

1 **TITLE:**
2 Intrafemoral Injection of Human Hematopoietic Stem and Progenitor Cells into
3 Immunocompromised Mice
4

5 **AUTHORS AND AFFILIATIONS:**

6 Emily F. Calderbank*, Laura Magnani, Elisa Laurenti*

7
8 Wellcome and Medical Research Council Cambridge Stem Cell Institute, Department of
9 Haematology, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, United Kingdom
10

11 **Email address of the co-author:**

12 Laura Magnani (lm2011@cam.ac.uk)

13
14 ***Corresponding authors:**

15 Emily F. Calderbank (ec568@cam.ac.uk)

16 Elisa Laurenti (el422@cam.ac.uk)

17
18 **SUMMARY:**

19 Intrafemoral injections allow for the engraftment of a small number of hematopoietic stem and
20 progenitor cells (HSPCs), by placing the cells directly in the bone marrow cavity. Here we describe
21 an experimental protocol of intrafemoral injection of human HSPCs into immunodeficient mice.
22

23 **ABSTRACT:**

24 Hematopoietic stem cells (HSCs) are defined by their lifelong ability to produce all blood cell
25 types. This is operationally tested by transplanting cell populations containing HSCs into
26 syngeneic or immunocompromised mice. The size and multilineage composition of the graft is
27 then measured over time, usually by flow cytometry. Classically, a population containing HSCs is
28 injected into the circulation of the animal, after which the HSCs home to the bone marrow, where
29 they lodge and begin blood production. Alternatively, HSCs and/or progenitor cells (HSPCs) can
30 be placed directly in the bone marrow cavity.
31

32 This paper describes a protocol for intrafemoral injection of human HSPCs into immunodeficient
33 mice. In short, preconditioned mice are anesthetized, and a small hole is drilled through the knee
34 into the femur using a needle. Using a smaller insulin needle, cells are then injected directly into
35 the same conduit created by the first needle. This method of transplantation can be applied in
36 varied experimental designs, using either mouse or human cells as donor cells. It has been most
37 widely used for xenotransplantation, because in this context, it is thought to provide improved
38 engraftment over intravenous injections, therefore improving statistical power and reducing the
39 number of mice to be used.
40

41 **INTRODUCTION:**

42 Blood has one of the highest regeneration rates in the human body, producing 1×10^{12} cells per
43 day in the adult human bone marrow¹. Hematopoietic stem cells (HSCs) guarantee blood
44 production over the lifespan by the process of hematopoiesis and are defined by their capacity

45 to produce all blood cell types (multipotentiality) while maintaining themselves (self-renewal).
46 Historically, the gold standard for testing the function of an HSC has always relied on
47 transplantation, testing the ability of a donor population to reconstitute all blood lineages of a
48 mouse long-term (commonly defined as a minimum of 20 weeks)². A large body of functional
49 work spanning several decades has demonstrated that the HSC compartment is heterogeneous
50 in both lineage output and long-term reconstitution. The toolkit to study hematopoiesis has
51 expanded considerably over the years, with many new techniques, including *in vitro* single-cell
52 functional assays, single-cell -omics approaches, and lineage tracing³. The latter have conclusively
53 demonstrated that the contributions of HSC and multipotent progenitors largely differ in native
54 hematopoiesis and under the stress imposed by transplantation. All these techniques
55 complement transplantation assays, which remain important to assess the long-term
56 repopulation capacity of HSCs. In the context of the study of human hematopoiesis,
57 xenotransplantation provides the only method to experimentally assess self-renewal in a whole-
58 organism setting.

59
60 Xenotransplantation of HSCs is commonly performed using intravenous injection of cells into
61 immunocompromised mice. However, HSCs are rare⁴ and access to human samples containing
62 HSCs is limited. In 2003, the group of John Dick adapted a protocol for bone marrow aspiration
63 and intrafemorally injected non-obese diabetic/severe combined immunodeficiency (NOD-SCID)
64 mice with Lin⁻CD34⁺ umbilical cord blood (CB) cells⁵. To our knowledge, there has been no
65 reported formal comparison of intravenous versus intrafemoral injections in long-term and serial
66 transplantation outcomes. However, compared directly with intravenous injections, intrafemoral
67 injections provide larger graft sizes with the same number of transplanted cells⁶, at least in the
68 short term. In addition, engraftment can be detected with many fewer hematopoietic stem and
69 progenitor cells (HSPCs) transplanted. This is thought to be because intrafemoral delivery
70 bypasses the need for HSCs to home to the bone marrow, which in the xenograft context is
71 limiting due to a lack of cross-species reactivity for a number of receptors and cytokines. Via the
72 use of intrafemoral injections, Notta and colleagues were the first to transplant single human
73 HSCs⁷, though extra considerations need to be taken, as described in their methods. Intrafemoral
74 delivery of HSPCs also has limitations. The injection itself disrupts and destroys part of the bone
75 marrow, and therefore is not indicated for studies of the crosstalk between HSCs and their bone
76 marrow microenvironment. Additionally, the maximum number of cells is limited by the volume
77 of that bone cavity and that may be too few for some applications. As with every technique, its
78 application in a specific experiment needs to be weighed up based on the benefits/disadvantages
79 and the question being asked. In the context of xenotransplantation, if the aim of the experiment
80 is to test the engraftment of a low number of human HSPCs with no assessment of
81 microenvironment, intrafemoral delivery is usually preferred over intravenous injection.

82
83 **PROTOCOL:**

84
85 All animal research presented here adheres to the Animals (Scientific Procedures) Act 1986
86 Amendment Regulations 2012 and was performed after ethical review and approval by the
87 University of Cambridge Animal Welfare and Ethical Review Body (AWERB). Female NOD.Cg-
88 Prkdc^{scid}||2rg^{tm1Wjl}/SzJ (NSG) mice, aged between 12 and 16 weeks (~21–30 g), bred in-house

89 and maintained in a Specific-Pathogen-Free animal facility, were used for intrafemoral injections.
90 De-identified CB samples were collected from healthy donors after informed consent by the
91 Cambridge Blood and Stem Cell Biobank (CBSB) in accordance with regulated procedures
92 approved by the Cambridgeshire Local Research Ethics Committee (18/EE/0199). De-identified
93 CB samples were obtained with informed consent from healthy donors through the Cambridge
94 Blood and Stem Cell Biobank (CBSB) in accordance with regulated procedures approved by the
95 Cambridgeshire Local Research Ethics Committee (18/EE/0199 research study).

96

97 **1. Preparation of the mouse**

98

99 1.1. Before irradiation, notch the ears of the mice for identification and weigh them for
100 baseline weight.

101

102 1.2. Twenty-four hours before transplantation of the cells, sub-lethally irradiate the mice with
103 2.4 Gy radiation.

104

105 **2. Preparation of cells**

106

107 NOTE: For these injections, cells can be used from fresh or frozen samples. Specific
108 subpopulations of cells can be sorted by flow cytometry. Alternatively, cells can be cultured in
109 the desired conditions before transplantation. For the experiments shown, we are using frozen
110 CB CD34⁺ cells.

111

112 2.1. Thaw the cells in a 50 mL tube by the dropwise addition of 10x the cell's volume of
113 prewarmed IMDM + 50% fetal bovine serum (FBS) + 0.1 mg/mL DNase while agitating the tube
114 manually. Centrifuge the cells at 500 × g for 5 min.

115

116 2.2. Resuspend the cells in 20–40 µL (ideally 25 µL) of PBS + Penicillin-Streptomycin (10 U/mL
117 or 0.1%) per mouse. If possible, allow extra cells for a dead volume when taking up the cells into
118 the syringe for injections. Store the cells on ice until injections. The maximum number of cells per
119 injection is 4 million cells.

120

121 **3. Preparation for intrafemoral injection in the animal facility**

122

123 3.1. Prepare the following three needles required for this procedure:

124

125 3.1.1. Prepare a 3 mL syringe with a 27 G 1/2" needle.

126

127 3.1.2. Prepare a 0.5 mL Insulin Syringe with 29 G x 12.7 mm needle containing the cell
128 suspension.

129

130 3.1.3. Prepare a 1 mL Insulin Syringe with 29 G x 0.5" needle with 0.1 mg/kg
131 buprenorphine (100 µL).

132

133 3.2. Anesthetize the mice in an anesthetic box (through the inhalation of isoflurane 2% (v/v)
134 and oxygen 2 L/min). Transfer to a nose cone and confirm its readiness for the procedure by toe
135 pinch.

136
137 NOTE: This procedure is carried out in a containment level 2 biosafety hood and sterile conditions
138 are used.

139 4. Intrafemoral injection

140
141
142 4.1. Lay the mouse on its back and have its hind leg flexed. Secure the hind leg using the non-
143 dominant hand by placing the thumb on the foot, the middle finger on the hip, and the index
144 finger on the outside of the femur.

145
146 4.2. Gently shave or pluck the hair from around the kneecap and use an alcohol swab to wipe
147 down the area.

148
149 4.3. Use the 3 mL syringe with a 27 G 1/2" needle and aim for the top inner corner of the
150 kneecap to gently drill a hole through the skin towards the femur. Although the needle may be
151 rotated back and forth at first, only use a clockwise motion once into the bone, until the whole
152 needle is in the bone.

153
154 NOTE: The goal of this step is to generate a conduit for cell delivery. (Optional) To check if the
155 needle is correctly in the bone, release the leg and rotate the syringe side to side; if it is correctly
156 in the bone, the whole leg should move with the rotation. Resecure the leg using the non-
157 dominant hand by placing the thumb on the foot, the middle finger on the hip, and the index
158 finger on the outside of the femur, before continuing.

159
160 4.4. Remove the needle using an anticlockwise rotation until it is halfway out. At this point,
161 use an alcohol swab to wipe around the needle (there may be a small drop of blood) and then
162 continue to turn the needle anticlockwise and remove the needle.

163
164 4.5. Insert the 0.5 mL insulin syringe containing the cells in the femoral shaft via the same
165 conduit. Once the needle is in, make a note of feeling a scratch indicating the correct location. At
166 this point, release the grip on the leg, but be careful not to remove the needle from the leg. Then,
167 gently, inject the 25 μ L of cell suspension into the femur and remove the needle.

168
169 NOTE: The 'scratch' described is like hitting a rough surface and if the needle feels it has gone in
170 smoothly with no rough feeling, it is not in the correct place. Most users understand this clearly
171 once they are successful in their practice.

172 5. Post injection care

173
174
175 5.1. Inject the mouse subcutaneously with Buprenorphine (0.1 mg/kg, 100 μ L) before
176 returning it to its cage and monitoring for recovery from the anesthetic.

177

178 NOTE: The mouse is not to be left unattended until it has regained sufficient consciousness to
179 maintain sternal recumbency and is not returned to the company of other animals until fully
180 recovered. Mice are unlikely to show any adverse effects to the intrafemoral injection; however,
181 intrafemoral injection may result in reduced activity and pain in the operated area.

182

183 5.2. Assess swelling of the hock, pain, and mobility following the procedure.

184

185 NOTE: Mice should regain normal limb mobility within 24 h of injection.

186

187 **6. Analyzing the data**

188

189 6.1. Sacrifice the mice by cervical dislocation or any approved method post injection at any
190 time e.g., 24–48 h for homing experiments, 4–12 weeks for short-term HSC activity, >18 weeks
191 for long-term engraftment. If analysis of peripheral blood (PB) is planned, bleed the mice before
192 sacrifice by any authorized method, yielding ideally 50–100 μL of blood (no more than 10% of
193 total volume). Remove rear leg bones and spleen according to standard dissection protocols.

194

195 6.2. For bone marrow:

196

197 6.2.1. Keep the injected femur (IF) and the non-injected bones (rear leg tibias and non-injected
198 femurs, termed BM) separate. Flush the bones using 1 mL of IMDM + 5% FBS and a 36 G x $\frac{3}{4}$ "
199 needle and centrifuge for 5 min at $500 \times g$.

200

201 6.2.2. Resuspend the pellet in 500 μL of PBS + 3% FBS and then transfer 50 μL to a well of a 96
202 round-bottom plate for staining.

203

204 6.2.3. Freeze any remaining bone marrow and store it in liquid nitrogen for further *ex vivo* or
205 secondary *in vivo* experiments.

206

207 6.3. For the PB:

208

209 6.3.1. Wash out the collection tube with 100 μL of PBS + 3% FBS, transfer the blood to a 5 mL
210 FACS tube., and make up the volume to 2.5 mL with PBS + 3% FBS.

211

212 6.3.2. Carefully pipette 1 mL of Pancoll into the bottom of the FACS tubes and centrifuge for 25
213 min at $500 \times g$ with the brake off.

214

215 6.3.3. Collect the buffy coat layer, transfer it to 1.5 mL tubes, and top up to 1.5 mL with PBS +
216 3% FBS. Centrifuge for 5 min at $500 \times g$.

217

218 6.3.4. Resuspend the pellet in 50 μL of PBS + 3% FBS and transfer to a well of a 96 round-bottom
219 plate for staining.

220

221 6.4. For the spleen:
222
223 6.4.1. Place the spleen in a cell strainer placed on a 50 mL tube and crush with the plunger from
224 a 3 mL syringe.
225
226 6.4.2. One milliliter at a time, add 5 mL of IMDM + 5% FBS to wash the cells through. Take 50 μ L
227 to a well of a 96 round-bottom plate for staining.
228
229 6.5. Prepare an antibody mastermix; here is an example for 10 samples:
230
231 6.5.1. Aliquot 550 μ L of PBS + 3% FBS (50 μ L/sample + 10% extra) in a 1.5 or 2 mL tube.
232
233 6.5.2. Add individual antibodies so that their final concentration is 2x based on their titration
234 (e.g., for an antibody titrated 1:100, add 11 μ L).
235
236 NOTE: Choose an antibody panel that assesses potential differentiation across all blood lineages
237 of interest, for example, CD19/FITC, GlyA/PE, CD45/PECy5, CD14/PECy7, CD33/APC, CD19/Alexa
238 700, CD45/BV510, and CD3/APCCy7.
239
240 6.6. Staining: add 50 μ L of antibody mastermix to each of the wells of the 96 round-bottom
241 plate containing the samples to stain. Stain for 20 min at room temperature, add 100 μ L of PBS
242 + 3% FBS to wash the cells, and centrifuge for 5 min at 500 $\times g$. Remove the supernatant.
243
244 6.7. Resuspend the pellet in 200 μ L of PBS + 3% FBS and pass each sample through a FACS
245 tube with a cell strainer cap. To bone marrow and spleen samples, add a further 200 μ L of PBS +
246 3% FBS.
247
248 6.8. Flow cytometry controls: Make single-stain controls using compensation beads by adding
249 100 μ L of PBS, 1 drop of positive beads, 1 drop of negative beads, and 1 μ L of the antibody to a
250 FACS tube. Leave for 5 min at room temperature and then add 300 μ L of PBS. Take 50 μ L of
251 unstained bone marrow cells made up to 400 μ L of PBS + 3% FBS as an unstained control.
252
253 6.9. Analyze the samples by flow cytometry.
254
255 6.9.1. Run single-stain controls and unstained for compensation as advised for the cytometer
256 used. Set up gating as in **Figure 1**.
257
258 6.9.2. For PB, run all cells and for bone marrow and spleen, run a minimum of 50,000 events per
259 sample depending on human engraftment levels.
260
261 **REPRESENTATIVE RESULTS:**
262 The engraftment of the intrafemorally injected cells can be assessed at any time point from 24 h
263 onwards depending on the experimental design. At the end time point, IF, BM, PB, and spleens

264 may be collected. These can be processed, and the level of engraftment assessed via flow
265 cytometry. To robustly call human engraftment even at low levels, we stained with two distinct
266 antibodies against human CD45 (clone HI30 and clone 2D1). Only cells positive for both
267 antibodies (CD45⁺⁺) were considered of human origin. The threshold of engraftment was set as
268 follows: (% CD45⁺⁺ + % GlyA⁺) ≥ 0.01 % and a minimum of 30 cells recorded in both gates (**Figure**
269 **1**)^{7,8}. Migration of human cells to bones other than the one injected is usually delayed. Therefore,
270 if the bones are harvested before 8 weeks, it is likely that the engraftment of the IF is higher than
271 the BM (**Figure 2A**). This tends to equalize after 8 weeks (**Figure 2B,C**). Engraftment levels in PB
272 are expected to be variable (**Figure 2D**).

273
274 All bone marrow cells were stained using an antibody panel that assesses the level of
275 engraftment across different blood lineages: CD19/FITC, GlyA/PE, CD45/PECy5, CD14/PECy7,
276 CD33/APC, CD19/Alexa 700, CD45/BV510, and CD3/APCCy7. To assess which blood lineages are
277 present in the human graft, we used the following thresholds: Lymphoid (Ly) lineage:
278 CD45⁺⁺ CD19⁺⁺ (positive for two different CD19 antibodies) and/or CD45⁺⁺ CD3⁺ ≥ 20 cells;
279 Myeloid (My) lineage: CD45⁺⁺ CD33⁺ ≥ 20 cells; Erythroid (Ery) lineage: CD45⁻ GlyA⁺ ≥ 20 cells
280 (**Figure 3A**). Lineage composition is usually similar between IF and BM, but in certain instances,
281 mature myeloid cells can be slightly but significantly increased in BM compared to IF (**Figure 3B**).

282 283 **FIGURE AND TABLE LEGENDS:**

284
285 **Figure 1: Representative human engraftment in the injected femur, other hind leg bones, and**
286 **peripheral blood of mice intrafemorally injected with human hematopoietic stem and**
287 **progenitor cells.** Representative flow plots of non-engrafted (Mouse 1) and engrafted (Mice 2
288 and 3) mice. Mice are counted as engrafted when (% CD45⁺⁺ + % GlyA⁺) ≥ 0.01% and a minimum
289 of 30 cells were recorded in both gates. Mouse 2 demonstrates a case where the engraftment in
290 the BM is lower than the IF. Mice were transplanted with CB CD34⁺ HSPCs and tissues were
291 analyzed at 12 weeks. Abbreviations: IF = intrafemoral; BM = bone marrow (other hind leg
292 bones), PB = peripheral blood; HSPCs = hematopoietic stem and progenitor cells.

293
294 **Figure 2: Comparison of engraftment in the injected femur and other hind leg bones at 4, 8,**
295 **and 20 weeks post intrafemoral injection. (A–C)** Size of the human graft (% CD45⁺⁺ + % GlyA⁺) in
296 IF and BM (left panels) and the ratio of engraftment in BM:IF (right panels) at 4 weeks (**A**, n = 5
297 mice), 8 weeks (**B**, n = 7 mice), and 20 weeks (**C**, n = 11 mice) post transplantation. Mice were
298 engrafted with 100, 500, or 3,000 Subset 1 (CD19⁻CD34⁺CD38⁻CD45RA⁻CD34^{lo}CLEC9A^{hi}) or Subset
299 2 (CD19⁻CD34⁺CD38⁻CD45RA⁻CD34^{hi}CLEC9A^{lo}) cells. Cell type and dose depicted by different
300 symbols (see legend). Mice shown below the black dashed line are considered non-engrafted as
301 their graft size falls below the threshold ([% CD45⁺⁺ + % GlyA⁺] ≥ 0.01% and at least 30 cells
302 recorded). CD45⁺⁺ cells are positive for two distinct CD45 antibodies. Ratio of engraftment BM:IF
303 for high dose mice only, 500 Subset 1 cells (A n = 3, B n = 4) or 3,000 Subset 1 cells (C n = 10). **p
304 < 0.01 by one-sample t-test. (**D**) Percentage human engraftment (% CD45⁺⁺ + % GlyA⁺) in PB
305 across time. Mice were engrafted with 3,000 Subset 1 (D, n = 10 mice). This is a re-analysis of the
306 data published in Belluschi et al.⁸. Abbreviations: IF = intrafemoral; BM = bone marrow (other
307 hind leg bones), PB = peripheral blood.

308

309 **Figure 3: Analysis of lineage potential *in vivo*.** (A) Representative example of the gating strategy
310 used to assess lineage potential *in vivo*. My lineage: CD45⁺ CD33⁺ ≥ 20 cells; Ly lineage:
311 CD45⁺ CD19⁺ (positive for two distinct CD19 antibodies) and/or CD45⁺ CD3⁺ ≥ 20 cells; Ery
312 lineage: CD45⁻ GlyA⁺ ≥ 20 cells. (B) Percentage of human Ly, My, and Ery engraftment in the
313 injected femur and other hind leg bones 20 weeks post transplantation of mice engrafted with
314 3000 Subset 1 (CD19⁻CD34⁺CD38⁻CD45RA⁻CD34^{lo}CLEC9A^{hi}). Only mice with percentage human
315 engraftment (% CD45⁺ + % GlyA⁺) > 1% shown. *p < 0.05 by paired *t*-test. This is a re-analysis of
316 the data published in Belluschi et al.⁸. Abbreviations: My = myeloid; Ly = lymphoid; Ery =
317 erythroid; FSC-A = forward scatter area; FSC-W = forward scatter width; PE = Phycoerythrin; APC
318 =Allophycocyanin; IF = intrafemoral; BM = bone marrow (other hind leg bones).

319

320 **DISCUSSION:**

321 Intrafemoral injections are a useful tool in xenotransplantation when only a small number of
322 HSPCs are available, providing improved engraftment compared to intravenous injections.
323 However, the technique requires dexterity and training. When practicing, we would recommend
324 using fresh cadavers of the correct weight range (see below) and injecting a colored dye (such as
325 trypan blue) so that upon dissection, it is clear if the injection went into the femur and was
326 restricted to it (no dye should be observed in the muscles). For this procedure, there are two
327 critical steps: positioning and feeling the correct insertion of the second needle in the conduit.
328 For positioning, although a method is recommended here, it is up to the individual to optimize
329 how the mouse leg is most comfortably and reproducibly held. For example, a member of our
330 team prefers to secure the leg from across the body. The key in any circumstance is that the leg,
331 and therefore, femur, is secure. The 'scratch' described to confirm whether the second needle is
332 correctly inserted in the femur, is like hitting a rough surface but is difficult to explain further in
333 writing. It is usually felt very clearly by most users once they are successful in their practice.

334

335 In the context of transplantation of human HSCs, and following a comparison of four
336 immunocompromised mice, NSG mice are most commonly used for this technique⁹. Nonetheless,
337 since the publication of that article in 2010, other immunocompromised mice have been
338 generated that can be utilized with intrafemoral injections such as
339 NOD.CgPrkdc^{scid}Il2rg^{tm1Wjl}Tg(CMVIL3,CSF2,KITLG)1Eav/MlorySzJ (NSG-SGM3)¹⁰ and
340 CSF1^{h/h} IL3/CSF2^{h/h}SIRPA^{tg} THPO^{h/h} Rag2^{-/-} Il2rg^{-/-} (MISTRG)¹¹, both producing human cytokines
341 to support human hematopoiesis in mice. Alternatively, the need for irradiation may be
342 overcome by the use of NOD,B6.SCID Il2rg^{-/-}Kit^{W41/W41} (NBSGW) mice¹².

343

344 This method does come with its limitations and considerations. As mentioned in the introduction,
345 this method is not useful if the microenvironment of the bone is of interest to the research as it
346 is damaged in the process of irradiation and injection. Additionally, the lineage output of the cells
347 can vary depending on the mouse model. For NSG mice, an improvement of erythroid
348 engraftment can be achieved if the mice are treated with human erythropoietin⁸. The age and
349 sex of the mice must also be considered. If the mice are too young and therefore small, there is
350 a risk of breaking the bone during the procedure and if the mice are older and bigger, it can be
351 hard to drill the initial hole. We recommend mice between 21 g and 30 g in weight. Furthermore,

352 as it has been published that for NSG mice, engraftment is improved in female mice compared
353 to males¹³, we preferentially use females over males. Due to the potentially higher engraftment
354 observed after intrafemoral injections compared to intravenous injections, the number of mice
355 needed to obtain detectable measurements and statistically significant results may be lower.
356 Caution should be taken with cell doses used, as high doses ($>5 \times 10^4$ CD34⁺ cells from CB) may
357 lead to saturation of the injected bone at the expense of systemic engraftment¹⁴.

358
359 To date, our laboratory has used intrafemoral injections for the xenotransplantation of healthy
360 CB⁸, spleen, and PB¹⁵ cells. However, many other studies have shown their use can be beneficial
361 for the transplantation of hematological samples from patients suffering from various
362 hematological diseases. For example, Medyouf and colleagues found that the addition of patient-
363 derived mesenchymal stromal cells improved engraftment of CD34⁺ cells from patients with
364 Myelodysplastic syndromes after intrafemoral injection¹⁶. Intrafemoral injections are also
365 commonly employed to test leukemic engraftment of Acute Myeloid Leukemia^{17,18} and Acute
366 Lymphoblastic Leukemia samples^{19,20}. Finally, intrafemoral injections have been used in a recent
367 clinical trial of hematopoietic stem cell gene therapy of adult and pediatric patients affected by
368 transfusion-dependent β -thalassaemia²¹, demonstrating their clinical relevance.

369

370 **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS:**

371 The authors acknowledge the group of Dr John Dick for previous work on this method, and
372 Monica Doedens for training. We are grateful to the Cambridge Blood and Stem Cell Biobank
373 (CBSB), specifically Dr. Joanna Baxter and the team of CBSB nurses who consented and collected
374 cord blood samples; our sample donors; the University Biomedical Service, specifically Nicolas
375 Lumley and staff at The Anne McLaren Building for maintenance of our mice strains and support
376 of our *in vivo* experiments; Shaaezmeen Basheer for editing of the manuscript.

377

378 E.L. is funded by a Sir Henry Dale Fellowship jointly funded by the Wellcome Trust and the Royal
379 Society (107630/Z/15/A). L.M. is supported by Sofinter – HR Welfare Program. This research was
380 funded in whole, or in part, by the Wellcome Trust (203151/Z/16/Z, 203151/A/16/Z,
381 215116/Z/18/Z) and the UKRI Medical Research Council (MC_PC_17230). For the purpose of
382 open access, the author has applied a CC BY public copyright licence to any Author Accepted
383 Manuscript version arising from this submission.

384

385 **DISCLOSURES:**

386 The authors declare no conflict of interest.

387

388 **REFERENCES:**

389

- 390 1. Dancey, J. T., Deubelbeiss, K. A., Harker, L. A., Finch, C. A. Neutrophil kinetics in man. *J Clin*
391 *Invest.* **58** (3), 705–715 (1976).
- 392 2. Purton, L. E., Scadden, D. T. Limiting factors in murine hematopoietic stem cell assays. *Cell*
393 *Stem Cell.* **1** (3), 263–270 (2007).
- 394 3. Laurenti, E., Göttgens, B. From haematopoietic stem cells to complex differentiation
395 landscapes. *Nature.* **553** (7689), 418–426 (2018).

- 396 4. Cosgrove, J., Hustin, L. S. P., Boer, R. J. de, Perié, L. Hematopoiesis in numbers. *Trends*
397 *Immunol.* **42** (12), 1100–1112 (2021).
- 398 5. Mazurier, F., Doedens, M., Gan, O. I., Dick, J. E. Rapid myeloerythroid repopulation after
399 intrafemoral transplantation of NOD-SCID mice reveals a new class of human stem cells. *Nat Med.*
400 **9** (7), 959–963 (2003).
- 401 6. McKenzie, J. L., Gan, O. I., Doedens, M., Dick, J. E. Human short-term repopulating stem
402 cells are efficiently detected following intrafemoral transplantation into NOD/SCID recipients
403 depleted of CD122+ cells. *Blood.* **106** (4), 1259–1261 (2005).
- 404 7. Notta, F. et al. Isolation of single human hematopoietic stem cells capable of long-term
405 multilineage engraftment. *Science.* **333** (6039), 218–221 (2011).
- 406 8. Belluschi, S. et al. Myelo-lymphoid lineage restriction occurs in the human
407 haematopoietic stem cell compartment before lymphoid-primed multipotent progenitors. *Nat*
408 *Commun.* **9** (1), 4100 (2018).
- 409 9. McDermott, S. P., Eppert, K., Lechman, E. R., Doedens, M., Dick, J. E. Comparison of human
410 cord blood engraftment between immunocompromised mouse strains. *Blood.* **116** (2), 193–200
411 (2010).
- 412 10. Billerbeck, E. et al. Development of human CD4+FoxP3+ regulatory T cells in human stem
413 cell factor-, granulocyte-macrophage colony-stimulating factor-, and interleukin-3-expressing
414 NOD-SCID IL2Rγ(null) humanized mice. *Blood.* **117** (11), 3076–3086 (2011).
- 415 11. Rongvaux, A. et al. Development and function of human innate immune cells in a
416 humanized mouse model. *Nat Biotechnol.* **32** (4), 364–372 (2014).
- 417 12. McIntosh, B. E. et al. Nonirradiated NOD,B6.SCID Il2ry^{-/-} KitW41/W41 (NBSGW) Mice
418 support multilineage engraftment of human hematopoietic cells. *Stem Cell Reports.* **4** (2), 171–
419 180 (2015).
- 420 13. Notta, F., Doulatov, S., Dick, J. E. Engraftment of human hematopoietic stem cells is more
421 efficient in female NOD/SCID/IL-2Rγc-null recipients. *Blood.* **115** (18), 3704–3707 (2010).
- 422 14. Futrega, K., Lott, W. B., Doran, M. R. Direct bone marrow HSC transplantation enhances
423 local engraftment at the expense of systemic engraftment in NSG mice. *Sci Rep.* **6**, 23886 (2016).
- 424 15. Mende, N. et al. Unique molecular and functional features of extramedullary
425 hematopoietic stem and progenitor cell reservoirs in humans. *Blood.* **139** (23), 3387–3401 (2022).
- 426 16. Medyouf, H. et al. Myelodysplastic cells in patients reprogram mesenchymal stromal cells
427 to establish a transplantable stem cell niche disease unit. *Cell Stem Cell.* **14** (6), 824–837 (2014).
- 428 17. Eppert, K. et al. Stem cell gene expression programs influence clinical outcome in human
429 leukemia. *Nat Med.* **17** (9), 1086–1093 (2011).
- 430 18. Sanchez, P. V. et al. A robust xenotransplantation model for acute myeloid leukemia.
431 *Leukemia.* **23** (11), 2109–2117 (2009).
- 432 19. Li, J., Chen, H., Zhao, S., Wen, D., Bi, L. Patient-derived intrafemoral orthotopic xenografts
433 of peripheral blood or bone marrow from acute myeloid and acute lymphoblastic leukemia
434 patients: clinical characterization, methodology, and validation. *Clin Exp Med.* **23** (4), 1293–1306
435 (2023).
- 436 20. Dobson, S. M. et al. Relapse-fated latent diagnosis subclones in acute B lineage leukemia
437 are drug tolerant and possess distinct metabolic programs. *Cancer Discov.* **10** (4), 568–587 (2020).
- 438 21. Markt, S. et al. Intrabone hematopoietic stem cell gene therapy for adult and pediatric
439 patients affected by transfusion-dependent β-thalassemia. *Nat Med.* **25** (2), 234–241 (2019).

