

Q: Did the Nextera Mate Pair kit enable you to generate the libraries you needed?

DLD: We received the HiSeq System about the same time that the Nextera Mate Pair kit became available. With the Nextera Mate Pair kit, we could produce much larger libraries, from 7 to 13 kb, and generate the final assembly of the kiwi genome. Nextera Mate Pair also allowed us to reduce our DNA input down to 4 µg. We then had contiguous genes that we could annotate and draw biological conclusions. It helped move our draft genome to an assembled genome.

With Nextera Mate Pair, you don't have to spend so much time in the lab. It gives you more time to spend on the analysis.

Q: How did the Nextera Mate Pair kit improve your workflow?

DLD: I like the fact that we don't need to shear DNA with the Nextera Mate Pair kit. Shearing requires more input DNA, because you lose so much material in the process. Also, the bigger the insert size the more material you lose in the library building process. With Nextera Mate Pair, the tagmentation step does the shearing for you. You just put the DNA on a gel and extract the sizes you're interested in. It's a great improvement, with a better workflow and less hands on time than other kits. With Nextera Mate Pair, you don't have to spend so much time in the lab. It gives you more time to spend on the analysis.

Q: How did you assess the quality of the kiwi genome assembly?

DLD: We assessed the quality of the assembly by comparing it to annotated genomes of the zebra finch and chicken. Comparatively, we did not see rearrangements and the genomes possessed common chromosome sequences, meaning synteny was kept. We did not have the entire chromosome, but our N50, which describes scaffold length, was good enough at about 4 Mb.

Q: What did the sequence tell you about the role of GPCR receptors in the kiwi genome?

DLD: To understand the genes involved in vision and olfaction, we annotated the olfactory receptor repertoire and all of the GPCRs. We found that olfactory receptors, classified as sensory GPCRs, have a higher diversification in these birds, providing them with a keen olfactory sense that they use in foraging. We also looked in genes we know are responsible for vision, like rhodopsin. We found that several opsins, belonging to the rhodopsin GPCR class that is involved in color vision are inactivated, most likely due to nocturnal adaptation.

Since the kiwi doesn't have problems with its lower limbs, we focused on genes known to be involved only in the development of the upper limbs. We annotated the Hox cluster and we looked in all of the fibroblast growth factors (FGF). One of the genes responsible for upper forelimb development, fibin, is most likely disrupted in the kiwi genome, and a potential cause for the absence of wings.

Q: How did you identify that the fibin gene may be disrupted in the kiwi genome?

DLD: We couldn't find this gene at all when we first annotated the genome. We used the Basic Local Alignment Search Tool (BLAST) to find regions of local similarity between a collection of sequences responsible for this gene. We took about 20 species of birds, mammals, and fish and blasted it against our entire assembly to see whether there is any remnant of it. We found what appears to be a gap close to the region where the fibin gene is supposed to be. We found the 3' UTR, a sequence of about 500 bp, but we did not retrieve any significant hits for an adjacent 280 bp. The gap, of about 2000 bp, is towards the 5' end. Given the fact that we did not see any mate pair support for that gap, we wondered why it appeared there.

It's amazing that we are now at the point where technology, like Nextera Mate Pair and the HiSeq System, make it so easy to assemble genomes and come to biological conclusions based on the data.

The fibin gene is well-conserved gene among species, so we aligned short insert size libraries against all of the known sequences for these genes from other species. We couldn't align anything. We tried long-range PCR and designed primers according to the sequences from other species, and this also failed to retrieve anything. It could be a region that is difficult to sequence, but we had good coverage and the GC content was not that high.

Q: How can you prove the gene is no longer there?

DLD: A loss, the absence of something, is hard to prove. Fibin knockdown has only been biologically tested in zebrafish, not in birds. We know that the synteny is kept on the scaffold. The genes that are supposed to be to the right and to the left of the fibin are there on the scaffold where the 3' UTR of fibin is located. The 3' UTR is probably kept, but the rest of the gene is lost. I expect that there was probably a loss of constraint on this gene since the kiwi didn't need to fly anymore. It may be disrupted or completely missing. Or the gap may be filled with a sequence unrelated to the fibin. If that is the case, I would have to prove that the sequence doesn't align with and can't be PCR amplified with primers from sequences of other species. We need to research this further.

Q: What are the next steps in your research?

DLD: We will keep working on the fibin gene to determine if it's truly missing. Our lab is also conducting studies using transcriptomics to characterize how a loss of a receptor impacts gene expression. I've been working on the GPCR34 knockout because this receptor is involved in immunity. The next step is to study the regulation of this receptor by using the HiSeq System to sequence transcriptomes of dendritic cells that are stimulated under different conditions.

