

Supplementary Data to:

Selenoprofiles: profile-based scanning of eukaryotic genome sequences for selenoprotein genes

Marco Mariotti and Roderic Guigó

Section S1: patterns used with SECISearch

We report here the patterns used with SECISearch in the current implementation of selenoprofiles. The syntax is the one used by PatScan, which is run under the hood by SECISearch. We are currently working to improve the patterns in terms of both specificity and sensitivity, so these may change soon.

Standard:

$r1=\{au,ua,gc,cg,gu,ug\}$ NNNNNNNNNN p1=7...7 3...13 ATGAN p2=10...13 AA (4...12 | 0...3 p3=3...6 3...6 r1~p3 0...3) (r1~p2[2,1,1] NGAN | r1~p2[2,1,0] NNGAN) 3...10 r1~p1[1,1,1] NNNNNNNNNN

Non-Standard:

$r1=\{au,ua,gc,cg,gu,ug\}$ NNNNNNNNNN p1=7...7 3...13 NNGAN p2=10...13 NN (4...13 | 0...2 p3=3...4 3...4 r1~p3 0...2) (r1~p2[1,1,1] NGAN | r1~p2[1,1,0] NNGAN) 3...10 r1~p1[1,1,1] NNNNNNNNNN

Twilight:

$r1=\{au,ua,gc,cg,gu,ug\}$ NNNNNNNNNN p1=7...7 3...13 NTGAN p2=10...13 (AR | CC) (4...12 | 0...3 p3=3...6 3...6 r1~p3 0...3) (r1~p2[2,1,1] NGAN | r1~p2[2,1,0] NNGAN) 3...10 r1~p1[1,1,1] NNNNNNNNNN

Table S2: List of releases of the Ensembl core databases used in this work. The genome release is 52 for all species except *Vicugna Pacos* for which is 51.

Species name	Ensembl core database release
<i>Aedes aegypti</i>	aedes_aegypti_core_52_1d
<i>Anopheles gambiae</i>	anopheles_gambiae_core_52_3k
<i>Bos taurus</i>	bos_taurus_core_52_4b
<i>Caenorhabditis elegans</i>	caenorhabditis_elegans_core_52_190
<i>Canis familiaris</i>	canis_familiaris_core_52_2j
<i>Cavia porcellus</i>	cavia_porcellus_core_52_3a
<i>Ciona intestinalis</i>	ciona_intestinalis_core_52_2l
<i>Ciona savignyi</i>	ciona_savignyi_core_52_2h
<i>Danio rerio</i>	danio_rerio_core_52_7e
<i>Dasypus novemcinctus</i>	dasypus_novemcinctus_core_52_1h
<i>Dipodomys ordii</i>	dipodomys_ordii_core_52_1a
<i>Drosophila melanogaster</i>	drosophila_melanogaster_core_52_54a
<i>Echinops telfairi</i>	echinops_telfairi_core_52_1g
<i>Equus caballus</i>	equus_caballus_core_52_2b
<i>Erinaceus europaeus</i>	erinaceus_europaeus_core_52_1e
<i>Felis catus</i>	felis_catus_core_52_1f
<i>Gallus gallus</i>	gallus_gallus_core_52_2j
<i>Gasterosteus aculeatus</i>	gasterosteus_aculeatus_core_52_1i
<i>Gorilla gorilla</i>	gorilla_gorilla_core_52_1
<i>Homo sapiens</i>	homo_sapiens_core_52_36n
<i>Loxodonta africana</i>	loxodonta_africana_core_52_1g
<i>Macaca mulatta</i>	macaca_mulatta_core_52_10j
<i>Microcebus murinus</i>	microcebus_murinus_core_52_1b
<i>Monodelphis domestica</i>	monodelphis_domestica_core_52_5g
<i>Mus musculus</i>	mus_musculus_core_52_37e
<i>Myotis lucifugus</i>	myotis_lucifugus_core_52_1g
<i>Ochotona princeps</i>	ochotona_princeps_core_52_1c
<i>Ornithorhynchus anatinus</i>	ornithorhynchus_anatinus_core_52_1i
<i>Oryctolagus cuniculus</i>	oryctolagus_cuniculus_core_52_1h
<i>Oryzias latipes</i>	oryzias_latipes_core_52_1h
<i>Otolemur garnettii</i>	otolemur_garnettii_core_52_1e
<i>Pan troglodytes</i>	pan_troglodytes_core_52_21j
<i>Pongo pygmaeus</i>	pongo_pygmaeus_core_52_1c
<i>Procavia capensis</i>	procavia_capensis_core_52_1a
<i>Pteropus vampyrus</i>	pteropus_vampyrus_core_52_1a
<i>Rattus norvegicus</i>	rattus_norvegicus_core_52_34u
<i>Saccharomyces cerevisiae</i>	saccharomyces_cerevisiae_core_52_1i
<i>Sorex araneus</i>	sorex_araneus_core_52_1e
<i>Spermophilus tridecemlineatus</i>	spermophilus_tridecemlineatus_core_52_1g
<i>Takifugu rubripes</i>	takifugu_rubripes_core_52_4k
<i>Tarsius syrichta</i>	tarsius_syrichta_core_52_1a
<i>Tetraodon nigroviridis</i>	tetraodon_nigroviridis_core_52_8b
<i>Tupaia belangeri</i>	tupaia_belangeri_core_52_1f
<i>Tursiops truncatus</i>	tursiops_truncatus_core_52_1a
<i>Vicugna pacos</i>	vicugna_pacos_core_51_1
<i>Xenopus tropicalis</i>	xenopus_tropicalis_core_52_41l

Table S3: Performances indices of selenoprofiles testing on human, drosophila and yeast genome. All families cited in the main article plus MsrA were considered. As reference, we considered the exonic structures annotated in Ensembl Core database, fetching the most similar to each selenoprofiles prediction. All annotations fetched in this way were then checked manually and compared with SelenoDB to make sure that both the selenoproteins were correctly annotated and that all genes were considered. In a some cases (drosophila SelK, SelH, SPS2 and human SelK, SelH, SelS, SelT, SelV, SelW1, TR1, TR2 and TR3) the fetched annotation was not carrying the selenocysteine residue, therefore it was modified to respect the annotation in SelenoDB. For machinery proteins not included in SelenoDB (SecS, PSTK, secp43), the annotations were selected among the selenoprofiles candidates analyzing the gene description in Ensembl. For some drosophila genes no description was available and the gene was selected after a manual sequence analysis. The annotations are split in three sets: selenoproteins, non-Sec homologues and machinery proteins. The selenoprotein set was compared with all selenoprofiles predictions with label "selenocysteine", while the homologues set was compared with the predictions with any other label. The machinery set was compared with all selenoprofiles predictions for machinery protein families.

Sensitivity (SN) and specificity (SP) were computed at the gene, exon, and nucleotide level. At the gene level, the number of false positives (FP) is reported instead of specificity. The exon level indexes are computed considering only the genes that were correctly paired between the predictions and the annotations, while the nucleotide indexes are computed considering everything. The average indexes at the end of the table are computed pulling together all genes for each set.

gene	level	exon	level	nucleotide	level	family, class, gene numbers
SN	FP	SN	SP	SN	SP	
Homo sapiens						
1	0	0	0	1	1	sps-selenoproteins: 1 gene
1	0	0.57	0.75	0.89	1	GPx-selenoproteins: 5 genes
1	0	0.63	0.71	0.98	0.97	DI-selenoproteins: 3 genes
1	0	1	1	1	1	15-kDa-selenoproteins: 1 gene
1	0	1	1	1	1	SelM-selenoproteins: 1 gene
1	0	1	1	1	1	SelH-selenoproteins: 1 gene
1	0	0.9	0.9	1	0.97	SelI-selenoproteins: 1 gene
1	1	0.6	0.75	1	0.5	SelK-selenoproteins: 1 gene
1	0	0.83	0.91	0.89	1	SelN-selenoproteins: 1 gene
1	0	1	1	1	1	SelO-selenoproteins: 1 gene
1	0	1	1	1	1	SelP-selenoproteins: 1 gene
1	0	1	1	1	1	SelR-selenoproteins: 1 gene
1	2	1	1	1	0.46	SelS-selenoproteins: 1 gene
1	1	0.8	0.8	0.96	0.53	SelT-selenoproteins: 1 gene
0.5	1	0.8	0.67	0.74	0.79	SelV-selenoproteins: 2 genes
1	0	0.91	0.89	0.99	0.92	TR-selenoproteins: 3 genes
1	2	0.88	0.88	0.96	0.4	sps-homologues: 1 gene
1	0	0.45	0.56	0.72	0.99	GPx-homologues: 3 genes
1	0	1	1	1	1	MsrA-homologues: 1 gene
/	2	/	/	/	/	SelJ-homologues: 0 genes
/	2	/	/	/	/	SelK-homologues: 0 genes
1	0	0.82	0.9	0.86	1	SelR-homologues: 2 genes
/	1	/	/	/	/	SelT-homologues: 0 genes
1	0	0.78	0.78	0.99	0.95	SelU-homologues: 3 genes
0	0	0	0	0	0	SelV-homologues: 1 gene
/	2	/	/	/	/	TR-homologues: 0 genes
1	1	0.76	0.81	0.99	0.43	sbp2-machinery: 1 gene
1	0	0.5	0.5	0.79	0.81	pstk-machinery: 1 gene
1	0	0.22	0.5	0.32	0.93	secp43-machinery: 1 gene
1	0	1	1	1	1	SecS-machinery: 1 gene
1	0	1	1	1	1	eEFsec-machinery: 1 gene

Drosophila melanogaster						
1	0	0.25	0.25	0.91	1	sps-selenoproteins: 1 gene
1	0	0	0	0.58	0.89	SelH-selenoproteins: 1 gene
1	0	1	1	1	1	SelK_insect-selenoproteins: 1 gene
1	0	0	0	0.99	1	sps-homologues: 1 gene
1	1	0.33	0.5	0.68	0.51	GPx-homologues: 1 gene
1	0	0	0	0.3	0.95	MsrA-homologues: 1 gene
1	0	0.33	0.5	0.92	1	15-kDa-homologues: 1 gene
/	1	/	/	/	/	SelM-homologues: 0 genes
1	0	0	0	0.92	0.88	SelH-homologues: 2 genes
1	3	0.5	0.4	0.88	0.33	SelI-homologues: 1 gene
/	1	/	/	/	/	SelK-homologues: 0 genes
0	0	0	0	0	0	SelK_insect-homologues: 1 gene
1	0	0.75	0.75	1	0.95	SelR-homologues: 1 gene
1	0	1	1	1	1	SelT-homologues: 1 gene
/	1	/	/	/	/	SelV-homologues: 0 genes
1	2	0.6	0.6	0.92	0.71	TR-homologues: 2 genes
1	0	1	1	1	1	sbp2-machinery: 1 gene
1	1	0	0	1	0.54	pstk-machinery: 1 gene
1	1	0.5	0.33	0.94	0.54	secp43-machinery: 1 gene
1	0	0.5	0.5	1	0.95	SecS-machinery: 1 gene
1	0	1	1	1	1	eEFsec-machinery: 1 gene
Saccharomyces cerevisiae						
1	0	0	0	0.97	1	GPx-homologues: 3 genes
1	0	0	0	0.61	1	MsrA-homologues: 1 gene
1	0	0	0	0.26	1	SelO-homologues: 1 gene
1	1	0	0	0.62	0.39	SelR-homologues: 1 gene
/	3	/	/	/	/	TR-homologues: 0 genes
/	1	/	/	/	/	pstk-machinery: 0 genes
Average (FP column refers to the total number)						
0.96	5	0.81	0.85	0.94	0.91	selenoproteins
0.97	22	0.57	0.6	0.8	0.58	homologues
1	4	0.71	0.77	0.93	0.68	machinery

Section S4: Exonerate vs genewise

In the following table, we report the global performance indices when we force the pipeline to choose always the exonerate or always the genewise prediction. When the standard routine of selenoprofiles is used (one of the two predictions is chosen according to the criteria detailed in the text) the indices improve or are the same.

gene	level	exon	level	nucleotide	level	class
SN	FP	SN	SP	SN	SP	
Average (FP column refers to the total number) choosing EXONERATE						
0.89	3	0.78	0.83	0.86	0.93	selenoproteins
0.9	14	0.6	0.63	0.73	0.65	homologues
0.9	4	0.74	0.72	0.91	0.68	machinery
Average (FP column refers to the total number) choosing GENEWISE						
0.96	5	0.8	0.85	0.94	0.91	selenoproteins
0.93	20	0.5	0.56	0.76	0.59	homologues
0.9	4	0.67	0.76	0.82	0.67	machinery

We observe that genewise is generally performing better than exonerate. Nonetheless, genewise is much slower than exonerate (it would not be feasible to use the cyclic procedure for genewise), so we believe that the best way to combine them is to use exonerate to outline the gene boundaries and genewise to refine the prediction. Anyway, since genewise appears to be more sensitive than exonerate, we created the `genewise_to_be_sure` routine (see text in the main manuscript) to ensure that we do not lose any potential candidates that would be missed by exonerate but caught by genewise. Also, in our experience genewise crashes systematically for some predictions (although it never crashed for the predictions in the testing set). We believe this is due to the fact that it was never tested with our particular scoring scheme, which may confound its computation. When this happens, selenoprofiles uses exonerate prediction instead, and this is another advantage of having two predictions available.

Section S5: Discussion of false positives

1. Selenocysteine labelled

In the human genome, 5 genes for which no annotation was found were predicted and labelled as “selenocysteine”. One belongs to the SelT family. This is characterized by a single-exon structure, and no potential SECIS was identified downstream. An additional analysis revealed that the conservation of the coding sequence extends in the 5' side for an additional portion respect to selenoprofiles prediction. This extension contains a frameshift. All these facts make us believe that this is a recent retro-transcribed pseudogene.

Two selenocysteine containing SelS genes were predicted. In both cases a poor scoring SECIS element was found downstream of the predicted coding sequence. The SelS family is characterized by domains of repetitive sequences, rich in lysine, glutamic acid and glycine. These domains causes the profile to hit the genome in a lot of locations. In both predicted genes, the conservation with the profile is too poor to conclude that these are real genes: excluding the regions of repetitive sequence, we found no significant similarity with any other known protein. It is very likely that these predictions have said selenoprotein features just by chance.

Then, a selenocysteine containing SelK gene was predicted. This gene is characterized by a single-exon structure, and two poor scoring SECIS elements were found downstream. No annotation corresponding to this gene was found in Ensembl. Nonetheless, a search with blast found an human hypothetical protein (gi code: 169213282), matching with 100% identity the selenoprofiles prediction but stopping at the UGA position. A blast search in ncbi human EST dataset resulted in no perfect matches, suggesting that this genomic region is not transcribed. The single exon structure and the absence of transcription suggest the occurrence of a retro-transcribed pseudogene.

Lastly, a selenocysteine containing SelV gene was predicted, consisting of two exons with two poor scoring SECIS elements downstream. This corresponds to the Ensembl pseudogene ENSG00000215900. Searching ncbi human ESTs, we found no evidence of transcription. We think that this is most likely a pseudogene, too.

2. Selenocysteine machinery proteins

For these proteins, 4 false positives were predicted in total in the human, fly and yeast genome by selenoprofiles. Two false PSTKs were predicted, one in drosophila and one in yeast. The PSTK proteins share a domain with high similarity with another protein family, KTI12, and this causes selenoprofiles to find also KTI12 proteins when searching the PSTK profile in genomes.

One false SECP43 protein was predicted in drosophila. This is actually a portion of the protein Rox8 (or RE71384p), since it shares a nucleotide binding domain with SECP43.

Lastly, the human protein SBP2-like is found using the SBP2 profile. These two proteins diverged recently, during vertebrate evolution (see Donovan et al, “Evolutionary history of selenocysteine incorporation from the perspective of SECIS binding proteins”, BMC evolutionary biology, 2009). They share high sequence similarity and, possibly, they are also functionally linked.