Supplementary Material

Recent progress in translational engineered *in vitro* models of the central nervous system

Polyxeni Nikolakopoulou^{1*}, Rossana Rauti^{2*}, Dimitrios Voulgaris³, Iftach Shlomy², Ben M. Maoz^{2,4,5#} Anna Herland^{1,3#}

¹AIMES, Center for the Advancement of Integrated Medical and Engineering Sciences, Department of Neuroscience, Karolinska Institute, Stockholm, Sweden
²Department of Biomedical Engineering, Faculty of Engineering, Tel Aviv University, Tel Aviv, Israel
³Division of Micro and Nanosystems, KTH Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm, Sweden
⁴Sagol School of Neuroscience, Tel Aviv University, Tel Aviv, Israel
⁵The Center for Nanoscience and Nanotechnology, Tel Aviv University, Tel Aviv, Israel

*These authors contributed equally to the work

[#]Correspondence to: Assistant Professor, Ben M. Maoz <u>bmaoz@tauex.tau.ac.il</u> Associate Professor, Anna Herland, <u>aherland@kth.se</u> +46700877005

Supplementary Figure 1



Α

Supplementary Figure 1: Modeling the complexity of the human CNS. A) The neural tissue is characterized by an immense cytoarchitectural complexity, illustrated in levels from left to right. The unique brain microenvironment, the vivid interplay among specialized neural cells, and the distinct regional characteristics are instrumental for brain functionality in health and disease. B) In CNS research, when attempting to create translatable models of the human brain, it is critical to reproduce the brain's unique functions, regions, and pathophysiology. Here, we have made an overviewing comparison of rodent *in vivo* models (the most commonly used mammal), standard two-dimensional (2D) cell culture models, organoid cultures and Organs-on-a-Chip (OoC) for their human specificity and their capacity to model human diseases, systemic effects, brain regionality, behavior, drug absorption, distribution, metabolism and excretion, and toxicity (ADME-Tox). We also rate the possibility for electrophysiological studies, detailed mechanistic studies, high throughput studies (HTS), and the cost of the model. For the three *in vitro* models, we divided them into the accessible cell sources, human primary cells, rodent primary cell and hiPCS, and cell lines. Notably, we want to emphasize that human primary cells from the CNS are scares. We further wish to highlight that this rating, the appropriateness of each model, varies for each specific study, and our rating should be used as a general guideline of what is possible to achieve with each model.

Model	Refs	Shear	Cell-cell	High	Similarity to	Graphical representation ¹
		stress	interactions	through	human	
TW ²	(Zenker et al., 2003; Colgan et al., 2008; Helms et al., 2014; Labus et al., 2014; Canfield et al., 2017; Delsing et al., 2018)	No	Co-culturing possible, tri- culturing more challenging to evaluate cell populations	Yes / Low	Minimal, ECM present only as anchoring points, 2D geometry	BMECs Co-Culture Cell Types
Porous-tube models	(Neuhaus <i>et</i> <i>al.</i> , 2006; Cucullo <i>et al.</i> , 2008; Marino <i>et al.</i> , 2018; Moya <i>et al.</i> , 2020)	Yes	Same as TW	Minimal / Moderate	Improved similarity to human physiology (shear stress, 3D lumical geometry), but minimal ECM present	a) $n_p \text{ pores}$ external environment inflow $rac{1}{}$ inflow $rac{1}{}$ inflo
Microfluidic chips (membrane- based) ³	(Booth and Kim, 2012; Prabhakarpan dian et al., 2013; Achyuta et al., 2013; Wang et al., 2017; Maoz et al., 2018)	Yes	Capability of compartmentalizati on and studying interactions between cell populations	Yes, however more time consuming than TW / Moderate	Same as porous- tube models	a binflux BBB chip Perivasc 1 Brain chip Brain B

Microfluidic chips (ECM-based)	(Brown <i>et al.</i> , 2015; Herland <i>et al.</i> , 2016, Xu <i>et al.</i> , 2016 <i>a</i> ; Adriani <i>et al.</i> , 2017; Partyka <i>et al.</i> , 2017)	Yes	Same as membrane- based microfluidic chips	Yes, however more time consuming than TW / Moderate	Utmost attmept at in vitro biomimicry (shear stress,3D geometry, ECM present)	I Medium Gel with astrocytes Gel with neurons ECs /Medium
--------------------------------------	--	-----	--	--	--	--

Supplementary Figure 2: Summary of in vitro models commonly used in BBB research

TW: Transwell; ECM: extracellular matrix; 2D: 2 dimensions; 3D: 3 dimensions; BMECs: brain microvasculature endothelial cells; PDMS: Polydimethylsiloxane; NVC: Neurovascular chip

Porous-tube models

- a. Graphical representation of a microcapillary-mimicking porouts tube that enables exchange with the external environment
- b. Top view of porous tubes, many tubes can run in paraller.

Microfluidic chips (membrane-based)

- a. A simplified graphical representation of the NVU
- b. A linked NVU-on-Chip. hBMECs (magenta) are cultured with brain astrocytes (blue) and pericytes (yellow) in the top compartment of the chips; human brain neuronal cells (green) and astrocytes (blue) are cultured in the lower compartment.

¹TW model reprinted with permission from (Canfield *et al.*, 2017); microfluidic chip model (membrane-based) reprinted with reuse permission from the original work of the corresponding authors from (Maoz *et al.*, 2018); porous-tube model model reprinted with permission from (Marino *et al.*, 2018); microfluidic model (ECM-based) reprinted with permission from (Adriani *et al.*, 2017);

² In this list, we consider studies that use TW in static cultures, there are, however, studies that implement flow in TW (Hinkel *et al.*, 2019).

³ In this list, microfluidic chips with a temporary membrane (i.e. a membrane that degrades over time) are not included, such as the work of (Tibbe *et al.*, 2018).



Not easily adapted to high-throughput assays





The microengineered nerve-on-a-chip device enabling the growth of parallel neural fibers bundles for physiological testing (from Huval et al., 2015).





Scheme of the BBB model, displying the apical chamber (vascular tissue) and the basolateral chamber (brain tissue cells). Porous architecture enables communication between the vascular and brain tissue).



Fluorescent reconstructions of neuronal fibers growth and migration immunostained for β -tubulin III (red) and glial cells (green). Nuclei are visualized by DAPI (blue) (from Huval et al., 2015).



CD-31 (green) stained endothelial cells and GFAP (red) stained astrocytes forming tight cells junctions in the SynBBB device (from Deosarkar et al., 2015) Ideal for clinical nerve compound action potential (CAP) and nerve fiber density (NFD) tests 3D in vitro system Succesfully adapted for electrophysiological recordings Only tested on rat tissue explants Not easily adapted to high-throughput assays

Possibility to maintain and image the micro-vessel for long periods of time Tissue compartment and microvascular channels that mimic the 3D-morphology of in vivo microvessels Porous interface that replace the use of membranes Size of the micro-channels Not easily adapted to high-throughput assays



Supplementary Figure 3: **Commercial OoC or chip providers.** Overview on commercial microfluidic chip providers, with a description and application of their device for brain application studies.