The *cis*-regulatory effects of modern human-specific variants

Authors

Carly V. Weiss[1,*], Lana Harshman[2,3,*], Fumitaka Inoue[2,3,4], Hunter B. Fraser[1], Dmitri A. Petrov[1,]

[†], Nadav Ahituv[2,3,†], David Gokhman[1,†]

[1] Department of Biology, Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305, USA

[2] Department of Bioengineering and Therapeutic Sciences, University of California San Francisco, San Francisco,

CA, 94158, USA.

[3] Institute for Human Genetics, University of California San Francisco, San Francisco, CA, 94158, USA.

[4] Present address: Institute for the Advanced Study of Human Biology (WPI-ASHBi), Kyoto University, Kyoto,

606-8501, Japan

[*] Equal contributors

[†] Corresponding authors

Abstract

The Neanderthal and Denisovan genomes enabled the discovery of sequences that differ between modern and archaic humans, the majority of which are noncoding. However, our understanding of the regulatory consequences of these differences remains limited, in part due to the decay of regulatory marks in ancient samples. Here, we used a massively parallel reporter assay in embryonic stem cells, neural progenitor cells and bone osteoblasts to investigate the regulatory effects of the 14,042 single-nucleotide modern human-specific variants. Overall, 1,791 (13%) of sequences containing these variants showed active regulatory activity, and 407 (23%) of these drove differential expression between human groups. Differentially active sequences were associated with divergent transcription factor binding motifs, and with genes enriched for vocal tract and brain anatomy and function. This work provides insight into the regulatory function of variants that emerged along the modern human lineage and the recent evolution of human gene expression.

Introduction

The fossil record allows us to directly compare skeletons between modern humans and their closest extinct relatives, the Neanderthal and the Denisovan. From this we can make inferences not only about skeletal differences, but also about other systems, such as the brain. These approaches have uncovered a myriad of traits that distinguish modern from archaic humans. For example, our face is flat with smaller jaws, our development is slower, our pelvises are narrower, our limbs tend to be slenderer, and our brain differs in its substructure proportions[1–3] (especially the cerebellum[4]). Despite our considerable base of knowledge of how modern humans differ from archaic humans at the phenotypic level, we know very little about the genetic changes that have given rise to these phenotypic differences.

The Neanderthal and the Denisovan genomes provide a unique insight into the genetic underpinnings of recent human phenotypic evolution. The vast majority of genetic changes that separate modern and archaic humans are found outside protein-coding regions, and some of these likely affect gene expression[5]. Such regulatory changes may have a sizeable impact on human evolution, as alterations in gene regulation are thought to underlie most of the phenotypic differences between closely related groups[6–9]. Indeed, there is mounting evidence that many of the noncoding variants that emerged in modern humans have altered gene expression in *cis*, shaped phenotypes, and have been under selection[5,10–18]. Fixed variants, in particular, could potentially underlie phenotypes specific to modern humans, and some of these variants might have been driven to fixation by positive selection.

Unfortunately, our ability to infer the regulatory function of noncoding variants is currently

limited[19]. In archaic humans, incomplete information on gene regulation is further exacerbated

by the lack of RNA molecules and epigenetic marks in these degraded samples[5]. We have

previously used patterns of cytosine degradation in ancient samples to reconstruct whole-genome

archaic DNA methylation maps[12,20,21]. However, despite various approaches to extract regulatory

information from ancient genomes[5,13,21–26], our understanding of gene regulation in archaic

humans remains minimal, with most archaic regulatory information being currently

inaccessible[5]. Additionally, whereas expression quantitative locus (eQTL) mapping can be used

to identify variants that drive differential expression between individuals, it can only be applied

to loci that are variable within the present-day human population. Therefore, fixed noncoding

variants are of particular interest in the study of human evolution, but are also particularly

difficult to characterize.

Massively parallel reporter assays (MPRAs) provide the ability to interrogate the regulatory

effects of thousands of variants *en masse*[27]. By cloning a candidate regulatory sequence

downstream to a short transcribable sequence-based barcode, thousands of sequences and

variants can be tested for regulatory activity in parallel. Thus, MPRA is an effective high-

throughput tool to identify variants underlying divergent regulation, especially in organisms

where experimental options are limited[28–31]. Here, we conducted a lentivirus-based MPRA

(lentiMPRA[32]) on the 14,042 fixed or nearly fixed single-nucleotide variants that emerged along

the modern human lineage. We generated a library of both the derived (modern human) and

ancestral (archaic human and ape) sequences of each locus and expressed them in three human

cell types: embryonic stem cells (ESCs), neural progenitor cells (NPCs), and primary fetal

osteoblasts. By comparing the transcriptional activities of each pair of sequences, we generated a

comprehensive catalog providing a map of sequences with regulatory potential and those that

alter gene expression. We found that 1,791 (13%) of the sequence pairs promote expression and

that 407 (23%) of these active sequences drive differential expression between the modern and

archaic alleles. These differentially active sequences are associated with differential transcription

factor binding affinity and are enriched for genes that affect the vocal tract and brain. This work

provides a genome-wide catalog of the *cis*-regulatory effects of genetic variants unique to

modern humans, allowing us to systematically interrogate recent human gene regulatory

evolution.

Results

LentiMPRA design and validation

To define a set of variants that likely emerged and reached fixation or near fixation along the

modern human lineage, we took all the single-nucleotide variants where modern humans differ

from archaic humans and great apes (based on three Neanderthal genomes[33–35], one Denisovan

genome[36], and 114 chimpanzee, bonobo, and gorilla genomes[37]). We excluded any polymorphic

sites within modern humans (in either the 1000 Genomes Project[38] or in dbSNP[39]), or within

archaic humans and great apes[33–37] (see Methods). The resulting set of 14,042 pairs of sequences

comprises those changes that likely emerged and reached fixation or near fixation along the

modern human lineage (**Supplementary File 1**). By definition, this list does not include variants

that introgressed from archaic humans into modern humans and spread to detectable frequencies.

We refer to the derived version of each variant as the *modern human sequence* and the ancestral

version as the *archaic human sequence*.

Figure 1. Using lentiMPRA to identify variants driving differential expression in modern humans. We
analyzed variants that likely emerged and reached fixation or near fixation along the modern human lineage (yellow)
and that were not polymorphic in any other ape or archaic genome (green) (top). The modern and archaic human
variants and their surrounding 200 bp were synthesized, cloned into barcoded expression constructs and infected in
triplicates into three human cell lines using a chromosomally integrating vector, following the lentiMPRA protocol[32]
(see methods). We compared the activity (RNA/DNA) of the modern and archaic human constructs to identify
variants promoting differential expression using MPRAnalyze[40] (bottom).

We synthesized a library composed of 200 base pair (bp) sequences per each of the 14,042 pairs

of sequences (**Fig. 1, Supplementary File 1**). Each sequence contained at its center either the

modern or archaic human variant. We amplified this library of sequences, each along with a

minimal promoter and barcode. We then inserted these constructs into the lentiMPRA vector, so

that the barcode, which is the readout of activity, is located within the 5'UTR of the reporter

gene and is transcribed if the assayed sequence is an active regulatory element[32]. We associated

each sequence with multiple barcodes to achieve a high number of independent replicates of

expression per sequence. Furthermore, we used a chromosomally integrating construct rather

than an episomal construct due to the improved technical reproducibility and correlation of

results from chromosomally integrating constructs with functional genomic signals like

transcription factor ChIP-seq and histone acetylation marks[41]. To reduce lentivirus site-of-

integration effects, this vector contained antirepressors on either side and was integrated in

multiple independent sites, with each sequence marked by multiple barcodes. 97% of sequences

had at least 10 barcodes associated with them, with a median of 96 barcodes per sequence

(**Supplementary Fig. 1a**).

The brain and skeleton have been the focus of evolutionary studies due to their extensive

phenotypic divergence within human lineages[3]. Therefore, we chose human cells related to each

of these central systems: NPCs and primary fetal osteoblasts. In addition, we used ESCs due to

their globally active transcription, which provides a general view of gene expression[42]. We used

the library of 14,042 pairs of archaic and modern human sequences, together with positive and

negative control sequences, to infect each cell type. As positive controls for ESCs and NPCs, we

added a set of 199 sequences with known regulatory capacity from previous MPRAs

(**Supplementary File 1**). To our knowledge, there have not been any MPRAs conducted in

osteoblasts, so we searched the literature for putative regulatory regions in osteoblasts and other

bone cell types and used these as putative positive controls (**Supplementary File 1**, see

Methods.). As negative controls, in all cell types, we randomly chose 100 sequences from the

library and scrambled the order of their bases, creating a set of GC-content matching sequences

that had not been previously established to drive expression.

We performed three replicates of library infection in each cell type and quantified barcode

abundance for each sequence in RNA and DNA (**Fig. 1**). To assess the reproducibility of our

lentiMPRA results, we calculated the RNA/DNA ratio (a measure of expression normalized to

the number of integrated DNA molecules) for each sequence and compared it across the three

replicates per cell type. We saw a strong correlation of RNA/DNA ratios between replicates for

all cell types (R = 0.76 – 0.96, $P < 10^{-100}$, **Supplementary Fig. 1b**). High barcode and read

coverage in MPRA generally provides increased power to detect differences in allelic

expression[32,43]. Thus, to determine how variability depended on our barcode counts, we

downsampled the number of barcodes per sequence and calculated the RNA/DNA ratio at each

step for each of the three replicates. In agreement with previous studies[41], we found that the

number of barcodes used in this study is well within the plateau, suggesting that the number of

barcodes is not a limiting factor in our experiment (**Supplementary Fig. 1c**). Finally, we

assessed the distribution of RNA/DNA ratios across our scrambled sequences and positive

controls. The mean RNA/DNA ratio of the scrambled sequences was lower than that of the

positive control sequences in ESCs and NPCs ($P = 2.7 \times 10^{-8}$ for ESCs and $P = 1.8 \times 10^{-6}$ for NPCs,

t-test, see Methods, **Supplementary Fig. 1d**), but not in osteoblasts ($P = 0.25$). This is unlikely

due to a problem with the osteoblasts, as the osteoblast-related controls show similar expression

in all three cell types. Moreover, ESC and NPC positive controls are active in osteoblasts ($P = $

1.1×10^{-3}). The correlation between replicates was also similar between osteoblasts and the other

two cell types (**Supplementary Fig. 1b**). Thus, the lack of activity of the osteoblast putative

positive controls is likely because, in contrast to the ESC and NPC positive controls, the

osteoblast putative positive controls were not previously tested in an MPRA and are not driving

as much expression as the true positive controls in the ESCs and NPCs. Overall, these results

suggest that the lentiMPRA was technically reproducible and adequately powered to detect

expression.

Supplementary Figure 1. Reproducibility of lentiMPRA data. a. Distribution of number of barcodes per each
sequence. **b.** Replicate-by-replicate correlation of expression (RNA/DNA). Each point represents an active
sequence. Pearson's R and *P*-values are shown. **c.** Simulations of barcode down-sampling showing Pearson's
correlation of expression (RNA/DNA) between replicates. Upper panel shows all sequences and lower panel shows
sequences with higher expression (RNA/DNA > 3). Pearson's R values are normalized to maximum Pearson's R
observed for each pair of replicates. **d.** Box plots of scrambled vs. positive control sequences. One-sided *t*-test *P*-
values are shown. ESC RNA/DNA values greater than 20 were set to 20. Black lines show the median.

Characterization of active regulatory sequences

We first examined which of the assayed sequences are able to drive expression. To do so, we

utilized MPRAnalyze[40], which uses a model for each of the RNA and DNA counts, estimates

transcription rate and then identifies sequences driving significant expression. We also added an

additional stringency filter whereby a sequence is only considered expressed if it had an

RNA/DNA ratio significantly higher than that of the scrambled sequences (FDR < 0.05). We

found that in ESCs, 8% (1,183) of sequence pairs drove expression in at least one of the alleles,

6% (814) in osteoblasts, and 4% (602) in NPCs (FDR < 0.05, see Methods). Hereinafter, we

refer to these sequences as *active* sequences. Overall, 13% (1,791) of archaic and modern human

sequence pairs were active in at least one cell type, 4% (586) in at least two cell types, and 2%

(222) in all three cell types (overlap of 75-fold higher than expected, $P < 10^{-100}$, Super Exact

test[44], **Fig. 2a**).

To test whether activity in our lentiMPRA reflects true biological function, we investigated

whether our active sequences had expected regulatory characteristics in the modern human

genome. Active sequences tend to bear active chromatin marks in their endogenous genomic

environment. Therefore, we examined whether active sequences in lentiMPRA tend to be

enriched for markers of active chromatin. We first tested overlap with five histone modification

marks and one histone variant associated with active chromatin (H3K27ac, H3K4me1,

H3K4me2, H3K4me3, H3K9ac, and H2A.Z), as well as with two histone modification marks

associated with repressed chromatin (H3K9me3 and H3K27me3, see Methods)[45]. We found that

on average, active sequences were 1.7x more likely than inactive sequences to have an active

chromatin mark. At the same time, these sequences tended to be depleted of repressive marks

(**Fig. 2b-d, Supplementary File 2**). This trend gets stronger when looking at more highly active

sequences. For example, while only 18% of inactive sequences overlap an H3K4me2 peak, 70%

of active sequences with an RNA/DNA ratio > 3 in ESCs overlap H3K4me2 peaks (*FDR* =

1.9×10^{-21}, hypergeometric test, **Fig. 2b-d, Supplementary File 2**). To further test the functional

characteristics of active sequences, we analyzed chromHMM annotation[45,46], which uses

chromatin signatures to subdivide the genome into functional regions. Compared to inactive

sequences, we found that active sequences are enriched for promoter and enhancer marks

(**Supplementary Fig. 2a-c**, **Fig. 2e, Supplementary File 1-2**). We also found that compared to

inactive sequences, active sequences are 6-32% closer to GTEx[47] eQTLs, depending on cell type

(FDR < 0.05, *t*-test). Active sequences are also 1.2-1.3x closer to transcription start sites (TSSs),

with 32-39% of them located within 10 kb of a TSS, depending on cell type (FDR < 0.05, *t*-test,

Supplementary File 2).

Finally, compared to inactive sequences, active sequences show higher sequence conservation in

primates, indicating a functional role (PhyloP, FDR = 1.1×10^{-3}, *t*-test, **Supplementary File 2**). In

summary, we found that sequences that are capable of driving expression tend to overlap active

chromatin marks, be depleted of repressive chromatin marks, be closer to TSSs and eQTLs, and

have higher sequence conservation, giving us confidence that the MPRA provides us with

biologically meaningful results.

Figure 2. Identification of modern human sequences promoting expression in lentiMPRA. a. Overlap between
cell types of active sequences. Super Exact test *P*-value is shown for the overlap of the three groups. **b-d.**
Enrichment levels of active and repressive histone modification marks within active sequences. Enrichment is
computed compared to inactive sequences. **e.** Enrichment of differentially active sequences in various chromatin-
based genomic annotations. Missing circles reflect no differentially active sequences in that category. Asterisks
mark significant enrichments (FDR < 0.05).
219

221 **Supplementary Figure 2. Classification of chromHMM annotations for different groups of variants.** Relative
222 percentage of bases in each chromHMM category throughout the entire genome (**a**), in fixed or nearly fixed modern
223 human-derived variants (**b**), in active sequences (**c**) and in differentially active sequences (**d**), per cell type.
224

Differentially active sequences between modern and archaic humans

We next set out to identify modern and archaic human sequences driving differential expression.

We used MPRAnalyze[40] to compare expression driven by the modern and archaic sequences.

Out of the active sequence pairs in each cell type, 110 (9%) in ESCs drive significantly

differential expression between modern and archaic humans, 243 (30%) in osteoblasts, and 153

(25%) in NPCs (FDR ≤ 0.05, see Methods, **Fig. 3a-c, Supplementary File 1**, see Discussion for

cell-type differences). We refer to these sequence pairs hereinafter as *differentially active*

sequences. Overall, we see significant overlap between cell types in differentially active

sequences: 407 sequences (23% of active sequences) were differentially active in at least one cell

type, 89 (5%) in at least two cell types, and 10 (0.6%) in all three cell types (8-fold higher than

expected, $P = 5 \times 10^{-7}$, Super Exact test[44], **Fig. 3d**).

As expected from such closely related organisms, and similar to other MPRAs that compared

nucleotide variants (see Discussion) including one that compared human and chimp sequences[30],

most sequences drove modest magnitudes of expression difference; of the 407 differentially

active sequences, the median fold-change was 1.2x, and only five sequences had a fold-change

greater than 2x (**Fig. 3a-c**). We refer to differentially active sequences where modern human

expression is higher/lower than archaic human expression as up/downregulating sequences,

respectively. In ESCs and NPCs, sequences were equally likely to be up- or downregulating

(51% and 52% of differentially active sequences were downregulating, $P = 0.92$ and $P = 0.63$,

respectively, Binomial test), while in osteoblasts downregulation was observed slightly more

often (59%, $P = 6.9 \times 10^{-3}$). For sequences that are differentially active in more than one cell type,

we found an exceptional agreement between the direction of differential activity, with the

regulation of 107 out of 109 pairs going in the same direction ($P = 9.2 \times 10^{-30}$, Binomial test), and

a high correlation between the magnitudes of differential activity (Pearson's R = 0.82, $P =$

1.6×10^{-27}). That differentially activity sequences from one cell type are predictive of differential

activity in other cell types, even of cell types as disparate as those used here, suggests that these

sequences are likely to be differentially active in other cell types not assayed in this lentiMPRA.

Figure 3. Differential activity of derived modern human sequences. a-c. Distributions of expression fold-changes (RNA/DNA) of active (light) and differentially active (dark) sequences in each cell type. **d.** Overlap of differentially active sequences between cell types. Super Exact test P-value is presented for the overlap of the three groups. In the 10 sequences that were differentially active across all three cells types, the direction of fold-change was identical across all cell types ($P = 1.9x10^{-3}$, Binomial test). **e.** Violin plots of predicted TF binding score difference between modern and archaic sequences. Positive scores represent increased binding in the modern sequence. Points show mean.

To further test the replicability of these results, we examined the relationship between pairs of overlapping differentially active sequences (i.e., variants that are < 200bp apart and thus appear in more than one sequence, three overlapping pairs in ESCs, five in osteoblasts, and two in NPCs). We found that the direction of expression change is identical in all pairs of overlapping sequences ($P = 2.0x10^{-3}$, binomial test), and that the magnitude of their expression change is

highly correlated (Pearson's R = 0.95, 2.4x10^{-5}, **Supplementary Fig. 3a**). To validate these

results with an orthogonal method, we tested four differentially active sequences from each cell

type in a luciferase reporter assay and found that the direction and magnitude of differential

expression tended to replicate the lentiMPRA results (9 out of 12 sequences, Pearson's R = 0.67,

P = 3.7x10^{-4}, **Supplementary Fig. 3b, Supplementary File 1**). These results suggest that the

lentiMPRA was both technically reproducible across cell types and assays and also indicative of

true biological signal.

Finally, we examined the endogenous genomic locations of differentially active sequences,

focusing on promoters and enhancers. Out of these 407 sequences, 34% (138) are within 10 kb of

a TSS. Analyzing chromHMM[46], we found that 8% (32) of the sequences are within or flanking

an active TSS, and 17% (70) are within a putative enhancer. To test if differentially active

sequences are enriched within specific chromHMM annotations, we compared the proportion

overlapping each annotation to that proportion in the other active sequences. We found that

sequences driving differential expression are over-represented within putative enhancer regions

(*P* = 3.6x10^{-3}, Fisher's exact test, see Discussion). This is mainly driven by enrichment within

ESCs and NPCs (2.2x and 2.54x, *P* = 5.1x10^{-3}, and *P* = 2.0x10^{-6}, respectively, **Supplementary**

Fig. 2c-d, **Supplementary File 3**, see Methods). These results support a model of rapid enhancer

evolution in modern humans, as previously reported for other mammals[48].

Supplementary Figure 3. Differential expression is replicated across overlapping sequences and in a reporter assay validation. a. Expression fold-change of overlapping pairs of sequences. Pearson's R and *P*-value are presented. **b.** Expression fold-change of lentiMPRA vs luciferase assay. Each pair of points connected by a line represent two replicates. Pearson's R and *P*-value are presented.

Molecular mechanisms underlying differential activity

Next, we sought to understand what regulatory mechanisms could be associated with differential

activity. Changes in expression are often linked to changes in regulatory marks, such as DNA

methylation. Thus, we checked the overlap between differentially active sequences and

differential methylation in modern versus archaic humans[12,20,21]. As hypermethylation of

regulatory elements is often associated with transcriptional downregulation[49], we tested if higher

activity levels in the lentiMPRA are associated with hypomethylation and vice versa. Because

the DNA methylation maps originate from bone samples, we compared them to the osteoblast

lentiMPRA data. We found that upregulating sequences indeed have a slight but significant

tendency to be hypomethylated and that downregulating sequences tend to be hypermethylated in

modern compared to archaic humans (-1% difference for upregulating sequences, and +2% for

downregulating sequences, *P* = 0.028, paired *t*-test). This trend strengthens when looking at the

most differentially regulating sequences. For example, the top ten most downregulating

sequences show on average +3.2% methylation in modern humans, whereas the top ten most

upregulating sequences show -7.4% methylation. We also found that differentially active

sequences tend to overlap previously reported differentially methylated regions[12] more often than

expected by chance ($P = 0.01$, overlap within 10 kb, hypergeometric test).

We conjectured that some of the differential activity in these loci might have been driven by

alterations in transcription factor (TF) binding. To investigate this, we compared predicted TF

binding affinity to the modern and archaic sequences using FIMO[50]. We found that: (1)

compared to other active sequences, the difference in predicted binding between the modern and

archaic human alleles tends to be larger for differentially active sequences (combined across cell

types: 4.3x, $P = 0.02$, t-test, **Supplementary Fig. 4a**); (2) the directionality of differential

expression tends to match the directionality of differential binding, i.e., upregulating sequences

tend to have stronger predicted binding for the modern human sequence, whereas

downregulating sequences tend to have stronger predicted binding for the archaic sequence ($P =$

3.7×10^{-6} for ESCs, $P = 1.7 \times 10^{-6}$ for osteoblasts, and $P = 1.3 \times 10^{-5}$ for NPCs, binomial test, **Fig.**

3e, see Methods); and (3) the magnitude of expression difference is correlated with the

magnitude of predicted binding difference (Pearson's R $= 0.43$ and $P = 1.2 \times 10^{-3}$ for ESCs,

Pearson's R $= 0.23$ and $P = 0.02$ for osteoblasts, and Pearson's R $= 0.35$ and $P = 2.4 \times 10^{-3}$ for

NPCs, **Supplementary Fig. 4b-d** and **Supplementary File 4**). These results support the notion

that alterations in TF binding played a role in shaping some of the expression differences

between modern and archaic humans.

To identify the TFs that primarily drove these observations, we investigated which motif changes

are most predictive of expression changes. For each TF and the sequences it is predicted to

differentially bind, we examined the correlation between binding and expression fold-change.

We found that changes to the motifs of 11 TFs in osteoblasts and 13 in NPCs were predictive of

expression changes, i.e., higher affinity to the modern human sequences was predictive of higher

expression of that sequence (**Supplementary Fig. 4e, Supplementary File 4**). All of these TFs

had a positive correlation between changes in their predicted binding affinity and changes in

expression of their bound sequences, reflective of an activator function.

Next, we sought to explore if some motif changes are particularly over-represented within

differentially active sequences, suggestive of a more central role in shaping modern human

regulatory evolution. To control for sequence composition biases, we used active sequences as a

background to search for motif enrichment in differentially active sequences. We found two

enriched motifs: ZNF281 (4.6-fold, FDR = 0.016, in NPCs) and SP3 (2.5-fold, FDR = 0.046, in

NPCs, **Supplementary File 4**). ZNF281, among other functions, is an inhibitor of neuronal

differentiation[51]. SP3 is a ubiquitously expressed TF involved in a wide variety of processes

including cell differentiation, proliferation, and synaptic gene regulation[52]. Both TFs bind GC-

rich sequences with overlapping binding specificities[53,54], evident also through the overlap

between them in predicted differential binding (**Supplementary File 4**). Out of 153 differentially

active sequences in NPCs, 23 (15%) are predicted to be differentially bound by SP3 (2.5-fold,

FDR = 0.046), and 14 by ZNF281 (4.6-fold, FDR = 0.016). Intriguingly, ZNF281 and SP3 are

also two of the TFs whose predicted differential binding is most tightly linked with differential

expression (**Supplementary Fig. 4e-g**). Overall, these data support a model whereby variants in

ZNF281 and SP3 motifs might have modulated their binding in NPCs, thereby shaping neural

expression differences between modern and archaic humans.

Supplementary Figure 4. Predicted TF binding is correlated with expression changes. a. Violin plots of
absolute predicted TF binding score difference between modern and archaic sequences. Points show mean. **b-d.**
Expression fold-change vs predicted TF binding fold-change. Positive scores represent increased binding in the
modern sequence. Parentheses show number of points in each quadrant with a score difference > 0. **e.** Pearson's
correlation between differential expression and predicted differential binding affinity. Only significant TFs (FDR <=
0.05, Supplementary File 4) are shown for osteoblasts (yellow) and NPCs (red). **f,g.** Expression fold-change vs
predicted TF binding fold-change for SP3 (e) and ZNF281 (f) in NPCs. Pearson's correlation R and *P*-value are
shown.
364

Phenotypic consequences of differential expression

In an attempt to assess the functional effects of the differential transcriptional activity we

detected, we first sought to link each sequence to the gene(s) it might regulate in its endogenous

genomic location. While most regulatory sequences are known to affect their closest gene[55,56],

some exert their function through interactions with more distal genes, often reflected in

chromatin conformation capture assays, such as Hi-C interactions[57], or eQTL associations[57,58].

To predict the genes linked to each sequence we combined data from four sources: (1) proximity

to transcription start sites; (2) proximity to eQTLs[47]; (3) proximity to putative enhancers[59]; and

(4) spatial interaction with promoters using Hi-C data[58] (see Methods). Using these data, we

generated for each cell type a list of genes potentially regulated by each sequence. Overall, 1,341

out of the 1,791 active sequences (75%) were linked to at least one putative target gene

(**Supplementary File 1**).

To study the potential functional effects of sequences driving differential expression, we

analyzed functions associated with their linked genes. To control for confounders such as cell

type-specific regulation, gene length, and GC content, we compared differentially active

sequences to other active sequences (instead of the genomic background), which minimizes

inherent biases in the active sequences. First, we tested Gene Ontology terms and found an

enrichment of the terms *G-protein coupled receptor signaling pathway* (2.9-fold, FDR = 0.019,

in ESCs), and *regulation of transcription, DNA-templated* (1.8-fold, FDR = 3.3×10^{-3}, in

downregulating sequences across all cells combined, **Supplementary File 4**). To obtain a more

detailed picture of phenotypic function, we ran Gene ORGANizer, a tool that uses monogenic

disorders to link genes to the organs they affect[60]. We analyzed the genes linked to differentially

active sequences and found that for genes linked to sequences driving up-regulation, the most

enriched body parts belong to the vocal tract, i.e., the vocal cords (5.0-fold, FDR = 1.1×10^{-3}),

voice box (larynx, 3.8-fold, FDR = 4.2×10^{-3}), and pharynx (3.3-fold, FDR = 8.3×10^{-3}, all within

ESCs, **Fig. 4a**). Interestingly, we have previously reported that the most extensive DNA

methylation changes in modern compared to archaic humans arose in genes affecting the vocal

tract[12]. Most subcranial, appendicular and axial skeletal parts are also over-represented within

upregulating sequences. Conversely, within sequences driving downregulation, the enriched

body parts are the cerebellum (3.0-fold, FDR = 3.9×10^{-3}, in NPCs) and urethra (2.3-fold, FDR =

0.04, in ESCs, **Fig. 4a, Supplementary File 5**). This is in line with previous reports of cerebellar

anatomy differences between modern humans and Neanderthals[1–3], including results suggesting

that the biggest differences in brain anatomy are in the cerebellum[4]. These data also provide

leads into the functional divergence of organs, like the urethra, that are not preserved in the fossil

record.

Next, we delved into individual phenotypes associated with the differentially active sequences.

To this end, we used the Human Phenotype Ontology (HPO) database[61], a curated database of

genes and the phenotypes they underlie in monogenic disorders. HPO covers a broad range of

phenotypes related to anatomy, physiology, and behavior. Within upregulating sequences, the

enriched phenotypes were involved in learning ability, craniofacial morphology, speech,

hormonal activity, heart anatomy, testicular descent, osteoarthritis, muscle tone, and spine

curvature (FDR < 0.05, **Fig. 4b**). Within downregulating sequences, we detected an enrichment

of phenotypes affecting cerebellar size, intellectual ability, seizures, kidney function, and

walking (FDR < 0.05, **Fig. 4b, Supplementary File 5**). These results reveal body parts and

phenotypes that were particularly associated with gene expression changes between modern and

archaic humans, and could be new candidates for phenotypes under selection.

Figure 4. Differentially active sequences are linked to genes affecting the vocal tract and brain. a. Gene ORGANizer enrichment map showing body parts that are significantly over-represented within genes linked to differentially active sequences (FDR < 0.05). Results for the top enriched organs are labeled. These, as well as all remaining enriched organs, are colored according to the enrichment scale. For full results see Supplementary File 5. **b.** HPO phenotypes significantly enriched within differentially active sequences. Fold enrichment and FDR are shown in parentheses. **c.** CpG islands and read density of active histone modification marks[45] around the differentially active sequence in *SATB2* (GRCh37 genome version).

Downregulation of *SATB2* potentially underlies brain and skeletal differences

This catalog of *cis*-regulatory changes allows us to explore specific sequence changes that

potentially underlie divergent phenotypes observed from fossils. To use the most robust data

from lentiMPRA, we examined the ten sequences that are differentially active across all three

cell types, and looked at their linked genes. To investigate the phenotypes that are potentially

linked to these genes, we looked for those genes whose phenotypes can be compared to the fossil

record (i.e., skeletal phenotypes). The only gene that fit these criteria was *SATB2*, a regulator of

brain and skeletal phenotypes[62]. First, we analyzed its linked variant (C to T transition), which is

at a position that is highly conserved in vertebrates (GRCh38: 199,469,203 on chromosome 2,

PhyloP score = 0.996). This position is found within a CpG island between two alternative TSSs

of *SATB2* (**Fig. 4c**). It is also found in the first intron of *SATB2-AS1*, an antisense lncRNA which

upregulates SATB2 protein levels[63]. To determine if this position lies within a regulatory region,

we investigated it for chromatin marks in modern humans. We found that it overlaps a DNase I-

hypersensitive site[64] and shows many peaks of active histone modification marks in all three cell

types (**Fig. 4c, Supplementary File** 1). Indeed, this sequence drives high expression in all three

cell types (fourth, eighth, and 19th percentile among active sequences, in ESCs, osteoblasts, and

NPCs, respectively, FDR < 10^{-5} across all). Although this sequence shows hallmarks of activity

in modern humans, compared to the archaic sequence the modern human sequence is

downregulating in all three cell types (-9% in ESCs, FDR = 6.8×10^{-4}, -27% in osteoblasts, FDR

= 2.2×10^{-42}, and -12% in NPCs, FDR = 1.1×10^{-7}). These results suggest that the ancestral version

of this sequence possibly promoted even higher expression in archaic humans.

SATB2 encodes a transcription factor expressed in developing bone and brain. Its activity

promotes bone formation, jaw patterning, cortical upper layer neuron specification, and

tumorigenesis[62]. Genome-wide association studies (GWAS) show that common variants near

SATB2 are mainly associated with brain and bone phenotypes, such as reaction time, anxiety,

mathematical abilities, schizophrenia, autism, and bone density[65]. Heterozygous loss-of-function

mutations in *SATB2* result in the *SATB2*-associated syndrome, which primarily affects

neurological and craniofacial phenotypes. This includes speech delay, behavioral anomalies

(e.g., jovial personality, aggressive outbursts, and hyperactivity), autistic tendencies, small jaws,

dental abnormalities, and morphological changes to the palate[66]. Additionally, reduced functional

levels of SATB2 due to heterozygous loss-of-function have been shown to be the cause of these

phenotypes in both human[62,66–68] and mouse[69–71]. Because these phenotypes are driven by

changes to functional SATB2 levels[62], we conjectured that the differential expression of *SATB2*

predicted from lentiMPRA might be linked to divergent modern human phenotypes. Thus, we

examined whether the phenotypes *SATB2* affects are divergent between archaic and modern

humans (e.g., if modern human jaw size is different than the jaw size of archaic humans). We

focused on phenotypes available for examination from the fossil record, primarily skeletal

differences between modern humans and Neanderthals. From HPO, we generated a list of 17

phenotypes known to be affected by *SATB2* and found that 88% (15) of them are divergent

between these human groups (**Supplementary File 6**). These include the length of the skull, size

of the jaws, and length of the dental arch. Next, based on *SATB*2 downregulation in modern

humans predicted from lentiMPRA, we examined whether the direction of a phenotypic change

between patients and healthy individuals matches the direction of phenotypic change between

modern and archaic humans. For example, given that *SATB2*-associated syndrome patients have

smaller jaws, we tested if modern human jaws are smaller compared to archaic humans. If

SATB2 expression is not in fact related to phenotypic divergence, there is a 50% likelihood for a

given phenotype to match the fossil record. Yet, we observed a match in direction in 80% of the

phenotypes (12 out of 15, **Supplementary File 6**). This includes smaller jaws, flatter face, and

higher forehead in modern compared to archaic humans. Overall, the observed number of

phenotypes that are both divergent and match in their direction of change is 2.3-fold higher than

expected by chance ($P = 1.3 \times 10^{-4}$, hypergeometric test, **Supplementary File 6,** see Methods).

Together, these data support a model whereby the C→T substitution in the promoter of *SATB2*,

which emerged and reached fixation in modern humans, likely reduced the expression of *SATB2*

and possibly affected brain and craniofacial phenotypes. However, further evidence is required to

elucidate the potential role of this variant in modern human evolution.

Discussion

Identifying noncoding sequence changes underlying human traits is one of the biggest challenges

in genetics. This is particularly difficult in ancient samples, where regulatory information is

scarce[5,21]. Here, we use an MPRA-based framework to study how sequence changes shaped

human gene regulation. By comparing modern to archaic sequences, we investigated how each

of the 14,042 single-nucleotide variants that emerged and reached fixation or near fixation in

modern humans have affected expression. We found an association between divergent TF motifs

and the sequences driving expression changes, suggesting that changes to TF binding might have

played a central role in shaping divergent modern human expression. Our results also suggest

that genes affecting the vocal tract and cerebellum might have been particularly affected by these

expression changes, which is in line with previous comparisons based on the fossil record[1–4] and

DNA methylation[12]. More importantly, these results provide candidate sequence changes

underlying these evolutionary trends.

LentiMPRA is designed for linking DNA sequence changes to expression changes *en masse*.

Notably, it has limitations that could influence our results, mainly by potentially generating false

negatives. First, our lentiMPRA library inserts were limited to ~200bp in length, due to

oligonucleotide synthesis technical restrictions, which may be insufficient to detect the activity

of longer enhancer sequences[41]. Second, some minimally active sequences may not be expressed

at a high enough level to pass our limit of detection. Third, some sequences may regulate

expression post-transcriptionally, which lentiMPRA is not designed to detect. Fourth, since test

sequences are randomly integrated into the genome, sequences that are dependent on their

endogenous genomic environments (e.g., on nearby TF binding sites) might show reduced

activity when inserted in new locations, while others might show activity that they otherwise

would not have. Our design partially addresses this through the use of insulators and multiple

independent integrations, which are intended to dilute location-specific effects. Additionally, all

biases are expected to similarly affect the modern and archaic human versions of each

sequence[41]. Fifth, transcriptional repression is less likely to be detected due to the low basal

activity of the minimal promoter used. Finally, differences in the *trans* environment of a cell

could have an effect on the ability of a sequence to exert its *cis*-regulatory effects. However,

previous data comparing substantially more divergent organisms (e.g., human-chimpanzee[30] and

human-mouse[72]) show that *cis*-regulatory changes exert their effects similarly across different

trans environments, suggesting the potential effect of such *trans* differences is likely minimal

between modern and archaic humans.

Importantly, when genomes from additional modern human individuals are sequenced and new

variants mapped, it might become clear that some of the variants we analyzed have not reached

fixation. However, regardless of whether they are completely fixed or not, these variants

represent derived substitutions that likely emerged in modern humans and spread to considerable

frequency. Further investigation is required to determine when they emerged, how rapidly they

spread, and whether their effect was neutral or adaptive.

As expected, we observed differences in activity and differential activity between cell

types[28,43,72]. Although some of this variation is likely biological (i.e. cell type-specific gene

regulation), it is difficult to determine what proportion of it is due to biological versus technical

factors (e.g., differences in lentivirus preparation, infection rate, or cell growth, see Methods).

Importantly, these differences are expected to result in false negatives rather than false positives.

In other words, some of the sequences that appear as active or differentially active in one cell

type might actually be active or differentially active in additional cell types (including cell types

that were not tested in this study). Thus, we largely refrained from comparisons between cell

types. Despite these caveats and limitations, lentiMPRA is a powerful high-throughput tool to

characterize the regulatory activity of derived variants, and indeed has become a common assay

to study the capability of sequences to promote expression[19].

With this method, we found that 1,791 (13%) of the 14,042 sequence pairs can promote

expression in at least one of the three cell types tested, and that 405 (23%) of these active

sequences show differential activity between modern and archaic humans (average fold-change:

1.24x, standard deviation: 0.18, **Fig. 2**, **Supplementary File 1**). Interpreting these results in light

of previous MPRAs is challenging, not only because of key differences in statistical power and

experimental design (e.g., sequence length), but also because of differing variant selection

processes for each MPRA. With the exception of highly repetitive regions, which were removed

from our library for technical reasons, the sequences we selected included all known modern

human-derived fixed or nearly fixed variants (see Methods). Conversely, previous reporter

assays and MPRAs on human intra- or inter-species variation used biased sets of variants by

selecting sequences with putative regulatory function (e.g., eQTLs[28], TF binding sites[16], ChIP-

seq peaks[29], or TSSs[72]) and/or regions showing particularly rapid evolution (e.g., human

accelerated regions[30,31,73,74]). In line with the fact that our data was not pre-filtered for putative

regulatory regions, the proportion of active and differentially active sequences we observed tends

to be slightly lower than these previous studies, but the magnitude of differential expression in

our active sequences was similar[16,28–31,72–74]. At the same time, we were capable of measuring

regulatory activity in regions that would otherwise be excluded by filtering for a specific set of

marks. Thus, future MPRAs on unfiltered sets of variants will enable the comparison of the

patterns we observed to patterns within modern humans, between more deeply divergent clades,

and of non-fixed modern-archaic differences.

Emergence of new regulatory elements is a common phenomenon in mammalian genomes[48,75].

Indeed, some instances of differential activity in our dataset could potentially be explained by the

emergence of entirely new regulatory sequences: in 22-34% (depending on cell type) of

differentially active sequences, only the derived sequence promotes activity (**Supplementary**

File 1). Some of these cases could potentially be the result of a new TF binding site. This is

supported by the observation that 20 of these sequences show significant predicted TF binding

only in the derived allele (**Supplementary File 4**).

Our results also suggest that sequences driving differential expression are over-represented

within putative enhancers, especially in ESCs and NPCs (**Supplementary Fig. 2c-d**,

Supplementary File 3). Enhancers have been suggested to be an ideal substrate for evolution

because of their tissue-specificity and temporal modularity[76]. Indeed, previous studies of

introgression between archaic and modern humans suggested that enhancers are some of the

most divergent regions between modern and archaic humans[11,25,77]. In line with the enrichment

we observed in NPCs, brain-related putative enhancers show particularly low introgression,

perhaps suggesting that the modern human sequences in these regions were adaptive[25,77]. To

fully characterize the underlying mechanisms of differential activity in enhancers, it is important

to disentangle the various factors and confounders that might contribute to this enrichment.

There are several alternative explanations for the enrichment we observe, namely that variants

within enhancers could be more likely to alter expression compared to other active sequences, or

they could be particularly detectable in lentiMPRA. This could be tested using saturation

mutagenesis MPRAs[43] to compare the effect of random mutations in enhancer and non-enhancer

modern human-derived active sequences.

Our results suggest that differentially active sequences are not randomly distributed across the

genome, but rather tend to be linked to genes affecting particular body parts and phenotypes. The

most pronounced enrichment was in the vocal tract, i.e., the vocal cords, larynx, and pharynx.

This was evident in both with Gene ORGANizer, where these organs are over-represented by up

to 5-fold, and also by HPO phenotype analysis, where the most enriched phenotype was nasal

speech (a phenotype that occurs when there is an abnormal closure of the soft palate against the

walls of the pharynx, 13-fold, FDR = 3×10^{-4}, **Fig. 4b**, **Supplementary File 5**). Overall, 53 of the

407 differentially active sequences were linked to genes which are known to affect one or more

vocal tract phenotypes. Previous reports have also suggested that the vocal tract went through

particularly extensive regulatory changes between modern and archaic humans[12], as well as

between humans and chimpanzees[78]. Intriguingly, the anatomy of the vocal tract differs between

humans and chimpanzees, and has been suggested to affect human phonetic range[79]. Comparing

the anatomy of archaic and modern human larynges is currently impossible because the soft

tissues of the larynx rapidly decay postmortem. However, together with these previous

reports[12,78], our results enable the study of vocal tract evolution from a genetic point of view and

suggest that genes influencing the modern human vocal tract have possibly gone through

regulatory changes that are not shared by archaic humans.

We also identified an enrichment of brain-related phenotypes, particularly those affecting the

size of the cerebellum (**Fig. 4**, **Supplementary File 5**). The cerebellum is involved in motor

control and perception, as well as more complex functions such as cognitive processing,

emotional regulation, language, and working memory[80]. Interestingly, the cerebellum has been

described as the most morphologically divergent brain region between modern and archaic

humans[1,4]. Evidence of divergent brain and cerebellar evolution can also be found at the

regulatory level. Studies of Neanderthal alleles introduced into modern humans through

introgression provide a clue as to the functional effects of divergent loci between archaic and

modern humans. These works have shown that many of the introgressed sequences were likely

negatively selected, with the strongest effect in regulatory regions[11,25], particularly in brain

enhancers[77]. Studies of introgressed sequences have also shown that the cerebellum is one of the

regions with the most divergent expression between Neanderthal and modern human alleles[10].

Together with our results, these data collectively suggest that sequences separating archaic and

modern humans are particularly linked to functions of the brain, and especially the cerebellum.

Functional information on archaic human genomes is particularly challenging to obtain because

of the postmortem decay of RNA and epigenetic marks in ancient samples. MPRA not only

provides a new avenue to identify differential regulation in archaic samples, but also reveals the

sequence changes underlying these differences. Here, we present a catalog providing regulatory

insight into the sequence changes that separate modern from archaic humans. This resource will

hopefully help assign functional context to various signatures of sequence divergence, such as

selective sweeps and introgression deserts, and facilitate the study of modern human evolution

through the lens of gene regulation.

Methods

Selection of fixed, derived variants and design of DNA oligonucleotides

We selected the variants for our lentiMPRA in the following manner. As a basis, we used the list of 321,820 modern human-derived single nucleotide changes reported to differ between modern humans and the Altai Neanderthal genome[33]. We then filtered this list to include only positions where the Vindija Neanderthal[34], and Denisovan[36] match the Altai Neanderthal variant (or have no information), and are also not polymorphic in any of the four ape species examined (61 *Pan troglodytes,* 10 *Pan paniscus,* 15 *Gorilla beringei*, and 28 *Gorilla gorilla*)[37]. Next, we excluded any loci which had any observed variation within modern humans in dbSNP, as annotated by Prüfer et al.[33] or in the 1000 Genomes project (phase 3)[38]. Finally, for technical limitations in downstream synthesis and cloning, we excluded variants at which the surrounding 200 base pairs (bp) had >25% repetitive elements as defined by RepeatMasker[81]. The resulting list contained 14,297 sequences and was used to design the initial set of DNA fragments. Upon completion of the lentiMPRA, another high-coverage Neanderthal genome (the Chagyrskaya Neanderthal) was published[35], and we subsequently decided to also filter out loci at which the Chagyrskaya Neanderthal genome did not match the ancestral sequence, bringing the final list of analyzed loci to 14,042 (28,082 ancestral and derived sequences, Supplementary File 1).

We designed DNA fragments (oligonucleotides, hereinafter oligos) centered on each variant, including the 99 bp upstream and 100 bp downstream of each variant (200 bp total). For each variant we designed two fragments, one with the ancestral sequence and one with the derived sequence. For cases where two or more variants would be included in the same oligo, we used either derived-only or ancestral-only variants throughout the oligo. The average variants per

oligo out of the 14,042 oligos was 1.1, with 12,680 containing one variant, 1,259 containing two,

96 containing three and seven containing four. We also included 100 negative control fragments,

created by randomly picking 100 of the designed DNA fragments and scrambling their sequence

(Supplementary File 1). Lastly, we incorporated 299 positive control fragments (i.e., expected to

drive expression). As the library was infected into three cell types (see later), we designed

positive controls for each of the cell types. For human embryonic stem cells (ESCs) and human

neural progenitor cells (NPCs), we used sequences which were previously shown to drive

expression in MPRA in each of these cell types (Supplementary File 1). For fetal osteoblast cells

(Hobs), we used putative and confirmed enhancers from mouse and human (Supplementary File

1). 15 bp adapter sequences for downstream cloning were added to the 5' (5'-

AGGACCGGATCAACT) and 3' (5'-CATTGCGTGAACCGA) ends of each fragment, bringing

the total length of each fragment to 230 bp. We synthesized each fragment as an oligonucleotide

through Agilent Technologies, twice independently to minimize synthesis errors (Supplementary

File 1).

Production of the plasmid lentiMPRA library and barcode association sequencing

The plasmid lentiMPRA library was generated as described in Gordon et al. [32]. In brief, the two

independently synthesized Agilent Technology oligo pools were amplified separately via a 5-

cycle PCR using a different pairs of primers for each pool (forward primers, 5BC-AG-f01.1 and

5BC-AG-f01.2; reverse primers, 5BC-AG-r01.1 and 5BC-AG-r01.2; Supplementary File 1),

adding a minimal promoter (mP) downstream of the test sequence. A second round of 5-cycle

PCR was performed with the same primers for both pools (5BC-AG-f02 and 5BC-AG-r02;

Supplementary File 1) to add a 15-bp random barcode downstream of the mP. The two pools

were then combined at a 1:1 ratio and cloned into a doubled digested (AgeI/SbfI) pLS-SceI

vector (Addgene, 137725) with NEBuilder HiFi Master Mix (NEB). The resulting plasmid

lentiMPRA library was electroporated into 10-beta competent cells (NEB) using a Gemini X2

electroporation system (BTX) [2kv, 25uF, 200Ω] and allowed to grow up overnight on twelve

15cm 100 mg/mL carbenicillin LB agar plates. Colonies were pooled and midiprepped (Qiagen).

We collected approximately 6 million colonies, such that ~200 barcodes were associated with

each oligo on average. To determine the sequences of the random barcodes and which oligos

they were associated with, we first amplified a fragment containing the oligo, mP and barcode

from each plasmid in the lentiMPRA library using primers that contain Illumina flow cell

adapters (P7-pLSmp-ass-gfp and P5-pLSmP-ass-i#, Supplementary File 1). We sequenced these

amplified sequences with a NextSeq 150PE kit using custom primers (R1, pLSmP-ass-seq-R1;

R2 (index read), pLSmP-ass-seq-ind1; R3, pLSmP-ass-seq-R2, Supplementary File 1) to obtain

approximately 150M total reads. We later did a second round of barcode association sequencing

of these fragments to obtain approximately 76M additional reads, for a combined total of

225,592,667 reads. To associate barcodes with oligos, we first mapped read pairs (R1 and R3) to

the original list of 28,993 oligos using bowtie2 (--very-sensitive)[82]. Next, we filtered out pairs of

reads that (1) did not map to the same oligo, (2) did not have at least one of the reads in the pair

with a mapping quality of ≥ 6, or (3) did not have the "proper pair" SAM designation. We linked

each pair of reads with the read covering its barcode (R2) and saved only those barcode reads

having at least a quality score of 30 across all 15 bases in the R2 read. We removed any barcodes

associated with more than a single unique oligo (i.e., "promiscuous" barcodes), as well as any

barcodes where we did not see evidence of its oligo association at least three times. We then

created a list of barcode-oligo associations – this final list comprised 3,495,698 unique barcodes

spanning 28,678 oligos (98.9% of the original list of 14,297 variant sequence pairs, 100 negative

sequences and 299 positive control sequences), which we refer to as the barcode-oligo

association list.

Cell culture and differentiation

Human fetal osteoblasts were purchased from Cell Applications Inc. (406K-05f) and were

maintained in osteoblast Growth Medium (Cell Applications Inc.). For passaging, cells were

washed with 1x PBS, dissociated with Trypsin/EDTA (Cell Applications Inc.), and plated at

approximately 5,000 cells/cm^2. H1-ESCs (embryonic stem cells, ESCs, WiCell WA-01,

RRID:CVCL_9771) were cultured on Matrigel (Corning) in mTeSR1 media (STEMCELL

Technologies) and medium was changed daily. For passaging, cells were dissociated using

StemPro Accutase (Thermo Fisher Scientific), washed and re-plated on Matrigel-coated dishes at

a dilution of 1:5 to 1:10 in mTeSR1 media supplemented with 10 μM Y-27632 (Selleck

Chemicals). ESCs were differentiated into neural progenitor cells (NPCs) by dual-Smad

inhibition as previously described (Chambers et al., 2009; Inoue et al., 2019). Briefly, ESCs were

cultured in mTeSR1 media until the cells became 80% confluent and then the media was

replaced with neural differentiation media consisting of: KnockOut DMEM (Life Technologies)

supplemented with KnockOut Serum Replacement (Life Technologies), 2 mM L-glutamine, 1x

MEM-NEAA (Life Technologies), 1x beta-mercaptoethanol (Life Technologies), 200 ng/mL

Recombinant mouse Noggin (R&D systems), and 10 μM SB431542 (EMD Millipore). On day 4

of differentiation, the neural differentiation media was gradually replaced by N2 media

[DMEM/F12 (Thermo Fisher Scientific) supplemented with N2 (Thermo Fisher Scientific)]

every 2 days (3:1 ratio on day 6, 1:1 on day 8 and 1:3 on day 10) while maintaining 200 ng/mL

Noggin and 10 µM SB431542. On day 12, cells were dissociated into single-cell using TrypLE

Express (Thermo Fisher Scientific) and cultured in N2B27 media [1:1 mixture of N2 media and

Neurobasal media (Thermo Fisher Scientific) with B27 (Thermo Fisher Scientific)]

supplemented with 20 ng/mL bFGF (R&D systems) and 20 ng/mL EGF (Millipore sigma)] on

Matrigel-coated dish. NPCs were maintained in N2B27 with bFGF and EGF for a month and

used for the following experiments at passage 15.

Cell line infection with lentiMPRA library, RNA- and DNA-seq and read processing

Lentivirus was produced and packaged with the plasmid lentiMPRA library in twelve 15cm

dishes of HEK293T cells using the Lenti-Pac HIV expression packaging kit, following the

manufacturer's protocol (GeneCopoeia). Additional lentivirus was produced as needed in

batches of ten 15cm dishes. Lentivirus containing the lentiMPRA library (referred to hereafter as

lentivirus) was filtered through a 0.45µm PES filter system (Thermo Scientific) and concentrated

with Lenti-X concentrator (Takara Bio). Titration reactions using varying amounts of lentivirus

were conducted on each cell type to determine the best volume to add, based on an optimal

number of viral particles per cell, as described in Gordon et al.[32]. Lentiviral infection, DNA/RNA

extraction, and barcode sequencing were all performed as described in Gordon et al.[32]. Briefly,

each replicate consisted of approximately 9.6 million cells each of ESC and osteoblast, and 20

million cells of NPC. ESC and osteoblast cells were seeded into four 10cm dishes per replicate

(with approximately 2.4 million cells in each dish), while NPCs were seeded into five 10cm

dishes per replicate (with approximately 4 million cells per dish). Additional cells were used for

NPCs due decreased efficiency of DNA/RNA extraction in NPCs). Three replicates were

performed per cell type. Cells were infected with the lentiMPRA library at a multiplicity of

infection (MOI) of 50 for NPCs and osteoblasts, and a MOI of 10 for ESCs. We used a lower

MOI for ESC because the cells are very sensitive to infection and a MOI higher than 10 would

result in cell death. For ESC and osteoblasts, cell media was changed to include 8ug/mL

polybrene before the addition of the lentiMPRA library to increase infection efficiency. The

media was replaced with growth media without polybrene approximately 24 hours after

infection. Infected cells were grown for three days before combining the plates of each replicate

for extraction of RNA and DNA via the Qiagen AllPrep mini kit (Qiagen). We subsequently

purified mRNA from the RNA using the Oligotex mRNA prep kit (Qiagen) and synthesized

cDNA from the resulting mRNA with SuperScript II RT (Invitrogen), using a primer containing

a unique molecular identifier (UMI) (P7-pLSmp-ass16UMI-gfp, Supplementary File 1). DNA

fragments were amplified from both the isolated DNA and generated cDNA, keeping each

replicate and DNA type separate, with 3-cycle PCR using primers that include adapters

necessary for sequencing (P7-pLSmp-ass16UMI-gfp and P5-pLSmP-5bc-i#, Supplementary File

1). These primers also contained a sample index for demultiplexing and a UMI for consolidating

replicate molecules (see later). A second round of PCR was performed to amplify the library for

sequencing using primers targeting the adapters (P5, P7, Supplementary File 1). The fragments

were purified and further sequenced with six runs of NextSeq 15PE with 10-cycle dual index

reads, using custom primers (R1, pLSmP-ass-seq-ind1; R2 (read for UMI), pLSmP-UMI-seq;

R3, pLSmP-bc-seq; R4 (read for sample index), pLSmP-5bc-seq-R2, Supplementary File 1).

Later, an additional two runs of 15PE of only the ESC samples were performed due to lower

lentivirus infection efficiency in this cell type. Each samples' R1 and R3 reads (containing the

barcode) were mapped with bowtie2 [82] (--very-sensitive) to the barcode-oligo association list.

Next, we applied several quality filters on the resulting alignments. We first filtered out read

pairs that didn't map as proper pairs, and then ensured the mapped sequence completely matched

the known barcode sequence by requiring that both R1 and R3 reads have CIGAR stings = 15M,

MD flags = 15 and a mapping quality of at least 20. Next, we consolidated read abundance per

barcode by selecting only reads with unique UMIs, the result being abundance counts for each

barcode, across each replicate library of each cell type for both RNA and DNA.

Data was deposited in GEO under accession number: GSE152404 (reviewer access token:

avujcogkdxixzij).

Measurement of expression and differential expression

We used the R package MPRAnalyze[40] (version 1.3.1,

https://github.com/YosefLab/MPRAnalyze) to analyze lentiMPRA data. To determine which

oligos were capable of promoting expression, we modeled replicate information into both the

RNA and DNA models of MPRAnalyze's quantification framework (rnaDesign = ~ replicate and

dnaDesign = ~ replicate) and extracted alpha, the transcription rate, for each oligo. MPRAnalyze

used the expression of our 100 scrambled oligos as a baseline against which to measure the level

of expression of each tested oligo. We corrected the mean absolute deviation (MAD) score-based

P-values from MPRAnalyze for multiple testing across tested oligos, including positive controls

and excluding scrambled sequences, using the Benjamini-Hochberg method, thus generating an

MAD score-based expression false discovery rate (FDR) for each oligo. For each variant and for

each cell type, we looked at both the ancestral and derived sequence oligos and assigned an oligo

as potentially capable of driving expression if it had an FDR ≤ 0.05 in at least one sequence, and

at least 10 barcodes in both sequences (Supplementary File 1). We aggregated UMI-normalized

read abundances across all barcodes of each oligo, across all replicates in a given cell type, and

calculated a simple ratio of expression as RNA abundance normalized to DNA abundance

(RNA/DNA ratio). Next, we determined an RNA/DNA ratio threshold per cell type. This was

done by first removing scrambled sequences that show RNA/DNA ratios >2 standard deviations

away from the average RNA/DNA ratio of all of the scrambled sequences, as these likely

represent oligos that are, by chance, capable of driving expression. This left 95 scrambled

sequences in ESCs, 94 in osteoblasts and 97 in NPCs. Then, we used the distribution of

RNA/DNA ratios of the remaining scrambled sequences to assign an FDR for each of the non-

scrambled oligos. FDR was calculated as the fraction of scrambled sequences that showed an

RNA/DNA ratio as high or higher than each non-scrambled oligo. Only oligos that passed both

tests described above (FDR ≤ 0.05 in each test) were considered as "active" (i.e., capable of

driving expression).

To measure differential expression between ancestral and derived sequences, we used

MPRAnalyze's comparative framework. In essence, this tool uses a barcode's RNA reads as an

indicator of expression level and normalizes this to the DNA reads as a measure of the number of

genomic insertions of that barcode (i.e., the number of fragments from which RNA can be

transcribed). MPRAnalyze uses information across all the barcodes for both alleles of a given

sequence, as well as information across all replicates. For the terms of the model, we included

replicate information in the RNA, DNA and reduced (null) models, allele information in the

RNA and DNA models, and barcode information only in the DNA model (rnaDesign = ~

replicate + allele, dnaDesign = ~ replicate + barcode + allele, reducedDesign = ~ replicate). We

extracted *P*-values and the differential expression estimate (fold-change of the derived relative to

ancestral sequence). Then, we corrected the *P*-values of the set of active oligos (see above) for

multiple testing with the Benjamini-Hochberg method to generate an FDR for each sequence.

We set a cutoff of FDR ≤ 0.05 to call a sequence capable of driving differential expression. From

this we generated, for each cell type, a list of sequences with differential expression between the

ancestral and derived alleles (Supplementary File 1).

Luciferase validation assays

Each assayed oligo was synthesized by Twist Biosciences and cloned into the pLS-mP-Luc

vector (Addgene 106253) upstream of the luciferase gene. Lentivirus was generated

independently for each vector using techniques as described for MPRA (see above), with the

omission of the filtering and concentration step, which was replaced with the collection of the

entirety of the cell culture media for use in subsequent infections. In addition, pLS-SV40-mP-

Rluc (Addgene 106292), to adjust for infection efficiency, was added at a 1:3 ratio to the assayed

vector for a total of 4ug for lentivirus production. We infected each cell type individually with

each viral prep. The amount of lentivirus added was based on titrations in which varying

amounts of a subset of viral preps were added to each cell type and cell death was observed 3

days post infection; the virus volume that produced between 30-50% death was used for

subsequent experiments. Approximately 20,000 cells were plated in 96-well plates and grown for

24-48 hours (~70% confluent) before the addition of lentivirus. For osteoblasts and ESCs,

8ug/mL polybrene was added to the culture media at the same time as the addition of the

lentivirus. The media was changed 24 hours after infection and cells were grown for an

additional 48 hours. The cells were then washed with PBS and lysed. Firefly and renilla

luciferase expression were measured using the Dual-Luciferase Reporter Assay System

(Promega) on the GloMax plate reader (Promega). Each oligo was tested using two biological

replicates on different days and each biological replicate consisted of three technical replicates.

Activity of a given oligo was calculated by normalizing the firefly luciferase activity to the

renilla luciferase. We then calculated the $\log_2$ fold change (LFC) between the ancestral and

derived alleles as $\log_2$(derived / ancestral). A full list of oligos tested and their LFC can be found

in **Supplementary File 1**.

We found that the mean difference in fold-change between replicates was 3-fold lower for the

differentially active vs other active sequences (0.22 vs 0.60), and that the variance of these

differences was 9-fold lower for differentially active sequences compared to other active

sequences (0.09 vs 0.83, Supplementary File 1), suggesting that differentially active sequences

reflect a true biological signal.

Predicting target genes

To connect the surrounding locus of each variant to genes it potentially regulates, we combined

four data sources. For each locus, we generated four types of gene lists, based on four largely

complementary approaches: (1) overlap with known expression quantitative trait loci (eQTLs);

(2) spatial interaction with promoters; (3) proximity to putative enhancers; and (4) proximity to a

transcription start site (TSS, Supplementary File 1). Each data source was obtained and

incorporated into each type of list as described below:

1) Proximity to known eQTLs

eQTLs are genetic variants between individuals shown to be associated with expression

differences. We reasoned that the target genes of the sequence surrounding a variant are

potentially similar to the target genes of nearby eQTLs. We downloaded eQTLs and their

associated genes from GTEx[47] (www.gtexportal.org, v8 on August 26, 2019) and overlapped the

locations of each eQTL with our list of sequences. We linked the target genes of any eQTLs

within +/-1 kb to each variant. We used all tissue types reported by GTEx, for each cell type in

the lentiMPRA. 9,503 out of the 14,042 loci were found within +/- 1 kb of an eQTL, with 83,777

eQTLS overall overlapping them.

2)   Spatial interaction with a promoter via Hi-C data

High-throughput chromosome conformation capture (Hi-C) techniques map spatial interactions

between segments of DNA. We reasoned that if a variant is found within or near a region that

was shown to interact physically with a promoter, that variant could be in a region involved in

regulating that promoter. We downloaded promoter capture Hi-C data from Jung et al.[58],

containing a list of all the significant interactions between promoters and other segments of the

genome across 27 tissue and cell types. We overlapped our variants with the locations of

interacting genomic fragments to find interactions within +/-10 kb of each variant. We then

linked each variant with the promoters that each interacting fragment was shown to contact. We

repeated this process twice: once to obtain a cell type-specific list, and once to obtain a generic

list. For the cell type-specific list of sequence-gene links, we included only those interactions

observed in cell types corresponding to the cell lines used in our lentiMPRA: ESCs, NPCs and

mesenchymal stem cells as an approximation for osteoblasts (given that osteoblast Hi-C data is

not publicly available to the best of our knowledge, and that osteoblasts differentiate from

MSCs). For the generic list, we used interactions across any of the 27 tissue and cell types

analyzed by Jung et al.[58]. 4,688 out of the 14,042 loci overlapped at least one region that

interacts with a promoter.

3) Putative enhancers

Lastly, we checked which of our variants were in previously reported putative enhancers. To this

end, we downloaded the GeneHancer database[59] V4_12 and searched for putative enhancers

within +/- 10kb of each of our variants, linking each variant to the target genes of each putative

enhancer within that distance. GeneHancer provides "elite" or "non-elite" status to their defined

enhancer-target gene connections depending on the strength of the evidence supporting each

connection. Using this information, we repeated the process twice: once for the elite status and

once for all annotations. 5,017 out of the 14,042 loci overlapped at least one putative enhancer

4) Promoters

Promoters were defined as the region 5kb upstream to 1kb downstream of GENCODE[83] v29

GRCh38 TSSs. If a variant fell within this region, we linked it to that TSS's gene. Each variant

was assigned to all the promoters it fell within. 1,466 out of the 14,042 loci were found within a

promoter.

Overall, 11,207 out of the 14,042 loci were linked to at least one putative target gene, with a

median of four target genes per locus. 2,830 of the remaining loci were linked to their closest

TSS, regardless of distance. The last 5 without hg38 coordinates for their closest TSS were not

linked to a gene. Importantly, these links do not necessarily mean that these target genes are

regulated by these loci, but rather they serve as a list of potential target genes for the loci

showing a regulatory function through lentiMPRA.

Differential transcription factor binding sites

We predicted differences in binding of human transcription factors caused by each of our

variants as follows. First, we downloaded the entire set of publicly available human transcription

factor binding motifs (7,705 motifs, 6,608 publicly available) from the Catalogue of Inferred

Sequence Binding Preferences (CIS-BP) database (http://cisbp.ccbr.utoronto.ca/), and filtered

them to include only motifs labeled as *directly determined* (i.e., we filtered out inferred motifs),

resulting in 4,351 motifs. Next, to enrich our mapping result for matches covering the variant

location, we trimmed each of our oligo sequences containing a single variant to +/- 30 bp around

the variant (the length of the longest motif). We did not trim oligos containing >1 variant. We

used FIMO[50] to map each remaining motif to both the ancestral and derived alleles of each

trimmed sequence (or untrimmed, for sequences with >1 variant). For each motif mapping to

both the ancestral and derived alleles at the same strand and location, we required that at least

one allele had a q-value (as supplied by FIMO) ≤ 0.05. For motifs where only one of the

ancestral or derived alleles had a reported mapping from FIMO for a given oligo, we searched all

the mappings of that motif for the lowest mapping score, and substituted that score for the

missing allele's score. Then, we found cases where the FIMO predicted binding score of a motif

differed between the ancestral and derived alleles. Finally, we linked each motif to the

transcription factor (TF) it is most confidently associated with in CIS-BP, thereby generating

lists of TFs that showed differential predicted binding for each sequence. For cases in which

multiple unique motifs corresponded to the same TF, we used the motif with the largest score

difference between alleles. TF enrichment analyses were done on all predicted differential TF

binding sites for TFs with a minimum of 10 predicted differential sites. This was done for each

cell type, as well as for the union of all differentially active sequences across all cell types.

Fisher's exact test was used to compute enrichment of a TF among differentially active

sequences compared to other active sequences. *P*-values were FDR-adjusted. A threshold of 10

sites per TF was used for the analysis of correlation between predicted binding and expression.

Overlapping loci with genomic features

The following datasets were used for the overlap analyses: GENCODE v28 GRCh38 human

genome TSSs[84], GTEx v8 eQTLs[47], and broad peaks for the following histone modification

marks: H3K27ac, H3K4me1, H3K4me2, H3K4me3, H3K9ac, H3K9me3, and H3K27me, and

the histone variant H2A.Z from the Roadmap Project for ESCs, ESC-derived NPCs, and

osteoblasts[45]. We overlapped each of these datasets with the lists of non-active and active

sequences, and computed enrichment *P*-values using a hypergeometric test. We repeated this for

various RNA/DNA cutoffs (1, 1.5, 2, 2.5, 3 and 3.5). Sex chromosomes were removed from the

analyses. *P*-values were FDR-adjusted using the Benjamini-Hochberg procedure.

Sequence conservation within primates was taken from the Altai Neanderthal genome

annotation, which used the PhyloP metric[33].

Phenotype enrichment analysis

Body part enrichment analyses were conducted using Gene ORGANizer v13. The analyses were

conducted on sequences driving increased expression, sequences driving decreased expression,

and all differentially active sequences. This was done in each of the three cell types, as well as on

the union of all three cell types. We repeated the analyses using various $\log_2$(fold-change)

thresholds: 0, 0.25, 0.5, 0.75 and 1, and on both the stringent and non-stringent locus-gene

associations. Analyses were done against the Gene ORGANizer[60] genomic background using the

ORGANizer tool with the *confident* option. *P*-values were FDR-adjusted using the Benjamini-

Hochberg procedure. For osteoblasts, non-skeletal organs were removed from the analyses. For

NPCs, non-neuronal organs were removed.

For the HPO analyses, we used HPO[61] build 1268 (08 November, 2019), analyzing gene lists

identical to the Gene ORGANizer analyses. Lists of phenotypes from HPO were generated for

each variant through its linked genes. Hypergeometric test *P*-values were computed per

phenotype and FDR-adjusted. Similarly to the Gene ORGANizer analysis, we removed non-

skeletal phenotypes from the osteoblast results, and non-neuronal phenotypes from the NPC

results.

Gene Ontology (GO) analyses on the same groups of genes described above revealed two

enriched terms: GO:0007186, G-protein coupled receptor signaling pathway (2.9-fold within

ESCs, up- and downregulating sequences, $\log_2$Fold-change cutoff: 0.25, FDR = 0.018), and

GO:0006355, regulation of transcription, DNA-templated (1.8-fold within the union of cell

types, downregulating sequences, $\log_2$Fold-change cutoff: 0.25, FDR = 3.3×10^{-3}).

SATB2 phenotypic analysis was done as previously described in Gokhman et al[14]. In short, we

used HPO[61] build 1268 (08 November, 2019) to link phenotypes to *SATB2*. In addition, we

conducted a literature search to expand gene-phenotype links to include studies that did not

appear on HPO (Supplementary File 6). We used only skeletal directional phenotypes, i.e.,

phenotypes that could be described on a scale (e.g., smaller/larger hands), as these could be

examined against the fossil record. This resulted in 34 phenotypes that are the result of *SATB2*

heterozygous loss-of-function (LOF) (Supplementary File 6). Phenotypes that are included in

another phenotype (e.g., *Prominent nasal bridge* and *Prominent nose*) were merged, and

contradicting phenotypes (e.g., *Broad nose* and *Thin/small nose*) were removed. This resulted in

a final list of 17 phenotypes (Supplementary File 6). Given that the mechanism underlying these

phenotypes is a decrease in the dosage of SATB2, and that *SATB2* is possibly downregulated in

modern humans, we sought to investigate if similar phenotypes exist between modern human

patients with *SATB2* heterozygous LOF and archaic humans. For each phenotype, we determined

if it is divergent between the modern and archaic humans based on previously published

annotation[14]. Then, for remaining divergent phenotypes, we tested if the direction between

patients and healthy individuals matches the direction between modern and archaic humans. The

significance of directionality match was computed using a binomial test, with a random

probability of success $p = 0.5$. To compute the significance of the overall number of phenotypes

that are divergent and match in direction, we compared the overall number of annotated

divergent phenotypes to the number of divergent phenotypes associated with *SATB2* using a

hypergeometric test. Out of a total of 696 annotated phenotypes between modern and archaic

humans[14], 434 are annotated as divergent, and the direction of 50% of them (217 phenotypes) is

expected to match by chance.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Tal Ashuach (MPRAnalyze), Terence Capellini, Evelyn Jagoda, Martin

Kircher, and the Fraser, Petrov and McCoy labs for helpful feedback. D.G. was supported by the

Human Frontier, Rothschild and Zuckerman fellowships. This work was supported in part by the

National Human Genome Research Institute grant 1UM1HG009408 (N.A.), the National

Institute of Mental Health grants 1R01MH109907 (N.A.) and 1U01MH116438 (N.A.), the

Uehara Memorial Foundation (F.I.) and the Stanford Center for Computational, Evolutionary and

Human Genomics (CEHG).

References

1.   Neubauer, S., Hublin, J. J. & Gunz, P. The evolution of modern human brain shape. *Sci.*
Adv. (2018). doi:10.1126/sciadv.aao5961

2.   Gunz, P. *et al.* Neandertal Introgression Sheds Light on Modern Human Endocranial
Globularity. *Curr. Biol.* (2019). doi:10.1016/j.cub.2018.10.065

3.   Aiello, L. & Dean, C. *An Introduction to Human Evolutionary Anatomy*. (Elsevier, 2002).

4.   Kochiyama, T. *et al.* Reconstructing the Neanderthal brain using computational anatomy.
Sci. Rep. (2018). doi:10.1038/s41598-018-24331-0

5.   Yan, S. M. & McCoy, R. C. Archaic hominin genomics provides a window into gene
expression evolution. *Curr. Opin. Genet. Dev.* **62**, 44–49 (2020).

6.   Britten, R. J. & Davidson, E. H. Repetitive and non-repetitive DNA sequences and a
speculation on the origins of evolutionary novelty. *Q. Rev. Biol.* (1971).
doi:10.1086/406830

7.   King, M. C. & Wilson, A. C. Evolution at two levels in humans and chimpanzees. *Science*
188, 107–116 (1975).

8.   Enard, D., Messer, P. W. & Petrov, D. A. Genome-wide signals of positive selection in
human evolution. *Genome Res.* (2014). doi:10.1101/gr.164822.113

9.   Fraser, H. B. Gene expression drives local adaptation in humans. *Genome Res.* **23**, 1089–
1096 (2013).

10.   McCoy, R. C., Wakefield, J. & Akey, J. M. Impacts of Neanderthal-Introgressed
Sequences on the Landscape of Human Gene Expression. *Cell* **168**, 916-927.e12 (2017).

11.   Petr, M., Pääbo, S., Kelso, J. & Vernot, B. Limits of long-term selection against
Neandertal introgression. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* (2019).
doi:10.1073/pnas.1814338116

12.   Gokhman, D. *et al.* Differential DNA methylation of vocal and facial anatomy genes in
modern humans. *Nat. Commun.* **11**, 1189 (2020).

13.   Colbran, L. L. *et al.* Inferred divergent gene regulation in archaic hominins reveals
potential phenotypic differences. *Nat. Ecol. Evol.* (2019). doi:10.1038/s41559-019-0996-x

14.   Gokhman, D. *et al.* Reconstructing Denisovan Anatomy Using DNA Methylation Maps.
Cell **179**, 180-192.e10 (2019).

15.   Dannemann, M. & Racimo, F. Something old, something borrowed: admixture and

adaptation in human evolution. *Curr. Opin. Genet. Dev.* **53**, 1–8 (2018).

16.   Weyer, S. & Pääbo, S. Functional analyses of transcription factor binding sites that differ

between present-day and archaic humans. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* (2016).

doi:10.1093/molbev/msv215

17.   Vespasiani, D. M., Jacobs, G. S., Brucato, N., Cox, M. P. & Romero, I. G. Denisovan

introgression has shaped the immune system of present-day Papuans. *bioRxiv*

2020.07.09.196444 (2020). doi:10.1101/2020.07.09.196444

18.   Grogan, K. E. & Perry, G. H. Studying human and nonhuman primate evolutionary

biology with powerful in vitro and in vivo functional genomics tools. *Evolutionary*

Anthropology (2020). doi:10.1002/evan.21825

19.   Chatterjee, S. & Ahituv, N. Gene Regulatory Elements, Major Drivers of Human Disease.

Annu. Rev. Genomics Hum. Genet. (2017). doi:10.1146/annurev-genom-091416-035537

20.   Gokhman, D. *et al.* Reconstructing the DNA methylation maps of the Neandertal and the

Denisovan. *Science* **344**, 523–7 (2014).

21.   Gokhman, D., Meshorer, E. & Carmel, L. Epigenetics: It's Getting Old. Past Meets Future

in Paleoepigenetics. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* **31**, 290–300 (2016).

22.   Barker, H. R., Parkkila, S. & Tolvanen, M. E. E. Evolution is in the details: Regulatory

differences in modern human and Neanderthal. *bioRxiv* (2020).

doi:doi.org/10.1101/2020.09.04.282749

23.   Batyrev, D., Lapid, E., Carmel, L. & Meshorer, E. Predicted Archaic 3D Genome

Organization Reveals Genes Related to Head and Spinal Cord Separating Modern from

Archaic Humans. *Cells* (2019). doi:10.3390/cells9010048

24.   Pedersen, J. S. *et al.* Genome-wide nucleosome map and cytosine methylation levels of an

ancient human genome. *Genome Res.* **24**, 454–466 (2014).

25.   Silvert, M., Quintana-Murci, L. & Rotival, M. Impact and Evolutionary Determinants of

Neanderthal Introgression on Transcriptional and Post-Transcriptional Regulation. *Am. J.*

Hum. Genet. (2019). doi:10.1016/j.ajhg.2019.04.016

26.   Moriano, J. & Boeckx, C. Modern human changes in regulatory regions implicated in

cortical development. *BMC Genomics* **21**, 304 (2020).

27.   Inoue, F. & Ahituv, N. Decoding enhancers using massively parallel reporter assays.

Genomics (2015). doi:10.1016/j.ygeno.2015.06.005

28.   Tewhey, R. *et al.* Direct identification of hundreds of expression-modulating variants

using a multiplexed reporter assay. *Cell* (2016). doi:10.1016/j.cell.2016.04.027

29.   Klein, J. C., Keith, A., Agarwal, V., Durham, T. & Shendure, J. Functional

characterization of enhancer evolution in the primate lineage. *Genome Biol.* (2018).

doi:10.1186/s13059-018-1473-6

30.   Ryu, H. *et al.* Massively parallel dissection of human accelerated regions in human and

chimpanzee neural progenitors. *bioRxiv* (2018). doi:10.1101/256313

31.   Uebbing, S. *et al.* Massively parallel discovery of human-specific substitutions that alter

neurodevelopmental enhancer activity. *bioRxiv* (2019). doi:10.1101/865519

32.   Gordon, M. G. *et al.* lentiMPRA and MPRAflow for high-throughput functional

characterization of gene regulatory elements. *Nat. Protoc.* (2020). doi:10.1038/s41596-

020-0333-5

33.   Prüfer, K. *et al.* The complete genome sequence of a Neanderthal from the Altai

Mountains. *Nature* **505**, 43–9 (2014).

34.   Prüfer, K. *et al.* A high-coverage Neandertal genome from Vindija Cave in Croatia.

Science (80-.). **358**, 655–658 (2017).

35.   Mafessoni, F. *et al.* A high-coverage Neandertal genome from Chagyrskaya Cave. *Proc.*

Natl. Acad. Sci. (2020). doi:10.1073/pnas.2004944117

36.   Meyer, M. *et al.* A high-coverage genome sequence from an archaic Denisovan

individual. *Science* **338**, 222–6 (2012).

37.   De Manuel, M. *et al.* Chimpanzee genomic diversity reveals ancient admixture with

bonobos. *Science (80-.).* (2016). doi:10.1126/science.aag2602

38.   Auton, A. *et al.* A global reference for human genetic variation. *Nature* (2015).

doi:10.1038/nature15393

39.   Sherry, S. T. dbSNP: the NCBI database of genetic variation. *Nucleic Acids Res.* (2001).

doi:10.1093/nar/29.1.308

40.   Ashuach, T. *et al.* MPRAnalyze: Statistical framework for massively parallel reporter

assays. *Genome Biol.* (2019). doi:10.1186/s13059-019-1787-z

41.   Inoue, F. *et al.* A systematic comparison reveals substantial differences in chromosomal

versus episomal encoding of enhancer activity. *Genome Res.* (2017).

doi:10.1101/gr.212092.116

42.   Efroni, S. *et al.* Global Transcription in Pluripotent Embryonic Stem Cells. *Cell Stem Cell*

(2008). doi:10.1016/j.stem.2008.03.021

43.   Kircher, M. *et al.* Saturation mutagenesis of twenty disease-associated regulatory elements

at single base-pair resolution. *Nat. Commun.* (2019). doi:10.1038/s41467-019-11526-w

44.   Wang, M., Zhao, Y. & Zhang, B. Efficient Test and Visualization of Multi-Set

Intersections. *Sci. Rep.* (2015). doi:10.1038/srep16923

45.   Roadmap Epigenomics Consortium *et al.* Integrative analysis of 111 reference human

epigenomes. *Nature* **518**, 317–329 (2015).

46.   Ernst, J. & Kellis, M. ChromHMM: Automating chromatin-state discovery and

characterization. *Nature Methods* (2012). doi:10.1038/nmeth.1906

47.   The GTEx Consortium. The Genotype-Tissue Expression (GTEx) pilot analysis:

Multitissue gene regulation in humans. *Science (80-.).* **348**, 648–660 (2015).

48.   Villar, D. *et al.* Enhancer evolution across 20 mammalian species. *Cell* (2015).

doi:10.1016/j.cell.2015.01.006

49.   Jones, P. A. Functions of DNA methylation: islands, start sites, gene bodies and beyond.

Nat. Rev. Genet. **13**, 484–92 (2012).

50.   Grant, C. E., Bailey, T. L. & Noble, W. S. FIMO: Scanning for occurrences of a given

motif. *Bioinformatics* (2011). doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/btr064

51.   Pieraccioli, M. *et al.* ZNF281 inhibits neuronal differentiation and is a prognostic marker

for neuroblastoma. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* (2018). doi:10.1073/pnas.1801435115

52.   Suske, G. NF-Y and SP transcription factors — New insights in a long-standing liaison.

Biochimica et Biophysica Acta - Gene Regulatory Mechanisms (2017).

doi:10.1016/j.bbagrm.2016.08.011

53.   Hahn, S. & Hermeking, H. ZNF281/ZBP-99: A new player in epithelial-mesenchymal

transition, stemness, and cancer. *Journal of Molecular Medicine* (2014).

doi:10.1007/s00109-014-1160-3

54.   Yamakawa, H. *et al.* The Transcription Factor Sp3 Cooperates with HDAC2 to Regulate

Synaptic Function and Plasticity in Neurons. *Cell Rep.* (2017).

doi:10.1016/j.celrep.2017.07.044

55.   Gasperini, M. *et al.* A Genome-wide Framework for Mapping Gene Regulation via

Cellular Genetic Screens. *Cell* (2019). doi:10.1016/j.cell.2018.11.029

56.   Fulco, C. P. *et al.* Activity-by-contact model of enhancer–promoter regulation from

thousands of CRISPR perturbations. *Nature Genetics* (2019). doi:10.1038/s41588-019-

0538-0

57.   Gasperini, M., Tome, J. M. & Shendure, J. Towards a comprehensive catalogue of

validated and target-linked human enhancers. *Nature Reviews Genetics* (2020).

doi:10.1038/s41576-019-0209-0

58.   Jung, I. *et al.* A compendium of promoter-centered long-range chromatin interactions in

the human genome. *Nat. Genet.* (2019). doi:10.1038/s41588-019-0494-8

59.   Fishilevich, S. *et al.* GeneHancer: genome-wide integration of enhancers and target genes

in GeneCards. *Database (Oxford).* (2017). doi:10.1093/database/bax028

60.   Gokhman, D. *et al.* Gene ORGANizer: Linking genes to the organs they affect. *Nucleic*

Acids Res. **45**, W138–W145 (2017).

61.   Köhler, S. *et al.* The Human Phenotype Ontology project: Linking molecular biology and

disease through phenotype data. *Nucleic Acids Res.* **42**, (2014).

62.   Zarate, Y. A. & Fish, J. L. SATB2-associated syndrome: Mechanisms, phenotype, and

practical recommendations. *American Journal of Medical Genetics, Part A* (2017).

doi:10.1002/ajmg.a.38022

63.   Liu, S. H. *et al.* A novel antisense long non-coding RNA SATB2-AS1 overexpresses in

osteosarcoma and increases cell proliferation and growth. *Mol. Cell. Biochem.* (2017).

doi:10.1007/s11010-017-2953-9

64.   Bernstein, B. E. *et al.* An integrated encyclopedia of DNA elements in the human genome.

Nature **489**, 57–74 (2012).

65.   Buniello, A. *et al.* The NHGRI-EBI GWAS Catalog of published genome-wide

association studies, targeted arrays and summary statistics 2019. *Nucleic Acids Res.*

(2019). doi:10.1093/nar/gky1120

66.   Zarate, Y. A., Kaylor, J. & Fish, J. SATB2-Associated Syndrome. in (eds. Adam, M. P. et

al.) (1993).

67.   Gigek, C. O. *et al.* A molecular model for neurodevelopmental disorders. *Transl.*

Psychiatry (2015). doi:10.1038/tp.2015.56

68.   Qian, Y. *et al.* Paternal Low-Level Mosaicism-Caused SATB2-Associated Syndrome.

Front. Genet. **10**, 630 (2019).

69.   Li, Y. *et al.* Satb2 Ablation Impairs Hippocampus-Based Long-Term Spatial Memory and

Short-Term Working Memory and Immediate Early Genes (IEGs)-Mediated Hippocampal

Synaptic Plasticity. *Mol. Neurobiol.* (2017). doi:10.1007/s12035-017-0531-5

70.   Zhang, Q., Huang, Y., Zhang, L., Ding, Y. Q. & Song, N. N. Loss of satb2 in the cortex

and hippocampus leads to abnormal behaviors in mice. *Front. Mol. Neurosci.* (2019).

doi:10.3389/fnmol.2019.00033

71.   Dobreva, G. *et al.* SATB2 Is a Multifunctional Determinant of Craniofacial Patterning and

Osteoblast Differentiation. *Cell* (2006). doi:10.1016/j.cell.2006.05.012

72.   Mattioli, K. *et al.* Cis and trans effects differentially contribute to the evolution of

promoters and enhancers. *Genome Biol.* **21**, 210 (2020).

73.   Prabhakar, S. *et al.* Human-specific gain of function in a developmental enhancer. *Science*

(80-.). (2008). doi:10.1126/science.1159974

74.   Capra, J. A., Erwin, G. D., Mckinsey, G., Rubenstein, J. L. R. & Pollard, K. S. Many

human accelerated regions are developmental enhancers. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. B Biol.*

Sci. (2013). doi:10.1098/rstb.2013.0025

75.   Villar, D., Flicek, P. & Odom, D. T. Evolution of transcription factor binding in

metazoans-mechanisms and functional implications. *Nature Reviews Genetics* (2014).

doi:10.1038/nrg3481

76.   True, J. R. & Carroll, S. B. Gene co-option in physiological and morphological evolution.

Annual Review of Cell and Developmental Biology (2002).

doi:10.1146/annurev.cellbio.18.020402.140619

77.   Telis, N., Aguilar, R. & Harris, K. Selection against archaic hominin genetic variation in

regulatory regions. *Nat Ecol Evol* (2020). doi:10.1038/s41559-020-01284-0

78.   Prescott, S. L. *et al.* Enhancer Divergence and cis-Regulatory Evolution in the Human and

Chimp Neural Crest. *Cell* **163**, 68–84 (2015).

79.   Lieberman, P. The Evolution of Human Speech: Its Anatomical and Neural Bases. *Curr.*

Anthropol. **48**, 39–66 (2007).

80.   Mariën, P. *et al.* Consensus paper: Language and the cerebellum: An ongoing enigma.

Cerebellum (2014). doi:10.1007/s12311-013-0540-5

81.   Smit, A., Hubley, R. & Green, P. RepeatMasker Open-3.0. *RepeatMasker Open-3.0*

(1996).

82.   Langmead, B. & Salzberg, S. L. Fast gapped-read alignment with Bowtie 2. *Nat. Methods*

(2012). doi:10.1038/nmeth.1923

83.   Harrow, J. *et al.* GENCODE: The reference human genome annotation for the ENCODE

project. *Genome Res.* (2012). doi:10.1101/gr.135350.111

84.   Frankish, A. *et al.* GENCODE reference annotation for the human and mouse genomes.

Nucleic Acids Res. (2019). doi:10.1093/nar/gky955

1172

ESCs   Osteoblasts   NPCs

a   Whole genome

b   Fixed derived variants

c   Active

d   Differentially active

- Active TSS
- Flanking Active TSS
- Bivalent/Poised TSS
- Flanking Biv. TSS/Enh
- Enhancers
- Genic enhancers
- Bivalent enhancers
- Strong transcription
- Weak transcription
- Transcr. at gene 5' and 3'
- Repressed PolyComb
- Weak Rep. PolyComb
- Quiescent/Low
- Heterochromatin

a

ESCs
Osteo.
NPCs

R = 0.95
P = 2.4x10^{-5}

Fold-change (2nd sequence, log$_2$)

0.8

-0.8   0.8

-0.8

Fold-change (1st sequence, log$_2$)

b

ESCs
Osteo.
NPCs

R = 0.67
P = 3.7x10^{-4}

Fold-change (Luciferase assay, log$_2$)

1.8

-1.5   1.5

-2.4

Fold-change (lentiMPRA, log$_2$)