**BACHELOR THESIS**

**Analysis of autologous binding preferences**

**of RNA-binding proteins**

**Analysis of loose autologous binding preferences of RNA-binding proteins**

submitted by

**Moritz Haderer**

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

**Bachelor of Science (BSc)**

Vienna, 2022

**UA 033 630**

**Bachelor’s degree programme Biology**

**Univ.-Prof. Dr. Bojan Zagrovic, BA**

Degree programme code as it appears on the

student record sheet:

Degree programme as it appears on the

student record sheet:

Supervisor:

Thesis writing

1. Abstract

RBPs, complementarity hypothesis, fuzzy binding

1. Introduction

What are RBPs

**what’s the complementarity hypothesis**

Arthur and Thomas’ work

what is my thought behind using ppms

what datasets did I use

Approach I used (FIMO, matrices)

1. Materials and Methods  
   1. Datasets used
      1. SELEX, ATtRACT, CLIP – CDS, 5UTR, 3UTR
      2. MANE as background, Markov-model with nt-distribution

Why use MANE instead of shuffled version of autologous sequence?

* 1. Thomas‘ and Arthur’s work  
     Using exact matching, in-silico translation, results
  2. PPMs, PWMs, PFMs, PSSMs
     1. Creating PFMs, converting to PPMs, PWMs
     2. Scoring
        1. Compare matrices with exact matching
        2. PSSM & binding energy
     3. Threshold
        1. P-Value approach
        2. Q-Value?
     4. Background
        1. Markov-models higher order

How can higher order influence match-finding

* 1. FIMO
     1. What is MEME Suite; What is FIMO
     2. Statistical approach
        1. Why is the background chosen as it is
        2. Calculating p-values, scores; approximation
           1. plot: score distribution

1. Autologous Binding/Results?
   1. Analysis of FIMO results + nice plots
2. Discussion
3. Appendix
   1. code
   2. fimo commands
4. Table of contents

[2. Materials and Methods 5](#_Toc99108449)

[2.1 Datasets 5](#_Toc99108450)

[2.1.1 ATtRACT (2016) 5](#_Toc99108451)

[2.1.2 HT-SELEX (2020) 6](#_Toc99108452)

[2.1.3 MANE select (v0.95) transcriptome 7](#_Toc99108453)

[2.2 Previous work 8](#_Toc99108454)

[2.2.1 Background 8](#_Toc99108455)

[2.2.2 Exact matching 9](#_Toc99108456)

[2.2.3 In-silico translation 9](#_Toc99108457)

[2.2.4 Position probability matrices 10](#_Toc99108458)

[2.3 My project/Generalizing the notion of “matching”/ 10](#_Toc99108459)

[2.3 FIMO 14](#_Toc99108460)

# 2. Materials and Methods

## 2.1 Datasets

As my analysis is based on the work of Arthur Theuer and Thomas Kapral, the natural choice was to continue working with the same datasets. They have led to interesting results with the previous approaches, hence it is to be expected that my analysis, being a generalization of what came before, should point in the same direction. In my work, I have focused on using position matrices to determine goodness-of-fit between an RBP’s binding preferences and its autologous mRNA sequence. For that reason, I have excluded the previously used datasets where no matrices were available.

### 2.1.1 ATtRACT (2016)

Giudice G, Sánchez-Cabo F, Torroja C, Lara-Pezzi E. ATtRACT-a database of RNA-binding proteins and associated motifs. Database (Oxford). 2016 Apr 7;2016:baw035. doi: 10.1093/database/baw035. PMID: 27055826; PMCID: PMC4823821.

ATtRACT is a project by Guidice et al. aiming to unify a series of different resources for information on RNA binding proteins and experimentally determined binding motifs. For this, the database ATtRACT has been created, which holds information on 370 RNA binding proteins and 1583 RBP motifs.

The data comes from the databases CISBP-RNA, SpliceAid-F and RBPDB. Not only has a unified database been created, but along with it a search algorithm, allowing for efficient search of motif occurrences in sequences.

In the ATtRACT database, the RNAcompete and SELEX parts were extracted due to their quality. In RNAcompete, some proteins showed affinity for multiple significantly different motifs. When this was the case, a protein in RNAcompete would yield multiple different matrices with unique matrix IDs. In my analysis, I used all available matrices.

experimentally validated

CISBP-RNA holds binding site info on in-vitro RNAcompete experiments

coherence in terms of reference gene names/identifier – brought together IDs

carried out in siloco analysis of protein-RNA structures available in PDB

38 different organisms and length from 4 to 12 nucleotides

algorithms for seach specific motif

SELEX and RNAcompete experiments have strong quality scores and were preferred over other samples

AEDB and SpliceAid-F contain SELEX and RNAcompete exps that have equally good quality scores

ATtRACT manually searched literature for “winner sequences” for RNAcompete and SELEX to create PPMs. Motifs containing ambiguous IUPAC letters are treated by counting every ambiguous letter as equally likely in PPM creation

RNAcompete is a high-thorughput in vitro assay and is able to portray a relatively exhaustive specificity profile. An RBP’s affinity to a large set (~250 000) of RNA molecules is tested and would, in theory, show yield a good overview of the binding specificity of the given RBP. Limitations to this method can lay in the choice of the RNA pool, as most of the designed target RNAs will exist in unstructured contexts. This means that mostly short and unpaired motifs will be bound.

matrix database content

attract database content

experiments used

experiments I used

papers that did those experiments

**Create plots that show:**

* **lengths of motifs of each experiment**

### 2.1.2 HT-SELEX (2020)

Jolma, A., Zhang, J., Mondragón, E., Morgunova, E., Kivioja, T., Laverty, K. U., Yin, Y., Zhu, F., Bourenkov, G., Morris, Q., Hughes, T. R., Maher, L. J., 3rd, & Taipale, J. (2020). Binding specificities of human RNA-binding proteins toward structured and linear RNA sequences. *Genome research*, *30*(7), 962–973. <https://doi.org/10.1101/gr.258848.119>

Experiment used High-thorughput RNA-SELEX with a “genome wide collection of RBPs and their RNA-binding domains” 🡪 used only domains or the entire RBP?

**Gerstberger S, Hafner M, Tuschl T. A census of human RNA-binding proteins. Nat Rev Genet. 2014 Dec;15(12):829-45. doi: 10.1038/nrg3813. Epub 2014 Nov 4. PMID: 25365966.**

(Above paper) says there are around 1500 RBPs in the human genome. An analysis of real binding affinities is a difficult physicochemical problem, as RNAs fold into complex 3D structures. In my analysis, I’ve restricted the scope to linear sequences. As Jolma et al.’s analysis contains both structural and linear data, I’ve thus filtered out the linear motifs and continued working with those.

**RNAcompete, SELEX and HT-SELEX**

RNAcompete is an in-vitro experimental technique where a Glutathione-S-Transferase-tag is added to an RBP of interest. The modified RBP is then incubated in a large pool of RNAs that has been designed to cover all combinatorially possible sequences of up to 9 bases. After incubation of the RBP in an environment holding an excess of RNA, a pull-down assay is performed, eluting all RNA sequences that have been bound by the tagged RBP. The bound sequences are then separated from the RBP and hybridized against a microarray.

As this assay is carried out in a large excess of RNA, the relative abundance of bound sequences indicates relative binding affinity.

SELEX, or “systematic evolution of ligands by exponential enrichment”, is another in-vitro technique for finding consensus motifs for RBPs. A SELEX run begins with a pool of DNA sequences of equal length, covering all combinatorially possible sequences. The DNA is in-vitro transcribed and an RBP is incubated in the resulting pool of RNA. Once incubation is finished, the unbound RNA sequences are washed out, whereas the bound targets are separated from the RBPs and reverse-transcribed to cDNA, which is then amplified via PCR and serves as the new starting point for the next SELEX run. After a certain number of runs, the resulting “winner” sequences are sequenced.

Diagram

Description automatically generated

**Cook KB, Hughes TR, Morris QD.** **High-throughput characterization of protein-RNA interactions**. Brief Funct Genomics. 2015 Jan;14(1):74-89. doi: 10.1093/bfgp/elu047. Epub 2014 Dec 13. PMID: 25504152; PMCID: PMC4303715.

High-throughput SELEX differs from SELEX in that a sample of all bound RNAs is sequenced using high-throughput methods after every run, thus allowing for the estimation of possible alternative binders.

### 2.1.3 MANE select (v0.95) transcriptome

To assess enrichment in autologous binding, a distribution of binding affinities serving as a null hypothesis is necessary. The MANE select database, being a large repository for almost 98 % of the human transcriptome, adeptly fit this purpose. MANE, or “Matched Annotation

from NCBI and EMBL-EBI“, is a large-scale collaboration between the National Center for Biotechnology Information and the European Bioinformatics institute as a Branch of the European Molecular Biology Laboratory. The database is available for download on [the NCBI homepage](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/refseq/MANE/).

Its goal was to create a clearly annotated and matching database for human transcriptome data. It now covers over 18.000 transcripts with detailed information on each protein-coding gene’s location, function, 3’-UTR, 5’-UTR and coding sequence (CDS) length. These transcript subsequences serve an important purpose in my analysis, as I consider enrichment of binding in each of them individually. As a filtering step, all RBPs in my dataset also had to have a corresponding autologous mRNA sequence available in MANE, otherwise they were discarded.

## 2.2 Previous work

Arthur Theuer and Thomas Kapral first initiated the analysis of enrichment in autologous binding of RNA-binding proteins. Their workings constructed a solid foundation for my project and indicate, that there is more information to be extracted from RBP-RNA interactions. While Arthur Theuer’s Bachelor’s thesis explored different frameworks for testing enrichment in autologous binding of RBPs, my project focusses on one of those frameworks, namely the application of position probability matrices to the problem of examining how affine an RBP is to its own mRNA.

**The datasets**

The datasets used by my predecessor are largely equal to the ones described in the previous section. However, since I only used RBP data that included probability matrices, the dataset provided by Dominguez et al. had to be excluded from the analysis. This dataset, which contains 76 RBPs and their respective affinity motifs, was created, and results published, in a 2018 study that used High-throughput RNA bind-n-seq to determine RBP motifs.

Dominguez D, Freese P, Alexis MS, Su A, Hochman M, Palden T, Bazile C, Lambert NJ, Van Nostrand EL, Pratt GA, Yeo GW, Graveley BR, Burge CB. Sequence, Structure, and Context Preferences of Human RNA Binding Proteins. Mol Cell. 2018 Jun 7;70(5):854-867.e9. doi: 10.1016/j.molcel.2018.05.001. Epub 2018 Jun 7. PMID: 29883606; PMCID: PMC6062212.

### 2.2.1 Background

As this matching was carried out for every transcript found in the MANE transcriptome database, a coverage value was calculated for each transcript, including the autologous transcript of every RBP.

As compositional and length biases are of concern, the background to be tested against was manipulated in several ways.

Instead of using the transcriptome sequences as they are, in one approach, they were randomly shuffled around to exclude compositional biases. In another approach, only transcripts of equal or higher length than the autologous mRNA were considered and, in turn, randomly shuffled around so as to avoid length and compositional biases. In a third approach, random sequences of equal length to the autologous mRNA of each RBP were created using the di-nucleotide frequency distribution of the MANE database.

### 2.2.2 Exact matching

Every RBP in the dataset has at least one motif it shows high affinity for. In an exact matching procedure, an alignment of these motifs to every point along a sequence is attempted and exact matches reported. For every transcript sequence tested against any given motif, a sequence-length array of zeros was created. Whenever a part of the sequence exactly matched the motif, the zeros at the position of this match were converted to ones. Finally, once the entire sequence has been searched, the average of the array was calculated, yielding a value between zero and one. This value is called the “coverage” of a sequence by a motif.

In a probabilistic context, motif length plays a big role in an exact matching procedure. Shorter motifs would be represented considerably more often in any random sequence than longer motifs would. To remedy this bias, motifs were fragmented to a specified size. Whenever a motif was longer than allowed, every possible subsequence of this motif was used to determine a combined coverage value.

The graph below shows the distribution of z-scores calculated from the coverages.

Chart, diagram

Description automatically generated

### 2.2.3 In-silico translation

A different framework for analyzing binding preferences of RBPs is given by a slightly altered research question: “Does an mRNA bind what it codes for?”. Considering this question, the motifs of each RBP were translated into all possible amino acid sequences they might code for. In terms of background, the MANE transcriptome includes the amino acid sequences of each RBP. Again, the motifs, now amino acid sequences, were matched with each protein sequence to determine coverage values. The graph below shows the distribution of z-scores calculated from the coverages.

Diagram

Description automatically generated

### 2.2.4 Position probability matrices

Probability matrices offer a probabilistic/generalized approach to the match finding problem. In this framework, a matrix is placed against the sequence to test, and a score is calculated by adding up/multiplying the values in the matrix. How exactly this scoring procedure happens is explained in detail in the next section.

Statistical background

In the context of counting motif matches using position probability matrices, an important issue is raised in determining what counts as a “match”. When a position in a sequence is scored according to a certain probability matrix, a wide range of scores can come out. In order to determine which score represents the lower threshold for what could count as a “match”, a numerical approach was taken in Thomas’ and Arthur’s analyses. In the following paragraph, I will attempt to describe said approach.

A motif of length five would hold 4 x 5 would hold 4^5 possibilities for computable scores. This arises from the fact that each nucleotide can come at any position. For determining a threshold, all possible scores must be computed. By choosing a user-specific percentile-threshold, a large portion of those possible scores can be discarded as insufficient to count as a match. This percentile threshold can, for example, be 0.05. Then, only the top 5 % of all scores will result in a match.

In theory, this approach is statistically sound. In practice, however, creating the entire distribution of scores poses a computational problem as the length of the matrix increases. With a matrix of length 15, 4^15, so more than a billion, scores would have to be computed. To deal with this computational constraint, an approximation of a threshold can be computed. In Arthur’s analysis, all possible scores were computed for motifs of length eight or below. Motifs longer than eight nucleotides long underwent random sampling. This means, that random arrangements of nucleotides of the length of the motif were generated and stored if the number of random arrangements did not surpass the threshold of 4^8. The result of this approximation is that, for each motif, only 4^8 possible scores are considered for creating the distribution.

While the distribution of possible scores for a given motif in place, a cutoff can yet again be chosen and, thereby, the “matching”-threshold determined.

While this is largely sufficient solution to this NP-hard problem, this approach has some obvious downsides. As Zhang et al. state in their paper, the P-values determined by methods like score approximation can deviate from the real P-value by orders of magnitude. In this example, the reason for this is the following: as soon as the length of the motif surpasses 10, only a sixteenth of all possible scores is considered. At motif length 12, only one in 256 scores is sampled.

put this section into my OWN part?

## 2.3 My project/Generalizing the notion of “matching”/

**Position frequency matrix**

Experiments for finding new motifs of RNA binding proteins will yield a number of motifs that have been bound by the RBP. These motifs will often be similar in length and composition. To account for non-similarities between bound motifs, the Position Frequency Matrix helps visualize the number of times a given nucleotide was found at position P of the motif. As the name suggests, it indicates the frequency of nucleotides at a position.

A list of ten motifs bound by a given RBP in an experiment might look like this:

…CGGC**AGUAA**ACCUCA…

…UGGC**AGUAC**GCAUGA…

…AGCC**AGUAC**UCAUCC…

…UGGC**AGUAA**CCAUUU…

…GGUC**AAUAA**CCAUCA…

…UGGC**AAUAA**UCAAAG…

…CGAU**AGUAA**GCAGCA…

…CUGC**ACUAA**UUACCC…

…UGUC**AGUAA**CAAUGA…

…UGGC**AGUAA**GCAUCA…

By counting the number of times a nucleotide is observed in a given position, a PMF of the following structure can be constructed:

**Position frequency matrix (PFM)**

A picture containing text, clock

Description automatically generated

Generated from motif counts in experiment

**FIND STUDIES THAT USED PFMs FOR STUFF**

Dustin E. Schones, Pavel Sumazin, Michael Q. Zhang, Similarity of position frequency matrices for transcription factor binding sites, Bioinformatics, Volume 21, Issue 3, 1 February 2005, Pages 307–313, <https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/bth480>

**Found method for comparing PFMs to each other in TFBS search**

**Position probability matrix**

Similarly to the position frequency matrix, the position probability matrix (or PPM) gives clear insight into the proportions of nucleotides bound at a given position. The main difference between the PFM and the PPM is a count-normalization to probability values (ranging from 0 to 1). This is done by dividing the frequency by the number of bound motifs. Continuing with the example from above, the corresponding PPM would be created by dividing each frequency count by ten:

**Position probability matrix (PPM)**

Table

Description automatically generated

In practice, the position probability matrix can be used to give a probability score to a novel motif by multiplying the letters’ corresponding probabilities over all positions. In a programmatical context, one usually deals with rather long/a large number of motifs to assign a score to. Potential downsides of this type of matrix are 1. multiplication is a more expensive computation than, e. g., addition. Once the sequences to be scored exceed a certain length, this is noticeable in the duration of computations. Another downside is that multiplication of very long matrices can lead to **underflow** when computing the score of a motif. As one is multiplying many small numbers, floating point precision can be thought of as a resource. This effect might skew the scoring and, consequently, determination of sufficiency of a score.

On counting position weight matrix matches in a sequence, with

application to discriminative motif finding

Saurabh Sinha

Department of Computer Science, University of Illinois

* Manages to give “strong” and “weak” occurrences of motifs a weight, independently of cutoffs
* “motif finding problem”: reveal statistical enrichment of certain (slightly) variable subsequences that serve as binding sites for transcription factors/RBPs?
* “counting” is a vague problem with multiple approaches:
  1. reporting whether a “match” is found or not (and how good the match is)
  2. Does the “best” match occur?
  3. sampling probability → “the probability of sampling a given k-mer from the probability distribution induced by a k-length PWM.”  
     “Naive approach: count all k-length substrings that have sampling probability above threshold”
  4. w-score: quantifies the total number of occurrences of a PWM in a sequence

**Position-specific scoring matrix**

To remedy both downsides of the PPM, a third type of matrix can be employed. The position-specific scoring matrix (PSSM), also called position weight matrix, can be derived from the PPM. It incorporates the background distribution of nucleotides of the target sequences. By computing the log-likelihood ratio of a nucleotide’s probability given the background distribution, the matrix’ entries can now be both positive and negative. The reason behind the alternative name “position weight matrix” is given by the interpretation of what these resulting values express: a positive value puts strong weight on a given nucleotide, while a negative value indicates, that this nucleotide should occur less often at that given position than the background distribution should suggest, thus reducing the weight.

An example calculation is easily done. First, let’s assume a uniform background distribution of 0.25 per nucleotide. Now, each value can be plugged into the equation:

Diagram

Description automatically generated

where:

Text

Description automatically generated



The log-likelihood ratio L is given by the binary logarithm of the probability of nucleotide i at position j divided by the probability of a nucleotide as given by the background distribution B.

Applying these manipulations to the PPM in the previous section, we get the following matrix:

**Position-specific scoring matrix (PSSM)**

**A C G U**

-1.32 -inf -inf -inf

-0.32 -1.32 1.49 -inf

-inf -inf -inf 2

2 -inf -inf -inf

1.68 -0.32 -inf -inf

A screenshot of a computer

Description automatically generated with low confidence

**Pseudocounts**

Since the logarithm is not defined at zero, the resulting matrix contains placeholders for an undefined value – often in form of negative infinity. A simple method to alleviate this issue is adding pseudocounts to the probability values in the PPM. In most practical applications, a pseudocount value of 0.1 is added to each entry in the position probability matrix. Doing this for the above PPM leads to the following PSSM:

**A C G U**

2.14 -1.32 0.26 -1.32

0.26 -1.32 1.68 -1.32

-1.32 -1.32 -1.32 2.14

2.14 -1.32 -1.32 -1.32

1.85 0.26 -1.32 -1.32

Table

Description automatically generated

**Information content**

Hertz GZ, Stormo GD. Identifying DNA and protein patterns with statistically significant alignments of multiple sequences. Bioinformatics. 1999 Jul-Aug;15(7-8):563-77. doi: 10.1093/bioinformatics/15.7.563. PMID: 10487864.

Background

FIMO takes position probability matrices as input, but these matrices are converted to position-specific scoring matrices as the first step of the scanning procedure. As described in the previous topic, to convert PPMs to PSSMs, the ratio between the likelihood of observing a given letter at a certain position of a matrix and the likelihood of observing a given letter in the background distribution is calculated. The resulting value is the likelihood-ratio, of which then the binary logarithm is computed to receive a log-likelihood ratio for every entry of the matrix. As the background distribution is essential in this calculation, it is necessary to spend some time on thinking about what the best distribution would be.

Markov chains of zero order

Markov chains of higher order

## 2.3 FIMO

Charles E. Grant, Timothy L. Bailey, William Stafford Noble, FIMO: scanning for occurrences of a given motif, Bioinformatics, Volume 27, Issue 7, 1 April 2011, Pages 1017–1018, <https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btr064>

**Meme Suite**

Meme Suite is a package comprised of multiple softwares that offer a full pipeline for motif discovery, enrichment, scanning and comparison. The MEME Suite package offers a full pipeline with a web application, a command line tool and an R integration.

In my analysis, I decided to use FIMO over the command line, as it offered the possibility of closely tailoring the scanning procedure to my needs.

FIMO Input preparation

Motifs

FIMO takes as an input tab-separated-value files containing position probability matrices with headers containing an identifier, additional information, the matrix length and width and more optional data. At the top of the file, some information on the MEME Suite version used as well as the alphabet the motifs are coding for.

These files are appropriately output by some of the MEME Suites softwares but can also be created from scratch by following the simple formatting layout provided by FIMO. Alternatively, FIMO offers a variety of conversion tools for common file types encountered in the space of motif analysis.

Sequences

The sequences the previously prepared motifs will scan have to be handed to FIMO in “.fasta” or, alternatively, “.fna”-format. Files of this format contain a unique identifier (such as a gene ID) and the sequence in question. In my analysis, I created one such file for each subsequence-type of the transcripts, i. e. 3’-UTR, 5’-UTR and CDS, as well as for the whole transcript itself.

**Distribution of nucleotides by subsequence**

A subsequence in this context can be understood as a smaller part of an entire transcript scanned by FIMO, i. e. the 3’-UTR, 5’-UTR and CDS.

As the frequency of nucleotides determines the entries of the PSSM, it has a large impact on the entire analysis.

Chart, pie chart

Description automatically generated

How does the background impact the scores?

Whenever the background frequency is greater than probability of a nucleotide as given by the matrix, the value yielded by the conversion from PPM to PSSM would be a negative one. Therefore, whenever a nucleotide has high frequency in the background, tendentially more values in the PSSM would be negative

Score cutoff:

Use of a background file: a Markov chain is created (zero order) and used to estimate the log likelihood ratio necessary for building up PSSMs from introduced PPMs.

Converts PPMs to PSSMs and runs them over each sequence.

A p-value cutoff is set by the user. In FIMO, the p-value of a match is calculated by creating the score distribution of all possible scores of a motif. The individual score calculated for a certain position on the scanned sequence is converted to a p-value using dynamic programming (**Staden R. Staden: searching for motifs in nucleic acid sequences. Methods Mol Biol. 1994;25:93-102. doi: 10.1385/0-89603-276-0:93. PMID: 8004185.**)

Using bejamini-hochberg

See appendix for exact commands

FIMO gets distribution of all scores; calculates probability of a certain score – how to get p-value from there?

Q-value

P-value cutoff and calculation

**Scoring**

Each input motif is converted to a PSSM (using log-odds)

What counts as an occurrence?

* “statistically significant log-odds score”
* p-value (so what is deemed “significant”) can be controlled

**Threshold setting**

Uses a dynamic programming algorithm to convert log-odds scores into p-values, assuming i.i.d. background. Program reports occurrences with a p-value of less than 1e-4.

Outputs

**EXTRA WRITTEN STUFF**

**Do RBPs bind their own mRNAs more than the average mRNA?**

**Autologous binding and how to analyze it**

RNA-binding proteins carry out a multitude of functions in the cell. It is their interactions with mRNA, the carrier sequence for genetic information, that makes them so important. Despite their importance, there exist only a handful of datasets pinpointing the mRNA sequence profiles those RNA-binding proteins (RBPs) like to bind to. In a set of experiments, around 170 such binding-profiles, or motifs, were discovered and reconfirmed.

The complementarity hypothesis states that a protein will have a larger affinity towards the coding sequence (CDS) of its own mRNA. Applying this hypothesis to the world of RBPs, a set of proteins that are known to bind mRNA in the first place, we would like to affirm that an RBP has a higher propensity to bind to its own coding region than to any other mRNA sequence and subsequence.

The MANE transcriptome dataset serves as a control dataset for our analysis. It’s a dataset of 200k~ mRNAs (the whole human transcriptome), including a number of RNA binding proteins.

In order to test the complementarity hypothesis, the RNA binding motifs of our RBPs are checked against every single sequence in the MANE transcriptome dataset.

A motif consists of a probability value that any of the four nucleotides would appear at a given position in the motif. When a sequence is similar enough to the motif, then the added up probabilities surpass a set threshold score (usually set via p-values and including a background distribution of nucleotides in the sequence considered in order to eliminate bias). According to the complementarity hypothesis, the score of a given RNA binding protein’s motif when it is run over its own mRNA should be significantly higher than the average score it would reach when running over any other mRNA. Additionally, scoring the coding sequence of its own (autologous) mRNA would reach a higher score than any other subsequences.

In practice, every sequence in the MANE transcriptome is handed to every single RNA binding motif and a score is calculated.

FIMO decides the cutoff score depending on the likelihood of getting the scanned subsequence with a given distribution of nucleotides.

The files FIMO outputs give the exact position and score of a motif that matched a sequence. In theory, following the complementarity hypothesis, a motif would match its own mRNA more often than a motif would match any other sequence.

The importance of background:

In Arthur’s project, he had different ways of making sure that motif-sequence matches weren’t just caused by random chance. Mainly, he did this by randomly shuffling around the nucleotides in his sequences. That way, he has a random dataset and a non-random dataset. Their differences will then make clear, which tendencies RNA binding proteins follow when binding motifs.

In my analysis, I had no shuffling of sequences to create a randomized background. Rather, I used FIMO to create a background distribution

**Appendix**

# Enables running MEME Suite

export PATH=$HOME/meme/bin:$HOME/meme/libexec/meme-5.4.1:$PATH

To save space, the --text option in the FIMO command enables us to write the tsv output directly to the appropriate file.

First, make sure to create a .tsv file for each FIMO command you will run, e. g. for each output file you expect to have. In my case, this would be 12 files, each called “experiment\_subsequence.tsv”. The commands to create these files are best executed from the “DATA” folder in my hierarchy, which is the main branching point for all the data FIMO needs. You can use the following commands to create the files:

touch FIMO\_OUT/rnacompete\_UTR3.tsv

touch FIMO\_OUT/rnacompete\_CDS.tsv

touch FIMO\_OUT/rnacompete\_UTR5.tsv

touch FIMO\_OUT/rnacompete\_full.tsv

touch FIMO\_OUT/selex\_UTR3.tsv

touch FIMO\_OUT/selex\_CDS.tsv

touch FIMO\_OUT/selex\_UTR5.tsv

touch FIMO\_OUT/selex\_full.tsv

touch FIMO\_OUT/htselex\_UTR3.tsv

touch FIMO\_OUT/htselex\_CDS.tsv

touch FIMO\_OUT/htselex\_UTR5.tsv

touch FIMO\_OUT/htselex\_full.tsv

Once the directories and files are in place, the FIMO commands are used as such:

fimo

--text

--max-stored-scores 214748364

--thresh 5e-2

--bfile FIMO\_input/background\_file.txt

FIMO\_input/motifs/motif\_file.txt

FIMO\_input/sequences/transcript\_file.txt

> FIMO\_OUT/ target\_file.tsv

Let’s break down each part of this command:

--text: reduces the output to “tsv” output sent to the standard-output, i. e. to the command line itself. This argument allows us to redirect the outputs to the appropriate file using the “>” operator.

--max-stored-scores: for score significance to be calculated, a certain number of matches will have to be held in memory. This argument is especially important when working with Q-values instead of P-values. The large number after the command is the maximum number of stored scores FIMO allows for.

--thresh: sets the custom P-value cutoff. The default cutoff lies at 1e-4.

--bfile: after this argument, a file containing the nucleotide frequency distribution of the background is added – in my example called “background\_file.txt”. This file can be created using the “fasta-get-markov” command, which is distributed together with MEME Suite. More on this command below. The background file contains a zero-order Markov model of the background distribution. No higher order models are allowed as input to FIMO. If a higher order model is entered, FIMO will only consider the zero-order part.

The penultimate argument hands the input motif file to FIMO, while the last one enters the sequence file.

The “>”-operator: In Linux, this operator is often used to wirte the output of a command to a file, which is exactly what happens here.

For each experiment-subsequence combination (e. g. RNAcompete+CDS, SELEX+UTR3 etc.) such a command must be constructed. The choice of background file and P-value threshold is left up to the user. To chain up multiple of these commands, one can place a semicolon “;” or an “and”-operator “&&” in between. While for the “and”-operator, the preceding command must have been completed successfully, the semicolon chains up commands without requiring successful completion.

Here are all FIMO commands I used, chained up by semicolons:

**ATtRACT - SELEX**

fimo --text --max-stored-scores 214748364 --thresh 5e-2 --bfile FIMO\_input/markov\_full.txt FIMO\_input/motifs/fimo\_attract\_selex

FIMO\_input/sequences/fimo\_transcriptome\_5utr.txt > FIMO\_OUT/selex\_UTR5.tsv;

fimo --text --max-stored-scores 214748364 --thresh 5e-2 --bfile FIMO\_input/markov\_full.txt FIMO\_input/motifs/fimo\_attract\_selex FIMO\_input/sequences/fimo\_transcriptome\_cds.txt > FIMO\_OUT/selex\_CDS.tsv;

fimo --text --max-stored-scores 214748364 --thresh 5e-2 --bfile FIMO\_input/markov\_full.txt FIMO\_input/motifs/fimo\_attract\_selex FIMO\_input/sequences/fimo\_transcriptome\_3utr.txt.txt > FIMO\_OUT/selex\_UTR3.tsv;

fimo --text --max-stored-scores 214748364 --thresh 5e-2 --bfile FIMO\_input/markov\_full.txt FIMO\_input/motifs/fimo\_attract\_selex FIMO\_input/sequences/fimo\_transcriptome\_full.txt > FIMO\_OUT/selex\_full.tsv

**ATtRACT - RNAcompete**

fimo --text --max-stored-scores 214748364 --thresh 5e-2 --bfile FIMO\_input/markov\_full.txt FIMO\_input/motifs/fimo\_attract\_rnacomp.txt FIMO\_input/sequences/ fimo\_transcriptome\_5utr.txt > FIMO\_OUT/rnacompete\_UTR5.tsv;

fimo --text --max-stored-scores 214748364 --thresh 5e-2 --bfile FIMO\_input/markov\_full.txt FIMO\_input/motifs/fimo\_attract\_rnacomp.txt FIMO\_input/sequences/fimo\_transcriptome\_cds.txt > FIMO\_OUT/rnacompete\_CDS.tsv;

fimo --text --max-stored-scores 214748364 --thresh 5e-2 --bfile FIMO\_input/markov\_full.txt FIMO\_input/motifs/fimo\_attract\_rnacomp.txt FIMO\_input/sequences/fimo\_transcriptome\_3utr.txt.txt > FIMO\_OUT/rnacompete\_UTR5.tsv;

fimo --text --max-stored-scores 214748364 --thresh 5e-2 --bfile FIMO\_input/markov\_full.txt FIMO\_input/motifs/fimo\_attract\_rnacomp.txt FIMO\_input/sequences/fimo\_transcriptome\_full.txt > FIMO\_OUT/rnacompete\_full.tsv

**HT-SELEX**

fimo --text --max-stored-scores 214748364 --thresh 5e-2 --bfile FIMO\_input/markov\_full.txt FIMO\_input/motifs/fimo\_htselex.txt FIMO\_input/sequences/fimo\_transcriptome\_5utr.txt > FIMO\_OUT/htselex\_UTR5.tsv;

fimo --text --max-stored-scores 214748364 --thresh 5e-2 --bfile FIMO\_input/markov\_full.txt FIMO\_input/motifs/fimo\_htselex.txt FIMO\_input/sequences/fimo\_transcriptome\_cds.txt > FIMO\_OUT/htselex\_CDS.tsv;

fimo --text --max-stored-scores 214748364 --thresh 5e-2 --bfile FIMO\_input/markov\_full.txt FIMO\_input/motifs/fimo\_htselex.txt FIMO\_input/sequences/fimo\_transcriptome\_3utr.txt > FIMO\_OUT/htselex\_UTR3.tsv;

fimo --text --max-stored-scores 214748364 --thresh 5e-2 --bfile FIMO\_input/markov\_full.txt FIMO\_input/motifs/fimo\_htselex.txt FIMO\_input/sequences/fimo\_transcriptome\_full.txt > FIMO\_OUT/htselex\_full.tsv

Setting a score threshold

false-positive rate: probability of “finding” a motif instance in background sequence

false-negative rate: prob of “not finding” an instance generated from the motif

ROC curve?

Patser threshold by Hertz and Stormo [2]

Scoring a matrix

Weight matrix values are very small (usually 0.x) and we risk underflow

Remedy: log-likelihoods are used; they allow us to add values instead of multiplying. Higher values give more insight because they differentiate different matches more clearly.

Log-likelihood ratio = Log(observed frequency / expected frequency)

Information content measured in bits

Including nucleotide dependency: the crux of PWMs

Higher order PWMs

Maximal Dependence Decomposition (MDD)

[1] On counting position weight matrix matches in a sequence, with application to discriminative motif finding; Saurabh Sinha

[2] Identifying DNA and protein patterns with statistically significant alignments of multiple sequences; G Z Hertz 1, G D Stormo

[3] Master’s thesis: “Higher order PWM for Modeling TF binding sites” (by Dhivya Srinivasan; in “papers” folder on lab pc)

Autologous binding

FIMO

Why FIMO rather than MAST?

* MAST reports a single score for each sequence - not one score per motif;
* MAST is useful when you need to rank your sequences based on how well each sequence matches all of your motifs

Inputs

**“Motif file”**

must contain “meme formatted motifs” for which there are different conversion tools available.

**Background**

Can be provided together with motif-file in command-line argument. They tell the MEME Suite how prevalent each letter of the motif alphabet was in the source sequences that were used to create the motifs.

Using FIMO via the web

* Can use a sequence database that’s provided; FIMO will use a background model based on the sequences provided


Using FIMO via command-line

* fasta-get-markov command creates a 0-order markov model from fasta sequence file
  + I used the command on the MANE.fa file and got a background file; the MANE sequences included all CDS, 3UTRs and 5UTRs (i think)




<https://meme-suite.org/meme/doc/fimo-output-format.html>

**Find out what FIMO does:**

**Various matches:**

****

**p-values for these matches:**

1. **9xG, 8xU, 2xA, 1xC = **
2. **9xG, 8xU, 2xA, 1xC**
3. ****
4. **9xG, 8xU, 2xA, 1xC**
5. ****
6. **6xG, 9xU, 2xA, 3xC**

**Background:**

****

**Best match:**

****

Best match: 7xG, 7xU, 4xC, 2xA

**FIMO paper:**

Charles E. Grant, Timothy L. Bailey, and William Stafford Noble, "FIMO: Scanning for occurrences of a given motif", *Bioinformatics*, **27**(7):1017-1018, 2011.

**command: bg=transcriptome; cutoff=5e-2**

fimo --oc FIMO\_OUT/background\_transcriptome\_pval5e-2/selex\_UTR5 --max-stored-scores 214748364 --thresh 5e-2 --bfile FIMO\_input/markov\_full.txt FIMO\_input/motifs/fimo\_attract\_selex.txt FIMO\_input/sequences/fimo\_transcriptome\_5utr.txt;fimo --oc FIMO\_OUT/background\_transcriptome\_pval5e-2/selex\_CDS --max-stored-scores 214748364 --thresh 5e-2 --bfile FIMO\_input/markov\_full.txt FIMO\_input/motifs/fimo\_attract\_selex.txt FIMO\_input/sequences/fimo\_transcriptome\_cds.txt;fimo --oc FIMO\_OUT/background\_transcriptome\_pval5e-2/selex\_full --max-stored-scores 214748364 --thresh 5e-2 --bfile FIMO\_input/markov\_full.txt FIMO\_input/motifs/fimo\_attract\_selex.txt FIMO\_input/sequences/fimo\_transcriptome\_full.txt;fimo --oc FIMO\_OUT/background\_transcriptome\_pval5e-2/selex\_UTR3 --max-stored-scores 214748364 --thresh 5e-2 --bfile FIMO\_input/markov\_full.txt FIMO\_input/motifs/fimo\_attract\_selex.txt FIMO\_input/sequences/fimo\_transcriptome\_3utr.txt;fimo --oc FIMO\_OUT/background\_transcriptome\_pval5e-2/rnacomp\_UTR5 --max-stored-scores 214748364 --thresh 5e-2 --bfile FIMO\_input/markov\_full.txt FIMO\_input/motifs/fimo\_attract\_rnacomp.txt FIMO\_input/sequences/fimo\_transcriptome\_5utr.txt;fimo --oc FIMO\_OUT/background\_transcriptome\_pval5e-2/rnacomp\_CDS --max-stored-scores 214748364 --thresh 5e-2 --bfile FIMO\_input/markov\_full.txt FIMO\_input/motifs/fimo\_attract\_rnacomp.txt FIMO\_input/sequences/fimo\_transcriptome\_cds.txt;fimo --oc FIMO\_OUT/background\_transcriptome\_pval5e-2/rnacomp\_full --max-stored-scores 214748364 --thresh 5e-2 --bfile FIMO\_input/markov\_full.txt FIMO\_input/motifs/fimo\_attract\_rnacomp.txt FIMO\_input/sequences/fimo\_transcriptome\_full.txt;fimo --oc FIMO\_OUT/background\_transcriptome\_pval5e-2/rnacomp\_UTR3 --max-stored-scores 214748364 --thresh 5e-2 --bfile FIMO\_input/markov\_full.txt FIMO\_input/motifs/fimo\_attract\_rnacomp.txt FIMO\_input/sequences/fimo\_transcriptome\_3utr.txt;fimo --oc FIMO\_OUT/background\_transcriptome\_pval5e-2/htselex\_UTR5 --max-stored-scores 214748364 --thresh 5e-2 --bfile FIMO\_input/markov\_full.txt FIMO\_input/motifs/fimo\_htselex.txt FIMO\_input/sequences/fimo\_transcriptome\_5utr.txt;fimo --oc FIMO\_OUT/background\_transcriptome\_pval5e-2/htselex\_CDS --max-stored-scores 214748364 --thresh 5e-2 --bfile FIMO\_input/markov\_full.txt FIMO\_input/motifs/fimo\_htselex.txt FIMO\_input/sequences/fimo\_transcriptome\_cds.txt;fimo --oc FIMO\_OUT/background\_transcriptome\_pval5e-2/htselex\_full --max-stored-scores 214748364 --thresh 5e-2 --bfile FIMO\_input/markov\_full.txt FIMO\_input/motifs/fimo\_htselex.txt FIMO\_input/sequences/fimo\_transcriptome\_full.txt;fimo --oc FIMO\_OUT/background\_transcriptome\_pval5e-2/htselex\_UTR3 --max-stored-scores 214748364 --thresh 5e-2 --bfile FIMO\_input/markov\_full.txt FIMO\_input/motifs/fimo\_htselex.txt FIMO\_input/sequences/fimo\_transcriptome\_3utr.txt

**Command: background:full transcript; Threshold: 1e-2**

fimo --oc FIMO\_OUT/background\_transcriptome\_pval1e-2/selex\_UTR5 --max-stored-scores 2147483646 --thresh 1e-2 --bfile FIMO\_input/markov\_full.txt FIMO\_input/motifs/fimo\_attract\_selex.txt FIMO\_input/sequences/fimo\_transcriptome\_5utr.txt;fimo --oc FIMO\_OUT/background\_transcriptome\_pval1e-2/selex\_CDS --max-stored-scores 2147483646 --thresh 1e-2 --bfile FIMO\_input/markov\_full.txt FIMO\_input/motifs/fimo\_attract\_selex.txt FIMO\_input/sequences/fimo\_transcriptome\_cds.txt;fimo --oc FIMO\_OUT/background\_transcriptome\_pval1e-2/selex\_full --max-stored-scores 2147483646 --thresh 1e-2 --bfile FIMO\_input/markov\_full.txt FIMO\_input/motifs/fimo\_attract\_selex.txt FIMO\_input/sequences/fimo\_transcriptome\_full.txt;fimo --oc FIMO\_OUT/background\_transcriptome\_pval1e-2/selex\_UTR3 --max-stored-scores 2147483646 --thresh 1e-2 --bfile FIMO\_input/markov\_full.txt FIMO\_input/motifs/fimo\_attract\_selex.txt FIMO\_input/sequences/fimo\_transcriptome\_3utr.txt;fimo --oc FIMO\_OUT/background\_transcriptome\_pval1e-2/rnacomp\_UTR5 --max-stored-scores 2147483646 --thresh 1e-2 --bfile FIMO\_input/markov\_full.txt FIMO\_input/motifs/fimo\_attract\_rnacomp.txt FIMO\_input/sequences/fimo\_transcriptome\_5utr.txt;fimo --oc FIMO\_OUT/background\_transcriptome\_pval1e-2/rnacomp\_CDS --max-stored-scores 2147483646 --thresh 1e-2 --bfile FIMO\_input/markov\_full.txt FIMO\_input/motifs/fimo\_attract\_rnacomp.txt FIMO\_input/sequences/fimo\_transcriptome\_cds.txt;fimo --oc FIMO\_OUT/background\_transcriptome\_pval1e-2/rnacomp\_full --max-stored-scores 2147483646 --thresh 1e-2 --bfile FIMO\_input/markov\_full.txt FIMO\_input/motifs/fimo\_attract\_rnacomp.txt FIMO\_input/sequences/fimo\_transcriptome\_full.txt;fimo --oc FIMO\_OUT/background\_transcriptome\_pval1e-2/rnacomp\_UTR3 --max-stored-scores 2147483646 --thresh 1e-2 --bfile FIMO\_input/markov\_full.txt  FIMO\_input/motifs/fimo\_attract\_rnacomp.txt FIMO\_input/sequences/fimo\_transcriptome\_3utr.txt;fimo --oc FIMO\_OUT/background\_transcriptome\_pval1e-2/htselex\_UTR5 --max-stored-scores 2147483646 --thresh 1e-2 --bfile FIMO\_input/markov\_full.txt FIMO\_input/motifs/fimo\_htselex.txt FIMO\_input/sequences/fimo\_transcriptome\_5utr.txt;fimo --oc FIMO\_OUT/background\_transcriptome\_pval1e-2/htselex\_CDS --max-stored-scores 2147483646 --thresh 1e-2 --bfile FIMO\_input/markov\_full.txt FIMO\_input/motifs/fimo\_htselex.txt FIMO\_input/sequences/fimo\_transcriptome\_cds.txt;fimo --oc FIMO\_OUT/background\_transcriptome\_pval1e-2/htselex\_full --max-stored-scores 2147483646 --thresh 1e-2 --bfile FIMO\_input/markov\_full.txt FIMO\_input/motifs/fimo\_htselex.txt FIMO\_input/sequences/fimo\_transcriptome\_full.txt;fimo --oc FIMO\_OUT/background\_transcriptome\_pval1e-2/htselex\_UTR3 --max-stored-scores 2147483646 --thresh 1e-2 --bfile FIMO\_input/markov\_full.txt FIMO\_input/motifs/fimo\_htselex.txt FIMO\_input/sequences/fimo\_transcriptome\_3utr.txt

**command: bg=transcriptome; cutoff=1e-3**

fimo --oc FIMO\_OUT/background\_transcriptome\_pval1e-3/selex\_UTR5 --max-stored-scores 2147483646 --thresh 1e-3 --bfile FIMO\_input/markov\_full.txt FIMO\_input/motifs/fimo\_attract\_selex.txt FIMO\_input/sequences/fimo\_transcriptome\_5utr.txt;fimo --oc FIMO\_OUT/background\_transcriptome\_pval1e-3/selex\_CDS --max-stored-scores 2147483646 --thresh 1e-3 --bfile FIMO\_input/markov\_full.txt FIMO\_input/motifs/fimo\_attract\_selex.txt FIMO\_input/sequences/fimo\_transcriptome\_cds.txt;fimo --oc FIMO\_OUT/background\_transcriptome\_pval1e-3/selex\_full --max-stored-scores 2147483646 --thresh 1e-3 --bfile FIMO\_input/markov\_full.txt FIMO\_input/motifs/fimo\_attract\_selex.txt FIMO\_input/sequences/fimo\_transcriptome\_full.txt;fimo --oc FIMO\_OUT/background\_transcriptome\_pval1e-3/selex\_UTR3 --max-stored-scores 2147483646 --thresh 1e-3 --bfile FIMO\_input/markov\_full.txt FIMO\_input/motifs/fimo\_attract\_selex.txt FIMO\_input/sequences/fimo\_transcriptome\_3utr.txt;fimo --oc FIMO\_OUT/background\_transcriptome\_pval1e-3/rnacomp\_UTR5 --max-stored-scores 2147483646 --thresh 1e-3 --bfile FIMO\_input/markov\_full.txt FIMO\_input/motifs/fimo\_attract\_rnacomp.txt FIMO\_input/sequences/fimo\_transcriptome\_5utr.txt;fimo --oc FIMO\_OUT/background\_transcriptome\_pval1e-3/rnacomp\_CDS --max-stored-scores 2147483646 --thresh 1e-3 --bfile FIMO\_input/markov\_full.txt FIMO\_input/motifs/fimo\_attract\_rnacomp.txt FIMO\_input/sequences/fimo\_transcriptome\_cds.txt;fimo --oc FIMO\_OUT/background\_transcriptome\_pval1e-3/rnacomp\_full --max-stored-scores 2147483646 --thresh 1e-3 --bfile FIMO\_input/markov\_full.txt FIMO\_input/motifs/fimo\_attract\_rnacomp.txt FIMO\_input/sequences/fimo\_transcriptome\_full.txt;fimo --oc FIMO\_OUT/background\_transcriptome\_pval1e-3/rnacomp\_UTR3 --max-stored-scores 2147483646 --thresh 1e-3 --bfile FIMO\_input/markov\_full.txt  FIMO\_input/motifs/fimo\_attract\_rnacomp.txt FIMO\_input/sequences/fimo\_transcriptome\_3utr.txt;fimo --oc FIMO\_OUT/background\_transcriptome\_pval1e-3/htselex\_UTR5 --max-stored-scores 2147483646 --thresh 1e-3 --bfile FIMO\_input/markov\_full.txt FIMO\_input/motifs/fimo\_htselex.txt FIMO\_input/sequences/fimo\_transcriptome\_5utr.txt;fimo --oc FIMO\_OUT/background\_transcriptome\_pval1e-3/htselex\_CDS --max-stored-scores 2147483646 --thresh 1e-3 --bfile FIMO\_input/markov\_full.txt FIMO\_input/motifs/fimo\_htselex.txt FIMO\_input/sequences/fimo\_transcriptome\_cds.txt;fimo --oc FIMO\_OUT/background\_transcriptome\_pval1e-3/htselex\_full --max-stored-scores 2147483646 --thresh 1e-3 --bfile FIMO\_input/markov\_full.txt FIMO\_input/motifs/fimo\_htselex.txt FIMO\_input/sequences/fimo\_transcriptome\_full.txt;fimo --oc FIMO\_OUT/background\_transcriptome\_pval1e-3/htselex\_UTR3 --max-stored-scores 2147483646 --thresh 1e-3 --bfile FIMO\_input/markov\_full.txt FIMO\_input/motifs/fimo\_htselex.txt FIMO\_input/sequences/fimo\_transcriptome\_3utr.txt

**command: bg=transcriptome; cutoff=1e-4**

fimo --oc FIMO\_OUT/background\_transcriptome\_pval1e-4/selex\_UTR5 --max-stored-scores 2147483646 --bfile FIMO\_input/markov\_full.txt FIMO\_input/motifs/fimo\_attract\_selex.txt FIMO\_input/sequences/fimo\_transcriptome\_5utr.txt;fimo --oc FIMO\_OUT/background\_transcriptome\_pval1e-4/selex\_CDS --max-stored-scores 2147483646 --bfile FIMO\_input/markov\_full.txt FIMO\_input/motifs/fimo\_attract\_selex.txt FIMO\_input/sequences/fimo\_transcriptome\_cds.txt;fimo --oc FIMO\_OUT/background\_transcriptome\_pval1e-4/selex\_full --max-stored-scores 2147483646 --bfile FIMO\_input/markov\_full.txt FIMO\_input/motifs/fimo\_attract\_selex.txt FIMO\_input/sequences/fimo\_transcriptome\_full.txt;fimo --oc FIMO\_OUT/background\_transcriptome\_pval1e-4/selex\_UTR3 --max-stored-scores 2147483646 --bfile FIMO\_input/markov\_full.txt FIMO\_input/motifs/fimo\_attract\_selex.txt FIMO\_input/sequences/fimo\_transcriptome\_3utr.txt;fimo --oc FIMO\_OUT/background\_transcriptome\_pval1e-4/rnacomp\_UTR5 --max-stored-scores 2147483646 --bfile FIMO\_input/markov\_full.txt FIMO\_input/motifs/fimo\_attract\_rnacomp.txt FIMO\_input/sequences/fimo\_transcriptome\_5utr.txt;fimo --oc FIMO\_OUT/background\_transcriptome\_pval1e-4/rnacomp\_CDS --max-stored-scores 2147483646 --bfile FIMO\_input/markov\_full.txt FIMO\_input/motifs/fimo\_attract\_rnacomp.txt FIMO\_input/sequences/fimo\_transcriptome\_cds.txt;fimo --oc FIMO\_OUT/background\_transcriptome\_pval1e-4/rnacomp\_full --max-stored-scores 2147483646 --bfile FIMO\_input/markov\_full.txt FIMO\_input/motifs/fimo\_attract\_rnacomp.txt FIMO\_input/sequences/fimo\_transcriptome\_full.txt;fimo --oc FIMO\_OUT/background\_transcriptome\_pval1e-4/rnacomp\_UTR3 --max-stored-scores 2147483646 --bfile FIMO\_input/markov\_full.txt  FIMO\_input/motifs/fimo\_attract\_rnacomp.txt FIMO\_input/sequences/fimo\_transcriptome\_3utr.txt;fimo --oc FIMO\_OUT/background\_transcriptome\_pval1e-4/htselex\_UTR5 --max-stored-scores 2147483646 --bfile FIMO\_input/markov\_full.txt FIMO\_input/motifs/fimo\_htselex.txt FIMO\_input/sequences/fimo\_transcriptome\_5utr.txt;fimo --oc FIMO\_OUT/background\_transcriptome\_pval1e-4/htselex\_CDS --max-stored-scores 2147483646 --bfile FIMO\_input/markov\_full.txt FIMO\_input/motifs/fimo\_htselex.txt FIMO\_input/sequences/fimo\_transcriptome\_cds.txt;fimo --oc FIMO\_OUT/background\_transcriptome\_pval1e-4/htselex\_full --max-stored-scores 2147483646 --bfile FIMO\_input/markov\_full.txt FIMO\_input/motifs/fimo\_htselex.txt FIMO\_input/sequences/fimo\_transcriptome\_full.txt;fimo --oc FIMO\_OUT/background\_transcriptome\_pval1e-4/htselex\_UTR3 --max-stored-scores 2147483646 --bfile FIMO\_input/markov\_full.txt FIMO\_input/motifs/fimo\_htselex.txt FIMO\_input/sequences/fimo\_transcriptome\_3utr.txt

Take a step back.

Basic questions:

**On the issue of full-transcript matching vs. UTR5 matching**

A number of motifs showed the following particularity: When the motif was scored against the full transcript sequence, no matches were recorded. When it was scored against, for example, the 5’ UTR subsequence, which is, obviously, contained within the full transcript, then matches were recorded.

What could be the reason for this on the FIMO side:

What could be the reason for this on the code side:

* Wrong sorting of sequence matches to motif IDs:
  + Confused listings of sequence IDs with motif IDs?

if there really was enrichment in autologous binding, a motif should have “stronger” matches in its own mRNA. This “strength” of matches is not even a part of the picture here. All we count is the “frequency of matches over a sequence by a motif that have a probability of 0,1% of occurring randomly”.