Coupled myovascular expansion directs cardiac growth and regeneration

Authors: Paige DeBenedittis[1], Anish Karpurapu[1], Albert Henry[2,3], Michael C. Thomas[1],

Timothy J. McCord[1], Kyla Brezitski[1], Anil Prasad[1], Yoshihiko Kobayashi[4], Svati H. Shah[1],

Christopher D. Kontos[1,5], Purushothama Rao Tata[4,6,7], R. Thomas Lumbers[3,8,9], and Ravi

Karra[1,6,7,10,*]

Affiliations:

[1]Division of Cardiology, Department of Medicine, Duke University Medical Center; Durham,

NC, USA

[2]Institute of Cardiovascular Science, University College London; London, UK

[3]Institute of Health Informatics, University College London; London, UK

[4]Department of Cell Biology, Duke University; Durham, NC, USA

[5]Department of Pharmacology & Cancer Biology, Duke University; Durham, NC, USA

[6]Regeneration Next, Duke University; Durham, NC, USA

[7]Center for Aging, Duke University Medical Center; Durham, NC, USA

[8]Health Data Research UK London, University College London; London, UK

[9]British Heart Foundation Research Accelerator, University College London; London, UK

[10]Department of Pathology, Duke University Medical Center; Durham, NC, USA

Address correspondence to: Ravi Karra MD MHS

21   Box 102152 DUMC

22   Durham, NC 27710

23   ravi.karra@duke.edu

ABSTRACT

Background: Heart regeneration requires multiple cell types to enable cardiomyocyte (CM)

proliferation. How these cells interact to create growth niches is unclear. Here we profile

proliferation kinetics of cardiac endothelial cells (CECs) and CMs in the neonatal mouse heart

and find that they are spatiotemporally coupled.

Methods and Results: We show that coupled myovascular expansion during cardiac growth or

regeneration is dependent upon VEGF-VEGFR2 signaling, as genetic deletion of *Vegfr2* from

CECs or inhibition of VEGFA abrogates both CEC and CM proliferation. Repair of cryoinjury

displays poor spatial coupling of CEC and CM proliferation. Boosting CEC density after

cryoinjury with virus encoding *Vegfa* enhances regeneration. Using Mendelian randomization,

we demonstrate that circulating VEGFA levels are positively linked with human myocardial

mass, suggesting that *Vegfa* can stimulate human cardiac growth.

Conclusions: Our work demonstrates the importance of coupled CEC and CM expansion and

reveals a myovascular niche that may be therapeutically targeted for heart regeneration.

Keywords: Myovascular, heart regeneration, cardiomyocyte proliferation.

Non-standard abbreviations and acronyms: cardiac endothelial cells (CECs), cryoinjury (CI),

cardiomyocytes (CMs), genome-wide association study (GWAS), left ventricular (LV),

Mendelian randomization (MR), protein quantitative trait loci, (pQTL), single cell RNA-

sequencing (scRNA-Seq)

INTRODUCTION

In many organs, heterologous cell types establish specialized microenvironments, or niches, that mediate tissue growth and regeneration. Alterations to niche constituents can affect the efficiency of tissue growth and outcomes after injury, making niches a possible target for therapeutic regeneration (1, 2). For organs like the intestines, bone marrow, skin, and skeletal muscle, niches are classically centered around a stem cell compartment (3). With a few notable exceptions, niches within organs that lack a resident stem cell are less defined. For instance, in the developing and regenerating neonatal mouse heart, hypoxic niches have been associated with regionalized growth, but the cellular makeup of these niches is unclear (4).

Studies in zebrafish, salamanders, and neonatal mice have established a template for innate heart regeneration through proliferation of spared cardiomyocytes (CMs) (5-8). However, innate heart regeneration is a multicellular process with required contributions from epicardial cells, inflammatory cells, and nerves (9-11). Recent work has highlighted a critical role for the vasculature in heart regeneration (12-15). In zebrafish and neonatal mice, cardiac endothelial cells (CECs) rapidly respond to injury, extending nascent vessels into the wound that ultimately guide CM growth (14, 16, 17). Lineage tracing studies have demonstrated that these new vessels form by proliferation of CECs (16-18). Functional interference with angiogenic responses in the zebrafish or the neonatal mouse heart is associated with defects in CM proliferation (14, 17). Conversely, overexpression of the master angiogenic factor, *vegfaa*, is sufficient to induce ectopic cardiac growth in zebrafish, suggesting that a stimulated vasculature instructs cardiac growth (19). However, a similar role for VEGFA-stimulated CECs in the mammalian heart has yet to be shown.

Here, we spatiotemporally model CM and CEC proliferation in the neonatal mouse heart to investigate the mechanisms underlying cardiac growth and regeneration. We find that CM and CEC proliferation are tightly coupled during postnatal cardiac growth. With cryoinjury (CI), a model of incomplete regeneration, this coupling is spatially impaired. We demonstrate that coupled myovascular expansion is dependent on VEGFA signaling to endothelial VEGFR2 and restoration of coupling after CI through exogenous *Vegfa* can enhance regeneration. Similarly, we find that genetically-determined levels of circulating VEGFA are associated with higher myocardial mass in humans, suggesting that VEGFA also regulates human myocardial growth. Together, these data demonstrate that coupled expansion of CECs and CMs within a myovascular niche regulates cardiac growth and regeneration.

RESULTS

Spatiotemporal coupling of EdU$^+$ CECs and EdU$^+$ CMs during postnatal growth

Neonatal mice are able to regenerate their hearts after injury during the first few days of life (20). The loss of regenerative capacity in the mouse heart is coincident with a developmental decline in the rate of CM proliferation. While the kinetics of CM proliferation in neonatal mice have been well-documented, dynamics of other cardiac cell types are not well characterized. To better define the relationship of CMs and CECs during the regenerative window of the neonatal mouse heart, we assayed CM and CEC cycling kinetics at various time points following an EdU pulse (Figure 1a-b). Cardiac sections at different developmental time points were stained for EdU incorporation along with PCM1 and Erg to specifically mark CM and CEC nuclei, respectively (17, 21-23). We developed customized image segmentation routines to objectively quantify large numbers of CECs and CMs from cardiac sections (3120 ± 734 CECs per heart and 2328 ± 751 CMs per heart, mean ± SD). Consistent with prior reports, we found the percentage of EdU$^+$ CMs to sharply decline over the first 10 days of life, with a second peak occurring at P5 (Fig. 1b,d). The increase in EdU$^+$ CMs at P5 likely coincides with a terminal round of DNA synthesis and binucleation of CMs (23, 24). EdU incorporation by CECs also declines from P1 to P10 (Fig. 1a,c) with a second peak at P7. While CM and CEC kinetics differ with regards to the timing of this second peak, the overall trends of their kinetics parallel each other. To determine the strength of this relationship, we compared rates of EdU$^+$ CECs and CMs for individual hearts and found them to be correlated (R = 0.59, p = 0.0007) (Fig. 1e). Above a threshold of ~8% EdU$^+$ CECs, each 1% increase in EdU$^+$ CMs is associated with a 1.03 ± 0.27% (p = 0.0007) increase in EdU$^+$ CECs.

Based on the strong temporal association of CEC and CM proliferation, we next sought to spatially relate CEC and CM cycling. Within thick sections of hearts from P4 mice pulsed with EdU, we observed numerous instances of EdU$^+$ CMs adjacent to EdU$^+$ CECs (Fig. 1f). To quantify this observation, we assigned coordinates to each CEC and CM nucleus and computed pairwise distances for every CEC and CM. We used this distance information to deconvolve overlapping microenvironments by mapping the position of every CEC relative to an EdU$^+$ CM or an EdU$^-$ CM as a function of distance, resulting in "pseudodistance maps" (Fig. 1g). When comparing the density of EdU$^+$ CECs relative to an EdU$^+$ CM or EdU$^-$ CM, we found the percentage of EdU$^+$ CECs to be enriched around EdU$^+$ CMs compared to EdU$^-$ CMs until about ~7 μm (p = 0.04 at 7

108   μm, two-sided Z-test) (Fig. 1g-h), providing evidence for coupled myovascular expansion during

109   physiologic growth.

Coupling of myovascular growth after cryoinjury to the neonatal mouse heart

Unlike other models of injury to the neonatal mouse heart, cryoinjury (CI) results in incomplete

or inefficient regeneration (25-28). Detailed analyses of CM proliferation kinetics after CI have

demonstrated that CM proliferation occurs in this model, but ostensibly at levels lower than that

of the uninjured neonatal heart (25, 27). Thus, we chose to evaluate myovascular expansion

following CI at P1 as a model of inefficient regeneration, in a regeneration-competent context. We

first profiled CM and CEC kinetics, considering on average of 2407 ± 891 CECs and 2153 ± 1495

CMs within the border zone for each heart (mean $\pm$ SD). We found that CM and CEC kinetics

generally follow the same trend as in the uninjured heart, with an approximately 50% decrease in

proliferation indices for both cell types over the first 10 days of life (Fig. 2a-d). When we compared

rates of CM and CEC proliferation in individual hearts, we once again noted that CM and CEC

proliferation rates are correlated with ~ 1% increase in the percentage of EdU^+ CECs for every

percent increase of EdU^+ CMs (R = 0.54, p = 0.008) (Fig. 2e). However, when we performed a

spatial analysis of CECs and CMs within the border zone, we did not detect enrichment of EdU^+

CECs in the immediate vicinity of EdU^+ CMs (Fig. 2g,h). In fact, EdU^+ CECs may even be

depleted around EdU^+ CMs in the border zone after CI, suggesting that CEC and CM proliferation

may not be efficiently coupled after CI.

Association of myovascular coupling with VEGFA-VEGFR2 signaling

To better understand the molecular mediators of myovascular coupling during growth and injury,

we performed single cell RNA-sequencing (scRNA-Seq) using border zones of P7 hearts that were

cryoinjured at P1. We profiled 1721 cells and identified 9 clusters of cells carrying markers of

CECs, CMs, fibroblasts, and inflammatory cells (Supplemental Table 1, Fig. 3a). Clusters 1, 4,

and 6 were notable for cells with CEC markers, such as *Fabp4, Pecam1, Erg,* and *Vegfr2*

(Supplemental Table 1). Compared to the other CEC clusters, cluster 4 had increased expression

of numerous proliferative markers, including *Ki67, Prc1, Ccna2, and Ccnb2* (Supplemental Table

2). A similar cluster of highly proliferative CECs has been also reported by other groups after

coronary ligation in neonatal and adult mice (29, 30). In the neonatal mouse heart, VEGFR2 marks

cardiac microvascular cells and these cells have recently been implicated in revascularization

following injury (17). Evaluation of sections from neonatal hearts under physiologic growth

conditions and after injury revealed multiple clusters of EdU$^+$ CMs in close proximity to EdU$^+$

VEGFR2$^+$ CECs (Fig. 3b,c), supporting a role for VEGFR2$^+$ microvascular CECs as contributing

to a myovascular niche of growth.

For many organs, parenchymal cells secrete angiogenic factors that enable matching of

vascular supply to organ size (31). Based on our prior work linking *vegfaa* overexpression to

ectopic cardiomyogenesis in the zebrafish heart, we assayed *Vegfa* expression during growth and

regeneration by single molecule fluorescent in situ hybridization (19). We found that under

physiologic growth conditions, *Vegfa* is expressed in CMs but at low levels (Supplemental Fig.

1a). After injury, *Vegfa* is sharply upregulated throughout the ventricle (Supplemental Fig. 1b).

However, based on our time course of CI responses, CEC proliferation wanes in the border zone

over time (Fig. 2a). To determine whether *Vegfa* levels may be contributing to CEC dynamics

after CI, we performed quantitative in situ hybridization of the border zone at P3 and P10 in hearts

cryoinjured at P1 (32). We found *Vegfa* expression to decline by ~50% from P3 to P10 in the

border zone (Fig. 3 d,e), paralleling kinetics of CEC cycling. Together, these data support a

dynamic role for myocardial VEGFA to endothelial VEGFR2 signaling as a regulator of the

myovascular expansion during growth and regeneration.

Requirement of endothelial *Vegfr2* for CM proliferation during growth and regeneration

Based on our scRNA-Seq experiments indicating that many proliferating CECs are *Vegfr2*$^+$, we

hypothesized that VEGFR2 signaling is a critical mediator of myovascular growth in the early

neonatal period. To conditionally delete *Vegfr2* from CECs, we crossed *Vegfr2*$^{flox/flox}$ mice to

Cdh5-CreER^{T2} mice to generate *Cdh5-CreER*^{T2}; *Vegfr2*$^{flox/flox}$ (*Vegfr2*$^{\Delta EC}$) and *Vegfr2*$^{flox/flox}$

(*Vegfr2*^{WT}) mice (33, 34). We verified loss of VEGFR2 from CECs by immunostaining for

VEGFR2 in *Vegfr2*$^{\Delta EC}$ mice (Supplementary Fig. 2a). Evaluation of CECs in *Vegfr2*$^{\Delta EC}$ mice

revealed fewer CECs than in *Vegfr2*^{WT} animals and a nearly 80% reduction in CEC proliferation

(Fig. 4a,b). To determine how CM growth is affected by the absence of *Vegfr2* from CECs, we

next assayed EdU incorporation by CMs. While CM numbers were largely preserved, CM cycling

was also attenuated by ~ 80% in *Vegfr2*$^{\Delta EC}$ mice compared to *Vegfr2*^{WT} mice (Fig. 4c,d) . We next

evaluated the effect of *Vegfr2* deletion from CECs on myovascular growth after cryoinjury. Similar

to our results during early neonatal growth, relative numbers of CECs were decreased while

relative CM numbers were preserved in *Vegfr2*$^{\Delta EC}$ hearts. We identified defects in both CEC and

CM incorporation of EdU after injury in *Vegfr2*$^{\Delta EC}$ mice (Fig. 4e-h). Specifically, we observed

Vegfr2^ΔEC hearts to have an almost 80% decrease in cycling CECs after injury and a 40% decrease

in cycling CMs. Consistent with our hypothesis, CM expansion during growth and regeneration is

dependent on intact *Vegfr2* in CECs.

Inhibition of VEGFA limits CEC and CM proliferation

Our expression data suggest a role for myocardial *Vegfa* in myovascular coupling during growth

and after injury (Fig. S1, 3d). To functionally test this concept, we obtained a well-described

synthetic antibody, B20-4.1.1 (anti-VEGFA), that binds murine VEGFA and prevents interaction

with its receptors (35). Treatment of neonatal mice with anti-VEGFA decreased CEC proliferation

by approximately 70% during early neonatal growth and by about 90% after injury indicating a

dependency of CEC proliferation on VEGFA (Fig. 5 a,b,e,f). Defects in CEC proliferation

following anti-VEGFA treatment were accompanied by decreases in the fraction of EdU$^+$ CMs

during growth and after injury (Fig. 5 c,d,g,h), further supporting the need for myovascular

coupling during growth and regeneration.

Prior work has described a critical role for tissue hypoxia as a regulator of CM proliferation

in both zebrafish and mice (4, 36, 37). Remarkably, hypoxic pre-conditioning of adult mice results

in cardiac growth and enhanced regenerative capacity (38). Mechanistically, hypoxia decreases

levels of reactive oxygen species, enabling CM cell cycle-reentry (36). As the decreased

vascularity in *Vegfr2*^ΔEC mice and anti-VEGFA treated mice might be expected to result in tissue

hypoxia, we examined hypoxia in CMs under these conditions. Pimonidazole is a 2-nitroimidazole

used to identify tissue hypoxia based on its formation of stable adducts in the presence of low

oxygen tension (39, 40). These adducts can be detected by immunofluorescence with the intensity

of staining directly proportional to the level of hypoxia. We administered pimonidazole prior to

harvest of hearts from *Vegfr2*^ΔEC mice, *Vegfr2*^WT mice, and mice injected with anti-VEGFA or

vehicle. We noted an approximately 75% increase in the intensity of pimonidazole uptake by CMs

of *Vegfr2*^ΔEC mice compared to *Vegfr2*^WT mice and an almost 2-fold increase in mice treated with

anti-VEGFA compared to mice treated with vehicle (Supplemental Fig. 3). Together, these results

suggest that CECs are a required mediator for CM proliferation in response to tissue hypoxia.

Exogenous VEGFA enhances the efficiency of innate regenerative responses.

Based on the impaired spatial myovascular coupling of CECs and CMs after CI (Fig. 2g-i) and the

decrease of *Vegfa* in the border zone after CI (Fig. 3d), we hypothesized that increasing *Vegfa*

levels within the border zone might enhance the efficiency of regenerative growth following CI

(19). To test our hypothesis, we generated adeno-associated virus to overexpress *Vegfa* (AAV-*Vegfa*) or GFP (AAV-*GFP*). We then cryoinjured mice at P1 and injected AAV-*Vegfa* or AAV-*GFP* into the border zone immediately after injury (Supplemental Fig. 2b-c). Gross examination of hearts injected with a resin to opacify the coronaries hearts at P21 identified increased vascularity at the site of injury of AAV-*Vegfa* hearts compared to AAV-*GFP* hearts (Supplemental Fig. 2c). In addition, we noted that AAV-*Vegfa* hearts had ~50% less scarring of the left ventricle and better cardiac function after CI (Fig. 6 a-), all suggestive of enhanced regeneration. Importantly, while CEC density was increased in animals treated with AAV-*Vegfa* (Fig. 6 e,f), this was accompanied by a more than 2-fold increase of Ki67$^+$ CMs in the border zone compared to hearts treated with AAV-*GFP* (Fig. 6h). Finally, we evaluated sarcomere morphology and α-SMA expression, two markers of CM maturity (20, 41). Compared to uninjured hearts and hearts treated with AAV-*GFP*, AAV-*Vegfa* treated hearts were notable for CMs with sarcomeric staining on the periphery of the cell, similar to prior descriptions of sarcomere disassembly (Supplemental Fig. 4a, b) (20). Also consistent with a less mature CM phenotype in AAV-*Vegfa* hearts, CMs were more likely to express the dedifferentiation marker αSMA after AAV-*Vegfa* treatment (Supplemental Fig. 4c-e). Together, these data indicate that exogenous *Vegfa* in the border zone can enhance regenerative responses after neonatal CI by increasing CECs, promoting CM dedifferentiation and proliferation, reducing scarring, and restoring ventricular function.

Association of genetically predicted VEGFA levels with myocardial mass in human

Our results after CI in neonatal mice suggest exogenous *Vegfa* could be used therapeutically to promote cardiac growth and regeneration. Indeed, exogenous *Vegfa* has been shown to stimulate cardiac repair after experimental infarction many times in adult mammals, even prompting several human clinical trials in patients with ischemic heart disease (42-47). However, clinical trials have largely failed to improve outcomes, possibly because of inefficient delivery methods that did not sufficiently raise local *Vegfa* levels (48, 49).

Based on its potential as a regenerative factor, we sought to conceptually determine whether VEGFA might regulate cardiac growth in humans using Mendelian randomization (MR). MR is an epidemiologic technique that uses genetic variation to infer causality from observational studies (50-52). Traditional observational studies that associate factors with an outcome are prone to confounding and cannot differentiate causation from reverse causation. However, because

innate factors tend to be independent of confounding variables, MR studies are used to point

towards causality, and have been used to successfully predict the results of clinical trials (53).

We performed two-sample *cis* Mendelian randomization (MR) analysis with genetically

predicted circulating VEGFA concentration as the exposure variable and traits of cardiac structure

and function as the outcomes (Fig. 7) (54). Under this framework, genetic variants acting in *cis*

that associate with protein abundance (protein quantitative trait loci, pQTL) are used as

instrumental variables to estimate the unconfounded causal effects of the protein on the outcomes

of interest (Fig. 7a). Genetic variants within the VEGFA gene region were selected from genetic

association summary statistics from a genome-wide association study (GWAS) of directly

measured circulating VEGFA concentration in over 30,000 individuals (Fig. 7b, Supplemental

Table 3) (55). Variant association statistics for six parameters of left ventricular (LV) structure and

function were then extracted from a GWAS of cardiac magnetic resonance imaging measures in

the UK Biobank (56). A summary of the GWAS is presented in Supplemental Table 4. We applied

these instruments, using a two-sample MR model that accounts for partial correlation between

instruments, to estimate the effect of genetically predicted circulating VEGFA on LV phenotypes

(52). We did not detect a link between genetically predicted VEGFA levels and left ventricular

volumes or ejection fraction but found that higher genetically predicted VEGFA levels resulted in

increased LV mass (at type I error rate = 0.05 / 6), (Fig. 7c,d). In total, we found an estimated 1.02

gram (95% CI = 0.33-1.70 gram, p = 0.004) increase in LVM per doubling of the circulating

VEGFA concentration. Because there is a lack of consensus on how genetic instruments are

selected and MR modeling, we performed a sensitivity analysis. Across 120 separate analyses

with varying thresholds for instrument selection and four different MR modeling approaches, 119

of these analyses indicate that higher levels of VEGFA are robustly associated with higher LVM

(Fig 7e). These results are consistent with the hypothesis that VEGFA promotes cardiac growth in

humans and support a possible therapeutic role for VEGFA.

DISCUSSION

We profiled CEC and CM dynamics to determine that CEC and CM cycling are

spatiotemporally coupled in the neonatal mouse heart. Uncoupling CECs from CMs, by deletion

of *Vegfr2* from CECs or with an anti-VEGFA antibody, dramatically decreases CM proliferation

(Figs 4 and 5). Conversely, improving CEC and CM coupling after CI by increasing local *Vegfa*

increases regeneration after CI (Fig. 6). Analogously, myocardial mass of the human heart

increases with higher VEGFA levels (Fig. 7). Together, our work demonstrates that the efficiency

of cardiac growth is dependent upon myovascular interactions, a finding with strong translational

relevance. Approximately 50% of patients with systolic heart failure have flow-limiting coronary

artery disease (57). Even in so-called "non-ischemic" cardiomyopathies, cardiac perfusion is

impaired due to microvascular disease and capillary rarefaction (58-62). Thus, as methods to

promote proliferation of adult mammalian CMs move towards therapeutics, mechanical or

molecular revascularization approaches may be a required adjunct for these approaches to be

maximally efficacious.

A key concept suggested by our work is that of growth niches, in which cycling CECs

establish inductive microenvironments to promote CM proliferation (Fig. 1, 2). We find that

cycling CECs are statistically enriched within 7 μm, or 1-2 cell lengths, of cycling CMs during

physiologic growth. Because we used pairwise comparisons of CEC and CM distances to

deconvolve overlapping niches, our spatial analysis likely underestimates the expanse of the niche

surrounding cycling CMs. However, our results are remarkably well-aligned with reported

increases of CM proliferation within 3 cell lengths of sprouting angiogenesis in cultured fetal heart

sections (63). Niches for CM expansion in the postnatal mammalian heart have been previously

identified around hypoxic regions, with hypoxia even being able to induce CM proliferation in the

adult mouse heart (4, 38). Mechanistically, hypoxia exerts its effect on CM proliferation cell

autonomously, by modulating reactive oxygen species and the DNA damage response (36). Our

work suggests another element to the phenomenon of hypoxia-induced CM proliferation. We were

able to induce hypoxia in the neonatal heart through two different approaches, genetic deletion of

Vegfr2 from CECs and with an anti-VEGFA antibody (Supplemental Fig. 3). However, even

though hypoxia would be predicted to increase CM proliferation, we observed decreased CM

cycling in these models. Thus, hypoxia mediated CM expansion is likely to involve both CM-

specific effects but to also depend on CECs within the hypoxic niche. While hypoxia may be one

approach to stimulate heart regeneration, therapeutic hypoxia for patients with heart failure may

be challenging. A better understanding of the signaling milieu of the hypoxic niche could lead to

alternate approaches for stimulating hypoxia-mediated regeneration.

Because depletion of CECs, either through deletion of *Vegfr2* from CECs or by

administration of anti-VEGFA, leads to defects in CM proliferation, our work demonstrates that

CECs promote CM cycling (Fig. 5, 6). Mechanistically, CEC expansion may simply lead to new
conduits for growth factors or other cell types that promote cardiac growth. However, multiple
lines of evidence also point to a direct role for CECs to influence CM proliferation through
angiocrines. Indeed, recent work in zebrafish and neonatal mice support this concept. In zebrafish,
inhibition of Notch in CECs results in reduced secretion of Wnt inhibitors that influence CM
proliferation (64). More directly, deletion of *Igf2* from CECs in developing mice abrogates CM
proliferation after neonatal cardiac injury (65). Interestingly, deletion of *Igf2* from CECs does not
affect physiologic CM cycling, raising the intriguing possibility that different angiocrines
modulate myocardial expansion during physiologic growth and after injury. Finally, different CEC
subsets may contribute different sets of angiocrines, as recent work suggests that *Reln* from
lymphatic endothelial cells has direct effects on CM proliferation (13). Future work to identify the
complement of angiocrines that instruct CM proliferation in different developmental and injury
contexts is needed.

Our work also suggests that restoring myovascular coupling can enhance regenerative
capacity. Unlike physiologic growth, CEC cycling is not enriched around cycling CMs in the
border zone after CI, a model of incomplete regeneration. Functionally increasing CEC density
through overexpression of the master angiokine *Vegfa* enhances CM cycling and reduces scarring
after CI, both signs of enhanced regeneration (Fig. 6). Taken together with our prior work showing
that *vegfaa* overexpression can induce ectopic heart regeneration in zebrafish, exogenous *Vegfa*
may be one approach to augment regeneration. Indeed, our MR study indicates that VEGFA levels
are causally linked to human myocardial mass and predict that more VEGFA can increase human
cardiac growth (Figure 7). Several clinical trials of *Vegfa* are now underway to revisit whether
exogenous VEGFA can be used therapeutically to treat human cardiovascular disease
(NCT03409627, NCT03370887, and NCT04125732). Compared to prior clinical trials, these
studies utilize newer delivery methods such as modified RNAs, newer generation viral vectors,
and more efficient plasmid delivery systems. Based partly on our findings, we would expect that
markers of increased CECs, such as improvements in myocardial perfusion, will predict VEGFA-
based treatment effects on cardiac mass and function.

We acknowledge several limitations to our work. First, although we focus on the coupling
of CECs and CMs during growth and regeneration, additional cell types also regulate cardiac
growth and are likely to be present within niches. Defining niche constituents may be critical to

efficiently instruct cardiac growth. Second, while we demonstrate a critical role of VEGFA-
VEGFR2 signaling to coordinate CEC and CM expansion, VEGFR2 broadly marks the cardiac
microvasculature. Future work to refine which microvascular cells instruct CM cycling could
enable more targeted regenerative approaches via cell transplantation or specific signaling cues.
Finally, while our MR studies point to a therapeutic benefit to using VEGFA to stimulate cardiac
growth, our MR studies model a lifetime of exposure to VEGFA and do not have the resolution to
confirm that increased myocardial mass is the result of CM expansion. Additional work to
determine whether VEGFA promotes cardiac growth across developmental stages and to directly
link VEGFA to human CM proliferation in vivo are needed to establish VEGFA as a bona fide
regenerative factor in humans.
In summary, here, we present work showing that coordinated growth of CECs and CMs guides
postnatal cardiac growth and regeneration. We speculate that a better understanding of the
signaling milieu within a myovascular niche can inform approaches for heart regeneration.
337
METHODS
Mice and Neonatal Cryoinjuries
CD-1 mice (Charles River Labs, Morrisville, NC) were used for profiling myovascular kinetics
during growth and regeneration. CD-1 mice were also used for anti-VEGFA antibody and AAV
experiments. *Cdh5-CreER*^{T2} and *Vegfr2*$^{flox/flox}$ strains have been previously described (33, 34).
Cdh5-CreER^{T2}; *Vegfr2*$^{flox/flox}$ and *Vegfr2*$^{flox/flox}$ mice were treated with 100 mg of tamoxifen
intraperitoneally at P0 and P1. Complete recombination was verified by immunostaining for
VEGFR2 (Supplementary Fig. 2). For EdU incorporation studies, 0.5 mg EdU was given
intraperitoneally 4 hours prior to tissue harvest. Cryoinjuries were performed on P1 pups as
previously described (25, 28).
The number of animals used in these studies is specified in the figure legends. For mouse
experiments, we included animals 1) confirmed to have *Vegfr2* deletion by immunostaining for
VEGFR2; 2) animals with weight loss after anti-VEGFA treatment; or 3) animals confirmed to
have *Vegfa* overexpression by in situ hybridization after injection with AAV-*Vegfa*. For assays
without computational scoring, readers were blinded to experimental groups. All protocols were
approved by the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee at Duke University.
Histology and Immunostaining

At the time of tissue harvest, hearts were perfused with KCl and then 4% PFA. Hearts were then

immersed in 30% sucrose overnight and embedded in Tissue Freezing Media for cryosectioning.

Cryosections were blocked with PBST (PBS with 0.1% Tween-20) containing 10%

newborn calf serum and 1% DMSO and incubated overnight with primary antibodies at 4ºC.

Cryosections were then washed with PBST and incubated with secondary antibodies and DAPI

(100 ng/ml). For EdU detection, cryosections were incubated in EdU staining solution (100 mM

Tris-HCl, 1 mM $CuSO_4$, 10 mM Azide, and 50 mM ascorbic acid in PBS) for 10 minutes. Primary

antibodies used for this study included: anti-PCM1 (Sigma, HPA023370, 1:100); anti-PCM1

(Santa Cruz, sc-398365, 1:100); anti-Erg (Abcam, ab92513, 1:25); anti-CD31

(BDBioscience, 553370, 1:100), anti-VEGFR2 (BDBioscience, 555307, 1:100), anti-Ki67

(ThermoFisher, 4-5698-82, 1:100), anti-Actinin (Cell Signaling, 6487P, 1:100), anti-Tnnt (DSHB

CT3, 1:25) αSMA (Abcam, ab5694, 1:200). Secondary antibodies and azides were conjugated to

Alexa-488, Alexa-594, or Alexa-633 (Invitrogen). To label CM nuclei, cryosections underwent

heat induced epitope retrieval with citrate buffer prior to immunostaining. Stained slides were

imaged on a Zeiss AxioImager M1 epifluorescent microscope, a Zeiss CSU-X1 spinning disk

confocal microscope, or a Zeiss LSM 510 confocal microscope. For physiologic growth

experiments, 9 -16 non-overlapping images (40X) of the left ventricle were obtained for each

section. For CI experiments, the border zone was defined as the entire region within 1-2 40X fields

of view along the entirety of the injury plane. For each heart, the 3 largest sections were imaged.

Quantification of CM and CEC Proliferation

We developed several customized image segmentation pipelines using CellProfiler and Ilastik for

automated scoring EdU[+] CECs and CMs (66, 67). For CEC quantification, grayscale images for

each channel were processed with rolling-ball background subtraction and used as input into a

CellProfiler routine that 1) identified Erg[+] nuclei based on Erg staining and DAPI intensity; 2)

identified EdU[+] nuclei based on EdU staining and DAPI staining; and 3) identified EdU[+] Erg[+]

nuclei based on the presence of an EdU object within an Erg object.

For CMs, grayscale images from individual channels were obtained using a Zeiss CSU-X1

spinning disk confocal microscope. Images were pre-processed to generate 32-bit grayscale

images and to create a set of images with merged PCM1 and DAPI channels. The DAPI image

and the merged PCM1-DAPI images were then input into machine learning routines to generate

probability maps for DAPI[+] nuclei and PCM1^{+}/DAPI[+] nuclei, using Ilastik. Machine learning

algorithms were trained using images from our physiologic growth experiments. Probability maps

and grayscale images were used as input for a CellProfiler pipeline that 1) identified nuclei based

on a DAPI probability map; 2) filtered nuclei for CMs based on the mean PCM1$^+$/DAPI$^+$ pixel

probability; 3) identified EdU$^+$ nuclei based on EdU staining and DAPI staining; and 4) identified

EdU+ CM nuclei based on the presence of an EdU object within a CM nucleus. CellProfiler output

data was tabulated using the dplyr package in R (68).

Proximity mapping

For proximity mapping, z-stack images of P4 hearts were obtained using a Zeiss LSM 510 confocal

microscope. CM and CEC nuclei were segmented using the Spots tool along with manual

refinement, assigned coordinates, and categorized as EdU$^+$ or EdU$^-$ using Imaris (Bitplane AG,

Zurich, Switzerland). Coordinate files were then used to determine the pairwise distance of each

CM and each CEC nucleus. Distances were used to compute the density of EdU$^+$ CECs as a

function of distance from each PCM1$^+$ nucleus using the dplyr and plotly packages in R (68, 69).

In situ hybridization

RNAscope Probe - Mm-Vegfa-O2 (Lot 16197A), with predicted reactivity against all known

murine *Vegfa* variants, was hybridized against cryosections using the manufacturer's protocol

(Advanced Cell Diagnostics, Hayward, CA). Images of sections were quantified using a

CellProfiler routine adapted from Erben et al (32). Briefly, the DAPI channel was used to identify

nuclei objects and the number of *Vegfa* spots adjacent to each nucleus was counted.

Single Cell RNA Sequencing and Analysis

The left ventricles of cryoinjured hearts were collected at P7. The apical third of the LV that

contained the injured area was then dissociated into single cells. Single cells were then captured

into droplets using microfluidics followed by preparation of single cell cDNA libraries as

previously described (70). Samples were sequenced on a single lane of an Illumina HiSeq.

Sequencing reads were mapped to Ensembl release NCBIM37.67. Aligned reads were binned and

collapsed onto cellular barcodes using the Drop-seq pipeline v1.13.3

(http://mccarrolllab.com/dropseq), resulting in a raw digital expression matrix containing the count

of unique UMIs for each gene in each cell (71).

Expression analysis was performed by the Duke Bioinformatics Shared Resource, using

the Seurat package (v2.2.0) in R/Bioconductor **(72)**. Cells with gene counts over 4,000 or less than

200 were removed. Genes expressed in less than three cells were also removed. To avoid over-

filtering CMs, we did not filter cells based on high expression of mitochondrial genes. Gene

expression, for 1721 cells across 12754 genes, was normalized by scaling by the total number of

transcripts, multiplying by 10,000, and log transformation. Unwanted sources of variation were

adjusted for by regression on the number of detected UMIs using the *ScaleData* function. We used

the JackStraw method to determine the number of statistically significant principal components

(PCs). The *FindClusters* function was used to identify cellular clusters, using the 20 significant

PCs and a 0.6 resolution. We used the t-SNE method to visualize cells across 20 PCs in two

dimensions. To identify cell types, we used the *FindAllMarkers* function. Parameters were set to

test all genes, expressed in at least 10% of the cells in each cluster, for differential expression.

Anti-VEGFA Antibody Treatment

Anti-VEGFA antibody (B20-4.1.1) was a kind gift from Genentech (San Francisco, CA). Neonatal

mice were injected with 5 mg/g of anti-VEGFA or vehicle at P0 and P4. Adequate injection of

anti-VEGFA was confirmed by significant weight loss compared to control animals at the time of

tissue harvest.

Determination of Hypoxia

Mice were given 60 mg/g pimonidazole (Hypoxyprobe, HP3-100kit) intraperitoneally 1.5 hours

prior to tissue harvest. Tissues sections were stained with an anti-pimonidazole antibody

(Hypoxyprobe, HP3-100kit, 1:100) and an antibody against a-actinin. For each heart, 9 images of

the left ventricle for 3 separate cardiac sections were obtained using an AxioImager M1

microscope. Images were quantified using a CellProfiler routine to 1) create an image mask based

on the a-actinin stain and 2) determine the mean intensity of anti-pimonidazole stain.

AAV Generation and Treatment

AAV encoding *Vegfa-164* under the control of a CMV promoter was generated by PCR amplifying

the *Vegf164* isoform of *Vegfa* from a mouse endothelial cDNA library and cloning this fragment

into the pTR2-eGFP with replacement of *EGFP* (73). AAV, serotype 9, was generated through the

Duke Viral Vector core. AAV virus encoding *GFP* under the control of a CMV promoter was

obtained from the Duke Viral Vector Core. For intracardiac injections, 12 μl of AAV at

1×10^9 vg/ml was injected circumferentially around the injured area immediately after CI

(Supplemental Fig. 2b).

Coronary vessel labeling

The coronary vasculature was visualized by injection of a low viscosity polyurethane resin
(PU4ii, VasQTec) into the apex of the left ventricle (74). Whole mount images were obtained
using a stereoscope.

Scar Assessment

451 P21 hearts were serially sectioned from base to apex and stained with acid fuchsin orange G, as
452 previously described (75). Stained slides were scanned with a Leica Aperio Digital Pathology
453 Slide Scanner. Scar area as a percentage of the left ventricle was scored by a blinded reader. The
454 average scar percentage across the 5 largest sections was determined for each heart.

Echocardiography

456 Fractional shortening was determined by echocardiography using the Duke Cardiovascular
457 Physiology Core. Images were analyzed by three blinded readers and an averaged reading is
458 reported.

Mendelian Randomization to Determine Effects of Circulating VEGFA Levels on Human
Cardiac Structure

Two-sample MR analysis was performed using summary statistics from GWAS of circulating
protein level measured with Olink proximity-extension assay in 30,931 individuals of European
ancestries and GWAS of cardiac MRI – derived left ventricular phenotypes in 16,923 UK Biobank
participants (Supplementary Table 4) (55, 56). To represent effect in the original unit of
measurements, the standardized estimates from both GWAS were back-transformed by
multiplying the MR effect estimate with the estimated standard deviation of the traits. MR
instruments for VEGFA were selected from variants that 1) are available in both GWAS, 2) located
within the 200 kilobases flanking region from the genomic coordinate of *VEGFA* gene; 3) have a
MAF > 0.01; 4) have a *P*-value for association with circulating VEGFA level < 1×10^{-4}; and 5) are
LD-clumped to an r^2 threshold of 0.4 using *plink* with --clump option (76). Mendelian
randomization analysis was performed using an inverse-variance weighted model accounting for
correlation between instruments, implemented in the *MendelianRandomization* R package (77,
78). Correlation between instruments were estimated from a random sample of 10,000 UK
Biobank participants of European ancestries (79).

To test the robustness of the cis-MR analysis, a series of sensitivity analyses were
performed by varying parameters for instrument selection and MR models. For instrument
selection, LD clumping was performed using five different r^2 thresholds (0.05, 0.1, 0.2, 0.4, and

0.6) and six different *P*-value thresholds for association with circulating VEGFA level (no

threshold), $1e^{-2}$, $1e^{-3}$, $1e^{-4}$, $1e^{-5}$, and $5e^{-8}$). Four different MR models were also tested for each

instrument set (inverse-variance weighted, MR-Egger, Principal component MR with 90%

variance explained, and Principal component MR with 99% variance explained) (80, 81). To

account for correlation between instruments, we implemented the method proposed by Burgess *et*

al. using an instrument correlation model derived from genotype data of a random subset of 10,000

UK Biobank participants of European ancestry (77).

Statistics

All means are presented as mean ± SEM and proportions as proportion ± 95% confidence interval

(95% CI). Statistical analysis between two groups was performed using a two-tailed unpaired t-

test test. Pairwise comparisons between multiple groups were performed using a two-tailed

unpaired t-test test with correction for multiple testing using Holm's method. A $p < 0.05$ was set

as an *a priori* threshold for significance. Statistical analysis and plots were generated in R using

the dplyr, ggpubr, and ggplot2 packages (68, 82, 83). For each experiment, individual data points

are presented in the plot and the sample size is specified in the figure legend.

Study approval

All animal protocols were approved by the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee at Duke

University.

Acknowledgments: We thank Ken Poss, Nenad Bursac, Doug Marchuk, and Howard Rockman

for comments and discussion. We would like to thank Dr. Helene Fradin Kirshner from the Duke

Bioinformatics Shared Resource for assistance with the analysis of scRNA-seq data.

Author contributions:

Conceptualization: RK

Methodology: RK, RTL, PRT, SHS

Investigation: PD, AK, AH, KB, AP, MCT, YK, TM, CK, RTL, RK

Visualization: PD, AK, AH, RTL, RK

Funding acquisition: RK, RTL

Project administration: PD, RTL, RK

Supervision: RK, RTL

Writing – original draft: PD, RK

Writing – review & editing: PD, AH, SHS, CDK, RTL, RK.

Sources of Funding:

National Institutes of Health grant R03 HL144812 (RK)

Duke University Strong Start Physician Scientist Award (RK),

Mandel Foundation Seed Grant (RK)

Walker P. Inman Endowment (RK)

UK Research and Innovation Rutherford Fellowship MR/S003754/1 hosted by Health Data

Research UK (RTL)

BigData@Heart Consortium funded by the Innovative Medicines Initiative-2 Joint Undertaking

grant 116074 (RTL)

National Institute for Health Research University College London Hospitals Biomedical

Research Centre (RTL)

Disclosures: None

References

1. Wagers AJ. The stem cell niche in regenerative medicine. *Cell Stem Cell.* 2012;10(4):362-9.
2. Lane SW, Williams DA, and Watt FM. Modulating the stem cell niche for tissue regeneration. *Nat Biotechnol.* 2014;32(8):795-803.
3. Fuchs E, and Blau HM. Tissue Stem Cells: Architects of Their Niches. *Cell Stem Cell.* 2020;27(4):532-56.
4. Kimura W, Xiao F, Canseco DC, Muralidhar S, Thet S, Zhang HM, et al. Hypoxia fate mapping identifies cycling cardiomyocytes in the adult heart. *Nature.* 2015;523(7559):226-30.
5. Poss KD, Wilson LG, and Keating MT. Heart regeneration in zebrafish. *Science.* 2002;298(5601):2188-90.
6. Kikuchi K, Holdway JE, Werdich AA, Anderson RM, Fang Y, Egnaczyk GF, et al. Primary contribution to zebrafish heart regeneration by gata4(+) cardiomyocytes. *Nature.* 2010;464(7288):601-5.
7. Oberpriller J, and Oberpriller JC. Mitosis in adult newt ventricle. *J Cell Biol.* 1971;49(2):560-3.
8. Jopling C, Sleep E, Raya M, Marti M, Raya A, and Izpisua Belmonte JC. Zebrafish heart regeneration occurs by cardiomyocyte dedifferentiation and proliferation. *Nature.* 2010;464(7288):606-9.
9. Wang J, Cao J, Dickson AL, and Poss KD. Epicardial regeneration is guided by cardiac outflow tract and Hedgehog signalling. *Nature.* 2015;522(7555):226-30.
10. Mahmoud AI, O'Meara CC, Gemberling M, Zhao L, Bryant DM, Zheng R, et al. Nerves Regulate Cardiomyocyte Proliferation and Heart Regeneration. *Dev Cell.* 2015;34(4):387-99.
11. Aurora AB, Porrello ER, Tan W, Mahmoud AI, Hill JA, Bassel-Duby R, et al. Macrophages are required for neonatal heart regeneration. *J Clin Invest.* 2014;124(3):1382-92.
12. Fernandez CE, Bakovic M, and Karra R. Endothelial Contributions to Zebrafish Heart Regeneration. *J Cardiovasc Dev Dis.* 2018;5(4).
13. Liu X, De la Cruz E, Gu X, Balint L, Oxendine-Burns M, Terrones T, et al. Lymphoangiocrine signals promote cardiac growth and repair. *Nature.* 2020.
14. Marin-Juez R, Marass M, Gauvrit S, Rossi A, Lai SL, Materna SC, et al. Fast revascularization of the injured area is essential to support zebrafish heart regeneration. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A.* 2016;113(40):11237-42.
15. Fan Q, Mao H, Angelini A, Coarfa C, Robertson MJ, Lagor WR, et al. Depletion of Endothelial Prolyl Hydroxylase Domain Protein 2 and 3 Promotes Cardiomyocyte Proliferation and Prevents Ventricular Failure Induced by Myocardial Infarction. *Circulation.* 2019;140(5):440-2.
16. Marin-Juez R, El-Sammak H, Helker CSM, Kamezaki A, Mullapuli ST, Bibli SI, et al. Coronary Revascularization During Heart Regeneration Is Regulated by Epicardial and Endocardial Cues and Forms a Scaffold for Cardiomyocyte Repopulation. *Dev Cell.* 2019;51(4):503-15 e4.
17. Das S, Goldstone AB, Wang H, Farry J, D'Amato G, Paulsen MJ, et al. A Unique Collateral Artery Development Program Promotes Neonatal Heart Regeneration. *Cell.* 2019;176(5):1128-42 e18.

18.   Zhao L, Borikova AL, Ben-Yair R, Guner-Ataman B, MacRae CA, Lee RT, et al. Notch
signaling regulates cardiomyocyte proliferation during zebrafish heart regeneration. *Proc*
Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2014;111(4):1403-8.
19.   Karra R, Foglia MJ, Choi WY, Belliveau C, DeBenedittis P, and Poss KD. Vegfaa
instructs cardiac muscle hyperplasia in adult zebrafish. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A.*
2018;115(35):8805-10.
20.   Porrello ER, Mahmoud AI, Simpson E, Hill JA, Richardson JA, Olson EN, et al.
Transient regenerative potential of the neonatal mouse heart. *Science.*
2011;331(6020):1078-80.
21.   Bergmann O, Zdunek S, Alkass K, Druid H, Bernard S, and Frisen J. Identification of
cardiomyocyte nuclei and assessment of ploidy for the analysis of cell turnover. *Exp Cell*
Res. 2011;317(2):188-94.
22.   Bergmann O, Bhardwaj RD, Bernard S, Zdunek S, Barnabe-Heider F, Walsh S, et al.
Evidence for cardiomyocyte renewal in humans. *Science.* 2009;324(5923):98-102.
23.   Alkass K, Panula J, Westman M, Wu T-D, Guerquin-Kern J-L, and Bergmann O. No
evidence for cardiomyocyte number expansion in preadolescent mice. *Cell.*
2015;163(4):1026-36.
24.   Soonpaa MH, Kim KK, Pajak L, Franklin M, and Field LJ. Cardiomyocyte DNA
synthesis and binucleation during murine development. *American Journal of Physiology-*
Heart and Circulatory Physiology. 1996;271(5):H2183-H9.
25.   Polizzotti BD, Ganapathy B, Walsh S, Choudhury S, Ammanamanchi N, Bennett DG, et
al. Neuregulin stimulation of cardiomyocyte regeneration in mice and human
myocardium reveals a therapeutic window. *Sci Transl Med.* 2015;7(281):281ra45.
26.   Polizzotti BD, Ganapathy B, Haubner BJ, Penninger JM, and Kuhn B. A cryoinjury
model in neonatal mice for cardiac translational and regeneration research. *Nat Protoc.*
2016;11(3):542-52.
27.   Darehzereshki A, Rubin N, Gamba L, Kim J, Fraser J, Huang Y, et al. Differential
regenerative capacity of neonatal mouse hearts after cryoinjury. *Dev Biol.*
2015;399(1):91-9.
28.   Bakovic M, Thakkar D, DeBenedittis P, Chong DC, Thomas MC, Iversen ES, et al.
Clonal Analysis of the Neonatal Mouse Heart using Nearest Neighbor Modeling. *Journal*
of Visualized Experiments: Jove. 2020(162).
29.   Wang Z, Cui M, Shah AM, Tan W, Liu N, Bassel-Duby R, et al. Cell-Type-Specific
Gene Regulatory Networks Underlying Murine Neonatal Heart Regeneration at Single-
Cell Resolution. *Cell Rep.* 2020;33(10):108472.
30.   Wu X, Reboll MR, Korf-Klingebiel M, and Wollert KC. Angiogenesis After Acute
Myocardial Infarction. *Cardiovasc Res.* 2020.
31.   Rafii S, Butler JM, and Ding BS. Angiocrine functions of organ-specific endothelial
cells. *Nature.* 2016;529(7586):316-25.
32.   Erben L, and Buonanno A. Detection and quantification of multiple RNA sequences
using emerging ultrasensitive fluorescent in situ hybridization techniques. *Current*
protocols in neuroscience. 2019;87(1):e63.
33.   Hooper AT, Butler JM, Nolan DJ, Kranz A, Iida K, Kobayashi M, et al. Engraftment and
reconstitution of hematopoiesis is dependent on VEGFR2-mediated regeneration of
sinusoidal endothelial cells. *Cell Stem Cell.* 2009;4(3):263-74.

34. Sorensen I, Adams RH, and Gossler A. DLL1-mediated Notch activation regulates
endothelial identity in mouse fetal arteries. *Blood.* 2009;113(22):5680-8.
35. Liang W-C, Wu X, Peale FV, Lee CV, Meng YG, Gutierrez J, et al. Cross-species
vascular endothelial growth factor (VEGF)-blocking antibodies completely inhibit the
growth of human tumor xenografts and measure the contribution of stromal VEGF.
Journal of Biological Chemistry. 2006;281(2):951-61.
36. Puente BN, Kimura W, Muralidhar SA, Moon J, Amatruda JF, Phelps KL, et al. The
oxygen-rich postnatal environment induces cardiomyocyte cell-cycle arrest through DNA
damage response. *Cell.* 2014;157(3):565-79.
37. Jopling C, Suñé G, Faucherre A, Fabregat C, and Izpisua Belmonte JC. Hypoxia induces
myocardial regeneration in zebrafish. *Circulation.* 2012;126(25):3017-27.
38. Nakada Y, Canseco DC, Thet S, Abdisalaam S, Asaithamby A, Santos CX, et al.
Hypoxia induces heart regeneration in adult mice. *Nature.* 2017;541(7636):222-7.
39. Raleigh JA, Calkins-Adams DP, Rinker LH, Ballenger CA, Weissler MC, Fowler WC,
Jr., et al. Hypoxia and vascular endothelial growth factor expression in human squamous
cell carcinomas using pimonidazole as a hypoxia marker. *Cancer Res.* 1998;58(17):3765-
8.
40. Miller G, Best M, Franko A, Koch C, and Raleigh J. Quantitation of hypoxia in
multicellular spheroids by video image analysis. *International Journal of Radiation
Oncology* Biology* Physics.* 1989;16(4):949-52.
41. Chen Y, Luttmann FF, Schoger E, Scholer HR, Zelarayan LC, Kim KP, et al. Reversible
reprogramming of cardiomyocytes to a fetal state drives heart regeneration in mice.
Science. 2021;373(6562):1537-40.
42. Zangi L, Lui KO, von Gise A, Ma Q, Ebina W, Ptaszek LM, et al. Modified mRNA
directs the fate of heart progenitor cells and induces vascular regeneration after
myocardial infarction. *Nat Biotechnol.* 2013;31(10):898-907.
43. Carlsson L, Clarke JC, Yen C, Gregoire F, Albery T, Billger M, et al. Biocompatible,
purified VEGF-A mRNA improves cardiac function after intracardiac injection 1 week
post-myocardial infarction in swine. *Molecular Therapy-Methods & Clinical
Development.* 2018;9:330-46.
44. Ferrarini M, Arsic N, Recchia FA, Zentilin L, Zacchigna S, Xu X, et al. Adeno-
associated virus-mediated transduction of VEGF165 improves cardiac tissue viability and
functional recovery after permanent coronary occlusion in conscious dogs. *Circulation
research.* 2006;98(7):954-61.
45. Lin YD, Luo CY, Hu YN, Yeh ML, Hsueh YC, Chang MY, et al. Instructive nanofiber
scaffolds with VEGF create a microenvironment for arteriogenesis and cardiac repair. *Sci
Transl Med.* 2012;4(146):146ra09.
46. Pearlman JD, Hibberd MG, Chuang ML, Harada K, Lopez JJ, Gladstone SR, et al.
Magnetic resonance mapping demonstrates benefits of VEGF–induced myocardial
angiogenesis. *Nature medicine.* 1995;1(10):1085-9.
47. Janavel GV, Crottogini A, Meckert PC, Cuniberti L, Mele A, Papouchado M, et al.
Plasmid-mediated VEGF gene transfer induces cardiomyogenesis and reduces
myocardial infarct size in sheep. *Gene therapy.* 2006;13(15):1133-42.
48. Taimeh Z, Loughran J, Birks EJ, and Bolli R. Vascular endothelial growth factor in heart
failure. *Nat Rev Cardiol.* 2013;10(9):519-30.

49.   Oh JG, and Ishikawa K. Recent highlights and advances in cardiac gene therapy. *Discov*
661   *Med.* 2019;28(155):229-35.
662   50.   Gray R, and Wheatley K. How to avoid bias when comparing bone marrow
663   transplantation with chemotherapy. *Bone marrow transplantation.* 1991;7:9-12.
664   51.   Emdin CA, Khera AV, and Kathiresan S. Mendelian Randomization. *JAMA.*
665   2017;318(19):1925-6.
666   52.   Schmidt AF, Finan C, Gordillo-Maranon M, Asselbergs FW, Freitag DF, Patel RS, et al.
667   Genetic drug target validation using Mendelian randomisation. *Nat Commun.*
668   2020;11(1):3255.
669   53.   Ference BA. How to use Mendelian randomization to anticipate the results of randomized
670   trials. *European Heart Journal.* 2017;39(5):360-2.
671   54.   Davey Smith G, and Hemani G. Mendelian randomization: genetic anchors for causal
672   inference in epidemiological studies. *Hum Mol Genet.* 2014;23(R1):R89-98.
673   55.   Folkersen L, Gustafsson S, Wang Q, Hansen DH, Hedman AK, Schork A, et al. Genomic
674   and drug target evaluation of 90 cardiovascular proteins in 30,931 individuals. *Nat*
675   *Metab.* 2020;2(10):1135-48.
676   56.   Aung N, Vargas JD, Yang C, Cabrera CP, Warren HR, Fung K, et al. Genome-Wide
677   Analysis of Left Ventricular Image-Derived Phenotypes Identifies Fourteen Loci
678   Associated With Cardiac Morphogenesis and Heart Failure Development. *Circulation.*
679   2019;140(16):1318-30.
680   57.   Benjamin EJ, Virani SS, Callaway CW, Chamberlain AM, Chang AR, Cheng S, et al.
681   Heart disease and stroke statistics—2018 update: a report from the American Heart
682   Association. *Circulation.* 2018.
683   58.   Drakos SG, Kfoury AG, Hammond EH, Reid BB, Revelo MP, Rasmusson BY, et al.
684   Impact of mechanical unloading on microvasculature and associated central remodeling
685   features of the failing human heart. *Journal of the American College of Cardiology.*
686   2010;56(5):382-91.
687   59.   Tsagalou EP, Anastasiou-Nana M, Agapitos E, Gika A, Drakos SG, Terrovitis JV, et al.
688   Depressed coronary flow reserve is associated with decreased myocardial capillary
689   density in patients with heart failure due to idiopathic dilated cardiomyopathy. *Journal of*
690   *the American College of Cardiology.* 2008;52(17):1391-8.
691   60.   Parodi O, De Maria R, Oltrona L, Testa R, Sambuceti G, Roghi A, et al. Myocardial
692   blood flow distribution in patients with ischemic heart disease or dilated cardiomyopathy
693   undergoing heart transplantation. *Circulation.* 1993;88(2):509-22.
694   61.   Abraham D, Hofbauer R, Schäfer R, Blumer R, Paulus P, Miksovsky A, et al. Selective
695   downregulation of VEGF-A165, VEGF-R1, and decreased capillary density in patients
696   with dilative but not ischemic cardiomyopathy. *Circulation research.* 2000;87(8):644-7.
697   62.   Mosseri M, Schaper J, Admon D, Hasin Y, Gotsman M, Sapoznikov D, et al. Coronary
698   capillaries in patients with congestive cardiomyopathy or angina pectoris with patent
699   main coronary arteries. Ultrastructural morphometry of endomyocardial biopsy samples.
700   *Circulation.* 1991;84(1):203-10.
701   63.   Miao Y, Tian L, Martin M, Paige SL, Galdos FX, Li J, et al. Intrinsic Endocardial
702   Defects Contribute to Hypoplastic Left Heart Syndrome. *Cell Stem Cell.* 2020;27(4):574-
703   89. e8.

64. Zhao L, Ben-Yair R, Burns CE, and Burns CG. Endocardial Notch Signaling Promotes
Cardiomyocyte Proliferation in the Regenerating Zebrafish Heart through Wnt Pathway
Antagonism. *Cell Rep.* 2019;26(3):546-54 e5.
65. Shen H, Gan P, Wang K, Darehzereshki A, Wang K, Kumar SR, et al. Mononuclear
diploid cardiomyocytes support neonatal mouse heart regeneration in response to
paracrine IGF2 signaling. *Elife.* 2020;9:e53071.
66. Lamprecht MR, Sabatini DM, and Carpenter AE. CellProfiler: free, versatile software for
automated biological image analysis. *Biotechniques.* 2007;42(1):71-5.
67. Berg S, Kutra D, Kroeger T, Straehle CN, Kausler BX, Haubold C, et al. Ilastik:
interactive machine learning for (bio) image analysis. *Nature Methods.* 2019:1-7.
68. Wickham H, Francois R, Henry L, and Müller K. dplyr: A Grammar of Data
Manipulation: https://CRAN. *R-project org/package= dplyr.* 2015.
69. Sievert C, Parmer C, Hocking T, Chamberlain S, Ram K, Corvellec M, et al. Plotly:
create interactive web graphics via 'plotly. js'. R package. version 4.7. 1; 2017. *URL*
https://CRAN R-project org/package= plotly. 2018.
70. Kobayashi Y, Tata A, Konkimalla A, Katsura H, Lee RF, Ou J, et al. Persistence of a
regeneration-associated, transitional alveolar epithelial cell state in pulmonary fibrosis.
Nat Cell Biol. 2020;22(8):934-46.
71. Macosko EZ, Basu A, Satija R, Nemesh J, Shekhar K, Goldman M, et al. Highly Parallel
Genome-wide Expression Profiling of Individual Cells Using Nanoliter Droplets. *Cell.*
2015;161(5):1202-14.
72. Butler A, Hoffman P, Smibert P, Papalexi E, and Satija R. Integrating single-cell
transcriptomic data across different conditions, technologies, and species. *Nat Biotechnol.*
2018;36(5):411-20.
73. Hewitt FC, Li C, Gray SJ, Cockrell S, Washburn M, and Samulski RJ. Reducing the risk
of adeno-associated virus (AAV) vector mobilization with AAV type 5 vectors. *J Virol.*
2009;83(8):3919-29.
74. Lee HK, Widmayer SJ, Huang M-N, Aylor DL, and Marchuk DA. Novel
Neuroprotective Loci Modulating Ischemic Stroke Volume in Wild-Derived Inbred
Mouse Strains. *Genetics.* 2019;213(3):1079-92.
75. Karra R, Knecht AK, Kikuchi K, and Poss KD. Myocardial NF-kappaB activation is
essential for zebrafish heart regeneration. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A.*
2015;112(43):13255-60.
76. Purcell S, Neale B, Todd-Brown K, Thomas L, Ferreira MA, Bender D, et al. PLINK: a
tool set for whole-genome association and population-based linkage analyses. *Am J Hum*
Genet. 2007;81(3):559-75.
77. Burgess S, Dudbridge F, and Thompson SG. Combining information on multiple
instrumental variables in Mendelian randomization: comparison of allele score and
summarized data methods. *Stat Med.* 2016;35(11):1880-906.
78. Yavorska OO, and Burgess S. MendelianRandomization: an R package for performing
Mendelian randomization analyses using summarized data. *Int J Epidemiol.*
2017;46(6):1734-9.
79. Bycroft C, Freeman C, Petkova D, Band G, Elliott LT, Sharp K, et al. The UK Biobank
resource with deep phenotyping and genomic data. *Nature.* 2018;562(7726):203-9.

80.   Bowden J, Davey Smith G, and Burgess S. Mendelian randomization with invalid
749   instruments: effect estimation and bias detection through Egger regression. *Int J*
750   *Epidemiol.* 2015;44(2):512-25.
751   81.   Burgess S, Zuber V, Valdes-Marquez E, Sun BB, and Hopewell JC. Mendelian
752   randomization with fine-mapped genetic data: Choosing from large numbers of correlated
753   instrumental variables. *Genet Epidemiol.* 2017;41(8):714-25.
754   82.   Wickham H. ggplot2. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Computational Statistics.*
755   2011;3(2):180-5.
756   83.   Kassambara A. 2017.
757
758

Figure 1. Myovascular coupling during early neonatal growth. **(A)** Representative images from postnatal day 1 (P1), 7 (P7), and 10 (P10) neonatal mouse hearts immunostained for Erg to mark CECs and EdU to identify proliferating CECs (arrows). **(B)** Representative images immunostained for PCM1 and EdU. Arrows point to EdU^+PCM1^+ proliferating CMs. **(C, D)** Quantitation of CEC and CM proliferation (n = 6 mice per time point). Each gray point is an individual heart. *p < 0.05, **p < 0.01, ***p< 0.001, ns = not significant, two-sided t-test corrected for multiple comparisons using Holm's method. **(E)** Correlation of CEC and CM proliferation. Black line is the best-fit regression line and gray area indicates the 95% CI. p value indicates significance of Pearson correlation. Each point represents an individual heart and is color coded by age. **(F)** Representative image from a P4 heart immunostained for PCM1, Erg, EdU, and DAPI. Boxed regions correspond to the adjacent magnified panels. Hollowed, yellow arrows are $PCM1^+EdU^+$ CMs and solid yellow arrows are Erg^+EdU^+ CECs. **(G)** Pseudodistance maps for detecting enrichment of EdU^+ CECs around EdU^+ CMs. Distance information for 12,374 CEC-CM pairs from 6 mice was used to map EdU^+ CECs (red dots) and EdU^- CECs (blue dots) relative to an averaged EdU^- and EdU^+ CM (center of the plot). Each line represents 2 μm from the center of an averaged CM nucleus. **(H)** Proportion of CEC's that are EdU^+ as a function of distance (μm) from $PCM1^+EdU^+$ nuclei (red) and $PCM1^+EdU^-$ nuclei (blue). 274 EdU^+ CMs and 3658 EdU^- CMs from 6 mice were considered, p = 0.04 at 7 μm, two-sided Z-test. Scale bars are 50 μm.

Figure 2. Myovascular coupling after cryoinjury. (**A, B)** Representative images from hearts collected at P1, P7, and P10 after cryoinjury (CI) at P1. Arrows point to EdU$^+$Erg$^+$ proliferating CECs in (A) and EdU$^+$PCM1$^+$ proliferating CMs in (B). **(C, D)** Quantitation of CEC and CM proliferation after CI (n = 5-6 mice per time point). Each gray point is an individual heart. **p < 0.01, ***p< 0.001, two-sided t-test corrected for multiple comparisons using Holm's method. **(E)** Correlation of CEC and CM proliferation. Black line is the best-fit regression line and gray area indicates the 95% CI. p value indicates significance of Pearson correlation. Each point is an individual heart, color coded by age. **(F)** Representative section from the border zone of a cryoinjured P4 heart immunostained for PCM1, Erg, EdU, and DAPI. Boxed regions correspond to the adjacent magnified panels. Hollowed, yellow arrows are PCM1$^+$EdU$^+$ CMs and solid yellow arrows are Erg$^+$EdU$^+$ CECs. **(G)** Pseudodistance maps for detecting enrichment of EdU$^+$ CECs around EdU$^+$ CMs. Distance information for 7,093 CEC-CM pairs from 6 mice post CI was used to map EdU$^+$ CECs (red dots) and EdU$^-$ CECs (blue dots) relative to an averaged EdU$^-$ and EdU$^+$ CM (center of the plot). Each line represents 2 μm from the center of an averaged CM nucleus. **(H)** Proportion of CEC's that are EdU$^+$ as a function of distance in μm from PCM1$^+$EdU$^+$ nuclei (red) and PCM1$^+$EdU$^-$ nuclei (blue). Solid line indicates the point estimate. 186 EdU$^+$ CMs and 2446 EdU$^-$ CMs were considered, p = not significant (ns) at 7 μm, two-sided Z-test. Scale bars are 50 μm.

Figure 3. VEGFA-VEGFR2 signaling is associated with myovascular coupling. **(A)** tSNE

plots of scRNA-seq data from P7 hearts that were underwent CI at P1. In the left most panel,

cells are colored by clusters identified by PCA analysis. Arrows point to a cluster of CECs that

are enriched for expression of *Mki67* and *Vegfr2* (purple). **(B, C)** Clusters of $EdU^+VEGFR2^+$

CECs adjacent to EdU^+Tnnt^+ CMs at P7 during growth (B) and after CI at P1 (C). Insets are

magnifications of the regions in the solid white boxes. **(D)** Single molecule in situ hybridization

for *Vegfa* in P3 and P10 hearts that underwent CI at P1. Dashed line indicates the approximate

injury plane, with the border zone above the line. Red marks *Vegfa* signal. **(E)** Quantitation of in

situ hybridization for *Vegfa* expression in the border zone of P3 (n = 5) and P10 (n=5) hearts

after CI at P1, **p = 0.008, two-sided t-test. Scale bars are 50 μm.

Physiologic Growth

A *Vegfr2*^{WT} *Vegfr2*^{ΔEC}
ERG
EdU
DAPI

B
% EdU Pos CECs

****

Vegfr2^{WT}   *Vegfr2*^{ΔEC}

C *Vegfr2*^{WT} *Vegfr2*^{ΔEC}
PCM1
EdU
DAPI

D
% EdU Pos CMs

***

Vegfr2^{WT}   *Vegfr2*^{ΔEC}

After Injury

E *Vegfr2*^{WT} *Vegfr2*^{ΔEC}
ERG
EdU
DAPI

F
% EdU Pos CECs

****

Vegfr2^{WT}   *Vegfr2*^{ΔEC}

G *Vegfr2*^{WT} *Vegfr2*^{ΔEC}
PCM1
EdU
DAPI

H
% EdU Pos CMs

**

Vegfr2^{WT}   *Vegfr2*^{ΔEC}

Figure 4: Requirement of *Vegfr2* in CECs for myovascular growth in the neonatal mouse heart. **(A)** Representative images of P4 hearts from *Vegfr2*^{WT} and *Vegfr2*$^{\Delta EC}$ mice, immunostained to detect cycling CECs. Arrows point to EdU$^+$ Erg$^+$ proliferating CECs. **(B)** Quantitation of CEC proliferation in *Vegfr2*^{WT} (n = 5) and *Vegfr2*$^{\Delta EC}$ mice (n = 6). ****p = 3.7x10^{-5}, two-sided t-test. **(C)** Representative images of P4 hearts from *Vegfr2*^{WT} and *Vegfr2*$^{\Delta EC}$ mice, immunostained to detect cycling CMs. Arrows point to EdU$^+$PCM1$^+$ proliferating CMs. **(D)** Quantitation of CM proliferation in *Vegfr2*^{WT} (n = 5) and *Vegfr2*^{DEC} mice (n = 6). ***p = 0.0004, two-sided t-test. **(E)** Images of P4 hearts from *Vegfr2*^{WT} and *Vegfr2*$^{\Delta EC}$ mice after CI at P1. Sections are immunostained to detect cycling CECs. Arrows point to EdU$^+$Erg$^+$ proliferating CECs. **(F)** Quantitation of CEC proliferation in *Vegfr2*^{WT} (n = 7) and *Vegfr2*$^{\Delta EC}$ mice (n = 8). ****p = 2.0x10^{-5}, two-sided t-test. **(G)** Representative images of P4 hearts injured at P1 from *Vegfr2*^{WT} and *Vegfr2*$^{\Delta EC}$ mice. Sections are immunostained to detect cycling CMs. Arrows point to EdU$^+$PCM1$^+$ proliferating CMs. **(H)** Quantitation of CM proliferation in *Vegfr2*^{WT} (n = 7) and *Vegfr2*$^{\Delta EC}$ mice (n = 8). **p = 0.004, two-sided t-test. Scale bars are 50 μm.

Figure 5: Requirement of VEGFA for myovascular growth in the neonatal mouse heart. **(A)**

Representative images of P4 hearts from mice injected with vehicle or anti-VEGFA. Sections are

immunostained to detect cycling CECs. Arrows point to EdU$^+$Erg$^+$ proliferating CECs. **(B)**

Quantitation of CEC proliferation at P4 after treatment with vehicle (n = 10) or anti-VEGFA (n =

5). ****p = 1.8x10^{-6}, two-sided t-test. **(C)** Representative images of P4 hearts after treatment with

vehicle or anti-VEGFA. Sections are immunostained to detect cycling CMs. Arrows point to

EdU$^+$PCM1$^+$ proliferating CMs. **(D)** Quantitation at P4 after treatment with vehicle (n = 10) or

anti-VEGFA (n = 5). **p = 0.003, two-sided t-test. **(E)** Images of P4 hearts from mice that

underwent CI at P1 and that were injected with vehicle or anti-VEGFA. Arrows point to EdU$^+$Erg$^+$

proliferating CECs. **(F)** Quantitation of CEC proliferation in *Vegfr2*^{WT} (n = 4) and *Vegfr2*$^{\Delta EC}$ mice

(n = 3). ****p = 6.9x10^{-5}, two-sided t-test. **(G)** Immunostaining for PCM1 and EdU in P4 hearts

from mice that underwent CI at P1 and that were treated with vehicle or anti-VEGFA. Arrows

point to EdU$^+$PCM1$^+$ proliferating CMs. **(H)** Quantitation of CM proliferation after treatment with

vehicle (n = 4) or anti-VEGFA (n = 3). **p = 0.008, two-sided t-test. Scale bars are 50 μm.

851
852

Figure 6: Effect of *Vegfa* overexpression on regeneration after CI. **(A)** AFOG staining of P21 hearts to visualize scar (blue). Arrows indicate vessels. Scale bar is 500 μm. **(B)** Quantitation of scar as a percentage of the left ventricle at P21 in animals injected with AAV-*GFP* (n = 8) or AAV-*Vegfa* (n= 8) at the time of CI at P1. *p = 0.038. **(C)** Fractional shortening at P21 in animals injected with AAV-*GFP* (n=6) or AAV-*Vegfa* (n=8) at the time of CI at P1. **p = 0.008, two-sided t-test. **(D)** Images of the border zone from P10 mice that underwent CI at P1. Sections are immunostained to mark proliferating Erg$^+$ Ki67$^+$ CECs (arrows). **(E)** Quantitation of CEC density at P14 after injection with AAV-GFP (n=4) or AAV-*Vegfa* (n = 4). *p = 0.035, two-sided t-test. **(F)** Images of the border zone from P14 mice that underwent CI at P1. Sections are immunostained to mark proliferating PCM1$^+$Ki67$^+$ CMs (arrows). **(G)** Quantitation of CM proliferation at P14 after injection with AAV-*GFP* (n = 4) or AAV-*Vegfa* (n = 4). *p =0.017, two-sided t-test.

Figure 7: Effect of circulating VEGFA levels on human cardiac structure. (A) Illustrative diagram of *cis*-Mendelian randomization (cis-MR) design to estimate the causal association between circulating VEGFA level and left ventricular mass (LVM). **(B)** Manhattan plot showing genome-wide genetic association with circulating VEGFA level. **(C)** *cis*-Mendelian randomization estimate with inverse-variance weighted model of circulating VEGFA level on left ventricular end-diastolic volume (LVEDV), left ventricular end systolic volume (LVESV), left ventricular ejection fraction (LVEF), left ventricular mass to volume ratio (LVMR), and LV mass (LVM). Each data point represents effect estimate in standard deviation (SD) change of the trait per doubling the circulating VEGFA concentration. Error bars indicate 95% confidence intervals (CI) of the estimates. $*p < 0.05$, $**p < 0.01$. **(D)** Regional genetic association plot for *cis*-region of the *VEGFA* gene (200 kilobase flanking region from transcript start and end sites) with *cis*-instruments for the main Mendelian randomization analysis highlighted. Estimated causal effects on LVM for each instrument are shown on the right panel with error bars representing 95% confidence interval. **(E)** Distribution of point estimates showing standard deviation (SD) gram change in LVM per doubling circulating VEGFA level as estimated with *cis*-MR with IVW model (red diamond) and sensitivity analyses with permutation of instrument selection methods and *cis*-MR models.

Supplemental Figures

Figure S1. *Vegfa* expression in the neonatal mouse heart. **(A-B)** Tilescan images of an

uninjured P3 heart (A) and a P3 heart that underwent CI at P1 (B). Sections are immunostained

for Tnnt (green) and hybridized with an in situ probe for *Vegfa* (red). Lines correspond to the

approximate injury plane. The asterisks correspond to the magnified images. Scale bar is 500

μm.

Figure S2. Approaches to manipulate VEGFA/VEGFR2 signaling. **(A)** Images of *Vegfr2*^{WT}

and *Vegfr2*$^{\Delta EC}$ mice at P3 after treatment with tamoxifen at P0. Sections are immunostained for

PECAM and VEGFR2. The dashed box corresponds to magnified images, shown as individual

channels. Scale bar is 100 μm. **(B)** Whole mount images of representative P10 hearts injected

with AAV-*GFP* at the time of CI at P1. (Top) Brightfield images of the ventricles with the black

dashed circle indicating the area of injury. (Bottom) Corresponding GFP images to show

concentration of GFP expression around the area of injury. **(C)** Whole mount images of

representative P21 hearts, injected with either AAV-*GFP* or AAV-*Vegfa* at the time of CI at P1.

Blue resin opacifies the coronary vasculature. Circled area indicates the approximated area of

injury. Scale bar is 1 μm. **(D)** Single molecule in situ hybridization for *Vegfa* in the border zone

of P10 hearts that were injected with either AAV-*GFP* or AAV-*Vegfa* after CI at P1. Dashed line

indicates the approximate plane of injury, with the region above the line corresponding to the

border zone. Red dots indicate *Vegfa* expression. Scale bar is 50 μm.

Figure S3: Myocardial hypoxia with loss of *Vegfr2* in CECs or after administration of anti-

VEGFA. **(A)** Images of sections from P4 *Vegfr2*^WT and *Vegfr2*^ΔEC hearts immunostained for

actinin (green) and pimonidazole (red) incorporation. **(B)** Quantitation of pimonidazole intensity

per µm of tissue stained with actinin in *Vegfr2*^WT (n = 3) and *Vegfr2*^ΔEC (n = 3) hearts. *p =

0.011, two-sided t-test. **(C)** Images of sections from P4 mice treated with vehicle or anti-

VEGFA. Sections are immunostained for actinin (green) and pimonidazole (red) incorporation.

(D) Quantitation of pimonidazole intensity per µm of tissue stained with actinin in mice treated

with vehicle (n = 4) or anti-VEGFA (n=4). **p = 0.005, two-sided t-test. Scale bars are 50 µm.

**Figure S4: Effect of *Vegfa* overexpression on sarcomere morphology and αSMA expression
in CMs after CI**. **(A-B)** Images from the site of injury of P21 mice that were treated with AAV-
GFP or AAV-*Vegfa* at the time of CI at P1. Dashed line indicates the approximate plane of
injury. The region above the line is the border zone (BZ) and the region below the line is the
injured area (IA). Boxed regions correspond to the adjacent magnified panels. Sections are
immunostained for the sarcomeric protein Tnnt (green). **(C-E)** Images of the border zone from
P21 mice that underwent injection of AAV-*GFP* **(D)** or AAV-*Vegfa* **(E)** at time of CI at P1 or
physiological control **(C)**. Sections are immunostained to mark CMs (Tnnt, green) and alpha-
smooth muscle actin (αSMA, red). Scale bars are 50 μm.