Matrix mechanics and water permeation regulate extracellular vesicle transport
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Cells release extracellular vesicles (EVs) to communicate over long distances, which requires EVs to traverse the extracellular matrix (ECM). However, given that the size of EVs is usually larger than the mesh size of the ECM, it is not clear how they can travel through the dense ECM. Here we show that, in contrast to synthetic nanoparticles, EVs readily transport through nanoporous ECM. Using engineered hydrogels, we demonstrate that the mechanical properties of the matrix regulate anomalous EV transport under confinement. Matrix stress relaxation allows EVs to overcome the confinement, and a higher crosslinking density facilitates a fluctuating transport movement through the polymer mesh, which leads to free diffusion and fast transport. Furthermore, water permeation through aquaporin-1 mediates the EV deformability, which further supports EV transport in hydrogels and a decellularized matrix. Our results provide evidence for the nature of EV transport within confined environments and demonstrate an unexpected dependence on matrix mechanics and water permeation.

EVs are cell-derived particles found in the ECM and described as ranging from 50 to 500 nm in diameter. However, the ECM has a range of mechanical properties and often features average mesh sizes smaller than those of the EVs (Fig. 1a).

To evaluate the extent to which EVs transport through the interstitial ECM, we engineered EVs from mouse mesenchymal stromal cells (MSCs) to contain the EV marker CD63 fused with Katushka2S (K2S, a far-red fluorescent protein) to visualize them after passive loading by incubation in a decellularized matrix from lung tissue. MSCs were chosen as the source of EVs because in vivo they are often present in interstitial regions surrounded by matrix. The expression of CD63–K2S in EVs (K2S–EVs) did not alter their expected size distribution (diameter (d) ≈ 50–150 nm) (Supplementary Fig. 1a). Multiphoton second harmonic imaging analysis showed that the EVs were distributed throughout the collagen fibres within the matrix (Fig. 1b). Despite a nanoscale mean porosity (Supplementary Fig. 1b,c) of the matrix, ~50% of the loaded CD63–K2S–EVs were released from the matrix within ~24.7 h (Fig. 1c,d), which suggests that EVs readily transport through naturally derived nanoporous matrices.

A decellularized matrix exhibited a complex shear modulus magnitude $G^*$ of ~750 Pa with a loss tangent (viscous modulus/elastic modulus, $G''/G'$) of ~0.15 (Fig. 2a and Supplementary Fig. 2a), and a stress relaxation behaviour ($\alpha i^\approx 15$) (Fig. 2b). To determine whether the matrix mechanics mediate the EV transport, we engineered alginate-based hydrogels with a range of mechanical properties known to be present in tissues. Importantly, alginate-based hydrogels are bio-inert, non-degradable and exhibit homogeneous nanoporous structures, which makes them ideal to model ECM without the influence of biochemical or degrading interactions. Hydrogels can be crosslinked physically through divalent cations or covalently through click chemistry, and $G^*$ is tunable for both (Fig. 2c (left) and Supplementary Fig. 2b). Physical crosslinking leads to stress relaxing hydrogels and covalent crosslinking leads to elastic hydrogels, as indicated by the loss tangent (Fig. 2c (right)) and stress relaxation times (Fig. 2d). We consider $G^*\approx 500$ Pa as ‘soft’ and $G^*\approx 3,000$ Pa as ‘stiff’. Alginate-based hydrogels are nanoporous, like the decellularized matrix (Supplementary Fig. 2c), regardless of the crosslinking density or type. This is consistent with the egg-box model of crosslinking between alginate chains, in which increased crosslinking is not expected to dramatically alter the mesh size. As expected, after dextran–FITC (hydrodynamic radius ~15 nm (ref. 11)) molecules were encapsulated in the hydrogels, most released completely within 24 hours (Fig. 2e). In contrast, a minimal release was observed for polystyrene nanoparticles (NPs; d ≈ 80–100 nm) (Supplementary Fig. 2d). As for decellularized tissue, some EVs released from the hydrogels; however, surprisingly, EV release was greater from stress relaxing hydrogels with a higher $G^*$. This effect occurred for EVs from other cells (Supplementary Fig. 2e), which suggests its generalizability across cell type. Liposomes with a similar size (Supplementary Fig. 2f) and lipid content as those of EVs did not exhibit a higher release from stress relaxing hydrogels with a higher $G^*$ (Supplementary Fig. 2g). Hydrogels did not undergo degradation or loss of mass over the tested time period (Supplementary Fig. 3a), which confirms the independence of degradation. Importantly, this observation is independent of Ca$^{2+}$, as treatment with ionomycin or EGTA did not affect the release (Supplementary Fig. 3b,c). To test whether the EV release is mechanosensitive in a more natural ECM composition, an interpenetrating network hydrogel of alginate and collagen-I polymers was fabricated in which the hydrogel $G^*$ was tunable independent of the collagen-I concentration (Supplementary Fig. 3d). Although EV release from the interpenetrating network was generally lower, depending on the collagen concentration, the release remains mechanosensitive (Supplementary Fig. 3e).

To study whether the EV release from engineered hydrogels corresponds to individual EV transport, we developed a three-dimensional (3D) particle-tracking approach that utilized high-speed 3D microscopy with deconvolution to visualize (Fig. 3a and Supplementary Videos) and calculate the mean square displacement (MSD) of the CD63–K2S–EVs over time in different environments. Particles were tracked immediately after hydrogel formation to capture the initial behaviours possibly affected by hydrogel swelling. Data were collected every $\Delta t = 0.267$ s over a total time $T \approx 8$ s. Next, data were ensemble-averaged over numerous tracks and fit to the power law form (1):

$$\langle \text{MSD}(t) \rangle = K_c t^\alpha$$

(1)

to calculate an effective ensemble exponent $\alpha$ and coefficient $K_c$. The effective diffusion coefficient:
Fig. 1 | EVs transport within decellularized lung tissue. a, EVs exist within ECMs, where often the mesh size is smaller than the size of EVs. Mechanisms and dependencies directing their potential transport under confinement are unclear. b, Representative images of collagen (top left), K2S-EVs (bottom left) and combined (top middle) of decellularized lung tissue with EVs passively loaded, imaged using second harmonic multiphoton microscopy. Scale bars, 15 μm. A pixel intensity chart (bottom right) drawn along the dotted line in the combined image demonstrates that EVs existed along fibres as the K2S pixel intensity correlates strongly with the collagen pixel intensity. The mean Pearson’s correlation coefficient (top right) is reported for N=9 regions of interest analysed across 3 pairs of background-subtracted images. *P<10⁻⁵ via an unpaired two-tailed t-test. Error bars denote the s.e.m. c, Mean % of EV released from the decellularized lung tissue over time with t_{50}=24.7 h. N=5 tissue slices across 3 independent experiments. d, Representative images of EV load (after 72 h) and release (after 24 h) in decellularized lung tissue. a.u., arbitrary units. Scale bars, 2 mm. Error bars denote the s.d.

\[ D_\tau = \frac{\text{MSD}(\tau)}{6\tau} \]  

was calculated for each track over each interval \( \tau = 4\Delta t \approx 1.06 \text{s} \) (ref. 14) to give:

\[ D_{1.06s} = \frac{\text{MSD}(\tau = 1.06 \text{s})}{6(1.06 \text{s})} \]  

Multiple values for \( D_{1.06s}(\tau) \) were obtained for a single track for each interval \( \tau \) and averaged to obtain a single \( D_{1.06s} \) for each track (Methods). We validated our method by measuring the transport of NPs in glycerol solutions with different solution viscosities and thus different expected transport speeds. NPs in these solutions show an \( \alpha \) of \( \sim 1 \) (Supplementary Fig. 4a,b), which indicates diffusive transport. Furthermore, they exhibited diffusion coefficients \( D_{1.06s} \) like those expected from conventional Stokes–Einstein theory (Supplementary Fig. 4c). In contrast, NPs in a stiff stress relaxing matrix exhibited a subdiffusive \((\alpha \approx 0.39)\), slower \((D_{1.06s} \approx 0.01 \mu \text{m}^2 \text{s}^{-1})\) transport (Supplementary Fig. 4d), which indicates confinement. Strikingly, EVs in a stiff stress relaxing matrix showed \( \alpha \) approaching that of NPs transporting in solution \((\alpha \approx 0.88)\) (Fig. 3b,c). EVs in a soft stress relaxing matrix exhibited a significantly lower \( D_{1.06s} \) (Fig. 3d) with subdiffusive transport \((\alpha \approx 0.49)\), whereas EVs in a stiff elastic matrix showed a more pronounced subdiffusive transport \((\alpha \approx 0.045)\), which indicates that the matrix stress relaxation allows EVs to overcome confinement.

Stress relaxing matrix systems can give rise to ‘dynamic heterogeneity’ wherein particles can escape confinement or ‘cages’ formed by the matrix. To determine an expected s.d. of \( D_{1.06s} \) for particles in a homogeneous system, tracks were simulated matched to measurement conditions (Methods). Simulated tracks followed the measured tracks for NPs transporting in solutions (Supplementary Fig. 4e). The s.d. of experimentally determined \( D_{1.06s} \) \((\sigma_{\text{exp}})\) was calculated and normalized to the s.d. of \( D_{1.06s} \) for simulated trajectories \((\sigma_{\text{sim}})\) to measure the degree of heterogeneity of \( D_{1.06s} \) (ref. 16). Although NPs in solution followed their simulated trajectories with a lower degree of heterogeneity, \( \sigma_{\text{exp}}/\sigma_{\text{sim}} \) (Supplementary Fig. 4f), EVs in the matrix showed a higher \( \sigma_{\text{exp}}/\sigma_{\text{sim}} \) (Fig. 3c), which indicates a more heterogeneous distribution of \( D_{1.06s} \). To investigate this behaviour, we analysed how individual EVs exhibited changes in transport motions over time by defining another 3D diffusion coefficient \((D_{0.53s})\) with shorter intervals \( \tau = 2\Delta t \approx 0.53 \text{s} \) to capture the local transport behaviours. \( D_{0.53s} \) was calculated for each interval \( \tau_i \) within the tracks to express each track as \( D_{0.53s}(\tau) \). Next, the difference of \( D_{0.53s}(\tau) \) between consecutive intervals \( \tau \) and \( \tau_{i+1} \) \((\tau_i \approx 0.53 \text{s}, \tau_{i+1} \approx 1.06 \text{s}, \ldots)\) was taken to calculate \( \Delta D_{0.53s} \):

\[ \Delta D_{0.53s}(\tau_i) = D_{0.53s}(\tau_{i+1}) - D_{0.53s}(\tau_i) \]  

which indicates the magnitude of changes in the diffusion coefficient over time within a track. To compare the spread of \( \Delta D_{0.53s} \) between groups, values for \( \Delta D_{0.53s} \) were normalized to the mean \( \Delta D_{0.53s} \) for each group (normalized \( \Delta D_{0.53s} \)). From a theoretical perspective, particle motion is facilitated when \( D_{i} > 0 \), particle motion is hindered when \( D_{i} < 0 \) and particle motion remains constant when \( D_{i} \approx 0 \) (Supplementary Fig. 5a). \( \Delta D_{0.53s} \) values were close to zero for NPs transporting in solution (Supplementary Fig. 5b).
which suggests that $\Delta D_{\text{inta}} \approx 0$ for particles that undergo free diffusion. However, individual tracks of EVs in a stiff matrix showed a much broader distribution of $\Delta D_{\text{inta}}$ (Fig. 3f and Supplementary Fig. 5c,d), which suggests that a stiff matrix drives the fluctuating transport motions within the tracks. Furthermore, $\Delta D_{\text{inta}}$ values were ~50% both positive and negative (Supplementary Fig. 5e), which indicates that this behaviour is associated with zero-mean fluctuations in transport motion.

To calculate the extent to which EVs escaped confinement, we modelled the matrix as a system of ‘cages’ with a defined size $c$ that transporting particles must overcome (Supplementary Fig. 6)17-19. As NPs in a stiff stress relaxing matrix were confined with $\alpha \approx 0.39$, $c$ was defined as the plateau MSD for this condition ($c \approx 0.09 \mu m^2$). Tracks were analysed to determine whether their MSD exceeded $c$ (the fraction of particles that escape from the cages) and, if so, the elapsed time before the MSD exceeded $c$ (the escape time). A significant amount of the EVs in a stiff stress relaxing matrix demonstrated the ability to escape cages and they did this more rapidly (~1.3 s) than the EVs in a soft stress relaxing matrix (Fig. 3g). In contrast, EVs in a stiff elastic matrix less readily escaped cages, which further shows that matrix stress relaxation is crucial to allow EV transport. Furthermore, we calculated the radius of gyration $R_g$ (ref. 29) for each particle, defined as the time-averaged root mean square displacement over the particle trajectory. EVs in a stiff stress relaxing matrix explored more space than EVs in a soft stress relaxing matrix, as indicated by a higher $R_g$ (Fig. 3h).

As the EVs showed the ability to transport in confined spaces, we hypothesized that intrinsic EV properties also drive their transport. Although lyophilized (freeze-dried) EVs possessed the same size distribution as freshly isolated EVs (Supplementary Fig. 7a), they did not exhibit a greater release from the stiff stress relaxing hydrogel (Fig. 4a)—this was further confirmed by a decrease in $D_{\text{inta}}$ by about tenfold and in $\alpha$ to ~0.25 (Fig. 4b). Non-lyophilized EVs with an integral membrane structure are probably required for mechanically sensitive transport, as lyophilizing EVs21 can compromise their membrane integrity. This is supported by the addition of the cryoprotectant trehalose to EV preparations during lyophilization22, which recovers release behaviour (Supplementary Fig. 7b). We speculated that transport may be regulated by EV surface interactions within hydrogels or actomyosin contractility within EVs. However, tethering the integrin binding ligand RGD (~0.8 $\mu M$) within hydrogels or treating hydrogels with drugs against myosin-II (blebbistatin) and Rho-associated protein kinase (Y27632) did not affect the EV release (Supplementary Fig. 7c,d). Importantly, ATP within EV preparations existed at a concentration much less than that in cells (Supplementary Fig. 7e), and EVs from cells partially (~50%) depleted of ATP do not release differently (Supplementary Fig. 7f), which indicates that EV transport mechanisms are probably metabolically passive rather than active.

Water permeation via aquaporins drives the migration of spatially confined cells independent of myosin-II23. As aquaporins are partitioned into EVs24, we hypothesized that water permeation
through aquaporins regulates EV transport. EV release in both stiff and soft stress relaxing hydrogels was increased by the addition of 3% polyethylene glycol (Fig. 4c), but did not occur if the EVs were freeze-dried (Supplementary Fig. 7g). We then tested whether aquaporins are required for EV release. AQPI is the dominant aquaporin isoform expressed in MSCs (Supplementary Fig. 8a and Supplementary Table 1). Treating cells with short interfering RNA (siRNA) against AQPI leads to an ~80% mRNA knockdown in cells (Supplementary Fig. 8b) and a ~60% reduction in the AQPI protein packaged into EVs (Supplementary Fig. 8c). AQPI depletion in EVs significantly increased their Young’s modulus (Fig. 4d and Supplementary Figs. 9a,b), which suggests that water permeation makes the EVs more deformable. AQPI depletion in EVs significantly decreased the EV release from hydrogels (Fig. 4e), and AQPI-depleted EVs showed an impaired release from decellularized matrices (Fig. 4f and Supplementary Fig. 9c), which indicates that the greater deformability via AQPI enhances the EVs ability to transport in the matrix. Although AQPI depletion
Fig. 4 | Aquaporin-1 mediates the ability of EVs to transport in engineered and decellularized matrices by increasing the EV deformability. a. After lyophilization, the mean % EV release decreased from stiff stress relaxing hydrogels. N = 3 hydrogels for each condition. **P = 0.012 via two-way ANOVA followed by Tukey’s test for multiple comparisons. b. Ensemble MSD curves for untreated (Unt; N = 279) versus lyophilized (Lyo; N = 618) EV tracks in a stiff stress relaxing matrix (left). Values of α from a non-linear fit by equation (1) (middle). Error bars represent the 95% confidence interval. Mean D_{106s} (right). *P = 2.9 × 10^{-12} via an unpaired two-tailed t-test. c. Hypertonic medium (3% polyethylene glycol, 300 kDa) significantly increased the mean % EV released from stress relaxing hydrogels. N = 3 hydrogels for each condition. *P = 0.026 (soft), P = 5 × 10^{-3} (stiff) via an unpaired two-tailed t-test. d. EVs from cells treated with siRNA against AQP1 (N = 6) exhibited a significantly higher mean Young’s modulus (E) than EVs from cells treated with a scrambled siRNA control (SCR, N = 7). *P = 0.005 via an unpaired two-tailed t-test. e. EVs depleted of AQP1 exhibited a significantly lower mean % released from stress relaxing hydrogels. N = 3 hydrogels for each condition. *P = 0.021 (soft), P = 8.6 × 10^{-3} (stiff) via an unpaired two-tailed t-test. f. The mean % release of AQP1-depleted EVs (N = 7) from decellularized lung tissue was significantly reduced versus a control (N = 8). *P = 0.010 via an unpaired two-tailed t-test. g. Ensemble MSD curves (left) for AQP1-depleted EV tracks (N = 613) versus control (N = 659) EV tracks. AQP1-depletion did not change the α values (middle). Error bars are the 95% confidence interval. AQP1-depletion significantly decreased the mean D_{106s} (right). *P = 1.3 × 10^{-7} via an unpaired two-tailed t-test. h. From an analysis of the tracks from g, AQP1-depleted EVs exhibited a significantly slower mean escape time than that of the control EVs in a stiff stress relaxing matrix. *P = 2.1 × 10^{-1} via an unpaired two-tailed t-test. Unless stated otherwise, the error bars denote s.e.m.

Reduced D_{106s} by about threefold, α remained unchanged for individual EVs (Fig. 4d). Liposomes encapsulated in the stiff stress relaxing matrix exhibited α ≈ 0.65 (Supplementary Fig. 9d) with a much lower D_{106s} (Supplementary Fig. 9e), which suggests that the presence of lipid membrane alone is insufficient for an enhanced EV transport. Pulling values from all the experimental groups of EVs in a matrix shows that α increases with increased D_{106s}, but becomes saturated near α ≈ 1.0 when D_{106s} is higher than 0.1 μm²s⁻¹ (Supplementary Fig. 9f), which suggests that a threefold decrease in D_{106s} via AQP1 depletion is
less likely to be sufficient to significantly decrease $\alpha$. Consistent with these results, AQP1 depletion decreased the time required for EVs to escape cages (Fig. 4h). Finally, AQP1 depletion did not affect the spread of $\Delta D_{\text{os}}$ (Supplementary Fig. 9g), which indicates the independence of AQP1 with fluctuating transport motion.

The results describe the ability of EVs to transport in a polymer matrix with an absence of matrix degradation, despite EVs being larger than the average mesh size of the matrices. The matrix stress relaxation allowed the EVs to readily escape cages formed by the polymer network (Fig. 5). A stiff matrix increased the fluctuating EV transport motions, and thus the combination of stiffness and stress relaxation led to a greatly enhanced EV transport. EVs were also subjected to water permeation through AQP1, which allowed the EVs to become more deformable by altering their volume, which enabled their escape from confinement. This behaviour is reminiscent of a model of the hopping diffusion of nanoparticles in entangled polymer matrices$^{25-27}$, in which it is hypothesized that nanoparticles show the ability to slide through a matrix under some conditions. The phospholipid content of EVs vary$^{28}$, and thus it will be interesting to determine whether and how these contents affect EV transport in matrix, as lipid asymmetry was shown to affect EV membrane stability$^{29}$. The observation that AQP1 mediates EV deformability and the resulting transport in ECM is important because the deformability of synthetic nanoparticles with lipid bilayers was recently shown to dramatically affect their accumulation in tissues both in vitro and in vivo$^{30}$. Future studies will test whether the presence of water channels on lipid vesicles alone is sufficient or if other membrane components are also necessary to facilitate EV transport under confinement in matrix. Furthermore, the 3D particle tracking approach utilized here can be extended to study EV transport in various environments, for investigating or treating diseases implicating EVs. Finally, the results may inform how therapeutic EVs can potentially be modified to better facilitate their delivery through tissue ECM. In summary, this study opens new avenues of investigations into EV transport behaviours that occur in the ECM.
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Methods
Particle size and number characterization. Particle size and number were obtained using a Nanoparticle Tracking Analysis 3.2 via a NanoSight NS300 (Malvern) with a 405 nm laser. Samples were introduced by a syringe pump at a rate 100 µl min⁻¹. Three 30 s videos were acquired using camera level 14 followed by detection threshold 7. Camera focus, shutter, blur, minimum track length, minimum expected particle size and maximum jump length were set automatically by the software. Samples were diluted as needed to maintain particles per video from 100 to 2,000.

Cell culture. All cells were cultured at 37 °C in 5% CO₂. HeLa cells (CCL-2, ATCC) were a gift from A. Karginov at the University of Illinois at Chicago (UIC). D1 MSCs (CRL-12424, ATCC), HeLa cells and HEK293T cells (CRL-3216, ATCC) were cultured using high-glucose DMEM (Thermo) supplemented with 10% FBS (Atlanta Biologicals), 1% penicillin/streptomycin (P/S; Thermo) and 1% Glutamax (Thermo) to 80% confluency before passing, no more than 30 times. Human Umbilical Vein endothelial cells (HUVEC) (no. CC-2519, Lonza) were a gift from Y. Komarova at UIC. HUVEC were cultured using Ham’s F-12K (Thermo) supplemented with 10% FBS, 1% P/S, 1% Glutamax, 0.1 mg/ml heparin (no. H3393, Sigma) and endothelial cell growth supplement (no. E2759, Sigma) at passage 5. Human MSCs (hMSCs) were derived by the plastic adherence of mononucleated cells from human bone marrow aspirate (Lonza). After 3 days, the adherent cells were cultured in the hMSC medium: α-minimal essential medium (Thermo) supplemented with 20% FBS, 1% P/S (Thermo Fisher Scientific) and 1% Glutamax (Thermo). After reaching 70–80% confluency at 10–14 days, the cells were split, expanded in the hMSC medium and used at passage 3. Cells were routinely tested for mycoplasma contamination and only used if no contamination was present.

Lentiviral expression of CD63 fused with K2S. A DNA plasmid that contained K2S was synthesized in a pUC57-Kan backbone (GenScript). The K2S sequence was cloned into a lentiviral construct that contained CD63 (LV112335, Applied Biological Materials) so that K2S fused to CD63 on the C terminus of CD63. D1 MSCs were transduced with lentivirus that contained the CD63-K2S plasmid using standard techniques. Briefly, lentiviral particles were produced with a second-generation lentiviral packaging system (LV003, Applied Biological Materials) so that K2S fused to CD63 on the C terminus of CD63. D1 MSCs were transduced with lentivirus that contained the CD63-K2S plasmid using standard techniques.

Extracellular vesicle isolation and preparation. To isolate EVs from cells, the cells were washed twice with Hank’s balanced salt solution (HBSS; Thermo) followed by incubation with serum-free growth medium for 1 h. Afterwards, the medium was exchanged with a medium that consisted of high-glucose DMEM supplemented with 10% FBS (Thermo) instead of 10% FBS. The next day, the medium was centrifuged at 2,000g for 10 min to remove cell debris followed by centrifugation at 10,000g to remove particles larger than 500 nm (ref. 2). Afterwards, the solution was added to a 100 kDa MW-cutoff column (Amicon) and centrifuged at 5,000 for 20 min followed by washing with an equal volume of HBSS. The retentate was resuspended and confirmed to contain concentrated EVs using NanoSight NS300 (Malvern).

Lyophilization of EVs. Concentrated EVs were frozen at −80 °C overnight. If applicable, the preparations were treated with 4% trehalose (Sigma) before freezing. They were then placed in a lyophilization chamber operating at <0.1 mbar vacuum and −10°C temperature overnight. The solid was reconstituted in HBSS and confirmed to contain EVs using NanoSight NS300.

Decellularization of lung tissues. All animal procedures were performed in compliance with National Institutes of Health and institutional guidelines approved by the ethical committee of UIC. Female C57BL/6 mice were purchased from The Jackson Laboratory, housed in the UIC Biologic Resources Laboratory and killed 12 weeks after birth. Lung tissue was harvested and decellularized based on techniques described previously3. Briefly, the heart–lung bloc was exposed and the heart–lung bloc was exposed and the heart–lung bloc was exposed and the heart–lung bloc was exposed and the heart–lung bloc was excised and washed through the airway and the right ventricle, incubated in a 0.1% Triton-X wash solution overnight at 4°C, washed and incubated in a 2% sodium deoxycholate wash solution overnight at 4°C. It was then washed, incubated in a 1 M NaCl wash solution for 1 h at room temperature, washed and incubated in a wash solution that contained DNAase at 1 h at room temperature. The tissue was placed in a solution of liquidified 5% low-melting agarose (MultiWell point agarose) (Lonza) and allowed to solidify at 4°C overnight. Slices were prepared using a tissue slicer (Braintree) into 1 mm sections and punched into 5 mm discs using a punch (Integra). Discs were placed in HBSS, incubated at 42°C for 30 min and washed several times.
with \( M_w \), the average molecular weight of polymers, \( \bar{V} \) the molar volume of hydrogel divided by the molar volume of water and \( z \) the Flory interaction parameter. The values were used to calculate the average hydrogel mesh size \( \xi \) through equation (9):

\[
\xi = V^{-\frac{1}{3}} \left( \frac{2CM_w}{M_r} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} I
\]

with \( C \) the polymer characteristic ratio, \( M_r \) the average molecular weight of the polymer repeating unit and \( I \) the carbon–carbon bond length. Differential scanning calorimetry was used to perform thermoporometry to measure the pore size parameter. The values were used to calculate the average hydrogel mesh size \( \xi \) through equation (9).

Bulk transport experiments. Liposomes (FormuMax, no. F60103-F) were obtained with a similar (80% cholesterol) content as that of the EVs.\(^{11}\) The encapsulation of particles or dextran in bulk alginate hydrogels was performed by mixing particles with alginate or click alginate followed by hydrogel formation. The hydrogels were punched into discs and placed into polystyrene plates with retention medium. If applicable, the hydrogels were treated with blebbistatin (Cayman 13013) or Y-27632 (Cayman 10005583). If necessary, gels were digested by adding medium with 3.4 mg ml\(^{-1}\) alginate lyase (Sigma) and placing at 37°C for 30 min. Release was measured using fluorescence for polystyrene nanoparticles (SpheroTech) and FTTC-dextran (500 kDa, Sigma). Percent release was determined at the indicated times as the number of particles in the medium \( P_m \) divided by \( P_{m0} \) plus the number of particles in the digested hydrogel \( P_0 \) as:

\[
\% \text{ release} = \frac{P_m}{P_{m0} + P_0} \times 100\%
\]

For EVs and liposomes, \( P_{m0} \) was measured as above using NanoSight NS300, but \( P_0 \) was determined by calculating the initial number of particles added to the hydrogel using NanoSight NS300. Samples without encapsulated particles were used to account for background.

3D single-particle tracking. CD63-K25 EVs were encapsulated in hydrogels, placed on dishes of no. 1.5 coverslip thickness (MatTek), and imaged at x60 with immersion oil of refractive index 1.518 (Cargille) using a DeltaVision OMX microscope (GE). Single channel 1.024 x 1.024 pixel (81.92 x 81.92 µm) images were obtained in 2 µm thick stacks with 0.125 µm spacing (16 images per stack) using the conventional imaging mode. Over ~8, 30 stacks were acquired for a stack frequency of 3.75 Hz and image frequency of 60 Hz. After acquisition, the images were processed through deconvolution using softWoRx.

Using the IMARIS Spot’s function, a custom particle tracking algorithm was created. Particle numbers were determined using intensity thresholding over regions that measured 10 x 10 x 1 pixels followed by tracking their 3D position \((x, y, z)\) over time \(t\). Tracks could continue if the particle was undetectable for a single elapsed time since the start of tracking:

\[
\text{MSD}(t) = \langle x(t) - x(t = 0) \rangle^2 + \langle y(t) - y(t = 0) \rangle^2 + \langle z(t) - z(t = 0) \rangle^2
\]

Tracks with less than five measurements of MSD were removed from further analysis. For ensemble-averaged tracks, a lower limit of 20 points and an upper limit of 30 points were defined to constrain the tracks considered for analysis, as uneven track sizes can bias the results.\(^{12}\) Owing to this, the data are shown only up to the lower limit of 20 points (\(t \approx 5\)). To account for static (or localization) error,\(^{12}\) for each particle type, particles were adhered to glass using (3-aminopropyl) triethoxysilane (Sigma) with a method described previously.\(^{13}\) The MSD was tracked for adherent particles over time, and the static error was defined as the plateau MSD. This error was subtracted from all subsequent MSD measurements for each experimental group.

Ensemble-averaged track data were generated by averaging the MSD for each track \(i\) at every time \(t\) elapsed since the start of tracking:

\[
\langle \text{MSD}(t) \rangle = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \text{MSD}(t_i)
\]

where \( N \) is number of tracks. Exponent \( \alpha \) was calculated for ensemble-averaged tracks using equation (13). Diffusion coefficient \( D_{\text{app}} \) was calculated over intervals \( r \approx 4\delta \approx 1.065 \) for each track, as in equation (3). Thus, if the total track time is \( T \), a given track has \( T/\delta \) values for \( D_{\text{app}}(t) \), which were averaged to provide a singular value for \( D_{\text{app}} \) for a given track. The expected \( D_{\text{app}} \) for particles was determined based on the Stokes–Einstein relation:

\[
D = \frac{k_B T}{6\pi \eta r}
\]

where \( k_B \) is the Boltzmann constant multiplied by temperature, \( T \) is the particle radius and \( \eta \) is the solution viscosity. The viscosity of glycerol solutions was determined previously.\(^{11}\) The degree of heterogeneity of \( D_{\text{app}} \) was defined as described in the main text. For each sample, simulations were performed to obtain an equal number of simulated tracks as the number of tracks measured for each sample. Each MSD(t) was drawn randomly from a zero-mean Gaussian distribution determined for each sample with variance \( \sigma^2 \). \( D_{\text{app}} \) was then calculated for simulated tracks as for experimental measurements (Eq. 2). ‘Cages’ of confinement were defined in the text. Tracks were evaluated for their ability to overcome this cage size by exceeding \( c \) (particles escaping) or not (particles not escaping). The timepoint at which the particle exceeds \( c \) is defined as the escape time, \( t_r \) defined as the time-averaged root mean square displacement of particle tracks as:

\[
R = \sqrt{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \text{MSD}(t_i)}
\]

over each measured timepoint \( t \), through the duration of the track.

ATP measurement and pharmacological depletion. ATP concentration was measured using a commercial kit (Cayman, 701410). Briefly, samples were lysed followed by the addition of a mixture that catalyses a reaction to produce bioluminescence based on the concentration of ATP within the samples. Values of bioluminescence were compared to a standard curve with a known concentration of ATP. To deplete ATP, the cells were treated with 1 mg ml\(^{-1}\) oligomycin (Cayman, 1404-19-9) and 1 mM 2-deoxy-d-glucose (Cayman, 154-17-6) for 24 h.

siRNA transfection. Scrambled siRNA (Dharmacon) or siRNA against AQP1 (AM16708, Ambion) was diluted to 160 nM in unsupplemented Opti-MEM medium (Thermo) and combined 1:1 with Opti-MEM supplemented with 2% Lipofectamine RNAiMAX (Thermo) and incubated at room temperature for at least 20 min. Cells were washed with HBSS and fresh growth medium was added to cells. The transfection solution was added dropwise for a final siRNA concentration of 4 nM and cells were incubated for 3 days followed by EV isolation.

Gene expression analysis. Trizol (Thermo Fisher Scientific) was added directly to cells. Chloriform (200 µl) was added per 1 ml of Trizol followed by centrifugation for 15 min at 15,000 r.p.m. and 4°C. The top layer was collected and RNA precipitated with 500 µl of isopropanol for 20 min at 4°C. Samples were centrifuged at 12,500 r.p.m. for 15 min at 4°C. The supernatant was removed, precipitated RNA was washed with 75% EtOH and centrifuged for 5 min at 7,500 r.p.m. and 4°C. EtOH was removed and the purified RNA was resuspended in 15 µl of RNase-free water. The RNA quantification was performed by NanoDrop. Complementary DNA was reverse transcribed by SuperScript-III (Thermo Fisher Scientific). qPCR was performed in the ViiA7 qPCR system with PowerSYBR Green master mix (Applied Biosystem). Samples were analysed in triplicate with 50 ng of complementary DNA per well. Relative gene expression was computed by the delta–delta threshold cycle method by comparing threshold cycle values to those of a reference gene (GAPDH). Supplementary Table 1 shows the list of primers for qPCR.

Atomic force microscopy. Vesicles were adhered to freshly cleaved mica by incubation at room temperature for 15 min followed by washing.\(^{16}\) Atomic force microscopy was performed using an MFP-3D Bio mode (Asylum Research) with a pyramidal tip (Bruker; MLCT, triangular, resonant frequency ~125 kHz) as described previously.\(^{16}\) Briefly, vesicles with a size range between about 50 and 300 nm were found by scanning in a tapping (a.c.) mode and indented until they reached 0.5 nN at 250 n m s\(^{-1}\) to generate a force–displacement curve. The data were analysed and converted to Young’s modulus (E) using MATLAB by modelling the data to a spring constant and a sliding interval and the surface of the vesicle was determined by a high and sustained change in the slope. The linear region was used to calculate \( E \) via the equation:

\[
F(\delta) = \frac{\alpha E \delta^2}{\delta^3}
\]

with \( F \) as the measured cantilever force and \( \delta \) as the tip displacement. The constant \( \alpha \) is determined by the vesicle geometry and assumed to be ~0.87 nm.

Western blot. Western blot was performed using conventional methods on samples prepared by RIPA buffer. For each lane, 20 µg of protein was added. Immunoblots were performed against AQP1 (sc-20810, SCBT, 1:2000) and GAPDH (60004-1-Ig, Proteintech, 1:5000) using an anti-rabbit or anti-mouse secondary antibody (rabbit: 115-035-003, mouse: 115-035-071, Jackson ImmunoResearch Laboratories) combined with Luminol (Santa Cruz) substrate for detection.
Statistical evaluation. Statistics were performed as described in the figure captions. All statistical analyses were performed using GraphPad Prism version 8.1.1. Unless otherwise noted, the statistical comparisons were made from at least three independent experiments by one-way ANOVA followed by Tukey’s multiple comparison test, and then were considered significant if $P<0.05$.

Reporting summary. Further information on research design is available in the Nature Research Reporting Summary linked to this article.

Data availability
The data that support the plots within this paper and other findings of this study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

Code availability
The codes used to analyse the data in this study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.
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Supplementary Figures

Supplementary Fig. 1. Relative sizes of EVs and decellularized lung ECM mesh. 

a, Representative EV size distribution. Data represents the mean of $N = 3$ preparations. 
b, Pore size distribution of decellularized lung tissue as measured by differential scanning calorimetry for $N = 1$ tissue slice. 
c, Mean mesh size as calculated by equilibrium swelling theory for $N = 3$ tissue slices over 2 independent experiments. Error bars are SD.
Supplementary Fig. 2. Physical properties of tissue ECM and engineered hydrogels with their effect on particle release. a, Frequency sweep of storage and loss moduli for decellularized lung tissue. \(N=3\) tissue slices. b, Frequency sweep of storage and loss moduli for hydrogels. (Left) Physically crosslinked stress relaxing hydrogels. (Right) Covalently crosslinked elastic hydrogels. \(N=3\) hydrogels for each condition. c, Hydrogel mesh size.
calculations. (Left) Calculated by equilibrium swelling theory, $N = 3$ hydrogels for each condition. (Right) Calculated by differential scanning calorimetry for stiff stress relaxing hydrogel, $N = 1$ hydrogel. d, Representative NP size distribution. $N = 3$ preparations. e, EVs derived from multiple cell types exhibit increased release from stiffer versus softer stress relaxing hydrogels. Each $N = 2$ hydrogels. f, Size distribution of liposomes with similar lipid composition to EVs. $N = 1$ preparation. g, Liposomes do not exhibit increased release from stiffer versus softer stress relaxing hydrogels. $N = 2$ hydrogels. Unless stated otherwise, data are obtained across $= 3$ independent experiments and error bars denote SEM.
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Supplementary Fig. 3. Examination of increased EV release from hydrogels. a, Stress relaxing hydrogels do not lose mass over the tested time period. Mass is normalized to hydrogel initial mass after 1 hour. Data represents the mean of $N = 3$ hydrogels across one experiment. b, Treatment of EVs encapsulated in hydrogels with ionomycin, a compound that facilitates calcium flux across membranes, does not affect EV release across a range of ionomycin concentrations. Dotted lines represent 0 mM ionomycin. $N = 2$ hydrogels across 2 independent experiments. c, Treatment of hydrogels with 2 mM EGTA, a calcium chelator, does not affect EV release. Data represents the mean of $N = 2$ hydrogels within one experiment. d, Interpenetrating network (IPN) hydrogels of collagen-1 and alginate exhibit tunable $G^*$ independent of collagen-1 concentration. Data represents the mean of $N = 2$ hydrogels for each condition. e, Though EVs release less overall with increasing collagen-1 concentration, release is greater from stiffer versus softer IPN hydrogels. $N = 2$ hydrogels for each condition. Unless stated otherwise, error bars denote SD.
Supplementary Fig. 4. Validation of 3D particle tracking methods using nanoparticles. a, Ensemble MSD curves for polystyrene nanoparticles transporting in solutions with various amounts of glycerol: 95% (N = 17), 80% (N = 32), 60% (N = 13). b, Values for effective transport exponent $\alpha$ by a non-linear fit of Equation 1 for curves presented in (a). Values are close to 1 as expected for particles transporting freely in solution. Error bars are 95% CI. c, Mean diffusion coefficient $D_{1.06}$ for nanoparticles transporting in each solution of glycerol matches that expected based on the theoretical Stokes-Einstein relationship. d, (Left) Ensemble MSD...
curves for polystyrene nanoparticles transporting in stiff stress relaxing matrix. (Middle) The value of $\alpha$ for nanoparticles in matrix is less than 1, indicating sub-diffusion. Error bars are 95% CI. (Right) Mean diffusion coefficient $D_{1.06s}$ for nanoparticles in matrix. Data are for $N = 343$ tracks. e, (Left) Simulated MSD curve for nanoparticles transporting in 80% vol/vol glycerol solution with (Middle) $\alpha$ value and (Right) $D_{1.06s}$. The curve and the values are similar to (b, Middle) as expected. $N = 32$ tracks. Error bars denote 95% CI. f, Degree of heterogeneity $\sigma_{\text{meas}}/\sigma_{\text{sim}}$ for nanoparticles transporting in glycerol solutions. $N = 5$ simulations. Error bars denote SEM.
Supplementary Fig. 5. Analysis of EV tracking data. a, Illustration of the relationship between $MSD(t)$, $D_\tau$, and $\Delta D_\tau$ values. Particle motion remains constant when $\Delta D_\tau \sim 0$, particle motion is facilitated when $\Delta D_\tau > 0$, and particle motion is hindered when $\Delta D_\tau < 0$. Values are arbitrary and for illustrative purposes only. b, Values for $\Delta D_{0.53s}$ over the length of the track for nanoparticles transporting in glycerol, 95% ($N = 17$), 80% ($N = 32$), 60% ($N = 13$). c, Values for $\Delta D_{0.53s}$ over the length of the track for EVs transporting in matrix, Stiff SR ($N = 279$), Soft SR ($N = 263$), Stiff E ($N = 89$). d, Standard deviation (SD) of $\Delta D_{0.53s}$ distributions for tracks in Fig. 3b measured at $t \sim 4.26$ seconds. e, Fraction of all $\Delta D_{0.53s}$ values for particle tracks with positive or negative value.
Supplementary Fig. 6. Illustration of cage size determined for nanoparticles in matrix.

Particles under confinement in matrix exhibit an $MSD$ that can be used to model the system as a set of cages with size $c$ defined by the $MSD$ plateau.
Supplementary Fig. 7. Mechanisms of mechanosensitive EV release from hydrogels. a, Lyophilization of EVs does not affect their size distribution after reconstitution. N = 2 preparations. b, Addition of 4% trehalose to EVs during lyophilization recovers their mean % release in stiff stress relaxing matrix. N = 2 hydrogels each condition. c, Presence of 0.8 μM RGD peptide tethered within stress relaxing hydrogels does not affect mean % EV release. d, Treating RGD-hydrogels containing encapsulated EVs with cytoskeletal inhibitors does not affect mean % EV release. e, EVs contain little ATP in comparison to their cells. The 10⁹ EVs are isolated from the 10⁶ cells over 24 hours. N = 2 preparations within one experiment. f, (Left) Cells are depleted of ATP by ~50% with treatment with 1 μg/mL oligomycin (OM) and 1mM 2-deoxy-D-glucose (DG). (Right) EVs from cells depleted of ATP do not exhibit a different release after 24 hours from stiff stress relaxing hydrogels. N = 2 hydrogels for each condition. g, Treating lyophilized EVs encapsulated in stress relaxing hydrogels with hypertonic solution does not affect their mean % release. Unless stated otherwise, all release experiments represent N = 2 hydrogels across 2 independent experiments and error bars denote SD.
**Supplementary Fig. 8. Aquaporin-1 knockdown in EVs.**

**a,** *AQP1* is the dominant aquaporin isoform in mMSCs. The y-axis is expressed as the log fold change of RNA expression relative to *GAPDH* RNA expression. Data represent the mean of *N* = 3 reactions in one experiment. **b,** Verification of RNA expression knockdown in cells by treatment with siRNA against *AQP1*. SCR = scrambled siRNA control. Data represent *N* = 3 reactions in one experiment. **c,** EVs collected from cells treated with siRNA against *AQP1* express less AQP1 protein. (Left) Western blot of EVs from cells treated with siRNA against *AQP1* or a scrambled (SCR) control siRNA. (Right) Blot quantification.
Supplementary Fig. 9. Effect of aquaporin-1 knockdown in EVs.

a, Representative images of EVs adhered to mica acquired using scanning mode with atomic force microscopy. Red circles indicate particles measuring 50-150nm in height that are measured for Young’s modulus. b, Representative force-displacement curves of EVs from cells treated with siRNA against AQPI versus a control. Red arrows indicate the range in which Young’s modulus is calculated. c, Representative image of AQPI-depleted EVs largely remaining within decellularized lung tissue 24 hours after loading. The axis scale is fluorescence intensity counts (AU). Scale bars = 2 mm. d, (Left) Ensemble MSD curves for liposomes in stiff stress relaxing matrix. (Right) Value for transport exponent α for the MSD curve. Error bars denote 95% CI. Data are for N = 58 tracks. e, Mean diffusion coefficient $D_{1.06}$ for liposomes in stiff stress relaxing matrix from (d). f, Values for α and mean $D_{1.06}$ plot for all groups of EVs in matrix measured in this study fit to a standard one-phase association curve. g, Distributions of the change in local transport coefficient $ΔD_{0.53}$ calculated at time ~4.26 seconds are similar for AQPI-depleted EVs (N = 613) versus a control (N = 659). Particles are analysed for $N ≥ 180$ tracks for each condition. Unless stated otherwise, error bars denote SEM.

Supplementary Movies

Movie S1: Tracking data overlaid with imaging data for representative transport of a single EV in stiff stress relaxing matrix shown in Fig. 3A. The length scale is micrometers and the time scale is seconds.

Movie S2: Tracking data overlaid with imaging data for representative transport of a single EV in soft stress relaxing matrix shown in Fig. 3A. The length scale is micrometers and the time scale is seconds.
**Movie S3:** Tracking data overlaid with imaging data for representative transport of a single EV in stiff elastic matrix shown in Fig. 3A. The length scale is micrometers and the time scale is seconds.

**Movie S4:** Tracking data overlaid with imaging data for representative transport of multiple EVs in stiff stress relaxing matrix. The length scale is micrometers and the time scale is seconds.

**Movie S5:** Tracking data overlaid with imaging data for representative transport of multiple EVs in soft stress relaxing matrix. The length scale is micrometers and the time scale is seconds.

**Movie S6:** Tracking data overlaid with imaging data for representative transport of multiple EVs in stiff elastic matrix. The length scale is micrometers and the time scale is seconds.

**Supplementary Table 1.** Quantitative PCR primers.

| Target | Sequence |
|--------|----------|
| GAPDH  | F: ACATCGCTCAGACACCATG  
        | R: TGTAGTTGAGGTCAATGAAGGG |
| AQP1   | F: CTGGCGATTGACTACACTGG  
        | R: AAGTCATAGATGAGCACTGCC |
| AQP2   | F: TTGGTTTCTCTGTACCCCTGG  
        | R: AACGGGCTGGATTCAATGG |
| AQP3   | F: CTTTGCCACCTATCCCTCTG  
        | R: CCACAGTGAAAGCCTCCAG |
| AQP4   | F: GTTTAGATCTGCTTTTCAAGG  
        | R: AATGTCCACACTTACCCAC |
| AQP5   | F: CTCCCAGCCTATCCATTG  
        | R: ACCCAGAAGACCCAGTGAG |