

The evolution of complex gene regulation by low specificity binding sites

Alexander J. Stewart¹, Joshua B. Plotkin^{1,2}

¹ Department of Biology, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA 19104, USA

² E-mail: jplotkin@sas.upenn.edu

Abstract

Transcription factor binding sites vary in their specificity, both within and between species. Binding specificity has a strong impact on the evolution of gene expression, because it determines how easily regulatory interactions are gained and lost. Nevertheless, we have a relatively poor understanding of what evolutionary forces determine the specificity of binding sites. Here we address this question by studying regulatory modules composed of multiple binding sites. Using a population-genetic model, we show that more complex regulatory modules, composed of a greater number of binding sites, must employ binding sites that are individually less specific, compared to less complex regulatory modules. This effect is extremely general, and it holds regardless of the regulatory logic of a module. We attribute this phenomenon to the inability of stabilising selection to maintain highly specific sites in large regulatory modules. Our analysis helps to explain broad empirical trends in the yeast regulatory network: those genes with a greater number of transcriptional regulators feature by less specific binding sites, and there is less variance in their specificity, compared to genes with fewer regulators. Likewise, our results also help to explain the well-known trend towards lower specificity in the transcription factor binding sites of higher eukaryotes, which perform complex regulatory tasks, compared to prokaryotes.

Introduction

Transcriptional regulators integrate signals from genes and the environment to ensure that the correct patterns of gene expression are maintained in the cell [1–7]. This can be a complicated task, particularly in higher eukaryotes where processes such as cell differentiation and complex inter-cellular signalling occur [1,4]. Generally, the more complex a signal integration task, the more complex the pattern of gene regulation required, and on the face of it we might expect more complex gene regulation to be carried out by binding sites of higher specificity – just as we might expect a very complicated machine to use high precision components. In this paper we show that, in fact, the opposite is true: natural selection favors less specific binding sites in more complex regulatory modules.

We use an established biophysical model of transcription factor binding to describe regulatory modules consisting of multiple transcription factor binding sites with a range of specificities. For selection of a given strength on gene expression we determine the average information of binding sites that participate in a module of a given size, across all possible regulatory logics. Our analysis predicts a strong, negative relationship between the information content of the binding sites maintained in a module, and the size of the module. Thus, we predict more complex regulation by less specific binding sites.

This simple but counter-intuitive result helps to explain two broad empirical patterns in the transcription networks within and between species. Firstly, regulatory complexity in eukaryotes is greater than in prokaryotes [8,9], and this difference is accompanied by a tendency towards less informative binding sites for eukaryotic transcription factors [10,11]. Secondly, within the yeast transcription network, we

observe that those genes whose expression is more variable across environmental conditions, and therefore require more complex integration of environmental signals, tend to have a greater number of transcription factor binding sites each with lower specificity, compared to genes whose expression is less variable across environmental conditions. This second empirical observation was previously made in a study by Bilu and Barkai [12]. Bilu and Barkai suggested their observed might be explained either by weaker selection on the expression of genes with highly variable expression, or by a tendency for multiple co-regulating binding sites to experience compensatory mutations. However we will show that no assumptions about the strength of selection on gene expression, or about the epistatic effects of mutations among binding sites, are necessary to explain these empirical patterns. Rather, it is necessary only to consider the impact of stabilizing selection on the information content of binding sites maintained in a regulatory module to explain the observed trends. Our results are quite general and so they can account for the broad empirical phenomenon that complex regulation tends to be carried out by low-specificity transcription factor binding sites.

Our paper is structured as follows: We begin by describing a standard biophysical model for transcription factor binding, which we use to construct fitness landscapes for regulatory modules consisting of multiple binding sites that are selected to execute a given regulatory logic. We analyse the evolution of these modules in the limit of weak mutation, and we determine whether, at equilibrium under stabilizing selection, the binding sites that belong to the module are likely to be functional or non-functional (i.e., whether they are likely to be bound by their respective transcription factors, or not). We determine how the information content of the transcription factors that belong to a module varies with the module size, for fixed selection strength and population size. To begin with, we focus on modules consisting of a single pair of transcription factors, since this case can be understood analytically. We then employ evolutionary simulations to explore larger modules. Our simulations exhaustively explore the possible regulatory logics for modules of a given size, and for any given module they explore a wide range of combinations of binding-site information content. Finally we consider the impact of variation in the co-expression patterns of transcription factor proteins on the ability of selection to maintain their binding sites in a regulatory module. We compare the results of our analysis to empirical data from the yeast transcription network, focusing on the information content of binding sites within regulatory modules.

Model and Results

Biophysical model of transcription factor binding

We use a long-established biophysical model of transcription factor binding [13–17], which treats a binding site as a sequence of n consecutive nucleotides for which there is an associated consensus sequence (or set of sequences) that results in a minimum binding energy. Any given realization of n consecutive bases can be characterized by its number of “mismatches”, i.e. the number of nucleotide positions at which it differs from the consensus sequence. In the standard model, each such mismatch increases the binding energy of the sequence, compared to the consensus sequence, by an amount ϵ . The increase in energy per-mismatch has been empirically measured to fall within the range 1 and $3 k_B T$ [10, 18]. The probability π_i that any given n nucleotide sequence is bound by a transcription factor is determined by the number of mismatches, i , the binding energy per-mismatch, ϵ , and the number of free transcription factor proteins in the cell, P , according to the equation:

$$\pi_i = \frac{P}{P + \exp[\epsilon i]}. \quad (1)$$

We describe the consensus sequence of a binding site by assuming that each of the n nucleotide positions can be treated as having a degeneracy, r , which quantifies the (average) number of different bases that can appear at each position and still result in minimum binding energy. Thus, if $r = 1$, minimum binding

energy is achieved only if each of the n nucleotides adopts a single specific base. If $r = 2$, minimum binding energy can be achieved if each of the n nucleotides adopts one of two bases, and so on. The average degeneracy for a given transcription factor can be calculated from the position-specific weight matrix (PSWM) of its binding site [11].

Increasing the average degeneracy r of a consensus sequence increases its “fuzziness”, and therefore lowers the specificity of the site, since a greater number of different nucleotide sequences result in minimum binding energy. Similarly reducing the length of the consensus sequence, n , also decreases its specificity, since fewer nucleotides need to be matched to a specific base to produce a sequence with minimum binding energy. In order to compare the specificities of different binding sites with different lengths and average degeneracies, we follow the approach used in earlier studies and measure the information content, I , of a PSWM [19, 20], which is given by $I = n \log_2 \left[\frac{4}{r} \right]$.

Mutation and selection in the weak mutation limit

We use the probability of binding, π_i to construct the fitness landscape of a regulatory module. As in previous studies [17], we assume that fitness is a linear function of the probability that a binding site under selection is in fact bound. Thus, for a single binding site with i mismatched nucleotides, the fitness w_i is given by $w_i = 1 - s(1 - \pi_i)$. (We later generalize this to modules composed of multiple binding sites). In the case of a single binding site, when $\pi_i = 1$ the site is always bound producing fitness $w_i = 1$. The parameter s quantifies the reduction in fitness that occurs when the binding site is unbound, so that if $\pi_i = 0$, and the site is always unbound, we assign fitness $w_i = 1 - s$.

Following the approach used in previous studies, we carry out our analysis of binding site evolution at a single target gene in the limit of weak mutation [21–23]. This regime is realistic because the per-nucleotide mutation rate in both prokaryotes and eukaryotes is low, $\mu \sim O(10^{-8})$, binding sites are typically short, $n \sim O(10)$, and selection on conserved binding sites is sufficiently strong, with $Ns \sim O(10)$, where N is the population size. In the weak-mutation limit, evolution occurs through a series of selective sweeps, with new mutations arising only after earlier mutations have either fixed or gone extinct. We can calculate the equilibrium distribution F_i of binding sites with i mismatched nucleotides (see SI). We find that when there is no selection, $s = 0$, then F_i is just a binomial distribution whose mean is determined by the rates of mutations that increase or decrease i . However, when selection is present, i.e. $s > 0$, the equilibrium distribution F_i is bimodal, with one peak occurring at values of i for which $\pi_i \sim 1$ and a second peak occurring at the neutral equilibrium, $i = n \left(1 - \frac{r}{4}\right)$ (Fig. 1a).

A definition of functional binding

The bimodal form for the equilibrium distribution of mis-matches is important because it provides a natural way to separate binding sites into “functional” and “non-functional”, and thus to simplify the analysis of modules with multiple binding sites. We adopt a simple, operational definition for functional binding sites: all binding sites for which the probability of binding exceeds one half, i.e. $\pi_i > 0.5$, are defined as functional; and all others are defined as non-functional. This is a natural definition because the probability of binding, π_i , is a sigmoidal function of the number of mis-matches, i , with a fairly sharp threshold occurring at the value of i for which $\pi_i = 0.5$ (the threshold value is given by $i = \frac{\log[P]}{\epsilon}$).

Given this definition, the equilibrium probability, f , that a binding site will be functional is given by

$$f = \sum_{\{i|\pi_i>0.5\}} F_i. \quad (2)$$

Fig. S1 shows how the probability a binding site is functional, f , depends upon the scaled strength of selection, Ns . This relationship displays a sharp, threshold behavior, as reported in [16]. Thus, as selection strength or population size increases, binding sites rapidly switch from having many mismatched




Figure 1 – The equilibrium distribution for the number of mismatched nucleotides at a binding site under stabilizing selection is bimodal. Top – The equilibrium distribution for a binding site of length $n = 20$ with redundancy $r = 1$ (corresponding to information content $I = 40$ bits) and selection strength $Ns = 10$. The dashed line shows the analytic approximation for the equilibrium distribution, and the points indicate the results of 10^3 Monte-Carlo simulations of evolution in the weak mutation limit (see SI). The left peak in the distribution, centred around a small number of mis-matched nucleotides, is the result of selection; whereas the right peak, centred around a large number of mis-matched nucleotides, is caused by genetic drift. The bimodal equilibrium distribution suggests a natural definition for the probability, f , that a binding site is functional (Eq. 2 main text): the summed probability of falling near the selected peak. The bottom panel shows how the probability of being functional, f , depends on the information content of the binding site, for given selection strength $Ns = 10$. Increasing the information content of the binding site results in a threshold-like decline in the probability that the binding site is functional. The gray line corresponds to functional probability $f = 0.5$, and the red line indicates the information content of the binding site for which this occurs, $I = 37.5$ bits in this case.

nucleotides to having few mismatched nucleotides, so that the chance of binding rapidly switches from below one-half to above one-half.

Evolution of a single binding site

Before considering complex regulatory modules, we will first analyze the evolution of a regulatory module composed of a single binding site. We consider a single binding site with information content I evolving in a population of size N under stabilizing selection of strength s for binding. As described above, we can determine the probability, f that it is functional in equilibrium. The information content of the binding site depends on its length n and average degeneracy r , which are independent parameters. However, any pair of values $\{n, r\}$ that result in a given information content, $I = n \log_2 \left[\frac{4}{r} \right]$, result in the same (or very close to the same) probability f of the site being functional (see SI – Fig. S2). Thus we confine ourselves to discussing the information content of sites in what follows.

Typically, the strength of selection on transcription factor binding sites is of order $Ns \sim 10$ [17, 24]. Assuming $Ns = 10$, Fig. 1b shows how the probability the site is functional, f , depends on its information content, I . The figure also indicates the critical value of information content that results in the binding site being functional with probability one-half; this occurs when $I = 37.5$ bits. For values of information content greater than this, the probability that the site is functional declines rapidly to zero; whereas a binding site with less than this amount of information has probability of being functional near 1. Therefore, a regulatory module consisting of a single binding site will likely be functional whenever $I \leq 37.5$, given selection of strength $Ns = 10$. This simple case forms a basis for comparison as we consider modules with multiple binding sites, below.

Evolution of regulatory modules composed of two binding sites

Next, we used our population-genetic model to study the evolution of regulatory modules composed of two binding sites. A pair of binding sites for two co-expressed transcription factors can be bound in four possible combinations. We assume that the regulated target gene produces fitness 1 if the two sites are bound in a “desired” combination, and it produces fitness $1 - s$ otherwise. The desired combination (or combinations) of transcription factor binding depend on the signal integration task to be executed by the regulatory module. For example, if the module carries out an AND logic, then the fitness of the regulated gene is 1 when both binding sites are bound and $1 - s$ otherwise. If the module carries out an OR logic, then the fitness is 1 when either one or both of the binding sites is bound. If the module carries out an XOR logic, then the fitness is 1 when one but not both binding sites are bound.

For a pair of binding sites, A and B , with i and j mismatched nucleotides respectively, the probability of desired binding for an AND regulatory module is given by $\sigma_{ij}^{AND} = \pi_i^A \pi_j^B$. For an OR regulatory module the probability of desired binding is $\sigma_{ij}^{OR} = \pi_i^A + \pi_j^B - \pi_i^A \pi_j^B$, and for an XOR regulatory module the probability of desired binding is $\sigma_{ij}^{XOR} = \pi_i^A + \pi_j^B - 2\pi_i^A \pi_j^B$. These three possible logics, and their associated binding probabilities are summarized in Table 1. In this table cooperativity between the two transcription factor proteins is neglected. The impact of cooperativity is considered in the SI (Fig. S5-S7).

Table 1: Regulatory logics for modules with two binding sites

Logic gate	Selected regulation	Probability of selected binding
AND	A and B must both be bound for correct regulation	$\pi_i^A \pi_j^B$
OR	Either A or B or both must be bound for correct regulation	$\pi_i^A + \pi_j^B - \pi_i^A \pi_j^B$
XOR	Either A or B but not both must be bound for correct regulation	$\pi_i^A + \pi_j^B - 2\pi_i^A \pi_j^B$

The equilibrium distribution of mismatched nucleotides (i, j) for the Markov processes describing the evolution of a two-site regulatory module, in the weak mutation limit, can be derived analytically (see SI). Fig. 2 shows contour plots for the probabilities, f_A and f_B , that each of the binding sites are functional in equilibrium, for different values of information content at each binding site. The figure shows these contours for each of the three possible regulatory logics described above, with selective strength $Ns = 10$. Also shown for comparison in Fig. 2a is a contour map for two binding sites functioning independently in isolation of each other. This corresponds to the case of a single binding site, as discussed in the previous section, with the modification that the information content of two such isolated binding sites, A and B , are shown, so that the contour map for this case may be directly compared with the contour maps for two-site regulatory modules (Fig. 2b-d).

Fig. 2 illustrates the central result of our study: for all three possible regulatory logics, the range of information content for which both binding sites are functional with high probability is much smaller, and occurs for lower information content, than the same region for a regulatory module consisting of a single binding site. Thus, our analysis predicts that functional binding sites belonging to two-site modules, regardless of their regulatory logic, will tend to have less information than binding sites occurring in single-site modules.

Evolution of regulatory modules composed of many binding sites

Our analysis of two-site regulatory modules can be naturally extended to describe larger regulatory modules. We consider a set of M co-expressed transcription factors whose binding sites co-regulate a target gene. The group of M binding sites can be bound by their respective transcription factors in 2^M possible combinations. Each combination of bound sites can, in turn, constitute a desirable or an undesirable




Figure 2 – Regulatory modules containing two binding sites are composed of individually less specific binding sites, compared to a module composed of a single binding site. Each panel shows a pair of overlapping contour plots with the probability that binding site A is functional, f_A , in red and the probability that binding site B is functional, f_B , in blue. Black lines indicate the contours $f_A = 0.5$ and $f_B = 0.5$. Purple regions indicate that both binding sites are likely to be functional, red regions indicate that only A is likely to be functional, blue regions indicate that only B is likely to be functional, and white regions indicate that neither site is likely to be functional. All plots are generated with selection strength $Ns = 10$. Clockwise from top left, the figures show: (i) Probability of being functional for individual binding sites in isolation: The purple region, which occurs when both binding sites have $I \lesssim 37.5$ bits, serves as a basis for comparison with two-site binding modules. (ii) A two-site module with AND logic, so that both A and B are selected to be bound. The purple region is smaller than in the one-site case, indicating that functional binding sites maintained in the module will contain less information than in the one-site case. (iii) A two-site module with OR logic, so that A or B is selected to be bound. Only a small purple region at low information content is visible. As a result, only the binding site with lower information content will typically remain functional. (iv) A two-site module with XOR logic, so that A or B but not both are selected to be bound; again, the binding sites maintained in such a two-site module each have less information than in a single-site module.

pattern of gene regulation. As a result there are 2^{2^M} possible logics that can be executed by a regulatory module composed of M binding sites. An example is illustrated in Table S1 (see SI). Analogously to the two-site case, we can construct a function $\sigma_{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_M}$ to describe the probability that a set of transcription factor binding sites, $\{A_1, A_2, \dots, A_M\}$, with $\{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_M\}$ mismatched nucleotides is bound in a desirable pattern, for a given regulatory logic. The equilibrium distribution of the Markov process for the number of mismatched nucleotides at each binding site can once again be found analytically in the weak-mutation limit. This expression is given in the Supporting Information, however the combinatorial explosion in the number of possible regulatory logics with module size means that a detailed analytical exploration of modules with more than 2 binding sites quickly becomes impractical.

Instead we performed evolutionary simulations in the weak mutation limit. We constructed regulatory modules in our simulations as follows: for each binding site we drew a energy contribution per mismatch, ϵ , and a number of proteins per cell, P , from a uniform distribution in the empirically determined ranges $1 \leq \epsilon \leq 3$ and $10^0 \leq P \leq 10^3$, respectively. We also drew a binding site length, n , and average degeneracy, r , from a uniform distribution in the range $5 \leq n \leq 40$ and $1 \leq r < 4$ respectively, with the additional constraint that we condition on $n(1 - \frac{r}{4}) > \frac{\log[P]}{\epsilon}$, in order to ensure that selection is able to differentiate between functional and non-functional sites.

We can easily extend our analysis of two-site modules by assuming a strict AND logic, or an OR logic, across all the binding sites in the multi-site module. In addition, we explored random logics as well. To do this, we chose a logic by selecting uniformly from among the 2^{2^M} possible logics.

Each module was then allowed to evolve until $> 10^2$ mutations fixed, in order to ensure that equilibrium has been reached, and the simulation was then stopped. Once the simulation was stopped, a module is defined as functional if each of its composite binding sites is functional. We calculate the average information content for all the functional modules of a given size. Because the parameter space we are sampling is large we constructed $> 10^8$ different regulatory modules of each size, with each module composed of different binding sites. Of these modules, typically $< 10^2$ are found to be functional.

Fig. 3 shows the relationship between the average information content of binding sites, and module size. We performed simulations using the randomly generated mixed logics, described above, as well as modules composed of randomly chosen binding sites executing AND and OR logics. In all three cases we observe a decline in the average information content per binding site as module size M increases. In addition, we observe a decline in the ensemble variance in information content of binding sites with module size. Thus, the region of parameter space in which functional modules are maintained by selection becomes smaller and it includes lower-information binding sites as the module size, and hence regulatory complexity, increases.

The environmental schedule of co-regulating transcription factors

So far we have focused on regulatory modules whose participating transcription factors are always co-expressed. Generally, of course, this is not the case, as transcription factors themselves are up-regulated and down-regulated in different patterns as the environment changes [25]. To account for this we modified our model to include changes in the patterns of transcription factor expression as cells experience different environmental conditions. We assumed that in a given condition a transcription factor is either fully expressed (i.e ON) or not expressed at all (i.e OFF). Whether or not a target gene is properly regulated depends as before on whether or not its transcription factor binding sites are bound in a desirable pattern. This in turn depends both on the pattern in which regulating transcription factors are expressed, and on the number of mismatched nucleotide at each transcription factor binding site.

This analysis is best understood in the case of a two-site module. For a pair of transcription factors A and B , we analyzed environmental variation such that transcription factor A is expressed without factor B in a proportion τ_A of environmental conditions; and likewise factor B is expressed without A in a proportion τ_B of conditions; and, finally, both transcription factors are co-expressed in a proportion τ_{AB} of conditions, with $\tau_A + \tau_B + \tau_{AB} = 1$. The function σ_{ij} for the probability that a two-site regulatory module is bound in a desired configuration now depends *both* on the probability that each transcription factor is expressed and the probability that they are bound to their binding site. The resulting equilibrium behavior is summarized in Table 2.

What is the impact of varying the environmental schedule on our results? If we set $\tau_A = \tau_B = \frac{1}{2}(1 - \tau_{AB})$ then we can simply consider variation in τ_{AB} , i.e the proportion of time that both A and B are co-expressed. When $\tau_{AB} = 1$ both factors are always co-expressed, as in our analysis above, and the probability that their binding sites are functional varies with information content shown in Fig. 2. As τ_{AB} decreases, so that transcription factors are not always expressed at the same time, we still find that complex regulation requires binding sites with less information. The precise range of information contents




Figure 3 – Information content of binding sites is predicted to decrease with module size, regardless of regulatory logic. Points show the ensemble average information content per binding site in a module, and bars show the ensemble standard deviation (bar width is 2SD either side of the mean). Panels top to bottom show modules with AND, OR and Mixed (arbitrary) logics. The left-hand column (100% overlap) corresponds to a model in which all transcription factors are co-expressed, at all times. The right-hand column (50% overlap) corresponds to a model in which any given pair of factors are co-expressed half the time. Monte Carlo simulations of binding site evolution in the weak selection limit were performed, as described in the main text. For each module size, replicate simulations were performed until at least 10^2 functional modules were produced. (Missing data points indicate that no functional modules were produced, after even 10^6 simulations.) All modules were evolved with selection strength $Ns = 10$. In all cases, the average information content of the functional binding sites in a module, and the ensemble variance of information content among functional binding sites, decrease with module size, M .

Table 2: Regulatory logics for two-site binding modules, when transcription factors are not always co-expressed

	Both expressed	Only A expressed	Only B expressed	Probability of selected binding
AND	A AND B	–	–	$\tau_{AB}\pi_i^A\pi_j^B$
OR	A OR B	A	B	$\tau_A\pi_i^A + \tau_B\pi_j^B + \tau_{AB}(\pi_i^A + \pi_j^B - \pi_i^A\pi_j^B)$
XOR	A XOR B	A	B	$\tau_A\pi_i^A + \tau_B\pi_j^B + \tau_{AB}(\pi_i^A + \pi_j^B - 2\pi_i^A\pi_j^B)$

that result in both binding sites being functional changes in a way that depends on the logic of the module. For OR and XOR logics, the range of information contents that results in functional binding for both sites increases as τ_{AB} decreases (Fig. S9-S11), and so the average information content of the pair of sites will

tend to increase. However for AND logic, as τ_{AB} decreases the range of information contents that result in both sites being functional decreases. When $\tau_{AB} = 0$, A and B are always expressed independently. For OR and XOR logic this means that the probability that both binding sites are functional varies with the information content of the sites in the same way as for a single site module (Fig. 2). For AND logic, when $\tau_{AB} = 0$, it is not possible to maintain both binding sites, because the transcription factors are never co-expressed.

Our analysis of variation in the co-expression of transcription factors naturally extends to arbitrary modules of M binding sites. To study this in the simplest case, we assumed that each transcription factor is expressed with fixed probability, independent of the environment. We then varied the expression overlap of all pairs of transcription factors by varying this probability. As shown in Fig. 3, decreasing the expression overlap of factors participating in a module alters how quickly the average information content of binding sites in functional modules declines with module size. For example, functional modules executing AND logics experience a more rapid decline in the information content of their composite binding sites, and functional modules executing OR logic experience a slower decline. Nonetheless the general trend we have discovered continues to hold: the mean and the ensemble variance of the information content of a binding site in a module declines with module size, even when transcription factors are not always expressed at the same time.

Empirical data on site specificity and module size

We have demonstrated that as the size and complexity of regulatory modules increase, the average and ensemble variance in the information content of the binding sites maintained by selection will decrease. How can we assess the complexity of regulatory modules to compare these predictions to empirical data? We have argued that the simplest way to do this is to look at the number binding sites regulating a target gene. Such an argument is supported by a comparison of prokaryotes and eukaryotes, where the regulatory complexity of eukaryotes tends to be greater [8,9]. Accordingly we find that, in a comparison of *Saccharomyces cerevisia* and *Escherichia coli*, the yeast genes have more regulators, and yeast transcription factors have lower information content binding sites. However, such a comparison is insufficient on its own to confirm the predictions of our model because of the well known and often discussed differences in the mechanisms of transcription regulation used by prokaryotes and eukaryotes [26,27].

A better way to empirically test our prediction is to consider variation in regulatory complexity within a given species. For this purpose we used the yeast transcription network [28–30], which benefits from extensive study and available datasets. We calculated the correlation between the number of binding sites that regulate a given target gene, and the average information content of the associated binding motifs. Here we found, as predicted by our analysis, a strong negative correlation between the number of regulators of a gene and the average information content of the regulatory motifs (Fig. 4). As predicted by our analysis, we also found a negative correlation between the number of regulators of a gene and the variance in the information content of its regulatory motifs across targets (Fig. 4).

Similar correlations to these, also within the yeast transcription network, were reported previously by Bilu and Barkai [12]. They found an increase in the “fuzziness” at a given transcription factor’s binding sites with the number of other regulators at a gene. This observation can also be understood within the context of our evolutionary model, because binding site information content decreases with module size, and lower information content binding sites tend to have greater degeneracy per nucleotide. Bilu and Barkai also observed a correlation between the variance in the expression of genes across environmental conditions, and the number of transcription factors regulating them. We observed the same correlation. This observation supports our interpretation that more regulators indicates greater regulatory complexity: genes with greater expression variation across environmental conditions require more complex regulation in order to perform the more complex signal integration tasks required for them to respond appropriately to different environments.

Bilu and Barkai suggested that their observations can be explained either by weaker selection on the




Figure 4 – The empirical relationship between the number of regulators of a gene and the information content of its regulatory binding sites, in the yeast transcription network [28–30]. Both the average information content of regulatory motifs (points) and its standard deviation (bars) decrease with the number of regulators. The dashed line is a linear fit to the data and shows a significantly negative slope ($p < 2 \times 10^{-8}$). Points show the average information content of binding motifs, for target genes binned according to the number of regulators. Bin sizes were chosen so that each bin contains at least 10 target genes. Bars show the standard deviation in the information content of binding sites, taken across all genes with a given number of regulators. Bars extend 1SD either side of the mean. There is a negative relationship between the standard deviation information content and the number of regulators ($p < 1 \times 10^{-4}$). For both the mean and ensemble standard deviation information content, the negative relationship observed in the yeast data coincides with the predictions of our population-genetic model.

expression of genes with highly variable expression across conditions, or by a tendency for multiple co-regulating binding sites to experience compensatory mutations leading to greater fuzziness. Our analysis does not rule out these explanations. However we have shown that no such assumptions are necessary to explain their observations: large, complicated regulatory modules are *a priori* expected to contain low-information binding sites, even under a constant strength of selection.

Discussion and Conclusion

Using a standard population-genetic model, we have shown that as the size of a regulatory module increases, the specificity of its constituent binding sites must tend to decrease if they are to be maintained. This general result does not depend on the specific logic being executed by a module, nor does it depend on the pattern of expression of the transcription factors that participate in the module.

Our results do not tell us how “best” to construct a regulatory module for a given task, a question which has been addressed elsewhere [5, 14, 31]. Rather, our results hold regardless of the logic favored by selection. In a certain light our results make simple, intuitive sense: it is *all* of the nucleotide positions that belong to a regulatory module that form the target of selection, and so as module size increases, the maximum mutation rate at any given site, and hence its maximum information content, must decrease. What is not obvious, however, is that this effect should be so pronounced, given the information content and selection strengths typical of transcription factor binding sites. Yet this is precisely what we find.

We have argued that our results help explain the observed variation in the specificity of regulators at different genes within the yeast transcription network and that they also help explain the tendency for eukaryotes to have lower information content binding sites than prokaryotes. On the basis of this, we would also expect that higher eukaryotes should have lower-information content binding sites than yeast, due to the greater regulatory complexity required to execute, for example, tissue-specific gene expression. A comparison of mouse and yeast binding sites supports this expectation [28–30, 32], with mouse tending

to use lower information content binding sites than yeast (*E. coli* = 14.9 bits, yeast = 12.1 bits, mouse = 10.6 bits). Although the population genetics of higher eukaryotes are complicated by the presence of frequent recombination, this is not likely to have an important impact on our study, since we are concerned with the evolution of only a small number of nucleotides at a particular genomic position.

Our analysis was conducted in the limit of weak mutation. As a result it is important to consider the timescales over which the evolutionary changes being described occur. Because transcription factor binding sites are short (~ 10 nt) the system typically reaches equilibrium in < 100 selective sweeps. However the rate of selective sweeps is low, occurring once every 10^6 – 10^8 generations. In yeast, which has a rapid cell division time (~ 2 hrs), this means that regulatory modules composed of binding sites that are “too specific” under our model will be lost under stabilizing selection over the course of tens of thousands of years. This time is short enough to produce the genome-wide association between the number of regulators and binding-site specificity according to the processes we have described. Similarly, time scales are short enough to be relevant to the differences in binding site information content among species.

In constructing our model we have assumed that transcription factors bind to their sites independently when participating in a module. In reality, factors in the same regulatory module may sometimes bind cooperatively [1, 4, 14]. To determine how such interactions between factors alter our results we analysed the case of two-site modules with cooperative binding. The results are shown in the SI, Fig. S5-S7. For AND, OR and XOR logic gates, interactions among factors alter the shape and size of the region in which both sites are maintained under stabilizing selection. However, this region is always limited to lower information-content sites, compared to the case in which sites are not part of a module. We also considered the case in which the increase in binding energy with each mismatched nucleotide, ϵ , decreases with information content. This has the effect that higher-information content sites can suffer a greater number of mismatches before becoming non-functional, compared to lower-information content sites. We find (see SI, Fig. S8) that although this correlation does allow higher-information content binding sites to be maintained on average, the negative correlation between module size and binding site information content persists. Finally, we considered the impact of changing selection strength on our results. When selection is very strong ($Ns = 100$), our results do not hold, since all binding sites are maintained, regardless of their information content. Similarly, when selection is very weak ($Ns = 1$), virtually no binding sites are maintained regardless of information content. However for intermediate values of selection strength ($1 < Ns < 20$) our results hold (see SI, Fig. S3-S4), and these are the values of selection strength typically associated with transcription factor binding sites [17, 24].

Higher eukaryotes must carefully orchestrate gene expression in order to produce the elaborate phenotypes associated with multi-cellularity. And even simple eukaryotes require complex regulation of genes that must respond to different environmental conditions. In spite of this, many eukaryotic genes have noisy expression, and many of the transcription factors that regulate them bind weakly. Our study suggests an evolutionary perspective on this phenomenon: complexity requires some sloppiness.

Acknowledgement

Literature Cited

- [1] Davidson EH, et al. (2002) A genomic regulatory network for development. *Science* 295:1669–78.
- [2] Eldar A, Elowitz MB (2010) Functional roles for noise in genetic circuits. *Nature* 467:167–73.
- [3] Guet CC, Elowitz MB, Hsing W, Leibler S (2002) Combinatorial synthesis of genetic networks. *Science* 296:1466–70.
- [4] Li H, Johnson AD (2010) Evolution of transcription networks—lessons from yeasts. *Curr Biol* 20:R746–53.

- [5] Little JW (2010) Evolution of complex gene regulatory circuits by addition of refinements. *Curr Biol* 20:R724–34.
- [6] Shen-Orr SS, Milo R, Mangan S, Alon U (2002) Network motifs in the transcriptional regulation network of escherichia coli. *Nat Genet* 31:64–8.
- [7] Tirosh I, Weinberger A, Carmi M, Barkai N (2006) A genetic signature of interspecies variations in gene expression. *Nat Genet* 38:830–4.
- [8] Lynch M (2006) The origins of eukaryotic gene structure. *Mol Biol Evol* 23:450–68.
- [9] Janga SC, Collado-Vides J, Babu MM (2008) Transcriptional regulation constrains the organization of genes on eukaryotic chromosomes. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 105:15761–6.
- [10] Lässig M (2007) From biophysics to evolutionary genetics: statistical aspects of gene regulation. *BMC Bioinformatics* 8 Suppl 6:S7.
- [11] Stewart AJ, Plotkin JB (2012) Why transcription factor binding sites are ten nucleotides long. *Genetics*.
- [12] Bilu Y, Barkai N (2005) The design of transcription-factor binding sites is affected by combinatorial regulation. *Genome Biol* 6:R103.
- [13] Bintu L, et al. (2005) Transcriptional regulation by the numbers: models. *Current Opinion In Genetics & Development* 15:116–124.
- [14] Buchler NE, Gerland U, Hwa T (2003) On schemes of combinatorial transcription logic. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 100:5136–41.
- [15] Chu D, Zabet NR, Mitavskiy B (2009) Models of transcription factor binding: sensitivity of activation functions to model assumptions. *J Theor Biol* 257:419–29.
- [16] Gerland U, Hwa T (2002) On the selection and evolution of regulatory dna motifs. *J Mol Evol* 55:386–400.
- [17] Mustonen V, Kinney J, Callan, Jr CG, Lässig M (2008) Energy-dependent fitness: a quantitative model for the evolution of yeast transcription factor binding sites. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 105:12376–81.
- [18] Gerland U, Moroz JD, Hwa T (2002) Physical constraints and functional characteristics of transcription factor-dna interaction. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 99:12015–20.
- [19] D’haeseleer P (2006) What are dna sequence motifs? *Nat Biotechnol* 24:423–5.
- [20] Sengupta AM, Djordjevic M, Shraiman BI (2002) Specificity and robustness in transcription control networks. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 99:2072–7.
- [21] Berg J, Willmann S, Lässig M (2004) Adaptive evolution of transcription factor binding sites. *BMC Evol Biol* 4:42.
- [22] Moses AM, Chiang DY, Kellis M, Lander ES, Eisen MB (2003) Position specific variation in the rate of evolution in transcription factor binding sites. *BMC Evol Biol* 3:19.
- [23] Sella G, Hirsh AE (2005) The application of statistical physics to evolutionary biology. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 102:9541–6.

- [24] He BZ, Holloway AK, Maerkl SJ, Kreitman M (2011) Does positive selection drive transcription factor binding site turnover? a test with drosophila cis-regulatory modules. *PLoS Genet* 7:e1002053.
- [25] Tirosh I, Barkai N (2008) Two strategies for gene regulation by promoter nucleosomes. *Genome Res* 18:1084–91.
- [26] Struhl K (1999) Fundamentally different logic of gene regulation in eukaryotes and prokaryotes. *Cell* 98:1–4.
- [27] Raj A, van Oudenaarden A (2008) Nature, nurture, or chance: stochastic gene expression and its consequences. *Cell* 135:216–226.
- [28] Lee TI, et al. (2002) Transcriptional regulatory networks in saccharomyces cerevisiae. *Science* 298:799–804.
- [29] Harbison CT, et al. (2004) Transcriptional regulatory code of a eukaryotic genome. *Nature* 431:99–104.
- [30] Bryne JC, et al. (2008) Jaspar, the open access database of transcription factor-binding profiles: new content and tools in the 2008 update. *Nucleic Acids Res* 36:D102–6.
- [31] Lynch M (2007) The evolution of genetic networks by non-adaptive processes. *Nature Reviews Genetics* 8:803–813.
- [32] Gama-Castro S, et al. (2011) Regulondb version 7.0: transcriptional regulation of escherichia coli k-12 integrated within genetic sensory response units (gensor units). *Nucleic Acids Res* 39:D98–105.