A long read optimized *de novo* transcriptome pipeline reveals novel ocular developmentally regulated gene isoforms and disease targets

Vinay S. Swamy[1], Temesgen D. Fufa[2], Robert B. Hufnagel[2], and David M. McGaughey[1,✉]

[1] Bioinformatics Group, Ophthalmic Genetics & Visual Function Branch, National Eye Institute, Institutes of Health

[2] Medical Genetics and Ophthalmic Genomics Unit, National Eye Institute, National Institutes of Health

✉ Correspondence: David M. McGaughey <mcgaugheyd@mail.nih.gov>

Abstract

De novo transcriptome construction from short-read RNA-seq is a common method for reconstructing mRNA transcripts within a given sample. However, the precision of this process is unclear as it is difficult to obtain a ground-truth measure of transcript expression. With advances in third generation sequencing, full length transcripts of whole transcriptomes can be accurately sequenced to generate a ground-truth transcriptome. We generated long-read PacBio and short-read Illumina RNA-seq data from a human induced pluripotent stem cell- derived retinal pigmented epithelium (iPSC-RPE) cell line. We use long-read data to identify simple metrics for assessing *de novo* transcriptome construction and optimize a short-read based *de novo* transcriptome construction pipeline. We apply this this pipeline to construct transcriptomes for 340 short-read RNA-seq samples originating from healthy adult and fetal human retina, cornea, and RPE. We identify hundreds of novel gene isoforms and examine their significance in the context of ocular development and disease.

Introduction

The transcriptome is defined as the set of unique RNA transcripts expressed in a biological system. A single gene can have multiple distinct transcripts, or isoforms, and there are multiple biological processes that drive the formation of these isoforms including alternative promoter usage, alternative splicing, and alternative polyadenylation. Gene isoforms can have distinct and critical functions in biological processes like development, cell differentiation, and cell migration (Dykes et al., 2018), (Trapnell et al., 2010), (Mitra et al., 2020). Alternative usage of isoforms has also been implicated in multiple diseases including cancer, cardiovascular disease, Alzheimer's disease and diabetic retinopathy (Vitting-Seerup and Sandelin, 2017), (Neagoe Ciprian et al., 2002), (Mills et al., 2013), (Perrin et al., 2005).

Accurate annotation of gene isoforms is fundamental for understanding their biological impact. For example, while the Gencode human comprehensive transcript annotation (release 28) contains 82335 protein coding and 121500 noncoding transcripts across 19901 genes and 38480 pseudogenes, but this annotation is incomplete (Frankish et al., 2019), (Zhang et al., 2020). Some of the first high throughput methods to find novel gene isoforms used short-read (~100bp) RNA-seq to identify novel exon-exon junctions and novel exon boundaries based soley on RNA-seq coverage (Nagalakshmi et al., 2008). More recently, several groups have developed specialized tools to use RNA-seq to reconstruct the whole transcriptome of a biological sample, dubbed *de novo* transcriptome construction (Haas et al., 2013),(Trapnell et al., 2010), (Pertea et al., 2015).

De novo transcriptome construction uses short-read RNA-seq to reconstruct full-length mRNA transcripts. However, a large number of samples are necessary to overcome the noise and short-read lengths of this type of data. Because of increasingly inexpensive sequencing cost, datasets of the necessary size are now available. For example, one of the most comprehensive *de novo* transcriptome projects to date is CHESS, which uses the GTEx data set to construct *de novo* transcriptomes in over 9000 RNA-seq samples from 44 distinct body locations to create a comprehensive annotation of mRNA transcripts across the human body (GTEx Consortium et al., 2017), (Pertea et al., 2018). However, since the

GTEx dataset does not include samples from any ocular tissues, the CHESS database
remains an incomplete annotation of the human transcriptome.

Despite the increasing number of tools developed, there is no gold standard to
evaluate the precision and sensitivity of *de novo* transcriptome construction on real (not
simulated) biological data. Long-read sequencing technologies provide a potential solution
to this problem as long-read sequencing can capture full length transcripts and thus, can be
used to identify a more comprehensive range of gene isoforms. While previous iterations of
long-read sequencing technologies typically had higher error rates, the new PacBio Sequel
II system sequences long-reads as accurately as short-read based sequencing (Wenger et
al., 2019).

We propose that long-read based transcriptomes can serve as a ground truth for
evaluating short-read based transcriptomes. In this study, we used PacBio long-read RNA
sequencing to inform the construction of short-read transcriptomes. We generated PacBio
long-read RNA-seq along with matched Illumina short-read RNA-seq data from a human
induced pluripotent stem cell (iPSC)-differentiated retinal pigmented epithelium (RPE) cell
line. We then designed a rigorous StringTie-based pipeline that maximizes the concordance
between short and long-read *de novo* transcriptomes.

Finally, we applied this optimized pipeline to a data set containing 340 human
ocular tissue samples compiled from mining previously published, publicly available short-
read RNA-seq data (Swamy and McGaughey, 2019). We built transcriptomes for three
major ocular tissues: cornea, retina, and RPE, using RNA-seq data from both adult and fetal
tissues to create a high-quality pan-eye transcriptome. In addition to ocular samples, we
used a subset of the GTEx data set to construct transcriptomes for tissues in 44 other
locations across the body.

We used our gold-standard informed pan-eye *de novo* transcriptome to reveal
hundreds of novel gene isoforms in the eye and analyze their potential impact on ocular
biology and disease. We provide transcript annotation derived from our *de novo*
transcriptomes as a resource to other researchers through an R package.

Results

Figure 1. Workflow for long-read informed *de novo* transcriptome
construction and analysis

Long-read PacBio RNA sequencing guides short-read *de novo* transcriptome construction

86
87

To evaluate the accuracy of short-read transcriptome construction, we first

generated PacBio long-read RNA-seq data and Illumina short-read RNA-seq data from iPSC-

RPE (Fig 1). These cells were differentiated using an optimized protocol, and thus minimal

biological variation is expected (Blenkinsop et al., 2015), (Maruotti et al., 2015). We used

these sequencing data to construct a long-read transcriptome and a short-read

transcriptome. In our long-read transcriptome we found 1163239 distinct transcripts, and

in our short-read transcriptome 366888 distinct transcripts

Figure 2. Transcript length and expression dictate transcriptome construction accuracy. A,B) Distributions of novel(A) and previously annotated(B) transcript lengths between PacBio (long-read) and Stringtie (short-read) transcriptomes. Each distribution is labeled with the total number of transcripts in the distribution C) short-read construction accuracy stratified by transcript length at different Transcripts Per Million (TPM)-based transcript exclusion thresholds. The "merge" method follows the protocol for constructing transcriptomes outlined by the StringTie authors and keeps any transcripts expressed above a specific TPM threshold in at least one samples. The "mean" method used by our pipeline keeps transcripts whose average expression across all samples is above a specific TPM threshold.

In our initial comparison between short and long-read transcriptomes, we noticed a low transcriptome construction accuracy (see Methods) of 0.208. When we examined the transcript lengths of each build we saw that the two methods show very different transcript length distributions for both novel and previously annotated transcripts, with the short-read build was comprised mostly of smaller transcripts (Fig 2A). As the PacBio data was generated using two different libraries for 2000 bp and >3000 bp transcripts, we expected an enrichment for longer transcripts in the PacBio data set (Supplemental Figure 2). To assess accuracy relative to transcript length, we grouped transcripts by length in 1000 bp intervals, and compared accuracy between each group. We found that accuracy significantly improves for transcripts longer than 2000 bp. The construction accuracy is 0.426 and 0.137 for transcripts above and below 2000 bp, respectively.

We experimented with various methods to remove spurious transcripts and improve construction accuracy. We first removed transcripts that were expressed <1 TPM in at least one sample as outlined in StringTie's recommended protocol (Pertea et al., 2016). This improved construction accuracy to 0.475 for transcripts longer than 2000bp and 0.212 for transcripts shorter than 2000bp. As this accuracy was still fairly low, we tried different filtering schemes, including experimenting with machine learning-based strategies to identify transcripts that were computational artifacts (data not shown), but we found that the simplest approach with high performance was to retain transcripts that had an average TPM above a specific threshold(Fig 2C). In our downstream pipeline we keep transcripts that have at least an average of 1 TPM across all samples of the same subtissue type as this threshold achieved a build accuracy of 0.772 for transcripts longer than 2000Bp and retained 48470 transcripts within this short-read RPE dataset.

131 **Thousands of novel gene isoforms are detected in human subtissue-specific**
132 **transcriptomes**

Tissue	Source	Samples	Studies	Transcriptome Count
RPE	Adult	48	4	32012
RPE	Fetal	49	7	49967
Retina	Adult	105	8	49714
Retina	Fetal	89	6	66255
Cornea	Adult	43	6	51469
Cornea	Fetal	6	2	59408

133
134
135
Table 1. Ocular sample dataset overview and transcriptome count. Transcriptome count is defined as the number of unique transcripts expressed in a given tissue type

136 We built transcriptomes from 340 publicly available ocular tissue RNA-seq samples

137 curated in EiaD using an efficient Snakemake pipeline (Köster and Rahmann, 2012). We

138 included both publicly collated non-disease, non-perturbed adult and fetal samples from

139 cornea, retina, and RPE tissues, mined from 29 different studies (Table 1). Our fetal tissues

140 consist of both human fetal tissues and human iPSC-derived tissue, as stem cell-derived

141 tissue has been showed to closely resemble fetal tissue. We inlcude our iPSC-RPE samples

142 originally used to develop our pipeline within this larger set of fetal RPE samples.

143 (Klimanskaya et al., 2004). To more accurately determine the tissue specificity of novel

144 ocular transcripts, we supplemented our ocular data set with 877 samples from 44 body

145 locations across 22 major tissues from the GTEx project and constructed transcriptomes

146 for each of these body locations (GTEx Consortium et al., 2017). We refer to each distinct

147 body location as a subtissue here after.

148 After initial construction of transcriptomes, we found 183442 previously annotated

149 transcripts and 6241675 novel transcripts detected in at least one of our 1217 samples. We

150 define a novel transcripts as all transcripts whose set of exons and introns do not exactly

151 match that of an annotated transcript within the Gencode, Ensembl, UCSC, and Refseq

152 annotation databases (Frankish et al., 2019), (Zerbino et al., 2018), (O'Leary et al., 2016).

153 After using the filtering methods described above, we merged all subtissue specific

154 transcriptomes into a single final transcriptome which contains 252983 distinct transcripts

155 with 87592 previously annotated and 165391 novel transcripts, and includes 114.9

megabases of previously unannotated genomic sequence (Table 1). We refer to the final

pan-body transcriptome as the DNTX annotation hereafter.

We split novel transcripts into two categories: novel isoforms, which are novel

variations of known genes, and novel loci, which are previously unreported, entirely novel

regions of transcribed sequence (Fig 3B). Novel isoforms are further classified by the

novelty of their encoded protein: isoforms with novel open reading frame, novel isoforms

with a known ORF, and isoforms with no ORF as noncoding isoforms (Fig 3A). The number

of distinct ORFs was significantly less than the number of transcripts, with 43279

previously annotated ORFs and 46226 novel ORFs across all subtissues. Furthermore,

across all subtissues there was an average of 10393 novel isoforms and 3716 novel ORFs.

Figure 3. Overview of novel isoforms. A) Number of novel gene isoforms, grouped by transcript type. Brain and body represent an average of 13 and 34 distinct subtissues, respectively. B) Novel protein coding and noncoding loci. Novel exon composition of novel isoforms, by isoform type. Labels indicate number of transcripts. C) Classification of novel exon types, stratified by novel isoform type.

Novel isoforms can occur due to an omission of a previously annotated exon,
commonly referred as exon skipping or the addition of an unannotated exon which we
refer to as a novel exon. We further classified novel exons by the biological process that
may be driving their formation: alternative promoter usage driving the addition of novel
first exons (FE), alternative polyadenylation driving the addition of novel terminal exons
(TE), and alternative splicing driving the formation of all novel exons that are not the first
or last exon (Landry et al., 2003), (Tian and Manley, 2017), (Wang et al., 2015). We then
split alternatively spliced exons into their commonly seen patterns, alternative 5' splice site
(A5SS), alternative 3' splice site (A3SS), and retained introns (RI). Exons whose entire
sequence was unannotated and is not a retained intron are fully novel exons. We note that
all three of these mechanisms can lead to exon skipping, so for simplicity we grouped all
novel isoforms resulting from exon skipping together. We found that the majority of novel
exons within our dataset are novel FEs. We noticed that the majority of RI exons lead to
novel ORFs, whereas novel isoforms with omitted exons more often lead to noncoding
isoforms. (Fig 3C)

De novo transcriptomes match previously published experimental data better than existing annotation

We validated *de novo* transcriptomes using three independent approaches. We first
looked for evolutionary conservation since it is commonly accepted as a proxy for
functional significance. We used the PhyloP 20 way species alignment, a measure of
conservation between species, to calculate the average conservation score for each exon in
the DNTX annotation and compared that to the average conservations score for each exon
in the Gencode annotation (Pollard et al., 2010). We found that, on average, exons in the
DNTX annotation are more conserved than exons in the Gencode annotation (pvalue <2.2e-
16) (Supplemental Figure 2A).

Next, since we observed an enrichment in novel first and last exons within our data
set, we decided to compare the TSS and TES within the DNTX annotation to two well-
established annotation databases from FANTOM and the polyA Atlas (Noguchi et al., 2017),
(Herrmann et al., 2020). We compared DNTX and Gencode TSS's to CAGE-seq data from the
FANTOM consortium; as CAGE-seq is optimized to detect the 5' end of transcripts, we

reasoned that it can serve as a valid ground truth set to evaluate TSS detection (Takahashi

et al., 2012). We calculated the absolute distance of DNTX TSS's to CAGE peaks, and

compared them to the absolute distance of Gencode TSS's to CAGE peaks. We found that, on

average, DNTX TSS's were closer to CAGE peaks than Gencode TSS's (pvalue <2.2e-

16)(Supplemental Figure 2B).

Finally, we evaluated TES's using the polyA Atlas, which is comprised of

polyadenylation signal annotation generated from aggregating 3' seq data from multiple

studies. As 3'-seq data is designed to accurately capture the 3' ends of transcripts, it can

similarly serve as a ground truth set to evaluate the accuracy of TES's (Beck et al., 2010).

We calculated the absolute distance of DNTX TES's to annotated polyA signals and

compared them to the absolute distance of Gencode TES's to polyA signals. We found that

on average DNTX TES's are closer to annotated polyadenylation signals than gencode TSS's

(pvalue <2.2e-16) (Supplemental Figure 2C)

De novo transcriptomes reduce overall transcriptome sizes

De novo transcriptomes removed on average 76.141 % of a subtissue's base

transcriptome. We defined base transcriptome for a subtissue as any transcript in the

Gencode annotation with non-zero TPM in at least one sample of a given subtissue. This

was a large reduction in transcriptome size and we wanted to ensure that we were not

unduly discarding data. We quantified transcript expression of each sample using Salmon

with two methods: once using the full gencode v28 human transcript annotation, and once

using its associated subtissue specific transcriptome. We found that despite the 76.141 %

reduction in number of transcripts between the base gencode and *de novo* transcriptomes

(Supplemental Figure 3A), the per-sample Salmon mapping rate increased on average by

2.041 % indicating that the vast majority of gene expression data is retained within our

transcriptome (Supplemental Figure 3B).

Novel Isoforms are identified in ocular tissues

230   Figure 4. Overview of novel gene isoforms in the eye. A) Set intersection of
231   novel isoforms in ocular transcriptomes. B) Boxplots of fraction isoform
232   usage (FIU) overlaid over FIU data points with estimated distribution of
233   data set above each boxplot.

Using the pan-eye transcriptome, we compared the overlap in constructed novel

isoforms across ocular subtissues and found that 77.968 % of novel isoforms are specific to

a singular ocular subtissue (Fig 4A). Additionally, fetal-like tissues had more novel isoforms

that their adult counterpart. For each novel isoform we then calculated fraction isoform

usage (FIU), or the fraction of total gene expression a transcript contributes to its parent

gene. We found that, on average, novel isoforms contributed to 20.584 % of their parent

gene's expression but in each subtissue we found multiple novel isoforms that contribute

to the majority of their parent genes expression (Fig 4B)

Differential usage of gene isoforms occurs during retinal development

Multiple studies have shown that gene isoforms play a significant role in eye

development (Bharti et al., 2008), (Mellough et al., 2019). We hypothesized that the DNTX

annotation provides additional insight into alternative isoform usage and identifies novel

gene isoforms potentially involved in eye development. We used RNA-seq data of the

developing retina from Mellough et al, an independent data set that we did not include for

transcriptome construction, and used a subset of the DNTX annotation corresponding to

fetal retina to quantify transcript expression and identify transcripts with significant

changes in expression across retinal development. Transcripts that are differentially

expressed (qvalue <.01) and have a mean FIU difference of .25 in at least one comparison of

time points are indicative of differential transcript usage (DTU).

Figure 5 Differential Transcript usage during retinal development. A) Volcano plot of tested transcripts B) Dot plot for gene set enrichment analysis C) Heatmap of hiearchical clustering of transcripts with DTU associated with eye development D) Transcript models for *MYO9A*, a gene undergoing DTU E) FIU change in *MYO9A* FIU across development F) average log-transformed TPM expression of *MYO9A* across retinal development

We analyzed 24 samples across 14 developmental days post fertilization and found

1717 transcripts across 812 genes displaying DTU (Fig 5A). We found that genes involved

in DTU are enriched(qvalue <.05) for genes related to eye and neurological development

(Fig 5B), and that hierarchical clustering of DTU transcripts generates an early stage and

late stage cluster (Fig 5C). One of these genes, *MYO9A*, is a classical example of DTU. *MYO9A*

is associated with the visual perception GO term, plays a role in ocular development, and

has been associated with ocular disease (Gorman et al., 1999). While expression of *MYO9A*

remains relatively unchanged across development, expression of two of its associated

isoforms in fetal retina (Fig 5D) changes dramatically during development: a novel isoform

is highly expressed early during development, but switched to the canonical isoform later

in development (Fig 5E,F). This novel isoform contains a novel exon within the protein

coding region of the isoform as well as novel last exon extending the 3' UTR (Fig 5d). A full

list of genes and transcripts displaying DTU is available in Supplemental Data

(Supplemental Data 4).

De novo transcriptomes allow for a more precise variant prioritization.

The identification of a disease-causing variant through genome sequencing is a

common step in diagnosing genetic disease, when disease causing variants cannot be

determined from exonic sequencing. Prediction of a variant's biological impact and

subsequent variant prioritization is a fundamental step in this process. Many methods for

predicting variant effects on protein function or gene expression are based on location

within the body of a transcript; for example variants that disrupt splice sites and start/stop

codons are considered to be the most damaging, while variants within intronic and

intergenic regions have unknown impact or are not classified, and, thus, are not included

for further consideration. However, multiple studies have identified pathogenic deep

intronic variants for retinal dystrophies (Braun et al., 2013), (Bauwens et al., 2019),

(Zernant et al., 2014), (Sangermano et al., 2019), (Jamshidi et al., 2019), (Mayer et al.,

2016), (Geoffroy et al., 2018). Pathogenic intronic variants are thought to function by

introducing a novel splice site, disrupting regulatory motifs, or altering a tissue-specific

transcript. To explore this third possibility, we mapped known pathogenic intronic variants

onto novel isoforms within the *de novo* transcriptomes.

Gene Name	Associated Disease	Location (hg19)	Canonical Variant HGVS	Gencode Predicted Consequence	DNTX Predicted Consequence	Published Study
ABCA4	ABCA4-associated maculopathy	Chr1:94481967 C>T	c.5197–557G>T, NM_000350.2	intron variant, downstream gene variant	5 prime UTR variant	Bauwens et al.
		Chr1:94546814 G>C	c.859–540C>G, NM_000350.2	intron variant	non coding transcript exon variant	
	Stargardt disease	Chr1:94484001 C>T	c.5196+1137G>A, NM_000350.2	intron variant, downstream gene variant	5 prime UTR variant	Braun et al. Zernant et al.
		Chr1:94484082 T>G	c.5196+1056A>G, NM_000350.2	intron variant, downstream gene variant	5 prime UTR variant	
		Chr1:94526934 T>G	c.1938-619A>G, NM_000350.2	intron variant, splice region variant, non coding transcript variant	non coding transcript exon variant	Zernant et al.
		Chr1:94527698 G>C	c.1937+435C>G, NM_000350.2	intron variant, upstream gene variant	non coding transcript exon variant	Sangermano et al.
		Chr1:94546780 C>G	c.859-506G>C, NM_000350.2	intron variant	non coding transcript exon variant	
IFT140	Ciliopathy	Chr16:1576595 C>A	c.2577+25G>A, NM_014714.3	upstream gene variant, intron variant, NMD transcript variant, non coding transcript exon variant, non coding transcript variant	missense variant	Geoffroy et al.
PROM1	Cone–rod dystrophy	Chr4:15989860 T>G	c.2077-521A>G, NM_006017.2	intron variant, upstream gene variant	5 prime UTR variant	Mayer et al.
RPGRIP1	RPGRIP1-mediated inherited retinal degeneration	Chr14:21789588 G>A	c.1611+27G>A, NM_020366.3	intron variant, non coding transcript variant, upstream gene variant, synonymous variant, NMD transcript variant, downstream gene variant	5 prime UTR variant	Jamshidi et al.

Table 2. Pathogenic variants previously considered intronic that are on
expressed transcripts in the retina *de novo* transcriptome. Canonical human
genome variation society (HGVS) annotation is based on transcripts from
the RefSeq annnotation. Predicted consequences were generaed with the
Variant Effect Predictor(VEP)

We used a list of 129 intronic and noncoding variants previously identified as

pathogenic for a retinal dystrophy and predicted the effect of these variants with Ensembl's

Variant Effect Predictor using a subset of the DNTX annotation corresponding to fetal and

adult retina as the input transcript annotation. We identified ten variants whose predicted

effect increased in severity due the presence of a novel gene isoform in a previously

intronic region (Table 2). Seven of these variants were in deep intronic hotpsots known for

pathogenic variation within the gene ABCA4.

Figure 6. Transcript models for selected Isoforms of *ABCA4* along with location of pathogenic intronic variants. Location is on the hg19 human genome build. Thick lines indicate protein coding regions. Arrow indicates direction of transcription. Introns not drawn to scale

These variants were spanned by three distinct novel isoforms with two containing open reading frames (ORFs) encoding only the carboxy-terminus of the canonical protein isoform, and one noncoding spanning the proximal half of the canonical isoform (Fig 6). *ABCA4* expression and function has also been observed in RPE (Lenis et al., 2018). However, we did not observe these transcripts in RPE, suggesting that these pathogenic variants are primarily affecting retinal-specific *ABCA4* transcripts. We note that these transcripts have not been experimentally validated.

To further highlight the potential importance of *de novo* transcriptomes for future genetic tests we determined how many genes associated with retinal disease from RetNet have novel isoforms (sph.uth.edu/retnet/). We found that within the set of genes with novel isoforms, there is significant enrichment of retinal disease genes (hypergeometric pvalue = 3.4e-04), with 220 out of 379 RetNet genes having a novel isoform. A full list of these genes is available in the Supplementary data(supplemental data 5).

A companion visualization tool enables easy use of *de novo* transcriptomes

A

B

C

Figure 7. Screenshots from dynamic *de novo* transcriptome visualization tool. A). FIU bar plot for selected gene and subtissue. B). Exon level diagram of transcript body Thicklines represent coding region of transcript. novel exons colored in red. Tooltip contains genomic location and phylop score C) Bargraph of fraction of samples within dataset each transcript was consructed in by tissue.

To make our results easily accessible we designed a R-Shiny app for visualizing and accessing our *de novo* transcriptomes. For each subtissue we show the FIU for each transcript associated with a gene (Fig 7A). We show the exon-intron structure of each transcript and mousing over exons show genomic location overlapping SNPs, and

phylogenetic conservation score (Fig 7B). We additionally show a barplot of the fraction of

samples each transcript was constructed in (Fig 7C). Users can also download the *de novo*

transcriptomes for selected subtissues in GTF and fasta format. Instructions to download

and run the app are available at https://github.com/vinay-

swamy/ocular_transcriptomes_shiny. While visualization of direct transcript expresion is

not a part of this app, it can be viewed in the eyeIntegration app (Swamy and McGaughey,

2019) by selected 'DNTX' as the transcript annotation. Finally, we provide all code as a

Snakemake workflow and provide a Docker container with all software required for the

pipeline available at https://github.com/vinay-swamy/ocular_transcriptomes_pipeline

Discussion

Motivated by the lack of a comprehensive transcriptome for the eye, we constructed

transcriptomes for adult and fetal retina, RPE and cornea. By using long-read RNA-seq data

to calibrate our short-read construction pipeline, we were able to identify biologically

relevant transcriptomes. We found that concordance between long and short-read-based

transcriptomes is directly related to transcript length and transcript expression. We saw a

clear inability within the PacBio data set to accurately detect transcripts shorter than

2000bp for both previously annotated and novel transcripts. As many of the transcripts

constructed using short-reads are below this threshold, long-read sequencing data

enriched for smaller transcript sizes would provide greater insight in future studies.

We used a large dataset compiled from published RNA-seq data to build the pan-eye

transcriptomes, an approach that has several key advantages. First, the large sample size

overcomes the noisy nature of RNA-seq data. Second, as the cohort is constructed from

many independent studies, we are more confident that the transcriptomes accurately

reflect the biology of their originating subtissue and are not a technical artifact due to

preparation of the samples. As another line of evidence, the *de novo* transcriptomes match

existing large scale data sets and are more conserved than existing annotations

(Supplemental Figure 2).

In each ocular subtissue we examined, we found hundreds of novel gene isoforms,

many of which were novel due to novel exons. Within ocular subtissues, these novel

isoforms are most commonly specific to single subtissue. This makes sense as a majority of

the exons in our *de novo* transcriptomes are first and last exons, which have been

previously shown to significantly contribute to the tissue specificity of gene isoforms

(Reyes and Huber, 2018). We also found that on average novel isoforms represent about

20.584 % of their parent gene's expression. Future studies are needed to identify the

function of these isoforms. One possibility is that some of these isoforms are only

expressed in rare cell types, as transcript annotation was previously shown to be

incomplete in rare cell types (Zhang et al., 2020). This especially makes sense in the retina

which contain over a dozen distinct cell types, several of which contribute to 5% or less of

the total cell population (Yan et al., 2020). As we imposed a strict expression filter as part

of our transcriptome pipeline, we may have removed transcripts specific to rare cell types.

In conclusion, we created the first pan-eye transcriptome annotation and showed

that it is useful in understanding the role of gene isoforms in ocular biology and improving

the ability to diagnose inherited eye diseases. We hope this work is useful as a starting

point for other researchers; [delete] to make the transcriptomes easily accessible to other

researchers we designed a webapp both for visualization and to quickly access tissue-

specific annotation files. We believe this project will enable other researchers to explore

new research directions and answer long pending questions.

Methods

Generation of PacBio long-read RNA sequencing data and Illumina short-read
RNA sequencing data

Human iPSCs were differentiated into RPE using previously described protocols in

(Bryan et al., 2018) and (May-Simera et al., 2018). iPSC-derived RPE (iPSC-RPE) cells at 42

days post differentiation were lysed with TRIzol reagent (Thermo Fisher Scientific; cat #

15596026) and total RNA was isolated using the Direct-zol RNA MiniPrep Kit (Zymo

Research, Irvine, CA). 5-6 μg total RNA that passed quality control metric (RIN >.9) were

used for PacBio library preparation. For PacBio HiFi circular consensus sequencing(CCS),

libraries were prepared following the "Procedure-Checklist-Iso-Seq-Express-Template-

Preparation-for-Sequel-and-Sequel-II-Systems" protocol. Two libraries were generated:

one to capture transcripts 2 kilobases(kb) or smaller, and one to capture transcripts

between 2-5kb. Sequencing was done on the PacBio Sequel II system for a movie time of 24

hours.

For Illumina sequencing, Poly-A selected stranded mRNA libraries were constructed

from 0.5-1 μg total RNA using the Illumina TruSeq Stranded mRNA Sample Prep Kits

according to manufacturer's instructions. Amplification was performed using 10-12 cycles

to minimize the risk of over-amplification. Unique dual-indexed barcode adapters were

applied to each library. Libraries were pooled in equimolar ratio and sequenced together

on a HiSeq 4000. At least 57 million 75-base read pairs were generated for each individual

library. Data was processed using illumina Real Time Analysis (RTA) version 2.7.7. All

library preparation and sequencing was performed at the National Institutes of Health

Intramural Sequencing Center (NISC).

Code availability and software versions.

To improve reproducibility, all code used for both the analyzing the data and

generating the figures for this paper was written as multiple Snakemake pipelines. Each

Snakefile contains the exact parameters for all tools and scripts used in each analysis.

(Köster and Rahmann, 2012) All code (and versions) used for this project is publicly

available in the following github repositories: https://github.com/vinay-

swamy/ocular_transcriptomes_pipeline (main pipeline), https://github.com/vinay-

swamy/ocular_transcriptomes_longread_analysis (long-read analysis pipeline),

https://github.com/vinay-swamy/ocular_transcriptomes_paper (figures and tables for this

paper), https://github.com/vinay-swamy/ocular_transcriptomes_shiny (webapp).

Additionally, all Snakefiles are included as supplementary data.(supplementary data files 1-

3)

Analysis of long-read data

PacBio sequencing movies were processed into full length, non-chimeric (FLNC)

reads using the IsoSeq3 3.1.2 pipeline in the PacBio SMRT link v7.0 software. The existing

ENCODE long-read RNA-seq pipeline (https://github.com/ENCODE-DCC/long-read-rna-

pipeline) was rewritten as a Snakemake workflow as follows. Transcripts were aligned to

the human genome using minimap2(18), using an alignment index built on the gencode

v28 primary human genome. Sequencing errors in aligned long-reads were corrected using

TranscriptClean (19) with default parameters. Splice junctions for TranscriptClean were

obtained using the TranscriptClean accessory script "get_SJs_from_gtf.py" using the

gencode v28 comprehensive transcript annotation as the input. A list of common variants

to avoid correcting were obtained from the ENCODE portal

(https://www.encodeproject.org/files/ENCFF911UGW/). The long-read transcriptome

annotation was generated with TALON (20). A TALON database was generated using the

talon_initialize_database command, with all default parameters, except for the "–5P" and "–

3p" parameters. These parameters represent the maximum distance between close 5' start

and 3' ends of similar transcript to merge and were both set to 100 to match parameters

used in later tools. Annotation in GTF format was generated using the talon_create_GTF

command, and transcript abundance values were generated using the talon_abundance

command.

Analysis of short-read RPE data

Each sample was aligned to the Gencode release 28 hg38 human genome assembly

using the genomic aligner STAR and the resulting BAM files were sorted using samtools

sort (Frankish et al., 2019),(Dobin et al., 2013),(Li et al., 2009). For each sorted BAM file, a

per-sample base transcriptome was constructed using StringTie with the Gencode v28

comprehensive annotation as a guiding annotation (Frankish et al., 2019),(Pertea et al.,

2015). All sample transcriptomes were merged with the long-read transcriptome using

gffcompare(Pertea and Pertea, 2020) with default parameters. We note that the default

values for the distance to merge similar 5' starts and 3 ends of transcripts in gffcompare is

the same to what we chose for TALON. We defined the metric construction accuracy, used

to evaluate short-read transcriptome construction as the following:

$Construction\ Accuracy = \dfrac{short\ read\ transcriptome\ \cap\ long\ read\ transcriptome}{short\ read\ transcriptome}$

Construction of subtissue-specific transcriptomes.

We constructed transcriptomes for 1217 samples in the Eye in a Disk(EiaD), a
dataset generated from aggregating publically available healthy, unperturbed RNA-seq
samples from 50 distinct locations of the body across 29 different studies. Specific
information on how this dataset was generated is detailed in the methods from our
previous work (Swamy and McGaughey, 2019). We constructed a transcriptome for each
sample, and merged samples together to create 50 subtissue-specific transcriptomes. We
define subtissue as a unique body location and are either temporally different versions of
the same tissue(adult vs fetal tissue), or different regions of a larger tissue (cortex vs
cerebellum in brain). Tissue refers to complete whole tissue (retina, brain, liver). For each
subtissue-specific transcriptome, we removed transcripts that had an average expression
less than 1 Transcripts Per Million (TPM) across all samples of the same subtissue type. All
subtissue-specific transcriptomes were merged to form a single unified annotation file in
general transfer format(GTF) to ensure transcript identifiers were the same across
subtissues. We merged all ocular subtissue transcriptomes to generate a separate pan-eye
transcriptome.

Subtissue specific transcriptome quantification

For each resulting subtissue specific transcriptome, we extracted transcript
sequences using the tool gffread and used these sequences to build a subtissue-specific
quantification index using the index mode of the alignment-free quantification tool Salmon
(Pertea and Pertea, 2020), (Patro et al., 2017). For each sample, we quantified transcript
expression using the quant mode of Salmon, using a sample's respective subtissue specific
quantification index. We similarly quantified all ocular samples using the pan-eye
transcriptome and the Gencode v28 reference transcriptome.

Annotation of novel exons

First, a comprehensive set of distinct, annotated exons was generated by merging
exon annotation from gencode, ensembl, UCSC, and refseq. We then defined a novel exon as
any exon within our transcriptomes that does not exactly match the chromosome, start,
end and strand of an annotated exon. Novels exons were classified by splitting exons into 3

categories: first, last, and middle exons. We then extracted all annotated exon start and stop

sites from our set of previously annotated exons. Novel middle exons that have an

annotated start but an unannotated end were categorized as a novel alternative 3' end

exons and similarly novel middle exons with an unannotated start but annotated end were

categorized as a novel alternative 5' start exons. Novel middle exons whose start and end

match annotated exon start and ends were considered retained introns. Novel middle

exons whose start and end do not match annotated starts and ends were considered fully

novel exons. We then classified novel first and last exons. Novel first exons were first exons

whose start is not in the set of annotated exon starts, and novel last exons were terminal

exons whose end is not in the set of annotated exon ends. This analysis of novel transcripts

is implemented in our Rscript "annotate_and_make_tissue_gtfs.R".

Validation of DNTX with phylop, CAGE data, and polyA signals

PhyloP scores for the phylop 20-way multi species alignment were downloaded

from UCSC's FTP server on October 16th, 2019 and converted from bigWig format to bed

format using the wig2bed tool in BEDOPs (Pollard et al., 2010), (Neph et al., 2012). The

average score per exon in both the gencode and DNTX annotation was calculated by

intersecting exon locations with phylop scores and then averaging the per base score for

each exon, using the intersect and groupby tools from the bedtools suite, respectively.

Significant difference in mean phylop score was tested with a Mann Whitney U test.

CAGE peaks were download from the FANTOM FTP server

(https://fantom.gsc.riken.jp/5/datafiles/reprocessed/hg38_latest/extra/CAGE_peaks/hg3

8_fair+new_CAGE_peaks_phase1and2.bed.gz) on June 15th 2020 (Noguchi et al., 2017).

Transcriptional start sites (TSS) were extracted from gencode and DNTX annotations; TSS

is defined as the start of the first exon of a transcript. Distance to CAGE peaks was

calculated using the closest tool in the bedtools suite. Significant difference in mean

distance to CAGE peak between DNTX and gencode annotation was tested with a Mann

Whitney U test.

Polyadenylation signal annotations were downloaded from the polyA site atlas

(https://polyasite.unibas.ch/download/atlas/2.0/GRCh38.96/atlas.clusters.2.0.GRCh38.96

.bed.gz) on June 15th 2020 (Herrmann et al., 2020). Transcriptional end sites(TES) were

extracted from gencode and DNTX annotations; TES is defined as the end of the terminal

exon of a transcript. Distance to polyA signal was calculated using the closest tool in the

bedtools suite (Quinlan and Hall, 2010). Significant difference in mean distance to polyA

signal was tested with a Mann Whitney U test.

Identification of novel protein coding transcripts

Protein-coding transcripts in the unified transcriptome were identified using the

TransDecoder suite (Haas et al., 2013). Transcript sequences in fasta format were extracted

from the final pan-body transcriptome using the TransDecoder util script

"gtf_genome_to_cdna_fasta.pl". Potential open reading frames(ORFs) were generated from

transcript sequences using the LongestORF module within TransDecoder, and the single

best ORF for each transcript was extracted with the Predict module within Transdecoder.

The resulting ORFs were mapped to genomic locations with the TransDecoder util script

"gtf_to_alignment_gff3.pl". For each ORF start and stop codons were extracted with the

script "agat_sp_add_start_stop.pl" scripts from the AGAT toolkit

(https://github.com/NBISweden/AGAT/). Transcripts with no detectable ORF or missing a

start or stop codon were labelled as noncoding.

Analysis of novel isoforms in eye tissues

An Upset plot was generated using the ComplexUpset package

(https://github.com/krassowski/complex-upset) (Lex et al., 2014). Fraction Isoform Usage

(FIU) was calculated for each transcript t associated with a parent gene g using the

following formula: $FIU_t = \frac{TPM_t}{TPM_g}$. Raincloud plots of FIU were generated using the

"R_Rainclouds" R package (Allen et al., 2019).

Analysis of fetal retina RNA-seq data.

RNA-seq samples from Mellough et al. were obtained from EiaD, and were not

included in the main dataset used for building transcriptomes. Outliers within the dataset

were identified by first performing principal component analysis of transcript level

expression data, calculating the center of all data using the first two principal components,

and subsequently removing five samples furthest away from the center of all data. The

remaining samples were normalized using calcNormFactors from the R package edgeR and

converted to weights using the voom function from the R package limma (Robinson et al.,

2010), (Ritchie et al., 2015). Differential expression was modeled using the lmFit function

using developmental time point as the model design and tested for significant change in

expression using the Ebayes function from limma. Gene Set enrichment was tested using

the R package clusterprofileR (Yu et al., 2012). Heatmaps were generated using the

ComplexHeatmap package (Gu et al., 2016).

Prediction of variant impact using *de novo* transcriptomes.

Noncoding variants previously associated with retinal disease from the Blueprint

Genetics Retinal dystrophy panel were obtained from the Blueprint Genetics website

(https://blueprintgenetics.com/tests/panels/ophthalmology/retinal-dystrophy-panel/).

The variants were converted from HGVS to VCF format using a custom python script

"HGVS_to_VCF.py". This VCF was then remapped to the hg38 human genome build using

the tool crossmap (Zhao et al., 2014). The VCF of variants was used as the input variants for

the Variant Effect Predictor(VEP) tool from Ensembl, with each subtissue specific

transcriptome as the input annotation (McLaren et al., 2016). VEP was additionally run

using the gencode v28 comprehensive annotation as the input annotation to identify

variants whose predicted impact increased in severity.

Figures, Tables, and Computing Resources

All statistical analyses, figures and tables in this paper were generated using the R

programming language. (R Core Team, 2019) A full list of packages and versions can be

found in the supplementary file session_info.txt. All computation was performed on the

National Institutes of Health high performance computer system Biowulf (hpc.nih.gov).

Competing Interests

All authors declare no Competing interests.

Supplemental Figures

Supplemental Figure 1. Distribution of PacBio long-read lengths for two
library sizes.

Supplemental Figure 2. Comparison of DNTX annotation to Gencode annotation. A) Average per exon Phylop score for Gencode and DNTX transcripts. B) Average distance of DNTX transcriptional start sites (TSS) and Gencode TSS to CAGE-seq peaks from the FANTOM consortium. C) Average distance of DNTX transcriptional end sites (TES) and Gencode TES to polyadenylation signals in the PolyA site atlas.

570 Supplemental Figure 3. Comparison of Salmon mapping rate change vs
571 transcriptome size decrease.

References

Allen M, Poggiali D, Whitaker K, Marshall TR, Kievit RA. 2019. Raincloud plots: A multi-
platform tool for robust data visualization. *Wellcome Open Research* **4**:63.
doi:10.12688/wellcomeopenres.15191.1

Bauwens M, Garanto A, Sangermano R, Naessens S, Weisschuh N, De Zaeytijd J, Khan M,
Sadler F, Balikova I, Van Cauwenbergh C, Rosseel T, Bauwens J, De Leeneer K, De Jaegere S,
Van Laethem T, De Vries M, Carss K, Arno G, Fakin A, Webster AR, Ravel de l'Argentière TJL
de, Sznajer Y, Vuylsteke M, Kohl S, Wissinger B, Cherry T, Collin RWJ, Cremers FPM, Leroy
BP, De Baere E. 2019. ABCA4-associated disease as a model for missing heritability in
autosomal recessive disorders: Novel noncoding splice, cis-regulatory, structural, and
recurrent hypomorphic variants. *Genetics in Medicine* **21**:1761–1771. doi:10.1038/s41436-
018-0420-y

Beck AH, Weng Z, Witten DM, Zhu S, Foley JW, Lacroute P, Smith CL, Tibshirani R, Rijn M
van de, Sidow A, West RB. 2010. 3′-End Sequencing for Expression Quantification (3SEQ)
from Archival Tumor Samples. *PLOS ONE* **5**:e8768. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0008768

Bharti K, Liu W, Csermely T, Bertuzzi S, Arnheiter H. 2008. Alternative promoter use in eye
development: Complex role and regulation of the transcription factor MITF. *Development*
(Cambridge, England) **135**:1169–1178. doi:10.1242/dev.014142

Blenkinsop TA, Saini JS, Maminishkis A, Bharti K, Wan Q, Banzon T, Lotfi M, Davis J, Singh D,
Rizzolo LJ, Miller S, Temple S, Stern JH. 2015. Human Adult Retinal Pigment Epithelial Stem
Cell-Derived RPE Monolayers Exhibit Key Physiological Characteristics of Native Tissue.
Investigative Ophthalmology & Visual Science **56**:7085–7099. doi:10.1167/iovs.14-16246

Braun TA, Mullins RF, Wagner AH, Andorf JL, Johnston RM, Bakall BB, Deluca AP, Fishman
GA, Lam BL, Weleber RG, Cideciyan AV, Jacobson SG, Sheffield VC, Tucker BA, Stone EM.
2013. Non-exomic and synonymous variants in ABCA4 are an important cause of Stargardt
disease. *Human Molecular Genetics* **22**:5136–5145. doi:10.1093/hmg/ddt367

Bryan JM, Fufa TD, Bharti K, Brooks BP, Hufnagel RB, McGaughey DM. 2018. Identifying
core biological processes distinguishing human eye tissues with precise systems-level gene
expression analyses and weighted correlation networks. *Human Molecular Genetics*
27:3325–3339. doi:10.1093/hmg/ddy239

Dobin A, Davis CA, Schlesinger F, Drenkow J, Zaleski C, Jha S, Batut P, Chaisson M, Gingeras
TR. 2013. STAR: Ultrafast universal RNA-seq aligner. *Bioinformatics (Oxford, England)*
29:15–21. doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/bts635

Dykes IM, Bueren KL van, Scambler PJ. 2018. HIC2 regulates isoform switching during
maturation of the cardiovascular system. *Journal of Molecular and Cellular Cardiology*
114:29–37. doi:10.1016/j.yjmcc.2017.10.007

Frankish A, Diekhans M, Ferreira A-M, Johnson R, Jungreis I, Loveland J, Mudge JM, Sisu C,
Wright J, Armstrong J, Barnes I, Berry A, Bignell A, Carbonell Sala S, Chrast J, Cunningham F,
Di Domenico T, Donaldson S, Fiddes IT, Garcia Giron C, Gonzalez JM, Grego T, Hardy M,
Hourlier T, Hunt T, Izuogu OG, Lagarde J, Martin FJ, Martinez L, Mohanan S, Muir P, Navarro
FCP, Parker A, Pei B, Pozo F, Ruffier M, Schmitt BM, Stapleton E, Suner M-M, Sycheva I,
Uszczynska-Ratajczak B, Xu J, Yates A, Zerbino D, Zhang Y, Aken B, Choudhary JS, Gerstein
M, Guigo R, Hubbard TJP, Kellis M, Paten B, Reymond A, Tress ML, Flicek P. 2019. GENCODE
reference annotation for the human and mouse genomes. *Nucleic acids research* **47**:D766–
D773. doi:10.1093/nar/gky955

Geoffroy V, Stoetzel C, Scheidecker S, Schaefer E, Perrault I, Bär S, Kröll A, Delbarre M, Antin
M, Leuvrey A-S, Henry C, Blanché H, Decker E, Kloth K, Klaus G, Mache C, Martin-Coignard
D, McGinn S, Boland A, Deleuze J-F, Friant S, Saunier S, Rozet J-M, Bergmann C, Dollfus H,
Muller J. 2018. Whole-genome sequencing in patients with ciliopathies uncovers a novel
recurrent tandem duplication in IFT140. *Human Mutation* **39**:983–992.
doi:10.1002/humu.23539

Gorman SW, Haider NB, Grieshammer U, Swiderski RE, Kim E, Welch JW, Searby C, Leng S,
Carmi R, Sheffield VC, Duhl DM. 1999. The Cloning and Developmental Expression of
Unconventional Myosin IXA (MYO9A) a Gene in the Bardet–Biedl Syndrome (BBS4) Region
at Chromosome 15q22–q23. *Genomics* **59**:150–160. doi:10.1006/geno.1999.5867

GTEx Consortium, Laboratory, Data Analysis &Coordinating Center (LDACC)—Analysis
Working Group, Statistical Methods groups—Analysis Working Group, Enhancing GTEx
(eGTEx) groups, NIH Common Fund, NIH/NCI, NIH/NHGRI, NIH/NIMH, NIH/NIDA,
Biospecimen Collection Source Site—NDRI, Biospecimen Collection Source Site—RPCI,
Biospecimen Core Resource—VARI, Brain Bank Repository—University of Miami Brain
Endowment Bank, Leidos Biomedical—Project Management, ELSI Study, Genome Browser
Data Integration &Visualization—EBI, Genome Browser Data Integration &Visualization—
UCSC Genomics Institute, University of California Santa Cruz, Lead analysts: Laboratory,
Data Analysis &Coordinating Center (LDACC): NIH program management: Biospecimen
collection: Pathology: eQTL manuscript working group: Battle A, Brown CD, Engelhardt BE,
Montgomery SB. 2017. Genetic effects on gene expression across human tissues. *Nature*
550:204–213. doi:10.1038/nature24277

Gu Z, Eils R, Schlesner M. 2016. Complex heatmaps reveal patterns and correlations in
multidimensional genomic data. *Bioinformatics* **32**:2847–2849.
doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/btw313

Haas BJ, Papanicolaou A, Yassour M, Grabherr M, Blood PD, Bowden J, Couger MB, Eccles D,
Li B, Lieber M, MacManes MD, Ott M, Orvis J, Pochet N, Strozzi F, Weeks N, Westerman R,
William T, Dewey CN, Henschel R, LeDuc RD, Friedman N, Regev A. 2013. De novo
transcript sequence reconstruction from RNA-Seq: Reference generation and analysis with
Trinity. *Nature protocols* **8**. doi:10.1038/nprot.2013.084

Herrmann CJ, Schmidt R, Kanitz A, Artimo P, Gruber AJ, Zavolan M. 2020. PolyASite 2.0: A
consolidated atlas of polyadenylation sites from 3′ end sequencing. *Nucleic Acids Research*
48:D174–D179. doi:10.1093/nar/gkz918

Jamshidi F, Place EM, Mehrotra S, Navarro-Gomez D, Maher M, Branham KE, Valkanas E,
Cherry TJ, Lek M, MacArthur D, Pierce EA, Bujakowska KM. 2019. Contribution of non-
coding mutations to RPGRIP1-mediated inherited retinal degeneration. *Genetics in medicine*
: official journal of the American College of Medical Genetics **21**:694–704.
doi:10.1038/s41436-018-0104-7

Klimanskaya I, Hipp J, Rezai KA, West M, Atala A, Lanza R. 2004. Derivation and
comparative assessment of retinal pigment epithelium from human embryonic stem cells
using transcriptomics. *Cloning and Stem Cells* **6**:217–245. doi:10.1089/clo.2004.6.217

Köster J, Rahmann S. 2012. Snakemake—a scalable bioinformatics workflow engine.
Bioinformatics **28**:2520–2522. doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/bts480

Landry J-R, Mager DL, Wilhelm BT. 2003. Complex controls: The role of alternative
promoters in mammalian genomes. *Trends in Genetics* **19**:640–648.
doi:10.1016/j.tig.2003.09.014

Lenis TL, Hu J, Ng SY, Jiang Z, Sarfare S, Lloyd MB, Esposito NJ, Samuel W, Jaworski C, Bok D,
Finnemann SC, Radeke MJ, Redmond TM, Travis GH, Radu RA. 2018. Expression of ABCA4
in the retinal pigment epithelium and its implications for Stargardt macular degeneration.
Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences **115**:E11120–E11127.
doi:10.1073/pnas.1802519115

Lex A, Gehlenborg N, Strobelt H, Vuillemot R, Pfister H. 2014. UpSet: Visualization of
Intersecting Sets. *IEEE Transactions on Visualization and Computer Graphics* **20**:1983–1992.
doi:10.1109/TVCG.2014.2346248

Li H, Handsaker B, Wysoker A, Fennell T, Ruan J, Homer N, Marth G, Abecasis G, Durbin R,
1000 Genome Project Data Processing Subgroup. 2009. The Sequence Alignment/Map
format and SAMtools. *Bioinformatics (Oxford, England)* **25**:2078–2079.
doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/btp352

Maruotti J, Sripathi SR, Bharti K, Fuller J, Wahlin KJ, Ranganathan V, Sluch VM, Berlinicke
CA, Davis J, Kim C, Zhao L, Wan J, Qian J, Corneo B, Temple S, Dubey R, Olenyuk BZ, Bhutto I,
Lutty GA, Zack DJ. 2015. Small-molecule–directed, efficient generation of retinal pigment
epithelium from human pluripotent stem cells. *Proceedings of the National Academy of*
Sciences **112**:10950–10955. doi:10.1073/pnas.1422818112

Mayer AK, Rohrschneider K, Strom TM, Glöckle N, Kohl S, Wissinger B, Weisschuh N. 2016.
Homozygosity mapping and whole-genome sequencing reveals a deep intronic PROM1
mutation causing cone–rod dystrophy by pseudoexon activation. *European Journal of*
Human Genetics **24**:459–462. doi:10.1038/ejhg.2015.144

May-Simera HL, Wan Q, Jha BS, Hartford J, Khristov V, Dejene R, Chang J, Patnaik S, Lu Q,
Banerjee P, Silver J, Insinna-Kettenhofen C, Patel D, Lotfi M, Malicdan M, Hotaling N,
Maminishkis A, Sridharan R, Brooks B, Miyagishima K, Gunay-Aygun M, Pal R, Westlake C,
Miller S, Sharma R, Bharti K. 2018. Primary Cilium-Mediated Retinal Pigment Epithelium
Maturation Is Disrupted in Ciliopathy Patient Cells. *Cell reports* **22**:189–205.
doi:10.1016/j.celrep.2017.12.038

McLaren W, Gil L, Hunt SE, Riat HS, Ritchie GRS, Thormann A, Flicek P, Cunningham F.
2016. The Ensembl Variant Effect Predictor. *Genome Biology* **17**:122. doi:10.1186/s13059-
016-0974-4

Mellough CB, Bauer R, Collin J, Dorgau B, Zerti D, Dolan DWP, Jones CM, Izuogu OG, Yu M,
Hallam D, Steyn JS, White K, Steel DH, Santibanez-Koref M, Elliott DJ, Jackson MS, Lindsay S,
Grellscheid S, Lako M. 2019. An integrated transcriptional analysis of the developing
human retina. *Development (Cambridge, England)* **146**. doi:10.1242/dev.169474

Mills JD, Nalpathamkalam T, Jacobs HIL, Janitz C, Merico D, Hu P, Janitz M. 2013. RNA-Seq
analysis of the parietal cortex in Alzheimer's disease reveals alternatively spliced isoforms
related to lipid metabolism. *Neuroscience Letters* **536**:90–95.
doi:10.1016/j.neulet.2012.12.042

Mitra M, Lee HN, Coller HA. 2020. Splicing Busts a Move: Isoform Switching Regulates
Migration. *Trends in Cell Biology* **30**:74–85. doi:10.1016/j.tcb.2019.10.007

Nagalakshmi U, Wang Z, Waern K, Shou C, Raha D, Gerstein M, Snyder M. 2008. The
Transcriptional Landscape of the Yeast Genome Defined by RNA Sequencing. *Science*
320:1344–1349. doi:10.1126/science.1158441

Neagoe Ciprian, Kulke Michael, del Monte Federica, Gwathmey Judith K., de Tombe Pieter
P., Hajjar Roger J., Linke Wolfgang A. 2002. Titin Isoform Switch in Ischemic Human Heart
Disease. *Circulation* **106**:1333–1341. doi:10.1161/01.CIR.0000029803.93022.93

Neph S, Kuehn MS, Reynolds AP, Haugen E, Thurman RE, Johnson AK, Rynes E, Maurano
MT, Vierstra J, Thomas S, Sandstrom R, Humbert R, Stamatoyannopoulos JA. 2012. BEDOPS:
High-performance genomic feature operations. *Bioinformatics* **28**:1919–1920.
doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/bts277

Noguchi S, Arakawa T, Fukuda S, Furuno M, Hasegawa A, Hori F, Ishikawa-Kato S, Kaida K,
Kaiho A, Kanamori-Katayama M, Kawashima T, Kojima M, Kubosaki A, Manabe R-i, Murata
M, Nagao-Sato S, Nakazato K, Ninomiya N, Nishiyori-Sueki H, Noma S, Saijyo E, Saka A, Sakai
M, Simon C, Suzuki N, Tagami M, Watanabe S, Yoshida S, Arner P, Axton RA, Babina M,
Baillie JK, Barnett TC, Beckhouse AG, Blumenthal A, Bodega B, Bonetti A, Briggs J,
Brombacher F, Carlisle AJ, Clevers HC, Davis CA, Detmar M, Dohi T, Edge ASB, Edinger M,
Ehrlund A, Ekwall K, Endoh M, Enomoto H, Eslami A, Fagiolini M, Fairbairn L, Farach-
Carson MC, Faulkner GJ, Ferrai C, Fisher ME, Forrester LM, Fujita R, Furusawa J-i,
Geijtenbeek TB, Gingeras T, Goldowitz D, Guhl S, Guler R, Gustincich S, Ha TJ, Hamaguchi M,
Hara M, Hasegawa Y, Herlyn M, Heutink P, Hitchens KJ, Hume DA, Ikawa T, Ishizu Y, Kai C,
Kawamoto H, Kawamura YI, Kempfle JS, Kenna TJ, Kere J, Khachigian LM, Kitamura T, Klein
S, Klinken SP, Knox AJ, Kojima S, Koseki H, Koyasu S, Lee W, Lennartsson A, Mackay-sim A,
Mejhert N, Mizuno Y, Morikawa H, Morimoto M, Moro K, Morris KJ, Motohashi H, Mummery
CL, Nakachi Y, Nakahara F, Nakamura T, Nakamura Y, Nozaki T, Ogishima S, Ohkura N,
Ohno H, Ohshima M, Okada-Hatakeyama M, Okazaki Y, Orlando V, Ovchinnikov DA, Passier
R, Patrikakis M, Pombo A, Pradhan-Bhatt S, Qin X-Y, Rehli M, Rizzu P, Roy S, Sajantila A,
Sakaguchi S, Sato H, Satoh H, Savvi S, Saxena A, Schmidl C, Schneider C, Schulze-Tanzil GG,
Schwegmann A, Sheng G, Shin JW, Sugiyama D, Sugiyama T, Summers KM, Takahashi N,
Takai J, Tanaka H, Tatsukawa H, Tomoiu A, Toyoda H, Wetering M van de, Berg LM van den,
Verardo R, Vijayan D, Wells CA, Winteringham LN, Wolvetang E, Yamaguchi Y, Yamamoto
M, Yanagi-Mizuochi C, Yoneda M, Yonekura Y, Zhang PG, Zucchelli S, Abugessaisa I, Arner E,
Harshbarger J, Kondo A, Lassmann T, Lizio M, Sahin S, Sengstag T, Severin J, Shimoji H,
Suzuki M, Suzuki H, Kawai J, Kondo N, Itoh M, Daub CO, Kasukawa T, Kawaji H, Carninci P,
Forrest ARR, Hayashizaki Y. 2017. FANTOM5 CAGE profiles of human and mouse samples.
Scientific Data **4**:170112. doi:10.1038/sdata.2017.112

O'Leary NA, Wright MW, Brister JR, Ciufo S, Haddad D, McVeigh R, Rajput B, Robbertse B,
Smith-White B, Ako-Adjei D, Astashyn A, Badretdin A, Bao Y, Blinkova O, Brover V,
Chetvernin V, Choi J, Cox E, Ermolaeva O, Farrell CM, Goldfarb T, Gupta T, Haft D, Hatcher E,
Hlavina W, Joardar VS, Kodali VK, Li W, Maglott D, Masterson P, McGarvey KM, Murphy MR,
O'Neill K, Pujar S, Rangwala SH, Rausch D, Riddick LD, Schoch C, Shkeda A, Storz SS, Sun H,

Thibaud-Nissen F, Tolstoy I, Tully RE, Vatsan AR, Wallin C, Webb D, Wu W, Landrum MJ,
Kimchi A, Tatusova T, DiCuccio M, Kitts P, Murphy TD, Pruitt KD. 2016. Reference sequence
(RefSeq) database at NCBI: Current status, taxonomic expansion, and functional annotation.
Nucleic Acids Research **44**:D733–745. doi:10.1093/nar/gkv1189

Patro R, Duggal G, Love MI, Irizarry RA, Kingsford C. 2017. Salmon provides fast and bias-
aware quantification of transcript expression. *Nature methods* **14**:417–419.
doi:10.1038/nmeth.4197

Perrin RM, Konopatskaya O, Qiu Y, Harper S, Bates DO, Churchill AJ. 2005. Diabetic
retinopathy is associated with a switch in splicing from anti- to pro-angiogenic isoforms of
vascular endothelial growth factor. *Diabetologia* **48**:2422–2427. doi:10.1007/s00125-005-
1951-8

Pertea G, Pertea M. 2020. GFF Utilities: GffRead and GffCompare. *F1000Research* **9**:304.
doi:10.12688/f1000research.23297.1

Pertea M, Kim D, Pertea GM, Leek JT, Salzberg SL. 2016. Transcript-level expression
analysis of RNA-seq experiments with HISAT, StringTie and Ballgown. *Nature Protocols*
11:1650–1667. doi:10.1038/nprot.2016.095

Pertea M, Pertea GM, Antonescu CM, Chang T-C, Mendell JT, Salzberg SL. 2015. StringTie
enables improved reconstruction of a transcriptome from RNA-seq reads. *Nature
Biotechnology* **33**:290–295. doi:10.1038/nbt.3122

Pertea M, Shumate A, Pertea G, Varabyou A, Breitwieser FP, Chang Y-C, Madugundu AK,
Pandey A, Salzberg SL. 2018. CHESS: A new human gene catalog curated from thousands of
large-scale RNA sequencing experiments reveals extensive transcriptional noise. *Genome
Biology* **19**:208. doi:10.1186/s13059-018-1590-2

Pollard KS, Hubisz MJ, Rosenbloom KR, Siepel A. 2010. Detection of nonneutral substitution
rates on mammalian phylogenies. *Genome Research* **20**:110–121.
doi:10.1101/gr.097857.109

Quinlan AR, Hall IM. 2010. BEDTools: A flexible suite of utilities for comparing genomic
features. *Bioinformatics (Oxford, England)* **26**:841–842.
doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/btq033

R Core Team. 2019. R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing. Vienna,
Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing.

Reyes A, Huber W. 2018. Alternative start and termination sites of transcription drive most
transcript isoform differences across human tissues. *Nucleic Acids Research* **46**:582–592.
doi:10.1093/nar/gkx1165

Ritchie ME, Phipson B, Wu D, Hu Y, Law CW, Shi W, Smyth GK. 2015. Limma powers
differential expression analyses for RNA-sequencing and microarray studies. *Nucleic Acids
Research* **43**:e47–e47. doi:10.1093/nar/gkv007

Robinson MD, McCarthy DJ, Smyth GK. 2010. edgeR: A Bioconductor package for
differential expression analysis of digital gene expression data. *Bioinformatics* **26**:139–140.
doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/btp616

Sangermano R, Garanto A, Khan M, Runhart EH, Bauwens M, Bax NM, Born LI van den, Khan
MI, Cornelis SS, Verheij JBGM, Pott J-WR, Thiadens AAHJ, Klaver CCW, Puech B, Meunier I,
Naessens S, Arno G, Fakin A, Carss KJ, Raymond FL, Webster AR, Dhaenens C-M, Stöhr H,
Grassmann F, Weber BHF, Hoyng CB, De Baere E, Albert S, Collin RWJ, Cremers FPM. 2019.
Deep-intronic ABCA4 variants explain missing heritability in Stargardt disease and allow
correction of splice defects by antisense oligonucleotides. *Genetics in Medicine* **21**:1751–
1760. doi:10.1038/s41436-018-0414-9

Swamy V, McGaughey D. 2019. Eye in a Disk: eyeIntegration Human Pan-Eye and Body
Transcriptome Database Version 1.0. *Investigative Ophthalmology & Visual Science*
60:3236–3246. doi:10.1167/iovs.19-27106

Takahashi H, Kato S, Murata M, Carninci P. 2012. CAGE- Cap Analysis Gene Expression: A
protocol for the detection of promoter and transcriptional networks. *Methods in molecular*
biology (Clifton, NJ) **786**:181–200. doi:10.1007/978-1-61779-292-2_11

Tian B, Manley JL. 2017. Alternative polyadenylation of mRNA precursors. *Nature Reviews*
Molecular Cell Biology **18**:18–30. doi:10.1038/nrm.2016.116

Trapnell C, Williams BA, Pertea G, Mortazavi A, Kwan G, Baren MJ van, Salzberg SL, Wold BJ,
Pachter L. 2010. Transcript assembly and quantification by RNA-Seq reveals unannotated
transcripts and isoform switching during cell differentiation. *Nature Biotechnology* **28**:511–
515. doi:10.1038/nbt.1621

Vitting-Seerup K, Sandelin A. 2017. The Landscape of Isoform Switches in Human Cancers.
Molecular Cancer Research **15**:1206–1220. doi:10.1158/1541-7786.MCR-16-0459

Wang Y, Liu J, HUANG B, XU Y-M, LI J, HUANG L-F, LIN J, ZHANG J, MIN Q-H, YANG W-M,
WANG X-Z. 2015. Mechanism of alternative splicing and its regulation. *Biomedical Reports*
3:152–158. doi:10.3892/br.2014.407

Wenger AM, Peluso P, Rowell WJ, Chang P-C, Hall RJ, Concepcion GT, Ebler J,
Fungtammasan A, Kolesnikov A, Olson ND, Töpfer A, Alonge M, Mahmoud M, Qian Y, Chin C-
S, Phillippy AM, Schatz MC, Myers G, DePristo MA, Ruan J, Marschall T, Sedlazeck FJ, Zook
JM, Li H, Koren S, Carroll A, Rank DR, Hunkapiller MW. 2019. Accurate circular consensus
long-read sequencing improves variant detection and assembly of a human genome. *Nature*
Biotechnology **37**:1155–1162. doi:10.1038/s41587-019-0217-9

Yan W, Peng Y-R, Zyl T van, Regev A, Shekhar K, Juric D, Sanes JR. 2020. Cell Atlas of The
Human Fovea and Peripheral Retina. *Scientific Reports* **10**:9802. doi:10.1038/s41598-020-
66092-9

Yu G, Wang L-G, Han Y, He Q-Y. 2012. clusterProfiler: An R Package for Comparing
Biological Themes Among Gene Clusters. *OMICS : a Journal of Integrative Biology* **16**:284–
287. doi:10.1089/omi.2011.0118

Zerbino DR, Achuthan P, Akanni W, Amode MR, Barrell D, Bhai J, Billis K, Cummins C, Gall A,
Girón CG, Gil L, Gordon L, Haggerty L, Haskell E, Hourlier T, Izuogu OG, Janacek SH,
Juettemann T, To JK, Laird MR, Lavidas I, Liu Z, Loveland JE, Maurel T, McLaren W, Moore B,
Mudge J, Murphy DN, Newman V, Nuhn M, Ogeh D, Ong CK, Parker A, Patricio M, Riat HS,
Schuilenburg H, Sheppard D, Sparrow H, Taylor K, Thormann A, Vullo A, Walts B, Zadissa A,
Frankish A, Hunt SE, Kostadima M, Langridge N, Martin FJ, Muffato M, Perry E, Ruffier M,
Staines DM, Trevanion SJ, Aken BL, Cunningham F, Yates A, Flicek P. 2018. Ensembl 2018.
Nucleic Acids Research **46**:D754–D761. doi:10.1093/nar/gkx1098

Zernant J, Xie Y(, Ayuso C, Riveiro-Alvarez R, Lopez-Martinez M-A, Simonelli F, Testa F,
Gorin MB, Strom SP, Bertelsen M, Rosenberg T, Boone PM, Yuan B, Ayyagari R, Nagy PL,
Tsang SH, Gouras P, Collison FT, Lupski JR, Fishman GA, Allikmets R. 2014. Analysis of the
ABCA4 genomic locus in Stargardt disease. *Human Molecular Genetics* **23**:6797–6806.
doi:10.1093/hmg/ddu396

Zhang D, Guelfi S, Garcia-Ruiz S, Costa B, Reynolds RH, D'Sa K, Liu W, Courtin T, Peterson A,
Jaffe AE, Hardy J, Botía JA, Collado-Torres L, Ryten M. 2020. Incomplete annotation has a
disproportionate impact on our understanding of Mendelian and complex neurogenetic
disorders. *Science Advances* **6**:eaay8299. doi:10.1126/sciadv.aay8299

Zhao H, Sun Z, Wang J, Huang H, Kocher J-P, Wang L. 2014. CrossMap: A versatile tool for
coordinate conversion between genome assemblies. *Bioinformatics (Oxford, England)*
30:1006–1007. doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/btt730