We report a covalent chemistry-based hepatocellular carcinoma (HCC)-specific extracellular vesicle (EV) purification system for early detection of HCC by performing digital scoring on the purified EVs. Earlier detection of HCC creates more opportunities for curative therapeutic interventions. EVs are present in circulation at relatively early stages of disease, providing potential opportunities for HCC early detection. We develop an HCC EV purification system (i.e., EV Click Chips) by synergistically integrating covalent chemistry-mediated EV capture/release, multimarker antibody cocktails, nanostructured substrates, and microfluidic chaotic mixers. We then explore the translational potential of EV Click Chips using 158 plasma samples of HCC patients and control cohorts. The purified HCC EVs are subjected to reverse-transcription droplet digital PCR for quantification of 10 HCC-specific mRNA markers and computation of digital scoring. The HCC EV-derived molecular signatures exhibit great potential for noninvasive early detection of HCC from at-risk cirrhotic patients with an area under receiver operator characteristic curve of 0.93 (95% CI, 0.86 to 1.00; sensitivity = 94.4%, specificity = 88.5%).
 Hepatocellular carcinoma (HCC) is the fourth most common cause of cancer-related deaths worldwide. The poor prognosis of HCC can be attributed to the fact that diagnosis is often made at a late stage in disease development. Earlier detection of HCC is critical to reducing high HCC mortality rates, as potentially curative therapeutic interventions are available to treat early-stage HCC. Current American Association for the Study of Liver Disease (AASLD) guidelines recommend biannual liver ultrasonography with or without serum alphafetoprotein (AFP) for at-risk patients with cirrhosis; however, ultrasound is not sensitive enough to detect early lesions, and the reported performance of AFP varies widely. Thus, the development of noninvasive diagnostics for early-stage HCC may significantly benefit cirrhotic patients at risk for developing HCC.

Among the three conventional liquid biopsy approaches in the context of oncology, i.e., circulating tumor cells (CTCs)7–9, circulating tumor DNA (ctDNA)10,11, and extracellular vesicles (EVs)12, EVs are present in circulation at relatively early stages of disease13 and persist across all disease stages. Furthermore, EVs’ inherent stability guarantees the integrity of biomolecular cargos. Therefore, tumor-derived EVs can be regarded as “biomarker reservoirs”14, promising downstream molecular analysis for noninvasive cancer diagnosis15. However, conventional EV isolation methods, e.g., ultracentrifugation16, precipitation processing, and microfluidic enrichment17–22 are based on EVs’ physical properties (density, solubility, or size), and are incapable of separating tumor-derived EVs from total EVs. Since the majority of EVs in circulation are not of tumor origin, high background noise makes analysis of total EVs of limited diagnostic power23.

To overcome this issue, our group24 and others23,25,26 have been exploring various immunoaffinity-based approaches to purify tumor-derived EVs. In parallel, others have been examining the potential of EVs and their mRNA cargos for HCC detection27. We envision a more sensitive and specific early HCC diagnostic assay can be achieved by (i) developing a rapid and effective HCC EV purification system using a multimarker cocktail to recognize, enrich, and recover HCC EVs secreted from highly heterogeneous HCC–28–30 and (ii) coupling downstream molecular profiling to obtain HCC EV-derived mRNA signatures capable of distinguishing early-stage HCC from at-risk cirrhotic patients.

In this study, we develop an HCC EV purification system (i.e., EV Click Chips, Fig. 1) by synergistically integrating four powerful approaches, including covalent chemistry-mediated EV capture/release, multimarker antibody cocktails31, nanostructured substrates32, and microfluidic chaotic mixers33, paving the way for implementation of noninvasive detection of early-stage HCC. First, the covalent chemistry-mediated EV capture/release is built upon the combined use of click chemistry34-mediated EV capture and disulfide cleavage35-driven EV release in conjunction with an optimized multimarker cocktail targeting three HCC-associated surface markers31, including EpCAM, ASGPRI, and CD147. Further, the incorporation of densely packed silicon nanowires substrates (SiNWS) dramatically increases the device surface area36 contacting/interacting with EVs. Moreover, the microfluidic chaotic mixer made of polydimethylsiloxane (PDMS) facilitates repeated physical contact36 between SiNWS and the flow-through HCC EVs, further enhancing the performance of EV capture. In contrast to previous antibody-mediated EV capture34, a pair of highly reactive click chemistry motifs37, i.e., tetrarazine (Tz) and trans-cyclooctene (TCO), are grafted onto EV capture substrates (i.e., SiNWS, via surface modification) and HCC EVs (via TCO-capture agent conjugation), respectively. Subsequently, the click chemistry reaction between Tz-grafted SiNWS and TCO-grafted HCC EVs is rapid, specific, irreversible, and bioorthogonal38, resulting in immobilization of the HCC EVs with improved capture efficiency and reduced background. After click chemistry-mediated HCC EV capture, exposure to a disulfide cleavage agent, 1,4-dithiothreitol (DTT)38 leads to the prompt release of the HCC EVs from the SiNWS by breaking the embedded disulfide bond. Recognizing the dire need of practical methods to quantitatively assess the performance (EV recovery yield and recovery purity) of any given EV purification system, we pioneer a quantitative evaluation method for assessing the performance of EV Click Chips. By adopting this quantitative method throughout the optimization process, we are able to accurately determine the performance of EV Click Chips, achieving an optimal HCC EV purification condition that is later used in the preclinical study. Finally, to progress toward noninvasive HCC screening, we examine the potential of a streamlined HCC EV-based mRNA assay that couples EV Click Chips for purification of HCC EVs and reverse-transcription droplet digital PCR (RT-ddPCR) for quantification of 10 HCC-specific mRNA transcripts39 using plasma samples from HCC patients and control cohorts. HCC EV-derived 10-gene molecular signatures exhibit great potential for noninvasive early detection of HCC from at-risk cirrhotic patients.

**Results**

**The design and preparation of an EV click chip.** An EV Click Chip (Fig. 1) is composed of two functional components: (i) Tz-grafted SiNWS: a patterned SiNWS covalently functionalized with disulfide bonds that link to terminal Tz motifs40, and (ii) an overlaid PDMS chaotic mixer41 (Supplementary Fig. 1), housed in a custom-designed microfluidic chip holder. The fabrication of Tz-grafted SiNWS began with introducing 10–15 µm densely packed Si nanowires (diameter = 100–200 nm) onto SiNWS, offering ~30 times more surface area (in contrast to a flat substrate) for facilitating click chemistry-mediated HCC EV capture. The incorporation of disulfide bonds and terminal Tz motifs onto SiNWS was carried out via a 3-step procedure40 (Supplementary Fig. 2). To confirm successful preparation of Tz-grafted SiNWS, X-ray photoelectron spectroscopy (XPS) was employed to monitor functional group transformation at each step40. The passive mixing behavior of the flow-through EVs in EV Click Chips was simulated (Supplementary Fig. 3) via the combined use of computational fluid dynamics (CFD) and dissipative particle dynamics (DPD) models35, offering a theoretical explanation on how the configuration of the EV Click Chip results in the enhanced physical contact36 between TCO-grafted HCC EVs and Tz-grafted SiNWS.

**Preparation of artificial plasma samples.** To allow accurate evaluation of the performance of EV Click Chips throughout the optimization process, artificial plasma samples were prepared by spiking 10-µL aliquoted HepG2 cell-derived EVs (harvested by ultracentrifugation45,46) into 90-µL plasma from a female healthy donor. As shown in Fig. 2a, the presence of male HepG2 cell-line-derived EVs in female plasma allows exploitation of the sex-determining region Y (SRY) gene for reliable quantification of HepG2-derived HCC EVs in purified EV samples since the SRY gene is absent in female healthy donor’s plasma.

RT-ddPCR assay for quantification of EVs. A RT-ddPCR assay in Fig. 2a was used to quantify the copy numbers of SRY and Clorf101 transcripts (encoded on Chromosome Y and Chromosome 1, respectively) in the artificial plasma samples before and after purification by EV Click Chips. The results can be used to calculate the recovery yield and recovery purity throughout the optimization process. We denoted the copy numbers of SRY transcripts in the original 10-µL aliquoted HepG2 EVs and the EV Click Chip-recovered HepG2 EVs as SRY transcripts_{HepG2 EV} and
SRY transcripts_{rec-EV}, respectively. The EV recovery yield obtained by EV Click Chips under a given condition can be obtained from the following equation:

$$\text{HepG2 EV recovery yield} = \frac{\text{SRY transcripts}_{\text{rec-EV}}}{\text{SRY transcripts}_{\text{ori-EV}}}$$

In order to obtain the recovery purity of the EVs recovered by EV Click Chips, we first measured the intrinsic ratios between $Clorf101$ and SRY transcripts in aliquoted HepG2 EVs across a wide range of concentrations. As shown in Supplementary Fig. 4a, the ratios between $Clorf101$ and SRY transcripts in HepG2 EVs exhibited a consistent linear correlation ($y = 1.95x, R^2 = 0.999$). With the $Clorf101$-to-SRY ratio determined as 1.95, we then calculated the recovery purity of the HepG2 EVs harvested from EV Click Chips as the ratio of the recovered SRY transcripts (contributed by recovered HepG2 EVs only) to the $Clorf101$
transcripts (contributed by both recovered HepG2 EVs and the nonspecifically captured background plasma-derived EVs, denoted as C1orf101 gene rec-EV) using the following equation:

\[ \text{HCC EV recover purity} = \frac{\text{SRY transcripts}_{\text{rec-EV}}}{\text{C1orf101 transcripts}_{\text{rec-EV}}} \times 1.95^* \]

*1.95 is specific to HepG2 EVs.

For HCC cell lines without SRY transcripts, cancer-cell-derived EVs were spiked into plasma from male donors, and the EV recovery yield and recovery purity can be calculated using equations shown in Supplementary Methods and Supplementary Fig. 4b, c. A reproducibility study on the C1orf101/SRY transcript quantification methods used in the equations was conducted and the results are summarized in Supplementary Table 1.

**HCC EV purification with EV click chips.** Prior to conducting HCC EV purification (capture/release) studies, TCO motif was covalently conjugated onto each antibody agent (Fig. 1a), and the TCO-conjugated antibody agents were incubated with the artificial or clinical plasma samples for 30 min at room temperature. In each study (Fig. 2a), a 100-µL artificial plasma sample was introduced into an EV Click Chip, in which the click chemistry-mediated rapid and irreversible immobilization of HCC EVs on...
SiNWS. Next, 100 µL DTT (50 mM) was introduced into the EV Click Chips to achieve disulfide cleavage-driven EV release. The DTT was removed in the subsequent RNA extraction process.

A multimarker cocktail optimization for HCC EV capture. Using published data from our group31 and others45,46, we identified surface markers that are highly expressed in HCC EVs, HCC CTCs, HCC cell lines, and primary tumor tissues of HCC patients, but virtually absent in white blood cells. Four candidate antibodies, i.e., anti-EpCAM, anti-ASGPR1, anti-CD147, and anti-GPC-3, against the corresponding surface markers were selected to achieve desired sensitivity and specificity for recognizing and capturing HCC EVs. The aforementioned RT-ddPCR assay was employed to assess the EV recovery yield of EV Click Chips in the presence of the individual antibodies and their cocktail mixtures. Figure 2b summarizes the recovery yields obtained by EV Click Chip at different TCO-to-anti-EpCAM mole ratios, and an optimal recovery yield was achieved at the TCO-to-anti-EpCAM ratio of 4:1. Under this TCO-to-antibody ratio, we suggest that the optimal amounts of individual candidate antibodies, i.e., anti-EpCAM (Fig. 2c), anti-ASGPR1 (Fig. 2d), anti-CD147 (Fig. 2e), and anti-GPC-3 (Supplementary Fig. 5a) are 50, 25, 25, and 50 ng, respectively. Using these optimized conditions, we compared the HCC EV recovery yields with different antibody cocktails. The data is summarized in Fig. 2f and Supplementary Fig. 5b and shows that the combination of anti-EpCAM, anti-CD147, and anti-ASGPR1 outperformed any single antibodies or other combinations.

Optimization of EV Click Chips for HCC EV purification. With the optimal antibody cocktail, flow rates of samples into EV Click Chips were studied, and >85% average recovery yields were observed at the flow rates of 0.2–1.0 mL h–1 (Fig. 2g). To allow for a faster turnaround time for clinical samples, the flow rate of 1.0 mL h–1 was selected. We then checked the dynamic range of EV Click Chips using artificial plasma samples spiked with different concentrations of EVs containing 0–9000 copies of SRY transcripts per 100-µL volume and confirmed the consistency of recovery yields (y = 0.827x, R^2 = 0.998) (Fig. 2h). To understand the crucial roles of the embedded silicon nanowires in SiNWS, the herringbone features in a PDMS chaotic mixer, and click chemistry-mediated EV capture, we carried out control experiments (Supplementary Fig. 6) using (i) the devices without embedded silicon nanowires in SiNWS or herringbone features in the PDMS chaotic mixer, and (ii) the devices based on immunoaffinity EV capture24 (NanoVilli Chips), in parallel with EV Click Chips and the ultracentrifugation approach44. EV Click Chips exhibited a recovery yield of 82.7 ± 1.34% and recovery purity of 90.2 ± 6.2%, which were significantly higher than those observed for the controls (Fig. 2i). The reproducibility of the EV Click Chips was evaluated by calculating the percent coefficient of variation (%CV) for recovery yields. The observed %CVs were calculated to be 1.12–12.65% for the intra-assay variability and 3.88 % for the inter-assay variability of the EV Click Chips (Supplementary Table 2). To test the general applicability of EV Click Chips and the optimized EV purification condition, the performance of EV Click Chips was further tested using six artificial samples prepared by spiking three different HCC EVs (collected from HCC cell lines, i.e., HepG2, SNU387, and Hep3B) into two types of plasma samples (collected from either HD or liver cirrhotic patients). Detailed calculations of the reproducibility, recovery yields, and recovery purities for these artificial samples are described in Supplementary Table 3 and Supplementary Fig. 4. Overall, EV Click Chips achieved recovery yields ranging from 81.2 to 94.6% and purities ranging from 85.9 to 99.1% (Fig. 2j).

Characterization of HCC EVs purified by EV click chips. To better understand the working mechanisms of the click chemistry-mediated EV capture and disulfide cleavage-driven EV release, fluorescence microscopy, transmission electron microscopy (TEM), dynamic light scattering (DLS), and/or scanning electron microscopy (SEM) were employed to characterize the EV sizes and EV/SiNWS interfaces during the EV purification process, in which freshly harvested HepG2 EVs in PBS and healthy donors’ plasma (Supplementary Fig. 7a–c) were used as a model system. To allow direct tracking of the capture and release processes of HCC EVs in EV Click Chips, HepG2 EVs were first labeled (Fig. 3a) with PKH26 dye (Sigma–Aldrich). The micrographs in Fig. 3b unveiled fluorescent signals on the SiNWS after EV capture and a dramatic signal reduction when the captured EVs were released by DTT. Figure 3c shows a representative TEM image of freshly harvested HepG2 EVs after uranyl acetate negative staining. These HepG2 EVs exhibited cup- or spherical-shaped morphologies with sizes ranging between 30 and 500 nm in diameter measured by TEM (inset of Fig. 3c). The size distributions of EVs measured by TEM were consistent with those observed by DLS (Supplementary Fig. 7d, e). Figure 3d shows a cross-sectional SEM image of Si nanowires with HepG2 EVs captured onto both the sidewalls (left) and the tops of the nanowires (right). After being released from EV Click Chips, the purified HepG2 EVs retained intact morphologies (Fig. 3e) with a similar size distribution (inset of Fig. 3e) to the freshly harvested HepG2 EVs. The purified HepG2 EVs from EV Click Chips were further verified by immunogold labeling with anti-CD63 (Supplementary Fig. 7f).
Quantification of 10 HCC-specific genes using purified HCC EVs. By adopting the optimal HCC EV purification conditions, a workflow (Fig. 4a) for a streamlined HCC EV-based mRNA assay was developed by coupling EV Click Chips and RT-ddPCR for quantification of 10 well-validated HCC-specific mRNA transcripts\(^{(39)}\) using clinical plasma samples. We collected 158 plasma samples from five cohorts, including (i) HCC cohort: newly diagnosed, treatment-naive HCC patients (n = 46, mean age = 66 y); (ii) cirrhosis cohort: patients with liver cirrhosis covering the etiology of hepatitis B virus (HBV), hepatitis C virus (HCV), alcoholic liver disease (ALD), and non-alcoholic steatohepatitis (NASH) (n = 26, mean age = 61 y). We confirmed that the cirrhosis cohort did not have HCC at the time of blood draw based on (1) negative multiphasic CT/MRI results, or (2) negative liver ultrasound results at the time of blood draw and a 6 month follow-up, or (3) observing no evidence of HCC on liver explant. (iii) hepatitis cohort: patients with chronic hepatitis B/C without liver cirrhosis (n = 25, mean age = 57 y); (iv) healthy donors (n = 23, mean age = 52 y); (v) other cancer cohort: patients with primary malignancies other than HCC, with or without liver metastases (n = 38, mean age = 58 y). The clinical characteristics of these cohorts are provided in Supplementary Tables 4–8. Clinical annotation of all the plasma samples was performed by a clinician blinded to the assay. For each clinical sample, 0.5 mL of aliquoted plasma was introduced into an EV Click Chip to obtain purified HCC EVs. After RNA extraction, RNA concentrations were evaluated by Bioanalyzer 2100, (Supplementary Table 9), then RT-ddPCR was carried out to quantify the 10 HCC-specific genes, i.e., *alpha-fetoprotein* (AFP), *glypican 3* (GPC3), *albumin* (ALB), *apolipoprotein H* (APOH), *fatty acid binding protein 1* (FABP1), *fibrinogen beta chain* (FGB), *fibrinogen gamma chain* (FGG), *alpha 2-HS glycoprotein* (AHSG), *retinol binding protein 4* (RBP4), and *transferrin* (TF)\(^{(39)}\). We confirmed that these 10 mRNA markers are detectable in pure HepG2 EVs.
A workflow of the streamlined HCC EV-based mRNA assay (EV Click Chips + RT-ddPCR)
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**Fig. 4** RT-ddPCR assay for quantification of 10 HCC-specific mRNA transcripts in purified HCC EVs. **a** A general workflow developed for conducting HCC EV purification, followed by quantification of 10 HCC-specific mRNA transcripts in the purified HCC EVs. **b** Heatmaps depicting relative signal intensities for each gene expression of the 10 HCC-specific genes across different patient cohorts. (upper) Patients with newly diagnosed HCC (n = 46) are grouped according to Barcelona Clinic Liver Cancer (BCLC) staging system from early stages to advanced stages. (middle) Noncancer cohorts, including patients with liver cirrhosis (n = 26), chronic hepatitis (n = 25), and healthy donors (n = 23). (lower) Patients with cancers other than HCC (n = 38): cancers of nonhepatic origin metastatic to the liver (MET, n = 12); other primary cancers (n = 26), including intrahepatic cholangiocarcinoma (ICC), prostate cancer, midgut neuroendocrine tumor (NET), breast cancer, and lung cancer. Primary copy numbers are log2-transformed for each gene across all disease states. Clinical characteristics for each cohort are listed in Supplementary Tables 4-8. HBV hepatitis B virus, HCV hepatitis C virus, ALD alcoholic liver disease, NASH non-alcoholic steatohepatitis.
Clinic Liver Cancer (BCLC) staging system allow for the heatmaps (Fig. 4b); the primary copy numbers are log2-transformed for each gene across all disease states. As depicted in the heatmaps, higher signals were observed in the HCC cohort, compared with those from the noncancer cohorts (i.e., cirrhosis, hepatitis, and healthy donors) and other cancer cohort, compared with those from the noncancer cohorts (i.e., cirrhosis, hepatitis, and healthy donors) and other cancer cohort. The area under the ROC curve (AUC) for distinguishing HCC from noncancer patients (i.e., cirrhosis, hepatitis, and healthy donors) was 0.87 (95% CI, 0.80–0.94; specificity = 93.8%, specificity = 74.5%, Fig. 5b). Similarly, the potential of HCC EV Z Score for distinguishing HCC patients from primary malignancies other than HCC with or without liver metastases was then explored, and the AUC was 0.95 (95% CI, 0.90–1.00; sensitivity = 95.7%, specificity = 89.5%, Fig. 5c).

**HCC EV Z Scores for early HCC detection.** Finally, we examined the potential of HCC EV Z Score to distinguish early-stage HCC (BCLC stage 0-A) from at-risk liver cirrhosis. The AUC was 0.93 (95% CI, 0.86–1.00; sensitivity = 94.4%, specificity = 88.5%, Fig. 5d), which outperformed the most widely used serum biomarker alpha-fetoprotein (AFP) (AUC = 0.69, P = 0.013, 95% CI, 0.55–0.83) for differentiating early-stage HCC (BCLC stage 0-A) vs. at-risk cirrhosis.

**Fig. 5 Statistical analysis on HCC EV Z Scores in different cohorts.** a Box plots representing the HCC EV Z Scores for different patient cohorts including early-stages HCC (n = 36), advanced-stage HCC (n = 10), cirrhosis (n = 26), hepatitis (n = 25), healthy donors (n = 23), and other cancers (n = 38). Whiskers ranging from minima to maxima, median and 25-75% IQR shown by box plots. Significant differences between different groups were evaluated using one-way ANOVA. b, c ROC curves for HCC EV Z Scores in b HCC versus noncancer (i.e., cirrhosis, hepatitis, and healthy donors) (AUC = 0.87, P = 9.64E-12, 95% CI, 0.80–0.94), c HCC versus other cancer (AUC = 0.95, P = 1.79E-12, 95% CI, 0.90–1.00). d ROC curves comparing HCC EV Z Scores (AUC = 0.93, P = 1.02E-8, 95% CI, 0.86–1.00) with the serum biomarker alpha-fetoprotein (AFP) level (AUC = 0.69, P = 0.013, 95% CI, 0.55–0.83) for differentiating early-stage HCC (BCLC stage 0-A) vs. at-risk cirrhosis. Barcelona Clinic Liver Cancer (BCLC); ROC receiver operator characteristic.
The combined use of a multimarker antibody cocktail and EV Click Chips could possibly lead to recovering EVs which are not of HCC origin. For example, anti-EpCAM could capture EVs from other epithelial tissues. To address this concern, we adopted the RT-ddPCR assay, which is capable of quantifying HCC-specific genes as a downstream readout for the purified HCC EVs. These 10 HCC-specific genes were selected from tissue lineage-associated transcripts expressed in liver cells but absent in blood cells and other tissues. Therefore, the resulting 10-gene signatures were predominantly contributed by HCC EVs, conferring a third layer of specificity to the streamlined HCC EV-based mRNA assay.

In the process of optimizing the EV Click Chip, we developed a simple and versatile quantitative evaluation method that has addressed the dire need of assessing the purification performance (EV recovery yield and recovery purity) of the EV Click Chip. Due to the lack of highly prevalent mutations in HCC, we devised a method where the SRY gene encoded on Chromosome Y from a male HCC cell line would be utilized as a surrogate HCC marker. An artificial plasma sample was prepared by spiking EVs from a male HCC cell line (e.g., HepG2) into plasma from a female healthy donor, and RT-ddPCR was adopted to count the copy numbers of the target SRY and the reference C1orf101 transcripts (encoded on Chromosome Y and Chromosome 1, respectively) for distinguishing and quantifying the spiked HCC EVs. This method is more convenient and quantitative than existing methods\(^\text{23}\) that required prelabeling or pretransfection of EVs with specific transcripts. This method is also broadly applicable to the optimization of any other tumor-derived EV purification platform prior to clinical study.

There have been promises on the horizon for emerging liquid biopsy-based HCC diagnostics such as ctDNA-based methylation for HCC detection\(^\text{58}\) and CTC-based RNA signature for HCC detection\(^\text{39}\). Although ctDNA methylation profiling using whole genome bisulfite sequencing can detect early-stage HCC\(^\text{58}\), its use in HCC screening may be challenging because of the relatively high cost and long turnaround time. On the other hand, CTCs seem to enable high specificity detection of HCC-specific mRNA signatures, but current data\(^\text{39}\) has shown that the sensitivity of CTC-based mRNA assays for early detection of HCC needs to be improved. Our streamlined HCC EV-based mRNA assay represents a promising noninvasive diagnostic solution for HCC early detection.

The streamlined HCC EV-based mRNA assay demonstrated high accuracy for differentiating HCC from noncancer (i.e., liver cirrhosis, chronic hepatitis, and healthy donors) and other cancer cohorts. While the at-risk cirrhotic population had very low EV Z scores across the board, three plasma samples (i.e., CLD12, CLD23, and CLD35) from chronic active HBV patients in the hepatitis cohort exhibited significantly higher signals in the heatmap, without any discernible HCC in imaging studies. Coincidently, two of these three patients (i.e., CLD12 and CLD23) had extremely high serum levels of HBV DNA of 3,752,532 and 20,900,652 IU mL\(^{-1}\), respectively. In a longitudinal study of 3653 chronic hepatitis B patients with an elevated serum level of HBV DNA (>2000 IU mL\(^{-1}\)) at baseline, these patients were found to have an increased risk for subsequent development of HCC\(^\text{39}\). As such, continued surveillance of these three patients with high HCC EV Z scores may predict the development of HCC in the future.

We note that this study does have some limitations. The preclinical study was conducted using single cohorts for the HCC groups and at-risk liver cirrhotic group. The clinical reliability assessment was conducted in a small number of patients. In addition, the longitudinal follow-up was lacking. To further
progress toward practical HCC screening in at-risk populations, validation and testing cohorts as well as longitudinal follow-up will be required across all etiologies of HCC.

In conclusion, we have developed an HCC EV purification system (i.e., EV Click Chips) which allows for the digital scoring of HCC-specific mRNA transcripts. The resultant HCC EV Z Score was very specific, demonstrating accurate discrimination of HCC patients from human subjects without cancer and patients with other malignancies. Perhaps most importantly, our HCC EV-based mRNA assay displayed high sensitivity and superior performance in distinguishing early-stage HCC (BCLC Stage 0-A, or within Milan Criteria, or within UNOS DS Criteria) from at-risk liver cirrhotic patients, with the potential to allow for the detection of HCC in earlier stages when curative intent treatments are amendable. Our streamlined HCC EV-based mRNA assay holds great promise to significantly augment the ability of current HCC diagnostic modalities for early detection of HCC.

Methods

Fabrication of Tz-grafted SiNWS. Our past experience in developing the NanoVilli EV Chip unveiled that 10–15-μm long vertically aligned Si nanowires confer more effective surface area and sufficient mechanical robustness for EV capture. Hence, 10–15-μm nanowires (diameter = 100–200 nm) were introduced onto Tz-grafted SiNWS via a fabrication process combining photolithographic patterning and silver (Ag) nanoparticle-templated wet etching, offering ~30 times more surface area (in contrast to a flat substrate) for facilitating click chemistry-mediated EV capture. In accordance with the protocols published in our previous study,[24] SiNWS were fabricated by combining the photolithographic patterning and Ag nanoparticle-templated wet etching.[26] In short, a p-type Si (100) wafer (Silicon Quest Int) was spin-coated with a thin film photoresist (AZ 5214, AZ Electronic Materials USA Corp.) by a resistivity of 10–20 Ω·cm. The Si wafer was then immersed into the etching solution containing HF (4.6 M, Sigma–Aldrich), AgNO3 (0.2 M, Sigma–Aldrich) and deionized (DI) water after being exposed to ultraviolet light. Finally, the Ag nanoparticle-templates were removed by immersing these Si wafer into boiling aqua regia (HC1/HNO3, 3:1 (v/v), Sigma–Aldrich) for 15 min. The SiNWS were then treated with acetone (≥99.5%, Sigma–Aldrich), followed by ethyl alcohol (Sigma–Aldrich) wash. As shown in Supplementary Fig. 2, we introduced a disulfide linker to couple with the Tz motifs grafted on the chips by designing a three-step chemical modification procedure: (i) Silanization: The SiNWS were first immersed in a freshly prepared piranha solution (H2SO4/H2O2, 2:1 (v/v), Sigma–Aldrich) for 1 h, followed by rinsing with DI water and ethanol successively, three times. After drying under nitrogen flow, the resultant SiNWS were sealed in a vacuum desiccator for treatment with vapor (vap) trimethylsilyl (TMS) silane linker (21.14 mg, 0.1% Sigma–Aldrich) for 45 min to introduce thiol groups onto the SiNWS. (ii) Incorporation of disulfide bond: OPPSS-PEG-NH2 (0.30 mg, 3.8 mM, Nanocs Inc.) was incubated with freshly prepared HS-SiNWS in dimethyl sulfoxide (DMSO, 200 μL) solution for 2 h to introduce disulfide linkers with terminal amine groups. Then the amine-derivatized (HS-N-SiNWS) were incubated with ethanol thiol (30 μL, Sigma–Aldrich) for 30 min in the dark (i.e., without light). (iii) To graft Tz motifs, the H2N-SiNWS was incubated with Tz-sulfo-NHS ester (0.32 mg, 3.8 mM, Click Chemistry Tools Bioconjugate Technology Company) in PBS (200 μL, PH = 8.5) for 1 h. The resulting Tz-grafted SiNWS were rinsed with DI water three times. After drying under nitrogen flow, the Tz-grafted SiNWS were stored at −20 °C.

Preparation of TCO-antibody conjugates. Goat anti human EpCAM (R&D Systems, Inc., reconstitute at 0.2 mg/mL, dilute 400 to 2000 times in samples), goat anti human CD147 (R&D Systems, Inc., reconstitute at 0.5 mg/mL, dilute 1000–2000 times in samples), rabbit anti human ASGPR1 (LifeSpan Biosciences, Inc., 1 mg/mL, dilute 2000–10,000 times in samples), and sheep anti human GPC3 (R&D Systems, Inc., reconstitute at 0.2 mg/mL, dilute 200–2000 times in samples) were incubated with TCO-PEG–NHS ester (0.5 mM, Click Chemistry Tools Bioconjugate Technology Company) in PBS using different mole ratios at room temperature for 30 min. The individual TCO-antibody conjugates were prepared freshly before their use.

Cell line culture. HepG2 and Hep3B cell lines were purchased from American Type Culture Collection and cultured in Eagle’s Minimum Essential Medium with 10% fetal bovine serum (FBS), 1% GlutaMAX-I and 100 U/mL penicillin-streptomycin (Thermo Fisher Scientific) in a humidified incubator with 5% CO2, 37 °C, 5% CO2 at Cedars-Sinai Medical Center as described in Materials and Methods. None of the included patients was a part of any clinical trial. Patient allocation to each of the cohorts was not random and was defined by their disease states.

Artificial plasma sample preparation. HepG2, Hep3B, SNU387 cells were cultured in 18 Nunc EasyDish dishes (145 cm2, Thermo Fisher Scientific) for 72 h. Then the culture medium was switched to serum-free culture medium (Thermo Fisher Scientific) to starve the cells for 24–48 h. The serum-free culture medium incubated with cells was finally collected for EV isolation. After first centrifugation at 3000 × g (4 °C) for 10 min to remove cells and cell debris, the supernatant was collected and transferred to new tubes and centrifuged at 2800 × g (4 °C) for 10 min to further eliminate the remaining cellular debris and large particles. The supernatant was carefully collected at the bottom of the tube and was carefully collected at the bottom of the tube and was frozen at −80 °C in 100 µL freshly harvested HepG2 EVs. For the optimization experiments, cDNA was tested for the expression of five genes (SRY, TMEF1, TMEF2, TMEF3, and TMEF4) in DNA extraction. For the clinical samples, 10 µL of total cDNA (12 µL) was injected into EV Click microfluidic devices. For EV release, 100 µL DTT solution (50 mM) was injected into the EV Click Chips at 1.0 mL·h−1 and the released EVs were collected in 1.5 mL RNase-free Eppendorf tubes for subsequent RNA extraction.

RNA extraction and RT-ddPCR. The HCC EVs recovered from EV Click Chips were lysed by 700 µL QIAzol Lysis Reagent. RNA was extracted using a miRNeasy Micro Kit (Qiagen, USA) according to the manufacturer’s instructions. Then the RNA was treated with RNase61,62 at 37 °C for 30 min. For the clinical samples, each 10 µL aliquot of EV pellets was spiked into 90 µL healthy donors’ plasma. The RNase-treated RNA samples were reverse transcribed with SMART 2.0 and the generated cDNA was amplified using specific primers and probes for CYP17A1, CYP17A2, CYP17B2, CYP17C1, and CYP17C2. The PCR was performed on a QX200 system (Bio-Rad Laboratories, Inc.) at 80°C. For the fluorescent labeling of captured EVs, 10 µL pure HepG2 EVs in 100 µL PBS were run through the chips. The EVs were then incubated with this PKH26 dye solution at room temperature for 30 min. After overnight lysisophosphatization, the samples were sputter-coated with gold at a rate of 2000 times in samples, and sheep anti human GPC3 (10,000 times in samples) were purchased from Thermo Fisher Scientific. The diluted EV Click Chips were incubated with this PKH26 dye solution at room temperature for 10 min. The EV Click Chips after HCC EV capture and release were observed by fluorescence microscopy.

EV click chips for HCC EV purification. After chip assembly and leak testing according to our previously described protocols,[24] the artificial plasma samples (100 µL) or clinical plasma samples (500 µL) incubated with TCO-antibodies were then injected into EV Click Chip microfluidic devices. For EV release, 100 µL DTT solution (50 mM) was injected into the EV Click Chips at 1.0 mL·h−1 and the released EVs were collected in 1.5 mL RNase-free Eppendorf tubes for subsequent RNA extraction.

For the clinical samples, 10 µL of total cDNA (12 µL) was divided into five tubes to detect the 10 genes with two fluorescence filters in each tube. DdPCR experiments were performed on a QX200 system (Bio-Rad Laboratories, Inc.) according to the manufacturer’s instructions. All primers and probes were purchased from Thermo Fisher Scientific and verified by cell lines and cell-line derived EVs (See Supplementary Notes and Supplementary Fig. 8). Data were analyzed using the QuantaSoftTM software to quantify the corresponding copy numbers of gene transcripts detected in each assay.

Enrollment of HCC patients and control cohorts. All the participants in this study were enrolled between October 2016 and October 2019 at Ronald Reagan UCLA Medical Center and Cedars-Sinai Medical Center. All the participants were at least 18 years of age. Treatment-naïve HCC patients across all stages (n = 46) were enrolled in this study. HCC patients who had other malignant tumors or severe mental diseases were excluded. The control cohorts consisted of patients with liver cirrhosis (n = 26), chronic hepatitis B/C without liver cirrhosis (n = 25), other malignancies without (n = 12) or with metastases (n = 6), and healthy donors (n = 23). A detailed description of each control cohort and clinical characteristics can be found in the Supplementary Information (Supplementary Tables 4–8). All patients and healthy donors provided written informed consent for this study according to the IRB protocol (IRB #14-000197) at UCLA and (IRB #000866) at Cedars-Sinai Medical Center. None of the enrolled patients was a part of any clinical trial. Patient allocation to each of the cohorts was not random and was defined by their disease states.
Clinical blood sample processing. Peripheral venous blood samples were collected from fasting patients or healthy donors with written informed consent from each patient or healthy donor according to the institutional review board (IRB) protocols at UCLA and Cedars-Sinai Medical Center. Each 8.0 mL blood sample was collected in a BD Vacutainer glass tube (BD Medical, Fisher Cat. #02-684-26) with acid citrate dextrose. Samples were processed according to the manufacturer’s protocol within 4 h of collection. The final plasma samples were collected for the HCC EV study after centrifugation at 10,000 × g for 10 min. The plasma samples were aliquoted and stored in −80 °C refrigerators. Five hundred microliter plasma samples were then incubated with TCO-conjugated anti-EpCAM (250 ng) and anti-CSGPR1 (125 ng) and anti-CD147 (125 ng) at room temperature for 30 min before being loaded into the EV Click Chips for the HCC EV purification. All plasma samples subjected to EV Click Chips and downstream RT-ddPCR assay underwent only one freeze-thaw cycle.

Statistical analysis. The EV recovery yields and purities are expressed as means ± SD. Significant differences between different groups were evaluated using one-way ANOVA. The 10-gene HCC EV Z Score, which represents the likelihood estimate of ASGPR1 (125 ng) and anti-CD147 (125 ng) at room temperature for 30 min before being loaded into the EV Click Chips for the HCC EV purification. All plasma samples subjected to EV Click Chips and downstream RT-ddPCR assay underwent only one freeze-thaw cycle.
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