Discovery of biased orientation of human DNA motif sequences

affecting enhancer-promoter interactions and transcription of genes

Naoki Osato[1][*]

[1]Department of Bioinformatic Engineering, Graduate School of Information Science

and Technology, Osaka University, Osaka 565-0871, Japan

[*]Corresponding author

E-mail address: naokiosato11@gmail.com, nosato@ist.osaka-u.ac.jp

Abstract

Chromatin interactions have important roles for enhancer-promoter interactions

(EPI) and regulating the transcription of genes. CTCF and cohesin proteins are located

at the anchors of chromatin interactions, forming their loop structures. CTCF has

insulator function limiting the activity of enhancers into the loops. DNA binding

sequences of CTCF indicate their orientation bias at chromatin interaction anchors –

forward-reverse (FR) orientation is frequently observed. DNA binding sequences of

CTCF were found in open chromatin regions at about 40% - 80% of chromatin

interaction anchors in Hi-C and in situ Hi-C experimental data. Though the number of

chromatin interactions was about seventy thousand in Hi-C at 50kb resolution, about

twenty millions of chromatin interactions were recently identified by HiChIP at 5kb

resolution. It has been reported that long range of chromatin interactions tends to

include less CTCF at their anchors. It is still unclear what proteins are associated with

chromatin interactions.

To find DNA binding motif sequences of transcription factors (TF), such as

CTCF, and repeat DNA sequences affecting the interaction between enhancers and

promoters of genes and their expression, first I predicted TF bound in enhancers and

promoters using DNA motif sequences of TF and experimental data of open chromatin

regions in monocytes and other cell types, which were obtained from public and

commercial databases. Second, transcriptional target genes of each TF were predicted

based on enhancer-promoter association (EPA). EPA was shortened at the genomic

locations of FR or reverse-forward (RF) orientation of DNA motif sequence of a TF,

which were supposed to be at chromatin interaction anchors and acted as insulator sites

like CTCF. Then, the expression levels of the transcriptional target genes predicted

based on the EPA were compared with those predicted from only promoters.

Total 369 biased orientation of DNA motifs (232 FR and 178 RF orientation, the

reverse complement sequences of some DNA motifs were also registered in databases,

so the total number was smaller than the number of FR and RF) affected the expression

level of putative transcriptional target genes significantly in $CD14^+$ monocytes of four

people in common. The same analysis was conducted in $CD4^+$ T cells of four people.

DNA motif sequences of CTCF, cohesin and other transcription factors involved in

chromatin interactions were found to be a biased orientation. Transposon sequences,

which are known to be involved in insulators and enhancers, showed a biased

orientation. The biased orientation of DNA motif sequences tended to be co-localized in

the same open chromatin regions. Moreover, for 36 − 95% of FR and RF orientations of

DNA motif sequences, EPI predicted from EPA that were shortened at the genomic

locations of the biased orientation of DNA motif sequence were overlapped with

chromatin interaction data (Hi-C and HiChIP) significantly more than other types of

EPAs.

Keywords: transcriptional target genes, gene expression, transcription factors, enhancer,

enhancer-promoter interactions, chromatin interactions, CTCF, cohesin, open chromatin

regions, co-location of transcription factors, homodimer, heterodimer, complex

Background

Chromatin interactions have important roles for enhancer-promoter interactions (EPI) and regulating the transcription of genes. CTCF and cohesin proteins are located at the anchors of chromatin interactions, forming their loop structures. CTCF has insulator function limiting the activity of enhancers into the loops (Fig. 1A). DNA binding sequences of CTCF indicate their orientation bias at chromatin interaction anchors – forward-reverse (FR) orientation is frequently observed (de Wit et al. 2015; Guo et al. 2015). About 40% - 80% of chromatin interaction anchors of Hi-C and in situ Hi-C experiments include DNA binding motif sequences of CTCF. Though the number of chromatin interactions was about seventy thousand in Hi-C at 50kb resolution (Javierre et al. 2016), about twenty millions of chromatin interactions were recently identified by HiChIP at 5kb resolution (Mumbach et al. 2017). However, it has been reported that long range of chromatin interactions tends to include less CTCF at their anchors (Jeong et al. 2017). Other DNA binding proteins such as ZNF143, YY1, and SMARCA4 (BRG1) are found to be associated with chromatin interactions and EPI (Bailey et al. 2015; Barutcu et al. 2016; Weintraub et al. 2017). CTCF, cohesin, ZNF143, YY1 and SMARCA4 have other biological functions as well as chromatin interactions and EPI. The DNA binding motif sequences of the transcription factors (TF) are found in open chromatin regions near transcriptional start sites (TSS) as well as chromatin interaction anchors.

DNA binding motif sequence of ZNF143 was enriched at both chromatin interaction anchors. ZNF143's correlation with the CTCF-cohesin cluster relies on its

weakest binding sites, found primarily at distal regulatory elements defined by the

'CTCF-rich' chromatin state. The strongest ZNF143-binding sites map to promoters

bound by RNA polymerase II (POL2) and other promoter-associated factors, such as the

TATA-binding protein (TBP) and the TBP-associated protein, together forming a

'promoter' cluster (Bailey et al. 2015).

DNA binding motif sequence of YY1 does not seem to be enriched at both

chromatin interaction anchors (Z-score < 2), whereas DNA binding motif sequence of

ZNF143 is significantly enriched (Z-score > 7; Bailey et al. 2015 Figure 2a). In the

analysis of YY1, to identify a protein factor that might contribute to EPI, (Ji et al. 2015)

performed chromatin immune precipitation with mass spectrometry (ChIP-MS), using

antibodies directed toward histones with modifications characteristic of enhancer and

promoter chromatin (H3K27ac and H3K4me3, respectively). Of 26 transcription factors

that occupy both enhancers and promoters, four are essential based on a CRISPR

cell-essentiality screen and two (CTCF, YY1) are expressed in >90% of tissues

examined (Weintraub et al. 2017). These analyses started from the analysis of histone

modifications of enhancer and promoter marks rather than chromatin interactions. Other

protein factors associated with chromatin interactions may be found from other

researches.

As computational approaches, machine-learning analyses to predict chromatin

interactions have been proposed (Schreiber et al. 2017; Zhang et al. 2017). However,

they were not intended to find DNA motif sequences of TF affecting chromatin

interactions, EPI, and the expression level of transcriptional target genes, which were

examined in this study.

DNA binding proteins involved in chromatin interactions are supposed to affect

the transcription of genes in the loops formed by chromatin interactions. In my previous

analysis, the expression level of human putative transcriptional target genes was

affected, according to the criteria of enhancer-promoter association (EPA) (Fig. 1B;

(Osato 2018)). EPI were predicted based on EPA shortened at the genomic locations of

FR orientation of CTCF binding sites, and transcriptional target genes of each TF bound

in enhancers and promoters were predicted based on the EPI. The EPA affected the

expression levels of putative transcriptional target genes the most among three types of

EPAs, compared with the expression levels of transcriptional target genes predicted

from only promoters (Fig. 2). The expression levels tended to be increased in

monocytes and $CD4^+$ T cells, implying that enhancers activated the transcription of

genes, and decreased in ES and iPS cells, implying that enhancers repressed the

transcription of genes. These analyses suggested that enhancers affected the

transcription of genes significantly, when EPI were predicted properly. Other DNA

binding proteins involved in chromatin interactions, as well as CTCF, may locate at

chromatin interaction anchors with a pair of biased orientation of DNA binding motif

sequences, affecting the expression level of putative transcriptional target genes in the

loops formed by the chromatin interactions. As experimental issues of the analyses of

chromatin interactions, chromatin interaction data are changed, according to

experimental techniques, depth of DNA sequencing, and even replication sets of the

same cell type. Chromatin interaction data may not be saturated enough to cover all

chromatin interactions. Supposing these characters of DNA binding proteins associated

with chromatin interactions and avoiding experimental issues of the analyses of

chromatin interactions, here I searched for DNA motif sequences of TF and repeat DNA

sequences, affecting EPI and the expression level of putative transcriptional target genes

in $CD14^+$ monocytes and $CD4^+$ T cells of four people and other cell types without using

chromatin interaction data. Then, putative EPI were compared with chromatin

interaction data.

Results

Search for biased orientation of DNA motif sequences

Transcription factor binding sites (TFBS) were predicted using open chromatin

regions and DNA motif sequences of transcription factors (TF) collected from various

databases and journal papers (see Methods). Transcriptional target genes were predicted

using TFBS in promoters and enhancer-promoter association (EPA) shortened at the

genomic locations of DNA binding motif sequence of a TF acting as insulator such as

CTCF and cohesin (RAD21 and SMC3) (Fig. 1B). To find DNA motif sequences of TF

acting as insulator, other than CTCF and cohesin, and repeat DNA sequences affecting

the expression level of genes, EPI were predicted based on EPA shortened at the

genomic locations of the DNA motif sequence of a TF or a repeat DNA sequence, and

transcriptional target genes of each TF bound in enhancers and promoters were

predicted based on the EPI. The expression levels of the putative transcriptional target

genes were compared with those predicted from promoters using Mann Whiteney U test,

two-sided (p-value < 0.05) (Fig. 2A). The number of TF showing a significant

difference of expression level of their putative transcriptional target genes was counted.

To examine whether the orientation of a DNA motif sequence, which is supposed to act

as insulator sites and shorten EPA, affected the number of TF showing a significant

difference of expression level of their putative transcriptional target genes, the number

of the TF was compared among forward-reverse (FR), reverse-forward (RF), and any

orientation (i.e. without considering orientation) of a DNA motif sequence shortening

EPA, using chi-square test (p-value < 0.05). To avoid missing DNA motif sequences

showing a relatively weak statistical significance by multiple testing collection, the

above analyses were conducted using monocytes of four people independently, and

DNA motif sequences found in monocytes of four people in common were selected.

Total 369 of biased (232 FR and 178 RF) orientation of DNA binding motif sequences

of TF were found in monocytes of four people in common, whereas only seven any

orientation of DNA binding motif sequence was found in monocytes of four people in

common (Fig. 2B; Table 1; Supplemental Table S1). FR orientation of DNA motif

sequences included CTCF, cohesin (RAD21 and SMC3), ZNF143 and YY1, which are

associated with chromatin interactions and EPI. SMARCA4 (BRG1) is associated with

topologically associated domain (TAD), which is higher-order chromatin organization.

The DNA binding motif sequence of SMARCA4 was not registered in the databases

used in this study. FR orientation of DNA motif sequences included SMARCC2, a

member of the same SWI/SNF family of proteins as SMARCA4.

The same analysis was conducted using DNase-seq data of CD4$^+$ T cells of four

people. Total 376 of biased (203 FR and 213 RF) orientation of DNA binding motif

sequences of TF were found in T cells of four people in common, whereas only seven

any orientation (i.e. without considering orientation) of DNA binding motif sequences

were found in T cells of four people in common (Supplemental Fig. S1 and

Supplemental Table S2). Biased orientation of DNA motif sequences in T cells included

CTCF, cohesin (RAD21 and SMC3), and SMARC. Among 369, 73 of biased

orientation of DNA binding motif sequences of TF were found in both monocytes and T

cells in common (Supplemental Table S5). For each orientation, 46 FR and 34 RF

orientation of DNA binding motif sequences of TF were found in both monocytes and T

cells in common. Without considering the difference of orientation of DNA binding

motif sequences, 113 of biased orientation of DNA binding motif sequences of TF were

found in both monocytes and T cells. As a reason for the increase of the number (113)

from 73, a TF or an isoform of the same TF may bind to a different DNA binding motif

sequence according to cell types and/or in the same cell type. About 50% or more of

alternative splicing isoforms are differently expressed among tissues, indicating that

most alternative splicing is subject to tissue-specific regulation (Wang et al. 2008)

(Chen and Manley 2009) (Das et al. 2007). The same TF has several DNA binding

motif sequences and in some cases one of the motif sequences is almost the same as the

reverse complement sequence of another motif sequence of the same TF. For example,

RAD21 had both FR and RF orientation of DNA motif sequences, but the number of the

FR orientation of DNA motif sequence was relatively small in the genome, and the RF

orientation of DNA motif sequence was frequently observed and co-localized with

CTCF. I previously found that a complex of TF would bind to a slightly different DNA

binding motif sequence from the combination of DNA binding motif sequences of TF

composing the complex in *C. elegans* (Tabuchi et al. 2011). From another viewpoint of

this study, the expression level of putative transcription target genes of some TF would

be different, depending on the genomic locations (enhancers or promoters) of DNA

binding motif sequences of the TF in monocytes and T cells of four people.

Moreover, using open chromatin regions overlapped with H3K27ac histone

modification marks known as enhancer and promoter marks, the same analyses were

performed in monocytes and T cells. H3K27ac histone modification marks were used in

the analysis of EPI, but were not used in the analysis of TF as insulator like CTCF and

cohesin in this study, since new biased orientation of DNA motif sequences were found

in this criterion. When H3K27ac histone modification marks were used in the analysis

of TF as insulator like CTCF and cohesin, the number of biased orientation of DNA

motif sequences was decreased. Total 233 of biased (179 FR and 70 RF) orientation of

DNA binding motif sequences of TF were found in monocytes of four people in

common, whereas only two any orientation of DNA binding motif sequence was found

(Supplemental Table S3). Though the number of biased orientation of DNA motif

sequences was reduced, CTCF, RAD21, SMC3, ZNF143, and YY1 were found. For T

cells using H3K27ac histone modification marks, total 291 of biased (173 FR and 143

RF) orientation of DNA binding motif sequences of TF were found in T cells of four

people in common, whereas only 10 any orientation of DNA binding motif sequences

were found (Supplemental Table S4). Though the number of biased orientation of DNA

motif sequences was reduced, CTCF, RAD21, SMC3, and YY1 were found. Scores of

CTCF, RAD21, and SMC3 were increased compared with the result of T cells without

using H3K27ac histone modification marks, and they were ranked in the top four.

Biased orientation of DNA motif sequences included JUNDM2 (JDP2), which is

involved in histone-chaperone activity, promoting nucleosome, and inhibition of histone

acetylation (Jin et al. 2006). JDP2 forms a homodimer or heterodimer with various TF

(https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Jun_dimerization_protein). As summary of the results

with and without H3K27ac histone modification marks, total 433 of biased (306 FR and

178 RF) orientation of DNA motif sequences were found in monocytes of four people

in common. Total 499 of biased (285 FR and 278 RF) orientation of DNA motif

sequences were found in T cells of four people in common. Total number of these

results in monocytes and T cells was 773 biased (513 FR and 413 RF) orientation of

DNA motif sequences. Biased orientation of DNA motif sequences found in both

monocytes and T cells were listed in Supplemental Table S5.

To examine whether the biased orientation of DNA binding motif sequences of

TF were observed in other cell types, the same analyses were conducted in other cell

types. However, for other cell types, experimental data of one sample were available in

ENCODE database, so the analyses of DNA motif sequences were performed by

comparing with the result in monocytes of four people. Among the biased orientation of

DNA binding motif sequences found in monocytes, 61, 135, 95, and 108 DNA binding

motif sequences were also observed in H1-hESC, iPS, Huvec and MCF-7 respectively,

including CTCF and cohesin (RAD21 and SMC3) (Table 2; Supplemental Table S6).

The scores of DNA binding motif sequences were the highest in monocytes, and the

other cell types showed lower scores. The results of the analysis of DNA motif

sequences in CD20$^+$ B cells and macrophages did not include CTCF and cohesin,

because these analyses can be utilized in cells where the expression level of putative

transcriptional target genes of each TF show a significant difference between promoters

and EPA shortened at the genomic locations of a DNA motif sequence acting as

insulator sites. Some experimental data of a cell did not show a significant difference

between promoters and the EPA (Osato 2018).

Instead of DNA binding motif sequences of TF, repeat DNA sequences were also

examined. The expression levels of transcriptional target genes of each TF predicted

based on EPA that were shortened at the genomic locations of a repeat DNA sequence

were compared with those predicted from promoters. Three RF orientation of repeat

DNA sequences showed a significant difference of expression level of putative

transcriptional target genes in monocytes of four people in common (Table 3). Among

them, LTR16C repeat DNA sequence was observed in iPS and H1-hESC with enough

statistical significance considering multiple tests (*p*-value < 10^{-7}). The same as CD14$^+$

monocytes, biased orientation of repeat DNA sequences were examined in CD4$^+$ T cells.

Three FR and two RF orientation of repeat DNA sequences showed a significant

difference of expression level of putative transcriptional target genes in T cells of four

people in common (Supplemental Table S7). MIRb and MIR3 were also found in the

analysis using open chromatin regions overlapped with H3K27ac histone modification

marks, which are enhancer and promoter marks. MIR and other transposon sequences

are known to act as insulators and enhancers (Bejerano et al. 2006; Rebollo et al. 2012;

de Souza et al. 2013; Jjingo et al. 2014; Wang et al. 2015).

Co-location of biased orientation of DNA motif sequences

To examine the association of 369 biased (FR and RF) orientation of DNA

binding motif sequences of TF, co-location of the DNA binding motif sequences in

open chromatin regions was analyzed in monocytes. The number of open chromatin

regions with the same pairs of DNA binding motif sequences was counted, and when

the pairs of DNA binding motif sequences were enriched with statistical significance

(chi-square test, p-value < 1.0 × 10^{-10}), they were listed (Table 4; Supplemental Table

S8). Open chromatin regions overlapped with histone modification of enhancer and

promoter marks (H3K27ac) (total 26,095 regions) showed a larger number of enriched

pairs of DNA motifs than all open chromatin regions (Table 4; Supplemental Table S8).

H3K27ac is known to be enriched at chromatin interaction anchors (Phanstiel et al.

2017). As already known, CTCF was found with cohesin such as RAD21 and SMC3

(Table 4). Top 30 pairs of FR and RF orientations of DNA motifs co-occupied in the

same open chromatin regions were shown (Table 4). Total number of pairs of DNA

motifs was 428, consisting of 120 unique DNA motifs, when the pair of DNA motifs

were observed in more than 80% of the number of open chromatin regions with the

DNA motifs. Biased orientation of DNA binding motif sequences of TF tended to be

co-localized in the same open chromatin regions.

To examine the association of 376 biased orientation of DNA binding motif

sequences of TF in CD4^{+} T cells, co-location of the DNA binding motif sequences in

open chromatin regions was analyzed. Top 30 pairs of FR and RF orientations of DNA

motifs co-occupied in the same open chromatin regions were shown (Supplemental

Table S9). Total number of pairs of DNA motifs was 99, consisting of 72 unique DNA

motifs, when the pair of DNA motifs were observed in more than 80% of the number of

open chromatin regions with the DNA motifs (chi-square test, p-value < 1.0×10^{-10}).

Among them, 11 pairs of DNA motif sequences including a pair of CTCF, SMC3, and

RAD21 in T cells were found in monocytes in common (Supplemental Table S9).

Comparison with chromatin interaction data

To examine whether the biased orientation of DNA motif sequences is associated

with chromatin interactions, enhancer-promoter interactions (EPI) predicted based on

enhancer-promoter associations (EPA) were compared with chromatin interaction data

(Hi-C). Due to the resolution of Hi-C experimental data used in this study (50kb), EPI

were adjusted to 50kb resolution. EPI were predicted based on three types of EPA: (i)

EPA shortened at the genomic locations of FR or RF orientation of DNA motif

sequence of a TF, (ii) EPA shortened at the genomic locations of DNA motif sequence

of a TF acting as insulator sites such as CTCF and cohesin (RAD21, SMC3) without

considering their orientation, and (iii) EPA without being shortened by the genomic

locations of a DNA motif sequence. EPA (i) showed a significantly higher ratio of EPI

overlapped with chromatin interactions (Hi-C) using DNA binding motif sequences of

CTCF and cohesin (RAD21 and SMC3) than the other two types of EPAs (n = 4,

binomial test, two-sided) (Supplemental Fig. S2). Total 58 biased orientation (38 FR

and 22 RF) of DNA motif sequences including CTCF, cohesin, and YY1 showed a

significantly higher ratio of EPI overlapped with Hi-C chromatin interactions (a cutoff

score of CHiCAGO tool > 1) than the other types of EPAs in monocytes (Supplemental

Table S10). When comparing EPI predicted based on only EPA (i) and (iii) with

chromatin interactions, total 215 biased orientation (130 FR and 102 RF) of DNA motif

sequences showed a significantly higher ratio of EPI predicted based on EPA (i)

overlapped with the chromatin interactions than EPI predicted based on EPA (iii)

(Supplemental material 2). The difference between EPI predicted based on EPA (i) and

(ii) seemed to be difficult to distinguish using the chromatin interaction data and the

statistical test in some cases. However, as for the difference between EPI predicted

based on EPA (i) and (iii), a larger number of biased orientation of DNA motif

sequences was found to be correlated with chromatin interaction data. Chromatin

interaction data were obtained from different samples from DNase-seq, open chromatin

regions, so individual differences seemed to be large from the results of this analysis.

Since, for some DNA motif sequences of transcription factors, the number of EPI

overlapped with chromatin interactions was small, if higher resolution of chromatin

interaction data (such as HiChIP, in situ DNase Hi-C, and in situ Hi-C data, or a tool to

improve the resolution such as HiCPlus) is available, the number of EPI overlapped

with chromatin interactions would be increased and the difference of the numbers

among three types of EPA would be larger and more significant (Rao et al. 2014;

Ramani et al. 2016; Mumbach et al. 2017; Zhang et al. 2018).

After the analysis of CD14$^+$ monocytes, to utilize HiChIP chromatin interaction

data in CD4$^+$ T cells, the same analysis for CD14$^+$ monocytes was performed using

DNase-seq data of four donors in CD4$^+$ T cells (Mumbach et al. 2017). EPI predicted

based on EPA were compared with three replications (B2T1, B2T2, and B3T1) of

HiChIP chromatin interaction data in CD4$^+$ T cells respectively. The resolutions of

HiChIP chromatin interaction data and EPI were adjusted to 5kb. EPI were predicted

based on the three types of EPA in the same way as CD14$^+$ monocytes using top 60%

expression level of all transcripts (genes) excluding transcripts not expressed in T cells.

The criteria of the analysis were determined to include known DNA motif sequences

involved in chromatin interactions such as CTCF and cohesin in the result, and the

result was consistent with that using Hi-C chromatin interaction data. EPA (iii) showed

the highest ratio of EPI overlapped with chromatin interactions (HiChIP) using DNA

binding motif sequences of CTCF and cohesin (RAD21 and SMC3), compared with the

other two types of EPA (i) and (ii) ($n = 4$, binomial test, two-sided, 95% confidence

interval) (Fig. 3). Total 136 biased orientation (70 FR and 73 RF) of DNA motif

sequences, which included CTCF, cohesin (RAD21 and SMC3), and SMARC in three

replications (B2T1, B2T2, and B3T1) and ZNF143 in two replications (B2T2 and

B3T1), showed a significantly higher ratio of EPI overlapped with HiChIP chromatin

interactions (more than 1,000 counts for each interaction) than the other types of EPAs

in T cells (Table 5). When comparing EPI predicted based on only EPA (i) and (iii) with

the chromatin interactions, total 356 biased orientation (194 FR and 200 RF) of DNA

motif sequences showed a significantly higher ratio of EPI predicted based on EPA (iii)

overlapped with the chromatin interactions than EPI predicted based on EPA (i) (Table

5; Supplemental material 2). As expected, the number of EPI overlapped with

chromatin interactions (HiChIP) was increased, compared with Hi-C chromatin

interactions. Most of biased orientation of DNA motif sequences (95%) were found to

be correlated with chromatin interactions, when comparing EPI predicted based on EPA

(i) and (iii) with HiChIP chromatin interactions.

Moreover, to examine the enhancer activity of EPI, the distribution of expression

level of putative target genes of EPI was compared between EPI overlapped with

HiChIP chromatin interactions and EPI not overlapped with them. Though the target

genes of EPI were selected from top 60% expression level of all transcripts (genes)

excluding transcripts not expressed in T cells, target genes of EPI overlapped with

chromatin interactions showed a significantly higher expression level than EPI not

overlapped with them, suggesting that EPI overlapped with chromatin interactions

activated the expression of target genes in T cells. Almost all (99.9%) FR and RF

orientations of DNA motifs showed a significantly higher expression level of putative

target genes of EPI overlapped with chromatin interactions than EPI not overlapped.

When a biased orientation of DNA motif showed a significantly higher expression level

of putative target genes of EPI overlapped with chromatin interactions than EPI not

overlapped, '1' was marked with in the tables of the comparison between EPI and

HiChIP chromatin interactions in Supplemental material 2. When a DNA motif showed

a significantly lower expression level, '-1' was marked with, however, it was not

observed in this analysis. When there was not significant difference of expression level,

'0' was marked with.

If biased orientation of DNA motif sequences of TF found in both monocytes and

T cells are biologically meaningful, these may match the result of the analysis of

HiChIP data. Among 376 FR and RF orientations of biased orientation of DNA motifs

of TF in T cells, 136 (36%) were biased orientation of DNA motifs in the analysis of

HiChIP data for three types of EPA (i) (ii) and (iii). Among 73 FR and RF orientations

of DNA motifs of TF found in both monocytes and T cells, 31 (42%) were biased

orientation of DNA motifs in the analysis of HiChIP data, which was significantly

higher ratio than all 376 biased orientation of DNA motifs in T cell, and included CTCF,

RAD21 and SMC3 (p-value < 0.015, binomial test, two-sided, 95% confidence interval)

(Supplemental Table S5 and Table 5). However, this may not imply that all 376 biased

orientation of DNA motifs included false-positive predictions, and may be due to the

limitation of resolution of the HiChIP data (5kb) or the small number of DNA binding

sites of a TF in genome sequences. Then, among 113 FR and RF orientations of DNA

motifs of TF found in both monocytes and T cells without considering the difference of

orientation (FR or RF) of DNA binding motifs, 42 (37%) were biased orientation of

DNA motifs in the analysis of HiChIP data, which was not significantly higher ratio.

This implied that the difference of orientation of DNA motifs was important to predict

EPI in comparison with HiChIP data.

Though the ratios of EPI overlapped with chromatin interactions were increased

by using many chromatin interaction data including lower score and count of chromatin

interactions (a cutoff score of CHiCAGO tool > 1 for Hi-C and more than 1,000 counts

for HiChIP), the ratios of EPI overlapped with chromatin interactions showed the same

tendency among the three types of EPAs. The ratio of EPI overlapped with Hi-C

chromatin interactions was increased using H3K27ac marks in both monocytes and T

cells. The ratio of EPI overlapped with HiChIP chromatin interactions was also

increased using H3K27ac marks. Chromatin interaction data were obtained from

different samples from DNase-seq, open chromatin regions in CD4$^+$ T cells, so

individual differences seemed to be large from the results of this analysis, and

(Mumbach et al. 2017) suggested that individual differences of chromatin interactions

were larger than those of open chromatin regions. ATAC-seq data, open chromatin

regions were available in CD4$^+$ T cells in the paper, however, when using ATAC-seq

data, the result of the analysis of biased orientation of DNA motif sequences was

different from DNase-seq data, and not included a part of CTCF and cohesin. Thus,

DNase-seq data collected from ENCODE and Blueprint projects were employed in this

study.

Discussion

To find DNA motif sequences of transcription factors (TF) and repeat DNA

sequences affecting the expression level of human putative transcriptional target genes,

the DNA motif sequences were searched from open chromatin regions of monocytes of

four people. Total 369 biased [232 forward-reverse (FR) and 178 reverse-forward (RF)]

orientation of DNA motif sequences of TF were found in monocytes of four people in

common, whereas only seven any orientation (i.e. without considering orientation) of

DNA motif sequence of TF was found to affect the expression level of putative

transcriptional target genes, suggesting that enhancer-promoter association (EPA)

shortened at the genomic locations of FR or RF orientation of the DNA motif sequence

of a TF or a repeat DNA sequence is an important character for the prediction of

enhancer-promoter interactions (EPI) and the transcriptional regulation of genes.

When DNA motif sequences were searched from monocytes of one person, a

larger number of biased orientation of DNA motif sequences affecting the expression

level of human putative transcriptional target genes were found. When the number of

donors, from which experimental data were obtained, was increased, the number of

DNA motif sequences found in all people in common decreased and in some cases,

known transcription factors involved in chromatin interactions such as CTCF and

cohesin (RAD21 and SMC3) were not identified by statistical tests. This would be

caused by individual difference of the same cell type, low quality of experimental data,

and experimental errors. Moreover, though FR orientation of DNA binding motif

sequences of CTCF and cohesin is frequently observed at chromatin interaction anchors,

the percentage of FR orientation is not 100, and other orientations of the DNA binding

motif sequences are also observed. Though DNA binding motif sequences of CTCF and

cohesin are found in various open chromatin regions, DNA binding motif sequences of

some TF would be observed less frequently in open chromatin regions. The analyses of

experimental data of a number of people would avoid missing relatively weak statistical

significance of DNA motif sequences of TF in experimental data of each person by

multiple testing correction of thousands of statistical tests. A DNA motif sequence was

found with *p*-value < 0.05 in experimental data of one person and the DNA motif

sequence found in the same cell type of four people in common would have *p*-value <

$0.05^4 = 6.25 \times 10^{-6}$. Actually, DNA motif sequences with *p*-value slightly less than

0.05 in monocytes of one person were observed in monocytes of four people in

common.

EPI were compared with chromatin interactions (Hi-C) in monocytes. EPAs

shortened at the genomic locations of DNA binding motif sequences of CTCF and

cohesin (RAD21 and SMC3) showed a significant difference of the ratios of EPI

overlapped with chromatin interactions, according to three types of EPAs (see Methods).

Using open chromatin regions overlapped with ChIP-seq experimental data of histone

modification of an enhancer mark (H3K27ac), the ratio of EPI not overlapped with

Hi-C was reduced. (Phanstiel et al. 2017) also reported that there was an especially

strong enrichment for loops with H3K27 acetylation peaks at both ends (Fisher's Exact

Test, $p = 1.4 \times 10^{-27}$). However, the total number of EPI overlapped with chromatin

interactions was also reduced using H3K27ac peaks, so more chromatin interaction data

would be needed to obtain reliable results in this analysis. As an issue of experimental

data, data for chromatin interactions and open chromatin regions were came from

different samples and donors, so individual differences would exist in the data.

Moreover, the resolution of chromatin interaction data used in monocytes was about

50kb, thus the number of chromatin interactions was relatively small (72,284 at 50kb

resolution with a cutoff score of CHiCAGO tool > 1 and 16,501 with a cutoff score of

CHiCAGO tool > 5). EPI predicted based on EPA shortened at the genomic locations of

DNA binding motif sequence of TF that were found in various open chromatin regions

such as CTCF and cohesin (RAD21 and SMC3) tended to be overlapped with a larger

number of chromatin interactions than TF less frequently observed in open chromatin

regions. Therefore, to examine the difference of the numbers of EPI overlapped with

chromatin interactions, according to the three types of EPAs, the number of chromatin

interactions should be large enough.

As HiChIP chromatin interaction data were available in CD4$^+$ T cells, biased

orientation of DNA motif sequences of TF were examined in T cells using DNase-seq

data of four people. The resolutions of chromatin interactions and EPI were adjusted to

5kb by fragmentation of genome sequences. In monocytes, the resolution of Hi-C

chromatin interaction data was converted by extending anchor regions of chromatin

interactions to 50kb length and merging the chromatin interactions overlapped with

each other. Fragmentation of genome sequences may affect the classification of

chromatin interactions of which anchors are located near the border of a fragment, but

the number of chromatin interactions would not be decreased, compared with merging

chromatin interactions. The number of HiChIP chromatin interactions was 19,926,360

at 5kb resolution, 666,149 at 5kb resolution with chromatin interactions (more than

1,000 counts for each interaction), and 78,209 at 5kb resolution with chromatin

interactions (more than 6,000 counts for each interaction). As expected, the number of

EPI overlapped with chromatin interactions was increased, and 36 − 95% of biased

orientation of DNA motif sequences of TF showed a statistical significance in EPI

predicted based on EPA shortened at the genomic locations of the DNA motif sequence,

compared with the other types of EPAs or EPA not shortened. False positive predictions

of EPI would be decreased by using H3K27ac marks and other features. The ratio of

EPI overlapped with Hi-C chromatin interactions was increased using H3K27ac marks

in both monocytes and T cells. The ratio of EPI overlapped with HiChIP chromatin

interactions was also increased using H3K27ac marks. However, the number of biased

orientation of DNA motif sequences showing a higher ratio of EPI overlapped with

HiChIP chromatin interactions than the other types of EPAs was decreased using

H3K27ac marks (Supplemental material 2).

When forming a homodimer or heterodimer with another TF, TF may bind to

genome DNA with a specific orientation of their DNA binding sequences (Fig. 4). From

the analysis of biased orientation of DNA motif sequences of TF, TF forming

heterodimer would also be found. If the DNA binding motif sequence of only the mate

to a pair of TF was found in EPA, EPA was shortened at one side, which is the genomic

location of the DNA binding motif sequence of the mate to the pair, and transcriptional

target genes were predicted using the EPA shortened at the side. In this analysis, the

mate to both heterodimer and homodimer of TF can be used to examine the effect on

the expression level of transcriptional target genes predicted based on the EPA

shortened at one side. For heterodimer, biased orientation of DNA motif sequences may

also be found in forward-forward or reverse-reverse orientation.

Some DNA binding sites of TF predicted using DNA binding motif sequences of

TF were changed according to the parameters of FIMO tool, particularly background

frequencies of ATGC nucleotides in genome sequences and p-value threshold. Repeat

DNA sequences also affected the result of the prediction. Without repeat masking, the

number of any orientation of DNA motifs of TF was increased. However, the p-value of

the DNA motifs was relatively high and close to the threshold, so these DNA motifs

seemed to be false positives. To decrease false-positive and false-negative predictions

of DNA binding sites of TF, improve the prediction of biased orientation of DNA

motifs, and obtain a robust result of the analysis, there may be a room to explore more

suitable parameters and methods, such as stricter p-value threshold, using genomic

regions conserved among species, masking some exons encoding mRNA, removing

DNA motifs highly affected by parameter changes (low information content), changing

the parameter of nucleotide frequencies according to genomic regions, considering

epigenetic modifications (DNA methylation and histone) and so on. For the analysis of

EPI, instead of using all DNA motif sequences of TF in databases, selecting DNA motif

sequences of TF indicating enhancer activity in a cell type using my method would

reduce the effect of TF not acting as enhancer (Osato 2018).

It has been reported that CTCF and cohesin-binding sites are frequently mutated

in cancer (Katainen et al. 2015). Some biased orientation of DNA motif sequences

would be associated with chromatin interactions and might be associated with diseases

including cancer.

The analyses in this study revealed novel characters of DNA binding motif

sequences of TF and repeat DNA sequences to analyze TF involved in chromatin

interactions, insulator function and forming a homodimer, heterodimer or complex with

other TF, affecting the transcriptional regulation of genes.

Methods

Search for biased orientation of DNA motif sequences

To examine transcriptional regulatory target genes of transcription factors (TF),

bed files of hg38 of Blueprint DNase-seq data for CD14$^+$ monocytes of four donors

(EGAD00001002286; Donor ID: C0010K, C0011I, C001UY, C005PS) were obtained

from Blueprint project web site (http://dcc.blueprint-epigenome.eu/#/home), and the bed

files of hg38 were converted into those of hg19 using Batch Coordinate Conversion

(liftOver) web site (https://genome.ucsc.edu/util.html). Bed files of hg19 of ENCODE

H1-hESC (GSM816632; UCSC Accession: wgEncodeEH000556), iPSC (GSM816642;

UCSC Accession: wgEncodeEH001110), HUVEC (GSM1014528; UCSC Accession:

wgEncodeEH002460),   and   MCF-7   (GSM816627;   UCSC   Accession:

wgEncodeEH000579)   were   obtained   from   the   ENCODE   websites

(http://hgdownload.cse.ucsc.edu/goldenPath/hg19/encodeDCC/wgEncodeUwDgf/;

http://hgdownload.cse.ucsc.edu/goldenPath/hg19/encodeDCC/wgEncodeUwDnase/).

As high resolution of chromatin interaction data using HiChIP became available

in CD4$^+$ T cells, to promote the same analysis of CD14$^+$ monocytes in CD4$^+$ T cells,

DNase-seq data of four donors were obtained from a public database and Blueprint

projects web sites. DNase-seq data of only one donor was available in Blueprint project

for CD4$^+$ T cells (Donor ID: S008H1), and three other DNase-seq data were obtained

from NCBI Gene Expression Omnibus (GEO) database. Though the peak calling of

DNase-seq data available in GEO database was different from other DNase-seq data in

ENCODE and Blueprint projects where 150bp length of peaks were usually predicted

using HotSpot (John et al. 2011), FASTQ files of DNase-seq data were downloaded

from NCBI Sequence Read Archive (SRA) database (SRR097566, SRR097618, and

SRR171574). Read sequences of the FASTQ files were aligned to the hg19 version of

the human genome reference using BWA (Li and Durbin 2009), and the BAM files

generated by BWA were converted into SAM files, sorted, and indexed using Samtools

(Li et al. 2009). Peaks of the DNase-seq data were predicted using HotSpot-4.1.1.

To identify transcription factor binding sites (TFBS) from the DNase-seq data,

TRANSFAC (2019.1), JASPAR (2018), UniPROBE (2018), BEEML-PBM,

high-throughput SELEX, Human Protein-DNA Interactome, transcription factor

binding sequences of ENCODE ChIP-seq data, and HOCOMOCO version 9 and 11

were used to predict insulator sites (Wingender et al. 1996; Newburger and Bulyk 2009;

Portales-Casamar et al. 2010; Xie et al. 2010; Zhao and Stormo 2011; Jolma et al. 2013;

Kheradpour and Kellis 2014) (Kulakovskiy et al. 2018). TRANSFAC (2011.1),

JASPAR (2012), UniPROBE (2012), BEEML-PBM, high-throughput SELEX, and

Human Protein-DNA Interactome were used to analyze enhancer-promoter interactions,

since these data were sufficient to identify biased orientation of DNA motif sequences

of TF with less computational time, reducing the number of any orientation of DNA

motif sequences of TF. Position weight matrices of transcription factor binding

sequences were transformed into TRANSFAC matrices and then into MEME matrices

using in-house scripts and transfac2meme in MEME suite (Bailey et al. 2009).

Transcription factor binding sequences of TF derived from vertebrates were used for

further analyses. Transcription factor binding sequences were searched from each

narrow peak of DNase-seq data in repeat-masked hg19 genome sequences using FIMO

with p-value threshold of 10^{-5} and background frequencies of ATGC nucleotides in

repeat-masked hg19 genome sequences (Grant et al. 2011). Repeat-masked hg19

genome　sequences　were　downloaded　from　UCSC　genome　browser

(http://genome.ucsc.edu/,

http://hgdownload.soe.ucsc.edu/goldenPath/hg19/bigZips/hg19.fa.masked.gz).　　　TF

corresponding to transcription factor binding sequences were searched computationally

by comparing their names and gene symbols of HGNC (HUGO Gene Nomenclature

Committee) -approved gene nomenclature and 31,848 UCSC known canonical

transcripts

(http://hgdownload.soe.ucsc.edu/goldenPath/hg19/database/knownCanonical.txt.gz),　as

transcription factor binding sequences were not linked to transcript IDs such as UCSC,

RefSeq, and Ensembl transcripts.

Target genes of a TF were assigned when its TFBS was found in DNase-seq

narrow peaks in promoter or extended regions for enhancer-promoter association of

genes (EPA). Promoter and extended regions were defined as follows: promoter regions

were those that were within distance of ±5 kb from transcriptional start sites (TSS).

Promoter and extended regions were defined as per the following association rule,

which is the same as that defined in Figure 3A of a previous study (McLean et al.

2010): the single nearest gene association rule, which extends the regulatory domain to

the midpoint between the TSS of the gene and that of the nearest gene upstream and

downstream without the limitation of extension length. Extended regions for EPA were

shortened at the genomic locations of DNA binding sites of a TF that was the closest to

a transcriptional start site, and transcriptional target genes were predicted from the

shortened enhancer regions using TFBS. Furthermore, promoter and extended regions

for EPA were shortened at the genomic locations of forward–reverse (FR) orientation of

DNA binding sites of a TF. When forward or reverse orientation of DNA binding sites

were continuously located in genome sequences several times, the most external

forward–reverse orientation of DNA binding sites were selected. The genomic positions

of genes were identified using 'knownGene.txt.gz' file in UCSC bioinformatics sites

(Karolchik et al. 2014). The file 'knownCanonical.txt.gz' was also utilized for choosing

representative transcripts among various alternate forms for assigning promoter and

extended regions for EPA. From the list of transcription factor binding sequences and

transcriptional target genes, redundant transcription factor binding sequences were

removed by comparing the target genes of a transcription factor binding sequence and

its corresponding TF; if identical, one of the transcription factor binding sequences was

used. When the number of transcriptional target genes predicted from a transcription

factor binding sequence was less than five, the transcription factor binding sequence

was omitted.

Repeat DNA sequences were searched from the hg19 version of the human

reference genome using RepeatMasker (Smit, AFA & Green, P RepeatMasker at

http://www.repeatmasker.org) and RepBase RepeatMasker Edition

(http://www.girinst.org).

For gene expression data, RNA-seq reads mapped onto human hg19 genome

sequences were obtained, including ENCODE long RNA-seq reads with poly-A of

H1-hESC, iPSC, HUVEC, and MCF-7 (GSM26284, GSM958733, GSM2344099,

GSM2344100, GSM958734, and GSM765388), and UCSF-UBC human reference

epigenome mapping project RNA-seq reads with poly-A of naive $CD4^+$ T cells

(GSM669617). Two replicates were present for H1-hESC, iPSC, HUVEC, and MCF-7,

and a single one for $CD4^+$ T cells. FPKMs of the RNA-seq data were calculated using

RSeQC (Wang et al. 2012). For monocytes, Blueprint RNA-seq FPKM data

('C0010KB1.transcript_quantification.rsem_grape2_crg.GRCh38.20150622.results',

'C0011IB1.transcript_quantification.rsem_grape2_crg.GRCh38.20150622.results',

'C001UYB4.transcript_quantification.rsem_grape2_crg.GRCh38.20150622.results',

and 'C005PS12.transcript_quantification.rsem_grape2_crg.GRCh38.20150622.results')

were downloaded from Blueprint DCC portal

(http://dcc.blueprint-epigenome.eu/#/files). Based on FPKM, UCSC transcripts with top

50% expression level of all the transcripts excluding transcripts not expressed were

selected in each cell type.

The expression level of transcriptional target genes predicted based on EPA

shortened at the genomic locations of DNA motif sequence of a TF or a repeat DNA

sequence was compared with the expression level of transcriptional target genes

predicted from promoter. For each DNA motif sequence shortening EPA,

transcriptional target genes were predicted using about 3,000 − 5,000 DNA binding

motif sequences of TF, and the distribution of expression level of putative

transcriptional target genes of each TF was compared between EPA and only promoter

using Mann-Whitney test, two-sided (p-value < 0.05). The number of TF showing a

significant difference of expression level of putative transcriptional target genes

between EPA and promoter was compared among forward-reverse (FR),

reverse-forward (RF), and any orientation (i.e. without considering orientation) of a

DNA motif sequence shortening EPA using chi-square test (p-value < 0.05). When a

DNA motif sequence of a TF or a repeat DNA sequence shortening EPA showed a

significant difference of expression level of putative transcriptional target genes among

FR, RF, or any orientation in monocytes of four people in common, the DNA motif

sequence was listed.

Though forward-reverse orientation of DNA binding motif sequences of CTCF

and cohesin are frequently observed at chromatin interaction anchors, the percentage of

forward-reverse orientation is not 100, and other orientations of the DNA binding motif

sequences are also observed. Though DNA binding motif sequences of CTCF and

cohesin are found in various open chromatin regions, DNA binding motif sequences of

some transcription factors would be observed less frequently in open chromatin regions.

The analyses of experimental data of a number of people would avoid missing relatively

weak statistical significance of DNA motif sequences in experimental data of each

person by multiple testing correction of thousands of statistical tests. A DNA motif

sequence was found with p-value < 0.05 in experimental data of one person and the

DNA motif sequence found in the same cell type of four people in common would have

p-value < 0.05^4 = 6.25×10^{-6}.

Co-location of biased orientation of DNA motif sequences

Co-location of biased orientation of DNA binding motif sequences of TF was examined. The number of open chromatin regions with the same pair of DNA binding motif sequences was counted, and when the pair of DNA binding motif sequences were enriched with statistical significance (chi-square test, p-value $< 1.0 \times 10^{-10}$), they were listed. For histone modification of an enhancer mark (H3K27ac), bed files of hg38 of Blueprint ChIP-seq data for CD14^{+} monocytes (EGAD00001001179) and CD4^{+} T cells (Donor ID: S000RD) were obtained from Blueprint web site (http://dcc.blueprint-epigenome.eu/#/home), and the bed files of hg38 were converted into those of hg19 using Batch Coordinate Conversion (liftOver) web site (https://genome.ucsc.edu/util.html). Networks of co-locations of biased orientation of DNA motif sequences were plotted using Cytoscape v3.71 with yFiles Layout Algorithms for Cytoscape (Shannon et al. 2003).

Comparison with chromatin interaction data

For comparison of EPA in monocytes with chromatin interactions, 'PCHiC_peak_matrix_cutoff0.txt.gz' file was downloaded from 'Promoter Capture Hi-C in 17 human primary blood cell types' web site (https://osf.io/u8tzp/files/), and chromatin interactions for Monocytes with scores of CHiCAGO tool > 1 and CHiCAGO tool > 5 were extracted from the file (Javierre et al. 2016). In the same way as monocytes, Hi-C chromatin interaction data of CD4^{+} T cells (Naive CD4^{+} T cells,

nCD4) were obtained.

Enhancer-promoter interactions (EPI) were predicted using three types of EPAs

in monocytes: (i) EPA shortened at the genomic locations of FR or RF orientation of

DNA motif sequence of a TF, (ii) EPA shortened at the genomic locations of any

orientation (i.e. without considering orientation) of DNA motif sequence of a TF, and

(iii) EPA without being shortened by a DNA motif sequence. EPI predicted using the

three types of EPAs in common were removed. First, EPI predicted based on EPA (i)

were compared with chromatin interactions (Hi-C). The resolution of chromatin

interaction data used in this study was 50kb, so EPI were adjusted to 50kb before their

comparison. The number and ratio of EPI overlapped with chromatin interactions were

counted. Second, EPI were predicted based on EPA (ii), and EPI predicted based on

EPA (i) were removed from the EPI. The number and ratio of EPI overlapped with

chromatin interactions were counted. Third, EPI were predicted based on EPA (iii), and

EPI predicted based on EPA (i) and (ii) were removed from the EPI. The number and

ratio of EPI overlapped with chromatin interactions were counted. The number and ratio

of the EPI were compared two times between EPA (i) and (iii), and EPA (i) and (ii)

(binomial distribution, p-value < 0.025 for each test, two-sided, 95% confidence

interval).

For comparison of EPA with chromatin interactions (HiChIP) in CD4^{+} T cells,

'GSM2705049_Naive_HiChIP_H3K27ac_B2T1_allValidPairs.txt',

'GSM2705050_Naive_HiChIP_H3K27ac_B2T2_allValidPairs.txt',   and

'GSM2705051_Naive_HiChIP_H3K27ac_B3T1_allValidPairs.txt'   files   were

downloaded from Gene Expression Omnibus (GEO) database (GSM2705049,

GSM2705050 and GSM2705051). The resolutions of chromatin interaction data and

EPI were adjusted to 5kb before their comparison. Chromatin interactions with more

than 6,000 and 1,000 counts for each interaction were used in this study.

Putative target genes for the analysis of EPI were selected from top 50%

expression level of all transcripts excluding transcripts not expressed in monocytes and

top 60% expression level of transcripts in $CD4^+$ T cells. The expression level of putative

target genes of EPI overlapped with HiChIP chromatin interactions was compared with

EPI not overlapped with them. For each FR or RF orientation of DNA motif, EPI were

predicted based on EPA and the overlap of EPI with chromatin interactions was

examined. When a putative transcriptional target gene of a TF in an enhancer was found

in both EPI overlapped with a chromatin interaction and EPI not overlapped with, the

target gene was removed. The distribution of expression level of putative target genes

was compared using Mann-Whitney test, two-sided (p-value < 0.05).

Acknowledgements

The supercomputing resource was provided by Human Genome Center of the Institute

of Medical Science at the University of Tokyo. Computations were partially performed

on the NIG supercomputer at ROIS National Institute of Genetics. Publication charges

for this article were funded by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number 16K00387. This

research was partially supported by the Platform Project for Supporting in Drug

Discovery and Life Science Research（Platform for Dynamic Approaches to Living

System） from Japan Agency for Medical Research and Development (AMED). This

research was partially supported by Development of Fundamental Technologies for

Diagnosis and Therapy Based upon Epigenome Analysis from Japan Agency for

Medical Research and Development (AMED). This work was partially supported by

JST CREST Grant Number JPMJCR15G1, Japan.

Figures

Figure 1. Chromatin interactions and enhancer-promoter association. (A) Forward–

reverse orientation of CTCF-binding sites are frequently found in chromatin interaction

anchors. CTCF can block the interaction between enhancers and promoters limiting the

activity of enhancers to certain functional domains (de Wit et al. 2015; Guo et al. 2015).

(B) Computationally-defined regulatory domains for enhancer-promoter association

(McLean et al. 2010). The *single nearest gene* association rule extends the regulatory

domain to the midpoint between this gene's TSS and the nearest gene's TSS both

upstream and downstream. Enhancer-promoter association was shortened at the

genomic locations of forward-reverse orientation of DNA binding motif sequence of a

transcription factor (e.g. CTCF in the figure).

Figure 2. Biased orientation of DNA motif sequences of transcription factors affecting

the transcription of genes. (A) Comparison of expression level of putative

transcriptional target genes. The median expression levels of target genes of the same

transcription factor binding sequences were compared between promoters and

enhancer-promoter association (EPA) shortened at the genomic locations of

forward-reverse orientation of DNA motif sequence of CTCF and cohesin (RAD21 and

SMC3) respectively in monocytes. Red and blue dots show statistically significant

difference (Mann-Whitney test) of the distribution of expression levels of target genes

between promoters and the EPA. Red dots show the median expression level of target

genes was higher based on the EPA than promoters, and blue dots show the median

expression level of target genes was lower based on the EPA than promoters. The

expression level of target genes predicted based on the EPA tended to be higher than

promoters, implying that transcription factors acted as activators of target genes. (B)

Biased orientation of DNA motif sequences of transcription factors in monocytes. Total

369 of biased orientation of DNA binding motif sequences of transcription factors were

found to affect the expression level of putative transcriptional target genes in monocytes

of four people in common, whereas only one any orientation (i.e. without considering

orientation) of DNA binding motif sequence was found to affect the expression level.

Figure 3. Comparison of enhancer-promoter interactions (EPI) with chromatin

interactions in T cells. EPI were predicted based on enhancer-promoter association

(EPA) shortened at the genomic locations of biased orientation of DNA binding motif

sequence of a transcription factor. Total 136 biased orientation (70 FR and 73 RF) of

DNA motif sequences including CTCF and cohesin showed a significantly higher ratio

of EPI overlapped with three replications of HiChIP chromatin interactions respectively

than the other types of EPAs in T cells. The upper part of the figure is a comparison of

EPI with HiChIP chromatin interactions with more than 6,000 counts for each

interaction, and the lower part of the figure is a comparison of EPI with HiChIP

chromatin interactions with more than 1,000 counts for each interaction. FR:

forward-reverse orientation of DNA motif. any: any orientation (i.e. without considering

orientation) of DNA motif. others: enhancer-promoter association not shortened at the

genomic locations of DNA motif. FR H3K27ac: EPI were predicted using DNA motif

in open chromatin regions overlapped with H3K27ac histone modification marks. *

p-value < 10^{-9}.

Figure 4. Schematic representation of chromatin interactions involving gene promoters.

ZNF143 contributes the formation of chromatin interactions by directly binding the

promoter of genes establishing looping with distal element bound by CTCF (Bailey et al.

2015).

Tables

Table 1. Top 90 biased orientation of DNA binding motif sequences of transcription

factors in monocytes. TF: DNA binding motif sequences of transcription factors. Score:

$-\log_{10}$ (*p*-value).

Forward-reverse orientation

TF	Score	TF	Score	TF	Score
SRF	74.05	EVI1	37.37	PAX5	28.42
YY1	71.30	ELK1:PAX1	36.54	RUNX2	27.95
ZNF658	70.76	RFX2	36.34	AP1	27.62
IRF7	65.05	SP2	36.15	ZNF836	27.60
PHYPADRAFT	63.98	ELF2	35.92	IRF	27.56
ESE3	60.18	NFIC	34.36	NR2F2	27.44
GCM1:CEBPB	58.35	HSF2	34.27	NR2C2	27.02
STAT1	55.66	KLF14	33.83	IKZF1	26.87
STA5A	54.84	ZF5	33.79	ESR2	26.64
RAD21	54.11	FXR	33.36	HIC1	26.58
TFE2	53.78	EPAS1	33.08	RREB1	26.56
ZNF623	53.59	USF	33.07	TCF12	26.29
ZNF317	52.78	ZNF646	32.47	FOS:JUN	26.07
ZNF93	52.13	ERR1	32.30	CMYB	25.86
CTCFL	50.49	NEUROD1	32.08	NKX61	25.41
HMBOX1	49.33	E2F8	31.95	TFAP2A	25.40
CTCF	47.24	ZNF660	31.55	NR4A3	25.37
ZKSC3	46.61	ZN219	31.45	ZNF709	25.15
STAT4	45.64	TCFAP2C	31.08	GTF3C2	25.04
E2F	45.63	MYB	30.93	SMAD5	24.40
SMAD2:SMAD3:SMAD4	43.91	HOXD12:ELK1	30.47	WT1	24.19
ABR1	43.81	THAP1	30.20	HIC2	24.16
P53	40.09	GATA1	30.17	ZNF695	24.07
BPTF	39.06	STAT3	29.85	ZSC31	23.98
RFX5	38.00	MXI1	29.73	GLIS1	23.79
HME1	37.88	SOX10	29.57	TCF3	23.55
NR1I2	37.70	HAT5	29.56	ZNF284	23.53
KLF1	37.61	PURA	29.03	PGAM2	23.44
AT4G28140	37.47	SMC3	28.59	ZFP82	23.35
ZKSCAN1	37.45	NFYB	28.50	ZNF214	23.32

784 Reverse-forward orientation

TF	Score	TF	Score	TF	Score
HNF1B	77.23	FOXI1	37.39	MSX2	26.00
STAT4	73.89	RARA	36.47	HOXC8	25.97
ZNF28	71.72	ZNF195	35.51	RXRA	25.45
TF7L1	67.52	ZNF449	34.50	MYOG	25.21
ZNF225	61.87	DOBOX5	34.48	SMAD4	25.15
CTCF	53.54	LEF1	33.87	PO3F2	24.99
STAT3	53.06	CETS2	33.69	IRF4	24.96
STAT5A	52.61	E2F3	33.22	ZNF233	24.53
PAX5	52.10	NKX3	33.07	RFX3	24.45
SRF	51.83	RBPJ	32.95	LDSPOLYA	23.76
ZNF670	50.69	SP1	32.79	ZNF682	23.56
ETV7	50.48	ZNF524	32.31	RXRB	23.34
TEL1	49.47	CDX2	32.10	EVI1	23.14
BCL6	49.19	TFAP4:ETV1	31.94	ETS2	22.98
ETV6	48.78	SOX2	30.80	OBOX2	22.95
NFY	47.73	SOX9	30.72	ZNF770	22.85
ZNF286B	46.85	PRDM1	30.66	ERG	22.75
ZFP82	46.84	CD59	29.85	TCF3	22.67
ZNF343	45.78	SOX11	29.34	IRF1	22.44
ZNF681	45.36	ZN320	28.86	TAACC	22.31
STAT5B	44.72	MYC	28.58	ZNF687	22.26
KLF16	44.33	ZNF316	28.34	IRF3	22.13
HNF4A	42.24	NR2F1	28.34	NRSE	21.97
P73	41.49	ZNF121	28.26	P53	21.92
EOMES	40.45	HOXB2:NHLH1	28.18	TCFAP2B	21.78
WT1	40.11	E2F2	27.94	AHR	21.40
BCL3	39.66	BDP1	27.63	ZFP641	20.09
SP8	38.96	HSF1	27.03	NRF3	19.94
TEAD1	38.73	ZBTB2	26.79	ZNF76	19.81
E2F4	37.67	SPI1	26.15	BRF2	19.77

787   **Table 2.** Top 30 forward-reverse orientation of DNA binding motif sequences of

788   transcription factors in HUVEC and MCF-7 cells. TF: DNA binding motif sequences of

789   transcription factors. Score: $-\log_{10}$ (*p*-value).

790   HUVEC   MCF-7

TF	Score	TF	Score
PAX5	19.30	E2F6	57.73
TBX5	14.60	EGR1	48.41
NANOG	12.98	ABR1	34.79
BATF	11.52	CACBINDINGPROTEIN	28.34
HNF1A	10.94	KLF16	28.16
THAP1	10.45	RREB1	25.42
NR2C2	9.67	PO4F1	24.64
SULT1A2	9.67	ZN219	23.13
CTCF	9.50	SP1	22.41
RAD21	9.01	SP2	21.88
COT2	6.84	KLF15	21.33
MYB	6.18	ZNF521	21.05
EKLF	6.17	CTCF	20.02
PIF7	5.95	ESE3	19.92
ZNF695	5.90	ZNF143	17.47
SMAD5	5.70	FOXP1	16.99
TCFAP2A	5.52	GTF2I	16.32
YY1	5.50	ERF9	15.59
YBX1	5.37	TF3A	15.51
CMYB	5.26	TCF3	14.03
HME1	5.07	HIC2	13.94
TCF12	5.06	GKLF	13.80
TFAP2A	4.83	CXXC1	13.75
HNF4A	4.36	SMC3	12.91
SMC3	4.20	CTCFL	12.67
RXRA:VDR	3.64	RAD21	12.00
P53	3.60	STA5B	11.94
STA5A	3.40	STAT1	11.78
STAT4	3.36	KLF12	11.57
ZNF71	2.93	SP4	11.20

791
792

793   **Table 3.** Biased orientation of repeat DNA sequences in monocytes. Score: $-\log_{10}$

794   (*p*-value).

Forward-reverse (FR) orientation (using H3K27ac histone modification marks)

Repeat DNA seq.	Score
MLT1F1	6.75

Reverse-forward (RF) orientation

Repeat DNA seq.	Score
LTR16C	69.39
L1ME4b	23.90
AluSg	23.61

Table 4. Top 30 of co-locations of biased orientation of DNA binding motif sequences
of transcription factors in monocytes. Co-locations of DNA motif sequence of CTCF
with another biased orientation of DNA motif sequence were shown in a separate table.
Motif 1,2: DNA binding motif sequences of transcription factors. # both: the number of
open chromatin regions including both Motif 1 and Motif 2. # motif 1: the number of
open chromatin regions including Motif 1. # motif 2: the number of open chromatin
regions including Motif 2. # others: the number of open chromatin regions not including
Motif 1 and Motif 2. Open chromatin regions overlapped with histone modification
marks (H3K27ac) were used (Total 26,095 regions).

Motif 1	Motif 2	# both	# motif 1	# motif 2	# others	p-value		Motif 1	Motif 2	# both	# motif 1	# motif 2	# others	p-value
MAZ	RREB1	7506	809	1770	16010	0		CTCF	MAZ	3371	671	5905	16148	0
KLF5	MAZ	7181	1151	2095	15668	0		CTCF	KLF5	3344	698	4988	17065	0
KLF13	MAZ	7128	881	2148	15938	0		CTCF	RREB1	3126	741	5189	17039	0
MAZ	ZN148	7079	1027	2197	15792	0		CTCF	RAD21	2456	1586	166	21887	0
MAZ	PATZ1	6931	1088	2345	15731	0		CTCF	CTCFL	1519	137	1078	23361	0
CDA7L	MAZ	6837	1050	2439	15769	0		CTCF	RXRA	1459	336	1641	22659	0
KLF13	RREB1	6802	1513	1207	16573	0		CTCF	SMC3	1036	170	1561	23328	0
MAZ	SP1	6698	811	2578	16008	0		CTCFL	MAZ	2462	469	6814	16350	0
CDA7L	KLF5	6668	1219	1664	16544	0		CTCFL	KLF5	2351	5981	580	17183	0
KLF5	ZN148	6644	1688	1462	16301	0		CTCFL	RAD21	1371	285	433	24006	0
KLF11	MAZ	6548	802	2728	16017	0		CDA7L	CTCF	3238	4649	804	17404	0
PATZ1	RREB1	6538	1777	1481	16299	0								
RREB1	ZN148	6521	1794	1585	16195	0								
KLF11	KLF5	6446	904	1886	16859	0								
MAZ	WT1	6444	1005	2832	15814	0								
KLF5	SP1	6337	1995	1172	16591	0								
CDA7L	ZN148	6313	1574	1793	16415	0								
MAZ	SMAD2	6297	1168	2979	15651	0								
SP1	ZN148	6292	1217	1814	16772	0								
KLF5	SMAD2	6281	2051	1184	16579	0								
CDA7L	KLF11	6232	1655	1118	17090	0								
RREB1	SP1	6219	2096	1290	16490	0								
WT1	ZN148	6205	1901	1244	16745	0								
PATZ1	WT1	6145	1874	1304	16772	0								
RREB1	WT1	6103	2212	1346	16434	0								
KLF13	SP1	6084	1425	1925	16661	0								
CDA7L	SP1	6051	1836	1458	16750	0								
CDA7L	SMAD2	6034	1853	1431	16777	0								
KLF11	RREB1	6034	1316	2231	16514	0								
KLF11	ZN148	6030	1320	2076	16669	0								

Table 5. Comparison of enhancer-promoter interactions (EPI) with chromatin

interactions in T cells. The upper tables show the number of biased orientation of DNA

motifs, where a significantly higher ratio of EPI, which were predicted based on

enhancer-promoter association (EPA) (iii), overlapped with HiChIP chromatin

interaction data than the other types of EPA (i) and (ii). The middle tables show the 70

FR and 73 RF orientations of DNA motifs found in common among B2T1, B2T2 and

B3T1 replications in the upper table. The lower table shows that among 43 biased

orientation of DNA motifs found in both monocytes and T cell, 31 were matched with

the analysis of HiChIP for three types of EPA. TF: DNA binding motif sequence of a

transcription factor. Score: $-\log_{10}$ (p-value). Inf: p-value = 0. Score 1: Comparison of

EPA shortened at the genomic locations of FR or RF orientation of DNA motif

sequence [EPA (iii)] with EPA not shortened [EPA (i)]. Score 2: Comparison of EPA

shortened at the genomic locations of FR or RF orientation of DNA motif sequence

[EPA (iii)] with EPA shortened at the genomic locations of any orientation of DNA

motif sequence [EPA (ii)].

1. Comparison of EPI with HiChIP data among three EPA (i), (ii) and (iii)

Replication of HiChIP data	Total no. (FR + RF) of DNA motifs	No. of FR DNA motifs	No. of RF DNA motifs
B2T1	165	86	90
B2T2	168	85	92
B3T1	189	96	105
DNA motifs found in common among replications			
B2T1 and B2T2	148	75	81
B2T1 and B3T1	148	48	81
B2T2 and B3T1	147	76	79
B2T1, B2T2 and B3T1	136	70	73

2. Comparison of EPI with HiChIP data between two EPA (i) and (iii)

Replication of HiChIP data	Total no. (FR + RF) of DNA motifs	No. of FR DNA motifs	No. of RF DNA motifs
B2T1	358	195	201
B2T2	360	196	203
B3T1	365	195	209
DNA motifs found in common among replications			
B2T1 and B2T2	357	195	200
B2T1 and B3T1	357	194	201
B2T2 and B3T1	358	194	203
B2T1, B2T2 and B3T1	356	194	200

Forward-reverse (FR) orientation

TF	Score 1	Score 2	TF	Score 1	Score 2
ABL1	120.20	4.48	NFAC2	102.90	10.64
AP2GAMMA	64.98	6.76	NFAC3	117.02	2.13
BATF	104.50	2.89	NFAC4	129.06	11.87
BC11A	114.77	4.72	NFAT5	169.03	10.79
CDC5L	46.20	12.32	P50:P50	147.45	6.59
CEBPG	113.24	8.73	PRDM6	243.21	13.67
CHOP	323.31	2.83	RAD21	98.81	10.93
CTCF	109.95	16.53	REL	100.28	8.06
CTCFL	89.06	16.88	RFX5	138.49	2.53
CXXC1	98.89	10.97	RREB	98.91	4.13
DEC1	105.31	6.77	RXRA	99.72	3.24
EGR1	129.00	12.41	SIN3A	39.49	6.17
EGR2	97.63	3.69	SMC3	78.49	20.74
EGR3	105.43	4.92	SMRC2	106.88	8.79
EKLF	98.41	10.61	SNF5	69.86	2.27
ELF5	114.76	3.90	SP5	58.99	5.59
ER71	246.20	2.48	SRP9	147.33	2.92
ERF:EOMES	323.31	15.05	STAF	201.83	9.43
ETV4	206.76	7.18	SUZ12	102.37	7.25
FOXA2	323.31	3.48	TAL1	109.90	13.57
FOXO3	323.31	3.71	TF65	118.80	4.02
GABPBETA	187.48	4.43	VEZF1	43.90	3.26
GATA5	176.92	1.89	YBOX1	91.34	4.41
GFI1	323.31	10.70	YBX1	165.05	4.58
GFI1B	252.86	12.43	ZBP89	82.45	6.26
HIC1	99.40	1.96	ZBRK1	323.31	4.03
HMGA2	322.83	7.48	ZBT16	157.35	20.95
INSM2	323.31	2.54	ZN263	63.43	8.19
JUN	184.60	16.41	ZNF227	323.31	3.42
JUNB	158.94	2.57	ZNF253	Inf	18.36
KLF1	188.04	1.92	ZNF331	120.46	2.13
LHX8	323.31	3.39	ZNF585A	179.25	8.49
MAF	136.76	6.56	ZNF681	Inf	35.47
MAFK	42.30	2.43	ZNF721	148.23	3.75
MYBB	253.52	8.74	ZNF846	Inf	11.20

Reverse-forward (RF) orientation

TF	Score 1	Score 2	TF	Score 1	Score 2
AML3	94.46	2.21	MZF1	100.14	3.15
AP1	71.45	6.80	NKX2-1	323.31	7.34
ARI5B	57.76	2.72	NKX2-4	Inf	5.82
CFOS	121.76	12.76	NKX2-5	323.31	4.23
CFOS:CJUN	194.70	21.29	P50	185.48	10.77
CHD2	76.76	2.22	P53	71.49	6.47
CREB3	166.87	18.45	P73	172.99	8.20
CREM	323.31	6.89	PKNX1	111.56	2.61
CTCF	74.93	18.84	POU2F1:ELK1	323.31	4.66
CTCFL	60.12	12.79	RELA	306.11	4.11
DBP	263.45	5.42	RP58	210.42	3.73
E2F1	122.59	4.07	RREB1	128.85	2.05
EFC	323.31	4.05	RXRB	57.75	2.29
EGR1	263.41	5.42	SALL4	100.01	13.24
EGR4	102.64	2.88	SIX6	96.78	11.15
ELF2	95.04	3.38	TCF3	220.95	6.37
ELF5	279.29	1.66	TCF4	64.91	2.34
EP300	82.68	3.97	TCFE2A	212.46	6.00
ETV2:PAX5	323.31	6.03	TF7L2	120.84	3.14
FOSB	146.18	14.44	XBP1	105.73	2.57
FOSL1	137.95	13.98	ZBTB4	323.31	5.23
FOXA	323.31	7.27	ZFP2	Inf	5.32
FOXA1	323.31	9.93	ZNF134	53.47	1.70
FOXO3A	323.31	6.53	ZNF16	243.81	3.54
GATA	209.11	8.22	ZNF260	98.46	2.69
GCM2:EOMES	56.33	4.61	ZNF28	323.31	4.61
GFI1	123.54	4.62	ZNF282	126.15	5.08
GFI1B	323.31	5.94	ZNF341	109.16	4.93
HSF1	44.39	3.11	ZNF468	105.25	2.85
HSF2	144.04	5.18	ZNF484	Inf	12.66
HXB1	323.31	3.91	ZNF542P	244.54	5.52
HXB6	323.31	5.57	ZNF580	78.41	2.95
IKZF1	65.38	6.13	ZNF625	Inf	6.14
JUN:FOSB	77.62	2.75	ZNF714	39.80	3.57
JUN:JUNB	126.45	3.73	ZNF721	111.46	4.37
LYL1	74.51	2.65	ZNF837	87.54	1.74
MTF1	303.27	1.86			

TF	Score 1	Score 2
BATF	104.50	2.89
CTCF	109.95	16.53
CTCFL	89.06	16.88
CXXC1	98.89	10.97
EGR1	129.00	12.41
EKLF	98.41	10.61
ELF5	114.76	3.90
EP300	82.68	3.97
ETV4	206.76	7.18
FOSL1	137.95	13.98
GFI1	323.31	10.70
HIC1	99.40	1.96
HSF1	44.39	3.11
HSF2	144.04	5.18
KLF1	188.04	1.92
MAFK	42.30	2.43
MYBB	253.52	8.74
P53	71.49	6.47
P73	172.99	8.20
RAD21	98.81	10.93
RFX5	138.49	2.53
RREB1	98.91	4.13
RXRA	99.72	3.24
RXRB	57.75	2.29
SMC3	78.49	20.74
TAL1	109.90	13.57
TCF3	220.95	6.37
TF65	118.80	4.02
YBX1	165.05	4.58
ZNF28	323.31	4.61
ZNF721	111.46	4.37

References

Bailey SD, Zhang X, Desai K, Aid M, Corradin O, Cowper-Sal Lari R, Akhtar-Zaidi B,
Scacheri PC, Haibe-Kains B, Lupien M. 2015. ZNF143 provides sequence
specificity to secure chromatin interactions at gene promoters. *Nat Commun* **2**:
6186.

Bailey TL, Boden M, Buske FA, Frith M, Grant CE, Clementi L, Ren J, Li WW, Noble
WS. 2009. MEME SUITE: tools for motif discovery and searching. *Nucleic*
acids research **37**: W202-208.

Barutcu AR, Lajoie BR, Fritz AJ, McCord RP, Nickerson JA, van Wijnen AJ, Lian JB,
Stein JL, Dekker J, Stein GS et al. 2016. SMARCA4 regulates gene expression
and higher-order chromatin structure in proliferating mammary epithelial cells.
Genome research **26**: 1188-1201.

Bejerano G, Lowe CB, Ahituv N, King B, Siepel A, Salama SR, Rubin EM, Kent WJ,
Haussler D. 2006. A distal enhancer and an ultraconserved exon are derived
from a novel retroposon. *Nature* **441**: 87-90.

Chen M, Manley JL. 2009. Mechanisms of alternative splicing regulation: insights from
molecular and genomics approaches. *Nat Rev Mol Cell Biol* **10**: 741-754.

Das D, Clark TA, Schweitzer A, Yamamoto M, Marr H, Arribere J, Minovitsky S,
Poliakov A, Dubchak I, Blume JE et al. 2007. A correlation with exon
expression approach to identify cis-regulatory elements for tissue-specific
alternative splicing. *Nucleic acids research* **35**: 4845-4857.

de Souza FS, Franchini LF, Rubinstein M. 2013. Exaptation of transposable elements
into novel cis-regulatory elements: is the evidence always strong? *Mol Biol Evol*
30: 1239-1251.

de Wit E, Vos ES, Holwerda SJ, Valdes-Quezada C, Verstegen MJ, Teunissen H,
Splinter E, Wijchers PJ, Krijger PH, de Laat W. 2015. CTCF Binding Polarity
Determines Chromatin Looping. *Molecular cell* **60**: 676-684.

Grant CE, Bailey TL, Noble WS. 2011. FIMO: scanning for occurrences of a given
motif. *Bioinformatics (Oxford, England)* **27**: 1017-1018.

Guo Y, Xu Q, Canzio D, Shou J, Li J, Gorkin DU, Jung I, Wu H, Zhai Y, Tang Y et al.
2015. CRISPR Inversion of CTCF Sites Alters Genome Topology and

Enhancer/Promoter Function. *Cell* **162**: 900-910.

Javierre BM, Burren OS, Wilder SP, Kreuzhuber R, Hill SM, Sewitz S, Cairns J,

Wingett SW, Varnai C, Thiecke MJ et al. 2016. Lineage-Specific Genome

Architecture Links Enhancers and Non-coding Disease Variants to Target Gene

Promoters. *Cell* **167**: 1369-1384 e1319.

Jeong M, Huang X, Zhang X, Su J, Shamim M, Bochkov I, Reyes J, Jung H, Heikamp

E, Presser Aiden A et al. 2017. A Cell Type-Specific Class of Chromatin Loops

Anchored at Large DNA Methylation Nadirs. *bioRxiv*.

Ji X, Dadon DB, Abraham BJ, Lee TI, Jaenisch R, Bradner JE, Young RA. 2015.

Chromatin proteomic profiling reveals novel proteins associated with

histone-marked genomic regions. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **112**: 3841-3846.

Jin C, Kato K, Chimura T, Yamasaki T, Nakade K, Murata T, Li H, Pan J, Zhao M, Sun

K et al. 2006. Regulation of histone acetylation and nucleosome assembly by

transcription factor JDP2. *Nat Struct Mol Biol* **13**: 331-338.

Jjingo D, Conley AB, Wang J, Marino-Ramirez L, Lunyak VV, Jordan IK. 2014.

Mammalian-wide interspersed repeat (MIR)-derived enhancers and the

regulation of human gene expression. *Mob DNA* **5**: 14.

John S, Sabo PJ, Thurman RE, Sung MH, Biddie SC, Johnson TA, Hager GL,

Stamatoyannopoulos JA. 2011. Chromatin accessibility pre-determines

glucocorticoid receptor binding patterns. *Nature genetics* **43**: 264-268.

Jolma A, Yan J, Whitington T, Toivonen J, Nitta KR, Rastas P, Morgunova E, Enge M,

Taipale M, Wei G et al. 2013. DNA-binding specificities of human transcription

factors. *Cell* **152**: 327-339.

Karolchik D, Barber GP, Casper J, Clawson H, Cline MS, Diekhans M, Dreszer TR,

Fujita PA, Guruvadoo L, Haeussler M et al. 2014. The UCSC Genome Browser

database: 2014 update. *Nucleic acids research* **42**: D764-770.

Katainen R, Dave K, Pitkanen E, Palin K, Kivioja T, Valimaki N, Gylfe AE,

Ristolainen H, Hanninen UA, Cajuso T et al. 2015. CTCF/cohesin-binding sites

are frequently mutated in cancer. *Nature genetics* **47**: 818-821.

Kheradpour P, Kellis M. 2014. Systematic discovery and characterization of regulatory

motifs in ENCODE TF binding experiments. *Nucleic acids research* **42**:

2976-2987.

Kulakovskiy IV, Vorontsov IE, Yevshin IS, Sharipov RN, Fedorova AD, Rumynskiy EI,

Medvedeva YA, Magana-Mora A, Bajic VB, Papatsenko DA et al. 2018.
HOCOMOCO: towards a complete collection of transcription factor binding
models for human and mouse via large-scale ChIP-Seq analysis. *Nucleic acids*
research **46**: D252-D259.

Li H, Durbin R. 2009. Fast and accurate short read alignment with Burrows-Wheeler
transform. *Bioinformatics (Oxford, England)* **25**: 1754-1760.

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

McLean CY, Bristor D, Hiller M, Clarke SL, Schaar BT, Lowe CB, Wenger AM,
Bejerano G. 2010. GREAT improves functional interpretation of cis-regulatory
regions. *Nature biotechnology* **28**: 495-501.

Mumbach MR, Satpathy AT, Boyle EA, Dai C, Gowen BG, Cho SW, Nguyen ML,
Rubin AJ, Granja JM, Kazane KR et al. 2017. Enhancer connectome in primary
human cells identifies target genes of disease-associated DNA elements. *Nature*
genetics **49**: 1602-1612.

Newburger DE, Bulyk ML. 2009. UniPROBE: an online database of protein binding
microarray data on protein-DNA interactions. *Nucleic acids research* **37**:
D77-82.

Osato N. 2018. Characteristics of functional enrichment and gene expression level of
human putative transcriptional target genes. *BMC Genomics* **19**: 957.

Phanstiel DH, Van Bortle K, Spacek D, Hess GT, Shamim MS, Machol I, Love MI,
Aiden EL, Bassik MC, Snyder MP. 2017. Static and Dynamic DNA Loops form
AP-1-Bound Activation Hubs during Macrophage Development. *Molecular cell*
67: 1037-1048.e1036.

Portales-Casamar E, Thongjuea S, Kwon AT, Arenillas D, Zhao X, Valen E, Yusuf D,
Lenhard B, Wasserman WW, Sandelin A. 2010. JASPAR 2010: the greatly
expanded open-access database of transcription factor binding profiles. *Nucleic*
acids research **38**: D105-110.

Ramani V, Cusanovich DA, Hause RJ, Ma W, Qiu R, Deng X, Blau CA, Disteche CM,
Noble WS, Shendure J et al. 2016. Mapping 3D genome architecture through in
situ DNase Hi-C. *Nat Protoc* **11**: 2104-2121.

Rao SS, Huntley MH, Durand NC, Stamenova EK, Bochkov ID, Robinson JT, Sanborn
940   AL, Machol I, Omer AD, Lander ES et al. 2014. A 3D map of the human
941   genome at kilobase resolution reveals principles of chromatin looping. *Cell* **159**:
942   1665-1680.

943   Rebollo R, Romanish MT, Mager DL. 2012. Transposable elements: an abundant and
944   natural source of regulatory sequences for host genes. *Annu Rev Genet* **46**:
945   21-42.

946   Schreiber J, Libbrecht M, Bilmes J, Noble W. 2017. Nucleotide sequence and DNaseI
947   sensitivity are predictive of 3D chromatin architecture. *bioRxiv*.

948   Shannon P, Markiel A, Ozier O, Baliga NS, Wang JT, Ramage D, Amin N,
949   Schwikowski B, Ideker T. 2003. Cytoscape: a software environment for
950   integrated models of biomolecular interaction networks. *Genome research* **13**:
951   2498-2504.

952   Tabuchi TM, Deplancke B, Osato N, Zhu LJ, Barrasa MI, Harrison MM, Horvitz HR,
953   Walhout AJ, Hagstrom KA. 2011. Chromosome-biased binding and gene
954   regulation by the Caenorhabditis elegans DRM complex. *PLoS Genet* **7**:
955   e1002074.

956   Wang ET, Sandberg R, Luo S, Khrebtukova I, Zhang L, Mayr C, Kingsmore SF,
957   Schroth GP, Burge CB. 2008. Alternative isoform regulation in human tissue
958   transcriptomes. *Nature* **456**: 470-476.

959   Wang J, Vicente-Garcia C, Seruggia D, Molto E, Fernandez-Minan A, Neto A, Lee E,
960   Gomez-Skarmeta JL, Montoliu L, Lunyak VV et al. 2015. MIR retrotransposon
961   sequences provide insulators to the human genome. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*
962   **112**: E4428-4437.

963   Wang L, Wang S, Li W. 2012. RSeQC: quality control of RNA-seq experiments.
964   *Bioinformatics (Oxford, England)* **28**: 2184-2185.

965   Weintraub AS, Li CH, Zamudio AV, Sigova AA, Hannett NM, Day DS, Abraham BJ,
966   Cohen MA, Nabet B, Buckley DL et al. 2017. YY1 Is a Structural Regulator of
967   Enhancer-Promoter Loops. *Cell* **171**: 1573-1588 e1528.

968   Wingender E, Dietze P, Karas H, Knuppel R. 1996. TRANSFAC: a database on
969   transcription factors and their DNA binding sites. *Nucleic acids research* **24**:
970   238-241.

Xie Z, Hu S, Blackshaw S, Zhu H, Qian J. 2010. hPDI: a database of experimental

human protein-DNA interactions. *Bioinformatics (Oxford, England)* **26**:
287-289.

Zhang H, Li F, Jia Y, Xu B, Zhang Y, Li X, Zhang Z. 2017. Characteristic arrangement
of nucleosomes is predictive of chromatin interactions at kilobase resolution.
Nucleic acids research **45**: 12739-12751.

Zhang Y, An L, Xu J, Zhang B, Zheng WJ, Hu M, Tang J, Yue F. 2018. Enhancing
Hi-C data resolution with deep convolutional neural network HiCPlus. *Nat*
Commun **9**: 750.

Zhao Y, Stormo GD. 2011. Quantitative analysis demonstrates most transcription
factors require only simple models of specificity. *Nature biotechnology* **29**:
480-483.