# Evidence for functional and non-functional classes of peptides translated from long non-coding RNAs

Jorge Ruiz-Orera[1,*], Pol Verdaguer-Grau[2], José Luis Villanueva-Cañas[1], Xavier Messeguer[2], M.Mar Albà[1,3,*]

[1]Evolutionary Genomics Group, Research Programme on Biomedical Informatics, Hospital del Mar Research Institute, Universitat Pompeu Fabra, Barcelona, Spain; [2]Computer Sciences Department, Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya, Barcelona, Spain; [3]Catalan Institution for Research and Advanced Studies, Barcelona, Spain.

*To whom correspondence should be addressed.

Running title: pervasive translation

Keywords: ribosome profiling, translation, de novo gene, long non-coding RNA, peptide, polymorphism, natural selection

# Abstract

There is accumulating evidence that some genes have originated *de novo* from previously non-coding genomic sequences. However, the processes underlying *de novo* gene birth are still enigmatic. In particular, the appearance of a new functional protein seems highly improbable unless there is already a pool of neutrally evolving peptides that can at some point acquire new functions. Here we show for the first time that such peptides do not only exist but that they are prevalent among the translation products of mouse genes that lack homologues in rat and human. The data suggests that the translation of these peptides is due to the chance occurrence of open reading frames with a favorable codon composition. Our approach combines ribosome profiling experiments, proteomics data and non-synonymous and synonymous nucleotide polymorphism analysis. We propose that effectively neutral processes involving the expression of thousands of transcripts all the way down to proteins provide a basis for *de novo* gene evolution.

The mammalian genome is pervasively transcribed, this includes functional genes but also

thousands of transcripts that are not conserved across species and which show weak or no

signatures of natural selection[1-3]. Many of the latter transcripts are annotated as long non-

coding RNAs (lncRNAs) because they lack conserved long open reading frames (ORFs).

Recent studies based on the sequencing of ribosome-protected RNA fragments (ribosome

profiling) have reported that a surprisingly large fraction of these transcripts is likely to translate

small peptides[4-9], although the significance of this finding has remained elusive.

Each ribosome profiling experiment generates millions of ribosome footprints that are

subsequently mapped to the genome or the transcriptome to identify open reading frames

(ORFs) that are being translated[10]. The codon-by-codon movement of the ribosome along the

coding sequence results in a characteristic pattern of three nucleotide periodicity of the mapped

reads, which makes ribosome profiling a very useful method to detect novel events of

translation[4,11,12]. Given enough sequence coverage the technique can uncover low-abundant

small peptides that would be otherwise difficult to detect by standard proteomics

approaches[13,14].

To assess the functional relevance of novel events of translation one can use the ratio between

the number of non-synonymous and synonymous substitutions in the putative coding

sequences[4,5]. However, this method requires an alignment of at least two homologous

sequences. A more general approach that can be used in the absence of homology is the ratio

between the number of non-synonymous and synonymous single nucleotide polymorphisms,

compared to the one expected under neutrality. Under no selection, non-synonymous and

synonymous polymorphisms accumulate at the same rate, whereas under purifying selection

there is a deficit of non-synonymous polymorphisms because some amino acid changes disrupt

the protein's function[15]. Single nucleotide polymorphism analysis can be performed on a gene-

by-gene basis or in pools of sequences that share certain features[2,16].

We previously observed that, as a whole, putatively translated lncRNAs and young protein-

coding genes share a number of similarities, such as small ORF size and weak selective

constraints, compared with more widely conserved genes[8]. This pointed to a link between the

translation of lncRNAs and the evolution of new proteins, but it did not solve the key question of

whether translation of new ORFs could occur in the absence of selection at the protein level.

This is a fundamental issue because for a new protein to acquire a function it first needs to be

produced in the cell at significant amounts. Here by employing a combination of ribosome

profiling data, sequence analysis and single nucleotide polymorphism information we obtain

strong evidence that the majority of mouse proteins that are not conserved in rat or human

selection evolve in a neutral manner. This study renders visible for the first time a layer of

protein expression that is not dependent on selective processes, filling a gap in our

understanding of the processes underlying *de novo* gene birth.

**Results**

First we set to identify translated open reading frames (ORFs) in mouse protein-coding genes

(codRNAs) and long non-coding RNAs (lncRNAs) using ribosome-profiling RNA-sequencing

(Ribo-Seq) data from eight different tissues and cell lines (Supplementary Table 1 and

references therein). In contrast to RNA sequencing (RNA-Seq) reads, which are expected to

cover the complete transcript, Ribo-Seq reads correspond to regions bound by ribosomes. We

mapped the RNA-Seq and Ribo-Seq reads to the mouse Ensembl gene annotations and, for the

sake of completeness, also to a set of previously obtained novel mouse transcripts that did not

correspond to annotated genes[3].

We used the RibORF program[4] to identify *bona fide* translated sequences among ORFs

covered by at least 10 Ribo-Seq reads in transcripts expressed in one or more tissues (Fig. 1a

and Supplementary Table 1). This program calculates a score for each ORF depending on the

3-nucleotide periodicity and uniformity of the mapped reads. Using a highly stringent RibORF

score cut-off of 0.7[4] we found that about 90% of the coding genes (15,020), and 20% of the

annotated lncRNAs (539), were predicted to be translated in at least one sample. Additionally,

we identified 286  genes that did not map to the gene annotations but contained translated

ORFs (Fig. 1b). A widely used criterion to annotate a transcript as protein-coding is the

presence of an ORF encoding a protein of at least 100 amino acids[17]. Not surprisingly, the vast

majority of ORFs translated from annotated and novel lncRNAs encoded proteins smaller than

100 amino acids (smORFs).

We hypothesized that some of the translated ORFs may evolve in a neutral manner and

constitute a reservoir for the evolution of new protein-coding genes. To test this hypothesis, we

first identified translated ORFs that were mouse-specific and then tested them for signatures of

selection. We performed exhaustive sequence similarity searches of the ORFs against high

coverage transcriptomes from human and rat as well as against the annotated proteomes of

101 different eukaryotic species (Fig. 2a, Supplementary Table 2 for a list of species, see

Methods for more details). For these searches we discarded any proteins shorter than 24 amino

acids, as the detection of homologues may be compromised in such cases due to lack of

sufficient sequence information. We identified 1,980 different translated ORFs that showed no

homology to expressed sequences in other species (class non-conserved or NC). In general,

these ORFs had lower codon usage bias than conserved ORFs, as measured by a previously

described hexamer-based coding score metric[8] (Fig. 2b).

To measure the strength of selection in conserved and non-conserved translated ORFs we

employed a large collection of mouse single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs) for the house

mouse subspecies *Mus musculus castaneus* [18]. We could map a total of 324,729 SNPs to the

set of translated ORFs. We grouped the ORFs into three different classes on the basis of

conservation and coding score (Fig. 2b), and calculated the ratio between the number of

observed non-synonymous and synonymous SNPs (PN/PS(obs)) in each class. We then

normalized it by the same ratio expected under neutrality (PN/PS(exp)). The expected PN/PS

was estimated using a table of nucleotide mutation frequencies in *Mus musculus castaneus* and

the observed codon frequencies in each set of sequences of interest (Supplementary Tables 3

and 4). This allowed us not only to compare the strength of selection across different sets of

sequences, as done in a previous study of ORFs translated from lncRNAs[8], but also to discard

selection if the normalized PN/PS was not significantly different from 1. Specifically, we used a

chi-square test that compared the number of observed and expected non-synonymous and

synonymous SNPs in each sequence set (Supplementary Table 5). As expected, the PN/PS of

randomly selected ORFs from introns was approximately 1.  Instead, the PN/PS of conserved

ORFs was around 0.15 (Fig. 2c, chi-square test p-value < $10^{-5}$), consistent with protein

functionality. One example in this group was Stannin[19,20], a highly conserved peptide that

regulates neuronal cell apoptosis (Fig. 3).

Non-conserved ORFs with high coding scores (NC-H coding score ≥ 0.1014, Fig. 2b and c,

Supplementary Figure 1) had weak but significant signatures of selection (p-value < 0.05),

possibly because of the existence of some functional mouse-specific genes. In contrast, the

PN/PS ratio of the remaining non-conserved ORFs was not significantly different from 1,

consistent with neutral evolution. Very similar results were obtained for non-conserved genes

annotated as coding or lncRNA (Fig. 2c) and the two sets were merged into a single group of

neutrally evolving ORFs (neutral ORFs). This set comprised about two thirds of the non-

conserved ORFs (1,291 out of 1,980 ORFs analysed), and represented ~6.8% of the total

number of mouse translated ORFs.

We used proteomics data from the PRIDE database[21] to further validate the translation of this

latter group of proteins. Despite their small size (median 44 amino acids), a limiting factor for

their detection by standard proteomics-based tecniques[22], we found proteomics evidence for 32

of the neutral ORFs (see Methods). This represents 2.5% of the proteins in this set (compared

to less than 0.2% false positive rate, see Methods). This fraction is similar to the one obtained

for conserved proteins subsampled to have a similar size distribution as the neutral ORFs

(2.9%; in contrast, about 41% of all conserved ORFs have proteomics evidence). The test

based on the PN/PS ratio confirmed that this subset of 32 ORFs did not deviate significantly

from neutrality either (Supplementary Table 5).

The above analyses grouped the sequences into classes before computing the PN/PS ratio. In

general, ORF-by-ORF analysis was not possible because the ORFs were small and contained

too few SNPs. Nevertheless, 41 of the neutrally evolving ORFs contained 10 or more SNPs,

and we decided to compute a normalized PN/PS ratio for these individual cases. The median

PN/PS of these ORFs was around 1 and the distribution of PN/PS values was very different

from that of conserved ORFs (Fig. 2d, Wilcoxon test, p-value < $10^{-5}$), consistent with the

previous results. Finally, we quantified the number of ORFs that contained SNPs that generated

premature stop codons, truncating more than half of the ORF, in the set of neutrally evolving

ORFs and in the set of conserved ORFs. In the first case we found 72 out of 1,282 ORFs that

contained this type of mutation (5.6%) and in the second case 296 out of 16,892 ORFs (1.75%).

Considering that neutral ORFs are in general much shorter than conserved ORFs (median

protein size 44 *versus* 412 amino acids), and thus less likely to accumulate ORF-truncating

mutations by chance alone, the data clearly indicates a strong excess of ORF-truncating SNPs

in neutral ORFs with respect to conserved ORFs. These analyses further support that the

selective pressures acting on both kinds of ORFs are very different.

We next inspected in more detail the ribosome profiling patterns of neutral ORFs with respect to

the rest of translated ORFs (hereafter called "functional"). Genes with a recent origin are usually

expressed at lower levels than older genes[23,24,3], so it was not surprising to observe that

neutrally evolving ORFs were associated with a lower number of Ribo-Seq reads per base than

the rest of translated ORFs (median 0.193 versus 0.474, respectively, Supplementary figure 2).

Consistent with translation, read periodicity in both neutral and functional ORFs was much

higher than the random expectation of 0.33 (median values 0.70 and 0.80, respectively; see

examples in Figure 3). Importantly, the results were highly reproducible across tissues (Figure

4a for hippocampus and embryonic stem cells; Supplementary Figure 3 hippocampus and

brain), a result we would not expect in the case of spurious ribosome profiling signals. In

general, the RibORF score of the translated ORFs was positively related to the number of

mapped Ribo-Seq reads (Spearman correlation R=0.408), and to the size of the ORFs

(Spearman correlation R=0.193). When we controlled for these two parameters, neutral and

functional ORFs had equivalent distributions of RibORF score, periodicity and uniformity values

(Figure 4b).

Subsequently, we compared our results to those obtained with two negative controls. The first

control contained ORFs in alternative frames of annotated protein coding sequences with

experimental protein evidence ("off-frame"). The second one contained randomly occurring

ORFs in small nuclear and nucleolar annotated RNA sequences ("sRNA"). The latter RNAs are

sometimes detected in ribosome profiling experiments due to the formation of ribonucleoprotein

particles that protect the RNA from degradation[25]. As before, we only considered ORFs with at

least 10 Ribo-Seq mapped reads. As expected, the vast majority of the ORFs in these controls

did not display significant 3-nucleotide read periodicity (Supplementary figure 2, see a specific

example in Figure 3). We found that only 234 out of 13,596 ORFs in "off-frame", and 10 out of

304 ORFs in "sRNA", had a RibORF score ≥0.7 (the threshold employed throughout our study).

This corresponds to an overall false discovery rate (FDR) of 1.75%, much lower than the

fraction of neutrally evolving proteins detected in our main analysis (6.8%).

Some transcripts contained relatively long ORFs but were not translated. One example of this

sort was the previously described *de novo* non-coding gene *Poldi*[26] that lacked any evidence of

translation in the data we analysed. We next asked which factors may influence the translation

of some neutrally evolving ORFs but not of others. First, we inspected the translation initiation

sequence context but did not detect any significant differences between translated and non-

translated ORFs (Supplementary Figure 4). We then hypothesized that the ORF coding score

could affect the "translatability" of the transcript because codons that are abundant in coding

sequences are expected to be more efficiently translated than other codons. Consistent with

this hypothesis, we found that the translated neutrally evolving ORFs exhibited higher coding

scores than non-translated ORFs with otherwise similar characteristics (Fig. 5a, Translated

versus non-translated Wilcoxon test, p-value < $10^{-5}$). Importantly, we obtained a similar result

after controlling for gene expression level (Fig. 5b, Wilcoxon test, p-value < $10^{-5}$). This is

consistent with codon composition having an effect *per se* in ORF translation. When controlling

by coding score, expression level, but not ORF length, had an effect on the translatability of the

transcript (Fig. 5c).

The results suggest that the neutral ORFs that are translated are enriched in codons that are

frequently found in functional protein coding sequences. This is consistent with the observation

that abundant codons enhance translation elongation[27], whereas rare codons might affect the

stability of the mRNA[28]. It has been previously hypothesized that the distinction between

translated and non-translated lncRNAs may be related to the relative amount of the lncRNA in

the nucleus and the cytoplasm[4]. However, we found evidence that some lncRNAs with nuclear

functions, such as *Malat1* and *Neat1*, were translated, suggesting that the cytosolic fraction of a

transcript can be translated independently of its role or preferred location.

**DISCUSSION**

The molecular mechanisms underlying *de novo* gene evolution are still poorly understood[29,30,31].

The sudden appearance of a new protein-coding gene from a genomic segment seems *a priori*

highly improbable, but the process becomes much more likely if the genome is already being

pervasively transcribed and translated outside functional protein-coding genes. An excess of

transcription was already noted in the first large-scale cDNA sequencing efforts performed in

human and mouse[32], and more recent studies have found a high rate of transcriptional turnover

when comparing closely related species[33]. Here we have shown that many of these transcripts

are translated even if they only contain small ORFs, with the data currently available we have

been able to identify 1,291 peptides in 1,132  genes that are likely to be of recent evolutionary

origin and that show no signs of selection. This number is likely to be a gross underestimate

because many transcripts are expressed at low levels, limiting their detection, and many cell

types and tissues have not yet been sampled. According to recent estimates, the cost of

transcription and translation in multicellular organisms is probably too small to overcome genetic

drift[34]. Therefore, these activities may be effectively neutral. Our results indeed support that

there is no barrier for the production of peptides that do not confer an immediate selective

advantage.

The putative precursors of novel proteins identified here are of small size, which is consistent

with observations for functional *de novo* genes identified in previous studies[23,35–37]. We have

also shown that random ORFs with a more favorable, coding-like, hexamer composition are

more likely to be translated than other ORFs. Codon usage bias in functional sequences is

related to the abundance of different tRNAs and correlates with expression level[38,39]. Thus, it

seems logical that the translated neutral ORFs are biased towards those codons that are

translated more efficiently.

The process of *de novo* gene origination involves the gain of a useful function by a previously

non-functional sequence. The rate at which this happens remains to be determined but it has

been observed that many random peptide sequences can function as secretion signals[40], and

selection for ATP-binding activity in a library of randomly generated 80 amino acid polypeptides

successfully identified several candidates capable of binding to ATP[41]. Recent experiments

performed in *E.coli* also suggest that random sequences can often affect cellular growth[42]. The

pervasive translation of the transcriptome implies that *de novo* gene evolution has much more

material at its disposal than previously thought.

**METHODS**

**Transcript assembly**

We used strand-specific polyA+ RNA sequencing data (RNA-Seq) data from different mouse

and human tissues to assembly the species transcriptomes (Gene Expression Omnibus mouse

GSE69241[3], GSE43721[43], and GSE43520[44]; human GSE69241[3]). The mouse RNA samples

were extracted from strain Balb/C. RNA-Seq reads were filtered by length (> 25 nucleotides)

and by quality using Condetri (v.2.2)[45] with the following settings: -hq = 30 –lq = 10. We aligned

the reads to the corresponding reference species genome with Tophat (v. 2.0.8, –N 3, -a 5 and

–m 1)[46]. Multiple mapping to several locations in the genome was allowed unless otherwise

stated. We assembled the transcriptome with Stringtie[47], merging the reads from all the

samples, with parameters -f 0.01, and -M 0.2. We used the species transcriptome as a guide

(Ensembl v.75), including all annotated isoforms, but permitting the assembly of annotated and

novel isoforms and genes (antisense, intergenic and intronic) as well. We excluded lncRNAs

that overlapped annotated pseudogenes or that showed significant sequence similarity to

known protein-coding sequences (BLASTP, e-value < $10^{-4}$). In the case of rat we employed a

previously generated transcript assembly[48].

**Ribosome profiling data**

We used ribosome profiling data (Ribo-Seq) from 8 different mouse tissues or cell lines (see

Supplementary Table 1), obtained from Gene Expression Omnibus under accession numbers

GSE51424[49], GSE50983[50], GSE22001[51], GSE62134[52], GSE72064[53], and GSE41246. Only

datasets corresponding to non-pathogenic conditions were considered. The reads from the

experimental replicates were merged before using RibORF to increase the resolution of the

read periodicity, as done in the original RibORF paper[4]. For all analyses we considered only

genes expressed at significant levels in at least one sample (RNA-Seq fragments per kilobase

per Million mapped reads (FPKM) > 0.2). The expression of the genes detected in these

samples is expected to be highly representative of the *Mus musculus* species as a whole. We

mapped several brain RNA-Seq datasets from *Mus musculus castaneus*[33] to the mouse

assembled transcriptome using NextGenMap[54]. As expected, the vast majority of the genes

expressed in brain samples from C57BL/6 mice[49] also showed evidence of expression in *Mus*

*musculus castaneus* brain RNA samples[33](Supplementary Table 6).

We discarded anomalous reads (length < 26 or > 33 nt) and reads that mapped to annotated

rRNAs and tRNAs in mouse from the Ribo-Seq sequencing datasets. Next, reads were mapped

to the assembled mouse genome (mm10) with Bowtie (v. 0.12.7, parameters -k 1 -m 20 -n 1 --

best --strata). Considering that the ORFs had to be extensively covered by reads to be

considered translated (high uniformity), we decided to include multiple mapped reads so as not

to compromise the detection of paralogous proteins (Supplementary Fig. 7). We used the

mapping of the Ribo-Seq reads to the complete set of annotated coding sequences in mouse to

compute the position of the P-site (second binding site for tRNA in the ribosome) for reads of

different size, as previously described[10,12].

**Identification of translated ORFs**

We predicted all translated ORFs (ATG to STOP) with a minimum length of 9 amino acids in the

transcripts with RibORF (v.0.1)[4]. Only ORFs with a minimum of 10 mapped Ribo-Seq reads

were considered. The RibORF classifier is based on a support vector machine algorithm,

originally applied to human transcripts. The input parameters are the read periodicity and the

read uniformity. The first one is the fraction of reads that correspond to the correct frame and

the second one corresponds to the percentage of maximum entropy, a value of 1 indicates a

completely even distribution of reads. For each ORF the program computes a score that

depends on the values of these two parameters[4]. We used the same score cut-off as in the

original paper (≥ 0.7), which had a reported false positive rate of 0.67% and false negative rate

of 2.5%.

We eliminated any redundancy in the translated ORFs by taking the longest ORF when several

overlapping translated ORFs were detected in the same gene. The identification of translated

ORFs was done separately for the different tissues (Supplementary Table 1), and the data was

subsequently integrated, taking the tissue with the highest RibORF score as representative.

Differences in the number of translated ORFs in different tissues were related to the depth of

sequencing and the number of reads that mapped to the top 5 most highly expressed proteins

(Supplementary Fig. 6 and 7, respectively). For genes with no evidence of translation we

selected the longest ORF across all transcripts for comparative purposes. Selecting the longest

ORF was justified by the fact that, in translated ORFs, the ORF with the highest number of

mapped Ribo-Seq reads was usually the longest ORF (75.7% for codRNAs and 84% for

lncRNAs). We also generated a set of 4,013 randomly taken ORFs from introns, after discarding

ORFs that showed significant sequence similarity to known proteins from the same species

(BLASTP, e-value < $10^{-4}$).

We generated a negative control set by combining out-of-frame ORFs in mouse coding genes

with experimental protein evidence according to Uniprot ("off-frame") and randomly occurring

ORFs in mouse small nuclear and nucleolar RNAs ("sRNAs"). These ORFs were required to

have at least 10 Ribo-Seq mapped reads and were processed in the same manner as the main

set of ORFs under study. The total number of sequences in the negative control was 13,900.

We also generated a positive control set composed of 2,163 randomly taken annotated mouse

coding sequences with protein evidence in Uniprot. With these controls we estimated a false

positive rate of 1.75% and a false negative rate of 2.54% for the above mentioned RibORF

score cut-off.

**Sequence conservation**

We searched for mouse translated ORF homologues in the human and rat transcriptomes using

TBLASTN (limited to one strand, e-value < $10^{-4}$)[55]. We also performed sequence similarity

searches against the annotated proteomes of 67 mammalian-species and 34 non-mammalian

eukaryotes from a diverse range of groups compiled in a previous study[48], using BLASTP (e-

value < $10^{-4}$). For these searches we only considered query proteins of size 24 amino acids or

longer, as shorter proteins may not contain sufficient information to perform homology searches.

Mouse ORFs that did not have any homology hits in other species were classified as non-

conserved, the rest as conserved. Translated non-conserved ORFs located upstream or

downstream of another longer ORF in a conserved transcript (uORFs and dORFs) were

excluded from this analysis.

We inspected the rat genomic syntenic regions of translated ORFs using LiftOver[56]. We

classified the ORFs in two groups depending on whether the ORF was truncated in rat or not

(the truncation had to affect more than half of the protein). For neutrally evolving ORFs the

number of cases in which the ORF was truncated was similar to the number of cases in which it

was not truncated, and in both cases the polymorphism patterns were consistent with neutrality

(Supplementary Table 5). This indicated that, for this group, the presence of a similar ORF in rat

does not imply functional conservation of the ORF. Therefore, we did not use information on rat

genomic synteny to classify the genes as conserved/non-conserved.

**Single nucleotide polymorphism analysis**

We obtained single nucleotide polymorphism (SNP) data from 20 individuals of the house

mouse subspecies *Mus musculus castaneus*[18]. We classified SNPs in ORFs as non-

synonymous (PN, amino acid altering) and synonymous (PS, not amino-acid altering). We

calculated the PN/PS ratio in each ORF group by using the sum of PN and PS in all the

sequences ((PN/PS)obs). We calculated the expected PN/PS under neutrality ((PN/PS)exp)

using the mutation frequencies between pairs of nucleotides in *Mus musculus castaneus* and

the codon composition of the different sequences or sets of sequences under study

(Supplementary Tables 2 to 5). The observed transition to transversion ratio was 4.42, very

similar to the 4.26 value obtained in early observations based on mouse-rat divergence data[57].

We tested for purifying selection by the number of observed and expected non-synonymous

and synonymous SNPs using a chi-square test with one degree of freedom. Positively selected

mutations are rapidly fixed in the population and their effect is expected to be negligible when

using SNP data.

**Proteomics data**

We used the proteomics database PRIDE[21] to search for peptide matches in the proteins

encoded by various gene sets. For a protein to have proteomics evidence, we required at least

two distinct perfect matches of peptides that did not map to any other protein in the dataset,

allowing for up to two mismatches. These are very stringent conditions with a false positive rate

< 0.2%[48].

**Coding score**

We used a previously described metric based on hexamer frequencies to calculate the coding

score of the sequences[8]. The method uses a table of pre-calculated hexamer scores that

measure the relative frequency of each hexamer in coding versus non-coding sequences.

These scores are then used to evaluate the coding propensity of a sequence based on its

hexamer composition. The method has been implemented in a computational program called

CIPHER that can be accessed online (http:// http://evolutionarygenomics.upf.edu/cipher).

**Statistical tests and plots**

The generation of plots and statistical tests was performed with the R package[58].

**Data availability**

Transcript assemblies from mouse, human and rat, as well as the mouse open reading frames (ORFs) predicted to be translated have been deposited at figshare (http://dx.doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.4702375). The code and executable file to calculate the coding score can be accessed at https://github.com/jorruior/CIPHER. The C program to calculated the PN/PS expected under neutrality is available at https://figshare.com/articles/computePNPS_c/5085706. Supplementary file 1 contains supplementary tables and figures.

**REFERENCES**

1. Kutter, C. *et al.* Rapid turnover of long noncoding RNAs and the evolution of gene expression. *PLoS Genet.* **8,** e1002841 (2012).

2. Wiberg, R. A. W. *et al.* Assessing Recent Selection and Functionality at Long Noncoding RNA Loci in the Mouse Genome. *Genome Biol. Evol.* **7,** 2432–44 (2015).

3. Ruiz-Orera, J. *et al.* Origins of De Novo Genes in Human and Chimpanzee. *PLOS Genet.* **11,** e1005721 (2015).

4. Ji, Z., Song, R., Regev, A. & Struhl, K. Many lncRNAs, 5'UTRs, and pseudogenes are translated and some are likely to express functional proteins. *Elife* **4,** e08890 (2015).

5. Raj, A. *et al.* Thousands of novel translated open reading frames in humans inferred by ribosome footprint profiling. *Elife* **5,** (2016).

6. Ingolia, N. T., Lareau, L. F. & Weissman, J. S. Ribosome profiling of mouse embryonic stem cells reveals the complexity and dynamics of mammalian proteomes. *Cell* **147,** 789–802 (2011).

7. Ingolia, N. T. *et al.* Ribosome Profiling Reveals Pervasive Translation Outside of

Annotated Protein-Coding Genes. *Cell Rep.* **8,** 1365–79 (2014).

8.   Ruiz-Orera, J., Messeguer, X., Subirana, J. A. & Alba, M. M. Long non-coding RNAs as

a source of new peptides. *Elife* **3,** e03523 (2014).

9.   Wilson, B. A. & Masel, J. Putatively noncoding transcripts show extensive association

with ribosomes. *Genome Biol. Evol.* **3,** 1245–52 (2011).

10.   Ingolia, N. T., Ghaemmaghami, S., Newman, J. R. S. & Weissman, J. S. Genome-wide

analysis in vivo of translation with nucleotide resolution using ribosome profiling. *Science*

**324,** 218–23 (2009).

11.   Bazzini, A. A. *et al.* Identification of small ORFs in vertebrates using ribosome

footprinting and evolutionary conservation. *EMBO J.* **33,** 981–93 (2014).

12.   Calviello, L. *et al.* Detecting actively translated open reading frames in ribosome profiling

data. *Nat Meth* **13,** 165–170 (2016).

13.   Aspden, J. L. *et al.* Extensive translation of small ORFs revealed by Poly-Ribo-Seq. *Elife*

e03528 (2014). doi:10.7554/eLife.03528

14.   Mackowiak, S. D. *et al.* Extensive identification and analysis of conserved small ORFs in

animals. *Genome Biol.* **16,** 1–21 (2015).

15.   Sunyaev, S., Kondrashov, F. A., Bork, P. & Ramensky, V. Impact of selection, mutation

rate and genetic drift on human genetic variation. *Hum. Mol. Genet.* **12,** 3325–3330

(2003).

16.   Gayà-Vidal, M. & Albà, M. M. Uncovering adaptive evolution in the human lineage. *BMC*

*Genomics* **15,** 599 (2014).

17.   Dinger, M. E., Pang, K. C., Mercer, T. R. & Mattick, J. S. Differentiating protein-coding

and noncoding RNA: challenges and ambiguities. *PLoS Comput. Biol.* **4,** e1000176

(2008).

18.   Harr, B. *et al.* Genomic resources for wild populations of the house mouse, Mus

musculus and its close relative Mus spretus. *Sci. Data* **3,** 160075 (2016).

19.   Buck-Koehntop, B. A., Mascioni, A., Buffy, J. J. & Veglia, G. Structure, dynamics, and

membrane topology of stannin: a mediator of neuronal cell apoptosis induced by

trimethyltin chloride. *J. Mol. Biol.* **354,** 652–65 (2005).

20.   Pueyo, J. I. *et al.* Hemotin, a Regulator of Phagocytosis Encoded by a Small ORF and

432             Conserved across Metazoans. *PLoS Biol* **14,** e1002395 (2016).

433    21.    Vizcaíno, J. A. *et al.* 2016 update of the PRIDE database and its related tools. *Nucleic*

434            *Acids Res.* **44,** D447–D456 (2016).

435    22.    Slavoff, S. A. *et al.* Peptidomic discovery of short open reading frame-encoded peptides

436            in human cells. *Nat. Chem. Biol.* **9,** 59–64 (2013).

437    23.    Toll-Riera, M. *et al.* Origin of primate orphan genes: a comparative genomics approach.

438            *Mol. Biol. Evol.* **26,** 603–12 (2009).

439    24.    Xie, C. *et al.* Hominoid-specific de novo protein-coding genes originating from long non-

440            coding RNAs. *PLoS Genet.* **8,** e1002942 (2012).

441    25.    Ji, Z., Song, R., Huang, H., Regev, A. & Struhl, K. Transcriptome-scale RNase-

442            footprinting of RNA-protein complexes. *Nat. Biotechnol.* **34,** 410–413 (2016).

443    26.    Heinen, T. J. A. J., Staubach, F., Häming, D. & Tautz, D. Emergence of a new gene from

444            an intergenic region. *Curr. Biol.* **19,** 1527–31 (2009).

445    27.    Yu, C. *et al.* Codon Usage Influences the Local Rate of Translation Elongation to

446            Regulate Co-translational Protein Folding. *Mol. Cell* **59,** 744–754 (2015).

447    28.    Presnyak, V. *et al.* Codon optimality is a major determinant of mRNA stability. *Cell* **160,**

448            1111–24 (2015).

449    29.    Tautz, D. & Domazet-Lošo, T. The evolutionary origin of orphan genes. *Nat. Rev. Genet.*

450            **12,** 692–702 (2011).

451    30.    Schlötterer, C. Genes from scratch – the evolutionary fate of de novo genes. *Trends*

452            *Genet.* (2015). doi:10.1016/j.tig.2015.02.007

453    31.    McLysaght, A. & Hurst, L. D. Open questions in the study of de novo genes: what, how

454            and why. *Nat. Rev. Genet.* **17,** 567–578 (2016).

455    32.    Okazaki, Y. *et al.* Analysis of the mouse transcriptome based on functional annotation of

456            60,770 full-length cDNAs. *Nature* **420,** 563–73 (2002).

457    33.    Neme, R. & Tautz, D. Fast turnover of genome transcription across evolutionary time

458            exposes entire non-coding DNA to de novo gene emergence. *Elife* **5,** (2016).

459    34.    Lynch, M. & Marinov, G. K. The bioenergetic costs of a gene. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S.*

460            *A.* **112,** 15690–5 (2015).

35.    Carvunis, A.-R. *et al.* Proto-genes and de novo gene birth. *Nature* **487,** 370–4 (2012).

36.    Zhao, L., Saelao, P., Jones, C. D. & Begun, D. J. Origin and spread of de novo genes in
Drosophila melanogaster populations. *Science* **343,** 769–72 (2014).

37.    Wilson, B. A., Foy, S. G., Neme, R. & Masel, J. Young Genes are Highly Disordered as
Predicted by the Preadaptation Hypothesis of De Novo Gene Birth. *Nat. Ecol. Evol.* **1,**
0146–146 (2017).

38.    Plotkin, J. B. & Kudla, G. Synonymous but not the same: the causes and consequences
of codon bias. *Nat. Rev. Genet.* (2011). doi:10.1038/nrg2899

39.    Dana, A. & Tuller, T. The effect of tRNA levels on decoding times of mRNA codons.
*Nucleic Acids Res.* **42,** 9171–81 (2014).

40.    Kaiser, C. A., Preuss, D., Grisafi, P. & Botstein, D. Many random sequences functionally
replace the secretion signal sequence of yeast invertase. *Science* **235,** 312–7 (1987).

41.    Keefe, A. D. & Szostak, J. W. Functional proteins from a random-sequence library.
*Nature* **410,** 715–718 (2001).

42.    Neme, R., Amador, C., Yildirim, B., McConnell, E. & Tautz, D. Random sequences are
an abundant source of bioactive RNAs or peptides. *Nat. Ecol. Evol.* (2017).
doi:10.1038/s41559-017-0127

43.    Soumillon, M. *et al.* Cellular source and mechanisms of high transcriptome complexity in
the mammalian testis. *Cell Rep.* **3,** 2179–90 (2013).

44.    Necsulea, A. *et al.* The evolution of lncRNA repertoires and expression patterns in
tetrapods. *Nature* **505,** 635–40 (2014).

45.    Smeds, L. & Künstner, A. ConDeTri--a content dependent read trimmer for Illumina data.
*PLoS One* **6,** e26314 (2011).

46.    Kim, D. *et al.* TopHat2: accurate alignment of transcriptomes in the presence of
insertions, deletions and gene fusions. *Genome Biol.* **14,** R36 (2013).

47.    Pertea, M. *et al.* StringTie enables improved reconstruction of a transcriptome from
RNA-seq reads. *Nat Biotech* **33,** 290–295 (2015).

48.    Luis Villanueva-Cañas, J. *et al.* New Genes and Functional Innovation in Mammals.
*Genome Biol. Evol.* **9,** 1886–1900 (2017).

49.    Gonzalez, C. *et al.* Ribosome profiling reveals a cell-type-specific translational landscape
in brain tumors. *J. Neurosci.* **34,** 10924–36 (2014).

50.    Castañeda, J. *et al.* Reduced pachytene piRNAs and translation underlie spermiogenic
493           arrest in Maelstrom mutant mice. *EMBO J.* **33,** 1999–2019 (2014).
494    51.    Guo, H., Ingolia, N. T., Weissman, J. S. & Bartel, D. P. Mammalian microRNAs
495           predominantly act to decrease target mRNA levels. *Nature* **466,** 835–40 (2010).
496    52.    Diaz-Munoz, M. D. *et al.* The RNA-binding protein HuR is essential for the B cell
497           antibody response. *Nat Immunol* **16,** 415–425 (2015).
498    53.    Cho, J. *et al.* Multiple repressive mechanisms in the hippocampus during memory
499           formation. *Science* **350,** 82–87 (2015).
500    54.    Sedlazeck, F. J., Rescheneder, P. & von Haeseler, A. NextGenMap: fast and accurate
501           read mapping in highly polymorphic genomes. *Bioinformatics* **29,** 2790–2791 (2013).
502    55.    Altschul, S. F. *et al.* Gapped BLAST and PSI-BLAST: a new generation of protein
503           database search programs. *Nucleic Acids Res.* **25,** 3389–402 (1997).
504    56.    Karolchik, D. *et al.* The UCSC Genome Browser database: 2014 update. *Nucleic Acids*
505           *Res.* **42,** D764–D770 (2014).
506    57.    Rosenberg, M. S., Subramanian, S. & Kumar, S. Patterns of Transitional Mutation
507           Biases Within and Among Mammalian Genomes. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* **20,** 988–993 (2003).
508    58.    R Development Core Team. R: a language and environment for statistical computing.
509           (2016).
510

511    **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**
512

We are grateful for valuable discussions with many colleagues during this study. The work was
funded by grants BFU2012-36820 and BFU2015-65235-P from Ministerio de Economía e
Innovación (Spanish Government) and co-funded by FEDER (EC). We also received funding
from Agència de Gestió d'Ajuts Universitaris i de Recerca Generalitat de Catalunya (AGAUR),
grant number 2014SGR1121.

**FIGURE LEGENDS**
520

**Figure 1. Detection of translated ORFs. a.** Workflow to identify translated ORFs. Ribosome profiling

(Ribo-Seq) reads, corresponding to ribosome-protected fragments, are mapped to all predicted canonical

ORFs with length ≥ 30 nucleotides in transcripts. This is performed with single-nucleotide resolution after

computing the read P-site per each read length. In each ORF, reads per frame and read uniformity are

evaluated by RiboORF. **b.** Number of translated and non-translated expressed genes belonging to

different classes after integrating data from eight different mouse tissues (Supplementary Table 1). **c.**

Number of translated ORFs belonging to different classes. The translated ORFs have been divided into

small ORFs (smORF, < 100 aa) and long ORFs (≥ 100 aa), depending on their length.

**Figure 2. Identification of selection signatures. a**. Workflow to identify conserved and non-conserved

ORFs. Translated ORFs shorter than 24 amino acids, as well as non-conserved upstream and

downstream ORF in conserved transcripts (uORFs and dORFs, see Methods), were filtered out. Any ORF

with at least one BLAST match in another species was classified as conserved (C), otherwise it was

classified as non-conserved (NC). **b.** Coding score in conserved (C) and non-conserved ORFs (NC).

Conserved ORFs showed significantly higher coding score values than non-conserved ones; *** Wilcoxon

test, p-value < $10^{-5}$. Non-conserved ORFs with a high coding score value (≥ 0.1014) were classified as

NC-H, and the rest were classified as NC-L. **c**. Analysis of selective constraints in translated ORFs. PN/PS

(obs/exp) refers to the normalized ratio between non-synonymous (PN) and synonymous (PS) single

nucleotide polymorphisms; a value of 1 is expected in the absence of selection at the protein level.

Conserved and NC-H ORFs showed significant purifying selection signatures. In contrast, NC-L ORFs did

not show evidence of purifying selection at the protein level. Many conserved ORFs in lncRNAs are likely

to encode functional micropeptides. Differences between observed and expected PN/PS were assessed

with a chi-square test, * p- value < 0.05, *** p-value < $10^{-5}$. Error bars indicate the standard error of the

sample proportion. Numbers of ORFs for the different categories are also displayed. **d.** Distribution of

normalized PN/PS values for individual ORFs in different gene classes. Only ORFs with at least 10 SNPs

were considered; the NC-H group contained too few cases to be analysed. The differences between C and

NC-L are significant (Wilcoxon test, p-value <$10^{-5}$).

**Figure 3. Three nucleotide periodicity of translated ORFs.** The mapping of Ribo-Seq reads on different

types of ORFs is shown. The Y axis represents the log-number of reads, the X axis the positions in the

ORF. The reads show strong frame bias in the functional (conserved) and the neutral (NC-L) examples,

with a preponderance of in-frame reads (green) versus off-frame reads (red and blue), while the frame bias

is randomly distributed in the negative control (SNORA18). The exon/intron structure and the amino acid

sequence for translated ORFs is also shown.

**Figure 4. Properties of neutrally evolving ORFs. a.** Relationship between the percentage of reads

falling in the correct frame in neural embryonic stem cells cells and hippocampus samples, for neutral and

functional ORFs having at least 10 reads in both samples and being translated in at least one sample.

Spearman correlation coefficient is R=0.4224 for the neutrat set (p-value < $10^{-5}$) and R=0.4360 for the

functional set (p-value < $10^{-5}$). **b.** Distribution of read periodicity, read uniformity and RibORF scores in

neutral and functional translated ORFs after controlling for the number of Ribo-Seq reads and size of

ORFs. The 'functional normalized' set is a randomly taken subset of the functional ORFs that has the

same number of mapped Ribo-Seq reads and ORF size distribution as the set of neutrally evolving ORFs

(n=900). Data is represented as box-plots for different number of read intervals; the box contains 50% of

the data, horizontal line is the median value.

**Figure 5. Factors influencing the translation of neutrally evolving ORFs. a.** Influence of coding score

in the translatability of neutrally evolving ORFs. Translated ORFs showed significantly higher coding score

than non-translated ORFs, both sets had significantly higher coding scores than introns (Wilcoxon test p-

value < $10^{-5}$, indicated by ***). **b.** Influence of coding score in the translatability of ORFs controlling for

gene expression values, the two sets have comparable maximum FPKM gene expression (median FPKM

value = 11.10). Translated ORFs showed significantly higher coding score values than non-translated

ORFs; (Wilcoxon test p-value < $10^{-5}$). **c.** Influence of maximum FPKM gene expression and ORF length in

the translatability of neutral ORFs normalized by coding score (median coding score value = -0.0052).

Translated ORFs showed significantly higher FPKM values than non-translated ORFs (Wilcoxon test p-

value < $10^{-5}$); differences in length were not significant.

**FIGURES**

**Figure 1**

**Figure 2**

587    **Figure 3**

591     **Figure 4**

**Figure 5**