



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

Edinburgh Research Explorer

Regulation and function of macrophage colony-stimulating factor (CSF1) in the chicken immune system

Citation for published version:

Wu, Z, Harne, R, Chintoan-Uta, C, Hu, J, Wallace, R, MacCallum, A, Stevens, M, Kaiser, P, Balic, A & Hume, D 2019, 'Regulation and function of macrophage colony-stimulating factor (CSF1) in the chicken immune system', *Developmental and Comparative Immunology*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dci.2019.103586>

Digital Object Identifier (DOI):

[10.1016/j.dci.2019.103586](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dci.2019.103586)

Link:

[Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer](#)

Document Version:

Peer reviewed version

Published In:

Developmental and Comparative Immunology

General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

The University of Edinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact openaccess@ed.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



1 **Regulation and function of macrophage colony-stimulating factor (CSF1) in the chicken**
2 **immune system**

3

4 Zhiguang Wu¹, Rakhi Harne¹, Cosmin Chintoan-Uta¹, Tuan-Jun Hu¹, Robert Wallace²,
5 Amanda MacCallum¹, Mark P. Stevens¹, Pete Kaiser¹, Adam Balic^{1*}, David A. Hume^{3*}

6

7 ¹The Roslin Institute, University of Edinburgh, Easter Bush, Midlothian EH25 9RG, UK, ²The

8 Department of Orthopedic Surgery, University of Edinburgh, Chancellor's Building, Edinburgh

9 BioQuarter, 49 Little France Crescent, Edinburgh EH16 4SB, UK and ³Mater Research

10 Institute-University of Queensland, Translational Research Institute, Woolloongabba, Qld

11 4104, Australia.

12

13 *Corresponding authors.

14

15 *E-mail: adam.balic@roslin.ed.ac.uk; David.Hume@uq.edu.au;

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28 **ABSTRACT**

29 Macrophage colony-stimulating factor (CSF1) is an essential growth factor to control the
30 proliferation, differentiation and survival of cells of the macrophage lineage in vertebrates. We
31 have previously produced a recombinant chicken CSF1-Fc fusion protein and administered it
32 to birds which produced a substantial expansion of tissue macrophage populations. To further
33 study the biology of CSF1 in the chicken, here we generated anti-chicken CSF1 antibodies
34 (ROS-AV181 and 183) using CSF1-Fc as an immunogen. The specific binding of each
35 monoclonal antibody was confirmed by ELISA, Western blotting and immunohistochemistry
36 on tissue sections. Using the anti-CSF1 antibodies, we show that chicken bone marrow derived
37 macrophages (BMDM) express CSF1 on their surface, and that the level appears to be regulated
38 further by exogenous CSF1. By capture ELISA circulating CSF1 levels increased transiently
39 in both layer and broiler embryos around the day of hatch. The levels of CSF1 in broilers was
40 higher than in layers during the first week after hatch. Antibody ROS-AV183 was able to block
41 CSF1 biological activity *in vitro* and treatment of hatchlings using this neutralising antibody *in*
42 *vivo* impacted on some tissue macrophage populations, but not blood monocytes. After anti-
43 CSF1 treatment, *CSF1R*-transgene reporter expressing cells were reduced in the bursa of
44 Fabricius and cecal tonsil and TIM4⁺ Kupffer cells in the liver were almost completely ablated.
45 Anti-CSF1 treatment also produced a reduction in overall bone density, trabecular volume and
46 TRAP⁺ osteoclasts. Our novel neutralising antibody provides a new tool to study the roles of
47 CSF1 in birds.

48

49 *Keywords:* Macrophages; CSF1; Chicken; Neutralising antibody

50 1. Introduction

51 Macrophage colony-stimulating factor (CSF1) controls the proliferation, differentiation and
52 survival of cells of the macrophage lineage in mammals and birds (Chitu and Stanley, 2017;
53 Garceau et al., 2015; Hume et al., 2019; Jenkins and Hume, 2014; Jenkins et al., 2013). CSF1
54 acts by binding to a tyrosine kinase receptor (CSF1R), which is encoded by the *c-fms* proto-
55 oncogene (Sherr et al., 1985). Expression of CSF1R is largely restricted to mononuclear
56 phagocytes (Rojo et al., 2017), but in mammals is detected on trophoblast cells (Arceci et al.,
57 1989; Regenstreif and Rossant, 1989) and in chickens it is detected at low levels on heterophil
58 granulocytes (Balic et al., 2014) and antigen sampling follicular epithelial cells in mucosal
59 lymphoid associated tissues (Balic et al., 2019; Sutton et al., 2018). A second ligand for CSF1R,
60 interleukin 34 (IL-34) has been identified (Lin et al., 2008); however, its expression is more
61 tissue restricted than CSF1 (Wang et al., 2012) and the functions and signalling activities of
62 these CSF1R ligands are not identical (Chihara et al., 2010; Liu et al., 2012; Wei et al., 2010).
63 Both chicken CSF-1 and IL-34 were shown to elicit macrophage growth from chicken BM cells
64 in culture (Garceau et al., 2010). We previously produced a recombinant chicken CSF1-Fc
65 fusion protein (Garceau et al., 2015). As in mice (Gow et al., 2014), CSF1-Fc administration
66 to birds produced a substantial expansion of tissue macrophage populations (Garceau et al.,
67 2015). Mutation of *Csf1* in mice (*op/op*) produces a substantial reduction of tissue macrophage
68 populations alongside pleiotropic impacts on somatic growth and development and variable
69 impacts in cancer and inflammatory disease models (Chitu and Stanley, 2006).

70 Some of these impacts are mimicked by neonatal treatment with neutralising anti-CSF1
71 antibody, when CSF1 levels are highest (Wei et al., 2005) or following prolonged treatment of
72 adults with anti-CSF1R antibody (MacDonald et al., 2010; Sauter et al., 2014). More recently,
73 neutralising monoclonal antibodies against mouse CSF1 and IL34 were developed and shown
74 to have selective impacts on tissue macrophage populations *in vivo* (Lin et al., 2019). To support

75 studies of the function of CSF1/CSF1R signalling in birds, we previously generated *CSF1R*
76 reporter transgenic lines (Balic et al., 2014) and an anti-CSF1R antibody (Garcia-Morales et
77 al., 2014). The antibody provides a marker for blood monocytes and tissue macrophages
78 (CD115), but it did not block binding of CSF1 and signalling by the receptor.

79 In the current study we describe the production and characterisation of a novel anti-chicken
80 CSF1 monoclonal antibody and show its applications in western blot, capture ELISA and
81 neutralising assays. We show here that in chicken CSF1 is produced at high levels by mature
82 macrophages themselves and contributes to the development of the immune system in the post
83 hatch period. We discuss the extent to which some of these insights may also be applicable to
84 mammalian macrophage development, homeostasis and function.

85 **2. Materials and methods:**

86 *2.1. Animal experiments*

87 All birds were obtained from the National Avian Research Facility at The Roslin Institute,
88 University of Edinburgh. Production of the transgenic chicken lines used in this study have
89 been previously described (Balic et al., 2104). All birds were hatched and housed in premises
90 licensed under a UK Home Office Establishment License in full compliance with the Animals
91 (Scientific Procedures) Act 1986 and the Code of Practice for Housing and Care of Animals
92 Bred, Supplied or Used for Scientific Purposes. All procedures were conducted under Home
93 Office project licences PPL 70/8940 (for transgenic animals; Prof. Helen Sang) and PPL
94 60/4420 (for administration of substances; Prof. Mark Stevens), according to the requirements
95 of the Animal (Scientific Procedures) Act 1986, with the approval of local ethical review
96 committees. Animals were humanely culled in accordance with Schedule 1 of the Animals
97 (Scientific Procedures) Act 1986.

98 *2.2. Monoclonal antibody production, purification, isotyping, and labelling*

99 Chimeric CSF1-Fc fusion protein was produced as previously described (Garceau et al.,
100 2015). The fusion protein has the minimal active fragment of chicken CSF1 and the chicken
101 IgY constant heavy chain domains 3 and 4. ChCSF1-Fc was used as immunogen to immunise
102 mice. Immunisation and fusion to generate hybridomas was carried out by Dundee Cell
103 Products (DCP, Dundee, UK). Following fusion, hybridoma supernatants were screened by
104 indirect ELISA for reactivity with recombinant chCSF1-Fc or diluted chicken serum (as IgY-
105 Fc control). Indirect ELISA was performed as described previously (Rothwell et al., 2001).
106 Briefly, assay plates (Nunc Immuno MaxiSorp, Thermo Fisher Scientific, UK) were coated
107 with recombinant chCSF1 or diluted chicken serum in Carbonate/Bicarbonate buffer at 4 °C
108 overnight. Hybridoma cultures or purified mAb were added after the pre-coated plates were
109 washed and blocked with 0.5% (w/v) casein in phosphate-buffered saline (PBS). After three
110 washes with PBS, plates were then incubated with goat anti-mouse Ig-horseradish peroxidase
111 (HRP; 1/1000, Southern Biotech, Cambridge, UK,) at room temperature (RT) for 1 hour.
112 Peroxidase activity was developed by adding trimethylbenzidine (TMB) substrate (Thermo
113 Fisher Scientific). The reaction was stopped by 2N sulfuric acid stop solution. Plates were read
114 at 450 nm in a SpectraMax 250 microplate spectrophotometer system (Molecular Devices,
115 Sunnyvale, CA, USA). Positive wells were single-cell cloned. Two monoclonal antibodies,
116 designated as ROS-AV181 and ROS-AV183 were purified using HiTrap Protein G affinity
117 columns and dialysed against PBS using 30 kDa molecular weight cut-off (MWCO) Slide-A-
118 Lyser cassettes (Pierce, Thermo Fisher Scientific). The concentrations of mAbs were
119 determined by absorbance at 280 nm with a Nanodrop. The antibody was isotyped using the
120 IsoStrip Mouse Monoclonal Antibody Isotyping Kit (Roche) according to the manufacturer's
121 instructions. Purified antibodies were biotinylated using Sulfo-NHS-LC-LC-biotin (Thermo
122 Fisher Scientific) and desalted to remove non-reacted biotin using Zeba™ Spin Desalting
123 Columns (Thermo Fisher Scientific) as per instructions.

124 For *in vivo* studies, large volumes of the neutralising mAb (ROS-AV183) and IgG1 isotype
125 control antibody (mouse anti-ovine CD335 (GR13.1)) were purified from hybridoma culture
126 and dialysed as above. Antibody was filtered through a low protein binding syringe 0.2 μm
127 filters (GE Healthcare Whatman™ Puradisc 25mm syringe filter) for sterilisation.

128 *2.3. Development of a capture ELISA assay and comparison of circulating CSF1 in broilers and*
129 *layers at different ages*

130 To develop a capture ELISA assay, a checkerboard titration method was used to determine
131 the optimal concentration of coating antibody and detecting antibody. After optimisation, a
132 capture ELISA assay was developed using ROS-AV181 as capture antibody and biotinylated
133 ROS-AV183 as detecting antibody. Briefly, assay plates were coated with capture antibody
134 ROS-AV181 at 2 $\mu\text{g}/\text{ml}$ overnight at 4 °C. Plates were washed and blocked as in the indirect
135 ELISA. Plates were incubated with test samples at RT for 1 h. Serially diluted recombinant
136 chicken CSF1 (produced in bacteria, Garceau, 2014) was used to generate a standard curve.
137 Plates were washed and incubated with biotinylated detecting antibody ROS-AV183 at 0.25
138 $\mu\text{g}/\text{ml}$ at RT for 1 h. After three washes, plates were incubated with streptavidin–HRP (1:5,000,
139 Pierce) for a further hour at RT before adding substrate (1-step TMB; Thermo Fisher Scientific)
140 and then 2N sulfuric acid stop solution. Absorbance was read at 450 nm.

141 For comparative analysis of CSF1 levels using the CSF1 ELISA assay, broiler eggs (Ross
142 308) and layer eggs (Novogen Brown) were bred in the National Avian Research Facility at
143 The Roslin Institute. Embryos were sacrificed for blood on day 19, 20 and chicks on day 1, day
144 2, day 3, day 7 and day 14. Sera were collected from clotted blood samples after spinning at
145 2,000 g for 10 minutes.

146 ELISA results were calculated using Graphpad Prism 6.07. Standard curve was interpolated
147 with Second order polynomial (quadratic).

148 *2.4. Western blotting of tissue lysates and sera*

149 Tissues and sera were collected from 8-week-old Novogen brown birds. Approximately 10
150 mg of tissue was homogenized in 500 μ L of cold radioimmunoprecipitation assay buffer (RIPA
151 Buffer) containing protease and phosphatase inhibitors (Roche) using CK mix homogenising
152 tubes and Precellys 24 (Bertin Instrument). After homogenisation, samples were centrifuged at
153 10,000 g for 20 min at 4°C to pellet cell debris. Protein concentration of total lysates was
154 determined using Pierce bicinchoninic acid (BCA) protein assay kit (Thermo Fisher Scientific)
155 according to the manufacturer's instructions.

156 Tissue lysate and serum samples were treated with SDS-PAGE reducing buffer, denatured
157 for 5 minutes at 100°C and loaded onto 4-20% pre-cast Mini-PROTEAN TGX Gels (Bio-Rad)
158 and transferred onto 0.45 μ m pore size Hydrophobic Immobilon-P Transfer Membrane
159 (Millipore) using a tank transfer method according to the tank's manufacturer instructions (Bio-
160 Rad). Blots were then washed in PBS and blocked in 0.5% skimmed milk/PBS for 1h at RT.
161 After washing three times, blots were incubated in primary antibodies (ROS-AV181, ROS-
162 AV183 or mouse IgG1 control at 1.0 μ g/ml) for 1 h at RT. Blots were then incubated with goat
163 anti-mouse IgG1- horseradish peroxidase (1/1000, Southern Biotech) diluted in 0.5% skimmed
164 milk powder/PBS. Detection was carried out using enhanced chemiluminescence (ECL) (GE
165 Healthcare Life Sciences), according to the manufacturer's instructions.

166 *2.5. Immunofluorescence staining and confocal imaging*

167 Spleen and bursa were isolated from commercial layer chickens (Hy-Line, UK), washed with
168 PBS and cryo-embedded in Tissue-Tek Optimal Cutting Temperature (OCT) compound
169 (Sakura Finetechnical). These tissues were sectioned at 10 μ m on a Leica CM1900 cryostat,
170 placed onto Superfrost Plus (Menzel-Gläser) glass slides and left to dry. Sections were fixed
171 in ice cold methanol for 20 mins and blocked for 1 h in blocking solution (10% normal horse
172 serum, 0.1% Triton X-100 in PBS (MST-PBS)) then incubated with anti-CSF1 antibody (ROS-
173 AV181) for 1 h at RT. After washing with PBS, slides were incubated with goat anti-mouse

174 IgG1 Alexa Fluor 647 (Invitrogen, 1/500) prior to nuclear staining with 4',6-diamidino-2-
175 phenylindole (DAPI, Invitrogen). Slides were washed in PBS for 30 mins on a shaker and
176 mounted using Prolong Gold anti-fade mounting solution (Invitrogen). Confocal images were
177 taken on Zeiss LSM 710 inverted microscope and processed using Zen 2012 (Blue Edition, Carl
178 Zeiss Microscopy) or ImageJ software.

179 Liver samples from *CSF1R*-eGFP transgenic reporter birds after subcutaneous injections
180 (described below) were collected in ice cold PBS and fixed in 4% paraformaldehyde (PFA)
181 overnight, followed by washing in PBS and storage in 30% sucrose until the tissues sank.
182 Tissues were then cryo-embedded in OCT and sectioned for staining with anti-TIM4 (clone
183 JH9, Hu et al., 2016) overnight at 4°C. Sections were then incubated with secondary antibodies;
184 Donkey anti-mouse IgG (H+L) (Invitrogen) to detect TIM4 and Rabbit anti-GFP Alexa Fluor
185 488 (Invitrogen) to detect *CSF1R*-eGFP. Slides were then washed, mounted and visualised as
186 described above. Images were processed using ImageJ. TIM4⁺ cells were counted in five
187 different images from five different areas of liver sections per animal per treatment.

188 2.6. Flow cytometric analysis

189 CSF1-Fc was prepared as described previously (Garceau et al., 2015). Anti-CSF1 and CSF1-
190 Fc were conjugated to Alexa Fluor 647 (AF647) using the AF647 Microscale Protein labelling
191 kit (Thermo Fisher Scientific) according to manufacturer's instructions.

192 To measure surface CSF1 on BMDM, chicken BMDMs were cultured from bone marrow
193 cells from hatchlings in the presence of recombinant chicken CSF-1 as previously described
194 (Garceau et al., 2010). On day 6 of culture, cells were refreshed with culture medium with CSF1
195 or starved of CSF1 for 18 h. On day 7, cells were stimulated with 0.5 µg/ml of
196 lipopolysaccharide (LPS; *E. coli* serotype 055:B5, Sigma) for 3 h or non-stimulated. Cells were
197 washed with cold FACS buffer (PBS/1.0%BSA/0.05% Sodium azide), incubated in anti-CSF1-
198 Alexa Fluor 647 or CSF1-Fc- Alexa Fluor 647 at 4°C for 30 min.

199 For flow cytometric analysis of primary cells, single cell suspensions were isolated from
200 blood and spleen. EDTA-treated blood was diluted to 2 ml and gently overlaid onto the same
201 volume of Lymphoprep with a density 1.077 g/mL (STEMcell Technologies) prior to
202 centrifugation at 400 g without brake for 30 min. Cells at the interface were carefully collected
203 and washed twice with FACS buffer. Spleens were collected in cold PBS, dispersed through a
204 100 µm cell strainer and isolated by centrifugation over Lymphoprep as described above for
205 blood cells. Cells were then blocked with FACS buffer for 5 min and incubated on ice with
206 monoclonal antibodies listed in table 1 at appropriate concentrations as determined by titration
207 assays. Cells were washed twice and re-suspended in FACS buffer and analysed using a BD
208 LRSFortessa (BD Biosciences, UK). SYTOX® Blue Dead Cell Stain (1.0 µM, Invitrogen) was
209 added 5 min prior to analysis to exclude dead cells. Doublets were discriminated based on signal
210 processing (SSC-A/H or FSC-A/H). Data were analysed using FlowJo software (FlowJo,
211 Ashlan, OR. USA).

212 2.7. Neutralisation of CSF1 activity

213 To determine the ability of antibodies to neutralise CSF1 *in vitro*, recombinant CSF1 was
214 pre-incubated with anti-CSF1 mAbs or a mouse IgG1 control at 37°C for two hours before
215 addition to bone marrow or Ba/F3 cells expressing the chicken CSF1R (Garceau et al., 2010).
216 Chicken bone marrow cells from embryonic day (ED) 20 Novogen embryos were cultured with
217 CSF1 and re-fed every 2-3 days with the same fresh media and incubated for 7 days. Ba/F3
218 cells expressing chicken CSF1R (Garceau et al., 2010) were maintained in culture with
219 complete RPMI medium supplemented with 10% heat-inactivated foetal bovine serum (FBS),
220 2 mM L-glutamine and antibiotics (100 g/ml penicillin, 100 g/ml streptomycin) and 5%
221 conditioned medium from X63 Ag8-653 myeloma cells carrying an expression vector for IL-3
222 (Karasuyama and Melchers, 1988) at 37°C, 5% CO₂ prior to assays for cellular metabolic
223 activity using the tetrazolium dye MTT. Cells were washed twice with PBS to remove any IL-

224 3, and plated in a 96 well plate in triplicate at 4×10^4 cells/well in 100 μ l of complete RPMI
225 without X63 supernatant. Cells were treated with serial dilutions of chicken CSF1 and incubated
226 for 72 h at 37 °C, 5% CO₂. 10 μ l of MTT (Sigma-Aldrich) stock solution (5 mg/ml) was added
227 directly to each well to achieve a final concentration of 0.5 mg/ml and incubated at 37 °C for 3
228 h before adding 100 μ l of solubilisation solution (0.1 M HCl, 10% Triton X-100 and
229 isopropanol) and incubation overnight. Plates were read at 570 nm.

230 2.8. Subcutaneous injection of anti-CSF1 in hatchlings

231 Seventeen newly hatched *CSF1R*-eGFP transgenic chicks (Balic et al., 2014) were weighed
232 and divided into two groups with matching body weight. One group of chicks was injected
233 subcutaneously in the breast muscle region with neutralising anti-CSF-1 antibody (ROS-
234 AV183) (10 mg/kg, ca. 500 μ g per bird) on each of four consecutive days. The control group
235 was treated with isotype control antibody (mouse anti-ovine CD335, clone GR13.1). Body
236 weights of all birds were measured on day 1, 2, 3, 4 and day 7. Blood was collected for flow
237 cytometry analysis into a BD Vacutainer collection tube and analysed by Flow Cytometry as
238 above. Lymphoid tissues including spleen, cecal tonsils and bursa were collected and placed in
239 PBS in a Petri dish for whole mount imaging performed using a Zeiss Axio Cam HR fluorescent
240 microscope. Surface area of the lymphoid tissues and mean fluorescence intensities of *CSF1R*
241 transgene was measured using Zeiss blue 2012 edition. Average values with standard deviation
242 graphs were plotted using GraphPad Prism 7 software. All results were analysed for statistical
243 significance with a non-parametric Mann Whitney test. Spleens were cut into halves for flow
244 cytometric analysis or immunofluorescence staining. All other tissues were fixed in 4% PFA
245 for immunofluorescence staining as described above.

246 2.9. microCT scanning of bones and TRAP staining

247 Seventeen left femur bones were subjected to micro-CT (computed tomography) scanning
248 to analyse bone volume and trabecular number. Femurs were fixed in 4% PFA overnight and

249 stored in 70% ethanol at 4°C until embedding in 0.5% agarose gel in a universal tube for
250 scanning. Skyscan 1172 at 60 kV, 150 μ A at a resolution of 5 μ m was used. Restructuring 3D
251 image was obtained using CTVox programme.

252 Tartrate-resistant acid phosphatase (TRAP) staining was performed as described previously
253 (Sauter et al., 2014). Briefly, right femur bones were decalcified, embedded, and sectioned by
254 the Royal (Dick) School of Veterinary Studies Clinical Pathology Laboratory (University of
255 Edinburgh, UK). Four-micrometer thick sections were stained with an acid phosphatase
256 leukocyte kit (Sigma) according to the manufacture's protocol. The staining results were
257 observed by Nikon Ni2 bright field microscopy and images were taken under 10 \times objective
258 lens. The positively-stained osteoclasts were counted following identification using their red
259 colour, location in resorption pits, large size, distinctive shape and presence of multiple nuclei.
260 Two sections from each of 5-6 treated and control birds bird were stained and 3-5 views were
261 imaged for quantification of osteoclasts. Statistical differences were analyzed with a non-
262 parametric Mann Whitney test.

263 **3. Results**

264 *3.1. Production of two monoclonal antibodies to chicken CSF1 and prediction of CSF1 isoforms*

265 To generate anti-CSF1 monoclonal antibodies, mice were immunized with chicken CSF1-
266 Fc. Splens were extracted and fused with myeloma cells by standard protocols. Hybridoma
267 supernatants were screened to identify clones that produced antibodies recognising CSF1-Fc,
268 but not the IgY fusion partner, in an indirect ELISA (Figure 1A). Two of the positive
269 hybridomas, designated as ROS-AV181 and ROS-AV183, were successfully cloned and tested
270 in a range of applications. Figure 1B shows these two mAbs recognise recombinant chCSF1 as
271 well as CSF1-Fc but do not bind IgY-Fc as tested by indirect ELISA.

272 In mammals, the CSF1 locus encodes at least three mRNA splice isoforms through
273 differential splicing. The protein products include 3 biologically active isoforms: a membrane-

274 spanning cell-surface glycoprotein, and secreted glycoprotein and proteoglycan isoforms. In
275 mice, the relative importance of these isoforms has been explored through transgenic
276 (re)expression in *Csf1*^{op/op} mice that lack endogenous CSF1 (Nandi et al., 2006; Ryan et al.,
277 2001); (Dai et al., 2004). The genomic structure of CSF1 is similar in chickens, and initial
278 characterization of *Csf1* mRNA indicated that all three isoforms were likely to exist in birds
279 (Garceau et al., 2010). Western blot analysis of serum (Figure 2A) with the two different anti-
280 CSF1 antibodies confirmed the presence of two major bands, consistent with the secreted
281 proteoglycan (monomeric Mr of ca 120kDa) and glycoprotein (monomeric Mr of ca. 35-40kDa)
282 isoforms. A faint low Mr band around 13-15kDa could be the core, unglycosylated and
283 monomeric active CSF1 molecule, or may be a degradation product. In extracts of tissues
284 (Figure 2B), the high Mr, presumptive proteoglycan isoform was dominant and was most
285 abundant in the three immune tissues tested, namely thymus, bursa and spleen. The low Mr
286 band detected in the circulation was notably highly expressed in bone marrow.

287 *3.2. Localization of CSF1 in the immune tissues and its expression on BMDM*

288 To determine the location of CSF1 in the immune tissues, we carried out
289 immunofluorescence staining of the spleen and bursa. In the spleen (Figure 3A and B), CSF1
290 staining was concentrated to the splenic ellipsoid, the major location of active phagocytosis of
291 blood-borne particles in the avian spleen, with some functional similarities to the marginal zone
292 of rodent spleen (Jeurissen, 1993; Zhang et al., 2015). In the bursa (Figure 3C-F), CSF1
293 expression was localised to the cortico-medullary boundary, which we have previously shown
294 to contain a prominent population of TIM4⁺ macrophages (Hu *et al.*, 2019).

295 In separate *in vitro* studies, we generated RNAseq profiles from chicken macrophages grown
296 in CSF1 (Freem et al., 2019). The data indicated that, unlike mouse bone marrow-derived
297 macrophages, but in common with all other mammalian species studied including rats and
298 humans, chicken macrophages grown in CSF1 express high levels of their own growth factor.

299 We used the RNAseq data to investigate the nature of the *CSF1R* transcript(s) in chicken
300 BMDM, confirming that they make the longer form of the mRNA encoding an integral
301 membrane form of the protein (Freem et al., 2019). Based upon the mRNA expression, we
302 examined whether the anti-CSF1 antibody would bind to the surface of chicken BMDM. To
303 remove exogenous CSF1, cells were washed and starved overnight of CSF1. In contrast to
304 mouse BMDM, which require exogenous CSF1 for survival (Griggs and Zinkewich-Peotti,
305 2009; Sester et al., 1999), chicken BMDM remain viable after CSF1 removal. To detect the
306 cell surface expression of CSF1R, recombinant CSF1-Fc labelled with Alexa Fluor® 647
307 (CSF1-Fc-AF647) was used. The use of the ligand to analyse surface CSF1R has been applied
308 previously in mice and rats (Hawley et al., 2018; Pridans et al., 2018; Rojo et al., 2019). Figure
309 4 shows that the entire BMDM population stained for surface CSF1 (as detected by anti-CSF1
310 antibody) or CSF1R (as detected by CSF1-Fc-AF647). Panel A shows that the binding of the
311 labelled ligand was only marginally increased when the cells were starved of exogenous CSF1
312 overnight, in contrast to the massive upregulation seen in CSF1-starved mouse BMDM (Sester
313 et al., 1999). On the other hand, cell surface CSF1 immunoreactivity was greatly reduced in the
314 cells incubated without CSF1 overnight. In mouse macrophages, stimulation with bacterial
315 lipopolysaccharide (LPS), or other toll-like receptor agonists, causes rapid release of CSF1R
316 from the cell surface (Sester et al., 1999). Like mouse, chicken BMDM respond to LPS with a
317 cascade of inflammatory gene activation (Garcia-Morales et al., 2015), but there was no impact
318 after 3 hours treatment on the level of surface CSF1-Fc-AF647 binding (Figure 4B). Instead,
319 LPS caused a significant reduction in cell surface CSF1 in the CSF1-starved cells, but not in
320 those that have been maintained in CSF1 (Figure 4B).

321 3.3. *Comparative analysis of circulating CSF1 levels in layers and broilers as detected by capture*
322 *ELISA*

323 We next tested combinations of the available monoclonal antibodies to generate a sandwich
324 capture ELISA, using recombinant bacterial-expressed chicken CSF1 as a standard. The
325 optimized assay had a detection limit around 62.5 pg/ml to 2 ng/ml (Figure 5A). In mice,
326 circulating CSF1 was reported to be highest in fetal and neonatal serum, around 30-40 ng/ml,
327 and declined in the postnatal period (Roth and Stanley, 1996). In mice, both CSF1 and CSF1R
328 mutations produce severe post-natal growth retardation (Chitu and Stanley, 2006). Broiler
329 chickens have been selected for rapid post-hatch weight gain. We therefore used the CSF1
330 ELISA to examine expression during embryonic development and the phase of rapid post-hatch
331 growth and to compare the time courses of circulating CSF1 in layer and broiler birds (Figure
332 5 B- D). The circulating CSF1 concentration prior to hatch was 10-fold lower than reported in
333 mice, around 3-5 ng/ml in late incubation. The level increased transiently in both layers and
334 broilers around the day of hatch. On average the level of CSF1 in broilers was higher than in
335 layers, but more variable. The differences between broiler and layer birds were significantly
336 greater from ED20 to post hatch D3.

337 *3.4. Confirmation of neutralising activity of the anti-CSF1 (ROS-AV183) antibody in vitro*

338 To assess whether antibodies would block CSF1 action, we used Ba/F3 growth factor-
339 dependent cells expressing the chicken CSF1R (Garceau et al., 2010). Figure 6A shows the
340 dose-response curve for chicken CSF1 using this assay. Note that the minimal active
341 concentrations (around 5 ng/ml) are in the range of serum concentrations measured above.
342 Figure 6B shows that one of the anti-CSF1 antibodies we generated, ROS-AV183, was able to
343 completely block the action of a just-maximal concentration of chicken CSF1. We confirmed
344 the biological activity by demonstrating that ROS-AV183, but not ROS-AV181, blocked the
345 ability of CSF1 to generate macrophages from bone marrow progenitors (Figure 6C). The
346 relatively stoichiometry (2.5 µg/ml blocking 400 ng/ml of CSF1) suggested that the antibody
347 could have sufficient affinity to block actions of CSF1 *in vivo*.

348 3.5. *Anti-CSF-1 antibody treatment in hatchlings*

349 To test the impact of inhibition of CSF1 *in vivo*, we utilized a *CSF1R* reporter line described
350 previously (Balic et al., 2014) and treated newly-hatched birds with the neutralising antibody
351 ROS-AV183 for four consecutive days. Treated birds showed no signs of illness and developed
352 normally. By contrast to the impact of anti-CSF1 treatment in mice (Wei et al., 2005), there was
353 no effect on post-hatch body weight gain (data not shown). To examine the transgene expression
354 in major lymphoid tissues including cecal tonsil, bursa and spleen, the mean fluorescence
355 intensity (MFI) and surface area was obtained from whole mount images analysis using Zeiss
356 blue software. The surface area of different organs was correlated to body weight of each bird,
357 regardless of treatment. There was no significant difference in the MFI or the surface area of
358 spleen (Figure 7A) but a significant decrease in the MFI of transgene expression was detected
359 in both cecal tonsil (Figure 7B) and bursa (Figure 7C) after anti-CSF1 treatment. Surface area
360 of bursa and cecal tonsil tissue remained unaffected. Representative images comparing treated
361 and untreated spleen, cecal tonsil and bursa are shown in Figure 7D-F. **The decrease in *CSF1R*-**
362 **transgene positive cells in cecal tonsil and the bursa of Fabricius from birds treated with anti-**
363 **CSF1 was further detected by confocal microscopy using anti-eGFP antibody (Supplemental**
364 **material Fig S1).**

365 Fig 8 shows the profiles of peripheral blood mononuclear cells from *CSF1R*-eGFP birds
366 treated with anti-CSF1 or an isotype control antibody. The blood cells were stained for the
367 monocyte marker KUL01, B cell marker BU.1 and class II MHC. The proportions of the
368 different cell populations were variable between birds, regardless of treatment. There was no
369 significant effect of anti-CSF1 on *CSF1R*⁺ KUL01⁺ monocytes (Fig 8A). Both MHC class II
370 (Fig 8B, which labels both B cells and monocytes) and Bu-1 (Fig 8C) staining indicated a
371 marginal reduction in circulating B cells. In the spleen, anti-CSF1 treatment had no impact on

372 the CSF1R⁺, KUL01⁺ populations (Figure 8D). However, the numbers of MHC II⁺ cells and
373 Bu-1⁺ cells in the spleen were significantly reduced (Figure 8E and F).

374 The liver tissue resident macrophage population (Kupffer cells) in mice is rapidly depleted
375 by treatment with anti-CSF1R antibody (MacDonald et al., 2010) or anti-CSF1 (Lin et al.,
376 2019). In the chick, the *CSF1R*-reporter is not expressed by Kupffer cells (KC), although they
377 express high levels of *CSF1R* mRNA (Hu et al., 2019). To assess the effect of anti-CSF1 in the
378 liver, we used an antibody against the KC marker TIM4 (Hu et al., 2019). Figure 9 shows that
379 TIM4⁺ cell population was almost completely ablated by anti-CSF1 treatment. Representative
380 immunohistochemistry images from three individual animals are shown in Figure 9A. Figure
381 9B shows that the average TIM4⁺ cell number per image was significantly reduced in the anti-
382 CSF1 treated group compared to the mouse IgG1 control group.

383 As CSF1 mRNA and protein were highly-expressed in bone marrow (Figure 2B), and
384 treatment of hatchling birds with CSF1-Fc increased bone density, trabecular thickness and
385 trabecular number within one week (Garceau et al., 2015), we examined the impact of anti-
386 CSF1 treatment on the same parameters. The bone volume and trabecular number were
387 significantly reduced in the treated birds, and correspondingly, the trabecular separation was
388 increased (Figure 10A and B). TRAP staining results showed that bone osteoclasts (OCL) were
389 significantly reduced by anti-CSF1 treatment (Figure 10C and D).

390 4. Discussion

391 We have generated anti-chicken CSF1 antibodies and utilised them to study the biology of
392 CSF1 in the chicken. In mammalian systems, there is surprisingly little information on the
393 location of CSF1 in tissues, and to our knowledge, no published staining with an anti-CSF1
394 monoclonal in any mammalian species. Somewhat at odds with the protein expression we have
395 observed by Western blotting, *CSF1* mRNA is widely expressed in cells and tissues in a recently
396 generated chicken expression atlas (www.biogps.org/chickenatlas) (Bush et al., 2018).

397 Nevertheless, chicken BMDM had the highest level of *CSF1* mRNA expression of any cell or
398 tissue assay including fibroblasts (Garceau et al., 2010). The difference between the mRNA and
399 protein data likely reflects differences in production of secreted versus cell membrane forms of
400 the protein in different tissues and cell types. A *Csfl-lacZ* reporter gene was used previously
401 in mice to locate CSF1-expressing cells (Ryan et al., 2001). They reported the presence of
402 *Csfl-lacZ* positive cells in the marginal zone of spleen and to a lesser extent in red pulp, and in
403 outer cortical areas of lymph nodes, where macrophages are concentrated. A recent study
404 located CSF1 in mouse lymph nodes to lymphatic endothelial cells and confirmed the function
405 in maintenance of the subcapsular sinus macrophage population (Mondor et al., 2019). In most
406 other tissues, the LacZ reporter was associated with epithelial and glandular structures. These
407 authors concluded that CSF1 was mainly expressed by cells of mesenchymal origin. Indeed,
408 the source of CSF1 in mice *in vivo* is commonly attributed to mesenchymal (endothelial cells,
409 fibroblasts, osteoblasts, adipocytes) and epithelial cells (Stanley and Chitu, 2014). In mice,
410 *Csfl* mRNA is not expressed by BMDM grown in CSF1, nor by any isolated tissue macrophage
411 population assayed by the ImmGen consortium (www.immgen.org). However, *CSF1* mRNA
412 was shown to be inducible during differentiation in human monocytes by growth factors and
413 phorbol esters (Horiguchi et al., 1988; Horiguchi et al., 1987; Horiguchi et al., 1986). The
414 highest level of expression of *CSF1* mRNA in the FANTOM5 human transcriptional atlas is in
415 monocyte-derived macrophages (Consortium et al., 2014). *Csfl* mRNA is also expressed at
416 high levels in pig (Freeman et al., 2012) and rat (Rojo et al., 2019) BMDM. Using the anti-
417 CSF1 antibody, we confirmed here that chicken BMDM also express CSF1 on their surface,
418 and the level appears to be regulated further by exogenous CSF1. Unlike mouse BMDM, once
419 progenitors have differentiated in response to CSF1 the resulting chicken BMDM do not depend
420 on exogenous CSF1 for survival, consistent with a role for autocrine CSF1.

421 Three species of CSF1 were detected in serum by Western blotting (Figure 2A). We used
422 the anti-CSF1 antibodies to develop an ELISA and to measure the concentration of circulating
423 CSF1. The level we detected, in the low ng/ml range, is consistent with the apparent saturation
424 of the CSF1R receptor with ligand in bioassays (Figure 6B). We previously demonstrated that
425 the availability of CSF1 in hatchling birds is not saturating for monocyte-macrophage
426 generation. The administration of exogenous CSF1-Fc produced a massive expansion of
427 circulating and tissue cell populations expressing *CSF1R* reporter genes (Garceau et al., 2015).
428 Here we characterized a neutralizing antibody and showed that it was able to block CSF1
429 biological activity *in vitro* (Figure 6). We were therefore able to demonstrate that CSF1 was
430 essential for the development and /or maintenance of tissue macrophages.

431 We also analysed the impact of anti-CSF1 on the development of the bone. Anti-CSF1
432 treatment produced a reduction in overall bone density and trabecular volume (Figure 10), the
433 reciprocal of the impact of CSF1-Fc treatment (Garceau et al., 2015). In mice, CSF1R is
434 expressed by bone-resorbing osteoclasts (OCL). CSF1-deficient mice are osteopetrotic, and
435 OCL are ablated in adult mice treated with anti-CSF1R leading to an increase in bone density
436 and trabecular volume. Paradoxically, treatment of mice with CSF1-Fc also increased bone
437 density despite an increase in OCL number (Gow et al., 2014). This apparent conflict probably
438 arises because ossification mediated by osteoblasts depends upon a novel macrophage
439 populations that is also CSF1-dependent (Batoon et al., 2017). Our studies in chicken are
440 conducted in juvenile birds with rapid bone growth. We speculate that the elevated CSF1 at
441 hatch (Figure 3), and the higher levels apparent in the rapidly growing broiler birds, may have
442 a regulatory function in skeletal growth.

443 In mice, although exogenous CSF1 can massively expand blood monocyte numbers (Yao et
444 al., 2014), CSF1 is not required for monocyte production. Anti-CSF1R antibody administration
445 to adult mice did not alter the number of monocytes, although it did selectively block their

446 differentiation to a non-classical phenotype (Gow et al., 2014). There was no effect of anti-
447 CSF1 on monocyte numbers in the treated chick (Figure 8). At present, we do not have any
448 evidence for functional heterogeneity of chicken monocytes, and anti-CSF1 did not alter
449 expression of the markers we currently have available (MHC Class II, KUL01).

450 Consistent with the impact of anti-CSF1R in mice, anti-CSF1 treatment did impact on some
451 tissue macrophage populations. There was almost complete loss of the TIM4⁺ KC population
452 in the liver (Figure 9), and partial loss of the *CSF1R*-transgene positive cells in the bursa and
453 cecal tonsil (Figure 7). Given the very high level of CSF1 protein in lymphoid organs, the
454 antibody may be less able to compete with endogenous ligand in these tissues. In the peripheral
455 blood and in spleen and bursa, there was an apparent selective effect on B cell numbers. A
456 selective defect in B cell lymphopoiesis was also reported in analysis of a *Csf1* knockout mouse
457 (Harris et al., 2012). Transgenic expression of the proteoglycan form of CSF1 was able to
458 restore B cell numbers in BM, blood and spleen (Nandi et al., 2006). Clearly the biology is
459 different in birds, in which B cells are produced by the bursa and **no classical lymph node**
460 **structures have been identified to date**. There is no evidence that *CSF1R* is expressed in chicken
461 B cells (Balic et al., 2014; Hu et al. 2019). Accordingly, we suggest that CSF1-dependent
462 macrophages in the bursa and spleen provide trophic factors that can influence the development
463 or survival of B cells. One macrophage-dependent candidate regulator of bursal B cell
464 development is B cell activating factor (BAFF, TNFSF13B) (Koskela et al., 2004). In the
465 chicken expression atlas (www.biogps.org/chickenatlas), *Tnfsf13b* mRNA is enriched in bursa,
466 expressed by BMDM, and strongly induced following stimulation with LPS.

467 5. Conclusion

468 We have produced two mouse monoclonal antibodies to chicken CSF1 and developed one
469 capture ELISA assay to quantify native CSF1. Antibody ROS-AV183 neutralised the
470 bioactivities of chCSF1 *in vitro*. Treatment of hatchlings using this neutralising antibody *in vivo*

471 impacted on some tissue macrophage populations. These antibodies are new tools to study the
472 roles of CSF1 in birds.

473

474

475 **Figure legends:**

476 Fig. 1. (A) Screening of hybridoma supernatant by indirect ELISA. Clone 6, 22, 23 and 25
477 recognised chCSF1 but not the IgY fusion partner. Clone 6 (ROS-AV181) and 22 (ROS-
478 AV183) were successfully cloned. (B) ROS-AV181 and 183 recognised non-tagged chCSF1
479 and chCSF1-Fc but not the IgY-Fc fusion partner in an indirect ELISA.

480

481 Fig. 2. Western Blot on serum samples and tissue lysates using anti-CSF-1 (ROS-AV181 or
482 ROS-AV183). (A) Western blot showing the two isoforms of circulating CSF1 in chicken
483 serum. Lane 1 and 3, 18 μ l of serum; lane 2 and 4, 9 μ l of serum. (B) Western blot showing
484 isoforms of CSF1 in tissue lysates. 1. Thymus, 2. Bursa, 3. Spleen, 4. Bone Marrow, 5. Cecal
485 Tonsil, 6. Brain 7. Muscle, 8. Heart, 9. Lung, 10. Kidney, 11. Liver, 12. Jejunum.

486

487 Fig. 3. Localization of CSF1 in the immune tissues. Tissue sections were processed as in
488 Materials and Methods. (A and B) CSF1 staining of spleen from a 16 week old chicken. CSF1
489 staining is localised to the ellipsoid surrounding the penicillar capillary. CSF1 (Red), and DAPI
490 (blue), scale bar = 20 μ m. (C-F) CSF1 staining on bursa of Fabricius from a 3 day old chick.
491 CSF1 staining is localised to the cells at the cortico-medullary junction. CSF1 (Red), IgY
492 (green) and DAPI (blue). (C and E) Objective lens 20 \times ; scale bar = 20 μ m. (D and F) Objective
493 lens 40 \times ; scale bar = 20 μ m.

494

495 Fig. 4. Flow cytometric analysis of surface expression of CSF1R on BMDM. BMDMs were
496 cultured with CSF1 for 6 days. At this point, half of the cells were starved of CSF1 overnight
497 (no CSF1) and the other half were cultured with CSF1 (with CSF1). Following a further 24
498 hours of culture, BMDM were stimulated with LPS for 3 hours. Cells were stained with either
499 anti-CSF1-AF647 or CSF1-Fc-AF647. All histograms are representatives of three independent
500 experiments. (A) Comparison of the staining profiles of CSF1 and CSF1-Fc between cells
501 starved of CSF1 (dotted line) or cultured with CSF1 (solid line). (B) Comparison of the staining
502 profiles between cells non-stimulated (solid line) or stimulated with LPS (dotted line) for 3
503 hours. Cells were cultured with CSF1 or starved of CSF1 as in A. ▲ Isotype controls.

504

505 Fig. 5. Development of a capture ELISA assay and comparison of CSF1 levels in sera between
506 broiler and layer birds. (A) Standard curve of capture ELISA assay. (B and C) CSF1
507 concentrations in sera from broilers (panel B) and layers (panel C) from embryonic day (ED)
508 19 to day 14 after hatch (n = 10). (D) Comparison of CSF1 concentrations in sera from broilers
509 (Blue) and layers (Red). A non-parametric Mann–Whitney test was used to analyse differences
510 of CSF1 levels between time intervals (panels B and C) and bird types (panel D). *P* values <
511 0.05 were considered significant.

512

513 Fig. 6. Neutralising effect of mAbs to CSF1. (A) Chicken CSF1 was titrated out on Ba/F3 cells
514 stably transfected with CSF1R (Ba/F3-CSFR) to determine a suitable concentration for
515 neutralising assay. 400 ng/ml was chosen. (B) Ba/F3-CSFR were cultured with CSF1, CSF1
516 pre-incubated with either ROS-AV181 or 183, mouse IgG1 control or without CSF1 for 72 hrs
517 before performing MTT assays. Cells cultured with CSF1 or CSF1 pre-incubated with ROS-
518 AV181 or isotype control proliferated. Cells cultured with CSF1 pre-incubated with ROS-
519 AV183 were dead when > 2.5 µg/ml of antibody was used. Assays were carried out in triplicate

520 and representative data from three independent experiments are shown. (C) Chicken bone
521 marrow cells were cultured with CSF1 pre-incubated with mAbs, CSF1 only or without CSF1.
522 Original magnification objective lens 10X.

523

524 Fig. 7. The effect of anti-CSF1 treatment on lymphoid organs in hatchling birds. *CSF1R*-eGFP
525 reporter (MacGreen) birds received anti-CSF1 (ROS-AV183) or mouse IgG1 control antibody
526 subcutaneously for four consecutive days from day of hatch and were sacrificed on day 7. (A-
527 C) Mean fluorescence intensity (MFI) and surface area between the two groups obtained using
528 Zen blue 2012 software, showing mean values of spleen, cecal tonsil and bursa. Error bars
529 represent standard error of the mean. Significance was indicated by * $P < 0.05$ using a Mann-
530 Whitney test. (D-F) Representative whole mount images of lymphoid tissues spleen, cecal tonsil
531 and bursa obtained using Zeiss Axio Cam HR microscope, scale bar = 1mm.

532

533 Fig. 8. The effect of anti-CSF1 treatment on blood leukocytes and splenocytes. Blood
534 leukocytes and splenocytes were isolated, stained with KUL01, anti-MHC class II and anti-Bu-
535 1 and analysed by flow cytometry. (A-C) The profiles of peripheral blood cells from *CSF1R*-
536 eGFP birds treated with anti-CSF1 ($n = 8$) or with mouse IgG1 isotype control antibody ($n =$
537 6). Significance is indicated by * $P < 0.05$ using a Mann-Whitney test. (D-F) The profiles of
538 spleen cell suspension from *CSF1R*-eGFP birds treated with anti-CSF1 ($n = 9$) or an isotype
539 control antibody ($n = 8$). Significance is indicated by *** $P < 0.001$ using a Mann-Whitney test.

540

541 Fig. 9. The effect of anti-CSF1 treatment on TIM4⁺ Kupffer cells. (A) Confocal images of
542 Kupffer cells as detected by anti-chicken TIM4 mAb (red) staining in liver tissue ($n = 8/9$)
543 using LSM 710 inverted microscope. Representative image from three birds from each
544 treatment. Green indicates *CSF1R* transgene expression, red indicates TIM4⁺ cells and blue

545 denotes nuclei. Scale bar = 20 μm . (B) The numbers of TIM4⁺ Kupffer cells per image were
546 quantified using ImageJ from 5 different images from 5 different regions of liver sample per
547 bird per treatment at 40 \times magnification. The graph indicates the average count of TIM4⁺ cells
548 (red channel) per image with standard deviation between the mouse IgG1 and anti-CSF1 treated
549 group. **** indicates significance at $P < 0.0001$ using a Mann–Whitney test.

550

551 Fig. 10. The effect of anti-CSF1 treatment on bone. (A) Comparison of bone volume and
552 trabecular thickness, number and separation by microCT scanning of femur bones between
553 chicks treated with mouse IgG1 or anti-CSF1 (N = 7/8). Significance is indicated by $*P < 0.05$,
554 using a Mann–Whitney test. (B) Representative 3D images from birds treated with mouse IgG1
555 and anti-CSF1 antibody obtained using CTVOX programme. Scale bar = 1.0 mm. (C)
556 Comparison of TRAP⁺ osteoclasts (black arrows) in the bone between mouse IgG1 and anti-
557 CSF1 treated groups. Significance is indicated by $***P < 0.005$, using a Mann–Whitney test.
558 (D) Representative TRAP staining images of mouse IgG1 and anti-CSF1 treated birds. Scale
559 bar = 50 μm

560

561

562

563

564

565

566

567

568

569

570 Table 1. List of primary and secondary antibodies used for flow cytometry and
 571 immunohistochemistry.
 572

Antibody name/Clone	Antigen	Isotype	Supplier	Working concentration µg/ml
Mouse anti-CD45-RPE/ clone LT-40	CD45	IgM	Southern Biotech	0.8
Mouse anti-chicken Monocytes/Macrophages- RPE /clone KUL01	MRC1L-B	IgG1	Southern Biotech	0.4
Mouse anti-Bu-1-RPE/ clone AV20	Bu-1a/b	IgG1	Southern Biotech	0.1
Mouse anti-chicken MHC II-RPE/ clone 2G11	MHC class II β-chain	IgG1	Southern Biotech	0.1
Mouse anti-CD3-RPE/ clone CT-3	CD3	IgG1	Southern Biotech	0.1
Mouse anti- CD41/61/clone 11C3	Integrin CD41/61	IgG1	Bio-Rad	0.8
Mouse anti-TIM4/clone JH9	TIM4	IgG1	In house (Hu et al., 2019; Hu et al., 2016)	0.1
Mouse IgG1 isotype control/GR13.1		IgG1	In house (Hu et al., 2019; Hu et al., 2016)	0.1
Mouse IgM isotype control-RPE		IgM	AlphaDiagnostic	0.8
Mouse IgG1 isotype control-RPE		IgG1	AlphaDiagnostic	0.1

573
 574
 575
 576
 577
 578
 579
 580
 581
 582
 583

584 **Acknowledgements**

585 This research was funded by Wellcome Trust with grant number 099164/Z/12/Z and the
586 Biotechnology and Biological Sciences Research Council (BBSRC) grants BB/M011925/1 and
587 BB/R003653/1. The National Avian Research Facility at The Roslin Institute receives strategic
588 funding from the BBSRC and the work was supported by BBSRC Institute Strategic
589 Programme Grant BBS/E/D/10002071 (Current ISP1 theme 2).

590 We thank Dr Anna Raper at The Roslin Institute for initially labeling CSF1-Fc, Prof Lonneke
591 Vervelde for suggesting to use chicken sera as IgY-Fc control for screening of hybridoma
592 supernatant and the Clinical Pathology Laboratory of the Royal (Dick) School of Veterinary
593 Studies at the University of Edinburgh for processing bone slides.

594 **References**

- 595 Arceci, R.J., Shanahan, F., Stanley, E.R., Pollard, J.W., 1989. Temporal expression and
596 location of colony-stimulating factor 1 (CSF-1) and its receptor in the female
597 reproductive tract are consistent with CSF-1-regulated placental development. *Proc*
598 *Natl Acad Sci U S A* 86, 8818-8822.
- 599 Balic, A., Chintoan-Uta, C., Vohra, P., Sutton, K., Cassady-Cain, R., Hu, T., Donaldson, D.,
600 Stevens, M., Hume, D., Sang, H., Mabbott, N. A., Vervelde, L., 2019. Antigen sampling
601 CSF1R-expressing epithelial cells are the functional equivalents of mammalian M cells in
602 the avian follicle-associated epithelium. *Frontiers in immunology* 10, 2019
- 603 Balic, A., Garcia-Morales, C., Vervelde, L., Gilhooley, H., Sherman, A., Garceau, V., Gutowska,
604 M.W., Burt, D.W., Kaiser, P., Hume, D.A., Sang, H.M., 2014. Visualisation of chicken
605 macrophages using transgenic reporter genes: insights into the development of the
606 avian macrophage lineage. *Development* 141, 3255-3265.
- 607 Batoon, L., Millard, S.M., Wullschlegel, M.E., Preda, C., Wu, A.C., Kaur, S., Tseng, H.W.,
608 Hume, D.A., Levesque, J.P., Raggatt, L.J., Pettit, A.R., 2017. CD169(+) macrophages are
609 critical for osteoblast maintenance and promote intramembranous and endochondral
610 ossification during bone repair. *Biomaterials*.
- 611 Bush, S.J., Freem, L., MacCallum, A.J., O'Dell, J., Wu, C., Afrasiabi, C., Psifidi, A., Stevens,
612 M.P., Smith, J., Summers, K.M., Hume, D.A., 2018. Combination of novel and public
613 RNA-seq datasets to generate an mRNA expression atlas for the domestic chicken. *BMC*
614 *genomics* 19, 594.
- 615 Chihara, T., Suzu, S., Hassan, R., Chutiwitoonchai, N., Hiyoshi, M., Motoyoshi, K., Kimura, F.,
616 Okada, S., 2010. IL-34 and M-CSF share the receptor Fms but are not identical in
617 biological activity and signal activation. *Cell Death Differ* 17, 1917-1927.
- 618 Chitu, V., Stanley, E.R., 2006. Colony-stimulating factor-1 in immunity and inflammation.
619 *Current opinion in immunology* 18, 39-48.

620 Chitu, V., Stanley, E.R., 2017. Regulation of Embryonic and Postnatal Development by the
621 CSF-1 Receptor. *Current topics in developmental biology* 123, 229-275.

622 Dai, X.M., Zong, X.H., Sylvestre, V., Stanley, E.R., 2004. Incomplete restoration of colony-
623 stimulating factor 1 (CSF-1) function in CSF-1-deficient *Csf1op/Csf1op* mice by
624 transgenic expression of cell surface CSF-1. *Blood* 103, 1114-1123.

625 Freem, L., Summers, K.M., Gheyas, A., Psifidi, A., Boulton, K., MacCallum, A., O'Dell J., Bush
626 S.,J., Hume, D.A., 2019. Analysis of the progeny of sibling 1 matings reveals regulatory
627 variation impacting the transcriptome of immune cells in commercial chickens.
628 *Frontiers in Genetics*, In press.

629 Freeman, T.C., Ivens, A., Baillie, J.K., Beraldi, D., Barnett, M.W., Dorward, D., Downing, A.,
630 Fairbairn, L., Kapetanovic, R., Raza, S., Tomoiu, A., Alberio, R., Wu, C., Su, A.I., Summers,
631 K.M., Tuggle, C.K., Archibald, A.L., Hume, D.A., 2012. A gene expression atlas of the
632 domestic pig. *BMC biology* 10, 90.

633 Garceau, V., 2014. Characterisation of the Chicken Mononuclear Phagocyte System, The
634 Roslin Institute. University of Edinburgh.

635 Garceau, V., Balic, A., Garcia-Morales, C., Sauter, K.A., McGrew, M.J., Smith, J., Vervelde, L.,
636 Sherman, A., Fuller, T.E., Oliphant, T., Shelley, J.A., Tiwari, R., Wilson, T.L., Chintoan-Uta,
637 C., Burt, D.W., Stevens, M.P., Sang, H.M., Hume, D.A., 2015. The development and
638 maintenance of the mononuclear phagocyte system of the chick is controlled by signals
639 from the macrophage colony-stimulating factor receptor. *BMC biology* 13, 12.

640 Garceau, V., Smith, J., Paton, I.R., Davey, M., Fares, M.A., Sester, D.P., Burt, D.W., Hume,
641 D.A., 2010. Pivotal Advance: Avian colony-stimulating factor 1 (CSF-1), interleukin-34
642 (IL-34), and CSF-1 receptor genes and gene products. *Journal of leukocyte biology* 87,
643 753-764.

644 Garcia-Morales, C., Nandi, S., Zhao, D., Sauter, K.A., Vervelde, L., McBride, D., Sang, H.M.,
645 Clinton, M., Hume, D.A., 2015. Cell-autonomous sex differences in gene expression in
646 chicken bone marrow-derived macrophages. *Journal of immunology* 194, 2338-2344.

647 Garcia-Morales, C., Rothwell, L., Moffat, L., Garceau, V., Balic, A., Sang, H.M., Kaiser, P.,
648 Hume, D.A., 2014. Production and characterisation of a monoclonal antibody that
649 recognises the chicken CSF1 receptor and confirms that expression is restricted to
650 macrophage-lineage cells. *Developmental and comparative immunology* 42, 278-285.

651 Gow, D.J., Sauter, K.A., Pridans, C., Moffat, L., Sehgal, A., Stutchfield, B.M., Raza, S., Beard,
652 P.M., Tsai, Y.T., Bainbridge, G., Boner, P.L., Fici, G., Garcia-Tapia, D., Martin, R.A.,
653 Oliphant, T., Shelly, J.A., Tiwari, R., Wilson, T.L., Smith, L.B., Mabbott, N.A., Hume, D.A.,
654 2014. Characterisation of a novel Fc conjugate of macrophage colony-stimulating factor.
655 *Molecular therapy : the journal of the American Society of Gene Therapy* 22, 1580-
656 1592.

657 Griggs, J., Zinkewich-Peotti, K., 2009. The state of the art: immune-mediated mechanisms of
658 monoclonal antibodies in cancer therapy. *British journal of cancer* 101, 1807-1812.

659 Harris, S.E., MacDougall, M., Horn, D., Woodruff, K., Zimmer, S.N., Rebel, V.I., Fajardo, R.,
660 Feng, J.Q., Gluhak-Heinrich, J., Harris, M.A., Abboud Werner, S., 2012. Meox2Cre-
661 mediated disruption of CSF-1 leads to osteopetrosis and osteocyte defects. *Bone* 50, 42-
662 53.

663 Hawley, C.A., Rojo, R., Raper, A., Sauter, K.A., Lisowski, Z.M., Grabert, K., Bain, C.C., Davis,
664 G.M., Louwe, P.A., Ostrowski, M.C., Hume, D.A., Pridans, C., Jenkins, S.J., 2018. *Csf1r*-
665 mApple Transgene Expression and Ligand Binding In Vivo Reveal Dynamics of CSF1R
666 Expression within the Mononuclear Phagocyte System. *Journal of immunology* 200,

667 2209-2223.Horiguchi, J., Sariban, E., Kufe, D., 1988. Transcriptional and
668 posttranscriptional regulation of CSF-1 gene expression in human monocytes. *Molecular*
669 *and cellular biology* 8, 3951-3954.

670 Horiguchi, J., Warren, M.K., Kufe, D., 1987. Expression of the macrophage-specific colony-
671 stimulating factor in human monocytes treated with granulocyte-macrophage colony-
672 stimulating factor. *Blood* 69, 1259-1261.

673 Horiguchi, J., Warren, M.K., Ralph, P., Kufe, D., 1986. Expression of the macrophage specific
674 colony-stimulating factor (CSF-1) during human monocytic differentiation. *Biochemical*
675 *and biophysical research communications* 141, 924-930.

676 Hu, T., Wu, Z., Bush, S.J., Freem, L., Vervelde, L., Summers, K.M., Hume, D.A., Balic, A.,
677 Kaiser, P., 2019. Characterization of Subpopulations of Chicken Mononuclear
678 Phagocytes That Express TIM4 and CSF1R. *Journal of immunology* 202, 1186-1199.

679 Hu, T., Wu, Z., Vervelde, L., Rothwell, L., Hume, D.A., Kaiser, P., 2016. Functional annotation
680 of the T-cell immunoglobulin mucin family in birds. *Immunology* 148, 287-303.

681 Hume, D.A., Gutowska-Ding, M.W., Garcia-Morales, C., Kebede, A., Bamidele, O., Trujillo,
682 A.V., Gheyas, A.A., Smith, J., 2019. Functional evolution of the colony-stimulating factor
683 1 receptor (CSF1R) and its ligands in birds. *Journal of leukocyte biology*.

684 Jenkins, S.J., Hume, D.A., 2014. Homeostasis in the mononuclear phagocyte system. *Trends*
685 *in immunology* 35, 358-367.

686 Jenkins, S.J., Ruckerl, D., Thomas, G.D., Hewitson, J.P., Duncan, S., Brombacher, F., Maizels,
687 R.M., Hume, D.A., Allen, J.E., 2013. IL-4 directly signals tissue-resident macrophages to
688 proliferate beyond homeostatic levels controlled by CSF-1. *The Journal of experimental*
689 *medicine* 210, 2477-2491.

690 Jeurissen, S.H., 1993. The role of various compartments in the chicken spleen during an
691 antigen-specific humoral response. *Immunology* 80, 29-33.

692 Karasuyama, H., Melchers, F., 1988. Establishment of mouse cell lines which constitutively
693 secrete large quantities of interleukin 2, 3, 4 or 5, using modified cDNA expression
694 vectors. *European journal of immunology* 18, 97-104.

695 Koskela, K., Nieminen, P., Kohonen, P., Salminen, H., Lassila, O., 2004. Chicken B-cell-
696 activating factor: regulator of B-cell survival in the bursa of fabricius. *Scandinavian*
697 *journal of immunology* 59, 449-457.

698 Lin, H., Lee, E., Hestir, K., Leo, C., Huang, M., Bosch, E., Halenbeck, R., Wu, G., Zhou, A.,
699 Behrens, D., Hollenbaugh, D., Linnemann, T., Qin, M., Wong, J., Chu, K., Doberstein, S.K.,
700 Williams, L.T., 2008. Discovery of a cytokine and its receptor by functional screening of
701 the extracellular proteome. *Science* 320, 807-811.

702 Lin, W., Xu, D., Austin, C.D., Caplazi, P., Senger, K., Sun, Y., Jeet, S., Young, J., Delarosa, D.,
703 Suto, E., Huang, Z., Zhang, J., Yan, D., Corzo, C., Barck, K., Rajan, S., Looney, C.,
704 Gandham, V., Lesch, J., Liang, W.C., Mai, E., Ngu, H., Ratti, N., Chen, Y., Misner, D., Lin,
705 T., Danilenko, D., Katavolos, P., Doudemont, E., Uppal, H., Eastham, J., Mak, J., de
706 Almeida, P.E., Bao, K., Hadadianpour, A., Keir, M., Carano, R.A.D., Diehl, L., Xu, M., Wu,
707 Y., Weimer, R.M., DeVoss, J., Lee, W.P., Balazs, M., Walsh, K., Alatsis, K.R., Martin, F.,
708 Zarrin, A.A., 2019. Function of CSF1 and IL34 in Macrophage Homeostasis,
709 Inflammation, and Cancer. *Frontiers in immunology* 10, 2019.

710 Liu, H., Leo, C., Chen, X., Wong, B.R., Williams, L.T., Lin, H., He, X., 2012. The mechanism of
711 shared but distinct CSF-1R signaling by the non-homologous cytokines IL-34 and CSF-1.
712 *Biochim Biophys Acta* 1824, 938-945.

713 MacDonald, K.P., Palmer, J.S., Cronau, S., Seppanen, E., Olver, S., Raffelt, N.C., Kuns, R.,
714 Pettit, A.R., Clouston, A., Wainwright, B., Branstetter, D., Smith, J., Paxton, R.J., Cerretti,
715 D.P., Bonham, L., Hill, G.R., Hume, D.A., 2010. An antibody against the colony-
716 stimulating factor 1 receptor depletes the resident subset of monocytes and tissue- and
717 tumor-associated macrophages but does not inhibit inflammation. *Blood* 116, 3955-
718 3963.

719 Mondor, I., Baratin, M., Lagueyrie, M., Saro, L., Henri, S., Gentek, R., Suerinck, D.,
720 Kastenmuller, W., Jiang, J.X., Bajenoff, M., 2019. Lymphatic Endothelial Cells Are
721 Essential Components of the Subcapsular Sinus Macrophage Niche. *Immunity*.

722 Nandi, S., Akhter, M.P., Seifert, M.F., Dai, X.M., Stanley, E.R., 2006. Developmental and
723 functional significance of the CSF-1 proteoglycan chondroitin sulfate chain. *Blood* 107,
724 786-795.

725 Pridans, C., Raper, A., Davis, G.M., Alves, J., Sauter, K.A., Lefevre, L., Regan, T., Meek, S.,
726 Sutherland, L., Thomson, A.J., Clohisey, S., Bush, S.J., Rojo, R., Lisowski, Z.M., Wallace,
727 R., Grabert, K., Upton, K.R., Tsai, Y.T., Brown, D., Smith, L.B., Summers, K.M., Mabbott,
728 N.A., Piccardo, P., Cheeseman, M.T., Burdon, T., Hume, D.A., 2018. Pleiotropic Impacts
729 of Macrophage and Microglial Deficiency on Development in Rats with Targeted
730 Mutation of the *Csf1r* Locus. *Journal of immunology* 201, 2683-2699

731 Regenstreif, L.J., Rossant, J., 1989. Expression of the *c-fms* proto-oncogene and of the
732 cytokine, CSF-1, during mouse embryogenesis. *Dev Biol* 133, 284-294.

733 Rojo, R., Pridans, C., Langlais, D., Hume, D.A., 2017. Transcriptional mechanisms that control
734 expression of the macrophage colony-stimulating factor receptor locus. *Clinical science*
735 131, 2161-2182.

736 Rojo, R., Raper, A., Ozdemir, D.D., Lefevre, L., Grabert, K., Wollscheid-Lengeling, E.,
737 Bradford, B., Caruso, M., Gazova, I., Sanchez, A., Lisowski, Z.M., Alves, J., Molina-
738 Gonzalez, I., Davtyan, H., Lodge, R.J., Glover, J.D., Wallace, R., Munro, D.A.D., David, E.,
739 Amit, I., Miron, V.E., Priller, J., Jenkins, S.J., Hardingham, G.E., Blurton-Jones, M.,
740 Mabbott, N.A., Summers, K.M., Hohenstein, P., Hume, D.A., Pridans, C., 2019. Deletion
741 of a *Csf1r* enhancer selectively impacts CSF1R expression and development of tissue
742 macrophage populations. *Nature communications* 10, 3215.

743 Roth, P., Stanley, E.R., 1996. Colony stimulating factor-1 expression is developmentally
744 regulated in the mouse. *Journal of leukocyte biology* 59, 817-823.

745 Rothwell, L., Hamblin, A., Kaiser, P., 2001. Production and characterisation of monoclonal
746 antibodies specific for chicken interleukin-2. *Veterinary immunology and*
747 *immunopathology* 83, 149-160.

748 Ryan, G.R., Dai, X.M., Dominguez, M.G., Tong, W., Chuan, F., Chisholm, O., Russell, R.G.,
749 Pollard, J.W., Stanley, E.R., 2001. Rescue of the colony-stimulating factor 1 (CSF-1)-
750 nullizygous mouse (*Csf1(op)/Csf1(op)*) phenotype with a CSF-1 transgene and
751 identification of sites of local CSF-1 synthesis. *Blood* 98, 74-84.

752 Sauter, K.A., Pridans, C., Sehgal, A., Tsai, Y.T., Bradford, B.M., Raza, S., Moffat, L., Gow, D.J.,
753 Beard, P.M., Mabbott, N.A., Smith, L.B., Hume, D.A., 2014. Pleiotropic effects of
754 extended blockade of CSF1R signaling in adult mice. *Journal of leukocyte biology* 96,
755 265-274.

756 Sester, D.P., Beasley, S.J., Sweet, M.J., Fowles, L.F., Cronau, S.L., Stacey, K.J., Hume, D.A.,
757 1999. Bacterial/CpG DNA down-modulates colony stimulating factor-1 receptor surface
758 expression on murine bone marrow-derived macrophages with concomitant growth
759 arrest and factor-independent survival. *Journal of immunology* 163, 6541-6550.

760 Sherr, C.J., Rettenmier, C.W., Sacca, R., Roussel, M.F., Look, A.T., Stanley, E.R., 1985. The c-
761 fms proto-oncogene product is related to the receptor for the mononuclear phagocyte
762 growth factor, CSF-1. *Cell* 41, 665-676.

763 Stanley, E.R., Chitu, V., 2014. CSF-1 receptor signaling in myeloid cells. *Cold Spring Harbor*
764 *perspectives in biology* 6.

765 Sutton, K., Costa, T., Alber, A., Bryson, K., Borowska, D., Balic, A., Kaiser, P., Stevens, M.,
766 Vervelde, L., 2018. Visualisation and characterisation of mononuclear phagocytes in the
767 chicken respiratory tract using CSF1R-transgenic chickens. *Vet Res* 49, 104.

768 The FANTOM Consortium and the RIKEN PMI and CLST (DGT)., 2014. A promoter-level
769 mammalian expression atlas. *Nature* 507, 462-470.

770 Wang, Y., Szretter, K.J., Vermi, W., Gilfillan, S., Rossini, C., Cella, M., Barrow, A.D., Diamond,
771 M.S., Colonna, M., 2012. IL-34 is a tissue-restricted ligand of CSF1R required for the
772 development of Langerhans cells and microglia. *Nat Immunol* 13, 753-760.

773 Wei, S., Lightwood, D., Ladyman, H., Cross, S., Neale, H., Griffiths, M., Adams, R., Marshall,
774 D., Lawson, A., McKnight, A.J., Stanley, E.R., 2005. Modulation of CSF-1-regulated post-
775 natal development with anti-CSF-1 antibody. *Immunobiology* 210, 109-119.

776 Wei, S., Nandi, S., Chitu, V., Yeung, Y.G., Yu, W., Huang, M., Williams, L.T., Lin, H., Stanley,
777 E.R., 2010. Functional overlap but differential expression of CSF-1 and IL-34 in their CSF-
778 1 receptor-mediated regulation of myeloid cells. *Journal of leukocyte biology* 88, 495-
779 505.

780 Yao, H., Zheng, G., Hsu, P.C., Kong, D., Cha, J.J., Li, W., Seh, Z.W., McDowell, M.T., Yan, K.,
781 Liang, Z., Narasimhan, V.K., Cui, Y., 2014. Improving lithium-sulphur batteries through
782 spatial control of sulphur species deposition on a hybrid electrode surface. *Nature*
783 *communications* 5, 3943.

784 Zhang, Q., Chen, B., Yang, P., Zhang, L., Liu, Y., Ullah, S., Wu, L., Waqas, Y., Le, Y., Chen, W.,
785 Chen, Q., 2015. Identification and structural composition of the blood-spleen barrier in
786 chickens. *Veterinary journal* 204, 110-116.

787

788

789