Cell Genomics, Volume 2

Supplemental information

Type 1 diabetes risk genes

mediate pancreatic beta cell

survival in response to proinflammatory cytokines

Paola Benaglio, Han Zhu, Mei-Lin Okino, Jian Yan, Ruth Elgamal, Naoki Nariai, Elisha Beebe, Katha Korgaonkar, Yunjiang Qiu, Margaret K.R. Donovan, Joshua Chiou, Gaowei Wang, Jacklyn Newsome, Jaspreet Kaur, Michael Miller, Sebastian Preissl, Sierra Corban, Anthony Aylward, Jussi Taipale, Bing Ren, Kelly A. Frazer, Maike Sander, and Kyle J. Gaulton



Figure S1. Effect of different cytokine treatments on islet accessible chromatin, related to Figure 2. A) Principal component analysis showing distribution of samples (n=35) based on the different cytokine treatments, color-coded as shown in the legend. Hi: high dose; Lo: low dose; 3cyt: IL-1 β , IFN- γ , TNFa; 2cyt: IL-1 β , IFN- γ . B) Number of cytokine-responsive cCREs (CR-cCREs) for each treatment compared to control, and union of all differential sites. C) Top: Scatterplot showing effect on cytokine-responsive cCREs (DESeq FDR <0.10) chromatin accessibility in islets after treatment with high doses of three cytokines (IL-1 β , IFN γ , and TNF α , xaxis) versus two cytokines (IL-1 β and IFN γ , y-axis). Bottom: density plot showing increased effect size in cytokine treatment with TNF α . Wilcoxon signed rank test p-value is shown. D) Heatmap of cytokine effect sizes (log₂ fold change, DESeq) on cytokine-responsive cCREs that change with treatment duration (linear regression p< 0.01). E) Example of two cytokine-responsive cCREs at the *HEATR2* and *CRHR1* loci that show increased accessibility over time. F) Motif enrichment for up-regulated or down-regulated cytokine–responsive cCREs identified using different duration of cytokine treatments. Motifs that were significantly enriched in at least one condition (HOMER FDR<0.05, indicated by an asterisk) are shown. Red boxes highlight motifs with visible differences in enrichment over time.



Figure S2. Defining islet cell sub-types from snATAC-seq profiles, related to Figure 2. A) Proportion of cells derived from different donors and treatment conditions in each cluster. **B**) UMAP plots showing promoter accessibility in a 1 kb window around the TSS for selected cell type marker genes. **C**) Genome browser plots showing aggregate read density (CPM-normalized read depth, range: 0-7, shown on vertical axis for each plot) for cells within each cell type for selected cell type marker genes. **D**) Gene Ontology enrichment analysis (Biological_Process_2021 database) for the closest genes to upregulated peaks (logFC >0.5 and FDR<0.05) in Beta 1 and Beta 2 sub-populations.



Figure S3. Cell type-specific changes in islet accessible chromatin upon inflammatory cytokine exposure, related to Figure 2. A) Left: Number of cytokine-responsive cCREs in bulk islet ATAC that overlap a snATAC from different cell types. Right: Number of cytokine-responsive cCREs in bulk islet ATAC that overlap a snATAC specific to a cell type. B) Heatmap of z-score normalized chromatin accessibility at significant cytokine-responsive cCREs (DESeq FDR<0.1) identified in beta, alpha and delta cells by snATAC comparing cytokine-treated and untreated samples. Endothelial, acinar, and stellate cells did not show any significant cytokine-responsive cCREs. C) Scatterplot showing cytokine-responsive cCRE effect sizes (DESeq log_2 fold change) in alpha and beta cells. D) Density plot showing increased cytokine-responsive cCREs significant in either beta or alpha cells (top), and in cytokine-responsive cCREs significant in both cell types (bottom). E) Comparison of motif enrichment in chromatin accessibility from cytokine treated alpha and beta cells. ChromVAR deviation scores within alpha or beta cells were averaged across treated and untreated cells and their difference (Δ CTY-UNT) was plotted in a scatterplot. The slope (ß) from linear regression and the most different motifs between alpha and beta are shown are shown.



p=1.7e-23

OR=1.8

Down

genes

10 15 20 25 30 0 5 -log10(P)

Figure S4. Cytokine-induced gene expression changes in pancreatic islets, related to Figure 3. A) Principal components plot of normalized and batch-corrected gene expression from high-dose-2-cytokine (orange), high-dose three cytokine (red) low-dose two cytokine (blue), low-dose three cytokine (green) -treated and untreated (purple) islets from a total of 16 samples. Donor ID is indicated on the top of each dot. B) Number of differentially expressed genes (DE genes, DESeq FDR<0.1) between each cytokine treatment condition and untreated islets. C) Venn diagram showing overlap between DE genes in each treatment. D) Heatmap showing the top 20 upregulated and top 20 downregulated genes common to each treatment vs untreated islets, and the top 10 differential genes (in bold) between high-dose two cytokine and high-dose three cytokine (i.e due to $TNF\alpha$). E) Gene ontology terms enriched among genes with up-regulated expression in cytokine-treated islets. G) Enrichment of islet distal cytokine-responsive cCREs (>10kb from TSS) for genes with concordant cytokineinduced effects, linked by HiChIP (FDR <0.1). Fisher's exact test p-values and odds ratios are shown. HiChIP was performed in untreated (left) or cytokine-treated (right) EndoC- β H1 cells. H) Fraction of pro-survival and prodeath genes from the CRISPR screen with differential expression in islets after high-dose cytokine treatment, linked to an islet cytokine-responsive cCRE (CR-cCRE) via co-accessibility, or both.

Figure S5. SNP-SELEX sequencing metrics, replicate consistency, and comparison with TF binding predictions, related to Figure 5. A) Fraction of reads retained after removing identical sequencing duplicate reads. The input is composed of 384 pools of oligos with different barcodes (from 4x 96-well plates); each SELEX cycle is composed of 768 assays (8x 96-well plates), performed twice. Median value is indicated at the top of each boxplot. B) Number of reads retained after removing identical sequencing duplicate reads. The y-axis is log scaled. C) Left: example of one experiment showing correlation between the percentages of reads mapping to each oligo (i.e. each dot) in replicate 1 versus replicate 2. Pearson correlation coefficient is indicated. Right: distributions of Pearson coefficients calculated as in the example, across all 768 experiments and cycles. D) Number of experiments showing enrichment at cycle 4 for motifs similar to the assayed TF protein in both replicates, only one of the two, and none. E) Hierarchical clustering of the pairwise distance (1-correlation) of allelic effects (PBS score) across different TF proteins, color-coded according to the structural family. 264 TFs that had a minimum of 100 testable SNPs are shown. F) Left: distribution of correlation between PBS and DeepSea Log fold change across TFs. The number of TFs analyzed (having both DeepSea predictions and SNP-SELEX results for at least 10 SNPs) are indicated. Rigth: scatterplot of PBS and DeepSea Log fold change across tested SNP-TF pairs (number indicated). Preferentially bound SNPs (pbSNPs) are shown in purple. G) Top: distribution of correlation between PBS and △PWM across TFs. The number of TFs analyzed (having measurements for both PWMs and SNP-SELEX for at least 10 SNPs) are indicated. Bottom: scatterplot of PBS and ΔPWM across all tested SNP-TF pairs (number indicated). pbSNPs are shown in purple. H) Pearson correlation coefficients between SNP-SELEX PBS score and Δ PWM in each TF across all bound SNPs, grouped by structural families. 234 TFs that had a minimum of 10 testable SNPs with PWM predicted effects are shown. I) Percentage of pbSNPs that corresponded to a predicted PWM change in each TF, grouped by TF family. 234 TFs that had a minimum of 10 testable SNPs with PWM predicted effects are shown

Figure S6. Electrophoretic mobility shift assay (EMSA) for rs35342456 at the *DEXI/SOCS1* **locus, related to Figure 6.** Three independent EMSA experiments (different cell cultures) and one replicate of binding reaction for experiment #3 are shown. MIN6 were cultured in control and cytokine media and nuclear extracts were used in binding reaction with oligonucleotides carrying either the reference (A) or alternate (C) allele of rs35342456. Both treated and untreated MIN6 cells nuclear extracts showed preferential binding to probes with the reference allele. The top-left panel (Experiment 1) shows the non-cropped image shown in **Figure 6E**.

Figure S7. SOCS1 knock-down effect in EndoC- β H1 cells, related to Figure 6. A) qPCR analysis of SOCS1 expression in EndoC- β H1 cells transduced with lentivirus expressing scramble (left) or small hairpin RNA (shRNA) targeting SOCS1. Data was shown as mean ± SD (n=3). P-values were calculated by unpaired two-tailed t-test. B) Representative flow cytometry plots showing apoptotic EndoC- β H1 cell (Apotracker+/ Propidium iodide-, highlighted in red) ratio in response to cytokine and vehicle (0.1% BSA) treatment. Apoptotic cells transduced with lentivirus expressing either scramble (left) or small hairpin RNA (shRNA) targeting SOCS1 (right) were compared. C) Examples of flow cytometry plots showing gating strategies to obtain plots shown in B.