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], Givanna
H. Putri[8], Ruta Gupta[6,7], Michael Crawford[9], Carlo Pulitano[9,10], Charbel Sandroussi[9,10], Jerome
M. Laurence[9,10], 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]The Walter and Eliza Hall Institute of Medical Research and The Department of Medical
Biology, The University of Melbourne, Australia

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

[10]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 and Givanna H. Putri 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

Perivascular macrophages

Highlights

• Imaging mass cytometry using 39 markers was used to map immune-infiltrating cells
in hepatocellular carcinoma (HCC)
• Perivascular macrophages (PVM) were seen to form unique intratumoural
neighbourhoods with immune cells
• PVM were identified as VEGFA^{+} within HCC tumours

List of abbreviations

FFPE   Formalin-fixed paraffin embedded

H&E   Haematoxylin and eosin

HCC   Hepatocellular carcinoma

IHC   Immunohistochemistry

IMC   Imaging mass cytometry

LSEC   Liver sinusoidal endothelial cell

MAIT cells   mucosal-associated invariant T cells

mIHC   Multiplex immunohistochemistry

MRS   myeloid response score

MVI   Microvascular invasion

PCA   Principal component analysis

PERMANOVA   Permutational multivariate analysis of variance

PVM   perivascular macrophage

81	ROI	Region of interest
82	RT	Room temperature
83	scRNA-seq	Single-cell RNA-sequencing
84	sPLS-DA	Sparse partial least squares-discriminant analysis
85	TAM	tumour-associated macrophage
86	TGF-β	transforming growth factor-beta
87	TIL	Tumour-infiltrating lymphocyte
88	TMA	Tissue microarray
89	TME	Tumour immune microenvironment
90	TNM	Tumour-node-metastasis
91	TSA	Tyramide signalling amplification
92	VEGFA	Vascular endothelial growth factor A

Data availability

95 Data are available on Zenodo (DOI 10.5281/zenodo.10547481).

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.

Methods: A 39-parameter imaging mass cytometry panel was optimised with markers targeting immune cells, stromal cells, endothelial cells, hepatocytes, and tumour cells. We mapped the immune landscape of tumour, invasive margin, and adjacent non-tumour regions across sixteen resected tumours comprising of 144 regions of interest. X-shift clustering and manual gating were used to characterise cell subsets, and Spectre quantified the spatial environment to identify cellular neighbourhoods. Ligand-receptor communication was quantified on two single-cell RNA-sequencing datasets and one spatial transcriptomic dataset.

Results: 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 VEGFA$^+$ perivascular macrophages. *VEGFA* was further identified as a ligand for communication between perivascular macrophages and CD34$^+$ endothelial cells.

Conclusions: Immune cell neighbourhood 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 VEGFA$^+$ perivascular macrophages within these tumours could play a key role in angiogenesis and vascular permeability.

Impact and Implications

We investigated the landscape of immune cells within liver cancer. A unique perivascular neighbourhood of immune cells was identified. This is important as the interaction of immune cells and the vasculature in liver cancer is a therapeutic target of current systemic therapy. The

128 characterisation in detail of this neighbourhood may potentially identify additional targets for
129 future therapies.

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 A
(VEGFA) 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].

HCC tumour cells are a well-known source of VEGFA [13,17], yet several immune cells have
been identified as alternate sources of VEGFA. *VEGFA*+ mast cells are thought to be pro-
tumour across several cancer types, although they are largely absent in HCC [18]. In contrast,
high levels of *FOLR2*+ macrophages, *PLVAP*+ endothelial cells, and Notch/VEGF signalling
are associated with an immunosuppressive niche within HCC tumours [19].

High-dimensional imaging mass cytometry (IMC) has previously been utilised to investigate
the tumour microenvironment in HCC across several contexts, including hepatitis B virus
infection [20], response to immunotherapies [21], and macrophage characterisation [22]. The latter
study is important as several studies have implicated macrophages in HCC, including
neighbourhood interactions associated with immune cell activation [23,24] and response to
immunotherapies [21]. However, more work is needed to better understand the role of immune
cells – particularly macrophages – in angiogenesis and vascular permeability in HCC.

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
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 VEGFA+ perivascular macrophages (PVMs) within the tumour regions
that interact with these immune aggregates in the perivascular space that was absent in adjacent
non-tumour regions, suggesting these 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. Inclusion criteria was based on the availability of liver tissue (frozen or paraffin embedded) from adult (>18 years old) males and females with HCC diagnosis. Patients also required availability of clinical, imaging, and histopathology data. 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. Whole specimens of HCC tissues from an additional eight patients were used to assess the intratumoural spatial relationship of PVMs and endothelial cells. Further details are provided in Supplementary Table 1.

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 non-tumour 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 non-tumour region was selected away from the tumour. The exact distance between the non-tumour and tumour was variable across patient samples with no fixed diameter. In many patient samples, these areas were selected from different blocks so we are unable to attain a fixed measurement for this distance. 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.

220　Both TMAs were sectioned at 7 μm onto charged slides. Figure 1 provides an overview of the

221　experimental design.

Antibody Panel

An antibody panel (Supplementary Table 2) 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 human tissue [25]. Antibodies were then re-validated on FFPE liver and HCC tissue

(Supplementary Figure 1). 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 2, including anti-FITC, anti-Cy3, anti-Cy5, and anti-biotin) at 4 °C.

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

Imaging Mass Cytometry

The Hyperion imaging mass cytometer (Standard BioTools) was used to acquire data from both TMA slides. A pulsed laser scanned and laser ablated the tissue at 200 Hz. IMC data files were analysed using MCD Viewer (version 1.0.560.6, Standard BioTools). MCD Viewer and histoCAT++ (version 2.2)[26] were used for visualising the images, TIFF extraction, and creating 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 [27,28]. 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-VEGFA (VG1, Dako). Single

marker staining is shown in Supplementary Figure 2.

Images (20X for quantification and 20X or 40X for representative images) from 8 HCC

specimens within tumour regions were captured using the Mantra quantitative pathology

imaging system in combination with Mantra Snap (version 1.0.3, Akoya Biosciences) and

inForm (version 2.4.2, Akoya Biosciences) to spectrally process images. Multispectral images

were exported as TIFF single images and were then imported into Fiji (version 1.53c) [29] to

process representative images. HALO (version 3.6.4134, Indica Labs) was used to perform cell

segmentation, threshold markers for cell phenotyping, and spatial analysis. Proximity analysis

was performed within the HALO Spatial Analysis module (Indica Labs). Phenotyped cells

were registered and plotted together on a single plot. The Proximity Analysis tool was used to

identify the number of VEGFA$^{+/-}$ macrophages within a proximity range of 0-100 μm of

CD34^{+} endothelial cells and non-endothelial cells in 20 μm increments.

Spatial data Analysis

Ilastik software (version 1.4.0b27) was used to segment single cells using the multicut method

[30], 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 (version 4.2.0)[31] using 'Spectre' (version 1.0

and development version)[32] (Figure 1D).

Single cells were manually gated using FlowJo (version 10.8, BD Bioscience) to identify

conventional immune cell subsets (Supplementary Figure 3). The area of each section was

calculated using Fiji (version 1.53c) [29], 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 (version 26-Apr-2018) was used [33], which

identified 238 clusters (Supplementary Figure 4A). 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 4B). 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

(version 1.1)[34], generating 47 clusters (20 CD45$^+$ clusters and 27 CD45$^-$ clusters)

(Supplementary Figure 4C). The spatial data were then quantified using Spectre [32], 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 4D).

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 [35]. 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 (version 6.24.0)[36].

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
(https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/geo/query/acc.cgi?acc=GSE149614), which consisted of cells
from paired non-tumour and tumour (8/10 patients) from newly diagnosed HCC patients [37].
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 [37]. Pre-
processed and pre-annotated data were used. Ligand-receptor communication between cells
was calculated using the R package 'CellCall' (version 1.0.7)[38].

A second cohort of HCC patients were similarly analysed as a validation
(https://data.mendeley.com/datasets/skrx2fz79n/1), which similarly consisted of cells from
paired non-tumour and tumour regions from six HCC patients [39]. 6/6 had HBV infection.
Cluster annotations from the first cohort were transferred to this second cohort using 'scANVI'
as part of 'scvi-tools' (version 1.0.4) [40,41] (Supplementary Figure 5). Ligand-receptor
communication was then similarly calculated on the transferred clusters.

Spatial transcriptomic analysis

Further confirmation was undertaken using publicly available CosMx SMI data made available
by nanoString [42]. The data contained one HCC tumour (grade G3, stage II) and one normal
liver tissue. Data had undergone cell segmentation and cell annotation. Data were analysed in
R using vignette from nanoString [42].

Endothelial cells were defined based on pre-annotated data, consisting of central venous liver
sinusoidal endothelial cells (LSEC), periportal LSEC, and portal endothelial cells.
Macrophages consisted of non-inflammatory and inflammatory macrophages. *CD34*-
expressing endothelial cells and *VEGFA*-expressing macrophages were identified based on
transcript expression. Close cells were defined as being within 20 μm of each other. Ligand-
receptor communication was quantified as described above.

Statistical tests

Statistics were calculated using packages available within R [31], 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 [43]. 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 (version 2.6-4)[44]. To calculate paired p-

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

multiple comparisons (version 0.4.1)[45]. 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 (version 0.9-83)[46].

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. Cellular neighbourhoods were inferred based on the average number of one cluster within 20 μm of another (or same) cluster [47]. 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. Cellular 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 cellular 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.

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 6A). 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 6B). 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 6C). 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 6C).

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 6A).

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 4D). Furthermore, certain clusters were phenotypically similar to each other based on marker expression and were combined (Supplementary Figure 7). 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 cellular neighbourhood interactions may be attributed to increased densities of the cells involved.

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

Having identified cluster 44 at the centre of multiple cellular 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
8). 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, including FXIIIA that is
expressed by macrophages [48-52], we hypothesised the myeloid cell to be a PVM. Further staining
using mIHC, which allowed for greater image resolution, showed that many of these PVM-like
cells also expressed VEGFA, suggesting they are indeed PVMs (Figure 5C) [53-55]. These cells
were also identified in additional specimens of HCC tissues from eight patients. Representative
images of mIHC staining of four of these HCC tumours are shown in Figure 6C. This staining
also showed VEGFA$^-$ macrophages in close association to CD34$^+$ endothelial cells indicating
that both VEGFA$^+$ and VEGFA$^-$ macrophages preferentially reside in close proximity to
CD34$^+$ endothelial cells (Figure 6A). Analysis of spatial interactions of VEGF$^{+/-}$ macrophages
to CD34$^+$ endothelial cells in HCC tumour tissue from these eight patients identified that
VEGFA$^+$ and VEGFA$^-$ macrophages preferentially reside 0-20 μm from CD34$^+$ endothelial
cells (Figure 6A). Although there was no significant difference in the number of VEGFA$^+$
macrophages compared to VEGF$^-$ macrophages in the proximity of CD34$^+$ endothelial cells,
significantly more VEGFA$^+$ and VEGFA$^-$ macrophages reside in close proximity (0-20 μm
from) to CD34$^+$ endothelial cells compared to those residing further away, 40-60, 60-80, 80-
100 μm (Figure 6A). In contrast, no significant difference in the number of VEGFA$^+$
macrophages residing close to non-endothelial cells (0-20 μm) was found when compared to
those residing further away (20-100 μm, 20 μm increments) (Figure 6B).

To determine whether any cell-cell communication was occurring between the CD34$^+$
endothelial cells and the VEGFA$^+$ 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 [37]. 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' [38]. 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 VEGFA$^+$ macrophages are communicating with CD34$^+$ endothelial cells. To

expand upon these results, additional validation was done. Similar findings were observed in

two additional publicly available cohorts, including a second single-cell RNA-sequencing

(scRNA-seq) cohort and a sub-cellular spatial transcriptomic dataset using CosMx (Figure 7A).

VEGFA$^+$ macrophages within 20 µm of *CD34*$^+$ endothelial cells are visualised in normal and

cancerous liver (Figure 7B). The levels of *VEGFA*$^+$ macrophages and *CD34*$^+$ endothelial cells

are summarised in Figure 7C. Despite $n = 1$, there was a higher density and proportion of

VEGFA$^+$ macrophages and *CD34*$^+$ endothelial cells within cancerous liver compared to normal

liver, as well as a higher level of cellular neighbourhood interactions (Figure 7C). Together

these data reveal that tumour regions are not only highly enriched with CD34$^+$ tumour

endothelial cells, but also have VEGFA$^+$ 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 8A) and 9 (Figure 8B) 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 8C). 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 8D) and 35 (Figure 8E) 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 8F). The increased cellular 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 cellular neighbourhood interaction with cluster 9, a memory CD8$^+$ T cell subset (Figure 9A, Supplementary Figure 9). 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 9C). The cellular neighbourhood interactions between these two myeloid cell populations were also higher in the tumour compared to non-tumour regions (Figure 9B) 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 10.

Clinical associations were assessed by correlating tumour cellular neighbourhood interactions with prognostic and clinicopathological data. There were no associations between tumour cellular neighbourhood interactions and cirrhosis, early recurrence (<2 years), MVI, or viral-associated HCC (Supplementary Figure 10).

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 [56,57]. 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 were associated with VEGFA, which is known to be a key driver of angiogenesis and hypervascularity within tumours. Mining publicly available scRNA-seq and spatial transcriptomic datasets to interrogate potential ligand-receptor interactions between PVMs and endothelial cells confirms VEGFA- 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 [58,59]. This is in-line with the consensus in the field that tumour-associated macrophages (TAMs) are derived primarily from circulating blood monocytes [60], and in human HCC, TAMs arise from CCR2$^+$ monocytes [61]. 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 CD8$^+$ T cell or CD4$^+$ T cell subset densities between tumour and non-tumour regions, suggests that the tumour immune microenvironment may be

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 [62]. 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 [63]. CD68 is commonly used as a liver TAM marker [64] 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 [65].

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 [62,63,66], IMC [22,67], and multimodal genomic analysis incorporating scRNA-seq and TCR receptor sequencing [68-70]. 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 [55]. 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 VEGFA [54,55]. We also show that these PVMs are indeed able to produce VEGFA. Importantly, pre-clinical models show that

PVMs are also largely derived from circulating monocytes [54]. 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 [71].

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) [55]. It is tempting to postulate that PVMs are critical not

only for angiogenesis and hypervascularity in HCC through the secretion of VEGFA 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 [72], 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 [53].

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 [70,73]. 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 [70]. 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 [68]. 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 [63]. 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 [74]. The tumour vasculature
in HCC is structurally and functionally abnormal, and the tumour vessels are excessively leaky
[75]. 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 scRNA-seq [76]. 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 [77]. 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 [68]. 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

Author names in bold designate shared co-first authorship

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.   **Shen H**, **Yu H**, **Li QY**, et al. Hepatocyte-derived VEGFA accelerates the progression of non-alcoholic fatty liver disease to hepatocellular carcinoma via activating hepatic stellate cells. *Acta Pharmacol Sin*. May 4 2022;doi:10.1038/s41401-022-00907-5

18. **Cheng S**, **Li Z**, Gao R, et al. A pan-cancer single-cell transcriptional atlas of tumor infiltrating
myeloid cells. *Cell*. Feb 4 2021;184(3):792-809 e23. doi:10.1016/j.cell.2021.01.010
19. Sharma A, Seow JJW, Dutertre CA, et al. Onco-fetal Reprogramming of Endothelial Cells
Drives Immunosuppressive Macrophages in Hepatocellular Carcinoma. *Cell*. Oct 15 2020;183(2):377-
394 e21. doi:10.1016/j.cell.2020.08.040
20. Traum D, Wang YJ, Schwarz KB, et al. Highly multiplexed 2-dimensional imaging mass
cytometry analysis of HBV-infected liver. *JCI Insight*. Apr 8 2021;6(7):e146883.
doi:10.1172/jci.insight.146883
21. **Ho WJ**, **Zhu Q**, Durham J, et al. Neoadjuvant cabozantinib and nivolumab convert locally
advanced hepatocellular carcinoma into resectable disease with enhanced antitumor immunity.
Nature Cancer. 2021;doi:10.1038/s43018-021-00234-4
22. **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
23. Ramachandran P, Dobie R, Wilson-Kanamori JR, et al. Resolving the fibrotic niche of human
liver cirrhosis at single-cell level. *Nature*. Nov 2019;575(7783):512-518. doi:10.1038/s41586-019-
1631-3
24. Ruf B, Bruhns M, Babaei S, et al. Tumor-associated macrophages trigger MAIT cell
dysfunction at the HCC invasive margin. *Cell*. Aug 17 2023;186(17):3686-3705 e32.
doi:10.1016/j.cell.2023.07.026
25. 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
26. 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
27. **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
28. 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
29. 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
30. 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
31. *R: A language and environment for statistical computing*. R Foundation for Statistical
Computing; 2021. https://www.R-project.org/
32. **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
33. 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
34. 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
35. 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

36.   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

37.   **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

38.   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

39.   **Liu Y**, **Xun Z**, **Ma K**, et al. Identification of a tumour immune barrier in the HCC
microenvironment that determines the efficacy of immunotherapy. *Journal of hepatology*. Jan 25
2023;doi:10.1016/j.jhep.2023.01.011

40.   **Xu C**, **Lopez R**, **Mehlman E**, Regier J, Jordan MI, Yosef N. Probabilistic harmonization and
annotation of single-cell transcriptomics data with deep generative models. *Mol Syst Biol*. Jan
2021;17(1):e9620. doi:10.15252/msb.20209620

41.   Luecken MD, Buttner M, Chaichoompu K, et al. Benchmarking atlas-level data integration in
single-cell genomics. *Nat Methods*. Jan 2022;19(1):41-50. doi:10.1038/s41592-021-01336-8

42.   nanoString. CosMx SMI Human Liver FFPE Dataset. Accessed 02/09/2023,
https://nanostring.com/products/cosmx-spatial-molecular-imager/ffpe-dataset/human-liver-rna-
ffpe-dataset/

43.   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

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

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

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

47.   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

48.   Henriksson P, Becker S, Lynch G, McDonagh J. Identification of intracellular factor XIII in
human monocytes and macrophages. *Journal of Clinical Investigation*. 1985;76(2):528-534.
doi:10.1172/jci112002

49.   Muszbek L, Adany R, Szegedi G, Polgar J, Kavai M. Factor XIII of blood coagulation in human
monocytes. *Thromb Res*. Feb 1 1985;37(3):401-10. doi:10.1016/0049-3848(85)90069-6

50.   Muszbek L, Yee VC, Hevessy Z. Blood coagulation factor XIII: structure and function. *Thromb
Res*. Jun 1 1999;94(5):271-305. doi:10.1016/s0049-3848(99)00023-7

51.   Adany R, Bardos H. Factor XIII subunit A as an intracellular transglutaminase. *Cell Mol Life
Sci*. Jun 2003;60(6):1049-60. doi:10.1007/s00018-003-2178-9

52.   Torocsik D, Bardos H, Hatalyak Z, et al. Detection of factor XIII-A is a valuable tool for
distinguishing dendritic cells and tissue macrophages in granuloma annulare and necrobiosis
lipoidica. *J Eur Acad Dermatol Venereol*. Aug 2014;28(8):1087-96. doi:10.1111/jdv.12290

53.   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

54.   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

55.   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

56.   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
57.   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
58.   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
59.   **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
60.   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
61.   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
62.   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
63.   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
64.   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
65.   **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
66.   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
67.   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
68.   **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
69.   **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
70.   **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
71.   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
72.   **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
73.   Galon J, Bruni D. Approaches to treat immune hot, altered and cold tumours with
combination immunotherapies. *Nat Rev Drug Discov*. Mar 2019;18(3):197-218. doi:10.1038/s41573-
018-0007-y

74.   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
75.   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
76.   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
77.   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 cellular 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 VEGFA$^+$ 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), VEGFA (cyan), CD34 (purple), and DAPI (dark blue). Yellow arrows pointing to white cells expressing HLA-DR, FXIIIA, and VEGFA. 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 – VEGFA$^+$ and VEGFA$^-$ perivascular macrophages preferentially reside in close proximity to CD34$^+$ endothelial cells intratumourally in HCC. A) Waterfall plot of number of VEGFA$^+$ and VEGFA$^-$ macrophages proximity to CD34$^+$ endothelial cells, 20 μm increments, range 0-100 μm. B) Number of VEGFA$^+$ macrophages in proximity to CD34$^+$ endothelial cells compared to non-endothelial cells (CD34$^-$ VEGFA$^-$), 20 μm increments, range 100 μm. C) 4/8 HCC patients representative images of OPAL mIHC of HCC tumour tissue stained for HLA-DR (red), FXIIIA (green), VEGFA (cyan), CD34 (magenta), and DAPI (blue). Scale bar= 50 μm. 2-way ANOVA with Uncorrected Fisher's test was used, *p<0.05, **p<0.001.

Figure 7 – *VEGFA$^+$* macrophages and *CD34$^+$* endothelial cells have a ligand-receptor communication via *VEGFA* within tumours. A) Ligand-receptor communication between

VEGFA+ macrophages (C48, ligand) and *CD34+* endothelial cells (C21, receptor) within

tumour. The single-cell RNA-sequencing (scRNA-seq) dataset consisted of paired non-tumour

and tumour regions from six HCC patients. The spatial transcriptomic dataset consisted of one

liver section from one HCC patient. B) Visualisation of the spatial transcriptomic data for

normal and HCC liver. *CD34+* endothelial cells are red, *VEGFA+* macrophages are blue. Close

cells (within 20 μm) are solid, whilst non-close cells are translucent. Other cell types are grey.

C) Quantification of relative levels of *CD34+* endothelial cells and *VEGFA+* macrophages in

the spatial transcriptomic dataset ($n = 1$).

1000

Figure 8 – Cluster 44 has a higher number of cellular 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.

1013

Figure 9 – Cellular 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.

1021

1022 **Figure 10 – Summary figure**. Liver resections were collected from 16 patients with HCC to
1023 create a tissue microarray. Regions include non-tumour, invasive margin, and tumour, each
1024 collected in triplicate. Imaging mass cytometry was done on sections with a representative
1025 image shown. Within the tumour, a unique intratumoural perivascular-immune neighbourhood
1026 was identified, featuring cells as described.

1027

1028

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

Count 34
Neighbourhood 12 to 37
Count 37
Neighbourhood 12 to 34
Neighbourhood 44 to 16
Percentage 37
Percentage 34
Density 37

Neighbourhood 3 to 28

Regression coefficient

A Non-tumour | Cluster 44 | Tumour

DNA
HLA-DR
CD34

Cluster 44
CD34+
HLA-DR+

B Total cells | Cluster 44

Normalised to mode

CD11c-152Nd | CD14-160Gd | CD16-148Nd | CD34-155Gd
CD45-154Sm | CD68-153Eu | CD86-156Gd | CD206-172Yb
FXIIIA-161Dy | HLA-DR-174Yb

C Tumour
HLA-DR FXIIIA VEGFA CD34 DAPI

D *CD34⁺ endothelial cell (C48) as ligand*

Non-tumour | Tumour
C48 | C21 | C48 | C21

Ligand_symbol
sender:CCL14
sender:CCL2
sender:CCL21
sender:CCL23
sender:CCL3
sender:CCL3L3
sender:CCL4
sender:CCL5
sender:CSF1
sender:CXCL12
sender:IFNG
sender:IGF2
sender:TGFB1
sender:TGFB3

Ligand | Receptor | TF

Ligand_symbol
sender:CCL14
sender:CCL15
sender:CCL2
sender:CCL3
sender:CCL3L3
sender:CCL4
sender:CCL5
sender:CXCL12
sender:EDN1

VEGFA⁺ macrophage (C21) as ligand

Non-tumour | Tumour
No ligand-receptor communication | C21 | C48

Ligand_symbol
sender:IGF1
sender:PDGFC
sender:TGFB1
sender:TNF
sender:VEGFA
sender:VEGFB

Ligand | Receptor | TF

Tumour

A

scRNA-seq dataset 2

C21 | **C48**

Spatial transcriptomic dataset

VEGFA+ macrophage | *CD34*+ endothelial cell

B

Cell coordinates in XY space

Cell type

- Close *CD34*+ endothelial cell
- Close *VEGFA*+ macrophage
- Non-close *CD34*+ endothelial cell
- Non-close *VEGFA*+ macrophage
- Other cell type

C

Subset density (cells/mm²)	Normal	HCC
VEGFA+ macrophages	26.34	36.27
Close *VEGFA*+ macrophages	1.26	3.65
CD34+ endothelial cells	26.75	46.61
Close *CD34*+ endothelial cells	1.51	4.04

Subset proportions	Normal	HCC
Close *VEGFA*+ macrophages (%*VEGFA*+ macrophages)	4.80%	10.1%
Close *CD34*+ endothelial cells (%*CD34*+ endothelial cells)	5.66%	8.67%

Average number within 20 μm	Normal	HCC
Macrophage to endothelial cell	0.060	0.132
Endothelial cell to macrophage	0.055	0.088

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

CD8A
HLA-DR
CD11c
DNA

Cluster 8
CD11c+
HLA-DR+

Cluster 9
CD8A+

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

CD14
CD68
FXIIIA
DNA

Cluster 45
CD14+
CD68+
FXIIIA+

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

VEGFA   **Perivascular macrophages**

CD206+
FXIIIA+
VEGFA+

Tumour cells

Endothelial cells

CD34+

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 legends

Supplementary Figure 1 – Single marker IMC staining. Representative images for
individual IMC antibodies.

Supplementary Figure 2 – Single marker OPAL staining. Representative images for
individual OPAL antibodies.

Supplementary Figure 3 – Manual gating strategy of immune cell subsets. Representative
gating strategy identifying immune cell subsets.

Supplementary Figure 4 – 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 5 – scANVI cluster annotation transfer. Cluster annotations were
transferred from initial single-cell RNA-sequencing (scRNA-seq) dataset (GSE149614) to a
second scRNA-seq dataset (https://data.mendeley.com/datasets/skrx2fz79n/1). A) UMAP
visualising the integrated original reference dataset (orange) with the second dataset (blue). B)
UMAP of predicted annotated clusters.

Supplementary Figure 6 – T cell and myeloid cell subset levels across regions. A) Densities of T cell subsets across regions. B) Densities of CD4$^+$ T cell subsets. Friedman test with Dunn's multiple comparison corrections was done. C) Densities of CD14$^-$ non-monocyte-derived macrophages across regions. D) Density and proportions (% of CD45$^+$ cells or total cells) across myeloid cell subsets. Wilcoxon test was used.

Supplementary Figure 7 – 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 8 – 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 9 – 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 10 – 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.

CD127

CD206

CD303

CK8/18

DNA1

DNA2

E-cadherin

Foxp3

Foxp3　　　CD3

▶ Treg

FXIIIA

Granzyme B

Granzyme B   **CD3**

▶ **Granzyme B+ T cell**

HepPar1

HLA-DR

IgA

Ki67

MPO

NaKATPase

PD-L1

PD-L2

PD-L2 **CD45**

▶ **PD-L2+ leukocyte**

Podoplanin

SIRPa

Vimentin

T-bet

T-bet **CD3**

▶ **T-bet+ T cell**

Supplementary Figure 2

DAPI

FXIIIA

HLA-DR

VEGF

CD34

Supplementary Figure 3

Supplementary Figure 4

Supplementary Figure 5

A   **Dataset integration**   **B**   **Cluster annotation transfer**

● Original
● Second dataset

cluster_2	cluster_22	cluster_38
cluster_3	cluster_23	cluster_39
cluster_4	cluster_24	cluster_42
cluster_5	cluster_25	cluster_43
cluster_7	cluster_26	cluster_44
cluster_8	cluster_27	cluster_45
cluster_9	cluster_29	cluster_46
cluster_10	cluster_30	cluster_47
cluster_11	cluster_31	cluster_48
cluster_12	cluster_32	cluster_49
cluster_13	cluster_33	cluster_50
cluster_14	cluster_34	cluster_51
cluster_16	cluster_36	cluster_52
cluster_20	cluster_37	cluster_53
cluster_21		

Supplementary Figure 6

Supplementary Figure 7

Cluster 35 ▶   **Cluster 45** ◀

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 44
Cluster 9 ► CD8A+   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

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

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

Non-tumour   ◄ **CD4**   **CD8A** ◄   **Invasive margin**   **Tumour**

256 μm   256 μm   256 μm

B

CD8A-146Nd

CD4-173Yb

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

C

PD-L1-152Sm

T-bet-158Gd

Normalised to mode

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

Supplementary Figure 10

Supplemenary Table 1: Patient cohort

ID	Experiment	Aetiology	Cirrhotic	BCLC	TNM	Largest tumour size (mm)	Tumour number	MVI	Differentiation	Previous Tx
1	IMC (TMA1)	HBV	Y	A	pT2	17	2	Y	Moderate	N
2	IMC (TMA1)	MASH	N	A	pT2	165	1	Y	Moderate	N
3	IMC (TMA1)	HBV	Y	A	pT1	40	2	N	Well	N
4	IMC (TMA1)	HCV, MASH	Y	A	pT1b	32	1	N	Poor	N
5	IMC (TMA1)	ALD	Y	A	T1bN0MX	35	1	N	Moderate	N
6	IMC (TMA1)	MASH	N	A	pT1b	37	1	N	Moderate	N
7	IMC (TMA1)	MASH	N	A	pT3	270	1	Y	Moderate	N
8	IMC (TMA1)	HBV	N	A	pT2	117	1	Y	Well to moderate	N
9	IMC (TMA2)	HCV	Y	A	pT2	30	1	Y	Moderate	N
10	IMC (TMA2)	HCV	N	A	pT2 Nx	170	1	Y	Moderate	N
11	IMC (TMA2)	ALD	Y	A	pT2	25	1	Y	Well to moderate	N
12	IMC (TMA2)	Unknown	N	B	T3 N0 M0	110	>3	Y	Moderate	N
13	IMC (TMA2)	HCV	Y	A	pT2	21	1	N	Well to moderate	N
14	IMC (TMA2)	HBV	N	A	pT1a	16	1	N	Moderate	N
15	IMC (TMA2)	MASH, ALD	N	A	pT1a	9	1	N	Well	N
16	IMC (TMA2)	Unknown	N	A	pT1b N0	140	1	N	Poor	N
17	OPAL	HBV	N	A	pT1b N0M0	150	1	Y	Moderate	N
18	OPAL	Unknown	Y	A	pT1b N0M0	120	1	N	Well	TACE
19	OPAL	ALD	N	A	pT2 N0M0	130	1	Y	Moderate	N
20	OPAL	HCV, ALD	Y	B	pT2 N0M0	45 + 18	2	N	Moderate	N
21	OPAL	Unknown	N	A	pT2 N0M0	160	1	Y	Poor	Atezolizumab
22	OPAL	HCV	N	A	pT4 N1 M0	45	1	Y	Poor	N
23	OPAL	Unknown	N	A	pT2 N0M0	180	1	Y	Moderate	N
24	OPAL	HBV	N	A	pT1b N0M0	71	1	N	Moderate	N

Supplementary Table 2: Imaging mass cytometry antibody panel

Metal	Marker	Clone	Species isotype	Company	Concentration
89Y	a-SMA	1A4	Mouse IgG2a	R&D Systems	1 µg mL^{-1}
113In	Vimentin	D21H3	Rabbit IgG	CST	1 µg mL^{-1}
139La	CD57	HNK-1	Mouse IgM	BD Biosciences	2 µg mL^{-1}
141Pr	CD20	H1	Mouse IgG2a	BD Biosciences	4 µg mL^{-1}
142Nd	CD11c	EP1347Y	Rabbit IgG	Abcam	2 µg mL^{-1}
143Nd	Foxp3-biotin	236A/E7	Mouse IgG1	eBioscience	10 µg mL^{-1}
	Anti-biotin	1D4-C5	Mouse IgG2a	DVS	1/100 dilution
144Nd	MPO	E1E7l	Rabbit IgG	CST	8 µg mL^{-1}
145Nd	E-cadherin	36/E-cadherin	Mouse IgG2a	BD Biosciences	4 µg mL^{-1}
146Nd	CD8a	D8A8Y	Rabbit IgG	CST	1.98 µg mL^{-1}
147Sm	Podoplanin	polyclonal (cat #AF3670, batch #XXO0219081)	Sheep IgG	R&D Systems	2 µg mL^{-1}
148Nd	CD16	EPR16784	Rabbit IgG	Abcam	8 µg mL^{-1}
149Sm	CD45RO	UCHL1	Mouse IgG2a	BioLegend	4 µg mL^{-1}
150Nd	CD69	EPR21814	Rabbit IgG	Abcam	0.986 µg mL^{-1}
	Anti-FITC	FIT-22	Mouse IgG1	BioLegend	4 µg mL^{-1}
151Eu	HepPar1*	OCH1E5	Mouse IgG1	Santa Cruz	2 µg mL^{-1}
152Sm	PD-L1	E1L3N	Rabbit IgG	CST	1/2000 dilution
	Cy3-donkey anti-rabbit	polyclonal (code 711-166-152, lot 122096)	Donkey IgG	Jackson ImmunResearch Laboratories	1/100 dilution
	Anti-Cy3	A-6	Mouse IgG1	Santa Cruz	4 µg mL^{-1}
153Eu	CD68	KP1	Mouse IgG1	BioLegend	2 µg mL^{-1}
154Sm	CD45	D9M8I	Rabbit IgG	Cell Signalling	3 µg mL^{-1}
155Gd	CD34*	QBend10	Mouse IgG1	Novus Biologicals	2 µg mL^{-1}
156Gd	CD86	polyclonal (cat #AF141NA)	Goat IgG	R&D Systems	2 µg mL^{-1}

158Gd	T-bet	D6N8B	Rabbit IgG	CST	6 μg mL^{-1}
159Tb	PD-L2*	D7U8C	Rabbit IgG	CST	50 μg mL^{-1}
160Gd	CD14	EPR3653	Rabbit IgG	Abcam	1 μg mL^{-1}
161Dy	FXIIIa	polyclonal (cat #SAF13A-AP, batch #AP1625-AR1)	Sheep IgG	Affinity Biologicals	2 μg mL^{-1}
162Dy	IgA*	3A5A5	Mouse IgG1	Proteintech	0.2 μg mL^{-1}
163Dy	CD11b	EPR1344	Rabbit IgG	Abcam	4 μg mL^{-1}
164Dy	SirPa	D6I3M	Rabbit IgG	Cell Signalling	4 μg mL^{-1}
165Ho	NaKATPase	EP1845Y	Rabbit IgG	Abcam	6 μg mL^{-1}
166Er	CD127	EPR2955(2)	Rabbit IgG	Abcam	4 μg mL^{-1}
167Er	CD66a	YTH71.3	Rat IgG2a	Abcam	4 μg mL^{-1}
168Er	Ki67	B56	Mouse IgG1	BD Biosciences	4 μg mL^{-1}
169Tm	CK8/18	5D3	Mouse IgG1	Leica	1/200 dilution
	AF647-donkey anti-mouse	polyclonal (code 715-606-150, lot 121469)	Donkey F(ab')$_2$ fragment	Jackson ImmunResearch Laboratories	1/100 dilution
	Anti-AF647/Cy5	CY5-15	Mouse IgG1	Sigma	4 μg mL^{-1}
170Er	CD3	polyclonal (cat #A045229-2)	Rabbit	Dako	4 μg mL^{-1}
171Yb	granzyme B	EPR8260	Rabbit IgG	Abcam	8 μg mL^{-1}
172Yb	CD206	685645	Mouse IgG2b	R&D Systems	4 μg mL^{-1}
173Yb	CD4	EPR6855	Rabbit IgG	Abcam	1 μg mL^{-1}
174Yb	HLA-DR	EPR3692	Rabbit IgG	Abcam	1 μg mL^{-1}
175Lu	CD303/BDCA2	polyclonal (cat #55427-1-AP)	Goat IgG	R&D Systems	4 μg mL^{-1}
176Yb	CD56	EPR2566	Rabbit IgG	Abcam	4 μg mL^{-1}
209Bi	DC-SIGN	polyclonal (cat # ab5715)	Rabbit IgG	Abcam	1.05 μg mL^{-1}

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