Supplementary Information

MnO₂-based Nanoparticles Remodeling Tumor Micro-environment to

Augment Sonodynamic Immunotherapy against Breast Cancer

Haiqin Liao^{a,b,c,d*}, Mingyu Chen^{b,c,d*}, Zhipeng Liao^{b,c,d}, Yi Luo^{b,c,d}, Sijie Chen^{b,c,d}, Long Wang ^{e,f}, Zhigang

Wang^a, Chengcheng Niu^{b,c,d†}

^a Department of Ultrasound, the Second Affiliated Hospital of Chongqing Medical University, Chongqing, 400010, China

^b Department of Ultrasound, The Second Xiangya Hospital, Central South University, Changsha, Hunan 410011, China

^c Research Center of Ultrasonography, The Second Xiangya Hospital, Central South University, Changsha, Hunan 410011, China

^d Clinical Research Center for Ultrasound and Treatment in Hunan Province, Hunan 410011, China

^e Department of Orthopedics, Xiangya Hospital, Central South University, Changsha, Hunan 410008, China

^f Hunan Engineering Research Center of Biomedical Metal and Ceramic Implants, Xiangya Hospital, Central South University, Changsha, China

*These authors contributed equally to this work.

†Address all correspondence to: Chengcheng Niu, Department of Ultrasound and Research Center of Ultrasonography, The Second Xiangya Hospital, Central South University, Changsha, Hunan, China, 410011; E-mail: niuchengcheng@csu.edu.cn



Figure S1. Quantification analysis of the mean fluorescence intensity (MFI) of $Ru(dpp)_2Cl]_3$ (n=3). Statistical significance was determined using one-way ANOVA with a Tukey post hoc test. *p < 0.05, **p < 0.01, ****p < 0.001.



Figure S2. Quantification analysis of MFI of DCF (n=3). Statistical significance was determined using one-way ANOVA with a Tukey post hoc test. *p < 0.05, **p < 0.01, ****p < 0.001, ****p < 0.0001.



Figure S3. A) Images of 2% erythrocyte suspensions treated with different concentrations of CMP@4T1m nanoparticles. Distilled water was applied as the positive control and 0.9% NaCl solution was utilized as the negative control. B) Hemolysis ratio of water, 0.9% Nacl and different concentrations of CMP@4T1m nanoparticles (n = 3). Statistical significance was determined using one-way ANOVA with a Tukey post hoc test. *p < 0.05, **p < 0.01, ***p < 0.001, ***p < 0.001, ns: No statistical significance.



Figure S4. Histological H&E staining of resected major organs after various treatments.



Figure S5. Quantitative analysis of liver and kidney function biomarkers (n=3). LDH: lactate dehydrogenase, ALP: alkaline phosphatase, ALT: alanine aminotransferase, CREA: creatinine, AST: aspartate aminotransferase, BUN: blood urea nitrogen. Statistical significance was determined using a two-tailed paired Student's t-test. ns: No statistical significance.



Figure S6. Quantification analysis of MFI of HIF-1 α (n=3). Statistical significance was determined using one-way ANOVA with a Tukey post hoc test. *p < 0.05, **p < 0.01, ****p < 0.001, ****p < 0.0001.



Figure S7. Quantification analysis of MFI of DHE (n=3). Statistical significance was determined using one-way



ANOVA with a Tukey post hoc test. **p* < 0.05, ***p* < 0.01, ****p* < 0.001, *****p* < 0.0001.

Figure S8. Gating strategies for A) CD80⁺ and CD86⁺ DCs in spleen, B) CD86⁺ and CD206⁺ macrophages and C)

CD3⁺ CD4⁺, and CD3⁺ CD8⁺ T cells in tumor corresponding to those in Figure 8A-D and Figure S10-11.



Figure S9. FCM histograms of A) splenic CD86⁺ DCs after various treatments, and B) its corresponding quantification analysis (n=3). Statistical significance was determined using one-way ANOVA with a Tukey post hoc test. *p < 0.05, **p < 0.01, ***p < 0.001, ****p < 0.0001.



 $\label{eq:Figure S10.} FCM \ histograms \ of \ intratumoral \ CD86^+ \ macrophages \ after \ various \ treatments.$