1

Consequences of human cytomegalovirus infection on small extracellular vesicles isolated

from first trimester placental histocultures

Mathilde Bergamelli [1] *, Hélène Martin [1] *, Mélinda Bénard [1,2], Jérôme Ausseil [1,3], Jean-Michel Mansuy [4], Ilse Hurbain[5,6], Maïlys Mouysset [1], Marion Groussolles [1,7,8], Géraldine Cartron [9], Yann Tanguy le Gac [9], Nathalie Moinard [10], Elsa Suberbielle [1], Jacques Izopet [1,4], Charlotte Tscherning [1,‡], Graça Raposo [5,6], Daniel Gonzalez-Dunia [1], Gisela d'Angelo [5], and Cécile E. Malnou [1]#

[1] Centre de Physiopathologie Toulouse-Purpan (CPTP), Université de Toulouse, INSERM, CNRS, UPS, Toulouse, France.

[2] CHU Toulouse, Hôpital des Enfants, Service de Néonatalogie, Toulouse, France.

[3] CHU Toulouse, Hôpital Rangueil, Laboratoire de Biochimie, Toulouse, France.

[4] CHU Toulouse, Hôpital Purpan, Laboratoire de Virologie, Toulouse, France.

[5] Institut Curie, CNRS UMR144, Structure et Compartiments Membranaires, Université Paris Sciences et Lettres, Paris, France.

[6] Institut Curie, CNRS UMR144, Plateforme d'imagerie cellulaire et tissulaire (PICT-IBiSA), Université Paris Sciences et Lettres, Paris, France.

[7] CHU Toulouse, Hôpital Paule de Viguier, Service de Diagnostic Prénatal, Toulouse, France.

[8] Equipe SPHERE Epidémiologie et Analyses en Santé Publique: Risques, Maladies chroniques et handicaps, Université de Toulouse, INSERM UMR1027, UPS, Toulouse, France.

[9] CHU Toulouse, Hôpital Paule de Viguier, Service de Gynécologie Obstétrique, Toulouse,

France.

[10] Groupe de Recherche en Fertilité Humaine (EA 3694), Université de Toulouse, Toulouse,

France; CECOS, Groupe d'activité de médecine de la reproduction, CHU Toulouse, Hôpital

Paule de Viguier, Toulouse, France.

[‡] Current address: Division of Neonatology, Sidra Medicine, Well-Cornell College, Doha, Qatar.

* These authors contributed equally to this work

Corresponding author

ABSTRACT

Currently, research on the use of non-invasive biomarkers as diagnosis and prognosis

tools during pathological pregnancies is in full development. Among these, the placenta-

derived small extracellular vesicles (sEVs) are considered as serious candidates. As such, their

composition is modified during many pregnancy pathologies and they can be easily purified

from a simple blood sample, as they are found in maternal serum. In this study, we describe

the isolation of sEVs from a histoculture model of first trimester placental explants. We

characterized these sEVs by a combination of biochemical, bead-based multiplex cytometry

and electron microscopy approaches and defined their associated markers and ultrastructure.

We next examined the consequences for sEVs secretion and characteristics of placenta

infection by the human cytomegalovirus. Under these conditions, the secretion and integrity

of sEVs was preserved. However, an increase in the expression level of several surface markers

was detected, opening up the prospect for the search for biomarkers predicting the severity

and the outcome of this congenital infection early during the pregnancy, which are still sorely

lacking.

Keywords: early placenta, extracellular vesicles, congenital infection, human cytomegalovirus,

histoculture.

INTRODUCTION

Long considered as a passive barrier, the placenta is now clearly recognized to actively

orchestrate the numerous exchanges between mother and fetus, in oxygen, nutrients and

waste, protecting the fetus against infections and allowing adaptation of maternal metabolism

to pregnancy [1, 2]. In the past decade, a new mode of communication of the placenta with

both maternal and fetal sides has been described and extensively studied, consisting in the

secretion of placental extracellular vesicles (EVs), which increases all along pregnancy and

stops after delivery [3, 4]. EVs are membranous nanovesicles released by cells in the

extracellular space and body fluids, under physiological and pathophysiological conditions [5,

6]. In a simplistic way, we can distinguish large microvesicles (up to 1 μm), derived from

plasma membrane by direct outward budding, and exosomes, ranging from 30 to 200 nm of

diameter, which are generated by inward budding of endosomal membrane before their

release into the extracellular space. Discrimination between the different types of EVs based

on their biogenesis pathway and/or physical characteristics is still the subject of intense work

and numerous studies, and their classification is continuously evolving [5-8]. Hence, as it is

often difficult to clearly prove the exact nature of exosomes compared to other vesicle

subtypes, the term exosome has sometimes been used improperly in the literature, which

must be interpreted with caution. We have therefore chosen in this manuscript to use the

terminology small EVs (sEVs), according to the ISEV guidelines [9].

Interestingly, placental sEVS are detected in the maternal serum during pregnancy and

their composition is altered upon placental pathologies, such as, amongst others, diabetes

mellitus, intrauterine growth restriction or preeclampsia [10-16]. Thus, sEVs may represent

precious non-invasive biomarkers reflecting the status of the placenta and of the pregnancy

[17, 18]. In order to identify such biomarkers for use in diagnosis or prognosis, it is important

to develop models close to the (patho)physiology allowing preparation of placental sEVs in a

robust and reproducible manner, guaranteeing their purity for downstream analysis. It is

especially the case for early placentas, since many pregnancy pathologies and developmental

defects are the result of placental insults occurring during the first trimester of pregnancy [19-

21]. In this regard, the use of tissue explant models is particularly relevant, since they preserve

the tissue cytoarchitecture, allowing to decipher the complex mechanism of

(patho)physiological processes [22, 23]. Finally, such models should endure chronic stressors,

to examine the effects of environmental insults on the secretion of sEVs over several days,

this aspect being particularly limiting in the currently available models.

Among many environmental agents, viral congenital infections are a major cause of

placental and fetal development impairments. Infection by the human cytomegalovirus

(hCMV) concerns 1% of live births in developed countries, and is responsible for various

placental and fetal damages, especially at the level of the fetal central nervous system, leading

to various brain disorders [24-26]. Non-invasive diagnostic tools to assess fetal infection by

hCMV are lacking, since the gold standard diagnosis is using PCR on amniotic fluid, resulting

in the necessity to perform an invasive amniocentesis, which is not devoid of risk [27].

Concerning prognosis, there are currently very few methods easily implementable to predict

fetal impairment, especially concerning neurosensorial damage [28-30]. Thus, the

identification of non-invasive diagnosis and prognosis biomarkers within sEVs would be a

great step forward in assessing placental and fetal damage and would provide a valuable

decision support tool.

In this context, we have adapted a histoculture model of first trimester placental

explants that was developed in our team [31, 32], in order to isolate sEVs with a purity

compatible with analyses of their composition and features. This model, permissive to hCMV

infection [31, 32], allowed us to purify sEVs devoid of contaminant viral particles. We showed

that the secretion and integrity of sEVs is preserved upon hCMV infection of placentals

explants, with significant modifications in the expression levels of some sEV surface proteins.

Thus, this model opens up immense prospects for modeling chronic stresses at the start of

pregnancy, like viral infections, to find biomarkers allowing to detect very early placental and

fetal damage.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Human ethic approval

The Germethèque biological resource center at the Toulouse site (BB-0033-00081) provided

21 placenta samples in order to carry out the research program. Except term of pregnancy, no

other associated clinical data were collected in accordance with policy concerning voluntary

pregnancy termination. Germethèque obtained the agreement from each patient to use the

samples (CPP.2.15.27). The steering committee gave its agreement for the realization of this

study on 05/02/2019. The biological resource center has a declaration DC-2014-2202 and an

authorization AC-2015-2350. The hosting request made to Germethèque bears the number

20190201 and its contract is referenced under the number 19 155C.

hCMV viral strain, viral stock production and titration

The viral strain of hCMV used in this study is the endotheliotropic VHL/E strain (a kind gift from

C. Sinzger, University of Ulm, Germany) [33]. Viral stock was made by amplification of the virus

on MRC5 cells and concentration by ultracentrifugation, as described previously [34]. Virus

titration was determined by indirect immunofluorescence assays against the Immediate Early

(IE) antigen of hCMV upon infection of MCR5 by serial dilutions of the viral stock [34].

Additionally, virus titration was also performed by qPCR as described on viral stock and

placental histoculture supernatants [35].

Placental histoculture and infection

In order to purify sEVs from placental histocultures, culture media was depleted beforehand

from EVs [9]. To this purpose, Dulbecco's Modified Eagle Medium (DMEM with Glutamax,

Gibco) supplemented with 20 % Fetal Bovine Serum (FBS, Sigma-Aldrich) was ultracentrifuged

at 100,000 g for 16 hours at 4 °C and filtered at 0.2 µm (rotor SW32Ti, with maximal

acceleration and brake). "Exofree" medium was then obtained by a 1:1 dilution with DMEM

to reach 10 % FBS and addition of antibiotics at the following concentrations: 100 U/ml

penicillin - 100 µg/ml streptomycin (Gibco), 2,5µg/ml amphotericin B (Gibco) and 100µg/ml

normocin (Invivogen).

Placental histocultures were adapted from the model we previously described and validated

(Figure 1 A) [31, 32, 36]. First trimester placentas (mean = 11.72 ± 0.39 (SEM) weeks of

amenorrhea, *i.e.* 9.72 ± 0.39 weeks of pregnancy) were collected following elective abortions

by surgical aspiration at Paule de Viguier Maternity Hospital (Toulouse, France) by the medical team. Isolation of trophoblastic villi was manually performed from total placental tissue with particular care to exclude decidua, membranes and umbilical cord, by manual dissection in Phosphate Buffer Saline (PBS). Tissues were washed in PBS until PBS cleared up, *i. e.,* upon elimination of red blood cells. Each placenta was dissected in small pieces (2-3 mm^3) and kept overnight in exofree medium in a 5 % CO_2 incubator at 37°C, to eliminate the remaining red blood cells. To infect placental explants by hCMV upon dissection, the overnight incubation was performed with 500μl of hCMV pure viral stock (corresponding to around 10^8 ffu) mixed with 500μl of exofree medium. The day after (day 0), explants were washed six times in PBS and installed, nine by nine, on re-hydrated gelatin sponges (Gelfoam, Pfizer) in a 6-well plate containing 3 ml of exofree medium per well (Figure 1 A). A minimum of six wells, *i.e.* 54 explants, were used per experimental condition. Conditioned medium was collected and totally replaced with fresh exofree medium every 3 to 4 days for the duration of the culture. To maximize the recovery of sEV and obtain a rate production compatible with further analyses, conditioned media were pooled and kept at 4°C until EV purification. At two time points during culture, 300 μl of culture supernatant were also used to measure β-HCG rate and evolution. Free β-HCG was measured on a COBAS system (Roche Diagnostics, Switzerland), modular analytics E170, cobas e601 according to manufacturer protocol (Application Code Number 033) and according to a published method [37]. In addition to β-HCG dosage, release of virus by infected explants, indicating active viral replication, was assessed by hCMV qPCR titration on supernatant, as described above [35].

At the end-point of the histoculture, total collected medium was used to perform sEV isolation. Placental explants were weighted in order to normalize, calculate sEV yield and define an appropriate resuspension volume upon sEV preparation. Three explants were used

to proceed to immuno-histochemistry analysis and the others were frozen at -80°C for further

analyses.

Histochemistry and immuno-histochemistry

Placental explants were fixed in formalin during 24 h at room temperature and embedded in

paraffin. Tissue sections (5 μm) were de-waxed using xylene and alcohol and epitope retrieval

was carried out using citrate buffer (pH 6) at 95°C during 20 min. Sections were re-hydrated

using TBS 0.01 % Tween 20 for 5 min and blocked with 2.5 % horse serum for 20 min.

Immunostainings were performed with the following antibodies: rabbit anti-Cytokeratin-7

(Genetex; 2 μg/mL), mouse anti-Vimentin (Santa-Cruz; 2 μg/mL) and mouse anti-placental

alkaline phosphatase (Biolegend; 1 μg/mL). Immunostaining for hCMV was performed, as

previously described [32], using a mouse monoclonal antibody directed against the hCMV IE

antigen (clone CH160, Abcam). Secondary antibody-coupled to biotin was then used prior to

Vectastain RTU elite ABC Reagent (Vector laboratories) and staining by diaminobenzidine

(DAB). Sections were finally counter-stained with hematoxylin. Image acquisition was

performed on a Leica DM4000B microscope or on a scanner Pannoramic 250 (3DHISTECH).

Isolation of sEVs

All steps were performed at 4 °C and PBS solution was filtered on a 0.22 μm filter. Procedures

were adapted from [38-40] according to ISEV guidelines [9] and are presented in Figure 2A.

From collected histoculture media, several differential centrifugations were carried out: a first

preclearing centrifugation for 30 min at 1,200 g to eliminate dead cells and large debris, a

second ultracentrifugation for 30 min at 12,000 g (rotor SW32Ti, with maximal acceleration

and brake) to eliminate large EVs (principally microvesicles), and a last ultracentrifugation of

the remaining supernatant for 1 hour at 100,000 g (Rotor SW32Ti, with maximal acceleration

and brake) allowed to pellet sEVs. The pellet was then resuspended either in 100 µl PBS or in

diluent C (Sigma) in order to stain the vesicles by the lipophilic dye PKH67 (Sigma) according

to the manufacturer instructions (5 min incubation; 1:1,000 dilution). sEVs were then

resuspended in a solution of 40 % iodixanol in sucrose and the last purification step was

carried out by ultracentrifugation on a discontinuous iodixanol/sucrose gradient (10 to 40 %

iodixanol) with deposition of the sEVs on the bottom of the tube, during 18 h at 100,000 g

(rotor SW41Ti, acceleration 5, no brake). The fractions 2+3 of the six fractions harvested,

corresponding to a density of, respectively, 1.086 and 1.116, were then pooled and washed in

25 ml PBS. After a last ultracentrifugation for 1 h at 100,000 g (Rotor SW32Ti, with maximal

acceleration and brake), the pellet was resuspended in PBS, in a volume proportional to the

weight of tissue (1 µl PBS per 1 mg tissue).

We submitted all relevant data of our experiments to the EV-TRACK knowledgebase (EV-

TRACK ID: EV200049) and obtained an EV-METRIC score of 100 % [41].

sEV flow cytometry

A Mascquant VYB Flow Cytometer (Myltenyi Biotec) was set up with Megamix-plus SSC FITC

(Biocytex Stago) calibration beads to standardize sEV measurements. Megamix-plus SSC beads

of variable diameters (160 nm, 200 nm, 240 nm and 500 nm) were separated depending on

size using SSC side scatter. A gating strategy was defined on 160 nm and 200 nm beads

populations to analyze events of size below 200 nm (Figure 2B).

sEV preparations, previously stained with PKH67 as described above, were diluted 1:200 in

filtered PBS and analyzed with the same parameters as those used for calibration beads.

Gating on events of size below 200 nm allowed count of sEVs and calculation of their

concentration for each preparation (Figure 2C). Each sample was analyzed twice. Data were

then analyzed with FlowJo software (BD).

Nanoparticle tracking analysis

sEV preparations were diluted 1:100 in filtered PBS (0.2 μm) and tracked using a NanoSight

LM10 (Marvern Pananalytical) equipped with a 405 nm laser. Videos were recorded three

times during 60 s for each sample at constant temperature (22°C) and analyzed with NTA

Software 2.0 (Malvern instruments Ltd). Data were analyzed with Excel and GraphPad Prism

(v8) softwares.

Transmission electron microscopy and immunolabeling electron microscopy

Procedures were performed essentially as described [42, 43].

For transmission electron microscopy (TEM), sEV preparations were loaded on copper

formvar/carbon coated grids (Ted Pella). Fixation was performed with 2 % paraformaldehyde

in 0.1 M phosphate buffer (pH 7.4), followed by a second fixation with PBS 1 % glutaraldehyde

in PBS. Samples were stained with 4 % uranyl acetate in methylcellulose.

For immunolabeling electron microscopy (IEM), sEV preparations were loaded on grids and

fixed with 2 % paraformaldehyde in 0.1 M phosphate buffer (pH 7.4). Immunodetection was

performed with a mouse anti-human CD63 primary antibody (Abcam ab23792). Secondary

incubation was next performed with a rabbit anti mouse Fc fragment (Dako Agilent Z0412).

Grids were incubated with Protein A-Gold 10 nm (Cell Microscopy Center, Department of Cell

Biology, Utrecht University). A second fixation step with 1 % glutaraldehyde in PBS was

performed. Grids were stained with uranyl acetate in methylcellulose.

All samples were examined with a Tecnai Spirit electron microscope (FEI, Eindhoven, The

Netherlands), and digital acquisitions were made with a numeric 4k CCD camera (Quemesa,

Olympus, Münster, Germany). Images were analysed with iTEM software (EMSIS) and

statistical studies were done with Prism-GraphPad Prism software (v8).

Multiplex bead-based flow cytometry assay

sEV preparations were subjected to bead-based multiplex EV analysis by flow cytometry using

the MACSPlex Exosome Kit, human (Miltenyi Biotec), according to the manufacturer

instructions [44].

Briefly, sEV preparations were incubated overnight with 39 different bead populations, each

coupled to a different capture antibody. The different bead populations are distinguishable

by flow cytometry by a specific PE and FITC labeling. sEVs bound to the beads were then

detected with a cocktail composed by anti-CD63, anti-CD9 and anti-CD81 antibodies coupled

to APC. Beads coupled to isotype control antibodies were used to assess potential non-specific

binding of sEVs. Background was also defined by performing the analysis without any sEVs.

Flow cytometry analysis was performed with a MACSQuant Analyzer 10 flow cytometer

(Miltenyi Biotec). The tool MACSQuantify was used to analyze flow cytometry data

(v2.11.1746.19438). The background signals were subtracted from the signals obtained for

beads incubated with sEVs. GraphPad Prism (v8) software was used to perform statistical

analysis of the data.

Western blot

sEV samples were lysed in non-reducing conditions in Laemmli buffer, heated for 5 min at 95

°C, and loaded on mini protean TGX precast 4-20 % gradient gels (Biorad) in tris-glycine buffer

for electrophoresis at 110 V for 2 h. Proteins were electro-transferred onto nitrocellulose membranes using the trans-blot turbo transfer system (Biorad) and membranes were blocked with Odyssey blocking buffer (Li-Cor Biosciences) for 1 h. Membranes were then incubated with primary antibodies: mouse anti-CD81 (200 ng/ml, Santa-Cruz), mouse anti-CD63 (500 ng/ml, BD Pharmingen) or mouse anti-CD9 (100 ng/ml, Millipore) overnight at 4 °C in Odyssey blocking buffer, followed by incubation with the secondary antibody IRDye 700 goat anti-mouse IgG (Li-Cor Biosciences), for 1 h at room temperature. Membranes were washed three times in TBS 0.1 % Tween 20 during 10 min after each incubation step and visualized using the Odyssey Infrared Imaging System (LI-COR Biosciences).

RESULTS

In order to isolate sEVs and standardize their production from placental tissue, we adapted the placental histoculture protocol already developed and characterized by our team [31, 32]. To this aim, first trimester placentas (mean = 11.72 ± 0.39 (SEM) weeks of amenorrhea; *i.e.* 9.72 ± 0.39 weeks of pregnancy) were obtained upon voluntary pregnancy termination and cultured as described in Materials and Methods section, in exofree medium. Culture supernatant was collected and renewed according to standardized time frame (Figure 1A). At the end of the culture (at day 14 or 15, exceptionally longer), placental explants were collected and weighted for normalization. At two different time-points after the beginning of culture, a sample of culture medium was subjected to β-HCG dosage to assess the viability of the placental explants [45]. As indicated in Figure 1B, placental explants secreted β-HCG at high levels, with a decrease with time, but which remains sustained and important (Measure 1, corresponding to β-HCG secreted between day 0 and 4: mean = 11,127 ± 1,699 mUI/ml;

Measure 2, corresponding to β-HCG secreted between day 7 and 11: mean = 2,478 ± 500

mUI/ml), similarly to our previous data [31]. Finally, evaluation of tissue architecture and

integrity was performed at the end of the culture by histochemistry and

immunohistochemistry. Tissue sections were examined for their expression of Cytokeratin-7

(CK-7; trophoblast marker), placental alkaline phosphatase (PLAP; syncitiotrophoblast marker)

and Vimentin (mesenchymal cell marker). The typical double layer of trophoblastic cells,

consisting of an outer syncitiotrophoblastic layer and an inner cytotrophoblastic layer, was

observed and surrounded the villous stroma (Figure 1D). These results indicated that

trophoblastic villi architecture was well preserved during the culture (Figure 1D) as we already

shown in previous works [31, 32].

To maximize the recovery of sEVs and allow their characterization, sEVs were prepared

from collected culture media pooled along the duration of the culture. For sEVS isolation,

differential ultracentrifugation steps and a final density ultracentrifugation on

Optiprep/sucrose gradient were combined (Figure 2A). Upon gradient ultracentrifugation, the

majority of sEVs was found into fractions 2 and 3, corresponding to a density of, respectively,

1.086 and 1.116, consistent with the density expected for sEVs [8, 38]. These fractions were

then pooled before a final ultracentrifugation step. The sEV pellet was then resuspended into

a final volume of PBS proportional to tissue weight for each experimental point, to allow the

normalization and comparison of sEV yield between experiments. Except when preparations

were intended to be used for multiplex bead-based flow cytometry assay, sEVs were

otherwise stained with the fluorescent lipophilic dye PKH67 before gradient

ultracentrifugation, to allow their counting by flow cytometry (Figure 2A). Flow cytometer was

calibrated with FITC-fluorescent beads of different sizes to define gating parameters before

analysis of sEV preparations (Figure 2B). Only vesicles of less than 200 nm of diameter were

counted; the majority of the analyzed events displayed an approximal size of less than 160 nm

(Figure 2C). The yields of sEVs were then calculated and normalized on the tissue weight. An

average yield of 29,459 ± 5,370 sEV/mg of tissue (mean ± SEM) was obtained when measured

by flow cytometry.

To further describe the population of purified sEVs, the approach of nanoparticle

tracking analysis (NTA) was used. Four independent sEV preparations were analyzed in

triplicate. Concentrations of sEVs determined for the four preparations lied in the same range

than the concentrations determined by flow cytometry and the comparison of the results

obtained by the two methods showed no significant difference (Supplementary Table 1). The

mode sizes for the four sEV preparations determined by NTA ranged between 125.7 and 170.7

nm, with a mean of 145.8 ± 9.3 nm (Figure 3A). In further details, the size distributions of two

of the sEV preparations showed small differences, as illustrated in Figures 3B and C, with only

slight peaks variations found at higher size, that may indicate the presence of aggregated

vesicles or contaminant microvesicles.

Next, an exhaustive morphological characterization of placental sEVs by TEM and IEM

was performed (Figure 4). This approach enables the analysis of membranous sEV and their

relative sizes with the selection of EV-like particles only, allowing the exclusion of aggregates

or of non-EV structures from the analysis. The preparations were highly enriched in vesicles

that presented the typical membranous appearance of sEVs (Supplementary Figure 1 and

Figure 4A). The average sEV size was then determined on isolated sEVs on two independent

sEV preparations. By this approach, determination is relative since the fixation and embedding

steps for the preparation of sEVs provoke shrinking of the vesicles. By focusing only on

selected sEVs according to their structures, average sizes obtained were 97 and 91 nm of

diameter for the two preparations (Figure 4B). More precisely, by observing sEV size

distribution, the majority of sEV diameters lied around 80 nm (Figure 4C). IEM allowing to

detect the canonical tetraspanin CD63, known to be enriched in endosome-derived exosomes,

was then performed. As observed in Figure 4D (and in Supplementary Figure 2), the majority

of sEVs were highly positive for CD63. A manual counting of CD63-positive sEVs among total

sEVs indicated that the percentage of CD63-positive sEVs was, respectively, of 60.32 and 61.83

% for the two sEV preparations.

Second, a multiplex bead-based flow cytometry assay was carried out to establish an

exhaustive map of sEV surface markers (Figure 5). To this aim, we used an assay that allows

for the simultaneous detection of up to 37 different EV surface markers in a semi-quantitative

way [44, 46]. As shown in Figure 5A and expected from the IEM results, a highly positive signal

for CD63, a canonical exosome surface protein, was observed, which was also detected by

western blot, as shown for two independent sEV preparations (Figure 5B). Two other

canonical sEV surface proteins, CD9 and CD81, were found expressed in the sEV preparations

(Figure 5A), but were not detected by western blot, probably because of the detection limit

of the antibodies (data not shown). Altogether, these data indicated that isolated sEVs showed

the typical features of canonical exosomes, regarding ultrastructure, size and presence typical

exosome markers.

This bead-based flow cytometry assay also showed the expression on sEV surface of

proteins expressed by trophoblastic cells like CD24 (already described on trophoblastic EVs)

[47], CD49e (also known as integrin α5) [48], CD105 [49], CD146 (also named MCAM) [50] or

CD236 (also known as EpCAM) [51]. Conversely, no expression of non-trophoblastic markers

was detected on sEVs preparations, like CD4, CD8, CD31, CD45 or HLA-ABC [48, 52]. Of note,

markers described for placental mesenchymal stem cells were also found at the surface of

isolated sEV like CD29 (also known as integrin β1), CD44 and SSEA-4 [53, 54], indicating that

these cells may also contribute to the sEV secretion of our model.

Next, the impact of the hCMV infection on the secretion and characteristics of

placental sEVs was examined. To this aim, placental explants were infected by the VHL/E

clinical strain overnight after tissue dissection, extensively washed and maintained in culture

during two weeks to let the virus disseminate, as already described by our team [31]. The

presence of virus release into the culture medium was monitored. To this end, one aliquot of

histoculture supernatant was taken after two medium renewals (corresponding to virus

released between days 7 and 11) and analyzed by qPCR. Upon infection, placental explants

displayed an active viral release, with hCMV titers in supernatant comprised between $1.05 \cdot 10^4$

and $1.53 \cdot 10^7$ copies/ml, the median lying at $3.04 \cdot 10^5$ copies/ml (Figure 6A). Virus quantified in

the supernatant did not correspond to remaining inoculum, since no viral genome was

detected by qPCR on control experiments performed with UV-irradiated virus (data not

shown). At the end of the culture, analysis of the tissue sections by immunohistochemistry

allowed to verify the presence of the IE viral antigen (Figure 6B). Some cells showed intense

staining, demonstrating that the virus had disseminated well into the tissue after two weeks.

Viral infection did not modify the weight of tissue upon culture compared to non-infected

conditions (Figure 6C), neither the level of secreted β-HCG that remained similar between

non-infected and infected placentas for both measures 1 and 2 (Figure 6D). Finally, the tissue

architecture remained well preserved as attested by immunohistochemistry performed

against CK-7, PLAP and Vimentin (Figure 6E), thereby guaranteeing that the sEV preparations

were valuable and did not correspond to sEVs isolated from dying tissues that may lead to

misinterpretation of the results.

Finally, the characteristics of the sEVs secreted by non-infected or infected placental

histocultures were compared. The protocol for sEV preparation, combining differential

ultracentrifugation and gradient ultracentrifugation, was used to guarantee that viral particles

did not contaminate sEV preparation, as it has been described previously [40]. Indeed, hCMV

particles are bigger and denser than sEVs and should not be co-purified with sEVs with density

gradient ultracentrifugation [40]. The absence of infectious viral particles in sEV fractions was

effectively confirmed, by applying sEVs purified from infected placental explants to MCR5 cells

and performing an anti-IE immunofluorescence assay. As expected, no IE expression was

detected (Supplementary Figure 3). Moreover, no viral particle was detected by TEM in sEV

preparations in all the wide field pictures examined (exemplified in Supplementary Figure 4).

The yield of purified sEVs in non-infected *versus* infected histocultures was then

compared. No significant difference between the two conditions was observed (Figure 7A),

indicating that hCMV infection did not impact the global production of sEV by placental tissue.

By TEM, sEVs prepared from infected explants displayed the same morphology (Figure 7C and

Supplementary Figure 4) and relative size distribution compared to sEVs isolated from non-

infected histocultures (Figure 7D), with no significant difference in their mean size (Figure 7E).

sEVs prepared from hCMV-infected explants also expressed CD63, that was detected both by

western blot (Figure 7B) and by IEM (Figure 7F-G and Supplementary Figure 5), being

expressed on nearly 60% of the vesicles (Figure 7H).

Finally, the surface expression levels of several proteins expressed by sEVs were

examined by multiplex bead-based flow cytometry assay in both conditions (Figure 7I). To

perform this assay, quantification of the sEVs by PKH67-based flow cytometry upon sEV

preparation could not be realized, since it would interfere with the assay. Thus, sEV quantity

was normalized between non-infected and infected conditions based on the weight of the

explants, since the hCMV infection did not impact on the yield of sEV secretion (Figure 7A).

sEVs isolated from hCMV infected explants expressed the same markers as sEVs isolated from

non-infected explants, but with a significant different level of expression upon infection for

some of the markers (Figure 7I). A 2-way ANOVA statistical test confirmed that the infection

modified the global pattern of expression of sEV surface proteins ($p<0.0001$ for the "Infection"

factor, no interaction with "Marker" factor). Most of the surface markers expressed in sEV

isolated from infected explants showed an increased expression upon infection. Bonferroni's

multiple comparison test indicated that two markers were significantly increased: CD81

($p=0,0223$) and CD326 (EpCAM; $p=0,0029$). In conclusion, our results indicate that hCMV

infection of placental explants preserves the global secretion of sEVs that conserve the typical

characteristics of exosomes, with an increase in the expression levels of some surface proteins

that may be candidates as sEV markers of hCMV infection.

DISCUSSION

An increasing number of works aim to study placental EVs and their role in

physiological and pathological pregnancy. To this purpose, several models have been used as

a source of EVs, both *in vivo*, *ex vivo* or *in vitro*. *In vivo*, study of placental EVs isolated from

blood is hard to interpret because they come from multiple tissues. The use of placental

primary cells or cell lines *in vitro* is very informative but may lack important aspects of

(patho)physiology occuring in a complex tissue architecture, especially during viral infection.

Here we adapted a previously established model of first trimester placental explants,

maintained in culture at the air/liquid interface, and permissive for hCMV replication [31, 32].

This model, which has also been used by other teams for different types of tissues [22],

including placenta [23, 55, 56] allows the maintenance of the tissue in culture for several days.

In this study, we confirmed that the integrity of the placental explants was preserved,

consistent with our previous results [31, 32], with a still sustained, while decreased, secretion

of β-HCG along the culture, indicating the viability of the tissue [45]. Moreover, different

immunohistochemistry staining showed that the complex cytoarchitecture of the

trophoblastic villi was well preserved at the end of the culture, even upon hCMV infection.

From these placental explants, we developed robust and reproducible conditions for

the recovery and isolation of sEVs, by a combination of successive differential and density

gradient ultracentrifugation steps, adapted from [38-40] and in strict accordance with MISEV

guidelines [9]. This allows to obtain pure sEV preparations devoid of contaminants, as

evidenced by the various characterizations that were next carried out and the EV-METRIC

score of 100% [41]. The different characterizations performed on sEV preparations showed

that they present many features of endosomal-derived exosomes, including membranous

vesicles as observed by TEM, an average relative diameter around 95 nm and the presence of

exosome components including CD63, CD9 and CD81. Since the subcellular origin of these

vesicles cannot, however, be definitively ruled on, we have therefore chosen to keep the

designation of sEVs in this manuscript [9].

While in some studies, the authors focus their analysis on EVs isolated from a single

cell type, here the global population of sEVs secreted from trophoblastic villi was examined.

The origin of the vesicles is therefore varied, reflecting those of the placental environment,

which allows to assess the overall changes of the vesicles following stress. As the tissue

architecture was well preserved, it is likely that the outer layers of cyto- and

syncitiotrophoblasts are prone to mostly contribute to the sEV secretion observed, and

proteins expressed by trophoblasts were effectively detected, like CD326, CD24 or CD49e, on

the sEV surface [47, 48, 51]. The presence of proteins described for mesenchymal stem cells

was also observed, like CD29, CD44 and SSEA-4, indicating that such cells also probably

participate to the secretion of sEV in our model [53, 57]. Of note, even if sEV have different

cell origin, the pattern of expression of surface markers is very reproducible amongst sEV

preparations.

In this study, the sEVs secreted by the placental villi during infection by hCMV were

examined. To our knowledge, this is the first model that allows the isolation of sEVs from first

trimester placenta in the context of the hCMV infection. This virus is characterized by a

dissemination from the mother to the fetus *via* an active replication in the placenta tissue [58,

59]. Consistent with previous works [31, 32, 56, 60], the virus disseminated in the placental

explants during the culture, and was produced and released into the medium. Based on

immunohistochemistry data, tissue infection levels observed were similar to what can be

observed on placentas during natural infection [61]. Under our conditions of infection, the

placental explants kept the same weight and histological structure, and continued to secrete

sEVs, at yields comparable to the uninfected explants. The challenge of preparing sEVs in the

context of viral infections is to purify sEVs without being contaminated by viral particles, which

have physicochemical characteristics similar to sEVs [40, 62, 63]. In the case of hCMV, the size

and density characteristics of the viral particles, with a diameter of the order of 150 to 180

nm and a higher density than EVs, make possible their elimination from the sEV preparation

thanks to the density gradient ultracentrifugation step [40]. We indeed confirmed that sEV

preparations were devoid of infectious virus particles, and that no viral structure could be

detected by TEM in the numerous fields examined.

To maximize the recovery of sEVs and allow their characterization in downstream

analyses, especially during a slow rate infection like by hCMV, the histoculture supernatants

were pooled along the culture. This may be a limitation for the sEV analysis, since it could hide

fluctuations or attenuate transient or late trends induced by the virus. However, a significant

change in the sEV surface marker signature was observed upon infection of placental explants,

with a modification of global expression level of several surface proteins. A significant surface

expression increase was observed notably for two proteins: CD81 and CD326. Of note, CD326

(EpCAM) has been suggested to play a role in placental development [51, 64] and CD81 has

been recently described to play a role in hCMV entry [65, 66], but this was not demonstrated

for placental cells. Hence, it is tempting to speculate that the secretion of sEVs with this

specific pattern upon hCMV infection may have a functional role, by influencing viral

dissemination into the tissue and/or contributing to placental defects.

Currently, there is a growing interest for the search for biomarkers reflecting the state

of the placenta, even of the fetus, within the placental sEVs [14, 16-18]. However, in numerous

models of placental explants described to date, sEVs were generally prepared within the first

16 to 48 hours of culture, a duration that does not allow to evaluate the long-term effects of

chronic stress. Hence, this model of early placental explants cultured over several days is a

valuable tool to evaluate the impact of chronic environmental stress, as viral infection but also

hypoxia or endocrine disruptors, on the secretion and composition of sEVs secreted by the

placenta in early pregnancy, and opens new perspectives in the search for biomarkers.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank the medical and paramedical staff of the gynecology unit at Paule de Viguier

Hospital, who allowed us to have access to the samples, as well as the patients who agreed to

participate in the study. We also warmly thank Louis Bujan and Mélanie Aubry, from the

Germethèque, for their help and professionalism, and Christian Sinzger who kindly provided

us with the hCMV strain and gave us precious advice for its production. We greatly thank

Benjamin Rauwel, Maryse Romao, Catherine Mengelle, Francine Chauvrier, Philippe Verdy,

Nicolas Kopf and Matthieu Barbet, as well as the whole ViNeDys team, for their technical

assistance and their numerous advices and discussions which allowed the progress of this

work. Our thanks also go to Anne-Laure Iscache, Valérie Duplan-Eche and Fatima L'Faqihi-

Olive, from the cytometry facility of the Center for Pathophysiology of Toulouse Purpan, as

well as to Florence Capilla and Annie Alloy, from the histology facility Gentoul Anexplo. We

also thank Laurence Nieto and Evert Haanappel from the Institute of Pharmacology and

Structural Biology, who allowed us to have access to the Nanosight device, and for their many

advices.

This project has received financial support from the French Society of Neonatology,

the French Biomedicine Agency, the Réseau Mère-Enfant de la Francophonie. Our work was

also financially supported by institutional grants from Inserm, CNRS and Toulouse 3 University.

This project is part of the doctorate thesis of Mathilde Bergamelli, who was funded by the

Ministry of Education and Research (MESR). The TEM experiments were performed on PICT-

IBiSA, Institut Curie, Paris, member of the France-BioImaging national research infrastructure,

and were supported by the French National Research Agency through the "Investments for

the Future" program (France-BioImaging, ANR-11-INSB-04), supported by the CelTisPhyBio

Labex (N° ANR-11-LB0038) part of the IDEX PSL (N°ANR-10-IDEX-0001-02 PSL).

DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

The authors report no conflict of interest.

REFERENCES

1. McNanley, T. and J. Woods, *Placental physiology.* Glob. libr. women's med., 2008.

2. Burton, G.J. and A.L. Fowden, *The placenta: a multifaceted, transient organ.* Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci, 2015. **370**(1663): p. 20140066.

3. Luo, S.S., et al., *Human villous trophoblasts express and secrete placenta-specific microRNAs into maternal circulation via exosomes.* Biol Reprod, 2009. **81**(4): p. 717-29.

4. Sarker, S., et al., *Placenta-derived exosomes continuously increase in maternal circulation over the first trimester of pregnancy.* J Transl Med, 2014. **12**: p. 204.

5. van Niel, G., G. D'Angelo, and G. Raposo, *Shedding light on the cell biology of extracellular vesicles.* Nat Rev Mol Cell Biol, 2018. **19**(4): p. 213-228.

6. Kalluri, R. and V.S. LeBleu, *The biology, function, and biomedical applications of exosomes.* Science, 2020. **367**(6478).

7. Colombo, M., G. Raposo, and C. Thery, *Biogenesis, secretion, and intercellular interactions of exosomes and other extracellular vesicles.* Annu Rev Cell Dev Biol, 2014. **30**: p. 255-89.

8. Kowal, J., et al., *Proteomic comparison defines novel markers to characterize heterogeneous populations of extracellular vesicle subtypes.* Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A, 2016. **113**(8): p. E968-77.

9. Thery, C., et al., *Minimal information for studies of extracellular vesicles 2018 (MISEV2018): a position statement of the International Society for Extracellular Vesicles and update of the MISEV2014 guidelines.* J Extracell Vesicles, 2018. **7**(1): p. 1535750.

10. Salomon, C., et al., *Gestational Diabetes Mellitus Is Associated With Changes in the Concentration and Bioactivity of Placenta-Derived Exosomes in Maternal Circulation Across Gestation.* Diabetes, 2016. **65**(3): p. 598-609.

11. Kandzija, N., et al., *Placental extracellular vesicles express active dipeptidyl peptidase IV; levels are increased in gestational diabetes mellitus.* J Extracell Vesicles, 2019. **8**(1): p. 1617000.

12. Miranda, J., et al., *Placental exosomes profile in maternal and fetal circulation in intrauterine growth restriction - Liquid biopsies to monitoring fetal growth.* Placenta, 2018. **64**: p. 34-43.

552   13.   Chiarello, D.I., et al., *Foetoplacental communication via extracellular vesicles in normal pregnancy*

553   *and preeclampsia.* Mol Aspects Med, 2018. **60**: p. 69-80.

554   14.   Cuffe, J.S.M., et al., *Review: Placental derived biomarkers of pregnancy disorders.* Placenta, 2017.

555   **54**: p. 104-110.

556   15.   Herrera-Van Oostdam, A.S., et al., *Placental exosomes viewed from an 'omics' perspective:*

557   *implications for gestational diabetes biomarkers identification.* Biomark Med, 2019. **13**(8): p. 675-

558   684.

559   16.   Malnou, E.C., et al., *Imprinted MicroRNA Gene Clusters in the Evolution, Development, and*

560   *Functions of Mammalian Placenta.* Front Genet, 2019. **9**: p. 706.

561   17.   Mitchell, M.D., et al., *Placental exosomes in normal and complicated pregnancy.* Am J Obstet

562   Gynecol, 2015. **213**(4 Suppl): p. S173-81.

563   18.   Jin, J. and R. Menon, *Placental exosomes: A proxy to understand pregnancy complications.* Am J

564   Reprod Immunol, 2018. **79**(5): p. e12788.

565   19.   O'Tierney-Ginn, P.F. and G.E. Lash, *Beyond pregnancy: modulation of trophoblast invasion and its*

566   *consequences for fetal growth and long-term children's health.* J Reprod Immunol, 2014. **104-105**:

567   p. 37-42.

568   20.   Silasi, M., et al., *Viral infections during pregnancy.* Am J Reprod Immunol, 2015. **73**(3): p. 199-213.

569   21.   Montiel, J.F., H. Kaune, and M. Maliqueo, *Maternal-fetal unit interactions and eutherian*

570   *neocortical development and evolution.* Front Neuroanat, 2013. **7**: p. 22.

571   22.   Grivel, J.C. and L. Margolis, *Use of human tissue explants to study human infectious agents.* Nat

572   Protoc, 2009. **4**(2): p. 256-69.

573   23.   Fitzgerald, W., et al., *Extracellular vesicles generated by placental tissues ex vivo: A transport*

574   *system for immune mediators and growth factors.* Am J Reprod Immunol, 2018. **80**(1): p. e12860.

575   24.   Cannon, M.J., D.S. Schmid, and T.B. Hyde, *Review of cytomegalovirus seroprevalence and*

576   *demographic characteristics associated with infection.* Rev Med Virol, 2010. **20**(4): p. 202-13.

577   25.   Kenneson, A. and M.J. Cannon, *Review and meta-analysis of the epidemiology of congenital*

578   *cytomegalovirus (CMV) infection.* Rev Med Virol, 2007. **17**(4): p. 253-76.

579   26.   Lanzieri, T.M., et al., *Seroprevalence of cytomegalovirus among children 1 to 5 years of age in the*
580   *United States from the National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey of 2011 to 2012.* Clin
581   Vaccine Immunol, 2015. **22**(2): p. 245-7.

582   27.   Leruez-Ville, M., et al., *Cytomegalovirus infection during pregnancy: state of the science.* Am J
583   Obstet Gynecol, 2020. **223**(3): p. 330-349.

584   28.   Leruez-Ville, M. and Y. Ville, *Fetal cytomegalovirus infection.* Best Pract Res Clin Obstet Gynaecol,
585   2017. **38**: p. 97-107.

586   29.   Benoist, G., et al., *Cytomegalovirus-related fetal brain lesions: comparison between targeted*
587   *ultrasound examination and magnetic resonance imaging.* Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol, 2008. **32**(7):
588   p. 900-5.

589   30.   Guerra, B., et al., *Ultrasound prediction of symptomatic congenital cytomegalovirus infection.* Am
590   J Obstet Gynecol, 2008. **198**(4): p. 380 e1-7.

591   31.   Lopez, H., et al., *Novel model of placental tissue explants infected by cytomegalovirus reveals*
592   *different permissiveness in early and term placentae and inhibition of indoleamine 2,3-dioxygenase*
593   *activity.* Placenta, 2011. **32**(7): p. 522-30.

594   32.   Benard, M., et al., *Human cytomegalovirus infection induces leukotriene B4 and 5-lipoxygenase*
595   *expression in human placentae and umbilical vein endothelial cells.* Placenta, 2014. **35**(6): p. 345-
596   50.

597   33.   Stegmann, C., et al., *The N Terminus of Human Cytomegalovirus Glycoprotein O Is Important for*
598   *Binding to the Cellular Receptor PDGFRalpha.* J Virol, 2019. **93**(11).

599   34.   Rolland, M., et al., *PPARgamma Is Activated during Congenital Cytomegalovirus Infection and*
600   *Inhibits Neuronogenesis from Human Neural Stem Cells.* PLoS Pathog, 2016. **12**(4): p. e1005547.

601   35.   Mengelle, C., et al., *Performance of a completely automated system for monitoring CMV DNA in*
602   *plasma.* J Clin Virol, 2016. **79**: p. 25-31.

603   36.   Rauwel, B., et al., *Activation of peroxisome proliferator-activated receptor gamma by human*
604   *cytomegalovirus for de novo replication impairs migration and invasiveness of cytotrophoblasts*
605   *from early placentas.* J Virol, 2010. **84**(6): p. 2946-54.

606   37.   Sturgeon, C.M. and E.J. McAllister, *Analysis of hCG: clinical applications and assay requirements.*

607   Ann Clin Biochem, 1998. **35 (Pt 4)**: p. 460-91.

608   38.   Ouyang, Y., et al., *Isolation of human trophoblastic extracellular vesicles and characterization of*

609   *their cargo and antiviral activity.* Placenta, 2016. **47**: p. 86-95.

610   39.   Thery, C., et al., *Isolation and characterization of exosomes from cell culture supernatants and*

611   *biological fluids.* Curr Protoc Cell Biol, 2006. **Chapter 3**: p. Unit 3 22.

612   40.   Zicari, S., et al., *Human cytomegalovirus-infected cells release extracellular vesicles that carry viral*

613   *surface proteins.* Virology, 2018. **524**: p. 97-105.

614   41.   Consortium, E.-T., et al., *EV-TRACK: transparent reporting and centralizing knowledge in*

615   *extracellular vesicle research.* Nat Methods, 2017. **14**(3): p. 228-232.

616   42.   Hurbain, I., et al., *Analyzing Lysosome-Related Organelles by Electron Microscopy.* Methods Mol

617   Biol, 2017. **1594**: p. 43-71.

618   43.   Raposo, G., et al., *B lymphocytes secrete antigen-presenting vesicles.* J Exp Med, 1996. **183**(3): p.

619   1161-72.

620   44.   Koliha, N., et al., *A novel multiplex bead-based platform highlights the diversity of extracellular*

621   *vesicles.* J Extracell Vesicles, 2016. **5**: p. 29975.

622   45.   Polliotti, B.M., et al., *Culture of first-trimester and full-term human chorionic villus explants: role of*

623   *human chorionic gonadotropin and human placental lactogen as a viability index.* Early Pregnancy,

624   1995. **1**(4): p. 270-80.

625   46.   Wiklander, O.P.B., et al., *Systematic Methodological Evaluation of a Multiplex Bead-Based Flow*

626   *Cytometry Assay for Detection of Extracellular Vesicle Surface Signatures.* Front Immunol, 2018. **9**:

627   p. 1326.

628   47.   Sammar, M., et al., *Expression of CD24 and Siglec-10 in first trimester placenta: implications for*

629   *immune tolerance at the fetal-maternal interface.* Histochem Cell Biol, 2017. **147**(5): p. 565-574.

630   48.   Lee, C.Q., et al., *What Is Trophoblast? A Combination of Criteria Define Human First-Trimester*

631   *Trophoblast.* Stem Cell Reports, 2016. **6**(2): p. 257-72.

632   49.   Gregory, A.L., et al., *Review: the enigmatic role of endoglin in the placenta.* Placenta, 2014. **35**

633   **Suppl**: p. S93-9.

634   50.   Higuchi, T., et al., *Cyclic AMP enhances the expression of an extravillous trophoblast marker,*

635   *melanoma cell adhesion molecule, in choriocarcinoma cell JEG3 and human chorionic villous*

636   *explant cultures.* Mol Hum Reprod, 2003. **9**(6): p. 359-66.

637   51.   Wong, F.T.M., C. Lin, and B.J. Cox, *Cellular systems biology identifies dynamic trophoblast*

638   *populations in early human placentas.* Placenta, 2019. **76**: p. 10-18.

639   52.   Blaschitz, A., H. Hutter, and G. Dohr, *HLA Class I protein expression in the human placenta.* Early

640   Pregnancy, 2001. **5**(1): p. 67-9.

641   53.   Lv, F.J., et al., *Concise review: the surface markers and identity of human mesenchymal stem cells.*

642   Stem Cells, 2014. **32**(6): p. 1408-19.

643   54.   Salomon, C., et al., *Exosomal signaling during hypoxia mediates microvascular endothelial cell*

644   *migration and vasculogenesis.* PLoS One, 2013. **8**(7): p. e68451.

645   55.   Faye, A., et al., *Evaluation of the placental environment with a new in vitro model of histocultures*

646   *of early and term placentae: determination of cytokine and chemokine expression profiles.*

647   Placenta, 2005. **26**(2-3): p. 262-7.

648   56.   Hamilton, S.T., et al., *Human cytomegalovirus-induces cytokine changes in the placenta with*

649   *implications for adverse pregnancy outcomes.* PLoS One, 2012. **7**(12): p. e52899.

650   57.   Salomon, C., et al., *Extravillous trophoblast cells-derived exosomes promote vascular smooth*

651   *muscle cell migration.* Front Pharmacol, 2014. **5**: p. 175.

652   58.   Pereira, L., et al., *Insights into viral transmission at the uterine-placental interface.* Trends

653   Microbiol, 2005. **13**(4): p. 164-74.

654   59.   Pereira, L., et al., *Congenital cytomegalovirus infection undermines early development and*

655   *functions of the human placenta.* Placenta, 2017. **59 Suppl 1**: p. S8-S16.

656   60.   Amirhessami-Aghili, N., et al., *Human cytomegalovirus infection of human placental explants in*

657   *culture: histologic and immunohistochemical studies.* Am J Obstet Gynecol, 1987. **156**(6): p. 1365-

658   74.

61.   Uenaka, M., et al., *Histopathological analysis of placentas with congenital cytomegalovirus infection.* Placenta, 2019. **75**: p. 62-67.

62.   Cantin, R., et al., *Discrimination between exosomes and HIV-1: purification of both vesicles from cell-free supernatants.* J Immunol Methods, 2008. **338**(1-2): p. 21-30.

63.   Nolte-'t Hoen, E., et al., *Extracellular vesicles and viruses: Are they close relatives?* Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A, 2016. **113**(33): p. 9155-61.

64.   Nagao, K., et al., *Abnormal placental development and early embryonic lethality in EpCAM-null mice.* PLoS One, 2009. **4**(12): p. e8543.

65.   Fast, L.A., et al., *Inhibition of Tetraspanin Functions Impairs Human Papillomavirus and Cytomegalovirus Infections.* Int J Mol Sci, 2018. **19**(10).

66.   Viswanathan, K., et al., *Quantitative membrane proteomics reveals a role for tetraspanin enriched microdomains during entry of human cytomegalovirus.* PLoS One, 2017. **12**(11): p. e0187899.

FIGURE LEGENDS

Figure 1: Placental histoculture set-up and characterization.

A) Pipeline of placental histoculture model. B) β-HCG measurements in histoculture

supernatant. For each placental histoculture, β-HCG measurement was realized in the

supernatant between days 3-5 (measure 1) and days 10-12 (measure 2). **** *p<0.0001* by

paired *t*-test (n=21 independent histocultures). C) Cross sections of immunohistochemistry

and hematoxylin staining of placental villi from histoculture at day 14, observed by bright field

microscope. a- Isotype control; b- Cytokeratin 7; c- PLAP; d- Vimentin. Image representative

from at least three independent experiments. Scale bar = 50 μm.

Figure 2: sEV preparation pipeline and flow cytometry analysis.

A) Pipeline of sEV preparation from placental histoculture collected medium. B) Flow cytometry standardization on fluorescent-FITC beads (160 nm, 200 nm, 240 nm and 500 nm). Each population size was defined on SSC granularity and FITC fluorescence parameters. The black rectangle indicates the gating strategy on small bead populations (160nm and 200nm). The dashed line represents the threshold for the detection of sEVs. C) Representative analysis of one placental sEV preparation gated on small events as described above. In this example, 89% of events were below 200nm. All data were analyzed with FlowJo software (BD).

Figure 3: Nanoparticle tracking analysis of sEV prepared from placental explants.

A) Individual analyses of mode size (nm) of four independent placental sEV preparations. Histograms represent mean of mode size ± SEM from three independent measurements (represented by individual dots) for each independent preparation. B) and C) Representative analyses of sEV size and concentration of two sEV samples (respectively, #37 in B and #38 in C).

Figure 4: Electron and immuno-electron microscopy characterization of placental sEVs.

A) Placental sEVs observed by TEM from two independent experiments. sEVs are indicated by black arrows. Scale bar = 100 nm. B) Mean size and min/max of placental sEVs for two independent experiments. Placental sEV size were measured manually with iTEM measure tool. C) Frequency distribution analysis of placental sEV size. Each bar of the histogram represents the mean ± SEM of the relative frequency per bin (bin width = 20 nm) of two independent experiments. Total sEV count was 172 for #31 and 208 for #32. D) Placental sEV were immunogold-labelled for CD63, revealed with Protein A-gold particle of 10 nm diameter and observed by TEM. Scale bar = 100 nm (n = 2). E) Percentage of placental sEV positive for

CD63 (at least one bead counted per sEV) for two independent experiments. Total sEV count

was 189 for #31 and 263 for #32.

Figure 5: Placental sEV surface protein analysis.

A) Surface expression level of several proteins of sEVs, based on the multiplex flow cytometry

Macsplex exosome kit assay. Each bar of the histogram represents the mean ± SEM calculated

from 6 independent experiments, expressed in Arbitrary Units (A. U.) for different sEV markers

indicated on the X axis. The dashed line represents the detection limit of the test (defined by

the two first controls on the left of the histogram). B) Representative western blot analysis

against CD63 performed on two independent sEV preparations (#33 and #35). CD63 appears

as a smear, since the non-reducing conditions of the western blot preserve its rich glycosylated

pattern. MW = molecular weight.

Figure 6: Impact of hCMV infection on placental histocultures.

A) Titration of hCMV genome copies released in histoculture supernatant at day 11, *i.e.* after

two medium changes and renewals. On the graph is indicated the median with 95% CI. n=12

independent experiments. B) Representative examples of immuno-histochemistry performed

against hCMV IE antigen at day 14 on sections of placental villi, counterstained with

hematoxylin. Scale bar = 50 μm. C) Comparison of the explant weight at the end-point of the

placental histocultures, performed for twelve independent experiments. Each of the placental

explants were pooled per condition and weighted (NI = non-infected). Statistical analysis of

explant weight variation between the two conditions was performed by Wilcoxon paired t test

on GraphPad Prism 8 software and showed no significant difference (ns; *p=0,3804*). D)

Comparison of the β-HCG secretion in explant supernatants was performed between non-

infected (NI) *versus* hCMV-infected placenta, measured with the same timeline as presented

in Figure 1A. ns, non-significant (*p=0.9697* for measure 1; *p=0,5693* for measure 2) by

Wilcoxon paired *t*-test. n=12 independent experiments. E) Cross sections of

immunohistochemistry and hematoxylin staining of hCMV infected placental villi from

histoculture at day 14, observed by bright field microscope. a- Isotype control; b- Cytokeratin

7; c- PLAP; d- Vimentin. Image representative from at least three independent experiments.

Scale bar = 50 μm.

Figure 7: Placental sEV isolation and characterization upon hCMV infection.

A) Comparison of the yield of sEV prepared per mg of placental tissue upon sEV preparation

between non-infected (NI) *versus* hCMV-infected placental explants. Yield is expressed in sEV

number/mg tissue, obtained from nine independent experiments. ns, non-significant by

Wilcoxon *t*-test. B) Western blot analysis against CD63 in sEVs prepared from non-infected

(NI) or infected (hCMV) placental explants. This result is representative for at least three

independent experiments. CD63 appears as a smear since the non-reducing conditions of the

western blot preserves its rich glycosylated pattern. MW = molecular weight. C) Placental sEV

isolated from non-infected (NI) *versus* infected (hCMV) placental explants, obtained by TEM.

These pictures are representative of two independent experiments. Scale bar = 100 nm. D)

Frequency distribution analysis of placental sEV size, compared between non-infected (NI)

versus infected (hCMV) placental explants. Each bar of the histogram represents the mean ±

SEM of the relative frequency per bin (bin width = 20 nm) of two independent experiments.

Placental sEV size were measured manually with iTEM measure tool. Total sEV count was 172

and 208 for the NI replicates; 176 and 185 for the hCMV replicates. Statistical analysis of the

distribution between the two conditions was performed by nested *t*-test and showed no

significant difference (*p=0.8814*). E) Mean size ± SEM of placental sEV purified from non-

infected (NI) or infected (hCMV) placental explants, calculated from the experiments

presented in (D). ns, non-significant by nested *t*-test (*p=0.8871*). F and G) Representative

pictures of IEM analysis of placental sEV using antibodies against CD63 (gold bead size = 10

nm), purified from non-infected (NI; F) *versus* infected (hCMV; G) placental explants (n = 2).

Scale bar = 100 nm. H) Percentage of placental sEV positive for CD63 (at least 1 bead counted

per sEV) for two independent experiments. Total sEV count was 189 and 263 for sEV isolated

from non-infected placental explants; 143 and 594 for sEV isolated from infected explants. ns,

non-significant by nested *t*-test. I) Surface expression level of different proteins of sEV isolated

from non-infected (NI) *versus* infected (hCMV) placental explants, based on the multiplex flow

cytometry Macsplex exosome kit assay. Results are represented by a heat-map, calculated

from 3 independent experiments for different sEV markers indicated on the left column. Blue

intensity is proportional to the level expression calculated in Arbitrary Units (A. U.), indicated

on the right of the heat-map. *p <0.0001* by 2-way ANOVA for "Infection" factor. Bonferroni

post-hoc comparison test indicated significant increase for CD81 (*, p=0.0223*) and CD326 (**,

p=0.0029) for hCMV compared to non-infected (NI) conditions.

Word count: 9007.

A

Medium collection and renewal

| D-1 | D0 | D 3-5 | D 7-8 | D 10-12 | D 14-15 | STOP |

Placenta dissection ON washing

Installation on gelatin sponge

βHCG Measure 1

βHCG Measure 2

- sEV preparation
- Tissue weighing

B

β-HCG measure in supernatant

****

β-HCG (mUI/mL)

10^5
10^4
10^3
10^2
10^1
10^0

Measure 1   Measure 2

C

a

b

c

d

Bergamelli et al, Fig 3

A

B sEV size

Mean size (nm)
100 50 0

#31 #32

C Size distribution of sEV

Relative frequency (percentage)
40 30 20 10 0

Size (nm)
20 40 60 80 100 120 140 160 180 200

D

E Proportion of CD63 positive sEV

% CD63 positive sEV
80 60 40 20 0

#31 #32

Bergamelli et al, Fig 4

A

sEV surface expression markers

B

Bergamelli et al, Fig 5

A

hCMV titer

B

NI

hCMV

C

Explant weight

D

β-HCG measure in supernatant

E

a

b

c

d

A sEV yield

B

C

D Size distribution of sEV

E sEV size

F

G

H Proportion of CD63 positive sEV

I sEV surface expression markers