Podocalyxin and ciliary neurotrophic factor receptor are novel components of the surfaceome of chondrogenic cells

Patrik Kovács[1], Peter Brazda[2], Tibor Hajdú[1], Boglárka Harsányi[1], Krisztián Juhász[1], Roland Takács[1],

Judit Vágó[1], Zhangzheng Wang[1], Clare Coveney[3], David J. Boocock[3], Csaba Matta[1,*]

[1] Department of Anatomy, Histology and Embryology, Faculty of Medicine, University of Debrecen,
Debrecen, H-4032, Hungary
[2] Central for Translational Immunology, University Medical Center Utrecht, Utrecht University, Utrecht,
The Netherlands
[3] School of Science and Technology, Nottingham Trent University, Nottingham NG11 8NF, United
Kingdom
15

* To whom correspondence should be addressed. Tel: +36-52-255+567; Email: matta.csaba@med.unideb.hu

Running title: The Chondroprogenitor Surfaceome

ORCiD IDs:
Patrik Kovács: 0000-0003-1588-7962
Peter Brazda: 0000-0002-0215-1692
Tibor Hajdú: 0000-0002-9954-1987
Krisztián Juhász: 0009-0009-4299-3227
Roland Takács: 0000-0002-1598-3922
Judit Vágó: 0000-0003-4379-6734
Zhangzheng Wang: 0000-0003-3871-5143
Clare Coveney: 0000-0001-7047-6408
David J. Boocock: 0000-0002-7333-3549
Csaba Matta: 0000-0002-9678-7420

Abstract

Background: Osteoarthritis is a degenerative joint disease characterized by progressive loss of articular cartilage and limited capacity for intrinsic repair. A major barrier to developing effective regenerative strategies is the incomplete understanding of the molecular mechanisms regulating chondrogenesis and cartilage maintenance. Cell surface proteins are key mediators of extracellular communication, adhesion, and signaling, yet the chondrogenic surfaceome remains incompletely mapped, with prior studies focusing primarily on mature or cytokine-activated chondrocytes. The aim of this study was to provide a temporal profile of the surfaceome during *in vitro* chondrogenic differentiation and to identify novel membrane proteins with potential roles in cartilage biology.

Methods: We applied a sialoglycoprotein-targeted glycocapture strategy to selectively enrich plasma membrane proteins from chick embryonic limb bud-derived micromass cultures undergoing chondrogenesis. Enriched samples underwent high-resolution shotgun proteomic analysis, and differentially expressed candidates were validated by western blotting, immunocytochemistry, and transient gene silencing. Functional effects on extracellular matrix gene regulation were assessed by quantitative RT-PCR and matrix histochemistry.

Results: This approach generated the first temporal surfaceome map of chondrogenic progenitors. Among identified candidates, two proteins not previously linked to chondrogenesis, podocalyxin (PODXL) and ciliary neurotrophic factor receptor (CNTFR), were detected at the plasma membrane and confirmed at the protein and transcript levels. Both proteins exhibited time-dependent downregulation during differentiation. Targeted knockdown revealed differential regulation of the fibrocartilage marker *COL1A1* expression, indicating non-redundant roles in cell-matrix signaling and survival pathways. Single-cell transcriptomic meta-analysis confirmed expression of both proteins in discrete human articular chondrocyte subpopulations.

Conclusions: This study expands the molecular framework of chondrogenesis, identifying PODXL and CNTFR as novel, temporally regulated surfaceome components with distinct roles

in extracellular matrix signaling. These findings complement prior proteomic analyses of

cytokine-activated mature articular chondrocytes and suggest new candidates for

developmental cartilage biomarkers and therapeutic targets for osteoarthritis. Our results

provide a resource for future cross-species surfaceome studies and highlight key pathways

for further investigation into cartilage lineage specification and matrix adaptation.

(318 words in Abstract)

Plain English Summary

Osteoarthritis is the most common joint disease worldwide, causing pain, stiffness, and

reduced mobility as the smooth cartilage that covers the ends of bones gradually breaks down.

Cartilage has a very limited ability to heal itself, and there are currently no treatments that can

stop or reverse the disease. Scientists are working on new ways to repair or replace damaged

cartilage, but to do this effectively, they need to understand the molecular "language" that

cartilage-forming cells use to develop and maintain healthy tissue.

In this study, we examined the set of proteins that are present on the surface of

cartilage-forming cells, known as the "surfaceome." These surface proteins play important

roles in how cells connect to their surroundings, receive signals, and work together to build

the cartilage matrix. Using a method to selectively capture and analyze these proteins, we

discovered two that had never been linked to cartilage development: podocalyxin and ciliary

neurotrophic factor receptor.

We found that these two proteins may have opposite effects on cartilage quality.

Because they can be detected on the outside of cells, they could be developed into markers

for early osteoarthritis detection or as targets for new therapies. Our findings open the door to

new strategies for diagnosing and treating joint disease by focusing on cell-surface

communication.

Keywords

surfaceome; chondrogenesis; cartilage regeneration; glycocapture; proteomics; cartilage;

osteoarthritis; PODXL; CNTFR

Background

Osteoarthritis (OA) is the most common form of arthritis, characterized by the progressive degeneration of articular cartilage, subchondral bone sclerosis, synovial inflammation, osteophyte formation, and subsequent loss of joint function, leading to chronic pain and disability (1). OA imposes a substantial global health burden, affecting more than 303 million adults worldwide (2). Despite its high prevalence, there are currently no FDA-approved disease-modifying OA drugs capable of halting disease progression or promoting cartilage repair, largely due to the heterogeneous nature of OA and incomplete understanding of its molecular drivers (3). Current treatments remain palliative, focusing on symptom relief, underscoring an urgent unmet need for innovative therapeutic strategies (4).

Regenerative medicine has emerged as a promising avenue to address this gap. Stem cell-based approaches, particularly those using mesenchymal stem cells (MSCs), hold potential for cartilage regeneration and functional restoration (5). However, clinical outcomes have thus far been modest (6). The major obstacles include poor MSC survival in the inflammatory joint microenvironment, coupled with limited integration into native cartilage, which often result in transient improvements without sustainable extracellular matrix (ECM) restoration (2), (7). A deeper understanding of the molecular pathways that control chondrogenesis is therefore essential for improving cartilage repair outcomes (8).

A key step in this process is identifying novel biomarkers in chondroprogenitor cells that could provide mechanistic insight into cartilage differentiation, guide patient stratification in light of OA heterogeneity, and inform targeted regenerative strategies. Biomarkers predictive of chondrogenic capacity could significantly improve MSC-based cartilage repair by enabling optimal cell sourcing and enhancing survival, integration, and ECM restoration.

In this context, profiling the surfaceome, i.e., the full dynamic complement of cell surface proteins, is of particular importance for understanding chondroprogenitor cell biology and optimizing cartilage tissue engineering approaches (9-11). Current surface markers such as CD44, CD73 show variable association with the chondrogenic potential of MSCs derived from different tissues (12), highlighting the need for more reliable and functionally relevant

surface markers (13). Such biomarkers could not only improve the selection of optimal cell

types for therapy but also support the design of biomaterials that mimic native chondrogenic

niches (14).

Our group has previously performed sialoglycoprotein-based surfaceome mapping of

mesenchymal stem cells and migratory chondrogenic progenitor cells to define adhesive and

signaling signatures at early cartilage lineage commitment, and to highlight differences

between these two cell types (9). In a subsequent study, we used a similar approach on

primary equine articular chondrocytes under normal and pro-inflammatory conditions to reveal

cytokine-induced surfaceome remodeling (15). While such earlier work has defined features

of the chondrocyte surfaceome under various physiological and pathological conditions, there

is a need for systematic temporal analysis during chondrogenic differentiation. Therefore, by

building on earlier findings, we aimed to establish a temporal, quantitative map of the

chondrogenic surfaceome using a developmental *in vitro* model to identify new

membrane-associated proteins involved in cartilage differentiation and phenotype

stabilization.

Here, we present a temporal landscape of the surfaceome of chondrogenic progenitor

cells during chondrogenesis. Using a sialoglycoprotein-targeted glycocapture method with

aminooxy-biotin, followed by shotgun proteomics (9, 15, 16), we enriched the cell surface

subproteome. We aimed to determine which membrane-associated proteins may be

associated with the transition from chondroprogenitor to mature chondrocyte states and how

these proteins integrate with extracellular matrix and cell-survival signaling. We identified

proteins not previously linked to chondrogenic differentiation. Notably, we discovered

podocalyxin (PODXL), a sialomucin known for regulating podocyte polarity, and ciliary

neurotrophic factor receptor (CNTFR), a neurotrophic signal transducer, as novel constituents

of the chondrogenic surfaceome. Their detection suggests convergence of adhesion- and

survival-related signaling pathways during chondrogenesis, expanding current knowledge of

extracellular signaling in cartilage development and highlighting potential translational targets

for OA therapy.

Methods

1. Experimental setup

This study employed a staged approach to define the surfaceome of embryonic chicken limb bud-derived chondrogenic cells at key stages of chondrogenic differentiation. Temporal proteomic profiling was conducted at days 1, 3, 6, 10, and 15 of micromass culture corresponding to key histodifferentiation stages (17, 18), combining sialoglycoprotein enrichment via aminooxy-biotin conjugation with high-resolution LC-MS/MS on 3 biological replicates (N = 3). Candidate surface markers ciliary neurotrophic factor receptor (CNTFR) and podocalyxin (PODXL) were validated through RT-qPCR, western blotting, and immunocytochemical localization. The integrated workflow, spanning discovery to functional validation, is summarized in Figure 1.

Figure 1. Experimental workflow.

2. Chondrogenic micromass cultures

Chondrogenic micromass cultures were established from embryonic chicken limb bud chondroprogenitors using a standardized protocol optimized for spontaneous chondrogenesis (18). Briefly, distal parts of limb buds were carefully excised from early-stage (Hamburger– Hamilton 22–24) chicken embryos and dissociated into a single-cell suspension via trypsin-EDTA digestion. Cells were resuspended in Ham's F12 medium (Gibco, Thermo Fisher

Scientific) supplemented with 10% fetal bovine serum (FBS, Gibco) and plated as 100 µL

micromass droplets (1.5×10^7 cells/mL) onto 6-well plates. Following a 2-hour adhesion phase

(37°C, 5% CO_2), cultures were gently flooded with fresh medium to maintain 3D architecture.

This model recapitulates *in vivo* chondrogenesis, including *COL2A1* upregulation and *SOX9*-

dependent ECM synthesis, as previously characterized in this system (17, 18). Cultures were

harvested at days 1, 3, 6, 10, and 15 to capture key transitions in surfaceome dynamics during

early differentiation.

3. Cell surface proteome labelling and enrichment, and total cell lysates

For a detailed methodology for cell surface sialoglycoprotein labelling and enrichment

of chondroprogenitor cells in micromass cultures, please see our protocol paper (16). Unless

otherwise stated, all reagents were purchased from Thermo Fisher Scientific. Briefly, sialic

acid residues on the cell surface proteins of micromass cultures were oxidized using 1 mM

sodium meta-periodate to generate reactive aldehyde groups. This was followed by incubation

in the dark for 1 hour at 4°C with 100 mM aminooxy-biotin (Biotium). After quenching with

glycerol, the labelled cells were lysed (1% Triton X-100, 150 mM NaCl, 5 mM iodoacetamide,

10 µL protease inhibitor cocktail, 0.1 mg/mL PMSF and 10 mM Tris-HCl; pH 7.6). Biotinylated

proteins were affinity-purified using NeutrAvidin agarose beads, followed by stringent washes

to remove nonspecific binders. Captured protein were reduced by 100 mM DTT and alkylated

in 50 mM iodoacetamide, and further wash steps were performed to minimize contamination

from intracellular components, and to prepare the sample for LC-MS/MS analysis. Captured

proteins were digested overnight with 5 µg MS-grade trypsin in 50 mM NH_4HCO_3. Solvents

were then evaporated in a vacuum concentrator centrifuge and stored at –80°C.

Parallel total proteome analysis of micromass cultures were prepared using lysis in

RIPA and sonication to shear DNA (3 × 10 sec pulses), ensuring membrane protein

solubilization. Samples were then stored at –80°C. This approach enabled comparative

quantification of surface-enriched vs. intracellular proteins during chondrogenesis.

4. Mass spectrometry, protein identification and quantification

Dried peptide samples were reconstituted in 150 µL of 10% acetonitrile with 0.1%

formic acid, shaken at 5°C for 20 minutes, followed by addition of 150 µL 0.1% formic acid to

yield a final concentration of 5% acetonitrile and 0.1% formic acid. After centrifugation at

12,000 × g for 2 minutes to remove particulates, supernatants were transferred to LC-MS

compatible vials. Peptide separation was performed on a Waters M-Class UPLC system

equipped with a Phenomenex Kinetex XB-C18 column (2.6 µm, 15 × 0.3 mm) maintained at

30°C, using a linear gradient of 3–35% acetonitrile (mobile phase B) over 12 minutes at a flow

rate of 10 µL/min, followed by washing at 80% B and re-equilibration to 3% B. Three microlitres

of each sample were injected in direct inject mode. Mass spectrometric analysis was

conducted on a Sciex 7600 ZenoTOF operating in positive ion mode with Data Independent

Acquisition (DIA, zenoSWATH), employing a 25 ms TOF-MS scan and 65 variable SWATH

windows (12 ms each) covering m/z 400–750, with a total cycle time of 1.146 s. Raw data files

were processed using DIA-NN (version 1.8.1) (19), with a *Gallus gallus* UniProt FASTA

database (Oct 2021), enabling library-free search and deep learning-based spectra prediction.

Label-free quantification was performed at a precursor false discovery rate (FDR) of 1.0%,

with default DIA-NN parameters unless otherwise specified. Protein identification and

quantification results were exported, and proteins were annotated using Gene Ontology (GO)

information from UniProt to infer subcellular localization (16).

The mass spectrometry proteomics data have been deposited to the

ProteomeXchange Consortium *via* the PRIDE partner repository with the dataset identifier

PXD064013.

5. Bioinformatics and pathway analysis

Proteomic intensity data were log2-transformed. Missing values were imputed using a

left-censored normal distribution via the minProb method (q = 0.001) from the *promor* package

in R (20) to simulate low-abundance signals below the detection threshold. Entries

representing protein families (where individual proteins could not be reliably deconvoluted)

were excluded from the downstream bioinformatic analysis workflow, as some of these were

also present as single entries in the matrix. Principal component analysis (PCA) was used to

assess sample variability and potential batch effects.

Differential protein expression (DEP) analysis was performed using the *DEqMS*

package in R, applying linear modeling with variance moderation based on peptide counts.

Proteins with |log2 fold-change| > 1 and Benjamini-Hochberg adjusted p-value (FDR) < 0.05

were considered DEPs. The *gorth* package was used to perform ortholog mapping from

chicken (*Gallus gallus*) to human (*Homo sapiens*). The resulting set of DEPs was z-score

scaled and grouped using hierarchical clustering to identify temporal expression patterns.

Gene Ontology (GO) enrichment analysis was performed for each DEP list and

temporal DEP cluster using *enrichGO*() and *compareCluster*() (*org.Hs.eg.db*, p-value < 0.05,

q-value < 0.2), covering Biological Process (BP), Molecular Function (MF), and Cellular

Component (CC) categories. Statistical analysis and visualization were carried out in R.

Our NGS dataset (BioProject IDs: PRJNA817177; PRJNA938813) (17) was processed

using R. Weighted gene correlation network analysis (WGCNA) was performed with the

WGCNA R package. For the construction of the protein-protein interaction (PPI) network, we

utilized the STRING database, and Cytoscape was employed to further screen the proximal

associated proteins. Enrichment analysis was carried out using the *clusterProfiler* R package.

7. Immunocytochemistry

On specified culture days, cells were dissociated using mild collagenase type I

treatment (Sigma) for 30 minutes at 37°C, resuspended in fresh F12 medium, and seeded

onto glass coverslips in 24-well plates. Cells were allowed to adhere for 2 hours in a humidified

incubator (37°C, 5% CO_2). Following attachment, cells were fixed in 10% formalin in 1 × PBS

for 30 minutes at room temperature (RT). After washing in PBS, non-specific binding sites

were blocked with 3% bovine serum albumin (BSA) and 10% serum from the host species of

the secondary antibody (see below) in PBS for 1 hour at RT.

For immunostaining, cells were incubated overnight at 4°C with anti-CNTFR (Abcam;

Cat. No. ab127425) at a dilution of 1:500, and anti-PODXL (Proteintech; Cat. No. 18150-1-

AP) antibodies at a dilution of 1:500, diluted in blocking solution. Primary antibodies were

detected using a goat anti-rabbit IgG secondary antibody conjugated to Alexa Fluor 555 (Life

Technologies Corporation; Cat. No. A27039) at a dilution of 1:1000, incubated for 1 hour at

RT. Cultures were mounted in Vectashield Hard Set mounting medium (Vector Laboratories)

containing DAPI to visualize nuclei. Subcellular localization of PODXL and CNTFR was

analyzed using an Olympus FV1000S confocal microscope (Olympus) equipped with a 60×

oil immersion objective (NA: 1.3). For excitation of AlexaFluor 555, 543 nm laser line was

used. The average pixel dwell time was 4 μs. Images of Alexa Fluor 555 and DAPI were

overlaid.

8. Western blot analysis

Total cell lysates for SDS–PAGE were prepared as previously described (21). To

ensure equal protein loading, after protein concentrations were determined, four-fold

concentrated Laemmli buffer (Thermo Fisher Scientific) was added to the lysates, and

samples were heated at 95°C for 10 minutes. In each lane, 20 μg of protein per sample was

loaded onto 10% SDS–polyacrylamide gels for separation. Following electrophoresis, proteins

were transferred onto nitrocellulose membranes using electroblotting. Membranes were

blocked with 5% non-fat dry milk dissolved in PBS for 1 hour at RT. Subsequently, membranes

incubated overnight at 4°C with the primary antibodies (anti-CNTFR at a dilution of 1:500, and

anti-PODXL at a dilution of 1:500). After three washes in PBST (PBS containing 0.1% Tween-

20) for a total of 30 minutes, membranes were incubated with an anti-rabbit IgG secondary

antibody (Bio-Rad Laboratories) in 1:1000 dilution for 1 hour at RT. Protein bands were

visualized using enhanced chemiluminescence (Millipore) according to the instructions

provided by the manufacturer. Equal protein loading was verified by probing for β-actin as a

loading control.

9. Transient gene silencing of CNTFR and PODXL

To investigate the impact of transient gene silencing of *CNTFR* and *PODXL* on chondrogenic differentiation, freshly isolated limb bud-derived progenitor cells were transfected with siRNA. Cells were resuspended at a density of 1.5×10^7 cells/mL in Ham's F12 medium and seeded into 12-well plates. Custom-designed siRNAs targeting CNTFR (Silencer™ Custom Designed siRNA; Cat. No. 4399666, Design ID: ABD1VPK) and PODXL (Design ID: ABHSP78), along with a non-targeting (NT) control (Silencer™ Select Negative Control No. 1 siRNA; Cat. No. 4390844; Life Technologies), were transfected into chondrogenic cells 2 hours post-attachment using Lipofectamine™ RNAiMAX Transfection Reagent (Cat. No. 13778150; Life Technologies) and Opti-MEM™ Reduced Serum Medium (Cat. No. 51985034; Life Technologies).

For the analysis of cartilage ECM production following gene silencing, colonies were fixed on culture day 6, stained with DMMB (pH 1.8), and photographed. Cartilage ECM production was quantified using a MATLAB script (18), with values normalized to NT control levels. Relative cell numbers or viability (inferred from mitochondrial activity) were analyzed via MTT assay (18). Optical density values were expressed as percentage changes relative to NT control.

Gene expression profiling of chondrogenic marker genes was performed as described previously (17) with minor adjustments. Micromass cultures were harvested 48 hours post-transfection. As cartilage ECM accumulation generally requires several days beyond this initial time point, these assays were designed to capture transcriptional trends reflecting early modulatory effects on chondrogenic gene regulation rather than fully developed phenotype changes. Total RNA was isolated using TRI Reagent (Applied Biosystems) following to the manufacturer's instructions. Total RNA (1 µg) was reverse-transcribed into cDNA using the High-Capacity cDNA Reverse Transcription Kit (Thermo Fisher Scientific) according to the manufacturer's protocol. The expression patterns of chondrogenic marker genes were quantified via CYBR Green-based RT-qPCR using the $2^{-\Delta\Delta Ct}$ method. Primer sequences (Integrated DNA Technologies) are provided in Table S1 (Additional file 1). RT-qPCR

307   reactions were set up using GoTaq qPCR Master Mix (Promega) and 20 ng of input cDNA per

308   each 10-µL reaction. Reactions were run on a QuantStudio 3 System (Thermo Fisher

309   Scientific) using a standard thermal profile (17). Of the six reference genes evaluated for

310   stability (*HPRT1*, *PPIA*, *RPL4*, *RPL13*, *RPS7*, *YWHAZ*), BestKeeper (22) identified *RPS7* as

311   the most stable transcript. All target gene data were normalized to *RPS7* expression.

Results

1. Temporal proteome dynamics in chondrogenic cultures

Principal component analysis (PCA) performed on the 5,207 proteins/protein groups identified in total lysates from chondrogenic micromass cultures revealed distinct proteomic profiles at each differentiation stage, with biological replicates clustering tightly by culture day (Figure 2A–B). The first principal component (PC1), which explains 42% of the variance, captured temporal progression, separating undifferentiated (day 1) from differentiated (days 10 and 15) cultures. PC2 (19% variance) distinguished intermediate differentiation stages (days 3–6) from both early and late time points.

A total of 792 proteins (323, 159, 272, and 38 for each consecutive timepoint comparison: day 1–3, day 3–6, day 6–10, and day 10–15, respectively) were identified as significantly upregulated. Similarly, 1368 proteins (714, 231, 178, and 245 for each corresponding timepoint comparison) were identified as significantly downregulated (Figure S1 in Additional file 1). Full lists of differentially expressed proteins (DEPs) for pairwise comparisons between consecutive days and between undifferentiated (day 1) versus mature (day 15) cultures are provided in the Supporting Information (Additional file 2).

To better characterize DEPs between each time point, we performed gene ontology (GO) analysis on the DEPs (Figure 2C–D). In case of proteins that were upregulated in consecutive time points, GO terms related to collagen-containing ECM synthesis, ECM organization, and integrin binding were over-represented. In contrast, when we looked at the downregulated DEPs separately, a much broader range of GO terms were identified, such as those related to DNA and RNA metabolism, DNA replication, and transcription factor binding, especially in the earlier time points. Between days 10–15, ECM-related GO terms were also enriched, indicating that ECM production has been completed by day 15 (mature/hypertrophic) cultures.

Figure 2. Quantitative proteomics analysis of total cell lysates from chondrogenic micromass cultures. A. Principal component analysis (PCA) of the total lysate samples of micromass cultures of chondroprogenitor cells undergoing chondrogenesis (5,207 proteins in the entire dataset). Each dot represents a biological replicate (n = 3). The PCA plot shows unsupervised clustering according to culture age along the principal component (PC) 1 and PC2 hyperplanes, accounting for 42% and 19% of the variance, respectively. **B.** The correlation matrix also demonstrates clear separation among the samples according to culture age. **C–D.** Enrichment analysis using gene ontology (GO) annotations for pairwise comparisons of culture days, showing the top GO terms (biological process (BP), cellular compartment (CC), or molecular function (MF)) by ranking them by the adjusted p-values (p.adjust < 0.001). Plots shown separately for upregulated (**C**, top panel) and downregulated (**D**, bottom panel) proteins. The *x*-axis is the adjusted p-value of the enriched terms.

2. Representative proteins and pathways in chondrogenic cultures

The identified DEPs in the total lysates of chondrogenic cultures were categorized into 5 clusters to delineate expression dynamics (Figure 3A–B). Protein lists for each cluster are provided in the Supporting Information (Additional file 3).

Cluster 1 (625 proteins) exhibited an initial steep downregulation during early *in vitro* chondrogenesis (days 1–3), plateauing thereafter. This group showed enrichment for GO terms related to RNA splicing, histone acetyltransferase activity, and RNA polymerase II mediated transcription (Figure 3C), suggesting phased suppression of transcriptional machinery in maturing cultures. Key proteins in this group include AKT1, FN1, SOX5, NOTCH1, and ITGB1. AKT1 is a central component in the PI3K/Akt pathway, which modulates the balance between chondrocyte proliferation and differentiation (23). Fibronectin (FN1), an ECM glycoprotein, drives chondrocyte differentiation and collagen production via the PI3K/Akt signaling pathway (24). The SOX5 transcription is part of the SOX trio (SOX5, SOX6, SOX9) driving chondrogenic lineage commitment and promoting expression of key cartilage ECM genes such as *COL2A1* (25). NOTCH1 is a receptor that regulates early chondrogenic lineage differentiation via SOX9 (26). Integrin beta-1 (ITGB1) is a cell surface receptor that mediates cell–matrix adhesion and signals for chondrocyte proliferation, migration, and differentiation (27).

Cluster 2 (173 proteins) displayed peak expression at day 6, with overrepresented GO terms linked to amino acid metabolism, connective tissue development, and collagen synthesis. This cluster included several functionally relevant proteins outside the collagen family (such as COL1A1, COL5A1, COL12A1, COL14A1, COL15A1), notably FRZB, TGFBR2, NFATC1, and THBS2, all of which are recognized as being involved in chondrocyte phenotype regulation, matrix remodeling, growth factor signaling, and cartilage regeneration. Specifically, frizzle-related protein (FRZB) is a secreted Wnt agonist that maintains chondrocyte phenotype and is highly expressed in articular chondrocytes (28). Transforming growth factor beta receptor II (TGFRB2), a cell surface receptor, is a critical regulator of chondrocyte maturation, and is essential in maintaining cartilage integrity (29). Nuclear factor

381   of activated T-cells 1 (NFATC1) is a transcription factor that acts as a marker in articular

382   cartilage progenitor cells. It is a key mediator of chondrocyte fate (30). Thrombospondin 2

383   (THBS2) is an ECM glycoprotein involved in cartilage regeneration (31).

Figure 3. Unsupervised clustering analysis of differentially expressed proteins (DEPs) in total cell lysates of chondrogenic cultures using the k-means algorithm. A–B. The expression dynamics of each cluster are shown in clusters 1–5. *x*-axis, time points (days of culturing). **C.** Pathway analysis using Gene Ontology (GO) annotation for the 5 clusters of proteins in total lysates of chondrogenic cells undergoing chondrogenic differentiation. Select terms for GO biological process (BP), cellular component (CC), and molecular functions (MF). Barplot shows significant terms, the *x*-axis is gene (protein) ratio and the number of proteins belonging to given enriched terms. These clusters outline a progressive remodeling of the proteome from a proliferative, transcriptionally active progenitor profile toward an ECM-producing, metabolically adapted chondrocyte phenotype.

395   **Cluster 3** (211 proteins) followed a U-shaped trajectory: downregulated initially but

396   upregulated in later stages and was enriched for GO terms related to mitochondrial and

397   ribosomal functions. This cluster contained key signaling and matrix-interacting proteins,

including ACVR1 (BMP receptor required for chondrogenesis), decorin (DCN), syndecan-1 (SDC1), tenascin-C (TNC), and transferrin receptor (TFRC), all of which have mechanistic roles in regulating chondrocyte proliferation, differentiation, matrix integrity, and developmental signaling in cartilage tissue (32, 33). Notably, decorin is a proteoglycan in the cartilage pericellular and territorial matrix that regulates ECM architecture and load-bearing properties (34). Syndecan-1 is a cell-surface protepglycan involced in cell–matrix interactions (35). Tenascin-C is an ECM glycoprotein with important roles in cartilage development and ECM production (36).

Cluster 4 (319 proteins) demonstrated progressive upregulation, peaking in mature chondrocytes (days 10–15), suggesting that these proteins are associated with the later stages of chondrogenic differentiation and may contribute to the functional maturation of chondrocytes. Over-represented GO terms in this cluster were related to ECM and collagen synthesis. This cluster included classic and emerging modulators of cartilage ECM and chondrocyte function such as ACAN (aggrecan, the major cartilage proteoglycan), major collagen types (COL2A1, COL6A1, COL8A1, COL9A1, COL22A1), COMP (cartilage oligomeric matrix protein; involved in matrix assembly), MATN1 (matrilin-1; involved in mechanotransduction), TIMP3 (tissue inhibitor of metalloproteinases; involved in matrix protection), ENO1 (alpha-enolase; involved in glycolysis) and LDHA (lactate dehydrogenase; involved in chondrocyte-specific glycolytic adaptation), all vital for cartilage tissue integrity and repair (8, 37).

Cluster 5 (346 proteins) showed a similar expression pattern to cluster 1 but with a more sustained downregulation throughout chondrogenesis. Over-represented GO terms in this cluster included histone modification and cell proliferation (DNA replication and chromosome condensation). This cluster included functional components and matrix regulators such as CD44 (hyaluronan adhesion), PDGFRA (platelet-derived growth factor receptor alpha; essential for chondroprogenitor specification), FBN2 (fibrillin-2; involved in matrix assembly and growth factor regulation), and VCAN (versican; modulates cartilage

morphogenesis and growth factor localization), all implicated in cartilage and joint development, repair, or disease (38-41).

Next, we carried out a detailed protein-protein interaction (PPI) analysis of each cluster using STRING and generated a small network with the top 20 hub proteins (Figure S2). In the PPI network of **Cluster 1**, spliceosome and ribosome biogenesis are recurrent pathways. Components of the PI3K/Akt and Wnt signaling were also enriched, whereas BIRC5 and SUMO1 regulate apoptosis and post-translational modifications, respectively. The PPI network in **Cluster 2** is centrally enriched in ECM dynamics and cell–matrix signaling, with focal adhesion and PI3K/Akt as hub pathways. The proteins in the network of **Cluster 3** are predominantly associated with ribosomal biogenesis, translation, and RNA processing, with strong enrichment in conserved pathways such as global protein synthesis, protein processing in endoplasmic reticulum, and mitochondrial translation. In a similar way to Cluster 2, the PPI network of **Cluster 4** is enriched in ECM remodeling, glycolysis, and cell adhesion signaling. ECM dynamics dominate this cluster, with collagens and modifiers driving ECM integrity. Glycolysis enzymes highlight metabolic reprogramming, and focal adhesion and PI3K/Akt couple signaling to pro-survival pathways. For **Cluster 5**, the PPI network is enriched in cell cycle regulation, DNA replication/repair, and chromatin remodeling.

3. Chondrogenic surfaceome dynamics via aminooxy-biotin enrichment

We next profiled the surfaceome during chondrogenic differentiation. Of 522 quantified proteins/protein groups, 18 detected in only one time point were excluded, leaving 504 proteins for differential protein expression analysis. PCA revealed low degree of variability among biological replicates, with clear separation by culture day along PC1 (40% variance) (Figure 4). This trajectory mirrored trends observed in the total proteome, reflecting stage-specific surfaceome dynamics as cells progressed from undifferentiated (day 1) to mature (day 15) states.

Figure 4. Quantitative proteomics analysis of aminooxy biotin (AOB) enriched samples from chondrogenic micromass cultures. A. PCA of the AOB-enriched samples of micromass cultures undergoing chondrogenesis (504 proteins in the dataset). Each dot represents a biological replicate (n = 3). The samples clustered together according to culture age along the principal component (PC) 1 and PC2 hyperplanes, which account for 40% and 15% of the variance, respectively. **B.** The correlation matrix (right panel) also signifies separation among the samples according to differentiation status. **C–D.** Pathway analysis using Gene Ontology (GO) annotation for the AOB-enriched subproteome of chondrogenic cells undergoing chondrogenic differentiation. Panel shows the top GO terms based on biological process (BP), cellular compartment (CC), or molecular function (MF), separately for upregulated (**C**, top panel) and downregulated (**D**, bottom panel) proteins, following ranking by adjusted p-values. The *x*-axis is the adjusted p-value of the enriched terms.

A total of 254 proteins (72, 74, 89, and 19 for each consecutive timepoint comparison: day 1–3, day 3–6, day 6–10, and day 10–15, respectively) were identified as significantly upregulated. Similarly, 170 proteins (10, 82, 31, and 47 for each corresponding timepoint comparison) were identified as significantly downregulated (Figure S3). DEP lists for pairwise comparisons of subsequent culture days are provided in the Supporting Information (Additional file 4).

We performed GO analysis on DEPs that were up or downregulated in later time points to better characterize DEPs between each time point (Figure 4C–D). Upregulated proteins were enriched in collagen biosynthesis (terms such as peptidyl-prolyl hydroxylation, L-ascorbic acid binding), ECM maturation (glycosaminoglycan biosynthesis), and cell–matrix adhesion, consistent with chondrocyte functional specialization. In contrast, GO terms associated with downregulated DEPs included developmental signaling (ephrin receptor pathway, Wnt-activated receptor activity, regulation of ERK1 and ERK2 cascade), growth factor modulation, and several terms related to neural processes (synapses and axonal growth), suggesting attenuation of plasticity pathways in mature cells.

4. Representative proteins and pathways in the chondrogenic surfaceome

Proteins in the aminooxy-biotin-enriched subproteome were classified into four clusters based on expression dynamics (Figure 5A–B). Protein lists for each cluster are provided in the Supporting Information (Additional file 5).

Cluster 1 (96 proteins) exhibited progressive upregulation during *in vitro* chondrogenesis, enriched in GO terms such as ECM organization, L-ascorbic acid binding, and peptidyl-prolyl hydroxylation (related to collagen alpha-chain synthesis), and bone development (Figure 5C). In addition to an overrepresentation of collagens, surfaceome cluster 1 contains key chondrocyte regulators and cartilage matrix constituents including MATN1 (pericellular mechanotransduction), SDC4 (syndecan-4; involved in ECM signaling), EPYC (epiphycan; a proteoglycan modulating collagen fibrillogenesis), TRPV4 (transient

491   receptor potential vanilloid 4; involved in mechanosensation), and SFRP3 (secreted frizzled-

492   related protein 3; a Wnt pathway inhibitor), together highlighting its biological significance for

493   cartilage phenotype maintenance and differentiation (42-44).

Figure 5. Unsupervised clustering analysis of differentially expressed proteins in the AOB-enriched subproteome during chondrogenesis using the k-means algorithm. A–B. The expression dynamics of each cluster are visible in clusters 1–4. The *x*-axis represents the time points (days of culturing). **C.** Pathway analysis using Gene Ontology (GO) annotation for the 4 clusters. Selected terms for GO biological processes (BP), cellular component (CC), and molecular functions (MF). Barplot shows significant terms, the *x*-axis is gene (protein) ratio and the number of proteins belonging to given enriched terms. Together, these clusters outline the progressive remodeling of the chondrogenic surfaceome.

504   **Cluster 2** (60 proteins) showed peak expression on culture day 6, with

505   overrepresented GO terms such as kinase activity, ephrin receptor activity, growth factor

506   binding, and FGF signaling. Surfaceome cluster 2 harbors several cell-surface regulators of

507   chondrocyte biology, including RECK (a membrane-anchored matrix metalloprotease inhibitor

508   (45)), FGFR2 (fibroblast growth factor receptor 2; regulates chondrocyte

proliferation/differentiation signaling (46)), multiple ephrin receptors (EPHA7, EPHB2, EPHB1, EPHB3 with potential roles in cartilage morphogenesis (47)), SRC kinase (chondrocyte phenotype control (48)), and GPC1 (glypical-1; a proteoglycan and cell surface co-receptor involved in growth factor pathway modulation (49)), highlighting surfaceome mechanisms in cartilage development and regeneration.

Cluster 3 (63 proteins) displayed transient suppression on culture day 6, followed by late-stage upregulation in mature cultures, with overrepresented GO terms related to RNA polymerase II and the cell cycle. This cluster includes surfaceome and secreted proteins with established contributions to cartilage biology, such as FGFR3 (regulation of proliferation and differentiation (50)), TGFR2 (matrix synthesis and hypertrophy control), TIMP3 (matrix protection), TSP2, and ANXA1 (annexin A1; chondroprotection and matrix homeostasis (51)), together highlighting the complexity of chondrocyte surface signaling and matrix regulation

Cluster 4 (88 proteins) declined steadily after day 3 in mature chondrocytes, suggesting roles restricted to early differentiation. Enriched GO terms in this cluster include muscle and nervous system development, as well as tyrosine kinase and growth factor signaling. This group included key regulatory surfaceome molecules such as SMO (smoothened; involved in the Indian Hedgehog (IHH) pathway and hypertrophy (52)), or FZD7 (frizzled 7; a Wnt receptor involved in chondroprotection (53)), highlighting the involvement of diverse signaling and adhesion pathways in cartilage biology and prospective OA therapy targets. This cluster contained several proteins without established roles in chondrogenesis, including PODXL (matrix adhesion and phenotype stability) and CNTFR (growth factor signaling and repair).

We also performed a detailed PPI network analysis of each surfaceome cluster using STRING (Figure S4). In **Cluster 1**, the PPI network is enriched in ECM remodeling, collagen biosynthesis, and protein folding, with additional roles in vesicle trafficking and oxidative stress response. The PPI network in **Cluster 2** was dominated by ephrin signaling with four Eph receptors, highlighting roles in developmental patterning. Endocytosis and RAB GTPases are central to membrane dynamics and intracellular transport. SRC and FGFR2 link focal

adhesion and growth factor signaling. **Cluster 3** is enriched in cytoskeletal organization,

calcium signaling, and cell adhesion pathways. Focal adhesion and actin cytoskeleton

pathways dominate the network, driven by actinin, myosin, and dystrophin. Calcium signaling

may integrate metabolic and inflammatory responses via CALM3 and S100A6. HMGB1 links

nuclear DNA repair with extracellular VEGF signaling. **Cluster 4** is dominated by ephrin

signaling with several Eph receptors, highlighting roles in cell migration during nodule

formation. Wnt and Hedgehog signaling pathways are central to developmental processes.

EGFR/FGFRs link growth factor signaling to MAPK activation.

5. Surfaceome enrichment enhances detection of low-abundance targets

Comparative analysis revealed limited overlap (23%) between proteins identified in

total lysates and surfaceome-enriched fractions (Table S2). Notably, 77% of AOB-enriched

proteins were undetectable in total lysates, demonstrating the method's enhanced capacity to

resolve low-abundance membrane-associated targets. Conventional whole-cell proteomics is

constrained by the dominance of high-abundance cytoplasmic and organellar proteins, which

often mask low-abundance surface-residing targets during MS analysis. By selectively

enriching surface proteins, our approach mitigates this dynamic range limitation, enabling

robust identification of membrane-associated and extracellular proteins that otherwise fall

below detection thresholds in unfractionated lysates. This methodological advance

underscores the efficacy of this method in resolving biologically critical surfaceome

components, which are frequently underrepresented in global proteomic analyses, and

highlights its utility for advancing receptor, biomarker, and therapeutic target discovery.

6. In silico and in vitro chondrogenic surfaceome

To maximize the identification of cell surface proteins, we inferred cell surface

localization for all detected proteins using established GO annotations for cellular component

and molecular function (16). We first applied this *in silico* prediction on the total cell lysate

dataset, defining the GO term-based surfaceome of chondrogenic cultures. Of the 5,207

proteins in this dataset, 885 proteins (17%) were predicted to localize to the cell surface.

Figure 6. Enrichment of cell surface proteins using the AOB labelling approach. A. Distribution
of the 504 surface proteins identified in this study (after manual curation using GO terms; dark bars,
core surfaceome; light bars, probably non-surface proteins) between different culture days. **B.** Full
symmetrical matrix of the surfaceome proteins across differentiating cultures (integers represent the
number of surfaceome proteins; non-integers represent Jaccard indices). **C.** Distribution of the
manually curated cell surface proteins identified in this study between micromass cultures of various
ages.

We then applied the same approach on the AOB-enriched dataset. The AOB-based

enrichment method substantially increased the proportion of identified cell surface proteins,

with 55–60% of proteins at all time points and across biological replicates annotated as cell

surface-localized (Figure 6A). This represents a significant improvement in the number of

surface proteins detected as chondrogenic differentiation progressed, as demonstrated by full

symmetrical matrix analysis (Jaccard index) (Figure 6B). We classified the identified

surfaceome proteins into major functional categories based on GO molecular function and

biological process annotations: enzymes, transporters, receptors, cell junctions and adhesion

proteins, ECM components, and unclassified/miscellaneous proteins (including known

interacting or binding partners of surface proteins; Table S3). The relative distribution of

surface proteins in these categories remained consistent throughout chondrogenesis.

We next examined qualitative expression dynamics of the cell surface proteins to

identify candidate surface biomarkers specific to the early stages of chondrogenic

differentiation (days 1–6). Using Venn diagram analysis of manually curated protein lists

across the studied time points (Figure 6C), only two proteins met the criteria for early-stage

specificity: ciliary neurotrophic factor receptor (CNTFR) and podocalyxin (PODXL).

Figure 7. Validation of the efficacy and specificity of the AOB-based glycocapture method.
Western blot for CNTFR (**A**) and PODXL (**B**) performed on total cell lysates of micromass cultures.
Representative blot image (n = 3). Full-length uncropped blots are presented in Figure S5.
Intracellular distribution of CNTFR (**C**) and PODXL (**D**) in cells of micromass cultures detected by
immunocytochemistry. Primary antibodies were visualised using Alexa555-conjugated anti-rabbit
secondary antibodies (red). Nuclear DNA was stained with DAPI (cyan). Data shown are
representative out of 3 independent experiments. Scale bar, 5 μm.

7. Validation of CNTFR and PODXL expression

To verify the expression of CNTFR and PODXL during chondrogenesis, we performed

western blot analyses on total cell lysates obtained from micromass cultures harvested at the

same time points as AOB-enriched samples. Both CNTFR and PODXL were clearly detected

on the blots. For CNTFR, a distinct band was observed at approximately 43 kDa, consistent

with its predicted molecular mass, and its expression displayed a gradual decrease over the

course of differentiation (Figure 7A). Similarly, PODXL was detected as a prominent ~60 kDa

band, also showing a progressive downregulation throughout the differentiation period (Figure

7B). Notably, the expression patterns of both CNTFR and PODXL closely mirrored the trends

observed in our quantitative proteomics analyses performed on the same cultures.

To further investigate the subcellular localization of CNTFR and PODXL, we carried

out immunocytochemistry followed by confocal microscopy. Both CNTFR and PODXL were

localized to the plasma membrane in chondrogenic cells, with additional intracellular staining

(Figure 7C–D). Although this analysis was qualitative, both markers appeared to be

downregulated at later stages of differentiation, with this trend being particularly pronounced

for PODXL. Notably, PODXL was primarily localized at the leading edge of cellular processes,

suggesting a potential role in cell morphology or migration during chondrogenesis.

To investigate the functional role of CNTFR and PODXL in our chondrogenic model,

we analyzed their regulatory networks using transcriptomic and proteomic data. STRING-

derived interaction network for both proteins (top 25 interactants) were cross-referenced with

expression profiles from our previously published RNA-seq dataset (17) of the same

chondrogenic model, and total lysate proteomics.

For CNTFR, 21 of the 25 interactants were expressed at the transcript level (Figures

S6–S7), and 8 also detected as proteins in the total lysates. PODXL showed expression of 14

interactant transcripts and 8 corresponding proteins. Weighted gene co-expression network

analysis (WGCNA) of RNA-seq data, using CNTFR or PODXL expression levels across

different samples as a trait, revealed clusters of genes highly correlated with CNTFR or

PODXL expression. Therefore, we screened the proximal associated proteins of CNTFR or

PODXL and their top 25 interactants within significantly correlated modules and integrated

them. The rationale behind this approach was to check the enrichment of GO information in

the co-expression modules. For CNTFR, five module eigengenes (MEs) were showing

significant degree of correlation (with the turquoise module showing the strongest correlation

to the trait), indicating that genes in these MEs may be associated with CNTFR or its top 25

interactants. We therefore performed functional enrichment analysis on these modules, in

which GO terms related to tyrosine phosphorylation, cell adhesion, cytokine and growth factor

activity, PI3K/Akt and MAPK pathways were enriched. For PODXL, out of five MEs showing

high degree of correlation with the gene and its interactants, the black ME displayed the

strongest correlation to the trait, in which GO terms such as cell-cell junction, potassium

channel activity, differentiation and morphogenesis were over-represented.

Figure 8. Effects of transient gene silencing of CNTFR or PODXL on osteochondral marker gene expression profiles and cartilage matrix production. A. Quantitative RT-qPCR analysis of CNTFR and PODXL mRNA levels in micromass cultures 48 hours post-transfection with target-specific siRNAs. Expression values are shown as fold change relative to non-targeting (NT) control, normalized to the reference gene *RPS7*. Data represent mean ± SEM (n = 3). Asterisks indicate significant differences relative to NT controls (p < 0.05). **B.** Representative DMMB-stained micromass cultures at day 6 illustrating cartilage matrix deposition after transient CNTFR or PODXL silencing compared with NT control. Scale bar = 1 mm. The lower panel shows the corresponding MATLAB-based quantitative analysis of metachromatic area normalized to NT = 100%. Data are mean ± SEM (n = 3). **C.** MTT assay results reflecting relative cell viability in day 6 cultures after silencing. Values are expressed as percentage of NT control (mean ± SEM, n = 3). **D.** Expression of key osteochondrogenic marker genes (*COL1A1, COL2A1, ACAN, RUNX2*) examined 48 hours after transfection. Values represent fold change versus NT control, normalized to *RPS7*. Data are mean ± SEM (n = 3); asterisks indicate p < 0.05.

8. Transient gene silencing of CNTFR and PODXL

To evaluate the functional impact of CNTFR and PODXL on matrix gene regulation,

we performed transient siRNA-mediated silencing in primary chondrogenic progenitor cells

prior to seeding as micromass cultures (culture day 0). Transfection efficiency and gene

silencing were confirmed in 2-day-old cultures (48 hours post-transfection), with *CNTFR* and

PODXL transcript levels reduced by approximately 57% and 49%, respectively, relative to the

non-targeting (NT) control (Figure 8A).

Although the DMMB-stained micromass cultures (Figure 8B) did not exhibit overt

qualitative differences in metachromatic intensity across experimental groups, we additionally

performed quantitative image analysis to ensure objective comparison of matrix yield. Using

MATLAB-based area quantification normalized to the non-targeting (NT) control (set

as 100%), the mean ± SEM values confirmed that total metachromatic matrix deposition

remained statistically unchanged following transient knockdown of *CNTFR* or *PODXL* (n = 3).

This finding supports the notion that the limited 48-hour window after siRNA treatment is

sufficient to capture early transcriptional but not morphological effects, as ECM accumulation

in this model typically becomes detectable only several days later. Similarly, cell viability and

proliferation remained unaffected on day 6 as assessed by MTT assay (Figure 8C).

However, RT-qPCR analysis performed 48 hours post-transfection revealed distinct

transcriptional effects on osteochondrogenic marker gene expression, consistent with early

transcriptional rather than morphological responses (Figure 8D). *CNTFR* silencing resulted in

marked upregulation of *ACAN* (2.9-fold), *COL2A1* (4.9-fold), *RUNX2* (2.5-fold), and *COL1A1*

(2.7-fold) relative to non-targeting (NT) control cultures, whereas *PODXL* silencing increased

ACAN (3.3-fold) and *RUNX2* (2.6-fold) expression but downregulated *COL1A1* (−3.8-fold).

These divergent transcriptional responses indicate that *CNTFR* and *PODXL* differentially

modulate ECM-related gene networks, potentially influencing the matrix composition rather

than its total production.

Although neither perturbation affected observable changes in ECM deposition or

proliferation, these findings highlight distinct effects on transcriptional regulation of ECM-

associated genes by *CNTFR* and *PODXL*. The contrasting modulation of *COL1A1* suggests

that these surface proteins may influence the qualitative composition and molecular specificity

of the ECM during chondrogenesis. Furthermore, the observed expression patterns reinforce

the concept that *PODXL* and *CNTFR* act as early regulatory nodes, modulating transcriptional

programs that precede measurable ECM remodeling during chondrogenesis.

Discussion

In this work, we identify podocalyxin (PODXL) and ciliary neurotrophic factor receptor

(CNTFR) as previously unrecognized cell surface constituents of chondrogenic progenitor

cells. By employing a glycocapture-assisted subproteome enrichment strategy combined with

high-throughput shotgun mass spectrometry, we achieved enhanced sensitivity for detecting

low-abundance surface compared to conventional whole-cell and surfaceome profiling

proteomics approaches, as demonstrated in earlier studies (10, 16, 54). While similar

enrichment and mass spectrometry-based workflows have previously been applied to

characterize the surfaceome of mesenchymal cells and primary equine chondrocytes under

normal and pro-inflammatory conditions (9, 15), the present work complements and extends

this methodology to systematically and quantitatively profile dynamic changes in the

surfaceome during *in vitro* chondrogenic differentiation in embryonic progenitor cells. Our

study offers a temporal and functional proteomic map of the chondrogenic cell surface in a

developmental (non-inflammatory) context, widening the molecular framework for

understanding how membrane proteins contribute to cartilage lineage specification and

phenotype stability.

CNTFR and implications for chondrogenesis

The identification of CNTFR in differentiating chondrocytes opens new perspectives

on neurotrophic cytokine signaling in cartilage biology. Ciliary neurotrophic factor (CNTF), a

member of the interleukin-6 (IL-6) family, signals through a tripartite receptor complex

comprising CNTFRα, gp130, and LIFR (55, 56). Initially characterized as a neuronal survival

and differentiation factor, CNTF has since been implicated in multiple tissues, including bone

and cartilage (57-59). Related ligands such as cardiotrophin-like cytokine (CLCF1) also

influence MSC differentiation and osteogenesis (60), reinforcing the idea of a functional role

for CNTF/CNTFR signaling in skeletal development (61).

CNTFR expression has known roles in cartilage homeostasis and OA progression. For

instance, upregulation of the CRLF1/CLCF1 complex, which competes with CNTF for CNTFR

binding, disrupts cartilage ECM homeostasis and exacerbates OA (58). Our finding of persistent CNTFR expression during chondrogenesis, coupled with its plasma membrane localization in differentiating chondrocytes, suggests dual roles in cartilage maintenance and pathological remodeling. This positions CNTFR as both a mechanistic regulator and potential therapeutic target in OA.

Our observation aligns with previous findings on signaling-driven regulation of chondrogenic differentiation. In particular, comprehensive analyses of cartilage lineage specification (62) and recent single-cell and transcriptomic profiling of chondrocyte subpopulations (8) highlighted the interplay between growth factor–mediated pathways (including IL-6 family cytokines, FGFR, and TGF-β signaling) and ECM remodeling as key determinants of progenitor maintenance and hypertrophic transition. Our results suggest that CNTFR activity may function within this network, modulating survival and fibrocartilaginous remodeling responses during differentiation.

Podocalyxin and progenitor state regulation

Podocalyxin (PODXL), classically associated with kidney podocytes and vascular endothelium, is a member of the CD34 transmembrane sialomucin family (63). It contributes to cell adhesion, migration, and progenitor cell maintenance (64, 65). Its presence in chondrogenic cells is novel and suggests potential roles in modulating progenitor cell responses to chondrogenic cues such as SOX9 and TGF-β signaling (66). This is conceptually consistent with previous studies demonstrating dynamic modulation of cell-matrix receptors and cytoskeletal regulators during the dedifferentiation-redifferentiation cycle of chondrocytes (62). Moreover, at the single-cell level, progenitor-like clusters characterized by strong expression of adhesion and polarity molecules were described (8), a feature reminiscent of PODXL-positive states in our study. Together, these findings support the hypothesis that PODXL may contribute to the maintenance of a transitional chondrogenic phenotype with migratory or matrix-adaptation potential. While evidence directly linking PODXL to

chondrogenesis is limited, its downregulation during osteogenic maturation and association

with progenitor-rich MSC populations highlight it as a candidate regulator of early cartilage

differentiation.

Opposing roles in ECM quality control

Our transient knockdown assays revealed opposing transcriptional regulation of

COL1A1, a well-known marker of fibrocartilage and mechanically compromised repair tissue

(62, 67), by *PODXL* and *CNTFR*. *CNTFR* silencing increased *COL1A1* expression (2.7-fold),

whereas *PODXL* silencing reduced it (−3.8-fold). The differential regulation of *COL1A1*

between the two knockdowns suggests that these proteins influence ECM-related

transcription through distinct pathways. PODXL may help sustain fibrogenic signaling (via β1-

integrin/FAK pathways) (68, 69), while CNTFR loss may mimic cytokine deprivation stress,

and trigger compensatory fibrotic responses, possibly through ERK/STAT3 signaling cross-

talk, reminiscent of synovial fibrosis in OA via impaired signaling (70). Thus, the responses

observed here are consistent with the predicted biological roles of CNTFR and PODXL, which

are reflected in the network associations shown in Figure S7.

The absence of overt changes in ECM production in our knockdown model suggests

functional redundancy in matrix remodeling, post-transcriptional regulation, or compensation

by other surface receptors. Quantitative evaluation of DMMB-positive areas using

MATLAB-based image analysis further confirmed that total matrix deposition was not

significantly altered by either treatment. The absence of visible or quantitative differences

therefore likely reflects the temporal separation between transcriptional and phenotypic

responses, rather than true lack of functional relevance.

Translational implications

Single-cell RNA-seq analysis of human articular chondrocytes revealed detectable

transcripts for both *CNTFR* (predominantly in effector and homeostatic chondrocytes) and

PODXL (at lower levels in *VEGFA*$^+$ cells, fibrochondrocytes, and pre-hypertrophic

chondrocytes) (Figure S8). This, combined with their extracellular accessibility, positions

CNTFR and PODXL as potentially detectable biomarkers in synovial fluid or serum, opening

avenues for early OA diagnosis and therapeutic monitoring.

Beyond their diagnostic potential, modulating PODXL-mediated cell-matrix

interactions or CNTFR-dependent signaling could open new, targeted approaches to cartilage

repair or OA management (71). While functional redundancy in chondrogenic signaling

networks or compensatory mechanisms from other surface receptors may mask direct

phenotypic impact in single knockdowns, combinatorial gene perturbations or pathway-

focused interventions could reveal their full regulatory capacity.

Limitations

The use of chicken embryonic limb bud-derived chondrogenic progenitor cells provides

a valuable developmental model but may not fully recapitulate all aspects of human

chondrogenesis or OA pathophysiology. While the embryonic avian limb model has been

extensively validated as a mechanistic system for studying cartilage differentiation, species-

specific variations in ECM composition, signaling dynamics, and progenitor populations may

limit the direct extrapolation of our findings to human articular cartilage. Similarly, the

micromass culture system, although well-established for modeling chondrogenic lineage

commitment (18), remains a simplified *in vitro* system that cannot reproduce the full cellular

complexity, mechanical stimuli, or biochemical heterogeneity present in the native joint

environment.

Our cell surface protein enrichment workflow focused on N-linked glycosylated plasma

membrane constituents, which ensures strong selectivity for *bona fide* surface proteins but

may underrepresent other biologically important groups such as non-glycosylated or O-linked

membrane proteins and secreted matrix components. Consequently, certain signaling or

adhesion receptor families involved in chondrogenic regulation may not have been captured.

In addition, although Gene Ontology (GO) annotation was performed using human ortholog

mapping to facilitate cross-species interpretation, specific biological processes may be unique

to avian systems or not entirely conserved between chicken and human cartilage (72, 73).

In addition, functional redundancy among surface receptors may partially mask

morphological or matrix-level phenotypes, as parallel signaling pathways can compensate for

transient loss of individual components. The transient siRNA-based functional assays for

PODXL and *CNTFR* were intentionally designed to capture short-term transcriptional

responses; however, such brief modulation may not fully reveal cumulative effects on

long-term ECM assembly, organization, or mechanical integrity.

Future studies incorporating human chondrogenic progenitors or patient-derived

chondrocyte models, coupled with more comprehensive surfaceome coverage and stable

gene perturbation strategies, will be necessary to confirm the translational relevance and fully

delineate the downstream signaling networks of these proteins and confirm the translational

relevance of the observed regulatory patterns. Fully comprehensive surfaceome profiling of

chondrogenic and mature chondrocytes will ultimately require integration of alternative

enrichment chemistries, spatial proteomics, and cell types, as well as deeper sampling under

both physiological and disease-mimicking conditions.

Conclusions

In summary, we map the dynamic surfaceome of chondrogenic cells and identify PODXL and CNTFR as newly identified components at the interface of cell communication, adhesion, and survival signaling, showing expression dynamics consistent with roles in ECM regulation. These findings deepen our understanding of chondrocyte surface signaling networks, hold promise for biomarker development and could inform therapeutic strategies in OA and cartilage regeneration.

Our study contributes new insight into surfaceome remodeling during embryonic chondrogenesis. The candidate surface proteins identified here provide a basis for further discovery efforts and functional exploration under a wider range of conditions. Future studies in human cellular and disease models will be crucial to determine their diagnostic and therapeutic potential. Furthermore, follow-up studies will be needed to expand the surfaceome landscape under diverse physiological (e.g., hormonally regulated, loaded cartilage) and pathological (inflammatory, OA-like) conditions. The dynamic and context-dependent nature of the chondrocyte surfaceome warrants integration of multiple complementary strategies, including alternative cell models, stimuli, and orthogonal enrichment techniques to approach a more complete characterization.

Additional files (Supplementary material)

- Additional file 1 (PDF) contains Supplementary Figures S1–S8 and Supplementary Tables S1–S3, providing additional data supporting the main findings.
- Additional files 2–5 (Excel spreadsheets) include: differential expression analysis and clustering results for total lysate proteomes (files 2–3) and surfaceome proteomes (files 4–5). Collectively, these materials offer expanded experimental details, data visualizations, and full quantitative proteomic datasets underlying the study.

DECLARATIONS

Ethics approval and consent to participate

Not applicable to thus manuscript.

Consent for publication

Not applicable to thus manuscript.

Availability of data and materials

The dataset supporting the conclusions of this article is available in the ProteomeXchange Consortium *via* the PRIDE partner repository with the dataset identifier PXD064013 (https://www.ebi.ac.uk/pride/archive/projects/PXD064013/private)

Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest. The authors wrote this paper within the scope of their academic and research positions. None of the authors has any relationships that could be construed as biased or inappropriate. Funding bodies were not involved in the study design, data collection, analysis, or interpretation. The decision to submit this paper for publication was not influenced by any funding bodies.

Funding

This paper was supported by the János Bolyai Research Scholarship of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, awarded to CM. CM was supported by the Young Researcher Excellence Programme (grant number: FK-134304) of the National Research, Development and Innovation Office, Hungary. This research was supported by the EKÖP-24-4 and EKÖP-24-3 University Research Fellowship Programme of the Ministry for Culture and Innovation from the source of the National Research, Development and Innovation Fund, Hungary, awarded to RT (EKÖP-24-4-II-DE-58), KJ (EKÖP-24-3-I-DE-290) and PK (EKÖP-24-3-II-DE-1). PK was supported by the PhD Excellence Scholarship from the Count István Tisza Foundation for the University of Debrecen. CM and RT also acknowledge financial support from the European Cooperation in Science and Technology COST Association Action CA21110 - Building an open European Network on OsteoArthritis research (NetwOArk); https://www.cost.eu/actions/CA21110/). This research was supported by the University of Debrecen Program for Scientific Publication, and by the National Academy of Scientist Education Program in Hungary.

Authors' contributions

All authors made substantial contributions to discussion of the content, writing of the original outline, and reviewing/editing of the article before submission. All authors approve the final version for publication and agree to be accountable for the accuracy and integrity of the study. Patrik Kovács: Formal analysis, Methodology, Validation, Visualisation, Writing—original draft, Writing—review & editing. Peter Brazda: Formal analysis, Visualisation, Writing—original draft, Writing—review & editing. Tibor Hajdú: Formal analysis, Methodology, Writing—original draft, Writing—review & editing. Boglárka Harsányi: Formal analysis, Methodology, Writing—original draft. Krisztián Juhász: Formal analysis, Methodology, Writing—original draft. Roland Takács: Formal analysis, Methodology, Validation, Writing—original draft, Writing—review & editing. Judit Vágó: Formal analysis, Methodology, Writing—original draft, Writing—review &

editing. Zhangzgeng Wang: Formal analysis, Methodology, Writing—original draft, Writing—

review & editing. Clare Coveney: Formal analysis, Methodology, Writing—original draft,

Writing—review & editing. David J. Boocock: Formal analysis, Software, Methodology,

Visualization, Writing—original draft, Writing—review & editing. Csaba Matta:

Conceptualization, Formal analysis, Funding acquisition, Methodology, Supervision,

Validation, Writing—original draft, Writing—review & editing.

Acknowledgements

The authors thank Mrs. Krisztina Biróné Barna and Ms. Éva Katona from the Department of

Anatomy, Histology and Embryology, and Prof. Éva Csősz and Mrs. Julianna Kökényesiné

Csáki from the Proteomics Core Facility, Department of Biochemistry and Molecular Biology,

Faculty of Medicine, University of Debrecen, for technical assistance.

References

1. Mobasheri A, Thudium CS, Bay-Jensen AC, Maleitzke T, Geissler S, Duda GN, et al. Biomarkers for osteoarthritis: Current status and future prospects. Best Pract Res Clin Rheumatol. 2023;37(2):101852.
2. Tong L, Yu H, Huang X, Shen J, Xiao G, Chen L, et al. Current understanding of osteoarthritis pathogenesis and relevant new approaches. Bone Res. 2022;10(1):60.
3. Rodriguez-Merchan EC. The Current Role of Disease-modifying Osteoarthritis Drugs. Arch Bone Jt Surg. 2023;11(1):11-22.
4. Maqbool M, Fekadu G, Jiang X, Bekele F, Tolossa T, Turi E, et al. An up to date on clinical prospects and management of osteoarthritis. Ann Med Surg (Lond). 2021;72:103077.
5. Richardson SM, Kalamegam G, Pushparaj PN, Matta C, Memic A, Khademhosseini A, et al. Mesenchymal stem cells in regenerative medicine: Focus on articular cartilage and intervertebral disc regeneration. Methods. 2016;99:69-80.
6. Muthu S, Korpershoek JV, Novais EJ, Tawy GF, Hollander AP, Martin I. Failure of cartilage regeneration: emerging hypotheses and related therapeutic strategies. Nat Rev Rheumatol. 2023;19(7):403-16.
7. Im GI, Kim TK. Regenerative Therapy for Osteoarthritis: A Perspective. Int J Stem Cells. 2020;13(2):177-81.
8. Matta C, Takacs R, Dvir-Ginzberg M, Richardson SM, Pelttari K, Pattappa G, et al. Insights into chondrocyte populations in cartilaginous tissues at the single-cell level. Nat Rev Rheumatol. 2025;21(8):465-77.
9. Matta C, Boocock DJ, Fellows CR, Miosge N, Dixon JE, Liddell S, et al. Molecular phenotyping of the surfaceome of migratory chondroprogenitors and mesenchymal stem cells using biotinylation, glycocapture and quantitative LC-MS/MS proteomic analysis. Sci Rep. 2019;9(1):9018.
10. Pauwels J, Fijalkowska D, Eyckerman S, Gevaert K. Mass spectrometry and the cellular surfaceome. Mass Spectrom Rev. 2022;41(5):804-41.

11. Takacs R, Mobasheri A, Matta C. Introduction: Methods for Studying the Plasma Membrane
and the Surfaceome. Methods Mol Biol. 2025;2908:1-9.
12. Alegre-Aguaron E, Desportes P, Garcia-Alvarez F, Castiella T, Larrad L, Martinez-Lorenzo
MJ. Differences in surface marker expression and chondrogenic potential among various
tissue-derived mesenchymal cells from elderly patients with osteoarthritis. Cells Tissues
Organs. 2012;196(3):231-40.
13. Lu Z, Yan L, Pei M. Commentary on 'Surface markers associated with chondrogenic
potential of human mesenchymal stromal/stem cells'. F1000Res. 2020;9.
14. Kalamegam G, Memic A, Budd E, Abbas M, Mobasheri A. A Comprehensive Review of
Stem Cells for Cartilage Regeneration in Osteoarthritis. Adv Exp Med Biol. 2018;1089:23-
36.
15. Jeremiasse B, Matta C, Fellows CR, Boocock DJ, Smith JR, Liddell S, et al. Alterations in
the chondrocyte surfaceome in response to pro-inflammatory cytokines. BMC Mol Cell Biol.
2020;21(1):47.
16. Kovacs P, Boocock DJ, Coveney C, Mobasheri A, Matta C. Aminooxy Biotin-Based
Characterization of the Surfaceome of Chondrogenic Cells. Methods Mol Biol.
2025;2908:65-79.
17. Takacs R, Vago J, Poliska S, Pushparaj PN, Ducza L, Kovacs P, et al. The temporal
transcriptomic signature of cartilage formation. Nucleic Acids Res. 2023;51(8):3590-617.
18. Takacs R, Juhasz T, Katona E, Somogyi C, Vago J, Hajdu T, et al. Isolation and Micromass
Culturing of Primary Chicken Chondroprogenitor Cells for Cartilage Regeneration. Curr
Protoc. 2023;3(7):e835.
19. Demichev V, Messner CB, Vernardis SI, Lilley KS, Ralser M. DIA-NN: neural networks and
interference correction enable deep proteome coverage in high throughput. Nat Methods.
2020;17(1):41-4.
20. Ranathunge C, Patel SS, Pinky L, Correll VL, Chen S, Semmes OJ, et al. promor: a
comprehensive R package for label-free proteomics data analysis and predictive modeling.
Bioinform Adv. 2023;3(1):vbad025.
21. Matta C, Juhasz T, Fodor J, Hajdu T, Katona E, Szucs-Somogyi C, et al. N-methyl-D-
aspartate (NMDA) receptor expression and function is required for early chondrogenesis.
Cell Commun Signal. 2019;17(1):166.
22. Pfaffl MW, Tichopad A, Prgomet C, Neuvians TP. Determination of stable housekeeping
genes, differentially regulated target genes and sample integrity: BestKeeper--Excel-based
tool using pair-wise correlations. Biotechnol Lett. 2004;26(6):509-15.
23. Kita K, Kimura T, Nakamura N, Yoshikawa H, Nakano T. PI3K/Akt signaling as a key
regulatory pathway for chondrocyte terminal differentiation. Genes Cells. 2008;13(8):839-50.
24. Zhang H, Chen X, Xue P, Ma X, Li J, Zhang J. FN1 promotes chondrocyte differentiation
and collagen production via TGF-beta/PI3K/Akt pathway in mice with femoral fracture.
Gene. 2021;769:145253.
25. Liu CF, Lefebvre V. The transcription factors SOX9 and SOX5/SOX6 cooperate genome-
wide through super-enhancers to drive chondrogenesis. Nucleic Acids Res.
2015;43(17):8183-203.
26. Haller R, Schwanbeck R, Martini S, Bernoth K, Kramer J, Just U, et al. Notch1 signaling
regulates chondrogenic lineage determination through Sox9 activation. Cell Death Differ.
2012;19(3):461-9.
27. Fukumoto T, Sanyal A, Fitzsimmons JS, O'Driscoll SW. Expression of beta1 integrins during
periosteal chondrogenesis. Osteoarthritis Cartilage. 2002;10(2):135-44.
28. Yagi H, Takahata Y, Murakami T, Nakaminami Y, Hagino H, Yamamoto S, et al.
Transcriptional regulation of FRZB in chondrocytes by Osterix and Msx2. J Bone Miner
Metab. 2022;40(5):723-34.
29. Wang W, Rigueur D, Lyons KM. TGFbeta signaling in cartilage development and
maintenance. Birth Defects Res C Embryo Today. 2014;102(1):37-51.
30. Zhang F, Wang Y, Zhao Y, Wang M, Zhou B, Zhou B, et al. NFATc1 marks articular
cartilage progenitors and negatively determines articular chondrocyte differentiation. Elife.
2023;12.
31. Niu J, Liu Y, Wang J, Wang H, Zhao Y, Zhang M. Thrombospondin-2 acts as a critical
regulator of cartilage regeneration: A review. Medicine (Baltimore). 2023;102(17):e33651.

32. Wang Y, Wen X, Guo Y, Wang Y, Gu Y. TFRC Ablation Induces Insufficient Cartilage Development Through Mitochondrial p53 Translocation-Mediated Ferroptosis. Int J Mol Sci. 2025;26(6).

33. Rigueur D, Brugger S, Anbarchian T, Kim JK, Lee Y, Lyons KM. The type I BMP receptor ACVR1/ALK2 is required for chondrogenesis during development. J Bone Miner Res. 2015;30(4):733-41.

34. Li Q, Han B, Wang C, Tong W, Wei Y, Tseng WJ, et al. Mediation of Cartilage Matrix Degeneration and Fibrillation by Decorin in Post-traumatic Osteoarthritis. Arthritis Rheumatol. 2020;72(8):1266-77.

35. Salminen-Mankonen H, Saamanen AM, Jalkanen M, Vuorio E, Pirila L. Syndecan-1 expression is upregulated in degenerating articular cartilage in a transgenic mouse model for osteoarthritis. Scand J Rheumatol. 2005;34(6):469-74.

36. Gruber BL, Mienaltowski MJ, MacLeod JN, Schittny J, Kasper S, Fluck M. Tenascin-C expression controls the maturation of articular cartilage in mice. BMC Res Notes. 2020;13(1):78.

37. Michelacci YM, Baccarin RYA, Rodrigues NNP. Chondrocyte Homeostasis and Differentiation: Transcriptional Control and Signaling in Healthy and Osteoarthritic Conditions. Life (Basel). 2023;13(7).

38. Choocheep K, Hatano S, Takagi H, Watanabe H, Kimata K, Kongtawelert P, et al. Versican facilitates chondrocyte differentiation and regulates joint morphogenesis. J Biol Chem. 2010;285(27):21114-25.

39. Huang J, Huang J, Li N, Wang L, Xiao Q. FBN2 promotes the proliferation, mineralization, and differentiation of osteoblasts to accelerate fracture healing. Sci Rep. 2025;15(1):4843.

40. Bartoletti G, Dong C, Umar M, He F. Pdgfra regulates multipotent cell differentiation towards chondrocytes via inhibiting Wnt9a/beta-catenin pathway during chondrocranial cartilage development. Dev Biol. 2020;466(1-2):36-46.

41. Ishida O, Tanaka Y, Morimoto I, Takigawa M, Eto S. Chondrocytes are regulated by cellular adhesion through CD44 and hyaluronic acid pathway. J Bone Miner Res. 1997;12(10):1657-63.

42. Oldefest M, Dusterhoft S, Desel C, Thysen S, Fink C, Rabe B, et al. Secreted Frizzled-related protein 3 (sFRP3)-mediated suppression of interleukin-6 receptor release by A disintegrin and metalloprotease 17 (ADAM17) is abrogated in the osteoarthritis-associated rare double variant of sFRP3. Biochem J. 2015;468(3):507-18.

43. O'Conor CJ, Leddy HA, Benefield HC, Liedtke WB, Guilak F. TRPV4-mediated mechanotransduction regulates the metabolic response of chondrocytes to dynamic loading. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2014;111(4):1316-21.

44. Zhang J, Zhang S, Zhou Y, Qu Y, Hou T, Ge W, et al. KLF9 and EPYC acting as feature genes for osteoarthritis and their association with immune infiltration. J Orthop Surg Res. 2022;17(1):365.

45. Kimura T, Okada A, Yatabe T, Okubo M, Toyama Y, Noda M, et al. RECK is up-regulated and involved in chondrocyte cloning in human osteoarthritic cartilage. Am J Pathol. 2010;176(6):2858-67.

46. Hellingman CA, Koevoet W, Kops N, Farrell E, Jahr H, Liu W, et al. Fibroblast growth factor receptors in in vitro and in vivo chondrogenesis: relating tissue engineering using adult mesenchymal stem cells to embryonic development. Tissue Eng Part A. 2010;16(2):545-56.

47. Arthur A, Gronthos S. Eph-Ephrin Signaling Mediates Cross-Talk Within the Bone Microenvironment. Front Cell Dev Biol. 2021;9:598612.

48. Bursell L, Woods A, James CG, Pala D, Leask A, Beier F. Src kinase inhibition promotes the chondrocyte phenotype. Arthritis Res Ther. 2007;9(5):R105.

49. Pan J, Ho M. Role of glypican-1 in regulating multiple cellular signaling pathways. Am J Physiol Cell Physiol. 2021;321(5):C846-C58.

50. Wen X, Li X, Tang Y, Tang J, Zhou S, Xie Y, et al. Chondrocyte FGFR3 Regulates Bone Mass by Inhibiting Osteogenesis. J Biol Chem. 2016;291(48):24912-21.

51. Yang L, Gong K, Ren G, Chen B. The Annexin A1 Protein Mimetic Peptide Ac2-26 prevents cellular senescence of CHON-001 chondrocytes against tumor necrosis factor-alpha via the Nrf2/NF-kappaB pathway. Biotechnol Appl Biochem. 2025;72(3):755-65.

52. Luan J, Tao H, Su Y. Taladegib controls early chondrocyte hypertrophy via inhibiting
smoothened/Gli1 pathway. Am J Transl Res. 2020;12(5):1985-93.
53. Ding Z, Lu W, Dai C, Huang W, Liu F, Shan W, et al. The CRD of Frizzled 7 exhibits
chondroprotective effects in osteoarthritis via inhibition of the canonical Wnt3a/beta-catenin
signaling pathway. Int Immunopharmacol. 2020;82:106367.
54. Lee MC, Sun B. Glycopeptide capture for cell surface proteomics. J Vis Exp. 2014(87).
55. Pasquin S, Sharma M, Gauchat JF. Ciliary neurotrophic factor (CNTF): New facets of an old
molecule for treating neurodegenerative and metabolic syndrome pathologies. Cytokine
Growth Factor Rev. 2015;26(5):507-15.
56. Sleeman MW, Anderson KD, Lambert PD, Yancopoulos GD, Wiegand SJ. The ciliary
neurotrophic factor and its receptor, CNTFR alpha. Pharm Acta Helv. 2000;74(2-3):265-72.
57. Askmyr M, White KE, Jovic T, King HA, Quach JM, Maluenda AC, et al. Ciliary neurotrophic
factor has intrinsic and extrinsic roles in regulating B cell differentiation and bone structure.
Sci Rep. 2015;5:15529.
58. Crisponi L, Buers I, Rutsch F. CRLF1 and CLCF1 in Development, Health and Disease. Int J
Mol Sci. 2022;23(2).
59. McGregor NE, Poulton IJ, Walker EC, Pompolo S, Quinn JM, Martin TJ, et al. Ciliary
neurotrophic factor inhibits bone formation and plays a sex-specific role in bone growth and
remodeling. Calcif Tissue Int. 2010;86(3):261-70.
60. Nahle S, Pasquin S, Laplante V, Rousseau F, Sharma M, Gauchat JF. Cardiotrophin-like
cytokine (CLCF1) modulates mesenchymal stem cell osteoblastic differentiation. J Biol
Chem. 2019;294(32):11952-9.
61. Tsuritani K, Takeda J, Sakagami J, Ishii A, Eriksson T, Hara T, et al. Cytokine receptor-like
factor 1 is highly expressed in damaged human knee osteoarthritic cartilage and involved in
osteoarthritis downstream of TGF-beta. Calcif Tissue Int. 2010;86(1):47-57.
62. Dehne T, Schenk R, Perka C, Morawietz L, Pruss A, Sittinger M, et al. Gene expression
profiling of primary human articular chondrocytes in high-density micromasses reveals
patterns of recovery, maintenance, re- and dedifferentiation. Gene. 2010;462(1-2):8-17.
63. Le Tran N, Wang Y, Nie G. Podocalyxin in Normal Tissue and Epithelial Cancer. Cancers
(Basel). 2021;13(12).
64. Larrucea S, Butta N, Arias-Salgado EG, Alonso-Martin S, Ayuso MS, Parrilla R. Expression
of podocalyxin enhances the adherence, migration, and intercellular communication of cells.
Exp Cell Res. 2008;314(10):2004-15.
65. Lee RH, Seo MJ, Pulin AA, Gregory CA, Ylostalo J, Prockop DJ. The CD34-like protein
PODXL and alpha6-integrin (CD49f) identify early progenitor MSCs with increased
clonogenicity and migration to infarcted heart in mice. Blood. 2009;113(4):816-26.
66. Chen H, Tan XN, Hu S, Liu RQ, Peng LH, Li YM, et al. Molecular Mechanisms of
Chondrocyte Proliferation and Differentiation. Front Cell Dev Biol. 2021;9:664168.
67. Embree MC, Chen M, Pylawka S, Kong D, Iwaoka GM, Kalajzic I, et al. Exploiting
endogenous fibrocartilage stem cells to regenerate cartilage and repair joint injury. Nat
Commun. 2016;7:13073.
68. Jiang C, Centonze A, Song Y, Chrisnandy A, Tika E, Rezakhani S, et al. Collagen signaling
and matrix stiffness regulate multipotency in glandular epithelial stem cells in mice. Nat
Commun. 2024;15(1):10482.
69. Khurana S, Schouteden S, Manesia JK, Santamaria-Martinez A, Huelsken J, Lacy-Hulbert
A, et al. Outside-in integrin signalling regulates haematopoietic stem cell function via
Periostin-Itgav axis. Nat Commun. 2016;7:13500.
70. Damerau A, Rosenow E, Alkhoury D, Buttgereit F, Gaber T. Fibrotic pathways and
fibroblast-like synoviocyte phenotypes in osteoarthritis. Front Immunol. 2024;15:1385006.
71. Zhang F, Clair AJ, Dankert JF, Lee YJ, Campbell KA, Kirsch T. Cytokine Receptor-like
Factor 1 (CRLF1) and Its Role in Osteochondral Repair. Cells. 2024;13(9).
72. Primmer CR, Papakostas S, Leder EH, Davis MJ, Ragan MA. Annotated genes and
nonannotated genomes: cross-species use of Gene Ontology in ecology and evolution
research. Mol Ecol. 2013;22(12):3216-41.
73. Wallis JW, Aerts J, Groenen MA, Crooijmans RP, Layman D, Graves TA, et al. A physical
map of the chicken genome. Nature. 2004;432(7018):761-4.