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- Central dogma: DNA $\xrightarrow{\text { exact copy }}$ RNA $^{\text {genetic code }}$ protein
- RNA editing: RNA gets edited before it is translated
- Example: mitochondrion of Physarum polycephalum
- most prevalent editing event: C insertion
- e.g., a piece of nad7:

DNA ... CAGAATTGCGATCCACATAT GGGCTTCTACAT GAGGTACTGAAAAACTTATAGAACATAAGAATTTCTTACAATCT TCCTTATTTTGAT GTCTTGAT...
mRNA ...CAGAAUUGCGAUCCACAUAUCGGGCUUCUACAUCGAGGUACUGAAAAACUUAUAGAACAUAAGAAUUUCUUACAAUCUCUUCCUUAUUUUGAUCGUCUUGAU. . .


- other editing events: U insertion, dinucleotide insertions, $\mathrm{C} \rightarrow \mathrm{U}$ conversion
- Editing is frequent: one insertion per 25 bases on average
- Other types of RNA editing occur in all kinds of organisms: humans, plant organelles, nematodes, kinetoplastids, viruses
- Some RNA editing is implied in viral defense.
- Some RNA editing is directed by guide RNAs.
- Some editing enzymes have been identified.
- Main issues in general:
- What is the mechanism of RNA editing?
- How are editing sites recognized?
- What is the biological function of RNA editing?

Specifically in Physarum polycephalum:

- Editing is extremely reliable
- Editing occurs co-transcriptionally
- All known mitochondrial protein coding genes are edited
- Nearly all mitochondrial stable RNA genes are edited
- Nothing is known about the actual editing mechanism
- Nothing is known about the recognition of editing sites
- Nothing is known about the biological function
- 497 editing sites known $\rightarrow$ later part of the talk
- 227 unambiguous C insertions in protein coding regions known
- Sort unambiguous C-insertions by codon positions
- Codon positions for editing sites in coding sequences

| codon position | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| number | 58 | 24 | 145 |
| percentage | $26 \%$ | $11 \%$ | $64 \%$ |

- Codon bias surprising since RNA editing is co-transcriptional
- Can we understand the codon preference?
- Simple evolutionary model:
- No codon preference in editing machinery

CAG

- Base deletion occurs during sequence evolution
- Sometimes base deletion can be rescued by editing
- Results in effective replacement of original base by C

- Fitness of new sequence depends only on amino acid sequence
- Include mutations and insertions: complete evolution model

- Fitness given by similarity of amino acid to original amino acid according to BLOSUM62 similarity matrix
- Know states, transitions, and fitness
$\Rightarrow$ can use Eigen theory to determine stationary state
- Average over all original codons
- Result:

- Insensitive to parameter choice

Note: our model implies that there is no other reason to choose the positions of most editing site but to "fix" the amino acid sequence

- Consistent with "cheap" editing
- Recent unpublished data from several organisms confirms random acquisition and loss of editing sites in myxomycetes
- How do we know the editing sites?
- Need to sequence both the genomic DNA and the RNAs
- Genomic DNA fully sequenced for Physarum polycephalum takano et al, 2001
- Sequencing RNAs is hard
- need to know where genes are
- need primers
- primers need to be complementary to edited RNA
- Situation for mitochondrion of Physarum polycephalum:
- six protein coding genes with experimentally determined editing sites in GenBank
- a handful of genes identified but editing sites not known
- several unidentified open reading frames
- four typical mitochondrial genes apparently missing
- Compare to Dictyostelium discoideum: 44 genes known
- Experimental determination of editing sites difficult
$\Rightarrow$ computational prediction to be confirmed by experiment
- Main idea: use protein sequences from other organisms
- Pick gene to predict editing sites of, e.g., nad7
- Pick protein for this gene from another species, e.g., Neisseria menigitidis
- Find all related protein sequences out of GenBank
$\longrightarrow 510$ sequences for nad7
- Look at each position in multiple alignment

- Extract probabilities $p_{i}(a)$ to find amino acid $a$ at position $i$

| $i \backslash a$ | A | R | N | D | C | Q | E | G | H | I | L | K | M | F | P | S | T | W | Y | V |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 42 | 0.05 | 0.01 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.005 | 0.01 | 0.02 | 0.68 | 0.007 | 0.009 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.006 | 0.008 | 0.02 | 0.04 | 0.02 | 0.004 | 0.007 | 0.01 |
| 54 | 0.07 | 0.09 | 0.14 | 0.05 | 0.005 | 0.04 | 0.04 | 0.04 | 0.07 | 0.02 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.009 | 0.03 | 0.02 | 0.09 | 0.05 | 0.007 | 0.15 | 0.02 |

Editing site prediction:

- Start with genomic sequence
. . . CAGAATTGCGATCCACATATGGGCTTCTACATGAGGTACTGAAAAACTTATAGAACATAAGAATTTCTTACAATCTTCCTTATTTTGATGTCTTGAT . . .
- Insert C's and translate
...CAGAATTGCGACTCCACATATGGGCTTCTACATGACGGTACTGAAAAACTTATCAGAACATACAGAATTTCTCTACAATCTTCCTTATTTTGCATGTCTTGCAT...
- Calculate probability

$$
\begin{aligned}
& p(\ldots Q N C D S T Y G L \ldots)= \\
& \quad=\ldots p_{35}(Q) p_{36}(N) p_{37}(C) p_{38}(D) p_{39}(S) p_{40}(T) p_{41}(Y) p_{42}(G) p_{43}(L) \ldots
\end{aligned}
$$

- Defines "energy landscape" over space of $2^{N}$ discrete states
- Identify ground state $\longrightarrow$ prediction of editing sites
- Use transfer matrix approach:
- Genomic sequence $b_{1} \ldots b_{N}$; protein model: $p_{i}(a)$ for $i=1, \ldots, M$
- Define $P_{i, j}$ as the probability of the most probable editing configuration ending at model position $i$ and genomic position $j$
- Without editing:

$$
P_{i, j}=p_{i}\left(a a\left[b_{j}-2, b_{j}-1, b_{j}\right]\right) P_{i-1, j-3}
$$

- With editing:

$$
P_{i, j}=\max \left\{\begin{array}{l}
p_{i}\left(a a\left[b_{j}-2, b_{j}-1, b_{j}\right]\right) P_{i-1, j-3} \\
p_{i}\left(a a\left[C, b_{j}-1, b_{j}\right]\right) P_{i-1, j-2} \\
p_{i}\left(a a\left[b_{j}-1, C, b_{j}\right]\right) P_{i-1, j-2} \\
p_{i}\left(a a\left[b_{j}-1, b_{j}, C\right]\right) P_{i-1, j-2}
\end{array}\right\}
$$

$\Rightarrow O(N M)$ algorithm

- In reality include amino acid insertions and deletions, local similarities, and sequence context
- Check performance on known genes:

| gene | amino acids | $C$ insertions | off by |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | $\geq 4$ |
| nad7 | $92 \%$ | $116 / 171=68 \%$ | 9 | 12 | 7 | 28 |
| cox1 | $93 \%$ | $112 / 159=70 \%$ | 8 | 15 | 8 | 27 |
| cox3 | $81 \%$ | $134 / 181=74 \%$ | 9 | 14 | 9 | 55 |
| cytb | $93 \%$ | $118 / 172=68 \%$ | 11 | 11 | 6 | 15 |
| atp | $93 \%$ | $106 / 152=70 \%$ | 7 | 8 | 4 | 15 |
| pL | $93 \%$ | $144 / 199=72 \%$ | 10 | 18 | 9 | 38 |
| total | $92 \%$ | $122 / 173=71 \%$ | 12 | 9 | 8 | 22 |

Real test: Finding new genes

- Search for missing genes nad2, nad4L, nad6, and atp8
- These genes could not be found by traditional gene finding
- Step 1: find location
- Pick a gene from the list
- Build PIE model for this gene from protein sequences of other organisms
- Cut genome into short overlapping pieces (length 1200 bases)
- Apply PIE to every piece of the genome
- PIE predicts best way to insert C's in each piece plus goodness measure
- Identify position of gene in genome by maximum in goodness measure


Step 2: primer design

- Primer has to be complementary to mRNA sequence
but: Do not know mRNA sequence
- Use PIE to predict editing site positions $\Rightarrow$ know mRNA sequence but: PIE makes mistakes
- Assign reliability measure to PIE's predictions by calculating probabilities in Boltzmann ensemble

- Use to select primers
- Location of all four genes found
- All but one primer worked
- All four genes confirmed by sequencing of mRNA

- New editing type in Physarum: deletional RNA editing
- Total increase in known editing sites by $50 \%$

|  | Previous <br> coding | Total <br> coding | Stable <br> RNA | Previous <br> total | total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Editing sites | 250 | 390 | 107 | 357 | 497 |
| C insertion | 222 | 353 | 97 | 319 | 450 |
| Unambiguous | 140 | 227 | 66 | 206 | 293 |

## Identification of editing sites IX

- Systematically search for all known mitochondrial genes
- Find 11 genes beyond the four experimentally verified ones
- Find 8 more candidates with lower statistical significance

- In total increased number of predicted genes from 11 to $26-34$
- Still have to be verified experimentally

Conclusions:

- Simple evolutionary model can explain codon bias
- Editing sites seem to be randomly acquired and lost

- RNA editing sites of known proteins can be computationally predicted with reasonable accuracy

Future directions:


- Comparative analysis of several organisms with editing
- Verify full genome predictions experimentally

