Human CD4/CD8 double positive T cells are both predictive and sufficient to mediate GVHD pathology

Nicholas J. Hess[1,2], David Turicek[1], Jeremiah Riendeau[3,4], Sean J. McIlwain[5], Emmanuel Contreras Guzman[3,4], Kalyan Nadiminti[2,8], Amy Hudson[6], Natalie Callander[2], Melissa C. Skala[3,4], Jenny E. Gumperz[7,8], Peiman Hematti[2,8], *Christian M. Capitini[1,8]

[1]Department of Pediatrics, University of Wisconsin School of Medicine and Public Health, Madison, WI

[2]Division of Hematology/Oncology, Department of Medicine, University of Wisconsin School of Medicine and Public Health, Madison, WI

[3]Morgridge Institute for Research, Madison, WI

[4]Department of Biomedical Engineering, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison, WI

[5]Department of Biostatistics and Medical Informatics, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison, WI

[6]Department of Microbiology and Immunology, Medical College of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, WI

[7]Department of Medical Microbiology and Immunology, University of Wisconsin School of Medicine and Public Health, Madison, WI

[8]University of Wisconsin Carbone Cancer Center, Madison, WI

*Corresponding Author:

Christian M. Capitini

University of Wisconsin School of Medicine and Public Health

WIMR 4137, 1111 Highland Ave

Madison, WI 53705

Office: (608) 262-2415

Fax: (608) 265-9721

Email: ccapitini@pediatrics.wisc.edu

ORCID: 0000-0001-5720-9305 (NJH); 0000-0003-1852-2192 (JG)

Abstract Word Count = 190

Word Count = 9704

Reference Count = 58

Running Title: DPTs Are Predictive and Sufficient for GVHD

Abstract

An important paradigm to improve allogeneic hematopoietic stem cell transplantations (allo-HSCTs) is the prevention of graft-vs-host disease (GVHD) while preserving the beneficial graft-vs-leukemia (GVL) activity of donor T cells. In an observational clinical study of adult allo-HSCT recipients, we identified five T cell specific predictive biomarkers of relapse and GVHD. One interesting biomarker was the emergence of a CD4/CD8 double positive T cell (DPT) population not present in the starting graft tissue. Using a xenogeneic transplant model, we reveal that DPTs are predictive of lethal GVHD irrespective of donor or graft source. We observed that DPTs originated from the CD8 T cell population, co-expressed both RUNX3 and THPOK and are not a by-product of a lymphopenic environment. Transcriptomic, metabolomic and functional assays all revealed DPTs to be a highly activated T cell population distinct from both CD4 and CD8 T cells. Importantly, DPTs isolated from GVHD mice were sufficient to mediate xenogeneic GVHD after re-transplantation but had no observable GVL activity when challenged in vivo with two human B-ALL malignancies. Overall, these studies highlight a GVHD-specific human T cell population with the potential to delineate GVL activity from GVHD pathology.

Introduction

Graft-vs-host disease (GVHD) and relapse remain the primary complications following allogeneic hematopoietic stem cell transplantation (allo-HSCT)[1–3]. While the field has made significant strides in reducing GVHD, current GVHD prophylaxis drug regimens target the entire T cell population, potentially hindering the efficacy of graft-vs-leukemia (GVL) activity mediated by donor T cells[4–8]. Thus, identifying predictive biomarkers and delineating specific cellular mechanism(s) leading to GVHD pathology versus GVL activity has remained a top priority for the field.

Unfortunately, separating the graft-vs-host (GVH) response of donor T cells from their GVL activity has proven difficult as both responses are derived from allogeneic antigen stimulation[7–9]. Nevertheless, several studies have investigated the role of specific HLA mismatches on the development of GVHD and GVL activity[10–13]. These studies have highlighted the importance of permissive and non-permissive HLA mismatches on GVHD development and non-relapse mortality, but correlating them with GVL activity has been met with limited success[10–14]. Furthermore, the use of haploidentical transplantations with post-transplant cyclophosphamide has shown that HLA matching of the donor and recipient may not play a dominant role in separating GVH and GVL activity[15,16].

While pre-transplant prognostic variables such as HLA-matching, conditioning regimens and graft source all influence allo-HSCT outcomes, these population-based variables are not able to predict individual patient outcomes[17–19]. Several post-transplant predictive variables have been discovered including sST2, REG3α, elafin and others[20–26]. These highly promising plasma-based biomarkers are generally released due to host damage and have shown efficacy in predicting the development of steroid-resistant GVHD and non-relapse mortality (NRM) either individually or combined into a predictive algorithm[20–26]. To date though, these biomarkers have not been able to predict an allo-HSCT recipients' chance of relapse as they measure the degree of host damage

rather than donor T cell alloreactivity.

While all the validated GVHD biomarkers to date have been plasma-based, the direct

investigation of T cell subsets as biomarkers has been another area of active investigation[27–30].

Both CD4 and CD8 T cells can respond to allogeneic antigens, but while CD8 T cell may be

directly responsible for cellular cytotoxicity, CD4 T cells have recently been the primary focus of

the field[31–33]. The CD4 population is unique in its capacity to polarize into a variety of different

subsets, based on the cytokine environment it finds itself, to drive an inflammatory response[34–40].

In the case of GVHD, TH_1 and $TH_{17/22}$ cells have been shown to be directly involved in driving the

pathogenesis of gastrointestinal, liver and skin pathology[35,41]. In contrast, the CD8 T cell

population is thought to be fairly uniform in their role as cytotoxic effectors licensed by CD4 T

cells. The discovery of CD8 regulatory T cells in murine GVHD though suggests CD8 T cells may

also be able to polarize into different subsets similar to the CD4 population[42,43]. Despite our

increased understanding of GVHD pathogenesis mediated allo-reactive T cells, T cell specific

GVHD prophylaxis regimens (e.g. ATG, abatacept) have been slow to enter the clinic and have

not yet shown a direct cellular mechanism separating GVH from GVL activity.

Interestingly, several recent studies have now identified a novel human T cell population co-

expressing both CD4 and CD8 lineage markers in a variety of chronic inflammatory diseases,

including GVHD[44–51]. Historically, CD4/CD8 double positive T cells (DPTs) have only existed as

a developmental stage of T cells in the thymus that are unable to survive in the periphery due to

the lack of survival signals[52,53]. The presence of DPTs in the periphery of these human chronic

inflammatory diseases suggests either a breakdown in T cell development or that DPTs in the

periphery are a previously unidentified mature human T cell population with an unknown origin

and function[53].

In this study, we identify five T cell metrics capable of predicting relapse, GVHD or both in allo-

HSCT recipients several weeks to months prior to their diagnosis. One of these predictive

biomarkers was the frequency of DPTs which we explored further in a xenogeneic transplant

model. This xenogeneic transplant model was able to successfully recapitulate the development

and predictive potential of DPTs with lethal xenogeneic GVHD. We also reveal that DPTs alone

are sufficient to mediate GVHD pathology but have little GVL activity against two human B-ALL

cancer lines. This study also identifies the origin of DPTs as the CD8 T cell population. Overall,

this study describes the origin and function of a novel human T cell population that has clinical

significance in its ability to predict GVHD in allo-HSCT recipients and is sufficient for GVHD

pathology but not GVL activity in a xenogeneic transplant model.

Results

T cell specific predictive biomarkers of relapse and GVHD in allo-HSCT recipients

To determine if the direct measurement of T cells in allo-HSCT recipients post-transplant can

serve as predictive biomarkers of relapse and/or GVHD, we collected 417 blood samples from 35

adult allo-HSCT recipients over their first 100 days post-transplant (Fig 1A). Patients were

included in the observational study irrespective of their conditioning regimen, donor HLA

matching, graft source or GVHD prophylaxis regimen with the only requirement being they

received post-transplant cyclophosphamide (Supplemental Table 1). Samples were processed

within seven days of collection and never frozen. Antigen-experienced T cells were gated based

on CD3 and CD45RO expression as a means to exclude non-reactive donor T cells and naïve T

cells that are present due to de novo hematopoiesis (Supplemental Fig 1).

From a total of 11 T cell metrics analyzed, we identified five metrics as having the capacity to

predict relapse, GVHD (of any grade) or ≥ grade 2 GVHD, the number of CD45RO$^+$ T cells and

frequency of blasting CD45RO$^+$ T cells, regulatory T cells (T$_{regs}$), CD8$^+$ T cells and DPTs (Fig 1B).

We first analyzed the samples collected between days 7 and 17 in three binary tests to determine

if any could significantly differentiate between two allo-HSCT outcomes. Tests that were shown

to be significant by t-test were further evaluated using a receiver-operator-characteristic (ROC)

analysis (Fig 1C). We identified two predictive biomarkers of relapse (CD45RO T cells and

frequency of Tregs), four predictive biomarkers of GVHD (CD45RO T cells and the frequency of

Tregs, CD8 and DPTs) and two predictive biomarkers of ≥ grade 2 GVHD (frequency of Tregs

and DPTs) (Fig 1C). Combining the individual T cell metrics into one multi-parameter analysis

further increased their predictive potential as measured by the area-under-the-curve (AUC) values

that reached 0.848, 0.736 and 0.701 for relapse, GVHD and ≥ grade 2 GVHD prediction

respectively (Fig 1D).

A second analysis included patient samples collected between days 22 and 83 and were further

normalized relative to each individual patient's date of low grade 1 or 2 GVHD diagnosis. For

patients who did not develop GVHD, we normalized their data to day 54, which was the average

time to GVHD diagnosis among our cohort. In this analysis, only three of the original five T cell

biomarkers showed any predictive value with all three metrics predicting relapse (CD45RO T cells

and the frequencies of CD8 and DPTs) and the frequency of CD8 and DPTs predicting both GVHD

(of any grade) and ≥ grade 2 GVHD (Fig 1E). Combining the predictive metrics into one multi-

parameter analysis as before further increase their predictive value with AUC values of 0.892,

0.741 and 0.734 for relapse, GVHD and ≥ grade 2 GVHD prediction respectively (Fig 1F).

Xenogeneic transplantation also reveals DPTs as a predictive biomarker of GVHD

development

To replicate our clinical observational study, we utilized a human xenogeneic transplant model

wherein we transplanted various human graft tissue into immunodeficient mice[31,54,55]. As in our

observational clinical study, we observed the presence of DPTs, which were not present in the

starting healthy graft tissue, primarily developing in mice that would later develop lethal

xenogeneic GVHD (Fig 2A). We confirmed that DPTs are not an artifact of doublets by

ImageStream analysis and develop even when isolated human T cells are used for transplantation

(Fig 2B and Supplemental Fig 2). DPTs were present in variety of GVHD target organs and

developed as early as 1wk after transplant in each of the four graft sources we tested (Fig 2C-H).

The increased frequency of DPTs was also a predictive biomarker of lethal GVHD development

in this model system at 1-, 3- and 6-weeks post-transplant (Fig 2I). We further confirmed that the

frequency of Tregs at 1-week after transplant could act as a predictive biomarker of lethal

xenogeneic GVHD but with the contribution of Tregs already well established in GVHD, we chose

to focus on the origin and function of DPTs for the remainder of this study (Supplemental Fig 3).

The DPT population is distinct from CD4 and CD8 T cells

Two alternative hypotheses against DPT being a unique T cell population is the possibility that

CD4 T cells co-expressing CD8α upon activation or that CD4 or CD8 T cells could co-express the

alternative lineage marker through trogocytosis. To determine if either of these are possible, we

first show that DPTs express both CD8α and CD8β, suggesting this population is not the result of

an activated CD4 T cell population (Supplemental Fig 4A-B). Furthermore, we flow-sorted DPTs

from GVHD mice and expanded them in vitro and/or transplanted them into a naïve mouse. In

both cases, the DPT population persisted even in the absence of single positive CD4 and CD8 T

cells suggesting that co-expression of the CD4 and CD8 lineage markers is sustained and not the

result of trogocytosis (Supplemental Fig 4C-F). Additionally, the DPT population does not appear

to be the result of a dead/dying T cell population due to high expression of the anti-apoptotic

protein BCL2 (Supplemental Fig 4G).

To explore if the CD4 and CD8 lineage markers are actually co-transcribed, we performed RNA-

seq on flow-sorted CD4, CD8 and DPTs from GVHD mice (Fig 3). Analysis of the transcriptome

from these cells revealed that DPTs express a transcriptional signature unique from CD4 or CD8

T cells (Fig 3A-B). Using a threshold of p<0.01 and a fold change of >10 to determine significance,

we reveal that DPTs differentially expressed 63 genes compared to CD4 and CD8 T cells (Fig

3A). Of the differentially expressed genes, we confirmed that both CD4 and CD8 are both

transcriptionally expressed in DPTs (Fig 3C-E). Interestingly, DPTs also appear to express

several genes normally associated with B cell biology, though the mechanism for this observation

requires further investigation (Fig 3E).

Using all 796 genes differentially expressed in the DPT:CD4 and DPT:CD8 comparisons, KEGG

BRITE functional hierarchical classification highlighted numerous differentially expressed genes

serving as enzymatic genes along with CD molecules commonly observed on T cells, exosome

machinery, transcription factors and cytokine/cytokine receptors (Supplemental Table 2). We also

surveyed 13 inflammatory and inhibitory co-receptors on the surface of CD4, CD8 and DPTs from

GVHD mice (Fig 4A-C, Supplemental Fig 5). Interestingly, DPT displayed intermediate expression

of CD27, OX40, PD-1 and LAG3 compared to CD4 and CD8 T cells analyzed from the blood or

spleen of GVHD mice (Fig 4A-C, Supplemental Fig 5). The expression of these markers was

further explored on the T cells from our observational clinical study (Fig 4D-L). While the

expression of these markers differed slightly, most likely due to differences in a murine versus

human host environment, DPTs still displayed an expression profile of a terminally differentiated

effector T cell population with little evidence of exhaustion (Fig 4D-L).

DPTs differentiate from the CD8 T cell population and upregulate THPOK

To identify the T cell population that gives rise to DPTs, we performed an unsupervised tSNE

clustering of human T cells from a xenogeneic GVHD mouse using a nine-color flow cytometry

panel (Fig 5A). This analysis, in addition to the global transcriptomic analysis, indicated that DPTs

cluster more closely with CD8 T cells than CD4 T cells. Thus, despite the well documented

plasticity of the CD4 lineage, our results suggest that DPTs may develop from the CD8 lineage

(Fig 3B, Fig 5A).

To test this hypothesis, we transplanted isolated CD4 or CD8 T cells from a healthy donor into

our xenogeneic transplant model. Elevated frequencies of DPTs were only observed in mice

transplanted with isolated CD8 T cells, indicating that mature CD8 T cells and not CD4 or

progenitor T cells give rise to the DPT population (Fig 5B-C). Clonal TCR analysis of the TRAB

gene within the CD4, CD8 and DPT populations also provide evidence that the CD4 and DPT

populations are experiencing clonal expansion. We identified fewer overall clones in the CD4 and

DPT populations when compared to the CD8 population. Furthermore, the top ten clones of both

the CD4 and DPT populations represent ~25% of the entire population while the top ten clones in

the CD8 population equal only half that number (Fig 3F, Supplemental Table 3).

To support our hypothesis that DPTs differentiate in response to xeno/allo-antigens and not as a

result of the lymphopenic environment found within allo-HSCT recipients and NSG mice, we

surveyed the phosphorylation status of several STAT proteins since they are downstream of a

variety of cytokine receptors, potentially offering insight into the development of DPTs.

Unfortunately, we could not identify any differences in the phosphorylation of STAT1, 3, 4 and 6

between the CD8 and DPT populations (Supplemental Fig 6A-B). Furthermore, the

transplantation of CD4 or CD8 T cells sorted from a previously transplanted xenogeneic GVHD

mouse into a naïve mouse did not result in the emergence of any DPTs (Fig 5D-F). This suggests

that the emergence of DPTs is not the result of lymphopenia or a xenogeneic microenvironment

but is instead the result of unknown activation events that occur early post-transplant in the CD8

T cell population.

Knowing that the transcriptome of DPT is unique compared to CD8 T cells and that transcription

factors were one of the functional analyses highlighted in the KEGG BRITE analysis, we further

investigated what transcription factors may be involved in the differentiation of DPT from the CD8

population. Interestingly, we observed that the transcriptional expression of the CD4 lineage

master transcription factor, THPOK (ZBTB7B) was significantly upregulated compared to CD8 T

cells (Fig 5G-H). DPTs also displayed significantly elevated levels of the CD8 lineage master

transcription factor, RUNX3, relative to CD4 T cells (Fig 5G-H). This dual expression of both CD4

and CD8 lineage master transcription factors was confirmed at the protein level by flow cytometry

which showed DPTs expressing an intermediate amount of each transcription factor relative to

their single positive T cell controls (Fig 5I-J). DPT also displayed differences in the polarizing

transcription factor T-bet (TBX21) which was increased relative to CD4 T cells but decreased

relative to CD8 T cells (Supplemental Fig 6C-E). There was also a small increase in the

expression of RORγt relative to CD8 T cells, a decrease in FOXP3 expression relative to CD4 T

cells and no difference in GATA3 expression (Supplemental Fig 6C-E).

Differentiated DPTs are a metabolically active and unique T cell population

To further explore DPT biology, we investigated their metabolic state relative to CD4 and CD8 T

cells. We analyzed sorted CD4, CD8 and DPTs from xenogeneic mice using a two-photon (2P)

autofluorescence imaging system (Fig 6A-E). This system is able to detect the autofluorescence

of NAD(P)H and FAD at a single cell resolution and use their ratios to determine the optical redox

ratio (ORR) of the cell population as a measurement of metabolic activity[56,57]. This analysis

revealed that the DPT population had elevated ORR, indicative of high metabolic activity (Fig 6A-

B). Furthermore, a random forest classifier trained to integrate the 10 metabolic parameters

imaged accurately identified the DPT population from CD4 and CD8 T cells (Fig 6C-E). This is

shown as a confusion matrix, ROC curve and a UMAP dimensionality reduction (Fig 6C-E).

Additional metabolic analysis using a Seahorse real-time metabolic analyzer independently

confirmed that DPTs have a higher ATP production rate than CD4 and CD8 T cells with the

increased ATP production primarily coming from glycolysis (Fig 6F). In addition to metabolic

differences, we also analyzed the T cell populations for evidence of "blasting". Blasting is

characterized by increased cell size and is marker of cellular proliferation in T cells. The DPT

population displayed higher frequencies of the blasting phenotype relative to CD8 T cells in both

xenogeneic and clinical GVHD samples (Supplemental Fig 7).

DPTs represent a GVHD-specific T cell population with little GVL activity

To confirm the role of DPTs in the pathology of xenogeneic GVHD, we flow-sorted CD4, CD8 and

DPTs from GVHD mice and re-transplanted each population individually into naïve mice (Fig 7A).

Interestingly, only DPTs caused lethal xenogeneic GVHD (Fig 7B-C). DPTs expanded rapidly

after transplantation and had increased infiltration into the spleen, liver, and lungs relative to CD4

and CD8 T cells (Fig 7D-F). Mice transplanted with DPTs also exhibited high levels of human

IFNγ in their plasma compared to CD8 T cells (Fig 7G). To further investigate the secretome of

DPTs, we cultured human T cells from GVHD mice overnight with brefeldin A prior to intracellular

cytokine staining. DPTs secreted a diverse repertoire of cytokines including granzyme and

perforin, the inflammatory modulators IL-17A, IL-22 and GM-CSF as well as the activation

cytokines IFNγ and TNFα (Fig 6H-I, Supplemental Fig 8). These data highlight the extreme pro-

inflammatory state of DPTs and reveal this population to be the primary mediator of xenogeneic

GVHD pathology.

While we have shown evidence that DPTs are sufficient to mediate GVHD pathology, we next

wanted to determine if they can also mediate GVL activity against two human B-ALL

malignancies, NALM-6 and RS4;11. Human B-ALL cell lines were injected seven days prior to

the transplantation of CD4, CD8 or DPTs flow-sorted from GVHD mice (Fig 8A). Relative to control

mice only receiving the B-ALL cell line NALM-6, both flow-sorted CD4 and CD8 T cells were able

to prolong survival while DPTs provided no survival advantage (Fig 8B). The extended survival of

mice given flow-sorted CD4 and CD8 T cells was due to their ability to control the expansion of

NALM-6 as seen by IVIS and flow cytometry quantification of the number of NALM-6 cells in the

blood of these mice (Fig 8C-D). The failure of DPTs to prolong survival was not due to a lack of

cells within the mouse or a failure of activation as measured by IFNγ (Fig 8E-F). In fact, sorted

CD8 T cells were able to prolong survival even in the absence of detectable IFNγ suggesting they

maintain some GVL activity even without CD4 T cell help (Fig 8F). An in vitro cytotoxicity assay

of the flow-sorted T cell populations also revealed that DPTs had a three-fold lower capacity to

kill NALM-6 compared to flow-sorted CD4 and CD8 T cells (Fig 8G). Next, we determined if there

were any differences between flow sorted CD4 and CD8 T cells from a GVHD mouse and freshly

isolated CD4 and CD8 T cells from a healthy donor. We reveal that fresh CD4 and CD8 T cells

provided a similar survival advantage as before, highlighting that flow sorted CD4 and CD8 T cells

from GVHD mice do not lose their capacity to mediate GVL activity (Supplemental Fig 9). To

ensure this result is not specific to NALM-6, we tested flow-sorted CD4, CD8 and DPTs against

a second B-ALL cell line, RS4;11. DPTs also failed to protect against RS4;11 while flow-sorted

CD4 and CD8 T cells were able to prolong survival (Fig 8H-K). These results suggest that the

DPT population, which differentiates from the CD8 T cell population after transplant, may

represent a GVHD-specific T cell population with limited GVL activity against human B-ALL

malignancies.

Discussion

In this study, we identified five novel T cell specific predictive biomarkers of relapse and GVHD

which included a unique CD4/CD8 double positive T cell (DPT) population. Human DPTs originate

from the CD8 population after transplant through a currently unknown mechanism and are

transcriptionally, metabolically, and functionally distinct from CD4 and CD8 T cells. Furthermore,

we revealed that DPTs are sufficient for GVHD pathology when transplanted into naïve NSG mice

but possess little GVL activity against two human B-ALL cell lines. With DPTs also being identified

in other human chronic inflammatory diseases beyond GVHD, the molecular characterization of

DPTs in this manuscript may provide additional insight into the pathogenesis of these complex

diseases.

The identification of novel predictive biomarkers of allo-HSCT outcome is an important endeavor

that many groups have investigated in the past using serum analytes as biomarkers[17–19]. As such,

the direct investigation of T cells as a source of predictive biomarkers represents an exciting field

of biomarker research. Our results here suggest that the direct investigation of T cell metrics can

predict allo-HSCT outcomes early after transplant, independent of most pre-transplant prognostic

variables currently used in the clinic (Supplemental Table 1). While the use of T cell predictive

biomarkers will have to be validated in a larger multi-center study, this study highlights their

potential as a biomarker capable of predicting both relapse and GVHD after transplant.

To identify the five T cell predictive biomarkers in this study, we gated solely on the CD45RO$^+$ T

cell population. The gating on CD45RO$^+$ T cells is based on the knowledge that CD45RO is only

expressed on effector and memory T cells and the hypothesis that gating on this effector/memory

T cell population would provide additional sensitivity and reduce the "noise" in the system. With

the patient's conditioning regimen eliminating or reducing their own T cell numbers to very low

levels, the CD45RO$^+$ T cell population most likely represents donor T cells from the graft. Thus,

we are using CD45RO as a marker to identify donor effector T cells that are activated against

either host or leukemia antigen. While we acknowledge that this gating strategy is not specific for

effector T cells, it allows us to remove naïve, non-reactive T cells that came from the donor graft

and naïve T cells generated de novo from hematopoiesis, which increases the sensitivity of our T

cell biomarkers.

Of the five T cell predictive biomarkers we identified, only DPTs lacked a verified biological

function. One recent manuscript which also identified DPTs in GVHD patients suggested that they

possess a regulatory function[44]. In our own analysis, we observed that an increase in the

percentage of DPTs was predictive of GVHD suggesting a positive correlation with pathology. In

our functional characterization of DPTs, we identified them as a highly activated T cell population

that expressed pro-inflammatory cytokines including IFNγ, TNFα, IL-17A, IL-22 and GM-CSF in

addition to perforin and granzyme (Fig 6H-I, Supplemental Fig 7). Furthermore, DPTs did not

display classical markers of exhaustion in our xenogeneic transplant model, with their expression

of PD-1, LAG3, TIGIT, TIM3 and CTLA4 all at or below CD4 or CD8 single-positive controls (Fig

4B-C, Supplemental Fig 5). This observation is further supported in our clinical observation study

where we show that DPTs express low levels of PD-1, TIGIT and lack the expression of LAG3

(Fig 4D-L). Our additional metabolic studies revealed they exist in an activated state that, when

re-transplanted in naïve mice, are sufficient to mediate GVHD pathology (Fig 7). These data

support our conclusion that DPTs represent a highly inflammatory T cell population that are

directly involved in pathology.

In addition to showing that DPTs are sufficient for lethal GVHD pathology, we also provide

evidence that they have limited GVL activity (Fig 7-8, Supplemental Fig 8). This surprising

observation is offset slightly by our inability to deplete DPTs without also depleting CD4 and/or

CD8 single-positive T cells. Currently, we have not identified a DPT specific marker uniquely

expressed by this population, which would have allowed us to confirm that the DPT population is

not required for GVL activity. Nevertheless, our experiments with flow sorted CD8 T cells from

GVHD mice which maintained GVL activity despite not being able to cause lethal xenogeneic

GVHD does provide supporting evidence that DPTs are not required for GVL activity (Fig 7 & 8).

While not conclusive, these data highlight the exciting possibility that a DPT-specific

immunotherapy may one day allow for the prevention of GVHD without inhibiting GVL activity.

With the CD4 T cell lineage have a well-established plasticity for different polarization states, we were surprised to identify CD8 T cell as the origin of DPTs (Fig 5)[34,37–39]. Other than a CD8/FOXP3 regulatory T cell population, there are few other polarization states of CD8 T cells that have been identified[42,43]. Furthermore, the master transcription factors of the CD8 and CD4 lineages, RUNX3 and THPOK respectively, are thought to negatively regulate each other[52]. While RUNX3 and THPOK are both expressed in thymocytes during T cell development, mature T cells are thought to be lineage restricted due to this process[52]. It was thus surprising that DPTs expressed both RUNX3 and THPOK, both at the level of transcription and protein, via a currently unknown mechanism. As such, additional studies will be required in the future to understand the signaling and epigenetic mechanism(s) associated with this dual transcription factor expression (Fig 5).

Overall, this study uncovers the previously unknown origin and function of a human CD4/CD8 DPT population in GVHD that can also serve as a predictive biomarker of GVHD in adult allo-HSCT patient samples. Metabolic, transcriptomic, and functional studies all identified DPTs as a T cell population with distinct inflammatory properties relative single positive CD4 and CD8 T cells. This highly inflammatory state resulted in lethal GVHD pathology when isolated DPTs were transplanted into naïve NSG mice while CD4 and CD8 T cells populations, also isolated from GVHD mice, failed to cause lethal pathology after re-transplantation. The DPT population though could not control two human B-ALL cell lines, suggesting that the development of this population from the CD8 T cell population might be dependent on chronic antigen stimulation from the host. Future studies will need to explore the connection of DPTs with other human chronic inflammatory disorders they have been identified in including rheumatoid arthritis, hepatitis B and C, β-thalassemia, renal carcinomas, breast cancers and islet graft rejection[45–51]. In conclusion, DPTs represent a unique T cell population whose presence should be directly investigated in other human chronic inflammatory diseases.

Methods

Isolation of Primary Human Cells. Human peripheral blood was collected from healthy consenting donors according to IRB protocol 2014-0806 (J.E.G.) and 2017-1070 (C.M.C). Leftover and de-identified remnants of human bone marrow and G-CSF mobilized peripheral blood grafts used for allo-HSCT procedures at our clinic were collected under IRB protocol 2016-0298 (P.H.). De-identified human umbilical cord blood was collected from the Medical College of Wisconsin's cord blood bank. All human blood samples were diluted 1:1 with leukocyte isolation buffer (PBS, 2mM EDTA, 2% FBS) prior to ficoll density-gradient centrifugation (1100xg for 15 min with 0 brake). When indicated, StemCell Technologies RosetteSep T cell, CD4 or CD8 enrichment kits were used.

Clinical Sample Collection. All patients receiving an allo-HSCT at the University of Wisconsin-Madison were prospectively enrolled between October 2020 and August 2021 on the minimal-risk IRB protocol 2020-1490 (C.M.C.). A total of 35 patients were enrolled on this study. Eligible patients had to receive post-transplant cyclophosphamide for GVHD prophylaxis at day +3/+4. Conditioning regimen, HLA matching status, graft source and patient disease type were all non-exclusion criteria for this study. Patients were divided into four respective categories based on their allo-HSCT outcome: no GVHD, grade 1 GVHD, grade 2 GVHD or grade 3-4 GVHD. Patient assignment into each respective GVHD category is based on their highest GVHD grade achieved between day 0 and 100 after transplant. The development of GVHD after day 100 was not factored into this analysis.

Excess blood from study patients was set aside after initial use and stored at 4ºC for 3-10 days before processing and was never frozen. A total of 0.5mL of blood was aliquoted from each patient collection tube for each flow cytometry test and centrifuged at 600xg for 4min at 4ºC. The cell pellet was resuspended in 1.5mL of 1X RBC lysis buffer (BioLegend), vortexed and rested for

2min prior to washing with 1mL of PBS and centrifugation. Supernatant was disposed of and a

second round of RBC lysis was performed. Afterwards, the cell pellet was re-suspended in 1.5mL

of flow buffer (1X PBS + 2% FBS) and aliquoted into three flow cytometry tubes for staining.

Transplantation of human cells into NSG Mice. All human cells were washed and resuspended in

150μL/mouse of sterile 1X PBS prior to retro-orbital injection. Equal numbers of male and female

immunodeficient NSG (NOD.Cg-*Prkdc^{scid} Il2rg^{tm1Wjl}*/SzJ, Jackson Laboratories) between the ages

of 8-16 weeks of age were used for all experiments. All mice were weighed and monitored weekly

for visible signs of GVHD with a scoring system carried out as follows: 0 = no signs of GVHD; 1

= 2-5% weight loss; 2 = 6-9% weight loss; 3 = 10-14% weight loss; 4 = ≥ 15% weight loss. Blood

was regularly drawn at 1, 3, 6, 9- and 12-weeks post-transplant by retro-orbital bleeding. At time

of euthanasia, the spleen, one lobe of the liver, lungs and femur were regularly collected for further

processing.

Flow Cytometry and Cell-Sorting. All cells were stained in flow buffer (PBS, 10% FBS) prior to

quantification on a ThermoFisher Attune NxT Flow Cytometer and analysis on FlowJo V10.

Antibody clones include mCD45 (A20), ICOS (C398.4A), T-bet (4B10), LAG3 (11C3C65), FASL

(NOK-1), CD4 (OKT4), CD69 (FN50), OX40 (Ber-ACT35), CD27 (O323), pSTAT4 (p38), RORγt

(Q21-559), CD44 (BJ18), NKG2D (1D11), PD-1 (EH12.2H7), THPOK (ZFP-67), TIGIT

(A15153G), CD45RO (UCHL1), TIM3 (F38-2E2), pSTAT6 (A15137E), IL-22 (2G12A41), GATA3

(16E10A23), CD8α (RPA-T8), CD8β (SIDI8BEE), CD25 (BC96), 4-1BB (4B4-1), CD28 (CD28.2),

RUNX3 (SD0803), CTLA4 (BNI3), PanHLA (w6/32), CD3 (UCHT1). Visualization of cells was

complete using an ImageStream Mark II.

For cell sorting, cells were collected from the blood, spleen, liver and lungs of mice transplanted

with a lethal dose of PB-MNC approximately 4 weeks prior. Processed tissues were ficolled as

described above to obtain mononuclear cells. Human cells were isolated from the combined

mononuclear cells using StemCell Technologies EasySep Mouse/Human Chimera isolation kit.

Human cells were then stained in sterile PBS with the human CD4 (OKT4) and CD8β (SIDI8BEE)

antibodies prior to sorting on a BD FACSAria Cell Sorter. Cells were then maintained in cell culture

for 2-3 days prior to transplantation and/or expansion.

Cell Lines and Cell Culture. The human B-ALL line RS4;11 and NALM-6 were purchased from

ATCC and cultured using standard RPMI-10 media (RPMI base media, 10% FBS, 1X Pen/Strep,

1mM NEAA, 1X GlutaMAX). After flow sorting, isolated human CD4, CD8 and DPT populations

were expanded by co-culturing with a 10X dose of γ-irradiated (25Gy) human mononuclear cells

from a third-party donor with 5µg/mL of PHA in RPMI-10 media supplemented with 5ng/mL of

human IL-2 and IL-7. RPMI-10 media supplemented with IL-2 and IL-7 was added/changed

approximately every 3-4 days.

RNA sequencing. T cells from five GVHD mice were pooled prior to flow-sorting of the CD4, CD8

and DPTs. Pooled T cell populations were then split into three replicates for RNA isolation. All

RNA isolation and sequencing was performed by the Gene Expression Center at the University

of Wisconsin-Madison. RNA was isolated with Qiagen RNeasy kit prior to a quality control check

using an Agilent Bioanalyzer and NanoDrop One spectrophotometer. mRNA libraries were

prepared using the TruSeq stranded mRNA kit and sequenced on an Illumina NovaSeq 6000

platform to 30 million reads per sample. Sample reads were processed by the University of

Wisconsin Biotechnology Center.

ELISAs. Mouse blood samples were diluted with 50µL of 1X PBS prior to centrifugation with 60µL

of the diluted plasma stored at -20^{0}C. Plasma was further diluted 1:5 prior to ELISA with Assay

Buffer (PBS, 1mM Tween-20, 5% FBS). IFNγ ELISAs used the MD-1 clone for coating and a

biotinylated 4S.B3 clone for detection prior to visualization with a streptavidin-HRP antibody

(BioLegend).

Two-photon lifetime imaging of NAD(P)H and FAD

A custom-built inverted multiphoton microscope (Bruker Fluorescence Microscopy, Middleton, WI,

USA), was used to acquire fluorescence intensity and lifetime images. The equipment consists of

an ultrafast laser (Spectra Physics, Insight DSDual), an inverted microscope (Nikon, Eclipse Ti),

and a 40X water immersion (1.15 NA, Nikon) objective. NAD(P)H and FAD images were obtained

for the same field of view. FAD fluorescence was isolated using an emission bandpass filter of

550/100 nm and excitation wavelength of 890 nm. NAD(P)H fluorescence was isolated using an

emission bandpass filter of 440/80 nm and an excitation wavelength of 750 nm. Fluorescence

lifetime images were collected using time-correlated single-photon counting electronics (SPC-

150, Becker and Hickl, Brookline, MA, USA) and a GaAsP photomultiplier tube (H7422P-40,

Hamamatsu, Bridgewater, NJ, USA). 512x512 pixel images were obtained using a pixel dwell

time of 4.8 µs over 60 s total integration time. To guarantee adequate photon observations for

lifetime decay fits and no photobleaching, the photon count rates were maintained at 1–2 x 10^5

photons/s. The instrument response function was calculated from the second harmonic

generation of urea crystals excited at 900 nm. A Fluoresbrite YG microsphere (Polysciences Inc.,

Warrington, PA, USA) was imaged as a daily standard for fluorescence lifetime. The lifetime

decay curves for the YG microsphere standard were fit to a single exponential decay and the

fluorescence lifetime was measured to be 2.1 ns (n = 7), which is consistent with published values.

NAD(P)H and FAD intensity and lifetime images were analyzed using SPCImage software

(Becker &Hickl, Berlin, Germany) as described previously[58]. The fluorescence lifetime decay

curve was deconvolved with the instrument response function and fit to a two-component

exponential decay model at each pixel, $I(t) = \alpha_1 * e^{(-t/\tau_1)} + \alpha_2 * e^{(-t/\tau_2)} + C$, where I(t) represents

the fluorescence intensity at time t after the laser excitation pulse, α accounts for the fractional

contribution from each component, C represents the background light, and τ is the fluorescence

lifetime of each component. Since both NAD(P)H and FAD can exist in two conformational states,

bound, or unbound to enzymes, a two-component model was used. For NAD(P)H, the short (τ_1)

and long (τ_2) lifetime components correspond with the unbound and bound conformations,

respectively. The mean lifetime (τ_m) was calculated using $\tau_m = \alpha_{1*}\,\tau_1 + \alpha_{2*}\,\tau_2$, for both NAD(P)H and

FAD. The optical redox ratio was determined from the NAD(P)H and FAD intensity images as the

intensity of NAD(P)H / (NAD(P)H + FAD). Semi-automated cell segmentation was performed

using the cyto2 model in Cellpose, which resulted in whole-cell masks, followed by manual

inspection and mask corrections by a trained scientist. Using the masks, single cell features were

extracted including bi-exponential fit parameters (τ_1, τ_2, α_1, α_2) for NAD(P)H and FAD, NAD(P)H

τ_m, FAD τ_m, and the optical redox ratio. Features were calculated on a per-cell level by averaging

all the pixels across each cell. A minimum of 100 cells were analyzed per condition to obtain

statistically robust results.

Metabolomic Assays. ATP production rate was calculated from flow sorted CD4, CD8 and DPT

using an Agilent Seahorse XF Real-Time ATP Rate Assay Kit using a Seahorse XF/XFe96

analyzer and following the manufacturer's instructions.

Bioluminescent Imaging. A total of $1E^6$ luciferase positive NALM-6 cells were injected retro-

orbitally seven days prior to human T cell transplantation as described above. Luminescence

detection was gathered at the indicated times using an IVIS Spectrum In Vivo Imaging System

(PerkinElmer). Briefly, mice were anesthetized and intraperitoneally injected with 100μL of D-

luciferin at 30mg/mL with luminescence obtained approximately 15 minutes later.

Statistics. Graphs and statistical tests were completed using GraphPad Prism 6. All significance

tests were performed using either unpaired parametric (for linear data) or non-parametric (for

logarithmic data) t -tests. For the biomarker multivariate analysis, we used the multiplications of

the empirical cumulative distribution factor (ecdf) for each variable to achieve a combined score

with the R language. The AUC-ROC was used to determine the optimal direction of the exdf (< or

>) for each variable. Generalization performance was estimated using leave-one-out cross-

validation. For the RNA-seq analysis each fastq file is assessed for quality control issues and

trimmed to remove adapter sequences that were not removed by the initial demultiplexing. After

trimming and QC, the reads were aligned to the human genome using the splice-junction aware

read aligner STAR. The software package RSEM was used to generate normalized read counts

for each gene and its potential isoforms. Genes with very low expression, which would otherwise

reduce statistical power, were filtered out. The program EdgeR is then employed to perform

differential gene expression analysis.

Study Approval. All work involving human cells and tissues was performed in accordance with

IRB protocol 2014-0806 (C.M.C.). All animal work performed in accordance with UW-Madison

IACUC approved protocol number M005915 (C.M.C.).

Author Contributions

N.J.H., J.E.G., P.H. and C.M.C. designed the study; N.J.H., D.T. and J.R. performed experiments;

N.J.H., J.R., S.M. and E.C.G. analyzed the data; K.N., A.W.H., N.C., M.C.S. J.E.G. and P.H.

provided resources; N.J.H. and C.M.C. drafted the manuscript. All authors revised and approved

the manuscript.

Grant Support

The authors would like to thank the Clinical Laboratory team at UW-Health including Hugo Stoffel-

Rosales, Robin Rustad and Kaitlyn Walker for their help with sample collection, as well as the

the University of Wisconsin Carbone Cancer Center (UWCCC) Flow Cytometry Core Facility,

UWCCC Small Molecule Screening Facility, UWCCC Small Animal Imaging and Radiotherapy

Facility and the UWCCC Experimental Animal Pathology Laboratory, who are all supported by

NIH/NCI P30-CA014520. The authors also utilized the University of Wisconsin-Madison

Biotechnology Center Bioinformatics Core Facility for the analysis of RNA-sequencing data. This

work was supported in part by NIH/NIAID T32-AI125231 (N.J.H), NIH/NHLBI T32-HL07899

(N.J.H.), NIH/NCATS UL1-TR002373 (N.J.H), the Cormac Pediatric Leukemia Fellowship (N.J.H)

and the Stem Cell and Regenerative Medicine Center Fellowship (N.J.H.). Additional funding

includes NIH/NIAID R21-AI116007 (J.E.G.), NIH/NIAID R01-AI136500 (J.E.G.), St. Baldrick's-

Stand Up to Cancer Pediatric Dream Team Translational Research Grant SU2C-AACR-DT-27-

17 (C.M.C.), NIH/NCI R01-CA215461 (C.M.C.) and the MACC Fund (C.M.C). Stand Up to Cancer

is a division of the Entertainment Industry Foundation. Research grants are administered by the

American Association for Cancer Research, the scientific partner of SU2C. The contents of this

article do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the Department of Health and Human

Services, nor does mention of trade names, commercial products, or organizations imply

endorsement by the US Government. None of these funding sources had any input in the study

design, analysis, manuscript preparation or decision to submit for publication.

Disclosure of Conflicts of Interest

C.M.C. reports honorarium from Bayer, Elephas Biosciences, Nektar Therapeutics and Novartis,

who had no input in the study design, analysis, manuscript preparation or decision to submit for

publication. The authors declare that no other relevant financial conflicts of interest exist.

References

1. D'Souza A, Fretham C, Lee SJ, et al. Current Use of and Trends in Hematopoietic Cell Transplantation in the United States. *Biol Blood Marrow Transplant*. 2020;26(8):e177–e182.
2. Gooptu M, Romee R, St Martin A, et al. HLA-haploidentical vs matched unrelated donor transplants with posttransplant cyclophosphamide-based prophylaxis. *Blood*. 2021;138(3):273–282.
3. Kanate AS, Majhail NS, Savani BN, et al. Indications for Hematopoietic Cell Transplantation and Immune Effector Cell Therapy: Guidelines from the American Society for Transplantation and Cellular Therapy. *Biol Blood Marrow Transplant*. 2020;26(7):1247–1256.
4. Martinez-Cibrian N, Zeiser R, Perez-Simon JA. Graft-versus-host disease prophylaxis: Pathophysiology-based review on current approaches and future directions. *Blood Reviews*. 2020;100792.
5. Ciurea SO, Zhang M-J, Bacigalupo AA, et al. Haploidentical transplant with posttransplant cyclophosphamide vs matched unrelated donor transplant for acute myeloid leukemia. *Blood*. 2015;126(8):1033–1040.
6. Battipaglia G, Labopin M, Kröger N, et al. Posttransplant cyclophosphamide vs antithymocyte globulin in HLA-mismatched unrelated donor transplantation. *Blood*. 2019;134(11):892–899.
7. Blazar BR, Hill GR, Murphy WJ. Dissecting the biology of allogeneic HSCT to enhance the GvT effect whilst minimizing GvHD. *Nat Rev Clin Oncol*. 2020;
8. Chang Y-J, Zhao X-Y, Huang X-J. Strategies for Enhancing and Preserving Anti-leukemia Effects Without Aggravating Graft-Versus-Host Disease. *Front Immunol*. 2018;9:3041.
9. Reddy P, Maeda Y, Liu C, et al. A crucial role for antigen-presenting cells and alloantigen expression in graft-versus-leukemia responses. *Nat. Med.* 2005;11(11):1244–1249.
10. Meurer T, Crivello P, Metzing M, et al. Permissive HLA-DPB1 mismatches in HCT depend on immunopeptidome divergence and editing by HLA-DM. *Blood*. 2021;137(7):923–928.
11. Mayor NP, Wang T, Lee SJ, et al. Impact of Previously Unrecognized HLA Mismatches Using Ultrahigh Resolution Typing in Unrelated Donor Hematopoietic Cell Transplantation. *JCO*. 2021;JCO.20.03643.
12. Petersdorf EW, Stevenson P, Bengtsson M, et al. HLA-B leader and survivorship after HLA-mismatched unrelated donor transplantation. *Blood*. 2020;136(3):362–369.
13. Petersdorf EW, Gooley TA, Malkki M, et al. HLA-C expression levels define permissible mismatches in hematopoietic cell transplantation. *Blood*. 2014;124(26):3996–4003.
14. Fuchs EJ, McCurdy SR, Solomon SR, et al. HLA informs risk predictions after haploidentical stem cell transplantation with posttransplantation cyclophosphamide. *Blood*. 2022;139(10):1452–1468.
15. Wachsmuth LP, Patterson MT, Eckhaus MA, et al. Post-transplantation cyclophosphamide prevents graft-versus-host disease by inducing alloreactive T cell dysfunction and suppression. *J Clin Invest*. 2019;129(6):2357–2373.
16. Nunes NS, Kanakry CG. Mechanisms of Graft-versus-Host Disease Prevention by Post-transplantation Cyclophosphamide: An Evolving Understanding. *Front Immunol*. 2019;10:2668.
17. Paczesny S. Biomarkers for posttransplantation outcomes. *Blood*. 2018;131(20):2193–2204.
18. Chen S, Zeiser R. Novel Biomarkers for Outcome After Allogeneic Hematopoietic Stem Cell Transplantation. *Front Immunol*. 2020;11:1854.
19. Adom D, Rowan C, Adeniyan T, Yang J, Paczesny S. Biomarkers for Allogeneic HCT Outcomes. *Front Immunol*. 2020;11:673.
20. Srinagesh HK, Özbek U, Kapoor U, et al. The MAGIC algorithm probability is a validated response biomarker of treatment of acute graft-versus-host disease. *Blood Adv*. 2019;3(23):4034–4042.

21. Hotta M, Satake A, Yoshimura H, et al. Elevation of Early Plasma Biomarkers in Patients with Clinical Risk Factors Predicts Increased Nonrelapse Mortality after Allogeneic Hematopoietic Stem Cell Transplantation. *Transplant Cell Ther*. 2021;27(8):660.e1-660.e8.

22. Rowan CM, Pike F, Cooke KR, et al. Assessment of ST2 for risk of death following graft-versus-host disease in pediatric and adult age groups. *Blood*. 2020;135(17):1428–1437.

23. Major-Monfried H, Renteria AS, Pawarode A, et al. MAGIC biomarkers predict long-term outcomes for steroid-resistant acute GVHD. *Blood*. 2018;131(25):2846–2855.

24. Zewde MG, Morales G, Gandhi I, et al. Evaluation of Elafin as a Prognostic Biomarker in Acute Graft-versus-Host Disease. *Transplantation and Cellular Therapy, Official Publication of the American Society for Transplantation and Cellular Therapy*. 2021;27(12):988.e1-988.e7.

25. Subburaj D, Ng B, Kariminia A, et al. Metabolomic identification of α-ketoglutaric acid elevation in pediatric chronic graft-versus-host disease. *Blood*. 2022;139(2):287–299.

26. Inamoto Y, Martin PJ, Lee SJ, et al. Dickkopf-related protein 3 is a novel biomarker for chronic GVHD after allogeneic hematopoietic cell transplantation. *Blood Adv*. 2020;4(11):2409–2417.

27. McCurdy SR, Radojcic V, Tsai H-L, et al. Signatures of GVHD and Relapse after Post-Transplant Cyclophosphamide Revealed by Immune Profiling and Machine Learning. *Blood*. 2021;blood.2021013054.

28. Cruz CRY, Bo N, Bakoyannis G, et al. Antigen-specific T cell responses correlate with decreased occurrence of acute GVHD in a multicenter contemporary cohort. *Bone Marrow Transplant*. 2021;

29. Podgorny PJ, Liu Y, Dharmani-Khan P, et al. Immune cell subset counts associated with graft-versus-host disease. *Biol Blood Marrow Transplant*. 2014;20(4):450–462.

30. Magenau JM, Qin X, Tawara I, et al. Frequency of CD4+CD25hiFOXP3+ Regulatory T Cells Has Diagnostic and Prognostic Value as a Biomarker for Acute Graft-versus-Host-Disease. *Biology of Blood and Marrow Transplantation*. 2010;16(7):907–914.

31. Hess NJ, Brown ME, Capitini CM. GVHD Pathogenesis, Prevention and Treatment: Lessons From Humanized Mouse Transplant Models. *Frontiers in Immunology*. 2021;12:3082.

32. Hill GR, Betts BC, Tkachev V, Kean LS, Blazar BR. Current Concepts and Advances in Graft-Versus-Host Disease Immunology. *Annu Rev Immunol*. 2021;

33. Teshima T, Hill GR. The Pathophysiology and Treatment of Graft-Versus-Host Disease: Lessons Learnt From Animal Models. *Front Immunol*. 2021;12:715424.

34. Piper C, Zhou V, Komorowski R, et al. Pathogenic Bhlhe40+ GM-CSF+ CD4+ T Cells Promote Indirect Alloantigen Presentation in the GI Tract during GVHD. *Blood*. 2019;

35. Gartlan KH, Bommiasamy H, Paz K, et al. A critical role for donor-derived IL-22 in cutaneous chronic GVHD. *Am. J. Transplant.* 2018;18(4):810–820.

36. Piper C, Hainstock E, Yin-Yuan C, et al. Single cell immune profiling reveals a developmentally distinct CD4+ GM-CSF+ T cell lineage that induces GI tract GVHD. *Blood Adv*. 2022;bloodadvances.2021006084.

37. Park S, Griesenauer B, Jiang H, et al. Granzyme A-producing T helper cells are critical for acute graft-versus-host disease. *JCI Insight*. 2020;

38. Hashimoto K, Kouno T, Ikawa T, et al. Single-cell transcriptomics reveals expansion of cytotoxic CD4 T cells in supercentenarians. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 2019;116(48):24242–24251.

39. Mucida D, Husain MM, Muroi S, et al. Transcriptional reprogramming of mature CD4^{+} helper T cells generates distinct MHC class II-restricted cytotoxic T lymphocytes. *Nat. Immunol.* 2013;14(3):281–289.

40. Takeuchi A, Saito T. CD4 CTL, a Cytotoxic Subset of CD4+ T Cells, Their Differentiation and Function. *Front Immunol*. 2017;8:.

41. Dwyer GK, Mathews LR, Villegas JA, et al. IL-33 acts as a costimulatory signal to generate alloreactive Th1 cells in graft-versus-host disease. *J Clin Invest*. 2022;e150927.

42. Agle K, Vincent BG, Piper C, et al. Bim regulates the survival and suppressive capability of CD8+
FOXP3+ regulatory T cells during murine GVHD. *Blood*. 2018;132(4):435–447.
43. Beres AJ, Haribhai D, Chadwick AC, et al. CD8+ Foxp3+ regulatory T cells are induced during graft-
versus-host disease and mitigate disease severity. *J. Immunol.* 2012;189(1):464–474.
44. Alhaj Hussen K, Michonneau D, Biajoux V, et al. CD4+CD8+ T-Lymphocytes in Xenogeneic and
Human Graft-versus-Host Disease. *Front Immunol*. 2020;11:579776.
45. Menard LC, Fischer P, Kakrecha B, et al. Renal Cell Carcinoma (RCC) Tumors Display Large Expansion
of Double Positive (DP) CD4+CD8+ T Cells With Expression of Exhaustion Markers. *Front Immunol*.
2018;9:2728.
46. Choi YJ, Park H-J, Park HJ, Jung KC, Lee J-I. CD4hiCD8low Double-Positive T Cells Are Associated with
Graft Rejection in a Nonhuman Primate Model of Islet Transplantation. *J Immunol Res*.
2018;2018:3861079.
47. Zahran AM, Saad K, Elsayh KI, Alblihed MA. Characterization of circulating CD4+ CD8+ double
positive and CD4- CD8- double negative T-lymphocyte in children with β-thalassemia major. *Int. J.
Hematol.* 2017;105(3):265–271.
48. Quandt D, Rothe K, Scholz R, Baerwald CW, Wagner U. Peripheral CD4CD8 double positive T cells
with a distinct helper cytokine profile are increased in rheumatoid arthritis. *PLoS ONE*.
2014;9(3):e93293.
49. Nascimbeni M, Pol S, Saunier B. Distinct CD4+CD8+ Double-Positive T Cells in the Blood and Liver of
Patients during Chronic Hepatitis B and C. *PLOS ONE*. 2011;6(5):e20145.
50. Desfrançois J, Derré L, Corvaisier M, et al. Increased frequency of nonconventional double positive
CD4CD8 αβ T cells in human breast pleural effusions. *International Journal of Cancer*.
2009;125(2):374–380.
51. Nascimbeni M, Shin E-C, Chiriboga L, Kleiner DE, Rehermann B. Peripheral CD4+CD8+ T cells are
differentiated effector memory cells with antiviral functions. *Blood*. 2004;104(2):478–486.
52. Egawa T. A Fateful Decision in the Thymus Controlled by the Transcription Factor ThPOK. *J.I.*
2021;206(9):1981–1982.
53. Overgaard NH, Jung J-W, Steptoe RJ, Wells JW. CD4+/CD8+ double-positive T cells: more than just a
developmental stage? *J. Leukoc. Biol.* 2015;97(1):31–38.
54. Hess NJ, Hudson AW, Hematti P, Gumperz JE. Early T Cell Activation Metrics Predict Graft-versus-
Host Disease in a Humanized Mouse Model of Hematopoietic Stem Cell Transplantation. *J. Immunol.*
2020;205(1):272–281.
55. Hess NJ, S Bharadwaj N, Bobeck EA, et al. iNKT cells coordinate immune pathways to enable
engraftment in nonconditioned hosts. *Life Sci Alliance*. 2021;4(7):.
56. Walsh AJ, Mueller K, Tweed K, et al. Classification of T-cell activation via autofluorescence lifetime
imaging. *Nat Biomed Eng*. 2021;5(1):77–88.
57. Samimi K, Contreras Guzman E, Trier SM, et al. Time-domain single photon-excited
autofluorescence lifetime for label-free detection of T cell activation. *Opt Lett*. 2021;46(9):2168–
2171.
58. Sharick JT, Walsh CM, Sprackling CM, et al. Metabolic Heterogeneity in Patient Tumor-Derived
Organoids by Primary Site and Drug Treatment. *Front Oncol*. 2020;10:553.
702

     Figure Legends

Figure 1. Post-transplant T cell metrics are predictive of allo-HSCT recipient disease

outcomes.

(A) Schematic depicting the study outline. 35 allo-HSCT recipients had weekly blood samples

collected and processed without freezing. (B) Dot plots taken from five concatenated allo-HSCT

recipients who did not develop GVHD and those that developed ≥ grade 2 GVHD. Yellow box

indicates gating strategy for each T cell metric analyzed. (C-D) Samples collected between the

day 7 and 17 collection intervals were used for the analysis in (C) while samples collected

between the day 22 and 83 collection intervals were further normalized to each patient's date of

GVHD diagnosis (or day 54 for patient without GVHD) and used in (D). Each T cell metric was

analyzed in three binary tests shown in the bar graphs (left columns) with any tests showing

significance further analyzed by ROC (right columns). The mean, 95 confidence interval,

significance values and AUC are indicated in each graph. Each sample was treated independently

in these analyses. (E-F) T cell metrics exhibiting predictive value in each allo-HSCT outcome

were combined into a mutli-parameter ROC analysis. Analysis of the day 7-17 collection intervals

are in (E) and the day 22-83 collection intervals further normalized to GVHD diagnosis are shown

in (F).

Figure 2. DPT develop after xenogeneic transplantation and are predictive of lethal GVHD

(A) Kaplan-meier survival curve and flow plots of mice transplanted with PB-MNC and

representative dot plots from mouse blood at three weeks post-transplant corresponding to mice

that did not develop GVHD (blue) and those that developed lethal GVHD (red). (B) Representative

imagestream visualization of human T cells isolated from mouse blood three weeks post-

transplant. (C) Representative dot plots of mice transplanted with either PB-, MB-, BM- or CB-

MNC either at the time of euthanasia (GVHD mice, bottom) or at 12 weeks post-transplant (No

GVHD, top). Gating and percentage of DPTs are indicated by the red box. (D) Graphical

representation of the data from (C) representing >8 independent experiments. (E) Percentage of

DPTs in the blood of mice developing GVHD (red) or no GVHD (blue) at 1-, 3- and 6-weeks post-

transplant. (F-H) Data from (E) separated based on the graft source used for transplantation. (I)

ROC analysis of the data from (F). PB (peripheral blood), MB (G-CSF mobilized peripheral blood),

BM (bone marrow), CB (umbilical cord blood), MNC (mononuclear cells). Parametric t-test was

used to determine significance. * $p<0.05$, ** $p<0.01$, *** $p<0.001$

Figure 3. The transcriptome of DPT is unique compared to CD4 and CD8 T cells

(A) Venn diagram of the number of unique and shared differentially expressed genes among the

three comparisons indicated. (B) Unsupervised hierarchical clustering of the RNA-seq samples

using the computed Pearson correlation for each pair of samples and the Euclidean distances of

the correlation distances determined. (C-D) Volcano plots showing the number of differentially

expressed genes in the DPT:CD4 (C) and DPT:CD8 (D) comparisons using a cutoff of a ≥ 1 log

expression difference and a p-value of 0.01. (E) List of the 63 genes differentially expressed in

both the DPT:CD4 and DPT:CD8 comparisons. (F) TCR clonality analysis of the TRB gene

segments. Total number of unique TRB clones is indicated while the ten clones with the highest

frequency are colored in the pie graph.

Figure 4. DPT Display A Transitional Expression Profile But With Reduced Expression of

Inhibitory Receptors

(A) Imagestream visualization of DPTs expressing NKG2D. (B-C) Fold MFI of CD4 (green), DPTs

(red) and CD8 T cells (blue) expression of eight pro-inflammatory (B) and five inhibitory (C) co-

stimulatory receptors taken from GVHD mice at 3 weeks post-transplant. Data represents the

average Fold MFI of > five mice. (D-L) Analysis of nine pro-inflammatory (D-I) or inhibitory

receptors (J-L) on the surface of CD4, DPT or CD8 T cells from the allo-HSCT patient samples

collected as part of our observational study. Each dot represents the average Fold MFI of that

marker across all samples collected for one individual patient. Each minimum of 10 patients was

collected for each marker. Fold MFI = median fluorescent intensity of marker / isotype control.

Parametric t-test was used to determine significance. * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

Figure 5. DPT differentiate from CD8 T cells after transplant and gain THPOK expression.

(A) Unsupervised tSNE clustering of human T cells concatenated from five GVHD mice using a

9-color flow cytometry panel. (B-C) Freshly isolated CD3, CD4 and CD8 PB-Tc from a healthy

donor were transplanted into mice. Representative dot plots show the percentage of DPT in

mouse blood at three weeks post-transplant (B) with the percentage of DPT quantified in (C). (D)

Five mice transplanted with PB-MNC for 3 weeks were euthanized and the human cells isolated

from GVHD tissues prior to flow-sorting of the CD4 and CD8 T cells. (E-F) Dot plots and bar graph

of the percentage of DPT in the blood of mice re-transplanted with flow-sorted CD4 and CD8 T

cells three weeks post-transplant. Each dot represents an individual mouse. (G-J) Schematic

showing the standard expression dynamic of the transcription factors RUNX3 and THPOK in CD8

and CD4 T cells (G). (H) Table showing the fold change and p-value of RUNX3 and THPOK

(ZBTB7B) from our RNA-seq dataset. (I-J) Histograms and bar graphs of the Fold MFI of THPOK

and RUNX3 expression in CD4, DPT and CD8 T cells from GVHD mice. Fold MFI = median

fluorescent intensity of marker / isotype control. Parametric t-test was used to determine

significance. * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

Figure 6. DPT cells exhibit a metabolically unique signature from other T cells.

(A) Representative images from live-cell imaging of NAD(P)H τm (0.5-1.5 ns), FAD τm (0.3-1.3

ns), and optical redox ratio images (shown are 6 image sets of 24 sets) from flow-sorted CD4,

CD8 and DPT from GVHD mice. All cells were cultured for 48hrs but activated cells were also

stimulated with CD3/CD28/CD2 12hrs prior to imaging. Scale bar at top left, 25 µm. (B) Scatter

plots of the optical redox ratio (NAD(P)H / (NAD(P)H + FAD), mean NAD(P)H lifetime in ns, mean

FAD lifetime in ns, % unbound NAD(P)H, % protein-bound FAD. Each dot represents a single cell

with mean at center and error bars representing 1 standard deviation. (C-D) Confusion matrix (C)

and ROC curve (D) of a random forest classifier trained on the 10 OMI parameters (NAD(P)H and

FAD τ1, τ2, α1, α2, τm) for classification of DPT cells from CD4 and CD8 T cells. (E) UMAP

dimensionality reduction analysis of OMI parameter results (τ1, τ2, α1, α2, τm) for both NAD(P)H

and FAD. (F) Seahorse analysis of the ATP production rate of flow-sorted CD4, DPT and CD8 T

cells. Parametric t-test was used to determine significance. * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001, ****

p<0.0001.Cell counts for each population: 365 CD4 ctrl, 598CD4 act, 199 DPT ctrl, 155 DPT act,

103 CD8 ctrl, 119 CD8 act.

Figure 7. DPTs are sufficient to mediate GVHD pathology.

(A) Schematic of experimental design. (B-G) Kaplan-meier survival curve (B) and GVHD score

(C) of mice transplanted with flow-sorted CD4, DPT and CD8 T cells from five pooled GVHD mice.

(D) Quantification of T cells numbers in GVHD target organs at time of euthanasia. Representative

H&E staining of liver and lung sections from transplanted mice (E) and histological scoring (F).

(G) Quantification of IFNγ levels in the plasma of transplanted mice. (H-I) Splenic T cells from

GVHD mice were cultured overnight with either Brefeldin A alone or Brefeldin A with a 4-hour

PMA/ionomycin stimulation prior to ICS staining of the indicated cytokine. Data is compiled from

4-13 mice. Non-parametric t-tests were used for determining significance between T cell numbers

while parametric t-tests were used for all other analyses. * p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

Figure 8. DPTs have limited GVL activity relative to CD4 and CD8 T cells.

(A) Schematic of experiment design. The B-ALL cell line NALM-6 was transplanted for (B-G) and

RS4;11 for (H-K). (B-G) Kaplan-meier survival curve (B), IVIS images (C), quantification of the

number of NALM-6 (D) and T cells (E) in the blood and IFNγ levels in the plasma (F). (G) NALM-

6 cells pre-loaded with Calcein dye were co-cultured with flow-sorted CD4, DPT and CD8 T cells

for four hours and supernatants quantified for the presence of calcein. Data is expressed relative

to a max kill condition using Triton-X. (H-K) Kaplan-meier survival curve (H), quantification of

RS4;11 (I) and T cells in the blood (J) and IFNγ in the plasma (K) of mice transplanted with

RS4;11. Non-parametric t-tests were used to determine significance for the quantification of B-

ALL and T cell numbers while parametric t-tests were used for all other analyses. * $p < 0.05$, **

$p < 0.01$

Comparison	Gene Name (Protein)	Fold Change	p-value
DPT:CD4	RUNX3	**0.728**	**1.15E^{-7}**
	ZBTB7B (THPOK)	-0.142	0.21
DPT:CD8	RUNX3	-.0188	0.163
	ZBTB7B (THPOK)	**1.093**	**8.14E^{11}**