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MAGIC: access portal to a cross-platform gene expression compendium for maize
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1 INTRODUCTION

Owing to its importance as sustainable food and feedstock, maize genomics is of high academic and industrial relevance. As a result, microarrays have been widely applied to interrogate the maize transcriptome, with currently >100 maize gene expression experiments being publicly available in online repositories such as GEO (Barrett et al., 2011) and ArrayExpress (Parkinson et al., 2009). However, cross-platform differences, the lack of consistent platform and measurement descriptions and inconsistent gene annotations in maize complicated the straightforward use of these data.

To integrate the data from different array platforms in a readily usable single compendium, we resolved gene annotation inconsistencies by reannotating probes of previously published Zea mays arrays using the published maize genome sequence (Schnable et al., 2009) and making measurements comparable across different platforms/experiments using an adapted version of the data integration method described by Engelen et al. (2011). This resulted in a cross-platform expression compendium containing 1749 microarrays covering 24 690 genes. Additional gene information was integrated from various external sources. Experimental annotations were manually curated. A web access portal MAGIC with a specialized set of exploration and analysis functionalities provides public access to this compendium.

2 MATERIALS AND METHODS

2.1 Compendium creation

The compendium itself corresponds to a matrix of which the rows correspond to genes and columns to sample contrasts. A sample contrast is defined as the comparison of the gene’s expression between two different biological samples, one acting as a test and the other as a reference. Each value in the matrix then represents the expression change of a gene presented as the log-ratio of its expression in the test versus the reference samples.

2.1.1 Probe reannotation

Probes were reannotated using the latest release of the maize genome. Original probe sequences, if available, were obtained from the respective platform annotation files or otherwise from GenBank based on the corresponding GI numbers. They were used as query against the curated ‘Filtered Gene Set’ (FGS) of the 5b.60 release of B73 maize genome using MegaBLAST version 2.2.17 (Zhang et al., 2000). Both the gene and the transcript models of FGS are searched to increase the eventual hit rate. Different blast parameters were chosen for oligo and cDNA probes, respectively, as they considerably differ in length and specificity. For probes that mapped to multiple genes, we identified the most specific hit by comparing the hit quality across different targets. Only probes for which a sufficiently unique probe-to-gene mapping (details in Supplementary Methods) could be identified were retained for compendium construction.

2.1.2 Expression data homogenization

Microarray experiments were retrieved from GEO and ArrayExpress. Each experiment can be composed of multiple arrays. A distinction is made between one- and two-channel arrays, which differ from each other in the number of samples tested per array. Irrespective of the used platform, raw expression intensities were extracted for each channel (sample) separately. To make measurements between one- and two-channel platforms comparable, all expression measurements were converted to log ratios (as contrasts) that compare the expression between a test and a reference sample, respectively, both from the same experiment. For each contrast, proper test and reference samples were assigned based on the corresponding experiment annotation. Raw expression data were subsequently normalized using dedicated procedures (Engelen et al., 2011) and mapped to the corresponding genes based on the probe annotation (see Section 2.1.1).
2.2 Compendium annotation

To improve biological interpretation of the compendium, we integrated gene (row) and contrast (column) annotation from publicly available resources and curated all available information.

To facilitate gene selection, we included, next to gene ids from 5b.60 genome release, gene names from MaizeGDB (Lawrence et al., 2004) and Xref assignments from www.maizesequence.org to provide mapping from EntreGene and UniProt ids. As for functional annotations, metabolic pathway information (version 2.0) from Gramene (Youens-Clark et al., 2010) and Gene Ontology annotations from www.maizesequence.org were provided.

To compensate for the often cryptic and incomplete condition annotation available in public expression repositories, we provided curated annotations incorporating the information from both online repositories and the corresponding publications. Note that in our compendium, expression values are represented as log-ratios of a contrast between two samples. Experimental annotation is provided both at the level of the individual sample and that of the contrast. Annotation at the sample level includes tissue, development stage and genotype specifications (breeding line). The first two are described using Plant Ontology (Avraham et al., 2008)-derived ontology terms, whereas genotype specifications are based on the names of cultivars or wild-type. At the contrast level, we associated perturbation annotations specified as a set of relevant properties and corresponding values of change that reflect the stimuli that trigger expression alterations in the test versus the reference.

2.3 Compendium exploration

To facilitate the exploration of the compendium, we constructed a web access portal MAGIC providing a set of analysis functionalities. At first, MAGIC allows users to specify their own subcompendium of interest, which only contains contrasts sharing the same characteristics. Users can choose between various predefined subcompendia. Subcompendia focusing on environmental perturbations and on comparisons between lines, between tissues and between development stages are available. Alternatively, users can generate customized subcompendia based on the sample and contrast annotations.

Once a (sub)compendium is selected, the system provides tools to explore and visualize the expression data in a module-centralized manner. Where a module is defined as a subset of the (sub)compendium containing the expression values of a set of genes under a set of contrasts. A module can be created starting from a query set of genes or contrasts to which the module is defined as the subcompendium containing the expression values of a set of genes under a set of contrasts. A module can be created starting from a query set of contrasts to which contrasts or genes are added, respectively, based on their properties (such as the coexpression level, or the expression consistency). An existing module can easily be altered, merged with other modules or split into several modules. Each module can be visualized as an interactive heatmap accompanied with corresponding annotation information.

Because most of the microarray platforms that MAGIC relies on were developed before the genome release of maize, none of them cover the full FGS gene set, and overlap in measured genes can be low for some platforms. We developed functionalities that help users to control the number of missing values in their analysis results (Website online help, section 6).

3 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The compendium available through MAGIC currently contains 24,690 genes and 1310 sample contrasts. It covers 62% of the genes in FGS of the 5b.60 release of B73 maize genome; the remaining genes are not represented on any of the 27 platforms included. The contrasts consist of 69 experiments obtained from GEO and ArrayExpress, amounting to 1749 microarrays. Details on the composition of the compendium in terms of the number of genes and experiments covered per platform can be found in Supplementary Tables S1 and S2. On average, a gene is measured in 9 of the 26 platforms and has been measured in 592 of 1310 contrasts (Supplementary Figs S1 and S2). The compendium can be downloaded through its webportal MAGIC. An elaborate online help, together with two tutorial case studies, illustrates how the various functionalities of MAGIC can be used to infer new biology. The case studies clearly illustrate how information from different platforms contributes to the results obtained by MAGIC, and how to cope with missing values that could become abundant if information from certain sets of platforms is combined.

In contrast to MAGIC, comparable initiatives treat data from different platforms or experiments separately. Genevestigator (Hruz et al., 2008) and CORNET (De Bodt et al., 2012) construct separate compendia for the Affymetrix Maize Genome Array (GPL4032) (containing 558 and 340 arrays for Genevestigator and CORNET) and the Nimblegen Maize 385k Array (GPL12620) (containing 180 arrays in both systems). PLEXdb (Dash et al., 2011), on the other hand, provides access to the data from 44 Affymetrix and Nimblegen experiments. In this system, data derived from each experiment are treated separately instead of being merged in a larger compendium. Of all these systems, only CORNET provides a restricted meta-analysis tool that allows combining information across the different compendia. Compared with these related initiatives, our approach is unique in directly combining data from different platforms in a single compendium, obviating the need for an additional meta-analysis step (Fierro et al., 2008) and enabling the construction of a much larger compendium and the direct data analysis across different platforms and experiments.
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