TITLE PAGE

***EX VIVO* EXPANSION POTENTIAL OF MURINE HEMATOPOIETIC STEM CELLS: A RARE PROPERTY ONLY PARTIALLY PREDICTED BY PHENOTYPE**

Qinyu Zhang[1], Rasmus Olofzon[1], Anna Konturek-Ciesla[1], Ouyang Yuan[1], David Bryder[1]

[1]Division of Molecular Hematology, Department of Laboratory Medicine, Lund Stem Cell Center, Faculty of Medical, Lund University, 221 84 Lund, Sweden.

Corresponding author:
David Bryder, DMH, BMC B12, Lund University, 221 84 Lund, Sweden +46706423951, David.Bryder@med.lu.se

Running title: HSC expansion *in vitro*

Key point:
Ex vivo self-renewal is an intrinsic property of rare candidate HSCs, with implications for assessments of HSC activity by transplantation.

ABSTRACT

The scarcity of hematopoietic stem cells (HSCs) restricts their use in both clinical settings and experimental research. Here, we examined a recently developed method for expanding rigorously purified murine HSCs *ex vivo.* After three weeks of culture, only 0.1% of cells exhibited the input HSC phenotype, but these accounted for almost all functional long-term HSC activity. Input HSCs displayed varying potential for *ex vivo* self-renewal, with alternative outcomes revealed by single cell multimodal RNA- and ATAC-seq profiling. While most HSC progeny offered only transient *in vivo* reconstitution, these cells efficiently rescued mice from lethal myeloablation. The amplification of functional HSC activity allowed for long-term multilineage engraftment in unconditioned hosts that associated with a return of HSCs to quiescence. Thereby, our findings identify several key considerations for *ex vivo* HSC expansion, with major implications also for assessment of normal HSC activity.

INTRODUCTION

Hematopoietic stem cells (HSCs) are the functional units in bone marrow transplantation (BMT) and gene therapy approaches via their ability for multilineage differentiation and long-term self-renewal[1]. However, restrictions in HSC numbers, the requirement of harsh host conditioning and challenges with how to genetically manipulate HSCs with retained function are barriers for BMT/gene therapy[2]. Due to the lack of reliable models for accurate assessment of human HSCs, mice continue to be the preferred experimental model for studying HSC biology. However, studying murine HSC biology also poses challenges due to the scarcity of HSCs.

Recently, culture conditions supporting efficient maintenance and expansion of murine HSCs were reported[3]. However, the expansion of functional *in vivo* HSC activity over a 28-day period (estimated to 236-899-fold) was not on par with the total cell expansion ($>10^4$-fold), demonstrating that large amounts of differentiated progeny were generated along with self-renewing HSC divisions[3]. Moreover, candidate HSCs (cHSCs) by phenotype represented only a minor portion of the cells at the culture end-point[3], although assessment of HSC activity based on this might be obscured by previous observations that HSCs change some phenotypes in culture[4]. While *in vitro* differentiation complicates assessments of HSC expansion, it might also be beneficial. For example, while HSCs can support lifelong hematopoiesis after bone marrow transplantation (BMT), they have limited capacity to rescue the host from lethal conditioning[5]. To address this limitation, there is a requirement for progenitor cells that can efficiently supply the host with mature blood cells, such as erythrocytes and platelets[6,7].

When transplanted, *in vivo* HSC activity is typically determined using both quantitative and qualitative parameters[8]. Most commonly, this is achieved by comparing to a known amount of competitor cells[9]. However, although the competitive repopulation assay (CRA) represents a mainstay in experimental HSC biology, it associates with shortcomings often neglected. First, while clinical BMT aims at transplanting large numbers of HSCs[10,11], experimental murine BMT typically use limited HSC grafts, which can strongly influence on HSC function[12]. Secondly, the CRA is from a quantitative perspective rather blunt, with sigmoidal rather than linear characteristics[9]. This limits the boundaries of the effects that can be measured. Thirdly, the CRA assesses HSC activity based on overall hematopoietic chimerism, which might reflect poorly on the actual HSC activity given the vastly different turnover rates

of different blood cells lineages[13]. At the same time, alternative assays such as limit

dilution assays or single-cell transplantation assays are cumbersome, expensive and

associated with ethical concerns. Newer developments in DNA barcoding technology

have overcome many of these issues[14].

Another concern with BMT is the use of aggressive host conditioning to permit

engraftment. While eradicating malignant cells is an important part of treatment

regimens for leukemic patients, the fates of HSCs in conditioned hosts versus native

hematopoietic contexts are dramatically different[15]. But transplantation into

unconditioned recipients is inefficient and requires large amounts of transplanted

HSCs to saturate available niches[16,17]. To achieve even limited HSC chimerism in

unconditioned hosts can have strong long-term therapeutic effects[18] and many

experimental approaches might benefit from avoiding host conditioning.

Here, we provide molecular and functional details on HSC differentiation and

self-renewal following culture and define a set of parameters critical for *in vivo*

assessment of HSC activity. Importantly, we find that HSC heterogeneity was a key

influencing factor for HSC expansion even among rigorously purified cHSCs. This

determinism has broad implications for experiments involving *in vitro* manipulation of

HSCs, but also when assessing normal HSC function by BMT.

RESULTS

In vivo HSC activity is restricted to cells expressing high levels of EPCR

We first assessed the *in vivo* reconstituting activity of cHSCs with different phenotypes. The endothelial protein C receptor (EPCR or PROCR/CD201) is highly expressed on HSCs[19], while CD41 (ITGA2B) was suggested to be functionally relevant for HSC maintenance and homeostasis[20]. Based on expression of EPCR and CD41, we isolated 4 subfractions within BM SLAM LSK cells (Lin⁻Sca1⁺cKit⁺CD150⁺CD48⁻/low) (Fig 1A) and competitively transplanted them at equal numbers into lethally irradiated recipients (Fig 1B). The reconstitution from the three EPCR^high fractions was restricted to the PB myeloid lineages 4-week post-transplantation (Fig 1C), and most of these recipients displayed robust long-term (beyond 16 weeks) multilineage reconstitution with equivalent cHSC chimerism in the BM (Fig 1C-D). EPCR^high CD41⁻ cells produced slightly more lymphoid cells than the EPCR^high CD41⁺ cells at the endpoint (Fig S1), but the cHSC chimerism in the BM was very similar to other tested EPCR^high fractions (Fig 1D). In contrast to Gekas et al.[20], we failed to observe that staining with the CD41 antibody (MWreg30 clone) compromises HSC engraftment. Transplantation of EPCR negative cells failed to associate with either long-term PB or BM cHSC chimerism, demonstrating lack of HSC activity within this fraction (Fig 1C-D).

Next, single EPCR⁺ SLAM LSKs were index sorted (Fig S1B) and expanded *ex vivo* in an F12-Polyvinyl alcohol (PVA) based culture media[21]. At an early stage (8 days, Fig S1C), cultures initiated with SLAM LSK cells with higher EPCR expression proliferated less compared to those with lower EPCR expression. However, after longer expansion (25 days, Fig S1C), the EPCR higher cells generated on average a larger amount of progeny. To evaluate the HSC activity following *ex vivo* expansion and to correlate this directly to EPCR expression levels, the expanded cells from index sorted cultures of cHSCs were collected and transplanted into individual lethally irradiated mice (Fig S1D). While freshly and stringently isolated HSCs normally fail to rescue mice from lethal irradiation[5], we here entertained that culturing of HSCs in addition to inducing self-renewal, would also generate progenitors that could radioprotect the hosts. If so, survival could be used as a proxy for combined hematopoietic stem and progenitor cell (HSPC) activity. Indeed, mice receiving progeny from SLAM LSK EPCR higher cells were more efficiently radioprotected (Fig 1E). Thereafter, we initiated cultures with EPCR^high or EPCR^lower SLAM LSK cells fractions (Fig S1E). Mice transplanted with cells expanded from EPCR^high cells

radioprotected 5/5 recipients, while only two out of 5 animals receiving the progeny of

EPCR^{low} cells survived long-term. As expected, these surviving mice displayed

exclusive test-cell derived myelopoiesis long-term after transplantation (Fig 1F).

Taken together, these experiments established that HSC activity was restricted

to EPCR^{high} HSCs, and such cells could effectively generate progeny *in vitro* that

rescue mice from lethal irradiation. Therefore, we operationally defined our input

cHSCs by their EPCR^{high} SLAM phenotype.

Phenotypic heterogeneity from *ex vivo* expanded cHSCs

The PVA-dependent cell culture system was reported to efficiently support HSC

activity *ex vivo* over several weeks[3]. However, the functional HSC frequency did not

appear on par with the total amount of cells generated by the end of the culture period,

suggesting the generation also of many differentiated cells[3]. To detail this, we

expanded aliquots of cHSCs *ex vivo* for 14-21 days, followed by multicolor

phenotyping. From 50 cHSCs, an average of 0.5 million (14 days) and 13.6 million

cells (21 days) were generated (Fig S2A) and which associated with a phenotypic

heterogeneity that increased over time (Fig S2B). With the assumption that HSCs

might retain their cell surface phenotype in cultures, we quantified EPCR^{high} SLAM

cells and observed a decrease in their frequency over time, although this was

numerically counteracted by the overall proliferation in cultures (Fig 2A). Thus,

quantification of cHSCs translated into an average expansion of 54-fold (26- to 85-fold)

and 291-fold (86- to 1,273-fold) at 14 and 21 days, respectively (Fig 2A).

To gain a deeper understanding of the cells generated in our *ex vivo* cultures,

we collected cells from the entire culture and isolated nuclei for single cell multiome

sequencing using a commercial platform from 10x Genomics. This approach combines

single-cell RNA sequencing and single-cell ATAC sequencing, allowing for integrated

analysis of these modalities. Data was analyzed in R[22] using mainly the Seurat[23] and

Signac[24] packages, with the SAILERX package[25].

Based on the transcriptomic signatures and distal motif identities, we were able

to identify not only early hematopoietic stem and progenitor cells (HSPCs), but also

many differentiated myeloid cells in the expansion cultures (Fig 2B), however with little

evidence for lymphoid differentiation. Assessment of a condensed HSC signatures

(Fig S2C) confirmed that the cHSCs were primarily located to cluster 5 (Fig 2D), with

trajectory analyses suggesting multiple differentiation pathways from early HSPCs to differentiated myeloid progeny (Fig 2C).

Since the EPCR expression also condensed to cluster 5 (Fig S2D), we further investigated whether the expression of EPCR marks cHSCs *ex vivo* by collecting *ex vivo* expanded EPCR+ cells for single-cell multiome sequencing. These cells displayed less heterogeneity than what we observed for the total culture (Fig 2B), which included a more even distribution of the condensed HSC signature (Fig 2E) as well as the expression of EPCR (Fig S2E). Here, the most pronounced separator for the interrogated cells attributed to the cell cycle position (Fig 2F).

To explore if other markers could provide additional phenotypic information for genuine HSCs in cultures, we applied an Fgd5 reporter mouse model previously shown to selectively mark HSCs *in situ*[26]. While the Fgd5 reporter only marked a subset of cells in culture (Fig S2F), we noted heterogeneous expression of CD48 within the Fgd5 positive fraction (Fig S2F-G) and that we failed to clearly demarcate in our single-cell multimodal data.

Collectively, these results demonstrated robust expansion of cHSCs using the PVA-based culture system, albeit with additional parallel generation of a large number of more differentiated cells. While the identities of most of the cells in cultures could be clearly deduced by their combined gene expression and chromatin accessibility profiles, this approach failed to inform on the heterogeneous expression pattern of CD48 on cHSCs (Fig S2).

Functional HSC activity associates to a minor LSK SLAM EPCR^{high} **fraction within *ex vivo* cultures**

Given our inability to distinctly identify cHSCs by their molecular profiles, we next explored the possibility to prospectively isolate HSCs from the cHSC cultures and instead rely on their functional ability to long-term repopulate lethally irradiated hosts for readout. cHSCs were isolated and cultured *ex vivo* for 21 days and the expanded cells were separated into two equal portions: one portion was kept unfractionated, while three subpopulations of CD150+LSKs: EPCR^{high}CD48$^{-/low}$, EPCR^{high}CD48+ and EPCR- were sorted from the other portion. The fractions were competitively transplanted into lethally irradiated mice, such that each recipient received fractions

equivalent to the expansion from 50 cHSCs (EE50) along with 500,000 competitor

WBM cells (Fig 3A).

Stable and very high long-term multilineage reconstitution was observed in all

recipients of unfractionated cultured cells. By contrast, test-cell derived reconstitution

was not recovered from EPCR$^-$ cells (Fig 3B and Fig S3). EPCR^{high}CD48$^+$ cells

produced very high reconstitution levels short-term after transplantation, but the

chimerism provided by these cells dropped considerably over time (Fig 3B and Fig S3).

This differed strikingly from recipients receiving the minor fraction of EPCR^{high}CD48$^-$

$^{/low}$ cells, which presented with robust long-term multilineage reconstitution (Fig 3B and

Fig S3). While almost no BM cHSC chimerism was observed from EPCR^{high}CD48$^+$

cells, EPCR^{high}CD48$^{-/low}$ cells produced very high chimerism in all evaluated progenitor

fractions, including for cHSCs (Fig 3C).

These data established that functional *in vivo* HSC activity following culture is

restricted to the minor fraction of SLAM LSK EPCR^{high} cells.

Quantification of HSC activity in *ex vivo* expansion cultures

Expanded cHSCs presented with a vastly higher reconstitution activity compared to

freshly isolated cHSCs, and mostly fell out of range for accurate quantification (Fig 3B).

We therefore assessed the impact of lowering the amount of input cHSCs and

enhancing the amount of competitor cells. Aliquots of 10 cHSCs were cultured and

expanded for 21 days. Cells from each culture (EE10) were next mixed with 2 or 20

million (2M or 20M) competitor WBM cells, followed by transplantation (Fig 4A,

'individual'). In parallel, we also included a group in which EE50 cHSCs were mixed

with 10 million WBM cells and split among 5 lethally irradiated recipients (Fig 4A,

'pooled'). This allowed us to assess the variability among input cHSCs,

Although robust reconstitution was observed in most recipients of 'individual'

cultures (Table 1, Fig 4B-C, Fig S4A-B), the levels of test-cell derived cells varied

extensively among these recipients. To quantify the HSC activity in each recipient, we

calculated the repopulating units (RUs)[9] for each lineage and recipient separately at

the experimental endpoint (Table 1). Short-lived myeloid cells has been proposed as

a better indicator of ongoing HSC activity[27], and in agreement with this, we observed

a high correlation between the RU^{myeloid} and RUs for cHSCs in the BM (Table 1). A

much more consistent HSC activity was observed in between recipients of 'pooled'

cells (Table 1, Fig 4B-C). This confirmed that the differential chimerism in recipients of limited cHSC numbers relates to an unresolved cellular heterogeneity of input cHSCs. RUs per initial cHSC were calculated for freshly isolated BM cHSCs (the three EPCR[high] groups from Fig 1B) and following 3-week culture ('pooled' group). This revealed 461- and 70-fold increases in PB myeloid and BM cHSC chimerism in recipients of *ex vivo* expanded cells, respectively. This is an estimate of the increase of functional HSC activity following *ex vivo* culture (Fig S4G).

We next assessed HSC clonality using a lentiviral barcoding approach. Five aliquots of 1,000 cHSCs were transduced with a barcode library[28] 48 hours after culture and then expanded for 19 days. Half of the expanded cells from each well were transplanted into one 'parental' recipient, respectively, while the other half was mixed with each other, with each 'daughter' recipient receiving 1/5 of the mixed cells (Fig 4D-i). As a proxy for the HSC activity, barcodes were extracted from BM test-derived myeloid cells 16-weeks post-transplantation. Following stringent filtering, we retrieved 223 unique barcodes in the 'parental' recipients, with a highly variable contribution (0.1 - 26.0%, Fig 4E-G). Representation of the same barcode in 'parental' and 'daughter' recipients demonstrates a shared clonal/HSC origin, where more robustly expanding HSCs should have a higher chance of reconstituting more 'daughter' recipients. Our data agreed well with this presumption (Fig 4E), and the most actively shared clones also associated with larger outputs in 'daughter' recipients (Fig 4F).

While our initial barcode experiments were designed to assess the *in vitro* expansion potential of cHSCs, a next set of experiments were executed to assess the clonal HSC activity following expansion. For this, cHSCs were *ex vivo* expanded for 13 days, provided with barcodes[29] overnight, and transplanted into 4 lethally irradiated recipients (Fig 4D-ii). 16-weeks post-transplantation, we recovered 573 unique barcodes. The median clone sizes of HSCs post-culture were significantly smaller than the pre-culture clones (Fig 4G), which was expected as more clones (573 vs 223) were evaluated in the 'post-culture' setting. However, the frequency of dominantly contributing clones was significantly less abundant (Fig 4H), demonstrating a more even contribution from individual clones in this setting. This is in line with the interpretation that expanded HSCs are functionally more equivalent than input cHSCs.

Finally, we assessed how the culture system supports the *in vivo* activity of fetal liver (FL) cHSCs. E14.5 FL-cHSCs were sorted using the same immuno-phenotype as BM cHSCs and cultured *ex vivo*. We observed an average 188-fold increase of

cHSCs following 21-days culture (Fig S4D). We used the 'pooled' approach for functional evaluation and competed EE10 cells with either 2 or 20 million WBM cells (Fig S4C). While *ex vivo* expanded FL-cHSCs contributed considerably to multilineage reconstitution (Fig S4E), we observed compared to adult cHSCs 5.7- and 6.6-fold lower reconstitution from FL-cHSCs within PB myeloid cells and cHSCs, respectively (Fig S4F-G).

Taken together, these experiments demonstrated robust increases in HSC activity following culture of cHSCs, albeit slightly less for FL-cHSCs. However, clonal barcode assessments revealed substantial variation in *ex vivo* expansion potential of even stringently purified input cHSCs.

Ex vivo expanded cHSCs returns to a quiescent state following engraftment in unconditioned recipients

Successful engraftment in an unconditioned setting requires large numbers of HSCs/HSPCs[16], which reportedly can be accommodated by PVA-cultured HSCs[3]. To test this, we transplanted EE100 CD45.1[+] cHSCs into lethally irradiated or unconditioned CD45.2[+] recipients (Fig S5A). In lethally irradiated hosts, cultured cells reconstituted >90% of PB cells, including with robust contribution of donor cells to the myeloid lineages. By contrast, most of the unconditioned recipients lacked long-term reconstitution (Fig S5B). Given that CD45 mismatching might be a sufficient immunological barrier to prevent HSPC reconstitution[30], we instead transplanted expanded cells into unconditioned F1 CD45.1[+]/CD45.2[+] hosts (Fig 5A). Clear long-term multilineage engraftment was observed in all these hosts (Fig 5B).

In the BM, cHSCs exist for the most part in a quiescent state, which contrasts the situation in cultures (Fig S5C). To investigate to what extent *ex vivo* expanded cHSCs could return to quiescence following transplantation, we expanded 100 CD45.2[+] cHSCs for 21 days and stained all their progeny with the proliferation-tracking dye Cell Trace Violet (CTV) prior to transplantation into CD45.1^{+}/CD45.2^{+} hosts. As a control, we transplanted CTV labelled unmanipulated CD45.2^{+} cKit-enriched BM cells (Fig 5C). In these animals, splenic CD4^{+} enriched cells were co-transplanted as a control for non-dividing cells (Fig S5D). Reconstitution and cHSC fates were monitored biweekly for up to 8-weeks post-transplant. Although the phenotypic cHSC contribution in recipients receiving *ex vivo* expanded cells outnumbered the contribution from unmanipulated cells two-weeks post-transplantation, the levels became comparable

later (Fig 5D). Recipients from both groups showed high levels of CTV signal two-weeks post-transplantation, with the majority of donor EPCR$^+$ cHSCs having undergone fewer than 3 cell divisions. Over time, increasing numbers of cHSCs had proliferated within both groups and with similar patterns (Fig 5E-F, Fig S5E), with a slightly higher number of undivided cHSCs retrieved from *ex vivo* expanded HSCs at all time points (Fig 5E). The most quiescent cHSCs associated with higher EPCR levels (Fig S5F-G), again attesting to the usefulness of EPCR to predict robust HSC activity.

Therefore, *ex vivo* expanded cHSCs can efficiently engraft immunologically matched hosts without conditioning. Under such conditions, expanded cHSCs can rapidly return to quiescence following transplantation.

DISCUSSION

Although many efforts have aimed to *in vitro* expand murine HSCs, the results have for the most part been disappointing[31]. A recent study suggested that the substitution of undefined serum products with the synthetic polymer PVA is one key determinant towards this goal[3]. Here, we detailed this culture system further. We focused on the requirements of candidate input HSCs, the reproducibility of the system, the cellular output and the functional *in vivo* performance of the *in vitro* replicating HSCs. Several observations that we believe are valuable not only for future applications of the PVA culture system, but also for HSC biology in general, emerged from our work.

While the PVA-system supports HSC activity even from unfractionated BM cell preparations[32], the long-term repopulating HSCs (LT-HSCs) in cruder input cell preparations is very low. While having its own advantages, this makes it difficult to track the fates of cHSCs. Therefore, we here consistently initiated cultures with more stringently purified cHSCs. As a starting point, we used cHSCs isolated based on a current standard SLAM phenotype (Lin⁻Sca⁺cKit⁺CD48⁻CD150⁺)[33]. In agreement with previous reports[34], we observed that CD201/EPCR further enriches for LT-HSCs, a knowledge that has so far not been adopted as a standard in the field[33]. This applied both to cHSCs isolated directly from the BM and following culture. In fact, despite that HSCs change many phenotypes in culture[4], the LT-HSC activity following culture was remarkably enriched not only in the EPCR positive fraction, but also for other phenotypic attributes of unmanipulated LT-HSCs. Importantly, such cHSCs represented only a very minor fraction in cultures (0.6% and 0.1% of 2- and 3-week cultures, respectively) but contained all LT-HSC activity, with the massive overall expansion in cultures leading to substantial net expansions of such cells (100- to 1,200-fold).

While we gained insights into the dynamics of *ex vivo* differentiation of cHSCs into mature lineages by simultaneously measuring ATAC signal and RNA transcripts in individual nuclei using single-cell multiome sequencing, the limited sensitivity of this method hindered the identification of more homogeneous populations of bona fide HSCs within the sorted EPCR+ cells. Therefore, we assessed the functional *in vivo* HSC activity in most of our subsequent work. While our clonal barcoding experiments unequivocally demonstrated HSC self-renewal, the large spectra in expansion potential of individual cHSCs was noteworthy. This variation was reduced when assessing HSC activity following culture and aligns with the interpretation that the

offspring of cHSCs that self-renew robustly in cultures exhibit less differences. Nonetheless, the demonstrated *in vitro* self-renewal refutes alternative views in which the culture process would mainly act to enhance the reconstitution capacity of individual HSCs, for instance by altering their homing properties and/or by the conversion of more differentiated progenitors into cells with LT-HSC activity. Therefore, our data support the view that this (or other) culture systems might not support all types of LT-HSCs previously alluded to[35]. Further support to this notion can be derived from our data on FL-cHSCs, which did not expand better than adult HSCs in the PVA system, despite that FL HSCs repopulate mice more efficiently than adult HSCs when unmanipulated[36]. In a broader sense, this associates also with the general concept of self-renewal and that has recently been highlighted in studies on native hematopoiesis, where distinct but only slowly contributing LT-HSCs co-exist with more active progenitors that can presumably also execute self-renewal divisions[37-39]. It appears that many aspects of this structure are re-created in cultures and, as we show, this requires as input the normally very slowly dividing and presumably most primitive LT-HSCs.

While the parallel self-renewal and differentiation in HSC cultures represent a fundamental difference compared to other *in vitro* stem cell self-renewal systems (e.g., for ES/iPS cells), where preferential self-renewal can be achieved, the differentiation of HSCs can be taken advantage of. We observed that even single cultured HSCs can enhance the speed of donor reconstitution and alleviate the effects of myeloablative conditioning, and the parallel self-renewal and differentiation can also be harnessed to approach HSC fate decisions at a molecular level[40]. This was exemplified by our single-cell multimodal experiments, which allowed for determinations of the differentiation trajectories of cHSCs in the culture system and their associated molecular features. However, as the expansion of genuine LT-HSC activity is far from unlimited, a shortage of HSCs is by all likelihood still an obstacle for larger-scale screening efforts such as genome-wide CRISPR screens and larger small molecule screens.

During our studies, we encountered several aspects of the CRA that are often neglected. First, the HSC activity when transplanted at limited numbers highlighted large variations in between recipients, which is in line with previous extensive single cell transplantation experiments[41-45]. While raised previously[46], taking into account not only the repopulating activity but also clonal aspects has not reached wide use.

Emerging barcoding technologies, by which many clones can be evaluated in a single

mouse, makes this easier. Secondly, the progeny from a relatively small number of

cultured cHSCs (10-50 cells) vastly outcompeted "standard" doses of competitor cells,

making quantification unreliable/impossible. This contrasted results from freshly

isolated cHSCs transplanted at the same doses used to initiate cultures. While this

concern could be overcome by adjusting the graft composition (e.g. enhancing the

number of competitor cells), extensive variation still existed among cultures that could

be eliminated by using larger amounts of input cells and splitting the contents into

individual recipients. This should have relevance also for normal HSC biology by

highlighting intrinsic rather than stochastic regulation as the central determinant for

persistent HSC function. A third consideration relates to the definition of ongoing HSC

activity. We and others have previously established that this is best mirrored by the

HSC contribution to myelopoiesis[47,48]. When we assessed cultured EPCR$^+$CD48$^+$ cells

(with predominantly transient multilineage activity), we observed prominent long-term

T cell contribution but limited myeloid reconstitution. This should not be confused with

the concept of HSC lineage-bias, but rather reflects that the pool of T cells *in vivo* can

be maintained by homeostatic proliferation and thus do not require continuous input

from HSCs. Thus, short-lived non-self-renewing multipotent progenitors, which are

generated in large numbers in culture, can contribute extensive (lymphoid) offspring

in the long-term but should not be mistaken for ongoing HSC activity. This

consideration is valid also for competitor grafts in the CRA (in the form of WBM cells),

which contain numerous progenitor cells that can rapidly and persistently contribute to

lymphopoiesis. Thus, as opposed to the classic CRA, where the overall donor

contribution is assessed[9], the contribution to short-lived lineages reflects better the

ongoing HSC activity, with the contribution to lymphoid lineages serving as a

qualitative parameter for multipotency. In agreement with previous viral barcoding

studies on HSCs[14] we observed that when cultured HSCs are barcoded and assessed

long-term, there is a strong correlation between barcodes in BM progenitors and

myeloid cells, while the pool of mature B cells contain clones that cannot be recovered

in other lineages (data not shown).

Successful repopulation of non-conditioned hosts is based on the suggestion

that large numbers of HSCs are needed to saturate those few BM niches available for

engraftment[18,49]. Avoiding toxic myeloablation has apart from evident clinical

implications also a precedence in experimental murine HSC biology, where lethal

myeloablation enforces vigorous HSC proliferation following transplantation[12], but
which contrasts native contexts[12,37,38]. We observed that the CD45.1/CD45.2
differences are sufficiently immunogenic to mediate long-term graft failure in the non-
conditioned setting, which in hindsight has been alluded to previously[18,30,50]. Thus, by
matching hosts for CD45-isoforms, we could successfully obtain low-level (2-5%) long-
term multilineage chimerism in adult non-myeloablated hosts from only 100 cHSCs.
Intriguingly, despite being activated to proliferate *in vitro*, many cHSCs rapidly returned
to a quiescent state *in vivo*, with the most dormant cHSCs exhibiting the most stringent
HSC phenotype (EPCR^high SLAM LSKs). The possibility for non-conditioned
transplantation should complement genetic lineage tracing models aimed at exploring
both normal and malignant hematopoiesis in more native/physiological contexts[12,37,38].
In summary, we here characterized and detailed murine HSCs as they self-
renew and differentiate *in vitro*. Although several aspects of the PVA system remain
to be explored, a powerful *in vitro* self-renewal system has been a long-sought goal in
HSC biology where HSCs have been notoriously difficult to uphold in an
undifferentiated/self-renewal state. The merger of this system with recent advances in
transplantation biology, genome engineering and single-cell techniques holds promise
for many exciting discoveries of relevance to both basic and more clinically oriented
hematopoietic research.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Mice

Adult (8-10-week-old) C57Bl/6N (CD45.2[+]) female mice were purchased from Taconic. Transgenic Fgd5-ZsGreen-2A-CreERT2 mice[26] (JAX:027789) was a kind gift from Derrick Rossi. Mice were maintained in the animal facilities at the Biomedical Center of Lund University and kept in environment-enriched conditions with 12-hour light-dark cycles and water and food provided *ad libitum*. All experimental procedures were approved by a local ethical committee (permits M186-15 and 16468/2020). All efforts were made to reduce the number of experimental animals and suffering.

BM transplantation

All mice used as recipients were 8 - 12 weeks of age. For conditioned recipients, mice were lethally irradiated (950 cGy) at least 4 h prior transplantation. The conditioned mice received prophylactic ciprofloxacin (HEXAL, 125 mg/L in drinking water) for 2 weeks beginning on the day of irradiation. All transplantations were performed through intravenous tail vein injection. The amount of transplanted test cells and competitor/support cells is described in the results section.

***In vitro* HSC culture**

In vitro HSC cultures were performed using F12-PVA based culture conditions as previously described[3]. In brief, cHSCs (HSCs (EPCR^{high}CD150$^+$CD48$^{-/low}$ LSKs) were sorted into 96-well flat-bottom plates (Thermo Scientific) coated with 100 ng/ml fibronectin (Sigma) for >1 hour at 37 °C prior to sorting. HSCs were sorted into 200 µl HSC media (Supplemental Table 1) and expanded at 37°C with 5% CO_2 for up to 21 days. The first media changes were performed 5 days (for $\geqslant$ 50 initial HSCs), 10 days (for 10 initial HSCs) or 15 days (for single-cell cultures) after initiation of cultures and then every 2 days. For pre-cultures associated with lentiviral transduction, the first media change was performed 24h after transduction and then as above. Cells were split at a 1:2-1:4 ratio into new fibronectin coated plates when reaching 80-90% confluency (normally every 4 days after the first split). In order to expand cHSCs to reach a workable number as well as avoiding vast numbers of differentiated cells generated after very long-term of culture (f.i. up to 4 weeks), the cHSCs were kept expanding *ex vivo* for 3 weeks as a standard protocol. Following 14- and/or 21-day

455　expansion, cellularity was assessed using an Automated Cell Counter (TC20, BioRad)

456　and used for flow cytometric analyses and/or transplantation.

Cell preparation

Mice were euthanized by cervical dislocation after which bones (both right and left

tibias, femurs, and pelvis) or spleens were extracted. Fetal cells were extracted from

livers at E14.5. Bones were crushed using a mortar and pestle and BM cells were

collected in ice-cold phosphate-buffered saline (PBS, Gibco) with 1% fetal bovine

serum (Sigma-Aldrich) (FACS buffer), filtered (100 μm mesh) and washed. FL or

spleen cells were brought into single cell suspension by grinding through a 100 μm

mesh. BM or FL cells were cKit-enriched by anti-cKit-APCeFluor780 (eBioscience)

staining and spleen cells were CD4-enrihced by anti-CD4-APC-Cy7 staining, followed

by incubation with anti-APC conjugated beads (Miltenyi Biotec). Magnetic separation

was performed using LS columns according to manufacturer's instructions (Miltenyi

Biotec). cKit-enriched BM or FL cells were washed and stained with fluorescently

labeled antibodies for analysis or sorting.

Peripheral blood (PB) chimerism analysis after transplantation was done as

previously described[39]. In brief, blood was drawn from tail vein into FACS buffer

containing 10 U/ml Heparin (Leo). After incubating with an equal volume of 2% dextran

(Sigma) in PBS at 37 °C, the upper phase was collected and erythrocytes were lyzed

using an ammonium chloride solution (STEMCELL Technologies) for 3 min at room

temperature, followed by washing.

For analysis and/or sorting after *ex vivo* expansion, cultured cells were

resuspended by pipetting and collected using FACS buffer. An aliquot was taken for

cell counting using an Automated Cell Counter (TC20, BioRad).

Flow cytometry analysis and FACS sorting

Cells were kept on ice when possible, with the FACS buffer kept ice-cold. Staining,

analysis and sorting were performed as previously described[12]. In brief, cells were

resuspended in Fc-block (1:50, 5×10^6 cells/50 μl, InVivoMab) for 10 min and then for

20 min with a twice concentrated antibody staining mixture (Supplemental Tables 2-

10) at 4 °C in dark. In case biotinylated lineage markers were included, a secondary

staining with streptavidin BV605 was performed for 20 min (1:400, 5×10^6 cells/100 μl,

Sony) at 4 °C in dark. After a final wash, the cells were resuspended in FACS buffer

containing propidium iodide (1:1000, Invitrogen).

All FACS experiments were performed at the Lund Stem Cell Center FACS

Core Facility (Lund University) on Aria III and Fortessa X20 instruments (BD). Bulk

populations were sorted using a 70-micron nozzle, 0.32.0 precision mask, and a flow

rate of 2 - 3K events/s. HSCs for single cell culture were index sorted. FACS analysis

was performed using FlowJo version 10.8.0 (Tree Star Inc.).

Multiome single-cell sequencing

Library preparation: Multiome sequencing experiments were performed at the

Center for Translational Genomics (Lund University) using the Chromium Next GEM

Single Cell Multiome ATAC + Gene Expression Reagent Bundle kit according to

manufacturer's instructions (10x Genomics). 40,000 viable cells or EPCR$^+$ viable cells

were sorted from *ex vivo* expanded cultures for multiome single-cell sequencing. Data

has been uploaded to GEO under accession number GSE234906

(https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/geo/query/acc.cgi?acc=GSE234906) and will be

available upon publication.

Bioinformatic analysis:

All accompanying code for the single-cell multiome analysis post Cell Ranger can be

found at this Github repository (https://github.com/razofz/DB_QZ_multiome), including

conda specifications for the environments used with exact versions of all packages.

i. Preprocessing

The count matrices were generated with the Cell Ranger ARC tool (v2.0.0), aligned to

the reference genome mm10. The aggregated dataset (containing data for both

samples) were then loaded into Signac/Seurat in R where non-standard chromosomes

were removed and the Seurat object split into the two samples, here named Diverse

and Immature, which corresponds to whole culture or sorted EPCR$^+$ cells, respectively.

The data were then filtered on UMI, gene and peak counts, as well as nucleosome

signal and TSS enrichment, with separate thresholds for the two samples. The ATAC

features were classified as either distal or proximal peaks, and split accordingly.

Proximal peaks were defined as a ± 2 kbp region around the transcription start site

(TSS). The TSS positions were retrieved from GREAT's website, and GREAT v4

mm10 version was used. All peaks not classified as proximal received the
classification "distal". Motifs were then identified for distal and proximal peaks
separately[51].

ii. Downstream processing and joint-modality dimensionality reduction
The samples were processed separately. Since SAILERX uses pre-existing
dimensionality reduction and clusters for the RNA modality, the RNA data was
normalized and scaled, highly variable genes (HVGs) were found, principal component
analysis (PCA) was run and clustering was performed, all with the Seurat standard
functions with default parameters. After that, relevant data was extracted (metadata
including RNA clusters, PCA embeddings, a whitelist of non-filtered out cell barcodes,
ATAC peak count matrix) and with it an hdf5 file similar to the example files provided
by the SAILERX repository was created (https://github.com/uci-cbcl/SAILERX). A
SAILERX model was then trained on the generated hdf5 files (still sample-wise)
according to their provided instructions. The resulting embeddings from the SAILERX
joint-modality dimensionality were then exported and imported into the respective
Seurat objects. In Seurat, the embeddings were used for graph construction, clustering
and constructing UMAPs. Scores for cell cycle gene signatures were calculated and
visualized (Fig 2E for the Immature sample) using Seurat's corresponding standard
functions with default parameters.

iii. Differential gene expression
Differential gene expression testing was performed on the resulting clusters using
Seurat's FindAllMarkers function with the HVGs found above. This analysis was used
to calculate HSC signature score as described below (v. HSC signature).

iv. ATAC processing and cluster annotation
Motif activity scores were identified with chromVAR[52] for distal and proximal peaks
respectively, still sample-wise. Differentially active motifs (DAMs) were then identified
for each cluster. Annotation of clusters in terms of cell type was then performed
manually with the help of DEGs and DAMs (Fig 2B), guided by preexisting data on the
expression profiles of cell types using the Enrichr platform
(https://maayanlab.cloud/Enrichr/).

 v. HSC signature

 A 13 gene condensed HSC signature list (Fig S2C) was obtained by mining genes

 associated to cluster 5 with publicly available gene expression data of HSCs from the

 ImmGen consortia and Bloodspot (https://servers.binf.ku.dk/bloodspot/). This

 signature was then used to calculate a score with Seurat's AddModuleScore function.

 A classification for expression of this gene signature was performed with a slightly

 modified version of Seurat's CellCycleScoring function, where instead of three

 classifications (S, G2M or Undecided/G1) two classifications were used (expressed or

 not expressed). This classification was then used to create the contours used in Fig

 2D-E, and the signature score used for coloring the points in the same plots.

 vi. Trajectory inference in the Diverse sample

 Trajectory inference was performed for the Diverse sample with the slingshot

 package[53]. As initiating cluster, the cluster 5 was assigned (the earliest cluster), and

 end clusters chosen were clusters 4, 1, 6 and 7. The slingshot function of slingshot

 was used with otherwise default parameters. A joint UMAP with the four resulting

 trajectories was constructed (Fig 2C). To circumvent the problem of interfering color

 scales, only the top 20% expressing cells for each marker was chosen for coloring,

 and overlapping cells between these sets were excluded.

 Assessment of HSC heterogeneity via DNA barcoding

 Lentiviral barcode libraries were purchased from AddGene (No. 115645 and No.

 83993) and amplified according to instructions[28,29]. AddGene 83993 is a Crispri gRNA

 library that was repurposed here for the purpose of lentiviral barcoding (e.g. no Cas9

 was co-expressed). These libraries were kind gifts from Samantha Morris and

 Jonathan Weissman.

 For pre-culture labelling, five wells containing 1000 CD45.1[+] HSCs each were

 sorted and cultured for 48 h. Cells were then transduced with the AddGene 115645

 library (containing >5737 unique barcodes) overnight with approximately 35%

 transduction efficiency, which was followed by regular culture procedures. After 19

 days, expanded cells were collected from each initial wells separately. Half of the

 expanded cells were transplanted into individual 'parental' CD45.2[+] recipients and the

 rest were mixed together and transplanted into five 'daughter' CD45.2[+] recipients.

 Each 'parental' or 'daughter' recipient received an estimated expansion equivalent to

500 cHSCs. For post-culture labelling, 3000 cHSCs were sorted from CD45.1$^+$ mice and expanded for 13 days. Thereafter, the cells were transduced with the AddGene 83993 library (containing >10090 unique barcodes) overnight at an approximate density of 100,000 cells/well. Half of the cultured and transduced cells were transplanted into 5 CD45.2$^+$ WT recipients. Each recipient received an estimated expansion equivalent of 300 cHSCs, of which approximately 15% were transduced according to assessments of transduction efficiencies. Barcode labelled cells were collected and analyzed from four recipients. For both pre- and post-culture labeling experiments, recipients were lethally irradiated and provided with 500,000 unfractionated CD45.2+ WBM cells each as support. At the experimental end points (16 weeks after transplantation), barcode labelled BM myeloid cells were sorted into 200 µl RNA lysis buffer (Norgen Biotek Corp) ("pre-culture" barcoding) or pelleted for genomic DNA extraction ("post-culture" barcoding) and proceeded to library preparation and sequencing analysis.

RNA was isolated according to the protocol of Single Cell RNA Purification Kit (Norgen Biotek Corp) and cDNA were synthesis using qScript cDNA SuperMix (Quantabio). Genomic DNA was extracted using PureLink Genomic DNA Mini Kit (Invitrogen). The 8- (pre-culture) and 21-base pair (bp) barcodes (post-culture) were amplified by PCR using Q5 High-Fidelity DNA Polymerase (New England Biolabs). Primers used are listed in Supplemental Table 11. Adapters containing index sequences (Supplemental Table 10) were added by PCR for 7 cycles. After each PCR amplification step, the products were cleaned up using SPRIselect beads (Beckman Coulter). Purified libraries were run on Agilent High Sensitivity DNA Kit chip (Agilent Technologies) to verify the expected size distribution, quantified by Qubit dsDNA HS Assay Kit (Thermo Fisher Scientific), and pooled at equimolar concentrations. Pooled libraries were loaded on an Illumina MiSeq Reagent Nano Kit v2 flow cell following protocols for single-end 100-cycle sequencing. FASTQ files were further assessed with FastQC (v.0.11.2), including read count, base quality across reads, and guanine and cytosine (GC) content per sequence.

After extracting the reads of each barcode, the frequency in each recipient was calculated and barcodes with a frequency less than 0.1% were considered background reads. This is an arbitrary cut-off. Barcodes present in more than one 'parental' recipient were excluded from analysis (7 % and 2% of barcodes pre- and post-culture, respectively) to avoid the possibility of including HSCs transduced independently with

the same barcode or potential over-represented barcodes. Reads were normalized to

10^6 total reads per recipient followed by statistical analyses.

Cell Trace Violet labelling for *in vitro* and *in vivo* HSC proliferation tracing

$CD45.2^+$ cultured cells, cKit-enriched BM cells or CD4-enriched spleen cells were

collected, washed and pelleted. Cells were resuspended to a final concentration of 5

x 10^6 cells/ml and labelled with 1 µM CTV (Invitrogen) in PBS for 10 min at 37 °C. The

reaction was stopped by adding same volume of ice-cold FACS buffer and washing

again with FACS buffer. For *in vitro* proliferation tracing, 10^5 CTV labeled cKit-enriched

BM cells were plated into each well containing F12-PVA culture media (Supplemental

Table 1). At each time point, half of the cultured cells were collected and stained for

evaluating cHSC CTV signals (Supplemental Table 8) while the remaining cells were

kept in culture for continue expansion. For *in vivo* proliferation tracing, CTV labeled

EE100 cultured cells or 5 x 10^6 cKit-enriched BM cells were mixed with 2 x 10^6 CTV

labeled CD4-enriched spleen cells and transplanted into one $CD45.1^+/CD45.2^+$

unconditioned recipients. For analysis, BM cells were cKit-enriched and stained

accordingly (Supplemental Table 9). CD4 positive spleen cells were collected from the

same recipient as a control for positive signal/undivided cells (Supplemental Table 10).

Statistical test

Statistical analyses were performed using Microsoft Excel and Graphpad Prism 9.

Significance was calculated by Mann-Whitney tests. Statistical significances are

described in figure legends for the relevant graphs. In all legends, n denotes biological

replicates.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We acknowledge Dr. Shabnam Kharazi for scientific discussions and technical support, Mr. Yun Sheng for advice on analysis for barcode sequencing and Prof. Hiromitsu Nakauchi and Dr. Adam C. Wilkinson for advice on cell cultures. The work was supported by grants from the Tobias Foundation, the Swedish Cancer Foundation, Barncancerfonden and the Swedish Research Council to D.B. and the Royal Physiographic Society of Lund foundation to Q.Z and A.K-C.

AUTHORSHIP CONTRIBUTIONS

Q.Z. designed the research, performed experiments, analyzed data, and wrote the manuscript; R.O. performed bioinformatic analysis and wrote the manuscript; A.K-C. and O.Y. performed experiments and analyzed data; D.B. supervised the project, was responsible for funding acquisition, designed the research, analyzed data and wrote the manuscript.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST DISCLOSURES

The authors report no conflict of interest.

REFERENCES

Konturek-Ciesla, A. & Bryder, D. Stem Cells, Hematopoiesis and Lineage Tracing: Transplantation-Centric Views and Beyond. *Frontiers in Cell and Developmental Biology* **10** (2022). https://doi.org:10.3389/fcell.2022.903528

Walasek, M. A., van Os, R. & de Haan, G. Hematopoietic stem cell expansion: challenges and opportunities. *Ann N Y Acad Sci* **1266**, 138-150 (2012). https://doi.org:10.1111/j.1749-6632.2012.06549.x

Wilkinson, A. C. *et al.* Long-term ex vivo haematopoietic-stem-cell expansion allows noncondition transplantation. *Nature* (2019). https://doi.org:10.1038/s41586-019-1244-x

Zhang, C. C. & Lodish, H. F. Murine hematopoietic stem cells change their surface phenotype during ex vivo expansion. *Blood* **105**, 4314-4320 (2005). https://doi.org:10.1182/blood-2004-11-4418

Nakauchi, H., Takano, H., Ema, H. & Osawa, M. Further characterization of CD34-low/negative mouse hematopoietic stem cells. *Ann N Y Acad Sci* **872**, 57-66; discussion 66-70 (1999). https://doi.org:10.1111/j.1749-6632.1999.tb08453.x

Yang, L. *et al.* Identification of Lin(-)Sca1(+)kit(+)CD34(+)Flt3- short-term hematopoietic stem cells capable of rapidly reconstituting and rescuing myeloablated transplant recipients. *Blood* **105**, 2717-2723 (2005). https://doi.org:10.1182/blood-2004-06-2159

Na Nakorn, T., Traver, D., Weissman, I. L. & Akashi, K. Myeloerythroid-restricted progenitors are sufficient to confer radioprotection and provide the majority of day 8 CFU-S. *J Clin Invest* **109**, 1579-1585 (2002). https://doi.org:10.1172/JCI15272

Purton, L. E. & Scadden, D. T. Limiting factors in murine hematopoietic stem cell assays. *Cell Stem Cell* **1**, 263-270 (2007). https://doi.org:10.1016/j.stem.2007.08.016

Harrison, D. E., Jordan, C. T., Zhong, R. K. & Astle, C. M. Primitive hemopoietic stem cells: direct assay of most productive populations by competitive repopulation with simple binomial, correlation and covariance calculations. *Exp Hematol* **21**, 206-219 (1993).

Barnett, D. *et al.* Guideline for the flow cytometric enumeration of CD34+ haematopoietic stem cells. Prepared by the CD34+ haematopoietic stem cell working party. General Haematology Task Force of the British Committee for Standards in Haematology. *Clin Lab Haematol* **21**, 301-308 (1999). https://doi.org:10.1046/j.1365-2257.1999.00253.x

Trebeden-Negre, H. *et al.* Delayed recovery after autologous peripheral hematopoietic cell transplantation: potential effect of a high number of total nucleated cells in the graft. *Transfusion* **50**, 2649-2659 (2010). https://doi.org:10.1111/j.1537-2995.2010.02746.x

Sawen, P. *et al.* Mitotic History Reveals Distinct Stem Cell Populations and Their Contributions to Hematopoiesis. *Cell Rep* **14**, 2809-2818 (2016). https://doi.org:10.1016/j.celrep.2016.02.073

Bryder, D., Sasaki, Y., Borge, O. J. & Jacobsen, S. E. Deceptive multilineage reconstitution analysis of mice transplanted with hemopoietic stem cells, and implications for assessment of stem cell numbers and lineage potentials. *J Immunol* **172**, 1548-1552 (2004). https://doi.org:10.4049/jimmunol.172.3.1548

Lu, R., Neff, N. F., Quake, S. R. & Weissman, I. L. Tracking single hematopoietic stem cells in vivo using high-throughput sequencing in

conjunction with viral genetic barcoding. *Nat Biotechnol* **29**, 928-933 (2011).
https://doi.org:10.1038/nbt.1977
15 Busch, K. & Rodewald, H. R. Unperturbed vs. post-transplantation
hematopoiesis: both in vivo but different. *Curr Opin Hematol* **23**, 295-303 (2016).
https://doi.org:10.1097/MOH.0000000000000250
16 Brecher, G., Ansell, J. D., Micklem, H. S., Tjio, J. H. & Cronkite, E. P. Special
proliferative sites are not needed for seeding and proliferation of transfused
bone marrow cells in normal syngeneic mice. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **79**,
5085-5087 (1982). https://doi.org:10.1073/pnas.79.16.5085
17 Bhattacharya, D. *et al.* Niche recycling through division-independent egress of
hematopoietic stem cells. *J Exp Med* **206**, 2837-2850 (2009).
https://doi.org:10.1084/jem.20090778
18 Bhattacharya, D., Rossi, D. J., Bryder, D. & Weissman, I. L. Purified
hematopoietic stem cell engraftment of rare niches corrects severe lymphoid
deficiencies without host conditioning. *J Exp Med* **203**, 73-85 (2006).
https://doi.org:10.1084/jem.20051714
19 Balazs, A. B., Fabian, A. J., Esmon, C. T. & Mulligan, R. C. Endothelial protein
C receptor (CD201) explicitly identifies hematopoietic stem cells in murine bone
marrow. *Blood* **107**, 2317-2321 (2006). https://doi.org:10.1182/blood-2005-06-
2249
20 Gekas, C. & Graf, T. CD41 expression marks myeloid-biased adult
hematopoietic stem cells and increases with age. *Blood* **121**, 4463-4472 (2013).
https://doi.org:10.1182/blood-2012-09-457929
21 Wilkinson, A. C., Ishida, R., Nakauchi, H. & Yamazaki, S. Long-term ex vivo
expansion of mouse hematopoietic stem cells. *Nat Protoc* (2020).
https://doi.org:10.1038/s41596-019-0263-2
22 Team, R. C. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. . (2022).
https://doi.org:https://www.R-project.org/
23 Hao, Y. *et al.* Integrated analysis of multimodal single-cell data. *Cell* **184**, 3573-
3587 e3529 (2021). https://doi.org:10.1016/j.cell.2021.04.048
24 Stuart, T., Srivastava, A., Madad, S., Lareau, C. A. & Satija, R. Single-cell
chromatin state analysis with Signac. *Nat Methods* **18**, 1333-1341 (2021).
https://doi.org:10.1038/s41592-021-01282-5
25 Cao, Y. *et al.* Integrated analysis of multimodal single-cell data with structural
similarity. *Nucleic acids research* **50**, e121 (2022).
https://doi.org:10.1093/nar/gkac781
26 Gazit, R. *et al.* Fgd5 identifies hematopoietic stem cells in the murine bone
marrow. *J Exp Med* **211**, 1315-1331 (2014).
https://doi.org:10.1084/jem.20130428
27 Domen, J., Cheshier, S. H. & Weissman, I. L. The role of apoptosis in the
regulation of hematopoietic stem cells: Overexpression of Bcl-2 increases both
their number and repopulation potential. *J Exp Med* **191**, 253-264 (2000).
https://doi.org:10.1084/jem.191.2.253
28 Biddy, B. A. *et al.* Single-cell mapping of lineage and identity in direct
reprogramming. *Nature* **564**, 219-224 (2018). https://doi.org:10.1038/s41586-
018-0744-4
29 Horlbeck, M. A. *et al.* Compact and highly active next-generation libraries for
CRISPR-mediated gene repression and activation. *Elife* **5** (2016).
https://doi.org:10.7554/eLife.19760

van Os, R. *et al.* Immunogenicity of Ly5 (CD45)-antigens hampers long-term engraftment following minimal conditioning in a murine bone marrow transplantation model. *Stem Cells* **19**, 80-87 (2001). https://doi.org:10.1634/stemcells.19-1-80

Wilkinson, A. C., Igarashi, K. J. & Nakauchi, H. Haematopoietic stem cell self-renewal in vivo and ex vivo. *Nature reviews. Genetics* **21**, 541-554 (2020). https://doi.org:10.1038/s41576-020-0241-0

Ochi, K., Morita, M., Wilkinson, A. C., Iwama, A. & Yamazaki, S. Non-conditioned bone marrow chimeric mouse generation using culture-based enrichment of hematopoietic stem and progenitor cells. *Nat Commun* **12**, 3568 (2021). https://doi.org:10.1038/s41467-021-23763-z

Challen, G. A., Pietras, E. M., Wallscheid, N. C. & Signer, R. A. J. Simplified murine multipotent progenitor isolation scheme: Establishing a consensus approach for multipotent progenitor identification. *Exp Hematol* **104**, 55-63 (2021). https://doi.org:10.1016/j.exphem.2021.09.007

Kent, D. G. *et al.* Prospective isolation and molecular characterization of hematopoietic stem cells with durable self-renewal potential. *Blood* **113**, 6342-6350 (2009). https://doi.org:10.1182/blood-2008-12-192054

Haas, S., Trumpp, A. & Milsom, M. D. Causes and Consequences of Hematopoietic Stem Cell Heterogeneity. *Cell Stem Cell* **22**, 627-638 (2018). https://doi.org:10.1016/j.stem.2018.04.003

Rebel, V. I., Miller, C. L., Eaves, C. J. & Lansdorp, P. M. The repopulation potential of fetal liver hematopoietic stem cells in mice exceeds that of their liver adult bone marrow counterparts. *Blood* **87**, 3500-3507 (1996).

Sun, J. *et al.* Clonal dynamics of native haematopoiesis. *Nature* **514**, 322-327 (2014). https://doi.org:10.1038/nature13824

Busch, K. *et al.* Fundamental properties of unperturbed haematopoiesis from stem cells in vivo. *Nature* **518**, 542-546 (2015). https://doi.org:10.1038/nature14242

Sawen, P. *et al.* Murine HSCs contribute actively to native hematopoiesis but with reduced differentiation capacity upon aging. *Elife* **7** (2018). https://doi.org:10.7554/eLife.41258

Weinreb, C., Rodriguez-Fraticelli, A., Camargo, F. D. & Klein, A. M. Lineage tracing on transcriptional landscapes links state to fate during differentiation. *Science* **367** (2020). https://doi.org:10.1126/science.aaw3381

Yamamoto, R. *et al.* Large-Scale Clonal Analysis Resolves Aging of the Mouse Hematopoietic Stem Cell Compartment. *Cell Stem Cell* **22**, 600-607 e604 (2018). https://doi.org:10.1016/j.stem.2018.03.013

Yamamoto, R. *et al.* Clonal analysis unveils self-renewing lineage-restricted progenitors generated directly from hematopoietic stem cells. *Cell* **154**, 1112-1126 (2013). https://doi.org:10.1016/j.cell.2013.08.007

Benz, C. *et al.* Hematopoietic stem cell subtypes expand differentially during development and display distinct lymphopoietic programs. *Cell Stem Cell* **10**, 273-283 (2012). https://doi.org:10.1016/j.stem.2012.02.007

Carrelha, J. *et al.* Hierarchically related lineage-restricted fates of multipotent haematopoietic stem cells. *Nature* **554**, 106-111 (2018). https://doi.org:10.1038/nature25455

Oguro, H., Ding, L. & Morrison, S. J. SLAM family markers resolve functionally distinct subpopulations of hematopoietic stem cells and multipotent progenitors. *Cell Stem Cell* **13**, 102-116 (2013). https://doi.org:10.1016/j.stem.2013.05.014

46 Ema, H. & Nakauchi, H. Expansion of hematopoietic stem cells in the developing liver of a mouse embryo. *Blood* **95**, 2284-2288 (2000).
47 Norddahl, G. L. *et al.* Accumulating mitochondrial DNA mutations drive premature hematopoietic aging phenotypes distinct from physiological stem cell aging. *Cell Stem Cell* **8**, 499-510 (2011). https://doi.org:10.1016/j.stem.2011.03.009
48 Domen, J. & Weissman, I. L. Hematopoietic stem cells and other hematopoietic cells show broad resistance to chemotherapeutic agents in vivo when overexpressing bcl-2. *Exp Hematol* **31**, 631-639 (2003). https://doi.org:10.1016/s0301-472x(03)00084-5
49 Czechowicz, A., Kraft, D., Weissman, I. L. & Bhattacharya, D. Efficient transplantation via antibody-based clearance of hematopoietic stem cell niches. *Science* **318**, 1296-1299 (2007). https://doi.org:10.1126/science.1149726
50 Xu, H., Exner, B. G., Chilton, P. M., Schanie, C. & Ildstad, S. T. CD45 congenic bone marrow transplantation: evidence for T cell-mediated immunity. *Stem Cells* **22**, 1039-1048 (2004). https://doi.org:10.1634/stemcells.22-6-1039
51 Fornes, O. *et al.* JASPAR 2020: update of the open-access database of transcription factor binding profiles. *Nucleic acids research* **48**, D87-D92 (2020). https://doi.org:10.1093/nar/gkz1001
52 Schep, A. N., Wu, B., Buenrostro, J. D. & Greenleaf, W. J. chromVAR: inferring transcription-factor-associated accessibility from single-cell epigenomic data. *Nat Methods* **14**, 975-978 (2017). https://doi.org:10.1038/nmeth.4401
53 Street, K. *et al.* Slingshot: cell lineage and pseudotime inference for single-cell transcriptomics. *BMC Genomics* **19**, 477 (2018). https://doi.org:10.1186/s12864-018-4772-0

TABLES

Table 1. RUs for each lineage in PB and for BM cHSCs of each recipient.

Recipients		PB	B cells	T cells	Myeloid cells	BM cHSCs
Individual BM EE10 + 2M	**#1**	6	6	6	4	12
	#2	31	35	19	27	75
	#3	21	23	17	35	70
	#4	98	144	46	57	21
	#5	1	1	2	0.03	0.4
Pooled BM EE10 + 2M	**#1**	101	78	173	583	49
	#2	110	84	120	516	82
	#3	87	68	103	248	130
	#4	101	70	149	384	187
	#5	65	127	186	331	112

842　*1 RU equals to the average reconstitution activity of 1×10^5 WBM cells.*

Figure 1

Figure 1. EPCR expression within the BM SLAM LSK fraction is a high-confidence predictor of transplantation-associated HSC activity.

(A) Expression patterns of EPCR and CD41 within the BM LSK SLAM fraction. Gates depict the assessed cell fractions.

(B) Strategy used to assess the correlation of EPCR and CD41 expression to the *in vivo* HSC activity.

(C) Test-cell derived chimerism 4 and 16weeks post-transplantation.

(D) Test-cell derived chimerism in BM EPCR$^+$ SLAM LSKs 16 weeks post-transplantation.

(E) Correlation between duration of radioprotection and EPCR expression levels. BM LSK SLAM cells were co-stained with EPCR and index-sorted at one cell per well, cultured for 21 days, and the content of each well transplanted to individual recipients (n = 22). Correlation to mortality of individual mice was made by assessing which well was transplanted into which mouse and coupling this to the index-sorting information. The grey dash line indicated the separation of EPCR higher (>4900) or lower expression (<4900) cHSCs.

(F) Donor contribution in PB myeloid cells. Mice were transplanted with *ex vivo* expanded cells from either 50 SLAM LSK EPCR^{low} (n = 5) or 50 SLAM LSK EPCR^{high} cells (n = 5) and assessments made 16 weeks after transplantation.

All data points depict values in individual recipients. Error bars denote SEM. The asterisks indicate significant differences. *, $p < 0.05$; **, $p < 0.01$. In E) a regression line was generated based on an end-point survival of 150 days (the time at which the experiment was terminated).

Figure 2

A Lin⁻Fcer1a⁻Sca1⁺cKit⁺CD150⁺EPCR⁺CD48⁻/low

B Whole culture

C Trajection of whole culture

0. Neutrophils	4. Monocytes
CEBPG ATF4 JUN	SMAD2::SMAD3 FOS SPIB
1. Neutrophils	5. cHSCs
CEBPD ATF4 RUNX3	RELA NFIX CTCF
2. Cycling cells	6. Basophils/Eosinophils
RUNX1 GATA1::TAL HLF	GATA4 RUNX1 MECOM
3. HPCs	7. Megakaryocytes/Erythrocytes
CEBPB RUNX1 HAND2	GATA1::TAL CTCF MEF2A

D HSC signatures

E HSC signatures of EPCR⁺ cells

F Cell cycle signatures of EPCR⁺ cells

Figure 2. The phenotypic properties of HSC expansion cultures.

(A) Frequency and fold change of phenotypic cHSCs (EPCR^{high} SLAM LSKs) in *ex vivo* cultures after 14 or 21 days of culture. Data points depict values from individual cultures initiated from 50 cHSCs. Error bars denote SEM. The asterisks indicate significant differences. ****, p < 0.0001.

(B) UMAP (based on SAILERX dimensionality reduction) of single-cell multiome profiling of cells expanded *ex vivo* for 21 days. Cell type annotations were derived using marker gene signatures and distal motif identities.

(C) Trajectory analysis of lineage differentiation for cells expanded *ex vivo* (left), with the top 3 scoring TF motifs of each cluster (right).

(D) Expression of HSC signature on whole culture.

(E) Expression of HSC signature of EPCR$^+$ cells sorted from *ex vivo* cultures.

(F) Cell cycle phase classification of EPCR$^+$ cells sorted from *ex vivo* cultures.

Figure 3

Figure 3. HSC activity can be prospectively isolated from cHSC cultures and associates to a minor EPCR+ SLAM LSK fraction.

(A) Strategy to assess the *in vivo* HSC activity of subfractions from *ex vivo* cultures.

(B) Test-cell derived chimerism in PB myeloid lineages over 24-weeks post-transplantation. Data represent mean values ± SEM (n = 5 for each group).

(C) Test-cell derived chimerism in BM progenitor subsets 24-weeks post-transplantation. Numbers indicate fold differences between the EPCR+ CD48-/low and EPCR+CD48+ fractions, and data points depict chimerism levels in individual recipients.

Figure 4

Figure 4 Quantification of repopulating activity from expanded cHSCs.

(A) Competitive transplantation strategies used to assess the repopulation of *ex vivo* expanded cHSCs.

(B) Test-cell derived PB reconstitution 16-weeks post-transplantation. Symbols denote individual mice and means ± SEM.

(C) BM cHSCs chimerism 16 weeks post transplantation. Symbols denote individual mice, and means ± SEM.

(D) Barcode approaches used to assess the clonal HSC contribution of *ex vivo* expanded HSCs before (i) or after (ii) *ex vivo* expansion.

(E) Clone sizes of unique barcodes in 'parental' recipients and their appearance in 'daughter' recipients, demonstrating extensive variation in expansion capacity among individual HSCs. Red lines indicate the median clone size in 'parental' recipients.

(F) Clone sizes of unique barcodes detected in BM myeloid cells of 'parental' recipients and their corresponding contribution in 'daughter' recipients. The red line denotes the correlation/linear regression.

(G) Clone sizes in 'parental' recipients transplanted with 'pre-culture' barcoded cells, or in recipients of 'post-culture' barcoded cells. Median clone sizes are shown with interquartile ranges.

(H) Frequency of barcodes and their clone sizes in recipients of pre- or post-cultured barcoded HSCs. BCs, barcodes.

All data points depict values in individual recipients or barcodes. Asterisks indicate significant differences. *, $p < 0.05$; ****, $p < 0.0001$.

Figure 5

Figure 5. Cultured cHSCs allow for transplantation into non-conditioned syngeneic recipients.

(A) Strategy to assess the ability of *ex vivo* expanded cHSCs to engraft unconditioned recipients.

(B) Test-cell derived PB reconstitution 24-weeks post-transplantation. Symbols denote individual mice and means ± SEM.

(C) Strategy used to assess the *in vivo* proliferation of *ex vivo* expanded cHSCs.

(D) BM cHSC chimerism 2-8 weeks post transplantation.

(E) Representative CTV label profiles of donor EPCR+ cHSCs compared to negative control signal (host EPCR+ cHSCs) and positive signal (donor CD4+ spleen cells) at 2 or 8 weeks post-transplantation.

(F) Donor EPCR+ cHSCs were evaluated for the number of cell divisions they had undergone through 8 weeks post-transplantation.

All data points depict values in individual recipients.