Structure determination of genomes and genomic domains by satisfaction of spatial restraints

Assessing the limits of restraint-based 3D Genomics

Marc A. Marti-Renom

Structural Genomics Group (ICREA, CNAG-CRG)

http://marciuslab.org
http://3DGenomes.org
http://cnag.crg.eu



Hybrid Method

Baù, D. & Marti-Renom, M. A. Methods 58, 300–306 (2012).

Experiments



Computation

Restraint-based Modeling

Baù, D. & Marti-Renom, M. A. Methods 58, 300–306 (2012).



Biomolecular structure determination 2D-NOESY data



Chromosome structure determination 3C-based data



http://3DGenomes.org



Are the models correct?



Jhunjhunwala (2008) Cell



Fraser (2009) Genome Biology Ferraiuolo (2010) Nucleic Acids Research



Kalhor (2011) Nature Biotechnology Tjong (2012) Genome Research



Junier (2012) Nucleic Acids Research



Duan (2010) Nature



Baù (2011) Nature Structural & Molecular Biology



Hu (2013) PLoS Computational Biology

Nucleic Acids Research Advance Access published March 23, 2015

Nucleic Acids Research, 2015 1 doi: 10.1093/nar/gkv221

Assessing the limits of restraint-based 3D modeling of genomes and genomic domains

Marie Trussart^{1,2}, François Serra^{3,4}, Davide Baù^{3,4}, Ivan Junier^{2,3}, Luís Serrano^{1,2,5} and Marc A. Marti-Renom^{3,4,5,*}

¹EMBL/CRG Systems Biology Research Unit, Centre for Genomic Regulation (CRG), Barcelona, Spain, ²Universitat Pompeu Fabra (UPF), Barcelona, Spain, ³Gene Regulation, Stem Cells and Cancer Program, Centre for Genomic Regulation (CRG), Barcelona, Spain, ⁴Genome Biology Group, Centre Nacional d'Anàlisi Genòmica (CNAG), Barcelona, Spain and ⁵Institució Catalana de Recerca i Estudis Avançats (ICREA), Barcelona, Spain

Received January 16, 2015; Revised February 16, 2015; Accepted February 22, 2015

ABSTRACT

Restraint-based modeling of genomes has been recently explored with the advent of Chromosome Conformation Capture (3C-based) experiments. We previously developed a reconstruction method to resolve the 3D architecture of both prokaryotic and eukaryotic genomes using 3C-based data. These models were congruent with fluorescent imaging validation. However, the limits of such methods have not systematically been assessed. Here we propose the first evaluation of a mean-field restraint-based reconstruction of genomes by considering diverse chromosome architectures and different levels of data noise and structural variability. The results show that: first, current scoring functions for 3D reconstruction correlate with the accuracy of the models; second, reconstructed models are robust to noise but sensitive to structural variability; third, the local structure organization of genomes, such as Topologically Associating Domains, results in more accurate models; fourth, to a certain extent, the models capture the intrinsic structural variability in the input matrices and fifth, the accuracy of the models can be a priori predicted by analyzing the properties of the interaction matrices. In summary, our work provides a systematic analysis of the limitations of a meanfield restrain-based method, which could be taken into consideration in further development of methods as well as their applications.

INTRODUCTION

expression regulation and replication (1-6). The advent of the so-called Chromosome Conformation Capture (3C) as-says (7), which allowed identifying chromatin-looping interactions between pairs of loci, helped deciphering some of the key elements organizing the genomes. High-throughput derivations of genome-wide 3C-based assays were established with Hi-C technologies (8) for an unbiased identification of chromatin interactions. The resulting genome in-teraction matrices from Hi-C experiments have been extensively used for computationally analyzing the organization of genomes and genomic domains (5). In particular, a sig-nificant number of new approaches for modeling the 3D organization of genomes have recently flourished (9-14). The main goal of such approaches is to provide an accurate 3D representation of the bi-dimensional interaction matrices, which can then be more easily explored to extract biolog-ical insights. One type of methods for building 3D models from interaction matrices relies on the existence of a limited number of conformational states in the cell. Such methods are regarded as mean-field approaches and are able to capture, to a certain degree, the structural variability around these mean structures (15).

We recently developed a mean-field method for modeling 3D structures of genomes and genomic domains based on 3C interaction data (9). Our approach, called TADbit, was developed around the Integrative Modeling Platform (IMP, http://integrativemodeing.org), a general framework for restraint-based modeling of 3D bio-molecular structures (16). Briefly, our method uses chromatin interaction frequencies derived from experiments as a proxy of spatial proximity between the ligation products of the 3C libraries. Two fragments of DNA that interact with high frequency are dynamically placed close in space in our models while two fragments that do not interact as often will be kept apart. Our method has been successfully applied to model the structures of genomes and genomic domains in eukaryote and prokarvote organisms (17-19). In all of our studies. the final models were partially validated by assessing their

*To whom correspondence should be addressed. Tel: +34 934 020 542; Fax: +34 934 037 279; Email: mmarti@pcb.ub.cat

Recent studies of the three-dimensional (3D) conforma-

tion of genomes are revealing insights into the organiza-

tion and the regulation of biological processes, such as gene

© The Author(s) 2015. Published by Oxford University Press on behalf of Nucleic Acids Research. This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits unrestricted reuse, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Trussart, et al. (2015). Nucleic Acids Research.

Toy models



by Ivan Junier

Toy interaction matrices



Reconstructing toy models



TADs & higher-res are "good"



Noise is "OK"



Structural variability is "NOT OK"



Can we predict the accuracy of the models?



Skewness "side effect"



Can we predict the accuracy of the models?

MMP = -0.0002 * Size + 0.0335 * SK - 0.0229 * KU + 0.0069 * SEV + 0.8126



Higher-res is "good"

put your \$\$ in sequencing

Noise is "OK"

no need to worry much

Structural variability is "NOT OK"

homogenize your cell population!

...but we can differentiate between noise and structural variability

and we can a priori predict the accuracy of the models



Marie Trussart François Serra Davide Baù

Gireesh K. Bogu Yasmina Cuartero François le Dily David Dufour Irene Farabella Mike Goodstadt Francisco Martínez-Jiménez Paula Soler Yannick Spill Marco di Stefano

in collaboration with Ivan Junier (Université Joseph Fourier) & Luís Serrano (CRG)





http://marciuslab.org
http://3DGenomes.org
http://cnag.crg.eu

Shameless promotion...



November 24th-27th, Lisbon



FUNDAÇÃO CALOUSTE GULBENKIAN Instituto Gulbenkian de Ciência http://gtpb.igc.gulbenkian.pt Programmer position available in our group in **Barcelona**



centro nacional de análisis genómico



Starting Nov-Dec 2015 martirenom@cnag.crg.eu