## WEBVTT

- 1 00:00:00.825 --> 00:00:03.748 <v -> College of Medicine and he is a member </v>
- 2 00:00:03.748 --> 00:00:07.927 of the Pelotonia Institute for Immuno-Oncology
- 3 00:00:07.927 --> 00:00:11.527 of Ohio State University as a candidate and a member.
- $4\ 00:00:12.406 \longrightarrow 00:00:14.514$  His research focuses on
- 5 00:00:14.514 --> 00:00:16.681 (mumbles)
- 6 00:00:18.163 --> 00:00:21.570 for integrative analysis on synaptic and genomic data
- $7\ 00:00:21.570 \longrightarrow 00:00:23.737$  with biomedical real data.
- $8\ 00:00:25.820 --> 00:00:29.140$  So welcome back Dongjun Chung.
- 9 00:00:29.140 --> 00:00:31.967 (audience member claps)
- $10\ 00:00:31.967 --> 00:00:32.800 < v -> Okay. < / v >$
- 11 00:00:34.270 --> 00:00:36.640 Thank you Wei, for the kind introduction
- $12\ 00:00:36.640 \longrightarrow 00:00:38.880$  and it's so great to come back.
- $13\ 00:00:38.880 \longrightarrow 00:00:40.523$  Although it's all virtual.
- $14\ 00:00:42.750 \longrightarrow 00:00:44.873$  I hope someday we can see in person.
- 15 00:00:45.840 --> 00:00:50.840 So today I will discuss our recent project
- $16\ 00{:}00{:}51.560$  -->  $00{:}00{:}56.560$  about the SPRUCE and MAPLE: Bayesian Multivariate
- $17\ 00:00:57.010$  --> 00:01:00.840 Mixture Models for Spatial Transcriptomics Data.
- $18\ 00:01:00.840 \longrightarrow 00:01:03.290$  Oh, by the way, can you hear me well?
- $19\ 00:01:03.290 \longrightarrow 00:01:04.634 < v \longrightarrow Ah$  yes, we can hear you.</v>
- 20~00:01:04.634 --> 00:01:05.717 < v -> Okay, great. </v>
- 21 00:01:07.431 --> 00:01:11.500 So, let me start us from some quick introduction
- $22\ 00:01:11.500 \longrightarrow 00:01:14.610$  about the single cell genomics.
- 23 00:01:15.890 --> 00:01:16.960 So in some sense,
- $24\ 00{:}01{:}16.960 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}21.420$  we can say that the last decade was the era of single cell
- 25 00:01:21.420 --> 00:01:23.517 genomic experiments.
- $26\ 00:01:23.517 \longrightarrow 00:01:26.380$  So it changed science in many ways.

- $27\ 00{:}01{:}26.380 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}31.380$  And also a great amount of the data has been generated
- $28\ 00:01:32.050 \longrightarrow 00:01:34.523$  using the single cell genomic technology.
- 29 00:01:35.601 --> 00:01:38.340 Single cell genomic experiments
- $30\ 00:01:38.340 \longrightarrow 00:01:42.141$  provide high-dimensional data at the cell level.
- 31 00:01:42.141 --> 00:01:43.660 By doing so,
- $32\ 00:01:43.660 \longrightarrow 00:01:48.350$  it allows to investigate cellular heterogeneity
- $33\ 00:01:48.350 \longrightarrow 00:01:51.570$  within each subject or the patient
- $34\ 00:01:51.570 --> 00:01:54.250$  which was not possible previously
- 35~00:01:54.250 --> 00:01:56.000 with the bulk of genomic data.
- $36\ 00:01:56.000 --> 00:02:00.393$  Which means that genomic data collected at the tissue level.
- $37\ 00:02:03.984 \longrightarrow 00:02:07.151$  So some kind of standard visualization
- $38\ 00:02:08.583$  --> 00:02:12.892 of the single cell genomic data is called a UMAP.
- 39 00:02:12.892 --> 00:02:13.725 And here,
- $40\ 00{:}02{:}13.725 --> 00{:}02{:}18.330$  this UMAP shows the distribution of the different clusters
- $41\ 00:02:18.330 \longrightarrow 00:02:19.780$  in the tumor,
- 42 00:02:19.780 --> 00:02:24.780 including the different immune cell type.
- 43 00:02:24.890 --> 00:02:27.020 And in this way,
- $44\ 00:02:27.020 \longrightarrow 00:02:29.040$  we can interrogate different types
- $45\ 00:02:29.040 \longrightarrow 00:02:31.583$  of the immune cell composition.
- $46\ 00:02:32.445 \longrightarrow 00:02:33.460$  And also there,
- $47\ 00:02:33.460 \longrightarrow 00:02:36.740$  we can look at what kind of general feature
- $48\ 00:02:36.740 --> 00:02:38.823$  imaged for each cell cluster.
- 49 00:02:40.390 --> 00:02:43.271 One of the recent (mumbles)
- 50 00:02:43.271 --> 00:02:45.820 is the emergence of the high-throughput
- 51 00:02:45.820 --> 00:02:50.690 spatial transcriptomics or the HST technology.
- 52 00:02:50.690 --> 00:02:55.690 So, with the emergence of the HST technology,
- $53~00:02:56.060 \longrightarrow 00:02:59.390$  we do not only look at the gene expression
- $54\ 00:02:59.390 \longrightarrow 00:03:03.230$  in the cell level or the close-to-cell level.

- $55\ 00:03:03.230 \longrightarrow 00:03:05.880$  We can now also notice that there are cross pointing
- $56\ 00:03:05.880 \longrightarrow 00:03:07.283$  spatial information.
- $57\ 00:03:08.350 --> 00:03:11.710$  The figure at the bottom shows one example.
- 58 00:03:11.710 --> 00:03:16.260 And here it shows the mouse brain tissue,
- $59\ 00:03:16.260 \longrightarrow 00:03:18.520$  and each cell cone.
- $60\ 00:03:18.520 --> 00:03:21.270$  Here cross pointer to one spot
- $61\ 00:03:21.270 \longrightarrow 00:03:24.130$  which is a group of the smaller...
- $62\ 00:03:24.130 --> 00:03:29.020$  small number of like two to ten at most.
- $63\ 00{:}03{:}29.020 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}34.020$  And color here indicate expression level of different gene.
- $64\ 00:03:34.410 --> 00:03:39.030$  So left one cross point to the Hpca gene.
- $65~00:03:39.030 \dashrightarrow 00:03:43.693$  Right one cross point to the Ttr gene, for example.
- $66\ 00:03:47.850 \longrightarrow 00:03:49.600$  And with the HST data,
- $67\ 00:03:49.600 \longrightarrow 00:03:52.710$  we can do a lot of interesting science
- $68\ 00:03:53.660 \longrightarrow 00:03:56.890$  to improve the parity in current medication.
- $69\ 00:03:56.890 \longrightarrow 00:03:58.680$  So for example,
- $70\ 00:03:58.680 -> 00:04:01.430$  we can now look at the spatial information
- $71\ 00:04:01.430$  --> 00:04:06.430 of the tissue architecture at the transcriptomics level.
- $72\ 00:04:07.330 \longrightarrow 00:04:09.430$  And then we can also investigate
- 73~00:04:09.430 --> 00:04:12.960 the cell-cell communication with the spatial information
- 74 00:04:12.960 --> 00:04:13.833 in our hand.
- 75 00:04:14.710 --> 00:04:19.250 So at the figure at the bottom left shows the UMAP.
- 76 00:04:19.250 --> 00:04:20.083 And here,
- $77\ 00:04:20.083$  --> 00:04:24.140 the different color indicates a different cell cluster.
- 78 00:04:24.140 --> 00:04:26.710 And if you look at the figure on the right,
- $79\ 00:04:26.710 \longrightarrow 00:04:29.880$  then you can see that there are a cluster
- $80\ 00:04:29.880 \longrightarrow 00:04:32.550$  in a meaningful way on the tissue.

- 81 00:04:32.550 --> 00:04:36.470 So in this way, we do not look at the different cell types
- $82\ 00:04:36.470 \longrightarrow 00:04:37.540$  within a tissue.
- $83\ 00:04:37.540$  --> 00:04:42.540 But also look at their spatial information at the same time.
- $84~00:04:46.597 \longrightarrow 00:04:49.200$  And there's many exciting applications
- $85\ 00:04:49.200$  --> 00:04:54.200 of the HST experiment, including the neuroscience.
- $86\ 00{:}04{:}56.570 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}01.320$  Including the brain cancer study such as the immuno-oncology
- $87\ 00:05:02.180 \longrightarrow 00:05:04.140$  and the developmental biology
- $88\ 00:05:04.140 \dashrightarrow 00:05:07.723$  which looks at the changes of the cellular composition
- $89\ 00:05:07.723 \longrightarrow 00:05:10.563$  across the different stage of the development.
- $90~00:05:11.540 \longrightarrow 00:05:16.220$  And here I specifically discuss the application
- 91 00:05:16.220 --> 00:05:19.453 in the cancer, especially the tumor microenvironment.
- 92 00:05:20.310 --> 00:05:22.310 And with the spatial information,
- 93 00:05:22.310 --> 00:05:26.910 we can now study their location of the immune cell
- $94\ 00:05:26.910 \longrightarrow 00:05:29.823$  and the tumor cell in the tumor tissue.
- $95~00:05:30.666 \longrightarrow 00:05:35.384$  We can also interrogate implication of distance
- $96\ 00:05:35.384 \longrightarrow 00:05:38.143$  on the tissue and their corresponding density.
- $97\ 00:05:39.000 \longrightarrow 00:05:42.320$  And we can also study the distribution
- $98\ 00:05:42.320 \longrightarrow 00:05:44.990$  of the immune regulator.
- 99 00:05:44.990 --> 00:05:48.785 And finally, the special spacial patterns
- $100\ 00:05:48.785 \longrightarrow 00:05:52.202$  such as the tertiary lymphoid structure.
- $101\ 00:05:56.113 \longrightarrow 00:05:59.101$  Then from the statistical point of view,
- $102\ 00:05:59.101 \longrightarrow 00:06:01.351$  how the HST data look like.
- $103\ 00:06:05.259 --> 00:06:10.010$  The first observation is in the HST data spatial structure,
- $104\ 00:06:10.010 \longrightarrow 00:06:13.220$  in the tissue architecture in a meaningful way.
- $105\ 00:06:13.220 \longrightarrow 00:06:15.550$  So as you discussed earlier,

- $106\ 00:06:15.550 --> 00:06:19.179$  we can see a similar type of the cell cluster
- $107\ 00{:}06{:}19.179 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}24.179$  often located in the close proximity in the tissue.
- $108~00{:}06{:}26.800 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}31.800$  And even after we exclude such kind of cell competition
- $109\ 00:06:32.260 \longrightarrow 00:06:34.600$  in the spatial location,
- $110\ 00:06:34.600 --> 00:06:38.390$  we can start to see some spatial pattern in the patient
- $111\ 00:06:38.390 \longrightarrow 00:06:39.970$  on the tissue.
- $112\ 00{:}06{:}39.970 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}43.390$  So the figure on the top shows the expression pattern
- $113\ 00:06:43.390 \longrightarrow 00:06:44.963$  of the three genes,
- 114 00:06:46.011 --> 00:06:47.483 PCP4, MBP and MTC01.
- $115\ 00{:}06{:}49.874 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}54.203$  After regressing out, with respect to the cell clusters.
- 116 00:06:55.907 --> 00:06:58.031 And as you can see, even after considering
- $117\ 00:06:58.031 \longrightarrow 00:06:59.590$  the cell cluster patterns,
- $118\ 00:06:59.590 \dashrightarrow 00:07:03.533$  you can start to see some interesting spatial patterns.
- 119 00:07:04.540 --> 00:07:08.840 That the figure at the bottom shows the distribution
- $120\ 00:07:08.840 \longrightarrow 00:07:13.840$  of each gene for each cell cluster.
- $121\ 00{:}07{:}13.920 {\:{\mbox{--}}\!>\:} 00{:}07{:}17.270$  And you can see that sometimes it's asymmetric
- 122 00:07:17.270 --> 00:07:21.660 but also often we can see non-symmetry
- 123 00:07:21.660 --> 00:07:24.513 in vascular distribution for each gene.
- $124\ 00:07:26.910 \longrightarrow 00:07:30.050$  So these are some of the key features
- $125\ 00:07:30.050 --> 00:07:33.160$  of the HST data we want to consider
- $126\ 00:07:33.160 \longrightarrow 00:07:36.620$  in the modeling of the HST data.
- 127 00:07:36.620 --> 00:07:39.200 So if I profile pick somebody,
- $128\ 00{:}07{:}39.200$  -->  $00{:}07{:}43.310$  Gene expression outcomes feature complex correlation
- $129\ 00:07:43.310 \longrightarrow 00:07:45.530$  such as the spatial correlation,
- $130\ 00:07:45.530 \longrightarrow 00:07:48.860$  and also gene-gene correlation,

- 131 00:07:48.860 --> 00:07:52.327 which mainly effects the biological pathway.
- $132\ 00:07:52.327 \longrightarrow 00:07:54.642$  Spatial structure can be
- 133 00:07:54.642 --> 00:07:56.230 (mumbles)
- 134 00:07:56.230 --> 00:07:59.902 cellular clustering entity expression patterns.
- 135 00:07:59.902 --> 00:08:01.800 And gene expression densities,
- $136\ 00:08:01.800 \longrightarrow 00:08:05.840$  often feature skewness and or heavy tears
- $137\ 00:08:05.840 \longrightarrow 00:08:08.133$  due to outlier cell spots.
- $138\ 00:08:09.454 \longrightarrow 00:08:13.410$  So ideally we seek to provide a model
- $139\ 00:08:13.410 \longrightarrow 00:08:16.400$  for identifying the tissue architecture
- $140\ 00:08:16.400 --> 00:08:18.923$  while accommodating these challenging features.
- 141 00:08:24.120 --> 00:08:28.040 So, especially during the last two years,
- $142\ 00:08:28.040 \longrightarrow 00:08:32.000$  several statistical methods have been proposed
- $143\ 00:08:32.000 \longrightarrow 00:08:34.171$  to model HST data.
- $144\ 00{:}08{:}34.171 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}38.870$  And still many of them are network-based approaches.
- $145\ 00{:}08{:}38.870 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}43.147$  Partially because the stragglers; the very famous packages
- $146\ 00:08:43.147 --> 00:08:45.313$  for the single cell genomic data analysis.
- 147 00:08:46.420 --> 00:08:48.530 And network-based approach has been proven
- $148\ 00:08:49.430 \longrightarrow 00:08:51.360$  to be powerful in this context.
- $149\ 00{:}08{:}51.360 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}55.554$  So based on that multiple network-based approach
- $150\ 00:08:55.554 \longrightarrow 00:09:00.554$  have been proposed including the Giotto, Seurat and stLearn.
- 151 00:09:03.370 --> 00:09:06.120 Because in the statistical model,
- $152\ 00{:}09{:}07.190 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}11.843$  recently Bayes Space was proposed by the group of the
- 153 00:09:11.843 --> 00:09:13.360 (mumbles)
- $154\ 00:09:13.360 \longrightarrow 00:09:15.310$  at the Fred Hutchinson.
- 155 00:09:15.310 --> 00:09:16.450 And essentially,
- $156\ 00:09:16.450 --> 00:09:21.140$  it uses a multivariate-t mixture model
- $157\ 00{:}09{:}21.140 --> 00{:}09{:}23.830$  to cluster cell spots.

- 158 00:09:23.830 --> 00:09:27.414 It implement spatial smoothing of clusters
- $159\ 00:09:27.414 \longrightarrow 00:09:32.300$  via a Pott's model prior on cluster labels.
- 160 00:09:32.300 --> 00:09:33.980 And interestingly,
- $161\ 00:09:33.980 \longrightarrow 00:09:38.980$  they try to predict sub-spots to increase the resolution.
- 162 00:09:40.890 --> 00:09:43.760 In spite of such interesting features,
- $163\ 00:09:43.760 --> 00:09:46.523$  it has also some number of drawbacks.
- 164 00:09:47.380 --> 00:09:48.529 For example,
- $165\ 00:09:48.529 \longrightarrow 00:09:52.210$  it assumes the symmetry of the gene expression densities,
- $166\ 00:09:52.210 \longrightarrow 00:09:56.223$  and it also relies on the approximate inference.
- $167\ 00{:}09{:}57.560 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}02.560$  And here our goal is to develop a statistical model
- $168\ 00:10:02.930 \longrightarrow 00:10:05.530$  that overcome these limitations
- $169\ 00{:}10{:}05.530 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}10.530$  and also provide the optimal tissue architecture prediction
- 170 00:10:10.570 --> 00:10:14.600 using the HST data which we call SPRUCE
- $171\ 00:10:17.720 \longrightarrow 00:10:20.300$  or the spatial random effects-based clustering
- $172\ 00:10:20.300 \longrightarrow 00:10:21.683$  of the single cell data.
- 173 00:10:30.240 --> 00:10:32.083 So this is our SPRUCE model.
- $174~00{:}10{:}35.404 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}39.750$  So here we use the i as the index for the cell spot
- $175\ 00:10:39.750 \longrightarrow 00:10:41.123$  in the tissue sample.
- $176\ 00:10:42.260 \longrightarrow 00:10:45.010$  And then we denote y i
- 177 00:10:45.010 --> 00:10:48.873 as the length of gene expression vector for spot i.
- $178\ 00{:}10{:}50.020$  -->  $00{:}10{:}55.020$  And based on the y i, we also may find a mixture model
- $179\ 00:10:55.670 \longrightarrow 00:10:57.323$  of the form.
- $180\ 00:10:58.600 \dashrightarrow 00:11:02.690$  So here we assume the k number of the mixture component.
- $181\ 00:11:02.690 \longrightarrow 00:11:03.990$  or the cell spot clusters.
- $182\ 00:11:05.650 \longrightarrow 00:11:09.670$  Theta k indicates the set of the parameters

- $183\ 00:11:09.670 --> 00:11:12.163$  specific to mixture component k.
- 184 00:11:13.105 --> 00:11:17.490 Pi k is the probability of the spot i
- $185\ 00:11:17.490 --> 00:11:19.343$  belonging to the component k.
- 186 00:11:22.380 --> 00:11:26.920 We further introduce z1 to zn,
- $187\ 00{:}11{:}26.920 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}30.910$  which are the latent mixture component indicators
- $188\ 00:11:30.910 \longrightarrow 00:11:32.675$  for each spot.
- $189\ 00:11:32.675 \longrightarrow 00:11:37.018$  And zi can have the value between one to k.
- 190 00:11:37.018 --> 00:11:39.710 And as I mentioned earlier,
- 191 00:11:39.710 --> 00:11:42.266 can you see the gene-gene correlation
- 192 00:11:42.266 --> 00:11:46.550 are key features of the HST data?
- $193\ 00:11:46.550 \longrightarrow 00:11:50.861$  So to account for skewness and gene-gene correlation,
- $194\ 00{:}11{:}50.861 {\:{\mbox{--}}}{>} 00{:}11{:}55.861$  we assume a multivariate skew-normal distribution.
- $195\ 00:11:55.961 \longrightarrow 00:11:58.670$  Where is the parameters?
- 196 00:11:58.670 --> 00:12:03.140 So first one indicates the main vector for spot i.
- $197~00{:}12{:}03.140 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}07.400$  and alpha k indicates gene-specific skewness parameters
- $198\ 00:12:07.400 \longrightarrow 00:12:09.700$  for mixture component k.
- $199~00{:}12{:}09.700 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}14.637$  And omega k is the gg scale matrix that captures correlation
- 200 00:12:14.637 --> 00:12:17.993 among the gene expression feature in the component k.
- $201~00{:}12{:}23.810 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}27.910$  And then we further represent MSN distribution
- $202\ 00:12:27.910 \longrightarrow 00:12:31.290$  using a convenient conditional representation.
- $203\ 00:12:31.290 \longrightarrow 00:12:35.740$  We use mu k for the mean of component k,
- 204 00:12:35.740 --> 00:12:38.420 phi i for the spatial effect,
- $205~00{:}12{:}38.420 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}43.420$  and t i and ksi k for the component-specific skewness
- $206\ 00:12:44.050 \longrightarrow 00:12:45.103$  of each gene.
- $207\ 00:12:47.134 \longrightarrow 00:12:49.563$  Epsilon i for the multivariate normal error.

- $208\ 00:12:53.235 \longrightarrow 00:12:57.600$  And then in order to further accommodate spatial dependence,
- $209\ 00:12:57.600 \longrightarrow 00:12:59.860$  we used the multivariate intrinsic
- 210 00:12:59.860 --> 00:13:01.820 conditionally autoregressive,
- 211 00:13:01.820 --> 00:13:05.150 or the CAR prior for phi i.
- 212 00:13:05.150 --> 00:13:06.473 So essentially,
- 213 00:13:07.920 --> 00:13:11.087 given all the spots except for spot i,
- 214 00:13:12.450 --> 00:13:16.710 we might suggest pi i as the normal distribution
- $215\ 00:13:16.710 \longrightarrow 00:13:19.653$  with the mean of its neighbors.
- $216\ 00{:}13{:}21.253 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}26.140$  And with the covariance matrix denoted as the lambda.
- 217 00:13:32.960 --> 00:13:35.300 And as you can see earlier,
- $218\ 00:13:35.300 \longrightarrow 00:13:39.870$  we see the two different levels of the spatial patterns.
- 219 00:13:39.870 --> 00:13:43.840 One for the spatial pattern of defect clustering.
- 220 00:13:43.840 --> 00:13:46.220 And another one is the spatial pattern
- $221\ 00:13:46.220 \longrightarrow 00:13:48.030$  of the gene expression.
- $222\ 00:13:48.030 \longrightarrow 00:13:53.030$  So for the spatial pattern of the cell clusters,
- 223 00:13:53.297 --> 00:13:57.720 we want to allow the probability of pi
- $224\ 00{:}13{:}57.720 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}00.730$  of belonging to each mixture component.
- $225\ 00:14:00.730 \longrightarrow 00:14:03.400$  Also to vary spatially as well.
- 226 00:14:03.400 --> 00:14:05.340 So in order to do so,
- 227 00:14:05.340 --> 00:14:09.180 we extend model I showed previously
- 228 00:14:09.180 --> 00:14:11.890 using the pi i k,
- $229\ 00:14:11.890 \longrightarrow 00:14:13.980$  which is the i specific.
- $230\ 00{:}14{:}13.980 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}18.170$  And then here we modeled this one as the sigmoid
- $231\ 00:14:18.170 \longrightarrow 00:14:19.733$  of the two parameters.
- $232\ 00:14:20.993 \longrightarrow 00:14:23.270$  And then part one in the interceptor
- $233\ 00:14:23.270 \longrightarrow 00:14:27.690$  for the baseline propensity of the membership
- 23400:14:27.690 --> 00:14:31.940 into component k shared by all cell spots.

- $235\ 00:14:31.940 --> 00:14:35.380$  And second term indicates the spatial random effects
- $236\ 00:14:35.380 \longrightarrow 00:14:40.053$  allowing the variation about the intersect.
- 237 00:14:42.400 --> 00:14:43.320 And again,
- $238\ 00:14:43.320 \longrightarrow 00:14:46.030$  to introduce the spatial association
- 239 00:14:46.030 --> 00:14:48.610 into the component membership model,
- 240 00:14:48.610 --> 00:14:52.303 we further assume the univariate intrinsic CAR prior.
- $241\ 00:14:53.236 \longrightarrow 00:14:55.320$  As you can see here.
- $242\ 00:14:55.320 \longrightarrow 00:14:59.713$  And here the one computational challenges,
- $243\ 00:15:00.850 \longrightarrow 00:15:02.863$  if you're interested, is format.
- $244\ 00:15:04.386 \longrightarrow 00:15:05.500$  Then it do not allow us to...
- $245\ 00:15:05.500 \longrightarrow 00:15:09.770$  It do not provide the closed form posterior distribution,
- $246\ 00:15:09.770 \longrightarrow 00:15:12.340$  which prevent Gibbs sampler.
- $247\ 00:15:12.340 \longrightarrow 00:15:16.600$  And in order to address this computation challenge,
- $248\ 00:15:16.600 \longrightarrow 00:15:19.660$  we extended our model
- $249\ 00{:}15{:}19.660 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}24.660$  using the results from the Polson et al in 2013, Jasa
- $250\ 00:15:25.470 --> 00:15:30.300$  on Polya-Gamma data augmentation to allow for Gibbs sampling
- $251\ 00:15:30.300 --> 00:15:32.643$  of the mixing weight model parameters.
- 252 00:15:33.510 --> 00:15:34.343 And essentially,
- $253\ 00:15:34.343 \longrightarrow 00:15:38.280$  we could assume that this can be represented
- $254\ 00:15:38.280 \longrightarrow 00:15:41.810$  as the Polya-Gama Data Augmentation.
- 255 00:15:41.810 --> 00:15:43.420 And by doing so,
- $256\ 00{:}15{:}43.420 {\: \hbox{--}}{>}\ 00{:}15{:}47.403$  everything can be implemented as the Gibbs sampler.
- $257\ 00:15:49.220 \longrightarrow 00:15:53.140$  In the case of the further outliers or heavytails,
- $258\ 00:15:53.140 \longrightarrow 00:15:55.680$  we can even further extend the model
- $259\ 00:15:55.680 \longrightarrow 00:15:58.680$  to the multivariate skew-t distribution

- $260\ 00:15:58.680 \longrightarrow 00:16:00.325$  that you can see here.
- 261 00:16:00.325 --> 00:16:02.850 Which can be very easily implemented
- $262\ 00:16:02.850 \longrightarrow 00:16:04.523$  given the existing model.
- 263 00:16:06.539 --> 00:16:09.700 To complete our model specification,
- 264 00:16:09.700 --> 00:16:13.690 we use the weekly specified prior,
- $265\ 00:16:13.690 \longrightarrow 00:16:15.610$  and then the quantity of prior.
- 266 00:16:15.610 --> 00:16:18.720 And by using this conjugate prior,
- $267\ 00{:}16{:}18.720 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}22.670$  we can do everything using the fully Gibbs sampler
- $268\ 00:16:22.670 \longrightarrow 00:16:23.840$  of the closed form
- $269\ 00:16:23.840 \longrightarrow 00:16:26.053$  which provide the best computation.
- $270\ 00:16:28.720 \longrightarrow 00:16:31.303$  And some additional consideration.
- 271 00:16:33.040 --> 00:16:33.950 So here,
- 272 00:16:33.950 --> 00:16:38.100 the one question is the optimal number of the **k**
- $273\ 00:16:38.100 --> 00:16:40.980$  worked in number of disparate clusters.
- 274 00:16:40.980 --> 00:16:42.470 So for the proposal,
- $275\ 00:16:42.470 \longrightarrow 00:16:46.130$  we use the product of the model selection approaches,
- 276 00:16:46.130 --> 00:16:48.950 and specifically we use the WAIC,
- $277\ 00:16:48.950 \longrightarrow 00:16:51.723$  or the widely applicable information criterion.
- $278~00{:}16{:}54{.}521 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}56{.}820$  In the patient mixture it's very common
- 279 00:16:56.820 --> 00:16:59.950 to observe the label switching program.
- $280\ 00:16:59.950 \longrightarrow 00:17:03.200$  So to protect against the label switching issue
- 281 00:17:03.200 --> 00:17:08.200 in the MCMC sampler, we use the canonical projection of z
- 282 00:17:08.300 --> 00:17:12.580 using the Peng and Cavalho, in 2016.
- 283 00:17:12.580 --> 00:17:16.700 And finally for the actual implementation,
- $284\ 00:17:16.700 \longrightarrow 00:17:18.690$  we use the Rccp
- $285\ 00:17:18.690 \longrightarrow 00:17:21.833$  to further improve the computation efficiency.
- $286\ 00{:}17{:}27.090$  -->  $00{:}17{:}32.090$  We implement the proposed model as on our package SPRUCE,

- $287\ 00{:}17{:}33.270 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}37.280$  and it's currently available from our data page.
- 288 00:17:38.366 --> 00:17:39.199 Here.
- $289\ 00:17:40.409 \longrightarrow 00:17:43.992$  And then the figure shows our digital page.
- 290 00:17:45.069 --> 00:17:47.652 When we developed our software,
- $291\ 00:17:49.220 \longrightarrow 00:17:53.081$  one of the popular software to pre-processing
- $292\ 00:17:53.081 --> 00:17:55.248$  and analyzing the HST data
- $293\ 00:17:56.536 \longrightarrow 00:17:58.453$  is the Seurat workflow.
- 294 00:17:59.661 --> 00:18:01.700 So when you develop our software,
- $295~00:18:01.700 \dashrightarrow 00:18:05.432$  we provide integration with the Seurat workflow
- $296\ 00:18:05.432 \longrightarrow 00:18:10.326$  so that our software can be embedded
- $297\ 00:18:10.326 \longrightarrow 00:18:12.180$  as part of the (mumbles) flow.
- 298 00:18:12.180 --> 00:18:14.177 So for example,
- $299\ 00:18:14.177 \dashrightarrow 00:18:18.971$  the data can be loaded into our using the Seurat.
- $300\ 00:18:18.971 --> 00:18:22.690$  and then people can apply the pre-processing
- $301\ 00:18:22.690 \longrightarrow 00:18:24.323$  using the Seurat workflow.
- 302 00:18:25.532 --> 00:18:26.365 And then that objective
- $303\ 00:18:26.365 --> 00:18:31.140$  can be fed into the SPRUCE analysis workflow.
- $304~00{:}18{:}31.140 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}34.360$  And then the output from the SPRUCE can, again,
- $305\ 00{:}18{:}34.360 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}38.646$  fit into the Seurat workflow for the visualization
- $306\ 00:18:38.646 \longrightarrow 00:18:40.580$  and downstream analysis
- $307\ 00:18:46.385 \longrightarrow 00:18:48.718$  So first for the simulation,
- $308\ 00:18:49.942 --> 00:18:54.067$  the first for the simulation is about the...
- $309\ 00:18:54.067 \longrightarrow 00:18:55.510$  Has the two purposes.
- $310\ 00:18:55.510 --> 00:18:59.079$  So first one is to assess the validity
- $311\ 00:18:59.079 \longrightarrow 00:19:01.293$  of the parameter estimation algorithm.
- 312 00:19:02.320 --> 00:19:04.870 And second is to quantify the effect
- $313\ 00:19:04.870 \longrightarrow 00:19:07.923$  of ignoring skewness and spatial information.

- $314\ 00:19:09.250 --> 00:19:13.189$  So in order to make our simulation more realistic,
- $315\ 00:19:13.189 \longrightarrow 00:19:17.718$  we use the sagittal mouse brain data as the tissue shape
- $316\ 00:19:17.718 \longrightarrow 00:19:20.020$  and the spot location.
- $317\ 00:19:20.020 \longrightarrow 00:19:22.800$  And we simulated the full clusters
- $318\ 00{:}19{:}22.800 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}26.630$  from the multivariate skew-normal distribution
- $319\ 00:19:26.630 \longrightarrow 00:19:28.163$  with the 16 genes.
- $320\ 00:19:31.032 \longrightarrow 00:19:32.510$  We considered the 26...
- $321\ 00:19:34.620 \longrightarrow 00:19:37.530\ 2696\ spots.$
- 322 00:19:37.530 --> 00:19:40.620 And then we considered three models,
- 323 00:19:40.620 --> 00:19:43.700 including the multivariate normal,
- 324 00:19:43.700 --> 00:19:45.040 multivariate skew-normal,
- $325~00{:}19{:}45.040 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}48.690$  and with no skew-normal with no spatial.
- $326\ 00:19:48.690 \longrightarrow 00:19:51.480$  So first one shows the implication
- 327 00:19:51.480 --> 00:19:54.930 of inadequate study of skewness and spatial.
- $328\ 00:19:54.930 \longrightarrow 00:19:57.510$  Second shows the implication
- 329 00:19:57.510 --> 00:20:00.440 of ignoring the spatial structure.
- $330\ 00:20:00.440 \longrightarrow 00:20:03.453$  And the final was our proposed model.
- $331\ 00:20:05.040 \longrightarrow 00:20:07.539$  And here the top left figure,
- $332\ 00:20:07.539 \longrightarrow 00:20:10.790$  shows the true cluster labels.
- 333 00:20:10.790 --> 00:20:12.130 And top of right shows
- 334 00:20:12.130  $\rightarrow$  00:20:17.130 the UMAP reduction of the gene expression pattern.
- $335\ 00:20:17.720 --> 00:20:22.070$  And as you can see, we can make the orange and the green,
- 336 00:20:22.070 --> 00:20:24.294 which is far away from each other,
- $337\ 00:20:24.294 \longrightarrow 00:20:25.660$  similar in the gene expression,
- 338 00:20:25.660 --> 00:20:29.970 so that it can be more challenging in the prediction.
- $339\ 00{:}20{:}29{.}970 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}34.770$  And we really test the performance of each model

- $340\ 00:20:34.770 --> 00:20:38.638$  using the ARI where the very close one
- $341\ 00:20:38.638 \longrightarrow 00:20:40.683$  indicates the better performance.
- $342\ 00:20:41.910 \longrightarrow 00:20:45.530$  And as you can see here, when we ignore
- 343 00:20:47.308 --> 00:20:50.550 the skewness and the spatial pattern,
- $344\ 00:20:50.550 \longrightarrow 00:20:52.383$  there is the big loss of the ARI.
- 345 00:20:55.182 --> 00:20:57.013 And by considering the skewness,
- $346\ 00:20:57.013 --> 00:20:59.980$  we gain some but still that there is being lost.
- 347 00:20:59.980 --> 00:21:03.950 And by further considering the spatial pattern,
- $348\ 00:21:03.950 --> 00:21:06.807$  we can improve the high level of the ARI.
- $349\ 00:21:10.770 \longrightarrow 00:21:14.160$  And for the real data application,
- $350\ 00:21:14.160 --> 00:21:16.943$  we consider the two applications.
- 351 00:21:18.160 --> 00:21:19.690 So,
- $352\ 00:21:19.690 \longrightarrow 00:21:24.690$  to compare the performance of the SPRUCE to existing tools,
- $353\ 00:21:25.630 --> 00:21:28.880$  we used the 10X Visium human brain data
- 35400:21:29.740 --> 00:21:33.423 from the Maynard et al, 2021, Nature Neuroscience.
- $355\ 00:21:36.340 --> 00:21:40.000$  Here at the rehab we have about the 3000 spots.
- $356\ 00:21:40.000 \longrightarrow 00:21:45.000$  And one of the good aspect of this data is
- $357\ 00:21:45.050 \longrightarrow 00:21:48.130$  It's very well annotated.
- $358\ 00:21:48.130 \longrightarrow 00:21:50.900$  So, the author,
- 359 00:21:50.900 --> 00:21:54.490 using his expert knowledge,
- $360\ 00:21:54.490 \longrightarrow 00:21:59.490$  they annotated the 3000 spots into the 5 brain layers.
- $361\ 00:21:59.630 \longrightarrow 00:22:03.443$  Including the white matter and the frontal cortex layers.
- 362 00:22:04.848 --> 00:22:06.030 And as I mentioned earlier,
- $363\ 00:22:06.030 \longrightarrow 00:22:10.510$  we use the standard Seurat pre-processing pipeline,
- $364~00{:}22{:}10.510 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}15.510$  including the normalization of using the sc transform
- $365~00:22:15.880 \longrightarrow 00:22:20.080$  and also selection of the most variable genes

- $366\ 00:22:20.080 --> 00:22:22.306$  using the existing pipeline.
- $367\ 00:22:22.306 \longrightarrow 00:22:26.543$  We consider the top 16 most variable genes.
- $368~00{:}22{:}28.912 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}33.670$  And we also consider the three other existing algorithms
- 369 00:22:33.670 --> 00:22:38.263 including BayesSpace, stLearn, Seurat and Giotto
- $370\ 00:22:40.100 \longrightarrow 00:22:42.460$  as the computing algorithms.
- $371\ 00:22:42.460 \longrightarrow 00:22:45.883$  And we use the default parameters for each of them.
- $372\ 00:22:49.318 \longrightarrow 00:22:50.568$  Here it shows the regions
- $373\ 00{:}22{:}51.872 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}54.490$  and top left figure shows the manual annotation
- 374 00:22:54.490 --> 00:22:57.640 provided by the author in the paper.
- 375 00:22:57.640 --> 00:23:02.640 And you can see the nice, five spatial clusters
- $376\ 00:23:02.905 \longrightarrow 00:23:05.070$  from inside out.
- $377\ 00:23:05.070 \longrightarrow 00:23:07.590$  And also there you can see
- $378\ 00:23:07.590 \longrightarrow 00:23:11.271$  that there is one, narrow cell cluster
- $379\ 00:23:11.271 \longrightarrow 00:23:14.593$  corresponding to the number four.
- 380 00:23:15.775 --> 00:23:18.392 Here we showed the real data for the SPRUCE,
- 381 00:23:18.392 --> 00:23:22.533 BayesSpace, stLearn, Seurat and the Giotto.
- $382\ 00{:}23{:}23.810$  -->  $00{:}23{:}28.260$  And in this case, the network-based approaches,
- 383 00:23:28.260 --> 00:23:32.087 including the stLearn, Seurat and the Giotto,
- $384\ 00:23:32.087 \longrightarrow 00:23:37.087$  all showed a lower performance compared to those algorithms.
- $385\ 00{:}23{:}38.074 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}41.620$  The BayesSpace showed relatively higher performance
- $386\ 00:23:41.620 \longrightarrow 00:23:44.963$  about the ARI of 0.55.
- $387\ 00:23:46.350 \longrightarrow 00:23:49.240$  SPRUCE further improved the performance
- $388\ 00:23:49.240 \longrightarrow 00:23:51.570$  compared to the BayesSpace.
- 389 00:23:51.570 --> 00:23:54.830 And one thing I noted here is the...
- 390 00:23:57.796 --> 00:24:00.130 The narrowed cell cluster,
- 391 00:24:00.130 --> 00:24:02.633 could it be identified by the SPRUCE?

- 392 00:24:04.015 --> 00:24:05.003 Which is interesting.
- $393\ 00:24:06.090 \longrightarrow 00:24:08.333$  And as the second example.
- $394\ 00:24:09.557 --> 00:24:12.620$  So first one is the more labeled data.
- $395\ 00:24:12.620 \longrightarrow 00:24:17.250$  We can compare our prediction to the existing annotation.
- $396\ 00{:}24{:}17.250 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}21.170$  And to further demonstrate the application of the SPRUCE
- $397\ 00{:}24{:}22.174 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}26.290$  to unlabeled data, we analyze the publicly available
- 398 00:24:26.290 --> 00:24:30.890 human invasive ductal carcinoma breast tissue.
- 399 00:24:30.890 --> 00:24:33.633 Again using the 10 X Visium platform.
- $400~00{:}24{:}35.900 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}38.420$  And we essentially followed the similar workflow
- $401\ 00:24:38.420$  --> 00:24:43.420 and we identify the top 16 most spatially variable genes.
- $402\ 00:24:44.544$  --> 00:24:49.544 And those included several tumor associated antigens,
- $403\ 00:24:49.650 --> 00:24:53.847\ TAA$ , in creating the GFRA1 and CXCL14.
- $404\ 00:24:56.470 \longrightarrow 00:25:00.250$  And also that there is the tumor suppressive gene,
- $405\ 00:25:00.250 \longrightarrow 00:25:02.823$  like MALAT1.
- $406~00{:}25{:}04.430 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}09.430$  And we use the SPRUCE to identify the 5 sub regions
- $407\ 00:25:09.600 \longrightarrow 00:25:11.493$  using these 16 features.
- $408\ 00:25:12.479 \longrightarrow 00:25:16.370$  This shows the 16 most variable genes.
- $409\ 00{:}25{:}16.370 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}21.370$  And you can see that there are very clear spatial patterns.
- 410 00:25:22.430 --> 00:25:27.430 For example the CXCL14 and GFRA1,
- $411\ 00:25:27.840 \longrightarrow 00:25:30.350$  expel on the right bottom side.
- $412\ 00{:}25{:}30.350 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}35.350$  While the MALAT1 express higher in the top left side.
- $413\ 00:25:38.400 \longrightarrow 00:25:41.540$  And this is the cluster prediction
- 414 00:25:41.540 --> 00:25:43.883 made by the SPRUCE algorithm.

- $415\ 00:25:45.670 \longrightarrow 00:25:47.760$  And you can see that it identified
- $416\ 00{:}25{:}47.760 --> 00{:}25{:}52.283$  the cluster too, which it highly coincide with the CLCX14
- $417\ 00:25:54.859 \longrightarrow 00:25:57.192$  and GFRAI1 with a study on.
- 418 00:25:59.048 --> 00:26:01.200 (mumbles)
- 419 00:26:01.200 --> 00:26:03.693 What the cell cluster 1,
- 420 00:26:05.336 --> 00:26:09.230 Is the MALAT1
- 421 00:26:09.230 --> 00:26:11.493 which is more tumor suppressor.
- $422\ 00:26:12.774 \longrightarrow 00:26:16.945$  So here we can see that the SPRUCE can identify
- 423 00:26:16.945 --> 00:26:20.080 the different group of the tissue architecture,
- $424\ 00{:}26{:}20.080 {\: \hbox{--}}{>}\ 00{:}26{:}25.080$  such as the tumor suppressor and then tumor related
- 425 00:26:25.354 --> 00:26:27.521 (mumbles)
- $426\ 00:26:32.947 \longrightarrow 00:26:36.800$  And we can also easily look at there,
- $427\ 00:26:36.800 \longrightarrow 00:26:39.520$  within cluster expression pattern
- $428\ 00:26:39.520 \longrightarrow 00:26:41.093$  and gene-gene correlation.
- 429 00:26:42.710 --> 00:26:44.110 As you could see earlier,
- $430\ 00:26:44.110 \longrightarrow 00:26:48.020$  on cell cluster 2 which equals 0.2 to the right
- $431\ 00:26:48.963 \longrightarrow 00:26:52.493$  higher than the GFRA1 and CXCL14.
- $432\ 00{:}26{:}52.493 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}57.039$  One, which is the cross point here is the highend MALAT1
- $433\ 00:26:57.039 \longrightarrow 00:26:58.000$  and so on.
- $434\ 00:26:58.000 \longrightarrow 00:27:02.470$  And also, in the case of cell cluster 2,
- $435\ 00:27:02.470 --> 00:27:05.500$  there's a very strong gene-gene correlation pattern.
- $436\ 00{:}27{:}05.500 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}10.023$  So we just support the proposed model that considered
- $437\ 00:27:11.120 \longrightarrow 00:27:14.430$  spatial pattern and also gene-gene correlation
- $438\ 00:27:14.430 \longrightarrow 00:27:15.263$  simultaneously.
- 439 00:27:19.800 --> 00:27:20.633 So,
- $440\ 00:27:20.633 --> 00:27:24.550$  so far I discussed the method
- $441\ 00:27:25.717 --> 00:27:29.783$  for our SPRUCE and its application.

- $442\ 00{:}27{:}32.510$  -->  $00{:}27{:}37.510$  And that we essentially expanded our work a little bit more
- 443 00:27:37.510 --> 00:27:38.510 to the MAPLE,
- $444\ 00{:}27{:}38.510 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}42.173$  which is the multi-sample spatial transcriptomics model
- $445\ 00{:}27{:}43.967 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}48.967$  Why we care about the multi-sample analysis of HST data?
- $446\ 00{:}27{:}49.280 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}52.910$  So currently most algorithms are designed in a way
- $447\ 00:27:52.910 \longrightarrow 00:27:56.630$  that it can more focus on a single sample.
- 448 00:27:56.630 --> 00:27:59.102 But even intuitively,
- $449\ 00:27:59.102 --> 00:28:03.460$  joint analysis of the multiple HST data
- $450\ 00:28:03.460 \longrightarrow 00:28:05.840$  can potentially boost the signal
- $451\ 00:28:05.840 \longrightarrow 00:28:08.980$  by sharing the information amongst samples.
- $452\ 00{:}28{:}08.980 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}13.170$  And also the joint analysis of the different samples
- $453\ 00{:}28{:}13.170 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}18.120$  can allow the differentiation analysis of the HST data.
- $454\ 00{:}28{:}18.120$  -->  $00{:}28{:}23.120$  So very often, each tissue is not our main interest.
- $455\ 00{:}28{:}23.980 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}27.400$  But we also want to compare tissue architecture
- $456\ 00:28:27.400 \longrightarrow 00:28:29.540$  between the different samples.
- $457\ 00:28:29.540 \longrightarrow 00:28:34.510$  For example, between the disease group versus the controls,
- $458\ 00:28:34.510 \longrightarrow 00:28:38.661$  responders versus the non responders to 13 treatments,
- $459\ 00:28:38.661 \longrightarrow 00:28:41.100$  such as the cancer immuno-therapy.
- $460\ 00{:}28{:}41.100$  -->  $00{:}28{:}45.633$  So to offset this limitation, we proposed MAPLE.
- 461 00:28:46.550 --> 00:28:50.080 And actually our existing SPRUCE framework
- $462\ 00:28:50.080 \longrightarrow 00:28:53.463$  already allows this one naturally.
- $463\ 00:28:54.796 \longrightarrow 00:28:56.997$  So, simply what it can do is
- $464\ 00{:}28{:}56.997 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}01.290$  instead of now analyzing each sample individually,

- $465\ 00:29:01.290 \longrightarrow 00:29:04.720$  we can jointly analyze all the samples together.
- $466\ 00:29:04.720 \longrightarrow 00:29:06.260$  And then by doing so,
- $467\ 00:29:06.260 \longrightarrow 00:29:07.940$  we can share information
- 468 00:29:07.940 --> 00:29:12.940 about the modeling of each cell spot cluster,
- $469\ 00:29:12.960 \longrightarrow 00:29:17.060$  and also their spatial pattern.
- 470~00:29:17.060 --> 00:29:21.920 But by introducing the sample-level covariate exp xi
- $471\ 00:29:21.920 \longrightarrow 00:29:23.723$  in the cell type composition,
- $472\ 00:29:27.380 \longrightarrow 00:29:28.790$  we can see the impact
- $473\ 00:29:28.790 \longrightarrow 00:29:31.817$  of the different sample-level covariate.
- $474\ 00:29:33.320 \longrightarrow 00:29:36.823$  Which I show more in detail in the coming slides.
- $475\ 00:29:41.460 \longrightarrow 00:29:44.970$  So the first application is the same mouse brain data,
- $476\ 00:29:44.970 \longrightarrow 00:29:47.230$  the human brain data...
- 477 00:29:47.230 --> 00:29:49.310 Sorry this should be the mouse brain,
- 478 00:29:49.310 --> 00:29:53.033 and here we see the two anterior parts,
- $479\ 00:29:53.900 \longrightarrow 00:29:55.600$  which look very similar.
- $480\ 00:29:55.600 \longrightarrow 00:29:57.400$  And then as you can see here,
- $481\ 00:29:57.400 --> 00:30:00.807$  when we jointly analyze the two sample
- 482 00:30:00.807 --> 00:30:04.380 cross pointing to the same part of the brain.
- 483 00:30:04.380 --> 00:30:08.210 It nicely identifies the cross pointing part
- $484\ 00:30:08.210 \longrightarrow 00:30:09.830$  between the two sample.
- 485 00:30:09.830 --> 00:30:13.682 Like one in the end, three on the top,
- $486\ 00:30:13.682 \longrightarrow 00:30:15.853$  five at the bottom and so on.
- $487\ 00:30:17.120 --> 00:30:20.950$  And because this is the Bayesag framework,
- 488 00:30:20.950 --> 00:30:24.640 it can also provide uncertainty measures
- $489\ 00:30:24.640 --> 00:30:27.510$  about our clustering prediction.
- $490\ 00{:}30{:}27.510 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}30.940$  And as you can see usually there is more uncertain
- 491 00:30:30.940 --> 00:30:34.520 about the clustering prediction

- $492\ 00{:}30{:}34.520 --> 00{:}30{:}37.850$  around the boundary between different cell clusters.
- 493 00:30:37.850 --> 00:30:40.070 Which kind of makes sense,
- $494\ 00:30:40.070 --> 00:30:43.190$  because we expect that maybe cell type
- $495\ 00{:}30{:}43.190 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}47.510$  might be more mixed together in the same cell spot.
- $496\ 00:30:47.510 \longrightarrow 00:30:50.190$  Also, there are some cell clusters
- 497 00:30:50.190 --> 00:30:52.890 with the higher level of the uncertainty
- $498\ 00{:}30{:}52.890 {\: -->\:} 00{:}30{:}55.640$  of which we are still trying to understand more
- $499\ 00:30:55.640 \longrightarrow 00:30:56.493$  at this point.
- $500\ 00:30:58.180 --> 00:31:01.450$  And this kind of the figure is the...
- 501 00:31:01.450 --> 00:31:04.673 what utility of this kind of joint analysis.
- $502\ 00:31:05.510 \longrightarrow 00:31:08.840$  So, for the identifier with T,
- $503\ 00:31:08.840 \longrightarrow 00:31:13.650$  we set the first cell cluster as the reference.
- 504 00:31:13.650 --> 00:31:16.370 And then here we see the two (mumbles)
- 505 00:31:16.370 --> 00:31:20.180 The top one shows the intercept,
- $506\ 00:31:20.180 \longrightarrow 00:31:24.740$  and then we can interpret this one as the relative size
- $507\ 00:31:24.740 \longrightarrow 00:31:26.470$  of each cell cluster.
- 508 00:31:26.470 --> 00:31:28.770 So then compared to the one,
- $509\ 00:31:28.770 --> 00:31:31.283$  we can say three and the six are larger.
- $510\ 00:31:32.230$  --> 00:31:35.910 So the three and the six are larger, compared to the one.
- 511 00:31:35.910 --> 00:31:38.514 Why the four is the smaller,
- $512\ 00:31:38.514 \longrightarrow 00:31:40.480$  well just smaller compared to the one.
- $513\ 00:31:40.480 \longrightarrow 00:31:44.840$  So this is what it can see by eye
- $514\ 00:31:44.840 --> 00:31:47.347$  from the tissue prediction region.
- $515\ 00:31:48.372 \longrightarrow 00:31:51.770$  But good thing is that this model allows us to quantify,
- $516\ 00:31:51.770 \longrightarrow 00:31:53.143$  what you see by eye.
- $517\ 00:31:54.520$  --> 00:31:57.450 And what is more interesting is the second one.

- 518 00:31:57.450 --> 00:31:58.283 So this one,
- $519\ 00:31:58.283 \longrightarrow 00:32:01.530$  is about the difference between the two sample.
- $520\ 00:32:01.530 \longrightarrow 00:32:02.363$  So again,
- 521 00:32:03.870 --> 00:32:06.654 so basically if it's higher,
- $522~00:32:06.654 \dashrightarrow 00:32:11.654$  then it means that certain tissue spot cluster
- 523 00:32:11.800 --> 00:32:14.250 getting bigger in the second sample.
- 524~00:32:14.250 --> 00:32:17.718 And if it's lower immune state is a kind of smaller
- $525\ 00:32:17.718 --> 00:32:20.270$  in the second sample and so on.
- 526 00:32:20.270 --> 00:32:21.192 So in this way,
- $527\ 00{:}32{:}21.192 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}26.192$  we can quantify the change of the tissue architecture
- $528\ 00:32:26.320 --> 00:32:28.003$  between different cell clusters.
- $529\ 00:32:30.330 \longrightarrow 00:32:35.320$  And another interesting example is this one.
- 530 00:32:35.320 --> 00:32:39.431 So here, the image of 2D to anterior samples,
- $531\ 00{:}32{:}39.431 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}44.210$  we now also look at the posterior sample as well.
- $532\ 00:32:44.210 --> 00:32:47.950$  So because this is two parts of the brain
- 533 00:32:47.950 --> 00:32:49.980 anterior and the posterior,
- $534\ 00:32:49.980 \longrightarrow 00:32:53.060$  the issue is kind of continuous between two.
- 535 00:32:53.060 --> 00:32:54.430 And as you can see here,
- $536\ 00:32:54.430 \longrightarrow 00:32:58.933$  cell cluster three is connected to the posterior side here.
- $537\ 00:32:59.974 --> 00:33:04.720$  Cell cluster one is connected to here and so on.
- $538\ 00:33:04.720 --> 00:33:08.050$  And then this kind of pattern is not clear
- $539\ 00:33:08.050 \longrightarrow 00:33:12.220$  if you analyze each data independently.
- 540 00:33:12.220 --> 00:33:15.610 And our MAPLE framework nicely captures
- 541 00:33:15.610 --> 00:33:17.750 such kind of sharing pattern.
- $542\ 00:33:17.750 --> 00:33:19.770$  And also the difference pattern
- 543 00:33:19.770 --> 00:33:22.950 between the different samples, interestingly.
- 544 00:33:22.950 --> 00:33:24.937 So at this point,

- $545\ 00:33:24.937 --> 00:33:27.350$  we are working on more simulation study
- $546\ 00:33:27.350 \longrightarrow 00:33:29.440$  and the real data analysis
- $547\ 00:33:29.440 \longrightarrow 00:33:32.540$  to further show the performance
- $548\ 00:33:32.540 \longrightarrow 00:33:36.043$  and understand the properties of the MAPLE at this point.
- 549~00:33:38.650 --> 00:33:43.650 So then I can't summarize my presentation today.
- $550\ 00:33:44.630 \longrightarrow 00:33:49.297$  So the high throughput spatial transcriptomics, or HST,
- $551\ 00:33:50.290 \longrightarrow 00:33:53.680$  provides unprecedented opportunities
- $552\ 00:33:53.680 \longrightarrow 00:33:57.430$  to investigate novel biological hypotheses,
- $553\ 00{:}33{:}57.430 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}01.513$  such as the tumor microenvironment and certain structure
- 554 00:34:04.816 --> 00:34:08.190 about the human brain and Alzheimer,
- $555\ 00:34:08.190 \longrightarrow 00:34:09.720$  and so on.
- 556 00:34:09.720 --> 00:34:12.700 And here we propose SPRUCE,
- $557\ 00:34:12.700 \longrightarrow 00:34:15.640$  a Bayesian multivariate mixture model
- 558~00:34:15.640 --> 00:34:17.733 for HST data analysis.
- 559 00:34:19.460 --> 00:34:22.190 SPRUCE has multiple strengths
- 560 00:34:23.290 --> 00:34:25.860 including the novel combination
- 561 00:34:25.860 --> 00:34:28.500 of the skewed normal density,
- $562~00{:}34{:}28.500 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}31.137$  Polya-Gamma data augmentation,
- $563\ 00:34:31.137 \longrightarrow 00:34:33.043$  and spatial random effect.
- 564 00:34:34.750 --> 00:34:36.850 Altogether, it allows to
- $565\ 00{:}34{:}36.850 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}41.040$  precisely infer spatially correlated mixture component
- $566\ 00:34:41.040 --> 00:34:43.293$  membership probabilities.
- 567 00:34:44.365 --> 00:34:48.829 In our simulation study and real data analysis,
- $568\ 00:34:48.829 \longrightarrow 00:34:52.820$  we could see that SPRUCE outperforms the existing method,
- $569\ 00:34:52.820 \longrightarrow 00:34:56.160$  in the tissue architecture identification.
- 570~00:34:56.160 --> 00:35:01.160 And finally our recent extension of the MAPLE

- $571\ 00:35:01.270$  --> 00:35:04.530 allows the joint clustering and differential analysis
- $572\ 00:35:04.530 --> 00:35:06.933$  of multiple HST data.
- 573 00:35:08.548 --> 00:35:12.815 So at this point SPRUCE is on the review in,
- 574 00:35:12.815 --> 00:35:14.970 (mumbles)
- $575\ 00:35:14.970 \longrightarrow 00:35:17.020$  in the biometrics.
- $576\ 00:35:17.020$  --> 00:35:21.033 Cross pointing manuscript is available in the bio archive.
- 577 00:35:22.040 --> 00:35:25.240 And there are multiple ongoing work
- $578\ 00:35:25.240 --> 00:35:28.230$  regarding the HST data modeling
- 579 00:35:28.230 --> 00:35:29.163 in our lab.
- 580~00:35:30.418 --> 00:35:34.580 So we are actually currently working on further improving
- 581~00:35:34.580 --> 00:35:36.700 the SPRUCE and the MAPLE
- 582 00:35:36.700 --> 00:35:39.350 by incorporating other characteristics
- $583~00:35:39.350 \dashrightarrow 00:35:44.350$  of the HST data, such as the relationships among cells.
- 584 00:35:44.360 --> 00:35:45.861 For example,
- $585\ 00:35:45.861$  --> 00:35:50.000 we know that there are some likened and receptor,
- $586\ 00:35:50.000 \longrightarrow 00:35:50.833$  for example.
- $587~00:35:50.833 \dashrightarrow 00:35:55.140$  Which we expect that they interact with each other
- $588\ 00:35:55.140 --> 00:35:57.390$  in their cell structure.
- 589~00:35:57.390 --> 00:36:00.950 And then by incorporating different prior information,
- $590~00{:}36{:}00.950 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}04.163$  we can further improve the SPRUCE and MAPLE.
- $591~00{:}36{:}05.610 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}09.633$  We are also working on the other statistical models
- $592\ 00:36:09.633 \longrightarrow 00:36:14.130$  for somewhat relevant, but different tasks.
- 593 00:36:14.130 --> 00:36:15.252 For example,
- $594\ 00{:}36{:}15.252 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}18.820$  currently we are also working on the streamlining framework,

- 595 00:36:18.820 --> 00:36:20.973 especially the graph neural network,
- $596\ 00:36:21.918 \longrightarrow 00:36:24.186$  which is called RESEPT.
- 597 00:36:24.186 --> 00:36:27.019 And then using the gene framework,
- 598 00:36:27.853 --> 00:36:29.610 we tried to come up with good embedding
- $599\ 00:36:29.610 --> 00:36:32.163$  of the HST gene expression pattern.
- $600\ 00{:}36{:}34.290 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}37.510$  Our current results show that such a combination
- $601~00{:}36{:}37.510 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}41.420$  of the stem learning and the statistical model approach
- $602\ 00:36:41.420 \longrightarrow 00:36:44.303$  can provide nice prediction performance.
- $603~00{:}36{:}47.149 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}50.437$  For this proposal, we developed a framework called RESEPT
- $604\ 00:36:51.970 \longrightarrow 00:36:54.020$  and cross pointing bio archive
- $605\ 00:36:54.877 \longrightarrow 00:36:57.090$  is also available publicly.
- $606\ 00:36:57.090 --> 00:36:59.350$  And then cross pointing paper
- $607\ 00:36:59.350 \longrightarrow 00:37:02.843$  is now under revision in the nature communications.
- 608 00:37:05.850 --> 00:37:08.724 Regarding cell-cell communications,
- $609\ 00{:}37{:}08.724 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}11.980$  using network-based approaches has some benefit
- $610\ 00{:}37{:}11.980 {\:-->\:} 00{:}37{:}15.930$  because the cell-cell communication can be nicely
- $611\ 00:37:15.930 \longrightarrow 00:37:19.403$  and naturally modeled using AGR network.
- $612\ 00:37:20.976 --> 00:37:24.620$  So we have the parallel work called the the Banyan
- $613\ 00:37:24.620 --> 00:37:26.970$  to identify the cell-cell communication
- $614\ 00{:}37{:}26.970 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}31.230$  and tissue architecture using the network-based approaches.
- $615\ 00{:}37{:}31.230 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}36.230$  And finally, there are the multiple effort experimentally
- $616\ 00:37:36.930 \longrightarrow 00:37:40.573$  to generate the spatial multimodal data.
- $617\ 00:37:41.670 \longrightarrow 00:37:42.503$  For example,
- $618\ 00{:}37{:}42.503 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}47.503$  the effect to seek such as the single cell genomics,

- $619\ 00:37:48.230 --> 00:37:52.580$  proteomics and the T-cell receptor at the same time.
- 620 00:37:52.580 --> 00:37:53.580 And very soon,
- 621 00:37:53.580 --> 00:37:56.780 everything are expected to be combined
- $622\ 00:37:56.780 \longrightarrow 00:37:59.663$  as the spatial transcriptomic structure.
- $623\ 00:38:00.630 \longrightarrow 00:38:03.430$  We are working on the direction
- $624\ 00:38:03.430 \longrightarrow 00:38:06.020$  to develop the statistical model
- 625~00:38:06.020 --> 00:38:09.733 for integration of the HST data with other matched data.
- 626~00:38:12.769 -->  $00:38:15.867~\mathrm{So}$  I would like to acknowledge my research team at OSU.
- 627 00:38:17.870 --> 00:38:22.560 Carter Allen is the main driver this project,
- 628 00:38:22.560 --> 00:38:25.310 and also my pitch assistant
- 629 00:38:26.883 --> 00:38:31.870 Qin Ma and Yuzhou Chang is my close collaborator
- $630\ 00:38:31.870 \longrightarrow 00:38:36.410$  for the HST data modeling project.
- 631 00:38:36.410 --> 00:38:37.798 And Zihai Li,
- $632\ 00:38:37.798$  --> 00:38:41.600 who is the director of the Immuno-Oncology Institute
- $633\ 00:38:41.600 \longrightarrow 00:38:44.143$  and also the expert in cancer.
- 634 00:38:46.070 --> 00:38:48.730 Won Chang at the University of Cincinnati
- $635~00{:}38{:}48.730 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}51.523$  who are the spatial statistics expert,
- 63600:38:52.907 --> 00:38:56.370 and MUSC collaborator Brian Neelon
- $637\ 00:38:56.370 \longrightarrow 00:38:57.833$  and my grant support.
- $638\ 00:38:59.650 \longrightarrow 00:39:02.920$  So, and this is the end of my presentation,
- 639 00:39:02.920 --> 00:39:05.480 and you can find my manuscript
- $640\ 00:39:05.480 --> 00:39:09.660$  and the software from the link here.
- $641\ 00:39:09.660 \longrightarrow 00:39:11.773$  If you have any questions and comment,
- $642\ 00:39:12.686 --> 00:39:16.969$  please let me know by email at chung.911@osu.edu.
- $643\ 00:39:16.969 --> 00:39:19.636$  So thank you for your attention.
- 644 00:39:28.588 --> 00:39:29.838 <-v -> So thank you.</v>
- $645\ 00:39:31.862 --> 00:39:35.693$  Do we have any questions from the audience in the classroom,

- $646\ 00:39:35.693 \longrightarrow 00:39:38.110$  or from the audience on zoom?
- $647\ 00:39:42.661 \longrightarrow 00:39:44.917 < v \longrightarrow Can I ask a question? < / v >$
- $648\ 00:39:44.917 \longrightarrow 00:39:46.250$  Can you hear me?
- $649\ 00:39:46.250 \longrightarrow 00:39:47.260 < v \longrightarrow Yes, mm-hm. < /v >$
- $650\ 00:39:47.260 --> 00:39:48.760 < v -> Right, Dongjun welcome back. < / v >$
- 651 00:39:49.600 --> 00:39:51.720 Great work, it's a nice presentation.
- 652 00:39:51.720 --> 00:39:53.194 I'm just wondering, like,
- 653 00:39:53.194 --> 00:39:55.760 when you do this from your own experience
- $654\ 00:39:55.760 \longrightarrow 00:39:57.200$  on the cell clustering,
- $655\ 00:39:57.200 \longrightarrow 00:40:00.410$  how much the spatial information contributes
- $656\ 00:40:00.410 \longrightarrow 00:40:02.593$  to the clustering.
- $657\ 00:40:02.593 \longrightarrow 00:40:03.426 < v \longrightarrow Sure. </v>$
- 658 00:40:09.017 --> 00:40:09.900 So,
- 659 00:40:09.900 --> 00:40:12.067 (mumbles)
- 660 00:40:14.598 --> 00:40:16.132 If you're here,
- 661 00:40:16.132 --> 00:40:18.450 so if you look at the Seurat workflow,
- 662 00:40:18.450 --> 00:40:21.710 you can see there's a still lot of the, kind of,
- $663\ 00{:}40{:}21.710$  -->  $00{:}40{:}24.783$  local boundary between different cell spot clusters.
- $664~00{:}40{:}27.730 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}31.830$  And when you analyze the same data using the SPRUCE,
- 665 00:40:31.830 --> 00:40:33.740 you can see much cleaner boundary.
- 666 00:40:33.740 --> 00:40:36.439 And often it will coincide with the
- $667\ 00:40:36.439 \longrightarrow 00:40:39.740$  expert analogy annotation.
- $668\ 00:40:39.740 --> 00:40:44.293$  So given that there is the significant contribution.
- $669\ 00:40:46.210 \longrightarrow 00:40:49.230$  of course even the gene expression,
- $670\ 00{:}40{:}49.230 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}52.460$  we still get some big picture, as you can see here.
- 671 00:40:52.460 --> 00:40:56.673 But spatial information provide much cleaner prediction
- $672\ 00:40:56.673 \longrightarrow 00:40:59.263$  about the tissue architecture in general.

- 673 00:41:01.330 --> 00:41:02.163 <v ->I see.</v>
- $674\ 00:41:02.163 \longrightarrow 00:41:03.747$  And also the skewness.
- 675 00:41:04.950 --> 00:41:07.740 Do you estimate that or that's like your heart
- $676\ 00:41:07.740 \longrightarrow 00:41:09.240$  was persuaded by the skewness?
- $677\ 00:41:12.049 \longrightarrow 00:41:14.443 < v \longrightarrow You mean which one? < / v >$
- 678 00:41:14.443 --> 00:41:16.000 <--> On k model.</-> ->  $\sim$
- $679~00{:}41{:}16.000 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}19.120$  Your model to specify, the k model you have there.
- $680\ 00:41:19.120 \longrightarrow 00:41:20.440$  I missed that part.
- 681 00:41:20.440 --> 00:41:22.863 Like, do you need to specify the skewness?
- 682 00:41:24.396 --> 00:41:26.440 <v ->Or learn from data.</v>
- 683 00:41:26.440 --> 00:41:27.273 < v -> Oh, I see.< / v >
- 684 00:41:27.273 --> 00:41:28.870 But from the data, how skew?
- $685\ 00:41:28.870 --> 00:41:30.600\ I\ mean,$  just in terms of how stable
- $686\ 00:41:30.600 \longrightarrow 00:41:32.573$  that alpha k can be estimated.
- 687 00:41:35.790 --> 00:41:38.240 <v ->So maybe I can answer it in two different ways.</v>
- $688~00{:}41{:}39.720 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}42.663$  So if there is this skewness in the data, I think yes.
- $689\ 00{:}41{:}43.655 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}47.650$  So we'll say it depends on how processed the data as well.
- $690~00:41:48.878 \longrightarrow 00:41:50.910$  So usually there's three different approaches
- $691~00{:}41{:}50.910 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}55.910$  to model the HST data in closed spatial embedding gene.
- 692 00:41:56.830 --> 00:41:58.103 And so you can see here,
- $693\ 00{:}41{:}58.103 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}00.853$  who are the people using the principle components?
- 694 00:42:01.854 --> 00:42:04.596 Who are the people use the team learning
- $695\ 00:42:04.596 \longrightarrow 00:42:05.953$  as the embedding step?
- $696\ 00:42:08.179 --> 00:42:12.040$  If you use the team learning or the PCA
- $697\ 00:42:12.040 \longrightarrow 00:42:15.580$  it's more likely symmetry in the real data.
- 698 00:42:15.580 --> 00:42:19.940 If you consider the spatial embedding gene,

 $699\ 00:42:19.940 --> 00:42:23.123$  we often hope to have the skewness, as you can see here.

 $700~00{:}42{:}24.410 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}29.410$  And then regarding your question, overall it works well.

701 00:42:30.434  $\rightarrow$  00:42:32.993 I don't have the exact quantification, but it works well.

 $702\ 00:42:34.220 \longrightarrow 00:42:36.830$  Especially stably in most cases.

703 00:42:36.830 --> 00:42:38.770 < v ->Yeah, I read the spatial Bayes paper.</br/>/v>

 $704\ 00:42:38.770 --> 00:42:41.160$  They seem to be working on the principle components, right?

705 00:42:41.160 --> 00:42:42.940 They do not work on individual genes, right?.

 $706\ 00:42:42.940 \longrightarrow 00:42:43.773 < v \longrightarrow No, yeah. < / v >$ 

 $707\ 00:42:43.773 \longrightarrow 00:42:45.500$  They base this on the PCA.

708 00:42:45.500 --> 00:42:47.180 <v ->Yeah, that's why it's completely puzzling me</v>

709 00:42:47.180 --> 00:42:48.013 while you're doing that.

710 00:42:48.013 --> 00:42:49.210 But anyway, yeah.

711  $00:42:49.210 \longrightarrow 00:42:50.043$  Thank you.

712 00:42:50.043 --> 00:42:51.421 < v ->Yeah so, so...< / v >

713 00:42:51.421 --> 00:42:53.988 (mumbles)

 $714\ 00:42:53.988 \longrightarrow 00:42:55.050$  so they mainly target the PCA.

715 00:42:55.050 --> 00:42:58.650 So they only can start the multivariate distribution.

 $716\ 00:42:58.650 \longrightarrow 00:43:01.180$  And also because of the same reason,

717 00:43:01.180 --> 00:43:04.980 their equivalence metrics means less density.

718 00:43:04.980 --> 00:43:05.813 <-> I see.</-> -> v

719 00:43:07.680 --> 00:43:09.222 Thank you.

720 00:43:09.222 --> 00:43:10.222 <v -> Thank you.</v>

721 00:43:22.460 --> 00:43:26.380 <v -> Do we have any questions from students in the classroom? </v>

722 00:43:31.690 --> 00:43:33.453 < v -> Wait, can I ask another question?< / v >

 $723\ 00:43:35.740 \longrightarrow 00:43:36.573$  So, towards the end,

- $724\ 00:43:36.573 --> 00:43:37.850$  you mentioned you tried
- $725\ 00:43:37.850 \longrightarrow 00:43:41.033$  to look at the cell-cell communication.
- $726\ 00:43:44.580 \longrightarrow 00:43:46.080$  That part.
- 727 00:43:46.080 --> 00:43:47.527 I'm very interested in that
- 728 00:43:49.464 --> 00:43:53.063 From our experience on the single cell spatial data are...
- $729\ 00:43:55.230 \longrightarrow 00:43:58.190$  Are you talking about you're learning from the single cell,
- $730\ 00:43:58.190 \longrightarrow 00:43:59.540$  or the spatial single cell?
- 731 00:44:02.298 --> 00:44:05.220 <v -> So, regarding the cell-cell communication </v>
- 732 00:44:05.220 --> 00:44:09.870 it's still very ongoing research at this point.
- 733 00:44:09.870 --> 00:44:12.960 I mean, not just our side but in general.
- 734 00:44:12.960 --> 00:44:16.876 Because most of the cell-cell communication prediction
- $735\ 00:44:16.876 \longrightarrow 00:44:19.700$  based on the database.
- 736 00:44:19.700 --> 00:44:22.480 So based on data, like on the receptor,
- 737 00:44:22.480 --> 00:44:24.550 pairing the database and checking
- $738\ 00:44:24.550 \longrightarrow 00:44:28.170$  their cross point on the expression in cross point spot
- $739\ 00:44:28.170 \longrightarrow 00:44:29.460$  of the cell.
- 740 00:44:29.460 --> 00:44:32.651 And then by checking that the cross pointing pair
- $741\ 00:44:32.651 \longrightarrow 00:44:34.330$  of the expression pattern
- $742\ 00:44:34.330 --> 00:44:36.290$  between the like and the receptor.
- $743\ 00:44:36.290 \longrightarrow 00:44:38.753$  They want to model cell-cell communication.
- 744 00:44:39.720 --> 00:44:42.160 It's not perfect, as you know,
- 745 00:44:42.160 --> 00:44:44.880 because it's like a computer.
- 746 00:44:44.880 --> 00:44:47.617 If you look at the chip, it's almost like
- 747 00:44:47.617 --> 00:44:48.450 (mumbles)
- $748\ 00:44:48.450 \longrightarrow 00:44:49.993$  but more like motive analysis.
- 749 00:44:50.850 --> 00:44:52.565 So there's some limitation,

 $750\ 00:44:52.565 \longrightarrow 00:44:57.214$  but it's a more likely general limitation at this point.

- 751 00:44:57.214 --> 00:44:58.047 <v ->Yeah,</v>
- 752 00:44:58.047 --> 00:44:59.430 I'm asking because we've been looking
- $753\ 00:44:59.430 --> 00:45:01.700$  at some of the spatial single cell data
- $754\ 00:45:01.700 \longrightarrow 00:45:04.060$  that were too noisy for the like
- $755\ 00:45:04.060 \longrightarrow 00:45:05.873$  and receptor gene expression levels.
- $756\ 00:45:07.200 \longrightarrow 00:45:09.112$  Just couldn't make it too far.
- $757\ 00:45:09.112 \longrightarrow 00:45:10.710$  (mumbles)
- 758 00:45:10.710 --> 00:45:12.730 But for a single cell, may be different?
- $759\ 00:45:12.730 --> 00:45:17.050\ I$  mean, probably there'll be more that, like...
- $760\ 00:45:17.050 \longrightarrow 00:45:18.320 < v \longrightarrow Yeah$ , three already.
- 761 00:45:18.320 --> 00:45:22.370 I mean, so if you go to high-resolution,
- 762 00:45:22.370 --> 00:45:23.613 it's a very noisy,
- $763\ 00:45:24.498 --> 00:45:28.100$  so very often we need to do some simplification.
- $764\ 00:45:28.100 \longrightarrow 00:45:31.200$  Like looking at multi-modal or the cell cluster,
- $765\ 00:45:31.200 \longrightarrow 00:45:32.333$  rather than the cell.
- 766 00:45:34.100 --> 00:45:37.820 It's still very multiple experimental limitation,
- $767\ 00:45:37.820 \longrightarrow 00:45:38.979$  at this point.
- $768\ 00:45:38.979 \longrightarrow 00:45:39.920$  (mumbles)
- 769 00:45:39.920 --> 00:45:40.753 Thank you.
- 770 00:45:50.936 --> 00:45:55.269 (class teacher addresses classroom)
- 771 00:46:00.210 --> 00:46:02.530 <v ->On the data from multiple samples </v>
- 772 00:46:02.530 --> 00:46:04.940 So, if we have samples from...
- 773 00:46:05.847 --> 00:46:08.014 (mumbles)
- 774 00:46:17.627 --> 00:46:20.663 <-> Oh yeah, that's a very good question. </v>
- 775 00:46:22.056 --> 00:46:22.889 So,
- 776 00:46:22.889  $\rightarrow$  00:46:27.760 actually we can answer in the two different ways.
- 777 00:46:28.800 --> 00:46:30.400 In some sense,

- 778 00:46:30.400 --> 00:46:33.390 good pre-processing is still important
- 779 00:46:35.362 --> 00:46:40.362 because it still depends on the expression patterns.
- $780\ 00:46:43.148 --> 00:46:45.910$  But still regarding the differences
- $781\ 00:46:45.910 --> 00:46:48.060$  between the different tissues.
- $782\ 00:46:48.060 \longrightarrow 00:46:49.400$  If there is a big difference,
- $783\ 00:46:49.400 \longrightarrow 00:46:51.110$  it can still detect the difference
- $784\ 00:46:51.110 \longrightarrow 00:46:53.720$  between the different sample.
- $785\ 00:46:53.720 \longrightarrow 00:46:55.444$  So, it can detect spots.
- $786\ 00:46:55.444 --> 00:46:58.552$  But still like a main goal is more
- $787\ 00:46:58.552 \longrightarrow 00:47:01.000$  for the similar type of tissue.
- 788 00:47:01.000 --> 00:47:02.080 If it's too different,
- 789 00:47:02.080 --> 00:47:04.083 maybe it's different research project.
- 790 00:47:05.375 --> 00:47:06.710 So, for example,
- 791 00:47:06.710 --> 00:47:09.990 here our targets is more about, for example,
- $792\ 00:47:09.990 \longrightarrow 00:47:12.960$  like same breast tissue,
- $793\ 00:47:12.960 \longrightarrow 00:47:17.562$  but with a different responders and non-responders group,
- $794\ 00:47:17.562 \longrightarrow 00:47:19.172$  for example.
- 795 00:47:19.172 --> 00:47:23.560 Or like a cell-cell long tissue, but the tumor but not tumor
- $796\ 00:47:23.560 \longrightarrow 00:47:24.393$  and so on.
- 797 00:47:25.410 --> 00:47:27.493 If you like a human and mouse,
- $798\ 00:47:29.332 --> 00:47:32.600$  then it might be somewhat different story,
- $799\ 00:47:32.600 \longrightarrow 00:47:34.410$  which might need much more work.
- 800 00:47:38.443 --> 00:47:41.526 <v -> Do we have any more questions here?</v>
- $801\ 00:47:57.568 \longrightarrow 00:47:59.170$  Okay, can we have all the questions
- $802\ 00:47:59.170 \longrightarrow 00:48:01.313$  from the audience on zoom?
- $803\ 00{:}48{:}21.176 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}25.550$  Okay, so it looks like we don't have any more questions.
- $804~00{:}48{:}25.550 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}30.340$  So Dr. Chung, thank you again for your nice presentation.

 $805~00{:}48{:}31.210 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}33.860$  Look forward to meeting in person sometime soon.

806 00:48:35.650 --> 00:48:38.247 <<br/>v -> And then thank you again Wei and Hongyou<br/></v>

 $807\ 00:48:38.247 --> 00:48:39.540$  for the invitation

 $808\ 00:48:39.540 \longrightarrow 00:48:43.320$  and it's a great come back, although virtually.

809 00:48:43.320 --> 00:48:45.980 And I hope to see you again.

810 00:48:45.980 --> 00:48:47.280 <v -> We'll come by in person.</v>

811 00:48:49.450 --> 00:48:50.700 <v -> Hopefully someday soon.</v>

812 00:48:52.820 --> 00:48:53.653 Okay, thank you.