

# Journal of Visualized Experiments

## Simple, affordable, and modular patterning of cells using DNA

--Manuscript Draft--

<b>Article Type:</b>	Methods Article - JoVE Produced Video
<b>Manuscript Number:</b>	JoVE61937R1
<b>Full Title:</b>	Simple, affordable, and modular patterning of cells using DNA
<b>Corresponding Author:</b>	Zev Gartner University of California San Francisco San Francisco, CA UNITED STATES
<b>Corresponding Author's Institution:</b>	University of California San Francisco
<b>Corresponding Author E-Mail:</b>	zev.gartner@ucsf.edu
<b>Order of Authors:</b>	Katelyn Ashley Cabral, B.S. David M. Patterson Olivia J. Scheideler Russell Cole Adam R. Abate David V. Schaffer Lydia L. Sohn Zev J. Gartner
<b>Additional Information:</b>	
<b>Question</b>	<b>Response</b>
Please indicate whether this article will be Standard Access or Open Access.	Open Access (US\$4,200)
Please indicate the <b>city, state/province, and country</b> where this article will be <b>filmed</b> . Please do not use abbreviations.	San Francisco, CA, USA
Please confirm that you have read and agree to the terms and conditions of the author license agreement that applies below:	I agree to the <a href="#">Author License Agreement</a>
Please specify the section of the submitted manuscript.	Bioengineering
Please provide any comments to the journal here.	

**TITLE:**

Simple, Affordable, and Modular Patterning of Cells using DNA

**AUTHORS AND AFFILIATIONS:**

Katelyn A. Cabral<sup>1</sup>, David M. Patterson<sup>2</sup>, Olivia J. Scheideler<sup>1</sup>, Russell Cole<sup>3</sup>, Adam R. Abate<sup>4,5,6</sup>, David V. Schaffer<sup>7,8</sup>, Lydia L. Sohn<sup>9</sup>, Zev J. Gartner<sup>2,6,10</sup>

<sup>1</sup>UC Berkeley - UC San Francisco Graduate Program in Bioengineering, San Francisco, CA

<sup>2</sup>Department of Pharmaceutical Chemistry, University of California San Francisco, San Francisco, CA

<sup>3</sup>Scribe Biosciences, San Francisco, CA

<sup>4</sup>Department of Bioengineering and Therapeutic Sciences, University of California San Francisco, San Francisco, CA

<sup>5</sup>California Institute for Quantitative Biosciences, University of California San Francisco, San Francisco, CA

<sup>6</sup>Chan Zuckerberg Biohub, University of California San Francisco, San Francisco, CA

<sup>7</sup>Department of Chemical & Biomolecular Engineering, University of California Berkeley, Berkeley, CA

<sup>8</sup>Helen Wills Neuroscience Institute, University of California Berkeley, Berkeley, CA

<sup>9</sup>Department of Mechanical Engineering, University of California Berkeley, Berkeley, CA

<sup>10</sup>Center for Cellular Construction, University of California San Francisco, San Francisco, CA

**Email addresses for co-authors:**

Katelyn A. Cabral ([katie.cabral@ucsf.edu](mailto:katie.cabral@ucsf.edu))

David M. Patterson ([dpatters10@gmail.com](mailto:dpatters10@gmail.com))

Olivia J. Scheideler ([olivia.scheideler@gmail.com](mailto:olivia.scheideler@gmail.com))

Russell Cole ([russell.cole@scribesciences.com](mailto:russell.cole@scribesciences.com))

Adam R. Abate ([adam@abatelab.org](mailto:adam@abatelab.org))

David V. Schaffer ([schaffer@berkeley.edu](mailto:schaffer@berkeley.edu))

Lydia L. Sohn ([sohn@berkeley.edu](mailto:sohn@berkeley.edu))

Zev J. Gartner ([zev.gartner@ucsf.edu](mailto:zev.gartner@ucsf.edu))

**Corresponding author:**

Zev J. Gartner ([zev.gartner@ucsf.edu](mailto:zev.gartner@ucsf.edu))

**KEYWORDS:**

micropatterning, tissue engineering, bioengineering, 3D cell culture, photolithography, microfabrication, cell biology

**SUMMARY:**

Here we present a protocol to micropattern cells at single-cell resolution using DNA-programmed adhesion. This protocol uses a benchtop photolithography platform to create patterns of DNA oligonucleotides on a glass slide and then labels cell membranes with commercially available complementary oligonucleotides. Hybridization of the oligos results in programmed cell

adhesion.

#### **ABSTRACT:**

The relative positioning of cells is a key feature of the microenvironment that organizes cell-cell interactions. To study the interactions between cells of the same or different type, micropatterning techniques have proved useful. DNA Programmed Assembly of Cells (DPAC) is a micropatterning technique that targets the adhesion of cells to a substrate or other cells using DNA hybridization. The most basic operations in DPAC begin with decorating cell membranes with lipid-modified oligonucleotides, then flowing them over a substrate that has been patterned with complementary DNA sequences. Cells adhere selectively to the substrate only where they find a complementary DNA sequence. Non-adherent cells are washed away, revealing a pattern of adherent cells. Additional operations include further rounds of cell-substrate or cell-cell adhesion, as well as transferring the patterns formed by DPAC to an embedding hydrogel for long-term culture. Previously, methods for patterning oligonucleotides on surfaces and decorating cells with DNA sequences required specialized equipment and custom DNA synthesis, respectively. We report an updated version of the protocol, utilizing an inexpensive benchtop photolithography setup and commercially available cholesterol modified oligonucleotides (CMOs) deployed using a modular format. CMO-labeled cells adhere with high efficiency to DNA-patterned substrates. This approach can be used to pattern multiple cell types at once with high precision and to create arrays of microtissues embedded within an extracellular matrix. Advantages of this method include its high resolution, ability to embed cells into a three-dimensional microenvironment without disrupting the micropattern, and flexibility in patterning any cell type.

#### **INTRODUCTION:**

The positioning of cells with respect to one another in a tissue is an important feature of the microenvironment<sup>1-4</sup>. Techniques used to pattern live cells into spatially controlled arrangements are valuable experimental tools for studying differentiation<sup>4-8</sup>, cell motility<sup>9</sup>, morphogenesis<sup>10-12</sup>, metabolism<sup>13</sup>, and cell-cell interactions<sup>7,14</sup>. A variety of methods exist for patterning cells, each with their own advantages and drawbacks<sup>3,4</sup>. Methods that create adhesive islands of extracellular matrix (ECM) proteins, such as microcontact printing and laser-cut stencils, are simple and scalable. However, it is difficult to pattern more than one or two cell types at a time because the adhesive properties of different cell types to different ECM molecules are often similar<sup>15-17</sup>. More complex micropatterns can be created with light-induced molecular adsorption (LIMAP), a technique that uses UV light to ablate PEG-coated regions and allow for subsequent protein adsorption<sup>18,19</sup>. This process can be repeated to create high-resolution micropatterns with multiple cell types. However, cross-binding of cells to the different protein patches can occur, resulting in poor pattern specificity<sup>19</sup>. Physical methods such as seeding cells onto micromechanical reconfigurable culture devices can create structured co-cultures with dynamic control, but without the flexibility in pattern design of microcontact printing or LIMAP<sup>14,8</sup>. Unlike the other techniques, bioprinting can create three-dimensional arrangements of cells within hydrogels<sup>20,21</sup>. However, bioprinted constructs have much lower resolution than other micropatterning techniques, with an average feature size on the order of hundreds of microns<sup>22</sup>. An ideal cell patterning method would have high resolution, pattern multiple cell types, use

equipment and reagents that are easily accessible, and have the ability to embed successful patterns into a hydrogel for three-dimensional (3D) cell culture. In this article, we present CMO-DPAC, a cell micropatterning technique that uses the flexibility and speed of DNA hybridization to target cell adhesion to a substrate. This method has been adapted from our previous protocols<sup>23, 24</sup> to make it more affordable, modular, and accessible. Using the current protocol, any lab should be able to set up a fully functional system without any specialized equipment or expertise.

DNA Programmed Assembly of Cells (DPAC) is a powerful tissue engineering technique that patterns cells at single-cell resolution with precise control over cell-cell spacing and tissue geometry. In DPAC, cell membranes are decorated with DNA oligonucleotides (oligos) using two lipid-modified oligos designed to hybridize on the cell membrane. Because the oligos are conjugated to hydrophobic lipids, they rapidly partition to the cell membrane<sup>25</sup> where they hybridize, increasing the net hydrophobicity of the non-covalently bound molecules, and thereby enhancing their lifetime at the cell surface<sup>26</sup>. The oligos are presented on the cell surface in a manner where they can hybridize with complementary oligos on other cells or DNA-functionalized glass slides to create defined 2D or 3D cell patterns with prescribed composition, cell-cell spacing, and geometry<sup>23, 24</sup>. The patterned microtissues can be cleaved off of the surface enzymatically and embedded into a hydrogel for prolonged 3D culture. When used in combination with primary cells or stem cells, the resulting collections of cells can undergo morphogenesis and form into organoids<sup>23, 27, 28</sup>. DPAC has been applied to investigate the dynamics of adult neural stem cell fate in response to competing signals<sup>6, 29</sup>, to study self-organization of mammary epithelial cells<sup>23, 28</sup>, and to generate “tissue origami” through mesenchymal condensation<sup>27</sup>.

DPAC allows for the precise placement of multiple cell populations and has substantially better resolution than extrusion-based bioprinters (on the order of microns)<sup>22, 23</sup>. In addition, unlike ECM-based patterning methods such as microcontact printing, DPAC does not require differential adhesion of the different cell types to an ECM-coated surface<sup>15, 23</sup>. It is ideal for answering questions about how the composition of a tissue affects its behavior, how cells integrate multiple cellular and microenvironmental cues when making decisions<sup>6, 29</sup>, and how pairs of cells interact with each other. An advantage of this method over other micropatterning methods is that it can be used for 3D cell culture in a single imaging plane, facilitating time-lapse studies of tissue self-organization and organoid morphogenesis<sup>23, 27, 30</sup>.

Despite these advantages, successful implementation of DPAC has required the synthesis of custom oligonucleotide reagents and access to specialized equipment for DNA patterning<sup>23, 24</sup>, limiting widespread adoption. For example, the optimal lipid-modified oligos (LMOs) used in the original protocol must be custom synthesized, modified to have a lignoceric acid or palmitic acid, and purified<sup>26</sup>. This process requires the use of a DNA synthesizer and a high-performance liquid chromatography instrument, as well as the purchasing of the associated reagents such as methylamine, a controlled substance that is subject to both institutional and federal regulations. As an alternative, LMOs can be custom purchased in bulk, but this requires a significant up-front investment in the technology.



To overcome these limitations, we have developed a revised version of DPAC that uses commercially available cholesterol-modified oligos (CMOs) in place of the custom-synthesized LMOs. To further reduce costs and to increase the flexibility of the platform, we have changed to a modular, three-oligo system. Instead of ordering a new cholesterol-modified oligo for each unique cell population, a user of this protocol can instead use the same cholesterol-modified oligos (“Universal Anchor” and “Universal Co-Anchor”) for every cell population and then employ an inexpensive, unmodified oligo (“Adapter Strand”) that hybridizes with both the Universal Anchor and either the amine-functionalized DNA on the surface or the Adapter Strand of another cell type.

Another limitation of the original DPAC protocol was that it created the DNA-patterned slides by using a high-resolution liquid printer (e.g., Nano eNabler, BioForce Nanosciences)<sup>23,24</sup>. While this instrument boasts extraordinary resolution and low reagent requirements, it is not available to most institutions and has a relatively low printing rate (approximately 1 feature patterned per second). Recently, two photolithographic methods have been developed to pattern DNA features onto surfaces. Viola and colleagues used a polyacrylamide and benzophenone coating that covalently bound single-stranded DNA oligos upon exposure to UV light<sup>30</sup>. Using this method, they were able to create tissue scaffolds that underwent large-scale, programmed shape changes as a result of cell contractility and self-organization. Scheideler et al. developed a method that uses UV exposure of a positive photoresist to selectively expose amine-modified DNA oligos to an aldehyde-functionalized slide<sup>29</sup>. After baking and reductive amination, the amine-modified DNA is covalently bound to the surface. This method was used to investigate the response of adult neural stem cells to spatially presented self-renewal and differentiation cues. This article adapts Scheideler et al.’s protocol to create the DNA patterns that will capture CMO-labeled cells. This photopatterning protocol can be performed without using a clean room. It uses inexpensive and commercially available equipment that is easily deployed on a benchtop or fume hood. The use of inexpensive or DIY (do-it-yourself) photolithography equipment increases accessibility to researchers without access to clean room facilities and allows researchers to try the technique without a large investment of time or resources<sup>31,32</sup>. However, better resolution and the alignment of multiple DNA features can be achieved by using the commercial spin coater and mask aligner commonly found in cleanroom facilities.

Here, we describe a method to pattern cells at single-cell resolution using DNA-based adhesion. First, photopatterning with a positive photoresist is used to create high-resolution patterns of amine-modified DNA onto an aldehyde-modified glass substrate. Next, the slide is treated to reduce non-specific cell attachment and PDMS flow cells are created to confine cells over patterned regions. Cells are then labeled with short DNA oligonucleotides that are functionalized with cholesterol and as a result insert into the cell membrane. The cells are then flowed over the DNA micropatterns. Hybridization between the cell-surface DNA and the DNA on the glass surface results in specific adhesion of the cells to the DNA pattern. Non-adherent cells are washed away, revealing the adherent cell pattern. This process can be repeated to pattern multiple cell types or to create multi-layered structures. If desired, the cells can be fully embedded into an ECM for 3D cell culture.

177  
178 **PROTOCOL:**

179  
180 **1. Design experiment**

181  
182 1.1. Plan out the desired experiment, considering feature size, feature spacing, number of cell  
183 types involved, and the arrangement of cells with respect to one another. Refer to  
184 **Supplemental File 1**, a guide for experimental design, and **Supplemental File 2**, which contains  
185 example oligo sequences.

186  
187 1.2. Design photomask using computer-aided design software. An example photomask is  
188 provided in **Supplemental File 3**.

189  
190 1.2.1. Draw a rectangle of the dimensions of a standard microscope slide (25 mm x 75mm).

191  
192 1.2.2. Draw four rectangular regions 10 mm wide and 10 mm long, distributed evenly across the  
193 slide.

194  
195 1.2.3. Within each region, draw features that are the desired size, shape, and spacing for the  
196 experiment. Cells will adhere only to these features in the experiment.

197  
198 1.2.4. To create aligned photomasks for multiple cell types, create a master drawing with all  
199 sets of features, then save versions that correspond to each cell type.

200  
201 1.2.5. Order a high-resolution (at least 20,000 dots per inch) transparency photomask from this  
202 CAD drawing with the features drawn in 1.2.3 transparent and the larger regions black.

203  
204 **2. Photopattern DNA onto aldehyde-functionalized slides (protocol adapted from Scheideler**  
205 **et al.<sup>29</sup>)**

206  
207 2.1. If patterning multiple cell types, fabricate fiducial markers on the aldehyde-functionalized  
208 slide before any DNA patterning to facilitate alignment of features. Alternative methods for  
209 creating fiducial markers are suggested in **Supplemental File 1**.

210  
211 2.1.1. To create metal fiducial markers, apply S1813 positive photoresist as described in steps  
212 2.3 – 2.11. Use a photomask that contains large features that will be easy to align later.  
213 Incorporate these features into the design of the photomasks that will be used for DNA  
214 patterning.

215  
216 2.1.2 Deposit a thin film (100 Angstroms) of titanium onto the slide using electron-gun  
217 evaporation<sup>29</sup>. Remove excess metal and photoresist using acetone, and then proceed to the  
218 DNA photopatterning.

2.2. Prepare a 20  $\mu$ M solution of a 5'-amine-modified oligo in DNA buffer (50 mM of sodium phosphate in water, pH = 8.5). See **Supplemental File 2** for suggested oligo sequences.

NOTE: It is possible to use as little as 5  $\mu$ M of amine-modified oligo for some patterns and applications, so surface DNA concentration may need to be optimized.

2.3. Pre-heat a hot plate to 100  $^{\circ}$ C.

2.4. Use double-sided tape or a vacuum to attach an aldehyde-functionalized glass slide to the rotor of a spin coater.

CAUTION: Slide detachment during spin-coating is a safety risk. Always use the spin coater in an enclosed container with a lid, such as an acrylic box.

NOTE: Label a corner of the slide by using a diamond scribe or similar implement to scratch the glass. This helps with slide identification and orientation after the photoresist has been washed away.

2.5. Use a disposable pipette to drop the positive photoresist onto the aldehyde slide. For even coatings, add small drops of the photoresist across the slide, instead of one large drop in the middle (**Supplemental Figure 1A**).

2.6. Using the spin coater, spin the slide at 3000 rpm for 30 s.

2.7. Place the slide on 100  $^{\circ}$ C hotplate for 1.5 min (soft bake) to crosslink photoresist.

2.8. Remove the slide from hotplate. Place a photomask with the features desired for this experiment on top of the slide and weigh the photomask down with a piece of glass (**Supplemental Figure 1B,C**). Cover the entire setup in an opaque box (**Supplemental Figure 1D**). Expose with a UV lamp (365 nm wavelength, 360 mW, 5 inches from slide, total radiant energy density 100 mJ/cm<sup>2</sup>) for 2 min.

NOTE: UV light will break the polymer bonds in the photoresist underneath transparent regions of the photomask, creating regions where DNA will later be able to adhere.

2.9. Develop the slide by immersing in developer solution for 3-5 mi (**Supplemental Figure 1E**).

2.10. Rinse away excess developer solution with water. Dry under a stream of air or nitrogen. (**Supplemental Figure 1F**).

2.11. Confirm that the photolithography was successful by looking at the slide under the microscope. Because the photoresist is UV-light sensitive, do this step quickly and then store the slide in the dark while preparing other slides (if applicable).

NOTE: A successfully patterned slide should have sharply defined edges for each feature, no cracking, and no feature distortion at the edges. Examples of correct and incorrect photolithography are provided in Supplemental Figure 2A. See Table 1 for troubleshooting suggestions if photolithography does not provide the desired feature quality.

2.12. Add a droplet of the 20  $\mu$ M amine-modified oligo solution (Step 2.1) onto each photopatterned region of the slide. Use a pipette tip to gently spread the droplet across the entire region, being careful not to scratch the slide. (**Supplemental Figure 1G**).

2.13. Bake the slide in a 65-70 °C oven until the DNA solution has fully dried onto the slide surface (about 1 h).

2.14. Perform reductive amination by placing the patterned, baked slides in a 15 cm cell-culture dish and place in a fume hood on top of a shaker. Weigh out 100 mg of sodium borohydride. In a fume hood, add 40 mL of phosphate-buffered saline (PBS), gently mix, and add to the dish containing the patterned slides. Let the reaction proceed for 15 min with gentle shaking.

NOTE: The amine on the oligo first forms a Schiff base with the aldehydes on the slide surface. This is a reversible covalent bond that must be converted to an irreversible bond prior to use in DPAC. Addition of a reducing agent (sodium borohydride) converts the Schiff base to a secondary amine by reductive amination.

CAUTION: The reaction of sodium borohydride with water creates hydrogen gas and will continue to do so for hours or days after the reaction begins. Perform the reductive amination step in a fume hood and keep all sodium borohydride solution waste in an open or loosely capped container in the fume hood for at least 24 h.

2.15. Remove unreacted DNA by washing twice with 0.1% sodium dodecyl sulfate (SDS) in water, then three times with distilled water. Dry the slide under a stream of nitrogen or air.

2.16. Rinse the slide with acetone to remove the remaining photoresist.

NOTE: At this point, the DNA has been irreversibly and covalently attached to the slide and all unreacted aldehyde functional groups have been converted to alcohols. The photoresist is no longer needed.

2.17. If multiple oligos will be patterned, return to step 2.4, align the photomask with fiducial marks, and repeat.

NOTE: The experiment can be paused here. Store slides in a vacuum desiccator. Under dry conditions, the slides can be stored for up to 3 months without a loss of quality.

**3. Make slide hydrophobic (optional) (protocol adapted from Todhunter et al.<sup>24</sup>)**

NOTE: It is advantageous, but not required, to modify the slide's surface chemistry to render it more inert and hydrophobic. Non-specific cell attachment is reduced on these surfaces<sup>33</sup>, thereby alleviating non-specific binding of cells to un-patterned areas of the slide. Additionally, if the patterned cells will ultimately be embedded within a hydrogel and transferred off the slide, the surface treatment is essential for reliable movement of the cell-laden hydrogel across the slide without distortion or tearing. Silanizing with (tridecafluoro-1,1,2,2-tetrahydrooctyl) dimethylchlorosilane results in the presence of hydrophobic fluoroalkyl groups on the slide surface.

CAUTION: Perform all steps from 3.1 onward in a chemical fume hood to prevent exposure to acetic acid and methylene chloride fumes.

3.1. Rinse slide with 10% acetic acid and then dry under an air stream.

3.2. In a glass Coplin jar, prepare a solution of 60 mL methylene chloride (dichloromethane), 0.6 mL of triethylamine, and 0.6 mL of (tridecafluoro-1,1,2,2-tetrahydrooctyl) dimethylchlorosilane. Stir with a metal spatula to rinse.

NOTE: These reagents are sensitive to water. They should be stored under dry conditions and used as fresh as possible.

3.3. Add the slide to the Coplin jar containing the silane solution. Place Coplin jar on an orbital shaker (set to 60-80 rpm) and allow the reaction of the silane and the slide to progress for 15 min.

3.4. Use metal forceps to remove the slide from the silane solution. Immerse slide in a Coplin jar containing methylene chloride for 1 minute to remove excess silane from the slide.

3.5. Immerse the slide in a 50 mL conical tube containing ethanol. Agitate. Immerse the slide in a 50 mL conical tube containing distilled water. Agitate.

NOTE: Methylene chloride and water are not miscible, so an ethanol rinse is needed to remove excess methylene chloride before the final water rinse.

3.6. Remove the slide from the water and inspect it. The slide should be fairly dry, with any water droplets having a contact angle of greater than 90°. Allow slides to dry fully and store in vacuum desiccator until use.

NOTE: The experiment can be paused here. Store the slide under dry conditions.

#### **4. Prepare PDMS flow cells and slide for experiment**

NOTE: Rectangular PDMS flow cells are used to concentrate the cells over the patterned regions of the slide. For experiments cultured in 3D, the flow cells form a mold for the hydrogel.

4.1. Make SU-8 master to use as mold for PDMS flow cells.

4.1.1. Pre-heat hotplate to 95 °C.

4.1.2. Add 5 mL of SU-8 2075 to a silicon wafer.

4.1.3. Spin coat the SU-8 on the wafer at 500 rpm for 10s, followed by 1,000 rpm for 30s. This should create features up to 240 µm in height<sup>34</sup>.

4.1.4. Soft bake the wafer on the hotplate for at least 45 min.

4.1.5. Remove the wafer from the hotplate. Put the photomask (see **Supplemental File 4**) (emulsion side down) on top of the wafer and weigh it down with a glass disc to ensure contact between the photomask and the slide.

4.1.6. Expose with UV light (365 nm) for a radiant energy density of 350 mJ/cm<sup>2</sup>.

4.1.7. Bake wafer on the hotplate for 12–15 min.

4.1.8. Place wafer in wide glass container. Cover wafer with SU-8 developer solution. Place on a shaker and develop while agitating for at least 15 min.

4.1.9. Use forceps to remove the wafer from the developer solution. Rinse for 5 s by spraying more developer solution from a squirt bottle. Spray with isopropyl alcohol to rinse. If a white precipitate appears, return the wafer to the developer solution and develop for longer.

4.1.10. Dry wafer under a stream of air or nitrogen.

4.1.11. Bake slide for 5 min.

NOTE: Once the master wafer has been created, it can be reused indefinitely as long as the features remain intact.

4.2. Prepare PDMS.

4.2.1. In a weigh boat, add polydimethylsiloxane elastomer and crosslinker in a 10:1 ratio (by mass). Stir vigorously to ensure even mixing.

4.2.2. De-gas the PDMS in a vacuum desiccator for 15-30 min until no more bubbles are visible.

4.2.3. Place the master wafer in a 15 cm tissue culture dish. Pour PDMS over the wafer. If bubbles appear, de-gas in a vacuum desiccator for a few minutes.

4.2.4. Bake in 60 °C oven for 3 h.

NOTE: After baking, PDMS flow cells can be stored on the benchtop indefinitely.

4.3. Prepare PDMS flow cells for the experiment.

4.3.1. Shortly before starting a CMO-DPAC experiment, cut out the required number of PDMS flow cells from the master wafer. Plasma oxidize with 10 cc/min room air for 90 s to render the surface hydrophilic.

4.3.2. Cut out each individual flow cell so that there is 1-2 mm of PDMS remaining on each side, then cut open the top and bottom of the flow cell to create an inlet and outlet.

4.3.3. Retrieve patterned slide created in Steps 2 and 3. Align on top of photomask.

4.3.4. Using the photomask as reference, place the PDMS flow cells on the slide in the location of each patterned region.

4.3.5. Add 50  $\mu$ L of phosphate buffered saline (PBS) + 1% bovine serum albumin (BSA) to the inlet of each flow cell, as shown in **Supplemental Figure 1H**. Confirm that the flow cell is completely filled by the PBS + 1% BSA and that there are no large bubbles. Proceed immediately to Steps 5 and 6.

NOTE: Blocking with BSA minimizes non-specific cell adhesion to the slide surface.

## 5. Lift and label cells with cholesterol-modified DNA

### 5.1. Prepare the cholesterol-modified DNA solutions.

5.1.1. For each set of cells in the experiment, mix together 3  $\mu$ L of a 100  $\mu$ M stock solution of the cholesterol-modified Universal Anchor Strand with 3  $\mu$ L of a 100  $\mu$ M stock solution of an Adapter Strand. Incubate for 1 minute. This will pre-hybridize the oligos. Add 69  $\mu$ L of phosphate-buffered saline (PBS) to create a 4  $\mu$ M Universal Anchor + Adapter solution.

5.1.2. For each set of cells in the experiment, add 3  $\mu$ L of a 100  $\mu$ M Universal cholesterol-modified Co-Anchor Strand stock solution to 12  $\mu$ L of PBS, creating a 20  $\mu$ M solution.

### 5.2. Prepare the single-cell suspension(s).

5.2.1. For adherent cells, use trypsin or other dissociation agent to remove the cells from the culture flask. Add culture media to neutralize the trypsin and centrifuge to pellet the cells. For non-adherent cells, collect the cell suspension and centrifuge to pellet the cells.

5.2.2. Resuspend the cell pellet in 1 mL of ice-cold PBS or serum-free media. Transfer 1-3 million cells to a 1.5 mL microcentrifuge tube. Centrifuge at 160 x *g* for 4 min.

NOTE: If the cell type being used is prone to clumping/aggregation, use PBS without calcium and magnesium ions for all wash steps to reduce unwanted cell aggregation. If viability is a particular concern for the cell type being used, use serum-free media instead of PBS. Media containing fetal bovine serum is not recommended for cell labeling as it can hinder incorporation of lipid-modified oligos.<sup>35</sup>

### 5.3. Label the cells with cholesterol-modified oligos.

5.3.1. Resuspend the cell pellet in 75  $\mu$ L of ice-cold PBS or serum-free media. Keep the cells in an ice bucket throughout the labeling and washing process to maximize cell viability and minimize loss of the cholesterol-modified oligos from the cell surface.

NOTE: Resuspending the cells before adding the DNA ensures that the distribution of DNA is uniform across the cell population.

5.3.2. Add the 75  $\mu$ L of the 4  $\mu$ M Universal Anchor + Adapter solution created in Step 5.1.1 to the microcentrifuge tube containing the cell suspension. Mix thoroughly by pipetting. Incubate for 5 min on ice.

5.3.3. Add 15  $\mu$ L of the Universal Co-Anchor Solution to the microcentrifuge tube. Mix thoroughly by pipetting. Incubate for 5 min on ice.

5.4. Remove excess oligos from the cell suspension. Add 1 mL of ice-cold PBS or serum-free media to the microcentrifuge tube. Mix with a P1000 pipette. Centrifuge at 160 x *g* for 4 min at 4 °C. Discard the supernatant. Repeat two more times.

NOTE: If cells are prone to clumping, pass the cell suspension through a 40  $\mu$ m filter before the final wash. If cells are prone to adsorption onto the side of the microcentrifuge tube, consider pre-blocking the tube with casein.

## 6. Pattern the DNA-labeled cells

6.1. Resuspend the cells in ice-cold PBS or serum-free media to create a cell-dense solution of at least 25 million cells/mL.

NOTE: For one slide using four of the 10 mm x 15 mm x 200  $\mu$ m PDMS flow cells described in Step 4, about 100  $\mu$ L of this dense cell suspension is required. Although most of these cells will not adhere to the pattern and will ultimately be discarded, having an extremely concentrated solution of cells over the pattern dramatically improves the efficiency of cell patterning.



6.2. Pick up slide and tilt it slightly. Add 25  $\mu$ L of cell suspension to the inlet of each flow cell on the patterned slide. Remove the PBS + 1% BSA solution from the outlet, allowing the cell suspension to fill the PDMS flow cell. Incubate on ice or at room temperature for 30 s.

NOTE: At this point, looking at the flow cell under a microscope should show densely packed cells with little to no gaps visible between cells. See **Supplemental Figure 2B**.

6.3. Aspirate 5  $\mu$ L of cell suspension from the outlet of the slide and add it back into the inlet. Repeat 10 times per flow cell.

NOTE: The adhesion of CMO-labeled cells to the DNA-patterned slide is nearly instantaneous. Flowing the cells over the pattern multiple times increases the probability that a cell will flow over a given DNA spot and be captured.

6.4. Gently pipette PBS or serum-free media into the inlet of each flow cell to wash out excess cells. Collect the cell suspension from the outlet. Repeat 2-4 times or until a visual inspection of the slide under the microscope confirms that there are no excess cells remaining.

NOTE: It can be advantageous to save the excess cells from the first wash. If the patterning efficiency is unsatisfactory, the excess cells can be centrifuged and resuspended in a lower volume of PBS to create a more cell-dense solution, and then the process can be repeated from Step 6.2.

6.5. Repeat Steps 6.1–6.4 for each set of cells in the pattern. For patterns in which multiple cell types are directly patterned by the surface template, start with the least abundant cell type of the pattern and finish with the most abundant cell type.

NOTE: It is advisable to do each round of cellular assembly sequentially instead of pooling the cells, even in conditions where the cells are all labeled with orthogonal DNA sequences. Pooling the cells effectively dilutes each cell population and reduces patterning efficiency.

6.6. After the final round of cell assembly is complete, the next steps will vary based on the specific experiment. If the cells are intended to remain on the glass, add media to a Petri dish containing the slide, and then gently use forceps to nudge the PDMS flow cells off of the slide. If the cells will be embedded into a hydrogel and cultured in 3D, proceed to Step 7.

## 7. Transfer into hydrogel for 3D culture (optional)

7.1. Prepare a hydrogel precursor solution containing 2% DNase.

NOTE: The composition of the solution will vary based on experimental setup. Matrigel and mixtures of Matrigel and collagen I work well in this protocol, but other hydrogels are also possible.

7.2. Add 50  $\mu$ L of hydrogel solution containing 2% DNase to the inlet of each flow cell. Aspirate the excess fluid from the outlet, driving the hydrogel solution into the flow cell. For viscous hydrogel precursors, tilting the slide slightly may be required to help the hydrogel flow into the flow cell.

7.3. Incubate the slide at 37 °C for 30-45 min (depending on hydrogel gelation kinetics) to allow the hydrogel to set and to cleave the DNA-based adhesion between the cells and the surface.

7.4. Remove each flow cell from the slide and place on top of hydrogel precursor solution.

7.4.1. Add 50  $\mu$ L of hydrogel precursor to a well of a 2-well chamber slide or a 6-well plate.

7.4.2. Pipette 10  $\mu$ L of PBS on either side of each flow cell.

7.4.3 Use a razor blade or fine-point tweezers to distribute the PBS along the full length of the flow cell, then gently lift the sides of the flow cell so that the PBS rushes underneath the hydrogel.

NOTE: This will “float” the hydrogel across the slide, allowing for transfer without distortion or tearing.

7.4.4. Use a razor blade to gently move the flow cell to the edge of the glass slide.

7.4.5. Invert the slide. With the razor blade, nudge the flow cell off the slide so that it lands on top of the razor blade.

7.4.6. Pick the flow cell off the razor blade using curved forceps. Invert the flow cell so that the cells are on the bottom, and then place on top of the droplet of hydrogel precursor solution.

7.4.7. Repeat Steps 7.4.1 – 7.4.6 for each flow cell.

7.5. Incubate for at least 30 min so that the hydrogel containing the patterned cells can bind to the hydrogel underlay, resulting in the full embedding of the patterned cells.

7.6. Remove the PDMS flow cell.

7.6.1. Add enough media to immerse the PDMS flow cell.

NOTE: The influx of media will loosen the adhesion between the hydrogel and the PDMS flow cell.

7.6.2. Use curved forceps, oriented along the long axis of the flow cell, to gently nudge the flow cell until it pops off and floats into the media. Collect the flow cell with forceps and discard.

NOTE: For optimal results, spread the curved forceps and apply gentle pressure to the walls of the PDMS flow cell. Apply force in the direction of the long axis of the flow cell.

## **8. Confirm successful labeling of cells with CMO (optional, for troubleshooting)**

8.1. Order a fluorescently modified (FAM or AF647) oligonucleotide that is complementary to the surface adhesion sequence of the Adapter Strand being used in the experiment.

8.2. Label cells with CMO DNA and wash out excess DNA as described in Step 5. Resuspend in 200  $\mu$ L of ice-cold PBS.

8.3. Make up a 4  $\mu$ M solution of the fluorescently labeled complementary oligonucleotide in PBS. Add 200  $\mu$ L of this solution to the cell suspension. Incubate on ice for 5 min.

8.4. Add 1 mL of ice-cold PBS. Mix. Centrifuge the cells to pellet them. Remove supernatant. Repeat this process two more times to wash out any DNA that has not hybridized.

8.5 Perform analytical flow cytometry to quantify the presence of DNA on the cell surface.

8.5.1 On a flow cytometer, analyze control cells that have not been labeled with DNA. Set up gates based on this population.

8.5.2 Analyze CMO-labeled cells that have been treated with a fluorescently labeled complementary oligonucleotide.

8.5.3 Calculate mean fluorescence intensity.

## **REPRESENTATIVE RESULTS:**

This protocol makes it possible to pattern cells in 2D and 3D with high precision and without the use of custom reagents or expensive cleanroom equipment. **Figure 1** shows an overview of the protocol. First, DNA-functionalized slides are created through photolithography. Next, cells are labeled with CMOs. The cells are then flowed over the slide, where they attach only to the DNA-functionalized regions of the slide. After excess cells are washed away, the desired pattern of cells is revealed. These cells can be cultured on the slide or embedded in a hydrogel containing DNase and transferred off the slide for 3D cell culture.

Labeling of cells with CMOs allows for their attachment to the DNA patterned slide (**Figure 2**). First, the cholesterol-modified Universal Anchor Strand is pre-hybridized with the Adapter Strand. Next, the Universal Anchor + Adapter solution is mixed 1:1 with the cell suspension. The cholesterol on the Universal Anchor + Adapter complex inserts into the cell membrane. Addition of the cholesterol-modified Universal Co-Anchor Strand, which hybridizes with the Universal Anchor Strand, improves the stability of the CMO complex in the cell membrane by increasing the net hydrophobicity of the duplex<sup>26</sup>. After washing out the excess DNA from the cell suspension, the cells are flowed over the slide. Hybridization between the Adapter Strand and

the Surface DNA Strand results in attachment of cells to the DNA-patterned regions of the slide.

The pattern of the cells is created by using photolithography to restrict the attachment of amine-modified DNA oligos to specific regions of an aldehyde-modified glass slide<sup>29</sup> (**Figure 3A**). Positive photoresist is spin-coated onto an aldehyde-functionalized slide. A transparency photomask is then placed on top of the slide and the slide is exposed to UV light. After developing, the regions of the slide that were exposed to UV light are no longer coated in photoresist and thus have exposed aldehyde groups. A 20  $\mu$ M solution of amine-modified DNA oligos is then dropped onto the slide and spread to cover the patterned regions. Baking followed by reductive amination results in a covalent bond between the amine-modified DNA and the slide. Remarkably, this process can be repeated to pattern multiple oligos without any loss of functionality of the previously patterned oligos (**Figure 3B**). However, care should be taken to avoid overlapping patterns, which results in the presence of both oligos at a reduced concentration (**Supplemental Figure 3**). Multiple cell populations can be patterned sequentially by using Adapter Strands that differ in their modular domain (the 20 bases closest to the 3' end).

Although this photopatterning protocol was developed by Scheideler et al. in the context of a clean room, we have demonstrated that it is possible to achieve similar results with an inexpensive, "home-brew" photolithography setup that fits easily within a chemical fume hood. The setup includes a \$400 spin coater made of a DC motor, digital controller, and CD cake box, as well as a UV lamp that was assembled from individual components and housed in a repurposed sharps container (**Figure 3C**). The main advantage of the home-brew photolithography setup is that it is very affordable (<\$1000 for all of the equipment) while still being able to create single-cell-sized features. However, the use of inexpensive equipment does have its limitations – for example, it is more challenging to precisely align fiducial markers to pattern multiple DNA oligos without use of a mask aligner. We recommend this inexpensive photolithography setup for labs that do not have convenient access to a clean room or that want to try this method without a large investment.

To identify optimal conditions for DNA-programmed cell adhesion, we systematically varied the concentrations of DNA strands on cell surfaces and measured the efficiency of cell adhesion to DNA-modified glass surfaces. The concentration of Universal Anchor + Adapter Strand and Universal Co-Anchor in labeling solutions were varied across several orders of magnitude (**Figure 4A,B**), resulting in  $10^4$  -  $10^6$  DNA complexes per cell (**Supplemental Figure 4**). Cell adhesion was dose dependent, with minimal cell adhesion to the DNA pattern when cells were labeled with CMOs at a concentration of 0.05  $\mu$ M or less, and high occupancy at a concentration of 2.5  $\mu$ M and higher. We, therefore, used a 2  $\mu$ M solution of Universal Anchor + Adapter Strand and 2  $\mu$ M solution of Universal Co-Anchor in most experiments. Cell adhesion would also be expected to decrease if the amount of DNA used on the glass surface decreased<sup>29</sup> or if mismatches between the Adapter Strand and surface strand increased. More information about Adapter Strand sequence design is provided in **Supplemental File 2**. CMO labeling using Adapter Strands without CpG repeats did not stimulate TLR9 in HEK cells expressing mouse TLR9 (**Supplemental Figure 5**).

We provide several demonstrations that the revised protocol provides reproducible and efficient

DNA-programmed cell adhesion. For example, human umbilical vein endothelial cells (HUVECs) labeled with CMOs adhered to DNA patterns with high efficiency. CMO-labeled HUVECs adhered as well as LMO-labeled HUVECs (**Figure 5A**). Cells patterned using CMO-DPAC retained their viability and functionality. Cells labeled with CMOs were stained by calcein AM and ethidium homodimer to assess viability (**Supplemental Figure 6**). Differences in viability compared to unlabeled control cells were small (94% vs 97%). Single MDCKs patterned via CMO-DPAC and transferred into Matrigel were able to proliferate and polarize correctly after 5 days of culture (**Figure 5B**). DPAC also provides a means of elaborating patterns of cells into the third dimension (**Figure 5C**). For example, multilayered, multicellular aggregates can be created by alternating layers of cells labeled with complementary CMOs (**Figure 5C**). These experiments demonstrate that the protocol is reproducible, does not negatively affect cell viability or functionality, and yields cellular patterns that can be successfully cultured within a single imaging plane in a 3D ECM.

By providing orthogonal DNA sequences to direct cell adhesion, DPAC provides a means of patterning multiple cell types on a single surface. To implement this feature of DPAC, DNA patterns generated by photolithography must be aligned with respect to one another. Metal fiduciary markers deposited onto the slide allowed for the alignment of multiple photomasks and therefore the patterning of multiple cell types at once. MCF10As stained with different unique dyes were labeled with orthogonal CMOs and patterned to create a visualization of the UC Berkeley and UCSF logos (**Figure 6**). This experiment demonstrates that multiple unique cell populations can be patterned together with high precision and without cross-contamination.

Successful patterning of cells using CMO-DPAC requires high-quality photolithography, sufficient concentration of oligo on the cell surface, a high density of cells over the pattern, and sufficient washing. Failure of any one of these steps affects the final result. **Supplemental Figure 2** includes example images of correct and incorrect photolithography (**Supplemental Figure 2A**), the desired cell density over the pattern to create fully occupied patterns (**Supplemental Figure 2B**), the loss of patterned cells due to overly vigorous pipetting during subsequent steps of DPAC (**Supplemental Figure 2C**), and undesired clumping of cells (**Supplemental Figure 2D**). **Table 1** includes a list of common failure points and the suggested troubleshooting. The use of fluorescent complementary oligos is recommended as a tool for troubleshooting to confirm the presence of patterned DNA on the slide and the presence of CMOs on the cell surface by flow cytometry (see Step 8 of protocol).

#### **FIGURE AND TABLE LEGENDS:**

**Figure 1: Overview of CMO-DPAC protocol.** First, a DNA-patterned slide is created by coating an aldehyde-functionalized glass slide with a positive photoresist, covering it with a transparency mask in the desired pattern, and exposing it to UV light. The UV-exposed photoresist is washed away with developer, leaving exposed regions of the aldehyde slide and allowing the binding of amine-functionalized DNA to the surface. Cells are then labeled with CMOs and flowed over the surface. The DNA on the cell membrane hybridizes to the DNA on the surface, resulting in adhesion.

**Figure 2: Cells are labeled with CMOs in a stepwise process.** First, the cholesterol-modified Universal Anchor Strand is pre-hybridized with the Adapter Strand. Next, the Universal Anchor + Adapter solution is mixed with the cell suspension. The cholesterol on the Universal Anchor + Adapter complex inserts into the cell membrane. After incubation, the cholesterol-modified Universal Co-Anchor Strand is added to the cell suspension, where it hybridizes with the Universal Anchor Strand and inserts into the cell membrane. The addition of the second cholesterol molecule increases the net hydrophobicity of the DNA complex and stabilizes it within the membrane<sup>26</sup>. After washing out the excess DNA, the cells are concentrated and added to a PDMS flow cell on top of the patterned surface. The 3' end of the Adapter Strand hybridizes with the Surface DNA Strand on the glass slide, resulting in adhesion to the slide specifically in regions functionalized with complementary DNA.

**Figure 3: Photolithography is used to create the DNA-patterned slides that will ultimately dictate the placement of cells.** (A) Overview of photolithography process. An aldehyde-functionalized slide is spin-coated with a positive photoresist. UV light shines onto the slide through a transparency photomask that is transparent where cell adhesion is desired. After the slide is developed, the regions that were previously exposed to UV light now have exposed aldehyde groups. A 20  $\mu$ M solution of an amine-functionalized DNA oligo is then dropped onto the slide and spread over the patterned regions. The slide is then baked to induce the formation of Schiff bonds (C=N) between the amine and aldehyde groups, a reversible covalent bond<sup>29</sup>. Subsequent reductive amination with 0.25% sodium borohydride in PBS converts the Schiff base to a secondary amine by reductive amination, resulting in an irreversible bond between the DNA and the slide. The remaining photoresist can then be removed by rinsing with acetone. (B) This process can be repeated to create multi-component DNA patterns and therefore perform experiments with multiple cell populations. (i) After the first oligo is patterned, the slide is again coated in photoresist and the protocol proceeds as before. Alignment of the photomasks using fiduciary markers is necessary for patterning multiple DNA strands. (ii) Each cell type being patterned differs in the 20-base modular domain of the Adapter Strand. By using orthogonal sets of complementary oligos, multiple cell types can be patterned without cross-adhesion.

**Figure 4: Adhesion of CMO-labeled cells to DNA patterns increases as a function of CMO concentration during labeling.** In this experiment, the Universal Anchor + Adapter Strand (pre-hybridized) and the Universal Co-Anchor were used at equal concentrations. Concentration refers to the concentration of CMO in the cell suspension during CMO labeling of cells. (A) Quantification of the percentage of 15  $\mu$ m diameter DNA spots that were occupied by CMO-labeled MCF10A cells as a function of CMO concentration during cell labeling. Data represented as the mean  $\pm$  standard deviation from three experiments. (B) Representative images of the DNA patterns (magenta) and adhered MCF10As (cyan) at different concentrations of CMO. Scale bar = 100  $\mu$ m.

**Figure 5: CMO-DPAC can be used to create two-dimensional cell patterns that can subsequently be embedded into a three-dimensional hydrogel for culture and/or layered to create multilayered structures.** (A) Direct comparison between CMO-labeled human umbilical vein

endothelial cells (HUVECs) and LMO-labeled HUVECs adhered to a linear DNA pattern. Both methods of cell labeling result in nearly 100% occupancy of the DNA pattern. **(B)** Single Madin-Darby Canine Kidney cells (MDCKs) expressing H2B-RFP were patterned onto 15  $\mu\text{m}$  diameter spots spaced 200  $\mu\text{m}$  apart and subsequently embedded in Matrigel. After 120 h of culture, the resulting epithelial cysts were fixed and stained for E-cadherin, actin, and collagen IV. Spheroid in white box is shown in detail. Scale bar = 50  $\mu\text{m}$ . **(C)** Multilayered cellular structures can be created by labeling separate cell populations with complementary Adapter Strands and patterning sequentially so that each new addition of cells adheres to the cell layer before it. **(i)** A schematic of the sequential patterning of cell populations to create multilayered structures. **(ii)** Three-layered cell aggregates of MCF10As (visualized using dyes) were created using this process. Scale bar = 50  $\mu\text{m}$ .

**Figure 6: Multiple cell types can be patterned without cross-contamination or loss of adhesion.** Multiple amine-modified DNA oligos were patterned sequentially onto an aldehyde slide and aligned through use of metal fiduciary markers. Three populations of MCF10As (cyan, magenta, yellow) were stained with unique dyes labeled with complementary CMOs, and patterned onto the slide, resulting in an image of the UC Berkeley and UCSF logos. Scale bar 1 mm.

**Supplemental Figure 1: Example images of the benchtop photolithography setup.** **(A)** Slide on spin coater, covered with positive photoresist, before spin coating. **(B)** Picture of transparency photomask. **(C)** During exposure, the photomask is sandwiched between the photoresist-coated slide and a glass disc. **(D)** Housing for UV lamp was made out of a re-purposed sharps container. **(E)** Slide immersed in developer solution. **(F)** Developed slide. **(G)** Amine-modified DNA solution spread on patterned regions of the slide. **(H)** PDMS flow cells placed on top of patterned regions of the slide.

**Supplemental Figure 2: Some examples of common failures of this protocol.** **(A)** **(i)** Under-baking before UV exposure or over-developing features post-exposure can result in features that have jagged edges and may be irregular in size. **(ii)** An example of a correctly photopatterned slide that has clean edges around features, uniform feature size, and no obvious cracks in the pattern. Scale bar = 50  $\mu\text{m}$ . **(B)** Cell density is critical to patterning efficiency. When observing the cells on top of the pattern under a microscope, few gaps should exist between cells, as evidenced by the example image on the left. Scale bar = 50  $\mu\text{m}$ . **(C)** Patterned cells can be sensitive to fluid forces arising from overly vigorous pipetting, which can damage and dislodge the patterned cells. Multilayered cell aggregates are particularly vulnerable, as one cell at the bottom is supporting a structure of multiple cells. **(i)** An array of cell aggregates successfully embedded into Matrigel. **(ii)** A grid of cell aggregates that dislodged as a result of pipetting viscous Matrigel too vigorously. **(D)** Clumping of cells can occur, particularly with epithelial cells. These clumps are usually homotypic but can be heterotypic (cells adhering to already patterned cells of a different type) if the cells are particularly sticky. Image shows three different populations of MCF10As were patterned onto an array composed of three different single-cell sized DNA spots (15  $\mu\text{m}$ ). Most DNA spots have 2-4 cells attached. Clumping can be resolved by EDTA treatment or by filtering out the clumps before patterning. Scale bar = 100  $\mu\text{m}$ .

**Supplemental Figure 3: Overlapping photopatterns results in presence of both oligos at reduced concentration.** Two orthogonal amine-modified oligos were photopatterned sequentially, first a vertical line (Strand 1), followed by a horizontal line that overlapped it (Strand 2). The oligos were then visualized by hybridization with fluorescent complementary oligos. (A) Fluorescence image of Strand 1. (B) Quantification of the fluorescence profile of Strand 1 over a 100  $\mu\text{m}$  vertical line spanning the overlap. (C) Fluorescence image of Strand 2. (D) Quantification of the fluorescence profile of Strand 2 over a 100  $\mu\text{m}$  horizontal line spanning the overlap. Scale bar = 50  $\mu\text{m}$ .

**Supplemental Figure 4: Quantification of DNA complexes on the cell surface as a function of CMO labeling concentration.** HUVECs were labeled with different concentrations of CMO solution, washed, and then incubated with a fluorescent complementary strand. An MESF (Molecules of Equivalent Soluble Fluorochrome) microsphere kit was used to do quantitative flow cytometry and estimate the number of DNA complexes on the cell surface as a function of CMO concentration during labeling.

**Supplemental Figure 5: CMO labeling does not stimulate TLR9 response.** An experiment was carried out to see whether CMO labeling would trigger the DNA-detection mechanism of TLR9 and whether this would be affected by CpGs in the Adapter Strand sequence. HEK cells expressing mouse TLR9 were incubated overnight with 0.2  $\mu\text{M}$  of either ODN 1826 (a CpG-containing TLR9 agonist), CMO Universal Anchor + Universal Co-Anchor + Adapter Strand containing the same sequence as ODN 1826 (CMO-CpG), or CMO Universal Anchor + Universal Co-Anchor + Adapter Strand containing a similar sequence but with replacement of the CpGs with GpCs (CMO-GpC). TLR9 stimulation would result in the production of SEAP (secreted embryonic alkaline phosphatase). SEAP secretion was quantified by a colorimetric assay (absorbance). Treatment conditions were compared to resting cells that were only treated with PBS. Incubation with CMO-GpC did not stimulate TLR9 expression. Incubation with CMO-CpG was slightly higher than resting cells but much lower than ODN-1826.

**Supplemental Figure 6: Viability of cells after CMO labeling process.** To assess how the protocol impacts viability, HUVECs were split into four populations: one remained on ice for 1 h, one was mock-labeled with PBS but otherwise taken through all centrifuge and wash steps, one was labeled with CMOs, and one was labeled with CMOs and filtered through a 40  $\mu\text{m}$  filter to remove clumps. The cells were then stained with calcein AM and ethidium homodimer to assess the number of alive and dead cells. All treatments resulted in significantly decreased viability than the ice control (one-way ANOVA with Tukey post-hoc analysis), but median viability for CMO-labeling (with or without filtering) was about 94%. Data collected from three independent experiments. \* =  $p < 0.05$ . \*\*\*\* =  $p < 0.0001$

**Table 1: A troubleshooting guide to identify and resolve potential failures that can arise from this protocol.** In particular, poor adhesion of cells to the pattern can have many root causes and this guide should help with the identification and resolution of those issues.

**DISCUSSION:**



In this article, we present a detailed protocol for high-resolution patterning of cells in 2D and 3D for in vitro cell culture experiments. Unlike previously published versions of this method, the protocol presented here focuses on usability: it does not require highly specialized equipment and all reagents can be purchased from vendors instead of requiring custom synthesis. Unlike other cell micropatterning methods, this method is rapid and cell-type agnostic: it does not require specific adhesion to extracellular matrix proteins<sup>15</sup>. Cells patterned by CMO-DPAC can be embedded within an extracellular matrix such as Matrigel or collagen, resulting in 3D cultures with much higher spatial resolution than is currently possible with extrusion printing-based methods<sup>22</sup>. CMO-DPAC can be used to create hundreds to thousands of microscopic features per slide, allowing for many replicates to be performed at the same time.

One of the most important parameters in the success of this protocol is the density of cells added to the flow cells on top of the patterned slide. Ideally, the density should be at least 25 million cells/mL. When loaded into the flow cells, this density of cells results in a nearly close-packed monolayer of cells above the pattern (**Supplemental Figure 2B**). These high cell densities maximize the probability that a cell will settle directly on top of a DNA spot and adhere. Reducing the cell density will decrease the overall patterning efficiency. Another critical step in this protocol is thoroughly re-suspending the cells in PBS or serum-free media before adding the CMO solution. The CMOs partition very rapidly into cell membranes and adding the CMO solution directly to a cell pellet will result in heterogeneous labeling of cells. After adding the CMO solution to the cell suspension, it is important to mix thoroughly by pipetting so that the cells are uniformly labeled with the CMOs. After the incubations, it is necessary to thoroughly wash out the excess CMOs through multiple centrifugation and wash steps. Excess free CMO present in the cell suspension will bind to the patterned amine-modified DNA on the glass slide, blocking hybridization and adhesion of the CMO-modified cells in suspension. Time is also a key consideration for this protocol. It is important to work as quickly as possible when using CMOs and to keep the cells on ice in order to minimize internalization of the CMOs and maximize cell viability. Flow cytometry experiments have shown that CMOs do not persist as long on the cell surface as LMOs, with 25% loss of CMO complexes over two hours of incubation on ice<sup>36</sup>. Furthermore, the viability of cells will decrease as the cell handling time increases. Viability can be maximized by working quickly, keeping cells on ice, using ice-cold reagents, and using serum-free media to provide some nutrients.

Although CMO-DPAC can be a powerful way of studying cell biology by patterning cells with high precision, it does have its limitations. CMO-DPAC experiments can be challenging, particularly as the experimental complexity is added with multiple cell types, layers, or 3D cell culture (**Supplemental File 1**). Experimental failures can be common when starting this protocol, as described in **Table 1**. Therefore, we recommend that users institute quality control checks (confirming that DNA is present on the slide, confirming that cells are sufficiently labeled with DNA (Step 8), confirming that excess cells have been thoroughly washed away, etc.) to make sure that the experiment succeeds and to identify steps that may require further optimization. We hope that the information provided in this manuscript and its supplemental files will help facilitate any required troubleshooting.

Cholesterol is a bioactive molecule whose internalization may influence cell metabolism, gene expression, and membrane fluidity<sup>37,38</sup>. A previous study compared the effects on gene expression of CMO- and LMO-labeled cells using single cell RNA sequencing. CMO-labeled HEK cells had altered gene expression compared to unlabeled and LMO-labeled cells<sup>36</sup>. Labeling cells with CMOs resulted in the differential expression (> 1.5-fold) of eight genes relative to unlabeled controls, including AP2B1, which has been linked to cholesterol and sphingolipid transport (GeneCards), and MALAT1, a long non-coding RNA that regulates cholesterol accumulation<sup>39</sup>. While minor, these transcriptional responses may nevertheless be of concern if the experiment in question is studying metabolism, membrane dynamics, or other cholesterol-associated pathways in cells.

This protocol is flexible and can be adjusted to meet the needs of each experiment. Because the CMO inserts itself into the lipid membrane instead of using any specific receptor, the method is cell type agnostic (HUVECs, MCF10As, HEKs, and MDCKs have been demonstrated here). Although cholesterol is a different hydrophobic anchor than our previously published LMOs, we have thus far found them to behave similarly. Thus, we would expect the CMOs to work with any of the wide variety of cell types that we have previously published with LMOs, including but not limited to neural stem cells, fibroblasts, peripheral blood mononuclear cells, tumor cells, and primary mammary epithelial cells<sup>6,23,27,29,36</sup>. CMO labeling does not stimulate TLR9, suggesting that the protocol is compatible with immune cells. Membrane incorporation of the CMO is a function of total cell size and the degree of negative charge in the cell glycocalyx<sup>35</sup>. Thus, we have included a protocol (Step 8) for testing the extent of membrane incorporation that is amenable to rapid optimization. The specific features of each cell pattern will inevitably vary based on the experimental design (see **Supplemental File 1** for more guidance). Although the photopatterning protocol described above for patterning the DNA is recommended, any method of spatially confining droplets of amine-DNA solution should work, such as the use of high-resolution droplet printers. The pattern resolution and minimum feature spacing will vary based on the method used. It is also theoretically possible to combine the DNA-photopatterning sections of this protocol with other methods that have been used to label cells with DNA, such as with DNA hybridized to membrane-expressed zinc fingers<sup>40</sup>, using NHS-conjugated DNA<sup>41</sup>, and reacting azido sialic acid residues on the cell surface with phosphine-conjugated DNA<sup>42</sup>. CMO-DPAC can be applied to a variety of experiments that require tight control over cell-cell spacing, including studies of the interactions between pairs of cells, co-culture experiments looking at the transfer of signals from “sender” cells to “receiver” cells, and investigations of the effect of nearby extracellular cues on stem cell differentiation<sup>6,29</sup>. The method can also be used to create microtissues that can be used to study cell migration in three dimensions, the self-organization of cells into tissues<sup>23,27</sup>, and the dynamic interplay between cells and the ECM<sup>27</sup>. We hope that this protocol will provide researchers with an accessible platform to explore new applications of high-resolution DNA-based cell patterning in their own labs.

#### **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS:**

The authors would like to thank Jeremy Garcia for testing this protocol and Bhushan Kharbikar for providing training on the equipment at the UCSF Biomedical Micro and Nanotechnology Core. This research was supported in part by grants from the Department of Defense Breast

Cancer Research Program (W81XWH-10-1-1023 and W81XWH-13-1-0221), NIH (U01CA199315, DP2 HD080351-01, 1R01CA190843-01, 1R21EB019181-01A, and 1R21CA182375-01A1), the NSF (MCB1330864), and the UCSF Center for Cellular Construction (DBI-1548297), an NSF Science and Technology Center. O.J.S was funded by an NSF Graduate Research Fellowship, a Siebel scholarship, and a P.E.O. Scholarship. Z.J.G and A.R.A. are Chan-Zuckerberg BioHub Investigators.

#### **DISCLOSURES:**

Z.J.G. is an advisor and equity holder in Provenance Biosciences.

#### **REFERENCES:**

1. Kreeger, P. K., Strong, L. E., Masters, K. S. Engineering approaches to study cellular decision-making. *Annual Review of Biomedical Engineering*. (December 2017), 49–72 (2018).
2. Goubko, C. a., Cao, X. Patterning multiple cell types in co-cultures: A review. *Materials Science and Engineering C*. **29** (6), 1855–1868 (2009).
3. Sun, W. et al. The bioprinting roadmap. *Biofabrication*. **12** (2), 022002 (2020).
4. Liu, W. F., Chen, C. S. Cellular and multicellular form and function. *Advanced Drug Delivery Reviews*. **59** (13), 1319–1328 (2007).
5. Duffy, R. M., Sun, Y., Feinberg, A. W. Understanding the role of ECM protein composition and geometric micropatterning for engineering human skeletal muscle. *Annals of Biomedical Engineering*. **44** (6), 2076–2089 (2016).
6. Chen, S. et al. Interrogating cellular fate decisions with high-throughput arrays of multiplexed cellular communities. *Nature Communications*. **7**, 10309 (2016).
7. Shaya, O. et al. Cell-cell contact area affects notch signaling and notch-dependent patterning. *Developmental Cell*. **40** (5), 505–511.e6 (2017).
8. Rao, N. et al. A co-culture device with a tunable stiffness to understand combinatorial cell–cell and cell–matrix interactions. *Integrative Biology*. **5** (11), 1344 (2013).
9. Sriraghavan, V., Desai, R. A., Kwon, Y., Mrksich, M., Chen, C. S. Micropatterned dynamically adhesive substrates for cell migration. *Langmuir*. **26** (22), 17733–17738 (2010).
10. Wong, L., Pegan, J. D., Gabela-Zuniga, B., Khine, M., McCloskey, K. E. Leaf-inspired microcontact printing vascular patterns. *Biofabrication*. **9** (2), 021001 (2017).
11. Chen, T. H. et al. Directing tissue morphogenesis via self-assembly of vascular mesenchymal cells. *Biomaterials*. **33** (35), 9019–9026 (2012).
12. Laurent, J. et al. Convergence of microengineering and cellular self-organization towards functional tissue manufacturing. *Nature Biomedical Engineering*. **1** (12), 939–956 (2017).
13. Lin, C., Khetani, S. R. Micropatterned co-cultures of human hepatocytes and stromal cells for the assessment of drug clearance and drug-drug interactions. *Current Protocols in Toxicology*. **2017** (May), 1–23 (2017).
14. Hui, E. E., Bhatia, S. N. Micromechanical control of cell-cell interactions. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*. **104** (14), 5722–5726 (2007).
15. D’Arcangelo, E., McGuigan, A. P. Micropatterning strategies to engineer controlled cell and tissue architecture in vitro. *BioTechniques*. **58** (1), 13–23 (2015).
16. Martinez-Rivas, A., González-Quijano, G. K., Proa-Coronado, S., Séverac, C., Dague, E. Methods of micropatterning and manipulation of cells for biomedical applications.

966 *Micromachines*. **8** (12), (2017).

967 17. Lee, S. et al. Simple lithography-free single cell micropatterning using laser-cut stencils.

968 *Journal of Visualized Experiments*. (158), e60888 (2020).

969 18. Strale, P. O. et al. Multiprotein printing by light-induced molecular adsorption. *Advanced*

970 *Materials*. **28** (10), 2024–2029 (2016).

971 19. Melero, C. et al. Light-induced molecular adsorption of proteins using the primo system

972 for micro-patterning to study cell responses to extracellular matrix proteins. *Journal of*

973 *Visualized Experiments*. **2019** (152) e60092 (2019).

974 20. Reid, J. A., Mollica, P. M., Bruno, R. D., Sachs, P. C. Consistent and reproducible cultures

975 of large-scale 3D mammary epithelial structures using an accessible bioprinting platform. *Breast*

976 *Cancer Research*. 1–13 (2018).

977 21. Wang, Z., Lee, S. J., Cheng, H.-J., Yoo, J. J., Atala, A. 3D bioprinted functional and

978 contractile cardiac tissue constructs. *Acta Biomaterialia*. **70**, 48-56 (2018).

979 22. Miri, A. K. et al. Effective bioprinting resolution in tissue model fabrication. *Lab on a*

980 *Chip*. **19** (11), 2019–2037 (2019).

981 23. Todhunter, M. E. et al. Programmed synthesis of three-dimensional tissues. *Nature*

982 *Methods*. **12** (10), 975–981 (2015).

983 24. Todhunter, M. E., Weber, R. J., Farlow, J., Jee, N. Y., Gartner, Z. J. Fabrication of 3D

984 microtissue arrays by DNA programmed assembly of cells. *Current Protocols in Chemical*

985 *Biology*. **8** (3), 147–178 (2016).

986 25. Csizmar, C. M., Petersburg, J. R., Wagner, C. R. Programming cell-cell interactions

987 through non-genetic membrane engineering. *Cell Chemical Biology*. **25** (8), 931–940 (2018).

988 26. Weber, R. J., Liang, S. I., Selden, N. S., Desai, T. A., Gartner, Z. J. Efficient targeting of

989 fatty-acid modified oligonucleotides to live cell membranes through stepwise assembly.

990 *Biomacromolecules*. **15** (12), 4621–4626 (2014).

991 27. Hughes, A. J. et al. Engineered tissue folding by mechanical compaction of the

992 mesenchyme. *Developmental Cell*. **44** (2), 165-178.e6 (2018).

993 28. Weber, R. J. et al. Rapid organoid reconstitution by chemical micromolding. *ACS*

994 *Biomaterials Science & Engineering*. **2** (11), 1851–1855 (2016).

995 29. Scheideler, O. J. et al. Recapitulating complex biological signaling environments using a

996 multiplexed, DNA-patterning approach. *Science Advances*. **6** (12), eaay5696 (2020).

997 30. Viola, J. M. et al. Guiding cell network assembly using shape-morphing hydrogels.

998 *Advanced materials (Deerfield Beach, Fla.)*. **2002195**, e2002195 (2020).

999 31. Mohammad, A., Davis, M., Aprelev, A., Ferrone, F. A. Note: Professional grade

1000 microfluidics fabricated simply. *Review of Scientific Instruments*. **87** (10), 1–4 (2016).

1001 32. Lee, O. J., Chuah, H. S., Umar, R., Chen, S. K., Yusra, A. F. I. Construction of cost effective

1002 homebuilt spin coater for coating amylose-amylopectin thin films. *Journal of Fundamental and*

1003 *Applied Sciences*. **9** (25), 279 (2018).

1004 33. Webb, K., Hlady, V., Tresco, P.A. Relative importance of surface wettability and charged

1005 functional groups on NIH 3T3 fibroblast attachment, spreading, and cytoskeletal organization.

1006 *Journal of Biomedical Materials Research*. **41** (3), 422–430 (1998).

1007 34. Microchem SU-8 2000 Permanent Epoxy Negative Photoresist. Processing Guidelines

1008 for: SU-8 2025, SU-8 2035, SU-8 2050, SU-8 2075. 1–5, at <[https://kayakuam.com/wp-](https://kayakuam.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/SU-82000DataSheet2025thru2075Ver4.pdf)

1009 [content/uploads/2019/09/SU-82000DataSheet2025thru2075Ver4.pdf](https://kayakuam.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/SU-82000DataSheet2025thru2075Ver4.pdf)> (2019).

35. Palte, M. J., Raines, R. T. Interaction of nucleic acids with the glycocalyx. *Journal of the American Chemical Society*. **134** (14), 6218–6223 (2012).
36. McGinnis, C. S. et al. MULTI-seq: sample multiplexing for single-cell RNA sequencing using lipid-tagged indices. *Nature Methods*. **16** (7), 619–626 (2019).
37. Maxfield, F. R., van Meer, G. Cholesterol, the central lipid of mammalian cells. *Current Opinion in Cell Biology*. **22** (4), 422–429 (2010).
38. Luo, J., Yang, H., Song, B. L. Mechanisms and regulation of cholesterol homeostasis. *Nature Reviews Molecular Cell Biology*. **21** (4), 225–245 (2020).
39. Liu, L., Tan, L., Yao, J., Yang, L. Long non-coding RNA MALAT1 regulates cholesterol accumulation in ox-LDL-induced macrophages via the microRNA-17-5p/ABCA1 axis. *Molecular Medicine Reports*. **21** (4), 1761–1770 (2020).
40. Mali, P., Aach, J., Lee, J. H., Levner, D., Nip, L., Church, G. M. Barcoding cells using cell-surface programmable DNA-binding domains. *Nature Methods*. **10** (5), 403–406 (2013).
41. Hsiao, S. C. et al. Direct cell surface modification with DNA for the capture of primary cells and the investigation of myotube formation on defined patterns. *Langmuir*. **25** (12), 6985–6991 (2009).
42. Gartner, Z. J., Bertozzi, C. R. Programmed assembly of 3-dimensional microtissues with defined cellular conductivity. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. (17), 1–5 (2009).

Figure 1




Figure 2





Figure 3

A



B






Figure 4






Figure 5

A




B



C

(i)



(ii)




Figure 6



Result	Possible Cause(s)	Suggested Fixes
Photolithography -features are cracked	Inconsistent or inadequate soft-bake	Increase time of soft-bake up to 3 minutes; verify actual temperature of hotplate and increase temperature as necessary
Photolithography – features are not sharp or have photoresist remaining within them	Under-development	Increase time that slide spends in developer solution; incorporate gentle agitation
Photolithography – features inconsistent across slide	UV light may not be centered or not focused properly	Adjust UV light setup to ensure collimated light of uniform intensity
Cells don't adhere to patterned spots with high efficiency	Not enough DNA on surface	Confirm that DNA is present on surface by hybridizing the slide with fluorescent complementary oligos and then imaging under microscope
	Cells are inadequately labeled with CMO	Add fluorescent complementary oligos to cell suspension and confirm fluorescence via flow cytometry
	Not enough cells over pattern	Collect cells by washing out from PDMS flow cell, centrifuge, and re-suspend in lower volume to concentrate the cells
	Too much remaining CMO in cell suspension, hybridizing with DNA on slide	Add another wash step. Be sure to remove as much supernatant as possible with each wash.
	Too much internalization of CMO due to time and temperature	Work quickly after labeling the cells with CMO; keep cells and slide on ice and use ice-cold reagents
Cells clump	Cells were not adequately separated during trypsinization	Use PBS + 0.04% EDTA during cell washes; pass cell suspension through 35 $\mu$ m filter before the final wash

Cells adhere non-specifically	If in one specific area – could be due to scratches on slide, misalignment of PDMS flow cells, or spillage of DNA outside the pattern region	Avoid scratches, be careful to align the PDMS flow cells to the pattern region
	If cells are adhering everywhere – inadequate blocking or washing	Add in more washes after patterning the cells; pipet more vigorously during washes; block with 1% BSA for longer before starting cell patterning; silanize slide (optional step 3) or confirm silanization was successful by measuring contact angle of water droplet
Bubbles form within flow cell	Pipetting errors, uneven hydrophilic surface created during plasma oxidation	If bubbles are small, add PBS to the inlet of the flow cell and they may be washed out. If bubbles are larger, apply gentle pressure to the PDMS flow cell, nudging the bubbles towards the inlet or outlet.
Cells initially adhere to pattern but are removed during washes, patterning of other cell types, or adding the hydrogel precursor	The shear forces from pipetting too vigorously can cause the cells to detach from the surface	Pipet more gently during subsequent washes, rounds of cell patterning, or adding hydrogel precursors. Because the hydrogel precursors are viscous, they are more likely to cause the pattern to dislodge, so take extra caution. Multilayered structures tend to be top-heavy and are more susceptible to being dislodged.
	Hydrogel sticks to slide	Confirm hydrophobicity of slide using contact angle measurements
		Use razor blade to lift PDMS fully on both edges, allowing PBS to float under the tissue

Tissue deforms during 3D transfer		This can happen with pure collagen hydrogels – consider adjusting the protein concentration or composition of hydrogel
	Cells don't transfer with the hydrogel and remain on the slide	Increase Turbo DNase concentration or increase incubation time
	Hydrogel is not solid enough	Increase incubation time and/or the gelation mechanism for the hydrogel in question (e.g. for collagen, make sure pH is correct)
	Hydrogel tears upon removing PDMS	Make PDMS flow cells hydrophilic using plasma oxidation before beginning experiment so that they detach easily upon adding media. Use forceps very gently to detach the PDMS.

Name of Material/ Equipment	Company	Catalog Number	Comments/Description
	Thermo		
2-well Chambered Coverglass w/ non-removable wells	Fisher Scientific	155379	
Acetic Acid	Sigma-Aldrich	A6283	
Adapter with External SM1 Threads and Internal SM3 Thread	ThorLabs	SM3A1	
Aldehyde Functionalized Slides	Schott	Nexterion Slide AL	Store under dry conditions after opening.
	Fisher		
All Plastic Syringes, 1 mL	Scientific	14-817-25	
Amine-Modified DNA Oligo	IDT	n/a	See Supplemental File 1 for suggested sequences.
Aspheric Condenser Lens	ThorLabs	ACL7560	
Borosilicate Disc, 6in Diameter X 1/2in Thick	Chemglass	CG-1906-23	
Cell Culture Dishes 60x15 mm style	Corning	353002	
Cholesterol-Modified Oligo	IDT	n/a	See Supplemental File 1 for suggested sequences.
Diamond Scribe	Excelta	475B	
DNA Oligonucleotide	IDT	n/a	See Supplemental File 1 for suggested sequences.
	Thermo		
	Fisher		
DPBS, no calcium, no magnesium	Scientific	14190250	
	Sigma-		
Isopropyl Alcohol	Aldrich	278475	
Matrigel Matrix, Growth Factor Reduced	Corning	354230	
Methylene Chloride	Fisher		
(Stabilized/Certified ACS)	Scientific	D37-4	
	Kayaku		
	Advanced		
MF-321 Developer	Materials	n/a	

	Kayaku Advanced		
Microposit S1813 Positive Photoresist	Materials	n/a	
Ø3" Adjustable Lens Tube, 0.81"			
Travel	ThorLabs	SM3V10	
Oven	Thermo		
PE-50 Compact Benchtop Plasma	Scientific	51-028-112H	
Cleaning System	Plasma		
	Etch	PE-50	
	CAD/Art		
Photomask (custom)	Services	n/a	Minimum feature size guaranteed by CAD/Art Services is 10 mi
	Fisher		
Razor Blades	Scientific	12-640	
RCT Basic Hot Plate	IKA	3810001	
	University		
Silicon Wafer (100 mm)	Wafer	590	
	Acros		
Sodium Borohydride, 98%, granules	Organics	419471000	
Spin Coater Kit	Instras	SCK-200	This is a low cost option, but any spin coater that can maintain
	Microche	Y111074	
SU-8 2075	m	0500L1GL	
	Microche	Y020100	
SU-8 Developer	m	4000L1PE	
Sylgard 184 Silicone Elastomer Kit	Dow	2646340	
	Sigma-		
Syringe Needles	Aldrich	Z192341	
T-Cube LED Driver, 1200 mA Max			
Drive Current	ThorLabs	LEDD1B	
Tridecafluoro-1,1,2,2-tetrahydrooctyl			
dimethylchlorosilane	Gelest	SIT8170.0	
	Sigma-		
Triethylamine	Aldrich	90335	



Turbo DNase	Thermo	
Tweezers Style N7	Fisher	
UV LED (365 nm, 190 mW (Min)	Scientific	AM2238
Mounted LED, 700 mA)	VWR	100488-324
Wafer Tweezers	ThorLabs	M365L2
WHEATON Dry-Seal vacuum	Agar	
desiccator	Scientific	T5063
	Millipore	
	Sigma	W365885

The curved shape of these tweezers is essential for delicately p



crons.

a speed of 3000 rpm will suffice.

icking up the PDMS flow cells containing patterned tissues.

We would like to thank Dr. Bajaj and our reviewers for their helpful feedback. We have addressed the reviewers' specific comments both here and in our revisions to the manuscript. This included adding some new details to the protocol, adding in an "Experimental Design" supplementary document to help users understand the possibilities and limitations of a CMO-DPAC experiment, and adding in four new supplementary figures containing new experimental data to address some specific reviewer comments.

We have also made minor changes in word choice and sentence structure to enhance clarity and brevity, as reflected in the Track Changes. We have also formatted the manuscript to match JoVE standards. The main figures were slightly adjusted for font and other minor aesthetic changes. The supplemental files were re-ordered and re-numbered.

**TITLE:**

Simple, affordable, and modular patterning of cells using DNA

**Editorial comments:**

Changes to be made by the Author(s):

1. Please take this opportunity to thoroughly proofread the manuscript to ensure that there are no spelling or grammar issues. The JoVE editor will not copy-edit your manuscript and any errors in the submitted revision may be present in the published version.

[We have proofread the manuscript.](#)

2. Please format the manuscript as: paragraph Indentation: 0 for both left and right and special: none, Line spacings: single. Please include a single line space between each step, substep and note in the protocol section. Please use Calibri 12 points

[We have altered the paragraph indentations, line spacing, and fonts to meet JoVE's requirements.](#)

3. From the title please remove the words like simple and affordable to make the title concise.

[We agree that the title could be more concise. We have decided to revise it to "Simple, affordable, and modular patterning of cells using DNA", which describes the general approach \(patterning cells with DNA as an adhesive\) and highlights the key innovations described in this paper compared to our previous publications.](#)

4. Please rephrase the Short Abstract/Summary to clearly describe the protocol and its applications in complete sentences between 10-50 words: "Presented here is a protocol ..."

[We have rephrased the Summary to be in complete sentences](#)

5. JoVE cannot publish manuscripts containing commercial language. Please remove all commercial language from your manuscript and use generic terms instead. All commercial products should be sufficiently referenced in the Table of Materials and Reagents.

For example: Turbo DNase, SCK-100, Instras Scientific, etc.

We have removed the commercial language.

6. DPAC is this commercial? If yes, please use generic term.

DPAC is not a commercial product. It is a technique developed by our lab.

7. Please ensure that all text in the protocol section is written in the imperative tense as if telling someone how to do the technique (e.g., "Do this," "Ensure that," etc.). The actions should be described in the imperative tense in complete sentences wherever possible. Avoid usage of phrases such as "could be," "should be," and "would be" throughout the Protocol. Any text that cannot be written in the imperative tense may be added as a "Note."

We have edited the protocol to use only the imperative tense.

8. The Protocol should contain only action items that direct the reader to do something.

We have revised the protocol to only include actions and moved other information to notes or to a supplemental Experimental Design document.

9. Please ensure you answer the "how" question, i.e., how is the step performed?

We have ensured that the "how" details are clear for each step.

10. 2.1: How do you create fiducial markers?

We added more detail to the fiducial marker suggestion and added alternatives into the supplemental Experimental Design document.

11. There is a 10-page limit for the Protocol, but there is a 3-page limit for filmable content. Please highlight 3 pages or less of the Protocol (including headings and spacing) that identifies the essential steps of the protocol for the video, i.e., the steps that should be visualized to tell the most cohesive story of the Protocol.

We have highlighted 3 pages' worth of the protocol for filming.

12. Please obtain explicit copyright permission to reuse any figures from a previous publication. Explicit permission can be expressed in the form of a letter from the editor or a link to the editorial policy that allows re-prints. Please upload this information as a .doc or .docx file to your Editorial Manager account. The Figure must be cited appropriately in the Figure Legend, i.e. "This figure has been modified from [citation]."

- We have not reused any figures from previous publications.

13. As we are a methods journal, please ensure that the Discussion explicitly cover the following in detail in 3-6 paragraphs with citations:

- a) Critical steps within the protocol
- b) Any modifications and troubleshooting of the technique
- c) Any limitations of the technique
- d) The significance with respect to existing methods
- e) Any future applications of the technique

We have covered these topics in the Discussion.

14. Please remove trademark (™) and registered (®) symbols from the Table of Equipment and Materials.

- We have removed these symbols from the materials table.

15. Please sort the materials table in alphabetical order.

- We have sorted the materials table in alphabetical order.

---

### **Reviewers' comments:**

#### **Reviewer #1:**

Major comments

Compared to the group's previously published protocol (Todhunter et al 2016), the new version of DPAC is indeed simpler, more affordable, and more modular. The rapid patterning of DNA using benchtop photolithography is much simpler and less specialized than the previous method of printing DNA using the Nano eNabler. The labeling of cells with cholesterol-modified oligos instead of lipid-modified oligos greatly reduces the cost of this reagent. And replacing the former "alphabet" of anchor strands with a universal anchor strand makes the technique more modular.

We are confident that the steps listed in the procedure would lead to the described outcome. The authors have demonstrated the feasibility of DPAC in multiple past publications, and their updates are reasonable. For example, their MULTI-seq method (McGinnis et al 2019) has already made use of both cholesterol-modified oligos and the universal anchor strand. While the steps in their procedure are clearly explained, they will benefit greatly from the accompanying video demonstration.

One potential application we would have liked to see the authors discuss is the feasibility of patterning cells permanently expressing surface zinc fingers (Mali et al Nature Methods 2013) instead of cells temporarily labeled with cholesterol-modified oligos. We would find this additional application exciting because it might allow the DNA-patterned surface to guide cell morphology changes (e.g. neurite extension) in addition to the cell's initial placement.

This is a potential exciting idea. We agree it is feasible for cells expressing zinc fingers on their surfaces to be patterned onto DNA-patterned surfaces given sufficiently high expression levels and long enough oligos to span the glycocalyx. Without testing these ideas directly, however, we are unsure whether this would result in cell morphology changes. Moreover, we speculate that a great deal of experimentation would probably be required to ensure that the zinc fingers allow for cell movement (perhaps requiring inside-out signaling, as with integrins and cadherins) instead of simply gluing the cells down onto the surface. Further, oligo addition would have to occur prior to experiment, as adding high concentration of oligo in solution would likely result in binding to both the zinc finger on the cell surface, as well as the complementary strand on the non-living surface, thereby squelching interactions. We added a reference to Mali et al in the discussion.

In their discussion, the authors helpfully note that they previously showed how internalization of the cholesterol-modified oligos can slightly alter gene expression in HEK cells. However, the original DPAC paper (Todhunter et al 2015) mentions that the method also works for immune cells, which can express TLR9, a DNA-detecting receptor especially sensitive to unmethylated CpG dinucleotides. Have the authors determined whether cholesterol-modified oligo labeling triggers TLR9 signaling in immune cells? Importantly, can this TLR9 signaling be avoided by labeling immune cells with CMOs that lack unmethylated CpGs? Although beyond scope, comments on the range of cells for which the method is applicable would be helpful.

- We thank the reviewer for this question, as we too have been meaning to investigate this more directly. We therefore used HEK cells that express mouse TLR9 (HEK-Blue TLR9). These cells produce SEAP (secreted embryonic alkaline phosphatase) in response to NF- $\kappa$ B and AP-1 activation, which happens as a result of TLR9 stimulation by CpG. We exposed the cells overnight to 0.2  $\mu$ M of either ODN 1826 (standard agonist for mouse TLR9), CMO Anchor + Co-Anchor + an Adapter Strand containing the ODN 1826 sequence (CMO-CpG), or CMO Anchor + Co-Anchor + an Adapter Strand that contains a similar sequence but with the CpGs flipped to GpCs (CMO-GpC). We found that the CMO-GpC did not stimulate SEAP production and the CMO-CpG stimulated SEAP production at a much lower rate than ODN 1826. This suggests that the normal CMO labeling process does not result in TLR9 activation, making it safe to use with cells that express TLR9. Although it was a minor effect, we would still recommend that CpG sequences be avoided when designing adapter strands. The data has been added to the paper in Supplemental Figure 5.

#### Minor comments

1 - What are the design rules? Some comments on minimum spot size, spacing, etc. would be helpful.

Since this information would be helpful to new users, but did not quite fit in the protocol, we elected to add a supplemental file outlining the design rules and discussing the various considerations when designing a CMO-DPAC experiment.

2.17 - When patterning oligos with the Nano eNabler, it was presumably possible for two oligo patterns to crisscross. What happens at these intersections if the user tries to do this with the photolithography method? Does the first oligo get destroyed by UV? Are there any reactive sites left for the second oligo?



- To test this, we photopatterned overlapping oligo patterns, first a vertical line and then a horizontal line (Supplemental Figure 3). We then hybridized with complementary fluorescent oligos and then measured fluorescence for 100  $\mu\text{m}$  down the center of the overlap region. We found that the first strand exhibited a mild decrease in fluorescence at the overlap point, suggesting slight DNA degradation by the UV (or a decrease in accessible patterning sites) during the second round of patterning. The second strand patterned did have some signal at the overlap, suggesting that there were still some reactive sites available for the second oligo.

3 - Could you please specify which functional groups present before and after the slide is made hydrophobic?

Before silanization, the aldehydes on the slide surface have been reduced to alcohols. After silanization, the slide is functionalized with fluoroalkyl groups. We added this detail to the protocol.

5.2.2 - This procedure involves multiple cell pelleting steps in low-protein conditions, which can be problematic for cell types prone to adsorbing to the walls of polypropylene tubes (e.g., epithelial cells). For performing DPAC on these cell types, you may want to recommend pre-blocking the polypropylene tubes using something like Biogenex's PowerBlock. The casein in PowerBlock would be less likely than albumin to sequester CMOs.

- Thank you, suggestion added.

6.4 - Are incompletely washed cells more likely to linger on incorrect DNA surfaces or on DNA-free surfaces? This would help a new user know what to expect during the washing process.

- Assuming that the oligos in the experiment are sufficiently orthogonal, incompletely washed cells are equally likely to remain on incorrect DNA surfaces or DNA-free surfaces.

6.5 - For cells in direct contact with the surface template, is there a recommended order for which cells should be patterned first? For example, should the most abundant cells in the pattern be patterned first or last? Should the smallest cell type (e.g. lymphocytes) be patterned first or last?

- We added a note to 6.5 to address this and included it in the experimental design guide (Supplemental File 1). Generally, it is preferred to pattern the least abundant (smallest number of features) cell type first and work your way to the most abundant. It doesn't make a large difference, but occasionally the presence of other cells on the slide can block fluid flow and slightly reduce

pattern adhesion for subsequent layers. In a pattern with few cells of a certain type, it becomes more important that 100% of those spots are actually occupied by the cell of interest. We have not observed any effect of cell size on the optimal patterning order.

7.3 - Are humidified and dry 37°C incubators equally effective? Even in a "dry" 37°C incubator, it seems like there could be a lot of condensation on the ice-cold DPAC slide. Would this condensation disrupt subsequent steps or put the cells in a hypotonic environment?

We have only used humidified 37 °C incubators. Condensation on the slide and flow cells can occur, but we have not found this to be an issue. The hydrogel solution encapsulating the cells at this point may protect the cells from the condensation. To reduce condensation, the cell-patterned slide can be kept at room temperature for a minute or two before being placed in the incubator.

7.4.3 - It seems like a pair of fine-point tweezers would be a safer and more precise way to distribute the PBS and lift the sides of the flow cell.

- Fine point tweezers could be used to help lift the flow cell so that the PBS can be distributed underneath. However, when removing the hydrogel from the slide, it is necessary to slide the hydrogel off the slide instead of lifting it up directly using tweezers. The large flat edge of the razor blade is helpful in translating the PDMS + hydrogel across the slide without distortion.

Table 1 - What are the possible causes and suggested fixes for excessive bubble formation within the flow cell during cell injection and washes?

We have added a row to Table 1 addressing bubbles within the flow cell.

Supplemental File 1 - For designing additional adapter strands, the authors should suggest a protocol for empirically testing orthogonality. We suspect that pairwise mixing of new-adapter-labeled cells with A-through-C'-labeled cells would be a rapid way to confirm orthogonality, as orthogonally-labeled cells should not form clumps with one another.

Thank you for the suggestion! We have used this approach in the past and we added the protocol to Supplemental File 2.

**Reviewer #2:**

## Manuscript Summary:

The manuscript describes a do it yourself protocol for micropatterning cells and assembling microtissues on top using DNA hybridization. The programmed cell adhesions provide high flexibility in terms of the possible structures, the possibility to incorporate multiple cell types and single cell resolution. The method is straightforward and both the reagents as well as the equipment are commercially available and comparatively cheap. All these benefits combined make this method very attractive for producing microtissues. The method is well described and discussed.

## Major Concerns:

None.

## Minor Concerns:

1) The assembled structures should not be named "spheroids" nor "tissues" as they are neither spherical since they are attached to a slide nor include multiple cell types which function as a whole as it is the case in a tissue.

Thank you for suggesting this clarification. We changed the wording to "multicellular aggregates" or "hydrogels" depending on context.

2) 5.3. The number of cells for labeling should be added. As shown in Figure 4, the efficiency depends on the concentration of the DNA strand and it is expected that the number of the cells is an equally important factor.

The number of cells for labeling has been added to 5.2.2.

3) A comment on how generalizable this method is to different cell types would be helpful to the reader. What factors need to be considered in the selection of the cell type?

Thank you for the suggestion. We have now commented on the generalizability of the protocol to different cell types (lines 1057-1061). Most cell types should succeed with this method. One factor to consider is size - for large cell aggregates or tissues, we have found capturing these in a flow-cell by DNA-based adhesion is challenging. For example, labeling the surface of organoids with CMOs did not result in successful patterning. The other factor is the glycocalyx – a high degree of negative charge on the glycocalyx can impeded labeling of cell membranes with lipid-modified oligos.

4) 5.4.1. What the cell viability of the cells after the DNA modification protocol? The filtering of the cells is expected to compromise cell viability and it should be quantified.

- After the DNA modification protocol, HUVECs were found to be ~95% viable by calcein AM/ethidium homodimer live/dead staining. We added this data to Supplemental Figure 6.

5) 6.3. What is the incubation time after each addition of cells to the flow cell?

The cells adhere nearly instantaneously to the slide, so only 30 seconds or so of incubation is required. We added the incubation step to 6.2.

6) 8.1. How many DNA strands per cell are incorporated with this protocol? How does the cell adhesion efficiency depend on the number of DNA strands per cell?

We used MESF (Molecules of Equivalent Soluble Fluorochrome) microspheres to quantify the number of DNA complexes (Anchor + Co-Anchor + Adapter Strand) present on the cell surface as a function of CMO concentration during labeling. The number of DNA complexes on the cell surface increased linearly with CMO concentration. At the highest concentration tested, there were approximately  $1.2 \times 10^6$  DNA complexes per cell. At the  $2 \mu\text{M}$  concentration used throughout the manuscript, there are about  $5 \times 10^5$  DNA complexes per cell. The data is presented in Supplemental File 4.

7) Typo: 8.4. Miz instead of Mix.

- Thanks for catching the typo!

### **Reviewer #3:**

Manuscript Summary:

The manuscript details a new protocol for DNA-templated cell patterning. The method builds upon previous work by a number of the laboratories involved, producing a very useful new solution that is well suited to broad dissemination. Notably, the use of commercially available cholesterol-modified oligonucleotides in a modular format dramatically reduces the cost of entry to this technology. Also, the use of photolithography reagents developed for semiconductor microfabrication, as used here, provides broad accessibility and higher precision compared to many soft lithography techniques. Often, the semiconductor reagents are incompatible with biological components, but here photoresist/UV/developer/acetone appear to be fully compatible with DNA. The manuscript is very well written, providing excellent detail and clear explanations of what is happening chemically in each step. Illustrations are also very well done. This protocol will benefit from

being filmed, since a number of steps appear to involve somewhat delicate manual manipulation (eg. removal of cell-embedded hydrogels).

Major Concerns:

I have no major concerns.

Minor Concerns:


It would be helpful for the authors to share what is known about the limitations of this protocol. What is the maximum number of different cell types that have been demonstrated? What is the maximum number of cell layers that have been stacked in a 3D construct? What is the reason that more cells or more layers have not been used? At what point, if any, does non-specific attachment begin to become an issue? Is there any observable degradation in previously patterned DNA as additional rounds of photopatterning are performed? Again, what is the maximum number of photopatterning rounds that has been demonstrated, and why has additional patterning not been performed? Even if it's simply because it was too arduous and time consuming to add more cell types or patterns, that is a real constraint, and it would be helpful for readers to understand what level of complexity can reasonably be created by this method.

-We have used a maximum number of four different cell types (Scheideler et al Science Advances 2020) and four layers of cells in 3D constructs. The most complex DPAC experiment that we have completed has been 2 cell types x 3 layers. More layers and/or cell types could be done, but it will increase the overall time of the experiment, as patterning the cells and washing them out takes about 10 minutes per cell population added. Non-specific attachment is typically only an issue with dense patterns, as new cells can get stuck behind previously patterned cells. Multi-layered structures experience more shear stress in the flow cell and are prone to being washed away, so we would recommend using a base DNA spot larger than a single cell for any experimental setups that are using three or more layers. We have done up to 10 rounds of photopatterning DNA without an appreciable loss in quality (Scheideler et al 2020), so the limit in terms of photopatterning is simply the amount of time that one wants to spend creating the slide. We added some more discussion of the limitations of the protocol to the discussion section, and also discussed experimental complexity in Supplemental File 1, a new file added regarding CMO-DPAC experimental design.

## Supplemental Figure 1

**A**

Positive Photoresist



**B**

Transparency Photomask




**C**

Glass Disc

Photomask

Slide



**D**

UV Lamp




**E**

Developer Bath




**F**

Developed Slide



**G**

Amine-DNA Solution




**H**

PDMS Flow Cells  
Placed On Top of  
Patterned Regions




## Supplemental Figure 2






Supplemental Figure 3







## Supplemental Figure 4



Supplemental Figure 5



Supplemental Figure 6



## Supplemental File 1 – Experimental Design Considerations

There are many aspects to consider when designing a CMO-DPAC experiment.

**Feature dimensions:** What size features are required? Transparency-style photomasks tend to have a minimum feature size of about 10  $\mu\text{m}$  diameter, and the maximum feature size can be millimeters or centimeters long. To pattern single cells, use DNA spots 10 – 20  $\mu\text{m}$  in diameter (ideal spot size will depend on size of cell). The number of cells adhering to a given DNA spot will increase as the size of the spot increases. The shape of the features can be adjusted to meet the needs of the experiment. Since the DNA is patterned by a photomask, any shape that can be drawn in a computer aided drawing program can become a pattern for cells.

**Spacing of features:** How close should the cells be to each other? To study the interaction between a pair of cells, pattern the single cell sized spots spaced only by a 10  $\mu\text{m}$  gap. To study the interaction between multi-layered aggregates of cells, a spacing of 100-300  $\mu\text{m}$  may be more appropriate. On the other hand, if each individual feature should be treated as an individual replicate and interactions between cells is undesirable, features should be spaced out several hundreds of microns apart. It can be challenging to align multiple oligos with high precision, so consider providing some extra space between features for different cell types. Overlapping features are not recommended, as it results in the presence of both oligos at the overlap region (Supplemental Figure 3), and therefore could have either cell type adhere to that region.

### Arrangement of cells relative to each other:

To create multilayered structures (Figure 5C), start by patterning the first cell population (bottom layer) onto the slide, then add cells that were labeled with an Adapter Strand complementary to the Adapter Strand of the first cell population. After washing away excess cells, the first population of cells will have the second population attached to the sides and top. To add a third layer, add cells labeled with the same Adapter Strand as the first cell population, and repeat for any additional layers, alternating between the two complementary Adapter Strands. The size of the multilayered aggregate will increase with each layer, both upwards and outwards. Since the aggregate is only attached to the slide at the bottom layer, aggregates of 3 or more layers can get top-heavy and prone to being washed away (Supplemental Figure 2C). Thus, we'd recommend using a base DNA spot of at least 30  $\mu\text{m}$  for large multilayered cell aggregates.

If the different cell populations will be arranged in the same layer (Figure 6), orthogonal oligos will be required. For example, for patterning three different cell types, use Adapter Strands A, B, and C (Supplemental File 2). Additionally, multiple orthogonal oligos (complementary to those Adapter Strands) will need to be photopatterned sequentially. Fiducial markers on the aldehyde slide will be required to align the slide with the photomask so that the different features are spaced correctly relative to each other. Fiducial markers can be created in a variety of ways, including by deposition of thin metal films<sup>1</sup>, using acetone-resistant ink or glass scratches to draw fiducial markers, aligning the edges of the photomask with the edges of the

slide (use a mask aligner for best results), or by preserving a photopatterned feature from the first round of photopatterning by using tape to protect it from the acetone wash. When patterning the cells onto the slide (Step 6), start with the least abundant cell population by number of features and work up to the most abundant cell population.

**Culture conditions of patterned cells:** After patterning the cells, the cells can then be cultured in 2D or 3D. The choice of how to culture the patterned cells will depend on the cell behaviors of interest and the timescale of the experiment. Culturing in 2D is simpler and faster – once the cells are patterned, put the slide in a Petri dish and add media. However, the DNA does not keep the patterned cells in place for more than a few hours. Eventually, membrane turnover and the deposition of ECM onto the glass surface will allow cells to migrate and break the original pattern. 3D cell culture opens up a lot of opportunities to observe 3D cell migration, tissue morphogenesis, and the interactions between cells and their ECM. Cells can be cultured for at least a week within the hydrogel, though they too will deviate from the initial pattern as they move and grow. One advantage of this method is that the patterned cells within the hydrogel are all in a single imaging plane, making it easy to observe cell behaviors over time. The downside is that the embedding of cells in the hydrogel for 3D cell culture increases the experiment time (by about 1.5 hours) and increases the failure rate of the experiment, as the transferring of the cell-laden hydrogel from the slide to the second hydrogel droplet can be challenging and requires practice.

**Experimental Complexity:** The more unique cell types that are patterned, the longer a given experiment will take, both with the photopatterning of the slides and with the patterning of the cells. As many as ten orthogonal oligos have been photopatterned successfully onto the same slide<sup>1</sup>. However, this can take several days of photopatterning to complete. Moreover, since it takes about 10 minutes per cell population to pattern the cells onto the slide and wash excess cells out (Step 6), increasing the number of cell populations in an experiment will increase the overall length of the experiment and potentially decrease cell viability. We have patterned up to 6 cell populations (2 photopatterned oligos x 3 layers each) at once, and a maximum of 4 cell layers at a time. More complexity is certainly possible, but there are certainly tradeoffs in terms of experimental effort and the likelihood of success. Complicated CMO-DPAC experiments can be more complicated to achieve and will likely require some optimization from the user.

We'd recommend learning CMO-DPAC by starting with just one or two cell populations, and then include additional cell populations if desired after the technique has been mastered.

1. Scheideler, O.J. *et al.* Recapitulating complex biological signaling environments using a multiplexed, DNA-patterning approach. *Science Advances*. **6** (12), eaay5696, doi: 10.1126/sciadv.aay5696 (2020).

## Supplemental File 2: Oligo Sequences Used

All oligos listed below were ordered from IDT. All oligos were resuspended in TE buffer at a concentration of 100  $\mu$ M.

Universal Anchor: 5'-TGAATCTCTGGGTGCCAAGGGTAAGCATCCAGCTGTCACT -{Chol}-3'

Universal Co-Anchor: 5'-{Chol} AGTGACAGCTGGATGCTTAC -3'

The cholesterol modifications are only available with a 100nmole (or greater) synthesis order and HPLC purification.

### Adapter Strands:

Overall Structure: 5'-CCTTGGCACCCAGAGATTCA (hybridizes with Universal Anchor) – poly T spacer (increasing oligo length improves efficiency of adhesion) - surface adhesion sequence -3'

Strand A: CCTTGGCACCCAGAGATTCA TTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTT ACTGACTGACTGACTGACTG

Strand A prime: CCTTGGCACCCAGAGATTCA TTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTT CAGTCAGTCAGTCAGTCAGT

Strand B: CCTTGGCACCCAGAGATTCA TTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTT AGAAGAAGAACGAAGAAGAA

Strand B prime: CCTTGGCACCCAGAGATTCA TTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTT TTCTTCTCGTTCTTCTTCT

Strand C: CCTTGGCACCCAGAGATTCA TTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTT AGCCAGAGAGAGAGAGAGAG

Strand C prime: CCTTGGCACCCAGAGATTCA TTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTT CTCTCTCTCTCTCTCTGGCT

To create multilayered cellular structures, use complementary sets of oligos for the Adapter Strands (A and A prime, Band B prime, etc.) To pattern multiple cell populations without the cells adhering to each other, use orthogonal Adapter Strands (A and B, B prime and C prime, etc).

### Designing Additional Adapter Strands:

Additional Adapter Strands can be created replacing the surface adhesion sequence following the poly T spacer with another 20-base oligo. Sequences that result in secondary structures of the oligo are undesirable.

It is recommended that the sequences for new Adapter Strands avoid CpG repeats, although TLR9 stimulation by CMO-labeling with CpG-containing Adapter Strands is low (Supplemental Figure 5).

When designing Adapter Strands to be orthogonal to each other, be aware that many mismatches are required for orthogonality. The presence of as few as six complementary bases

between oligos can be sufficient for hybridization and subsequent cell adhesion. To confirm that two Adapter Strands are sufficiently orthogonal, label two populations of cells with the CMOs as described in Step 5. Mix the two populations together and incubate with shaking for 5 minutes. If the cells form clusters, the Adapter Strands are hybridizing and are not sufficiently orthogonal to be used in the same experiment.

**Adapter Strands Used to Test TLR9 Stimulation:**

CMO-CPG: CCTTGGCACCCAGAGATTCA TTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTT TCCATGACGTTCTGACGTT

CMO-GPC: CCTTGGCACCCAGAGATTCA TTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTT TCCATGAGCTTCCTGAGCTT





