Genome-wide discovery of SLE genetic risk variant allelic enhancer activity

Xiaoming Lu*[1], Xiaoting Chen*[1], Carmy Forney[1], Omer Donmez[1], Daniel Miller[1], Sreeja

Parameswaran[1], Ted Hong[1,2], Yongbo Huang[1], Mario Pujato[3], Tareian Cazares[4], Emily R.

Miraldi[3-5], John P. Ray[6], Carl G. de Boer[6], John B. Harley[1,4,5,7,8], Matthew T. Weirauch[#,1,3,5,8,9],

Leah C. Kottyan[#,1,4,5,9]

*Contributed equally

[#]Co-corresponding authors: Leah.Kottyan@cchmc.org; Matthew.Weirauch@cchmc.org

[1]Center for Autoimmune Genomics and Etiology, Cincinnati Children's Hospital Medical Center,

Cincinnati, Ohio, USA, 45229.

[2]Department of Pharmacology & Systems Physiology, University of Cincinnati, College of

Medicine, Cincinnati, Ohio, USA, 45229.

[3]Division of Biomedical Informatics, Cincinnati Children's Hospital Medical Center, Cincinnati,

Ohio, USA, 45229.

[4]Division of Immunobiology, Cincinnati Children's Hospital Medical Center, Cincinnati, Ohio, USA,

45229.

[5]Department of Pediatrics, University of Cincinnati, College of Medicine, Cincinnati, Ohio, USA,

45229.

[6]Broad Institute of Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) and Harvard University,

Cambridge, Massachusetts, USA, 02142.

[7]US Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center, Cincinnati, Ohio, USA 45229.

[8]Division of Developmental Biology, Cincinnati Children's Hospital Medical Center, Cincinnati,

Ohio, USA, 45229.

[9]Division of Allergy and Immunology, Cincinnati Children's Hospital Medical Center, Cincinnati,

Ohio, USA, 45229.

Abstract

Genome-wide association studies of Systemic Lupus Erythematosus (SLE) nominate 3,073 genetic variants at 91 risk loci. To systematically screen these variants for allelic transcriptional enhancer activity, we constructed a massively parallel reporter assay (MPRA) library comprising 12,396 DNA oligonucleotides containing the genomic context around every allele of each SLE variant. Transfection into the Epstein-Barr virus-transformed B cell line GM12878 revealed 482 variants with enhancer activity, with 51 variants showing genotype-dependent (allelic) enhancer activity at 27 risk loci. Comparison of MPRA results in GM12878 and Jurkat T cell lines highlights shared and unique allelic transcriptional regulatory mechanisms at SLE risk loci. In-depth analysis of allelic transcription factor (TF) binding at and around allelic variants identifies one class of TFs whose DNA-binding motif tends to be directly altered by the risk variant and a second, larger class of TFs that bind allelically without direct alteration of their motif by the variant. Collectively, our approach provides a blueprint for the discovery of allelic gene regulation at risk loci for any disease and offers insight into the transcriptional regulatory mechanisms underlying SLE.

Systemic Lupus Erythematosus (SLE) is an autoimmune disease that can affect multiple organs,

leading to debilitating inflammation and mortality[1]. Up to 150 cases are found per 100,000

individuals, and the limited treatment options contribute to considerable economic and social

burden[1,2]. Epidemiological studies have established a role for both genetic and environmental

factors in the development of SLE[2]. SLE has a relatively high heritability[3]. The vast majority of

patients do not have a single disease-causing mutation (such as mutations in complement protein

1q); instead, genetic risk is accumulated additively through many genetic risk loci with modest

effect sizes[4].

Genome-wide association studies (GWASs) have identified 91 genetic risk loci that increase

disease risk of SLE in a largely additive fashion[4]. Each SLE risk locus is a segment of the genome

containing a polymorphic "tag" variant (i.e. the variant with the most significant GWAS p-value)

and the genetic variants in linkage disequilibrium with the tag variant. The majority (68%) of the

established SLE risk loci do not contain a disease associated coding variant that changes amino

acid usage[5]. Instead, variants at these loci are found in non-coding regions of the genome such

as introns, promoters, enhancers, and other intergenic areas. Enrichment of these variants in

enhancers and at transcription factor (TF) binding sites[6,7] implies that transcriptional perturbation

may be a key to the development of SLE[8]. However, given the large number of candidate variants

identified by GWASs, identification of the particular causal variant(s) remains challenging.

SLE is a complex disease that involves multiple cell types[2]. Previous systematic studies

demonstrate that SLE risk loci are enriched for B cell specific genes[9] and regulatory regions[10].

Established biological mechanisms further highlight a key role for B cells in SLE - as the

autoantibody-secreting cell type, B cells are critical to the pathoetiology of SLE, a disease

characterized by autoantibody production[11]. B cells also present self-antigens to T cells in the

development of an autoantigen-focused (i.e. "self") inflammatory response[12]. Meanwhile, Epstein-

Barr virus (EBV)-infected B cells have been implicated in SLE, with patients having a greater

number of EBV-infected B cells and a higher viral load than people without SLE[13,14]. In addition,

EBV infection is significantly more prevalent in SLE cases than controls[15,16], and EBV-encoded

EBNA2 interactions with the human genome are concentrated at SLE risk loci in EBV-transformed

B cell lines[10]. *In vitro*, EBV infection can transform B cells into a lymphoblastoid cell line (LCL)[17].

We have recently shown that histone mark and human and viral protein chromatin

immunoprecipitation followed by sequencing (ChIP-seq) datasets from EBV-transformed B cell

lines are highly and specifically enriched at SLE risk loci relative to non-EBV transformed B cell

lines[9,10]. Given the above evidence, we chose the EBV-transformed B cell line GM12878 to study

the effects of SLE risk variants at many SLE risk loci.

To systematically identify the SLE genetic risk variants that contribute to transcriptional

dysregulation in the EBV-transformed B cell line GM12878, we designed and applied a massively

parallel reporter assay (MPRA)[18-27] (**Figure 1, Supplemental Figure 1**). MPRA extends standard

reporter assays, replacing low-throughput luciferase with high-throughput mRNA expression

detection. In this study, we used MPRA to simultaneously screen the full set of genome-wide

significant SLE-associated genetic variants for effects on gene regulation. Using this experimental

approach, we nominate 51 putative causal variants that result in genotype-dependent (allelic)

transcriptional regulation. Comparison of MPRA results between GM12878 and the Jurkat T cell

line reveals shared and cell-type specific allelic behavior. Integration of these data with TF binding

site predictions and functional genomics data reveals two distinct mechanisms whereby TFs bind

risk variants in an allelic manner - directly impacted by a given variant (i.e. the variant directly

alters the TF's DNA-binding site) or indirectly impacted by the variant (i.e. the variant alters the

DNA binding of the TF's physical interaction partner or modulates chromatin accessibility).

Collectively, these results provide an important resource for understanding SLE disease risk

mechanisms and reveal an important role for groups of TFs in the mediation of allelic enhancer

activity at plausibly causal SLE risk variants in EBV-transformed B cells.

Results

MPRA library design and quality control

We first collected all SLE-associated risk loci reaching genome-wide association significance ($p<5\times10^{-8}$) published through March 2018 **(Supplemental Data Set 1)**. Studies of all ancestral groups were included, and independent risk loci were defined as loci with lead (tag) variant at $r^2<0.2$. For each of these 91 risk loci, we performed linkage disequilibrium (LD) expansion ($r^2>0.8$) in each ancestry of the initial genetic association(s), to include all possible disease-relevant variants **(Supplemental Data Set 2)**. In total, this procedure identified 3,073 genetic variants. All established alleles of these variants were included, with 36 variants having three or more alleles. We also included 20 additional genetic variants from a previously published study[19] as positive and negative controls to assess the library's performance **(Supplemental Data Set 3)**.

For each variant, we generated a pair of 170 base pair (bp) DNA oligonucleotides (subsequently referred to as "oligos") for each allele, with the variant located in the center and identical flanking genomic sequence across the alleles **(Supplemental Data Set 4)**. A total of 12,478 oligos (3,093 variants with 6,239 alleles) were synthesized. For barcoding, a pool of random 20mers were added to the oligo through PCR. Each unique barcode was matched with perfectly synthesized oligos. The number of unique barcodes per oligo had an approximately normal distribution with a median of 729 barcodes per oligo **(Supplemental Figure 2A, Supplemental Data Set 5)**. Only oligos with at least 30 unique barcodes were used for downstream analyses. A fragment containing a minimal promoter and an eGFP gene was inserted between the oligo and barcode to generate the MPRA transfection library. We note that the use of a minimal promoter allows us to effectively measure the ability of alleles to enhance, but not reduce, transcriptional activity. Three aliquots of the library were independently transfected into the EBV-transformed B cell line

GM12878. We then used nucleic acid capture to enrich for eGFP mRNA and sequenced the

barcode region. The normalized barcode ratio between the eGFP mRNA and the plasmid DNA

was used to quantify the amount of enhancer activity driven by each oligo (see **Supplemental**

Note 1, Supplemental Figure 5F, G). This mRNA to DNA ratio measures the enhancing effect

of an allele on eGFP expression under the control of a minimal promoter **(Figure 1, Supplemental**

Figure 1). We observed strong correlation of enhancer activity between experimental replicates

(mean pairwise Pearson correlation of 0.99) **(Supplemental Figure 2B, C, D)**. Likewise,

calibration variants showed high accuracy, with 17 of the 20 variants matching the results of a

previous study[19] (87.5% sensitivity and 75% specificity), collectively demonstrating a robust

experimental system **(Supplemental Data Set 3)**.

Hundreds of SLE risk variants are located in genomic regions with enhancer activity in

EBV-transformed B cells

Using the SLE MPRA library, we next identified genetic variants capable of driving enhancer

activity in the EBV-transformed B cell line GM12878. An SLE risk variant was considered a

candidate for enhancer activity if an oligo corresponding to any allele had significantly increased

transcriptional regulatory activity compared to controls (see Methods). Not all statistically

significant changes in transcriptional activity are necessarily biologically relevant – a highly

consistent, but slight change in expression levels is statistically, but not biologically, meaningful.

We therefore considered an oligo to have enhancer activity only when (1) the oligo had statistically

significant enhancer activity ($p_{FDR}<0.05$) and (2) we observed at least a 50% increase in

transcriptional activity compared to the corresponding barcode counts in the plasmid control.

Based on these criteria, 16% of SLE risk variants (482 variants, 853 alleles) demonstrated

enhancer activity, henceforth referred to as "enhancer variants" (enVars) and "enhancer alleles"

(enAlleles), respectively (**Figure 2A, Supplemental Data Set 6**).

We next explored the potential effects of enVars on gene expression. We connected each enVar

to one or more genes using an approach that takes into account chromatin looping interactions,

expression quantitative trait loci (eQTLs), and gene proximity (**Supplemental Data Set 2,**

Supplemental Data Set 7) (see Methods). This approach identified 1,006 genes in total, which

are enriched for expected SLE-related processes such as the interferon pathway, the antigen

processing and presentation pathway, and cytokine-related pathways (**Supplemental Figure 3,**

Supplemental Data Set 8), providing functional support for the enVars we identified.

Next, we searched for functional genomic features enriched within enVars relative to non-enVars

using the RELI algorithm[10]. In brief, RELI estimates the significance of the intersection between

an input set of genomic regions (e.g., enVars) and each member of a collection of functional

genomics datasets (e.g., ChIP-seq for a particular histone mark or TF). For this analysis, we

identified, curated, and systematically processed the 576 GM12878 ChIP-seq datasets available

in the NCBI Gene Expression Omnibus (GEO) database (see Methods). Using RELI, we observed

significant enrichment for overlap between enVars and multiple histone modification marks,

including H3K4me3 (5.8-fold, $p_{corrected}$ <10^{-21}) and H3K27ac (2.0-fold, $p_{corrected}$ <10^{-13}) (**Figure 2B,**

Supplemental Data Set 9). As expected, we did not identify enrichment for repressive marks

such as H3K9me3 or H3K27me3[28] (**Figure 2B, Supplemental Data Set 9**). Altogether, the

genomic features present within enVars confirm that many SLE genetic risk loci likely alter

transcriptional regulation in EBV-transformed B cells.

We next asked if the genomic binding sites of particular TFs were enriched within our enVars

using RELI and the TF ChIP-seq datasets from GM12878. As expected, the enVars are highly

enriched for ChIP-seq signal of TFs involved in regulation of the immune response, relative to

variants lacking enhancer activity (**Figure 2C**, **Supplemental Data Set 9**). In particular, we found

significant enrichment for all members of the NFκB TF family: REL/C-Rel (6.4-fold, $p_{corrected}$ <10^{-26}),

NFKB1/p50 (3.0-fold, $p_{corrected}$ <10^{-18}), RELA/p65 (3.1-fold, $p_{corrected}$ <10^{-16}), RELB (2.7-fold,

$p_{corrected} < 10^{-10}$), and NFKB2/p52 (2.2-fold, $p_{corrected} < 10^{-7}$). These results are consistent with our

previous findings that altered binding of NFκB TFs is likely an important mechanism conferring

SLE risk[10]. We also found significant enrichment for other TFs that have been previously

implicated in SLE pathogenesis, such as PAX5[29], MED1[30], IKZF1[31], ELF1[32] and the EBV-encoded

EBNA2 transactivator[10] (**Figure 2C, Supplemental Data Set 9**). As a complementary approach,

we next assessed enrichment for TF binding site motifs in the enAllele DNA sequences using

HOMER[33] and motifs contained in the Cis-BP database[34] (see Methods). This analysis also

revealed enrichment of multiple TF families with known roles in SLE, including ETS, NFκB, and

IRF[3] (**Figure 2D, Supplemental Data Set 10**). Many of these same TFs also have enriched ChIP-

seq peaks at SLE risk loci[10]. Collectively, these results indicate that particular TFs tend to not only

concentrate at SLE risk loci[10], but also concentrate at alleles capable of driving gene expression

in EBV-transformed B cells.

MPRA identifies 51 SLE risk variants with allelic enhancer activity in EBV-transformed B cells

We next used our MPRA library to identify SLE genetic risk variants that drive allele-dependent

(allelic) enhancer activity. Allelic activity was assessed for each enVar by comparing enhancer

activity between each pairs of alleles. We considered a SLE variant allelic if (1) at least one of its

alleles is an enAllele; (2) we observed significant genotype-dependent activity using Student's *t*-

test[19,35] (see **Supplemental Note 2, Supplemental Figure 6**); and (3) the oligos had more than

a 25% change between any pair of alleles. Using these criteria, we identified 51 SLE risk variants

(11% of enVars, 1.7% of all SLE risk variants) as allelic enVars in GM12878 (**Figure 3A,**

Supplemental Data Set 11). For 31 of these 51 allelic enVars, the risk allele decreased enhancer

activity relative to the non-risk allele, which is statistically indistinguishable from the 20 variants

with increased risk allele activity (p=0.1). Three of the allelic enVars can also alter the amino acid

sequence of proteins – rs1059702 (IRAK1), rs1804182 (PLAT), and rs3027878 (HCFC1),

consistent with previous studies identifying dual-use codons in the human genome[36]. Collectively,

these 51 variants represent causal variant candidates for 27 SLE risk loci (30% of all tested loci)

(**Supplemental Data Set 12**). For these 27 risk loci, our approach reduced the number of potential

causal variants with allelic activity in GM12878 from an average of 84 variants to an average of

two variants per risk locus (**Figure 3B**). For example, at 17q12 (marked by rs8079075), we reduce

the candidate causal variant set from 249 to one, with the rs112569955 "G" risk allele showing a

36% increase in enhancer activity compared to the "A" non-risk allele.

Particular TFs have altered binding at SLE loci with allelic enhancer activity

To identify candidate regulatory proteins that might participate in allelic SLE mechanisms, we next

used RELI to identify GM12878 ChIP-seq datasets that significantly overlap allelic enVars

(**Supplemental Data Set 13**). Many of the top results are consistent with our previous study[10],

including the enriched presence of general enhancer features such as the H3K27ac histone mark

(17 of 51 allelic enVars, 13.6-fold enriched, $p_{corrected} < 10^{-38}$), mediator complex subunit MED1 (17

of 51 allelic enVars, 13.0-fold enriched, $p_{corrected} < 10^{-34}$), and the histone acetyltransferase p300

(16 of 51 allelic enVars, 12.4-fold enriched, $p_{corrected} < 10^{-32}$), along with particular regulatory

proteins that participate in "EBV super enhancers"[37] and play key roles in B cells such as ATF7

(15 of 51 allelic enVars, 11.3-fold enriched, $p_{corrected} < 10^{-26}$), Ikaros/IKZF1 (19 of 51 allelic enVars,

9.7-fold enriched, $p_{corrected} < 10^{-25}$), and the NFκB subunit RELA (13 of 51 allelic enVars, 12.4-fold

enriched, $p_{corrected} < 10^{-24}$). Also consistent with our previous study[10], we observe strong enrichment

for the EBV-encoded EBNA2 protein (7 of 51 allelic enVars, 17.7-fold enriched, $p_{corrected} < 10^{-19}$).

Collectively, these data reveal particular regulatory proteins that might participate in the

mechanisms contributing to SLE at multiple risk loci by driving allelic enhancer activity.

We next used the MARIO pipeline[10] to search for allelic binding events (i.e. allelic imbalance

between sequencing read counts) at SLE variants within 1,058 LCL ChIP-seq datasets (576 from

GM12878). By necessity, this approach is limited to the 47 allelic enVars that are heterozygous

in at least one of these cell lines. In total, this procedure identified 11 variants with strong allelic

imbalance (MARIO ARS value > 0.4) in at least one ChIP-seq dataset (**Supplemental Data Set**

14), revealing groups of TFs and transcriptional regulators that allelically bind SLE risk variants

with genotype-dependent MPRA enhancer activity. For example, the rs3101018 variant, which is

associated with SLE[38] and rheumatoid arthritis[39] in Europeans, shows 1.7-fold stronger enhancer

activity for the reference/non-risk 'C' allele compared to the non-reference/risk 'T' allele (**Figure**

4A). These results are consistent with a previously established eQTL obtained from GTEx[40],

which demonstrates higher Complement C4A (*C4A*) expression in EBV-transformed B cell lines

for the rs3101018 'C' allele than the 'T' allele (**Figure 4B**). Our MARIO allelic ChIP-seq analysis

reveals 15 regulatory proteins that prefer the 'C' allele and 2 that prefer the 'T' allele (**Figure 4C,**

Supplemental Figure 4A). Among these, particularly robust signal is obtained for ATF7, with one

experimental replicate in GM12878 displaying 77 vs. 18 reads ('C' vs. 'T') and another showing

66 vs. 23 reads ('C' vs. 'T') (**Supplemental Data Set 14**). Moreover, CREB1 and CREM strongly

favor the 'C' allele as well (**Supplemental Data Set 14**). In agreement with these data,

computational analysis of the DNA sequences surrounding this variant predicts that ATF7,

CREB1, and CREM will all bind more strongly to the 'C' than the 'T' allele (**Figure 4D**). Intriguingly,

ten additional proteins (FOXK2, PKNOX1, ARID3A, ZBTB40, ZNF217, ARNT, ELF1, IKZF2,

MEF2B, and FOXM1) also bind allelically and have known DNA binding motifs[41], but none of them

have binding sites altered by the variant. Further, we do not observe allelic chromatin accessibility

in an available GM12878 ATAC-seq dataset (9 vs. 7 unique reads). Together, these results reveal

a potentially causative SLE regulatory mechanism involving weaker direct binding of

ATF7/CREB1/CREM to the 'T' risk allele, altering the recruitment of additional proteins to the

locus and lowering the expression of *C4A*.

We observe a similar phenomenon for the rs2069235 variant, which is associated with SLE in

Asian ancestries[42] and rheumatoid arthritis in Europeans[43]. rs2069235 displays much stronger

enhancer activity for the 'A' (non-reference/risk) allele compared to the 'G' (reference/non-risk)

allele (**Figure 4E**), consistent with the established synaptogyrin 1 (*SYNGR1)* eQTL in EBV-

transformed B cell lines[40] (**Figure 4F**). Inspection of our allelic ChIP-seq data reveals 14 proteins

preferentially binding the 'A' allele, with none preferring the 'G' allele (**Figure 4G, Supplemental**

Figure 4B). Among these 14 proteins, only ELF1 has its binding site directly altered by the variant

(**Figure 4H**). Strikingly, 55 of the 78 available H3K27ac datasets are allelic at this variant, with all

55 preferring the 'A' allele. Likewise, 24 of 46 H3K4me1 datasets are allelic, with all of them also

preferring the 'A' allele. Both of these histone marks are indicative of active chromatin[28]. Only a

single histone mark dataset prefers the 'G' allele – the H3K27me3 mark, which is indicative of

silenced chromatin[28] (**Figure 4G, Supplemental Figure 4B**). Together, these data are consistent

with a potentially causative SLE molecular mechanism involving an allele-dependent enhancer

consisting of stronger direct binding of ELF1 to the 'A' risk allele, along with indirectly altered

binding of multiple additional TFs to this locus.

Genotype-dependent binding to SLE variants with allelic enhancer activity by *variant*

***overlapping* and *variant adjacent* TFs**

As illustrated by the above examples, a particular TF can be involved in allelic mechanisms that

are either directly impacted by a given variant (i.e. the variant directly alters the TF's DNA-binding

site) or indirectly impacted by the variant (i.e. the variant alters the DNA binding of the TF's

physical interaction partner, modulates chromatin accessibility, or affects another mechanism). At

a given locus, we designate such TFs as *variant overlapping* and *variant adjacent* TFs,

respectively (**Figure 5A**). We next sought to discover such TFs at the 51 allelic enVars. At each

allelic enVar locus, we identified *variant overlapping* TFs as those TFs predicted to have strong

binding to one allele and weak binding to the other allele. Likewise, we identified *variant adjacent*

TFs as those TFs with proximal strong predicted binding sites that do not directly overlap the

variant (see Methods). We then searched for particular TFs that tend to act as *variant overlapping*

TFs or as *variant adjacent* TFs at the 51 allelic eVars using a proportion test (see Methods) and

confirmed that their binding site locations are distributed relative to the variant as expected

(**Figure 5B**). Consistent with our results at the *C4A* and *SYNGR1* loci, *variant overlapping* TFs

include members of the ETS (e.g., ELF1) and ATF-like (e.g., ATF7) families, along with other TFs

whose genetic loci are associated with SLE, including IRF5[44] (**Figure 5C**, **Supplemental Data**

Set 15). *Variant adjacent* TFs represent a largely distinct class, but also include several TFs with

SLE genetic associations, including NFκB[45], the Ikaros (IKZF) family[46], and HMGA family

members[47] (**Figure 5D, Supplemental Data Set 15**). Collectively, these analyses reveal two

distinct classes of TFs at a given SLE-associated locus that both likely play key roles in SLE

mechanisms, along with particular TFs that tend to participate in one class or the other.

Allelic transcription regulatory mechanisms shared and unique across cell types

To explore the cell-type specificity of allelic enhancer activity, we transfected our SLE MPRA

library into Jurkat cells, a T cell line, as T cells are another important cell type in SLE[48]. We

identified 92 SLE risk variants as allelic enVars in Jurkat cells, 25% of which were also found in

GM12878 (**Supplemental Figure 5A, B, Supplemental Data Set 11**). We then repeated the

experiment in Jurkat cells stimulated with the inflammatory cytokine TNFα, a key cytokine in SLE

development[49], to identify stimulation-dependent allelic enVars. This resulted in the identification

of 102 allelic enVars, 28 of which were specific to the stimulated Jurkat cells (**Supplemental**

Figure 5C, D, Supplemental Data Set 11). Altogether, our study identified a total of 145 allelic

enVars across 50 independent SLE risk loci (**Supplemental Figure 5E**). These results highlight

allelic transcriptional regulatory mechanisms that are both cell-type and inflammatory signaling

dependent.

In summary, through the application of an allelic MPRA library to the EBV-transformed B cell line

GM12878, we identified global transcriptional enhancer activity at 16% of SLE-associated genetic

variants (enVars), with particular transcriptional regulatory proteins concentrated at these

genomic locations. We further identified 51 SLE risk variants with allelic enhancer activity (allelic

enVars) that we now nominate as plausibly causal by acting through genotype-dependent

changes to enhancer activity in GM12878. Upon comparison to allelic enhancer activity in the

Jurkat T cell line, we identified shared and unique allelic transcriptional regulatory mechanisms at

SLE risk loci. Using experimental TF ChIP-seq data and TF binding site motif scanning, we

propose a model where the collective action of the genotype-dependent binding of particular

variant overlapping and *variant adjacent* TFs leads to genotype-dependent transcriptional activity

at SLE risk loci.

Discussion

Genome-wide association studies identify genetic loci with statistical disease associations.

However, each risk locus often contains many plausibly causal variants due to linkage

disequilibrium. This study is the first direct genome-wide measurement of enhancer activity at the

~3,000 known SLE genetic risk variants in any context. Unbiased experimental approaches such

as MPRA are vital for resolving causal variants and their molecular mechanisms of action.

Our results indicate that 16% of the SLE risk variants examined in this study have enhancer

activity in the EBV-transformed B cell line GM12878. Furthermore, 51 of these enhancer variants

at 27 loci have allelic enhancer activity. These findings are consistent with the theory that a large

proportion of the genetic risk of SLE is mediated through transcriptional perturbation of critical B

cell genes. Importantly, SLE risk loci exhibit cell-type and inflammatory signaling dependent allelic

enhancer activity, with only 25% of allelic enVars shared between GM12878 and Jurkat cells.

These results highlight both shared and unique allelic transcriptional regulatory mechanisms for

SLE risk.

In this study, we used the EBV-transformed B cell line GM12878 as a model for exploring the

effects of SLE risk variants. Previous studies have shown that B cells play a critical role in SLE

development as immune cells that secrete autoantibodies driving etiology[11]. The relationship

between EBV and SLE is widely appreciated. For example, EBV-infected B cells are more

prevalent in SLE patients than in healthy people[13,14] and patients with SLE have a higher EBV

viral load and infection rate relative to controls[15,16]. Additionally, the EBV transcriptional regulator

EBNA2 occupies SLE risk loci in a genotype-dependent manner[10]. *In vivo,* EBV infection can

convert primary B cells to activated lymphoblasts[50,51]. EBV will eventually enter latency in resting

memory B cells and establish lifelong infection[52]. *In vitro*, EBV infection transforms B cells into

immortalized lymphoblastoid cell lines (LCLs)[17]. While we chose the EBV-transformed B cell line

GM12878 as the primary disease model for our study, there are limitations to the use of EBV-

transformed B cell lines. For example, GM12878 is an immortalized cell line with differences in

DNA methylation and gene expression levels from resting and activated B cells[53,54]. A recent study

also suggests that EBV infection causes B cells to undergo a germinal center-like differentiation

into cells partially resembling plasmablasts and early plasma cells[55], which is only a transient

stage *in vivo*. Altogether, these limitations need to be considered when interpreting allelic

transcriptional regulation of SLE risk variants in EBV-transformed B cell lines.

A critical finding of this study is that SLE risk variants with allelic enhancer activity likely alter the

binding of many TFs. Although variants can directly affect the binding of *variant overlapping* TFs

via disruption of a DNA-binding site, they can also simultaneously alter the binding of other *variant*

adjacent TFs, presumably via genomic mechanisms such as altered chromatin accessibility,

altered histone marks, indirect TF recruitment through physical interactions, changes in DNA

shape, or changes to protein interaction partner DNA binding. This finding corroborates the

previously proposed genetic variation-mediation model of motif-dependent and motif-independent

TF binding[56-58]. In general, a given TF can be *variant overlapping* at one locus and *variant adjacent*

at another, as exemplified by ATF7 (**Figure 4C, G**). Nonetheless, particular TF families tend to

act as *variant overlapping* TFs at SLE loci (such as Ets, E-box, and ATF), whereas others tend to

act as *variant adjacent* TFs (such as HMGA, Hox, and NFκB). Notably, many of these *variant*

overlapping and *variant adjacent* TFs are themselves encoded by genetic risk loci associated with

SLE (e.g., IRF5[44], NFκB[45], and ETS1[59]), suggesting that there are multiple means through which

a particular TF can contribute to disease-based genetic mechanisms. For example, IRF5 targets

might be mis-regulated in an SLE patient due to genetic associations in the promoter of *IRF5* that

result in altered IRF5 protein levels[44], or by genetic variants located within or adjacent to IRF5

binding sites at other genomic loci. It is currently unknown if these TF attributes are shared with

other human diseases.

This study reveals possible causal genetic mechanisms involving altered binding of particular TFs

at two important SLE risk loci. *C4A* is a component of the inflammatory complement pathway that

is critical for the appropriate clearance of apoptotic cells[60]. People without *C4A* due to rare,

protein-changing mutations are at a greatly increased risk for autoimmune diseases, including

type I diabetes and SLE[61]. Further, the risk of developing SLE is 2.62 times higher in subjects

with low total *C4A*[60]. Consistent with this observation, the SLE risk allele of rs3101018 at this

genetic locus identified in our MPRA is associated with lower *C4A* expression (**Figure 4A**).

Moreover, this variant is an eQTL for *C4A* in EBV-transformed B cell lines and whole blood cells,

with the risk allele displaying lower *C4A* expression[62] (**Figure 4B, Supplemental Data Set 7**).

rs3101018 is located in the Human Leukocyte Antigen (HLA) region of the genome. While many

genetic variants at this locus alter amino acid usage in major histocompatibility complex molecules

and affect antigen presentation, non-coding genetic variants across the HLA region have also

been demonstrated to affect gene expression independently of HLA-type[63-65]. Additionally, the

SLE risk locus encoding *SYNGR1* was recently identified in a high-density genotyping study of

subjects with Asian ancestry[42] and also increases disease risk for schizophrenia[66], primary biliary

cirrhosis[67], and rheumatoid arthritis[68]. *SYNGR1* is an integral membrane protein that is most

robustly expressed in neurons of the central nervous system; however, there is measurable

transcription and translation of *SYNGR1* in other tissues, including developing B cells[69]. eQTL

data from EBV-transformed B cell lines and whole blood cells[62] (**Figure 4F, Supplemental Data**

Set 7) further support our MPRA-based findings of SLE risk genotype-dependent enhancer

activity and gene expression at this locus. Altogether, the results of our MPRA study provide

mechanistic insight into these variants through the identification of allelic enVars that facilitate

SLE-risk genotype-dependent gene expression.

GWAS provides important discernment of the genetic origins of disease. In conjunction with other

genome-scale assays such as ATAC-seq, ChIP-seq, and HiChIP-seq, MPRA reveals likely causal

variants and genes, and enables the assembly of causal mechanisms affecting gene expression.

In this study, we used MPRA to uncover specific genetic variants within the risk haplotypes of a

complex disease in specific cell types. Our integrative analyses reveal specific molecular

mechanisms underlying genotype-dependent transcriptional regulation and SLE disease risk. We

conclude that MRPA is a robust tool for the nomination of causal genetic risk variants for any

phenotype or disease with risk loci that act through genotype-dependent gene regulatory

mechanisms, with this study providing a blueprint for dissecting the genetic etiology of many

complex human diseases.

Online Methods

Variant selection and DNA sequence generation

All SLE-associated genetic risk loci reaching genome-wide significance published through March 2018 were included in this study[31,38,44,59,70-79]. A total of 91 genetic risk loci were used for linkage disequilibrium (LD) expansion ($r^2 > 0.8$) based on 1000 Genomes Data[80] in the ancestry(ies) of the initial genetic association using PLINK[81] (**Supplemental Data Set 1**). All expanded variants were updated to the dbSNP 151 table[82] from the UCSC table browser[83] based on either variant name or genomic location. Unmappable variants were discarded. We also included 20 genetic variants from the Tewhey *et al.*[19] study as positive and negative controls.

For single nucleotide polymorphisms, we pulled 170 base pairs (bps) of hg19-flanking DNA sequences for every allele, with the variant located in the center (84 bps upstream and 85 bps downstream of the variant). For the other types of variants (indels), we designed the flanking sequences to ensure that the longest allele has 170 bps. Adapters (15bps) were added to each sequence at either end (5'-ACTGGCCGCTTGACG - [170 bp oligo] - CACTGCGGCTCCTGC-3') to make a 200 bp DNA sequence (**Supplemental Data Set 4**). For all resulting sequences, we created a forward and reverse complement sequence to compensate for possible DNA synthesis errors. A total of 12,478 oligos (3,093 variants, 6,239 alleles) were obtained from Twist Bioscience.

MPRA experiments

Library Assembly

For assembly of the MPRA library, we followed the procedure described by Tewhey *et al.*[19] with minor modifications. In brief, we first created the empty vector pGL4.23ΔxbaΔluc from pGL4.23[luc2/minP] using primer Q5_deletion_rev and Q5_deletion_fwd following the manufacturer's instruction of the Q5 Site-Directed Mutagenesis Kit. Then, 20bps barcodes were added to the synthesized oligos through 24X PCR with 50 μL system, each containing 1.86ng oligo, 25 μL NEBNext® Ultra™ II Q5® Master Mix, 1μM MPRA_v3_F and MPRA_v3_201_R.

PCR was performed under the following conditions: 98°C for 2 mins, 12 cycles of (98°C for 10

sec, 60°C for 15 sec, 72°C for 45 sec), 72°C for 5 mins. Amplified product was purified and cloned

into SfiI digested pGL4.23ΔxbaΔluc by Gibson assembly at 50°C for 1 hr. The assembled

backbone library was purified and then transformed into *Escherichia coli* (*E.coli)* through

electroporation (2kV, 200 ohm, 25 μF). Electroporated *E.coli* was expanded in 200 mL of LB Broth

buffer supplemented with 100 μg/mL of carbenicillin at 37°C for 12 to 16 hrs. Plasmid was then

extracted using the QIAGEN Plasmid Maxi Kit.

We next created the pGL4.23[eGFP/miniP] plasmid. An eGFP fragment was amplified from MS2-

P65-HSF1_GFP (Addgene #61423) through PCR with a 50μl system containing 1 ng plasmid, 25

μL NEBNext® Ultra™ II Q5® Master Mix, 0.5 μM GFP_seq_MS2-P65-HSF1_GFP_FWD and

GFP_seq_MS2-P65-HSF1_GFP_REV. PCR was performed under the following conditions: 98°C

for 2 mins, 20 cycles of (98°C for 10 sec, 60°C for 15 sec, 72°C for 30 sec), 72°C for 5 mins. The

amplified fragment was purified and then inserted into XbaI and NcoI digested pGL4.23[luc2/minP]

through Gibson assembly at 50°C for 1 hr. The assembled plasmid was purified and then

transformed into *E.coli* through chemical transformation. Transformed *E.coli* was expanded in 100

mL of LB Broth buffer supplemented with 100 μg/mL of carbenicillin at 37°C for 12 to 16 hrs.

Plasmid was then extracted using the QIAGEN Plasmid Maxi Kit.

A miniP + eGFP fragment was amplified from pGL4.23[eGFP/miniP] through 8X PCR with 50 μL

system, each containing 1 ng plasmid, 25 μL NEBNext® Ultra™ II Q5® Master Mix, 0.5μM 200-

MPRA_v3_GFP_Fusion_v2_F and 201-MPRA_v3_GFP_Fusion_v2_R. PCR was performed

under the following conditions: 98°C for 2 mins, 20 cycles of (98°C for 10 sec, 60°C for 15 sec,

72°C for 45 sec), 72°C for 5 mins. The amplified product was purified and then inserted into AsiSI

digested backbone library through Gibson assembly at 50°C for 1.5 hrs to create the transfection

library. The resulting library was re-digested by RecBCD and AsiSI, purified and then transformed

into *E.coli* through electroporation (2kV, 200 ohm, 25 μF). Transformed *E.coli* was cultured in 5L

of LB Broth buffer supplemented with 100 μg/mL of carbenicillin at 37 °C for 12 to 16 hrs. The

plasmid was then extracted using the QIAGEN Endo-free Plasmid Giga Kit.

Oligo and barcode association

The oligo and barcode regions were amplified from the backbone library through 4X PCR with a

100 μL system containing 200 ng plasmid, 50 μL NEBNext® Ultra™ II Q5® Master Mix, 0.5 μM

TruSeq_Universal_Adapter_P5 and MPRA_v3_TruSeq_Amp2Sa_F_P7. PCR was performed

under the following conditions: 95°C for 20 sec, 6 cycles of (95°C for 20 sec, 62°C for 15 sec,

72°C for 30 sec), 72°C for 2 mins. The product was then purified, and indices were added through

a 100μl system containing all purified product, 50μl NEBNext® Ultra™ II Q5® Master Mix, 0.5 μM

TruSeq_Universal_Adapter_P5 and index primer. PCR was performed as above, except for only

5 cycles. Samples were purified, molar pooled, and sequenced using 2x125bp on Illumina

NextSeq 500.

Transfection

The GM12878 cell line was grown in RPMI medium supplemented with 10% FBS, 100 units/mL

of penicillin, and 100 μg/mL of streptomycin. Cells were seeded at a density of 5 x 10^5 cells/mL

the day before transfection. For triplicate transfections, we collected a total of 5 x 10^7 cells per

replicate. Cells were then suspended with 50 μg transfection library plasmid in 400 μL Buffer R.

Electroporation was performed with the Neon transfection system in 100μl tips with 3 pulses of

1200V, 20 ms each. After transfection, cells were recovered in 50 mL pre-warmed RPMI medium

supplemented only with 10% FBS for 24 hrs. Cells were then collected for preparation of the

sequencing library for barcode counting.

The Jurkat cell line was grown in RPMI medium supplemented with 10% FBS, 100 units/mL of

penicillin, and 100 μg/mL of streptomycin. Cells were seeded at a density of 5 x 10^5 cells/mL the

day before transfection. For each experimental group, we collected a total of 5 x 10^7 cells per

replicate for 5 replicates. Cells were then resuspended with 50 μg transfection library plasmid in

400 μL Buffer R. Electroporation was performed with the Neon transfection system in 100μl tips

with 3 pulses of 1350V, 10 ms each. After transfection, cells were recovered in 50 mL pre-warmed

RPMI medium supplemented only with 10% FBS for 24 hrs. After recovery, cells were

supplemented with or without 100ng/ml TNFα for 24 hrs. Cells were then collected for preparation

of the sequencing library for barcode counting.

Sequencing library for barcode counting

For sample from GM12878 cell, total RNA of transfected cells was extracted by the RNeasy Midi

Kit following the manufacturer's instruction. Extracted RNA was subjected to DNase treatment in

a 375 μL system with 2.5 μL Turbo DNase and 37.5 μL Turbo DNase Buffer at 37°C for 1 hr. 3.75

μL 10% SDS and 37.5 μL 0.5M EDTA were added to stop DNase with 5 mins of incubation at

75°C. The whole volume was used for eGFP probe hybridization in an 1800 μL system, with 450

μl 20X SSC Buffer, 900 μL Formamide and 1 μL of each 100 μM Biotin-labeled GFP probe One

to Three. The probe hybridization was performed through incubation at 65°C for 2.5 hrs. 200 μL

Dynabeads™ MyOne™ Streptavidin C1 was prepared according to the manufacturer's instruction.

The beads were suspended in 250 μL 20X SSC Buffer and incubated with the above probe

hybridization reaction at room temperature for 15 mins. Beads were then collected on a magnet

and washed with 1X SSC Buffer once, and 0.1X SSC Buffer twice. eGFP mRNA was eluted first

through adding 12.5 μL ddH2O, heating at 70°C for 2 mins and collecting on a magnet, then

adding another 12.5 μL ddH2O, heating at 80°C for 2 mins and collecting on a magnet. All

collected elution was performed with another DNase treatment in a 30 μL system containing 0.5

μL Turbo DNase and 3 μL Turbo DNase Buffer at 37°C for 1 hr. 0.5 μL 10% SDS was added to

halt DNase reaction. Eluted mRNA was purified through RNA Clean SPRI Beads. mRNA was

reverse transcribed to cDNA using SuperScript™ IV First-Strand Synthesis System with gene

specific primer MPRA_v3_Amp2Sc_R, following the manufacturer's instruction. cDNA and

plasmid control were then used for building sequencing libraries following the Tag-seq Library

Construction section in the paper of Tewhey *et al.*[19]. A total of two PCRs were needed for building

the sequencing library. The first PCR was performed with TruSeq_Universal_Adapter_P5 and

MPRA_V3_Illumina_GFP_F.   The   second   PCR   was   performed   with

TruSeq_Universal_Adapter_P5 and index primer. Samples were purified, molar pooled, and

sequenced using 1x75bp on Illumina NextSeq 500.

For samples from Jurkat cells, total DNA and RNA of transfected cells were extracted by the

Qiagen ALLPrep DNA/RNA Mini Kit following the manufacturer's instruction[23]. Extracted RNA was

processed the same as above to obtain cDNA. cDNA, extracted DNA, and plasmid control were

then used for building sequencing libraries following the Tag-seq Library Construction section in

the paper of Tewhey *et al.*[19]. A total of two PCRs were needed for building the sequencing library.

The   first   PCR   was   performed   with   TruSeq_Universal_Adapter_P5   and

MPRA_V3_Illumina_GFP_F.   The   second   PCR   was   performed   with

TruSeq_Universal_Adapter_P5 and index primer. Samples were purified, molar pooled, and

sequenced using 1x100bp on Illumina NovaSeq 6000.

All primers used in this study are provided in **Supplemental Table 1.**

MPRA data analysis

Oligo and barcode association

Paired-end, 125 bp reads were first quality filtered using Trimmomatic-0.38[84] (flags: PE -phred33,

LEADING:25, TRAILING:25, MINLEN:80). Read 1 was then separated into the 20bp barcode

region and the oligo-matching region. The trimmed oligo-matching regions of Read 1 and Read 2

were mapped back to the synthesized oligo sequences using Bowtie2[85] (flags: -X 250, --very-

sensitive, -p 16). Barcodes were then associated with the oligo sequences using the read ID. Only

uniquely mapped barcodes were used for downstream analysis.

Barcode counting

Single end 75/100 bp reads were first quality filtered using Trimmomatic-0.38[84] (flags: PE -

phred33, LEADING:3, TRAILING:3, MINLEN:70). Each read was then separated into the 20bp

barcode region and the constant region. The trimmed constant regions of the reads were mapped

back to the constant region within the eGFP 3' UTR using Bowtie2[85] (flags: --very-sensitive, -p

16). Only reads with Levenshtein distance of 4 or less within the constant region and perfect

matches to the two bases directly adjacent to the barcode were kept. Barcodes were then

associated with the retained reads using the read ID. Only barcodes that met our quality threshold

requirements described above in the methods section "*Oligo and barcode association*" were used

for downstream analysis.

Enhancer variant (EnVar) identification

We followed the procedures described in the "Identification of Regulatory Oligos" section of

Tewhey *et al.*[19] with minor modifications. In brief, oligos (alleles) with 30 or more unique barcodes

from the plasmid control were included for analysis. All barcodes were summarized at the oligo

level. Barcode count totals for each oligo, including all SLE variants and the 20 control variants,

were passed into DESeq2[86] (R version 3.5.3[87]) to estimate the fold change and significance

between plasmid controls (see **Supplemental Note 1, Supplemental Figure 5F, G**) and the

experiment replicates. A Benjamini-Hochberg FDR adjusted p-value of less than 0.05 was

required for significance. Only significant alleles with greater than or equal to a 1.5x fold change

were identified as enhancer alleles (enAlleles). A variant was identified as an enhancer variant

(enVar) if any allele of this variant was an enAllele. Results for the 20 control variants were

compared to data from Tewhey *et al.*[19] to estimate accuracy, sensitivity, and specificity.

 Allelic enVar identification

Only enVars were considered for allelic analysis. The barcode counts from every allele of each

enVar were used for calculating p-values by comparing the log2 ratios of the non-reference allele

vs the reference allele, normalized by plasmid controls, using Student's *t*-test[19,35]. p-values were

adjusted with the Benjamini-Hochberg FDR-based procedure. A corrected p-value of less than

0.05 was required for significance. Only significant alleles with 25%-fold changes or greater were

identified as allelic enVars (see **Supplemental Note 2, Supplemental Figure 6**). We have

created an R package (mpraprofiler) for performing this analysis, which is available on the

Weirauch lab GitHub page (https://github.com/WeirauchLab/).

Downstream MPRA analysis

Gene annotation

We annotated each SLE genetic variant with its nearest gene using the NCBI RefSeq table[88]

downloaded from the UCSC table browser[83]. enVars were annotated using a combination of DNA

looping interactions (GM12878 Capture Hi-C data[89,90]) and eQTL data obtained from the eQTL

Catalogue, a resource that contains quality controlled, uniformly re-computed eQTLs from 19

eQTL publications[62,91-110], EBV-transformed B cell lines (GTEx Analysis V7 (dbGaP Accession

phs000424.v7.p2)[40] and other individual studies[111-114]. For all variants, the target genes were

annotated (**Supplemental Data Set 2**) using the union of promoter interacting genes and eQTL

genes from B cells with and without EBV transformation, when available. Otherwise, target genes

were annotated as the nearest gene. Allelic enVar gene targets were classified into four tiers: a

Tier 1) variant is both an eQTL and also loops to the promoter of the same gene; a Tier 2) variant

has an eQTL for at least one gene; a Tier 3) variant only loops to the promoter of at least one

gene; a Tier 4) variant is neither an eQTL nor loops to the promoter of any gene (**Supplemental**

Data Set 12).

TF binding site motif enrichment analysis

To identify specific TFs whose binding might contribute to the enhancer activity observed in our

MPRA experiments, we performed HOMER[33] TF binding site motif enrichment analysis.

Specifically, we used HOMER to calculate the enrichment of each motif in the sequence of

enAlleles compared to the sequences of non-enAlleles. HOMER was modified to use the large

library of human position weight matrix (PWM) binding site models contained in build 2.0 of the

CisBP database[34] and a log base 2 likelihood scoring system.

GO enrichment analysis

Enrichr[115,116] was used for GO enrichment analysis. In short, the target genes of enVars were

passed to Enrichr for analysis. Results from the GO biological process (2018) category were used

(**Supplemental Data Set 8, Supplemental Figure 3)**.

Identification and processing of publicly available LCL ChIP-seq data

1,058 ChIP-seq datasets were obtained from the Gene Expression Omnibus (GEO)[117] using

custom scripts that searched for ChIP-seq experiments performed in EBV-transformed

lymphoblastoid cell lines (LCLs). The annotations for every dataset (assay type, cell line, assayed

molecule) were manually checked by two authors (MTW and LCK) to ensure accuracy. The

Sequence Read Archive (SRA) files obtained from GEO were analyzed using an automated

pipeline. Briefly, the pipeline first runs QC on the FastQ files containing the sequencing reads

using FastQC (v0.11.2)[118]. If FastQC detects adapter sequences, the pipeline runs the FastQ files

through Trim Galore (v0.4.2)[119], a wrapper script that runs cutadapt (v1.9.1)[120] to remove the

detected adapter sequence from the reads. The quality controlled reads are then aligned to the

reference human genome (hg19/GRCh37) using bowtie2 (v2.3.4.1)[85]. The aligned reads (in .BAM

format) are then sorted using samtools (v1.8.0)[121] and duplicate reads are removed using picard

(v1.89)[122]. Finally, peaks are called using MACS2 (v2.1.2) (flags: callpeak -g hs -q 0.01 -f BAM)[123].

ENCODE blacklist regions[124] were removed from the peak sets using the hg19-blacklist.bed.gz

file available at https://github.com/Boyle-Lab/Blacklist/tree/master/lists/Blacklist_v1. ChIP-seq

datasets GSM1666207, GSM2748907 and GSM1599157 were removed due to the low number

of cells used in the experiments.

Functional genomics dataset enrichment analysis with RELI

We used the RELI[10] algorithm to identify genomic features (TF binding events, histone marks,

etc.) that coincide with enVars. As input, RELI takes the genomic coordinates of enVars. RELI

then systematically intersects these coordinates with one of the GM12878 ChIP-seq datasets,

and the number of input regions overlapping the peaks of this dataset (by at least one base) is

counted. Next, a p-value describing the significance of this overlap is estimated using a

simulation-based procedure. To this end, a 'negative set' is created for comparison to the input

set, which in this study contains the set of non-enVars (i.e., variants with no allele having an

adjusted p-value of less than 0.05 and more than 10%- fold change in the DESeq2 result). A

distribution of expected overlap values is then created from 2,000 iterations of randomly sampling

from the negative set, each time choosing a set of negative examples that match the input set in

terms of the total number of genomic loci. The distribution of the expected overlap values from

the randomized data resembles a normal distribution and can thus be used to generate a Z-score

and corresponding p-value estimating the significance of the observed number of input regions

that overlap each ChIP-seq dataset.

We performed similar RELI analysis for allelic enVars. As input, we used the allelic enVar sites.

For the 'negative set', we used the set of common SNPs taken from the dbSNP142 database

downloaded from the UCSC table browser[83].

Identification of allelic ChIP-seq reads using MARIO

To identify possible mechanisms underlying our allelic enVars, we applied our MARIO[10] method

to the LCL ChIP-seq dataset collection described above. In brief, MARIO identifies common

genetic variants that are (1) heterozygous in the assayed cell line and (2) located within a peak

in a given ChIP-seq dataset. It then examines the sequencing reads that map to each

heterozygote in each peak for imbalance between the two alleles. Results are combined across

experimental replicates to produce a robust Allelic Reproducibility Score (ARS). Results with

MARIO ARS value > 0.4 that also pass the following three post-processing filters were considered

allelic. (1) The variant must be significantly allelic for a given protein/histone mark (ARS > 0.4) in

at least 50% of the datasets in which that variant was heterozygous; (2) The same allele must be

significantly preferred (ARS > 0.4) in at least 75% of the datasets where that variant shows

significant allelic behavior; and (3) The replicates of a given experiment must all prefer the same

strong allele. These post-processing filters were applied to remove results with inconsistent allelic

imbalance, extending the procedures of our previous study[10].

Identification of* variant overlapping *and* variant adjacent *TFs

Variant overlapping TFs were identified using an algorithm that compares predicted TF binding

motif scores between the different alleles of each allelic enVar. First, we padded each allele of a

given allelic enVar with 25 bps of upstream and downstream DNA sequence (a sufficient length

to account for any known human TF binding sites[125]). The algorithm consists of two major

components: (1) individually scoring the two alleles of a given variant with a given TF model; and

(2) quantifying the difference in the binding intensity between these two alleles. DNA sequences

are scored using the large collection of human TF position frequency matrix (PFM) models

contained in the Cis-BP database[34] and the log-likelihood PFM scoring system[126]. Since log-

likelihood score distributions vary substantially (depending on the information content of a given

motif), we employ a simple scaled scoring system that maps a given log-likelihood score to the

percentage of the maximum achievable log-likelihood score of the given motif – we refer to this

value as the "relative PFM score". We identify binding site altering events (i.e. "creating" or

"breaking" a predicted binding site for a given TF motif) as cases where one allele has a relative

PFM score of 70% or higher, and the other allele has a score of less than 40%. For a given variant,

any TF with allelic ChIP-seq sequencing reads (see above) and a binding site altering event for

any of its motifs was deemed a *variant overlapping* TF. Any TF with allelic ChIP-seq sequencing

reads and a lack of a binding site altering event for any of its motifs was deemed a *variant adjacent*

TF.

We next sought to identify particular TFs that tend to be *variant overlapping* TFs at SLE allelic

enVars. To this end, we calculated the fraction of times each TF motif has a binding site altering

event (as defined above) at SLE allelic enVars. As background, we calculated the fraction of

times each TF motif has a binding site altering event at non-allelic enVars. The significance of the

difference between these two fractions was then calculated using a proportions test. Results are

provided in **Supplemental Data Set 15**.

We used a similar procedure to identify particular TFs that tend to be *variant adjacent* TFs at SLE

allelic enVars. We performed HOMER motif enrichment analysis using the full 170bp allelic enVar

DNA sequences as input. The standard HOMER null model (scrambled input sequence,

maintaining dinucleotide frequencies) was used as background. The fractions of motif "hits"

obtained in the foreground vs. background set were then compared, and significance was again

calculated using a proportions test. Results are provided in **Supplemental Data Set 15**.

Data availability

MPRA data are available in the Gene Expression Omnibus (GEO) database under accession

number GSE143792. Full datasets and processed results are provided in the Supplementary

Material.

Code availability

Source code, with full documentation and examples, are freely available under the GNU General

Public License on the Weirauch Lab GitHub page:

https://github.com/WeirauchLab

Acknowledgements

We thank Roger Pique-Regi and Francesca Luca for their consultation and guidance in the

development of our MPRA libraries and approach. We thank Kevin Ernst for computational

support. We greatly appreciate Aaron Zorn, Raphael Kopan, Marc Rothenberg, and Stephen

Waggoner for constructive feedback and guidance.

This work was funded by the National Institutes of Health (F32 AI129249, K99-HG009920, P30

AR070549, P30 DK078392, R01 AI024717, R01 AI148276, R01 AR073228, R01 DK107502, R01

GM055479, R01 HG010730, R01 NS099068, U01 AI130830, U01 HG008666), Cincinnati

Children's Hospital Research Foundation (Academic and Research Committee award, Center for

Pediatric Genomics pilot funding, Endowed Scholar award), the Veterans Administration (I01

BX001834), the Ohio Supercomputing Center, and the State of Ohio.

Author Contributions

This manuscript was written by XL, XC, MTW, and LCK with critical input from CF, OD, DM, SP,

TH, YH, MP, TC, ERM, JPR, CGdB, and JBH. Experiments were designed by XL, JPR, CGdB,

MTW, and LCK with computational design by XL, XC, SP, JPR, CGdB, MTW, and LCK.

Experiments were performed by XL, CF, OD, DM, and YH. Analysis was performed by XL, XC,

and SP. Data were provided by TH, MP, TC, ERM, and MTW. Funding was provided by JPR,

CGdB, JBH, MTW, and LCK.

Competing Interests Statement. None of the authors have conflicts to disclose.

References

1.   Carter, E.E., Barr, S.G. & Clarke, A.E. The global burden of SLE: prevalence, health
disparities and socioeconomic impact. *Nat Rev Rheumatol* **12**, 605-20 (2016).
2.   Tsokos, G.C. Systemic Lupus Erythematosus. *New England Journal of Medicine* **365**,
2110-2121 (2011).
3.   Deng, Y. & Tsao, B.P. Genetic susceptibility to systemic lupus erythematosus in the
genomic era. *Nat Rev Rheumatol* **6**, 683-92 (2010).
4.   Visscher, P.M. *et al.* 10 Years of GWAS Discovery: Biology, Function, and Translation.
Am J Hum Genet **101**, 5-22 (2017).
5.   Fike, A.J., Elcheva, I. & Rahman, Z.S.M. The Post-GWAS Era: How to Validate the
Contribution of Gene Variants in Lupus. *Curr Rheumatol Rep* **21**, 3 (2019).
6.   Corradin, O. *et al.* Modeling disease risk through analysis of physical interactions
between genetic variants within chromatin regulatory circuitry. *Nat Genet* **48**, 1313-1320
(2016).
7.   Farh, K.K. *et al.* Genetic and epigenetic fine mapping of causal autoimmune disease
variants. *Nature* **518**, 337-43 (2015).
8.   Teruel, M. & Alarcon-Riquelme, M.E. The genetic basis of systemic lupus
erythematosus: What are the risk factors and what have we learned. *J Autoimmun* **74**,
161-175 (2016).
9.   Hu, X. *et al.* Integrating autoimmune risk loci with gene-expression data identifies
specific pathogenic immune cell subsets. *Am J Hum Genet* **89**, 496-506 (2011).
10.   Harley, J.B. *et al.* Transcription factors operate across disease loci, with EBNA2
implicated in autoimmunity. *Nat Genet* **50**, 699-707 (2018).
11.   Karrar, S. & Cunninghame Graham, D.S. Abnormal B Cell Development in Systemic
Lupus Erythematosus: What the Genetics Tell Us. *Arthritis Rheumatol* **70**, 496-507
(2018).
12.   Dorner, T., Giesecke, C. & Lipsky, P.E. Mechanisms of B cell autoimmunity in SLE.
Arthritis Res Ther **13**, 243 (2011).
13.   Draborg, A.H., Duus, K. & Houen, G. Epstein-Barr virus and systemic lupus
erythematosus. *Clin Dev Immunol* **2012**, 370516 (2012).
14.   McClain, M.T. *et al.* Early events in lupus humoral autoimmunity suggest initiation
through molecular mimicry. *Nat Med* **11**, 85-9 (2005).
15.   James, J.A. *et al.* An increased prevalence of Epstein-Barr virus infection in young
patients suggests a possible etiology for systemic lupus erythematosus. *J Clin Invest*
100, 3019-26 (1997).
16.   Hanlon, P., Avenell, A., Aucott, L. & Vickers, M.A. Systematic review and meta-analysis
of the sero-epidemiological association between Epstein-Barr virus and systemic lupus
erythematosus. *Arthritis Res Ther* **16**, R3 (2014).
17.   Pope, J.H. Establishment of Cell Lines from Peripheral Leucocytes in Infectious
Mononucleosis. *Nature* **216**, 810-811 (1967).
18.   Patwardhan, R.P. *et al.* Massively parallel functional dissection of mammalian enhancers
in vivo. *Nat Biotechnol* **30**, 265-70 (2012).
19.   Tewhey, R. *et al.* Direct Identification of Hundreds of Expression-Modulating Variants
using a Multiplexed Reporter Assay. *Cell* **165**, 1519-1529 (2016).
20.   Ulirsch, J.C. *et al.* Systematic Functional Dissection of Common Genetic Variation
Affecting Red Blood Cell Traits. *Cell* **165**, 1530-1545 (2016).
21.   Liu, Y. *et al.* Functional assessment of human enhancer activities using whole-genome
STARR-sequencing. *Genome Biol* **18**, 219 (2017).

22. Vockley, C.M. *et al.* Massively parallel quantification of the regulatory effects of
noncoding genetic variation in a human cohort. *Genome Res* **25**, 1206-14 (2015).
23. Klein, J.C. *et al.* Functional testing of thousands of osteoarthritis-associated variants for
regulatory activity. *Nat Commun* **10**, 2434 (2019).
24. Choi, J. *et al.* Massively parallel reporter assays of melanoma risk variants identify MX2
as a gene promoting melanoma. *Nat Commun* **11**, 2718 (2020).
25. Lin, X. *et al.* FAM13A Represses AMPK Activity and Regulates Hepatic Glucose and
Lipid Metabolism. *iScience* **23**, 100928 (2020).
26. Madan, N. *et al.* Functionalization of CD36 cardiovascular disease and expression
associated variants by interdisciplinary high throughput analysis. *PLoS Genet* **15**,
e1008287 (2019).
27. Zhang, S. *et al.* Allele-specific open chromatin in human iPSC neurons elucidates
functional disease variants. *Science* **369**, 561-565 (2020).
28. Zhou, V.W., Goren, A. & Bernstein, B.E. Charting histone modifications and the
functional organization of mammalian genomes. *Nat Rev Genet* **12**, 7-18 (2011).
29. Ruer-Laventie, J. *et al.* Overexpression of Fkbp11, a feature of lupus B cells, leads to B
cell tolerance breakdown and initiates plasma cell differentiation. *Immun Inflamm Dis* **3**,
265-79 (2015).
30. Armstrong, D.L. *et al.* GWAS identifies novel SLE susceptibility genes and explains the
association of the HLA region. *Genes Immun* **15**, 347-54 (2014).
31. Han, J.W. *et al.* Genome-wide association study in a Chinese Han population identifies
nine new susceptibility loci for systemic lupus erythematosus. *Nat Genet* **41**, 1234-7
(2009).
32. Yang, J. *et al.* ELF1 is associated with systemic lupus erythematosus in Asian
populations. *Hum Mol Genet* **20**, 601-7 (2011).
33. Heinz, S. *et al.* Simple combinations of lineage-determining transcription factors prime
cis-regulatory elements required for macrophage and B cell identities. *Mol Cell* **38**, 576-
89 (2010).
34. Weirauch, M.T. *et al.* Determination and inference of eukaryotic transcription factor
sequence specificity. *Cell* **158**, 1431-1443 (2014).
35. Ray, J.P. *et al.* Prioritizing disease and trait causal variants at the TNFAIP3 locus using
functional and genomic features. *Nat Commun* **11**, 1237 (2020).
36. Stergachis, A.B. *et al.* Exonic transcription factor binding directs codon choice and
affects protein evolution. *Science* **342**, 1367-72 (2013).
37. Zhao, B. *et al.* Epstein-Barr virus exploits intrinsic B-lymphocyte transcription programs
to achieve immortal cell growth. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **108**, 14902-7 (2011).
38. International Consortium for Systemic Lupus Erythematosus, G. *et al.* Genome-wide
association scan in women with systemic lupus erythematosus identifies susceptibility
variants in ITGAM, PXK, KIAA1542 and other loci. *Nat Genet* **40**, 204-10 (2008).
39. Black, M.H. & Watanabe, R.M. A principal-components-based clustering method to
identify multiple variants associated with rheumatoid arthritis and arthritis-related
autoantibodies. *BMC Proc* **3 Suppl 7**, S129 (2009).
40. Consortium, G.T. The Genotype-Tissue Expression (GTEx) project. *Nat Genet* **45**, 580-5
(2013).
41. Lambert, S.A. *et al.* Similarity regression predicts evolution of transcription factor
sequence specificity. *Nat Genet* **51**, 981-989 (2019).
42. Sun, C. *et al.* High-density genotyping of immune-related loci identifies new SLE risk
variants in individuals with Asian ancestry. *Nat Genet* **48**, 323-30 (2016).
43. Okada, Y. *et al.* Genetics of rheumatoid arthritis contributes to biology and drug
discovery. *Nature* **506**, 376-81 (2014).

44. Kottyan, L.C. *et al.* The IRF5-TNPO3 association with systemic lupus erythematosus has
two components that other autoimmune disorders variably share. *Hum Mol Genet* **24**,
582-96 (2015).
45. Li, Y. *et al.* Genetic Variants of IkappaB Kinase beta (IKBKB) and Polymerase beta
(POLB) Were Not Associated with Systemic Lupus Erythematosus Risk in a Chinese
Han Population. *PLoS One* **10**, e0132556 (2015).
46. Zhang, Y.M. *et al.* Association of the IKZF1 5' UTR variant rs1456896 with lupus
nephritis in a northern Han Chinese population. *Scand J Rheumatol* **46**, 210-214 (2017).
47. Patel, Z.H. *et al.* A plausibly causal functional lupus-associated risk variant in the
STAT1-STAT4 locus. *Hum Mol Genet* **27**, 2392-2404 (2018).
48. Tsokos, G.C. Systemic lupus erythematosus. *N Engl J Med* **365**, 2110-21 (2011).
49. Zhu, L.J., Yang, X. & Yu, X.Q. Anti-TNF-alpha therapies in systemic lupus
erythematosus. *J Biomed Biotechnol* **2010**, 465898 (2010).
50. Zhou, H. *et al.* Epstein-Barr Virus Oncoprotein Super-enhancers Control B Cell Growth.
Cell Host & Microbe **17**, 205-216 (2015).
51. Kurth, J. *et al.* EBV-Infected B Cells in Infectious Mononucleosis: Viral Strategies for
Spreading in the B Cell Compartment and Establishing Latency. *Immunity* **13**, 485-495
(2000).
52. Babcock, G.J., Hochberg, D. & Thorley-Lawson, D.A. The Expression Pattern of
Epstein-Barr Virus Latent Genes In Vivo Is Dependent upon the Differentiation Stage of
the Infected B Cell. *Immunity* **13**, 497-506 (2000).
53. Hernando, H. *et al.* The B cell transcription program mediates hypomethylation and
overexpression of key genes in Epstein-Barr virus-associated proliferative conversion.
Genome Biology **14**, R3 (2013).
54. Hansen, K.D. *et al.* Large-scale hypomethylated blocks associated with Epstein-Barr
virus-induced B-cell immortalization. *Genome Res* **24**, 177-84 (2014).
55. Mrozek-Gorska, P. *et al.* Epstein–Barr virus reprograms human B lymphocytes
immediately in the prelatent phase of infection. *Proceedings of the National Academy of
Sciences* **116**, 16046 (2019).
56. Deplancke, B., Alpern, D. & Gardeux, V. The Genetics of Transcription Factor DNA
Binding Variation. *Cell* **166**, 538-554 (2016).
57. Kilpinen, H. *et al.* Coordinated effects of sequence variation on DNA binding, chromatin
structure, and transcription. *Science* **342**, 744-7 (2013).
58. Reddy, T.E. *et al.* Effects of sequence variation on differential allelic transcription factor
occupancy and gene expression. *Genome Res* **22**, 860-9 (2012).
59. Lu, X. *et al.* Lupus Risk Variant Increases pSTAT1 Binding and Decreases ETS1
Expression. *Am J Hum Genet* **96**, 731-9 (2015).
60. Tsang, A.S.M.W.P. *et al.* Comprehensive approach to study complement C4 in systemic
lupus erythematosus: Gene polymorphisms, protein levels and functional activity. *Mol
Immunol* **92**, 125-131 (2017).
61. Juptner, M. *et al.* Low copy numbers of complement C4 and homozygous deficiency of
C4A may predispose to severe disease and earlier disease onset in patients with
systemic lupus erythematosus. *Lupus* **27**, 600-609 (2018).
62. Momozawa, Y. *et al.* IBD risk loci are enriched in multigenic regulatory modules
encompassing putative causative genes. *Nat Commun* **9**, 2427 (2018).
63. D'Antonio, M. *et al.* Systematic genetic analysis of the MHC region reveals mechanistic
underpinnings of HLA type associations with disease. *Elife* **8**(2019).
64. Lam, T.H., Shen, M., Tay, M.Z. & Ren, E.C. Unique Allelic eQTL Clusters in Human
MHC Haplotypes. *G3 (Bethesda)* **7**, 2595-2604 (2017).

65. Aguiar, V.R.C., Cesar, J., Delaneau, O., Dermitzakis, E.T. & Meyer, D. Expression
estimation and eQTL mapping for HLA genes with a personalized pipeline. *PLoS Genet*
15, e1008091 (2019).
66. Iatropoulos, P. *et al.* Association study and mutational screening of SYNGR1 as a
candidate susceptibility gene for schizophrenia. *Psychiatr Genet* **19**, 237-43 (2009).
67. Kim, K. *et al.* High-density genotyping of immune loci in Koreans and Europeans
identifies eight new rheumatoid arthritis risk loci. *Ann Rheum Dis* **74**, e13 (2015).
68. Liu, J.Z. *et al.* Dense fine-mapping study identifies new susceptibility loci for primary
biliary cirrhosis. *Nat Genet* **44**, 1137-41 (2012).
69. Wu, C. *et al.* BioGPS: an extensible and customizable portal for querying and organizing
gene annotation resources. *Genome Biol* **10**, R130 (2009).
70. Liu, L. *et al.* Genome-wide association study identifies three novel susceptibility loci for
systemic lupus erythematosus in Han Chinese. *Br J Dermatol* **179**, 506-508 (2018).
71. Morris, D.L. *et al.* Genome-wide association meta-analysis in Chinese and European
individuals identifies ten new loci associated with systemic lupus erythematosus. *Nat*
Genet **48**, 940-946 (2016).
72. Alarcon-Riquelme, M.E. *et al.* Genome-Wide Association Study in an Amerindian
Ancestry Population Reveals Novel Systemic Lupus Erythematosus Risk Loci and the
Role of European Admixture. *Arthritis Rheumatol* **68**, 932-43 (2016).
73. Zhang, Y. *et al.* Genome-wide search followed by replication reveals genetic interaction
of CD80 and ALOX5AP associated with systemic lupus erythematosus in Asian
populations. *Ann Rheum Dis* **75**, 891-8 (2016).
74. Kunz, M. *et al.* Genome-wide association study identifies new susceptibility loci for
cutaneous lupus erythematosus. *Exp Dermatol* **24**, 510-5 (2015).
75. Lei, S.F. & Deng, F.Y. Identification of susceptibility genes for systemic lupus
erythematosus with a genome-wide gene-based association study. *Scand J Rheumatol*
43, 426-8 (2014).
76. Okada, Y. *et al.* A genome-wide association study identified AFF1 as a susceptibility
locus for systemic lupus eyrthematosus in Japanese. *PLoS Genet* **8**, e1002455 (2012).
77. Yang, W. *et al.* Genome-wide association study in Asian populations identifies variants
in ETS1 and WDFY4 associated with systemic lupus erythematosus. *PLoS Genet* **6**,
e1000841 (2010).
78. Cervino, A.C., Tsinoremas, N.F. & Hoffman, R.W. A genome-wide study of lupus:
preliminary analysis and data release. *Ann N Y Acad Sci* **1110**, 131-9 (2007).
79. Langefeld, C.D. *et al.* Transancestral mapping and genetic load in systemic lupus
erythematosus. *Nat Commun* **8**, 16021 (2017).
80. The Genomes Project, C. *et al.* A global reference for human genetic variation. *Nature*
526, 68 (2015).
81. Chang, C.C. *et al.* Second-generation PLINK: rising to the challenge of larger and richer
datasets. *Gigascience* **4**, 7 (2015).
82. Sherry, S.T. *et al.* dbSNP: the NCBI database of genetic variation. *Nucleic Acids Res* **29**,
308-11 (2001).
83. Karolchik, D. *et al.* The UCSC Table Browser data retrieval tool. *Nucleic Acids Res* **32**,
D493-6 (2004).
84. Bolger, A.M., Lohse, M. & Usadel, B. Trimmomatic: a flexible trimmer for Illumina
sequence data. *Bioinformatics* **30**, 2114-20 (2014).
85. Langmead, B. & Salzberg, S.L. Fast gapped-read alignment with Bowtie 2. *Nat Methods*
9, 357-9 (2012).
86. Love, M.I., Huber, W. & Anders, S. Moderated estimation of fold change and dispersion
for RNA-seq data with DESeq2. *Genome Biol* **15**, 550 (2014).
87. Team, R.C. R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing. (2019).

88. Pruitt, K.D., Tatusova, T. & Maglott, D.R. NCBI Reference Sequence (RefSeq): a
curated non-redundant sequence database of genomes, transcripts and proteins.
Nucleic Acids Res **33**, D501-4 (2005).

89. Cairns, J. *et al.* CHiCAGO: robust detection of DNA looping interactions in Capture Hi-C
data. *Genome Biol* **17**, 127 (2016).

90. Jung, I. *et al.* A compendium of promoter-centered long-range chromatin interactions in
the human genome. *Nat Genet* **51**, 1442-1449 (2019).

91. Kerimov, N. *et al.* eQTL Catalogue: a compendium of uniformly processed human gene
expression and splicing QTLs. *bioRxiv*, 2020.01.29.924266 (2020).

92. Alasoo, K. *et al.* Shared genetic effects on chromatin and gene expression indicate a
role for enhancer priming in immune response. *Nat Genet* **50**, 424-431 (2018).

93. Chen, L. *et al.* Genetic Drivers of Epigenetic and Transcriptional Variation in Human
Immune Cells. *Cell* **167**, 1398-1414 e24 (2016).

94. Gutierrez-Arcelus, M. *et al.* Passive and active DNA methylation and the interplay with
genetic variation in gene regulation. *Elife* **2**, e00523 (2013).

95. Lappalainen, T. *et al.* Transcriptome and genome sequencing uncovers functional
variation in humans. *Nature* **501**, 506-11 (2013).

96. Kilpinen, H. *et al.* Common genetic variation drives molecular heterogeneity in human
iPSCs. *Nature* **546**, 370-375 (2017).

97. Nedelec, Y. *et al.* Genetic Ancestry and Natural Selection Drive Population Differences
in Immune Responses to Pathogens. *Cell* **167**, 657-669 e21 (2016).

98. Quach, H. *et al.* Genetic Adaptation and Neandertal Admixture Shaped the Immune
System of Human Populations. *Cell* **167**, 643-656 e17 (2016).

99. Schwartzentruber, J. *et al.* Molecular and functional variation in iPSC-derived sensory
neurons. *Nat Genet* **50**, 54-61 (2018).

100. Buil, A. *et al.* Gene-gene and gene-environment interactions detected by transcriptome
sequence analysis in twins. *Nat Genet* **47**, 88-91 (2015).

101. van de Bunt, M. *et al.* Transcript Expression Data from Human Islets Links Regulatory
Signals from Genome-Wide Association Studies for Type 2 Diabetes and Glycemic
Traits to Their Downstream Effectors. *PLoS Genet* **11**, e1005694 (2015).

102. Schmiedel, B.J. *et al.* Impact of Genetic Polymorphisms on Human Immune Cell Gene
Expression. *Cell* **175**, 1701-1715 e16 (2018).

103. Jaffe, A.E. *et al.* Developmental and genetic regulation of the human cortex
transcriptome illuminate schizophrenia pathogenesis. *Nat Neurosci* **21**, 1117-1125
(2018).

104. Ng, B. *et al.* An xQTL map integrates the genetic architecture of the human brain's
transcriptome and epigenome. *Nat Neurosci* **20**, 1418-1426 (2017).

105. Lepik, K. *et al.* C-reactive protein upregulates the whole blood expression of CD59 - an
integrative analysis. *PLoS Comput Biol* **13**, e1005766 (2017).

106. Taylor, D.L. *et al.* Integrative analysis of gene expression, DNA methylation,
physiological traits, and genetic variation in human skeletal muscle. *Proc Natl Acad Sci*
U S A **116**, 10883-10888 (2019).

107. Fairfax, B.P. *et al.* Genetics of gene expression in primary immune cells identifies cell
type-specific master regulators and roles of HLA alleles. *Nat Genet* **44**, 502-10 (2012).

108. Fairfax, B.P. *et al.* Innate immune activity conditions the effect of regulatory variants
upon monocyte gene expression. *Science* **343**, 1246949 (2014).

109. Kasela, S. *et al.* Pathogenic implications for autoimmune mechanisms derived by
comparative eQTL analysis of CD4+ versus CD8+ T cells. *PLoS Genet* **13**, e1006643
(2017).

110. Naranbhai, V. *et al.* Genomic modulators of gene expression in human neutrophils. *Nat*
Commun **6**, 7545 (2015).

111. Degner, J.F. *et al.* DNase I sensitivity QTLs are a major determinant of human
expression variation. *Nature* **482**, 390-4 (2012).
112. Liang, L. *et al.* A cross-platform analysis of 14,177 expression quantitative trait loci
derived from lymphoblastoid cell lines. *Genome Res* **23**, 716-26 (2013).
113. Raj, T. *et al.* Polarization of the effects of autoimmune and neurodegenerative risk
alleles in leukocytes. *Science* **344**, 519-23 (2014).
114. Lee, M.N. *et al.* Common genetic variants modulate pathogen-sensing responses in
human dendritic cells. *Science* **343**, 1246980 (2014).
115. Chen, E.Y. *et al.* Enrichr: interactive and collaborative HTML5 gene list enrichment
analysis tool. *BMC Bioinformatics* **14**, 128 (2013).
116. Kuleshov, M.V. *et al.* Enrichr: a comprehensive gene set enrichment analysis web server
2016 update. *Nucleic Acids Res* **44**, W90-7 (2016).
117. Barrett, T. *et al.* NCBI GEO: archive for functional genomics data sets--update. *Nucleic*
Acids Res **41**, D991-5 (2013).
118. Andrews, S. FastQC: a quality control tool for high throughput sequence data. (2010).
119. Goodwin, S., McPherson, J.D. & McCombie, W.R. Coming of age: ten years of next-
generation sequencing technologies. *Nat Rev Genet* **17**, 333-51 (2016).
120. Bentley, D.R. *et al.* Accurate whole human genome sequencing using reversible
terminator chemistry. *Nature* **456**, 53-9 (2008).
121. Patwardhan, R.P. *et al.* High-resolution analysis of DNA regulatory elements by
synthetic saturation mutagenesis. *Nat Biotechnol* **27**, 1173-5 (2009).
122. Vaughn, S.E. *et al.* Lupus risk variants in the PXK locus alter B-cell receptor
internalization. *Front Genet* **5**, 450 (2014).
123. Kottyan, L.C. *et al.* The IRF5-TNPO3 association with systemic lupus erythematosus has
two components that other autoimmune disorders variably share. *Hum Mol Genet* **24**,
582-96 (2015).
124. Amemiya, H.M., Kundaje, A. & Boyle, A.P. The ENCODE Blacklist: Identification of
Problematic Regions of the Genome. *Sci Rep* **9**, 9354 (2019).
125. Lambert, S.A. *et al.* The Human Transcription Factors. *Cell* **172**, 650-665 (2018).
126. Stormo, G.D. Consensus patterns in DNA. *Methods Enzymol* **183**, 211-21 (1990).

Figure Legends

Figure 1. Massively Parallel Reporter Assays Workflow. See text for description.

Figure 2. Regulatory activity of enhancer variants (enVars). a. Distribution of MPRA

regulatory activity. The normalized fold-change of MPRA activity relative to plasmid control (X-

axis) was calculated using DESeq2. Enhancer alleles (enAlleles) were identified as those alleles

with significant activity relative to control ($p_{adj} < 0.05$) and at least a 50% increase in activity (see

Methods). b. Enrichment of histone marks in GM12878 cell at enVars compared to non-enVars.

p-values were estimated using RELI (see Methods). Full RELI results are provided in

Supplemental Data Set 9. c. Enrichment of regulatory protein and transcription factor (TF)

binding at enVars compared to non-enVars. The top 15 TFs (based on RELI p-values) that overlap

at least 10% of enVars are shown. Full results are provided in **Supplemental Data Set 9**. d. TF

binding site motif enrichment for enVars compared to non-enVars. p-values were obtained from

HOMER using the full oligo sequences of enVars and non-enVars (see Methods). The top 15

enriched TF motif families are shown. Full results are provided in **Supplemental Data Set 10**.

Figure 3. Regulatory activity of allelic enhancer variants (allelic enVars). a. Identification of

allelic enVars. Genotype dependence (Y-axis) is defined as the normalized fold change of MPRA

activity between the non-reference and reference alleles (see Methods). MPRA enhancer activity

(X-axis) is presented as the maximum normalized fold-change of MPRA activity for any allele of

the variant. Allelic enVars were defined as variants with a significant difference in MPRA activity

($p_{adj} < 0.05$) between any pair of alleles and at least a 25% change in activity difference (see

Methods). b. MPRA enhancer activity at the 27 risk loci with at least one allelic enVar. Bar plots

indicate the total number of variants at each locus. Variants with allelic enhancer activity (allelic

enVars) are shown in red. Variants lacking allelic enhancer activity are shown in grey.

Figure 4. Lupus risk allele-dependent gene regulatory mechanisms at
the *C4A* and *SYNGR1* genomic loci. a. and e. Normalized MPRA enhancer activity of each
experimental replicate for rs3101018 and rs26069235. b. and f. Expression trait quantitative loci
(eQTLs) revealing genotype-dependent expression of C4A and SNYGR1 for rs3101018 and
rs26069235 in EBV-transformed B cell lines (GTEx). c. and g. Genotype-dependent activity of
transcription factors, transcriptional regulators, and histone marks in EBV-transformed B cell
lines for rs3101018 and rs26069235. Results with MARIO ARS value >0.4 and consistent allelic
imbalance across ChIP-seq datasets are included (see Methods). The X-axis indicates the
preferred allele, along with a value indicating the strength of the allelic behavior, calculated as
one minus the ratio of the weak to strong read counts (e.g., 0.5 indicates the strong allele has
twice the reads of the weak allele). The median value is plotted when data from multiple cell
lines are available, with full results provided in **Supplemental Figure 4**. The numbers in
parentheses represent the number of ChIP-seq datasets with significant allelic activity (i.e. MARIO
ARS value > 0.4) out of the number of datasets where the given variant is inside a ChIP-seq peak
and is also heterozygous in the given cell line. *Variant overlapping* TFs are indicated in
black. *Variant adjacent* TFs are shown in green (see definition in **Figure 5a**). d. and h.
DNA binding motif logos are shown for the ATF/CREB/CREM family, and ELF1 in the context
of the DNA sequence surrounding rs3101018 and rs2069235, respectively. Tall nucleotides
above the X-axis indicate preferred DNA bases. Bases below the X-axis are disfavored.
Figure 5. Identification of *variant overlapping* and *variant adjacent* TFs. a. Model of *variant*
overlapping and *variant adjacent* transcription factors (TFs). *Variant overlapping* TFs allelically
bind on top of variants, while *variant adjacent* TFs allelically bind near variants. b. TF binding site
location distribution for *variant overlapping* and *variant adjacent* TFs, relative to allelic enVars. c.
TF motif families enriched for participating as *variant overlapping* TFs at allelic enVars. Motif
disruption p-values were estimated by comparing the fraction of motif disruption events at allelic
enVars to the fraction observed at non-allelic enVars (see Methods). d. TF motif families enriched

for participating as *variant adjacent* TFs at allelic enVars. Motif enrichment p-values were

estimated by comparing the fraction of predicted TF binding sites in allelic enVars to random

expectation (see Methods). For both the *variant overlapping* and *variant adjacent* analyses, motif

families are shown with p_{adj} <0.0001 and three or more allelic events at allelic enVar loci, or five

or more predicted binding sites at allelic enVar loci, respectively.

GWAS loci   LD expansion   Insert oligo with barcode into vector   Backbone library

Allelic enhancer activity   Barcode expression with transfection   Transfection library   Insert GFP into backbone library

Figure 1

Figure 2

Figure 3

Figure 4

a

b

TF binding site distribution

c

Variant overlapping TFs

d

Variant adjacent TFs

Figure 5