Engineering inducible signaling receptors to enable erythropoietin-free
erythropoiesis

Aadit P. Shah[1,2]*, Kiran R. Majeti[2]*, Freja K. Ekman[1,2,3], Sridhar Selvaraj[2], Eric Soupene[4],
Prathamesh Chati[5], Roshani Sinha[6,7], Sofia E. Luna[1,2], Carsten T. Charlesworth[3], Travis
McCreary[6,7], Benjamin J. Lesch[6,7], Devesh Sharma[6,7], Simon N. Chu[6,7], Matthew H.
Porteus[2]†, M. Kyle Cromer[6,7,8]†

Affiliations:
[1]School of Medicine, Stanford University, Stanford, CA, USA
[2]Department of Pediatrics, Stanford University, Stanford, CA, USA
[3]Department of Genetics, Stanford University, Stanford, CA, USA
[4]Benioff Children's Hospital Oakland, University of California, San Francisco, San
Francisco, CA, USA
[5]Department of Biological & Medical Informatics, University of California, San Francisco,
San Francisco, CA, USA
[6]Department of Surgery, University of California, San Francisco, San Francisco, CA, USA
[7]Eli & Edythe Broad Center for Regeneration Medicine, University of California, San
Francisco, San Francisco, CA, USA
[8]Department of Bioengineering & Therapeutic Sciences, University of California, San
Francisco, San Francisco, CA, USA

*These authors contributed equally to the study
†Correspondence: mporteus@stanford.edu, kyle.cromer@uscf.edu

Abstract

Blood transfusion plays a vital role in modern medicine. However, availability is
contingent on donated blood, and frequent shortages pose a significant healthcare
challenge. *Ex vivo* manufacturing of red blood cells (RBCs) derived from universal donor
O-negative pluripotent stem cells emerges as a solution, yet the high cost of recombinant
cytokines required for *ex vivo* erythroid differentiation remains a major barrier.
Erythropoietin (EPO) signaling through the EPO receptor is indispensable to RBC

development, and EPO is one of the most expensive components in erythroid-promoting media. Here, we used design-build-test cycles to develop highly optimized small molecule-inducible EPO receptors (iEPORs) which were integrated at a variety of genomic loci using homology-directed repair genome editing. We found that integration of iEPOR at the endogenous *EPOR* locus in an induced pluripotent stem cell producer line enabled culture with small molecule to yield equivalent erythroid differentiation, transcriptomic changes, and hemoglobin production compared to cells cultured with EPO. Due to the dramatically lower cost of small molecules vs. recombinant cytokines, these efforts eliminate one of the most expensive elements of *ex vivo* culture media— EPO cytokine. Because dependence on cytokines is a common barrier to *ex vivo* cell production, these strategies could improve scalable manufacturing of a wide variety of clinically relevant cell types. More broadly, this work showcases how synthetic biology and genome editing may be combined to introduce precisely regulated and tunable behavior into cells, an advancement which will pave the way for increasingly sophisticated cell engineering strategies.

Introduction

Blood cell transfusion plays an essential role in modern medicine. In support of surgery, obstetrics, trauma care, and cancer chemotherapy, approximately 35,000 units of blood are drawn daily in the U.S., contributing to an annual provision of 12 million red blood cell (RBC) units[1]. However, availability is contingent on donated blood, resulting in supply constraints and safety concerns. Blood shortages pose a significant global healthcare challenge, expected to worsen with aging populations and decreasing donor numbers[2]. Moreover, patient populations with especially rare blood types constitute up to 5% of blood transfusion cases[3] and are most vulnerable to these shortages. From a financial perspective, the cost of RBC transfusion has been steadily increasing over the past two decades, accounting for nearly 10% of total inpatient hospital expenditure[4]. Collectively, these factors are expected to worsen the significant unmet medical need for transfusable blood.

To address these challenges, *ex vivo* manufacturing of RBCs in bioreactors from producer cell lines, such as pluripotent stem cells (PSCs), emerges as a renewable and

scalable solution[5]. Early clinical trials have shown that *ex vivo*-derived RBCs may be

delivered to patients with no reported adverse events[6]. In addition, *ex vivo*-derived RBCs

offer potential benefits compared to donor blood, including a lower risk of infectious

disease transmission, streamlined production, product uniformity, and ability to source

or genetically engineer antigen-negative cells[2]. However, *ex vivo* RBC production is still

prohibitively expensive, owing in large part to the high cost of recombinant cytokines

required to stimulate producer cells to expand and differentiate into erythroid cells[7].

Erythropoietin (EPO) signaling through the EPO receptor (EPOR) is indispensable to RBC

development[8], and of all components in erythroid-promoting media, EPO is one of the

most expensive[7]. Given prior success manipulating the EPOR to increase erythropoietic

output[9] and the ease with which erythroid development is modeled *ex vivo*[10], in this work

we used synthetic biology tools and genome editing technology to de-couple EPOR

signaling from the EPO cytokine.

The cellular mechanisms that regulate erythroid differentiation from hematopoietic

stem and progenitor cells (HSPCs) are well understood, and efficient differentiation

requires activation of the EPOR/JAK/STAT signaling cascade by EPO[11]. In its native form,

two EPOR monomers dimerize in the presence of EPO to activate downstream

signaling[12]. Prior work has shown that EPOR dimerization may be initiated by a range of

dimer orientations and proximities using agonistic diabodies or in the context of chimeric

receptors[12–14]. Because mutant FK506 binding proteins (FKBP)-based dimerization

domains have been deployed to create small molecule-inducible safety switches[15], we

hypothesized that FKBP domains could be repurposed to create synthetic EPOR

receptors to place EPO signaling under control of a small molecule. Here, we

demonstrate that EPOR signaling can be induced by small molecule stimulation of highly

optimized chimeric receptors—hereafter termed inducible EPORs (iEPORs). We then

used homology-directed repair genome editing to integrate these iEPORs under

regulation of various endogenous and exogenous promoters to identify strategies that

best recapitulate native EPOR signaling.

This work establishes iEPORs as a tool that enables highly efficient *ex vivo*

production of RBCs using a low-cost small molecule. By removing dependence on one

of the most expensive elements of *ex vivo* erythrocyte production, these efforts address

one of the major barriers to meeting the global demand for blood with *ex vivo*-

manufactured RBCs. More broadly, this work demonstrates how synthetic biology and

genome editing may be combined to introduce precisely regulated and tunable behavior

into cells for a wide variety of therapeutic applications.

Results

FKBP-EPOR chimeras enable small molecule-dependent erythropoiesis

To determine whether FKBP domains could be successfully repurposed to

dimerize EPOR monomers and initiate downstream EPOR signaling, we first designed a

set of seven candidate FKBP-EPOR chimeras. These included placement of the FKBP

domain at the N-terminus, C-terminus, at various locations within the native EPOR, and

as a full replacement of the EPOR extracellular domain (**Fig. 1A**). DNA donor templates

corresponding to each design were packaged in AAV6 vectors and integrated into the

CCR5 safe harbor site in human primary HSPCs using combined CRISPR/AAV6-

mediated genome as previously described[16–18]. Expression of each FKBP-EPOR chimera

was driven by the strong, constitutive SFFV promoter followed by a 2A-YFP to allow

fluorescent readout of edited cells (**Fig. 1A**). Edited HSPCs were then subjected to an

established 14-day *ex vivo* erythrocyte differentiation protocol[19,20] in the absence of EPO

and with or without 1nM of FKBP dimerizer AP20187 small molecule (hereafter referred

to as "BB" dimerizer)[15]. Since EPO is essential for differentiation, we hypothesized that

erythroid differentiation would only occur when BB stimulated a functional iEPOR to

activate downstream signaling (**Fig. 1B**).

At the end of differentiation, we stained cells for established erythroid markers

and analyzed by flow cytometry (**Supplementary Fig. S1**). As expected, we found that

unedited "Mock" conditions yielded no erythroid cells (CD34$^-$/CD45$^-$/CD71$^+$/GPA$^+$), while

HSPCs edited with iEPOR designs 1.4 and 1.5 showed BB-dependent erythroid

differentiation (**Fig. 1C**; **Supplementary Fig. S2**). Although FKBP-EPOR design 1.4

appeared to be most effective, for downstream optimizations we iterated on design 1.5

due to the smaller cassette size and because removal of the entire EPOR extracellular

domain is expected to eliminate potential activation by EPO cytokine. This allowed us to

create a receptor that could activate the EPOR pathway only when dimerizer was present

but not when endogenous hormone was present. Further investigation of iEPOR 1.5

found a >4x selective advantage imparted to edited cells by the end of erythroid
differentiation when cells were cultured in the presence of BB without EPO as indicated
by increasing edited allele frequency measured by droplet digital PCR (ddPCR)(**Fig. 1D**).
In addition, virtually all cells that acquired erythroid markers in the iEPOR 1.5 condition
were YFP[+] (**Fig. 1E**), indicating that only edited cells were capable of differentiation.

To investigate why certain FKBP-EPOR designs were non-functional, we used
AlphaFold2[21] to generate *in silico* structure predictions of each candidate iEPOR in
comparison to wild-type EPOR. We observed a high-confidence structure generated
across wild-type EPOR extracellular and transmembrane domains, with low-confidence
scores given to signal peptide and intracellular regions (**Supplementary Fig. S3**). For
candidate iEPORs, we observed a high-confidence structure corresponding to the FKBP
domain at the anticipated location among all designs. Although this analysis did not
reveal any obvious protein structure disruption caused by addition of FKBP domains to
the EPOR protein, our experiments demonstrated that FKBP placement within the EPOR
has a great bearing on its signaling potential. We found that only those constructs with
FKBP placed immediately upstream of the EPOR transmembrane domain could initiate
BB-dependent signaling. Therefore, it is possible that designs with FKBP within the
intracellular domain may interfere with JAK/STAT signaling, while FKBPs placed further
upstream of the transmembrane domain may not mediate sufficient proximity of EPOR
intracellular domains to achieve sustained signaling.

Signal peptides and hypermorphic EPOR mutation increase iEPOR potency

Initial iEPOR designs 1.4 and 1.5 both mediated BB-dependent erythroid
production, yet they were unable to achieve a level of differentiation equivalent to
unedited cells cultured with EPO (mean of 78.9% and 32.2% of the amount of
differentiation achieved with unedited cells +EPO for iEPOR 1.4 and 1.5, respectively;
Fig. 1C). Therefore, we engineered second-generation iEPORs to determine if addition
of a signal peptide (SP) onto iEPOR 1.5 could enhance potency, since elimination of the
entire EPOR extracellular domain also removes the native SP at the N-terminus. To test
the effect of these modifications, we designed and built constructs that added the native
EPOR SP or the IL6 SP[22] onto the N-terminus of iEPOR 1.5. This comparison was

performed because SPs for cytokines are known to be particularly strong[23,24], and we

observed in unpublished work that the IL6 SP effectively mediates export to the HSPC

membrane (data not shown). These DNA donor templates were packaged into AAV6 and

integrated into the *CCR5* locus as before (**Fig. 2A**). We then performed *ex vivo* erythroid

differentiation in the presence or absence of EPO and BB. We found that addition of

EPOR SP and IL6 SP both improved mean erythroid differentiation in the presence of BB

alone (44.5% and 62.6%, respectively) compared to the original iEPOR 1.5 design

(32.2%)(**Fig. 2B** & **Supplementary Fig. S4**). These vectors also yielded a further selective

advantage in the presence of BB (both with and without EPO), achieving a mean 10.0-

and 10.6-fold increase in edited allele frequency by the end of erythroid differentiation

with addition of EPOR and IL6 SPs, respectively (**Fig. 2C** & **Supplementary Fig. S5A**).

Given the higher efficacy of iEPOR 1.5 with IL6 SP, we investigated whether

incorporation of a naturally occurring nonsense mutation (*EPOR*^{W439X}) that truncates the

70 C-terminal amino acids of EPOR and eliminates a negative inhibitory domain may

additionally increase receptor potency[9]. Therefore, we designed a vector with this

truncated EPOR intracellular domain as well as IL6 SP and observed a further

enhancement, achieving a mean of 90.9% erythroid differentiation compared to EPO-

cultured HSPCs (**Fig. 2B**). This significantly increased the selective advantage of edited

cells cultured in the presence of BB, achieving a mean 11.9-fold increase in edited alleles

by the end of erythroid differentiation (**Fig. 2C**). As before, virtually all cells that acquired

erythroid markers were YFP$^+$, indicating that only edited cells stimulated with BB were

able to initiate EPOR signaling (**Fig. 2D**). Notably, a substantial portion of cells also

differentiated in the absence of BB, which we addressed in downstream experiments.

We will hereafter refer to our optimized FKBP-EPOR design 1.5 with IL6 SP and naturally

occurring truncation as "iEPOR").

To ensure that iEPOR-stimulated erythroid cells produce functional hemoglobin,

we performed hemoglobin tetramer high-performance liquid chromatography (HPLC) at

the end of erythroid differentiation. We found that cells edited with the optimized iEPOR

and cultured with BB yielded a hemoglobin production profile consisting primarily of adult

and fetal hemoglobin (HbA and HbF, respectively). This hemoglobin production profile

was indistinguishable from that produced by unedited cells culture with EPO (**Fig. 2E**).

Finally, we used AlphaFold2 to predict the structure of the optimized iEPOR and

find remarkable similarity to the predicted structure of the naturally occurring truncated

EPOR (**Fig. 2F**). As expected, we observe a shortening of the low-confidence intracellular domain for the truncated EPOR compared to wild-type EPOR (**Supplementary Fig. S6**) as well as a high-confidence structure corresponding to the FKBP domain in the expected location for the optimized iEPOR. As with native EPOR SP, we also observe a low-confidence region corresponding to the IL6 SP.

iEPOR expression profile impacts receptor function

        While our optimized iEPOR was effective at mediating small molecule-dependent erythroid differentiation and hemoglobin production, we observed some erythroid differentiation and hemoglobin production in the absence of BB as well (**Fig. 2B-E**). This could be due to the strong, constitutive viral SFFV promoter driving supraphysiologic levels of receptor expression that induced ligand-independent dimerization. In contrast to the potent SFFV promoter, prior work has shown that CD34^{+} HSPCs express low levels of the endogenous *EPOR*, and expression increases modestly over the course of *ex vivo* erythroid differentiation[25]. Therefore, in the next round of optimizations, we explored the impact of various expression profiles on iEPOR activity. To do so, we developed targeted integration strategies that placed an identical optimized iEPOR under expression from: 1) an exogenous yet weaker, constitutive human *PGK1* promoter following integration at the *CCR5* locus (hereafter referred to as "*PGK*(iEPOR)"); 2) the strong erythroid-specific *HBA1* promoter following integration into the start codon of the *HBA1* locus[10] (hereafter referred to as "*HBA1*(iEPOR)"); and 3) the endogenous *EPOR* locus following integration into the 3' end of the gene and linked by a 2A cleavage peptide (hereafter referred to as "*EPOR*(iEPOR)")(**Fig. 3A**). We chose these additional integration strategies to investigate whether extremely high *iEPOR* expression or simply constitutive expression throughout differentiation was most responsible for the dimerizer-independent activity of SFFV(iEPOR). These experiments also investigated whether erythroid-specific expression of iEPOR from the highly expressed *HBA1* locus may elicit the most dramatic pro-erythroid effect or if, alternatively, integration of iEPOR at the endogenous *EPOR* locus may best recapitulate native EPOR signaling—analogous to the effective regulation of synthetic T cell receptors when knocked into the native *TRAC* locus[26].

Following integration of each vector into the intended site in primary HSPCs, we

performed *ex vivo* erythroid differentiation in presence or absence of EPO and BB. We

observed that all three integration strategies yielded effective erythroid differentiation in

presence of BB compared to unedited cells cultured with EPO (**Fig. 3B** & **C**). However,

the greatest differences were found in edited conditions cultured without BB or EPO.

Compared to the mean 26.3% erythroid differentiation we observed previously in the

SFFV(iEPOR)-edited condition without EPO or BB, expression of iEPOR from the *PGK*

and *EPOR* promoters both reduced BB-independent activity (mean of 2.2% and 20.0%

in *PGK*(iEPOR) and *EPOR*(iEPOR) conditions, respectively)(**Fig. 3B** & **C**). In contrast, we

found that expression of iEPOR from the *HBA1* promoter drove high frequencies of

erythroid differentiation in the presence and absence of BB, indicating constitutive

activity (**Fig. 3B** & **C**). Because *HBA1* is expressed much more highly than *EPOR* by the

end of *ex vivo* differentiation[27], we hypothesize this BB-independent activity could be a

result of supraphysiologic levels of *iEPOR* expression from the *HBA1* promoter that leads

to spontaneous signaling even in absence of dimerizing ligand. As before, we confirmed

that each iEPOR integration strategy yielded normal production of adult and fetal

hemoglobin when edited cells were cultured in the presence of BB without EPO (**Fig. 3D**).

Due to the high level of erythroid differentiation observed in the *HBA1*(iEPOR) condition,

it was unsurprising that edited cells cultured with neither EPO nor BB also produced a

substantial amount of adult and fetal hemoglobin.

Next, we determined whether expression of *iEPOR* from these different promoters

has a bearing on the dose response to BB. While prior work using BB found 1nM to be

most effective at activating small molecule-inducible safety switches[15], we observed

substantial erythroid differentiation at levels well below 1nM of BB. In fact, we found that

1pM and 10pM of BB yielded erythroid differentiation that was comparable to EPO in

cells edited with *EPOR*(iEPOR) and *PGK*(iEPOR) strategies, respectively (**Fig. 3E**).

However, to achieve mean differentiation that was identical to or greater than EPO-

stimulated cells required a dose of 0.1nM for *PGK*(iEPOR)- and *EPOR*(iEPOR)-edited

populations. In contrast, we found that cells edited with *HBA1*(iEPOR) yielded efficient

erythroid differentiation across the entire dose range, including in the absence of BB (**Fig.**

3E), consistent with constitutive activity of this integration strategy.

In its native form, EPO cytokine dimerizes two EPOR monomers, leading to a

JAK/STAT signaling cascade culminating in translocation of phosphorylated STAT5 to

the nucleus, which initiates a pro-erythroid transcriptional program[11]. While we have

shown that iEPOR-edited cells stimulated with BB acquire classic erythroid markers and

produce normal hemoglobin profiles, an open question is whether this synthetic stimulus

recapitulates the complex transcriptional response of native EPOR signaling (**Fig. 4A**). To

investigate this, we edited HSPCs with our various iEPOR integration strategies (**Fig. 3A**)

and performed bulk RNA-sequencing (RNA-Seq) on at d14 of erythroid differentiation in

absence of EPO and presence of BB. For comparison, we also performed RNA-Seq on

unedited cells at the beginning (d0) and end (d14) of erythroid differentiation in the

presence of EPO. These efforts yielded an average of 55.1M reads per sample with

98.5% of reads aligned to the genome and 97.2% with Quality Score $\geq$20

(**Supplementary Fig. S7**).

In analyzing these data, we found that alpha-, gamma-, and beta-globin are

among the most significantly upregulated genes in unedited cells at d14 vs. d0 (**Fig. 4B**

& **C**). Similarly for all cells edited with iEPOR, these globins are also among the most

significantly upregulated genes (**Fig. 4B** & **C**). In fact, by the end of differentiation these

globins comprise a mean of 86.5%, 76.9%, 63.3%, and 83.7% of all reads for unedited

cells cultured with EPO as well as *PGK*(iEPOR)-, *HBA1*(iEPOR), and *EPOR*(iEPOR)-edited

cells cultured with BB, respectively (**Supplementary Fig. S8A**). As previously observed,

we found that *EPOR* expression increases over the course of erythroid differentiation[25]

(38.8-fold from d0 to d14 in unedited cells; **Fig. 4B** & **Supplementary Fig. S8B**). In all

iEPOR-edited cells we observe roughly equivalent levels of *EPOR* compared to unedited

cells, which is expected since each integration strategy preserves native *EPOR*

expression. As for *iEPOR* expression, we find that both *PGK* and *EPOR* promoters drive

expression comparable to that of native *EPOR* at d14 in unedited cells (**Fig. 4B** &

Supplementary Fig. S8C). However, the *HBA1* promoter drives supraphysiologic levels

of *iEPOR*, with expression nearing that of the globins. Since the *HBA1*(iEPOR) integration

strategy replaces a full copy of the *HBA1* gene with *iEPOR* transgene, it is not surprising

to find a significant decrease in *HBA1* expression in this condition as well (**Fig. 4B**,

Supplementary Fig. S8A, & **S8D**). Consistent across donors, genes most highly

expressed in HSPCs are uniformly downregulated in all d14 samples while erythroid-

specific genes are uniformly upregulated (**Fig. 4B**, **4C**, & **Supplementary Fig. S8D-G**).

Because of this, we find that d0 HSPCs and all d14 samples segregate into two distinct

hierarchies (**Supplementary Fig. 9A**), indicating a high degree of similarity across all d14

samples regardless of whether these were unedited cells cultured with EPO or iEPOR-

edited cells cultured with BB.

Although consistent differences were observed comparing all conditions to d0

HSPCs, we next determined whether significant differences existed at the end of

differentiation between unedited cells cultured with EPO and iEPOR-edited conditions

cultured with BB. This comparison revealed an extremely high degree of similarity

between unedited cells cultured with EPO and *PGK*(iEPOR)-edited cells cultured with BB;

only three genes were differentially expressed, including upregulation of the *iEPOR*

transgene (**Fig. 4D**). In contrast, the transcriptome of *HBA1*(iEPOR)-edited cells departed

more substantially from unedited cells, with a total of 39 differentially expressed genes.

As expected, in this condition we observed significant upregulation of *iEPOR* as well as

downregulation of *HBA1*. Remarkably, we find that the only differentially expressed gene

in *EPOR*(iEPOR)-edited conditions is the *iEPOR* transgene, indicating that this condition

best recapitulated native EPOR signaling. These conclusions were further supported by

principal component analysis, which found that all d14 samples clustered separately from

d0 samples and that *EPOR*(iEPOR)-edited cells stimulated with BB most closely resemble

unedited cells cultured with EPO (**Fig. 4E**). Gene co-expression network analysis

additionally revealed a high degree of similarity between iEPOR-edited conditions and

unedited cells cultured with EPO (**Supplementary Fig. S9B**).

To determine which cellular processes were activated by EPO compared to edited

cells cultured with BB, we performed gene ontology analysis of differentially expressed

genes in each condition compared to unedited cells at d0 (**Fig. 4F**). At d14, the most

highly enriched pathways were hydrogen peroxide (H_2O_2) catabolism—a critical function

of erythrocytes to process the significant amounts of superoxide and H_2O_2 that occur

during oxygen transport[28]. We also find gas transport and erythroid differentiation

processes to be highly enriched across all d14 samples. From this analysis, the

HBA1(iEPOR) condition shows the most substantial departure from native EPOR

signaling, with a number of significantly enriched pathways unrelated to erythrocyte

function. On the other hand, we find that *EPOR*(iEPOR) most closely resembles native EPOR signaling, leading us to conclude that expression of synthetic receptors from the endogenous promoter is likely to best recapitulate the transcriptomic changes initiated by native cytokine signaling.

iEPOR enables EPO-free erythropoiesis from O-negative induced pluripotent stem cells

All prior work was done in primary HSPCs to determine whether we could successfully engineer small molecule-inducible EPORs that recapitulate native erythroid development and function. However, while primary hematopoietic HSPCs may be sourced from umbilical cord blood and mobilized peripheral blood to produce RBCs *ex vivo*, their expansion capacity is limited[2]. As a solution, induced pluripotent stem cell (iPSC) producer lines provide a potentially unlimited source of patient-derived RBCs[6]. Therefore, in downstream experiments we used an iPSC line called PB005 derived from a healthy donor with O-negative blood type[29] to determine if iEPORs could effectively produce erythroid cells from a "universal" blood donor.

To test this, we integrated our most effective *iEPOR* expression strategies—*PGK*(iEPOR) and *EPOR*(iEPOR)—into the PB005 iPSC line and isolated homozygous knock-in clones (**Fig. 5A** & **Supplementary Fig. S10A**). These clones were then subjected to an established 12-day differentiation into hematopoietic progenitor cells (HPCs). Surprisingly, we found that *EPOR*(iEPOR)-edited clones yielded a substantially greater total cell count compared to both unedited and *PGK*(iEPOR)-edited clones (**Supplementary Fig. S10B**), although this condition had a slightly higher proportion of cells staining for erythroid markers (**Supplementary Fig. S10C & D**). Following iPSC-to-HPC differentiation, we performed a 14-day RBC differentiation without EPO and +/-BB (**Fig. 5A**). We found that all cells (unedited and edited) effectively differentiated in the presence of EPO, whereas no erythroid differentiation was observed in unedited cells in the absence of EPO (**Fig. 5B** & **Supplementary Fig. S11A**). *PGK*(iEPOR)-edited cells stimulated with BB yielded a high percentage of erythroid cells, but differentiation efficiency was significantly less than that achieved by EPO in these clones at every timepoint (**Fig. 5B**). In addition, overall cell proliferation was substantially lower than that achieved with EPO (**Fig. 5C**). In contrast, *EPOR*(iEPOR) clones achieved a differentiation

efficiency that was indistinguishable from clones cultured with EPO; cell proliferation over

the course of differentiation was also nearly equivalent to that achieved with EPO (**Fig.**

5B & **C**). Given frequent clonal differences observed in proliferation capacity, we also

examined cell proliferation from the best *PGK*(iEPOR)- and *EPOR*(iEPOR)-edited clones.

By day 14, the most highly proliferative *PGK*(iEPOR)-edited clone only achieved 37.3%

of the proliferation of that same clone when cultured with EPO (**Supplementary Fig.**

S11B). However, the most effective *EPOR*(iEPOR)-edited clone achieved even greater

proliferation (107.8%) compared to the same clone cultured with EPO.

Next, we measured the hemoglobin profiles of these iPSC-derived erythroid cells

using HPLC and observed fetal hemoglobin to be the most prevalent tetramer in the

presence of EPO, which is consistent with prior studies[30]. We found this to be the case

as well for clones edited with both *PGK*(iEPOR) and *EPOR*(iEPOR) conditions cultured

with BB (**Fig. 5D**). While *PGK*(iEPOR) conditions cultured with BB almost uniformly

expressed lower fetal hemoglobin than their EPO-cultured counterparts, we observed the

opposite for *EPOR*(iEPOR)-edited conditions, with clones cultured with BB typically

producing elevated levels of fetal hemoglobin relative to those same clones cultured with

EPO (**Fig. 5D** & **E**). However, there appeared to be some clonal variation since not all

clones conformed to these trends (**Fig. 5E**). These findings were further confirmed by

quantifying hemoglobin production per cell, which was done using HPLC to quantify the

amount of heme released by hemoglobin based on a standard curve. This analysis

revealed generally elevated hemoglobin production across *EPOR*(iEPOR)-edited clones

cultured with BB compared to the same clones cultured with EPO (median of 33.1 vs.

24.4pg hemoglobin per cell, respectively; **Supplementary Fig. S11C**). In contrast, clones

edited with *PGK*(iEPOR) showed higher hemoglobin production when cultured with EPO

(median of 21.1 vs. 32.1pg hemoglobin per cell with BB vs. EPO, respectively).

Importantly, these levels of hemoglobin production are within the range expected for

normal RBCs in the blood stream (25.4-34.6pg/cell)[31,32]. We note that while transfused

RBCs typically produce more HbA than HbF, the healthy phenotype of patients with

hereditary persistence of fetal hemoglobin (HPFH) and the recent approval of Casgevy to

induce high levels of HbF to treat sickle cell disease and β-thalassemia provide support

that a blood product with high HbF should be both safe and effective[33,34].

Discussion

In this work we combined synthetic protein engineering with the specificity of homology-directed repair genome editing to enable small molecule control of cell differentiation and behavior. By first optimizing highly effective small molecule-responsive receptors and then integrating them into endogenous regulatory machinery, we effectively recapitulated native receptor signaling. These efforts enable cell signaling to be stimulated by low-cost small molecules instead of recombinant cytokines currently required for *ex vivo* cell manufacturing. In this specific instance, EPO is one of the most expensive components of erythroid-promoting media[7]. Here, we demonstrate that *EPOR*(iEPOR)-edited cells cultured with a small molecule are capable of achieving equivalent erythroid differentiation, transcriptomic changes, and hemoglobin production compared to cells cultured with EPO. For comparison, we determined the cost per mg of the largest commercially available units of recombinant human EPO and AP20187 (BB) small molecule. We found that the price per mg of BB was nearly 50-fold less than that of recombinant EPO (**Fig. 5F**). In addition, 1/10th the amount of BB compared to recombinant EPO was required to yield equivalent erythroid production from *EPOR*(iEPOR)-edited iPSCs. Taken together, the corresponding estimates for cost of EPO required to produce a single unit of RBCs at a culture density of 5e7/mL is $1,246.50, conversely the cost to produce an equivalent amount of RBCs using BB is $2.25. While the tools and editing strategies defined in the work enable replacement of recombinant EPO with low-cost small molecule, additional key advances must be achieved for *ex vivo* RBC production to become biologically and economically feasible. These include further reducing the cost of erythroid-promoting media, better replicating high-density RBC production that occurs *in vivo*[30,35], and improving enucleation of adult hemoglobin-producing RBCs[36]. This is a multi-faceted problem and will require sustained efforts to further reduce production expenses. Nevertheless, by eliminating the requirement of EPO cytokine in erythroid-promoting media, this work brings us one major step closer to establishing *ex vivo* RBC production as a scalable and renewable source of blood cells for transfusion medicine.

More broadly, we envision a future where clinically relevant cell types may be manufactured off-the-shelf and at scale to meet the broad spectrum of patient needs. However, significant advances are needed to improve affordability and accessibility to

patients. Given the complexities of large-scale cell manufacturing, many innovations have

been accomplished by mechanical engineers who have developed improved

bioreactors[30,37,38]. Our work demonstrates how challenges within this space may also be

addressed by genome engineers to create more effective producer cells to seed these

advanced bioreactors. Because dependence on expensive cytokines is a common barrier

to scalable production of any cells *ex vivo*, the strategies defined in this work may be

readily adapted to enable large-scale production of platelets, neutrophils, T cells, and

many other clinically relevant cell types. This will ensure that advancements in cell

engineering may be rapidly translated to patients at a cost that is both affordable and

accessible.

Finally, this work demonstrates the power of iterative design-build-test cycles to

rapidly improve function of synthetic proteins. In this work, test cycle 1 defined the ideal

placement of an FKBP domain within the EPO receptor. Test cycle 2 enhanced efficacy

of iEPOR designs by incorporation of signal peptides and a naturally occurring *EPOR*

mutation. Finally, test cycle 3 defined the ideal expression profile of our optimized iEPOR

cassette when placed under a variety of exogenous and endogenous promoters. Perhaps

unsurprisingly, we find that integration of the optimized iEPOR at the endogenous *EPOR*

locus best recapitulates native EPOR signaling, an engineering attribute enabled by

homology-directed repair genome editing. In addition, given the incredible modularity of

membrane-bound receptors[39], it is possible that the small molecule-inducible

architecture defined in this work may inform the design of other potentially useful small

molecule-inducible receptors to modulate a wide variety of cell signals. If so, it is likely

that synthetic receptor function may be fine-tuned by design-build-test cycles as well as

genome editing to mediate precise integration into the genome. Gaining precisely

regulated and tunable control over cells will thus pave the way for increasingly

sophisticated cell engineering applications.

Methods

Integration vector design

Integration vectors were designed such that the left and right homology arms (LHA and

RHA, respectively) are immediately flanking the cut site in exon 2 of the *CCR5* locus or

exon 8 of the *EPOR* locus. For *HBA1* integration, full gene replacement was achieved as

previously described[10] using split homology arms—the LHA corresponding to the region

immediately upstream of the start codon and RHA corresponding to the region

immediately downstream of the cut site in the 3' UTR of the *HBA1* gene. Homology arm

length ranged from 400-1000bp. To avoid the possibility of unintended recombination of

iEPOR with the endogenous locus for *EPOR*(iEPOR)-edited conditions, we disguised

homology of iEPOR by creating silent mutations within the *EPOR* domains at every

possible codon, with a preference for codons that occurred more frequently throughout

the human genome[40]. All custom sequences for cloning were ordered from Integrated

DNA Technologies (IDT; Coralville, Iowa, USA). Gibson Assembly MasterMix (New

England Biolabs, Ipswich, MA, USA) was used for the creation of each vector as per the

manufacturer's instructions.

AAV6 DNA repair template production & purification

All AAV6 vectors were cloned into the pAAV-MCS plasmid (Agilent Technologies,

Hayward, CA, USA), which contains inverted terminal repeats (ITRs) derived from AAV2.

To produce AAV6 vectors, we seeded HEK293T cells (Life Technologies, South San

Francisco, CA, USA) in 2-5 15cm^2 dishes at 13-15×10^6 cells per plate; 24h later, each

dish was transfected using 112μg polyethyleneimine, 6μg of ITR-containing plasmid, and

22μg of pDGM6 (gift from D. Russell, University of Washington), which contains the AAV6

cap genes, AAV2 rep genes, and Ad5 helper genes. After 48-72h of incubation, cells were

collected and AAV6 capsids were isolated using the AAVPro Purification Kit (All

Serotypes, Takara Bio, San Jose, USA), as per the manufacturer's instructions. AAV6

vectors were titered using a Bio-Rad QX200 ddPCR machine and QuantaSoft software

(v.1.7, Bio-Rad, Hercules, CA, USA) to measure the number of vector genomes as

described previously[10].

HSPC culture

Human CD34$^+$ HSPCs were cultured as previously described[10]. CD34$^+$ HSPCs were

sourced from fresh cord blood (generously provided by the Stanford Binns Family

Program for Cord Blood Research) and Plerixafor- and/or G-CSF-mobilized peripheral

blood (AllCells, Alameda, CA, USA or STEMCELL Technologies, Vancouver, Canada).

CD34$^+$ HSPCs were cultured at 1-5×10^5 cells/mL in StemSpan SFEMII (STEMCELL

Technologies) or Good Manufacturing Practice Stem Cell Growth Medium (SCGM,
CellGenix, Freiburg, Germany) base medium supplemented with a human cytokine
(PeproTech, Rocky Hill, NJ, USA) cocktail: stem cell factor (100ng/mL), thrombopoietin
(100ng/mL), Fms-like tyrosine kinase 3 ligand (100 ng/ml), interleukin-6 (100ng/mL),
streptomycin (20mg/mL)(ThermoFisher Scientific, Waltham, MA, USA), and penicillin
(20U/mL)(ThermoFisher Scientific, Waltham, MA, USA), and 35nM of UM171 (cat.:
A89505; APExBIO, Houston, TX, USA). The cell incubator conditions were 37°C, 5% CO_2,
and 5% O_2.

Genome editing of HSPCs
Chemically modified CRISPR guide RNAs (gRNAs) used to edit CD34^{+} HSPCs at *CCR5*,
HBA1, and *EPOR* were purchased from Synthego (Redwood City, CA, USA). The gRNA
modifications added were 2'-O-methyl-3'-phosphorothioate at the three terminal
nucleotides of the 5' and 3' ends, as described previously[41]. The target sequences for
gRNAs were as follows: *CCR5*: 5'-GCAGCATAGTGAGCCCAGAA-3'; *HBA1*: 5'-
GGCAAGAAGCATGGCCACCGAGG-3'; and *EPOR*: 5'-AGCTCAGGGCACAGTGTCCA-
3'. All Cas9 protein was purchased from Aldevron (Alt-R S.p. Cas9 Nuclease V3; Fargo,
ND, USA). Cas9 ribonucleoprotein (RNP) complexes were created at a Cas9/gRNA molar
ratio of 1:2.5 at 25°C for a minimum of 10mins before electroporation. CD34^{+} cells were
resuspended in P3 buffer plus supplement (cat.: V4XP-3032; Lonza Bioscience,
Walkersville, MD, USA) with complexed RNPs and electroporated using the Lonza 4D
Nucleofector (program DZ-100). Cells were plated at 1-2.5×10^{5} cells/mL following
electroporation in the cytokine-supplemented media described previously. Immediately
following electroporation, AAV6 was supplied to the cells at between 2.5-5e3 vector
genomes per cell. The small molecule AZD-7648, a DNA-dependent protein kinase
catalytic subunit inhibitor, was also added to cells immediately post-editing for 24h at
0.5nM to improve homology-directed repair frequencies as previously reported[42].

Ex vivo **erythroid differentiation**
Following editing, HSPCs derived from healthy patients or iPSC-derived HPCs were
cultured for 14d at 37°C and 5% CO_2 in SFEMII medium (STEMCELL Technologies,
Vancouver, Canada) as previously described[19,20]. SFEMII base medium was
supplemented with 100U/mL penicillin/streptomycin (ThermoFisher Scientific, Waltham,

MA, USA), 10ng/mL stem cell factor (PeproTech, Rocky Hill, NJ, USA), 1ng/mL

interleukin-3 (PeproTech, Rocky Hill, NJ, USA), 3U/mL EPO (eBiosciences, San Diego,

CA, USA), 200µg/mL transferrin (Sigma-Aldrich, St. Louis, MO, USA), 3% antibody serum

(heat-inactivated; Sigma-Aldrich), 2% human plasma (isolated from umbilical cord blood

provided by Stanford Binns Cord Blood Program), 10µg/mL insulin (Sigma-Aldrich), and

3U/mL heparin (Sigma-Aldrich). In the first phase, at days 0–7 of differentiation (day 0

being 2-3d post editing), cells were cultured at 1×10^5 cells/mL. In the second phase (days

7–10), cells were maintained at 1×10^5 cells/mL and IL-3 was removed from the culture.

In the third phase (days 11–14), cells were cultured at 1×10^6 cells/mL and transferrin was

increased to 1mg/mL. For -EPO conditions, cells were cultured in the same culture

medium as listed above except for the removal of EPO from the media. For conditions

with the addition of BB homodimerizer (AP20187)(Takara Bio, San Jose, USA), 1µL of

0.5mM BB was diluted in 999µL PBS (HI30; BD Biosciences, San Jose, CA, USA), of

which 2µL of the dilution was added for every 1mL of differentiation media to reach a

desired concentration of 1nM. Fresh BB was added at each media change (Day 0, 4, 7,

11). For experiments requiring additional dilutions, BB was diluted further in PBS to reach

the required concentration (as low as 1pM).

Immunophenotyping of differentiated erythrocytes

HSPCs subjected to erythroid differentiation were analyzed at d14 for erythrocyte

lineage-specific markers using a FACS Aria II and FACS Diva software (v.8.0.3; BD

Biosciences, San Jose, CA, USA). Edited and unedited cells were analyzed by flow

cytometry using the following antibodies: hCD45 V450 (1:50 dilution; 2µl in 100µl of

pelleted RBCs in 1×PBS buffer; HI30; BD Biosciences), CD34 APC (1:50 dilution; 561;

BioLegend, San Diego, CA, USA), CD71 PE-Cy7 (1:500 dilution; OKT9; Affymetrix, Santa

Clara, CA, USA), and CD235a PE (GPA)(1:500 dilution; GA-R2; BD Biosciences). In

addition to cell-specific markers, cells were also stained with Ghost Dye Red 780 (Tonbo

Biosciences, San Diego, CA, USA) to measure viability.

Editing frequency analysis

Between 2-4d post editing, HSPCs were harvested and QuickExtract DNA extraction

solution (Epicentre, Madison, WI, USA) was used to collect genomic DNA (gDNA).

Additional samples were collected at various stages of differentiation (d4, 7, 11, and 14

of erythroid differentiation) gDNA was then digested using BamH1-HF as per the
manufacturer's instructions (New England Biolabs, Ipswich, MA, USA). Percentage of
targeted alleles within a cell population was measured with a Bio-Rad QX200 ddPCR
machine and QuantaSoft software (v.1.7; Bio-Rad, Hercules, CA, USA) using the
following reaction mixture: 1-4µL of digested gDNA input, 10µL of ddPCR SuperMix for
Probes (no dUTP)(Bio-Rad), primer/probes (1:3.6 ratio; Integrated DNA Technologies,
Coralville, IA, USA) and volume up to 20µL with H_2O. ddPCR droplets were then
generated following the manufacturer's instructions (Bio-Rad): 20µL of ddPCR reaction,
70µL of droplet generation oil, and 40µL of droplet sample. Thermocycler (Bio-Rad)
settings were as follows: 98°C (10mins), 94°C (30s), 57.3°C (30s), 72°C (1.75mins)(return
to step 2×40-50 cycles), and 98°C (10mins). Analysis of droplet samples was performed
using the QX200 Droplet Digital PCR System (Bio-Rad). To determine percentages of
alleles targeted, the numbers of Poisson-corrected integrant copies/mL were divided by
the numbers of reference DNA copies/mL. The following primers and 6-FAM/ZEN/IBFQ-
labeled hydrolysis probes were purchased as custom-designed PrimeTime quantitative
PCR (qPCR) assays from Integrated DNA Technologies: All *HBA1* vectors: forward: 5'-
AGTCCAAGCTGAGCAAAGA-3', reverse: 5'-ATCACAAACGCAGGCAGAG-3', probe: 5'-
CGAGAAGCGCGATCACATGGTCCTGC-3';   all   *CCR5*   vectors: forward: 5'-
GGGAGGATTGGGAAGACAAT-3', reverse: 5'-TGTAGGGAGCCCAGAAGAGA-3', probe:
5'-CACAGGGCTGTGAGGCTTAT-3'. The primers and HEX/ZEN/IBFQ-labeled hydrolysis
probe, purchased as custom-designed PrimeTime qPCR Assays from Integrated DNA
Technologies,   were   used   to   amplify   the   *CCRL2*   reference   gene: forward: 5'-
GCTGTATGAATCCAGGTCC-3', reverse: 5'-CCTCCTGGCTGAGAAAAAG-3', probe: 5'-
TGTTTCCTCCAGGATAAGGCAGCTGT-3'.

AlphaFold2 structural predictions
Energy-predicted structures were derived by applying AlphaFold2 (v2.3.2)[21] on wild-type
EPOR, truncated EPOR, and iEPOR sequences. Five differently trained neural networks
were applied to produce unrelaxed structure predictions. Energy minimization was
applied to the best predicted unrelaxed structure (highest average highest average
predicted distance difference test (pLDDT) and lowest predicted aligned error) to produce
the optimal relaxed structure.

Hemoglobin tetramer analysis

Frozen pellets of approximately 1×10^6 cells *ex vivo*-differentiated erythroid cells were thawed and lysed in 30µL of RIPA buffer with 1x Halt Protease Inhibitor Cocktail (ThermoFisher Scientific, Waltham, MA, USA) for 5mins on ice. The mixture was vigorously vortexed and cell debris was removed by centrifugation at 13,000 RPM for 10mins at 4°C. HPLC analysis of hemoglobins in their native form was performed on a cation-exchange PolyCAT A column (35 × 4.6mm^2, 3µm, 1,500Å)(PolyLC Inc., Columbia, MD, USA) using a Perkin-Elmer Flexar HPLC system (Perkin-Elmer, Waltham, MA, USA) at room temperature and detection at 415nm. Mobile phase A consisted of 20mM Bis-tris and 2mM KCN at pH 6.94, adjusted with HCl. Mobile phase B consisted of 20mM Bis-tris, 2mM KCN, and 200mM NaCl at pH 6.55. Hemolysate was diluted in buffer A prior to injection of 20µL onto the column with 8% buffer B and eluted at a flow rate of 2 mL/min with a gradient made to 40% B in 6mins, increased to 100% B in 1.5mins, returned to 8% B in 1min, and equilibrated for 3.5mins. Quantification of the area under the curve of peaks was performed with TotalChrom software (Perkin-Elmer) and raw values were exported to GraphPad Prism software (v9) for plotting and further analysis.

Bulk RNA-sequencing

Total RNA was extracted from frozen pellets of approximately 1×10^6 cells per condition using RNeasy Plus Micro Kit (Qiagen, Redwood City, CA, USA) according to the manufacturer's instructions. Sequencing was provided by Novogene (Sacramento, CA, USA) and raw FASTQ files were aligned to the GRCh38 reference genome extended with the iEPOR target sequence and quantified using Salmon (v1.9.0)[43] with default parameters. Quality control was performed by Novogene.

Differential gene expression analysis & gene set enrichment analysis

The estimated gene expression counts were used with DESeq2[44] to conduct differential gene expression analysis between sample groups. Mitochondrial and lowly expressed genes were removed (sum NumReads <1). The top 50 up- and down-regulated genes based on adjusted p-value were isolated and analyzed with Enrichr[45] to yield functional annotations.

Principal component analysis & gene distribution plots

Mitochondrial genes were removed from the gene expression matrix (TPM) and the

remaining genes were used to conduct principal component analysis with all samples.

Gene expression for experimental and control groups were averaged and log-normalized.

Average   gene   expression   distributions   were   plotted   using   Seaborn

(https://github.com/atsumiando/RNAseq_figure_plotter_python).

Gene co-expression network analysis

The TPM-normalized gene expression matrix of all *PGK*(iEPOR)-, *HBA1*(iEPOR)-, and

EPOR(iEPOR)-edited conditions (n=10) was used to construct a pairwise gene similarity

matrix where each entry represented the Spearman correlation coefficient between a pair

of genes. The correlation between a specified set of *EPOR*-related genes was compared

for both *EPOR* and *iEPOR* to determine which genes *iEPOR* adequately mimics in the

immediate gene co-expression network of native *EPOR*.

iPSC line & culture

A previously published iPSC line, PB005 derived from peripheral blood of a donor with

O$^-$ blood type was used in this study[46]. iPSCs were cultured and maintained in mTeSR1

medium (cat.: 85850; STEMCELL Technologies, Vancouver, Canada) on Matrigel (cat.:

354277; Corning, NY, USA)-coated plates. For passaging, cells at a confluency of 80-

90% were incubated with Accutase (cat.: AT104; Innovative Cell Technologies, San

Diego, USA) for 5-7mins to dissociate into single cells and replated in mTeSR1 medium

supplemented with 10mM of ROCKi (Y27632; cat.: 10005583; Cayman Chemical, Ann

Arbor, MI, USA). After 24h, cells were maintained in fresh mTeSR1 medium with daily

media changes. For freezing iPS cells, STEM-CELLBANKER freezing medium (cat.:

11924; Amsbio, Cambridge, MA, USA) was used.

Genome editing of iPSCs

iPSCs were genome edited using the CRISPR/AAV platform as described previously[17,42].

Cas9 RNP complex was formed by combining 5µg of Cas9 (Alt-R S.p. Cas9 Nuclease

V3; Fargo, ND, USA) and 2µg of gRNA (Synthego, Redwood City, CA, USA) and

incubating at room temperature for 15mins. iPSCs pre-treated with ROCKi (Y27632; cat.:

10005583; Cayman Chemical, Ann Arbor, MI, USA) for 24 hours were dissociated with

Accutase (cat.: AT104; Innovative Cell Technologies, San Diego, USA) into single cells.

1-5x10^5 iPSCs were resuspended in 20µL of P3 primary cell nucleofector solution plus

supplement (cat.: V4XP-3032; Lonza Bioscience, Walkersville, MD, USA) along with the

RNP complex and nucleofected using Lonza 4D Nucleofector (program CA-137). After

nucleofection, iPSCs were plated in mTeSR1 medium supplemented with ROCKi,

0.25µM AZD7648 (cat.: S8843; Selleck Chemicals, Houston, TX, USA) and AAV6 donor

at 2.5x10^3 vector genomes per cell, based on ddPCR titers as above. After 24h, cells

were switched to medium with mTeSR1 and ROCKi. From the following day, cells were

maintained in mTeSR1 medium without ROCKi.

Single-cell cloning of iPSCs

To isolate single cell clones, genome-edited iPSCs were plated at a density of 250 cells

per well of a 6-well plate in mTeSR1 medium supplemented with 1x CloneR2 reagent

(cat.: 100-0691; STEMCELL Technologies, Vancouver, Canada). After 48h, cells were

switched to fresh mTeSR1 medium with 1x CloneR2 and incubated for 2d. Following this,

iPSCs were maintained in mTeSR1 medium without CloneR2 with daily media changes.

At d7-10, single cell colonies were picked by scraping and propagated individually. The

isolated single cell iPSCs were genotyped using PCR with primers annealing outside the

homology arms to identify clones with bi-allelic knock-in. The following primers were

used   for   genotyping: *CCR5*   integration: forward: 5'-

CTCATAGTGCATGTTCTTTGTGGGC-3', reverse: 5'-CCAGCCCAGGCTGTGTATGAAA-

3'; *EPOR* integration: forward: 5'-GCCACATGGCTAGAGTGGTAT-3', reverse: 5'-

CTTTCTTAGAACATGGCCTGATTCAGA-3'.

iPSC-to-erythrocyte differentiation

iPSCs were differentiated into CD34$^+$ HPCs using the STEMdiff Hematopoietic Kit (cat.:

05310; STEMCELL Technologies, Vancouver, Canada) according to the manufacturer's

protocol. Briefly, iPSCs at 70-80% confluency were dissociated into aggregates using

ReLeSR (cat.: 100-0484; STEMCELL Technologies). Aggregates were then diluted 10-

fold, and 100µL of the diluted suspension was aliquoted into a 96-well plate for

quantification. Approximately 80 aggregate colonies were subsequently plated per well

of a 12-well plate pre-coated with Matrigel and maintained in mTeSR1 medium. 24h post-

plating, the number of colonies per well was manually quantified, and the medium was

replaced with differentiation medium A. The medium was then changed according to the

kit's instructions for a total of 12 days. On d12, suspension cells were harvested by

pipetting cells up and down to ensure a homogeneous cell suspension. To assess the

efficiency of differentiation, as determined by $CD34^+/CD45^+$ expression, cells were

analyzed using flow cytometry with the erythrocyte flow panel previously described for

HSPCs. Following this, $CD34^+$ cells were further differentiated into erythroid cells using

the three-phase system described above, either in the presence or absence of EPO and

BB.

Heme detection analysis

Quantification of the amount of hemoglobin produced in cells was obtained by

quantitative detection of the heme peak released from hemoglobin. Lysate were obtained

from $1-2x10^5$ cells as frozen pellets, as described for hemoglobin tetramer analysis. The

relationship between heme and hemoglobin was established from serially diluted

hemolysate made with a blood sample of a known hemoglobin content. Detection of

heme was performed by reverse-phase PerkinElmer Flexar HPLC system (PerkinElmer)

with a Symmetry C18 column (4.6 ×75mm, 3.5µm; Waters Corporation, Milford, MA, USA)

at 415nm. Mobile phase A consisted of 10% methanol made in acetonitrile and mobile B

of 0.5% trifluoroacetic acid in water adjusted at pH 2.9 with NaOH. Samples were

injected at a flow rate of 2mL/min in 49% A, followed by a 3min gradient to 100% A. The

column was then equilibrated to 49% A for 3mins.

Statistical analysis

All statistical tests on experimental groups were done using GraphPad Prism software

(v9). The exact statistical tests used for each comparison are noted in the individual figure

legends.

Data availability

RNA-seq data will be uploaded to the NCBI Sequence Read Archive submission. The

filtered data for all figures in this study are provided in the Extended Data.

Conflicts of interest

Acknowledgements

The authors thank the following funding sources that made this work possible: Stanford

Medical Scholars Research Program, the American Society of Hematology Minority

Medical Student Award Program, and the Stanford Medical Scientist Training Program

to S.E.L.; National Science Foundation Graduate Research Fellowship Program to B.J.L.;

University of California, San Francisco NIH T32 Research Training in Transplant Surgery

Fellowship to S.N.C.; and University of California, San Francisco Program for

Breakthrough Biomedical Research: New Frontier Research Award to M.K.C. We also

would also like to thank the Stanford Binns Program for Cord Blood Research for

providing CD34$^+$ HSPCs and the FACS Core Facility at the Stanford Institute of Stem Cell

Biology and Regenerative Medicine as well as University of California, San Francisco

Flow Core for access to flow cytometry machines. Finally, we would like to thank Caleb

Grossman for helpful discussions and feedback as we planned initial experiments.

References

1.   Klein, H. G., Hrouda, J. C. & Epstein, J. S. Crisis in the sustainability of the U.S. blood

747   system. *N. Engl. J. Med.* **377**, 1485–1488 (2017).

748   2.   Trakarnsanga, K. *et al.* An immortalized adult human erythroid line facilitates sustainable

749   and scalable generation of functional red cells. *Nat. Commun.* **8**, 14750 (2017).

750   3.   Campbell-Lee, S. A. & Kittles, R. A. Red blood cell alloimmunization in sickle cell

751   disease: listen to your ancestors. *Transfus. Med. Hemother.* **41**, 431–435 (2014).

752   4.   Trentino, K. M. *et al.* Increased hospital costs associated with red blood cell transfusion.

753   *Transfusion* **55**, 1082–1089 (2015).

754   5.   Giarratana, M.-C. *et al.* Ex vivo generation of fully mature human red blood cells from

755   hematopoietic stem cells. *Nat. Biotechnol.* **23**, 69–74 (2005).

756   6.   Giarratana, M.-C. *et al.* Proof of principle for transfusion of in vitro-generated red blood

757   cells. *Blood* **118**, 5071–5079 (2011).

758   7.   Timmins, N. E. & Nielsen, L. K. Blood cell manufacture: current methods and future

759   challenges. *Trends Biotechnol.* **27**, 415–422 (2009).

760   8.   Suzuki, N. *et al.* Erythroid-specific expression of the erythropoietin receptor rescued its

761   null mutant mice from lethality. *Blood* **100**, 2279–2288 (2002).

762   9.   Camarena, J. *et al.* Using human genetics to develop strategies to increase

763   erythropoietic output from genome-edited hematopoietic stem and progenitor cells.

764   *BioRxiv* (2023) doi:10.1101/2023.08.04.552064.

765   10.   Cromer, M. K. *et al.* Gene replacement of α-globin with β-globin restores hemoglobin

766   balance in β-thalassemia-derived hematopoietic stem and progenitor cells. *Nat. Med.*

767   **27**, 677–687 (2021).

768   11.   Mohan, K. *et al.* Topological control of cytokine receptor signaling induces differential

769   effects in hematopoiesis. *Science* **364**, (2019).

770   12.   Moraga, I. *et al.* Tuning cytokine receptor signaling by re-orienting dimer geometry with

771   surrogate ligands. *Cell* **160**, 1196–1208 (2015).

13.   Ohashi, H., Maruyama, K., Liu, Y. C. & Yoshimura, A. Ligand-induced activation of

chimeric receptors between the erythropoietin receptor and receptor tyrosine kinases.

Proc Natl Acad Sci USA **91**, 158–162 (1994).

14.   Muthukumaran, G., Kotenko, S., Donnelly, R., Ihle, J. N. & Pestka, S. Chimeric

erythropoietin-interferon gamma receptors reveal differences in functional architecture of

intracellular domains for signal transduction. *J. Biol. Chem.* **272**, 4993–4999 (1997).

15.   Martin, R. M. *et al.* Improving the safety of human pluripotent stem cell therapies using

genome-edited orthogonal safeguards. *Nat. Commun.* **11**, 2713 (2020).

16.   Charlesworth, C. T. *et al.* Priming human repopulating hematopoietic stem and

progenitor cells for cas9/sgrna gene targeting. *Mol. Ther. Nucleic Acids* **12**, 89–104

(2018).

17.   Martin, R. M. *et al.* Highly Efficient and Marker-free Genome Editing of Human

Pluripotent Stem Cells by CRISPR-Cas9 RNP and AAV6 Donor-Mediated Homologous

Recombination. *Cell Stem Cell* **24**, 821-828.e5 (2019).

18.   Scharenberg, S. G. *et al.* Engineering monocyte/macrophage-specific

glucocerebrosidase expression in human hematopoietic stem cells using genome

editing. *Nat. Commun.* **11**, 3327 (2020).

19.   Dulmovits, B. M. *et al.* Pomalidomide reverses γ-globin silencing through the

transcriptional reprogramming of adult hematopoietic progenitors. *Blood* **127**, 1481–

1492 (2016).

20.   Hu, J. *et al.* Isolation and functional characterization of human erythroblasts at distinct

stages: implications for understanding of normal and disordered erythropoiesis in vivo.

Blood **121**, 3246–3253 (2013).

21.   Yang, Z., Zeng, X., Zhao, Y. & Chen, R. AlphaFold2 and its applications in the fields of

biology and medicine. *Signal Transduct. Target. Ther.* **8**, 115 (2023).

22.   Adam, N. *et al.* Unraveling viral interleukin-6 binding to gp130 and activation of STAT-

signaling pathways independently of the interleukin-6 receptor. *J. Virol.* **83**, 5117–5126

(2009).

23.   Duitman, E. H., Orinska, Z., Bulanova, E., Paus, R. & Bulfone-Paus, S. How a cytokine is

chaperoned through the secretory pathway by complexing with its own receptor:

lessons from interleukin-15 (IL-15)/IL-15 receptor alpha. *Mol. Cell. Biol.* **28**, 4851–4861

(2008).

24.   Figueiredo Neto, M. & Figueiredo, M. L. Skeletal muscle signal peptide optimization for

enhancing propeptide or cytokine secretion. *J. Theor. Biol.* **409**, 11–17 (2016).

25.   Forejtnikovà, H. *et al.* Transferrin receptor 2 is a component of the erythropoietin

receptor complex and is required for efficient erythropoiesis. *Blood* **116**, 5357–5367

(2010).

26.   Eyquem, J. *et al.* Targeting a CAR to the TRAC locus with CRISPR/Cas9 enhances

tumour rejection. *Nature* **543**, 113–117 (2017).

27.   Chu, S. N. *et al.* Dual α-globin and truncated erythropoietin receptor knock-in restores

hemoglobin production in α-thalassemia major-derived hematopoietic stem and

progenitor cells. *BioRxiv* (2023) doi:10.1101/2023.09.01.555926.

28.   Scott, M. D., Lubin, B. H., Zuo, L. & Kuypers, F. A. Erythrocyte defense against

hydrogen peroxide: preeminent importance of catalase. *J. Lab. Clin. Med.* **118**, 7–16

(1991).

29.   Masaki, H. *et al.* Interspecific in vitro assay for the chimera-forming ability of human

818   pluripotent stem cells. *Development* **142**, 3222–3230 (2015).

819   30.   Yu, S. *et al.* Selection of O-negative induced pluripotent stem cell clones for high-

820   density red blood cell production in a scalable perfusion bioreactor system. *Cell Prolif.*

821   **55**, e13218 (2022).

822   31.   Revin, V. V. *et al.* Study of Erythrocyte Indices, Erythrocyte Morphometric Indicators,

823   and Oxygen-Binding Properties of Hemoglobin Hematoporphyrin Patients with

824   Cardiovascular Diseases. *Adv. Hematol.* **2017**, 8964587 (2017).

825   32.   Table 1, Complete blood count - Blood Groups and Red Cell Antigens - NCBI

826   Bookshelf. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK2263/table/ch1.T1/.

827   33.   Forget, B. G. Molecular basis of hereditary persistence of fetal hemoglobin. *Ann. N. Y.*

828   *Acad. Sci.* **850**, 38–44 (1998).

829   34.   Frangoul, H. *et al.* CRISPR-Cas9 Gene Editing for Sickle Cell Disease and β-

830   Thalassemia. *N. Engl. J. Med.* **384**, 252–260 (2021).

831   35.   Sivalingam, J. *et al.* A Scalable Suspension Platform for Generating High-Density

832   Cultures of Universal Red Blood Cells from Human Induced Pluripotent Stem Cells.

833   *Stem Cell Reports* **16**, 182–197 (2021).

834   36.   Miharada, K., Hiroyama, T., Sudo, K., Nagasawa, T. & Nakamura, Y. Efficient

835   enucleation of erythroblasts differentiated in vitro from hematopoietic stem and

836   progenitor cells. *Nat. Biotechnol.* **24**, 1255–1256 (2006).

837   37.   Bayley, R. *et al.* The productivity limit of manufacturing blood cell therapy in scalable

838   stirred bioreactors. *J. Tissue Eng. Regen. Med.* **12**, e368–e378 (2018).

38.   Ahmed, S., Chauhan, V. M., Ghaemmaghami, A. M. & Aylott, J. W. New generation of

bioreactors that advance extracellular matrix modelling and tissue engineering.

Biotechnol. Lett. **41**, 1–25 (2019).

39.   Bell, M. *et al.* Modular chimeric cytokine receptors with leucine zippers enhance the

antitumour activity of CAR T cells via JAK/STAT signalling. *Nat. Biomed. Eng.* (2023)

doi:10.1038/s41551-023-01143-w.

40.   Tanida-Miyake, E., Koike, M., Uchiyama, Y. & Tanida, I. Optimization of mNeonGreen

for Homo sapiens increases its fluorescent intensity in mammalian cells. *PLoS ONE* **13**,

e0191108 (2018).

41.   Hendel, A. *et al.* Chemically modified guide RNAs enhance CRISPR-Cas genome

editing in human primary cells. *Nat. Biotechnol.* **33**, 985–989 (2015).

42.   Selvaraj, S. *et al.* High-efficiency transgene integration by homology-directed repair in

human primary cells using DNA-PKcs inhibition. *Nat. Biotechnol.* (2023)

doi:10.1038/s41587-023-01888-4.

43.   Patro, R., Duggal, G., Love, M. I., Irizarry, R. A. & Kingsford, C. Salmon provides fast

and bias-aware quantification of transcript expression. *Nat. Methods* **14**, 417–419

(2017).

44.   Love, M. I., Huber, W. & Anders, S. Moderated estimation of fold change and dispersion

for RNA-seq data with DESeq2. *Genome Biol.* **15**, 550 (2014).

45.   Kuleshov, M. V. *et al.* Enrichr: a comprehensive gene set enrichment analysis web

server 2016 update. *Nucleic Acids Res.* **44**, W90-7 (2016).

46. Sun, S. *et al.* Human pluripotent stem cell-derived macrophages host

Mycobacterium abscessus infection. *Stem Cell Reports* (2022)

doi:10.1016/j.stemcr.2022.07.013.

Figure 1. Screening of FKBP-EPOR chimeras to facilitate EPO-free erythroid differentiation.

A: Schematic of chimeric FKBP-EPOR transgenes integrated at the *CCR5* locus via CRISPR/AAV-mediated editing. Red boxes represent the location of FKBP within the EPOR.

B: Schematic of HSPC editing and subsequent erythroid differentiation.

C: Percentage of edited HSPCs that acquired erythroid markers (CD34-/CD45-/CD71+/GPA+) +/-BB normalized to unedited cells +EPO at d14 of differentiation. Bars represent median +/-SEM; * = p<0.05 by unpaired t-test.

D: Percent edited alleles over the course of differentiation +/-BB and +/-EPO. Bars represent median +/-SEM.

E: Representative flow cytometry staining and gating scheme for iEPOR 1.5-edited HSPCs at d14 of differentiation -EPO and +/-BB. Arrows indicate that only gated cells are displayed on the subsequent plot.

Figure 2: Modulation of iEPOR effect by addition of signal peptide & EPOR truncation.

A: Schematic of second-generation iEPORs integrated at *CCR5* locus. Red boxes represent the FKBP domain; yellow and green triangles indicate EPOR and IL6 SPs, respectively; dashed line represents EPOR truncation.

B: Percentage of edited HSPCs that acquired erythroid markers (CD34⁻/CD45⁻/CD71⁺/GPA⁺) +/-BB normalized to unedited cells +EPO at d14 of differentiation. iEPOR 1.5 data from Fig. 1C shown for comparison. Bars represent median +/-SEM; * = p<0.05, ** = p<0.01, and **** = p<0.0001 by unpaired t-test.

C: Percent edited alleles over the course of differentiation +/-BB and +/-EPO. Bars represent median +/-SEM; * = p<0.05 and **** = p<0.0001 comparing d0 vs. d14 within treatment by unpaired t-test.

D: Representative flow cytometry staining and gating scheme for iEPOR-edited HSPCs at d14 of differentiation -EPO and +/-BB. Arrows indicate that only gated cells are displayed on the subsequent plot.

E: Representative hemoglobin tetramer HPLC plots at d14 of erythroid differentiation. +BB and -BB/-EPO conditions were from cells edited with iEPOR; +EPO condition was from unedited cells. All plots normalized to 1e6 cells.

F: AlphaFold2-based structure prediction of truncated EPOR and iEPOR. SP was removed since this sequence will be cleaved following translocation to the membrane. TMD labeled with an arrow as a reference point.

Figure 3: Modulation of iEPOR effect by expression from various promoters.

A Schematic of third-generation iEPORs that drive expression from: 1) PGK promoter from *CCR5* safe harbor site; 2) erythroid-specific *HBA1* locus; and 3) endogenous *EPOR* locus.

B: Percentage of edited HSPCs that acquired erythroid markers (CD34⁻/CD45⁻/CD71⁺/GPA⁺) +/-BB normalized to unedited cells +EPO at d14 of differentiation. SFFV(iEPOR) data from Fig. 2B shown here for comparison. Bars represent median +/-SEM; * = p<0.05, and **** = p<0.0001 by unpaired t-test.

C: Representative flow cytometry staining and gating scheme for edited HSPCs at d14 of differentiation -EPO and +/-BB. Arrows indicate that only gated cells are displayed on the subsequent plot.

D: Representative hemoglobin tetramer HPLC plot of edited HSPCs at d14 of differentiation -EPO and +/-BB.

E: Dose response of edited HSPCs cultured over a range of [BB] at d14 of differentiation normalized to unedited cells +EPO. Bars represent median +/-SEM; *** = p<0.001 and **** = p<0.0001 comparing +EPO/+BB to +BB conditions by unpaired t-test.

Figure 4: Transcriptome-wide comparison of iEPOR-edited cells to EPO-differentiated cells.

A: Schematic of well-characterized native EPO+EPOR signaling effects vs. undefined BB+iEPOR signaling effects.

B: Transcripts per million (TPM) from RNA-Seq with annotation for globin, *EPOR*, and *iEPOR* genes.

C: Volcano plot comparing unedited and edited HSPCs at d14 of differentiation vs. unedited HSPCs at d0. Dashed lines are drawn at +/-2 $\log_2$ fold change and p=0.01. Total number of significantly down- and upregulated genes is shown in top left and top right of each plot, respectively.

D: Volcano plot comparing edited HSPCs at d14 +BB vs. unedited HSPCs at d14 +EPO. Dashed lines are drawn at +/-2 $\log_2$ fold change and p=0.01. Total number of significantly down- and upregulated genes is shown in top left and top right of each plot, respectively.

E: Principal component analysis of all conditions with covariance ellipses.

F: Summary of gene ontology (GO) analysis comparing all d14 conditions vs. d0 control. Differentially expressed genes from volcano plots (Fig. 4C) were used as input. Specific GO pathways were binned into broader categories and enrichment score was derived by Enrichr software. Count refers to the number of genes within each GO pathway that contributed to enrichment.

Figure 5: Differentiation of iPSCs into erythroid cells using iEPOR+BB compared to exogenous EPO.

A: Schematic of iPSC-to-erythroid cell differentiation strategy and subsequent analysis.

B: Percentage of cells that acquired erythroid markers (CD34⁻/CD45⁻/CD71⁺/GPA⁺) over the course of differentiation. Bars represent mean +/-SEM; ns = not statistically significant, * = p<0.05, ** = p<0.01, *** = p<0.001, and **** = p<0.0001 comparing +BB to +EPO conditions by unpaired t-test.

C: Percentage of total cell proliferation normalized to clones cultured +EPO over the course of differentiation. Bars represent mean +/SEM; ns = not statistically significant, * = p<0.05, ** = p<0.01, *** = p<0.001, and **** = p<0.0001 comparing +BB to +EPO conditions by unpaired t-test.

D: Representative hemoglobin tetramer HPLC plots of edited and unedited iPSC-derived erythroid cells at end of differentiation.

E: Ratio of HbF production in +BB vs. +EPO conditions of iEPOR-edited iPSC-derived erythroid cells at end of differentiation.

F: Cost comparison of EPO and BB (lowest price per mg commercially available for purchase as of 2/9/24).