1   **PIPETS: A statistically informed, gene-annotation agnostic analysis method to study bacterial**

2   **termination using 3'-end sequencing.**

4   Quinlan Furumo[1] and Michelle Meyer[1*]

8   [1]Department of Biology, Boston College, Chestnut Hill, MA, 02135, United States.

9   *Corresponding author: m.meyer@bc.edu

Abstract:

Background: Over the last decade the drop in short-read sequencing costs have allowed

experimental techniques utilizing sequencing to address specific biological questions to

proliferate, oftentimes outpacing standardized or effective analysis approaches for the data

generated. There are growing amounts of bacterial 3'-end sequencing data, yet there is

currently no commonly accepted analysis methodology for this datatype. Most data analysis

approaches are somewhat *ad hoc* and, despite the presence of substantial signal within

annotated genes, focus on genomic regions outside the annotated genes (e.g. 3' or 5' UTRs).

Furthermore, lack of a systematic approach to analyzing such data makes it impossible to

compare conclusions generated by different labs, using different organisms.

Results: We present PIPETS (**P**oisson **I**dentification of **PE**aks from **T**erm-**S**eq data), an R package

available on Bioconductor that provides a novel analysis method for 3'-end sequencing data.

PIPETS is a statistically informed, gene-annotation agnostic methodology. Across two different

datasets PIPETS identified significant 3'-end termination signal across a wider range of

annotated genomic contexts than existing analysis approaches, suggesting that existing

approaches may miss biologically relevant signal. Furthermore, assessment of the previously

called 3'-end positions not captured by PIPETS showed that they were uniformly very low

coverage.

1 **Conclusions:** PIPETS provides a broadly applicable platform to compare 3'-end sequencing data

2 sets across different organisms. It requires only the 3'-end sequencing data, and is broadly

3 accessible to non-expert users.

Background

The study of alternative and premature bacterial transcription termination is a rapidly growing

field that aims to understand bacterial responses to changes in environmental conditions. The

current standard for studying this is 3-prime-end-sequencing (3'-seq)/Term-seq which non-

specifically tags the 3' ends of RNA, allowing for short-read sequencing to map these ends and

quantify their relative frequencies. Initial studies using 3'-seq focused on identifying regulatory

elements in the 5'UTRs of annotated genes by focusing exclusively on signal in the 5'- and 3'-

UTRs of these genes [1–3]. This analysis methodology was used or closely mirrored by several

studies afterwards, many of which noted an abundance of 3'-seq signal in other genomic

regions of the data [4–6]. Other studies created their own custom analysis methods to study 3'-

seq data in order to study specific regulatory signals or to add additional sequencing

information [7, 8]. Although many different studies have identified that there are biologically

relevant 3'-seq signal levels in regions outside of the 3'-UTR of genes, there is not a consensus

on an analysis method to best analyze 3'-seq data. Furthermore, while analysis scripts are

available in many cases, these are typically poorly documented and challenging to implement

for non-expert users. Without a standardized 3'-seq analysis method, findings from different

studies are impossible to compare short of reanalyzing many large-scale data sets, and it is

challenging to contextualize whether findings from diverse organisms are due to differences in

the biology, the data collection method, or the data analysis performed.

In this work, we introduce **PIPETS** (**P**oisson **I**dentification of **PE**aks from **T**erm-**S**eq data). PIPETS

is an R package available on Bioconductor that analyzes mapped data from 3'-end sequencing,

which nonspecifically captures transcript termination signal, whether that be from transcript

termination, regulatory cleavage, truncation, or other biological processes [9–14]. In contrast to

many existing approaches for 3'-seq analysis, PIPETS analyzes all 3'-seq signal, regardless of

annotated gene positions, and uses statistically informed methods to identify biologically

relevant 3'-end signal. We demonstrate the use of PIPETS on two existing 3'-seq datasets.

Implementation:

The inputs for PIPETS are mapped 3'-seq Bed files that contain at least chromosome, read start,

read stop, read quality score, and strand information for each read. Alternatively PIPETS can use

Genomic Ranges objects from the GenomicRanges package so long as the input data contains

the same information as above [15]. PIPETS begins by filtering out reads that do not have a read

quality score equal to or greater than the user defined value (readScoreMinimum parameter).

This helps to reduce the runtime of PIPETS and the potential for low confidence read signal from

biological or technical errors to be misconstrued as positive signal. With the quality trimmed

reads set by the user inputs, PIPETS calculates the 3'-end read coverage of every genomic

position using the terminal position of each read corresponding to the terminal site in the

transcript. PIPETS subsequently analyzes this data in three main steps: 1) A sliding window

function which uses a Poisson Distribution Test to identify genomic coordinates with significant

3'-end termination read coverage and 2) A condensing step that combines the signal of

consecutive significant genomic positions into one termination "peak" and 3) A peak

condensing step that combines proximal significant peaks into one signal. These steps ensure

that technical or biological error does not conflate noise as significant signal while pruning the

total number of individual peaks reported to make analysis manageable (Figure 1).

7
Figure 1: Workflow of PIPETS. Before PIPETS performs analysis, it first trims reads based on read quality and
separates the passing reads into those that map to the top and complement strands. Then PIPETS analyzes
the two strands separately through three steps. First, a sliding window-based Poisson Distribution Test is used
to identify genomic coordinates with 3'-seq read coverage that is significantly higher than the surrounding
area. The results of this step undergo Benjamini-Hochberg multiple testing correction to control for Type I
error. Second, consecutive significant genomic coordinates are combined into individual "peaks". Third,
proximal peaks are combined into individual larger "peaks".
15
16   One of the inherent challenges associated with analysis of RNA-seq data generally is the large

17   range of read values obtained across different transcripts. Low read coverage does not

18   necessarily indicate a lack of biological significance, as some transcripts have a low basal

19   expression level. However, in the case of 3'-end sequencing, the "noise" created from cleavage

of transcripts (either during *in vitro* RNA processing or within the cell) will also be higher for

more highly expressed transcripts, potentially much higher than true signal for a lowly

expressed transcript. To account for this, PIPETS uses a sliding window approach to ensure that

termination read coverage significance is assigned locally. By default, the sliding window spans

51 genomic positions, moving 25 nucleotides with each step. PIPETS then uses a Poisson

Distribution Test to determine if the read coverage of any position within the window is

significantly higher than expected from the surrounding average. To minimize the rate of Type I

error from the large number of tests performed, PIPETS uses Benjamini-Hochberg multiple

testing correction on all significant results. The sliding window approach ensures that genomic

positions with read coverage dwarfed by distal highly expressed regions are not overlooked,

increasing PIPETS sensitivity.

Even for input data with millions of reads, a vast majority of genomic coordinates will have very

few or no termination reads mapped to them. Because every single genomic coordinate cannot

be the site of a biologically significant termination event, we associate most low read coverage

events to technical or biological noise that are unlikely to be biologically significant. Thus, we

employ a global minimum read coverage cutoff based on the read coverage of the data.

Positions with 3'-end read depth below this cutoff are not considered, speeding analysis and

reducing the effect of low-signal noise on analysis. Rather than set a specific minimum read-

depth, PIPETS determines this global cutoff from mapped the read coverage in an individual

data file.

To determine the global minimum read coverage cutoff, PIPETS first sorts the genomic

coordinates from highest to lowest read coverage and identifies the positions that account for a

percentage of the total read coverage of the file (defined by threshAdjust, 75% by default). The

average of these high read coverage values of each file, which are most likely to be derived from

biologically significant signal, is the minimum read coverage cutoff for an individual input file.

This results in a global cutoff that is informed by biologically relevant signal that can be used to

filter out noise and reduce run-time by reducing the total number of genomic positions tested.

To account for possible high read coverage outliers, the parameter highOutlierTrim defines the

top percentage (0.01 by default) of these highest read coverage positions that are excluded

from the calculation of the global read coverage cutoff. All positions removed this way will still

be analyzed by PIPETS, but this helps to ensure that PIPETS is not heavily biased by either high

or low read coverage outliers.

The data structure of a biologically significant bacterial termination site for 3'-seq data

resembles a peak, with a position of highest read coverage and flanking positions of lesser read

coverage that are still higher than surrounding noise [16–18]. This signal is the result of several

factors, namely imperfect bacterial termination, RNA degradation, and technical noise from the

sequencing itself. Each genomic position from the significant results of Step One is unlikely to be

an independent termination signal; many of these positions are adjacent to others and together

they form one site of termination. To better reflect the biological context of these data, the

significant genomic positions identified in step one undergo two condensing steps: 1) Combine

consecutive significant positions into single termination peaks, and 2) Combine proximal

termination peaks to abbreviate total results volume. The first round of condensing performed

by PIPETS identifies significant positions that are within 2 nucleotides of each other.

Consecutive significant positions are then combined into a single termination "peak" which

contains the full range of consecutive positions and uses the highest read coverage position

within for downstream analysis. PIPETS then combines proximal termination peaks within 20

nucleotides of each other as termination signals so close to each other are likely not

independent sites of transcript termination[16–18].

PIPETS relies on a number of parameters, the values of which initially were generated in an *ad*

hoc manner. These include the size of the sliding window (slidingWindowSize), the distance the

sliding window moves with each step (slidingWindowMovementDistance), the p-value used for

the Poisson distribution test and Benjamini-Hochberg multiple testing correction (user_pValue),

the proportion of data used to determine the global minimum read cutoff (threshAdjust), the

proportion of data considered to be high outliers in the calculation of the global minimum read

cutoff (highOutlierTrim), the distance between adjacent positions considered to be a single peak

during the first peak condensing step (adjacentPeakDistance), and the maximum distance

between adjacent peaks condensed in the second peak condensing step

(peakCondensingDistance). We established the default values of these parameters using *S.*

pneumoniae 3'-seq data generated in our lab [4] with the intention of identifying as many

results as possible that we were confident had the potential to be biologically significant (which

may be distinct than statistically significantly greater than background). We developed the two

peak condensing steps of PIPETS (Figure 1) in order to reduce the total number of results that

had to be analyzed such that both the highest expressing 3'-seq peaks were present, as well as

smaller peaks in potentially lower basal expression regions of the genome.

To systematically establish default values for these parameters, we assessed the impact that

changes to values of each parameter had on results sets. We found that, outside of extremely

high or low values, most of the parameters had little impact on the total number of results and

did not heavily impact the read depth cutoffs or the total count of significant results

(Supplemental Figures 1,2). However, changes to the global minimum read coverage cutoff

substantially impact the sensitivity of PIPETS. This value is determined from the input data by

two PIPETS parameters: threshAdjust and highOutlierTrim, and testing revealed that minor

adjustments to these values can greatly affect the distribution of read coverage values that are

assessed. Altering the threshAdjust and highOutlierTrim values changes the strictness of

PIPETS. In datasets with very high read depths or datasets from very long genomes, we

recommend increasing the strictness of PIPETS' noise filtering by lowering the value of

threshAdjust (from 75% to values from 50% - 60%). This will reduce the effect of global

increases to basal noise levels and ensure that PIPETS remains most sensitive to biologically

relevant signal. Alternatively, increasing the value of threshAdjust (from 75% to values from 80%

- 95%) will make PIPETS less strict and is useful when studying data sets with low read coverage

or data from smaller genomes. In the event where a small portion of the genomic positions in

the data account for a disproportionately large percentage of the total read coverage for a data

set (for example in samples with poor rRNA depletion), increasing the value of highOutlierTrim

(from 0.01 to values from 0.025 − 0.05) can reduce the bias imparted by these outliers.

highOutlierTrim is the more sensitive parameter and its values may be more variable from

dataset to dataset.

<u>Comparison Methodology:</u>

In this work we compared the results of PIPETS with the results of the original analysis method

for data sets from two organisms. First, we examined *S. pneumoniae* 3'-seq data from two

conditions (no-drug-control time 0 and no-drug-control time 30) that were generated in our lab

(available at SRP136114) [4]. We ran this data at default parameters (threshAdjust = 0.75 and

highOutlierTrim = 0.01) before categorizing the results as 3'-UTR (less than or equal to 150 bp

downstream of the STOP codon with respect to strand), 5'-UTR (less than or equal to 450 bp

upstream of the START codon with respect to strand), coding region (inside of the coding region

of a gene), 3'-UTR & Coding region (less than or equal to 150 bp downstream of the stop codon

of one gene with respect to strand and inside the coding region of a different gene), and

intergenic (none of the other categories). To stay consistent with the previous analysis method

[2], we chose for 5'-UTR signal to override 3'-UTR in our reported metrics. In Figure 2A we

represent the originally reported peaks all as 3' ends as originally reported. We used the TIGR4

genome annotation (NC_003028.3) to assign the above categories. When comparing the results

of the original Warrier method and PIPETS, we classified overlapping results when two peaks

reported from the different analyses were within 5bp of each other (Figure 2A, Figure 2B).

When studying the Warrier results specific peaks, we calculated the read quality trimmed read

coverage values based on the combined 3'-seq read coverage from the ND0 and ND30 samples

combined (Figure 2D).

Second, we assessed *B. subtilis* data from the first paper to present 3'-seq as a method

(available at PRJEB12568) [2]. This study had 9 experimental conditions with three replicates for

all conditions but one, resulting in 26 total files. We analyzed all of these files individually and

followed the Dar protocol of sub setting the results to only those that were present in all three

replicates of a given condition. We then performed the same categorization and comparative

results overlapping as above. We used the AL009126 genome annotation for *B. subtilis* in our

results categorization. For this part of the work, we ran PIPETS twice, once with default

parameters (threshAdjust = 0.75 and highOutlierTrim = 0.01) and once with only one changed

parameter (threshAdjust = 0.85).

Results and Discussion:

Figure 2: PIPETS analysis of Warrior 3'-seq data. We analyzed the Warrior 3'-seq data on PIPETS using default parameters (threshAdjust = 0.75, highOutlierTrim = 0.01). A) Compared to the 1864 significant sites reported in the 3'-UTR of annotated genes from the original results [4], PIPETS identified 2220 significant peaks. 419 of these peaks were in of the 3'-UTR (within 150 bp of the stop codon) of annotated genes, while the other 1801 were found in other genomic contexts that are unique to PIPETS. B) When comparing the two results sets,

1   PIPETS and the Warrier analysis identified 790 shared peaks. C) When using the raw 3'-seq read coverage of
2   the remaining 1074 results that were unique to the Warrier analysis, only 153 had 3'-seq read coverage
3   greater than 300. D) When using only reads with a read quality score of 30 or higher, only 6 of the Warrier
4   analysis specific results had read coverage greater than 300.
5
We first tested PIPETS on *Streptococcus pneumoniae* data generated by our own lab [4].

Previous analysis of this data was performed using an analysis method that mirrored that of the

first 3'-seq paper [2]. We developed PIPETS to analyze this data to better capture 3'-seq signal

outside of just the 3'-UTR of annotated genes and thus we wanted to compare PIPETS' results

with the original method. The original method identified 1864 termination sites across three

conditions, and as a result of the analysis parameters many of these identified sites had very

low read coverages. PIPETS, when run with default parameters, identified 2220 significant peaks

between just two of these conditions (no-drug-control samples at 0 and 30 minutes). Of these

2220 peaks, 136 were in intergenic regions, 340 were in the 5'-UTR of a gene, 1077 were inside

coding regions, 419 were in the 3'-UTR of a gene, and 248 that were present in the 3'-UTR of

one gene and inside the coding region of a different adjacent gene (Figure 1A, Supplementary

Data). PIPETS identified 1801 significant peaks outside of 3'-UTR regions, all of which would not

have been considered by the original analysis method.

Although PIPETS was successful in identifying 3'-seq signal outside of 3'-UTR regions, we still

wanted to identify how successful PIPETS was at identifying the results from the original

analysis. Of the 1864 sites from the original analysis, PIPETS identified 790 (Figure 2B). It was

expected that not all of the sites identified by the original analysis would be identified as

significant by PIPETS due to the substantially more lax method of significant identification in the

original method [4]. Of the 1055 unique remaining sites of the original analysis, 902 had 3'-seq

read coverage values less than 300 (Figure 2C). We wanted to identify the cause of PIPETS

"missing" 153 of the results from the original method that had high read coverage values. An

important distinction in analysis between PIPETS and the original method is the read quality

trimming that PIPETS performed. We compared the raw read coverage and quality score

trimmed read coverage at the locations identified by the original analysis and saw that only 6 of

the results from the original analysis had more than 300 reads that passed read quality cutoffs

(Figure 2D). We further investigated the specific peak identified by the original analysis with the

highest 3'-seq read coverage not identified by PIPETS. This position was identified as significant

by PIPETS, however, it was placed into a larger 3'-seq peak with a different highest read

coverage coordinate that may have been outside the distance parameters in the original

analysis.

Figure 3: Representative selection of PIPETS specific results from Warrier data. A) PIPETS uniquely identified a significant 3'-seq peak inside of the *ptsP* gene 172 bp after the start codon. IGV display of read pileup data shows that this peak has read coverage within the same range of the likely true terminator signal in the 3'-UTR. B) PIPETS uniquely identified a 3'-seq peak inside of the SP_RS10700 gene. This peak has roughly half of the read pileup of the likely terminator signal, but its read pileup in comparison to the surrounding area indicates likely biological relevance. C) PIPETS identified significant 3'-seq signal in the expected 3'-UTRs of *rpsG* and *fusA* genes (black arrows), but also identified a significant peak in the intergenic region between these two genes (red arrow). This PIPETS specific peak has read pileup values higher than the *rpsG* terminator signal and half as much as the potential *fusA* terminator suggesting biological significance.

The largest disparity between the PIPETS results and the Warrier results was the dramatic

increase in significant 3'-seq peaks identified outside of 3'-UTR's of genes for the PIPETS results.

Among these results, there are clear instances of 3'-seq signal inside of coding regions of genes,

and there are several instances of 3'-seq peaks that could potentially function as premature

terminators in genes. Observing the read pile up data for at these sites in IGV, it is clear that

there are 3'-seq read buildup events that are of 50% or greater magnitude in relation to the

read buildup at the expected termination site at the end of the gene. These premature sites

identified by PIPETS strongly indicate that the *ptsP* and SP_RS10700 (Figure 3A and 3B

respectively) genes have biologically relevant premature termination sites. These events are 172

and 207 bp past the start codon of their respective genes, and would not be captured by

existing 3'-seq analysis methods. Additionally, PIPETS identified a novel un-identified interaction

in the data between the *rpsG* and *fusA* genes (Figure 3C). PIPETS identified significant 3'-seq

peaks at the annotated termination sites of both genes (indicated with black arrows) but it also

identified significant amounts of 3'-seq signal in a region between both genes. IGV read

buildups and PIPETS read coverage outputs suggest that there is biologically significant event

causing substantial 3'-end coverage in this area. This signal too, would have been entirely

missed by the original analysis method since the signal does not fall within the close constraints

of being within 150 bp of the stop codon of a gene.

A threshAdjust = 0.75 (default)

D threshAdjust = 0.85

Legend:
- 3'-UTR (<= 150 bp downstream of STOP codon) (cyan)
- 3'-UTR & Coding Region (red)
- 5'-UTR (<= 450 bp upstream of START codon) (gold)
- Intergenic (dark green)
- Coding Region (light purple)

B threshAdjust = 0.75 (default)

PIPETS: 122, overlap 240, Dar: 1203

E threshAdjust = 0.85

PIPETS: 413, overlap 745, Dar: 698

C / **F** Read Coverage Distribution of Dar Analysis Specific Peaks

threshAdjust = 0.75 (default): 253, 118, 90, 193, 547

threshAdjust = 0.85: 241, 14, 9, 41, 390

Legend:
- 10 > x (red)
- 10 <= x < 50 (yellow)
- 50 <= x < 100 (blue)
- 100 <= x < 150 (purple)
- 150 <= x (gray)

1
2   **Figure 4: PIPETS analysis of Dar data.** A) Using default parameters on the Dar data, PIPETS identified 362
3   significant peaks, primarily in 3'-UTR and 5'-UTR regions. 3'-UTR peaks for Dar data are as originally reported
4   [2] B) PIPETS identified 240 of the results from the original Dar data and had 122 unique results. C) Of the
5   remaining 1203 Dar analysis specific results, 1085 had 3'-seq read coverage values less than 150 and 800 had
6   read coverage less than 50, which can be too low to distinguish from noise. D) To increase the number of

peaks that PIPETS identified, we reduced the strictness of PIPETS by increasing threshAdjust to 0.85. This
resulted in PIPETS identifying 1158 significant peaks across a broader range of genomic regions. E) PIPETS
identified 745 of the peaks found by the original analysis with these parameter changes, and identified 413
unique 3'-seq peaks. F) Of the 698 Dar analysis specific peaks, only 14 had read coverage values greater than
150. The parameter change of the PIPETS analysis increased its sensitivity to identifying lower read coverage
3'-seq signal.
7
We next tested PIPETS on *Bacillus subtilis* data from the first paper to implement 3'-end

sequencing as a method of studying bacterial termination [2]. The sequencing depth of the

original data was low relative to modern sequencing standards, with no replicate sequencing

file with more than 3 million aligned reads. Their analysis methodology focused only on the

position of highest termination signal in the 5'-UTR and 3'-UTR of annotated genes, did not

consider reads strand specifically, and excluded all other data from analysis. We were curious

whether a more systematic analysis method would alter conclusions of the original work. From

their combined data, Dar et al. identified 1443 total termination positions that passed their

minimum read thresholds and were in the 5'-UTR or 3'-UTR of genes of interest [2].

We first ran PIPETS on the default parameters and compared that results set to the results of

the Dar method. With "threshAdjust" set to 0.75, PIPETS identified 362 significant peaks: 5 were

in intergenic regions, 154 were in the 5'-UTR of genes, 14 were inside coding regions, 170 were

in the 3'-UTR of a gene, and 19 were present in the 3'-UTR of one gene and inside the coding

region of a different adjacent gene (Figure 4A). PIPETS identified 240 of the 1443 sites identified

by the original method (Figure 4B), and while more than half of these remaining sites had 3'-seq

read coverage values less than 50 (Figure 4C), we still wanted to ensure that PIPETS was

properly able to study this data even if most of the identified results had low 3'-seq read

coverages.

In order to improve PIPETS' performance for this data, we changed the "threshAdjust"

parameter from 0.75 to 0.85 to make PIPETS more sensitive to lower 3'-seq read coverages.

With this change, PIPETS identified 1158 significant peaks, 25 were in intergenic regions, 417

were in the 5'-UTR of a gene, 126 were inside coding regions, 522 were in the 3'-UTR of a gene,

and 68 that were present in the 3'-UTR of one gene and inside the coding region of a different

adjacent gene (Figure 4D). Notably, this singular change to PIPETS increased the number of

significant peaks from 362 to 1158, and also helped to greatly increase the number of significant

peaks identified inside of coding regions as well as peaks present in the 3'-UTR of one gene and

inside the coding region of a different adjacent gene. When compared to the original results set,

PIPETS was now able to identify 745 of the original method's peaks (Figure 4E). With only 64 of

the remaining unidentified peaks having 3'-seq read coverage greater than 50 (Figure 4F), we

were confident that PIPETS was appropriately analyzing this data set and identifying most 3'-seq

signal that originated from biologically significant events, yet not imposing arbitrary constraints

on which data are included in the analysis.

15
16 **Figure 5: Peaks per gene changes based on threshAdjust for Dar Data.** While the number of
17 total significant peaks identified by PIPETS increases with change to threshAdjust, the number
18 of genes with multiple peaks per gene does not disproportionately increase. This means that

1 PIPETS is increasingly sensitive to 3'-seq signal inside of more total genes without increasing the
2 rate of misidentifying excess peaks from noise inside of genes.
3
We were curious if the dramatic increase in significant peaks identified by PIPETS upon

parameter changes had any recognizable pattern in the data. We tested if the change in number

of peaks found in coding regions had any preferential changes. A large increase in the number

of genic peaks identified within a small number of highly expressed genes would potentially

indicate an increase in calling noisy 3'-end coverage within high coverage areas as legitimate

peaks. The results run with "threshAdjust" = 0.75 had very few genes with any significant peak

identified inside, and there were no genes that had more than one peak inside for the top

strand and no genes with more than 2 peaks for the complement strand (Figure 5). When

PIPETS was run with "threshAdjust" = 0.85, while there was a large increase in the total number

of genes with significant peaks inside, there was not a proportional increase in the number of

genes with more than one significant peak inside (Figure 5). While there is no expected value of

potential alternative termination sites inside of any given coding region, we would not expect

there to be many genes with several termination sites (greater than 5) due to potential negative

overcomplexity. The increased sensitivity PIPETS ("threshAdjust" = 0.85) rarely identified more

than 3 peaks within a single gene, suggesting that the parameter change increases PIPETS

sensitivity to identifying signal, without mistakenly over-identifying noise within gene coding

regions as significant results.

Figure 6: Representative selection of PIPETS specific results from Dar data. A) PIPETS uniquely identified a 3'-seq peak that is inside of the *rnpB* gene and in the 5'-UTR of the *rlmKB* gene. The positioning of this peak could allow it to function as a regulating signal for both genes. B) PIPETS uniquely identified a significant peak in the 5'-UTR of the *recQ* gene. The IGV displayed read buildup indicates that this peak has dramatically higher read coverage than the surrounding region, suggesting biological relevance. C) PIPETS uniquely identified 14 significant 3'-seq peaks from 14 tRNA's in a ~2000 bp region. Each of the peaks indicated by arrows were not identified by the Dar analysis, and while tRNA's are often not the focus 3'-seq studies, these peaks account for all of the 3'-seq signal in these areas and the magnitude of these peaks suggests biological relevance.

Among the significant peaks identified by PIPETS that were not identified in the Dar method,

there are many instances of clear 3'-ends occurring within genes. We identified two examples of

PIPETS specific significant peaks that corresponded with clearly biologically relevant sites for

genes in the *B. subtilis* genome. When visualized with IGV, read buildups at the annotated ends

of the *rlmKB* and *recQ* genes (Figure 6A and 6B respectively) drops off dramatically after the

position identified by PIPETS as a significant 3'-seq read coverage peak. This indicates a standard

termination signal where the large buildup of 3'-seq reads at the site identified by PIPETS

provides insight to a termination event that was undetected by the Dar analysis. We also noted

that the Dar method largely ignored signal associated with various non-coding sequence

annotations, including tRNAs. While tRNA's are not often considered in analyses of this nature,

they still make up a significant portion of the total 3'-seq read depth for these files. We highlight

here that PIPETS identified significant 3'-seq peaks for a set of 14 tRNA's in a ~2000 bp region

that directly correspond with IGV signal in the same positions (Figure 6C). While such sites are

accessible via reanalysis of the raw data, this omission during initial analysis points toward the

challenges of comparing different datasets, generated by different labs, using different

organisms, analyzed with *ad hoc* tools, in order to gain broader insight into how 3'-end

generation differs across bacterial species.

<u>Conclusions:</u>

The number of studies utilizing 3'-seq is rapidly increasing across diverse sets of organisms, yet

there is not an easy to download, standardized analysis method currently available. Here we

present PIPETS, a new 3'-seq analysis method that identifies statistically significant 3'-seq signal

in a gene annotation agnostic fashion. When compared to existing 3'-seq analysis

methodologies, PIPETS identified many significant 3'-seq signals outside of the 3'-UTR of genes,

without sacrificing the ability to identify most of the highly expressed 3'-seq sites in the 3'-UTRs.

The tunable parameters of PIPETS allow for the adjustment of the sensitivity of the analysis,

which allows PIPETS to analyze data of varying read depths as well as account for biological

differences between different species. When studying the data presented here, we noted a

large proportion of the significant identified peaks were present outside the 3'-UTR of

annotated genes. While altering the ad hoc definitions of 5'- and 3'-UTR to be more inclusive of

coding regions may capture more of these peaks, such definitions may ultimately vary across

diverse organisms and ultimately remove biologically relevant sites from analysis based on

arbitrary constraints. Given the likely biological implications of 3'-seq signal inside of gene

coding regions as well as other genomic regions, it is important to ensure that 3'-data a

comprehensively assessed in annotation agnostic ways. With its statistically informed

significance measures, PIPETS is able to more confidentially parse signal from noise in 3'-Seq

data, and identify potentially biologically significant results in genome regions that have

previously been un-analyzed.

<u>Additional Files:</u>

Supplementary Figures: Furumo_Supplementary_Figs.pdf, pdf file, Results from PIPETS

parameter testing demonstrating insensitivity to minor parameter adjustments.

Additional Datafile 1: Warrier_PIPETS_Results.csv, csv file, all PIPETS predicted peaks (default

parameters) from Warrier et. al. [4] dataset described.

Additional Datafile 2: Dar_PIPETS_Results_threshAdjust075.csv, csv file, all PIPETS

(threshAdjust=0.75) predicted peaks from Dar et al. [2] dataset.

Additional Datafile 3: Dar_PIPETS_Results_threshAdjust085.csv, csv file, all PIPETS

(threshAdjust=0.85) predicted peaks from Dar et al. [2] dataset.

Declarations:

<u>Ethics approval and consent to participate:</u>

Not applicable.

<u>Consent for publication:</u>

All authors give consent for publication.

<u>Availability and requirements:</u>

Project Name: PIPETS: Poisson Identification of Peaks from Term-Seq data

Project home page: https://bioconductor.org/packages/release/bioc/html/PIPETS.html or

https://github.com/qfurumo/PIPETS

Operating system(s): Platform independent

Programming language: R

Other requirements: R >4.4.0

License: GPL-3

Any restrictions to use by non-academics: none.

<u>Competing Interests:</u>

No competing interest is declared.

<u>Funding:</u>

This work was supported by National Institute of Health (NIH) grants awarded to M.M.:

R21AI148895 and R01GM134259.

<u>Author Contributions:</u>

Q.F. and M.M. conceptualized the software, Q.F. developed the software and published it, Q.F.

and M.M analyzed the results. Q.F. and M.M. wrote and reviewed the manuscript.

<u>Acknowledgements:</u>

We would like to thank Irem Ozkan and Leo Ahumada Manuel for their invaluable assistance as

early testers of PIPETS. We would also like to thank the Bioconductor team for their support

during the submission process.

<u>Citations:</u>

1. Dar D, Sorek R. High-resolution RNA 3'-ends mapping of bacterial Rho-dependent transcripts.
Nucleic Acids Res. 2018;46:6797–805.

2. Dar D, Shamir M, Mellin JR, Koutero M, Stern-Ginossar N, Cossart P, et al. Term-seq reveals abundant ribo-regulation of antibiotics resistance in bacteria. Science. 2016;352:aad9822.

3. Konikkat S, Scribner MR, Eutsey R, Hiller NL, Cooper VS, McManus J. Quantitative mapping of mRNA 3' ends in Pseudomonas aeruginosa reveals a pervasive role for premature 3' end formation in response to azithromycin. PLoS Genet. 2021;17:e1009634.

4. Warrier I, Ram-Mohan N, Zhu Z, Hazery A, Echlin H, Rosch J, et al. The Transcriptional landscape of Streptococcus pneumoniae TIGR4 reveals a complex operon architecture and abundant riboregulation critical for growth and virulence. PLoS Pathog. 2018;14:e1007461.

5. Millman A, Dar D, Shamir M, Sorek R. Computational prediction of regulatory, premature transcription termination in bacteria. Nucleic Acids Res. 2017;45:886–93.

6. Petroni E, Esnault C, Tetreault D, Dale RK, Storz G, Adams PP. Extensive diversity in RNA termination and regulation revealed by transcriptome mapping for the Lyme pathogen B. burgdorferi. bioRxiv. 2023;:2023.01.04.522626.

7. Ju X, Li D, Liu S. Full-length RNA profiling reveals pervasive bidirectional transcription terminators in bacteria. Nat Microbiol. 2019;4:1907–18.

8. Mandell ZF, Oshiro RT, Yakhnin AV, Vishwakarma R, Kashlev M, Kearns DB, et al. NusG is an intrinsic transcription termination factor that stimulates motility and coordinates gene expression with NusA. Elife. 2021;10:e61880.

9. Saberi F, Kamali M, Najafi A, Yazdanparast A, Moghaddam MM. Natural antisense RNAs as mRNA regulatory elements in bacteria: a review on function and applications. Cell Mol Biol Lett. 2016;21:6.

10. Chao Y, Vogel J. A 3' UTR-Derived Small RNA Provides the Regulatory Noncoding Arm of the Inner Membrane Stress Response. Mol Cell. 2016;61:352–63.

11. Ruiz de los Mozos I, Vergara-Irigaray M, Segura V, Villanueva M, Bitarte N, Saramago M, et al. Base pairing interaction between 5'- and 3'-UTRs controls icaR mRNA translation in Staphylococcus aureus. PLoS Genet. 2013;9:e1004001.

12. Vanderpool CK, Balasubramanian D, Lloyd CR. Dual-function RNA regulators in bacteria. Biochimie. 2011;93:1943–9.

13. Rosinski-Chupin I, Sauvage E, Sismeiro O, Villain A, Da Cunha V, Caliot M-E, et al. Single nucleotide resolution RNA-seq uncovers new regulatory mechanisms in the opportunistic pathogen Streptococcus agalactiae. BMC Genomics. 2015;16:419.

14. Papenfort K, Vogel J. Regulatory RNA in bacterial pathogens. Cell Host Microbe. 2010;8:116–27.

15. Lawrence M, Huber W, Pagès H, Aboyoun P, Carlson M, Gentleman R, et al. Software for
computing and annotating genomic ranges. PLoS Comput Biol. 2013;9:e1003118.

16. Conway T, Creecy JP, Maddox SM, Grissom JE, Conkle TL, Shadid TM, et al. Unprecedented
High-Resolution View of Bacterial Operon Architecture Revealed by RNA Sequencing. mBio.
2014;5:10.1128/mbio.01442-14.

17. Stringer AM, Baniulyte G, Lasek-Nesselquist E, Seed KD, Wade JT. Transcription termination
and antitermination of bacterial CRISPR arrays. Elife. 2020;9:e58182.

18. Mitra P, Ghosh G, Hafeezunnisa M, Sen R. Rho Protein: Roles and Mechanisms. Annu Rev
Microbiol. 2017;71:687–709.

10
11