Discovery of biased orientation of human DNA motif sequences

affecting enhancer-promoter interactions and transcription of genes

Naoki Osato[1][*]

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

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

[*]Corresponding author

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

Abstract

Chromatin interactions have important roles for enhancer-promoter interactions (EPI) and regulating the transcription of genes. CTCF and cohesin proteins are located at the anchors of chromatin interactions, forming their loop structures. CTCF has insulator function limiting the activity of enhancers into the loops. DNA binding sequences of CTCF indicate their orientation bias at chromatin interaction anchors – forward-reverse (FR) orientation is frequently observed. DNA binding sequences of CTCF were found in open chromatin regions at about 40% - 80% of chromatin interaction anchors in Hi-C and in situ Hi-C experimental data. It has been reported that long range of chromatin interactions tends to include less CTCF at their anchors. It is still unclear what proteins are associated with chromatin interactions.

To find DNA binding motif sequences of transcription factors (TF) such as CTCF affecting the interaction between enhancers and promoters of transcriptional target genes and their expression, here, I predicted human transcriptional target genes of TF bound in open chromatin regions in enhancers and promoters in monocytes and other cell types using experimental data in public database. Transcriptional target genes were predicted based on enhancer-promoter association (EPA). EPA was shortened at the genomic locations of FR orientation of DNA binding motifs of TF, which were supposed to be at chromatin interaction anchors.

The expression level of the target genes predicted based on EPA was compared with target genes predicted from only promoters. Total 287 biased orientation of DNA motifs [159 forward-reverse (FR) and 153 reverse-forward (RF) orientation, the reverse

complement sequences of some DNA motifs are also registered in databases, so the total

number is smaller than the number of FR and RF] affected the expression level of

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

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

sequences of CTCF, cohesin and other transcription factors involved in chromatin

interactions were found to be biased orientation. Transposon sequences, which are

known to be involved in insulators and enhancers, showed biased orientation. Moreover,

EPI predicted using FR or RF orientation of DNA motif sequences were overlapped

with chromatin interaction data (Hi-C and HiChIP) more than other EPA.

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

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

regions

Background

Chromatin interactions have important roles for enhancer-promoter interactions

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

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

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

binding sequences of CTCF indicate their orientation bias at chromatin interaction

anchors – forward-reverse (FR) orientation is frequently observed (de Wit et al. 2015;

Guo et al. 2015). About 40% - 80% of chromatin interaction anchors of Hi-C and in situ

Hi-C experiments include DNA binding motif sequences of CTCF. However, it has been

reported that long range of chromatin interactions tends to include less CTCF at their

anchors (Jeong et al. 2017). Other DNA binding proteins such as ZNF143, YY1, and

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

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

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

and enhancer-promoter interactions. The DNA binding motif sequences of the

transcription factors 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 an enhancer mark rather than chromatin interactions. Other protein

factors associated with chromatin interactions may be found from other researches.

As computational approaches, machine-learning analyses to predict chromatin

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

they were not intended to find DNA motif sequences of transcription factors 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 loop formed by chromatin interactions. In my previous

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

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

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

forward-reverse orientation of CTCF binding sites affected the expression level of

putative transcriptional target genes the most, compared with the expression level of

transcriptional target genes predicted from only promoters (Fig. 1B). The expression

level tended to be increased in monocytes and CD4^{+} T cells, implying that enhancers

activated the transcription of genes, and decreased in ES and iPS cells, implying that

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

affected the transcription of genes significantly, when EPI were predicted properly.

Other DNA binding proteins involved in chromatin interactions, as well as CTCF,

would 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 loop 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 transcription factors

and repeat DNA sequences, affecting EPI and the expression level of putative

transcriptional target genes in CD14$^+$ monocytes and CD4$^+$ T cells of four people and

other cell types without using chromatin interaction data. Then, putative EPI were

compared with chromatin interaction data.

Results

Search for biased orientation of DNA motif sequences

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

regions and DNA motif sequences of transcription factors collected from various

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

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

genomic locations of DNA binding motif sequences of transcription factors such as

CTCF and cohesins (RAD21 and SMC3). To find DNA motif sequences of transcription

factors, other than CTCF and cohesin, and repeat DNA sequences affecting the

expression level of putative transcriptional target genes, transcriptional target genes of

each transcription factor were predicted based on EPA shortened at the genomic

locations of DNA motif sequences, and the expression level of the putative

transcriptional target genes was compared with those predicted from promoters using

Mann Whiteney U test (*p*-value < 0.05) (Fig. 2). The number of transcription factors

showing a significant difference of expression level of putative transcriptional target

genes was counted. To examine whether the orientation of DNA motif sequences

shortening EPA affected the number of transcription factors showing a significant

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

transcription factors was compared among forward-reverse, reverse-forward, and any

orientation of DNA motif sequences shortening EPA, using chi-square test (*p*-value <

0.05). To avoid missing DNA motif sequences showing a relatively weak statistical

significance by multiple testing collection, the above analyses were conducted using

monocytes of four people independently, and DNA motif sequences found in monocytes

of four people in common were selected. Total 287 of biased (159 forward-reverse and

153 reverse-forward) orientation of DNA binding motif sequences of transcription

factors have been found in monocytes of four people in common, whereas only one any

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

been found in monocytes of four people in common (Fig. 3; Table 1; Supplemental

Table S1). Forward-reverse orientation of DNA motif sequences included CTCF,

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

interactions and enhancer-promoter interactions (EPI). SMARCA4 (BRG1) is

associated with topologically associated domain (TAD), which is higher-order

chromatin organization. The DNA binding motif sequences of SMARCA4 was not

registered in the databases used in this study. Forward-reverse orientation of DNA motif

sequences included SMARCC2, a member of the same SWI/SNF family of proteins as

SMARCA4.

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

people. Total 265 of biased (158 forward-reverse and 139 reverse-forward) orientation

of DNA binding motif sequences of transcription factors have been found in T cells of

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

orientation) of DNA binding motif sequences have been found in T cells of four people

in common (Supplemental Fig. S1 and Supplemental Table S2). Biased orientation of

DNA motif sequences in T cells included CTCF, cohesion (RAD21 and SMC3),

ZNF143, YY1, and SMARC. Biased orientation of DNA motif sequences in T cells and

monocytes (when using H3K27ac histone modification marks, which is described in the

next paragraph) included JUNDM2 (JDP2), which is involved in histone-chaperone

activity, promoting nucleosome, and inhibition of histone acetylation (Jin et al. 2006).

JDP2 forms a homodimer or heterodimer with various transcription factors

(https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Jun_dimerization_protein). Among 287, 61 of biased

orientation of DNA binding motif sequences of transcription factors were found in both

monocytes and T cells in common (Supplemental Table S5). For each orientation, 31

forward-reverse and 34 reverse-forward orientation of DNA binding motif sequences of

transcription factors were found in both monocytes and T cells in common. Without

considering the difference of orientation of DNA binding motif sequences, 84 of biased

orientation of DNA binding motif sequences of transcription factors were found in both

monocytes and T cells. As a reason for the increase of the number from 61, a

transcription factor or an isoform of the same transcription factor may bind to a

different DNA binding motif sequence according to cell types and/or in the same cell

type. The same transcription factor has several DNA binding motif sequences and in

some cases one of the motif sequence is almost the same as the reverse complement

sequence of another motif sequence of the same transcription factor. For example,

RAD21 showed both forward-reverse and reverse-forward orientation of the DNA motif

sequences, but the number of forward-reverse orientation was relatively small in the

genome, and reverse-forward orientation of the DNA motif sequence was frequently

observed and co-localized with CTCF. I previously found that a complex of

transcription factors would bind to a slightly different DNA binding motif sequence

from the combination of DNA binding motif sequences of transcription factors

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

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

transcription factors would be different, depending on the genomic locations (enhancers

or promoters) of DNA binding motif sequences of the transcription factors in monocytes

and T cells of four people.

Moreover, using open chromatin regions overlapped with H3K27ac histone

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

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

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

cohesion, since in this condition, new biased orientation of DNA motif sequences was

found. Total 241 of biased (141 forward-reverse and 120 reverse-forward) orientation of

DNA binding motif sequences of transcription factors have been found in monocytes of

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

orientation) of DNA binding motif sequences have been found (Supplemental Table S3).

Though the number of biased orientation of DNA motif sequences was reduced, JDP2

was found in monocytes as well as T cells. CTCF, RAD21, SMC3, ZNF143, YY1, and

SMARCC2 were also found. For T cells using H3K27ac histone modification marks,

total 195 of biased (107 forward-reverse and 110 reverse-forward) orientation of DNA

binding motif sequences of transcription factors have been found in T cells of four

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

have been found (Supplemental Table S4). Though the number of biased orientation of

DNA motif sequences was reduced, CTCF, RAD21, SMC3, YY1, and SMARCC2 were

found. Scores of CTCF, RAD21, and SMC3 were increased compared with the result of

T cells without using H3K27ac histone modification marks, and they were ranked in the

top six. As summary of the results with and without H3K28ac histone modification

marks, total 386 of biased (223 forward-reverse and 214 reverse-forward) orientation of

DNA motif sequences have been found in monocytes of four people in common. Total

348 of biased (202 forward-reverse and 198 reverse-forward) orientation of DNA motif

sequences have been found in T cells of four people in common. Total of these results of

monocytes and T cells was 590 biased (368 forward-reverse and 359 reverse-forward)

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

in both monocytes and T cells was listed in Supplemental Table S5.

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

transcription factors was observed in other cell types, the same analyses were conducted

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

available in ENCODE database, so the analyses of DNA motif sequences were

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

orientation of DNA binding motif sequences found in monocytes, 71, 69, 82, 56, and 53

DNA binding motif sequences were also observed in CD4$^+$ T cells, H1-hESC, iPS,

Huvec and MCF-7 respectively, including CTCF and cohesin (RAD21 and SMC3)

(Table 2; Supplemental Table S6). The scores of DNA binding motif sequences were the

highest in monocytes, and the other cell types showed lower scores. The results of the

analysis of DNA motif sequences in CD20$^+$ B cells and macrophages did not include

CTCF and cohesin, because these analyses can be utilized in cells where the expression

level of putative transcriptional target genes of each transcription factor show a

significant difference between promoters and EPA shortened at the genomic locations of

DNA motif sequences. Some experimental data of a cell did not show a significant

difference between promoters and EPA (Osato 2018).

Instead of DNA binding motif sequences of transcription factors, repeat DNA

sequences were also examined. The expression level of transcriptional target genes

predicted based on EPA shortened at the genomic locations of repeat DNA sequences

was compared with the expression level of transcriptional target genes predicted from

promoters. Three reverse-forward orientation of repeat DNA sequences showed a

significant difference of expression level of putative transcriptional target genes in

monocytes of four people in common (Table 3). Among them, LTR16C repeat DNA

sequence was observed in iPS and H1-hESC with enough statistical significance

considering multiple tests (p-value $< 10^{-7}$). The same as CD14^{+} monocytes, biased

orientation of repeat DNA sequences was examined in CD4^{+} T cells. Three

forward-reverse and two reverse-forward orientation of repeat DNA sequences showed

a significant difference of expression level of putative transcriptional target genes in T

cells of four people in common (Supplemental Table S7). MIRb and MIR3 were also

found in the analysis using open chromatin regions overlapped with H3K27ac histone

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

sequences are known to be involved in insulators and enhancers (Bejerano et al. 2006;

Rebollo et al. 2012; de Souza et al. 2013; Jjingo et al. 2014; Wang et al. 2015).

Co-location of biased orientation of DNA motif sequences

To examine association of 287 biased (forward-reverse and reverse-forward)

orientation of DNA binding motif sequences of transcription factors, co-location of the

DNA binding motif sequences in open chromatin regions in monocytes was analyzed.

The number of open chromatin regions with the same pairs of DNA binding motif

sequences was counted, and when the pairs of DNA binding motif sequences were

enriched with statistical significance (chi-square test, p-value $< 1.0 \times 10^{-10}$), they were

listed (Table 4; Supplemental Table S8). Open chromatin regions overlapped with

histone modification of an enhancer mark (H3K27ac) (total 26,095 regions) showed a

larger number of enriched pairs of DNA motifs than all open chromatin regions (Table

4; Supplemental Table S8). H3K27ac is known to be enriched at chromatin interaction

anchors (Phanstiel et al. 2017). As already known, CTCF was found with cohesin such

as RAD21 and SMC3 (Table 4). Top 30 pairs of FR and RF orientations of DNA motifs

co-occupied in the same open chromatin regions were shown (Table 4). Total number of

pairs of DNA motifs was 492, consisting of 115 unique DNA motifs, when the pair of

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

with the DNA motifs.

The same as CD14$^+$ monocytes, to examine association of 265 biased orientation

of DNA binding motif sequences of transcription factors, co-location of the DNA

binding motif sequences in open chromatin regions in CD4$^+$ T cells was analyzed. Top

30 pairs of FR and RF orientations of DNA motifs co-occupied in the same open

chromatin regions were shown (Supplemental Table S9). Total number of pairs of DNA

motifs was 332, consisting of 118 unique DNA motifs, when the pair of DNA motifs

were observed in more than 60% of the number of open chromatin regions with the

DNA motifs (chi-square test, p-value $< 1.0 \times 10^{-10}$). Among them, 12 pairs of DNA

motif sequences including a pair of CTCF, SMC3, and RAD21 in T cells were found in

monocytes in common (Supplemental Table S9).

Pairs of biased orientation of DNA motif sequences surrounding genes

CTCF and cohesin are found in chromatin interaction anchors and are considered
to form homodimers. Transcription factors are also known to form heterodimers with
another transcription factor. In this study, if the DNA binding motif sequence of only the
mate to a pair of transcription factors was found in EPA, EPA was shortened at one side,
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 one side. In this
analysis, the mate to both heterodimer and homodimer of transcription factors can be
used to examine the effect on the expression level of transcriptional target genes
predicted based on the EPA shortened at one side. To examine whether biased
orientation of DNA motif sequences tend to be found as a pair of the same transcription
factor or different transcription factors in upstream and downstream of genes, the
enrichment of pairs of biased orientation of DNA motif sequences was investigated. The
number of genes having a pair of forward-reverse or reverse-forward orientation of
DNA motif sequences was counted using all pairs of the DNA motif sequences, and
statistical tests (chi-square test) were conducted, which is almost the same as the
analysis of co-location of biased orientation of DNA motif sequences using the number
of genes instead of open chromatin regions in this analysis. Fig. 4 and Supplemental Fig.
S2 showed that not only a pair of the same transcription factor, but also a pair of
different transcription factors were found in upstream and downstream of genes. DNA
motif sequences of CTCF and cohesin (RAD21 and SMC3) were enriched near the

same genes, but cohesin tended to be found with another transcription factor near the

same genes as well. The result of the analysis seems to be different between monocytes

and T cells. Some of these transcription factors would form homodimers or

heterodimers directory or indirectly composing a complex structure, contributing to

make chromatin interactions.

Comparison with chromatin interaction data

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

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

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

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

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

EPA without being shortened by DNA motif sequences, (ii) EPA shortened at the

genomic locations of DNA motif sequences of transcription factors such as CTCF and

cohesin (RAD21, SMC3) without considering their orientation, and (iii) EPA shortened

at the genomic locations of forward-reverse or reverse-forward orientation of DNA

motif sequences of transcription factors. EPA (iii) showed the highest ratio of EPI

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

CTCF and cohesin (RAD21 and SMC3), compared with the other two types of EPA

(Fig. 5). Total 59 biased orientation (40 FR and 23 RF) of DNA motif sequences

including CTCF and cohesin showed a higher ratio of EPI overlapped with Hi-C than

the other types of EPA in monocytes (Table 5). Chromatin interaction data were

obtained using different samples from DNase-seq, open chromatin regions, so

individual differences seemed to be large from the results of this analysis. Since, for

some DNA motif sequences of transcription factors, the number of EPI overlapped with

chromatin interactions was small, if higher resolution of chromatin interaction data

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

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

interactions would be increased and the difference of the numbers among three types of

EPA might be larger and more significant than the current results (Rao et al. 2014;

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

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

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

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

based on EPA were compared with HiChIP chromatin interaction data in CD4$^+$ T cells.

The resolutions of HiChIP chromatin interaction data and EPI were adjusted to 1kb. EPI

were predicted based on the three types of EPA in the same way as CD14$^+$ monocytes.

EPA (iii) showed the highest ratio of EPI overlapped with chromatin interactions

(HiChIP) using DNA binding motif sequences of CTCF and cohesin (RAD21 and

SMC3), compared with the other two types of EPA (Supplemental Fig. S3). Total 134

biased orientation (88 FR and 54 RF) of DNA motif sequences including CTCF and

cohesin showed a higher ratio of EPI overlapped with HiChIP than the other types of

EPA in T cells (Supplemental Table S10). As expected, the number of EPI overlapped

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

interactions. However, the same as CD14$^+$ monocytes, chromatin interaction data were

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

study.

Discussion

To find DNA motif sequences of transcription factors and repeat DNA sequences

affecting human putative transcriptional target genes, DNA motif sequences were

searched from open chromatin regions of monocytes of four people. Total 287 biased

(159 forward-reverse and 153 reverse-forward) orientation of DNA motif sequences

were found in monocytes of four people in common, whereas only one any orientation

(i.e. without considering orientation) of DNA motif sequence was found to affect

putative transcriptional target genes, suggesting that EPA shortened at the genomic

locations of forward-reverse or reverse-forward orientation of DNA motif sequences of

transcription factors is an important character for EPI and transcription of genes.

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

larger number of biased orientation of DNA motif sequences affecting human putative

transcriptional target genes has been found. When the number of people, from which

experimental data were obtained, was increased, the number of DNA motif sequences

found in all people in common decreased and in some cases, known transcription

factors involved in chromatin interactions such as CTCF and cohesin (RAD21 and

SMC3) were not identified by statistical tests. This would be caused by individual

difference of the same cell type, low quality of experimental data, and experimental

errors. Moreover, though forward-reverse orientation of DNA binding motif sequences

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

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

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

CTCF and cohesin are found in various open chromatin regions, DNA binding motif

sequences of some transcription factors would be observed less frequently in open

chromatin regions. The analyses of cells of a number of people would avoid missing

relatively weak statistical significance of DNA motif sequences in cells of each person

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

was found with p-value < 0.05 in cells of one person and the DNA motif sequence

found in the same cell type of four people in common would have p-value < $(0.05)^4$ =

0.00000625. Actually, DNA motif sequences with p-value slightly less than 0.05 in

monocytes of one person were observed in monocytes of four people in common.

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

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

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

overlapped with chromatin interactions, according to three types of EPA (FR, any, and

others). 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 and the difference of the ratio of EPI overlapped with chromatin

interactions among the three types of EPA became larger (data not shown). (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 study. As an issue of experimental data, chromatin interaction data were

obtained using different samples from DNase-seq, open chromatin regions, so

individual differences were not reflected to chromatin interaction data. Moreover, the

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

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

cutoff score of CHiCAGO tool > 1). EPA shortened at the genomic locations of DNA

binding motif sequences of transcription factors found in various open chromatin

regions such as CTCF and cohesin (RAD21 and SMC3) tend to be overlapped with a

larger number of chromatin interactions than DNA binding motif sequences of

transcription factors less frequently observed in open chromatin regions. Therefore, to

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

according to three types of EPA (FR or RF, any, and others), 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 transcription factors were examined in T cells

using DNase-seq data of four people. The resolutions of chromatin interactions and EPI

were adjusted to 1kb by fragmentation of genome sequences. In monocytes, the

resolution of Hi-C chromatin interaction data was converted by extending anchor

regions of chromatin interactions to 50kb length and merging chromatin interactions

overlapped with each other. Fragmentation of genome sequences may affect the

classification of chromatin interactions of which anchors are located near the border of a

fragment, but the number of chromatin interactions would not be decreased, compared

with merging chromatin interactions. The number of HiChIP chromatin interactions was

28,918,687 at 1kb resolution. As expected, the number of EPI overlapped with

chromatin interactions was increased, and about half of biased orientation of DNA motif

sequences of transcription factors showed a statistical significance in EPI predicted

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

compared with the other types of EPA. But the difference of the ratios of EPI

overlapped with chromatin interactions, according to three types of EPA (FR or RF, any,

and others), became smaller in T cells than monocytes (Supplemental Fig. S3), due to

higher resolution of chromatin interactions. False positive predictions of EPI would be

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

with Hi-C chromatin interactions was increased by using H3K27ac marks in both

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

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

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

HiChIP chromatin interactions than the other types of EPA was slightly decreased using

H3K27ac marks (data not shown).

Though the number of known DNA binding proteins and transcription factors

involved in chromatin interactions would be less than 20 or so, about 300 DNA binding

proteins showed enrichment of biased orientation of their DNA binding sequences, and

known DNA binding proteins involved in chromatin interactions were found in the

biased orientation of DNA binding sequences. JUNDM2 (JDP2) found in T cells and

monocytes is not known DNA binding proteins involved in chromatin interactions.

JDP2   is   involved   in   histone   and   nucleosome-related   functions   such   as

histone-chaperone activity, promoting nucleosome, and inhibition of histone acetylation

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

factors   (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Jun_dimerization_protein).   Thus,   the   main

function of JDP2 may not be associated with chromatin interactions, but it forms a

homodimer or heterodimer with transcription factors, potentially forming a chromatin

interaction through the binding of JDP2 and another transcription factor, like chromatin

interactions formed by YY1 transcription factor (Weintraub et al. 2017). When forming

a homodimer or heterodimer with another transcription factor, transcription factors may

bind to genome DNA with a specific orientation of their DNA binding sequences. From

the analysis of biased orientation of DNA motif sequences of transcription factors, such

transcription factors would also be found. If the DNA binding motif sequence of only

the mate to a pair of transcription factors was found in EPA, EPA was shortened at one

side, 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 one side. In

this analysis, the mate to both heterodimer and homodimer of transcription factors can

be used to examine the effect on the expression level of transcriptional target genes

predicted based on the EPA shortened at one side. For heterodimer, biased orientation of

DNA motif sequences may be found in forward-forward or reverse-reverse orientation.

I reported that the ratio of the number of functional enrichment of putative

transcriptional target genes in the total number putative transcriptional target genes

changed according to the types of EPA, in the same way as gene expression level (Osato

2018). JDP2 showed a higher ratio of functional enrichment of putative transcriptional

target genes using EPA shortened at genomic locations of forward-reverse orientation of

the DNA binding motif sequence, compared with the other types of EPA

(reverse-forward or any orientation) in monocytes and T cells, among monocytes, T

cells and CD20$^+$ B cells. While the genome-wide analysis of functional enrichments of

putative transcriptional target genes takes computational time, the genome-wide

analysis of gene expression level is finished with less computational time. The analysis

of gene expression level can be used for a cell type and experimental data where the

expression levels of transcriptional target genes predicted from EPA are significantly

different from those predicted from only promoter.

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

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

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

including cancer.

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

sequences of transcription factors and repeat DNA sequences, and would be useful to

analyze transcription factors involved in chromatin interactions and/or forming a

homodimer, heterodimer or complex with other transcription factors, affecting the

expression and transcriptional regulation of genes.

Methods

Search for biased orientation of DNA motif sequences

To examine transcriptional regulatory target genes, bed files of hg38 of Blueprint

DNase-seq data for CD14$^+$ monocytes of four donors (EGAD00001002286; Donor ID:

C0010K, C0011I, C001UY, C005PS) were obtained from Blueprint project web site

(http://dcc.blueprint-epigenome.eu/#/home), and the bed files of hg38 were converted

into those of hg19 using Batch Coordinate Conversion (liftOver) web site

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

CD4$^+$_Naive_Wb11970640 (GSM1014537; UCSC Accession: wgEncodeEH003156),

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

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

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

wgEncodeEH000579)   were   obtained   from   the   ENCODE   websites

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

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

As high resolution of chromatin interaction data using HiChIP became available

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

DNase-seq data of four donors were obtained from ENCODE and Blueprint projects

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

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

ENCODE project. Though the peak calling of DNase-seq data available in ENCODE

database was different from other DNase-seq data in ENCODE and Blueprint projects

where 150bp length of peaks were usually predicted using HotSpot (John et al. 2011),

FASTQ files of DNase-seq data were downloaded from NCBI Sequence Read Archive

(SRA) database (SRR097566, SRR097618, and SRR171574). Read sequences of

FASTQ files were aligned to the hg19 version of the human genome reference using

BWA (Li and Durbin 2009), and the BAM files generated by BWA were converted into

SAM files, sorted, and indexed using Samtools (Li et al. 2009). Peaks of the DNase-seq

data were predicted using HotSpot-4.1.1.

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

TRANSFAC (2013.2), JASPAR (2010), UniPROBE, BEEML-PBM, high-throughput

SELEX, Human Protein-DNA Interactome, and transcription factor binding sequences

of ENCODE ChIP-seq data were used (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). Position weight matrices of transcription factor

binding sequences were transformed into TRANSFAC matrices and then into MEME

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

Transcription factor binding sequences of transcription factors derived from vertebrates

were used for further analyses. Searches were conducted for transcription factor binding

sequences from each narrow peak using FIMO with p-value threshold of 10^{-5} (Grant et

al. 2011). Transcription factors corresponding to transcription factor binding sequences

were searched computationally by comparing their names and gene symbols of HGNC

(HUGO Gene Nomenclature Committee) -approved gene nomenclature and 31,848

UCSC known canonical transcripts

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

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

RefSeq, and Ensembl transcripts.

Target genes of a transcription factor were assigned when its TFBS was found in

DNase-seq narrow peaks in promoter or extended regions for enhancer-promoter

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

promoter regions were those that were within distances of ±5 kb from transcriptional

start sites (TSS). Promoter and extended regions were defined as per the following

association rule, which is the same as that defined in Figure 3A of a previous study

(McLean et al. 2010): the single nearest gene association rule, which extends the

regulatory domain to the midpoint between the TSS of the gene and that of the nearest

gene upstream and downstream without the limitation of extension length. Extended

regions for EPA were shortened at the genomic locations of DNA binding sites of

transcription factors that were the closest to a transcriptional start site, and

transcriptional target genes were predicted from the shortened enhancer regions using

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

genomic locations of forward–reverse orientation of DNA binding sites of transcription

factors. When forward or reverse orientation of DNA binding sites were continuously

located in genome sequences several times, the most external forward–reverse

orientation of DNA binding sites were selected. The genomic positions of genes were

identified using 'knownGene.txt.gz' file in UCSC bioinformatics sites (Karolchik et al.

2014). The file 'knownCanonical.txt.gz' was also utilized for choosing representative

transcripts among various alternate forms for assigning promoter and extended regions

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

target genes, redundant transcription factor binding sequences were removed by

comparing the target genes of a transcription factor binding sequence and its

corresponding transcription factor; if identical, one of the transcription factor binding

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

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

sequence was omitted.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(GSE58310, GSE58310_GeneExpression.csv.gz, Monocytes_Day0_RPMI) was used

(Saeed et al. 2014). Based on RPKM, UCSC transcripts with expression levels among

top 30% of all the 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 sequences of transcription factors or

repeat DNA sequences was compared with the expression level of transcriptional target

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

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

motif sequences of transcription factors, and the expression level of putative

transcriptional target genes of each transcription factor was compared between EPA and

only promoter using Mann-Whitney test (p-value < 0.05). The number of transcription

factors showing a significant difference of expression level of putative transcriptional

target genes between EPA and promoter was compared among forward-reverse,

reverse-forward, and any orientation of DNA motif sequences shortening EPA using

chi-square test (p-value < 0.05). When DNA motif sequences of transcription factors or

repeat DNA sequences shortening EPA showed a significant difference of expression

level of putative transcriptional target genes in forward-reverse, reverse-forward, or any

orientation in monocytes of four people in common, the DNA motif sequences were

listed.

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

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

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

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

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

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

The analyses of cells of a number of people would avoid missing relatively weak

statistical significance of DNA motif sequences in cells of each person by multiple

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

with p-value < 0.05 in cells of one person and the DNA motif sequence found in the

same cell type of four people in common would have p-value $< 0.05^4 = 0.00000625$.

Co-location of biased orientation of DNA motif sequences

Co-location of biased orientation of DNA binding motif sequences of

transcription factors was examined. The number of open chromatin regions with the

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

binding motif sequences were enriched with statistical significance (chi-square test,

p-value $< 1.0 \times 10^{-10}$), they were listed.

For histone modification of an enhancer mark (H3K27ac), bed files of hg38 of

Blueprint ChIP-seq data for CD14$^+$ monocytes (EGAD00001001179) and CD4$^+$ T cells

(Donor   ID: S000RD)   was   obtained   from   Blueprint   web   site

(http://dcc.blueprint-epigenome.eu/#/home), and the bed files of hg38 were converted

into   those   of   hg19   using   Batch   Coordinate   Conversion   (liftOver)   web   site

(https://genome.ucsc.edu/util.html).

Comparison with chromatin interaction data

For   comparison   of   EPA   in   monocytes   with   chromatin   interactions,

'PCHiC_peak_matrix_cutoff0.txt.gz' file   was   downloaded   from   'Promoter   Capture

Hi-C in 17 human primary blood cell types' web site (https://osf.io/u8tzp/files/), and

chromatin interactions for Monocytes with scores of CHiCAGO tool > 1 were extracted

from the file (Javierre et al. 2016).

EPI were predicted using three types of EPA in monocytes: (i) EPA shortened at

the genomic locations of forward-reverse or reverse-forward orientation of DNA motif

sequences of transcription factors, (ii) EPA shortened at the genomic locations of any

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

transcription factors, and (iii) EPA without being shortened by DNA motif sequences.

EPI predicted using the three types of EPA in common were removed. First, EPI

predicted based on EPA (i) were compared with chromatin interactions (Hi-C). The

resolution of chromatin interaction data used in this study was 50kb, so EPI were

adjusted to 50kb before their comparison. The number and ratio of EPI overlapped with

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

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

EPI overlapped with chromatin interactions were counted. Third, EPI were predicted

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

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

The number and ratio of the EPI compared two times between EPA (i) and (iii), and

EPA (i) and (ii) (binomial distribution, p-value < 0.025 for each test).

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

'GSM2705049_Naive_HiChIP_H3K27ac_B2T1_allValidPairs.txt' file was downloaded

from Gene Expression Omnibus (GEO) database (GSM2705049). The resolutions of

chromatin interaction data and EPI were adjusted to 1kb before their comparison.

Acknowledgements

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

research was partially supported by Development of Fundamental Technologies for

Diagnosis and Therapy Based upon Epigenome Analysis from Japan Agency for

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

JST CREST Grant Number JPMJCR15G1, Japan.

Figures

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

genomic locations of forward-reverse orientation of DNA binding motif sequences of

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

Figure 2. Comparison of median expression level of putative transcriptional target genes. The median expression levels of target genes of the same transcription factor binding sequences were compared between promoters and EPA shortened at the genomic locations of forward-reverse orientation of DNA motif sequences of CTCF and cohesin (RAD21 and SMC3). Red and blue dots show statistically significant difference (Mann-Whitney test) of the distribution of expression levels of target genes between promoters and EPA. Red dots show the median expression level of target genes was higher based on EPA than promoters, and blue dots show the median expression level of target genes was lower based on EPA than promoters. The expression level of target genes predicted based on the EPA tended to be higher than promoters, implying that transcription factors acted as enhancers of target genes.

Figure 3. Biased orientation of DNA motif sequences of transcription factors in monocytes. Total 287 of biased orientation of DNA binding motif sequences of

 transcription factors have been found to affect the expression level of putative

683 transcriptional target genes in monocytes of four people in common, whereas only one

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

685 have been found to affect the expression level.

Figure 4. Pairs of biased orientation of DNA binding motif sequences of transcription

factors enriched in upstream and downstream of some genes. The number of genes

having a pair of forward-reverse orientation of DNA motif sequences was counted using

all pairs of the DNA motif sequences, and statistical tests (chi-square test) were

conducted in T cells. Gray circles show pairs of DNA motif sequences of CTCF and

cohesin (RAD21 and SMC3). CTCF and cohesin are known to be involved in chromatin

interactions and tend to show biased orientation of DNA binding motif sequences to

form chromatin loops. Other pairs of forward-reverse orientation of DNA motif

sequences were also enriched near genes.

Figure 5. Comparison of DNA binding motif sequences of transcription factors with

chromatin interactions in monocytes. Total 59 biased orientation (40 FR and 23 RF) of

DNA motif sequences including CTCF and cohesin showed a higher ratio of EPI

overlapped with Hi-C than the other types of EPA in monocytes. FR: forward-reverse

orientation of DNA motifs. any: any orientation of DNA motifs. others:

enhancer-promoter association not shortened at the genomic locations of DNA motifs. *

p-value $< 10^{-5}$.

719 **Tables**

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

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

722 $-\log_{10}$ (*p*-value).

723 Forward-reverse orientation

DNA motif of TF	Score	TF	Score	TF	Score
SRF	75.45	STAT5A	31.24	SMARCC2	21.86
IRF7	71.05	E2F8	30.62	ZNF695	21.78
MINI20	61.68	TP53	30.56	ZNF28	21.77
CTCF	61.62	STAT5B	29.94	ZNF316	21.66
E2F	59.32	STAT3	29.85	TBP	21.60
STAT1	58.94	FOS	29.75	NFIB	21.45
ZNF317	55.97	CEBPZ	29.42	PHOX2B	20.82
CEBPG	55.46	RAD21	28.67	DEC	20.62
ZNF623	54.71	SMAD2	28.60	ZNF709	20.58
ZNF93	54.23	GATA2	28.52	YY1	20.57
HMBOX1	52.99	KLF6	28.02	EIF5A2	20.55
SMAD2_SMAD3_SMAD4	50.66	HOXB1	27.62	ZNF148	20.45
FOXN2	49.88	GLI1	27.09	PAX5	20.05
SPEF1	49.52	GCM1	26.73	POU6F1	19.93
ZNF646	43.95	ZNF676	26.66	FOXO4	19.72
TFE3	42.46	TCF3	26.32	EBF	19.26
MYB	41.98	EHF	26.32	ZNF648	19.12
STAT4	40.54	TCF12	26.29	HENMT1	19.02
ZNF716	40.39	MEF2A	26.22	PARG	18.78
KLF14	39.64	HIC1	25.34	ZNF460	18.64
FOXA1	38.13	EGR2	24.92	SLC25A20	17.83
USF	37.74	NR2F2	24.86	KLF5	17.77
EN1	37.01	PLAGL1	24.65	XRCC4	17.53
ZNF219	35.37	REST	24.53	WT1	17.34
IKZF1	33.79	ZNF143	23.67	SULT1A2	17.34
ZIC1	33.60	YBX1	22.99	FUBP1	17.33
SMC3	33.37	PRDM15	22.63	DNAAF2	17.26
ESR2	32.07	ZNF92	22.22	ZNF521	17.25
TP63	31.98	ZNF214	22.11	XBP1	16.85
ZNF836	31.66	PTF1A	22.09	SP1	16.84

736 Reverse-forward orientation

TF	Score	TF	Score	TF	Score
RFX5	102.30	TFAP2B	34.55	ZNF449	27.96
TCF7	75.34	TBP	34.47	ZNF233	27.66
SRF	65.52	ZNF670	34.33	SOX2	26.46
ZNF28	63.89	ZNF350	34.30	RXRA	26.07
HNF1B	62.46	ZNF687	33.82	MYF6	25.85
ZNF225	62.18	NFKB2	33.05	MAFK	25.81
CEBPB	59.69	RFX3	32.74	CEBPZ	25.73
NFY	58.96	NFE2L3	32.69	POU2F2	25.59
ZNF286B	54.73	TRIM28	32.27	ETS2	25.05
CTCF	53.16	SP3	32.22	HSF1	24.76
PAX5	52.57	FLI1	32.15	AHR	23.56
STAT1	52.11	RBAK	31.92	PAX6	23.48
ISL1	49.73	NR2F1	31.80	IRF4	22.47
ETV7	47.08	NKX3-1	31.55	ETV3	21.90
KLF16	46.45	ZIC2	31.40	FOXP2	21.72
SP1	46.03	PARP1	31.19	CDX2	21.45
SMAD3	45.27	ZNF195	31.06	NFATC1	21.24
STAT5B	44.72	BDP1	30.84	SP4	21.14
TEAD1	43.00	SOX9	30.72	USF1	20.92
ZNF579	42.94	SP8	30.49	MSX2	20.84
ZBTB2	42.28	ZNF121	30.04	PPARG	20.70
ZNF343	41.01	ZNF202	30.01	MYEF2	20.23
DOBOX5	39.21	CD59	29.85	MYC_MAX	20.22
NANOG	38.84	RXRB	29.57	ZNF711	19.84
NFE2L2	38.53	STAT5A	29.31	ZBTB18	19.60
OBOX2	38.00	SOX11	29.09	HSF2	19.51
ZNF652	37.84	WT1	29.06	DNAAF2	19.00
ZNF30	37.59	CREM	28.65	IRF3	18.88
MYOG	36.34	ZNF316	28.34	TFAP2E	18.87
GABPB1_GABPB2	35.96	HAND1_TCF3	28.07	BCL11A	18.59

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

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

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

752 MCF-7　　　　　　iPS

TF	Score	TF	Score
RAD21	16.21	ZIC3	19.32
SMC3	15.63	ZNF521	18.93
CTCF	15.12	TFE3	16.63
E2F	10.14	ZNF317	16.43
SLC25A20	9.62	NKX2-5	16.25
HOXA7	8.29	HES1	15.34
STAT5B	7.55	ZBTB24	14.21
REST	7.25	SMC3	13.76
SIRT6	7.05	FOS	13.69
KLF3	6.53	RAD21	13.05
YY1	5.30	ZNF836	11.64
PLAGL1	4.97	TBX5	11.48
ZNF219	4.91	CTCF	11.24
STAT1	4.43	STAT1	11.19
SNTB1	4.42	RUNX2	10.28
ETS	3.16	WT1	10.27
XRCC4	3.15	ZIC1	9.60
ZBTB6	3.12	MAX	8.55
DBP	2.53	KLF3	8.29
SETDB1	2.53	KLF14	8.25
RREB1	2.50	ZNF143	7.81
E2F5	2.38	E2F5	7.66
KLF5	2.33	SIRT6	7.56
SPEF1	2.22	EN1	7.49
ZNF143	2.20	YY1	7.02
ZNF460	2.19	STAT5B	6.73
FOS	2.18	MAZ	6.39
GATA2	1.97	ZNF148	6.20
MAZ	1.95	TCF3	5.73
PARG	1.94	EGR2	5.45

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

757 (*p*-value).

758 Monocytes H3K27ac_EP
Forward-reverse (FR) orientation (when using H3K27ac histone modification marks)

DNA repeat seq.	Score
MLT1F1	6.75

Reverse-forward (RF) orientation

DNA repeat seq.	Score
LTR16C	69.39
L1ME4b	23.90
AluSg	23.61

Table 4. Top 30 of co-locations of biased orientation of DNA binding motif sequences

of transcription factors in monocytes. Co-locations of DNA motif sequences of CTCF

with other biased orientation of DNA motif sequences were shown in a separate table.

Motif 1,2: DNA binding motif sequences of transcription factors. # both: the number of

open chromatin regions including both Motif 1 and Motif 2. # motif 1: the number of

open chromatin regions including Motif 1. # motif 2: the number of open chromatin

regions including Motif 2. # others: the number of open chromatin regions not including

Motif 1 or Motif 2. Open chromatin regions overlapped with histone modification

(H3K27ac) were used (Total 26,095 regions).

Motif 1	Motif 2	# both	# motif 1	# motif 2	# others	p-value
CTCF	SMAD2	4527	781	4478	16309	0
CTCF	RREB1	4379	929	4757	16030	0
CTCF	ZNF263	4357	951	4875	15912	0
CTCF	SP1	4321	987	4052	16735	0
CTCF	RAD21	3804	1504	225	20562	0
CTCF	KLF6	3695	852	3800	17748	0
CTCF	SMC3	1259	178	1977	22681	0
CTCF	RXRA	1220	259	2559	22057	0

Motif 1	Motif 2	# both	# motif 1	# motif 2	# others	p-value
SMAD2	ZNF263	7427	1578	1805	15285	0
SMARCC2	ZNF263	7354	1192	1893	15656	0
RREB1	SP1	7208	1957	1165	15765	0
SIRT6	ZNF263	7126	1154	2121	15694	0
MAZ	SP1	7052	909	1321	16813	0
MAZ	ZNF263	7022	999	2225	15849	0
SP1	ZNF263	7009	1364	2223	15499	0
SMAD2	SP1	6925	2080	1448	15642	0
MAZ	RREB1	6920	967	2245	15963	0
SIRT6	SMAD2	6766	1514	2239	15576	0
SIRT6	SMARCC2	6668	1612	1878	15937	0
PLAGL1	SMAD2	6637	1074	2368	16016	0
MAZ	SMAD2	6627	1334	2378	15756	0
PARG	SMAD2	6602	1012	2403	16078	0
PLAGL1	ZNF263	6571	1140	2661	15723	0
EGR2	RREB1	6565	787	2600	16143	0
KLF6	RREB1	6563	932	2573	16027	0
MAZ	SMARCC2	6562	1459	1984	16090	0
RREB1	ZNF263	6551	1607	2681	15256	0
KLF6	SP1	6541	954	1832	16768	0
PLAGL1	RREB1	6496	1215	2640	15744	0
EGR2	SP1	6492	860	1881	16862	0
KLF6	SMAD2	6491	1004	2514	16086	0
PARG	ZNF263	6390	1224	2842	15639	0
PLAGL1	SP1	6318	1393	2055	16329	0
KLF6	ZNF263	6304	1191	2928	15672	0
EGR2	SMAD2	6270	1082	2735	16008	0
EGR2	ZNF263	6253	1099	2979	15764	0
EGR2	MAZ	6219	1133	1742	17001	0
PARG	RREB1	6219	1395	2917	15564	0

Table 5. Comparison of biased orientation of DNA binding motif sequences of

transcription factors with chromatin interaction data in monocytes. TF: DNA binding

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

of EPA shortened at genomic locations of FR or RF orientation of DNA binding

sequences with EPA not shortened. Score 2: Comparison of EPA shortened at genomic

locations of FR or RF orientation of DNA binding sequences with EPA shortened at

genomic locations of any orientation of DNA binding sequences.

Forward-reverse   Reverse-forward orientation

TF	Score 1	Score 2
BRF1	3.21	5.75
CTCF	6.09	6.80
E2F	19.43	3.24
E2F5	10.58	2.02
EGR2	4.28	10.11
ETS	7.66	5.74
FOS	28.64	3.75
FOSB	7.98	1.99
FOXO4	7.98	5.84
GCM1	2.51	3.47
GTF3C2	20.26	4.66
IRF7	16.36	2.03
KLF14	18.52	8.08
KLF3	6.42	6.43
KLF5	8.64	2.69
MAZ	1.82	4.55
NR3C1	6.39	4.50
PARG	5.38	4.21
PITX3	10.31	5.62
PLAGL1	11.50	5.42
POU6F1	31.28	7.60
PTF1A	8.91	4.50
RAD21	9.28	5.16
RFTN1	42.64	6.22
RREB1	7.47	6.40
RUNX2	2.97	1.68
SETDB1	1.63	2.08
SMAD2	4.10	3.48
SMC3	10.24	6.21
SP1	20.98	4.64
SPI1	3.86	1.71
TFAP2A	5.10	1.63
TFE3	94.90	3.64
YY1	13.88	7.04
ZBTB6	15.08	3.93
ZIC1	5.37	1.63
ZNF148	14.51	4.47
ZNF219	15.44	7.99
ZNF28	11.88	3.36
ZNF460	14.14	1.63

TF	Score 1	Score 2
ATF3	29.41	5.12
BDP1	13.04	6.13
CTCF	11.59	8.71
DNAAF2	19.53	1.95
E2F2	3.90	1.74
EBF1	2.45	5.28
FOXP2	3.11	3.04
IRF4	9.16	1.71
IRF8	3.67	3.29
KLF16	6.94	2.53
PAX5	47.18	3.82
POLR3A	24.37	7.71
RAD21	4.14	2.23
RXRA	14.78	5.39
SMAD4	19.98	2.50
SP1	8.87	5.20
SP3	5.83	2.84
SP4	12.56	3.60
SP8	7.80	2.75
TFAP2A	4.62	3.59
TFAP2B	6.97	2.24
TRIM28	1.74	2.43
ZNF202	18.81	2.19

References

References

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Javierre BM, Burren OS, Wilder SP, Kreuzhuber R, Hill SM, Sewitz S, Cairns J,
Wingett SW, Varnai C, Thiecke MJ et al. 2016. Lineage-Specific Genome
Architecture Links Enhancers and Non-coding Disease Variants to Target Gene
Promoters. *Cell* **167**: 1369-1384 e1319.

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

E, Presser Aiden A et al. 2017. A Cell Type-Specific Class of Chromatin Loops
Anchored at Large DNA Methylation Nadirs. *bioRxiv*.

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

Jin C, Kato K, Chimura T, Yamasaki T, Nakade K, Murata T, Li H, Pan J, Zhao M, Sun
K et al. 2006. Regulation of histone acetylation and nucleosome assembly by
transcription factor JDP2. *Nat Struct Mol Biol* **13**: 331-338.

Jjingo D, Conley AB, Wang J, Marino-Ramirez L, Lunyak VV, Jordan IK. 2014.
Mammalian-wide interspersed repeat (MIR)-derived enhancers and the
regulation of human gene expression. *Mob DNA* **5**: 14.

John S, Sabo PJ, Thurman RE, Sung MH, Biddie SC, Johnson TA, Hager GL,
Stamatoyannopoulos JA. 2011. Chromatin accessibility pre-determines
glucocorticoid receptor binding patterns. *Nature genetics* **43**: 264-268.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Bejerano G. 2010. GREAT improves functional interpretation of cis-regulatory
regions. *Nature biotechnology* **28**: 495-501.
Mumbach MR, Satpathy AT, Boyle EA, Dai C, Gowen BG, Cho SW, Nguyen ML,
Rubin AJ, Granja JM, Kazane KR et al. 2017. Enhancer connectome in primary
human cells identifies target genes of disease-associated DNA elements. *Nature*
genetics **49**: 1602-1612.
Newburger DE, Bulyk ML. 2009. UniPROBE: an online database of protein binding
microarray data on protein-DNA interactions. *Nucleic acids research* **37**:
D77-82.
Osato N. 2018. Characteristics of functional enrichment and gene expression level of
human putative transcriptional target genes. *BMC Genomics* **19**: 957.
Phanstiel DH, Van Bortle K, Spacek D, Hess GT, Shamim MS, Machol I, Love MI,
Aiden EL, Bassik MC, Snyder MP. 2017. Static and Dynamic DNA Loops form
AP-1-Bound Activation Hubs during Macrophage Development. *Molecular cell*
67: 1037-1048.e1036.
Portales-Casamar E, Thongjuea S, Kwon AT, Arenillas D, Zhao X, Valen E, Yusuf D,
Lenhard B, Wasserman WW, Sandelin A. 2010. JASPAR 2010: the greatly
expanded open-access database of transcription factor binding profiles. *Nucleic*
acids research **38**: D105-110.
Ramani V, Cusanovich DA, Hause RJ, Ma W, Qiu R, Deng X, Blau CA, Disteche CM,
Noble WS, Shendure J et al. 2016. Mapping 3D genome architecture through in
situ DNase Hi-C. *Nat Protoc* **11**: 2104-2121.
Rao SS, Huntley MH, Durand NC, Stamenova EK, Bochkov ID, Robinson JT, Sanborn
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.
Rebollo R, Romanish MT, Mager DL. 2012. Transposable elements: an abundant and
natural source of regulatory sequences for host genes. *Annu Rev Genet* **46**:
21-42.
Saeed S, Quintin J, Kerstens HH, Rao NA, Aghajanirefah A, Matarese F, Cheng SC,
Ratter J, Berentsen K, van der Ent MA et al. 2014. Epigenetic programming of
monocyte-to-macrophage differentiation and trained innate immunity. *Science*
(New York, NY) **345**: 1251086.

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

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.

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

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 Z, Hu S, Blackshaw S, Zhu H, Qian J. 2010. hPDI: a database of experimental
human protein-DNA interactions. *Bioinformatics (Oxford, England)* **26**:
287-289.

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

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

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