Deciphering novel TCF4-driven mechanisms underlying a common triplet repeat

expansion-mediated disease

Short title (69/70 characters): Transcriptomic signatures of a common triplet

repeat disease

Authors

Nihar Bhattacharyya[1], Niuzheng Chai[1*], Nathaniel J Hafford-Tear[1*], Amanda N Sadan[1*], Anita

Szabo[1*], Christina Zarouchlioti[1], Jana Jedlickova[2], Szi Kay Leung[3], Tianyi Liao[1], Lubica

Dudakova[2], Pavlina Skalicka[2,4], Mohit Parekh[1], Ismail Moghul[1,5], Aaron R Jeffries[3], Michael E

Cheetham[1], Kirithika Muthusamy[5], Alison J Hardcastle[1,5], Nikolas Pontikos[1,5], Petra Liskova[2,4],

Stephen J Tuft[1,5], Alice E Davidson[1,5†]

Affiliations

[1] University College London Institute of Ophthalmology, London, ECIV 9EL, UK

[2] Department of Paediatrics and Inherited Metabolic Disorders, First Faculty of Medicine,

Charles University and General University Hospital in Prague, Prague, Czech Republic

[3] Faculty of Health and Life Sciences, University of Exeter, Exeter, EX4 4PY, UK

[4] Department of Ophthalmology, First Faculty of Medicine, Charles University and General

University Hospital in Prague, Prague, Czech Republic

[5] Moorfields Eye Hospital, London, EC1V 2PD, UK

[†] To whom correspondence should be addressed:

Dr Alice Davidson, UCL Institute of Ophthalmology, 11-43 Bath Street, London, UK

Email: alice.davidson@ucl.ac.uk

*These authors contributed equally to the manuscript

Keywords: TCF4 dysregulation, RNA toxicity, spliceopathy, triplet-repeat, repeat expansion-

mediated disease, corneal dystrophy, Fuchs endothelial corneal dystrophy, *TCF4,* long-read

sequencing, RNA-Seq, Iso-Seq, rare *TCF4* variants, isoform-specific dysregulation

Abstract: (Max 300 words)

(274/300)

Fuchs endothelial corneal dystrophy (FECD) is an age-related cause of vision loss, and the

most common repeat expansion-mediated disease in humans characterised to date. Up to 80%

of European FECD cases have been attributed to expansion of a non-coding CTG repeat

element (termed CTG18.1) located within the ubiquitously expressed transcription factor

encoding gene, *TCF4*. The non-coding nature of the repeat and the transcriptomic complexity of

TCF4 have made it extremely experimentally challenging to decipher the molecular

mechanisms underlying this disease. Here we comprehensively describe CTG18.1 expansion-

driven molecular components of disease within primary patient-derived corneal endothelial cells

(CECs), generated from a large cohort of CTG18.1-expanded (Exp+) and CTG 18.1-

independent (Exp-) FECD cases. We employ long-read, short-read, and spatial transcriptomic

techniques to interrogate expansion-specific transcriptomic biomarkers. Interrogation of long-

read sequencing and alternative splicing analysis of short-read transcriptomic data together

reveals the global extent of altered splicing occurring within Exp+ FECD, and unique transcripts

associated with CTG18.1-expansions. Similarly, differential gene expression analysis highlights

the total transcriptomic consequences of Exp+ FECD within CECs. Furthermore, differential

exon usage, pathway enrichment and spatial transcriptomics reveal *TCF4* isoform ratio skewing

solely in Exp+ FECD with potential downstream functional consequences. Lastly, exome data

from 134 Exp- FECD cases identified rare (minor allele frequency <0.005) and potentially

deleterious (CADD>15) *TCF4* variants in 7/134 FECD Exp- cases, suggesting that *TCF4*

variants independent of CTG18.1 may increase FECD risk. In summary, our study supports the

hypothesis that at least two distinct pathogenic mechanisms, RNA toxicity and *TCF4* isoform-

specific dysregulation, both underpin the pathophysiology of FECD. We anticipate these data

will inform and guide the development of translational interventions for this common triplet-

repeat mediated disease.

Author's summary:

200/200

Fuchs endothelial corneal dystrophy (FECD) leads to vision loss and is the most common

repeat expansion-mediated disease characterised to date; most patients harbour a non-coding

CTG repeat expansion within *TCF4*. FECD represents an important paradigm for other rare and

devastating neurological repeat-mediated diseases, given its relatively mild, age-related, and

tissue-specific nature. Intriguingly, despite *TCF4* being ubiquitously expressed, FECD patients

only experience corneal disease, and the biological reason for this tissue-specificity remains

elusive. Here, we use tissue from 25 FECD patients to perform complementary long-read, short-

read and spatial transcriptomic analyses of diseased cells to enhance our understanding of

mechanisms underpinning this disease. These data highlight that at least two mechanisms,

RNA toxicity and *TCF4* isoform-specific dysregulation, concurrently underlie the disease state in

affected corneal cells. Furthermore, *TCF4* isoform skewing, with evidence of downregulation,

suggests this mechanism in part may explain the unique vulnerability of the cornea. In addition,

7/134 molecularly unsolved FECD expansion negative cases were identified to harbour rare and

potentially deleterious *TCF4* variants, further supporting the hypothesis that dysregulation of

TCF4 may be key to FECD pathophysiology. Biological insights presented here will guide the

development of personalised FECD therapies and may inform the development of repeat-

expansion mediated therapies more broadly.

Introduction:

Fuchs endothelial corneal dystrophy (FECD) is a common, age-related, and visually

disabling disease estimated to affect up to 4.5% of people over the age of 50 years (1). It

primarily affects the corneal endothelium, a monolayer of post-mitotic cells on the posterior

corneal surface that function to maintain relative corneal dehydration. As the disease

progresses, collagenous excrescences (guttae) form on the thickened corneal endothelial

basement membrane (Descemet membrane) and corneal endothelial cells (CECs) undergo

accelerated cell death, which results in corneal oedema and opacity (2) Affected individuals

typically experience symptoms in their 5th to 6th decade, with glare, reduced contrast sensitivity,

and blurred vision (3). Transplantation of donor endothelial tissue is the preferred treatment for

cases with visually significant symptoms. However, given an increasing societal burden of age-

related disease coupled with a global shortage of suitable donor tissue, there is a pressing

clinical need for alternative treatments (2,4).

Up to 80% of FECD cases of European descent have one or more expanded copies of a

CTG trinucleotide repeat element (termed CTG18.1; MIM #613267) located within an intronic

region of the transcription factor encoding gene *TCF4* (3,5). We have previously demonstrated,

in our large (n=450) FECD cohort, that an expanded copy of this CTG repeat (defined as ≥50

copies) confers >76-fold increased risk for developing FECD (6). Expansion of non-coding

repeat elements within the human genome have been identified to cause more than 30 human

diseases to date (7), including fragile X tremor ataxia syndrome (MIM #300623), myotonic

dystrophy types 1 and 2 (MIM #160900 and #602668) and *C9orf72*-associated amyotrophic

lateral sclerosis (ALS) and frontotemporal dementia (MIM #105550)(7). Expansion-positive

(Exp+) FECD represents by far the most common disease within this category. However, to

date, it has only been established that it affects the cornea, which is in contrast to the majority of

the other much rarer non-coding repeat expansion disorders that typically have devastating

outcomes on neurological and/or neuromuscular systems. Despite these differences, strong

mechanistic molecular parallels exist between CTG18.1-mediated FECD and other non-coding

repeat expansion diseases, whereby multiple pathogenic mechanisms occur concurrently to

drive pathology (7,8).

We, and others, have demonstrated that splicing dysregulation is a key feature of FECD

in the presence of one or more expanded CTG18.1 alleles (5,6,9–11). Alongside this RNA

induced toxicity, repeat-associated non-AUG (RAN) dependent translation of the expanded

repeat, and dysregulation of *TCF4* itself have also been hypothesised to contribute to the

underlying pathology of CTG18.1 Exp+ mediated FECD. However, a comprehensive

understanding of consequences and role of both the spliceopathy and downstream effects of

the *TCF4* dysregulation have yet to be characterised in parallel in the same model system.

Furthermore, because *TCF4* comprises >90 alternative spatially and temporally expressed

isoforms, deciphering transcript-specific level dysregulation has proven to be extremely

challenging and a consistent pattern of *TCF4* dysregulation has yet to be associated with

CTG18.1 expansions in CECs (12–14). Such diversity is reflected in the varied functional roles

TCF4 plays in human development, alongside the range of human disease associated with

TCF4 variants in addition to FECD. For example, *TCF4* haploinsufficiency results in Pitt-Hopkins

syndrome (MIM #610954)(15,16), a severe neurodevelopmental disorder, whereas somatic

TCF4 mutations are commonly identified in Sonic hedgehog medulloblastoma (17) and common

germline variants have been associated with Schizophrenia risk (18,19).

In this study, we used a large cohort of biologically independent primary FECD case-

derived CECs to isolate the effects of the multiple parallel pathogenic processes underlying

CTG18.1-mediated FECD. We present long-read transcriptomic data to enhance our

understanding of the increased isoform diversity observed in Exp+ FECD, and spatial

transcriptomics to demonstrate *TCF4*-isoform dysregulation. For the first time, we also isolate

downstream transcriptomic signatures of dysregulation that we hypothesise to be driven by

TCF4-isoform dysregulation that may, in part, explain the tissue specificity of the disease. We

go on to explore the potential relevance of TCF4 dysregulation to FECD, independent of the

CTG18.1 expansion, by interrogating expansion-negative FECD cases for rare *TCF4* variants

through exome sequencing and subsequently applying a gene-burden style approach.

Results

RNA-seq data reveal CTG18.1 expansion-mediated FECD to be transcriptomically distinct

from non-expanded FECD

To further increase our understanding of CTG18.1 expansion-associated splicing

dysregulation events, and better understand the relationship between individual events to

transcript-specific isoforms, we generated long-read RNA-seq data from biologically

independent unpassaged primary CEC cultures derived from healthy control (n=4. mean age

65.3 years) and Exp+ FECD (mono-allelic CTG18.1 allele repeat length ≥50) (n=4, mean age

66.8 years) tissues (**Table 1**)**.** After alignment and stringent quality control, reads that displayed

evidence of 5' degradation, intrapriming and reverse transcription template switching were

removed. Exp+ and control samples were subsequently analysed with SQANTI3 to assess

isoform diversity (**Figure 1A,B and Table 2, S1**). We also generated short-read RNA-seq data

from unpassaged primary CEC cultures derived from healthy control (n=4, mean age 58.5

years), Exp+ FECD (mono-allelic CTG18.1 allele repeat length ≥50) (n=3, mean age 63.3

years) and Exp- FECD (bi-allelic CTG18.1 allele repeat lengths ≤30) (n=3, mean age 63.3

years) tissues (**Table 1**). Exome data generated from the Exp- FECD cases were analysed for

the presence of variants in any previously FECD-associated genes, such as *TCF4, COL8A2,*

SLC4A11, ZEB1, and *AGBL1*(3), to identify any potential underlying genetic cause. No rare

(MAF <0.005) or potentially deleterious (CADD >15) variants were identified. Hierarchical

clustering using heatmap visualisation and PCA analysis revealed that Exp+ samples grouped

separately from not only the controls, but also the Exp- samples **(Figure 1C, D)**. Notably, Exp-

samples also clustered together on the PCA plot, but the heatmap derived from hierarchical

clustering highlighted that greater intra-group variability existed between Exp- samples

compared to variability within control and Exp+ groups (**Figure 1C**). We hypothesise that the

increased transcriptomic diversity within the Exp- group is due to potentially distinct, as yet

unidentified, genetic causes driving disease for each FECD case-derived sample. We included

all three groups in the downstream comparative pipelines using the following pairwise

comparisons; **(PWC1)** control versus Exp+ FECD, **(PWC2)** Exp+ FECD versus Exp- FECD, and

(PWC3) control versus Exp- FECD.

164
165

Table 1: Summary of FECD case and control-derived corneal endothelial cell (CEC) cultures analysed by short and long-read RNA-seq, and spatial transcriptomics.

Sample	Sex	Age*	Ethnicity**
Long-read			
Control 1	Female	68	White-European
Control 2	Male	>50	Undeclared
Control 3	Female	74	Undeclared
Control 4	Male	69	White-European
FECD1exp+ (43/90)	Female	74	White-European
FECD2exp+ (14/80)	Male	78	White-European
FECD3exp+ (18/86)	Female	70	White-European
FECD4exp+ (26/78)	Female	45	Undeclared
Short-read			
Control 1	Female	68	White-European
Control 5	Male	55	White-European
Control 6			
Control 7	Female	56	Black-African
FECD5exp+ (16/86)	Female	67	White-European
FECD6exp+ (12/106)	Male	69	White-European
FECD7exp+ (16/94)	Female	54	White-European
FECD1exp- (13/18)	Female	64	European/Black Caribbean
FECD2exp- (18/24)	Female	73	White-European
FECD3exp- (22/28)	Male	53	Black-African
Spatial transcriptomics			
Control 8 (12/16)	Female	45	Black-African
Control 9 (15/33)	Female	46	White-European
Control 10 (25/26)	Male	70	White-European
FECD4exp- (15/15)	Female	48	White-European
FECD5exp- (16/23)	Female	57	Undeclared
FECD6exp- (15/16)	Female	58	Undeclared
FECD8exp+ (63/88)	Female	75	Undeclared
FECD9exp+ (12/76)	Male	61	Undeclared
FECD10exp+ (18/67)	Male	65	Undeclared

CTG18.1 expansion status is denoted in brackets for all FECD-case derived CEC lines analysed. *Age at time of corneal tissue excision. **Self-reported by affected individual

Figure 1: Exp+ FECD samples are transcriptomically distinct in both short- and long-read datasets when compared to control and Exp- samples. A) Bar chart showing proportion of annotated genes in long read transcriptomic dataset with only one transcript detect vs 2 or more transcripts in Control and Exp+ samples. Exp+ long-read samples have a higher proportion of genes with more than one isoform identified. **B)** Proportion of annotated transcripts with full splice matches. Exp+ FECD and Control samples have similar percentages of full splice matches suggesting additional splicing diversity seen in Exp+ is not predominantly due to aberrant splicing. **C)** Hierarchical clustering heatmap of sample-to-sample distances within short-read RNA-Seq data. Darker colours denote higher similarities between samples, demonstrating that Exp+ and control are more similar within each subgroup than with other samples. Exp- shows a similar result but is less pronounced, likely due to differences in unidentified underlying genetic causes. **D)** Principal component plot of all short-read samples. All three subsets of data cluster separately in the PCA plot.

Alternative splicing analysis of long-read and short-read transcriptomic data

demonstrate the complexity of increased splicing events underlying CTG18.1 expansion-

mediated disease

Iso-seq and subsequent SQANTI3 analysis (**Table 2, S1**) revealed a higher proportion of

isoforms per gene in Exp+ samples (1.7 unique isoforms per unique gene in Exp+ vs 1.3 in

control). Additionally we see a higher proportion of known non-canonical splice junctions in

Exp+ samples. When characterising transcripts based on splice junctions, we see similar

proportions of isoform subtypes (**Table S1**). This is consistent with previous work (5,9–11) and

validated by our short read data (**Figure S2**), whereby Exp+ samples showed greater isoform

diversity compared to control and Exp- samples, but not an overall skew in the types of

alternative splicing observed.

206
Table 2: Summary of SQANTI3 analysis of IsoSeq data. In-depth characterisation of isoforms
in control and Exp+ long-read RNA-seq data utilising SQANTI3 pipeline following stringent
quality control. SQANTI3 subdivides splice junctions into known (present in reference
transcriptome) and novel (not in reference transcriptome). Canonical splice junctions refer to the
most common type of splice junction (with GT donor and AG acceptor sites), while non-
canonical refers to other more rare and tissue specific splice junctions with different donor and
acceptor sites

	Control (n=4)		**Exp+** FECD (n=3)	
Genes	2,318		4,652	
Isoforms	3,113		8,032	
Gene Classification				
	# of genes		# of genes	
Annotated Genes	2,309		4,642	
Novel Genes	9		10	
Splice Junction Classification				
	# splice junctions	Percent	# splice junctions	Percent
Known canonical	27,552	97.18	52,153	97.35
Known non-canonical	1	0.00001	21	0.04
Novel canonical	798	2.81	1,400	2.61
Novel non-canonical	0	0	0	0

To further characterise and quantify alternative splicing events within our short-read

dataset, we utilised rMATS, a junction-based method that employs a hierarchical framework, to

model unpaired datasets and evaluate and quantify all major alternative splice types (20–22).

Comparing Exp+ to control samples (PWC1) we identified 2,118 significant alternative splicing

events in 1,437 genes (**Figures S1, S2, Table S2)**. Alternative splicing comparisons including

Exp+ (PWC1 and PWC2) yielded the most alternative splice types in every category (**Figure S1,**

S2) further reinforcing the spliceopathy aspects of this genetic subtype of disease.

We then compared the rMATS and Iso-seq results to a subset of published datasets

exploring differential splicing in FECD patient-derived samples (**Table S3**) and selected 24

published differential splicing events (from 23 genes) that had previously been identified by

bioinformatic or *in vitro* methods to be strongly associated with CTG18.1 expansion-mediated

FECD(3,5,6). Alternative splicing analysis of our transcriptomic dataset identified that 75.0%

(18/24) of these events were significant in PWC1 (control vs Exp+, **Table S3**). In addition to

these 24 selected events, rMATS identified another 10 novel and significant differential splicing

events within Exp+ in these genes, highlighting the increasing complexity of splicing

dysregulation within Exp+ FECD. Long-read sequencing confirmed the presence of these novel

splicing events in Exp+ FECD (**Table S4**). Also, it was interesting to note that *FN1* was

identified to have robust alternative splicing in Exp+, and further investigation showed that

alternatively spliced exons in Exp+ corresponded with skipping of the Extra Domain A (EDA)

and Extra Domain B (EDB) protein domains that play a critical role in signal transduction and

fibrillar formation (23) (**Table S5**).

Skipped exon alternative splicing events were the most common in all three pairwise

comparisons (**Figure S1**). Prior work regarding alternative splicing in FECD has focused on

MBNL1/2 sequestration(5,6,24) as MBNL proteins are key regulators of exon splicing(25,26).

Given their complex role, we attempted to determine if the flanking intronic sequences of

alternatively spliced exons were enriched for common RNA-binding protein (RBP) binding

motifs. We focussed our RBP motif enrichment analysis (rMAPS2(27)) on the 250bp region

upstream of alternatively spliced exons and isolated those areas where there was enrichment in

PWC1 and PWC2, but not PWC3 (i.e. events enriched within Exp+ CEC lines). By filtering

rMAPS results in this manner, a trend whereby skipped exons are significantly ($p < 0.05$)

upregulated by RNA-binding proteins with TT-containing binding motifs and downregulated by

RNA-binding proteins with CG-containing binding motifs was observed (**Table S6**). As MBNL

proteins favour YCGY binding motifs, this suggests that other RNA-binding proteins with TT-

containing motifs could also play a role in driving the spliceopathy underpinning a key

mechanism of disease in Exp+ FECD.

Evidence of TCF4 dysregulation appears enriched in CTG18.1-mediated FECD,

highlighting specific candidate biomarkers for this genetic subtype of disease

254   Differential gene expression was assessed with DESeq2(28) in all three groups. For all

comparisons an FDR corrected P-value (padj) of <0.05 was used as a threshold for significance

(**Table S7**). A total of 4,399 genes (16.7% of all mapped genes) were identified to be

differentially expressed between the Exp+ and controls (PWC1; **Figure 2A**). Of these, 1,905

genes had a shrunkLFC value (accurate $\log_2$fold values of expression accounting for high

dispersion and low expression counts) of greater than 1 or less than -1. Overall, PWC2 and

PWC3 groups resulted in lowered differential gene expression, with 2,273 and 2,118

significantly differentially expressed genes, respectively **(Figure 2A; Table S7)**.

262   Pairwise analysis revealed considerable overlap between dysregulated genes identified

by all three pairwise comparisons **(Figure 2A),** however, highest convergence was observed by

PWC1 (Exp+ versus control) and PWC2 (Exp+ v Exp-), suggesting these events are driven by

CTG18.1 expansions. In total, both pairwise comparisons reveal 1,150 dysregulated genes

uniquely and significantly dysregulated in Exp+ FECD case-derived samples. Conversely, by

comparing the overlap between PWC1 and PWC3 (Exp+ vs control and Exp- vs control) we

identified a further 1,105 genes that are dysregulated in FECD, irrespective of the underlying

genetic cause, and thus representing more ubiquitous signatures of the disease. Dysregulated

genes in PWC1, including Exp+ unique and common to FECD, did not skew directionally and

were evenly up or down-regulated within our analysis (**Figure 2C**). We isolated 3,183 genes

that are uniquely dysregulated in Exp+ FECD, 2,033 genes dysregulated solely in PWC1 and a

further 1,150 dysregulated genes shared with PWC2; (highlighted in orange **Figure 2A**) and

proceeded with downstream analysis (**Table S7**).

We conducted pathway analysis using g:profiler(29) (querying gene ontology, KEGG

pathway, and Reactome pathways). Gene ontology and KEGG pathway analysis of PWC1

dysregulated genes was consistent with previously published transcriptomes(5,10,11). While

total *TCF4* gene expression was not significantly downregulated in Exp+ (**Figure 2B**),

intriguingly, we observed strong parallels to pathway enrichment analyses highlighted from a

study of *TCF4* neural progenitor knockdown cell model(30) within the 3,183 genes uniquely

dysregulated in Exp+, such as protein processing in endoplasmic reticulum, MAPK signalling,

actin cytoskeletal regulation, endocytosis and apoptosis (**Figure 2D**). Critically, these pathways

are not enriched in PWC3, suggesting that these are unique to Exp+ CECs. Furthermore,

several enriched pathways involving Wnt signalling were seen in the 3,183 dysregulated genes

unique to Exp+ that are not present in PWC3, again suggesting *TCF4* function may be modified

within Exp+ FECD CECs (**Table S9**). Furthermore, enrichment of dysregulated genes in

pathways involving other repeat expansion-mediated diseases and misfolded protein aggregate

diseases suggest mechanistic parallels which reinforce Exp+ CECs as a model system with

broad relevance to repeatome biology (**Table S9**).

The consistent presence of PI3K-Akt pathway enrichment within GO, KEGG, and

Reactome results in Exp+ dysregulated genes (and its consistent absence in PWC3 pathway

enrichment) suggests that Exp+ FECD CECs may interact with growth factors and the

extracellular matrix in a unique manner. Hence, components of the PI3K-Akt pathway may

serve as informative biomarkers for Exp+ FECD in future clinical trial settings, and thus warrant

further investigation. Additional pathways are enriched in this set of genes (and not in PWC3)

that involve RNA processing and binding, other repeat-mediated disease related mechanisms,

epithelial to mesenchymal transition, and multiple signal transduction cascades with

extracellular matrix interactions (**Table S9**).

To determine if other RNA-binding proteins may be implicated in the alternative splicing

seen in Exp+ FECD, we cross-referenced our short-read data with a list of ~1500 human RNA-

binding proteins(31), and discovered that there were 207 RBPs uniquely dysregulated in Exp+

(59 downregulated and 148 upregulated), including *MBNL1, CELF1, ESRP2,* and a variety of

hnRNP and DDX encoding genes (**Table S8**). Both the hnRNP and DDX family of RNA-binding

proteins have previously been implicated in other repeat expansion diseases(29,32–34). It is

likely that a combination of these dysregulated RBPs plays a role in driving the alternative

splicing seen in Exp+ FECD.

Figure 2: Differential gene expression analysis on Exp+ FECD, Exp- FECD, and control primary CEC transcriptomes. **A)** Differential gene expression was assessed via DESeq2. Three pairwise comparisons were conducted: PWC1 (Exp+ vs control), PWC2 (Exp+ vs Exp-), and PWC3 (Exp- vs control). Venn diagrams show overlap of significantly differentially expressed genes (adjusted p-value < 0.05) within these three comparisons. **B)** Total *TCF4* expression showed no significant dysregulation between the different groups. **C)** Volcano plot shows the distribution of gene expression in Exp+ FECD compared to the control group. Horizontal dotted lines denote the boundary between significance (adjusted p-value < 0.05), whereas vertical dotted lines show a shrunkLFC cutoffs for -1 and 1. Dark grey solid markers show significantly expressed genes with a fold change magnitude greater than 1. Solid orange markers delineate uniquely Exp+ differentially expressed genes. **D)** Pathways enriched in Exp+

320   vs Control (g:profiler). Shaded grey boxes show direction of pathway enrichment in TCF4
321   knockdown models (Doostparast Torshizi et al. 2019). Green dots show pathways that are
322   significantly enriched in PWC3 as well. Solid orange dots and open orange circle show that
323   pathway enrichment persists in genes unique to Exp+ (1,150 genes and 3,183 genes,
324   respectively)
325
Differential TCF4 exon usage suggests isoform ratio disruption of TCF4 in CTG18.1-

mediated FECD

Given signatures of *TCF4* dysregulation were apparent in the pathway enrichment

analysis of Exp+ CECs (**Figure 2D**), we then aimed to determine if any tangible patterns of

TCF4 transcript-specific dysregulation was observed in the Exp+ CECs, despite total *TCF4*

levels not being significantly different between Exp+, Exp- and control CECs **(Figure 2B).** Due

to transcriptional diversity and complexity of TCF4 transcripts, DEXSeq2(35) was used to

assess differential exon usage utilising our short-read transcriptomic data.

DEXSeq2 utilises generalised linear models to detect differential exon usage while

controlling for biological variation. This analysis allowed us to query gene expression and

splicing at the exon level. In concordance with our rMATs and DESeq2 analysis, higher levels of

transcriptome-wide differential exon usage events were observed in PWC1 and PWC2

compared to PWC3 (**Figure S3**), suggesting these patterns of differential exon usage are likely

attributed to CTG18.1-related pathology.

Our short-read transcriptomic data reveals that multiple *TCF4* exons (n=15) were

significantly dysregulated in Exp+ compared to control and Exp- FECD samples (PWC1 results

shown in **Figure 3A, Table S10**), whereas no significant differences were observed between

Exp- and control (PWC3, **Figure 3B, Table S10**), demonstrating for the first time that differential

TCF4 exon usage is driven by CTG18.1 expansions and not a downstream feature of FECD

unrelated to the primary genetic driver. A subset of exons contained within a small group of

TCF4 transcripts (8 out of 93) are upregulated in Exp+, while an increased number of more

broadly expressed exons are downregulated (appearing in 64 out of 93 transcripts) (**Figure 3A,**

Table S10). Transcripts containing downregulated exons are primarily included in longer

isoforms of the gene which contain 3 AD domains, while the upregulated exons (excluding those

surrounding the repeat) appear in shorter *TCF4* isoforms containing only two AD domains. This

suggests that Exp+ CECs may be employing certain compensatory measures in response to

the transcript-specific dysregulation that is induced by the presence of CTG18.1 repeat

expansions. Interestingly, our rMATS analysis independently detects this same phenomenon

(**Table S11**), which showed a significant mutually exclusive exon splicing event whereby the last

exon in common with most 3 AD domain-containing isoforms (Exon 6 in ENST000000354452.8)

was favoured in the control group, while the first exon in common with all isoforms (Exon 7 in

ENST000000354452.8) was favoured in the Exp+ group.

We also detect significant retention of the intron flanking the CTG18.1 repeat, previously

described by Sznajder et al. 2018(36) in Exp+ FECD **(Figure 3A).** The intronic region is

significantly upregulated in Exp+ CECs (E173 and E174) in both PWC1 and PWC2 excluding

PWC3 **(Figure 3A, Table S10)**. While this intron represents the 5' untranslated region (UTR) of

several transcripts of *TCF4*, it is also included within an intronic region in 32 out of 93 currently

annotated *TCF4* transcripts.

366
367
Figure 3: CTG18.1 expansion-mediated FECD results in alternative *TCF4* exon usage
within corneal endothelial cells. A) Differences in exon usage between control (grey dotted
line) and Exp+ (orange dotted line) CECs. Significantly upregulated and downregulated exons
are highlighted with blue and red vertical lines, respectively. The location of CTG18.1 is
depicted with an orange line. Inset boxes magnify dysregulated regions. A genomic schematic
of *TCF4* with transcripts aligned is presented below the axis. Key protein domains highlighted
(green - basic helix loop helix (bHLH) domain, blue - activation domains (ADs), red - main
nuclear localization signal (NLS). **B)** Differences in exon usage between control (grey dotted
line) and Exp- (green dotted line) CECs. No exons were statistically dysregulated.

377
378
379
380

RNAScope shows robust detection of altered TCF4 isoform expression in CTG18.1-

mediated FECD case-derived corneal endothelial cells

We performed spatial transcriptomics, via RNAScope, to further validate our hypothesis

that a subset of *TCF4* isoforms containing the third AD3 domain are being selectively

downregulated due to the presence of an expanded CTG18.1 allele (≥50 repeats). For the first

time, we visualised *TCF4* transcripts within Exp+ FECD, Exp- FECD, and control CECs using

two distinct sets of probes, termed A and B (**Figure 4A**). Probe set A comprises a set of probes

that allow the visualisation of all *TCF4* transcripts in the cell (probe A covers all exons in the

transcript Isoform B+ which contains 3 AD domains, TCF4-201, ENST00000354452.8,

NM_001083962.2). Probe set B targets exons in the canonical longer TCF4-201 *TCF4*

transcript which do not overlap with the canonical shorter *TCF4* transcript (Isoform A+/J which

contains 2 AD domains, AD1 and AD2, TCF4-204, ENST00000457482.7, NM_001243234.2).

Hence, these probe sets enable the detection, visualisation, and quantification of the ratio of

longer AD3-containing transcripts, previously identified to be downregulated in Exp+ CECs via

our differential exon usage analysis, compared to total *TCF4* transcripts (**Figure 3A**).

The *TCF4* transcripts were visualised in control, Exp+ and Exp- FECD case-derived

CECs (n=3 for each group) (**Figure 4B, Table 1 and S12**). Each independent primary CEC

culture was also probed with a negative control (targeting bacterial genes) and a $(CAG)_7$-Cy3

probe, using a standard FISH protocol, to validate the presence or absence of CUG-specific

RNA foci derived from expanded copies of CTG18.1 (**Table S12**). RNA foci were consistently

detected in all CTG18.1 Exp+ CECs, and were absent from control and Exp- CECs. Using

CellProfiler (version 4), puncta representing *TCF4* transcripts, detected with both probe set A

and B, were quantified and puncta/cell values were established for each image and averaged

across images with at least 100 nuclei imaged per condition per line. Finally, a ratio was

calculated establishing the proportion of longer AD3 containing transcripts compared to total

TCF4 transcripts for each biological replicate. This showed that, on average, Exp+ CECs had a

significantly smaller proportion of the longer AD3-containing transcripts (16.33% ± 4.53)

compared to unaffected control CECs (36% ± 6.9, p=0.0145) and non-expanded FECD CECs

(30.9% ± 5.17, p=0.0213). This result suggests that the presence of the expanded repeat alone

consistently skews *TCF4* transcript ratios to favour shorter isoforms. As this subgroup of

isoforms typically contains only two out of three activation domains, a higher prevalence of

shorter TCF4 isoforms may affect potential dimerization and TCF4 transcriptional function in

Exp+ CECs.

417
418
419

Figure 4: RNAScope probes targeting *TCF4* transcripts demonstrate that longer
transcripts containing AD3 account for a smaller proportion of total transcripts in Exp+
FECD CECs. A) Probe targeting schematic for *TCF4*. Probe A targets all exons in
NM_001083962.2 and visualises total *TCF4* transcripts, while Probe B targets only the 5' exons,
excluding those that are contained within shorter transcripts (NM_001243234.2). Probe B
visualises the longer subset of AD3-containing transcripts within the cell. CTG18.1 is highlighted
in orange. Green bar denotes TCF4 bHLH region, blue regions highlight TCF4 activation
domains, red box shows the bipartite TCF4 NLS signal and orange shows the genomic region
containing the CTG18.1 repeat. **B)** Representative confocal images of Exp+, Exp- and control
CECs with nuclei (blue, DAPI) and *TCF4* puncta (visualised with Cy3 but represented here with
white). Scale bars represent 20 μm. **C)** Plotting the proportion of longer AD3-containing *TCF4*
transcripts in Exp+ (orange), control (black), and Exp- (green) shows that Exp+ have
significantly lower proportion of AD3-containing transcripts compared to both control (p =
0.0145) and Exp- (p = 0.0213) CECs, while there is no significant difference between control
and Exp- (p = 0.362). Open circle denotes mean and error bars show standard deviation.
Significance determined with student T-test.

436
437
438

Rare TCF4 variants identified within a genetically refined CTG18.1 expansion-negative

FECD cohort suggest isoform-specific TCF4 dysregulation may be a risk factors for

FECD in the absence of CTG18.1 expansions

We next wanted to explore if rare and potentially deleterious *TCF4* variants could be

contributing to disease in FECD cases without a CTG18.1 expansion, given that Exp+ CECs

display alternative *TCF4* exon usage and skewed ratios of *TCF4* isoforms (**Figure 3 and 4**),

with detectable downstream features of TCF4-driven dysregulation (**Figure 2D**). To test this

hypothesis we interrogated exome data generated from 134 Exp-FECD cases, acquired from

our ongoing inherited corneal disease research program, representing approximately 22% of

total FECD cases recruited to date. Overall, 8 rare and potentially deleterious (MAF <0.005;

CADD score >15) *TCF4* variants were identified in 7/134 probands (**Table 3**). Sanger

sequencing confirmed the presence of all 8 variants and exome data from these cases were

also interrogated using the same thresholds (MAF <0.005, CADD >15) to determine if any other

rare variants in genes previously associated with FECD could also be contributing to disease (3)

(**Table S13**). The large number of rare and potentially deleterious *TCF4* variants detected in this

cohort seemed intriguing given the high levels of evolutionary constraint on this essential and

ubiquitously expressed transcription factor encoding gene (pLI=1, missense Z=4.1 gnomAD).

We therefore decided to apply CoCoRV, a rare variant analysis framework to determine if the

Exp-FECD cohort was indeed enriched for rare and potentially deleterious *TCF4* variants

compared to the gnomAD dataset. CoCoRV utilises the publicly available genotype summary

counts to prioritise disease-predisposition genes in case cohorts (37). Under a dominant model,

applying the ethnically-stratified analysis pipeline, and filtering for rare (MAF <0.005) and

potentially deleterious (CADD score threshold of >15) variants, an inflation factor estimate

(λemp) 1.21 was achieved. At the exome wide level *TCF4* was ranked as 34/17,025 genes with

a p-value of 0.001 suggesting the Exp-FECD cohort could be enriched for rare and potentially

deleterious *TCF4* variants. However, after applying CoCoRV's stringent false discovery rate

correction methodology *TCF4* no longer remained significant (corrected p-value = 0.249).

Interestingly rare variants identified in Proband A (Variant 1a/1b), B (Variant 2) and D

(Variant 4) and E (Variant 5) are all predicted to only affect a small fraction of total *TCF4*

transcripts (**Table 3, S14 and Figure 6**). For Proband A, two consecutive *in cis* heterozygous

missense and nonsense variants were identified. These occur within the coding region of only

one (out of 93) *TCF4* transcripts (ENST00000566286.5; c.[57G>T; 58A>T]; p.[(Arg19Ser;

p.Lys20*)]) and in the 5' UTR of a further 5/93 transcripts. The variant identified in Proband B is

only encompassed by the same 6 *TCF4* transcripts (ENST00000566286.5; c.66G>A,

p.(Glu22=)). Despite being synonymous, Splice AI predicts the variant introduces loss of the

splice donor site (SpliceAI Δ score 0.78). Furthermore, SpliceRover also predicts that this could

result in the activation of a cryptic splice donor site downstream (from 0.098 to 0.233) of the

wildtype donor site, which would introduce a short frameshift insertion followed by a premature

termination codon (PTC) c.66_67insGTGCTCGATGAATTTTC, p.(Arg23Valfs*12). The variant

identified in Proband D (Variant 4) is within the protein coding region of three (out of 93) *TCF4*

transcripts and in the 5' UTR of one additional transcript. Variant 5 is only encompassed by the

5' UTR of a single *TCF4* transcript. Collectively, all of these identified variants have the potential

to exert a functional impact on TCF4, but importantly only on a small subset of overall

transcripts.

Table 3: Summary of rare and potentially deleterious *TCF4* variants identified in a FECD
CTG18.1 Exp- cohort (n=134)

Variant ID	FECD Exp-Cases (n=134)	Variant (hg38)	HGVSc, HGVSp	CADD, MAF gnomAD	Included within CoCoRV analysis
1a	Proband A	chr18:55588479-C-A	ENST00000566286.1: c.57G>T, p.(Arg19Ser)	18.3, 0	Yes
1b	Proband A	chr18:55588478-T-A	ENST00000566286.1: c.58A>T, p.(Lys20Ter)	16.45, 0	Yes
2	Proband B	chr18:55588470-C-T	ENST00000566286.1: c.66G>A, p.(Glu22=)	18.39, 0.002122	Yes
3	Proband C	chr18:55464063-T-C	ENST00000354452.3: c.207+13A>G	20.6, 0.0002234	Yes
4	Proband D	chr18:55403689-A-G	ENST00000544241.2: c.26T>C, p.(Ile9Thr)	17.29, 0	Yes
5	Proband E	chr18:55321599-C-T	ENST00000354452.3: c.549+28760G>A	16.74, 0	No*
6	Proband F	chr18:55261560-A-C	ENST00000354452.3: c.923-27T>G	22.3, 0.0007644	Yes
7	Proband G	chr18:55261512-G-A	ENST00000354452.3: c.944C>T, p.(Ala315Val)	24.6, 0.0005734	Yes

Rare (MAF < 0.005 in gnomAD genomes) and potentially deleterious (CADD score threshold of >15) *TCF4* variants identified within a FECD CTG18.1 Exp- cohort (n=134). Abbreviations are as follows: gnomAD, The Genome Aggregation Database; MAF, minor allele frequency, HGVSc, coding DNA sequence based on the Human Genome Variation Society; HGVSp, protein sequence based on the Human Genome Variation Society. *Variant filtered out at Variant Quality Recalibration step.

Figure 6: Schematic map of rare and potentially deleterious variants identified in molecularly unsolved FECD cases within *TCF4*, without CTG18.1 expansions. All 8 rare (MAF<0.005) and potentially pathogenic (CADD>15) variants in 7 Exp- Probands are mapped along *TCF4* genomic region and transcriptomic locations contextualised. Proband A variants are found in *cis* within the proband. Conserved intronic transcripts refer to variants located in intronic regions identified as conserved via GERP conservation scores on Ensembl. Splice modifying refers to transcripts where the variant identified would induce alternative splicing. Transcript numbers where the variant occurred within introns were not included. UTR: untranslated region. NLS: nuclear localization signal. bHLH: basic helix loop helix

Discussion:

FECD is now recognized to be the most common repeat expansion-mediated disease in humans, with up to 80% of European FECD cases harbouring CTG18.1 expansions(3). The non-coding nature of the repeat and the transcriptomic complexity of *TCF4* have made it extremely experimentally challenging to decipher the molecular mechanisms underlying this disease. Thus, many aspects of its pathophysiology remain elusive, despite the strong mechanistic parallels with other repeat-mediated diseases, and the urgent clinical need for new treatments for this common and visually disabling disease. To tackle this challenge, we employed a large, biologically independent set of primary FECD case-derived CEC lines and numerous complementary transcriptomic methodologies to gain novel mechanistic insight into both RNA toxicity driven and *TCF4* dysregulation-related molecular features of this repeat-mediated disease. By including both Exp+ and Exp- FECD patient data, we have been able to dissect out more generic downstream biomarkers that occur irrespective of CTG18.1 expansion

status. Our extensive long- and short-read RNA-Seq data and spatial transcriptomic analysis of

FECD case-derived CEC lines demonstrates that, in addition to being a spliceopathy,

expansion-positive FECD is concurrently associated with isoform-specific patterns of *TCF4*

dysregulation, hence providing novel mechanistic insights into the pathophysiology of this triplet-

repeat mediated disease. Furthermore, we have identified a subset of Exp- FECD cases with

rare and potentially deleterious *TCF4* variants, supporting the hypothesis that dysregulation of

TCF4 itself irrespective of CTG18.1 expansions may also be a risk factor for FECD.

Our robust transcriptomic analysis, presented within a biologically relevant cellular and

genomic context, highlights an array of novel molecular signatures driven by CTG18.1

expansions, as well as validating a range of previously described Exp+-associated

transcriptomic events. We anticipate that many of the novel events identified here could serve

as informative biomarkers to aid the development of CTG18.1 targeted therapeutic approaches.

To date, CUG-containing RNA foci and MBNL1/2 missplicing have been adopted as the

standard for therapeutic outcome measures (6,24,38,39). Data presented here support and

expand the hypothesis that accumulation of repeat expansion-derived RNA structures induce

toxic gain-of-function effects that disrupt cellular homeostasis and induce aberrant RNA

metabolism(6,24). For instance, we have discovered a novel array of RBP encoding transcripts,

including *MBNL3*, *CELF1* and a range of *hnRNP* and *DDX* family members, uniquely

dysregulated in Exp+ CECs that warrant future follow up to elucidate their respective

contributions to aberrant RNA metabolism related mechanisms. However, such biomarkers may

only relate to the spliceopathy aspects of the disease and our data go on to also illustrate that

translational efforts would also benefit from using more diverse outcome measures. In addition

to RNA metabolism biomarkers, global Exp+-mediated differential gene expression profiles,

alongside *TCF4*-specific dysregulation itself, should also be included as relevant outcome

measures for Exp+ therapies being developed, given we hypothesise these processes are also

pivotal to the pathology. Novel cell surface biomarkers reported here that are specifically

upregulated in Exp+ (e.g. *ITGA5* and *ITGB1*) could have particular utility in a clinical trial setting

due to their accessible locations. Other membrane encoding proteins interfacing with the

extracellular matrix or signal transduction could also be a rich source of potential external

markers, such as cell surface receptors involved in the P13K-Akt pathway (e.g. *EGFR, MET,*

and *LTK*) that we show are specifically upregulated in Exp+ CECs.

Genetic stratification of patient-derived CECs in this study has also highlighted that Exp+

FECD is transcriptionally distinct from Exp- disease. The data show that 72% of all differentially

expressed genes, 81% of skipped exon events, and 72% of all enriched pathways detected in

Exp+ are unique to the repeat expansion disease. For example, in accordance with previous

studies (11,40), we observe that pronounced upregulation of fibronectin (*FN1*) is a robust

transcriptomic feature of FECD, irrespective of genetic underlying cause. However, our

comprehensive transcriptomic analysis has enabled us to determine that the EDA/B+ forms of

fibronectin (23) are significantly favoured in Exp+ FECD. This illustrates that *FN1* expression

and splicing can act as both a general FECD molecular biomarker and an Exp+ specific

biomarker. Similarly, *AQP1* previously documented to be downregulated in FECD (41), has here

been demonstrated to only display marked downregulation in Exp+ CECs, illustrating the

importance of stratifying cases based on CTG18.1 status. Our long-read data revealed that the

splicing diversity seen in Exp+ FECD is not predominantly a result of abnormal missplicing,

given the proportion of annotated full splice match transcripts remains the same between control

and Exp+. This further exemplifies the unique transcriptome of Exp+ FECD endothelial cells.

However the increased proportion of non-canonical splice junctions seen in Exp+ also suggests

that CTG18.1-specific isoforms may be present within the endothelium and warrants future

investigation. These examples, alongside the emerging evidence that the Exp+ FECD displays

distinctive pathological features and epidemiological characteristics(4,6), suggests that Exp+

FECD should be categorised as a distinct clinical entity. We suggest integrating CTG18.1

genotyping into routine FECD clinical care pathways is warranted, especially given the

numerous international efforts underway to develop gene-directed therapies for CTG18.1-

mediated FECD (24,38,39,42).

Our complementary RNA-seq approaches, in combination with the spatial resolution of *TCF4*

transcripts subgroups, has highlighted a unique and distinctive pattern of TCF4-specific

dysregulation that occurs within Exp+ FECD. Additionally, our pathway analysis has isolated

features of dysregulation that we hypothesise represent downstream consequences of this

isoform shift and an important pathogenic component of the disease. Notably, we have

observed commonality between signalling transduction pathways dysregulated in our Exp+

CECs (e.g. P13K-Akt and MAPK) and those dysregulated in neural progenitor cell *TCF4*

knockdown transcriptomes(30). We postulate that this convergence is being driven by TCF4

functional dysregulation, as the shift in isoform distributions towards shorter (1-2 AD domains)

versus longer (2-3 AD domains) isoforms would result in lowered TCF4 activity within the cell.

TCF4 isoforms with 3 AD domains have been shown to have an order of magnitude more

transcription activation function than the shorter isoforms containing 1 or 2 activation domains

(14). Furthermore, given that domains in the AD3-containing isoforms can also dictate

intracellular location and dimerization partners of TCF4, we also hypothesise that additional

TCF4-driven functional implications of this shift occur within affected CECs that requires future

experimental investigation. Interestingly, a recent single-cell (sc)RNA-seq study has identified

that varying levels of *TCF4* expression exist within discrete populations of healthy CECs(43).

Future application of scRNA-seq to FECD-case derived CEC samples, alongside probing

mechanisms of somatic instability within the corneal endothelium will shed light upon the unique

vulnerability of this cell layer to CTG18.1 expansions (44,45).

Additionally, we identify rare and predicted deleterious *TCF4* variants in 7/134 Exp-

FECD cases. This was notable to us given the high levels of evolutionary constraint acting on

TCF4 and suggests such rare variants may be acting as risk factors for FECD, independently of

CTG18.1 repeat expansion. This could also in-part explain the established missing heritability of

the disease(3) and does further reinforcing the hypothesis that dysregulation of *TCF4* itself is

pivotal to the pathophysiology of FECD. Despite a rare variant gene-burden style analysis of

these data not reaching significance, we observed an emerging trend whereby a subset of

qualifying variants identified notably affected regions of the gene not included by the vast

majority of *TCF4* isoforms. Hence they can only be predicted to exert a functional impact on a

small subset of total TCF4 transcripts. This observation is in keeping with the relatively mild and

tissue specific nature of FECD, which is in stark contrast to the severe neurodevelopmental

disorder Pitt-Hopkins associated with total *TCF4* haploinsufficiency(46). Hence, we propose that

TCF4 variants which subtly affect TCF4 functionality may induce CEC-specific disease. Further

experimental investigation of these variants and the potential tissue specific role they may exert

in the corneal endothelium warrants further future investigation.

Parallels can be drawn to other repeat expansion-mediated disorders, such as fragile X

syndrome (*FRM1*)(47), spinocerebellar ataxia type 7 (*ATXN7,* MIM #164500)(48) and *C9orf72*-

mediated ALS(49), whereby rare loss-of-function mutations have been proposed to induce

comparable phenotypic outcomes to non-coding repeat expansions. However, in these

instances total haploinsufficiency is thought to underlie the respective pathogenic mechanisms,

in contrast to this scenario whereby we hypothesise only a fraction of total *TCF4* isoforms are

susceptible to the effect of either CTG18.1 expansions or *TCF4* variants within the corneal

endothelium. In a limited number of DM1 cases, FECD has been recognised to be part of the

phenotypic spectrum, suggesting that CEC dysfunction can also arise from CTG repeat

expansions in *DMPK* (50,51)*.* Data presented in this study suggests that *TCF4 variants*,

independent of the repeat, may also represent a potential path to FECD. We suggest future

FECD genetic screening approaches should include sequencing of coding and regulatory

regions of *TCF4,* to further elucidate the potential role that rare *TCF4* variants may play in the

absence of CTG18.1 expansions.

In conclusion, this study supports the hypothesis that at least two distinct pathogenic

mechanisms, RNA toxicity and *TCF4* isoform-specific dysregulation, underpin the

pathophysiology of the transcriptionally distinct CTG18.1-mediated FECD. In our established

primary corneal endothelial system, we see evidence of *TCF4* isoform dysregulation at the

TCF4 transcript level and can detect the potential downstream effects of the isoform-specific

pattern of TCF4 dysregulation. Our data also suggests that, in rare instances, irrespective of

CTG18.1 expansions, FECD cases can harbour *TCF4* variants that may independently induce

isoform-specific TCF4 dysregulation and act as risk factors for disease. This supports the

hypothesis that *TCF4* dysregulation is a key mechanism underlying this common, age-related

and visually disabling disease. We anticipate that concepts and biomarkers identified by this

study will inform and guide the development of future translational interventions targeting this

triplet-repeat mediated disease, and these in turn may act as exemplars for much rarer and

currently untreatable and severe repeat expansion disorders that typically affect less accessible

neurological/neuromuscular systems.

634
635

Materials and Methods:

Subject Recruitment, phenotyping and bio-sample processing

The study adhered to the tenets of the Declaration of Helsinki and was approved by the

Research Ethics Committees of University College London (UCL) (22/EE/0090), Moorfields Eye

Hospital (MEH) London (13/LO/1084), or the General University Hospital (GUH) Prague (2/19

GACR). All participants provided written informed consent and had either clinical signs of FECD

or had a previous corneal transplant for FECD. For participants who had planned endothelial

keratoplasty, we collected the diseased corneal endothelium and Descemet membrane (DM)

removed as part of the surgical procedure (MEH and GUH). We obtained control tissue as

donor corneoscleral discs classed as unsuitable for clinical transplantation due to non-CEC

related reasons (Miracles in Sight Eye Bank, Texas, USA) and removed a disc of tissue of

similar dimensions to the clinical samples. We stored all excised tissues in either Eusol-C

(Alchimia) or Lebovitz L-15 media (Life Technologies) before transferring to the laboratory for

processing. Participant genomic DNA was extracted from whole blood (QIAgen Gentra

Puregene Blood Kit), whereas control DNA was extracted from the remaining tissue of the

corneoscleral disc (QIAgen Blood and Tissue kits).

CTG18.1 genotyping

We determined the CTG18.1 repeat length using a short tandem repeat (STR)

genotyping assay as previously described in Zarouchlioti et al. 2018[6], originally adapted from

Wieben et al. 2012[52]. Briefly, STR-PCR was performed using a 6'-FAM-conjugated primer (5'

CAGATGAGTTTGGTGTAAGAT 3') upstream of the repeat and an unlabeled primer (5'

ACAAGCAGAAAGGGGGCTGCAA 3') downstream. Post-PCR, products were combined with

GeneMarker ROX500 ladder and separated on an ABI 3730 Electrophoresis capillary DNA

analyzer (Applied Biosystems). Sizing and data analysis was performed on GeneMarker

software (SoftGenetics). To distinguish between samples with presumed bi-allelic non-

expanded alleles of equal length and samples with a larger repeat length beyond the detection

limit of the STR-PCR, we performed a further triplet-primed PCR assay to confirm the presence

or absence of a CTG18.1 allele above the detection range of the STR assay (approximately 125

repeats), following previously published methods(53).

Primary corneal endothelial cell (CEC) culture

We isolated and cultured FECD and control-derived CECs as described by Zarouchlioti

et al. 2019(6), adapted from Peh et al. 2015(54). Briefly, to dissolve the DM and detach the

CECs, the tissue sample was incubated for 2 to 4 hours in 0.2% collagenase type I. After

incubation, the CECs were resuspended in stabilisation media (containing Human Endothelial-

SFM (Life technologies) supplemented with 5% foetal bovine serum (FBS), 1%

antibiotic/antimycotic, and 0.1% selective ROCK inhibitor Y-27632 (AdooQ BioSciences)), and

then seeded into 6-well plates pre-coated with FNC coating mixture (Stratech). After 24 hours,

we replaced the culture media with expansion media (Ham's F-12 Nutrient Mix with GlutaMAX

Supplement (Life Technologies)/Medium 199 GlutaMAX Supplement (Life Technologies), 20

µg/mL ascorbic acid, 1% insulin-transferrin-selenium (Life Technologies), 5% FBS, 1%

antibiotic/antimycotic, 10 ng/mL bFGF (Life Technologies) and 0.1% selective ROCK inhibitor Y-

27632 (AdooQ BioSciences)). All cells were cultured at 37ºC and 5% CO_2 with twice-weekly

media changes.

RNA extraction

All primary CEC monolayer cultures selected for downstream analysis displayed a

consistent morphology characteristic of CECs *in vivo.* Total RNA was extracted from the primary

CEC lines using a NucleoSpin RNA XS kit (Macherey-Nagel), in accordance with the

manufacturer's protocol. The RNA was eluted and stored at -80ºC prior to sequencing.

Short-read RNA-seq

Stranded RNA-seq libraries were prepared by BGI Genomics using the TruSeq RNA

Library Prep Kit (Illumina) following the manufacturer's protocol. We sequenced these with

either a HiSeq 4000 platform (Illumina) with short-read strand-specific library prep with poly A

enrichment (Illumina). Paired-end reads were filtered to remove low-quality reads (Q ≤5) or

those with >10% of N base calls. Adaptor sequences were also removed during data quality

analysis. We checked the quality of the resulting fastq files for the short-read data using FastQC

Quantification(55). Reads were aligned to the human genome (hg38) using STAR(56)

(v2.7.10a). After alignment, hierarchical clustering was performed using PoiClaClu(57). We also

performed principal component analysis (PCA) using PCAtools(58) (v2.2.0) to determine global

sample clustering.

We analysed differential gene expression using DESeq2(28) (version 1.8.2), with

independent hypothesis weighting (IHW) testing of the results to generate FDR values(59,60),

and log$_2$fold change was calculated using the apeglm (v 1.2) package(61). We then determined

significance as FDR corrected-p value (padj) <0.05. In addition, we analysed different exon

usage amongst the subgroups with DEXSeq2(35) (v 1.17.28). Significant results were filtered

using an FDR-corrected P-value of <0.05. Pathway analysis was performed by g:Profiler on

significantly dysregulated genes(62).

We assessed differential splicing at a junction-based level with rMATS-turbo 4.1.2(20)

with the Ensembl hg38 release 105 GTF file as reference. Default rMATS settings were used.

For this study, we focused on splicing events that are fully/partly annotated by Ensembl.

Significant alternative splicing events were identified as an absolute delta percent spliced in

(psi) magnitude ≥ 0.1 and FDR ≤ 0.05. rMATs output was subsequently analysed using

rMAPS2(27) and maser 1.12.1(63).

Long-read RNA-seq

PacBio Sequel long-read transcriptomic sequencing (Iso-Seq)(64) was applied to

generate full-length cDNA sequences from control and FECD Exp+ primary CEC-derived RNA

samples. Raw reads were processed and de-multiplexed with Iso-Seq (v3) and merged for

transcript collapse using Cupcake(64) (parameters: "-c 0.85 -i 0.95 --dun-merge-5-shorter").

High-quality, full-length transcripts from the merged dataset were then aligned to the human

reference genome (hg38) using Minimap2(65) (v2.17, parameters: "-ax splice -uf --

secondary=no -C5 -O6,24 -B4") and annotated using SQANTI3(66) (v7.4). SQANTI filtering of

artefacts (intra-priming and reverse transcriptase template switching) was then applied.

RNAScope detection of TCF4 transcripts

We seeded primary FECD case-derived CECs on chamber slides (Lab-tek) and

confluent CEC cultures were stained using standard RNAScope protocols with minor

adjustments (ACD Bio). We used the Hs-TCF4-C2 (cat. 557411) probe set to detect all *TCF4*

isoforms, as well as a custom set of *TCF4* probes to detect all 5' exons in the *TCF4* transcript

NM_001083962.2 excluding all 3' exons contained in the shorter transcript NM_001243234.2.

Akoya TSA Cy3 fluorophores were used to visualise probe staining. Negative control probes

(cat. 320871) were provided by ACD-Bio to verify specificity. All CEC lines analysed by

RNAScope were also tested for RNA foci in parallel via fluorescence *in situ* hybridization (FISH)

using a CUG-specific probe (Cy3-(CAG)$_7$)(6). A minimum of 100 cells and four images were

acquired for each cell line and each probe.

Exome Sequencing and Rare Variant Analysis

Exome sequencing libraries were generated from 134 Exp- FECD patient whole blood

derived gDNA samples, using a SureSelect Human All Exome V6 capture kit (Agilent, USA) or

SeqCap EZ MedExome Enrichment Kit (Roche) and sequenced on a HiSeq 4000 or HiSeq

2500 platform (Illumina). All raw FECD case sequencing data was aligned and annotated

following our previously published methods(67).In brief, sequencing reads were aligned using

Novoalign (version 3.02.08) and . Variants and indels were called according to Genome

Analysis Toolkit (GATK) (version 4.4.0.0) best practices (joint variant calling followed by variant

quality score recalibration) were normalised and quality-controlled, as recommended by

CoCoRV(37). CoCoRV, a rare variant analysis framework, was applied to prioritise disease-

predisposition genes in the Exp-FECD cohort, utilising publicly available genotype summary

counts from gnomAD (genomes version 2.1.1) as a control dataset. For consistency, both case

and control variants were annotated using the Variant Effect Predictor (VEP) (release 110) (68).

The CoCoRV pipeline was then run in accordance to default setting, applying a dominant model

and ethnically stratified in accordance with ethnicity predictions generated from the case cohort

using Fraposa(69). Variants of interest were defined as having a CADD score (CADD) >15 (70),

and a minor allele frequency (MAF) <0.005 in the Genome Aggregation Database (version

2.1.1) (71). FECD cases identified to harbour rare *TCF4* variants were additionally interrogated

for rare and potentially disease-associated variants (MAF<0.005 in gnomAD and Kaviar

Genomic Variant Database; CADD>15) in previously reported FECD-associated genes,

including *COL8A2*, *SLC4A11*, *AGBL1* and *ZEB1*(3). Splice site predictions were subsequently

made using SpliceAI(72) and SpliceRover(73) for all qualifying variants in *TCF4* and any other

FECD-associated genes.

Author Contributions: NB and AED conceptualised the study. NB, NJHT, ANS, CZ, JJ, LD,

PS, MP, KM, PL, SJT contributed to the generation of the data. NB, NC, NJHT, AS, SKL, TL,

IM, ARJ, MEC, AJH, NP and AED all contributed to the analysis and interpretation of the data.

AED and NB wrote the manuscript. All authors read and approved the final version of the

document.

Acknowledgments: We would like to thank all affected individuals for participating in this

research. We would also like to acknowledge Miracles for Sight Eye bank for providing control

corneal tissue. This work was funded by a UKRI Future Leader Fellowship MR/S031820/1

(AED, CZ, AS), Moorfields Eye Charity GR000060, GR001395, GR001337 (AED, NB, NHT, AS,

NP) and Sight Research UK SAC 036 (AED, AJS), the Rosetrees Trust (AED, AJS), and the

The National Institute for Health Research Biomedical Research Centre at Moorfields Eye

Hospital National Health Service Foundation Trust and UCL Institute of Ophthalmology (AED,

NC., SJT, KM, AJH, MEC, NP). JJ, LD., PS, and PL were supported by GACR 20-19278S,

UNCE/MED/007 and SVV 260631. NP was supported by an NIHR AI Award (AI

AWARD02488). This project utilised equipment funded by the UK Medical Research Council

(MRC) Clinical Research Infrastructure Initiative (award number MR/M008924/1).

783
784

References:

1. Lorenzetti DW, Uotila MH, Parikh N, Kaufman HE. Central cornea guttata. Incidence in the general population. Am J Ophthalmol. 1967 Dec;64(6):1155–8.
2. Matthaei M, Hribek A, Clahsen T, Bachmann B, Cursiefen C, Jun AS. Fuchs Endothelial Corneal Dystrophy: Clinical, Genetic, Pathophysiologic, and Therapeutic Aspects. Annu Rev Vis Sci. 2019;5(1):151–75.
3. Fautsch MP, Wieben ED, Baratz KH, Bhattacharyya N, Sadan AN, Hafford-Tear NJ, et al. TCF4-mediated Fuchs endothelial corneal dystrophy: Insights into a common trinucleotide repeat-associated disease. Prog Retin Eye Res. 2021 Mar 1;81:100883.
4. Thaung C, Davidson AE. Fuchs endothelial corneal dystrophy: current perspectives on diagnostic pathology and genetics—Bowman Club Lecture. BMJ Open Ophthalmol. 2022 Jul 1;7(1):e001103.
5. Wieben ED, Baratz KH, Aleff RA, Kalari KR, Tang X, Maguire LJ, et al. Gene Expression and Missplicing in the Corneal Endothelium of Patients With a TCF4 Trinucleotide Repeat Expansion Without Fuchs' Endothelial Corneal Dystrophy. Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci. 2019 Aug 30;60(10):3636–43.
6. Zarouchlioti C, Sanchez-Pintado B, Hafford Tear NJ, Klein P, Liskova P, Dulla K, et al. Antisense Therapy for a Common Corneal Dystrophy Ameliorates TCF4 Repeat Expansion-Mediated Toxicity. Am J Hum Genet. 2018 Apr 5;102(4):528–39.
7. Depienne C, Mandel JL. 30 years of repeat expansion disorders: What have we learned and what are the remaining challenges? Am J Hum Genet. 2021 May 6;108(5):764–85.
8. Balendra R, Isaacs AM. C9orf72-mediated ALS and FTD: multiple pathways to disease. Nat Rev Neurol. 2018 Sep;14(9):544–58.
9. Wieben ED, Aleff RA, Tang X, Butz ML, Kalari KR, Highsmith EW, et al. Trinucleotide Repeat Expansion in the Transcription Factor 4 (TCF4) Gene Leads to Widespread mRNA Splicing Changes in Fuchs' Endothelial Corneal Dystrophy. Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci. 2017 Jan 24;58(1):343–52.
10. Wieben ED, Aleff RA, Tang X, Kalari KR, Maguire LJ, Patel SV, et al. Gene expression in the corneal endothelium of Fuchs endothelial corneal dystrophy patients with and without expansion of a trinucleotide repeat in TCF4. PLOS ONE. 2018 Jul 2;13(7):e0200005.
11. Chu Y, Hu J, Liang H, Kanchwala M, Xing C, Beebe W, et al. Analyzing pre-symptomatic tissue to gain insights into the molecular and mechanistic origins of late-onset degenerative trinucleotide repeat disease. Nucleic Acids Res. 2020 Jul 9;48(12):6740–58.
12. Westin IM, Viberg A, Byström B, Golovleva I. Lower Fractions of TCF4 Transcripts Spanning over the CTG18.1 Trinucleotide Repeat in Human Corneal Endothelium. Genes. 2021 Dec 17;12(12):2006.
13. Sirp A, Leite K, Tuvikene J, Nurm K, Sepp M, Timmusk T. The Fuchs corneal dystrophy-associated CTG repeat expansion in the TCF4 gene affects transcription from its alternative promoters. Sci Rep. 2020 Oct 28;10(1):18424.
14. Sepp M, Kannike K, Eesmaa A, Urb M, Timmusk T. Functional diversity of human basic helix-loop-helix transcription factor TCF4 isoforms generated by alternative 5' exon usage and splicing. PloS One. 2011;6(7):e22138.
15. Zweier C, Peippo MM, Hoyer J, Sousa S, Bottani A, Clayton-Smith J, et al. Haploinsufficiency of TCF4 causes syndromal mental retardation with intermittent hyperventilation (Pitt-Hopkins syndrome). Am J Hum Genet. 2007 May;80(5):994–1001.
16. Amiel J, Rio M, de Pontual L, Redon R, Malan V, Boddaert N, et al. Mutations in TCF4, encoding a class I basic helix-loop-helix transcription factor, are responsible for Pitt-Hopkins syndrome, a severe epileptic encephalopathy associated with autonomic dysfunction. Am J Hum Genet. 2007 May;80(5):988–93.

17. Hellwig M, Lauffer MC, Bockmayr M, Spohn M, Merk DJ, Harrison L, et al. TCF4 (E2-2)
harbors tumor suppressive functions in SHH medulloblastoma. Acta Neuropathol (Berl).
2019 Apr 1;137(4):657–73.
18. Stefansson H, Ophoff RA, Steinberg S, Andreassen OA, Cichon S, Rujescu D, et al.
Common variants conferring risk of schizophrenia. Nature. 2009 Aug 6;460(7256):744–7.
19. Schizophrenia Psychiatric Genome-Wide Association Study (GWAS) Consortium. Genome-
wide association study identifies five new schizophrenia loci. Nat Genet. 2011 Sep
18;43(10):969–76.
20. Shen S, Park JW, Lu Z xiang, Lin L, Henry MD, Wu YN, et al. rMATS: Robust and flexible
detection of differential alternative splicing from replicate RNA-Seq data. Proc Natl Acad Sci.
2014 Dec 23;111(51):E5593–601.
21. Shen S, Park JW, Huang J, Dittmar KA, Lu Z xiang, Zhou Q, et al. MATS: a Bayesian
framework for flexible detection of differential alternative splicing from RNA-Seq data.
Nucleic Acids Res. 2012 Apr 1;40(8):e61.
22. Park JW, Tokheim C, Shen S, Xing Y. Identifying Differential Alternative Splicing Events
from RNA Sequencing Data Using RNASeq-MATS. In: Shomron N, editor. Deep
Sequencing Data Analysis [Internet]. Totowa, NJ: Humana Press; 2013 [cited 2022 Oct 31].
p. 171–9. (Methods in Molecular Biology). Available from: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-
62703-514-9_10
23. Dalton CJ, Lemmon CA. Fibronectin: Molecular Structure, Fibrillar Structure and
Mechanochemical Signaling. Cells. 2021 Sep;10(9):2443.
24. Hu J, Rong Z, Gong X, Zhou Z, Sharma VK, Xing C, et al. Oligonucleotides targeting TCF4
triplet repeat expansion inhibit RNA foci and mis-splicing in Fuchs' dystrophy. Hum Mol
Genet. 2018 Mar 15;27(6):1015–26.
25. Konieczny P, Stepniak-Konieczna E, Sobczak K. MBNL proteins and their target RNAs,
interaction and splicing regulation. Nucleic Acids Res. 2014;42(17):10873–87.
26. Konieczny P, Stepniak-Konieczna E, Sobczak K. MBNL expression in autoregulatory
feedback loops. RNA Biol. 2018 Jan 2;15(1):1–8.
27. Hwang JY, Jung S, Kook TL, Rouchka EC, Bok J, Park JW. rMAPS2: an update of the RNA
map analysis and plotting server for alternative splicing regulation. Nucleic Acids Res. 2020
Jul 2;48(W1):W300–6.
28. Love MI, Huber W, Anders S. Moderated estimation of fold change and dispersion for RNA-
seq data with DESeq2. Genome Biol. 2014 Dec 5;15(12):550.
29. Mori K, Lammich S, Mackenzie IRA, Forné I, Zilow S, Kretzschmar H, et al. hnRNP A3
binds to GGGGCC repeats and is a constituent of p62-positive/TDP43-negative inclusions
in the hippocampus of patients with C9orf72 mutations. Acta Neuropathol (Berl). 2013
Mar;125(3):413–23.
30. Doostparast Torshizi A, Armoskus C, Zhang H, Forrest MP, Zhang S, Souaiaia T, et al.
Deconvolution of transcriptional networks identifies TCF4 as a master regulator in
schizophrenia. Sci Adv. 2019 Sep 11;5(9):eaau4139.
31. Gerstberger S, Hafner M, Tuschl T. A census of human RNA-binding proteins. Nat Rev
Genet. 2014 Dec;15(12):829–45.
32. Li M, Zhuang Y, Batra R, Thomas JD, Li M, Nutter CA, et al. HNRNPA1-induced
spliceopathy in a transgenic mouse model of myotonic dystrophy. Proc Natl Acad Sci. 2020
Mar 10;117(10):5472–7.
33. Laurent FX, Sureau A, Klein AF, Trouslard F, Gasnier E, Furling D, et al. New function for
the RNA helicase p68/DDX5 as a modifier of MBNL1 activity on expanded CUG repeats.
Nucleic Acids Res. 2012 Apr;40(7):3159–71.
34. Pettersson OJ, Aagaard L, Andrejeva D, Thomsen R, Jensen TG, Damgaard CK. DDX6
regulates sequestered nuclear CUG-expanded DMPK-mRNA in dystrophia myotonica type
1. Nucleic Acids Res. 2014 Jun;42(11):7186–200.

35. Anders S, Reyes A, Huber W. Detecting differential usage of exons from RNA-Seq data. Nat
Preced. 2012 Apr 4;1–1.
36. Sznajder ŁJ, Thomas JD, Carrell EM, Reid T, McFarland KN, Cleary JD, et al. Intron
retention induced by microsatellite expansions as a disease biomarker. Proc Natl Acad Sci
U S A. 2018 Apr 17;115(16):4234–9.
37. Chen W, Wang S, Tithi SS, Ellison DW, Schaid DJ, Wu G. A rare variant analysis
framework using public genotype summary counts to prioritize disease-predisposition
genes. Nat Commun. 2022 May 11;13(1):2592.
38. ProQR Therapeutics. Open-Label, Single-Dose, Exploratory Study With QR-504a to
Evaluate Safety, Tolerability, and Corneal Endothelium Molecular Biomarker(s) in Subjects
With Fuchs Endothelial Corneal Dystrophy With Trinucleotide Repeat Expansion in the
TCF4 Gene (FECD3) [Internet]. clinicaltrials.gov; 2022 May [cited 2023 Mar 6]. Report No.:
NCT05052554. Available from: https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT05052554
39. Powers A, Rinkoski TA, Cheung K, Schehr H, Osgood N, Livelo C, et al. GeneTAC™ small
molecules reduce toxic nuclear foci and restore normal splicing in corneal endothelial cells
derived from patients with Fuchs endothelial corneal dystrophy (FECD) harboring repeat
expansions in transcription factor 4 (TCF4). Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci. 2022 Jun
1;63(7):2753-A0242.
40. Goyer B, Thériault M, Gendron SP, Brunette I, Rochette PJ, Proulx S. Extracellular Matrix
and Integrin Expression Profiles in Fuchs Endothelial Corneal Dystrophy Cells and Tissue
Model. Tissue Eng Part A. 2018 Apr;24(7–8):607–15.
41. Thériault M, Gendron SP, Brunette I, Rochette PJ, Proulx S. Function-Related Protein
Expression in Fuchs Endothelial Corneal Dystrophy Cells and Tissue Models. Am J Pathol.
2018 Jul 1;188(7):1703–12.
42. Angelbello AJ, Benhamou RI, Rzuczek SG, Choudhary S, Tang Z, Chen JL, et al. A Small
Molecule that Binds an RNA Repeat Expansion Stimulates Its Decay via the Exosome
Complex. Cell Chem Biol. 2021 Jan 21;28(1):34-45.e6.
43. Wang Q, Dou S, Zhang B, Jiang H, Qi X, Duan H, et al. Heterogeneity of human corneal
endothelium implicates lncRNA NEAT1 in Fuchs endothelial corneal dystrophy. Mol Ther -
Nucleic Acids. 2022 Mar 8;27:880–93.
44. Handsaker R, Kashin S, Reed N, Lee WS, McDonald TM, Tan S, et al. Somatic DNA repeat
expansion underlies Huntington's Disease neuropathology (Plenary Abstract). In
Washington DC; 2023.
45. Gall-Duncan T, Sato N, Yuen RKC, Pearson CE. Advancing genomic technologies and
clinical awareness accelerates discovery of disease-associated tandem repeat sequences.
Genome Res [Internet]. 2021 Dec 29 [cited 2022 Jan 28]; Available from:
https://genome.cshlp.org/content/early/2021/12/28/gr.269530.120
46. Sirp A, Roots K, Nurm K, Tuvikene J, Sepp M, Timmusk T. Functional consequences of
TCF4 missense substitutions associated with Pitt-Hopkins syndrome, mild intellectual
disability, and schizophrenia. J Biol Chem. 2021 Dec;297(6):101381.
47. Tekendo-Ngongang C, Grochowsky A, Solomon BD, Yano ST. Beyond Trinucleotide
Repeat Expansion in Fragile X Syndrome: Rare Coding and Noncoding Variants in FMR1
and Associated Phenotypes. Genes. 2021 Oct 22;12(11):1669.
48. Nath S, Caron NS, May L, Gluscencova OB, Kolesar J, Brady L, et al. Functional
characterization of variants of unknown significance in a spinocerebellar ataxia patient using
an unsupervised machine learning pipeline. Hum Genome Var. 2022 Apr 14;9(1):1–12.
49. Liu F, Liu Q, Lu CX, Cui B, Guo XN, Wang RR, et al. Identification of a novel loss-of-function
C9orf72 splice site mutation in a patient with amyotrophic lateral sclerosis. Neurobiol Aging.
2016 Nov 1;47:219.e1-219.e5.
50. Winkler NS, Milone M, Martinez-Thompson JM, Raja H, Aleff RA, Patel SV, et al. Fuchs'
Endothelial Corneal Dystrophy in Patients With Myotonic Dystrophy, Type 1. Invest

Ophthalmol Vis Sci. 2018 Jun 1;59(7):3053–7.

51. Mootha VV, Hansen B, Rong Z, Mammen PP, Zhou Z, Xing C, et al. Fuchs' Endothelial Corneal Dystrophy and RNA Foci in Patients With Myotonic Dystrophy. Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci. 2017 Sep 1;58(11):4579–85.

52. Wieben ED, Aleff RA, Tosakulwong N, Butz ML, Highsmith WE, Edwards AO, et al. A Common Trinucleotide Repeat Expansion within the Transcription Factor 4 (TCF4, E2-2) Gene Predicts Fuchs Corneal Dystrophy. PLOS ONE. 2012 Nov 21;7(11):e49083.

53. Vasanth S, Eghrari AO, Gapsis BC, Wang J, Haller NF, Stark WJ, et al. Expansion of CTG18.1 Trinucleotide Repeat in TCF4 Is a Potent Driver of Fuchs' Corneal Dystrophy. Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci. 2015 Jul;56(8):4531–6.

54. Peh GSL, Chng Z, Ang HP, Cheng TYD, Adnan K, Seah XY, et al. Propagation of human corneal endothelial cells: A novel dual media approach. Cell Transplant. 2015;24(2):287–304.

55. Babraham Bioinformatics - FastQC A Quality Control tool for High Throughput Sequence Data [Internet]. [cited 2022 Oct 31]. Available from: https://www.bioinformatics.babraham.ac.uk/projects/fastqc/

56. Dobin A, Davis CA, Schlesinger F, Drenkow J, Zaleski C, Jha S, et al. STAR: ultrafast universal RNA-seq aligner. Bioinformatics. 2013 Jan 1;29(1):15–21.

57. Witten DM. Classification and clustering of sequencing data using a Poisson model. Ann Appl Stat. 2011 Dec;5(4):2493–518.

58. Blighe K. PCAtools: everything Principal Component Analysis [Internet]. 2023 [cited 2023 Feb 20]. Available from: https://github.com/kevinblighe/PCAtools

59. Ignatiadis N, Huber W. Covariate powered cross-weighted multiple testing. J R Stat Soc Ser B Stat Methodol. 2021;83(4):720–51.

60. Ignatiadis N, Klaus B, Zaugg JB, Huber W. Data-driven hypothesis weighting increases detection power in genome-scale multiple testing. Nat Methods. 2016 Jul;13(7):577–80.

61. Zhu A, Ibrahim JG, Love MI. Heavy-tailed prior distributions for sequence count data: removing the noise and preserving large differences. Bioinformatics. 2019 Jun;35(12):2084–92.

62. Raudvere U, Kolberg L, Kuzmin I, Arak T, Adler P, Peterson H, et al. g:Profiler: a web server for functional enrichment analysis and conversions of gene lists (2019 update). Nucleic Acids Res. 2019 Jul 2;47(W1):W191–8.

63. Veiga DT. maseR: Mapping Alternative Splicing Events to pRoteins [Internet]. 2022 [cited 2023 Feb 20]. Available from: https://github.com/DiogoVeiga/maser

64. Gordon SP, Tseng E, Salamov A, Zhang J, Meng X, Zhao Z, et al. Widespread Polycistronic Transcripts in Fungi Revealed by Single-Molecule mRNA Sequencing. PLOS ONE. 2015 Jul 15;10(7):e0132628.

65. Li H. Minimap2: pairwise alignment for nucleotide sequences. Bioinformatics. 2018 Sep 15;34(18):3094–100.

66. Tardaguila M, Fuente L de la, Marti C, Pereira C, Pardo-Palacios FJ, Risco H del, et al. SQANTI: extensive characterization of long-read transcript sequences for quality control in full-length transcriptome identification and quantification. Genome Res. 2018 Jan 3;28(3):396–411.

67. Pontikos N, Yu J, Moghul I, Withington L, Blanco-Kelly F, Vulliamy T, et al. Phenopolis: an open platform for harmonization and analysis of genetic and phenotypic data. Bioinformatics. 2017 Aug 1;33(15):2421–3.

68. McLaren W, Gil L, Hunt SE, Riat HS, Ritchie GRS, Thormann A, et al. The Ensembl Variant Effect Predictor. Genome Biol. 2016 Jun 6;17(1):122.

69. Zhang D, Dey R, Lee S. Fast and robust ancestry prediction using principal component analysis. Bioinforma Oxf Engl. 2020 Jun 1;36(11):3439–46.

70. Kircher M, Witten DM, Jain P, O'Roak BJ, Cooper GM, Shendure J. A general framework for

988   estimating the relative pathogenicity of human genetic variants. Nat Genet. 2014
989   Mar;46(3):310–5.

990 71. Glusman G, Caballero J, Mauldin DE, Hood L, Roach JC. Kaviar: an accessible system for
991   testing SNV novelty. Bioinformatics. 2011 Nov 15;27(22):3216–7.

992 72. Jaganathan K, Kyriazopoulou Panagiotopoulou S, McRae JF, Darbandi SF, Knowles D, Li
993   YI, et al. Predicting Splicing from Primary Sequence with Deep Learning. Cell. 2019 Jan
994   24;176(3):535-548.e24.

995 73. Zuallaert J, Godin F, Kim M, Soete A, Saeys Y, De Neve W. SpliceRover: interpretable
996   convolutional neural networks for improved splice site prediction. Bioinformatics. 2018 Dec
997   15;34(24):4180–8.

 Supplemental material:

A)

	PWC1:Exp+ v Ctr	PWC2:Exp+ v Exp-	PWC3:Exp- v Ctr
Alternative 3' Splice Site ∎	155 (7.32%)	136 (6.99%)	131 (6.74%)
Alternative 5' Splice Site ∎	133 (6.28%)	121 (6.22%)	106 (5.45%)
Mutually Exclusive Exons ▪	235 (11.10%)	187 (9.61%)	170 (8.74%)
Retained Introns ▪	108 (5.10%)	120 (6.17%)	92 (4.73%)
Skipped Exons ▫	1487 (70.21%)	1381 (71.00%)	1144 (58.82%)
Total Events	2118	1945	1643

Figure S1: Pairwise comparison of rMATS alternative splicing analysis demonstrates increased levels of alternative splicing in Exp+ FECD compared to both Exp- FECD and control primary corneal endothelial cells. Short-read RNA-seq data generated from primary corneal endothelial cells were analysed by rMATS **A)** Table of rMATS events for each pairwise comparison (PWC). Significance denoted by FDR ≤ 0.05 and deltapsi magnitude larger than 0.1. Values in brackets show percentage of total splice events **B)** Venn diagram of skipped exon event coordinates between all PWCs. The largest overlap is observed between PWC1 and PWC2 highlighting an enrichment of skipped exon events in Exp+ FECD compared to Exp- FECD and controls.

Figure S2: Alternative splicing analyses of short-read CEC RNA-seq data demonstrate
increased levels of alternative splicing in Exp+ FECD. A) Summary of global differences in
splicing events categorised by rMATS. N=4 for controls, N=3 each for FECD Exp+ and FECD
Exp-. The most common splice category of alternative splicing observed between all pairwise
comparisons was skipped exon, representing ~70% of all significant alternative splicing events
detected. Alt 3' SS: alternative 3' splice site, Alt 5' SS: alternative 5' splice site, Ret. Intron:
retained intron, MXE: mutually exclusive exon **B)** Volcano plot of statistically significant skipped
exon events in PWC1 (Control vs Exp+). The dpsi value denotes the magnitude of change for
each dysregulated skipped exon event identified. A positive dspi denotes decreased levels of
exon inclusion in Exp+, whereas a negative dspi denotes increased levels of exon inclusion in
Exp+.
1023

A)

	Number of exons	Number of genes
PWC1: Ctr v Exp+	3245	1560
PWC2: Exp+ v Exp-	2026	1176
PWC3: Exp- v Ctr	1544	893

B) Differentially expressed exons

1024
Figure S3: Pairwise comparison of differentially expressed exons identified by DEXSeq2
demonstrates increased levels of alternative splicing in Exp+ FECD compared to both
Exp- FECD and control primary corneal endothelial cells. A) Table of DEXSeq2 events
and genes for each pairwise comparison (PWC). Significance denoted by p-adj ≤ 0.05. **B)** Venn
diagram of dysregulated exons coordinates between all three PWCs. The largest overlap is
observed between PWC1 and PWC2, highlighting an enrichment of skipped exon events in
Exp+ FECD compared to Exp- FECD and controls.
1032
1033
1034
1035

1036

1037

1038 **Table S1: Summary of SQANTI3 analysis of IsoSeq data.** In depth characterization of
1039 isoforms in control and Exp+ long-read RNA-seq utilising SQANTI3 pipeline following stringent
1040 quality control.
1041

Characterization of transcripts based on splice junctions				
	# isoforms	# genes	# isoforms	# genes
Full Splice Match (FSM)	1,163	1,047	3,130	2,598
Incomplete Splice Match	647	535	2,268	1,377
Novel In Catalog (NIC)	829	685	1,797	1,336
Novel Not In Catalog (NNC)	437	375	778	639
Genic Genomic	3	3	5	5
Antisense	6	5	4	4
Fusion	24	21	35	33
Intergenic	4	4	6	6
Terminology based on Tardaguila et al 2018. n= 4 for controls and n=3 for FECD Exp+ (with one sample duplicated to acquire additional depth). FSM: full splice match. ISM: Incomplete splice match. NIC: Novel in catalog. NNC: Novel not in catalog.…………………………………				

1042

1043 **Table S2: Summary of rMATs results.** The top five splice events detected for the following
1044 pairwise comparisons (PWC) are presented; **(PWC1)** control versus Exp+ FECD, **(PWC2)** Exp+
1045 FECD versus Exp- FECD, and **(PWC3)** control versus Exp- FECD.

 Table S3. rMATS identified significant differentially spliced events in Exp+ matching
 published events with strong association to CTG18.1-expansion mediated FECD.

Gene	Identified by rMATS (yes/no)	rMATS splice type	Differential splicing detected via SQANTI3	Skipped Exon Coordinates (hg38)	dpsi	FDR
ABI1[3,6]	Yes	SE	Yes	chr10:26771075 - 26771089	0.28	1.82E-07
ADD3[3,6]	No	-	Yes	-	-	-
AKAP13[3,6]	Yes	SE	Yes	chr15:85658537 - 85658590	0.203	0.003372
TSPOAP1[3,6]	Yes	SE	Excluded	chr17:58308541 - 58309380	0.222	0.028978
CD46[3,6]	No	-	Yes	-	-	-
CLASP1[3,6]	Yes	SE	Yes	chr2:121445449 - 121445496	0.451	0
COPZ2[3,6]	Yes	SE	No	chr17:48027676 - 48027789	0.118	7.49E-13
EXOC1†[3,6]	Yes	SE	Yes	chr4:55888888 - 55888932	-0.141	0.000691
FGFR1†[3,6]	Yes	SE	Yes	chr8:38429682 - 38429948	-0.248	0
GOLGA2[3,6]	Yes	SE	Yes	chr9:128272785 - 128272865	-0.188	1.10E-07
INF2†[3,6]	Yes	SE	Yes	chr14:104715284 -104715340	0.507	0
ITGA6†[3,6]	Yes	SE	No	chr2:172501772 - 172501901	0.263	0
KIF13A[a3,6]	Yes	SE	Excluded	chr6:17789872 - 17789910	0.17	0.00714
KIF13A[b3,6]	No	-	Excluded	-	-	-
MBNL1*[3,5,6]	Yes	SE	Yes	chr3:152446704 - 152446757	-0.15	0.000337
MBNL2*[3,5,6]	Yes	SE	Yes	chr13:97356796 - 97356849	-0.145	3.66E-13
MYO6[3,6]	No	-	Yes	-	-	-
NHSL1[3,6]	Yes	SE	Yes	chr6:138441983 - 138442114	-0.222	0.011795

NUMA1*[3,5,6]	Yes	SE	Yes	chr11:72012401 - 72012442	0.268	0
PLEKHM2[3,6]	Yes	SE	Yes	chr1:15721329 - 15721388	0.234	1.27E-10
PPFIBP1*	Yes	SE	Yes	chr12:27677064 - 27677096	0.162	7.22E-05
SCARB1[3,6]	No	-	Yes	-	-	-
SYNE1*[3,6]	Yes	SE	Yes	chr6:152145487 - 152145555	0.223	4.36E-09
VEGFA[3,6]	No	-	Yes	-	-	-

* Events previously validated by RT-PCR, in addition to Mixture of Isoforms (MISO) and MAP-RSeq.[6–8]

† Events where the dysregulated exons match published work, but the flanking exons are not a perfect match.

SE: skipped exon. Samples labeled as excluded from Iso-seq analysis were excluded due to insufficient coverage during sequencing

1048

Table S4: Details on the pairwise comparison(s) where rMATS identified new significant differentially spliced events matching published differentially spliced genes with strong association to CTG18.1-expansion mediated FECD.

Gene	rMATS splice type	Exon Coordinates (hg38)	FDR	dpsi	Verified in Iso-Seq
FGFR1	MXE	chr8:38429681-38429948, 38457355-38457534	0	0.125	Yes
MBNL1	SE	chr3:1522994040-152300367	1.13E-10	-0.101	Yes
KIF13A	SE	chr6:17789871-17789910	1.73E-09	0.339	Excluded
KIF13A	SE	chr6:17794248-17794395	1.63E-07	0.125	Excluded
AKAP13	SE	chr15:85662387-85662453	0.0012	0.126	Yes
MBNL2	SE	chr13:97356795-97356849	0.0492	-0.304	Yes
MBNL2	SE	chr13:97366458-97366553	0.0011	-0.114	Yes
NUMA1	A5SS	chr11:72068078-72068231 (long), 72068104-72068231 (short)	0.0441	0.113	No
NUMA1	SE	chr11:72049418-72049539	0.0175	-0.107	Yes
TSPOAP1	SE	chr17:58320108-58320129	0.0002	-0.362	Excluded
MXE: mutually exclusive exon event. SE: skipped exon event. A5SS: alternative 5' splice site event. Genes excluded from Iso-Seq analysis were done so due to insufficient coverage					

1052
1053

1054 **Table S5: Differential gene expression and alternative splicing of fibronectin (*FN1*) in all**
1055 **three pairwise comparisons.**

Differential gene expression (DESeq2)		
	shrunkLFC	*padj*
PWC1	2.924967657	9.18E-24
PWC2	n.s	n.s
PWC3	2.137134317	2.63E-12
Alternative splicing (rMATS)		
	Dysregulated exons	*dPSI*	*FDR*
PWC1	Exon 25 (EDB)	-0.253,	0,
	Exon 33 (EDA)	-0.305	0
PWC2	Exon 25 (EDB)	0.262,	0,
	Exon 33 (EDA)	0.179	4.76E-05
PWC3	Exon 25 (EDB)	-0.126	0.007044931
Exon 25 (EDB) is defined by the genomic coordinates chr2:215,392,931-215,393,203 and Exon 33 (EDA) by chr2:215,380,811-215,381,080. Padj = FDR-adjusted p-value, dPSI=delta percent spliced in, FDR = False discovery rate, n.s. = not significant			

1056
1057

1058 **Table S6: rMAPS-identified RNAbinding motif enrichment in PWC1 and PWC2, which was**
1059 **also absent in PWC3.**

GC-containing motifs upregulating skipped exon in Exp+	
PCBP2	CC[CT][CT]CC[ACT}
RBM4	GCGCG[GC][GC]
RBM4	GCGCG[GC]G
RBM45	GACGA[AC][ACG]
TT-containing motifs downregulating skipped exon events in Exp+	
HNRNPC	[ACT]TTTTT[GT]
HNRNPCL1	[ACT]TTTTT[GT]
PCBP1	C[CT]TTCC
ZC3H14	TTT[AGT]TTT

1060
1061 **Table S7: Differentially expressed genes for all three pairwise comparisons including list**
1062 **of dysregulated genes that are not common to FECD in general.**
1063
1064

1065
1066   **Table S8: Dysregulated RNA binding proteins uniquely in PWC1.**

Downregulated uniquely in Exp+ (n=59)

*PPARGC1B, ZNF385A, **ESRP2**, IFIH1, NSUN7, C2orf15, IFIT1, **DDX25**, CELF5, ENDOU, NPM2, AFF3, **DDX60**, IFIT3, OAS3, PAIP2B, OASL, ERN2, PLD6, DDX60L, VARS2, DHX58, CSDC2, CPEB3, IFIT2, NYNRIN, PTGES3L-AARSD1, PIH1D2, DIS3L, ZNF106, MOV10, RAVER2, PNPT1, PDCD4, SCAF11, PAN2, MIF4GD, ZNF473, PARP1, TDRD7, ANGEL1, TRMT44, RRNAD1, PRPF40B, WARS2, TRIM56, TST, MRPL34, MRPS9, ZC3H7A, ENDOV, TRPT1, ADAT1, SKIV2L, HEXIM1, MRPL49, REPIN1, EIF2D, RALYL*

Upregulated uniquely in Exp+ (n=148)

*SRRT, UBAP2L, STRAP, **DDX56**, CCNT2, ZC3H15, TSR3, NOL7, **DDX1**, ZC3H18, SYMPK, PTGES3, NCL, RRP1, PES1, ZC3H14, SCAF4, TNPO3, MTPAP, R3HDM1, SRP54, CNBP, HDLBP, **CELF1**, RUVBL1, SSB, KPNB1, EIF4G2, DHX15, MRPL52, NONO, CMTR2, MTG1, DHX36, NXF1, SMG1, SRP72, **HNRNPDL**, SF3B4, EIF3B, EEF1E1, CAPRIN1, RBMS1, PSMA6, LSM7, FIP1L1, SRSF10, DGCR8, AFF4, LARP1B, IPO4, DENR, LRRFIP1, RP9, WDR3, MVP, DUSP11, NOP16, U2AF2, DYNLL1, **MBNL1**, SRPK2, RRP12, PIN4, UTP6, ABCE1, GRSF1, IMP4, EIF4A1, PNO1, PDCD11, RRBP1, CPSF6, RRS1, RPS24, RBM18, SFPQ, CCAR1, UTP14A, RBM12, DDX52, SUB1, **HNRNPAB**, FARSA, MSL3, TRMT61A, NARS2, EIF4G1, TRA2B, NOP14, RPF1, ZC3H12C, NOL10, RANBP6, EIF6, RTCA, BOP1, SERBP1, WDR4, ZC3H13, NOL6, AIMP2, XPO6, FARSB, **HNRNPM**, DDX21, STAU2, IPO5, RRP9, UTP20, LRRFIP2, RBM14, MAK16, ZNF326, DCAF13, EIF3C, TOP1, EIF5A, SYNCRIP, PELO, AGFG1, CTU2, PRDX1, ISG20L2, TPR, NOC2L, NOP10, CCDC86, RBM3, CALR, POP1, ZNF579, AGO2, PARP4, HINT3, DDX49, BZW1, SPATS2, YRDC, BZW2, ELAVL2, ISG20, DYNC1H1, RBFOX1, RBPMS, PCBP3, ENOX1, IGF2BP3*

1067
1068

1069 **Table S9: Pathway enrichment (GO, KEGG, and Reactome) for PWC1, PWC3, and**
1070 **dysregulated genes unique to Exp+.**
1071
1072
1073 **Table S10: DEXSeq results for *TCF4* in all three pairwise comparisons showing**
1074 **dysregulation of exons within the gene.**
1075
1076 **Table S11: rMATS *TCF4* mutually exclusive exon events demonstrating a shift between**
1077 **longer isoforms containing 2+ AD domains and shorter isoforms containing 1-2 AD**
1078 **domains detected via alternative splicing pipelines.**
1079

	NM_001083962.2/ENST00000354452.8 exon numbering			
Splice type event (PWC1)	**Exon 7**	**Exon 6**	**dpsi**	**FDR**
Mutually exclusive exon	chr18:55350873-55351003	chr18:55403453-55403518	0.103	0.0023
Mutually exclusive exon	chr18:55350873-55351000	chr18:55403453-55403518	0.102	0.0030
Consequence:	**Higher in Exp+**	**Higher in Control**		
	First exon common to both long and short isoforms	**Last exon common to the majority of long isoforms**		

1080
1081
1082

1083 **Table S12**: *TCF4* **isoform RNAScope sample summary with results of FISH with probe**
1084 **targeting repeat and negative RNAScope control experiments (with probes targeting**
1085 **bacterial genes).**

Sample	CTG18.1 repeat genotype	CUG specific foci present	Negative control clear?	Probe B proportion (%)
Unaffected Controls				
Control 8	12/16	No	Yes	29.43
Control 9	15/33	No	Yes	28.08
Control 10	25/26	No	Yes	40.55
			Average	36.02 ± 6.9
CTG18.1 expansion negative FECD				
FECD4exp-	15/15	No	Yes	27.67
FECD5exp-	16/23	No	Yes	28.18
FECD6exp-	15/16	No	Yes	36.86
			Average	30.90 ± 5.17
CTG18.1 expansion positive FECD				
FECD8exp+	63/88	Yes	Yes	15.05
FECD9exp+	12/76	Yes	Yes	12.58
FECD10exp+	18/67	Yes	Yes	21.36
			Average	16.33 ± 4.53

1098   **Table S13:** Summary of rare, potentially deleterious, variants in FECD-associated genes
1099   identified in Proband B.
1100

Variant (hg38)	Gene	HGVSc, HGVSp	CADD, MAF gnomAD, MAF Kaviar	Proband
chr20-3231199-C-T	*SLC4A11*	Het c.1040G>A, p.(Arg347Gln)	19.24, 1.39×10^{-3}, 5.2×10^{-4}	Proband B 0/1
Exome data from all probands with *TCF4* rare variants were interrogated to determine if rare and potentially deleterious variants in previously reported FECD-associated genes, including *COL8A2, SLC4A11, AGBL1, and ZEB1* could explain their respective disease (MAF < 0.005 in publicly available gnomAD genomes, exomes and Kaviar, CADD score > 15. A single heterozygous *SLC4A11* variant of uncertain significance was identified in Proband B. The annotation from Variant Effect Predictor is filtered to the "most severe" transcripts which is ENST00000380056.3. Abbreviations are as follows: Kaviar, Kaviar Genomic Variant database; gnomAD, The Genome Aggregation Database; UTR, untranslated region; MAF, minor allele frequency; HGVSc, coding DNA sequence based on the Human Genome Variation Society; HGVSp, protein sequence based on the Human Genome Variation Society.				

1101
1102
1103

 Table S14: Clinical data of probands with Fuchs endothelial corneal dystrophy identified
 to have rare and potentially deleterious heterozygous *TCF4* variants.

Age* Sex Ethnicity	CTG18.1 repeat genotype	Age at keratoplasty (years)***	CCT (µm) before surgery	Pre-op BCVA	CCT (µm) after surgery	Final BCVA**	Associated ocular features	Family history (1º relatives)
57/F/black Proband A	10/12	57 OD 59 OS	495 OD 493 OS	NA	441 OD 431 OS (DMEK)	0.67 OD 0.67 OS	Cataract surgery	Unknown
42/M/black Proband B	17/23	NP	589 OD 577 OS	NP	NP	0.67 OD 0.67 OS	Nil	Unknown
61/F/mixed race (white/black) Proband C	13/18	61 OD 63 OS	NA 691 OS	NA	681 OD (DSAEK) 539 OS (DMEK)	1.0OD 0.67 OS	Cataract surgery	Unknown
74/F/white Proband D	12/15	75 OD 74 OS	NA	NA	442 OD 464 OS (DMEK)	1.0 OD 1.0 OS	Cataract surgery	Yes
60/F/white Proband E	12/16	71 OD 60 OS (PK)	605 OD NA OS	0.2 OD 0.25 OS	NA	0.4 OD 0.6 OS	Cataract surgery, secondary glaucoma	No
64/F/white Proband F	12/18	73 OD 72 OS	640 OD 535 OS	0.5 OD 0.5 OS	572 OD 527 OS (DMEK)	0.67 OD 0.67 OS	Cataract surgery	Yes
56/F/white Proband G	12/18	59 OD (PK) 63 OS (DSAEK) 71 OS	NA	NA	532 OD 539 OS	0.5 OD 0.8 OS	EBMD, cataract surgery, secondary glaucoma	Yes

M male, F female, OD right eye, OS left eye, DMEK Descemet membrane endothelial
keratoplasty, DSAEK Descemet's stripping automated endothelial keratoplasty, PK penetrating
keratoplasty, CCT central corneal thickness, BCVA best corrected visual acuity, NP corneal
surgery not performed, NA not available, EBMD epithelial basement membrane degeneration
(Cogan),*Age at diagnosis, **BCVA values converted to decimal annotation, ***DMEK unless
stated.
1112
1113
1114
1115