WEBVTT

- NOTE duration:"00:58:02.2830000"
- NOTE recognizability:0.934
- NOTE language:en-us
- NOTE Confidence: 0.98753315
- $00:00:00.000 \longrightarrow 00:00:00.940$ Yeah.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9373763
- $00{:}00{:}03.180 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}06.078$ OK, so today's second part of our
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9373763
- $00{:}00{:}06{.}078 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}08{.}753$ travel through the analysis of a
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9373763
- $00:00:08.753 \dashrightarrow 00:00:11.459$ single cell RNA seek data processing.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9373763
- $00:00:11.460 \rightarrow 00:00:14.348$ Last time we started with the defining how
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9373763
- $00{:}00{:}14.348 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}17.697$ single cell RNA sequencing works and the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9373763
- $00:00:17.697 \rightarrow 00:00:19.745$ differences between different protocols.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9373763
- 00:00:19.750 --> 00:00:21.930 For example, coverage on jeans,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9373763
- $00:00:21.930 \longrightarrow 00:00:24.975$ how they isolate cells and so on.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9373763
- $00:00:24.980 \longrightarrow 00:00:28.228$ Today we we deal more with the with
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9373763
- $00:00:28.228 \longrightarrow 00:00:31.079$ the real analysis of the data.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9373763
- $00{:}00{:}31.080 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}33.380$ So last time we arrived.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9373763
- $00:00:33.380 \longrightarrow 00:00:35.726$ At the point where we saw,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9373763

 $00:00:35.730 \rightarrow 00:00:37.338$ these are starting steps,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9373763

 $00{:}00{:}37{.}338 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}40{.}829$ we saw that from the molecular point of view,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9373763

 $00:00:40.830 \rightarrow 00:00:43.672$ this strategy is to link the original

NOTE Confidence: 0.9373763

 $00:00:43.672 \rightarrow 00:00:46.235$ RNA molecule with an oligo nucleotide

NOTE Confidence: 0.9373763

 $00{:}00{:}46.235 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}49.594$ called the cell barcode that allow us to

NOTE Confidence: 0.9373763

 $00:00:49.594 \rightarrow 00:00:52.250$ identify the cell of origin of the RNA

NOTE Confidence: 0.9373763

 $00:00:52.250 \rightarrow 00:00:56.300$ and then another important part is the UMIA.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9373763

 $00{:}00{:}56{.}300 \dashrightarrow 00{:}00{:}58{.}485$ Molecular identifier that is a

NOTE Confidence: 0.9373763

 $00{:}00{:}58.485 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}01{.}249$ random nucleotide that allow us to

NOTE Confidence: 0.9373763

 $00:01:01.249 \rightarrow 00:01:03.277$ correct for amplification biases,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9373763

 $00:01:03.280 \longrightarrow 00:01:05.968$ so to keep only those duplicate

NOTE Confidence: 0.9373763

 $00:01:05.968 \longrightarrow 00:01:08.320$ reads that are belonging to

NOTE Confidence: 0.9373763

 $00:01:08.320 \dashrightarrow 00:01:10.720$ different molecules in our cells,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9373763

 $00{:}01{:}10.720 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}15.067$ and we're not amplified during the PCR.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9373763

 $00{:}01{:}15{.}070 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}18{.}174$ So after this steps away and after the

NOTE Confidence: 0.9373763

 $00:01:18.174 \rightarrow 00:01:21.409$ mapping we also cover these last time and

- NOTE Confidence: 0.94731027
- 00:01:21.410 --> 00:01:24.080 we're sorry. I'm question yes.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.94731027
- 00:01:24.080 --> 00:01:27.195 How can you have the same UMI
- NOTE Confidence: 0.94731027
- 00:01:27.195 --> 00:01:30.039 and two different RNAs? Oh, I see
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9228061
- $00:01:30.040 \longrightarrow 00:01:31.930$ 2015. If you have the same,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9228061
- 00:01:31.930 --> 00:01:33.808 Umm I you collapse the reader.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9228061
- $00:01:33.810 \longrightarrow 00:01:36.008$ So if the read is the same,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9228061
- $00{:}01{:}36{.}010 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}38{.}145$ the UMI is the same and the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9228061
- $00{:}01{:}38{.}145 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}39{.}780$ cell barcode is the same.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9228061
- 00:01:39.780 --> 00:01:41.040 You collapse the read
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9228061
- $00:01:41.040 \longrightarrow 00:01:43.230$ and you know I see I see
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9228061
- $00{:}01{:}43{.}230 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}46{.}020$ the one I'm looking at I see so you could
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9228061
- $00{:}01{:}46.097 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}48.614$ have the same cell barcode, the same.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9228061
- $00:01:48.614 \dashrightarrow 00:01:50.973$ Umm I but a different sequence because
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9228061
- $00{:}01{:}50{.}973 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}53{.}587$ you're in a different part of the same RNA.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9840043
- $00:01:54.640 \longrightarrow 00:01:56.607$ Well, in theory that depends on the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9840043

 $00:01:56.607 \rightarrow 00:01:58.340$ protocol, because some of those are

NOTE Confidence: 0.9840043

 $00{:}01{:}58{.}340 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}00{.}259$ only three prime end and so this

NOTE Confidence: 0.9840043

 $00{:}02{:}00{.}260 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}02{.}789$ is I'm looking at numbers five and six there.

NOTE Confidence: 0.900073

00:02:06.450 --> 00:02:09.260 Five and six other reads you mean, yeah?

NOTE Confidence: 0.900073

 $00:02:09.260 \longrightarrow 00:02:11.010$ Well, uhm, yes in theory.

NOTE Confidence: 0.900073

 $00:02:11.010 \longrightarrow 00:02:12.386$ But in theory, yes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.900073

 $00{:}02{:}12.386 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}14.450$ So these would be a different

NOTE Confidence: 0.900073

00:02:14.522 --> 00:02:16.628 RNA could be a different gene,

NOTE Confidence: 0.900073

 $00{:}02{:}16.630 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}18.736$ but randomly they have the same.

NOTE Confidence: 0.900073

 $00:02:18.740 \dashrightarrow 00:02:23.540$ Umm, I yeah. So in theory it can happen.

NOTE Confidence: 0.900073

 $00:02:23.540 \dashrightarrow 00:02:26.500$ It depends on the length of the UMI,

NOTE Confidence: 0.900073

 $00:02:26.500 \rightarrow 00:02:28.350$ because they are randomly generated.

NOTE Confidence: 0.900073

 $00:02:28.350 \longrightarrow 00:02:29.076$ For example,

NOTE Confidence: 0.900073

 $00:02:29.076 \rightarrow 00:02:32.420$ if you have if they are 12 nucleotide long,

NOTE Confidence: 0.900073

 $00:02:32.420 \longrightarrow 00:02:34.982$ the probability to have two that are

NOTE Confidence: 0.900073

 $00:02:34.982 \rightarrow 00:02:37.598$ identical is for elevated at the 12th,

- NOTE Confidence: 0.900073
- 00:02:37.600 00:02:40.216 so the longer they are the lower

 $00:02:40.216 \longrightarrow 00:02:42.780$ is the probability to have two.

NOTE Confidence: 0.900073

 $00:02:42.780 \longrightarrow 00:02:45.600$ Umm with the same sequence.

NOTE Confidence: 0.900073

00:02:45.600 --> 00:02:46.550 OK, yeah.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9335265

00:02:49.010 --> 00:02:51.116 Uhm, OK, so you're my abstract.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9335265

 $00:02:51.120 \rightarrow 00:02:53.238$ Their strategy used to reduce amplification

NOTE Confidence: 0.9335265

 $00:02:53.238 \dashrightarrow 00:02:55.680$ biases in order to correct for that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9335265

 $00:02:55.680 \rightarrow 00:02:57.906$ And in single sat there important

NOTE Confidence: 0.9335265

 $00{:}02{:}57{.}906 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}00{.}093$ because the low because of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.9335265

 $00:03:00.093 \dashrightarrow 00:03:01.995$ low material we start with that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9335265

 $00{:}03{:}02{.}000 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}04{.}128$ That is the content there any content

NOTE Confidence: 0.9335265

00:03:04.128 --> 00:03:07.036 of a single cell and also the elevated

NOTE Confidence: 0.9335265

00:03:07.036 --> 00:03:09.380 number of amplification cycles that are NOTE Confidence: 0.9335265

 $00{:}03{:}09{.}380 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}11.830$ necessary in order to amplify the signal.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9335265

 $00:03:11.830 \dashrightarrow 00:03:14.198$ So after the mapping of the reason we NOTE Confidence: 0.9335265

00:03:14.198 --> 00:03:16.515 arrived at these gene expression matrix

NOTE Confidence: 0.9335265

 $00{:}03{:}16{.}515 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}18{.}999$ where you have each column represents.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9335265

00:03:19.000 --> 00:03:22.330 One of the cell of our sample and each NOTE Confidence: 0.9335265

 $00{:}03{:}22{.}330$ --> $00{:}03{:}25{.}829$ row is a gene and already last time we NOTE Confidence: 0.9335265

 $00{:}03{:}25{.}829 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}29{.}593$ saw this fact that if you compare bulk

NOTE Confidence: 0.9335265

 $00:03:29.593 \dashrightarrow 00:03:33.208$ versus single cell matrix at the single cell, NOTE Confidence: 0.9335265

 $00:03:33.208 \longrightarrow 00:03:35.293$ one is has lower numbers,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9335265

 $00:03:35.300 \longrightarrow 00:03:37.918$ lower counts and that means that we

NOTE Confidence: 0.9335265

 $00{:}03{:}37{.}918 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}40{.}443$ have a higher potential contribution of

NOTE Confidence: 0.9335265

 $00{:}03{:}40{.}443 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}44{.}080$ noise and also we have a several zeros.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9335265

 $00{:}03{:}44.080 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}48.066$ So like 60 to 80% of all the values

NOTE Confidence: 0.9335265

 $00:03:48.066 \rightarrow 00:03:49.488$ will be 0.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9335265

 $00{:}03{:}49{.}490 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}52{.}122$ And the problem is that many of these

NOTE Confidence: 0.9335265

 $00:03:52.122 \longrightarrow 00:03:54.389$ zeros are not biologically true,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9335265

 $00:03:54.390 \longrightarrow 00:03:57.099$ so it doesn't mean that the gene

NOTE Confidence: 0.9335265

 $00:03:57.099 \rightarrow 00:03:59.290$ is not expressed in the cell,

- NOTE Confidence: 0.9335265
- $00:03:59.290 \longrightarrow 00:04:01.330$ but they are technical because
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9335265
- $00:04:01.330 \longrightarrow 00:04:03.370$ they were not detected during
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9335265
- $00{:}04{:}03{.}438 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}05{.}410$ our any capturing approaches.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9335265
- $00{:}04{:}05{.}410 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}08{.}546$ So that's the main difference in terms
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9335265
- $00:04:08.546 \dashrightarrow 00:04:12.009$ of number with respect to bug RNA seek.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9335265
- $00{:}04{:}12.010 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}14.509$ So the first step said that we
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9335265
- $00:04:14.509 \dashrightarrow 00:04:17.289$ cover all the preprocessing steps.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9335265
- $00:04:17.290 \longrightarrow 00:04:19.490$ So after the digital account
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9335265
- $00:04:19.490 \longrightarrow 00:04:21.250$ matrix arriving at that,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9335265
- $00:04:21.250 \longrightarrow 00:04:24.295$ try to remove a basically put cells
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9335265
- $00:04:24.295 \longrightarrow 00:04:26.736$ that are potentially low of low
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9335265
- $00{:}04{:}26{.}736 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}29{.}836$ quality and also gene set that are
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9335265
- $00{:}04{:}29.836 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}32.686$ potentially irrelevant for our analysis.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9335265
- $00{:}04{:}32.690 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}35.826$ So the first step in the preprocessing.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9335265
- $00:04:35.830 \longrightarrow 00:04:39.208$ Is that we want to remove?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9335265

 $00:04:39.210 \rightarrow 00:04:42.738$ Empty droplets or dying cells, so it could.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9335265

00:04:42.738 --> 00:04:45.354 It could happen that during the

NOTE Confidence: 0.9335265

00:04:45.354 --> 00:04:47.200 preparation of our libraries,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9335265

 $00:04:47.200 \longrightarrow 00:04:48.272$ some cells,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9335265

 $00:04:48.272 \rightarrow 00:04:51.488$ some droplets are empty or filled

NOTE Confidence: 0.9335265

 $00{:}04{:}51{.}488 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}55{.}059$ there with the cells that are dying.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9335265

00:04:55.060 --> 00:04:57.985 So usually I wait to spot these are is

NOTE Confidence: 0.9335265

 $00:04:57.985 \rightarrow 00:05:01.247$ a quality of the data so that we can.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9335265

 $00:05:01.250 \rightarrow 00:05:04.175$ What we can do is we can count the NOTE Confidence: 0.9335265

00:05:04.175 --> 00:05:06.861 number of reads or the number of UM NOTE Confidence: 0.9335265

 $00:05:06.861 \longrightarrow 00:05:09.510$ eyes that we detect in each cell.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9335265

00:05:09.510 --> 00:05:12.009 That's the sum of the number of

NOTE Confidence: 0.9335265

 $00{:}05{:}12.009 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}14.121$ unique reads that are aligned for

NOTE Confidence: 0.9335265

 $00{:}05{:}14.121 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}16.778$ each cell and we we can rank the

NOTE Confidence: 0.9335265

 $00{:}05{:}16.778 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}19.137$ cells from the the one with more.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9335265

 $00:05:19.140 \longrightarrow 00:05:21.948$ Umm I with the one with less you MI

- NOTE Confidence: 0.9335265
- $00{:}05{:}21.948 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}25.069$ and we have this sort of distribution.

 $00{:}05{:}25{.}070 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}28{.}070$ And then we can decide to remove the

NOTE Confidence: 0.9335265

 $00:05:28.070 \rightarrow 00:05:30.805$ bottom cells that you see here in red,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9335265

 $00{:}05{:}30{.}810 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}34{.}107$ the one the cells where the UMI

NOTE Confidence: 0.9335265

00:05:34.107 --> 00:05:36.589 is number is very low.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9335265

 $00:05:36.590 \longrightarrow 00:05:38.830$ So this is a onesie strategy to

NOTE Confidence: 0.9335265

 $00:05:38.830 \dashrightarrow 00:05:40.480$ remove ourselves where we don't

NOTE Confidence: 0.9335265

 $00:05:40.480 \longrightarrow 00:05:42.045$ have coverage of many genes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9335265

 $00:05:42.050 \longrightarrow 00:05:44.290$ We don't have a lot of reads,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9335265

 $00:05:44.290 \longrightarrow 00:05:47.050$ and likely the it's.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9335265

 $00:05:47.050 \longrightarrow 00:05:48.762$ South of something wrong

NOTE Confidence: 0.9335265

 $00{:}05{:}48.762 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}50.046$ during the preparation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9335265

00:05:50.050 -> 00:05:50.880 For example,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9335265

 $00{:}05{:}50{.}880 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}53{.}370$ the IT was the droplet was

NOTE Confidence: 0.9335265

 $00:05:53.370 \rightarrow 00:05:56.060$ slow or this cell was dying.

00:05:56.060 --> 00:05:58.478 Another way to capture dying to

NOTE Confidence: 0.9335265

 $00:05:58.478 \rightarrow 00:06:01.054$ remove dying cells is that usually

NOTE Confidence: 0.9335265

 $00{:}06{:}01{.}054 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}03{.}700$ dying cells are associated with a

NOTE Confidence: 0.9335265

 $00{:}06{:}03.700 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}06.795$ high number of reads that mapped to

NOTE Confidence: 0.9335265

 $00:06:06.795 \dashrightarrow 00:06:09.475$ mitochondrial genes so they have dying.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9335265

00:06:09.475 --> 00:06:11.110 Cells have extensive

NOTE Confidence: 0.9335265

 $00:06:11.110 \longrightarrow 00:06:12.200$ mitochondrial contamination.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9863362

 $00:06:12.200 \dashrightarrow 00:06:14.672$ And so one can quantify the number of

NOTE Confidence: 0.9863362

 $00{:}06{:}14.672 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}17.099$ reads that map to mitochondrial genes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9863362

 $00{:}06{:}17.100 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}21.834$ I think there are 40 genes in the human.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9863362

 $00{:}06{:}21.840 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}23.755$ Human cells, they are associated

NOTE Confidence: 0.9863362

 $00:06:23.755 \rightarrow 00:06:25.287$ with the mitochondrial chromosome,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9863362

 $00{:}06{:}25{.}290 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}28{.}602$ and if these numbers, if the number of

NOTE Confidence: 0.9863362

 $00:06:28.602 \rightarrow 00:06:30.647$ mitochondrial reads is less than 5%,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9863362

 $00:06:30.650 \longrightarrow 00:06:32.560$ then you keep the cell.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9863362

 $00:06:32.560 \rightarrow 00:06:35.624$ If it's higher than that 10 or 20%,

- NOTE Confidence: 0.9863362
- $00:06:35.630 \rightarrow 00:06:38.045$ then you remove the entire set because

 $00:06:38.045 \dashrightarrow 00:06:40.988$ there is a high probability that the

NOTE Confidence: 0.9863362

 $00:06:40.988 \rightarrow 00:06:43.736$ these high numbers contamination is due

NOTE Confidence: 0.9863362

 $00:06:43.811 \rightarrow 00:06:46.347$ to the fact that the cell was dying.

NOTE Confidence: 0.972797

 $00:06:49.340 \longrightarrow 00:06:51.356$ Uhm then, on the other side

NOTE Confidence: 0.972797

 $00:06:51.356 \longrightarrow 00:06:53.330$ we want also to remove.

NOTE Confidence: 0.972797

 $00:06:53.330 \dashrightarrow 00:06:56.002$ So all the technique is based on the

NOTE Confidence: 0.972797

 $00:06:56.002 \rightarrow 00:06:58.420$ fact that we isolate single cell.

NOTE Confidence: 0.972797

 $00{:}06{:}58{.}420 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}01{.}400$ But sometimes this doesn't.

NOTE Confidence: 0.972797

00:07:01.400 --> 00:07:02.110 Happen properly,

NOTE Confidence: 0.972797

 $00:07:02.110 \longrightarrow 00:07:04.950$ so it means that it can happen that

NOTE Confidence: 0.972797

 $00{:}07{:}05{.}020 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}07{.}407$ two cells share the same barcode or

NOTE Confidence: 0.972797

 $00:07:07.407 \rightarrow 00:07:10.210$ two cells were not physically separated,

NOTE Confidence: 0.972797

 $00{:}07{:}10.210 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}13.266$ so they were included in the same droplet.

NOTE Confidence: 0.972797

 $00{:}07{:}13.270 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}16.166$ For example, if we are using the droplet

00:07:16.166 --> 00:07:18.943 approach and so we want to identify

NOTE Confidence: 0.972797

 $00{:}07{:}18{.}943 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}20{.}923$ possible doublets and remove those,

NOTE Confidence: 0.972797

 $00:07:20.930 \dashrightarrow 00:07:26.160$ so a double letter is a we define doublet as.

NOTE Confidence: 0.972797

 $00:07:26.160 \longrightarrow 00:07:28.476$ A droplet or as a isolation

NOTE Confidence: 0.972797

 $00:07:28.476 \longrightarrow 00:07:30.540$ not of one single cell,

NOTE Confidence: 0.972797

 $00{:}07{:}30{.}540 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}32{.}928$ but of two or more sets.

NOTE Confidence: 0.972797

 $00{:}07{:}32{.}930 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}35{.}866$ The most common event is that you have

NOTE Confidence: 0.972797

 $00:07:35.866 \rightarrow 00:07:38.900$ two cells included in the same droplet.

NOTE Confidence: 0.972797

 $00:07:38.900 \longrightarrow 00:07:41.276$ So when you develop are they?

NOTE Confidence: 0.972797

 $00:07:41.280 \longrightarrow 00:07:42.561$ Single cell techniques?

NOTE Confidence: 0.972797

 $00{:}07{:}42.561 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}45.123$ Are there are experimental ways to

NOTE Confidence: 0.972797

 $00{:}07{:}45.123 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}47.100$ evaluate the probability to have

NOTE Confidence: 0.972797

 $00{:}07{:}47.100 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}49.640$ doubles and the approaches that we use?

NOTE Confidence: 0.972797

 $00:07:49.640 \longrightarrow 00:07:51.480$ There are spacious mixing,

NOTE Confidence: 0.972797

 $00:07:51.480 \longrightarrow 00:07:54.240$ so you combine for example population

NOTE Confidence: 0.972797

 $00:07:54.312 \longrightarrow 00:07:56.538$ of human cells and mouse cells.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.972797
- $00:07:56.540 \rightarrow 00:07:59.762$ And then use when you map the reads from

00:07:59.762 --> 00:08:02.749 each cell you see or you see how many

NOTE Confidence: 0.972797

 $00:08:02.749 \rightarrow 00:08:06.419$ for how many cells you have a double mapping.

NOTE Confidence: 0.972797

 $00:08:06.420 \longrightarrow 00:08:09.100$ So how for how many cells some of

NOTE Confidence: 0.972797

 $00:08:09.100 \rightarrow 00:08:11.906$ your reads mapped to the human genome,

NOTE Confidence: 0.972797

 $00:08:11.910 \longrightarrow 00:08:14.106$ some of your reads mapped to

NOTE Confidence: 0.972797

 $00:08:14.106 \rightarrow 00:08:15.204$ the mouse genome.

NOTE Confidence: 0.972797

 $00{:}08{:}15{.}210 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}19{.}610$ You see here in this plot the mapping of the.

NOTE Confidence: 0.972797

 $00:08:19.610 \longrightarrow 00:08:20.272$ The cells,

NOTE Confidence: 0.972797

 $00:08:20.272 \longrightarrow 00:08:21.927$ so on the human transcript

NOTE Confidence: 0.972797

 $00:08:21.927 \longrightarrow 00:08:24.169$ and on the mouse transcript.

NOTE Confidence: 0.972797

 $00{:}08{:}24.170 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}26.837$ So all these cells are means that

NOTE Confidence: 0.972797

 $00:08:26.837 \rightarrow 00:08:29.109$ they contain only mouse a cells.

NOTE Confidence: 0.972797

 $00{:}08{:}29{.}110 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}31{.}390$ Here they contain only human cells.

NOTE Confidence: 0.972797

 $00{:}08{:}31{.}390 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}34{.}050$ What you see here is the identification

- $00:08:34.050 \longrightarrow 00:08:34.810$ of doublets,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.972797
- $00:08:34.810 \longrightarrow 00:08:37.090$ because here the content is mixed,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.972797
- 00:08:37.090 --> 00:08:38.990 you have something from mouse,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.972797
- $00:08:38.990 \longrightarrow 00:08:40.127$ something from human,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.972797
- $00:08:40.127 \longrightarrow 00:08:42.780$ and this is likely to be because
- NOTE Confidence: 0.972797
- $00{:}08{:}42.854 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}44.960$ one mouse and one human cells
- NOTE Confidence: 0.972797
- $00:08:44.960 \longrightarrow 00:08:47.349$ were included in the same droplet.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.972797
- $00:08:47.350 \longrightarrow 00:08:49.720$ So the comparison of these two.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.972797
- $00{:}08{:}49{.}720 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}52{.}058$ Plot is something to say that the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.972797
- $00:08:52.058 \dashrightarrow 00:08:53.515$ probability to having doublets
- NOTE Confidence: 0.972797
- $00:08:53.515 \rightarrow 00:08:55.460$ obviously depends on the concentration
- NOTE Confidence: 0.972797
- $00:08:55.460 \longrightarrow 00:08:57.929$ of your cells at the beginning.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.972797
- $00:08:57.930 \longrightarrow 00:08:59.522$ That's why, for example,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.972797
- $00:08:59.522 \rightarrow 00:09:02.670$ here when you have 12.5 cells where we
- NOTE Confidence: 0.972797
- 00:09:02.670 --> 00:09:05.382 call it are you have very few events,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.972797
- $00:09:05.390 \rightarrow 00:09:07.250$ only one droplet doublet event.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.972797
- $00{:}09{:}07{.}250 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}09{.}085$ When you increase the contrast
- NOTE Confidence: 0.972797
- $00{:}09{:}09{.}085 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}10.553$ concentration of cells probably
- NOTE Confidence: 0.972797
- $00:09:10.553 \rightarrow 00:09:12.467$ increase the efficiency of sequencing.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.972797
- $00:09:12.470 \longrightarrow 00:09:14.335$ Are your single self because
- NOTE Confidence: 0.972797
- $00:09:14.335 \longrightarrow 00:09:16.200$ you have less empty droplet,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.972797
- $00:09:16.200 \longrightarrow 00:09:18.205$ but you also increase the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.972797
- 00:09:18.205 --> 00:09:19.809 probability you have doublets.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.972797
- $00:09:19.810 \longrightarrow 00:09:21.390$ That you see here.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.972797
- $00{:}09{:}21.390 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}23.365$ So the number here increase.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.972797
- $00:09:23.370 \longrightarrow 00:09:25.340$ So obviously this is possible.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.972797
- $00{:}09{:}25.340 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}27.265$ This evaluation is possible because
- NOTE Confidence: 0.972797
- 00:09:27.265 --> 00:09:29.690 you are mixing two species before,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.972797
- $00:09:29.690 \longrightarrow 00:09:31.665$ but it's not always feasible
- NOTE Confidence: 0.972797
- 00:09:31.665 --> 00:09:32.850 in our experiment,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.972797
- $00:09:32.850 \longrightarrow 00:09:35.498$ so we need to have a way to
- NOTE Confidence: 0.972797

 $00:09:35.498 \longrightarrow 00:09:37.598$ predict the possibility that a

NOTE Confidence: 0.972797

00:09:37.598 --> 00:09:40.748 cell was not really a single cell,

NOTE Confidence: 0.972797

 $00{:}09{:}40.750 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}42.720$ but it was a doublet,

NOTE Confidence: 0.972797

 $00{:}09{:}42.720 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}44.815$ so there are computational approaches

NOTE Confidence: 0.972797

 $00:09:44.815 \longrightarrow 00:09:48.124$ that try to evaluate for each of these

NOTE Confidence: 0.972797

 $00:09:48.124 \rightarrow 00:09:50.777$ cells that we obtain the possibility that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.972797

 $00:09:50.780 \longrightarrow 00:09:52.316$ It's not really a single cell,

NOTE Confidence: 0.972797

 $00:09:52.320 \longrightarrow 00:09:55.160$ but it's a doublet.

NOTE Confidence: 0.972797

 $00{:}09{:}55{.}160 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}57{.}670$ So there are many progress,

NOTE Confidence: 0.972797

00:09:57.670 --> 00:09:58.157 many,

NOTE Confidence: 0.972797

00:09:58.157 --> 00:10:00.592 many procedures that are used

NOTE Confidence: 0.972797

 $00:10:00.592 \longrightarrow 00:10:04.158$ at a common approach is these in

NOTE Confidence: 0.972797

 $00{:}10{:}04.158 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}06.194$ silico simulation of tablets.

NOTE Confidence: 0.972797

 $00{:}10{:}06{.}200 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}09{.}620$ This means that you have your

NOTE Confidence: 0.972797

 $00{:}10{:}09{.}620 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}11{.}900$ matrix with digital counts

NOTE Confidence: 0.97385466

 $00:10:12.002 \rightarrow 00:10:13.628$ with your cells.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.97385466
- $00:10:13.630 \longrightarrow 00:10:15.670$ You simulate the doublet by

 $00{:}10{:}15.670 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}17.710$ selecting two random cells to

NOTE Confidence: 0.97385466

00:10:17.787 --> 00:10:20.077 random cells and combining them,

NOTE Confidence: 0.97385466

 $00:10:20.080 \rightarrow 00:10:23.520$ meaning that for each of these two cells,

NOTE Confidence: 0.97385466

 $00:10:23.520 \longrightarrow 00:10:25.396$ you calculate the hypothetical

NOTE Confidence: 0.97385466

 $00:10:25.396 \longrightarrow 00:10:28.210$ cell that contains the sum of

NOTE Confidence: 0.97385466

 $00:10:28.289 \longrightarrow 00:10:30.395$ the reeds of the two cells.

NOTE Confidence: 0.97385466

 $00:10:30.400 \longrightarrow 00:10:33.410$ So this is an in silico tablet,

NOTE Confidence: 0.97385466

 $00{:}10{:}33{.}410 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}36{.}446$ so you generate thousands of these

NOTE Confidence: 0.97385466

 $00:10:36.446 \longrightarrow 00:10:40.030$ in silico tablets and you and the

NOTE Confidence: 0.97385466

 $00{:}10{:}40.030 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}42.958$ procedure is to mix these doubles

NOTE Confidence: 0.97385466

 $00{:}10{:}42{.}958 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}45{.}349$ together with the real cells.

NOTE Confidence: 0.97385466

 $00{:}10{:}45{.}350 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}47{.}968$ And so that they are analyzed together.

NOTE Confidence: 0.97385466

 $00{:}10{:}47{.}970 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}50{.}130$ So at some point of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.97385466

 $00:10:50.130 \longrightarrow 00:10:52.460$ analysis that we will see later,

 $00:10:52.460 \longrightarrow 00:10:54.330$ cells can be clustered together,

NOTE Confidence: 0.97385466

 $00:10:54.330 \rightarrow 00:10:57.050$ and so for each of the original cell

NOTE Confidence: 0.97385466

 $00{:}10{:}57{.}050 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}00{.}276$ one can see how many in silico tablets NOTE Confidence: 0.97385466

 $00{:}11{:}00{.}276 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}02{.}930$ are in the surrounding of the cell.

NOTE Confidence: 0.97385466

00:11:02.930 --> 00:11:05.698 So for each cell I can calculate how

NOTE Confidence: 0.97385466

 $00{:}11{:}05{.}698 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}07{.}545$ many neighbors in the neighborhood NOTE Confidence: 0.97385466

 $00:11:07.545 \rightarrow 00:11:10.554$ how many real cells there are and how NOTE Confidence: 0.97385466

 $00:11:10.554 \rightarrow 00:11:12.649$ many simulated tablets there are.

NOTE Confidence: 0.97385466

 $00{:}11{:}12.650 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}15.359$ And the principle is that the ratio.

NOTE Confidence: 0.97385466

 $00{:}11{:}15{.}360$ --> $00{:}11{:}17{.}634$ Between the simulated tablets and the NOTE Confidence: 0.97385466

 $00{:}11{:}17.634 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}20.639$ real cells is a score that represents

NOTE Confidence: 0.97385466

 $00:11:20.639 \rightarrow 00:11:22.999$ the possibility the probability of

NOTE Confidence: 0.97385466

 $00:11:22.999 \longrightarrow 00:11:25.586$ this cell to be a tablet itself.

NOTE Confidence: 0.97385466

 $00{:}11{:}25{.}590 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}28{.}742$ So the principle is that if my cell

NOTE Confidence: 0.97385466

 $00:11:28.742 \rightarrow 00:11:31.310$ is surrounded by in silico tablets,

NOTE Confidence: 0.97385466

 $00:11:31.310 \longrightarrow 00:11:34.360$ then it's likely a tablet.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.97385466
- $00:11:34.360 \longrightarrow 00:11:36.640$ If it's surrounded by if the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.97385466
- 00:11:36.640 --> 00:11:39.348 tablets are all far from my cells,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.97385466
- $00:11:39.350 \rightarrow 00:11:42.038$ then probably these cells are not tablets.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.98445684
- $00:11:44.190 \rightarrow 00:11:45.758$ Was this step clear?
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9851623
- $00:11:47.950 \longrightarrow 00:11:49.386$ Kind of sort of somehow
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9851623
- 00:11:49.386 --> 00:11:51.060 you you teach it what a
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9851623
- 00:11:51.127 --> 00:11:52.390 doublet looks like,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9851623
- $00:11:52.390 \rightarrow 00:11:54.609$ and then it can find those things,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9851623
- $00{:}11{:}54{.}610 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}56{.}829$ or you teach it, but a double
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9851623
- 00:11:56.829 --> 00:11:59.044 it looks like, and it says OK,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9851623
- $00:11:59.044 \rightarrow 00:12:00.624$ I'm certain percentage should be
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9851623
- 00:12:00.630 --> 00:12:02.849 doubled, yes, so you build the doublets,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9851623
- 00:12:02.850 --> 00:12:05.386 taking two random cells. After I got that
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9851623
- $00{:}12{:}05{.}390 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}07{.}430$ part, I just don't understand how
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9851623
- $00:12:07.430 \longrightarrow 00:12:09.510$ that helps you identify a real one.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9589141

 $00:12:10.820 \longrightarrow 00:12:13.018$ Yeah, so the idea is that yeah,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9589141

 $00:12:13.020 \longrightarrow 00:12:15.491$ yeah is is that real tablets will

NOTE Confidence: 0.9589141

 $00:12:15.491 \rightarrow 00:12:17.647$ be surrounded by in silico tablets NOTE Confidence: 0.9589141

 $00{:}12{:}17.647 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}20.481$ while a real cells will be far from

NOTE Confidence: 0.9589141

00:12:20.481 --> 00:12:23.430 the in silico tablets. OK OK, I have

NOTE Confidence: 0.96831703

 $00{:}12{:}23{.}430 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}25{.}602$ a related, maybe a related question NOTE Confidence: 0.96831703

 $00{:}12{:}25{.}602 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}28{.}068$ 'cause the idea of a doublet is

NOTE Confidence: 0.96831703

 $00:12:28.068 \longrightarrow 00:12:30.273$ that you have jeans from more than

NOTE Confidence: 0.96831703

 $00{:}12{:}30{.}347 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}32{.}627$ one cell that are being sequenced.

NOTE Confidence: 0.96831703

 $00{:}12{:}32{.}630 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}34{.}580$ We have this thing that happened

NOTE Confidence: 0.96831703

 $00{:}12{:}34{.}580 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}37{.}228$ and I'm I'm a basket in general,

NOTE Confidence: 0.96831703

00:12:37.230 --> 00:12:39.617 'cause I'm assuming it would be true

NOTE Confidence: 0.96831703

 $00{:}12{:}39{.}617 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}42{.}018$ for other people as well when we

NOTE Confidence: 0.96831703

 $00{:}12{:}42.018 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}43.986$ did parathyroid the cells that make

NOTE Confidence: 0.96831703

00:12:44.053 --> 00:12:45.948 parathyroid hormone have a humongous

NOTE Confidence: 0.96831703

00:12:45.948 --> 00:12:48.624 amount of PTH as their you know,

- NOTE Confidence: 0.96831703
- $00:12:48.624 \rightarrow 00:12:49.398$ main transcript.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.96831703
- $00:12:49.398 \longrightarrow 00:12:51.720$ The ones that were negative ETH.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.96831703
- $00:12:51.720 \longrightarrow 00:12:53.040$ All had some PTH,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.96831703
- $00:12:53.040 \longrightarrow 00:12:55.020$ nothing on the order of like.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.96831703
- $00:12:55.020 \longrightarrow 00:12:57.330$ Let's say we had 1000 for PTH.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.96831703
- $00{:}12{:}57{.}330 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}59{.}190$ We'd have like three or one
- NOTE Confidence: 0.96831703
- $00:12:59.190 \longrightarrow 00:13:00.960$ or two in the cells.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.96831703
- 00:13:00.960 00:13:03.290 That should have been negative.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.96831703
- $00{:}13{:}03.290 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}04.850$ And it's hard to believe that
- NOTE Confidence: 0.96831703
- 00:13:04.850 --> 00:13:06.268 every cell in the parathyroid
- NOTE Confidence: 0.96831703
- $00:13:06.268 \rightarrow 00:13:08.164$ actually has some RNA in it.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.96831703
- 00:13:08.170 -> 00:13:09.458 For this parathyroid hormone,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.96831703
- 00:13:09.458 --> 00:13:11.798 it's much more likely that the cell
- NOTE Confidence: 0.96831703
- 00:13:11.798 --> 00:13:13.543 that looks like an endothelial
- NOTE Confidence: 0.96831703
- 00:13:13.543 --> 00:13:14.939 cell really isn't endothelial
- NOTE Confidence: 0.96831703

 $00:13:14.996 \longrightarrow 00:13:16.766$ cell in those three little reeds.

NOTE Confidence: 0.96831703

 $00{:}13{:}16.770 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}17.248$ We're wrong,

NOTE Confidence: 0.96831703

00:13:17.248 --> 00:13:18.682 but I don't know how that

NOTE Confidence: 0.96831703

 $00:13:18.682 \rightarrow 00:13:19.650$ would have happened.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9832647

 $00:13:20.940 \longrightarrow 00:13:23.635$ Yeah, I don't know if that could

NOTE Confidence: 0.9832647

 $00:13:23.635 \longrightarrow 00:13:28.170$ be also like a contamination. Uhm?

NOTE Confidence: 0.9832647

 $00:13:28.170 \longrightarrow 00:13:30.433$ But if it's three instead of 3000, well,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9832647

 $00{:}13{:}30{.}433 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}32{.}697$ it that's a good signal to noise ratio.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9832647

00:13:32.700 --> 00:13:34.674 I would say I. I absolutely agree.

NOTE Confidence: 0.97211456

00:13:34.680 --> 00:13:36.766 I just thought there was maybe some

NOTE Confidence: 0.97211456

 $00{:}13{:}36.766 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}38.236$ general principle in single cells

NOTE Confidence: 0.97211456

 $00:13:38.236 \longrightarrow 00:13:40.056$ seek that we needed to look at,

NOTE Confidence: 0.97211456

 $00{:}13{:}40.060 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}41.470$ but that's not the case.

NOTE Confidence: 0.98215544

 $00{:}13{:}42.550 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}44.182$ No, the only things come coming to my

NOTE Confidence: 0.98215544

 $00:13:44.182 \dashrightarrow 00:13:46.039$ mind is this for the possibility of it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.98215544

 $00:13:46.040 \longrightarrow 00:13:48.536$ Yeah there is. There are some.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.98215544
- 00:13:48.540 --> 00:13:49.698 Possibility of supernatant

 $00{:}13{:}49.698 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}52.014$ contamination so that you get some

NOTE Confidence: 0.98215544

 $00:13:52.014 \rightarrow 00:13:53.837$ early that is in the solution.

NOTE Confidence: 0.98215544

 $00:13:53.840 \rightarrow 00:13:55.954$ For example, it could be something,

NOTE Confidence: 0.98215544

 $00:13:55.954 \longrightarrow 00:13:57.370$ especially if it's abundant,

NOTE Confidence: 0.98215544

 $00{:}13{:}57{.}370 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}58{.}778$ so it could be.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9823647

 $00:13:58.780 \longrightarrow 00:14:01.678$ Thank you that Diane maybe one other

NOTE Confidence: 0.9823647

 $00:14:01.678 \longrightarrow 00:14:04.158$ explanation for your finding is that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9823647

 $00{:}14{:}04{.}160 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}05{.}770$ That those cells have some

NOTE Confidence: 0.9823647

00:14:05.770 --> 00:14:07.058 illegitimate transcription going on,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9823647

 $00{:}14{:}07{.}060 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}11{.}110$ and so you know that could be an explanation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9823647

 $00{:}14{:}11{.}110 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}13{.}378$ Yes, absolutely, but that would be real.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9823647

 $00:14:13.380 \longrightarrow 00:14:15.030$ That would suggest that endothelial

NOTE Confidence: 0.9823647

 $00{:}14{:}15{.}030 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}17{.}036$ cells in the parathyroid like to

NOTE Confidence: 0.9823647

 $00{:}14{:}17.036 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}18.556$ turn on some parathyroid hormone,

 $00:14:18.560 \longrightarrow 00:14:21.470$ which would be a little weird.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9823647

 $00{:}14{:}21{.}470 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}23{.}150$ But the definition of illegitimate

NOTE Confidence: 0.9823647

 $00:14:23.150 \longrightarrow 00:14:24.830$ transcription is expression of any NOTE Confidence: 0.9823647

 $00:14:24.888 \rightarrow 00:14:26.448$ gene transcripted any cell type.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9823647

 $00{:}14{:}26{.}450 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}29{.}929$ I mean that's fine, but you know.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9823647

 $00{:}14{:}29{.}930 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}31{.}710$ Is that that parathyroid tissue

NOTE Confidence: 0.9823647

 $00:14:31.710 \longrightarrow 00:14:34.060$ that was sequenced is not adenoma,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9823647

00:14:34.060 --> 00:14:35.930 it's normal, it's abnormal, OK?

NOTE Confidence: 0.9875988

00:14:38.590 --> 00:14:40.750 Diane were those cells like washed

NOTE Confidence: 0.9875988

 $00{:}14{:}40.750 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}43.370$ before they were put on the sequencer?

NOTE Confidence: 0.9875988

 $00{:}14{:}43{.}370 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}44{.}450$ 'cause maybe there's.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9875988

 $00:14:44.450 \rightarrow 00:14:45.890$ Maybe somehow some transcripts

NOTE Confidence: 0.9875988

 $00:14:45.890 \rightarrow 00:14:47.450$ are just leaking through.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9875988

 $00:14:47.450 \longrightarrow 00:14:49.474$ If there's a lot of them they were.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9875988

00:14:49.480 --> 00:14:51.251 Yeah, yeah, that gets back to maybe

NOTE Confidence: 0.9875988

00:14:51.251 -> 00:14:52.504 the contamination. I don't know.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.9875988
- $00:14:52.504 \rightarrow 00:14:54.540$ I thought that the machine washed the cell,

 $00:14:54.540 \longrightarrow 00:14:56.058$ but I don't know specifically I.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9875988

 $00{:}14{:}56{.}060 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}58{.}274$ I'm sure that the person that kind of goes

NOTE Confidence: 0.9875988

 $00:14:58.274 \rightarrow 00:15:00.097$ through all this plumbing to get there,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9875988

 $00:15:00.100 \longrightarrow 00:15:01.365$ so it's a little surprising

NOTE Confidence: 0.9875988

00:15:01.365 - 00:15:03.900 that would happen, but maybe.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9875988

00:15:03.900 --> 00:15:04.948 All right, moving on.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9875988

 $00:15:04.948 \rightarrow 00:15:06.520$ I thought it was maybe something

NOTE Confidence: 0.9875988

00:15:06.571 --> 00:15:07.636 we all needed to know,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9875988

 $00:15:07.640 \longrightarrow 00:15:09.872$ but that it seems to be a specific problem.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9875988

 $00:15:09.880 \longrightarrow 00:15:10.872$ Sorry, cells were definitely

NOTE Confidence: 0.9875988

 $00{:}15{:}10.872 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}12.112$ was hed before they went on.

NOTE Confidence: 0.98769796

 $00{:}15{:}16{.}930 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}18{.}688$ OK, moving on but thank you.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589663

 $00:15:20.710 \longrightarrow 00:15:24.246$ Uh, OK, so the next step after this,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589663

 $00{:}15{:}24{.}250 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}27{.}434$ so these were to remove cells that we

 $00:15:27.434 \rightarrow 00:15:30.428$ didn't want in the following analysis.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589663

 $00{:}15{:}30{.}430 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}33{.}088$ The next step is the normalization.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589663

 $00{:}15{:}33{.}090 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}36{.}177$ So the normalization, as in any experiment,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589663

 $00{:}15{:}36{.}180 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}38{.}922$ has the aim of removing systematic

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589663

 $00{:}15{:}38{.}922 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}40{.}750$ differences in the quantification

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589663

 $00:15:40.823 \rightarrow 00:15:42.367$ of genes between cells.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589663

 $00{:}15{:}42{.}370 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}45{.}247$ So we saw the methods that are

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589663

 $00{:}15{:}45{.}247 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}48{.}109$ used for the bulk RNA secret.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589663

 $00{:}15{:}48{.}110 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}50{.}858$ So the simplest approach is the.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589663

 $00{:}15{:}50{.}860 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}53{.}224$ Library size normalization so that each

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589663

 $00{:}15{:}53{.}224 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}56{.}283$ cell so the the signal for each from

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589663

 $00{:}15{:}56{.}283 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}59{.}141$ each cell is divided for the total sum

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589663

 $00{:}15{:}59{.}141 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}01{.}837$ of the Council of the number of reads

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589663

00:16:01.840 --> 00:16:05.125 or Umm I across all genes for each cell.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589663

 $00:16:05.130 \longrightarrow 00:16:06.960$ So this is simplest approach.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589663

 $00:16:06.960 \longrightarrow 00:16:08.424$ Normalization for the size

- NOTE Confidence: 0.8589663
- $00:16:08.424 \rightarrow 00:16:10.620$ of the library for each cell.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8589663
- $00{:}16{:}10.620 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}12.296$ The questionable assumption of
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8589663
- $00:16:12.296 \rightarrow 00:16:14.391$ these approaches is that you're
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8589663
- $00:16:14.391 \longrightarrow 00:16:16.098$ assuming that each cell should
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8589663
- $00{:}16{:}16{.}098 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}17{.}940$ have the same number of reads.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8589663
- $00:16:17.940 \longrightarrow 00:16:19.074$ This is problematic.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8589663
- $00:16:19.074 \longrightarrow 00:16:20.964$ It's problematic in the biker.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8589663
- $00:16:20.970 \longrightarrow 00:16:23.609$ I have a secret to assume that
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8589663
- 00:16:23.609 --> 00:16:25.807 all your samples should have
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8589663
- $00:16:25.807 \rightarrow 00:16:28.753$ approximately the same number of RNA.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8589663
- 00:16:28.760 --> 00:16:30.580 It's even more, uh,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8589663
- 00:16:30.580 --> 00:16:33.310 questionable for the single cell because
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8589663
- $00{:}16{:}33{.}394 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}35{.}998$ we know some cells depending on the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8589663
- $00{:}16{:}35{.}998 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}38{.}557$ cell type can have different number
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8589663
- 00:16:38.557 --> 00:16:41.287 of model of RNA molecules depending
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8589663

 $00:16:41.287 \dashrightarrow 00:16:44.158$ on the translation and transcript.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589663

00:16:44.158 --> 00:16:47.168 Depending on the transcription activities.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589663

 $00:16:47.170 \longrightarrow 00:16:48.262$ So the alternative,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589663

 $00{:}16{:}48.262 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}50.082$ the main alternatives that are

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589663

 $00{:}16{:}50{.}082 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}52{.}318$ used to this simplest approach,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589663

 $00:16:52.320 \longrightarrow 00:16:56.058$ is to use a spike in RNA.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589663

00:16:56.060 --> 00:16:56.414 Uhm,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589663

 $00:16:56.414 \rightarrow 00:16:57.830$ there are many benches,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589663

 $00:16:57.830 \longrightarrow 00:16:59.954$ many kids of spiking RNAs that

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589663

 $00:16:59.954 \longrightarrow 00:17:01.016$ are now available,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589663

 $00{:}17{:}01{.}020 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}03{.}510$ and the assumption for this for

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589663

 $00{:}17{:}03.510 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}05.601$ when normalizing for this begin

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589663

 $00:17:05.601 \longrightarrow 00:17:08.051$ is that inside each cell there is

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589663

 $00{:}17{:}08.051 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}10.646$ the same amount of spike in RNA's.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589663

 $00:17:10.650 \longrightarrow 00:17:13.380$ And then this suggestion that

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589663

 $00:17:13.380 \longrightarrow 00:17:16.110$ the common suggestion in the.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.8589663
- $00:17:16.110 \longrightarrow 00:17:18.987$ Approach is that it's better to use
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8589663
- 00:17:18.987 --> 00:17:21.691 a single cell specific methods and
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8589663
- $00{:}17{:}21.691 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}24.918$ it's better not to use the methods
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8589663
- $00:17:25.010 \longrightarrow 00:17:27.428$ that are commonly used in the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8589663
- $00:17:27.428 \dashrightarrow 00:17:29.495$ bike and they seek normalization.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8589663
- $00{:}17{:}29{.}495 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}33{.}135$ The reason for this is that the bulk
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8589663
- $00{:}17{:}33{.}135 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}35{.}675$ methods do not take into consideration
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8589663
- $00:17:35.675 \rightarrow 00:17:39.380$ the fact that most of the values are zeros,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8589663
- $00{:}17{:}39{.}380 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}42{.}392$ and so using by chronic normalization
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8589663
- $00:17:42.392 \longrightarrow 00:17:44.978$ methods could lead that tool
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8589663
- $00:17:44.978 \longrightarrow 00:17:46.460$ very stranger size.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8589663
- $00{:}17{:}46.460 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}46.850$ Factors.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8589663
- $00:17:46.850 \rightarrow 00:17:49.580$ So all these single set specific methods
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8589663
- $00{:}17{:}49.580 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}51.611$ somehow take into consideration this
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8589663
- $00:17:51.611 \rightarrow 00:17:53.987$ problem of the excessive zeros and
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8589663

- $00:17:53.987 \rightarrow 00:17:56.839$ they use different strategies to normalize.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8589663
- $00{:}17{:}56.840 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}58.695$ So there are many methods
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8589663
- $00:17:58.695 \longrightarrow 00:18:00.179$ for the single cell.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8589663
- $00{:}18{:}00{.}180 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}02{.}030$ Some of those consider instead
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8589663
- $00:18:02.030 \longrightarrow 00:18:04.656$ of all the single cells pools of
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8589663
- $00{:}18{:}04.656 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}06.756$ cells so that they normalize that
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8589663
- $00:18:06.756 \longrightarrow 00:18:08.350$ not each single cell,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8589663
- $00:18:08.350 \rightarrow 00:18:10.570$ but the normalized groups of cells
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8589663
- 00:18:10.570 --> 00:18:12.800 where the content is summed up,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8589663
- $00{:}18{:}12{.}800 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}16{.}464$ and this somehow reduces the number of zeros.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8589663
- $00{:}18{:}16{.}470 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}18{.}936$ And then another methodology is try
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8589663
- $00:18:18.936 \rightarrow 00:18:21.119$ to correct to normalize differently
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8589663
- $00:18:21.119 \longrightarrow 00:18:23.454$ for different groups of genes
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8589663
- $00:18:23.454 \rightarrow 00:18:25.950$ depending on whether they are low.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8589663
- $00:18:25.950 \longrightarrow 00:18:27.768$ They have low,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8589663
- $00:18:27.768 \longrightarrow 00:18:30.798$ medium or high expression levels.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.8589663
- $00:18:30.800 \rightarrow 00:18:34.288$ Uh, so the key point here is that,

 $00:18:34.290 \longrightarrow 00:18:35.595$ uh, as usual,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589663

 $00:18:35.595 \rightarrow 00:18:38.205$ the normalization choices affect the results,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589663

 $00:18:38.210 \longrightarrow 00:18:40.716$ so this is taken from a paper

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589663

 $00:18:40.716 \longrightarrow 00:18:43.473$ published last year that was comparing

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589663

 $00{:}18{:}43{.}473 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}45{.}609$ a different normalization methods

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589663

 $00{:}18{:}45.609 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}48.677$ developed for single cell RNA seek data.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589663

 $00{:}18{:}48.680 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}51.186$ So here this is a simple data

NOTE Confidence: 0.8589663

 $00:18:51.186 \longrightarrow 00:18:52.260$ set of mouse

NOTE Confidence: 0.9192497

 $00:18:52.351 \longrightarrow 00:18:54.399$ embryonic data where you

NOTE Confidence: 0.9192497

00:18:54.399 --> 00:18:56.959 have two population of cells.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9192497

 $00{:}18{:}56{.}960 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}00{.}964$ Then Veronica stem cells and the method.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9192497

 $00:19:00.970 \dashrightarrow 00:19:03.256$ They are colored according to this,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9192497

 $00{:}19{:}03.260 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}05.546$ to the two, to the two

NOTE Confidence: 0.9192497

 $00:19:05.546 \longrightarrow 00:19:07.070$ populations they belong to.

 $00:19:07.070 \rightarrow 00:19:09.751$ So what you see is the result

NOTE Confidence: 0.9192497

 $00{:}19{:}09{.}751 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}11{.}260$ without normalization at all.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9192497

 $00:19:11.260 \longrightarrow 00:19:13.990$ So it seems to work quite fine

NOTE Confidence: 0.9192497

 $00:19:13.990 \rightarrow 00:19:15.450$ even without normalizing it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9192497

00:19:15.450 --> 00:19:18.156 All this simple normalization here is

NOTE Confidence: 0.9192497

 $00{:}19{:}18{.}156$ --> $00{:}19{:}20{.}711$ the library size normalization and also NOTE Confidence: $0{.}9192497$

00:19:20.711 --> 00:19:23.077 this seems to be working quite fine

NOTE Confidence: 0.9192497

 $00:19:23.077 \rightarrow 00:19:25.350$ except for this cell here and then.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9192497

 $00{:}19{:}25{.}350 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}27{.}750$ You see six different methods that

NOTE Confidence: 0.9192497

 $00{:}19{:}27.750 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}30.146$ were developed only for single cell

NOTE Confidence: 0.9192497

00:19:30.146 --> 00:19:32.318 RNA seek and their divided in.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9192497

 $00{:}19{:}32{.}320$ --> $00{:}19{:}35{.}584$ Two groups are based on the fact that NOTE Confidence: 0.9192497

00:19:35.584 --> 00:19:38.370 they require spiking RNAs to worker,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9192497

00:19:38.370 --> 00:19:41.362 and this is basic German Sam STRT or

NOTE Confidence: 0.9192497

 $00{:}19{:}41{.}362 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}44{.}417$ they do not require speaking RNAs.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9192497

 $00:19:44.420 \longrightarrow 00:19:46.862$ So the general message here is

- NOTE Confidence: 0.9192497
- $00:19:46.862 \rightarrow 00:19:49.170$ that depending of these methods,

00:19:49.170 --> 00:19:51.235 the separation of this population

NOTE Confidence: 0.9192497

 $00:19:51.235 \rightarrow 00:19:53.920$ change a lot and different methods,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9192497

 $00:19:53.920 \longrightarrow 00:19:57.518$ so there is no method that works

NOTE Confidence: 0.9192497

 $00{:}19{:}57{.}518 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}00{.}139$ better for each data set.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9192497

 $00{:}20{:}00{.}140 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}03{.}276$ So I would say it's usually important to

NOTE Confidence: 0.9192497

 $00{:}20{:}03.276 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}06.246$ to try different methods and depending

NOTE Confidence: 0.9192497

00:20:06.246 --> 00:20:09.820 on whether you have spikings or not,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9192497

 $00{:}20{:}09{.}820 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}14.580$ the possibility are either limited or not.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9192497

 $00:20:14.580 \longrightarrow 00:20:16.460$ This is another excellent yes,

NOTE Confidence: 0.94115114

00:20:16.460 --> 00:20:17.956 sorry so it's alright.

NOTE Confidence: 0.94115114

00:20:17.956 --> 00:20:19.455 Yeah, it's actually quite

NOTE Confidence: 0.94115114

00:20:19.455 - 00:20:21.330 interesting to see this result,

NOTE Confidence: 0.94115114

 $00{:}20{:}21{.}330 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}23{.}583$ you know, seems to the simple

NOTE Confidence: 0.94115114

 $00:20:23.583 \rightarrow 00:20:26.210$ normalization is at best in this case.

00:20:26.210 --> 00:20:28.590 If simply just judging from how tight

NOTE Confidence: 0.94115114

 $00{:}20{:}28{.}590 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}31{.}743$ the same cell population is and how far

NOTE Confidence: 0.94115114

 $00{:}20{:}31.743 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}34.080$ away two distinct populations should be, NOTE Confidence: 0.94115114

 $00{:}20{:}34.080 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}37.617$ but I would assume this is done by maybe NOTE Confidence: 0.94115114

 $00:20:37.617 \longrightarrow 00:20:40.079$ something like a sort of a Euclidean

NOTE Confidence: 0.94115114

 $00{:}20{:}40.080 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}41.636$ distance based measurements, because NOTE Confidence: 0.94115114

 $00:20:41.636 \rightarrow 00:20:44.300$ if you simply normalize by library size.

NOTE Confidence: 0.94115114

 $00:20:44.300 \rightarrow 00:20:45.780$ If you use a correlation,

NOTE Confidence: 0.94115114

 $00{:}20{:}45.780 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}47.250$ that wouldn't change anything, right?

NOTE Confidence: 0.94115114

 $00{:}20{:}47.250 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}48.730$ Because the correlation between the

NOTE Confidence: 0.94115114

 $00{:}20{:}48.730 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}50.500$ genes will still remain the same,

NOTE Confidence: 0.94115114

 $00{:}20{:}50{.}500 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}52{.}306$ or between cells will still remain

NOTE Confidence: 0.94115114

 $00{:}20{:}52{.}306 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}53{.}510$ the same regardless whether

NOTE Confidence: 0.94115114

 $00:20:53.560 \longrightarrow 00:20:54.920$ mobilized by library or not.

NOTE Confidence: 0.96328956

 $00:20:55.670 \rightarrow 00:20:59.070$ Yeah, then here. So I didn't see it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.96328956

 $00:20:59.070 \longrightarrow 00:21:00.360$ So this anticipation.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.96328956
- $00:21:00.360 \longrightarrow 00:21:02.080$ So here the visualization

 $00:21:02.080 \longrightarrow 00:21:04.623$ of this cluster is based on

NOTE Confidence: 0.96328956

00:21:04.623 --> 00:21:06.203 this approach of dimensional

NOTE Confidence: 0.96328956

 $00:21:06.203 \rightarrow 00:21:08.419$ reduction that is called Disney.

NOTE Confidence: 0.96328956

 $00:21:08.420 \longrightarrow 00:21:10.550$ So that could also affect.

NOTE Confidence: 0.96328956

 $00{:}21{:}10.550 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}13.343$ So these differences that you see here

NOTE Confidence: 0.96328956

 $00:21:13.343 \rightarrow 00:21:16.497$ change also if you change the dimension.

NOTE Confidence: 0.96328956

 $00:21:16.500 \rightarrow 00:21:18.620$ If you change the dimensionality

NOTE Confidence: 0.96328956

 $00:21:18.620 \longrightarrow 00:21:19.468$ reduction method.

NOTE Confidence: 0.97818357

00:21:22.130 --> 00:21:24.711 Used it to plot the results, but I agree,

NOTE Confidence: 0.97818357

 $00:21:24.711 \rightarrow 00:21:26.433$ so here is the simple normalization.

NOTE Confidence: 0.97818357

 $00:21:26.440 \longrightarrow 00:21:28.778$ Seems to be one of the most

NOTE Confidence: 0.97818357

00:21:28.778 --> 00:21:30.684 effective in terms of separating

NOTE Confidence: 0.97818357

 $00{:}21{:}30{.}684 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}32{.}759$ the two clusters at least.

NOTE Confidence: 0.97818357

 $00{:}21{:}32{.}760 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}34{.}962$ This is another example with another

 $00:21:34.962 \rightarrow 00:21:37.850$ data set of mouth longevity, real cells.

NOTE Confidence: 0.97818357

 $00{:}21{:}37.850 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}40.195$ So here you have more cluster of

NOTE Confidence: 0.97818357

 $00:21:40.195 \rightarrow 00:21:42.409$ cells corresponding to different.

NOTE Confidence: 0.91594625

 $00:21:45.170 \longrightarrow 00:21:46.625$ Differentiation points so

NOTE Confidence: 0.91594625

 $00:21:46.625 \longrightarrow 00:21:49.050$ different stages of the embryo,

NOTE Confidence: 0.91594625

 $00{:}21{:}49{.}050 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}51{.}829$ a 14 and 1618 and then and

NOTE Confidence: 0.91594625

 $00:21:51.829 \longrightarrow 00:21:54.914$ then the green are the adults

NOTE Confidence: 0.91594625

 $00:21:54.914 \rightarrow 00:21:57.298$ that cells epithelial cells,

NOTE Confidence: 0.91594625

00:21:57.300 --> 00:22:00.900 so also here they called the basic A

NOTE Confidence: 0.91594625

 $00{:}22{:}00{.}900 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}05{.}009$ take home message is that there is no

NOTE Confidence: 0.91594625

 $00{:}22{:}05{.}009 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}07{.}969$ consensus on which method is best,

NOTE Confidence: 0.91594625

 $00{:}22{:}07{.}970 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}09{.}910$ and different methods can

NOTE Confidence: 0.91594625

 $00:22:09.910 \longrightarrow 00:22:11.850$ lead to different results.

NOTE Confidence: 0.98387814

 $00:22:15.850 \longrightarrow 00:22:19.009$ So that in each, depending on the data set,

NOTE Confidence: 0.98387814

 $00{:}22{:}19{.}010 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}21{.}467$ the methods that perform the best changes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8880952

 $00:22:24.530 \longrightarrow 00:22:26.842$ And what you don't have here is a
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8880952
- $00{:}22{:}26.842 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}28.999$ methods that are taken from the back,

 $00:22:29.000 \longrightarrow 00:22:30.770$ so they were not considered in

NOTE Confidence: 0.8880952

 $00:22:30.770 \longrightarrow 00:22:32.280$ this in this comparison here.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325

 $00:22:35.670 \rightarrow 00:22:38.646$ OK, so this was for the preprocessing steps.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325

 $00:22:38.650 \rightarrow 00:22:40.888$ Then the post processing the steps.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325

 $00:22:40.890 \longrightarrow 00:22:43.530$ At this the the after we have the

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325

 $00{:}22{:}43.530 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}45.369$ normalized our normalized data.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325

 $00{:}22{:}45{.}370 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}47{.}645$ We can start the second part of

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325

 $00{:}22{:}47.645 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}49.960$ the analysis and the main steps

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325

 $00{:}22{:}49{.}960 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}52{.}075$ here are the dimensional reduction.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325

 $00{:}22{:}52.080 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}54.800$ So we will see that these data since

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325

 $00{:}22{:}54.800 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}57.464$ they have a lot of rows and columns

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325

 $00{:}22{:}57{.}464 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}00{.}289$ there they have a high dimensionality.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325

 $00{:}23{:}00{.}290 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}02{.}460$ This is problematic for the

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325

 $00:23:02.460 \longrightarrow 00:23:04.196$ code for the interpretation.

 $00:23:04.200 \rightarrow 00:23:07.336$ For the visualization and also for the, NOTE Confidence: 0.90325 00:23:07.340 --> 00:23:09.990 uh, uh, running a computational NOTE Confidence: 0.90325 00:23:09.990 --> 00:23:12.640 procedures because it can take NOTE Confidence: 0.90325 $00:23:12.727 \rightarrow 00:23:14.946$ it can take a lot of time, NOTE Confidence: 0.90325 $00:23:14.950 \longrightarrow 00:23:17.800$ so the reduction to a medium NOTE Confidence: 0.90325 00:23:17.800 --> 00:23:20.242 dimensional space is usually performed NOTE Confidence: 0.90325 $00:23:20.242 \longrightarrow 00:23:23.392$ or performed on the genes so that NOTE Confidence: 0.90325 00:23:23.392 --> 00:23:25.983 instead of having a 10,000 genes NOTE Confidence: 0.90325 $00{:}23{:}25{.}983 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}29{.}164$ that we have at this point we have NOTE Confidence: 0.90325 $00:23:29.164 \longrightarrow 00:23:31.873$ 1030 dimensions and we will see that NOTE Confidence: 0.90325 $00:23:31.873 \rightarrow 00:23:34.278$ these dimensions can represent. NOTE Confidence: 0.90325 00:23:34.280 --> 00:23:36.484 Combination of different genes. NOTE Confidence: 0.90325 $00:23:36.484 \longrightarrow 00:23:41.460$ But the key point is that you reduce the NOTE Confidence: 0.90325 $00:23:41.460 \longrightarrow 00:23:45.114$ number of dimensions from 10,000 to 10. NOTE Confidence: 0.90325 $00:23:45.120 \rightarrow 00:23:47.955$ So this is the first important step, NOTE Confidence: 0.90325 $00:23:47.960 \rightarrow 00:23:51.614$ so I will speak about this quite in detail.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.90325
- $00:23:51.620 \longrightarrow 00:23:54.476$ So the problem is this curse of

 $00:23:54.476 \longrightarrow 00:23:57.005$ dimensionality so that we have 2010

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325

00:23:57.005 -> 00:23:59.453 to 20,000 genes as features and

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325

 $00:23:59.453 \rightarrow 00:24:01.867$ depending on our experiment we have

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325

 $00:24:01.867 \longrightarrow 00:24:04.610$ 10,000 up to 1,000,000 of cells that

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325

 $00:24:04.610 \longrightarrow 00:24:07.445$ we want to analyze and to consider.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325

00:24:07.450 --> 00:24:11.095 So we need to reduce the number of features,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325

00:24:11.100 -> 00:24:13.536 in particular the number of genes,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325

 $00:24:13.540 \longrightarrow 00:24:14.326$ the rational.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325

 $00:24:14.326 \longrightarrow 00:24:17.077$ Is that there are two two points

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325

 $00:24:17.077 \longrightarrow 00:24:18.580$ for the rational.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325

 $00{:}24{:}18.580 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}21.464$ The first is that not all the

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325

 $00{:}24{:}21{.}464 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}22{.}700$ genes are important.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325

 $00{:}24{:}22.700 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}25.484$ If our aim is to classify cells according

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325

 $00{:}24{:}25{.}484 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}28{.}059$ to their differences in expression,

 $00:24:28.060 \rightarrow 00:24:30.120$ not all genes are important.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325

 $00{:}24{:}30{.}120 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}33{.}280$ So for example for sure genes that are

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325

00:24:33.280 --> 00:24:35.468 never expressed are not important,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325

 $00{:}24{:}35{.}470 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}38{.}044$ but also house keeping genes that are

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325

00:24:38.044 --> 00:24:40.653 always expressed at the same level

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325

 $00{:}24{:}40{.}653 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}43{.}101$ are also not important in separating NOTE Confidence: 0.90325

 $00:24:43.101 \longrightarrow 00:24:45.420$ the cells and we select these.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325

 $00:24:45.420 \longrightarrow 00:24:48.150$ Jeans for this point that through

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325

00:24:48.150 --> 00:24:49.515 feature gene selection,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325

 $00:24:49.520 \rightarrow 00:24:52.523$ then the second point is that many

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325

 $00:24:52.523 \rightarrow 00:24:54.980$ genes are correlated in expression,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325

 $00{:}24{:}54{.}980 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}57{.}272$ so it's redundant to have two

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325

 $00:24:57.272 \rightarrow 00:24:59.461$ genes that are highly correlated

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325

 $00:24:59.461 \rightarrow 00:25:01.797$ as two separate information.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325

 $00{:}25{:}01.800 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}06.770$ We can combine them into one dimension.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325

 $00:25:06.770 \rightarrow 00:25:09.745$ And these correlation is taking care during

- NOTE Confidence: 0.90325
- $00:25:09.745 \longrightarrow 00:25:11.730$ the dimensionality reduction approaches.

 $00:25:11.730 \longrightarrow 00:25:13.534$ So for this election,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325

 $00:25:13.534 \rightarrow 00:25:15.338$ for the first step,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325

 $00:25:15.340 \rightarrow 00:25:19.516$ selection of genes that are important.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325

 $00{:}25{:}19{.}520 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}21{.}960$ The aim is to select the genes that

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325

 $00{:}25{:}21{.}960 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}23{.}638$ contain useful information about the

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325

 $00:25:23.638 \rightarrow 00:25:25.983$ biology of the system and so they

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325

 $00{:}25{:}26.051 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}28.865$ are the genes that have difference in

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325

 $00:25:28.865 \rightarrow 00:25:30.434$ expression between different cells

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325

 $00{:}25{:}30{.}434 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}32{.}912$ and we want to remove genes that

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325

 $00:25:32.912 \rightarrow 00:25:34.811$ contain either only noise because

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325

 $00{:}25{:}34.811 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}37.055$ they have low expression level and

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325

 $00{:}25{:}37.055 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}39.697$ so all the variation is noise or the

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325

 $00{:}25{:}39.697 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}42.400$ jeans that do not have variation among genes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325

 $00:25:42.400 \rightarrow 00:25:44.376$ So the house keeping genes.

 $00:25:44.376 \longrightarrow 00:25:47.340$ And the simplest approach to do

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325

 $00{:}25{:}47{.}434 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}50{.}059$ that is to calculate for each gene

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325

 $00{:}25{:}50{.}059 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}53{.}644$ a sort of measure that is a variance

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325

 $00:25:53.644 \longrightarrow 00:25:55.540$ corrected for the mean.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325

 $00:25:55.540 \longrightarrow 00:25:58.186$ So we have seen something similar.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325

 $00{:}25{:}58{.}190 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}02{.}168$ Also during the lesson for the bulk RNA seek,

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325

 $00:26:02.170 \longrightarrow 00:26:05.257$ because the approach is not so different.

NOTE Confidence: 0.90325

00:26:05.260 --> 00:26:08.796 So you rank GS, you build a model.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9336727

 $00{:}26{:}08{.}800 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}11{.}446$ Each dot. Here is a gene,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9336727

 $00{:}26{:}11.450 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}15.058$ and you expect the variance of the gene.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9336727

 $00{:}26{:}15{.}060 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}17{.}100$ To be proportional to the

NOTE Confidence: 0.9336727

 $00{:}26{:}17.100 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}19.140$ average expression of the gene,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9336727

 $00{:}26{:}19.140 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}21.198$ meaning that the more the gene

NOTE Confidence: 0.9336727

 $00:26:21.198 \rightarrow 00:26:23.625$ is expressed that the more random

NOTE Confidence: 0.9336727

 $00{:}26{:}23.625 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}26.080$ fluctuation fluctuation you also expect.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9336727

 $00:26:26.080 \longrightarrow 00:26:28.856$ So you build a sort of model that

- NOTE Confidence: 0.9336727
- $00:26:28.856 \longrightarrow 00:26:30.578$ captures a random variations

 $00{:}26{:}30{.}578 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}33{.}416$ that you expect in your genes,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9336727

 $00{:}26{:}33{.}420 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}36{.}468$ and then you see which genes are outliers

NOTE Confidence: 0.9336727

 $00{:}26{:}36{.}468 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}39{.}607$ so they show more variance than the

NOTE Confidence: 0.9336727

00:26:39.607 --> 00:26:42.725 baseline variance that is based on the

NOTE Confidence: 0.9336727

 $00{:}26{:}42.725 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}45.322$ noise or or on the random variation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9336727

 $00{:}26{:}45{.}330 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}47{.}598$ In expression and those genes that

NOTE Confidence: 0.9336727

 $00:26:47.598 \rightarrow 00:26:50.310$ are highly variants are the ones that

NOTE Confidence: 0.9336727

 $00{:}26{:}50{.}310 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}52{.}185$ you select for further analysis,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9336727

 $00{:}26{:}52{.}190 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}54{.}906$ because there are those genes where you

NOTE Confidence: 0.9336727

 $00{:}26{:}54{.}906 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}57{.}168$ don't have only technical variations

NOTE Confidence: 0.9336727

 $00{:}26{:}57{.}168 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}00{.}240$ or but you have biological variation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9336727

 $00{:}27{:}00{.}240$ --> $00{:}27{:}02{.}480$ The questionable assumption here is NOTE Confidence: 0.9336727

 $00{:}27{:}02{.}480 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}04{.}720$ that the biological variability is

NOTE Confidence: 0.9336727

 $00:27:04.793 \rightarrow 00:27:07.228$ higher than the technical variability,

 $00{:}27{:}07{.}230 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}09{.}804$ because the assumption here is that

NOTE Confidence: 0.9336727

 $00{:}27{:}09{.}804 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}12{.}531$ all these outlier genes that show

NOTE Confidence: 0.9336727

 $00{:}27{:}12{.}531$ --> $00{:}27{:}15{.}327$ higher variance than the average are NOTE Confidence: 0.9336727

 $00{:}27{:}15{.}327 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}17{.}793$ important because this higher variance NOTE Confidence: 0.9336727

00:27:17.793 --> 00:27:20.228 is biological variance and obviously

NOTE Confidence: 0.9336727

 $00{:}27{:}20{.}228 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}23{.}540$ also here as in some balcony approach,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9336727

 $00{:}27{:}23.540 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}26.168$ you could have some methods that

NOTE Confidence: 0.9336727

00:27:26.168 --> 00:27:28.670 penalize jeans having high variance,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9336727

 $00{:}27{:}28.670 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}29.768$ but lo Mein.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9336727

00:27:29.768 --> 00:27:32.330 Because you don't trust them so much,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9336727

 $00{:}27{:}32{.}330 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}34{.}496$ but the assumption is that you

NOTE Confidence: 0.9336727

 $00{:}27{:}34{.}496 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}36{.}825$ calculate a measure of variance and

NOTE Confidence: 0.9336727

 $00{:}27{:}36{.}825 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}39{.}273$ you consider the top variant genes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9336727

 $00{:}27{:}39{.}280 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}41{.}296$ And you remove the others from the analysis.

NOTE Confidence: 0.985337

 $00{:}27{:}44.890 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}46.786$ Then there is the dimensionality reduction,

NOTE Confidence: 0.985337

 $00:27:46.790 \longrightarrow 00:27:49.310$ so this is a family of approaches

- NOTE Confidence: 0.985337
- $00:27:49.310 \longrightarrow 00:27:51.439$ that are using complex data.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.985337
- $00:27:51.440 \longrightarrow 00:27:54.590$ To reduce the number of dimensions of
- NOTE Confidence: 0.985337
- $00{:}27{:}54{.}590 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}58{.}429$ the data so this has a double purpose,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.985337
- $00:27:58.430 \longrightarrow 00:28:01.662$ as I say that to help the analysis
- NOTE Confidence: 0.985337
- $00{:}28{:}01.662 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}03.531$ downstream analysis because the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.985337
- $00{:}28{:}03{.}531 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}05{.}996$ reducing the dimension speed the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.985337
- $00{:}28{:}05{.}996 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}08{.}553$ calculation times and also to
- NOTE Confidence: 0.985337
- $00:28:08.553 \rightarrow 00:28:10.545$ help the visually visualization.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.985337
- 00:28:10.550 --> 00:28:12.780 Especially when you report single
- NOTE Confidence: 0.985337
- 00:28:12.780 --> 00:28:16.533 cell data they need is to show data
- NOTE Confidence: 0.985337
- $00{:}28{:}16{.}533 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}18{.}923$ in simple and interpretable output.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.985337
- $00{:}28{:}18{.}930 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}22{.}290$ So usually this is a 2D plot.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.985337
- $00:28:22.290 \longrightarrow 00:28:24.330$ And so they mentioned I did.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.985337
- $00{:}28{:}24{.}330 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}27{.}221$ Action are also used in order to
- NOTE Confidence: 0.985337
- $00:28:27.221 \longrightarrow 00:28:28.873$ compress high dimensional information
- NOTE Confidence: 0.985337

 $00{:}28{:}28{.}873 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}31{.}888$ so that it can be presented in a 2D

NOTE Confidence: 0.985337

 $00{:}28{:}31{.}961 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}34{.}600$ plot and the two are different needs.

NOTE Confidence: 0.985337

 $00{:}28{:}34.600 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}36.156$ There are multiple methodologies.

NOTE Confidence: 0.985337

 $00{:}28{:}36{.}156 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}38{.}101$ Each one has different advantages

NOTE Confidence: 0.985337

 $00{:}28{:}38{.}101 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}39{.}210$ and limitations,

NOTE Confidence: 0.985337

 $00{:}28{:}39{.}210$ --> $00{:}28{:}41{.}870$ so the classic example of a dimensional

NOTE Confidence: 0.985337

 $00{:}28{:}41{.}870 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}44{.}912$ reduction that we always have in mind

NOTE Confidence: 0.985337

 $00:28:44.912 \rightarrow 00:28:46.744$ and possibly historically speaking,

NOTE Confidence: 0.985337

 $00{:}28{:}46{.}750 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}50{.}730$ is one of the oldest is when you have a NOTE Confidence: 0.985337

 $00:28:50.832 \rightarrow 00:28:54.702$ problem to draw a 2D map of the Earth.

NOTE Confidence: 0.985337

 $00{:}28{:}54{.}710 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}57{.}318$ So Earth is 3D and you want that

NOTE Confidence: 0.985337

 $00:28:57.318 \longrightarrow 00:29:00.560$ 2D map that keeps most of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.985337

 $00:29:00.560 \rightarrow 00:29:03.065$ reliable information on the geography

NOTE Confidence: 0.985337

 $00:29:03.156 \longrightarrow 00:29:05.326$ on the geography of Earth.

NOTE Confidence: 0.985337

 $00:29:05.330 \dashrightarrow 00:29:07.886$ So where the continents are placed,

NOTE Confidence: 0.985337

 $00:29:07.890 \rightarrow 00:29:10.865$ their shapes, their areas and so on,

- NOTE Confidence: 0.985337
- $00:29:10.870 \rightarrow 00:29:13.000$ so there are different approaches,

 $00:29:13.000 \rightarrow 00:29:15.215$ many different approaches to convert

NOTE Confidence: 0.985337

00:29:15.215 --> 00:29:18.540 the 3D map of Earth into 2D maps,

NOTE Confidence: 0.985337

 $00:29:18.540 \rightarrow 00:29:20.766$ and for example here you see one

NOTE Confidence: 0.985337

 $00{:}29{:}20.766 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}23.502$ of the most famous projections that

NOTE Confidence: 0.985337

 $00:29:23.502 \longrightarrow 00:29:25.774$ is called Mercator projections.

NOTE Confidence: 0.985337

 $00{:}29{:}25{.}780 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}29{.}188$ So this was developed in the 16th century,

NOTE Confidence: 0.985337

 $00{:}29{:}29{.}190 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}32{.}438$ and it's the one used by sailors because

NOTE Confidence: 0.985337

 $00{:}29{:}32{.}438 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}35{.}497$ it keeps the directions and shapes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.985337

00:29:35.500 --> 00:29:37.677 So it's a good map to know

NOTE Confidence: 0.985337

00:29:37.677 --> 00:29:39.710 what is North East or West.

NOTE Confidence: 0.985337

 $00{:}29{:}39{.}710 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}42.815$ And the problem is that there is a high

NOTE Confidence: 0.985337

 $00{:}29{:}42.815 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}45.215$ distortion in this map of areas so that

NOTE Confidence: 0.985337

 $00{:}29{:}45{.}215 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}48{.}140$ the the more you are far from the equator,

NOTE Confidence: 0.985337

 $00:29:48.140 \longrightarrow 00:29:49.755$ the more areas that seems

 $00:29:49.755 \longrightarrow 00:29:51.047$ larger than they are.

NOTE Confidence: 0.985337

 $00{:}29{:}51{.}050 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}53{.}192$ And so for example here it seems

NOTE Confidence: 0.985337

 $00:29:53.192 \longrightarrow 00:29:54.854$ that Greenland is bigger than

NOTE Confidence: 0.985337

 $00:29:54.854 \longrightarrow 00:29:56.559$ the whole of South America.

NOTE Confidence: 0.985337

 $00{:}29{:}56{.}560 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}59{.}144$ That is not so. This is the distortion.

NOTE Confidence: 0.985337

 $00:29:59.150 \rightarrow 00:30:02.559$ So other projections such as these two.

NOTE Confidence: 0.985337

 $00:30:02.560 \longrightarrow 00:30:04.580$ And they are projections where

NOTE Confidence: 0.985337

 $00:30:04.580 \longrightarrow 00:30:06.600$ the the area is preserved,

NOTE Confidence: 0.985337

 $00{:}30{:}06{.}600 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}09{.}302$ and so that this area corresponds really

NOTE Confidence: 0.985337

 $00{:}30{:}09{.}302 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}11.848$ to the smallest areas with respect.

NOTE Confidence: 0.985337

 $00:30:11.850 \longrightarrow 00:30:13.870$ For example to South America.

NOTE Confidence: 0.985337

 $00:30:13.870 \longrightarrow 00:30:16.411$ But these kind of maps do not

NOTE Confidence: 0.985337

 $00{:}30{:}16.411 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}18.320$ preserve shapes and direction,

NOTE Confidence: 0.985337

 $00:30:18.320 \longrightarrow 00:30:21.480$ so that the common point is any

NOTE Confidence: 0.985337

 $00:30:21.480 \longrightarrow 00:30:23.565$ projection will be will distort

NOTE Confidence: 0.985337

 $00:30:23.565 \longrightarrow 00:30:25.590$ the some of the features.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.985337
- $00:30:25.590 \rightarrow 00:30:27.625$ So reduction of dimensionality is

 $00{:}30{:}27.625 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}30.619$ always an approximation and it brings it

NOTE Confidence: 0.985337

 $00:30:30.619 \rightarrow 00:30:32.844$ brings some distortions and deviations.

NOTE Confidence: 0.985337

 $00:30:32.850 \rightarrow 00:30:35.447$ And as a for the Earth map,

NOTE Confidence: 0.985337

 $00{:}30{:}35{.}450 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}37{.}220$ we have different approaches also

NOTE Confidence: 0.985337

 $00:30:37.220 \longrightarrow 00:30:39.831$ for our single cell data we see

NOTE Confidence: 0.985337

 $00:30:39.831 \longrightarrow 00:30:41.379$ there are different techniques.

NOTE Confidence: 0.98599946

 $00:30:44.150 \longrightarrow 00:30:45.440$ Is this clear?

NOTE Confidence: 0.9871331

00:30:48.520 --> 00:30:50.448 Anyway, it's a very good analogy,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9871331

 $00:30:50.448 \longrightarrow 00:30:53.750$ so this is a we some feedback.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9871331

 $00{:}30{:}53{.}750 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}56{.}547$ So the first one that we will see with a real

NOTE Confidence: 0.9871331

 $00{:}30{:}56{.}547 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}58{.}707$ example is principal component analysis.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9871331

 $00:30:58.710 \longrightarrow 00:31:00.942$ So in our case we are studying cells

NOTE Confidence: 0.9871331

 $00{:}31{:}00{.}942 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}03{.}050$ based on the expression of genes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9871331

 $00:31:03.050 \rightarrow 00:31:05.045$ So in that in our simple example

 $00:31:05.045 \dashrightarrow 00:31:07.259$ we will have six cells and since

NOTE Confidence: 0.9871331

 $00{:}31{:}07{.}259 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}09{.}197$ they are simple cells they have

NOTE Confidence: 0.9871331

 $00:31:09.264 \rightarrow 00:31:11.420$ only they express or women age 25,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9871331

 $00:31:11.420 \longrightarrow 00:31:12.482$ only four genes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9871331

 $00:31:12.482 \longrightarrow 00:31:15.407$ And So what you see here is the

NOTE Confidence: 0.9871331

00:31:15.407 --> 00:31:17.217 expression level of each gene

NOTE Confidence: 0.9871331

 $00{:}31{:}17{.}217 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}20{.}119$ from A to D in this six sets.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9871331

 $00:31:20.120 \longrightarrow 00:31:23.224$ So now we can use the expression levels,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9871331

 $00{:}31{:}23{.}230 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}26{.}060$ uh, so in in as a way to map cells

NOTE Confidence: 0.9871331

 $00:31:26.148 \longrightarrow 00:31:28.746$ and the expression level of each

NOTE Confidence: 0.9871331

 $00:31:28.746 \longrightarrow 00:31:31.400$ gene is a different dimension.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9871331

 $00:31:31.400 \longrightarrow 00:31:34.576$ So in this case we have a four

NOTE Confidence: 0.9871331

 $00:31:34.576 \rightarrow 00:31:36.200$ dimensional space that obviously

NOTE Confidence: 0.9871331

 $00:31:36.200 \longrightarrow 00:31:39.176$ we cannot plot a on a 2D plot.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9871331

 $00{:}31{:}39{.}180 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}41{.}392$ So one simple so we could plot

NOTE Confidence: 0.9871331

 $00:31:41.392 \longrightarrow 00:31:44.268$ on a two diploid cells based on

- NOTE Confidence: 0.9871331
- $00{:}31{:}44{.}268 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}46{.}568$ the expression of two genes,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9871331
- 00:31:46.570 00:31:50.226 and so we can take jeanae engine be.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9871331
- $00:31:50.230 \longrightarrow 00:31:52.925$ And build these sort of map of
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9871331
- $00{:}31{:}52{.}925 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}55{.}343$ these cells based on the expression
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9871331
- $00{:}31{:}55{.}343 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}58{.}476$ level of gene eight that is our X
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9871331
- $00{:}31{:}58{.}476 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}01{.}149$ axis and gene B that is our Y axis.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9871331
- $00:32:01.150 \longrightarrow 00:32:04.062$ And here you see where cells are
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9871331
- $00{:}32{:}04.062 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}06.236$ located according to the expression
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9871331
- $00:32:06.236 \longrightarrow 00:32:08.768$ of eight of these two genes.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9871331
- 00:32:08.770 00:32:11.398 So the expression of each gene
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9871331
- $00:32:11.398 \longrightarrow 00:32:12.712$ is a dimension.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9871331
- $00:32:12.720 \longrightarrow 00:32:15.360$ So now with this weekend plot,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9871331
- 00:32:15.360 00:32:17.988 two genes in a 2D map,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9871331
- $00{:}32{:}17{.}990 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}19{.}742$ and so for performing
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9871331
- $00:32:19.742 \dashrightarrow 00:32:21.056$ principal component analysis,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9871331

 $00:32:21.060 \rightarrow 00:32:23.811$ what is usually done at the beginning

NOTE Confidence: 0.9871331

 $00{:}32{:}23.811 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}26.329$ is to center the measurement,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9871331

 $00:32:26.330 \longrightarrow 00:32:28.640$ meaning that these genes here

NOTE Confidence: 0.9871331

 $00:32:28.640 \dashrightarrow 00:32:30.950$ they have an average expression

NOTE Confidence: 0.9871331

 $00:32:31.026 \longrightarrow 00:32:32.916$ of seven for these jeans.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9871331

 $00{:}32{:}32{.}920 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}35{.}920$ This is the average of jinei

NOTE Confidence: 0.9871331

 $00{:}32{:}35{.}920 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}37{.}920$ across the six cells.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9871331

 $00:32:37.920 \longrightarrow 00:32:39.078$ And so on.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9871331

00:32:39.078 --> 00:32:41.780 So these gene B has an average

NOTE Confidence: 0.9871331

 $00{:}32{:}41.877 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}44.413$ of 4.5 GC of six and so on.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9871331

 $00{:}32{:}44{.}420 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}46{.}694$ So centering the data means that

NOTE Confidence: 0.9871331

00:32:46.694 --> 00:32:48.636 you calculated the mean expression

NOTE Confidence: 0.9871331

 $00{:}32{:}48.636 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}51.142$ of the gene across all these cells

NOTE Confidence: 0.9871331

 $00{:}32{:}51{.}142 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}53{.}588$ and you subtract the mean from all

NOTE Confidence: 0.9871331

 $00{:}32{:}53{.}588 \dashrightarrow 00{:}32{:}57{.}359$ the values of the gene so that you.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9871331

 $00:32:57.360 \longrightarrow 00:32:59.436$ Switch from this matrix that is

- NOTE Confidence: 0.9871331
- $00:32:59.436 \longrightarrow 00:33:01.623$ not centered to this matrix that

 $00:33:01.623 \longrightarrow 00:33:03.087$ is centered around 0.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9871331

00:33:03.090 - 00:33:05.238 So I simply from the top

NOTE Confidence: 0.9871331

00:33:05.238 --> 00:33:06.670 row I subtracted seven,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9871331

 $00{:}33{:}06{.}670 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}09{.}883$ so 11 -- 7 is 4 and so on.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9871331

 $00{:}33{:}09{.}890 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}12{.}130$ From the second I subtract 4.5 and

NOTE Confidence: 0.9871331

 $00:33:12.130 \longrightarrow 00:33:15.542$ so on so that you see in the centered

NOTE Confidence: 0.9871331

 $00{:}33{:}15{.}542 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}18{.}228$ values are also negative and the common

NOTE Confidence: 0.9871331

 $00:33:18.228 \rightarrow 00:33:22.979$ point is that the mean for each gene is 0.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9871331

00:33:22.980 --> 00:33:24.520 So usually before performing

NOTE Confidence: 0.9871331

00:33:24.520 --> 00:33:25.675 like I mentioned,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9871331

00:33:25.680 --> 00:33:26.832 I did action.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9871331

 $00:33:26.832 \rightarrow 00:33:29.136$ This centering is is performed and

NOTE Confidence: 0.9871331

 $00{:}33{:}29{.}136 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}32{.}066$ it's also helpful in the visualization.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9871331

 $00:33:32.070 \longrightarrow 00:33:33.096$ So before centering,

 $00:33:33.096 \rightarrow 00:33:35.490$ the cells were were looking like this.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9871331

 $00{:}33{:}35{.}490 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}36{.}516$ After the centering,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9871331

 $00:33:36.516 \dashrightarrow 00:33:38.226$ these are the new coordinates,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9871331

 $00{:}33{:}38{.}230 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}40{.}582$ so nothing changed that it's only the

NOTE Confidence: 0.9871331

 $00{:}33{:}40{.}582 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}43{.}210$ origin of the axis and the position of

NOTE Confidence: 0.9871331

 $00{:}33{:}43{.}210 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}45{.}750$ the zero that are that are different.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9871331

 $00:33:45.750 \longrightarrow 00:33:48.137$ But if you look at the cells,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9871331

 $00:33:48.140 \longrightarrow 00:33:51.002$ the points are exactly in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.9871331

 $00{:}33{:}51{.}002 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}52{.}910$ same position as before.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9871331

 $00{:}33{:}52{.}910 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}55{.}166$ No one question that we can

NOTE Confidence: 0.9871331

 $00{:}33{:}55{.}166 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}56{.}670$ ask here is weather.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9871331

 $00:33:56.670 \longrightarrow 00:33:59.694$ So what you see here is that the

NOTE Confidence: 0.9871331

 $00{:}33{:}59{.}694 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}01{.}558$ difference here of the cells.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9411312

 $00:34:01.560 \longrightarrow 00:34:04.032$ We can capture the difference of

NOTE Confidence: 0.9411312

 $00{:}34{:}04{.}032 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}06{.}122$ these cells because they differ

NOTE Confidence: 0.9411312

 $00:34:06.122 \dashrightarrow 00:34:08.698$ in the expression of A&B and one

- NOTE Confidence: 0.9411312
- $00:34:08.698 \longrightarrow 00:34:11.174$ question we can ask is whether it

 $00:34:11.174 \rightarrow 00:34:13.965$ is better to weather GTA or gene bit

NOTE Confidence: 0.9411312

 $00:34:13.965 \rightarrow 00:34:16.215$ is better in separating these cells.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9411312

 $00:34:16.220 \rightarrow 00:34:18.180$ So this corresponds to asking

NOTE Confidence: 0.9411312

 $00:34:18.180 \longrightarrow 00:34:20.566$ how much of the variability of

NOTE Confidence: 0.9411312

 $00:34:20.566 \dashrightarrow 00:34:22.690$ the data is associated with this.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9411312

 $00:34:22.690 \longrightarrow 00:34:25.150$ Progression of GD or with

NOTE Confidence: 0.9411312

 $00:34:25.150 \longrightarrow 00:34:27.610$ the expression of Gene D.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9411312

 $00:34:27.610 \longrightarrow 00:34:30.080$ And so the question is,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9411312

 $00{:}34{:}30{.}080 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}33{.}139$ what is the variation of these six

NOTE Confidence: 0.9411312

 $00{:}34{:}33.139 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}36.535$ points that is associated with gene

NOTE Confidence: 0.9411312

 $00{:}34{:}36{.}535 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}39{.}187$ expression engine B expression?

NOTE Confidence: 0.9411312

 $00:34:39.190 \longrightarrow 00:34:42.286$ So there is a simple way to calculate

NOTE Confidence: 0.9411312

 $00{:}34{:}42.286 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}44.140$ the variation associated that

NOTE Confidence: 0.9411312

 $00:34:44.140 \rightarrow 00:34:47.626$ corresponds to the formula of the variance.

 $00{:}34{:}47.630 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}51.158$ So this is an example to calculate the

NOTE Confidence: 0.9411312

 $00:34:51.158 \rightarrow 00:34:54.286$ variation that is associated with gene 8.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9411312

00:34:54.290 --> 00:34:57.834 So here we're considering the X axis here,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9411312

 $00{:}34{:}57{.}840 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}01{.}136$ so I can draw a projection from each

NOTE Confidence: 0.9411312

 $00{:}35{:}01{.}136 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}04.675$ cell to these axis and calculate the

NOTE Confidence: 0.9411312

 $00:35:04.675 \dashrightarrow 00:35:08.329$ distance from the origin to each cell.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9411312

00:35:08.330 --> 00:35:09.060 And basically,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9411312

 $00:35:09.060 \rightarrow 00:35:11.615$ since here where we centered the data,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9411312

 $00:35:11.620 \dashrightarrow 00:35:13.080$ the distance basically correspond

NOTE Confidence: 0.9411312

 $00:35:13.080 \rightarrow 00:35:14.540$ to these expression level.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9411312

 $00{:}35{:}14.540 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}17.816$ So cell one has a distance of four cell,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9411312

 $00{:}35{:}17.820 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}21.980$ two or distance of five and so on.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9411312

 $00{:}35{:}21{.}980 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}24{.}514$ Now if we want to measure the

NOTE Confidence: 0.9411312

 $00:35:24.514 \rightarrow 00:35:26.959$ variation with the variance formula,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9411312

 $00{:}35{:}26{.}960 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}29{.}312$ the variance formula is to take

NOTE Confidence: 0.9411312

 $00:35:29.312 \rightarrow 00:35:32.272$ the square of each of the distance

- NOTE Confidence: 0.9411312
- $00:35:32.272 \longrightarrow 00:35:34.020$ of these six distances.

 $00{:}35{:}34.020 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}36.792$ Some disc wears and then divide everything

NOTE Confidence: 0.9411312

 $00{:}35{:}36{.}792 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}39{.}827$ by the number of observation minus one.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9411312

 $00:35:39.830 \longrightarrow 00:35:42.553$ So this is how we calculate the

NOTE Confidence: 0.9411312

 $00{:}35{:}42.553 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}45.220$ variance of the expression of GD.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9411312

 $00:35:45.220 \longrightarrow 00:35:48.125$ So the formula here is the following.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9411312

 $00:35:48.130 \longrightarrow 00:35:50.620$ So we take the six distances,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9411312

 $00:35:50.620 \longrightarrow 00:35:52.244$ we square the distances.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9411312

 $00:35:52.244 \rightarrow 00:35:55.678$ With some the results and we divide by 5.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9411312

 $00:35:55.680 \rightarrow 00:35:59.684$ So the variance of jinei is 30.8.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9411312

 $00{:}35{:}59{.}690 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}03{.}148$ We can do the same for jinbe.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9411312

 $00{:}36{:}03.150 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}06.153$ And in order to have the variance

NOTE Confidence: 0.9411312

 $00:36:06.153 \rightarrow 00:36:08.525$ associated with Gene B Now looking

NOTE Confidence: 0.9411312

00:36:08.525 --> 00:36:10.535 at this blotter A and C,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9411312

 $00:36:10.540 \longrightarrow 00:36:13.652$ it seems by I that gene A has

- $00:36:13.652 \rightarrow 00:36:14.430$ more differences,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9411312
- $00{:}36{:}14.430 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}16.380$ higher variance than Gene B,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9411312
- $00:36:16.380 \longrightarrow 00:36:19.292$ and you can see these also by
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9411312
- $00:36{:}19.292 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}22.031$ looking at the range of the axis
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9411312
- $00:36:22.031 \longrightarrow 00:36:25.710$ minus 6 to 6 -- 4 -- 4 to four.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9411312
- $00:36:25.710 \longrightarrow 00:36:29.600$ So we can so the variance of GA is 30.8.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9411312
- $00{:}36{:}29{.}600 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}30{.}782$ In this case,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9411312
- $00:36:30.782 \longrightarrow 00:36:34.349$ the variance of gene B is less in this.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9411312
- $00{:}36{:}34{.}350 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}37{.}089$ Cases in 8.3.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9411312
- $00:36:37.090 \longrightarrow 00:36:38.815$ So the calculation of the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9411312
- 00:36:38.815 --> 00:36:41.269 variance of Steam V is the same,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9411312
- 00:36:41.270 --> 00:36:42.658 but instead of projecting
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9411312
- $00{:}36{:}42.658 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}44.393$ cells on the X axis,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9411312
- $00:36:44.400 \longrightarrow 00:36:47.008$ we project cells on the Y axis and
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9411312
- $00{:}36{:}47.008 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}49.620$ that's how I come with these results.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9411312
- $00:36:49.620 \rightarrow 00:36:52.012$ Now we can see that if we consider

- NOTE Confidence: 0.9411312
- $00:36:52.012 \longrightarrow 00:36:54.279$ the global variance of our data

 $00{:}36{:}54{.}279 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}55{.}875$ along these two dimensions,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9411312

 $00{:}36{:}55{.}880 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}58{.}728$ we can say that.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9411312

 $00:36:58.730 \dashrightarrow 00:37:01.985$ That that the expression of gene A

NOTE Confidence: 0.9411312

 $00{:}37{:}01{.}985 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}04{.}932$ contains 80% of the global variance.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9411312

 $00{:}37{:}04{.}932 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}07{.}950$ And the expression of Gene B

NOTE Confidence: 0.9411312

 $00:37:08.049 \longrightarrow 00:37:11.022$ contains 20% approximately of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.9411312

 $00{:}37{:}11.022 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}14.646$ whole variance where the whole the

NOTE Confidence: 0.9411312

 $00:37:14.646 \longrightarrow 00:37:18.127$ whole variance is just 30.8 + 8.3.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9411312

 $00{:}37{:}18{.}130 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}20{.}560$ So if now I have to select only one

NOTE Confidence: 0.9411312

 $00{:}37{:}20.560 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}23.643$ of these dimension based on the on the

NOTE Confidence: 0.9411312

 $00{:}37{:}23.643 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}25.960$ fact that variation is information,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9411312

00:37:25.960 --> 00:37:27.224 I would select Jeannie.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9411312

 $00{:}37{:}27{.}224 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}30{.}141$ So if I have to drop one of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.9411312

00:37:30.141 --> 00:37:32.353 genes I would drop Gene B because

 $00:37:32.426 \rightarrow 00:37:34.510$ it contains less information,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9089681

 $00{:}37{:}34{.}510 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}35{.}930$ less variance than Jenny.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8130577

 $00:37:38.230 \longrightarrow 00:37:41.074$ Now the question for PCA is

NOTE Confidence: 0.8130577

00:37:41.074 --> 00:37:44.348 whether it is whether is there a

NOTE Confidence: 0.8130577

 $00:37:44.348 \longrightarrow 00:37:47.330$ line that is not jean ae origin B.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8130577

00:37:47.330 --> 00:37:50.823 It's not one of these that captures NOTE Confidence: 0.8130577

 $00{:}37{:}50{.}823 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}53{.}030$ more variation that maximizes

NOTE Confidence: 0.8130577

 $00:37:53.030 \dashrightarrow 00:37:56.130$ the variation that is captured.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8130577

00:37:56.130 --> 00:37:59.746 So the question is to try to calculate

NOTE Confidence: 0.8130577

 $00{:}37{:}59{.}746 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}02{.}209$ the variance that is associated

NOTE Confidence: 0.8130577

 $00{:}38{:}02{.}209 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}05{.}137$ with each of these possible lines

NOTE Confidence: 0.8130577

 $00:38:05.137 \rightarrow 00:38:08.200$ in the same way as we did here.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8130577

 $00:38:08.200 \longrightarrow 00:38:10.882$ But the changing the line and

NOTE Confidence: 0.8130577

 $00{:}38{:}10{.}882 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}12{.}670$ so changing this calculation.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8130577

 $00{:}38{:}12.670 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}16.606$ So this is a problem of like minimization

NOTE Confidence: 0.8130577

 $00:38:16.606 \rightarrow 00:38:21.086$ of the distances or maximization of the.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.8130577
- $00:38:21.090 \longrightarrow 00:38:23.349$ Of the various.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8130577
- $00:38:23.350 \longrightarrow 00:38:25.798$ And so we can find that
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8130577
- $00:38:25.798 \longrightarrow 00:38:27.430$ among all the possibilities,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8130577
- $00{:}38{:}27{.}430 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}29{.}465$ the line that maximizes the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8130577
- $00{:}38{:}29{.}465 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}31{.}093$ variance for our data.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8130577
- $00{:}38{:}31{.}100 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}35{.}188$ In this case this is the line.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8130577
- 00:38:35.190 > 00:38:36.998 That maximizes the variance,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8130577
- $00:38:36.998 \rightarrow 00:38:40.236$ and basically what we found is the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8130577
- $00{:}38{:}40{.}236 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}42{.}924$ principal component want of our data.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8130577
- 00:38:42.930 --> 00:38:44.814 So principal component principal
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8130577
- $00{:}38{:}44{.}814 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}47{.}640$ component one is exactly that the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8130577
- 00:38:47.718 --> 00:38:49.823 that the dimension that maximizes
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8130577
- $00{:}38{:}49{.}823 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}52{.}463$ the variance of data with respect
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8130577
- $00{:}38{:}52{.}463 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}54{.}748$ to all the other possibilities
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8130577
- $00{:}38{:}54{.}748 \dashrightarrow 00{:}38{:}57{.}258$ toward the other possible lines.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8130577

 $00:38:57.258 \rightarrow 00:39:02.004$ In this case that cross the origin.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8130577

00:39:02.010 --> 00:39:04.514 Now once we identify PC one PC two,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8130577

 $00:39:04.520 \dashrightarrow 00:39:06.215$ so the second principle component

NOTE Confidence: 0.8130577

 $00{:}39{:}06{.}215 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}08{.}658$ is the line that is orthogonal to

NOTE Confidence: 0.8130577

 $00{:}39{:}08{.}658 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}11{.}031$ the first step and this is easy

NOTE Confidence: 0.8130577

00:39:11.031 --> 00:39:12.935 because we are in a case where

NOTE Confidence: 0.8130577

 $00:39:12.935 \longrightarrow 00:39:16.410$ we have only two dimension so.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8130577

 $00:39:16.410 \longrightarrow 00:39:17.822$ The second principle component

NOTE Confidence: 0.8130577

 $00{:}39{:}17.822 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}20.425$ is simply the the line that is

NOTE Confidence: 0.8130577

 $00{:}39{:}20{.}425 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}22{.}505$ orthogonal to the principal component,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8130577

 $00{:}39{:}22{.}510 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}23{.}898$ one that we found.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8130577

00:39:23.898 --> 00:39:26.700 So once we identify this principal component,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8130577

 $00{:}39{:}26.700 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}28.818$ now we can represent our data

NOTE Confidence: 0.8130577

 $00:39:28.818 \longrightarrow 00:39:31.779$ not from the point of view of our

NOTE Confidence: 0.8130577

 $00{:}39{:}31{.}779 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}33{.}619$ original jeans of the expression

NOTE Confidence: 0.8130577

 $00:39:33.619 \rightarrow 00:39:35.459$ of our original jeans,

- NOTE Confidence: 0.8130577
- $00:39:35.460 \longrightarrow 00:39:37.833$ but from the point of view of

00:39:37.833 --> 00:39:39.823 a principal component want and

NOTE Confidence: 0.8130577

 $00:39:39.823 \longrightarrow 00:39:41.179$ principal component tool.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8130577

 $00:39:41.180 \rightarrow 00:39:45.302$ So this means that we are rotating the data.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8130577

 $00:39:45.310 \longrightarrow 00:39:46.438$ In this way,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8130577

 $00{:}39{:}46{.}438 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}48{.}694$ so that now our reference system

NOTE Confidence: 0.8130577

 $00:39:48.694 \rightarrow 00:39:51.577$ system of reference is not given by

NOTE Confidence: 0.8130577

 $00:39:51.577 \rightarrow 00:39:54.358$ our regional expression but by PC1 and PC2.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9277948

 $00{:}39{:}56{.}830 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}59{.}668$ But the data are always dissing.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9277948

 $00:39:59.670 \longrightarrow 00:40:02.045$ They didn't change their respective

NOTE Confidence: 0.9277948

 $00{:}40{:}02.045 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}05.358$ localization, so we just rotated the data.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9277948

 $00{:}40{:}05{.}360 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}08{.}356$ Now the advantage of doing this is

NOTE Confidence: 0.9277948

 $00{:}40{:}08.356 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}11.783$ that now if we calculate the variance

NOTE Confidence: 0.9277948

 $00{:}40{:}11.783 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}15.320$ associated with PC one and PC two,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9277948

 $00{:}40{:}15.320 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}18.528$ we can see that a difference with respect

 $00:40:18.528 \rightarrow 00:40:22.429$ to our original to our regional dimensions.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9277948

 $00{:}40{:}22{.}430 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}26{.}759$ So we can see that PCA captures almost 100%.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9277948

 $00{:}40{:}26.760 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}29.772$ Of the variance of our data

NOTE Confidence: 0.9277948

00:40:29.772 -> 00:40:32.909 while PC two captures much less.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9277948

 $00{:}40{:}32{.}910 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}35{.}438$ And this is because.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9277948

 $00:40:35.440 \longrightarrow 00:40:37.895$ Exactly because PC one was

NOTE Confidence: 0.9277948

 $00:40:37.895 \rightarrow 00:40:40.350$ selected because it was maximising

NOTE Confidence: 0.9277948

 $00:40:40.434 \rightarrow 00:40:42.849$ my maximising this value here.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9277948

 $00{:}40{:}42.850 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}45.132$ So and here you see the difference

NOTE Confidence: 0.9277948

 $00:40:45.132 \longrightarrow 00:40:46.828$ between the variance with the

NOTE Confidence: 0.9277948

00:40:46.828 --> 00:40:48.784 original dimension gene and gene B,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9277948

 $00:40:48.790 \rightarrow 00:40:50.770$ and with the new principal components.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9277948

 $00{:}40{:}50{.}770 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}53{.}450$ So the advantage of the technique is that

NOTE Confidence: 0.9277948

 $00:40:53.450 \rightarrow 00:40:56.706$ now if I want to drop one of the dimension.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9277948

 $00:40:56.710 \longrightarrow 00:40:59.038$ So if we want to pass from 2

NOTE Confidence: 0.9277948

 $00:40:59.038 \longrightarrow 00:41:00.669$ dimensions to one dimension,

- NOTE Confidence: 0.9277948
- 00:41:00.670 --> 00:41:02.320 if I select PC one,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9277948
- $00:41:02.320 \longrightarrow 00:41:05.332$ I lose a less than 5% of the information,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9277948
- $00:41:05.332 \rightarrow 00:41:07.930$ while with the original gene and gene B,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9277948
- 00:41:07.930 --> 00:41:10.570 if I choose ginae I had to lose
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9277948
- $00:41:10.570 \longrightarrow 00:41:13.006 20\%$ of the information in this way.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9277948
- $00{:}41{:}13.010 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}14.192$ I reduced dimension.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9277948
- $00{:}41{:}14.192 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}16.950$ It can reduce the dimension from 2
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9277948
- $00:41:17.026 \rightarrow 00:41:19.606$ dimensions to one that keeping almost
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9277948
- $00{:}41{:}19.606 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}22.258$ all of the information of the data.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9277948
- $00:41:22.260 \longrightarrow 00:41:25.662$ And this is the trick used by
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9277948
- 00:41:25.662 --> 00:41:27.120 principal component analysis.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9277948
- $00{:}41{:}27{.}120 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}28{.}014$ Ah, so.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9277948
- 00:41:28.014 --> 00:41:30.696 This is a more complex example,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9277948
- $00{:}41{:}30.700 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}33.396$ so this was an example with four dimensions.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9277948
- $00:41:33.400 \rightarrow 00:41:35.080$ If you remember our regional,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9277948

 $00{:}41{:}35{.}080 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}37{.}439$ our original table was with four genes,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9277948

 $00{:}41{:}37{.}440 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}40{.}473$ so we can do the same with four jeans.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9277948

 $00{:}41{:}40{.}480 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}42{.}676$ With four dimensions we can calculate NOTE Confidence: 0.9277948

 $00:41:42.676 \longrightarrow 00:41:44.140$ the original variance associated

NOTE Confidence: 0.9277948

 $00:41:44.195 \longrightarrow 00:41:45.869$ with each of the original jeans.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9277948

 $00{:}41{:}45.870 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}48.228$ So Gene age in BC and D expressed as

NOTE Confidence: 0.9277948

 $00{:}41{:}48.228 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}50.918$ a percentage of the entire variance.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9277948

 $00:41:50.920 \longrightarrow 00:41:51.492$ And again,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9277948

00:41:51.492 --> 00:41:53.780 if I had to choose the two genes

NOTE Confidence: 0.9277948

 $00:41:53.849 \rightarrow 00:41:55.979$ containing most of the variance,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9277948

 $00{:}41{:}55{.}980 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}58{.}091$ I would choose jean ae engine, see.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9277948

00:41:58.091 --> 00:42:00.246 But still I would lose.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9277948

 $00{:}42{:}00{.}250 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}02{.}824$ 10% of the variance associated with

NOTE Confidence: 0.9277948

 $00{:}42{:}02{.}824 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}06{.}032$ Gene B and 20% associated with Gene D.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9277948

00:42:06.032 --> 00:42:07.897 Like if I perform principal

NOTE Confidence: 0.9277948

 $00:42:07.897 \rightarrow 00:42:09.260$ component transformation,

- NOTE Confidence: 0.9277948
- 00:42:09.260 --> 00:42:11.462 I found I find four principal

 $00:42:11.462 \longrightarrow 00:42:14.496$ components in a way that the first

NOTE Confidence: 0.9277948

 $00:42:14.496 \rightarrow 00:42:16.976$ step maximizes the explained variance.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9277948

 $00:42:16.980 \longrightarrow 00:42:19.560$ II is orthogonal to the first,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9277948

 $00{:}42{:}19.560 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}21.276$ and maximising maximizes the

NOTE Confidence: 0.9277948

 $00:42:21.276 \longrightarrow 00:42:23.850$ residual variance and and so on.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9277948

 $00{:}42{:}23.850 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}27.058$ So the advantages that now if I consider

NOTE Confidence: 0.9277948

 $00{:}42{:}27.058 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}30.359$ these two components and they remove it.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9277948

00:42:30.360 --> 00:42:34.490 These two I only lose that like 3 to 4%

NOTE Confidence: 0.9277948

 $00:42:34.490 \longrightarrow 00:42:38.620$ of the variance and I can keep more than 90%.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9277948

 $00:42:38.620 \longrightarrow 00:42:40.680$ While here I could keep

NOTE Confidence: 0.9277948

 $00{:}42{:}40.680 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}44.009$ only 70% of the variance.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9277948

 $00:42:44.010 \rightarrow 00:42:47.216$ And if I consider only these two

NOTE Confidence: 0.9277948

00:42:47.216 --> 00:42:49.900 dimensions and I plot my data,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9277948

 $00{:}42{:}49{.}900 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}53{.}516$ my cells here, I can obtain this plotter.

 $00:42:53.520 \rightarrow 00:42:56.131$ So these are the original cells

NOTE Confidence: 0.9277948

 $00{:}42{:}56{.}131 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}58{.}621$ based on the expression of these

NOTE Confidence: 0.9277948

 $00{:}42{:}58.621 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}01.617$ four genes plotted in the first two

NOTE Confidence: 0.9277948

 $00{:}43{:}01{.}699 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}04{.}011$ principal component where dimension

NOTE Confidence: 0.9277948

 $00:43:04.011 \longrightarrow 00:43:07.109$ one explains 74% of the variance

NOTE Confidence: 0.9277948

 $00:43:07.109 \rightarrow 00:43:09.374$ and dimension to explains 23%.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9277948

 $00{:}43{:}09{.}380 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}13{.}568$ This corresponds to these values here.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9277948

 $00{:}43{:}13.570 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}15.730$ And the advantagous PCA. So this.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9277948

00:43:15.730 --> 00:43:16.402 So again,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9277948

 $00:43:16.402 \longrightarrow 00:43:18.754$ the trick was to reduce the space

NOTE Confidence: 0.9277948

00:43:18.754 --> 00:43:20.768 from four to two dimensions,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9277948

 $00:43:20.770 \longrightarrow 00:43:23.746$ but keeping most of the information.

NOTE Confidence: 0.96314806

00:43:23.750 --> 00:43:26.108 And so they they new dimensions,

NOTE Confidence: 0.96314806

 $00{:}43{:}26.110 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}28.777$ dimension, PC one and PC two are

NOTE Confidence: 0.96314806

00:43:28.777 --> 00:43:30.812 combinations of linear combinations of

NOTE Confidence: 0.96314806

 $00:43:30.812 \longrightarrow 00:43:33.266$ the old dimensions and the advantage

- NOTE Confidence: 0.96314806
- $00:43:33.266 \rightarrow 00:43:36.399$ of PCA is that I can easily calculate
- NOTE Confidence: 0.96314806
- $00{:}43{:}36{.}399 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}38{.}872$ how much the expression of the original
- NOTE Confidence: 0.96314806
- $00:43:38.872 \longrightarrow 00:43:41.140$ jeans is important in each of the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.96314806
- $00:43:41.213 \rightarrow 00:43:43.397$ newly found principal components.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.96314806
- $00:43:43.400 \rightarrow 00:43:46.144$ For example, in a plot like this.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.96314806
- $00{:}43{:}46.150 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}49.420$ And this is the this is a plot that shows
- NOTE Confidence: 0.96314806
- $00:43:49.506 \rightarrow 00:43:51.941$ that principal component one captures
- NOTE Confidence: 0.96314806
- $00:43:51.941 \longrightarrow 00:43:55.259$ a lot of the expression of Gene 8.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.96314806
- 00:43:55.260 --> 00:43:58.530 B&C while Gindi is not very
- NOTE Confidence: 0.96314806
- 00:43:58.530 --> 00:44:00.710 important in principal component
- NOTE Confidence: 0.96314806
- $00{:}44{:}00{.}803 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}03{.}619$ one while principal components,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.96314806
- $00:44:03.620 \longrightarrow 00:44:06.308$ who is mainly capturing
- NOTE Confidence: 0.96314806
- $00:44:06.308 \longrightarrow 00:44:09.668$ the expression of Gene D.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.96314806
- $00:44:09.670 \longrightarrow 00:44:11.006$ And in this example,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.96314806
- $00:44:11.006 \rightarrow 00:44:13.776$ a explanation of this is if you look
- NOTE Confidence: 0.96314806

 $00:44:13.776 \longrightarrow 00:44:15.864$ at the original values that gene

NOTE Confidence: 0.96314806

00:44:15.864 --> 00:44:18.228 AB&C are very highly correlated,

NOTE Confidence: 0.96314806

 $00:44:18.230 \longrightarrow 00:44:20.105$ so they're highly expressed in

NOTE Confidence: 0.96314806

 $00:44:20.105 \rightarrow 00:44:22.320$ the first three cells and low.

NOTE Confidence: 0.96314806

 $00:44:22.320 \longrightarrow 00:44:24.504$ They have low expression in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.96314806

 $00:44:24.504 \longrightarrow 00:44:27.148$ in the four to the 6th cells,

NOTE Confidence: 0.96314806

 $00:44:27.150 \longrightarrow 00:44:29.382$ while gindi is a little bit

NOTE Confidence: 0.96314806

00:44:29.382 --> 00:44:31.333 different because gene is highly

NOTE Confidence: 0.96314806

 $00{:}44{:}31{.}333 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}34{.}035$ expressed in cell 24 and five and

NOTE Confidence: 0.96314806

 $00:44:34.035 \rightarrow 00:44:36.077$ low expression in 1/2 and three.

NOTE Confidence: 0.96314806

 $00{:}44{:}36{.}080 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}39{.}500$ So this means that Gene D is not correlated.

NOTE Confidence: 0.96314806

 $00:44:39.500 \rightarrow 00:44:41.908$ With the expression of the other genes,

NOTE Confidence: 0.96314806

00:44:41.910 --> 00:44:44.630 so that's why using PCA I can capture

NOTE Confidence: 0.96314806

 $00{:}44{:}44{.}630 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}47{.}082$ the correlated expression of these three

NOTE Confidence: 0.96314806

 $00:44:47.082 \rightarrow 00:44:49.632$ genes in the first principal component.

NOTE Confidence: 0.96314806

 $00:44:49.640 \longrightarrow 00:44:52.352$ And and the the.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.96314806
- $00:44:52.352 \rightarrow 00:44:56.018$ Uhm, expression of Gene D that is
- NOTE Confidence: 0.96314806
- $00{:}44{:}56.018$ --> $00{:}44{:}59.410$ different and not correlated with the other.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.96314806
- $00:44:59.410 \longrightarrow 00:45:01.374$ Using the second component.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.96314806
- $00{:}45{:}01{.}374 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}02{.}847$ The second dimension,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.96314806
- $00{:}45{:}02{.}850 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}05{.}796$ obviously in the real case scenario
- NOTE Confidence: 0.96314806
- $00:45:05.796 \longrightarrow 00:45:07.269$ we start from,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.96314806
- $00:45:07.270 \longrightarrow 00:45:10.216$ if we start from 3000 genes,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.96314806
- $00:45:10.220 \longrightarrow 00:45:13.160$ we start from 3000 of dimensions.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.96314806
- 00:45:13.160 --> 00:45:16.076 But if you look at PCA
- NOTE Confidence: 0.96314806
- 00:45:16.076 --> 00:45:18.560 plots up sometimes you can.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.96314806
- $00:45:18.560 \longrightarrow 00:45:21.070$ You can always find also
- NOTE Confidence: 0.96314806
- $00:45:21.070 \longrightarrow 00:45:23.078$ the percentage of variance.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.96314806
- $00{:}45{:}23.080 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}25.810$ That is explained from each dimension
- NOTE Confidence: 0.96314806
- $00{:}45{:}25{.}810 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}29{.}905$ so you can see how much of the entire
- NOTE Confidence: 0.96314806
- 00:45:29.905 --> 00:45:32.666 information of the data can be
- NOTE Confidence: 0.96314806

 $00:45:32.666 \rightarrow 00:45:35.071$ explained only using two dimensions

NOTE Confidence: 0.96314806

00:45:35.071 -> 00:45:37.930 and how much you are missing.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8432129

00:45:40.080 --> 00:45:41.860 Uh, no PCA is, uh,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8432129

 $00{:}45{:}41.860 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}43.888$ it was worth explaining because he's

NOTE Confidence: 0.8432129

 $00:45:43.888 \dashrightarrow 00:45:46.840$ still one of the most used at techniques.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8432129

 $00{:}45{:}46.840 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}48.976$ Also in single cell data analysis.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8432129

00:45:48.980 --> 00:45:52.076 But you don't see PCA offer in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8432129

 $00{:}45{:}52.076 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}54.219$ visualization of single cell data.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8432129

 $00{:}45{:}54{.}220 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}56{.}225$ And that's because the principal

NOTE Confidence: 0.8432129

00:45:56.225 --> 00:45:58.296 component analysis, as I said,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8432129

 $00:45:58.296 \rightarrow 00:46:00.828$ has the advantage of being highly

NOTE Confidence: 0.8432129

 $00{:}46{:}00{.}828 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}02{.}508$ interpretable because from the

NOTE Confidence: 0.8432129

00:46:02.508 --> 00:46:04.866 components I can go back quite

NOTE Confidence: 0.8432129

 $00:46:04.866 \longrightarrow 00:46:07.449$ easily to the to the original jeans,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8432129

 $00:46:07.450 \longrightarrow 00:46:10.730$ so I can establish which genes are important

NOTE Confidence: 0.8432129

 $00:46:10.730 \longrightarrow 00:46:13.469$ are important in each of the dimensions.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8432129
- 00:46:13.470 --> 00:46:15.206 It is computationally efficient,

 $00{:}46{:}15{.}206 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}18{.}218$ but when I want to visualize a

NOTE Confidence: 0.8432129

00:46:18.218 --> 00:46:21.780 single cell RNA seek data, it's.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8432129

 $00:46:21.780 \longrightarrow 00:46:23.550$ It's lesser it's not very

NOTE Confidence: 0.8432129

 $00:46:23.550 \longrightarrow 00:46:24.966$ appealing to the eye,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8432129

 $00:46:24.970 \rightarrow 00:46:27.794$ so and the reason for this is again,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8432129

 $00:46:27.800 \rightarrow 00:46:30.624$ that the data in single cell are nonlinear.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8432129

 $00:46:30.630 \longrightarrow 00:46:32.748$ They have an excess of zeros,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8432129

 $00{:}46{:}32.750 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}35.228$ and so if you plot the principle,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8432129

 $00:46:35.230 \longrightarrow 00:46:37.000$ the first two principal components,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8432129

 $00:46:37.000 \longrightarrow 00:46:39.124$ often you don't have a clear

NOTE Confidence: 0.8432129

 $00{:}46{:}39{.}124 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}40{.}186$ separation of cells,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8432129

 $00:46:40.190 \longrightarrow 00:46:42.668$ and that's what you want to show,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8432129

 $00{:}46{:}42.670 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}46.499$ especially if you want if you're generating.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8432129

 $00:46:46.500 \rightarrow 00:46:49.884$ Figure that is going to represent your data.

- $00:46:49.890 \longrightarrow 00:46:51.582$ So for this reason,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8432129
- $00:46:51.582 \longrightarrow 00:46:53.274$ mainly for the visualization,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8432129
- $00:46:53.280 \longrightarrow 00:46:56.248$ not for the analysis of the data,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8432129
- $00:46:56.250 \longrightarrow 00:46:58.889$ come in the first year of single
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8432129
- $00{:}46{:}58{.}889 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}01{.}520$ cell analysis of the most employed
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8432129
- $00:47:01.520 \longrightarrow 00:47:03.880$ approach was called the Disney,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8432129
- $00{:}47{:}03.880 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}06.430$ so it's at least a caustic
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8432129
- 00:47:06.430 --> 00:47:07.280 neighborhood embedding.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8432129
- $00{:}47{:}07{.}280 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}09{.}818$ So this approach is not linear,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8432129
- $00:47:09.820 \longrightarrow 00:47:11.512$ as principal component is
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8432129
- $00:47:11.512 \longrightarrow 00:47:13.204$ based on graph methods.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8432129
- $00:47:13.210 \longrightarrow 00:47:16.507$ So on this I will not spend.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8432129
- 00:47:16.510 --> 00:47:19.765 A lot in explaining how it works,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8432129
- $00:47:19.770 \longrightarrow 00:47:23.760$ but basically it's a random procedure and
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8432129
- $00:47:23.760 \rightarrow 00:47:27.760$ being nonlinear it means that it corrects.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8432129
- $00:47:27.760 \longrightarrow 00:47:29.930$ The original data using the

- NOTE Confidence: 0.8432129
- $00:47:29.930 \longrightarrow 00:47:31.666$ nonlinear equation equation and
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8432129
- 00:47:31.666 --> 00:47:34.202 the advantage is that it's better
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8432129
- $00:47:34.202 \longrightarrow 00:47:36.232$ in showing clusters of cells,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8432129
- $00{:}47{:}36{.}240 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}37{.}449$ so that's it.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8432129
- $00{:}47{:}37{.}449 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}39{.}867$ It's able to retain the local
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8432129
- $00{:}47{:}39{.}867 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}42{.}729$ structure of the data in low dimension
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8432129
- $00:47:42.729 \longrightarrow 00:47:44.847$ where the low structure local
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8432129
- $00{:}47{:}44.847 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}47.132$ structure means cluster of cells
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8432129
- $00{:}47{:}47{.}132 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}50{.}229$ that are very similar to each other.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8432129
- $00:47:50.229 \longrightarrow 00:47:52.767$ The disadvantage is that it's a
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8432129
- $00{:}47{:}52.767 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}55.538$ stochastic method so that each iteration
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8432129
- $00{:}47{:}55{.}538 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}57{.}803$ can produce a different result.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8432129
- $00:47:57.810 \longrightarrow 00:47:59.270$ That's not true for PCA.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8432129
- 00:47:59.270 --> 00:48:01.300 It has a long time to run,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8432129
- $00:48:01.300 \rightarrow 00:48:03.328$ especially when you increase the number
- NOTE Confidence: 0.8432129

 $00:48:03.328 \longrightarrow 00:48:06.290$ of cells and it's considered to be bad then.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8432129

 $00:48:06.290 \rightarrow 00:48:09.618$ In keeping the global structure of the data,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8432129

00:48:09.620 --> 00:48:12.525 and I have an example of design,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8432129

 $00{:}48{:}12{.}530 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}15{.}858$ so this is a data set with a.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8432129

 $00{:}48{:}15{.}860 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}18{.}392$ I think it's balcony seeker samples

NOTE Confidence: 0.8432129

 $00{:}48{:}18{.}392 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}20{.}430$ from different cancer from the.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8432129

 $00:48:20.430 \longrightarrow 00:48:23.111$ So each color here is a sample

NOTE Confidence: 0.8432129

00:48:23.111 -> 00:48:25.566 from a different cancer type and

NOTE Confidence: 0.8432129

 $00{:}48{:}25{.}566$ --> $00{:}48{:}28{.}415$ then the same data where run twice

NOTE Confidence: 0.8432129

 $00{:}48{:}28{.}505 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}31{.}145$ with the Disney approach and these

NOTE Confidence: 0.8432129

 $00{:}48{:}31{.}145 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}34{.}618$ are the two outputs so you can see

NOTE Confidence: 0.8432129

00:48:34.618 --> 00:48:36.753 that that something is conserved.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8432129

 $00{:}48{:}36{.}760 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}38{.}448$ Between the two run.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8432129

00:48:38.448 --> 00:48:41.718 Uh, so the number of cluster and they come,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8432129

 $00:48:41.720 \rightarrow 00:48:44.933$ the size of the class and probably they they.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8432129

 $00:48:44.940 \longrightarrow 00:48:46.890$ The assignment of each sample to

- NOTE Confidence: 0.8432129
- $00{:}48{:}46{.}890 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}48{.}860$ each cluster has been conserved.

 $00:48:48.860 \longrightarrow 00:48:51.261$ Them and also the shape of this

NOTE Confidence: 0.8432129

 $00{:}48{:}51{.}261 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}52{.}790$ single clastres somehow closer.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8432129

 $00{:}48{:}52{.}790 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}55{.}558$ But if you look at the organization of

NOTE Confidence: 0.8432129

 $00{:}48{:}55{.}558 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}58{.}498$ the whole cluster of the of the classes,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8432129

 $00{:}48{:}58{.}500 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}59{.}574$ that is different.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8432129

 $00:48:59.574 \rightarrow 00:49:00.290$ For example,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8432129

 $00:49:00.290 \longrightarrow 00:49:02.205$ these orange cluster here in

NOTE Confidence: 0.8432129

 $00{:}49{:}02{.}205 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}04{.}120$ run one is in the

NOTE Confidence: 0.9128054

 $00{:}49{:}04{.}204 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}06{.}997$ middle and while uh and and green

NOTE Confidence: 0.9128054

 $00{:}49{:}06{.}997 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}09{.}448$ is opposite to read the wild.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9128054

00:49:09.450 --> 00:49:12.969 Red and green are very near to each other,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9128054

 $00{:}49{:}12{.}970 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}15{.}707$ so for the capturing the class time,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9128054

00:49:15.710 --> 00:49:17.270 visualizing the class set

NOTE Confidence: 0.9128054

 $00:49:17.270 \longrightarrow 00:49:18.830$ this method it's good.

00:49:18.830 --> 00:49:21.259 But then if I start the interpreting

NOTE Confidence: 0.9128054

 $00:49:21.259 \rightarrow 00:49:23.530$ the distance between different clusters,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9128054

 $00{:}49{:}23.530 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}26.260$ these methods is not any more valuable,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9128054

 $00{:}49{:}26{.}260 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}28{.}962$ so it's not reliable because it depending

NOTE Confidence: 0.9128054

 $00:49:28.962 \rightarrow 00:49:32.126$ on the initial random step of the analysis,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9128054

 $00:49:32.130 \longrightarrow 00:49:34.356$ it could lead to different maps

NOTE Confidence: 0.9128054

 $00{:}49{:}34{.}356 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}36{.}430$ and that's the main reason.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9662275

00:49:36.430 --> 00:49:38.778 Yeah, I'm sorry, yeah.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9662275

00:49:38.780 --> 00:49:41.131 I was just wondering so like is there

NOTE Confidence: 0.9662275

 $00{:}49{:}41{.}131 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}43{.}566$ any value in like sort of running the

NOTE Confidence: 0.9662275

00:49:43.566 --> 00:49:45.660 program like a bunch of times, right?

NOTE Confidence: 0.9662275

 $00:49:45.660 \dashrightarrow 00:49:47.035$ Like just iteratively and then

NOTE Confidence: 0.9662275

 $00:49:47.035 \rightarrow 00:49:48.950$ taking the average of the distances?

NOTE Confidence: 0.9662275

 $00{:}49{:}48{.}950 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}50{.}954$ There's some truth that emerges there

NOTE Confidence: 0.9662275

00:49:50.954 --> 00:49:53.317 when you like repeat it a whole bunch

NOTE Confidence: 0.9662275

 $00:49:53.317 \rightarrow 00:49:55.230$ of times or it's just not useful.

 $00:49:56.620 \longrightarrow 00:49:59.875$ Uhm, I don't think I can answer

NOTE Confidence: 0.83529186

00:49:59.875 --> 00:50:03.274 to that personally, so I wouldn't

NOTE Confidence: 0.83529186

 $00{:}50{:}03{.}274 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}07{.}282$ know the answer to this question.

NOTE Confidence: 0.83529186

00:50:07.290 --> 00:50:09.817 Uhm, I don't know if anyone tried,

NOTE Confidence: 0.83529186

 $00:50:09.820 \longrightarrow 00:50:11.815$ so there is a way to reproduce

NOTE Confidence: 0.83529186

 $00{:}50{:}11.815 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}13.686$ the analysis to performing so

NOTE Confidence: 0.83529186

 $00{:}50{:}13.686 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}15.586$ called of pseudorandom analysis,

NOTE Confidence: 0.83529186

00:50:15.590 --> 00:50:16.790 meaning random analysis.

NOTE Confidence: 0.83529186

 $00{:}50{:}16.790 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}19.964$ When you run a program is based on

NOTE Confidence: 0.83529186

 $00:50:19.964 \rightarrow 00:50:22.085$ a seed that is a random number,

NOTE Confidence: 0.83529186

 $00{:}50{:}22.090 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}23.900$ but it can be kept.

NOTE Confidence: 0.83529186

 $00{:}50{:}23.900 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}26.406$ It can be remembered during the different

NOTE Confidence: 0.83529186

 $00{:}50{:}26{.}406 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}28{.}970$ iterations and if you keep the seed

NOTE Confidence: 0.83529186

 $00{:}50{:}28.970 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}30.755$ constant you can reproduce results,

NOTE Confidence: 0.83529186

 $00:50:30.760 \longrightarrow 00:50:31.909$ but that's not.

- $00:50:31.909 \longrightarrow 00:50:34.207$ So that's a way to keep
- NOTE Confidence: 0.83529186
- $00{:}50{:}34{.}207 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}36{.}428$ consistent the program if you run.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.83529186
- $00:50:36.430 \longrightarrow 00:50:38.320$ The program in different on
- NOTE Confidence: 0.83529186
- $00:50:38.320 \rightarrow 00:50:39.834$ different machines, for example,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.83529186
- 00:50:39.834 --> 00:50:42.096 but I don't know if that.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9837538
- $00{:}50{:}44{.}550 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}45{.}990$ If this has been done,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9837538
- $00:50:45.990 \rightarrow 00:50:47.901$ maybe so, but I don't know what
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9837538
- $00:50:47.901 \longrightarrow 00:50:49.720$ would be the result of that.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9837538
- $00{:}50{:}49{.}720 \dashrightarrow 00{:}50{:}51{.}624$ So to run it a lot of times
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9837538
- $00:50:51.624 \longrightarrow 00:50:53.499$ and trying to capture a sort
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9837538
- $00:50:53.499 \longrightarrow 00:50:55.169$ of stability in the distances,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9837538
- $00:50:55.170 \longrightarrow 00:50:59.042$ sure sure. So in the field,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9837538
- $00:50:59.042 \longrightarrow 00:51:01.724$ are the fact that if, for example,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9837538
- $00:51:01.724 \rightarrow 00:51:05.170$ if you look at the publication so you can,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9837538
- $00:51:05.170 \longrightarrow 00:51:07.788$ you can like data the analysis according
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9837538
- $00:51:07.788 \rightarrow 00:51:10.920$ to the method that they used to visualize.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.9837538
- $00:51:10.920 \longrightarrow 00:51:13.424$ So if you look at some plot and
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9837538
- $00:51:13.424 \rightarrow 00:51:15.580$ it's at Disney probability analysis
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9837538
- $00{:}51{:}15{.}580 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}18{.}954$ is before a 2018 2018 because in
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9837538
- 00:51:19.035 --> 00:51:21.731 2018 the what is now the the the
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9837538
- $00{:}51{:}21{.}731 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}23{.}820$ most used approach to visualize
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9837538
- $00{:}51{:}23.820 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}26.640$ the single cell data has been
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9837538
- $00:51:26.640 \rightarrow 00:51:28.970$ presented and that's the you map.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9837538
- $00{:}51{:}28{.}970 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}29{.}981$ The human method.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9837538
- $00{:}51{:}29{.}981 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}34{.}029$ So if you see a plot that is uses as
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9837538
- 00:51:34.029 --> 00:51:36.177 a dimensionality reduction technique,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9837538
- $00:51:36.180 \longrightarrow 00:51:38.416$ the human deaths from
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9837538
- $00{:}51{:}38{.}416 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}41{.}770$ 2018 to now more or less.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9837538
- $00{:}51{:}41{.}770 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}44{.}158$ So the humor is also another
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9291115
- $00{:}51{:}44.160 \dashrightarrow 00{:}51{:}46.958$ question is also common, sort of, uh,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9291115
- $00:51:46.958 \rightarrow 00:51:49.744$ so I've actually noticed that if you,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9291115

- 00:51:49.750 --> 00:51:50.938 for example Disney,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9291115
- $00:51:50.938 \rightarrow 00:51:54.140$ if you just have a completely random data,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9291115
- 00:51:54.140 --> 00:51:57.796 so let's say, OK, I generate the a
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9291115
- 00:51:57.796 --> 00:52:00.790 computer generated completely random data.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9291115
- $00:52:00.790 \longrightarrow 00:52:02.644$ Supposedly it will be a fuzzy
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9291115
- $00:52:02.644 \longrightarrow 00:52:04.300$ ball in this PC plot,
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9291115
- $00{:}52{:}04{.}300 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}07{.}152$ but if you do in the Disney it will
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9291115
- $00{:}52{:}07{.}152 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}09{.}329$ become some kind of patterns you can
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9291115
- $00{:}52{:}09{.}329 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}11{.}318$ start to see emerging from that.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9291115
- $00:52:11.320 \longrightarrow 00:52:13.114$ I just wonder for things like
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9291115
- $00:52:13.114 \longrightarrow 00:52:15.150$ you map and other things. Is
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9728567
- $00{:}52{:}15{.}150 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}17{.}172$ this also the same problem or
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9728567
- $00:52:17.172 \longrightarrow 00:52:19.806$ it's a yeah it's the same problem
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9728567
- $00{:}52{:}19.806 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}22.224$ so all these methods because all
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9728567
- $00:52:22.224 \rightarrow 00:52:24.828$ these methods like try to maximize.
- NOTE Confidence: 0.9728567
- $00:52:24.830 \rightarrow 00:52:27.116$ The separation of these objects and

- NOTE Confidence: 0.9728567
- $00:52:27.116 \rightarrow 00:52:29.927$ the the problem is that the boss 40s

 $00{:}52{:}29{.}927 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}32{.}599$ and also for your map you have noise.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9728567

 $00:52:32.600 \rightarrow 00:52:34.712$ So if your differences mainly driven

NOTE Confidence: 0.9728567

 $00:52:34.712 \longrightarrow 00:52:37.190$ by noise, UM, they tried, they they.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9728567

00:52:37.190 --> 00:52:39.296 They basically create patterns from noise,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9728567

 $00{:}52{:}39{.}300 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}43{.}100$ yeah. And this is a less a problem

NOTE Confidence: 0.9728567

 $00:52:43.100 \rightarrow 00:52:45.429$ with the PCA. That's right, yeah.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9728567

 $00:52:45.430 \longrightarrow 00:52:47.614$ So this is not solved by the human,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9728567

 $00:52:47.620 \longrightarrow 00:52:49.924$ So what it seems to be solved by

NOTE Confidence: 0.9728567

 $00:52:49.924 \dashrightarrow 00:52:52.467$ the UMAP is mainly that it's faster.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9728567

00:52:52.470 --> 00:52:54.756 Uh, it's faster than his name,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9728567

 $00{:}52{:}54{.}760 \dashrightarrow 00{:}52{:}58{.}189$ so it can be applied in a reasonable time.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9728567

 $00{:}52{:}58{.}190 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}01{.}232$ So when the data set is very high in

NOTE Confidence: 0.9728567

 $00{:}53{:}01{.}232 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}04{.}017$ terms of number of cells and also it

NOTE Confidence: 0.9728567

 $00:53:04.017 \rightarrow 00:53:06.912$ seems to be better in a preserving

 $00:53:06.912 \rightarrow 00:53:09.992$ this global structure of the data so

NOTE Confidence: 0.9728567

 $00{:}53{:}09{.}992 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}12{.}224$ that also the distances between the

NOTE Confidence: 0.9728567

 $00{:}53{:}12.224 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}14.570$ different clusters are more like reliable,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9728567

 $00{:}53{:}14{.}570 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}17{.}412$ I think there is actually a parameter

NOTE Confidence: 0.9728567

 $00{:}53{:}17{.}412 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}20{.}658$ where you kind of tune how much you are.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9728567

 $00:53:20.660 \longrightarrow 00:53:22.780$ You give weight to the.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9728567

 $00:53:22.780 \dashrightarrow 00:53:25.370$ Local structure or to the global structure,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9728567

 $00:53:25.370 \rightarrow 00:53:27.897$ but it's generally considered to be more

NOTE Confidence: 0.9728567

 $00{:}53{:}27.897 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}30.918$ reliable on the global structure of the data,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9728567

00:53:30.920 --> 00:53:33.356 so it's considered to be like a

NOTE Confidence: 0.9728567

 $00{:}53{:}33{.}356 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}35{.}947$ trade off a good tradeoff between

NOTE Confidence: 0.9728567

 $00:53:35.947 \dashrightarrow 00:53:38.863$ the PCA and the Disney approach.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9728567

 $00{:}53{:}38{.}870 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}40{.}040$ Barca, it hasn't.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9728567

 $00:53:40.040 \longrightarrow 00:53:42.380$ So both these methods have problems.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9728567

00:53:42.380 - 00:53:44.330 For example in interpret ability.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9728567

 $00:53:44.330 \longrightarrow 00:53:47.678$ So PCA is easy to go back to the

- NOTE Confidence: 0.9728567
- $00:53:47.678 \longrightarrow 00:53:50.163$ original jeans in Disney and

00:53:50.163 --> 00:53:52.683 you map it's very problematic.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9728567

 $00{:}53{:}52{.}690 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}53{.}370$ And uhm,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9728567

 $00:53:53.370 \longrightarrow 00:53:53.710$ yeah.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9728567

 $00{:}53{:}53{.}710 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}56{.}090$ And also you map is a random

NOTE Confidence: 0.9728567

 $00:53:56.175 \rightarrow 00:53:57.600$ so different runs,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9728567

 $00:53:57.600 \rightarrow 00:53:59.868$ so give you slightly different results.

NOTE Confidence: 0.98754835

00:54:02.190 --> 00:54:04.828 Can I ask you another quick question?

NOTE Confidence: 0.98754835

 $00{:}54{:}04{.}830 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}07{.}467$ So when you say the difference in

NOTE Confidence: 0.98754835

 $00:54:07.467 \longrightarrow 00:54:09.731$ time for like processing the data,

NOTE Confidence: 0.98754835

 $00:54:09.731 \longrightarrow 00:54:12.370$ what is the scale of that time?

NOTE Confidence: 0.98754835

00:54:12.370 --> 00:54:15.009 Are you saying like hours or days?

NOTE Confidence: 0.8509196

00:54:15.910 --> 00:54:18.106 Ah well, it did, but it's,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8509196

 $00{:}54{:}18{.}110 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}19{.}578$ uh, well it diverted.

NOTE Confidence: 0.8509196

 $00:54:19.578 \longrightarrow 00:54:21.413$ Depending on the number of,

 $00:54:21.420 \longrightarrow 00:54:23.508$ uh, cells, so it could be

NOTE Confidence: 0.8509196

 $00:54:23.508 \longrightarrow 00:54:25.820$ that if you have 100 cells,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8509196

 $00:54:25.820 \longrightarrow 00:54:27.650$ you don't notice the difference,

NOTE Confidence: 0.8509196

 $00:54:27.650 \rightarrow 00:54:29.858$ but scaling. So adding data you.

NOTE Confidence: 0.955195369999999

 $00{:}54{:}32{.}190 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}33{.}862$ You delete a lot, so for this day

NOTE Confidence: 0.955195369999999

 $00{:}54{:}33{.}862 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}35{.}843$ I know that there are a lot of

NOTE Confidence: 0.955195369999999

 $00{:}54{:}35{.}843 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}37{.}515$ variation of these names that have

NOTE Confidence: 0.955195369999999

00:54:37.515 -> 00:54:39.045 been working on the efficiency,

NOTE Confidence: 0.955195369999999

 $00:54:39.050 \longrightarrow 00:54:42.292$ so they are faster. Uh, but, uh.

NOTE Confidence: 0.955195369999999

00:54:42.292 --> 00:54:45.589 I guess it's also problem of memory,

NOTE Confidence: 0.955195369999999

 $00{:}54{:}45{.}590 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}47{.}956$ so personally I never run an analysis

NOTE Confidence: 0.955195369999999

 $00:54:47.956 \longrightarrow 00:54:50.428$ on a sample that was more than

NOTE Confidence: 0.955195369999999

 $00:54:50.428 \longrightarrow 00:54:52.498$ 20 thirty thousand cells and so

NOTE Confidence: 0.955195369999999

 $00{:}54{:}52{.}575 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}54{.}771$ personally I don't know how problematic

NOTE Confidence: 0.955195369999999

00:54:54.771 -> 00:54:57.660 it is to work with Disney with a

NOTE Confidence: 0.955195369999999

 $00:54:57.660 \longrightarrow 00:54:59.790$ large data set of 1,000,000 cells.

 $00:54:59.790 \longrightarrow 00:55:01.920$ But the problem is that the

NOTE Confidence: 0.955195369999999

 $00:55:01.920 \longrightarrow 00:55:03.340$ more cells you are,

NOTE Confidence: 0.955195369999999

 $00:55:03.340 \rightarrow 00:55:05.470$ the more you gain in time.

NOTE Confidence: 0.955195369999999

 $00:55:05.470 \rightarrow 00:55:08.958$ Using you map against at least basic Disney.

NOTE Confidence: 0.955195369999999

00:55:08.960 --> 00:55:12.660 Sure. OK, so this is only technical.

NOTE Confidence: 0.955195369999999

 $00:55:12.660 \longrightarrow 00:55:13.914$ It's not really.

NOTE Confidence: 0.955195369999999

 $00:55:13.914 \rightarrow 00:55:18.171$ So the key point also is that depending

NOTE Confidence: 0.955195369999999

 $00:55:18.171 \rightarrow 00:55:21.867$ on the dimensionality choice you make.

NOTE Confidence: 0.955195369999999

 $00:55:21.870 \rightarrow 00:55:24.078$ There is an answer look different,

NOTE Confidence: 0.955195369999999

 $00:55:24.080 \longrightarrow 00:55:27.040$ so this is the same data set up,

NOTE Confidence: 0.955195369999999

 $00{:}55{:}27.040 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}28.880$ so normalization is the same.

NOTE Confidence: 0.955195369999999

 $00:55:28.880 \rightarrow 00:55:31.100$ The input data was the same,

NOTE Confidence: 0.955195369999999

 $00{:}55{:}31{.}100 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}32{.}940$ it's from a mouse brain.

NOTE Confidence: 0.955195369999999

 $00{:}55{:}32{.}940 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}35{.}154$ So here you see some populations

NOTE Confidence: 0.955195369999999

 $00:55:35.154 \rightarrow 00:55:36.630$ that correspond to neurons,

 $00:55:36.630 \rightarrow 00:55:38.838$ different types of neurons and microglia,

NOTE Confidence: 0.955195369999999

 $00:55:38.840 \longrightarrow 00:55:39.761$ and solar cells.

NOTE Confidence: 0.955195369999999

 $00:55:39.761 \longrightarrow 00:55:41.910$ And you see the representation of these

NOTE Confidence: 0.955195369999999

00:55:41.967 --> 00:55:44.377 datasets using principal component analysis.

NOTE Confidence: 0.955195369999999

 $00:55:44.380 \longrightarrow 00:55:46.768$ So cells here are colored according

NOTE Confidence: 0.955195369999999

 $00:55:46.768 \rightarrow 00:55:49.667$ to the cell type and and you

NOTE Confidence: 0.955195369999999

 $00:55:49.667 \rightarrow 00:55:52.200$ see that you can see the classes.

NOTE Confidence: 0.955195369999999

00:55:52.200 --> 00:55:54.426 But you but but for example,

NOTE Confidence: 0.955195369999999

 $00{:}55{:}54{.}430 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}56{.}290$ points within the same clusters.

NOTE Confidence: 0.955195369999999

 $00:55:56.290 \rightarrow 00:55:58.150$ That kind of spread around,

NOTE Confidence: 0.955195369999999

 $00:55:58.150 \rightarrow 00:56:00.424$ so that's why for the visualization

NOTE Confidence: 0.955195369999999

 $00:56:00.424 \longrightarrow 00:56:02.726$ of the cluster this is less

NOTE Confidence: 0.955195369999999

 $00{:}56{:}02.726 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}04.850$ clear than the other two methods.

NOTE Confidence: 0.955195369999999

 $00:56:04.850 \rightarrow 00:56:07.886$ So these two methods try basically

NOTE Confidence: 0.955195369999999

 $00{:}56{:}07.886 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}09.910$ maximizes the completeness of

NOTE Confidence: 0.955195369999999

 $00:56:09.994 \rightarrow 00:56:12.209$ the data inside the cluster.

- NOTE Confidence: 0.955195369999999
- 00:56:12.210 --> 00:56:16.218 And using different two different approaches.

 $00{:}56{:}19{.}440 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}21{.}790$ And then again, for interpreting these data,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9799622

 $00:56:21.790 \rightarrow 00:56:23.465$ it's more about just seeing

NOTE Confidence: 0.9799622

 $00:56:23.465 \longrightarrow 00:56:25.469$ like how cells are similar to

NOTE Confidence: 0.9799622

 $00:56:25.470 \longrightarrow 00:56:27.150$ each other within a cluster,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9799622

 $00:56:27.150 \longrightarrow 00:56:28.640$ like how they cluster separately

NOTE Confidence: 0.9799622

 $00{:}56{:}28.640 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}30.544$ as opposed to like the distances

NOTE Confidence: 0.9799622

 $00{:}56{:}30{.}544 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}32{.}329$ between the cluster being able

NOTE Confidence: 0.9799622

 $00{:}56{:}32{.}329 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}34{.}163$ to infer any relationship from

NOTE Confidence: 0.9799622

00:56:34.163 --> 00:56:35.520 that distance, right? Well,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9799622

 $00{:}56{:}35{.}520 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}37{.}865$ here you could be interested also well,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9799622

00:56:37.870 --> 00:56:39.880 for sure if you use Disney,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9799622

 $00:56:39.880 \rightarrow 00:56:42.560$ the distances between them as you see here,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9799622

 $00:56:42.560 \longrightarrow 00:56:46.070$ the distances tend to be like.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9799622

 $00:56:46.070 \longrightarrow 00:56:48.190$ More or less the same,

 $00:56:48.190 \rightarrow 00:56:50.445$ so their equally distributed button

NOTE Confidence: 0.9799622

00:56:50.445 --> 00:56:53.950 here in new map you can have a

NOTE Confidence: 0.9799622

 $00{:}56{:}53{.}950 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}56{.}266$ distances that are that have a

NOTE Confidence: 0.9799622

 $00:56:56.266 \rightarrow 00:56:58.786$ range so low to high distances.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9799622

 $00{:}56{:}58{.}790 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}01{.}328$ So here it can be informative.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9799622

 $00:57:01.330 \longrightarrow 00:57:03.450$ But basically when you use

NOTE Confidence: 0.9799622

 $00:57:03.450 \longrightarrow 00:57:05.146$ this for the visualization,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9799622

 $00{:}57{:}05{.}150 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}07{.}838$ what you want to communicate is

NOTE Confidence: 0.9799622

00:57:07.838 --> 00:57:10.588 that you identify the clusters of

NOTE Confidence: 0.9799622

 $00{:}57{:}10.588 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}13.612$ different cells and you want to be

NOTE Confidence: 0.9799622

 $00{:}57{:}13.612 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}16.670$ able to see them where they are in.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9799622

 $00:57:16.670 \rightarrow 00:57:17.942$ Which relation they are?

NOTE Confidence: 0.9799622

00:57:17.942 --> 00:57:20.390 How many cells belong to each cluster,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9799622

 $00:57:20.390 \longrightarrow 00:57:21.359$ and so on.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9799622

 $00{:}57{:}21.359 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}23.297$ So usually these then are annotated

NOTE Confidence: 0.9799622

 $00{:}57{:}23.297 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}25.546$ with the name of the cluster based

- NOTE Confidence: 0.9799622
- $00:57:25.546 \longrightarrow 00:57:27.588$ on marker genes and so obviously

 $00{:}57{:}27{.}588 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}29{.}423$ these for the visualization are

NOTE Confidence: 0.9799622

 $00:57:29.423 \longrightarrow 00:57:31.541$ better if you want to label

NOTE Confidence: 0.9799622

 $00:57:31.541 \rightarrow 00:57:33.226$ your clusters and then this.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9799622

00:57:33.230 --> 00:57:35.596 But PCA is still the common tool,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9799622

 $00{:}57{:}35{.}600 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}37{.}553$ one of the most common tools that

NOTE Confidence: 0.9799622

 $00:57:37.553 \rightarrow 00:57:39.990$ are run in the downstream analysis,

NOTE Confidence: 0.9799622

00:57:39.990 - 00:57:41.820 meaning that Disney new map I

NOTE Confidence: 0.9799622

 $00{:}57{:}41.820 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}43.489$ really used mainly for visualization

NOTE Confidence: 0.9799622

 $00:57:43.489 \longrightarrow 00:57:45.399$ of data but nothing else.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9799622

00:57:45.400 --> 00:57:47.220 Specially it isn't but PCA.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9799622

 $00{:}57{:}47{.}220 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}49{.}768$ Is the basis for the clustering and

NOTE Confidence: 0.9799622

 $00{:}57{:}49.768 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}52.220$ for the trajectory analysis and so on.

NOTE Confidence: 0.9799622

 $00{:}57{:}52{.}220 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}55{.}140$ So still all the pipelines many of the

NOTE Confidence: 0.9799622

 $00:57:55.140 \rightarrow 00:57:57.570$ old departments are still using the PCA,

 $00{:}57{:}57{.}570 \dashrightarrow 00{:}57{:}59{.}940$ it's just for the visualization that

NOTE Confidence: 0.9799622

 $00{:}57{:}59{.}940 \dashrightarrow 00{:}58{:}02{.}283$ they use these alternative approaches.