Supplementary material

Loss of monocarboxylate transporter 1 aggravates white matter injury after experimental

subarachnoid hemorrhage in rats

Running Title: MCT1 in white matter injury after SAH



Experiment 2: The effect of rotarod study on SOX10+ITPR2+ oligodendrocyte and MCT1



Experiment 3: The roles of miRNA-29b and miRNA-124 in regulating MCT1



Figure S1. Experimental design. Experimental designs for the three different experiments: Experiment 1, time course and cellular localization of MCT1 and its effects on myelin damage and repair after SAH. Experiment 2, effect of rotarod training on SOX10+ ITPR2+ oligodendrocytes and MCT1. Experiment 3, roles of miRNA-29b and miRNA-124 in regulating MCT1.



Figure S2. The transfection efficiency of plasmid and antagomir in the corpus callosum region. A. The transfection efficiency of plasmids in the corpus callosum region. Plasmid MCT1 have YFP label (yellow) and nuclei were fluorescently labeled with DAPI (blue). The yellow fluorescence signal was observed in corpus callosum region. Scale bar = $50 \mu m$. B. The transfection efficiency of antagomir in the corpus callosum region. Antagomir have Cy5 labels (yellow) and nuclei were fluorescently labeled with DAPI (blue). The yellow fluorescence signal was observed in corpus callosum region. Antagomir have Cy5 labels (yellow) and nuclei were fluorescently labeled with DAPI (blue). The yellow fluorescence signal was observed in corpus callosum region both in the antagomir-NC group, the antagomir-29b-39 group and the antagomir-124-3p group. Scale bar = $50 \mu m$. C. The quantitative graph of the transfection efficiency. Data are presented as mean \pm SD. n = 3 per group.



Figure S3. A. Relative expression level of miR-29b-3p in the corpus callosum of SD rats in the sham and SAH groups. **B.** Relative expression level of miR-124-3p in the corpus callosum of SD rats in the sham and SAH groups. Data are presented as mean $\pm SD$. n = 6 per group. $**P \leq 0.01$, $****P \leq 0.0001$.

| Group | Mortality Rate | Excluded |
|------------------------|-----------------|----------|
| Experiment 1 | | |
| Part 1 | | |
| sham | 0% (0/10) | 0 |
| SAH(3h,6h,12h,24h,48h) | 21.88% (14/64) | 6 |
| Part 2 | | |
| sham | 0% (0/18) | 0 |
| SAH | 18.18% (4/22) | 2 |
| SAH+Vector | 10% (2/20) | 1 |
| SAH+Over-MCT1 | 14.29% (3/21) | 0 |
| Experiment 2 | | |
| sham | 0% (0/20) | 0 |
| sham+training | 0% (0/20) | 0 |
| SAH | 20.83% (5/24) | 2 |
| SAH+training | 13.64% (3/22) | 2 |
| Experiment 3 | | |
| sham | 0% (0/12) | 0 |
| SAH | 14.29% (3/21) | 1 |
| SAH+antagomir-NC | 25% (2/8) | 0 |
| SAH+antagomir-29b-3p | 14.29% (1/7) | 0 |
| SAH+antagomir-124-3p | 14.29% (1/7) | 1 |
| Total | 12.84% (38/296) | 15 |
| sham | 0% (0/80) | 0 |
| SAH | 17.59% (38/216) | 15 |

Table S1 The total mortality and exclusion rates of experimental rats

Table S2 MCT1 overexpression plasmid

Final sequence:

ATGCCACCTGCGATTGGCGGGCCAGTGGGGGTACACCCCCCAGATGGAGGCTGGGGCTGG GCGGTGGTAGTTGGAGCCTTCATTTCTATTGGCTTCTCCTATGCATTTCCCAAATCCATCAC TGTCTTCTTTAAAGAGATTGAAATTATATTCAGTGCAACGACCAGTGAAGTGTCATGGATA TCGTCCATCATGCTGGCTGTCATGTATGCCGGAGGTCCTATCAGCAGTATCTTGGTGAATA AATATGGCAGCCGTCCAGTAATGATTGCTGGTGGCTGCCTGTCTGGCTGTGGCTTGATTGC AGCTTCTTTCTGTAACACGGTGCAGGAACTTTACTTCTGCATTGGTGTCATTGGAGGTCTT GGGCTTGCTTTCAACTTGAACCCAGCTCTGACTATGATTGGCAAGTATTTCTACAAGAAGC GACCATTGGCCAATGGCCTGGCTATGGCAGGCAGGCCAGTGTTCCTCTCTACCCTGGCTCC ACTTAATCAGGCTTTCTTTGGTATTTTTGGCTGGAGAGGAAGCTTCCTAATTCTTGGGGGGC CTCCTCCTCAACTGTTGTGTGGAGCTGGATCCCTGATGCGACCAATAGGGCCTCAGCAAGGC AAGGTGGAAAAACTCAAGTCCAAAGAGTCTCTCCAGGAAGCTGGGAAGTCTGATGCAAA TACAGATCTCATTGGAGGAAGTCCCAAAGGAGAAAAGCTGTCAGTCTTCCAAACAGTTAA TAAATTCCTGGACTTGTCCCTGTTTACCCATAGAGGCTTTTTGCTGTACCTGTCTGGAAAT GCATTTTTCCAGTGAGAAGTCAGCCTTCCTCCTTTCCATTTTGGCTTTTGTTGATATGGTGG CCAGACCGTCCATGGGTCTTGCAGCCAACACCAGGTGGATCAGACCTCGAGTCCAGTACT TTTTTGCTGCTTCTGTTGTTGCGAATGGAGTGTGCCATTTGCTGGCACCTTTGTCTACGACC ATTGTTTGAGACGTTGATGGACCTCGTTGGACCCCAGAGGTTCTCCAGTGCTGTGGGCTTG GTGACCATTGTGGAATGTTGTCCTGTCCTCGTGGGACCACCACTTTTAGGCCGCCTCAATG ACATGTATGGAGACTA

CAAATACACATACTGGGCTTGTGGCGTGATCCTCATCATCGCAGGCCTCTACCTCTTCATT GGTATGGGCATCAATTATCGACTTGTGGCCAAAGAACAGAAAGCGGAAGAAAAGAAGAG GGACGGTAAAGAGGACGAGACCAGCACTGATGTTGATGAGAAGCCCAAGAAGAACAATGA AAGAAACACAGTCGCCAGCGCCACTGCAGAACAGCTCTGGAGACCCCGCGGAGGAGGAG AGCCCAGTC

Clone ID: ORa00732D ORF Clones (Accession No.): NM_012716.2 (ORF Sequence)

| Antibody | | AB_2756669 | AB_570666 | AB_306298 | AB_94882 |
|-----------|--------------|---------------|-----------------|-------------------|------------------|
| ID | | | | | |
| Antibody | MCT1 | Anti-MCT1 | Olig-2 antibody | Anti- | Anti-Alzheimer |
| name | Antibody | (SLC16A1) | AF | Neurofilament, | Precursor |
| | | Antibody | 555 Conjugate | Heavy, 200 kD | Protein A4, a.a. |
| | | | | Antibody | 66-81 of |
| | | | | | APP {N- |
| | | | | | terminus} |
| Target | MCT1 | MCT1 | Olig-2 | 200 kD | Alzheimer |
| antigen | human, | (SLC16A1) | human, | Neurofilament | Precursor |
| | mouse | human, | mouse, rat | Heavy-Neuronal | Protein A4 |
| | | mouse, rat | | Marker | human, |
| | | | | human, mouse, rat | mouse, rat |
| Vendor | Proteintech | Alomone | Millipore | Abcam | Millipore |
| | | Labs | | | |
| Cat | 20139-1-AP | AMT-011 | ab9610-af555 | ab8135 | MAB348 |
| number | | | | | |
| Proper | (Proteintech | (Alomone | (Millipore Cat# | (Abcam Cat# | (Millipore Cat# |
| Citation | Cat# | Labs Cat# | ab9610-af555, | ab8135, | MAB348, |
| | 20139-1-AP) | AMT-011, | RRID:AB_5706 | RRID:AB_306298) | RRID:AB_9488 |
| | | RRID:AB_27 | 66) | | 2) |
| | | 56669) | | | |
| Reference | Reference(3) | Reference(2) | Reference(64) | Reference(3) | Reference(20) |
| Clonality | Polyclonal | Polyclonal | Polyclonal | Polyclonal | Monoclonal |
| | antibody | antibody | antibody | antibody | antibody |
| Clone ID | | | | | Clone 22C11 |
| Host | Rabbit | Rabbit | Rabbit | Rabbit | Mouse |
| Organism | | | | | |
| Comment | WB,IP,IHC,I | IF, IFC, IHC, | IF | IHC,ICC,IF,WB | IHC,IF,WB |
| S | F | WB | | | |
| Applicate | WB=1:1000 | IF=1:200 | IF=1:150 | IF=1:500 | IF=1:250 |
| dilution | | | | | |

Table S3 Resource Identifiers for antibodies

| Antibody ID | AB_305869 | AB_2564642 | AB_11091087 | |
|-------------|----------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Antibody | Myelin Basic | Neurofilament | ITPR2 | SOX10 Antibody |
| name | Protein | H (NF-H), | antibody | [SOX10/991] |
| | Monoclonal | Nonphosphoryl | | |
| | Antibody | ated antibody | | |
| Target | Myelin Basic | Neurofilament | Rabbit ITPR2 | SOX10 Mouse, |
| antigen | Protein | H NF-H | human, mouse, | human |
| | human, | human, mouse, | rat | |
| | mouse, rabbit, | rat, | | |
| | rat | | | |
| Vendor | Abcam | BioLegend | Bioss | Abcam |
| Cat number | ab7349 | 801701 | bs-4243R | ab212843 |
| Proper | (Abcam Cat# | (BioLegend | (Bioss Cat# bs- | (Abcam Cat# |
| Citation | ab7349, | Cat# 801701, | 4243R, | ab212843 |
| | RRID:AB_30 | RRID:AB_256 | RRID:AB_110 | |
| | 5869) | 4642) | 91087) | |
| Reference | Reference(24) | Reference(11) | Reference() | Reference(1) |
| Clonality | Monoclonal | Monoclonal | Polyclonal | Monoclonal |
| | antibody | antibody | antibody | antibody |
| Clone ID | Clone 12 | Clone SMI 32 | | SOX10/991 |
| Host | Rat | Mouse | Rabbit | Mouse |
| Organism | | | | |
| Comments | WB,ELISA, | IHC- | ELISA,IHC-P, | WB,IHC-P |
| | RIA,IHC,IF | P,WB,ICC | IHC-F,ICC,IF | ICC/IF,Flow Cyt |
| A 1 | WD 1 1000 | WD 1 1000 | IE 1 500 | IF 1 500 |
| Applicate | WB=1:1000 | WB=1:1000 | IF=1:500 | IF=1:500 |
| dilution | IF=1:300 | IF=1:300 | | |

Table S4 Resource Identifiers for antibodies

| | Description | Hours after | in vivo or | Test used | Stat-value | One- or |
|---------|---------------|-------------|------------|-----------|----------------------|----------|
| | | SAH or | in vitro | | | two- |
| | | Sham | | | | tailed P |
| | | surgery | | | | value? |
| Fig. 1A | Relative | 3h-48h | in vivo | One-way | F(5,54)=3.154, | Two- |
| | protein level | | | ANOVA | P=0.0357, 95% | tailed |
| | of MCT 1 | | | | CI=0.02105 to | |
| | | | | | 0.8159 | |
| | | | | | (sham vs. SAH 48h) | |
| | | | | | $\eta^2 = 0.2261$ | |
| Fig. 1B | Mean density | 48h | in vivo | t-test | P=0.0004, t = 5.292, | Two- |
| | of MCT 1 | | | | df = 10, 95% CI= - | tailed |
| | | | | | 0.5995 to -0.2443 | |
| | | | | | (sham vs. SAH 48h) | |
| Fig. 2A | Relative | 48h | in vivo | One-way | F(3,20)=37.98, | Two- |
| | protein level | | | ANOVA | P=0.0002, 95% | tailed |
| | of MCT 1 | | | | CI=0.2804 to | |
| | | | | | 0.6883 | |
| | | | | | (sham vs. SAH); | |
| | | | | | P=0.0003,95% CI=- | |
| | | | | | 0.7923 to -0.3843 | |
| | | | | | (SAH+ Vector vs. | |
| | | | | | SAH+ Over-MCT | |
| | | | | | 1) | |
| | | | | | $\eta^2 = 0.8505$ | |
| Fig. 2C | Relative | 48h | in vivo | One-way | F(3,20)=25.52, | Two- |
| | fluorescent | | | ANOVA | P=0.0002, | tailed |
| | intensity of | | | | 95% CI=0.2786 to | |
| | MCT 1 | | | | 0.6475 (sham vs. | |
| | | | | | SAH); P=0.0002, | |
| | | | | | 95% CI=-0.5267 to | |
| | | | | | -0.1577 | |
| | | | | | (SAH+ Vector vs. | |
| | | | | | SAH+ Over-MCT | |

Table S5 Statistical table

| | | | | | 1) | |
|---------|-------------------------|-----|---------|---------|---------------------|--------|
| | | | | | $\eta^2 = 0.7926$ | |
| Fig. 2E | Number of β- | 48h | in vivo | One-way | F(3,20)=26.37, | Two- |
| | APP per mm ² | | | ANOVA | P=0.0001, 95% | tailed |
| | | | | | CI=-291.6 to -141.4 | |
| | | | | | (sham vs. SAH); | |
| | | | | | P=0.0479, 95% | |
| | | | | | CI=0.5554 to 150.8 | |
| | | | | | (SAH+ Vector vs. | |
| | | | | | SAH+ Over-MCT | |
| | | | | | 1) | |
| | | | | | $\eta^2 = 0.7982$ | |
| Fig. 3A | Relative | 48h | in vivo | One-way | F(3,20)=13.82, | Two- |
| | protein level | | | ANOVA | P=0.0002, 95% | tailed |
| | of MBP | | | | CI=0.2036 to | |
| | | | | | 0.6633 | |
| | | | | | (sham vs. SAH); | |
| | | | | | P=0.0169, 95% | |
| | | | | | CI=-0.5019 to - | |
| | | | | | 0.04209 | |
| | | | | | (SAH+ Vector vs. | |
| | | | | | SAH+ Over-MCT | |
| | | | | | 1) | |
| | | | | | $\eta^2 = 0.6747$ | |
| Fig. 3B | Relative | 48h | in vivo | One-way | F(3,20)=14.18, | Two- |
| | protein level | | | ANOVA | P=0.0008, 95% | tailed |
| | of SMI 32 | | | | CI=-2.096 to - | |
| | | | | | 0.7349 | |
| | | | | | (sham vs. SAH); | |
| | | | | | P=0.0399, 95% | |
| | | | | | CI=0.02673 to | |
| | | | | | 1.388 | |
| | | | | | (SAH+ Vector vs. | |
| | | | | | SAH+ Over-MCT | |
| | | | | | 1) | |

| | | | | | $\eta^2 = 0.6802$ | |
|---------|--------------|---------|---------|----------|---------------------------|--------|
| Fig. 3D | SMI32/MBP | 48h | in vivo | One-way | F(3,20)=12.69, | Two- |
| | ratio | | | ANOVA | P=0.0001, 95% | tailed |
| | | | | | CI=-4.058 to -1.308 | |
| | | | | | (sham vs. SAH); | |
| | | | | | P=0.0498, 95% | |
| | | | | | CI=0.001149 to | |
| | | | | | 2.751 | |
| | | | | | (SAH+ Vector vs. | |
| | | | | | SAH+ Over -MCT | |
| | | | | | 1) | |
| | | | | | $\eta^2 = 0.6555$ | |
| Fig. 4A | Rotarod test | pre-35d | in vivo | Two-way | F(3,40)=367.8, | Two- |
| | | | | repeated | P=0.002, 95% CI=- | tailed |
| | | | | ANOVA | 46.53 to -10.74 | |
| | | | | | (Bonferroni's test, | |
| | | | | | day 21, SAH+ | |
| | | | | | Vector vs. SAH+ | |
| | | | | | Over-MCT 1); | |
| | | | | | P=0.0479, 95% | |
| | | | | | CI=-35.9 to -0.1017 | |
| | | | | | (Bonferroni' s test, | |
| | | | | | day 28, SAH+ | |
| | | | | | Vector vs. SAH+ | |
| | | | | | Over-MCT 1); | |
| | | | | | P=0.003, 95% CI=- | |
| | | | | | 45.72 to -9.92 | |
| | | | | | (Bonferroni's test, | |
| | | | | | day 35, SAH+ | |
| | | | | | Vector vs. SAH+ | |
| | | | | | Over-MCT 1) | |
| | | | | | partial $\eta^2 = 0.7841$ | |
| Fig. 4B | Adhesive | pre-35d | in vivo | Two-way | F(3,40)=118.8, | Two- |
| | removal test | | | repeated | P=0.0457, 95% | tailed |
| | | | | ANOVA | CI=0.03406 to | |

| | | | | | 5.966 | |
|---------|---------------|---------|---------|---------|---------------------------|--------|
| | | | | | (Bonferroni's test, | |
| | | | | | day 21, SAH+ | |
| | | | | | Vector vs. SAH+ | |
| | | | | | Over-MCT 1); | |
| | | | | | P=0.005, 95% | |
| | | | | | CI=1.489 to 7.42 | |
| | | | | | (Bonferroni's test, | |
| | | | | | day 28, SAH+ | |
| | | | | | Vector vs. SAH+ | |
| | | | | | Over-MCT 1); | |
| | | | | | P=0.0457, 95% | |
| | | | | | CI=0.03406 to | |
| | | | | | 5.966 (Bonferroni's | |
| | | | | | test, day 35, SAH+ | |
| | | | | | Vector vs. SAH+ | |
| | | | | | Over-MCT 1) | |
| | | | | | partial $\eta^2 = 0.6836$ | |
| Fig. 4C | Morris water | 29d-33d | in vivo | Two-way | F(3,200)=57.45, | Two- |
| _ | maze learning | | | ANOVA | P=0.0301, 95% | tailed |
| | test | | | | CI=0.2842 to 9.061 | |
| | | | | | (Bonferroni's test, | |
| | | | | | SAH+ Vector vs. | |
| | | | | | SAH+ Over-MCT | |
| | | | | | 1) | |
| | | | | | partial $\eta^2 = 0.4629$ | |
| Fig. 4E | Morris water | 34d | in vivo | One-way | F(3,40)=7.878, | Two- |
| _ | maze memory | | | ANOVA | P=0.0046, 95% | tailed |
| | test | | | | CI=1.807 to 12.28 | |
| | | | | | (sham vs. SAH); | |
| | | | | | P=0.0464, 95% | |
| | | | | | CI=-10.49 to - | |
| | | | | | 0.06147 | |
| | | | | | (SAH+ Vector vs. | |
| | | | | | SAH+ Over-MCT | |

| | | | | | 1) | |
|---------|---------------|-----|---------|---------|---------------------------|--------|
| | | | | | $\eta^2 = 0.3714$ | |
| Fig. 4F | Morris water | 34d | in vivo | One-way | F(3,40)=0.3952, | Two- |
| | maze | | | ANOVA | P=0.9803, 95% | tailed |
| | swimming | | | | CI=-5.688 to 4.259 | |
| | speed | | | | (sham vs. SAH); | |
| | | | | | P=0.7914, 95% | |
| | | | | | CI=-3.243 to 6.663 | |
| | | | | | (SAH+ Vector vs. | |
| | | | | | SAH+ Over-MCT | |
| | | | | | 1) | |
| | | | | | $\eta^2 = 0.0288$ | |
| Fig. 5B | %ITPR2+ out | 48h | in vivo | Two-way | F(1,12)=19.85, | Two- |
| | of | | | ANOVA | P=0.0008, 95% | tailed |
| | SOX10+ | | | | CI=-12.12 to - | |
| | | | | | 0.01835 | |
| | | | | | (Bonferroni's test, | |
| | | | | | sham vs. | |
| | | | | | sham+ training); | |
| | | | | | P=0.0494, 95% | |
| | | | | | CI=-12.12 to - | |
| | | | | | 0.01835 | |
| | | | | | (SAH vs. SAH+ | |
| | | | | | training) | |
| | | | | | partial $\eta^2 = 0.6234$ | |
| Fig. 5D | Relative | 7d | in vivo | One-way | F(3,20)=12.5, | Two- |
| | protein level | | | ANOVA | P=0.0436, 95% | tailed |
| | of MCT 1 | | | | CI=-1.027 to - | |
| | | | | | 0.01199 | |
| | | | | | (sham vs. sham+ | |
| | | | | | training); | |
| | | | | | P=0.0003, 95% | |
| | | | | | CI=-1.425 to - | |
| | | | | | 0.4104 (SAH vs. | |
| | | | | | SAH+ | |

| | | | | | training | |
|---------|----------------|-----|---------|------------|---------------------------|--------|
| | | | | | $\eta^2 = 0.6521$ | |
| Fig. 5F | %MCT1+ out | 7d | in vivo | Two-way | F(1,20)=19.57, | Two- |
| | of | | | ANOVA | P=0.0244, 95% | tailed |
| | SOX10+ | | | | CI=-13.4 to -0.711 | |
| | | | | | (Bonferroni's test, | |
| | | | | | sham vs. | |
| | | | | | sham+ training); | |
| | | | | | P=0.0413, 95% | |
| | | | | | CI=-12.89 to - | |
| | | | | | 0.2052 | |
| | | | | | (SAH vs. SAH+ | |
| | | | | | training) | |
| | | | | | partial $\eta^2 = 0.4947$ | |
| Fig. 6A | Correlation in | 35d | in vivo | Pearson | r=0.6475, | Two- |
| | sham group | | | Product | **P=0.0027; | tailed |
| | between | | | linear | Y = 2.896*X + | |
| | Rotarod test | | | regression | 129.6; | |
| | and %MCT1+ | | | analyses | 95% CI=0.2738 to | |
| | out of | | | | 0.8513 | |
| | SOX10+ | | | | | |
| Fig. 6B | Correlation in | 35d | in vivo | Pearson | r=0.6668, | Two- |
| | SAH group | | | Product | **P=0.0025; | tailed |
| | between | | | linear | Y = 3.089*X + 78; | |
| | Rotarod test | | | regression | 95% CI=0.2903 to | |
| | and %MCT1+ | | | analyses | 0.8645 | |
| | out of | | | | | |
| | SOX10+ | | | | | |
| Fig. 6C | Correlation in | 35d | in vivo | Pearson | r=-0.5521, | Two- |
| | sham group | | | Product | *P=0.0142; | tailed |
| | between | | | linear | Y = -0.1736*X + | |
| | Adhesive | | | regression | 10.32; | |
| | removal test | | | analyses | 95% CI=-0.8046 to | |
| | and %MCT1+ | | | | -0.1307 | |
| | out of | | | | | |

| | SOX10+ | | | | | | |
|---------|----------------|-----|-----|---------|------------|---------------------|--------|
| Fig. 6D | Correlation in | 35d | | in vivo | Pearson | r=-0.4722, | Two- |
| | SAH group | | | | Product | *P=0.0478; | tailed |
| | between | | | | linear | Y = -0.2772*X + | |
| | Adhesive | | | | regression | 16.25; | |
| | removal test | | | | analyses | 95% CI=-0.7695 to | |
| | and %MCT1+ | | | | | -0.00689 | |
| | out of | | | | | | |
| | SOX10+ | | | | | | |
| Fig. 7A | Relative | 24h | and | in vivo | One-way | F(2,15)=26.84, | Two- |
| | expression of | 48h | | | ANOVA | P=0.0002, 95% | tailed |
| | miR-29b-3p | | | | | CI=-7.197 to -3.541 | |
| | | | | | | (sham vs. SAH 48h) | |
| | | | | | | $\eta^2 = 0.7816$ | |
| Fig. 7B | Relative | 24h | and | in vivo | One-way | F(2,15)=9.486, | Two- |
| | expression of | 48h | | | ANOVA | P=0.0053, 95% | tailed |
| | miR-124-3p | | | | | CI=-2.403 to - | |
| | | | | | | 0.4524 | |
| | | | | | | (sham vs. SAH 48h) | |
| | | | | | | $\eta^2 = 0.5584$ | |
| Fig. 7C | Relative | 48h | | in vivo | One-way | F(4,35)=12.81, | Two- |
| | protein level | | | | ANOVA | P=0.0074, 95% | tailed |
| | of MCT 1 | | | | | CI=0.09376 to | |
| | | | | | | 0.8052 | |
| | | | | | | (sham vs. SAH); | |
| | | | | | | P=0.0060, 95% | |
| | | | | | | CI=-0.815 to - | |
| | | | | | | 0.1036 | |
| | | | | | | (SAH+ antagomir- | |
| | | | | | | NC vs. | |
| | | | | | | SAH+antagomir- | |
| | | | | | | 29b-3p); P=0.0003, | |
| | | | | | | 95% CI=-0.9395 to | |
| | | | | | | -0.2281(SAH+ | |
| | | | | | | antagomir-NC vs. | |

| | | | | | | SAH+antagomir- | |
|----------|---------------|-----|-----|---------|---------|---------------------|--------|
| | | | | | | 124-3p) | |
| | | | | | | $\eta^2 = 0.5941$ | |
| Fig. 7E | Relative | 48h | | in vivo | One-way | F(4,25)=6.714, | Two- |
| | fluorescent | | | | ANOVA | P=0.0410, 95% | tailed |
| | intensity | | | | | CI=0.01481 to | |
| | of MCT 1 | | | | | 0.9742 | |
| | | | | | | (sham vs. SAH); | |
| | | | | | | P=0.0066, 95% | |
| | | | | | | CI=-1.102 to - | |
| | | | | | | 0.1424 | |
| | | | | | | (SAH+ antagomir- | |
| | | | | | | NC vs. | |
| | | | | | | SAH+antagomir- | |
| | | | | | | 29b-3p); P=0.0462, | |
| | | | | | | 95% CI=-0.9653 to | |
| | | | | | | -0.00597(SAH+ | |
| | | | | | | antagomir-NC vs. | |
| | | | | | | SAH+antagomir- | |
| | | | | | | 124-3p) | |
| | | | | | | $\eta^2 = 0.5178$ | |
| Fig. S3A | Relative | 24h | and | in vivo | One-way | F(2,15)=33.4, | Two- |
| | expression of | 48h | | | ANOVA | P=0.0001, 95% | tailed |
| | miR-29b-3p | | | | | CI=-3.458 to -1.866 | |
| | | | | | | (sham vs. SAH 48h) | |
| | | | | | | $\eta^2 = 0.8166$ | |
| Fig. S3B | Relative | 24h | and | in vivo | One-way | F(2,15)=7.967, | Two- |
| | expression of | 48h | | | ANOVA | P=0.0027, 95% | tailed |
| | miR-124-3p | | | | | CI=-1.433 to - | |
| | | | | | | 0.3304 | |
| | | | | | | (sham vs. SAH 48h) | |
| | | | | | | $\eta^2 = 0.5151$ | |