

Visualization of the maternal immune system at the maternal-fetal interface

Krop, J.

Citation

Krop, J. (2023, September 6). *Visualization of the maternal immune system at the maternal-fetal interface*. Retrieved from https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3638824

Version:	Publisher's Version
License:	<u>Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral</u> <u>thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University</u> <u>of Leiden</u>
Downloaded from:	https://hdl.handle.net/1887/3638824

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

J. Krop¹, J.M. Kapsenberg¹, C. van der Keur¹, F. Koning¹, S. Heidt¹, F.H.J. Claas¹, M.L.P. van der Hoorn², M. Eikmans¹

¹Department of Immunology, Leiden University Medical Center, Leiden, The Netherlands ²Department of Obstetrics, Leiden University Medical Center, Leiden, The Netherlands



A SPECIFIC SUBSET OF REGULATORY T CELLS WITH MULTIPLE CO-SIGNALLING MOLECULES IS LESS PREVALENT IN THE DECIDUA BASALIS OF WOMEN WITH A HISTORY OF UNEXPLAINED RECURRENT PREGNANCY LOSS

ABSTRACT

Recurrent pregnancy loss (RPL) occurs in 1%-2% of couples trying to conceive. Unexplained recurrent pregnancy loss (uRPL) is a heterogeneous condition affecting 50%-70% of RPL cases, of which disruption in maternal immune tolerance is thought to be a contributing factor. Previous data show that Treg frequencies and function are reduced in women with uRPL. Some women do experience a successful pregnancy after a history of uRPL. In this study we hypothesized that Treg frequencies are comparable to a control group of women without a history of RPL. Using a 42-marker CyTOF panel focussing on T cell markers we measured term decidua basalis and parietalis single-cell digests of women with a history of uRPL and now a successful pregnancy (case group) and from pregnant women without a history of RPL (control group). We found that Treg phenotypes do not significantly differ between these groups. Interestingly, we identified a subset of Tregs expressing multiple co-stimulatory molecules and co-inhibitory molecules simultaneously; 4-1BB, OX40, ICOS, CD27, CD28, CD95, CTLA-4, PD1 and TIGIT. This Treg subset was present in a significantly lower frequency in the basalis in cases compared to controls. The results suggest that decidual Treg frequencies in women with a history of uRPL during term pregnancy 'normalized' toward those seen in controls, instead of being lower, as previously described in 1st trimester decidua during pregnancy loss. The Treg subset we identified needs to be further studied to better understand the clinical implication.

INTRODUCTION

Recurrent pregnancy loss (RPL) affects 1%-2% of couples trying to conceive. In 50%-70% of these couples no underlying cause can be found, and this is indicated as unexplained RPL (uRPL) [1-3]. As of 2018, RPL is defined as two or more pregnancy losses before 24 weeks of gestation [4]. Some couples with a history of uRPL do get an ongoing pregnancy with a healthy live born child as result.

Pregnancy is a semi-allogeneic situation in which maternal immune regulation is instrumental to sustain a healthy pregnancy. Indeed, Treg cells are shown to be essential for healthy pregnancy in allogeneic mice opposed to mice with a syngeneic pregnancy[5]. Furthermore, the maternal-fetal interface represents an anti-inflammatory environment: M2 macrophages, uterine natural killer (NK) cells, and the Th2 pathway predominate, and fetal extravillous trophoblast (EVT) cells do not express the classical HLA antigens but they do upregulate the immune regulatory HLA-G molecule. Imbalance in this environment could lead to uRPL and therefore immunomodulatory treatments have been proposed for women with uRPL. However, efficacy of different treatments is not yet clear [6, 7]. Providing a better understanding of what is needed to sustain a successful pregnancy in women with uRPL aids in selecting suitable treatment candidates.

A systematic review by Keller et al. shows that the frequency and functionality of Tregs is decreased in women with uRPL compared to controls, both in peripheral blood and the decidua [8]. However, some women after uRPL have a successful pregnancy which led us to the question if their decidual Treg frequencies 'normalized' to those observed in healthy controls and if their phenotype is similar.

Previously we showed that women with a history of uRPL and a subsequent successful pregnancy demonstrate increased HLA-G expression locally at the maternal-fetal interface [9], but reduced soluble HLA-G levels in their plasma [10]. HLA-G is an important immune checkpoint molecule that can inhibit the effector function of T cells, NK cells, and myeloid cells [11]. This indicates that there are immunological differences between women with a history of uRPL and subsequent successful pregnancy and a control group of pregnant women with no history of uRPL.

Therefore, we studied if women with a history of uRPL and subsequent successful pregnancy have similar decidual Treg frequencies and phenotype compared to controls.

METHOD

Study material

Placentas of 3rd trimester pregnancies were obtained after uncomplicated pregnancy delivered by either spontaneous vaginal delivery (at home or in the Leiden University Medical Center; LUMC) or primary or secondary cesarean section in the LUMC. All samples were obtained after informed consent and the study was carried out in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki and with the guidelines issued by the Medical Ethics committee of the LUMC (protocol P11.196). Exclusion criteria for uRPL group and control group were BMI > 35, gestational diabetes, preeclampsia, fetal growth restriction, early ruptured membranes. Criteria for uRPL were at least 3 consecutive miscarriages and exclusion of all risk factors as stated in ESHRE guideline 2018 [4].

Decidual leukocytes from both the decidua basalis and parietalis were isolated as previously described [12]. In short, the decidual layers (basalis and parietalis) were macroscopically dissected from the placenta. Peripheral blood was mostly washed away from the tissue with PBS and finally with RPMI 1640 medium (Life Technologies), after which the tissue was minced and resuspended with Accutase (on RT, Gibco Life technologies). The tissue with Accutase was transferred to a C tube, homogenised, and incubated for 1 hour at 37°C. After digestion, cells were filtered through a 250-µm and 70-µm filter and washed with RPMI. Lastly, the leukocytes were isolated using Percoll (GE Healthcare) gradients and washed with RPMI, after which they were counted and kept overnight (4 to 12 hours) at 4°C before staining for mass cytometry. Before staining a reference sample was thawed and stained along in every staining round, to confirm marker stability and have a control staining differences.

Suspension mass cytometry

Cells were incubated with 20 U/ml Benzonase Nuclease (Sigma-Aldrich) for 5 minutes, filtered over a 70-µm filter, and counted. A maximum of 3.5 million cells were stained per tube. Next to that, an aliquot from the reference sample containing PBMCs, PHA stimulated PBMCs, IL-15 stimulated PBMCs was thawed and taken along in every staining to account for marker variation over time, staining mixes, and machine variations. The samples were stained for mass cytometry with the panel in Supplementary Table 1. Most antibodies were pre-conjugated from Fluidigm or self-conjugated using the MaxPar X8 Polymere Antibody Labeling Kit according to the manufacturer's protocol (Fluidigm, California, USA). 193Pt, 198Pt, 209Bi were conjugated as described before [13]. Antibody staining and data acquisition was performed as previously described (Van Unen, Immunity 2016) adding intracellular staining. In short, cells were incubated with 1 uM Cell-ID Intercalator-103Rh (Fluidigm) for 15' at room temperature (RT), washed taken-up in 45 μ l and incubated with 5 μ l of Fc receptor block (Biolegend) for 10'. Next, 50 µl of the antibody mix was added to incubate for 45' at RT. After staining, 2 ml of Stain buffer (Fluidigm) with 10U/ml Bezonase Nuclease was added and centrifuged after 5'. The cells were washed once more before continuing intracellular staining. For intracellular staining cells were incubated with 1 ml of FoxP3 Fix/Perm solution (Ebio) for 45' at 4°C. Next, cells were washed with perm buffer (Ebio) and taken up in 50 µl perm buffer after which 50 µl of the intracellular antibody mix was added for incubation of 30' at RT. Cells were washed once with perm buffer and twice with Stain buffer and incubated with 42 nM Cell-ID Intercalator in MaxPar Fix-Perm buffer for 60' at RT. Prior to acquisitions cells were washed three times with Stain buffer, once with milliQ (shortly before acquisition) and counted. Cells were taken up in a dilution of $7*10^{5}$ cells/ml in milliQ and EQ calibration beads (Fluidigm) for normalization were added 1:10 diluted and measured with the Helios mass cytometer (Fluidigm).

Immunofluorescence

FFPE sections of parietalis and basalis were deparaffinized by a series of xylene and ethanol after which antigen retrieval was performed by microwaving for 10 minutes with 10 mM citrate solution (pH 6.0). Slides were incubated with primary antibodies mouse-IgG1 anti-human FoxP3 (clone

236A/E7, eBioscience) and rabbit-IgG anti-human CD3 (clone ab828, Abcam). Lastly, goat-antirabbit IgG-AF546 (Invitrogen) and goat anti-mouse IgG1-AF488 (Invitrogen) where used to visualize the primary antibodies. Slides were covered using DAPI-ProLong Gold (Invitrogen, P36941) and a coverslip. Slides were scanned using the Panoramic MIDI2 scanner (Sysmex).

Data analysis

Statistical analysis was Performed using GraphPad Prism Version 9.3.1. Mann-Whitney test was used to assess statistical differences between the case and control group. P-values < 0.05 were considered to denote statistically significant differences.

Suspension mass cytometry

Reference samples between every measurement were compared to identify problems with marker expression. Living single CD45+ cells were selected using FlowJo, as described before [12]. Next, the single cell data were loaded in Cytosplore, hyperbolic-arcsinh transformation with cofactor 5 was performed and a five-level HSNE was performed, here the frequency of T cells within the CD45+ cells were calculated. Within the HSNE T cells were selected and zoomed into to level three HSNE, where CD4, CD8 and TCRyd T cell frequencies were calculated. All T cells were exported and uploaded to OMIQ. In OMIQ the frequency of Tregs was calculated within the CD3+CD4+ T cells. Furthermore, Treg numbers, CD45RO+ CD4+ cell excluding Tregs numbers (CD4 central memory/effector memory T cells; CD4-cm/em) and CD8+ T cell numbers were exported, and ratios were determined.

Immunofluorescence

CaseViewer (3DHistech) version 2.4 was used to select decidual area and in that area cells were counted that are positive for both the DAPI (nucleus staining), CD3 and FoxP3 and had a size between 4-10 μ m. Area and Treg cell numbers in that area were exported and the number of Tregs per mm² decidual area was calculated.

RESULTS

Patient Characteristics

Pregnancy from women with a history of uRPL (case group) had a mean gestational age (GA) of 40 weeks and 2 days, whereas pregnancy from women without a history of uRPL (control group) had an average GA of 41 weeks and 4 days (Table 1). Both the case and control group had a median parity of 1. The case group had a median of three miscarriages in their history and the control group none. Average age for the women in the case and control group was 31 and 32, respectively. BMI was not significantly different between cases (mean 24.5) and controls (mean 23.7).

T cell frequencies do not differ between cases and controls

Using HSNE we could identify the T cell population within the CD45 compartment. T cell frequencies did not significantly differ between the case and control group in both the basalis and

Parameter	History uRPL successful pregnancy	Control (no history of RPL)	
(medians)	(n=9)	(n=5)	p-Value
Gestation age (wks+days)	40+2 (37+3 - 41)	41+4 (39 – 42+1)	p = 0.134
Parity	1 (1-3)	1 (1-3)	p = 0.706
Previous miscarriages	3 (3-8)	0	p<0.001
Maternal age	31 (26 – 39)	32 (26 – 37)	p = 0.629
Maternal BMI	24.5 (18.7 – 26.2)	23.7 (21.1 – 33.5)	p> 0.999

Table 1. Medians (min-max) of patient characteristics, Mann Whitney test.

parietalis (Figure 1A). We did observe heterogeneity within both the cases and controls for CD4 and CD8 T cell frequencies within the CD45 compartment (data not shown).

Decidual CD4, CD8, and $\gamma\delta$ T cell frequencies within total T cells did not significantly differ between the case and control group (Figure 1B, C and D), neither was there a difference between basalis and parietalis T cell frequencies.

Women with a history of uRPL have similar decidual Treg frequencies compared to controls

Within the CD4 T cell compartment the frequencies of CD25highFoxP3+ Tregs was determined and the ratio between Treg and CD4-Tcm/em and between Treg and CD8 was calculated. No significant difference was observed for the Treg frequencies, Treg:CD4-Tcm/em ratio and Treg:CD8 ratio between cases and controls (Figure 2A). Both groups showed a considerable heterogeneity. To confirm our findings, we counted the CD3+FoxP3+ cells of the same samples in situ using IF and calculated the Treg cell counts per mm² decidual surface area. Again, we did not observe a significant difference between cases and controls (Figure 2B).

The Treg subset with co-signalling molecules in basalis is less prevalent in cases compared to controls

tSNE analysis on the Tregs show that these cells were FoxP3+, CD25+, CD127dim, and Helios+ (Figure 3A). Interestingly, we found a Treg subset that expresses the co-stimulatory immune checkpoint molecules 4-1BB, OX40, ICOS, CD27, CD28, and CD95. Furthermore, this subset also expressed the inhibitory checkpoint molecules CTLA-4, PD-1, and TIGIT, but lacked expression of TIM3 and LAG3. Lastly, they expressed CD39 and CD69 (Figure 2A). There were significantly more of these cells present in the control basalis Treg compartment than in the basalis of cases (p = 0.012) (Figure 3B).

DISCUSSION

We aimed to get a better understanding of the decidual maternal immune system needed for an ongoing pregnancy. We found that women with a history of uRPL and subsequent successful pregnancy have comparable decidual Treg frequencies to controls. However, we do find a Treg subset which expresses multiple costimulatory and co-inhibitory molecules. This subset is less prevalent in the case basalis compared to controls.



Figure 1. Decidual T cell frequencies in decidua parietalis (Par) and basalis (Bas) of women with a successful birth after uRPL (case) and controls. HSNE visualization and frequencies of T cells within the total CD45+ decidual immune cells show a wide spread between T cell frequencies between individuals (A). HSNE visualization and frequencies within the total T cells for CD4 T cells (B), CD8 T cells (C) and TCR $\gamma\delta$ T cells (D) shows no significant differences between cases and controls.

87



Figure 2. Decidual Treg frequencies in decidua parietalis (Par) and basalis (Bas) of women with a successful birth after uRPL (case) and controls. (A) Within the CD4+ T cell population CD25+FoxP3+ Treg cells are gated, Treg frequencies are plotted as are ratios between Treg cells and CD4-cm/em and Treg cells and CD8 cells. No significant differences are observed between cases and controls. (B) IF staining visualized CD3+ cells (red) and CD3+FoxP3+ double positive Treg cells (yellow). Treg counts per mm2 were not significantly different between cases and controls.

Literature studying women with a successful pregnancy after uRPL is limited and mainly focuses on peripheral blood rather than the local immune system. There are several studies focusing on decidual Tregs in women with uRPL: these studies have been put together in a meta-analysis by Keller et al. [8]. The meta-analysis shows that women with uRPL have less decidual Tregs compared to controls, both in the decidua and in peripheral blood. We found that women with a successful pregnancy after uRPL display similar Treg frequencies and numbers per mm² decidua tissue compared to controls. This may suggest that these women needed to establish normal (similar as controls) Treg frequencies to sustain a successful pregnancy.

Next to Treg frequencies we compared the Treg:CD4-Tcm/em and Treg:CD8 ratios between the cases and controls, which did not show a significant difference. However, Treg frequencies and Treg:Tcm/em ratio were increased in the decidua parietalis in the cases compared to the decidua basalis. It could be due to sample size that this was not significant in the control group. Previous studies also found higher Treg frequencies in the decidua parietalis compared to the basalis [12, 14]. Our group previously showed a difference in immune cell networks in the decidua basalis and parietalis. The network for the parietalis showed Treg cells in the same network as CD4-Tem and CD4-Tcm, while this was less apparent in the decidua basalis where the innate immune cells were predominantly present [12]. This indicates that different immune cell interactions in the basalis



4



Figure 3. Treg phenotypes. (A) tSNE visualization of 23 markers from the T cells panel. Treg cells from the decidua basalis and parietalis, and cases and controls are equally distributed over the tSNE. Encircled is a cluster of cells that expresses several co-stimulatory as co-inhibitory (co-signaling Treg subset) molecules simultaneously. This co-signaling Treg subset shows significantly increased frequencies in the basalis of controls compared to the basalis of cases (p = 0.012, Mann-Whitney test).

compared to the parietalis contributes to the two different microenvironments. Other than a different immune cell composition [14], differences in collagen fibril composition [15], blood vessel presence, and density of lymphatic vessels [16] indicate that the basal landscape is vastly different from the parietalis.

When focusing on the Treg phenotype we noticed that the Tregs are Helios positive, which indicates they have a stable Treg phenotype [17, 18]. They express CD39 and CD69 suggesting they are highly active and suppressive [19-21]. Interestingly, we found a Treg subset expressing multiple co-stimulatory and co-inhibitory molecules. This Treg subset was present in lower frequencies in the decidua basalis in women with a history of uRPL compared to controls. Next to TCR recognition, co-stimulation is required for Treg development and function [22]. Initially, it was thought that only CD28 was the second signalling molecule next to TCR recognition. However, now it has become clear that there are many different co-signals that play a role in Treg activation and differentiation [23]. We measured multiple co-signalling molecules to get an idea of the potential functional capacity of the Treg cells. However, since the Treg subset we found expresses many different co-signalling molecules to get an idea of the potential functional capacity of the Treg cells. However, which ligands they have and other microenvironmental factors such as cytokine presence.

The procedure of counting the Treg cells in the IF slides highlighted the rarity of Treg cells in the decidua, and within this population only 5%-15% expresses a wide assortment of co-signalling molecules. Due to this low number, studying their functional capacity is paramount to determining their importance in creating an immune regulatory environment.

uRPL is a very heterogeneous group where likely not every couple has the same underlying cause. For that matter, high sample size could aid in defining different groups of women with uRPL. We acknowledge the limitations of our study, which include the few cases we studied, limiting the rigor of our findings based on environmental factors, mode of delivery and parity of our samples. Furthermore, in future studies paired miscarriage material could confirm if these women previously had reduced Treg frequencies which normalized in this pregnancy. A comment that needs to be made concerning the current study is that we looked at third trimester decidua, which has a different immunological environment than first trimester decidua [13]. Future research could use paired peripheral blood of women experiencing a pregnancy loss and following a subsequent successful pregnancy to see if Treg frequencies are already different in 1st trimester and if they increase in term pregnancy.

In summary, we found that Treg frequencies did not differ between cases and controls. We did observe a Treg subset expressing multiple co-stimulatory and co-inhibitory molecules, which has a lower abundance in decidua basalis of women with a history of uRPL compared to that of controls. Functional testing is needed to identify their functional capacity.

REFERENCES

1. Diejomaoh, M.F., Recurrent spontaneous miscarriage is still a challenging diagnostic and therapeutic quagmire. Med Princ Pract, 2015. 24 Suppl 1(Suppl 1): p. 38-55.

- 2. Youssef, A., et al., Defining recurrent pregnancy loss: associated factors and prognosis in couples with two versus three or more pregnancy losses. Reproductive BioMedicine Online, 2020. **41**(4): p. 679-685.
- Medicine, P.C.o.t.A.S.f.R., Evaluation and treatment of recurrent pregnancy loss: a committee opinion. Fertil Steril, 2012. 98(5): p. 1103-11.
- 4. RPL, T.E.G.G.o., et al., ESHRE guideline: recurrent pregnancy loss. Human Reproduction Open, 2018. 2018(2).
- 5. Aluvihare, V.R., M. Kallikourdis, and A.G. Betz, *Regulatory T cells mediate maternal tolerance to the fetus*. Nature Immunology, 2004. **5**(3): p. 266-271.
- 6. Genest, G., et al., Immunotherapy for recurrent pregnancy loss: a reappraisal. F&S Reviews, 2022. 3(1): p. 24-41.
- 7. Mekinian, A., et al., Unexplained Recurrent Miscarriage and Recurrent Implantation Failure: Is There a Place for Immunomodulation? Am J Reprod Immunol, 2016. **76**(1): p. 8-28.
- Keller, C.C., et al., Recurrent miscarriages and the association with regulatory T cells; A systematic review. Journal of Reproductive Immunology, 2020. 139: p. 103105.
- Craenmehr, M.H.C., et al., Increased HLA-G Expression in Term Placenta of Women with a History of Recurrent Miscarriage Despite Their Genetic Predisposition to Decreased HLA-G Levels. International journal of molecular sciences, 2019. 20(3): p. 625.
- 10. Krop, J., et al., Soluble HLA-G blood levels are not increased during ongoing pregnancy in women with a history of recurrent pregnancy loss. J Reprod Immunol, 2022. **153**: p. 103665.
- 11. Carosella, E.D., et al., Chapter Two HLA-G: An Immune Checkpoint Molecule, in Advances in Immunology, F.W. Alt, Editor. 2015, Academic Press. p. 33-144.
- 12. van der Zwan, A., et al., Visualizing Dynamic Changes at the Maternal-Fetal Interface Throughout Human Pregnancy by Mass Cytometry. Frontiers in Immunology, 2020. **11**(2430).
- 13. Krop, J., et al., Imaging mass cytometry reveals the prominent role of myeloid cells at the maternal-fetal interface. iScience, 2022. **25**(7): p. 104648.
- Solders, M., et al., Maternal Adaptive Immune Cells in Decidua Parietalis Display a More Activated and Coinhibitory Phenotype Compared to Decidua Basalis. Stem Cells Int, 2017. 2017: p. 8010961.
- Sinai Talaulikar, V., et al., Differences in collagen ultrastructure of human first trimester decidua basalis and parietalis: Implications for trophoblastic invasion of the placental bed. Journal of Obstetrics and Gynaecology Research, 2014. 40(1): p. 80-88.
- Genbačev, O., L. Vićovac, and N. Larocque, The role of chorionic cytotrophoblasts in the smooth chorion fusion with parietal decidua. Placenta, 2015. 36(7): p. 716-22.
- 17. Kim, H.-J., et al., Stable inhibitory activity of regulatory T cells requires the transcription factor Helios. Science, 2015. **350**(6258): p. 334-339.
- 18. Lam, A.J., et al., Helios is a marker, not a driver, of human Treg stability. Eur J Immunol, 2022. 52(1): p. 75-84.
- Ahlmanner, F., et al., CD39(+) regulatory T cells accumulate in colon adenocarcinomas and display markers of increased suppressive function. Oncotarget, 2018. 9(97): p. 36993-37007.
- 20. Cortés, J.R., et al., Maintenance of immune tolerance by Foxp3+ regulatory T cells requires CD69 expression. Journal of Autoimmunity, 2014. 55: p. 51-62.
- Yu, L., et al., CD69 enhances immunosuppressive function of regulatory T-cells and attenuates colitis by prompting IL-10 production. Cell Death & Disease, 2018. 9(9): p. 905.
- 22. Bretscher, P. and M. Cohn, A theory of self-nonself discrimination. Science, 1970. 169(3950): p. 1042-9.
- 23. Bour-Jordan, H. and J.A. Bluestone, *Regulating the regulators: costimulatory signals control the homeostasis and function of regulatory T cells.* Immunol Rev, 2009. **229**(1): p. 41-66.

CD45 89y H130 3089003B Fluidigm mouse Live/death 103Rh 103Rh 3089003B Fluidigm mouse Live/death 103Rh TB21 McM-56 (10069) Introgen mouse TGF-b 115in TB21 McA797 Biolegend mouse TGF-b 141 Pr C034E3 3141003A Fluidigm mouse CR6 (CD196) 141 Pr C034E3 3141003A Fluidigm mouse CP4 143 Nd ACT35 350002 Biolegend mouse G7034 143 Nd RF14 314001B Fluidigm mouse CD4 143 Nd RPA-14 3145001B Fluidigm mouse CD54 144 Nd RPA-13 3145001B Fluidigm mouse CD531 (LAC3) 145 Nd RPA-13 3145001B Fluidigm mouse CD532 (LAC3) 143 Nd RPA-18 3145001B Fluidigm mouse CD54		marker	metal	clone	cat#	Сотрапу	isotype	dilution	on reference sample
n 103Rh Huidigm 114-qdotc55 MEM-56 C10069 Invitrogen mouse 15h TB21 MCA797 Bio-rad mouse 165 TB21 MCA797 Bio-rad mouse 175h TB21 MCA797 Bio-rad mouse 1965 141 Pr C034E3 3141003A Huidigm mouse 440 ACT35 350002 Biolegend mouse 143 Nd C131 MA1-80734 Invitrogen mouse 145 Nd RPA-14 314501B Fluidigm mouse 145 Nd RPA-14 314501B Fluidigm mouse 145 Nd RPA-14 314501B Fluidigm mouse 146 Nd RPA-13 345001B Fluidigm mouse 147 Sm 116265 369302 Biolegend mouse 148 Nd RBSA43 16-9500-82 Invitrogen mouse 147 Sm 202 3149010B Fluidigm	CD45		89y	HI30	3089003B	Fluidigm	mouse	150	yes
I14-qdot655 MEM-56 Q10069 Invitrogen mouse I15In TB21 MCA797 Bio-rad mouse J15In TB21 MCA797 Bio-rad mouse J15In TB21 MCA797 Bio-rad mouse X40) 141 Pr C034E3 3141003A Huidigm mouse X40) 143 Nd GB11 MA1-80734 Invitrogen mouse × 143 Nd B-D48 MB5335051 mybiosource mouse × 144 Nd FN50 31440188 Fluidigm mouse × 144 Nd RPA-14 31450018 Fluidigm mouse × 144 Nd RPA-18 31460018 Fluidigm mouse × 147 Sm 1C3C65 36902 Biolegend mouse × 147 Sm 1C3C65 36902 Biolegend mouse × 147 Sm 1C3C65 36902 Biolegend mouse × <td< td=""><td>Live/dea</td><td>÷</td><td>103Rh</td><td></td><td></td><td>Fluidigm</td><td></td><td>500</td><td>yes</td></td<>	Live/dea	÷	103Rh			Fluidigm		500	yes
IISIn TB21 MCA797 Bio-rad mouse D196) 141 Pr G034E3 3141003A Fluidigm mouse X40) 142 Nd ACT35 350002 Biolegend mouse X40) 142 Nd ACT35 350002 Biolegend mouse x81 143 Nd CB11 MA1-80734 Invitrogen mouse x8 143 Nd B-D48 MS335051 mybiosource mouse x8 143 Nd FN50 31440188 Fluidigm mouse x145 Nd RPA-T4 3146018 Fluidigm mouse 45 Nd RPA-T8 3146018 Fluidigm mouse AC3) 147 Sm 1162C65 36302 Biolegend mouse AC3) 147 Sm 1163C65 363002 Biolegend mouse AC3) 147 Sm 1162C65 Biolegend mouse mouse AC3) 150 Ng 1669C66 mouse mouse TL	CD45RA		114-qdot655	MEM-56	Q10069	Invitrogen	mouse	200	yes
D19(6) 141 Pr C034E3 3141003A Fluidigm mouse DX40) 142 Nd ACT35 350002 Biolegend mouse DX41 ACT35 350002 Biolegend mouse Pe B 143 Nd GB11 MA1-80734 Invitrogen mouse Pe B 143 Nd B-D48 MB5335051 mybiosource mouse Pe B 143 Nd B-D48 MB5335051 mybiosource mouse 145 Nd RP-T4 3140018 Fluidigm mouse 145 Nd MB5A43 16-9500-82 Invitrogen mouse 147 Nd MB5A43 16-9500-82 Invitrogen mouse 148 Nd MB5A43 16-9500-82 Invitrogen mouse 148 Nd MB5A43 16-9500-82 Invitrogen mouse 147 Md MB5A43 16-9500-82 Invitrogen mouse 147 Md MB5A43 16-9500-82 Invitrogen mouse 147 Md 180018	TGF-b		115In	TB21	MCA797	Bio-rad	mouse	40	ОП
OX40 142 Nd $ACT35$ 350002 $Biolegend$ mouse ne B 143 Nd $CB11$ $AA1-80734$ Invitrogen mouse ne B 143 Nd $B-D48$ $M85335051$ mybiosource mouse ne B 143 Nd $B-D48$ $M85335051$ mybiosource mouse 144 Nd $FN50$ 31440188 $Fluidigm$ mouse 145 Nd $RPA-T4$ 31450018 $Fluidigm$ mouse 146 Nd $RPA-T4$ 31450018 $Fluidigm$ mouse 148 Nd $RPA-T4$ 31450018 $Fluidigm$ mouse LAG3) 147 Sm $11C3C65$ 369502 369602 $Biolegend$ mouse LAG3) 147 Sm $11C3C65$ 31490108 $Fluidigm$ mouse LAG3) 150 Su $2A3$ 31490108 $Fluidigm$ mouse LAG3) 150 Su 23330200 $8106gend$ mouse 71030 Stobu 5300	CCR6 (C	CD196)	141 Pr	G034E3	3141003A	Fluidigm	mouse	100	yes
ne B 143 Nd GB11 MA1-80734 Invitrogen mouse ne 143 Nd B-D48 MB5335051 mybiosource mouse 144 Nd FN50 3144018B Fluidigm mouse 144 Nd FN50 3144018B Fluidigm mouse 145 Nd RPA-T4 3145001B Fluidigm mouse 145 Nd RPA-T4 3145001B Fluidigm mouse 146 Nd RPA-T4 3145001B Fluidigm mouse 147 Sm 1162G65 369302 369602 Biolegend mouse LAG3) 147 Sm 2A3 3149010B Fluidigm mouse LAG3 150 Dy BN13 369602 Biolegend mouse CTLA-4) 150 Dy BN13 369602 Biolegend mouse ICOS) 151 Eu 233 3151020C Fluidigm mouse ICOS 151 Eu 2398.4A 3153014B Fluidigm mouse ICOS </td <td>CD134 (</td> <td>OX40)</td> <td>142 Nd</td> <td>ACT35</td> <td>350002</td> <td>Biolegend</td> <td>mouse</td> <td>100</td> <td>yes</td>	CD134 (OX40)	142 Nd	ACT35	350002	Biolegend	mouse	100	yes
e 143 Nd B-D48 MBS335051 mybiosource mouse 144 Nd FN50 3144018B Fluidigm mouse 145 Nd FN50 3144018B Fluidigm mouse 145 Nd RPA-T4 3145001B Fluidigm mouse 145 Nd RPA-T8 3145001B Fluidigm mouse 146 Nd RPA-T8 3145001B Fluidigm mouse 146 Nd RPA-T8 3145001B Fluidigm mouse 147 M IS0Dy BN13 36902 Biolegend mouse CTLA-4) IS0Dy BN13 369602 Fluidigm mouse CTLA-4) IS0Dy BN13 369602 Fluidigm mouse ICOS) IS1E C398.4A 3151020C Fluidigm mouse ICOS) IS1E C398.4A 3151020C Fluidigm mouse ICOS) IS1E C398.4A 3153014B Fluidigm mouse ICOS IS2 SM	granzyr	ne B	143 Nd	GB11	MA1-80734	Invitrogen	mouse	200	yes
144 Nd FN50 3144018B Fluidigm mouse 145 Nd RPA-T4 3145001B Fluidigm mouse 145 Nd RPA-T8 3145001B Fluidigm mouse 146 Nd RPA-T8 3145001B Fluidigm mouse 146 Nd RPA-T8 3145001B Fluidigm mouse 146 Nd RPA-T8 3145001B Fluidigm mouse 147 Sm 1732G65 369302 Biolegend mouse 148 Nd MBSA43 16-9500-82 Invitrogen mouse 149 Sm 2A3 3149010B Fluidigm mouse (COS) 151 Eu 2A3 3151020C Fluidigm mouse (ICOS) 151 Eu C398.4A 3151020C Fluidigm mouse (ICOS) 151 Eu C398.4A 3151020C Fluidigm mouse (ICOS) 151 Eu C398.4A 3153014B Fluidigm mouse (ICM3) 154 Sm Fluidigm mouse <td>perfori</td> <td>пе</td> <td>143 Nd</td> <td>B-D48</td> <td>MBS335051</td> <td>mybiosource</td> <td>mouse</td> <td></td> <td>yes</td>	perfori	пе	143 Nd	B-D48	MBS335051	mybiosource	mouse		yes
145 Nd RPA-T4 3145001B Fluidigm mouse 146 Nd RPA-T8 3145001B Fluidigm mouse 146 Nd RPA-T8 3146001B Fluidigm mouse 146 Nd RPA-T8 345001B Fluidigm mouse 147 Sm 11C3C65 369302 Biolegend mouse 148 Nd MBSA43 16-9500-82 Invitrogen mouse 148 Nd MBSA43 16-9500-82 Invitrogen mouse 148 Nd MBSA43 16-9500-82 Invitrogen mouse (CCIJ-4J) 150 Dy BN13 36902 Biolegend mouse (ICOS) 151 Eu C398.4A 3151020C Fluidigm mouse (ICOS) 151 Eu C398.4A 315020C Fluidigm mouse (ICOS) 151 Eu C398.4A 3153014B Fluidigm mouse (ITM3) 154 Sm Fluidigm mouse mouse mouse (ITM3) 154 Sm 3	CD69		144 Nd	FN50	3144018B	Fluidigm	mouse	300	yes
146 Nd RPA-T8 3146001B Fluidigm mouse (LAG3) 147 Sm 11C3G65 369302 Biolegend mouse 148 Nd MBSA43 16-9500-82 Invitrogen mouse 148 Nd MBSA43 16-9500-82 Invitrogen mouse 148 Nd MBSA43 16-9500-82 Invitrogen mouse 149 Sm 2A3 3149010B Fluidigm mouse (CTLA-4) 150 Dy BN13 369602 Biolegend mouse (ICOS) 151 Eu C398.4A 3151020C Fluidigm mouse (ICOS) 151 Eu C398.4A 3153014B Fluidigm mouse (ITM3) 154 Sm 7170 3153014B Fluidigm mouse (TIM3) 154 Sm 7560 Biolegend mouse mouse (ITM3) 154 Sm 7560 Biolegend mouse mouse (TIM3) 156 Gd Ber-ACTB 350202 Biolegend mouse <	CD4		145 Nd	RPA-T4	3145001B	Fluidigm	mouse	100	yes
(LdG3) 147 Sm 11C3C65 369302 Biolegend mouse 148 Nd MBSA43 16-9500-82 Invitrogen mouse 148 Nd MBSA43 16-9500-82 Invitrogen mouse 149 Sm 2A3 3149010B Fluidigm mouse (CTLA-4) 150 Dy BNI3 369602 Biolegend mouse (TLA-4) 155 Dy BN13 369602 Biolegend mouse (TCO3) 151 Eu C398.4A 3151020C Fluidigm mouse 152 Sm 11F2 3152008B Fluidigm mouse 153 Eu CD7-6B7 3153014B Fluidigm mouse (TIM3) 154 Sm F38-2E2 3154010B Fluidigm mouse (TIM3) 154 Sm F38-2E2 3154010B Fluidigm mouse (TIM3) 154 Sm F38-2E2 3154010B Fluidigm mouse (TIM3) 154 Sm 87020 Biolegend mouse mouse	CD8a		146 Nd	RPA-T8	3146001B	Fluidigm	mouse	200	yes
148 Nd MBSA43 16-9500-82 Invitrogen mouse 149 Sm 2A3 3149010B Fluidigm mouse 149 Sm 2A3 3149010B Fluidigm mouse (CTLA-4) 150 Dy BN13 369602 Biolegend mouse (CTLA-4) 150 Dy BN13 369602 Biolegend mouse 151 Lu C398.4A 3151020C Fluidigm mouse 152 Sm 11F2 3152008B Fluidigm mouse 153 Eu CD7-6B7 3153014B Fluidigm mouse (TIM3) 154 Sm F38-2E2 3154010B Fluidigm mouse (TIM3) 154 Sm F38-2E2 3156020C Biolegend mouse (TIM3) 155 Gd Ber-ACT8 350202 Biolegend mouse (LIB1) 156 Gd CH1/75 3156020C Fluidigm mouse 157 Gd 2H7 302302 Biolegend mouse 157 Gd 2H7	CD223	(LAG3)	147 Sm	11C3C65	369302	Biolegend	mouse	40	yes
149 Sm 2A3 3149010B Fluidigm mouse (CTLA-4) 150 Dy BN13 369602 Biolegend mouse (ICOS) 151 Eu C398.4A 3151020C Fluidigm mouse (ICOS) 151 Eu C398.4A 3151020C Fluidigm mouse (ICOS) 152 Sm 11F2 3152008B Fluidigm mouse 1 152 Sm 11F2 3152014B Fluidigm mouse 0(TIM3) 154 Sm 707-6B7 3153014B Fluidigm mouse 0(TIM3) 154 Sm F38-2E2 3154010B Fluidigm mouse 0(TIM3) 154 Sm F38-2E2 3156020C Fluidigm mouse 0(TIM3) 154 SG Ber-ACTB 3520202 Biolegend mouse ILRB1) 156 Gd 2H7 3156020C Fluidigm mouse ILRB1) 155 Gd Brolegend mouse mouse mouse ILRB1 157 Gd Bu15	TIGIT		148 Nd	MBSA43	16-9500-82	Invitrogen	mouse	50	yes
(CTLA-4) I50 Dy BNI3 369602 Biolegend mouse (ICOS) I51 Eu C398.4A 3151020C Fluidigm hamster (ICOS) 151 Eu C398.4A 3151020C Fluidigm hamster 1 152 Sm 11F2 3152008B Fluidigm mouse 153 Eu CD7-6B7 3153014B Fluidigm mouse •(TIM3) 154 Sm F38-2E2 3154010B Fluidigm mouse •(TIM3) 154 Sm F38-2E2 3154010B Fluidigm mouse •(TIM3) 155 Gd Ber-ACT8 350202 Biolegend mouse ILRB1) 156 Gd CH1/75 3156020C Fluidigm mouse IS7 Gd 2H7 302302 Biolegend mouse I57 Gd Bu15 337202 Biolegend mouse I57 Gd Bu15 337202 Biolegend mouse I57 Gd Bu15 337202 Biolegend mouse	CD25		149 Sm	2A3	3149010B	Fluidigm	mouse	200	yes
(ICOS) IST Eu C398.4A 3151020C Fluidigm hamster I 152 Sm 11F2 31500208 Fluidigm mouse 153 Eu CD7-6B7 3153014B Fluidigm mouse 153 Eu CD7-6B7 3153014B Fluidigm mouse 153 Eu CD7-6B7 3153014B Fluidigm mouse 154 Sm F38-2E2 3154010B Fluidigm mouse 155 Gd Ber-ACT8 350202 Biolegend mouse ILRBI) 155 Gd CH1/75 3156020C Fluidigm mouse 157 Gd 2H7 302302 Biolegend mouse 157 Gd Bu15 37202 Biolegend mouse (CTRN) 158 Gd 484-1 3158013C Fluidigm m	CD152	(CTLA-4)	150 Dy	BNI3	369602	Biolegend	mouse		yes
IS2 Sm IIF2 31S2008B Fluidigm mouse 153 Eu CD7-6B7 31S3014B Fluidigm mouse 153 Eu CD7-6B7 31S3014B Fluidigm mouse (TIM3) 154 Sm F38-2E2 3154010B Fluidigm mouse 155 Gd Ber-ACT8 350202 Biolegend mouse 157 Gd CH1/75 3156020C Fluidigm mouse 157 Gd 2H7 302302 Biolegend mouse 157 Gd Bu15 37202 Biolegend mouse 157 Cd Bu15 37202 Biolegend mouse (CTR7) 159 Tb	CD278	(ICOS)	151 Eu	C398.4A	3151020C	Fluidigm	hamster	50	yes
IS3 Eu CD7-6B7 3153014B Fluidigm mouse (TIM3) 154 Sm F38-2E2 3154010B Fluidigm mouse 155 Gd Ber-ACT8 350202 Biolegend mouse LRB1) 155 Gd CH1/75 3156020C Fluidigm mouse LRB1) 155 Gd CH1/75 3156020C Fluidigm mouse 157 Gd 2H7 302302 Biolegend mouse 157 Gd Bu15 37202 Biolegend mouse 157 Gd Bu15 37702 Biolegend mouse (4-1B) 158 Gd 4B4-1 3158013C Fluidigm mouse (CCR7) 159 Tb C043H7 3159003A Fluidigm mouse	TCRgd		152 Sm	11F2	3152008B	Fluidigm	mouse	50	yes
(TIM3) 154 Sm F38-2E2 3154010B Fluidigm mouse 155 Gd Ber-ACT8 350202 Biolegend mouse ILRB1) 156 Gd GHI/75 3156020C Fluidigm mouse ILRB1) 155 Gd 2H7 302302 Biolegend mouse IS7 Gd 2H7 302302 Biolegend mouse 157 Gd Bu15 337202 Biolegend mouse (4-1B) 158 Gd 484-1 3158013C Fluidigm mouse (CCR7) 159 Tb G043H7 3159003A Fluidigm mouse	CD7		153 Eu	CD7-6B7	3153014B	Fluidigm	mouse	300	yes
IS5 Gd Ber-ACT8 350202 Biolegend mouse ILRB1) 156 Gd GH/75 3156020C Fluidigm mouse IS7 Gd 2H7 302302 Biolegend mouse 157 Gd 2H7 302302 Biolegend mouse 157 Gd Bu15 337202 Biolegend mouse (4-1B) 158 Gd 484-1 3158013C Fluidigm mouse (CCR7) 159 Tb G043H7 3159003A Fluidigm mouse	CD366	(TIM3)	154 Sm	F38-2E2	3154010B	Fluidigm	mouse	50	yes
ILRB1) 156 Gd GHI/75 3156020C Fluidigm mouse 157 Gd 2H7 302302 Biolegend mouse 157 Gd Bu15 337202 Biolegend mouse (4-1B8) 158 Gd 4B4-1 3158013C Fluidigm mouse (CCR7) 159 Tb G043H7 3159003A Fluidigm mouse	CD103		155 Gd	Ber-ACT8	350202	Biolegend	mouse	50	yes
157 Cd 2H7 302302 Biolegend mouse 157 Cd Bu15 337202 Biolegend mouse (4-1BB) 158 Cd 4B4-1 3158013C Fluidigm mouse (CCR7) 159 Tb C043H7 3159003A Fluidigm mouse	ILT2 (L	ILRB1)	156 Gd	GHI/75	3156020C	Fluidigm	mouse	100	yes
157 Cd Bu15 337202 Biolegend mouse (4-1BB) 158 Cd 4B4-1 3158013C Fluidigm mouse (CCR7) 159 Tb G043H7 3159003A Fluidigm mouse	CD20		157 Gd	2H7	302302	Biolegend	mouse	200	yes
(4-1BB) 158 Gd 4B4-1 3158013C Fluidigm mouse (CCR7) 159 Tb G043H7 3159003A Fluidigm mouse	CD11c		157 Gd	Bu15	337202	Biolegend	mouse		yes
CCRZ) 159 Tb G043H7 3159003A Fluidiam mouse	CD137 ((4-1BB)	158 Gd	484-1	3158013C	Fluidigm	mouse	50	yes
	CD197	(CCR7)	159 Tb	G043H7	3159003A	Fluidigm	mouse	100	yes

Supplementary Table 1. Suspension mass cytometry panel

SUPPLEMENTARY DATA

4

CHAPTER 4

intracellular	marker	metal	clone	cat#	Сотрапу	isotype	dilution	on reference sample
yes	Tbet	160 Gd	4B10	3160010C	Fluidigm	mouse	100	yes
	KLRG1	161 Dy	REA261	120-014-229	Miltenyi Biotec	human	50	yes
yes	FOXp3	162 Dy	259D/C7	3162024A	Fluidigm	mouse	75	yes
yes	EOMES	163 Dy	WD1928	14-4877-82	eBioscience	mouse	100	yes
	CD161	164 Dy	HP-3G10	3164009B	Fluidigm	mouse	200	yes
	CD127	165 Ho	AO19D5	3165008B	Fluidigm	mouse	400	yes
	CD39	166 Er	A1	328202	Biolegend	mouse	200	yes
	CD27	167 Er	O323	3167002B	Fluidigm	mouse	200	yes
yes	Helios	168 Er	22F6	137202	Biolegend	hamster	75	yes
yes	GATA3	169 Tm	REA174	130-108-061	Miltenyi Biotec	human	50	yes
	CD3	170 Er	UCHTI	3170001B	Fluidigm	mouse	150	yes
	CD28	171 Yb	CD28.2	302902 or 302937	Biolegend	mouse	150	yes
	CD38	172 Yb	HIT2	3172007B	Fluidigm	mouse	500	yes
	CD45RO	173 Yb	UCHL1	304239	Biolegend	mouse	150	yes
yes	RORyt	174 Yb	028-835	562197	BD Bioscience	mouse	40	ОП
	CD279 (PD-1)	175 Lu	EH 12.2H7	3175008B	Fluidigm	mouse	150	yes
	CD56	176 Yb	NCAM16.2	3176008B	Fluidigm	mouse	200	yes
yes	DNA1	1911r			Fluidigm		2500	yes
yes	DNA2	193Ir			Fluidigm		2500	yes
	CD57	194 Pt	hcd57	322325	Biolegend	mouse	100	yes
	HLA-DR	198 Pt	L243	307602	Biolegend	mouse	150	yes
	CD95 (Fas)	209Bi	DX2	305602	Biolegend	mouse	100	yes

Supplementary Table 1. (continued)