**[The real cost of sequencing: higher than you think!](http://papers.gersteinlab.org/papers/costseq/index.html)**

[**The real cost of sequencing:**](http://papers.gersteinlab.org/papers/costseq/index.html)processing, storage & data transfer

## Introduction:

The contemporaneous development of biopolymer sequencing and the digital computer started a digital revolution in the biosciences. Some historians of science have argued that the lack of computers in biology was partially due to the incompatibility of computational approaches and biological research (cite Hallam Stevens Life out of sequence). The data generated by biological experiments was often not in a form that benefited from computational processing power. However, this changed with the advent of Sanger sequencing and generation of ever greater amounts of sequence data. Large amounts of sequence data could be stored in databases and conceptualized in a computational framework. As the computational and biological sciences have developed together they have spurred and reacted to innovations in each other.

The computing technologies used in the analysis of sequence data have helped shape how researchers approach such analysis and the structure of biological research more generally. The PC era in which Sanger DNA sequencing developed left its imprint on how sequence data is analyzed. In the 1980’s sequence databases were developed and filled with ever larger amounts of sequence. However, most of the data relevant to an investigator could be downloaded and processed on local client. The rise of the internet encouraged sharing of sequence data and enabled new bioinformatics approaches in which analysis programs could be hosted on websites and data could then be uploaded onto these sites for analysis. These conditions coupled with the increasing availability of reference genomes for various species including humans created an environment in which researchers could better query the existing sequencing knowledge base and situate their work within it.

In relation to coevolution of sequencing and computing there are a number of key concepts to keep in mind. First there is the concept of a number of paradigms for scientific computing. These have been popularized by the eminent databases such as Kim Gray from Microsoft. Here the third paradigm is thought of as the traditional supercomputing base, large calculation base scientific computing, for instance computing a rocket trajectory from a set of equations. This tends to favor differential equations and linear algebraic type computations. The new fourth paradigm is much more data intensive and is really computing for the big data era where as opposed to simulating over and over large amounts of mathematical calculations one is often trying to find patterns in very large datasets and here the premium is much more on data intra operability and statistical pattern finding.

The second key concept is the interplay between fixed end variable costs. Much of the decrease in sequencing costs has been trading the variable cost of reagents in sequencing people's time for fixed costs in terms of ever more efficient and complicated equipment. The same paradigm plays out in terms of computing with for instance cloud computing representing and opposite shift to an all variable cost model from the traditional fixed cost.

The third key concept to take into account to grapple with these developments is the idea of scaling laws covering the entire industry. The key one of course is the Moore's laws governing the scaling of computer technology.

Microsoft researcher Jim Gray argued that the use of computers to process large volumes is leading to a “fourth paradigm” in scientific research in which discovery is fueled by the “capture, curation, and analysis” of information. This 4th paradigm holds the possibility of synthesizing the previous paradigms of empirical observation, theory, and computational simulation. However, in order to fully realize the potential of this approach to science, significant investment must be made in both the computational infrastructure to support data processing and sharing as well as providing training resources for researchers to better understand, handle, and compare large datasets.

The advent of next generation sequencing (NGS) has led to a dramatic increase in the scale of sequence datasets (see box on increase in sequencing). A key component of the sequence data infrastructure is the sequence read archive (SRA), which was created to store and organize high throughput sequencing data generated for research purposes. The database has grown significantly since its creation in 2007. It now contains approximately 3.9\*1015 bases with approximately half of these being open access. These datasets are too large for the old sharing and analysis paradigms. However, the development of NGS has coincided with the rise distributed and cloud computing which provide promising avenues for handling the vast amounts of sequence data being generated and stored in databases. However, this combination of technologies also presents new challenges. Distributed computing systems for storing and sharing this data must also account for the protected nature of some of these datasets. Additionally, the different cost structure of these new computing paradigms can have an impact on how funding agencies and researchers approach data analysis. In the past computing often involved a large fixed cost associated with purchasing a machine followed by low variable costs. Cloud computing removes the need for a large initial fixed cost investment. However, the variable costs associated with cloud computing access are significantly higher. These two technologies are increasingly intertwined and have a significant impact on both the scale, scope, and methods of biological research.

## Backdrop of the computer industry & Moore's law:

Semiconductor technology has dramatically stimulated the development of integrated circuits for more than the last half century, which has led to the development of the personal computer and the Internet era. People have made observations of various laws which model and predict the rapid developmental progresses in these high-tech areas that are driven by the progress in semiconductor technology. For instance, the well-known Moore’s law accurately predicted that the number of transistors integrated in each square inch would double every two year \cite{}. In fact, the semiconductor industry has used the Moore’s law to plan its research and development progress. Besides Moore’s law, various other corresponding predictive laws have also been proposed for related high-tech development (<http://spectrum.ieee.org/semiconductors/materials/5-commandments/2)> For instance, from an economic point of view, Rock’s law (also called Moore’s second law) was proposed to predict the cost of a semiconductor chip fabrication plant doubles around every four years. Similarly, Kryder’s law describes the related roughly yearly doubling of the area storage density of hard drives over the last few decades.

The roughly yearly doubling scaling of these described by these laws over the period of multiple decades is not simply the scaling behavior of a single technology but the superposition of the S-curve behavior of each technology over its life (see figure 1). The S-curve behavior of an individual technology is due to the three main phases (development, expansion and maturity). For example, Kyder’s Law, yearly doubling scaling behavior over the last two and a half decades is the superposition of the S-curves of five different storage technologies. This behavior is also true for sequencing based technologies.

The success of the predictive laws in high tech areas in last half century have encouraged the development of laws to forecast trends in related emergent technologies including sequencing based technologies. The cost of sequencing did roughly follow a Moore’s law behavior in the decade before 2008 \cite{NIH cost-seq figure}. However, the sequencing cost has not followed a Moore’s like law since 2008 after the introduction of new high throughput sequencing technologies \cite{NIH cost-seq figure}. Instead, it has dropped faster than would be expected using Moore’s law as a guide. In the past five years, the cost of a personal genome has dropped to XXX in 2014 from XXXX in 2008. This departure from Moore’s law is due to the dramatically different S-curve slopes for Sanger sequencing and NGS. Consequently, transition between these technologies represented a new cost scaling regime. Thus, we think that the development of sequencing technology at this stage is far away from following a predictive trajectory.

## Innovations underlying scaling in alignment algorithms:

## [[SKL2MG: I didn’t use 4 eras, for I found it is difficult to isolate MAQ and novoalign from BWA etc. And it is too strong if we claim NGS tools didn’t use SW at all. ]]

## Alignment tools have co-evolved with sequencing technology to meet demand of sequence data processing. Their running time fulfills Moore’s Law and decreases by half every 18 months (see figure 2). Underlying this improved performance are a series of discrete algorithmic advances. In the early Sanger sequencing age, the Smith-Waterman and Needleman-Wunsch algorithms used dynamic programming to find a local or global optimal alignment. But the quadratic complexity of these approaches make it impossible to map sequences to a large genome. In light of this computational time bottleneck and increasing dataset sizes, hash table based methods that use a seed-and-extend paradigm with a word of length k(k-mer) as the seed were developed to drive down alignment time. The original FASTA approach simply combines the K-mer to find the common ones between query and target sequences. However, it cannot make sure best alignments are seeded. To improve, BLAST adopts a heuristic statistical method to find high-scoring segment pairs (HSPs) by using substitution matrix and k-letter word, which can perform over 50 times faster than Smith-waterman algorithm. Not like BLAST hashing the query sequence and scanning it against sequence database, BLAT builds a k-mer index for the genome and scans against query sequence and is able to achieve run times 500 times faster than BLAST.

## Now, the challenge has turned into rapidly aligning millions of short sequences (reads) to a reference genome for next generation sequencing (NGS) aligners. Similar to BLAT, MAQ and Novoalign are both based on k-mer hash tables. Gapped-kmer is used by MAQ to improve the sensitivity of seed-and-extension schema. And then Suffix array/tree and its variant data structure are widely used in reads alignment. STAR employs the uncompressed suffix array to find a maximal exactly matched seeds and then extend based on seed clusters. BWA and Bowtie utilize Burrows-Wheeler Transform (BWT) to link suffix array with FM-index (Ferragina–Manzini index or Full-text index in Minute space) and find exact match by backward searching. They convert inexact match, which allow mismatches and gaps, into exact match by enumerating all combinations of mismatches and gaps. Finally, these tools sacrifice optimal alignment for extremely fast retrieval of exact matches.

## Meanwhile, many of the algorithmic advancements employed by alignment tools try to reduce the marginal mapping cost by building an index data structure. In general, a negative correlated trend can be found between the index and alignment time (see figure 2). In particular, he hash table based tools: BLAT, MAQ and Novoalign build index structure very fast, but relatively require more time to do alignment. BWA and STAR take much more time to build index data structure (FM-index and suffix array), but reads alignment of these tools are ultra fast. Decreasing “marginal” alignment cost by reasonably increasing “fixed” index time makes them more suitable to handle progressively increasing NGS data.

## Computational component of sequencing - what's happening in bioinformatics:

[[STL(Sep4): The flow here is “data is getting large > hard to share > we need to move to cloud > we can even do computation in the cloud and only transfer the result to the user, saving transmission cost etc. “ It describes a data warehouse that can do some minimal computation

The scope is too narrow. Cloud is more perceived as an economic and flexible way to do computing rather than data distribution. Computing is like utility nowadays. Users pay as they go, very flexible, the economy also scales…]]

The decreasing cost of sequencing and increasing amount of sequence reads generated are placing greater demands on the computational resources and knowledge necessary to handle sequence data. It is critically important that as the amount of sequencing data continues to increase it is not simply stored but done so in a manner that is easily and intuitively accessible to the larger research community. In terms of the way that we see the bioinformatics computing paradigm changing in response to the ever increasing amounts of sequencing data we see a number of key directions of change. The first is related to the need for more and more distributed and parallel computing to handle the large amounts of data and compute. The second involves the need for compression to handle the very large file sizes and for this compression to be more specific to sequencing data than just the generic compression one uses. Third, much of the sequencing data will be private data related to identifiable individuals and so there needs to be much thought into how to secure this particularly within a cloud computing environment.

Scalable storage, query and analysis technologies are necessary to handle the increasing amounts of genomic data being generated and stored. For example, distributed file system greatly increases the storage I/O bandwidth, making distributed computing and data management possible. Another example is the NoSQL database which provides excellent horizontal scalability, data structure flexibility, and support for high load interactive queries.

Traditional scientific computing paradigm is aggressively optimized on linear algebra. This is not of much benefit to nowadays bioinformatics research, which heavily uses statistical learning algorithms, user defined functions and semi-structured data. Moreover, today the parallel programming paradigm has evolved from fine-grained MPI/MP to robust, highly scalable frameworks such as MapReduce and Apache Spark. This situation calls for customized paradigms specialized for bioinformatics study. We have already seen some exciting work in this field (cite ADAM from AMP Berkeley)

Changing computing paradigms such as cloud computing are playing a role in managing the flood of sequencing data. HIPAA compliant cloud resources are being developed so that datasets can be stored and shared on remote servers. Analysis scripts are then uploaded to the cloud and the analysis is performed remotely. This greatly reduces the data transfer requirements since only the script and analysis results are transferred to and from the cloud.

In a similar fashion to the way that the internet gave rise “open source” software, the human reference genome (particularly that from the “public consortium”) was associated with “open data.” Researchers were encouraged to build upon existing publicly available sequence knowledge and contribute additional sequence data or annotations. However, now there is a change as more individual genomes are sequenced and concerns for the privacy of the sequenced subjects necessitates securing the sequence data and only providing access to authenticated users. [[plos cb article]

However, privacy protection in the cloud environment becomes a huge concern. Researchers are interested in finding reliable and affordable solution to minimize the risk of sensitive data leakage. Privacy protection in cloud environment can be split into two layers: a. protect sensitive data from leaking to a third party [[cite…some interesting work includes (limited) computation and query directly on encrypted database, isolating encrypted data etc.]]; b. make the computation oblivious to the cloud service provider [[cite…]]].

The explosion of sequencing data has posed a need of efficient methods for storage and transmission. General algorithms like gzip offer great compatibility, good compression speed and acceptable compression efficiency on sequencing data and are thus widely used. However, to further reduce storage footprint and transmission time, customized algorithms are needed. Many researchers use SAM/BAM (Sequence/Binary Alignment/Map) format to store reads. An extensively accepted compression method, CRAM, is able to shrink BAM file by ~30% losslessly and more if lossy on quality score (\cite 21245279). CRAM only records the differences between reads and the reference genome and applies Huffman coding. Developing new and better compression algorithms is an active research field. We believe excellent compatibility and balance between usability and compression ratio are the keys for compression methods. With the latter depending heavily on specific research purposes, there is perhaps no one-size-fit-all algorithm. Besides compression, there is also work on data representation format to improve scalability in parallel computation and achieve better compatibility by defining an explicit data schema (\cite Massie: EECS-2013-207).

## The cost of sequencing and the changing biological landscape:

The decrease in the cost of sequencing that has accompanied the introduction of new NGS machines and the corresponding increase in the size of sequence databases has changed both the biological research landscape and the common modes of research. The amount of sequence data generated by the research community has exploded over the past ten years. This data has come from a variety of sources. In some cases, the decreasing cost has enabled ambitious large-scale projects aimed at measuring human variation in large cohorts and profiling cancer genomes. On the other hand, as sequencing has become less expensive it has become easier for individual labs with smaller budgets to undertake sequencing projects. These developments have helped democratize and spread sequencing technologies and research, increasing the diversity and specialization of experiments. Using Illumina sequencing alone, nearly 150 different experimental strategies have been described (ref poster “For all your Seq needs) yielding information about nucleic acid secondary structure, interactions with proteins, spatial information within a nucleus, and more. Perhaps unsurprisingly, the market continues to expect growth from Illumina; their stock valuation outperforms other small-cap biotech, as well as similarly sized companies from other sectors (see figure 4).

The growth of sequence databases has reduced the cost of obtaining useful sequence information for analysis. Sequence data downloadable from databases is ostensibly free. However, costs arise in the need for computational storage and analysis resources as well as the training necessary to handle and interpret the data. The analysis of sequence data has lower fixed costs but higher variable costs compared to sequence generation. Variable costs associated with data transfer, storage, and processing all scale with the amount of sequence data being analyzed. Meanwhile, the training and salary of bioinformatics analysts is a key fixed cost in sequence analysis. The combination of costs in sequence data analysis doesn’t provide the same economy of scale seen in the generation of sequence data.

In an era of squeezed budgets and fierce competition, job prospects for scientists with training in computational biology remain strong (\cite Explosion of Bioinformatics Careers Science 2014). Universities have increased the number of hires in the areas of computer science, and specifically in bioinformatics (see figure 4).

The changing cost structure of sequencing will of course upend the social enterprise of genomics and bio computing. Traditionally finances place a great premium on data and seeing this as a thing of great value. But now with sequencing prices falling rapidly the analysis is taking up the larger fraction of the real value in an experiment. This of course shifts the credit and collaboration and the focus of scientific work. Furthermore the cost structure analysis is very different. One can see this straight off in terms of the rapid number of increasing jobs for bioinformaticians whereas in the past there was little demand for them at universities. One can see more and more of them now. However bioinformaticians fundamentally operate on a different cost structure than sequencing machines being essentially fixed costs with a very little variable nature relative to projects.

This of course necessitates that many of the big projects in addition to having large amounts of sequencing data pay attention to making very efficient the analysis in data processing. This can often come in the framework of having a large-scale collaboration where much of the analysis and processing of the data is done in a unified collaborative fashion meaning that the entire dataset after the fact can be used as a bulk without having to reprocess. It might seem superficially much cheaper to pool and aggregate the results of many smaller experiments but the reprocessing costs of aggregating all of these datasets is actually considerably larger many times than redoing the sequencing experiment itself. Hence, while people thought that the advent of next generation sequencing machines would democratize sequencing, moving away from the large consortia, in fact the opposite is the case and the need for uniformity and standardization in very large datasets has in fact encouraged very large consortiums such as 1000 Genomes and TTTA.

In the future, one might like to see a way of encouraging this uniformity and standardization without having an explicit consortium structure, letting many people spool small sequencing experiments and analyses together. Perhaps this could be done by open community standards in a very similar way to the way the internet was built through pooling of many individual open source actors using community-based standards.

These trends also run the risk of fragmenting the genomics research community. If the sequence data generated by individual labs is not processed uniformly and sequence databases are not made easily accessible and searchable then analysis of integrated datasets will become increasingly challenging. In addition to posing technical issues for data storage, the increasing volume of sequences being generated presents a challenge to integrate newly generated information with the existing knowledge base.

**Box:** **Illustrations of the dramatic increase in rate and amount of sequencing**:

The size and growth rate of the SRA highlight the importance of efficiently storing sequence data for access by the broader scientific community. The SRA’s centrality in the storage of DNA sequences from next generation platforms means that it also serves as a valuable indicator of the scientific uses of sequencing.

A more detailed analysis of the SRA illustrates the pace at which different disciplines adopted sequencing. Plots depicting the cumulative number of bases deposited in the SRA and linked to by papers appearing in different journals provide a proxy for sequencing adoption. More general journals such as Nature and Science show early adoption. Meanwhile, SRA data deposited by articles from more specific journals such as Cell and Molecular Ecology remained low for a significantly longer time before dramatically increasing (see figure 3).

Additionally, it is interesting to look at the contribution of large sequence depositions compared to smaller submissions. This provides an indication of the size distribution of sequencing projects. At one end of this size spectrum are large datasets generated through the collaborative effort of many labs. These include projects that have taken advantage of sequencing trends to generate population scale genomic data (1000 Genomes) or extensive characterization of cancer genomes by The Cancer Genome Atlas (TCGA). On top of generating vast amount of sequencing data to better understand human variation and disease, high throughput sequencing has dramatically expanded the number of species whose genomes are are documented. The number of newly sequenced genomes has exhibited an exponential increase in recent years.