Title

Constrained Open Chromatin Regions Reveal Functional Elements Shaping Human Traits

Kohei Tomizuka[1]†, Masaru Koido[1,2]†,*, Akari Suzuki[3]†, Soichiro Yoshino[1], Nao Tanaka[1], Yuki

Ishikawa[1], Xiaoxi Liu[1], Satoshi Koyama[4], Kazuyoshi Ishigaki[5], Yasuhiro Murakawa[6], Immune

transcript/enhancer consortium (ITEC)[#], Kazuhiko Yamamoto[3,7], Chikashi Terao[1,8,9,*]

Affiliations

[1]Laboratory for Statistical and Translational Genetics, RIKEN Center for Integrative Medical

Sciences, 1-7-22 Suehiro-cho, Tsurumi-ku, Yokohama City, Kanagawa, 230-0045, Japan.

[2]Laboratory of Complex Trait Genomics, Department of Computational Biology and Medical

Sciences, Graduate School of Frontier Sciences, The University of Tokyo, 4-6-1, Shirokane-

dai, Minato-ku, Tokyo, 108-8639, Japan.

[3]Laboratory for Autoimmune Diseases, RIKEN Center for Integrative Medical Sciences, 1-7-

22 Suehiro-cho, Tsurumi-ku, Yokohama City, Kanagawa, 230-0045, Japan.

[4]Laboratory for Cardiovascular Genomics and Informatics, RIKEN Center for Integrative

Medical Sciences, 1-7-22 Suehiro-cho, Tsurumi-ku, Yokohama City, Kanagawa, 230-0045,

Japan.

[5]Laboratory for Human Immunogenetics, RIKEN Center for Integrative Medical Sciences, 1-

7-22 Suehiro-cho, Tsurumi-ku, Yokohama City, Kanagawa, 230-0045, Japan.

[6]RIKEN-IFOM Joint Laboratory for Cancer Genomics, RIKEN Center for Integrative Medical

Sciences, 1-7-22 Suehiro-cho, Tsurumi-ku, Yokohama City, Kanagawa, 230-0045, Japan.

[7]Drug Discovery Antibody Platform Unit, RIKEN Center for Integrative Medical Sciences, 1-

7-22 Suehiro-cho, Tsurumi-ku, Yokohama City, Kanagawa, 230-0045, Japan.

[8]Clinical Research Center, Shizuoka General Hospital, 4 Chome-27-1 Kitaando, Aoi Ward,

Shizuoka, 420-8527, Japan.

[9]Department of Applied Genetics, The School of Pharmaceutical Sciences, University of

Shizuoka, 52-1 Yada, Suruga Ward, Shizuoka, 422-8526, Japan.

[#]Immune transcript/enhancer consortium (ITEC) members

Matteo Guerrini, Hiroaki Hatano, Keiko Hikino, Kazuyoshi Ishigaki, Yuki Ishikawa, Michihiro

Kono, Xiaoxi Liu, Yasuhiro Murakawa, Masahiro Nakano, Akiko Oguchi, Raku Son, Akari

Suzuki, Kazuhiro Takeuchi, Nao Tanaka, Chikashi Terao, Kohei Tomizuka, Kazuhiko

Yamamoto, Soichiro Yoshino

[†]These authors contributed equally: Kohei Tomizuka, Masaru Koido, Akari Suzuki

*Corresponding authors:

Chikashi Terao (chikashi.terao@riken.jp)

Masaru Koido (masaru.koido@a.riken.jp)

Abstract

Open chromatin regions (OCRs) define cell-type-specific regulatory elements across the

genome, yet their functional significance varies, making it challenging to pinpoint biologically

essential regions. Here, we introduce CAMBUS (Chromatin Accessibility Mutation Burden

Score), a machine-learning framework that identifies active and evolutionarily constrained

OCRs by leveraging surrounding DNA sequences. Applying CAMBUS to 29 immune cell

types, we identified 66,043 constrained OCRs, which were highly enriched for known

enhancers and super-enhancers, independent of known epigenetic markers and annotated

regions. These OCRs overlapped with regulatory elements implicated in immune-mediated

diseases and experimentally validated functional variants, including rare variants, particularly

in leukocyte-related traits. Furthermore, CAMBUS revealed distinct transcriptional regulatory

landscapes, linking genetic constraint with gene regulation in immune cells and identifying

plausible connections between 1,533 causal variants and 70 complex traits. By defining

biologically constrained regulatory elements at high resolution, CAMBUS provides a

framework for understanding the selective pressures shaping the non-coding genome and

its role in human health and disease.

Introduction

Genome sequences define species identities and evolutionary trajectories by

shaping cellular, organ, and functional complexities [1,2]. Given that protein-coding regions

account for only a small fraction of vertebrate genomes [3], understanding the role of non-

coding regions—particularly active regulatory elements—is critical for deciphering the

molecular basis of species identity and function [4,5]. Active regulatory regions, such as

enhancers, regulate gene expression in a cell-type- and state-specific manner [6-9].

Several genome-wide experimental methods, including chromatin

immunoprecipitation followed by sequencing (ChIP-seq) for histone modifications, DNase I

hypersensitive site sequencing (DNase-seq), and assay for transposase-accessible

chromatin using sequencing (ATAC-seq), have been developed to identify candidate

regulatory regions. Among them, ATAC-seq has become widely adopted due to its technical

simplicity and robust performance [10,11]. Compared with ChIP-seq peaks, ATAC-seq-defined

open chromatin regions (OCRs) provide high positional specificity for identifying regulatory

elements [12]. Because chromatin accessibility is a prerequisite for gene transcription, mapping

and characterizing OCRs—particularly those that are cell-type-specific or conserved across

multiple lineages—offers crucial insights into general and context-specific regulatory

mechanisms, evolutionary constraint, and complex traits [13,14].

Although genome-wide association studies (GWAS) have highlighted the

enrichment of disease-associated variants within non-coding regions [15,16], and particularly

within regulatory elements [7,17,18], distinguishing active regulatory elements from OCRs

remains challenging [15,19,20], as ATAC-seq measures chromatin openness but does not

directly assess regulatory activity [21,22]. Therefore, integrating additional layers of information,

such as evolutionary constraint and epigenomic signals, is necessary to identify active and

functional regulatory regions more precisely.

Constrained genomic regions, which show evidence of purifying selection, serve as

important markers of functionally active elements [5,23]. Recent large-scale human whole-

genome sequencing efforts have enabled the development of constraint metrics such as

Gnocchi [24], which leverage local mutability to infer constrained sites. Consortia efforts such

as ENCODE Phase 3 have combined chromatin accessibility with histone modification ChIP-

seq signals to annotate candidate cis-regulatory elements (cCREs). Still, the systematic

identification of constrained, cell-type-specific active regulatory regions across diverse

tissues remains an open challenge.

Chromatin accessibility quantitative trait loci (caQTLs), which identify genetic

variants that alter chromatin openness, provide further evidence that genetic variation at

regulatory regions influences complex traits [25,26]. However, caQTL mapping requires large

cohorts and is limited in its ability to assess rare variants. Recently, machine learning models

trained on DNA sequences have emerged as a powerful alternative, capable of predicting

regulatory activity and inferring variant effects without requiring population-level data [27-29].

These models have enabled the tissue- and cell-type-specific prediction of gene expression

and chromatin features from sequence alone [29,30].

Together, these observations highlight the need for methods that integrate

evolutionary constraint, chromatin accessibility, and DNA sequence features to prioritize

functional regulatory elements. Yet, the constraint landscape of cell-type-specific OCRs

remains poorly understood, limiting our ability to interpret their functional relevance.

Motivated by this gap, we developed CAMBUS (Chromatin Accessibility Mutation Burden

Score), a new framework for prioritizing active and evolutionarily constrained OCRs. By

leveraging sequence-embedded constraint information (Fig. 1), CAMBUS provides a

principled approach to identify regulatory elements with likely functional importance across

diverse cell types. We assessed the characteristics of CAMBUS and their cell-type specificity

using OCRs in various cell types in peripheral blood mononuclear cells (PBMCs). By

leveraging CAMBUS, we identified 1,533 cell-type-specific regulatory variants with potential

functional significance in complex traits across European (EUR) and East Asian (EAS)

ancestries (Fig. 1D and 1E). We demonstrated how integrating genetic constraint with

chromatin accessibility can refine the biological interpretation of non-coding regulatory

variants and their roles in transcriptional regulation in a cell-type-specific manner.

Results

Cell-type-specific OCR predictions from DNA sequences

We sorted PBMCs (peripheral blood mononuclear cells) and Neutrophils from 55 Japanese

individuals (Methods). PBMCs were sorted into 27 immune cell types by cell sorter and

conducted ATAC-seq for the 27 cell types and PBMC and Neutrophil (hereafter, 29 cell types)

in eight subgroups (CD4; CD4^{+} T-cells, CD8; CD8^{+} T-cells, B; B cells, Mono; Monocytes, DC;

dendritic cells, NK; Natural Killer cell, Neutrophils, and PBMC) (Supplementary Table 1). The

number of cell types in this study is comparable to that in recent scATAC-seq studies using

PBMC [31,32]. Notably, the 29 cell types include minor cell types, such as double-negative B-

cells (~5% in B-cells) [33]. After stringent quality control, we obtained 7,939,714 OCRs that

covered 498 Mb (16.1 %) of the human genome (Methods). The median number and size of

OCRs for 29 cell types were 252,668 OCRs and 276 bp, respectively. Among the 7,939,714

OCRs, 330,367 (4.2%) were observed in only one cell type, and 437,368 (5.5%) were

observed in only one out of the eight subgroups. Both hierarchical clustering and dimension

reduction using principal component analysis (PCA) and uniform manifold approximation and

projection (UMAP) showed that these OCRs could clearly distinguish the eight subgroups

but not all 29 immune cell types (Extended Data Fig. 1).

We first examined whether machine learning models (CAMBUS ML (Chromatin

Accessibility Mutation Burden Score machine learning) models) can predict the OCRs of

each of 29 cell types from DNA sequence patterns. For this purpose, we used the deep

convolutional neural network to predict whether OCRs overlap within the central 200bp of

5kb input DNA sequences (Methods). We observed a notably high mean area under the

receiver operating characteristic curve (AUROC) of 0.87, with a minimum of 0.84

(neutrophils), to predict OCRs across 29 cell types in the testing dataset (Fig. 2A). We

observed that cell-type-specific OCRs were more challenging to predict; however, even for

the OCRs observed in only one cell type, the mean AUROC was 0.74 (Fig. 2B), suggesting

CAMBUS ML models could effectively capture cell-type-specific genetic architecture

underlying OCRs. Notably, this level of prediction accuracy has been enough for successful

downstream analyses (such as *in silico* mutagenesis for GWAS variants) in the previous

studies: for example, AUROC per cell = 0.762 [34] and mean AUROC for enhancer RNAs =

0.69 [29].

We also assessed the accuracy of *in silico* mutagenesis on the cell-type-specific OCRs in

the 29 cell types. The direction concordance between the *in silico* mutation effects and the

estimated effect sizes from caQTL was increased by a higher threshold of the mutation

effects, as shown in previous studies [27,29]. Particularly when variants were selected based

on a threshold where accessibility probability changed by more than 10%, indicating high

confidence of *in silico* mutagenesis, the direction concordance with caQTL effect sizes

(Methods) reached 90% for the major six cell types (CD4, CD8, B, Mono, DC, and NK) (Fig.

2C; Supplementary Table 2). We also confirmed the good concordance using the

independent caQTL study of lymphoblastoid cell lines (LCL; B cell lineage; Fig. 2D; Extended

Data Fig. 2A) [25]. As expected, the concordance dropped when we compared *in silico*

mutation effects in non-B cell types with the caQTL study (Extended Data Fig. 2B). Thus,

CAMBUS ML models incorporating surrounding DNA sequence patterns could accurately

predict OCRs within the 29 cell types, including cell-type specific ones, and mutation effects

on these OCRs in a cell-type specific manner.

Detecting constrained OCRs by CAMBUS

To infer constraint levels in the OCRs, we calculated *in silico* saturated mutation effects,

quantifying the predicted changes in accessibility probability for all possible single nucleotide

mutations within 2kb of each OCR (whether or not the mutations were reported), inspired by

the previous study working on transcript expression levels [27] (Methods). We aggregated and

took the mean of mutation effects within 2kb of each OCR and called this value CAMBUS.

Hereafter, we defined OCRs with negative CAMBUS as CAMBUS+ (where the '+' denotes

positive constraint) based on the local false discovery rate (FDR) method (Fig. 3A, 3B;

Method). Besides, we defined a more relaxed CAMBUS+ set by extracting the bottom 5% of

the overall CAMBUS distribution as relaxed CAMBUS+ OCRs. The median number of

CAMBUS+ OCRs was 1,584, covering 0.056% of the human genome, while that of relaxed

CAMBUS+ OCRs was 12,632, covering 0.33%. Notably, read counts from ATAC-seq were

not a determinant factor for CAMBUS+ OCRs (Extended Data Fig. 3A), reinforcing that our

machine-learning approach incorporated information from DNA sequence patterns into

OCRs, not from technical fluctuations or noises.

To confirm our key assumption that CAMBUS+ OCRs (or relaxed CAMBUS+ OCRs) are

under positive constraint, we first assessed whether CAMBUS+ OCRs overlapped with

evolutionarily conserved regions, as defined by phylogenetic P-values (phyloP) scores

derived from conservation across 46 vertebrate species [35]. As expected, phyloP scores in

CAMBUS+ OCRs were significantly higher than those in control OCRs across 29 cell types

(Method; for example, two-sided t-test P < 1.1 × 10^{-4} CAMBUS+ OCRs in NaiveCD4;

Supplementary Table 3). Next, we assessed whether CAMBUS+ OCRs are also supported

by the genomic non-coding constraint of haploinsufficient variation (Gnocchi), a constraint

metric estimated by comparing observed allele counts in diverse human populations with the

estimated counts in each 1kb region of the human genome [24]. We found that CAMBUS+

OCRs significantly cover the strongly constrained regions compared to control OCRs (for

example, two-sided t-test P = 7.5 × 10^{-59} for CAMBUS+ OCRs in NaiveCD4). Although

CAMBUS+ OCRs contained a greater proportion of coding regions than control OCRs

(Extended Data Fig. 3B), the same trend was observed even when the analysis was

restricted to non-coding regions (two-sided t-test P = 2.2 × 10^{-40} for CAMBUS+ OCRs in

NaiveCD4; Fig. 3C; Extended Data Fig. 3C). Following the previous study [24], we evaluated

the odds ratio (OR) of CAMBUS+ OCRs for the region with Gnocchi ≥ 4, comparing with the

OR of the known candidate regulatory elements: ENCODE cCREs (promoter-like, proximal

enhancer-like, distal enhancer-like, and CTCF-only cCREs), FANTOM5 enhancers, and

super-enhancers. The CAMBUS+ OCRs showed the strongest constraint (OR=11.45 (95%

confidence interval (CI) 9.33–14.05), P=4.7 × 10^{-68} by Fisher's Exact test) among the

compared regulatory elements (Fig. 3D; Supplementary Table 4). Meta-analysis

demonstrated the consistent tendency across the 29 cell types (OR=8.71 (95% CI 7.85–9.66),

P=3.1 × 10^{-365} from random-effect meta-analysis; Fig. 3E). Notably, the pooled OR was also

greater than that of the ENCODE promoter-like regulatory elements, the strongest constraint

candidate regulatory elements in the Gnocchi-proposing paper (OR=7.3) [24], indicating that

CAMBUS+ could find OCRs under very strong positive constraints. The relaxed CAMBUS+

OCRs also showed the same but weaker tendency (Extended Data Fig. 3D).

Previous studies [36] demonstrated that enhancers, especially those activated in T-cells,

are enriched in archaic genome sequences due to positive selection. Consistently, we

observed that CAMBUS+ OCRs showed significant enrichment in the selection signals [37]

(OR=1.4 (95% CI 1.3–1.5), P=1.1 × 10^{-26} from random-effect meta-analysis; Extended Data

Fig. 3E), the Neanderthal genome sequences observed in the Japanese population [38]

(OR=1.4 (95% CI 1.4–1.5), P=4.8 x 10^{-32} from random-effect meta-analysis; Extended Data

Fig. 3F), and the Neanderthal and Denisovans' sequences observed in 1000 Genomes

populations (Supplementary Table 5) [39]. Besides, we observed the enrichment of CAMBUS+

in human ancestor quickly evolved regions (HAQER) [40] (OR=2.35 (95% CI 1.91–2.89), P=8.3

× 10^{-16}).

In addition, we observed CAMBUS+ OCRs showed significant enrichment in the

pathogenic regulatory variants cataloged in the Human Gene Mutation Database (HGMD) [41]

(OR=2.70 (95% CI 2.43–2.99), P = 1.7 x 10^{-77}; from random-effect meta-analysis; Extended

Data Fig. 3G; Supplementary Table 6).

Taken together, CAMBUS+ OCRs can define novel constrained regions, well supported

by other constraint metrics.

Enrichment of active regulatory elements by selecting CAMBUS+ OCRs

All OCRs obtained in this study were well overlapped with the known candidate regulatory

elements; for example, 73.66% of all OCRs in NaiveCD4 were overlapped with super-

enhancers (the median of 29 cell type is 74.70%) and 4.49% with FANTOM5 [6] enhancers

(the median of 29 cell type is 5.10%; Supplementary Table 7), both of which are known to be

enriched for causal variants [42]. We further explored that CAMBUS+ OCRs could aid in

prioritizing functional regulatory elements (Methods). For example, CAMBUS+ OCRs in

NaiveCD4 significantly enriched the known regulatory elements, especially for active

enhancers like super-enhancers [43] (OR=9.07 (95% CI 6.80–12.11), Fisher's exact test P =

2.0×10^{-102}) and FANTOM5 enhancers (OR=6.16 (95% CI 5.39–7.03), Fisher's exact test P

$= 6.3 \times 10^{-111}$) (Supplementary Table 8). Meta-analysis showed a consistent trend across 29

cell types (OR=6.63 (95% CI 5.50–7.99), P = 1.1×10^{-87} from random-effect meta-analysis

for super-enhancers; Extended Data Fig. 3H, and OR=5.19 (95% CI 4.87–5.54), P = 4.9 ×

10^{-547} from random-effect meta-analysis for FANTOM5 enhancers; Extended Data Fig. 3I).

Remarkably, after adjusting with known constraint metrics (Gnocchi and phyloP), we still

observed statistically significant enrichment for prioritizing regulatory elements by CAMBUS+

OCRs across the 29 cell types (Fig. 3E; Supplementary Table 9). Reflecting the

characteristics of the analyzed cell types (blood and immune cell types), a comparison of

enrichment across four tissues (blood/hematopoietic, brain, kidney, and lung) revealed the

strongest prioritization of blood's regulatory elements by NaiveCD4 CAMBUS+ OCRs (super-

enhancers; OR=6.83 (95% CI 6.07–7.71), P=1.1×10^{-217}; FANTOM5 enhancers; OR=7.64

(95% CI 6.64–8.78), P=8.7×10^{-179} from logistic regression; Fig. 3F; Supplementary Table

10). This pattern was consistently observed across 29 cell types (Supplementary Table 11).

We also confirmed that the relaxed CAMBUS+ OCRs exhibited the same tendency

(Extended Data Fig. 3J; Supplementary Table 12). Taken together, CAMBUS+ OCRs (and

relaxed CAMBUS+ OCRs) effectively capture cell-type-specific active regulatory elements

under positive constraints, particularly enhancers, that were not well captured by the previous

methods.

Heritability enrichment of CAMBUS+ in blood-relevant diseases and traits

We computed heritability enrichments in CAMBUS+ OCRs using stratified LD score regression (S-LDSC) [44] conditioning on known functional annotations and all OCRs from this study (Methods). We used GWAS summary statistics for 33 complex traits, including 14 immune-mediated traits (e.g., multiple sclerosis (MS), rheumatoid arthritis (RA), and Atopic dermatitis (AD)), from European (EUR) and East Asian (EAS) populations (Supplementary Table 13). To avoid false positives [45], we used the relaxed CAMBUS+ OCRs (the median proportion of single nucleotide polymorphism (SNPs) across the 29 cell types was 0.5%) for primary analyses instead of the CAMBUS+ OCRs (the median was 0.07%).

As a result, the highly significant heritability enrichment was observed in a wide variety of immune-mediated diseases (FDR < 5%; Fig. 4A; Supplementary Table 14). Particularly, plausible pairs of immune traits and cell types were observed to show the strongest enrichment of heritability among the 29 cell types: MS and T_h17 [46], and systemic lupus erythematosus (SLE) and B cells [47,48] (Extended Data Fig. 4A). Besides, other plausible pairs included pairs of RA with CD4 or CD8, and AD with CD4 (particularly Th2 [49]), or CD8.

Based on these results, we hypothesized that polygenic risk scores (PRS) prioritized by CAMBUS+ OCRs could enhance their predictive ability. To evaluate this hypothesis, we focused on CAMBUS+ OCRs in double-negative B cells (DN B), which showed significant enrichment for the heritability of SLE in EAS ancestry (Extended Data Fig. 4A) and was also known for its functional associations with SLE [50]. We constructed the PRS based on variants overlapping CAMBUS+ OCRs and evaluated the additional performance of the conventional PRS using five-fold cross-validation using 137,620 individuals of EAS ancestry (1,178 cases and 136,442 controls; Methods) [51]. We performed logistic regression on the five validation datasets to estimate the effect sizes of the PRS derived from the additional variants, conditioning on the conventional PRS. A fixed effect meta-analysis demonstrated that the

additional variants significantly improved the predictive performance of PRS (P = 3.12 × 10^{-6}

; Supplementary Table 15; Methods).

Putative causal variants were enriched in CAMBUS+ OCRs

We assessed whether CAMBUS+ OCRs could prioritize the putative causal variants for

complex traits, using the large-scale statistical fine-mapping studies in 94 traits in EUR

ancestry [52] and 62 traits in EAS ancestry [53]. We intersected CAMBUS+ OCRs and the

putative causal variants and cataloged 1,210 and 323 for trait-related cell-type-specific

putative causal variants in both EUR and EAS ancestries, respectively (Methods). The

CAMBUS+ OCRs were significantly enriched for all variants in 95% credible sets (median

OR:3.85 and 3.94 in EUR and EAS, respectively, Extended Data Fig. 5A). In line with a data

source of OCRs, CAMBUS+ OCRs exhibited significantly higher enrichment for the putative

causal variants of leukocyte-related traits than non-hematopoietic traits (two-sided *t*-test P =

1.0 × 10^{-11} in EUR ancestry and 1.4 x 10^{-2} in EAS ancestry; Extended Data Fig. 5B). As an

example, the enrichment of CAMBUS+ OCRs for type 1 helper T-cells was stronger among

variants with high posterior inclusion probability (PIP) (>0.9) for hematopoietic traits in EAS

ancestry than those with low PIP (≤ 0.1) (OR=7.62 (95% CI 3.60–16.18), P = 1.2 × 10^{-7} from

logistic regression; Fig. 5A), and this enrichment was further increased when restricted in the

leukocyte traits (OR=11.0 (95% CI 4.04–29.96), P = 2.7 × 10^{-6}; Fig. 5A). Meta-analysis

showed this trend was consistent across 29 cell types (OR=8.99 (95% CI 7.85–10.29), P =

8.8 × 10^{-221} for EUR ancestry; OR=19.24 (95% CI 16.03 – 23.09), P = 3.9 × 10^{-221} for EAS

ancestry; Fig. 5B). The median regional length of CAMBUS+ (845 bp) was much shorter than

that of 95% credible sets (3.0M bp for EUR ancestry and 1.1M bp for EAS ancestry). Taken

together, CAMBUS+ OCRs can pinpoint or at least narrow down causal variants. Notably,

even for rare variants (minor allele frequency (MAF) < 0.01), the putative causal variants of

hematopoietic traits were significantly enriched in CAMBUS+ OCRs in at least one cell type

(Methods; OR=4.68 (95% CI 2.66–7.99), two-sided Fisher's exact test P = 2.23 × 10^{-6}; Fig.

5C). This suggested that CAMBUS+ OCRs can potentially prioritize even rare causal variants

from GWAS results which are difficult to prioritize in the conventional statistical fine-mapping

[20].

Leveraging the overlapped putative causal variants, we found plausible examples of putative

causal variants where CAMBUS+ OCRs led to the biological interpretation of GWAS findings.

First, rs13122305 was the only one overlapping with CAMBUS+ OCRs in monocytes among

seven candidate causal variants in a credible set for monocyte count (Fig. 5D). The nearest

gene of this variant is *COQ2*, whose anti-inflammatory functions via regulating gene

expression were reported [54,55]. Additionally, we found that the Activity-by-Contact (ABC)

model's prediction (ABC enhancer) in monocytes only overlapped with rs13122305 and that

COQ2 was also supported by the ABC model with the second-highest ABC score (0.025)

among the eight target genes. Second, among the three candidate causal variants in a

credible set in the FCGR region for Albumin/Globulin ratio (AG), only rs2487451 overlapped

with non-classical Monocyte CAMBUS+ OCR. Non-classical monocytes, known to display

antigen presenting properties [56], were the only cell type among 29 cell types whose OCR

overlapped with a candidate causal variant. The nearest gene was *FCGR3B*, encoding a

receptor (FcγRIIIB) that binds to the Fc region of IgG (Immunoglobulin) antibodies, which is

known to be expressed in non-classical monocytes [57]. Third, rs55646091, a putative causal

variant for asthma (PIP = 0.99), overlapped with CAMBUS+ OCR of regulatory T-cells (T-

reg) (Fig. 5E) among the 29 cell types. The nearest gene of this variant was *LRRC32*

(leucine-rich repeat-containing 32), which regulates TGF-beta. LRRC32 was potentially

involved in Asthma [58] and whose encoding protein was known as a surface marker for T-reg.

Furthermore, this variant-gene pair was also supported by the ABC model and *LRRC32*

displayed the highest ABC score (ABC score = 0.041 that is much higher than the threshold

corresponding to 70% recall and 59% precision) [59] among the nine genes connected with the

regulatory element overlapping with the OCR and the variant. Fourth, we found that

rs8009224 was the only one that overlapped with CAMBUS+ OCRs of plasmablast

(Extended Data Fig. 6A) among the seven putative causal variants for hemoglobin A1c levels.

This is an intronic variant of *MIDEAS* (Mitotic Deacetylase Associated SANT Domain Protein),

which is low frequent in both 1KG EUR (MAF = 3.4%) and EAS (MAF = 1.2%) and also

associated with mean corpuscular hemoglobin concentration [60]. The overlapping regulatory

element was connected to the 16 genes by the ABC enhancer in B-cell, and the putative

target gene with the second highest ABC score is *MIDEAS* (ABC score = 0.097, much higher

than the proposed threshold corresponding to 70% recall and 59% precision) [59]. Lastly, we

demonstrated that CAMBUS+ in T-reg could prioritize only one putative causal variant

(rs9814991) from numerous variants (fifty-seven) in this credible set for eosinophils count

(Extended Data Fig. 6B).

Discussion

In this study, we developed CAMBUS based on the hypothesis that DNA

sequencing patterns surrounding OCRs contain hidden information defining OCR constraints.

Although CAMBUS+ OCRs were derived from a fundamentally different approach, they were

well supported by conventional constraint metrics as expected, while also capturing high-

resolution, cell-type-specific regions that are both active and constrained, beyond existing

annotations. An alternative potential approach using ATAC-seq (or DNase-seq) could

prioritize regions with high accessibility (i.e., regions with many read counts). However,

previous studies have suggested no relationship between accessibility and functionality or

constraints [61-63]. Consistently, accessibility was not a determinant factor in defining

CAMBUS+ OCRs. Thus, leveraging surrounding DNA sequence patterns through machine

learning offers a unique and effective strategy for identifying biologically important OCRs.

CAMBUS+ OCRs can mark active and functional regulatory elements, particularly

tissue-specific active enhancers, even after being adjusted for known constraint metrics

(Gnocchi and phyloP). Furthermore, CAMBUS+ OCRs captured a significant proportion of

the heritability for many complex traits, highlighting their biological and genetic relevance.

CAMBUS+ OCRs effectively prioritized regulatory causal variants for immune-related traits,

even rare causal variants. By defining biologically constrained regulatory elements,

CAMBUS+ OCRs will provide a foundation for understanding the regulatory architecture of

complex traits and their biological insights into genetic variations especially in non-coding

regions.

We demonstrate that CAMBUS+ OCRs can effectively prioritize causal rare variants

for complex traits. A previous study showed that rare variants tend to be enriched in the

constraint genome [64], consistent with our study as CAMBUS+ OCRs can mark such

constrained regions. In GWAS using SNP arrays, low statistical power and low imputation

accuracy for rare variants make it difficult to detect rare variant associations and identify

causal rare variants through statistical fine-mapping. Despite these challenges, CAMBUS+

OCRs can facilitate the rare variant prioritization that might otherwise be missed.

Eosinophilic asthma is a subtype characterized by elevated levels of eosinophils [65].

In this analysis, we identified a variant (rs55646091) associated with asthma linked to

increased eosinophil counts (PIP = 0.03). This variant exhibited positive effect sizes in both

traits (0.20 for asthma, 0.072 for eosinophil counts), suggesting that carriers of this variant

demonstrate elevated eosinophil levels, which contribute to inflammation and the onset of

asthma [66]. Notably, this variant overlaps specifically with the OCR in T-reg cells among 29

blood cell types analyzed. The nearest gene of this variant is *LRRC32*, which regulates TGF-

beta, a known surface marker of T-reg cells, which has been previously implicated in immune

regulation [67]. The findings from this analysis provide additional evidence supporting a

biological mechanism in which the variant, through its effects on T-reg cells, leads to

increased eosinophil counts, thereby contributing to the development of asthma. This insight

deepens our understanding of the role of T-reg cells and *LRRC32* in asthma pathogenesis,

particularly in eosinophilic inflammation.

In this study, we focused on various immune cell types; however, our approach is

broadly applicable to other tissues and cell types. As GWAS results continue to accumulate,

integrating CAMBUS+ OCRs with these expanding resources has the potential to uncover

further insights into the regulatory mechanisms underlying complex traits. Moreover, this

method can be applicable to OCRs identified at the single-cell level, further extending its

applicability. Taken together, CAMBUS+ OCRs not only capture constrained and functional

regulatory elements but also facilitate the interpretation of non-coding genetic variants by

prioritizing causal variants in a cell-type-specific manner without relying on LD information

and allele frequencies.

Method

Sample and library preparation

We collected peripheral blood (PB) cells from 55 healthy Japanese volunteers and sorted

them into 29 cell types. PBMCs were isolated by density gradient separation with Ficoll-

Paque (GE healthcare) immediately after blood drawing. Erythrocytes were lysed with a

potassium ammonium chloride buffer, and non-specific binding was blocked with Fc-gamma

receptor antibodies. PBMC is stained with cell surface specific antibodies (Supplementary

Table 22). 27 immune cell populations were sorted by FACS (BDAria III) using the gating

strategy (Supplementary Table 1; Extended Data Fig. 7). In addition, neutrophils were

isolated by MACSxpress Neutrophil Isolation Kits human (Miltenyi Biotec) from 4 × 106

PBMC cells. Sorted cells, isolated PBMC, and Neutrophils were stored at −80°C in CytoStor-

10 (Charles River Laboratories Cell Solutions). Libraries for ATAC-seq were prepared using

a modified protocol of Omni-ATAC [68]. Genomic DNA from whole blood was isolated using

QIAamp DNA Blood Mini Kits, respectively. ATAC-seq was performed using 150bp paired-

end on Illumina NovaSeq6000. In total, we obtained a median of 13.34M (+/- 7.56M) reads

per sample. This study was approved by the Ethics Committees of RIKEN. Written informed

consent was obtained from each volunteer.

Mapping ATAC-seq data

ATAC-seq data were processed following the ENCODE ATAC-seq pipeline (version 1.8.0)

as follows: Raw reads were trimmed using cutadapt (version 2.5) and aligned to human

genome assembly GRCh38 analysis set using bowtie2 (version 2.3.4.3) for each sample.

After alignment, duplicated reads were removed using MarkDuplicates (Picard version

2.20.7-SNAPSHOT), retaining uniquely mapped reads and improperly paired reads using

samtools (version 1.9), and removed reads that mapped to the mitochondrial genome.

In total, we obtained a median of 5.39M (s.d. 3.28M) QCed reads per sample.

ATAC-seq peak calling

For each 29 immune cell type, we used the samtools merge command to merge the QCed

reads for each cell type and used MACS2 (version 2.1.1) to identify the ATAC-seq peaks

(OCRs) following a recent study [26] with parameters (-p 0.01 --shift -75 –extsize 150 --

nomodel). We obtained a median of 253,553 (±66,738) OCRs with a median peak width of

271bp (±18bp) (FDR<0.05). Using the alignment file for each cell type, we calculated the

read counts for each OCR with bedtools (version 2.30.0)'s coverage function.

Quality control for ATAC-seq dataset

We first assessed the quality of ATAC-seq data using Pearson correlations of chromatin accessibility among the samples for each cell type, using 614,516 peaks that were identified from across all samples using the same parameters described above (these peaks were only used for the quality control purpose). We filtered OCRs out when the Pearson correlations were not greater than 0.65 (determined by manual inspection of the distribution of these correlations). Additionally, we excluded outlier samples with low Pearson correlations by visual inspection (Supplementary Table 16). Samples with a mapped rate of less than 0.5 were further excluded. Finally, we obtained 1,386 samples (the median number of donors per cell type is 48; Supplementary Table 1).

Hierarchical clustering and dimension reduction

We first chose the top 5,000 accessible OCRs (defined by TPM) from each cell type and merged them across 29 cell types, resulting in a total of 145,000 unique regions. We then created a binary matrix (0, 1) to indicate whether each 300bp bin across the genome was overlapped by the corresponding OCRs. Hierarchical clustering was performed using Ward's method of Euclidean distance using the binary matrix. PCA for the binary matrix was performed using the binaryPCA function from the scBFA package (version 1.16.0) [69] in R with default parameters. UMAP was performed with the top five PCs using the umap function from the scikit-learn package (version 0.18.1) in Python with default parameters.

Strategy for the CAMBUS ML model

The CAMBUS ML model was built upon the DeepSEA architecture, a deep CNN model [30]. We used the Selene library (v0.4.7) to train the CAMBUS ML model. A 5kb reference sequence, randomly chosen with Selene, is used as input features, five times longer than

the sequence used in the original DeepSEA model to capture broader genomic contexts. The

model outputs a sigmoid function-derived score, which can be interpreted as a proxy for the

likelihood that the OCRs overlap with the central 200bp of the input sequence (see

Supplementary Table 17 for the configuration details). We referred to this predicted

probability for chromatin accessibility as the accessibility probability.

We combined 7,939,714 OCRs across 29 cell types using the `bedtools merge` function and

obtained 1,349,934 non-overlapping unique input sequences. According to Selene's default

settings, we used chromosomes 8 and 9 as testing, chromosomes 6 and 7 as validation, and

the other autosomal chromosomes as training data. The details of Selene's parameters are

described in Supplementary Table 17.

In silico saturated mutagenesis using the trained CAMBUS ML model

For all bases within 1kb from the center of each OCR, we used the trained CAMBUS ML

model to calculate the predictions for all possible single-based mutations. This

comprehensive approach provides an unbiased analysis of mutational effects across the

entire sequence, rather than focusing on only specific known polymorphisms. To quantify the

mutation effect, we calculated the difference in log fold changes of predictions between the

reference and alternative alleles for each site and averaged them across all bases. In total,

we obtained 505 million mutation effects (median across the 29 cell types).

Validation of CAMBUS ML model with _in silico_ mutagenesis

We compared the _in silico_ mutation effects predicted by the CAMBUS ML model with effect

sizes from the caQTL study. The samples for caQTL (n=74, including additional independent

samples to increase statistical power) were genotyped using Infinium ASA-24+v1.0 kit, and

whole genome imputation was conducted after stringent quality control (Supplementary

Table 18). The caQTLs were mapped using RASQUAL (v1.1) with default parameters. The

permutation to empirically obtain the null distribution for each region was performed with

default parameters, resulting in a median of 654 lead caQTLs with FDR < 0.1, which we

compared against the *in silico* mutation effects. Additionally, we calculated the *in silico*

mutation effects for 297,308 autosomal lead SNVs in the previous study's caQTL. The

positions of those lead SNVs were mapped to the hg38/GRCh38 coordinate using the liftOver

tool with the hg19ToHg38.over.chain file to be consistent with our study. To further refine the

comparison, we filtered the target caQTL peaks>50% overlapping with our OCRs and

selected the variants inside the peak. In total, we used 156,039 caQTLs peak pairs to

compare with the mutation effect.

Identification of putative constraint open chromatin region

We modeled the distribution of the mean mutation effect (*in silico* saturated mutagenesis)

within 2kb of each OCR (CAMBUS) as a mixture of a Gaussian null distribution. We

hypothesized that the OCRs with negative CAMBUS are likely positive constraint regions

and OCRs with neither negative nor positive CAMBUS as control OCRs. We calculated local

FDR with the locfdr function in the locfdr R package (version 1.1-8) for each cell type. This

analysis identified a median of 1,584 putative positive constraint OCRs across 29 cell types

with FDR < 0.5, referred to as CAMBUS+ OCRs, and a median of 248,749 control OCRs

across 29 cell types [27]. We also defined relaxed CAMBUS+ OCRs by extracting the bottom

5% of the CAMBUS distribution for each cell type (Supplementary Table 19).

Enrichment of CAMBUS+ OCRs in constraint regions

We evaluated whether CAMBUS+ OCRs are enriched in constraint regions of the genome

using Gnocchi. We used the 1,984,900 QCed Gnocchi (see URLs) and calculated the OR

following the methodology described in the previous paper [24] for 1,843,559 non-coding 1-kb

windows. In brief, we counted the number of overlapping 1kb windows within the following

bins: (∞, -4), [−4,−3), [−3,−2), [−2,−1), [−1,−0), [0,1), [1,2), [2,3), [3,4), [4,∞) with each

CAMBUS+ OCR. ORs were calculated by comparing these overlaps with all 1kb windows.

Fisher's exact test was conducted to estimate the statistical significance (p-value). The OR

of the known regulatory elements for each bin was obtained from the gnomAD download site

(see URLs) and used for the comparison.

To calculate the enrichment of the phyloP score in CAMBUS+ OCRs, we used the scores for

all 46 species (see URLs) and mapped the positions of those datasets to the hg38/GRCh38

coordinate using liftOver as described previously. The overlapping regions were considered

to be overlapped if they had more than 50% overlap with each other.

Enrichment of CAMBUS+ OCRs in the positive selection signals

We evaluated whether CAMBUS+ OCRs are enriched in the positive selection signals

observed in the previous study [37]. For each CAMBUS+ OCR, we counted overlapping

annotations for the positive selection signals observed in the EUR population and estimated

the OR compared with all OCRs using a logistic regression model. To perform enrichment

analysis of HAQERs [40], we first created merged OCRs by combining CAMBUS+ OCRs from

29 different cell types (merged CAMBUS+ OCRs). The number of overlapped merged

CAMBUS+ OCRs in the HAQERs was counted, and OR was estimated compared with all

OCRs using a logistic regression model.

Also, we evaluated whether CAMBUS+ OCRs are enriched in the archaic genome. For each

CAMBUS+ OCR, we counted overlapping annotations for the Neanderthal genome

sequences observed in the Japanese population [38] and the Neanderthal and Denisovans'

sequences observed in 1000 Genomes populations [39], and estimated the OR compared with

all OCRs using a logistic regression model.

Correlation between CAMBUS and regulatory elements

We evaluated the functional enrichment of CAMBUS+ OCRs in known regulatory elements,

including ENCODE cCREs, FANTOM5 enhancers, and super-enhancers (see URLs). For

each CAMBUS+ OCR, we counted overlapping annotations for each known regulatory

element and, calculated the OR compared with all OCRs, and tested it using Fisher's exact

test, as described in the previous section. For tissue-expressed FANTOM5 enhancers, we

obtained count per million (CPM) data for 249,599 enhancers across 347 tissue/cell types

with hg19 coordinates (see URLs) and selected enhancers expressed in hematopoietic_cell

(N = 163), brain (N = 85), kidney (N = 16), and lung (N = 8) based on a threshold of CPM >=

0.1 in at least 10% of individuals in each enhancer. As described previously, the positions

were mapped to the hg38/GRCh38 coordinate using liftOver. For tissue-expressed super-

enhancers, we obtained Blood (N = 115), brain (N = 203), kidney (N = 34), and lung (N =

119) enhancers with hg38 coordinates (see URLs) and merged these enhancers by tissue

with `bedtools merge` function. The adjusted OR with Gnocchi and phyloP was estimated

using a logistic regression model, adjusting for the average Gnocchi and phyloP of

overlapping CAMBUS+ OCRs and control CAMBUS OCRs.

For all analyses, regions were considered to be overlapped if they had more than 50%

overlap with each other.

Heritability enrichment analysis

To estimate heritability enrichment in each OCR, we conducted stratified-linkage

disequilibrium score regression (S-LDSC) with LDSC (ver.1.0.1) using the baseline model

(version 1.2; 53 categories). The p-value of the coefficient for CAMBUS+ OCR (or relaxed

CAMBUS+ OCR) was obtained by adjusting for the 53 categories in the baseline model and

all OCRs in each cell type. Multiple testing correction across all trait-cell type pairs was

performed to estimate FDR using the Storey method [70]. The summary statistics were

obtained from Alkes Price Lab (See URLs and our previous study [9]), and five GWAS results

in EAS ancestry: systemic lupus erythematosus [51], rheumatoid arthritis [71], Systemic sclerosis

[72], Atopic dermatitis [73], and Takayasu arteritis [74]. For this analysis, CAMBUS OCRs' positions

were mapped to the hg19 coordinate using the UCSC liftOver tool with

hg38ToHg19.over.chain file to be consistent with summary statistics. After mapping to hg19,

regions mapped to different chromosomes were excluded from the analysis.

PRS analysis

The PRS was constructed using PLINK v1.9, following a systematic approach with p-value

thresholds using SLE GWAS in EAS ancestry. To select relevant variants for the PRS, we

selected SNPs that met 20 types of p-value thresholds: 1, 0.9, 0.8, 0.7, 0.6, 0.5, 0.4, 0.3, 0.2,

0.1, 0.05, 0.01, 0.005, 5.0×10^{-4}, 5.0×10^{-5}, 1.0×10^{-5}, 5.0×10^{-6}, 1.0×10^{-7}, 5.0×10^{-7} and

5.0×10^{-8}. After selecting SNPs based on these thresholds, we applied LD clumping to

remove SNPs in high linkage disequilibrium (LD) using nine types of r^2 thresholds (0.1, 0.2,

0.3, 0.4, 0.5, 0.6, 0.7, 0.8, 0.9) and a 250kb physical distance. This process yielded 180 PRS

models. To determine the optimal PRS model, we applied a 5-fold cross-validation strategy.

The dataset was divided into five folds, with four folds used for training and one for testing in

each iteration. We computed PRSs for all 180 models using variants from SLE GWAS in

EAS ancestry [51] for each training set. We calculated the AUC with pROC (v1.18.4) to select

the combination of p-value and r² parameters that yielded the best AUC for each training set.

We then took the two variant sets; (a) variants filtered with the best parameters, and (b) all

variants overlapping with DN B CAMBUS+ OCRs as prioritized variants. To mitigate

overfitting due to LD structures, we removed the variants with LD>0.7 with variants in set (b).

We then calculated the PRS for both sets (a) and (b) for each of the five test sets, we

estimated the effect size of PRS from set (b), controlling for the PRS from set (a) using a

logistic regression model. Finally, we performed a fixed-effects meta-analysis to evaluate the

improvement in predictive power with the prioritized variants.

Fine-mapping enrichment analysis

We downloaded the UKB fine-mapped variants of 94 complex diseases and traits from the

Finucane lab (see URLs) and obtained BBJ fine-mapped variants of 62 quantitative traits

from a recent study [53]. Regarding the UKB fine-mapped variants, we used PIP from the

SuSiE. The positions of those datasets were mapped to the hg38/GRCh38 coordinate using

liftOver as described previously. In total, we obtained 830,654 trait-variant pairs for UKB and

544,745 trait-variant pairs for BBJ. The number of overlapped variants for each trait in 29 cell

types of CAMBUS+ OCRs was counted, and the OR was estimated using all OCRs in each

29-cell type as the background and calculated P-value from the logistic regression model.

After Bonferroni correction (P=0.05 divided by the number of tested phenotypes), the median

of OR is calculated from the significant enrichment in UKB and BBJ (Extended Data Fig. 5A,

B; Supplementary Table 20).

We categorized each trait into hematopoietic and non-hematopoietic. Furthermore,

hematopoietic traits are categorized into leukocyte and non-leukocyte traits (Supplementary

Table 21). The number of traits and variants in each category are described in Supplementary

Table 21.

Then, we counted the overlap of variants for each leukocyte and non-leukocyte and non-

hematopoietic for each 29 cell-type CAMBUS+ OCRs. We calculated the OR using the

method described above.

To perform enrichment analysis of rare variants, we first created merged OCRs by combining

CAMBUS+ OCRs from 29 different cell types (merged CAMBUS+ OCRs). The number of

overlapped variants with MAF < 0.01 and PIP > 0.1 in merged CAMBUS+ OCRs was counted

for all traits and only hematopoietic traits, and the OR was calculated using the variants with

MAF < 0.01 and PIP <= 0.1 as the background and calculated one-sided Fisher's exact P-

value.

Catalog cell-type-specific putative causal variants

We chose variants as putative causal variants from each of the credible sets overlapping

only one variant with CAMBUS+ OCRs. Then, we filtered the variants that overlapped with

only one cell type of CAMBUS+ OCRs. In total, we obtained 186 and 62 cell-type-specific

putative causal variants. Furthermore, we chose the variants that overlapped only one

subgroup (one of the CD4, CD8, B, Mono, DC, NK, Neutrophil; Supplementary Table 1).

Finally, we obtained 1,210 and 323 for trait-related cell-type-specific putative causal variants

from both EUR and EAS ancestries, respectively.

Statistical analysis

For p-value calculation with R, in case of insufficient precision with standard floating-point

arithmetic, the Rmpfr package (ver 0.9.2) was used to handle high-precision floating-point

arithmetic to calculate p-value with z-score. For the meta-analysis, the pooled OR was

calculated using a random effect model with metafor R package (version 2.0-0).

Data availability

The CAMBUS will be publicly available online soon after acceptance.

Code availability

The CAMBUS and its calculation scripts will be publicly available online soon after

acceptance.

URLs

Gnocchi   is   at   https://gnomad.broadinstitute.org/downloads#v3-genomic-constraint.

Enrichment for Gnocchi with the known cCREs is at gs://gnomad-nc-constraint-v31-

paper/fig_tables/constraint_z_genome_1kb.annot.txt.   ENCODE   cCREs   V3   is   at

https://screen.encodeproject.org/.   FANTOM5   enhancer   is   at

https://zenodo.org/record/556775/.   Super   enhancer   is   at

https://bio.liclab.net/sedb/download.php.   Phylop   is   at

https://hgdownload.cse.ucsc.edu/goldenPath/hg19/phyloP46way/primates.   GWAS

summary statistics are at https://alkesgroup.broadinstitute.org/sumstats_formatted, and

https://alkesgroup.broadinstitute.org/UKBB/.   ABC   predictions   are   at

https://mitra.stanford.edu/engreitz/oak/public/Nasser2021/AllPredictions.AvgHiC.ABC0.015.

minus150.ForABCPaperV3.txt.gz.   UKB   fine-mapped   variants   are   at

https://www.finucanelab.org/data.   FANTOM5   tissue-expressed   data   is   at

https://zenodo.org/records/5348471.

Acknowledgment

We would like to thank all the participants in the study. We deeply thank all the members of

the Laboratory for Statistical and Translational Genetics, RIKEN Center for Integrative

Medical Sciences for the technical support. We acknowledge the use of Biorender for aspects

of the figures. This work was supported by Japan Agency for Medical Research and

Development (AMED) grants 21ek0109555, 21tm0424220, 21ck0106642, 23ek0410114,

and 23tm0424225. Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (JSPS) KAKENHI grant

JP20H00462 and JP23K14164, Takeda Hosho Grants for Research in Medicine.

Author contributions

637   K.T., M.K., and C.T. conceived the study design. A.S. performed ATAC-sequencing and DNA

638   genotyping. K.T. and N.T. performed whole genome imputation. K.T. analyzed this study with

639   the help of S.Y., N.T., Y.I., X.L., S.K., and M.K. M.K. and C.T. supervised this study. S.Y.,

640   N.T., S.K., K.I., Y.M., Immune transcript/enhancer consortium, and K.Y. provided helpful

641   comments and discussion. K.T., M.K., A.S., and C.T. wrote the manuscript.

Ethics declarations

Competing interests

The authors declare no competing financial interests.

Figure legends

Fig. 1 | Study design. Overview of the study design. **A,** Dataset comprising 29 cell types

was used to validate our approach, and a machine learning model was developed to predict

OCRs. **B,C,** Identification of putative constraint OCRs (CAMBUS+). **D,** Characteristics of

CAMBUS+ OCRs based on CAMBUS. **E,** Characterization of CAMBUS+ OCRs and

prioritization for putative causal variants.

Fig. 2 | Accuracy of CAMBUS ML model and its mutation effect. A, Predictive accuracy of the CAMBUS ML models across 29 cell types. The dashed line represents the mean AUROC across the 29 cell types (0.87). **B,** Specificity of CAMBUS ML models with respect to OCR sharing. The x-axis shows the number of cell types sharing OCRs. For example, the leftmost category represents OCRs shared among 20 to 28 cell types, and the rightmost category indicates OCRs unique to a single cell type. **C,** Direction concordance between *in*

660 *silico* mutation effect from CAMBUS ML and effect size from our caQTL study. **D,** Direction

661 concordance between *in silico* mutation effect from the CAMBUS ML for Naïve B and effect

662 size from independent LCL caQTL study. The Pearson correlation coefficient (Pearson corr.)

663 was calculated to assess the relationship between *in silico* mutation effects and eQTL effect

664 sizes.

*The Gnocchi are colored with ■ if >4 and colored with ▨ if < 4

Fig. 3 | CAMBUS+ OCRs can mark constraint regions and active enhancers. A,

Distribution of CAMBUS. The red part represents putative constraint OCRs. **B,** Genome

browser view at representative constraint region around CAMBUS+ in monocytes

(chr3:141,217,899-141,218,844). The black box represents Gnocchi with Z > 4, and the grey

box represents Gnocchi with Z < 4. **C,** Distribution of non-coding Gnocchi in CAMBUS+

OCRs and CAMBUS control in NaiveCD4. The t-tests were performed between CAMBUS+

OCRs and CAMBUS+ control. **D,E,** Enrichment (odds ratio; OR) of CAMBUS+ in non-coding

Gnocchi (n = 1,843,599), comparing with the known regulatory elements (using the previous

study's results, see URLs) in non-coding Gnocchi (n = 1,843,599). We calculated the OR of

CAMBUS+ (n = 1,266) and CAMBUS control (n = 251,807) for NaiveCD4 using various

Gnocchi' thresholds in (**D**) and OR for each CAMBUS+ OCR in 29 cell types and their pooled

OR through random effects meta-analysis using Gnocchi > 4 in (**E**). The blue dashed line

represents the OR of ENCODE cCRE-PLS (**E**). **F**, Enrichment of CAMBUS+ OCRs for

NaiveCD4 (n = 1,266) in the known cCREs (ENCODE cCRE-PLS; n = 40,891, ENCODE

cCRE-pELS; n = 172,027, ENCODE cCRE-dELS; n = 789,200, ENCODE CTCF-only; n =

35,839, FANTOM5 enhancers; n = 63,280, Super enhancers; n = 16,472), adjusted for

Gnocchi and phyloP. **G,** Enrichment of CAMBUS+ for NaiveCD4 (n = 1,266) in the tissue

expressed FANTOM5 enhancers (hematopoietic cells; n = 64,225, Brain; n = 62,978, Kidney;

n = 35,177, Lung; n = 26,630), and Super enhancers (Blood; n = 8,055, Brain; n = 9,372,

Kidney; n = 4,712, Lung; n = 9,878). The dashed line represents no enrichment (OR=1.0; **D,**

E, F, G). CAMBUS control in NaiveCD4 (n = 251,807) is used as background in (**F, G**). The

error bars represent 95% confidence intervals, with only lower bounds shown in C (See

Supplementary Table 4 for higher bounds).

Fig. 4 | Heritability enrichment for immune-mediated diseases. A, The heritability enrichment of various GWAS traits (in total, 33 GWAS for EUR and EAS ancestries; Supplementary Table 13) in CAMBUS+ OCRs for each of 29 cell types. The heatmap colors indicate -log10-scale p-value of the coefficient for CAMBUS+ annotation in S-LDSC (coefficient P). '*' indicates significance (qvalue < 0.05) after FDR correction.

Fig. 5 | Prioritization of putative causal variants using CAMBUS+ OCRs. A, Enrichment

of putative causal variants in leukocyte (leuko), non-leukocytes (non_leuko), hemato (leuko

+ non_leuko), and non-hematopoietic (non_hemato) traits in CAMBUS+ OCRs for Th1.

Putative causal variants were obtained from statistical fine-mapping analysis of many

complex traits' GWAS results for EAS and EUR populations [52,53]. **B,** Forest plot showing the

enrichment of CAMBUS+ OCRs across 29 cell types and the pooled OR in highly confident

putative causal variants (PIP > 0.9). Variants with PIP <= 0.1 were used as the background

for OR calculation. **C,** Enrichment of CAMBUS+ OCRs for any of 29 cell types in putative

causal rare variants (maf < 0.01 in EAS), evaluated by comparing the proportion of

CAMBUS+ OCRs overlapping with putative causal rare variants with PIP > 0.1. The left dot

represents the OR calculated using all the putative causal variants, while the right dot

represents the OR based only on the putative causal variants for hematopoietic phenotypes.

The dashed line represents no enrichment (OR=1.0). **D,E,** Representative examples of

variants associated with monocyte counts prioritized with CAMBUS+ in Mono (**D**) and asthma

prioritized with CAMBUS+ in regulatory T-cells (**E**) in putative causal variants in EUR

ancestry and surrounding genomic annotations. The navy boxes represent putative causal

variants in this credible set. The blue dashed line represents an enhancer-gene connection

to the nearest protein-coding gene predicted by the ABC model for CD14$^+$ monocytes (**D**)

and HUVEC (**E**). The gene with the highest ABC score is also shown in (**D**). All the other

CAMBUS+ OCRs around putative causal variants (rs13122305 (**D**), rs55646091 (**E**)) are also

shown in the figures (The purple box represents PBMC).

Extended Data Figure

Extended Data Fig. 1 | Clustering analysis and dimension reduction using PCA and

UMAP. A-C, (**A**) Hierarchical clustering, (**B**) PCA, and (**C**) UMAP (**C**) of 1,386 samples. The

top 5,000 most accessible OCRs were used for these analyses. The colors indicate the

classification of samples into eight subgroups across 29 cell types. **D,** UMAP of 1,386

samples (**C**) colored by eleven types of CD4; other subgroups are colored with grey.

Extended Data Fig. 2 | Accuracy of *in silico* mutation effect. A, Comparison of direction
concordance between *in silico* mutation effects predicted by the CAMBUS ML models
(across five B-cell types) and effect sizes from an independent LCL caQTL study. The

Pearson correlation coefficient (Pearson corr.) was calculated to assess the relationship

between *in silico* mutation effects and eQTL effect sizes. The x-axis represents a threshold

of *in silico* mutation effects to calculate direction concordance, where 'all' indicates no

threshold was applied. **B,** Comparison of direction concordance between *in silico* mutation

effects from the CAMBUS ML models and effect size from the LCL caQTL study. Absolute *in*

silico mutation effects greater than > 0.1 are used (see Fig. 2C).

Extended Data Fig. 3 | CAMBUS+ can mark constraint regions and active enhancers.

A, Scatter plot of median TPM and CAMBUS in Naïve CD4. The vertical dashed line

represents the top 5% of the median TPM. **B,** The number of OCRs in coding and non-coding

regions for each CAMBUS+ OCRs and CAMBUS control. The region of coding and non-

coding are referred to previous study [24]. **C,** The distribution of non-coding Gnocchi (median)

for each CAMBUS+ OCRs and CAMBUS control in each 29 cell type. **D,** OR of relaxed

CAMBUS+ OCRs across 29 cell types in Gnocchi> 4 and pooled OR estimated through

random effect meta-analysis. The blue dashed line represents the OR of ENCODE promoter-

like elements. **E-I,** OR and the pooled OR of the CAMBUS+ OCRs in UKB selection signals

(**E**), Neanderthal genome sequences derived from samples of EAS ancestry (**F**), pathogenic

regulatory variants (**G**), super-enhancers (**H**) and FANTOM5 enhancers (**I**). **J,** ORs of relaxed

CAMBUS+ (NaiveCD4; n = 12,736) in cell-type-specific regulatory elements: the tissue

expressed FANTOM5 enhancers (hematopoietic cells; n = 64,225, Brain; n = 62,978, Kidney;

n = 35,177, Lung; n = 26,630), and super-enhancers (Blood; n = 8,055, Brain; n = 9,372,

Kidney; n = 4,712, Lung; n = 9,878). The dashed line represents no enrichment (OR=1.0; **D-**

J)

A

Extended Data Fig. 4 | Heritability enrichment for immune-mediated diseases. A, The -log10-scale coefficient P of CAMBUS+ OCRs in 29 cell types for SLE GWAS in EAS ancestry. The dashed line indicates a coefficient P = 0.05. '*' indicates significance (qvalue < 0.05) after FDR correction.

Extended Data Fig. 5 | Prioritization of putative causal variants using CAMBUS+ OCRs.

A, Median OR of all variants in 95% credible sets in CAMBUS+ OCRs across 29 cell types. We used putative causal variants from statistical fine-mapping studies in EUR and EAS ancestries [52,53]. The solid line represents the median OR across 29 cell types. **B,** Enrichment of the putative causal variants in leukocyte (leuko), non-leukocytes (non_leuko), and non-hematopoietic (non_hemato) traits in CAMBUS+ OCRs across 29 cell types. Only cell types with P < 0.05 are shown (27 cell types in BBJ leuko; 28 in UKB non_hemato; 29 in BBJ non_leuko, BBJ non_hemato, UKB leuko, and UKB non_leuko), and dots indicate -log10-scale p-value. t-tests were performed between leuko and non_hemato traits, with significance levels denoted as P <0.05 ('*') and P < 0.001 ('***').

Extended Data Fig. 6 | Prioritization of putative causal variants using CAMBUS+ OCRs.

A,B, representative example of variants associated with Hemoglobin A1c level prioritized with CAMBUS+ in plasma blast in putative causal variants in EUR ancestry (**A**) and eosinophils prioritized with CAMBUS+ in regulatory T-cell (**B**) and their surrounding genomic annotations. The navy boxes represent putative causal variants in the credible set. The blue dashed line represents an enhancer-gene connection to the nearest protein-coding gene predicted by the ABC model in B-cells (**A**). All the other CAMBUS+ OCRs around putative causal variants (rs8009224 (**A**)) are also shown in the figures (The purple box represents PBMC).

A

Yellow: Mono/DC/NK
Green: CD8/B
Red: CD4

Extended Data Fig. 7 | Sorting strategy for immune cell subsets. A, Representative

FACS plots describing gating strategies for 27 cell types. See Supplementary Table 1 for

flow cytometry antibodies used in this study.

References

1   Pollen, A. A., Kilik, U., Lowe, C. B. & Camp, J. G. Human-specific genetics: new tools to
explore the molecular and cellular basis of human evolution. *Nat Rev Genet* **24**, 687-711
(2023). https://doi.org:10.1038/s41576-022-00568-4
2   O'Bleness, M., Searles, V. B., Varki, A., Gagneux, P. & Sikela, J. M. Evolution of genetic
and genomic features unique to the human lineage. *Nat Rev Genet* **13**, 853-866 (2012).
https://doi.org:10.1038/nrg3336
3   Leypold, N. A. & Speicher, M. R. Evolutionary conservation in noncoding genomic regions.
Trends Genet **37**, 903-918 (2021). https://doi.org:10.1016/j.tig.2021.06.007
4   Franchini, L. F. & Pollard, K. S. Human evolution: the non-coding revolution. *BMC Biol*
15, 89 (2017). https://doi.org:10.1186/s12915-017-0428-9
5   Ward, L. D. & Kellis, M. Evidence of abundant purifying selection in humans for recently
acquired   regulatory   functions.   *Science*   **337**,   1675-1678   (2012).
https://doi.org:10.1126/science.1225057

6   Andersson, R. *et al.* An atlas of active enhancers across human cell types and tissues.
Nature **507**, 455-461 (2014). https://doi.org:10.1038/nature12787
7   Soskic, B. *et al.* Chromatin activity at GWAS loci identifies T cell states driving complex
immune diseases. *Nat Genet* **51**, 1486-1493 (2019). https://doi.org:10.1038/s41588-019-
0493-9
8   Gupta, A. *et al.* Dynamic regulatory elements in single-cell multimodal data implicate key
immune cell states enriched for autoimmune disease heritability. *Nat Genet* **55**, 2200-
2210 (2023). https://doi.org:10.1038/s41588-023-01577-7
9   Oguchi, A. *et al.* An atlas of transcribed enhancers across helper T cell diversity for
decoding   human   diseases.   *Science*   **385**,   eadd8394   (2024).
https://doi.org:10.1126/science.add8394
10   Buenrostro, J. D., Giresi, P. G., Zaba, L. C., Chang, H. Y. & Greenleaf, W. J. Transposition
of native chromatin for fast and sensitive epigenomic profiling of open chromatin, DNA-
binding proteins and nucleosome position. *Nat Methods* **10**, 1213-1218 (2013).
https://doi.org:10.1038/nmeth.2688
11   Yan, F., Powell, D. R., Curtis, D. J. & Wong, N. C. From reads to insight: a hitchhiker's
guide   to   ATAC-seq   data   analysis.   *Genome   Biol*   **21**,   22   (2020).
https://doi.org:10.1186/s13059-020-1929-3
12   Consortium, E. P. *et al.* Expanded encyclopaedias of DNA elements in the human and
mouse genomes. *Nature* **583**, 699-710 (2020). https://doi.org:10.1038/s41586-020-2493-
4
13   Zhang, K. *et al.* A single-cell atlas of chromatin accessibility in the human genome. *Cell*
184, 5985-6001 e5919 (2021). https://doi.org:10.1016/j.cell.2021.10.024
14   Boyle, A. P. *et al.* High-resolution mapping and characterization of open chromatin across
the genome. *Cell* **132**, 311-322 (2008). https://doi.org:10.1016/j.cell.2007.12.014
15   Maurano, M. T. *et al.* Systematic localization of common disease-associated variation in
regulatory   DNA.   *Science*   **337**,   1190-1195   (2012).
https://doi.org:10.1126/science.1222794
16   Claussnitzer, M. *et al.* A brief history of human disease genetics. *Nature* **577**, 179-189
(2020). https://doi.org:10.1038/s41586-019-1879-7
17   Trynka, G. *et al.* Chromatin marks identify critical cell types for fine mapping complex trait
variants. *Nat Genet* **45**, 124-130 (2013). https://doi.org:10.1038/ng.2504
18   Zeng, B. *et al.* Genetic regulation of cell type-specific chromatin accessibility shapes brain
disease   etiology.   *Science*   **384**,   eadh4265   (2024).
https://doi.org:10.1126/science.adh4265
19   Visscher, P. M. *et al.* 10 Years of GWAS Discovery: Biology, Function, and Translation.
Am J Hum Genet **101**, 5-22 (2017). https://doi.org:10.1016/j.ajhg.2017.06.005
20   Schaid, D. J., Chen, W. & Larson, N. B. From genome-wide associations to candidate
causal variants by statistical fine-mapping. *Nat Rev Genet* **19**, 491-504 (2018).
https://doi.org:10.1038/s41576-018-0016-z
21   Thibodeau, A., Uyar, A., Khetan, S., Stitzel, M. L. & Ucar, D. A neural network based
model effectively predicts enhancers from clinical ATAC-seq samples. *Sci Rep* **8**, 16048
(2018). https://doi.org:10.1038/s41598-018-34420-9
22   Klemm, S. L., Shipony, Z. & Greenleaf, W. J. Chromatin accessibility and the regulatory
epigenome. *Nat Rev Genet* **20**, 207-220 (2019). https://doi.org:10.1038/s41576-018-
0089-8
23   Radke, D. W. *et al.* Purifying selection on noncoding deletions of human regulatory loci
detected   using   their   cellular   pleiotropy.   *Genome Res* **31**, 935-946 (2021).
https://doi.org:10.1101/gr.275263.121
24   Chen, S. *et al.* A genomic mutational constraint map using variation in 76,156 human
genomes. *Nature* **625**, 92-100 (2024). https://doi.org:10.1038/s41586-023-06045-0
25   Kumasaka, N., Knights, A. J. & Gaffney, D. J. Fine-mapping cellular QTLs with RASQUAL
and ATAC-seq. *Nat Genet* **48**, 206-213 (2016). https://doi.org:10.1038/ng.3467

26 Gate, R. E. *et al.* Genetic determinants of co-accessible chromatin regions in activated T
cells across humans. *Nat Genet* **50**, 1140-1150 (2018). https://doi.org:10.1038/s41588-
018-0156-2

27 Zhou, J. *et al.* Deep learning sequence-based ab initio prediction of variant effects on
expression and disease risk. *Nat Genet* **50**, 1171-1179 (2018).
https://doi.org:10.1038/s41588-018-0160-6

28 Eraslan, G., Avsec, Z., Gagneur, J. & Theis, F. J. Deep learning: new computational
modelling techniques for genomics. *Nat Rev Genet* **20**, 389-403 (2019).
https://doi.org:10.1038/s41576-019-0122-6

29 Koido, M. *et al.* Prediction of the cell-type-specific transcription of non-coding RNAs from
genome sequences via machine learning. *Nat Biomed Eng* **7**, 830-844 (2023).
https://doi.org:10.1038/s41551-022-00961-8

30 Zhou, J. & Troyanskaya, O. G. Predicting effects of noncoding variants with deep
learning-based sequence model. *Nat Methods* **12**, 931-934 (2015).
https://doi.org:10.1038/nmeth.3547

31 Zhang, J. Y. *et al.* Single-cell landscape of immunological responses in patients with
COVID-19. *Nat Immunol* **21**, 1107-1118 (2020). https://doi.org:10.1038/s41590-020-
0762-x

32 Benaglio, P. *et al.* Mapping genetic effects on cell type-specific chromatin accessibility
and annotating complex immune trait variants using single nucleus ATAC-seq in
peripheral blood. *PLoS Genet* **19**, e1010759 (2023).
https://doi.org:10.1371/journal.pgen.1010759

33 Li, Y., Li, Z. & Hu, F. Double-negative (DN) B cells: an under-recognized effector memory
B cell subset in autoimmunity. *Clin Exp Immunol* **205**, 119-127 (2021).
https://doi.org:10.1111/cei.13615

34 Yuan, H. & Kelley, D. R. scBasset: sequence-based modeling of single-cell ATAC-seq
using convolutional neural networks. *Nat Methods* **19**, 1088-1096 (2022).
https://doi.org:10.1038/s41592-022-01562-8

35 Pollard, K. S., Hubisz, M. J., Rosenbloom, K. R. & Siepel, A. Detection of nonneutral
substitution rates on mammalian phylogenies. *Genome Res* **20**, 110-121 (2010).
https://doi.org:10.1101/gr.097857.109

36 Silvert, M., Quintana-Murci, L. & Rotival, M. Impact and Evolutionary Determinants of
Neanderthal Introgression on Transcriptional and Post-Transcriptional Regulation. *Am J*
Hum Genet **104**, 1241-1250 (2019). https://doi.org:10.1016/j.ajhg.2019.04.016

37 Nait Saada, J. *et al.* Identity-by-descent detection across 487,409 British samples reveals
fine scale population structure and ultra-rare variant associations. *Nat Commun* **11**, 6130
(2020). https://doi.org:10.1038/s41467-020-19588-x

38 Liu, X. *et al.* Decoding triancestral origins, archaic introgression, and natural selection in
the Japanese population by whole-genome sequencing. *Sci Adv* **10**, eadi8419 (2024).
https://doi.org:10.1126/sciadv.adi8419

39 Browning, S. R., Browning, B. L., Zhou, Y., Tucci, S. & Akey, J. M. Analysis of Human
Sequence Data Reveals Two Pulses of Archaic Denisovan Admixture. *Cell* **173**, 53-61
e59 (2018). https://doi.org:10.1016/j.cell.2018.02.031

40 Mangan, R. J. *et al.* Adaptive sequence divergence forged new neurodevelopmental
enhancers in humans. *Cell* **185**, 4587-4603 e4523 (2022).
https://doi.org:10.1016/j.cell.2022.10.016

41 Stenson, P. D. *et al.* Human Gene Mutation Database (HGMD): 2003 update. *Hum Mutat*
21, 577-581 (2003). https://doi.org:10.1002/humu.10212

42 Hnisz, D. *et al.* Super-enhancers in the control of cell identity and disease. *Cell* **155**, 934-
947 (2013). https://doi.org:10.1016/j.cell.2013.09.053

43 Jiang, Y. *et al.* SEdb: a comprehensive human super-enhancer database. *Nucleic Acids*
Res **47**, D235-D243 (2019). https://doi.org:10.1093/nar/gky1025

44 Finucane, H. K. *et al.* Partitioning heritability by functional annotation using genome-wide
association summary statistics. *Nat Genet* **47**, 1228-1235 (2015).
https://doi.org:10.1038/ng.3404

45 Tashman, K. C., Cui, R., O'Connor, L. J., Neale, B. M. & Finucane, H. K. Significance
testing for small annotations in stratified LD-Score regression. *medRxiv*,
2021.2003.2013.21249938 (2021). https://doi.org:10.1101/2021.03.13.21249938

46 Moser, T., Akgun, K., Proschmann, U., Sellner, J. & Ziemssen, T. The role of TH17 cells
in multiple sclerosis: Therapeutic implications. *Autoimmun Rev* **19**, 102647 (2020).
https://doi.org:10.1016/j.autrev.2020.102647

47 Jarvinen, T. M. *et al.* Replication of GWAS-identified systemic lupus erythematosus
susceptibility genes affirms B-cell receptor pathway signalling and strengthens the role of
IRF5 in disease susceptibility in a Northern European population. *Rheumatology (Oxford)*
51, 87-92 (2012). https://doi.org:10.1093/rheumatology/ker263

48 Fillatreau, S., Manfroi, B. & Dorner, T. Toll-like receptor signalling in B cells during
systemic lupus erythematosus. *Nat Rev Rheumatol* **17**, 98-108 (2021).
https://doi.org:10.1038/s41584-020-00544-4

49 Honda, T. & Kabashima, K. Reconciling innate and acquired immunity in atopic dermatitis.
J Allergy Clin Immunol **145**, 1136-1137 (2020). https://doi.org:10.1016/j.jaci.2020.02.008

50 Chung, M. K. Y. *et al.* Functions of double-negative B cells in autoimmune diseases,
infections, and cancers. *EMBO Mol Med* **15**, e17341 (2023).
https://doi.org:10.15252/emmm.202217341

51 Yin, X. *et al.* Meta-analysis of 208370 East Asians identifies 113 susceptibility loci for
systemic lupus erythematosus. *Ann Rheum Dis* **80**, 632-640 (2021).
https://doi.org:10.1136/annrheumdis-2020-219209

52 Kanai, M. *et al.* Insights from complex trait fine-mapping across diverse populations.
medRxiv, 2021.2009.2003.21262975 (2021).
https://doi.org:10.1101/2021.09.03.21262975

53 Koyama, S. *et al.* Population-specific putative causal variants shape quantitative traits.
Nature Genetics (2024). https://doi.org:10.1038/s41588-024-01913-5

54 Armanfar, M., Jafari, A., Dehghan, G. R. & Abdizadeh, L. Effect of coenzyme Q10
supplementation on exercise-induced response of inflammatory indicators and blood
lactate in male runners. *Med J Islam Repub Iran* **29**, 202 (2015).

55 Mantle, D., Heaton, R. A. & Hargreaves, I. P. Coenzyme Q10 and Immune Function: An
Overview. *Antioxidants (Basel)* **10** (2021). https://doi.org:10.3390/antiox10050759

56 Mukherjee, R. *et al.* Non-Classical monocytes display inflammatory features: Validation
in Sepsis and Systemic Lupus Erythematous. *Sci Rep* **5**, 13886 (2015).
https://doi.org:10.1038/srep13886

57 Nassir, N. *et al.* Single-cell transcriptome identifies FCGR3B upregulated subtype of
alveolar macrophages in patients with critical COVID-19. *iScience* **24**, 103030 (2021).
https://doi.org:10.1016/j.isci.2021.103030

58 Li, Y. K. *et al.* Single-nucleotide polymorphism rs6592645 confers asthma risk through
regulating LRRC32 expression. *Exp Ther Med* **26**, 451 (2023).
https://doi.org:10.3892/etm.2023.12150

59 Fulco, C. P. *et al.* Activity-by-contact model of enhancer-promoter regulation from
thousands of CRISPR perturbations. *Nat Genet* **51**, 1664-1669 (2019).
https://doi.org:10.1038/s41588-019-0538-0

60 Barton, A. R., Sherman, M. A., Mukamel, R. E. & Loh, P. R. Whole-exome imputation
within UK Biobank powers rare coding variant association and fine-mapping analyses.
Nat Genet **53**, 1260-1269 (2021). https://doi.org:10.1038/s41588-021-00892-1

61 Kuderna, L. F. K. *et al.* Identification of constrained sequence elements across 239
primate genomes. *Nature* **625**, 735-742 (2024). https://doi.org:10.1038/s41586-023-
06798-8

62 Roadmap Epigenomics, C. *et al.* Integrative analysis of 111 reference human
epigenomes. *Nature* **518**, 317-330 (2015). https://doi.org/10.1038/nature14248
63 Martens, L. D., Fischer, D. S., Yepez, V. A., Theis, F. J. & Gagneur, J. Modeling fragment
counts improves single-cell ATAC-seq analysis. *Nat Methods* **21**, 28-31 (2024).
https://doi.org/10.1038/s41592-023-02112-6
64 Karczewski, K. J. *et al.* The mutational constraint spectrum quantified from variation in
141,456 humans. *Nature* **581**, 434-443 (2020). https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-020-2308-
7
65 Nelson, R. K., Bush, A., Stokes, J., Nair, P. & Akuthota, P. Eosinophilic Asthma. *J Allergy*
Clin Immunol Pract **8**, 465-473 (2020). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaip.2019.11.024
66 Harb, H. & Chatila, T. A. Regulatory T-cells in asthma. *Curr Opin Allergy Clin Immunol*
23, 151-157 (2023). https://doi.org/10.1097/ACI.0000000000000887
67 Tran, D. Q. *et al.* GARP (LRRC32) is essential for the surface expression of latent TGF-
beta on platelets and activated FOXP3+ regulatory T cells. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **106**,
13445-13450 (2009). https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0901944106
68 Corces, M. R. *et al.* An improved ATAC-seq protocol reduces background and enables
interrogation of frozen tissues. *Nat Methods* **14**, 959-962 (2017).
https://doi.org/10.1038/nmeth.4396
69 Li, R. & Quon, G. scBFA: modeling detection patterns to mitigate technical noise in large-
scale single-cell genomics data. *Genome Biol* **20**, 193 (2019).
https://doi.org/10.1186/s13059-019-1806-0
70 Storey, J. D. A Direct Approach to False Discovery Rates. *Journal of the Royal Statistical*
Society Series B: Statistical Methodology **64**, 479-498 (2002).
https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9868.00346
71 Ishigaki, K. *et al.* Multi-ancestry genome-wide association analyses identify novel genetic
mechanisms in rheumatoid arthritis. *Nat Genet* **54**, 1640-1651 (2022).
https://doi.org/10.1038/s41588-022-01213-w
72 Ishikawa, Y. *et al.* GWAS for systemic sclerosis identifies six novel susceptibility loci
including one in the Fcgamma receptor region. *Nat Commun* **15**, 319 (2024).
https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-023-44541-z
73 Tanaka, N. *et al.* Eight novel susceptibility loci and putative causal variants in atopic
dermatitis. *J Allergy Clin Immunol* **148**, 1293-1306 (2021).
https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaci.2021.04.019
74 Terao, C. *et al.* Genetic determinants and an epistasis of LILRA3 and HLA-B*52 in
Takayasu arteritis. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **115**, 13045-13050 (2018).
https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1808850115