Supplementary Material

Conserved and species-specific transcription factor co-binding patterns drive divergent gene regulation in human and mouse

Adam G. Diehl¹, Alan P. Boyle^{1,2}*

¹Department of Computational Medicine and Bioinformatics, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI 48109, USA
²Department of Human Conotice, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI 48100, USA Department of Human Genetics, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI 48109, USA

List of Supplementary Items

Figure S1. Effects of removing patterns present in 10,000 random data permutations.

(A) Distribution of p-values relative to grammatical pattern lengths in the unfiltered dataset shows no apparent difference between long and short patterns at either end of the p-value spectrum. **(B)** Length distributions of grammatical patterns in the unfiltered dataset, filtered, and discarded fractions of the dataset. Although the bulk of filtered patterns contained between 2 and 5 factors, removing these patterns caused a mean shift of only 2 units between the unfiltered and filtered datasets, with no effect on maximum and minimum pattern lengths. **(C-D)** Venn diagrams show the segmentation of regulatory space into 15 possible grammatical and positional classes in the unfiltered dataset (C) and filtered dataset(D). The first letter of each cell type was used to construct a class label for each cell in the diagrams. These labels describe the cell-specificity of the corresponding grammatical patterns and positionally-conserved loci. Each segment in the Venn diagrams is labelled with its grammatical class and the number of grammatical patterns assigned to the class. **(C)** The unfiltered dataset contains a total of 1498 grammatical patterns, 86% of which are shared between human and mouse. **(D)** The filtered dataset contains a total of 780 grammatical patterns, 76% of which are shared between human and mouse. Therefore, data filtration did not bias our observations towards increased conservation.

Figure S2. Grammatical pattern distributions within positional classes.

Each column in the matrix represents a combination of matched or mismatched patterns between sequences bound at the same locus. Column headings indicate the positional class represented by a set of columns and the number below each column represents the total number of CRMs within the subset. Cells with matching colors in a column share the same grammatical pattern while cells with mismatched colors are occupied by different grammatical patterns. Green cells indicate sequences which are physically present, but are not occupied in the given cell type. Grey cells indicate sequences which are physically absent in the given species as a result of sequence gain or loss. Orange hues indicate species-specific sequence gains and purple hues indicate sequence losses in the other species, based on phylogenetic maximum parsimony prediction using three outgroup species.

Figure S3. Gain/loss phylogeny.

Phylogenetic tree describing evolutionary relationships between human, mouse and the outgroup species horse, dog and elephant, used in assigning non-orthologous CRMs as species-specific gains or losses.

Aggregate Grammatical Classes

Figure S4. Aggregate grammatical classes explained.

Grammatical classes were aggregated into six species-specific and tissue-specific aggregate grammatical classes to facilitate further analysis of functional specificity.

Figure S5. Frequency histograms of functional annotations associated with regulatory function in six aggregate grammatical classes after excluding the two largest cohesin-related grammatical patterns from the MCKG class.

(A) Intersection with DNaseI Hypersensitive Sites **(B)** Intersection with ChromHmm active chromatin states. **(C)** Intersection with PhastCons elements.

Distance from ChIP−seq Peak Summit

Figure S6. Conserved PhastCons scores cluster near ChIP-seq peak summits in all fractions of the dataset.

PhastCons scores within 400bp windows centered over ChIP-seq peak summits from 1000 randomly-selected CRMs classified as orthologs, losses, and gains in Human and Mouse. Clustering of scores approaching 1 centered around ChIP-seq peak summits suggests significant contributions of occupied TFBS to overall conservation in many CRMs. Scores approaching 1 in more distant foci may correspond with additional TFBSs for which we lack ChIP-seq data, TFBSs occupied only in other cell types, or other classes of functional sequence not annotated in the current study. Longer stretches of high PhastCons scores, concentrated among the top rows of all groups, likely reflect the "smoothing" effect of the PhastCons hidden Markov model over stretches of DNA containing multiple conserved features in close proximity.

Figure S7. Grammatical patterns predict matched chromatin states more accurately than positional conservation of chromatin states predicts matched grammatical patterns.

(A) Fractions of positionally-conserved locus pairs with matched Promoter, Strong Enhancer, or Weak Enhancer chromatin states and/or grammatical patterns. **(B)** Fractions of locus pairs within grammatical patterns where the underlying Promoter, Strong Enhancer, or Weak Enhancer chromatin state

also matches. **(C)** Chromatin states within all 77 CRMs CRMs in grammatical pattern 821 (CG gramatical class (M and K). (D) Ten randomly-selected orthologous loci representing positional class CG and containing the promoter state in one or both of C and G. Each block represents a different genomic locus, with individual rows representing the chromatin states observed in the cell type indicated.

Figure S8. Graphical definition of counting conventions used in chromatin state heatmaps. In all panels, a theoretical set of loci or patterns are given with associated data for the promoter chromatin state, and the accompanying heatmap shows the result from the applicable counting procedure. **(A)** For Fig 4C, counts are aggregated over all grammatical patterns. All grammatical patterns in which >= 50% of CRMs carry a given state are counted in the total column. Among these patterns, In-class: >= 50% of CRMs in cells belonging to the grammatical class carry the state. Outside class: >= 50% of modules from nonmember cells carry the state. **(B)** For Fig 4D, counts are pooled over all positionally-conserved loci. All loci carrying a given state in >= 1 occupied cell are counted toward the total column. Match: the cell-specificity of chromatin states matches that expected based on the positional class. Mismatch 1: 1 or more cells not included in the positional class carry

the given state. Mismatch 2: 1 or more cells within the positonal class lack the given state. **(C)** For sup fig 5A, counts represent the number of times a chromatin mark was observed in >= 50% of peaks form a given pattern within a grammatical class in one cell type given that it was observed in >= 50% of peaks from the pattern in a reference cell type. **(D)** For sup fig 5B, counts represent the number of observations in which a chromatin mark was observed at a positional locus in one cell given that it

P = Promoter SE = Strong Enhancer WE = Weak Enhancer RP = Polycomb Repressed

Figure S9. Chromatin state overlaps in individual cell types by grammatical and positional class.

Heat maps describe the degree of conservation of ChromHMM chromatin states between loci in positional classes and patterns in grammatical classes representing a non-collapsed view of Fig. 4. Shading densities within each cell represent the fraction of loci or patterns that carry the given chromatin state marks. **(A)** Within grammatical classes, the frequency of overlap for each cell type with a matching module annotation in at least 50% of the loci from all other cell types. This is analogous to "inside class", on a per cell basis, from Fig. 4C. **(B)** Within positional classes, the frequency of overlap for each cell type with a matching module annotation in at the same loci from all other cell types. This is analogous to "match" on a per cell basis from Fig. 4D.

Figure S10. Cell-specificity of chromatin states is not affected by inclusion thresholds. (A-C) Thresholds for grammatical patterns are arranged in order of increasing stringency. **(A)** Cell-specificity of chromatin states for grammatical patterns, requiring >= 75% of CRMs within a pattern include a given state. **(B)** Cell-specificity of chromatin states for grammatical patterns, requiring >= 90% of CRMs within a pattern include a given state. **(C)** Cell-specificity of chromatin states for grammatical patterns, requiring 100% of CRMs within a pattern include a given state. **(D and E)** Thresholds for positional classes are arranged in order of decreasing stringency. **(D)** Cell-specificity of chromatin states for positional classes, allowing up to 1 mismatch before a locus is counted toward either mismatch category. **(E)** Cell-specificity of chromatin states for positional classes, allowing 1 mismatch for loci occupied in 3 cells and up to 2 mismatches in loci occupied in 4 cells, before a locus is counted toward either mismatch categories.

Table S1.

Identification of transcription factor binding datasets used in this project. All data were obtained from the ENCODE project through encodeproject.org. Accession numbers are provided along with organism, cell, and other relevant information.

Table S2.

Identification of chromHMM annotations used in this project. All data were obtained from the ENCODE project through encodeproject.org. Accession numbers are provided along with organism, cell, and other relevant information.

Table S3.

Identification of DNase-seq datasets used in this project. All data were obtained from the ENCODE project through encodeproject.org. Accession numbers are provided along with organism, cell, and other relevant information.

Table S4.

Identification of RNA-seq datasetsused in this project. All data were obtained from the ENCODE project through encodeproject.org. Accession numbers are provided along with organism, cell, and other relevant information.

Table S5.

Orthology statistics and PhastCons element intersections for human and mouse CRMs and background sequences. Numbers of CRMs/background sequences, percent sequences mappable by bnMapper, and percent of sequences containing <= 1 phastCons element are given for mouse and human sequences for the total dataset, orthologous CRMs, unmapped CRMs (gains and losses combined), species-specific gains and species-specific losses. Odds ratios and p-values were calculated using individual Fisher's Exact tests against matched background sequences. P-values were corrected for multiple testing with the holm method.

Table S6.

Percentage of CRMs and background sequences overlapping DNaseI hypersensitive (DHS) sites. The number of human and mouse CRMs in each of six grammatical categories are given along with percentages of CRMs and background sequences within each category overlapping a DHS site(s), for the total dataset, orthologous CRMs, unmapped CRMs (gains and losses combined), species-specific gains and species-specific losses. Odds ratios and p-values were calculated using individual Fisher's Exact tests against matched background sequences. P-values were corrected for multiple testing with the holm method.

Table S7.

Percentage of CRMs and background sequences marked with active chromatin states from ChromHMM [27]. The number of human and mouse CRMs in each of six aggregate grammatical categories are given along with percentages of CRMs and background sequences within each category overlapping regions of the genome assigned to active states (states 1-5) by ChromHMM (see table S1), for the total dataset, orthologous CRMs, unmapped CRMs (gains and losses combined), species-specific gains and species-specific losses. Odds ratios and p-values were calculated using individual Fisher's Exact tests against matched background sequences. P-values were corrected for multiple testing with the holm method.

Table S8.

GWAS Ontology terms and associated functional classifications.

Table S9.

GWAS Ontology term enrichments found within human CRMs pooled across all grammatical patterns. For each term, observed counts were collected by counting the occurrences of each term among CRM-associated GWAS and GWAS-linked SNPs within the human dataset to compute the expected binomial frequency. Each term was counted only once per CRM in cases where a CRM contained multiple SNPs annotated with the same term. All terms in the total dataset with uncorrected p-values \leq 0.05 are reported in the table but only those passing a 0.05 threshold after multiple testing correction by the FDR method were retained for further analysis. Immune terms are presented in red text.

Table S10.

GWAS Ontology term enrichments by aggregate grammatical class. CRMs were separated by aggregate grammatical class and binomial enrichment tests for each GWAS Ontology term was performed following the same procedures as for the pooled set. Terms presented in blue text were found only in the analysis of aggregate grammatical classes, but not in the pooled dataset. Immune terms are presented in red text.

Table S11.

GWAS Ontology term enrichments by individual grammatical class. CRMs were separated into individual grammatical classes and binomial enrichment tests for each GWAS Ontology term was performed following the same procedures as for the pooled set. Terms presented in blue text were found only in the analysis of individual grammatical classes, but not in the pooled dataset. Immune terms are presented in red text.

Table S3

