TNFR1-mediated senescence and lack of TNFR2-signaling limit human intervertebral disc cell repair in back pain conditions

Authors: Jennifer Gansau[1], Elena Grossi[2,3], Levon Rodriguez [1,4], Minghui Wang[4], Damien M. Laudier[1], Saad Chaudhary[1], Andrew C. Hecht[1], Wenyu Fu[5], Robert Sebra[4], Chuanju Liu[5], James C. Iatridis[1,*]

Affiliations:

[1]Department of Orthopaedics, Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai; New York, NY 10029, USA.

[2]Department of Oncological Sciences, Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai; New York, NY 10029, USA.

[3]Department of Dermatology, Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai; New York, NY 10029, USA.

[4]Department of Genetics & Genomic Sciences, Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai; New York, NY 10029, USA.

[5]Department of Orthopaedics & Rehabilitation, Yale University School of Medicine; New Haven, CT 06510, USA.

*Corresponding author. James C Iatridis

Email: james.iatridis@mssm.edu

Address: Leni and Peter W. May Department of Orthopaedics

      One Gustave Levy Place, Box 1188

      Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai

      New York, NY 10029, USA

Telephone: +1-212-241-1517

ABSTRACT

Poor intervertebral disc (IVD) healing causes IVD degeneration (IVDD) and progression to herniation and back pain. This study identified distinct roles of TNFα-receptors (TNFRs) in contributing to poor healing in painful IVDD. We first isolated IVDD tissue of back pain subjects and determined the complex pro-inflammatory mixture contained many chemokines for recruiting inflammatory cells. Single-cell RNA-sequencing of human IVDD tissues revealed these pro-inflammatory cytokines were dominantly expressed by a small macrophage-population. Human annulus fibrosus (hAF) cells treated with IVDD-conditioned media (CM) underwent senescence with greatly reduced metabolic rates and limited inflammatory responses. TNFR1 inhibition partially restored hAF cell metabolism sufficiently to enable a robust chemokine and cytokine response to CM. We showed that the pro-reparative TNFR2 was very limited on hIVD cell membranes so that TNFR2 inhibition with blocking antibodies or activation using Atsttrin had no effect on hAF cells with CM challenge. However, TNFR2 was expressed in high levels on macrophages identified in scRNA-seq analyses, suggesting their role in repair responses. Results therefore point to therapeutic strategies for painful IVDD involving immunomodulation of TNFR1 signaling in IVD cells to enhance metabolism and enable a more robust inflammatory response including recruitment or delivery of TNFR2 expressing immune cells to enhance IVD repair.

SUMMARY STATEMENT

TNFR1 signaling drives cells towards senesce and muted inflammatory response in painful intervertebral disc degeneration, while limited TNFR2 signaling may limit disc cell repair responses.

INTRODUCTION

Back and neck pain are leading causes of global disability impacting >100 million US adults, leading to missed workdays, massive health care expenditures and contribute to opioid usage, and represents a tremendous global socioeconomical burden (1-4). Intervertebral disc (IVD) herniation involving annulus fibrosus (AF) defects is a direct cause of pain and disability that can predispose to IVD degeneration (IVDD) and result in painful disability (1, 5, 6). Chronic inflammation is a characterizing feature of IVDD and herniation with pro-inflammatory cytokines contributing to progressive IVDD and pain (7-10). Pro-inflammatory cytokines play known roles in IVD matrix catabolism, neurovascular ingrowth, nociception and cellular senescence (8-20). Tumor necrosis factor-alpha (TNFα), interleukin-1 Beta (IL-1β) and interleukin-6 (IL-6) are major cytokines identified in the IVD known to propagate matrix catabolism and nociception, and considered targets for therapeutic strategies (8, 9, 11-14, 20, 21).

Human clinical trials and animal studies show promise for TNFα blocking in IVDD, but mixed results prompt a need for further research. In human clinical trials for IVD herniation with radiculopathy, local and systemic administration of TNFα blocking agents, including infliximab, etanercept and adalimumab, showed some promise for pain reduction but remained inconclusive since trials exhibited broad heterogeneity in effects and several showed negative findings (22-28). While a randomized, double-blinded, placebo-controlled trial of 43 patients with disc herniation found some decrease of average back pain using etanercept compared to placebo after 28 weeks, a randomized, controlled trial that enrolled 40 discectomy patients with disc herniation concordant with radicular pain, found infliximab had similar effects as placebo at 3-month follow-up (23, 29). Meanwhile, preclinical animal studies show efficacy with early TNFα blocking with reduced pain and improved IVD degeneration score (13, 30). These mixed clinical and animal results highlight

importance of TNFα, but also a need to better understand TNFα signaling and crosstalk between

IVD and immune cells (7). Therefore, here, we focus on specific roles of TNFα-receptors.

TNFα signaling occurs via 2 receptors: TNFα-receptor 1 (TNFR1) is implicated in the pro-

inflammatory response that promote tissue catabolism, and TNFα-receptor 2 (TNFR2) is

associated with cell survival and tissue repair/regeneration (31-34). Current treatment strategies

involve antibody-based inhibition with a high binding affinity for TNFα and therefore actively

prevents TNFα from binding to both TNFR1 and TNFR2 (23, 30, 32, 35, 36). Selective TNFR

inhibition shows promise for IVDD since TNFR1^{-/-} mice protected from IVDD while TNFR2^{-/-}

mice accelerated IVDD (20). The engineered protein Atsttrin is a TNFR2 activator derived from

progranulin, and this novel therapeutic was shown in osteoarthritis and IVD organ culture to shift

TNFα signaling from TNFR1 to a greater TNFR2 response (37-41). However, these studies need

validation in a human model system with a translational strategy.

A common strategy for simulating IVDD conditions is supplementation of cell culture

media with pro-inflammatory cytokines such as TNFα, IL-1β and IL-6 (10, 37, 42-44). However,

painful human IVDD with herniation is known to involve multiple cytokines and chemokines that

are collectively responsible for different cellular functions thought to inhibit IVD repair and

promote painful responses (8). We therefore applied a human relevant cell culture model system

that recapitulated the complex cytokine environment of human IVDD.

This study tested the hypotheses that human IVDD involves a complex cytokine mixture

that drives IVD cells towards senescence and can be shifted towards a reparative responsive by

inhibiting TNFR1 and promoting TNFR2 activity. This study used human tissue and cells from

painful IVDD subjects and autopsies, and applied cell culture, bulk RNA-sequencing, single-cell

RNA-sequencing (scRNA-seq), gene and protein assays. We determined that the many cytokines

and chemokines present in IVDD tissue from surgical subjects were dominantly expressed by a

small population of macrophages, and expressed at far lower levels by IVD cells. Next, we showed

that IVDD conditioned media (CM) treatment on human AF (hAF) cells *in vitro* had the largest

effects inhibiting metabolic rates and promoting senescence. Blocking TNFR1 signaling during

CM exposure sufficiently restored hAF cell metabolism to enable a robust pro-inflammatory

response. However, blocking TNFR2 and enhancing TNFR2 signaling with Atsttrin during CM

exposure had no effects on hAF cells. Finally, we showed TNFR1 is highly expressed by IVD cells

and increased with IVDD grade underscoring its importance in IVDD, and we showed that TNFR2

was expressed at minimal amounts by IVD cells suggesting limited TNFR2 signaling at below

therapeutic levels in IVDD conditions.

RESULTS
CM contains many cytokines & chemokines dominantly expressed by macrophages

To characterize the IVDD pro-inflammatory microenvironment, human surgical IVD

specimens containing both AF and NP portions were collected (Table S1) and cultured in Basal

media for 72 hours under constant agitation, leading to cytokine release and generating IVDD

derived CM (Fig. 1A). CM cytokines and chemokines were analyzed with a human

cytokine/chemokine panel 48-plex discovery Assay® Array, with pro-inflammatory cytokines

(e.g., IL-1β, IL-6, TNFα), anti-inflammatory cytokines (e.g., IL-1RA, IL-4, IL-10, IL-13), and

chemokines (e.g., MIP-1α/CCL3, MIP1β/CCL4, MCP-1/CCL2 and MCP-3/CCL7) detected (Fig.

1B, Table S2). To determine the cells producing these factors, we performed scRNA-seq on cells

isolated from 5 herniated IVD specimens containing AF and NP regions from 3 subjects

undergoing Anterior cervical discectomy and fusion (ADF) procedure (1 male, 2 female) (Fig. 1A,

Fig. S1A, Table S1). The 13,259 cells were analyzed to identify 14 clusters that were annotated

using UniCell Deconvolve (Fig. S1), a pre-trained, unbiased, deep learning model system (45).

Cell cluster 13 was identified as a small population of macrophages using UniCell and we

manually confirmed this annotation as macrophages by evaluating expression of markers including

CD68, CXCL16, C1QB and *CD14* (Fig. S2A). While these macrophages represent only 0.16% of

the cells of the specimens (Fig. S2B), they are highlighted because they expressed the genes

translating to the cytokines present in the IVDD CM at high levels (Fig. 1C, Fig. 1D). Specifically,

the macrophage cluster contained 217 significantly upregulated genes including *IL1B, CCL3*

(*MIP1α*), *CCL3L1* and *CCL4* (*MIP1β*), and emphasized the robustness of its pro-inflammatory

roles compared to all other cell clusters (Fig. 1E), and this population did not express IVD cell

phenotypic markers. Pathway analysis showed macrophage expression pattern was significantly

enriched for "TNFα Signaling via NFκB" (Score= 385.8, adj. p-value= 2.27×10^{-13}), "Inflammatory

Response" (Score= 123.6, adj. p-value= 5.89×10^{-7}) and "Complement" (Score= 100.3, adj. p-

value= 3.22×10^{-6}) (Fig. 1F). M1-macrophage markers were 2.5-fold greater (average of 82%, red

dotted line) than M2-macrophage markers (average of 29%, green dotted line) suggesting

macrophages were in an M1 pro-inflammatory phenotype with little conversion to M2 reparative

phenotype (Fig. 1G, Fig. S2C). Macrophages expressed the cytokines found in CM at high levels

suggesting a role contributing to the CM profiles. Meanwhile, cytokines in CM were expressed by

IVD cells at levels that were considerably lower than by the macrophages. We conclude IVDD

tissue from back pain subjects contains a complex 'cocktail' of pro-inflammatory cytokines and

chemokines dominantly expressed by a very small population of macrophages enriched for TNFα

signaling.

CM inhibited hAF cell metabolism and produced a muted inflammatory response

We next used CM to challenge hAF cells in the development of an *in vitro* model system

representing the complex IVDD cytokine microenvironment (Fig. 2). Use of the CM cytokine

'cocktail' was significant since most IVD cell culture models challenge cells with a single cytokine

(most commonly TNFα or IL-1β). The 2D hAF cell culture model system maintains the elongated

phenotype of native AF cells and simplifies cellular solute transport conditions. CM was applied

in a 2-part study on dosing and timing, and compared with Basal media. CM was generated from

specimens collected and pooled from 9 subjects (Table S1). The dosing study applied increasing

CM concentrations (Basal, 25%, 50% and 100% CM) to hAF cells cultured for 24 hours in Basal

media (Fig. 2A). CM concentration decreased the number of hAF cells visible in culture (Fig. 2B)

and significantly decreased hAF cell metabolic activity (Fig. 2C). While increasing CM dose

reduces relative nutrients available, we confirmed glucose concentration in all CM conditions was

several folds greater than required for hAF cells under these culture conditions (46) to confirm

results were related to cytokine concentration changes.

We next performed a timing study with 100% CM (Fig. 2A) and showed CM treatment

again reduced cell numbers and MTT at 24-hours and further decreased cell numbers with more

granulated cell morphology with elongated stress fibers (Fig. 2D), and reduced MTT at 72 hours

(Fig. 2E). *COL1A1* and *ADAMTS4* were also significantly decreased with CM at both time points

(Fig. 2F), although CM exposure did not result in significantly altered pro-inflammatory cytokines

(Fig. S3C). *TNFRSF1A* and *TNFRSF1B* (genes for TNFR1 and TNFR2, respectively) were

significantly increased with CM at 24 hours but then significantly decreased at 72 hours (Fig. 2G).

Even though *TNFRSF1A* and *TNFRSF1B* levels were both responsive to CM treatment, we show

TNFRSF1B was expressed at extremely low levels 100-1000x times below *TNFRSF1A* expression

levels (Fig. 3H). Overall, we conclude that CM causes hAF cells to have reduced metabolic rate,

and a limited pro-inflammatory response. We also identified that CM altered TNFR1 and TNFR2

signaling, yet, hAF cells expressed *TNFRSF1B* at levels orders of magnitudes lower than

TNFRSF1A.

170   TNFR1 blocking enhanced hAF cell metabolic and pro-inflammatory response while

171   TNFR2 blocking and Atsttrin had no effects

Since CM altered expression levels of *TNFRSF1A* and *TNFRSF1B* in hAF cells, we next

evaluated their functional roles on hAF cells challenged by CM using blocking antibodies αTNFR1

and αTNFR2, and using TNFR2 activator Atsttrin with bulk RNA-Seq analyses. CM was

supplemented with inhibiting antibodies at 10 µg/mL and Atsttrin at 200 ng/mL, and hAF cells

were cultured for 24 hours (Table 1, Fig. 3A). Blocking TNFR1 partially rescued hAF cells from

CM with improved cell morphology (Fig. 3B) and significantly increased MTT (p <0.05, Fig. 3C)

compared to CM (p<0.05) and αTNFR2 (p<0.01), although αTNFR1 was significantly reduced

compared to Basal (p<0.05, Fig. 3C). While MTT values were only partially rescued for αTNFR1,

it was sufficient to promote a substantially different transcriptome with robust pro-inflammatory

transcriptomic profile (Fig. 3D & 3E). Specifically, Bulk RNA-seq with principal component

analysis (PCA) on transcriptome showed three distinct clusters (Basal, αTNFR1 and the three

remaining groups – CM, αTNFR2, Atsttrin) (Fig. 3D). The αTNFR1 robustly increase in pro-

inflammatory cytokines expression shown on the top 50 DEGs on the heatmap (Fig. 3E).

TNFRSF1A expression was significantly upregulated in CM, αTNFR2 and Atsttrin compared to

Basal, and significantly inhibited for αTNFR1, validating the importance of TNFR1 signaling

under CM conditions and successful blocking by αTNFR1 (Fig. 3F). *TNFRSF1B* expression was

not affected by CM, αTNFR2, or Atsttrin suggesting little TNFR2 signaling under the complex

cytokine challenge of CM.

CM, αTNFR2 and Atsttrin groups had nearly identical responses for all assays, suggesting

little TNFR2 signaling. Specifically, CM, αTNFR2 and Atsttrin exhibited more floating cells

compared to Basal and αTNFR1 (pink arrows, Fig. 3B) and significantly lower MTT relative

optical density compared to Basal (Fig. 3C). The majority of the variability on the green cluster on

PCA was from donor differences with very little variability from treatment group (CM, αTNFR2

or Atsttrin) (Fig. 3D). The heatmap of the top 50 differentially expressed genes (DEGs) similarly

showed distinct patterns for Basal, αTNFR1 and CM groups and near identical patterns for CM,

αTNFR2 and Atsttrin groups (Fig. 3E). While the Z-score for *TNFRSF1B* was significantly

increased with αTNFR1 inhibition (Fig. 3F), we believe TNFR2 signaling may not have biological

impact in IVD since it was not reduced by αTNFR2, since CM, αTNFR2 and Atsttrin had nearly

identical results across assays, and because qPCR showed *TNFRSF1B* expression levels were 100-

1000x lower than *TNFRSF1A* (Fig. 2H). Overall, we have 3 key findings. First, CM significantly

inhibited metabolic rate of hAF cells. Second, TNFR1 inhibition partially restored hAF cell

metabolic rates sufficiently to enable a robust pro-inflammatory response. Third, results suggest

little functional role for TNFR2 signaling in hAF cells exposed to CM. The lack of responsiveness

of TNFR2 inhibition adds to our data on lack of TNFR2 expression in IVD cells in supporting our

hypothesis that IVD cells have limited TNFR2 signaling.

CM inhibited hAF DNA replication while αTNFR1 shifted hAF cell pro-inflammatory

response to predict enhanced immune cell recruitment

Basal, αTNFR1 and CM were analyzed further with gene set enrichment analysis (GSEA)

and network analysis with ingenuity pathway analyses (IPA) because of the large transcriptional

differences and to discern how TNFR1 modulation shifted the response of hAF cells to the CM

challenge. Meanwhile αTNFR2 and Atsttrin were not further analyzed since they had negligible

transcriptomic differences from CM. CM significantly downregulated 509 DEGs and significantly

upregulated 762 DEGs compared to Basal (Fig. 4A). The most significantly downregulated DEGs

were of the minichromosome maintenance gene family (*MCM* genes), which play roles in DNA

replication (47). GSEA further showed CM had the highest scores for depleting biological

processes related to Cell cycle and DNA replication while inflammatory responses were most

significantly enriched (Fig. 4B). The αTNFR1 treatment compared to CM significantly

downregulated 490 DEGs, and significantly upregulated 545 DEGs (Fig. 4C). GSEA predicted

these DEGs to be enriched for IL-27 mediated signaling (Fig. 4D), which has multiple effects in

modulating inflammatory responses (48). Additional enriched biological processes were related to

Regulation of Neuroinflammatory Response, and Response to Cytokine, demonstrating a shift in

the inflammatory pathways activated by CM (Fig. 4D). Processes related to Presynaptic

Endocytosis and Regulation of Calcium Ion Dependent Exocytosis were significantly depleted,

suggesting TNFR1 blocking could influence communication with the peripheral nervous system

as compared to CM. The αTNFR1 group (which also contained CM) compared to Basal

significantly downregulated 448 DEGs and significantly 1072 DEGs with *NFKB2*, *TNFAIP3* and

CCL5 among the highest fold change (FC) DEGs (Fig. 4E). The αTNFR1 treated CM condition,

therefore enriched biological processes related to cellular response to type 1 interferon, cytokine-

mediated signaling pathways, and inflammatory response compared to Basal and depleted

processes related to axonogenesis and axon guidance (Fig. 4F). Network analysis using QIAGEN

IPA predicted that CM would activate hAF cell senescence and inhibit proliferation compared to

Basal (Fig. 4G). Meanwhile network analyses predicted that hAF cells treated with αTNFR1 would

enhance cell activity and processes related to immune cell recruitment compared to CM (Fig. 4H).

Further, αTNFR1 treated CM predicted inhibition of SOCS1, a suppressor of cytokine signaling,

compared to Basal, to promote the robust pro-inflammatory response observed. Overall, CM depletes DNA replication and enriches inflammation. While, αTNFR1 enabled enhanced the hAF cell pro-inflammatory response to CM and predicted immune cell recruitment.

CM inhibited cell cycle and promoted senescence that was partially restored with αTNFR1

The reduced metabolic rates of hAF cells with increased CM concentration and reductions with αTNFR1 motivated a closer investigation of the cell proliferation, apoptosis, and cell cycle for Basal, αTNFR1, and CM groups (Fig. 5A). We considered cell cycle genes transcription patterns relevant across multiple cellular models across different biological contexts (49, 50), and determined that CM significantly downregulated hAF genes related to each phase of the cell cycle compared to Basal (Fig. 5B). Furthermore, CM caused hAF cells to be express G0 markers indicative of quiescence (i.e., downregulation of *FOXM1, BIRC5* and *H2AFZ* and upregulation of *PFDN5* and *RPS14*) (50) relative to Basal. Blocking TNFR1 led to a pattern of cell cycle markers between CM and Basal, suggesting a partial cell cycle recovery. *MKI67*, the gene coding for the proliferation marker KI67, was significantly decreased for hAF cells in CM (p<0.0001), while αTNFR1 was significantly different from CM and Basal (Fig. 5C). The senescence marker SA-β-Gal (Fig. 5D) was significantly increased in hAF cells in CM compared to Basal, and compared to αTNFR1 (Fig. 5E), again suggesting a partial recovery by αTNFR1. The apoptosis marker Caspase-3 (Casp3) (Fig. 5F) showed no difference in co-localization of cleaved Casp3 and DAPI using the Pearson's correlation coefficient (PCC) or in fluorescent intensity within the nuclei between groups (Fig. 5G, Fig. 5H), suggesting no changes in apoptosis. Together, transcriptomic and protein assay results indicated that CM downregulated hAF cell cycle markers and increased senescence and not apoptosis, while αTNFR1 partially protected and restored cell cycle from senescence. While the senescence and cell cycle recovery was only partial with αTNFR1, the

expression profile (Fig. 3, Fig. 4) showed it was sufficient to enable hAF cells to mount a robust

pro-inflammatory response.

TNFR1 increases with IVDD while TNFR2 is expressed only in macrophages

We further analyzed roles of TNFR1 and TNFR2 in IVDs using immunohistochemistry

(IHC) on human autopsy samples and scRNA-seq on human IVDD samples. Human IVDs of

various degeneration grades (n=14, Rutgers grade 1.3-12) were stained for TNFR1 and TNFR2

respectively and the outer AF (oAF) analyzed using HALO Multiplex module (Fig. 6A). TNFR1

was found in the cell membrane of oAF cells as expected, and the % positive cells for TNFR1

significantly correlated with IVDD Grade (Fig. 6B, Fig. 6C). This significant correlation between

TNFR1 protein expression and Rutgers IVDD grade was also found in the inner AF and NP (Fig.

S5). TNFR2 only showed faint staining within and around the nuclei of oAF cells suggesting little

presence of TNFR2 (Fig. 6B). Furthermore, the % TNFR2 positivity of these faintly stained cells

were not affected by IVDD grade in the oAF (Fig. 6D), or inner AF and NP regions (Fig. S5). We

used scRNA-seq of human IVDD subjects to further investigate which human IVD cells expressed

the genes for TNFR1 and TNFR2. *TNFRSF1A* was expressed in nearly all cells in the scRNA-seq

analyses and had particularly high expression levels in AF and NP cells as well as erythrocytes

(Fig. 6E, Fig. 6F) supporting its important role in IVD response to IVDD CM conditions. In

contrast, *TNFRSF1B* was at extremely low levels in all IVD cell populations (Fig. 6E, Fig. 6F), in

line with the extremely low expression levels in hAF cells on qPCR, and faint TNFR2 staining.

Interestingly, the small macrophage population expressed *TNFRSF1B* at very high levels and

TNFRSF1A at negligible levels. Results therefore support our hypotheses that TNFR2 signaling is

very low in all IVD cells and further emphasize the importance of TNFR1 signaling in all IVD

cells with TNFR1 signaling increasing with IVDD grade. The scRNA-seq also shows importance

of TNFR2 signaling in immune cell populations.

DISCUSSION

There is a major need to develop improved therapeutic targets to manage the chronic pro-

inflammatory conditions in painful IVDD, and to develop strategies for IVD cell

immunomodulation to slow IVDD progression or enhance IVD healing. Here, we use multiple

human model systems to understand roles of TNFR1 and TNFR2 in modulating the complex

cytokine and chemokine environment of IVDD. We first show that IVDD derived CM contains

elevated levels of at least 32 cytokines and chemokines highlighting the complex pro-

inflammatory environment with known roles recruiting inflammatory cells. It was notable that

these chemokines were dominantly expressed by a small population of macrophages while native

IVD cells (present in substantially larger numbers) expressed these pro-inflammatory factors at

much lower levels. CM treatment on hAF cells had the largest effects reducing metabolic rate, and

promoting cell cycle arrest and senescence, and promoted more muted transcriptional expression

patterns. TNFR1 signaling was strongly involved in this muted metabolic and inflammatory

response since results showed TNFR1 was expressed by all IVD cells and increased with IVDD

grade, and since blocking TNFR1 with a CM challenge rescued hAF cell metabolic rate and

senescence sufficiently to mount a robust pro-inflammatory response. On the other hand, results

supported the hypothesis that TNFR2 signaling was very limited in IVD cells since blocking and

Atsttrin had no effects on hAF treated with CM treatment, and since extremely low levels of

TNFR2 were measured in IVD cells with qPCR, bulk RNA-seq, scRNA-seq and IHC staining.

Meanwhile macrophages expressed TNFR2 at high levels, and αTNFR1 treatment predicted

enhanced inflammatory cell recruitment suggesting the immunomodulation of TNFR1 and TNFR2

signaling in the IVD may be possible with enhanced interactions of IVD and immune cells.

We showed that IVDD tissue from herniation subjects produced high concentrations of

several pro-inflammatory cytokines and chemokines that had their largest effects limiting hAF cell

metabolic and inflammatory responses. The complex combination of cytokines and chemokines

present in IVDD CM are consistent with literature showing a variety of cytokines increase with

severity of symptomatic IVD herniation, and that elevated IL-6 plays an important role in painful

conditions (11, 51). CM was used to establish and characterize an *in vitro* hAF cell IVDD model

capable of promoting and maintaining an IVDD phenotype. The major effects of CM on hAF cells

were reduced IVD cell metabolic rates, arrested cell cycle, senescence, and a relatively muted

transcriptional response to the complex cytokine and chemokine mixture in CM conditions.

Inhibiting TNFR1 enabled hAF cells to sufficiently recover from CM conditions to mount a robust

pro-inflammatory response suggesting recovery may be possible under certain conditions. The

IVD extracellular matrix is capable of binding cytokines such as TNFα and IL-1β through

fibronectin (52), and these cytokines sequestered within the IVD matrix may continue stimulating

an IVDD response on affected cells. Individual cytokines can induce premature senescence in IVD

cells (17, 53) and this study further shows complex cytokines in CM can arrest hAF cell cycle,

induce senescence, and limit IVD cell inflammatory responses independent of nutrient load. The

harsh IVDD chemical microenvironment with limited nutrients is often considered a key factor in

the 'frustrated' IVD healing response that stimulates the production of chronic pro-inflammatory

conditions and results in increased senescence observed with IVDD (54-60). However, IVD cells

are adapted to the low oxygen and glucose microenvironment of the IVD and limited nutrients do

not explain the reduced hAF cell metabolism from CM challenge in this cell culture study since

there were ample nutrients present in CM conditions of all concentrations. We used Basal as

control because healthy IVD controls were not available (i.e., surgical samples are degenerated,

scoliosis is a different disease process, we do not have access to organ donor samples, and autopsy

samples are treated differently and not comparable), and we expect healthy IVD CM would

produce effects between the Basal and IVDD CM conditions reported in this study. This study

supports the literature showing IVDD cytokines and chemokines play roles inhibiting IVD cell

cycle, promoting senescence (17), and inducing a muted transcriptional response in IVDD.

IVD cell immunomodulation may be important to arrest IVDD and promote IVD healing,

and this study strongly showed a role for TNFR1 since blocking TNFR1 enable hAF cells to mount

a robust pro-inflammatory response to the complex CM mixture, even though cell metabolic rate

and senescence were only partially rescued. Wang et al., showed a mechanistic role of TNFR1 in

IVD healing with significantly improved IVD degeneration score in TNFR1$^{-/-}$ mice (20). The

strong TNFR1 immunostaining and increased % positivity with advancing human IVDD grade in

this study is similar to prior studies on TNFR1 IHC (31, 61, 62). Translationally, TNFR1-CRISPRi

modulation in a rat *in vivo* model improved IVD degeneration and pain response (63). Reduced

pain-like behaviors with TNFR1 inhibition are consistent with the depletion of axonogenesis and

presynaptic endocytosis identified in this study when blocking the TNFR1 pathway, and suggests

TNFR1 may play roles in pain and IVDD. The more robust pro-inflammatory response in this

study with TNFR1 inhibition may be beneficial since recent studies suggest acute inflammation is

important to promote healing and inhibit chronic pain (64). Further, regenerative healing in

tendons requires a more robust and short-term immune response compared to inferior adult healing

(65, 66). We believe this study and growing literature suggest that IVD cell immunomodulation

with a more acute pro-inflammatory response may be important in shifting IVDD conditions to a

more reparative state, and this study builds on the literature suggesting TNFR1 modulation as an

important therapeutic target.

The limited TNFR2 signaling in IVD cells found in this study was a strong finding

supported by qPCR, bulk RNA-seq, scRNA-seq, IHC methods and blocking studies. Lack of

TNFR2 signaling in IVD cells has potential for a shift in our understanding of IVD

pathophysiology, suggesting IVD cells have limited capacity to mount a repair/regeneration

response regardless of their microenvironmental conditions. However, there is a significant body

of literature on TNFR2 signaling in the IVD that lacks clarity and needs to be contextualized with

this study. For example, TNFR2 IHC was expressed in up to ~ 15% of IVD cells in this study, but

the immunostaining was very faint and had no changes in IVD cells with advancing IVDD. Even

though review articles suggest TNFR1 and TNFR2 are comparably expressed in the IVD (9, 10),

the papers cited are more closely aligned with our findings suggesting limited role for TNFR2.

Specifically, TNFR2 was not detectable in AF and NP samples from controls or at very low

expression levels and was not increased with IVDD (31, 61, 62). However, TNFR2 levels were

increased in human IVDs near defects and in IVDs with immune cells infiltrates (61, 62),

suggesting increased TNFR2 signaling in IVDs involves immune cells. The scRNA-seq in this

study results support this concept showing *TNFRSF1B* in inflammatory cells but not in IVD cells,

and this is supported by our qPCR results showing extremely low *TNFRSF1B* levels in hAF cells.

Furthermore, the PanglaoDB scRNA-seq database with over 5M mouse and human cells

sequenced shows *TNFRSF1B* is expressed at detectable levels in few cell types, predominantly

immune cells including dendritic cells, macrophages and T cells (67). We believe the lack of

effects of αTNFR2 and Atsttrin in hAF challenged with CM in this study is best understood if hAF

cells indeed have negligible TNFR2 signaling since αTNFR2 had no effects and since Wang et al.,

showed that Atsttrin had no effects on TNFR2^{-/-} mice to indicate that Atsttrin is TNFR2-dependent

(20). However, TNFR2 signaling is important in IVD degeneration and healing since IVD

degeneration increased in TNFR2$^{-/-}$ mice and Atsttrin suppressed TNFα-mediated inflammation in

IVD tissue and organ culture models (20, 37). The model systems of these studies showing TNFR2

efficacy in IVDD involve immune cells that are capable of robust TNFR2 signaling. Therefore,

our results and the literature all point to a very limited role of TNFR2 in IVD cells. However,

TNFR2 signaling appears to be important in IVDD progression and most likely involves TNFR2

signaling of macrophages and possibly other immune cells.

The scRNA-seq analyses identified that the cytokines detected in the multiplex array of

IVDD CM were dominantly expressed by a very small population of macrophages and only

expressed by native IVD cells at drastically lower levels. Despite substantially lower expression

levels in IVD cells, their contribution to the CM cytokines cannot be excluded due to their larger

cell numbers in the tissue. The small population of macrophages present were in a predominantly

M1 phenotype and also expressed markers (i.e., *ACP5* and *CTSK*, the genes coding for the proteins

TRAP and CATHEPSIN K), suggesting their potential osteoclastic origin (Fig. S2D, Fig. S2E)

(68). The scRNA-seq results in this study are complementary to human IVDs with IHC identifying

small numbers of macrophages infiltrating human IVDDs with a predominantly M1 state that does

not convert to a reparative M2 polarization state (55). The small numbers of macrophages isolated

in human surgical IVDD in this study further suggests there may be too few immune cells

infiltrating the IVDs to enable an effective healing response since inflammatory cell numbers and

healing responses depend on species, tissue, timing, and age (69). However, human IVD scRNA-

Seq studies are mixed in the number of immune cells identified making this a dynamic area of

research and some studies have reported greater numbers of inflammatory cells in human IVDs

(70-72). The numbers of immune cells identified in human IVDs will vary depending on

degenerative state and isolation methods. We also believe differences in relative abundance of

immune cells identified across human IVD scRNA-seq studies are likely related to the annotation

methods since IVD cells are known to produce many cytokines and exhibit immune-modulatory

behaviors (7, 8, 15, 16, 62), and we had a strict definition of macrophages based on UniCell (45)

and lack of IVD cell phenotypic marker expression. An integrated data set and improved precision

on phenotypic markers in the immune cell populations present in the IVD in healthy and IVDD

conditions are needed to better reconcile differences in relative numbers of macrophages identified

across IVD scRNA-seq studies. Regardless, immunomodulation of native IVD cells likely offers

more promise for translation since IVD cells are present in much greater numbers than immune

cells in the IVD. For example, recently developed bioactive tension-activated nanofiber patches

can modulate IVD pro-inflammatory responses through the IL-1β pathway (73), and such

approaches can be modified to target additional cytokines and receptors to modulate IVD cell

response to the complex IVDD CM environment.

In conclusion, results demonstrate distinct roles of TNFR1 and TNFR2 signaling in IVD

cell response to IVDD conditions. We show hAF cells subjected to IVDD CM conditions had

inhibited metabolic rate, senescence, and a muted inflammatory response. Targeted TNFR1

blocking under the CM challenge partially rescued hAF cell MTT response sufficiently to enable

them to mount a more robust inflammatory response to CM challenge, with production of many

chemokines capable of recruiting immune cells. Meanwhile, native IVD cells appear to lack the

capacity for a TNFR2-driven repair under cytokine challenges and must instead rely on recruiting

TNFR2 expressing cells, such as macrophages for repair responses. Results point to future

therapeutic strategies for painful IVDD involving immunomodulatory strategies for IVD cells

including TNFR1 inhibition to restore IVD cell cycle and IVD cell metabolic rates in response to

IVDD conditions, and recruitment or delivery of TNFR2 expressing cells that may offer additional

benefit for IVD repair.

MATERIALS AND METHODS
Sex as a biological variable

Our study uses human specimen from both sexes for various experiments (outlined below

and in supplementary Tables S1 and S3), but it was not considered a biological variable.

Tissue source

This study was approved by Mount Sinai Institutional Review Board (IRB# STUDY-19-

01394-MOD001) project titled 'Orthopedic Cell and Tissue Repository'. For media conditioning,

nine human IVDs were obtained from patients (6 males, 3 females), 34-65 years old (mean = 50.4).

For cell isolation, six IVDs were obtained (4 males, 2 females), 25-71 years old (mean = 45.8).

The collected specimen was assessed, and AF and NP were carefully separated for cell isolation.

All patients experienced back or neck pain and underwent disc fusion or discectomy surgery.

Assessment of the disease state was performed using Pfirrmann grading on Pre-surgery MRI

images. Informed consent from patients was given prior to surgery Specimen information is given

in Table S1. Human samples for IHC were obtained from an institutional biobank of cadaveric

IVDs. This study included 15 lumbar IVDs (8 Male, 7 Female) (Table S3). The morphological

degeneration of each sample was quantified using the Rutgers degeneration scale that ranges from

grade 1-12, with 12 as the most degenerated (74). Each sample was graded for Rutgers grade by

three trained and independent graders who were blinded to the sample age, sex, and to the Pfirrman

grade.

Conditioning of media

Immediately after IVD collection, tissues were cut into smaller pieces, if necessary and

washed three times in Phosphate-Buffered Saline (PBS) supplemented with 2% Penicillin /

Streptomicin (10,000 U/mL, Gibco) and Primocin (100 µg/mL, Invivogen). Afterwards, the tissue

was cultured in 10 mL media (RoosterNourish™-MSC, RoosterBio) per gram tissue and

maintained under constant agitation at 37°C and 5% CO_2 for 72 hours. CM was collected and

frozen as individual samples at -80°C for later analysis. After initial characterization and analysis

of statistical differences between samples, media collected from 9 individuals were combined to

reduce number of variables in consecutive experiments.

Media analysis/ Multiplex cytokine array analysis

For quantification of pro-inflammatory cytokines released from surgical samples, media

was sampled and analyzed using a Human Cytokine/Chemokine 48-Plex Discovery Assay® Array

(catalog no. HD48, Eve Technologies). The 48-Plex Discovery Assay used 100 µL of undiluted

cell culture media per run and each run was performed in duplicates. Fluorescence intensity values

were derived from the discovery assay and are in direct proportion to the concentration of proteins

in the samples.

Isolation and culture of hAF cells

The hAF cells were isolated from surgical specimens. Briefly, collected AF tissue was

finely minced and digested using collagenase type I (400 U/mL, Gibco, USA) for 12 hours under

constant agitation at 37°C in serum-free high glucose DMEM containing Penicillin / Streptomycin

and Amphotericin B (0.25 µg/mL). Using a 70 µm cell strainer debris was removed from the

tissue/cell suspension. Cells were either immediately processed for scRNA-seq analysis or seeded

at 5,000 cells/cm^2 in RoosterNourish™-MSC media (Rooster Bio) under normoxic (21% O_2)

conditions at 37°C and 5 % CO_2 to passage 2-3 to have sufficient cells for CM challenge and

blocking experiments. RoosterNourish™-MSC media was selected since it is designed to support

high volume expansion of human cells without media changes and therefore had ample nutrients

for hAF cell growth under all conditions and obviated the need to adjust nutrient concentrations as

we adjusted CM concentration and timing. Specifically, glucose concentration in our media at all

CM concentrations ranged 15-40 mM glucose which is several folds greater than the glucose

demand for hAF cells in native conditions (46).

When primary cells reach 70-80 % confluency, media was changed according to study

design (Table 1). Specifically, for Basal group, media was replaced by fresh RoosterNourish™-

MSC media (Rooster Bio), for the dosing experiment, CM was diluted using Basal media and for

the TNFR blocking experiment, CM was supplemented with anti-TNFR1 (10 µg/mL, MAB225-

500, R&D Systems), anti-TNFR2 (10 µg/mL, MAB726-500, R&D Systems) or Atsttrin

(200 ng/mL, manufactured in-house). Cultures were moved into a hypoxic environment (5% O_2)

for the duration of the experiment and note that cell growth rates did not result in overlapping cells

for the 24-72 hour studies performed.

scRNAseq sample preparation and analyses

Immediately after isolation, cells of from 3 patients (5 specimens) were further cleaned up

using the LeviCell system (Levitas Bio) according to manufacturer's protocols to remove excess

debris. Afterwards, samples were processed according to Chromium 3' Gene Expression V3.1 Kit

(10X Genomics, Pleasanton, CA) using manufacturer's guidelines. An estimated 5,000 cells were

loaded onto each channel with a targeted cell recovery of approximately 3,000 cells/sample. This

was followed by sequencing on a S4 NovaSeq chip (Illumina Inc., San Diego, CA). Qubit 3 (Fisher

Scientific) and 2100 Bioanalyzer (Agilent Technologies, Santa Clara, CA) were used for quality

check of library.

Sequencing data were aligned and quantified using the Cell Ranger Single-Cell Software

Suite (version 7.1.0, 10x Genomics) against the reference genome GRCh38. The pipeline grouped

and de-duplicated reads confidently mapped to the transcriptome by 10X cellular barcodes and

UMIs (Unique Molecular Identifiers), then summarized counts into feature-barcode matrices. The

R-based package Seurat (v4.3) was used for further processing and analysis (75). For quality

control, standard pre-processing steps were applied to remove cells with <500 mapped genes,

<1,000 gene counts, and >20% mitochondrial content. The data were further filtered to removed

genes detected in less than 5% of cells per sample. All pre-processed samples were RPCA-

integrated using the SCTransform normalization method. The top 4,000 variable features were

used to define 20 integration anchors. PCA identified 30 dimensions for unsupervised graph-based

clustering via uniform manifold approximation and projection (UMAP) at a 0.5 resolution

parameter (76). Genes expressed in >10% of cells in a cluster with an average $\log_2$-fold change

>0.25 were selected as DEGs using FindMarkers. Cell types identified from the resulting UMAP

were manually annotated based on each cluster's DEG profile and further confirmed using

UniCell, an unbiased cell type deconvolution pipeline that leverages a deep learning neural

network pre-trained on >28 million annotated single cells from published studies *(43)*. Pathway

enrichment was performed using Enrichr to determine significantly enriched biological pathways

based on upregulated DEGs, and normalized enrichment scores were reported for top gene

pathway sets.

MTT assay

To determine the metabolic activity and respective cell viability, cells were cultured in

media, supplemented with 0.5 mg/mL 3-[4,5-dimethylthiazol-2-yl]-2,5-diphenyltetrazolium

bromide (MTT, Sigma, USA) for 4 hrs at 37ºC. Afterwards, cells were lysed using Dimethyl

Sulfoxide to release insoluble formazan, which was quantified at $\lambda_{ab} = 540$ nm with $\lambda_{ref} > 650$ nm.

Absorbance was normalized to basal group to compare between replicates.

Gene expression analysis using qRT-PCR

Quantitative reverse transcription polymerase chain reaction (qRT-PCR) was used to quantify the gene expression of hAF cells that were retained during *in vitro* culture of CM model optimization. RNA was extracted from samples using the RNeasy Micro Kit (QIAGEN INC, USA) according to manufacturer instructions and eluted in 15 µL RNase free water. RNA concentration was quantified using a Thermo Scientific NanoDrop™ One UV–Vis spectrophotometer (Thermo Fisher Scientific) followed by synthesis of complementary DNA (cDNA) using the SuperScript® VILO™ MasterMix (Invitrogen, Waltham, MA) according to manufacturer instructions. The PowerUp™ SYBR™ Green Master Mix (Invitrogen) was used with human primers for Glyceraldehyde 3-Phosphate Dehydrogenase (*GAPDH*, Hs.PT.39a.22214836), Collagen Type I Alpha 1 Chain (*COL1A1*, Hs.PT.58.15517795), ADAM Metallopeptidase with Thrombospondin Type 1 Motif 4 (*ADAMTS4*, Hs.PT.58.19934831), TNF Receptor Superfamily Member 1A (*TNFRSF1A*, Hs.PT.58.19429998) and TNF Receptor Superfamily Member 1B (*TNFRSF1B*, Hs.PT.58.40638488) (all from Integrated DNA Technologies, Coralville IA) according to manufacturer instructions for qRT-PCR. qRT-PCR was performed by the Mount Sinai qPCR CoRE using an ABI PRISM 7900HT sequence detection system with robotic arms (Applied Biosystems, Foster City, CA). Data was analyzed using the $2^{-\Delta\Delta Ct}$ method (77), normalized to housekeeping gene glyceraldehyde 3-phosphate dehydrogenase (GAPDH) and relative to hAF cells cultured basal media. $2^{-\Delta\Delta Ct}$ calculations were conducted using Microsoft Excel (Microsoft, Redmond, NM).

Bulk RNA sequencing and analyses

Bulk RNAseq was used to evaluate changes in gene expression of hAF cells after TNFα signaling modulation ("TNFR blocking"). RNA was extracted from samples using the RNeasy

Micro Kit (QIAGEN INC, USA) according to manufacturer instructions with DNase application

and eluted in 15 µL RNase free water. RNA concentration was quantified using a Thermo

Scientific NanoDrop™ One UV–Vis spectrophotometer (Thermo Fisher Scientific). RNA

integrity (RIN) was measured with an Agilent 2100 BioAnalyzer. 2 µg of total RNA from each

sample were used for library preparation. Each library was constructed from RNA from hAF cells

from 5 individual donors. First, polyadenylated transcripts were enriched using NEXTFLEX

Poly(a) Beads 2.0 (PerkinElmer); then, RNA libraries were prepared using the NEXTFLEX®

Rapid Directional RNA-Seq Kit 2.0 (PerkinElmer). Library concentration was measure by Qubit,

while library quality and size were calculated with an Agilent 2100 BioAnalyzer. Single-end read

sequencing was performed using an Illumina NextSeq 550 instrument and a High-output kit, at a

depth of 33 million reads per sample.

Differential expression of bulk transcriptomic analysis involved several steps. FASTQ files

of sequenced reads were aligned to human transcriptome (GENCODE annotation model p10

release 27) using the STAR aligner (v2.5.3a), with an average alignment rate of over 80%. Gene-

level expression was quantified by the feature Counts (v1.6.3) and normalized by the voom

function in R/limma packages. Differential expression was called by R/limma. PCA and clustering

were performed in R. Significant DEGs were determined using R/limma at a false discovery rate

of 5%, with a fold change greater than or equal to 2. Gene ontology and pathway enrichment was

performed using Enrichr to determine significantly enriched or depleted pathways, and normalized

enrichment scores reported for top gene ontology and pathway sets.

Network analyses used QIAGEN Ingenuity Pathway Analysis (IPA) (QIAGEN Inc.,

https://digitalinsights.qiagen.com/IPA) using their developed algorithms (78). Included were

DEGs with a FC <-1.5 and >1.5 and a p-value ≤0.01.

Heatmaps for cell cycle were created using bulk RNS-seq results and selecting genes

recommended for cell cycle analyses with sequencing data that are relevant across multiple cellular

models across different biological contexts (49, 50).

Senescence and cell cycle analyses

SA-β-Gal staining was performed using the Senescence Detection Kit (Abcam, ab65351)

following the manufacturer's protocol. Briefly, hAF cells were fixed for 15 min with 1× fixation

solution, washed with PBS and incubated overnight at 37 °C in 1× staining solution. Brightfield

images were captured at 20X on the VWR® Trinocular Inverted Microscope. SA-β-Gal positive

cells from 5 biological replicates with n=9 technical replicates per group were analyzed using the

ImageJ Cell Counter Plugin.

Cleaved-Casp3 staining involved hAF cells fixed in Z-fix formalin fixative for 10 min at

room temperature followed by permeabilization for permeabilization using 0.5% TritonX-100 for

5 minutes. Cells were incubated for 1 hour at room temperature with serum-free protein block

(Dako X0909) to block non-specific binding sites followed by Cleaved-Casp3 primary antibody

(Abcam, ab49822, 1:1000) at 4°C over night. Next, the secondary antibody (Cy™5 Donkey Anti-

Rabbit IgG, 1:400) (Jackson ImmunoResearch, 711-175-152) was added for 1 hour. Finally,

sections were cover slipped using ProLong™ Gold antifade reagent with DAPI (Invitrogen

P36931). Dual-channel images were captured at 20X on the Zeiss AxioImager fluorescence

microscope. For Co-localization analysis, ImageJ Plugin "EzColocalization" was used to quantify

Pearson's correlation coefficient (79). For nuclear fluorescent intensity, the Intensity Density

(IntDen) of Casp3 signal within the nuclear reason was determined using ImageJ. A total of 5

biological replicates with n=4 technical replicates were analyzed.

IHC analysis of human IVDs

Human specimens were fixed in formaldehyde, embedded in resin, and sectioned in the

sagittal plane as previously described (80). Mid-sagittal 5°μm sections from each sample were

stained with picrosirius red/alcian blue (PR/AB) for morphological reference. Prior to staining,

tissue sections were deplasticized and rehydrated. Sections were then treated with proteinase K

(S3020, Dako North America, Carpinteria, CA) followed by protein block (X0909, Dako North

America). At room temperature, sections were incubated for one hour with either rabbit polyclonal

primary antibody against TNF Receptor 1 (dilution 1:400, ab111119, Abcam, Cambridge, MA),

recombinant rabbit monoclonal primary antibody against TNF Receptor 2 [EPR1653] (dilution

1:200, ab109322, Abcam, Cambridge, MA) or normal rabbit serum (ab7487, Abcam) as a negative

control. Then sections were incubated for 30 minutes at room temperature with anti-rabbit IgG

peroxidase secondary antibodies (ImmPRESS reagent, Vector Laboratories, Burlingame, CA).

Afterwards the sections were treated with hydrogen peroxide block (ab94710, Abcam) for 10 min

followed by diaminobenzidine-based peroxidase substrate for a minute (ImmPACT DAB Vector

Laboratories). Finally, the sections were counterstained with 0.1% toluidine blue before mounting.

Whole digital slide images were obtained using NanoZoomer S210 from Hamamatsu.

Quantification of TNFR1/2 was performed using HALO Image Analysis Platform (v3.6.4134.137,

Indica Labs, Albuquerque, NM, USA). Briefly, tissues were annotated to identify the regions to

include in the analysis. Once the analysis area is defined, TNFR1/2 is quantified using HALO

Multiplex module. The bright filed algorithm uses color deconvolution to separate the

chromogenic stains and this allows for the generation of the "markup" image of the of the separated

chromogenic stains based on selected settings that will generate the results.

Statistical analyses

The statistical analyses were performed in R (v4.2.3) using R-based package Seurat (v4.3) for analysis of scRNA-seq data and R-based Limma for analysis of bulk RNA-seq data. For all other data, statistical analyses were performed using GraphPad Prism (v10) software. One-way ANOVA or Two-way ANOVA with Tukey's post-tests were used to compare between groups. Results were displayed as mean ± standard deviation. Significance was accepted at a level of $p < 0.05$.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank Monica Garcia-barros and the Biorepository and Pathology CoRE at the MSSM for the assistance and contribution of the immunohistochemistry quantification using the HALO software. We thank Dr. Nadine Schrode for her assistance and insights on the scRNA-seq analysis. We thank Dr. Nilsson Holguin for useful discussions on interpretations.

Funding

National Institutes of Health / National Institute of Arthritis and Musculoskeletal and Skin Diseases grant R01AR078857 (JCI). National Institutes of Health / National Institute of Arthritis and Musculoskeletal and Skin Diseases grant R01AR080096 (JCI).

Author contributions

Conceptualization: JCI, JG
Study design: JG, EG, JCI
Resource acquisition: SC, ACH, WF, CL
Performed experiments: JG, EG, DL
Analyzed and interpreted the results, and prepared the figures: JG, EG, LR, MW, RS, CL, JCI
Funding acquisition: JCI
Project administration: JG, JCI
Supervision: JCI, JG, RS
Writing—original draft: JG, JCI
Writing—review, editing and approval: JG, EG, LR, MW, DL, SC, ACH, RS, CL, JCI

Competing interests: Authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Data and materials availability: All data are available in the main text or the supplementary

materials. Data and code for RNA-seq analysis will be made available upon manuscript

acceptance.

REFERENCES

1.　Hartvigsen J, Hancock MJ, Kongsted A, Louw Q, Ferreira ML, Genevay S, et al. What
low back pain is and why we need to pay attention. *Lancet.* 2018.
2.　Hoy D, Bain C, Williams G, March L, Brooks P, Blyth F, et al. A systematic review of
the global prevalence of low back pain. *Arthritis Rheum.* 2012;64(6):2028-37.
3.　Hoy D, March L, Brooks P, Blyth F, Woolf A, Bain C, et al. The global burden of low
back pain: estimates from the Global Burden of Disease 2010 study. *Ann Rheum Dis.*
2014;73(6):968-74.
4.　Katz JN. Lumbar disc disorders and low-back pain: socioeconomic factors and
consequences. *J Bone Joint Surg Am.* 2006;88 Suppl 2:21-4.
5.　Fujii K, Lai A, Korda N, Hom WW, Evashwick-Rogler TW, Nasser P, et al. *Ex vivo*
biomechanics of repaired rat intervertebral discs using genipin crosslinked fibrin adhesive
hydrogel. *J Biomech.* 2020;113:110100.
6.　Iatridis JC, Nicoll SB, Michalek AJ, Walter BA, and Gupta MS. Role of biomechanics on
intervertebral disc degeneration and regenerative therapies: What needs repairing in the
IVD and what are promising biomaterials for its repair? *The Spine Journal.* 2012:In
Press.
7.　Bermudez-Lekerika P, Crump KB, Tseranidou S, Nuesch A, Kanelis E, Alminnawi A, et
al. Immuno-Modulatory Effects of Intervertebral Disc Cells. *Front Cell Dev Biol.*
2022;10:924692.
8.　Risbud MV, and Shapiro IM. Role of cytokines in intervertebral disc degeneration: pain
and disc content. *Nat Rev Rheumatol.* 2014;10(1):44-56.
9.　Wang C, Yu X, Yan Y, Yang W, Zhang S, Xiang Y, et al. Tumor necrosis factor-alpha: a
key contributor to intervertebral disc degeneration. *Acta Biochim Biophys Sin (Shanghai).*
2017;49(1):1-13.
10.　Wang X, Wang H, Yang H, Li J, Cai Q, Shapiro IM, et al. Tumor necrosis factor-alpha-
and interleukin-1beta-dependent matrix metalloproteinase-3 expression in nucleus
pulposus cells requires cooperative signaling via syndecan 4 and mitogen-activated
protein kinase-NF-kappaB axis: implications in inflammatory disc disease. *Am J Pathol.*
2014;184(9):2560-72.
11.　Jacobsen HE, Khan AN, Levine ME, Filippi CG, and Chahine NO. Severity of
intervertebral disc herniation regulates cytokine and chemokine levels in patients with
chronic radicular back pain. *Osteoarthritis Cartilage.* 2020;28(10):1341-50.
12.　Le Maitre CL, Freemont AJ, and Hoyland JA. The role of interleukin-1 in the
pathogenesis of human intervertebral disc degeneration. *Arthritis Res Ther.*
2005;7(4):R732-45.

13. Lai A, Moon A, Purmessur D, Skovrlj B, Laudier DM, Winkelstein BA, et al. Annular
puncture with tumor necrosis factor-alpha injection enhances painful behavior with disc
degeneration *in vivo*. *Spine J.* 2016;16(3):420-31.
14. Walter BA, Purmessur D, Likhitpanichkul M, Weinberg A, Cho SK, Qureshi SA, et al.
Inflammatory Kinetics and Efficacy of Anti-inflammatory Treatments on Human
Nucleus Pulposus Cells. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976).* 2015;40(13):955-63.
15. Purmessur D, Freemont AJ, and Hoyland JA. Expression and regulation of neurotrophins
in the nondegenerate and degenerate human intervertebral disc. *Arthritis Res Ther.*
2008;10(4):R99.
16. Richardson SM, Purmessur D, Baird P, Probyn B, Freemont AJ, and Hoyland JA.
Degenerate human nucleus pulposus cells promote neurite outgrowth in neural cells.
PLoS One. 2012;7(10):e47735.
17. Silwal P, Nguyen-Thai AM, Mohammad HA, Wang Y, Robbins PD, Lee JY, et al.
Cellular Senescence in Intervertebral Disc Aging and Degeneration: Molecular
Mechanisms and Potential Therapeutic Opportunities. *Biomolecules.* 2023;13(4).
18. Jiang W, Glaeser JD, Kaneda G, Sheyn J, Wechsler JT, Stephan S, et al. Intervertebral
disc human nucleus pulposus cells associated with back pain trigger neurite outgrowth in
vitro and pain behaviors in rats. *Sci Transl Med.* 2023;15(725):eadg7020.
19. Wang Y, Che M, Xin J, Zheng Z, Li J, and Zhang S. The role of IL-1beta and TNF-alpha
in intervertebral disc degeneration. *Biomed Pharmacother.* 2020;131:110660.
20. Wang S, Sun G, Fan P, Huang L, Chen Y, and Chen C. Distinctive roles of tumor
necrosis factor receptor type 1 and type 2 in a mouse disc degeneration model. *J Orthop
Translat.* 2021;31:62-72.
21. Walter BA, Likhitpanichkul M, Illien-Junger S, Roughley PJ, Hecht AC, and Iatridis JC.
TNFalpha transport induced by dynamic loading alters biomechanics of intact
intervertebral discs. *PLoS One.* 2015;10(3):e0118358.
22. Autio RA, Karppinen J, Niinimaki J, Ojala R, Veeger N, Korhonen T, et al. The effect of
infliximab, a monoclonal antibody against TNF-alpha, on disc herniation resorption: a
randomized controlled study. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976).* 2006;31(23):2641-5.
23. Korhonen T, Karppinen J, Paimela L, Malmivaara A, Lindgren KA, Bowman C, et al.
The treatment of disc-herniation-induced sciatica with infliximab: one-year follow-up
results of FIRST II, a randomized controlled trial. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976).*
2006;31(24):2759-66.
24. Cohen SP, Bogduk N, Dragovich A, Buckenmaier CC, 3rd, Griffith S, Kurihara C, et al.
Randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled, dose-response, and preclinical safety
study of transforaminal epidural etanercept for the treatment of sciatica. *Anesthesiology.*
2009;110(5):1116-26.
25. Sainoh T, Orita S, Miyagi M, Inoue G, Kamoda H, Ishikawa T, et al. Single Intradiscal
Administration of the Tumor Necrosis Factor-Alpha Inhibitor, Etanercept, for Patients
with Discogenic Low Back Pain. *Pain Med.* 2016;17(1):40-5.
26. Genevay S, Viatte S, Finckh A, Zufferey P, Balague F, and Gabay C. Adalimumab in
severe and acute sciatica: a multicenter, randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled
trial. *Arthritis Rheum.* 2010;62(8):2339-46.
27. Goupille P, Mulleman D, Paintaud G, Watier H, and Valat JP. Can sciatica induced by
disc herniation be treated with tumor necrosis factor alpha blockade? *Arthritis Rheum.*
2007;56(12):3887-95.

28.   Jing S, Yang C, Zhang X, Wen S, and Li Y. Efficacy and safety of etanercept in the
treatment of sciatica: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Clin Neurosci.*
2017;44:69-74.

29.   Freeman BJ, Ludbrook GL, Hall S, Cousins M, Mitchell B, Jaros M, et al. Randomized,
double-blind, placebo-controlled, trial of transforaminal epidural etanercept for the
treatment of symptomatic lumbar disc herniation. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976).*
2013;38(23):1986-94.

30.   Evashwick-Rogler TW, Lai A, Watanabe H, Salandra JM, Winkelstein BA, Cho SK, et
al. Inhibiting tumor necrosis factor-alpha at time of induced intervertebral disc injury
limits long-term pain and degeneration in a rat model. *JOR Spine.* 2018;1(2).

31.   Andrade P, Visser-Vandewalle V, Philippens M, Daemen MA, Steinbusch HW, Buurman
WA, et al. Tumor necrosis factor-alpha levels correlate with postoperative pain severity
in lumbar disc hernia patients: opposite clinical effects between tumor necrosis factor
receptor 1 and 2. *Pain.* 2011;152(11):2645-52.

32.   Kalliolias GD, and Ivashkiv LB. TNF biology, pathogenic mechanisms and emerging
therapeutic strategies. *Nat Rev Rheumatol.* 2016;12(1):49-62.

33.   Huang J, Yu S, Ji C, and Li J. Structural basis of cell apoptosis and necrosis in TNFR
signaling. *Apoptosis.* 2015;20(2):210-5.

34.   Yang S, Wang J, Brand DD, and Zheng SG. Role of TNF-TNF Receptor 2 Signal in
Regulatory T Cells and Its Therapeutic Implications. *Front Immunol.* 2018;9:784.

35.   Sedger LM, and McDermott MF. TNF and TNF-receptors: From mediators of cell death
and inflammation to therapeutic giants - past, present and future. *Cytokine Growth Factor*
Rev. 2014;25(4):453-72.

36.   Rajput A, and Ware CF. In: Ralph AB, and Philip DS eds. *Encyclopedia of Cell Biology.*
Waltham: Academic Press; 2016:354-63.

37.   Ding H, Wei J, Zhao Y, Liu Y, Liu L, and Cheng L. Progranulin derived engineered
protein Atsttrin suppresses TNF-alpha-mediated inflammation in intervertebral disc
degenerative disease. *Oncotarget.* 2017;8(65):109692-702.

38.   Liu CJ, and Bosch X. Progranulin: a growth factor, a novel TNFR ligand and a drug
target. *Pharmacol Ther.* 2012;133(1):124-32.

39.   Tang W, Lu Y, Tian QY, Zhang Y, Guo FJ, Liu GY, et al. The growth factor progranulin
binds to TNF receptors and is therapeutic against inflammatory arthritis in mice. *Science.*
2011;332(6028):478-84.

40.   Zhao YP, Tian QY, Liu B, Cuellar J, Richbourgh B, Jia TH, et al. Progranulin knockout
accelerates intervertebral disc degeneration in aging mice. *Sci Rep.* 2015;5:9102.

41.   Wei JL, Fu W, Ding YJ, Hettinghouse A, Lendhey M, Schwarzkopf R, et al. Progranulin
derivative Atsttrin protects against early osteoarthritis in mouse and rat models. *Arthritis*
Res Ther. 2017;19(1):280.

42.   Purmessur D, Walter BA, Roughley PJ, Laudier DM, Hecht AC, and Iatridis J. A role for
TNFalpha in intervertebral disc degeneration: a non-recoverable catabolic shift. *Biochem*
Biophys Res Commun. 2013;433(1):151-6.

43.   Maidhof R, Jacobsen T, Papatheodorou A, and Chahine NO. Inflammation induces
irreversible biophysical changes in isolated nucleus pulposus cells. *PLoS One.*
2014;9(6):e99621.

44.   Johnson ZI, Doolittle AC, Snuggs JW, Shapiro IM, Le Maitre CL, and Risbud MV. TNF-
alpha promotes nuclear enrichment of the transcription factor TonEBP/NFAT5 to

selectively control inflammatory but not osmoregulatory responses in nucleus pulposus
cells. *J Biol Chem.* 2017;292(42):17561-75.

45.   Charytonowicz D, Brody R, and Sebra R. Interpretable and context-free deconvolution of
multi-scale whole transcriptomic data with UniCell deconvolve. *Nat Commun.*
2023;14(1):1350.

46.   McDonnell EE, and Buckley CT. Two- and three-dimensional in vitro nucleus pulposus
cultures: An in silico analysis of local nutrient microenvironments. *JOR Spine.*
2022;5(3):e1222.

47.   Tye BK. MCM proteins in DNA replication. *Annu Rev Biochem.* 1999;68:649-86.

48.   Han L, Chen Z, Yu K, Yan J, Li T, Ba X, et al. Interleukin 27 Signaling in Rheumatoid
Arthritis Patients: Good or Evil? *Front Immunol.* 2021;12:787252.

49.   Whitfield ML, Sherlock G, Saldanha AJ, Murray JI, Ball CA, Alexander KE, et al.
Identification of genes periodically expressed in the human cell cycle and their
expression in tumors. *Mol Biol Cell.* 2002;13(6):1977-2000.

50.   Riba A, Oravecz A, Durik M, Jimenez S, Alunni V, Cerciat M, et al. Cell cycle gene
regulation dynamics revealed by RNA velocity and deep-learning. *Nat Commun.*
2022;13(1):2865.

51.   Weber KT, Alipui DO, Sison CP, Bloom O, Quraishi S, Overby MC, et al. Serum levels
of the proinflammatory cytokine interleukin-6 vary based on diagnoses in individuals
with lumbar intervertebral disc diseases. *Arthritis Res Ther.* 2016;18:3.

52.   Vaday GG, Hershkoviz R, Rahat MA, Lahat N, Cahalon L, and Lider O. Fibronectin-
bound TNF-alpha stimulates monocyte matrix metalloproteinase-9 expression and
regulates chemotaxis. *J Leukoc Biol.* 2000;68(5):737-47.

53.   Feng C, Liu H, Yang M, Zhang Y, Huang B, and Zhou Y. Disc cell senescence in
intervertebral disc degeneration: Causes and molecular pathways. *Cell Cycle.*
2016;15(13):1674-84.

54.   Adams MA, Lama P, Zehra U, and Dolan P. Why do some intervertebral discs
degenerate, when others (in the same spine) do not? *Clin Anat.* 2015;28(2):195-204.

55.   Nakazawa KR, Walter BA, Laudier DM, Krishnamoorthy D, Mosley GE, Spiller KL, et
al. Accumulation and localization of macrophage phenotypes with human intervertebral
disc degeneration. *Spine J.* 2018;18(2):343-56.

56.   Huang YC, Urban JP, and Luk KD. Intervertebral disc regeneration: do nutrients lead the
way? *Nat Rev Rheumatol.* 2014;10(9):561-6.

57.   Le Maitre CL, Freemont AJ, and Hoyland JA. Accelerated cellular senescence in
degenerate intervertebral discs: a possible role in the pathogenesis of intervertebral disc
degeneration. *Arthritis Res Ther.* 2007;9(3):R45.

58.   Yee A, Lam MP, Tam V, Chan WC, Chu IK, Cheah KS, et al. Fibrotic-like changes in
degenerate human intervertebral discs revealed by quantitative proteomic analysis.
Osteoarthritis Cartilage. 2016;24(3):503-13.

59.   Patil P, Niedernhofer LJ, Robbins PD, Lee J, Sowa G, and Vo N. Cellular senescence in
intervertebral disc aging and degeneration. *Curr Mol Biol Rep.* 2018;4(4):180-90.

60.   Yurube T, Takeoka Y, Kanda Y, Kuroda R, and Kakutani K. Intervertebral disc cell fate
during aging and degeneration: apoptosis, senescence, and autophagy. *N Am Spine Soc J.*
2023;14:100210.

61.   Bachmeier BE, Nerlich AG, Weiler C, Paesold G, Jochum M, and Boos N. Analysis of
tissue distribution of TNF-alpha, TNF-alpha-receptors, and the activating TNF-alpha-

converting enzyme suggests activation of the TNF-alpha system in the aging
intervertebral disc. *Ann N Y Acad Sci.* 2007;1096:44-54.

62. Phillips KL, Chiverton N, Michael AL, Cole AA, Breakwell LM, Haddock G, et al. The
cytokine and chemokine expression profile of nucleus pulposus cells: implications for
degeneration and regeneration of the intervertebral disc. *Arthritis Res Ther.*
2013;15(6):R213.

63. Stover JD, Trone MAR, Weston J, Lewis C, Levis H, Philippi M, et al. Therapeutic TNF-
alpha Delivery After CRISPR Receptor Modulation in the Intervertebral Disc. *bioRxiv.*
2023:2023.05.31.542947.

64. Parisien M, Lima LV, Dagostino C, El-Hachem N, Drury GL, Grant AV, et al. Acute
inflammatory response via neutrophil activation protects against the development of
chronic pain. *Sci Transl Med.* 2022;14(644):eabj9954.

65. Chazaud B. Inflammation and Skeletal Muscle Regeneration: Leave It to the
Macrophages! *Trends Immunol.* 2020;41(6):481-92.

66. Howell KL, Kaji DA, Li TM, Montero A, Yeoh K, Nasser P, et al. Macrophage depletion
impairs neonatal tendon regeneration. *FASEB J.* 2021;35(6):e21618.

67. Franzen O, Gan LM, and Bjorkegren JLM. PanglaoDB: a web server for exploration of
mouse and human single-cell RNA sequencing data. *Database (Oxford).* 2019;2019.

68. Takeshita S, Kaji K, and Kudo A. Identification and characterization of the new
osteoclast progenitor with macrophage phenotypes being able to differentiate into mature
osteoclasts. *J Bone Miner Res.* 2000;15(8):1477-88.

69. Eming SA, Wynn TA, and Martin P. Inflammation and metabolism in tissue repair and
regeneration. *Science.* 2017;356(6342):1026-30.

70. Chen F, Lei L, Chen S, Zhao Z, Huang Y, Jiang G, et al. Serglycin secreted by late-stage
nucleus pulposus cells is a biomarker of intervertebral disc degeneration. *Nat Commun.*
2024;15(1):47.

71. Cherif H, Mannarino M, Pacis AS, Ragoussis J, Rabau O, Ouellet JA, et al. Single-Cell
RNA-Seq Analysis of Cells from Degenerating and Non-Degenerating Intervertebral
Discs from the Same Individual Reveals New Biomarkers for Intervertebral Disc
Degeneration. *Int J Mol Sci.* 2022;23(7).

72. Gan Y, He J, Zhu J, Xu Z, Wang Z, Yan J, et al. Spatially defined single-cell
transcriptional profiling characterizes diverse chondrocyte subtypes and nucleus pulposus
progenitors in human intervertebral discs. *Bone Res.* 2021;9(1):37.

73. Peredo AP, Gullbrand SE, Friday CS, Orozco BS, Dehghani B, Jenk AC, et al. Tension-
activated nanofiber patches delivering an anti-inflammatory drug improve repair in a goat
intervertebral disc herniation model. *Sci Transl Med.* 2023;15(722):eadf1690.

74. Rutges JP, Duit RA, Kummer JA, Bekkers JE, Oner FC, Castelein RM, et al. A validated
new histological classification for intervertebral disc degeneration. *Osteoarthritis*
Cartilage. 2013;21(12):2039-47.

75. Satija R, Farrell JA, Gennert D, Schier AF, and Regev A. Spatial reconstruction of
single-cell gene expression data. *Nat Biotechnol.* 2015;33(5):495-502.

76. Shaath H, Vishnubalaji R, Elkord E, and Alajez NM. Single-Cell Transcriptome Analysis
Highlights a Role for Neutrophils and Inflammatory Macrophages in the Pathogenesis of
Severe COVID-19. *Cells.* 2020;9(11).

77. Livak KJ, and Schmittgen TD. Analysis of relative gene expression data using real-time
quantitative PCR and the 2(-Delta Delta C(T)) Method. *Methods.* 2001;25(4):402-8.

78. Kramer A, Green J, Pollard J, Jr., and Tugendreich S. Causal analysis approaches in
Ingenuity Pathway Analysis. *Bioinformatics.* 2014;30(4):523-30.
79. Stauffer W, Sheng H, and Lim HN. EzColocalization: An ImageJ plugin for visualizing
and measuring colocalization in cells and organisms. *Sci Rep.* 2018;8(1):15764.
80. Walter BA, Torre OM, Laudier D, Naidich TP, Hecht AC, and Iatridis JC. Form and
function of the intervertebral disc in health and disease: a morphological and stain
comparison study. *J Anat.* 2015;227(6):707-16.
863
864

865 **FIGURES & LEGENDS**

867
FIGURE 1

Fig. 1. Painful human IVDD tissue contains high concentrations chemokines and cytokines,
dominantly expressed from a small population of M1 macrophages highly enriched
for TNF-alpha signaling. (A) Specimen from subjects were collected and either used for
CM generation and characterization (top) or for cell dissociation and scRNA-seq analysis
(bottom). (B) IVDD CM contains a complex array of pro- and anti-inflammatory
cytokines and chemokines. (C) IVDD cytokines are dominantly expressed by
macrophage sub-population of IVD cells with surprisingly little expression in other
IVDD cell populations. (D) UMAP of IVDD cells annotated with UniCell Deconvolve
identified 7 cell types including a small population of macrophages. Since relatively few
IVD studies are included in the UniCell Deconvolve training set, we parenthetically
added IVD-specific annotations to the UMAP. (E) Volcano plot shows DEGs with pro-
inflammatory genes CCL3, CCL4 and IL1B as most significantly upregulated genes,
which contribute to (F) pathways analysis revealing TNF-alpha signaling as the most
significant and highest enriched pathway of this population. (G) M1/M2 macrophage
polarization quantification showed a 3-fold higher amount of M1 macrophages within the
IVD.

886
887
FIGURE 2

Fig. 2. Human AF cell IVDD model system shows CM reduces MTT metabolic activity and
modulates TNFR1 and TNFR2 responses. (A) CM generated from 9 subjects were first
applied in different dosages (0-100%) for 24 hours ("Media Dosing"), followed by
culture for 24 hours and 72 hours respectively ("Media Timing") (B) Cell growth area
decreases with increasing concentration of CM, which is reflected in (C) where cell
proliferation significantly decreases with increasing CM, indicated by MTT assay. (D)
Culturing hAF cells for 72 hours in CM has a detrimental effect on cell growth and
morphology compared to Basal and 24 hours CM exposure, which is also seen in (E) with
significantly lower relative OD, indicating lower cell growth, and (F) reduced *COL1A1*
and *ADAMTS4* expression, and limited inflammatory response (Fig. S3). (G) hAF cell
culture in CM for 24 hours significantly increases gene expression *TNFRSF1A* (gene for
TNFR1) and *TNFRSF1B* (gene for TNFR2) compared to Basal and 72 hours culture. (H)
Relative gene expression normalized to *GAPDH* of *TNFRSF1A* and *TNFRSP1B* after 24
and 72 hours ($2^{-\Delta CT}$). *, **, *** and **** represent significant differences between
groups with p< 0.05, 0.01, 0.001 and 0.0001 respectively. Scale bar = 100 μm.

FIGURE 3

Fig. 3. TNFR1 blocking of hAF cells with IVDD CM partially rescues metabolic rate and
expresses a pro-inflammatory transcriptome while TNFR2 blocking and Atsttrin
had no effects. (A) Cells were either cultured for 24 hours in Basal media, CM or CM
supplemented with αTNFR1, TNFR2 or Atsttrin respectively. (B) hAF cells in CM,
αTNFR2 and Atsttrin show greater number of floating dead cells (arrowheads), which is
consistent with (C) reduced cell growth/viability in CM, αTNFR2 and Atsttrin compared
to basal, which was partly recovered in αTNFR1. (D) Distinct transcriptomic difference
between Basal, αTNFR1 and all other groups are apparent in PCA plot, and (E) heatmap,
which shows a clear change in top DRG patterns with many pro-inflammatory genes
among the top 50 DEGs. (F) Gene expression of TNFR1 is significantly downregulated
upon TNFR1 blocking, whereas TNFR2 is upregulated. *, ** and *** represent
significant differences between groups with $p < 0.05$, 0.01 and 0.001 respectively. Scale
bar = 50 µm.

FIGURE 4

Fig. 4. CM reduces mitotic responses while TNFR1 inhibition promotes processes for
immune cell recruitment. (A) 509 of 1271 DEGs in CM were significantly
downregulated compared to Basal. (B) Biological processes depleted upon CM were
related to DNA replication and mitosis. (C) Comparing αTNFR1 to CM, 454/1035 DEGs
were significantly upregulated. (D) Biological processes modulated by αTNFR1were
related to an enrichment of IL-27 signaling and RNase activity. (E) Volcano plot
comparing αTNFR1 to Basal significantly upregulated 1072/1520 DEGs. (D) Hereby,
biological processes related to cytokine signaling and inflammatory responses were
enriched, while axonogenesis and axon guidance was depleted. (G) Qiagen IPA analysis
of CM vs Basal predicted an activation of senescence while proliferation was inhibited.
(H) Inhibition of TNFR1 activates processes related to immune-cell recruitment in IPA
analysis.

FIGURE 5

Fig. 5. IVDD CM inhibited active hAF cell mitosis and promoted senescence that was
partially prevented with TNFR1 inhibition. (A) Schematic of different stages of the
cell cycle. (B) Heatmaps using transcripts selected to study cell cycle in multiple cellular
models and different biological contexts (49, 50) showed Basal activated hAF cell cycle
while CM caused expression of G0 phase transcripts. (C) MKI67 proliferation marker
was significantly decreased in CM compared to Basal and αTNFR1. (D) SA-β-Gal
staining of hAF cells was (E) significantly higher in CM compared to Basal and
αTNFR1. (F) Staining for cleaved Casp3 showed (G) no difference in co-localization of
cleaved Casp3 and DAPI and (H) no difference nuclear cleaved Casp3 intensity density.
*, ** and **** represented p< 0.05, 0.01 and 0.0001, respectively. Scale bar = 50 µm.

FIGURE 6

Fig. 6. TNFR1 expression was expressed in all IVD cells and correlated with IVD
degeneration grade while TNFR2 was only expressed in macrophages and not IVD
cells. (A) Analysis of IHC was performed using HALO Multiplex module, whereby the
oAF region was determined using PSR/AB staining and the ROI overlayed onto
TNFR1/2 IHC imaged for follow up AI-based analysis. (B) Intensity and quantity of
TNFR1 increases with Rutgers degeneration grade, while TNFR2 shows faint staining
across degeneration. (C) Correlation between TNFR1 positive cells and Rutgers grade is
significant (p=0.0162), while (D) there is no correlation with TNFR2 positive cells and
Rutgers grade. (E) UMAP of herniated IVD specimen showed TNFR1 expression across
cell populations and little TNFR2 expression. (F) TNFR2 is expressed exclusively in
macrophage-derived cell population. Scale bar (full IVD) = 5 mm, Scale bar (AF cell) =
10 μm.

Table 1. Experimental groups for *in vitro* hAF cell culture experiments

	Groups and supplements		Duration
Dosing	Basal	-	24 hours
	CM	25% 50% 100%	
Timing	Basal	-	24 hours
	CM	100%	72 hours
TNFR blocking	Basal	-	24 hours
	CM	-	
	CM + αTNFR1	10 µg/mL	
	CM + αTNFR2	10 µg/mL	
	CM + Atsttrin	200 ng/mL	