

Supplementary Fig. S2. MIBC-derived succinate induces the lineage characteristics of endothelial on SMCs. (a-b) Representative immunofluorescence (IF) staining images (a) and protein expression (b) of endothelial signature in PBSMCs co-cultured with the indicated CM/PDBC or CM/PDBC. Scale bars, 20 μ m. GAPDH served as a loading control. (c) *In vitro* tube formation assay was performed with PBSMCs pre-educated with CM from NMI/PDBC or MI/PDBC, followed by CD31-staining in the tube forming cells (Scale bars, 50 μ m); and the angiogenesis capability of PBSMCs were quantified by *in vivo* Matrigel plug assay (Scale bars, 20 μ m). (d) NMI/PDBC-CM and MI/PDBC-CM were fractionated into SFC with micromolecular (< 3 kDa) and LFC with macromolecules (> 3 kDa). IB analysis of expression of endothelial specific marker in PBSMCs co-cultured with NMIBC- or MIBC-derived SFC or LFC. GAPDH served as a loading control. (e) Real-time PCR analysis of the mRNA expression of *CD31*, *CD144*, and *vWF* in PBSMCs under the indicated treatment. *GAPDH* serves as the internal control. (f-g) Succinate levels in the condition medium of bladder cancer cell lines (e) and NMI-PDBC (n = 8) or MI-PDBC cells (n = 7) (f). (g) Real-time PCR analysis of the mRNA expression of *CD31*, *CD144*, and *vWF* in PBSMCs treated with the indicated concentrations of succinate. (h) The morphology changes of PBSMCs with the indicated treatments. Scale bars, 50 μ m. (i) AUROC curve analysis of the discriminative power of serum succinate in NMIBC and MIBC patients ($P = 0.001$; SE = 0.026; AUC = 0.796). Each error bar in a, c, d, e, f and h represents the mean \pm SD of three independent experiments. Statistical analysis was performed using Two-way ANOVA with Šídák's multiple comparisons test for (a, e and h), and unpaired two-tailed t tests for (c and g). ** $P < 0.01$; *** $P < 0.001$; ns, not significant.

Supplementary Fig. S2

