cdev: A ground-truth based measure to evaluate RNA-seq normalization performance Supplemental Information

Diem-Trang Tran, Matthew Might

August 29, 2021



Fig. S1: The proportion of true reference counts, the simulation counterpart of the fraction of reads mapped to ERCC spike-ins.



Fig. S2: Correlation of the ERCC spike-ins selected as true references, visualized in parallel coordinate plots (PCP) and histograms. In PCP, RNA species (ERCC spike-in) constitute the parallel y-axes and samples are plotted as polylines. Parallel lines indicates high correlation.



Fig. S3: Expression levels of ERCC spike-ins selected as true references, after normalizing by various $\mathbf{methods},$ in comparison with normalizano tion (raw) and ground-truth normalization.



Fig. S4: Fold-change MSE as a function of normalization quality on simulation data. Left column: Fold-change MSE as the function of reference set quality, measured in the fraction of true differential genes. Right column: Fold-change MSE as a predictor of DE detection performance. Panels (A-F) represent the relationship on homogeneous fold-change simulation, panels (G-J) on heterogeneous fold-change simulation.



Fig. S5: False positive rate (FPR) and False negative rate (FNR) of DE detection on simulated data sets normalized by different methods.



Fig. S6: Fold-change MSE and *cdev* in comparing common normalizers on simulation data sets. (A,B) Performance of various normalizers, measured in fold-change MSE and *cdev*, on data sets simulated at increasing fraction of differential expression. (C,D) AUC of DE detection as a function of fold-change MSE and *cdev*, on the simulation with 90% of the genes being differential.



Fig. S7: Additional close-up examination of discordance between cdev and fold-change MSE on real data sets. In labels of the plots, A denotes the ground truth obtained by normalizing against the true references R, \mathbf{A}_{rand} the result of normalizing against a random set of genes R_{rand} which has the same number of genes as R, and \mathbf{X} the un-normalized read count. In all cases, the column index j implies the selection of samples from heart and kidney.



Fig. S8: The effect of scaling magnitude on different DE detection methods. The receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curve of DE detection using (A) DESeq, (B) edgeR, and (C) limma on simulation data normalized by multiples of the true scaling vector. (D) DE detection performance summarized by area under the ROC curve (AUROC). Note that the y-axis does not start from zero, to magnify the differences for better visibility.