LETTER

# EVIDENCE THAT INCONSISTENT GENE PREDICTION CAN MISLEAD ANALYSIS OF ALGAL GENOMES

Yibi Chen

Institute for Molecular Bioscience, The University of Queensland, Brisbane, QLD 4072, Australia; School of Chemistry and Molecular Biosciences, The University of Queensland, Brisbane, QLD 4072, Australia

Timothy G. Stephens

Institute for Molecular Bioscience, The University of Queensland, Brisbane, QLD 4072, Australia

Debashish Bhattacharya

Department of Biochemistry and Microbiology, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, NJ 08901, USA

Raúl A. González-Pech

Institute for Molecular Bioscience, The University of Queensland, Brisbane, QLD 4072, Australia

Cheong Xin Chan[1]

Institute for Molecular Bioscience, The University of Queensland, Brisbane, QLD 4072, Australia; School of Chemistry and Molecular Biosciences, The University of Queensland, Brisbane, Queensland 4072, Australia

[1]Author for correspondence, e-mail: c.chan1@uq.edu.au, phone number: +61-7-33462617, fax number: +61-7-33462101

## Abstract

Comparative algal genomics often relies on predicted gene models from *de novo* assembled genomes. However, the artifacts introduced by different gene-prediction approaches, and their impact on comparative genomic analysis, remains poorly understood. Here, using available genome data from six dinoflagellate species in Symbiodiniaceae, we identified potential methodological biases in the published gene models that were predicted using different approaches. We developed and applied a comprehensive customized workflow to predict genes from these genomes. The observed variation among predicted gene models resulting from our workflow agreed with current understanding of phylogenetic relationships among these taxa, whereas those published earlier were largely biased by the distinct approaches used in each instance. Importantly, these biases mislead the inference of homologous gene families and synteny among genomes, thus impacting biological interpretation of these data. Our results demonstrate that a consistent gene-prediction approach is critical for comparative genomics, particularly for non-model algal genomes.


We implemented a customized, comprehensive workflow to predict protein-coding genes in six published draft Symbiodiniaceae genomes: *Breviolum minutum* (Shoguchi et al. 2013), *Symbiodinium tridacnidorum*, *Cladocopium* sp. C92 (Shoguchi et al. 2018), *Symbiodinium microadriaticum* (Aranda et al. 2016), *Cladocopium goreaui* and *Fugacium kawagutii* (Liu et al. 2018). These draft genomes, generated largely using short-read sequence data, remain fragmented (e.g. N50 lengths range from 98.0 Kb for *C. goreaui* to 573.5 Kb for *S. microadriaticum*); we treat these genome assemblies independently as is standard practice. The published gene models from these four studies were predicted using three different approaches: (a) *ab initio* using AUGUSTUS (Stanke et al. 2006) guided by transcriptome data (Shoguchi et al. 2013, Shoguchi et al. 2018), (b) *ab initio* using AUGUSTUS guided by

[1]Author for correspondence, e-mail: c.chan1@uq.edu.au, phone number: +61-7-33462617, fax number: +61-7-33462101

a more stringent selection of genes (Aranda et al. 2016), and (c) a more-thorough approach incorporating evidence from transcriptomes, machine learning tools, homology to known sequences and *ab initio* methods (Liu et al. 2018). Because repetitive regions are commonly removed prior to gene prediction, multi-copy genes are sometimes mis-identified as repeats and excluded from the final gene models. To address this issue, we adapted the workflow from Liu et al. (2018) to ignore inferred repeats in the final step that integrates multiple evidence sources using EVidenceModeler (Haas et al. 2008). To minimize potential contaminants in the published draft genomes and their impact on gene prediction, we identified and removed genome scaffolds that share high similarity (BLASTn, $E \leq 10^{-20}$, bit-score $\geq 1000$, query cover $\geq 5\%$) to bacterial, archaeal and viral genome sequences, adopting a similar approach to Liu et al. (2018). We then compared, for each genome, the published gene models in the remaining scaffolds against the predicted gene models in these same scaffolds using our approach. Specifically, we assessed metrics of gene models, and the inference of homologous gene families and conserved synteny within a phylogenetic context.

For simplicity, hereinafter we refer to the published gene models as $\alpha$ genes, and those predicted in this study as $\beta$ genes. Compared to $\alpha$ genes, the structure of $\beta$ genes (based on the distribution of intron lengths) resembles more closely the structure of dinoflagellate genes inferred using transcriptome data (Figure S1). These results suggest that $\beta$ genes are likely to be more biologically realistic. Variation between $\alpha$ and $\beta$ genes was assessed using the following ten metrics: number of predicted genes per genome, average gene length, number of exons per genome, average exon length, number of introns per genome, average intron length, proportion of splice-donor site motifs (GT, GC or GA), number of intergenic regions, and average length of intergenic regions.

[1]Author for correspondence, e-mail: c.chan1@uq.edu.au, phone number: +61-7-33462617, fax number: +61-7-33462101

As shown in Table S1, the metrics for $\alpha$ and $\beta$ genes differed substantially. The number of $\alpha$ genes per genome was much higher in some cases and showed greater variation (mean 48,050; standard deviation 16,741) than that of $\beta$ genes (mean 32,819; standard deviation 7567). This is likely due to the more-stringent criteria used by our workflow to delineate protein-coding genes. The larger variation in the number of $\alpha$ genes is likely due to biases arising from the distinct prediction methods and not assembly artifacts, because the same genome assembly for each species was used to independently derive $\alpha$ and $\beta$ genes. In general, most predicted genes (>60% genes in each genome) were supported by transcriptome evidence (BLASTn, $E \leqslant 10^{-10}$). In some cases, $\beta$ genes have stronger transcriptome support than $\alpha$ genes; e.g. 82.6% compared to 66.9% in *S. tridacnidorum*, and 78.4% compared to 61.9% in *Cladocopium* sp. C92 (Table S1).

Variation in the ten observed metrics among $\alpha$ and $\beta$ genes was also assessed using Principal Component Analysis (Fig. 1a). The $\alpha$ genes are more widespread along principal component 1 (PC1, between –0.54 and 0.44), with those based on AUGUSTUS-predominant workflows distinctly separated (PC1 < –0.18; Fig. 1a). The $\beta$ genes are distributed more narrowly on PC1 (between –0.01 and 0.36) and more widely along principal component 2 (PC2; between –0.56 and 0.20). Interestingly, the distribution of genes along PC2 exhibits a pattern that is consistent with our current understanding of the phylogeny of these six species (Fig. 1b). Specifically, the *Symbiodinium* species are clearly separated from the others along PC2 (Fig. 1a) and the two *Cladocopium* species are clustered more closely based on $\beta$, rather than $\alpha$ genes. Therefore, PC1 (explaining 52.47% of the variance) largely reflects the variation introduced by distinct gene prediction methods, whereas the distribution along PC2 (explaining 25.83% of the variance) is likely attributable to the phylogeny of these species. This result suggests that variation among $\alpha$ genes is predominantly due to methodological

[1]Author for correspondence, e-mail: c.chan1@uq.edu.au, phone number: +61-7-33462617, fax number: +61-7-33462101

biases, and that these biases are larger compared to those of *β* genes. Variation in the latter appears to be more biologically relevant and consistent with Symbiodiniaceae evolution.

Genomes that are phylogenetically closely related are expected to share greater synteny than those that are more distantly related. Here, we defined a collinear syntenic gene block as a region common to two genomes in which five or more genes are coded in the same order and orientation. These gene blocks were identified using SynChro (Drillon et al. 2014) at *Delta* = 4. Overall, 421 collinear syntenic blocks (implicating 2454 genes) between any genome-pairs were identified among *α* genes, compared to 426 blocks (implicating 2553 genes) among *β* genes (Figs. 2a and 2b). Based on *α* genes comparison (Fig. 2a), *S. microadriaticum* and *S. tridacnidorum* shared the largest number of syntenic blocks (130; 760 genes), whereas *S. microadriaticum* and *F. kawagutii* shared the fewest (1; 6 genes). Surprisingly, *S. tridacnidorum* and *Cladocopium* sp. C92 shared 38 blocks (222 genes). This close relationship is not evident between any other pair of genomes from these two genera (e.g. only 3 blocks implicating 15 genes between *S. microadriaticum* and *C. goreaui*), and is even closer than the relationship between the two *Cladocopium* species (i.e. *C. goreaui* and C92: 33 blocks, 187 genes). The unexpectedly high conserved synteny between *S. tridacnidorum* and *Cladocopium* sp. C92 may be explained by the fact that these genes were predicted with the same method (Shoguchi et al. 2018). In contrast, based on the *β* genes comparison (Fig. 2b), the number of syntenic blocks shared between any *Symbiodinium* and *Cladocopium* species did not vary to the same extent; e.g. 7 blocks (38 genes) between *S. tridacnidorum* and *Cladocopium* sp. C92, and 10 blocks (55 genes) between *S. microadriaticum* and *C. goreaui*. The number of *β* genes implicated in blocks shared by these two genera is also smaller than those between the two *Cladocopium* species (263 genes in 48 blocks), consistent with their closer phylogenetic relationship.

[1]Author for correspondence, e-mail: c.chan1@uq.edu.au, phone number: +61-7-33462617, fax number: +61-7-33462101

To assess the impact of methodological biases on the delineation of homologous gene families, Orthofinder v2.3.1 (Emms and Kelly 2018) was used to infer "orthogroups" from protein sequences (i.e. homologous protein sets) encoded by the $\alpha$ and $\beta$ genes (Figs 2c and 2d). More homologous sets were inferred among the $\alpha$ genes (33,580) than among the $\beta$ genes (26,380), likely due to the higher number of $\alpha$ genes in all genomes. Genomes from closely related taxa are expected to share more homologous sequences (and therefore more sets) than those that are phylogenetically distant. Most of the identified homologous sets (6431 from $\alpha$ genes, 4941 from $\beta$ genes) contained sequences from all analyzed taxa; these represent core gene families of Symbiodiniaceae. Similar to the results of the synteny analysis described above, the pattern of homologous sets shared between members from *Symbiodinium* and *Cladocopium* varies among the $\alpha$ genes (Fig. 2c). For instance, 638 homologous sets are shared only between *S. tridacnidorum* and *Cladocopium* sp. C92, compared to 89 between *C. goreaui* and *S. tridacnidorum*. In contrast, the corresponding number of homologous sets inferred based on $\beta$ genes are closer to each other (Fig. 2d); i.e. 100 between *S. tridacnidorum* and *Cladocopium* sp. C92, and 132 between *C. goreaui* and *S. tridacnidorum*.

Our results indicate that comparative genomics using the $\alpha$ genes (i.e. simply based on published gene models) could lead to the inference that *S. tridacnidorum* and *Cladocopium* sp. C92 are more closely related with each other than is each of them with other isolates in their corresponding genus. The bias introduced by different gene-prediction approaches can significantly impact downstream comparative genomic analyses and lead to incorrect biological interpretations. We therefore urge the research community to consider a consistent gene-prediction workflow when pursuing comparative genomics, particularly among highly divergent, non-model algal genomes. Although we only considered dinoflagellate genomes

[1]Author for correspondence, e-mail: c.chan1@uq.edu.au, phone number: +61-7-33462617, fax number: +61-7-33462101

from a single family in this study, the implication of our results can be applied more broadly to all other non-model eukaryote genomes.

**Acknowledgements**

TGS is supported by an Australian Government Research Training Program Scholarship. RAGP is supported by an International Postgraduate Research Scholarship and a University of Queensland Centenary Scholarship. This work was supported by Australian Research Council grants (DP150101875 and DP190102474) awarded to CXC and DB, and the computational resources of the Australian National Computational Infrastructure (NCI) Facility through the NCI Merit Allocation Scheme (project d85) awarded to CXC.

**References**

Aranda, M., Li, Y., Liew, Y. J., Baumgarten, S., Simakov, O., Wilson, M. C., Piel, J., Ashoor, H., Bougouffa, S., Bajic, V. B., Ryu, T., Ravasi, T., Bayer, T., Micklem, G., Kim, H., Bhak, J., LaJeunesse, T. C. & Voolstra, C. R. 2016. Genomes of coral dinoflagellate symbionts highlight evolutionary adaptations conducive to a symbiotic lifestyle. *Scientific Reports* **6**:39734.

Drillon, G., Carbone, A. & Fischer, G. 2014. SynChro: a fast and easy tool to reconstruct and visualize synteny blocks along eukaryotic chromosomes. *PLoS ONE* **9**:e92621.

Emms, D. M. & Kelly, S. 2018. OrthoFinder2: fast and accurate phylogenomic orthology analysis from gene sequences. *bioRxiv*:466201.

Haas, B. J., Salzberg, S. L., Zhu, W., Pertea, M., Allen, J. E., Orvis, J., White, O., Buell, C. R. & Wortman, J. R. 2008. Automated eukaryotic gene structure annotation using EVidenceModeler and the Program to Assemble Spliced Alignments. *Genome Biol.* **9**:1.

[1]Author for correspondence, e-mail: c.chan1@uq.edu.au, phone number: +61-7-33462617, fax number: +61-7-33462101

LaJeunesse, T. C., Parkinson, J. E., Gabrielson, P. W., Jeong, H. J., Reimer, J. D., Voolstra, C. R. & Santos, S. R. 2018. Systematic revision of Symbiodiniaceae highlights the antiquity and diversity of coral endosymbionts. *Curr. Biol.* **28**:2570-80.

Liu, H., Stephens, T. G., González-Pech, R. A., Beltran, V. H., Lapeyre, B., Bongaerts, P., Cooke, I., Aranda, M., Bourne, D. G., Forêt, S., Miller, D. J., van Oppen, M. J. H., Voolstra, C. R., Ragan, M. A. & Chan, C. X. 2018. *Symbiodinium* genomes reveal adaptive evolution of functions related to coral-dinoflagellate symbiosis. *Commun. Biol.* **1**:95.

Shoguchi, E., Beedessee, G., Tada, I., Hisata, K., Kawashima, T., Takeuchi, T., Arakaki, N., Fujie, M., Koyanagi, R., Roy, M. C., Kawachi, M., Hidaka, M., Satoh, N. & Shinzato, C. 2018. Two divergent *Symbiodinium* genomes reveal conservation of a gene cluster for sunscreen biosynthesis and recently lost genes. *BMC Genomics* **19**:458.

Shoguchi, E., Shinzato, C., Kawashima, T., Gyoja, F., Mungpakdee, S., Koyanagi, R., Takeuchi, T., Hisata, K., Tanaka, M. & Fujiwara, M. 2013. Draft assembly of the *Symbiodinium minutum* nuclear genome reveals dinoflagellate gene structure. *Curr. Biol.* **23**:1399-408.

Stanke, M., Keller, O., Gunduz, I., Hayes, A., Waack, S. & Morgenstern, B. 2006. AUGUSTUS: *ab initio* prediction of alternative transcripts. *Nucleic Acids Res.* **34**:W435-W39.

## Data accessibility

All genome data (after removal of microbial contaminants), and the predicted gene models from this study are available at: https://cloudstor.aarnet.edu.au/plus/s/JXALPndBKLNYgF9

[1]Author for correspondence, e-mail: c.chan1@uq.edu.au, phone number: +61-7-33462617, fax number: +61-7-33462101

## Author contribution

YC, RAGP and CXC conceived the study and designed the experiments. YC conducted all computational analyses. YC, TGS, RAGP and CXC analyzed and interpreted the results. YC and RAGP prepared all figures, tables, and the first draft of this manuscript. YC, TGS and RAGP provided analytical tools and scripts. All authors wrote, reviewed, commented on and approved the final manuscript.

## Competing interests

The authors declare no competing interests.

[1]Author for correspondence, e-mail: c.chan1@uq.edu.au, phone number: +61-7-33462617, fax number: +61-7-33462101

202 **Figures**




203

204 **Fig. 1. Gene metrics of *α* and *β* genes from six Symbiodiniaceae genomes.** (a) Principal
205 Component Analysis plot based on ten metrics of the predicted gene models, shown for the *α*
206 genes in orange, and the *β* genes in purple, for each of the six genomes (noted in different
207 symbols) as indicated in the legend. The two *Cladocopium* species and the two *Symbiodinium*
208 species were highlighted for clarity. (b) A tree topology depicting the phylogenetic
209 relationship among the six taxa, based on (LaJeunesse et al. 2018).

210

[1]Author for correspondence, e-mail: c.chan1@uq.edu.au, phone number: +61-7-33462617, fax number: +61-7-33462101




**Fig. 2. Conserved synteny and homologous sets among six Symbiodiniaceae genomes.** The number of collinear syntenic gene blocks between each genome-pair is shown for those inferred based on (a) *α* and (b) *β* genes; the upper bar chart shows the number of blocks, the lower bar chart shows the number of implicated genes in these blocks, and the middle panel shows the genome-pairs corresponding to each bar with a line joining the dots that represent the implicated taxa. The number of homologous sets inferred from (c) *α* and (d) *β* genes is shown, in which the taxa represented in the set corresponding to each bar are indicated in the bottom panel. The most remarkable differences between (a) and (b), and (c) and (d), focusing on *Symbiodinium* and *Cladocopium* species are highlighted in red.

[1]Author for correspondence, e-mail: c.chan1@uq.edu.au, phone number: +61-7-33462617, fax number: +61-7-33462101