SEPP and TIPP for metagenomic analysis

Tandy Warnow Department of Computer Science University of Texas

Phylogeny (evolutionary tree)



From the Tree of the Life Website, University of Arizona

How did life evolve on earth?



Courtesy of the Tree of Life project

Metagenomics:

Venter et al., Exploring the Sargasso Sea:

Scientists Discover One Million New Genes in Ocean Microbes



Computational Phylogenetics and Metagenomics



Courtesy of the Tree of Life project



Metagenomic data analysis

NGS data produce fragmentary sequence data Metagenomic analyses include unknown species

Taxon identification: given short sequences, identify the species for each fragment

Issues: accuracy and speed

Phylogenetic Placement

Input: Backbone alignment and tree on fulllength sequences, and a set of query sequences (short fragments)

Output: Placement of query sequences on backbone tree

Phylogenetic placement can be used for taxon identification, but it has general applications for phylogenetic analyses of NGS data.

Major Challenges

- Phylogenetic analyses: standard methods have poor accuracy on even moderately large datasets, and the most accurate methods are enormously computationally intensive (weeks or months, high memory requirements)
- Metagenomic analyses: methods for species classification of short reads have *poor sensitivity*. Efficient high throughput is necessary (millions of reads).

Today's Talk

- SATé: Simultaneous Alignment and Tree Estimation (Liu et al., Science 2009, and Liu et al. Systematic Biology, 2011)
- SEPP: SATé-enabled Phylogenetic Placement (Mirarab, Nguyen and Warnow, Pacific Symposium on Biocomputing 2012)
- TIPP: Taxon Identification using Phylogenetic Placement (Nguyen, Mirarab, and Warnow, in preparation -TIPP+Metaphyler collaboration with Mihai Pop and Bo Liu)

Part 1: SATé

- Liu, Nelesen, Raghavan, Linder, and Warnow, *Science*, 19 June 2009, pp. 1561-1564.
- Liu et al., Systematic Biology, 2011, 61(1):90-106
- Public software distribution (open source) through the University of Kansas, in use, world-wide





The true multiple alignment

- Reflects historical substitution, insertion, and deletion events
- Defined using transitive closure of pairwise alignments computed on edges of the true tree



Input: unaligned sequences

- S1 = AGGCTATCACCTGACCTCCA
- S2 = TAGCTATCACGACCGC
- S3 = TAGCTGACCGC
- S4 = TCACGACCGACA

Phase 1: Multiple Sequence Alignment

- S1 = AGGCTATCACCTGACCTCCA
- S2 = TAGCTATCACGACCGC
- S3 = TAGCTGACCGC
- S4 = TCACGACCGACA

- S1 = -AGGCTATCACCTGACCTCCA
- S2 = TAG-CTATCAC--GACCGC--
- S3 = TAG-CT----GACCGC--
- S4 = ----TCAC -GACCGACA

Phase 2: Construct tree

S1 = AGGCTATCACCTGACCTCCAS1 = -AGGCTATCACCTGACCTCCAS2 = TAGCTATCACGACCGCS2 = TAG-CTATCAC--GACCGC---S3 = TAGCTGACCGCS3 = TAG-CT----GACCGC---S4 = TCACGACCGACAS4 = -----TCAC--GACCGC---



Simulation Studies



Two-phase estimation

Alignment methods

- Clustal
- POY (and POY*)
- Probcons (and Probtree)
- Probalign
- MAFFT
- Muscle
- Di-align
- T-Coffee
- Prank (PNAS 2005, Science 2008)
- Opal (ISMB and Bioinf. 2007)
- FSA (PLoS Comp. Bio. 2009)
- Infernal (Bioinf. 2009)
- Etc.

Phylogeny methods

- Bayesian MCMC
- Maximum parsimony
- Maximum likelihood
- Neighbor joining
- FastME
- UPGMA
- Quartet puzzling
- Etc.

RAxML: heuristic for large-scale ML optimization



1000 taxon models, ordered by difficulty (Liu et al., 2009)

Problems

- Large datasets with high rates of evolution are hard to align accurately, and phylogeny estimation methods produce poor trees when alignments are poor.
- Many phylogeny estimation methods have poor accuracy on large datasets (even if given correct alignments)
- *Potentially useful genes are often discarded* if they are difficult to align.

These issues seriously impact large-scale phylogeny estimation (and Tree of Life projects)

Obtain initial alignment and estimated ML tree

Tree







If new alignment/tree pair has worse ML score, realign using a different decomposition

Repeat until termination condition (typically, 24 hours)

One SATé iteration (really 32 subsets)





1000 taxon models, ordered by difficulty



1000 taxon models, ordered by difficulty

24 hour SATé analysis, on desktop machines (Similar improvements for biological datasets)



1000 taxon models ranked by difficulty

Part II: SEPP

- SEPP: SATé-enabled Phylogenetic
 Placement, by Mirarab, Nguyen, and Warnow
- Pacific Symposium on Biocomputing, 2012 (special session on the Human Microbiome)

Phylogenetic Placement

 Align each query sequence to backbone alignment

 Place each query sequence into backbone tree, using extended alignment

Align Sequence

- S1 = -AGGCTATCACCTGACCTCCA-AA
- S2 = TAG-CTATCAC--GACCGC--GCA
- S3 = TAG-CT----GACCGC--GCT
- S4 = TAC---TCAC--GACCGACAGCT
- Q1 = TAAAAC



Align Sequence



S2

S3

S1

S2

S3

S4

Q1

Place Sequence



S1 = -AGGCTATCACCTGACCTCCA-AA S2 = TAG-CTATCAC--GACCGC--GCA S3 = TAG-CT----GACCGC--GCT S4 = TAC----TCAC--GACCGACAGCT Q1 = ----T-A--AAAC-----

Phylogenetic Placement

- Align each query sequence to backbone alignment
 - HMMALIGN (Eddy, Bioinformatics 1998)
 - PaPaRa (Berger and Stamatakis, Bioinformatics 2011)
- Place each query sequence into backbone tree
 - Pplacer (Matsen et al., BMC Bioinformatics, 2011)
 - EPA (Berger and Stamatakis, Systematic Biology 2011)

Note: pplacer and EPA use maximum likelihood

HMMER vs. PaPaRa



Insights from SATé










SEPP Parameter Exploration

- Alignment subset size and placement subset size impact the accuracy, running time, and memory of SEPP
- 10% rule (subset sizes 10% of backbone) had best overall performance

SEPP (10%-rule) on simulated data



SEPP (10%) on Biological Data



16S.B.ALL dataset, 13k curated backbone tree, 13k total fragments

SEPP (10%) on Biological Data



16S.B.ALL dataset, 13k curated backbone tree, 13k total fragments

For 1 million fragments:

PaPaRa+pplacer: ~133 days

HMMALIGN+pplacer: ~30 days

SEPP 1000/1000: ~6 days

Part III: Taxon Identification

Objective: identify the taxonomy (species, genus, etc.) for each short read (a classification problem)





Taxon Identification

- Objective: identify species, genus, etc., for each short read
- Leading methods: Metaphyler (Univ Maryland), Phylopythia, PhymmBL, Megan

Megan vs MetaPhyler on 60bp rpsB gene



OBSERVATIONS

- MEGAN is very conservative
- MetaPhyler makes more correct predictions than MEGAN
- Other methods not as sensitive on these 31 marker genes as MetaPhyler (see MetaPhyler study in Liu et al, BMC Bioinformatics 2011)

Thus, the best taxon identification methods have **high precision** (make accurate predictions), but **low sensitivity** (i.e., they **fail to classify** a large portion of reads) even at higher taxonomy levels.

TIPP: Taxon Identification using Phylogenetic Placement



TIPP - Version 1

Given a set Q of query sequences for some gene, a taxonomy T*, and a set of full-length sequences for the gene,

- Compute backbone alignment/tree pair (T,A) on the full-length sequences, using SATé
- Use SEPP to place query sequence into T*
 - Compute extended alignment for each query sequence, using (T,A)
 - Place query sequence into T* using pplacer (maximizing likelihood score)

TIPP - Version 1

Given a set Q of query sequences for some gene, a taxonomy T*, and a set of full-length sequences for the gene,

- Compute backbone alignment/tree pair (T,A) on the full-length sequences, using SATé
- Use SEPP to place query sequence into T*
 - Compute extended alignment for each query sequence, using (T,A)
 - Place query sequence into T* using pplacer (maximizing likelihood score)

But ... TIPP version 1 too aggressive (over-classifies)

TIPP version 2

- Consider uncertainty in each step of the algorithm.
- Use statistical support values from pplacer and from HMMER to move placements up towards the root of the tree.
- Classify each fragment at the LCA of all placements obtained for the fragment.

TIPP version 2 dramatically reduces false positive rate with small reduction in true positive rate by considering uncertainty, using statistical techniques.

TIPP+Metaphyler

- Use Metaphyler to perform initial placement of read into taxonomy
- Use TIPP to modify the placement, moving the read further into the clade identified by Metaphyler

Results on rpsB gene (60 bp)



Summary

- SATé gives better alignments and trees than standard alignment estimation methods
- SEPP can enable alignment of short (fragmentary) sequences into alignments of full-length sequences, and phylogenetic placement into gene trees or taxonomies
- TIPP enables taxon identification of short reads -- not limited to 31 marker genes, and no training is needed.

Overall message

 When data are difficult to analyze, develop better methods - don't throw out the data.

Phylogenetic "Boosters"

- SATé: co-estimation of alignments and trees
- SEPP/TIPP: phylogenetic analysis of fragmentary data

Algorithmic strategies: divide-and-conquer and iteration to improve the accuracy and scalability of a *base method*

Phylogenetic "boosters" (meta-methods)

Goal: improve accuracy, speed, robustness, or theoretical guarantees of base methods

Examples:

- DCM-boosting for distance-based methods (1999)
- DCM-boosting for heuristics for NP-hard problems (1999)
- SATé-boosting for alignment methods (2009)
- SuperFine-boosting for supertree methods (2011)
- SEPP-boosting for metagenomic analyses (2012)
- DACTAL-boosting for all phylogeny estimation methods (in prep)

Acknowledgments

- Guggenheim Foundation Fellowship, Microsoft Research New England, National Science Foundation: Assembling the Tree of Life (ATOL), ITR, and IGERT grants, and David Bruton Jr. Professorship
- NSERC support to Siavash Mirarab
- Collaborators:
 - SATé: Kevin Liu, Serita Nelesen, Sindhu Raghavan, and Randy Linder
 - SEPP: Siavash Mirarab and Nam Nguyen
 - TIPP: Siavash Mirarab, Nam Nguyen, Bo Liu, and Mihai Pop