RNA-binding proteins regulate post-transcriptional responses to TGF-β to coordinate function and mesenchymal activation of murine endothelial cells

Rhys Wardman PhD^{1,2,7}, Merve Keles PhD^{1,2}, Ihor Pachkiv¹, Shruthi Hemanna MSc^{1,2}, Steve Grein MSc^{1,2}, Jennifer Schwarz PhD³, Frank Stein PhD³, Roxana Ola PhD⁴, Gergana Dobreva PhD^{2,5}, Matthias W. Hentze $MD⁶$ and Joerg Heineke MD^{1,2,7}

1Department of Cardiovascular Physiology, European Center for Angioscience (ECAS), Medical Faculty Mannheim of Heidelberg University, 68167 Mannheim, Germany.

2German Center for Cardiovascular Research (DZHK), partner site Heidelberg/Mannheim, Germany. 3Proteomics Core Facility, European Molecular Biology Laboratory (EMBL), Meyerhofstraße 1, 69117 Heidelberg, Germany. 4Cardiovascular Pharmacology, ECAS, Medical Faculty Mannheim of Heidelberg University, 68167 Mannheim, Germany ⁵Cardiovascular Genomics and Epigenomics, ECAS, Medical Faculty Mannheim of Heidelberg University, 68167 Mannheim, Germany 6 European Molecular Biology Laboratory (EMBL), Meyerhofstraße 1, 69117 Heidelberg, Germany.

7Corresponding authors:

Rhys Wardman, PhD, Department of Cardiovascular Physiology, European Center for Angioscience (ECAS), Medical Faculty Mannheim, University of Heidelberg, Ludolf-Krehl-Str. 7-11, 68167 Mannheim, Germany. Phone: +49-621-383-71858. Email: rhys.wardman@medma.uni-heidelberg.de

Joerg Heineke, MD, Department of Cardiovascular Physiology, European Center for Angioscience (ECAS), Medical Faculty Mannheim, University of Heidelberg, Ludolf-Krehl-Str. 7-11, 68167 Mannheim, Germany. Phone: +49-621-383-71855. Fax: +49-621-383-71851. Email: joerg.heineke@medma.uni-heidelberg.de

Supplemental Figures

C

Pathway enrichment downregulated RBPs

Figure S1. Ontological analysis of endothelial RBPs (related to figure 1). A. Pathway (KEGG and GO biological process) enrichment of all RBPs identified by RNA interactome capture of MCECs. B. Pathway (KEGG and GO biological process) enrichment of RBPs with increased RNA binding upon TGF-β stimulation (10 ng/ml, 24 h) (fold change 100% or greater) as identified by RNA interactome capture. C. Pathway (KEGG and GO biological process) enrichment of RBPs with decreased RNA binding upon TGF-β stimulation (10 ng/ml, 24 h) (fold change 100% or greater) as identified by RNA interactome capture.

Figure S2. Effects of TGF-β on MCECs and mesenchymal activation A. Effects of TGF-β on tubule formation. MCECs were incubated with TGF-β for 24 hours followed by tubule formation assay. Quantifications reflect total tubule length in visible field, n=3, data shown as average ±SEM, significance assessed with one-way ANOVA and Tukey's multiple comparison test, significance shown to three significant figures. Scale bar 250 µm. **C. Pathway enrichment differentially expressed genes.** Dot plot showing the enriched pathways in differentially expressed genes following TGF-β stimulation**. D. Pathway enrichment upregulated genes.** Dot plot showing selected enriched pathways of upregulated genes following TGF-β stimulation. **F. Pathway enrichment downregulated genes.** Dot plot showing selected enriched pathways of downregulated genes following TGF-β stimulation. **E. Overlap between TGF-β regulated RBPs and differential expressed genes upon TGF-β stimulation.** Overlap of RBPs which showed a greater than two fold change in RNA binding upon TGF-β stimulation (10 ng/ml, 24 h) with differentially expressed RNAs (RNA seq.) following TGF-β stimulation (10 ng/ml, 24 h).

Figure S3. Mechanism of RNA binding activity regulation. A. Effects of PI3K/AKT inhibition on RNA binding. MCECs were incubated in 10 ng/ml TGF-β for 24 hours in the presence of increasing concentrations of Pictilisib, a selective inhibitor of the PI3K/AKT signalling pathway, followed by UV-crosslinking and RNA interactome capture. Quantifications reflect changes in abundance of proteins in RNA interactome isolates, normalised to input lysate, n=3, error bars show average ±SEM, no statistical significance after one-way ANOVA and Tukey's multiple comparison test. **B. Effects of ERK inhibition on RNA binding.** MCECs were incubated in 10 ng/ml TGF-β for 24 hours in the presence of increasing concentrations of PD 0325901, a selective inhibitor of the MEK1 and MEK2, followed by UV-crosslinking and RNA interactome capture. Quantifications reflect changes in abundance of proteins in RNA interactome isolates, normalised to input lysate, n=3, data shown as average ±SEM, no statistical significance after one-way ANOVA and Tukey's multiple comparison test.

µ**g/ml Ctl 0.5 1 2**

Ctl 0.5 1 2

µ**g/ml**

Figure S4. A. Effects of hnRNP H1 overexpression on mesenchymal marker gene expression. MCECs were transfected with hnRNP H1 OE construct (48 h) and TGF-β stimulation (10 ng/ml, 24 h), followed by RNA isolation and RT-qPCR analysis of the expression of selected mesenchymal genes. Expression normalised to *Gapdh*, n=3, each in triplicate, data shown as average ±SEM, normality assessed by Shapiro Wilk and significance assessed by unpaired Student's t-test, significance shown to three significant figures. **B. Effects of Csde1 overexpression on mesenchymal marker gene expression.** MCECs were transfected with Csde1 OE construct (48 h) and TGF-β stimulation (10 ng/ml, 24 h), followed by RNA isolation and RT-qPCR analysis of the expression of selected mesenchymal genes. All expression normalised to *Gapdh*, n=3, each in triplicate, data shown as average ±SEM, normality assessed by Shapiro Wilk and significance assessed by unpaired Student's t-test, significance shown to three significant figures. **C. Effects of hnRNP H1 and Csde1 overexpression on tubule formation.** hnRNP H1 and Csde1 were overexpressed (48 h) in MCECs incubated with TGF-β (24). Cells were cultured on matrigel membrane (24 h), flourescently labelled and tubule formation assessed by microscopy. Quantifications represent average total tubule length and number of complete loops. Representative images (n=3 triplicates scale bar $100 \mu m$). Data shown as average \pm SEM, normality assessed by Shapiro Wilk, significance assessed by one way-ANOVA with Dunnett's multiple comparison, significance shown to three significant figures. **D. Effects of hnRNP H1 and Csde1 overexpression on LDL uptake.** hnRNP H1 and Csde1 were overexpressed (48 h) +/- TGF-β stimulation (10 ng/ml, 24 h). MCECs were then incubated in fluorescently labelled LDL and uptake assessed and quantified by fluorescence microscopy. Data shown as average ±SEM. Normality assessed by Shapiro Wilk, significance assessed by one way-ANOVA with Dunnett's multiple comparison, significance shown to three significant figures. **E. Optimisation/validation of siRNA knockdown of hnRNP H1 and Csde1 (Western blot).** MCECs were transfected with increasing concentrations of sihnRNP H1 or siCsde1 siRNA and expression assessed after 48 hours by Western blot. Expression relative to *Gapdh,* n=3, data shown as average ±SEM, normality assessed by Shapiro Wilk, significance assessed by one way-ANOVA with Dunnett's multiple comparison, significance shown to three significant figures. **F. Optimisation/validation of siRNA knockdown of hnRNP H1 and Csde1 (RT-qPCR).** MCECs were transfected with increasing concentrations of sihnRNP H1 or siCsde1 siRNA and expression assessed after 48 hours by RT-qPCR. Expression relative to *Gapdh,* n=3, data shown as average ±SEM, normality assessed by Shapiro Wilk, significance assessed by one way-ANOVA with Dunnett's multiple comparison, significance shown to

three significant figures. **G. Optimisation/validation of hnRNP H1 and Csde1 overexpression.** MCECs were transfected with increasing concentrations of hnRNP H1 or Csde1 constructs and expression assessed after 48 hours by RT-qPCR. Expression relative to *Gapdh,* n=3, data shown as average ±SEM, normality assessed by Shapiro Wilk, significance assessed by one way-ANOVA with Dunnett's multiple comparison, significance shown to three significant figures.

Figure S5. hnRNP H1 and Csde1 in primary human endothelial cells. A. TGF-β regulated changes in RNA binding are conserved in HUVECs. Human Umbilical Vein Endothelial Cells (HUVECs) were incubated in increasing TGF-β (24 h) followed by UV-crosslinking and RIC. Quantifications reflect changes in abundance in RIC isolates, normalised to input lysate, n=3, data shown as average ±SEM. Normality assessed by Shapiro Wilk, significance assessed by one-way ANOVA with a Dunnett's multiple comparison test, significance shown to three significant figures. **B. Effects of hnRNP H1 and Csde1 knockdown on mesenchymal gene expression in HUVECs.** hnRNP H1 or Csde1 were knocked down in HUVECs by siRNA for 48 hours followed by RT-qPCR analysis of selected mesenchymal marker genes. Expression normalised to *Gapdh,* n=3 each in triplicate, data shown as average ±SEM, normality assessed by Shapiro Wilk, significance assessed by one-way ANOVA with a Dunnett's multiple comparison test, significance shown to three significant figures. **C. Effects of hnRNP H1 and Csde1 knockdown on LDL uptake in HUVECs.** hnRNP H1 and Csde1 were knocked down in HUVECs (siRNA, 48 h), cells were incubated in fluorescently labelled LDL and uptake assessed by fluorescence microscopy. Representative images (n=3 experiments, scale bar 100µm)**.** Data shown as average ± SEM. n=3 (10 quantifications per replicate), normality assessed by Shapiro Wilk, significance assessed by one-way ANOVA with a Dunnett's multiple comparison test, significance shown to three significant figures. **D. Effects of hnRNP H1 and Csde1 knockdown on tubule formation in HUVECs.** hnRNP H1 and Csde1 were knocked down in HUVECs (siRNA, 48 h), cells were plated on matrigel (24 h), fluorescently labelled and tubule formation assessed by microscopy. Quantifications represent average total tubule length and number of complete loops. Representative images (n=3 triplicates scale bar 100µm). Data shown as average ± SEM, normality assessed by Shapiro Wilk, significance assessed by one-way ANOVA with a Dunnett's multiple comparison test, significance shown to three significant figures. **E. Effects of hnRNP H1 and Csde1 knockdown on LDL uptake in HCMECs .** hnRNP H1 and Csde1 were knocked down in HCMECs (siRNA, 48 h), cells were incubated in fluorescently labelled LDL and uptake assessed by fluorescence microscopy. Representative images (n=3 experiments, scale bar 100µm)**.** Data shown as average ± SEM. n=3 (10 quantifications per replicate), significance assessed by a Krucksal-Wallis test, significance shown to three significant figures.

Figure S6. Effects of hnRNP H1 knockdown on alternative splicing patterns. A. Significant alternative splicing events following hnRNP H1 knockdown. Pie chart showing the significant alternative splicing changes upon sihnRNP H1 knockdown in both the presence and absence of TGF-β stimulation as detected by RNA sequencing between siCtl vs sihnRNP H1 conditions (FDR < 0.05). **B. Significant alternative splicing events following hnRNP H1 knockdown in the absence of TGF-β stimulation.** Pie chart showing the significant alternative splicing events upon knockdown of hnRNP H1 under basal conditions (siCtl 0 ng/ml TGF-β vs sihnRNP H1 0 ng/ml TGF-β) as detected by RNA sequencing (FDR < 0.05). **C. Significant alternative splicing events following hnRNP H1 knockdown in the presence of TGF-β stimulation.** Pie chart showing the significant alternative splicing events upon knockdown of hnRNP H1 in the presence of TGF-β stimulation (siCtl 10 ng/ml TGF-β vs sihnRNP H1 10 ng/ml TGF-β) as detected by RNA sequencing (FDR < 0.05). **D. Alternative splicing following sihnRNP H1 knockdown in the presence and absence of TGFβ stimulation.** Dot plot showing enriched pathways in genes which showed significant changes in splicing (FDR <0.05) in sihnRNP H1 vs siCtl samples in both the presence and absence of TGF-β stimulation. **E. Representative examples of alternative splicing events.** Representative splicing maps of differentially spliced transcripts upon knockdown of hnRNP H1.

Figure S7. Effects of Csde1 knockdown on alternative splicing patterns. A. Significant alternative splicing events following Csde1 knockdown. Pie chart showing the significant alternative splicing changes upon siCsde1 knockdown in both the presence and absence of TGF-β stimulation as detected by RNA sequencing between siCtl vs siCSde1 conditions (FDR < 0.05). **B. Significant alternative splicing events following Csde1 knockdown in the absence of TGF-β stimulation.** Pie chart showing the significant alternative splicing events upon knockdown of Csde1 under basal conditions (siCtl 0 ng/ml TGF-β vs siCsde1 H1 0 ng/ml TGF-β) as detected by RNA sequencing (FDR < 0.05). **C. Significant alternative splicing events following Csde1 knockdown in the presence of TGF-β stimulation.** Pie chart showing the significant alternative splicing events upon knockdown of Csde1 in the presence of TGF-β stimulation (siCtl 10 ng/ml TGF-β vs siCsde1 10 ng/ml TGF-β) as detected by RNA sequencing (FDR < 0.05). **D. Alternative splicing following siCsde1 knockdown in the presence and absence of TGF-β stimulation.** Dot plot showing enriched pathways in genes which showed significant changes in splicing (FDR <0.05) in siCsde1 vs siCtl samples in both the presence and absence of TGF-β stimulation. **E. Representative examples of alternative splicing events.** Representative splicing maps of differentially spliced transcripts upon knockdown of Csde1.

Endothelial cell expression

Figure S8. A. Expression of selected EndoMT marker genes in endothelial cells after TAC. RT-qPCR analysis of genes in isolated cardiac endothelial cells from sham and two week TAC operated mice. Data shown as average ± SEM, normality assessed by Shapiro Wilk test, significance assessed by Student's t-test, significance shown to three significant figures. **B. Expression of hnRNP H1 and target genes in whole heart and endothelial cells after TAC.** RT-qPCR analysis of *hnRNP H1, Col1a1* and *Smad6* expression in whole heart and isolated endothelial cells from sham and two week TAC operated mice. Data shown as average ± SEM, normality assessed by Shapiro Wilk test, significance assessed by Student's t-test, significance shown to three significant figures. **C. Expression of** *Csde1* **and target genes in whole heart and endothelial cells after TAC.** RT-qPCR analysis of *Csde1*, *Col5a1* and *Itga3* expression in whole heart and isolated endothelial cells from sham and two week TAC operated mice. Data shown as average ± SEM, normality assessed by Shapiro Wilk test, significance assessed by Student's t-test, significance shown to three significant figures.

Supplementary Excel tables

Supplementary Table 1.

Proteomic analysis of the TGF-β regulated RNA interactome (related to Figure 1).

Supplementary Table 2.

RIP analysis of TGF-β regulated RNA binding patterns of hnRNP H1 (related to Figure 4).

Supplementary Table 3.

RNA sequencing analysis of differential RNA expression following si-hnRNP H1 knockdown (related to Figure 4).

Supplementary Table 4.

RIP analysis of TGF-β regulated RNA binding patterns of Csde1 (related to Figure 6).

Supplementary Table 5.

RNA sequencing analysis of differential RNA expression following si-Csde1 knockdown (related to Figure 6).

Source data

Source data related to Figure 1

Uncropped/unprocessed representative Western blots relating to Figure 1G. Boxes reflect data quantified in Figure 1 H (validation of TGF- β driven changesin cross-linked RBPs.)

Source data relating to Figure 2.

Uncropped/unprocessed representative Western blots relating to Figure 2C. Boxes reflect data quantified in Figure 2D (Quantification of dose dependent TGF- β driven changesin RBPs.)

Uncropped/unprocessed representative Western blots relating to Figure 2E. Boxes reflect data quantified in Figure 2F (Quantification of time dependent TGF- β driven changesin RBPs.)

Uncropped/unprocessed representative Western blots relating to Figure 2G. Boxes reflect quantified data shown in H. Lamin A/C and Gapdh were used as markers to show efficient separation of the nuclear and cytoplasmic fractions.

Source data relating to Figure 2J.

Source data related to Figure 3.

Source data related to Figure 3F.

Source data related to Figure 3G.

Full source data related to Figure 1G. Boxes reflect data quantified in Figure 1 H (validation of TGF- β driven changes in cross-linked RBPs relative to the corresponding input lysate)

Full source data related to Figure 2C. Boxes reflect data quantified in Figure 2D (Quantification of dose dependent TGF- β driven changes in RBPs relative to lysate.)

Full source data related to Figure 2E. Boxes reflect data quantified in Figure 2F (Quantification of time dependent TGF- β driven changes in RBPs relative to lysate .)

Full source data related to Figure 2G and H. Boxes reflect quantified data shown in H. Lamin A/C and Gapdh were used as markers to show efficient separation of the nuclear and cytoplasmic fractions.

Full source data related to Figure 2J. Boxes reflect data shown in quantifications (changes in RNA binding in response to TGF-β).

Full source data related to Figure 2K. Boxes reflect data shown in quantifications (changes in RNA binding in response to TGF-β).

Full source data related to Figure 3G. Boxes reflect data shown in quantifications (changes in RNA binding in response to TGF-β).

Major Resources Table

In order to allow validation and replication of experiments, all essential research materials listed in the Methods should be included in the Major Resources Table below. Authors are encouraged to use public repositories for protocols, data, code, and other materials and provide persistent identifiers and/or links to repositories when available. Authors may add or delete rows as needed.

Animals (in vivo studies)

Genetically Modified Animals

Antibodies

DNA/cDNA Clones

Cultured Cells

Data & Code Availability

Other

ARRIVE GUIDELINES

The ARRIVE guidelines [\(https://arriveguidelines.org/\)](https://arriveguidelines.org/) are a checklist of recommendations to improve the reporting of research involving animals. Key elements of the study design should be included below to better enable readers to scrutinize the research adequately, evaluate its methodological rigor, and reproduce the methods or findings.

Study Design

Sample Size: Please explain how the sample size was decided Please provide details of any a *prior* sample size calculation, if done.

Inclusion Criteria

Matched aged and sex.

Exclusion Criteria

Matched aged and sex.

Randomization

No randomisation.

Blinding

Unblind.