Yale University

Bass Building, Rm 432A
266 Whitney Avenue
PO Box 208114
New Haven, CT 06520-8114

203 432 6105
360 838 7861 (fax)
mark@gersteinlab.org

30th November 2015

Nature Communications
75, Varick Street
Fl 9, New York
NY, 10013-1917
USA

Dear Dr. Cho,

Thank you for the invitation to revise and resubmit our manuscript. In this and the previous re-submission, we have expended significant efforts to address *all* the concerns of the three reviewers, to the extent of modifying our algorithm and reprocessing and re-analyzing *hundreds* of datasets.

We are heartened that Reviewers #1 and #3 endorsed our manuscript for publication in *Nature Communications*. However, we are rather surprised by Reviewer #2's continued criticisms. Fundamentally, we feel that the remaining criticisms represents relatively minor sources of bias in these data. Nonetheless, we have tried to do all potential calculations to address the criticism -- involving many month-long computes. We demonstrate in our response and manuscript that the effects he or she claims are largely inconsequential to the results we report in our piece. Moreover, Reviewer #2's comments suggest that there is a universally accepted standard for reporting allelic effects, which is simply not the case and we hope to make this clear in this letter and in the response.

Now in detail, Reviewer #2 had cited two major concerns in both rounds of reviews: (a) mapping and (b) overdispersion in the datasets.

For (a), as also explained in our current response to the reviewer, the allelic differences in mapping, or 'allelic mapping bias', *includes* the reference bias, which we have already accounted for by the use of diploid personal genomes. Various studies have a different take on how to account for the bias (Supplementary Table 1), with many agreeing that the alignment to a personal genome, as we have done here, is a conservative and effective method for mitigating a large amount of potentially confounding bias [1, 2, 3].

Nonetheless, in this round of revision, we have strived to quantify and compensate for the bias highlighted by Reviewer #2, which we termed the 'ambiguous mapping bias' [1,4]. We show that the ambiguous mapping bias has a smaller effect than the reference bias and does not change the main results of our previous submission. Thus, we interpreted Reviewer #2's comment as asking us to add in a small bias correction filter in order to make our approach fully compliant

Deleted: <object>
Formatted: Font: 10 pt
Deleted: 21st
Formatted: Font color: Black
Deleted: the
Formatted: Font color: Black
Deleted: We
Formatted: Font color: Black
Deleted: worked very hard to make sure we
Formatted
Deleted: all the
Formatted: Font color: Black
Deleted: and downstream analyses for each round of submission.
Formatted: Font color: Black
Deleted: therefore
Formatted: Font color: Black
Deleted: find our responses satisfactory and have
Formatted: Font color: Black
Deleted: comments
Formatted: Font color: Black
Deleted: accounting for differences in …apping between alleles
Deleted: construction and …se of the…diploid personal genomes. Moreover, at least three other publications from peer-reviewed journals such as Nature, Science and PLoS Genetics regarded the reference bias as the major source of allelic mapping bias [1, 2, 7]. More importantly, various…arious studies have a different take on how to account for the bias (please see …upplementary Table 1 of our revised manuscript
Formatted: Font color: Red
Deleted: using …he alignment to a personal genome, as we have done here, is one of the most rigorous ways […conservative and effective method for mitigating a large
Deleted: accounted…trived to quantify and compensate f
Formatted: Font color: Auto
Deleted: also
Formatted: Font color: Auto
Deleted: it
Formatted
Deleted: For the second time, we have taken another 3

with what he or she sees as the standard for the field. While small, this addition actually required many month-long re-computes to reprocess all the 1,263 datasets in a uniform fashion. Moreover, our approach actually exceeds this level of correction since it accounts for additional issues, such as reference bias correction, better read alignment and the ability to incorporate variants beyond just SNVs, e.g. indels (as shown by Sudmant *et al.*) [5].

For (b), in his previous comments he mentioned that "the correct analysis must use *some* strategy to estimate the overdispersion parameter and take it into account when testing for ASE". Based on just this very general description, we first responded by explaining that there is indeed a range of perspectives and methods to account for the issue of overdispersion [4,6-9] (please also refer to Supplementary Table 1). We then went to great lengths to implement a novel two-step procedure to account for overdispersion in the context of our approach. In response, he commented that the previous methods were "mistakes" and that they "got it wrong". We would like to point out that these methods are some of the *most current* work by *authorities* and *peer-reviewed* by colleagues in the field. More importantly, the key point that we are trying to make is *not* to show the 'correctness' of these methods, but to point to the broader reality that there is currently a diversity of methods in the community. For example, Castel *et al.* from *Genome Biology* [1] describes a new tool in the GATK software package and discussed the best practices for allele-specific analyses that do *not* take overdispersion into account. Van de Geijn *et al.* from *Nature Methods* [4] introduced a new allele-specific detection tool that takes into account overdispersion on a per-individual basis (similar to our pipeline; not site-specific as suggested by Reviewer #2).

Given the plurality of current approaches, the fact that the reviewer has been insisting on his/her points of view suggests his/her prejudice for a particular 'right' approach, when there is simply no firm consensus. Furthermore, our current approach has already been extensively discussed and utilized in the ENCODE [10], and the Epigenomics Roadmap consortia. It has also been implemented in the recent *Nature* publication by the 1000 Genomes Project Structural Variants (SV) group [5], which was the reason we initially submitted this manuscript as a companion to the 1000 Genomes paper, as the methods were extensively used by the consortium, particularly in the SV and Functional Interpretation groups.

We have made considerable efforts to modify our manuscript to take into account Reviewer #2's criticisms while preserving the main themes of our manuscript. We are deeply encouraged by the other two reviewers' endorsements of our current manuscript and indeed strongly believe that our approach and resource will generate considerable interest in the community. Hence, we do hope to seek your understanding and consideration of this cover letter when making your decision.

Yours sincerely,

Mark Gerstein
Albert L. Williams Professor of Biomedical Informatics,
Co-director of the Yale Program in Computational Biology and Bioinformatics
Co-chair of 1000 Genomes Project Consortium Functional Interpretation Group

---

Deleted: analyses. We hope that we have satisfied the reviewer in this aspect…he ability to incorporate variants beyond just SNVs, e.g. indels (as shown by accounting for not one, but two, main types of allelic mapping bias.

Deleted: over-dispersion…verdispersion parameter and take it into account when testing for ASE". Based on just this very general description, we first responded by first …xplaining that there is actually…ndeed a wide …ange of perspectives and methods.…to account for the issue of overdispersion [4,6-9] (please also refer to Supplementary Table 1). We then went to great lengths to implement a novel two-step procedure to account for overdispersion in the context of our approach, taking approximately 3 months to reprocess all data and analyses. ¶
¶
. In response to his comment… he commented that the previous methods were "mistakes" and that they "got it wrong", we…. We would like to emphasize…oint out that the publications that we cited in our responses…hese methods are a selection

Deleted: performed

Deleted: in the field

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Font: Italic

Formatted: Font: Italic

Deleted: community. The

Formatted: Font: Italic

Deleted: For example, while the GTEx consortium [1] did attempt to correct for allelic mapping bias, they did not account for overdispersion. Ding *et al.* [2] neither explicitly correct for allelic mapping bias nor account for overdispersion. While we were revising our manuscript, we have also become aware of two more publications. Castel *et al.* from *Genome Biology* [3

Deleted: is again…as been insisting on his/her points of view suggests his/her prejudice for a particular 'right' approach, when there is simply no firm consensus. ¶
¶
Our use of the personal genomes has already been cited by many previous publications in the field as a more rigorous way of alleviating allelic mapping bias [3, 5, 6]. …urthermore, our current approach has already been extensively discussed and ultimately …tilized in the

Deleted: significant…onsiderable efforts to improve…odify our manuscript and incorporate all the

Deleted: ¶

Formatted: Right

Formatted: Left, Indent: Left: 0"

Formatted: Right

Formatted: Right, Indent: Left: 0"

Formatted: Left, Indent: Left: 0"

[1] Castel *et al.* (2015). *Genome Biol.*, 16(1):195, PMID: 26381377

[2] Panousis *et al.* (2014). *Genome Biol.*, 15(9):467, PMID: 25239376

[3] Stevenson *et al.* (2013). *BMC Genomics*, 14:536, PMID: 23919664

[4] van de Geijn *et al.* (2015). *Nat Methods*, doi: 10.1038/nmeth.3582 [epub ahead of print], PMID: 26366987

[5] Sudmant *et al.* (2015). *Nature*, 526(7571):75-81. PMID: 26432246

[6] Sun (2012). *Biometrics.* 68(1):1-11

[7] Mayba *et al.* (2014). *Genome Biology.* 15(8):405

[8] Crowley *et al.* (2015). *Nature Genetics.* 47(4):353-60

[9] Harvey *et al.* (2015). *Bioinformatics.* 31(8):1235-42

[10] Djebali *et al.* (2012). *Nature*, 489(7414):101-8, PMID: 22955620

Moved down [1]: (2015).

Deleted: ¶
[1] The GTEx Consortium

Deleted: *Science*, 348(6235):648-60, PMID: 25954001¶
[2] Ding *et al.*

Moved down [2]: (2014).

Deleted: *PLoS Genet.*, 10(11):e1004798, PMID: 25411781¶
[3

Formatted: Font: 11 pt

Moved (insertion) [2]

Moved (insertion) [3]

Moved (insertion) [4]

Deleted: Panousis

Deleted: *Biol.*,

Moved (insertion) [1]

Deleted:):467, PMID: 25239376

Deleted: [6

Moved up [3]:] Stevenson *et al.* (2013). *BMC Genomics*, 14:536, PMID: 23919664¶

Deleted: [7

Deleted: [8

Moved up [4]: Sudmant *et al.* (2015). *Nature*, 526(7571):75-81. PMID: 26432246