Neuron-specific coding and regulatory sequences are the most highly conserved in amniote brains despite neuron-specific cell size diversity

Linhe Xu [a], Suzana Herculano-Houzel *[a,b]

[a] Department of Psychology, Vanderbilt University

[b] Vanderbilt Brain Institute, Vanderbilt University

*Corresponding author. Email: suzana.herculano@vanderbilt.edu

Author Contributions: Xu and Herculano-Houzel designed the research; Xu conducted the research; Xu and Herculano-Houzel wrote the manuscript together.

Competing Interest Statement: The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Keywords: dN/dS | phastCons | neuronal diversity | glial cells | negative selection | molecular evolution | neuronal activity | firing rate

Abstract

Neurons are unique in that they are the only cell type in the body to display massive diversity in

cell size, morphology, phenotype, and function both within individuals and across species. Here

we use datasets encompassing up to 92 mammalian and 31 sauropsidian species to examine

whether neuron-specific diversity occurs with higher evolutionary variation of neuron-specific

coding and regulatory sequences compared to non-neuronal cell-specific sequences. We find that

the opposite is true: Neuronal diversity in mammalian and sauropsidian evolution arose despite

extreme levels of negative selection on neuron-specific protein-coding sequences on par with

ATPase coding sequences, the benchmark of evolutionary conservation. We propose that such

strong evolutionary conservation is imposed by excitability, which continually exposes cells to the

risk of excitotoxic death, and speculate that neuronal cell size diversity is a self-organized

consequence of variability in levels of activity, possibly constrained by energy supply to the

developing brain.

Introduction

Most single-nucleated cells in the mammalian body, including glial cells in the brain, maintain a

constant size across species from mice to elephants[1,2]. The exception is neurons, whose size (the

sum of the soma, axon, and dendrite) varies widely both within each brain and across species,

often becoming larger in larger brains within each clade, as gauged by neuronal densities spanning

at least 1,000-fold variation across mammalian brain structures and species[3]. Moreover, neuronal

variation extends beyond simple cell size: Single-cell transcriptomic studies have confirmed that at

least several dozen different types of neuronal cells exist within a single cerebral cortex[4,5], onto

which different physiological properties can be mapped[6]. In contrast, despite sharing a progenitor

cell type with neurons[7], astrocyte and oligodendrocyte cells are much more restricted in subtypes

and cell size (all arbors included), varying in density by less than 10-fold within brains and across

mammalian species[3,8,9], with consistently only a few cell types defined transcriptomically[4,5].

We have suggested that the high conservation of glial cell types and densities compared to

neurons is evidence of strict evolutionary constraints against glial cell variation, whereas the

immense phenotypic diversity of neurons suggests evolutionary variation[9]. Brain-specific protein-

coding genes have been shown to be under stronger selective pressure than widely expressed

genes[10]. However, brains are composed of not only neurons but also glial cells and endothelial

cells. A later study that examined all mRNA expressed in neuronal- and non-neuronal cells in

mouse reported that neuron-expressed gene sequences tend to show stronger negative correlation

between a measure of evolutionary conservation and levels of gene expression than gene

sequences expressed in other cell types[11], which the authors attribute to stronger selection

pressure against transcriptional and translational errors in more highly expressed sequences[12,13].

However, the explanatory power of gene expression level over coding sequence variation reported
in the literature is very low, always less than 10% both in whole tissues[14] (e.g., calculated from R
values reported from Additional Data File 6 of *Tuller et al., 2008*) and in single cells[11] (calculated
as Spearman correlation coefficients in *Hu et al., 2020*). Such a low explanatory power casts doubts
over the relevance of the authors' conclusion that there is stronger selective pressure against
variation in neuron-expressed genes compared to genes expressed in other cells. More recently,
an analysis between human and mouse of the levels of conservation of gene co-expression in
different cell types found less divergence in neurons compared to glial cells[15]. Most importantly, all
of these studies have been restricted to mouse-human or human-chimpanzee comparisons,
leaving unaddressed the wider question of whether the enormous diversity in neuronal cell size
compared to all other cell types throughout brain evolution that we have documented across ~100
species, including dinosaurs[16], birds[17], human[18], and other mammals[19], can be accounted for by
higher variability of neuron-specific genes, or, alternatively, whether that diversity occurs despite
strong conservation of these genes, in which case other mechanisms must be sought.

Here we compare protein-coding and upstream promoter sequences of neuron-, glial- and
endothelial cell-specific genes across 92 mammalian and 31 sauropsidian species
(**Supplementary Data S1**) to test our initial hypothesis that neuron-specific DNA sequences are
more diverse than those specific to other brain cell types on the levels of protein-coding genes,
upstream promoter sequences, and cis-regulatory elements. To ensure that our results were not
biased or limited to any particular definition of cell type-specific genes, we performed all of our
analyses on four datasets, each generated with a different technique, tissue specificity, animal age
and sex, and data clustering method. The first is the Barres mouse brain transcriptomic database[20]
that lists the expression level of genes in collections of purified neurons, astrocytes, microglia,
endothelial cells, and three developmental stages of oligodendrocytes. The second and third are
the Linnarsson single cell transcriptomic databases obtained respectively with single cells isolated
with microfluidic chip sequenced by Illumina HiSeq 2000[21] or dissociated cell populations
sequenced by the droplet-based 10X Genomics Chromium[22], and which also differed in being
restricted to regions of cerebral cortical tissue[21] or extending to the entire CNS and PNS[22] of male
and female juvenile mice. Finally, the fourth dataset is another single cell transcriptomic database
obtained with a different droplet-based method, Drop-seq, in male adult mice[23].

As a proxy for evolutionary selective pressure acting on protein-coding sequences, we
compared dN/dS ratios[24] of neuron-, glia- and endothelium-specific genes calculated from dN and
dS values in the Ensembl 98 database[25], using either mouse, rat, human, or chicken as the
reference genome. The dN/dS ratios are calculated pairwise for each gene between two species
and represent the ratio between non-synonymous and synonymous substitution rates in protein-
coding sequences for that gene. A ratio of 1 indicates neutral evolution of the coding sequence.

Values of dN/dS greater than 1 indicate positive/directional selection, and values of dN/dS smaller

than 1 indicate negative/purifying selection. We expected that if the coding sequences of both

neuron- and glia-specific genes are under negative/purifying selection, they should consistently

exhibit dN/dS<1, consistent with previous findings in the literature[10]. Additionally, we predicted that

neuron-specific genes should have larger values of dN/dS than glial cell-specific genes and

endothelium-specific genes given the extreme diversity in neuronal morphologies and cell sizes

across mammalian species.

We used two approaches to compare evolutionary conservation of regulatory elements of glial

and neuronal cell-specific sequences. First, we examined phastCons scores for the 2,000 bp

upstream of coding sequences, as used in comparable studies[26,27], employing the same definition

of cell type-specific genes as in the dN/dS analysis. The phastCons scores indicate the probability

that an individual base pair in a sequence is evolutionarily conserved, and those scores can be

averaged to provide a mean phastCons score for an entire promoter region across all species in

the dataset[28–30]. Second, we examined phastCons scores for cis-regulatory elements uncovered

by single-cell chromatin accessibility essays in neuronal or non-neuronal cells in the mouse

cerebrum[31]. Because cis-regulatory elements are not confined to any particular upstream

sequence, this analysis complements any shortcomings of the comparison of regulatory elements

in the 2,000 bp upstream region of coding sequences.

Results

Contrary to our expectation that the large evolutionary diversity of neuronal cell size would

correspond to less evolutionary conservation of neuron-specific sequences compared to glial cell-

specific sequences, we found that in all four datasets, using the mouse genome as reference, the

distribution of dN/dS ratios in mammals is sharply shifted towards lower values for neuron-specific

genes compared to glial- or endothelial cell-specific genes. This is true whether the dN/dS ratio for

individual neuronal-, glial- or endothelial-specific genes in each species is considered (**Figure 1A**;

Supplementary Table S1 and **Supplementary Table S2**); whether the *averaged* dN/dS ratio

across *all* genes specific to neuronal, glial or endothelial cells of all subtypes pooled together is

plotted in each species (**Figure 1C**; **Supplementary Table S3** and **Supplementary Table S4**),

which circumvents the fact that some genes have missing orthologs in some species; and whether

the *averaged* dN/dS across all genes specific to *specific* non-overlapping cell subtypes is plotted

(**Figure 1E**; **Supplementary Table S3** and **Supplementary Table S4**). The same data are depicted

as histograms in **Figures 1B and 1D**, which show that the distribution of average dN/dS ratios is

significantly shifted towards lower values for neuron-specific genes compared to other cell subtype-

specific genes. We find that genes specific and exclusive to each glial subtype all have a distribution

of dN/dS ratios that is significantly shifted towards higher values than neuron-specific genes, with

the highest median found for microglia-specific genes (**Figure 1D,E**). Similar results were obtained

when using the human genome (**Supplementary Figure S1**) or the rat genome (**Supplementary**

Figure S2) as reference for the calculation of dN/dS, and also across 31 sauropsidian species,

using the chicken genome as reference (**Figure 2**), which indicates that our findings in mammalian

species generalize to amniotes.

Figure 1: Neuron-specific genes have lower dN/dS ratios than genes specific to glial and

endothelial cell types, calculated using the **mouse** genome as reference. **(A)** Enhanced box-strip

plots (letter-value plots[32] overlaying on top of strip plots) of **pairwise** dN/dS ratios of neuron-, glial

cell-, and endothelial/vascular cell-specific protein-coding genes in 92 mammalian species against

the mouse ortholog. Each dot represents one gene's pairwise dN/dS in one species relative to the

mouse ortholog. **(B, C)** Distribution plots and enhanced box-strip plots of dN/dS ratios **averaged**

across 92 mammalian species against mouse reference genome for neuron-, glial cell-, and

endothelial/vascular cell-specific protein-coding genes. Each dot represents averaged dN/dS ratios

of one gene. **(D, E)** Distribution plots and enhanced box-strip plots of dN/dS ratios **averaged** across

92 mammalian species against mouse reference genome for cell-**subtype**-specific genes. Each

dot represents averaged dN/dS ratios of one gene. Each panel shows cell-type-specific genes

defined with expression data from four studies, labeled at the top of this figure. For enhanced box

plots: the p-values indicate the significance of Mann-Whitney U-tests within each pair of cell types;

"ns": $p \geq 0.05$, "p<0.05": $p < 0.05$, "*": $p < 10^{-4}$, "**": $p < 10^{-84}$, "***": $p < 10^{-164}$, "****": $p < 10^{-244}$, "*****":

$p < 5 \times 10^{-324}$. Numbers in the box for each cell type are the medians of pairwise dN/dS ratios, with a

95% confidence interval for the medians in parentheses. The sample size (number of genes) is

labeled for each cell type at the top. For distribution plots: a median dN/dS ratio is labeled for each

cell type. ATPases and housekeeping genes are considered benchmarks for very low dN/dS (and

strong negative selective pressure), while immune system-related genes, and especially MHCs,

represent a benchmark for high dN/dS (and strong positive selective pressure). The median of all

protein-coding genes is also included as a benchmark.

Figure 2: Neuron-specific genes have lower dN/dS ratios than genes specific to glial and endothelial cell types, calculated using the **chicken** genome as reference. **(A)** Enhanced box-strip plots of **pairwise** dN/dS ratios of neuron-, glial cell-, and endothelial/vascular cell-specific protein-coding genes in 31 **sauropsidian** species against the chicken ortholog. Each dot represents one gene's pairwise dN/dS in one species relative to the chicken ortholog. **(B, C)** Distribution plots and enhanced box-strip plots of dN/dS ratios **averaged** across 31 sauropsidian species against chicken reference genome for neuron-, glial cell-, and endothelial/vascular cell-specific protein-coding

genes. Each dot represents averaged dN/dS ratios of one gene. **(D, E)** Distribution plots and enhanced box-strip plots of dN/dS ratios **averaged** across 31 sauropsidian species against chicken reference genome for cell-**subtype**-specific genes. Each dot represents averaged dN/dS ratios of one gene. Each panel shows cell-type-specific genes defined with expression data from four studies, labeled at the top of this figure. For enhanced box plots: the p-values indicate the significance of Mann-Whitney U-tests within each pair of cell types; "ns": $p \geq 0.05$, "p<0.05": $p < 0.05$, "*": $p < 10^{-4}$, "**": $p < 10^{-84}$, "***": $p < 10^{-164}$, "****": $p < 10^{-244}$, "*****": $p < 5 \times 10^{-324}$. Numbers in the box for each cell type are the medians of pairwise dN/dS ratios, with a 95% confidence interval for the medians in parentheses. The sample size (number of genes) is labeled for each cell type at the top. For distribution plots: a median dN/dS ratio is labeled for each cell type.

The 92 mammalian species in our analyses encompass all major mammalian clades
(marsupials, afrotherians, xenarthrans, glires, primates, carnivorans, chiropterans, eulipotyphlans,
perissodactyls, artiodactyls), with the exception of monotremes. To address whether our mammal-
wide results apply to all clades, we compared pairwise dN/dS ratios for neuronal and non-neuronal
cell type-specific genes defined with the Barres expression database[20] in individual representative
species from different clades: primates (human), glires (rat), marsupials (opossum and Tasmanian
devil), chiroptera (large flying fox), carnivorans (cat) and artiodactyls (pig). In all of these species,
we found significantly lower values of dN/dS for neuron-specific genes compared to genes specific
to glial cells (**Table 1**), glial subtypes (**Supplementary Table S5**), and endothelial cells with the
exception of oligodendrocyte-specific genes in rat and flying fox (**Supplementary Figure S3**, upper
panel). These results hold across the four gene-specificity-defining methods, the four reference
genomes, and the individual target species (92 mammalian species and 31 sauropsidian species;
Supplementary Table S6 and **Supplementary Table S7**).
A similar analysis using all genes expressed by each cell type (whether or not exclusively),
defined as all protein-coding genes with FPKM higher than 1 for each cell type in the Barres dataset,
also confirmed that neuron-expressed genes have a distribution of dN/dS ratios in these select
species shifted towards lower values than other cell type-expressed genes (**Supplementary**
Figure S3, lower panel; **Supplementary Table S8**).
184

Table 1: Neuron-specific genes have lower dN/dS ratios than glia-specific genes in representative
mammalian species. Inferential statistics for cell type-specific genes dN/dS ratios' calculated
against the mouse reference genome for species representative of the different mammalian clades
examined, with cell-type-specificity defined according to expression data from the Barres
expression database[20]. To validate the result of lower neuron-specific genes' dN/dS ratios, neuron-
specific genes' dN/dS are compared to glia-specific genes' dN/dS between mouse and one of
seven representative mammalian species. Median dN/dS and 95% confidence interval ($CI_{95\%}$), as
well as the Mann-Whitney U test results (p-value and common language effect size), are reported
here. Values excerpted from **Supplementary Table S6** and **Supplementary Table S7**.

Species	Neuron-specific Genes median dN/dS ($CI_{95\%}$)	Glia-specific Genes median dN/dS ($CI_{95\%}$)	Mann-Whitney U Test p-value	CLES
Human	0.063 (0.059-0.068)	0.117 (0.112-0.123)	3.24×10^{-40}	66.27%
Rat	0.075 (0.068-0.083)	0.135 (0.126-0.143)	4.69×10^{-37}	65.30%
Opossum	0.061 (0.058-0.065)	0.085(0.079-0.090)	4.67×10^{-12}	59.23%
Megabat	0.084 (0.074-0.089)	0.130 (0.118-0.141)	4.01×10^{-16}	64.18%
Tasmanian Devil	0.057 (0.054-0.061)	0.087 (0.080-0.091)	7.03×10^{-19}	62.23%
Cat	0.067 (0.062-0.071)	0.114 (0.109-0.123)	3.99×10^{-38}	66.22%
Pig	0.064 (0.061-0.069)	0.114 (0.107-0.124)	1.96×10^{-41}	67.00%

To provide benchmarks against which to compare the values of dN/dS for neuron-specific

genes, we calculated median dN/dS ratios for genes known to be highly or poorly conserved, as

well as for all protein-coding genes, across the same 92 mammalian species compared to the

mouse (**Figure 1B,D**), human (**Supplementary Figure S1**), and rat reference genomes

(**Supplementary Figure S2**), and across the same 31 sauropsidian species compared to the chicken

reference genome (**Figure 2B,D**). We found that almost half of all neuron-specific genes have

values of dN/dS smaller than the median dN/dS of ATPases and housekeeping genes (low dN/dS),

which are the gold standards for highly conserved gene sequences[33,34]. Remarkably, neuron-

specific genes are as evolutionarily conserved as the benchmarks of conservations, if not more,

regardless of the reference genome used, and across four independent gene expression datasets

(**Supplementary Table S3** and **Supplementary Table S4**). Conversely, with human, rat, and

mouse reference genomes, microglia-specific genes have a similar distribution of dN/dS ratios to

immune system-specific genes, which are known to be highly variable (high dN/dS)[35], although still

smaller than the high dN/dS ratio benchmark for major histocompatibility complex (MHC) genes[36].

To put into context the low dN/dS ratios of neuron-specific genes (defined according to *Zhang*

et al., 2014)[20], we compared them to the dN/dS ratios of organ-specific genes in mouse, defined

as genes with expression detected only in that organ but not anywhere else in the MGI GXD mouse

gene expression database[37]. Interestingly, except for heart- and musculature-specific genes, we

found that liver, lung, skin, pancreas, kidney, and brain-specific genes as a whole all have

significantly higher average dN/dS ratios than neuron-specific genes (pancreas<0.05, all other

p<0.0001; **Figure 3**; **Table 2**).

Figure 3. All organ-specific genes (including the brain) other than heart-specific and musculature-specific genes have significantly higher dN/dS than neuron-specific genes. The box plot shows a comparison of dN/dS between neuron-specific genes, as defined by the Barres dataset, and organ-specific genes in the body, using the mouse genome as reference. The p-values were generated by the Mann-Whitney U test between neuron-specific genes and each gene specificity. Note that brain-specific genes overlap with both glia-specific and neuron-specific genes previously analyzed. Data points that extend the 1.5 interquartile range past the low and high quartiles are identified as outliers and are not shown.

226 **Table 2.** Organ-specific dN/dS compared to neuron-specific genes defined using the Barres
227 dataset as in **Figure 3**. The dN/dS ratios listed are the average across 92 mammalian target
228 genomes against the mouse reference genome. Organ-specificity is based on the MGI expression
229 database[37]. The 95% confidence intervals are provided alongside the median dN/dS. Mann-
230 Whitney U-test p-values and common language effect sizes (CLES) are reported.

Organ	# Genes	Median dN/dS (CI$_{95\%}$)	M.W.U. p-value Against Neuron	CLES
Neuron	1,301	0.07 (0.07-0.08)	N/A	N/A
Heart	48	0.08 (0.06-0.11)	0.21	55.37%
Brain	412	0.11 (0.09-0.12)	**5.94×10^{-11}**	60.68%
Musculature	17	0.13 (0.06-0.16)	7.85×10^{-2}	62.40%
Kidney	43	0.15 (0.09-0.21)	**9.83×10^{-6}**	69.79%
Pancreas	42	0.15 (0.11-0.18)	**2.48×10^{-4}**	66.59%
Skin	34	0.16 (0.10-0.25)	**1.08×10^{-6}**	74.46%
Lung	37	0.17 (0.12-0.23)	**1.73×10^{-6}**	73.02%
Liver	77	0.22 (0.17-0.27)	**1.68×10^{-20}**	81.43%

Next, we sought to determine, still using the Barres dataset to define cell type-specific genes[20],

whether the neuron-specific genes with low dN/dS and the microglial cell-specific genes with high

dN/dS are disproportionately related to particular biological processes. We first identified the 71

slim gene ontology (GO) categories[38] to which the cell type-specific genes belong (**Supplementary**

Data S2). For each GO category, we then performed a contingency analysis between cell type-

specificity and the bottom and top 25% values of the distribution of dN/dS using the χ^2 test of

independence (concatenated stats in **Supplementary Table S9**; visualization and detailed

contingency tables in **Supplementary Data S3**). This test allows us to find whether any GO

category is particularly overrepresented amongst neuron-specific genes with low dN/dS ratios, or

amongst microglia-specific genes with high dN/dS ratios. As expected given the mesodermal origin

of microglial cells[39], we found highly significant associations between microglial cell-specific genes

with the top 25% values of dN/dS and immune system-related GOs (χ^2=36.048, p=1.92×10^{-9}), in

agreement with previous reports of enrichment of immune system-related genes in microglial

cells[40]. In contrast, neuron-specific genes with low dN/dS ratios were significantly associated with

transport-related and signal transduction-related GOs (transport: χ^2=78.41, p=8.39×10^{-19}; signal

transduction: χ^2=54.20, p<1.82×10^{-13}). Nonetheless, virtually all GO categories with more than 225

cell type-specific genes represented showed a significant association between cell type being

neuronal and dN/dS ratios in the lowest 25% of the distribution.

Finally, we tested whether the large evolutionary variability of neuronal cell size might be

attributed to a particularly high evolutionary variability of neuronal cell type-specific **regulatory**

regions, including the promoters and the cis-regulatory regions of neuron-specific genes, despite

the extreme conservation of the coding regions. We first defined promoter regions as the 2,000 bp

upstream of the coding sequences for each cell type-specific gene, according to common usage in

the literature[26,27], and defining cell-specificity of genes according to each of the four databases used

in the dN/dS analysis[20–23]. We used phastCons scores[41] to quantify the evolutionary conservation

level of non-coding regulatory elements per gene. The phastCons score represents the probability

of negative selection for each base pair given its flanking base pairs, based on probabilities of state

transitions in phylogenetic hidden Markov models, with values ranging from 0 to 1 such that the

higher the phastCons value for a nucleotide in the sequence, the more likely that that base pair

went through negative selection.

Average phastCons scores for the 2,000 bp upstream **promoter** region for cell type-specific

genes were sourced from the UCSC Genome Browser[29] using 1) phastCons60way,which is a

multiple alignment of 60 vertebrate species, including 44 mammals, 6 sauropsids (birds and non-

avian reptiles), 9 fish, and 1 amphibian, centered around the mouse GRCm38 reference genome,

and 2) phastCons77way, which is a multiple alignment of 77 vertebrate species, including 62

sauropsids, 10 fish, 3 amphibians, and 2 mammals. Promoters with less than 80% coverage were

filtered out. At the same p<0.0001 level employed for coding sequences, we found no significant

differences in promoter region phastCons scores between neuron- and endothelial cell-specific

genes; between phastCons of endothelial cell- and glial cell-specific genes; or between neuron-

and glia-specific genes. The only exception was found in the Saunders dataset using the chicken-

centered phastCons77way score, where promoter regions of neuron-specific genes had

significantly higher phastCons scores (therefore more conserved) than those of glial-specific

promoter regions (**Figure 4A, C**). Adopting a less stringent p-value threshold of 0.05 would yield

promoter phastCons scores that were actually higher for neuron-specific genes compared to glial-

cell-specific genes (except in the *Zeisel et al., 2015* dataset with phastCons60way), which would

suggest that neuronal promoter sequences are more evolutionarily conserved than glial promoter

sequences, not less. Importantly, log-transformed dN/dS ratios of the coding region of cell type-

specific genes have virtually no explanatory power over phastCons for the promoter region of the

same genes (**Figure 4B, D**). The low correlation that fails to reach statistical significance indicates

that the strong conservation of coding sequences unveiled by dN/dS ratios is not compensated by

an increased diversity at the 2,000-bp promoter region of neuron-specific genes.

Figure 4: Upstream 2,000 bp regions of neuron-specific genes are not more conserved than those of glial-specific genes. With cell type-specific genes defined with four different datasets, we compared phastCons scores of the 2,000 bp upstream promoter region of cell type-specific calculated with (**A, B**) mouse-referenced multiple alignment of the genomes of 60 vertebrate species and (**C, D**) chicken-referenced multiple alignment of the genomes of 77 vertebrate species. (**A, C**) The phastCons scores show no difference at the $p<0.0001$ level across neuronal-, glial- and endothelial cell-specific genes, except with phastCons77way score in neuron and glial cell-specific genes defined with the Saunders dataset, where neuron-specific genes' promoters has significantly higher dN/dS (aka, more conserved) than that of glial cell-specific genes. The p-values reported are from Mann-Whitney U tests; sample size n (i.e., number of cell type-specific genes with high-coverage phastCons) are also reported; in the middle boxes of enhanced box plots, median and

95% confidence interval (in parentheses) are reported. **(B, D)** Virtually no explanatory power was
discovered between log-transformed average dN/dS ratios and phastCons scores of brain cell type-
specific genes with linear regression (all R^2 less than 0.02). R^2 and p-value for the linear fits are
reported.

The 2,000 bp sequence upstream of a coding region does however not necessarily function as

its promoter. In contrast, chromatin accessibility assays reveal functionally defined cis-regulatory

regions, which have been performed in single cell nuclei of neurons and non-neuronal cells in the

mouse cerebrum[31]. We calculated the average phastCons scores for these cis-regulatory regions,

again sourced from the UCSC Genome Browser[29], using a multiple alignment of 60 vertebrate

species centered around the mouse GRCm38 reference genome (phastCons60ways). In line with

our dN/dS observations, we found that functionally defined neuronal cis-regulatory DNA elements

have significantly higher phastCons than non-neuronal cis-regulatory DNA elements (**Figure 5**),

which indicates that both neuronal-specific cis-regulatory DNA elements and coding sequences

are more highly conserved than non-neuronal elements and sequences.

Figure 5. Neuronal cis-regulatory elements (cCREs) have higher phastCons (mouse-centered phastCons60way) than non-neuronal cCREs, indicating they are evolutionarily more conserved. The p-value is reported for Mann-Whitney U test; n: sample size, i.e., number of cCREs; median of phastCons as well as the 95% confidence interval in parentheses reported in the middle box of the enhanced boxplots.

We then tested whether the high conservation of neuron-specific sequences is associated with

high levels of gene expression in these cells compared to other cell types. Crossing dN/dS scores

for each gene with average expression levels per cell defined as fragments per kilobase of

transcript sequence per million mapped fragments[20] (FPKM) or as unique molecular identifiers

(UMI) counts[22,23], we found that gene expression level has virtually no explanatory power over

dN/dS across genes (all three R^2 values smaller than 0.04; **Figure 6**). Additionally, ANCOVA tests

for all three datasets reveal statistically significant differences in dN/dS ratios between neuronal,

endothelial/vascular cells, and glial cell types even after controlling for expression level

(**Supplementary Table S10**), with lower dN/dS scores for neuron-specific genes compared to non-

neuronal-specific genes with similar expression levels (**Figure 6**).

Figure 6. Expression level has virtually no explanatory power over dN/dS of cell type-specific genes, and neuron-specific coding sequences have lower dN/dS values than glial-specific sequences of similar expression level. The upper panel is all cell type-specific genes' dN/dS and their expression level in corresponding cell types. The lower panel is the same data points color coded with cell type. R^2 and p-value for each linear regression between log-transformed dN/dS ratios and expression levels are labeled.

It is paradoxical that neuron-specific coding sequences and cis-regulatory DNA elements are
more evolutionarily conserved than their non-neuronal counterparts given the much more
evolutionarily diverse morphology and cell sizes of neurons, a paradox that indicates that the source
of neuronal cell size variability lies elsewhere than in the genome. How could diversity in
mammalian neuronal cell size arise both in development and in evolution without building on
genomic diversity? We hypothesize, building on our recent demonstration that energy supply to the
adult brain is limiting to brain metabolism[42], that in a scenario where neuronal excitation is
energetically costly[43] and the metabolic rate of the developing brain is also supply-limited, there
should be a trade-off between neuronal firing rates and growing cell size, such that neurons with
lower firing rates would be the ones to have more energy available for cell growth and thus attain
larger adult cell sizes.

To test the hypothesis that variations in cell size should be correlated with (gene-based or not)
neuron-specific differences in firing activity, such that larger neurons have lower firing rates, we
examined the relationship between cell volume and firing rate across human cortical neurons in the
Allen Brain Atlas Cell Type Database[44], which covers a range of more than 30-fold variation in
reconstructed cell volume, including all arbors in the tissue (but no spines). We restricted our
analysis to human cortical neurons, 75% of which in the database are excitatory, because the vast
majority of mouse cortical neurons in the database were inhibitory. We analyzed all 131 human
cortical neurons with both morphological reconstruction and electrophysiological recordings
available and calculated their cell volume in the tissue (including soma and all dendritic and axonal
arbors) and representative firing rates (see "Materials and Methods"). We found that firing rate and
cell size are indeed negatively correlated amongst excitatory neurons (Spearman ρ=-0.59,
p<0.0001; **Figure 7**), such that larger neurons in the human cerebral cortex have significantly lower
firing rates.

364
365 **Figure 7. Firing rates and cell volume are negatively correlated across individual neurons in the**
366 **human cerebral cortex.** Linear regression on log-transformed firing rate and cell volume: $y = -0.92x + 4.27$; Pearson's R=-0.61, p=6.814 × 10⁻¹⁵; Spearman's ρ=-0.59, p=1.13 × 10⁻¹³.
367

Discussion

Our initial motivation for this study was to explain the source of the enormous cell size and
morphological diversity specific to neurons. Here we refute our initial hypothesis that the enormous
evolutionary diversity in neuronal cell size (and therefore density) is due to higher variability in
neuron-specific DNA sequences (protein-coding or regulatory) accumulated from mutations in
molecular evolution, compared to other cell types. Although it has long been established that
differences in protein-coding DNA sequences cannot explain all the morphological differences
cross-species[45], changes in gene expression and regulation are believed to be major players in
establishing a species' biological uniqueness[46]. However, we find evidence that, across vertebrate
species, both neuron-specific coding sequences and cis-regulatory sequences are remarkably
more conserved than their endothelial cell- and glial cell-specific counterparts, a higher
conservation that cannot be explained simply by higher levels of expression, contrary to what has
been suggested for protein-coding genes in yeast[12,13]. Our findings go beyond an earlier discovery
that brain-specific genes as a whole are highly conserved[10] by showing that it is specifically the
neuron-specific sequences that admit very little evolutionary variation, showing as much
conservation as ATPases, the benchmark for evolutionary conservation[33]. Importantly, our findings
are reproducible across four methods of defining cell type-specific gene expression in brain cells
that range from quantifying gene expression levels in cells isolated by immunopanning to
unsupervised clustering of single cell RNA expression, despite the imperfect alignment across

methods, as shown in the Venn diagram in **Supplementary Figure S4**. Additionally, we show that
the distinctly higher conservation of neuron-specific coding sequences over glial-specific coding
sequences occurred in parallel in both reptilian (including birds) and mammalian brain evolution,
which implies that fundamental constraints to variation of neuron-specific sequences have been at
work across more than 300 million years of evolution[47]. Outside the nervous system, we only find
similarly low dN/dS values of genes expressed specifically in other tissues with excitable cells (heart
and musculature; **Figure 3** and **Table 2**). Interestingly, we finding that the most conserved neuron-
specific genes are enriched in transport-related and signal transduction-related GOs, categories
that include genes involved in mediating neuronal excitability, such as ionic channels and
metabotropic receptors (**Supplementary Table S9**). We thus hypothesize that molecular pathways
associated with electrical excitability events, such as action potentials and membrane
repolarization, are particularly sensitive to disruptions that can lead to excitotoxic cell death (for
example, calcium overload from prolonged opening of voltage-gated calcium channels leading to
mitochondrial release of cytochrome c, triggering the cell death pathway[48]). We postulate that, in
the nervous system, this sensitivity strongly restricts the universe of possible functional
configurations of those genes expressed specifically in neurons, but not in the other, non-excitable
cells that compose brain tissue.

Our results have the important implication that the enormous morphological and functional
diversity of neurons within and across mammalian brains arises in a context of strong regulatory
and coding sequence conservation. Thus, unless post-transcriptional and/or post-translational
mechanisms is responsible for neuronal cell volumes that are at least 500 times more variable than
non-neuronal cell volume in adults[3], or these are due to evolutionary variation in a very particular
subset of genes, both cross-species and within-brain differences in neuronal size must arise
through self-organizing mechanisms that build on cell-intrinsic variations in levels of gene
expression.

However it happens, one expected requirement for the development and evolution of larger
neuronal cell sizes is higher energy use, simply because of the larger volume of biosynthesis that
builds larger dendritic arbors, axons, and neuronal cell bodies[49]. In neurons, the total energy costs
of cell function are compounded by the inflating energetic cost of individual action potentials as
neurons become larger, due to the larger membrane capacitance and ATP used to reestablish
membrane potential, and further compounded by increased numbers of synapses – unless levels
of activity can undergo compensatory regulation[43,50]. Importantly, we have recently demonstrated
that brain energetics is constrained by a limited energy supply from blood flow that depends on
capillary density in the brain[42,51], such that oxygen delivery rates have very little room to increase
even with an increase in blood flow to local tissue due to oxygen diffusivity from the capillary to

brain tissues negatively correlating to blood flow[42]. As a result, neurons within a territory supplied
by the same capillary and astrocyte share the same limiting energy and oxygen supply.

It is in the context of such a limiting energy supply extending to the developing brain that we
propose that diversity in neuronal cell size arises from the imposed balance between excitability
(firing activity) and cell growth. Specifically, we hypothesize that in a scenario where neuronal
excitation is energetically costly[43] and the metabolic rate of the developing brain is also supply-
limited, there should be a trade-off between neuronal firing rates and growing cell size, such that
neurons with lower firing rates (for instance due to varying firing rate set points, which are
characteristic of each neuron through mechanisms yet to be specified[52,53]) would be the ones to
have more energy available for cell growth and thus attain larger adult cell sizes. We further
propose that differences in combinatorial gene expression across individual neurons in early
development[6] directly modulate neuronal excitability and indirectly affect the maximal cell size that
a neuron can attain given a limiting blood supply. Such a central role of excitability in self-regulating
neuronal cell size would solve the seeming paradox of how come neurons are the only single-
nucleus cell type that occurs in a wide range of cell sizes within individuals, when all cells share the
same genome (that is, other than variation from aneuploidies[54]).

Finally, we speculate that species- and clade-specific supply-limited energetics of the
developing nervous system during those stages when neurons are in the process of establishing
their adult cell sizes links together cell size variation in development and in evolution. For instance,
any factors that modulate the blood supply to the uterus during gestation might impact the rate at
which energy is supplied to the embryo, and thus allow for a larger range of adult neuronal cell
sizes to be attained through the self-regulation of neuronal cell size proposed above. What we
propose is thus a testable mechanism of self-regulation of neuronal cell size that solves the
seeming paradox of high variability in neuronal cell size in the presence of extreme conservation
of neuron-specific sequences.

To summarize, we propose that it is excitability that allows neurons to be uniquely variable in
their cell size amongst single-nucleated cells. Neurons are continuously and rapidly excitable
thanks to their ability to regenerate the resting membrane potential, without which cells would die[55].
The fact that only neurons can dynamically vary their activity and thus the rate of energy use is, we
propose, what sets neurons apart from other cells in the body in their enormous elasticity in
neuronal cell volume (soma and all neurites included). Regulation of neuronal cell size through
electrical excitability would also explain the surprisingly extreme level of conservation of neuron-
specific genes, which we show to be on par with the highly conserved ATPase genes. We submit
that viability under conditions of fast and relentless excitability is restricted to cells that express only
very particular protein sequences, and most evolutionary tampering with them is swiftly met with
cell death.

Materials and Methods

Definition of cell-type-specific genes

Cell type-specific genes were selected based on gene expression levels in different cell types

in the brain according to each of four different studies, configuring four datasets that we examined

to test for congruity in our results. First, we used data from a mouse brain cell type enrichment

study from the Ben Barres lab (*Zhang et al., 2014*)[20] with expression levels in FPKM for 22,458

genes in neurons; astrocytes; oligodendrocytes in three states (precursor cell, newly formed,

myelinating); microglia; and endothelial cells.[*] For the purpose of this study, we averaged the

expression level of cells in all three oligodendrocytic states and used the mean FPKM as the

expression level for oligodendrocytes. We arbitrarily defined as cell type-specific genes those

genes with expression levels in one brain cell type greater than the sum of expression levels in the

other four cell types. For example, if a gene's expression level in neurons is greater than the sum

of its expression level in astrocytes, microglia, oligodendrocytes, and endothelial cells, we

considered this gene to be a neuron-specific gene in the mouse brain. We repeated the same

process to determine astrocyte-, oligodendrocyte-, microglia- and endothelial cell-specific genes.

We then averaged the FPKM values in astrocytes, oligodendrocytes, and microglial cells and used

that value as the expression level in glial cells as a whole. Effectively, that means that for the five-

cell-types (NEAMO) analysis we use a threshold of four times the average expression level across

four other cell types. We then identified glial cell-specific genes as genes with expression levels in

glial cells greater than four times its average expression level in neurons and endothelial cells,

arithmetically similar to our threshold for the five-cell-types analysis. Therefore, cell type-specific

genes identified with the Barres dataset are exclusive, meaning that neuronal-, glial-, and

endothelial cell-specific genes are non-overlapping. Alternatively, using the same database, we

identified cell type-expressed genes, are protein-coding genes with their expression level (FPKM)

in one cell type greater than 1, whatever their expression level in other cell types.

Three additional scRNA-seq studies were used to select cell type-specific genes to test the

generalizability and robustness of our results. The first, a study from the Linnarsson group on the

somatosensory cortex and hippocampal CA1 in P21-P31 mice of both sexes, *Zeisel et al.,* 2015,

which has nine major cell types after clustering, provided lists of cell type-specific genes for each

cell type in their supplement[21]. This study selected cell type-specific genes based on two criteria:

1) the gene was enriched with 99.9% posterior probability in that cell type and 2) the gene is not

enriched in any other cell type. To make this analysis comparable to our analysis with the Barres

data, we merged the nine cell types into three cell types: neurons (originally CA1 pyramidal

---

[*] The original data portal https://web.stanford.edu/group/barres_lab/brain_rnaseq.html is no longer
accessible, and the interactive portal was transferred to a new site http://www.brainrnaseq.org/.

neurons, S1 pyramidal neurons, and interneurons), glial cells (originally oligodendrocytes,
astrocytes, microglial cells, and ependymal cells), and capillary cells (originally endothelial cells
and mural cells) and did three-group analyses. Like the neurons, the mural cells are also excitable
cells[56,57], including vascular smooth muscle cells and pericytes[21] that regulate the rate of blood
flow[58]. As single-cell expression level values for *Zeisel et al., 2015* were not disclosed in the dataset,
we could not include a regression analysis between dN/dS and FPKM or UMI count for it as we did
for other studies in **Figure 6**.

The Linnarsson group later published a more comprehensive scRNA-seq dataset of the entire
mouse nervous system, including not only the CNS but also the PNS and the enteric nervous
system (*Zeisel et al., 2018*)[22]. After dimensionality reduction through manifold learning and
clustering, they generated a curated classification of cells in the mouse nervous system, with 265
clusters in total. These clusters were automatically assigned to one of seven major classes, namely
neurons, oligodendrocytes, astrocytes, ependymal cells, peripheral glia, immune cells, and
vascular cells. We accessed expression level (UMI counts) and additional meta-data of all 265 cell
clusters through a multidimensional matrix in loom format[†]. One data layer that *Zeisel et al., 2018*
provided is a "trinary score" which indicates whether a gene can be confidently categorized as
expressed in a specific cluster. We used a 0.999 trinary score cut-off to define cell type-specific
genes. For CNS neuronal, CNS glial, and CNS endothelial cell-specific genes, if a gene has a
"trinary score" greater or equal to 0.999 in at least one cluster under the umbrella cell type, but not
in any cluster under the other two umbrella cell types, it is defined as cell type-specific. To make
this three-cell-type analysis comparable to our analysis using the Barres database, we included
microglial clusters as glial clusters. With the same 0.999 trinary score threshold, we also defined
cell type-specific genes on umbrella clusters defined for the entire nervous system (i.e., not just
CNS) by *Zeisel et al., 2018*, recorded as Rank 1 Taxonomy in their metadata labeling. In this case,
we use the Linnarsson criterion and clustered microglial clusters into the immune cell group.

The third scRNA-seq dataset (and the fourth RNA-seq study) we used was a study from the
McCarroll group (*Saunders et al., 2018*)[23], which developed the Drop-seq sequencing method, that
collected ~700,000 single cells in nine regions of the adult mouse brain and clustered them into
565 clusters (referred to as "metacells") that are transcriptionally distinct[‡]. The "metacells" can be

---

[†] The aggregated loom file can be downloaded from https://storage.googleapis.com/linnarsson-lab-loom/l5_all.agg.loom. The data portal can be accessed at http://mousebrain.org/. This file type can be processed with the loompy python package developed the Linnarsson group: https://linnarssonlab.org/loompy/.
[‡] Data retrieved from stable data portal http://dropviz.org/. Aggregate UMI counts in https://storage.googleapis.com/dropviz-downloads/static/metacells.BrainCellAtlas_Saunders_version_2018.04.01.csv. Annotations for the 565 clusters in https://storage.googleapis.com/dropviz-downloads/static/annotation.BrainCellAtlas_Saunders_version_2018.04.01.xlsx.

categorized into three master classes: neurons, glial cells, or vascular cells. For each "metacell",

we calculated an "expression percentage" by dividing each gene's aggregate UMI counts by the

total UMI counts in that "metacell". We then define cell type-specific genes as genes with more than

0.1% of the total expression of metacells annotated to be in that cell type that at the same time

have the expression percentage value greater than four times the average expression percentage

in other cell types.

Benchmark Genes

ATPase genes, housekeeping genes, immune genes, and MHC genes were used as

benchmarks in this study. Human "ATPase genes" used were retrieved from the HUGO Gene

Nomenclature Committee database[59][§]; mouse, rat, and chicken ATPase genes are orthologs of

the human genes. "Housekeeping genes" used were human housekeeping genes[60][**] or mouse,

rat, and chicken orthologs of these genes for the other three reference genome. "Immune genes"

were mouse or human genes associated with GO:0045087 (innate immune response), selected

from the InnateDB database[61][††]; rat and chicken immune genes were retrieved from RGD[62] and

Ensembl 98[25], respectively. For the mouse and human reference genomes, "MHC genes" were

retrieved from the literature[63]; for the rat and chicken reference genomes, "MHC genes" were

genes associated with the GO term MHC protein complex from the RGD database or from

Ensembl 98, respectively.

We defined liver-, kidney- (metanephros-), lung-, skin-, brain-, heart-, pancreas-, and

musculature-specific genes as genes with expression recorded only in that organ and no other

organ in the MGI mouse gene expression database (GXD)[37].

The dN/dS Ratios

Pairwise dN/dS ratios of the genes of interest for each of 92 mammalian species (excluding

the reference species) using as reference the mouse (GRCm38.p6) or human (GRCh38.p13) or

rat (Rnor 6.0) genome and were calculated from dN and dS values retrieved from the Ensembl 98

database[25][‡‡]. A similar procedure was used for the genes of interest expressed in each of 31

sauropsidian (including birds) species using the chicken reference genome (GRCg6a) as

---

[§] Human ATPase gene names from the HGNC portal at
https://www.genenames.org/data/genegroup/#!/group/412. Mouse orthologs matched to human ATPase
genes with the online BioMart GUI of Ensembl 98; same for mouse orthologs of other human genes below.
[**] Retrieved from the stable link: https://www.tau.ac.il/~elieis/HKG/.
[††] Retrieved from the stable link: https://www.innatedb.com/annotatedGenes.do?type=innatedb.
[‡‡] We access the Ensembl data with a custom bash script that loop through available species with XML
BioMart RESTful access. This data can also be accessed through the online BioMart GUI
(https://useast.ensembl.org/biomart/martview). Older versions of Ensembl are now archived. To access
version 98 used in this study, go to http://sep2019.archive.ensembl.org/index.html.

548   reference. Orthologues that are not one-to-one orthologues across pairs of species were filtered

549   out for that target species.

Gene Ontology

Gene Ontology (GO) slim terms associated with each gene of interest are biological

processing slim ontology terms restricted to the mouse species. The genes mapped to each GO

slim term were retrieved from the Princeton University Lewis-Sigler Institute for Integrative

Genomics' Generic GO Term Mapper[38,§§]. The ontology aspects selected were "biological

processing" and restricted to the species *Mus musculus* (MGI). Additional ontology terms

"regulation of cell size", "regulation of membrane potential", "membrane depolarization",

"membrane hyperpolarization", and "membrane repolarization", which are not included in the slim

terms, were also added on top of the slim terms because of our interest in cell size regulation and

potential roles of unique properties of neurons. The list of genes belonging to each GO term can

be found in **Supplementary Data S2**.

Regulatory Elements' PhastCons Scores

"Promoter sequences" of cell type-specific genes were defined as the 2,000 base pairs of

DNA upstream of each coding sequence in the mouse or chicken genome. Coordinates of these

promoters on the autosomes, sex chromosomes, or mitochondria genome were calculated based

on the coordinates of the coding sequence on the mouse or chicken genome, and whether the

gene is on the positive or negative strand. We downloaded bigWig files for both

phastCons60way[***] (from a mammal-rich vertebrate multiple alignment centered around the

mouse genome) and phastCons77way[†††] (from a sauropsid-rich multiple alignment centered

around the chicken genome), which contain the phastCons scores for all available loci on the

mouse and chicken genome. We then fed the start and end position of the promoters and the

bigWig files to the Unix executable program bigWigSummary[64] to estimate the average

phastCons scores of each promoter, and proceeded to filter out entries with less than 80%

phastCons coverage for quality control. These phastCons scores may also be retrieved with the

UCSC Genome Browser's Table Browser utility[29]. For the list of species included in the two

multiple alignments, see **Supplementary Data S1**.

The coordinates for neuronal and non-neuronal candidate cis-regulatory sequences were

defined based on a chromatin accessibility study on the mouse cerebrum using single nucleus

ATAC-seq[31]. Neuronal cis-regulatory DNA elements are those associated with both GABAergic

---

[§§] Access at https://go.princeton.edu/cgi-bin/GOTermMapper on October 13th, 2019.
[***] Stable link at: http://hgdownload.cse.ucsc.edu/goldenpath/mm10/phastCons60way/.
[†††] Stable link at: https://hgdownload.soe.ucsc.edu/goldenPath/galGal6/phastCons77way/.

and glutamatergic neurons but not non-neuronal cells; non-neuronal cis-regulatory DNA elements
are those associated with non-neuronal cell types but not associated with any of the neuronal cell
types. The coordinates of these cis-regulatory elements and the mouse-centered
phastCons60way bigwig file were similarly fed to bigWigSummary for calculating the average
phastCons scores of each element. After filtering out cis-regulatory DNA elements with less than
80% coverage of phastCons scores for quality control, we analyzed the phastCons of a resulting
131,482 neuronal cis-regulatory DNA elements and 37,774 non-neuronal cis-regulatory DNA
elements.

Single Cell Electrophysiology and Morphology Data
Neuronal cell volume and representative firing rate are calculated based on the Allen Brain
Atlas Cell Type Database[44]. Data from 156 cerebral cortical neurons from 35 human subjects that
had both morphology reconstructions and electrophysiology recordings are publicly available,
which we accessed through the Allen SDK[65] with our custom Python scripts. Of the 156 human
neurons, 131 has a valid "representative sweep" (see below). The human cortex database
consists of both inhibitory (with dendrite type "aspiny") and excitatory neurons (with dendrite type
"sparsely spiny" or "spiny"), but predominantly the latter. The mouse counterpart of the dataset
consists almost exclusively of inhibitory neurons and for this reason is not included in this study.
From the downloaded SWC files denoting the morphology of each cell, we calculated whole
cell volumes (soma and all dendritic and axonal arbors in the volume) with the Python package
"neuron_morphology", which assumes that each compartment is a conic frustum[‡‡‡]. Dendritic
spines are not included in original morphological models and therefore are not included in our
volume estimates.
For those cells that had morphological reconstructions in the database, we retrieved and
studied the quality-controlled current clamp recordings. For each neuron, we first identified the
rheobase (the lowest long-square stimulus amplitude at which a cell starts to have spikes) from
the cell electrophysiology metadata. We then used the Allen criterion of selecting the current
clamp recording with stimulus amplitude 40 to 60 pA above rheobase to select a representative
long-square sweep for each neuron. This gave us 131 human cortical neurons with a qualified
representative sweep (32 inhibitory neurons and 99 excitatory neurons). We then calculated the

---

[‡‡‡] The pre-calculated volume included in the cell metadata was estimated with L-Measure, which assumes each component to be a cylinder. Since the SWC files include the radius at each node, we reasoned that the conic frustum-based volume estimation would better capture each neuron's volume in 3D space.

firing rate as the number of spikes during the 1-second stimulation interval for that representative

sweep for each cell[§§§].

Statistical Analysis and the Sharing of Reproducible Codes

We conducted all statistical analyses with custom Python scripts, which are publicly available

at https://github.com/VeritatemAmo/neuron-glia-dNdS together with all codes and data needed for

replicating this study.

Because dN/dS are log-normally distributed, we chose to use a median-based description of

dN/dS values. Confidence intervals are based on ranked dN/dS values of each gene group. A

binomial interval was first fitted to the number of genes with the Python SciPy package's

"stats.binom.interval" package, with alpha set to 0.95. After ranking the genes in each group

based on dN/dS value, the genes at the low and high interval threshold of each group are set as

the lower and higher bound of the confidence interval.

Mann Whitney U tests were performed with the "mwu" function of the pingouin package or

"stats.mannwhitneyu" function of the SciPy package. The p-values that these packages return are

in the float64 double-precision floating-point format. This means the smallest positive number that

can be represented is $4.9406564584124654 \times 10^{-324}$. Therefore, when we get a p-value of "0.0"

from these packages, we report it as $p < 5 \times 10^{-324}$ in this paper. We try to include a common

language effect size (CLES) to assist our readers in understanding the result whenever possible,

but with the huge amount of entries for all 92 species pairwise dN/dS ratios (i.e., when we use

raw pairwise dN/dS ratios instead of dN/dS ratios average across the 92 mammalian species),

that calculation of CLES exceed our computational capability, and the standard U statistics were

reported instead in **Supplementary Table S2**.

For contingency analyses, we developed a custom statistical and visualization analysis

pipeline. Essentially, we generated a crosstable with the Python crosstab function from the

pandas library between a cell type and a gene ontology. Then, with the SciPy library, odds ratios

were calculated with the "fisher_exact" function, and χ^2 values and p values were generated using

the "chi2_contingency" function. The contingency table between each GO term and the genes

with the lowest or highest 25% dN/dS ratios, along with distribution plots of cell type-specific

genes that belong to each GO term, are included in **Supplementary Data S3** and

Supplementary Table S9.

Before running linear regression analyses, we first confirmed the normality of the distribution

of log-transformed phastCons and dN/dS values with Q-Q plots. We then ran a least square

---

[§§§] The pre-calculated firing rate in the Allen electrophysiology metadata is the inverse of inter-spike interval, which yields artificially high firing rates for bursting neurons. Because we are interested in estimating energetic cost of firing over longer time intervals, we calculated firing rates as indicated instead.

linear regression of log-transformed phastCons and dN/dS scores of cell-type-specific genes.

Since zero values cannot be log-transformed, they were excluded from the linear regression.

Acknowledgments

We thank Profs. John A Capra (now at UCSF) and Jon H Kaas for in-person advice and the

Vanderbilt University's Advanced Computing Center for Research and Education (ACCRE) for

technical support. We thank Drs. Nathan Gouwens and Jeremy Miller at the Allen Brain Institute

for assistance in using their dataset. We thank Prof. Arpiar Saunders for assisting our

understanding and providing further information about their DropViz data. We thank Prof. Amit

Zeisel for helping us interpret the trinary scores reported in their 2018 paper. We thank Prof. Ye

Zhang for directing us to the new data portal of the Barres dataset. This work was supported

exclusively by Vanderbilt University start-up funds to SHH.

Competing Interest Statement: The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

References

1.   Savage, V. M. *et al.* Scaling of number, size, and metabolic rate of cells with body size in

mammals. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **104**, 4718–4723 (2007).

2.   Schmidt-Nielsen, K. *Scaling: why is animal size so important?* (Cambridge University Press,

1984).

3.   Mota, B. & Herculano-Houzel, S. All brains are made of this: a fundamental building block of

brain matter with matching neuronal and glial masses. *Front. Neuroanat.* **8**, 127 (2014).

4.   Bakken, T. E. *et al.* Comparative cellular analysis of motor cortex in human, marmoset and

mouse. *Nature* **598**, 111–119 (2021).

5.   BRAIN Initiative Cell Census Network (BICCN). A multimodal cell census and atlas of the

mammalian primary motor cortex. *Nat. 2021 5987879* **598**, 86–102 (2021).

6.   Yuste, R. *et al.* A community-based transcriptomics classification and nomenclature of

neocortical cell types. *Nat. Neurosci.* **23**, 1456–1468 (2020).

7.   Kriegstein, A. & Alvarez-Buylla, A. The Glial Nature of Embryonic and Adult Neural Stem

Cells. *Annu. Rev. Neurosci.* **32**, 149–184 (2009).

8.   Herculano-Houzel, S. The glia/neuron ratio: How it varies uniformly across brain structures

and species and what that means for brain physiology and evolution. *GLIA* **62**, 1377–1391

(2014).

9.   Herculano-Houzel, S. & Dos Santos, S. You Do Not Mess with the Glia. *Neuroglia* **1**, 193–219

(2018).

10.   Biswas, K., Chakraborty, S., Podder, S. & Ghosh, T. C. Insights into the dN/dS ratio

heterogeneity between brain specific genes and widely expressed genes in species of

different complexity. *Genomics* **108**, 11–17 (2016).

11. Hu, G., Li, J. & Wang, G. Z. Significant Evolutionary Constraints on Neuron Cells Revealed by

Single-Cell Transcriptomics. *Genome Biol. Evol.* **12**, 300–308 (2020).

12. Drummond, D. A., Raval, A. & Wilke, C. O. A Single Determinant Dominates the Rate of Yeast

Protein Evolution. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* **23**, 327–337 (2006).

13. Pál, C., Papp, B. & Hurst, L. D. Highly Expressed Genes in Yeast Evolve Slowly. *Genetics* **158**,

927–931 (2001).

14. Tuller, T., Kupiec, M. & Ruppin, E. Evolutionary rate and gene expression across different

brain regions. *Genome Biol.* **9**, 1–11 (2008).

15. Pembroke, W. G., Hartl, C. L. & Geschwind, D. H. Evolutionary conservation and divergence

of the human brain transcriptome. *Genome Biol.* **22**, 1–33 (2021).

16. Herculano-Houzel, S. Theropod dinosaurs had primate-like numbers of telencephalic

neurons. *J. Comp. Neurol.* **531**, 962–974 (2023).

17. Olkowicz, S. *et al.* Birds have primate-like numbers of neurons in the forebrain. *Proc. Natl.*

Acad. Sci. U. S. A. **113**, 7255–7260 (2016).

18. Azevedo, F. A. C. *et al.* Equal numbers of neuronal and nonneuronal cells make the human

brain an isometrically scaled-up primate brain. *J. Comp. Neurol.* **513**, 532–541 (2009).

19. Herculano-Houzel, S., Catania, K., Manger, P. R. & Kaas, J. H. Mammalian Brains Are Made of

These: A Dataset of the Numbers and Densities of Neuronal and Nonneuronal Cells in the

Brain of Glires, Primates, Scandentia, Eulipotyphlans, Afrotherians and Artiodactyls, and

Their Relationship with Body Mass. *Brain. Behav. Evol.* **86**, 145–163 (2015).

20. Zhang, Y. *et al.* An RNA-Sequencing Transcriptome and Splicing Database of Glia, Neurons,

and Vascular Cells of the Cerebral Cortex. *J. Neurosci.* **34**, 11929–11947 (2014).

21. Zeisel, A. *et al.* Cell types in the mouse cortex and hippocampus revealed by single-cell RNA-

seq. *Science* **347**, 1138–1142 (2015).

22. Zeisel, A. *et al.* Molecular Architecture of the Mouse Nervous System. *Cell* **174**, 999-

1014.e22 (2018).

23. Saunders, A. *et al.* Molecular Diversity and Specializations among the Cells of the Adult

Mouse Brain. *Cell* **174**, 1015-1030.e16 (2018).

24. Yang, Z. PAML: a program package for phylogenetic analysis by maximum likelihood.

Bioinformatics **13**, 555–556 (1997).

25. Cunningham, F. *et al.* Ensembl 2019. *Nucleic Acids Res.* **47**, D745–D751 (2019).

26. An, J. Y. *et al.* Genome-wide de novo risk score implicates promoter variation in autism

spectrum disorder. *Science* **362**, eaat6576 (2018).

27. Shi, W. & Zhou, W. Frequency distribution of TATA Box and extension sequences on human

promoters. *BMC Bioinformatics* **7**, S2 (2006).

28. Kent, W. J. *et al.* The human genome browser at UCSC. *Genome Res.* **12**, 996–1006 (2002).

29. Karolchik, D. *et al.* The UCSC table browser data retrieval tool. *Nucleic Acids Res.* **32**, D493–

D496 (2004).

30. Siepel, A. *et al.* Evolutionarily conserved elements in vertebrate, insect, worm, and yeast

genomes. *Genome Res.* **15**, 1034–1050 (2005).

31. Li, Y. E. *et al.* An atlas of gene regulatory elements in adult mouse cerebrum. *Nature* **598**,

129–136 (2021).

32. Hofmann, H., Wickham, H. & Kafadar, K. Letter-Value Plots: Boxplots for Large Data. *J.*

Comput. Graph. Stat. **26**, 469–477 (2017).

33. Gogarten, J. P. & Taiz, L. Evolution of proton pumping ATPases: Rooting the tree of life.

Photosynth. Res. **33**, 137–146 (1992).

34. Zhang, L. & Li, W. H. Mammalian Housekeeping Genes Evolve More Slowly than Tissue-

Specific Genes. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* **21**, 236–239 (2004).

35. Shultz, A. J. & Sackton, T. B. Immune genes are hotspots of shared positive selection across

birds and mammals. *eLife* **8**, (2019).

36. Piertney, S. B. & Oliver, M. K. The evolutionary ecology of the major histocompatibility

complex. *Heredity* **96**, 7–21 (2006).

37. Smith, C. M. *et al.* The mouse Gene Expression Database (GXD): 2019 update. *Nucleic Acids*

Res. **47**, D774–D779 (2019).

38. Boyle, E. I. *et al.* GO::TermFinder--open source software for accessing Gene Ontology

information and finding significantly enriched Gene Ontology terms associated with a list of

genes. *Bioinformatics* **20**, 3710–3715 (2004).

39. Rio-Hortega, P. The Microglia. *The Lancet* **233**, 1023–1026 (1939).

40. McKenzie, A. T. *et al.* Brain Cell Type Specific Gene Expression and Co-expression Network

Architectures. *Sci. Rep.* **8**, 8868 (2018).

41. Kosiol, C. *et al.* Patterns of positive selection in six mammalian genomes. *PLoS Genet.* **4**,

(2008).

42. Herculano-Houzel, S. & Rothman, D. L. From a Demand-Based to a Supply-Limited

Framework of Brain Metabolism. *Front. Integr. Neurosci.* **16**, 7 (2022).

43. Attwell, D. & Laughlin, S. B. An energy budget for signaling in the grey matter of the brain. *J.*

Cereb. Blood Flow Metab. **21**, 1133–1145 (2001).

44. Allen Institute for Brain Science. Allen Cell Types Database. celltypes.brain-map.org (2015).

45. King, M. C. & Wilson, A. C. Evolution at two levels in humans and chimpanzees. *Science* **188**,

107–116 (1975).

46. Sholtis, S. J. & Noonan, J. P. Gene regulation and the origins of human biological uniqueness.

Trends Genet. **26**, 110–118 (2010).

47. Kemp, T. S. Evolution of the mammal-like reptiles. in *The Origin and Evolution of Mammals*

(Oxford University Press, 2005).

48. Orrenius, S., Zhivotovsky, B. & Nicotera, P. Regulation of cell death: the calcium–apoptosis

link. *Nat. Rev. Mol. Cell Biol.* **4**, 552–565 (2003).

49. Lane, N. How energy flow shapes cell evolution. *Curr. Biol.* **30**, R471–R476 (2020).

50. Herculano-Houzel, S. Scaling of brain metabolism with a fixed energy budget per neuron:

Implications for neuronal activity, plasticity and evolution. *PLoS ONE* **6**, e17514 (2011).

51. Ventura-Antunes, aLissa & Herculano-Houzel, S. Energy supply per neuron is constrained by

capillary density in the mouse brain. *Front. Integr. Neurosci.* **16**, (2022).

52. Turrigiano, G. G. & Nelson, S. B. Homeostatic plasticity in the developing nervous system.

Nat. Rev. Neurosci. **5**, 97–107 (2004).

53. Tyssowski, K. M. *et al.* Firing Rate Homeostasis Can Occur in the Absence of Neuronal

Activity-Regulated Transcription. *J. Neurosci.* **39**, 9885–9899 (2019).

54. Rehen, S. K. *et al.* Constitutional aneuploidy in the normal human brain. *J. Neurosci.* **25**,

2176–2180 (2005).

55. Lane, N. & Martin, W. F. The origin of membrane bioenergetics. *Cell* **151**, 1406–1416 (2012).

56. Burdyga, T. & Borysova, L. Calcium signalling in pericytes. *J. Vasc. Res.* **51**, 190–199 (2014).

57. Kamouchi, M. *et al.* Calcium influx pathways in rat CNS pericytes. *Mol. Brain Res.* **126**, 114–

120 (2004).

58. Hartmann, D. A. *et al.* Brain capillary pericytes exert a substantial but slow influence on

blood flow. *Nat. Neurosci. 2021 245* **24**, 633–645 (2021).

59. Yates, B. *et al.* Genenames.org: The HGNC and VGNC resources in 2017. *Nucleic Acids Res.*

45, D619–D625 (2017).

60. Eisenberg, E. & Levanon, E. Y. Human housekeeping genes, revisited. *Trends Genet.* **29**, 569–

574 (2013).

61. Breuer, K. *et al.* InnateDB: Systems biology of innate immunity and beyond - Recent updates

and continuing curation. *Nucleic Acids Res.* **41**, D1228–D1233 (2013).

62. Smith, J. R. *et al.* The Year of the Rat: The Rat Genome Database at 20: a multi-species

knowledgebase and analysis platform. *Nucleic Acids Res.* **48**, D731–D742 (2020).

63. Shiina, T., Blancher, A., Inoko, H. & Kulski, J. K. Comparative genomics of the human,

macaque and mouse major histocompatibility complex. *Immunology* **150**, 127–138 (2017).

64. Harris, R. S. Improved pairwise alignment of genomic DNA. (PennState, 2007).

65. Allen Institute for Brain Science. Allen SDK. allensdk.readthedocs.io (2015).