A joint model of cell-type-specific RNA and protein expressions in the human brain

Donglu Bai, Prashant S. Emani, Mark Gerstein^{*}, Departments of Molecular Biophysics and Biochemistry, Yale University, New Haven, CT 06520, USA

Motivation and Workflow



• No proteomic amplification methods as the same resolution as singlecell RNA-seq

• To address this, we have leveraged scRNA-seq to aid in identification of celltype-specific proteomic signatures by incorporating the

Results

Yale

Transcriptional parameters for marker gene SLC17A7

The probability that the gene is in the "on" state: $P_{on} = \frac{K_{on}}{K_{on} + K_{off}}$

The variation of transcriptional parameters across different cell types for SLC17A7





Inference Target

Gene activation & transcriptional rates

Deconvolution of cell-type proportions

Cell-type protein translational rates

Train/test linear ML for inferring cell-type protein signatures

Genomics Assay(s) Single-cell RNAseq (ROSMAP)

Single-cell RNA-seq + Bulk-tissue RNAseq (ROSMAP)

Proteomics (ROSMAP)

Proteomics (ROSMAP) + Cell-type proportions +transcriptional parameters

Methods and Approaches

Noisy Beta-Poisson Model

Based our model on the BPSC model of Vu et al^{*}, but with a noise term H(Y|x) added

 $Q(Y) = \sum H(Y|x). P(x)$ М

stochastic nature of gene expression

• Our goal is to better understand the biological variation between cell-type specific mRNA and protein distributions in human brain tissue samples

Cell-type specific protein translation rates



$$P(x) = p_0 I(x = 0) + (1 - p_0) \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} p_m BP\left(\frac{x}{\lambda_2^{(m)}}\right) \alpha^{(m)}, \beta^{(m)}, \lambda_1^{(m)}$$

$$H(Y|x) = Binomial(Y|x, p_T) = {\binom{x}{Y}} \cdot (1 - p_T)^{x-Y} \cdot p_T^{Y}$$

Y = Experimentally Observed RNA counts x = Underlying "true" RNA counts p_{T} = Probability of counts dropping out

Transcriptional bursting rate: $s \equiv \lambda_1$ Probability of gene being "on": $p \equiv u$ Gene activation rate: $k_{On} \equiv \alpha$ Gene inactivation rate: $k_{Off} \equiv \beta$

For our current implementation(m), we only consider a single mode

Deconvolution of cell-type proportions in mixtures

We deconvolve the bulk RNA-seq expression using the same snRNA-seq data we used for the parameter inference



Inference of cell-type specific protein translation rates

For solving the master equation for RNA and protein numbers, the equilibrium protein numbers are*:

$$\langle n \rangle_{gc} = \nu'_{Transl,gc} \cdot s'_{gc} \cdot \frac{1}{\frac{k'_{off,gc}}{1 + \frac{k'_{off,gc}}{1 + \frac{k'$$

Assessing test error (RMSE) in linear ML



Density Distribution of P-values for Two Permutation Types





Assumption: The translation rate is the same across individuals, but different across cell types and genes

Train and test linear ML for inferring cell-type protein signatures



Conclusions and Future Directions

- SLC17A7 is an excitatory neuron marker, yet it shows high P_{on} and s for inhibitory neurons. This shows that our inferred transcriptional rates may lack biological accuracy. We may need to adjust parameter fitting for low-expression profiles or use single-cell ATAC-seq for better constraint
- Bisque deconvolution confirms expected cell-type proportions
- Low slopes and R square indicate a minor negative correlation between transcriptional and translational rates, as expected
- The permuted labels in proteomics have a significant effect given the high density of low pvalues. In contrast, the permuted cell type labels doesn't show as strong an effect given its broader p-value distribution

Bennett, David A., et al. "Religious orders study and rush memory and aging project." Journal of Alzheimer's disease 64.s1 (2018): S161-S189. Vu, Trung Nghia, et al. "Beta-Poisson model for single-cell RNA-seq data analyses." Bioinformatics 32.14 (2016): 2128-2135. Peccoud, Jean, and Bernard Ycart. "Markovian modeling of gene-product synthesis." Theoretical population biology 48.2 (1995): 222-234 Shahrezaei, Vahid, and Peter S. Swain. "The stochastic nature of biochemical networks." Current opinion in biotechnology 19.4 (2008): 369-374