Chromatin remodeling protein CHD4 regulates axon guidance of spiral ganglion neurons in the developing cochlea

Jihyun Kim[1,2,*], Edward Martinez[1,2,*], Jingyun Qiu[2], Julie Zhouli Ni[3], Kelvin Y. Kwan[1,2]

[1]Keck Center for Collaborative Neuroscience and Stem Cell Research Center, Rutgers University, Piscataway, NJ 08854, USA

[2]Department of Cell Biology and Neuroscience, Rutgers University, Piscataway, NJ 08854, USA

[3] Department of Molecular Biology and Biochemistry, Rutgers University, Piscataway, NJ 08854, USA

* J.K. and E.M. contributed equally to this work.

Corresponding Author:

Kelvin Y. Kwan

Address: 604 Allison Road, D250 Nelson Labs, Piscataway, NJ 08854

Email: kwan@dls.rutgers.edu

Running Title: CHD4 axon guidance

Key Words: CHD4, spiral ganglion neurons, axon guidance, epigenetics, chromatin remodeling

Word Count:

Number of Figures: 6

Number of Tables: 3

Number of Supplemental Figures: 5

Number of Supplemental Tables: 1

Abstract (191 words)

Spiral ganglion neurons (SGNs) are the primary afferent neurons that convey sound information from the cochlea, but the epigenetic changes that occur during development are unknown. We identified the chromodomain helicase binding protein 4 (CHD4) expression in SGNs. CHD4 is an ATP-dependent chromatin remodeler. We employed the *Neurog1* (*Ngn1*) CreERT[2] *Chd4* conditional knockout animals to investigate *Chd4* function in SGNs. SGNs are classified as type I and II neurons with different innervation patterns. SGNs lacking CHD4 showed abnormal fasciculation of type I neurons along with improper pathfinding of type II fibers. CHD4 binding to chromatin from immortalized multipotent otic progenitor-derived neurons was used to identify candidate target genes in SGNs. Gene ontology analysis of CHD4 target genes revealed cellular processes involved in axon guidance, axonal fasciculation, and the ephrin receptor signaling pathway. Eph/ephrin signaling regulates various biological processes, including axon guidance. We confirmed increased Eph/ephrin transcripts in SGNs from *Chd4* conditional knockout cochleae. The results implicate epigenetic changes in circuit wiring by modulating the expression of a subset of axon guidance molecules. The results also provide insights into neurodevelopmental diseases such as Sifrim-Hitz-Weiss syndrome (SIHIWES) and inform strategies for regenerating SGNs.

Introduction

Spiral ganglion neurons (SGNs) in the cochlea are essential for conveying sound information from the cochlear hair cells to the brainstem (Dabdoub, Fritzsch et al. 2016). Assembly of these specialized neural circuits and the rules that govern the complexity require distinct developmental steps and activity-dependent synaptic refinement (Sitko and Goodrich 2021). SGNs are categorized as type I and type II neurons. Type I neurons are large, myelinated, and comprise ~95% of the SGNs that form a single synapse with inner hair cells of the cochlea. Type II neurons are small, unmyelinated neurons, constituting about 5% of the SGNs. Each type II SGN contacts multiple outer hair cells to form *en passant* synapses (Liberman, Wang et al. 2011, Weisz, Lehar et al. 2012, Moser, Karagulyan et al. 2023). The innervation pattern of type I and type II SGNs occurs through a series of defined stages. During early development, neurosensory precursors marked by the expression of *Neurog1*, a key transcription factor required for SGN development, give rise to spiral ganglion neurons (SGNs). Starting around embryonic day 10 (E10), the *Neurog1*-expressing precursors delaminate from the otic vesicle by E11, forming neuronal precursors. Between E12-14, SGNs extend their peripheral axons towards the cochlear hair cells and central axons towards the brainstem. By E15, initial innervation patterns are established between SGNs, their target hair cells, and the cochlear nucleus in the brainstem. Starting at E16, the neural circuits undergo refinement through activity-dependent mechanisms that involve synapse formation and refinement (Appler and Goodrich 2011, Coate and Kelley 2013). The initial establishment of circuit assembly in spiral ganglion neurons (SGNs) requires cellular processes such as axon guidance and repulsion cues to pattern and assemble the circuits (Sitko and Goodrich 2021). How genes involved in axon guidance are regulated is not well understood.

Epigenetic changes can significantly influence the expression of axon guidance genes during development. Changes such as DNA methylation and histone modifications can control gene expression patterns and the timing of guidance cues. For instance, epigenetic modifications can regulate the

expression of genes encoding guidance molecules like netrins, ephrins, slits, semaphorins and

neuropilin, which are essential for directing peripheral axon patterns (Gillespie, Marzella et al. 2005,

Coate, Raft et al. 2012, Defourny, Poirrier et al. 2013, Coate, Spita et al. 2015, Kim, Ibrahim et al. 2016,

Salehi, Ge et al. 2017). By modulating accessibility to cis-regulatory elements that control the

transcription of these genes, epigenetic changes can regulate the timing and expression levels of axon

guidance genes to control wiring.

Mutations in genes that code for epigenetic modifiers that cause syndromic hearing loss implicate these

molecules in cochlear development. Pathogenic variants in DNA methyltransferases (DNMT1), histone

methyltransferases (EHMT1, KMT2D), acetyltransferase (KAT6B), and the chromodomain helicase DNA

binding (CHD) protein family are associated with hearing loss (Layman and Zuo 2014). The CHD family

of proteins mobilizes and rearranges nucleosomes to alter chromatin accessibility. Pathogenic variants

in CHD4 and CHD7 are associated with Sifrim-Hitz-Weiss and CHARGE syndrome, respectively

(Micucci, Sperry et al. 2015, Clapier, Iwasa et al. 2017). Sifrim-Hitz-Weiss (SIHIWES) is an autosomal

dominant intellectual developmental disorder with variable congenital abnormalities. Patients with

SIHIWES show delayed development, intellectual disability, facial dysmorphism, and ear abnormalities,

including hearing loss (Sifrim, Hitz et al. 2016, Weiss, Terhal et al. 2016). Hearing loss in patients with

SIHIWES is confounded by the potential function of CHD4 in many different inner ear cell types during

development. In the mouse, the expression of CHD4 and components of the nucleosome remodeling

and deacetylase (NuRD) complex are detected in many types of cells in the cochlear sensory epithelium

(Layman, Sauceda et al. 2013). CHD4 has been studied in the context of the NuRD complex (Tong,

Hassig et al. 1998, Xue, Wong et al. 1998, Zhang, LeRoy et al. 1998). Paralogs from six protein families

form the core NuRD complex (Torchy, Hamiche et al. 2015, Millard, Varma et al. 2016). Multiple paralogs

from each protein family can form distinct NuRD complexes (Torrado, Low et al. 2017). The ATP-

dependent nucleosome remodeler CHD4 and the histone deacetylases (HDAC1, HDAC2) form the

catalytic subunits. Other members include the methyl binding proteins (MBD2, MBD3), and structural

subunits (MTA1, MTA2, MTA3, GATAD2A, GATAD2B, RBBP4, RBBP7). The NuRD complex localizes

to different cis-regulatory elements to affect gene expression (Morra, Lee et al. 2012, Watson, Mahajan

et al. 2012, Marques, Gryder et al. 2020).

A decrease in transcription caused by the NuRD complex affects a myriad of cellular processes, including

maintenance of cell identity, DNA damage repair, cell cycle progression, and cancer (Polo, Kaidi et al.

2010, Hung, Kohnken et al. 2012, Pan, Hsieh et al. 2012, Hosokawa, Tanaka et al. 2013, Yang, Yamada

et al. 2016, Xia, Huang et al. 2017, Bornelov, Reynolds et al. 2018, Marques, Gryder et al. 2020). CHD4

binds to thousands of sites in the mammalian genome in a cell-type-specific manner, and studies show

that CHD4 forms distinct protein complexes with NuRD-independent functions (Low, Webb et al. 2016,

Hoffmeister, Fuchs et al. 2017, Kaaij, Mohn et al. 2019). To clarify the function of CHD4, we employed a

conditional knockout model to understand CHD4's function in developing spiral ganglion neurons (SGNs).

SGNs are the primary afferent neurons in the cochlea that convey auditory signals from the sensory hair

cells to the cochlear nucleus in the brainstem. Improper function of SGNs could result in sensorineural

hearing loss. We examined *Chd4* function in SGNs using a transgenic mouse line harboring the

Neurog1(*Ngn1*) CreER[T2] (Koundakjian, Appler et al. 2007), *Chd4* conditional knockout (cKO) alleles

(Williams, Naito et al. 2004), and a tdTomato reporter (Madisen, Zwingman et al. 2010).

Materials and Methods

Generation of *Chd4* conditional knockout mice

All procedures were based on institutional animal care, used committee research guidelines, and were

done at Rutgers University. *Chd4*$^{tm1Kge/tm1Kge}$ (*Chd4* floxed*)* animals (RRID: MGI:3641408) were obtained

from Dr. Katia Georgopoulos (Williams, Naito et al. 2004). Neurog1(Ngn1) CreER^{T2} animals and Ai9

R26R tdTomato reporter animals were purchased from Jackson Laboratory (RRID: IMSR_JAX:008529

and RRID: IMSR_JAX:007909, respectively) (Koundakjian, Appler et al. 2007, Madisen, Zwingman et

al. 2010). PCR genotyping was performed using the EconoTaq Plus Green 2X Master Mix (Biosearch

Technologies, #30033-1) and primer pairs for wild-type and *Chd4* floxed alleles (Table 1). For Cre-

induced excision of loxP-flanked exons that code for the ATPase domain of *Chd4*, a mixture of tamoxifen

and β-estradiol was diluted in corn oil. β-estradiol was included to help alleviate the anti-estrogen effects

of tamoxifen treatments. Tamoxifen doses for pregnant female mice were adjusted for maternal body

weight. Pregnant dams were gavaged with 6.25mg/kg of tamoxifen (Sigma Aldrich, #T5648) and

6.25µg/kg of β-estradiol (Sigma Aldrich, #E8875) daily on embryonic days (E) 8.5- 10.5 to induce Cre

activity. For staging timed embryos, the morning that vaginal plugs were observed, pregnant female mice

were considered carrying E 0.5 embryos.

Tissue fixation and preparation

Embryos or postnatal pups were sacrificed for inner ear dissection. The temporal bone was identified and

removed after bisecting the mouse head and removing the brain. The inner ear was separated from the

temporal bone and fixed directly in 4% formaldehyde in 1X PBS overnight at 4°C and washed with 1X

PBS overnight at 4°C. Extraneous tissue and bone surrounding the cochlea were removed to obtain the

cochlear epithelium and the cochlear duct. Reissner's membrane was removed to expose the sensory

epithelium before being processed for immunostaining and *in situ* hybridization. After processing, the

cochlea, including spiral ganglion and sensory epithelium, was flat-mounted.

Immunohistochemistry

The micro-dissected cochlea tissues fixed in 4% formaldehyde in 1X PBS were permeabilized in wash

buffer (1X PBS with 0.1% Triton X-100) for 10 min before being incubated for at least 1 hour in blocking

buffer (1X PBS with 0.1% Triton X-100 and 10% normal goat serum) at room temperature. Samples were

incubated overnight at 4°C with appropriate primary antibodies diluted in the blocking solution. Samples

were then washed with 1X PBS and incubated with the appropriate combinations of DAPI (1 µg/ml), Alexa

Fluor 488, Alexa Fluor 568, or Alexa Fluor 647 conjugated secondary antibodies (Thermo Fisher

Scientific) for 2 hours at room temperature and washed in 1x PBS before mounting in Prolonged Gold

Antifade (Invitrogen, #P36934).

iMOP cells were fixed in 4% formaldehyde in 1X PBS for 20 minutes at room temperature, incubated in

blocking buffer for 1 hour at RT, and incubated overnight with the primary antibodies in blocking buffer at

4°C. The next day, cells were washed with 1X PBS and incubated with appropriate combinations of DAPI

(1 µg/ml), Alexa Fluor 488, Alexa Fluor 568, or Alexa Fluor 647 conjugated secondary antibodies (Thermo

Fisher Scientific) in a blocking buffer for 2 hours at RT. Samples were washed with 1X PBS and mounted

in Prolonged Gold Antifade. All antibodies used for immunostaining are listed in Table 2.

Single-molecule *in situ* hybridization

Single-molecule fluorescence in situ hybridization (smFISH) was performed using RNAscope (Wang et

al., 2012). The RNAscope multiplex fluorescent reagent kit version 2 (Advanced Cell Diagnostics,

#323100) was used to detect target RNAs according to the manufacturer's instructions. RNAscope

probes are listed in Table 3. Immunohistochemistry was performed after the smFISH protocol to enhance

and detect tdTomato protein. Samples were incubated in blocking buffer (1X PBS, 10% goat serum, and

0.3% Triton X-100) for 1 hour at room temperature, followed by overnight incubation with rabbit anti-RFP

in blocking buffer at 4°C. After incubation with primary antibodies, samples were washed with 1x PBS

and incubated with appropriate combinations of DAPI (1 μg/ml) and Alexa Fluor 568 conjugated

secondary antibodies (Thermo Fisher Scientific) in a blocking buffer for 2 hours at room temperature.

Samples were washed with 1X PBS and mounted in Prolonged Gold Antifade. All antibodies used with

RNAscope are listed in Table 2.

Fluorescence micrograph acquisition and visualization

128 Samples were mounted on a 1.5-cover glass and acquired on a Zeiss LSM800 point scanning confocal

129 microscope. Antibody-conjugated fluorophores and tdTomato fluorescent protein were excited using four

130 laser lines (405, 488, 561, and 633nm). 1024X1024 images were acquired using either the 40X (1.4 NA)

131 or 63X (1.4 NA) objective with 1.5-2x digital zoom and 4X Kalmann averaging. The brightness and

132 contrast of images were adjusted and viewed using Zen Blue (Zeiss) or ImageJ.

Cell Culture for iMOP cells

Proliferating iMOP cells were cultured in suspension with DMEM/F12 (Gibco, #11320033) containing

N21-MAX supplement (R&D Systems, #AR008), 25 μg/ml carbenicillin (Fisher Scientific, # BP2648-1),

and 20 ng/ml bFGF (PeproTech, #450-33). Cells were passaged weekly by dissociation using TrypLE

Express (Gibco, #12604013), harvested by centrifugation, and resuspended in a fresh medium. To

generate iMOP-derived neurons, tissue culture dishes or 12mm coverslips placed in a 24-well plate were

coated with 10 μg/mL of poly-D-lysine (PDL; Corning, #354210) for 1 hour at 37°C, then coated overnight

with 10 μg/mL of laminin (Gibco, # 23017015) at 37°C, and washed 3 times with 1X PBS before plating

cells. Proliferating iMOP cultures were dissociated in TrypLE Express, harvested by centrifugation, and

resuspended in neurobasal media (Gibco, #2113049). Resuspended cells were counted using a Moxi

counter, and particles between 9-13 μm were considered as cells. Dissociated iMOP cells were plated in

PDL-laminin coated culture dishes (1.5-2x10^5 /dish for CUT&Tag) or coverslips in a 24-wells (0.8x10^5

cells/well for immunostaining) and cultured in a neurobasal medium containing N21-MAX, 2 mM L-

glutamine (Gibco, #25030081), and 1 μM K03861 (Selleck chemicals, #S8100) for neuronal

differentiation. On day 3 of culture, the Culture One Supplement (Gibco, A3320201) was added to the

media. Fresh medium was added every other day, and neuronal cultures were harvested 7 days after

being plated for neuronal differentiation and used for CUT&Tag or immunostaining.

CUT&Tag

Cells from proliferating iMOPs and iMOP-derived neurons were harvested and processed using the

CUT&Tag-IT Assay Kit (Active Motif, 53160) according to the manufacturer's instructions. Cells were

gently dissociated using TrpLE Express and counted and harvested by centrifugation. For each

CUT&Tag reaction, 500,000 cells were used. The supernatant from the cell pellet was removed, and cells

were resuspended in a wash buffer and placed on ice. Cells were enriched using magnetic Concanavalin

A beads and resuspended in an antibody buffer containing a primary antibody to the protein of interest.

H3K4me3, p300, CHD4, and IgG antibodies were used for individual samples. All antibodies are listed in

Table 2. Two independent samples were used for each antibody condition. Primary antibodies were

incubated with the cells for 2 hours at room temperature or overnight at 4°C. All antibodies for CUT&Tag

were used at 1:50 dilution. After incubation, the cells were washed and incubated in a buffer containing

the assembled pA-Tn5 transposomes and incubated for 1 hour at RT. Cells were washed and processed

for tagmentation by incubation in the appropriate buffer for 1 hour at 37°C. A solution containing EDTA,

SDS, and proteinase K was added to stop the reaction and solubilize DNA fragments. The solution was

placed on a magnetic stand, and the supernatant containing soluble DNA fragments was retained. The

DNA solution was purified using a column. The DNA fragments were subjected to PCR amplification and

purified using SPRI beads. Libraries generated were quantified and subjected to quality control before

performing an Illumina HiSeq 3000 platform (2x150bp). All antibodies used for CUT&Tag are listed in

Table 2.

Peak calling

Paired-end CUT&Tag reads were aligned to the mm10 genome assembly with bowtie2. Only mapped

reads were retained, written to the output, and used for the downstream analysis (Langmead and

Salzberg 2012). The bowtie2 SAM output files were converted into BAM files using Samtools (Li,

Handsaker et al. 2009). After alignment, sequence reads were scaled using the bamCoverage command

in deepTools to remove duplicates and generate normalized bigwig files with reads as Reads Per

Kilobase per Million (RPKM) (Ramirez, Dundar et al. 2014). UCSC bigWigToBedGraph utility was used

to generate bedgraph files from bigwig files (Kent, Zweig et al. 2010). Peaks were called using Sparse

Enrichment Analysis for CUT&RUN (SEACR) (Meers, Tenenbaum et al. 2019). SEACR output bed files

from CHD4, H3K4me3, and p300 were generated using CHD4, H3K4me3, and p300 bedgraph files as

target files while using IgG bedgraph file as a threshold. BEDtools (Quinlan and Hall 2010) was used to

identify consensus peaks with at least 10% reciprocal overlap between replicate samples. Only

consensus peaks were used for downstream analysis. CUT&Tag signal tracks were visualized on

Integrative Genomic Viewer (IGV) (Robinson, Thorvaldsdottir et al. 2011).

Identifying CHD4-bound promoters and enhancers

To perform a global survey of CHD4-bound promoters and enhancers, we first defined CHD4-bound

promoters and enhancers in proliferating iMOPs and iMOP-derived neurons. H3K4me3 and p300 were

used as promoter and enhancer marks, respectively. CHD4-bound promoters (CHD4+ H3K4me3+) and

enhancers (CHD4+ p300+) in iMOPs were identified using BEDtools intersect command. CHD4+

H3K4me3+ were identified as regions with at least one base pair overlap between CHD4 and H3K4me3

peaks. CHD4+ p300+ regions were defined using the same strategy. SEACR total signals were obtained

from the SEACR output file and plotted as box and whisker plots to show the quartiles, mean (circle), and

median (line) values. Cell state-specific CHD4-bound promoters or enhancers were identified based on

their presence or absence in progenitors and neurons. Genome arithmetic was done using bedtools.

Heatmap and profile plots

Heatmaps and profile plots were generated using deepTools. The signal and region files were obtained

from the CUT&Tag data. Normalized bigwig files from two replicates were merged using bigwigCompare

to acquire average bigwig files and used as signal files. The summit regions corresponding to the

maximum SEACR peak signal from CHD4 were used as region files. DeepTools was used to visualize

CHD4 and H3K4me3 reads as heatmaps or profile plots. Plots were centered at the summits of CHD4+

H3K4me3+, and the average CHD4 or H3K4me3 bigwig signals were plotted +/- 3 kb from the summits.

To visualize CHD4 and p300 reads, the summits from CHD4+ p300+ were used as the center, and the

average bigwig signals of either CHD4 or p300 bigwig files were plotted within +/- 3kb of the summits.

Quantification of heatmap total signals

To quantify CUT&Tag signals displayed in heatmaps, the -outFileNameMatrix option in deepTools was

used to retrieve the matrix of signal values underlying the heatmaps. CUT&Tag signals within specified

genomic regions were added to obtain the summed signal values. Heatmap signals between progenitors

and neurons within the +/- 3kb window were visualized as box and whisker plots.

Gene ontology (GO) analysis

To annotate CHD4+ common and neuron-specific promoters and enhancers, ChIPpeakAnno was utilized

to determine the closest genes along with the corresponding ensembl gene IDs to those regions (Zhu,

Gazin et al. 2010). Unique ensembl gene IDs near CHD4-bound promoters and enhancers were used

for GO analysis using DAVID (The Database for Annotation, Visualization and Integrated Discovery)

(Huang, Sherman et al. 2009).

De Novo Motif Discovery, Comparison and Visualization

Genomic coordinates from SEACR-called CHD4 summits were used to define regions of interest. The

regions were converted to GRanges objects. Corresponding DNA sequences were extracted from the

Mus musculus (mm10) reference genome using the BSgenome.Mmusculus.UCSC.mm10 package. The

MEME suite was employed for motif analysis using the memes R package (Bailey, Johnson et al. 2015,

Nystrom and McKay 2021). MEME (Multiple Em for Motif Elicitation) was used for *de novo* motif

discovery. MEME was configured to identify 20 motifs using the anr (Any Number of Repetitions) model,

with motif widths ranging from 6-15 base pairs, searching both forward and reverse complement strands.

Position frequency matrices (PFMs) of discovered motifs were normalized to probabilities and visualized

as sequence logos using universal motif and ggplot2.

Discovered *de novo* motifs were compared against known transcription factor binding motifs from the

JASPAR2024 CORE database for *Mus musculus* using TomTom. *De novo* motifs, corresponding to the

most statistically significant match in JASPAR2024, were based on e-values $< 1 \times 10^{-5}$. The best-

matching transcription factor names were used for motif annotation. To assess motif occurrence and

distribution around the transcriptional start site (TSS), FIMO (Find Individual Motif Occurrences) was

utilized. The regions +/-1kb around the TSS of axon guidance genes harboring CHD4 summits were

extracted. FIMO was used to scan these regions for occurrences of all *de novo* motifs. FIMO results were

filtered to retain only statistically significant matches with a p-value < 0.05. Motif occurrences with best-

match transcription factor names using the TomTom results were mapped and visualized with each axon

guidance gene using ggplot2. Individual motif instances were visualized as points relative to the TSS.

Statistical analysis

Statistical analyses were performed using either R (R version 4.4.3) or OriginPro (Origin Lab) for normally

distributed data. The means of data were presented and subjected to an unpaired two-tailed Student's t-

test to determine statistical significance and provide a p-value. Results with p values <0.05 were

considered statistically significant. Unless noted, the p values are defined as *p<0.05, **p<0.01, and

***p<0.001. Bar graphs display the means ± standard error of the mean (SEM), and violin plots show the

distribution and mean of the data points. The numbers displayed in the text indicated the means ± SEM.

Data for CUT&Tag and RNAscope were determined not to be normally distributed using the Shapiro-

Wilks normality test. The median was presented and subjected to a non-parametric Wilcoxon rank-sum

test to determine whether the paired samples differed statistically. Analysis of the data was performed in

R. The normalized read counts (RPKM) from CUT&Tag were displayed as box and whisker plots to show

the quartiles, means, and medians. Horizontal lines within the box denoted the median values, while the

circles represented the means. The number displayed in the text indicates the median ± standard

deviation (sd) of CUT&Tag signals for box and whisker plots. The RNAscope images were counted to

determine the distribution, mean, and median of puncta counts per cell. Unless noted, the p-values from

the Wilcoxon rank-sum test were defined as $p < 0.05$ to be significant. The numbers displayed indicate

the median ± sd in the text and the median of puncta counts in the figure. The variance was calculated

as the sum of the squared difference between puncta counts and the sample mean, divided by the sample

size minus one. Levene's test for the homogeneity of variance was used to determine whether the

variances were statistically significant. The p-values from Levene's test were defined as $p<0.05$ to be

significant.

Results

CHD4 expression in cochlear cell types

SGNs are bipolar and pseudounipolar neurons of the cochlea. The somas of SGNs reside within the modiolus and extend a peripheral process through Rosenthal's canal towards the sensory hair cells, while a central process from the cell soma projects to the cochlear nucleus in the brainstem. SGNs are broadly classified as type I and type II neurons. Type I SGNs are the primary afferents that consist of 90-95% of the neuronal population in the spiral ganglion. Type I SGNs are myelinated and form a single synaptic bouton with inner hair cells that reside in the organ of Corti (Fig. 1A). Multiple type I SGNs synapse along the basolateral surface of inner hair cells (IHCs) (Liberman 1982). Type I SGNs differ in sensitivity to sound and spontaneous firing rate (SR), as revealed by single-fiber recordings in the cat auditory nerve (Kiang, Pfeiffer et al. 1965). The relationship between threshold and SR predicted three distinct populations of low, medium, and high SR neurons (Liberman 1978). These three subtypes are present irrespective of tonotopic position along the length of the cochlea (Borg, Engstrom et al. 1988, Schmiedt 1989, Winter, Robertson et al. 1990, el Barbary 1991, Taberner and Liberman 2005, Shrestha, Chia et al. 2018, Sun, Wang et al. 2022). SGNs display different receptors and ion channel regulators that shape their sensitivity and SR. The molecular heterogeneity correlated with the differences in electrophysiological properties of these neurons (Adamson, Reid et al. 2002, Chen, Xue et al. 2011, Liu, Manis et al. 2014, Liu and Davis 2014).

Type II afferent neurons account for 5–10% of the neuronal population (Spoendlin 1972, Ruggero, Santi et al. 1982). Type II SGNs are pseudounipolar and unmyelinated neurons that turn towards the cochlear base (Zhang and Coate 2017). During outgrowth, Type II SGN peripheral axons turn after the growth cone passes between the basolateral surfaces of the inner pillar cells. Turning occurs among the outer pillar and Deiters' cells as they are directed towards the cochlear base (Fig. 1A). This process is mediated

by planar cell polarity complexes formed between cochlear-supporting cells for non-cell autonomous

regulation of axon pathfinding (Ghimire, Ratzan et al. 2018, Ghimire and Deans 2019). The peripheral

axons then gradually ascend apically toward the outer hair cells (OHCs) after turning to join other type II

axons in one of three outer spiral bundles that extend along the length of the cochlea (Fig. 1B). Each

type II afferent neuron innervates multiple OHCs from the same row, with individual OHC receiving an

en-passant contact from a type II afferent neuron (Zhang and Coate 2017).

To determine the expression of CHD4, neonatal cochleae from embryonic day (E) 18.5 embryos were

harvested. At this point, type I and type II SGNs are morphologically distinct, and the neurites have

extended toward IHCs and OHCs, respectively. The cochleae were subjected to immunostaining with

CHD4 and TUBB3 antibodies to mark the presence of type I and type II SGNs along with CHD4 (Fig.

1C). The fiber tracks from their innervation pattern can identify the type of SGNs. As previously described,

many different cell types within the organ of Corti, including IHCs and OHCs, express CHD4 (Layman,

Sauceda et al. 2013). We confirmed the presence of CHD4 in MYO7A labeled hair cells (Fig. 1D). CHD4

was also expressed in the nuclei of inner pillar, outer pillar and the three rows of Dieter cells and other

supporting cells (Fig. 1E). Finally, CHD4 was strongly expressed in the nucleus of spiral ganglion neurons

(SGNs) marked by TUBB3 in the modiolus (Fig. 1F). Expression of CHD4 was present in all TUBB3-

marked SGNs. The presence of *Chd4* transcripts in developing SGNs (Lu, Appler et al. 2011) and our

results suggest that CHD4 may function in SGNs during inner ear development.

Deletion of *Chd4* in SGNs

CHD4 is present in many inner ear cell types, and mutations that inactivate CHD4 chromatin remodeling

activity may contribute to improper development or dysfunction of multiple inner ear cell types. Since

SGNs highly express CHD4, we wanted to delineate how CHD4 ablation in SGNs contributes to the

development of the cochlea and hearing loss. Targeted ablation of CHD4 from SGNs using a

Neurogenin1 (Ngn1) CreER^{T2} *Chd4*$^{flox/flox}$ animal was accomplished. The Ngn1 CreER^{T2} *Chd4*$^{flox/flox}$

animals contain two copies of the *Chd4* conditional knockout (cKO) allele, where loxP sites flanked exons

that code for the ATPase domain required for nucleosome repositioning (Williams, Naito et al. 2004). The

Ngn1 CreER^{T2} transgenes harbor a tamoxifen-inducible Cre expressed in neurosensory progenitors and

can be used for genetic manipulations in SGNs (Koundakjian, Appler et al. 2007). Tamoxifen

administration to Ngn1 CreER^{T2} animals allowed Cre-mediated excision of loxP-flanked DNA in inner ear

neurosensory progenitors that become SGNs (Koundakjian, Appler et al. 2007, Raft, Koundakjian et al.

2007). To ensure Cre activity was present in the intended cell types, *Chd4*$^{flox/flox}$ Ngn1 CreER^{T2} were

crossed to the Ai9 tdTomato reporter (Madisen, Zwingman et al. 2010). In the triple transgenic animals,

tamoxifen administration allows Cre-activated Ai9 tdTomato reporter expression and enables

fluorescence visualization of SGN cell bodies and axonal projections while simultaneously deleting *Chd4*

(Fig. 2A). Control (Ngn1 CreER^{T2}; Ai9) and *Chd4* cKO (Ngn1 CreER^{T2}; *Chd4*$^{flox/flox}$; Ai9) lines were

generated. Timed matings from either control or *Chd4* cKO lines produced pregnant dams that were

administered with tamoxifen to produce embryos for analysis.

During inner ear development, delaminating otic progenitors around E9 from the proneurosensory

domain of the otic vesicle coalesce to form the cochlear-vestibular ganglion (CVG). As development

progresses, the CVG neurons segregate to create the spiral ganglion. A population of neurons exits the

cell cycle and terminally differentiates at the base and middle of the cochlea starting from E9.5-10.5. Most

SGNs exit the cell cycle around E11.5 in the middle and base of the cochlea, while cells in the apex exit

the cell cycle at E12.5. After exiting the cell cycle, peripheral projections from SGNs extend toward the

sensory epithelium of the cochlea. At E12.5, SGN projections begin to extend beyond the spiral ganglion

border. At E15.5, SGN peripheral axon outgrowth continues along the length of the cochlea. Type I SGNs

form radial fiber bundles that undergo fasciculation. Between E15.5-18.5, type I-like SGN processes

show extensive branching around and beyond the inner hair cells. The neurites are subsequently refined

by retracting from the outer hair cell region (Appler and Goodrich 2011, Coate, Spita et al. 2015). Type II

SGNs are notably distinct from Type I SGNs by E16.5 based on their peripheral projections ending at the outer hair cell region (Bruce, Kingsley et al. 1997). The Ngn1 CreER[T2] animals with a reporter can mark delaminating neurosensory progenitors that develop into type I and type II SGNs at the aforementioned developmental stages (Koundakjian, Appler et al. 2007).

Chd4 was deleted by administering daily tamoxifen doses to pregnant dams between E8.5-10.5. During this time, *Chd4* was deleted from neurosensory progenitors that give rise to SGNs. Labeled cells were used to study the consequences of *Chd4* ablation in developing type I and type II SGNs. E18.5 embryos were harvested from pregnant dams after tamoxifen treatment. Although some embryos survived, many resorptions occurred perinatally after tamoxifen administration. Quantification and comparison of resorbed embryos from control and *Chd4* cKO dams suggest a significant reduction in viability of *Chd4* cKO embryos (Fig. S1A). Quantifying the number of surviving embryos from individual litters obtained from pregnant dams showed a statistically significant reduction in embryo viability after *Chd4* deletion (Fig. S1B). Cre recombinase expression in the Ngn1 CreERT[2] is not limited to the inner ear but can also be observed throughout the central nervous system (Kim, Hori et al. 2011). These findings suggest deleting *Chd4* in other cell types may decrease viability in the *Chd4* cKO embryos.

Cochleae were harvested and used for immunostaining from the remaining embryos. To ensure that the genetic deletion of *Chd4* lacked protein, immunofluorescence labeling of the CHD4 protein was done. TUBB3 immunofluorescence was used to identify SGNs. The tdTomato fluorescence suggested that Cre activity was present in TUBB3-marked SGNs in both control and *Chd4* cKO cochleae samples. Even though SGNs were present in the cochleae, only the CHD4 signal was seen in controls and not in *Chd4* cKO cochleae (Fig. 2B). These results showed that CHD4 protein was absent in the *Chd4* cKO cochlea after tamoxifen treatment and that CHD4 was not essential for SGN viability at embryonic and neonatal stages. In E18.5 embryonic cochlea, an increase in the number of tdTomato+ and TUBB3-negative cells was observed in *Chd4* cKO (Fig. 2C). To quantify the percentage of the marked cell populations, SGNs

from dissected cochlea were divided into three regions corresponding to the apex, middle, and base of

the cochleae. In controls, a low percentage of cells lacking TUBB3 but expressing tdTomato was

observed (apex: 6.81 ± 1.69%, middle: 4.07 ± 1.94%, base: 3.95 ± 1.74%), while in *Chd4* cKO cochlea,

increased percentages of these cells were observed along the length of the cochleae (apex: 12.06 ±

2.25%, middle: 8.73 ± 0.91%, base: 7.82 ± 1.29%; apex, $p < 0.14$, middle, $p < 0.10$; base, $p < 0.15$) (Fig.

2D). The percentage of TUBB3 labeled SGNs marked by tdTomato allowed us to confirm the efficiency

of Cre-mediated activity in these cells. In control embryos, Cre activity was observed in almost all SGNs

with a slight decrease in labeled cells at the apex (apex: 89.86 ± 3.56%, middle: 97.09 ± 1.48%, base:

98.97 ± 0.36%). Since development proceeds in a base-to-apex manner, the decreased percentage of

tdTomato-marked cells located at the apical region of the cochlea was likely due to a small population of

late-born neurons that were not exposed to tamoxifen during the time window of administration. *Chd4*

cKO displayed similar percentages of tdTomato marked cells (apex: 84.35 ± 2.99%, middle: 95.71 ±

1.96%, base: 98.91 ± 0.2%; apex $p < 0.30$; middle $p < 0.60$; base, $p < 0.90$). The percentages of

tdTomato+TUBB3+ cells from control and *Chd4* cKO cochlea were not statistically different (Fig. 2E).

The numbers of tdTomato+ cells from *Chd4* cKO were not significantly different from control (44.22 ±

0.41% for control, 49.70 ± 2.32% for *Chd4* cKO, $p < 0.08$) (Fig. 2F). These results suggest that tamoxifen

induced Cre recombination was efficient along the entire length of the cochlea and was similar between

control and *Chd4* cKO cochleae.

Chd4 cKO cochleae displayed altered fasciculation of radial fiber bundles

Deletion of *Chd4* in embryos showed that SGNs were present and in comparable percentages as

controls. Although *Chd4* may not dramatically affect the viability or early developmental stages, we

wanted to determine whether loss of *Chd4* showed discernible differences at later stages. Post-mitotic

neurons from the spiral ganglion extend neurites towards inner and outer hair cells, starting from the base

to the apex. Type I and type II SGNs target IHCs and OHCs, respectively. Type I and type II SGN fiber

tracks and innervation patterns were marked by performing whole mount TUBB3 immunostaining using

cochleae from control and *Chd4* cKO (Fig. 3A).

The peripheral axons of type I SGNs extend from the soma to form a radial bundle. The type I SGN fibers

fasciculate, the terminals extensively branch around the inner spiral plexus (ISP) and retract from the

outer hair cell region back into the IHC region (Fig. 3B). In *Chd4* cKO cochleae, radial fibers were less

compact and showed wider nerve fascicles. The area between the fiber bundles was identified by

converting TUBB3 immunofluorescent images to black-and-white binary images. The white regions

between fiber bundles and the total area from the SGN soma to the sensory epithelium were determined

from images taken along the length of the cochlea (Fig. 3C). The percent area unoccupied by radial fibers

relative to the total area was calculated and used as a metric for fasciculation (Fig. 3D). The average

percentage of unoccupied space in *Chd4* cKO cochleae was significantly decreased (33.19 ± 2.59% for

control and 25.12 ± 1.28% for *Chd4* cKO, p < 0.05). The result suggested that the radial fibers from *Chd4*

cKO cochleae covered more area and thus were wider than controls (Fig. 3E). The fiber bundles were

counted in control and *Chd4* cKO cochleae to determine the fascicle numbers in the inner spiral plexus

(ISP) (Fig. 3F). The ISP consists of the region where radial fibers extend from the soma through

the *habenula perforata* to innervate the IHC (Fig. 1). The average number of fascicles in ISP per inner

radial bundle increased significantly in *Chd4* cKO cochleae (4.48 ± 0.16 bundles for control and 6.54 ±

0.67 bundles for *Chd4* cKO, p < 0.01) (Fig. 3G). These results show an increased number of inner radial

fiber bundles and less compact bundling of the nerve fiber.

***Chd4* cKO cochleae display improper turning of type II fibers**

Type II SGNs constitute only 5-10% of the total SGN population, but their axonal projections are spatially

distinct from type I SGNs. During development, their peripheral processes cross the tunnel of Corti into

the outer hair cell region, where the axons make a right-angle turn and travel from the base of the cochlea

towards the apex to make *en passant* synapses with outer hair cells. The outer spiral fibers are the

bundled neurites from type II SGNs that extend along the OHC region. Each OHC is innervated by 2-5

type II SGNs (Huang, Barclay et al. 2012, Martinez-Monedero, Liu et al. 2016). To look at the outer spiral

fiber tracks, TUBB3-labeled neurons from whole mount cochleae were used for analysis (Fig. 4A). The

magnified images of outer spiral fibers usually display three main fiber tracks that travel along individual

rows of outer hair cells with intermittent fibers crossing these tracks. To show quantitative differences

between the outer spiral tracks, intensity profiles from control and *Chd4* cKO cochleae images spanning

the outer hair cell region were taken (Fig. 4B). Measurements of the intensity profile show different peaks

corresponding to the presence of fibers. The intensity profile plot showed three prominent peaks in the

control cochlea (black). In contrast, *Chd4* cKO cochlea (red) displayed additional peaks (Fig. 4C). The

data suggested that there are type II SGN fibers or individual axons that detract from the outer fiber tracts

(Fig. 4C). Each major peak corresponds to an outer spiral bundle consisting of multiple fibers. The

appearance of the minor peaks within a major peak corresponds to the increased dispersion of the fibers

within an outer spiral fiber. The number of distinct fibers observed by fluorescent microscopy in the outer

hair cell region was counted and normalized based on the area to validate the altered axon paths. Similar

to the intensity profile, the number of fibers in the OHC area increased in *Chd4* cKO samples compared

to controls (13.98 ± 0.73 fibers for controls and 17.64 ± 0.78 fibers for *Chd4* cKO, $p < 0.03$) (Fig. 4D).

These results suggest aberrant bundling of the outer spiral fibers after *Chd4* ablation in SGNs.

We also noticed the aberrant turning of the outer spiral fiber tracks. Turning of the type II SGN fibers

usually occurs near the inner pillar cell (IPC), outer pillar cell (OPC) or Dieter cell (DC) region. Confocal

micrographs were acquired below the outer hair cell layer up to the sensory epithelium to visualize the

fiber turning. Individual fibers from control cochleae turned towards the base of the cochlea before joining

one of the three outer spiral fiber tracks. In contrast, the *Chd4* cKO cochleae showed fibers turning in the

opposite direction (Fig. 4E, yellow arrows). Incorrectly turned type II fibers were quantified in control and

Chd4 cKO cochleae (Fig. 4F). These data showed that the deletion of *Chd4* increases the incorrect

turning of type II SGNs in the outer spiral fibers (0.12 ± 0.06 fibers for control and 1.93 ± 0.14 fibers for

Chd4 cKO, $p < 2.83 \times 10^{-4}$). Turning of the fibers has previously been shown to require cell signals from

supporting cells (Ghimire, Ratzan et al. 2018, Ghimire and Deans 2019, Deans 2022). To ensure that

supporting cells in the organ of Corti were present and not indirectly affected by *Chd4* deletion,

immunostaining for both hair cells and supporting cells, using MYO7A and SOX2, was performed in

control and *Chd4* cKO cochlea. A single row of inner hair cells and three rows of outer hair cells were

present in both samples. Moreover, SOX2-labeled supporting cells showed the presence of organized

supporting cells residing below hair cells (Fig. S2). These results suggest that *Chd4* deletion in SGNs

affects the turning of type II SGNs in a cell-autonomous manner.

Chd4 cKO cochleae display aberrant basal to apical axon path towards outer hair cells

Alterations in axon paths could also be due to how fibers exit Rosenthal's canal and ascend toward the

outer hair cells. To determine if this is the case, reconstructed confocal images of MYO7A-labeled hair

cells provide a landmark for the terminal destination of axons. We observed that many type II tracks take

a more circuitous route toward the OHCs because the fibers initially descend basally and migrate further

away from the soma of outer hair cells (Fig. 4G). The distances were obtained from the bottom of

individual OHC somas to the furthest detectable axon fibers directly below. The measurements were

used to quantify the aberrant axon path (Fig. 4H). The measurements showed an increase in the average

distance of the fibers to the bottom of hair cells in *Chd4* cKO cochleae (17.84 ± 0.66µm for control and

29.87 ± 3.74µm for *Chd4* cKO, $p < 0.03$). The increased distance measured in *Chd4* cKO cochleae

suggested that outer spiral fibers do not properly ascend from Rosenthal's canal towards the outer hair

cells (Fig. 4I). Many of these changes in fiber tracks and innervation patterns observed both in type I and

type II SGNs are reminiscent of axon guidance defects. Although these findings implicate CHD4 in axon

pathfinding, the molecular targets for CHD4 in SGNs are unknown.

Enrichment of CHD4 at cis-regulatory regions of *Eph* and *Ephrin* genes

CHD4 function is cell-type dependent, and its chromatin activity likely alters a unique repertoire of cis-

regulatory elements in SGNs to control gene expression. A significant hurdle is identifying high-

confidence occupancy sites for CHD4 in SGNs by chromatin immunoprecipitation followed by deep

sequencing (ChIP-seq) or Cleavage Under Targets & Tagmentation (CUT&Tag). The inability to identify

these high-confidence sites in SGNs is partly due to the large number of cells required for the

experiments. Instead of primary SGNs, we used immortalized multipotent otic progenitor (iMOP)-derived

neurons to determine genome-wide binding sites for CHD4 to identify potential target genes.

Immortalized multipotent otic progenitors (iMOP) derived neurons are highly similar at the transcriptome

level to primary otic progenitors from which they were derived and can differentiate into cells that display

bipolar and pseudounipolar morphology similar to SGNs (Kwan, Shen et al. 2015).

Immunostaining confirmed the presence of CHD4 in the nucleus of proliferating iMOPs and TUBB3-

expressing iMOP-derived neurons (Fig. 5A). To identify genome-wide CHD4 binding sites, CUT&Tag

was performed using CHD4 antibodies on proliferating iMOP and iMOP-derived neurons. CHD4

occupancy is cell-type specific and is recruited to active promoters and enhancers to repress transcription

(Yang, Yamada et al. 2016, Yoshida, Hu et al. 2019). We used the H3K4me3 and p300 marks as genomic

landmarks for promoters and enhancers. Sparse Enrichment Analysis for CUT&RUN (SEACR) identified

regions of high-confidence enrichment, known as peaks, from all CUT&Tag sequence reads (Meers,

Bryson et al. 2019). We compared CHD4 peaks to H3K4me3 and p300-bound regions. The heatmaps

provided a distribution of the reads within a +/- 3 kb window. The profile plots allowed us to evaluate the

read density over the same genomic regions qualitatively. We identified CHD4+ H3K4me3+ regions

based on the occupancy of CHD4 and H3K4me3 peaks in proliferating iMOP cells and iMOP-derived

neurons (Fig. S3B). The CHD4+ H3K4me3+ regions corresponded to CHD4-bound promoters. Similarly,

we defined CHD4+ p300+ regions in proliferating iMOP cells and iMOP-derived neurons (Fig. S3C). The

CHD4+ p300+ regions corresponded to CHD4-bound enhancers. From the profile plots, we noticed that

the CHD4 signal increased in iMOP-derived neurons compared to proliferating iMOPs at both promoters

and enhancers. We quantified and compared the CHD4 total signals at CHD4+ H3K4me3+ promoters

and CHD4+ p300+ enhancers between proliferating iMOP and iMOP-derived neurons. We showed that

at CHD4-bound promoters, CHD4 total signals increased 2.80-fold in iMOP-derived neurons (57,811.40

± 65,983.40 RPKM) compared to proliferating iMOPs (20,684.90 ± 25,408.89 RPKM, $p < 2.20 \times 10^{-16}$).

At CHD4-bound enhancers, we found a 4.65-fold increase of CHD4 total signal in iMOP-derived neurons

(134,027.50 ± 102,349.97 RPKM) compared to proliferating iMOPs (28,837.65 ± 29,014.11 RPKM, p <

2.20×10^{-16}) (Fig. 5B). The results suggest that increased enrichment of CHD4 at cis-regulatory regions

in iMOP-derived neurons may regulate gene expression during neuronal differentiation.

To investigate the involvement of CHD4 during neuronal differentiation, we identified CHD4 binding sites

present in iMOP-derived neurons. We did this by comparing CHD4-bound regions between proliferating

iMOPs and iMOP-derived neurons. At CHD4+ H3K4me3+ promoters, we found 982 progenitor-specific,

168 neuron-specific, and 1,092 common promoters in both proliferating iMOPs and iMOP-derived

neurons. At CHD4+ p300+ enhancers, we identified 2,106 progenitor-specific, 223 neuron-specific, and

750 common enhancers (Fig. 5C). We focused on common and neuron-specific regions since CHD4

activity may exert epigenetic changes at these sites during neuronal differentiation. We generated

heatmaps and profile plots for each of the regions. At common promoters, we observed a 1.20-fold

increase of H3K4me3 in iMOP-derived neurons (25,871.92 ± 12,797.10 RPKM) compared to proliferating

iMOPs (21,550.36 ± 9,015.10 RPKM, $p < 3.67 \times 10^{-23}$) and a 2.28-fold increase in CHD4 in iMOP-derived

neurons (5,407.49 ± 2,955.04 RPKM) compared to proliferating iMOPs (2,371.49 ± 1573.27 RPKM, p <

3.46×10^{-282}). At neuron-specific promoters, a 1.31-fold increase in H3K4me3 (proliferating iMOP

17,105.85 ± 10,709.21 RPKM, iMOP-derived neurons 22,411.04 ± 14,180.57 RPKM, $p < 3.87 \times 10^{-7}$) and

3.30-fold increase in CHD4 (proliferating iMOP 1,397.09 ± 2,617.01 RPKM, iMOP-derived neuron

4,608.37 ± 3,173.27 RPKM, $p < 4.22 \times 10^{-45}$) was observed in iMOP-derived neurons (Fig. 5D). All

observed increases in H3K4me3 and CHD4 were statistically significant.

We performed a similar analysis for enhancers. The heatmaps and profile plots showed a distribution of

p300 and CHD4 centered at common and neuron-specific enhancers. A 3.37-fold increase in p300

(proliferating iMOP = 2,838.41 ± 1,713.93 RPKM, iMOP-derived neuron = 9,578.39 ± 4531.32 RPKM, p

$< 5.92 \times 10^{-223}$) was observed at common enhancers. CHD4 displayed a 2.84-fold increase in signal from

iMOP-derived neurons (proliferating iMOP 4,068.79 ± 2,542.82 RPKM, iMOP-derived neuron 11,559.34

± 4,647.43 RPKM, $p < 9.30 \times 10^{-210}$). At common and neuron-specific enhancers, a statistically significant

increase in signal was detected for p300 and CHD4 in iMOP-derived neurons compared to proliferating

iMOPs (Fig. 5E). The results suggest that CHD4 was significantly enriched at specific promoters and

enhancers during neuronal differentiation. The increased occupancy likely alters the chromatin state of

these cis-regulatory regions to regulate transcription.

To gain biological insights into CHD4 targets, genes near common and neuron-specific regulatory

elements were identified (Table S1). The identified target genes were used for gene ontology analysis.

Gene ontology (GO) analysis revealed function in chromatin organization ($p < 5.10 \times 10^{-14}$), which is

consistent with the predicted cellular process of CHD4 in inner ear neurons. Other biological processes

such as ephrin receptor signaling ($p < 4.90 \times 10^{-5}$), axon guidance ($p < 2.00 \times 10^{-13}$), semaphorin-plexin

signaling during axon guidance ($p < 2.70 \times 10^{-2}$), axonal fasciculation ($p < 1.60 \times 10^{-2}$), and axonogenesis

($p < 1.60 \times 10^{-14}$) were some of the notable cellular processes (Fig. S3A). The GO analysis suggested

that CHD4 gene targets may regulate processes involved in axon pathfinding, including ephrin receptor

signaling. We identified *Epha4*, *Epha7*, *Ephb3*, *Efna3*, *Efna4*, *Efnb2*, *Efna5*, *Efnb1*, *Ephb2,* and other

axon guidance genes as candidates based on their proximity to CHD4-bound promoter and enhancer

regions (Table S1). Ephrin signaling pathways are essential in guiding SGN peripheral axons. We

focused on *Epha4*, *Epha7*, and *Efnb2* because these genes have previously been implicated to function

in the inner ear (Coate, Raft et al. 2012, Defourny, Poirrier et al. 2013, Kim, Ibrahim et al. 2016, Petitpre,

Wu et al. 2018, Sanders and Kelley 2022). At *Epha4* and *Epha7*, CHD4, and H3K4me3 peaks were

observed near the transcriptional start site. We also observed an increase in CHD4 and p300 in iMOP-

derived neurons at multiple intronic regions, a region upstream at *Epha4* and a singular downstream site

at *Epha7* (Fig. 5F). A similar observation was noted for *Efnb2* (Fig. S3D), where CHD4 was enriched at

the H3K4me3 marked promoter along with increased CHD4 and p300 signals at a downstream enhancer

region. In contrast, CHD4 was not observed at the transcriptional start site of *Calb2*, a non-target gene

(Fig. S3E). These results imply that CHD4 binding to promoters and enhancers may control the

transcription of *Eph* receptors and *Efn* ligands. The altered expression of these genes may be pertinent

to the axon guidance deficits seen in the *Chd4* cKO cochleae.

DNA binding motifs near Eph receptor and ephrin ligand genes

Although CHD4 may regulate the epigenetic state at cis-regulatory regions of axon guidance genes, it

does not have a direct DNA-binding motif (Laureano, Kim et al. 2023). We wanted to identify potential

transcription factors that may regulate the expression of *Eph* and *Efn* genes. To gain insight into the

transcriptional regulation, *de novo* DNA motif discovery on CHD4-enriched regions was done to identify

potential TF binding sites. Starting with SEACR-defined summits obtained from CHD4 peaks, we first

identified 1,095 sites within ±1 kb of TSS (Fig. S4A). Next, we focused on CHD4 binding within ±1 kb of

TSS at axon guidance genes to identify 16 sites (Fig. S4B). *De novo* motif discovery was done to identify

motif consensus sequences. To annotate the *de novo* motifs, they were compared to known TF motifs,

and statistically significant matches were displayed on a heatmap with their corresponding p values (Fig.

S4C). Motif occurrences and Information Content Scores (ICS), a conservation metric, were determined

and plotted (Fig. S4D). Motif occurrences and relative positions to the TSS were shown for each axon

guidance gene (Fig. S5A). The probability of base pair composition from identified motifs was visualized

using sequence logos (Fig. S5B).

We identified distinct combinations of TF motifs for *Epha4*, *Epha7*, and *Efnb2*, genes previously

implicated in axon guidance in the cochlea. *Epha4* contained *Stat2* (Signal transducer and activator of

transcription 2), two *Lhx3 (*LIM homeobox 3), and an *Ar* (Androgen Receptor) motif. *Epha7* harbored

Stat2, *Plagl1* (Pleiomorphic Adenoma Gene-like 1), and *Hnf1A* (Hepatic Nuclear Factor 1 Alpha) motifs.

Efnb2 displayed a single *Ar* motif. These motifs were displayed as sequence logos (Fig. 6A). This

analysis revealed potential TFs that may function with CHD4 to regulate *Epha4*, *Epha7,* and *Efnb2*

transcription.

Chd4 cKO showed increased *Eph* and *Efn* mRNA levels in SGNs

To validate if deletion of CHD4 in SGNs affects the level of ephrin molecules, cochleae from control and

Chd4 cKO were subjected to fluorescence *in situ* hybridization (RNAscope)*.* We used *Calb2* (*Calbindin2*)

transcripts as a marker for SGNs and as a gene unaffected by CHD4. We simultaneously probed for the

Eph or *Efn* transcripts. TUBB3 immunolabeling was combined with RNAscope to demarcate SGNs for

quantification in control (Fig. 6B) and *Chd4* conditional knockout (Fig. 6C). The soma of individual TUBB3-

marked SGNs were used to determine regions of interest for puncta quantification to determine the

relative number of mRNA molecules in each neuron (Fig. 6D).

The *Calb2* puncta were quantified and there was no significant difference observed in *Calb2* transcript

levels between *Chd4* cKO (8 ± 5.51 *Calb2* puncta/cell) and control (9 ± 6.16 *Calb2* puncta/cell, $p < 0.13$)

(Fig. 6E). The distribution of *Calb2* puncta counts per cell was visualized as a histogram to display the

number of cells with specified *Calb2* puncta/cell. This histogram was transformed into a density plot to

illustrate the probability distribution of puncta counts per cell. The variance was calculated using the

density plot. As observed, the density plots for both control and *Chd4* cKO SGNs were not appreciably

different, and the variance of *Calb2* transcripts showed a slight 1.25-fold decrease in *Chd4* cKO (σ^2 =

30.36) compared to the control (σ^2 = 37.93, p < 0.04) (Fig. 6E).

In contrast, the average number of *Epha4* puncta in the SGN population increased in *Chd4* cKO (13 ±

6.29 puncta/cell) compared to the control (7 ± 4.00 puncta/cell, $p < 1.74 \times 10^{-39}$) and was statistically

significant. By transforming the distribution of the *Epha4* puncta/cell into a density plot, we observed a

2.47-fold increase in the variance of *Epha4* transcripts in *Chd4* cKO (σ^2 = 39.51) compared to control

SGNs (σ^2 = 16.00, $p < 2.27 \times 10^{-14}$). The non-overlapping regions in the density estimates reflect the

increased probability of cells with higher *Epha4* transcript levels in the absence of *Chd4* (Fig. 6F). The

results suggest that deletion of *Chd4* in SGNs increases *Epha4* in a subpopulation of SGNs. In contrast

to *Epha4*, the decreased variance in *Calb2* puncta/cell may be caused by a CHD4-independent

mechanism or an indirect effect of *Chd4* deletion.

To further validate additional targets of axon guidance genes, we performed RNAscope on the two other

members of the Ephrin receptor and ephrin ligand family, *Epha7* and *Efnb2,* that displayed CHD4 binding

at their promoters. *Epha7* puncta in SGNs were significantly increased in *Chd4* cKO (18 ± 7.55 *Epha7*

puncta/cell) compared to the control (12 ± 5.67 *Epha7* puncta/cell, $p < 2.48 \times 10^{-45}$) and the variance of

Epha7 transcripts showed a 1.77-fold increase in *Chd4* cKO (σ^2 = 56.95) compared to the control SGNs

(σ^2 =32.19, $p < 8.29 \times 10^{-11}$) (Fig. 6G). A similar increase in *Efnb2* puncta *was* observed in *Chd4* cKO (23

± 9.31 puncta/cell*)* compared to control (16 ± 8.22 puncta/cell, $p < 7.33 \times 10^{-24}$). A 1.28-fold increase in

the *Efnb2* variance was observed in *Chd4* cKO (σ^2 = 86.76) compared to control SGNs (σ^2 =67.57, p <

0.04) (Fig. 6H). The results suggest an increased likelihood of *Chd4* cKO SGNs harboring more *Epha4*,

Epha7, and *Efnb2* transcripts, due to the loss of CHD4. The data indicate that CHD4 normally represses

transcription of a subset of Eph receptor and ephrin ligand genes. Ablation of *Chd4* increases transcript

levels of the axon guidance genes in a proportion of cells, resulting in aberrant peripheral axon

pathfinding.

Discussion

CHD4 is expressed in cochlear supporting cells and hair cells from E18 to P21 (Layman, Sauceda et al. 2013). Gene expression analysis showed that *Chd4* transcripts are present and changing in developing murine SGNs from E12 to P15 (Lu, Appler et al. 2011). *De novo* pathogenic variants of *CHD4* correlate to SIHIWES, an autosomal dominant neurodevelopmental disorder. Patients with pathogenic variants of CHD4 show variable symptoms, and many have hearing loss (Sifrim, Hitz et al. 2016, Weiss, Terhal et al. 2016). CHD4 has a core ATPase SWI/SNF domain that hydrolyzes ATP and converts it into chromatin repositioning activity. Some pathogenic mutations result in CHD4 protein with reduced chromatin remodeling activity (Weiss, Lazar et al. 2020). To clarify the contribution of CHD4 in SGNs, we employed a conditional knockout mouse model that allows Cre-dependent inducible deletion of the exons coding for the ATPase domain of CHD4 in SGNs. The conditional knockout mouse allowed us to separate the CHD4 function from other inner ear cell types, such as hair cells and supporting cells. Our current results implicate a cell-autonomous role for CHD4 in the pathfinding of SGN peripheral axons during inner ear development. The lack of CHD4 chromatin remodeling activity in SGNs resulted in aberrant axon guidance. The altered pathfinding may affect the transmission of neural signals and innervation of hair cells. These deficits likely contribute to hearing loss in patients with SIHIWES and provide insight into how other neural circuits may be affected.

CHD4 is a core subunit in the Nucleosome Remodeling and Deacetylase (NuRD) complex (Tong, Hassig et al. 1998, Xue, Wong et al. 1998, Zhang, LeRoy et al. 1998). The NuRD complex acts mainly as a transcriptional repressor and localizes to sites of active transcription. At these sites, CHD4 repositions nucleosomes and subunits of the complex, such as histone deacetylases (HDAC) 1 and 2 deacetylate histones (Morra, Lee et al. 2012, Watson, Mahajan et al. 2012). Although CHD4 has many other paralogs, distinct NuRD complexes with individual CHD paralogs (CHD3, CHD4, and CHD5) have specific molecular functions and do not compensate for the loss of a singular CHD. The remaining paralogous

CHDs did not compensate for the cellular effects of ablating CHD4 (Nitarska, Smith et al. 2016). CHD4-

containing NuRD complexes in the inner ear may contain distinct protein subunits that alter the epigenetic

landscape at cis-regulatory regions. Our results suggest a role for CHD4 in axon guidance during SGN

development. Even if paralogs were present in SGNs, they did not fully compensate for the observed

axon guidance deficits. We used iMOP-derived neurons as a cellular system to study SGN development.

We showed increased CHD4 occupancy at distinct sets of promoters and distal enhancers during

neuronal differentiation. We propose that CHD4 exerts epigenetic changes on cis-regulatory elements to

attenuate transcription of axon guidance genes until the appropriate developmental time. Without CHD4,

the core NuRD complex does not form, and axon guidance genes may show increased transcription

without NuRD-dependent nucleosome repositioning and histone deacetylase activities. The exquisite

temporal transcriptional control of axon guidance genes is likely required to establish the appropriate

fasciculation and innervation patterns.

Although CHD4 has domains that interact with modified histones, it lacks a specific DNA-binding domain

(Reid, Zhong et al. 2024). Motif analysis was performed to identify potential TF that function with CHD4.

We identified TF binding motifs within a single CHD4 binding site at promoters of many axon guidance

genes. The clustered motifs in some axon guidance genes, such as *Epha4* and *Epha7,* may facilitate

cooperative TF binding. Individual transcription factor binding sites often exhibit relatively weak binding

affinities. However, when multiple TFs bind nearby, they can engage in protein-protein interactions or

induce DNA conformational changes that collectively strengthen their overall DNA binding affinity. This

cooperativity often leads to a synergistic activation or repression of gene expression, where the combined

effect of multiple TFs is greater than the sum of each TFs contribution (Wang, Xie et al. 2025). The

synergistic binding of TFs with nucleosome remodeling activity from CHD4 may allow for high specificity

and tune transcriptional regulation for precise control of axon guidance genes.

The various distinct motifs within a cluster also highlight combinatorial control of transcription.

Transcription is not typically governed by a single regulatory element but rather by the intricate interplay

of multiple TFs. These regulatory modules may serve as integration points for diverse cellular signals,

allowing transcription only when a specific combination of TFs is present during development. This

combinatorial logic could enable complex regulatory programs to coordinate distinct steps of axon

guidance in the cochlea.

Our identified candidate set of Eph receptors and ephrin ligand genes (*Epha4*, *Epha7*, and *Efnb2*) is

noteworthy since it suggests that the combination of axon guidance genes contributes to the wiring of the

developing cochlea. Eph receptors are a family of receptor tyrosine kinases that mediate many essential

processes through promiscuous interactions with membrane-bound ephrin ligands (Kania and Klein

2016). Identifying Eph receptors and their ephrin ligands in the cochlea is particularly challenging. The

cochlea's intricate structure makes isolating specific Eph/ephrin interactions complicated without

disrupting the function of other cell types in the tissue. The Eph/ephrin system also features significant

redundancy and promiscuity, where multiple receptors can bind to the same ligand and vice versa,

complicating the identification of specific functional roles. Genetic knockout models often show

compensatory mechanisms among *Eph* family members, masking phenotypic effects and making

functional studies even more complex. Here, we used the epigenetic modification of regulatory elements

around a candidate set of axon guidance genes responsible for assembling neural circuits in the cochlea.

Ephrins are divided into the glycosyl-phosphatidylinositol (GPI) linked ephrin-A and the transmembrane

ephrin-B ligands. Ephrins (EFN) bind to Eph receptors (EPH) of the same class, except for EPHA4.

EPHA4 interacts with EFNA, B2, and B3 ligands. Deletion of *Epha4* showed ectopic innervation of outer

hair cells by a subset of type I SGNs (Defourny, Poirrier et al. 2013). EPHA4 interacts with EFNA5 to

control target specification, expressed primarily in OHCs and a subset of type I SGNs. Previously, *Efna5*

was reported to be expressed in a subset of type I SGNs, but recent evidence implicated *Efna5* mainly

in type II SGNs (Petitpre, Wu et al. 2018, Sanders and Kelley 2022). The otic mesenchyme surrounding

the SGN axons also expresses *EphA4* (Coate, Spita et al. 2015). This pattern of EPHA4 expression

guides fasciculation through EFNB2 interactions in the developing SGN axons. Another *Eph* receptor,

EphA7, in SGNs, is required for neurite outgrowth. Loss of *EphA7* resulted in more sparse fiber bundles

and fewer synaptic contacts on inner hair cells (Kim, Ibrahim et al. 2016). *EfnB2* is one of the ephrin

ligands, and a high level of *Efnb2* mRNA expression was detected during SGN development, especially

at E13.5 and E15.5, when SGN fasciculation initiates. Deletion of *Efnb2* in SGNs showed defective

fasciculation of inner radial bundles and an increased number of aberrantly crossing SGN axons between

fascicles (Micucci, Sperry et al. 2015). These studies implicate the function of ephrin signaling in

developing peripheral auditory circuits.

Although we observed axon guidance deficits in the *Chd4* cKO cochleae, the phenotypes are distinct.

Using the *Ngn1* CreER^{T2}, we only perturbed SGNs while leaving the other cell types, such as hair cells

and otic mesenchyme, untouched. Instead of inactivating the function of ephrin receptor or ephrin ligands,

Chd4 deletion increased *Epha4, Epha7, and Efnb2* transcript levels in SGNs, revealing a molecular

perturbation relevant to SIHWES disease. The *Chd4* cKO model also differs from the Eph receptor and

Ephrin ligand single knockouts because it affects the expression of multiple axon guidance genes. The

subtle cellular phenotypes in single *Eph* and *Efn* knockout mice suggest that the proper wiring of the

peripheral auditory circuit may require the combined effects of multiple *Eph* and *Efn* members. Finally,

the *Chd4* cKO model differs from ablating *Eph* and *Efn* genes because it increases transcription of its

target genes. Our findings align with the function of numerous *Eph* and *Efn* genes during SGN

development and suggest that CHD4 may coordinate the expression levels of several *Eph* and *Efn* to

shape the type I and II SGN innervation patterns.

Congenital hearing loss syndromes are often associated with pathogenic genetic variants in a single

gene. Hearing loss can be syndromic or non-syndromic. Syndromic hearing impairment is associated

with clinical features in other organ systems, while non-syndromic hearing impairment has no discernible

clinical abnormalities other than in the middle or inner ear. Syndromic hearing loss accounts for over 400

genetic syndromic hearing loss conditions (Toriello, Reardon et al. 2004). The characteristics of

syndromic hearing loss vary among the different syndromes and affect hearing in either one or both ears.

The extent of hearing loss varies dramatically and can range from profound to mild. Different syndromes

show distinct features of hearing loss at various sound frequencies. Improper development or dysfunction

of the sensory cells and neurons of the inner ear correlates with many forms of syndromic hearing loss.

Patients with Sifrim-Hitz-Weiss disease show variable congenital disabilities. This observation is

reminiscent of CHARGE syndrome, a genetic disorder caused by pathogenic variants in CHD7. CHD7

and CHD4 are part of the chromodomain helicase DNA-binding protein family (Micucci, Sperry et al.

2015). Global chromatin regulators such as CHD7 and CHD4 can robustly affect transcription and trigger

cell-autonomous changes during critical periods in development. We show that altering the epigenetic

landscape by deleting CHD4 early during otic development (E8.5-E10.5) affects pathfinding and

connectivity of SGN peripheral axons at multiple steps during axon guidance and may contribute to

hearing loss in SIHIWES.

Although the phenotype is robust, the penetrance is variable. We believe this is a central aspect observed

in mutations of chromodomain helicase DNA-binding proteins. Cellular heterogeneity may contribute to

the variable phenotype. There are four distinct subtypes of SGNs: type Ia, Ib, Ic, and type II (Petitpre, Wu

et al. 2018, Shrestha, Chia et al. 2018, Sun, Wang et al. 2022). CHD4 may function differently in each

neuronal subtype, resulting in differing cellular phenotypes. The difference is evident in the axon guidance

phenotypes observed in type I compared to type II neurons. Ablation of CHD4 affected the fasciculation

of radial fibers and branching in the inner spiral plexus region for type I SGNs. In contrast, type II neurons

displayed a circuitous path to innervate the base of outer hair cells and inappropriate turning at the outer

hair cell region. Deleting CHD4 affected the peripheral axons differently in type I and II SGNs.

In addition to the heterogeneity of neuronal subtypes, variability within type I and II fibers was also

observed. The phenotypic variability includes the extent of type I radial fiber bundling and branching of

terminals in the inner spiral plexus. CHD4 function in SGN type Ia, b, and c fibers may contribute to the

observed variability. Cellular heterogeneity, however, cannot be attributed to the improper turning of

some type II peripheral axons. Some type II fibers are seemingly unaffected, whereas others turn in the

opposite direction. Stochasticity in molecular processes may be a contributing mechanism. Stochastic

gene expression involves biochemical processes such as transcription and translation. The limiting

number of molecules that catalyze transcription leads to biological variability, as observed by the dramatic

differences in transcript levels even within isogenic cells (Raj and van Oudenaarden 2008). Deletion of

CHD4 may alter the chromatin state of cis-regulatory elements and impact the stochasticity in

transcription. The epigenetic perturbation could increase both transcript levels and the variance of

specific genes after ablating CHD4. We showed an increase in the median number of *Epha4, Epha7,*

and Efnb2 transcripts in *Calb2*-marked SGNs, concomitant with an increase in the variance of the

transcript numbers. The increase in transcripts and variance was specific for *Epha4, Epha7, and Efnb2*,

not *Calb2*. The larger variance results in a broader distribution of neurons with *Epha4, Epha7, and Efnb2*

and displays a cell population that exceeds the normal range of *Epha4, Epha7, and Efnb2* levels in control

SGNs. The percentage of neurons with increased *Epha4, Epha7, and Efnb2* transcripts may possess

altered protein expression levels of EPHA4, EPHA7, and EFNB2 and perturb axon guidance. In contrast,

cells that retain *Epha4, Epha7, and Efnb2* transcripts within the normal range may retain normal axon

pathfinding. The increase in transcriptional variance may contribute to the heterogeneous cellular

phenotypes observed for type I and type II SGNs.

In summary, multiple axon guidance deficits of type I and II SGNs were observed using a *Chd4*

conditional knockout mouse model. These deficits likely arise at different developmental time points and

implicate CHD4 function at varying steps of SGN pathfinding. The candidate CHD4 binding sites include

promoters and enhancers that regulate the transcription of a subset of *Eph* receptors and *Efn* ligands.

CHD4, as part of the core NuRD complex, may impose a repressive epigenetic state on these cis-

regulatory elements to attenuate transcription until the appropriate time during development. Inactivation

of CHD4 increases transcript levels of axon guidance genes to perturb the stereotypic peripheral axon

patterning. These results also have a broader implication on the formation of neuronal circuits during

development and regeneration.

Conflict of Interest:

The authors declared no potential conflicts of interest in the research, authorship, and publication of this article.

Accession Numbers:

The GEO accession number for the CUT&Tag raw fastq data, along with the processed bigwig and SEACR peak files, is GSE250033. IGV session with the CUT&Tag tracks can be provided upon request.

Author contribution:

JK and EM were responsible for the experimental design, execution of experiments, and the acquisition and analysis of immunofluorescent images. JN performed CUT&Tag, and JQ analyzed data from CUT&Tag. KYK assisted in CUT&Tag and RNAscope analysis. KYK conceived the project and performed motif analysis. JK, EM, and KYK wrote the manuscript.

Acknowledgments:

We thank Dr. Katia Georgopoulos (Mass General Hospital) and Dr. Lisa Goodrich (Harvard Medical School) for providing the *Chd4*flox/flox animals and advice on dosing the Ngn1 CreER^T2 animals, respectively. We acknowledge Dr. Alejandra Laureano and Ms. Anna Maria Hinman for initially generating and maintaining the mouse line. NIH R01 DC015000 supported this work for KYK.

Fig. 1

Fig. 2

Fig. 3

Fig. 5

Figure Legend

Figure 1. CHD4 expression in the spiral ganglion and the organ of Corti.

(A) Top-down schematic depicting the innervation pattern of type I and II SGNs. Type I SGNs extend

single, unbranched neurites that innervate an individual inner hair cell (IHC). Type II SGNs extend

neurites into the outer hair cell (OHC) region, turn basally, and can contact multiple OHCs. (B) Sagittal

schematic of the innervation pattern. Multiple Type I SGNs innervate a single IHC. Type II neurites make

a basal turn in the region near Deiters' cells, a supporting cell type. (C) Immunofluorescence labeling of

CHD4 (green), TUBB3 (magenta), and MYO7A (white) from a flat-mounted cochlea. TUBB3 and MYO7A

label neurons and hair cells, while DAPI (blue) marks nuclei. Different regions of immunolabeled E18.5

cochlea. (D) Expression of CHD4 in the single row of inner hair cells (IHC) and the three rows of outer

hair cells (OHC1-3). (E) CHD4 labeling in supporting cells, including inner pillar (IP), outer pillar (OP),

and three rows of Dieter cells (DC1-3). The nuclei of supporting cells reside underneath hair cells. (F)

CHD4 labeling in spiral ganglion neurons. Scale bar as marked.

Figure 2. Deletion of *Chd4* from SGNs using Neurog1 CreER^{T2} Chd4 $^{flox/flox}$ mice.

(A) Schematic illustration of Cre-mediated *Chd4* deletion following tamoxifen induction in *Chd4*

conditional knockout (cKO) mice containing Neurog1 CreER^{T2}; *Chd4*$^{flox/flox}$; tdTomato alleles.

Administration of tamoxifen at E8.5-E10.5 deletes loxP flanked exons coding for the *Chd4* ATPase

domain and activates expression of the tdTomato reporter. Animals without the *Chd4* cKO allele

(Neurog1 CreER^{T2}; tdTomato) were used as controls. (B) Immunostaining of CHD4 and TUBB3 marked

neurons in E18.5 cochlea. tdTomato expression correlates with the presence of Cre activity. Nuclear

CHD4 expression was observed in DAPI-marked nuclei in control SGNs but was absent in *Chd4* cKO

SGNs after tamoxifen administration. (C) Confocal micrographs from the spiral ganglion. Yellow arrows

indicate tdTomato$^+$ and TUBB3$^-$ cells. (D) Percentages of tdTomato$^+$ and TUBB3$^-$ cells found within the

apex, middle, and base regions of the cochlea (apex, $p < 0.136$, middle, $p < 0.095$; base, $p < 0.148$;

control, n=3 and Chd4 cKO, n=3 cochlea) (E) Percentages of cells expressing tdTomato and TUBB3

from the base to apex of the cochlea from control and *Chd4* cKO cochleae (apex p<0.30; middle p<0.60;

base, p < 0.90; control, n=3 and Chd4 cKO, n=3 cochleae) (F) Normalized number of tdTomato$^+$ cells

per 100 μm^2 area in control and Chd4 cKO cochleae (p < 0.08; control, n=27 and *Chd4* cKO n=27 images

were analyzed from control, n=3 and *Chd4* cKO, n=3 cochleae). The Student's t-test was used for

statistical analysis using the number of cochleae. Scale bar as marked.

Figure 3. Inner radial bundles display fasciculation defects in *Chd4* cKO cochleae

(A) TUBB3-labeled cochleae from E18.5 control and *Chd4* cKO animals. Images are ordered from base

to apex. (B) Depiction of the inner spiral plexus (ISP) near the base of inner hair cells and peripheral

projections from type I (radial fibers) and II SGNs from E18.5 cochlea. (C) Binarized images of TUBB3-

labeled control and *Chd4* cKO cochleae at E18.5. (D) Regions between radial fiber bundles were outlined

in red. (E) The identified areas were quantified and compared between control and *Chd4* cKO (p < 0.05;

control, n=10 and *Chd4* cKO, n=13 images were analyzed from control, n=3 and *Chd4* cKO, n=3

cochleae). (F) Binarized images of control and *Chd4* cKO E18.5 cochleae around the ISP. (G)

Comparison of the normalized number of fascicles in the ISP per radial bundle between control and *Chd4*

cKO cochleae (p < 0.01; control, n=31 and *Chd4* cKO, n=26 bundles were analyzed from control, n=5

and *Chd4* cKO, n=3 cochleae). The Student's t-test was used for statistical analysis. Scale bars as

marked.

Figure 4. Type II spiral ganglion neurons display turning defects in the *Chd4* cKO mice.

(A) TUBB3-labeled neuronal projections in E18.5 control and *Chd4* cKO cochleae**.** Type II fibers can be

distinguished by their anatomical location. (B) Type II fibers from the control show stereotypic tracks that

turn towards the base and travel along individual rows of outer hair cells. *Chd4* cKO type II fibers showed

aberrant fiber tracks. (C) The intensity profile plot was measured along the white and red lines to highlight

the differences between the control and Chd4 cKO fiber tracks. Peaks from fluorescence intensity

measurements indicate the presence of a fiber track. Control cochleae show three peaks correlating with

fibers along the three rows of outer hair cells. Chd4 cKO samples showed an additional peak, suggesting

aberrant fiber tracks. (D) Normalized number of fibers entering the OHC region per 100 μm from control

and *Chd4* cKO E18.5 cochleae (p < 0.03; control, n=9 and *Chd4* cKO, n=10 images were analyzed from

control, n=3 and *Chd4* cKO, n=3 cochleae). (E) Optical section from TUBB3 and DAPI-labeled confocal

micrographs that visualize fibers entering the OHC region. Blue arrows mark correctly turned while yellow

arrows show incorrect turning type II fibers. (F) The normalized number of incorrectly turned type II fibers

per 100 μm from control and *Chd4* cKO E18.5 cochleae (p < 2.82×10^{-4}; control, n=3 and *Chd4* cKO,

n=3 cochleae). (G) 3D-rendered images highlighting the axonal trajectory from SGNs (TUBB3+, green)

to hair cells (MYO7A+, blue). (H) Schematic of peripheral SGN axonal projections to outer hair cells. Red

arrows represent the distance between contact points in the OHCs (red dashed line) and the final turning

point on the incoming axon. (I) Average distances from the base of outer hair cells to the axon bundles

showed differences between control and *Chd4* cKO (p < 0.03; control, n=11, and *Chd4* cKO, n=11 images

were analyzed from control, n=3 and *Chd4* cKO, n=3 cochleae). The Student's t-test was used for

statistical analysis. Scale bars as marked.

Figure 5. CHD4 binds to the promoters of genes involved in axon guidance, including members

of the ephrin family of signaling molecules, in iMOP-derived neurons.

(A) Overlap of CHD4 in the nuclei (DAPI) of proliferating iMOP and TUBB3-labeled iMOP-derived

neurons. CUT&Tag was performed using proliferating iMOP cells and iMOP-derived neurons. CUT&Tag

peaks were identified using SEACR. (B) Box and whisker plots show SEACR total signals for CHD4 at

CHD4+ H3K4me3+ and CHD4+p300+ in proliferating iMOPs were significantly different from that in

iMOP-derived neurons (p < 2.20×10^{-16}). (C) Venn diagrams show the overlap of CHD4+ H3K4me3+

promoters and CHD4+ p300+ enhancers between progenitors (P) and neurons (N). (D) Heatmaps and

profile plots show H3K4me3 and CHD4 signals within +/- 3kb of the summit regions of common and

neuron-specific promoters. Box and whisker plots show significantly increased H3K4me3 and CHD4

signals at both common and neuron-specific promoters in progenitors compared to neurons. (E)

Heatmaps and profile plots show p300 and CHD4 signals within +/- 3kb of the summit regions of common

and neuron-specific enhancers. Box and whisker plots show significantly increased p300 and CHD4

signals at both common and neuron-specific enhancers in progenitors compared to those in neurons. (F)

Enrichment of CHD4 (orange), H3K4me3 (blue), and p300 (green) at the specified genomic region of

Epha4 and *Epha7* in proliferating iMOPs and iMOP-derived neurons. Highlighted genomic regions

represent H3K4me3-marked promoters. Highlighted regions with asterisks denote the regions with

increased enrichment of CHD4 and p300 in iMOP-derived neurons. The number of asterisks denotes the

peaks with increased CHD4 and p300 levels. The Wilcoxon rank-sum test was used for statistical

analysis. Scale bars as marked.

Figure 6. *Chd4* cKO shows an increased *Eph and Efn* mRNA expression in SGNs.

(A) Occurrence and position of transcription factor (TF) binding motifs relative to the transcriptional start

site (TSS) at *Epha4*, *Epha7,* and *Efnb2*. E16.5 (B) control and (C) *Chd4* cKO cochlea were processed

for single-molecule RNA fluorescence *in situ* hybridization (smFISH) with probes against *Epha4* and

Calb2. Cochleae were immunolabeled with TUBB3 to visualize SGNs. (D) The number of puncta for

individual TUBB3-labeled cells (dashed line) was quantified. (E) Box plots representing median (lines)

and mean (circles) values after comparing smFISH puncta between control and *Chd4* cKO samples for

Calb2 and distribution plots of puncta in control and *Chd4* cKO SGNs (p < 0.13). Kernel densities for

Calb2 transcripts (p < 0.04; control, n=350 cells from 3 cochleae and Chd4 cKO, n=345 cells from 3

cochleae). (F) Box and distribution plots of the number of puncta for *Epha4* in control and *Chd4* cKO

SGNs (p < 1.74×10^{-39}). Kernel density plots for *Epha4* transcripts display the non-overlapping region

(hashed region), suggesting an increased probability of cells from *Chd4* cKO with higher levels of *Epha4*

transcripts compared to the control (p < 2.27×10^{-14}; control, n=350 cells from 3 cochleae and Chd4

cKO, n=345 cells from 3 cochleae). (G) Box and distribution plots of *Epha7* transcripts in control and

Chd4 cKO SGNs (p < 2.48×10^{-45}). Non-overlapping region of densities in *Epha7* (hashed region)

between control and *Chd4* cKO displays an increased probability of cells from *Chd4* cKO with higher

levels of *Epha7* ($p < 8.29 \times 10^{-11}$; control, n=632 cells from 4 cochleae and *Chd4* cKO, n=436 cells from

3 cochleae). (H) Box and distribution plots of the number of *Efnb2* transcripts in SGNs from control and

chd4 cKO ($p < 7.33 \times 10^{-24}$). Kernel density plots for *Efnb2* transcripts show an increased non-overlapping

density region of *Efnb2* transcripts from *Chd4* cKO (hashed region) compared to the control. ($p < 0.04$;

control, n=363 from 3 cochleae and *Chd4* cKO n=340 cells from 3 cochleae). The Wilcoxon rank-sum

test and Levene's test were used for statistical analysis.

Fig. S1

Fig. S2

Fig. S5

Supplemental Figure Legend

Supplemental Figure 1. Survival of *Chd4* conditional knockout mice

(A) Average percentage of viable pups from all collected control and mutant litters (p < 4.36 × 10^{-6}; control,

n=16 and *Chd4* cKO, n=13 litters). (B) Distribution of the percentages of surviving E18.5 pups from control

and *Chd4* cKO litters after tamoxifen treatment. The p-value and sample size are listed. The Student's t-

test was used for statistical analysis.

Supplemental Figure 2. The arrangement of supporting and hair cells is unaffected following the

deletion of *Chd4* within spiral ganglion neurons

Immunofluorescent labeling of MYO7A and SOX2 marked hair cells and supporting cells from E18.5

cochleae. Confocal stacks from control and *Chd4* cKO cochleae with MYO7A-marked hair cells and

SOX2-marked supporting cells. OHC (outer hair cell), IHC (inner hair cell), D (Deiters' cells), OP (outer

phalangeal cells) and IP (inner phalangeal cells). Scale bar as marked.

Supplemental Figure 3. Identifying CHD4 binding at promoters and enhancers of target genes

(A) Table showing Gene Ontology ID, description of each category, and corresponding adjusted p values

using the Benjamini-Hochberg method for multiple testing correction. (B) Heatmaps and profile plots of

CHD4 and H3K4me3 signals within +/- 3kb of the summit regions of CHD4+ H3K4me3+ in both

proliferating iMOP and iMOP-derived neurons. (C) Heatmaps and profile plots of CHD4 and p300 signals

within +/- 3kb of the summit regions of CHD4+ p300+ in proliferating iMOPs and iMOP-derived neurons.

(D) Enrichment of CHD4 (orange), H3K4me3 (blue), and p300 (green) at the specified genomic regions of

Efnb2 in proliferating iMOPs and iMOP-derived neurons. Highlighted genomic regions represented

H3K4me3-marked promoters, while highlighted regions with asterisks denote regions with increased

CHD4 and p300 in iMOP-derived neurons. The number of asterisks indicates the number of peaks that

show increased CHD4 and p300 levels. Scale bars as marked.

Supplemental Figure 4. *De novo* **motif discovery and annotation**

(A) A histogram displaying 1,095 CHD4 peaks relative to the transcriptional start sites (TSS) from all the

CHD4 binding sites. The dashed red line separates the upstream and downstream regions at the TSS.

(B) Distribution of 16 CHD4 peaks relative to TSS at axon guidance genes. (C) A heatmap depicting the

pairwise comparison between a set of *de novo* motif sequences with known transcription factor (TF)

names. The consensus sequences are shown on the right, and sites corresponding to binding site of the

TFs on the bottom. The color intensity represents the statistical significance similarity comparisons ($p <$

0.05). (D) Information Content (IC) scores of annotated motifs showing the number of occurences with

the associated Information Content (IC) score. The IC score reflects the specificity or conservation of the

motif.

Supplemental Figure 5. Motif consensus sequences and occurence

(A) The occurrence and position relative to the TSS of annotated motifs. Each panel represents the

genomic region around the TSS of the axon guidance gene. Within each panel, dots represent the

occurrence of a TF motif relative to the TSS. (B) Sequence logos for the various TF binding motifs

identified in the axon guidance genes. Each logo contains the motif name and its unique JASPAR

accession number.

Table 1. List of primers used for genotyping

Allele	Sequence (5'→ 3')	Amplicon Size
Chd4	TCC AGA AGA AGA CGG CAG AT	Wild-type: 275bp
	CTG GTC ATA GGG CAG GTC TC	*Chd4* floxed allele: 400bp
Ai9 tdTomato	AAG GGA GCT GCA GTG GAG TA	Wildtype: 287bp
	CCG AAA ATC TGT GGG AAG TC	
	GGC ATT AAA GCA GCG TAT CC	Ai9 allele: 196bp
	CTG TTC CTG TAC GGC ATG G	
Generic Cre	AGC GAT CGC TGC CAG GAT	Cre: 382bp
	ACC AGC GTT TTC GTT CTG CC	
Neurogenin1-specific Cre	AGC CCA TTC ACT CCC TGA G	Cre: 527bp
	ATC AAC GTT TTC TTT TCG GA	

Table 2. List of antibodies used for immunostaining and CUT&Tag

Antibody	Company	Identifier	Dilution	Purpose
mouse anti-CHD4	Abcam	Cat# ab70469, RRID: AB_2229454	1:100 (tissue) 1:300 (cells)	Immunostaining
rabbit anti-MYO7A	Proteus Bioscience	Cat# 25-6790, RRID: AB_10015251	1:200	Immunostaining
mouse anti-Tuj1 (TUBB3)	BioLegend	Cat# 801202, RRID: AB_10063408	1:300	Immunostaining
rabbit anti-Tuj1 (TUBB3)	BioLegend	Cat# 802001, RRID: AB_2564645	1:300	Immunostaining
rabbit anti-Sox2	Millipore	Cat# AB5603, RRID: AB_2286686	1:100	Immunostaining
Rabbit anti-RFP	Rockland	Cat# #600-401-379, RRID: AB_2209751	1:300	Immunostaining
goat anti-mouse Alexa 488	Thermo Fisher Scientific	Cat# A-11001, RRID: AB_2534069	1:500	Immunostaining
goat anti-mouse Alexa 647	Thermo Fisher Scientific	Cat# A-21235, RRID: AB_2535804	1:500	Immunostaining
goat anti-rabbit Alexa 488	Thermo Fisher Scientific	Cat# A-11034, RRID: AB_2576217	1:500	Immunostaining
goat anti-rabbit Alexa 647	Thermo Fisher Scientific	Cat# A-21246, RRID: AB_2535814	1:500	Immunostaining
goat anti-rabbit Alexa 568	Thermo Fisher Scientific	Cat# A-11011, RRID: AB_143157	1:500	Immunostaining
rabbit anti-p300	Santa Cruz Biotechnology	Cat # sc-585, RRID: AB_2231120	1:50	CUT&Tag
rabbit anti-H3K4me3	Active Motif	Cat# 39060, RRID: AB_2615077	1:50	CUT&Tag
rabbit anti-CHD4	Abcam	Cat# ab72418, RRID: AB_1268107	1:50	CUT&Tag
rabbit IgG	Jackson ImmunoResearch	Cat# 011-000-003, RRID: AB_2337118	1:50	CUT&Tag

Table 3. List of RNAscope probes used for smFISH

RNAscope Probe	Accession Number	Probe Region	Catalog Number	Company
Mm-Calb2-C2	NM_007586.1	147-1265	313641-C2	Advanced Cell Diagnostics, Inc.
Mm-Epha4	NM_007936.3	291-1191	419081	
Mm-Calb2-C3	NM_007586.1	147-1265	313641-C3	
Mm-Epha7-C2	NM_010141.4	1024-1981	430961-C2	
Mm-Efnb2	NM_010111.5	174-1316	477671	

References

Adamson, C. L., M. A. Reid, Z. L. Mo, J. Bowne-English and R. L. Davis (2002). "Firing features and
potassium channel content of murine spiral ganglion neurons vary with cochlear location." <u>J Comp</u>
<u>Neurol</u> **447**(4): 331-350.

Appler, J. M. and L. V. Goodrich (2011). "Connecting the ear to the brain: Molecular mechanisms of
auditory circuit assembly." <u>Prog Neurobiol</u> **93**(4): 488-508.

Bailey, T. L., J. Johnson, C. E. Grant and W. S. Noble (2015). "The MEME Suite." <u>Nucleic Acids Res</u>
43(W1): W39-49.

Borg, E., B. Engstrom, G. Linde and K. Marklund (1988). "Eighth nerve fiber firing features in normal-
hearing rabbits." <u>Hear Res</u> **36**(2-3): 191-201.

Bornelov, S., N. Reynolds, M. Xenophontos, S. Gharbi, E. Johnstone, R. Floyd, M. Ralser, J. Signolet,
R. Loos, S. Dietmann, P. Bertone and B. Hendrich (2018). "The Nucleosome Remodeling and
Deacetylation Complex Modulates Chromatin Structure at Sites of Active Transcription to Fine-Tune
Gene Expression." <u>Mol Cell</u> **71**(1): 56-72 e54.

Bruce, L. L., J. Kingsley, D. H. Nichols and B. Fritzsch (1997). "The development of vestibulocochlear
efferents and cochlear afferents in mice." <u>Int J Dev Neurosci</u> **15**(4-5): 671-692.

Chen, W. C., H. Z. Xue, Y. L. Hsu, Q. Liu, S. Patel and R. L. Davis (2011). "Complex distribution
patterns of voltage-gated calcium channel alpha-subunits in the spiral ganglion." <u>Hear Res</u> **278**(1-2):
52-68.

Clapier, C. R., J. Iwasa, B. R. Cairns and C. L. Peterson (2017). "Mechanisms of action and regulation
of ATP-dependent chromatin-remodelling complexes." <u>Nat Rev Mol Cell Biol</u> **18**(7): 407-422.

Coate, T. M. and M. W. Kelley (2013). "Making connections in the inner ear: recent insights into the
development of spiral ganglion neurons and their connectivity with sensory hair cells." <u>Semin Cell Dev</u>
<u>Biol</u> **24**(5): 460-469.

Coate, T. M., S. Raft, X. Zhao, A. K. Ryan, E. B. Crenshaw, 3rd and M. W. Kelley (2012). "Otic
mesenchyme cells regulate spiral ganglion axon fasciculation through a Pou3f4/EphA4 signaling
pathway." <u>Neuron</u> **73**(1): 49-63.

Coate, T. M., N. A. Spita, K. D. Zhang, K. T. Isgrig and M. W. Kelley (2015). "Neuropilin-2/Semaphorin-
3F-mediated repulsion promotes inner hair cell innervation by spiral ganglion neurons." <u>Elife</u> **4**.

Dabdoub, A., B. Fritzsch, A. N. Popper and R. R. Fay (2016). <u>The primary auditory neurons of the</u>
<u>mammalian cochlea</u>. New York, Springer.

Deans, M. R. (2022). "Planar cell polarity signaling guides cochlear innervation." <u>Dev Biol</u> **486**: 1-4.

Defourny, J., A. L. Poirrier, F. Lallemend, S. Mateo Sanchez, J. Neef, P. Vanderhaeghen, E. Soriano,
C. Peuckert, K. Kullander, B. Fritzsch, L. Nguyen, G. Moonen, T. Moser and B. Malgrange (2013).
"Ephrin-A5/EphA4 signalling controls specific afferent targeting to cochlear hair cells." <u>Nat Commun</u> **4**:
1438.

el Barbary, A. (1991). "Auditory nerve of the normal and jaundiced rat. I. Spontaneous discharge rate
and cochlear nerve histology." <u>Hear Res</u> **54**(1): 75-90.

Ghimire, S. R. and M. R. Deans (2019). "Frizzled3 and Frizzled6 Cooperate with Vangl2 to Direct
Cochlear Innervation by Type II Spiral Ganglion Neurons." <u>J Neurosci</u> **39**(41): 8013-8023.

Ghimire, S. R., E. M. Ratzan and M. R. Deans (2018). "A non-autonomous function of the core PCP
protein VANGL2 directs peripheral axon turning in the developing cochlea." <u>Development</u> **145**(12).

Gillespie, L. N., P. L. Marzella, G. M. Clark and J. M. Crook (2005). "Netrin-1 as a guidance molecule in
the postnatal rat cochlea." <u>Hear Res</u> **199**(1-2): 117-123.

Hoffmeister, H., A. Fuchs, F. Erdel, S. Pinz, R. Grobner-Ferreira, A. Bruckmann, R. Deutzmann, U.
Schwartz, R. Maldonado, C. Huber, A. S. Dendorfer, K. Rippe and G. Langst (2017). "CHD3 and CHD4
form distinct NuRD complexes with different yet overlapping functionality." <u>Nucleic Acids Res</u> **45**(18):
10534-10554.

Hosokawa, H., T. Tanaka, Y. Suzuki, C. Iwamura, S. Ohkubo, K. Endoh, M. Kato, Y. Endo, A. Onodera,
D. J. Tumes, A. Kanai, S. Sugano and T. Nakayama (2013). "Functionally distinct Gata3/Chd4
complexes coordinately establish T helper 2 (Th2) cell identity." <u>Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A</u> **110**(12):
4691-4696.

Huang, D., B. T. Sherman and R. A. Lempicki (2009). "Systematic and integrative analysis of large
gene lists using DAVID bioinformatics resources." <u>Nat Protoc</u> **4**(1): 44-57.

Huang, L. C., M. Barclay, K. Lee, S. Peter, G. D. Housley, P. R. Thorne and J. M. Montgomery (2012).
"Synaptic profiles during neurite extension, refinement and retraction in the developing cochlea." <u>Neural</u>
<u>Dev</u> **7**: 38.

Hung, H., R. Kohnken and J. Svaren (2012). "The nucleosome remodeling and deacetylase chromatin
remodeling (NuRD) complex is required for peripheral nerve myelination." <u>J Neurosci</u> **32**(5): 1517-1527.

Kaaij, L. J. T., F. Mohn, R. H. van der Weide, E. de Wit and M. Buhler (2019). "The ChAHP Complex
Counteracts Chromatin Looping at CTCF Sites that Emerged from SINE Expansions in Mouse." <u>Cell</u>
178(6): 1437-1451 e1414.

Kania, A. and R. Klein (2016). "Mechanisms of ephrin-Eph signalling in development, physiology and
disease." <u>Nat Rev Mol Cell Biol</u> **17**(4): 240-256.

Kent, W. J., A. S. Zweig, G. Barber, A. S. Hinrichs and D. Karolchik (2010). "BigWig and BigBed:
enabling browsing of large distributed datasets." <u>Bioinformatics</u> **26**(17): 2204-2207.

Kiang, N. Y., R. R. Pfeiffer, W. B. Warr and A. S. Backus (1965). "Stimulus Coding in the Cochlear
Nucleus." <u>Ann Otol Rhinol Laryngol</u> **74**: 463-485.

Kim, E. J., K. Hori, A. Wyckoff, L. K. Dickel, E. J. Koundakjian, L. V. Goodrich and J. E. Johnson
(2011). "Spatiotemporal fate map of neurogenin1 (Neurog1) lineages in the mouse central nervous
system." <u>J Comp Neurol</u> **519**(7): 1355-1370.

Kim, Y. J., L. A. Ibrahim, S. Z. Wang, W. Yuan, O. V. Evgrafov, J. A. Knowles, K. Wang, H. W. Tao and L. I. Zhang (2016). "EphA7 regulates spiral ganglion innervation of cochlear hair cells." Dev Neurobiol **76**(4): 452-469.

Koundakjian, E. J., J. L. Appler and L. V. Goodrich (2007). "Auditory neurons make stereotyped wiring decisions before maturation of their targets." J Neurosci **27**(51): 14078-14088.

Kwan, K. Y., J. Shen and D. P. Corey (2015). "C-MYC transcriptionally amplifies SOX2 target genes to regulate self-renewal in multipotent otic progenitor cells." Stem Cell Reports **4**(1): 47-60.

Langmead, B. and S. L. Salzberg (2012). "Fast gapped-read alignment with Bowtie 2." Nat Methods **9**(4): 357-359.

Laureano, A., J. Kim, E. Martinez and K. Y. Kwan (2023). "Chromodomain helicase DNA binding protein 4 in cell fate decisions." Hear Res **436**: 108813.

Layman, W. S., M. A. Sauceda and J. Zuo (2013). "Epigenetic alterations by NuRD and PRC2 in the neonatal mouse cochlea." Hear Res **304**: 167-178.

Layman, W. S. and J. Zuo (2014). "Epigenetic regulation in the inner ear and its potential roles in development, protection, and regeneration." Front Cell Neurosci **8**: 446.

Li, H., B. Handsaker, A. Wysoker, T. Fennell, J. Ruan, N. Homer, G. Marth, G. Abecasis, R. Durbin and S. Genome Project Data Processing (2009). "The Sequence Alignment/Map format and SAMtools." Bioinformatics **25**(16): 2078-2079.

Liberman, L. D., H. Wang and M. C. Liberman (2011). "Opposing gradients of ribbon size and AMPA receptor expression underlie sensitivity differences among cochlear-nerve/hair-cell synapses." J Neurosci **31**(3): 801-808.

Liberman, M. C. (1978). "Auditory-nerve response from cats raised in a low-noise chamber." J Acoust Soc Am **63**(2): 442-455.

Liberman, M. C. (1982). "Single-neuron labeling in the cat auditory nerve." Science **216**(4551): 1239-1241.

Liu, Q., P. B. Manis and R. L. Davis (2014). "I h and HCN channels in murine spiral ganglion neurons: tonotopic variation, local heterogeneity, and kinetic model." J Assoc Res Otolaryngol **15**(4): 585-599.

Liu, W. and R. L. Davis (2014). "Calretinin and calbindin distribution patterns specify subpopulations of type I and type II spiral ganglion neurons in postnatal murine cochlea." J Comp Neurol **522**(10): 2299-2318.

Low, J. K., S. R. Webb, A. P. Silva, H. Saathoff, D. P. Ryan, M. Torrado, M. Brofelth, B. L. Parker, N. E. Shepherd and J. P. Mackay (2016). "CHD4 Is a Peripheral Component of the Nucleosome Remodeling and Deacetylase Complex." J Biol Chem **291**(30): 15853-15866.

Lu, C. C., J. M. Appler, E. A. Houseman and L. V. Goodrich (2011). "Developmental profiling of spiral ganglion neurons reveals insights into auditory circuit assembly." J Neurosci **31**(30): 10903-10918.

Madisen, L., T. A. Zwingman, S. M. Sunkin, S. W. Oh, H. A. Zariwala, H. Gu, L. L. Ng, R. D. Palmiter, M. J. Hawrylycz, A. R. Jones, E. S. Lein and H. Zeng (2010). "A robust and high-throughput Cre reporting and characterization system for the whole mouse brain." Nat Neurosci **13**(1): 133-140.

Marques, J. G., B. E. Gryder, B. Pavlovic, Y. Chung, Q. A. Ngo, F. Frommelt, M. Gstaiger, Y. Song, K. Benischke, D. Laubscher, M. Wachtel, J. Khan and B. W. Schafer (2020). "NuRD subunit CHD4 regulates super-enhancer accessibility in rhabdomyosarcoma and represents a general tumor dependency." Elife **9**.

Martinez-Monedero, R., C. Liu, C. Weisz, P. Vyas, P. A. Fuchs and E. Glowatzki (2016). "GluA2-Containing AMPA Receptors Distinguish Ribbon-Associated from Ribbonless Afferent Contacts on Rat Cochlear Hair Cells." eNeuro **3**(2).

Meers, M. P., T. D. Bryson, J. G. Henikoff and S. Henikoff (2019). "Improved CUT&RUN chromatin profiling tools." Elife **8**.

Meers, M. P., D. Tenenbaum and S. Henikoff (2019). "Peak calling by Sparse Enrichment Analysis for CUT&RUN chromatin profiling." Epigenetics Chromatin **12**(1): 42.

Micucci, J. A., E. D. Sperry and D. M. Martin (2015). "Chromodomain helicase DNA-binding proteins in stem cells and human developmental diseases." Stem Cells Dev **24**(8): 917-926.

Millard, C. J., N. Varma, A. Saleh, K. Morris, P. J. Watson, A. R. Bottrill, L. Fairall, C. J. Smith and J. W. Schwabe (2016). "The structure of the core NuRD repression complex provides insights into its interaction with chromatin." Elife **5**: e13941.

Morra, R., B. M. Lee, H. Shaw, R. Tuma and E. J. Mancini (2012). "Concerted action of the PHD, chromo and motor domains regulates the human chromatin remodelling ATPase CHD4." FEBS Lett **586**(16): 2513-2521.

Moser, T., N. Karagulyan, J. Neef and L. M. Jaime Tobon (2023). "Diversity matters - extending sound intensity coding by inner hair cells via heterogeneous synapses." EMBO J **42**(23): e114587.

Nitarska, J., J. G. Smith, W. T. Sherlock, M. M. Hillege, A. Nott, W. D. Barshop, A. A. Vashisht, J. A. Wohlschlegel, R. Mitter and A. Riccio (2016). "A Functional Switch of NuRD Chromatin Remodeling Complex Subunits Regulates Mouse Cortical Development." Cell Rep **17**(6): 1683-1698.

Nystrom, S. L. and D. J. McKay (2021). "Memes: A motif analysis environment in R using tools from the MEME Suite." PLoS Comput Biol **17**(9): e1008991.

Pan, M. R., H. J. Hsieh, H. Dai, W. C. Hung, K. Li, G. Peng and S. Y. Lin (2012). "Chromodomain helicase DNA-binding protein 4 (CHD4) regulates homologous recombination DNA repair, and its deficiency sensitizes cells to poly(ADP-ribose) polymerase (PARP) inhibitor treatment." J Biol Chem **287**(9): 6764-6772.

Petitpre, C., H. Wu, A. Sharma, A. Tokarska, P. Fontanet, Y. Wang, F. Helmbacher, K. Yackle, G. Silberberg, S. Hadjab and F. Lallemend (2018). "Neuronal heterogeneity and stereotyped connectivity in the auditory afferent system." Nat Commun **9**(1): 3691.

Polo, S. E., A. Kaidi, L. Baskcomb, Y. Galanty and S. P. Jackson (2010). "Regulation of DNA-damage responses and cell-cycle progression by the chromatin remodelling factor CHD4." EMBO J **29**(18): 3130-3139.

Quinlan, A. R. and I. M. Hall (2010). "BEDTools: a flexible suite of utilities for comparing genomic features." Bioinformatics **26**(6): 841-842.

Raft, S., E. J. Koundakjian, H. Quinones, C. S. Jayasena, L. V. Goodrich, J. E. Johnson, N. Segil and A. K. Groves (2007). "Cross-regulation of Ngn1 and Math1 coordinates the production of neurons and sensory hair cells during inner ear development." Development **134**(24): 4405-4415.

Raj, A. and A. van Oudenaarden (2008). "Nature, nurture, or chance: stochastic gene expression and its consequences." Cell **135**(2): 216-226.

Ramirez, F., F. Dundar, S. Diehl, B. A. Gruning and T. Manke (2014). "deepTools: a flexible platform for exploring deep-sequencing data." Nucleic Acids Res **42**(Web Server issue): W187-191.

Reid, X. J., Y. Zhong and J. P. Mackay (2024). "How does CHD4 slide nucleosomes?" Biochem Soc Trans **52**(5): 1995-2008.

Robinson, J. T., H. Thorvaldsdottir, W. Winckler, M. Guttman, E. S. Lander, G. Getz and J. P. Mesirov (2011). "Integrative genomics viewer." Nat Biotechnol **29**(1): 24-26.

Ruggero, M. A., P. A. Santi and N. C. Rich (1982). "Type II cochlear ganglion cells in the chinchilla." Hear Res **8**(3): 339-356.

Salehi, P., M. X. Ge, U. Gundimeda, L. Michelle Baum, H. Lael Cantu, J. Lavinsky, L. Tao, A. Myint, C. Cruz, J. Wang, A. M. Nikolakopoulou, C. Abdala, M. W. Kelley, T. Ohyama, T. M. Coate and R. A. Friedman (2017). "Role of Neuropilin-1/Semaphorin-3A signaling in the functional and morphological integrity of the cochlea." PLoS Genet **13**(10): e1007048.

Sanders, T. R. and M. W. Kelley (2022). "Specification of neuronal subtypes in the spiral ganglion begins prior to birth in the mouse." Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A **119**(48): e2203935119.

Schmiedt, R. A. (1989). "Spontaneous rates, thresholds and tuning of auditory-nerve fibers in the gerbil: comparisons to cat data." Hear Res **42**(1): 23-35.

Shrestha, B. R., C. Chia, L. Wu, S. G. Kujawa, M. C. Liberman and L. V. Goodrich (2018). "Sensory Neuron Diversity in the Inner Ear Is Shaped by Activity." Cell **174**(5): 1229-1246 e1217.

Sifrim, A., M. P. Hitz, A. Wilsdon, J. Breckpot, S. H. Turki, B. Thienpont, J. McRae, T. W. Fitzgerald, T. Singh, G. J. Swaminathan, E. Prigmore, D. Rajan, H. Abdul-Khaliq, S. Banka, U. M. Bauer, J. Bentham, F. Berger, S. Bhattacharya, F. Bu'Lock, N. Canham, I. G. Colgiu, C. Cosgrove, H. Cox, I. Daehnert, A. Daly, J. Danesh, A. Fryer, M. Gewillig, E. Hobson, K. Hoff, T. Homfray, A. K. Kahlert, A. Ketley, H. H. Kramer, K. Lachlan, A. K. Lampe, J. J. Louw, A. K. Manickara, D. Manase, K. P. McCarthy, K. Metcalfe, C. Moore, R. Newbury-Ecob, S. O. Omer, W. H. Ouwehand, S. M. Park, M. J. Parker, T. Pickardt, M. O. Pollard, L. Robert, D. J. Roberts, J. Sambrook, K. Setchfield, B. Stiller, C. Thornborough, O. Toka, H. Watkins, D. Williams, M. Wright, S. Mital, P. E. Daubeney, B. Keavney, J. Goodship, R. M. Abu-Sulaiman, S. Klaassen, C. F. Wright, H. V. Firth, J. C. Barrett, K. Devriendt, D. R. FitzPatrick, J. D. Brook and M. E. Hurles (2016). "Distinct genetic architectures for syndromic and nonsyndromic congenital heart defects identified by exome sequencing." Nat Genet **48**(9): 1060-1065.

Sifrim, A., M. P. Hitz, A. Wilsdon, J. Breckpot, S. H. Turki, B. Thienpont, J. McRae, T. W. Fitzgerald, T. Singh, G. J. Swaminathan, E. Prigmore, D. Rajan, H. Abdul-Khaliq, S. Banka, U. M. Bauer, J. Bentham, F. Berger, S. Bhattacharya, F. Bu'Lock, N. Canham, I. G. Colgiu, C. Cosgrove, H. Cox, I. Daehnert, A. Daly, J. Danesh, A. Fryer, M. Gewillig, E. Hobson, K. Hoff, T. Homfray, I. Study, A. K. Kahlert, A. Ketley, H. H. Kramer, K. Lachlan, A. K. Lampe, J. J. Louw, A. K. Manickara, D. Manase, K. P. McCarthy, K. Metcalfe, C. Moore, R. Newbury-Ecob, S. O. Omer, W. H. Ouwehand, S. M. Park, M. J. Parker, T. Pickardt, M. O. Pollard, L. Robert, D. J. Roberts, J. Sambrook, K. Setchfield, B. Stiller, C. Thornborough, O. Toka, H. Watkins, D. Williams, M. Wright, S. Mital, P. E. Daubeney, B. Keavney, J. Goodship, U. K. Consortium, R. M. Abu-Sulaiman, S. Klaassen, C. F. Wright, H. V. Firth, J. C. Barrett, K. Devriendt, D. R. FitzPatrick, J. D. Brook, S. Deciphering Developmental Disorders and M. E. Hurles (2016). "Distinct genetic architectures for syndromic and nonsyndromic congenital heart defects identified by exome sequencing." Nat Genet **48**(9): 1060-1065.

Sitko, A. A. and L. V. Goodrich (2021). "Making sense of neural development by comparing wiring strategies for seeing and hearing." Science **371**(6525).

Spoendlin, H. (1972). "Innervation densities of the cochlea." Acta Otolaryngol **73**(2): 235-248.

Sun, Y., L. Wang, T. Zhu, B. Wu, G. Wang, Z. Luo, C. Li, W. Wei and Z. Liu (2022). "Single-cell transcriptomic landscapes of the otic neuronal lineage at multiple early embryonic ages." Cell Rep **38**(12): 110542.

Taberner, A. M. and M. C. Liberman (2005). "Response properties of single auditory nerve fibers in the mouse." J Neurophysiol **93**(1): 557-569.

Tong, J. K., C. A. Hassig, G. R. Schnitzler, R. E. Kingston and S. L. Schreiber (1998). "Chromatin deacetylation by an ATP-dependent nucleosome remodelling complex." Nature **395**(6705): 917-921.

Torchy, M. P., A. Hamiche and B. P. Klaholz (2015). "Structure and function insights into the NuRD chromatin remodeling complex." Cell Mol Life Sci **72**(13): 2491-2507.

Toriello, H. V., W. Reardon, R. J. Gorlin and R. J. Gorlin (2004). Hereditary hearing loss and its syndromes. Oxford ; New York, Oxford University Press.

Torrado, M., J. K. K. Low, A. P. G. Silva, J. W. Schmidberger, M. Sana, M. Sharifi Tabar, M. E. Isilak, C. S. Winning, C. Kwong, M. J. Bedward, M. J. Sperlazza, D. C. Williams, Jr., N. E. Shepherd and J. P. Mackay (2017). "Refinement of the subunit interaction network within the nucleosome remodelling and deacetylase (NuRD) complex." FEBS J **284**(24): 4216-4232.

Wang, X., C. Xie, K. Shen, D. Li and X. S. Xie (2025). "Quantification and potential functional relevance of binding cooperativity of adjacent transcription factors on DNA." Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A **122**(18): e2422555122.

Watson, A. A., P. Mahajan, H. D. Mertens, M. J. Deery, W. Zhang, P. Pham, X. Du, T. Bartke, W. Zhang, C. Edlich, G. Berridge, Y. Chen, N. A. Burgess-Brown, T. Kouzarides, N. Wiechens, T. Owen-Hughes, D. I. Svergun, O. Gileadi and E. D. Laue (2012). "The PHD and chromo domains regulate the ATPase activity of the human chromatin remodeler CHD4." J Mol Biol **422**(1): 3-17.

Weiss, K., H. P. Lazar, A. Kurolap, A. F. Martinez, T. Paperna, L. Cohen, M. F. Smeland, S. Whalen, S. Heide, B. Keren, P. Terhal, M. Irving, M. Takaku, J. D. Roberts, R. M. Petrovich, S. A. Schrier Vergano, A. Kenney, H. Hove, E. DeChene, S. C. Quinonez, E. Colin, A. Ziegler, M. Rumple, M. Jain, D. Monteil,

E. R. Roeder, K. Nugent, A. van Haeringen, M. Gambello, A. Santani, L. Medne, B. Krock, C. M.
Skraban, E. H. Zackai, H. A. Dubbs, T. Smol, J. Ghoumid, M. J. Parker, M. Wright, P. Turnpenny, J.
Clayton-Smith, K. Metcalfe, H. Kurumizaka, B. D. Gelb, H. Baris Feldman, P. M. Campeau, M. Muenke,
P. A. Wade and K. Lachlan (2020). "The CHD4-related syndrome: a comprehensive investigation of the
clinical spectrum, genotype-phenotype correlations, and molecular basis." Genet Med **22**(2): 389-397.

Weiss, K., P. A. Terhal, L. Cohen, M. Bruccoleri, M. Irving, A. F. Martinez, J. A. Rosenfeld, K. Machol,
Y. Yang, P. Liu, M. Walkiewicz, J. Beuten, N. Gomez-Ospina, K. Haude, C. T. Fong, G. M. Enns, J. A.
Bernstein, J. Fan, G. Gotway, M. Ghorbani, D. D. D. Study, K. van Gassen, G. R. Monroe, G. van
Haaften, L. Basel-Vanagaite, X. J. Yang, P. M. Campeau and M. Muenke (2016). "De Novo Mutations
in CHD4, an ATP-Dependent Chromatin Remodeler Gene, Cause an Intellectual Disability Syndrome
with Distinctive Dysmorphisms." Am J Hum Genet **99**(4): 934-941.

Weisz, C. J., M. Lehar, H. Hiel, E. Glowatzki and P. A. Fuchs (2012). "Synaptic transfer from outer hair
cells to type II afferent fibers in the rat cochlea." J Neurosci **32**(28): 9528-9536.

Williams, C. J., T. Naito, P. G. Arco, J. R. Seavitt, S. M. Cashman, B. De Souza, X. Qi, P. Keables, U.
H. Von Andrian and K. Georgopoulos (2004). "The chromatin remodeler Mi-2beta is required for CD4
expression and T cell development." Immunity **20**(6): 719-733.

Winter, I. M., D. Robertson and G. K. Yates (1990). "Diversity of characteristic frequency rate-intensity
functions in guinea pig auditory nerve fibres." Hear Res **45**(3): 191-202.

Xia, L., W. Huang, M. Bellani, M. M. Seidman, K. Wu, D. Fan, Y. Nie, Y. Cai, Y. W. Zhang, L. R. Yu, H.
Li, C. A. Zahnow, W. Xie, R. W. Chiu Yen, F. V. Rassool and S. B. Baylin (2017). "CHD4 Has
Oncogenic Functions in Initiating and Maintaining Epigenetic Suppression of Multiple Tumor
Suppressor Genes." Cancer Cell **31**(5): 653-668 e657.

Xue, Y., J. Wong, G. T. Moreno, M. K. Young, J. Cote and W. Wang (1998). "NURD, a novel complex
with both ATP-dependent chromatin-remodeling and histone deacetylase activities." Mol Cell **2**(6): 851-
861.

Yang, Y., T. Yamada, K. K. Hill, M. Hemberg, N. C. Reddy, H. Y. Cho, A. N. Guthrie, A. Oldenborg, S.
A. Heiney, S. Ohmae, J. F. Medina, T. E. Holy and A. Bonni (2016). "Chromatin remodeling inactivates
activity genes and regulates neural coding." Science **353**(6296): 300-305.

Yoshida, T., Y. Hu, Z. Zhang, A. O. Emmanuel, K. Galani, B. Muhire, H. J. Snippert, C. J. Williams, M.
Y. Tolstorukov, F. Gounari and K. Georgopoulos (2019). "Chromatin restriction by the nucleosome
remodeler Mi-2beta and functional interplay with lineage-specific transcription regulators control B-cell
differentiation." Genes Dev **33**(13-14): 763-781.

Zhang, K. D. and T. M. Coate (2017). "Recent advances in the development and function of type II
spiral ganglion neurons in the mammalian inner ear." Semin Cell Dev Biol **65**: 80-87.

Zhang, Y., G. LeRoy, H. P. Seelig, W. S. Lane and D. Reinberg (1998). "The dermatomyositis-specific
autoantigen Mi2 is a component of a complex containing histone deacetylase and nucleosome
remodeling activities." Cell **95**(2): 279-289.

Zhu, L. J., C. Gazin, N. D. Lawson, H. Pages, S. M. Lin, D. S. Lapointe and M. R. Green (2010).
"ChIPpeakAnno: a Bioconductor package to annotate ChIP-seq and ChIP-chip data." BMC
Bioinformatics **11**: 237.