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Abstract
Empirical evidence from human studies has demonstrated a correlative relationship between perfluorooctane sulfonate (PFOS) exposure and increased risks of preeclampsia and fetal developmental complications. Although experimental and circumstantial data suggest that PFOS induces endothelial dysfunction, leading to decreased uterine arterial blood flow and gestational hypertension, the precise regulatory mechanisms responsible for this effect remain unknown. To address this issue, we treated human uterine artery endothelial cells (hUAECs) isolated from pregnant women with 10 µmol/L PFOS or vehicle and conducted comparative transcriptomic analyses. We identified a total of 19 differentially expressed genes, 9 of which were upregulated and 10 were down-regulated in PFOS-treated pregnant hUAECs. Pre-ranked gene set enrichment analysis unveiled a distinct set of activated genes involved in osmotic stress, cellular stress response, translation regulation, metabolic regulation, and oxidation-reduction processes in PFOS-treated pregnant hUAECs. Furthermore, PFOS treatment resulted in the down-regulation of genes implicated in cardiac muscle cell proliferation, embryonic morphogenesis, and muscle cell proliferation. In addition, we observed differential splicing events in 2678 genes in hUAECs exposed to PFOS, with cross-comparison analysis revealing 4 genes that were both differentially expressed and alternatively spliced and were implicated in oxidative stress and cardiac development. In conclusion, this study provides a comprehensive understanding of the molecular mechanisms underlying PFOS-induced gestational uterine artery endothelial dysfunction during pregnancy, offering a valuable resource for future research in this field.
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Introduction
Per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) encompass a vast array of approximately 5000 synthetic compounds, which are extensively utilized in consumer and industrial goods due to their unique characteristics, including heat resistance, water and oil repellence, and stability [1]. These substances do not degrade, remain in the environment for a long time, and bio-accumulate inside human bodies for up to 3 to 9 years [2]. Human exposure to PFAS occurs through various routes, including drinking water, contaminated food and fish, dermal contact with PFAS products, occupational exposure, and inhalation of contaminated indoor air and dust [3]. PFOS (Perfluorooctane Sulfonic Acid), is widely prevalent among the numerous PFAS compounds. PFOS is most commonly found and highly concentrated PFAS in drinking water in many regions of the USA [4]. Research has established the extensive prevalence...
of PFOS among the general public, with its presence being identified in various human matrices, including blood, urine, breast milk, and amniotic fluid [4-7]. In recent risk assessment reports, the United States Environmental Protection Agency and the European Food Safety Authority have identified PFOS as a potential reproductive toxicant that can cause adverse developmental effects during pregnancy [8, 9]. Since PFOS has been detected in blood samples of the majority of pregnant women [10], understanding the potential health effects of PFOS exposure during pregnancy has become a growing concern.

During normal pregnancy, the maternal cardiovascular system undergoes significant changes, including decreased systemic blood pressure, vascular resistance, and increased blood volume and cardiac output [11]. Uterine blood flow plays a crucial role in this process. The maternal uterine artery undergoes exquisite remodeling during pregnancy, which allows it to withstand a 20–40 fold increase in blood flow compared to the nonpregnant state [12, 13]. The endothelial cells in the uterine arteries are crucial for these pregnancy-related uterine vascular adaptations [14]. The clinical relevance of optimal uterine artery endothelial cell function is frequently emphasized by its malfunction contributing to gestational pathologies such as fetal growth restriction and preeclampsia and increased risk of metabolic diseases such as diabetes and cardiovascular diseases later in life [15, 16]. The local production of vasodilators, particularly nitric oxide (NO) by the uterine artery endothelial cells, is critical for the pregnancy-associated rise in uterine blood flow [17, 18]. Therefore, any disruption in the uterine artery endothelial function can lead to complications during pregnancy.

Epidemiological studies have established a correlation between PFOS exposure and preeclampsia [19]. Animal studies indicate that PFOS exposure in pregnant rats may contribute to gestational hypertension, reduced uterine arterial blood flow, attenuated endothelium-dependent relaxation response, and decreased eNOS activity and NO production [20, 21]. In nonpregnant animals, PFOS exposure disrupts the communication between endothelial cells and astrocytes, resulting in inflammation, cardiac fibrosis, and myocardial hypertrophy [22]. In vitro studies demonstrate that PFOS induces endothelial permeability aberrations and triggers tight junction opening [23]. PFOS exposure also inhibits angiogenesis in human umbilical vein endothelial cells by reducing cellular sprouting through diminished vascular endothelial growth factor signaling [24]. Furthermore, the EPA ToxCast™ project identifies PFOS as a potential disruptor of blood vessel formation and remodeling [66]. Additionally, prenatal PFOS exposure leads to increased cardiovascular dysfunction in offspring, including hypertension and decreased endothelial function [25]. Although circumstantial and experimental evidence indicates that PFOS causes endothelial dysfunction with an associated decrease in uterine arterial blood flow and gestational hypertension, the specific regulatory mechanisms through which PFOS induces endothelial dysfunction remain unclear. In order to improve our understanding of this issue, we conducted a study using human uterine artery endothelial cells (hUAECs) isolated from healthy pregnant women and treated with PFOS. Our study represents the first comprehensive evaluation of the global transcriptome changes, alternative splicing, and potential pathways implicated in PFOS-induced gestational uterine arterial endothelial dysfunction.

Material and Methods

RNA Sample Preparation from hUAECs

Dr. Dongbao Chen, University of California Irvine, provided the hUAECs. These cells were isolated from pregnant women (35–36 weeks of gestation) between 30 and 45 years old undergoing hysterectomy. Written consent was obtained from all participants, and ethical approval (HS#2013-9763) was granted by the Institutional Review Board at the University of California Irvine. The isolation and culture methods for hUAECs were performed as described previously [26, 27]. The cells were purified, validated, and cultured in endothelial cell medium (ECM; ScienCell, La Jolla, CA) containing 5% fetal bovine serum, endothelial growth supplements, and 1% penicillin/streptomycin. The cells were used within 4–5 passages and were treated with PFOS for 24 hours at a concentration of 10 μmol/L. This dose (10 μmol/L) was chosen because PFOS in human serum range between 0.6 and 4.8 μM following exposure [28]. Others have used similar PFOS concentrations for in vitro studies [29, 30]. Thus, in this in vitro exposure study, the culture was treated with vehicle (DMSO) or 10 μmol/L PFOS for 24 h (n = 4), followed by comparative transcriptomic analysis. RNA was isolated from the cells using an RNaseq mini kit (Qiagen, Valencia, CA), and the experimental procedures are depicted in Figure 1.

Library Preparation and Sequencing

Before sequencing library preparation, the integrity and concentration of RNA were evaluated using a bio-analyzer (Agilent Technologies, Santa Clara, CA) and approximately 1–2 μg of total RNA from each sample was utilized for RNA-seq library preparation using the KAPA Stranded RNA-Seq Library Prep Kit (Illumina, San Diego, CA) [31]. The mRNA was enriched from the total RNA using the NEBNext Poly(A) mRNA Magnetic Isolation Module (#E7490S, NEB; Ipswich, MA), and rRNA was removed using the Ribozero Magnetic Gold Kit (MRZG126, Illumina). The mRNA was then fragmented into small pieces with divalent cations under elevated temperatures. These RNA fragments were then converted into first-strand cDNA using random primers and SuperScript II reverse transcriptase (Invitrogen, Waltham, MA), followed by second-strand cDNA synthesis using DNA Polymerase I and RNase H. The cDNA fragments underwent
end repair and had a single ‘A’ base added before ligating the indexing adapters. The final cDNA library was purified and enriched through PCR.

The completed libraries were subjected to quality control assessments, including concentration determination, fragment size distribution analysis between 400-600 bp, and detection of adapter dimer contamination using Agilent 2100 Bioanalyzer (Agilent Technologies, Santa Clara, CA). The library quantity was evaluated using the absolute quantification qPCR method. The barcoded libraries were pooled in equal amounts and utilized for sequencing. The DNA fragments within the well-mixed libraries were denatured using 0.1 M NaOH to produce single-stranded DNA molecules, loaded onto channels of the flow cell at a concentration of 8 pM, and amplified in situ with the NovaSeq 6000 S4 Reagent Kit (300 cycles). The sequencing process was conducted using the Illumina NovaSeq 6000 system in accordance with the manufacturer's guidelines, with a total of 150 cycles being run.

Data Processing and Bioinformatics Analysis

The entire workflow pipeline for sequencing, data processing, differential expression, alternative splicing, and bioinformatics analysis is depicted in Figure 2. Image analysis and base calling were performed using Solexa pipeline v1.8 (Off-Line Base Caller software, v1.8). The raw paired-end reads quality was assessed using the FastQC software. The reads were trimmed (51 and 31 adapter bases removed using cutadapt) and mapped to the reference genome utilizing the Hisat2 software. Transcript abundances for each sample were estimated using StringTie, and the FPKM value was calculated for gene and transcript levels using the R package Ballgown. Differentially expressed genes and transcripts were filtered using the Ballgown R package. Novel genes and transcripts were predicted from the assembled results by comparing them to the reference annotation using StringTie and Ballgown. The coding potential of these sequences was evaluated using CPAT [32]. Alternative splicing events were detected using rMATS [33]. Principal component analysis and correlation analysis were conducted based on gene expression levels using statistical computing and graphics environments such as R, Python, or Shell.

Digital PCR (dPCR) Validation of DEGs

The copy number analysis of the top 4 up- and down-regulated genes from the RNA sequencing data set was performed using the QIAcuity one-plate digital PCR instrument (Qiagen). A total of 1 µg of total RNA from both vehicle- and PFOS-treated hUAECs (n = 4/group) was reverse transcribed using an iScript cDNA synthesis kit (Bio-Rad Laboratories, Hercules, California), and 20 ng cDNA was used per reaction in each well of a 96-well PCR nanoplate containing 8.5K partitions per well. The PCR reactions were set up using 0.8 µM gene-specific forward and reverse primers and 4 µL of 3× EvaGreen PCR master mix (Qiagen). The amplification was performed according to the manufacturer's instructions, using a 3-step cycling protocol for 40 cycles: denaturation at 95°C for 15 sec, annealing at 60°C for 15 sec, and extension at 72°C for 15 sec followed by 5 min cooling period at 40°C. In the QIAcuity dPCR instrument, software version 2.0 was used for thermocycling, partitioning, and data analysis based on the random distribution of the target sequence into 8500 partitions per well. Gene-specific primers for YTHDF3, TDG, SORD, LRRCD8D, NDRG5, PRKAR1A, MYC, and CCDC137 were purchased from Integrated DNA Technologies (Coralville, Iowa; see Table 1).

Results

Statistics of the hUAEC Transcriptome

High-throughput next-generation RNA sequencing was used to uncover the variances in transcriptional regulation and alternative splicing patterns between control and PFOS-treated hUAECs. A total of 178,130,275 raw paired-end reads were obtained, with a Q30 quality score ranging from 92%–93%. Supplementary Table S1 and Figure S1 present the quality scores for all samples. Following preprocessing and trimming, approximately 94% of reads (177,964,704) were successfully aligned to the human genome assembly GRCh37 utilizing hisat2 (Table 2). The application of StringTie transcript assembly and ballgown expression analysis revealed the presence of positive transcriptional signal (FPKM reads) for 11,036 genes and 26,310 transcripts in the control group, as well as 11,054 genes and 26,124 transcripts in the PFOS-treated hUAECs. The differential gene expressions between groups based on genes with ANOVA p-value ≤ 0.05 on FPKM abundance were confirmed through

Figure 1: RNA-seq experiment workflow
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Figure 2: Workflow pipeline for sequencing, data processing, differential expression, alternative splicing, and bioinformatics analysis.

Table 1: Human-specific primer sequences used for dPCR analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gene</th>
<th>Forward</th>
<th>Reverse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YTHDF3</td>
<td>GCTACTTTCAAGCATAACCACCTC</td>
<td>ACAGGACATCTTCATAAGGTTATTG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDG</td>
<td>CATGCAGCAGTAACCTGGG</td>
<td>GGTATCCACTGCCCATTAGGA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SORD</td>
<td>GCCGATAAATCTGCACTCCC</td>
<td>CGCCTTCCTCAAAGGTGACATTG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRRC8D</td>
<td>CTTGAGCTATCTAGTGCTTTCG</td>
<td>TTAAGGTGCCGCAACTTCGGGA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDRG4</td>
<td>GCCCTTCTGATGTAATGATCGT</td>
<td>GTGCTTGGTATATCTCCGTAGTG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRKAR1A</td>
<td>TATGGAACACCGAGAGCAGCCA</td>
<td>CATCTCCGCTTTCTCAGTGCT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MYC</td>
<td>CCTGTTGCTCCATGAGGAGAC</td>
<td>CAGACTCGAATCCTTGGCCAGG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCDC137</td>
<td>TATGAGGAGCCGCAAGAGATG</td>
<td>CCTCTCCCTTTGCTCTTTCT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Summary of hUAEC mRNA Sequencing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Raw Pairs</th>
<th>Trimmed</th>
<th>Mapped</th>
<th>Unmapped</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V1</td>
<td>20816103</td>
<td>20806923</td>
<td>94.69%</td>
<td>5.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2</td>
<td>16526274</td>
<td>16518739</td>
<td>93.63%</td>
<td>6.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V3</td>
<td>21347578</td>
<td>21331521</td>
<td>94.85%</td>
<td>5.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V4</td>
<td>21401824</td>
<td>21389977</td>
<td>95.50%</td>
<td>4.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>21878019</td>
<td>21871270</td>
<td>95.33%</td>
<td>4.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>28802744</td>
<td>28740516</td>
<td>93.07%</td>
<td>6.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>22930108</td>
<td>22915770</td>
<td>94.30%</td>
<td>5.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td>24427625</td>
<td>24389988</td>
<td>93.62%</td>
<td>6.38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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principal component analysis (Supplementary Figure S2A). The strong correlation in gene expression between biological samples in both groups was further supported by a Pearson $R^2$ score exceeding 0.92 (Supplementary Figure S2B). The overall experimental design is illustrated in Figure 1, and the comprehensive workflow pipeline encompassing sequencing, data processing, differential expression, alternative splicing, and bioinformatics analysis is presented in Figure 2.

mRNA of hUAECs treated with vehicle and PFOS (n=4/group) were sequenced on the Illumina X-ten/NovaSeq platform, yielding approximately 50–80 million 2 × 125-bp paired-end reads per sample, which was then mapped to the human reference genome (GRCh37). V-Vehicle treated; P-PFOS treated.

Differentially Expressed Genes (DEGs)

Out of the total number of identified genes, 11036 and 11054 were detected in the control and PFOS-treated groups, respectively. Using the R package ballgown with a fold change cutoff of 1.5, a p-value cutoff of ≤0.05, and a minimum FPKM value of ≥0.5 in one group, we identified differential expression of 19 genes. Among the DEGs, the majority (52.6%, 10 genes) were found to be downregulated in the PFOS-treated group, while the remaining genes (47.4%, 9 genes) were upregulated compared to the control group. DEG expression profiles were prepared for all biological replicates and presented on a heatmap (Figure 3) and Circos plot (Figure 4). The 9 upregulated protein-coding genes were: AP002748.4, HNRNPA1L2, LRRCD8D, YTHDF3, SORD, EEF1G, NPIPA7, TDG, AC006486.1 (Table 3). The 10 downregulated gene were: MYC, CCDC137, NDRG4, PRKAR1A, ARMT1, HIPK1, PBX2, GNA11, INCC00994, CLCN5 (Table 4).

dPCR Validation of Differentially Expressed Genes

We performed dPCR absolute quantification of the top four up-and-down-regulated genes identified in the datasets to validate our RNA sequencing findings. Our results showed the same direction of expression under dPCR and had comparable log2 fold change confirming that the copy numbers of LRRCD8D, YTHDF3, TDG, and SORD were increased, while the copy numbers of MYC, CCDC137, NDRG5, and PRKAR1A were decreased in PFOS-treated hUAECs compared to vehicle-treated controls (Figure 5A). Additionally, the Pearson’s correlation analysis showed the expression levels calculated via RNA-Seq were significantly positively correlated to the expression levels determined via dPCR, supporting the validity of our findings (Figure 5B).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gene Name</th>
<th>Locus</th>
<th>log2FC</th>
<th>Fold Change</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>q-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AP002748.4</td>
<td>chr11:66276550-66301084</td>
<td>1.2198876</td>
<td>2.3292856</td>
<td>0.0383892</td>
<td>0.999661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HNRNPA1L2</td>
<td>chr13:53214921-53217931</td>
<td>1.2195783</td>
<td>2.328763</td>
<td>0.0351532</td>
<td>0.999661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRRCD8D</td>
<td>chr1:90286573-90402170</td>
<td>1.1324837</td>
<td>2.1923584</td>
<td>0.0420282</td>
<td>0.999661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YTHDF3</td>
<td>chr8:64081112-64125344</td>
<td>1.0068202</td>
<td>2.0094772</td>
<td>0.0318647</td>
<td>0.999661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SORD</td>
<td>chr15:4531502-4539383</td>
<td>0.7746909</td>
<td>1.7108235</td>
<td>5.77E-05</td>
<td>0.744206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEF1G</td>
<td>chr11:63237073-63241558</td>
<td>0.6726028</td>
<td>1.593461</td>
<td>0.0456739</td>
<td>0.999661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPIPA7</td>
<td>chr16:16472912-16487811</td>
<td>0.665088</td>
<td>1.5872273</td>
<td>0.029134</td>
<td>0.999661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDG</td>
<td>chr12:10435958-104382652</td>
<td>0.609161</td>
<td>1.5235719</td>
<td>0.0182253</td>
<td>0.999661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC006486.1</td>
<td>chr19:42738735-42759284</td>
<td>0.5863786</td>
<td>1.5014731</td>
<td>0.0424556</td>
<td>0.999661</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Upregulated differentially expressed genes (DEGs) in PFOS treated compared with control.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gene Name</th>
<th>Locus</th>
<th>log2FC</th>
<th>Fold Change</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>q-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MYC</td>
<td>chr8:128747680-128753680</td>
<td>-2.114034</td>
<td>0.2310002</td>
<td>0.0247795</td>
<td>0.999661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCDC137</td>
<td>chr17:7963394-79640934</td>
<td>-1.265227</td>
<td>0.416034</td>
<td>0.0129473</td>
<td>0.999661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDRG4</td>
<td>chr16:58496750-58547532</td>
<td>-0.910151</td>
<td>0.5321296</td>
<td>0.0083197</td>
<td>0.999661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRKAR1A</td>
<td>chr17:65507921-6547460</td>
<td>-0.759105</td>
<td>0.5908629</td>
<td>0.0442921</td>
<td>0.999661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARMT1</td>
<td>chr6:15177339-151791236</td>
<td>-0.742352</td>
<td>0.5977641</td>
<td>0.0014993</td>
<td>0.999661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIPK1</td>
<td>chr1:114471814-114520491</td>
<td>-0.739487</td>
<td>0.5989523</td>
<td>0.0033497</td>
<td>0.999661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBX2</td>
<td>chr6:32152518-32157963</td>
<td>-0.653634</td>
<td>0.6357772</td>
<td>0.0087111</td>
<td>0.999661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNA11</td>
<td>chr19:3094408-3124002</td>
<td>-0.647347</td>
<td>0.6384534</td>
<td>0.0058419</td>
<td>0.999661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INCC00994</td>
<td>chr9:136890561-13689788</td>
<td>-0.617223</td>
<td>0.6519248</td>
<td>0.0315418</td>
<td>0.999661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLCN5</td>
<td>chr:X:49687225-49863892</td>
<td>-0.596516</td>
<td>0.6613489</td>
<td>0.0003333</td>
<td>0.999661</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Downregulated differentially expressed genes (DEGs) in PFOS treated compared with control.
To elucidate the cellular and molecular mechanisms affected by PFOS exposure, we conducted a pre-ranked gene set enrichment analysis (PGSEA) for Gene Ontology (GO). Our analysis identified 17 activated processes in the 'biological process' category, with the top four processes being response to osmotic stress \((p = 7.93 \times 10^{-5})\), regulation of translation \((p = 3.29 \times 10^{-3})\), organophosphate metabolic process \((p = 1.05 \times 10^{-2})\), and oxidation-reduction process \((p = 1.23 \times 10^{-2})\). Additionally, we identified 122 suppressed processes, with the top four being cardiac muscle cell proliferation \((p = 4.75 \times 10^{-6})\), embryonic morphogenesis \((p = 6.19 \times 10^{-6})\), muscle cell proliferation \((p = 7.98 \times 10^{-6})\), and animal organ development \((p = 2.17 \times 10^{-5})\), all with FDR = 0.001 (Figure 6).

In the 'cellular component' category, PFOS activated five processes, with the top three being intracellular membrane-bounded organelle \((p = 6.28 \times 10^{-2})\), endoplasmic reticulum \((p = 6.28 \times 10^{-2})\), and extracellular exosome \((p = 7.42 \times 10^{-2})\) with FDR = 0.36. Additionally, we found 29 suppressed processes, with the top three being synapse \((p = 3.07 \times 10^{-3})\), lysosomal membrane \((p = 3.65 \times 10^{-3})\), and vacuolar membrane \((p = 4.70 \times 10^{-3})\) with FDR = 0.07 (Figure 7).

Finally, in the 'molecular function' category, PFOS activated four processes, with the top three being organic cyclic compound binding \((p = 5.81 \times 10^{-2})\), protein binding \((p = 5.84 \times 10^{-2})\), and identical protein binding \((p = 7.68 \times 10^{-2})\). Furthermore, we identified 70 suppressed processes, with the top three being protein binding \((p = 1.74 \times 10^{-3})\), purine ribonucleotide binding \((p = 1.94 \times 10^{-3})\), and purine nucleotide binding \((p = 1.99 \times 10^{-3})\), all with FDR = 0.03 (Figure 8).

Upon conducting KEGG pathways analysis, it was found that DEGs were involved in three suppressed pathways, but none were activated in the PFOS-exposed group. These pathways include cellular senescence \((p = 2.18 \times 10^{-3})\), human cytomegalovirus infection \((p = 4.49 \times 10^{-3})\), and pathways in cancer \((p = 2.38 \times 10^{-2})\) (Figure 9).
Alternative Splicing Patterns

Using splice junction counts as input, alternative splicing events (ASE) were investigated using the rMATS paired model (v3.2.1 beta) to determine the extent of alternative splicing changes in PFOS-treated hUAECs. Five basic and widely accepted alternative splicing modes were identified, including alternative 5’ splice site (A5SS), alternative 3’ splice site (A3SS), skipped exon (SE), retained intron (RI), and mutually exclusive exons (MXE). The hUAECs exhibited a total of 49,802 ASEs, with SE being the most frequently observed mode (69.2% or 34,443 SE events) and A5SS being the least common (6.1% or 3,055 A5SS events) (Figure 10).

Out of the 49,802 ASEs identified, a total of 2,678 events exhibited differential alternative splicing (DASE) in PFOS-exposed hUAECs compared to vehicle-treated cells (at the threshold of FDR > 0.1, p > 0.05). Of the 2,678 DASE events, there were 217 A5SS (with 107 increased events and 110 decreased events), 273 A3SS (with 132 increased events and 141 decreased events), 1,699 SE (with 718 increased events and 981 decreased events), 214 RI (with 103 increased events and 111 decreased events), and 275 MXE (with 167 increased events and 108 decreased events) (Table 5).

Further cross-comparison analysis revealed 4 genes (NDRG4, PRKAR1A, TDG, YTHDF3) that were both differentially expressed and alternatively spliced, and were implicated in oxidative stress and cardiac development. We found that

Figure 6: Top 10 enriched GO terms related to Biological Processes. Ordered from top to bottom by p-value (-log10 scaled), with the most significant pathway on the top.

Figure 7: Top 10 enriched GO terms related to Cellular Component, ordered from top to bottom by p-value (-log10 scaled), with the most significant pathway on the top.

Figure 8: Top 10 enriched GO terms related to Molecular Function, ordered from top to bottom by p-value (-log10 scaled), with the most significant pathway on the top.
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PFOS downregulated gene NDRG4 was represented in all 5 ASEs while PRKAR1A was associated with 3 ASEs (A3SS, A5SS, SE). Similarly, PFOS-upregulated genes TDG and YTHDF3 were associated with 3 ASEs (A3SS, RI, SE) and 2 ASEs (MXE and SE), respectively. The top 2 representative rMATs sashimi plots for up (YTHDF3 and TDG) and down (NDRG4 and PRKAR1A) exon skipping events in PFOS- and vehicle-treated hUAECs are presented in Figure 11.

**Discussion**

The present study, for the first time, employed high-throughput next-generation RNA sequencing to discern the differences in transcriptional regulation and alternative splicing patterns between vehicle and PFOS-treated hUAECs. In the control and PFOS-treated groups, 11,036 and 11,054 genes were detected, respectively, and 19 genes were differentially expressed, of which 10 genes were downregulated and 9 genes were upregulated in the PFOS-treated group compared to the control group. PFOS exposure induced activation of pathways related to stress response and suppression of pathways involved in cardiac muscle cell proliferation and embryogenesis. Differential exon skipping appears to be the most predominant alternative splicing event in hUAECs, with 4 genes, including NDRG4, PRKAR1A, TDG and YTHDF3, exhibiting both differential gene expression and differential alternative splicing in the PFOS-exposed hUAECs. While many of these genes were associated with pathologies [34-37], the differential expression of these genes in PFOS-exposed hUAECs relative to controls suggests that these genes may have a unique role in mediating PFOS-induced gestational uterine vascular endothelial dysfunctions.

In mammals, the maternal uterine artery undergoes exquisite remodeling during pregnancy. The diameter of the uterine artery in the late pregnant state becomes two.
to three-fold larger compared to the nonpregnant state in both humans and animals [13, 38, 39]. This increase in uterine artery diameter is accompanied by a substantial rise in blood flow, with a striking 20-40 fold increase observed during late pregnancy [40, 41]. The endothelial cells in the uterine arteries are crucial for these pregnancy-related uterine vascular adaptations [14]. Any constraint in the uterine artery blood flow leads to pregnancy disorders such as preeclampsia and fetal growth restriction [16]. The prevailing consensus posits a correlation between gestational pathologies and pro-oxidative and inflammatory conditions [42, 43]. Nevertheless, the underlying etiological factors that underpin the induction of oxidative stress and inflammation in pregnancy pathologies remain unclear. Studies suggest that environmental exposures, specifically PFOS, are linked to heightened risks of adverse pregnancy outcomes [44-46]. However, the mechanistic basis for how PFOS elicits these gestational complications remains unknown. In this present study, a comprehensive analysis of the transcriptome of hUAECs revealed that PFOS triggers alterations in many pathways associated with osmotic stress, cellular stress response, translation regulation, metabolic regulation, and oxidation-reduction processes. It is noteworthy that these GO terms are intricately linked to oxidative stress. Despite numerous reports attesting to the association between PFOS and oxidative stress in pregnancy [47, 48], the precise mechanisms through which PFOS induces oxidative stress are yet to be fully elucidated. However, this study provides evidence that PFOS exposure upregulates several genes, including LRRC8D, SORD, TDG, EEF1G, and YTHDF3, which play a pivotal role in the induction of oxidative stress. For example, LRRC8D, which encodes a protein that generates anion channels, stimulates Nox1, NF-xB activity and extracellular superoxide production [49]. Similarly, PFOS induced upregulation of SORD (encodes sorbitol dehydrogenase), which elevates the reduced form of NADH, leading to the activation of NADH oxidase activity and the production of superoxide anions [50]. Moreover, PFOS exposure elicits the upregulation of TDG, which encodes the enzyme thymine DNA glycosylase. TDG plays a crucial role in DNA repair and epigenetic regulation, as well as in the regulation of gene expression involved in endothelial cell response to stress, including inflammation and oxidative stress [51, 52]. Therefore, the activation of LRRC8D, SORD, TDG, EEF1G, and YTHDF3 genes in hUAECs following PFOS exposure is noteworthy and warrants further exploration to ascertain whether their activation contributes to the induction of oxidative stress and endothelial dysfunction.

Simultaneously, we observed that exposure to PFOS elicited suppression of several pathways, such as cardiac muscle cell proliferation, cardiac muscle tissue growth, embryonic morphogenesis, animal organ development, and anatomical structure morphogenesis. All these GO terms are associated with cardiovascular development and embryogenesis. More specifically, exposure to PFOS has been observed to downregulate the expression of critical genes, including NDRG4, PRKAR1A, HIPK1, PBX2, GNA11, and MYC, which play vital roles in embryonic morphogenesis, cardiac muscle growth, and proliferation. For example, NDRG4 regulates the Wnt signaling pathway, which is critical for cell migration, proliferation, and tissue patterning during cardiovascular development [53, 54]. Downregulation of HIPK2, a transcriptional cofactor downstream of the TGF-β/BMP signaling pathway, affects cellular responses to TGF-β during fetal development, leading to poor adherens junction formation and excessive proliferation in endothelial cells, resulting in early embryonic lethality [55, 56]. PBX2 plays a role in organ and tissue formation and patterning, including the cardiovascular, nervous, skeletal, and digestive systems [57], while GNA11 regulates smooth muscle contraction and angiogenesis [58]. MYC controls cell proliferation, differentiation, and survival, and its downregulation can lead to abnormal phenotypes such as heart bleeding, pericardium edema, and spinal curvature [59]. Numerous investigations have demonstrated a correlative relationship between exposure to PFOS and developmental toxicity, as evidenced by several studies [60-63]. Maternal exposure to PFOS has been shown to result in impaired cardiac function, characterized by systolic alterations, left ventricular hypertrophy, and fibrosis, as well as an increased likelihood of cardiac developmental anomalies in offspring [21, 64]. Despite uncertainties regarding the precise mechanisms by which PFOS induces developmental toxicity, it is imperative to explore the potential involvement of several identified genes (NDRG4, PRKAR1A, HIPK1, PBX2, GNA11, and MYC) in the pathogenesis of PFOS-induced cardiac developmental dysfunction.

Analysis in the context of molecular functions showed that PFOS exposure triggered the activation of four distinct processes, with the top three being organic cyclic compound binding, protein binding, and identical protein binding. This finding suggests that PFOS may have an impact on protein function and structural dynamics within cells. On the other hand, we identified 70 suppressed processes as a result of PFOS exposure, with the top three being protein binding, purine ribonucleotide binding, and purine nucleotide binding. The suppression of protein binding, in particular, is a significant finding, as it suggests that PFOS may interfere with the proper formation and functioning of protein complexes, which are essential for many cellular processes. Specifically, our findings suggest that PFOS may disrupt normal cellular processes by altering protein function and binding. Consistently, both the experimental and computational analyses indicate that PFOS binds with human serum albumin, FAT6 and FAT3/4 and alters their function [65].

The splicing of precursor mRNA is a crucial step in gene regulation that allows for the production of functionally
diverse proteins from a single gene, known as isoforms. These isoforms may play unique roles in protein-protein, protein-ligand, protein-nucleic acid, or protein-membrane interactions, as well as in localization and enzymatic properties [66]. Alternative splicing mechanisms are triggered in response to demand and cellular need. A macromolecular machine tightly regulates this process, including splicing enhancers, silencers, serine-arginine-rich proteins, and spliceosomes. These components work synergistically and antagonistically to ensure precise control of splicing [66-68]. Intriguingly, our findings indicate that PFOS exposure was associated with the activation of five processes in the 'cellular component' category, including intracellular membrane-bounded organelles, endoplasmic reticulum, and extracellular exosomes, which were all linked to the regulation of alternative splicing [69, 70]. Consistently, we detected 2,678 differential splicing events in hUAECs exposed to PFOS, suggesting that PFOS exposure significantly altered the splicing landscape. In addition, a subset of differentially expressed genes, including NDRG4, PRKAR1A, TDG, and YTHDF3, showed changes in splicing patterns, indicating that splicing could contribute to the differential expression of these genes. Further studies are warranted to investigate whether changes in splicing patterns are associated with functional alterations. Furthermore, it is essential to elucidate whether diversification of splicing or switching to alternative splicing variants is more critical for PFOS-induced endothelial dysfunction.

In conclusion, this study has shed light on the previously unknown mechanisms underlying the cardiovascular complications associated with maternal PFOS exposure. Our findings have identified a number of potential candidate genes that may play a role in mediating these effects. Further investigations are needed to elucidate the specific contributions of these candidate genes in PFOS-induced abnormal cardiovascular adaptations during pregnancy and developmental toxicity.
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Supplementary Materials: Supplementary Table S1 and Figure S1. Q30 quality scores and whiskers plot for all samples. Supplementary Figure S2. Principal component analysis (PCA) and Pearson R² gene-expression correlation analysis.
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Table S1: Quality scores.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Reads Count</th>
<th>Bases Num</th>
<th>Bases Num (Q ≥ 30)</th>
<th>Q30 (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V1</td>
<td>20816103</td>
<td>20806923</td>
<td>94.69%</td>
<td>5.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2</td>
<td>16526274</td>
<td>16518739</td>
<td>93.63%</td>
<td>6.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V3</td>
<td>21347578</td>
<td>21331521</td>
<td>94.85%</td>
<td>5.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V4</td>
<td>21401824</td>
<td>21389977</td>
<td>95.50%</td>
<td>4.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>21878019</td>
<td>21871270</td>
<td>95.33%</td>
<td>4.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>28802744</td>
<td>28740516</td>
<td>93.03%</td>
<td>6.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>22930108</td>
<td>22915770</td>
<td>94.30%</td>
<td>5.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td>24427625</td>
<td>24389988</td>
<td>93.62%</td>
<td>6.38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Generally, the percentage of the number of bases with Q ≥ 30 should greater than 80%.

Supplementary Figure S1A: Control quality score whiskers plots
Supplementary Figure S1B: PFOS quality score whiskers plots
Supplementary Figure S2: Principal component (PCA) and Pearson R2 gene-expression correlation analysis