Cell Reports, Volume 🔳 🔳

# **Supplemental information**

## Generation of salivary glands derived

### from pluripotent stem cells via conditional

## blastocyst complementation

Junichi Tanaka, Akihiro Miura, Yuko Shimamura, Youngmin Hwang, Dai Shimizu, Yuri Kondo, Anri Sawada, Hemanta Sarmah, Zurab Ninish, Kenji Mishima, and Munemasa Mori



Endo

### Figure S1. Lineage-tracing, Fgfr2 loss of function, and scRNA-seq analysis of Cre driver candidate genes for

### CBC, Related to Figure 1

(A) Representative confocal imaging of the salivary gland in the E18.5 Shh<sup>Cre/+</sup>; Rosa<sup>LSL-tdTomato/+</sup> (left) and Shh<sup>Cre/+</sup>; Fqfr2<sup>flox/flox</sup>; Rosa<sup>LSL-tdTomato/+</sup> mouse (right). Immunostaining of tdTomato: red, E-cadherin (E-cad): cyan, DAPI: gray. (N=3) (B) Representative confocal imaging of the salivary gland in the E18.5 Pitx2<sup>Cre/+</sup>; Rosa<sup>LSL-tdTomato/+</sup> (left) and Pitx2<sup>Cre/+</sup>; Fqfr2<sup>flox/flox</sup>; Rosa<sup>LSL-tdTomato/+</sup> mouse (right). Immunostaining of tdTomato: red, E-cadherin (E-cad): cyan, DAPI: gray. (N=3) (C) The morphometric analysis: % of tdTomato-positive cells in E-cad<sup>+</sup> epithelial cells from the E18.5 Shh<sup>Cre/+</sup>; Rosa<sup>LSLtdTomato/+</sup> or Pitx2<sup>Cre/+</sup>; Rosa<sup>LSLtdTomato/+</sup> mice. (N = 3 per biological replicates, 5 fields per group). Error bars represent mean  $\pm$  SD. (D) Annotated uniform manifold approximation projection (UMAP) plots of mouse oral epithelium at E12.0. Clusters assigned: ADL, anterodorsal-lateral; ADM, anterodorsal-medial; AVL, anteroventrallateral; AVM, anteroventral-medial; Di, diastema; IK, initiation knot; In, incisor; Mo, molar; PL, posterior-lateral; PM, posterior-medial; P/S, periderm and suprabasal cells; SG, salivary gland; T, tongue; V1, ventral 1; V2, ventral 2. (E) Feature plots for the expression of candidate Cre-driver genes in mouse oral epithelium at E12.0. (F) Dot plots for top 10 differentially expressed genes of tongue (T) and posterior-lateral (PL) culsters. (G) Annotated UMAP plots of E8.5 mouse embryos. (H) Feature plots for the expression of candidate Cre-driver genes in E8.5 mouse embryos. Red dot aria is the boundary region of the oral cavity. (I) Representative confocal imaging of the oral cavity in the E9.5 Shh<sup>Cre/+</sup>; Rosa<sup>LSL-tdTomato/+</sup> (left) and E9.5 Pitx2<sup>Cre/+</sup>; Rosa<sup>LSL-tdTomato/+</sup> mouse (right). Each right panel is an enlarged image of a white dotted box. Shh lineage labeled only the endoderm (Endo) (arrowhead) but not ectoderm (Ecto) (arrow). Pitx2 lineage labeled neither of them. tdTomato: red, DAPI: gray. (N=3) Scale bars: 100 μm.



### Fgfr2<sup>cKO</sup> ;Rosa<sup>LSL-tdTomato/+</sup> + nEGFP miPSC

#### Figure S2. The developing salivary glands rescued by the donor cells had normal salivary gland structure and

#### differentiation, Related to Figure 3

Representative IF-confocal imaging of complemented salivary gland from the E17.5 chimeric mice of  $Fgfr2^{cKO}$ +nEGFP miPSC. The right panel is an enlarged image of a white dotted box. Immunostaining of tdTomato: red, EGFP: green, each cell type maker: cyan, DAPI: gray. (N=3) Scale bars: 100  $\mu$ m.

Α

Fgfr2<sup>hetero</sup> ;Rosa<sup>LSL-tdTomato/+</sup> + PSC<sup>CAG-EGFP</sup>









### Figure S3. The complemented salivary glands in adulthood had normal functions, Related to Figure 4

(A) Representative PAS-staining images of complemented salivary gland from the 4 weeks-old chimeric mice of  $Fgfr2^{cKO}$ + mPSCs or  $Fgfr2^{hetero}$ + mPSCs. The bottom panel is an enlarged image. (N=3) Scale bars: 100  $\mu$ m. (B) Analysis of body weight. Het:  $Fgfr2^{hetero}$ , PSC<sup>CAG-EGFP</sup>, cKO:  $Fgfr2^{cKO}$ , PSC<sup>CAG-EGFP</sup>. Statistical analyses: unpaired Student's t-test, significant: p<0.05. no significant change: n.s. Error bars represent mean  $\pm$  SD.

### Table S1. Summary for conditional blastocyst complementation, Related to Figure 3

| Cell Line              | host mice | Number<br>of host<br>blastocy<br>sts | % survival (number of pups of<br>embryos/number of<br>transferred blastocysts) | r % survival at P0 (number of<br>pups survived P0/number of<br>pups born) | % chimera<br>formation at<br>analysis | Analysis | % cKO<br>genotyping | % Salivary gland<br>complementation (Number<br>of complementation in Fgfr2<br>cKO genotype ) |
|------------------------|-----------|--------------------------------------|--|---|---------------------------------------|----------|---------------------|--|
| nGFP <sup>+</sup> iPSC | Foxa2     | 16                                   | 75% (12/16)  | -   | 83% (10/12)                           | E17.5    | 50% (5/10)          | 100% (5/5)   |
| PSC <sup>CAG-GFP</sup> | Foxa2     | 78                                   | 56% (44/78)  | 77% (34/44)   | 87% (27/31)                           | 4 weeks  | 21% (5/24)          | 100% (5/5)   |

| Table S2. E | 17.5 chimerism | of Foxa2-driven | Fgfr2 cKO | conditional blastoc | vst complement                         | ation. Related to | Figure 3 |
|-------------|----------------|-----------------|-----------|---------------------|--|-------------------|----------|
|             |                |                 |           |                     | J ~~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ ~ |                   |          |

|                                    | Liver (%) | Hematopoietic cells (%) | Salivary galnd |                |  |
|------------------------------------|-----------|-------------------------|----------------|----------------|--|
|                                    |           |                         | Epithelium (%) | Mesenchyme (%) |  |
| Fgfr2 сКО                          | 56.2      | 71.3                    | 100            | 92.3           |  |
|                                    | 54.5      | 64.9                    | 100            | 59.4           |  |
|                                    | 48.3      | 62.9                    | 100            | 57.2           |  |
|                                    | 14.4      | 21.1                    | 100            | 48.4           |  |
| Fgfr2 hetero                       | 60.2      | 68.7                    | 63.4           | 81.1           |  |
|                                    | 55.8      | 70                      | 63             | 68.2           |  |
|                                    | 24.8      | 32                      | 88.5           | 59.8           |  |
|                                    | 9.7       | 12.6                    | 84             | 42.1           |  |
| Average Chimerism in Fgfr2 cKO (%) | 43.35     | 55.05                   | 100            | 64.325         |  |
| Average in Fgfr2 hetero (%)        | 37.625    | 45.825                  | 74.725         | 62.8           |  |