Evolutionarily conserved elements in vertebrate, insect, worm, and yeast genomes

John Spieth
Washington University School of Medicine in St. Louis

LaDeana W. Hillier
Washington University School of Medicine in St. Louis

Richard K. Wilson
Washington University School of Medicine in St. Louis

et al

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.wustl.edu/open_access_pubs

Recommended Citation
https://digitalcommons.wustl.edu/open_access_pubs/2073

This Open Access Publication is brought to you for free and open access by Digital Commons@Becker. It has been accepted for inclusion in Open Access Publications by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons@Becker. For more information, please contact vanam@wustl.edu.
Evolutionarily conserved elements in vertebrate, insect, worm, and yeast genomes

Adam Siepel, Gill Bejerano, Jakob S. Pedersen, et al.

*Genome Res.* 2005 15: 1034-1050
Access the most recent version at doi:10.1101/gr.3715005

**Supplemental Material**  
http://genome.cshlp.org/content/suppl/2005/07/18/gr.3715005.DC1.html

**References**  
This article cites 85 articles, 50 of which can be accessed free at:  
http://genome.cshlp.org/content/15/8/1034.full.html#ref-list-1

**Creative Commons License**  
This article is distributed exclusively by Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory Press for the first six months after the full-issue publication date (see  
http://genome.cshlp.org/site/misc/terms.xhtml). After six months, it is available under a Creative Commons License (Attribution-NonCommercial 3.0 Unported License), as described at  
http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/3.0/.

**Email Alerting Service**  
Receive free email alerts when new articles cite this article - sign up in the box at the top right corner of the article or click here.
We have conducted a comprehensive search for conserved elements in vertebrate genomes, using genome-wide multiple alignments of five vertebrate species (human, mouse, rat, chicken, and Fugu rubripes). Parallel searches have been performed with multiple alignments of four insect species (three species of Drosophila and Anopheles gambiae), two species of Caenorhabditis, and seven species of Saccharomyces. Conserved elements were identified with a computer program called phastCons, which is based on a two-state phylogenetic hidden Markov model (phylo-HMM). PhastCons works by fitting a phylo-HMM to the data by maximum likelihood, subject to constraints designed to calibrate the model across species groups, and then predicting conserved elements based on this model. The predicted elements cover roughly 3%–8% of the human genome (depending on the details of the calibration procedure) and substantially higher fractions of the more compact Drosophila melanogaster (37%–53%), Caenorhabditis elegans (18%–37%), and Saccharomyces cerevisiae (47%–68%) genomes. From yeasts to vertebrates, in order of increasing genome size and general biological complexity, increasing fractions of conserved bases are found to lie outside of the exons of known protein-coding genes. In all groups, the most highly conserved elements (HCEs), by log-odds score, are hundreds or thousands of bases long. These elements share certain properties with ultraconserved elements, but they tend to be longer and less perfectly conserved, and they overlap genes of somewhat different functional categories. In vertebrates, HCEs are associated with the 3′ UTRs of regulatory genes, stable gene deserts, and megabase-sized regions rich in moderately conserved noncoding sequences. Noncoding HCEs also show strong statistical evidence of an enrichment for RNA secondary structure.

[Supplemental material is available online at www.genome.org. The multiple alignments, predicted conserved elements, and base-by-base conservation scores presented here can be downloaded from http://www.cse.ucsc.edu/~acs/conservation. Up-to-date versions of these data sets are displayed in the “Conservation” and “Most Conserved” tracks in the UCSC Genome Browser (http://genome.ucsc.edu). The phastCons program is part of a software package called PHAST (PHylogenetic Analysis with Space/Time models), which is available by request from acs@soe.ucsc.edu.]
nones to be aligned (Brudno et al. 2003; Blanchette et al. 2004; Bray and Pachter 2004), cross-species conservation is emerging as a primary research tool in genomics. It is now possible to conduct large-scale searches for conserved sequences and to use the results of such searches to help stimulate new hypotheses and drive experimentation (Nobrega et al. 2003, 2004; Frazer et al. 2004; Wolfe et al. 2005).

Comparative studies suggest that mammalian genomes contain large numbers of functional elements that have yet to be identified and characterized. Analyses of human and rodent genomes (Mouse Genome Sequencing Consortium 2002; Chiaromonte et al. 2003; Roskin et al. 2003; Cooper et al. 2004; Rat Genome Sequencing Project Consortium 2004) indicate that about 5% or more of bases in mammalian genomes are under purifying selection, while protein-coding genes are believed to account for only about 1.5% of bases, leaving at least 3.5% that are thought to be functional, but not to code for proteins. (A high rate of turnover of constrained bases might put this fraction considerably higher; see Smith et al. 2004.) This conserved noncoding sequence—the “dark matter” of the genome—has been the subject of intense recent interest (e.g., Frazer et al. 2001, 2004; Shabalin et al. 2001; Dermitzakis et al. 2002; Bejerano et al. 2004a,b; Nobrega et al. 2004; Wolfe et al. 2005) but remains, for the most part, poorly understood. While there is less “dark matter” in the genomes of insects, worms, and yeasts, these genomes also contain many conserved sequences whose functions are not yet known (Bergman et al. 2002; Kellis et al. 2003; Stein et al. 2003).

Most groups have used pairwise alignments and simple, percent identity-based methods for identifying conserved elements. For example, Dermitzakis et al. (2002) and Nobrega et al. (2003) have defined conserved elements as intervals of at least 100 bp with >70% identity. Tools such as VISTA (Mayor et al. 2000), PipMaker (Schwartz et al. 2000), and zPicture (Ovcharenko et al. 2004) can be used to construct alignments, visualize annotations and percent identity levels, and/or define conserved elements according to length and identity thresholds. As more genomes have become available, however, it has become essential to make use of multiple (n-way) rather than just pairwise (2-way) alignments, and to consider the phylogeny of the species that are represented. A few methods for detecting conserved elements in multiple alignments have been described, some using a phylogenetic model (e.g., Stojanovic et al. 1999; Boffelli et al. 2003; Margulies et al. 2003; Chapman et al. 2004; Cooper et al. 2004; Ovcharenko et al. 2005a). Of the methods described so far, however, only the “phylogenetic shadowing” method (Boffelli et al. 2003) (to our knowledge) makes use of the branch lengths of the phylogeny, allows for multiple substitutions per site on single branches of the tree, and considers the “pattern” of substitution (e.g., the tendency for transitions to occur more frequently than transversions). In addition, most methods (including phylogenetic shadowing) use a sliding window of fixed size, which can be a limitation. For example, if the window size is small, it may be difficult to discriminate effectively between conserved and nonconserved regions, but if it is large, small conserved elements may be missed, even if highly conserved.

In this study, we describe a new program, called phastCons, that is designed to identify conserved elements in multiply aligned sequences. PhastCons is based on a phylogenetic hidden Markov model (phylo-HMM), a type of statistical model that considers both the process by which nucleotide substitutions occur at each site in a genome and how this process changes from one site to the next (Yang 1995; Felsenstein and Churchill 1996; Siepel and Haussler 2004). Phylo-HMMs provide a principled, mathematically rigorous framework in which to address problems of “segmentation” using comparative sequence data—i.e., problems in which aligned sequences are to be parsed into segments of different classes (e.g., “conserved” and “nonconserved” or “coding” and “noncoding”). For several reasons, they are attractive tools for the problem of identifying conserved elements; they can be used with a general phylogeny and the best available continuous-time Markov models of nucleotide substitution, they do not require a sliding window of fixed size, they allow nearly all parameters to be estimated from the data by maximum likelihood, and they permit all necessary computations to be carried out efficiently on large-scale data sets.

Using phastCons, we have conducted comprehensive searches for conserved elements in four separate genome-wide multiple alignments, consisting of five vertebrate genomes, four insect genomes, two Caenorhabditis genomes, and seven Saccharomyces genomes. This study contains a detailed discussion of our results. Some highlights are as follows:

- Roughly 3%-8% of the human genome consists of sequences conserved in vertebrates and/or other eutherian mammals. Much higher fractions of the more compact D. melanogaster (17%-53%), C. elegans (18%-37%), and S. cerevisiae (47%-68%) genomes are conserved across closely related species. From yeasts to vertebrates, in order of increasing genome size and general biological complexity, increasing fractions of conserved bases are found to lie outside of known or suspected exons of protein-coding genes, apparently reflecting the importance of regulatory and other noncoding sequences in complex eukaryotes.

- In all species groups, the most highly conserved elements (HCEs), by log-odds score, are hundreds or thousands of bases long and show extreme levels of conservation, but not the perfect identity seen in ultraconserved elements. Less than half (42%) of the vertebrate HCEs overlap exons of known protein-coding genes, in contrast to insects, worms, and yeasts, where nearly all (>93%) HCEs overlap such exons.

- Some of the most extreme conservation in vertebrates is seen in 3' UTRs, particularly of genes that regulate other genes, possibly reflecting widespread post-transcriptional regulation. This trend is less pronounced in insects and was not observed in worms. (Data for yeasts was not available.)

- HCEs in vertebrate 3' UTRs, and to a lesser extent, HCEs in 5' UTRs, show strong statistical evidence of an enrichment for local RNA secondary structure, consistent with the hypothesis of a role in post-transcriptional regulation. HCEs in introns and intergenic regions also appear to be enriched for local RNA secondary structure, indicating that many may encode functional RNAs.

- In vertebrates, intergenic HCEs are strongly enriched (nearly fivefold) in stable gene deserts, suggesting that many of them may act as distal cis-regulatory elements for precisely regulated genes (Ovcharenko et al. 2005b).

Results

Predicted conserved elements

Four separate genome-wide multiple alignments were prepared for the four species groups, with the human, D. melanogaster, C.
The estimated “nonconserved” branch lengths for vertebrates were fairly consistent with recent results based on (apparently) neutrally evolving DNA in mammals (Cooper et al. 2004), but were not accurate representations of the neutral substitution process in all respects. In particular, the branches to the more distant species (chicken and Fugu) were significantly underestimated, because the genomes of these species are, in general, alignable to the human, mouse, and rat genomes only in regions that are under at least partial constraint. Similar effects were observed with the insect, worm, and yeast phylogenies. Nevertheless, inaccuracies in the estimates of some (particularly longer) nonconserved branch lengths do not appear to have strongly influenced our results (see Supplemental material). Moreover, our method has certain advantages over more traditional methods for estimating neutral substitution rates, such as by using fourfold degenerate (4d) sites in coding regions—e.g., it does not depend on 4d sites being free from selection or being suitable proxies for neutrally evolving sites in general; and as an “unsupervised” learning method (see Methods), it is not dependent on possibly incomplete and/or erroneous annotations.

As an approximate way of calibrating our methods across species groups, we constrained the model parameters such that the coverage of known coding regions by predicted conserved elements (i.e., the fraction of coding bases falling in conserved elements) was equivalent in all groups. We chose a target coverage of 65% (±1%), as estimated from human/mouse comparisons (Chiaromonte et al. 2003). This number was adjusted for alignment coverage in coding regions, yielding 56% for the worm data set and 68% for the insects and yeasts. The degree of “smoothing” of the phylo-HMM was also constrained by forcing the expected amount of phylogenetic information (in an information theoretic sense) required to predict a conserved element to be equal for all data sets (see Methods). Our results are, in general, not highly sensitive to the precise level of target coverage used in this calibration procedure (see Supplemental material).

Based on the estimated parameters, conserved elements were then identified in each set of multiple alignments, using the phastCons program (see Methods). About 1.31 million conserved elements were predicted for the vertebrate data set, about 472,000 for the insects, about 98,000 for the worms, and about 68,000 for the yeasts. Each predicted element was assigned a log-odds score indicating how much more likely it was under the conserved state of the phylo-HMM than under the nonconserved state (see Supplemental material). A synteny filter, designed to eliminate predictions that were based on alignments of nonorthologous sequence (especially transposons or processed pseudogenes), reduced the numbers of predictions for vertebrates and insects to about 1.18 million and 467,000, respectively; alignments of nonorthologous sequence were less prevalent in the worm and yeast data sets, so the filter was omitted in these cases. The remaining predicted elements cover 4.3% of the human genome, 44.5% of D. melanogaster, 26.4% of C. elegans, and 55.6% of S. cerevisiae. These numbers are somewhat sensitive to the methods used for parameter estimation. Various different methods produced coverage estimates of 2.8%–8.1% for the vertebrates, 36.9%–53.1% for the insects, 18.4%–36.6% for the worms, and 46.5%–67.6% for the yeasts (see Supplemental material). Note that the vertebrate coverage is similar to recent estimates of 5%–8% for the share of the human genome that is under purifying selection (Chiaromonte et al. 2003; Roskin et al. 2003; Cooper et al. 2004), despite the use of quite different methods and data sets.

(In the discussion that follows, specific estimates of quantities of interest will be given, rather than ranges of estimates. The reader should bear in mind that, while these estimates are generally not highly sensitive to the method used for parameter estimation, they do change somewhat from one method to another. Further details are given in the Supplemental material.)

The 1.18 million vertebrate elements, in addition to covering 66% of the bases in known coding regions (approximately the target level), cover 23% of the bases in known 5’ UTRs and 18% of the bases in known 3’ UTRs—15.5-fold, 5.3-fold, and 4.3-fold enrichments, respectively, compared with the expected coverage if the predicted conserved elements were distributed randomly across 4.3% of the genome (Fig. 3). Almost nine of 10 (88%) known protein-coding exons are overlapped by predicted elements, as well as almost two of three known UTR exons (63% of 5’-UTR exons and 64% of 3’-UTR exons; when an exon contains both UTR and coding sequence, the UTR portion is considered to be a separate “UTR exon”). Regions not in known genes, but matching publicly available mRNA or spliced EST sequences (“other mRNAs” in Fig. 3) show 9.2% coverage by conserved elements (a 2.1-fold enrichment), and regions not in known genes or other mRNAs, but transcribed according to data from the Affymetrix/NCI Human Transcriptome project (“other trans”; see Methods), which presumably include a mixture of undocumented coding regions, UTRs, noncoding RNAs, and other

The state-transition diagram for the phylo-HMM used by phastCons, which consists of a state for conserved regions (c) and a state for nonconserved regions (n). Each state is associated with a phylogenetic model (ψc and ψn); these models are identical except for a scaling parameter (p (0 ≤ p ≤ 1), which is applied to the branch lengths of ψc and represents the average rate of substitution in conserved regions as a fraction of the average rate in nonconserved regions (see Methods). Two parameters, μ and ν (0 ≤ μ, ν ≤ 1), define all state-transition probabilities, as illustrated. The probability of visiting each state first (indicated by arcs from the node labeled “begin”) is simply set equal to the probability of that state at equilibrium (stationarity). The model can be thought of as a probabilistic machine that “generates” a multiple alignment, consisting of alternating sequences of conserved (dark gray) and nonconserved (light gray) alignment columns (see example at bottom).
Evolutionarily conserved elements

Figure 2. The assumed tree topologies for the vertebrate, insect, worm, and yeast data sets (top to bottom) and the branch lengths estimated for the conserved (left) and nonconserved (right) states of the phylo-HMM. The conserved and nonconserved phylogenies are identical, except for the scaling constant $\rho$, which was estimated at 0.33, 0.24, 0.36, and 0.32 (top to bottom). Horizontal lines indicate branch lengths and are drawn to scale, both within and between species groups. The estimated trees were unrooted; arbitrary roots were chosen for display purposes. Note that some distortions in the branch lengths occur due to alignment-related ascertainment biases (see text and Supplemental material).

Conserved elements in all three species groups, but still appear to contain substantial numbers of conserved bases. The fractions of introns and intergenic regions in conserved elements are similar, with introns showing slightly higher fractions in all groups but yeast (where they are few in number). In worms, our estimates of the fractions of coding regions, introns, and intergenic regions that are conserved are fairly similar to estimates based on an early comparative study of C. elegans and C. briggsae (Shabalina and Kondrashov 1999), while in insects, our estimates of these fractions for intronic and intergenic regions are roughly 1-1/2–2 × higher than estimates based on D. melanogaster/D. virilis comparisons (Bergman and Kreitman 2001). Note that the results for worm may be influenced by the difficulty of aligning noncoding regions in C. elegans and C. briggsae and by the limited phylogenetic information in pairwise alignments (see Discussion and Supplemental material).

Conversely, looking at how the predicted conserved elements are composed, we find that only about 28% of the bases predicted to be conserved in vertebrates fall in known or likely exons, including UTRs (Fig. 3). In vertebrates, 18.0% of conserved bases fall in known coding regions (CDRs), 1.1% and 3.6% fall in known 5' and 3' UTRs, respectively, and another 5.2% fall in other mRNAs. Another 2.4% fall in other transcribed regions, leaving about 70% unannotated. (The percentage in RNA genes and other known noncoding functional elements is negligible.) These numbers are in good agreement with both bulk statistical estimates, based on genome-wide human/mouse and human/mouse/rat alignments, of the share of the human genome that is under selection (Chiaromonte et al. 2003; Roskin et al. 2003; Cooper et al. 2004), and with an analysis of conserved elements in the region of the CFTR gene (Margulies et al. 2003; Thomas et al. 2003). Broadly speaking, if ~5% of the human genome is conserved, and if ~1.5% codes for proteins (and these are mostly conserved), then noncoding regions must account for about 0.035/0.05 = 70% of conserved elements. Margulies et al. (2003), using two different methods, found that 72% of bases in predicted conserved elements in the CFTR region were not in exons. Cooper et al. (2004) reported similar results based on whole-genome human/mouse/rat alignments.

Interestingly, a non-negligible fraction (3.7%) of the predicted conserved elements are found in ARs. Simulation experiments (see Supplemental material) and inspection of individual cases suggest that most of these conserved ARs are not likely to be false-positive predictions. While most bases in ARs have evolved neutrally (ARs are underrepresented fivefold in conserved elements), some have apparently taken on critical functions that may help to differentiate mammals from ancestral vertebrates (Britten 1997; Jordan et al. 2003; van de Lagaemaat et al. 2003).
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Many conserved ARs show relatively weak conservation, but some are more strongly conserved. For example, one highly con-

served element of more than 700 bp, in a gene desert between the

ezinc finger genes ZNF537 and ZNF507, contains a 351-bp L1MCa repeat. Three conserved elements in introns of the RNA-

processing gene SRRM2, ranging from 478 to 975 bp in length, contain L2 or L3b repeats.

Moving from vertebrates to insects and then to worms and
to yeasts, in decreasing order of genome size and general biological

complexity, a progressively larger fraction of conserved ele-

ments can be seen to fall in coding regions and UTRs, and a

progressively smaller fraction in introns and unannotated re-

gions (Fig. 3). In particular, the fraction of bases in predicted

conserved elements that fall in known or likely protein-coding

exons increases from 28% in vertebrates to 34% in insects, 59%
in worms, and 86% in yeasts, so that while most conserved bases

in vertebrates and insects apparently do not code for proteins,

most in worms and yeasts do. This trend can be seen as an ex-
pected consequence of increasing gene density (the more gene-
dense genomes have smaller fractions of noncoding bases), but it

nevertheless underscores the importance of noncoding regions

in the genomes of complex eukaryotes, whose complexity appar-

ently derives not so much from increased numbers of protein-
coding genes as from more elaborate mechanisms for gene regu-

lation. Note that the fraction of conserved elements in introns

and intergenic regions may be underestimated for the two-

species worm data set (see Discussion and Supplemental

material).

The lengths of the predicted elements for all four species

groups are approximately geometrically distributed, averaging

about 100–120 bp for the vertebrate, insect, and yeast groups and

about 270 bp for the less phylogenetically informative worm

group. In all groups, elements range in length from 5 bp to thou-

sands of basepairs. A more detailed analysis in vertebrates re-

vealed noticeable differences in the length distributions of the

elements associated with different types of annotations; ele-

ments in ARs are shortest, on average, those in introns and in-

tergenic regions are slightly longer, those in UTRs are longer still,

and those in CDSs are longest (Supplemental Fig. S3). Accord-

ingly, the composition of conserved elements is strongly depen-

dent on the length-dependent element scores (Supplemental Fig.

S3). In particular, the fractions of elements in coding regions,

UTRs, and other mRNAs tend to increase with score, while the

fraction in introns tend to decrease. The fraction in 3′ UTRs is

particularly large among the highest scoring elements, suggest-

ing some special role for highly conserved 3′ UTRs in vertebrates

(see below). The percentage of bases in ARs also decreases sharply

with element score. Additional details are given in the Supple-

mental material.

**Base-by-base conservation scores**

In addition to predictions of discrete conserved elements, phast-

Cons produces a continuous-valued “conservation score” for
each base of the reference genome. These scores are plotted along

the genome and displayed as part of a conservation track in the

version of the UCSC Genome Browser (Karolchik et al. 2003)
dedicated to the reference genome. Beneath the plot of conser-

vation scores, the conservation track also has an alignment dis-

play, which shows either a graphical summary of the pairwise

alignments between each genome and the reference genome, or

(at appropriate zoom levels) the actual bases of the multiple

alignment. Conservation tracks have been produced for all four

data sets discussed in this study and are displayed in the UCSC

Genome Browsers for the human, D. melanogaster, C. elegans, and

S. cerevisiae genomes (Fig. 4).

Like the predicted elements, the base-by-base conservation

scores are derived from the two-state phylo-HMM. The conser-

vation score at each base in the reference genome is defined as the

posterior probability that the corresponding alignment col-

umn was generated by the conserved state (rather than the non-

conserved state) of the phylo-HMM, given the model parameters

and the multiple alignment. (Thus, the scores range between 0

and 1.) The conservation scores can be interpreted as probabili-

ties that each base is in a conserved element, given the assump-

tions of the model and the maximum-likelihood parameter esti-

mates. The scores are also influenced by the values of two user-
defined tuning parameters (see Methods). The same parameter

estimates and user-defined parameters are used for both the con-

servation scores and the predicted elements.
Figure 4. Screen shots of the conservation tracks in the (A) human and (B) *S. cerevisiae* UCSC Genome Browsers. Each conservation track has two parts, a plot of conservation scores, and beneath it, a display showing where each of the other genomes aligns to the reference genome. (Darker shading indicates higher BLASTZ scores; white indicates no alignment.) A separate track labeled “PhastCons Conserved Elements” shows predicted conserved elements and log-odds scores. In A, exons 7–11 of the RNA-edited human gene *GRIA2* are shown. Peaks in the conservation plot generally correspond to exons and valleys to noncoding regions, but a 158-bp conserved noncoding element can be seen near the 3′ end of exon 11. This conserved element includes the editing complementary sequence (ECS) of the RNA editing site in exon 11. The displays seen when zooming in to the base level at a typical exon (left) and in the region of the RNA editing site (right; see arrow) are shown as insets. On the left, several synonymous substitutions are visible (highlighted bases) and the elevated conservation abruptly ends after the splice site, while on the right, there are fewer synonymous substitutions and the elevated conservation extends into the intron. In the base-level display, the vertical orange bars and numbers above them indicate “hidden” indels and their lengths—i.e., deletions in the human genome or insertions in other genomes. In B, the *S. cerevisiae* GAL1 gene and 5′-flanking region are shown. Strong cross-species conservation can be seen in the regulatory region upstream of the promoter, as well as in the protein-coding portion of the gene. The conserved element shown at bottom overlaps three GAL4-binding sites (highlighted in base-level view). A fourth GAL4-binding site also is reflected by a small bump in the conservation scores (left arrow), as is the promoter itself (right arrow).
The conservation tracks are useful devices for visualizing cross-species conservation along a genome, and are complementary to tracks in the browser describing known protein-coding and RNA genes, known regulatory regions, aligned mRNA and EST sequences, gene predictions, and so on. With appropriate parameter settings, many functional elements stand out clearly as "mesas" of cross-species conservation against a "plain" of neutral or nearly neutral evolution (Fig. 4). Sometimes the conservation track lends support to independent annotations such as gene predictions; in other cases, it highlights conserved sequences that are not supported by any existing annotations and helps to stimulate further investigation into possible functions of these sequences. Using the UCSC Table Browser (http://genome.ucsc.edu/cgi-bin/hgTables), it is possible to define regions of the genome having scores that exceed (or fall below) some threshold, and to conduct searches that intersect the conservation scores with other annotations (e.g., "find all intervals with conservation scores above 0.9 that do not overlap known genes"). The conservation track has been popular with users of the UCSC Genome Browser and the phastCons conservation scores are already in use in several other research projects (e.g., ENCODE Project Consortium 2004; Elnitski et al. 2005; Ovachenko et al. 2005b; King et al. 2005).

Highly conserved elements

The genome-wide sets of conserved elements predicted for each of the four species groups were ranked by log-odds score, and the top-scoring elements were extracted for further analysis. The top 5000 elements were selected from the vertebrate and insect sets, and the top 1000 were selected from the smaller worm and yeast sets. (The numbers of elements selected were essentially arbitrary—they were chosen to be small enough that only truly extreme cases of cross-species conservation would be included, but large enough to allow meaningful statistics to be obtained. The results discussed below are not highly sensitive to these numbers.)

These highly conserved elements (HCEs) are like ultraconserved elements (UCEs) (Bejerano et al. 2004b) in that they show extreme evolutionary conservation (defined by some arbitrary threshold), but HCEs tend to be longer than UCEs and tend to have less extreme sequence conservation, due to the length dependency of the log-odds scores. In addition, the set of vertebrate HCEs is about 10-fold larger than the set of UCEs and is based on a different set of species (including chicken and Fugu). HCEs are different from (and in some ways complementary to) UCEs; nevertheless, the vertebrate HCEs do include about 80% of the human/rodent UCEs identified by Bejerano et al. (2004b). (The 20% that are not included tend to be short, mean length 231 bp.)

The vertebrate HCEs cover 0.14% of the human genome. They are considerably longer on average than elements in the full set (lengths ranged from 318 to 4922 bp, with mean 781.4 bp) and they have a larger fraction of bases in CDS and UTR regions (Supplemental Fig. S3). At the base level, coding regions are enriched 22-fold for HCEs, while 3′ UTRs and 5′ UTRs are enriched 11-fold and eightfold, respectively. Nevertheless, only 42% of HCEs overlap known exons (36% overlap CDS exons, 9% overlap 5′ UTR exons, and 16% overlap 3′ UTR exons), with 19% falling completely in known introns, and another 32% completely in unannotated regions. The fraction of HCEs overlapping known exons is somewhat higher than the 23% observed for UCEs (Bejerano et al. 2004b), presumably because of the length dependency of the log-odds scores and the tolerance for a small number of substitutions.

The HCEs identified for the other three sets of genomes cover a higher percentage of each reference genome (2.5% in insect, 1.9% in worm, and 8.0% in yeast) and are much more likely to overlap coding regions (93% of HCEs in insect, 98% in worm, and 99% in yeast overlapped CDSs). As with the vertebrates, the HCEs for the other three species groups are quite long, with lengths ranging from 197 to 5783 bp (mean 627.9 bp) for the insects, 622 to 12646 bp (mean 1889.6 bp) for the worms, and 323 to 4005 bp (mean 973.5 bp) for the yeasts. The fractions of HCEs in insects overlapping UTRs are similar to those in vertebrates (6.1% and 15.5% overlap 5′ and 3′ UTRs, respectively), but in worm, these fractions are considerably lower (1.9% and 3.7%). (Sparse data on UTRs in yeasts did not allow for a comparison with this group.) In insect, worm, and yeast, only about 1%-5% of highly conserved elements fall completely in introns or intergenic regions. In general, highly conserved elements appear to become more strongly associated with genes as genome sizes become smaller and gene densities increase, consistent with the trend discussed above for the larger set of conserved elements (Fig. 3).

HCEs in the 3′ UTRs of vertebrate genes

As noted above, 3′ UTRs account for an unexpectedly large fraction of bases in vertebrate HCEs, and this trend becomes more pronounced as higher scoring subsets of all conserved elements are considered—3′ UTRs account for 9.6% of bases in the top 5000 elements, 12.5% in the top 1000, and 14.3% in the top 100, compared with 5.6% in all conserved elements (Supplemental Fig. S3). In contrast, 5′ UTRs are only slightly overrepresented in HCEs (1.5% of bases, compared with 1.1% in all conserved elements), and they are almost absent in the top 100 elements. Some of the most extreme conservation in vertebrate genomes is seen in the 3′ UTRs of DNA- and RNA-binding genes such as NOVA1, ELAVL4, ZFHX1B, BCL11A, and SYNCRIP, which, in turn, are regulators of other genes (Supplemental Table S3; Fig. 5), suggesting that regulation in 3′ UTRs plays a key role in critical regulatory networks. These findings are consistent with earlier reports of widespread conservation in 3′ UTRs (Duret et al. 1993; Lipman 1997), some of which have noted an enrichment for genes in DNA-binding proteins (Duret et al. 1993). It is likely that many conserved 3′-UTR sequences are involved in post-transcriptional regulatory mechanisms, e.g., by influencing subcellular localization, transcript stability, or translatability (Duret et al. 1993; Grzybowska et al. 2001; Mignone et al. 2002).

Post-transcriptional regulation by microRNA (miRNA) binding in 3′ UTRs is of particular interest, as it is believed that miRNAs may regulate the translation of a large fraction of eukaryotic genes (e.g., John et al. 2004; Krek et al. 2005; Lewis et al. 2005; Xie et al. 2005). Most genes known and predicted to be targeted by miRNAs—in D. melanogaster and C. elegans as well as human and mouse—show only moderate conservation in their 3′ UTRs, with short conserved elements alternating with non-conserved regions. There are exceptions, however, such as HOXB8, which is targeted by miR-196 in mouse and has a 1135-bp HCE in its 3′ UTR. MiR-196 is unusual among known animal miRNAs for its near-perfect complementarity to its HOXB8 target site and for inducing cleavage of the HOXB8 mRNA rather than inhibiting translation (Yekta et al. 2004). Human genes with predicted miRNA targets appear to be somewhat enriched for 3′-UTR HCEs;
examples include the genes for the eukaryotic translation initiation factor EIF4E, the methyl CpG-binding protein MECP, the DNA-binding proteins (and oncoproteins) MYC and MYCN, the homeobox protein NBPHOX, and the ubiquitin protein ligase UBE3A, which is mutated in Angelman syndrome (John et al. 2004). We also found several examples of D. melanogaster genes with predicted miRNA target sites and HCEs in their 3′ UTRs, such as the Hox cluster genes Abd-B, Antp, Scr, and Ubx (Enright et al. 2003). Correlations between HCEs and predicted miRNA target sites must be treated cautiously, because they may be artifacts of considering conservation in target-site prediction. Still, miRNA binding may provide at least a partial explanation for extreme conservation in some 3′ UTRs, e.g., because of multiple, possibly overlapping, target sites and/or requirements for near-perfect complementarity.

Three groups of known RNA-binding proteins and the mRNAs they bind provide further circumstantial evidence for a connection between HCEs in 3′ UTRs and post-transcriptional regulation, and moreover (if predictions of target sites are accurate), for a connection with miRNAs. John et al. (2004) found a substantial enrichment for predicted miRNA targets among the genes for the fragile X mental retardation protein FMR1, the ELAV-like proteins, and the polyadenylation-binding proteins (CPEBs), and among the genes whose mRNAs are known to be bound by these proteins, suggesting that miRNAs play a critical role in the regulatory networks in which these genes participate. Interestingly, the same genes are also highly enriched for HCEs in 3′ UTRs (Fig. 5). The FMR1 gene and its mRNA cargoes BASP1, CACNA1D, CIC, DDX5, HNRPA2B, and HTR1B, all contain both predicted miRNA target sites and HCEs in their 3′ UTRs, as do the genes ELAVL1, ELAVL2, and ELAVL4, the genes GAP-43, FOS, and MYC, whose mRNAs are bound by ELAV-like proteins, and all four known human CPEB genes. The PURA and PURB genes, which interact with FMR1 at the protein level, also have HCEs in their 3′ UTRs.

Another possible reason for highly conserved sequences in 3′ UTRs might be gene regulation via antisense transcription. (Here, we mean cis-acting rather than trans-acting antisense transcription—i.e., transcription of both DNA strands at the same locus.) For example, if long perfect RNA duplexes were essential for regulation, then sequence conservation might result from selection against allelic divergence (Lipman 1997). This possibility is of particular interest in light of the recent identification of a large number of apparent sense/antisense transcriptional units in eukaryotic genomes, many of which overlap in their 3′ UTRs (Shendure and Church 2002; Yelin et al. 2003) and in light of accumulating evidence for the importance of antisense transcription in various kinds of transcriptional and post-transcriptional regulation (Lavorgna et al. 2004; Dahary et al. 2005). However, we have not observed a strong correlation between antisense transcription and extreme conservation (HCEs) in 3′ UTRs, or for that matter, extreme conservation in 5′ UTRs or coding regions. Only a few of the 40 known sense/antisense pairs reviewed by Shendure and Church (2002) contain HCEs coinciding with regions of sense/antisense overlap. (A striking example is the nuclear receptor NR1D1, whose 3′ UTR overlaps the 3′-most exon of the thyroid hormone receptor THRA, as well as a 1651-bp HCE and an ultraconserved element). Most sense/antisense pairs show only moderate conservation.

**Secondary structure in noncoding HCEs**

Because several known mechanisms for post-transcriptional regulation involve stem-loop (and other) structures in UTRs (Ross 1996; Mignone et al. 2002), strong conservation in UTRs may occur partly as a result of structural constraints. We tested HCEs in UTRs for statistical evidence of secondary structure using a model analogous to a phylo-HMM, but with a stochastic context-free grammar (SCFG) in place of a hidden Markov model. SCFGs are richer computational models than HMMs, which can accommodate the long distance base pairing that occurs in RNA structures (Durbin et al. 1998). Compared with an ordinary SCFG, a “phylo-SCFG” gains additional power for detecting secondary structure by picking up on the tendency for compensatory substitutions in stem-pairing sites (Knudsen and Hein 1999; Pedersen et al. 2004) (see also Rivas and Eddy 2001). We evaluated the HCEs in UTRs using a “folding potential score” (FPS), a log-odds score derived from two phylo-SCFGs—one allowing for both
Figure 6. Histograms of folding potential scores (FPSs) for (A) highly conserved elements (HCEs) in 3′ UTRs vs. a random sample of 3′ UTRs without HCEs, (B) HCEs in 3′ UTRs vs. HCEs in 5′ UTRs, and (C) HCEs in introns vs. HCEs in coding regions (vertebrate data in all cases). Scores are based on a phylogenetic stochastic context-free grammar, and represent the potential for local secondary structure in a sliding window of 150 bp (see Methods). In all three cases, the difference between the distributions is highly statistically significant ($P = 8.8 \times 10^{-66}$, $P = 1.1 \times 10^{-8}$, and $P = 4.4 \times 10^{-215}$, respectively; Wilcoxon rank sum test).
There are several known cases of RNA-edited ion channel genes involved in neurotransmission, and both editing sites and complementary sequences are known to be highly conserved (Aruscavage and Bass 2000; Hoopengardner et al. 2003). Indeed, the RNA-editing site in GRIA2, shown in Figure 4, corresponds to an HCE, as do the editing sites in the related genes GRIA3 and GRIA4. A recently identified RNA-editing site in KCNA1 (Hoopengardner et al. 2003) also corresponds to an HCE, one of the top 100 by log-odds score. Other categories, such as “ubiquitin cycle,” “RNA binding,” “miRNA metabolism,” and “miRNA processing” are particularly strongly enriched in genes overlapped by HCEs in 3′ UTRs, suggesting that many of these HCEs may have functional roles in post-transcriptional regulation. The known human genes overlapped by HCEs include many well-studied disease genes (Supplemental Table S3).

In insects, worms, and yeasts, genes overlapped by HCEs in coding regions are enriched for some of the same GO categories as in vertebrates, but there are also substantial differences across species groups (Supplemental Table S4). The insects show the greatest similarity to the vertebrates, with enrichment for several trans-dev categories, as well as for categories such as “protein binding,” “cell-cell signaling,” “scaffolding,” and “voltage-gated ion channel activity.” The apparent connection with RNA editing occurs also in insects; the RNA-edited potassium channel genes shaker, ether-a-go-go, and slowpoke (Hoopengardner et al. 2003) each overlap four or more HCEs (see related observations by Glazov et al. 2005). Some new categories also appear in insects, such as “metamorphosis” and “oogenesis.” The worm and yeast sets are generally quite different from the vertebrate and insect sets, although overlap does occur in several categories, including “RNA binding,” “ion transport,” and “chromatin assembly or disassembly.” Categories unique to worm and yeast are among the most strongly enriched for each species group: “structural constituent of cuticle” in worm and “structural constituent of ribosome” in yeast. The enrichment for cuticle (primarily collagen) genes is intriguing, as these genes seem to require the same kind of precise regulation required by many development genes—the nematode cuticle is synthesized multiple times in different forms during the nematode life cycle, in a complex process involving the differential expression of more than 150 individual collagen genes (Johnstone 2000).

As in vertebrates, the insect genes overlapped by HCEs in 3′ and 5′ UTRs are enriched for several trans-dev categories. Insect genes overlapped in 3′ UTRs, however, are not enriched for the “ubiquitin cycle,” “RNA binding,” “miRNA metabolism,” and “miRNA processing” categories, which are strongly enriched in their vertebrate counterparts, and are enriched for new categories such as “structural constituent of ribosome,” “cell-cell signaling,” and “scaffolding.” We did see an association in insects, as in vertebrates, between 3′-UTR HCEs and certain known post-transcriptional regulatory networks. For example, the insect orthologs of the vertebrate FMRI, ELAV-like, and CPEB genes all have HCEs overlapping their 3′ UTRs. Due to sparse data, a comparison across all species groups was not possible with the genes overlapped by HCEs in UTRs and introns.

The general conclusions of this section remain unchanged if the number of conserved elements considered is altered by a factor of two—e.g., if the top-scoring 500 or 2000 worm elements are analyzed instead of the top-scoring 1000.

### Vertebrate HCEs and segments rich in conserved noncoding sequence

Based on human/chicken comparisons, the “conserved noncoding fraction” (CNF) of the human genome (fraction of nonrepetitive noncoding sequence that aligns to chicken) in regions on the order of a megabase in size has been observed to vary considerably across the genome. Segments of particularly high CNF tend to be gene-poor and G+C-poor. In addition, these high-CNFF segments contain 60% of human/chicken ultraconserved elements.
while themselves occupying only 2.3% of the human genome, and the genes overlapping them are significantly enriched for particular (mostly trans-dev) GO categories (International Chicken Genome Sequencing Consortium 2004).

We defined an alternative set of (vertebrate) high-CNF segments (“phastCons high-CNF segments,” as opposed to “human/chicken high-CNF segments”) as maximal intervals of at least 250 kb having CNF$_{pc}$ of at least 10%, where CNF$_{pc}$ is the fraction of noncoding bases that fall in the complete set of conserved elements predicted by phastCons (genome-wide average: 3.4%); repetitive regions are included here). There are 101 phastCons high-CNF segments covering 2.1% of the human genome and averaging 601 kb in length and 13.8% CNF$_{pc}$. Unlike human/chicken high-CNF segments, these segments are not significantly depleted for genes, but like human/chicken high-CNF segments, they show a significant enrichment for trans-dev genes. Certain phastCons high-CNF segments with below-average human/chicken noncoding conservation appear to contain significant mammal-specific conservation (see Supplemental material).

Even if redefined such that the HCEs are excluded when computing the CNF$_{pc}$, the phastCons high-CNF segments overlap 13% of all HCEs and 18% of intronic/intergenic HCEs—enrichments of eightfold and 13-fold, respectively. Thus, there appears to be a strong correlation between moderate conservation in megabase-sized regions and extreme conservation in smaller regions of hundreds or thousands of bases. These independently defined phastCons high-CNF segments also include 23% of human/rodent ultraconserved elements, a 15-fold enrichment.

**HCEs and gene deserts**

We also examined the question of whether vertebrate HCEs are associated with unusually large intergenic regions in the human genome (“gene deserts”), using 545 such regions recently analyzed by Ovcharenko et al. (2005b). These gene deserts have a minimum length of 640 kb and cover 25% of the human genome; they tend to have low G+C content, high single nucleotide polymorphism (SNP) rates, and decreased fractions of bases conserved between human, chicken, and mouse. On the basis of human/chicken conservation, Ovcharenko et al. (2005b) divided them into “stable” deserts (higher conservation) and “variable” deserts (lower conservation), and found several differences between these two classes that are not direct consequences of conservation level—e.g., flanking genes of stable deserts were primarily enriched for trans-dev GO categories, while different categories were associated with variable deserts. Human/chicken synteny breaks are almost completely absent in stable deserts, suggesting that these regions may harbor cis-regulatory elements whose order, orientation, and position with respect to flanking genes are maintained by purifying selection (consistent with recent experimental results—Nobrega et al. 2003; Kimura-Yoshida et al. 2004; Uchikawa et al. 2004) (but, see also Nobrega et al. 2004).

Stable gene deserts account for only 12% of bases in intergenic regions, yet 53% of the 1578 intergenic HCEs fall within or overlap stable deserts, 4.5 times the expected number. In contrast, variable gene deserts account for 30% of bases in intergenic regions and only 2.2% of intergenic HCEs fall within or overlap variable deserts. Conversely, 75% of stable deserts include or are overlapped by at least one HCE, while this is true for only 15% of variable deserts. Thus, HCEs are substantially enriched in stable gene deserts and depleted in variable gene deserts, and most stable deserts have HCEs, while most variable deserts do not. These results lend additional support to the claim that stable and variable gene deserts are fundamentally different, and further suggest that many intergenic HCEs may be distal cis-regulatory elements, particularly of trans-dev genes. See related findings by Woolfe et al. (2005).

The largest human/chicken high-CNF segment, a 3.5-Mb region of human chromosome 2, spans the ARHGAP15, GTDC1, and ZFHX1B genes and about two-thirds of a 3.3-Mb gene desert on one side of ZFHX1B (International Chicken Genome Sequencing Consortium 2004; Hillier et al. 2005). Both ZFHX1B, which encodes a zinc finger/homeodomain transcription factor mutated in Hirschsprung disease syndrome (Supplemental Table S3), and ARHGAP15 have numerous HCEs overlapping coding regions, introns, and UTRs (23 in ZFHX1B, ranging from 351 to 2476 bp, and 22 in ARHGAP15, ranging from 500 to 1316 bp). The 2.1-Mb portion of this high-CNF segment falling in the gene desert contains 38 HCEs covering 1.3% of its bases—more than nine times the genome-wide average. This region vividly illustrates the associations among high-CNF segments, gene deserts, trans-dev genes, and highly conserved elements. The gene deserts flanking the developmental genes DACH1, OTX2, and SOX2, all of which have been shown experimentally to harbor distal enhancers (Nobrega et al. 2003; Kimura-Yoshida et al. 2004; Uchikawa et al. 2004), are also rich in HCEs.

**Discussion**

We have conducted genome-wide searches for conserved elements in four groups of eukaryotic species, using a new method for identifying conserved elements that considers the phylogeny of each species group, makes use of continuous-time Markov models of nucleotide substitution, and allows key parameters to be estimated by maximum likelihood. To our knowledge, this is the first genome-wide survey and comparison of conserved elements in different groups of eukaryotic species (excluding comparisons primarily of proteomes; e.g., Rubin et al. 2000). Our results generally support previous estimates of the fraction of the human genome under selection and the fraction of conserved human bases that fall in noncoding regions, and they allow for an approximate quantitative comparison of these fractions across species groups. In addition, we have identified highly conserved elements (HCEs), similar in some ways to ultraconserved elements, but on average, longer and less perfectly conserved, in all four species groups. Several interesting properties of these HCEs have been noted, including an association in vertebrates and insects with 3’ UTRs, particularly of genes for DNA- and RNA-binding proteins, an enrichment in vertebrates and insects for statistical evidence of RNA secondary structure, and associations in vertebrates with high-CNF segments and stable gene deserts.

As with ultraconserved elements, the reasons for the extreme conservation observed in most vertebrate HCEs remain unknown, but statistical enrichments and individual cases suggest that at least some of these sequences function as cis-regulatory binding sites, as RNA genes, in mRNA secondary structures important for RNA editing or post-transcriptional regulation, or as microRNA targets. Similar evidence was found for insect HCEs. The lengths of the conserved sequences, however, remain puzzling. What could explain such sustained conservation, spanning hundreds or thousands of bases? This kind of conservation is not seen ordinarily with sequences of any known
functionality. If the existence of multiple, overlapping constraints (e.g., overlapping binding sites, binding sites overlapping with RNA structural or protein-coding constraints, or overlapping protein-coding and RNA structural constraints (as in RNA editing sites within coding regions)). A related possibility is that these sequences are "hubs" of regulatory networks, because of their interactions with many other RNAs or proteins (each interaction possibly involving a slightly different subset of bases), have become evolutionarily "frozen." The presence of 3’-UTR HCEs in the FMRF1, CPEB, and ELAV-like genes, as well as in related genes, seems to support this hypothesis. Still, it is possible that some HCEs have single, as-yet-undiscovered functions, which are capable of producing such extreme conservation individually. We also cannot rule out the possibility that their conservation has a mutational, rather than a selectional explanation—that is, that somehow these sequences have been shielded from mutations and/or subjected to constraints. Space has not allowed for a detailed discussion of another phenomenon known to be associated with unusual levels of cross-species conservation: that of alternative splicing (e.g., Sorek and Ast 2003; Bejerano et al. 2004b; Rahman et al. 2004; Sugnet et al. 2004). Alternative splicing might (as noted by a reviewer of this paper) provide some useful clues about how unusual noncoding conservation arises. For example, sequences flanking (and within) alternatively spliced exons—which are believed to mediate splicing by weakly binding various interacting proteins (e.g., Black 2003)—may tend to be conserved because they have been fine tuned by evolution to promote splicing in certain tissue types or development stages, but not in others. In addition, the same sequence may bind more than one factor, or may have roles both in protein binding and in determining secondary structure, and thus, may provide another example of conservation due to multiple, overlapping constraints. It is worth noting that an association between HCEs and alternative splicing might explain some of the functional enrichments we have observed, since alternative splicing is known to affect some classes of genes (including development genes and ion channel genes) more than others. However, we have not found an enrichment for HCEs in a set of about 5000 alternatively retained cassette exons (Sugnet et al. 2004), as compared with a background set of exons. On the other hand, the flanking intronic regions of these exons do show a 1.5 to twofold enrichment for conserved elements (including non-HCEs). These elements tend to be short, e.g., compared with those in 3’ UTRs, and may fail to be identified as HCEs simply for this reason. The relationship between alternative splicing and cross-species conservation is explored further in a forthcoming study by C. Sugnet, K. Srinivasan, T.A. Clark, G. O’Brien, M. Cline, A. Williams, D. Kulp, J. Blume, D. Haussler, and M. Ares, (in prep.).

Clearly, our comparison of conserved elements across species groups is dependent on the procedure used to calibrate the model. Our approach of holding fixed the coverage of coding regions by predicted conserved elements assumes that coding regions evolve in fundamentally similar ways across species groups (more similar than noncoding regions), and that the fraction of sites in coding regions that are conserved is not highly sensitive to the phylogeny. This approach has some obvious deficiencies. First, there undoubtedly are differences between groups in how coding regions evolve, potentially making a fixed threshold effectivley more or less stringent in certain groups than in others. Some possible reasons for such differences include differences in effective population size, in the strength and type of evolutionary force.
creased somewhat, but did not change dramatically; the general properties of conserved elements and HCEs were essentially unchanged.

The phylo-HMM used by phastCons is a fairly rich probabilistic model, but it is clearly not realistic in several respects. The assumptions that all sites evolve at one of two evolutionary rates (conserved and nonconserved), that these rates are uniform across the genome, that sites evolve independently conditional on whether they are in conserved or nonconserved regions, and that the phylogenetic models for conserved and nonconserved regions have the same branch-length proportions, base compositions, and substitution patterns, all represent oversimplifications of the complex process of sequence evolution in eukaryotic genomes (e.g., Hardison et al. 2003; Hwang and Green 2004; Siepel and Haussler 2004). In addition, treating alignment gaps as missing data ignores an important source of phylogenetic information. We have experimented with versions of phastCons that address various of these deficiencies, e.g., by introducing states for additional evolutionary rates (Yang 1995; Felsenstein and Churchill 1996), allowing the phylogenetic models to have different branch-length proportions or substitution patterns, or using substitution models that consider context dependencies in substitution rates (Siepel and Haussler 2004). In general, the more parameter-rich and complex versions increase the computational burden of parameter estimation and prediction without producing an appreciable improvement in the quality of the program's output. More complex parameterizations also increase the danger of converging on biologically uninteresting local maxima of the likelihood function. Thus, we have settled on the relatively simple model described here for its efficiency, interpretability, and apparent effectiveness at discriminating between conserved and nonconserved sequences. Still, some additional complexity in the model may turn out to be warranted. Possible extensions include better handling of indels (alignment gaps), allowing for lineage-specific conserved elements, and detecting elements with other types of evolutionary signatures, such as those under positive selection.

Finally, it is important to note that our entire analysis is conditional on whole-genome alignments produced by the MULTIZ program. This program shows good accuracy in simulation experiments (Blanchette et al. 2004), and our synteny filters help to ensure that only orthologous conserved elements are considered, but whole-genome alignment is a difficult problem, and programs that address it are still in their infancy. Some conserved elements are undoubtedly missed because of alignment failures, and even with synteny filtering, other predicted elements are probably spurious in that they are based on alignments of nonorthologous sequence. Furthermore, misplacements of alignment gaps may cause regions to appear more or less conserved than they really are. It will be important to recompute predictions of conserved elements continually as multiple aligners improve.

A survey of conserved elements is of interest in its own right, by helping to shed light on the evolutionary forces that have shaped eukaryotic genomes, but it is only a first step toward exhaustively characterizing the diverse functional elements in these genomes. Much work needs to be done to establish which conserved elements are functional and to work out what their functions are (ENCODE Project Consortium 2004). We hope that genome-wide predictions of conserved elements and visualization devices such as the conservation track in the UCSC Genome Browser will be helpful resources toward this end.

Methods

Sequence data and multiple alignments

The most recent assemblies displayed in the UCSC Genome Browser as of Dec. 1, 2004 were used for the human, mouse, rat, chicken, D. melanogaster, D. yakuba, D. pseudoobscura, A. gambiae, C. elegans, C. briggsae, and S. cerevisiae genomes. Contigs for S. castelli, S. kluveri, and S. kudriavzevi were obtained from http://www.genetics.wustl.edu/saccharomycesgenomes/Contigs and contigs for S. mikatae, S. bayanus, and S. paradoxus were obtained from http://www.broad.mit.edu/ftp/pub/annotation/fungi/comp_yeasts. Additional details are given in Supplemental Table S1.

Multiple alignments for each species group were prepared using version 10 of the MULTIZ program. MULTIZ builds a multiple alignment from local pairwise alignments of a designated reference genome with each other genome of interest (Blanchette et al. 2004). Pairwise alignments were obtained by using BLASTZ (Schwartz et al. 2003), then were passed through the alignment "chaining" and "netting" pipeline described by Kent et al. (2003), which ensures that each base of the reference genome is aligned to at most one base in each other genome, with the selection procedure being guided by considerations of synteny.

The multiple alignments consisted of blocks of local alignment covering 40.0% of the human genome, 86.9% of D. melanogaster, 43.8% of C. elegans, and 96.6% of S. cerevisiae (Supplemental Table S2). The alignment coverage in known coding regions was considerably higher than the overall coverage (95.4% for human, 99.5% for D. melanogaster, 80.6% for C. elegans, and 99.5% for S. cerevisiae).

Annotations

Annotations for only the reference genome of each species group were considered. The sets of known human coding regions, 5' and 3' UTRs and introns were based on the UCSC “Known Genes” track as of 11/17/2004 and the set of “other mRNAs” was based on the “human mRNAs” and “human spliced ESTs” tracks as of the same date. The “other trans” set was based on data from Phase 2 of the Affymetrix/NCI Human Transcriptome project (Cheng et al. 2005). The transcriptional fragments for the SK-N-AS cell line only were used; coverage may increase when additional cell lines become available. Results were extrapolated from chromosomes 6, 7, 13, 14, 19, 20, 21, 22, X, and Y to the entire genome. Ancestral repeats (ARs) were defined as sequences in the human genome annotated by RepeatMasker (http://ftp.genome.washington.edu/cgi-bin/RepeatMasker) as belonging to any of a large number of repeat families previously identified as having been active prior to the eutherian radiation (Mouse Genome Sequencing Consortium 2002; Hardison et al. 2003). Putative RNA genes were identified by extracting 451 human entries from the hand-curated “seed” portion of Rfam (Griffiths-Jones et al. 2003) and mapping them to the genome using BLAT (Kent 2002). Only exact matches were retained, but many of these genes are short and some tend to match repeats, so some false matches are undoubtedly included in this set. (The 451 sequences mapped perfectly to 561 positions in the genome.)

All base-level coverage statistics were computed in the coordinate system of the reference genome using the featureBits program (http://www.soe.ucsc.edu/~kent/src/unzipped/hg/featureBits). The CDS, 5' UTR, 3' UTR, other mRNA, other transcribed, and intron sets were kept disjoint by giving priority to annotation classes in the order listed; e.g., if a base was annotated as both CDS and 5' UTR, then it was counted as belonging to the CDS class. Statistics describing overlapping features (e.g., the
fraction of exons overlapped by conserved elements) were based on a version of the annotations containing only unique, nonoverlapping instances of each feature type (e.g., only one of several CDS exons associated with different isoforms of the same gene). The longest member of each set of overlapping features was selected.

Similar procedures were used with the other species groups. For *D. melanogaster*, known protein-coding genes from FlyBase were used (release 3.2 annotations) (FlyBase Consortium 2003), and for *S. cerevisiae*, known genes from the Saccharomyces Genome Database (SGD) (Christie et al. 2004) were used. (ORFs classified in SGD as “verified” and “uncharacterized” were included and those classified as “dubious” were excluded.) For *C. elegans*, known protein-coding genes from WormBase (Harris et al. 2004) and RefSeq (Pruitt et al. 2003) were combined, in order to maximize data on UTRs.

**PhastCons**

PhastCons is based on a two-state phylogenetic hidden Markov model (phylo-HMM), with a state for conserved regions and a state for nonconserved regions (Fig. 1). Phylo-HMMs are hidden Markov models whose states are associated with probability distributions over alignment columns, as defined by phylogenetic models (Yang 1995; Felsenstein and Churchill 1996; Siepel and Haussler 2005). In the model used by phastCons, the phylogenetic models associated with the two states are identical except for a scaling parameter \( \rho \) (0 \( \leq \rho \leq 1 \)), which is applied to the branch lengths of the conserved phylogeny and represents the average rate of substitution in conserved regions as a fraction of the average rate in nonconserved regions. The model is defined more precisely in the Supplemental material.

The free parameters of the model were estimated from a multiple alignment by maximum likelihood, using an expectation maximization (EM) algorithm. The algorithm alternates between an expectation (E) step and a maximization (M) step until convergence. The E step involves computing posterior expected counts of the number of times each distinct alignment column is “emitted” by each state of the HMM, and posterior expected counts of the number of times each possible state transition occurs. The M step involves updating the parameters of the model to maximize a quantity called the expected complete log likelihood, which is based on the posterior expected counts. This is a completely “unsupervised” learning procedure—i.e., the parameters of the model and a separation between “conserved” and “nonconserved” sequences are learned directly from the data, without relying on annotations of known conserved elements. Details are given in the Supplemental material.

For practical reasons, exact maximum likelihood estimates (m.l.e.’s) of free parameters were not obtained for entire genome-wide data sets, but instead, the genome-wide alignments were divided into fragments of, at most, about 1 Mb in length (in the coordinate system of the reference genome), and parameters were estimated separately for each fragment. (Wherever possible, the “cuts” between fragments were made in regions of no cross-species alignment, e.g., in transposon insertions in the reference genome.) These separately estimated parameters were then averaged to obtain a single approximate m.l.e. for each genome-wide data set. Fragments with sparse data (<1000 sites aligned) were excluded from this procedure, but the amount of data discarded in this way was negligible, and the average parameter estimates can reasonably be said to represent the entire genome-wide data sets. The individual parameter estimates were fairly consistent and their averages should be close to true genome-wide m.l.e.’s (see Supplemental material).

Using these average parameter estimates, conserved elements were then predicted, and conservation scores were generated for each alignment fragment in a second genome-wide pass. Conserved elements were predicted using the Viterbi algorithm (Durbin et al. 1998). Conservation scores—posterior probabilities that each site was generated by the conserved state—were computed using the forward/backward algorithm (Durbin et al. 1998). Each predicted conserved element was assigned a log-odds score, indicating how much more likely it is under the conserved phylogenetic model than under the nonconserved model (see Supplemental material).

For purposes of both parameter estimation and prediction, missing data in the alignments (e.g., from large-scale insertions and deletions, assembly gaps, or extreme sequence divergence) and smaller scale alignment gaps (from micro-indels) were handled by marginalizing over missing bases when computing emission probabilities. Predicted vertebrate elements were discarded if they did not fall on the syntenic net between human and mouse (Kent et al. 2003), and predicted insect elements were discarded if they did not fall on either the *D. melanogaster/D. yakuba* syntenic net or the *D. melanogaster/D. pseudoobscura* syntenic net. See the Supplemental material for additional details.

**Constraints on coverage and smoothness**

The parameters of the model were estimated by maximum likelihood subject to two constraints: a coverage constraint, determining how much of the target genome is predicted to be conserved and a smoothness constraint, determining how similar the conservation scores are from one site to the next and how fragmented the conserved elements are. As noted above, the coverage constraint was that some target fraction of the bases in known coding regions must be covered by predicted conserved elements, after adjusting for alignment coverage in coding regions. A target of 65% was used for the main analysis, but we also experimented with targets of 55% and 75% (see Supplemental material). The smoothness constraint was that a quantity called the phylogenetic information threshold (PIT) must be the same for all species groups. This constraint was designed to ensure that predicted conserved elements were supported by similar (minimal) amounts of phylogenetic evidence, taking into consideration differences in phylogenetic information per site.

Briefly, let \( L_{\text{min}} \) be the expected minimum length of a sequence of conserved sites (in the midst of a stretch of nonconserved sites) required for a conserved element to be predicted. Assuming conserved and nonconserved sites are drawn independently from the distributions associated with \( \psi \) and \( \psi_{\text{nr}} \) respectively, \( L_{\text{min}} \) is given by:

\[
L_{\text{min}} = \log \frac{\log \left( \frac{v + \log \mu - \log(1 - v) - \log(1 - \mu)}{\log(1 - v) - \log(1 - \mu)} \right)}{H(\psi_{\text{nr}})} - H(\psi, \psi_{\text{nr}})
\]

where \( H(\psi_{\text{nr}}) \) is the relative entropy of the distribution associated with \( \psi_{\text{nr}} \) with respect to the distribution associated with \( \psi \). The PIT is defined as the product of \( L_{\text{min}} \) and the relative entropy \( H(\psi_{\text{nr}}) \); it can be interpreted as the expected minimum amount of phylogenetic information required to predict a conserved element. The PIT was constrained to be equal to 9.8 bits for all data sets. More details are given in the Supplemental material.

These constraints were met by iteratively adjusting two tuning parameters as follows: \( \gamma \), defined as the expected coverage by conserved elements, and \( \omega \), defined as the expected length of a
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