A Dual-Functional Embolization-Visualization System for Fluorescence Image-Guided Tumor Resection

M. Martin Jensen^{a,b} Zachary B. Barber^{a,b}, Nitish Khurana^{b,c}, Kyle J. Isaacson^{a,b}, Douglas Steinhauff^{a,b}, Bryant Green^{a,b}, Joseph Cappello^c, Abigail Pulsipher^{b,d}, Hamidreza Ghandehari^{a,b,c,d†}, Jeremiah A. Alt^{a,b,c,d†}

^aDepartment of Bioengineering, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, UT, 84112 USA ^bUtah Center for Nanomedicine, Nano Institute of Utah, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, UT, 84112 USA ^cDepartment of Pharmaceutics and Pharmaceutical Chemistry, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, UT, 84112 USA ^dDepartment of Surgery, Division of Otolaryngology–Head and Neck Surgery, University of Utah School of Medicine, Salt Lake City, UT 84113

[†]Co-corresponding Authors:

Hamidreza Ghandehari, PhD University of Utah 36 S. Wasatch Dr. Sorenson Molecular Biotechnology Building, 5211 Salt Lake City, UT 84112-5001 hamid.ghandehari@utah.edu Jeremiah Alt, MD, PhD University of Utah 50 North Medical Drive School of Medicine, 3C120 Salt Lake City, UT 84132 jeremiah.alt@hsc.utah.edu

Supplemental Information





Figure S1: Modeling of ICG release from SELP matrices using the Korsmeyer-Peppas model. Points represent the average of 6 experimental replicates. The doted lines represent the regression line for each data set.






Figure S3: Pressure vs. flow rate through 3 microfluidic tumor models plumbed in parallel. A) Pressure profiles with a flow rate ramp using PBS for the 3rd generation design of microfluidic tumor model. **B**) Flow rate vs. pressure showed the anticipated linear relationship. The dashed line indicates the regression line of the flow profile. Each point represents the average of 10 seconds of data taken form the equilibrium pressure of the system at each flow rate.