Supplemental Material

Role of Hepatocyte- and Macrophage-Specific PPARγ in Hepatotoxicity Induced by Diethylhexyl Phthalate in Mice

Miao Xu, Yongning Li, Xiaohong Wang, Qiannan Zhang, Lei Wang, Xin Zhang, Wenming Cui, Xiaomin Han, Ning Ma, Haishan Li, Hongyun Fang, Song Tang, Jingguang Li, Zhaoping Liu, Hui Yang, and Xudong Jia

Table of Contents

Table S11. Dose response curves of PPRE in PPRE-THP-1 cells derived macrophages [mean stain area (μm^2); mean; n=3/treatment].

Table S12. Dose response curve of CD36 in PPRE-THP-1 cells derived macrophages [mean stain area (μm^2); mean, n=3/treatment)].

Table S13. Dose response curve of PPRE and CD36 in MEHP treated macrophages with/without PPARα/γ antagonists [mean stain area (μm^2); mean, n=3/treatment].

Table S14. Liver weight and liver index in WT and Hep-KO mice [mean ± SD (n)].

Table S15. Clinical chemistry panel in WT and Hep-KO mice [mean ± SD (n)].

Table S16. Concentration of hepatic TG in WT and Hep-KO mice [μg/mg tissue; mean ± SD (n)].

Table S17. Hepatic pathological severity evaluation in WT and Hep-KO mice [evaluating scores; mean ± SD (n)].

Table S18. Macrophages evaluation in liver sections from WT and Hep-KO mice [cell number per site; mean ± SD (n)].

Table S19. Liver weight and liver index in WT and Mac-KO mice [mean ± SD; n=5/group].

Table S20. Concentration of hepatic TG in WT and Mac-KO mice [μg/mg tissue; mean ± SD; n=5/group].

Table S21. Hepatic pathological severity and oil red staining evaluation in WT and Mac-KO mice [evaluating scores; mean ± SD; n=5/group].

Table S22. M2 macrophages analysis in liver of WT and Mac-KO mice using flow cytometry [% of $CD45^+$ cells; mean ± SD; n=5/group].

Table S23. Macrophages evaluation in liver sections from WT and Mac-KO mice [cell number per site; mean ± SD; n=5/group].

Table S24. Monocyte evaluation in liver from WT and Mac-KO mice [% of $CD45^+$ cells; mean ± SD; n=5/group].

Table S25. M2 macrophages polarization evaluation in BMDM from WT and Mac-KO mice [$CD206^+$ cells (%); mean ± SD; n=15 technical replicates/treatment].

Table S26. Relative expression of DEGs associated with M2 macrophages in MEHP treated macrophages [Z scores; n=3/treatment; provided as Excel Table S26].

Table S27. Relative expression of DEGs associated with PPAR pathway in MEHP treated macrophages [Z scores; n=3/treatment; provided as Excel Table S27].

Table S28. Characteristics of PPRE-THP-1 cells derived M2 macrophages [Mean stain area (μm2); mean ± SD; n=2/subtype].

Table S29. Dose response curves of PPRE/CD209/LD in DEHP/MEHP treated M2 macrophages [% of control; mean, n=3/treatment].

Table S30. Data for Figure 5G: Dose response curves of CD209 in PPARα/γ agonists treated M2 macrophages [Mean stain area ($μm^2$); mean; n=3/treatment].

Table S31. Data for Figure 5H: Dose response curves of CD209 in PPARα/γ antagonists treated M2 macrophages [Mean stain area ($μm^2$); mean, n=3/treatment].

Table S32. Response of CD209/CD36/LD in MEHP treated M2 macrophages with/without PPARα/γ antagonists [Mean stain area ($μm^2$); mean ± SD (n)].

Table S33. Data for Figure 6A: Transcriptomic profiling of livers from different mice models [DEGs; provided as Excel Table S33].

Table S34. Data for Figure 6B: Relative expression of DEGs associated with lipid metabolism in liver from different mice models [Z scores; n=4-6/group; provided as Excel Table S34].

Table S35. Pathway enrichment analysis of DEGs in liver from different mice models [enrichment scores].

Table S36. Data for Figure 6D: GO analysis of DEGs in livers from different mice models [provided as Excel Table S36].

Table S37. Superclass constitution of lipid metabolites in liver from different mice models [lipid counts; average ratio (DEHP/CT ratio)].

Table S38. Data for Figure 6F: Class constitution of lipid metabolites in livers from different mice models [lipid counts; average ratio (DEHP/CT ratio); provided as Excel Table S38].

Table S39. Evaluation of mitochondrial OXPHOS, fatty acid uptake and LD in HepG2 cells treated with MEHP with/without specific inhibitors [Mean stain area ($μm^2$); mean±SD; n=5/treatment].

Table S40. Evaluation of mitochondrial OXPHOS and LD in HepG2 cells treated with MEHP with/without M2 macrophages [Mean stain area (μm2); mean ± SD; n=5/treatment].

Table S41. Relative expression of DEGs associated with OXPHOS in HepG2 cells treated with MEHP with/without M2 macrophages [Z scores; n=2/treatment].

Table S42. Relative expression of DEGs associated with glycolysis in HepG2 cells treated with MEHP with/without M2 macrophages [Z scores; n=3/treatment].

Table S43. Relative expression of DEGs associated with lipid metabolism in HepG2 cells treated with MEHP with/without M2 macrophages [Z scores; n=3/treatment].

Table S44. Body weight fluctuation in DEHP treated mice [g; mean ± SD; n=10/group].

Table S45. Data for Figure S2B: Enriched KEGG pathways (level 2) in DEHP treated mice [number of genes; provided as Excel Table S45].

Table S46. Relative expression of DEGs associated with lipid metabolism in HepG2 cells treated with MEHP [Z scores; n=3/treatment].

Table S47. Relative expression of DEGs associated with PPAR pathway in DEHP treated mice [Z scores; n=6/group; provided as Excel Table S47].

Table S48. Pathway enrichment analysis of DEGs in HepG2 cells treated with MEHP [n=3/treatment].

Table S49. Clinical chemistry panel in WT and Mac-KO mice [mean ± SD (n)].

Table S50. Macrophages and neutrophils analysis in liver of WT and Mac-KO mice using flow cytometry [% of $CD45^+$ cells; mean ± SD (n)].

Table S51. Macrophages featured cytokines analysis in liver of WT and Mac-KO mice using flow cytometry [pg/mg protein; mean ± SD; n=5].

Table S52. $CD69^+$ M1 macrophages evaluation in BMDM from WT and Mac-KO mice [mean stain area (μm2); mean±SD (n)].

Table S53. Relative expression of DEGs associated with M1 macrophages in MEHP treated macrophages [Z scores; n=3/treatment; provided as Excel Table S53].

Table S54. Macrophages lipid metabolism analysis in liver of WT and Mac-KO mice using flow cytometry [% of $CD45^+$ cells; mean ± SD; n=5/treatment].

Figure S1. Gating strategy for flow cytometry of mouse liver.

Figure S2. The effect of DEHP on hepatic lipid metabolism.

Figure S3. Activation of PPAR isoforms by DEHP and MEHP at the molecular level.

Figure S4. The function of PPARγ in hepatic macrophages.

Figure S5. The effects of DEHP and MEHP on Macrophages polarization.

Additional File- Excel Document