Nanoscale Molecular Quantification of Stem Cell-Hydrogel Interactions

Stephanie A. Maynard^{1Δ}, Amy Gelmi^{1‡Δ}, Stacey C. Skaalure¹, Isaac J. Pence¹, Charlotte Lee-Reeves¹, Julia E. Sero^{1‡‡}, Thomas E. Whittaker¹, Molly M. Stevens¹*

¹Department of Materials, Department of Bioengineering and Institute of Biomedical Engineering, Imperial College London, London, SW7 2AZ, United Kingdom
[‡] Current address: Applied Chemistry and Environmental Science, School of Science, RMIT University, Melbourne, VIC 3001, Australia
^{‡‡} Current address: University of Bath, Claverton Down, Bath, BA2 7AY, United Kingdom Δ These authors contributed equally

*Corresponding author



Supplementary Information

Figure S1. Characterization of RGD peptide-functionalized hydrogels. (a) Young's modulus of hydrogels was measured using AFM. N = 14-16 gels for each condition. Mean \pm SD for each condition are 18 ± 2 kPa, 23 ± 3 kPa, and 22 ± 5 kPa, for 100%, 10%, and 0% RGD, respectively. (b) Fluoraldehyde assay of total peptide content in different hydrogel conditions. N = 4 measurements each from 4-5 gels per condition. Brown-Forsythe and Welch unequal variances unpaired one-way ANOVA, Dunnett's T3 multiple comparison test. Dot plots represent mean \pm SD. *p < 0.05, **p < 0.01, ***p < 0.001.



Figure S2. Analysis of number of cells bound to hydrogels. Total number of nuclei per cm², as measured from images taken at 10x magnification within a 1.2 x 1.2 mm region of hydrogel. N = 4 images per condition. Parametric unpaired two-tailed t-test. Box plots represent median \pm IQR, whiskers represent minimum and maximum. ns = not significant.



Figure S3. Average migration velocity of hMSCs. Average velocity of hMSC tracks on hydrogels of 100% and 10% RGD concentration, compared to TCP controls. N = 613-1203 tracks per condition. Non-parametric Kruskal-Wallis ANOVA with Dunn's multiple comparison test. Dot plots represent median \pm IQR. ***p < 0.001.



Figure S4. AFM force curve controls. Example force-distance curves of hMSC unbinding from 10% RGD hydrogel, 100% RGD hydrogel following blocking of the hMSC in RGD, 0% RGD (scrambled) hydrogel, RGD functionalized gold surface (Au-RGD), and unfunctionalized gold surface (Au).



Figure S5. AFM event forces for controls. Comparison of total event forces when hMSCs were interfaced with (a) 100% RGD hydrogel and 0% RGD (scrambled) hydrogel, (b) 100% RGD hydrogel and 100% RGD hydrogel following RGD blocking of hMSC, (c) Au and RGD-functionalized Au. (d) Average total and RGD-specific rupture events on 0% RGD hydrogel and RGD functionalized Au substrates. (e) Percentage of RGD rupture events per force displacement curve on 0% RGD hydrogel and RGD functionalized Au substrates. N = 3, n = 5 per condition.



Figure S6. AFM loading rate. (a) Representative force-distance curve showing a single molecule unbinding event, between hMSC and 100% RGD hydrogel with a retraction velocity of 0.1 μ m/s. (b) Dependence of the average rupture force measured for single molecule unbinding events on the 100% RGD hydrogel with loading rate. N = 3, n = 40 per retraction velocity condition.



Figure S7. dSTORM localization precision. (a) Localization precision of single AlexaFluor647 detections was measured, median = 16.7 nm. (b) Intensity profile of two clusters (line profile inset) gives a full width half maximum (FWHM) of 140-160 nm. Scale bar = 500 nm.



Figure S8. dSTORM cluster analysis for control. Analysis of total number of surface localizations, number of clusters and density of clusters of integrin $\alpha 5\beta 1$ per ROI for hMSCs in contact with untreated glass control and 100% RGD hydrogels. N = 5-15. Welch's unequal variances unpaired two-tailed t-test. Box plots represent median ± IQR. ns = not significant.