organs induced by external perturbations, but not the gene expression changes (Tsoucas et

al., 2019; Wang et al., 2019). Exception to this is CDseq (Kang et al., 2019). However, the calculation

of only the overall gene expression patterns of each cell-type using only synthetic, but not real, datasets

are shown for CDseq (Kang et al., 2019).  Our approach detected not only several previously known

gene expression changes (Figure 5B), but also many others in each cell-type at each stage in the MI-

heart (Figure 5B). Hence, their future experimental validation could facilitate the identification of

therapeutic targets and/or biomarkers for MI pathogenesis.

While we were unable to definitively demonstrate how well our method work for the human

bulk-tissue RNA-seq deconvolution due to the lack of the exactly paired scRNA-seq data of the

corresponding bulk-tissues, we provided some evidence to support this possibility (Figure 6). The future

availability of such paired datasets for human organs/bulk-tissues would provide an opportunity to

validate this possibility. Various large databases of human organ RNA-seq (normal and pathological)

are available (e.g., https://gtexportal.org/home/, https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/projects/gap/cgi-

bin/study.cgi?study_id=phs001203.v1.p1). Their deconvolution is an efficient use of the existing

resource and also provide quick and useful working-hypotheses for targeted experimental validations.

This is complementary to expensive and labor-intensive real scRNA-seq analyses of all human 30

trillion cells of healthy and disease subjects.

Our method is not just a "poor-person's tool kit" in place of a real organ scRNA-seq. It is a

complementary approach providing opportunities for efficient and effective use of the existing datasets

and bioresources that are difficult, time-consuming and/or labor/cost-intensive to be replicated and/or

expanded. It is also an in silico tool to generate biologically relevant and experimentally testable

hypothesis for biological and/or medical questions.

While we demonstrate the usefulness of our approach, some future improvements would further

accelerate its applications. Even with the cell type-specific weighting-factors, we were unable to offset

the discrepancies between the real and the virtual whole-organ transcriptome in the skin and the thymus

(Figure 2C). While the sex and the strain are matched between the whole-organ and scRNA-seq in these

organs (Kozawa et al., 2019; Kozawa et al., 2018; Tabula Muris et al., 2018), some procedural artifacts

such as cell-dissociation methods of these organs or the subtle differences in the housing environment

of the mice and/or the site of tissue harvesting (especially the skin) could have influenced the lack of

significant improvements by the weighting-factors. These possibilities could be solved by obtaining the

exactly pair-matched organs/tissues for the whole-organ and scRNA-seq data. Other potential

improvements include the development of a completely reference-free deconvolution algorithm (i.e.,

the complete deconvolution) and the bias/hypothesis-free detection of rare unexpected cell-types.

Importantly, even with these future improvements, the cell type-specific weighting-factors and also

their calculation method described herein remain essential.

## Materials and methods

### Data preprocessing & count-normalization

All data processing and analyses were performed using R version 3.6.1. All cell-type labels are as described in each of the original scRNA-seq studies(Han et al., 2018; Tabula Muris et al., 2018). Gene symbols in the scRNA-seq data were converted to the corresponding ones in the whole organ RNA-seq data by using entrez gene IDs derived from "org.Mm.egALIAS2EG" in R package of "org.Mm.eg.db". ERCC-labelled genes were removed as they are spike-in genes. In addition, the counts of three genes, *Rn45s*, *Akap5* and *Lrrc17*, were also removed as they are non-mRNA artifacts significantly influencing the total counts. We then adjusted the total counts of each cell in the scRNA-seq datasets to 100 by normalizing those of each gene. We chose arbitrarily 100 herein but lager numbers result in difficulty treating the resulting inverse matrix. On the other hand, with the smaller numbers, the transcript counts of individual genes become too small. The same normalization process was also applied to each of the whole-organ RNA-seq datasets.

### Calculation of reference cell-type ratios

For 11 organs (aorta, fat, kidney, large intestine, liver, lung, marrow, pancreas, skin, spleen, & thymus), the cell-type ratios described in *Tabula Muris*(Tabula Muris et al., 2018) were used as the references. For the skeletal muscle, the cell type ratios described in Mouse Cell Atlas(Han et al., 2018) were used as the reference. For the heart, the cell-type ratios described in *Tabula Muris*(Tabula Muris et al., 2018) were modified as the cardiac muscles and the non-muscle cells were separately analyzed and the reported ratio of cardiac muscle cells (3.1%) appears significantly smaller than that (30 – 40%) is generally agreed in the field on the basis of various previous studies (Banerjee et al., 2007; Bergmann et al., 2015; Nag, 1980; Pinto et al., 2016; Raulf et al., 2015; Walsh et al., 2010; Zhou and Pu, 2016). For this modification, we set the ratio of the cardiac-muscle cells at 30% and the remaining 70% was divided by the non-muscle cell types by maintaining their ratios among them the same. For the brain, we estimated the reference cell-type ratio based on the reports in NIH (http://www.nervenet.org/papers/BrainRev99.html#Numbers) using the cell subject numbers of the cell-types in scRNA-seq data described in *Tabula Muris* (Tabula Muris et al., 2018). 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

murine brain (http://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*

(Tabula Muris et al., 2018). 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*(Tabula

Muris et al., 2018); 2) the ratios of these four glial cell types follow those of *Tabula Muris* (Tabula

Muris et al., 2018) 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" (10.00%), "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 human

organs, we used the mouse cell-type ratios for the heart and the kidney, as the references.

**Selection of signature gene sets for cell-type distinction**

Random Forest (RF) was performed to compute 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, 'randomForest' package in R was used for tuning and

producing a classifier by RF. The scRNA-seq data were first divided into two: the training data for

producing a classifier by RF and the test data for F1-score calculation to test accuracy in the classifier.

The cell-type ratios as described in the previous section were used for the RF analyses. 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**

The apparent gap between the "synthetic" and "real" whole-organ RNA-seq count data across many

organs (Figure 2A) indicated the necessity to account for putative cell type-specific differences. One

possible such variation could be total cellular RNA contents (Marinov et al., 2014; Schmidt and Schibler,

1995)(see also the detailed description in Results section). Hence, we computed weighting-factors to

correct such differences. The concept of computation strategy for the weighting-factors is summarized

in Figure 2B and its legend. Briefly, the 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 RNA contents among

various cell-types are lost from the count data. With the cell type-specific weighting-factors ($w_1$, $w_2$,

$w_3$, etc.), the RNA-sequencing data recover such loss, hence leading to more accurate deconvolution.

In the computation, we calculated at least 100 weighting-factors for each virtual-cell/cell-subject of

each cell-type, instead of one weighting-factor per cell-type and made them follow Gaussian

distribution. 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 $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $w_j > 0$ and $\mathbf{x}_j \in \mathbb{R}^n$ denote the normalized whole-organ RNA-seq counts vector, the

weighting-factor for each cell subject $j$, and the normalized scRNA-seq counts matrix, respectively.

The $n$ is the total number of the signature genes for the organs. In this study, 100, 300, 2,000 signature

genes were selected according to the ranking on the basis of "Mean Decrease in Gini" values calculated

by the RF analyses. When the total number of signature gene derived by the RF analyses is less than

2,000, all signature genes were used (1,577 for the aorta and 1,461 for the kidney). The combination of

cell subjects (i.e. the virtual cells), $C^m$ , was selected at random while maintaining the cell-type ratio of

the reference data with the total number of cell subjects, $m$, which is set to become equal to or less than

$n$ (the latter in the case when the number of the selected signature genes are too large to collect the

equal number of the cell subjects). With this model, $w_j$ was calculated by solving a quadratic problem

under the constraint that the resulting value is over 0.01 as follows:

$$451 \quad \widetilde{w}_j = \mathrm{argmin}_{w_j} \sum_i^S \left| m\mathbf{y}_i - \sum_j w_j \mathbf{x}_j \right|^2 \ s.t. \ w_j \geq 0.01. \tag{2}$$

Here, $S$ is the number of whole-organ RNA-seq count datasets. In this study, we used biological

duplicate count datasets of the corresponding whole-organ RNA-seq, thus $S$ is 2. This quadratic

problem was solved by using "quadprog" 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 subject. 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:

$$459 \quad \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_j \sim \mathcal{N}\left(\mu_{w_j}\mathbf{x}_j, \sigma^2_{w_j}\mathrm{diag}(\mathbf{x}_j \odot \mathbf{x}_j)\right) \tag{3}$$

460 where, $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_j$, $\mu_{w_j}$, and $\sigma^2_{w_j}$ denote the weighted count vector for the cell subject $j$, the mean of the

461 weighting-factors for the cell subject $j$, and the variance of the weighting factors for the cell subject $j$,

462 respectively. Operator $\odot$ represents the element-wise product between two vectors. On the basis of the

463 computed mean and variance of the weighting-factors for each cell subjects, the weighted count vector

464 of cell-type $k$ was calculated by assuming that they follow Gaussian distribution as follows:

$$465 \quad \bar{\mathbf{x}}_k \sim \mathcal{N}\left(\frac{1}{N_k}\sum_j \mu_{w_j}\mathbf{x}_j, \frac{1}{N_k}\sum_j \sigma^2_{w_j}\mathrm{diag}(\mathbf{x}_j \odot \mathbf{x}_j)\right) \ (j \in C^k). \tag{4}$$

466 where, $k$, $C^k$, and $N_k$ denote a cell-type, a group of subjects labeled with cell-type $k$, and the number

467 of subjects in $C^k$, respectively.

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

470 The concept of our framework is described as (Figure 3A) and the model is as follows:

$$471 \quad \mathbf{y} = \mathbf{X}\mathbf{r} \tag{5}$$

472 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

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

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

475 $\mathbf{r}$, we employed Bayes' theorem. To apply Bayes' theorem, noise $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \beta^{-1}\mathbf{I})$ was added to Equation

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

$$P(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{r}) = \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{Xr}, \beta^{-1}\mathbf{I}) \tag{6}$$

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

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

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

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

482 follows:

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

$$P(\mathbf{r}) = \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{r}|\mathbf{0}, \alpha^{-1}\mathbf{I}) \tag{9}$$

485 where, $\alpha$ denotes a hyperparameter. In prior distribution $P(\mathbf{X})$, $\mathcal{N}(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k | \boldsymbol{\mu}_k', \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_k^{-1})$ is the same as Equation

486 (4). In other words, $\boldsymbol{\mu}_k' = \frac{1}{N_k}\sum_j \mu_{w_j} \mathbf{x}_j$, and $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_k^{-1} = \frac{1}{N_k}\sum_j \sigma_{w_j}^2 \operatorname{diag}(\mathbf{x}_j \odot \mathbf{x}_j)$. Instead of directly

487 maximizing the posterior distribution, we employed iterative strategy that estimates $\mathbf{r}$ and $\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k$ that

488 maximizes $P(\mathbf{r}|\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X})$ and $P(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k|\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{r}, \{\bar{\mathbf{x}}_l\}_{l \neq k})$ for each $\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k$.

489 For $\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k$ estimate, we employed the following probability equation:

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

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

492 the following equations:

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

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

495 In the resulting $\mathbb{E}[\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k]$, all negative values were set to zero.

496 For $\boldsymbol{r}$ estimate, we employed the following probability equation:

$$P(\mathbf{r}|\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) \propto P(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{r})P(\mathbf{r}). \tag{13}$$

498 Then, $P(\mathbf{r}|\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X})$ follows Gaussian distribution and its mean can be calculated by the following equation:

$$499 \qquad \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{r}] = (\alpha \mathbf{I} + \beta \mathbf{X}^t \mathbf{X})^{-1} \beta \mathbf{X}^t \mathbf{y}. \qquad\qquad (14)$$

For both resulting $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{r}]$ and as $\mathbb{E}[\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k]$, all negative values were set to zero.

To estimate the gene expression pattern ($\{\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k^*\}_{k=1}^K$) and cell-type proportion ($\mathbf{r}^*$), we repeatedly

performed the computation of $\mathbf{X}$ and $\mathbf{r}$ alternately until both converge or, otherwise, the 1,001 iterations

were conducted. The convergence here is defined as the MSE of the iterations $t$ and $t-1$ is less than

$1e^{-10}$ for both $\mathbf{X}$ and $\mathbf{r}$. As initial $\mathbf{r}$ and $\mathbf{X}$ used the cell-type ratio and the mean of weighted counts of

the reference datasets. The hyperparameters $\alpha$ and $\beta$ were set as $10^{-3}, 10^{-2}, \dots, 10^3$ for convenience.

The results with the combination of the number of signature gene-sets (100, 300, 2,000/1,577/1,461)

hyperparameters ($\alpha$ and $\beta$) that produced high similarity (based on the high Pearson and Spearman

correlation coefficients and low mean squared errors) to the real whole-organ RNAs-seq are selected as

the best predicted results and shown in each Figure.

**Virtual t-SNE analysis**

The virtual transcriptome data of each mouse organ was analyzed by t-SNE analyses. By setting the

total sampling size as 3,000, the number of the sampled cells for each cell type and the virtual single-

cell transcript counts for a cell-type k follow $\mathrm{P}^*(\mathbf{r})$ and $\mathrm{P}^*(\bar{\mathbf{x}}_k)$, respectively. This sampling process

was repeated until the total sampling size of 3,000 is achieved. Then, we applied t-SNE to these sampled

virtual scRNA-seq count data using R package 'Rtsne' with parameter perplexity = 50.

**Disease model computation**

For the disease model computation, we first calculated weighting-factors using the whole-organ RNA-

seq data of sham hearts (Kozawa et al., 2018) using the same reference cell-type ratio of the normal

mouse for each stage (E, M, L). We then computed the cell-type ratios and gene expression profiles for

each stage as described above using the whole heart RNA-seq of the sham/MI models (Kozawa et al.,

2018).

**Human bulk-tissue deconvolution**

The human heart and kidney RNA-seq data are from "The Human Protein Atlas"

(https://www.proteinatlas.org/). For their deconvolution, we used the cell type-dependent weighting-

factors for the corresponding mouse organ. The total counts of all genes of the human bulk-tissue RNA-

seq data were first normalized to 100. We then matched the mouse gene symbols to the ones of the

human by extracting genes with common names between mouse and human. This resulted in a total of

16,144 genes. Using these mouse-human common gene sets, we performed the computation procedures

as described for the mouse datasets, hence the cell type annotations of the virtual human data are

according to those of the mouse data. Since there no exactly paired scRNA-seq data are available for

the human bulk-tissue data, the virtual cell-type ratios are compared to the references used for the mouse

study in Figures 1 and 3. For the gene expression pattern comparisons, as no paired scRNA-seq data

are available, we used the scRNA-seq data derived from pieces of tissues excised from the human left

ventricle (LV) and the left auricle/left atrial appendages (LA) (Wang et al., 2020) (GSE109816) and a

small part of the human kidney (Liao et al., 2020) (GSE131685) for the heart and the kidney,

respectively. The quality control filtering for the heart count data is conducted according to the

publication, except that the alignment rate filtering was not performed since no information on this was

available in the published study. In addition, we used the human genes that are present in both this

human heart scRNA-seq and the human heart RNA-seq (derived from Human Protein Atlas). The

kidney data are exactly as published. The total counts for each cell-type are normalized to 100 and the

average counts for each gene were calculated from all samples (the heart = 12, the kidney = 3). For the

gene expression comparison, we selected the genes that are commonly detected in both the real and

virtual data for each of the matching cell-types, and then the total real and virtual counts are each

normalized to 100 for each matching cell-type. For the comparisons, the Pearson correlation, Spearman

correlation and mean squared error analyses are conducted. The results with the combination of the

number of signature gene-sets (Heart: 94, 275, 1,832; Kidney: 86, 262, 1,325) and the hyperparameters

($\alpha$ and $\beta$) that produced high similarity (based on the high Pearson and Spearman correlation

coefficients and low MSEs) of the virtual to the real whole-organ RNAs-seq are selected as the best

predicted results and shown in Figure 6.

**Virtual differential gene expressing analysis**

The sum of the mean counts of all genes is normalized to a million. The count of each gene was rounded

off to integer and analyzed using R package, 'DESeq2 (version 1.24.0)'. The predicted counts per cell-

type was analyzed by comparing MI with sham at every stage and using 2 predicted count data-set in

every model (E,M,L-Sham/MI).

**MuSiC and DWLS**

MuSiC was conducted as described (Wang et al., 2019). For DWLS(Tsoucas et al., 2019), we replaced

solve.QP (R package: quadprog) by solve_osqp (R package: osqp) for quadratic problem solver.

**Datasets**

In this study, used are all publicly available datasets. Murine whole-organ RNA-seq data are from 11

weeks-old male C57BL6/N Jcl and derived from "i-organs.atr.jp" (Kozawa et al., 2020; Kozawa et al.,

2018). Human whole-organ RNA-seq data are from "The Human Protein Atlas"

(https://www.proteinatlas.org/; heart (ERR315328) and kidney (ERR315494)). The scRNA-seq data

are from *Tabula Muris* (aorta, brain, fat, heart, kidney, large intestine, liver, lung, marrow, pancreas,

skin, spleen, and thymus) and they are derived from 10-15 weeks-old male C57BL6/JN Mice (Tabula

Muris et al., 2018). The skeletal muscle scRNA-seq data are from 8-10 weeks-old female C57BL6/J

reported in "Mouse Cell Atlas"(Han et al., 2018). The adult human heart and kidney scRNA-seq data

are from GSE109816 and GSE131685, respectively.

**Data availability**

The public datasets are as indicated and the raw data are available as source data in this paper.

**Code availability**

The code for our algorithm is freely available (http://i-organs.atr.jp/Code_submit.zip).
580

**Acknowledgements**

We thank R. Takahashi, E. Kojima, K. Sugisaka for administrative assistance. We are also grateful to

the members of Sato lab at ATR and Karydo TherapeutiX, Inc. for advice and discussion throughout

the course of this work. This work was supported by funds from JST ERATO Grant Number

JPMJER1303 (T.N.S.) and Nakatani Foundation (T.N.S.).

**Author contributions**

T.N.S. conceived the idea of the project, designed the overall experiments and supervised the overall

research project. K.T. and S.K. performed all in silico analyses. T.N.S., K.T., S.K. wrote the manuscript.

**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 partly employed by

Karydo TherapeutiX, Inc. Correspondence and requests for materials should be addressed to T.N.S.

(island1005@gmail.com).

**Additional files**

**Supplement file 1.** Information on the whole-organ/bulk-tissue RNA-seq and scRNA-seq datasets.

**References**

Abbas, A.R., Wolslegel, K., Seshasayee, D., Modrusan, Z., and Clark, H.F. (2009). Deconvolution of

blood microarray data identifies cellular activation patterns in systemic lupus erythematosus. PloS one

*4*, e6098.

Anversa, P., Olivetti, G., Melissari, M., and Loud, A.V. (1980). Stereological measurement of cellular

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

and cellular cardiology *12*, 781-795.

Avila Cobos, F., Vandesompele, J., Mestdagh, P., and De Preter, K. (2018). Computational

deconvolution of transcriptomics data from mixed cell populations. Bioinformatics *34*, 1969-1979.

Banerjee, I., Fuseler, J.W., Price, R.L., Borg, T.K., and Baudino, T.A. (2007). 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.

Bergmann, O., Zdunek, S., Felker, A., Salehpour, M., Alkass, K., Bernard, S., Sjostrom, S.L.,

Szewczykowska, M., Jackowska, T., Dos Remedios, C*., et al.* (2015). Dynamics of Cell Generation and

Turnover in the Human Heart. Cell *161*, 1566-1575.

Cleutjens, J.P., Verluyten, M.J., Smiths, J.F., and Daemen, M.J. (1995). Collagen remodeling after

myocardial infarction in the rat heart. The American journal of pathology *147*, 325-338.

Dammrich, J., and Pfeifer, U. (1983). Cardiac hypertrophy in rats after supravalvular aortic constriction.

I. Size and number of cardiomyocytes, endothelial and interstitial cells. Virchows Arch B Cell Pathol

Incl Mol Pathol *43*, 265-286.

Deng, Q., Ramskold, D., Reinius, B., and Sandberg, R. (2014). Single-cell RNA-seq reveals dynamic,

random monoallelic gene expression in mammalian cells. Science *343*, 193-196.

Fraccarollo, D., Galuppo, P., Bauersachs, J., and Ertl, G. (2002). Collagen accumulation after

myocardial infarction: effects of ETA receptor blockade and implications for early remodeling.

Cardiovascular research *54*, 559-567.

Gaujoux, R., and Seoighe, C. (2012). Semi-supervised Nonnegative Matrix Factorization for gene

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

Gong, T., Hartmann, N., Kohane, I.S., Brinkmann, V., Staedtler, F., Letzkus, M., Bongiovanni, S., and

Szustakowski, J.D. (2011). Optimal deconvolution of transcriptional profiling data using quadratic

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

Gong, T., and Szustakowski, J.D. (2013). DeconRNASeq: a statistical framework for deconvolution of

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

Han, X., Wang, R., Zhou, Y., Fei, L., Sun, H., Lai, S., Saadatpour, A., Zhou, Z., Chen, H., Ye, F.*, et al.*

(2018). Mapping the Mouse Cell Atlas by Microwell-Seq. Cell *172*, 1091-1107 e1017.

Kang, K., Meng, Q., Shats, I., Umbach, D.M., Li, M., Li, Y., Li, X., and Li, L. (2019). CDSeq: A novel

complete deconvolution method for dissecting heterogeneous samples using gene expression data.

PLoS computational biology *15*, e1007510.

Kozawa, S., Sagawa, F., Endo, S., De Almeida, G.M., Mitsuishi, Y., and Sato, T.N. (2020). Predicting

Human Clinical Outcomes Using Mouse Multi-Organ Transcriptome. iScience *23*, 100791.

Kozawa, S., Sagawa, F., Endo, S., Maria de Almeida, G., Mitsuishi, Y., and Sato, T.N. (2019).

Predicting Human Clinical Outcomes using Mouse Multi-Organ Transcriptome. iScience *In press*.

Kozawa, S., Ueda, R., Urayama, K., Sagawa, F., Endo, S., Shiizaki, K., Kurosu, H., Maria de Almeida,

G., Hasan, S.M., Nakazato, K.*, et al.* (2018). The Body-wide Transcriptome Landscape of Disease

Models. iScience *2*, 238-268.

Leask, A. (2010). Potential therapeutic targets for cardiac fibrosis: TGFbeta, angiotensin, endothelin,

CCN2, and PDGF, partners in fibroblast activation. Circulation research *106*, 1675-1680.

Li, B., Severson, E., Pignon, J.C., Zhao, H., Li, T., Novak, J., Jiang, P., Shen, H., Aster, J.C., Rodig, S.*,*

*et al.* (2016). Comprehensive analyses of tumor immunity: implications for cancer immunotherapy.

Genome biology *17*, 174.

Liao, J., Yu, Z., Chen, Y., Bao, M., Zou, C., Zhang, H., Liu, D., Li, T., Zhang, Q., Li, J.*, et al.* (2020).

Single-cell RNA sequencing of human kidney. Sci Data *7*, 4.

Marinov, G.K., Williams, B.A., McCue, K., Schroth, G.P., Gertz, J., Myers, R.M., and Wold, B.J.

(2014). From single-cell to cell-pool transcriptomes: stochasticity in gene expression and RNA splicing.

Genome Res *24*, 496-510.

Mattfeldt, T., Kramer, K.L., Zeitz, R., and Mall, G. (1986). Stereology of myocardial hypertrophy

induced by physical exercise. Virchows Arch A Pathol Anat Histopathol *409*, 473-484.

McCurdy, S.M., Dai, Q., Zhang, J., Zamilpa, R., Ramirez, T.A., Dayah, T., Nguyen, N., Jin, Y.F.,

Bradshaw, A.D., and Lindsey, M.L. (2011). SPARC mediates early extracellular matrix remodeling

following myocardial infarction. American journal of physiology Heart and circulatory physiology *301*,

H497-505.

Murakoshi, M., Saiki, K., Urayama, K., and Sato, T.N. (2013). An anthelmintic drug, pyrvinium

pamoate, thwarts fibrosis and ameliorates myocardial contractile dysfunction in a mouse model of

myocardial infarction. PloS one *8*, e79374.

Nag, A.C. (1980). Study of non-muscle cells of the adult mammalian heart: a fine structural analysis

and distribution. Cytobios *28*, 41-61.

Nakao, K., Minobe, W., Roden, R., Bristow, M.R., and Leinwand, L.A. (1997). Myosin heavy chain

gene expression in human heart failure. The Journal of clinical investigation *100*, 2362-2370.

Newman, A.M., Liu, C.L., Green, M.R., Gentles, A.J., Feng, W., Xu, Y., Hoang, C.D., Diehn, M., and

Alizadeh, A.A. (2015). Robust enumeration of cell subsets from tissue expression profiles. Nature

methods *12*, 453-457.

Pinto, A.R., Ilinykh, A., Ivey, M.J., Kuwabara, J.T., D'Antoni, M.L., Debuque, R., Chandran, A., Wang,

L., Arora, K., Rosenthal, N.A*., et al.* (2016). Revisiting Cardiac Cellular Composition. Circulation

research *118*, 400-409.

Raulf, A., Horder, H., Tarnawski, L., Geisen, C., Ottersbach, A., Roll, W., Jovinge, S., Fleischmann,

B.K., and Hesse, M. (2015). Transgenic systems for unequivocal identification of cardiac myocyte

nuclei and analysis of cardiomyocyte cell cycle status. Basic Res Cardiol *110*, 33.

Regev, A., Teichmann, S.A., Lander, E.S., Amit, I., Benoist, C., Birney, E., Bodenmiller, B., Campbell,

P.J., Carninci, P., Clatworthy, M*., et al.* (2017). Science Forum: The Human Cell Atlas. Elife *6*.

Repsilber, D., Kern, S., Telaar, A., Walzl, G., Black, G.F., Selbig, J., Parida, S.K., Kaufmann, S.H., and

Jacobsen, M. (2010). Biomarker discovery in heterogeneous tissue samples -taking the in-silico

deconfounding approach. BMC bioinformatics *11*, 27.

Sandberg, R. (2014). Entering the era of single-cell transcriptomics in biology and medicine. Nature

methods *11*, 22-24.

Schirone, L., Forte, M., Palmerio, S., Yee, D., Nocella, C., Angelini, F., Pagano, F., Schiavon, S.,

Bordin, A., Carrizzo, A*., et al.* (2017). A Review of the Molecular Mechanisms Underlying the

Development and Progression of Cardiac Remodeling. Oxid Med Cell Longev *2017*, 3920195.

Schmidt, E.E., and Schibler, U. (1995). Cell size regulation, a mechanism that controls cellular RNA

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

the liver-enriched transcription factor DBP. J Cell Biol *128*, 467-483.

Sergeeva, I.A., and Christoffels, V.M. (2013). Regulation of expression of atrial and brain natriuretic

peptide, biomarkers for heart development and disease. Biochimica et biophysica acta *1832*, 2403-2413.

Shah, M.S., and Brownlee, M. (2016). Molecular and Cellular Mechanisms of Cardiovascular Disorders

in Diabetes. Circulation research *118*, 1808-1829.

Shen-Orr, S.S., and Gaujoux, R. (2013). Computational deconvolution: extracting cell type-specific

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

Tabula Muris, C., Overall, c., Logistical, c., Organ, c., processing, Library, p., sequencing,

Computational data, a., Cell type, a., Writing, g*., et al.* (2018). Single-cell transcriptomics of 20 mouse

organs creates a Tabula Muris. Nature *562*, 367-372.

Tang, Y., Nyengaard, J.R., Andersen, J.B., Baandrup, U., and Gundersen, H.J. (2009). The application

of stereological methods for estimating structural parameters in the human heart. Anat Rec (Hoboken)

*292*, 1630-1647.

Tsoucas, D., Dong, R., Chen, H., Zhu, Q., Guo, G., and Yuan, G.C. (2019). Accurate estimation of cell-

type composition from gene expression data. Nat Commun *10*, 2975.

van den Borne, S.W., Diez, J., Blankesteijn, W.M., Verjans, J., Hofstra, L., and Narula, J. (2010).

Myocardial remodeling after infarction: the role of myofibroblasts. Nature reviews Cardiology *7*, 30-

37.

van den Brink, S.C., Sage, F., Vertesy, A., Spanjaard, B., Peterson-Maduro, J., Baron, C.S., Robin, C.,

and van Oudenaarden, A. (2017). Single-cell sequencing reveals dissociation-induced gene expression

in tissue subpopulations. Nature methods *14*, 935-936.

Walsh, S., Ponten, A., Fleischmann, B.K., and Jovinge, S. (2010). Cardiomyocyte cell cycle control

and growth estimation in vivo--an analysis based on cardiomyocyte nuclei. Cardiovascular research *86*,

365-373.

Wang, L., Yu, P., Zhou, B., Song, J., Li, Z., Zhang, M., Guo, G., Wang, Y., Chen, X., Han, L.*, et al.*

(2020). Single-cell reconstruction of the adult human heart during heart failure and recovery reveals the

cellular landscape underlying cardiac function. Nature cell biology *22*, 108-119.

Wang, N., Gong, T., Clarke, R., Chen, L., Shih Ie, M., Zhang, Z., Levine, D.A., Xuan, J., and Wang,

Y. (2015). UNDO: a Bioconductor R package for unsupervised deconvolution of mixed gene

expressions in tumor samples. Bioinformatics *31*, 137-139.

Wang, X., Park, J., Susztak, K., Zhang, N.R., and Li, M. (2019). Bulk tissue cell type deconvolution

with multi-subject single-cell expression reference. Nat Commun *10*, 380.

Zaitsev, K., Bambouskova, M., Swain, A., and Artyomov, M.N. (2019). Complete deconvolution of

cellular mixtures based on linearity of transcriptional signatures. Nat Commun *10*, 2209.

Zhong, Y., Wan, Y.W., Pang, K., Chow, L.M., and Liu, Z. (2013). Digital sorting of complex tissues

for cell type-specific gene expression profiles. BMC bioinformatics *14*, 89.

Zhou, P., and Pu, W.T. (2016). Recounting Cardiac Cellular Composition. Circulation research *118*,

368-370.

**Figure 1. Estimation of the composite cell type-ratios of 14 mouse organs by MuSiC and DWLS.**
The whole-organ RNA-seq of 14 real mouse organs were deconvolved by MuSiC and DWLS and the
computed ratios are shown. The reference ratios are as described in Materials and methods. Pearson
and Spearman correlation coefficients and mean squared errors of the predicted cell type compositions
in comparison to the reference compositions are indicated at the top of each bar in this order from the
top to the bottom. The cell type annotations (color coded on the right) are indicated by abbreviations
and their full annotations are available in Figure 1 – source data 1.

**Figure 1 – Source data 1.** Cell type abbreviations, cell-type ratios, comparison between methods.

740
**Figure 2. Synthetic whole-organ RNA-seq by the cell type-specific weighting-factors.**

**(A)** Sum of scRNA-seq transcriptomes of the composite cell-types weighted by their ratios. The x-axis:

The number of the signature gene sets used for the calculation. The y-axis: Pearson correlation

coefficients. **(B)** The Concept of "the cell type-specific weighting-factor". Shown is the case of an organ

consisting of three cell types with 7 different genes (wiggling lines of different colors). The concept of

"the cell type-specific weighting-factors (the lower panel) is compared to that of the existing other

methods (the upper raw) such as MuSiC, DWLS and others. In the existing other methods, it is commonly assumed that the whole-organ (labeled as "Whole Organ") is the sum of the normalized transcript counts of each cell-type (i.e., the total counts for each cell is the same) (labeled as "Real scRNAseq") weighted by the cell-type ratios (labeled as "Cell Type Ratio"). Hence, the synthetic whole-organ RNA-seq data (labeled as "Virtual Whole Organ RNAseq") differ significantly from the real whole-organ RNA-seq data (labeled as "Real Whole Organ RNAseq"). This difference is fixed by the cell type-specific weighting-factors ($w_1$, $w_2$, $w_3$, etc.) (labeled as "Weighting Factors") in our method (the lower panel). Although we compute at least 100 weighting-factors for each "virtual-cell/cell-subject" and calculated their mean and variance (Figure 2 – Figure supplement 1), the diagram shows the mean weighting-factor value ($w_1$, $w_2$, $w_3$, etc.) for each cell-type. **(C)** The improved synthetic whole-organ RNA-seq by the cell type-specific weighting-factors. The x-axis: The number of the signature gene sets used for the calculation. The y-axis: Pearson correlation coefficients.

**Figure 2 – Source data 1.** Pearson correlation coefficients between synthetic and real whole-organ RNA-seq.

**Figure 2 – Figure supplement 1.** The computed cell type-specific weighting-factors.

**Figure 2 – Figure supplement 1 – source data 1.** The number of all signature genes, the list of all signature genes and their Mean Decrease in Gini, the weighting-factors for each cell-type and their mean and variance.

**Figure 3. The deconvolution framework and the computation of the cell type-ratios of 10 mouse**

**organs.**

**(A)** The schematic diagram describing the concept of our deconvolution method. 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 cell type-specific weighting-factors: $w_1$, $w_2$, $w_3$ 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 or, otherwise, the 1,001 iterations were
conducted (see Materials and methods). The convergence here is defined as the MSE of the iterations $t$
and $t-1$ is less than $1e^{-10}$ for both **X** and **r** (see Materials and methods). Upon completing the
iterations, the sum of the virtual transcript counts weighted by the cell type-specific weighting-factors
(indicated as "Virtual scRNAseq") weighted by the virtual cell-type ratios (indicated as "Predicted cell-
type ratio) generate the virtual whole-organ transcriptome (indicated as "Virtual Whole Organ
RNAseq", as shown at the far right of this panel. **(B)** Bar graph showing the cell type-ratios computed
by our method (V-scRNAseq) for each organ. The reference cell-type ratios and the ratios estimated by
MuSiC and DWLS are show as comparisons. The bar graphs are composed of the cell-types computed
to be present for each organ by our method. Those that are not detected by our method are omitted. **(C)**
The quantitative similarity of the computed ratios to the reference ratios are shown by heatmap of MSEs
for MuSiC, DWLS and our method (V-scRNAseq). MSEs: Mean Squared Errors.
788
789    **Figure 3 – Source data 1.** Cell-type ratios of the reference and those computed by each method,
790    MSE/Pearson/Spearman of the cell-type ratio comparison between the reference and each method,
791    MSE/Pearson/Spearman of the cell-type ratio and the transcriptome comparisons between the reference
792    and our method for each organ.
793

**Figure 4. Computation of the complete transcriptome of the composite cell-types of 10 mouse organs.**

**(A)** 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 (all organs, except the skeletal muscle) and 14,323 (the skeletal muscle) genes. The results with the same

800     combination of the hyperparameters ($\alpha$ and $\beta$) used for Figure 3B are shown. **(B)** The t-SNE for all

801     virtual organs. The labels for x- and y-axes are indicated as Reference at the bottom right.

803     **Figure 4 – Source data 1.** Mean and variance of virtual count data for all genes for each cell-type of

804     all organs.

806
807
**Figure 5. Computation of both ratios and transcriptome changes of the composite cell types in**
**the heart of a mouse model for myocardial infarction.**

**(A)** The estimated cell-type ratios in the MI heart relative to those of sham control heart at each stage

(E, M, L) are shown as bar graph. They are shown as mean and standard error bars. Deconvolution

results using sham (n=2) and MI (n=2 at each stage) are compared in all four combinations and plotted.

**(B)** The virtual differential gene expression for each cell type is shown as volcano plots. Sham (n=2)

and MI (n=2 at each stage). Each stage is color coded (shown on the right). The experimentally known

differentially expressed genes that are also identified by this analysis are indicated with gene

names/labels in each plot. The gene names/labels are also color coded according to the stage color codes.

**Figure 5 – Source data 1.** Weighting-factors, Pearson/Spearman/MSE of the cell-type ratio and the

transcriptome comparisons between the reference and our method with the selected hyperparameters,

the ratio of each cell-type, mean/SE of the cell-type ratio comparison (MI vs. Sham) for each cell-type.

**Figure 5 – Source data 2.** DESeq, the mean and variance of the counts for each cell-type.

823
**Figure 6. Cell-type and transcriptome deconvolution of the human heart and kidney.**

**(A)** The estimated cell type ratios of the human heart and kidney. Mouse weighting-factors are used to

calculate the cell-type ratios using human bulk-tissue RNA-seq data. The cell type annotations are

indicated by abbreviations at the bottom for each organ and they are the same as those of the mouse.

**(B)** The heatmap showing the Spearman correlation coefficients, Pearson correlation coefficients and

MSE (Mean Squared Errors) between virtual and real transcriptome of each cell type.

**Figure 6 – Source data 1.** Cell-type ratios computed by the reference and all methods,

MSE/Pearson/Spearman of the cell-type ratio and the transcriptome comparisons between the reference

and our method for each organ, the mean and variance of the counts of all genes for each cell-type,

Spearman/Pearson/MSE of the transcriptome comparisons between the related cell-types, virtual vs.

real counts of all genes for each cell type comparison.

837
838
**Figure Supplement 1. The computed cell type-specific weighting-factors**
Box and scatter plots showing the weighting-factors for each cell-type in each-organ. Shown are the
means of individual virtual-cells/cell-subjects for each cell-type in each organ. The results with 100,
300, 2,000 (1,577 for the aorta, 1,461 for the kidney) cell type-specific signature gene sets (indicated at
the top of each box-plot) are shown. The scale of the y-axis is selected to show all boxplots for each
cell-type. The labels on x and y axes are described at the reference plot at the right bottom. WF: cell-
type specific weighting-factors.
846
847 **Figure 2 − Figure supplement 1 − source data 1.** The number of all signature genes, the list of all
848 signature genes and their Mean Decrease in Gini, the weighting-factors for each cell-type and their
849 mean and variance.
850