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. DNA binding sequences of

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

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

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

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

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

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

chromatin interactions.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

36  Total 229 biased orientations of DNA motifs (130 FR and 128 RF orientations,

37 the reverse complement sequences of some DNA motifs were also registered in

38 databases, so the total number was smaller than the number of FR and RF) affected the

39 expression level of putative transcriptional target genes significantly in $CD14^+$

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

41 cells of four people. DNA motif sequences of CTCF, cohesin and other transcription

42 factors involved in chromatin interactions were found to be a biased orientation.

43 Transposon sequences, which are known to be involved in insulators and enhancers,

44 showed a biased orientation. The biased orientations of DNA motif sequences tended to

45 be co-localized in the same open chromatin regions. Moreover, for 51 - 204 of FR and

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

47 were shortened at the genomic locations of the biased orientation of DNA motif

48 sequence were overlapped with chromatin interaction data significantly more than other

49 types of EPAs.

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

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

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

Background

Chromatin interactions have important roles for enhancer-promoter interactions

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

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

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

binding sequences of CTCF indicate their orientation bias at chromatin interaction

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

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

Hi-C experiments include DNA binding motif sequences of CTCF. Though the number

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

(Javierre et al. 2016), about twenty millions of chromatin interactions were recently

identified by HiChIP at 5kb resolution (Mumbach et al. 2017). However, it has been

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

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

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

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

ZNF143, YY1 and SMARCA4 have other biological functions as well as chromatin

interactions and EPI. The DNA binding motif sequences of the transcription factors

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

chromatin interaction anchors.

DNA binding motif sequence of ZNF143 was enriched at both chromatin

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

antibodies directed toward histones with modifications characteristic of enhancer and

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

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

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

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

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

protein factors associated with chromatin interactions may be found from other

researches.

As computational approaches, machine-learning analyses to predict chromatin

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

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

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

examined in this study.

DNA binding proteins involved in chromatin interactions are supposed to affect

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

transcription of genes. These analyses suggested that enhancers affected the

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

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

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

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

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

chromatin interactions, chromatin interaction data are changed, according to

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

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

chromatin interactions. Supposing these characters of DNA binding proteins associated

with chromatin interactions and avoiding experimental issues of the analyses of

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

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

in $CD14^+$ monocytes and $CD4^+$ T cells of four people without using chromatin

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

Results

Search for biased orientation of DNA motif sequences

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

EPA, using Fisher's exact test (p-value < 0.05). To avoid missing DNA motif sequences

showing a relatively weak statistical significance by multiple testing correction, 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 229 of biased (130 FR and 128 RF) orientation of DNA binding motif sequences

of TF were found in monocytes of four people in common, whereas only 11 any

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

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

sequences included CTCF, cohesin (RAD21), and YY1, which are associated with

chromatin interactions and EPI. NFI (Nuclear factor-1) has been reported to have

enhancer-blocking activity (Gaussin et al. 2012), and NFI showed a biased orientation

in monocytes and CD4$^+$ T cells.

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

people. Total 211 of biased (120 FR and 122 RF) orientation of DNA binding motif

sequences of TF were found in T cells of four people in common, whereas only 15 any

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

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

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

cohesin (RAD21 and SMC3), YY1 and SMARC. SMARCA4 (BRG1) is associated

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

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

databases used in this study. FR orientation of DNA motif sequences included

SMARCC2, a member of the same SWI/SNF family of proteins as SMARCA4. Biased

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

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

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

(https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Jun_dimerization_protein). Between 229 and 211, 69 of

biased orientation of DNA binding motif sequences of TF were found in both

monocytes and T cells in common (Supplemental Table S5). For each orientation, 42

FR and 36 RF orientations of DNA binding motif sequences of TF were found in both

monocytes and T cells in common. Without considering the difference of orientation of

DNA binding motif sequences, 88 of biased orientation of DNA binding motif

sequences of TF were found in both monocytes and T cells. As a reason for the increase

of the number (88) from 69, a TF or an isoform of the same TF may bind to a different

DNA binding motif sequence according to cell types and/or in the same cell type. About

50% or more of alternative splicing isoforms are differently expressed among tissues,

indicating that most alternative splicing is subject to tissue-specific regulation (Wang et

al. 2008) (Chen and Manley 2009) (Das et al. 2007). The same TF has several DNA

binding motif sequences and in some cases one of the motif sequences is almost the

same as the reverse complement sequence of another motif sequence of the same TF.

For example, RAD21 had both FR and RF orientations of DNA motif sequences, but

the number of the FR orientation of DNA motif sequence was relatively small in the

genome, and the RF orientation of DNA motif sequence was frequently observed and

co-localized with CTCF. I previously found that a complex of TF would bind to a

slightly different DNA binding motif sequence from the combination of DNA binding

motif sequences of TF composing the complex in *C. elegans* (Tabuchi et al. 2011).

From another viewpoint of this study, the expression level of putative transcription

target genes of some TF would be different, depending on the genomic locations

(enhancers or promoters) of DNA binding motif sequences of the TF in monocytes and

T cells of four people.

Moreover, using open chromatin regions overlapped with H3K27ac histone

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

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

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

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

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

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

motif sequences was decreased. Total 188 of biased (105 FR and 107 RF) orientations

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

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

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

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

H3K27ac histone modification marks, total 178 of biased (108 FR and 96 RF)

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

in common, whereas only 15 any orientation of DNA binding motif sequences were

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

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

summary of the results with and without H3K27ac histone modification marks, total

289 of biased (165 FR and 166 RF) orientation of DNA motif sequences were found in

monocytes of four people in common. Total 262 of biased (154 FR and 151 RF)

orientations of DNA motif sequences were found in T cells of four people in common.

Total number of these results in monocytes and T cells was 433 biased (262 FR and 264

RF) orientations of DNA motif sequences. Biased orientations of DNA motif sequences

found in both monocytes and T cells were listed in Supplemental Table S5.

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

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

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

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

DNA sequences showed a significant difference of expression level of putative

transcriptional target genes in monocytes of four people in common (Table 2). The

same as CD14^{+} monocytes, biased orientations of repeat DNA sequences were

examined in CD4$^+$ T cells. Two FR and one RF orientations 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 S6). MIRc was also

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

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

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

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

Co-location of biased orientations of DNA motif sequences

To examine the association of 229 biased (FR and RF) orientations of DNA

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

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

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

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

(Fisher's exact test, p-value $< 1.0 \times 10^{-9}$), they were listed (Table 3; Supplemental

Table S7). As already known, CTCF was found with cohesin RAD21 (Table 3). Top 30

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

regions were shown (Table 3). Total number of pairs of DNA motifs was 261,

consisting of 148 unique DNA motifs, when the pair of DNA motifs was observed in

more than 60% of the number of open chromatin regions with the DNA motifs. Biased

orientations of DNA binding motif sequences of TF tended to be co-localized in the

same open chromatin regions.

To examine the association of 211 biased orientations of DNA binding motif

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

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

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

Table S8). Total number of pairs of DNA motifs was 400, consisting of 141 unique

DNA motifs, when the pair of DNA motifs was observed in more than 60% of the

number of open chromatin regions with the DNA motifs (Fisher's exact test, p-value <

1.0×10^{-9}). Among them, 21 pairs of DNA motif sequences including a pair of CTCF,

and RAD21 in T cells were found in monocytes in common (Supplemental Table S8).

In both monocytes and CD4$^+$ T cells, some pairs of DNA motifs including CTCF

and RAD21 were found to be perfectly co-localized in the same open chromatin regions.

Almost all genomic positions of a DNA motif were located with genomic positions of

another DNA motif in the same open chromatin regions. This would be due to the strict

criteria of the search for DNA binding motif sequences of TF to reduce false prediction

of DNA binding sites of TF. Moreover, the number of pairs of DNA motif sequences

found in both monocytes and CD4$^+$ T cells in common was increased, compared with

general DNA motif searches using position weight matrix and allowing substitutions of

DNA sequences during motif searches. The score (p-value) of CTCF was relatively high

(50.54), but the score of RAD21 was lower (23.98) (Table 1). Almost all DNA binding

sequences of CTCF were co-localized with those of RAD21. However, some DNA

binding sequences of RAD21 were located in other genomic regions, which may not be

associated with chromatin interactions and biased orientations of the DNA motif

sequences. This might decrease the score of RAD21, compared with CTCF.

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. Due to the resolution of Hi-C experimental data available for this study

(50kb), 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, (ii) EPA shortened at the

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

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

the genomic locations of a DNA motif sequence. EPI were predicted based on the three

types of EPA using top 60% expression level of all transcripts (genes) excluding

transcripts not expressed in T cells. The criteria of the analysis were determined to

include known DNA motif sequences involved in chromatin interactions such as CTCF

and cohesin in the result. EPA (i) 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 (ii) and (iii) (*n*

= 4, binomial test, two-sided, 95% confidence interval) (Supplemental Fig. S2). Total

51 biased orientation (33 FR and 23 RF) of DNA motif sequences, which included

CTCF, cohesin (RAD21 and SMC3), SMARCC1, and NFI 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 4). When comparing EPI predicted based on only EPA (i) and

(iii) with the chromatin interactions, total 204 biased orientation (116 FR and 116 RF)

of DNA motif sequences showed a significantly higher ratio of EPI predicted based on

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

(iii) (Table 4; Supplemental material 2). The difference between EPI predicted based on

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

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

predicted based on EPA (i) and (iii), a larger number of biased 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 seemed to be large from the results of this analysis.

Most of biased orientations of DNA motif sequences (97%) were found to be correlated

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

with HiChIP chromatin interactions.

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

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

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

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

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

chromatin interactions showed a significantly higher expression level than EPI not

overlapped with them, suggesting that EPI overlapped with chromatin interactions

activated the expression of target genes in T cells. 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 the comparison between EPI and HiChIP chromatin

interactions in Supplemental material 2. When a DNA motif showed a significantly

lower expression level, '-1' was marked with, and when there was not significant

difference of expression level, '0' was marked with. However, they were not observed

in this analysis. HiChIP data were produced using H3K27ac antibody, so chromatin

interactions acting as repressor would not be identified.

The ratio of EPI overlapped with HiChIP chromatin interactions was also

increased using H3K27ac marks. Chromatin interaction data were obtained from

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

individual differences seemed to exist 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 orientations of DNA motif sequences was different from

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

collected from ENCODE and Blueprint projects were employed in this study.

Discussion

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

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

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

four people. Total 229 biased [130 forward-reverse (FR) and 128 reverse-forward (RF)]

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

common, whereas only 11 any orientation (i.e. without considering orientation) of DNA

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

target genes, suggesting that enhancer-promoter association (EPA) shortened at the

genomic locations of FR or RF orientation of the DNA motif sequence of a TF or a

repeat DNA sequence is an important character for the prediction of enhancer-promoter

interactions (EPI) and the transcriptional regulation of genes.

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

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

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

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

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

known transcription factors involved in chromatin interactions such as CTCF and

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

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

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

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

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

motif sequences are also observed (Guo et al. 2015). Though DNA binding motif

sequences of CTCF and cohesin are found in various open chromatin regions, DNA

binding motif sequences of some TF would be observed less frequently in open

chromatin regions. The analyses of experimental data of a number of people would

avoid missing relatively weak statistical significance of DNA motif sequences of TF in

experimental data of each person by multiple testing correction of thousands of

statistical tests. A DNA motif sequence was found with p-value < 0.05 in experimental

data of one person and the DNA motif sequence found in the same cell type of four

people in common would have p-value < 0.05^4 = 6.25 $\times$ 10^{-6}. Actually, DNA motif

sequences with p-value slightly less than 0.05 in monocytes of one person were

observed in monocytes of four people in common.

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 cells using DNase-seq

data of four people. 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 51 − 204

of biased 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. False positive

prediction of EPI would be reduced by using H3K27ac marks and other features. The

ratio of EPI overlapped with HiChIP chromatin interactions was increased using

H3K27ac marks. However, the number of biased orientations of DNA motif sequences

showing a higher ratio of EPI overlapped with HiChIP chromatin interactions than the

other types of EPAs was decreased using H3K27ac marks (Supplemental material 2).

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. 3). 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. For heterodimer, 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 substitution 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, 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. Though the number of biased orientations of DNA

motif sequences of TF was decreased, the number of the DNA motif sequences found in

both monocytes and CD4$^+$ T cells in common was increased, 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 substitution of

a DNA sequence. To obtain more accurate result of analysis, I plan to refine the method

to find biased orientations of DNA motif sequences of TF.

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 and repeat DNA sequences to analyze TF involved in chromatin

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

other TF, affecting the transcriptional regulation of genes.

Methods

Search for biased orientations of DNA motif sequences

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

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

(EGAD00001002286; Donor ID: C0010K, C0011I, C001UY, C00408) 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).

As high resolution of chromatin interaction data using HiChIP became available

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

TRANSFAC (2019.2), 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. Position weight matrices of 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 TF

derived from vertebrates were used for further analyses. Transcription factor binding

sequences were searched from each narrow peak of DNase-seq data in repeat-masked

hg19 genome sequences using 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.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

representative transcripts among various alternate forms for assigning promoter and

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

transcriptional target genes, redundant transcription factor binding sequences were

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

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

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

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

was omitted.

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

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

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

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

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

sequences were obtained from UCSF-UBC human reference epigenome mapping

project RNA-seq reads with poly-A of naive CD4^{+} T cells (GSM669617). FPKMs of

the RNA-seq data were calculated using RSeQC (Wang et al. 2012). For monocytes,

Blueprint　　　　　RNA-seq　　　　　FPKM　　　　　data

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

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

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

were　　　downloaded　　　from　　　Blueprint　　　DCC　　　portal

(http://dcc.blueprint-epigenome.eu/#/files). However, RNA-seq FPKM data for C00408

was not available, so RNA-seq FPKM data for C001UY was used for C00408. Based

on 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 or a repeat DNA

sequence was compared with the expression level of transcriptional target genes

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

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

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

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

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

significant difference of expression level of putative transcriptional target genes

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

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

DNA motif sequence shortening EPA using Fisher's exact test (p-value < 0.05). When a

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

significant difference of expression level of putative transcriptional target genes among

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

sequence was listed.

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

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

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

sequences are also observed (Guo et al. 2015). Though DNA binding motif sequences

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

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

chromatin regions. The analyses of experimental data of a number of people would

avoid missing relatively weak statistical significance of DNA motif sequences in

experimental data of each person by multiple testing correction of thousands of

statistical tests. A DNA motif sequence was found with p-value < 0.05 in experimental

data of one person and the DNA motif sequence found in the same cell type of four

people in common would have p-value < 0.05^4 = 6.25 $\times$ 10^{-6}.

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 open chromatin regions with the same pair of DNA binding

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

enriched with statistical significance (Fisher's exact test, p-value $< 1.0 \times 10^{-9}$), they

were 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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

were compared with chromatin interactions. The resolution of chromatin interaction

data used in this study was 1-5kb, so EPI were adjusted to 5kb before their comparison.

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

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

were removed from the EPI. The number and ratio of EPI overlapped with chromatin

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

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

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

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

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

interval).

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Acknowledgements

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

research was partially supported by Development of Fundamental Technologies for

Diagnosis and Therapy Based upon Epigenome Analysis from Japan Agency for

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

JST CREST Grant Number JPMJCR15G1, Japan.

Figures

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Figure 2. Biased 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 and

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Biased orientations of DNA motif sequences of transcription factors in monocytes.

Total 229 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 of four people in common, whereas only 11 any orientation (i.e. without

considering orientation) of DNA binding motif sequence was found to affect the

expression level.

Figure 3. Schematic representation of chromatin interactions involving gene promoters.

ZNF143 contributes the formation of chromatin interactions by directly binding the

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

2015).

Tables

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

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

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

Forward-reverse orientation

TF	Score	TF	Score	TF	Score
TCF3	123.12	ETS	49.44	DDIT3	29.23
ZNF592	120.55	SOX6	49.42	NRF1	28.86
EOMES	109.78	AP2A	49.36	SREBP2	28.63
GMEB2	75.32	CEBPA	47.31	YY1	28.02
CEBPG	74.27	FOSL1	44.41	FOXM1	27.64
FOXA1	73.14	ATOH1	43.94	VSX1	27.38
FOXA2	72.93	NFATC2	43.63	AP-1	27.13
DBX2	72.66	TBX3	42.82	STAT5A	26.61
NFYA	71.62	CREB	42.45	KLF10	26.24
TP53	66.60	EGR1	41.57	mix-a	26.06
E2F4	65.71	HOXA4	41.47	HLF	25.64
TLX2	64.10	FOXO1	40.92	FOXG1	25.44
IKZF1	63.69	BARHL1	40.43	DLX3	24.92
RFX6	61.62	ZNF189	39.78	ZNF180	24.86
SFN	59.89	SP1	39.54	BARX2	24.45
FOXO3	59.78	ATF3	37.30	REST	24.25
ZBTB18	59.45	CTNNB1	37.01	SMAD	24.05
PPARG	57.25	ZNF579	36.10	RAD21	23.98
ZNF675	54.71	MZF1	35.58	SRY	23.97
HNF1B	53.86	BACH2	35.38	LRF	23.46
ITGB2	53.86	ZIC1	34.59	ZNF300	22.62
RFX4	53.41	CTCFL	34.55	FOXJ2	22.35
TBP	53.06	CXXC1	34.42	TCF7	22.18
CBFB	52.31	GCM2	34.26	MNX1	21.99
TEAD1	51.39	MEIS1:EOMES	34.02	SOX	21.98
ZBTB7A	50.61	HNF4	34.00	MAZ	21.87
CTCF	50.54	HINFP	33.29	HMGIY	21.53
SOX5	50.51	PDX1	32.36	STAT4	21.33
BRCA1	50.47	CEBPD	30.87	TBR1	21.22
SOX3	49.47	RUNX1	29.40	NKX2-5	21.17

682
683

Reverse-forward orientation

TF	Score	TF	Score	TF	Score
ZBTB48	175.35	HOXA11	47.37	CEBP	32.34
ZBTB38	107.55	POU4F3	46.76	RUNX3	32.09
MSX1	105.86	LBX1	46.13	TCF7	31.09
POLYA	98.31	NR5A1	44.93	AR	30.08
RFX5	97.45	ETV5	44.91	ZBTB7B	29.59
SMAD1	83.39	FOXL1	44.50	ESX1	29.45
YBX1	80.34	NFATC2	43.63	CTNNB1	29.43
KLF4	79.72	NR3C1	42.45	HDAC2	29.27
NR2C2	78.27	ETV6	41.44	HIC1	29.16
OTX	74.43	TFAP2A	40.97	NRF1	29.02
CEBPG	74.27	TCF7L2	40.86	HOXD3	28.50
SP1	73.86	PGR	40.58	ZFP42	28.20
BARHL1	72.65	SP2	39.15	NR4A1	27.71
PITX3	71.71	EBF1	38.13	NR4A3	25.50
TEAD3	68.36	ZNF384	37.81	LMX1A	25.31
FOXA2	68.31	ISX	37.47	NFATC4	25.26
ZBTB16	68.09	GFI1	36.99	PAX2	25.04
EN2	64.71	ATF6	36.81	RAX2	24.73
HOXA7	64.52	REST	36.52	FOXD2	24.55
ZBTB7A	63.80	NFYB	36.38	RHOXF1	23.71
NFATC1	61.71	FOS	36.12	CTCFL	23.46
KLF2	61.64	RUNX2	35.21	CREB1	23.28
TEAD1	61.03	YY1	34.76	EN1	22.00
STAT	56.11	CREB3	34.64	SPIB	21.81
SOX6	55.25	MEIS1	34.49	NFAT	20.97
TFAP2C	53.06	CTCF	33.99	LEF1	20.94
HOXA2	52.05	EGR1	33.22	MYB	20.77
FOXO4	51.30	ISL2	33.21	NKX3-2	20.72
ZBTB18	49.30	RUNX1	33.17	CCAAT	20.42
SPDEF	49.26	PDX1	32.57	FLI1	19.65

Table 2. Biased orientation of repeat DNA sequences in monocytes. Score: $-\log_{10}$ (p-value).

Reverse-forward (RF) orient	
Repeat DNA seq.	Score
AluJo	85.18
AluJb	17.73
L1M5	12.24

Reverse-forward (RF) orientation (using H3K27ac histone modification marks)	
Repeat DNA seq.	Score
AluJb	26.27

Table 3. Top 30 of co-locations of biased orientations of DNA binding motif sequences

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

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

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

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

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

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

Motif 1 and Motif 2. Total number of open chromatin regions is 145,866.

Motif 1	Motif 2	# both	# motif 1	# motif 2	# others	p-value
SOX	TCF7L2	21268	0	129	124469	0
LEF1	TCF7L2	21268	0	126	124472	0
LEF1	SOX	21268	129	126	124343	0
DLX5	PRRX2	20580	0	128	125158	0
NFAT	NFATC4	16105	0	110	129651	0
ETV4	FLI1	15046	3276	0	127544	0
LEF1	SOX10	14773	24783	6621	99689	0
SOX	SOX10	14772	24784	6625	99685	0
SOX10	TCF7L2	14744	6524	24812	99786	0
ELF5	ETV4	13205	5117	6384	121160	0
ELF5	FLI1	12971	6618	2075	124202	0
RUNX2	RUNX3	12875	3088	174	129729	0
RUNX1	RUNX3	12866	0	183	132817	0
RUNX1	RUNX2	12866	3097	0	129903	0
HMGA1	HMX1	12611	0	15149	118106	0
NFATC1	NFATC3	10877	231	0	134758	0
NFATC1	NFATC4	10831	5274	277	129484	0
NFAT	NFATC1	10831	277	5384	129374	0
NFAT	NFATC3	10815	62	5400	129589	0
NFATC3	NFATC4	10815	5290	62	129699	0
BHLHE40	MITF	10319	65	19796	115686	0
HOXA2	MEOX2	9999	0	125	135742	0
EMX1	MEOX2	9999	0	125	135742	0
BCL6	HMGA1	7648	4963	32936	100319	0
MEIS1	MEIS3	6973	4122	13183	121588	0
BHLHE40	TCF12	6343	23772	57	115694	0
HMGA1	STAT5A	4835	34254	2003	104774	0
FOXD2	FOXL1	4606	0	6432	134828	0
DLX3	DLX5	4561	24	16147	125134	0
DLX5	MSX1	4561	24	16147	125134	0

Motif 1	Motif 2	# both	# motif 1	# motif 2	# others	p-value
CTCF	RAD21	1450	0	1306	143110	0
CTCF	CTCFL	1061	389	399	144017	0
CTCF	ZBTB7A	634	14	7766	137452	0
CTCF	ZBTB7	633	517	15	144701	0
CTCF	ZNF300	505	8862	143	136356	0
CTCFL	RAD21	1459	1	1297	143109	0
CTCFL	ZBTB7A	1150	0	7250	137466	0
CTCFL	ZNF300	900	250	8467	136249	0
BHLHE40	CTCF	606	389	29509	115362	8.06E-169

Table 4. 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) (iii), overlapped with HiChIP chromatin

interaction data than the other types of EPA (i) and (ii). The middle tables show the 33

FR and 23 RF orientations of DNA motifs found in common among B2T1, B2T2 and

B3T1 replications in the upper table. The lower table shows that among 69 biased

orientations of DNA motifs found in both monocytes and T cell, 24 were matched with

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

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

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

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

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

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

motif sequence [EPA (ii)].

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

Replication of HiChIP data	Total no. (FR + RF) of DNA motifs	No. of FR DNA motifs	No. of RF DNA motifs
B2T1	71	42	34
B2T2	81	47	40
B3T1	94	55	47
DNA motifs found in common among replications			
B2T1 and B2T2	60	35	30
B2T1 and B3T1	59	38	26
B2T2 and B3T1	68	42	32
B2T1, B2T2 and B3T1	51	33	23

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	205	116	117
B2T2	205	116	117
B3T1	208	119	119
DNA motifs found in common among replications			
B2T1 and B2T2	204	116	116
B2T1 and B3T1	205	116	117
B2T2 and B3T1	204	116	116
B2T1, B2T2 and B3T1	204	116	116

Forward-reverse (FR)

TF	Score 1	Score 2
AP-1	81.68	15.19
AP2A	142.68	5.30
BPTF	59.08	3.31
CTCF	323.31	7.60
CTCFL	323.31	2.44
DBP	118.88	18.18
DLX3	30.22	4.12
ETS1	82.43	2.00
FOSB	79.38	14.49
FOSL1	42.29	7.04
IKZF1	83.93	8.70
JUN	39.30	5.81
JUNB	110.84	3.66
KLF4	37.29	15.02
KLF5	68.20	9.30
LBX1	154.16	2.69
NEUROD2	48.90	4.73
NFIL3	152.37	2.69
NKX2-2	198.62	2.31
NKX2-5	136.48	8.97
NR2F1	82.58	7.16
NR3C1	77.96	17.53
RAD21	53.81	7.70
RFX7	29.86	1.93
SMARCC1	39.89	6.15
SMC3	300.51	23.65
SPI1	219.80	7.68
SREBF2	68.43	2.84
TEAD4	45.79	10.37
VDR:RXRA	82.58	7.16
ZBTB7A	101.61	5.36
ZEB1	107.06	5.51
ZXDC	23.35	6.26

Reverse-forward (RF)

TF	Score 1	Score 2
AP-1	79.38	14.49
CACD	67.66	8.44
CRX	56.13	4.27
CTCF	5.65	3.43
CTCFL	101.61	5.36
ETV4	103.13	6.18
FOS	76.64	14.21
FOSL1	39.62	6.42
FOSL2	42.00	6.41
FOXA2	323.31	1.69
GATA	293.73	3.88
HDAC1	323.31	11.46
HEY2	257.47	3.23
HIC2	62.15	14.91
JUND:FOSL1	40.68	6.95
MEIS1	72.99	10.02
MEQ	118.91	5.86
NFI	101.48	10.50
NFIL3	114.14	2.15
SOX4	151.86	4.45
TFAP2C	136.94	5.62
YBX1	111.24	2.03
ZNF354C	54.72	6.02

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

TF	Score 1	Score 2
AP-1	81.68	15.19
AP2A	142.68	5.30
CTCF	323.31	7.60
CTCFL	323.31	2.44
DLX3	30.22	4.12
ETS1	82.43	2.00
FOSL1	42.29	7.04
IKZF1	83.93	8.70
JUN	39.30	5.81
KLF4	37.29	15.02
NKX2-5	136.48	8.97
RAD21	53.81	7.70
SPI1	219.80	7.68
ZBTB7A	101.61	5.36
ZEB1	107.06	5.51

TF	Score 1	Score 2
AP-1	79.38	14.49
CTCF	5.65	3.43
CTCFL	101.61	5.36
FOS	76.64	14.21
FOSL1	39.62	6.42
FOXA2	323.31	1.69
MEIS1	72.99	10.02
TFAP2C	136.94	5.62
YBX1	111.24	2.03

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.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Gaussin A, Modlich U, Bauche C, Niederlander NJ, Schambach A, Duros C, Artus A, Baum C, Cohen-Haguenauer O, Mermod N. 2012. CTF/NF1 transcription factors act as potent genetic insulators for integrating gene transfer vectors. *Gene Ther* **19**: 15-24.

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.

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

778   Jeong M, Huang X, Zhang X, Su J, Shamim M, Bochkov I, Reyes J, Jung H, Heikamp
779   E, Presser Aiden A et al. 2017. A Cell Type-Specific Class of Chromatin Loops
780   Anchored at Large DNA Methylation Nadirs. *bioRxiv*.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

2976-2987.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Rebollo R, Romanish MT, Mager DL. 2012. Transposable elements: an abundant and

840   natural source of regulatory sequences for host genes. *Annu Rev Genet* **46**:
841    21-42.

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

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

848 van Helden J. 2003. Regulatory sequence analysis tools. *Nucleic acids research* **31**:
849    3593-3596.

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

853 Wang J, Vicente-Garcia C, Seruggia D, Molto E, Fernandez-Minan A, Neto A, Lee E,
854    Gomez-Skarmeta JL, Montoliu L, Lunyak VV et al. 2015. MIR retrotransposon
855    sequences provide insulators to the human genome. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*
856    **112**: E4428-4437.

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

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

862 Wingender E, Dietze P, Karas H, Knuppel R. 1996. TRANSFAC: a database on
863    transcription factors and their DNA binding sites. *Nucleic acids research* **24**:
864    238-241.

865 Xie Z, Hu S, Blackshaw S, Zhu H, Qian J. 2010. hPDI: a database of experimental
866    human protein-DNA interactions. *Bioinformatics (Oxford, England)* **26**:
867    287-289.

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

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

873   480-483.