No cell is an island: circulating T cell:monocyte complexes are markers of immune perturbations

Authors: Julie G. Burel[1], Mikhail Pomaznoy[1], Cecilia S. Lindestam Arlehamn[1], Daniela Weiskopf[1], Ricardo da Silva Antunes[1], Veronique Schulten[1], Mariana Babor[1], Grégory Seumois[1], Jason A. Greenbaum[1], Sunil Premawansa[2], Gayani Premawansa[3], Ananda Wijewickrama[4], Rashmi Tippalagama[5], Aruna D. deSilva[1,5], Robert H. Gilman[6,7], Mayuko Saito[8], Randy Taplitz[9], Pandurangan Vijayanand[1,10], Alessandro Sette[1,10], Bjoern Peters[1,10, *]

Affiliations:

[1]Division of Vaccine Discovery, La Jolla Institute for Allergy and Immunology, La Jolla, CA, USA.

[2]Department of Zoology and Environment Science, Science Faculty, University of Colombo, Sri Lanka.

[3]North Colombo Teaching Hospital, Ragama, Sri Lanka.

[4]National Institute of Infectious Diseases, Gothatuwa, Angoda, Sri Lanka.

[5]Genetech Research Institute, Colombo, Sri Lanka #present address: Dept of Paraclinical Sciences, Faculty of Medicine, General Sir John Kotelawala Defence University, Ratmalana, Sri Lanka.

[6]Johns Hopkins University Bloomberg School of Public Health, Baltimore, MD, USA.

[7]Universidad Peruana Caytano Hereida, Lima, Peru.

[8]Department of Virology, Tohoku University Graduate School of Medicine, Sendai, Japan.

[9]Division of infectious diseases, University of California San Diego, La Jolla, CA, USA.

[10]Department of Medicine, University of California San Diego, La Jolla, CA, USA.

*Correspondence to: bpeters@lji.org

Abstract: We set out to detect a transcriptional signature in CD4 T cells of individuals at risk of

progression to active tuberculosis. We indeed found such a signature which surprisingly could be

tracked to a cell population expressing both T cell (CD3) and monocyte (CD14) markers. Imaging

experiments revealed that $CD3^+CD14^+$ cells included T cell:monocyte complexes with high TCR

signaling activity. Broadening our investigation beyond tuberculosis, we also found $CD3^+CD14^+$-

complexes as a function of time post tetanus, diphtheria and pertussis (Tdap) vaccination and as a

function of disease severity in dengue infection. These data suggest that circulating

Tcell:monocyte complexes form *in vivo* as a result of T cells recognizing antigen presented on the

monocytes, and that the conventional wisdom in flow cytometry to avoid studying cell:cell

complexes should be re-visited.

One sentence summary: T cell:monocyte complexes observed in flow cytometry are not a

technical artefact but reflect true biological interaction between immune cells.

Introduction

Detecting immune perturbations can help diagnose diseases. Our specific interest has been in Tuberculosis (TB), a highly prevalent disease caused by the bacterial pathogen *Mycobacterium tuberculosis* (Mtb) with nearly 2 billion people affected worldwide [1]. TB infections form a spectrum: on one end, there are individuals with controlled infection (latent tuberculosis infection, or LTBI) and on the other end individuals with active disease [2]. Only a small fraction (5-15%) of individuals with LTBI will ever develop active disease, which is associated with significant morbidity and mortality [1]. Treatment for LTBI individuals to eradicate the bacteria is an effective way to prevent active disease. However, due to the risk of side-effects associated with these treatments and low proportion of individuals actually progressing to active disease, treatment of all LTBI individuals to eliminate the disease in high prevalence countries is not justified.

To overcome this hurdle, the WHO has called for the development of diagnostic tests that can reliably predict LTBI progressors with a sensitivity and specificity of 90% [3]. This would enable targeted treatment of at-risk LTBI individuals with the goal of eradicating the disease. Recent efforts towards the development of such tests has included transcriptomic profiling which discovered concise gene signatures predictive of LTBI progression [4, 5]. These results demonstrate the applicability of transcriptional profiling to develop diagnostic tests for risk of TB progression, but the performance of these tests is still far from reaching WHO's goal, and there is still no mechanistic understanding of immune responses required for protection.

We recently identified a gene signature in memory CD4$^+$ T cells that distinguishes individuals with LTBI from uninfected individuals [6]. Such transcriptional profiling of selected cell populations is not a realistic option as a diagnostic test for TB in low resource environments, but it can provide a clearer picture of the role that CD4$^+$ T cells play in TB immunity and in the mechanisms of

disease progression, which is harder to do in whole blood studies [7]. We targeted CD4$^+$ T cells

as they are known to be key players in TB protective immunity [8, 9]. In particular, antigen-specific

CD4$^+$ T cell responses have been shown to be associated with protection in the context of BCG

vaccination [10], and defects in the development of CD4$^+$CCR6$^+$CXCR3$^+$ T cells, which contain

the vast majority of Mtb epitope-specific T cells in LTBI subjects [11], are associated with

increased susceptibility to Mycobacteria infections in humans [12].

Here we asked if the transcriptome data of purified memory CD4$^+$ T cells in latent TB infected

individuals contained a gene signature associated with risk of disease progression that could help

understand the changing role of CD4$^+$ T cells with progression to active disease. We used a

validated marker of TB risk progression that was available to us, namely the

Monocyte/Lymphocyte (M/L) ratio. Dysregulation of M/L ratio is a well known feature of active

TB. It has been described as early as in 1929, where patients with active TB showed high M/L

ratio at the onset of disease, that decreased to normal values as healing occurred [13]. More

recently, M/L ratio has shown good discriminatory power to identify active TB progressors within

LTBI affected adults (HIV seropositive [14] or seronegative [15]), and infants [16]. We found that

LTBI subjects with a high M/L ratio (hence higher risk of progression to disease) indeed had a

distinct gene expression profile in their CD4$^+$ memory T cells, which was surprisingly highly

enriched for monocyte-associated genes. We ultimately traced this discovery to a general

phenomenon of circulating T-cell:monocyte complexes in the blood that can be detected following

immune perturbations, and could serve as a general diagnostic and mechanistic tool to better

monitor and understand T cell:APC immune interactions.

Results

<u>Unexpected detection of monocyte gene expression in CD4+ memory T cells from M/L high subjects.</u>

To identify individuals at high risk of progression to active disease in our previously characterized cohort of LTBI individuals [6], we determined the frequency of monocytes and lymphocytes in their cryopreserved PBMC using our previously published 10-color flow cytometry panel [17]. M/L ratio was calculated based on forward and side scatter identification of the monocyte and lymphocyte populations (**Fig. S2A**), and showed high inter-individual variability within the LTBI cohort (**Fig. S2B**). To identify biological relevant thresholds to apply to the LTBI cohort, we calculated the M/L ratio from a TB negative cohort of 29 individuals [6] in the same fashion. The highest M/L ratio amongst any TB negative subjects was used as a threshold to classify LTBI individuals as M/L high (>0.56, n=6 subjects). The median M/L ratio in the TB negative cohort was then used to classify the remaining LTBI individuals into M/L low (< 0.31, n=12 subjects) and M/L intermediate (M/L int) (0.31 – 0.56, n=12 subjects) (**Fig. 1A**, **Fig. S2B**). Thus, based on the M/L ratio from Mtb uninfected individuals, we could group our LTBI cohort into individuals with presumed high, intermediate, and low risk to develop active TB.

We wanted to determine if there was a signature in the previously obtained transcriptomic profiles of memory CD4+ T cells in our LTBI cohort that distinguishes high risk from low risk individuals. Weighted Gene-Coexpression Network Analysis (WGCNA [18]) identified 10 modules containing genes with correlated expression patterns. For each module, we compared the overall level of expression of genes in the module for a given individual with the M/L ratio. This identified one module containing 53 genes that significantly positively correlated with the M/L ratio (spearman correlation = 0.49, *p* value = 0.006, **Fig. S3A**), and which could readily discriminate

M/L high from M/L low individuals (**Fig. 1B**). Surprisingly, many of the genes contained within

the 53-gene module were previously described as being highly expressed in monocytes but not in

T cells (**Fig. S3B, Table S2**). In particular, the 53-gene module contained the commonly used

monocyte lineage marker CD14, the monocyte/macrophage lineage marker CD68, and the

granulocytes/monocyte S100 calcium binding protein S100A9. All of these genes showed

increased expression levels in M/L high compared to M/L low subjects (**Fig. 1C**). By examining

the fcs files that were acquired during cell sorting (**Fig. S1A**), we identified that indeed there was

a subpopulation within sorted memory $CD4^+$ T cells that stained positive for CD14 (**Fig. 1D**). The

proportion of memory $CD4^+$ T cells that were $CD14^+$ was higher in M/L high compared to M/L

low subjects (**Fig. 1D**), suggesting that this cell subset is responsible for the expression of the 53-

gene monocyte module identified in Fig. 1B. The $CD14^+$ memory $CD4^+$ T cell population had

similar forward and side scatter (FSC/SSC) values to other memory $CD4^+$ T cells and was thus

sorted along with conventional $CD14^-$ memory $CD4^+$ T cells (**Fig. S4**). In particular, there was no

indication that the $CD14^+$ memory $CD4^+$ T cells were the product of a technical artefact, such as

dead cells or a compensation issue.

<u>Two distinct $CD3^+CD14^+$ cell populations are present in the monocyte and lymphocyte size gate.</u>

When gating on live FSC/SSC (including both monocytes and lymphocytes) cells, two populations

of $CD3^+CD14^+$ were identified: $CD3^+CD14^{hi}$ cells and $CD3^+CD14^{mid}$ cells (**Fig. 2A**). $CD3^+CD14^{hi}$

cells were predominantly contained within the monocyte size gate (Mgate), whereas $CD3^+CD14^{mid}$

cells were contained within the lymphocyte size gate (Lgate) (**Fig. 2B**). Thus, $CD3^+CD14^{hi}$ and

$CD3^+CD14^{mid}$ cells can also be identified as '$CD3^+CD14^+$ Mgate' and '$CD3^+CD14^+$ Lgate,

respectively. Similar to $CD14^+$ memory $CD4^+$ T cells, the frequency of total live $CD3^+CD14^+$ cells

was higher in M/L high compared to M/L low subjects (**Fig. 2C**). However, the relative proportion

of CD3$^+$CD14$^+$ cells in the Lgate and Mgate was independent of M/L ratio (**Fig. 2D**), suggesting

that both cell populations are generated through a common mechanism.

To examine how the gene expression program in CD3$^+$CD14$^+$ cells compares to conventional T

cells and monocytes, we performed single-cell RNA sequencing. Single cells from monocytes

(CD3$^-$CD14$^+$), T cells (CD3$^+$CD14$^-$), CD3$^+$CD14$^+$ Mgate cells and CD3$^+$CD14$^+$ Lgate cells were

sorted from one LTBI subject. Principal Component Analysis (PCA) of the entire set of genes

showed that CD3$^+$CD14$^+$ Mgate cells represent an intermediate population between T cells and

monocytes, whereas CD3$^+$CD14$^+$ Lgate cells represent an intermediate population between T cells

and CD3$^+$CD14$^+$ Mgate cells (**Fig. 2E**). The 53-gene monocyte module previously identified (Fig.

1C) was sufficient to distinguish between the four sorted cell populations with gradual expression

from high to low within monocytes, CD3$^+$CD14$^+$ Mgate, CD3$^+$CD14$^+$ Lgate and T cells,

respectively (**Fig. 2F**). This further confirmed that the CD3$^+$CD14$^+$ Mgate- and Lgate- populations

are distinct, and seem to show an intermediate gene expression profile between monocytes and T

cells.

<u>CD3$^+$CD14$^+$ cells consist of T cells bound to monocytes or monocyte debris.</u>

We aimed to visualize the CD3$^+$CD14$^+$ cells and the distribution of their markers using imaging

flow cytometry. Live events were divided into monocytes (CD3$^-$CD14$^+$), T cells (CD3$^+$CD14$^-$),

CD3$^+$CD14^{hi} cells, and CD3$^+$CD14^{mid} cells (**Fig. 3A**), and a random gallery of images was

exported for each population. As expected, monocytes and T cells contained exclusively single

cells that expressed either CD14 (monocytes) or CD3 (T cells), respectively (**Fig. 3B**, *first and*

second panel). To our surprise, CD3$^+$CD14^{hi} cells contained predominantly two cells, sometimes

even three cells, but no single cells (**Fig. 3B**, *third panel*). The doublets (or triplets) always

contained at least one CD14$^+$ cell, and one CD3$^+$ cell (**Fig. 3B**, *third panel*). CD3$^+$CD14^{mid} cells

contained predominantly single CD3$^+$ cells, but also some doublets of one CD3$^+$ cell and one

CD14$^+$ cell, but with CD14 expression lower than average monocytes, and these doublets were

present in the upper part of the CD14^{mid} gate (**Fig. 3B**, *fourth panel*). The majority of CD3$^+$ T cell

singlets in the CD3$^+$CD14^{mid} population, but not in the CD3$^+$CD14$^-$ T cell population, contained

smaller CD14$^+$ particles, often seen at the periphery of the CD3$^+$ T cell membrane (**Fig. 3B and**

3C). Looking more closely at the CD14$^+$ particles contained within the CD3$^+$CD14^{mid} population

using confocal microscopy, they were found to have size and shape similar to cell debris (**Fig. 3D**).

Similarly, single sorted monocytes and T cells contained exclusively one CD14$^+$ cell or one CD3$^+$

cell, respectively, whereas single sorted CD3$^+$CD14$^+$ cells contained one CD3$^+$ cell and one CD14$^+$

cell (**Fig. S5**). Taken together, these results demonstrate that CD3$^+$CD14^{hi} cells are tightly bound

T cell:monocyte complexes, in such strong interaction that sample processing and flow cytometry

acquisition did not break them apart. This conclusion is further supported by CD3$^+$CD14^{hi}

complexes being found in the monocyte size gate, and by their RNA expression profile showing a

nearly perfect mix between monocytes and T cells. Conversely, the CD3$^+$CD14^{mid} population

appears to predominantly consist of single CD3$^+$ T cells with attached CD14$^+$ cell debris. This is

again supported by these cells falling into the lymphocyte size gate, and the single cell RNA

sequencing data showing them clustering closer to T cells (Fig. 2D).

T cell:monocyte complexes show active T-cell receptor signaling.

Next, we sought to determine whether the association between T cells and monocytes within the

T cell:monocyte complexes was the result of random cellular proximity during sample freezing or

preparation (and thus a technical artefact), or if the complexes represent a true biological interface.

A key interaction between T cells and monocytes is the formation of immune synapses between

antigen-presenting monocytes and antigen-specific T cells. Upon formation of immune synapses,

T-cell receptor (TCR) signaling is triggered in T cells through the binding of antigen/MHC

complex with the TCR. In human T cells, TCRz, Zap70 and LAT are the earliest signaling

molecules downstream of TCR activation [19]. Binding of the MHC/peptide complex to TCR

triggers the recruitment of these molecules to the TCR and their phosphorylation. TCRz and Zap70

were both present at higher frequencies in CD3$^+$CD14^{hi} complexes compared to individual T cells,

whereas LAT was expressed at similar levels between both T cell containing subsets (**Fig. 3E**).

Importantly, all three molecules presented a higher degree of phosphorylation in CD3$^+$CD14^{hi}

complexes compared to T cells not present in a complex (**Fig. 3E** and **3F**). Activation was much

more pronounced in the CD3$^+$CD14^{hi} population containing the intact Tcell:monocyte pairs

compared to CD3$^+$CD14^{mid} population containing T cells and monocyte debris (**Fig. 3E** and **3F**),

so we focused on this intact cell pairs population for the remainder of this study.

Beside TCR/MHC binding, adhesion molecules are critical for the formation of immune synapses

[20]. In particular, upon interaction with ICAM1 on the antigen-presenting cell (APC), the integrin

LFA-1 on the T cell surface undergo a drastic redistribution by focusing almost exclusively at the

cell:cell point of contact, thus forming a 'ring' that can be visualized [21]. Using imaging flow

cytometry, we found a drastic increase in LFA-1 fluorescence intensity in the CD3+CD14^{hi}

complexes, compared to singlets T cells or singlets monocytes (**Fig. 3G**). Looking within the

'LFA-1 bright' CD3$^+$CD14^{hi} doublets, we observed that almost the totality of LFA-1 expression

was clustered at one specific location on the T cell, corresponding to the point of contact with the

monocyte (**Fig. 3H**).   Overall, this suggests that T cell:monocyte complexes are enriched for

immune synaptic interactions, and that the T cells in the intact complexes are likely to be in the

process of recognizing antigen presented to them by the monocytes.

<u>T cell:monocyte complexes are increased post vaccination and in severe dengue infection.</u>

Our data suggest circulating T cell:monocyte complexes detected at higher frequency in LTBI

subjects with high M/L ratio are biologically meaningful and the result of immune synaptic

interactions. Thus, they should also be present in other situations where active antigen presentation

by monocytes to T cells is taking place. To determine if this was true, we looked at the changes in

frequency of T cell:monocyte complexes in two very different immune perturbation models: First,

in tetanus, diphtheria and pertussis (Tdap) booster vaccination in healthy adults from San Diego,

we indeed observed a significantly higher frequency of $CD3^+CD14^+$ complexes one day post boost,

which resumes to baseline levels at seven days post boost (**Fig. 4A**). Second, we found that in

subjects with acute dengue fever from Sri Lanka, patients that developed hemorrhagic fever (the

more severe form of dengue) had higher frequency of $CD3^+CD14^+$ upon hospitalization compared

to convalescent subjects, as opposed to patients that had a less severe forms of acute dengue

infection (**Fig. 4B**). Importantly, the distinction between hemorrhagic vs. non-hemorrhagic fever

may become clear days into hospitalization, so the ability to discriminate these two groups of

individuals based on $CD3^+CD14^+$ frequency at the time of admission has potential diagnostic

value. Taken together, these data confirmed that circulating T cell:monocyte complexes can be

found directly *ex vivo* in different immune perturbations, and their frequency is associated with

clinical parameters such as time post vaccination and disease severity.

<u>The T cell phenotype within T cell:monocyte complexes reflect pathogen-specific polarization of</u>

<u>immune responses.</u>

The phenotype of T cells involved in antigen recognition for the different immune perturbations

studied is expected to be distinct. Tdap vaccine contains exclusively protein antigens and is thus

expected to elicit predominantly $CD4^+$ T cell responses [22]. Mtb is a bacterial pathogen known

to trigger strong CD4$^+$ responses [23] as opposed to dengue virus, which is a viral antigen. Thus,

if the T cell:monocyte complexes are the result of antigen specific immune perturbations, their T

cell phenotype should vary based on the nature of the perturbation. We indeed found that in LTBI

the majority of complexes contained CD4$^+$ T cells, which was even more pronounced in the Tdap

boost model as expected (**Fig. 4C.**). In contrast, in dengue acute individuals, there were much less

CD4$^+$ complexes, but interestingly a shift towards CD4$^-$CD8$^-$ double negative cells (**Fig. 4C**).

These cells could constitute gamma-delta T cells that are known to be strongly activated in the

peripheral blood during acute dengue fever [24]. Taken together, these data show that the

phenotype of T cells contained within CD3$^+$CD14^{hi} complexes follows differential pattern of CD4

vs. CD8 polarization in the three systems studied, further supporting the notion that the formation

of this complex is the result of T cell immune recognition triggered by the immune perturbation.

<u>T cell:monocyte complexes of acute dengue infected subjects are enriched for infected monocytes.</u>

There are growing evidence that monocytes can uptake and process both cell-associated antigen

(through direct infection or phagocytosis of infected cells) and extracellular antigen for

presentation to T cells, to a similar fashion to dendritic cell subsets (reviewed in [25]). However,

the contribution of monocytes in the process of antigen presentation, in particular for pathogens

that infect monocytes, is largely overlooked. In the case of dengue, monocytes are known to get

infected, therefore we examined if we could detect the presence of virus in the T cell:monocyte

complexes of subjects with acute disease. Staining for the presence of virus by flow cytometry, we

indeed found that CD3$^+$CD14^{hi} complexes contained a higher number of dengue particles

compared to monocytes not engaged in a complex (**Fig. 4D**). Thus, identifying pathogens in T

cell:monocyte complexes can give insights on the cause and targets of ongoing immune responses.

Discussion

In this study, we set out to determine if LTBI subjects with different predicted level of risk of developing active TB (based on M/L ratio) showed alterations in the transcriptional profile of their memory CD4$^+$ T cells, which are involved in controlling the disease. This led to the discovery that individuals at higher risk of developing active TB had an increased frequency of T cells circulating in peripheral blood that were tightly associated with monocytes, and less frequently, with monocyte-derived debris. T cells in the intact complexes showed high levels of TCR signaling and enrichment for immune synaptic markers, suggesting that they were in functional interaction, such as recognizing epitopes presented by the monocytes. Expansion of our studies to other immune perturbations namely Tdap boost vaccination and dengue virus infection again showed increases in circulating T cell:monocyte complexes which correlated with time from vaccination, disease severity, and presence of viral pathogen in the monocytes. Overall, this is consistent with the hypothesis that immune perturbations, even if they originally occur in tissues or lymph nodes, can lead to the generation of T cell:monocyte complexes that can be detected in peripheral blood.

Importantly, detecting T cell:monocyte (and likely more broadly T cell:APC) complexes can provide information on the immune perturbations based on which the complexes were formed. In disease patient populations, a higher T cell:monocyte complexes frequency seems to be associated with higher risk for developing active disease in the case of TB, and with severe forms of disease in the case of dengue virus infection. In both cases, it will be necessary to run prospective trials to irrefutably demonstrate that T cell:monocyte complexes frequency have predictive power of the course of disease. Similarly, in vaccine trials, the T cell:APC frequency should be examined as an early readout to gauge how well the immune system has responded to the vaccine. Finally, in apparently 'healthy' populations, or those with diffuse symptoms, an unusually high frequency of

circulating complexes in an individual could be used as an indicator of a yet to be determined

immune perturbation.

Beyond detecting abnormal frequency of T cell:APC complexes, characterizing the T cells and

APCs in these complexes can provide further insights into the associated immune perturbation.

Our data suggest that there are drastic differences in terms of CD4 and CD8 expression in the

detected complexes depending on the immune perturbation studied. Additional T cell

characteristics, such as the expression of tissue homing markers or TCR expressed can provide

further information on the underlying immune perturbation. Studying the APCs can similarly

provide additional information: the cell type, its receptor phenotype, and especially the presence

of infectious agents in APCs present in a T cell complex can provide a powerful diagnostic tool.

Pathogen detection could be done as in this study using dengue-specific antibodies, or more

generally by looking for the presence of bacterial or viral RNA or DNA in the APC.

Why were T cell:monocyte complexes not detected and excluded in flow cytometry based on

gating strategies to avoid doublets? Surprisingly, all usual parameters (pulse Area (A), Height (H)

and Width (W) from forward and side scatter) looked identical between T cell:monocyte intact

complexes (CD3$^+$CD14^{hi}) and singlets T cells or monocytes (**Fig. S6A**). The only parameter that

could readily distinguish between intact CD3$^+$CD14^{hi} complexes and single T cells or monocytes

was the brightfield area parameter from the imaging flow cytometer (**Fig. S6B**), which is a feature

absent in non-imaging flow cytometry. Thus, it seems that gating approaches and parameters

available in conventional flow cytometry are not sufficient to discriminate tightly bound cell pairs

from individual cells.

Given that T cell:monocyte complexes are not excluded by conventional FACS gating strategies,

why were they not reported previously? Examining our own past studies, a major reason is that

lineage markers for T cells (CD3), B cells (CD19) and monocytes (CD14) are routinely used to

remove cells not of interest in a given experiment by adding them to a 'dump channel'. For

example, most of our CD4$^+$ T cell studies have CD8, CD19 and CD14, and dead cell markers

combined in the same channel [6, 26]. Other groups studying e.g. CD14$^+$ monocytes are likely to

add CD3 to their dump gate. This means that complexes of cells that have two conflicting lineage

markers such as CD3 and CD14 will often be removed from studies from the start. Additionally,

the detection of complexes by flow cytometry is not straightforward. In our hands, we have found

that conventional flow analyzers give low frequency of complexes and poor reproducibility in

repeat runs. This is opposed to cell sorters, presumably due to differences in their fluidics systems

which puts less stress on cells and does not disrupt complexes as much. Both the routine exclusion

of cell populations positive for two conflicting lineage markers and the lack of reproducibility in

terms of frequencies for such cell populations on different platforms has likely contributed to them

not being reported.

Moreover, even if a panel allows for the detection of complexes, and there is a stable assay used

to show their presence, there is an assumption in the field that detection of complexes is a result

of experimental artefacts. For example, we found a report of double positive CD3$^+$CD34$^+$ cells

detected by flow cytometry in human bone marrow, which followed up this finding and found

them to be doublets using microscopy imaging. The authors concluded that these complexes are

the product of random association and should be ignored [27]. Their conclusion may well be true

for their study, but it highlights a dogma in the field of cytometry that pairs of cells have to be

artifacts. Another study described CD3$^+$CD20$^+$ singlets cells observed by flow cytometry as

doublets of T cells and B cells, and also concluded them to be a technical artefact, in the sense that

these cells are not singlets double expressing CD3 and CD20 [28]. In this case however, authors

pointed out that 'Whether the formation of these doublets is an artefact occurring during staining

or is a physiologic process remains to be determined' [28]. We ourselves assumed for a long time

that we might have an artefact finding, but given the persistent association of T cell:monocyte

complexes frequency and phenotype with clinically and physiologically relevant parameters, we

came to a new conclusion: cells are meant to interact with other cells. Thus, detecting and

characterizing complexes of cells isolated from tissues and bodily fluids, can provide powerful

insights into cell:cell communication events that are missed when studying cells as singlets only.

Material and methods

<u>Ethics statement</u>

Samples from individuals with LTBI were obtained from the University of California, San Diego Antiviral Research Center clinic (AVRC at UCSD, San Diego) and the Universidad Peruana Cayetano Heredia (UPCH, Peru). Dengue samples were obtained from healthy adult blood donors from the National Blood Center (NBC), Ministry of Health, Colombo, Sri Lanka, in an anonymous fashion as previously described [29]. Acute dengue fever samples have been collected at National Institute of Infectious Diseases, Gothatuwa, Angoda, Sri Lanka and the North Colombo Teaching Hospital, Ragama, in Colombo, Sri Lanka. Longitudinal Tdap booster vaccination samples were obtained from healthy adults from San Diego, USA. Ethical approval to carry out this work is maintained through the La Jolla Institute for Allergy and Immunology Institutional Review Board, the Medical Faculty of the University of Colombo (which served as a National Institutes of Health–approved institutional review board for Genetech) and the John's Hopkins School of Public Health Institutional Review Board (RHG holds dual appointment at UPCH and JHU). All clinical investigations have been conducted according to the principles expressed in the Declaration of Helsinki. All participants, except anonymously recruited blood bank donors in Sri Lanka, provided written informed consent prior to participation in the study.

<u>Subjects and samples</u>

LTBI status was confirmed in subjects by a positive IFN-γ release assay (IGRA) (QuantiFERON-TB Gold In-Tube, Cellestis or T-SPOT.TB, Oxford Immunotec) and the absence of clinical and radiographic signs of active TB. Mtb uninfected control subjects were confirmed as IGRA negative. Acute and convalescent dengue virus fever samples were classified by detection of virus (PCR+) and/or dengue-specific IgM and IgG in the serum. Laboratory parameters such as platelet

and leukocyte counts, hematocrit, hemoglobulin, AST, ALT and if applicable an ultrasound

examination of the chest and abdomen or an X-ray were used to further diagnose patients with

either dengue fever (DF) or dengue hemorrhagic fever (DHF), a more severe form of disease,

according to WHO's guidelines. Longitudinal Tdap booster vaccination samples were obtained

from individuals originally vaccinated in childhood, and boosted with the DTP vaccine Tdap

(Adacel). Blood samples were collected prior, one day and seven days post boost. For all cohorts,

PBMC were obtained by density gradient centrifugation (Ficoll-Hypaque, Amersham Biosciences)

from leukapheresis or whole blood samples, according to the manufacturer's instructions. Cells

were resuspended to 10 to 50 million cells per mL in FBS (Gemini Bio-Products) containing 10%

dimethyl sulfoxide (Sigma) and cryopreserved in liquid nitrogen.

<u>Flow cytometry</u>

Surface staining of unfixed PBMC was performed as previously described in [17]. Briefly, cells

were stained with fixable viability dye eFluor506 (eBiosciences) and various combinations of the

antibodies listed in **Table S1** for 20min at room temperature. For detection of dengue virus positive

cells, staining was performed as above, using the 2H2 antibody, an IgG2a reactive for the prM/M

protein of dengue virus, serotypes 1–4 (IgG2a anti-DENV1-4 prM) [30]. This antibody was

obtained from Sujan Shresta (La Jolla Institute, La Jolla, CA, USA) and conjugated to FITC using

the Pierce FITC antibody labeling kit (ThermoFisher). For intracellular staining of

unphosphorylated and phosphorylated TCR signaling molecules, surface stained PBMC were

fixed with 100 μl paraformaldehyde (PFA) 4% for 15min at room temperature, washed twice in

PBS, and permeabilized with pre-chilled True-Phos Perm buffer (Biolegend) for 45min at -20°C.

After two washes in PBS, cells were stained for intracellular TCR signaling antibodies (**Table S1**)

for 30min at room temperature. After the final staining step, cells were washed twice in PBS, and

resuspended in FACS buffer (PBS containing 0.5% FBS, 2mM EDTA, pH 8.0) and stored at 4°C

protected from light until acquisition. Acquisition was performed on a BD LSR-I cell analyzer

(BD Biosciences) or on a BD FACSAria III cell sorter (BD Biosciences). Compensation was

realized with single-stained beads (UltraComp eBeads, eBiosciences) in PBS using the same

antibody dilution as for the cell staining.

<u>Cell sorting</u>

PBMC were stained with fixable viability dye eFluor506 (eBiosciences) and various combinations

of the antibodies listed in **Table S1** as described in the flow cytometry section above. Cell sorting

was performed on a BD Aria III/Fusion cell sorter (BD Biosciences). 100,000 memory $CD4^+$ T

cells were sorted into TRIzol LS reagent (Invitrogen) for RNA extraction. Single cell sorts of $CD3^-$

$CD14^+$ monocytes, $CD3^+CD14^-$ T cells and $CD3^+CD14^+$ Mgate and Lgate cells for RNA

sequencing were performed in a 96-well PCR plate containing 4 µl cell lysis buffer. All gating

strategies are available in **Fig. S1**.

<u>Imaging flow cytometry</u>

For the visualization of $CD3^+CD14^+$ cells, PBMC were stained with CD3-AF488 and CD14-PE,

or CD3-AF488, CD14-BV421 and LFA1-PE (see Table S1 for antibody details) as described in

the flow cytometry section above. After two washes in PBS, cells were resuspended to $10x10^6$

cells/mL in FACS buffer containing 5µg/mL Hoechst (Invitrogen) and 1µg/mL 7-AAD

(Biolegend) and stored at 4°C protected from light until acquisition. Acquisition was performed

with ImageStreamX MkII (Amnis) and INSPIRE software version 200.1.620.0 at 40X

magnification and the lowest speed setting. A minimum of 4,000 $CD3^+CD14^+$ events in focus were

collected. Data analysis was performed using IDEAS version 6.2.183.0.

Microscopy

$CD3^-CD14^+$ monocytes, $CD3^+CD14^-$ T cells and $CD3^+CD14^+$ cells were single- cell sorted as

described in the cell sorting section on to a microscopy glass slide. Crystals containing sorting

buffer and cells were then visualized on a confocal microscope (ZEISS LSM 880) with 20x 0.8NA

objective using transmitted light photon multiplier tube (PMT). Fluorescence signals

corresponding to CD3 and CD14 were detected with spectrally tuned PMTs using 488 nm and 594

nm excitation lines. Additionally, freshly sorted cells were immobilized using CyGel Sustain

(Abcam) according to manufacturer recommendations. Three dimensional rendering of cellular

fragments (Fig. 3D.) was created in Imaris 9.1 software (Bitplane).

Bulk RNA sequencing and analysis

RNA sequencing and analysis of memory $CD4^+$ T cells from LTBI infected subjects was

performed as described in [31, 32] and quantified by qPCR as described previously [33]. 5 ng of

purified total RNA was used for poly(A) mRNA selection, full length reverse-transcription and

amplified for 17 cycles, following the smart-seq2 protocol [31, 32]. After purification with

Ampure XP beads (Ratio 0.8:1, Beckmann Coulter) and quantification (Picogreen assay,

Invitrogen), 1ng of cDNA was used to prepare a Nextera XT sequencing library with the Nextera

XT DNA library preparation and index kits (Illumina). Samples were pooled and sequenced using

the HiSeq2500 (Illumina) to obtain at least 12 million 50-bp single-end reads per library. The

single-end reads that passed Illumina filters were filtered for reads aligning to tRNA, rRNA, and

Illumina adapter sequences. The reads were then aligned to UCSC hg19 reference genome using

TopHat (v 1.4.1) [34], filtered for low complexity reads, and parsed with SAMtools [35]. Read

counts to each genomic feature were obtained using HTSeq-count program (v 0.6.0) [36] using the

"union" option. Raw counts were then imported to R/Bioconductor package DESeq2 [37] to

identify differentially expressed genes among samples. Modular analysis was performed using

automatic network construction and module detection implemented in WGCNA R package [18]

following the steps described in package authors' guidelines.

<u>Single-cell RNA sequencing and analysis</u>

Single cell RNA sequencing was performed using Smart-seq2 as previously described [31]. Single

cells were sorted by flow cytometry into 96-well PCR plates containing 4 µl cell lysis buffer. RNA

loss was minimized by performing on-plate RNA capture, reverse-transcription and whole

transcriptome pre-amplification (24 cycles) that results in ~1–30 ng of cDNA as previously

described [31]. 0.3 to 0.5 ng of pre-amplified cDNA was used to generate barcoded Illumina

sequencing libraries (Nextera XT library preparation kit, Illumina) in an 8µL reaction volume.

Multiple quality-control steps were included to ensure the consistency during the procedure for all

samples. Samples that failed at quality-control steps as described in [31, 38], were eliminated from

downstream procedures and analysis. Libraries were pooled and sequenced on the HiSeq2500

Illumina platform to obtain more than 2 million 50-bp single end reads per cell. Single-cell RNA-

seq data were mapped against the human hg19 reference genome using TopHat (v1.4.1., - -library-

type fr-secondstrand -C) and Gencode version 19 (GRCh37.p13) as gene model reference for

alignment. Sequencing read coverage per gene was counted using HTSeq-count (-m union -s yes

-t exon -i gene_id, http://www huber.embl.de/users/anders/HTSeq/). Counts per gene are obtained

by counting all the transcripts mapping to a gene and is together referred to as transcript. To

normalize for sequencing depth and varying transcript length counts were TPM (Transcripts Per

Million reads) transformed. For PCA analysis only genes with at least 20 TPM were considered.

PCA was performed in Python using Scipy SVD algorithm and plotted with Matplotlib [39].

References

1.	The World Health Organization: Global tuberculosis report 2017. Available from: http://www.who.int/tb/publications/global_report/en/.

2.	Pai M, Behr MA, Dowdy D, Dheda K, Divangahi M, Boehme CC, et al. Tuberculosis. Nat Rev Dis Primers. 2016;2:16076. Epub 2016/10/28. doi: 10.1038/nrdp.2016.76. PubMed PMID: 27784885.

3.	Seshadri P, Denkinger C. Draft Target Product Profile: Test for progression of tuberculosis infection 2016. Available from: http://www.finddx.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/05/TPP-LTBIprogression.pdf].

4.	Zak DE, Penn-Nicholson A, Scriba TJ, Thompson E, Suliman S, Amon LM, et al. A blood RNA signature for tuberculosis disease risk: a prospective cohort study. Lancet. 2016;387(10035):2312-22. Epub 2016/03/28. doi: 10.1016/s0140-6736(15)01316-1. PubMed PMID: 27017310; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC5392204.

5.	Suliman S, Thompson E, Sutherland J, Weiner Rd J, Ota MOC, Shankar S, et al. Four-gene Pan-African Blood Signature Predicts Progression to Tuberculosis. Am J Respir Crit Care Med. 2018. Epub 2018/04/07. doi: 10.1164/rccm.201711-2340OC. PubMed PMID: 29624071.

6.	Burel JG, Lindestam Arlehamn CS, Khan N, Seumois G, Greenbaum JA, Taplitz R, et al. Transcriptomic Analysis of CD4(+) T Cells Reveals Novel Immune Signatures of Latent Tuberculosis. J Immunol. 2018;200(9):3283-90. Epub 2018/04/01. doi: 10.4049/jimmunol.1800118. PubMed PMID: 29602771.

7.	Burel JG, Peters B. Discovering transcriptional signatures of disease for diagnosis versus mechanism. Nat Rev Immunol. 2018;18(5):289-90. Epub 2018/04/10. doi: 10.1038/nri.2018.26. PubMed PMID: 29629714.

8.	Barnes PF, Bloch AB, Davidson PT, Snider DE, Jr. Tuberculosis in patients with human immunodeficiency virus infection. N Engl J Med. 1991;324(23):1644-50. Epub 1991/06/06. doi: 10.1056/nejm199106063242307. PubMed PMID: 2030721.

9.	Flynn JL, Chan J. Immunology of tuberculosis. Annu Rev Immunol. 2001;19:93-129. Epub 2001/03/13. doi: 10.1146/annurev.immunol.19.1.93. PubMed PMID: 11244032.

10.	Fletcher HA, Snowden MA, Landry B, Rida W, Satti I, Harris SA, et al. T-cell activation is an immune correlate of risk in BCG vaccinated infants. Nat Commun. 2016;7:11290. Epub 2016/04/14. doi: 10.1038/ncomms11290. PubMed PMID: 27068708; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC4832066.

11.	Lindestam Arlehamn CS, Gerasimova A, Mele F, Henderson R, Swann J, Greenbaum JA, et al. Memory T cells in latent Mycobacterium tuberculosis infection are directed against three

antigenic islands and largely contained in a CXCR3+CCR6+ Th1 subset. PLoS Pathog.
2013;9(1):e1003130. Epub 2013/01/30. doi: 10.1371/journal.ppat.1003130. PubMed PMID:
23358848; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC3554618.

12.   Okada S, Markle JG, Deenick EK, Mele F, Averbuch D, Lagos M, et al.
IMMUNODEFICIENCIES. Impairment of immunity to Candida and Mycobacterium in humans
with bi-allelic RORC mutations. Science. 2015;349(6248):606-13. Epub 2015/07/15. doi:
10.1126/science.aaa4282. PubMed PMID: 26160376; PubMed Central PMCID:
PMCPMC4668938.

13.   Blackfan KDD, L.K. The monocyte in active tuberculosis - supravital studies of the blood.
Am J Dis Child. 1929;37(2):233-43. doi: doi:10.1001/archpedi.1929.01930020003001.

14.   Naranbhai V, Hill AV, Abdool Karim SS, Naidoo K, Abdool Karim Q, Warimwe GM, et
al. Ratio of monocytes to lymphocytes in peripheral blood identifies adults at risk of incident
tuberculosis among HIV-infected adults initiating antiretroviral therapy. J Infect Dis.
2014;209(4):500-9. Epub 2013/09/18. doi: 10.1093/infdis/jit494. PubMed PMID: 24041796;
PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC3903371.

15.   Rakotosamimanana N, Richard V, Raharimanga V, Gicquel B, Doherty TM, Zumla A, et
al. Biomarkers for risk of developing active tuberculosis in contacts of TB patients: a prospective
cohort study. Eur Respir J. 2015;46(4):1095-103. Epub 2015/08/08. doi:
10.1183/13993003.00263-2015. PubMed PMID: 26250497.

16.   Naranbhai V, Kim S, Fletcher H, Cotton MF, Violari A, Mitchell C, et al. The association
between the ratio of monocytes:lymphocytes at age 3 months and risk of tuberculosis (TB) in the
first two years of life. BMC Med. 2014;12:120. Epub 2014/07/19. doi: 10.1186/s12916-014-0120-
7. PubMed PMID: 25034889; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC4223414.

17.   Burel JG, Qian Y, Lindestam Arlehamn C, Weiskopf D, Zapardiel-Gonzalo J, Taplitz R,
et al. An Integrated Workflow To Assess Technical and Biological Variability of Cell Population
Frequencies in Human Peripheral Blood by Flow Cytometry. J Immunol. 2017;198(4):1748-58.
Epub 2017/01/11. doi: 10.4049/jimmunol.1601750. PubMed PMID: 28069807; PubMed Central
PMCID: PMCPMC5296239.

18.   Zhang B, Horvath S. A general framework for weighted gene co-expression network
analysis. Stat Appl Genet Mol Biol. 2005;4:Article17. Epub 2006/05/02. doi: 10.2202/1544-
6115.1128. PubMed PMID: 16646834.

19.   Chakraborty AK, Weiss A. Insights into the initiation of TCR signaling. Nat Immunol.
2014;15(9):798-807. Epub 2014/08/20. doi: 10.1038/ni.2940. PubMed PMID: 25137454; PubMed
Central PMCID: PMCPMC5226627.

20.   Dustin ML. The immunological synapse. Cancer Immunol Res. 2014;2(11):1023-33. Epub
2014/11/05. doi: 10.1158/2326-6066.cir-14-0161. PubMed PMID: 25367977; PubMed Central
PMCID: PMCPMC4692051.

21.   Wabnitz GH, Samstag Y. Multiparametric Characterization of Human T-Cell Immune
Synapses by InFlow Microscopy. Methods Mol Biol. 2016;1389:155-66. Epub 2016/07/28. doi:
10.1007/978-1-4939-3302-0_10. PubMed PMID: 27460243.

22.   Bancroft T, Dillon MB, da Silva Antunes R, Paul S, Peters B, Crotty S, et al. Th1 versus
Th2 T cell polarization by whole-cell and acellular childhood pertussis vaccines persists upon re-
immunization in adolescence and adulthood. Cell Immunol. 2016;304-305:35-43. Epub
2016/05/24. doi: 10.1016/j.cellimm.2016.05.002. PubMed PMID: 27212461; PubMed Central
PMCID: PMCPMC4899275.

23.   Lindestam Arlehamn CS, McKinney DM, Carpenter C, Paul S, Rozot V, Makgotlho E, et
al. A Quantitative Analysis of Complexity of Human Pathogen-Specific CD4 T Cell Responses in
Healthy M. tuberculosis Infected South Africans. PLoS Pathog. 2016;12(7):e1005760. Epub
2016/07/15. doi: 10.1371/journal.ppat.1005760. PubMed PMID: 27409590; PubMed Central
PMCID: PMCPMC4943605.

24.   Tsai CY, Liong KH, Gunalan MG, Li N, Lim DS, Fisher DA, et al. Type I IFNs and IL-18
regulate the antiviral response of primary human gammadelta T cells against dendritic cells
infected with Dengue virus. J Immunol. 2015;194(8):3890-900. Epub 2015/03/04. doi:
10.4049/jimmunol.1303343. PubMed PMID: 25732728.

25.   Jakubzick CV, Randolph GJ, Henson PM. Monocyte differentiation and antigen-presenting
functions. Nat Rev Immunol. 2017;17(6):349-62. Epub 2017/04/25. doi: 10.1038/nri.2017.28.
PubMed PMID: 28436425.

26.   Arlehamn CL, Seumois G, Gerasimova A, Huang C, Fu Z, Yue X, et al. Transcriptional
profile of tuberculosis antigen-specific T cells reveals novel multifunctional features. J Immunol.
2014;193(6):2931-40. Epub 2014/08/06. doi: 10.4049/jimmunol.1401151. PubMed PMID:
25092889; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC4157075.

27.   Kudernatsch RF, Letsch A, Stachelscheid H, Volk HD, Scheibenbogen C. Doublets
pretending to be CD34+ T cells despite doublet exclusion. Cytometry A. 2013;83(2):173-6. Epub
2013/01/03. doi: 10.1002/cyto.a.22247. PubMed PMID: 23281028.

28.   Henry C, Ramadan A, Montcuquet N, Pallandre JR, Mercier-Letondal P, Deschamps M,
et al. CD3+CD20+ cells may be an artifact of flow cytometry: comment on the article by Wilk et
al. Arthritis Rheum. 2010;62(8):2561-3; author reply 3-5. Epub 2010/05/28. doi:
10.1002/art.27527. PubMed PMID: 20506165.

29.   Weiskopf D, Angelo MA, de Azeredo EL, Sidney J, Greenbaum JA, Fernando AN, et al.
Comprehensive analysis of dengue virus-specific responses supports an HLA-linked protective
role for CD8+ T cells. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2013;110(22):E2046-53. Epub 2013/04/13. doi:
10.1073/pnas.1305227110. PubMed PMID: 23580623; PubMed Central PMCID:
PMCPMC3670335.

30. Zellweger RM, Miller R, Eddy WE, White LJ, Johnston RE, Shresta S. Role of humoral
versus cellular responses induced by a protective dengue vaccine candidate. PLoS Pathog.
2013;9(10):e1003723. Epub 2013/11/10. doi: 10.1371/journal.ppat.1003723. PubMed PMID:
24204271; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC3814346.

31. Picelli S, Bjorklund AK, Faridani OR, Sagasser S, Winberg G, Sandberg R. Smart-seq2
for sensitive full-length transcriptome profiling in single cells. Nat Methods. 2013;10(11):1096-8.
Epub 2013/09/24. doi: 10.1038/nmeth.2639. PubMed PMID: 24056875.

32. Seumois G, Zapardiel-Gonzalo J, White B, Singh D, Schulten V, Dillon M, et al.
Transcriptional Profiling of Th2 Cells Identifies Pathogenic Features Associated with Asthma. J
Immunol. 2016;197(2):655-64. Epub 2016/06/09. doi: 10.4049/jimmunol.1600397. PubMed
PMID: 27271570; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC4936908.

33. Seumois G, Vijayanand P, Eisley CJ, Omran N, Kalinke L, North M, et al. An integrated
nano-scale approach to profile miRNAs in limited clinical samples. Am J Clin Exp Immunol.
2012;1(2):70-89. Epub 2013/01/11. PubMed PMID: 23304658; PubMed Central PMCID:
PMCPMC3538381.

34. Trapnell C, Pachter L, Salzberg SL. TopHat: discovering splice junctions with RNA-Seq.
Bioinformatics. 2009;25(9):1105-11. Epub 2009/03/18. doi: 10.1093/bioinformatics/btp120.
PubMed PMID: 19289445; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC2672628.

35. Li H, Handsaker B, Wysoker A, Fennell T, Ruan J, Homer N, et al. The Sequence
Alignment/Map format and SAMtools. Bioinformatics. 2009;25(16):2078-9. Epub 2009/06/10.
doi: 10.1093/bioinformatics/btp352. PubMed PMID: 19505943; PubMed Central PMCID:
PMCPMC2723002.

36. Anders S, Pyl PT, Huber W. HTSeq--a Python framework to work with high-throughput
sequencing data. Bioinformatics. 2015;31(2):166-9. Epub 2014/09/28. doi:
10.1093/bioinformatics/btu638. PubMed PMID: 25260700; PubMed Central PMCID:
PMCPMC4287950.

37. Love MI, Huber W, Anders S. Moderated estimation of fold change and dispersion for
RNA-seq data with DESeq2. Genome Biol. 2014;15(12):550. Epub 2014/12/18. doi:
10.1186/s13059-014-0550-8. PubMed PMID: 25516281; PubMed Central PMCID:
PMCPMC4302049.

38. Patil VS, Madrigal A, Schmiedel BJ, Clarke J, O'Rourke P, de Silva AD, et al. Precursors
of human CD4(+) cytotoxic T lymphocytes identified by single-cell transcriptome analysis. Sci
Immunol. 2018;3(19). Epub 2018/01/21. doi: 10.1126/sciimmunol.aan8664. PubMed PMID:
29352091; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC5931334.

39. Hunter JD. Matplotlib: a 2D Graphics Environment. Computing in Science & Engineering.
2007;9(3):90-5. doi: 10.1109/MCSE.2007.55.

Acknowledgments: We thank the flow cytometry core facility at the La Jolla Institute for

assistance in cell sorting and technical discussion (in particular Dr. Cheryl Kim and Dr. Denise

Hinz). We thank Dr. Zbigniew Mikulski from the microscopy core at the La Jolla Institute for

assistance and technical advice on microscopy imaging. We thank Yoav Altman at the Sanford

Burnham Prebys flow cytometry core for technical assistance with imaging flow cytometry. We

thank Dr. Joe Trotter from the R&D Advanced Technology Group at BD Biosciences for useful

technical discussion about cytometry instrument fluidic systems. We thank Dr. Klaus Ley from

the La Jolla Institute for multiple suggestions on experimental design. We thank Dr. Amnon

Altman from the La Jolla Institute for TCR signaling experimental design. **Funding:** Research

reported in this manuscript was supported by the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious

Diseases division of the National Institutes of Health under award number U19AI118626,

R01AI137681, HHSN272201400045C, S10OD021831 and S10OD016262. The content is solely

the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of the

National Institutes of Health. Imaging flow cytometry was supported by the James B. Pendleton

Charitable trust. **Author contributions:** conceptualization: JGB, MP, CLA, MB, AS and BP;

investigation: JGB, MP, CLA, DW, RSA, VS and GS; resources: CLA, JAG, SP, GP, AW, RT,

ADS, RH, MS, RT and PV; writing (original draft preparation): JGB and BP; writing (review and

editing): all authors; funding acquisition: AS and BP. **Competing interests:** Authors declare no

competing interests. **Data and materials availability:** Sequencing data is accessible online

through Gene Expression Omnibus (accession numbers GSE84445, GSE99373 and GSE117435,

https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/geo) and Immport (Study number SDY820,

http://www.immport.org). All other data is available in the main text or the supplementary

materials.

Fig. 1. Unexpected detection of CD14 in sorted CD4^{+} memory T cells from M/L high LTBI subjects. A) LTBI subjects were stratified based on their Monocyte/Lymphocyte (M/L) ratio measured as the frequency of CD14^{+} cells from live cells by flow cytometry. B) M/L ratio in LTBI subjects positively correlated with the expression of a 53-gene module in *ex vivo* sorted memory CD4^{+} T cells. C) CD14, CD68 and S100A9 gene expression in memory CD4^{+} T cells of M/L high, int and low LTBI subjects. D) The frequency of CD14^{+} cells within sorted CD4^{+} memory T cells in M/L high, int and low LTBI subjects. Data were derived from 30 LTBI subjects (6 M/L high, 16 M/L int and 8 M/L low) and 29 Mtb negative control subjects. Statistical differences were determined using the non-parametric Wilcoxon test; *, $p < 0.05$; **, $p < 0.01$; ***, $p < 0.001$.

Fig. 2. Two separate CD3$^+$CD14$^+$ cell populations exist in Mgate and Lgate that form intermediate populations between T cells and monocytes. Cryopreserved PBMC from LTBI subjects were stained for CD3 and CD14 protein expression and acquisition performed on BD Aria III cell sorter. A) Gated on 'singlets' total live cells, two populations of CD3$^+$CD14$^+$ cells can be identified based on the level of expression of CD14. B) Based on FSC and SSC parameters, CD3$^+$CD14^{hi} cells are contained within the monocyte gate (Mgate), whereas CD3$^+$CD14^{mid} cells are contained within the lymphocyte gate (Lgate). C) The frequency of total CD3$^+$CD14$^+$ cells and D) their repartition into Mgate vs Lgate in M/L High (n=6), M/L Int (n=16) and M/L Low (n=8) LTBI subjects. E) PCA on all genes and F) expression of the 53-gene module associated with M/L ratio (determined in Fig. 1B) from RNA single-cell sequencing of CD14$^+$CD3$^-$ monocytes (n=21), CD14$^-$CD3$^+$ T cells (n=22), CD3$^+$CD14$^+$ Mgate cells (n=22) and CD3$^+$CD14$^+$ Lgate cells (n=20) derived from one LTBI subject.

Fig. 3. CD3⁺CD14⁺ cells are tightly bound T cell:monocyte complexes that do not result from random interaction. A) Gating strategy and B) random gallery of events for monocytes (CD14⁺CD3⁻), T cells (CD3⁺CD14⁻), CD3⁺CD14^hi cells and CD3⁺CD14^mid cells determined by imaging flow cytometry (ImageStream, Amnis) from one LTBI subject. CD14⁺ cell debris were identified within C) CD3⁺CD14^mid cells by imaging flow cytometry (ImageStreamX MkII, Amnis) and D) CD3⁺CD14⁺ Lgate cells by confocal microscopy after bulk population cell sorting. Frequency of E) total and F) phosphorylated TCRz, Zap70 and LAT positive cells in monocytes

(CD14$^+$CD3$^-$), T cells (CD3$^+$CD14$^-$) and CD3$^+$CD14$^+$ cells determined by phosphoflow.

Acquisition was performed on a BD Aria III cell sorter. Data was derived from 8 LTBI subjects

and two independent experiments. G) LFA-1 expression (raw pixel intensity) of live doublets

CD3$^+$CD14^{hi}, live singlets T cells (CD3$^+$CD14$^-$) and live singlets monocytes (CD14$^+$CD3$^-$) and H)

representative gallery of live doublets CD3$^+$CD14^{hi} LFA-1 bright events determined by imaging

flow cytometry (ImageStreamX MkII, Amnis) from one LTBI subject. BF: brightfield.

Fig. 4. CD3⁺CD14⁺ complexes are also present in other immune perturbations and contain diagnostic and mechanistic information. Frequency of total CD3⁺CD14⁺ cells in A) previously vaccinated healthy adults (n=15) before, one day and seven days post-boost with Tdap vaccine and in B) individuals with acute dengue fever (n=7), acute dengue hemorrhagic fever (n=18) or previously infected (convalescent, n=39). C) CD4⁺ and CD8⁺ Boolean gating in CD3⁺CD14⁺ cells of LTBI subjects (n=30), previously vaccinated healthy adults one day post boost with Tdap vaccine (n=15) and acute dengue virus infected subjects (n=25). D) Dengue virus expression in monocytes (CD14⁺CD3⁻), T cells (CD3⁺CD14⁻) and CD3⁺CD14⁺ cells of subjects with PCR positive acute dengue infection (n=10) and previously infected convalescent subjects (n=5) determined by flow cytometry. Data was acquired with a BD LSR-II (A) or a BD Aria III cell sorter (B-E). In Tdap boosted individuals, statistical differences over time were determined using the non-parametric paired Wilcoxon test; other statistical differences were determined using the non-parametric Wilcoxon test; *, $p < 0.05$; **, $p < 0.01$; ****, $p < 0.0001$.