Spatial mapping of the hepatocellular carcinoma landscape identifies unique intratumoural perivascular-immune neighbourhoods

Felix Marsh-Wakefield[†1,2], Cositha Santhakumar[†1,2,3], Angela L. Ferguson[†1,2], Thomas M. Ashhurst[4,5], Joo-Shik Shin[6,7], Fiona H. X. Guan[3], Nicholas J. Shields[4], Barry J. Platt[2], Ruta Gupta[6,7], Michael Crawford[8], Carlo Pulitano[8,9], Charbel Sandroussi[8,9], Jerome M. Laurence[8,9], Ken Liu[1,3,4], Geoffrey W. McCaughan[‡1,3,4], Umaimainthan Palendira[‡2]

[†/‡]Authors contributed equally

[1]Liver Injury & Cancer Program, Centenary Institute

[2]Human Immunology Laboratory, School of Medical Sciences, Faculty of Medicine and Health, The University of Sydney

[3]A.W. Morrow Gastroenterology and Liver Centre, Royal Prince Alfred Hospital

[4]School of Medical Sciences, Faculty of Medicine and Health, The University of Sydney

[5]Sydney Cytometry Core Research Facility, The University of Sydney

[6]Central Clinical School, Sydney Medical School, The University of Sydney

[7]Department of Tissue Pathology and Diagnostic Oncology, Royal Prince Alfred Hospital, NSW Health Pathology

[8]Australian National Liver Transplant Unit, Royal Prince Alfred Hospital

[9]Royal Prince Alfred Institute of Academic Surgery, University of Sydney

Author contributions

Felix Marsh-Wakefield, Cositha Santhakumar, and Angela L. Ferguson contributed substantially to the conception and design of the paper; acquisition of data; analysis and interpretation of data; drafting and revising the paper extensively and critically for important intellectual content. Thomas M. Ashhurst contributed substantially to the analysis and interpretation of data; revising the paper critically for important intellectual content. Joo-Shik Shin, Fiona H. X. Guan, Nicholas J. Shields, Barry J. Platt, Ruta Gupta, Michael Crawford, Carlo Pulitano, Charbel Sandroussi, and Jerome M. Laurence contributed substantially to acquisition of data; revising the paper critically for important intellectual content. Ken Liu

contributed substantially to the conception and design of the paper; interpretation of data; revising the paper extensively and critically for important intellectual content. Geoffrey W. McCaughan and Umaimainthan Palendira contributed substantially to the conception and design of the paper; interpretation of data; drafting and revising the paper extensively and critically for important intellectual content. All authors provided final approval of the version to be published.

Address of correspondence

Felix Marsh-Wakefield

f.marsh-wakefield@centenary.org.au

Centenary Institute, Camperdown 2050, NSW, Australia

Financial support and sponsorship

This work was funded by the Joan Krefft bequest to the A.W. Morrow Gastroenterology and Liver Centre (Royal Prince Alfred Hospital) and Cancer Institute NSW (2021/ATRG2028). Felix Marsh-Wakefield is supported by the International Society for the Advancement of Cytometry (ISAC) Marylou Ingram Scholars Program. Cositha Santhakumar is supported by the Sydney Cancer Partners PhD scholarship.

Conflicts of interest

Nothing to report.

Keywords

Tumour immunology

Spatial proteomics

Imaging mass cytometry

Human liver cancer

| 56 | Perivascular macrophages | |

58 **List of abbreviations**

59	HCC	Hepatocellular carcinoma
60	VEGF	Vascular endothelial growth factor
61	TME	Tumour immune microenvironment
62	IMC	Imaging mass cytometry
63	FFPE	Formalin-fixed paraffin embedded
64	MVI	Microvascular invasion
65	H&E	Haematoxylin and eosin
66	ROI	Region of interest
67	TIL	Tumour-infiltrating lymphocyte
68	TMA	Tissue microarray
69	IHC	Immunohistochemistry
70	RT	Room temperature
71	mIHC	Multiplex immunohistochemistry
72	TSA	Tyramide signalling amplification
73	PCA	Principal component analysis
74	sPLS-DA	Sparse partial least squares-discriminant analysis
75	TNM	Tumour-node-metastasis
76	PERMANOVA	Permutational multivariate analysis of variance
77	PVM	perivascular macrophage
78	TGF-β	transforming growth factor-beta
79	TAM	tumour-associated macrophage

80	MRS	myeloid response score
81	MAIT cells	mucosal-associated invariant T cells
82		

Abstract

Background & Aims: Hepatocellular carcinoma (HCC) develops in the context of chronic inflammation, however, the opposing roles the immune system plays in both the development and control of tumours is not fully understood. Mapping immune cell interactions across the distinct tissue regions could provide greater insight into the role individual immune populations have within tumours.

Approach & Results: Using highly multiplexed imaging mass cytometry, we have mapped the immune landscape of tumour, invasive margin, and adjacent non-tumour regions across sixteen resected tumours comprising of 144 regions of interest and over 10,000 parameters. We show immune cell densities remain largely consistent across these three regions, except for subsets of monocyte-derived macrophages which are enriched within the tumours. Mapping cellular interactions across these regions in an unbiased manner identifies immune neighbourhoods comprised of tissue-resident T cells, dendritic cells, and various macrophage populations around perivascular spaces. Importantly, we identify multiple immune cells within these neighbourhoods interacting with VEGF$^+$ perivascular macrophages.

Conclusions: Cellular interactions, but not cell densities, differ between intratumoural and adjacent non-tumour regions in HCC. Unique intratumoural immune neighbourhoods around the perivascular space points to an altered landscape within tumours. Enrichment of VEGF$^+$ perivascular macrophages within these tumours could play a key role in angiogenesis and vascular permeability.

Introduction

Liver cancer is the sixth most incident cancer and the third leading cause of cancer-related death in the world [1] with hepatocellular carcinoma (HCC) accounting for approximately 90 % of cases [2]. The five-year overall survival of HCC after diagnosis is approximately 20 % and this statistic has not changed significantly over the past decade despite advancements in treatment options [3]. This poor prognosis is attributable to its phenotypic and genetic heterogeneity, its occurrence in patients with reduced liver reserve (cirrhosis), high rates of tumour recurrence following curative treatments, and its predisposition to metastasise in advanced stages [4]. Although immunotherapy has recently revolutionised the treatment of advanced-stage disease in other malignancies such as melanoma and lung cancer, objective

response rates to systemic combination therapies in advanced HCC have been suboptimal (less than 30 %) [5-7].

Being the prototypical cancer of inflammatory origin, immune responses in HCC are implicated in both pro- and anti-tumoural activities [8]. Understanding the complex interplay between immune cells and the tumour environment is therefore critical. Recent studies using single-cell approaches have identified the diverse phenotype of immune cells within HCC tumours and provided some insight into their possible functional roles [9]. However, several of these single-cell methodologies lack spatial context, therefore limiting our ability to determine the potential impact that specific cellular interactions have on clinical outcomes. Spatially resolving these cellular interactions could provide greater insight into how various immune populations contribute to tumour development, progression, and control.

Angiogenesis is also a key feature of HCC, wherein hypervascularisation and leaky vessels pose challenges to the cellular immune control of tumours and influences responses to various therapies [10-12]. Amongst many angiogenic factors, vascular endothelial growth factor (VEGF) has been identified as the key driver of neovascularisation in HCC, with tumour cells largely implicated in its production [13,14]. The importance of angiogenesis (and its interplay with the tumour immune microenvironment, TME) is evident by recent data showing that combination bevacizumab (anti-VEGFA) and atezolizumab (anti-PD-L1) antibodies improved survival in patients with advanced unresectable HCC [5]. Interestingly, this strategy has been found to have a synergistic effect [15,16]. However, what role immune cells have in angiogenesis and vascular permeability in HCC remains unclear.

In this study, we interrogated the tumour and adjacent non-tumour immune microenvironment in patients with resectable HCC using a high-dimensional tissue imaging platform known as imaging mass cytometry (IMC). We spatially resolved cellular interactions in these regions to identify immune neighbourhoods in intratumoural perivascular spaces that comprised of liver-resident CD4$^+$ and CD8$^+$ T cells, dendritic cells, and phenotypically diverse macrophages. Importantly, we showed enrichment of VEGF$^+$ perivascular macrophages within the tumour

144   regions that interact with these immune aggregates in the perivascular space, suggesting these

145   immune neighbourhoods could be important in the development and/or progression of HCC.

Methods

Patients

Institutional human research ethics was obtained by the Sydney Local Health District Ethics Review Committee (HREC 2020/ETH02093). Research was conducted in accordance with both the Declarations of Helsinki and Istanbul, with written consent given in writing by all subjects. Treatment naïve patients undergoing curative resection for HCC from 2019 until 2021 at a single tertiary institution were identified from the Royal Prince Alfred Liver Biobank. The formalin-fixed paraffin embedded (FFPE) tissues were retrieved from the Department of Tissue Pathology and Diagnostic Oncology and Royal Prince Alfred Hospital. Relevant clinicopathological data was obtained from electronic medical records. Clinicopathological data included age, sex, aetiology of liver disease, presence of cirrhosis, presence of microvascular invasion (MVI), and largest tumour size. Of the sixteen HCC patients, two have since begun treatment with immune checkpoint inhibitors, and one is now part of a placebo-controlled trial.

Tissue Microarray Preparation

The haematoxylin and eosin (H&E) stained sections from the sixteen patients were reviewed by a liver pathologist. One region of interest (ROI) was selected from the tumour, invasive margin, and peritumour regions. The tumour ROI was selected based on the high abundance of tumour-infiltrating lymphocytes (TILs) on H&E stained sections. The invasive margin was defined at the border of the malignant tumour and consisted of approximately 50 % malignant and 50 % non-malignant tissue. The peri-tumour region was selected away from the tumour. Three 1 mm diameter (triplicate) cores were taken from each ROI for creation of the two tissue microarrays (TMAs) (Figure 1A). Tonsils and hepatocellular adenoma were used as batch controls for the TMAs. Both TMAs were sectioned at 7 μm onto charged slides. Figure 1 provides an overview of the experimental design.

Antibody Panel

An antibody panel (Supplementary Table 1) was designed to identify various components of the HCC TME and background liver tissue, including malignant and non-malignant

hepatocytes, immune cells, immune checkpoint inhibitors, cell signalling pathways, stromal cells, and structural markers. Antibodies were selected based on clones previously validated in our lab on FFPE liver tissue and from published studies in HCC [17]. Antibodies that were purchased unconjugated were all tested and validated by conventional immunohistochemistry (IHC) prior to metal conjugation. Post-metal conjugation antibodies were revalidated and titrated using IMC. Pre-conjugated antibodies (Sydney Cytometry Reagent Bank) were tested and titrated for our tissue and staining conditions prior to experimental use. Antibody-metal conjugations were done using the X8 Maxpar conjugation kit as per the manufacturer's protocol (Standard BioTools).

Tissue staining for imaging mass cytometry

TMA sections were baked at 60 °C for 60 minutes prior to deparaffinisation and rehydration. Heat-induced antigen retrieval was performed by boiling the samples at 100 °C for 15 minutes in pH 9.0 antigen retrieval buffer (10 mmol L^{-1} Tris base, 1 mmol L^{-1} EDTA, 0.05 % Tween 20, pH 9.0). The TMA slides were allowed to cool down to room temperature (RT) before proceeding.

Sections were incubated with 3 % hydrogen peroxide prior to washing and blocking (Akoya Biosciences, Antibody Diluent/Block). Slides were then stained with anti-CD69 (clone EPR21814, Abcam) at RT before washing with TBS-T. Secondary OPAL-HRP (PerkinElmer) was added to the slides at RT before washing in TBS-T. Slides were stained with TSA Plus FITC (PerkinElmer) at RT before washing with TBS-T. Slides were microwave treated (as described above) before letting them cool down to RT before proceeding.

Slides were then washed in TBS-T before blocking in blocking buffer (Akoya Biosciences) for 45 minutes at 37 °C. Slides were blocked with 20 % donkey serum (in DPBS) for 10 minutes at RT. Slides were stained with anti-PD-L1 (clone E1L3N, CST) and anti-CK8/18 (clone 5D3, Leica) for 45 minutes at RT before washing in TBS-T. Slides were then stained with Cy3 anti-rabbit (711-166-152, Jackson ImmunoResearch Laboratories) for PD-L1 and Cy5 anti-mouse (715-606-150, Jackson ImmunoResearch Laboratories) for CK8/18. Slides were washed in TBS-T and DPBS. Slides were avidin/biotin blocked (Life Technologies). Slides were then stained in anti-Foxp3 biotin (clone 236A/E7, eBioscience) before washing in TBS-T. TMA sections were incubated overnight with a metal-tagged antibody cocktail (Supplementary Table 1, including anti-FITC, anti-Cy3, anti-Cy5, and anti-biotin) at 4 °C.

209 TMA sections were washed in 0.1 % Triton-X (in DPBS) and DPBS. TMA sections were
210 stained with Cell-ID Ir-Intercalator in DPBS (Standard BioTools). TMA sections were washed
211 in deionised H_2O before being allowed to air dry at RT (Figure 1B).

Imaging Mass Cytometry

214 The Hyperion imaging mass cytometer (Standard BioTools) was used to acquire data from
215 both TMA slides. A pulsed laser scanned and laser ablated the tissue at 200 Hz. IMC data files
216 were analysed using MCD Viewer (version 1.0.560.6, Standard BioTools). MCD Viewer and
217 histoCAT++ [18] were used for visualising the images, TIFF extraction, and creating
218 representative pseudo-colour images. (Figure 1C-D).

Multiplex Immunohistochemistry

FFPE tumour specimen blocks were sectioned at 4 μm and stained using OPAL multiplex IHC
(mIHC) staining kit (Akoya Biosciences) according to optimised in-house protocols as
previously described [19,20]. Tissue sections were baked at 60 °C for 60 minutes prior to
deparaffinisation and rehydration. Heat-induced antigen retrieval was performed by boiling the
samples at 100 °C for 15 minutes in pH 9.0 antigen retrieval buffer. Sections were incubated
with 3 % hydrogen peroxide prior to washing and blocking (Antibody Diluent/Block, Akoya
Biosciences). Sections were then incubated with a single purified primary antibody for 35
minutes at RT, washed, and then incubated with HRP (OPAL polymer HRP (Akoya
biosciences), sheep-HRP (Invitrogen), or MACH-3 mouse 2-step (Biocare, 10 minutes/step))
for 10 minutes at RT. Sections were washed prior to incubation with OPAL fluorochromes
diluted in tyramide signalling amplification (TSA) reagent (Akoya Biosciences). Antigen
retrieval was repeated, and subsequent antibodies stained for as described above. At completion
of all antibody staining, samples were counterstained for DAPI (Cell Signalling Technologies)
prior to mounting with Prolong Diamond (Life Technologies).

Primary antibodies used were anti-HLA-DR (TAL-1B5, Abcam), anti-FXIIIa (SAF13A,
Affinity Biologicals), anti-CD34 (QBEnd/10, Leica), and anti-VEGF (VG1, Dako).

Representative high-powered images (20X and 40X) within tumour regions were captured
using the Mantra quantitative pathology imaging system in combination with Mantra snap

(Akoya Biosciences) and inForm (Akoya Biosciences) to spectrally process images.
Multispectral images were exported as TIFF single images and were imported into Fiji (version
1.53c) [21].

Spatial data Analysis

Ilastik software (version 1.4.0b27) was used to segment single cells using the multicut method
[22], as this method does not rely on nuclei (Figure 1C). Masks were created to then quantify
marker expression levels for each single cell in R [23] using 'Spectre' [24] (Figure 1D).

Single cells were manually gated using FlowJo (version 10.8, BD Bioscience) to identify
conventional immune cell subsets (Supplementary Figure 1). The area of each section was
calculated using Fiji (version 1.53c) [21], which was then used to calculate the density of each
conventional subset. Spectre was then used to quantify, for every cell, the average number of
each cell subset within a 20 μm radius.

For unsupervised analysis, X-shift clustering was used [25], which identified 238 clusters
(Supplementary Figure 2A). The median signal intensity of CD45 was calculated for each
cluster before running z-score normalisation. Clusters with values below zero were considered
$CD45^-$, and values above zero were considered $CD45^+$. The latter were divided into $CD45^{low}$
and $CD45^{hi}$ with a cut-off equal to the absolute value of the smallest value (Supplementary
Figure 2B). Cells then underwent X-shift clustering within each of the three groups ($CD45^-$,
$CD45^{low}$, and $CD45^{hi}$) resulting in 91, 36, and 18 clusters respectively. Similar clusters were
then combined using the function simprof as part of the 'clustsig' R package [26], generating 47
clusters (20 $CD45^+$ clusters and 27 $CD45^-$ clusters) (Supplementary Figure 2C). The spatial
data were then quantified using Spectre [24], including cluster densities, average distance
between each cluster and every other cluster, average number of cells within 20 μm for each
cluster, and the proportions of each cluster. As each region was done in triplicate, the results
were averaged so each patient tissue region had a single value for each quantification.

When analysing the $CD45^+$ clusters, the number of clusters with ≥ 5 cells in each region were
calculated. Clusters with < 5 cells across less than a third of total regions were excluded, which
removed six clusters (Supplementary Figure 2D).

Heatmaps were generated using Spectre. The median signal intensity for each cluster was
calculated and then min-max scaled.

Each patient region contained thousands of parameters, so linear dimensionality reduction

algorithms were used to reduce the complexity. A principal component analysis (PCA) was

performed using Spectre to identify differences between the three tissue ROIs: non-tumour,

invasive margin, and tumour. A PCA reduced the dimensions based on the overall variance

within a given dataset, including human and experimental variability. In addition to a PCA, a

sparse partial least squares-discriminant analysis (sPLS-DA) was done [27]. An sPLS-DA

reduces the dimensions based on differences between groups and is not as strongly affected by

unwanted variability. The R package 'mixOmics' was used for the sPLS-DA [28]. The sPLS-DA

used leave-one-out validation, calculating the Mahalanobis distance with at least three

components generated. When using all clusters, up to ten variables were selected for each

component. For select immune cell neighbourhood interactions, there was no limit to the

number of variables assessed for each component.

Ligand-receptor communication

Single-cell transcriptomic analyses were done using the GSE149614 dataset, which consisted

of cells from paired non-tumour and tumour (8/10 patients) from newly diagnosed HCC

patients [29]. These patients were pathologically confirmed and proven to have no other cancers.

7/10 patients had viral infection (five with HBV, two with HCV), 3/10 had tumour-node-

metastasis (TNM) stage I, 1/10 had stage II, 2/10 stage IIIA, 2/10 stage IIIB, and 2/10 stage IV

[29]. Pre-processed and pre-annotated data were used. Ligand-receptor communication between

cells was calculated using the R package 'CellCall' [30].

Statistical tests

Statistics were calculated using packages available within R [23], using Type III Sum of Squares,

unless stated otherwise. Plots were generated using R and GraphPad Prism (version 9.0.0). For

the PCA, a permutational multivariate analysis of variance (PERMANOVA) was done. The

data were scaled with the Euclidean distance calculated between datapoints. Permutational tests

are powerful non-parametric tests that do not assume homogeneity of variance or normality of

distribution [31]. 4,999 permutations (for a total of 5,000 tests) were done using all parameters to

compare between groups (non-tumour, invasive margin, and tumour regions). The R package

'vegan' was used for PERMANOVA calculations [32]. To calculate paired p-values between

groups, the R package 'pairwiseAdonis' was used with Holm's correction for multiple

comparisons [33]. A similar method was used for the sPLS-DA, but only the parameters that were

identified in the first two components were used in their calculation.

For the manually gated results, a Friedman test with Dunn's multiple comparison corrections

was done to compared between groups (non-tumour, invasive margin, and tumour regions).

For comparisons between non-tumour and tumour, a Wilcoxon test was used. These were

calculated in Graphpad Prism (version 9.0.0).

For comparisons between non-tumour and tumour, a PERMANOVA with Holm's correction

was used for the sPLS-DA (as above). For paired comparisons for individual parameters a

permutation student's t-test was done using the perm.t.test function as part of the

'RVAideMemoire' R package [34].

Results

Study design

Sixteen treatment naïve HCC patients who underwent liver resections were included in this study. Of these patients, twelve were male and the median age was 64.5 years (range 33-84 years). The aetiology of chronic liver disease was viral in seven patients, non-viral in eight patients, and dual viral and non-viral pathology in one patient. Nine patients were cirrhotic, and half the cases had evidence of microvascular invasion. The median largest tumour size was 36 mm (range 9-270 mm). Quantitative protein expression on single cells and spatial mapping of cellular neighbourhood interactions were performed on patient tissue samples from selected regions (non-tumour, invasive margin, and tumour) (Figure 1C-D).

The spatial landscape differs between HCC tumour regions

We mapped the full cellular landscape (immune cells, stromal cells, endothelial cells, hepatocytes, and tumour cells) of HCC to identify any differences between non-tumour, invasive margin, and tumour regions. X-shift clustering was initially performed on all cells. This unbiased approach identified 47 clusters (Figure 2A). The spatial environment was quantified for each patient and tissue region. A PCA was run on > 10,000 parameters, including individual cluster levels (density, percentage of total cells, count), average distances between clusters, and neighbour interactions across each region. Neighbourhood interactions were inferred based on the average number of one cluster within 20 μm of another (or same) cluster [35]. The PERMANOVA revealed significant differences between the three regions (p=0.0030), which was limited to a difference between non-tumour and tumour (p=0.0006) but not between invasive margin and tumour or non-tumour (Figure 2B, p=0.2467). We then determined the parameters that contribute most to the identified variance. This revealed the primary differentiator as the distance between individual clusters, suggesting that the spatial distribution of cells could be key in HCC (Figure 2C). Using a more targeted approach that provides greater granularity to the parameters that potentially differentiate these regions, the sPLS-DA also showed clear differences between each of the three regions (Figure 2D). The differentiating parameters included not only distance between clusters, but also cell proportions and densities (Figure 2E). Component 1 (represented by the x-axis) separated all regions. Cluster 37, identified as endothelial cells, had differences in density, percentage, and count. Cluster 34, another endothelial cell subset, differed in percentage and count. Neighbourhood interactions

of cluster 44 (myeloid cells) to 16 (hepatocytes), cluster 12 (hepatocytes) to 34 (endothelial

cells), and cluster 12 (hepatocytes) to 37 (endothelial cells) also differed between regions,

particularly between non-tumour and tumour regions. Component 2 (y-axis) separated the

invasive margin, with neighbourhood interactions of cluster 3 (T cells) to 28 (endothelial cells).

Together, these data show that our unbiased analytical approach to identify differences in HCC

tissue regions demonstrates clear distinctions in the overall cellular landscape. We were

particularly interested in the immune cell microenvironment within these regions. Thus, we

specifically examined quantities and spatial relationships of immune cells.

354 Innate, but not adaptive, immune cell densities differ between HCC and adjacent tissue

Differences in the immune landscape of the tumour, invasive margin, and adjacent non-tumour

regions were investigated to determine whether cell densities differentiated the three regions.

Manual gating analysis was performed to identify conventional immune cell subsets, including

both innate and adaptive immune populations (Figure 3). Surprisingly, the densities of these

immune subsets were mostly similar across the three regions. T cells (particularly CD4$^+$ T

cells) constituted the largest proportion of immune cells across all regions and their densities

remained consistent (Figure 3A-B, Supplementary Figure 3A). Of the myeloid cells,

macrophages constituted the largest proportion across regions (Figure 3A). There was a higher

density of macrophages and dendritic cells within tumour compared to non-tumour regions

(Figure 3B).

A more targeted analysis of innate immune cell subsets revealed subsets of macrophages

(CD16$^+$ CD68$^+$ CD206$^+$ CD11c$^{+/-}$), possibly monocyte-derived (based on CD14 expression),

were significantly higher within tumour compared with non-tumour regions (Figure 3C). In

contrast, CD11c$^+$ and CD11c$^-$ macrophages that were CD14$^-$ were not different

(Supplementary Figure 3B). These subsets were also higher (as a proportion of total cells) in

the tumour compared with non-tumour regions, with the exception of monocyte-derived

CD206$^+$ CD11c$^-$ macrophages (Supplementary Figure 3C). As a proportion of total immune

cells, only the monocyte-derived CD11c$^+$ macrophages were higher in the tumour compared

with non-tumour regions (Supplementary Figure 3C).

There were no significant differences in the density of T cell subsets between regions (Figure

3B). Most T cells were CD4$^+$ rather than CD8$^+$ across regions, with most CD4$^+$ T cells

expressing CD69, consistent with tissue-resident CD4$^+$ T cells (Supplementary Figure 3A).

Together, these data demonstrate that innate immune cells, particularly monocyte-derived macrophages, are significantly increased within tumour when compared to non-tumour regions.

Unique immune cell neighbourhood interactions exist within the HCC tumour

As the densities and proportions of most conventional immune cell subsets were similar across regions, we next spatially analysed these regions to investigate immune cell neighbourhood interactions. When investigating CD45$^+$ clusters alone to focus on immune cells, six clusters had < 5 cells in more than one third of the images, so were removed from further analysis (Supplementary Figure 2D). Furthermore, certain clusters were phenotypically similar to each other and were combined (Supplementary Figure 4). As a result, ten CD45$^+$ clusters were included in the neighbourhood analysis (Figure 4A).

To identify immune cell interactions that differ between regions, an sPLS-DA was performed that revealed differences in immune cell neighbourhood interactions between non-tumour and tumour regions (Figure 4B). Multiple immune cell neighbourhood interactions were identified (Figure 4C). The first component (x-axis) parameters were further investigated. Cluster 44 was more commonly within 20 μm of other clusters (including 3, 8, 9, 35, 44) within tumour compared to non-tumour regions. Likewise, cluster 35 was commonly within 20 μm of cluster 45, and cluster 9 within 20 μm of cluster 8 within HCC tumour regions. These seven immune cell neighbourhood interactions were identified to be more common within tumour regions when compared to non-tumour regions (Figure 4D). We then determined whether these interactions could have been impacted by individual cell densities. The density of clusters 8, 9, 44, and 45 was higher within tumour compared to non-tumour whilst the opposite was true for cluster 35 (Figure 4E). There was no difference in the density of cluster 3 when comparing tumour and non-tumour regions. These data show that multiple immune cell neighbourhood interactions are more frequent within HCC tumour regions when compared to non-tumour regions. Some of these increased neighbourhood interactions may be attributed to increased densities of the cells involved.

Increased immune cell interactions with VEGF$^+$ perivascular macrophages in HCC tumour tissue

Having identified cluster 44 at the centre of multiple neighbourhood interactions, this cell

cluster was investigated further. Closer examination of the expression markers associated with

cluster 44 revealed expression of both CD45 (indicating a haematopoietic cell) and tumour

endothelial marker CD34 (Figure 5A). This prompted us to closely examine all images to

determine potential close interactions between two different cell types (Supplementary Figure

5). We found that cluster 44 was in fact two discrete cells in close proximity: a tumour

endothelial cell characterised by CD34 expression, and a myeloid cell which on further

phenotyping also expressed CD14, CD16, CD45, CD68, CD86, CD206, FXIIIA, and HLA-

DR, but not CD11c (Figure 5B). Based on the close proximity of this myeloid cell to the tumour

endothelial cell with reference to the phenotypic markers expressed, we hypothesised the

myeloid cell to be a perivascular macrophage (PVM). Further staining using mIHC, which

allowed for greater image resolution, showed that this PVM-like cell also expressed VEGF,

suggesting they are indeed PVMs (Figure 5C) [36-38].

To determine whether any cell-cell communication was occurring between the CD34$^+$

endothelial cells and the VEGF$^+$ PVM, publicly-available single-cell transcriptomic data were

analysed. The GSE149614 dataset consisted of tumour resections from newly diagnosed HCC

patients with paired non-tumour and tumour tissue cell dissociates [29]. The pre-annotated data

included endothelial cells expressing *Cd34* (C48) and macrophages expressing *Vegfa* (C21)

that we considered to most closely resemble PVM. Ligand-receptor communication was

inferred using 'CellCall' [30]. When C48 (*Cd34*$^+$ endothelial cells) acted as the ligand, several

chemokine ligands were predicted to interact with chemokine receptors on C21 in both non-

tumour and tumour regions (Figure 5D). When C21 (*Vegfa*$^+$ macrophages) acted as the ligand,

there was communication within the tumour but not non-tumour tissue with endothelial cell

(C48) receptors. Furthermore, *Vegfa* and *Tgfb1* were predicted ligands from C21, suggesting

the VEGF$^+$ macrophages are communicating with CD34$^+$ endothelial cells. Together these data

reveal that tumour regions are not only highly enriched with CD34$^+$ tumour endothelial cells,

but also have VEGF$^+$ PVM that potentially interact with these endothelial cells in that region.

Perivascular immune cell aggregates consist of liver-resident CD4$^+$ and CD8$^+$ T cells,

dendritic cells, and macrophages within HCC tumour tissue

Having identified multiple clusters neighbouring with cluster 44, we then defined all clusters that were found in close proximity of cluster 44. Clusters 3 (Figure 6A) and 9 (Figure 6B) were T cells (CD45$^+$ CD3$^+$). Further phenotyping showed cluster 3 to be CD4$^+$ CD45RO$^+$ CD69$^+$, suggestive of liver-resident memory CD4$^+$ T cells, and cluster 9 to be CD8A$^+$ CD45RO$^+$ CD69$^+$ Tbet$^+$ PD-L1$^+$, likely liver-resident memory CD8$^+$ T cells (Figure 6C). Both clusters had a higher interaction with cluster 44 within the tumour, suggesting an interaction between CD4$^+$ and CD8$^+$ T cells with PVMs and tumour endothelium.

Clusters 8 (Figure 6D) and 35 (Figure 6E) were CD45$^+$ CD14$^+$ HLA-DR$^+$ myeloid cells. Cluster 8 was also CD11c$^+$ CD16$^+$ CD68$^+$ CD206$^+$ FXIIIA$^+$, suggestive of a potential macrophage, while cluster 35 was CD11c$^-$ CD16$^+$ CD68$^+$ CD206$^+$ FXIIIA$^-$, possibly representing a dendritic cell population (Figure 6F). The increased neighbourhood interaction of these cells with PVM-endothelial cell cluster (cluster 44) in the HCC tumour tissue points to an interaction between the tumour endothelium/PVM niche and other myeloid cells within the TME.

Cluster 8, a macrophage subset, was also found to have a neighbourhood interaction with cluster 9, a memory CD8$^+$ T cell subset (Figure 7A, Supplementary Figure 6). Clusters 35 (a dendritic cell subset) and 45 were both CD45$^+$ CD14$^+$ HLA-DR$^+$. Cluster 45 had a macrophage phenotype as CD16$^+$ CD68$^+$ FXIIIA$^+$ (Figure 7C). The neighbourhood interactions between these two myeloid cell populations were also higher in the tumour compared to non-tumour regions (Figure 7B) despite the density of cluster 35 being lower in the tumour compared to the non-tumour regions (Figure 4E). Together, these single cell maps reveal that unique intratumoural immune aggregates (consisting of T cells, dendritic cells, and macrophages) interact with PVM and may exert potential pro-tumoural and angiogenic functions. These findings are summarised in Figure 8.

Clinical associations were assessed by correlating tumour neighbourhood interactions with prognostic and clinicopathological data. There were no associations between tumour neighbourhood interactions and cirrhosis, early recurrence (<2 years), MVI, or viral-associated HCC (Supplementary Figure 7).

Discussion

The treatment of HCC remains a major challenge and novel therapeutic strategies are urgently required. Irrespective of its aetiology, HCC mostly develops in diseased liver with concomitant chronic inflammation, thus implicating the immune system in both the pathogenesis of the disease as well as tumour control. Understanding the complex interactions between immune cells and the TME is therefore paramount [39,40]. We used high-dimensional spatial analysis to map multiple cellular neighbourhood interactions across three regions: the non-tumour, invasive margin, and tumour regions. Mapping the immune landscape across these regions showed that only innate cell densities, but not T cell or B cell densities, are increased within tumour regions compared to non-tumour regions and that macrophages (likely monocyte-derived) are enriched within tumour tissue. We further identified immune aggregates around the perivascular space that are unique to the tumour region. Detailed analysis of this region shows that PVMs are at the centre of these interactions and are closely associated with not only the tumour endothelial cells, but also multiple immune populations, including liver-resident CD4$^+$ and CD8$^+$ T cells, macrophages, and dendritic cells. Functionally, we show that these PVMs are capable of producing VEGF, which is known to be a key driver of angiogenesis and hypervascularity within tumours. Mining publicly available single-cell datasets to interrogate potential ligand-receptor interactions between PVMs and endothelial cells confirms VEGF-VEGF receptor interactions and also suggests that other potential pro-tumoural mechanisms involving transforming growth factor-beta (TGF-β) are active within these unique immune aggregates.

How the tumour immune microenvironment and its composition is impacted by hepatocarcinogenesis remains unclear. Our data show enrichment of phenotypically diverse populations of macrophages within the tumour compared to non-tumour regions. Based on CD14 expression, these populations were most likely monocyte-derived [41,42]. This is in-line with the consensus in the field that tumour-associated macrophages (TAMs) are derived primarily from circulating blood monocytes [43], and in human HCC, TAMs arise from CCR2$^+$ monocytes [44]. Interestingly, we found other CD14$^-$ macrophage populations were either reduced within tumours or did not show any difference compared to adjacent non-tumour tissue. This, together with no changes in T cell densities between tumour and non-tumour regions, suggests that the tumour immune microenvironment is largely skewed by the

recruitment of monocytes. Furthermore, our findings on several myeloid cell populations

regarding their overall numbers and cell-cell interactions should be compared with the findings

of Wu *et al.* who devised a myeloid response score (MRS) in using 244 resected human HCC

samples [45]. Tumours with a high MRS score were enriched in $CD11b^+$, $CD15^+$, $CD163^+$,

$CD33^+$, $CD68^+$, and $CD204^+$ cells. These were thought to be immunosuppressive in nature and

associated with poor prognosis. In addition, Kurebayashi *et al.* found that macrophages were

the most common immune cell detected in 919 regions from 158 resected HCC tumours [46].

CD68 is commonly used as a liver TAM marker [47] and this subset was found to be increased

in our tumours. Similarly, $CD206^+$ $CD14^+$ monocyte-derived macrophages were also enriched

within the tumour in our study. A dysregulated balance towards $CD206^+$ M2 polarised

macrophages has also been associated with aggressive tumour phenotypes and worse prognosis

in HCC [48].

Where these macrophages localise within tumour tissue is critical to our understanding of how

the immune environment impacts tumour development, persistence, as well as tumour control.

Many previous studies have interrogated the TME in HCC using various techniques including

mIHC [45,46,49], IMC [50,51], and multimodal genomic analysis incorporating single-cell RNA

sequencing and TCR receptor sequencing [52-54]. However, not all these techniques facilitate

spatial analyses to identify cell-cell interactions between multiple different types of cells within

the TME. Our study provides a comprehensive analysis of the composition of the tumour

immune microenvironment of HCC and adjacent non-tumour tissue whilst further identifying

novel cell-cell interactions between immune cells and the tumour vasculature. Through this

spatial mapping we have identified a cellular neighbourhood around the endothelium and

PVMs of potential importance.

The close physical association between tumour endothelial cells and macrophages prompted

us to define them as PVMs. Currently, there is no consensus on the definition of PVMs as they

can have different phenotypes across tissues. However, a unifying feature is that they lie in

close proximity to blood vessels, either in direct contact or located within one cell thickness

from it [38]. However, PVMs have not yet been described in healthy adult liver tissue. In diseased

tissues such as cancer, these cells have been shown to express VEGF [37,38]. We also show that

these PVMs are indeed able to produce VEGF. Importantly, pre-clinical models show that

PVMs are also largely derived from circulating monocytes [37]. In line with this, Matasubra *et al.* found that the majority of angiopoietin (TIE2^{+}) expressing macrophages in liver cancer were located in the perivascular areas of tumour tissue and their presence not only correlated with the degree of angiogenesis, but also with the levels of their counterparts in blood [55]. Several other functions of PVMs have been described both in other healthy adult tissues (phagocytosis, antigen presentation, and immune regulation), and in the progression of pathological conditions (angiogenesis, metastasis, immunosuppression, recruitment of other leukocytes, and post-therapy relapse) [38]. It is tempting to postulate that PVMs are critical not only for angiogenesis and hypervascularity in HCC through the secretion of VEGF but are also responsible for the 'leaky' vessels seen in HCC that compromise immune control mechanisms. There is evidence from pre-clinical models to support both these possibilities. TIE2-expressing monocytes were found to be critical for tumour angiogenesis [56], supporting the fact monocyte-derived cells within tumours are key for angiogenesis. In addition, in a murine model of breast cancer, macrophage-specific depletion of VEGFA reduced both vascular permeability and circulating tumour cells whilst restoring vascular junctions [36].

Our TMA selection criteria of highly abundant TILs on H&E suggest we have selected areas that share features of the *Inflamed Class* of HCC [54]. This class represents approximately 35 % of HCC tumours and is characterised by a microenvironment with increased interferon signalling and higher immune infiltration (increased TILs, macrophages, tertiary lymphoid structures, and elevated expression of checkpoint molecules) compared with non-inflamed tumours [54]. The inflamed subclass exhibits a significantly higher fraction of CD8^{+} T cells and M1 macrophages when compared to the non-inflamed profiles. However, despite the presence of high TILs, these tumours persist. There could be many factors that contribute to this tumour persistence, including enrichment of clonally exhausted CD8^{+} T cells and regulatory T cells within HCC tissues [52]. Our finding of no difference in the T cell density between tumour and non-tumour tissues is of interest. We also found that CD4^{+} T cells were more abundant than CD8^{+} T cells within the HCC TME, consistent with previous studies [46]. Furthermore, CD4^{+} T cells expressing CD69 were the most common subset of CD4^{+} T cells across all regions in our study. Importantly, we found close interactions between these T cells and PVMs in the perivascular space. This niche could facilitate regulatory interactions for effector and resident T cells. We also identified multiple myeloid cells interacting with T cells within this niche,

although the functional role of these myeloid cells remains unknown. Further studies are
required to identify how and why T cells are potentially impaired within such tumour regions.

The findings from our study have several clinical implications. The identification of increased
TIL density within a perivascular-immune neighbourhood (consisting of tumour endothelial
cells and PVMs) warrants discussion of current therapeutic approaches that target immune-
vascular cross-talk and the role of vascular normalisation in HCC [57]. The tumour vasculature
in HCC is structurally and functionally abnormal, and the tumour vessels are excessively leaky
[58]. Immune-vascular cross-talk underpins the rationale for using bevacizumab, an anti-VEGFA
monoclonal antibody that normalises tumour vasculature, in conjunction with immune
checkpoint inhibitors in advanced unresectable HCC [5]. Advanced colorectal cancer patients
receiving combined FOLFOX and bevacizumab have decreased VEGFB-mediated
angiogenesis, including reduced myeloid cell-endothelial cell communication via VEGF as
identified by single-cell RNA sequencing [59]. In pre-clinical HCC models, anti-angiogenic
therapy in conjunction with anti-PD-1 therapy further promotes vascular normalisation
mediated by $CD4^+$ T cells [16]. Recently, biomarkers for response to systemic therapies in
advanced HCC have been developed. Haber *et al.* found that tumours expressing high amounts
of an 11-gene signature (IFNAP) captured a unique immune microenvironment characterised
by a high gene expression of activated $CD4^+$ memory T cells, M1 macrophages, and plasma
cells. This novel signature predicted response and survival in patients treated in the first-line
setting with anti-PD1 monotherapy [60]. However, this study did not incorporate spatial analyses
to determine immune cell interactions within the immune microenvironment captured by the
IFNAP gene signature.

There are notable limitations to our study. Single-cell sequencing of TILs in HCC has identified
eleven unique subsets: five $CD8^+$ and six $CD4^+$ T cell clusters including naïve, effector, and
exhausted T cells, and mucosal-associated invariant T (MAIT) cells [52]. We were unable to
identify some of these subsets (undefined lymphocytes and undefined non-lymphocyte
immune cells) due to constraints on the number of markers that can be included in a single
IMC panel. Cell segmentation can become problematic when defining single cells sectioned
from a three-dimensional organ. As such, cluster 44 was first identified as a single cell rather
than two discrete closely interacting cells. This issue was resolved by examining representative

images to confirm the presence of two discrete cells. Functionality of the PVM population was

inferred by *in silico* analysis, rather than single cell analysis or cell isolation and culture

experiments *ex vivo*. Finally, our sample size was small. Correlations with prognostic and

clinicopathological data were performed but no associations were found, perhaps related to the

limited sample size.

In summary, our study has identified a novel myeloid population in HCC characteristic of

PVMs, and identified several immune cell and vascular neighbourhood interactions occurring

more commonly within HCC tumours. Using IMC, we were able to comprehensively

immunophenotype and spatially map the immune landscape of human HCC tumour and

adjacent non-tumour tissue. Further studies are required to evaluate the function of these

immune cells, their effect on immune-mediated tumour control and therapeutic responses, and

their role in hepatocarcinogenesis and HCC progression.

Acknowledgements

Assistance with the study: We gratefully acknowledge the subsidised access to Sydney

Cytometry and thank the support staff in this core facility for their assistance. We thank the

Australian Centre for Microscopy & Microanalysis at the University of Sydney for their

assistance with this work.

Presentations: Preliminary data were presented at the 2023 EASL Liver Cancer Summit

(Estoril, Portugal); 2023 CYTO (Montreal, Canada); and GESA AGW (Brisbane, Australia).

References

1. Sung H, Ferlay J, Siegel RL, et al. Global Cancer Statistics 2020: GLOBOCAN Estimates of Incidence and Mortality Worldwide for 36 Cancers in 185 Countries. *CA Cancer J Clin*. May 2021;71(3):209-249. doi:10.3322/caac.21660

2. Llovet JM, Kelley RK, Villanueva A, et al. Hepatocellular carcinoma. *Nat Rev Dis Primers*. Jan 21 2021;7(1):6. doi:10.1038/s41572-020-00240-3

3. Siegel RL, Miller KD, Fuchs HE, Jemal A. Cancer statistics, 2022. *CA Cancer J Clin*. Jan 2022;72(1):7-33. doi:10.3322/caac.21708

4. Amicone L, Marchetti A. Microenvironment and tumor cells: two targets for new molecular therapies of hepatocellular carcinoma. *Transl Gastroenterol Hepatol*. 2018;3:24. doi:10.21037/tgh.2018.04.05

5. Finn RS, Qin S, Ikeda M, et al. Atezolizumab plus Bevacizumab in Unresectable Hepatocellular Carcinoma. *The New England journal of medicine*. May 14 2020;382(20):1894-1905. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa1915745

6. Abou-Alfa GK, Lau G, Kudo M, et al. Tremelimumab plus Durvalumab in Unresectable Hepatocellular Carcinoma. *NEJM Evidence*. 2022;1(8)doi:10.1056/EVIDoa2100070

7. Ren Z, Xu J, Bai Y, et al. Sintilimab plus a bevacizumab biosimilar (IBI305) versus sorafenib in unresectable hepatocellular carcinoma (ORIENT-32): a randomised, open-label, phase 2–3 study. *The Lancet Oncology*. 2021;22(7):977-990. doi:10.1016/s1470-2045(21)00252-7

8. Ringelhan M, Pfister D, O'Connor T, Pikarsky E, Heikenwalder M. The immunology of hepatocellular carcinoma. *Nature immunology*. Mar 2018;19(3):222-232. doi:10.1038/s41590-018-0044-z

9. Aliya S, Lee H, Alhammadi M, Umapathi R, Huh YS. An Overview on Single-Cell Technology for Hepatocellular Carcinoma Diagnosis. *International journal of molecular sciences*. Jan 26 2022;23(3)doi:10.3390/ijms23031402

10. Yamaguchi S, Tomomatsu N, Kagoshima M, Okumoto T, Komatsu H. Effects of Y-24180, a receptor antagonist to platelet-activating factor, on allergic cutaneous eosinophilia in mice. *Life sciences*. 1999;64(11):PL139-44. doi:10.1016/s0024-3205(99)00024-7

11. Morse MA, Sun W, Kim R, et al. The Role of Angiogenesis in Hepatocellular Carcinoma. *Clin Cancer Res*. Feb 1 2019;25(3):912-920. doi:10.1158/1078-0432.CCR-18-1254

12. Liu K, Dennis C, Prince DS, et al. Vessels that encapsulate tumour clusters vascular pattern in hepatocellular carcinoma. *JHEP Rep*. Aug 2023;5(8):100792. doi:10.1016/j.jhepr.2023.100792

13. Yamaguchi R, Yano H, Iemura A, Ogasawara S, Haramaki M, Kojiro M. Expression of vascular endothelial growth factor in human hepatocellular carcinoma. *Hepatology*. Jul 1998;28(1):68-77. doi:10.1002/hep.510280111

14. Kaseb AO, Hanbali A, Cotant M, Hassan MM, Wollner I, Philip PA. Vascular endothelial growth factor in the management of hepatocellular carcinoma: a review of literature. *Cancer*. Nov 1 2009;115(21):4895-906. doi:10.1002/cncr.24537

15. Tian L, Goldstein A, Wang H, et al. Mutual regulation of tumour vessel normalization and immunostimulatory reprogramming. *Nature*. Apr 13 2017;544(7649):250-254. doi:10.1038/nature21724

16. Shigeta K, Datta M, Hato T, et al. Dual Programmed Death Receptor-1 and Vascular Endothelial Growth Factor Receptor-2 Blockade Promotes Vascular Normalization and Enhances Antitumor Immune Responses in Hepatocellular Carcinoma. *Hepatology*. Apr 2020;71(4):1247-1261. doi:10.1002/hep.30889

17. Ferguson AL, Sharman AR, Allen RO, et al. High-Dimensional and Spatial Analysis Reveals Immune Landscape-Dependent Progression in Cutaneous Squamous Cell Carcinoma. *Clin Cancer Res*. Nov 1 2022;28(21):4677-4688. doi:10.1158/1078-0432.CCR-22-1332

18. Catena R, Montuenga LM, Bodenmiller B. Ruthenium counterstaining for imaging mass cytometry. *The Journal of pathology*. Apr 2018;244(4):479-484. doi:10.1002/path.5049

19.   Hewavisenti R, Ferguson A, Wang K, et al. CD103+ tumor-resident CD8+ T cell numbers underlie improved patient survival in oropharyngeal squamous cell carcinoma. *J Immunother Cancer*. Jun 2020;8(1)doi:10.1136/jitc-2019-000452

20.   Hewavisenti RV, Ferguson AL, Gasparini G, et al. Tissue-resident regulatory T cells accumulate at human barrier lymphoid organs. *Immunology and cell biology*. Sep 2021;99(8):894-906. doi:10.1111/imcb.12481

21.   Schindelin J, Arganda-Carreras I, Frise E, et al. Fiji: an open-source platform for biological-image analysis. *Nat Methods*. Jun 28 2012;9(7):676-82. doi:10.1038/nmeth.2019

22.   Berg S, Kutra D, Kroeger T, et al. ilastik: interactive machine learning for (bio)image analysis. *Nat Methods*. Dec 2019;16(12):1226-1232. doi:10.1038/s41592-019-0582-9

23.   *R: A language and environment for statistical computing*. R Foundation for Statistical Computing; 2021. https://www.R-project.org/

24.   Ashhurst TM, Marsh-Wakefield F, Putri GH, et al. Integration, exploration, and analysis of high-dimensional single-cell cytometry data using Spectre. *Cytometry Part A : the journal of the International Society for Analytical Cytology*. Mar 2022;101(3):237-253. doi:10.1002/cyto.a.24350

25.   Samusik N, Good Z, Spitzer MH, Davis KL, Nolan GP. Automated mapping of phenotype space with single-cell data. *Nat Methods*. Jun 2016;13(6):493-6. doi:10.1038/nmeth.3863

26.   Clarke KR, Somerfield PJ, Gorley RN. Testing of null hypotheses in exploratory community analyses: similarity profiles and biota-environment linkage. *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology*. 2008;366(1-2):56-69. doi:10.1016/j.jembe.2008.07.009

27.   Marsh-Wakefield F, Juillard P, Ashhurst TM, et al. Peripheral B-cell dysregulation is associated with relapse after long-term quiescence in patients with multiple sclerosis. *Immunology and cell biology*. Jul 2022;100(6):453-467. doi:10.1111/imcb.12552

28.   Rohart F, Gautier B, Singh A, Le Cao KA. mixOmics: An R package for 'omics feature selection and multiple data integration. *PLoS Comput Biol*. Nov 2017;13(11):e1005752. doi:10.1371/journal.pcbi.1005752

29.   Lu Y, Yang A, Quan C, et al. A single-cell atlas of the multicellular ecosystem of primary and metastatic hepatocellular carcinoma. *Nat Commun*. Aug 6 2022;13(1):4594. doi:10.1038/s41467-022-32283-3

30.   Zhang Y, Liu T, Hu X, et al. CellCall: integrating paired ligand-receptor and transcription factor activities for cell-cell communication. *Nucleic Acids Res*. Sep 7 2021;49(15):8520-8534. doi:10.1093/nar/gkab638

31.   Anderson MJ. A new method for non-parametric multivariate analysis of variance. *Austral Ecol*. Feb 2001;26(1):32-46. doi:DOI 10.1046/j.1442-9993.2001.01070.x

32.   *vegan: Community Ecology Package*. 2019. https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=vegan

33.   *pairwiseAdonis: Pairwise Multilevel Comparison using Adonis*. 2017. https://github.com/pmartinezarbizu/pairwiseAdonis

34.   *RVAideMemoire: Testing and Plotting Procedures for Biostatistics*. 2021. https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=RVAideMemoire

35.   Gide TN, Silva IP, Quek C, et al. Close proximity of immune and tumor cells underlies response to anti-PD-1 based therapies in metastatic melanoma patients. *Oncoimmunology*. 2020;9(1):1659093. doi:10.1080/2162402x.2019.1659093

36.   Harney AS, Arwert EN, Entenberg D, et al. Real-Time Imaging Reveals Local, Transient Vascular Permeability, and Tumor Cell Intravasation Stimulated by TIE2hi Macrophage-Derived VEGFA. *Cancer Discov*. Sep 2015;5(9):932-43. doi:10.1158/2159-8290.CD-15-0012

37.   Lewis CE, Harney AS, Pollard JW. The Multifaceted Role of Perivascular Macrophages in Tumors. *Cancer cell*. Jul 11 2016;30(1):18-25. doi:10.1016/j.ccell.2016.05.017

38.   Lapenna A, De Palma M, Lewis CE. Perivascular macrophages in health and disease. *Nature reviews Immunology*. Nov 2018;18(11):689-702. doi:10.1038/s41577-018-0056-9

39.   Marsh-Wakefield F, Ferguson AL, Liu K, Santhakumar C, McCaughan G, Palendira U.
Approaches to spatially resolving the tumour immune microenvironment of hepatocellular
carcinoma. *Ther Adv Med Oncol*. 2022;14:17588359221113270. doi:10.1177/17588359221113270
40.   Wang Y, Wang P, Zhang Z, Zhou J, Fan J, Sun Y. Dissecting the tumor ecosystem of liver
cancers in the single-cell era. *Hepatol Commun*. Sep 1
2023;7(9)doi:10.1097/HC9.0000000000000248
41.   Haniffa M, Ginhoux F, Wang XN, et al. Differential rates of replacement of human dermal
dendritic cells and macrophages during hematopoietic stem cell transplantation. *The Journal of
experimental medicine*. Feb 16 2009;206(2):371-85. doi:10.1084/jem.20081633
42.   McGovern N, Schlitzer A, Gunawan M, et al. Human dermal CD14(+) cells are a transient
population of monocyte-derived macrophages. *Immunity*. Sep 18 2014;41(3):465-477.
doi:10.1016/j.immuni.2014.08.006
43.   Yang L, Zhang Y. Tumor-associated macrophages: from basic research to clinical application.
J Hematol Oncol. Feb 28 2017;10(1):58. doi:10.1186/s13045-017-0430-2
44.   Li X, Yao W, Yuan Y, et al. Targeting of tumour-infiltrating macrophages via CCL2/CCR2
signalling as a therapeutic strategy against hepatocellular carcinoma. *Gut*. Jan 2017;66(1):157-167.
doi:10.1136/gutjnl-2015-310514
45.   Wu C, Lin J, Weng Y, et al. Myeloid signature reveals immune contexture and predicts the
prognosis of hepatocellular carcinoma. *The Journal of clinical investigation*. Sep 1 2020;130(9):4679-
4693. doi:10.1172/JCI135048
46.   Kurebayashi Y, Ojima H, Tsujikawa H, et al. Landscape of immune microenvironment in
hepatocellular carcinoma and its additional impact on histological and molecular classification.
Hepatology. Sep 2018;68(3):1025-1041. doi:10.1002/hep.29904
47.   Donne R, Lujambio A. The liver cancer immune microenvironment: Therapeutic implications
for hepatocellular carcinoma. *Hepatology*. May 1 2023;77(5):1773-1796. doi:10.1002/hep.32740
48.   Dong P, Ma L, Liu L, et al. CD86(+)/CD206(+), Diametrically Polarized Tumor-Associated
Macrophages, Predict Hepatocellular Carcinoma Patient Prognosis. *International journal of
molecular sciences*. Mar 1 2016;17(3):320. doi:10.3390/ijms17030320
49.   Sia D, Jiao Y, Martinez-Quetglas I, et al. Identification of an Immune-specific Class of
Hepatocellular Carcinoma, Based on Molecular Features. *Gastroenterology*. Sep 2017;153(3):812-
826. doi:10.1053/j.gastro.2017.06.007
50.   Sheng J, Zhang J, Wang L, et al. Topological analysis of hepatocellular carcinoma tumour
microenvironment based on imaging mass cytometry reveals cellular neighbourhood regulated
reversely by macrophages with different ontogeny. *Gut*. Jun 2022;71(6):1176-1191.
doi:10.1136/gutjnl-2021-324339
51.   Mi H, Ho WJ, Yarchoan M, Popel AS. Multi-Scale Spatial Analysis of the Tumor
Microenvironment Reveals Features of Cabozantinib and Nivolumab Efficacy in Hepatocellular
Carcinoma. *Frontiers in immunology*. 2022;13:892250. doi:10.3389/fimmu.2022.892250
52.   Zheng C, Zheng L, Yoo JK, et al. Landscape of Infiltrating T Cells in Liver Cancer Revealed by
Single-Cell Sequencing. *Cell*. Jun 15 2017;169(7):1342-1356 e16. doi:10.1016/j.cell.2017.05.035
53.   Zhang Q, He Y, Luo N, et al. Landscape and Dynamics of Single Immune Cells in
Hepatocellular Carcinoma. *Cell*. Oct 31 2019;179(4):829-845 e20. doi:10.1016/j.cell.2019.10.003
54.   Montironi C, Castet F, Haber PK, et al. Inflamed and non-inflamed classes of HCC: a revised
immunogenomic classification. *Gut*. Jan 2023;72(1):129-140. doi:10.1136/gutjnl-2021-325918
55.   Matsubara T, Kanto T, Kuroda S, et al. TIE2-expressing monocytes as a diagnostic marker for
hepatocellular carcinoma correlates with angiogenesis. *Hepatology*. Apr 2013;57(4):1416-25.
doi:10.1002/hep.25965
56.   De Palma M, Venneri MA, Galli R, et al. Tie2 identifies a hematopoietic lineage of
proangiogenic monocytes required for tumor vessel formation and a mesenchymal population of
pericyte progenitors. *Cancer cell*. Sep 2005;8(3):211-26. doi:10.1016/j.ccr.2005.08.002

57.   Liu K, Zhang X, Xu W, et al. Targeting the vasculature in hepatocellular carcinoma treatment:
Starving versus normalizing blood supply. *Clin Transl Gastroenterol*. Jun 15 2017;8(6):e98.
doi:10.1038/ctg.2017.28
58.   Santhakumar C, Gane EJ, Liu K, McCaughan GW. Current perspectives on the tumor
microenvironment in hepatocellular carcinoma. *Hepatol Int*. Dec 2020;14(6):947-957.
doi:10.1007/s12072-020-10104-3
59.   Yang M, Yang C, Ma D, Li Z, Zhao W, Yang D. Single-cell analysis reveals cellular
reprogramming in advanced colon cancer following FOLFOX-bevacizumab treatment. *Front Oncol*.
2023;13:1219642. doi:10.3389/fonc.2023.1219642
60.   Haber PK, Castet F, Torres-Martin M, et al. Molecular Markers of Response to Anti-PD1
Therapy in Advanced Hepatocellular Carcinoma. *Gastroenterology*. Jan 2023;164(1):72-88 e18.
doi:10.1053/j.gastro.2022.09.005

Figure legends

Figure 1 – Experimental overview. A) Sixteen HCC patients underwent liver resections. 1 mm diameter regions of non-tumour, invasive margin, and tumour were selected from each patient in triplicate to create a tissue microarray. B) Sections were stained with antibodies conjugated to heavy metals which were then ablated by a Helios imaging mass cytometer to quantify regions. C) Ilastik software was used to define cell borders to create a mask of single cells. D) R package Spectre quantified marker expression for each segmented cell across regions.

Figure 2 – Spatial environment differs between liver regions. A) X-shift clustering was used to identify 47 clusters represented by a heatmap. Each row is a different cluster, each column a different marker. B) Principal component analysis (PCA) of all spatial data. Symbols and colours represent a different region from individual patients. 95 % confidence interval shown. A PERMANOVA with Holm's correction was performed on all parameters. C) The parameters that contributed most to the variance across the first two components are shown. Horizontal red dashed line represents the value if all parameters contributed equally. D) A sparse partial least squares-discriminant analysis (sPLS-DA) generated a similar plot, with the selected parameters for the first two components shown. A PERMANOVA with Holm's correction was performed on select parameters from the first two components. E) The parameters that contribute most to the differences between regions across the first two components are shown. n = 16 HCC patients, each with non-tumour, invasive margin, and tumour regions.

Figure 3 – Tumour has higher densities of monocyte-derived $CD11c^+$ and $CD11c^-$ macrophage subsets compared to non-tumour regions. A) Proportion of conventional immune cells across regions. B) The density of conventional immune subsets across regions. Friedman test with Dunn's multiple comparison corrections was performed. C) Log_2 fold change comparing densities of monocyte-derived $CD11c^+$ and $CD11c^-$ macrophages between tumour and non-tumour regions. Wilcoxon test was used. *p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001. n = 16 HCC patients.

Figure 4 – Immune cell neighbours differ between non-tumour and tumour regions. A) Heatmap of CD45$^+$ clusters. Each row is a cluster, each column is a marker. B) sPLS-DA comparing non-tumour to tumour regions. Symbols and colours represent a different region from individual patients. 95 % confidence interval shown. C) Selected parameters for the first two components are shown. Select comparisons between non-tumour and tumour neighbourhood interactions (D) and densities (E). n = 16 HCC patients, each with non-tumour, invasive margin, and tumour regions. A permutation student's t-test was done, p-values ≤0.1 are shown, mean is shown.

Figure 5 – Cluster 44 consists of endothelial and VEGF$^+$ perivascular macrophages. A) Cluster 44 (green) location indicated between non-tumour and tumour regions from the same patient. Yellow arrows point towards the location of HLA-DR$^+$ CD34$^+$ cells (yellow). B) Histograms showing relative marker expression for cluster 44 (red) compared to total cells (grey). C) OPAL multiplex immunohistochemistry of tumour regions. HLA-DR (red), FXIIIA (green), VEGF (cyan), CD34 (purple), and DAPI (dark blue). Yellow arrows pointing to white cells expressing HLA-DR, FXIIIA, and VEGF. D) Ligand-receptor communication between *CD34$^+$* endothelial cells and *VEGFA$^+$* macrophages. 10 patients with HCC and paired non-tumour and tumour regions were used.

Figure 6 – Cluster 44 has a higher number of neighbourhood interactions with clusters 9, 3, 8, and 35 within tumour compared to non-tumour. A) Cluster 3 (CD3$^+$ CD4$^+$ cells, white arrows) and cluster 44 (CD34$^+$ HLA-DR$^+$ cells, yellow arrows) location indicated between non-tumour and tumour regions. B) Cluster 9 (CD8A$^+$ cells, white arrows) and cluster 44 (CD34$^+$ HLA-DR$^+$ cells, yellow arrows) location indicated between non-tumour and tumour regions. C) Histograms representing marker expression of cluster 3 (blue), cluster 9 (red), and total cells (grey). D) Cluster 8 (CD11c$^+$ HLA-DR$^+$, yellow arrows) and cluster 44 (CD34$^+$ HLA-DR$^+$, white arrows) location indicated between non-tumour and tumour regions. E) Cluster 35 (CD68$^+$, white arrows) and cluster 44 (CD34$^+$ HLA-DR$^+$, yellow arrows) location indicated between non-tumour and tumour regions. F) Histograms representing marker expression of cluster 8 (blue), cluster 35 (red), and total cells (grey). Representative non-tumour and tumour regions are from the same patient.

Figure 7 – Neighbourhood interactions between clusters 8 and 9, and clusters 35 and 45

are higher in tumour than non-tumour. A) Cluster 8 (CD11c$^+$ HLA-DR$^+$, yellow arrows)

and cluster 9 (CD8A$^+$, white arrows) location indicated between non-tumour and tumour

regions. B) Cluster 35 (CD14$^+$ CD68$^+$, yellow arrows) and cluster 45 (CD14$^+$ CD68$^+$ FXIIIA$^+$,

white arrows) location indicated between non-tumour and tumour regions. C) Histograms

representing marker expression of cluster 45 (red) and total cells (grey). Representative non-

tumour and tumour regions are from the same patient.

Figure 8 – Summary figure. Liver resections were collected from patients with HCC to create

a tissue microarray. Regions include non-tumour, invasive margin, and tumour. Imaging mass

cytometry was done on sections with a representative image shown. Within the tumour, a

unique intratumoural perivascular-immune neighbourhood was identified, featuring cells as

described.

A 16 HCC patients

Non-tumour

Invasive margin

Tumour

1 mm cores

B

Antibody staining   Tissue ablation   Mass spectrometry

C

X191Ir_DNA1

D   αSMA   CD45   E-cadherin

A

Scaled median marker expression

Low ▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬▬ High

B ▲ Non-Tumour ● Invasive Margin ■ Tumour

Group comparison	R²	P-value
PERMANOVA	0.0700	*0.0030*
Invasive Margin vs Tumour	0.0393	0.2476
Non-Tumour vs Invasive Margin	0.0416	0.2476
Non-Tumour vs Tumour	0.0812	*0.0006*

C

Contribution of variables to Dim-1-2

D ▲ Non-Tumour ● Invasive Margin ■ Tumour

Group comparison	R²	P-value
PERMANOVA	0.4362	*0.0004*
Invasive Margin vs Tumour	0.1957	*0.0008*
Non-Tumour vs Invasive Margin	0.2785	*0.0008*
Non-Tumour vs Tumour	0.5417	*0.0006*

E

Contribution on comp 1   Contribution on comp 2

A Cluster 44

Non-tumour | Tumour

DNA
HLA-DR
CD34

Cluster 44
CD34+
HLA-DR+

B Total cells · Cluster 44

CD11c-152Nd · CD14-160Gd · CD16-148Nd · CD34-155Gd

CD45-154Sm · CD68-153Eu · CD86-156Gd · CD206-172Yb

FXIIIA-161Dy · HLA-DR-174Yb

Normalised to mode

C Tumour

HLA-DR FXIIIA VEGF CD34 DAPI

D *Cd34*⁺ endothelial cell (C48) as ligand

Non-tumour
C48 — C21

Tumour
C48 — C21

Vegfa⁺ macrophage (C21) as ligand

Non-tumour
No ligand-receptor communication

Tumour
C21 — C48

A. **Cluster 3-44**

Non-tumour | Tumour

CD3
CD4
HLA-DR
CD34
DNA

Cluster 44
CD34+
HLA-DR+

Cluster 3
CD3+
CD4+

B. **Cluster 9-44**

Non-tumour | Tumour

CD8A
HLA-DR
CD34
DNA

Cluster 44
CD34+
HLA-DR+

Cluster 9
CD8A+

C.

Cluster 3
Cluster 9
Total cells

CD3-170Er | CD4-173Yb | CD8A-146Nd | CD45-154Sm | CD45RO-149Sm | CD69-150Nd | PD-L1-152Sm | Tbet-158Gd

D. **Cluster 8-44**

Non-tumour | Tumour

CD11c
HLA-DR
CD34
DNA

Cluster 44
CD34+
HLA-DR+

Cluster 8
CD11c+
HLA-DR+

E. **Cluster 35-44**

Non-tumour | Tumour

FXIIIA
CD68
HLA-DR
CD34
DNA

Cluster 44
CD34+
HLA-DR+

Cluster 35
CD68+

F.

Cluster 8
Cluster 35
Total cells

CD11c-152Nd | CD14-160Gd | CD16-148Nd | CD45-154Sm | CD68-153Eu | CD206-172Yb | FXIIIA-161Dy | HLA-DR-174Yb

A | Non-tumour | Cluster 9-8 | Tumour

CD8A
HLA-DR
CD11c
DNA

256 μm

Cluster 8
CD11c+
HLA-DR+

Cluster 9
CD8A+

B | Non-tumour | Cluster 35-45 | Tumour

CD14
CD68
FXIIIA
DNA

256 μm

Cluster 45
CD14+
CD68+
FXIIA+

Cluster 35
CD14+
CD68+

C Total cells Cluster 45

Normalised to mode

CD11c-152Nd CD14-160Gd CD16-148Nd CD45-154Sm CD68-153Eu CD206-172Yb FXIIIA-161Dy HLA-DR-174Yb

Tissue microarray

Imaging mass cytometry

Invasive margin

Tumour   Non-tumour

Spatial mapping

Unique intratumoural perivascular-immune neighbourhood

VEGF

Perivascular macrophages

CD206+
FXIIIA+
VEGF+

Endothelial cells

CD34+

Tumour cells

Dendritic cells

CD14+
FXIIIA−

Liver resident memory CD8+ T cells

CD45RO+
CD69+

Liver resident memory CD4+ T cells

CD45RO+
CD69+

CD11c+ macrophage

CD14+
FXIIIA+

CD11c− macrophage

CD14+
FXIIIA+

Supplementary Figure 1 – Manual gating strategy of immune cell subsets. Representative gating strategy identifying immune cell subsets.

Supplementary Figure 2 – Clustering of single cells. A) Total cells were clustered using X-shift. B) The median signal intensity of CD45 was calculated for each cluster before running z-score normalisation. Red vertical line is at zero, whereby a negative cluster indicates no CD45 expression, whilst a positive value indicates CD45 expression. The blue line represents the absolute value of the smallest value, used to differentiate between CD45^{low} and CD45^{hi} populations. C) Cells then underwent X-shift clustering within each of the three groups (CD45^{-}, CD45^{low}, CD45^{hi}) resulting in 91, 36, and 18 clusters respectively. Similar clusters were then combined using the function simprof as part of the 'clustsig' R package, generating 47 clusters (20 CD45^{+} clusters and 27 CD45^{-} clusters). D) The number of CD45^{+} clusters with ≥5 cells in each region were calculated. Clusters with <5 cells across less than a third of total regions were excluded, which removed six clusters. Heatmaps show the scaled median signal expression of each marker (columns) across each cluster (rows).

Supplementary Figure 3 – T cell and myeloid cell subset levels across regions. A) Densities of T cell subsets across regions. Friedman test with Dunn's multiple comparison corrections was done. B) Densities of CD14^{-} non-monocyte-derived macrophages across regions. C) Density and proportions (% of CD45^{+} cells or total cells) across myeloid cell subsets. Wilcoxon test was used.

Supplementary Figure 4 – Phenotypically similar clusters were combined. CD45^{+} clusters that were phenotypically similar were combined. Representative images show each cluster (red) compared to total cells (grey).

Supplementary Figure 5 – Representative images of parameters that contributed to differences between non-tumour and tumour regions. Representative images of cluster

results on segmented data (green, dark blue, dark red dots). Images of imaging mass cytometry
with markers and clusters as indicated.

Supplementary Figure 6 –T cell marker expression. A) Representative image of CD4 (red)
and CD8A (green) staining. B) Plot showing cluster 3 (blue, CD4$^+$ T cells), cluster 9 (red, CD8$^+$
T cells), and total cells (grey) against CD4 and CD8 staining. C) Plots showing cluster 3 (blue,
CD4$^+$ T cells), cluster 9 (red, CD8$^+$ T cells), and total cells (grey) for PD-L1 and T-bet
expression.

Supplementary Figure 7 – No association between clinical parameters and tumour
neighbourhood interaction. Tumour neighbourhood interactions were correlated with A)
cirrhosis, B) early recurrence (<2 years), C) microvascular invasion (MVI), and D) viral-
associated HCC. Permutation student's t-test.

Single cells

CD45+CD3-CD20+
B Cells

CD45+CD3+CD20-CD4-CD8+
CD8+ T Cells

CD45+CD3+CD20-CD4+CD8-
CD4+ T Cells

CD45+CD3-CD20-CD14+HLADR+FXIIIa+CD11c-
Monocyte Derived CD11c- Macrophages

CD45+CD3-CD20-CD14+HLADR-
Monocytes

CD45+CD3-CD20-CD14+HLADR+FXIIIa+CD11c+
Monocyte Derived CD11c+ Macrophages

CD45+CD3-CD20-CD14+HLADR+FXIIIa-CD11c+
Monocyte Derived CD11c+ Dendritic Cells

CD45+CD3-CD20-CD14-HLADR+FXIIIa+CD11c-
Non-Monocyte Derived CD11c- Macrophages

CD45+CD3-CD20-CD14-HLADR+FXIIIa+CD11c+
Non-Monocyte Derived CD11c+ Macrophages

CD45+CD3-CD20-CD14-HLADR+FXIIIa-CD11c+
Non-Monocyte Derived CD11c+ Dendritic Cells

CD45+CD3+CD20-CD4+CD8-FOXP3+
FOXP3+ CD4+ T Cells

CD45+CD3+CD20-CD4+CD8-FOXP3-Tbet+
Tbet + CD4+ T Cells

CD45+CD3+CD20-CD4+CD8-FOXP3-Tbet-CD69+
CD69+ CD4+ T Cells

A Total cells

B CD45⁻ CD45^low CD45^hi

C CD45^hi

CD45^low

D CD45+ cells

Normalised median expression

Excluded clusters 1, 6, 32, 40, 41, 43

Cluster 35 ► (yellow) **Cluster 45** ◄ (white)

Non-tumour **Invasive margin** **Tumour**

Cluster 35-45 interactions (cluster 45 surrounding cluster 35)

FXIIIA **CD14** **CD68** **DNA**

Non-tumour **Invasive margin** **Tumour**

256 µm 256 µm 256 µm

Cluster 35 **Cluster 45**

Cluster 35 ► **CD14+ CD68+** **Cluster 45** ◄ **CD14+ CD68+ FXIIIA+**

Cluster 9 ◄ **Cluster 44** ◄

| Non-tumour | Invasive margin | Tumour |

Cluster 9-44 interactions (cluster 44 surrounding cluster 9)

DNA **HLA-DR** **CD34** **CD8A**

| Non-tumour | Invasive margin | Tumour |

256 μm   256 μm   256 μm

Cluster 9
Cluster 9 ► CD8A+

Cluster 44
Cluster 44 ► CD34+ HLD-DR+

Cluster 35 ▶ **Cluster 44** ▶

Non-tumour   **Invasive margin**   **Tumour**

Cluster 35-44 interactions (cluster 44 surrounding cluster 35)

CD68 **FXIIIA** **HLA-DR** **CD34** **DNA**
Non-tumour   **Invasive margin**   **Tumour**

256 μm   256 μm   256 μm

Cluster 35   **Cluster 44**
Cluster 35 ▶ **CD68+**   **Cluster 44** ▶ **CD34+** **HLD-DR+**

Cluster 8 ◄ Cluster 44 ➤

Non-tumour · **Invasive margin** · **Tumour**

Cluster 8-44 interactions (cluster 44 surrounding cluster 8)

CD34 · CD11c · HLA-DR · DNA

Non-tumour · **Invasive margin** · **Tumour**

256 μm · 256 μm · 256 μm

Cluster 44 · Cluster 8

Cluster 44 ➤ CD34+HLA-DR+ · Cluster 8 ◄ CD11c+ HLA-DR+

Cluster 3 ◀   Cluster 44 ▶

Non-tumour   Invasive margin   Tumour

Cluster 3-44 interactions (cluster 44 surrounding cluster 3)

CD3 CD4 HLA-DR CD34 DNA

Non-tumour   Invasive margin   Tumour

256 μm   256 μm   256 μm

Cluster 3

Cluster 44

Cluster 3 ◀ CD3+ CD4+   Cluster 44 ▶ CD34+ HLA-DR+

A

Non-tumour   ▼CD4 CD8A◀   Tumour
              Invasive margin

256 μm   256 μm   256 μm

B

CD8A-146Nd (y-axis)
CD4-173Yb (x-axis)

Cluster 3 (CD4+ T cells)   Cluster 9 (CD8+ T cells)   Total cells

C

PD-L1-152Sm (y-axis)
T-bet-158Gd (x-axis)

Normalised to mode

T-bet-158Gd   PD-L1-152Sm

Supplementary Table 1: Imaging mass cytometry antibody panel

Metal	Marker	Clone	Species isotype	Company
89Y	a-SMA	1A4	Mouse IgG2a	R&D Systems
113In	Vimentin	D21H3	Rabbit IgG	CST
139La	CD57	HNK-1	Mouse IgM	BD Biosciences
141Pr	CD20	H1	Mouse IgG2a	BD Biosciences
142Nd	CD11c	EP1347Y	Rabbit IgG	Abcam
143Nd	Foxp3-biotin	236A/E7	Mouse IgG1	eBioscience
	Anti-biotin	1D4-C5	Mouse IgG2a	DVS
144Nd	MPO	E1E7l	Rabbit IgG	CST
145Nd	E-cadherin	36/E-cadherin	Mouse IgG2a	BD Biosciences
146Nd	CD8a	D8A8Y	Rabbit IgG	CST
147Sm	Podoplanin	polyclonal (cat #AF3670, batch #XXO0219081)	Sheep IgG	R&D Systems
148Nd	CD16	EPR16784	Rabbit IgG	Abcam
149Sm	CD45RO	UCHL1	Mouse IgG2a	BioLegend
150Nd	CD69	EPR21814	Rabbit IgG	Abcam
	Anti-FITC	FIT-22	Mouse IgG1	BioLegend
151Eu	HepPar1*	OCH1E5	Mouse IgG1	Santa Cruz
152Sm	PD-L1	E1L3N	Rabbit IgG	CST
	Cy3-donkey anti-rabbit	polyclonal (code 711-166-152, lot 122096)	Donkey IgG	Jackson ImmunResearch Laboratories
	Anti-Cy3	A-6	Mouse IgG1	Santa Cruz
153Eu	CD68	KP1	Mouse IgG1	BioLegend
154Sm	CD45	D9M8I	Rabbit IgG	Cell Signalling
155Gd	CD34*	QBend10	Mouse IgG1	Novus Biologicals
156Gd	CD86	polyclonal (cat #AF141NA)	Goat IgG	R&D Systems

158Gd	T-bet	D6N8B	Rabbit IgG	CST
159Tb	PD-L2*	D7U8C	Rabbit IgG	CST
160Gd	CD14	EPR3653	Rabbit IgG	Abcam
161Dy	FXIIIa	polyclonal (cat #SAF13A-AP, batch #AP1625-AR1)	Sheep IgG	Affinity Biologicals
162Dy	IgA*	3A5A5	Mouse IgG1	Proteintech
163Dy	CD11b	EPR1344	Rabbit IgG	Abcam
164Dy	SirPa	D6I3M	Rabbit IgG	Cell Signalling
165Ho	NaKATPase	EP1845Y	Rabbit IgG	Abcam
166Er	CD127	EPR2955(2)	Rabbit IgG	Abcam
167Er	CD66a	YTH71.3	Rat IgG2a	Abcam
168Er	Ki67	B56	Mouse IgG1	BD Biosciences
169Tm	CK8/18	5D3	Mouse IgG1	Leica
	AF647-donkey anti-mouse	polyclonal (code 715-606-150, lot 121469)	Donkey F(ab')$_2$ fragment	Jackson ImmunResearch Laboratories
	Anti-AF647/Cy5	CY5-15	Mouse IgG1	Sigma
170Er	CD3	polyclonal (cat #A045229-2)	Rabbit	Dako
171Yb	granzyme B	EPR8260	Rabbit IgG	Abcam
172Yb	CD206	685645	Mouse IgG2b	R&D Systems
173Yb	CD4	EPR6855	Rabbit IgG	Abcam
174Yb	HLA-DR	EPR3692	Rabbit IgG	Abcam
175Lu	CD303/BDCA2	polyclonal (cat #55427-1-AP)	Goat IgG	R&D Systems
176Yb	CD56	EPR2566	Rabbit IgG	Abcam
209Bi	DC-SIGN	polyclonal (cat # ab5715)	Rabbit IgG	Abcam

*Antibodies conjugated and titrated by our group. All others were conjugated by Sydney Cytometry or bought directly conjugated from Standard BioTools.