Discovery of biased orientations of human regulatory motifs affecting

transcription of genes and including known insulators

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 (EPIs) 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. Other DNA binding proteins such as YY1, ZNF143 and SMARCA4 are also reported to be associated with chromatin interactions. It is still unclear what proteins are associated with chromatin interactions and insulator function.

To find DNA binding motif sequences of transcription factors (TFs) like CTCF, affecting the interaction between enhancers and promoters of genes and their expression by the insulator function of the TFs, first, I predicted TF bound in enhancers and promoters using DNA motif sequences of TFs and experimental data of open chromatin regions in monocytes, T, Th17, Treg, GM12878 cells, HMEC and NPC, which were obtained from public and commercial databases. Second, transcriptional target genes of each TF were predicted based on enhancer-promoter association (EPA). An EPA was shortened at the FR or reverse-forward (RF) orientation of DNA motif sites of a TF, which were supposed to be at chromatin interaction anchors and acted as insulator sites. Then, the expression levels of transcriptional target genes predicted based on the EPA were compared with those predicted from closed chromatin regions.

Total 96 biased orientations of DNA motifs (64 FR and 52 RF orientations, 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 monocytes, T cells, HMEC

and NPC in common, including known TFs associated with chromatin interaction and

insulator function such as CTCF, cohesin (RAD21 and SMC3), YY1 and ZNF143.

Compared with chromatin interaction data, for 44 (69%) FR and 28 (54%) RF

orientations of DNA motif sequences in CD4$^+$ T cells, EPIs predicted from EPAs that

were shortened at the biased orientations of DNA motif sites, overlapped with

chromatin interactions significantly more than other types of EPAs. Using gene

expression data among 53 tissues, 43 (72%) FR and 40 (80%) RF orientations of DNA

motifs showed significantly reduced correlation in expression level of nearby genes

separated by the motif sites. These analyses suggest that the DNA motifs are associated

with insulator functions.

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

(EPIs) 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). The DNA

binding sequence of CTCF indicate its orientation bias at chromatin interaction anchors

– forward-reverse (FR) orientation is frequently observed (Rao et al. 2014; de Wit et al.

2015; Guo et al. 2015). Other DNA binding proteins such as ZNF143, YY1 and

SMARCA4 (BRG1) are found to be associated with chromatin interaction 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 interaction

and EPI. The DNA binding motif sequences of these transcription factors (TFs) 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). This research started from the analysis of histone

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

protein factors associated with chromatin interaction and insulator function may be

found from other researches.

As computational approaches, machine-learning analyses to predict chromatin

interactions were proposed (Schreiber et al. 2017; Zhang et al. 2017). However, they

were not intended to find DNA motif sequences of TFs affecting chromatin interaction,

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. To analyze this

property, I found that the expression level of human putative transcriptional target genes

of a TF was significantly changed, according to the criteria of enhancer-promoter

association (EPA) (Osato 2018). An EPA was shortened at the FR orientation of CTCF

binding sites, and transcriptional target genes of each TF bound in enhancers and

promoters were predicted based on the EPA (Fig. 1B). The expression levels of

transcriptional target genes were significantly changed, compared with the expression

levels of transcriptional target genes predicted from promoters (or closed chromatin

regions). The expression levels tend to be increased in monocytes and CD4$^+$ T cells,

implying that enhancers activate the transcription of genes. The expression levels tend

to be decreased in ES and iPS cells, implying that enhancers repress the transcription of

genes. These analyses showed that the expression level of putative transcriptional target

genes of a TF bound in enhancers was changed significantly, as EPIs were predicted

properly using insulator sites of CTCF. This suggests that the difference of the

expression level would be an index of the accuracy of the prediction of transcriptional

target genes of a TF based on an EPA. 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 sites, affecting the expression

level of putative transcriptional target genes through their insulator function.

As experimental issues of analyses of chromatin interactions, chromatin

interaction data are changed, according to experimental techniques, the number of reads

of DNA sequencing and even replication sets of the same cell type. Chromatin

interaction data may not be saturated enough to contain all chromatin interactions and

may include experimental noise such as ligation error. Supposing the properties of DNA

binding proteins associated with chromatin interactions and avoiding experimental

issues of analyses of chromatin interactions, here I searched for DNA motif sequences

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

monocytes, T cells, HMEC and NPC without using chromatin interaction data. Then,

putative EPIs were compared with chromatin interaction and gene expression data.

Results

Search for biased orientations of DNA motif sequences

Transcription factor binding sites (TFBSs) 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 enhancers. An enhancer-promoter association (EPA) was shortened at the DNA binding motif sites 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, affecting the expression level of genes, An EPA was shortened at the DNA motif sites of a putative insulator TF, and transcriptional target genes of each general TF bound in (i) distal open chromatin regions (enhancers) and (ii) closed chromatin regions in promoters were predicted based on the EPA, in order to estimate enhancer activity of each TF. The ratio of expression level of putative transcriptional target genes of each TF between (i) and (ii) was calculated. The distribution of the ratios of all TF was compared among forward-reverse (FR), reverse-forward (RF) and any orientation (i.e. without considering orientation) of DNA motif sites of an insulator TF shortening EPA using Mann-Whitney test, two-sided (p-value $< 10^{-7}$), and the number of putative insulator TFs with significant difference of the distributions of expression level among FR, RF and Any was counted (Fig. 2A). To check the prediction of DNA motif sites of TFs, the distribution of DNA motif sites were examined in the human genome. DNA motif sites of TFs associated with chromatin interactions were found near TSS (Fig. 2B). ZNF143 is known to bind to

promoter of genes establishing looping with distal element bound by CTCF (Fig. 5)

(Bailey et al. 2015). YY1 is multi-functional transcriptional regulator and is involved in

transcriptional activation, repression and initiation (Shrivastava and Calame 1994; Xi et

al. 2007). Most of DNA sites of the TFs were found in intergenic and intron regions of

the human genome (Fig. 2C). Several hundreds of FR and RF orientations of DNA

motifs of TFs were found in monocytes, T cells, human mammary epithelial cells

(HMEC) and neural progenitor cells (NPC) (Fig. 3). The number of the TFs seemed to

be changed, according to the number of DNase-seq reads, since the number of the reads

in monocyte is larger than the other three cell types. When DNase-seq reads increase,

more DNA motif sites may be predicted to some extent. Total 96 of biased (64 FR and

52 RF) orientations of DNA binding motif sequences of TFs were found in the four cell

types in common, whereas any orientation of DNA binding motif sequence was not

found (Fig. 3; Table 1; Supplemental material). The FR orientation of DNA motif

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

associated with chromatin interaction and EPI.

Without considering the difference of orientations of DNA binding motif

sequences among cell types, 175 of biased orientations of DNA binding motif

sequences of TFs were found in the four cell types in common. These numbers (96 and

175) are unique number of TFs with biased orientation of DNA motifs, and not the

number of DNA motifs. As one of reasons for the increase of the number 175 from 96, 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 (Das et al. 2007; Wang et al.

2008; Chen and Manley 2009). As another reason, 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.

Moreover, 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

TFs composing the complex in *C. elegans* (Tabuchi et al. 2011). The difference of

binding specificity of pairs of transcription factors was reported (Jolma et al. 2015).

Cofactors also contribute to alter binding specificity of transcription factors (Ansari and

Peterson-Kaufman 2011; Slattery et al. 2011; Merabet and Mann 2016). These increase

the variety and number of (biased orientations of) DNA binding motif sequences of a TF,

which are potentially involved in different biological functions among cell types.

Comparison with chromatin interaction data

To examine whether the biased orientations of DNA motif sequences are

associated with chromatin interaction, enhancer-promoter interactions (EPIs) predicted

based on an enhancer-promoter association (EPA) were compared with chromatin

interaction data. HiChIP chromatin interaction data were used for CD4$^+$ T cells

(Mumbach et al. 2017). EPIs predicted based on an EPA were compared with three

replications (B2T1, B2T2 and B3T1) of HiChIP chromatin interaction data respectively.

The resolutions of HiChIP chromatin interaction data and EPIs were adjusted to 5

kilobases (kb). EPI were predicted based on three types of EPAs: (i) EPA shortened at

the FR or RF orientation of DNA motif sites of a TF acting as insulator such as CTCF,

(ii) EPA shortened at the DNA motif sites of a TF without considering their orientation,

and (iii) EPA without being shortened by DNA motif sites. Total 201 biased orientations

[133 (49%) FR and 90 (43%) RF of 273 FR and 211 RF] of DNA motif sequences in T

cells, which included CTCF, cohesin (RAD21 and SMC3), ZNF143 and YY1 in three

replications (B2T1, B2T2, and B3T1), showed a significantly higher ratio of EPIs

overlapped with HiChIP chromatin interactions with $\geq 1,000$ counts for each interaction

in EPA (i) than the other types of EPA (ii) and (iii) in T cells (Table 2). When comparing

EPIs predicted based on only EPA (i) and (iii) with the chromatin interactions, total 390

biased orientations [261 (96%) FR and 199 (94%) RF of 273 FR and 211 RF] of DNA

motif sequences in T cells showed a significantly higher ratio of EPIs overlapped with

the chromatin interactions in EPA (i) than EPA (iii) (Table 2; Supplemental material).

The difference between EPIs predicted based on EPA (i) and (ii) seemed to be difficult

to distinguish using the chromatin interaction data and statistical test in some cases.

However, as for the difference between EPIs predicted based on EPA (i) and (iii), a

larger number of biased orientations of DNA motif sequences were 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 may exist. (Mumbach et al. 2017) suggested that individual differences of

chromatin interactions were larger than those of open chromatin regions. Most of biased

orientations of DNA motif sequences (95%) were found to be correlated with chromatin

interactions, when comparing EPIs predicted based on EPA (i) and (iii) with HiChIP

chromatin interactions.

Additionally, to confirm these tendencies of comparison of EPIs with HiChIP

chromatin interactions, the same analysis was conducted using HiChIP chromatin

interaction data in Th17, Treg and GM12878 cells. Total 128 biased orientations [76

(38%) FR and 64 (35%) RF of 200 FR and 183 RF] of DNA motif sequences in Th17

cells, which included CTCF, cohesin (RAD21 and SMC3), ZNF143 and YY1 in three

replications (B1T2, B2T1, and B3T1), showed a significantly higher ratio of EPIs

overlapped with HiChIP chromatin interactions in EPA (i) than the other types of EPA

(ii) and (iii) (Supplemental material). When comparing EPIs predicted based on only

EPA (i) and (iii) with the chromatin interactions, total 282 biased orientations [182

(91%) FR and 162 (89%) RF of 200 FR and 183 RF] of DNA motif sequences showed a

significantly higher ratio of EPIs overlapped with the chromatin interactions in EPA (i)

than EPA (iii) (Supplemental material).

For Treg cells, chromatin interactions in one biological replication were

overlapped with EPIs, but those in the other two biological replications were less

overlapped with EPIs, so the one replication (B3T1) was used for this analysis. Total

281 biased orientations [154 (53%) FR and 176 (54%) RF of 290 FR and 323 RF] of

DNA motif sequences, which included CTCF, cohesin (RAD21 and SMC3), ZNF143

and YY1, showed a significantly higher ratio of EPIs overlapped with HiChIP

chromatin interactions in EPA (i) than the other types of EPA (ii) and (iii) (Supplemental

material). When comparing EPIs predicted based on only EPA (i) and (iii) with the

chromatin interactions, total 482 biased orientations [283 (98%) FR and 309 (96%) RF

of 290 FR and 323 RF] of DNA motif sequences showed a significantly higher ratio of

EPIs overlapped with the chromatin interactions in EPA (i) than EPA (iii) (Supplemental

material).

For GM12878 cells, total 168 biased orientations [96 (38%) FR and 98 (35%) RF

of 229 FR and 237 RF] of DNA motif sequences, which included CTCF, cohesin

(RAD21 and SMC3), ZNF143 and YY1 in two replications (B1 and B2), showed a

significantly higher ratio of EPIs overlapped with HiChIP chromatin interactions in EPA

(i) than the other types of EPA (ii) and (iii) (Supplemental material). When comparing

EPIs predicted based on only EPA (i) and (iii) with the chromatin interactions, total 366

biased orientations [218 (95%) FR and 227 (96%) RF of 229 FR and 237 RF] of DNA

motif sequences showed a significantly higher ratio of EPIs overlapped with the

chromatin interactions in EPA (i) than EPA (iii) (Supplemental material).

In situ Hi-C data was available from 4D nucleome data portal in HMEC, and was

compared with putative EPIs. Total 222 biased orientations [155 (50%) FR and 108

(40%) RF of 310 FR and 269 RF] of DNA motif sequences, which included CTCF,

cohesin (RAD21 and SMC3), ZNF143 and YY1, showed a significantly higher ratio of

EPIs overlapped with in situ Hi-C chromatin interactions (≥ 1 count for each interaction,

i.e. all interactions) in EPA (i) than the other types of EPA (ii) and (iii) (Supplemental

material). When comparing EPIs predicted based on only EPA (i) and (iii) with the

chromatin interactions, total 406 biased orientations [268 (86%) FR and 230 (86%) RF

of 310 FR and 269 RF] of DNA motif sequences showed a significantly higher ratio of

EPIs overlapped with the chromatin interactions in EPA (i) than EPA (iii) (Supplemental

material). There were six replications of in situ Hi-C experimental data of HMEC, but

other replications contained much smaller number of chromatin interactions. The

HiChIP chromatin interaction data in T cells were expected to be enriched with

enhancer-promoter interactions, since it used H3K27ac antibody to collect chromatin

interactions. In situ Hi-C data contain all types of chromatin interactions and thus,

contain a smaller number of enhancer-promoter interactions, relative to HiChIP data.

Chromatin interactions with a small number of counts may be artifacts derived from

ligation errors during experiments (Lieberman-Aiden et al. 2009; Yardimci et al. 2019).

Therefore, other replications of in situ Hi-C data with a smaller number of chromatin

interactions will not be available for this analysis.

Promoter capture Hi-C data of NPC was downloaded and analyzed in the same

way as T cell and HMEC (Jung et al. 2019). Total 109 biased orientations [61 (28%) FR

and 60 (25%) RF of 205 FR and 241 RF] of DNA motif sequences, which included

CTCF, cohesin (RAD21 and SMC3), ZNF143 and YY1, showed a significantly higher

ratio of EPIs overlapped with promoter capture Hi-C chromatin interactions (≥1 count

for each interaction, i.e. all interactions) in EPA (i) than the other types of EPA (ii) and

(iii) (Supplemental material). When comparing EPIs predicted based on only EPA (i)

and (iii) with the chromatin interactions, total 186 biased orientations [99 (48%) FR and

103 (43%) RF of 205 FR and 241 RF] of DNA motif sequences showed a significantly

higher ratio of EPIs overlapped with the chromatin interactions in EPA (i) than EPA (iii)

(Supplemental material).

All three types of chromatin interaction data (HiChIP, in situ Hi-C and promoter

capture Hi-C) indicated that EPIs predicted based on EPA (i) that were shortened at

DNA motif sites of known TFs associated with chromatin interactions (CTCF, RAD21,

SMC3, ZNF143 and YY1), overlapped with more chromatin interactions than the other

EPA (ii) and (iii) in six cell types (T cells, Th17, Treg, GM12878, HMEC and NPC).

For monocyte, Hi-C data was available, but it was not analyzed, due to the low

resolution of chromatin interaction data (50 kb).

There may be a possibility that the biased orientations of DNA motif sites of

known TFs associated with chromatin interactions such as CTCF, RAD21, SMC3, YY1

and ZNF143 are located with the biased orientations of DNA motif sites of other TFs,

and thus, they showed a significantly higher ratio of EPIs overlapped with chromatin

interactions in EPA (i) than the other types of EPA (ii) and (iii). However, among 273

FR and 211 RF orientations of DNA motifs of TFs not including known TFs such as

CTCF, RAD21, SMC3, YY1 and ZNF143 in T cells, the DNA motif sites of only 15

(6%) FR and 9 (4%) RF orientations of DNA motifs of TFs overlapped with $\geq 60\%$ of

DNA motif sites of biased orientations of DNA motifs of either of the known TFs at 5

kb resolution.

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

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

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

genes of EPIs were selected from top 4,000 transcripts (genes) in terms of the

expression level of all transcripts (genes) excluding transcripts not expressed in T, Th17,

Treg and GM12878 cells respectively, target genes of EPIs overlapped with chromatin

interactions showed a significantly higher expression level than EPIs not overlapped

with them, suggesting that EPIs overlapped with chromatin interactions activated the

expression of target genes in the four cell types. Almost all (99% - 100%) FR and RF

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

target genes of EPIs overlapped with chromatin interactions than EPIs not overlapped in

the four cell types. When a biased orientation of DNA motif showed a significantly

higher expression level of putative target genes of EPIs overlapped with chromatin

interactions than EPIs not overlapped, '1' was marked with in the tables of comparison

between EPIs and HiChIP chromatin interactions in Supplemental material. DNA motifs

showing a significantly lower expression level or not showing a significant difference of

expression level were not observed in this analysis. HiChIP data were produced using

H3K27ac antibody, so chromatin interactions acting as repressor would not be identified.

However, for in situ Hi-C and promoter capture Hi-C data in HMEC and NPC, the

significant difference of expression level of putative target genes of EPIs was observed

in a small percentage (less than 1%) of biased orientations of DNA motifs.

Correlation of expression level of gene pairs separated by DNA motif sites of a TF

To examine the effect of biased orientations of DNA motif sequences on gene

expression, I compared the expression level of protein-coding genes the most closely

located to upstream and downstream of biased orientations of DNA motif sites in the

human genome. Closely located genes including divergent gene pairs are expected to

show correlation of gene expression among tissues (Purmann et al. 2007; Xie et al.

2007). When a biased orientation of DNA motif sites act as insulator (e.g. CTCF), the

correlation of gene expression level would be reduced. Among 96 biased (64 FR and 52

RF) orientations of DNA motifs of TFs found in common in monocytes, T cells, HMEC

and NPC, TFs with ≥50 genomic locations of the DNA motif sites were selected, after

the elimination of ubiquitously expressed genes among 53 tissues and DNA motif sites

near the genes with coefficient of variance <90 (see Methods). After this filtering, 43

(72%) FR and 40 (80%) RF of 60 FR and 50 RF showed a distribution of significantly

lower correlation of gene expression of the closest genes of the DNA motif sites of a TF

than the correlation of all pairs of neighbor genes with intergene distance <1 megabases

(Mb) (Mann-Whitney test, p-value < 0.05) (Table 3). The FR and RF orientations of

TFs included known TFs associated with chromatin interactions such as CTCF, RAD21,

SMC3, YY1 and ZNF143. Top 20 of the FR and RF orientations of DNA motifs were

selected in ascending order of the median correlation coefficient of expression level of

the closest gene pairs of the DNA motif sites of a TF. The 20 TFs included known TFs

associated with chromatin interactions such as CTCF, RAD21 and SMC3 (Fig. 4)

(Mann-Whitney test, p-value < 0.01). Instead of using all DNA motif sites of a TF,

when DNA motif sites of a TF were limited to sites examined for biased orientations of

DNA motifs in EPAs, 33 (60%) FR and 36 (77%) RF of 55 FR and 47 RF showed a

distribution of significantly lower correlation of expression level of gene pairs separated

by the sites (Supplemental material). With intergene distance <20 kb and TFs with ≥50

genomic locations of the DNA motif sites, 21 (34%) FR and 8 (15%) RF of 62 FR and

52 RF showed a distribution of significantly lower correlation of gene expression of the

closest genes of the DNA motif sites of a TF than the correlation of all pairs of neighbor

genes (Supplemental material).

Some DNA motif sites of biased orientations of DNA motifs of a TF were found

from genomic regions not including known DNA motif sites of TFs associated with

chromatin interactions such as CTCF, RAD21, SMC3, YY1 and ZNF143, and were

located in genomic regions with significantly lower correlation of expression level of

gene pairs. A large number of DNA motif sites of a TF tend to show significantly lower

correlation of gene expression (Median numbers of DNA motif sites showing

significantly lower correlation were 656 and 479 for FR and RF respectively, and

median numbers of DNA motif sites not showing lower correlation were 122 and 115

for FR and RF respectively. Mann-Whitney test p-value = 0 and $< 10^{-10}$ for FR and RF

respectively). The DNA motif sites of many TFs showed a significantly lower

correlation of gene expression, so there may be a possibility that when we take a small

number of gene pairs randomly (about hundreds as the same as the number of DNA

motif sites of a TF), the correlation of gene pairs might be significantly low occasionally.

However, the possibility that happen was lower than the expectation from p-value

threshold by computer simulation.

Co-location of biased orientations of DNA motif sites of TFs

To examine the association of biased orientations of DNA binding motif

sequences of TFs, co-location of the DNA binding motif sequences within 200bp to

each other, which is close to the length of core DNA around octamer of core histone

(146bp), that is, the length of the minimum open chromatin region, was analyzed in

monocytes, T cells, HMEC, and NPC. The same pairs of DNA binding motif sequences

in upstream and downstream of genes in EPAs were enumerated, and the pairs of DNA

binding motif sequences found in ≥ 100 genomic regions were listed (Table 4;

Supplemental material). Majority of pairs of DNA motif sites overlapped with more

than 1 base, but the same tendency was found in the analysis of DNA motif sites of all

TFs (Supplemental material). As already known, CTCF was found with cohesin RAD21

and SMC3 (Table 4). Top 30 pairs of FR and RF orientations of DNA motifs overlapped

or co-localized were shown (Table 4). Total numbers of unique pairs of DNA motif sites

of TFs overlapped or co-localized were 404 (FR) and 662 (RF) in monocytes, consisting

of 177 (39% of all FR) and 218 (43% of all RF) unique DNA motifs. Only ten

overlapping or co-location of DNA motifs of TFs were found in the four cell types in

common, including pairs of CTCF, RAD21, SMC3 and YY1. This implied that most of

overlapping and co-location of DNA motifs of TFs act in cell-type-specific manner

(Supplemental material). Pairs of biased orientations of DNA binding motifs of TFs

tend to overlap, and relatively a small number of motifs are co-localized in upstream

and downstream of genes. Overlapping DNA motifs act as DNA binding sites of several

TFs simultaneously or competitively (Ackerman et al. 1991; Yoon and Chikaraishi

1992; Ansari and Peterson-Kaufman 2011; Slattery et al. 2011; Chatterjee et al. 2012;

He et al. 2015; Kin et al. 2016; Merabet and Mann 2016). CTCF and cohesin have also

been reported to act coordinately with another TF and a protein such as Klf4 and Brd2

(Wei et al. 2013; Hsu et al. 2017). Klf4 recruits cohesin to the Oct4 enhancer region.

BRD2 supports boundary (insulator) activity of CTCF. The analysis of 457 ChIP-seq

data sets on 119 human TFs showed that secondary motifs were detected in addition to

the canonical motifs of the TFs, indicating tethered binding and co-binding between

multiple TFs (Wang et al. 2012a). The authors observed significant position and

orientation preferences between many co-binding TFs. Overlapping DNA motif sites of

TFs found in this study may not be artifact, but biologically functional. Though repeat

sequences in human genome were masked, more than a hundred of pairs of DNA motif

sites overlapped at hundreds or thousands upstream and downstream regions of genes.

Discussion

To find DNA motif sequences of transcription factors (TFs) affecting the

expression level of human putative transcriptional target genes, DNA motif sequences

were searched from open chromatin regions of monocytes, T cells, HMEC and NPC.

Total 96 biased [64 forward-reverse (FR) and 52 reverse-forward (RF)] orientations of

DNA motif sequences of TFs were found in the four cell types in common, whereas any

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

not found to affect the expression level of putative transcriptional target genes,

suggesting that an enhancer-promoter association (EPA) shortened at the FR or RF

orientation of DNA motif sites of a TF includes more accurate prediction of

enhancer-promoter interactions (EPIs), which were supported by the comparisons with

chromatin interaction and gene expression data..

In general, DNA motif sequences of TFs were searched from genome sequences

using position weight matrix or position frequency matrix and allowing mismatches of

DNA sequences under a certain threshold. However, the change of the threshold

affected the result of analyses, and it seems to be difficult to find the best parameter

setting to reduce false-positive and false-negative predictions of DNA biding sites of

TFs. Therefore, firstly, to obtain a robust result in this study, position weight matrixes of

DNA motifs were converted into consensus DNA sequences including degenerated sites,

which consist of alphabet of 15 characters (See Methods). This does not need parameter

setting in the search for DNA motif sequences, and is the same as k-mer analysis of

DNA motif sequences of TFs. Thought the number of genomic regions matched with a

DNA motif sequence was decreased, about 200 FR and RF orientations of DNA motif

sequences of TFs were found, and the number of any orientation of DNA motif

sequences of TFs was quite small, suggesting that false-positive prediction of DNA

biding sites of TFs was reduced. However, the length of the consensus DNA sequences

of some TFs is relatively long. When the core DNA binding sequence of a TF is short (5

or 6 bp), it may be strict to find perfect matches of long consensus DNA sequences in

genome sequences, not allowing a mismatch of the DNA sequence (Methods in (Xie et

al. 2007)).

Secondly, protein interaction quantitation (PIQ) tool was used to find DNA motif

sites of TFs (Sherwood et al. 2014). PIQ predicts DNA motif sites of TFs by reducing

noises of DNase-seq data, and the comparison of the prediction with ChIP-seq data

revealed that PIQ has a better performance than other tools and digital genome

footprinting (DNase-DGF). The prediction of DNA motif sites of TFs using PIQ in this

study showed an increase of biased orientations of DNA motif sequences of TFs,

reducing the number of any orientation of DNA motif sequences of TFs. The number of

DNA motif sites of TFs was expected to increase, relative to the above method to use

consensus DNA sequences of TFs in the preceding section. However, the number of

DNA motif sites was almost the same or slightly decreased, compared with the result of

consensus DNA sequences, suggesting that PIQ increases true positive predictions of

DNA motif sites, reducing false positive predictions.

To estimate the enhancer activity of DNA motifs of TFs, the expression level of

putative transcriptional target genes of a TF was compared between DNA motif sites of

TFs in distal open chromatin regions (enhancers) and closed chromatin regions in

promoters. Previously, the expression level was compared between distal open

chromatin regions and open chromatin regions in promoters. However, it would be easy

to understand the comparison of DNA motif sites of a TF between distal open chromatin

regions and closed chromatin regions to estimate the enhancer activity of TFs. The

number of DNA motif sites in closed chromatin regions was large, so the number in

closed chromatin regions in promoter was used.

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

genome DNA with a specific orientation of their DNA binding sequences (Fig. 5). From

the analysis of biased orientations of DNA motif sequences of TFs, TFs forming

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

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

DNA binding motif site 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 TFs can be used to examine the effect on the expression

level of transcriptional target genes predicted based on the EPA shortened at one side.

Biased orientations of DNA motif sequences may also be found in forward-forward or

reverse-reverse orientation.

At first, EPIs were compared with chromatin interactions (Hi-C) in monocytes.

Using open chromatin regions overlapped with peaks of ChIP-seq experiment of histone

modification marks of an enhancer (H3K27ac), the ratio of EPIs not overlapped with

chromatin interactions 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 EPIs 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

obtained from different samples and donors, so individual differences would exist. The

resolution of chromatin interaction data used in monocytes was about 50 kb, thus the

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

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

CHiCAGO tool > 5) ('PCHiC_peak_matrix_cutoff0.txt.gz' file was downloaded from

'Promoter Capture Hi-C in 17 human primary blood cell types' website

https://osf.io/u8tzp/files/). To examine the difference of the numbers of EPIs overlapped

with chromatin interactions, according to the three types of EPAs, the unique and total

number of chromatin interactions should be large enough.

As HiChIP chromatin interaction data were available in CD4$^+$ T, Th17, Treg and

GM12878 cells, biased orientations of DNA motif sequences of TFs were examined in

the four cell types. The resolutions of chromatin interactions and EPIs were adjusted to

5 kb by fragmentation of genome sequences. The number of unique HiChIP cis (i.e. in

the same chromatin) chromatin interactions was 19,926,360 at 5 kb resolution in B2T1

replication of T cells, 666,149 at 5 kb resolution with chromatin interactions ($\geq$1,000

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

($\geq$6,000 counts for each interaction) (Supplemental material). As expected, the number

of EPIs overlapped with chromatin interactions was increased, and 133 FR and 90 RF

orientations of DNA motif sequences of TFs showed a statistical significance in EPIs

predicted based on an EPA shortened at the DNA motif sites of TFs, compared with the

other types of EPA or EPA not shortened. The numbers of unique HiChIP cis chromatin

interactions in other cell types (Th17, Treg and GM12878) were shown in Supplemental

material. The numbers of unique cis chromatin interactions at 5 kb resolution were

different among replications in Th17 cells, so the numbers of interactions were adjusted

between the numbers with $\geq$1,000 and $\geq$6,000 counts for each interaction in T cells.

For Treg, chromatin interactions in one biological replication overlapped with EPIs, but

those in the other two biological replications were less overlapped with EPIs, so the one

replication was used for this analysis. HiChIP analysis used H3K27ac antibody to

capture chromatin interactions and identified twenty millions of chromatin interactions,

but the number of peaks of ChIP-seq experimental data of H3K27ac is usually less than

a hundred thousand. There seems to be much difference of the number of H3K27ac sites

between HiChIP and ChIP-seq, so ChIP-seq peaks of H3K27ac may not cover all

H3K27ac sites. For HMEC, in situ Hi-C chromatin interaction data were available, the

number of unique in situ Hi-C cis chromatin interactions was 121,873,642 at 3 kb

resolution. All chromatin interaction data were used for this analysis to compare EPIs

with chromatin interactions. For NPC, the number of unique promoter capture Hi-C cis

chromatin interactions was 9,436,689 at 5 kb resolution. All chromatin interaction data

were utilized for analysis.

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

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

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

including cancer.

The analyses in this study revealed properties of DNA binding motif sequences of

TFs involved in chromatin interaction, insulator function and potentially forming a

homodimer, heterodimer or complex with other TFs, affecting the transcriptional

regulation of genes.

Methods

Search for biased orientations of DNA motif sequences

To identify transcription factor binding sites (TFBSs) from open and closed

chromatin regions, TRANSFAC (2019.2), JASPAR (2018), UniPROBE (2018),

high-throughput SELEX, 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 (2019.2) was used to analyze enhancer-promoter

interactions, because these data were sufficient to identify biased orientations of DNA

motif sequences of insulator TFs with less computational time, reducing the number of

any orientation of DNA motif sequences of TFs. To reduce false positive prediction of

DNA motif sites of TFs in open chromatin regions, protein interaction quantitation

(PIQ) tool was used with 12,249 position frequency matrices converted from DNA

motifs of vertebrate TFs in the above databases and DNase-seq data from GEO and

Encode database (GSM1024791 CD14$^+$ monocytes; GSM665812 CD4$^+$ T cell;

GSM736634 Human mammary epithelial cell, HMEC; GSM878615 Neural progenitor

cell, NPC; ENCFF263GMV, ENCFF886XEV Th17; GSM1024741 Treg; GSM736620

GM12878) (Sherwood et al. 2014). To find open chromatin regions associated with

enhancer (and promoter) activity, ChIP-seq experimental data of H3K27ac was

downloaded (GSM773004). Narrow peaks of ChIP-seq data were predicted using macs2

callpeak (Zhang et al. 2008). To predict DNA motif sites of TFs from closed chromatin

regions, another method was used. Position weight matrices of vertebrate transcription

factor binding sequences were converted into DNA consensus sequences, which

consist of alphabet of 15 characters (the four bases A, C, G, T, the six two-fold

degenerate IUPAC codes R=[AG], Y=[CT], K=[GT], M=[AC], S=[GC], W=[AT], the

four three-fold degenerate IUPAC codes B=[CGT], D=[AGT], H=[ACT], V=[ACG],

and the four-fold degenerate character N=[ATGC]) using convert matrix in RSAT

website (van Helden 2003). Transcription factor binding sequences of vertebrate TFs

were used for further analyses. Transcription factor binding sequences were searched

from narrow peaks of DNase-seq data in repeat-masked hg19 genome sequences using

Match tool in TRANSFAC with similarity score cutoff of 1 after transforming the DNA

consensus sequences of TFs into position frequency matrixes for Match search (Kel et

al. 2003). 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).   TFs

corresponding to transcription factor binding sequences were searched computationally

and manually 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 DNA binding sites of a TF that was the closest to a TSS, and

transcriptional target genes were predicted from the shortened enhancer regions using

TFBS. Furthermore, promoter and extended regions for EPA were shortened at the

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 internal (i.e. closest to a TSS) 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 selecting 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 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 from UCSF-UBC human reference epigenome mapping

project RNA-seq reads with poly-A of naive $CD4^+$ T cells (GEO: GSM669617).

RNA-seq reads were aligned in repeat-masked hg19 genome sequences using BWA

with default parameters (Li and Durbin 2009). FPKMs of the RNA-seq data were

calculated using RSeQC (Wang et al. 2012b). For monocytes, Blueprint RNA-seq

FPKM   data

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

were downloaded from Blueprint DCC portal

(http://dcc.blueprint-epigenome.eu/#/files). RNA-seq reads with poly-A of human

mammary epithelial cells (HMEC) in Encyclopedia of DNA Elements at UCSC

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

'wgEncodeCshlLongRnaSeqHmecCellPapAlnRep1.bam' file), H1 derived neural

progenitor cell (NPC) (GEO: GSM915326, ENCODE: ENCFF529SIO), Th17

(GSM2859479, NCBI SRA: SRR6298326), Treg (GSM2859476, SRR6298323) and

GM12878 (GSE78551, ENCFF297QCE) were used. Based on log2-transformed FPKM,

UCSC transcripts were arranged in descending order of expression level, and top 4,000

transcripts were selected in each cell type.

The expression level of transcriptional target genes predicted based on EPAs

shortened at the DNA motif sites of a TF was compared with the expression level of

transcriptional target genes predicted from closed chromatin regions in promoters. For

each DNA motif sequence shortening EPAs, transcriptional target genes were predicted

using DNA binding motif sequences of vertebrate TFs in TRANSFAC database, and the

ratio of expression level of putative transcriptional target genes of each TF was

calculated between EPAs and closed chromatin regions in promoters. The distribution of

the ratios of all TFs was compared among forward-reverse (FR), reverse-forward (RF)

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

shortening EPAs using Mann-Whitney test, two-sided (p-value $< 10^{-7}$). Other

parameters for the analysis were that the number of transcriptional target genes of a TF

was ≥ 50, and the number of general TFs (not insulator TFs) to predict transcriptional

target genes was ≥ 50. The number of DNA motif sites of a TF (insulator TF)

shortening EPAs was ≥ 100.

Comparison with chromatin interaction data

For comparison of EPIs with chromatin interactions (HiChIP) in CD4$^+$ T, Th17,

Treg and GM12878 cells,

'GSM2705049_Naive_HiChIP_H3K27ac_B2T1_allValidPairs.txt',

'GSM2705050_Naive_HiChIP_H3K27ac_B2T2_allValidPairs.txt',

'GSM2705051_Naive_HiChIP_H3K27ac_B3T1_allValidPairs.txt',

'GSM2705054_Th17_HiChIP_H3K27ac_B1T2_allValidPairs.txt',

'GSM2705055_Th17_HiChIP_H3K27ac_B2T1_allValidPairs.txt',

'GSM2705056_Th17_HiChIP_H3K27ac_B3T1_allValidPairs.txt',

'GSM2705059_Treg_HiChIP_H3K27ac_B3T1_allValidPairs.txt',

'GSM2705041_GM_HiChIP_H3K27ac_B1_allValidPairs.txt',

'GSM2705042_GM_HiChIP_H3K27ac_B2_allValidPairs.txt' files were downloaded

from Gene Expression Omnibus (GEO) database. The resolutions of chromatin

interactions and EPIs were adjusted to 5 kb before their comparison. Chromatin

interactions with $\geq$6,000 and $\geq$1,000 counts for each interaction were used in CD4$^+$ T

cells. According to the unique numbers of chromatin interactions in replications in Th17,

Treg and GM12878 cells, chromatin interactions with $\geq$1,000 (B1T2 in Th17),

$\geq$2,000 (B2T1 and B3T1 in Th17), $\geq$6,000 (B3T1 in Treg), $\geq$4,000 (B1 and B2 in

GM12878) counts for each interaction were analyzed.

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

in monocytes: (i) EPA shortened at the FR or RF orientation of DNA motif sites of a TF,

(ii) EPA shortened at the any orientation (i.e. without considering orientation) of DNA

motif sites of a TF, and (iii) EPA without being shortened by a DNA motif site. EPIs

predicted in the three types of EPAs in common were removed. EPIs predicted from

EPA (i) were removed from EPIs predicted from EPA (ii). EPIs predicted from EPA (i)

and (ii) were removed from EPIs predicted from EPA (iii). The resolution of HiChIP

chromatin interaction data was 1-5 kb, so EPIs were adjusted to 5 kb before their

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

compared two times between EPIs (i) and (iii), and EPIs (i) and (ii) (binomial

distribution, *p*-value < 0.025 for each test, two-sided, 95% confidence interval).

For comparison of EPIs with chromatin interactions (in situ Hi-C) in HMEC,

'HMEC_4DNFI97O9SAZ.pairs.gz' file was downloaded from 4D nucleome data portal

(http://data.4dnucleome.org). The genomic positions of chromatin interactions were

converted   into   hg19   version   of   human   genome   using   liftOver   tool

(http://hgdownload.soe.ucsc.edu/downloads.html#liftover).   The   resolutions   of

chromatin interaction data and EPIs were adjusted to 3 kb before their comparison. All

chromatin interactions were used for analysis. For comparison of EPIs with chromatin

interactions (promoter capture Hi-C) in NPC, 'GSE86189_npc.po.all.txt.bz2' file was

downloaded from GEO database (GSE86189). The resolutions of chromatin interaction

data and EPIs were adjusted to 5 kb before their comparison. All chromatin interactions

were used for analysis.

Putative target genes for the comparison of EPIs and chromatin interactions were

selected from top 4,000 transcripts in term of the expression level. The expression level

of putative target genes of EPIs overlapped with chromatin interactions was compared

with EPIs not overlapped with them. When a putative transcriptional target gene of a TF

in an enhancer was found in both an EPI overlapped with a chromatin interaction and an

EPI not overlapped with, the target gene was eliminated. The distribution of expression

level of putative target genes was compared using Mann-Whitney test, two-sided

(p-value < 0.05).

Correlation of expression level of gene pairs separated by DNA motif sites of a TF

To examine the correlation of expression level of genes pairs separated by DNA

motif sites of a TF, gene expression data among 53 tissues were obtained from

'GTEx_Analysis_2016-01-15_v7_RNASeQCv1.1.8_gene_median_tpm.gct.gz' file in

GTEx database (https://gtexportal.org/home/). The correlation of log2-transformed gene

expression level was analyzed based on protein-coding transcripts of RefSeq (RefSeq

ID with 'NM_'). The same genomic location of RefSeq transcripts were removed. DNA

motif sites overlapped with RefSeq transcripts were eliminated. Genes closest to a DNA

motif sites and another gene were analyzed using BEDOPS closest-features (Neph et al.

2012). Mann-Whitney test was performed using R.

Co-location of biased orientations of DNA motif sites of TFs

Co-location of biased orientations of DNA binding motif sites of TFs was

examined. The number of genomic regions with the same pair of biased orientations of

DNA motifs of TFs in upstream and downstream of genes in EPAs was counted, and the

same pair of DNA motif sites of TFs found in ≥100 genomic regions was listed.

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

Web links to original figures.

Figure 1. (A) Figure 1. Enhancers and their features. (Shlyueva et al. 2014)

https://static-content.springer.com/esm/art%3A10.1038%2Fnrg3682/MediaObjects/415

76_2014_BFnrg3682_MOESM18_ESM.ppt

Graphical Abstract (de Wit et al. 2015)

https://marlin-prod.literatumonline.com/cms/attachment/7d219941-8398-4373-9ac9-8bf

92c5eba1d/fx1.jpg

(B) Supplementary Figure 2. Computationally-defined regulatory domain (McLean et al.

2010)

https://static-content.springer.com/esm/art%3A10.1038%2Fnbt.1630/MediaObjects/415

87_2010_BFnbt1630_MOESM11_ESM.pdf

Figure 4. The Role of CBS Location and Orientation in CTCF-Mediated Genome-wide

DNA Looping (Guo et al. 2015)

https://marlin-prod.literatumonline.com/cms/attachment/297a06ad-7568-483e-9904-9ae

2af081251/gr4.jpg

Figure 1. Chromatin interaction 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 (Rao et al. 2014; Shlyueva et al.

2014; 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 forward-reverse orientation of DNA binding motif sites

of a transcription factor in this study (e.g. CTCF in the figure).

Figure 2. Identification of DNA motif sites of TFs from open chromatin regions and

properties of DNA motif sites of TFs. (A) Comparison of expression level of putative

transcriptional target genes. Each dot shows the median expression level (FPKM) of

target genes predicted from DNA sites of a transcription factor in closed chromatin

regions (or promoters) (X-axis) and enhancer-promoter association (EPA) shortened at

the forward-reverse orientation of DNA motif sites of CTCF (Y-axis) in T cell (upper

left graph). The distribution of expression level was changed according to four criteria

of EPAs (four graphs) (see Method) (Osato 2018). Red dots show the median expression

level of target genes was significantly higher in EPA than closed chromatin regions, and

blue dots show the median expression level of target genes was significantly lower in

EPA than closed chromatin regions (Mann-Whitney test). The expression level of target

genes predicted in EPA tend to be higher than closed chromatin regions, implying that

TFs acted as activators of target genes. DNA motif sites of TFs overlapped with

H3K27ac ChIP-seq peaks showed significant differences of expression level of target

genes, and DNA motif sites not overlapped with H3K27ac peaks did not show the

difference (lower right two graphs). This suggested that the significant differences of

expression level were associated with enhancer (and promoter) signals of H3K27ac. (B)

Distribution of DNA motif sites of TFs near TSS. ZNF143 and YY1 tend to be located

near TSS, and CTCF tend to be observed more from distant regions than around TSS in

monocyte. (C) Distribution of DNA motif sites of TFs in the human genome in

monocytes. Most of DNA motif sites were found from intergenic and intron regions.

YY1 is known to be at TSS in the edge of exons of genes, and is associated with

transcriptional   activation,   repression   and   initiation.   YY1   is   multi-functional

transcriptional regulator (Shrivastava and Calame 1994; Xi et al. 2007)

Figure 3. Biased orientations of DNA motif sequences of TFs affecting the transcription of genes by putative insulator function of the DNA motif sites. Total 96 (64 FR and 52 RF) of biased orientations of DNA binding motif sequences of TFs were found to affect significantly the expression level of putative transcriptional target genes in monocytes, T cells, HMEC and NPC in common, whereas any orientation (i.e. without considering

 orientation) of DNA binding motif sequence of a TF was not found to affect the

 expression level significantly.

Figure 4. Genes separated by predicted DNA binding sites of biased orientations of DNA motifs of TFs are less correlated in gene expression. Top 20 TFs are shown according to ascending order of median correlation coefficient. Correlation coefficient between neighboring gene pairs is shown in terms of probability density (A) and cumulative distribution (B). Brown line (All), correlation between all neighboring genes; gray shading in (A) and red line (random) in (B), correlation between randomly chosen gene pairs; Purple line (no_CTCF), correlation between gene pairs not separated by predicted CTCF sites.

Web links to original figures.

Figure 5. Schematic representation of chromatin interactions involving gene promoters

(Bailey et al. 2015).

https://www.nature.com/articles/ncomms7186/figures/5

Figure 5. 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. Biased orientations of DNA binding motif sequences of TFs in monocytes, T cells, HMEC and NPC. TF: DNA binding motif sequences of transcription factors.

Forward-reverse orientation

TF	P-value	TF	P-value	TF	P-value
AHR	0	MYC	0	**ZNF143**	0
ARNT	0	MYCN	0	ZNF740	0
ARNTL	7.96E-08	MZF1	0	ZNF770	6.51E-08
ATF2	3.09E-14	NFY	1.72E-11	ZNF84	0
ATF3	2.22E-15	NFYB	0		
BCL	0	NONO	0		
BHLHE41	5.55E-14	NRF1	1.63E-11		
CREB3L1	0	OVOL2	0		
CTCF	0	PLAG1	0		
CXXC1	0	PLAGL1	0		
E2F	0	**RAD21**	0		
E2F1	0	REST	0		
EGR1	0	RFX1	0		
EGR3	0	SIN3A	0		
EGR4	0	SIX5	0		
ELF1	0	**SMC3**	0		
ELF2	5.74E-13	SP2	1.04E-11		
ELK3	3.33E-15	TFAP2A	0		
ELK4	6.19E-11	TFAP2B	2.22E-16		
ERG	0	TFAP2C	0		
ETS	0	TP73	0		
ETS1	0	USF1	0		
ETV7	2.31E-08	XBP1	0		
HEY2	0	**YY1**	0		
HIC1	0	YY2	0		
HINFP	6.46E-14	ZBTB33	0		
INSM1	2.22E-16	ZBTB7A	0		
KLF4	0	ZFP62	0		
KLF7	9.07E-09	ZFX	0		
MAX	0	ZIC1	0		

Reverse-forward orientation

TF	P-value	TF	P-value
AP1	0	RFX2	0
ARNT	1.26E-11	RFX5	0
ATF3	0	RUNX3	0
BHLHE40	8.88E-16	SP1	0
CREB1	0	SP2	0
CTCF	0	SP4	0
E2F	2.32E-13	SPDEF	0
E2F3	0	SREBF2	0
EFNA2	6.61E-11	STAT	0
EGR1	0	TATA	0
EGR2	0	TFAP2B	2.00E-15
ETS1	0	TFAP2C	0
FLI1	1.05E-13	TFCP2L1	0
FLI1:FIGLA	0	USF1	7.55E-10
FOS	0	YBX1	0
GMEB2	0	**YY1**	0
HIF1A	0	YY2	0
KLF4	0	ZBTB33	0
MITF	0	ZBTB7B	0
MYB	0	ZNF100	6.22E-14
MYC	0	**ZNF143**	0
MYCN	0	ZNF432	0
MZF1	0		
NFKB1	0		
NFYA	2.31E-13		
NR3C1	0		
NRF1	0		
OSR2	0		
PBX3	0		
PLAG1	2.78E-14		

Table 2. Comparison of enhancer-promoter interactions (EPIs) with chromatin

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

motifs, where a significantly higher ratio of EPIs predicted based on enhancer-promoter

association (EPA) (i) overlapped with HiChIP chromatin interactions than the other

types of EPA (ii) and (iii). The middle tables show 133 FR and 90 RF orientations of

DNA motifs in T cells found in common among B2T1, B2T2 and B3T1 replications in

the upper table. The lower tables show that among 64 FR and 52 RF biased orientations

of DNA motifs found in common in monocytes, T cell, HMEC and NPC, 44 (69%) FR

and 28 (54%) RF were matched with the analysis of HiChIP chromatin interactions for

three types of EPAs. TF: DNA binding motif sequence of a transcription factor. Score: –

$\log_{10}$ (*p*-value). Score 1: Comparison of EPAs shortened at the FR or RF orientation of

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

EPAs shortened at the FR or RF orientation of DNA motif sites [EPA (i)] with EPAs

shortened at the any orientation of DNA motif sites [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	226	153	101
B2T2	221	149	98
B3T1	237	160	109
DNA motifs found in common among replications			
B2T1 and B2T2	212	141	95
B2T1 and B3T1	212	143	93
B2T2 and B3T1	208	138	93
B2T1, B2T2 and B3T1	201	133	90

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	395	262	205
B2T2	398	264	204
B3T1	394	263	203
DNA motifs found in common among replications			
B2T1 and B2T2	394	262	202
B2T1 and B3T1	391	261	202
B2T2 and B3T1	392	262	200
B2T1, B2T2 and B3T1	390	261	199

Forward-reverse (FR)

TF	Score 1	Score 2
AHR	38.81	13.41
ARNTL	155.78	1.96
ATF1	323.31	15.00
ATF3	323.31	35.22
BCL	153.72	3.52
CREB	90.91	2.32
CREB3	323.31	38.74
CREB3L1	323.31	27.96
CTCF	323.31	3.50
CTCFL	174.90	2.09
CXXC1	69.92	3.30
E2	323.31	20.15
E2F	122.12	21.87
E2F1	43.22	2.85
EGR1	79.09	3.79
EGR2	176.69	4.53
EGR3	85.25	34.18
EHF	323.31	8.66
ELF1	203.38	3.86
ELF2	227.62	7.83
ELF5	323.31	8.76
ELK1:TBX21	126.46	8.41
ELK1:TEF	323.31	7.99
ELK4	117.83	4.81
ENO1	80.42	3.13
EPAS1	65.43	7.76
ERF	207.67	6.25
ERG	199.81	25.70
ETS	196.80	1.63
ETS1	308.00	3.92

TF	Score 1	Score 2
ETS2	208.78	13.99
ETV1	153.32	7.02
ETV3	140.11	14.58
ETV5:EVX1	145.48	17.33
ETV5:HES7	8.76	8.74
ETV5:TCF3	203.52	5.90
FOXN4	73.43	5.59
FOXO1:ELK3	323.31	43.51
GABPA	197.57	20.39
GABPA:GABPB1	142.28	6.10
GCM2	13.68	18.80
GDNF	286.73	3.15
GMEB1	136.68	10.56
HIC1	223.55	4.56
HIF1A	241.47	1.71
HOXB2:ETV1	102.22	2.42
ID2	323.31	14.52
INSM1	193.85	15.87
JUN:JUNB	275.78	6.48
JUNB:JUN	202.73	5.07
KLF	252.10	8.35
KLF15	323.31	22.56
KLF17	87.51	14.77
KLF2	90.74	15.34
KLF4	209.71	9.38
KLF7	229.95	11.96
LHX8	244.38	2.95
MAX	323.31	8.35
MAZ	109.42	3.37
MBD2	8.41	1.95

TF	Score 1	Score 2
MNT	215.63	8.00
MTF1	323.31	14.21
MXI1	323.31	70.98
MYC	84.79	24.93
MYCN	165.16	25.87
MZF1	81.83	2.29
NFKB1	279.24	14.27
NFKB1:NFKB1	323.31	13.79
NFY	323.31	3.42
NONO	323.31	9.24
NR2C2	323.31	3.64
NRF1	45.13	30.75
OVOL2	323.31	31.61
PATZ1	101.85	9.30
PLAG1	177.90	11.02
PURA	196.04	17.98
R	22.49	3.99
RAD21	258.21	4.81
RBAK	267.43	11.25
RELA	323.31	4.68
RFX1	159.78	17.05
RFX4	323.31	35.28
RFX5	323.31	26.52
SAP1	124.23	14.63
SMC3	222.09	1.76
SP1	235.48	29.09
SP2	94.11	9.54
SP4	14.30	6.31
SPDEF	179.39	16.81
SPIC	323.31	28.49

TF	Score 1	Score 2
STAT	84.60	1.69
STAT1	323.31	5.38
TCF12	111.44	16.79
TCF3	323.31	14.05
TEAD4:ETV4	226.28	5.90
TFAP2A	25.86	20.26
TFAP2B	90.03	6.10
TFAP2C	169.60	8.55
TFAP4	93.98	2.36
TFE3	139.21	16.71
TP73	198.45	7.75
TR4	39.01	4.97
USF1	194.06	3.56
VEZF1	134.36	3.49
XBP1	323.31	44.58
XRCC5:XRCC6	132.56	3.92
YY1	62.59	5.30
ZBED6	183.14	20.23
ZBTB17	48.37	7.27
ZBTB26	151.91	16.84
ZBTB5	120.19	9.58
ZBTB7A	52.89	30.58
ZFX	13.33	14.55
ZFY	36.57	4.04
ZIC3	266.75	10.54
ZIC4	17.27	9.30
ZNF140	323.31	4.99
ZNF143	323.31	35.38
ZNF165	323.31	7.80
ZNF25	281.69	7.72

TF	Score 1	Score 2
ZNF322	120.49	11.55
ZNF325	69.42	2.74
ZNF408	214.73	2.22
ZNF467	127.21	4.64
ZNF479	226.76	3.26
ZNF48	106.17	9.88
ZNF511	84.74	9.87
ZNF553	93.45	9.17
ZNF555	232.83	7.63
ZNF624	235.50	3.84
ZNF672	266.64	10.80
ZNF675	323.31	5.81
ZNF676	323.31	16.54

Reverse-forward (RF)

TF	Score 1	Score 2	TF	Score 1	Score 2	TF	Score 1	Score 2
ARNT	323.31	14.12	MAX	304.34	8.64	TFE3	95.23	10.59
ARNT2	41.41	42.78	MLXIPL	64.44	10.74	THAP1	127.72	5.07
ASCL2	138.15	6.41	MUSCLE	23.05	3.47	**YY1**	323.31	9.92
ATF3	323.31	14.64	MYB	323.31	17.68	YY2	47.49	2.61
ATF4	323.31	25.14	MYBL1	316.23	23.27	ZBTB33	90.29	7.78
ATF7	79.30	4.96	MYC	323.31	12.23	ZBTB45	323.31	57.08
BCLAF1	148.24	8.52	MZF1	200.49	22.73	ZBTB7A	89.19	16.19
BHLHE40	323.31	12.42	NFY	209.97	3.22	ZBTB7B	43.90	23.59
CDCA7L	84.72	8.42	NFYA	323.31	11.75	ZFP64	147.00	13.59
CREB3	206.55	11.07	NHLH1	105.19	4.42	ZIC3	42.65	15.39
CREB3L1	323.31	7.63	NR1H3	323.31	9.38	ZNF100	27.67	4.75
CREB3L2	67.51	7.98	NR3C1	43.16	8.31	**ZNF143**	63.03	9.69
CTCF	240.61	4.56	OSR2	111.77	14.65	ZNF148	213.77	18.93
E2F	78.16	7.07	RFX1	323.31	22.99	ZNF16	323.31	47.43
E2F1	124.10	15.73	RXRA	146.30	15.11	ZNF37A	310.67	14.79
E2F3	65.67	8.85	SALL1	277.84	1.91	ZNF410	140.45	13.57
E2F6	165.75	30.69	SCRT2	301.48	9.60	ZNF419	247.63	11.25
EFNA2	255.01	10.95	SMAD6	259.24	7.43	ZNF429	87.05	32.39
ELK3	143.48	7.57	SP100	20.75	7.99	ZNF436	323.31	11.48
EP300	121.01	10.90	SP2	294.86	2.59	ZNF468	21.12	7.67
ETV5:CLOCK	42.10	7.29	SP4	110.94	19.63	ZNF557	299.44	9.58
GLIS2	37.40	17.34	SPDEF	185.85	14.35	ZNF575	39.45	14.38
GMEB2	323.31	7.81	SPZ1	323.31	9.87	ZNF586	260.73	6.18
HES1	88.18	9.46	SREBF1	67.27	15.74	ZNF611	279.80	15.65
HES7	166.52	14.60	SREBF2	297.27	1.62	ZNF616	189.53	30.98
HIVEP1	323.31	4.90	TAF1	252.27	17.47	ZNF692	202.47	2.33
HOXB2:ELK1	217.94	11.92	TATA	2.16	4.02	ZNF727	214.01	17.22
IRC900814	323.31	4.89	TFAP2A	20.17	29.15	ZNF770	300.52	4.71
KLF4	213.35	9.49	TFAP2B	29.46	12.62	ZNF773	150.45	8.84
KLF8	323.31	17.42	TFAP2C	112.10	51.21	ZSCAN21	323.31	5.55

813 Forward-reverse (FR) Reverse-forward (RF)

TF	Score 1	Score 2
AHR	38.81	13.41
ARNTL	155.78	1.96
ATF3	323.31	35.22
BCL	153.72	3.52
CREB3L1	323.31	27.96
CTCF	323.31	3.50
CXXC1	69.92	3.30
E2F	122.12	21.87
E2F1	43.22	2.85
EGR1	79.09	3.79
EGR3	85.25	34.18
ELF1	203.38	3.86
ELF2	227.62	7.83
ELK4	117.83	4.81
ERG	199.81	25.70
ETS	196.80	1.63
ETS1	308.00	3.92
HIC1	223.55	4.56
INSM1	193.85	15.87
KLF4	209.71	9.38
KLF7	229.95	11.96
MAX	323.31	8.35
MYC	84.79	24.93
MYCN	165.16	25.87
MZF1	81.83	2.29
NFY	323.31	3.42
NONO	323.31	9.24
NRF1	45.13	30.75
OVOL2	323.31	31.61
PLAG1	177.90	11.02

TF	Score 1	Score 2
RAD21	258.21	4.81
RFX1	159.78	17.05
SMC3	222.09	1.76
SP2	94.11	9.54
TFAP2A	25.86	20.26
TFAP2B	90.03	6.10
TFAP2C	169.60	8.55
TP73	198.45	7.75
USF1	194.06	3.56
XBP1	323.31	44.58
YY1	62.59	5.30
ZBTB7A	52.89	30.58
ZFX	13.33	14.55
ZNF143	323.31	35.38

TF	Score 1	Score 2
ARNT	323.31	14.12
ATF3	323.31	14.64
BHLHE40	323.31	12.42
CTCF	240.61	4.56
E2F	78.16	7.07
E2F3	65.67	8.85
EFNA2	255.01	10.95
GMEB2	323.31	7.81
KLF4	213.35	9.49
MYB	323.31	17.68
MYC	323.31	12.23
MZF1	200.49	22.73
NFYA	323.31	11.75
NR3C1	43.16	8.31
OSR2	111.77	14.65
SP2	294.86	2.59
SP4	110.94	19.63
SPDEF	185.85	14.35
SREBF2	297.27	1.62
TATA	2.16	4.02
TFAP2B	29.46	12.62
TFAP2C	112.10	51.21
YY1	323.31	9.92
YY2	47.49	2.61
ZBTB33	90.29	7.78
ZBTB7B	43.90	23.59
ZNF100	27.67	4.75
ZNF143	63.03	9.69

Table 3. Correlation of expression level of gene pairs separated by DNA motif sites of a

TF. Pairs of genes separated by 64 FR and 52 RF orientations of DNA motif sites of TFs

found in common in monocytes, T cells, HMEC and NPC were analyzed to find

significantly lower correlation of their expression level than the correlation of all pairs

of nearby genes among 53 tissues. Score: $-\log_{10}$ (p-value) of Mann-Whitney test.

Median correlation: median correlation coefficient of expression level of nearby gene

pairs separated by DNA motif sites. The median correlation coefficient of expression

level of all pairs of nearby genes is 0.17. # DNA site: number of DNA motif sites of a

TF separating gene pairs with expression data. Ubiquitously expressed genes with

coefficient of variance <90 and DNA motif sites nearby were not used for statistical test,

so the number of DNA motif sites was relatively small. The results using all genes were

shown in Supplemental material. All DNA motif sites of a TF were used including DNA

motif sites examined for the biased orientations of DNA motif sites of a TF in EPAs.

The results using only the biased orientations of DNA motif sites of a TF were shown in

Supplemental material.

Forward-reverse (FR)   **Reverse-forward (RF)**

TF	Score	Median correlation	# DNA site
AHR	1.80	0.12	520
ARNT	1.35	0.09	141
ATF2	1.40	0.11	166
ATF3	3.61	0.11	795
BHLHE41	2.02	0.07	118
CREB3L1	2.88	0.05	127
CTCF	6.02	0.09	837
E2F	3.73	0.10	444
E2F1	3.79	0.11	868
EGR1	2.97	0.10	391
ELF1	4.86	0.10	714
ELF2	3.88	0.11	781
ELK3	1.86	0.12	547
ELK4	2.44	0.11	663
ETS	3.34	0.11	523
ETS1	4.27	0.11	687
ETV7	3.68	0.11	662
HIC1	1.65	0.11	380
HINFP	1.33	0.09	258
KLF4	2.00	0.13	718
MYC	3.86	0.11	762
MYCN	2.36	0.11	583
MZF1	1.74	0.10	261
NFYB	2.97	0.10	264
NRF1	2.21	0.11	640
PLAG1	2.93	0.10	503
PLAGL1	2.55	0.10	414
RAD21	6.08	0.09	852
REST	4.35	0.11	920
RFX1	2.38	0.08	81
SIN3A	3.31	0.11	813
SMC3	6.18	0.09	625
SP2	2.30	0.12	738
TFAP2A	4.17	0.11	767
TFAP2C	2.13	0.11	470
USF1	4.24	0.10	628
XBP1	6.65	0.07	379
ZBTB33	4.90	0.10	701
ZBTB7A	2.82	0.10	485
ZFP62	2.95	0.11	565
ZFX	2.69	0.11	581
ZIC1	4.47	0.11	829
ZNF770	3.38	0.08	271

TF	Score	Median correlation	# DNA site
AP1	3.87	0.11	744
ARNT	2.95	0.10	453
ATF3	4.34	0.10	665
BHLHE40	2.49	0.07	155
CREB1	1.79	0.11	303
CTCF	5.96	0.09	721
E2F	3.95	0.10	663
E2F3	4.05	0.09	616
EFNA2	3.51	0.10	543
EGR1	2.58	0.10	428
EGR2	1.39	0.13	747
ETS1	3.75	0.11	667
FLI1:FIGLA	5.41	0.08	428
FOS	3.51	0.11	777
GMEB2	1.36	0.09	310
HIF1A	2.34	0.11	448
KLF4	2.21	0.12	744
MITF	3.14	0.10	419
MYC	4.85	0.10	704
MYCN	2.79	0.10	507
NFKB1	1.59	0.11	342
NFYA	2.15	0.10	229
NRF1	2.01	0.12	615
OSR2	1.99	0.12	301
PBX3	2.20	0.11	253
RFX2	2.12	0.09	168
RFX5	3.03	0.05	75
RUNX3	2.01	0.11	241
SP1	2.73	0.11	725
SP2	2.15	0.12	1090
SP4	2.33	0.11	479
SPDEF	5.29	0.07	449
TFAP2B	3.42	0.11	855
TFAP2C	2.05	0.11	576
TFCP2L1	1.45	0.13	362
YBX1	1.34	0.13	160
YY1	2.23	0.01	50
ZBTB33	3.44	0.11	886
ZBTB7B	2.27	0.13	892
ZNF143	2.26	0.07	81

Table 4. Top 30 of co-location and overlapping biased orientations of DNA binding

motif sequences of TFs in monocytes. Co-location and overlapping DNA motif

sequences of CTCF with another biased orientation of DNA motif sequence were shown

in separate tables. Motif 1,2: DNA binding motif sequences of TFs. No.: the number of

genomic locations with both Motif 1 and Motif 2 in upstream and downstream of genes

in EPAs (< 1 Mb distance from TSS of genes). Total number of genes is 30,523.

Forward-reverse (FR)

Motif 1	Motif 2	No.	Mean of distances bet. DNA sites (nt)	Median of distances bet. DNA sites (nt)	Mean of distances from TSS (nt)	Median of distances from TSS (nt)	Interquartile range of distance from TSS (nt)
FOS	JUN	3332	0.00	0	43202.95	18085	5524 - 48583
CTCF	**SMC3**	2876	0.01	0	34606.92	13716	3073 - 39471
FOSL2	JUN	2807	0.00	0	40389.84	17365	5424 - 45251
FOSB	FOSL2	2644	0.00	0	44302.93	17867	5633 - 47209
EGR1	EGR2	2397	0.00	0	14578.21	1251	247 - 11473
CTCF	**RAD21**	2352	0.00	0	33492.68	12913	2824 - 37672
RAD21	**SMC3**	2343	0.02	0	33572.80	14302	3856 - 37159
ATF3	FOSL2	2322	0.00	0	42784.04	17841	5366 - 48236
FOSL2	JUNB	2305	0.02	0	42884.36	17867	5706 - 46515
ETS2	ETSLIKE	2205	0.00	0	37660.66	15765	4146 - 41462
FOS	JUNB	2151	0.00	0	38403.20	16367	4849 - 44736
IRF	IRF4	1962	0.00	0	40794.41	15872	3969 - 45946
FOSL2	SMARCC1	1945	0.00	0	42429.69	17369	5094 - 46586
EGR1	WT1	1941	0.16	0	12485.23	427	93 - 5394
FOSB	JUN	1808	0.02	0	36648.74	16705	5156 - 40309
ATF3	JUN	1713	0.02	0	38101.24	17119	5294 - 43559
JUN	TFAP2A	1628	0.00	0	42262.97	18017	5089 - 47094
FOSL2	TFAP2A	1628	0.00	0	36606.38	16201	4949 - 41948
BACH2	SMARCC1	1462	0.16	0	38673.02	14778	4060 - 41262
ELF1	ETS1	1459	0.00	0	37056.72	14346	3370 - 40339
CHD2	E2F	1429	0.00	0	19220.38	1579	329 - 16257
JUN	NR3C1	1262	0.00	0	35052.17	14418	3844 - 38534
USF1	USF2	1260	0.00	0	25188.91	4726	413 - 24699
BACH2	JUNB	1238	0.15	0	36252.37	15302	4462 - 39393
BACH2	FOSB	1184	0.22	0	37190.80	14778	4038 - 41262
ETSLIKE	GABPA	1164	0.00	0	32352.24	11683	2356 - 36919
CTCF	CTCFL	1151	0.00	0	30252.04	11606	2229 - 34539
NR5A1	NR5A2	1133	0.00	0	41171.86	12243	2488 - 43136
ATF3	BACH2	1094	0.18	0	35659.16	13605	3821 - 39756
ETS2	GABPA	1092	0.06	0	27250.24	12184	2858 - 32196

847 Reverse-forward (RF)

Motif 1	Motif 2	No.	Mean of distances bet. DNA sites (nt)	Median of distances bet. DNA sites (nt)	Mean of distances from TSS (nt)	Median of distances from TSS (nt)	Interquartile range of distance from TSS (nt)
EGR1	EGR3	3012	0.00	0	17005.00	709	149 - 10393
NR1I2	NR1I3	2932	0.00	0	49622.84	20548	5924 - 58436
ZIC1	ZIC3	2871	0.07	0	21511.64	3092	434 - 19128
EGR	WT1	2612	0.04	0	9949.38	396	102 - 4266
FOS	FOS:JUN	2512	0.01	0	37200.80	15466	4438 - 42373
EGR	EGR3	2293	0.17	0	11634.92	532	135 - 6044
MAFG	NFE2L1:MAFG	2272	0.03	0	34641.56	16917	5284 - 42097
KLF10	SP1	2233	0.00	0	9778.94	297	73 - 3077
EGR	EGR2	2160	0.16	0	10502.76	490	129 - 5227
KLF3	SP3	2036	0.00	0	6974.78	246	63 - 1447
KLF1	SP3	1771	0.00	0	7748.42	264	66 - 1829
KLF10	SP3	1734	0.00	0	7275.48	222	58 - 1320
KLF7	SP4	1639	0.00	0	12521.62	309	58 - 4894
KLF1	SP1	1574	0.05	0	6780.46	245	61 - 1438
AP1	JUNB	1572	0.05	0	34158.07	15451	4746 - 40315
EGR1	WT1	1543	0.31	0	12742.28	444	111 - 5553
EGR1	SP1:SP3	1393	0.08	0	7789.54	307	91 - 1886
FOS:JUN	JUNB	1386	0.14	0	33012.80	14245	3900 - 37988
SP1	SP3	1372	0.00	0	8845.31	293	77 - 1816
EHF	ELF1	1366	0.02	0	41217.39	13357	2842 - 43178
CTCF	RXRA	1362	0.00	0	29981.33	10937	2100 - 31407
AP1	FOS	1327	0.03	0	33225.52	13455	3503 - 37399
ATF1	ATF3	1215	0.00	0	23125.06	3798	342 - 21091
ELK1	ZNF200	1156	0.05	0	22200.49	2883	181 - 17610
SP1	SP4	1137	0.00	0	7371.85	215	63 - 1232
EHF	ELF3	1134	0.00	0	36296.46	10912	596 - 37318
MEIS2	TGIF1	1018	0.00	0	47677.15	17654	3273 - 49233
KLF3	SP1	1017	0.06	0	6514.33	226	60 - 994
SPI1	ZNF200	913	0.06	0	10962.81	425	85 - 6046
AP1	FOS:JUN	860	0.09	0	50412.92	24217	7302 - 60018

850 FR orientation of CTCF

Motif 1	Motif 2	No.	Mean of distances bet. DNA sites (nt)	Median of distances bet. DNA sites (nt)	Mean of distances from TSS (nt)	Median of distances from TSS (nt)	Interquartile range of distance from TSS (nt)
CTCF	SMC3	2876	0.01	0	34606.92	13716	3073 - 39471
CTCF	RAD21	2352	0.00	0	33492.68	12913	2824 - 37672
CTCF	CTCFL	1151	0.00	0	30252.04	11606	2229 - 34539
CTCF	ZBTB7A	470	0.27	0	23227.96	7065	745 - 23496
CTCF	E2F	123	0.81	0	7913.36	222	61 - 1997
CTCF	WT1	120	0.00	0	3543.72	114	44 - 375
CTCF	MYC	110	2.30	0	31289.45	11948	2887 - 33972

853 RF orientation of CTCF

Motif 1	Motif 2	No.	Mean of distances bet. DNA sites (nt)	Median of distances bet. DNA sites (nt)	Mean of distances from TSS (nt)	Median of distances from TSS (nt)	Interquartile range of distance from TSS (nt)
CTCF	RXRA	1362	0.00	0	29981.33	10937	2100 - 31407
CTCF	CTCFL	429	0.00	0	25171.22	9834	1859 - 24741
CTCF	RAD21	337	0.00	0	38829.91	17973	6117 - 45749
CTCF	ZIC1	126	1.40	0	35480.65	10286	2316 - 29380
CTCF	ZIC3	108	0.00	0	30219.32	10904	4463 - 31037

856   **References**

858   Ackerman SL, Minden AG, Williams GT, Bobonis C, Yeung CY. 1991. Functional
859   significance of an overlapping consensus binding motif for Sp1 and Zif268 in
860   the murine adenosine deaminase gene promoter. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **88**:
861   7523-7527.

862   Ansari AZ, Peterson-Kaufman KJ. 2011. A partner evokes latent differences between
863   Hox proteins. *Cell* **147**: 1220-1221.

864   Bailey SD, Zhang X, Desai K, Aid M, Corradin O, Cowper-Sal Lari R, Akhtar-Zaidi B,
865   Scacheri PC, Haibe-Kains B, Lupien M. 2015. ZNF143 provides sequence
866   specificity to secure chromatin interactions at gene promoters. *Nat Commun* **2**:
867   6186.

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

872   Chatterjee R, Zhao J, He X, Shlyakhtenko A, Mann I, Waterfall JJ, Meltzer P,
873   Sathyanarayana BK, FitzGerald PC, Vinson C. 2012. Overlapping ETS and CRE
874   Motifs ((G/C)CGGAAGTGACGTCA) preferentially bound by GABPalpha and
875   CREB proteins. *G3 (Bethesda)* **2**: 1243-1256.

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

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

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

885   Guo Y, Xu Q, Canzio D, Shou J, Li J, Gorkin DU, Jung I, Wu H, Zhai Y, Tang Y et al.
886   2015. CRISPR Inversion of CTCF Sites Alters Genome Topology and
887   Enhancer/Promoter Function. *Cell* **162**: 900-910.

He X, Syed KS, Tillo D, Mann I, Weirauch MT, Vinson C. 2015. GABPalpha Binding
to Overlapping ETS and CRE DNA Motifs Is Enhanced by CREB1: Custom
DNA Microarrays. *G3 (Bethesda)* **5**: 1909-1918.
Hsu SC, Gilgenast TG, Bartman CR, Edwards CR, Stonestrom AJ, Huang P, Emerson
DJ, Evans P, Werner MT, Keller CA et al. 2017. The BET Protein BRD2
Cooperates with CTCF to Enforce Transcriptional and Architectural Boundaries.
Molecular cell **66**: 102-116 e107.
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.
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.
Jolma A, Yin Y, Nitta KR, Dave K, Popov A, Taipale M, Enge M, Kivioja T, Morgunova
E, Taipale J. 2015. DNA-dependent formation of transcription factor pairs alters
their binding specificity. *Nature* **527**: 384-388.
Jung I, Schmitt A, Diao Y, Lee AJ, Liu T, Yang D, Tan C, Eom J, Chan M, Chee S et al.
2019. A compendium of promoter-centered long-range chromatin interactions in
the human genome. *Nature genetics* **51**: 1442-1449.
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.
Kel AE, Gossling E, Reuter I, Cheremushkin E, Kel-Margoulis OV, Wingender E. 2003.
MATCH: A tool for searching transcription factor binding sites in DNA
sequences. *Nucleic acids research* **31**: 3576-3579.
Kheradpour P, Kellis M. 2014. Systematic discovery and characterization of regulatory
motifs in ENCODE TF binding experiments. *Nucleic acids research* **42**:
2976-2987.
Kin K, Chen X, Gonzalez-Garay M, Fakhouri WD. 2016. The effect of non-coding
DNA variations on P53 and cMYC competitive inhibition at cis-overlapping

motifs. *Hum Mol Genet* **25**: 1517-1527.

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.

Lieberman-Aiden E, van Berkum NL, Williams L, Imakaev M, Ragoczy T, Telling A,
Amit I, Lajoie BR, Sabo PJ, Dorschner MO et al. 2009. Comprehensive
mapping of long-range interactions reveals folding principles of the human
genome. *Science (New York, NY)* **326**: 289-293.

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.

Merabet S, Mann RS. 2016. To Be Specific or Not: The Critical Relationship Between
Hox And TALE Proteins. *Trends Genet* **32**: 334-347.

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.

Neph S, Kuehn MS, Reynolds AP, Haugen E, Thurman RE, Johnson AK, Rynes E,
Maurano MT, Vierstra J, Thomas S et al. 2012. BEDOPS: high-performance
genomic feature operations. *Bioinformatics (Oxford, England)* **28**: 1919-1920.

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.

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

958 Purmann A, Toedling J, Schueler M, Carninci P, Lehrach H, Hayashizaki Y, Huber W,
959   Sperling S. 2007. Genomic organization of transcriptomes in mammals:
960   Coregulation and cofunctionality. *Genomics* **89**: 580-587.

961 Rao SS, Huntley MH, Durand NC, Stamenova EK, Bochkov ID, Robinson JT, Sanborn
962   AL, Machol I, Omer AD, Lander ES et al. 2014. A 3D map of the human
963   genome at kilobase resolution reveals principles of chromatin looping. *Cell* **159**:
964   1665-1680.

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

967 Sherwood RI, Hashimoto T, O'Donnell CW, Lewis S, Barkal AA, van Hoff JP, Karun V,
968   Jaakkola T, Gifford DK. 2014. Discovery of directional and nondirectional
969   pioneer transcription factors by modeling DNase profile magnitude and shape.
970   *Nature biotechnology* **32**: 171-178.

971 Shlyueva D, Stampfel G, Stark A. 2014. Transcriptional enhancers: from properties to
972   genome-wide predictions. *Nature reviews Genetics* **15**: 272-286.

973 Shrivastava A, Calame K. 1994. An analysis of genes regulated by the multi-functional
974   transcriptional regulator Yin Yang-1. *Nucleic acids research* **22**: 5151-5155.

975 Slattery M, Riley T, Liu P, Abe N, Gomez-Alcala P, Dror I, Zhou T, Rohs R, Honig B,
976   Bussemaker HJ et al. 2011. Cofactor binding evokes latent differences in DNA
977   binding specificity between Hox proteins. *Cell* **147**: 1270-1282.

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

982 van Helden J. 2003. Regulatory sequence analysis tools. *Nucleic acids research* **31**:
983   3593-3596.

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

Wang J, Zhuang J, Iyer S, Lin X, Whitfield TW, Greven MC, Pierce BG, Dong X,

Kundaje A, Cheng Y et al. 2012a. Sequence features and chromatin structure

around the genomic regions bound by 119 human transcription factors. *Genome*

research **22**: 1798-1812.

Wang L, Wang S, Li W. 2012b. RSeQC: quality control of RNA-seq experiments.

Bioinformatics (Oxford, England) **28**: 2184-2185.

Wei Z, Gao F, Kim S, Yang H, Lyu J, An W, Wang K, Lu W. 2013. Klf4 organizes

long-range chromosomal interactions with the oct4 locus in reprogramming and

pluripotency. *Cell Stem Cell* **13**: 36-47.

Weintraub AS, Li CH, Zamudio AV, Sigova AA, Hannett NM, Day DS, Abraham BJ,

Cohen MA, Nabet B, Buckley DL et al. 2017. YY1 Is a Structural Regulator of

Enhancer-Promoter Loops. *Cell* **171**: 1573-1588 e1528.

Wingender E, Dietze P, Karas H, Knuppel R. 1996. TRANSFAC: a database on

transcription factors and their DNA binding sites. *Nucleic acids research* **24**:

238-241.

Xi H, Yu Y, Fu Y, Foley J, Halees A, Weng Z. 2007. Analysis of overrepresented motifs

in human core promoters reveals dual regulatory roles of YY1. *Genome research*

17: 798-806.

Xie X, Mikkelsen TS, Gnirke A, Lindblad-Toh K, Kellis M, Lander ES. 2007.

Systematic discovery of regulatory motifs in conserved regions of the human

genome, including thousands of CTCF insulator sites. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*

104: 7145-7150.

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.

Yardimci GG, Ozadam H, Sauria MEG, Ursu O, Yan KK, Yang T, Chakraborty A, Kaul

A, Lajoie BR, Song F et al. 2019. Measuring the reproducibility and quality of

Hi-C data. *Genome Biol* **20**: 57.

Yoon SO, Chikaraishi DM. 1992. Tissue-specific transcription of the rat tyrosine

hydroxylase gene requires synergy between an AP-1 motif and an overlapping E

box-containing dyad. *Neuron* **9**: 55-67.

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, Liu T, Meyer CA, Eeckhoute J, Johnson DS, Bernstein BE, Nusbaum C,

Myers RM, Brown M, Li W et al. 2008. Model-based analysis of ChIP-Seq

(MACS). *Genome Biol* **9**: R137.

Zhao Y, Stormo GD. 2011. Quantitative analysis demonstrates most transcription factors

require only simple models of specificity. *Nature biotechnology* **29**: 480-483.

1026