

Fig. S1. Additional iPS<sup>tet-MyoD</sup> clones were generated from a healthy control, FSHD1 and FSHD2 patients. A. Representative images of immunofluorescence staining of SSEA4 (red) and TRA-1-  $60$  (yellow) in undifferentiated iPSC<sup>tet-MyoD</sup> clones. Scale bar: 500 µm. B. Representative images of immunofluorescence staining of myosin heavy chain (MyHC, green) in differentiated myocytes at day 8. Scale bar: 500 µm. C. Differentiation efficiency was quantified by calculating the percentage of MyHC positive nuclei in total nuclei at day 8 (*n* =4). D-G. RT-qPCR analysis among day0 (undifferentiated) and day8 (differentiated) of each clone (*n* =3) for D) pluripotency markers, E) myogenic markers, F) DUX4 and its downstream targets and, G) ACTB as a reference gene. Relative expression levels were normalized to RPLP0 as an internal control in each sample and subsequently to F1#1 at day8 (differentiated). Data information: In (D-H), data are represented as mean  $\pm$  SEM.



**Fig. S2.** DNA methylation analysis on D4Z4 region showed stably low states among cell types from the F1 (FSHD1) individual with those levels lower than the previously reported level for non-FSHD allele (26%, refered in (1)). This result implicates that DNA methylation status on D4Z4 region is independent of reprograming process or myogenic differentiation process in FSHD allele.



**Fig. S3.** Representative images of immunofluorescence staining of myosin heavy chain (MyHC, green) in differentiated myocytes of A) HC#1, B) F1#1, C) F2#1, and D) IC#1 incubated with 2- ME or with  $H_2O_2$  at varieties of concentration for 24 hours at day 8. Scale bar: 500  $\mu$ m. Note that most of the cells show comparable morphology and cell density among the conditions with 0 -100  $\mu$ M H<sub>2</sub>O<sub>2</sub> in each clone.



**Fig. S4.** RT-qPCR analysis showed that FSHD1 (F1) fibroblasts did not express A) DUX4 and B) ZSCAN4 (*n* =3), compared to differentiated myocytes of F1#1. N.D.: not detected. The representative result of electrophoresis of the PCR-products in RT-qPCR analysis for DUX4 is shown above the graph in (A).



**Fig. S5.** IC#2 resembled DUX4 increase by oxidative stress and epigenetic features of IC#1, related to Figure 3 and 4. A. RT-qPCR analysis for DUX4 and ZSCAN4 among parental F2#1 myocytes and isogenic control IC#2 myocytes at day 8 in the absence or presence of 100  $\mu$ M  $H_2O_2$  stimulation for 24 hours ( $n = 3$ ). Relative expression levels were normalized to RPLP0 as an internal control in each sample and subsequently to  $F2#1$  without  $H_2O_2$ . B. DNA methylation analysis on 4q35. C. ChIP RT-qPCR was performed on 4q35 for H3K9me3, H3K4me2 (as a negative control), HP1ɤ and SMCHD1 (*n* =3). Relative %input was normalized to F2#1. Data information: The data in (A) and (C) are represented as mean  $\pm$  SEM.



**Fig. S6.** UV-C exposure increased DUX4 expression. A. Scheme of UV-C exposure. UV-C in the laminar flow cabinet was used. The estimated power is  $\sim$  1 J/m2  $\cdot$  sec. Medium was replaced by PBS at the time of UV-C exposure. Differentiated myocytes, at day 8 after induction, were exposed to UV-C, incubated for 24 or 9 hours, and analyzed. B. Representative phase-contrast images of F1#1 myocytes exposed to UV-C. Exposure to UV-C for 10 seconds, but not one minute allowed most of the cells to be attached on the dish without morphological abnormality 1 day after stimulation. Scale bars:  $500 \mu m$  for upper panels and  $100 \mu m$  for lower panels. C. RTqPCR was performed for DUX4, its downstream targets (ZSCAN4, TRIM43, and MBD3L2), and MYH3 in HC#1, F1#1, F2#1, and IC#1 myocytes exposed to UV-C and incubated for 24 hours (*n* =3 for each condition). Relative expression levels were normalized to RPLP0 as an internal control in each sample and subsequently to F1#1 without UV-C exposure. D. Representative images of immunofluorescence staining of MyHC (green) and ɤ-H2AX (red) of HC#1, F1#1, F2#1, and IC#1 myocytes at day 8 exposed to UV-C. Cells were fixed 9 hours after UV-C exposure. Scale bar:  $100 \mu m$ . E. The percentages of  $\alpha$ -H2AX positive nuclei in total nuclei in (D)  $(n=3)$ . Data information: In (C) and (E), data are represented as mean  $\pm$  SEM. \*P  $\leq$  0.05, \*\*P  $\leq$ 0.01, \*\*\* $P \le 0.001$  (Student's t-test in (C) and (E)).











F1#1 myocytes

F2#1 myocytes

**Fig. S7.** Figure S7. The effect of inhibition of various kinases on DUX4 activity. A) Inhibition of MAPK families did not suppress DUX4 increase by H2O2. RT-qPCR was performed for DUX4 and ZSCAN4 in F1#1 myocytes under  $H_2O_2$  stimulation treated with PD-0325901, SP-600125 or SB-203580 (inhibitors for MEK, JNK, or  $p38$  MAPK, respectively) (n = 3 for each condition). Relative expression levels were normalized to RPLP0 as an internal control in each sample and subsequently to the condition with  $0 \mu M H_2O_2$ . DMSO was added to each sample to keep its final concentration comparable among all the conditions. B-C) Inhibition of ATM did not suppress DUX4 activity in the absence of oxidative stress. RT-qPCR was performed for DUX4 and ZSCAN4 in F1#1 myocytes (B) and F2#1 myocytes (C) in the presence or absence of  $H_2O_2$ stimulation treated with 20  $\mu$ M KU-55933 (KU) or equal volume of the solvent (DMSO) (n =3 for each condition). Relative expression levels were normalized to RPLP0 as an internal control in each sample and subsequently to the condition with  $0 \mu M H_2O_2$  and DMSO. DMSO was added to each sample to keep its final concentration comparable among all the conditions.

Data information: In (A-C) data are represented as mean  $\pm$  SEM. In (B-C),  ${}^*P \le 0.05$ , N.S. not significant (One way ANOVA followed by Tukey's test)..



**Fig. S8. A model of involvement of oxidative stress in FSHD pathogenesis.** Oxidative stress (OS) is a environmental stress which is easy to be triggered by physiological conditions such as extreme exercise, muscle damage or inflammation in skeletal muscle. OS causes transient DNA damage response mediated by ATM signaling, which is kept away from non-FSHD "closed" 4q35 chromatin, but has an aberrant access to FSHD "opened" 4q35 chromatin. This causes upregulation of DUX4 gene expression and can affect disease onset or progression.



**Table S1. Information about the donors for the iPSC establishment.** 



## **Table S2. Primers used for the correction of SMCHD1 mutation in iPSCs**



**Table S4. Primers used in RT-qPCR analysis** 

	Target		Sequence		PCR condition		Ref	
$RT-qPCR$	<b>ACTB</b>	Fw	CTCTTCCAGCCTTCCTTCC		Denature	$95^{\circ}$ C	15''	
		Rv	CACCTTCACCGTTCCAGTTT		Anealing	$60^{\circ}$ C	60''	
	RPLP0	Fw	AAACGAGTCCTGGCCTTGTCT		Denature	$95^{\circ}$ C	15''	
		Rv	GCAGATGGATCAGCCAAGAAG		Anealing	$60^{\circ}$ C	60''	
	OCT3/4	Fw	GACAGGGGGAGGGAGGAGCTAGG		Denature	$95^{\circ}$ C	15''	
		Rv	CTTCCCTCCAACCAGTTGCCCCAAAC		Anealing	$60^{\circ}$ C	60''	
	<b>NANOG</b>	Fw	CAGTCTGGACACTGGCTGAA		Denature	$95^{\circ}$ C	15''	
		Rv	CTCGCTGATTAGGCTCCAAC		Anealing	$60^{\circ}$ C	60''	
	SOX <sub>2</sub>	Fw	GGGAAATGGGAGGGGTGCAAAAGAGG		Denature	$95^{\circ}$ C	15''	
		Rv	TTGCGTGAGTGTGGATGGGATTGGTG		Anealing	$60^{\circ}$ C	60''	
	<b>MYOG</b>	Fw	TGGGCGTGTAAGGTGTGTAA		Denature	$95^{\circ}$ C	15''	
		Rv	CGATGTACTGGATGGCACTG		Anealing	$60^{\circ}$ C	60''	
	MYH <sub>3</sub>	Fw	GCAGATTGAGCTGGAAAAGG		Denature	$95^{\circ}$ C	15''	
		Rv	TCAGCTGCTCGATCTCTTCA		Anealing	$60^{\circ}$ C	60''	
	<b>CKM</b>	Fw	ACATGGCCAAGGTACTGACC		Denature	$95^{\circ}$ C	15''	
		Rv	TGATGGGGTCAAAGAGTTCC		Anealing	$60^{\circ}$ C	60''	
	DUX4	Fw	CCTGGGATTCCTGCCTTCTA		Denature	$95^{\circ}$ C	30''	54
		Rv	AGCCAGAATTTCACGGAAGA		Anealing	$62^{\circ}$ C	45''	
	ZSCAN4	Fw	GTGGCCACTGCAATGACAA		Denature	$95^{\circ}$ C	15''	54
		Rv	AGCTTCCTGTCCCTGCATGT		Anealing	$60^{\circ}$ C	60''	
	MBD3L2	Fw	CGTTCACCTCTTTTCCAAGC		Denature	$95^{\circ}$ C	15''	54
		Rv	AGTCTCATGGGGAGAGCAGA		Anealing	$60^{\circ}$ C	$60^{\prime\prime}$	
	TRIM43	Fw	ACCCATCACTGGACTGGTGT		Denature	$95^{\circ}$ C	15''	54
		Rv	CACATCCTCAAAGAGCCTGA		Anealing	$60^{\circ}$ C	60''	