

# System Wide Analyses have Underestimated Protein Abundances and Transcriptional Importance in Animals

Jingyi Jessica Li<sup>1</sup>, Peter J. Bickel<sup>1</sup> and Mark D. Biggin<sup>2,\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Statistics, University of California, Berkeley CA 94720.

<sup>2</sup>Genomics Division, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, 1 Cyclotron Road, MS 84-171, Berkeley CA 94720

\*Correspondence [mdbiggin@lbl.gov](mailto:mdbiggin@lbl.gov)

**Proteome wide surveys in mammalian tissue culture cells suggest that the protein expressed at the median abundance is present at 8,000 - 16,000 molecules per cell. Comparisons of protein and mRNA abundances imply that differences in mRNA expression between genes explain only 10-40% of the differences in protein levels. We find, however, that the proteome wide surveys have significantly underestimated protein abundances. Using previously published individual measurements for 61 housekeeping proteins to rescale whole proteome data from Schwanhauser et al.<sup>1</sup>, we find that the median protein detected is expressed at 170,000 molecules per cell. We further find that our corrected protein abundance estimates show a higher correlation and a stronger linear relationship with mRNA abundances than do the uncorrected protein data.**

**To estimate the degree to which mRNA expression levels determine protein levels, it is critical to determine the experimental errors in protein and mRNA abundance data and to consider all genes, not only those whose protein expression is readily detected. We estimate the measurement errors in data from Schwanhauser et al.<sup>1</sup> and show that when these are taken into account mRNA levels explain at least 56% of the differences in protein abundance between the 4,212 genes detected. We also model protein expression levels in a cell for all genes and demonstrate using this data that mRNA levels now explain 92% of protein expression. As a result, we predict that translation rates vary much less between genes than implied by many studies. We show that this conclusion is supported by independent measurements of translation rates in tissue culture cells by Ingolia et al.<sup>2</sup>.**


## Introduction

The protein products of genes are expressed at very different levels from each other in an animal cell. Thousands of genes are not detectably expressed. Of those that are, their proteins are present at levels that differ by five orders of magnitude. Cytoplasmic actin, for example, is expressed at  $1.5 \times 10^8$  molecules per cell<sup>3</sup>, whereas some transcription factors are expressed at only  $4 \times 10^3$  molecules per cell<sup>4</sup>. There are four major steps that determine differences in protein expression: differences in the rates at which genes are transcribed, mRNAs are degraded, proteins are translated, and proteins are degraded (Fig.1). The combined effect of transcription and mRNA degradation together determine mRNA abundances (Fig.1). The joint effect of protein translation and protein degradation control the relative differences between mRNA and protein concentrations (Fig. 1).

Transcription has long been regarded as a dominant step and is controlled by sequence specific transcription factors that differentially interact with *cis*-regulatory DNA regions. It has increasingly been realized, however, that the rates of the other three steps vary significantly between genes as well<sup>1-2, 5-9</sup>. MicroRNAs, for example, differentially interact with mRNAs of different genes to alter rates of mRNA degradation and protein translation<sup>10-12</sup>.

To quantify the relative importance of each of the four steps, label free mass spectrometry methods have been developed that can measure the absolute number

of protein molecules per cell for thousands of genes<sup>1, 13-17</sup>. By comparing these data to mRNA abundance data, the relative importance of transcription and mRNA degradation versus protein translation and protein degradation can be determined<sup>1, 15, 17</sup> (Fig. 1). By measuring mRNA degradation and protein degradation rates as well, the rates of transcription and translation can be additionally inferred<sup>1</sup>. Using this approach to study mouse NIH3T3 fibroblasts, Schwanhauser et al. concluded that mRNA levels explain ~40% of the variability in protein levels and that the cellular abundance of proteins is predominantly controlled at the level of translation<sup>1</sup>. They suggested that transcription is the second largest determinant and that the degradation of mRNAs and proteins play a significant but lesser role.




**Figure 1: The steps regulating protein expression.** The steady state abundances of proteins and mRNAs are each determined by their relative rates of production (i.e. transcription or translation) and their rates of degradation.

Our initial reading of the Schwanhausser et al. paper<sup>1</sup>, however, suggested that their protein abundance estimates are much lower than established values for individual proteins from the literature. In attempting to characterize the reason for this discrepancy, we also came to suspect that additional sources of experimental error had not been taken into account. Below we describe our re-analysis of this paper and also discuss the relationship between our conclusions and those of Schwanhausser et al. and other system wide studies.

## Results and Discussion

**A non-linear underestimation of protein abundances**  
 We first noticed that published abundances of 53 mammalian housekeeping proteins<sup>3-4, 18-25</sup> are on average 16 fold higher than those from Schwanhausser et al.'s label free mass spectrometry data (Dataset S1). For example, Schwanhausser et al.'s estimate for Actin is  $1.6 \times 10^7$  molecules per cell compared to the earlier estimate of  $1.5 \times 10^8$ , and for RNA polymerase II is  $1.2 \times 10^4$  molecules per cell compared to a previous value of  $3.2 \times 10^5$ . The protein estimates from the literature were derived largely by western blot or SILAC mass spectrometry and were measured in several animal cell lines. Given that this array of individual measurements all disagree with Schwanhausser et al.'s whole proteome data along a similar trend line, the error is probably in the whole proteome data.

Once we brought this discrepancy to Schwanhausser et al.'s attention, they upwardly revised their abundance estimates (see Corrigendum<sup>1</sup>). In addition, they provided western blot or Selected Reaction Monitoring (SRM) mass spectrometry measurements for eight polypeptides in NIH3T3 cells. We find, however, that Schwanhausser et al.'s second whole proteome abundances still underestimate proteins that are expressed below  $10^6$  molecules per cell, with the lowest abundance proteins being underestimated the most (Fig. 2a; Dataset S1). This discrepancy is unlikely to result from differences in the size or metabolic activity of the different cell types assayed, we suggest, for the following reasons. One, such differences should affect all protein abundances equally, not just the lower abundances. Two, five of the individual protein measurements for proteins with lower abundances (Orc2, Orc4, HDAC3, NFkB1, and NFkB2) are from NIH3T3 cells and are on average 3.7 fold higher than the second whole proteome estimates from the same cell line (Dataset S1). Three, Schwanhausser et al.'s second estimates for RNA polymerase II and general transcription factors such as TFIIIB and TFIIE are only 1.6 fold higher than those in yeast<sup>26</sup> and are 7.1 times less than those in HeLa cells<sup>24</sup>. Yeast cells have  $1/40^{\text{th}}$  the volume,  $1/200^{\text{th}}$  the amount of DNA and  $1/4$  the number of genes of NIH3T3 and HeLa cells<sup>27</sup>. Two fold reductions in the concentrations of a single general transcription factor have, in some cases, phenotypic consequence<sup>28-31</sup>. Thus, it is unlikely that a rapidly dividing mammalian cell could function with much larger




**Figure 2: A non-linear bias in protein abundance estimates and its correction.** **a**, The y axis shows the ratios of 61 individually derived protein abundance estimates divided by the abundance estimates from Schwanhausser et al.'s second whole proteome dataset. The x axis shows Schwanhausser et al.'s second whole proteome abundance estimates. The red line indicates the locally weighted line of best fit (Lowess parameter  $f=1.0$ ), and the vertical dotted grey lines show the locations of the 1st quartile, median and 3rd quartile of the abundance distribution of the 5,028 proteins detected in the whole proteome analysis. **b**, The same as panel a. except that the whole proteome estimates of Schwanhausser et al. have been corrected using a two-part linear model and the abundances from the 61 individual protein measurements.

reductions in the amounts of all of these essential regulators to levels close to those found in yeast.

### Correcting the non-linear bias

Schwanhausser et al. calibrated protein abundances by mixing known amounts of 48 protein standards with a crude protein extract from NIH3T3 cells and then measuring several thousand proteins in the mixture by label free mass spectrometry. Unfortunately, only 20 of the "spiked in" protein standards were detected and these were present at the equivalent  $> 8.0 \times 10^5$  molecules per cell, a level that represents only the most



**Figure 3: Calibrating absolute protein abundances.** **a**, The relationship between iBAC mass spectrometry signal (x axis) and the amounts of the 20 “spiked in” protein standards (y axis) used by Schwanhauser et al. to calibrate their whole proteome abundances (data kindly provided by Matthias Selbach, Dataset S2). The line of best fit is shown (red). **b**, The relationship between individually derived estimates for 61 housekeeping proteins (y axis) and Schwanhauser et al.’s second whole proteome estimates (x axis). The two part line of best fit used to correct the second whole proteome estimates is shown (solid red line) as is the single linear regression (dashed red line). **c**, The fit of different regression models for the data in panel b. The y axis shows the leave-one-out cross validation root mean square error for each model. The x axis shows the protein abundance used to separate the data for two part linear regressions. The red curve shows the optimum change point for a two part linear model is at an abundance of  $\sim 10^6$  molecules per cell. The dashed red horizontal line shows the root mean square error for the single linear regression.


highly expressed 11% of the proteins detected (Fig 3a) (M. Selbach, personal communication<sup>1</sup>). To convert mass spectrometry signals to protein abundances, Schwanhauser et al. assumed that a linear relationship defined using these 20 “spiked in” standards holds true for proteins at all abundances (Fig. 3a). The discrepancy between the resulting estimates and individual protein measurements, however, suggests that this assumption is not valid. We therefore employed the 61 individual protein measurements from the literature as they span a much wider abundance range. In a plot of these data vs Schwanhauser et al.’s second whole proteome estimates, we found that a two-part linear regression gave a statistically better fit over a single regression (Fig. 3b and c) ( $p$ -value=0.0002). We then used this two-part regression to derive new abundance estimates for all 5,028 proteins in Schwanhauser et al.’s dataset (Dataset S1). As Figure 2b shows, the correction removes the non linear bias.

In our rescaled data, the median abundance protein is present at 170,000 molecules per cell (Fig. 2b), considerably higher than Schwanhauser et al.’s original estimate of 16,000 molecules per cell and significantly above their second estimate of 50,000 molecules per cell. For low abundance proteins the effect is larger. In our corrected data, the median sequence specific transcription factor is present at 71,000 molecules per cell versus Schwanhauser et al.’s estimates of first 3,500 then 9,300 molecules per cell (Dataset S1). Our correction reduces the range of detected abundances by  $\sim 50$  fold and the variance by 2.8 fold compared to Schwanhauser et al.’s second estimates (Dataset S1, Table S1).

### **Corrected protein abundances show an increased correlation with mRNA abundances**

As an independent check on the accuracy of our corrected abundances, we compared them to Schwanhauser et al.’s RNA-seq mRNA expression data. Our corrected protein abundances correlate more highly with mRNA abundances than do Schwanhauser et al.’s second whole proteome estimates (compare Fig. 4a and b). The increase in correlation coefficient is statistically highly significant ( $p$ -value $<10^{-29}$ ) (Materials and Methods), arguing that our non-linear correction to the whole proteome abundances has increased the accuracy of these estimates. The most dramatic change is that the scatter about the line of best fit is reduced and shows a stronger linear relationship. The 50% prediction band shows that prior to correction the half of proteins whose abundances are best predicted by mRNA levels are expressed over an 11 fold range (unlogged), but after correction they are expressed over a narrower, 4 fold range (Fig. 4a and b). The correction reduces the width of the 95% prediction band even further, by 18 fold.

For our corrected data, the median number of proteins translated per mRNA is 9,800 compared to Schwanhauser et al.’s original estimate of 900 and their second estimate of 2,800. In yeast, the ratio of protein molecules translated per mRNA is 4,200 - 5,600<sup>32-33</sup>. Given that mammalian cells have a higher protein copy number than yeast<sup>27</sup>, it is not unreasonable that the ratio in mammalian cells would be the higher.



**Figure 4: Protein abundance estimates versus mRNA abundances** **a**, The relationship between Schwanhausser et al.'s second protein abundance estimates vs mRNA levels for 4,212 genes in NIH3T3 cells. The linear regression of the data is shown in red, the 50% prediction band by dashed green lines, and the 95% prediction band by dashed blue lines. **b**, The relationship between our corrected estimates of protein abundance vs mRNA levels. The linear regression and prediction bands are labeled as in panel a.

### ***The relative importance of transcriptional versus post transcriptional process***

As a result of experimental measurement errors, the coefficient of determination between measured mRNA and measured protein levels—i.e.  $R^2$  shown in Fig. 4b—will be less than that between true protein and true mRNA levels. With an accurate estimate of these errors, it is possible to calculate the correlation between true protein and true mRNA abundances. The variance in the residuals is the displacement along the y axis of data points about the line of best fit. In the comparison between measured protein and measured mRNA abundances (Fig. 4b), this variance is composed of experimental error and genuine differences in the rates of translation and protein degradation between genes. From the estimated error and the variance in the residuals, it is therefore possible to infer the variance


due to the combined effects of translation and protein degradation.

There are two forms of experimental error: stochastic and systematic. Stochastic error is the variation between replica experiments and is estimated from this variation. Systematic error is the reproducible under or over estimation of each data point, and is estimated by comparing the results obtained with the assay being used to those from gold standard measurements using the most accurate method available.

Schwanhausser et al. limited their estimation of experimental error to stochastic errors determined from the variance between replica datasets. Because our correction of the whole proteome abundances reduces the total variance in measured protein expression levels, we first reestimated the proportion of the variance in the residuals in Fig. 4b that is due to stochastic measurement error (Materials and Methods). We find that 7% results from stochastic protein error and 0.8% from stochastic mRNA error.

Schwanhausser et al., however, also noted a significant variance between their whole genome RNA-Seq data and NanoString measurements for 79 genes ( $R^2=0.79$  in Fig. S8A in Schwanhausser et al.<sup>1</sup>), though they did not take this into account subsequently. NanoString gives an accurate measure of nucleic acid abundance as correlation coefficients of  $R^2=0.99$  are obtained when NanoString data are compared to known concentrations of nucleic acid standards<sup>34</sup>. Thus, it is reasonable to consider NanoString as a gold standard that can be used to assess the systematic mRNA error. The variance in Schwanhausser et al.'s NanoString/RNA-seq comparison is equivalent to 23.3% of the variation in the residuals in Fig 4b, 29 fold larger than the stochastic component of mRNA error. RNA-Seq suffers reproducible biases in the number of DNA sequence reads obtained for different GC content genomic regions<sup>35-36</sup>. These several fold biases result from the PCR amplification and high throughput sequencing steps that this method employs and which Schwanhausser et al.'s protocol included. The variance between the NanoString and RNA-Seq data is, therefore, probably due mostly to systematic error in the RNA-Seq data and this should be accounted for in any analysis.


It is also important to assess the systematic error in the whole proteome abundances as label free mass spectrometry includes such biases<sup>16, 33, 37</sup>. In principle the "spiked in" protein standards in Schwanhausser et al.'s calibration experiment (Fig. 3a) should provide gold standard data. In practice, however, the variance in this experiment is significantly higher than that observed between the whole proteome estimates and other abundance data that is known to contain significant error (M. Selbach personal communication). For example, the variance in Schwanhausser et al.'s calibration experiment would contribute 1.4 fold more to the variance in the residuals in Fig. 4b than the variance



**Figure 5. A model for true protein abundances versus true mRNA abundances for all mouse genes.** The x-axis shows true mRNA abundances estimated from RNA-Seq data for 15,325 genes (black) and modeled abundances for the remaining 5,984 genes whose expression is not detectable (blue). The y-axis shows the levels of true protein expression expected for each gene (Materials and Methods). The plot shows the result of a typical simulation. The theoretical  $R^2$  value is 0.92.

between the corrected whole proteome estimates and the 61 individual protein measurements would. Since no other suitable gold standard is available, we are thus unable to estimate the systematic protein error.

Taking the stochastic protein error as a minimum estimate of protein error and the variance from the NanoString/RNA-seq comparison as an estimate of RNA error, it can be shown that true mRNA levels explain at least 56% of true protein levels, and by extension protein degradation and translation explain no more than 44% (Materials and Methods). These estimates, though, only consider the 4,212 genes for which both mRNA and protein abundance data are available. There are many thousands of other genes that are weakly or not detectably transcribed and as a result produce little or no protein<sup>38-39</sup>. To take these genes into account, we simulated the true levels of protein expected for an extensive mouse polyA+ mRNA-Seq dataset<sup>38</sup> (Materials and Methods). When this simulation is applied to only to those genes for which Schwanhausser et al. were able to measure both mRNA and protein abundances, mRNA levels again predict 56% of true protein abundances, indicating that our simulation of protein expression is reasonable. When all 15,325 genes for which mRNA expression data is available are considered, true mRNA levels now predict 80% of true protein levels (Table S1). When an additional 5,984 genes that are not detectably transcribed are also included by modeling them with very low expression values, true mRNA levels explain




**Figure 6. Measured versus inferred translation rates.** The relative density of ribosomes per mRNA for each gene directly measured by Ingolia et al.<sup>2</sup> (grey lines) compared to the translation rates for each gene inferred by Schwanhausser et al.<sup>1</sup> (black lines). The distribution of values from Ingolia was scaled proportionally to have the same median as that of the Schwanhausser et al. values, and the gene frequencies of the two distributions were normalized to have the same total. The locations of the 2.5 and 97.5 percentiles of each distribution are shown as dashed lines.

92% of true protein expression (Fig 5; Table S1). This increase in the correlation between mRNA and protein levels is expected. The addition of many low expression values will inevitably have this effect if the variance in translation and protein degradation is assumed to be constant at all abundances.

Schwanhausser et al. directly measured mRNA and protein degradation rates and calculated the percentage that each contributed to the variance in protein abundances. Using this information, it is possible to determine the relative importance of transcription, RNA degradation, translation and protein degradation for different scenarios (Table S1, Materials and Methods). When the expression of all genes is considered, transcription explains ~89% of the variance in true protein levels, RNA degradation explains 3%, translation ~6%, and protein degradation ~2% (Table S1). Clearly these estimates are tentative and depend on the particular assumptions we have made. We believe, though, that they are more accurate than Schwanhausser et al.'s suggestion that translation is the predominant determinant of protein expression and that mRNA levels explain around 40% of the variability in protein levels<sup>1</sup> (Table S1).

#### **Direct measurements of translation rates support our analysis**

Direct measurements of system wide translation rates by Ingolia et al. using ribosome profiling<sup>2</sup> support our conclusion that translation rates vary less than



**Figure 7. Comparison of corrected and uncorrected whole proteome abundance estimates.** **a.** The distributions of protein abundance estimates for 4,680 orthologous proteins in NIH3T3 cells (black lines) or HeLa cells (red lines). The values from Schwanhauser et al.'s second estimates and Wisniewski et al.'s estimates are shown as dashed lines. The values for our corrected abundance estimates are shown as continuous lines. **b.** The ratios of HeLa cell whole proteome abundance estimates divided by individual measurements from the literature for 66 proteins. Results for the original data from Wisniewski et al. (dashed line) and after these values have been corrected (continuous line) are plotted. The green dashed vertical line indicates a ratio of 1.

Schwanhauser et al. suggest. For 95% of the genes whose mRNA was detected, measured translation rates vary only nine fold in mouse embryonic stem cells (Fig. 6). In contrast, Schwanhauser et al. inferred that for 95% of detected genes translation rates vary 110 fold (Fig. 6). It is even possible that actual (true) translation rates vary less than Ingolia et al.'s measurements suggest: Ribosome profiling employs high throughput DNA sequencing, which as discussed above is subject to bias based on DNA sequence content<sup>35-36</sup> that could introduce systematic experimental error.

Ingolia et al. also showed that translation rates change only several fold upon differentiation of embryonic stem cells and, with the exception of the translation machinery, the change affects all expressed genes to a similar degree<sup>2</sup>. Other system wide studies, including a separate analysis by Schwanhauser et al, also suggest that the differential regulation of translation may be limited to modest changes at a subset of genes<sup>1, 9</sup>. Perhaps translation will prove to be an important step for fine tuning protein expression levels.

#### **Implication for other system wide studies**

Two other system wide estimates of protein abundance in mammalian cells are, like Schwanhauser et al.'s, lower than ours. These two reports suggest that the median abundance protein detected is present at 8,000<sup>13</sup> or 9,700<sup>14</sup> molecules per cell vs our estimate of 170,000 molecules per cell. Since these lower estimates provide less than 1/10<sup>th</sup> of the number of histones needed to cover the diploid genome with nucleosomes and are lower than published estimates for a wide array of other housekeeping proteins, it is unlikely that they are accurate.

After completion of the remainder of this manuscript, Wisniewski et al. published protein abundance estimates for HeLa cells that are generally higher than ours and spread over a broader range<sup>40</sup> (Fig. 7a). These new estimates are also higher on average than the set of individual protein measurements from the literature by a median of 240% higher (Dataset S3, Fig. 7b). Since most of these individual measurements were made for proteins in HeLa cells, Wisniewski et al.'s estimates must be incorrectly scaled. Using our two part linear regression strategy, we therefore corrected Wisniewski et al.'s whole proteome data (Materials and Methods, Figure S1; Dataset S3), bringing the average variation between the whole proteome estimates and individual protein measurements to within 6% of each other (Fig. 7b; Dataset S3). Interestingly, the correction dramatically increases the similarity between the distributions of protein abundances in HeLa and NIH3T3 cells for all orthologous proteins (Fig. 7a). In addition, the correction increases the correlation between HeLa cell protein and HeLa mRNA abundances to a statistically significant extent (p-value,  $6 \times 10^{-20}$ ) and reduces the 50% and 95% confidence bounds for this relationship by 1.7 fold and 4.6 fold respectively. Wisniewski et al. scaled their protein abundances using the total cellular protein content and the sum of the mass spectrometry signals for all detected polypeptides. They assumed that mass spectrometry signals are proportional to protein abundance. In contrast, our scaling strategy makes no such assumption and instead uses many individual measurements of housekeeping proteins to estimate a multipart (spline) function. The increased correlations obtained with individual protein measurements and with mRNA abundances for two cell lines suggests that our scalings are the more accurate.

Other estimates for the contribution of mRNA levels in determining protein expression in mammals are lower than ours, suggesting that mRNA levels contribute 10%-40%<sup>15, 17</sup> vs our estimate of at least 56% for detected proteins and 92% if all genes are considered. These other studies did not take systematic experimental errors into account and did not include genes whose protein expression was not detected. Thus, they are likely all underestimates.

## Conclusions

Quantitative whole proteome analyses can offer profound insights into the control of gene expression and provide baseline parameters for much of systems biology. It is critical, though, to first ensure that these data are correctly scaled, that experimental measurement errors are accounted for as thoroughly as possible, and that direct measurements of each step are made.


## Materials and Methods

### Correcting protein abundance

For NIH3T3 cells, individual protein abundance measurements for 61 housekeeping proteins (Dataset S1) were  $\log_{10}$  transformed along with the corresponding estimates from Schwanhausser et al.'s second whole proteome dataset. Model selection of different regressive models by leave-one-out cross-validation was used to fit the training data<sup>41</sup>. This showed that a plausible two-part linear regression with a change point at  $10^6$  molecules per cell (line  $<1 \times 10^6$ ...slope=0.56, intercept=2.64; line  $>1 \times 10^6$ ...slope=1.06, intercept=-0.41) fit the data far better than by accident (Wilk's analysis, likelihood ratio test p-value=0.0002<sup>41</sup>; Fig. 3b and c). The resulting two-part linear model was used to correct all 5,028 protein abundance estimates (Fig. 2b, Dataset S1).

The null hypothesis that the correlation coefficient of the uncorrected Schwanhausser et al. protein abundance estimates vs mRNA estimates ( $R_1=0.626$ ) is equal to that of our corrected protein estimates vs mRNA estimates ( $R_2=0.642$ ) was tested using the method for comparing dependent correlation coefficients<sup>42</sup>, given that the uncorrected and corrected protein abundance estimates and the mRNA estimates can be assumed to have a multivariate Gaussian distribution. The resulting two-sided p-value  $< 10^{-29}$  shows that  $R_2$  is statistically significantly larger than  $R_1$ .

To correct protein abundance estimates for HeLa cells<sup>40</sup>, the same strategy used for NIH3T3 cells was employed. A two-part linear regression with a change point at  $10^{6.8}$  molecules per cell fit the data far better than by accident (Wilk's analysis, likelihood ratio test p-value=0.00003) (Fig. S1). The resulting two-part linear model was used to correct all HeLa cell protein abundance estimates (Fig. 7; Dataset S3). The correlation of HeLa cell protein abundance estimates with mRNA abundances was determined using the mean values of replica HeLa cell RNA-Seq datasets



**Figure 8. The relationship between true and measured protein and mRNA levels.**

from the ENCODE consortium<sup>43</sup> (GEO Accession ID "GSM765402"). The hypothesis that our corrected protein abundances correlate more highly with these HeLa mRNA abundances than the uncorrected estimates was tested as above, resulting in a two sided p-value of  $6 \times 10^{-20}$ .

### The contribution of mRNA to protein levels in NIH3T3 cells

The variance term in a linear model between measured protein abundance (MP) (response) and measured mRNA levels (MR) (predictor) is decomposed in a standard way (ANOVA<sup>41</sup>) into three components (Fig. 8). These components of the variance in the residuals represent mRNA measurement error ( $e_R$ ), protein measurement error ( $e_p$ ), and the variance in a linear model between true protein abundance (TP) and true mRNA levels (TR) that results from differences in the rates of protein degradation and translation (PDT).

Statistically, we can write three linear models from Figure 8:

$$TR = b_R MR + c_R + e_R \quad (1)$$

$$TP = b TP + c + PDT \quad (2)$$

$$MP = TP + c_p + e_p \quad (3)$$

where TR, MR, TP, MP are abundance values on a  $\log_{10}$  scale;  $e_R$  and  $e_p$  represent the error introduced in measuring mRNA and protein abundances; PDT represents the centered genuine differences in protein degradation and translation rates between genes; the three sources of variation ( $e_R$ ,  $e_p$  and PDT) are independent random variables with mean 0; the reversal of the causal relationship between TR and MR in model (1) is assumed to be valid because TR and MR likely have a joint Gaussian distribution; and the slope of TP in model (3) can be assumed to be 1 because the ratios between the 61 protein published abundance measurements and our corrected estimates are close to 1 (Fig. 2b). Combining (1)-(3), we write the linear model

between measured protein abundance (MP) and measured mRNA levels (MR) as

$$MP = bb_R MR + bc_R + c + c_P + be_R + PDT + e_P \quad (4).$$

Based on model (4)

- i. We first estimated  $\text{var}(be_R + PDT + e_P)$  as  $\hat{\sigma}_{all}^2$  and  $bb_R$  as  $\hat{b}_{all}$  from fitting the above model with the 8,424 corrected mass spec and RNA-Seq data points pooled from the two replicates (Dataset S1). By independence, we have

$$\text{var}(be_R + PDT + e_P) = b^2 \text{var}(e_R) + \text{var}(PDT) + \text{var}(e_P)$$

- ii. We next estimated  $\text{var}(e_R)$  as  $\hat{\sigma}_R^2$  and  $b_R$  as  $\hat{b}_R$  from fitting model (1) with the 77 NanoString (“TR”) vs RNA-Seq (“MR”) data points, after removing two outliers (Dataset S2).
- iii. We could not estimate  $\text{var}(e_P)$  from directly fitting model (3), as TP data is not available. As a surrogate, we estimated  $\text{var}(e_P)$  as  $\hat{\sigma}_P^2$  from the following linear model that quantifies the stochastic error in mass spec replicate data:

$$MP_{ij} = \text{avg}MP_i + (e_P)_{ij}, j=1,2 \quad (5),$$

where  $MP_{ij}$  is the corrected mass spec data for the  $i$ th protein in the  $j$ th replicate in Schwanhausser et al., and  $\text{avg}MP_i$  is the average of our corrected protein data for the  $i$ th protein,  $i = 1, \dots, 4,212$  (Dataset S1). Please note that  $\hat{\sigma}_P^2$  is potentially an underestimate of the protein error as we only consider the stochastic error, not the systematic error.

- iv. From the estimates  $\hat{\sigma}_{all}^2$ ,  $\hat{b}_{all}$ ,  $\hat{\sigma}_R^2$ ,  $\hat{b}_R$  and  $\hat{\sigma}_P^2$  above, we estimate  $\text{var}(PDT)$  as

$$\hat{\sigma}_{PDT}^2 = \hat{\sigma}_{all}^2 - \left( \frac{\hat{b}_{all}}{\hat{b}_R} \right)^2 \hat{\sigma}_R^2 - \hat{\sigma}_P^2$$

Hence, we have successfully decomposed the variance estimate  $\hat{\sigma}_{all}^2$ , i.e. the estimated variance of residuals between measured protein levels and measured mRNA levels, into 3 components:

- $\hat{\sigma}_R^2$ —RNA error (23.3% of  $\hat{\sigma}_{all}^2$ )
- $\hat{\sigma}_P^2$ —protein error (7% of  $\hat{\sigma}_{all}^2$ )
- $\hat{\sigma}_{PDT}^2$ —protein degradation & translation (69.6% of  $\hat{\sigma}_{all}^2$ )

From the diagram and the above calculation, we also derived the percentage of variability in the unobserved true protein levels explained by the unobserved true mRNA levels.

$$\frac{\hat{\sigma}_{MP}^2 - \hat{\sigma}_P^2 - \hat{\sigma}_{PDT}^2}{\hat{\sigma}_{MP}^2 - \hat{\sigma}_P^2} = 55.9\%,$$

where  $\hat{\sigma}_{MP}^2$  is the variance of the corrected measured protein levels.

We separately estimated the stochastic mRNA error from the replicate RNA-Seq measurements of the 4,212 genes (Dataset S1). The stochastic mRNA error contributes 0.8% of  $\hat{\sigma}_{all}^2$ .

### **The contribution of mRNA to protein levels for all mouse genes**

To estimate gene expression levels for all genes we employed a deep RNA-Seq dataset that detected polyA+ mRNA for 15,325 protein coding genes in mouse Th2 cells<sup>38</sup>. To place these abundance estimates on the same scale as those of Schwanhausser et al’s data, the 3,841 mRNAs expressed above 1 RPKM (reads per kilobase of exon per million mapped reads) in common between the two datasets were identified. The Th2 cell data were then scaled to have the same median and variance for these common genes (Fig. S2). Because it is not possible to represent zero expression on a log scale, we derived very low mRNA expression levels for the 5,984 genes not detectably transcribed by assuming a mean of -3.0 (log10) and a variance of 0.5 (log10), following a suggestion by Hebenstreit et al<sup>38</sup>. The expected levels of protein expressed from all genes were then simulated using  $\hat{b}_R$ ,  $\hat{c}_R$ ,  $\hat{\sigma}_R^2$ ,  $\hat{b}$ ,  $\hat{c}$  and  $\hat{\sigma}_{PDT}^2$  estimated from our correction to Schwanhausser et al.’s NIH3T3 cell data, previous section.

### **The contributions of transcription, translation and protein and mRNA degradation**

To determine the relative contributions of measured RNA degradation (RD) and measured protein degradation (PD) to the variance in true protein expression (TP), we estimated their variances,  $\text{var}(\text{RD})$  and  $\text{var}(\text{PD})$ . We took Schwanhausser et al.’s calculated percentages for the contribution of RD and PD to explain the variance of their uncorrected mass whole proteome abundances<sup>1</sup> (6.4% for RD and 4.9% PD, Matthias Selbach personal communication). Since the variance of the uncorrected mass spec data is 0.93, we thus calculated  $\text{var}(\text{RD})$  and  $\text{var}(\text{PD})$  as 0.059 and 0.045 respectively. We then estimated the fraction of  $\text{var}(\text{RD})$  and  $\text{var}(\text{PD})$  due to stochastic error using the same approach employed to determine stochastic protein error and used this value to estimate  $\text{var}(\text{true RD})$  and  $\text{var}(\text{true PD})$  as 0.05 and 0.04 respectively. The relative contributions of  $\text{var}(\text{true RD})$  and  $\text{var}(\text{true PD})$  to  $\text{var}(\text{TP})$  (estimated as  $\hat{\sigma}_{MP}^2 - \hat{\sigma}_P^2$ ) was calculated for several scenarios (Table S1). For the same scenarios, we also determined the contribution of transcription to  $\text{var}(\text{TP})$  as  $(\text{var}(\text{TR}) - \text{var}(\text{true RD})) / \text{var}(\text{TP})$ , where  $\text{var}(\text{TR})$  was estimated as  $\hat{\sigma}_{MP}^2 - \hat{\sigma}_P^2 - \hat{\sigma}_{PDT}^2$ , and the contribution of translation as  $(\text{var}(\text{TP}) - \text{var}(\text{TR}) - \text{var}(\text{true PD})) / \text{var}(\text{TP})$  (Table S1).



## Acknowledgments

We are indebted to Matthias Selbach for providing his second whole proteome abundance estimates and ancillary data from the Schwanhauser et al. analysis. We acknowledge his patient answering of our questions about the Schwanhauser et al. paper. We also thank Sarah Teichmann for helping us better understand the Hebenstreit et al. analysis of mRNA expression and Susan Celniker and David Knowles for constructive comments on our manuscript. This work was supported in part by NIH grant P01 GM009655. Work at Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory was conducted under Department of Energy contract DEAC02-05CH11231.

## References

1. B. Schwanhauser, D. Busse, N. Li, G. Dittmar, J. Schuchhardt, J. Wolf, W. Chen, M. Selbach, Global quantification of mammalian gene expression control. *Nature* 2011, **473**. 337-42.
2. N. T. Ingolia, L. F. Lareau, J. S. Weissman, Ribosome profiling of mouse embryonic stem cells reveals the complexity and dynamics of mammalian proteomes. *Cell* 2011, **147**. 789-802.
3. E. H. Kislaukis, X. Zhu, R. H. Singer, beta-Actin messenger RNA localization and protein synthesis augment cell motility. *J. Cell Biol.* 1997, **136**. 1263-70.
4. M. D. Biggin, Animal transcription networks as highly connected, quantitative continua. *Dev. Cell.* 2011, **21**. 611-26.
5. R. de Sousa Abreu, L. O. Penalva, E. M. Marcotte, C. Vogel, Global signatures of protein and mRNA expression levels. *Mol Biosyst* 2009, **5**. 1512-26.
6. M. Rabani, J. Z. Levin, L. Fan, X. Adiconis, R. Raychowdhury, M. Garber, A. Gnirke, C. Nusbaum, N. Hacohen, N. Friedman, I. Amit, A. Regev, Metabolic labeling of RNA uncovers principles of RNA production and degradation dynamics in mammalian cells. *Nat Biotechnol* 2011, **29**. 436-42.
7. M. W. Hentze, L. C. Kuhn, Molecular control of vertebrate iron metabolism: mRNA-based regulatory circuits operated by iron, nitric oxide, and oxidative stress. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* 1996, **93**. 8175-82.
8. E. Yang, E. van Nimwegen, M. Zavolan, N. Rajewsky, M. Schroeder, M. Magnasco, J. E. Darnell, Jr., Decay rates of human mRNAs: correlation with functional characteristics and sequence attributes. *Genome Res.* 2003, **13**. 1863-72.
9. A. C. Hsieh, Y. Liu, M. P. Edlind, N. T. Ingolia, M. R. Janes, A. Sher, E. Y. Shi, C. R. Stumpf, C. Christensen, M. J. Bonham, S. Wang, P. Ren, M. Martin, K. Jessen, M. E. Feldman, J. S. Weissman, K. M. Shokat, C. Rommel, D. Ruggero, The translational landscape of mTOR signalling steers cancer initiation and metastasis. *Nature* 2012, **485**. 55-61.
10. O. Hobert, Gene regulation by transcription factors and microRNAs. *Science* 2008, **319**. 1785-6.
11. R. S. Pillai, S. N. Bhattacharyya, W. Filipowicz, Repression of protein synthesis by miRNAs: how many mechanisms? *Trends Cell Biol* 2007, **17**. 118-26.
12. V. A. Gennarino, G. D'Angelo, G. Dharmalingam, S. Fernandez, G. Russolillo, R. Sanges, M. Mutarelli, V. Belcastro, A. Ballabio, P. Verde, M. Sardiello, S. Banfi, Identification of microRNA-regulated gene networks by expression analysis of target genes. *Genome Res.* 2012, **22**. 1163-72.
13. C. Vogel, S. Abreu Rde, D. Ko, S. Y. Le, B. A. Shapiro, S. C. Burns, D. Sandhu, D. R. Boutz, E. M. Marcotte, L. O. Penalva, Sequence signatures and mRNA concentration can explain two-thirds of protein abundance variation in a human cell line. *Mol Syst Biol* 2010, **6**. 400.
14. M. Beck, A. Schmidt, J. Malmstroem, M. Claassen, A. Ori, A. Szymborska, F. Herzog, O. Rinner, J. Ellenberg, R. Aebersold, The quantitative proteome of a human cell line. *Mol Syst Biol* 2011, **7**. 549.
15. C. Vogel, E. M. Marcotte, Insights into the regulation of protein abundance from proteomic and transcriptomic analyses. *Nat Rev Genet* 2012, **13**. 227-32.
16. M. Bantscheff, S. Lemeer, M. M. Savitski, B. Kuster, Quantitative mass spectrometry in proteomics: critical review update from 2007 to the present. *Anal Bioanal Chem* 2012, **404**. 939-65.
17. T. Maier, M. Guell, L. Serrano, Correlation of mRNA and protein in complex biological samples. *FEBS Lett* 2009, **583**. 3966-73.
18. A. Hanamura, J. F. Caceres, A. Mayeda, B. R. Franza, Jr., A. R. Krainer, Regulated tissue-specific expression of antagonistic pre-mRNA splicing factors. *RNA* 1998, **4**. 430-44.
19. S. G. Gregory, M. Sekhon, J. Schein, S. Zhao, K. Osoegawa, C. E. Scott, R. S. Evans, P. W. Burridge, T. V. Cox, C. A. Fox, R. D. Hutton, I. R. Mullenger, K. J. Phillips, J. Smith, J. Stalker, G. J. Threadgold, E. Birney, K. Wylie, A. Chinwalla, J. Wallis, L. Hillier, J. Carter, T. Gaige, S. Jaeger, C. Kremtzki, D. Layman, J. Maas, R. McGrane, K. Mead, R. Walker, S. Jones, M. Smith, J. Asano, I. Bosdet, S. Chan, S. Chittaranjan, R. Chiu, C. Fjell, D. Fuhrmann, N. Girm, C. Gray, R. Guin, L. Hsiao, M. Krzywinski, R. Kutsche, S. S. Lee, C. Mathewson, C. McLeavy, S. Messervier, S. Ness, P. Pandoh, A. L. Prabhu, P. Saeedi, D. Smailus, L. Spence, J. Stott, S. Taylor, W. Terpstra, M. Tsai, J. Vardy, N. Wye, G. Yang, S. Shatsman, B. Ayodeji, K. Geer, G. Tsegaye, A. Shvartsbeyn, E. Gebregeorgis, M. Krol, D. Russell, L. Overton, J. A. Malek, M. Holmes, M. Heaney, J. Shetty, T. Feldblyum, W. C. Nierman, J. J. Catanese, T. Hubbard, R. H. Waterston, J. Rogers, P. J. de Jong, C. M. Fraser, M. Marra, J. D. McPherson, D. R. Bentley, A physical map of the mouse genome. *Nature* 2002, **418**. 743-50.

20. A. Wollfe, *Chromatin: Structure and Function*. 3rd Edition ed.; Academic Press: 1998.
21. M. F. Princiotta, D. Finzi, S. B. Qian, J. Gibbs, S. Schuchmann, F. Buttgerit, J. R. Bennink, J. W. Yewdell, Quantitating protein synthesis, degradation, and endogenous antigen processing. *Immunity* 2003, *18*. 343-54.
22. R. Brosi, H. P. Hauri, A. Kramer, Separation of splicing factor SF3 into two components and purification of SF3a activity. *J. Biol. Chem.* 1993, *268*. 17640-6.
23. P. G. Wong, S. L. Winter, E. Zaika, T. V. Cao, U. Oguz, J. M. Koomen, J. L. Hamlin, M. G. Alexandrow, Cdc45 limits replicon usage from a low density of preRCs in mammalian cells. *PLoS One* 2011, *6*. e17533.
24. H. Kimura, Y. Tao, R. G. Roeder, P. R. Cook, Quantitation of RNA polymerase II and its transcription factors in an HeLa cell: little soluble holoenzyme but significant amounts of polymerases attached to the nuclear substructure. *Mol. Cell. Biol.* 1999, *19*. 5383-92.
25. M. Zeiler, W. L. Straube, E. Lundberg, M. Uhlen, M. Mann, A Protein Epitope Signature Tag (PrEST) library allows SILAC-based absolute quantification and multiplexed determination of protein copy numbers in cell lines. *Mol Cell Proteomics* 2012, *11*. O111 009613.
26. T. Borggrefe, R. Davis, A. Bareket-Samish, R. D. Kornberg, Quantitation of the RNA polymerase II transcription machinery in yeast. *J. Biol. Chem.* 2001, *276*. 47150-3.
27. R. Milo, P. Jorgensen, U. Moran, G. Weber, M. Springer, BioNumbers--the database of key numbers in molecular and cell biology. *Nucleic Acids Res.* 2010, *38*. D750-3.
28. N. Aoyagi, D. A. Wassarman, Developmental and transcriptional consequences of mutations in *Drosophila* TAF(II)60. *Mol. Cell. Biol.* 2001, *21*. 6808-19.
29. J. C. Eissenberg, J. Ma, M. A. Gerber, A. Christensen, J. A. Kennison, A. Shilatifard, dELL is an essential RNA polymerase II elongation factor with a general role in development. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* 2002, *99*. 9894-9.
30. A. M. Deutschbauer, D. F. Jaramillo, M. Proctor, J. Kumm, M. E. Hillenmeyer, R. W. Davis, C. Nislow, G. Giaever, Mechanisms of haploinsufficiency revealed by genome-wide profiling in yeast. *Genetics* 2005, *169*. 1915-25.
31. D. U. Kim, J. Hayles, D. Kim, V. Wood, H. O. Park, M. Won, H. S. Yoo, T. Duhig, M. Nam, G. Palmer, S. Han, L. Jeffery, S. T. Baek, H. Lee, Y. S. Shim, M. Lee, L. Kim, K. S. Heo, E. J. Noh, A. R. Lee, Y. J. Jang, K. S. Chung, S. J. Choi, J. Y. Park, Y. Park, H. M. Kim, S. K. Park, H. J. Park, E. J. Kang, H. B. Kim, H. S. Kang, H. M. Park, K. Kim, K. Song, K. B. Song, P. Nurse, K. L. Hoe, Analysis of a genome-wide set of gene deletions in the fission yeast *Schizosaccharomyces pombe*. *Nat Biotechnol* 2010, *28*. 617-23.
32. S. Ghaemmaghami, W. K. Huh, K. Bower, R. W. Howson, A. Belle, N. Dephoure, E. K. O'Shea, J. S. Weissman, Global analysis of protein expression in yeast. *Nature* 2003, *425*. 737-41.
33. P. Lu, C. Vogel, R. Wang, X. Yao, E. M. Marcotte, Absolute protein expression profiling estimates the relative contributions of transcriptional and translational regulation. *Nat Biotechnol* 2007, *25*. 117-24.
34. G. K. Geiss, R. E. Bumgarner, B. Birditt, T. Dahl, N. Dowidar, D. L. Dunaway, H. P. Fell, S. Ferree, R. D. George, T. Grogan, J. J. James, M. Maysuria, J. D. Mitton, P. Oliveri, J. L. Osborn, T. Peng, A. L. Ratcliffe, P. J. Webster, E. H. Davidson, L. Hood, K. Dimitrov, Direct multiplexed measurement of gene expression with color-coded probe pairs. *Nat Biotechnol* 2008, *26*. 317-25.
35. J. C. Dohm, C. Lottaz, T. Borodina, H. Himmelbauer, Substantial biases in ultra-short read data sets from high-throughput DNA sequencing. *Nucleic Acids Res.* 2008, *36*. e105.
36. M. S. Cheung, T. A. Down, I. Latorre, J. Ahringer, Systematic bias in high-throughput sequencing data and its correction by BEADS. *Nucleic Acids Res.* 2011, *39*. e103.
37. S. Kuntumalla, J. C. Braisted, S. T. Huang, P. P. Parmar, D. J. Clark, H. Alami, Q. Zhang, A. Donohue-Rolfe, S. Tzipori, R. D. Fleischmann, S. N. Peterson, R. Pieper, Comparison of two label-free global quantitation methods, APEX and 2D gel electrophoresis, applied to the *Shigella dysenteriae* proteome. *Proteome Sci* 2009, *7*. 22.
38. D. Hebenstreit, M. Fang, M. Gu, V. Charoensawan, A. van Oudenaarden, S. A. Teichmann, RNA sequencing reveals two major classes of gene expression levels in metazoan cells. *Mol Syst Biol* 2011, *7*. 497.
39. D. Hebenstreit, A. Deonaraine, M. M. Babu, S. A. Teichmann, Duel of the fates: the role of transcriptional circuits and noise in CD4+ cells. *Curr Opin Cell Biol* 2012, *24*. 350-8.
40. J. R. Wisniewski, P. Ostasiewicz, K. Dus, D. F. Zielinska, F. Gnad, M. Mann, Extensive quantitative remodeling of the proteome between normal colon tissue and adenocarcinoma. *Mol Syst Biol* 2012, *8*. 611.
41. P. J. Bickel, K. A. Doksum, *Mathematical Statistics: Basic Ideas and Selected Topics*. 2nd ed.; Prentice Hall: 2001; Vol. 1.
42. I. Olkin, J. D. Finn, Testing correlated correlations. *Psychological Bulletin* 1990, *108*. 330-333.
43. E. P. Consortium, M. RM, S. J, S. M, D. I, H. RC, B. BE, G. TR, K. WJ, B. E. e. a. P. P. PMC3079585, A user's guide to the encyclopedia of DNA elements (ENCODE). *PLoS Biol.* 2011, *9*. e1001046.

**Table S1. The contribution of different steps in gene expression to the variance in true protein abundances between genes.**


	variance true protein levels (log10)	Percent contribution to variance in true protein levels				
		mRNA	Transcription	RNA degradation	Translation	Protein degradation
Schwanhausser 2 <sup>nd</sup> . <sup>a</sup>	0.93	40%	34%	6%	55%	5%
Li et al 4,212 genes <sup>b</sup>	0.34	56%	41%	15%	32%	12%
Li et al 15,325 genes <sup>c</sup>	0.77	80%	73%	7%	15%	5%
Li et al 21,309 genes <sup>d</sup>	1.8	92%	89%	3%	6%	2%

<sup>a</sup> Estimates from Schwanhausser et al., based on the 4,212 genes for which NIH3T3 cell protein and mRNA abundance data are available.


<sup>b</sup> Our estimates for same the 4,212 genes studied by Schwanhausser et al. after correcting the protein abundance data and taking experimental error into account.

<sup>c</sup> Our estimates for the 15,325 genes detectably expressed in mouse Th2 cells.

<sup>d</sup> Our estimates assuming that the 5,984 genes not detectably expressed in Th2 cells have mRNA expression of mean -3 (log10) and SD=0.5 (log10).



**Figure S1. Calibrating absolute protein abundances in HeLa cells.** **a**, The relationship between individually derived estimates for 66 housekeeping proteins (y axis) and Wisniewski et al.'s whole proteome estimates from HeLa cells (x axis) (Dataset S3). The two part line of best fit used to correct the whole proteome estimates is shown (solid red line) as is the single linear regression (dashed red line). **b**, The fit of different regression models for the data in panel a. The y axis shows the leave-one-out cross validation root mean square error for each model. The x axis shows the protein abundance used to separate the data for two part linear regressions. The red curve shows the optimum change point for a two part linear model is at an abundance of  $\sim 10^{6.8}$  molecules per cell. The dashed red horizontal line shows the root mean square error for the single linear regression.



**Figure S2. Scaling Hebenstreit et al.'s mRNA abundances.** The distribution of mRNA abundances from three datasets are shown. The 3,841 mRNAs expressed above 1 RPKM in the Hebenstreit et al. RNA-Seq data that are in common with mRNAs detected by Schwanhausser et al were identified (dashed red line). These abundances were then scaled to have the same median and variance as Schwanhausser et al data (solid red line). This scaling was in addition applied to all other genes in the Hebenstreit et al. data and the resulting values used in the simulation shown in Figure 5.