Human-specific lncRNAs contributed critically to human evolution by distinctly regulating gene expression

Jie Lin[1,2], Yujian Wen[1], Ji Tang[1], Xuecong Zhang, Huanlin Zhang, Hao Zhu[1,3,4*]

1 Bioinformatics Section, School of Basic Medical Sciences, Southern Medical University, Guangzhou, 510515, China

2 Guangdong Provincial Key Laboratory of Medical Molecular Diagnostics, Institute of Aging Research, Guangdong Medical University, Dongguan, 523808, China

3 Guangdong-Hong Kong-Macao Greater Bay Area Center for Brain Science and Brain-Inspired Intelligence, Southern Medical University, Guangzhou, 510515, China

4 Guangdong Provincial Key Lab of Single Cell Technology and Application, Southern Medical University, Guangzhou, 510515, China

* Corresponding author. Email: zhuhao@smu.edu.cn (H.Z.)

ABSTRACT

What genes and regulatory sequences differentiate humans from apes and from archaic humans, which share highly similar genomes but show distinct phenotypes, has puzzled researchers for decades. Previous studies have examined species-specific protein-coding genes and related regulatory sequences, revealing that birth, loss, and changes in these genes and sequences can drive speciation and evolution. However, investigations of species-specific lncRNA genes and the related regulatory sequences, which critically determine epigenetic regulation, remain very limited. We identified human-specific (HS) lncRNAs from GENCODE-annotated human lncRNAs, predicted their DNA binding domains (DBDs) and binding sites (DBSs) genome-wide, analyzed the DBS sequences in modern humans (CEU, CHB, and YRI), archaic humans (Altai Neanderthals, Denisovans, and Vindija Neanderthals), and chimpanzees, and analyzed how HS lncRNAs and DBSs influence gene expression in modern and archaic humans. Our results suggest that HS lncRNAs and their DBSs have substantially reshaped gene expression. This reshaping has evolved continuously from archaic to modern humans, enabling humans to adapt to new environments and lifestyles, promoting brain evolution, and also resulting in differences among modern humans. Further analyses of HS TFs and their DBSs obtained results suggesting that HS lncRNAs may contribute more significantly than HS

TFs to human evolution.

Keywords: Long noncoding RNA; Human-specific lncRNA; Human evolution; Archaic human genomes

1. INTRODUCTION

The limited genomic but substantial phenotypic and behavioral differences between humans and other hominids make the question of which sequence changes have critically driven human evolution an enduring puzzle (Anton et al., 2014; Pollen et al., 2023). Sequence changes include the birth and loss of genes, as well as the turnover and modifications of regulatory sequences (Albalat and Canestro, 2016; Kaessmann, 2010; Prud'homme et al., 2007). Waves of studies have identified genes that promote human brain development (e.g., *NOTCH2NL* and *ASPM*) (Evans et al., 2005; Fiddes et al., 2018; Mekel-Bobrov et al., 2005; Pinson et al., 2022; Suzuki et al., 2018). However, many conclusions from the gene birth-centric studies are controversial (Currat et al., 2006; Timpson et al., 2007; Yu et al., 2007). Since genes essential for brain development may not necessarily regulate other human traits (some of which preceded brain enlargement), these new brain-related genes do not fully answer the above question. Moreover, investigations into how species-specific lncRNAs, a major class of new genes in mammals, contribute to human evolution remain limited. Studies revealed regulatory sequence changes important for human evolution, including new sequences (Liu et al., 2021), lost sequences (McLean et al., 2011), human accelerated regions (HARs) (Dong et al., 2016; Mangan et al., 2022; Prabhakar et al., 2006; Whalen and Pollard, 2022), and turnover of transcription factor (TF) binding sites (Krieger et al., 2022; Otto et al., 2009; Zhang et al., 2023). Nevertheless, no systematic analysis of lncRNA binding sites, which also regulate transcription, has been reported.

Experimental studies over the past decades have generated substantial findings about lncRNAs and epigenetic regulation. (a) About one-third of human lncRNAs are primate-specific (Derrien et al., 2012). (b) Species-specific lncRNAs exhibit distinct expression in tissues and organs of different species (Sarropoulos et al., 2019). (c) Many lncRNAs can bind to DNA sequences by forming RNA:DNA triplexes (Abu Almakarem et al., 2012), thereby recruiting histone and DNA modification enzymes to binding sites and regulating transcription (Lee, 2009; Roadmap Epigenomics et al.,

2015). (d) Approximately 40% of differentially expressed human genes result from interspecies epigenetic differences (Hernando-Herraez et al., 2015). Thus, not only human-specific (HS) TFs and their DNA binding sites (TF DBS), but also HS lncRNAs and their DNA binding sites (lncRNA DBS), critically regulate gene expression human-specifically.

To examine the latter, which have had few reports, the first step is to identify HS lncRNAs. Unlike DNA sequence search, RNA sequence search for identifying homologous and orthologous lncRNA genes needs combined structure and sequence alignment (Nawrocki, 2014; Nawrocki and Eddy, 2013), and human lncRNAs' orthologues in other mammals determine HS lncRNAs. Many lncRNAs contain DNA binding domains (DBDs) that can bind to DBSs. Since RNA:DNA triplexes follow specific base-pairing rules (Abu Almakarem et al., 2012), these rules allow computational prediction of DBDs and DBSs, and accordingly, target genes and transcripts (Lin et al., 2019; Wen et al., 2022). Gene expression in organs and tissues, especially those examined by the GTEx project (GTEx Consortium, 2017), provides data to investigate whether the expression of lncRNAs and their targets is correlated, supporting their regulatory relationship. Finally, the sequenced genomes of modern humans, archaic humans, and multiple apes allow cross-species analysis of the genomes and transcriptomes (1000 Genomes Project Consortium et al., 2012; Chimpanzee Sequencing and Analysis Consortium, 2005; Meyer et al., 2012; Prufer et al., 2017; Prüfer et al., 2013). Thus, it is feasible to examine whether and how HS lncRNAs and their DBSs have contributed to human evolution by human-specifically regulating gene expression.

This study identified HS lncRNAs upon the orthologues of the GENCODE-annotated human lncRNA genes in 16 mammalian genomes, predicted HS lncRNAs' DBDs and DBSs in the genomes of modern humans (CEU, CHB, and YRI), archaic humans (Altai Neanderthals, Denisovans, Vindija Neanderthals), as well as counterparts of DBSs in the genome of chimpanzees (Figure 1A). Joint prediction of DBDs and DBSs (which form RNA:DNA triplexes) using local alignment is more reasonable than (and outperforms) DBS prediction based on base-pairing rules (Lin et al., 2019). We validated the DBS prediction by knocking out (KO) predicted DBDs using CRISPR/Cas9, performing RNA-seq before and after KO, and examining whether the differentially expressed genes were predicted target genes. To accurately analyze DBSs with different lengths and identity values

(the percentage of paired RNA and DNA nucleotides in a triplex), we defined *binding affinity* (length

x identity) and classified DBSs into strong and weak ones based on *binding affinity* and also old and

young ones based on when most of their sequence changes occurred. We then utilized multiple

datasets and methods to perform cross-population and cross-species analyses, including gene set

enrichment analyses, evolutionary/population genetics analyses, and transcriptomic analyses. The

results suggest that HS lncRNAs and their DBSs have distinctly and continuously reshaped gene

expression during human evolution, and this reshaped gene expression greatly determines human

traits, from the rapidly evolved brain to the highly modified immune and metabolism systems.

2. RESULTS

2.1. HS lncRNAs regulate diverse genes and transcripts

How many human lncRNAs are human-specific is a question without a precise estimate. After

searching for orthologues of the 13562 GENCODE-annotated human lncRNA genes (v18) in 16

mammalian genomes and the genomes of archaic humans using the *Infernal* program (which

performs a combined RNA sequence and structure alignment) (Figure 1A) (Lin et al., 2019;

Nawrocki, 2014; Nawrocki et al., 2009), we identified 66 lncRNA genes that exist in humans but not

in any other species (Supplementary Table 1). Then, we predicted DBSs of the 66 HS lncRNAs in the

5000 bp promoter regions of the 179128 Ensembl-annotated transcripts (release 79) using *the*

LongTarget program (Supplementary Note 1) (Lin et al., 2019). Since DBD1's DBSs vastly

outnumber other DBDs' DBSs, suggesting that DBD1 (hereafter simply called DBD) and its DBSs are

more reliable, for each HS lncRNA, we analysed only DBD1 and its DBSs. We defined the binding

affinity of a DBS as the product of its length and identity (the percentage of paired RNA and DNA

nucleotides), and focused on DBSs with binding affinity>=60 (strong DBSs). The analysis of DBSs at

known imprinted genes and the comparison of DBSs with CHART-seq-reported binding sequences

("peaks") suggest that binding affinity characterizes DBSs better than length (Supplementary Fig. 2)

(He et al., 2015). Since DBSs generated more recently may be weak yet play new and/or subtle

functions, we also analyzed DBSs with 36<binding affinity<60 (weak DBSs). 105141 strong DBSs

(mean length>147 bp) were identified in 96789 transcripts of 23396 genes, and 152836 weak DBSs

were identified in 127898 transcripts of 33185 genes (Figure 1B; Supplementary Table 2, 3). Several

HS lncRNAs (especially RP11-423H2.3) have abundant targets; many targets have DBSs of multiple

HS lncRNAs; many HS lncRNAs have multiple DBSs in a target; only about 1.5% of target genes (0.6%

of target transcripts) are human-specific (Figure 1C); and HS lncRNAs themselves show complex

targeting relationships (Figure 1D; Supplementary Note 2). These suggest that the limited number

of HS lncRNAs has significantly reshaped the expression of substantial genes.

We validated DBS prediction using multiple methods and datasets (Supplementary Note 1;

Supplementary Fig. 1-5). (a) HS lncRNA DBSs overlap well with experimentally identified DNA

methylation and histone modification signals in multiple cell lines (https://genome.UCSC.edu). (b)

Many DBSs co-localize with annotated cis-regulatory elements (cCREs) in genes' promoter regions

(https://genome.UCSC.edu). (c) Predicted DBSs overlap well with experimentally detected DBSs of

NEAT1, MALAT1, and MEG3 (Mondal et al., 2015; West et al., 2014). (d) We used CRISPR/Cas9 to

knock out predicted DBDs (100-200 bp) in several lncRNAs across multiple cell lines, performed

RNA-seq before and after DBD knockout, and analyzed the resulting differential gene expression.

We found that the |fold change| of target genes was significantly larger than the |fold change| of

non-target genes (one-sided Mann-Whitney test, p = 3.1e-72, 1.49e-114, 1.12e-206, 2.58e-09,

6.49e-41, 0.034, and 5.23e-07, respectively). (e) The *LongTarget* program uses a variant of the

Smith-Waterman local alignment to identify DBD and DBS simultaneously; statistically, a local

alignment (i.e., a triplex containing a pair of DBD and DBS) of 147 bp (the mean length of strong

DBSs) is extremely unlikely to be generated by chance (p < 8.2e-19 to 1.5e-48).

HARs are conserved genomic loci yet show accelerated evolution in the human lineage. Multiple

researchers postulate that HARs critically promote human evolution; however, results from the

related studies are controversial (Levchenko et al., 2018). The Zoonomia Project recently identified

312 HARs important for 3D genome rewiring and neurodevelopment (Keough et al., 2023). We

found that only 8 of these HARs overlap 26 DBSs of 14 HS lncRNAs, suggesting that DBSs and HARs

are different kinds of sequences.

Figure 1. Study Overview. (A) The relationships between chimpanzees, the three archaic humans (Altai Neanderthals, Denisovans, and Vindija Neanderthals), and the three modern human populations. Dashed lines indicate the phylogenetic distances from modern humans to archaic humans and chimpanzees. Genes and DBSs have the following implications: the DBS in *B2M* lacks a counterpart in chimpanzees; the DBS in *ABL2* has great differences between archaic and modern humans; the DBS in *IRNAR1* is highly polymorphic in modern humans. Red letters in DBSs indicate tissue-specific eQTLs or population-specific favored mutations. (B) The mean length and binding affinity of strong DBSs. (C) Number of target genes and transcripts of the 66 HS lncRNAs. (D) The illustrative figure shows the targeting relationships between HS lncRNAs (see the full figure in Supplementary Note 2). (E) The sequence distances of DBSs (the top 40%) from modern humans to chimpanzees and archaic humans. (F) The illustrative figure shows the GTEx tissues used to investigate the impacts of HS lncRNA-target transcript pairs on gene expression (see the full figure in Figure 3).

2.2. HS lncRNAs' target genes characterize human evolution and traits

AS strong and weak DBSs may occur in different periods in human evolution, it is interesting and necessary to examine whether the related target genes are enriched in different functions. For genes with significant sequence differences between humans and chimpanzees, studies have generated different estimates, ranging from 1.24% to 5% (Britten, 2002; Ebersberger et al., 2002). More genes

exhibit expression differences due to variations in regulatory sequences. To reliably differentiate genes with strong and weak DBSs, we sorted target genes by their DBS binding affinity and chose the top 2000 genes (DBS length>252 bp and binding affinity>151) and bottom 2000 genes (DBS length<60 bp but binding affinity>36) to conduct over-representation analysis using the *g:Profiler* program and Gene Ontology (GO) database (Supplementary Table 4). The top and bottom 2000 genes (with the whole genome as the background) are co-enriched in GO terms important for human evolution, including "neuron projection development" (GO:0031175), "learning" (GO:0007612), "regulation of anatomical structure size" (GO: GO:0090066), "head development" (GO:0060322), and "regulation of locomotion" (GO:0040012) (Supplementary Note 3; Supplementary Table 4). Genes with strongest DBSs (514 DBSs have length >500 bp) include *IFNAR1* and *NFATC1* (important for immune function), *KIF21B* and *NTSR1* (critical for neural development), *SLC2A11* and *SLC2A1* (involved in glucose usage), *BAIAP3* (a brain-specific angiogenesis inhibitor), *TAS1R3* (a receptor for the sweet taste response), and several primate-specific noncoding RNA genes (e.g., *CTD-3224I3.3* which is highly expressed in the cerebellum, lung, and testis) (Table 1; Supplementary Table 4, 5). On the other hand, genes with weak DBSs are enriched in such GO terms as "response to alcohol" (GO:0097305), "response to temperature stimulus" (GO:0009266), "DNA methylation or demethylation" (GO:0044728), and "female pregnancy" (GO:0007565) (Supplementary Note 3). Since weak DBSs are more likely to have occurred recently, these findings suggest that some regulatory functions of HS lncRNAs were obtained recently.

Table 1 Genes with DBSs that have largest binding affinity and mostly changed sequence distances (from modern humans to archaic humans and chimpanzees)

Target gene	Annotation	Binding affinity	Mostly changed
IFNAR1	i.e., Interferon Alpha And Beta Receptor Subunit 1.	794	C,D
NFATC1	A TF that induces gene transcription during immune responses.	736	C

NFATC1	A TF that induces gene transcription during immune responses.	491	C,A,D
ANKLE2	Diseases associated with ANKLE2 include microcephaly.	527	C,D
SEMA4D	Regulating phosphatidylinositol 3-kinase signaling, neuron projection development, and phosphate metabolic process.	495	C,A,D
KIF21B	Essential for neuronal morphology, synapse function, and learning and memory.	471	C
ALDH3B2	An aldehyde dehydrogenase for alcohol metabolism.	444	C
NTSR1	A brain and gastrointestinal peptide that mediates functions of neurotensin (e.g., hypotension, hyperglycemia, hypothermia, and antinociception).	402	C,A,D
MC5R	A receptor for melanocyte-stimulating hormone and adrenocorticotropic hormone.	397	C
THEG	Specifically expressed in the germ cells and involved in spermatogenesis.	395	C,D
HERC6	In pathways including class I MHC-mediated antigen processing and presentation, and the innate immune system.	369	C,A,D
SLC2A11	Facilitating glucose transporter.	356	C
NGEF	Playing a role in axon guidance regulating ephrin-induced growth cone collapse and dendritic spine morphogenesis.	354	C
SHC2	Involved in the signal transduction pathways of neurotrophin-activated Trk receptors in cortical neurons.	345	C,D

BAIAP3	Regulating behavior and food intake by controlling calcium-stimulated exocytosis of neurotransmitters, serotonin, and hormones like Insulin.	321	C
SLURP1	A marker of late differentiation of the skin.	319	C
MLPH	Involved in melanosome transport.	307	C
TAS1R3	Responding to the umami taste stimulus and recognizing diverse natural and synthetic sweeteners.	304	C, D
SLC2A1	A major glucose transporter in the mammalian blood-brain barrier.	356	C
CTD-3224I3.3	An lncRNA is highly expressed in the cerebellum, lung, and testis.	312	C,A,D

Letters 'C', 'A', 'D', and 'V' indicate that the DBS in the gene has mostly changed sequence distances

from modern humans to chimpanzees, Altai Neanderthals, Denisovans, and Vindija Neanderthals,

respectively. SNORA59B and TTTY8/TTTY8B have quite different DBSs (with binding affinity values

of 736 and 491) in *NFATC1*, so they are displayed separately.

2.3. The reshaping of gene expression has greatly evolved

The human genome is approximately 99%, 99%, and 98% identical to the genomes of chimpanzees,

bonobos, and gorillas (Chimpanzee Sequencing and Analysis Consortium, 2005; Prufer et al., 2012).

However, the sequence variants that critically differentiate these species remain unclear. We

therefore examined whether DBSs of HS lncRNAs are conserved in these species or are human-

specific. Notably, 97.81% of the 105141 strong DBSs have counterparts in chimpanzees, raising the

possibility that these sequences have evolved considerably during human evolution.

HS lncRNAs may be generated before, with, or after their DBSs. To further clarify these situations,

we identified the counterparts of HS lncRNAs and their DBSs also in Altai Neanderthals, Denisovans,

and Vindija Neanderthals (Meyer et al., 2012; Prufer et al., 2017; Prüfer et al., 2013). Counterparts

of HS lncRNAs and strong DBSs were identified in these archaic humans, but the distances (distance

per base) of HS lncRNAs are smaller than the distances of DBSs between archaic and modern

humans, suggesting that the counterpart sequences of many DBSs existed before HS lncRNAs. In

other words, these distances suggest that HS lncRNAs may have reshaped gene expression

substantially in humans.

We computed DBS distances in two ways to examine DBS evolution. The first is from the

reconstructed human ancestor (downloaded from the EBI website) to chimpanzees, archaic

humans, and modern humans; the second is from chimpanzees and archaic humans to modern

humans. In the first set of distances, many DBS distances from the human ancestor to modern

humans are smaller than those to archaic humans. For example, DBSs in the top 20% genes in the

human ancestor have distances >0.015 to modern humans, but more DBSs have distances >0.015

to Altai Neanderthals, Denisovans, and even chimpanzees (Supplementary Note 3). This anomaly is

caused by the reconstructed human ancestor, which is built using six primates without archaic

humans. On the other hand, the second set of distances agrees well with the phylogenetic distances

between chimpanzees, archaic humans, and modern humans. DBSs with large distances account for

a small portion (Figure 1E); we postulate that genes containing these DBSs may greatly characterize

human evolution. To set a cutoff for "large distance", we turned to a recent study that identified 5984

genes differentially expressed between human-only and chimpanzee-only iPSC lines, including

4377 genes whose differential expression is due to trans-acting differences between humans and

chimpanzees (Song et al., 2021). A distance cutoff of 0.034 identifies 4248 (the top 20%) genes in

chimpanzees, as well as 1256, 2514, and 134 genes in Altai Neanderthals, Denisovans, and Vindija

Neanderthals, respectively. Since Prufer et al. reported that "it has been suggested that Denisovans

received gene flow from a hominin lineage that diverged prior to the common ancestor of modern

humans, Neandertals, and Denisovans" and that "we find that the Denisovan genome carries fewer

derived alleles that are fixed in Africans, and thus tend to be older, than the Altai Neandertal genome"

(Prufer et al., 2017), these gene numbers agree with the phylogenetic relationships between archaic

and modern humans (Figure 1A; Supplementary Table 6).

To determine whether target genes with mostly changed DBSs are enriched in specific functions,

we applied overrepresentation analysis to target genes in chimpanzees, Altai Neanderthals,

Denisovans, and Vindija Neanderthals using the *g:Profiler* program and GO database. To make

statistical significance comparable across chimpanzees, Altai Neanderthals, and Denisovans, we

used just the top 1256 genes as the input for the three. The 1256 genes in chimpanzees and Altai

Neanderthals are enriched in multiple common GO terms. However, "behavior" (GO:0007610) and

"cognition" (GO:0050890) have much higher significance in Altai Neanderthals than in chimpanzees

(Figure 2), and some GO terms such as "learning" (GO:0007612), "learning or memory"

(GO:0007611), and "glucose homeostasis" (GO:0042593) are enriched only in Altai Neanderthals.

Agreeing with the closer relationship between Vindija Neanderthals and modern humans, the 134

genes in Vindija Neanderthals are enriched only in two GO terms with low significance

("smoothened signaling pathway" (GO:0007224) and "regulation of smoothened signaling pathway"

(GO:0008589)) (Supplementary Table 7). These results provide valuable insights into when and

how HS lncRNA-mediated epigenetic regulation impacts human evolution.

GO terms	Adjusted_p	GO terms	Adjusted_p
regulation of vesicle-mediated transport	2.78E-04	behavior	1.32E-06
maintenance of location	7.46E-04	trans-synaptic signaling	1.43E-06
mitochondrial RNA metabolic process	9.22E-04	learning	2.16E-05
positive regulation of GTPase activity	1.12E-03	neuron projection development	9.91E-05
protein localization to plasma membrane	2.20E-03	cognition	1.49E-04
modification-dependent macromolecule catabolic process	2.35E-03	regulation of lipid localization	2.40E-04
regulation of GTPase activity	2.77E-03	learning or memory	4.74E-04
ubiquitin-dependent protein catabolic process	2.89E-03	response to hypoxia	5.76E-04
miRNA metabolic process	3.29E-03	associative learning	7.42E-04
receptor-mediated endocytosis	3.50E-03	regulation of neuron projection development	1.63E-03
neuron projection development	3.78E-03	response to virus	2.25E-03
behavior	5.23E-03	brain development	3.10E-03
brain development	7.47E-03	cell morphogenesis involved in neuron differentiation	3.93E-03
regulation of anatomical structure size	7.79E-03	response to nutrient levels	5.76E-03
negative regulation of neuron projection development	8.50E-03	neuron projection morphogenesis	6.68E-03
head development	8.61E-03	glucose homeostasis	6.86E-03
regulation of neuron projection development	9.23E-03	head development	7.90E-03
cell morphogenesis involved in neuron differentiation	1.07E-02	visual behavior	1.04E-02
axon development	2.96E-02	glucose metabolic process	1.41E-02
retina development in camera-type eye	3.12E-02	axon development	1.66E-02
response to starvation	3.12E-02	response to light stimulus	1.69E-02
regulation of lipid localization	3.78E-02	regeneration	1.71E-02
lipid storage	3.78E-02	sensory perception of mechanical stimulus	2.38E-02
adult locomotory behavior	4.81E-02	sensory perception of sound	2.98E-02
cognition	4.99E-02	response to alcohol	4.31E-02

Figure 2. 1256 target genes whose DBSs have the largest distances from modern humans to

chimpanzees and Altai Neanderthals are enriched in different *Biological Processes* GO terms. Upon

significance threshold = 0.05 (Benjamini-Hochberg FDR), the two gene sets in chimpanzees and

Altai Neanderthals are enriched in 199 and 409 GO terms (50<terms size<1000), respectively.

Shared GO terms are color-marked. Left: Top GO terms enriched in genes in chimpanzees. Right:

Top GO terms enriched in genes in Altai Neanderthals.

2.4. Epigenetic regulation by HS lncRNAs shows differences in modern humans

To check whether the reshaped gene expression has been population-specifically revised in modern humans, we analyzed single-nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs, with minimal allele frequency (MAF)≥0.1) in strong DBSs using the 1000 Human Genome data (1000 Genomes Project Consortium et al., 2012). We computed SNP number and SNP number per base for each DBS, identified highly polymorphic DBSs (SNP number per base in CEU, CHB, and YRI are 5 times larger than the average), and obtained the intersection of highly polymorphic DBSs and DBSs with mostly changed sequence distances (distance>0.034, from modern humans to chimpanzees, Altai Neanderthals, and Denisovans) (Supplementary Table 8). Most genes in the intersection are lncRNA genes, and protein-coding genes include those important for human evolution and adaptation (especially metabolism and immune), such as *SCTR*, *TLR, NCR*, *IFNAR1*, *NFATC1*, *TAS1R3*, *INS*, *ST3GAL4*, and *FN3KRP*. The rich SNPs, in addition to large sequence distances and Tajima's D, indicate DBS differences in modern humans. Genes involved in sugar metabolism are especially notable. A key feature of modern human diets is high sugar intake, which can cause non-enzymatic oxidation of proteins (i.e., glycation) and deactivate protein functions. Among proteins encoded by genes in this intersection, TAS1R3 recognizes diverse natural and synthetic sweeteners, Insulin decreases blood glucose concentration, ST3GAL4 regulates protein glycosylation, and FN3KRP deglycates proteins. These DBSs and target genes indicate continuous evolution of transcriptional regulation with human and population specificity.

To examine whether these SNPS are neutral or indicate selection signals, we next used multiple statistical tests (with widely adopted parameters), including XP-CLR (Chen et al., 2010), iSAFE (Akbari et al., 2018), Tajima's D (Tajima, 1989), Fay-Wu's H (Fay and Wu, 2000), the fixation index (Fst) (Weir and Cockerham, 1984), and linkage disequilibrium (LD) (Slatkin, 2008), to detect selection signals in HS lncRNAs and strong DBSs in CEU, CHB, and YRI (the three representative populations of Europeans, Asians, and Africans) (Supplementary Note 4, 5; Supplementary Table 9, 10, 11). Selection signals were detected in several HS lncRNA genes in CEU and CHB but not in YRI, as well as in more DBSs in CEU and CHB than in YRI. These results agree well with findings reported in previous studies, including that fewer selection signals are detected in YRI (Sabeti et al., 2007; Voight et al., 2006). Selection signals in considerable DBSs were detected by multiple tests, indicating the reliability of the analysis. DBSs in the two pigmentation-related genes *MC1R* and

290 *MFSD12* and the two odor reception-related genes *OR6C1* and *TAS1R3* are notable examples. The

291 dense SNPs, population-specific selection signals, and specific functions of these genes together

292 indicate the ongoing reshaping of gene expression in modern humans.

294 **Table 2 Genes with most polymorphic DBSs and DBSs with mostly changed sequence**

295 **distances from modern humans to archaic humans and chimpanzees**

Target gene	Annotation	SNP number	Mostly changed
IFNAR1	i.e., Interferon Alpha And Beta Receptor Subunit 1.	31	C,D
DECR2	The related pathways include metabolism and regulation of lipid metabolism.	17	C,A,D
DOK7	Essential for neuromuscular synaptogenesis.	17	C,D
TAS1R3	Responding to the umami taste stimulus and recognizing diverse natural and synthetic sweeteners.	17	C,D
NFATC1	A TF that induces gene transcription during immune responses.	16	C
ELSPBP1	Binding to spermatozoa and playing a role in sperm capacitation.	15	C,D
ST3GAL4	Involved in protein glycosylation.	15	C,D
CAMK2B	Calcium/calmodulin-dependent protein kinase important for dendritic spine and synapse formation and maintaining synaptic plasticity.	13	C,D
HLA-DQB1-AS1	Highly expressed in EBV-transformed lymphocytes, lung, spleen.	13	C,A,D,V
ANKLE2	Diseases associated with ANKLE2 include microcephaly.	12	C,D

KRTAP1-3	The KAP proteins form a matrix of keratin intermediate filaments that contribute to the structure of hair fibers.	12	C,A,D
INS, INS-IGF2	Insulin decreases blood glucose concentration.	11	C,A,D
SHC2	Involved in the signal transduction pathways of neurotrophin-activated Trk receptors in cortical neurons	11	C,D
FN3KRP	Deglycating proteins to restore their function, important for modern humans adaptive to high glucose intake and functions in all tissues.	10	C,D
TFB1M	The encoded protein is part of the basal mitochondrial transcription complex and is necessary for mitochondrial gene expression.	10	C,A,D

The most SNP-rich DBSs are also DBSs with mostly changed sequence distances from modern
humans to archaic humans and chimpanzees. C, A, D, and V indicate that the DBS in the gene has
mostly changed sequence distances from modern humans to chimpanzees (C), Altai Neanderthals
(A), Denisovans (D), and Vindija Neanderthals (V), respectively.

2.5. Young weak DBSs may have greatly promoted recent human evolution

To further examine whether the reshaping has been revised recently, we classified strong and weak
DBSs with mostly changed sequence distances into "old" ones, "young" ones, and "others". DBSs with
"Human-Chimp distance>0.034 AND Human-Altai Neanderthals distance=0" were defined as old
ones, and DBSs with "Human-Altai Neanderthals distance>0.034 OR Human-Denisovan
distance>0.034" were defined as young ones, which demark early and late sequence changes in
human evolution. As we identified favored and hitchhiking mutations in 17 human populations
(Tang et al., 2022; Tang et al., 2023), we further classified DBSs into six classes - strong old, strong
young, strong others, weak old, weak young, weak others, and examined the numbers of favored
and hitchhiking mutations in each class (Supplementary Table 16). Favored and hitchhiking
mutations are most enriched in the weak young class; we interpret that these DBSs may have

considerably promoted recent human evolution.

2.6. SNPs in DBSs have cis-effects on gene expression

To verify the above genomic and population genetics analysis, we further examined SNPs in DBSs

and their impact on gene expression using transcriptomic data. Based on the Genotype-Tissue

Expression (GTEx) data (GTEx Consortium, 2017), we identified expression quantitative trait loci

(eQTLs) in DBSs using the widely adopted criteria of MAF≥0.1 and cis-effect size (ES)≥0.5. 1727

SNPs, with MAF ≥0.1 in at least one population and absolute values of ES≥0.5 in at least one tissue,

were identified in DBSs in autosomal genes (Supplementary Table 12,13). These eQTLs include 372

"conserved" ones (i.e., also in DBSs in the three archaic humans) and 1020 "novel" ones (i.e., only in

DBSs in modern humans). Many conserved eQTLs are in brain tissues and have high derived allele

frequencies (DAFs) in all three modern populations. A notable eQTL with high DAFs in all three

populations and positive ES≥0.5 in 44 out of 48 GTEx tissues is rs2246577 in the DBS in *FN3KRP*,

whose encoded protein deglycates proteins to restore their function (Table 2). In contrast, many

novel eQTLs are in a particular tissue and have population-specific DAFs (Supplementary Note 6).

Next, we performed two analyses to examine how eQTLs in DBSs influence gene expression. First,

we computed the expression correlation between HS lncRNAs and target transcripts with DBSs

having eQTLs in specific tissues. Most (94%) HS lncRNA-target transcript pairs showed significant

expression correlation in tissues in which the eQTLs were identified (|Spearman's rho| >0.3 and

FDR <0.05). Second, we examined whether eQTLs are more enriched in DBSs than in Ensembl-

annotated promoters by computing and comparing the density of eQTLs in the two classes of

regions. In the comparison, we used promoters as the reference (background) because they contain

DBSs. The results indicate that eQTLs are more enriched in DBSs than in promoters (one-sided

Mann-Whitney test, p=0.0) (Supplementary Note 6). Thus, population-specific SNPs and tissue-

specific eQTLs, on the levels of genome and transcriptome, respectively, suggest that DBSs enable

HS lncRNAs to regulate transcription with population- and tissue-specific features.

2.7. HS lncRNAs promote brain evolution from archaic to modern humans

To further confirm that SNPs in DBSs have cis-effects on gene expression, we examined the impact

of HS lncRNA-DBS on gene expression in the GTEx tissues (GTEx Consortium, 2017). 40 autosomal HS lncRNAs are expressed in at least one tissue (median TPM>0.1) and form 198876 HS lncRNA-target transcript pairs in all tissues. Of these pairs, 45% show a significant expression correlation in specific tissues (Spearman's |rho|>0.3 and FDR<0.05). To assess the likelihood that these correlations could be obtained by chance, we randomly sampled 10000 pairs of lncRNAs and protein-coding transcripts genome-wide and found that only 2.3% of pairs showed significant expression correlation (Spearman's |rho|>0.3 and FDR<0.05). Moreover, a higher percentage (56%) of HS lncRNA-target transcript pairs with significant correlation is detected in at least one brain region, indicating more extensive gene expression regulation by HS lncRNAs in the brain (Figure 3A).

To obtain supporting evidence on the transcriptome level, we analyzed nine experimental datasets (Supplementary Note 7). **First**, we analyzed two datasets of epigenetic studies: one examining H3K27ac and H3K4me2 profiling in human, macaque, and mouse corticogenesis, and the other examining gene expression and H3K27ac modification in eight brain regions in humans and four other primates (Reilly et al., 2015; Xu et al., 2018). Compared with the genome-wide background, 84% and 73% of genes in the two datasets have DBSs for HS lncRNAs, indicating significantly higher enrichment in HS lncRNA targets (p=1.21e-21 and 1.2e-56, two-sided Fisher's exact test). When using gene expression in chimpanzees as the control, 1851 genes show human-specific transcriptomic differences in one or multiple brain regions, whereas only 240 genes show chimpanzee-specific transcriptomic differences. **Second**, we analyzed two datasets of PsychENCODE studies, one examining spatiotemporally differentially expressed genes and spatiotemporally differentially methylated sites in 16 brain regions, and the other examining the spatiotemporal transcriptomic divergence across human and macaque brain development (Li et al., 2018; Zhu et al., 2018). In the first dataset, 65 HS lncRNAs are expressed in all 16 brain regions, 109 transcripts have spatiotemporally differentially methylated sites in their promoters, and 56 of the 109 transcripts have DBSs for HS lncRNAs. In the second dataset, 8951 genes show differential expression between the human and macaque brains, and 72% of differentially expressed genes in the human brain have DBSs for HS lncRNAs. Thus, both datasets show significant enrichment for HS lncRNA regulation. **Third**, three studies identified genes critically regulating cortical expansion

(Florio et al., 2018; Johnson et al., 2018; Suzuki et al., 2018). Of the 40 reported protein-coding genes,

29 have DBSs of HS lncRNAs in promoter regions (Supplementary Table 14). Thus, these genes are

enriched with DBSs of HS lncRNAs compared to the genome-wide background (p<0.01, two-sided

Fisher's exact test). **Fourth**, we analyzed two datasets of brain organoid studies. By establishing and

comparing cerebral organoids between humans, chimpanzees, and macaques, Pollen et al.

identified 261 human-specific gene expression changes (Pollen et al., 2019). By fusing human and

chimpanzee iPS cells and differentiating the hybrid iPS cells into hybrid cortical spheroids, Agoglia

et al. generated a panel of tetraploid human-chimpanzee hybrid iPS cells and identified thousands

of genes with divergent expression between humans and chimpanzees (Agoglia et al., 2021). We

found that 261 and 1102 genes in the two datasets are enriched with DBSs of HS lncRNAs compared

to the genome-wide background (p=1.2e-16 and 3.4e-74).

Finally, we examined the evolution of the impact of HS lncRNAs and their DBSs on gene expression

further using the GTEx data (the transcript expression matrices). For each DBS in an HS lncRNA-

target transcript pair that shows correlated expression in a GTEx tissue, we computed the sequence

distances of this DBS from the HS lncRNA-target transcript pair in modern humans to the pairs in

the three archaic humans. Then, we compared the distribution of DBS sequence distances in each

tissue with the distribution of DBS sequence distances in all tissues as the background (one-sided

two-sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov test). DBSs in HS lncRNA-target transcript pairs with correlated

expression in brain regions have significantly changed sequence distances since the Altai

Neanderthals and Denisovans (Figure 3B), suggesting that gene expression regulation by HS

lncRNAs in the brain has undergone significant evolution recently (Ponce de Leon et al., 2021).

Results from other GTEx tissues, including Kidney-Cortex, Ovary, and Skin-Sun Expressed (Figure

3B), also suggest continuous influences of reshaped gene expression on human evolution.

The above results prompted us to examine whether HS lncRNAs may have contributed more

significantly to human evolution than HS TFs (Supplementary Note 9). Based on the "hg38-panTro6"

gene sets reported by Kirilenko et al. and the human TF lists reported by previous studies and used in

the *SCENIC* package (Bahrami et al., 2015; Kirilenko et al., 2023; Lambert et al., 2018), we identified five

potential HS TFs. Then, we predicted their DBSs in the 5000 bp promoter regions of the 179128

Ensembl-annotated transcripts (release 79) using *FIMO* and *CellOracle* (Grant et al., 2011; Kamimoto et al., 2023), identified counterparts of these DBSs in archaic humans and chimpanzees, computed sequence distances of DBSs from modern humans to archaic humans and chimpanzees (Supplementary Table 18), computed the Pearson correlation of HS TFs and target transcripts across GTEx tissues, and computed sequence distances of DBSs in HS TF-target transcript pairs across GTEx tissues from modern humans to archaic humans. Highly correlated HS TF-target transcript pairs are distributed across multiple tissues, rather than being confined to the brain; additionally, significantly changed DBSs do not densely occur in the brain (Supplementary Figs. 25 and 26). These results further support that HS lncRNAs have promoted human evolution by specifically regulating gene expression.

Figure 3. The impact of HS lncRNA-DBS interaction on gene expression in GTEx tissues and organs. (A) The distribution of the percentage of HS lncRNA-target transcript pairs with correlated expression across GTEx tissues and organs. Higher percentages of correlated pairs are in brain regions than in other tissues and organs. (B) The distribution of significantly changed DBSs (in terms of sequence distance) in HS lncRNA-target transcript pairs across GTEx tissues and organs between archaic and modern humans. Orange, red, and dark red indicate significant changes from Denisovans (D), Altai Neanderthals and Denisovans (AD), and all three archaic humans (ADV). DBSs

in HS lncRNA-target transcript pairs with correlated expression in seven brain regions (in dark red) have changed significantly and consistently since the Altai Neanderthals, Denisovans, and Vindija Neanderthals (one-sided two-sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov test, significant changes determined by FDR <0.001).

2.8. HS lncRNAs mediate human-specific correlated gene expression in the brain

To explore the evidence indicating that the high percentage of correlated gene expression in the brain (Figure 3A) is human-specific, we used the GTEx data from the human frontal cortex (BA9) and anterior cingulate cortex (BA24) (n=101 and 83, respectively) (Consortium et al., 2017), the transcriptomic data for the same brain regions in macaques (n=22 and 25, respectively) (Zhu et al., 2018), and the *eGRAM* program we developed recently for examining transcriptional regulation modules, to identify gene modules. In the human brain, HS lncRNAs' target genes form distinct modules, characterized by rich correlation relationships (Pearson's r>0.8) and enrichment in neurodevelopment-related KEGG pathways (hypergeometric distribution test, FDR<0.05). In contrast, in the same macaque brain regions, the orthologues of HS lncRNAs' target genes do not have these features (Figure 4; Supplementary Figure 24; Supplementary Table 17). The distinct differences in gene modules in these brain regions support that the reshaped gene expression by HS lncRNAs is human-specific.

Figure 4. Human-specifically reshaped gene expression by HS lncRNAs in the frontal cortex (BA9).
(A) Genes expressed in the human frontal cortex are enriched for HS lncRNAs' target genes and
neurodevelopment-related pathways. Squares, dots, and colors indicate HS lncRNAs, gene modules
(Module_1 and Module_2 are illustrated), and enriched KEGG pathways, respectively. (B)
Comparison of modules and genes in humans (indicated by H) and macaques (indicated by M). In
each pair of modules, green and blue dots denote human genes and their orthologues, and lines
between dots indicate correlated expression. Note that many orthologous genes in macaques are
not in the modules but displayed in the corresponding positions, and correlated expression is more

prominent in humans than in macaques.

3. DISCUSSION

The trivial genomic differences but substantial phenotypic and behavioral differences between

modern humans, archaic humans, and apes make the question of what genomic differences critically

determine modern humans a profound one. This question has been addressed by numerous studies

employing various methods. Previous studies notably examined new protein-coding genes and

HARs, reporting that HS protein-coding genes promote rapid neocortex expansion (Fiddes et al.,

2018; Florio et al., 2018; Pinson et al., 2022) and that HARs are significantly enriched in domains

important for human-specific 3D genome organization (Keough et al., 2023). Many studies also

examined the functions of lncRNAs in humans and mice. However, HS lncRNAs and lncRNA DBSs

have been overlooked. Since gene expression can be substantially rewired by TFs and TF DBSs

(Johnson, 2017), it is sensible to postulate that HS lncRNAs and their DBSs may have greatly

reshaped gene expression. Verifying this postulation needs examination of cross-species genomic

and transcriptomic data. This study aimed to verify this postulation by identifying HS lncRNAs, their

DBSs, and the counterparts of these DBSs in modern humans, ancient humans, and chimpanzees.

We used multiple methods to analyze diverse data, and our results suggest that HS lncRNAs have

greatly reshaped (or even rewired) gene expression in humans.

As DBS prediction is the basis of the study, we used multiple methods, including DBD KO using

CRISPR/Cas9, following the analysis of differential expression of target genes, to validate predicted

DBSs. When running programs including *Infernal*, *LongTarget*, and g:*Profiler* and performing

statistical tests that detect selection signals, we used default parameters that suit most situations

and widely used significance levels. When identifying those of HS lncRNAs' target genes that

probably most critically differentiate humans from chimpanzees, the top 20% (4248) of genes were

used whose DBSs in humans or the counterparts of these DBSs in chimpanzees have the largest

binding affinity or sequence distances. In support that these parameters, significance levels, and

cutoffs are reasonable, the numbers of genes we obtained that differentiate modern humans from

archaic humans and chimpanzees agree with the phylogenetic relationships revealed by previous

studies (Prufer et al., 2017), and are approximate to the number (4377) of differentially expressed

genes between human-only and chimpanzee-only iPSC lines due to trans-acting differences

between humans and chimpanzees (Song et al., 2021). Importantly, since weak DBSs may be less

reliable than strong ones, we classified DBSs into strong/weak ones and old/young ones. We found

that different classes of DBSs have distinct evolutionary and functional features, which is generally

sensible given that human evolution has undergone different big events. Due to the nature of data

analysis, it is challenging to eliminate bias, false positives, false negatives, and the impact of varying

parameter values. Other parameters and cutoff values may generate somewhat (but not

significantly) different results (e.g., a DBS distance cutoff=0.035 would determine 4157 top target

genes). Not all detected signals reliably indicate positive selection, but the main conclusions are

based on binding affinity, sequence distance, and SNP number, instead of selection signals in DBSs

(Tables 1, 2). Genes have different transcript/isoform numbers, but this may unlikely cause

confounding effects in downstream analyses such as overrepresentation analysis (Figure 2) and

transcriptomic data analysis (Figure 3) because the input to *g:Profiler* is a non-redundant gene list

and each RNA-seq file normally has just one record for each gene, even if some genes may have one

but others have multiple DBSs (before their one or multiple transcripts). While a gene with more

DBSs/transcripts may have a higher chance to evolve a large DBS sequence distance, this more likely

suggests that the transcript with a large DBS sequence distance has become more/less important

than others.

We have a few notes on several findings. First, Neanderthal-inherited sequences have measurable

impacts on gene expression in modern humans, but the impacts are least detectable in the brain

(McCoy et al., 2017). Here, we find that HS lncRNAs and their DBSs have more significantly

influenced gene expression in the brain than in other tissues. Second, the regulation of many genes

by HS lncRNAs may have undergone rapid evolution, notable examples including those making

humans adapt to high sugar intake. Third, intensively regulated genes are enriched in different

functions at different periods of human evolution, as evidenced by genes with strong/weak and

young/old DBSs and with DBSs containing "old" and "new" SNPs. Notable details include that DBSs

containing "old" and "new" SNPs are in genes regulating neural development and glucose

metabolism. Fourth, newly emerged regulations (i.e., target genes with young weak DBSs) may have

significantly promoted recent human evolution.

The above findings also raise new questions. First, a high percentage (about 85%) of protein-coding

regions in the mouse and human genomes is identical, but many mouse lncRNAs are rodent-specific

(Yue et al., 2014). Thus, two questions arise: how these lncRNAs specifically rewire gene expression

in mice and to what extent human- and mouse-specific lncRNAs cause the cross-species

transcriptional regulation differences (Breschi et al., 2017; Hodge et al., 2019; Zhu et al., 2018).

Second, whether mice and other mammals have such species-specific lncRNAs as RP11-423H2.3

that regulate the expression of substantial genes. Third, whether lineage- and species-specific

lncRNAs would make many evolutionary novelties preordained.

4. MATERIAL AND METHODS

4.1. Data sources

The sequences of human (GRCh38/hg38, GRCh37/hg19) and chimpanzee genomes (panTro5) were

obtained from the UCSC Genome Browser (http://genome.UCSC.edu). Three high-quality archaic

human genomes were obtained from the Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology

(https://www.eva.mpg.de/genetics/index.html), which include an Altai Neanderthal that lived

approximately 122 thousand years ago (kya) (Prüfer et al., 2013), a Denisovan (an Asian relative of

Neanderthals) that lived approximately 72 kya (Meyer et al., 2012), and a Vindija Neanderthal that

lived approximately 52 kya (Prufer et al., 2017). The ancestral sequences for the human genome

(GRCh37) (which were generated upon the EPO alignments of six primate species human,

chimpanzee, gorilla, orangutan, macaque, and marmoset) were downloaded from the EBI website

(ftp://ftp.1000genomes.ebi.ac.uk/vol1/ftp/phase1/analysis_results/supporting/ancestral_alignm

ents/). The SNP data of modern humans were obtained from the 1000 Genomes Project (phase I)

(1000 Genomes Project Consortium et al., 2012). The three modern human populations are CEU

(Utah residents with Northern and Western European ancestry), CHB (Han Chinese in Beijing,

China), and YRI (Yoruba in Ibadan, Nigeria), which contain 100, 99, and 97 individuals, respectively.

The genetic map files of modern humans were downloaded from the 1000 Genomes Project website

(ftp://ftp-

trace.ncbi.nih.gov/1000genomes/ftp/technical/working/20110106_recombination_hotspots/).

The 1000 Genomes phased genotype data in VCF format were downloaded from the International

Genome Sample Resource website (http://www.internationalgenome.org/). Annotated human

genes and transcripts were obtained from the Ensembl website (http://www.Ensembl.org). FASTA-

format nucleotide sequences were converted from VCFs using the *vcf-consensus* program in the

*VCFtool*s package when necessary (Danecek et al., 2011). Data in the GeneCards Human Gene

Database (www.genecards.org) were used to annotate genes and transcripts.

RNA-sequencing (RNA-seq) data (transcripts per million [TPM]) and eQTL data of human tissues

were obtained from the Genotype-Tissue Expression Project (GTEx, v8) website

(https://gtexportal.org/) (GTEx Consortium, 2017). Histone modification and DNA methylation

signals in multiple cell lines and ENCODE Candidate Cis-Regulatory Elements (cCRE) were obtained

from the UCSC Genome Browser (http://genome.UCSC.edu). The genome-wide DNA binding sites

of lncRNA NEAT1, MALAT1, and MEG3 were obtained from experimental studies (Mondal et al.,

2015; West et al., 2014). The predicted and experimentally detected DBSs in target genes of MALAT1,

NEAT1, and MEG3 are given in the supplementary table (Supplementary Table 15).

4.2. Identifying HS lncRNA genes

We used the *Infernal* program (Nawrocki et al., 2009), which searches orthologous RNA sequences

upon sequence and structure alignment, to identify orthologous exons in 16 mammalian genomes

for each exon in each of the 13562 GENCODE (v18)-annotated human lncRNA genes (Lin et al.,

2019). The 16 mammals were chimpanzee (CSAC 2.1.4/panTro4), macaque (BGI CR_1.0/rheMac3),

marmoset (WUGSC 3.2/calJac3), tarsier (Broad/tarSyr1), mouse lemur (Broad/micMur1), tree

shrew (Broad/tupBel1), mouse (GRCm38/mm10), rat (Baylor3.4/rn4, RGSC6.0/rn6), guinea pig

(Broad/cavPor3), rabbit (Broad/oryCun2), dog (Broad   CanFam3.1/canFam3),   cow   (Baylor

Btau_4.6.1/bosTau7),   elephant(Broad/loxAfr3),   hedgehog   (EriEur2.0/eriEur2),   opossum

(Broad/monDom5), and platypus (WUGSC 5.0.1/ornAna1) (http://genome.UCSC.edu). If the

number of orthologous exons of a human lncRNA gene in a genome exceeded half the exon number

of the human lncRNA gene, these orthologous exons were assumed to form an orthologous lncRNA

gene. If a human lncRNA gene had no orthologous gene in all of the 16 mammals, it was assumed to

be human-specific.

4.3. Identifying DBSs of HS lncRNAs

LncRNAs bind to DNA sequences by forming RNA:DNA triplexes. Each triplex comprises triplex-forming oligonucleotides (TFO) in the lncRNA and a triplex-targeting site (TTS) in the DNA sequence. We used the *LongTarget* program to predict HS lncRNAs' DNA binding domains (DBD) and binding sites (DBS) with the default parameters (*Ruleset* = all, *T.T. penalty* = -1000, *CC penalty* = 0, *Offset* = 15, *Identity* ≥ 60, *Nt* ≥ 50) (Lin et al., 2019; Wen et al., 2022). The *LongTarget* program predicts DBDs and DBSs simultaneously, where a DBD comprises a set of densely overlapping TFOs and a DBS comprises a set of densely overlapping TTSs. For each HS lncRNA, we predicted its DBSs in the 5000 bp promoter regions (-3500 bp upstream and +1500 bp downstream the transcription start site) of the 179128 Ensembl-annotated transcripts (release 79). For each DBS, its binding affinity is the product of DBS length and the averaged *Identity* score of all TTSs (the *Identity* score is the percentage of paired nucleotides). Strong and weak DBSs were classified based on binding affinity ≥60 and <60. A transcript whose promoter region contains a strong DBS of an HS lncRNA was assumed to be a target transcript of the HS lncRNA, and the gene containing this transcript was assumed to be a target gene of the HS lncRNA. As the 1000 Genomes Project (phase I) data and the archaic human genomes are based on GRCh37/hg19, the coordinates of DBSs were converted from GRCh38/hg38 to GRCh37/hg19 using the *liftover* program from the UCSC Genome Browser (Kuhn et al., 2013).

4.4. Experimentally validating DBS prediction

A 157 bp sequence (chr17:80252565-80252721, hg19) containing the DBD of RP13-516M14.1, a 202 bp sequence (chr1:113392603-113392804, hg19) containing the DBD of RP11-426L16.8, and a 198 bp sequence (chr17:19460524-19460721, hg19) containing the DBD of SNORA59B, were knocked out in the HeLa cell line, RKO cell line, and SK-MES-1 cell line, respectively. Two sequences (chr1:156643524-156643684, chr10:52445649-52445740, hg38) containing the DBD of two wrongly transcribed noncoding sequences were knocked out in the HCT-116 and A549 cell lines, respectively. The seven knockouts were performed by UBIGENE, Guangzhou, China (http://www.ubigene.com) using CRISPR-U™, a revised version of CRISPR/Cas9 technology. Before and after the seven DBD knockouts, RNA sequencing (RNA-seq) was performed by Novogene,

Beijing, China (https://cn.novogene.com) and HaploX, Shenzhen, China (https://www.haplox.cn/).

The reads were aligned to the human GRCh38 genome using the *Hiasat2* program (Kim et al., 2019),

and the resulting SAM files were converted to BAM files using *Samtools* (Li et al., 2009). The *Stringtie*

program was used to quantify gene expression levels (Pertea et al., 2015). Fold change of gene

expression was computed using the *edgeR* package (Robinson et al., 2010), and significant up- and

down-regulation of target genes after DBD knockout was determined upon |log2(fold change)| > 1

with FDR < 0.1.

Genome-wide DBSs of NEAT1, MALAT1, and MEG3 were experimentally detected (Mondal et al.,

2015; West et al., 2014). We also used these data to validate DBS prediction by predicting DBSs of

the three lncRNAs and checking the overlap between predicted and experimentally detected DBSs

(Supplementary Table 15).

4.5. Mapping DBSs of HS lncRNAs in the chimpanzee and archaic human genomes

We used the *liftover* program from the UCSC Genome Browser (http://genome.UCSC.edu) to map

loci of DBSs in the human genome hg38 to the chimpanzee genome Pan_tro 3.0 (panTro5). The

mapping results were examined by checking the human-chimpanzee pairwise alignment

(hg38 vs panTro5) in the UCSC Genome Browser (http://genome.UCSC.edu). 97.81%

(100403/102651) of DBSs were mapped, and the 2248 unmapped DBSs in 429 genes were

considered human-specific. We used *vcf-consensus* in the *VCFtool*s package to extract the DBSs of

HS lncRNAs from the VCF files of Altai Neanderthals, Denisovans, and Vindija Neanderthals. The

variant with the highest quality score was selected whenever multiple variant calls were observed

at a given locus. The obtained DBS sequences in chimpanzees and three archaic humans are called

counterparts of DBSs in these genomes.

4.6. Estimating sequence distances of DBSs between different genomes

We first aligned DBS sequences in the genomes of humans, chimpanzees, Altai Neanderthals,

Denisovans, and Vindija Neanderthals using the *MAFFT*7 program for measuring sequence

distances from modern humans to chimpanzees and archaic humans (Katoh and Standley, 2013).

We then computed sequence distances using the *dnadist* program with the Kimura 2-parameter

model in the *PHYLIP* (3.6) package (http://evolution.genetics.washington.edu/phylip.html) and

the *Tamura-Nei model* in the *MEGA7* package (Kumar et al., 2016). The two methods generated

equivalent results. The largest distance between DBSs in humans and their counterparts in

chimpanzees is 5.383. Since 2248 DBSs in 429 human genes do not have counterparts in

chimpanzees, we assumed that these DBSs have sequence distances of 10.0 between humans and

chimpanzees. The relationship between cross-species sequence distances and cross-species

phenotypic distances is little known. Based on the report that 5984 genes were identified

differentially expressed between *human-only and chimpanzee-only iPSC lines (*including 4377 whose

differential expression was due to cross-species trans-acting differences) (Song et al., 2021) and on

the report that "the Denisovan genome thus tend to be older, than the Altai Neandertal genome"

(Prufer et al., 2017), we chose 0.034 as the DBS sequence distance cutoff for identifying "mostly

changed DBSs" from modern humans to chimpanzees and archaic humans. 0.034 determined 4248

genes (the top 20%) in chimpanzees, and 1256, 2514, and 134 genes in Altai Neanderthals,

Denisovans, and Vindija Neanderthals, respectively, which may critically characterize humans from

chimpanzees and three archaic humans. If cutoff=0.035, since 91 genes have DBS sequence

distance=0.034, 4248-91=4157 genes, this small difference in gene number (4248 vs 4157) would

not significantly influence overrepresentation analysis (Figure 2).

We determined human ancestral sequences of DBSs based on the human ancestor sequences from

the EBI website, which were generated based on the EPO alignments of six primate species. We used

the above-mentioned methods to calculate the sequence distances DBSs from the human ancestor

to chimpanzees, archaic humans, and modern humans. We found that when the human-chimpanzee

ancestral sequence has the ancestral sequence (which means the inference of ancestral allele is of

high confidence), DBS distances from the human ancestor to modern humans are larger than to

archaic humans, but this situation only accounts for about 63.8%. For many DBSs, the distances

from the human ancestor to modern humans are smaller than to archaic humans (especially

Neanderthals and Denisovans) and even to chimpanzees. This defect may be caused by the absence

of archaic humans in building the human ancestral sequence.

4.7. Detecting positive selection signals in HS lncRNA genes and DBSs

We used multiple tests to detect positive selection signals in HS lncRNA genes. First, we used the

XP-CLR test (parameters = -w1 0.001 300 100 -p0 0.95, window size = 0.1 cM, grid size = 100 bp)

to perform six pairwise genome-wide scans (i.e., CEU-CHB, CEU-YRI, CHB-CEU, CHB-YRI, YRI-CEU,

and YRI-CHB) (Chen et al., 2010). The upper 1% of scores across the entire genome in each pairwise

scan was 34.6 in the CEU-YRI scan, 16.8 in the CEU-CHB scan, 45.0 in the CHB-YRI scan, 26.9 in the

CHB-CEU scan, 14.1 in the YRI-CEU scan, and 14.1 in the YRI-CHB scan. These scores were used as

the thresholds of positive selection signals in these populations. Second, we used the *iSAFE* program

to scan each genomic region containing an HS lncRNA gene and its 500-kb upstream and

downstream sequences (Akbari et al., 2018). Strongly selected loci were detected only in CEU and

CHB. Third, we used the *VCFtools* program to calculate Tajima's D values for each HS lncRNA gene

in CEU, CHB, and YRI (Danecek et al., 2011). The calculation was performed using a 1500-bp non-

overlapping sliding window because the lengths of these genes exceed 1500 bp. To generate a

background reference for assessing the significant increase or decrease of Tajima's D for HS lncRNA

genes in a population, we calculated Tajima's D values across the whole genome using a sliding

window of 1500 bp. As the values of Tajima's D were compared with the background reference,

significant D<0 and D>0 indicate positive (or directional) selection and balancing selection,

respectively, rather than population demography dynamics (Tajima, 1989). Fourth, we used the

integrated Fst to detect positive selection signals in HS lncRNA genes. The Fst of each HS lncRNA

gene was computed for three comparisons, i.e., CEU-YRI, CHB-YRI, and CHB-CEU. Extreme Fst

values of SNPs were detected in HS lncRNA genes in the comparisons of CEU-YRI and CHB-YRI. Since

allele frequencies for different loci vary across a genome and genetic drift may have different effects

at different loci, we used a sliding window of 1500 to compare Fst values of HS lncRNA genes with

the genome-wide background. Extreme Fst values indicate positive selection. Finally, we applied

linkage disequilibrium (LD) analysis to each HS lncRNA gene. We computed the pairwise LD (r^2) in

CEU, CHB, and YRI for common SNPs (with minimal allele frequency (MAF) ≥ 0.05 in at least one

population) in HS lncRNA genes and DBSs using the *PLINK* program (Purcell et al., 2007).

Significantly increased LD was detected in SNPs in HS lncRNA genes in CEU and CHB. The LD

patterns were portrayed using the *Haploview* program (Barrett et al., 2005).

Next, we used the above tests to detect positive selection signals in DBSs. First, the 100 bp grid size

of the XP-CLR test also allowed the detection of selection signals in DBSs. Second, we performed

Tajima's D and Fay-Wu's H tests (Fay and Wu, 2000; Tajima, 1989). We calculated Tajima's D values

for each DBS in CEU, CHB, and YRI using the *VCFtools* program (Danecek et al., 2011), with a sliding

window of 147 bp (the mean length of strong DBSs). To generate a background reference for judging

the significant increase or decrease of Tajima's D in a population, we calculated Tajima's D values

across the whole genome using the same sliding window. As values of Tajima's D were compared

with the background reference, a significant D<0 and D>0 indicate positive (or directional) selection

and balancing selection, respectively. Fay-Wu's H values were calculated similarly using the

VariScan program (Vilella et al., 2005). Calculating Fay-Wu's H demands the ancestral sequences as

the outgroup. We extracted the ancestral sequences of DBSs from the human ancestral sequence,

which was generated upon the EPO alignments of six primate species (human, chimpanzee, gorilla,

orangutan,   macaque,   and   marmoset)

(ftp://ftp.1000genomes.ebi.ac.uk/vol1/ftp/phase1/analysis_results/supporting/ancestral_alignm

ents/). Third, we computed the Fst to measure the frequency differences of alleles in DBSs between

populations. For the CEU-YRI, CHB-YRI, and CHB-CEU pairwise comparisons, we used the revised

VCFtools program to compute the weighted Fst for all SNPs in each DBS (Weir and Cockerham, 1984).

Fourth, we integrated the weighted Fst values in the three populations into an "integrated Fst"

which indicated whether the DBS locus was under selection in a certain population (Nielsen and

Slatkin, 2013). We used sliding windows of 147 bp for comparing Fst values of DBSs with the

genome-wide background. We empirically denoted the values of integrated Fst in the upper 10% of

scores across the entire genome as statistically significant. To determine positive selection more

reliably, we used Tajima's D and the integrated Fst to jointly determine if a DBS was under positive

selection in a population. The thresholds that determined the upper 10% of Tajima's D values across

the entire genome in CEU, CHB, and YRI were -0.97, -0.96, and -0.97, respectively, and the threshold

that determined the upper 10% of integrated Fst values across the entire genome in the three

populations was 0.22. For example, a DBS was assumed to be under positive selection in CEU if (a)

the DBS had a Tajima's D<-0.97 in CEU and Tajima's D>0.0 in the two other populations and (b) the

DBS had an integrated Fst>0.22. Analogously, a DBS was assumed to be under positive selection in

both CEU and CHB if the DBS had a Tajima's D <-0.97 in CEU, <-0.96 in CHB, and >0.0 in YRI, and had

an integrated Fst>0.22.

4.8. Functional enrichment analysis of genes

We used the *g:Profiler* program (with the parameter settings: Organism=Homo sapiens, Ordered query = No, Significance threshold = Benjamini-Hochberg FDR, User threshold = 0.05, 50 < terms size < 1000) and the Gene Ontology (GO) database to perform over-representation analysis (Raudvere et al., 2019). This analysis is used to determine which pre-defined gene sets (GO terms) are more prevalent (over-represented) in a list of "interesting" genes than would be expected by chance. The lists of genes included genes with the strongest DBSs in humans, genes with the weakest DBSs in humans, and genes with mostly changed DBSs in chimpanzees and three archaic humans. To choose genes with strong DBSs, we ranked genes in descending order based on binding affinity and chose the top 2000 genes. To choose genes with weak DBSs, we first ranked genes in ascending order based on binding affinity, then ranked genes in descending order based on the number of regulatory HS lncRNAs, and finally chose the top 2000 genes with binding affinity ≤40 and regulatory HS lncRNAs ≥5. We used the distance threshold of 0.034 to select genes with mostly changed DBSs. Genes with mostly changed DBSs in chimpanzees include the 429 genes in which 2248 DBSs lack counterparts. 4248, 1256, 2514, and 134 genes in chimpanzees, Altai Neanderthals, Denisovans, and Vindija Neanderthals have DBSs with distance ≥0.034. To make the statistical significance comparable across chimpanzees, Altai Neanderthals, and Denisovans, we used the same number of genes (the top 1256 genes whose DBSs have the largest DBS distances) as the input to the *g:Profiler* program.

4.9. Analysing SNP frequencies in human populations

The frequency of common SNPs (MAF ≥0.05) in DBSs in the three modern human populations was computed using the *VCFtools* package (Danecek et al., 2011). The ancestral/derived states of SNPs were inferred from the human ancestor sequences and were used to determine derived allele frequency.

4.10. Analysing the cis-effect of SNPs in DBSs on target gene expression

SNPs with MAF >0.1 in DBSs in any of the three modern human populations and absolute values of cis-effect size >0.5 (FDR <0.05) in any of the GTEx tissues were examined for an influence on the

expression of the target genes (GTEx Consortium, 2017). SNPs that are eQTLs in the GTEx tissues

and have biased derived allele frequencies (DAF) in the three modern human populations were

examined to estimate whether the eQTL is population-specific.

4.11. Examining the tissue-specific impact of HS lncRNA-regulated gene expression

First, we examined the expression of HS lncRNA genes across the GTEx tissues. HS lncRNA genes

with a median TPM value >0.1 in a tissue were considered robustly expressed in that tissue. Upon

this criterion, 40 HS lncRNA genes were expressed in at least one tissue and were used to examine

the impact of HS lncRNA regulation on gene and transcript expression (other HS lncRNAs may

function in the cytoplasm). Since an HS lncRNA gene may have multiple transcripts, we adopted the

transcript that contains the predicted DBD and has the largest TPM value as the representative

transcript of the HS lncRNA. We calculated the pairwise Spearman's correlation coefficient between

the expression of an HS lncRNA (the representative transcript) and the expression of each of its

target transcripts using the *scipy.stats.spearmanr* program in the *scipy* package. The expression of

an HS lncRNA gene and a target transcript was considered to be significantly correlated if the

|Spearman's rho|>0.3, with Benjamini-Hochberg FDR<0.05. We examined the percentage

distribution of correlated HS lncRNA-target transcript pairs across GTEx tissues and organs (Figure

3A).

We examined all GTEx tissues to determine in which tissues HS lncRNA-regulated gene expression

may have undergone significant changes from archaic to modern humans. GTEx data have both gene

expression matrices and transcript expression matrices; we used the latter to examine the change

of HS lncRNA-target transcript pairs from modern humans to archaic humans. If a pair of HS lncRNA

and target transcript is robustly expressed in a tissue and their expression shows a significant

correlation (|Spearman's rho|>0.3, with Benjamini-Hochberg FDR<0.05) in the tissue, we computed

the sequence distance of the HS lncRNA's DBS in the transcript from the three archaic humans to

modern humans. We compared the sequence distances of all DBSs in each tissue with the sequence

distances of all DBSs in all GTEx tissues (as the background). A one-sided two-sample Kolmogorov-

Smirnov test was used to examine whether the sequence distances of all DBSs in a specific tissue

deviate from the background distribution (which reflects the "neutral evolution" of gene

expression). For each tissue, if the test result was Benjamini-Hochberg FDR < 0.001, the tissue was considered to have significantly changed gene expression regulated by the HS lncRNA. We used different colors to mark tissues with significantly changed gene expression regulation since Altai Neanderthals, Denisovans, and Vindija Neanderthals, and used "D", "A.D.", and "ADV" to indicate changes since Denisovans, since Altai Neanderthals and Denisovans, and since Altai Neanderthals, Denisovans, and Vindija Neanderthals, respectively (Figure 3B).

4.12. Examining enrichment of favored and hitchhiking mutations in DBSs

Using the deep learning network *DeepFavored*, which integrates multiple statistical tests for identifying favored mutations (Tang et al., 2022), we identified 13339 favored mutations and 244098 hitchhiking mutations in 17 human populations (Tang et al., 2023). In this study, we classified DBSs in two ways: into strong ones (affinity>60) and weak ones (36<affinity<60), and into old ones (Human-Chimp distance>0.034 AND Human-Altai Neanderthals distance=0), young ones (Human-Altai Neanderthals distance>0.034 OR Human-Denisovan distance>0.034), and others. We then examined the number of favored and hitchhiking mutations in each class of DBSs. The weak young DBSs have the largest proportion of favored and hitchhiking mutations.

4.13. Identifying and analyzing transcriptional regulatory modules

Most clustering algorithms classify genes into disjoint modules based on expression correlation without considering regulatory relationships (Saelens et al., 2018). The *GRAM* program identifies gene regulatory modules based on correlation and TF-TFBS binding (Bar-Joseph et al., 2003). LncRNAs transcriptionally regulate genes based on lncRNA-DBS binding and correlate gene expression. We developed the *eGRAM* program to identify gene modules based on correlated expression, TF-TFBS interaction, and lncRNA-DBS interaction. In this study, we used *eGRAM* to identify gene modules in the same regions of the human and macaque brains and enriched KEGG pathways using reported RNA-seq datasets (n=101 and 83 for frontal cortex and n=22 and 25 for anterior cingulate cortex) (GTEx Consortium, 2017; Zhu et al., 2018). The default parameters, DBS binding affinity=60, Pearson correlation=0.5, module size=50, and FDR=0.01 (hypergeometric distribution test), were used. The key steps of the program are as follows. (a1) Identify each lncRNA's correlated lncRNAs, which may form a set of co-regulators. (a2, optional) Identify each

TF's correlated TFs, which may form a set of co-regulators. (b1) Compute the correlation between each lncRNA and all genes. (b2, optional) Compute the correlation between each TF and all genes. (c1) Identify each lncRNA's target genes. (c2, optional) Identify each TF's target genes. (d1) Identify each lncRNA set's target module upon correlation and targeting relationships. (d2, optional) Identify each TF set's target module upon correlation and targeting relationships. (e) Check whether TFs' modules contain lncRNAs' targets and whether lncRNAs' modules contain TFs' targets, which reveal genes co-regulated by TFs and lncRNAs and genes independently regulated by TFs and ncRNAs. (f) Performs pathway enrichment analysis for all modules.

4.14 The analysis of HS TFs and their DBSs

Kirilenko et al recently identified orthologous genes in hundreds of placental mammals and birds and organized genes into pairwise datasets using humans and mice as the references (e.g., "hg38-panTro6", "hg38-mm10", and "mm10-hg38") (Kirilenko et al., 2023). Based on the "many2zero" and "one2zero" gene lists (which contain 0 and 147 genes) in the hg38-panTro6 dataset, which indicate the multiple human genes and the one human gene that have no orthologues in chimpanzees, we identified HS protein-coding genes. Further, based on three human TF lists reported by two studies and used in the *SCENIC* package (Bahrami et al., 2015; Lambert et al., 2018), we identified HS TFs. Based on the JASPAR database and using the *CellOracle* program (with default parameters), we predicted DBSs of HS TFs. Then, we repeated the steps of our HS lncRNA analyses (Supplementary Note 9), including computing sequence distances of DBSs and examining the impact of HF TF-target transcript pairs on gene expression in GTEx tissues and organs.

DECLARATION OF COMPETING INTEREST

The authors declare no competing interests.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

H.Z. designed the study and drafted the manuscript. J.L. performed most of the data analyses. Y.W. and J.T. performed XP-CLR, iSAFE, and favored mutation analyses. J.L. and H.Z. developed the *eGRAM* program. All authors have read the manuscript and consent to its publication.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (31771456 to H.Z.) and the China Postdoctoral Science Foundation (2020M682788 to J.L.).

DATA AND CODE AVAILABILITY

GENCODE human lncRNAs are available at the website (https://www.gencodegenes.org/human/). Human lncRNAs' orthologues in 16 mammals, as well as the *LongTarget* program, are available at the *LongTarget*/*LongMan* website (http://www.gaemons.net/). The *eGRAM* code is available on the GitHub website (https://github.com/LinjieCodes/eGRAMv2R1). Other programs and tests are open-source and freely available. The RNA-seq data of the three HS lncRNAs before and after DBD KO have been deposited in the NCBI GEO database (https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/geo) (accession number GSE213231). The RNA-seq data of the other four cases of DBD KO have been deposited in the NCBI GEO database (https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/geo) (accession number is GSE229846). The data on favored and hitchhiking mutations are available from the PopTradeOff database or upon request. All other data are in Supplementary Tables.

SUPPLEMENTARY DATA

Two supplementary files are available online with the manuscript. One is a PDF file containing 9 Supplementary Notes and 26 Supplementary Figures, and the other is an Excel file containing 18 Supplementary Tables.

REFERENCES

1. 1000 Genomes Project Consortium, Abecasis, G.R., Auton, A., Brooks, L.D., DePristo, M.A., Durbin, R.M., Handsaker, R.E., Kang, H.M., Marth, G.T., and McVean, G.A. (2012). An integrated map of genetic variation from 1,092 human genomes. Nature *491*, 56-65.
2. Abu Almakarem, A.S., Petrov, A.I., Stombaugh, J., Zirbel, C.L., and Leontis, N.B. (2012). Comprehensive survey and geometric classification of base triples in RNA structures. Nucleic Acids Res *40*, 1407-1423.
3. Agoglia, R.M., Sun, D., Birey, F., Yoon, S.J., Miura, Y., Sabatini, K., Pasca, S.P., and Fraser, H.B. (2021). Primate cell fusion disentangles gene regulatory divergence in neurodevelopment. Nature *592*, 421-427.
4. Akbari, A., Vitti, J.J., Iranmehr, A., Bakhtiari, M., Sabeti, P.C., Mirarab, S., and Bafna, V. (2018). Identifying the favored mutation in a positive selective sweep. Nat Methods *15*, 279-282.
5. Albalat, R., and Canestro, C. (2016). Evolution by gene loss. Nat Rev Genet *17*, 379-391.
6. Anton, S.C., Potts, R., and Aiello, L.C. (2014). Human evolution. Evolution of early Homo: an integrated

biological perspective. Science *345*, 1236828.

7.   Bahrami, S., Ehsani, R., and Drablos, F. (2015). A property-based analysis of human transcription factors. BMC
Res Notes *8*, 82.

8.   Bar-Joseph, Z., Gerber, G.K., Lee, T.I., Rinaldi, N.J., Yoo, J.Y., Robert, F., Gordon, D.B., Fraenkel, E., Jaakkola, T.S.,
Young, R.A.*, et al.* (2003). Computational discovery of gene modules and regulatory networks. Nat Biotechnol
21, 1337-1342.

9.   Barrett, J.C., Fry, B., Maller, J., and Daly, M.J. (2005). Haploview: analysis and visualization of LD and haplotype
maps. Bioinformatics *21*, 263-265.

10.   Breschi, A., Gingeras, T.R., and Guigo, R. (2017). Comparative transcriptomics in human and mouse. Nat Rev
Genet *18*, 425-440.

11.   Britten, R. (2002). Divergence between samples of chimpanzee and human DNA sequences is 5%, counting
indels. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A *99*.

12.   Chen, H., Patterson, N., and Reich, D. (2010). Population differentiation as a test for selective sweeps. Genome
Res *20*, 393-402.

13.   Chimpanzee Sequencing and Analysis Consortium (2005). Initial sequence of the chimpanzee genome and
comparison with the human genome. Nature *437*, 69-87.

14.   Consortium, G.T., Laboratory, D.A., Coordinating Center -Analysis Working, G., Statistical Methods groups-
Analysis Working, G., Enhancing, G.g., Fund, N.I.H.C., Nih/Nci, Nih/Nhgri, Nih/Nimh, Nih/Nida*, et al.* (2017).
Genetic effects on gene expression across human tissues. Nature *550*, 204-213.

15.   Currat, M., Excoffier, L., Maddison, W., Otto, S.P., Ray, N., Whitlock, M.C., and Yeaman, S. (2006). Comment on
"Ongoing adaptive evolution of ASPM, a brain size determinant in Homo sapiens" and "Microcephalin, a gene
regulating brain size, continues to evolve adaptively in humans". Science *313*, 172; author reply 172.

16.   Danecek, P., Auton, A., Abecasis, G., Albers, C.A., Banks, E., DePristo, M.A., Handsaker, R.E., Lunter, G., Marth,
G.T., Sherry, S.T.*, et al.* (2011). The variant call format and VCFtools. Bioinformatics *27*, 2156-2158.

17.   Derrien, T., Johnson, R., Bussotti, G., Tanzer, A., Djebali, S., Tilgner, H., Guernec, G., Martin, D., Merkel, A.,
Knowles, D.G.*, et al.* (2012). The GENCODE v7 catalog of human long noncoding RNAs: analysis of their gene
structure, evolution, and expression. Genome Res *22*, 1775-1789.

18.   Dong, X., Wang, X., Zhang, F., and Tian, W. (2016). Genome-Wide Identification of Regulatory Sequences
Undergoing Accelerated Evolution in the Human Genome. Mol Biol Evol *33*, 2565-2575.

19.   Ebersberger, I., Metzler, D., Schwarz, C., and Paabo, S. (2002). Genomewide comparison of DNA sequences
between humans and chimpanzees. Am J Hum Genet *70*, 1490-1497.

20.   Evans, P.D., Gilbert, S.L., Mekel-Bobrov, N., Vallender, E.J., Anderson, J.R., Vaez-Azizi, L.M., Tishkoff, S.A.,
Hudson, R.R., and Lahn, B.T. (2005). Microcephalin, a gene regulating brain size, continues to evolve adaptively
in humans. Science *309*, 1717-1720.

21.   Fay, J.C., and Wu, C.I. (2000). Hitchhiking under positive Darwinian selection. Genetics *155*, 1405-1413.

22.   Fiddes, I.T., Lodewijk, G.A., Mooring, M., Bosworth, C.M., Ewing, A.D., Mantalas, G.L., Novak, A.M., van den
Bout, A., Bishara, A., Rosenkrantz, J.L.*, et al.* (2018). Human-Specific NOTCH2NL Genes Affect Notch Signaling
and Cortical Neurogenesis. Cell *173*, 1356-1369 e1322.

23.   Florio, M., Heide, M., Pinson, A., Brandl, H., Albert, M., Winkler, S., Wimberger, P., Huttner, W.B., and Hiller, M.
(2018). Evolution and cell-type specificity of human-specific genes preferentially expressed in progenitors of
fetal neocortex. Elife *7*.

24.   Grant, C.E., Bailey, T.L., and Noble, W.S. (2011). FIMO: scanning for occurrences of a given motif. Bioinformatics
27, 1017-1018.

25.   GTEx Consortium (2017). Genetic effects on gene expression across human tissues. Nature *550*, 204-213.

26.   He, S., Zhang, H., Liu, H., and Zhu, H. (2015). LongTarget: a tool to predict lncRNA DNA-binding motifs and
binding sites via Hoogsteen base-pairing analysis. Bioinformatics *31*, 178-186.

27.   Hernando-Herraez, I., Garcia-Perez, R., Sharp, A.J., and Marques-Bonet, T. (2015). DNA Methylation: Insights
into Human Evolution. PLoS Genet *11*, e1005661.

28.   Hodge, R.D., Bakken, T.E., Miller, J.A., Smith, K.A., Barkan, E.R., Graybuck, L.T., Close, J.L., Long, B., Johansen,
N., Penn, O.*, et al.* (2019). Conserved cell types with divergent features in human versus mouse cortex. Nature
573, 61-68.

29.   Johnson, A.D. (2017). The rewiring of transcription circuits in evolution. Curr Opin Genet Dev *47*, 121-127.

30.   Johnson, M.B., Sun, X., Kodani, A., Borges-Monroy, R., Girskis, K.M., Ryu, S.C., Wang, P.P., Patel, K., Gonzalez,
D.M., Woo, Y.M.*, et al.* (2018). Aspm knockout ferret reveals an evolutionary mechanism governing cerebral
cortical size. Nature *556*, 370-375.

31.   Kaessmann, H. (2010). Origins, evolution, and phenotypic impact of new genes. Genome Res *20*, 1313-1326.

32.   Kamimoto, K., Stringa, B., Hoffmann, C.M., Jindal, K., Solnica-Krezel, L., and Morris, S.A. (2023). Dissecting cell
identity via network inference and in silico gene perturbation. Nature *614*, 742-751.

33.   Katoh, K., and Standley, D.M. (2013). MAFFT Multiple Sequence Alignment Software Version 7: Improvements
in Performance and Usability. Molecular Biology and Evolution *30*, 772-780.

34.   Keough, K.C., Whalen, S., Inoue, F., Przytycki, P.F., Fair, T., Deng, C., Steyert, M., Ryu, H., Lindblad-Toh, K.,
Karlsson, E.*, et al.* (2023). Three-dimensional genome rewiring in loci with human accelerated regions. Science
380, eabm1696.

35.   Kim, D., Paggi, J.M., Park, C., Bennett, C., and Salzberg, S.L. (2019). Graph-based genome alignment and
genotyping with HISAT2 and HISAT-genotype. Nat Biotechnol *37*, 907-915.

36.   Kirilenko, B.M., Munegowda, C., Osipova, E., Jebb, D., Sharma, V., Blumer, M., Morales, A.E., Ahmed, A.W.,
Kontopoulos, D.G., Hilgers, L.*, et al.* (2023). Integrating gene annotation with orthology inference at scale.
Science *380*, eabn3107.

37.   Krieger, G., Lupo, O., Wittkopp, P., and Barkai, N. (2022). Evolution of transcription factor binding through
sequence variations and turnover of binding sites. Genome Res *32*, 1099-1111.

38.   Kuhn, R.M., Haussler, D., and Kent, W.J. (2013). The UCSC genome browser and associated tools. Brief
Bioinform *14*, 144-161.

39.   Kumar, S., Stecher, G., and Tamura, K. (2016). MEGA7: Molecular Evolutionary Genetics Analysis Version 7.0
for Bigger Datasets. Molecular Biology and Evolution *33*, 1870-1874.

40.   Lambert, S.A., Jolma, A., Campitelli, L.F., Das, P.K., Yin, Y., Albu, M., Chen, X., Taipale, J., Hughes, T.R., and
Weirauch, M.T. (2018). The Human Transcription Factors. Cell *175*, 598-599.

41.   Lee, J.T. (2009). Lessons from X-chromosome inactivation: long ncRNA as guides and tethers to the epigenome.
Genes Dev *23*, 1831-1842.

42.   Levchenko, A., Kanapin, A., Samsonova, A., and Gainetdinov, R.R. (2018). Human Accelerated Regions and
Other Human-Specific Sequence Variations in the Context of Evolution and Their Relevance for Brain
Development. Genome Biol Evol *10*, 166-188.

43.   Li, H., Handsaker, B., Wysoker, A., Fennell, T., Ruan, J., Homer, N., Marth, G., Abecasis, G., Durbin, R., and
Genome Project Data Processing, S. (2009). The Sequence Alignment/Map format and SAMtools.
Bioinformatics *25*, 2078-2079.

44.   Li, M., Santpere, G., Imamura Kawasawa, Y., Evgrafov, O.V., Gulden, F.O., Pochareddy, S., Sunkin, S.M., Li, Z.,
Shin, Y., Zhu, Y.*, et al.* (2018). Integrative functional genomic analysis of human brain development and
neuropsychiatric risks. Science *362*.

45.   Lin, J., Wen, Y., He, S., Yang, X., Zhang, H., and Zhu, H. (2019). Pipelines for cross-species and genome-wide

prediction of long noncoding RNA binding. Nat Protoc *14*, 795-818.

46.   Liu, J., Mosti, F., and Silver, D.L. (2021). Human brain evolution: Emerging roles for regulatory DNA and RNA.
962   Curr Opin Neurobiol *71*, 170-177.

963   47.   Mangan, R.J., Alsina, F.C., Mosti, F., Sotelo-Fonseca, J.E., Snellings, D.A., Au, E.H., Carvalho, J., Sathyan, L.,
964   Johnson, G.D., Reddy, T.E.*, et al.* (2022). Adaptive sequence divergence forged new neurodevelopmental
965   enhancers in humans. Cell *185*, 4587-4603 e4523.

966   48.   McCoy, R.C., Wakefield, J., and Akey, J.M. (2017). Impacts of Neanderthal-Introgressed Sequences on the
967   Landscape of Human Gene Expression. Cell *168*, 916-+.

968   49.   McLean, C.Y., Reno, P.L., Pollen, A.A., Bassan, A.I., Capellini, T.D., Guenther, C., Indjeian, V.B., Lim, X., Menke,
969   D.B., Schaar, B.T.*, et al.* (2011). Human-specific loss of regulatory DNA and the evolution of human-specific
970   traits. Nature *471*, 216-219.

971   50.   Mekel-Bobrov, N., Gilbert, S.L., Evans, P.D., Vallender, E.J., Anderson, J.R., Hudson, R.R., Tishkoff, S.A., and Lahn,
972   B.T. (2005). Ongoing adaptive evolution of ASPM, a brain size determinant in Homo sapiens. Science *309*,
973   1720-1722.

974   51.   Meyer, M., Kircher, M., Gansauge, M.T., Li, H., Racimo, F., Mallick, S., Schraiber, J.G., Jay, F., Prufer, K., de Filippo,
975   C.*, et al.* (2012). A High-Coverage Genome Sequence from an Archaic Denisovan Individual. Science *338*, 222-
976   226.

977   52.   Mondal, T., Subhash, S., Vaid, R., Enroth, S., Uday, S., Reinius, B., Mitra, S., Mohammed, A., James, A.R., Hoberg,
978   E.*, et al.* (2015). MEG3 long noncoding RNA regulates the TGF-beta pathway genes through formation of RNA-
979   DNA triplex structures. Nat Commun *6*, 7743.

980   53.   Nawrocki, E.P. (2014). Annotating functional RNAs in genomes using Infernal. Methods Mol Biol *1097*, 163-
981   197.

982   54.   Nawrocki, E.P., and Eddy, S.R. (2013). Infernal 1.1: 100-fold faster RNA homology searches. Bioinformatics *29*,
983   2933-2935.

984   55.   Nawrocki, E.P., Kolbe, D.L., and Eddy, S.R. (2009). Infernal 1.0: inference of RNA alignments. Bioinformatics *25*,
985   1335-1337.

986   56.   Nielsen, R., and Slatkin, M. (2013). An Introduction to Population Genetics. Sinauer Associates Inc Publishers.

987   57.   Otto, W., Stadler, P.F., Lopez-Giraldez, F., Townsend, J.P., Lynch, V.J., and Wagner, G.P. (2009). Measuring
988   transcription factor-binding site turnover: a maximum likelihood approach using phylogenies. Genome Biol
989   Evol *1*, 85-98.

990   58.   Pertea, M., Pertea, G.M., Antonescu, C.M., Chang, T.C., Mendell, J.T., and Salzberg, S.L. (2015). StringTie
991   enables improved reconstruction of a transcriptome from RNA-seq reads. Nat Biotechnol *33*, 290-295.

992   59.   Pinson, A., Xing, L., Namba, T., Kalebic, N., Peters, J., Oegema, C.E., Traikov, S., Reppe, K., Riesenberg, S., Maricic,
993   T.*, et al.* (2022). Human TKTL1 implies greater neurogenesis in frontal neocortex of modern humans than
994   Neanderthals. Science *377*, eabl6422.

995   60.   Pollen, A.A., Bhaduri, A., Andrews, M.G., Nowakowski, T.J., Meyerson, O.S., Mostajo-Radji, M.A., Di Lullo, E.,
996   Alvarado, B., Bedolli, M., Dougherty, M.L.*, et al.* (2019). Establishing Cerebral Organoids as Models of Human-
997   Specific Brain Evolution. Cell *176*, 743-756 e717.

998   61.   Pollen, A.A., Kilik, U., Lowe, C.B., and Camp, J.G. (2023). Human-specific genetics: new tools to explore the
999   molecular and cellular basis of human evolution. Nat Rev Genet, 1-25.

62.   Ponce de Leon, M.S., Bienvenu, T., Marom, A., Engel, S., Tafforeau, P., Alatorre Warren, J.L., Lordkipanidze, D.,
Kurniawan, I., Murti, D.B., Suriyanto, R.A.*, et al.* (2021). The primitive brain of early Homo. Science *372*, 165-
171.

63.   Prabhakar, S., Noonan, J.P., Paabo, S., and Rubin, E.M. (2006). Accelerated evolution of conserved noncoding

sequences in humans. Science *314*, 786.

64.   Prud'homme, B., Gompel, N., and Carroll, S.B. (2007). Emerging principles of regulatory evolution. Proc Natl
Acad Sci U S A *104 Suppl 1*, 8605-8612.

65.   Prufer, K., de Filippo, C., Grote, S., Mafessoni, F., Korlevic, P., Hajdinjak, M., Vernot, B., Skov, L., Hsieh, P.S.,
Peyregne, S.*, et al.* (2017). A high-coverage Neandertal genome from Vindija Cave in Croatia. Science *358*,
655-658.

66.   Prufer, K., Munch, K., Hellmann, I., Akagi, K., Miller, J.R., Walenz, B., Koren, S., Sutton, G., Kodira, C., Winer, R.*,
et al.* (2012). The bonobo genome compared with the chimpanzee and human genomes. Nature *486*, 527-
531.

67.   Prüfer, K., Racimo, F., Patterson, N., Jay, F., Sankararaman, S., Sawyer, S., Heinze, A., Renaud, G., Sudmant, P.H.,
de Filippo, C.*, et al.* (2013). The complete genome sequence of a Neanderthal from the Altai Mountains.
Nature *505*, 43-49.

68.   Purcell, S., Neale, B., Todd-Brown, K., Thomas, L., Ferreira, M.A., Bender, D., Maller, J., Sklar, P., de Bakker, P.I.,
Daly, M.J.*, et al.* (2007). PLINK: a tool set for whole-genome association and population-based linkage analyses.
Am J Hum Genet *81*, 559-575.

69.   Raudvere, U., Kolberg, L., Kuzmin, I., Arak, T., Adler, P., Peterson, H., and Vilo, J. (2019). g:Profiler: a web server
for functional enrichment analysis and conversions of gene lists (2019 update). Nucleic Acids Res *47*, W191-
W198.

70.   Reilly, S.K., Yin, J., Ayoub, A.E., Emera, D., Leng, J., Cotney, J., Sarro, R., Rakic, P., and Noonan, J.P. (2015).
Evolutionary genomics. Evolutionary changes in promoter and enhancer activity during human corticogenesis.
Science *347*, 1155-1159.

71.   Roadmap Epigenomics, C., Kundaje, A., Meuleman, W., Ernst, J., Bilenky, M., Yen, A., Heravi-Moussavi, A.,
Kheradpour, P., Zhang, Z., Wang, J.*, et al.* (2015). Integrative analysis of 111 reference human epigenomes.
Nature *518*, 317-330.

72.   Robinson, M.D., McCarthy, D.J., and Smyth, G.K. (2010). edgeR: a Bioconductor package for differential
expression analysis of digital gene expression data. Bioinformatics *26*, 139-140.

73.   Sabeti, P.C., Varilly, P., Fry, B., Lohmueller, J., Hostetter, E., Cotsapas, C., Xie, X., Byrne, E.H., McCarroll, S.A.,
Gaudet, R.*, et al.* (2007). Genome-wide detection and characterization of positive selection in human
populations. Nature *449*, 913-918.

74.   Saelens, W., Cannoodt, R., and Saeys, Y. (2018). A comprehensive evaluation of module detection methods
for gene expression data. Nat Commun *9*, 1090.

75.   Sarropoulos, I., Marin, R., Cardoso-Moreira, M., and Kaessmann, H. (2019). Developmental dynamics of
lncRNAs across mammalian organs and species. Nature *571*, 510-514.

76.   Slatkin, M. (2008). Linkage disequilibrium--understanding the evolutionary past and mapping the medical
future. Nat Rev Genet *9*, 477-485.

77.   Song, J.H.T., Grant, R.L., Behrens, V.C., Kucka, M., Roberts Kingman, G.A., Soltys, V., Chan, Y.F., and Kingsley,
D.M. (2021). Genetic studies of human-chimpanzee divergence using stem cell fusions. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S
A *118*.

78.   Suzuki, I.K., Gacquer, D., Van Heurck, R., Kumar, D., Wojno, M., Bilheu, A., Herpoel, A., Lambert, N., Cheron, J.,
Polleux, F.*, et al.* (2018). Human-Specific NOTCH2NL Genes Expand Cortical Neurogenesis through
Delta/Notch Regulation. Cell *173*, 1370-1384 e1316.

79.   Tajima, F. (1989). Statistical method for testing the neutral mutation hypothesis by DNA polymorphism.
Genetics *123*, 585-595.

80.   Tang, J., Huang, M., He, S., Zeng, J., and Zhu, H. (2022). Uncovering the extensive trade-off between adaptive

evolution and disease susceptibility. Cell Rep *40*, 111351.

81. Tang, J., Zhang, H., Zhang, H., and Zhu, H. (2023). PopTradeOff: A database for exploring population-specificity of adaptive evolution, disease susceptibility, and drug responsiveness. Comput Struct Biotechnol J *21*, 3443-3451.

82. Timpson, N., Heron, J., Smith, G.D., and Enard, W. (2007). Comment on papers by Evans et al. and Mekel-Bobrov et al. on Evidence for Positive Selection of MCPH1 and ASPM. Science *317*, 1036; author reply 1036.

83. Vilella, A.J., Blanco-Garcia, A., Hutter, S., and Rozas, J. (2005). VariScan: Analysis of evolutionary patterns from large-scale DNA sequence polymorphism data. Bioinformatics *21*, 2791-2793.

84. Voight, B.F., Kudaravalli, S., Wen, X., and Pritchard, J.K. (2006). A map of recent positive selection in the human genome. PLoS Biol *4*, e72.

85. Weir, B.S., and Cockerham, C.C. (1984). Estimating F-Statistics for the Analysis of Population Structure. Evolution *38*, 1358-1370.

86. Wen, Y., Wu, Y., Xu, B., Lin, J., and Zhu, H. (2022). Fasim-LongTarget enables fast and accurate genome-wide lncRNA/DNA binding prediction. Comput Struct Biotechnol J *20*, 3347-3350.

87. West, J.A., Davis, C.P., Sunwoo, H., Simon, M.D., Sadreyev, R.I., Wang, P.I., Tolstorukov, M.Y., and Kingston, R.E. (2014). The long noncoding RNAs NEAT1 and MALAT1 bind active chromatin sites. Mol Cell *55*, 791-802.

88. Whalen, S., and Pollard, K.S. (2022). Enhancer Function and Evolutionary Roles of Human Accelerated Regions. Annu Rev Genet *56*, 423-439.

89. Xu, C., Li, Q., Efimova, O., He, L., Tatsumoto, S., Stepanova, V., Oishi, T., Udono, T., Yamaguchi, K., Shigenobu, S.*, et al.* (2018). Human-specific features of spatial gene expression and regulation in eight brain regions. Genome Res *28*, 1097-1110.

90. Yu, F., Hill, R.S., Schaffner, S.F., Sabeti, P.C., Wang, E.T., Mignault, A.A., Ferland, R.J., Moyzis, R.K., Walsh, C.A., and Reich, D. (2007). Comment on "Ongoing adaptive evolution of ASPM, a brain size determinant in Homo sapiens". Science *316*, 370.

91. Yue, F., Cheng, Y., Breschi, A., Vierstra, J., Wu, W., Ryba, T., Sandstrom, R., Ma, Z., Davis, C., Pope, B.D.*, et al.* (2014). A comparative encyclopedia of DNA elements in the mouse genome. Nature *515*, 355-364.

92. Zhang, X., Fang, B., and Huang, Y.F. (2023). Transcription factor binding sites are frequently under accelerated evolution in primates. Nat Commun *14*, 783.

93. Zhu, Y., Sousa, A.M.M., Gao, T., Skarica, M., Li, M., Santpere, G., Esteller-Cucala, P., Juan, D., Ferrandez-Peral, L., Gulden, F.O.*, et al.* (2018). Spatiotemporal transcriptomic divergence across human and macaque brain development. Science *362*.