



HAL
open science

Extra-cellular matrix in multicellular aggregates acts as a pressure sensor controlling cell proliferation and motility

Monika Elzbieta Dolega, Sylvain Monnier, Benjamin Brunel, Jean-François Joanny, Pierre Recho, Giovanni Cappello

► To cite this version:

Monika Elzbieta Dolega, Sylvain Monnier, Benjamin Brunel, Jean-François Joanny, Pierre Recho, et al.. Extra-cellular matrix in multicellular aggregates acts as a pressure sensor controlling cell proliferation and motility. *eLife*, 2021, 10, 10.7554/eLife.63258 . hal-03015345v2

HAL Id: hal-03015345

<https://hal.science/hal-03015345v2>

Submitted on 17 Mar 2021

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Extra-cellular matrix in multicellular aggregates acts as a pressure sensor controlling cell proliferation and motility

Monika E. Dolega¹, Sylvain Monnier², Benjamin Brunel¹, Jean-François Joanny³, Pierre Recho^{1*}, Giovanni Cappello^{1*}

*For correspondence:

Pierre.Recho@univ-grenoble-alpes.fr (PR); Giovanni.Cappello@univ-grenoble-alpes.fr (GC)

¹ Université Grenoble Alpes, Laboratoire Interdisciplinaire de Physique, CNRS, F-38000 Grenoble, France; ² Université de Lyon, Université Claude Bernard Lyon 1, CNRS, Institut Lumière Matière, F-69622, VILLEURBANNE, France; ³ Collège de France, PSL Research University, 11 place Marcelin Berthelot, 75005 Paris, France

Abstract Imposed deformations play an important role in morphogenesis and tissue homeostasis, both in normal and pathological conditions. To perceive mechanical perturbations of different types and magnitudes, tissues need appropriate detectors, with a compliance that matches the perturbation amplitude. By comparing results of selective osmotic compressions of CT26 mouse cells within multicellular aggregates and global aggregate compressions, we show that global compressions have a strong impact on the aggregates growth and internal cell motility, while selective compressions of same magnitude have almost no effect. Both compressions alter the volume of individual cells in the same way over a short-timescale, but, by draining the water out of the extracellular matrix, the global one imposes a residual compressive mechanical stress on the cells over a long-timescale, while the selective one does not. We conclude that the extracellular matrix is as a sensor that mechanically regulates cell proliferation and migration in a 3D environment.

1 Introduction

Aside from biochemical signaling, cellular function and fate also depend on the mechanical state of the surrounding extracellular matrix (ECM) (*Humphrey et al., 2014*). The ECM is a non-cellular component of tissues providing a scaffold for cellular adhesion and triggering numerous mechanotransduction pathways, involved in morphogenesis and homeostasis (*Vogel, 2018*). An increasing number of studies *in vivo* and *in vitro* shows that changing the mechanical properties of the ECM by re-implanting tissues or changing the stiffness of the adherent substrate is sufficient to reverse aging (*Segel et al., 2019*), accelerate developmental processes (*Barriga et al., 2018*) or modulate tumor malignancy (*Paszek et al., 2005; Tanner et al., 2012*).

The importance of the mechanical context in cancer has been highlighted for a long time by experiments altering the composition and stiffness of the ECM (*Levental et al., 2009*). It has also been shown that the tumor growth is modulated by the mechanical compression caused by the tumor itself, as it expands in a confined environment (*Fernandez-Sanchez et al., 2010; Nia et al., 2016*). Such patho-physiological growth under pressure has also been studied *in vitro*. When multicellular aggregates are confined by soft gels (*Helmlinger et al., 1997; Alessandri et al., 2013; Taubenberger*

40 *et al., 2019*) or submitted to a gentle osmotic compression (*Montel et al., 2011; Dolega et al., 2017*),
 41 their growth is substantially reduced. It has been demonstrated that the cell cytoskeleton is involved
 42 in the response to compression and can trigger the growth impediment through a cell-cycle inhi-
 43 bition (*Taubenberger et al., 2019; Delarue et al., 2014*). In addition, the cellular volume has been
 44 recently proposed to be a key parameter in the mechanosensitive pathway (*Delarue et al., 2014;*
 45 *Han et al., 2020*). Nevertheless, it is not known how such mild global compression is transduced to
 46 the individual cells of the aggregate to alter their proliferation.

47
 48 Here, we posit that cells mainly respond to the
 49 mechanical stress transmitted by the ECM, when
 50 the aggregate is under compression. This hypoth-
 51 esis is motivated by two evidences. First, an ag-
 52 gregate is a composite material made of cells, ex-
 53 tracellular matrix and interstitial fluid. The pres-
 54 ence of hydrated extracellular matrix is evidenced
 55 by the abundance of fibronectin in the intersti-
 56 tial space (figure 1a and Appendix C). As the ECM
 57 is 100 to 1000-fold more compressible than the
 58 cells, it absorbs most of the deformation, but still
 59 transmits the mechanical stress to the cells. Sec-
 60 ond, whereas an osmotic pressure of a few kPa
 61 strongly reduces the cell proliferation within mul-
 62 ticellular aggregates, an identical pressure has no
 63 effect on individual cells cultured on a Petri dish,
 64 in the absence of ECM (*Montel et al. (2011)* and
 65 Figure 4f). In addition, the use of drugs affect-
 66 ing the cytoskeleton organization has a negligible
 67 effect on the effective compressibility of multicel-
 68 lular aggregates (Appendix G. This indicates that
 69 the volume loss under compression is mainly due
 70 to ECM dehydration (*Dolega et al., 2020*).

71 To test the hypothesis that cells respond to
 72 the ECM deformation, we introduce an experimen-
 73 tal method that uncouples the cell volume change
 74 from the mechanical stress transmitted to the cells
 75 through the ECM. We apply this method for both
 76 multicellular aggregates and individual cells em-
 77 bedded in a gelified ECM. In parallel, we present
 78 a theoretical framework to estimate both the dis-
 79 placement and the stress at the ECM/cell interface
 80 in response to an osmotic compression, and ver-
 81 ify experimentally its qualitative prediction. At a
 82 longer timescale, we probe the effect of the ECM
 83 compression on the cellular response. In particu-
 84 lar, we demonstrate that, even in the absence
 85 of cell deformation, the ECM alone regulates cell
 86 proliferation and motility.




Figure 1. Selective compression method. **(a)** Immuno-fluorescent staining of fibronectin in the interstitial space of a multicellular spheroid made of CT26 cells **(b)** Schematic view of a cell (gray) embedded in extracellular matrix (filaments), permeated by interstitial fluid (light pink). **(c)** Big osmolytes (green) do not penetrate through the ECM and induce a global compression. Being much more compressible than the cells, the extracellular matrix absorbs most of the deformation and exert a positive osmotic stress on the cell. **(d)** Small osmolytes (blue) enter the ECM without exerting any osmotic pressure on it. Conversely, they compress the cell which, in turn, exerts a tension on the ECM.

2 Results

2.1 Selective-compression method

We developed a simple method to either selectively compress cells embedded in ECM or the whole aggregate composed of ECM and cells. This method is based on the use of osmolytes of different sizes. When big enough, the osmolytes do not infiltrate the ECM and thus compress the whole aggregate by dehydrating the ECM, which in turn mechanically compresses the cells (*Monnier et al., 2015*). When smaller than the exclusion size of the ECM, the osmolytes percolate through the ECM meshwork and compress the cells which can then pull on the ECM (see schematic in figure 1 b-d and Appendix B). We already proved (*Montel et al., 2012*) that a gentle osmotic pressure Π_d exerted using large dextran molecules considerably reduces the proliferation of cells inside multicellular spheroids. The effect was visible starting from $\Pi_d = 500$ Pa and saturated at $\Pi_d \simeq 5$ kPa. Unless explicitly stated, the experiments described in this article were performed at $\Pi_d \simeq 5$ kPa, a value that minimizes the pressure, but exacerbates the biological effects.

We validated our approach by compressing ECM, cells and multicellular spheroids (MCS) using osmolytes with gyration radii R_g respectively larger and smaller than the ECM pore sizes (figure 2). As osmolytes, we used dextran molecules ranging from 10 to 2000 kDa. As a proxy of ECM, we used Matrigel (MG), a commercially available matrix secreted by cancer cells (*Kleinman and Martin, 2005*). To visualize the effect of the compression on the ECM, we prepared microbeads composed of matrigel, with a diameter of $100 \mu\text{m}$ (fig. 2a). As shown in figure 2a (top panel), fluorescent dextran molecules with a gyration radius below 5 nm (MW < 70 kDa, hereafter called "Small"; (*Granath, 1958*)) equally color the MG beads and the surrounding solution (left). Conversely, dextran molecules larger than 15 nm (MW > 500 kDa, "Big") do not penetrate inside the MG beads, which appear darker than the surroundings (right). By following the evolution of the bead diameter subjected to $\Pi_d = 5$ kPa (measurements taken before the compression and 45 minutes after the compression), we observed that small dextran molecules compress the matrigel beads by $2.5 \pm 0.7\%$ of their initial volume (figure 2a, middle and bottom panels). Conversely, the same pressure caused by big dextran molecules occasions a much larger compression of $63 \pm 5\%$ (figure 2b). The relatively minor compression occasioned by small dextran can be explained by thermodynamic theories involving chemical interaction between the matrix and the permeating polymer (*Brochard, 1981; Bastide et al., 1981*), an aspect that we neglect in this article.

Analogous experiments were performed using individual CT26 cells (murine colon carcinoma cells) and multicellular spheroids made with the same cell line. As the volume loss of individual cells is not measurable at $\Pi_d = 5$ kPa (*Monnier et al., 2015*), individual CT26 cells are submitted to $\Pi_d = 15$ kPa. At this pressure, we measured a relative compression $\Delta V_c / V_c = 3.8 \pm 0.8\%$ (figure 2c), where V_c is the cell volume and ΔV_c the volume loss upon the application of Π_d . This compression indicates that CT26 cells have an effective osmotic modulus $K_c = 400 \pm 100$ kPa. In contrast to single cells, MCS are much more compressible, as they lose up to 15% of their volume under an osmotic pressure with big dextran of $\Pi_d = 5$ kPa (figure 2d; See also *Dolega et al. (2020)* for a detailed mechanical analysis). Furthermore, these measurements indicate that MCS have a typical effective osmotic modulus of $K_s \simeq 30$ kPa, 15-folds smaller than that of individual cells (*Dolega et al., 2020*). In contrast, small dextran molecules have no measurable effect on the volume of MCS, for moderate osmotic pressures (up to $\Pi_d = 10$ kPa). However, larger pressures with these small osmolytes can lead to a cell compression within the MCS associated with a swelling of the interstitial space as we show in Section 2.3.

These results confirm the ability of our method to discriminate between the effects occasioned by the compression of the whole MCS, and those due to the compression of the cells alone within the aggregate.




Figure 2. Cell and Matrigel Compression. (a) Fluorescently labeled dextran molecules only permeate the beads (top-left panel) if their gyration radius is smaller than 5 nm. Otherwise (top-right panel) they are larger than the exclusion size of the matrigel network and are excluded from the bead. Compression of MG beads, occasioned by dextran molecules of two different sizes (Small: 70 kDa; Big: 500 kDa). Phase contrast images taken before and after the addition of pressure. (b) Beads lose $63 \pm 5\%$ of their initial volume when compressed using big dextran, and $2.5 \pm 0.7\%$ with small Dextran. $N=10$. (c) Compression of individual cells using dextran of different sizes, with $\Pi_d = 15$ kPa. At $\Pi_d = 5$ kPa the compressibility of individual cells is not measurable. Cell compressibility is thus negligible in comparison to that of Matrigel. (d) MCS compression under $\Pi_d = 5$ kPa, exerted using small (blue) and big (green) dextran molecules. In control experiments (0 kPa), the culture medium is replaced by fresh medium without dextran. (box : \pm SEOM; error bars: \pm SD • : single realizations).

2.2 Theory: the effect of a selective compression applied to a cell nested in extra-cellular matrix

For simplicity, we consider the case of a single cell nested in a large -compared to the cell size- ball of ECM and subjected to the osmotic pressure Π_d obtained by supplementing the culture medium with either small or big dextran. We assume that the small dextran can freely permeate in the ECM meshwork while the big one is excluded. Our aim is to compute the displacement of the cell boundary as well as the stress applied on the cell upon application of Π_d in both conditions. Our model, detailed in Appendix A.5, essentially couples a classical active pump-and-leak model (Hoppensteadt and Peskin, 2012) for the cell volume regulation through ion pumping and the constitutive behaviour of the ECM, which is assumed to be poro-elastic at a short timescale where remodelling is negligible. The cell cortex mechanics plays a negligible role in setting the cell volume since it involves stresses that are small compared to the osmotic forces. For simplicity, we neglect the mechano-sensitive nature of ion channels.

We show in Appendix A.5 that, for realistic estimates of the model parameters, the application of Π_d with both small or big dextran leads to the same cell volume loss which does not involve the mechanical properties of the ECM but only the cell volume regulation system:

$$\frac{\Delta V_c}{V_c} = \frac{\Pi_d}{(1 - \beta)\Pi_e}, \quad (1)$$

where Π_e is the osmotic pressure of ions in the culture medium and $\beta \simeq 0.1$ is a non-dimensional parameter representing the active pumping of ions (see Appendix A.4). The relation (1) shows that the reduction of the cell volume under compression is mainly resisted by the active osmotic equilibration of ions through the cell membrane. For relatively low pressures ($\Pi_d \ll \Pi_e \simeq 500$ kPa), the relative change of volume $\Delta V_c/V_c$ is negligible. More quantitatively, formula (1) provides the estimate of the osmotic modulus of a cell $K_c = (1 - \beta)\Pi_e \simeq 450$ kPa which is in agreement with the value measured for CT26 cells.

However, the mechanical stress applied by the ECM to the cell is qualitatively and quantitatively different in the two situations. For big dextran, this stress is compressive as the dominating effect of the dextran is to compress the ECM which in turn compresses the cells. Within some realistic

160 approximations the amount of this compressive stress (the traction force applied by the matrix on
161 the cell) can be approximated as the applied osmotic pressure:

$$T_{\text{big}} = -\Pi_d < 0. \quad (2)$$

162 In sharp contrast with the previous situation, for small dextran, the stress applied by the ECM on
163 the cell is tensile. In fact, the dominating effect is that small dextran compresses the cells but not
164 the ECM. Thus, cell compression is balanced by a tensile force in the ECM. This tension is given by

$$T_{\text{small}} = \frac{G \Pi_d}{3(1-\beta)\Pi_e} > 0, \quad (3)$$

165 where G is the ECM shear modulus. Formulas (1), (2) and (3) hold in the ideal case, where osmolytes
166 do not interact with the matrix and the axisymmetric system has stress free boundaries at infinity
167 (the ECM ball radius is much larger than the cell radius).

168 In practice, for a moderate osmotic shock $\Pi_d \simeq 5$ kPa, the dextran concentration is much
169 smaller than the characteristic ion concentration of the external medium (few hundreds millimolars)
170 and the tension can be considered negligible: $T_{\text{small}} \simeq 20$ Pa \ll $|T_{\text{big}}| \simeq 5$ kPa because the ECM is
171 soft. Therefore, in this condition, the presence of ECM makes the cell mechanically sensitive to a
172 moderate osmotic compression using big dextran molecules, but not when using small dextran
173 molecules. In both cases the cell volume is affected in the same negligible way, but the mechanical
174 stress applied by small dextran on the cell is negligible compared to that exerted by big dextran.

175 If the osmotic pressure is further increased, the compression with small or big dextran can
176 induce a measurable effect on the cell volume. However, the mechanical stress applied by the ECM
177 to the cell remains fundamentally different in both situations: tensile for the small dextran and
178 compressive for the big one.

179 **2.3 Selective compression of ECM in multicellular spheroids.**

180 To test our theoretical predictions that the interstitial space is compressed under dextran pressure,
181 we injected individual MCS (4-5 days old) into a 2D confiner microsystem and let them relax for few
182 hours (figure 3a). The MCS were thus immobilized and partially flattened inside the 2D confiner. In
183 order to follow the evolution of the interstitial space under an osmotic compression, the culture
184 medium was supplemented with a fluorescent tracer. The interstitial fluorescence was measured
185 using two-photon microscopy (figure 3b). The images of the confined multicellular aggregates
186 were normalized to the fluorescence of the external medium and segmented with a thresholding
187 procedure, and the signal exceeding the threshold value was integrated over the whole aggregate
188 to quantify the total fluorescence of the interstitial space (figure 3c). Due to optical limitations, we
189 emphasized the effect by increasing the applied osmotic pressure to $\Pi_d = 40$ kPa for small dextran
190 and to $\Pi_d = 15$ kPa for the big ones.

191 In accordance with our theoretical predictions, we obtained two opposite behaviors, depending
192 on the dextran size. Small dextran molecules induced a $\sim 35 \pm 10\%$ increase in the fluorescence
193 intensity in the interstitial space (figure 2c) while the total volume of the aggregate was reduced by
194 $\sim 10\%$ (figure 2d). Simultaneously, the cell volume decreased (Appendix D), thus stretching the ECM
195 into occupying more interstitial space. In contrast, for big dextran we measured a loss of half the
196 fluorescence, meaning that a large amount of interstitial liquid had left the intercellular space of
197 the aggregate. The extracellular matrix was thus compressed as predicted by eq.(2) and the overall
198 MCS volume of the whole aggregate was reduced by $\sim 17\%$ (figure 2d). We argued in *Dolega et al.*
199 (2020) that the total volume reduction of the aggregate obtained with big dextran could be due
200 mostly to the compressibility of the ECM, while the cells are quasi-incompressible. The volume
201 reduction of the aggregate induced by a 15 kPa pressure did not differ much from the one obtained
202 with a $\Pi_d = 5$ kPa compression, as the ECM was already fully squeezed at 5kPa.

203 These results are consistent with our theoretical prediction that big and small dextran have an
204 opposite effect on the matrix. The first puts the ECM under compression, while the latter puts the




Figure 3. Effect of small versus big dextran on tissue intercellular space. (a) Schematic of the 2D confiner micro-device. The tissue is confined between the glass coverslip and the PDMS and does not move during medium exchange. (b) 2-photon images of the tissue before and after (20min) osmotic shocks for dextran chains of 6kDa (small) and 2MDa (big), for a given mass concentration of 100g/L. Images were taken in the equatorial plane of the tissue, meaning $35\mu\text{m}$ above the glass slide. Scale Bar: $50\mu\text{m}$ (c) Mean fluorescence of the intercellular space averaged over the whole aggregate shown in panel b. (d) volume loss of spheroids submitted to $\Pi_d^{Small} = 40\text{ kPa}$ (small dextran) and $\Pi_d^{Big} = 15\text{ kPa}$ (big dextran).

205 ECM under tension. Remarkably, in both cases the cells within the aggregate undergo almost the
 206 same deformation.

207 **2.4 ECM compression controls cell proliferation and motility**

208 To understand the role of the ECM on the cell fate at longer timescale, we assessed the proliferation
 209 and the motility of cells within MCS cultured in the presence of small and big dextran. Figure 4a
 210 represents the equatorial cryosections of spheroids in the three mechanical states ($\Pi_d = 0\text{kPa}$, Π_d
 211 $= 5\text{kPa}$ small dextran, and $\Pi_d = 5\text{kPa}$ big dextran). Proliferating cells were immuno-stained for
 212 Ki-67, a nuclear antigen present during the cell cycle, but absent in G0 phase (Gerdes et al., 1984).
 213 Whereas cells in control MCS ($\Pi_d = 0\text{ Pa}$) present a rather uniform proliferation pattern, a global
 214 compression of MCS (big Dextran) stops cell division in the core and alters the overall MCS growth,
 215 as previously reported (Helmlinger et al., 1997; Alessandri et al., 2013; Montel et al., 2011). The
 216 density of Ki67-positive cells is reported in panel figure 4 b, as a function of the distance from the
 217 spheroid center and for the three conditions represented in panel figure 4 a. Remarkably, under
 218 pressure the density of Ki67-positive cells uniformly decreases across the MCS. Consequently, the
 219 ratio between the proliferating cells in the periphery of the MCS and those in its core increases
 220 under pressure: 2 without pressure, 2.5 under 5kPa exerted by small dextran and 5 when the same
 221 pressure is exerted by big dextran. To quantify the change of cell division rate, we monitored the
 222 volumetric growth of the spheroid for three conditions (control, small and big dextran) and for
 223 several days (figure 4c-d). In all cases, the spheroids initially grew exponentially (continuous lines).
 224 However, the MCS growth rate (time to double its volume) almost doubled under the big dextran
 225 compression, increasing from $36\pm 1\text{ h}$ for the control and small dextran conditions (gray circles and
 226 blue squares, respectively) to $68\pm 4\text{ h}$ for the compression with big dextran (green triangles).

227 Because experiments with MCS are typically performed in solution, where a metastatic behavior
 228 is not possible, we evaluated the cell motility within the aggregate, using the Dynamic Light Scatter-
 229 ing technique introduced by Brunel et al. (2020) (see details in Appendix F). The mean migration
 230 velocity of cells was reduced by 50% at $\Pi_d = 5\text{ kPa}$ with big dextran, as compared to the unstressed
 231 case (figure 4e). Strikingly, both proliferation and motility remained almost unaltered when the
 232 MCS were exposed to an equivalent pressure ($\Pi_d = 5\text{ kPa}$) applied by small dextran to selectively
 233 compress the cells while leaving the native ECM unstrained (small Dextran, blue).

234 To verify that neither proliferation nor motility are directly modified by the direct action of




Figure 4. Growth of spheroids under pressure. (a) Proliferating cells inside MCS revealed by immunostaining of Ki67 with no pressure, under global compression of $\Pi_d = 5$ kPa (big dextran) and under selective compression of the cells by the same amount (small dextran). Scale bar: $100 \mu\text{m}$ (b) Density of Ki67-positive cells with respect to the distance from the center of the aggregate. Three conditions: No pressure (9 MCS), $\Pi_d = 5$ kPa with small dextran (26 MCS) and $\Pi_d = 5$ kPa with big dextran (19 MCS). Error bars = standard error of the mean. (c) Time evolution of the spheroid sizes (Full images are $700 \times 700 \mu\text{m}$) and (d) quantification of the volume increase, in the three reference conditions. (e) Cell migration speed within MCS also significantly depends on ECM compression. $N = 5$ independent experiments per condition. Error bars represent \pm SEM. Experiments were repeated at least on three independent samples. (f) Division time of CT26 cells in 2D (Petri dish), respectively with no pressure (11.4 ± 0.5 h), with $\Pi_d = 5$ kPa/small dextran (11.0 ± 0.3 h) and with $\Pi_d = 5$ kPa/big dextran (10.9 ± 0.4 h). (g) Mean velocity of individual cells on a Petri dish, before ($N = 9$) and after compression ($N = 7$).

235 dextran in contact with the cells, we measured the proliferation and the velocity of individual cells
 236 plated in a Petri dish. Measurements were performed at low density to permit cell proliferation and
 237 migration. The results (4f-g) show that both proliferation and motility remained similar, before and
 238 after the addition of dextran at a final pressure $\Pi_d \approx 5$ kPa.

239 Since the interstitial space is dehydrated under osmotic compression, cells may get in contact
 240 with each other, occasioning contact inhibition of proliferation and locomotion. However, it is also
 241 possible that cells sense and react to the stress in the ECM. To discriminate between these two
 242 hypotheses, we embedded individual cells in a MG matrix, before compressing the whole system
 243 with an osmotic pressure $\Pi_d = 5$ kPa using either small or big dextran. After a few days, we observed
 244 two clearly different phenotypes. Cells grown without pressure or in the presence of small dextran
 245 were sparse in the MG (figure 5a, left panel). Conversely, cells cultured with big dextran proliferated
 246 locally (figure 5a, right panel). Therefore, MG compression appears to inhibit cell motility and
 247 to promote the formation of mini-spheroids, which suggests that ECM compression has a direct
 248 effect on the cell-ECM biophysical signaling. The different cell morphology is particularly clear in
 249 the organization of the actin cytoskeleton. Cytoplasmic actin labeling revealed the presence of
 250 numerous protrusions, associated with high cell anisotropy, in cells cultured in a relaxed MG matrix
 251 (figure 5b, left and middle panels), whereas cells appeared smooth and formed round structures,
 252 when the MG was compressed (figure 5b, right panel). Of note, cells at the MG surface often
 253 extended outside the MG. Those cells not fully embedded in MG were excluded from our analysis.

254 These different morphologies also correlates with different motilities. Cells embedded in a

255 compressed MG were nearly immobile, while they migrated through relaxed MG with a velocity
 256 comparable to that measured on flat surfaces. The results are summarized in figure 5c, where
 257 we report ≈ 40 trajectories per condition. To highlight differences and similarities between the
 258 three compression conditions, the starting points of all trajectories are translated to the origin and,
 259 although isotropic, they are divided in three quadrants. Quantification is reported in figure 5d. From
 260 this experiment we conclude that whereas no appreciable differences are observable between
 261 control and the small dextran condition, the cell motility dramatically drops under MG compression
 262 with big dextran.

263 To quantify the effect of ECM compression on proliferation, we prepared several samples
 264 with the same number of hoechst-stained cells embedded in the MG and measured the overall
 265 fluorescence over time. Figure 5e shows the typical time evolution of the Hoechst signal for the
 266 three conditions: proliferation rate drops considerably when the MG is compressed (Big Dextran,
 267 Δ), compared to the case without pressure (\circ), but also compared to the case where the pressure is
 268 selectively exerted on the cells with no MG compression (Small Dextran, \square). Figure 5f quantifies the
 269 mean growth rate, measured on at least 15 samples for each condition, collected on 8 independent
 270 experiments (different days and cell passages). Under pressure, the matrigel get dehydrated and
 271 compacted, which may directly influence cell proliferation. On the one hand a denser matrigel is
 272 less compressible and, thus, less favorable to cell proliferation (*Baker et al., 2015*). On the other
 273 hand, matrigel compression concentrates matrix-bound growth factors, which may promote cell
 274 division. To determine which effect dominates, we measured the proliferation rate at different initial
 275 MG concentrations, between 2 g/l and 8 g/l (experiments reported in panels a-f were performed
 276 with MG at 4.5 g/l). Our experiments show that within this range, the matrigel density has little to
 277 no effect on cell proliferation (see figure 5g).

278 These experiments confirmed that it is the compressive stress transmitted to the cells by the
 279 surrounding ECM, rather than a direct osmotic pressure on the cells, that strongly impacts cell
 280 motility and proliferation.

281 3 Discussion and Conclusion

282 Large osmotic and mechanical pressures (of the order of 100 kPa) can cause a decrease in cell
 283 volume and consequently a deformation of the cell nucleus (*Zhou et al., 2009; Kim et al., 2015*)
 284 which may ultimately feedback on the cell proliferation. It has been recently proposed that the
 285 volume of the cell or its nucleus can be key to crucial processes such as proliferation, invasion
 286 and differentiation *Guo et al. (2017); Han et al. (2020)*. However the weak osmotic pressures (of
 287 the order of 1 kPa) that we apply have no measurable effect on the cell volume. In addition, it
 288 is well-known from a biological standpoint that such small volume perturbations are buffered by
 289 active regulatory processes in the cell (*Hoffmann et al., 2009; Cadart et al., 2019*). Yet, both cell
 290 proliferation and motility decrease in MCS submitted to weak osmotic compression. Our results
 291 show that, for such weak compressions, the cell volume is unchanged while the ECM located
 292 in between the cells is directly impacted. This mechano-sensitive role of the ECM could explain
 293 the reported evidences that osmotic pressures applied by big dextran and mechanical pressures
 294 similarly affect the growth of MCS. (*Helmlinger et al., 1997; Alessandri et al., 2013; Montel et al.,*
 295 *2011*). Indeed, in this case the osmotic pressure induces a mechanical one applied on the cells
 296 through the ECM drainage. Thanks to its bulk modulus $K_{ECM} \approx 1$ kPa, the ECM behaves as a
 297 pressure sensor for the cell in the kPa range. Of note, stress relaxation in the ECM could occur
 298 through cleavage and remodeling of its components and such active processes should be quantified
 299 in the future.

300 Several mechanisms may explain how the dehydration of the extracellular matrix can result in
 301 an inhibition of proliferation and motility. First, the reduction of the interstitial space promotes
 302 interactions between neighbouring cells, which may activate contact inhibition signals of both
 303 proliferation and locomotion (*Roycroft and Mayor, 2016*). Second, the ECM porosity and tortuosity
 304 change within a compressed MCS, such that its effective permeability to oxygen, nutrients, growth




Figure 5. Individual cells in Matrigel. **(a)** Hoechst-labelled cell nuclei superimposed to phase image. Images are taken after 2 days of proliferation in MG, either with small (left panel) or big (right panel) dextran molecules. Maximal projection from epifluorescence stacks. **(b)** Cell morphology and anisotropy revealed by labelling of cytoplasmic actin. Maximal projection of 50 μm confocal Z-stack. In relaxed MG, the cells appear more elongated and with long protrusions. **(c)** Cell motility in MG under different compression states. Starting points of trajectories are translated to the origin, to highlight the typical distance over which cells move in the three compressive states. **(d)** Quantification of in-plane velocity extracted from mean square displacements, under different compression conditions. With no pressure or with small dextran (5 kPa), the average velocities are respectively $5.8 \pm 0.8 \mu\text{m}/\text{h}$ and $5.2 \pm 0.5 \mu\text{m}/\text{h}$. Under 5 kPa exerted by big dextran, the cells are immobile ($v = 0.5 \pm 0.4 \mu\text{m}/\text{h}$), where the error is due to tracking uncertainties. **(e)** Temporal evolution of nuclear fluorescence integrated over the whole sample. No pressure (\circ), 5 kPa with small dextran (\square) and 5 kPa with big dextran (\triangle). **(f)** Cell proliferation rate in the three conditions. $n = 15$, from 8 independent experiments. **(g)** Cell proliferation rate at different initial Matrigel concentration, with no pressure. Boxes represent the mean values \pm SEM, error bars correspond to the standard deviation, small markers are individual experiments and large markers the median.

305 factors and cytokines is reduced and might activate inhibition signals without cell-cell contact.
306 However, both options are incompatible with the results we obtained with single cells embedded
307 in MG (Figure 5). During the first 2-3 days after seeding, cells are either isolated or grouped in
308 aggregates of 2 to 4 cells with limited cell-cell contacts. Additionally, a key factor limiting the
309 diffusion of oxygen and nutrients in MCS is the tortuosity of the interstitial space (*Bläßle et al.,*
310 *2018*). This constraint is simply absent in experiments with single cells embedded in MG, suggesting
311 that the cell proliferation inhibition is most probably not related to hypoxia and starvation.

312 The present work therefore points at a direct mechanosensitive response of cells to the ECM
313 deformation. The microscopic structure of the ECM is modified under compression (e.g. density
314 increase and reduction of porosity), with consequences on the ECM rheology. Compression of the
315 ECM is clearly accompanied by an increase in its bulk modulus and, due to its fibrillar structure, to
316 a non-trivial and non-linear evolution of its stiffness (*Sopher et al., 2018; Kurniawan et al., 2016*).
317 For example, the rheological properties of synthetic ECM have been shown to affect growth of
318 aggregates and single cells through the regulation of stretched-activated channels (*Nam et al., 2019*).
319 As integrin-dependent signals and focal adhesion assembly are regulated by the stress and strain
320 between the cell and the ECM, the osmotic compression may steer the fate of cells in terms of
321 morphology, migration and differentiation (*Pelham and Wang, 1997; Choquet et al., 1997; Sunyer*
322 *et al., 2016; Isenberg et al., 2009; Butcher et al., 2009; Engler et al., 2006; Staunton et al., 2019;*
323 *Panzetta et al., 2019*). This aspect is also relevant from an oncological point of view. Indeed the
324 ECM is strongly modified in tumour tissues and the solid stress within tumors can reach several
325 kPa, which is in accordance with the pressure applied here (*Nia et al., 2016*). For example, in
326 tumors, there is a decrease in the ratio collagen/hyaluronan (*Voutouri et al., 2016*). The latter, more
327 hydrophilic than the first one, tends to swell and stiffen the ECM. Whether a corrupted matrix
328 is a contributing cause or the consequence of the neoplasia remains an open question, but the
329 correlation between matrix mechanics and uncontrolled proliferation is more and more widely
330 accepted (*Bissell et al., 2002; Lelièvre and Bissell, 2006; Broders-Bondon et al., 2018*).

331 In future experiments it will be crucial to identify whether the ECM compression and the
332 associated changes in stiffness play a dominant role, or if - as we suggest - the mechanical stress
333 applied on the cell through the ECM is the key ingredient directly triggering the cell biological
334 adaptation in term of proliferation and motility.

335 **4 Acknowledgements**

336 We warmly thank J. Prost and F. Jülicher for drawing our attention to the potential impact of the
337 poroelasticity in MCS, A. Dawid and J. Revilloud for the valuable suggestion to set up the proliferation
338 assay in MG, C. Verdier for the valuable exchanges about the evolution of the ECM rheology under
339 stress, and T. Boudou for the many fruitful discussion and careful proofreading of the manuscript.
340 This work was supported by the Agence Nationale pour la Recherche (Grant ANR-13-BSV5-0008-01),
341 by the Institut National de la Santé et de la Recherche Médicale (Grant PC201407), by the Centre
342 National de la Recherche Scientifique (Grant MechanoBio 2018), by the Comité de Haute-Savoie de
343 la Ligue contre le Cancer, and by a CNRS Momentum grant (P.R.)

344 5 Methods and Materials

345 5.1 Key resources table

Reagent type (species) or resource	Designation	Source or Reference	Identifier	Additional information
Cell Line (<i>mouse</i>)	CT26	ATCC CRL-2638	RRID: CVCL 7256	
Chemical compound, drug	Matrigel/MG	Corning; 354234		
Chemical compound, drug	Small Dextran	Sigma Aldrich; D9260		
Chemical compound, drug	Big Dextran	Sigma-Aldrich; D5376		
Antibody	Anti-Fibronectin (<i>Monoclonal mouse</i>)	Sigma Aldrich; F7387	RRID: AB 476988	(1:200)
Antibody	Anti-Ki-67 (<i>Polyclonal rabbit</i>)	Sigma Aldrich; AB9260	RRID: AB 2142366	(1:200)

347 5.2 Cell culture, MCSs formation, and growth under mechanical stress

348 CT26 (mouse colon adenocarcinoma cells, ATCC CRL-2638; American Type Culture Collection were
 349 cultured under 37 °C, 5% CO₂ in DMEM supplemented with 10% calf serum and 1% antibiotic / anti-
 350 antimycotic (culture medium). Cells are tested every month for mycoplasma. None of the experiments
 351 was made using cells with mycoplasma. Spheroid were prepared on agarose cushion in 96 well
 352 plates at the concentration of 500 cell/well and centrifuged initially for 5 minutes at 800rpm to
 353 accelerate aggregation. After 2 days, Dextran (molecular mass 1, 10, 40, 70, 100, 200, 500 and 2000
 354 kDa; Sigma-Aldrich, St. Louis, MO) was added to the culture medium to exert mechanical stress,
 355 as previously described (*Monnier et al., 2015*). To follow spheroid growth over the time, phase
 356 contrast images were taken daily. Spheroid were kept under constant pressure over observation
 357 period. Images were analysed manually using Imagej. Each experiment was repeated 3 times, with
 358 32 individual spheroids per condition.

359 5.3 Measurement of MCSs volume

360 The area of the MCS equatorial section was measured before and after addition of dextran, then
 361 converted to volume assuming that the MCS is spherical. To induce compression, half of the culture
 362 medium was removed and replaced with fresh medium containing dextran 2X (two-fold the target
 363 concentration). The error affecting this measurement mainly comes from the fact that spheroids
 364 rotate during buffer exchange. As they are not perfectly spherical, the area of the equatorial section
 365 may change by up to few percent. To homogenize the experiments, control spheroids (no pressure)
 366 were also measured before and after buffer exchange. In the latter case, 50% of the culture medium
 367 was simply aspirated and replaced by fresh medium not supplemented with dextran.

368 5.4 Fabrication of Matrigel beads

369 Matrigel beads (Matrigel Corning, Ref: 354234) were prepared using vortex method (*Dolega et al.,*
 370 *2017*). Oil phase of HFE-7500/PFPE-PEG (1.5% w/v) was cooled down to 4 °C. For 400 μL of oil, 100 μL
 371 of Matrigel were added. Solution was vortexed at full speed for 20 seconds and subsequently kept
 372 at 37 °C for 20 minutes for polymerization. Beads were eventually transferred to PBS phase by
 373 washing out the surfactant phase.

374 **5.5 Fluorescence eXclusion method (single cell volume measurements)**

375 Cell volume was obtained using Fluorescence Exclusion microscopy (*Cadart et al., 2017; Zlotek-*
 376 *Zlotkiewicz et al., 2015*). Briefly, cells were incubated in PDMS chips, with medium supplemented
 377 with a fluorescent dye that does not enter the cells. Cells thus excluded fluorescence, and one
 378 extracted cellular volume by integrating the fluorescence intensity over the whole cell. Chips for
 379 volume measurements of single cells were made by pouring a mixture (1:10) of PMDS elastomer and
 380 curing agent (Sylgard 184) onto a brass master and cured at 80 °C for at least of 2 hours. Inlet and
 381 outlets were punched with a 3mm biopsy puncher. Chips were prepared few days before, bounded
 382 with oxygen plasma for 30s, warmed up at 80 °C for 3 minutes then incubated with Poly-L-lysine
 383 (sigma) for 30min to 1hrs, washed with PBS, then washed with dH₂O, dried and stored sealed with a
 384 paraffin film. The chambers were washed with PBS before cell injection. Imaging started within
 385 10 minutes after cell injection in order to prevent adhesion and thus cells response to the shear
 386 stress generated by the medium exchange. Acquisition was performed at 37 °C in CO₂ independent
 387 medium (Life Technologies) supplemented with 1g/L FITC dextran (10kDa, from Sigma Aldrich) on
 388 an epifluorescence microscope (Leica DMI8) with a 10x objective (NA. 0.3 from LEICA).
 389 Master molds were fabricated on a brass substrate with a micromilling machine (MiniMill/3;
 390 Minitech) using a 100- μ m-diameter milling cutter (Minitech). Height profiles and surface roughness
 391 were measured with a vertical scanning interferometric profilometer (Brucker). 3D mold design and
 392 tool paths were generated using Autodesk Inventor Professional software (Autodesk). Molds for
 393 spheroid confinement were made with classical soft lithography techniques.

394 **5.6 Tissue compression experiments**

395 Spheroids were harvested 4 or 5 days after cell seeding and injected in the *2D confiner* microsystem
 396 (figure 3a) using a MFCS pressure controller (Fluigent). Spheroid were partially flattened between
 397 two parallel surfaces, perpendicular to the optical axis of the microscope, and rested for two to
 398 5 hours to relax in the microsystem at 37 °C in CO₂ independent medium. Before acquisition,
 399 medium supplemented with 2g/L FITC-dextran (10 kDa from Sigma Aldrich) was injected to label
 400 the intercellular space. Medium exchange was performed manually using large inlets (> 1 mm)
 401 during two-photon acquisition. Acquisitions were performed at 37 °C on a Nikon C1 two-photon
 402 microscope coupled with a femtosecond laser at 780nm with a 40x water-immersion (NA. 1.10)
 403 objective (Nikon). The *2D confiner* chip was made by pouring PDMS elastomere and curing agent
 404 (1:10) into the mold and cured for at least 2 hours. The chips were bounded to glass coverslips with
 405 30s oxygen plasma, immediately after bounding. A solution of PLL-g-PEG (Surface Solutions) at 1g/L
 406 was injected and incubated for 30 minutes in humid atmosphere to prevent cell surface adhesion
 407 during the experiment. The chips were washed with dH₂O and dried and sealed with a paraffin film.
 408 Fluorescence of the Intercellular space (ICS) was measured using MatLab software. As control and
 409 dextran solutions have different levels of fluorescence, the fluorescence in the ICS was normalized
 410 by the one outside the ICS in order to compensate these variations. Then, first the tissue (cells
 411 and ICS) was segmented with a thresholding procedure. The threshold was determined in order to
 412 obtained accurate segmentation of the ICS before application of the osmotic stress. The surface
 413 of the ICS was computed as the ratio of pixels in the ICS to the number of pixels of the tissue. For
 414 each spheroid, 50 planes - 13 μ m above and below the equatorial plane - were taken into account to
 415 compute the change of the ICS surface.

416 **5.7 Cell culture in Matrigel**

417 Experiments have been conceived to start the culture from individual cells embedded in Matrigel.
 418 At day 1, the cells were resuspended, then dispersed in a solution containing matrigel at the final
 419 concentration of 4.5 g/l. The cells were diluted to 10,000-50,000 cells/ml, a concentration at which
 420 the average distance between neighboring cells is about 250-400 μ m. We therefore consider them
 421 as isolated entities. The MG/cell ensemble was gelified in 200 μ l wells, at 37 °C, for 30 minutes. To
 422 avoid cell sedimentation, we gently flipped the sample over, every two minutes. The samples were

423 then redeposited in the incubator under three pressure conditions: no pressure and 5 kPa exerted
424 by small and 5 kPa exerted big dextran.

425 **5.8 Cells Migration in Matrigel**

426 To quantify cell migration in Matrigel, individual cells were observed by phase contrast microscopy.
427 Z-stacks were collected every 20 minutes and for several days, with slices spaced by 50 μm . Then the
428 full stack was projected to one single layer (maximum intensity projection). Cells were tracked manu-
429 ally in the 2D plane, using the ImageJ MTrackJ plugin (<https://imagejscience.org/meijering/software/mtrackj/>)

430 **5.9 Cryosectioning and Immunostaining**

431 Spheroids were fixed with 5% formalin (Sigma Aldrich, HT501128) in PBS for 30 min and washed
432 once with PBS. For cryopreservation spheroids were exposed to sucrose at 10% (w/v) for 1 hour, 20%
433 (w/v) for 1 hour and 30% (w/v) overnight at 4 °C. Subsequently spheroids were transferred to a plastic
434 reservoir and covered with Tisse TEK OCT (Sakura) in an isopropanol/dry ice bath. Solidified samples
435 were brought to the cryotome (Leica CM3000) and sectioned into 15 μm slices. Cut layers were
436 deposited onto poly-L-lysine coated glass slides (Sigma) and the region of interest was delineated
437 with DAKO pen. Samples were stored at -20 °C prior immunolabelling. For fibronectin and Ki67
438 staining samples were permeabilized with Triton X 0.5% in TBS (Sigma T8787) for 15 minutes at RT.
439 Nonspecific sites were blocked with 3% BSA (Bovine serum Albumin) for 1 hour. Then, samples
440 were incubated with first antibody (Fibronectin, Sigma F7387, 1/200 and Ki67; Millipore ab9260,
441 1/500) overnight at 4 °C. Subsequently samples were thoroughly washed with TBS three times, for
442 15 minutes each. A second fluorescent antibody (goat anti-mouse Cy3, Invitrogen; 1/1000) was
443 incubated for 40 minutes along with phalloidin (1/500, Alexa Fluor 488, Thermo Fisher Scientific).
444 After extensive washing with TBS (four washes of 15 minutes) glass cover slides were mounted on
445 the glass slides with a Progold mounting medium overnight (Life Technologies P36965) and stored
446 at 4 °C before imaging.

447 **5.10 Statistical analysis**

448 Student's t-test (unpaired, two tailed, equal variances) was used to calculate statistical significance
449 as appropriate by using the *ttest2()* function of Matlab (MathWorks). Statistical significance is given
450 by *, $P < 0.05$; **, $P < 0.01$; ***, $P < 0.001$; ****, $P < 0.0001$.

451 [9pt,lineno]elife

452 lipsum [version=4]mhchem siunitx M


453 [utf8]inputenc graphicx dcolumn siunitx textcomp xcolor [normalem]ulem

454 **Appendix 1**455 **A Theoretical model of the osmotic compression of a single cell nested**
456 **in matrigel**

457 Our aim is to qualitatively understand the nature of the steady state mechanical stress and
458 displacement of a cell nested in a matrix in two paradigmatic situations:

- 459 • when some small osmolytes (typically dextran) that can permeate the matrix pores are
460 introduced in the solution,
- 461 • when some big osmolytes that are excluded from the matrix are introduced in the
462 solution.

463 The matrix is a meshwork of biopolymers permeated by an aqueous solution containing
464 ions. These ions can also permeate the cell cytoplasm via specific channels and pumps
465 integrated in the plasmic membrane (*Hoffmann et al., 2009; Lang et al., 1998*). For simplicity,
466 we restrict our theoretical description to Na^+ , K^+ and Cl^- ions which have specific channels
467 and a well studied pump (*Therien and Blostein, 2000*) which actively pumps out three sodium
468 ions in exchange of having two potassium ions in. Attached right under the cell membrane via
469 some specific cross-linkers (*Diz-Muñoz et al., 2010*), the cell cortex is a thin 'muscle-like' actin
470 network cross-linked by passive and contractile cross-linkers such as myosin II. The cortex
471 has been shown to be an important regulator of the cell surface tension (*Clark and Paluch,*
472 *2011; Salbreux et al., 2012*) as exemplified during motility (*Hawkins et al., 2011; Farutin*
473 *et al., 2019*) and cell morphogenesis (*Turlier et al., 2014; Sedzinski et al., 2011; Tinevez*
474 *et al., 2009; Charras et al., 2008*). The cell membrane and cortex enclose the cytoplasm a
475 meshwork of macromolecules permeated by water and containing the aforementioned ions.
476 See Appendix figure 1 for a scheme of the model.



477 **Appendix 1 Figure 1.** Scheme of a cell nested in a porous matrix.

480 For simplicity we assume a spherical geometry with a cell of radius r_c inside a matrix
481 ball of radius r_m . Each point in the space \mathbf{x} can therefore be localized by its radial position
482 $\mathbf{x} = r\mathbf{e}_r$, where \mathbf{e}_r is radial unit vector. We assume a spherical symmetry of the problem such
483 that all the introduced physical fields are independent of the angular coordinates θ and φ .
484 Throughout this text, we restrict ourselves to a linear theory which typically holds when the
485 deformation in the matrix is assumed to remain sufficiently small. A more quantitative theory
486 would require to take into account both the non-linear aspects of the matrix deformation
487 and the osmotic pressure created by the polymer.

A.1 Conservation laws at the cell-matrix interface

Water conservation.

From Kedem-Katchalsky theory (*Staverman, 1952; Kedem and Katchalsky, 1958, 1963; Baranowski, 1991; Elmoazzen et al., 2009*), assuming that the aqueous solvent moves through specific and passive channels, the aquaporins (*Day et al., 2014*), we can express the incoming water flux \mathbf{j}_w in the cell at $r = r_c$ as (*Yi et al., 2003; Hui et al., 2014; Strange, 1993; Hoffmann et al., 2009; Mori, 2012; Cadart et al., 2019*):

$$\mathbf{j}_w \cdot \mathbf{e}_r = L_p [p_m - p_c - (\Pi_m - \Pi_c)], \quad (4)$$

where $\Pi_{m,c}$ denote the osmotic pressures in the matrix phase and the cell while $p_{m,c}$ are the hydrostatic pressures defined with respect to the external (i.e. atmospheric) pressure. The so-called filtration coefficient L_p is related to the permeability of aquaporins. In a dilute approximation which we again assume for simplicity, the osmotic pressure is dominated by the small molecules in solution and thus reads

$$\Pi_m = k_B T (N_m + K_m + C_m + D_m) \text{ and } \Pi_c = k_B T (N_c + K_c + C_c), \quad (5)$$

where k_B is the Boltzmann constant, T the temperature, $N_{c,m}$, $K_{c,m}$ and $C_{c,m}$ are the (number) concentrations of sodium, potassium and chloride in the cytoplasm and the extra-cellular medium and D_m is the extra-cellular Dextran (necessary small as big are excluded) concentration in the matrix phase. We neglect in (5) the osmotic contribution associated with the large macromolecules composing the cell organelles and the cytoskeleton compared to the ionic contributions. In a similar manner, the osmotic contribution of the matrix polymer is also neglected. At steady state, the water flux vanishes ($\mathbf{j}_w = 0$) leading to the relation at $r = r_c$,

$$p_m - p_c = \Pi_m - \Pi_c. \quad (6)$$

Ions conservation.

As each ion travels through the plasma membrane via specific channels and pumps, the intensities of each ionic current at $r = r_c$ is given by Nernst-Planck laws (*Mori, 2012*),

$$\begin{aligned} i_N &= g_N \left[v_c - \frac{k_B T}{q} \log \left(\frac{N_m}{N_c} \right) \right] + 3qj_p \\ i_K &= g_K \left[v_c - \frac{k_B T}{q} \log \left(\frac{K_m}{K_c} \right) \right] - 2qj_p \\ i_C &= g_C \left[v_c + \frac{k_B T}{q} \log \left(\frac{C_m}{C_c} \right) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

where $g_{N,K,C}$ are the respective conductivities of ions, v_c is the cell membrane potential, q is the elementary charge and j_p is the pumping rate associated to the Na-K pump on the membrane which is playing a fundamental role for cellular volume control (*Hoffmann et al., 2009*). The factors 3 and 2 are related to the stoichiometry of the sodium potassium pump. Again, in steady state, currents $i_{N,K,C} = 0$, leading to the Gibbs-Donnan equilibrium:

$$N_c = N_m e^{-\frac{q(v_c - v_N)}{k_B T}}, \quad K_c = K_m e^{-\frac{q(v_c - v_K)}{k_B T}} \text{ and } C_c = C_m e^{\frac{qv_c}{k_B T}}, \quad (8)$$

where the active potentials related to the pumping activity $v_{N,K}$ are $v_N = -3qj_p/g_N$ and $v_K = 2qj_p/g_K$.

Supposing that the cell membrane capacitance is vanishingly small (*Mori, 2012*), we can neglect the presence of surface charges and impose an electro-neutrality constraint for the intra-cellular medium:

$$N_c - C_c + K_c - \rho_c z_c = 0, \quad (9)$$

where z_c is the average number of (negative in the physiological pH = 7.4 conditions) electric charges carried by macromolecules inside the cell and ρ_c is their density. As macromolecules are trapped inside the cell membrane, we can express $\rho_c = X_c/(4\pi r_c^3/3)$ where X_c is the number of macro-molecules which is fixed at short timescale and only increases slowly through synthesis as the amount of dry mass doubles during the cell cycle (**Cadart et al., 2019**).

Force balance.

At the interface between the cell and the matrix ($r = r_c$), we can express the mechanical balance as

$$\Sigma_c^{\text{bulk}} \mathbf{e}_r + \sigma_c^{\text{surf}} \mathbf{e}_r = \Sigma_m \mathbf{e}_r. \quad (10)$$

In (10), Σ_c^{bulk} is the Cauchy stress in the cytoplasm which we decompose into $\Sigma_c^{\text{bulk}} = \Sigma_c^{\text{skel}} - p_c \mathbf{I}$, with a first contribution due to the cytoskeleton and a second contribution due to the hydrostatic pressure in the cytosol. The identity matrix is denoted \mathbf{I} . The contribution due to the mechanical resistance of the cortex and membrane is denoted σ_c^{surf} . In our spherical geometry, we can express $\sigma_c^{\text{surf}} = 2\gamma_c/r_c$ where γ_c is a surface tension in the cell contour. Finally Σ_m is the stress in the matrix phase for which we postulate a poro-elastic behavior such that, $\Sigma_m = \Sigma_m^{\text{el}}(\epsilon_m) - p_m \mathbf{I}$ (the Biot coefficient (**Coussy, 2004**) is assumed to be one.) where

$$\Sigma_m^{\text{el}} = 2G\mathbf{E}_m + \left(K_d - \frac{2G}{3}\right) \text{tr}(\mathbf{E}_m)\mathbf{I}, \quad (11)$$

is the Hooke's law with \mathbf{E}_m the (small) elastic strain in the matrix, G the shear modulus and K_d the drained bulk modulus.

In the absence of cytoskeleton and external matrix, (10) reduces to Laplace law:

$$\frac{2\gamma_c}{r_c} = p_c - p_m$$

and more generally reads,

$$(\Sigma_c^{\text{skel}} - \Sigma_m^{\text{el}}) \mathbf{e}_r \cdot \mathbf{e}_r + \frac{2\gamma_c}{r_c} = p_c - p_m. \quad (12)$$

Such relation provides the hydrostatic pressure jump at the cell membrane ($r = r_c$) entering in the osmotic balance (6) and, combining (6) and (12), we obtain

$$(\Sigma_c^{\text{skel}} - \Sigma_m^{\text{el}}) \mathbf{e}_r \cdot \mathbf{e}_r + \frac{2\gamma_c}{r_c} = \Pi_c - \Pi_m. \quad (13)$$

A.2 Conservation laws in the extra-cellular matrix

Water conservation.

Assuming that the extra-cellular fluid follows a Darcy law, mass conservation of the incompressible water permeating the matrix can be expressed as

$$\frac{\partial n}{\partial t} - \frac{\kappa}{\mu} \frac{1}{r} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \left(r \frac{\partial p_m}{\partial r} \right) = 0, \quad (14)$$

where n is the matrix porosity, κ the matrix permeability and μ the fluid viscosity. At steady state, $\partial_t n = 0$ and (14) is associated with no flux boundary conditions at r_c and r_m given by

$$\frac{\partial p_m}{\partial r} \Big|_{r=r_c} = 0.$$

It follows that p_m is homogeneous in the matrix and its value is imposed by a relation similar to (6) with an infinitely permeable membrane at r_m :

$$p_m(r) = \Pi_m - \Pi_e. \quad (15)$$

In (15), Π_e is the external osmotic pressure which reads

$$\Pi_e = k_B T (N_e + K_e + C_e + D_e) \quad (16)$$

where N_e , K_e and C_e denote the ions concentrations in the external solution and D_e the concentration of Dextran added to the external solution.

Ions conservation.

As we are interested in the steady-state only, the Poisson-Nernst fluxes of ions concentrations in the matrix locally vanish leading to:

$$\frac{\partial N_m}{\partial r} + \frac{N_m q}{k_B T} \frac{\partial v_m}{\partial r} = \frac{\partial K_m}{\partial r} + \frac{K_m q}{k_B T} \frac{\partial v_m}{\partial r} = \frac{\partial C_m}{\partial r} - \frac{C_m q}{k_B T} \frac{\partial v_m}{\partial r} = 0,$$

where $v_m(r)$ is the electro-static potential in the matrix.

As v_m is defined up to an additive constant, we chose that $v_m(r_m) = 0$ and, imposing the continuity of ions concentrations at the transition between the matrix and the external solution $N_m|_{r_m} = N_e$, $K_m|_{r_m} = K_e$ and $C_m|_{r_m} = C_e$, we obtain

$$N_m = N_e e^{-\frac{qv_m}{k_B T}}, K_m = K_e e^{-\frac{qv_m}{k_B T}} \text{ and } C_m = C_e e^{\frac{qv_m}{k_B T}}. \quad (17)$$

Next, we again suppose for simplicity that the capacitance of both the porous matrix and the external media are vanishingly small leading to the electro-neutrality constraints

$$\begin{aligned} N_m + K_m - C_m - z_m \rho_m &= 0 \\ N_e + K_e - C_e &= 0, \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

where z_m is the number of negative charges carried by the biopolymer chains forming the matrix and ρ_m is their density. As we use uncharged Dextran, its concentration does not enter in expressions (18). Using, (17) in tandem with (18), we obtain

$$v_m = -\frac{k_B T}{q} \sinh^{-1} \left(\frac{z_m \rho_m}{2C_e} \right). \quad (19)$$

Re-injecting this expression into (17), we obtain the steady state concentrations of ions in the matrix phase:

$$N_m = N_e e^{\sinh^{-1} \left(\frac{z_m \rho_m}{2C_e} \right)}, K_m = K_e e^{\sinh^{-1} \left(\frac{z_m \rho_m}{2C_e} \right)} \text{ and } C_m = C_e e^{-\sinh^{-1} \left(\frac{z_m \rho_m}{2C_e} \right)}. \quad (20)$$

Next, we make the realistic assumption that the chloride concentration (number of ions per unit volume) is much larger than the density of fixed charges carried by the polymer chains (number charges per unit volume): $z_m \rho_m / C_e \ll 1$. Indeed using the rough estimates of Section A.4, the average number of charge carried per amino-acid is 0.06 and the typical concentration of matrix is 5 g/L. As the molar mass of an amino-acid is roughly 150g/mol, we can estimate in moles that $z_m \rho_m \simeq 2\text{mM}$ while $C_e \simeq 100\text{mM}$. We can thus simplify (20) up to first order to obtain,

$$N_m = N_e \left(1 + \frac{z_m \rho_m}{2C_e} \right), K_m = K_e \left(1 + \frac{z_m \rho_m}{2C_e} \right) \text{ and } C_m = C_e \left(1 - \frac{z_m \rho_m}{2C_e} \right). \quad (21)$$

633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687

As a result, we obtain that the only steady state contribution of

$$\Pi \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \Pi_e - \Pi_m = k_B T (D_e - D_m) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{for small Dextran} \\ k_B T D_e & \text{for big Dextran,} \end{cases} \quad (22)$$

is imposed by Dextran since the ions only start to contribute to this difference at second order in the small parameter $z_m \rho_m / C_e$. We therefore conclude that, in good approximation, Π vanishes for small Dextran molecules that can permeate the matrix and equates to the imposed and known quantity $k_B T D_e$ for big Dextran molecules that cannot enter the matrix pores.

It then follows from (15) that the hydrostatic pressure equilibrates with the imposed osmotic pressure,

$$p_m(r) = -\Pi. \quad (23)$$

Force balance.

Using the spherical symmetry of the problem, the only non vanishing components of the stress tensor are Σ_m^{rr} and $\Sigma_m^{\theta\theta} = \Sigma_m^{\varphi\varphi}$. Therefore, the local stress balance reads

$$\frac{\partial \Sigma_m^{rr}}{\partial r} + \frac{2}{r} (\Sigma_m^{rr} - \Sigma_m^{\theta\theta}) = 0,$$

Assuming a small enough displacement, the non-vanishing components of the strain tensor are given by, $\mathbf{E}_m^{rr} = \partial u_r / \partial r$ and $\mathbf{E}_m^{\theta\theta} = \mathbf{E}_m^{\varphi\varphi} = u_r / r$ where u_r is the radial (and only non-vanishing) displacement component from an homogeneous reference configuration corresponding to a situation where the matrix is not subjected to any external loading and $r_{c,m} = R_{c,m}$. Using the poro-elastic constitutive behavior (11), u_r satisfies

$$\left(K_d + \frac{4}{3} G \right) \left(\frac{\partial^2 u_r}{\partial r^2} + \frac{2}{r} \frac{\partial u_r}{\partial r} - \frac{2}{r^2} u_r \right) = \frac{\partial p_m}{\partial r}. \quad (24)$$

This equation is supplemented with the traction free boundary condition at $r = r_m$

$$\Sigma_m \mathbf{e}_r = 0. \quad (25)$$

Combined with (23), the two above equations (24) and (25) lead to the solution

$$u_r(r) = \epsilon^0 r + \frac{r_m^3 (\Pi + 3K_d \epsilon^0)}{4Gr^2}, \quad (26)$$

where the introduced constants ϵ^0 is found using the displacement continuity at the cell matrix- interface:

$$u_r(r_c) = u \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} r_c - R_c, \quad (27)$$

with u given by the change of the cell radius from a reference configuration with radius R_c . The general expression of u_r therefore reads,

$$u_r(r) = \frac{ur_c^2 (4Gr_c^3 + 3K_d r_m^3) + \Pi r_m^3 (r_c^3 - r^3)}{r^2 (4Gr_c^3 + 3K_d r_m^3)}, \quad (28)$$

leading to the following form of the total mechanical stress in the surrounding matrix:

$$\Sigma_m(r) = \frac{2Gr_c^2 (3K_d u + r_c \Pi)}{r^3 (4Gr_c^3 + 3K_d r_m^3)} \times \begin{pmatrix} 2(r^3 - r_m^3) & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & (2r^3 + r_m^3) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & (2r^3 + r_m^3) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (29)$$

A.3 Formulation of the model

Combining (5) with (13) and taking into account (21), we obtain the relation linking the cell mechanics and the osmotic pressures inside the cell and outside the matrix:

$$(\Sigma_c^{\text{skel}} - \Sigma_m^{\text{el}})\mathbf{e}_r \cdot \mathbf{e}_r + \frac{2\gamma_c}{r_c} = k_B T (N_c + K_c + C_c - N_e - K_e - C_e - D_m).$$

We suppose that the stress in the cytoskeleton is regulated at a homeostatic tension such that $\Sigma_c^{\text{skel}} \mathbf{e}_r \cdot \mathbf{e}_r \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \Sigma_a$ is a fixed given constant modeling the spontaneous cell contractility. We can then linearize the cell mechanical contributions close to $r_c = R_c$ to obtain

$$\Sigma_c^{\text{skel}} \mathbf{e}_r \cdot \mathbf{e}_r + \frac{2\gamma_c}{r_c} = \tilde{\Sigma}_a - k_c u,$$

where $\tilde{\Sigma}_a = \Sigma_a + 2\gamma_c/R_c$ and the effective cell mechanical stiffness is $k_c = 2\gamma_c/R_c^2$.

Using (23) and (29) close to $r_{c,m} = R_{c,m}$ we can express,

$$-\Sigma_m^{\text{el}} \mathbf{e}_r \cdot \mathbf{e}_r = \frac{12GK_d(R_m^3 - R_c^3)u + (4G + 3K_d)R_m^3 R_c \Pi}{4GR_c^4 + 3K_d R_c R_m^3}.$$

We therefore finally get the linear relation,

$$\tilde{\Sigma}_a + \tilde{k}u + \tilde{\alpha}\Pi = k_B T (N_c + K_c + C_c - N_e - K_e - C_e - D_m), \quad (30)$$

where,

$$\tilde{k} = -k_c + \frac{12GK_d(R_m^3 - R_c^3)}{4GR_c^4 + 3K_d R_c R_m^3} \text{ and } \tilde{\alpha} = \frac{(4G + 3K_d)R_m^3}{4GR_c^3 + 3K_d R_m^3}.$$

In the limit where $R_m \gg R_c$,

$$\tilde{k} = -k_c + \frac{4G}{3R_c} \text{ and } \tilde{\alpha} = 1 + \frac{4G}{3K_d}.$$

Next, using (8) and (21) and neglecting $z_m \rho_m / C_e \ll 1$ we obtain the relation linking the externally controlled osmolarity with the cell and matrix mechanics:

$$\frac{\tilde{\Sigma}_a + \tilde{k}u + (\tilde{\alpha} - 1)\Pi}{k_B T} = N_e \left(e^{-\frac{q(v-v_N)}{k_B T}} - 1 \right) + K_e \left(e^{-\frac{q(v-v_K)}{k_B T}} - 1 \right) + C_e \left(e^{\frac{qv}{k_B T}} - 1 \right) - D_e. \quad (31)$$

In a similar way, we combine (8) with (9) with again (21) in the limit where $z_m \rho_m / C_e \ll 1$ to express the electro-neutrality condition

$$N_e e^{-\frac{q(v-v_N)}{k_B T}} + K_e e^{-\frac{q(v-v_K)}{k_B T}} - C_e e^{\frac{qv}{k_B T}} = \frac{3z_c X_c}{4\pi R_c^3} \left(1 - \frac{3u}{R_c} \right), \quad (32)$$

where we have additionally linearized the right handside close to $r_c = R_c$.

The two equations (31) and (32) constitute our final model.

A.4 Cell volume in the reference situation

We begin by computing the cell radius and the cell membrane potential in the reference configuration where by definition $u = 0$ and $\Pi = D_e = 0$ as no Dextran is present at all. In this case, we solve for the membrane potential $v_c \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} V_c$ and radius R_c in (31) and (32) to find their reference values. This computation strictly follows (**Hoppensteadt and Peskin, 2012**).

Defining the non-dimensional parameters,

$$\beta = \frac{N_e e^{qv_N/(k_B T)} + K_e e^{qv_K/(k_B T)}}{C_e} \text{ and } \sigma = \frac{\tilde{\Sigma}_a}{k_B T C_e}$$

we find the reference radius and membrane potential,

$$R_c = \left(\frac{3z_c X_c}{4\pi C_e \sqrt{(\sigma + 2)^2 - 4\beta}} \right)^{1/3}$$

and

$$V_c = \frac{k_B T}{2q} \log \left(-\sqrt{(\sigma + 2)^2 - 4\beta} + \sigma + 2 \right).$$

Given that the typical concentration of chloride ions outside the cell is of the order of 100 millimolar, the osmotic pressure $k_B T C_e$ is of the order 10^5 Pa (i.e. an atmosphere). In sharp contrast, the typical mechanical stresses in the cytoskeleton and the cortex are of the order of $10^2 - 10^3$ Pa (*Julicher et al., 2007*). Therefore the non-dimensional parameter σ is of the order of $\sigma \sim 10^{-3}$ and will be neglected in the following. We then finally obtain the reference values,

$$R_c = \left(\frac{3z_c X_c}{8\pi C_e \sqrt{1 - \beta}} \right)^{1/3}, \quad V_c = \frac{k_B T}{q} \log \left(1 - \sqrt{1 - \beta} \right).$$

The pumping rate enables the cell to maintain a finite a volume. When $j_p \rightarrow 0$, $\beta \rightarrow 1$ and the cell swells to infinity because nothing balances the osmotic pressure due to the macromolecules trapped inside. So it is expected that dead cells will swell and lyse. The same happens if the pumping rate is too high. Indeed, as the membrane permeability of potassium is higher than the one of sodium, if the pumping rate is very high, a lot of potassium ions will be brought in (more than sodium ions will be expelled out) and to equilibrate osmolarity with the exterior, water will swell the cell until it bursts. Between these two unphysiological situations, computing the variation of volume with respect to the pumping rate, one gets that this variation vanishes when,

$$j_p^{opt} = \frac{k_B T}{q^2} \frac{g_N g_K}{g_N + g_K} \log \left(\frac{N_e g_K}{K_e g_N} \right).$$

At such pumping rate the volume is less sensitive to small variations in the pumping rate that may occur.

Rough estimates.

The computation of the effective charge carried by macromolecules is complex. The folding of proteins and the electrostatic screening of charges between them (Manning effect) plays a role. See (*Barrat and Joanny, 1997*) for a review. We can still make a rough estimate in the following way. We assume that macromolecules are mostly proteins. At physiological pH = 7.4, three types of amino-acids carry a positive charge, Lysine (7%), Arginine (5.3%), Histidine (0.7%) while two others Aspartate (9.9%) and Glutamate (10.8%) carry a negative charge. Added to this, Histidine has a pKa = 6 smaller than the pH so the ratio of [histidine neutral base]/[histidine charged acid] is $10^{\text{pH} - \text{pKa}} = 25$. Hence the contribution of histidine may be neglected. The occurrence of the aforementioned amino acids in the formation of proteins is also known. The average length of proteins is roughly 400 amino acids. We subsequently obtain the average effective number of negative charges as,

$$z_c = 400(9.9 + 10.8 - 7 - 5.3)/100 = 25.$$

Such estimate needs to be refined and account for sugars and other macromolecules which carry more negative charges per chain but a interval from $z_c = 10$ to $z_c = 100$ charges is a plausible estimate.

The estimate of β requires the knowledge of the physiological external concentration of ions $C_e = 150$ mM, $N_e = 140$ mM and $K_e = 10$ mM as well as conductances of sodium and potassium ions through the plasmic membrane. Here again the situation is complicated

since the dynamical opening of channels due to some change in the membrane potential (*Hodgkin and Huxley, 1952*) as well as the mechanical opening mediated by membrane stretching can play a role and affect these quantities. Nevertheless a rough estimate can be given (*Yi et al., 2003*)

$$g_N = 2 \times 10^{-6} \text{C.V}^{-1} \cdot \text{s}^{-1} \text{ and } g_K = 4.5 \times 10^{-5} \text{C.V}^{-1} \cdot \text{s}^{-1}$$

Also the pump rate is estimated in (*Luo and Rudy, 1991*),

$$j_p = 2.78 \times 10^{-12} \text{mol.s}^{-1}.$$

This pump rate is in good agreement with the optimal pump rate predicted by the model ,

$$j_p^{opt} = 3 \times 10^{-12} \text{mol.s}^{-1}.$$

This leads to an estimate of

$$\beta = 0.1.$$

The density of macromolecules inside the cell is then found to be $\rho_c = 3 \times 10^6$ macromolecules per μm^{-3} which is a correct order of magnitude (*Milo, 2013*). To further check the soundness of the above theory we can also compute the membrane potential and obtain $V_c = -73\text{mV}$ in good agreement with classical values .

A.5 Osmotic compression of the cell

We now consider the case where, from the reference configuration, we impose an additional osmotic pressure in the external solution with Dextran polymers $\Pi_d = k_B T D_e$. We recall that according to formula (22), $\Pi = 0$ for small Dextran molecules while $\Pi = \Pi_d$ for big Dextran molecules.

We use (31) and (32) to compute the ensuing small displacement u . Assuming in good approximation that the osmotic pressure imposed by chloride ions is much larger (10^5 Pa) than the mechanical resistance of the cell cortex and the external matrix (10^3 Pa) $k_B T C_e \gg \tilde{k} R_c$ we find that,

$$u = - \frac{(z_c X_c)^{1/3} ((\tilde{\alpha} - 1)\Pi + \Pi_d)}{4 \cdot 3^{2/3} \pi^{1/3} (1 - \beta)^{7/6} C_e^{4/3} k_B T}.$$

Strikingly, making the realistic simplifying assumptions that $K_d \gg G$ and $R_m \gg R_c$, leads to the same displacement of the cell membrane in the two situations of small and big Dextran:

$$u = - \frac{D_e (z_c X_c)^{1/3}}{4 \cdot 3^{2/3} \pi^{1/3} (1 - \beta)^{7/6} C_e^{4/3}},$$

showing that the two different osmotic loading are not distinguishable at that level. The main text relation (1) is obtained by assuming that the osmotic pressure of negatively charged ions is half the osmotic pressure of all ions.

However, the mechanical stress applied of the cell is completely different in both situations. For small Dextran, the mechanical stress confining the cell reads,

$$T^{\text{small}} = \Sigma_m \mathbf{e}_r \cdot \mathbf{e}_r |_{R_c} = \frac{2D_e G}{3C_e(1 - \beta)}$$

while for big Dextran it reads,

$$T^{\text{big}} = \Sigma_m \mathbf{e}_r \cdot \mathbf{e}_r |_{R_c} = -\Pi_d + T^{\text{small}}.$$

Since $T^{\text{small}} \ll \Pi_d$ by at least one order of magnitude, the most important feature that changes between small and big Dextran is that $T^{\text{small}} > 0$ while $T^{\text{big}} < 0$. The physical picture behind this is that small Dextran compresses the cell without draining the water out of the

matrix. Therefore, the cell behaves as a small inclusion which volume is reduced by the osmotic compression. In response, the matrix is elastically pulling back to balance the stress at the interface. In contrast, for big Dextran, the water is drained out of the matrix which therefore compresses the cell.

Notice that, like the membrane displacement, the variation of the membrane potential $v \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} v_c - V_c$ is the same in the two situations:

$$v = -\frac{k_B T}{q} \frac{D_e}{2\sqrt{1 - \beta C_e}},$$

where we have made the same previous simplifying assumptions that $k_B T C_e \gg \bar{k} R_c$, $K_d \gg G$ and $R_m \gg R_c$. Again such variation is negligibly small in our conditions where $D_e \ll C_e$ by several order of magnitudes. This further indicates that the biological response of the cell in response to a big Dextran compression has a mechanical rather than an electro-static origin.


B Mechanical transmission of the stress through Matrigel

The purpose of this appendix is to verify that an extracellular matrix effectively transmits the mechanical stresses to the cells within it. To this end, we embedded soft polyacrylamide (PA) beads in a matrigel scaffold (see Appendix figure 2a), before compressing the whole scaffold either with small or with big dextran. The polyacrylamide beads were fabricated as detailed in *Dolega et al. (2017)*, they have a typical size of 20-50 μm , a bulk modulus modulus $K_{PA} \simeq 15$ kPa and are fluorescently labelled. We evaluated the volume reduction of the PA beads by imaging them before and after compression (Appendix figure 2b). The bead volume was estimated by measuring the surface of its equatorial section, and assuming that the compression is isotropic. This assumption is valid only for beads located at the top of the droplet ($z > 1$ mm), where the interaction with the substrate is negligible.

The bead volume change $\Delta V/V$ (Appendix figure 2c) is measured under three experimental conditions:

- the culture medium is replaced by fresh medium with identical osmotic pressure (Control, $n = 20$ beads),
- the medium is replaced by fresh medium supplemented with small Dextran at $\Pi_d = 5$ kPa (Small, $n = 20$),
- the fresh medium is supplemented with big Dextran at $\Pi_d = 5$ kPa (Big, $n = 18$),

We observe that, when the MG is compressed by big dextran molecules, the PA beads are also lose 25% of their volume, even though they are not directly in contact with the osmolytes (green). Such a volume loss is compatible with a mechanical pressure applied of the beads of few kPa (*Dolega et al., 2017*) and shows that the externally applied osmotic pressure results in a similar mechanical pressure applied on the beads through the drainage and compression of the MG meshwork. In contrast, if the dextran molecules are small enough to penetrate the MG and the PA beads, no mechanical stress is exerted on the inclusions (blue).



883
884
885
886
887
888
889


Appendix 1 Figure 2. Compression of polyacrylamide beads embedded in Matrigel. (a) Schematic view of the experiment: compressible polyacrylamide beads (in red) are embedded in a matrigel drop and imaged before and after the addition of Dextran at $\Pi_d = 5$ kPa. **(b)** Images of a fluorescent bead, respectively before and after compression. The bead volume is deduced from its equatorial section, assuming that the beads remain spherical after compression. **(c)** Volume decrease of polyacrylamide beads under compression occasioned by small (blue) and big (green) dextran

891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901

C Interstitial space

C.1 Volume fraction of the interstitial space

To evaluate the volume fraction of the interstitial space in multi-cellular spheroids (MCS), we supplement the culture medium with sulforhodamine-B, a hydrophilic fluorophore that stains the extracellular space without penetrating the cells. From confocal sections of MCS (Appendix figure 3a) we determine the thickness of the thin layer between two adjacent cells. By fitting the intensity profile to a Gaussian distribution (Appendix figure 3b), and taking into account that the instrumental function (resolution 270nm) broadens the profile, we estimate the extracellular layer to $0.9 \pm 0.1 \mu\text{m}$ (histogram in Appendix figure 3c; N=132). With an average cell diameter of $20 \mu\text{m}$, we evaluate that the fraction of extracellular space is approximately $n_m = V_m/V_0 = 14 \pm 5\%$.



902
903
904
905
906

Appendix 1 Figure 3. Volume fraction estimation. (a) Confocal section of a MCS, the extracellular space of which is filled with sulforhodamine-B. (b) Intensity profile across two extracellular layers. The width of intercellular space is computed by fitting the intensity to a gaussian profile. (c) Distribution of the intercellular layer thicknesses.

908

C.2 Compression of ECM in the interstitial space of MCS

909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920


The evolution of the rheological properties of ECM filling the interstitial space of MCS is very difficult to evaluate, as the interstitial layer is extremely thin (see previous section). However, we can empirically define an exclusion-size (i.e. porosity), above which globular molecules do not penetrate the gel. To evaluate this exclusion-size, we dip the MCS in a solution containing fluorescent tracers with different radii. As shown in Appendix figure 4a, tracers with $R_S = 4.4$ nm and $R_S = 5.8$ nm permeate the extracellular space of the MCS but not those larger than 14.8 nm. In order to quantify the relative amount of tracers inside the MCS, we compare the average fluorescence measured inside the MCS, $\langle I_{In} \rangle$ and in the surrounding solution $\langle I_{Out} \rangle$. Appendix figure 4b reports the relative intensities $\langle I_{In} \rangle / \langle I_{Out} \rangle$, obtained respectively at an external osmotic pressure $\Pi_d = 0$ Pa and at $\Pi_d = 5$ kPa. In both cases, the fluorescence level lowers with large tracers.

From the results presented in this section, we deduce that:

921
922
923
924
925

- The intercellular space is rich in fibronectin, a protein constitutive of the extracellular matrix;
- The intercellular space has a porosity comparable to that of matrigel gelified in vitro;
- The exclusion size of the intercellular space slightly decreases under compression, indicating a moderate compaction of the extracellular matrix.

926



927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
936

Appendix 1 Figure 4. Exclusion size of the ECM in MCS. (a) Confocal sections of three MCS dipped in culture media supplemented with Dextran of increasing molecular weights. To avoid saturation of $\langle I_{Out} \rangle$, photomultiplier gain is kept low. This reduces the visibility of extracellular space inside the MCS. In the middle stripe of each image, the brightness is increased of the same amount to make the fluorescence of Dextran visible in the extracellular space. (b) Relative intensity $\langle I_{In} \rangle / \langle I_{Out} \rangle$ for different Dextran sizes, respectively without pressure (gray boxes) and with 5 kPa (green boxes). Box sizes and error bars represent respectively the standard error of the mean and the standard deviation. Controls results (no pressure) are obtained from 58 MCS per condition. Experiments under pressure are averaged over 16 (for 4.4 nm), 14 (for 5.8 nm) and 13 (for 14.8 nm) MCS.

937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950


D Cell Volume

In order to estimate how cells react to an overall compression of the whole MCS, we measure the cell volume change within the aggregate.

Cell contours are manually segmented from stack piles obtained with 2-photon imaging. Manual segmentation is performed with Amira software. Cell volume is extracted before and after application of osmotic pressure for the same cell in order to measure its compression. Spherical cells are excluded from the analysis as they may undergo cell division and display rapid volume changes. Cells larger than $7000 \mu\text{m}^3$ are also discarded from the analysis as they may be two cells rather than one. The results are reported in Appendix figure 5 and show that cells appear to be compressed both by small (40 kPa) and big (15 kPa) dextran molecules. The pressures are chosen to match with the experiments presented in figure 3 of the main article.


Notice that this method is much less accurate than the "fluorescence exclusion" method used to determine the volume of individual cells. The results have to be taken as qualitative.

956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
965



Appendix 1 Figure 5. Cell volume change.

Volume loss of cells inside the spheroids, under $\Pi_d^{Small} = 40 \text{ kPa}$ and $\Pi_d^{Big} = 15 \text{ kPa}$ respectively.



Appendix 1 Figure 6. Matrigel bulk modulus.

Compression of the Matrigel beads as a function of the osmotic pressure. Small circles correspond to individual measurements on different MG beads, large circles to the mean value at a given pressure and error bars to the standard deviation. Data are fitted to a hyperelastic model to determine the bulk modulus of matrigel (continuous line).

967


E Matrigel Bulk Modulus

In this section, we estimate the bulk modulus of the extracellular matrix. As interstitial ECM is difficult to characterize in-situ, we use matrigel (MG) beads to roughly estimate the rheological properties of ECM. Consistently with native ECM, large Dextran molecules were also excluded from microbeads made of MG suggesting an equivalent effective permeability (Dolega et al., 2020). To determine the bulk modulus of MG beads, we follow their compression at different dextran concentration. To facilitate the measurement, the beads are doped with fluorescent nanoparticles. In Appendix figure 6, we display the volume decrease V/V_0 of MG beads as a function of the osmotic stresses, between 15 and 500 Pa (V_0 being the bead

volume before compression). The continuous line represents the best fit to a Mooney-Rivlin model, the derivative of which represent the bulk modulus K_m (Rivlin and Saunders, 1951). For small deformations, the best fit is obtained for a bulk modulus $K_m = 450 \pm 100$ Pa.

F Dynamic Light Scattering and Motile Activity inside MCS

The scope of this section is to illustrate how to determine cell motility inside an opaque multicellular aggregate. Previous works already indicate that pressure affects cell motility in multicellular spheroids, but the observations are limited to either the superficial layer (Alessandri et al., 2013) or to the long-term centripetal motion (Delarue et al., 2013). Recently, we developed a method to measure the cell velocity in the deep layers of MCS without using confocal microscopy, which is limited in terms of sample thickness and observation time. In our setup (Brunel et al., 2017, 2020) (Appendix figure 7a), the MCS is observed by phase contrast (Appendix figure 7c) and is simultaneously illuminated with an infrared laser (850 nm). The light scattered by the MCS in the forward direction produces an interference pattern, which is collected by a camera (Appendix figure 7b). From the of temporal fluctuations of this pattern (signal shown in Appendix figure 7d and its autocorrelation function in Appendix figure 7e), one computes the average velocity of cells, moving inside the MCS. It has to be noticed that this technique, an evolution of the Dynamic Light Scattering, provides information on the 3D motility, and not only on the 2D motion as previously measured by Alessandri et al. at the surface of MCS Alessandri et al. (2013). With this method, we measure the average speed in the three cases of interest: without pressure, when a pressure is selectively applied on the cells, but not on the ECM (small Dextran), and when the pressure is applied to the whole MCS (big Dextran). The results are shown in Appendix figure 7f and 7g: whereas the average speed is comparable in the first two cases (10 ± 1 $\mu\text{m}/\text{h}$; magenta and cyan), it is reduced by a factor of two when the compression is exerted on the entire MCS (4.8 ± 0.5 $\mu\text{m}/\text{h}$, blue).



1004 **Appendix 1 Figure 7. . Motile activity measured by Dynamic Light Scattering (DLS) under**
 1005 **different pressure conditions.** (a) The experimental setup combines two counter-propagating optical
 1006 pathways, with two different wavelengths. This allows us to observe the MCS simultaneously by DLS
 1007 ($\lambda_{DLS} = 850\text{nm}$, dark red in the sketch) and by phase contrast ($\lambda_{phase} = 530\text{nm}$, green). The DLS signal
 1008 and phase contrast image are illustrated respectively in panels (b) and (c). DLS signals are acquired at
 1009 different scattering vectors \mathbf{q} and averaged over rings of equal $q=|\mathbf{q}|$ (colored sectors in panel (b)). (d)
 1010 Time evolution of diffraction intensity at three different \mathbf{q} ; colors correspond to that of sectors in panel
 1011 (b). (e) Intensity-Intensity autocorrelation functions for the three different scattering vectors. In the
 1012 single-scattering regime, the intensity signal decorrelates in a typical timescale $\tau = 1/qv^0$, where v^0 is
 1013 the mean cell velocity inside the MCS. (f-g) respectively the decorrelation time as a function of q and the
 1014 resulting mean cell velocity, measured in three different conditions: with no pressure, $v^0 = 10 \pm 1 \mu\text{m/h}$
 1015 (magenta), with 5 kPa exerted by small Dextran, $v^0 = 9.8 \pm 0.8 \mu\text{m/h}$ (cyan), and with $\Pi_e = 5 \text{ kPa}$ exerted
 1016 by large Dextran, $v^0 = 4.8 \pm 0.5 \mu\text{m/h}$ (blue). Box sizes correspond to the standard error of the mean (N =
 1018 5 MCS) and the error bars to the standard deviation.

1019 G Cytoskeleton and Compressibility


1020 Aggregate compressibility depends primarily on three elements: the compressibility of
 1021 the cells, that of the extracellular matrix, and the volumetric ratio between the two. In
 1022 this section, we want to evaluate how the rheology of the cytoskeleton contributes to
 1023 the apparent compressibility of MCS. To do so, we prepare six 96-wells plates of identical
 1024 spheroids. To avoid the formation of a necrotic core, the MCS initial radius does not exceed
 1025 $200\mu\text{m}$. Subsequently, five drugs and big dextran molecules (2 MDa) are added to the
 1026 different plates:

- 1027 • Y-27632 ROCK inhibitor, to reduce cell contractility,
- 1028 • Blebbistatin, to inhibit acto-myosin activity,
- 1029 • Cytochalasin D, to inhibit actin polymerization,
- 1030 • Nocodazole, to promote microtubule depolymerization,
- 1031 • Paclitaxel, to impede microtubule depolymerization.

As a control, a subset of spheroids are exposed either to the drug alone, without dextran
 in solution or to Dimethyl Sulfoxide (DMSO). The MCS volumes are obtained by measuring
 the surface of their equatorial planes and considering them as a perfectly spherical object.
 The volume is measured before adding the drug, then 45 minutes after exposure to the
 drug alone (gray in Appendix figure 8) or to the drug supplemented with dextran (green in
 Appendix figure 8) and normalized to the initial volume of each MCS.

We observe that drugs modify the MCS volume in different manners (see the figure below)
 as compared to the control (DMSO). This is in agreement with the fact such pharmacological
 perturbations are known to impact the single cell volume in different manners (*Stewart et al.,*
2011). When dextran is added to the solution, the spheroids get compressed from their
 initial state (with the drug); such final compression (Dextran+Drug) is comparable to that
 obtained with dextran alone but the amount of compression with respect to the initial state
 varies depending on the drug.

This result is compatible with our idea the 5 kPa Dextran compression reduces almost to
 the maximum the inter-cellular space and that cells are then almost fully connective in the
 final state. Thus, depending on the amount of compression that the drug first creates, the
 ensuing compression with Dextran will change depending on the available inter-cellular
 space that remains. For instance, in the presence of cytochalasin, the extra-cellular space
 is already largely reduced compared to DMSO so when the osmotic compression follows,
 there is hardly no inter-cellular space which can still be compressed. This seems to be an
 additional indication that the MCS compressibility in response to a gentle osmotic pressure
 is more related to the rheology of the extracellular space than to the internal organization
 and contractility of the cytoskeleton as we argue in *Dolega et al. (2020)*.



Appendix 1 Figure 8. . Influence of cytoskeleton structure and contractility on MCS

compressibility. In gray, the relative change of the MCS volume after injection of drug (or DMSO alone in control experiments). In green, the volume change after addition of drug+dextran at 5 kPa. BoxPlot represent the standard error of the mean, error bars the standard deviation, and circles/squares the volume change of individual spheroids.

References

- Alessandri, K., Sarangi, B. R., Gurchenkov, V. V., Sinha, B., Kiessling, T. R., Fetler, L., Rico, F., Scheuring, S., Lamaze, C., Simon, A., Geraldo, S., Vignjevic, D., Domejean, H., Rolland, L., Funfak, A., Bibette, J., Bremond, N., and Nassoy, P. (2013). Cellular capsules as a tool for multicellular spheroid production and for investigating the mechanics of tumor progression in vitro. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 110(37):14843–14848.
- Baker, B. M., Trappmann, B., Wang, W. Y., Sakar, M. S., Kim, I. L., Shenoy, V. B., Burdick, J. A., and Chen, C. S. (2015). Cell-mediated fibre recruitment drives extracellular matrix mechanosensing in engineered fibrillar microenvironments. *Nature materials*, 14(12):1262–1268.
- Baranowski, B. (1991). Non-equilibrium thermodynamics as applied to membrane transport. *Journal of membrane science*, 57(2):119–159.
- Barrat, J.-L. and Joanny, J.-F. (1997). Theory of polyelectrolyte solutions. *Advances in Chemical Physics, Polymeric Systems*, page 1.
- Barriga, E. H., Franze, K., Charras, G., and Mayor, R. (2018). Tissue stiffening coordinates morphogenesis by triggering collective cell migration in vivo. *Nature*, 554(7693):523–527.
- Bastide, J., Candau, S., and Leibler, L. (1981). Osmotic deswelling of gels by polymer solutions. *Macromolecules*, 14(3):719–726.
- Bissell, M. J., Radisky, D. C., Rizki, A., Weaver, V. M., and Petersen, O. W. (2002). The organizing principle: microenvironmental influences in the normal and malignant breast. *Differentiation*, 70(9-10):537–546.
- Bläžile, A., Soh, G., Braun, T., Mörsdorf, D., Preiß, H., Jordan, B. M., and Müller, P. (2018). Quantitative diffusion measurements using the open-source software pyfrap. *Nature communications*, 9(1):1–14.
- Brochard, F. (1981). Polymer networks swollen by a homopolymer solution. *Journal de Physique*, 42(3):505–511.
- Brodors-Bondon, F., Nguyen Ho-Boulidoires, T. H., Fernandez-Sanchez, M.-E., and Farge, E. (2018). Mechanotransduction in tumor progression: The dark side of the force. *The Journal of Cell Biology*, 217(5):1571–1587.
- Brunel, B., Blanch, C., Gourrier, A., Petrolli, V., Delon, A., Joanny, J.-F., Carminati, R., Pierrat, R., and Cappello, G. (2017). Structure and dynamics of multicellular assemblies measured by coherent light scattering. *New Journal of Physics*, 19(7):073033.
- Brunel, B., Levy, V., Millet, A., Dolega, M. E., Delon, A., Pierrat, R., and Cappello, G. (2020). Measuring cell displacements in opaque tissues: dynamic light scattering in the multiple scattering regime. *Biomedical optics express*, 11(4):2277–2297.
- Butcher, D. T., Alliston, T., and Weaver, V. M. (2009). A tense situation: Forcing tumour progression. *Nature Reviews Cancer*, 9(2):108–22.

- 1094 Cadart, C., Venkova, L., Recho, P., Lagomarsino, M. C., and Piel, M. (2019). The physics of cell-size regulation
1095 across timescales. *Nature Physics*, 15(10):993–1004.
- 1096 Cadart, C., Zlotek-Zlotkiewicz, E., Venkova, L., Thouvenin, O., Racine, V., Le Berre, M., Monnier, S., and Piel, M.
1097 (2017). *Fluorescence eXclusion Measurement of volume in live cells*, volume 139. Elsevier Ltd.
- 1098 Charras, G. T., Coughlin, M., Mitchison, T. J., and Mahadevan, L. (2008). Life and times of a cellular bleb. *Biophysical
1099 journal*, 94(5):1836–1853.
- 1100 Choquet, D., Felsenfeld, D. P., and Sheetz, M. P. (1997). Extracellular matrix rigidity causes strengthening of
1101 integrin- cytoskeleton linkages. *Cell*, 88(1):39–48.
- 1102 Clark, A. G. and Paluch, E. (2011). Mechanics and regulation of cell shape during the cell cycle. In *Cell cycle in
1103 development*, pages 31–73. Springer.
- 1104 Coussy, O. (2004). *Poromechanics*. John Wiley & Sons.
- 1105 Day, R. E., Kitchen, P., Owen, D. S., Bland, C., Marshall, L., Conner, A. C., Bill, R. M., and Conner, M. T. (2014).
1106 Human aquaporins: regulators of transcellular water flow. *Biochimica et Biophysica Acta (BBA)-General Subjects*,
1107 1840(5):1492–1506.
- 1108 Delarue, M., Montel, F., Caen, O., Elgeti, J., Siaugue, J.-M., Vignjevic, D., Prost, J., Joanny, J.-F. m. c., and Cappello, G.
1109 (2013). Mechanical control of cell flow in multicellular spheroids. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 110:138103.
- 1110 Delarue, M., Montel, F., Vignjevic, D., Prost, J., Joanny, J. F. J.-F., and Cappello, G. (2014). Compressive stress
1111 inhibits proliferation in tumor spheroids through a volume limitation. *Biophysical Journal*, 107(8):1821–1828.
- 1112 Diz-Muñoz, A., Krieg, M., Bergert, M., Ibarlucea-Benitez, I., Muller, D. J., Paluch, E., and Heisenberg, C.-P. (2010).
1113 Control of directed cell migration in vivo by membrane-to-cortex attachment. *PLoS biology*, 8(11):e1000544.
- 1114 Dolega, M., Zurlo, G., Goff, M. L., Greda, M., Verdier, C., Joanny, J.-F., Cappello, G., and Recho, P. (2020). Mechanical
1115 behavior of multi-cellular spheroids under osmotic compression. *Journal of the Mechanics and Physics of Solids*,
1116 page 104205.
- 1117 Dolega, M. E., Delarue, M., Ingremeau, F., Prost, J., Delon, A., and Cappello, G. (2017). Cell-like pressure sensors
1118 reveal increase of mechanical stress towards the core of multicellular spheroids under compression. *Nature
1119 Communications*, 8(May 2016):1–9.
- 1120 Elmoazzen, H. Y., Elliott, J. A., and McGann, L. E. (2009). Osmotic transport across cell membranes in nondilute
1121 solutions: a new nondilute solute transport equation. *Biophysical journal*, 96(7):2559–2571.
- 1122 Engler, A. J., Sen, S., Sweeney, H. L., and Discher, D. E. (2006). Matrix Elasticity Directs Stem Cell Lineage
1123 Specification. *Cell*, 126(4):677–689.
- 1124 Farutin, A., Étienne, J., Misbah, C., and Recho, P. (2019). Crawling in a fluid. *Physical Review Letters*, 123(11):118101.
- 1125 Fernandez-Sanchez, M.-E., Serman, F., Ahmadi, P., and Farge, E. (2010). Mechanical induction in embryonic devel-
1126 opment and tumor growth: integrative cues through molecular to multicellular interplay and evolutionary
1127 perspectives. In *Methods in cell biology*, volume 98, pages 295–321. Elsevier.
- 1128 Gerdes, J., Lemke, H., Baisch, H., Wacker, H.-H., Schwab, U., and Stein, H. (1984). Cell cycle analysis of a cell
1129 proliferation-associated human nuclear antigen defined by the monoclonal antibody ki-67. *The journal of
1130 immunology*, 133(4):1710–1715.
- 1131 Granath, K. A. (1958). Solution properties of branched dextrans. *Journal of Colloid Science*, 13(4):308–328.
- 1132 Guo, M., Pegoraro, A. F., Mao, A., Zhou, E. H., Arany, P. R., Han, Y., Burnette, D. T., Jensen, M. H., Kasza, K. E.,
1133 Moore, J. R., Mackintosh, F. C., Fredberg, J. J., Mooney, D. J., Lippincott-Schwartz, J., and Weitz, D. A. (2017).
1134 Cell volume change through water efflux impacts cell stiffness and stem cell fate. *Proceedings of the National
1135 Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 114(41):E8618–E8627.
- 1136 Han, Y. L., Pegoraro, A. F., Li, H., Li, K., Yuan, Y., Xu, G., Gu, Z., Sun, J., Hao, Y., Gupta, S. K., Li, Y., Tang, W., Kang, H.,
1137 Teng, L., Fredberg, J. J., and Guo, M. (2020). Cell swelling, softening and invasion in a three-dimensional breast
1138 cancer model. *Nature Physics*, 16(1):101–108.
- 1139 Hawkins, R. J., Poincloux, R., Bénichou, O., Piel, M., Chavrier, P., and Voituriez, R. (2011). Spontaneous contractility-
1140 mediated cortical flow generates cell migration in three-dimensional environments. *Biophysical journal*,
1141 101(5):1041–1045.

- 1142 Helmlinger, G., Netti, P. A., Lichtenbeld, H. C., Melder, R. J., and Jain, R. K. (1997). Solid stress inhibits the growth
1143 of multicellular tumor spheroids. *Nature biotechnology*, 15:778–783.
- 1144 Hodgkin, A. and Huxley, A. (1952). Propagation of electrical signals along giant nerve fibres. *Proceedings of the*
1145 *Royal Society of London. Series B, Biological Sciences*, pages 177–183.
- 1146 Hoffmann, E. K., Lambert, I. H., and Pedersen, S. F. (2009). Physiology of cell volume regulation in vertebrates.
1147 *Physiological reviews*, 89(1):193–277.
- 1148 Hoppensteadt, F. C. and Peskin, C. S. (2012). *Modeling and simulation in medicine and the life sciences*, volume 10.
1149 Springer Science & Business Media.
- 1150 Hui, T., Zhou, Z., Qian, J., Lin, Y., Ngan, A., and Gao, H. (2014). Volumetric deformation of live cells induced by
1151 pressure-activated cross-membrane ion transport. *Physical review letters*, 113(11):118101.
- 1152 Humphrey, J. D., Dufresne, E. R., and Schwartz, M. A. (2014). Mechanotransduction and extracellular matrix
1153 homeostasis. *Nature Reviews Molecular Cell Biology*, 15(12):802–812.
- 1154 Isenberg, B. C., DiMilla, P. A., Walker, M., Kim, S., and Wong, J. Y. (2009). Vascular smooth muscle cell durotaxis
1155 depends on substrate stiffness gradient strength. *Biophysical Journal*, 97(5):1313–1322.
- 1156 Julicher, F., Kruse, K., Prost, J., and Joanny, J.-F. (2007). Active behavior of the cytoskeleton. *Physics reports*,
1157 449(1-3):3–28.
- 1158 Kedem, O. and Katchalsky, A. (1963). Permeability of composite membranes. part 1. electric current, volume
1159 flow and flow of solute through membranes. *Trans. Faraday Soc.*, 59:1918–1930.
- 1160 Kedem, O. t. and Katchalsky, A. (1958). Thermodynamic analysis of the permeability of biological membranes to
1161 non-electrolytes. *Biochimica et biophysica Acta*, 27:229–246.
- 1162 Kim, D.-H., Li, B., Si, F., Phillip, J. M., Wirtz, D., and Sun, S. X. (2015). Volume regulation and shape bifurcation in
1163 the cell nucleus. *Journal of cell science*, 128(18):3375–3385.
- 1164 Kleinman, H. K. and Martin, G. R. (2005). Matrigel: basement membrane matrix with biological activity. In
1165 *Seminars in cancer biology*, volume 15, pages 378–386. Elsevier.
- 1166 Kurniawan, N. A., Chaudhuri, P. K., and Lim, C. T. (2016). Mechanobiology of cell migration in the context of
1167 dynamic two-way cell-matrix interactions. *Journal of Biomechanics*, 49(8):1355–1368.
- 1168 Lang, F., Busch, G. L., Ritter, M., VÖLKL, H., Waldegger, S., Gulbins, E., and HÄUSSINGER, D. (1998). Functional
1169 significance of cell volume regulatory mechanisms. *Physiological reviews*, 78(1):247–306.
- 1170 Lelièvre, S. A. and Bissell, M. J. (2006). Three dimensional cell culture: the importance of microenvironment in
1171 regulation of function. *Reviews in Cell Biology and Molecular Medicine*.
- 1172 Levental, K. R., Yu, H., Kass, L., Lakins, J. N., Egeblad, M., Erler, J. T., Fong, S. F., Csiszar, K., Giaccia, A., Weninger,
1173 W., Yamauchi, M., Gasser, D. L., and Weaver, V. M. (2009). Matrix Crosslinking Forces Tumor Progression by
1174 Enhancing Integrin Signaling. *Cell*, 139(5):891–906.
- 1175 Luo, C.-h. and Rudy, Y. (1991). A model of the ventricular cardiac action potential. depolarization, repolarization,
1176 and their interaction. *Circulation research*, 68(6):1501–1526.
- 1177 Milo, R. (2013). What is the total number of protein molecules per cell volume? a call to rethink some published
1178 values. *Bioessays*, 35(12):1050–1055.
- 1179 Monnier, S., Delarue, M., Brunel, B., M., D., E., Delon, A., Cappello, G., Dolega, M. M. E., Delon, A., and Cappello, G.
1180 (2015). Effect of an osmotic stress on multicellular aggregates. *Methods*, 94:114–119.
- 1181 Montel, F., Delarue, M., Elgeti, J., Malaquin, L., Basan, M., Risler, T., Cabane, B., Vignjevic, D., Prost, J., Cappello, G.,
1182 and Joanny, J.-F. (2011). Stress clamp experiments on multicellular tumor spheroids. *Physical Review Letters*,
1183 107(18):1–4.
- 1184 Montel, F., Delarue, M., Elgeti, J., Vignjevic, D., Cappello, G., and Prost, J. (2012). Isotropic stress reduces cell
1185 proliferation in tumor spheroids. *New Journal of Physics*, 14(5):055008.
- 1186 Mori, Y. (2012). Mathematical properties of pump-leak models of cell volume control and electrolyte balance.
1187 *Journal of mathematical biology*, 65(5):875–918.

- 1188 Nam, S., Gupta, V. K., Lee, H.-p., Lee, J. Y., Wisdom, K. M., Varma, S., Flaum, E. M., Davis, C., West, R. B., and
 1189 Chaudhuri, O. (2019). Cell cycle progression in confining microenvironments is regulated by a growth-
 1190 responsive TRPV4-PI3K/Akt-p27 ^{Kip1} signaling axis. *Science Advances*, 5(8):eaaw6171.
- 1191 Nia, H. T., Liu, H., Seano, G., Datta, M., Jones, D., and Rahbari, N. (2016). Solid stress and elastic energy as
 1192 measures of tumour mechanopathology. *Nature Publishing Group*, 1(November):1–11.
- 1193 Panzetta, V., Fusco, S., and Netti, P. A. (2019). Cell mechanosensing is regulated by substrate strain energy rather
 1194 than stiffness. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 116(44):22004–22013.
- 1195 Paszek, M. J., Zahir, N., Johnson, K. R., Lakins, J. N., Rozenberg, G. I., Gefen, A., Reinhart-King, C. A., Margulies,
 1196 S. S., Dembo, M., Boettiger, D., Hammer, D. A., and Weaver, V. M. (2005). Tensional homeostasis and the
 1197 malignant phenotype. *Cancer Cell*, 8(3):241–254.
- 1198 Pelham, R. J. and Wang, Y. L. (1997). Cell locomotion and focal adhesions are regulated by substrate flexibility.
 1199 *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 94(25):13661–13665.
- 1200 Rivlin, R. S. and Saunders, D. (1951). Large elastic deformations of isotropic materials vii. experiments on the
 1201 deformation of rubber. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series A, Mathematical and*
 1202 *Physical Sciences*, 243(865):251–288.
- 1203 Roycroft, A. and Mayor, R. (2016). Molecular basis of contact inhibition of locomotion. *Cellular and Molecular Life*
 1204 *Sciences*, 73(6):1119–1130.
- 1205 Salbreux, G., Charras, G., and Paluch, E. (2012). Actin cortex mechanics and cellular morphogenesis. *Trends in*
 1206 *cell biology*, 22(10):536–545.
- 1207 Sedzinski, J., Biro, M., Oswald, A., Tinevez, J.-Y., Salbreux, G., and Paluch, E. (2011). Polar actomyosin contractility
 1208 destabilizes the position of the cytokinetic furrow. *Nature*, 476(7361):462–466.
- 1209 Segel, M., Neumann, B., Hill, M. F. E., Weber, I. P., Viscomi, C., Zhao, C., Young, A., Agle, C. C., Thompson, A. J.,
 1210 Gonzalez, G. A., Sharma, A., Holmqvist, S., Rowitch, D. H., Franze, K., Franklin, R. J. M., and Chalut, K. J. (2019).
 1211 Niche stiffness underlies the ageing of central nervous system progenitor cells. *Nature*, 573(7772):130–134.
- 1212 Sopher, R. S., Tokash, H., Natan, S., Sharabi, M., Shelah, O., Tchaicheeyan, O., and Lesman, A. (2018). Nonlinear
 1213 Elasticity of the ECM Fibers Facilitates Efficient Intercellular Communication. *Biophysical Journal*, 115(7):1357–
 1214 1370.
- 1215 Staunton, J. R., So, W. Y., Paul, C. D., and Tanner, K. (2019). High-frequency microrheology in 3D reveals mismatch
 1216 between cytoskeletal and extracellular matrix mechanics. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*,
 1217 116(29):14448–14455.
- 1218 Staverman, A. (1952). Non equilibrium thermodynamics of membrane processes. *Trans. Faraday Soc.*, 48:176–
 1219 185.
- 1220 Stewart, M. P., Helenius, J., Toyoda, Y., Ramanathan, S. P., Muller, D. J., and Hyman, A. A. (2011). Hydrostatic
 1221 pressure and the actomyosin cortex drive mitotic cell rounding. *Nature*, 469(7329):226–230.
- 1222 Strange, K. (1993). *Cellular and molecular physiology of cell volume regulation*. CRC Press.
- 1223 Sunyer, R., Conte, V., Escribano, J., Elosegui-Artola, A., Labernadie, A., Valon, L., Navajas, D., García-Aznar,
 1224 J. M., Muñoz, J. J., Roca-Cusachs, P., and Trepast, X. (2016). Collective cell durotaxis emerges from long-range
 1225 intercellular force transmission. *Science*, 353(6304):1157–1161.
- 1226 Tanner, K., Mori, H., Mroue, R., Bruni-Cardoso, A., and Bissell, M. J. (2012). Coherent angular motion in the
 1227 establishment of multicellular architecture of glandular tissues. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*,
 1228 109(6):1973–1978.
- 1229 Taubenberger, A. V., Girardo, S., Träber, N., Fischer-Friedrich, E., Kräter, M., Wagner, K., Kurth, T., Richter, I., Haller,
 1230 B., Binner, M., Hahn, D., Freudenberg, U., Werner, C., and Guck, J. (2019). Hydrogels: 3D Microenvironment
 1231 Stiffness Regulates Tumor Spheroid Growth and Mechanics via p21 and ROCK (Adv. Biosys. 9/2019). *Advanced*
 1232 *Biosystems*, 3(9):1970092.
- 1233 Therien, A. G. and Blostein, R. (2000). Mechanisms of sodium pump regulation. *American Journal of Physiology-Cell*
 1234 *Physiology*, 279(3):C541–C566.

- 1235 Tinevez, J.-Y., Schulze, U., Salbreux, G., Roensch, J., Joanny, J.-F., and Paluch, E. (2009). Role of cortical tension in
1236 bleb growth. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 106(44):18581–18586.
- 1237 Turlier, H., Audoly, B., Prost, J., and Joanny, J.-F. (2014). Furrow constriction in animal cell cytokinesis. *Biophysical*
1238 *journal*, 106(1):114–123.
- 1239 Vogel, V. (2018). Unraveling the Mechanobiology of Extracellular Matrix. *Annual Review of Physiology*, 80(1):353–
1240 387.
- 1241 Voutouri, C., Polydorou, C., Papageorgis, P., Gkretsi, V., and Stylianopoulos, T. (2016). Hyaluronan-Derived
1242 Swelling of Solid Tumors, the Contribution of Collagen and Cancer Cells, and Implications for Cancer Therapy.
1243 *Neoplasia (United States)*, 18(12):732–741.
- 1244 Yi, C.-S., Fogelson, A. L., Keener, J. P., and Peskin, C. S. (2003). A mathematical study of volume shifts and ionic
1245 concentration changes during ischemia and hypoxia. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, 220(1):83–106.
- 1246 Zhou, E., Trepats, X., Park, C., Lenormand, G., Oliver, M., Mijailovich, S., Hardin, C., Weitz, D., Butler, J., and
1247 Fredberg, J. (2009). Universal behavior of the osmotically compressed cell and its analogy to the colloidal
1248 glass transition. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 106(26):10632–10637.
- 1249 Zlotek-Zlotkiewicz, E., Monnier, S., Cappello, G., Le Berre, M., and Piel, M. (2015). Optical volume and mass
1250 measurements show that mammalian cells swell during mitosis. *Journal of Cell Biology*, 211(4):765–774.