

Supplementary Data

SUPPLEMENTARY FIG. S1. Comparison of muscle architecture characteristics in the TEMR responder and TEMR max responder animals. **(A)** Schematic representation of the regions where measurements were obtained (*yellow boxes*) in TEMR responders and TEMR max responders. *Red shading* on the TEMR responder indicates the defect area, where *de novo* muscle regeneration nominally occurred. **(B)** Median FCSA measurements were calculated from ~200 fibers in the cortex of the TA from each animal (TEMR responder $n=5$, TEMR max responder $n=3$). Medians were significantly different ($*p < 0.05$, Mann–Whitney test) from each other. Values are the median with minimum to maximum range due to the nonparametric distribution of the data. **(C)** Median FCSA measurements were calculated from ~200 fibers in the core of the TA from each animal (TEMR responder $n=5$, TEMR max responder $n=3$). Medians were significantly different ($*p < 0.05$; Mann–Whitney test) from each other. Values are the median with minimum to maximum range. **(D)** The TEMR max responder cortex FCSA frequency distribution curve displays a similar range of FCSA values as that of the TEMR responder muscles and there were no significant differences at any bin size (multiple t -tests correcting for false discovery rate, $p > 0.05$ at all points). **(E)** The TEMR max responder core FCSA frequency distribution curve displays a similar range of FCSA values as that of the TEMR responder muscles, and there were no significant differences in any bin size (multiple t -tests correcting for false discovery rate, $p > 0.05$ at all points). Please note that when grouped into bins, FCSA had a normal distribution, and therefore, parametric statistical analyses were used, whereas analysis of the entire population of FCSA values revealed a non-normal distribution and required nonparametric statistical analyses. **(F)** In the cortex, two-way ANOVA revealed no effect of treatment ($p > 0.9$), and no treatment–fiber-type interaction ($p > 0.5$), but a significant effect of fiber type ($p < 0.05$). **(G)** In the core, two-way ANOVA revealed no effect of treatment ($p > 0.9$), and no interaction ($p > 0.06$), but in contrast, no effect of fiber type either ($p = 0.2$) capillaries **(H)** and vessels **(I)** were quantified. There were no significant differences between the TEMR responders and TEMR max responders for both analyses (Mann–Whitney test, $p > 0.9$). **(J)** TEMR max responders had levels of innervation comparable to the TEMR responders (unpaired t -test, $p = 0.7$). **(K)** CD68⁺/CD163[−] macrophage numbers were not significantly different between TEMR responders and TEMR max responders (Mann–Whitney test, $p = 0.1$). **(L)** CD68⁺/CD163⁺ macrophage numbers were not significantly different between TEMR responders and TEMR max responders (Mann–Whitney test, $p = 0.6$). Values are expressed as the median \pm range except in **(F, G, and J)**, where they are expressed as the mean \pm standard error of the mean. Sample sizes are noted in parentheses. ns, not significant; ANOVA, analysis of variance; TEMR, tissue-engineered muscle repair; TA, tibialis anterior; FCSA, fiber cross-sectional area.

