Discovery of biased orientations of regulatory motifs affecting human

gene transcription and including chromatin-associated motifs

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 play essential roles in 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. Other DNA

binding proteins such as YY1, ZNF143 and SMARCA4 are also reported to be involved

in chromatin interactions. However, the overall picture of proteins associated with

chromatin interactions and insulator function is still unclear. Here I describe a

systematic and comprehensive approach to discover DNA binding motif sequences of

transcription factors (TFs), affecting the interaction between enhancers and promoters

of genes and their expression. This analysis identified 96 biased orientations of DNA

motifs of TFs that affected the expression level of putative transcriptional target genes

significantly in monocytes, T cells, HMEC and NPC in common, and included known

TFs involved in chromatin interactions and insulator function such as CTCF, cohesin

(RAD21 and SMC3), YY1 and ZNF143. The 96 biased orientations of DNA motifs

contain 64 forward-reverse (FR) and 52 reverse-forward (RF) orientations of DNA

motifs (Some TFs have more than one DNA motifs in databases, so the total number is

smaller than the sum of FR and RF). The merger of DNA motif sites of biased

orientation of a TF and CTCF showed a higher expression level of putative

transcriptional target genes than DNA motif sites of only CTCF, and 42 TFs, except for

CTCF, RAD21 and SMC3, indicated a higher expression level. Among 42 TFs, KLF4

and ERG were reported to be associated with chromatin interactions. Most of the other

TFs were also known to have chromatin-associated functions. Moreover, to confirm the

predicted DNA motifs, first, they were compared with chromatin interaction data. Despite the limitation of resolution of chromatin interaction data, for 44 (69%) FR and 28 (54%) RF orientations of DNA motif sequences in CD4$^+$ T cells, EPIs predicted based on an enhancer-promoter association (EPA) that was shortened at the biased orientations of DNA motif sites, overlapped with chromatin interactions significantly more than other types of EPAs. Second, 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. Some DNA motif sites of biased orientations of DNA motifs of TFs were found between nearby genes not including DNA motif sites of the known TFs involved in chromatin interactions and between low correlation of expression level of nearby genes. These analyses suggest that the DNA motifs affect gene expression.

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 play essential roles in 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 involved in chromatin interaction and EPI (Bailey et al. 2015;

Barutcu et al. 2016; Weintraub et al. 2017). ZNF143 is known to bind more to promoter

of genes than distal regions, establishing looping with distal element bound by CTCF

(Bailey et al. 2015). DNA binding motif sequence of ZNF143 is significantly enriched

at both chromatin interaction anchors (Z-score > 7), whereas DNA binding motif

sequence of YY1 does not seem to be enriched (Z-score < 2; Bailey et al. 2015 Figure

2a). CTCF, cohesin, ZNF143, YY1 and SMARCA4 have various biological functions

other than chromatin interaction. These transcription factors (TFs) are bound in open

chromatin regions near transcriptional start sites (TSS) as well as chromatin interaction

anchors, which may reduce the enrichment of the DNA motif sites of the TFs at

chromatin interaction anchors.

Computational approaches to predict chromatin interactions were developed

(Schreiber et al. 2017; Zhang et al. 2017). However, they were not intended to find

DNA motif sequences of TFs involved in chromatin interactions. (Xie et al. 2005)

mentioned in Conclusion section that the next challenge will be to develop systematic

methods to discern the specific functions of these motifs in a genome-wide fashion.

DNA binding proteins involved in chromatin interactions are considered to affect

the transcription of genes in the loops formed by chromatin interactions. To confirm this

notion, I previously 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 the transcriptional target genes were significantly different, compared with the

expression levels of transcriptional target genes of TFs predicted based on only

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. The expression level of putative transcriptional target

genes of a TF bound in enhancers is changed significantly, when EPIs are predicted

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

of the expression level would reflect the accuracy of prediction of transcriptional target

genes of a TF based on a given EPA. Using this approach, I planned to search for other

DNA binding proteins involved in chromatin interactions, affecting the expression level

of putative transcriptional target genes through their insulator function.

Experimental analyses of chromatin interactions in molecular biology have

technical limitations: chromatin interaction data are altered, 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 noises such as ligation error.

Avoiding the technical limitations of experimental analyses, here I searched

computationally 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 and DNA motif sites of

TFs 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

based on 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 TFs with

insulator function, 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 the enhancer activity of each general 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 general TFs was compared among

forward-reverse (FR), reverse-forward (RF) orientations and non-orientation (i.e.

without considering orientation) of DNA motif sites of an insulator TF shortening an

EPA using Mann-Whitney test, two-sided (p-value $< 10^{-7}$), and putative insulator TFs

with significant differences of the distributions of the ratios of expression level among

FR, RF orientations and non-orientation were enumerated (Fig. 2A).

To confirm the prediction of TFBS, the distributions of TFBS were examined in

the human genome. TFBS involved in chromatin interactions were identified 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 motif sites of

the TFs were identified 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 TFBS may be

predicted to some extent. Total 96 of biased (64 FR and 52 RF) orientations of DNA

binding motif sequences of TFs were discovered in the four cell types in common,

whereas non-orientation of DNA binding motif sequences of TFs were not detected (Fig.

3; Table 1; Supplemental material). The FR orientation of DNA motif sequences

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

chromatin interaction and EPI.

Without considering the difference of orientations of DNA binding motif

sequences among cell types, 175 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 numbers of TFs with biased orientations of DNA motifs, and not the unique

numbers of DNA motifs. Possible causes of the number 175 increased from 96 are as

follows: (1) 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). (2) 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 in the same or

different databases of TFs. (3) I previously found that a complex of TFs 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). In

other reports, the difference of binding specificity of pairs of TFs was investigated

(Jolma et al. 2015). Cofactors also contribute to alter binding specificity of TFs (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.

There may be a possibility that DNA binding sites of biased orientations of TFs

were located near those of CTCF, so the biased orientations of TFs seem to have

insulator function. To address the issue, an EPA was shortened at the DNA binding sites

of biased orientations of CTCF and another biased orientation of a TF in 96 TFs found

in common among the four cell types. Transcriptional target genes of TFs were

predicted based on the EPA, and the ratio of expression level of transcriptional target

genes of a TF in open chromatin regions in the EPA and closed chromatin regions in

promoter was examined. The ratio was compared between an EPA shortened at the

DNA binding sites of CTCF and the merger of those of CTCF and another biased

orientation of a TF. If the DNA binding sites of biased orientation of a TF include

insulator sites not associated with those of CTCF, the ratio would be higher than an EPA

shortened at the DNA binding sites of only CTCF. However, there are many DNA

binding sites of CTCF in the human genome, the difference between the ratios may not

be large. The biased orientations of CTCF consist of 19 DNA binding motif sequences

in monocyte. When comparing the DNA sites of each DNA binding motif sequence of

CTCF with those of merger of the same CTCF and another biased orientation of a TF,

among 96 biased orientations of TFs, 79, 70, 95 and 62 TFs showed a higher ratio in

monocyte, CD4$^+$ T cell, HMEC and NPC respectively (p-value < 0.05) (Supplemental

material). YY1 was in a higher rank (the top in HMEC and NPC, second in T cell, and

fifth in monocyte). The rank of each TF was normalized by the lowest rank in each cell

type and was summed in the four cell types, where 45 TFs were found in common

(Table 2). The result is consistent that the DNA binding sites of YY1 are not frequently

located close to those of CTCF and are associated with chromatin interactions inside

chromatin interactions formed by CTCF (Weintraub et al. 2017) (Figure 2C, D, E and

Figure 7E in the reference). About 45 – 65% of DNA binding sites of ZNF143 are

closely located to those of CTCF in three cell types (Wen et al. 2018) (Figure 1a in the

reference). DNA binding sites of ZNF143 tend to be close to transcriptional start sites in

promoters. Other biased orientations of TFs potentially have DNA sites with insulator

function other than DNA sites of CTCF. Actually, KLF4 (Di Giammartino et al. 2019)

and ERG (Zhang et al. 2019; Li et al. 2020) were found to be associated with chromatin

interactions. Myc (Knoepfler et al. 2006; Sabo and Amati 2014), ETS family including

ELK3 (Yang et al. 2015), RUNX3 (Lee et al. 2019), USF1 (Huang et al. 2007; Li et al.

2016), AHR/ARNT (Swanson 2002), SP2 (Volkel et al. 2015), EGR2 (Mager et al.

2008; Frob and Wegner 2020; Wust et al. 2020), ZBTB33 (Blattler et al. 2013), NF-Y

(Oldfield et al. 2014), MITF (Levy and Fisher 2011; Laurette et al. 2015), NONO (Ma

et al. 2016), FLI1 (Riggi et al. 2014), E2F (Taubert et al. 2004; Blais and Dynlacht

2007; Subtil-Rodriguez et al. 2014) were associated with chromatin remodeling,

chromatin accessibility and/or histone modification. DNA sites of these TFs would

affect gene expression by chromatin-associated functions. (Huang et al. 2007)

mentioned that the insulator element at the 5' end of the chicken beta-globin locus acts

as a barrier, protecting transgenes against silencing effects of adjacent heterochromatin.

The transcription factor USF1 binds within the insulator and that this site is important

for generating in adjacent nucleosomes histone modifications associated with active

chromatin and, by inference, with barrier function. As another criterion of comparison,

when the DNA sites of DNA motif sequences of all biased orientations of CTCF were

merged, and an EPA was shortened at the merged DNA sites, among 96 biased

orientations of TFs, 1, 0, 34 and 14 TFs showed a higher ratio in monocyte, CD4^{+} T cell,

HMEC and NPC respectively (*p*-value < 0.05), and included YY1 in HMEC and NPC,

but did not include YY1 and ZNF143 in monocyte and T cell (Supplemental material).

The criterion of the comparison seemed to be strict. DNA binding sites of CTCF

involved in non-insulator function and false-positive predictions of DNA binding sites

of CTCF might affect the result of the analysis.

Comparison with chromatin interaction data

To ask 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.

EPIs predicted based on an EPA were compared with three replications (B2T1, B2T2

and B3T1) of HiChIP chromatin interaction data in CD4^{+} T cells separately (Mumbach

et al. 2017). The resolutions of HiChIP chromatin interaction data and EPIs were

adjusted to 5 kilobases (kb). 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 $\geq 1,000$ counts for each

interaction and 78,209 at 5 kb resolution with $\geq 6,000$ counts for each interaction

(Supplemental material). 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 with putative insulator

function 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.

For 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), 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 3). When comparing EPIs predicted based on only EPA (i) and (iii) with

the chromatin interactions, for total 390 biased orientations [261 (96%) FR and 199

(94%) RF of 273 FR and 211 RF] of DNA motif sequences in T cells, a significantly

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

(Table 3; 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

a 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 correlated with chromatin interaction data. Most of biased orientations

of DNA motif sequences (95%) were correlated with chromatin interactions, when

comparing EPIs predicted based on EPA (i) and (iii) with HiChIP chromatin interactions.

Chromatin interaction data were obtained from different samples from DNase-seq open

chromatin regions, so individual differences may exist. Individual differences of

chromatin interactions were larger than those of open chromatin regions (Mumbach et

al. 2017).

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. For 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), 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, for total 282 biased orientations [182 (91%) FR

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

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

(Supplemental material).

In 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. For 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, 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, for total

482 biased orientations [283 (98%) FR and 309 (96%) RF of 290 FR and 323 RF] of

DNA motif sequences, a significantly higher ratio of EPIs overlapped with the

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

In GM12878 cells, for 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), 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, for total 366

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

motif sequences, a significantly higher ratio of EPIs overlapped with the chromatin

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

In situ Hi-C data in HMEC, which are available in 4D nucleome data portal, were

compared with putative EPIs. The number of unique in situ Hi-C cis chromatin

interactions was 121,873,642 at 3 kb resolution. For 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, a significantly higher

ratio of EPIs overlapped with in situ Hi-C chromatin interactions ($\geq$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, for total 406 biased orientations [268 (86%) FR

and 230 (86%) RF of 310 FR and 269 RF] of DNA motif sequences, 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 they were produced with H3K27ac

antibody to capture chromatin interactions. In situ Hi-C data consist of all types of

chromatin interactions and thus, contain a smaller number of enhancer-promoter

interactions than HiChIP data. Chromatin interactions with a small number of counts

may be artifacts occurred by 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

procudure as T cell and HMEC (Jung et al. 2019). The number of unique promoter

capture Hi-C cis chromatin interactions was 9,436,689 at 5 kb resolution. For 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, 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, for total 186

biased orientations [99 (48%) FR and 103 (43%) RF of 205 FR and 241 RF] of DNA

motif sequences, 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 was shortened at DNA

motif sites of known TFs involved in 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). In

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

chromatin interaction data (50 kb).

The biased orientations of DNA motif sites of known TFs involved in chromatin

interactions such as CTCF, RAD21, SMC3, YY1 and ZNF143 may be overlapped 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 the known TFs 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 investigate 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 separately, target genes of EPIs

overlapped with chromatin interactions indicated 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. For almost all

(99% - 100%) FR and RF orientations of DNA motifs, 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.

Recently high resolution of chromatin interaction data were publicly available

(Krietenstein et al. 2020). The biased orientations of DNA sites of TFs were examined

using Micro-C chromatin interaction data in human fibroblast. The resolution of the

data was adjusted to 200 b. DNA sites of CTCF, RAD21 and SMC3 showed a

significant directional bias at the pairs of chromatin interaction anchors. DNA sites of

SMRC2 showed a directional bias at the anchors. SMARCA4 is known to be involved

in higher-order chromatin structure such as topologically associating domain (TAD)

(Barutcu et al. 2016). DNA motifs of SMARCA4 did not exist in the databases of DNA

motifs of TFs used in this analysis. SMRC2 was not identified in this analysis, because I

searched for DNA sites of TFs affecting EPI and gene expression, which are not

high-order chromatin structure. ATF3 and ZBTB7A in Table 2 were found among top 32

biased orientations of DNA sites of TFs at the pairs of chromatin interaction anchors

with p-value $< 10^{-50}$. Deletion of an ATF3 binding site affected the expression of a target

gene, which was far apart from the site (Kim et al. 2017). ZBTB7A is involved in the

changes in chromatin accessibility and the regulation of gene expression (Ramos Pittol

et al. 2018). DNA sites of YY1 and ZNF143 also indicated a weak directional bias at the

chromatin interaction anchors. In this analysis, biased orientations of DNA sites of TFs

were investigated based on the difference of distribution of expression level of putative

transcriptional target genes, and YY1 and ZNF143 showed significant directional biases,

implying that the analysis in this study is able to find TFs that do not have a strong

directional bias based on the number of DNA sites at chromatin interaction anchors.

Most of TFs (37/39), except for CTCF, RAD21 and SMC3, in Table 2 showed weak

directional biases at the chromatin interaction anchors.

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

To ask whether the biased orientations of DNA motif sites affect gene expression,

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

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

human genome. The expression levels of closely located genes including divergent gene

pairs tend to be correlated among tissues (Purmann et al. 2007; Xie et al. 2007). When a

biased orientation of DNA motif sites serve 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 (CV) <90. After this filtering, 43 (72%) FR and

40 (80%) RF of 60 FR and 50 RF showed significantly lower correlations of expression

levels of gene pairs separated by the DNA motif sites of a TF than the correlations of all

pairs of neighbor genes with intergene distance <1 megabase (Mb) (Mann-Whitney test,

p-value < 0.05) (Table 4). The FR and RF orientations of TFs included known TFs

involved in 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 levels of gene pairs separated by the

DNA motif sites of a TF. The 20 TFs included known TFs involved in 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 an EPA, 33 (60%)

FR and 36 (77%) RF of 55 FR and 47 RF showed significantly lower correlations of

expression levels of gene pairs separated by the DNA motif sites (Supplemental

material). With intergene distance <20 kb, 21 (34%) FR and 8 (15%) RF of 62 FR and

52 RF showed significantly lower correlations of expression levels of gene pairs

separated by the DNA motif sites of a TF than the correlations of all pairs of neighbor

genes (Supplemental material).

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

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

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

median numbers of DNA motif sites not showing lower correlations significantly were

122 and 115 for FR and RF respectively. Mann-Whitney test p-value = 0 and < 10^{-10} for

FR and RF respectively). This suggests that if the criteria to examine the correlations of

expression levels of gene pairs separated by DNA motif sites are more stringent, and

thus the number of DNA motif sites is reduced, it would be more difficult to identify

using a statistical test the difference of correlations of expression levels of gene pairs

separated by the reduced DNA motif sites of TFs, particularly for TFs with a small

number of DNA motif sites.

Among 91 biased orientations of DNA motifs of TFs found in common in the

four cell types, after removing five known TFs involved in chromatin interactions such

as CTCF, RAD21, SMC3, YY1 and ZNF143, DNA motif sites of 88 TFs were located

at ≥1 genomic regions between gene pairs not including DNA motif sites of the known

TFs, and at ≥1 genomic regions between low correlation (< 0.13) of expression level of

gene pairs (when ubiquitously expressed genes among 53 tissues were eliminated with

CV <90. The median correlation coefficient of expression level of all pairs of nearby

genes is 0.17, Table 4). DNA motif sites of 52 TFs were placed at ≥10 genomic

regions.

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 5;

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). CTCF was partially overlapped with cohesin RAD21 and

SMC3 (Table 5). Top 30 pairs of FR and RF orientations of DNA motifs overlapped or

co-localized were shown (Table 5). 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 identified in the four cell types in common,

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

overlapping and co-location of DNA motifs of TFs serve 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 function

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

The approach in this study is an initial comprehensive method to find DNA motif

sequences of transcription factors (TFs) affecting enhancer-promoter interactions (EPIs)

and gene expression, such as CTCF and cohesin (RAD21 and SMC3), without using

chromatin interaction data. 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 non-orientation (i.e. without

considering orientation) of DNA motif sequences of TFs were 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 EPIs, which were supported by

the comparisons with chromatin interaction and gene expression data. FF and RR

orientations of DNA sites of TFs were not examined in this analysis, since CTCF has

FR or RF orientation of its DNA sites. Among 96 biased orientations of DNA motif

sequences of TFs, 42, except for CTCF, RAD21 and SMC3, showed a different

distribution of expression level of putative transcriptional target genes in comparison

with CTCF under a statistical threshold; four of the 42 were reported to be associated

with chromatin interactions and most of the others were known to have

chromatin-associated functions. The analysis of biased orientations of DNA sites of the

42 TFs at pairs of chromatin interaction anchors indicated a weak statistical significance,

except for two TFs, suggesting that 40 TFs were difficult to find (Bailey et al. 2015).

To predict DNA motif sites of TFs, I tried several tools and methods, and then

used protein interaction quantitation (PIQ) tool (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 has revealed that PIQ shows 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 increased the number of biased orientations of

DNA motif sequences of TFs, reducing the number of non-orientation of DNA motif

sequences of TFs. At first, the number of predicted DNA motif sites of TFs was

expected to increase, relative to using consensus DNA sequences of TFs, which seemed

to be stringent to find all DNA motif sites of a TF in the genome. However, the number

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

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

predictions of DNA motif sites, reducing false positive predictions.

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). The

approach in this study would be able to identify TFs forming heterodimer. If the DNA

motif site of only the mate to a pair of TFs was found in an EPA, the EPA was shortened

at one side of the DNA motif site, and transcriptional target genes were predicted based

on the EPA shortened at the side. In this analysis, the mate to both heterodimer and

homodimer of TFs can be tested 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.

TFs that are multi-functional transcriptional regulator such as YY1 may not

indicate a strong directional bias of their DNA motif sites. Though some proportion of

DNA motif sites of a TF involved in chromatin interaction and insulator function lie in

biased orientation in the genome, the other DNA motif sites of the TF may not form a

dimer with another TF, and not be present in a specific orientation in the genome. Thus,

overall proportion of biased orientations of DNA motif sites of a TF may be reduced, so

that a statistical test cannot detect it.

The approach in this study was tested to search for repeat sequences serving as

insulator sites and affecting the expression level of putative transcriptional target genes

of TFs. A small number of repeat sequences were identified and included MIR, which

acts as insulators (Wang et al. 2015).

CTCF and cohesin-binding sites are frequently mutated in cancer (Katainen et al.

2015). Some biased orientations of DNA motif sequences would be involved in

chromatin interactions and might be associated with diseases including cancer.

The analyses taken here suggest that biased orientations of DNA motifs of

discovered TFs affect enhancer-promoter interactions and the expression level of

putative transcriptional target genes of general TFs bound in enhancers and promoters.

This gives insight into the nature of TFs and contributes to the researches of functions

and molecular mechanisms of chromatin interactions, regulation of chromatin, histone

modifications, transcriptional regulation and transcriptional cascades.

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

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

DNA motif sites of TFs in open chromatin regions, DNA motif search was performed

by protein interaction quantitation (PIQ) tool 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, narrow peaks of ChIP-seq

experimental data of H3K27ac were predicted using macs2 callpeak (GEO:

GSM773004) (Zhang et al. 2008). To predict DNA motif sites of TFs from closed

chromatin regions, another method was employed. 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 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),

because 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 of 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. The limitation of extension

length was ＜1 Mb in this study. Extended regions for an EPA were shortened at the

DNA motif sites of a putative insulator TF that were the closest to a TSS, and

transcriptional target genes were predicted based on the shortened EPA and DNA motif

sites of a general TF in open chromatin regions. Promoter and extended regions of an

EPA were shortened at the forward–reverse (FR) orientation of DNA binding sites of a

putative insulator TF. When forward or reverse orientation of DNA binding sites were

continuously located in the genome 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 to select representative transcripts among various alternate forms for assigning

promoter and extended regions of an EPA. From the list of transcription factor binding

sequences and transcriptional target genes, redundant transcription factor binding

sequences were removed by comparing the putative target genes of a transcription

factor binding sequence and its corresponding TF; if identical, one of the transcription

factor binding sequences was chosen. When the number of transcriptional target genes

predicted based on a transcription factor binding sequence was less than five, the

transcription factor binding sequence was omitted.

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

sequence were obtained from UCSF-UBC human reference epigenome mapping project

RNA-seq reads with poly-A of naive CD4$^+$ T cells (GEO: GSM669617). 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 analyzed. 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 by RSeQC (Wang et al.

2012b). 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 based on closed chromatin regions in promoters.

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

predicted based on 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 an EPA and closed chromatin regions in promoters.

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

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

DNA motif sequence shortening an EPA using Mann-Whitney test, two-sided (p-value <

10^{-7}). Other parameters for the analysis were set as follows: the number of

transcriptional target genes of a TF was ≥50, the number of general TFs (not insulator

TFs) to predict transcriptional target genes was ≥50, and the number of DNA motif

sites of a TF (insulator TF) shortening an EPA 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 ≥6,000 and ≥1,000 counts for each interaction were analyzed in the

comparison in CD4^{+} T cells. According to the unique numbers of chromatin interactions

in replications in Th17, Treg and GM12878 cells, chromatin interactions with ≥1,000

(B1T2 in Th17), ≥2,000 (B2T1 and B3T1 in Th17), ≥6,000 (B3T1 in Treg), ≥4,000

(B1 and B2 in GM12878) counts for each interaction were analyzed in the comparison.

Enhancer-promoter interactions (EPIs) were predicted based on 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 non-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 based on the three types of EPAs in common were removed. EPIs

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

predicted based on EPA (i) and (ii) were removed from EPIs predicted based on 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 EPI (i) and (iii), and EPI (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, the

genomic positions of chromatin interactions in 'HMEC_4DNFI97O9SAZ.pairs.gz' file

in 4D nucleome data portal (http://data.4dnucleome.org) 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 in the comparison. For comparison of EPIs with

chromatin interactions (promoter capture Hi-C) in NPC, the resolutions of chromatin

interaction data in 'GSE86189_npc.po.all.txt.bz2' file (GEO: GSE86189) and EPIs were

adjusted to 5 kb before their comparison. All chromatin interactions were used in the

comparison.

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 the same transcriptional target gene of a TF

in an enhancer was predicted based on 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).

Micro-C chromatin interaction data in human fibroblast (4D nucleome data portal

ID: 4DNFICOEXGPJ) was converted into hg19 version of human genome using

liftOver tool and was adjusted to 200 b resolution. The same genomic locations of pairs

of chromatin interaction anchors were merged.

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.

Acknowledgements

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

of Medical Science at the University of Tokyo. Publication charges for this article were

funded by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number 16K00387. 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. The enhancer-promoter

association was shortened at the forward-reverse orientation of DNA binding motif sites

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

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

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

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

target genes predicted based on DNA motif sites of a transcription factor in closed

chromatin regions in promoters (X-axis) and an 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) (Osato 2018). Red dots indicate the median

expression level of target genes was significantly higher in an EPA than closed

chromatin regions, and blue dots indicate the median expression level of target genes

was significantly lower in an EPA than closed chromatin regions (Mann-Whitney test).

The expression level of target genes predicted based on an EPA tend to be higher than

closed chromatin regions, implying that TFs serve as activators of target genes. DNA

motif sites of TFs overlapped with H3K27ac ChIP-seq peaks were associated with a

significant difference of expression level of target genes, and DNA motif sites not

overlapped with H3K27ac peaks were not associated with the difference (lower right

two graphs). This suggests that the significant difference of expression level is

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 in 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 in intergenic and intron regions. YY1 is known to be at

TSS in the edge of exons of genes, and is involved in transcriptional activation,

repression and initiation.

Figure 3. Biased orientations of DNA motif sequences of TFs affect the transcription of genes by the 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 affected significantly the expression level of putative transcriptional target genes in monocytes, T cells, HMEC and NPC in common, whereas non-orientation (i.e. without considering

orientation) of DNA binding motif sequence of a TF did not 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 selected

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 in common. 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 biased orientation of a TF and CTCF in terms of expression

level of putative transcriptional target genes. The merger of DNA motif sites of a TF

and CTCF showed a higher expression level of putative transcriptional target genes than

DNA motif sites of only CTCF. In each cell type, a rank was divided by the lowest rank

for normalization. Rank total: the sum of the normalized ranks. Known TFs associated

with chromatin interactions are indicated in bold.

Rank	TF	Rank total	monocyte	T cell	HMEC	NPC	Rank	TF	Rank total	monocyte	T cell	HMEC	NPC
1	**YY1**	0.58	0.28	0.11	0.11	0.08	24	XBP1	2.37	0.94	0.56	0.33	0.54
2	NR3C1	0.60	0.06	0.06	0.33	0.15	25	PBX3	2.40	0.50	0.89	0.78	0.23
3	MYC	0.93	0.06	0.39	0.33	0.15	26	**ZNF143**	2.44	0.39	0.94	0.33	0.77
4	YY2	1.08	0.56	0.33	0.11	0.08	27	NFYB	2.45	0.33	0.72	0.78	0.62
5	TATA	1.19	0.78	0.22	0.11	0.08	28	TFAP2C	2.48	0.28	0.94	0.33	0.92
6	MAX	1.32	0.06	0.28	0.22	0.77	28	NFY	2.48	0.72	0.78	0.44	0.54
7	MZF1	1.56	0.33	0.39	0.22	0.62	29	ZBTB7A	2.56	0.56	0.67	0.33	1.00
8	SREBF2	1.64	0.39	0.33	0.22	0.69	30	FOS	2.62	1.00	0.89	0.11	0.62
9	ATF3	1.71	0.06	0.67	0.22	0.77	31	**RAD21**	2.66	0.50	0.61	0.78	0.77
10	CREB3L1	1.74	0.28	0.89	0.11	0.46	31	AHR	2.66	1.00	0.94	0.33	0.38
11	ETS1	1.78	0.50	0.33	0.33	0.62	32	KLF4	2.69	0.72	0.94	0.33	0.69
12	ETS	1.84	0.28	0.83	0.11	0.62	33	**SMC3**	2.77	0.56	0.89	0.56	0.77
13	RUNX3	1.99	0.28	0.89	0.67	0.15	34	MITF	2.83	0.67	0.72	0.44	1.00
14	PLAG1	2.00	0.17	0.72	0.11	1.00	35	ELK3	2.89	0.72	0.83	0.33	1.00
15	TP73	2.12	0.44	1.00	0.44	0.23	35	NONO	2.89	0.89	0.78	0.22	1.00
16	MYB	2.14	0.17	0.83	0.44	0.69	36	ERG	2.94	0.78	0.83	0.33	1.00
17	USF1	2.15	0.94	0.83	0.22	0.15	37	FLI1	3.00	0.94	0.83	0.22	1.00
18	ARNT	2.16	0.39	0.94	0.44	0.38	38	ZNF770	3.07	0.72	0.83	0.67	0.85
19	**CTCF**	2.17	0.33	0.78	0.44	0.62	39	E2F	3.15	1.00	0.89	0.33	0.92
20	SP2	2.25	0.83	0.89	0.22	0.31	40	HIC1	3.17	0.89	0.94	0.33	1.00
21	EGR2	2.26	0.94	0.17	0.22	0.92	41	BHLHE41	3.33	0.94	0.94	0.44	1.00
22	ZBTB33	2.28	0.06	1.00	0.22	1.00	41	PLAGL1	3.33	0.56	1.00	0.78	1.00
23	YBX1	2.32	0.56	0.78	0.22	0.77							

Table 3. 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 that were predicted based on an

enhancer-promoter association (EPA) (i) overlapped with HiChIP chromatin

interactions than the other types of EPA (ii) and (iii) in T cells. The middle tables show

133 FR and 90 RF orientations of DNA motifs found in common among B2T1, B2T2

and B3T1 replications in T cells in the upper table. The lower tables show that among

64 FR and 52 RF 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 according to three types of EPAs. TF: DNA binding

motif sequence of a transcription factor. Score: $-\log_{10}$ (*p*-value). Score 1: Comparison of

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

not shortened [EPA (iii)]. Score 2: Comparison of an EPA shortened at the FR or RF

orientation of DNA motif sites [EPA (i)] with an EPA shortened at the non-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

827   FR and RF orientations of DNA motifs found in common among three replications in T

828   cell.

829   Forward-reverse (FR)

TF	Score 1	Score 2	TF	Score 1	Score 2	TF	Score 1	Score 2
AHR	38.81	13.41	ETS2	208.78	13.99	MNT	215.63	8.00
ARNTL	155.78	1.96	ETV1	153.32	7.02	MTF1	323.31	14.21
ATF1	323.31	15.00	ETV3	140.11	14.58	MXI1	323.31	70.98
ATF3	323.31	35.22	ETV5:EVX1	145.48	17.33	MYC	84.79	24.93
BCL	153.72	3.52	ETV5:HES7	8.76	8.74	MYCN	165.16	25.87
CREB	90.91	2.32	ETV5:TCF3	203.52	5.90	MZF1	81.83	2.29
CREB3	323.31	38.74	FOXN4	73.43	5.59	NFKB1	279.24	14.27
CREB3L1	323.31	27.96	FOXO1:ELK3	323.31	43.51	NFKB1:NFKB1	323.31	13.79
CTCF	323.31	3.50	GABPA	197.57	20.39	NFY	323.31	3.42
CTCFL	174.90	2.09	GABPA:GABPB1	142.28	6.10	NONO	323.31	9.24
CXXC1	69.92	3.30	GCM2	13.68	18.80	NR2C2	323.31	3.64
E2	323.31	20.15	GDNF	286.73	3.15	NRF1	45.13	30.75
E2F	122.12	21.87	GMEB1	136.68	10.56	OVOL2	323.31	31.61
E2F1	43.22	2.85	HIC1	223.55	4.56	PATZ1	101.85	9.30
EGR1	79.09	3.79	HIF1A	241.47	1.71	PLAG1	177.90	11.02
EGR2	176.69	4.53	HOXB2:ETV1	102.22	2.42	PURA	196.04	17.98
EGR3	85.25	34.18	ID2	323.31	14.52	R	22.49	3.99
EHF	323.31	8.66	INSM1	193.85	15.87	**RAD21**	258.21	4.81
ELF1	203.38	3.86	JUN:JUNB	275.78	6.48	RBAK	267.43	11.25
ELF2	227.62	7.83	JUNB:JUN	202.73	5.07	RELA	323.31	4.68
ELF5	323.31	8.76	KLF	252.10	8.35	RFX1	159.78	17.05
ELK1:TBX21	126.46	8.41	KLF15	323.31	22.56	RFX4	323.31	35.28
ELK1:TEF	323.31	7.99	KLF17	87.51	14.77	RFX5	323.31	26.52
ELK4	117.83	4.81	KLF2	90.74	15.34	SAP1	124.23	14.63
ENO1	80.42	3.13	KLF4	209.71	9.38	**SMC3**	222.09	1.76
EPAS1	65.43	7.76	KLF7	229.95	11.96	SP1	235.48	29.09
ERF	207.67	6.25	LHX8	244.38	2.95	SP2	94.11	9.54
ERG	199.81	25.70	MAX	323.31	8.35	SP4	14.30	6.31
ETS	196.80	1.63	MAZ	109.42	3.37	SPDEF	179.39	16.81
ETS1	308.00	3.92	MBD2	8.41	1.95	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

833 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

836 FR and RF orientations of DNA motifs found in common in the four cell types.

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

TF	Score 1	Score 2	TF	Score 1	Score 2	TF	Score 1	Score 2
AHR	38.81	13.41	**RAD21**	258.21	4.81	ARNT	323.31	14.12
ARNTL	155.78	1.96	RFX1	159.78	17.05	ATF3	323.31	14.64
ATF3	323.31	35.22	**SMC3**	222.09	1.76	BHLHE40	323.31	12.42
BCL	153.72	3.52	SP2	94.11	9.54	**CTCF**	240.61	4.56
CREB3L1	323.31	27.96	TFAP2A	25.86	20.26	E2F	78.16	7.07
CTCF	323.31	3.50	TFAP2B	90.03	6.10	E2F3	65.67	8.85
CXXC1	69.92	3.30	TFAP2C	169.60	8.55	EFNA2	255.01	10.95
E2F	122.12	21.87	TP73	198.45	7.75	GMEB2	323.31	7.81
E2F1	43.22	2.85	USF1	194.06	3.56	KLF4	213.35	9.49
EGR1	79.09	3.79	XBP1	323.31	44.58	MYB	323.31	17.68
EGR3	85.25	34.18	**YY1**	62.59	5.30	MYC	323.31	12.23
ELF1	203.38	3.86	ZBTB7A	52.89	30.58	MZF1	200.49	22.73
ELF2	227.62	7.83	ZFX	13.33	14.55	NFYA	323.31	11.75
ELK4	117.83	4.81	**ZNF143**	323.31	35.38	NR3C1	43.16	8.31
ERG	199.81	25.70				OSR2	111.77	14.65
ETS	196.80	1.63				SP2	294.86	2.59
ETS1	308.00	3.92				SP4	110.94	19.63
HIC1	223.55	4.56				SPDEF	185.85	14.35
INSM1	193.85	15.87				SREBF2	297.27	1.62
KLF4	209.71	9.38				TATA	2.16	4.02
KLF7	229.95	11.96				TFAP2B	29.46	12.62
MAX	323.31	8.35				TFAP2C	112.10	51.21
MYC	84.79	24.93				**YY1**	323.31	9.92
MYCN	165.16	25.87				YY2	47.49	2.61
MZF1	81.83	2.29				ZBTB33	90.29	7.78
NFY	323.31	3.42				ZBTB7B	43.90	23.59
NONO	323.31	9.24				ZNF100	27.67	4.75
NRF1	45.13	30.75				**ZNF143**	63.03	9.69
OVOL2	323.31	31.61						
PLAG1	177.90	11.02						

Table 4. 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. All DNA motif sites of a TF were used,

except for DNA motif sites separating pairs of ubiquitously expressed genes with

coefficient of variance <90.

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

TF	Score	Median correlation	# DNA site	TF	Score	Median correlation	# DNA site
AHR	1.80	0.12	520	AP1	3.87	0.11	744
ARNT	1.35	0.09	141	ARNT	2.95	0.10	453
ATF2	1.40	0.11	166	ATF3	4.34	0.10	665
ATF3	3.61	0.11	795	BHLHE40	2.49	0.07	155
BHLHE41	2.02	0.07	118	CREB1	1.79	0.11	303
CREB3L1	2.88	0.05	127	**CTCF**	5.96	0.09	721
CTCF	6.02	0.09	837	E2F	3.95	0.10	663
E2F	3.73	0.10	444	E2F3	4.05	0.09	616
E2F1	3.79	0.11	868	EFNA2	3.51	0.10	543
EGR1	2.97	0.10	391	EGR1	2.58	0.10	428
ELF1	4.86	0.10	714	EGR2	1.39	0.13	747
ELF2	3.88	0.11	781	ETS1	3.75	0.11	667
ELK3	1.86	0.12	547	FLI1:FIGLA	5.41	0.08	428
ELK4	2.44	0.11	663	FOS	3.51	0.11	777
ETS	3.34	0.11	523	GMEB2	1.36	0.09	310
ETS1	4.27	0.11	687	HIF1A	2.34	0.11	448
ETV7	3.68	0.11	662	KLF4	2.21	0.12	744
HIC1	1.65	0.11	380	MITF	3.14	0.10	419
HINFP	1.33	0.09	258	MYC	4.85	0.10	704
KLF4	2.00	0.13	718	MYCN	2.79	0.10	507
MYC	3.86	0.11	762	NFKB1	1.59	0.11	342
MYCN	2.36	0.11	583	NFYA	2.15	0.10	229
MZF1	1.74	0.10	261	NRF1	2.01	0.12	615
NFYB	2.97	0.10	264	OSR2	1.99	0.12	301
NRF1	2.21	0.11	640	PBX3	2.20	0.11	253
PLAG1	2.93	0.10	503	RFX2	2.12	0.09	168
PLAGL1	2.55	0.10	414	RFX5	3.03	0.05	75
RAD21	6.08	0.09	852	RUNX3	2.01	0.11	241
REST	4.35	0.11	920	SP1	2.73	0.11	725
RFX1	2.38	0.08	81	SP2	2.15	0.12	1090
SIN3A	3.31	0.11	813	SP4	2.33	0.11	479
SMC3	6.18	0.09	625	SPDEF	5.29	0.07	449
SP2	2.30	0.12	738	TFAP2B	3.42	0.11	855
TFAP2A	4.17	0.11	767	TFAP2C	2.05	0.11	576
TFAP2C	2.13	0.11	470	TFCP2L1	1.45	0.13	362
USF1	4.24	0.10	628	YBX1	1.34	0.13	160
XBP1	6.65	0.07	379	**YY1**	2.23	0.01	50
ZBTB33	4.90	0.10	701	ZBTB33	3.44	0.11	886
ZBTB7A	2.82	0.10	485	ZBTB7B	2.27	0.13	892
ZFP62	2.95	0.11	565	**ZNF143**	2.26	0.07	81
ZFX	2.69	0.11	581				
ZIC1	4.47	0.11	829				
ZNF770	3.38	0.08	271				

Table 5. 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 are 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 an EPA (< 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

867   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

870   Co-location and overlapping DNA motifs of CTCF with another DNA motifs.

871   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

874   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

References

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

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

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.

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.

Blais A, Dynlacht BD. 2007. E2F-associated chromatin modifiers and cell cycle control.
Curr Opin Cell Biol **19**: 658-662.

Blattler A, Yao L, Wang Y, Ye Z, Jin VX, Farnham PJ. 2013. ZBTB33 binds
unmethylated regions of the genome associated with actively expressed genes.
Epigenetics Chromatin **6**: 13.

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

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 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.
Di Giammartino DC, Kloetgen A, Polyzos A, Liu Y, Kim D, Murphy D, Abuhashem A,
Cavaliere P, Aronson B, Shah V et al. 2019. KLF4 is involved in the
organization and regulation of pluripotency-associated three-dimensional
enhancer networks. *Nat Cell Biol* **21**: 1179-1190.
Frob F, Wegner M. 2020. The role of chromatin remodeling complexes in Schwann cell
development. *Glia* **68**: 1596-1603.
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.
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.
Huang S, Li X, Yusufzai TM, Qiu Y, Felsenfeld G. 2007. USF1 recruits histone
modification complexes and is critical for maintenance of a chromatin barrier.
Mol Cell Biol **27**: 7991-8002.
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.

Kim DE, Procopio MG, Ghosh S, Jo SH, Goruppi S, Magliozzi F, Bordignon P, Neel V,

Angelino P, Dotto GP. 2017. Convergent roles of ATF3 and CSL in chromatin

control of cancer-associated fibroblast activation. *J Exp Med* **214**: 2349-2368.

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.

Knoepfler PS, Zhang XY, Cheng PF, Gafken PR, McMahon SB, Eisenman RN. 2006.

Myc influences global chromatin structure. *EMBO J* **25**: 2723-2734.

Krietenstein N, Abraham S, Venev SV, Abdennur N, Gibcus J, Hsieh TS, Parsi KM,

Yang L, Maehr R, Mirny LA et al. 2020. Ultrastructural Details of Mammalian

Chromosome Architecture. *Molecular cell* **78**: 554-565 e557.

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.

Laurette P, Strub T, Koludrovic D, Keime C, Le Gras S, Seberg H, Van Otterloo E,

Imrichova H, Siddaway R, Aerts S et al. 2015. Transcription factor MITF and

remodeller BRG1 define chromatin organisation at regulatory elements in

melanoma cells. *eLife* **4**.

Lee JW, Kim DM, Jang JW, Park TG, Song SH, Lee YS, Chi XZ, Park IY, Hyun JW, Ito

Y et al. 2019. RUNX3 regulates cell cycle-dependent chromatin dynamics by

functioning as a pioneer factor of the restriction-point. *Nat Commun* **10**: 1897.

Levy C, Fisher DE. 2011. Dual roles of lineage restricted transcription factors: the case
of MITF in melanocytes. *Transcription* **2**: 19-22.

Li F, Yuan Q, Di W, Xia X, Liu Z, Mao N, Li L, Li C, He J, Li Y et al. 2020. ERG
orchestrates chromatin interactions to drive prostate cell fate reprogramming. *J*
Clin Invest doi:10.1172/JCI137967.

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

Li Y, Schulz VP, Deng C, Li G, Shen Y, Tusi BK, Ma G, Stees J, Qiu Y, Steiner LA et al.
2016. Setd1a and NURF mediate chromatin dynamics and gene regulation
during erythroid lineage commitment and differentiation. *Nucleic acids research*
44: 7173-7188.

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.

Ma C, Karwacki-Neisius V, Tang H, Li W, Shi Z, Hu H, Xu W, Wang Z, Kong L, Lv R
et al. 2016. Nono, a Bivalent Domain Factor, Regulates Erk Signaling and
Mouse Embryonic Stem Cell Pluripotency. *Cell Rep* **17**: 997-1007.

Mager GM, Ward RM, Srinivasan R, Jang SW, Wrabetz L, Svaren J. 2008. Active gene
repression by the Egr2.NAB complex during peripheral nerve myelination. *J*
Biol Chem **283**: 18187-18197.

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.

Oldfield AJ, Yang P, Conway AE, Cinghu S, Freudenberg JM, Yellaboina S, Jothi R.
2014. Histone-fold domain protein NF-Y promotes chromatin accessibility for
cell type-specific master transcription factors. *Molecular cell* **55**: 708-722.

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

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.

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

Ramos Pittol JM, Oruba A, Mittler G, Saccani S, van Essen D. 2018. Zbtb7a is a
transducer for the control of promoter accessibility by NF-kappa B and multiple
other transcription factors. *PLoS Biol* **16**: e2004526.

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

Riggi N, Knoechel B, Gillespie SM, Rheinbay E, Boulay G, Suva ML, Rossetti NE,
Boonseng WE, Oksuz O, Cook EB et al. 2014. EWS-FLI1 utilizes divergent
chromatin remodeling mechanisms to directly activate or repress enhancer
elements in Ewing sarcoma. *Cancer Cell* **26**: 668-681.

Sabo A, Amati B. 2014. Genome recognition by MYC. *Cold Spring Harb Perspect Med*
4.

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

Sherwood RI, Hashimoto T, O'Donnell CW, Lewis S, Barkal AA, van Hoff JP, Karun V,
Jaakkola T, Gifford DK. 2014. Discovery of directional and nondirectional
pioneer transcription factors by modeling DNase profile magnitude and shape.

Nature biotechnology **32**: 171-178.

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

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

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

Subtil-Rodriguez A, Vazquez-Chavez E, Ceballos-Chavez M, Rodriguez-Paredes M,
Martin-Subero JI, Esteller M, Reyes JC. 2014. The chromatin remodeller CHD8
is required for E2F-dependent transcription activation of S-phase genes. *Nucleic*
acids research **42**: 2185-2196.

Swanson HI. 2002. DNA binding and protein interactions of the AHR/ARNT
heterodimer that facilitate gene activation. *Chem Biol Interact* **141**: 63-76.

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

Taubert S, Gorrini C, Frank SR, Parisi T, Fuchs M, Chan HM, Livingston DM, Amati B.
2004. E2F-dependent histone acetylation and recruitment of the Tip60
acetyltransferase complex to chromatin in late G1. *Mol Cell Biol* **24**: 4546-4556.

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

Volkel S, Stielow B, Finkernagel F, Stiewe T, Nist A, Suske G. 2015. Zinc finger
independent genome-wide binding of Sp2 potentiates recruitment of histone-fold
protein Nf-y distinguishing it from Sp1 and Sp3. *PLoS Genet* **11**: e1005102.

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

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

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.

Wen Z, Huang ZT, Zhang R, Peng C. 2018. ZNF143 is a regulator of chromatin loop. *Cell Biol Toxicol* **34**: 471-478.

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.

Wust HM, Wegener A, Frob F, Hartwig AC, Wegwitz F, Kari V, Schimmel M, Tamm ER, Johnsen SA, Wegner M et al. 2020. Egr2-guided histone H2B monoubiquitination is required for peripheral nervous system myelination. *Nucleic acids research* doi:10.1093/nar/gkaa606.

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, Lu J, Kulbokas EJ, Golub TR, Mootha V, Lindblad-Toh K, Lander ES, Kellis M. 2005. Systematic discovery of regulatory motifs in human promoters and 3' UTRs by comparison of several mammals. *Nature* **434**: 338-345.

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.

Yang H, Schramek D, Adam RC, Keyes BE, Wang P, Zheng D, Fuchs E. 2015. ETS
family transcriptional regulators drive chromatin dynamics and malignancy in
squamous cell carcinomas. *eLife* **4**: e10870.

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.

Zhang Z, Chng KR, Lingadahalli S, Chen Z, Liu MH, Do HH, Cai S, Rinaldi N, Poh
HM, Li G et al. 2019. An AR-ERG transcriptional signature defined by
long-range chromatin interactomes in prostate cancer cells. *Genome research*
29: 223-235.

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

1128