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,

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, which were

supposed to be at chromatin interaction anchors and acted as insulator sites like CTCF.

The expression levels of the transcriptional target genes predicted based on the

EPA were compared with those predicted from only promoters. Total 287 biased

orientation of DNA motifs (159 FR and 153 RF orientation, the reverse complement

sequences of some DNA motifs were also registered in databases, so the total number

was smaller than the number of FR and RF) affected the expression level of putative

transcriptional target genes significantly in 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 a biased orientation. Transposon sequences, which are known to be

involved in insulators and enhancers, showed a biased orientation. The biased

orientation of DNA motif sequences tended to be co-localized in the same open

chromatin regions. Moreover, for ~85% of FR and RF orientations of DNA motif

sequences, EPI predicted from EPA that were shortened at the genomic locations of the

biased orientation of DNA motif sequence were overlapped with chromatin interaction

data (Hi-C and HiChIP) significantly more than other types of EPAs.

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 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 promote 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

EPA, 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 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 (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 (p-value < 0.05) (Fig. 2). 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 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 FR and 153 RF) orientation of DNA binding motif sequences of TF were

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

DNA binding motif sequence was found in monocytes of four people in common (Fig.

3; Table 1; Supplemental Table S1). FR orientation of DNA motif sequences included

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

chromatin interactions and 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. FR 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 FR and 139 RF) orientation of DNA binding motif

sequences of TF were found in T cells of four people in common, whereas only four 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), ZNF143, YY1, and SMARC. Biased orientation of DNA

motif sequences in T cells and monocytes (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 TF

(https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Jun_dimerization_protein). Among 287, 61 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, 31 FR and 34 RF

orientation 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, 84 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 (84)

from 61, 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 orientation 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 241 of biased (141 FR and 120 RF) orientation of

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

common, whereas only one any orientation of DNA binding motif sequence was 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 FR and 110 RF)

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

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

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 H3K27ac histone modification marks, total

386 of biased (223 FR and 214 RF) orientation of DNA motif sequences were found in

monocytes of four people in common. Total 348 of biased (202 FR and 198 RF)

orientation 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 590 biased (368 FR and 359

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

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

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

TF were 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, 69, 82, 56, and 53 DNA binding

motif sequences were also observed in 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 TF show a significant difference between promoters

and EPA shortened at the genomic locations of a DNA motif sequence acting as

insulator sites. Some experimental data of a cell did not show a significant difference

between promoters and the EPA (Osato 2018).

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 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 were examined in CD4$^+$ T cells.

Three FR and two RF 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 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 orientation of DNA motif sequences

To examine the association of 287 biased (FR and RF) orientation 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 (chi-square

test, *p*-value < 1.0 × 10^{-10}), they were listed (Table 4; Supplemental Table S8). Open

chromatin regions overlapped with histone modification of enhancer and promoter

marks (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. Biased orientation of DNA binding motif sequences of TF tended to be

co-localized in the same open chromatin regions.

To examine the association of 265 biased orientation 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 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. TF are also known to form heterodimers with another TF. In this

study, 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. To

examine whether biased orientation of DNA motif sequences tend to be found as a pair

of the same TF or different TF in upstream and downstream of genes, the enrichment of

pairs of biased orientation of DNA motif sequences was investigated. The number of

genes with a pair of FR or RF orientation of DNA motif sequences was counted using

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

conducted. The total number of genes (transcripts) with a biased orientation of DNA

motif sequence in their upstream or/and downstream was about 20,000. This is almost

the same way of analysis as co-location of biased orientation of DNA motif sequences,

and the analysis here used the number of genes instead of open chromatin regions. Fig.

4 and Supplemental Fig. S2 showed that not only pairs of the same TF, but also pairs of

different TF were found in upstream and downstream of genes. The number of DNA

motif sequences of the same TF was assigned independently in each figure of heat map,

so for example, 'CTCF_1' in Fig. 4 may not be the same DNA motif sequence of

'CTCF_1' in another figure in Supplemental Fig. S2. DNA motif sequences of CTCF

and cohesin (RAD21 and SMC3) were enriched near the same genes, but cohesin

tended to be found with another TF near the same genes as well. The number of some

pairs of biased orientation of DNA motif sequences in genome sequences was small,

though they showed statistical significance (Supplemental material 2). The result of the

analysis seems to be different between monocytes and T cells and between using

H3K27ac histone modification marks and not using them (Supplemental Fig. S2). Some

of these TF would form homodimers or heterodimers directory or indirectly composing

a complex structure, contributing to make chromatin interactions (Fig. 6).

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 the genomic locations of a DNA motif sequence, (ii)

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

insulator sites such as CTCF and cohesin (RAD21, SMC3) without considering their

orientation, and (iii) EPA shortened at the genomic locations of FR or RF orientation of

DNA motif sequence of TF. EPA (iii) showed significantly a higher ratio of EPI

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

CTCF and cohesin (RAD21 and SMC3) than the other two types of EPAs

(Supplemental Fig. S3). Total 59 biased orientation (40 FR and 23 RF) of DNA motif

sequences including CTCF, cohesin, and YY1 showed significantly a higher ratio of EPI

overlapped with Hi-C chromatin interactions (a cutoff score of CHiCAGO tool > 1)

than the other types of EPAs in monocytes (Supplemental Table S10). When comparing

EPI predicted based on only (i) and (iii) with chromatin interactions, total 174 biased

orientation (101 FR and 84 RF) of DNA motif sequences showed significantly a higher

ratio of EPI predicted based on (iii) overlapped with the chromatin interactions than EPI

predicted based on (i) (Supplemental material 2). The difference between EPI predicted

based on (ii) and (iii) 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 (i) and (iii), a larger number of biased orientation 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. 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 (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 5kb. EPI

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

using top 60% of all the transcript (gene) 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, and the

result was consistent with the result using Hi-C chromatin interaction data. 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 EPAs (Fig. 5). Total 121 biased orientation (73 FR and 58

RF) of DNA motif sequences including CTCF, cohesin, ZNF143, and SMARC showed

a 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 5). When

comparing EPI predicted based on only (i) and (iii) with the chromatin interactions,

total 226 biased orientation (132 FR and 123 RF) of DNA motif sequences showed a

363 higher ratio of EPI predicted based on (iii) overlapped with the chromatin interactions

364 than EPI predicted based on (i) (Supplemental material 2). As expected, the number of

365 EPI overlapped with chromatin interactions (HiChIP) was increased, compared with

366 Hi-C chromatin interactions. Most of biased orientation of DNA motif sequences (85%)

367 were found to be correlated with chromatin interactions, when comparing EPI predicted

368 based on (i) and (iii) with HiChIP chromatin interactions.

369  Though the ratios of EPI overlapped with chromatin interactions were increased

370 by using many chromatin interaction data including lower score and count of chromatin

371 interactions (a cutoff score of CHiCAGO tool > 1 for Hi-C and more than 1,000 counts

372 for HiChIP), the ratios of EPI overlapped with chromatin interactions showed the same

373 tendency among three types of EPA (FR, any and others). The ratio of EPI overlapped

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

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

376 was also increased using H3K27ac marks. The same as CD14$^+$ monocytes, chromatin

377 interaction data were obtained from different samples from DNase-seq, open chromatin

378 regions in CD4$^+$ T cells, so individual differences seemed to be large from the results of

379 this analysis, and (Mumbach et al. 2017) suggested that individual differences of

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

381 open chromatin regions were available in CD4$^+$ T cells in the paper, however, when

382 using ATAC-seq data, the result of the analysis of biased orientation of DNA motif

383 sequences was different from DNase-seq data, and not included a part of CTCF and

384 cohesin. Thus, DNase-seq data collected from ENCODE and Blueprint projects were

385   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 287 biased [159 forward-reverse (FR) and 153 reverse-forward (RF)]

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

common, whereas only one 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 orientation 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. 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 <

$0.05^4 = 0.00000625$. 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. EPAs

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 EPAs (see Methods).

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 came from

different samples and donors, so individual differences would exist in the 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 a cutoff score of CHiCAGO tool > 1 and 16,501 with a cutoff score of

CHiCAGO tool > 5). EPI predicted based on EPA shortened at the genomic locations of

DNA binding motif sequence of TF that were 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 TF 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 EPAs, the number of chromatin

interactions should be large enough.

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

orientation 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. In monocytes, the resolution of Hi-C

chromatin interaction data was converted by extending anchor regions of chromatin

interactions to 50kb length and merging the 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 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 46 − 85% of biased

orientation 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 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 using H3K27ac marks

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

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

orientation 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).

Though the number of known DNA binding proteins and TF involved in

chromatin interactions would be less than 30 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 TF

(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 TF, potentially forming a chromatin interaction through the binding of

JDP2 and another TF, like chromatin interactions formed by YY1 (Weintraub et al.

2017). In the analysis of HiChIP chromatin interaction data, JDP2 was in the list of

biased orientation of DNA motif sequences showing a higher ratio of EPI overlapped

with HiChIP chromatin interactions than the other types of EPAs, using chromatin

interactions with more than 6,000 counts (Supplemental material 2). When forming a

homodimer or heterodimer with another TF, TF 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 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 orientation of DNA motif sequences may also 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 of 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 the genomic locations of FR orientation of the DNA

binding motif sequence, compared with the other types of EPAs (RF or any orientation)

in monocytes and T cells, among monocytes, T cells and CD20$^+$ B cells. While the

genome-wide analysis of functional enrichment 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 based on EPA are significantly different from those predicted from only

promoter.

It has been reported that CTCF and cohesin-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 TF and repeat DNA sequences, and would be useful to analyze TF

involved in chromatin interactions and/or forming a homodimer, heterodimer or

complex with other TF, affecting the transcriptional regulation of genes.

Methods

Search for biased orientation 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, 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 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 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 (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 TF derived from vertebrates were used for

further analyses. Transcription factor binding sequences were searched from each

narrow peak of DNase-seq data using FIMO with p-value threshold of 10^{-5} (Grant et al.

2011). TF 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 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 TF 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 (FR) orientation of

DNA binding sites of 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, 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) were used

(Saeed et al. 2014). Based on RPKM, UCSC transcripts with expression level 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 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 expression level of putative transcriptional target genes of each TF was

compared between EPA and only promoter using Mann-Whitney test (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 chi-square 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 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 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 = 0.00000625.

Co-location of biased orientation of DNA motif sequences

Co-location of biased orientation 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 (chi-square test, *p*-value < 1.0×10^{-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) were 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 and

CHiCAGO tool > 5 were extracted from the file (Javierre et al. 2016). In the same way

as monocytes, Hi-C chromatin interaction data of CD4$^+$ T cells (Naive CD4$^+$ T cells,

nCD4) were obtained.

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 TF, (ii) EPA shortened at the genomic locations of any orientation (i.e.

without considering orientation) of DNA motif sequence of 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 (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 5kb before their comparison.

Chromatin interactions with more than 6,000 and 1,000 counts for each interaction were

used in this study.

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. 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 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 were found to affect the expression level of putative transcriptional

target genes in monocytes of four people in common, whereas only one any orientation

(i.e. without considering orientation) of DNA binding motif sequence was 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 genes. The number of genes with a pair

of forward-reverse orientation of DNA motif sequences was counted using all pairs of

the DNA motif sequences found in open chromatin regions overlapped with H3K27ac

histone modification marks in T cells, and statistical tests (chi-square test) were

conducted. The number of genes where a pair of forward-reverse orientation of DNA

motif sequences were enriched with p-value < 0.05 was counted and shown as heat map.

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

have biased orientation of DNA binding motif sequences to form chromatin loops.

Other pairs of forward-reverse orientation of DNA motif sequences were also enriched

in upstream and downstream of genes.

Figure 5. Comparison of enhancer-promoter interactions (EPI) with chromatin interactions in T cells. EPI were predicted based on enhancer-promoter association (EPA) shortened at the genomic locations of biased orientation of DNA binding motif sequence of a transcription factor. Total 121 biased orientation (73 FR and 58 RF) of DNA motif sequences including CTCF and cohesin showed a higher ratio of EPI overlapped with HiChIP chromatin interactions than the other types of EPAs in T cells. The upper part of the figure is a comparison of EPI with HiChIP chromatin interactions with more than 6,000 counts for each interaction, and the lower part of the figure is a comparison of EPI with HiChIP chromatin interactions with more than 1,000 counts for each interaction. FR: forward-reverse orientation of DNA motif. any: any orientation (i.e. without considering orientation) of DNA motif. others: enhancer-promoter association not shortened at the genomic locations of DNA motif. FR H3K27ac: EPI were predicted using DNA motif in open chromatin regions overlapped with H3K27ac histone modification marks. * p-value $< 10^{-4}$.

Figure 6. 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 orientation 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

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

763 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

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

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

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

769   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
770 | PARG | 1.94 | | EGR2 | 5.45 |

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

774   (*p*-value).

Forward-reverse (FR) orientation (using H3K27ac histone modification marks)

Repeat DNA seq.	Score
MLT1F1	6.75

Reverse-forward (RF) orientation

Repeat DNA 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 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. Open chromatin regions overlapped with histone modification

marks (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 enhancer-promoter interactions (EPI) with chromatin

interactions in T cells. 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 with EPA not

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

orientation of DNA motif sequence with EPA shortened at the genomic locations of any

orientation of DNA motif sequence.

Forward-reverse (FR) orientation

TF	Score 1	Score 2	TF	Score 1	Score 2
APEX1	13.57	3.85	PRDM15	Inf	3.21
AR	Inf	8.30	RAD21	56.16	4.21
CDC5L	65.46	12.23	RARB	113.99	2.28
CTCF	101.79	14.94	REL	104.66	7.95
DDIT3_CEBPA	249.72	4.78	RREB	117.64	3.13
EBF1	48.10	2.27	RREB1	116.79	3.39
EGR1	97.56	6.09	SMC3	90.56	17.59
EGR3	130.86	2.73	SOAT1	22.63	1.88
EGR4	59.94	2.91	SOX18	113.13	6.71
ELF5	119.97	2.85	SRP9	117.49	3.47
EP300	28.41	15.12	TAL1	70.39	1.82
ETV4	270.06	2.16	TCF7L2	93.32	8.22
FOXF2	42.79	5.16	TFCP2	260.99	4.13
FOXN4	76.81	4.80	THRA	145.85	4.05
FOXO3	323.31	5.49	TP53	323.31	9.13
FOXO6	63.29	1.77	TP63	172.00	3.90
GATA	104.41	2.17	YBX1	164.76	5.23
GATA5	89.03	4.38	ZBTB7A	66.49	4.74
GFI1B	184.13	11.81	ZFP14	97.38	5.25
GLIS2	32.14	1.87	ZNF219	32.59	7.48
HBP1	281.23	3.05	ZNF253	323.31	21.30
HIC1	101.63	3.27	ZNF585A	185.37	6.09
HOXA13	103.63	3.71	ZNF616	129.96	8.66
HOXA2	323.31	5.81	ZNF639	193.43	1.77
INSM2	323.31	2.02	ZNF681	323.31	35.04
IRF	206.25	2.09	ZNF701	41.48	1.65
IRF5	39.54	3.78	ZNF721	225.60	5.52
KLF1	146.64	3.51	ZNF75A	43.99	3.51
LHX8	245.03	2.34	ZNF770	66.18	2.95
MAF	66.63	3.85	ZNF786	323.31	15.68
MINI20	102.68	3.29	ZNF790	74.59	6.71
MYC	39.24	2.64	ZNF84	149.37	3.38
MZF1	24.10	1.64	ZNF846	Inf	10.92
NFATC2	37.81	1.92			
NFKB1	195.32	11.43			
NR0B1	13.24	1.84			
NR2C2	137.27	12.28			
OTX2	40.38	2.77			
P50_P50	131.79	6.49			
PITX1	37.22	2.17			

Reverse-forward (RF) orientation

TF	Score 1	Score 2	TF	Score 1	Score 2
BCL11B	101.77	5.58	ZFP2	323.31	6.24
CEBPA	323.31	2.37	ZNF143	134.24	1.81
CREB3	139.16	13.51	ZNF174	159.72	7.65
CTCF	119.43	20.80	ZNF257	172.88	3.75
DBP	25.72	1.84	ZNF28	323.31	3.53
EGR1	247.74	1.65	ZNF282	100.44	4.02
EP300	135.93	6.30	ZNF300	Inf	3.91
ESR1	101.75	9.30	ZNF341	94.91	5.59
ETS1	250.92	1.76	ZNF44	165.34	3.45
ETV1	272.94	3.43	ZNF484	301.75	12.63
ETV3	323.31	2.99	ZNF526	82.28	4.67
FOS	101.53	9.02	ZNF580	55.73	2.98
FOXA	323.31	9.16	ZNF625	323.31	2.31
FOXA1	323.31	8.99	ZNF658	92.95	4.92
FOXG1	235.13	2.77	ZNF718	165.94	2.09
FOXN4	61.07	5.39	ZNF721	86.39	7.28
FOXO3	306.90	5.33	ZNF773	219.31	13.43
GATA1	314.93	1.91	ZNF777	137.69	1.96
HLTF	82.82	1.85			
HOXA10	29.26	1.81			
HOXB6	197.15	2.21			
IRF5	Inf	6.92			
KLF13	148.08	4.91			
KLF8	120.36	2.97			
NFE2L2	155.83	3.83			
NFKB1	106.02	7.09			
NKX2-1	323.31	4.01			
NKX2-4	Inf	5.73			
NKX2-5	323.31	5.80			
NR4A1	116.75	2.99			
PPARGC1A	57.39	3.36			
RAD21	41.87	3.16			
RUNX2	124.18	5.84			
SIX6	95.00	3.28			
SMARC	323.31	6.02			
SRF	323.31	6.78			
TAL1	124.35	4.80			
TCF12	74.48	2.21			
ZBTB18	240.63	9.05			
ZBTB4	323.31	2.06			

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.

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.

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

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

Wang 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.