Alu-Containing Exons are Alternatively Spliced

Rotem Sorek,[1,2,4] Gil Ast,[3] and Dan Graur[1]

[1]Department of Zoology, George S. Wise Faculty of Life Sciences, Tel Aviv University, Ramat Aviv 69978, Israel; [2]Compugen, Tel Aviv 69512, Israel; [3]Department of Human Genetics, Sackler Faculty of Medicine, Tel Aviv University, Ramat Aviv 69978, Israel

Alu repetitive elements are found in ~1.4 million copies in the human genome, comprising more than one-tenth of it. Numerous studies describe exonizations of *Alu* elements, that is, splicing-mediated insertions of parts of *Alu* sequences into mature mRNAs. To study the connection between the exonization of *Alu* elements and alternative splicing, we used a database of ESTs and cDNAs aligned to the human genome. We compiled two exon sets, one of 1176 alternatively spliced internal exons, and another of 4151 constitutively spliced internal exons. Sixty one alternatively spliced internal exons (5.2%) had a significant BLAST hit to an *Alu* sequence, but none of the constitutively spliced internal exons had such a hit. The vast majority (84%) of the *Alu*-containing exons that appeared within the coding region of mRNAs caused a frame-shift or a premature termination codon. *Alu*-containing exons were included in transcripts at lower frequencies than alternatively spliced exons that do not contain an *Alu* sequence. These results indicate that internal exons that contain an *Alu* sequence are predominantly, if not exclusively, alternatively spliced. Presumably, evolutionary events that cause a constitutive insertion of an *Alu* sequence into an mRNA are deleterious and selected against.

Alu elements are short interspersed elements (SINEs), typically 300 nucleotides long, which account for >10% of the human genome (International Human Genome Sequencing Consortium 2001; Li et al. 2001). Despite their being genetically functionless, *Alu* elements have been suggested to have broad evolutionary impacts (Mighell et al. 1997; Szmulewicz et al. 1998; Hamdi et al. 1999; International Human Genome Sequencing Consortium 2001). *Alu*s are found in all primates (including prosimians), but in no other organism (Kapitonov and Jurka 1996; Schmid 1996). Therefore, it is tempting to suggest that they have played a role in the evolution of primates. However, the nature of this role is still under debate.

It has been shown in numerous studies that fragments of *Alu* sequences may appear in mature mRNAs, sometimes in the protein-coding region (Makalowski et al. 1994; Yulug et al. 1995; Nekrutenko and Li 2001). Some *Alu* insertions were found to be translated in vivo. For example, translated splice variants of the biliary glycoprotein containing an *Alu* fragment were identified by Western immunoblot analysis (Barnett et al. 1993). Another example is that of the human decay-acceleration factor (DAF), in which 10% of its transcripts contain an *Alu* fragment. There are indications that the *Alu*-containing DAF mRNA is translated to create a peptide that differs from the common DAF by a hydrophilic carboxy terminus, which inhibits the migration of DAF into the cell membrane (Caras et al. 1987).

A recent study reports that transposable elements are found in the protein-coding regions of ~4% of human genes, and that *Alu* elements account for about one-third of these insertions (Nekrutenko and Li 2001). Under the assumption of 30,000 genes in the human genome, there should be ~400 genes that contain fragments of *Alu* elements in their protein-coding regions. The insertion of an *Alu* sequence into a mature mRNA may cause a genetic disease, but an *Alu* insertion may also contribute to protein variability and versatility (Makalowski et al. 1994).

The vast majority of the insertions of *Alu* sequences into mature mRNAs are splicing mediated (Makalowski et al. 1994; Nekrutenko and Li 2001). This is possible because both strands of *Alu* sequences contain motifs that resemble consensus splice sites (Makalowski et al. 1994). Mutations within intronic *Alu* sequences may yield active splice sites, that is, part of the intronic *Alu* sequence will be exonized.

In theory, an insertion of an *Alu* sequence into a mature mRNA, especially if it is in the protein-coding region, should be deleterious to the organism. Therefore, there must be a mechanism that allows such a large number of *Alu* insertions into the human transcriptome, keeping it yet unharmed. Using genomically aligned cDNAs and ESTs, we scanned the genome to locate *Alu*-derived internal exons. We show that all *Alu*-derived exons found in our study are alternatively spliced. Thus, from an evolutionary point of view, exonized *Alu* sequences increase the coding and regulatory versatility of the transcriptome, and at the same time, maintain the intactness of the genomic repertoire.

RESULTS

To obtain the intron-exon structures of human genes, we used the output of the LEADS software platform (Shoshan et al. 2001) that was run on the December 2000 draft human genome, and the cDNAs and ESTs from GenBank version 121. The software cleans the expressed sequences from repeats, vectors, and immunoglobulins. It then aligns the expressed sequences to genome, taking alternative splicing into account and clusters overlapping expressed sequences into clusters that represent genes or partial genes (see Methods for a detailed description of the process).

Our search focused on internal exons, that is, exons that are flanked by at least one exon on the 5' side and one on the 3' side. We chose to work with internal exons because the prediction of terminal exons using EST alignments is problematic. We searched the LEADS output for cases of exon skip-

ping, that is, internal exons that are skipped in some of the splice variants of a certain gene (alternatively spliced internal exons). We also created a set of constitutively spliced internal exons, for example, internal exons that are found in all detected splice variants of the gene. For these compilations, we first selected clusters containing four or more expressed sequences, in which at least one sequence was a cDNA (13,097 clusters). In this set of clusters, we searched for substructures of the cluster containing three exons separated by two introns. We took only those cases in which both introns agreed with the GT/AG, GC/AG, or AT/AC rules, and were not covered by expressed sequences. An internal exon was defined as an exon embedded between the two introns. An internal exon was classified as an alternative internal exon if there was at least one sequence that contained the three exons, and one sequence that contained both flanking exons, but skipped the middle one. A constitutive internal exon was defined as an internal exon supported by at least four sequences for which no alternative splicing was observed (Fig. 1). We limited our search to exons shorter than 400 bases, because the length of internal exons only rarely exceeds a few hundred bases (Deutsch and Long 1999).

Under the rules defined above, we obtained 4151 constitutively spliced internal exons (coming from 1662 clusters) and 1176 alternatively spliced internal exons (coming from 1042 clusters). These sets represent, of course, only a fraction of the real number of internal exons in the genome. There are several reasons for not identifying all internal exons. First, a large number of ESTs that represent intron contamination align to places in the genome that are normally introns. Because we searched only for exons flanked by introns that are not covered by expressed sequences, we may have missed introns masked by the contaminated ESTs. Second, for the set of constitutively spliced internal exons, we chose only exons supported by four sequences or more, namely from relatively highly expressed genes. This condition may have led to the exclusion of exons from genes poorly represented in the EST database (dbEST). And finally, we searched only the subset of genes for which a cDNA sequence had been deposited in GenBank.

A BLASTn search of the alternatively spliced internal exons against the NCBI *Alu* database (Claverie and Makalowski 1994) yielded 61 exons (5.2%) hitting an *Alu* sequence with an E score lower than 10^{-10} (Table 1). These exons were declared *Alu*-containing exons. A second search of the database with the 4151 constitutive exons has failed to identify even one *Alu*-like sequence. These results indicate that internal exons that contain an *Alu* sequence are predominantly, if not exclusively, alternatively spliced.

We further analyzed the *Alu*-containing exons to check their influence on the transcripts they are inserted into. As a reference set of exons, we used a set of 62 alternatively spliced internal exons compiled by Hide et al. (2001) from 52 genes on chromosome 22. In their study, Hide et al. (2001) used a rigorous in silico method to scan the annotated genomic sequence of chromosome 22 to identify alternatively spliced internal exons that are skipped in some of the transcripts. We took the set of exons from chromosome 22 as a set representing the normal population of alternatively spliced internal exons, and compared it with the set of *Alu*-containing exons we found.

Of our 61 *Alu*-containing alternatively spliced internal exons, 54 had an unambiguous coding-region annotation in the GenBank cDNAs. Of these, 45 (83%) were located within the protein-coding region and 9 (17%) within the 5′ untranslated region (UTR). No *Alu*-containing exons were found in the 3′ UTR. Although it is known that most expressed *Alu* sequences are found within the 3′ UTRs of mRNAs (Yulug et al. 1995), our finding is not surprising given that 3′ UTRs are mostly found in the terminal exon (Deutsch and Long 1999), whereas the exons in our study were internal ones. As seen in Figure 2, the distribution of *Alu*-containing exons along the mRNA was similar to the distribution of alternatively spliced internal exons from chromosome 22. The slight bias of *Alu*-containing exons toward being found in the 5′ UTR of the mRNA was not statistically significant.

Figure 1 Schematic representation of the multiple alignment of the mRNAs of a microsomal glutathione transferase homolog gene with the genomic sequence. Three GenBank mRNAs (blue) align to the same genomic locus on chromosome 9, NT_008541 (red). Three ESTs that map to this locus are presented (purple), 38 other ESTs that align to the locus are not displayed to save space. Gaps in the alignment of mRNAs represent introns in the DNA. Four exons (marked I, II, III, and IV) are inferred from the presented alignment. Exon II is an alternative internal exon, contained entirely within an *Alu* repeat. Exon III is a constitutive internal exon, found in all detected splice variants and supported by seven expressed sequences (only five are shown). The LEADS output was searched for internal exons. A total of 1176 alternatively spliced internal exons were found, 61 of them (5.2%) contained an *Alu* fragment. A total of 4151 constitutive internal exons were found; none of them contained an *Alu* fragment.

Table 1. Features of *Alu*-Containing Alternatively Spliced Internal Exons

	EST/RNA confirming exon skip (1)	EST/RNA confirming exon insertion (2)	Exon len. (3)	No. sequences confirming exon skip (4)	No. sequences confirming exon insertion (5)	Place (6)	Effect on CDS (7)	*Alu* subfamily (8)	GenBank annotation (9)
1	AB046854	AF257238	75	1	1	CDS	+	AluSc	Membrane-associated guanylate kinase
2	D86198	BF223241	81	145	6	CDS	+	AluJb	Dolichol-phosphate-mannose synthase
3	HSU76420	HSU76421	120	3	9	CDS	+	AluJb	dsRNA edenosine deaminase
4	AF161516	AF152097	42	6	1	CDS	+	AluSp	Similar to *Rattus novergicus* CDS5 activator binding
5	AB000459	AB000460	123	10	1	CDS	+	AluSq	Unknown protein product
6	AI791889	HS4261062	102	1	3	CDS	+	AluSp	Unknown protein product
7	AF013970	AF069747	76	3	1	CDS	alt n	AluJo	MTG8-like protein
8	AF042345	H41675	98	2	7	CDS	3't	AluJb	Ectopic viral integration site 5
9	HSGPLP	BF207526	210	69	2	CDS	3't	AluJb	Glutathione peroxidase-like
10	HSU64564	HSU64570	138	15	2	CDS	3't	AluJb	Myelin/oligodendrocyte glycoprotein
11	AF177862	AA157902	95	139	1	CDS	3't	AluJb	Nuclear protein of unknown function
12	AF086904	AF217975	114	14	1	CDS	3't	AluSq	Protein kinase Chk2
13	HSM802141	AK002113	138	8	2	CDS	3't	FLAM_C	Strong similarity to rat exocyst complex protein Sec15
14	AB032995	BF087651	123	12	3	CDS	3't	AluJo	Unknown protein product
15	HSM800948	AA195214	126	1	1	CDS	3't	AluJo	Unknown protein product
16	HSARSE	AA160312	286	2	1	CDS	f/s	FLAM_C	Arylsulfatase E
17	HSU43746	BE869603	126	2	1	CDS	f/s	AluSx	Breast cancer susceptibility (BRCA2)
18	HSU15782	BF247748	96	18	2	CDS	f/s	AluJo	Cleavage stimulation factor 77kDa subunit
19	AF280109	AF280111	121	4	1	CDS	f/s	AluSg	Cytochrome P450 subfamily IIIA polypeptide 43
20	AF121908	AF065216	98	2	1	CDS	f/s	AluSx	Cytosolic phospholipase A2 β
21	HSU06654	AA071342	106	36	1	CDS	f/s	AluJb	Differentiation antigen melan-A protein
22	HSU07707	BE842355	101	4	1	CDS	f/s	AluJb	Epidermal growth factor receptor substrate (eps15)
23	AF244135	A1949382	61	17	3	CDS	f/s	AluSg	Hepatocellular carcinoma-associated antigen 66
24	HUMHRLFB	BE513181	151	23	3	CDS	f/s	AluJo	hRlf β subunit (p102 protein)
25	HSICAM2	BE261894	116	29	1	CDS	f/s	AluJb	ICAM-2, cell adhesion ligand for LFA-1
26	AB018010	AW381165	132	53	4	CDS	f/s	AluJb	Membrane glycoprotein 4F2 heavy chain
27	AF072247	AA285195	128	25	2	CDS	f/s	AluSg/x	Methyl-CpG binding domain-containing protein MBD3
28	HUMMEVKIN	AF217536	118	12	2	CDS	f/s	AluJb	Mevalonate kinase
29	AK001322	AK022939	89	1	1	CDS	f/s	AluJo	mRNA from NT2 neuronal precursor cells
30	D83735	BE836938	122	54	3	CDS	f/s	AluSx	Neutral calponin
31	AF010316	AF217965	122	7	1	CDS	f/s	AluJb	Microsomal glutathione transferase homolog
32	HSAJ4875	AA225691	75	36	10	CDS	f/s	AluSp	Putative glucosyltransferase
33	AF021819	BE567765	93	198	1	CDS	f/s	FLAM_C	RNA-binding protein regulatory subunit
34	AF095742	BF038501	95	20	1	CDS	f/s	AluSx	Serine protease ovasin
35	AF151858	AA397587	71	34	4	CDS	f/s	AluSc	Similar to putative t1/st2 receptor binding protein precursor
36	AF072810	AW835499	82	6	1	CDS	f/s	AluJo	Transcription factor WSTF
37	AK026835	AA460397	77	13	1	CDS	f/s	AluJb	Unknown protein product
38	HUMRSC765	AU151565	91	33	1	CDS	f/s	FLAM_A	Unknown protein product
39	BF513753	AK000502	97	5	1	CDS	f/s	AluSx	Unknown protein product
40	AK024815	AL046389	101	1	1	CDS	f/s	AluJo	Unknown protein product
41	AK001755	AK023461	134	7	1	CDS	f/s	AluSc	Unknown protein product
42	AB002315	AL043085	151	3	1	CDS	f/s	AluJb	Unknown protein product
43	AK022568	BE898836	76	16	5	CDS	f/s	AluJb	Weakly similar to Acyl-CoA dehydrogenase
44	AK022147	AV714478	127	6	1	CDS	f/s	AluSx	Weakly similar to the yeast GTPase-activating protein GYP7
45	AF003924	AW954573	122	6	3	CDS	f/s	AluSg	Zinc finger protein ANC_2H01
46	AF039918	BE867770	117	2	1	5UTR		FRAM	CD39-like protein CD39L4
47	AF070674	BF216095	130	7	2	5UTR		AluSx	Inhibitor of apoptosis protein-1 (MIHC)
48	AF071107	AF071108	84	8	2	5UTR		FLAM_A	SMAD5
49	AF130312	BF184073	103	37	1	5UTR		AluSx	TATA box binding protein-related factor 2
50	AFO78864	BE747669	131	21	1	5UTR		AluSx	TS58

(Table continued on following page.)

Table 1. (*Continued*)

	EST/RNA confirming exon skip (1)	EST/RNA confirming exon insertion (2)	Exon len. (3)	No. sequences confirming exon skip (4)	No. sequences confirming exon insertion (5)	Place (6)	Effect on CDS (7)	*Alu* subfamily (8)	GenBank annotation (9)
51	BF086933	AK002100	71	7	2	5UTR		AluSx	Unknown protein product
52	AK001235	BE788268	119	18	2	5UTR		FLAM_C	Unknown protein product
53	AK001715	BE740371	248	20	1	5UTR		AluJb	Unknown protein product
54	HUMZFX	HSZFX3	128	2	1	5UTR		AluSx	Zinc finger protein X-linked
55	BF306258	AK024074	74	2	2	N/A		AluSx	Moderately similar to zinc finger protein 91
56	AA435797	HSU92992	122	8	1	N/A		AluSg	mRNA from brain tissue, CAG repeat region
57	HSM801006	HSM800877	106	2	2	N/A		AluJb	Similar to zinc finger helicase
58	AK023856	AA344993	98	16	2	N/A		AluY	Unknown protein product
59	AA210960	AK021447	114	6	3	N/A		AluSg	Unknown protein product
60	T99367	AB007962	118	2	1	N/A		AluJb	Unknown protein product
61	AK026653	BF037972	147	8	1	N/A		AluY	Unknown protein product

(1) One of the GenBank sequences (RNA or EST) showing the exon-skipping pattern. The name presented is the GenBank locus.
(2) One of the GenBank sequences (RNA or EST) confirming the existence of the *Alu*-containing exon. The name presented is the GenBank locus.
(3) The length of the *Alu*-containing exon.
(4) Number of expressed sequences (RNAs and ESTs) showing the exon-skipping pattern.
(5) Number of expressed sequences (RNAs and ESTs) confirming the existence of the *Alu*-containing exon.
(6) The location of the *Alu*-containing exon along the mRNA is denoted as follows: (CDS) the exon is inserted within the protein-coding region; (5UTR) the exon is inserted within the 5′UTR; (N/A) missing or contradictory GenBank annotation.
(7) The effects of the insertion of the *Alu*-containing exon in the protein-coding region is denoted as follows: (+) the exon adds a domain, namely inserted in frame and do not contain an in-frame stop codon; (alt n) exon insertion causes the alteration of the amino terminus of the protein; (3′t) exon insertion contains an in-frame premature stop codon; (f/s) exon insertion causes a frame-shift.
(8) The subfamily of the *Alu* element, see Table 2. RepeatMasker (http://repeatmasker.genome.washington.edu/cgi-bin/RepeatMasker) was run on the DNA around each *Alu*-containing exon to determine the subfamily type.
(9) GenBank annotation of the locus.

However, the influence of the *Alu*-containing exons on the coding region of the protein is significantly different from the influence of the alternatively spliced internal exons from chromosome 22 (Fig. 3). In 38 cases (84%) of 45 *Alu*-containing exons that are located within the protein-coding region, the insertion of an *Alu*-containing exon results in a shortened protein, either through frameshift (30 cases, 66.6%) or through an in-frame stop codon within the *Alu*-containing exon itself (8 cases, 17.8%). In comparison, only 21 alternatively spliced internal exons (44%) from chromosome 22 set yielded a premature termination, 18 of them (38%) cause frameshift.

Only 6 (13%) *Alu*-containing exons neither contain stop

Figure 2 Location of alternatively spliced internal exons within the mRNA. Data for 54 *Alu*-containing exons, for which there was non-contradictory information in the GenBank annotation, is presented in lighter shaded bars. Data of 62 alternatively spliced internal exons from chromosome 22, compiled by Hide et al (2001) are presented as reference (darker shaded bars).

codons nor affect the original termination codon. These exons can, therefore, be regarded as genuine domain donors. The lengths of these domains range between 15 and 42 amino acids, and their predicted isoelectric points vary from 3.4 to 11. The set of alternatively spliced internal exons from chromosome 22 behaves differently — 22 of the exons (46%) in this set are domain donors.

We suggest measuring the strength of the splice sites of an alternatively spliced internal exon by means of a retention ratio, which is calculated as the number of mRNA sequences that contain the alternatively spliced exon divided by the total number of mRNA sequences. In practice, the retention ratio for a gene or a locus was calculated as the observed number of expressed sequences that contain the alternatively spliced exon as well as the two flanking exons divided by the total number of expressed sequences aligned to the locus (see Table 1 for the number of sequences that confirmed each exon or skipped it). Most *Alu*-containing exons have a small retention ratio (average of 0.21), that is, they are only found in about one-fifth of all mRNA transcripts. This value is, of course, overestimated, because by necessity we took only loci in which there was at least one sequence showing an alternative internal exon. Loci with a small number of covering expressed sequences bias the ratio upward. Thus, the retention ratio for the 31 cases, in which the number of sequences is 10 or above, averages in 0.11 (Fig. 4). In comparison, the average retention ratio of the 1115 alternatively spliced internal exons that do not contain *Alu* sequences is 0.41 (data not shown).

Figure 3 Effect of exon insertion on the protein-coding region. Data for 45 *Alu*-containing exons occurring within the protein-coding region are presented in lighter shaded bars. Data of 48 alternatively spliced internal exons from chromosome 22 (Hide et al. 2001), which occur in the protein-coding region, are presented as reference (darker shaded bars). Exons were considered as domain adding if their length was a multiple of three, and there was no in-frame stop codon within them. Exons were considered as causing a premature termination either when they caused a frame-shift or when they presented an in-frame stop codon. Data for alternatively spliced internal exons from chromosome 22 were calculated from Table 2 in Hide et al. (2001).

Following the convention in the literature, we define the poly(A)-containing *Alu* sequence as the plus strand and the complementary poly(T)-containing sequence as the minus strand. A total of 52 of the 61 *Alu*-containing exons (85%) involve the minus strand. The uneven distribution between the strands is probably due to the fact that the minus strand of the *Alu* consensus sequence contains more motifs that resemble splice sites than the plus strand (Makalowski et al.1994; Makalowski 2000). Table 3 enumerates the splice sites utilized by the *Alu*-containing exons and the location of these splice sites along the consensus *Alu* sequence. There were seven sites in the minus strand of the *Alu* sequence that were utilized as 5′ splice sites (donors), of which three had not been reported previously (Makalowski 2000). Twelve sites in the minus strand of the *Alu* sequence were utilized as 3′ splice sites (acceptors); all but one were not reported previously (Makalowski 2000). In the plus strand, we identified a single potential acceptor site and three potential donor sites — one of these was identified previously (Makalowski 2000).

It has been proposed that *Alu* evolution proceeds through successive waves of fixation, in which each *Alu* subfamily is derived from a small number of source sequences belonging to an evolutionarily older subfamily (Jurka and Milosavljevic 1991; Batzer et al. 1996; Kapitonov and Jurka 1996). Key nucleotide positions are distinctive between *Alu* subfamilies (Jurka and Milosavljevic 1991; Batzer et al. 1996). We used a collection of 153,645 annotated *Alu* elements mapped to the human genome (Stenger et al. 2001) to determine the frequency of each *Alu* subfamily in the human genome. `RepeatMasker` (http://repeatmasker.genome.washington.edu/cgi-bin/RepeatMasker) was run on the DNA around each *Alu*-containing exon to determine the borders of the *Alu* in the DNA and the subfamily type. We found that older subfamilies (such as *Alu*-J and *Alu* monomers) are significantly over-represented ($P < 6.4 \times 10^{-21}$) in the *Alu*-containing exons, whereas newer subfamilies (Alu-S and Alu-Y) are under-represented (Table 2).

The average length of an *Alu*-containing exon was 114 bases, with the longest exon being 286 bases, and the shortest 42 bases. As a typical *Alu* element contains 300 bases, the exons contain only a fraction of the *Alu* sequence. We used `RepeatMasker` to determine the borders of the *Alu* element on the genome. All *Alu* elements found within exons were extending into at least one of the flanking introns. We found no case of an *Alu* element totally contained within an exon, but this might be due to the fact that we limited our search to exons shorter than 400 bases, and an insertion of a full *Alu*

element into an exon would result in a very long exon. We note that full-length *Alu* elements have been found previously in terminal exons. However, our study excluded terminal exons. These results indicate that all 61 *Alu*-containing exons found in our set resulted from exonization of part of an intronic *Alu* element, rather than directly inserted into preexisting exons.

DISCUSSION

From our results, it is clear that constitutive *Alu*-containing internal exons are either absent or very rare in the human transcriptome, whereas alternative *Alu*-containing internal exons appear frequently. Additionally, *Alu*-containing exons have a significantly lower average retention ratio than alternatively spliced internal exons that do not contain *Alu*. These findings imply that *Alu* splice-like sites that had evolved into strong constitutive splice sites were most probably selected against because of their interference with normal protein production. In contrast, mutational changes in *Alu* sequences resulting in the creation of weak splice sites are tolerated, especially if their retention ratio is low. There are several documented genetic diseases caused by a mutation that led to the creation of a strong splice site in an otherwise normal intronic *Alu*. For example, a G→C mutation in an *Alu* sequence within intron 3 of ornithine δ-aminotransferase (OAT), caused the creation of a strong donor site, consequently leading to the constitutive insertion of a novel *Alu* exon between exons 3 and 4. The insertion caused an in-frame stop codon, which led to OAT deficiency (Mitchell et al. 1991; Makalowski 2000). This is an example of the possible deleterious effect of *Alu*-containing exons that has become constitutively inserted within a transcript.

According to our data, older subfamilies (monomers and *Alu*-J) are over-represented in the set of *Alu*-containing exons compared with their distribution in the genome (Table 2). Since, by definition, members of older subfamilies were retroposed to the human genome earlier than members of newer subfamilies, they had more time to diverge from the *Alu* ancestor. Members of the *Alu*-J subfamilies show ~86% identity to the *Alu* consensus sequence, whereas members of the *Alu*-S subfamilies show ~92%–93% identity (Kapitonov and Jurka 1996). Therefore, the bias toward older subfamilies in the set of *Alu*-containing exons may reflect the number of substitutions needed to create a functional splice site within the retroposed *Alu* sequence to allow for its exonization.

Another possibility that would explain the fact that we did not find constitutive *Alu*-containing internal exons is that old *Alu*-containing internal exons that became fixed show only a poor similarity to the consensus *Alu* sequence, and, therefore, could no longer be recognized by similarity searches as *Alu* derived.

We have chosen to focus on alternative splicing events of the exon-skipping type for two reasons. First, this type is the most frequent type of alternative splicing (Hide et al. 2001). Second, many unspliced ESTs found in the ESTs database (dbEST) represent sequenced introns (intron contamination) and contain *Alu* sequences, and, therefore, we preferred not to use unspliced expressed sequences as evidence for alternative splicing. In the exon-skipping type of alternative splicing,

Figure 4 Retention ratios of highly covered *Alu*-containing exons. Retention ratio for each exon was calculated by the number of expressed sequences that contain the exon as well as both flanking exons, divided by the total number of sequences that contain both flanking exons. Only the 31 exons with 10 or more total sequences that contain both flanking exons were taken for this analysis. Therefore, every exon represents ~3% of the exons dataset.

gene ZNF177 has been reported to contain both an *Alu* and an L1 fragment in the constitutively spliced exon 4 (Baban et al. 1996; Landry et al. 2001). Apart from the two mRNAs reported by (Baban et al. 1996), we failed to find a single EST that may be used to determine whether or not this exon is really constitutive. However, we predict that splice variants that do not contain this exon will be discovered in the future.

We have shown that exonized *Alu* elements are alternatively spliced. Thus, *Alu* elements have the evolutionary potential to enhance the coding capacity and regulatory versatility of the genome without compromising its integrity.

both variants are spliced — the skipping variant contains a large intron that skips the alternative internal exon, and the variant containing the exon has two introns, one on each of the alternatively spliced internal exon's sides.

Due to the strict nature of our search, not all alternatively spliced internal exons were retrieved, and, therefore, not all documented *Alu*-containing exons appear in our database. We have taken only exons flanked by true introns on both sides. A true intron was defined as an intron abiding by the GT/AG, GC/AG, or AT/AC rules, without any of its nucleotides covered by an expressed sequence. Due to the large number of ESTs that represent intron contamination and align to places in the genome that are normally introns, many true exon-skipping cases were most probably disregarded in our study. In the same manner, our database of constitutively spliced internal exons is probably only a fraction of the complete set of constitutively spliced internal exons in the genome, because, in addition to the demand that the exon will be flanked by true introns, we have taken into account only exons covered by at least four sequences. Finally, we examined only genes for which the cDNA was deposited in GenBank, disregarding clusters made entirely of ESTs.

The literature describes numerous individual studies in which *Alu* insertions were found within an mRNA. The vast majority of these cases are described as splice variants, with another splice variant that does not contain the *Alu* insertion in evidence. In the literature, we found two instances of internal *Alu*-containing exons that were reported to be found in all detected splice variants. Neither case appears in either our dataset of constitutive exons or in the alternative exons dataset. The reason for these exclusions was the alignment of intron-contaminated ESTs to these two loci. We have searched manually for ESTs matching these two loci. The human hematopoietic progenitor kinase (HPK1) contains an *Alu*-derived peptide in its carboxyl terminus. This *Alu* insertion was reported previously as fixed, that is, the *Alu* was present in all transcripts (Hu et al. 1996; Nekrutenko and Li 2001). We found 25 ESTs that skip the *Alu*-containing exon (exon 26), whereas only three sequences (two of them were mRNAs) contained the exon (data not shown). The zinc finger

METHODS

The Gencarta Database and its `LEADS` output was licensed from Compugen Ltd. (http://www.cgen.com). Briefly, the `LEADS` output was created as follows. ESTs and cDNAs from GenBank version 121 were cleaned from terminal vector sequences, and low-complexity stretches and repeats in the expressed sequences were masked. Sequences with internal vector contamination and sequences identified as immunoglobulins or T-cell receptors were discarded. In the next stage, expressed sequences were heuristically compared with the genome to find likely high-quality hits. They were then aligned to the genome by use of a spliced alignment model that allows long gaps. Only sequences having >94% identity to a stretch in the genome were used in further stages. Sequences having hits to more than one locus in the genome were analyzed to choose the correct locus, taking into account percent identity and intron content (to differentiate between genes and processed pseudogenes). Sequences mapping to two or more chromosomes, or sequences in which the inferred introns were longer than 400,000 were discarded as suspected chimeras. Low-quality sequence ends that disagreed with the DNA were trimmed. In the clustering and assembly stage, overlapping expressed sequences and corresponding genomic sequences were multiply aligned. Positions on the genomic sequence in which there is at least one sequence that opens or closes a long gap were considered splice sites. Where possible, long gaps begin with a GT or GC dinucleotide and end with an AG dinucleotide. The resulting multiple alignment is represented as a directed graph, in which each vertex represents the multiple alignment of sequences between two detected splice sites. An edge exists between two vertices if at least one sequence continues from the first multiple alignment to the second. Every sequence has a hyperedge consisting of the vertices through which it passes.

The 13,097 clusters that contained at least 4 expressed sequences, of which at least 1 was a cDNA sequence, were selected for the internal-exon search. An intron was defined as a vertex containing only the genomic sequence, and a true intron as an intron abiding by the GT/AG, GC/AG, or AT/AC rules. An exon was defined as a vertex containing at least one expressed sequence, and an internal exon was defined as an exon embedded between two true introns. Substructures of the cluster containing three exons separated by two introns, in which the second exon is an internal exon, were searched.

Table 2. Distributions of *Alu* Subfamilies within the Genome and *Alu*-Containing Exons[a]

Subfamily	Age (million years)[b]	Distribution in the genome[c]		Distribution in the set of *Alu*-containing exons[d]	
		Occurrences	Percent	Occurrences	Percent
Alu monomer	112	1183	1%	7	11%
Alu-J	81	45156	29%	26	43%
Alu-S	48-31	88645	58%	26	43%
Alu-Y	19	15574	10%	2	3%
Unknown family	—	3087	2%	0	0%

[a]There is a statistically significant difference between two distributions ($P < 6.4 \times 10^{-21}$).
[b]Age of *Alu* subfamilies from Kapitonov and Jurka (1996).
[c]Distribution in the genome was calculated from a set of 153,645 human *Alu*s compiled previously by Stenger et al. (2001), available at http://dir.niehs.nih.gov/ALU.
[d]Subfamily types of the *Alu* sequences contained within alternatively spliced internal exons were determined using `RepeatMasker` (http://repeatmasker.genome.washington.edu/cgi-bin/RepeatMasker).

An internal exon was classified as an alternatively spliced internal if there was at least one sequence that contained the three exons, and one sequence that contained both flanking exons, but skipped the middle one. A constitutively spliced internal exon was defined as an internal exon covered by at least four sequences, for which no alternative splicing was observed. The search was limited to exons shorter than 400 bases.

Constitutive and the alternative exons were searched using the `PERL` programs `GetConstitutiveExons.pl` and `GetAlternativeCassetteExons.pl`, respectively (http://www.kimura.tau.ac.il/~rotem/ALU/). Packages used by these programs for parsing the `LEADS` output, compiled for SUN architecture, can be downloaded from http://www.cgen.com/parse_LEADS. Exons datasets can be downloaded from http://www.kimura.tau.ac.il/~rotem/ALU. Both exons datasets were compared with the NCBI *Alu* database (ftp://ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pub/jmc/alu/, (Claverie and Makalowski 1994)) using the `BLASTn` program with default parameters. Genomic sequences near the *Alu*-containing exons were extracted from `LEADS` clusters using the `GetAlternativeCassetteExons.pl` program. Exon-intron structures of genes containing *Alu* exon were double checked using the `Sim4` Program for spliced alignment (Florea et al. 1998). Isoelectric point was predicted using the `Expasy` online service http://www.expasy.ch/tools/pi_tool.html. Location in mRNA and influence on protein-coding regions were inferred manually from GenBank annotations. Data for alternatively spliced internal exons from chromosome 22 were calculated from Table 2 in Hide et al. (2001). *Alu* subfamilies, orientation, and borders on the genomic sequence were determined using `RepeatMasker`

Table 3. Potential Splice Sites in the *Alu* Consensus Sequence that are Utilized by *Alu*-Containing Exons

Alu strand	Type of potential splice site	Location in *Alu* consensus sequence[a]	Times utilized[b]	Reported previously[c]
Minus	5′ splice site (donor)	4	1	No
		23	7	Yes
		138	2	Yes
		158	22	Yes
		170	1	Yes
		200	4	No
		206	4	No
Minus	3′ splice site (acceptor)	65	1	No
		114	3	No
		116	8	No
		119	1	No
		120	1	No
		255	4	No
		273	1	No
		275	13	No
		276	1	No
		277	1	No
		279	11	Yes
		281	2	No
Plus	5′ splice site (donor)	51	2	No
		69	2	Yes
		101	4	No
Plus	3′ splice site (acceptor)	45	1	No

[a]Location of the potential splice sites in the *Alu* consensus sequence follows the numbering in Jurka and Milosavljevic (1991).
[b]The number of *Alu*-containing alternatively spliced exons that utilize the splice site.
[c]Compared with Makalowski (2000).

(http://repeatmasker.genome.washington.edu/cgi-bin/
RepeatMasker). Subfamilies of genomic *Alu* sequences were
inferred from http://dir.niehs.nih.gov/ALU/map (Stenger et
al. 2001).

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

REFERENCES

Baban, S., Freeman, J.D., and Mager, D.L. 1996. Transcripts from a novel human KRAB zinc finger gene contain spliced *Alu* and endogenous retroviral segments. *Genomics* **33:** 463–472.

Barnett, T.R., Drake, L., and Pickle, W. 1993. Human biliary glycoprotein gene: Characterization of a family of novel alternatively spliced RNAs and their expressed proteins. *Mol. Cell. Biol.* **13:** 1273–1282.

Batzer, M.A., Deininger, P.L., Hellmann-Blumberg, U., Jurka, J., Labuda, D., Rubin, C.M., Schmid, C.W., Zietkiewicz, E., and Zuckerkandl, E.1996. Standardized nomenclature for *Alu* repeats. *J. Mol. Evol.* **42:** 3–6.

Caras, I.W., Davitz, M.A., Rhee, L., Weddell, G., Martin, Jr., D.W., and Nussenzweig, V. 1987. Cloning of decay-accelerating factor suggests novel use of splicing to generate two proteins. *Nature* **325:** 545–549.

Claverie, J.M. and Makalowski, W. 1994. *Alu* alert. *Nature* **371:** 752.

Deutsch, M. and Long, M. 1999. Intron-exon structures of eukaryotic model organisms. *Nucleic Acids Res.* **27:** 3219–3228.

Florea, L., Hartzell, G., Zhang, Z., Rubin, G.M., and Miller, W. 1998. A computer program for aligning a cDNA sequence with a genomic DNA sequence. *Genome Res.* **8:** 967–974.

Hamdi, H., Nishio, H., Zielinski, R., and Dugaiczyk, A. 1999. Origin and phylogenetic distribution of *Alu* DNA repeats: Irreversible events in the evolution of primates. *J. Mol. Biol.* **289:** 861–871.

Hide, W.A., Babenko, V.N., van Heusden, P.A., Seoighe, C., and Kelso, J.F. 2001. The contribution of exon-skipping events on chromosome 22 to protein coding diversity. *Genome Res.* **11:** 1848–1853.

Hu, M.C., Qiu, W.R., Wang, X., Meyer, C.F., and Tan, T.H. 1996. Human HPK1, a novel human hematopoietic progenitor kinase that activates the JNK/SAPK kinase cascade. *Genes & Dev.* **10:** 2251–2264.

International Human Genome Sequencing Consortium 2001. Initial sequencing and analysis of the human genome. *Nature* **409:** 860–921.

Jurka, J. and Milosavljevic, A. 1991. Reconstruction and analysis of human *Alu* genes. *J. Mol. Evol.* **32:** 105–121.

Kapitonov, V. and Jurka, J. 1996. The age of *Alu* subfamilies. *J. Mol. Evol.* **42:** 59–65.

Landry, J.R., Medstrand, P., and Mager, D.L. 2001. Repetitive elements in the 5′ untranslated region of a human zinc-finger gene modulate transcription and translation efficiency. *Genomics* **76:** 110–116.

Li, W.H., Gu, Z., Wang, H., and Nekrutenko, A. 2001. Evolutionary analyses of the human genome. *Nature* **409:** 847–849.

Makalowski, W. 2000. Genomic scrap yard: How genomes utilize all that junk. *Gene* **259:** 61–67.

Makalowski, W., Mitchell, G.A., and Labuda, D. 1994. *Alu* sequences in the coding regions of mRNA: A source of protein variability. *Trends Genet.* **10:** 188–193.

Mighell, A.J., Markham, A.F., and Robinson, P.A. 1997. *Alu* sequences. *FEBS Lett.* **417:** 1–5.

Mitchell, G.A., Labuda, D., Fontaine, G., Saudubray, J.M., Bonnefont, J.P., Lyonnet, S., Brody, L.C., Steel, G., Obie, C,. and D. Valle 1991. Splice-mediated insertion of an *Alu* sequence inactivates ornithine δ-aminotransferase: A role for *Alu* elements in human mutation. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **88:** 815–819.

Nekrutenko, A. and Li, W.H. 2001. Transposable elements are found in a large number of human protein-coding genes. *Trends Genet.* **17:** 619–621.

Schmid, C.W. 1996. *Alu*: Structure, origin, evolution, significance and function of one- tenth of human DNA. *Prog. Nucleic Acid Res. Mol. Biol.* **53:** 283–319.

Shoshan, A., Grebinskiy, V., Magen, A., Scolnicov, A., Fink, E., Lehavi, D., and Wasserman, A. 2001. Designing oligo libraries taking alternative splicing into account. In Microarrays: Optical Technologies and Informatics, *Proc SPIE* (ed. M.L. Bittner, Y. Chen, A.N. Dorsel, and E.D. Dougherty) Vol. 4266, pp. 86–95. SPIE, Bellingham, WA.

Stenger, J.E., Lobachev, K.S., Gordenin, D., Darden, T.A., Jurka, J. and Resnick, M.A. 2001. Biased distribution of inverted and direct *Alus* in the human genome: Implications for insertion, exclusion, and genome stability. *Genome Res.* **11:** 12–27.

Szmulewicz, M.N., Novick, G.E., and Herrera, R.J. 1998. Effects of *Alu* insertions on gene function. *Electrophoresis* **19:** 1260–1264.

Yulug, I.G., Yulug, A., and Fisher, E.M. 1995. The frequency and position of *Alu* repeats in cDNAs, as determined by database searching. *Genomics* **27:** 544–548.

WEB SITE REFERENCES

ftp://ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pub/jmc/alu/; The NCBI *Alu* database.

http://dir.niehs.nih.gov/ALU/map; Database of *Alu* elements in the human genome from Stenger et al. (2001).

http://repeatmasker.genome.washington.edu/cgi-bin/RepeatMasker; The `RepeatMasker` program by Smit and Green.

http://www.cgen.com; Compugen home page.

http://www.expasy.ch/tools/pi_tool.html; A tool that computes isoelectric point (pI) and molecular weight (Mw).

http://www.kimura.tau.ac.il/~rotem/ALU/; Supplementary material from corresponding author.