A liquid biopsy for detecting circulating mesothelial precursor cells: A new biomarker for diagnosis and prognosis in mesothelioma
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**ABSTRACT**

Background: Malignant pleural mesothelioma (MPM) is an aggressive cancer related to asbestos exposure. Early diagnosis is challenging due to generic symptoms and a lack of biomarkers. We previously demonstrated that mesothelial precursor cells (MPC) characterized by mesothelin (MSLN)+CD90+CD34+ could be implicated in the development of mesothelioma after asbestos exposure. Here, we aimed to determine the clinical significance of detecting MPC in blood for early-stage diagnosis and prognosis of mesothelioma.

Methods: Due to the rarity of MPC in blood, it is challenging to identify this cell population using conventional techniques. Hence, we have developed a microfluidic liquid biopsy platform called MesoFind that utilizes an immunomagnetic, mesothelin capture strategy coupled with immunofluorescence to identify rare populations of cells at high sensitivity and precision. To validate our technique, we compared this approach to flow cytometry for the detection of MPC in murine blood and lavage samples. Upon successful validation of the murine samples, we then proceeded to examine circulating MPC in 23 patients with MPM, 23 asbestos-exposed individuals (ASB), and 10 healthy donors (HD) to evaluate their prognostic and diagnostic value.

Finding: MPC were successfully detected in the blood of murine samples using MesoFind but were undetectable with flow cytometry. Circulating MPC were significantly higher in patients with epithelioid MPM compared to HD and ASB. The MPC subpopulation, MSLN+ and CD90+, were upregulated in ASB compared to HD suggesting an early role in pleural damage from asbestos. The MPC subpopulation, MSLN+ and CD34+, in contrast, were detected in advanced MPM and associated with markers of poor prognosis, suggesting a predominant role during cancer progression.

Interpretation: The identification of circulating MPC presents an attractive solution for screening and early diagnosis of epithelioid mesothelioma. The presence of different subtypes of MPC have a prognostic value that could be of assistance with clinical decisions in patients with MPM.
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1. Introduction

Malignant pleural mesothelioma (MPM) is an aggressive malignancy that is generally associated with asbestos exposure and is one of the most common forms of occupational cancer. Despite several
Research in context

Evidence before this study: Malignant pleural mesothelioma is an aggressive malignancy with dismal prognosis. Due to the lack of detectable biomarkers in early development of the disease, most mesothelioma patients are typically diagnosed in advanced stages. Mesothelial precursor cells (MPC) are a heterogeneous population of cells that have recently been identified in early recruitment to inflamed mesothelium. We have previously observed a significant increase in MPC in the lavage of malignant murine models which suggests MPC are a suitable biomarker for early monitoring of mesothelioma. MPC are quite rare in circulation and thus to date, no studies have been able to investigate the clinical utility of detecting MPC in mesothelioma.

Add value of this study: This is the first study to isolate and characterize the molecular profiles of MPC in circulation. This study introduces a microfluidic platform for the detection of MPC with superior sensitivity and specificity when compared to other current blood screening approaches. We have defined several subpopulations of MPC and found correlations with their biomarker expression to various clinical indications.

Implications of all the available evidences: Our study introduces a useful liquid biopsy approach for screening mesothelioma patients that has the potential for earlier diagnosis and more precise prognosis. This study further highlights the role of MPC in early to late stages of mesothelioma development.

In particular, we observed a considerable elevation in mesothelial precursor cells (MPC) in peritoneal lavage collected from asbestos-exposed mice when compared to a control group [30]. Although the functions of MPC are still under discussion, it is believed that the recruitment of macrophages and free floating mesothelial-like cells (mesothelin+) after tissue damage can contribute to the regeneration of the damaged mesothelium and have a potential role in tumor-promotion [31,32]. Here, we extend the investigation of MPCs and mesothelial precursor-like cells by determining the clinical significance of their detection in the blood for early diagnosis and prognosis in mesothelioma.

Flow cytometry is a powerful technique that allows for the phenotypic characterization and identification of heterogeneous populations of cells. In our preliminary work, we attempted to detect CD34+, CD90+, and mesothelin (MSLN)+ MPC in blood as previously described [30,31] using flow cytometry. Unfortunately, this method lacks the sensitivity and resolution for identifying the low levels of these cells in the blood. Microfluidic methods offer advantages for the detection of rare cells due to their high throughput, sensitivity, and selectivity compared to traditional approaches [33]. Here, we introduce a novel liquid biopsy assay that takes advantage of a microfluidic approach called MesoFind to isolate and analyze MPCs and MPC-like cells as potential diagnostic and prognostic biomarkers. Our group has previously developed numerous microfluidic platforms with a similar approach for the detection of rare and novel biomarkers in various cancers and diseases [33–45]. Our prior strategies generally focused on the detection of circulating tumor cells (CTC); however, the detection of MPCs as a screening approach provides significant advantages over CTC analysis for two reasons: (1) MPCs are more abundant than CTCs and, (2) MPCs are likely overexpressed much earlier in the disease. With these two factors in mind, we demonstrate in this work an effective approach that monitors circulating MPC for early diagnosis and prognosis of the disease through systematic studies of both murine and clinical blood samples.

2. Methods

2.1. Ethics statement

All animal experiments were approved by the Animal Research Ethics Board (REB) at the Toronto General Hospital Research Institute (3399.18). Animal care and experiments were performed in accordance with institutional and Canadian Institute of Health guidelines. All individuals have provided written consent and the protocol was approved by the REB at Princess Margaret Cancer Centre (04-0715 and 19-5858).

2.2. Cell lines and culture

RN5 mouse mesothelioma cells (RRID:CVCL_4250) were established and provided by the Marc de Perrot group [30]. R55, H2052 (CRL-5915, RRID:CVCL_1518, ATCC, USA), and H2452 (CRL-5946, RRID:CVCL_1553, ATCC, USA) were cultured in RPMI-1640 (350-015, Wisent Bioproducts, Canada) supplemented with 10% fetal bovine serum (FBS) (Wisent Bioproducts, Canada). Cells were passaged regularly and collected for downstream analysis when the confluency was approximately 80%.

2.3. Mouse intraperitoneal model

Mice were injected intraperitoneally (i.p.) with either RN5 cells or saline as a control. At designated time points after injection, the mice were sacrificed, and the blood and lavage were collected. The collected samples were then processed through flow cytometry and the microfluidic chip, MesoFind. All animal experiments were approved...
by the Animal Research Ethics Board (REB) at the Toronto General Hospital Research Institute.

2.4. Clinical sample collection

All blood samples were collected in CellSave preservation tubes (79000005, Menarini Silicon Biosystems Inc, USA) and blood analysis was performed within 48 hours. From the cohort of 56 individuals recruited, 10 were healthy volunteers (Table 1), 23 were individuals with known exposure to asbestos (Table 2), and 23 were individuals diagnosed with malignant pleural mesothelioma (Table 3). The inclusion criteria for asbestos-exposed individuals were as follows: (1) age > 30 years old, (2) prior asbestos exposure at least 20 years ago and/or (3) documented pleural plaques from x-ray. The exclusion criteria were the presence of any prior cancer other than non-melanomic skin cancer. Healthy individuals had no known exposure to asbestos and no history of any cancer and other medical condition. All individuals have provided written consent and the protocol was approved by the REB at Princess Margaret Cancer Centre.

2.5. Microfluidic chip fabrication

A combination of stereolithography and soft-lithography techniques were used to generate MesoFind microfluidic devices. Briefly, 3D printed positive molds were fabricated using stereolithography ($\mu$Microfluidics Edition 3D Printer from Creative CADworks, Canada). Polydimethylsiloxane (PDMS) (Dow Corning, USA) was cast onto the positive molds and baked for 2 hours at 70°C to generate negative molds. The negative molds were treated in a saturated detergent solution (Sparkleen, Thermo Fisher Scientific, USA) in 70% ethanol for one hour at room temperature. PDMS was then cast onto the negative molds and baked for 2 hours at 70°C to generate PDMS positive imprints. The PDMS imprints were peeled and bonded onto thickness #1 glass slides (Ted Pella, USA) using plasma treatment and were then incubated overnight at 100°C. The inlets and outlets were punched and high-purity silicone tubing (McMaster-Carr, USA) was inserted. Tubing connections were sealed with liquid PDMS followed by an hour of baking at 70°C. Chips were flushed with 0.1% Pluronic F-68 (P5556, Sigma-Aldrich, USA) in phosphate buffer saline (PBS) (Wisent Bioproducts, Canada) overnight before usage.

2.6. MesoFind sample preparation

All samples prepared for MesoFind processing were aliquoted into 0.5 mL volumes. RNS, H2052, and H2452 cells were harvested from culture and suspended in PBS at a density of 50 cells/mL and 200 cells/mL (supplementary figure 1). Mice lavage samples were counted and diluted to 2000 cells/mL in PBS. Blood samples were collected in CellSave preservation tubes (79000005, Menarini Silicon Biosystems Inc, USA) and aliquoted to 0.5 mL right before MesoFind processing.

Surface mesothelin were tagged in the 0.5 mL samples with 1$\mu$L of anti-mesothelin biotin (A852584767, Antibodies-Online, USA) in mice and RNS samples or 1 $\mu$L of anti-mesothelin biotin (BS-0300R-BIOTIN, Bioss Antibodies, USA) in H2052, H2452, and clinical blood samples and left for 30 minutes at room temperature. Cells were then conjugated with 10 $\mu$L of anti-biotin microbeads (130-105-637, Miltenyi Biotec, USA) at room temperature for another 30 minutes.

2.7. MesoFind assay

After an overnight treatment of 0.1% Pluronic F-68 in PBS, the microfluidic chips were assembled with an array of grade N52 neodymium magnets (D14-N52, K&J Magnetics, USA) placed above and below the chip. The chips were then connected to a syringe pump (Chemxy, USA) and were set to withdraw at 500 $\mu$L/h. All following steps were performed on-chip using the syringe pump. The Pluronic F-68 were washed away with 100 $\mu$L PBS prior to sample introduction. The whole 0.5 mL aliquot of sample conjugated with magnetic microbeads were processed through the chip and washed with 500$\mu$L of CilniMACS PBS/EDTA buffer (Miltenyi Biotec, USA). Samples were then fixed with 4% paraformaldehyde (PFA) (F8775, Sigma-Aldrich, USA) in PBS and permeabilized with 0.2% Triton-X-100 (X-100, Sigma-Aldrich, USA) in PBS. Cells were then washed with a solution containing 0.1% Tween 20 (P9416, Sigma-Aldrich, USA) and 1% Bovine Serum Albumin (BSA) (A7906, Sigma-Aldrich, USA) in PBS. The captured cells were then immunostained with 200$\mu$L of an antibody cocktail containing either 2mg/mL of anti-CD34 AF488 (bs-8996R-A488, Bioss Antibodies, USA), 2mg/mL of anti-CD90 AF555 (bs-0778R-A555, Bioss Antibodies, USA), and 0.6 $\mu$g/mL anti-CD45 APC (17-0451-83, Invitrogen, USA) for mice-related samples or 1mg/mL of anti-CD34 AF488 (ab195013, Abcam, Canada), 0.5mg/mL of anti-CD90 AF555 (bs-10430R-A555, Bioss Antibodies, USA), and 1.2 $\mu$g/v of anti-CD45 APC (555485, BD Biosciences, USA) for human-related samples. Only the immunostaining step was processed at 200$\mu$L/h to ensure adequate staining time. The cells were then washed again with washing buffer and stained with DAPI (R37606, Invitrogen, USA). The microfluidic chips are then disassembled from the syringe pumps and magnets and are ready for analysis. After completing the MesoFind protocol above, the microfluidic chips were scanned using a Nikon Ti-E Eclipse microscope with Andor’s Neo sCMOS camera. Fluorescent images were obtained in the channels corresponding to DAPI, AF488, AF555, and APC. The images were then overlaid and converted to TIFF format. Imaris x64 8.1.2 (Bitplane, Switzerland) was used to process the TIFF images. Using the program’s spot detection feature, the X-coordinates of the fluorescent markers were identified and exported to Microsoft Excel (Windows, USA). A script written in Visual Basics for Applications (VBA) (Windows, USA) was used to colocalize fluorescent spots and display the total counts for every combination of fluorescent overlap in Excel.

### Table 1

| Patient ID | Sex | Smoking Status | Packs/Day | Asthma | Hypertension | Heart Attack | Prior Cancer |
|------------|-----|----------------|-----------|--------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| HD1        | Male | Never          |           | No     | No           | No           | No           |
| HD2        | Male | Smoker         | 1         | No     | No           | No           | No           |
| HD3        | Female | Never          |           | No     | No           | No           | No           |
| HD4        | Male | Never          |           | No     | No           | No           | No           |
| HD5        | Female | Never          |           | No     | No           | No           | No           |
| HD6        | Male | Never          |           | No     | No           | No           | No           |
| HD7        | Male | Never          |           | No     | No           | No           | No           |
| HD8        | Male | Never          |           | No     | No           | No           | No           |
| HD9        | Female | Never          |           | No     | No           | No           | No           |
| HD10       | Male | Never          |           | No     | No           | No           | No           |

| Patient ID | Sex | Smoking Status | Packs/Day | Asthma | Hypertension | Heart Attack | Prior Cancer |
|------------|-----|----------------|-----------|--------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| HD1        | Male | Never          |           | No     | No           | No           | No           |
| HD2        | Male | Smoker         | 1         | No     | No           | No           | No           |
| HD3        | Female | Never          |           | No     | No           | No           | No           |
| HD4        | Male | Never          |           | No     | No           | No           | No           |
| HD5        | Female | Never          |           | No     | No           | No           | No           |
| HD6        | Male | Never          |           | No     | No           | No           | No           |
| HD7        | Male | Never          |           | No     | No           | No           | No           |
| HD8        | Male | Never          |           | No     | No           | No           | No           |
| HD9        | Female | Never          |           | No     | No           | No           | No           |
| HD10       | Male | Never          |           | No     | No           | No           | No           |
Table 2
Characteristics of asbestos-exposed individuals.

| Patient ID | Age | Sex  | Medical Condition | Asbestos Exposure | Smoking Status |
|------------|-----|------|-------------------|-------------------|---------------|
| Asb-0503   | 69  | Female | No | Yes | No | Yes | pneumonia | Indirect | N/A | unknown | Former Smoker 0.25 | 30 |
| Asb-0483   | 76  | Male | No | Yes | No | No | No | Direct | 40 | Unknown | Never | 1 |
| Asb-0691   | 70  | Male | No | No | No | Yes | No | Direct | 14 | Unknown | Never | 1 |
| Asb-0939   | 65  | Male | No | No | No | No | No | Direct | 35 | Unknown | Former Smoker 2 | 17 |
| Asb-0945   | 74  | Male | No | Yes | No | No | No | Direct | 38 | Unknown | Former Smoker 1.5 | 2 |
| Asb-0935   | 76  | Male | No | Yes | No | No | No | Direct | 63 | Unknown | Former Smoker 1.25 | 27 |
| Asb-1343   | 68  | Male | No | No | No | No | No | Direct | 42 | Unknown | Former Smoker 0.25 | 10 |
| Asb-0674   | 81  | Male | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | Indirect | 39 | Unknown | Never | 1 |
| Asb-1397   | 64  | Male | No | No | No | N/A | N/A | Direct | 34 | Unknown | Former Smoker 1 | 34 |
| Asb-0137   | 78  | Male | No | No | No | No | No | Indirect | 19 | Unknown | Never | 1 |
| Asb-1121   | 53  | Male | No | No | No | No | No | Direct | 30 | Unknown | Former Smoker 1 | 27 |
| Asb-1400   | 65  | Male | No | No | Yes | No | No | Direct | 33 | Amphibole & Chrysotile | Former Smoker 1 | 40 |
| Asb-0929   | 76  | Male | No | Yes | No | No | No | Indirect | 40 | Unknown | Never | 1 |
| Asb-0067   | 73  | Male | No | Yes | No | No | No | Direct | 15 | Unknown | Never | 0.25 |
| Asb-0064   | 84  | Male | No | Yes | No | No | No | Indirect | 39 | Unknown | Never | 1 |
| Asb-1124   | 59  | Male | Yes | No | No | Yes | COPD | Direct | 27 | Unknown | Former Smoker 1 | 40 |
| Asb-0501   | 73  | Male | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | Direct | 37 | Unknown | Former Smoker 0.5 | 4 |
| Asb-0496   | 73  | Male | No | No | No | Yes | No | Direct | 39 | Unknown | Former Smoker 0.3 | 10 |
| Asb-1442   | 70  | Male | No | No | No | No | No | Indirect | 16 | Unknown | Former Smoker 1 | 40 |
| Asb-1213   | 62  | Male | No | Yes | No | No | No | Direct | 30 | Unknown | Never | 1 |
| Asb-0846   | 82  | Male | No | No | No | No | No | Direct | 39 | Unknown | Former Smoker 1 | 35 |
| Asb-1386   | 69  | Male | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | Atrial fibrillation, arthritis | Direct | 2 | Chrysotile | Former Smoker 1 | 20 |
Table 3

Clinical features of patients with malignant pleural mesothelioma.

| Patient ID | Age | Sex | Side | Mesotype         | Resectable Tumor | Lymph Node Metastasis | Distant Metastasis | Stage | PET (SUV) |
|------------|-----|-----|-----|------------------|------------------|----------------------|--------------------|-------|-----------|
| MPM 03     | 78  | female | right | epithelioid | no           | yes                  | no                 | III   | n/a       |
| MPM 06     | 66  | female | right | epithelioid | no           | no                   | no                 | n/a   | n/a       |
| MPM 07     | 73  | male | right | sarcomatoid | no           | no                   | no                 | II    | 11.1      |
| MPM 08     | 70  | male | left  | epithelioid | no           | no                   | no                 | II    | n/a       |
| MPM 09     | 55  | female | right | epithelioid | yes          | no                   | no                 | III   | 18.4      |
| MPM 12     | 67  | male | right | desmoplastic | no           | yes                  | contralateral lung | IV    | n/a       |
| MPM 13     | 71  | male | left  | epithelioid | no           | no                   | contralateral lung | IV    | n/a       |
| MPM 15     | 79  | male | left  | epithelioid | no           | yes                  | no                 | III   | n/a       |
| MPM 21     | 72  | female | left | epithelioid | yes          | yes                  | no                 | III   | 8.9       |
| MPM 23     | 72  | male | left  | epithelioid | no           | no                   | no                 | III   | 13.7      |
| MPM 24     | 70  | male | right | epithelioid | no           | yes                  | no                 | III   | 5.3       |
| MPM 25     | 81  | male | right | epithelioid | yes          | no                   | no                 | IV    | 5.3       |
| MPM 27     | 57  | male | right | epithelioid | no           | no                   | no                 | IV    | 5.3       |
| MPM 28     | 76  | male | right | epithelioid | no           | no                   | peritoneal         | IV    | n/a       |
| MPM 29     | 80  | male | right | epithelioid | no           | no                   | peritoneal         | IV    | n/a       |
| MPM 31     | 75  | male | right | epithelioid | no           | no                   | no                 | III   | n/a       |
| MPM 32     | 76  | male | right | epithelioid | no           | yes                  | no                 | III   | 5.1       |
| MPM 33     | 79  | male | right | epithelioid | no           | no                   | no                 | III   | n/a       |
| MPM 34     | 68  | male | right | epithelioid | no           | no                   | no                 | III   | 5.3       |
| MPM 35     | 73  | female | right | epithelioid | no           | no                   | no                 | II    | 8.5       |
| MPM 37     | 82  | male | right | epithelioid | no           | no                   | no                 | I     | n/a       |
| MPM 40     | 72  | male | left  | epithelioid | yes          | no                   | no                 | n/a   | n/a       |
| MPM 41     | 79  | male | right | epithelioid | yes          | no                   | no                 | II    | 3.7       |

2.8. Fluorescent verification of mesothelin expression

To verify the MSLN expression in each zone on the MesoFind chip, 50,000 RNS cells were loaded, captured with anti-MSLN conjugated to magnetic microbeads, and washed following the same protocol stated earlier. Cells were then stained with anti-rabbit IgG conjugated to Alexa Fluor 647 (ab350075, Abcam, Canada) and washed on-chip. MesoFind chips were then analyzed with fluorescent microscopy. The fluorescent intensities of 10 randomly selected cells from each zone were background-subtracted and normalized to the average fluorescent intensity at zone 1. The intensity values were then compared to predicted mesothelin expressions based on the average flow velocity in each zone.

2.9. Flow cytometry

Flow cytometry was used to detect the expression of mesothelin, CD34, and CD90. RNS, H2052, and H2452 were harvested from culture and prepared in PBS at 2 × 10^6 cells/mL. The cells were then incubated in 1% BSA in PBS for 30 minutes on ice. The samples were incubated at room temperature for 30 minutes in a 1% BSA in PBS buffer solution containing 2% (v/v) of anti-mesothelin biotin (ABIN2584767, Antibodies-Online, USA) for RNS cells or 2% (v/v) of anti-mesothelin biotin (BS-0300R-BIOTIN, Bioss Antibodies, USA) for H2052 and H2452 cells. The samples were then washed three times with 0.1% Tween-20 and 1% BSA in PBS. Afterwards, cells were then incubated in the dark for 1 hour at room temperature with a cocktail of antibodies containing either 2μg/mL of anti-CD34 AF488 (bs-8996R-A488, Bioss Antibodies, USA), 2μg/mL of anti-CD90 AF555 (bs-0778R-A555, Bioss Antibodies, USA), and 2 μg/mL streptavidin AF647 (405237, Biologend, USA) for RNS samples or 1 μg/mL of anti-CD34 AF488 (ab195013, Abcam, Canada), 0.5 μg/mL of anti-CD90 AF555 (bs-10430R-A555, Bioss Antibodies, USA), and 2 μg/mL streptavidin AF647 (405237, Biologend, USA) for H2052 and H2452 samples. After washing three times with 0.1% Tween-20 and 1% BSA in PBS, the cells analyzed using the FACSCanto flow cytometer (BD Biosciences, USA) and 10,000 events were measured. Mouse lavage samples were processed using the same protocol as RNS samples.

2.10. Statistical analysis

All statistics were reported as mean ± SEM. Comparative groups were evaluated using unpaired t-test with α = 0.05. To determine the analytical sensitivity of the device, the capture efficiency of the MesoFind device was determined by introducing RNS, H2052, and H2452 cells into the chip and the proportion of MSLN+ cells captured on-chip were reported as capture efficiency (supplementary figure 1). A cut off expression index value was determined between comparative groups to maximize the geometric mean of clinical sensitivity and specificity. Clinical sensitivity and specificity were calculated as followed:

\[
\text{Sensitivity} = \frac{\text{True Positive}}{\text{True positive} + \text{False Negative}}
\]

\[
\text{Specificity} = \frac{\text{True Negative}}{\text{True Negative} + \text{False Positive}}
\]

True positive are outcomes that are above the set cut-off threshold and clinically evaluated as positive. In general, clinical sensitivity reports the proportion of correctly identified true positive values whereas the specificity reports the proportion of correctly identified true negative values.

2.11. Role of funding source

The funding source has no role in study design; in the collection, analysis, and interpretation of data; in the writing of the report; and in the decision to submit the paper for publication. No payment was received to write this article by a pharmaceutical company or other agency.

3. Results

3.1. MPC liquid biopsy approach

The microfluidic chip employed for MPC analysis utilizes immunomagnetic separation of mesothelin-expressing cells through nanoparticle-mediated cell sorting. Mesothelin is a generally accepted hallmark biomarker that is overexpressed in...
epithelioid mesothelioma [30–32] while also a key biomarker presented on MPCs. This approach allows for simple sample preparation and analysis of whole unprocessed blood (Fig. 1A). Blood samples were initially labeled with anti-MSLN antibody conjugated to biotin. The samples were then incubated with anti-biotin antibodies functionalized to magnetic nanoparticles. Cells with high surface mesothelin expressions will generally have greater magnetic susceptibility. Cells are then loaded into the microfluidic device under the influence of an external magnetic field to facilitate the capture of MSLN+ cells. Embedded within the chip are numerous X-shaped microstructures to create low-flow regions to enhance the capture of target cells.

Due to the large degree of heterogeneity in mesothelioma, we anticipated the existence of heterogeneous subpopulations of MPC with variable expression of MSLN+, CD34+, and CD90+ in circulation (Fig. 1B). To address this challenge, our microfluidic approach stratifies the target cells into 8 different capture zones, each corresponds to a specific expression level of cell-surface mesothelin (Fig. 1C). The channel heights increase between each consecutive zone leading to a stepwise decrease in flow velocity along the chip. As a result, cells with higher levels of magnetic labeling are captured in earlier zones under high flow velocity and correspondingly have higher mesothelin surface expression. Using this approach, we can generate a mesothelin expression profile by enumerating the cells distributed among the eight zones. To evaluate the identity of each MSLN+ cell, we have designed our chip to be compatible with immunofluorescence microscopy. For simplicity, we distinguish the variable CD34 and CD90-expressing MPC through the presence or absence of signal under immunofluorescent imaging. Hence, the contributing MPC subpopulations for our analysis are segregated based on following phenotypes: MSLN+ CD34+ CD90+, MSLN+ CD34- CD90+, MSLN+ CD34+ CD90-, and MSLN+ CD90+.

Although the shedding of mesothelin in the blood has been widely accepted to correlate with mesothelioma progression once the tumor reaches a certain volume [18-21], it is unclear whether this elevation in mesothelin shedding occurs through the elevation of mesothelin protein expression on single cells or via the cumulative increase in the number of mesothelin-expressing cells. Regardless of the mechanism, we can calculate a single expression index value that encompasses both criteria through the following equation:

\[
\text{Expression Index (EI)} = \sum_{n=1}^{8} (N_n \times V_n)
\]

Fig. 1. Overview of mesothelial precursor cells (MPC) analysis using a microfluidic approach. (a) Sample preparation for MPC analysis is quick and simple. MSLN+ cells are tagged with biotinylated anti-MSLN antibody and further conjugated with anti-biotin magnetic nanoparticle (MNP) complex. Magnetically labeled samples are loaded into the microfluidic chip at 500 μL/h with external magnets placed above and below the device to facilitate magnetic trapping of targeted cells. (b) Multiple populations of MPC exist in circulation and are subcategorized based on varying combinations of CD34 and CD90 in conjunction with mesothelin (MSLN). Image created with BioRender. (c) Overview of Mesofind microfluidic chip for MPC isolation. The microfluidic device contains 8 different zones with a sequential increase in height from 50 μm to 400 μm (inlet-to-outlet) and features varying average linear flow velocities (1.0x, 0.50x, 0.33x, 0.25x, 0.20x, 0.17x, 0.14x, 0.13x). Cells magnetically labeled with mesothelin are captured in different zones based on the relative amount of magnetic content. Cells with higher MSLN expression (high magnetic content) are captured in earlier zones whereas cells with less MSLN (low magnetic content) are captured in later zones. Captured cells are fluorescently labeled with CD34 and CD90 antibodies to identify and isolate different MPC subpopulations. (d) MSLN expression profiles are generated for each MPC subpopulation based on the captured location on the chip. Each MPC subtype is predicted to exhibit different clinical characteristics in patients and their expression of MSLN correlates to the severity of the conditions.
where \( N_n \) represents the number of target cells captured in zone \( n \), and \( V_n \) is the relative flow velocity which corresponds to the level of mesothelin surface protein expression per cell. The \( V_n \) for the zone closest to the outlet (lowest expression) was given an arbitrary value of 1 (i.e. \( V_8 = 1 \)) and the \( V_n \) for the remaining zones were normalized to this value. Generally, the higher the \( EI \), the higher the expression of mesothelin. With this approach, we can utilize the mesothelin \( EI \) to generate a threshold value for diagnostic purposes while also cross-correlating between various clinical characteristics for prognostic evaluation in mesothelioma patients (Fig. 1D). The MesoFind assay allows for the simultaneous analysis of multiple populations of cells and thus allows us to better understand the contributing roles of each MPC subpopulation in mesothelioma development.

3.2. Validation in murine models

To ensure optimal capture of MPCs, the processing flow rate was carefully adjusted to allow for the complete capture of low-mesothelin expressing cells while maintaining high throughput and adequate distribution along the device. This optimal threshold was reached at 0.5mL/h, where the total recovery was maximized in mouse mesothelioma cell lines (RN5 104 ± 6%) and human mesothelioma cell lines (H2052 97 ± 2%, H2452 98 ± 6%) spiked in healthy human blood (Fig. 2A). To distinguish between MPC subpopulations and leukocytes, we performed immunofluorescent staining with DAPI, CD34 (AF488), CD90 (AF555), and CD45 (APC) on-chip. Cells were identified with DAPI nuclear stain while leukocytes were negatively selected with CD45+ staining. Three subpopulations of MPC shown in Fig. 2B were clearly differentiated using fluorescence imaging and represented as MSLN+ CD34+ CD90+ CD45-, MSLN+ CD34- CD90+ CD45-, and MSLN+ CD34+ CD90- CD45-.

We first evaluated the capability of the MesoFind chip to detect traditional MPC cells (MSLN+ CD90+ CD45+). RN5 mouse mesothelioma cell lines were injected intraperitoneally in mice and sacrificed after 1 – 6 weeks. We collected both blood and peritoneal lavage samples and compared the performance of flow cytometry and MesoFind for MPC detection (Fig. 2C). The increasing number of MPCs in mice peritoneal lavage was similarly detected using MesoFind (Fig. 2D) and flow cytometry (Fig. 2E) due to the abundance of MPCs in the peritoneal cavity. On the other hand, we were only able to...
visualize MPCs in the blood using MesoFind (Fig. 2F, G). Flow cytometry could not detect MPCs in the blood at any time point during tumor progression and the naïve state despite using the same flow cytometric gating criteria that were used to detect the cells in the lavage (Fig. 2H, I). Furthermore, by evaluating EI instead of total counts, we observed a more noticeable correlation in mesothelin expression with respect to the progression of the disease (Fig. 2G). This suggests that the increase in the number of high-expressing mesothelin MPC is correlated to the advancement of mesothelioma.

3.3. Clinical evaluation of MPCs

We then proceeded to validate MesoFind using clinical specimens. This study consisted of 23 patients with MPM confirmed by histological diagnosis (MPM), 23 individuals with known exposure to asbestos (ASB), and 10 healthy donors (HD) with no known exposure to asbestos. The asbestos-exposed individuals were recruited from our screening program with low dose CT chest [46] and MPM patients were recruited from our mesothelioma clinic during their evaluation for surgical resection [47]. Overall, there was a noticeable increase in the total number of traditional MPCs (MSLN+ CD34+ CD90+ CD45−) in whole blood for the ASB and MPM group compared to healthy donors (Fig. 3A). It is interesting to note that circulating MPCs in the ASB group were elevated in some individuals despite the absence of known malignancy suggesting that individuals may have a different degree of severity in pleural damage after asbestos exposure and some may be at a higher risk for mesothelioma. We also observed, as expected, that MPC levels were particularly high in patients with epithelioid MPM compared to biphassic and sarcomatoid MPM. We further evaluated the EI of all MPC subpopulations (Fig. 3B) and analyzed each of them for their sensitivity and specificity in predicting various clinical conditions. The MPC subpopulations with the highest overall sensitivity and specificity are summarized in Fig. 3 C-H.

In terms of diagnostic value, all MPC subpopulations exhibited a significantly higher mesothelin expression in MPM patients...
compared to HD and thus can be used to reliably distinguish between healthy individuals and those with malignant disease (Fig. 3B). Additionally, we were interested in analyzing the ASB group more specifically as these individuals are at risk of developing mesothelioma, but the risk for a specific individual is unknown. Hence, MPC could be extremely helpful to refine screening in asbestos-exposed individuals to be able to focus on individuals at particularly high risk for mesothelioma.

After evaluating an El threshold value for all subpopulations, the MPC subtype with MSLN+ CD90- CD34+ CD45- marker expression had the most distinct El between ASB and MPM with a clinical sensitivity of 81% and specificity of 70% (Fig. 3C). This MPC subpopulation interestingly shows an elevation only in malignancy and therefore can complement as a screening tool to closely monitor ASB individuals at high risk for developing mesothelioma before malignancy is fully established. On the other hand, MSLN+ CD90+ CD34- CD45-MPC subpopulations elicit higher mesothelin response in ASB individuals compared to HD, which suggests the early involvement of these MPC subtypes in tissue repair and maintenance (Fig. 3D).

Prognosis of mesothelioma is often difficult to determine due to the heterogeneity of patients and poorly defined features for characterization. MesoFind can assist in the prognosis by providing clear and objective numerical scores. Here, we evaluated all the MPC subpopulations for different clinical prognosis. Mesothelioma is often categorized into different histological subtypes. While epithelioid subtypes are the most prevalent, sarcomatoid subtypes are often associated with worse prognosis and biphasic tumors are generally an intermediary between the two. In our study, we examined 16 individuals with epithelioid and 5 individuals with biphasic mesothelioma who had complete staging with a plan for possible radical surgery. The MPC subpopulation of MSLN+ CD90+ CD45- displayed a marked increase in mesothelin expression for epithelioid MPM compared to biphasic MPM (Fig. 3E). Although biphasic cancers tend to have a poorer prognosis, it nonetheless agrees with other reports as mesothelin tends to exhibit greater expressions in epithelioid cancer compared to other histotypes [48,49]. Using an El threshold value of 2650, MesoFind has a high sensitivity (95%) and specificity (80%) for distinguishing between biphasic and epithelioid MPM subtypes. In accordance with these results, we shifted our focus on the analysis of epithelioid MPM as they are more prevalent in the mesothelioma population compared to other histotypes and more responsive to changes in mesothelin expression. Due to the low number of PET scans data (n=8), we divided the data into high and low standardized uptake values (SUV) (SUV >6 and SUV <6), which is known to be an adequate cut-off to determine prognosis [50]. MSLN+ CD34+ CD45-MPC subtype displayed the greatest separation between the two groups however the difference is only significant at an 84% confidence level (p = 0.16) (Fig. 3F). Although it is not intended to replace PET scans, MesoFind could provide another indirect measurement of tumor progression and growth with high sensitivity and specificity (84% and 87% respectively) (Fig. 3F).

Some MPM patients in this study had developed advanced stages of mesothelioma and as a result, many patients were not eligible for radical surgery. To evaluate the predictive potential of MPCs for tumor resectability, we performed a retrospective analysis of MPC populations on our MPM cohort. MSLN+ CD90+ CD34- CD45- subtypes had the highest predictive value to determine resectability with a 100% sensitivity, confirming that MSLN+ CD90+ CD34- CD45- tends to be associated with earlier stage MPM (Fig. 3G). However, the number of patients undergoing surgery in this cohort was small and the average El between resectable and unresectable tumors was not significant (p=0.38) with only 50% specificity obtained using an El cut-off value of 200. Nodal metastasis is another important prognostic factor in MPM that can be difficult to determine clinically [51]. The El values for MSLN+ CD34+ CD45- populations were significantly different between individuals with and without nodal metastasis (Fig. 3H). With a cut-off El value of 24500, this MPC population can assist with screening for nodal metastasis in MPM with a clinical sensitivity and specificity of 67% and 100% respectively. Overall, these findings demonstrate that circulating MSLN+ CD90+ CD45- MPC subtype increases with pleural damage related to asbestos and continues to rise during the early development of mesothelioma, while MSLN+ CD34+ CD45- MPC subtype starts rising with established MPM and are associated with more advanced mesothelioma (Fig. 4).

4. Discussion

In this study, we have developed an assay that effectively identifies various MPC populations and we have highlighted the clinical potential in evaluating circulating MPC in mesothelioma and asbestos-exposed individuals. For this study, other causes of mesothelial inflammation such as pleural infection and pleurodesis were not included and could be a potential source of false positive counts of MPCs. MPCs are still largely understudied due to the difficulty in their detection, particularly in the blood. Unlike CTCs, MPCs can be elevated well before tumor development as shown in our study. We were able to detect 262 ± 43, 537 ± 137, and 1664 ± 360 MPCs in 0.5ml of blood from HD, ASB, and MPM patients respectively. In contrast, for 7.5ml of blood CTCs are detected on the order of 1 CTCs for healthy and benign diseases and up to the order of 10 CTCs for malignant diseases using CellSearch [52]. From a biological perspective, CTCs are often able to disseminate into the blood after significant development in the tumor. MPCs on the other hand are predicted to mobilize as soon as inflammation occurs in the mesothelium. As such, MPCs are expected to be elevated much earlier compared to CTCs in mesothelioma. Using MesoFind, we have elucidated key MPC subtypes with excellent diagnostic and prognostic potential. All subtypes of MPC were significantly elevated compared to healthy donors with no known exposure to asbestos. Two MPC subtypes, MSLN+ CD90- CD34- CD45- and MSLN+ CD90- CD34+ CD45-, had a different profile in the blood depending on the exposure to asbestos and presence of advanced mesothelioma. MSLN+ CD90+ CD34- CD45- exhibited a much greater level of mesothelin in asbestos-exposed individuals compared to healthy controls, even before malignancy. The importance of CD90 in chronic pleural damage is supported by previous work demonstrating that CD90 expression is critical for the recruitment of leukocytes to the site of inflammation [53]. These findings suggest that CD90+ MPC have an early role in the recruitment of inflammatory cells after pleural damage. Future prospective studies on these populations will be important to clarify the clinical roles of MPC in early stages of MPM development and provide more evidence on the early diagnostic and staging utility of MPC. The role of MPC in the context of mesothelioma in situ will also be an important area of investigations. In contrast, MSLN+ CD90- CD34+ CD45- are more
relevant in the context of mesothelioma since this MPC subtype is extremely low in the absence of mesothelioma despite asbestos exposure, but significantly elevated in MPM and associated with markers of advanced disease characterized by high SUV on PET scan and lymph node metastasis on biopsy. It is not clear whether the CD34+ MPC subtypes are contributing to disease progression or simply a bystander related to malignancy. MSLN+ CD90- CD34+ CD45-MPC subtype could potentially be helpful to monitor tumor response after therapeutic interventions and act as a predictive marker for cancer progression or recurrence. Surgical resection was predominantly performed in patients with high MSLN+ CD90+ and low MSLN+ CD34+subpopulations (Fig. 3G), suggesting that the balance between these two subtypes of MPC may help to detect MPM at an early stage accessible to surgery.

We have also demonstrated the merits of using Mesofind for the analysis of MPC in blood. Compared to flow cytometry, our approach has much greater sensitivity and requires less sample volume for analysis. We have also evaluated the MSLN expression in each zone through analyzing fluorescent intensities (supplementary figure 2). Although the fluorescent signals correlated strongly with predicted mesothelin expression values in early zones (zones 1 to 4), the fluorescent resolution falls off after around zone 5 and is unable to distinguish MSLN expression in later zones. In addition, fluorescent intensities signals are difficult to standardize due to complications such as large variation between microscopes and varying interference from stray light. Overall, the MSLN expression Mesofind assay is much easier to standardize and has a higher resolution compared to evaluating fluorescent intensities alone. The Mesofind assay also maintains the ability to segregate heterogeneous populations of cells and allow for the phenotypic profiling of surface markers. Segregated populations can be isolated from the chip for further genetic analysis and can complement other genetic detection tools such as RNA editing quantification [54].

The capability to process whole blood with simple workflow highlights the amenability of using this technique in clinical practice. Although the total run time for the Mesofind assay is approximately 6 hours, the microfluidic assay, fluorescent scanning, and image analysis can all be fully automated. The material cost comes to around $4 USD per device but with injection molding, the costs can be further reduced. Overall, the Mesofind assay is inexpensive and simple to use making it very feasible for clinical adoption.

In conclusion, our microfluidic assay successfully addressed many clinical implications of detecting and identifying heterogeneous populations of MPC. Through the evaluation of both murine and clinical samples, we have consistently identified higher expressions of MPC as a function of disease progression. In our cohort of 23 MPM, 23 ASB, and 10 HD, we were able to identify specific subtypes of MPC that have excellent predictive values for clinical diagnosis and prognosis of mesothelioma. This is the first study analyzing the involvement of MPC in mesothelioma and thus further investigations will be important to elucidate the biological mechanism and clinical roles of MPC in mesothelioma progression. To ensure the practical usage of this technology, prospective studies that monitors MPC in patients through disease development and therapeutic intervention will help to provide the evidence for the possible integration of this technology in a clinical setting.
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