Supporting Information

IL-6-targeted Ultrasmall Superparamagnetic Iron Oxide Nanoparticles for Optimized MRI Detection of Atherosclerotic Vulnerable Plaques in Rabbits

Huaqiang Mo, ‡^{a, b} Chenxing Fu, ‡^{a, b} Zhiye Wu,^{a, b} Peng Liu,^{a, b} Zhibo Wen,^c Qingqing Hong,^{a, b} Yanbin Cai,^{*a, b} and Gongxin Li^{*a, b}

^a Department of Cardiology, Zhujiang Hospital, Southern Medical University, Guangzhou 510280, People's Republic of China; E-mail: ligxin@163.com.

^b Laboratory of Heart Center, Zhujiang Hospital, Sino-Japanese Cooperation Platform for Translational Research in Heart Failure, Guangdong Provincial Biomedical Engineering Technology Research Center for Cardiovascular Diseases, Guangzhou 510280, People's Republic of China; E-mail: skyer1@smu.edu.cn.

^c Department of Radiology, Zhujiang Hospital, Southern Medical University, Guangzhou 510280, People's Republic of China.

‡ These authors equally contributed to this work.



Fig. S1 TEM size (left), hydrodynamic size (right) of NC-USPIO and anti-IL-6-USPIO.



Fig. S2 Zeta potential of NC-USPIO and anti-IL-6-USPIO.



Fig.S3 The correlation between different concentrations and $1/T_2$ in Gd-DTPA.



Fig.S4 ELISA results show the activity of anti-IL-6-USPIO on OD450 value.



Fig. S5 In vitro cytotoxicity test of anti-IL-6-USPIO against HUVECs. CCK-8 assay results for evaluating the viability of the cells after incubation with different concentrations of Fe for 48 h.



Fig. S6 Confocal microscopy images of macrophages after 24 h incubation with LPS (A) and without LPS (B).



Fig. S7 HE staining in control (B2) and experimental (A2) group with pathological section of signal variation (Original magnification: $\times 200$ or $\times 100$), the two groups are respectively showed in Figure B1 and A1 (Original magnification: $\times 50$). Red and blue arrows in A show vulnerable plaque and stable plaque respectively.



Fig. S8 Masson staining in control (B2) and experimental (A2) group with pathological section of signal variation (Original magnification: $\times 200$ or $\times 100$), the two groups are respectively showed in Figure B1 and A1 (Original magnification: $\times 50$). Red and blue arrows in A show vulnerable plaque and stable plaque respectively.



Fig. S9 Prussian blue staining (A1×50, A2×200), Immunohistochemistry staining of IL-6 (B×50) and CD68 (C×50) in experimental group. black arrows in A show the iron deposition in atherosclerotic plaques.



Fig. S10 A) Blood analysis of Anti-IL-6-USPIO with different blood index. B) The timeactivity curve of ¹²⁵I-Anti-IL-6-USPIO in kidney and blood, respectively. C) The biodistribution of ¹²⁵I-Anti-IL-6-USPIO measured at 1, 12, 24, and 48 h post injection.

| (incar = SD, i otor is: rhan sear) | | | | |
|------------------------------------|------------------|--|------------------|--|
| Group | Plain scan | Time after NC-USPIO enhancement scan (h) | | |
| | | 24 | 48 | |
| Experiment (n=45) | 40.59 ± 1.25 | 28.09 ± 1.58* | 23.98 ± 2.53* | |
| Control(n=15) | 39.70 ± 1.60 | 39.53 ± 1.92 | 39.26 ± 1.89 | |

Tab. S1 Comparison of SNR in blood vessel walls before and after injection of NC-USPIO. (Mean \pm SD, *P<0.01 *vs.* Plain scan)

Tab. S2 Comparison of SNR in blood vessel walls before and after injection of anti-IL-6-USPIO. (Mean \pm SD, *P<0.01 *vs*. Plain scan)

| Group | Plain scan | Time after anti-IL-6- scar | USPIO enhancement n (h) |
|-------------------|------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------|
| | | 24 | 48 |
| Experiment (n=45) | 40.59 ± 1.25 | $21.94 \pm 2.47*$ | $16.88 \pm 2.47*$ |
| Control(n=15) | 39.70 ± 1.60 | 39.23 ± 2.19 | 39.05 ± 2.25 |

Tab. S3 Comparison of plaque detection rate in three contrast agents. (**P*=0.007 *vs*. Gd-DTPA, χ^2 =7.252; #*P*=0.039 *vs*. Gd-DTPA, χ^2 =4.270; ^*P*=0.714 (Fisher probabilities) *vs*. NC-USPIO)

| Contrast agent | Positive | Negative |
|-----------------|--------------|-----------|
| Anti-IL-6-USPIO | 42 (93.3) *^ | 3 (6.7) |
| NC-USPIO | 40 (88.9) # | 5 (11.1) |
| Gd-DTPA | 31 (68.9) | 14 (31.1) |

Tab. S4 Comparison of vulnerable plaque detection rate in three contrast agents. (*P=0.014 vs. Gd-DTPA, χ^2 =6.067; #P=0.200 vs. Gd-DTPA, χ^2 =1.641; ^P=0.350 (Fisher probabilities) vs. NC-USPIO)

| Contrast agent | Positive | Negative |
|-----------------|--------------|----------|
| Anti-IL-6-USPIO | 25 (96.2) *^ | 1 (3.8) |
| NC-USPIO | 22 (84.6) # | 4 (15.4) |
| Gd-DTPA | 17 (65.4) | 9 (34.6) |