Engineering the cell–material interface for controlling stem cell adhesion, migration, and differentiation
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ABSTRACT

The effective utilization of stem cells in regenerative medicine critically relies upon our understanding of the intricate interactions between cells and their extracellular environment. While bulk mechanical and chemical properties of the matrix have been shown to influence various cellular functions, the role of matrix interfacial properties on stem cell behavior is unclear. Here, we report the striking effect of matrix interfacial hydrophobicity on stem cell adhesion, motility, cytoskeletal organization, and differentiation. This is achieved through the development of tunable, synthetic matrices with control over their hydrophobicity without altering the chemical and mechanical properties of the matrix. The observed cellular responses are explained in terms of hydrophobicity-driven conformational changes of the pendant side chains at the interface leading to differential binding of proteins. These results demonstrate that the hydrophobicity of the extracellular matrix could play a considerably larger role in dictating cellular behaviors than previously anticipated. Additionally, these tunable matrices, which introduce a new control feature for regulating various cellular functions offer a platform for studying proliferation and differentiation of stem cells in a controlled manner and would have applications in regenerative medicine.

© 2011 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

The interaction of stem cells with their surrounding microenvironment is fundamental to multiple processes such as cell migration, proliferation, lineage specificity, and tissue morphogenesis [1–8]. The microenvironment is comprised of the extracellular matrix (ECM), the aqueous milieu enriched with soluble morphogens, and the neighboring cells [2,9]. How the soluble components influence cellular processes has been studied extensively, but it has become clearer only over the last decade or so that the “insoluble” component, the ECM, plays an equally important role in stem cell growth and differentiation [5,7,10–12].

Most studies examining matrices as regulators of stem cell function have attributed the effects of the matrix to their “bulk” mechanical and chemical properties [10,12–14]. However, since cells interact with the matrix through the cell–matrix interface, the “interfacial” properties of the matrix—interfacial energy, hydrophobicity, and surface topography—play an equally important role in regulating stem cell functions. Mei et al. have recently conducted a high throughput analysis examining how various material properties correlate with the adhesion and self-renewal of human embryonic stem cells and found that matrix hydrophobicity exhibits a strong correlation with the observed cellular behaviors [15]. Also, we know that changes in the mechanical or chemical properties of the matrix, which strongly modulate stem cell behavior, could also introduce changes in the interfacial properties, suggesting possible role of interfacial properties co-acting with bulk parameters to modulate cellular functions.

The role of interfacial properties on cellular behaviors is not surprising as almost a century ago D’Arcy Thompson foretold the importance of interfacial properties in dictating cell form and morphogenesis [16,17]. Over the years, interfacial properties have been implicated to play increasingly important roles on a wide spectrum of cellular functions ranging from cell adhesion and mechanics [17–21] to the function of biomolecules [22,23]. However, the role of interfacial properties such as hydrophobicity independent of functional group(s) and mechanical properties on stem cell growth and differentiation has not been examined so far.

One of the major challenges in understanding the effect of matrix interfacial properties has been de-convoluting its effects from those arising due to the bulk properties of the matrix. In this study, we address this issue by developing tunable, synthetic matrices in which...
the interfacial hydrophobicity is controlled in a systematic manner by varying the alkyll chain length of pendant side chains without altering the chemical functional group and mechanical properties of the matrix. Using these matrices, we demonstrate that the interfacial hydrophobicity of the matrix, which determines how favorably (or unfavorably) the matrix interacts with the aqueous milieu, play a pivotal role in governing adhesion, cytoskeletal organization, migration, and differentiation of human mesenchymal stem cells (hMSCs).

2. Materials and methods

2.1. Synthesis of acryloyl amino acid (AA) monomers

AA monomers were synthesized from the following materials: C1: Glucose (Fisher Scientific); C2: 3-aminopropanoic acid (Acros Organics); C3: 4-aminobutyric acid (Acros Organics); C4: 5-aminovaleric acid (Aldrich); C5: 6-aminocaproic acid (Acros Organics); C6: 7-aminobutanoic acid (Peptech Corporation); C7: 8-aminocaproic acid (Acros Organics); C10: 11-aminoundecanoic acid (Aldrich), as described elsewhere [24]. Briefly, 0.1 mol glucose and 0.11 mol NaOH were dissolved in 80 ml deionized water in an ice bath under vigorous stirring. To this, 0.11 mol acryloyl chloride in 15 ml tetrahydrofuran was added drop wise. The pH was maintained at 7.5–7.8 until the reaction was complete. The reaction mixture was then extracted using ethyl acetate. The clear aqueous layer was acidified to pH 2.0 and then extracted with ethyl acetate. The organic layers were collected, combined, and dried over sodium sulfate. The solution was then filtered, concentrated, and precipitated in petroleum ether. Further purification was achieved by repeated precipitation and the final product was lyophilized. The synthesis of this monomer was followed by a similar procedure, with variations in pH during the acidification: pH 2.0 for C2, and C3; pH 3.0 for C4, C5, and C6; pH 5.0 for C7 and C10.

2.2. Hydrogel preparation

The hydrogels were synthesized by copolymerizing acrylamide (Am) with AA monomers at 7:1, 6:2, 5:3, and 3:5 mol ratios. The monomers were dissolved in a DMSO/water mixture (1:2), and polymerized in BioRad 1 mm spacer glass plates at room temperature using 1% w/v bis-acrylamide (cross-linker) and 1% ammonium persulfate/TMED (initiator/accelerator). In one set of experiments, we polymerized C5 hydrogels in silanized glass to promote collapse of side chains and increase their hydrophobicity. To silanize the glass slides, they were immersed in anhydrous toluene containing chlorotrimethylsilane (3:1 ratio) for 30 min, washed with methanol and toluene, and air-dried. In all experiments, 1 cm² hydrogel disks were used. For cell culture experiments, hydrogels were sterilized in 70% ethanol and washed with sterile PBS containing 50 units/ml penicillin/streptomycin, changing buffer every hour. Hydrogel disks were incubated in culture media for 16 h before washing with sterile PBS containing 50 units/ml penicillin/streptomycin, changing buffer every hour. Hydrogel disks were incubated in culture media for 16 h before plating cells. Since the concentration of AA monomers in the hydrogels is very small and all the monomers are completely soluble in the solvent prior to gelation, the hydrogels thus formed is mainly composed of random copolymers [24].

2.3. Monomer and hydrogel characterization

Proton nuclear magnetic resonance spectra (1H NMR) of monomers were recorded on a Varian Mercury-400 spectrometer at 400 MHz. Carbon-13 nuclear magnetic resonance spectra (13C NMR) were recorded on a Varian Mercury-400 spectrometer at 100 MHz; CDCl₃ or D₂O were used as solvents. 13C NMR spectra of hydrogels were recorded on a JEOL ECA500 spectrometer at 125.68 MHz using D₂O as a solvent (Figs. S1 and S2).

2.4. Mechanical measurements

The hydrogel rigidity (compressive modulus) was measured using a Multimode AFM equipped with a Nanoscope IIIA controller from Veeco Instruments (Santa Barbara, CA) run by NanoScope software v5.30. AFM images were acquired in contact mode at forces of ~4 nN with an “E” scanner (maximum scan area 12 × 12 mm², from Veeco) using Si₃N₄ cantilevers (Veeco) with 0.06 N/m nominal spring constants. The data was acquired in a 1 × PBS buffer solution. Gel samples were typically stored at 37 °C between 1 and 5 days in an incubator before imaging. No significant difference in sample morphology was noticed as a function of incubation time. The PBS solution was changed 4 times before imaging to remove possible contaminants. For a given scan area, the reported roughness value is the average root mean square (RMS) roughness obtained from two different spots of triplicate specimens. Data was analyzed using the nanoscope software. Flat-tening order 3 was applied to all images to correct for tilt and bow before roughness analysis.

2.6. Surface characterization

Surface roughness was characterized using a Multimode AFM equipped with a Nanoscope IIIA controller from Veeco Instruments (Santa Barbara, CA) run by NanoScope software v5.30. AFM images were acquired in contact mode at forces of ~4 nN with an “E” scanner (maximum scan area 12 × 12 mm², from Veeco) using Si₃N₄ cantilevers (Veeco) with 0.06 N/m nominal spring constants. The data was acquired in a 1 × PBS buffer solution. Gel samples were typically stored at 37 °C between 1 and 5 days in an incubator before imaging. No significant difference in sample morphology was noticed as a function of incubation time. The PBS solution was changed 4 times before imaging to remove possible contaminants. For a given scan area, the reported roughness value is the average root mean square (RMS) roughness obtained from two different spots of triplicate specimens. Data was analyzed using the nanoscope software. Flat-tening order 3 was applied to all images to correct for tilt and bow before roughness analysis.

2.7. Culture of hMSCs

hMSCs (p7043L, Tulane University) were expanded in growth medium (αMEM, 10% fetal bovine serum, 2 mM glutamine, and 50 units/ml penicillin/streptomycin). Fourth passage (P4) hMSCs were used for all the experiments.

2.8. Time-lapse video analysis

Time-lapse video was captured on a Nikon Ti-E microscope, equipped with an environmental control incubator (In vivo Scientific). Images were captured every 5 min for 19 h on the fourth day after plating. Temperature and CO₂ were maintained at 37 °C and 5%. Video and image analysis were performed with ImageJ (NIH). From each video, x/y coordinates of the cell nuclei were noted for ten cells, in 10 min intervals, and normalized to a common point of origin. Total distance traveled was calculated as the cumulative distance regardless of the direction of movement. Experiments were done in duplicate.

2.9. Cell count and surface area analysis

Three images from different fields of view were captured per hydrogel. The total number of adherent cells in each field was counted and averaged per hydrogel. The surface area of ten cells, chosen at random from each field, was measured. In each experiment, three hydrogel samples per hydrogel group were analyzed. All experiments were done in triplicate.

2.10. Shear force assay

We used a modified flow chamber system, which permits hydrogels to be placed in the center and sealed with a glass slide. Laminar flow was applied using a PV4 peristaltic pump (Stenner) for 15 s after which cells were imaged and flow rate was increased. The stress on the cells was calculated using the Navier–Stokes equation for a Couette flow between two parallel plates: \( \tau \) (dyne/cm²) = \( Q \mu / W H \), where \( Q \) is flow rate (ml/min), \( \mu \) is viscosity (g/cm·s) and \( W \) and \( H \) are width and height of the flow area. The force required to detach a cell was then calculated as the measured stress multiplied by the cell surface area.

2.11. Protein adsorption analysis

Protein adsorption to hydrogels from the serum was determined using Western blot analysis. The hydrogels were incubated for 4 h in PBS. Adsorbed proteins were eluted from the gel by incubating in 100 μl of 2× SDS protein sample buffer (Biorad) for 30 min at 37 °C. Protein samples were analyzed by Western blot using anti-fibronectin (BD Biosciences), anti-laminin β-2 (Santa Cruz), anti-vitronectin (Millipore), anti-fibrinogen γ (Santa Cruz), and anti-collagen I (Fitzgerald) antibodies.

2.12. Surface coverage calculations

The surface coverage of hydrogels with fibronectin (FN) molecules was calculated from quantitation of western blot images. The surface coverage, \( S \), is defined as the area covered by FN molecules adsorbed on a hydrogel: \( S = \alpha N_{av} S/2 \), where \( \alpha \) is the area of the extended FN molecule (140 nm × 2 nm), \( N_{av} \) is the Avogadro number, and \( S \) is the calculated amount of adsorbed FN in moles. \( \alpha \) was calculated by incubating hydrogels with 50 μg/ml of FN in PBS 4 h at 37 °C. Adsorbed FN was eluted from the gel, as described above and analyzed by Western blot. Quantification was carried out by computer-assisted densitometry against a standard curve. The quantity \( N_{av} \) is multiplied by 1/2 because the functional FN molecule is a dimer and \( S \) is calculated for the monomer. Experiments were done in triplicate and calculated values were averaged for each hydrogel.
Fig. 1. hMSC cell adhesion and spreading on hydrogels display a non-monotonic dependence on pendant chain hydrophobicity and comonomer concentration. (A) Schematic of hydrogels synthesized from acrylamide (Am) and acryloyl amino acid monomers (AA). The hydrogels are referred to as C1, C2, . . . , C10 depending upon the number of CH2 groups \( (n = 1\text{–}10) \) on their pendant side chains. (B) Compressive modulus of Am-co-AA hydrogels (Am:AA = 7:1). Error bars indicate standard deviation. (C) Contact angle measurements of water droplets on 7:1 hydrogels with varying alkyl side chain lengths. The values are presented as mean ± standard deviation. (D) 4 × 4 μm² AFM images of Am-co-AA hydrogels display flat surfaces with low roughness values. All images were acquired in PBS buffer using contact mode with triangular cantilevers of 0.06 N/m nominal spring constant. (E) Brightfield images of hMSCs on C1–C10 hydrogels and their quantification (F) after 24 h of plating. Error bars indicate standard deviation \( P < 0.0001, n = 9 \). Scale bars in E = 400 μm (G) Quantification of cell spreading on the hydrogels. Plot graphs display individual cell area measurements. Bars indicate the mean area for all measured cells. \( P < 0.0001, n = 90 \).
Fig. 2. Time-lapse video analysis of hMSC motility on C1, C3, and C5 hydrogels of 7:1 Am:AA. (A) Brightfield images of hMSCs taken every 25 min during a 75-min span. Colored dots track the position of the cell nuclei through all frames. Scale bar = 100 μm. (B) Graphical representation of cell displacements. The graphs trace the displacements of two representative cells (shown in red and blue) from each hydrogel over 19 h. Each dot represents the position of a few select cell nuclei at 10-min intervals relative to their position at time 0. Plot area for all graphs is 450 μm × 450 μm. Tick marks = 50 μm. (C) Traveled distance profile of three representative cells from each hydrogel. Each line indicates the total distance traveled by a cell over 19 h. Dots represent the distance traveled over a 10-min interval. (D) Shear forces required to detach cells from hydrogel matrices. Plot graphs display the individual cell measurements. Bars indicate the mean force for all measured cells. P < 0.0001; n = 39. (For interpretation of the references to colour in this figure legend, the reader is referred to the web version of this article).
Fig. 3. C5 hydrogels promote hMSC organization. Brightfield (left column) and actin immunofluorescent staining (right column) of hMSCs on C3 and C5 hydrogels and glass coverslips (Cvs) after 4 and 14 days in culture. Scale bars = 100 μm (brightfield); 50 μm (immunofluorescence).
2.13. Electrostatic calculations

The electrostatic potentials for FN type-III repeats 7 through 10 and 12 through 14 were calculated by solving the linearized Poisson–Boltzmann equation (PBE) with the APBS package [26]. Coordinates for the two fragments of human FN encompassing type-III repeats 7 through 10 [27] and 12 through 14 [28] were obtained from the Protein Data Bank (PDB entries 1NF and 1FNY, respectively). Hydrogen atoms were added to the crystal structures using PDBePQR [29], and charges and radii were assigned according to PARSE force field parameters [30]. The electrostatic surface potential of the two fragments of FN was calculated by solving the linearized Poisson–Boltzmann equation (PBE) with the APBS package. PBE calculations were performed at 310 K, using a 150 mM NaCl environment with solvent and solute dielectric constants of 2.0 and 78.5, respectively. APBS output including structures with 3D surface potentials was visualized using PyMOL (www.pymol.org).

2.14. Docking calculations

Using the FN fragments described above as receptors, we utilized AutoDock Vina 1.0 [31] software to identify potential binding sites for the CH-COO– ligand. Polar hydrogen atoms and Gasteiger-Marsili charges [32] were added to FN, and CH-COO– was prepared through the same procedure. Default parameters were used as described in the manual with the exception of the maximum number of binding modes, which was set to 10,000. Binding modes within 1 kcal/mol of the most favorable binding free energy conformation (−3 kcal/mol) are shown in Fig. 6B.

2.15. Osteogenic differentiation

P4 hMSCs were cultured on C3 and C5 hydrogels and coverslips at a cell density of 5000 cells/cm² for 4 days in growth medium before changing into osteogenic medium (DMEM, 10% FBS, 50 μg/ml ascorbic acid, 10 μM dexamethasone, and 50 units/ml penicillin/streptomycin) [33]. Cells were cultured under differentiating conditions for up to 21 days. Samples were collected at different time points for analysis. We denote day 0 time point as the day when the cells were switched to differentiating medium. In addition to cells cultured in osteogenic medium, we also characterized hMSCs cultured in growth medium (absence of osteogenic-inducing soluble factors) to understand matrix-mediated osteogenic differentiation.

2.16. Myogenic differentiation

P4 hMSCs were cultured on C3 and C5 hydrogels and coverslips at a cell density of 5000 cells/cm² for 7 days in growth medium, and then switched to myogenic medium (DMEM, 10 mM transferrin, 5 mg/ml insulin, 20 nM progesterone, 0.1 mM putrescine, 5.2 μM selenite, 0.1 mM acetylcholine chloride, 10 mM ascorbic acid-2-phosphate, 10 μg/ml insulin, 20 nM progesterone, and 0.1 mM putrescine). Cells were transcribed into cDNA using SuperScript First-Strand Synthesis System (Invitrogen). The qRT-PCR products were separated by electrophoresis at 100 V on a 2% agarose gel and stained with Fast Blue RR/naphthol.

2.17. Immunofluorescence

Cells were fixed with 4% paraformaldehyde, washed in PBS, and blocked/permeabilized (3% bovine serum albumin, 0.1% Triton X-100, in PBS) for 30 min. Cells were incubated with primary antibody, as labeled, diluted in blocking solution for 1 h at room temperature, washed in PBS, then incubated in Alexa Fluor 488-conjugated secondary antibodies (Invitrogen) diluted at 1:250 in blocking solution for 1 h at room temperature. In some instances, as labeled, Alexa Fluor 488-conjugated phalloidin (Invitrogen) was used, at 1:20 dilution, in blocking solution for 1 h at room temperature. Hydrogels were mounted with VectaShield-DAPI (Vector Laboratories), and imaged using a Zeiss Observer A1 microscope equipped with an X-Cite 120 (EXFO) mercury lamp. Primary antibodies: Osteocalcin, 1:100 (ab13420, Abcam); collagen I, 1:250 (70R-CR007X, Fitzgerald); desmin, 1:100 (ab15200, Abcam); collagen I, 1:250 (70R-CR007X, Fitzgerald); desmin, 1:100 (ab15200, Abcam); myosin heavy chain, 1:100 (A4.1025, Developmental Hybridoma Bank); desmin, 1:100 (ab15200, Abcam); myosin heavy chain, 1:100 (MF-20, Developmental Hybridoma Bank).

2.18. Alkaline phosphatase assay

ALP staining was performed using Sigma Kit #85 (Sigma–Aldrich) per manufacturer’s instructions [34]. In brief, cells were fixed in acetone/citrate solution, rinsed with water and stained with Fast Blue RR/naphthol.

2.19. Alizarin red staining

4% paraformaldehyde fixed cells were incubated for 30 min at room temperature in a 40 μM alizarin red solution (pH 4.1). Unincorporated dye was washed off with PBS.

2.20. Real time and quantitative PCR

Total RNA was extracted from three replicate samples with Trizol, and reverse-transcribed into cDNA using SuperScript First-Strand Synthesis System (Invitrogen). qRT-PCR reactions were performed using the SYBR Green PCR Mastermix and the ABI Prism 7700 Sequence Detection System (Perkin Elmer/Applied Biosystems, Rotkreuz, Switzerland) [34]. The cDNA samples were analyzed using β-actin as a reference. The level of expression of each target gene is calculated as 2-DΔCt [31]. The qRT-PCR products were separated by electrophoresis at 100 V on a 2% agarose gel in Tris–acetate–EDTA buffer and visualized after staining with ethidium bromide. The PCR primers are listed in Table S1.

2.21. Statistical analysis

One-way ANOVA with Bonferroni post-hoc analysis was used to analyze the data presented in Figs. 1 and 2, Fig. S4 and S5. A two-way ANOVA with Bonferroni post-hoc analysis was used to analyze the data presented in Figs. 4 and 5B.

3. Results

3.1. Design of tunable matrices with varying hydrophobicity

We have developed tunable synthetic matrices with precise control over their hydrophobicity by copolymerizing acrylamide (Am) with acryloyl amino acid (AA) monomers having dangling side chain of varying lengths, ranging from 1 to 10 CH₂ groups, terminating with a carboxyl group (Fig. 1A). These matrices are labeled C₁, C₂, …, C₁₀ depending on the number of side chain CH₂ groups. The synthesis of AA monomers and hydrogels are confirmed by proton (¹H) and carbon (¹³C) NMR spectroscopy (Figs. S1 and S2). Varying the number of side chain CH₂ groups, while maintaining the same molar ratio of Am to AA (e.g., 7 Am: 1 AA), permits us to modulate the surface hydrophobicity without altering the functional group, charge density, surface roughness, and bulk mechanical properties. The water contact angle measurements of the hydrogels confirm the increase in intrinsic hydrophobicity with increasing number of side chain CH₂ groups (Fig. 1C). Furthermore, we confirm that hydrogels of different hydrophobicity exhibit similar elastic modulus and surface roughness through compression tests and AFM imaging, respectively (Fig. 1B and D, and Fig. S3).

3.2. Matrix hydrophobicity-mediated cell adhesion and proliferation of hMSCs

Two hours post-plating of human bone marrow derived mesenchymal stem cells (hMSCs), it was clear that the incorporation of AA monomers increased the adhesive nature of the inherently bioinert Am hydrogels. However, significant differences in cell adhesion and spreading are noted amongst the various hydrogels, exhibiting a non-monotonic dependence on the length of the monomer side chain (Fig. S4, left). By 24 h, most cells (49.0 ± 2.6 cells/mm²) adhere onto the C5 hydrogels. In contrast, less than half the cells adhere on C1, C7, or C10 hydrogels (25.6 ± 1.5, 22.7 ± 1.5, and 17.8 ± 0.6 cells/mm², respectively: Fig. 1E and F). The adhered cells proliferated on all the hydrogels, as noted from the ~1.5–2.5 fold increase in cell numbers after 4 days (Fig. S4C, left). Concomitant with the number of adherent cells, there are also marked changes in cell morphology and spreading (Fig. 1G and Fig. S4B, left). The few adherent cells on C1 hydrogels are either round or elongated with small lamellipodia (Fig. 1E). The surface area of these cells measure 2349 ± 94.2 μm² on average and never exceeds 5000 μm². Conversely, cells on the C5 hydrogels display larger surface areas (3000–13,000 μm²; average 6427 ± 238.8 μm²), thus, side chains of 4–6 CH₂ groups seem ideal for cell adhesion and spreading.

Having established that a small amount of C5 monomer significantly enhances cell adhesion, we next investigated the effect of hydrogel composition by increasing the mole fraction of C5 moieties within the hydrogels: 7:1, 6:2, 5:3, and 3:5 (Fig. S5). Note that in cases where C5 content is increased (e.g. 3:5), the bulk mechanical and chemical properties are no longer invariant. The number of cells adhered to 6:2 hydrogels are similar to those on 7:1, but exhibit...
Fig. 4. Osteogenic differentiation of hMSCs. (A) Alkaline phosphatase (ALP) staining of hMSCs on C5 and C3 hydrogels and glass coverslips (Cvs) at 14 days in osteogenic medium; scale bar = 200 μm. Alizarin red S (AR) and immunofluorescent (green) staining for collagen I (Col1) and osteocalcin (Ocn) after 21 days. White (C5 hydrogels) and black (glass coverslips) arrowheads, in alizarin red S staining, point to calcium nodules. Nuclei in immunofluorescent stainings are labeled blue with DAPI. Scale bars = 100 μm (AR and collagen I) and 50 μm (Ocn). (B) Quantitative PCR of hMSCs cultured on C5 hydrogels or control (C3 hydrogels) for 14 or 21 days under osteogenic conditions. Plot graphs express “Relative fold expression” R. Ayala et al. / Biomaterials 32 (2011) 3700–3711
a significant increase in cell spreading, averaging 9063 ± 331.0 μm² with some measuring >17,000 μm² (Figs. S4, right and S5). Surprisingly, further increase in C5 concentration (5:3, 3:5) results in a significant decrease in both cell adhesion and spreading.

3.3. Matrix hydrophobicity influences migration of hMSCs

Time-lapse video analysis of hMSCs on hydrogels corroborates the notable differences in cell morphology and spreading, while revealing contrasting differences in movement between C1 and C5 hydrogels, with cells on C3 hydrogels yielding an intermediate behavior (Fig. 2 and Movies S1–S3). On C1 hydrogels, cells continuously change their shape, often extending and contracting lamellipodia in multiple directions as if searching for a “sticky” site, then elongating in one direction before snapping back to a round morphology (which sometimes resulted in cell detachment) to begin the search process once again. Furthermore, cells often form multicellular clusters for extended periods of time before separating, indicating a preference for cell–cell interactions over cell–matrix interactions. In contrast, cells on C5 hydrogels display large, slowly evolving morphologies that rarely cluster despite high cell density.

Supplementary videos related to this article can be found at doi: 10.1016/j.biomaterials.2011.02.004.

Graphic representations of the cellular movements reveal an erratic and random behavior with frequent directional changes for cells on C1 hydrogels, while cells on C5 hydrogels move in more deliberate and precise orientation (Fig. 2B). Also, the cells on C1 hydrogels travel significantly longer distances (1224.5 μm) averaging 1.11 μm/min and display “step-like” movements, compared to the smooth and slow (495.6 μm at 0.45 μm/min) movements observed on C5 hydrogels (Fig. 2C). Though the cells on C3 hydrogels are also somewhat erratic, they change direction less frequently and travel slower (1022.2 μm at 0.93 μm/min) than those on C1 hydrogels. These results are consistent with cell motility and migration speed being inversely proportional to cell surface area [6,35,36]. This is further confirmed by a shear-flow detachment assay where an average force of 20.1 ± 3.2 nN is needed to detach cells from C5 hydrogels, while the cells on C1 and C3 hydrogels only require 4.3 ± 0.8 and 11.2 ± 1.4 nN, respectively (Fig. 2D).

3.4. Matrix hydrophobicity influences cellular organization

Evaluation of long-term hMSC cultures reveals that C5 hydrogels provide an environment conducive for cell proliferation and migration, in accordance with their optimal adhesiveness. Surprisingly, these hMSCs (in growth medium) that lack orientation at earlier time points self-organize into a linear array as they reach confluency (Fig. 3). Such reorganization is also evident at the molecular level, as noted by the parallel, unidirectional organization of the actin cytoskeleton. This level of organization is in stark contrast to that of the less confluent hMSCs on C5 hydrogels, which show a spread, multidirectional actin cytoskeleton. Such cellular organization is unique to C5 hydrogels, as we do not observe it on other hydrogels or coverslips. Conversely, hMSCs on C3 hydrogels, which support cell survival and proliferation, tend to aggregate into large “rosette-like” clusters and maintain a fibroblastic morphology. Likewise, hMSCs grown on glass coverslips, while having similar morphology at low densities as those on C5 hydrogels, never attain the same degree of intracellular actin organization once they reach confluency (Fig. 3). The structural organization of the actin cytoskeleton is a direct response to cell–matrix and cell–cell interactions [4,35,37,38]; therefore, the organized arrangement of hMSCs speaks of highly coordinated cell–cell and cell–matrix interactions on C5 hydrogels.

3.5. Matrices with optimal hydrophobicity promote hMSCs differentiation

Cell–cell and cell–matrix interactions are known to play important roles in the differentiation commitment of stem cells through modulation of cell morphology and intracellular stress distribution [37,39–43]. We have taken advantage of the unique C5 hydrogel-mediated cytoskeletal organization to induce osteogenic and myogenic differentiation of hMSCs. We also compared the differentiation against corresponding C3 hydrogels and the widely used coverslips, though the properties of the coverslips are very different form the hydrogels.

At an initial cell density of 5000 cells/cm², hMSCs on C5 hydrogels exhibit spread morphology after 4 days of culture in growth medium (Fig. 3), which is more likely to undergo osteogenic differentiation [10,37,42]. Upon exposure to osteogenic medium, these cells undergo osteogenic differentiation, as characterized by gene and protein expressions (Fig. 4A and B). After 14 days of culture, alkaline phosphatase (ALP) activity and expression are detected in the hMSCs on C5 hydrogels while little and no activity is detected on coverslips and C3 hydrogels. In addition to the upregulation of osteogenic markers (Fig. 4B), hMSCs on C5 hydrogels stain positive for Alizarin red S (AR), collagen type 1, and osteocalcin (Fig. 4A). The AR staining reveals more calcium deposition and nodule formation on C5 hydrogels than on coverslips, and none on C3 hydrogels. Intense staining of osteocalcin and collagen type 1 is also observed on C5 hydrogels. Furthermore, hMSCs on C5 hydrogels undergo osteogenic differentiation even in the absence of any osteogenic-inducing soluble factors (Fig. 4C). We also determine the ability of C5-mediated alignment of hMSCs on myogenic differentiation. The parallel arrangement of the actin cytoskeleton closely resembles that of myoblasts in culture and thereby may facilitate myogenic differentiation [10]. Indeed, these hMSCs cultured under myogenic conditions stain positive for desmin, MF20, and MHC (Fig. 5A) and also maintain higher expressions of myogenic markers such as MyoD, Myf5, and MHC (Fig. 5B). In contrast, cells on coverslips show minimal staining for MF20 and MHC. Surprisingly, while cells on C3 hydrogels show long-term survival and proliferation (~21 days) in growth medium, they undergo cell death when cultured in myogenic medium.

We also note that although the cells undergoing osteogenic differentiation continued to expand and become confluent they retain a spread morphology and random organization typical of osteoblasts, never aligning as under normal growth conditions (Figs. S6 and S7). On the other hand, the cells undergoing myogenic differentiation not only maintain their original aligned organization, but become longer and thinner, with a parallel actin filament cytoarchitecture reminiscent of myoblasts (Figs. S6 and S7).
3.6. Matrix hydrophobicity influences protein adsorption

Proteins at the cell–matrix interface play an important role on adhesion of cells onto synthetic matrices lacking cell surface binding ligands. The effect of matrix hydrophobicity on protein adsorption has been well documented [44–46], and its effect on cell adhesion has been demonstrated [45,47]. To dissect the role of proteins in regulating cell adhesion, we examine the proteins that selectively adsorb on 7:1 hydrogels with varying hydrophobicity. Western blot analysis reveals that the hydrogels selectively adsorb fibronectin (FN) and laminin (LN) from the serum (Fig. 6A) and other ECM proteins (vitronectin, collagen I, and fibrinogen) are absent. While little FN and LN are found on C1, C3, and C7 hydrogels, abundant protein is adsorbed on C5 hydrogels. This bell-shaped protein adsorption profile reflects the cell adhesion trend found on 7:1 hydrogels (Fig. 1F). The C5 monomer mediated protein adsorption is also evident in hydrogels with increasing C5 content; 3:5 C5 adsorbed more protein compared to the corresponding 7:1 hydrogels (Fig. 6A).

3.7. Reach and accessibility of hydrogel side chains determines protein adsorption

To understand the non-monotonic adsorption of FN and LN on hydrogels with varying hydrophobicity, we examine the binding of the AA alkyl side chains of the hydrogel to ECM proteins using FN as a model system. We first compute the electrostatic potential of two fragments of FN with known crystal structures: type-III repeats 7–10 [27] and 12–14 [28] (Fig. 6B). Other FN domains are not examined, as their structures are not known. Both fragments display multiple regions of positive and negative electrostatic potentials with the former acting as binding sites for the matrices’ carboxyl groups, as confirmed by docking calculations of CH3COO– on the two fragments. The yellow spheres in Fig. 6B indicate the most favorable binding sites, with binding free energies between −2 and −3 kcal/mol. These sites are located in the positively charged pockets, where the van der Waals interactions are also strong. This observation, along with the expected atomic-level corrugation of the hydrogel surface, implies that the side chains must be sufficiently long to allow their terminal carboxyl groups to reach the binding sites on FN, thus explaining the small adsorption of FN on the surface of C1 hydrogels. As the chains become longer, the binding sites become more reachable, leading to increased adsorption.

The above argument, however, cannot explain the drop in adsorption observed on hydrogels with longer side chains (e.g., C7). To explain this effect, we hypothesize that the long side chains are highly hydrophobic and collapse onto the surface of the hydrogel, thus decreasing the accessibility of carboxyl groups for binding. We confirm this by computing the density of carboxyl groups in our hydrogel (w0.1 M) and comparing it against solubility data of carboxylic acids [48] with varying hydrocarbon chain lengths (Fig. 6C). Short chains are completely soluble in water, but the solubility of chains larger than C4 decreases sharply with chain length. In fact, chains longer than C6 are no longer soluble in water.
at densities similar to those found in the hydrogels. This suggests that the side chains in C7 and C10 hydrogels likely collapse in a manner reminiscent of phase separation, rendering their terminal carboxyl groups inaccessible for binding. This argument is further supported by the significant reduction in cell adhesion observed when the side chains of the highly adhesive C5 hydrogels are forced to collapse (Fig. 6D).

To understand the poor cell adhesion and growth observed on 3:5 C5 hydrogels despite the large protein adsorption, we quantify the surface coverage of FN on 7:1 and 3:5 C5 hydrogels. Our western blot quantification shows that the 7:1 and 3:5 hydrogels adsorb 0.26 and 1.47 pmol/cm² of FN, respectively. These amounts translate to ~22% and ~124% surface coverage for the two hydrogels, respectively. These values are likely to be underestimated given that the adsorbed FN is highly impervious to detergent extraction [49]. We anticipate that the excess FN adsorbed on 3:5 C5 hydrogels results in a combination of conformational changes and steric inhibition [50], reducing their interaction with cell surface integrins and thus decreasing cell adhesion.

4. Discussion

This work demonstrates that small changes in matrix hydrophobicity through addition or deletion of CH2 groups can dramatically alter cell–matrix interactions and in turn have a profound impact on various cellular behaviors such as adhesion, shape, motility, cytoskeletal organization, and differentiation. Another aspect of this study is the use of matrices that allow one to deconvolute the effects of matrix hydrophobicity from other effects arising from surface chemistry, surface topography, and mechanical properties of the matrices.

Interestingly, adhesion and spreading of hMSCs depend non-monotonically on matrix hydrophobicity, which correlates well with protein adsorption at the matrix interfaces with varying chain
lengths but fixed composition. Our computational analyses reveal an intriguing mechanism for the observed bell-shaped protein adsorption profile. For short chains, the terminal carboxyl groups of AA side chains have limited reach to access FN binding sites, while for long chains, their hydrophobic collapse into the matrix results in decreased accessibility of carboxyl groups for binding.

The observed correlation between protein adsorption and cell adhesion is not surprising given that the adhesion is often mediated through proteins [45,47]. However, what is intriguing is that the protein adsorption alone could not support cell adhesion, as evident from the failure of 3:5 C5 hydrogels to support cell adhesion despite the large amount of proteins adsorbed. To our knowledge, very little data exists on the effects of super-saturated protein coverage on cell adhesion. Our surface coverage calculations of FN along with available literature [50–52] suggest that the excess adsorption of proteins could result in conformational changes and/or steric inhibition, thus limiting the interactions between the cell surface integrins and the underlying matrix. A number of studies have shown the influence of surface hydrophobicity and surface chemistry on conformation and assembly of proteins at the interface [51–53]. Taken together, our results imply that an optimal balance of hydrophobic–hydrophilic forces is required for promoting cell–matrix interactions.

We would like to point out that increasing the C5 content also increases the bulk rigidity of the hydrogels due to increase in osmotic pressure and repulsion between the charged carboxyl groups. However, the observed decrease in cell adhesion with increasing C5 content cannot be attributed to these changes in matrix rigidity, as it is well known that increasing rigidity leads to enhanced cell adhesion and spreading [10]. That we observe the contrary suggests that factors other than bulk mechanical properties are responsible for the observed effects.

In addition to modulating cell adhesion, hydrophobicity also influences the cytoskeletal organization of hMSCs in a cell-density dependent manner. Previous studies have shown that the cytoskeletal changes that stem cells undergo responding to their extrinsic/intrinsic cues can direct their differentiation commitment [10,37,39,43]. By harnessing the changes in cytoskeletal organization of hMSCs on C5 hydrogels, we were able to direct their differentiation into both myogenic and osteogenic lineages. Interestingly, the C5 hydrogels could promote osteogenic differentiation even in the absence of osteogenic-inducing factors.

Furthermore, even though the adhered cells on C3 hydrogels exhibited long-term growth, they not only failed to differentiate, but underwent cell death in myogenic differentiation conditions. This suggests the plausible requirement of strong cell–matrix adhesion to support the cytoskeletal rearrangements and intra-cellular tensions that the stem cells undergo during differentiation. Such interplay between matrix adhesivity and cell-generated tension on the function of cells has been demonstrated previously using differentiated cells [5,54,55].

5. Conclusions

This study advances our understanding of how interfacial modulation of the extracellular matrix, which occurs both in tissue formation and disease progression, can play a considerably larger role in dictating cellular behaviors than previously envisioned. Ultimately, such an understanding of matrix interface-mediated adhesion, migration, and differentiation of stem cells could have implications in regenerative medicine. Moreover, the tunable matrices developed here introduce a new control parameter for regulating various cellular functions, thus offering a platform for studying proliferation and lineage specificity of stem cells in a controlled manner.
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