Discovery of biased orientations of human DNA motif sequences

affecting enhancer-promoter interactions and transcription of genes

Naoki Osato[1]*

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

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

*Corresponding author

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

Abstract

Chromatin interactions have important roles for enhancer-promoter interactions (EPI) and regulating the transcription of genes. CTCF and cohesin proteins are located at the anchors of chromatin interactions, forming their loop structures. CTCF has insulator function limiting the activity of enhancers into the loops. DNA binding sequences of CTCF indicate their orientation bias at chromatin interaction anchors – forward-reverse (FR) orientation is frequently observed. Other DNA binding proteins such as YY1, ZNF143, and SMARCA4 are also reported to be associated with chromatin interactions. It is still unclear what proteins are associated with chromatin interactions and insulator functions.

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

Total 96 biased orientations of DNA motifs (64 FR and 52 RF orientations, the

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

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

level of putative transcriptional target genes significantly in monocytes, T cells, HMEC

and NPC in common. For 44 (69%) FR and 28 (54%) RF of 64 FR and 52 RF

orientations of DNA motif sequences in CD4$^+$ T cells, EPI predicted from EPA that was

shortened at the genomic locations of the biased orientation of DNA motif sequence

were overlapped with chromatin interaction data significantly more than other types of

EPAs. Moreover, 43 (72%) FR and 40 (80%) RF of 64 FR and 52 RF orientations of

DNA motifs found in the four cell types in common showed significantly reduced

correlation in expression level of nearby genes separated by the motif sites, implying

that the DNA motifs were associated with insulator functions.

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

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

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

Background

Chromatin interactions have important roles for enhancer-promoter interactions

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

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

insulator function limiting the activity of enhancers into the loops (Fig. 1A). DNA

binding sequences of CTCF indicate their orientation bias at chromatin interaction

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

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

and SMARCA4 (BRG1) are found to be associated with chromatin interactions and EPI

(Bailey et al. 2015; Barutcu et al. 2016; Weintraub et al. 2017). CTCF, cohesin, ZNF143,

YY1 and SMARCA4 have other biological functions as well as chromatin interactions

and EPI. The DNA binding motif sequences of the transcription factors (TF) are found

in open chromatin regions near transcriptional start sites (TSS) as well as chromatin

interaction anchors.

DNA binding motif sequence of ZNF143 was enriched at both chromatin

interaction anchors. ZNF143's correlation with the CTCF-cohesin cluster relies on its

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

antibodies directed toward histones with modifications characteristic of enhancer and

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

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

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

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

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

protein factors associated with chromatin interactions and insulator functions may be

found from other researches.

As computational approaches, machine-learning analyses to predict chromatin

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

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

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

examined in this study.

DNA binding proteins involved in chromatin interactions are supposed to affect

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

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

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

(Osato 2018)). EPA was shortened at the genomic locations of FR orientation of CTCF

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

promoters were predicted based on the EPA. The EPA affected the expression levels of

putative transcriptional target genes, compared with the expression levels of

transcriptional target genes predicted from promoters (or closed chromatin regions) (Fig.

2A). The expression levels tend to be increased in monocytes and CD4$^+$ T cells,

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

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

of genes. These analyses suggested that enhancers affected the transcription of genes

significantly, when EPI were predicted properly. Other DNA binding proteins involved

in chromatin interactions, as well as CTCF, may locate at chromatin interaction anchors

with a pair of biased orientation of DNA binding motif sequences, affecting the

expression level of putative transcriptional target genes in the loops formed by the

chromatin interactions. As experimental issues of the analyses of chromatin interactions,

chromatin interaction data are changed, according to experimental techniques, depth of

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

data may not be saturated enough to cover all chromatin interactions. Supposing these

characters of DNA binding proteins associated with chromatin interactions and avoiding

experimental issues of the analyses of chromatin interactions, here I searched for DNA

motif sequences of TF, 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 EPI were compared with chromatin interaction and gene expression

data.

Results

Search for biased orientations of DNA motif sequences

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

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

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

using TFBS in promoters and enhancers. Enhancer-promoter association (EPA) was

shortened at the genomic locations of DNA binding motif sequence of a TF acting as

insulator such as CTCF and cohesin (RAD21 and SMC3) (Fig. 1B). To find DNA motif

sequences of TF acting as insulator, other than CTCF and cohesin, affecting the

expression level of genes, EPA was shortened at the genomic locations of DNA motif

sequence of a TF, and transcriptional target genes of each TF bound in (i) distal open

chromatin regions (enhancers) and (ii) closed chromatin regions in promoters were

predicted based on the EPA, in order to estimate enhancer activity of each TF. The ratio

of expression level of putative transcriptional target genes of each TF between (i) and

(ii) was calculated. The distribution of the ratios of all TF was compared among

forward-reverse (FR), reverse-forward (RF), and any orientation (i.e. without

considering orientation) of a DNA motif sequence shortening EPA using Mann-Whitney

test, two-sided (p-value $< 10^{-7}$), and the number of TF with significant difference of the

distributions among FR, RF and Any was counted (Fig. 2A). Several hundreds of FR

and RF orientations of DNA motifs of TF were found in monocytes, T cells, HMEC and

NPC. The number of the TF seemed to be changed, according to the number of

DNase-seq reads, since the number of the reads of monocyte is larger than other three

cell types (i.e. more DNA motif sites would be predicted to some extent, if DNase-seq

reads increase). Total 96 of biased (64 FR and 52 RF) orientations of DNA binding

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

orientation of DNA binding motif sequence was not found (Fig. 2B; Table 1;

Supplemental material). FR orientation of DNA motif sequences included CTCF,

cohesin (RAD21 and SMC3), YY1 and ZNF143 which are associated with chromatin

interactions and EPI.

Without considering the difference of orientation of DNA binding motif

sequences, 175 of biased orientations of DNA binding motif sequences of TF were

found in the four cell types in common. As a reason for the increase of the number (175)

from 96, a TF or an isoform of the same TF may bind to a different DNA binding motif

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

alternative splicing isoforms are differently expressed among tissues, indicating that

most alternative splicing is subject to tissue-specific regulation (Das et al. 2007; Wang

et al. 2008; Chen and Manley 2009). 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. I previously

found that a complex of TF would bind to a slightly different DNA binding motif

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

complex in *C. elegans* (Tabuchi et al. 2011). The difference of binding specificity of

pairs of transcription factors was reported (Jolma et al. 2015). Cofactors also contribute

to alter binding specificity of transcription factors (Ansari and Peterson-Kaufman 2011;

Slattery et al. 2011; Merabet and Mann 2016). These increase the variety and number of

DNA binding motif sequences of a TF.

Comparison with chromatin interaction data

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

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

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

HiChIP chromatin interaction data for CD4^{+} T cells were used (Mumbach et al. 2017).

EPI predicted based on EPA were compared with three replications (B2T1, B2T2, and

B3T1) of HiChIP chromatin interaction data in CD4^{+} T cells respectively. The

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

were predicted based on three types of EPA: (i) EPA shortened at the genomic locations

of FR or RF orientation of DNA motif sequence of a TF acting as insulator sites such as

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

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

genomic locations of a DNA motif sequence. Total 201 biased orientations [133 (49%)

FR and 90 (43%) RF of 273 FR and 211 RF] of DNA motif sequences in T cells, which

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

(B2T1, B2T2, and B3T1) showed a significantly higher ratio of EPI overlapped with

HiChIP chromatin interactions (more than 1,000 counts for each interaction) than the

other types of EPAs in T cells (Table 2). When comparing EPI predicted based on only

EPA (i) and (iii) with the chromatin interactions, total 390 biased orientations [261

(96%) FR and 199 (94%) RF of 273 FR and 211 RF] of DNA motif sequences in T cells

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

the chromatin interactions than EPI predicted based on EPA (iii) (Table 2; Supplemental

material). The difference between EPI predicted based on EPA (i) and (ii) seemed to be

difficult to distinguish using the chromatin interaction data and the statistical test in

some cases. However, as for the difference between EPI predicted based on EPA (i) and

(iii), a larger number of biased orientations of DNA motif sequences was found to be

correlated with chromatin interaction data. Chromatin interaction data were obtained

from different samples from DNase-seq, open chromatin regions, so individual

differences may exist. (Mumbach et al. 2017) suggested that individual differences of

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

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

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

chromatin interactions.

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

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

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

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

level of all transcripts (genes) excluding transcripts not expressed in T cells, target

genes of EPI overlapped with chromatin interactions showed a significantly higher

expression level than EPI not overlapped with them, suggesting that EPI overlapped

with chromatin interactions activated the expression of target genes in T cells. All FR

and RF orientations of DNA motifs showed a significantly higher expression level of

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

overlapped. When a biased orientation of DNA motif showed a significantly higher

expression level of putative target genes of EPI overlapped with chromatin interactions

than EPI not overlapped, '1' was marked with in the tables of comparison between EPI

and HiChIP chromatin interactions in Supplemental material. DNA motifs showing a

significantly lower expression level or not showing 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.

Correlation of expression level of gene pairs separated by a DNA motif sequence

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

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

located to upstream and downstream of biased orientations of DNA motif sequences in

human genome. Closely located genes are expected to show correlation of gene

expression among tissues (Xie et al. 2007). When a biased orientation of DNA motif

sequence acts 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 found in

common in monocytes, T cells, HMEC, and NPC, top 20 were selected in ascending

order of the median correlation coefficient of expression level of the closest gene pairs

of the DNA motif that was observed in more than 50 genomic locations. The number of

genomic locations was relatively small, when ubiquitously expressed genes among 53

tissues and DNA motif sites near the genes were eliminated with coefficient of variance

< 90 (see Methods). Pairs of genes near all 20 motifs showed a distribution of

significantly lower correlation of gene expression level than all pairs of genes, and

included known DNA binding motif sequences of TF associated with chromatin

interactions such as CTCF, RAD21, and SMC3 (Fig 3) (Mann-Whitney test, p-value <

0.01). Of 96 biased orientations of DNA motifs found in common in the four cell types,

43 (72%) FR and 40 (80%) RF of 60 FR and 50 RF with variable expression data of

nearby genes among 53 tissues showed a distribution of significantly lower correlation

of gene expression of the closest genes of the DNA motifs than the correlation of all

pairs of neighbor genes (Mann-Whitney test, p-value < 0.05) (Table 3). The DNA

motifs included known DNA binding motif sequences of TF associated with chromatin

interactions such as CTCF, RAD21, SMC3, YY1 and ZNF143. Though the number of

DNA motif sites was reduced, compared with all DNA motif sites of a TF, DNA motif

sites examined for biased orientation in EPA showed a distribution of significantly

lower correlation of expression level of gene pairs separated by the sites (33 (60%) FR

and 36 (77%) RF of 55 FR and 47 RF orientations of DNA motifs of TF with variable

expression data of nearby genes) (Supplemental material). Some DNA motif sites of

biased orientations of DNA motifs were found from genomic regions not including

known DNA motifs of TF associated with chromatin interactions such as CTCF,

RAD21, SMC3, YY1 and ZNF143, and located in significantly lower correlation of

expression level of gene pairs. Significantly lower correlation of gene expression tend to

be observed in DNA motifs with relatively a large number of genomic sites (Median

number of sites of statistically significant DNA motifs is 656 and 479 for FR and RF

respectively, and not significant DNA motifs is 122 and 115 for FR and RF respectively.

p-value = 0 and < 10^{-10} for FR and RF respectively, Mann-Whitney test). Many DNA

motifs showed significantly lower correlation of gene expression, so I wondered there

may be a possibility that when we take a small number of gene pairs randomly (about

hundreds as the same as the number of DNA motif sites), the correlation of gene pairs

might be significantly low occasionally. However, the possibility that happen was low

and less than expectation from *p*-value threshold by computer simulation.

Co-location of biased orientations of DNA motif sequences

To examine the association of biased orientations of DNA binding motif

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

other was analyzed in monocytes, T cells, HMEC, and NPC. The number of genes with

the same pairs of DNA binding motif sequences in upstream and downstream of the

genes in EPA was counted, and the pairs of DNA binding motif sequences found in

more than 100 genes were listed (Table 4; Supplemental material). Majority of pairs of

DNA motif sites were overlapped with more than 1bp, but the same tendency was found

in the analysis of DNA motif sites of all TF (Supplemental material). As already known,

CTCF was found with cohesin RAD21 and SMC3 (Table 4). Top 30 pairs of FR and RF

orientations of DNA motifs overlapped or co-localized were shown (Table 4). Total

number of pairs of DNA motifs overlapped or co-localized was 433 (FR) and 708 (RF)

in monocytes, consisting of 178 (39% of all FR) and 213 (42% of all RF) unique DNA

motifs. Only eight overlapping or co-location of DNA motifs of TF were found in the

four cell types in common, including pairs of CTCF, RAD21 and SMC3. This implied

that most of overlapping and co-location of DNA motifs of TF were cell-type-specific

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

to be overlapped, and relatively a small number of motifs were co-localized in upstream

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

TF simultaneously or competitively (Ackerman et al. 1991; Yoon and Chikaraishi 1992;

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

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

reported to act cooperatively with other TF and 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

TF 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 more than a hundred or a thousand upstream and downstream

regions of genes.

Discussion

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

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

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

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

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

orientation (i.e. without considering orientation) of DNA motif sequence of TF was not

found to affect the expression level of putative transcriptional target genes, suggesting

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

RF orientation of DNA motif sequence of a TF is effective for the prediction of

enhancer-promoter interactions (EPI).

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

number of chromatin interactions was relatively small (72,284 at 50kb resolution with a

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

5) ('PCHiC_peak_matrix_cutoff0.txt.gz' file was downloaded from 'Promoter Capture

Hi-C in 17 human primary blood cell types' website https://osf.io/u8tzp/files/). To

examine the difference of the numbers of EPI overlapped with chromatin interactions,

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

large enough.

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

orientations of DNA motif sequences of TF were examined in T cell. The resolutions of

chromatin interactions and EPI were adjusted to 5kb by fragmentation of genome

sequences. The number of HiChIP chromatin interactions was 19,926,360 at 5kb

resolution, 666,149 at 5kb resolution with chromatin interactions (more than 1,000

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

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

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

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

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

compared with the other types of EPAs or EPA not shortened. HiChIP analysis used

H3K27ac antibody to capture chromatin interactions and identified twenty millions of

chromatin interactions, but the number of peaks of ChIP-seq data of H3K27ac is usually

less than a hundred thousand. There seems to be much difference of the number of

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

all H3K27ac sites.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

one side. Biased orientations of DNA motif sequences may also be found in

forward-forward or reverse-reverse orientation.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

which consist of A, T, G, C, R, Y, M, K, S, W, B, H, V, D, and N letters. This does not

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

analysis of DNA motif sequences of TF. Thought the number of genomic regions

matched with a DNA motif sequence was decreased, about 200 FR and RF orientations

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

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

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

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

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

genome sequences, not allowing a mismatch of a DNA sequence.

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

sites of TF (Sherwood et al. 2014). PIQ predicts DNA motifs sites of TF by reducing

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

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

footprinting (DNase-DGF). The results of prediction of DNA motif sites of TF using

PIQ in this study showed an increase of biased orientations of DNA motif sequences of

TF, reducing the number of any orientation of DNA motif sequences of TF. The number

of DNA motif sites of TF was expected to increase, compared with the above method to

use consensus DNA sequences of TF. However, the number of DNA motif sites was

almost the same or slightly decreased, compared with the result of consensus DNA

sequences, suggesting that PIQ increases true positive prediction of DNA motif sites,

reducing false positive prediction.

To estimate enhancer activities of DNA motifs of TF, the expression level of

putative transcriptional target genes of a TF was compared between DNA motifs of TF

in distal open chromatin regions (enhancers) and closed chromatin regions in promoters.

Previously, the expression level was compared between distal open chromatin regions

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

comparison of DNA motif sites of a TF between distal open chromatin regions and

closed chromatin regions to estimate the enhancer activity of TF. The number of DNA

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

regions in promoter was used.

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

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

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

including cancer.

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

sequences of TF involved in chromatin interactions, insulator function and potentially

forming a homodimer, heterodimer or complex with other TF, affecting the

transcriptional regulation of genes.

Methods

Search for biased orientations of DNA motif sequences

To identify transcription factor binding sites (TFBS) 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, since these data were sufficient to identify biased orientations of DNA

motif sequences of TF with less computational time, reducing the number of any

orientation of DNA motif sequences of TF. To reduce false positive prediction of DNA

motif sites of TF in open chromatin regions, protein interaction quantitation (PIQ) tool

was used with 12,249 position frequency matrices converted from DNA motifs of

vertebrate TF in the above databases and DNase-seq data from GEO database

(GSM1024791 CD14$^+$ monocytes; GSM665812 CD4$^+$ T cell; GSM736634 HMEC;

GSM878615 NPC) (Sherwood et al. 2014). To predict DNA motif sites of TF from

closed chromatin regions, another method was used. Position weight matrices of

vertebrate transcription factor binding sequences were converted into DNA consensus

sequences considering degenerated sites using convert matrix in RSAT website (van

Helden 2003). Transcription factor binding sequences of vertebrate TF were used for

further analyses. Transcription factor binding sequences were searched from each

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

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

consensus sequences of TF 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).   TF

corresponding to transcription factor binding sequences were searched computationally

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

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

canonical   transcripts

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

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

RefSeq, and Ensembl transcripts.

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

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

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

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

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

434 which is the same as that defined in Figure 3A of a previous study (McLean et al. 2010):

435 the single nearest gene association rule, which extends the regulatory domain to the

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

443 were continuously located in genome sequences several times, the most internal (i.e.

444 closest to a transcript) forward–reverse orientation of DNA binding sites were selected.

445 The genomic positions of genes were identified using 'knownGene.txt.gz' file in UCSC

446 bioinformatics sites (Karolchik et al. 2014). The file 'knownCanonical.txt.gz' was also

447 utilized for choosing representative transcripts among various alternate forms for

448 assigning promoter and extended regions for EPA. From the list of transcription factor

449 binding sequences and transcriptional target genes, redundant transcription factor

450 binding sequences were removed by comparing the target genes of a transcription factor

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

binding sequences was used. When the number of transcriptional target genes predicted

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

binding sequence was omitted.

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

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

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

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

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

sequences were obtained from UCSF-UBC human reference epigenome mapping

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

FPKMs of the RNA-seq data were calculated using RSeQC (Wang et al. 2012b). For

monocytes, Blueprint RNA-seq FPKM data

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

were downloaded from Blueprint DCC portal

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

skeletal muscle myoblasts (HSMM) (GEO: GSM958744, Encode: ENCSR000CWN)

and H1 derived neural progenitor cell (NPC) (GEO: GSM915326, Encode:

ENCFF529SIO) were used. Based on log2-transformed FPKM, UCSC transcripts were

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

selected in each cell type.

The expression level of transcriptional target genes predicted based on EPA

shortened at the genomic locations of DNA motif sequence of a TF was compared with

the expression level of transcriptional target genes predicted from closed chromatin

regions in promoters. For each DNA motif sequence shortening EPA, transcriptional

target genes were predicted using DNA binding motif sequences of vertebrate TF in

TRANSFAC database, and the ratio of expression level of putative transcriptional target

genes of each TF was calculated between EPA and closed chromatin regions in

promoters. The distribution of the ratios of all TF was compared among forward-reverse

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

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

10^{-7}). Other parameters for the analysis were that the number of transcriptional target

genes of a TF was more than 50, and the number of TF (not insulator TF) to predict

transcriptional target genes was more than 50. The number of DNA motif sites of TF

(insulator TF) shortening EPA was more than 100. When a DNA motif sequence of a TF

shortening EPA showed a significant difference of expression level of putative

transcriptional target genes among FR, RF or any orientation, the DNA motif sequence

was listed.

Comparison with chromatin interaction data

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

'GSM2705049_Naive_HiChIP_H3K27ac_B2T1_allValidPairs.txt',

'GSM2705050_Naive_HiChIP_H3K27ac_B2T2_allValidPairs.txt',   and

'GSM2705051_Naive_HiChIP_H3K27ac_B3T1_allValidPairs.txt'   files   were

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

503 without being shortened by a DNA motif sequence. EPI predicted in the three types of

504 EPAs in common were removed. First, EPI predicted based on EPA (i) were compared

505 with chromatin interactions. The resolution of chromatin interaction data used in this

506 study was 1-5kb, so EPI were adjusted to 5kb before their comparison. The number and

507 ratio of EPI overlapped with chromatin interactions were counted. Second, EPI were

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

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

510 Third, EPI were predicted based on EPA (iii), and EPI predicted based on EPA (i) and

511 (ii) were removed from the EPI. The number and ratio of EPI overlapped with

512 chromatin interactions were counted. The number and ratio of the EPI were compared

513 two times between EPA (i) and (iii), and EPA (i) and (ii) (binomial distribution, p-value

514 < 0.025 for each test, two-sided, 95% confidence interval).

515  Putative target genes for the analysis of EPI were selected from top 4000

516 transcripts in term of the expression level. The expression level of putative target genes

of EPI overlapped with HiChIP chromatin interactions was compared with EPI not

overlapped with them. For each FR or RF orientation of DNA motif, EPI were predicted

based on EPA and the overlap of EPI with chromatin interactions was examined. When

a putative transcriptional target gene of a TF in an enhancer was found in both EPI

overlapped with a chromatin interaction and EPI not overlapped with, the target gene

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

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

Correlation of expression level of gene pairs separated by a DNA motif sequence

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

motif sequence, 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 was removed. DNA

motifs overlapped with RefSeq transcripts were eliminated. Genes closest to DNA

motifs and other genes were analyzed using BEDOPS closest-features (Neph et al.

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

Co-location of biased orientations of DNA motif sequences

Co-location of biased orientations of DNA binding motif sequences of TF was

examined. The number of genes with the same pair of DNA motifs of biased

orientations of DNA motifs of TF in upstream and downstream of genes in EPA was

counted, and the pairs of DNA motifs found in more than 100 genes were listed.

Acknowledgements

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

research was partially supported by Development of Fundamental Technologies for

Diagnosis and Therapy Based upon Epigenome Analysis from Japan Agency for

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

JST CREST Grant Number JPMJCR15G1, Japan.

561   and indicate if changes were made. The Creative Commons Public Domain Dedication

562   waiver (http://creativecommons.org/publicdomain/zero/1.0/) applies to the data made

563   available in this article, unless otherwise stated.

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

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

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

activity of enhancers to certain functional domains (Rao et al. 2014; Shlyueva et al.

2014; de Wit et al. 2015; Guo et al. 2015). (B) Computationally-defined regulatory

domains for enhancer-promoter association (McLean et al. 2010). The *single nearest*

gene association rule extends the regulatory domain to the midpoint between this gene's

TSS and the nearest gene's TSS both upstream and downstream. Enhancer-promoter

association was shortened at the genomic locations of forward-reverse orientation of

DNA binding motif sequence of a transcription factor (e.g. CTCF in the figure).

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

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

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

transcription factor binding sequences were compared between promoters (or closed

chromatin regions) and enhancer-promoter association (EPA) shortened at the genomic

locations of forward-reverse orientation of DNA motif sequence of CTCF and cohesin

(RAD21 and SMC3) respectively in monocytes. Red and blue dots show statistically

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

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

level of target genes was higher based on the EPA than promoters, and blue dots show

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

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

promoters, implying that transcription factors acted as activators of target genes (Osato

2018). (B) Biased orientations of DNA motif sequences of transcription factors. Total 96

of biased orientations of DNA binding motif sequences of transcription factors were

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

T cells, HMEC and NPC in common, whereas any orientation (i.e. without considering

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

level.

Figure 3. Genes separated by predicted DNA binding sites of biased orientations of DNA motifs of TFs are less correlated in gene expression. Top 20 TF are shown according to ascending order of median correlation coefficient. Correlation coefficient between neighboring gene pairs is shown in terms of probability density (A) and cumulative distribution (B). Brown line (All), correlation between all neighboring genes; gray shading in (A) and red line (random) in (B), correlation between randomly chosen gene pairs; Purple line (no_CTCF), correlation between gene pairs not separated by predicted CTCF sites.

Web links to original figures.

Figure 5. Schematic representation of chromatin interactions involving gene promoters

(Bailey et al. 2015).

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

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

ZNF143 contributes the formation of chromatin interactions by directly binding the

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

2015).

Tables

Table 1. Biased orientations of DNA binding motif sequences of transcription factors in monocytes, T cells, HMEC and NPC. TF: DNA binding motif sequences of transcription factors.

Forward-reverse orientation

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

Reverse-forward orientation

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

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

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

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

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

data than the other types of EPA (ii) and (iii). The middle tables show 133 FR and 90

RF orientations of DNA motifs in T cells found in common among B2T1, B2T2 and

B3T1 replications in the upper table. The lower table shows that among 64 FR and 52

RF biased orientations of DNA motifs found in common in monocytes, T cell, HMEC

and NPC, 44 (69%) FR and 28 (54%) RF were matched with the analysis of HiChIP for

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

$\log_{10}$ (*p*-value). Score 1: Comparison of EPA shortened at the genomic locations of FR

or RF orientation of DNA motif sequence [EPA (i)] with EPA not shortened [EPA (iii)].

Score 2: Comparison of EPA shortened at the genomic locations of FR or RF orientation

of DNA motif sequence [EPA (i)] with EPA shortened at the genomic locations of any

orientation of DNA motif sequence [EPA (ii)].

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

Replication of HiChIP data	Total no. (FR + RF) of DNA motifs	No. of FR DNA motifs	No. of RF DNA motifs
B2T1	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

661   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

665 Reverse-forward (RF)

TF	Score 1	Score 2
ARNT	323.31	14.12
ARNT2	41.41	42.78
ASCL2	138.15	6.41
ATF3	323.31	14.64
ATF4	323.31	25.14
ATF7	79.30	4.96
BCLAF1	148.24	8.52
BHLHE40	323.31	12.42
CDCA7L	84.72	8.42
CREB3	206.55	11.07
CREB3L1	323.31	7.63
CREB3L2	67.51	7.98
CTCF	240.61	4.56
E2F	78.16	7.07
E2F1	124.10	15.73
E2F3	65.67	8.85
E2F6	165.75	30.69
EFNA2	255.01	10.95
ELK3	143.48	7.57
EP300	121.01	10.90
ETV5:CLOCK	42.10	7.29
GLIS2	37.40	17.34
GMEB2	323.31	7.81
HES1	88.18	9.46
HES7	166.52	14.60
HIVEP1	323.31	4.90
HOXB2:ELK1	217.94	11.92
IRC900814	323.31	4.89
KLF4	213.35	9.49
KLF8	323.31	17.42

TF	Score 1	Score 2
MAX	304.34	8.64
MLXIPL	64.44	10.74
MUSCLE	23.05	3.47
MYB	323.31	17.68
MYBL1	316.23	23.27
MYC	323.31	12.23
MZF1	200.49	22.73
NFY	209.97	3.22
NFYA	323.31	11.75
NHLH1	105.19	4.42
NR1H3	323.31	9.38
NR3C1	43.16	8.31
OSR2	111.77	14.65
RFX1	323.31	22.99
RXRA	146.30	15.11
SALL1	277.84	1.91
SCRT2	301.48	9.60
SMAD6	259.24	7.43
SP100	20.75	7.99
SP2	294.86	2.59
SP4	110.94	19.63
SPDEF	185.85	14.35
SPZ1	323.31	9.87
SREBF1	67.27	15.74
SREBF2	297.27	1.62
TAF1	252.27	17.47
TATA	2.16	4.02
TFAP2A	20.17	29.15
TFAP2B	29.46	12.62
TFAP2C	112.10	51.21

TF	Score 1	Score 2
TFE3	95.23	10.59
THAP1	127.72	5.07
YY1	323.31	9.92
YY2	47.49	2.61
ZBTB33	90.29	7.78
ZBTB45	323.31	57.08
ZBTB7A	89.19	16.19
ZBTB7B	43.90	23.59
ZFP64	147.00	13.59
ZIC3	42.65	15.39
ZNF100	27.67	4.75
ZNF143	63.03	9.69
ZNF148	213.77	18.93
ZNF16	323.31	47.43
ZNF37A	310.67	14.79
ZNF410	140.45	13.57
ZNF419	247.63	11.25
ZNF429	87.05	32.39
ZNF436	323.31	11.48
ZNF468	21.12	7.67
ZNF557	299.44	9.58
ZNF575	39.45	14.38
ZNF586	260.73	6.18
ZNF611	279.80	15.65
ZNF616	189.53	30.98
ZNF692	202.47	2.33
ZNF727	214.01	17.22
ZNF770	300.52	4.71
ZNF773	150.45	8.84
ZSCAN21	323.31	5.55

Forward-reverse (FR)

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

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

Reverse-forward (RF)

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

Table 3. Correlation of expression level of gene pairs separated by a DNA motif site among 53 tissues. Pairs of genes separated by 64 FR and 52 RF orientations of DNA motifs of TF 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 genes. Score: $-\log_{10}$ (p-value) of Mann-Whitney test. Median correlation: median correlation coefficient of expression level of nearby gene pairs separated by a DNA motif. The median correlation coefficient of expression level of all pairs of nearby genes is 0.17. # DNA site: number of DNA motif sites of TF separating gene pairs with expression data. Ubiquitously expressed genes with coefficient of variance < 90 and a

DNA motif site nearby were not used for statistical test, so the number of DNA site is

relatively small. The results using all genes were shown in Supplemental material. All

DNA motif sites of a TF were used including DNA motif sites examined for biased

orientation in EPA. The results using only biased orientation of DNA motif sites

examined in this study were shown in Supplemental material 2.

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 4. Top 30 of overlapping biased orientations of DNA binding motif sequences of

transcription factors in monocytes. Overlapping DNA motif sequence of CTCF with

another biased orientation of DNA motif sequence were shown in a separate table.

Motif 1,2: DNA binding motif sequences of transcription factors. No.: the number of

genes with both Motif 1 and Motif 2 in upstream and downstream of genes (< 1 Mbp

distance from genes). Total number of genes is 31,227.

Forward-reverse (FR)

Motif 1	Motif 2	No.
FOS	JUN	3647
FOS	FOSL2	3284
CTCF	SMC3	3131
FOSL2	JUN	3072
FOSB	FOSL2	2897
FOSL2	JUNB	2870
EGR1	EGR2	2609
RAD21	SMC3	2580
CTCF	RAD21	2574
ATF3	FOSL2	2553
ETS2	ETSLIKE	2420
FOS	JUNB	2353
JUN	JUNB	2324
EGR1	WT1	2182
IRF	IRF4	2157
FOSL2	SMARCC1	2137
FOSB	JUN	1975
ELF1	ETS1	1920
ATF3	JUN	1882
JUN	TFAP2A	1790
FOSL2	TFAP2A	1769
BACH2	SMARCC1	1598
CHD2	E2F	1558
E2F1	RBL1	1485
JUN	SMARCC1	1434
JUN	NR3C1	1406
USF1	USF2	1399
BACH2	JUNB	1351
ETSLIKE	GABPA	1303
BACH2	FOSB	1298

Reverse-forward (RF)

Motif 1	Motif 2	No.
SP1	SP3	3763
EGR1	EGR3	3530
NR1I2	NR1I3	3199
ZIC1	ZIC3	3176
EGR	WT1	2917
FOS	FOS:JUN	2801
EGR	EGR3	2528
AP1	FOS	2524
MAFG	NFE2L1:MAFG	2496
KLF10	SP1	2485
EGR	EGR2	2387
KLF3	SP3	2267
GABPA	ZNF200	2113
KLF1	SP3	1961
KLF10	SP3	1898
AP1	JUNB	1843
FOS:JUN	JUNB	1800
KLF7	SP4	1791
KLF1	SP1	1753
KLF1	SP2	1746
SP2	SP3	1706
EGR1	WT1	1681
SP1	SP2	1644
CTCF	RXRA	1524
EHF	ELF1	1514
EGR1	SP1:SP3	1507
KLF1	KLF3	1463
ATF1	ATF3	1335
ELK1	ZNF200	1296
AP1	FOS:JUN	1288

FR

Motif 1	Motif 2	No.
CTCF	SMC3	3131
CTCF	RAD21	2574
CTCF	CTCFL	1263
CTCF	ZBTB7A	515
CTCF	E2F	140
CTCF	WT1	134
CTCF	MYC	120
CTCF	PLAGL1	108

RF

Motif 1	Motif 2	No.
CTCF	RXRA	1524
CTCF	CTCFL	788
CTCF	RAD21	439
CTCF	ZIC1	141
CTCF	ZIC3	120

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.

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.

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.

Ji X, Dadon DB, Abraham BJ, Lee TI, Jaenisch R, Bradner JE, Young RA. 2015.
Chromatin proteomic profiling reveals novel proteins associated with
histone-marked genomic regions. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **112**: 3841-3846.

Jolma A, Yan J, Whitington T, Toivonen J, Nitta KR, Rastas P, Morgunova E, Enge M,
Taipale M, Wei G et al. 2013. DNA-binding specificities of human transcription
factors. *Cell* **152**: 327-339.

Jolma A, Yin Y, Nitta KR, Dave K, Popov A, Taipale M, Enge M, Kivioja T, Morgunova
E, Taipale J. 2015. DNA-dependent formation of transcription factor pairs alters
their binding specificity. *Nature* **527**: 384-388.

Karolchik D, Barber GP, Casper J, Clawson H, Cline MS, Diekhans M, Dreszer TR,
Fujita PA, Guruvadoo L, Haeussler M et al. 2014. The UCSC Genome Browser
database: 2014 update. *Nucleic acids research* **42**: D764-770.

Katainen R, Dave K, Pitkanen E, Palin K, Kivioja T, Valimaki N, Gylfe AE, Ristolainen
H, Hanninen UA, Cajuso T et al. 2015. CTCF/cohesin-binding sites are
frequently mutated in cancer. *Nature genetics* **47**: 818-821.

Kel AE, Gossling E, Reuter I, Cheremushkin E, Kel-Margoulis OV, Wingender E. 2003.
MATCH: A tool for searching transcription factor binding sites in DNA
sequences. *Nucleic acids research* **31**: 3576-3579.

Kheradpour P, Kellis M. 2014. Systematic discovery and characterization of regulatory
motifs in ENCODE TF binding experiments. *Nucleic acids research* **42**:
2976-2987.

Kin K, Chen X, Gonzalez-Garay M, Fakhouri WD. 2016. The effect of non-coding
DNA variations on P53 and cMYC competitive inhibition at cis-overlapping
motifs. *Hum Mol Genet* **25**: 1517-1527.

Kulakovskiy IV, Vorontsov IE, Yevshin IS, Sharipov RN, Fedorova AD, Rumynskiy EI,
Medvedeva YA, Magana-Mora A, Bajic VB, Papatsenko DA et al. 2018.
HOCOMOCO: towards a complete collection of transcription factor binding
models for human and mouse via large-scale ChIP-Seq analysis. *Nucleic acids*
research **46**: D252-D259.

McLean CY, Bristor D, Hiller M, Clarke SL, Schaar BT, Lowe CB, Wenger AM,

Bejerano G. 2010. GREAT improves functional interpretation of cis-regulatory
771   regions. *Nature biotechnology* **28**: 495-501.

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

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

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

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

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

786   Phanstiel DH, Van Bortle K, Spacek D, Hess GT, Shamim MS, Machol I, Love MI,
787   Aiden EL, Bassik MC, Snyder MP. 2017. Static and Dynamic DNA Loops form
788   AP-1-Bound Activation Hubs during Macrophage Development. *Molecular cell*
789   **67**: 1037-1048.e1036.

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

794   Rao SS, Huntley MH, Durand NC, Stamenova EK, Bochkov ID, Robinson JT, Sanborn
795   AL, Machol I, Omer AD, Lander ES et al. 2014. A 3D map of the human
796   genome at kilobase resolution reveals principles of chromatin looping. *Cell* **159**:
797   1665-1680.

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

800   Sherwood RI, Hashimoto T, O'Donnell CW, Lewis S, Barkal AA, van Hoff JP, Karun V,
801   Jaakkola T, Gifford DK. 2014. Discovery of directional and nondirectional
802   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.

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.

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.

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

3593-3596.

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

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

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

research **22**: 1798-1812.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

238-241.

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.

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.

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