

# Supplementary Tables

*Selcen Ar*

16 09 2019

Table S1: *minsamp* sample dataset that includes interaction factors.

| competing | miRNA | Competing_expression | miRNA_expression | seed_type | region | energy |
|-----------|-------|----------------------|------------------|-----------|--------|--------|
| Gene1     | Mir1  | 10000                | 1000             | 0.43      | 0.30   | -20    |
| Gene2     | Mir1  | 10000                | 1000             | 0.43      | 0.01   | -15    |
| Gene3     | Mir1  | 5000                 | 1000             | 0.32      | 0.40   | -14    |
| Gene4     | Mir1  | 10000                | 1000             | 0.23      | 0.50   | -10    |
| Gene4     | Mir2  | 10000                | 2000             | 0.35      | 0.90   | -12    |
| Gene5     | Mir2  | 5000                 | 2000             | 0.05      | 0.40   | -11    |
| Gene6     | Mir2  | 10000                | 2000             | 0.01      | 0.80   | -25    |

Note: Energy values in miRNA:target pairs are represented by high-throughput studies (Helwak et al. 2013; Moore et al. 2015) which are utilized in this study. On the other hand, we have specified the other interaction factors, seed type and location of binding region on the target, as numeric values based on the previous studies.(Grimson et al. 2007) have compared the seed types' effect on target repression with few miRNA had canonical seed pairing in their study. Additionally, (Bartel 2009) and (Betel et al. 2010) have studied on functional and non-functional seed interactions. Based on results of these studies we have arranged seed types of miRNA:target interactions as numeric values. We also have redefined location of binding region on the target as numeric values, based on studies of (Hausser et al. 2013) and (Helwak et al. 2013). With this process, we have handled this entegrated dataset in context of competitor behaviours and functionality of interactions.

Table S2: Efficiency factors for seed types.

| seed_type             | Coefficient |
|-----------------------|-------------|
| 5-mer                 | 0.05        |
| 5-mer_noncanonical    | 0.04        |
| 6-mer                 | 0.07        |
| 6-mer_noncanonical    | 0.05        |
| 6-merA1               | 0.07        |
| 6-merA1_noncanonical  | 0.05        |
| 7-mer                 | 0.23        |
| 7-mer_noncanonical    | 0.19        |
| 7-merA1               | 0.19        |
| 7-merA1_noncanonical  | 0.16        |
| 7-mer-8m              | 0.25        |
| 7-mer-8m_nonacnonical | 0.21        |
| 8-mer                 | 0.43        |
| 8-mer_noncanonical    | 0.35        |
| 9-mer                 | 0.43        |
| 9-mer_noncanonical    | 0.35        |
| none                  | 0.01        |

Table S3: Efficiency factors for binding regions on targets

| location of binding region on target | Coefficient |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|
| 3'UTR                                | 0.84        |
| CDS                                  | 0.42        |
| 5'UTR                                | 0.01        |

Table S4: Example of E9GE\_mirnagenormal dataset.

| hgnc_symbol | miRNA_name    | mirna_RPM | GE_normal | Energy | seed_type_effect | region_effect |
|-------------|---------------|-----------|-----------|--------|------------------|---------------|
| CCNG1       | hsa-let-7a-5p | 111204.15 | 5245.00   | -25.10 | 0.05             | 0.84          |
| DICER1      | hsa-let-7a-5p | 111204.15 | 3285.00   | -24.40 | 0.43             | 0.42          |
| SESN1       | hsa-let-7a-5p | 111204.15 | 1179.00   | -22.20 | 0.05             | 0.93          |
| NIPBL       | hsa-let-7a-5p | 111204.15 | 4503.00   | -22.10 | 0.05             | 0.42          |
| INTS12      | hsa-let-7a-5p | 111204.15 | 600.00    | -21.90 | 0.05             | 0.42          |
| FNIP1       | hsa-let-7a-5p | 111204.15 | 1248.00   | -21.80 | 0.43             | 0.84          |

As a result of simulation a dataset, a graph object is obtained that includes various variables in edge and node data. A graph object includes variables at followings.

## REFERENCES

- Bartel, David P. 2009. "MicroRNAs: Target Recognition and Regulatory Functions." *Cell* 136 (2): 215–33. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2009.01.002>.
- Betel, Doron, Anjali Koppal, Phaedra Agius, Chris Sander, and Christina Leslie. 2010. "Comprehensive Modeling of microRNA Targets Predicts Functional Non-Conserved and Non-Canonical Sites." *Genome Biology* 11 (8): R90.
- Grimson, Andrew, Kyle Kai-How Farh, Wendy K. Johnston, Philip Garrett-Engele, Lee P. Lim, and David P. Bartel. 2007. "MicroRNA Targeting Specificity in Mammals: Determinants Beyond Seed Pairing." *Molecular Cell* 27 (1): 91–105. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.molcel.2007.06.017>.
- Hausser, J., A. P. Syed, B. Bilen, and M. Zavolan. 2013. "Analysis of CDS-Located miRNA Target Sites Suggests That They Can Effectively Inhibit Translation." *Genome Research* 23 (4): 604–15. <https://doi.org/10.1101/gr.139758.112>.
- Helwak, Aleksandra, Grzegorz Kudla, Tatiana Dudnakova, and David Tollervey. 2013. "Mapping the Human miRNA Interactome by CLASH Reveals Frequent Noncanonical Binding." *Cell* 153 (3): 654–65. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2013.03.043>.
- Moore, Michael J., Troels K. H. Scheel, Joseph M. Luna, Christopher Y. Park, John J. Fak, Eiko Nishiuchi, Charles M. Rice, and Robert B. Darnell. 2015. "miRNA-Target Chimeras Reveal miRNA 3'-End Pairing as a Major Determinant of Argonaute Target Specificity." *Nature Communications* 6 (November): 8864. <https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms9864>.