Computational identification of new structured cis-regulatory elements in the 3′-untranslated region of human protein coding genes
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ABSTRACT

Messenger ribonucleic acids (RNAs) contain a large number of cis-regulatory RNA elements that function in many types of post-transcriptional regulation. These cis-regulatory elements are often characterized by conserved structures and/or sequences. Although some classes are well known, given the wide range of RNA-interacting proteins in eukaryotes, it is likely that many new classes of cis-regulatory elements are yet to be discovered. An approach to this is to use computational methods that have the advantage of analysing genomic data, particularly comparative data on a large scale. In this study, a set of structural discovery algorithms was applied followed by support vector machine (SVM) classification. We trained a new classification model (CisRNA-SVM) on a set of known structured cis-regulatory elements from 3′-untranslated regions (UTRs) and successfully distinguished these and groups of cis-regulatory elements not been strained on from control genomic and shuffled sequences. The new method outperformed previous methods in classification of cis-regulatory RNA elements. This model was then used to predict new elements from cross-species conserved regions of human 3′-UTRs. Clustering of these elements identified new classes of potential cis-regulatory elements. The model, training and testing sets and novel human predictions are available at: http://mRNA.otago.ac.nz/CisRNA-SVM.

INTRODUCTION

The translation of messenger ribonucleic acid (mRNA) is a precisely regulated process. There are a large number of cis-regulatory elements in mRNAs, most of them found in untranslated regions (UTRs). Both the 5′-UTR and 3′-UTR contain a multitude of translational control elements, many of which are structured (1–5). The 5′-UTR elements generally affect translational initiation, for example, upstream initiation codons and internal ribosomal entry sites (IRESs) (6). A more diverse range of regulatory mechanisms are associated with the 3′-UTR (4,5). Translational activation (7,8), repression (9), alternative splicing (10), mRNA stability (11) and localization (12) can all be controlled through cis-regulatory RNA elements in the 3′-UTR.

Some cis-regulatory elements on 3′-UTRs function at the primary sequence level and are included in several databases of regulatory RNA motifs (4,5,13,14). Some common elements include AU-rich (ARE) (15), CU-rich (16) or GU-rich (17) elements recruiting specific protein factors, which stabilize or destabilize the mRNA. RNA structure has also been shown to play an important role in the function of some cis-regulatory elements. In viruses, complex RNA structures are frequently present in 3′-UTRs and are a common feature of translational control (18–20). In cellular genomes, there are diverse structured elements. There is evidence that a 100 base structure localizes the human vimentin mRNA, whereas a small and less thermodynamically stable AU-rich stem loop has been identified in the 3′-UTR of human Myc mRNA, that is likely to be the signal for the perinuclear localization of that mRNA (21). Some cis-regulatory elements are characterized by distinct secondary structures, such as the iron-responsive element (22), the gamma interferon inhibitor of translation (GAIT) element (23) and many large mRNA localization elements in Drosophila (24–27). A recent study also identified frequent small structural elements associated with stability of mammalian mRNAs (28). However, structures of cis-regulatory RNAs are often less conserved across distantly related species in comparison with non-coding RNAs.
Translational control through cis-regulatory elements is most frequently associated with genes that require precise temporal and/or spatial regulation. In humans, localized translation is important for the function of certain mRNAs, including some transcription factors (21,29) and numerous neuronal mRNAs (30). Disease-associated mRNA localization mechanisms have also been characterized in humans (31,32). Extensive experimental studies have revealed localized mRNAs at genomic scale (30,33,34). However, despite the identification of numerous localized RNAs, the cis-regulatory elements, which potentially regulate localization and other post-transcriptional events, remain largely unknown. Gene ontological (GO) studies have revealed that, common cis-regulatory elements such as the ARE and GU-rich elements are over-represented in the 3′-UTRs of unstable mRNAs, and some of them have conserved secondary structures (21,29,35). Notably, genes involved in transcription regulation, cell cycle, apoptosis and RNA processing (36) are often tightly regulated to ensure a rapid response of transcription and translation in a given time and place of the cell. Therefore, it is likely that currently unknown regulatory RNA elements exist in these genes. On the basis of known elements, we expect that there are a large number of structured cis-regulatory RNA elements yet to be identified.

Various computational methods have been developed for RNA structural analysis. Folding a single sequence based on thermodynamic stability does not have enough specificity for genome-wide scans due to high false-positive rates. Therefore, genome scans for structural RNAs are generally performed on alignments. There are three major approaches to predict structurally conserved RNA elements (37,38): align-then-fold, fold-then-align and simultaneously fold-and-align. The first approach is the least computationally intensive; however, it relies highly on the quality of the sequence alignment and is not able to predict structures from alignments with low sequence similarities. On the contrary, the second approach eliminates the requirement of a prior sequence alignment and looks for the most stable common structure. However, this approach relies on the accuracy of secondary structure predictions of each RNA sequence. The third approach often uses a dynamic programming algorithm first introduced by Sankoff (39), which was implemented in a number of programs to look for common structures among sequences with low similarity, but this approach is often very computationally intensive.

A number of programs have been applied to genome-wide identification of novel structured RNAs (40,41), such as RNAz (42), RNA sampler (43), Efofold (44), RSMatch (45), Foldalign (46), CMfinder (47), RNApromo (48) and LocARNA (49). Given the complexity and variety of structured RNAs in a genome, the performance of different approaches differs considerably (43,45,47). Few studies have incorporated machine-learning algorithms such as support vector machine (SVM) or neural network to search for specific types of RNA structures with increased sensitivities and specificities (43,50,51).

In this study, we developed a new approach combining several different RNA structural prediction strategies, with a SVM classifier trained specifically for cis-regulatory RNAs, rather than ncRNA genes. Our new model CisRNA-SVM is able to distinguish cis-regulatory RNAs from random genomic sequences or shuffled sequences with higher sensitivities than existing methods. Combined with a comparative genomics approach, we then used our new model to search for novel structured cis-regulatory elements in the 3′-UTRs of human genes. Results are validated by the identification of known cis-elements, such as the selenocysteine insertion sequence (SECIS) element, iron responsive element (IRE) and histone 3′-UTR. New classes of novel structures are found by subsequent clustering analysis.

**MATERIALS AND METHODS**

**Data sets for training and testing**

The positive training alignments are the seed alignments of 98 filtered Rfam cis-regulatory elements (CisReg A, mRNA.otago.ac.nz/CisRNA-SVM) (52). Three sets of sub-alignments with different optimal and maximal pairwise identities were selected from each seed alignment using the rnaSelectSeq.pl tool from RNAz 2.0 package (50). The three sets are (i) optimal 50%, max 65%; (ii) optimal 70%, max 85% and (iii) optimal 85%, max 90%. This generated a total of 294 alignments, of which 233 were unique and used for training. The negative training set consists of random genomic alignments or dinucleotide shuffled CisReg A alignments. The negative control genomic alignments were obtained from 500 sequences immediately downstream (after the polyadenylation site) of protein-coding genes on chromosome 21 from University of California, Santa Cruz (UCSC) hg19 assembly (53). They were divided into 120-nt windows (40-nt sliding) resulting in 1488 alignments, 638 of which were included in the negative training set and the remaining 850 used in testing. Dinucleotide shuffled CisReg A set was generated using alignment-shuffling algorithm, Multiperm (54). Each of the 294 positive training alignments was shuffled twice, and one set was used in training, the other testing. In addition, a testing set consisting of a second group of 127 Rfam cis-regulatory elements was also used. This set contains additional cis regulatory elements including large 5′-IRES's (mainly viral) riboswitches (mainly bacterial 5′) and pseudoknots (mainly viral and coding; CisReg B, mRNA.otago.ac.nz/CisRNA-SVM). Alignments were selected from the CisReg B seed alignments with optimally 60% and maximum 80% pairwise identity.

**Alignments of 3′-UTR sequences**

The initial 3′-UTR alignments were obtained from the TargetScan database (www.targetscan.org). These had been extracted from the UCSC genome alignments. Species with almost identical sequences to the common model organisms were removed (i.e. chimpanzee and rat), and from the remaining species, only the ones have higher sequence coverage were selected for our analysis. In
total, 10 vertebrate species were included in the initial alignments (human, mouse, dog, horse, cow, opossum, platypus, lizard, chicken and frog). The alignments were converted to Clustalw format and separated into 120-nt/80-nt sliding windows using rnazWindow.pl tool from RNAz 2.0 package (50) to obtain six-sequence alignments with the human sequence in each alignment as the reference sequence.

Alignments and scores

Four programs were chosen for the training process: RNAalifold from the ViennaRNA-1.8.4 package (55), LocARNA-1.5.2 (49), Foldalign-2.1.1 (56) and Cove (57). They represented the three alignment strategies: align-then-fold, fold-then-align, simultaneous fold-and-align and covariance-based methods. Cove has been developed into the package Infernal (58), and this now requires an initial seed alignment, therefore is not suitable for a de novo search in unaligned sequence sets as in our study. However, the Infernal cmsearch tool was used later as a testing method for confirming the presence of known RNA elements. In addition, we assumed that all sequences in the training and testing sets were either definitely positive or negative; therefore, we did not use a more recent covariance-based de novo motif search tool CMfinder (47), which selects candidates with stable structures before an iterative search. This feature of CMfinder resulted in many known positive training alignments not producing models. Cove is a well-established method and is widely used in searching for small RNA structures, such as its implementation in trNAsc-SE (59).

Feature scores were obtained from each of the four programs. Clustalw alignments were used for RNAalifold input, and the program was run with--noLP option to suppress single base-pair stems. For LocARNA, the multiple alignment version mlocarna was used. The feature scores for both RNAalifold and LocARNA are the minimum free energy of the aligned structure. Foldalign generated all-against-all pairwise alignments of the input multi-fasta alignment, and the average score was used as the feature score. The program coveb from the Cove-2.4.2 package was used, and the average bit score was taken as the feature score. Finally, the scores from all the programs were normalized by the length of alignment. The program APSI.java (www.mybiosoftware.com/tag/apsi) was used to compute the average pairwise sequence identity (APSI). Scripts giving the details of score processing can be found at mRNA.otago.ac.nz/CisRNA-SVM.

Support vector machine

The SVM classification model was made using Libsvm 2.9 (60) using SVM classification with radial basis function. The 233 unique alignments generated from the CisReg A set were positive instances, and the combined genomic (638) and shuffled alignments (294) were negative instances. The feature scores, GC content and APSI were scaled with set ranges, and a standard grid search and 5-fold cross-validation were performed for each model training procedure. As the ratio of positive training set to the negative training set was 1:4, a weighting ratio of 4:1 of positive:negative was initially used in all the training procedures. First, each feature score plus GC content and APSI was trained as individual SVM classification models to test the classification potential of the particular feature score. Then, the combination of all four structural alignment programs was tested against models with one program removed. Finally, scores that contributed positively in overall classification were incorporated into the final model. All the models were tested on three testing sets: CisReg B alignments, 850 different genomic alignments and the other set of 294 shuffled CisReg A.

Analysis of putative cis-regulatory elements

The predicted positive alignments were first combined to obtain non-overlapping alignments, and the human sequences from all alignments were extracted. Two sets of resultant sequences were obtained with SVM prediction probability ($P > 0.5$ and $P > 0.9$). The sequences were then analysed with Infernal 1.0 cmsearch (58) to test for the presence of known RNA elements. The result sequences with $P > 0.9$ were further analysed for potential new clusters of structures. Functional annotation with association to ontology was performed using DAVID bioinformatics resources 6.7 (61).

For clustering analysis, non-redundant human sequences were locally folded with RNALfold (55), and the sequence regions corresponding to the most stable local structures were extracted. The sequence regions were then aligned using MUSCLE (62), and the phylogenetic tree generated during the second iteration was used to obtain clusters of sequences with sufficient similarity. The tree was converted into an R-hclust object and subsequently cut at various depths to generate clusters. The clusters were realigned using MAFFT (63), option ‘% mafft-qinsi’ and sorted based on average pairwise sequence identity. The final cutting depth used was determined empirically by the number of clusters with average pairwise identity greater than 0.5 that retained the positive control Histone 3’-element cluster.

RESULTS

Classification of true-positive cis-regulatory elements by the individual methods

The goal of our method was to distinguish cis-regulatory structures from both a shuffled background and other potential structures in random genomic regions. This tool could then be used to scan genomes. We did not require accurate structural predictions for this process. To make a model for the identification of new cis-regulatory RNA elements, a training set of known cis-regulatory elements were manually selected from the Rfam database (52,64). They all fulfilled the following criteria: had only one experimentally verified secondary structure, did not contain pseudoknots and did not have large complex structures. The resulting 98 elements (named CisReg A) are exclusive of riboswitches, pseudoknots and internal ribosome entry sites (IRESs). The set of 127 cis-regulatory elements excluded from set A was retained as a testing
set (CisReg B). Only well-characterized seed alignments from Rfam were used in this study. The negative training and testing sets were generated from genomic regions following 3′-UTRs and dinucleotide shuffled CisReg A alignments (see ‘Materials and Methods’ section).

Four RNA structural identification programs were selected to represent the three major strategies in searching for conserved RNA structures: ‘align-then-fold’, ‘fold-then-align’ and ‘simultaneous fold-and-align’. The selected programs also represent several commonly used structural prediction approaches, including thermodynamic energy minimization combined with evolutionary conservation, the Sankoff algorithm and expectation maximization with covariance models. The selection was based on several criteria: the program is well established in the field, a numeric score is produced with the result, the program generates results on all the training and testing alignments and the program does not internally eliminate part of the training sequences based on rules regarding thermodynamic stability. Because of the large number of RNA structural prediction programs available, it is not feasible to test all of them. Therefore, based on the aforementioned criteria, we have chosen RNAalifold (55), LocARN (49) and Foldalign (56) and Cove (57).

We used normalized scores in all the subsequent analyses (as described in ‘Materials and Methods’ section). First, RNAalifold, LocARN, Foldalign and Cove were each tested for their ability to distinguish CisReg A set from the same set dinucleotide shuffled. Each program was run with the positive and negative data sets. Each program alone had only moderately different scores on the two data sets (Supplementary Figure S1). We then tested whether each program could better classify elements if two other general features were also used, the average GC content and average pairwise sequence identity (APSI). The three scores for each were input into a SVM (see ‘Materials and Methods’ section).

Including both GC and APSI made a major contribution to the classification success of the four programs (Supplementary Figure S2). Therefore, they were incorporated into the SVM in all the following analyses. Figure 1 shows the improved sensitivity and specificity of the additional scores and SVM method compared with the resulting windows, most elements were wholly contained within a window, whereas a few windows had only partial elements. Figure 3 compared the SVM decision values of the training seed alignments and those of the testing UTR windows. Overall, the decision values for UTR windows were lower than the training seed alignments. This result was expected as the UTR windows had either flanking sequence outside the element or they only contained part of the element. In four of the seven cases, at least one element was predicted. However, this does indicate a loss in sensitivity on the automatically processed 3′-UTR alignments.

**CisRNA-SVM: a new classification model**

We then tested to see whether combining scores from all four programs in one SVM classifier could improve the classification. First, the feature scores of all four programs were used as attributes in SVM training/testing, and subsequently four SVM models were tested with one attribute (score from each of the four programs) removed from the total SVM attributes. The sensitivity and specificity of the final SVM model and those of each program with the SVM classifier are shown in Figure 2, and the corresponding percentage of positive classification is listed in Table 2. The model (CisRNA-SVM) combining of all four programs had the overall best performance. It correctly classified 91.8% of the CisReg A set, whereas false positively classifying just 0.9% of the shuffled set.

Tenfold cross-validation of this model indicated 92.4% accuracy. Notably, the CisRNA-SVM model also performed well in classifying the CisReg B set, which had rather different structural properties compared with the CisReg A set, indicating the model’s strong potential for identifying new cis-regulatory elements not seen in the training set. In summary, our method classified 91.8% CisReg A alignments and 84.3% CisReg B alignments as positive, which corresponded to 96 of 98 CisReg A families and 108 of 127 CisReg B families.

The performance of the model was also tested on automatically processed 3′-UTR alignments containing either complete or partial known cis-regulatory elements. We selected a number of elements for this test: SECIS (RF00031), Histone3 (RF00032), IRE (RF00037), Vimentin3 (RF00109), GAIT (RF00179), G-CSF, SLIDE (RF00183) and DNA polymerase beta (DPB) (RF01455). All elements are also in CisReg A, but the training set does not always contain the human or mammalian sequences (e.g. Histone3), and their training seed alignments had length ranging between 26 nt and 100 nt. These elements have all been found in human 3′-UTRs. A number of vertebrate full-length 3′-UTR alignments (3 selenoprotein mRNAs, 3 histone mRNAs, the transferring receptor C mRNA, the vimentin mRNA, the ceruloplasmin mRNA and the deoxyribonucleic acid polymerase II mRNA) known to contain these elements were randomly selected and processed into 120-nt windows. In the resulting windows, most elements were wholly contained within a window, whereas a few windows had only partial elements. Figure 3 compared the SVM decision values of the training seed alignments and those of the testing UTR windows. Overall, the decision values for UTR windows were lower than the training seed alignments. This result was expected as the UTR windows had either flanking sequence outside the element or they only contained part of the element. In four of the seven cases, at least one element was predicted. However, this does indicate a loss in sensitivity on the automatically processed 3′-UTR alignments.

**Genome-wide scans of UTRs for regions containing putative new cis-regulatory RNA elements**

In total, 154 803 sub alignments with length of 120 nt were processed from vertebrate 3′-UTR alignments. Each alignment had the human sequence as the reference and contained five other vertebrate sequences selected based on their pairwise identity to the human sequence (optimal sequence identity of 70%; see section ‘Materials and Methods’). Each alignment was analysed by the four programs to obtain the feature score, which were then used as input for SVM classification using the CisRNA-SVM model. The probability of each alignment being positive (Pp) was used as prediction result. By default (Pp > 0.5), 32 043 alignments were classified as positive and were merged to give 22 038 non-overlapping
alignments. Different $P$ value cutoffs may be set to get higher confidence levels of prediction. At $P_p > 0.9$, there were only 4887 positive alignments, which when merged gave 4424 non-overlapping alignments. Given the false-positive rates obtained from SVM model training, at $P_p > 0.9$, the false-positive rates based on either shuffled alignments or genomic alignments were reduced to 0% and 0.6%, respectively.

Human sequences from the above two sets of alignments were extracted to be analysed for the presence of known structured 3′-UTR elements. First, all positively predicted sequences ($P_p > 0.5$) were searched using the models in the Rfam database 10.0 (64) using cmsearch (58) and compared with the total number of known elements in Rfam. Results were shown in

---

**Table 1.** Performance of various SVM models measured by the percentage of alignments classified as positive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>CisReg A (%)</th>
<th>CisReg B (%)</th>
<th>Genomic (%)</th>
<th>Shuffled (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RNAalifold (R)</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LocARN (L)</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foldalign (F)</td>
<td>70.1</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cove (C)</td>
<td>70.1</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R + L + F</td>
<td>73.5</td>
<td>61.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R + L + C</td>
<td>89.1</td>
<td>75.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R + F + C</td>
<td>91.8</td>
<td>77.2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L + F + C</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>72.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CisRNA-SVM</td>
<td>91.8</td>
<td>84.3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Supplementary Table S1. In total, the CisRNA-SVM method identified 39 of 62 histone 3'-UTR elements, 3 of 7 IREs and 7 of 15 SECIS elements. We also used the TransTerm set of cis-regulatory elements (5), and the result was similar. TransTerm also contains unstructured and non-Watson Crick structures, and our hits also included non-canonically structured G-quartet, as well as several apparently unstructured elements, such as the ARE and CU-rich elements.

The genomic positions of the human predicted cis-elements are available at http://mRNA.otago.ac.nz/CisRNA-SVM. The sequences corresponding to Pp > 0.9 result set were analysed for local RNA structures using RNALfold from Vienna RNA package (55), and several top ranked stable structures based on minimum free energy were shown in Figure 4. The most stable local structures for all sequences are available at mRNA.otago.ac.nz/CisRNA-SVM.

To address the question as to whether these elements were found in particular classes of genes, for example highly regulated mRNAs, or placed across all classes of mRNAs, we mapped the genes to GO terms (see ‘Materials and Methods’ section). Table 2 lists the top functional groups for each main GO category. These results indicate a striking enrichment of structural elements in the 3'-UTRs of mRNAs encoding proteins involved in ion binding (24.6% of the total elements with P value 1.06E-15) and are components of the plasma membrane (13%, P value 2E-12). A significant proportion of the elements were found in the mRNAs of protein involved in transcription (12.3%, P value 2.54E-7), as well as cell cycle regulation, transport and localization.

New classes of structured cis-elements

Given the relatively small number of known cis-regulatory elements, mainly within a few classes, most of our predictions do not match known RNA classes. To further investigate the potential functional relations between these cis-elements, we applied a clustering method using

![Graph showing performance of CisRNA-SVM classifier](image)

**Table 2.** Functional classification of genes containing predicted cis-regulatory elements with high confidence (P > 0.9)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Molecular function</th>
<th>Biological process</th>
<th>Cellular component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GO:0043177 (ion binding)</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>1.06E-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GO:0046872 (metal ion binding)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.46E-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GO:0043169 (cation binding)</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>3.95E-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GO:0046914 (transition metal ion binding)</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>1.46E-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GO:0008270 (zinc ion binding)</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>5.01E-12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
pairwise distances to search for new groups of cis-regulatory RNA motifs.

Clustering analysis was performed on the human sequences of the high confidence set (Pp > 0.9). First, highly similar sequences (with identify >95%) were removed, resulting in 4409 non-redundant sequences. Regions of all the sequences containing the thermodynamically most stable structures were extracted, and the sequences were aligned using MUSCLE (62), and a phylogenetic tree was generated based on pairwise sequence distances. The resulting tree successfully generated one cluster including the known Histone 3'-UTR elements. The cluster was shown in Supplementary Figure S3. The tree was subsequently trimmed at various depths to obtain clusters of potential new elements.

To determine a feasible trimming depth, the Histone 3'-UTR cluster was used as a control. Several trimmings of the tree were tested, and the final cutting depth was chosen, so that the histone 3'-UTR cluster remained intact, while resulting in the maximum number of clusters with pairwise sequence identity > 0.5. In total, the trimming resulted in 4059 leaves, which corresponded to 134 clusters containing 2 sequences and 75 clusters containing 3 or more sequences. Figure 5 shows the structures of several large clusters with six or more sequences. The known histone 3'-UTR cluster, which also belonged to this group, is not shown.

Cluster (a) mostly contains genes involved in signal transduction, and they form a highly conserved AU-rich single stem-loop structure. AU-rich stem–loop structures had previously been found to regulate mRNA stability in a number of mRNAs (11,21,65). It is likely that this ARE is also associated with stability. Cluster (b) consists of ion binding and actin cytoskeleton-associated genes, and the consensus structure has a highly conserved GC-rich stem. Two sequences are missing the potential second stem; however, the middle region also shows significant sequence similarities. Cluster (c) exhibits the least sequence similarity among the four clusters, with a consenus uridine in the center loop, the seven sequences form a conserved structure. Three of the seven protein genes in this cluster are involved in development. Cluster (d) consists of seven zinc finger protein genes and titin, which binds adenosine triphosphate and ankyrin and is involved in adult heart development. This cluster has the highest sequence similarity, which reflects the evolutionary relations among the zinc finger protein family.

A number of other highly ranked clusters can be found in Supplementary Text (alignments of top ranked clusters) with detailed description of the genes and GO information. The result indicated that the potential clusters of new cis-regulatory elements did contain some functionally related genes, however, were not exclusive to genes of the same function. The clusters were more likely to contain genes within broader functional categories such as signal transduction, ion binding, and development.
as ion binding, metabolite binding, regulation of signalling pathways or being associated with membrane.

**DISCUSSION**

In this study, we developed and used a method taking advantage of multiple RNA structural analysis programs combined with the classification capability of a SVM. With a specifically targeted training data set, we were able to distinguish structures that exhibit features of a defined class of *cis*-regulatory RNA elements from a genomic background. The method was shown to be considerably more sensitive and specific than single structural prediction programs. The sensitivity and specificity of the detection can also be adjusted by filtering on the SVM decision value or by functional classification to narrow down the candidates for experimental testing.

This method requires an initial sequence alignment. The quality of alignments has an impact on both the model building and classification. Here, we used alignments of vertebrate genomes made without consideration of RNA

---

**Figure 4.** Predicted local structures of top ranked potential *cis*-regulatory elements based on MFE. (a) NM_000612: insulin-like growth factor 2 (somatomedin A); (b) NM_001080402: coiled-coil domain containing 61; (c) NM_022823: fibronectin type III domain containing 4; (d) NM_021241: widely interspaced zinc finger motifs; (e) NM_018129: pyridoxamine 5'-phosphate oxidase; (f) NM_004430: early growth response 3; (g) NM_182894: visual system homeobox 2; (h) NM_016162: inhibitor of growth family, member 4; (i) NM_018113: limb region 1 homolog (mouse)-like and (j) NM_015094: hypermethylated in cancer 2.
structure (53). Alternative alignments or realignments with a consideration of RNA structure may assist in detecting structures but might also bias the analysis to certain types of structured elements. Two of the 98 CisReg A set were not classified as positive by CisRNA-SVM: the potato virus X 3'-UTR element and the Hsp90 5'-UTR cis-regulatory element. Both of the elements had almost identical sequences in the training alignments and, therefore, did not provide useful information to the classifier. These might be improved with ongoing improvements to the Rfam database or possibly by including the predicted ‘full’ Rfam families.

We used genomic regions downstream of the 3'-UTR as an exciting negative set. The downstream sequences of protein coding genes may contain regulatory elements acting at the unprocessed pre-mRNA level or transcriptional level. CisRNA-SVM distinguished these from the cis-regulatory RNA elements we wish to detect. Surprisingly, given its training, the performance of CisRNA-SVM model on CisReg B set was still quite good (84.3%). Many pseudoknot elements are included in set B, and the programs used here do not predict pseudoknots. In addition, there are many large elements in the B set containing long unstructured regions, which fall into sub alignment windows.

Identification of cis-regulatory RNAs has been a difficult task mainly due to poor conservation, AU-richness and unusual structures. Our method is able to identify difficult-to-detect structures such as the IRE or the SECIS element, which contains four non-canonical A-G pairs. However, additional methodology will be required to recognize pseudoknots or unusual structures, e.g. G-quartets. Such methods could potentially be added to the set of software used for training or used for

Figure 5. Putative large clusters of cis-regulatory structures. (Cluster a) ZFAT (NM_001029939): zinc finger and AT hook domain containing; SRGAP3 (NM_001033171): SLIT-ROBO Rho GTPase-activating protein 3; RELL1 (NM_001085400): RELT-like 1; RGS4 (NM_00102445): regulator of G-protein-signalling 4; PREDH1 (NM_028300): hN-acid dehalogenase-like hydrolase domain containing 1; LEMD3 (NM_014319): LEM domain containing 3; GNG12 (NM_018841): G protein, gamma 12; SH3TC2 (NM_024577): SH3 domain and tetratricopeptide repeats 2 and ADAMTS9 (NM_182920): ADAM metallopeptidase with thrombospondin type 1 motif. (Cluster b) WIPF1 (NM_001077269): WAS/WASL interacting protein family; FTO (NM_001080432): fat mass obesity associated; P2RX1 (NM_002558): purinergic receptor P2X, ligand-gated ion channel; HOOK1 (NM_0153888): hook homolog 1 (Drosophila); ZNF572 (NM_152412): zinc finger protein 572 and SREK1-interacting protein. (Cluster c) PDE6B (NM_000283): phosphodiesterase 6B, cGMP specific; EREG (NM_001432): epiregulin; PMP2 (NM_002577): peripheral myelin protein 2; HDHD1 (NM_012080): haloacid dehalogenase-like hydrolase domain containing 1; SIX4 (NM_017420): SIX homeobox 4; FENX3 (NM_030971): sideroflexin 3 (FENX3) and CREG2 (NM_153836): cellular repressor of E1A-simulated genes 2. (Cluster d) ZNF761 (NM_001008401): zinc finger protein 761; ZNF85 (NM_003429); ZNF117 (NM_015852); ZNF708 (NM_021269) and ZNF430 (NM_025189) and TTN (NM_133473): titin.

Figure 5.
post-processing of the putative elements discovered, as done here using Rfam and TransTerm elements (5,64). An alternative approach was recently used to detect enrichment of very common small ~17 base elements with four to five base stems associated with mRNA stability. Such small elements did not form part of our known element training set, and these would be unlikely to be detected by our method or by any method requiring thermodynamic stability (28).

We compared our method to two popular genome-wide ncRNA prediction programs, RNAz (50) and Evofold (44,66). Intersecting the genomic positions of predicted RNA structures with those of Rfam elements showed that our result contained mostly cis-regulatory RNAs that our model was trained on, whereas the other two programs also predicted many microRNAs and snoRNAs. As our approach specifically targeted cis-regulatory RNAs rather than ncRNAs in general, our result did not have large overlap with ncRNAs predicted by either RNAz or Evofold, as shown in Supplementary Figure S4. However, the common 3’-UTR structures predicted by RNAz and Evofold only consist of 23% and 10% of RNAz and Evofold predictions on the 3’-UTR, indicating clear difference of underlying structural prediction algorithms. Our result overlaps more with RNAz predictions, possibly due to the fact that RNAz also implements a SVM but was trained on ncRNA families different from our training families (50).

Our method predicted several thousand cis-regulatory-like secondary structures in 3’-UTRs with high probability of SVM prediction (Pp > 0.9). This sequence set contains previously known 5 SECIS elements and 11 Histone 3’-elements. These sequences represent a rich source of elements for further testing. To facilitate this, we have provided the data as bed files that can be mapped to the common 3’-UTR structures predicted by RNAz and Evofold, as shown in Supplementary Figure S4. However, overall, our study has developed an effective way for searching structured cis-elements exhibiting features of the previously known cis-elements and proposes many for further experimental testing. CisRNA-SVM is designed to detect subtle structures of cis-regulatory RNAs but could be retrained to search for other types of RNA structures, for example small non-coding RNA genes.
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