FX-Cell: Quantitative cell release from fixed plant tissues for single-cell

genomics

D. Blaine Marchant[a,†], Brad Nelms[a,b,†], Virginia Walbot[a]

Corresponding authors. Email: danielm1@stanford.edu (DBM); nelms@uga.edu (BN);

walbot@stanford.edu (VW)

[a]Department of Biology, Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305, USA

Footnotes

[b]Current address: Department of Plant Biology, University of Georgia, Athens, GA 30602

[†]DBM and BN contributed equally to this work

Short title: FX-Cell for plant scRNA-seq
15

ABSTRACT

Single-cell RNA-sequencing (scRNA-seq) can provide invaluable insight into cell development,

cell type identification, and plant evolution. However, the resilience of the cell wall makes it

difficult to dissociate plant tissues and release individual cells for single-cell analysis. Here, we

show that plant organs can be rapidly and quantitatively dissociated into cells if fixed prior to

enzymatic digestion. Fixation enables digestion at high temperatures at which enzymatic activity

is optimal and stabilizes the plant cell cytoplasm, rendering cells resistant to mechanical shear

force while maintaining high quality RNA. This protocol, FX-Cell, releases four to ten-fold

more recoverable cells than optimized protoplasting methods applied to maize anthers or root

tips with no cell type biases and can be readily applied to a variety of plant taxa and tissues with

no optimization. FX-Cell and scRNA-seq analysis were applied to maize anthers for which 95%

of the cells were dispersed and provided suitable scRNA-seq data for the identification of anther

cell types with marker genes and well-understood biological functions, including rare meiocytes

(~1% anther cells). In addition, the scRNA-seq data provided putative marker genes and gene

ontology information for the identification of unknown cell types. FX-Cell also preserves the

morphology of the isolated cells, permitting cell type identification without staining. Ultimately,

FX-Cell can be applied to a range of plant species and tissues with minimal to no optimization

paving the way for plant scRNA-seq analyses in non-model taxa and tissues.

INTRODUCTION

The cell holds the genetic blueprint of an organism, yet neighboring cells can differ dramatically

in morphology and function. Understanding the gene expression patterns that lead to these

differences can provide profound insight into the role, developmental trajectory, and evolution of

cell types, tissues, and even organisms. Single-cell RNA sequencing (scRNA-seq) has catalyzed

our understanding of animal cells leading to major breakthroughs in cell biology (Han *et al.*,

2020), medicine (Lim *et al.*, 2020; Paik *et al.*, 2020), and evolution (Kanton *et al.*, 2019);

however, the usage of scRNA-seq in plants has been hampered largely by the presence of the cell

wall, which complicates the separation and isolation of single cells (Seyfferth *et al.*, 2021).

Plant biologists have largely overcome this hurdle by enzymatically digesting, or

protoplasting, the wall of living plant cells (Nelms and Walbot, 2019; Zhang *et al.*, 2019; Liu *et*

al., 2021; Lopez-Anido *et al.*, 2021; Denyer *et al.*, 2019). Lacking the cell wall, protoplasts rely

on the turgor pressure against the cell membrane for stability making them highly susceptible to

bursting via mechanical force or osmotic stress. Generally, protoplasting has been rate-limiting

in implementing scRNA-seq as the needed enzymes, enzyme concentrations, digestion time, and

digestion conditions vary depending on the species and tissue under investigation. Inadequate

protoplasting can result in cell type biases, cell clumps, cell debris, mRNA leakage, or cell lysis,

all of which will interfere with the downstream processing needed for scRNA-seq. Even with an

optimized protocol, protoplasts are extremely fragile and can have ectopic expression patterns as

a result of the lengthy digestion treatment (Denyer *et al.*, 2019).

In response to these limitations, one solution has been implementing single nucleus

RNA-sequencing (snRNA-seq) in which plant cells are lysed to release the intact nuclei (Conde

et al., 2021; Sunaga-Franze *et al.*, 2021). The nuclei are then isolated and the total nuclear RNA

can be reverse transcribed and sequenced. Although snRNA-seq has the benefit of avoiding cell

protoplast preparation, nuclear RNA rather than mainly cytoplasmic mRNA is sequenced. As a

result, there is significantly less RNA per cell, less sensitive detection of rare transcripts, and an

inability to detect distinct isoforms; importantly, nuclear mRNA does not capture the dynamics

of translatable mRNAs, which accumulate in the cytoplasm and vary in abundance there over

time among different cell types (Sunaga-Franze *et al.*, 2021; Thrupp *et al.*, 2020).

While recent plant single-cell RNA-seq analyses have begun to diversify in terms of taxa

and tissues (Satterlee *et al.*, 2020; Nelms and Walbot, 2019; Nelms and Walbot, 2022; Xu *et al.*,

2021; Bezrutczyk *et al.*, 2021; Bai *et al.*, 2022; Zhang *et al.*, 2021), the majority of plant scRNA-

seq studies have focused on the root tip of *Arabidopsis thaliana* as it has relatively few cell

types, established protoplast protocols, and numerous cell type marker genes (Denyer *et al.*,

2019; Jean-Baptiste *et al.*, 2019; Ryu *et al.*, 2019; Zhang *et al.*, 2019; Shulse *et al.*, 2019). Even

in such a well-studied system, these analyses have been instrumental in establishing and refining

the spatial and temporal development of the different cell types (Denyer *et al.*, 2019; Zhang *et*

al., 2019), identifying new marker genes for rare cell types (Denyer *et al.*, 2019), and

discovering the genetic basis for mutant phenotypes (Ryu *et al.*, 2019). Expanding both the

taxonomic and tissue diversity of scRNA-seq research in plants promises to address questions

related to all realms of basic and applied plant sciences.

Here, we show that cells can be released more efficiently if plant tissues are fixed prior to

enzymatic digestion following our novel protocol, FX-Cell. Coagulant fixatives (e.g., Farmer's

Solution, Carnoy's Solution, Methacarn) stabilize cells by coagulating the protein matrix while

removing lipid membranes. We found that fixation followed by cell wall digestion provides two

key benefits for cell release: it (i) stabilizes the cell cytoplasm so that cells can withstand harsher

shear forces without breaking, and (ii) allows enzymatic digestion to occur at higher

temperatures (~50°C) where the cellulase enzymes are most active (Pardo and Forchiassin,

1999). RNA integrity is maintained by fixation, and high quality RNA can be extracted for later

analysis by scRNA-seq. We quantified the cell release of FX-Cell and that of established

protoplasting protocols in maize anthers and root tips. We also found that the FX-Cell protocol

could readily be applied to a variety of non-model plant systems and maintains cellular

morphology after cell wall digestion. This is a critical advancement over previous protoplast-

based cell isolation methods as cell morphology is often the sole means of differentiating cell

types in taxa and tissues lacking cell type marker genes. To test the genomic suitability of cells

released through FX-Cell we performed scRNA-seq on fixed maize anthers. Maize anthers

provide an ideal test system for scRNA-seq as the cell type composition of the anther,

morphology, and development of the anther cell types are well-documented (Figure 1, A-C)

(Kelliher and Walbot, 2011), yet varying degrees of background knowledge (marker genes,

biological function, developmental trajectory) exist regarding the genetic activity for each cell

type. Meiocytes account for only 1% of the cells in maize anthers, therefore, serve as an

exceptional test case for determining if this protocol can be applied to even rare cell types. We

demonstrate that FX-Cell can be broadly applied to a variety of taxa and tissues with little to no

optimization to provide high-quality scRNA-seq data, thus permitting scalable single-cell

research throughout the many study systems of plant biology.

RESULTS

Fixation increases cellular release of plant tissues

Cell isolation is perhaps the greatest technical hurdle in scRNA-seq of plant tissues. To

determine the possible benefits of fixation on cell isolation, we quantified cell release of fixed

plant cells and fresh protoplasts following optimized protocols for both maize anthers and maize

root tips. We found that an optimized maize anther protoplast protocol (Nelms and Walbot,

2019) had a mean release of 4,387 cells per anther after 90 min digestion and 11,333 cells per

anther when extended to 16 h (Figure 1D). In comparison, if anthers were fixed prior to

digestion, 15,900 cells were released within 90 min; this increase in cell release is presumably

because the cells were stabilized against mechanical lysis by fixation, while unfixed protoplasts

are very fragile. When incubation temperature was increased from 30□ (standard) to 50□ we

observed an average release of 45,033 isolated cells (Figure 1D), close to the theoretical number

of 50,000 cells in a 2.0 mm maize anther (Kelliher and Walbot, 2011). The standard

protoplasting protocol released very few epidermal and endothecial cells, both of which tended

to remain clumped and undigested, producing a skewed release favoring tapetal cells, middle

layer cells, and meiocytes. When the anthers were fixed then digested at 50□ we did not observe

any cell clumps, debris, or undigested material, suggesting that the digestion was complete

(Figure 1E). In addition to increasing the cell release efficiency and cell type representation, we

found that fixation prior to digestion maintained cells' natural morphology allowing the potential

for cell type identification post-isolation (Figure 1F).

To test the applicability of our fixation-based protocol to another optimized protoplasting

protocol of a different maize tissue, we quantified cell release from maize primary root tips after

dissociation using: (i) an established maize root tip protoplasting protocol (Ortiz-Ramírez *et al.*,

2018); (ii) our fixed-cell method with the enzyme mix from Ortiz-Ramírez et al. (2018); (iii) our

fixed-cell method with a reduced enzyme mix. Root tips digested by live tissue protoplasting

released 24,667 cells per root tip, similar to what has been reported in the literature

(Ortiz-Ramírez *et al.*, 2018). In contrast, root tips that were fixed then digested at higher

temperatures released approximately four times as many cells using both the protoplasting

enzyme mix and our reduced enzyme mix (Figure 2A). Similar to the results we found in anthers,

fixed root tips showed little evidence of cell clumps or debris after digestion, suggesting that

nearly all cells were released from the tissue (Figure 2B). Protoplasting protocols can be difficult

to establish for new tissues. For instance, Ortiz-Ramirez et al. (2018) used a complex protocol to

achieve adequate cell release from root tips, including a four-enzyme blend and pretreating live

root tissue with L-cysteine. After fixation, we obtained equivalent cell release from roots when

using the four-enzyme blend and L-cysteine pretreatment of Ortiz-Ramirez et al. (2018) or using

a simpler two-enzyme blend without any treatments (Figure 2A), suggesting the approach might

be applied to new tissues with minimal optimization.

To test this hypothesis, we quantified cell release in three additional maize tissues (apical

meristem, leaf, young ear) and four non-model plant taxa and tissues (*Amborella trichopoda* leaf,

Nymphaea colorata leaf, *Capsella bursa-pastoris* leaf and stem) using both our fixation-based,

reduced enzyme protocol and a standard protoplasting protocol (Nelms and Walbot, 2019).

Although the protoplasting protocol utilized in this experiment was originally optimized for

maize anthers, it could serve as a standard starting point for developing a novel protoplasting

protocol for new plant tissues or taxa. Cellular morphology was maintained in each fixed sample

(Extended Data Fig. 1), allowing obvious differentiation of the varying cell types. Cell release

was 10- to 364-fold higher in fixed tissues compared to fresh protoplasts, with the exception of

maize leaves in which there were 3.6 as many cells released via fresh protoplasting as by the

fixation-based protocol (Extended Data Fig. 2). Presumably, cells with large fluid filled

vacuoles, such as maize mesophyll, are very fragile after fixation due to the lack of coagulated

proteins; however, testing digestion temperatures, enzyme concentrations, and dissociation

methods may surmount even these more difficult cell types. Overall, our fixation-based protocol

readily dissociated varying tissues from a breadth of plant species into single cells with no

optimization.

RNase-depletion of enzyme is necessary for maintaining RNA quality

While fixation itself does not affect RNA quality, it removes the cell membrane and makes the

internal RNA contents accessible to RNases in solution. This creates a challenge during

enzymatic digestion because most cell wall digesting enzymes are complex mixtures that contain

substantial RNase activity. We tested several RNase inhibitors, including commercial inhibitors,

EDTA, and vanadyl ribonucleoside complexes, but found none that could effectively inhibit the

RNase activity in protoplasting enzyme blends. This is partly because many available RNase

inhibitors target the RNase A family of enzymes (MacIntosh, 2011), which is only produced in

vertebrates. Secreted fungal RNases are primarily of the T1 and T2 families (MacIntosh, 2011).

To surmount this complication, we adapted a column-based method to reduce fungal T1

and T2 RNases by binding them to agarose coupled with guanosine monophosphate (GMP)

(Fields *et al.*, 1971). We found that cell wall digesting enzymes readily passed through GMP-

agarose columns, while the contaminating RNases remained bound. After column depletion,

RNase activity was almost completely removed from the enzyme blend (Figure 2C). RNase-

depleted enzymes were stable when stored as glycerol stocks for at least a year.

RNA quality after high temperature digestion

We next tested the effect of the fixed tissue dissociation procedure on RNA quality. RNA isolated from fixed maize anthers had an average RNA Integrity Number (RIN) of 9.3 demonstrating fixation did not cause any significant decrease in RNA quality (Figure 2D). Fixed anthers digested at 50□ in a commercial enzyme blend had a RIN of 4.1 with very noticeable loss of ribosomal RNA. After fixation then digestion with RNAse-depleted enzymes, the RIN was 6.7 demonstrating the fixed tissue dissociation protocol can produce RNA of reasonable quality, although there is a decrease in RNA integrity relative to undigested tissue. When fixed anthers were incubated in enzyme buffer at 50□ without enzymes, we observed a similar RIN of 6.1. Therefore, the decrease in RNA integrity during incubation is not exogenous enzyme-dependent, rather we suspect this degradation is caused by endogenous anther RNases that survive the fixation process. Future improvements of the method may be able to inhibit residual tissue RNases.

Utilization of FX-Cell for scRNA-seq

Do single cells isolated via FX-Cell have sufficient RNA of high enough quality for scRNA-seq? We prepared four libraries of 96 maize anther cells with FX-Cell (Figure 3A). Two of the libraries were sorted and isolated using a BioSorter (Union Biometrica) and two with a Hana (Namocell). Of the 384 possible single cell samples, 307 had more than 500 UMIs and 200 genes detected after removal of cell-cycle genes. We detected an average of 5,885 UMIs and 2,016 transcribed genes per cell. The dataset was classified into four distinct clusters, two of which were subset and reclustered based on marker gene expression to produce six total clusters (Figure 3B). The total number of UMIs did not vary between the six cell clusters (Extended Data Fig. 3); furthermore, these two independent scRNA-seq experiments using different cell sorting platforms each contributed to the different clusters, indicating that the cell clustering was reproducible between replicates (Extended Data Fig. 3).

We next asked if the FX-Cell scRNA-seq data was sufficient enough to associate the cell clusters with established maize anther cell types based on known marker genes and gene expression of anther cell types isolated by laser capture micro-dissection (LCM) (Zhou *et al.*, 2022). We observed a strong correlation between the genes expressed in Cluster 6 and genes expressed in tapetal cells by LCM (Figure 3C; Extended Data Fig. 3). Cluster 6 further expressed

several male-sterility genes known to be up-regulated in the tapetum: *basic Helix-Loop-Helix 51*
(*bHLH51*), *Male-sterile 8* (*Ms8*), and *Male-sterile 44* (*Ms44*) (Nan *et al.*, 2017; Wang *et al.*,
2010; Fox *et al.*, 2017) (Figures 3, D-F; Extended Data Fig. 4). Genes expressed in Cluster 5
were highly correlated with the LCM meiocyte sample and also had strong expression of genes
known to be highly expressed in meiocytes: *Trehalose 6-Phosphate Phosphatase* (*Trps8*), *C3H*
Transcription Factor 33 (*C3H3*), and a *Small Heat Shock Protein* (*sHSP*) (Nelms and Walbot,
2019; Zhou *et al.*, 2022) (Figure 3, G-J; Extended Data Fig. 3, 4). Based on these data, we
conclude that Cluster 6 contains tapetal cells and Cluster 5 contains meiocytes.

The remaining cell clusters all showed low correlation with the LCM tapetal and
meiocyte samples but high correlation with the LCM sample data consisting of other somatic
cells (epidermis, endothecium, middle layer) (Figure 4; Extended Data Fig. 3). Beyond the
tapetum, the maize anther contains multiple different somatic cell types including middle layer,
endothecium, epidermis, connective, and vasculature. There is no expression data for these
anther cell types and so we attempted to associate the remaining clusters to cells based on
knowledge of anther cell biology. Murphy *et al.* (2015) discovered that the endothecium contains
chloroplasts unlike the other anther cell layers. We found plastid transcripts were more highly
expressed in Cluster 1 than in any other cluster (Figure 4B; Extended Data Fig. 3). Furthermore,
transcripts for the photosynthesis-associated genes identified by Murphy *et al.,* (2015) and
nuclear-encoded chloroplastic proteins (PantherDB Family #21649) (Mi *et al.*, 2021) were
selectively expressed in Cluster 1 (Figures 4, C-E; Extended Data Fig. 4). Thus, we assign
Cluster 1 as endothecium.

The anther epidermis produces cuticular waxes to seal and protect the maize anther from
the environment. These waxes are formed by converting C_2 acetyl-coenzyme A (acetyl-CoA)
into C_{16} or C_{18} fatty acids then further converted into fatty acyl-CoAs by long-chain acyl-CoA
synthetases (LACS); these are remodeled and extended into C_{24} to C_{34} fatty acids, or very-long-
chain fatty acids (VLCFAs) (Zheng *et al.*, 2019; Schnurr *et al.*, 2004). A number of genes have
been found to regulate the production of theses epicuticular waxes in maize, rice, and
Arabidopsis (Zheng *et al.*, 2019; Jung *et al.*, 2006; Schnurr *et al.*, 2004). We focused on
Glossy14, the maize homolog of rice *Wax-Deficient Anther1* (*Wda1*), and the maize homolog of
Arabidopsis LACS2 – mutations in these three genes have been shown to result in significantly
decreased epicuticular wax load (Zheng *et al.*, 2019; Jung *et al.*, 2006; Schnurr *et al.*, 2004). We

found that Cluster 2 had the highest average expression levels and proportion of cells expressing

these genes, suggesting Cluster 2 is epidermis (Figures 4, F-H; Extended Data Fig. 4).

The final two clusters were unidentifiable as little is known about the genetic activity of

the remaining somatic cell types: the middle layer, connective cells, and vasculature. However,

we were able to generate a list of the most specifically expressed genes for each cluster,

providing a putative list of marker genes (Figure 5). We were also able to identify modules of co-

regulated genes specific to each cluster (Figure 5B). Cluster-specific modules can be analyzed

for gene ontology (GO) term enrichment providing insight into the biological processes, cellular

component, and molecular function and of each module. For example, Module 31, which was

highly up-regulated in the endothecium cluster, is highly enriched for genes relating to

photosynthesis and localized in the chloroplast (Figure 5C). Similar analyses can be utilized to

verify cluster identification or further narrow down the cell type identity of unknown clusters.

DISCUSSION

Difficulties in the dissociation of tissues and isolation of single cells have restricted plant single-

cell RNA-sequencing to only the most researched plant species and tissues. FX-Cell can be

readily adapted to an array of plant taxa and tissues spanning well beyond typical model plant

species and tissues for single-cell molecular analyses. By incorporating cellular fixation and cell

wall digestion enzymes depleted of RNases, we demonstrated that FX-Cell had a significantly

higher and more representative cell release than well-established fresh protoplasting protocols in

multiple tissues and species while maintaining high-quality RNA with minimal or no additional

optimization. Fixation stabilizes cells by coagulating the entire cytosol into a protein matrix

making them more resistant to mechanical force and permitting the use of increased digestion

temperatures relative to highly fragile and environmentally sensitive fresh protoplasts. FX-Cell is

also highly scalable, permitting the isolation and sequencing of a few cells isolated by hand to

thousands of cells isolated and dispensed with a cell sorter.

Two technologies for isolating large plant cells in high-throughput applications were

identified: the BioSorter (Union Biometrica, Inc.) and Hana (Namocell). These two technologies

can readily sort and dispense single fixed plant cells of varying sizes and shapes into plates for

library preparation. Although we utilized a modified CEL-Seq2 library preparation protocol for

our scRNA-seq analyses, SPLiT-seq (Rosenberg *et al.*, 2018), a relatively new and inexpensive

way to construct scRNA-seq libraries, requires fixed cells and is well-suited to work smoothly

with FX-Cell.

FX-Cell provided high-quality cells for scRNA-seq. We identified tapetal, epidermal,

endothecial, and meiocyte cells from fixed maize anthers based on a few known cell type marker

genes and the established biology of specific cell types (Figure 3). The notable presence of

meiocytes (~1% of anther cells) in our scRNA-seq dataset validated the ability of FX-Cell to

liberate and hence distinguish even rare cell types. The remaining unknown cells likely consist of

the middle layer, vascular, and connective cells, but little is known about the expression patterns

of these somatic cell types. For example, the function of the middle layer is completely

unknown, although its developmental origin and fate are well-established in maize. This

ephemeral cell layer differentiates from the secondary parietal cells along with the tapetum early

in anther development then undergoes programmed cell death prior to the completion of meiosis.

A few male-sterile maize mutants have aberrant middle layer phenotypes, however, the cell layer

has been largely understudied relative to the tapetum (Walbot and Egger, 2016). Targeted

analysis of this enigmatic cell layer using scRNA-seq could reveal its function and activity in the

anther.

It is entirely possible that unknown cell types exist among the vascular and connective

tissues or even among the primary four somatic layers of the anther, as demonstrated by Murphy

et al., (2015) with the subclassification of the endothecium into the subepidermal endothecium

and interendothecium, the endothecial cells adjacent to the connective tissue. In addition, maize

tapetal cells asynchronously become binucleate throughout meiosis, suggesting a key

developmental transition in this cell type. The substructure of the tapetal cluster may reflect this

cellular change or the binucleate tapetal cells could be clustered in the unidentified clusters.

Increased sampling and the incorporation of developmental trajectories would heighten the

resolution of each cell cluster revealing unknown and unresolved cell types.

The *de novo* identification of the top specific marker genes and co-regulated gene

modules for each cluster can help elucidate the identity of unknown scRNA-seq cell clusters.

RNA *in situ* hybridization of these putative marker genes could locate these cells within the

maize anther, while LCM RNA-seq of the known cell layers could serve as a background

reference. GO term enrichment analyses of the co-regulated gene modules can provide critical

insight into the function and biology of unknown cell clusters. Coupled with scRNA-seq, high-

throughput imaging of each fixed cell before library preparation can categorize cells based on

size and shape traits that differ considerably among plant cell types, but these traits are

eliminated by protoplasting.

With any new method, it is important to consider potential limitations. The advantage of

our method is that it dramatically increases the release of cells from plant tissues. However, there

are some contexts where this method has drawbacks. First, some plant cells have large fluid

filled vacuoles and are very fragile after fixation; for instance, we found maize leaf mesophyll

cells do not hold up well to our method. As a result, other approaches may be better for cells

with very high water content. With any new tissue, we recommend first testing this method using

commercially available enzymes to see how well the cells of interest are successfully released

before committing to RNase-depletion of the enzymes.

Second, we suspect the method will not be compatible with widely used droplet-based

technologies such as 10X Genomics. This is because the large size and unusual shape of many

plant cells (10 - 100 µm) relative to animal cells (10 - 30 µm) might result in clogging of the

microfluidic chips used for droplet-based scRNA-seq with fixed cells. Elongated plant cells

become spherical via protoplasting making their overall dimensions more feasible for the

microfluidic channels of droplet-based technologies. In addition, we surmise that if a protoplast

is too large and blocks the entrance of the microfluidic channel, it will likely lyse via pressure.

This prevents clogging of the chip, but also biases the downstream analyses as larger cells will

be selectively removed. In contrast, fixed cells will maintain their natural, elongated shapes and

are too stable to lyse due to pressure, making the chances of clogging much higher.

Single-cell RNA-seq has revolutionized our understanding of animal cell identification,

development, and evolution over the last two decades while scRNA-seq in plants has been slow

to develop, largely reflecting the extensive optimization required for dissociating and isolating

plant cells. FX-Cell should similarly open the door to such discoveries for plant research

regardless of species or tissue.

METHODS

Plant growth and anther dissection

Zea mays (inbred line W23 *bz2*) individuals were grown under greenhouse conditions in Stanford, CA, USA with 14-h day/10-h night lighting. Daily irrigation and fertilization were maintained for robust growth. Beginning five to six weeks after planting, individual plants were felled ~20 cm above ground level for anther dissection between 8:00 and 9:00 am. The sacrificed plants were taken to the lab within 10 min where the tassels were dissected out of the stem and leaf whorl. A Leica M60 dissecting scope (Leica Microsystems Inc.) and stage micrometer (Fisher Scientific) were used to isolate 2.0 mm anthers from the upper florets of spikelets along the central spike of the tassel.

Cellular release

Cell release of fixed and fresh maize anthers was compared in a variety of conditions. Three 2.0 mm anthers were pooled per replicate with five replicates per condition. Fresh anthers were digested at 30□ for 90 min or 16 h in the enzyme mix from Nelms & Walbot (2019). Fixed samples were left in ice-cold Farmer's solution (3:1 100% ethanol:glacial acetic acid) for two h, washed twice in ice-cold 0.1X phosphate-buffered saline (PBS; Sigma-Aldrich) for five min, then digested at 30□ or 50□ for 90 min in 20 mM MES, pH 5.7 with a 1:10 dilution of RNase-depleted cell wall digesting enzyme stock (enzymes were stored in glycerol stocks, see below; stocks were normalized so that a 1:10 dilution has the same A280 as a 1.25% w/v Cellulase-RS and 0.4% w/v Macerozyme-R10 solution). The cells from the digested, fixed anthers were dissociated via shear force between two microscope slides with thin tape as a spacer. For each replicate, the number of single cells was estimated using a hemocytometer then averaged. Images of the dissociated cells were taken on a Nikon Diaphot inverted microscope with a mounted Nikon D40 camera.

Cell release from maize root tips was compared in three conditions: fresh protoplasting following Ortiz-Ramirez *et al.* 2018, fixation and digestion with the enzyme concentrations from Ortiz-Ramirez *et al*. 2018, or fixation and digestion with our highly reduced enzyme mix. Maize seeds were treated, germinated, and grown following Ortiz-Ramírez *et al.* (2018). Seedling primary roots were cut 5 mm above the tip with a scalpel. Three root tips were pooled per replicate with five replicates per condition. Fresh root tips were pre-treated, washed, digested in

enzyme (1.2% Cellulase-RS, 0.36% Pectolyase Y-23, 0.4% Macerozyme-R10, 1.2% Cellulase-
R10; Sigma Aldrich; Yakult Pharmaceutical Industry Co.), filtered, and washed. The fresh
protoplasts were counted with a hemocytometer. The fixed samples were left in ice-cold
Farmer's solution for two h, washed twice with ice-cold 0.1X PBS for five min then digested at
50□ with the enzyme mix from Ortiz-Ramírez *et al.* (2018) or the enzyme mix from this
protocol. Digested tissue was manually disrupted with pipetting, then the number of individual
cells counted with a hemocytometer.

We expanded our sampling by comparing the cell release of FX-Cell to a standard
protoplasting protocol (Nelms and Walbot, 2019) in three additional maize tissues (apical
meristems, young leaves, young ears) and four non-model plant taxa and tissues (leaves from the
basal angiosperms, *Amborella trichopoda* and waterlily, *Nymphaea colorata,* leaf and stem tissue
from the non-model Brassicaceae *Capsella bursa-pastoris*). For each tissue, comparably sized
samples were either fixed in Farmer's solution, washed twice 0.1X PBS, and digested at 50□ in
our reduced enzyme mix as previously described or directly digested at 30□ for 90 min in the
enzyme mix from Nelms and Walbot (2019). For each replicate, the number of single cells was
estimated using a hemocytometer then averaged. Images of the dissociated cells were taken on a
Nikon Diaphot inverted microscope with a mounted Nikon D40 camera.

RNase-depletion of enzymes
RNases present in fungal cell wall digesting enzymes were depleted by passing concentrated
enzyme solution through agarose beads coupled with guanosine monophosphate (GMP). GMP
beads were prepared using the procedure from Kanaya & Uchida (1981), with modifications: 50
mL suspended ω-aminohexyl–agarose beads (Sigma-Aldrich) were washed three times in water
and then three times in 0.1M borax, pH 9.0 (Sigma-Aldrich). Meanwhile, sodium metaperiodate
(Chem-Impex) was dissolved in 6 mL water to a final concentration of 0.2 M, and 488 mg
guanosine monophosphate was added; the solution was incubated at room temperature (RT) in
the dark for 1 h with gentle mixing. The washed agarose beads were resuspended in 0.1 M borax,
pH 9.0 to a total volume of 36 mL, then the 6 mL solution containing oxidized GMP was added
and the reaction was incubated at RT with gentle mixing for 2-4 h. Finally, 136 mg of solid
sodium borohydride (Sigma-Aldrich) was slowly added to the reaction, and the solution was
gently mixed at 4□ for 1 h with the cap loosened to allow ventilation. The coupled GMP beads

were washed three times each with 0.1 M borax, then water, then 1 M sodium chloride. Washed
beads were loaded into a cleaned out Superdex 200 10/300 FPLC column (Cytiva) and stored in
1 M sodium chloride until further use. Remaining beads were stored in a sealed container in 1 M
sodium chloride until further use.

For RNase-depletion, the enzymes were resuspended at 10X concentration (12.5% w/v
Cellulase-RS and 4% w/v Macerozyme R10) in RNase binding buffer (RBB; 150 mM NaCl, 10
mM citrate, pH 7.0). Four mL of GMP beads were loaded in a Kontes Flex-Column (Kimble
Chase) gravity flow column and equilibrated with RBB at 4□, then the enzyme mix was passed
through this column. The flow through was collected and then run through the pre-equilibrated
GMP-agarose FPLC column at 4□ using a peristaltic pump. Fractions were collected, and those
with >0.1 absorbance at A280 were pooled. Pooled enzymes were concentrated using an Amicon
Ultra-15 Centrifugal Filter Unit, MWCO 30 kDa (MilliporeSigma) at 4□ until a 1:10 dilution of
the enzyme blend had 0.75 absorbance at A280. The Amicon concentrators were made using
regenerated cellulase esters and the concentrated enzyme blend was capable of weakening these
membranes; for future RNase-depletions, it is recommended to use a centrifugal concentrator
with a membrane made from a different material. Concentrated enzymes were mixed 1:1 with
glycerol and stored at -20□ until further use. For digestions, enzyme stocks were used at 1/10th
the final volume. RNase activity in the RNase-depleted and commercial enzyme mix was
quantified using the Ambion RNaseAlert Lab Test Kit (Invitrogen).

RNA integrity
Anther RNA quality was tested in three conditions of cell preparation: 1) fixed in Farmer's
solution then washed twice in 0.1X PBS then flash frozen, 2) fixed, washed, and digested in
commercial enzyme, and 3) fixed, washed, and digested in RNase-depleted enzyme. For each
condition, 2.0 mm anthers were isolated from five separate plants with ten anthers pooled per
plant. The flash frozen samples were homogenized via bead beating in a 2000 Geno/Grinder
(SPEX CertiPrep) with baked 4 mm steel balls. The fixed samples were left in ice-cold Farmer's
solution for two h, washed twice in ice-cold 0.1X PBS for five min, then incubated at 50□ for 90
min with RNase-depleted or commercial enzyme (1.25% w/v Cellulase-RS and 0.4% w/v
Macerozyme R10). The RNeasy Plant Mini Kit (Qiagen) was used to extract RNA from samples
via the standard protocol. RNA was quality-checked on an Agilent 2100 BioAnalyzer with the

RNA 6000 Nano assay (Agilent Technologies). The RNA Integrity Number (RIN) for the five
replicates of each condition were averaged and reported alongside the error.
417

Fixed cell isolation for scRNA-Seq

Anthers from four individuals of wild-type (W23) maize were dissected out. One of the three
anthers per floret was used for imaging on a Nikon Diaphot inverted microscope with a Nikon
D40 mounted camera at 10X magnification. The remaining two anthers per floret were fixed in
ice-cold Farmers solution for two h, washed twice for 5 min in 0.1X PBS, and then one anther
was digested for 90 min at 50□ in the RNase-depleted enzyme mix while the other anther was
saved at -20□. Following digestion, shear force was applied to the anther between two
microscope slides with thin tape on each end to prevent the anther from being fully crushed. The
top microscope slide was slid back and forth 5-10 times and the sample checked under the
dissecting scope to ensure separation of the fixed cells. The cells were washed from the slides
into 1 mL of cold 0.1X PBS via pipette and stained with SYBR Green I nucleic acid gel stain
(Invitrogen) for 20 min. The cells were then filtered through a 100 µm (if bound for the
BioSorter) or 40 µm (if bound for the Hana) nylon cell strainer (Corning Inc.) into 50 mL Falcon
tubes. The stained cells were then sorted into 384-well plates or 96-well plates, each well
containing 0.8 µL Primer Master Mix (0.225% Triton X-100, 1.6 mM dNTP mix, 1.875 uM
barcoded oligo[dT] CEL-seq2 primers; Sigma-Aldrich, New England Biolabs) using a BioSorter
(Union BioMetrica) or Hana Single Cell Dispenser (Namocell). Following cell sorting, the plates
were spun at 400 x g then stored at -80□.
436

CEL-Seq2 library preparation

Single cell libraries were prepared following the CEL-seq2 protocol(Hashimshony *et al.*, 2016)
with alterations similar to Nelms & Walbot (2019). The samples were thawed then incubated at
65□ for 3 min, spun, then incubated again at 65□ for 3 min then placed on ice. To each sample
0.7 µL of reverse transcription mix (8:2:1:1 of Superscript IV 5X Buffer, 100 mM DTT, RNase
Inhibitor, Superscript IV; ThermoFisher Scientific) was added, spun down, then incubated at
42□ for 2 min, 50□ for 15 min, 55□ for 10 min then placed on ice. The samples were pooled by
row into 8-strip tubes and excess primers were digested with the addition of 4.6 µL exonuclease I
mix (2.5 µL of 10X Exonuclease I Buffer, 2.1 µL Exonuclease I; New England Biolabs) then

incubated at 37□ for 20 min, 80□ for 10 min then placed on ice. To each of the pooled samples
44.28 µL (1.8X volume) of pre-warmed RNAClean XP beads was added and mixed well via
pipette. The samples were left to incubate at RT for 15 min then placed on a magnetic rack until
the liquid became clear. The supernatant was carefully pipetted out, making sure not to disturb
the beads, and discarded. The beads were washed twice with 100 µL of freshly prepared 80%
ethanol. The ethanol was pipetted out then the beads were left to dry for five min. The RNA was
eluted from the beads with 7 µL RNase-free water and incubated for two min at RT then mixed
via pipette.

Second strand synthesis was initiated with the addition of 3 µL second strand synthesis
mix (2.31 µL Second Strand Reaction dNTP-free Buffer, 0.23 µL 10 mM dNTPs, 0.08 µL DNA
ligase, 0.3 µL DNA polymerase I, 0.08 µL RNase H; New England Biolabs) and then incubated
at 16□ for 4 h. Samples were further pooled into a single tube and 30 µL Ampure XP beads
(Beckman Coulter Life Sciences) with 66 µL bead binding buffer (2.5 M NaCl, 20% PEG 8000;
Sigma-Aldrich) (1.2X volume) was added. The sample was incubated for 15 min at RT then
washed and dried as described for the RNAClean XP beads above. The RNA was eluted from
the beads with 6.4 µL of RNase-free water, left to incubate for 2 min at RT, and mixed via
pipette.

In vitro transcription was initiated with the addition of 9.6 µL of MegaScript T7 IVT mix
(1:1:1:1:1:1 of CTP solution, GTP solution, UTP solution, ATP solution, 10X Reaction Buffer,
T7 Enzyme Mix; ThermoFisher Scientific) to the sample then incubated at 37□ overnight. The
beads were removed from the sample with a magnetic rack and 28.8 µL (1.8X volume) of pre-
warmed RNAClean XP beads (Beckman Coulter Life Sciences) was added then incubated at RT
for 15 min then washed and dried as described above. Once dry, 6.5 µL of RNase-free water was
added to the beads, incubated for 2 min at RT, and mixed via pipette. The amplified RNA quality
and quantity were analyzed with an RNA Pico 6000 chip on an Agilent 2100 BioAnalyzer
(Agilent Technologies).

To the samples 1.5 µL of priming mix (9:5:1 of RNase-free water, 10 mM dNTPs, 1M
tagged random hexamer primer: 5'-GCCTTGGCACCCGAGAATTCCANNNNNN) was added
and incubated at 65□ for 5 min then placed on ice. A second round of reverse transcription was
initiated with the addition of 4 µL of reverse transcription mix (4:2:1:1 of First Strand Buffer, 0.1
M DTT, RNaseOUT, SuperScript II; ThermoFisher Scientific) to each sample then incubated at

25☐ for 10 min, 42☐ for 1 h, and 70☐ for 10 min before being placed on ice. For the final PCR,

5.5 µL of sample were added to 21 µL of PCR master mix with Illumina TruSeq Small RNA

PCR primer (RP1) and Index Adaptor (RPI "X") (6.5 µL RNase-free water, 12.5 µL Ultra II Q5

Master Mix, 1 µL of 10 µM RP1, 1 µL of 10 µM RPI "X"). Libraries were amplified with 13

rounds of PCR (98☐ for 30 sec, then 13 cycles of 98☐ for 10 sec, 65☐ for 15 sec, and 72☐ for

30 sec and finished with 72☐ for 3 min). The final PCR products were purified with 26.5 µL

(1.0X volume) of Ampure XP beads (Beckman Coulter Life Sciences) then incubated at RT for

15 min then washed and dried as described above. The cDNA was eluted from the beads with 25

µL RNase-free water and purified again with 25 µL (1.0X volume) of Ampure XP beads

(Beckman Coulter Life Sciences) then incubated at RT for 15 min then washed and dried as

described above. The final purified libraries were eluted into 10 µL RNase-free water incubated

for 2 min at RT and mixed via pipette. The cDNA was then assessed with an Agilent

BioAnalyzer High Sensitivity DNA chip.

Two libraries of 96 cells isolated with the BioSorter were sequenced on a HiSeqX and

two libraries of 96 cells isolated with the Hana were sequenced on a NovoSeq (Illumina) at

Novogene Co. (Sacramento, CA, USA) with paired-end 150 base-pair (bp) reads. Primer

sequences can be found in Extended Data Table 1-2. All primers were synthesized by the

Stanford Protein and Nucleic Acid Facility (PAN, Stanford University, Stanford, CA, USA).

Detailed step-by-step protocols of enzyme RNase-depletion, fixed cell isolation, and library

preparation can be found in the Supplementary Materials.

Read filtering, mapping, and initial processing

Paired-end raw reads were demultiplexed based on cell-specific barcodes (Extended Table 1)

using Fastq-Multx (Aronesty, 2013). The UMI sequences from read 1 were added to the read 2

sequence names and then filtered and trimmed with Fastp (parameters: -y -x -3 -f 6) (Chen *et al.*,

2018). The clean reads were mapped to the B73 reference genome (AGP v. 4) (Jiao *et al.*, 2017)

with HiSat2 (Kim *et al.*, 2019), and unique molecular identifiers (UMIs) quantified with

SAMtools (Li *et al.*, 2009) and UMI-tools (Smith *et al.*, 2017). Cell cycle heterogeneity has been

shown to distort the clustering of cells, thus all cell-cycle genes from Nelms and Walbot (2019)

were removed and cells with fewer than 500 UMIs or 200 genes detected were discarded. Genes

that were detected in fewer than 3 cells were also discarded.

To initially compare our dataset with that of known cell types we assessed the similarity
of our data with laser-capture microdissection (LCM) sequencing data of known cell types and
whole anthers (Zhou *et al.*, 2022), which were also prepared from 2.0 mm W23 maize anthers
using the same CEL-Seq2 library preparation. UMIs were normalized into transcripts per million
(TPM) and log transformed after adding a pseudocount of 100. We then subtracted the single cell
TPMs by the log transformed TPMs of the whole anthers to produce ratio measurements. The
LCM data had samples for tapetal, meiocyte, and other somatic (middle layer, endothecium,
epidermis) cell types and were similarly processed relative to the whole anther data. We then
calculated the cell-to-cell Pearson's correlations of all our single cells relative to each of the
LCM samples.
518
Cell clustering and cell type identification
Cell clustering and cell type analyses were performed using Monocle 3 (Cao *et al.*, 2019) in
R/RStudio (R Core Team, 2013; Team, 2015). The UMI counts were normalized via log and size
factor with an added pseudocount of 1 and dimensionality reduced via Principal Component
Analysis (PCA) consisting of 10 principal components based on the leveling point of an elbow
plot of the percentage of variance explained by ranked principal components. Batch effects were
removed with the align_cds function in Monocle. Clusters were determined and visualized with
Uniform Manifold Approximation and Projection (UMAP) with a resolution of 0.01 (McInnes *et*
al., 2020). Correlation values of each cell with the LCM tapetal, meiocyte, and other somatic cell
types were mapped onto the UMAP, as well as the percentages of transcripts from the plastid
genome and mitochondrial genome. The meiocyte cluster was manually separated from the
endothecium cluster based on the LCM correlation data and meiocyte marker genes; it is likely
that Monocle did not separate these clusters due to the scarcity of meiocyte cells despite the clear
separation in the UMAP. The other somatic 1 (OS1) cluster was subset and reclustered to
identify and separate the epidermis cluster based on putative marker genes of the known biology
of the cell type (Table 1).
De novo cluster-specific marker genes were identified and ranked using pseudo R^2 values
from the marker_test_res function in Monocle. Co-regulated genes were grouped into modules
by using the graph_test function to calculate Moran's I for each gene then applying the Louvian
community analysis with a resolution of 0.01 via the find_gene_modules function. We then

plotted the aggregate expression of all genes per module for each UMAP cluster to identify
cluster-enriched gene modules. The genes from these cluster-enriched modules were then
extracted and analyzed for gene ontology (GO) term enrichment relative to the Maize AGPv.4
reference in AgriGO v2 (Tian *et al.*, 2017).
543

544 **Data availability**
545 Sequencing data are deposited in the NCBI Gene Expression Omnibus under BioProject
546 PRJNA760550.
547

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS
This work was supported by the National Science Foundation awards 1907220 (to DBM) and
17540974 (to B. C. Meyers and V.W.). We thank Ed Buckler for sequencing of the preliminary
libraries.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS
DBM and BN performed most experiments and designed the study. BN designed and optimized
the enzyme RNase-depletion protocol. DBM analyzed the RNA-seq data. DBM wrote the
manuscript with input from BN and VW.
557

558 **COMPETING INTERESTS**
559 A patent on the enzyme RNase-depletion protocol has been filed by Stanford University with BN
560 as inventor (U.S. Patent Application No. 17/196,681).
561

LITERATURE CITED

Aronesty, E. (2013) Comparison of sequencing utility programs, Open Bioinf. *J*, **7**, 1–8.

Bai, Y., Liu, H., Lyu, H., Su, L., Xiong, J. and Cheng, Z.-M.M. (2022) Development of a
single-cell atlas for woodland strawberry (Fragaria vesca) leaves during early Botrytis
cinerea infection using single cell RNA-seq. *Hortic. Res.*

Bezrutczyk, M., Zöllner, N.R., Kruse, C.P.S., Hartwig, T., Lautwein, T., Köhrer, K.,
Frommer, W.B. and Kim, J.-Y. (2021) Evidence for phloem loading via the abaxial
bundle sheath cells in maize leaves. *Plant Cell*, **33**, 531–547.

Cao, J., Spielmann, M., Qiu, X., et al. (2019) The single-cell transcriptional landscape of
mammalian organogenesis. *Nature*, **566**, 496–502.

Chaubal, R., Zanella, C., Trimnell, M.R., Fox, T.W., Albertsen, M.C. and Bedinger, P.
(2000) Two male-sterile mutants of Zea mays (Poaceae) with an extra cell division in the
anther wall. *Am. J. Bot.*, **87**, 1193–1201.

Chen, S., Zhou, Y., Chen, Y. and Gu, J. (2018) fastp: an ultra-fast all-in-one FASTQ
preprocessor. *Bioinformatics*, **34**, i884–i890. Available at:
https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/bty560.

Conde, D., Triozzi, P.M., Balmant, K.M., et al. (2021) A robust method of nuclei isolation for
single-cell RNA sequencing of solid tissues from the plant genus Populus. *PLoS One*, **16**,
e0251149. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0251149.

Denyer, T., Ma, X., Klesen, S., Scacchi, E., Nieselt, K. and Timmermans, M.C.P. (2019)
Spatiotemporal Developmental Trajectories in the Arabidopsis Root Revealed Using High-
Throughput Single-Cell RNA Sequencing. *Dev. Cell*, **48**, 840-852.e5. Available at:
https://doi.org/10.1016/j.devcel.2019.02.022.

Fields, R., Dixon, H.B., Law, G.R. and Yui, C. (1971) Purification of ribonuclease T 1 by
diethylaminoethylcellulose chromatography. *Biochem. J.*, **121**, 591–596. Available at:
https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/5114970.

Fox, T., DeBruin, J., Haug Collet, K., et al. (2017) A single point mutation in Ms44 results in
dominant male sterility and improves nitrogen use efficiency in maize. *Plant Biotechnol. J.*,
15, 942–952.

Han, X., Zhou, Z., Fei, L., et al. (2020) Construction of a human cell landscape at single-cell
level. *Nature*, **581**, 303–309. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-020-2157-4.

Hashimshony, T., Senderovich, N., Avital, G., et al. (2016) CEL-Seq2: sensitive highly-

multiplexed single-cell RNA-Seq. *Genome Biol.*, **17**, 77.

Jean-Baptiste, K., McFaline-Figueroa, J.L., Alexandre, C.M., et al. (2019) Dynamics of gene

expression in single root cells of arabidopsis thaliana. *Plant Cell*, **31**, 993–1011.

Jiao, Y., Peluso, P., Shi, J., et al. (2017) Improved maize reference genome with single-

molecule technologies. *Nature*, **546**, 524–527. Available at:

https://doi.org/10.1038/nature22971.

Jung, K.-H., Han, M.-J., Lee, D., et al. (2006) Wax-deficient anther1 Is Involved in Cuticle and

Wax Production in Rice Anther Walls and Is Required for Pollen Development. *Plant Cell*,

18, 3015–3032. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1105/tpc.106.042044.

Kanaya, S. and Uchida, T. (1981) Purification of ribonuclease T1 by affinity chromatography.

J. Biochem., **89**, 591–597.

Kanton, S., Boyle, M.J., He, Z., et al. (2019) Organoid single-cell genomic atlas uncovers

human-specific features of brain development. *Nature*, **574**, 418–422. Available at:

https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-019-1654-9.

Kelliher, T. and Walbot, V. (2011) Emergence and patterning of the five cell types of the Zea

mays anther locule. *Dev. Biol.*, **350**, 32–49. Available at:

http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0012160610011917.

Kim, D., Paggi, J.M., Park, C., Bennett, C. and Salzberg, S.L. (2019) Graph-based genome

alignment and genotyping with HISAT2 and HISAT-genotype. *Nat. Biotechnol.*, **37**, 907–

915.

Li, H., Handsaker, B., Wysoker, A., Fennell, T., Ruan, J., Homer, N., Marth, G., Abecasis,

G. and Durbin, R. (2009) The sequence alignment/map format and SAMtools.

Bioinformatics, **25**, 2078–2079.

Lim, B., Lin, Y. and Navin, N. (2020) Advancing Cancer Research and Medicine with Single-

Cell Genomics. *Cancer Cell*, **37**, 456–470. Available at:

https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1535610820301483.

Liu, Q., Liang, Z., Feng, D., et al. (2021) Transcriptional landscape of rice roots at the single-

cell resolution. *Mol. Plant*, **14**, 384–394. Available at:

https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1674205220304457.

Lopez-Anido, C.B., Vatén, A., Smoot, N.K., Sharma, N., Guo, V., Gong, Y., Anleu Gil,

M.X., Weimer, A.K. and Bergmann, D.C. (2021) Single-cell resolution of lineage trajectories in the Arabidopsis stomatal lineage and developing leaf. *Dev. Cell*, **56**, 1043-1055.e4. Available at: https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1534580721002112.

MacIntosh, G.C. (2011) RNase T2 Family: Enzymatic Properties, Functional Diversity, and Evolution of Ancient Ribonucleases BT - Ribonucleases. In A. W. Nicholson, ed. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, pp. 89–114. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-21078-5_4.

McInnes, L., Healy, J. and Melville, J. (2020) UMAP: uniform manifold approximation and projection for dimension reduction.

Mi, H., Ebert, D., Muruganujan, A., Mills, C., Albou, L.-P., Mushayamaha, T. and Thomas, P.D. (2021) PANTHER version 16: a revised family classification, tree-based classification tool, enhancer regions and extensive API. *Nucleic Acids Res.*, **49**, D394–D403.

Nan, G., Zhai, J., Arikit, S., Morrow, D., Fernandes, J., Mai, L., Nguyen, N., Meyers, B.C. and Walbot, V. (2017) MS23 , a master basic helix-loop-helix factor , regulates the specification and development of the tapetum in maize. , 163–172.

Nelms, B. and Walbot, V. (2019) Defining the developmental program leading to meiosis in maize. *Science (80-.).*, **364**, 52–56.

Nelms, B. and Walbot, V. (2022) Gametophyte genome activation occurs at pollen mitosis I in maize. *Science (80-.).*, **375**, 424–429.

Ortiz-Ramírez, C., Arevalo, E.D., Xu, X., Jackson, D.P. and Birnbaum, K.D. (2018) An efficient cell sorting protocol for maize protoplasts. *Curr. Protoc. plant Biol.*, **3**, e20072.

Paik, D.T., Cho, S., Tian, L., Chang, H.Y. and Wu, J.C. (2020) Single-cell RNA sequencing in cardiovascular development, disease and medicine. *Nat. Rev. Cardiol.*, **17**, 457–473. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1038/s41569-020-0359-y.

Pardo, A.G. and Forchiassin, F. (1999) Influence of temperature and pH on cellulase activity and stability in Nectria catalinensis. *Rev. Argent. Microbiol.*, **31**, 31–35.

R Core Team (2013) R: A language and environment for statistical computing.

Rosenberg, A.B., Roco, C.M., Muscat, R.A., et al. (2018) Single-cell profiling of the developing mouse brain and spinal cord with split-pool barcoding. *Science (80-.).*, **360**,

176–182.

Ryu, K.H., Huang, L., Kang, H.M. and Schiefelbein, J. (2019) Single-cell RNA sequencing
resolves molecular relationships among individual plant cells. *Plant Physiol.*, **179**, 1444–
1456.

Satterlee, J.W., Strable, J. and Scanlon, M.J. (2020) Plant stem-cell organization and
differentiation at single-cell resolution. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.*, **117**, 33689–33699.

Schnurr, J., Shockey, J. and Browse, J. (2004) The acyl-CoA synthetase encoded by LACS2 is
essential for normal cuticle development in Arabidopsis. *Plant Cell*, **16**, 629–642.

Seyfferth, C., Renema, J., Wendrich, J.R., et al. (2021) Advances and Opportunities in Single-
Cell Transcriptomics for Plant Research. *Annu. Rev. Plant Biol.*, **72**, 847–866. Available at:
https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-arplant-081720-010120.

Shulse, C.N., Cole, B.J., Ciobanu, D., et al. (2019) High-throughput single-cell transcriptome
profiling of plant cell types. *Cell Rep.*, **27**, 2241–2247.

Smith, T., Heger, A. and Sudbery, I. (2017) UMI-tools: modeling sequencing errors in Unique
Molecular Identifiers to improve quantification accuracy. *Genome Res.*, **27**, 491–499.

Sunaga-Franze, D.Y., Muino, J.M., Braeuning, C., et al. (2021) Single-nuclei RNA-
sequencing of plant tissues. *bioRxiv*, 2020.11.14.382812. Available at:
http://biorxiv.org/content/early/2021/02/02/2020.11.14.382812.abstract.

Team, Rs. (2015) RStudio: integrated development for R. *RStudio, Inc., Boston, MA URL*
http//www. rstudio. com, **42**, 84.

Thrupp, N., Frigerio, C.S., Wolfs, L., et al. (2020) Single-nucleus RNA-Seq is not suitable for
detection of microglial activation genes in humans. *Cell Rep.*, **32**, 108189.

Tian, T., Liu, Y., Yan, H., You, Q., Yi, X., Du, Z., Xu, W. and Su, Z. (2017) agriGO v2. 0: a
GO analysis toolkit for the agricultural community, 2017 update. *Nucleic Acids Res.*, **45**,
W122–W129.

Walbot, V. and Egger, R.L. (2016) Pre-Meiotic Anther Development: Cell Fate Specification
and Differentiation. *Annu. Rev. Plant Biol.*, **67**, 365–395. Available at:
https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-arplant-043015-111804.

Wang, D., Oses-Prieto, J.A., Li, K.H., Fernandes, J.F., Burlingame, A.L. and Walbot, V.
(2010) The male sterile 8 mutation of maize disrupts the temporal progression of the
transcriptome and results in the mis-regulation of metabolic functions. *Plant J.*, **63**, 939–

951.

Xu, X., Crow, M., Rice, B.R., et al. (2021) Single-cell RNA sequencing of developing maize
ears facilitates functional analysis and trait candidate gene discovery. *Dev. Cell*, **56**, 557–
568.

Zhang, T.-Q., Chen, Y. and Wang, J.-W. (2021) A single-cell analysis of the Arabidopsis
vegetative shoot apex. *Dev. Cell*, **56**, 1056–1074.

Zhang, T.Q., Xu, Z.G., Shang, G.D. and Wang, J.W. (2019) A Single-Cell RNA Sequencing
Profiles the Developmental Landscape of Arabidopsis Root. *Mol. Plant*, **12**, 648–660.
Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.molp.2019.04.004.

Zheng, J., He, C., Qin, Y., et al. (2019) Co-expression analysis aids in the identification of
genes in the cuticular wax pathway in maize. *Plant J.*, **97**, 530–542.

Zhou, X., Huang, K., Teng, C., Abdelgawad, A., Batish, M., Meyers, B.C. and Walbot, V.
(2022) 24-nt phasiRNAs move from tapetal to meiotic cells in maize anthers. *New Phytol.*,
n/a. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1111/nph.18167.

 TABLES

 Table 1. Marker genes and source.

Cell Type	Gene ID	Gene Name	Panther Family	Source
Tapetum	Zm00001d053895	*bHLH51*	TRANSCRIPTION FACTOR ABORTED MICROSPORES (PTHR31945:SF11)	Nan et al., 2017
Tapetum	Zm00001d012234	*Ms8*	BETA-1,3-GALACTOSYLTRANSFERASE 8-RELATED (PTHR11214:SF275)	Wang et al., 2010
Tapetum	Zm00001d052736	*Ms44*	NON-SPECIFIC LIPID-TRANSFER PROTEIN C4 (PTHR35501:SF7)	Fox et al., 2017
Endothecium	Zm00001d032197	*Cab*	CHLOROPHYLL A-B BINDING PROTEIN 4, CHLOROPLASTIC (PTHR21649:SF4)	
Endothecium	Zm00001d021435	*Lhcb2*	CHLOROPHYLL A-B BINDING PROTEIN 1, CHLOROPLASTIC (PTHR21649:SF108)	
Endothecium	Zm00001d000279	*Rbcl2*	RIBULOSE BISPHOSPHATE CARBOXYLASE LARGE CHAIN (PTHR42704:SF9)	Murphy et al., 2015
Epidermis	Zm00001d004198	*Gl14*	CASP-LIKE PROTEIN 2B1 (PTHR33573:SF30)	Zheng et al., 2018
Epidermis	Zm00001d014055	ZM-*wda1*	VERY-LONG-CHAIN ALDEHYDE DECARBONYLASE GL1-5 (PTHR11863:SF210)	Jung et al., 2006
Epidermis	Zm00001d053127	ZM-*Lacs2*	LONG CHAIN ACYL-COA SYNTHETASE 2 (PTHR43272:SF4)	Schnurr et al., 2004; Zhao et al., 2019
Meiocyte	Zm00001d039101	*C3h3*	PROTEIN TIS11 (PTHR12547:SF18)	Nelms & Walbot, 2019
Meiocyte	Zm00001d050069	*Trps8*	TREHALOSE 6-PHOSPHATE PHOSPHATASE (PTHR10788:SF24)	Nelms & Walbot, 2019
Meiocyte	Zm00001d044874	ZM-*sHSP*	SHSP DOMAIN-CONTAINING PROTEIN (PTHR46991:SF9)	Zhou et al., 2021

     FIGURE LEGENDS

Figure 1. Maize anther anatomy and cellular release with FX-Cell. (A) Transverse section of
the maize anther at the beginning of meiosis. (B) Percentage of each cell type per 2.0 mm maize
anther based on cell counts from Kelliher & Walbot (2011). (C) Average dimensions for each
cell type of the 2.0 mm maize anther from Kelliher & Walbot (2011). Cell types are color coded:
orange is epidermis (EP); green is endothecium (EN); red is middle layer (ML); blue is tapetum
(TAP); pink is meiocyte (M); white is vascular/connective. (D) Maize anthers were digested for
90 min or 16 h at 30°C following the Nelms and Walbot (2019) protoplasting protocol, and cell
release quantified via hemocytometer (grey bars). Fixed maize anthers were digested for 90 min
at 30°C and 50°C using the reduced enzyme mix and cell release similarly quantified (blue bars).
(E) Fixed maize anther cells after digestion and mechanical dissociation. (F) Transverse section
of a maize anther lobe (from Chaubal et al., 2000) with representative images of isolated fixed
cells for each anther cell type. Nuclei are shaded blue.

Figure 2. Maize root tip cellular release and RNA integrity of fresh and fixed protoplasting protocols. (A) Cellular release of maize root tips comparing the optimized protoplasting protocol from Ortiz-Ramirez *et al.* (2018) and the fixation-based protocol. Maize root tips were digested following Ortiz-Ramírez *et al.* (2018) and cell release quantified via hemocytometer (grey bars). Maize root tips were fixed then digested at 50°C for 90 min using the Ortiz-Ramírez *et al.* (2018) protoplast enzyme mix and the reduced enzyme mix then cell release was similarly quantified (blue bars). (B) Fixed maize root tip cells after digestion and mechanical dissociation. (C) RNA degradation rate of commercial versus RNase-depleted enzyme mix. (D) RNA quality of fixed maize anthers without any digestion, fixed maize anthers that were digested at 50°C for 90 min in enzyme buffer lacking enzymes, fixed maize anther that were digested at 50°C for 90 min using commercial enzyme mix, and fixed maize anthers that were digested at 50°C for 90 min using RNase-depleted enzyme mix. Different letters denote statistically significant variation (Student's *t* test, $P < 0.05$) and error bars represent standard error.

Figure 3. FX-Cell overview and maize anther scRNA-seq of tapetum and meiocyte marker genes. (A) Step-by-step schematic of FX-Cell for scRNA-seq. (B) UMAP clustering of 307 cells from 2.0 mm maize anthers into six distinct clusters. (C) Correlation values of each cell with LCM tapetal data. (D-F) Expression values per maize anther cell of tapetal marker genes mapped onto the UMAP clusters. (G) Correlation values of each cell with LCM meiocyte data. (H-J) Expression values per maize anther cell of meiocyte marker genes mapped onto the UMAP clusters.

Figure 4. Endothecium and epidermis marker gene expression in maize anther cells. (A) Correlation values of each cell with LCM other somatic cell types (middle layer, endothecium, epidermis) data. (B) Percentage of total UMIs originating from the plastid for each cell. (C-E) Expression values per maize anther cell of putative endothecium marker genes mapped onto the UMAP clusters. (F-H) Expression values per maize anther cell of putative epidermis marker genes mapped onto the UMAP clusters.

Figure 5. *De novo* **marker gene identification and co-regulated gene modules.** (A) Top three marker genes for each UMAP cluster with expression and percentage of cells from each cluster expressing the gene. (B) Co-regulated gene modules and expression scores for each UMAP cluster. (C) Gene ontology (GO) enrichment analysis of Module 31 sorted by biological processes (blue bars) and cellular component (green bars). Significantly enriched GO terms were selected based on a false discovery rate (FDR) < 0.05.

763 **EXTENDED DATA FIGURE LEGENDS**

765 **Extended Data Fig. 1 Cell dissociation and morphology via FX-Cell.** Fixed (A) maize apical

766 meristem cells, (B) maize leaf cells, (C) maize ear cells, (D) *Amborella trichopoda* leaf cells, (E)

767 *Nymphaea colorata* leaf cells, (F) *Capsella bursa-pastoris* leaf cells, and (G) *Capsella bursa-*

768 *pastoris* stem cells after digestion and mechanical dissociation.

Extended Data Fig. 2 Cellular release of varying plant tissues via protoplasting and FX-Cell. Number of individual cells released using fresh protoplasting (Nelms and Walbot, 2019) or FX-Cell from (A) maize apical meristem tissue, (B) maize leaf tissue, (C) maize ear tissue, (D) *Amborella trichopoda* leaf tissue, (E) *Nymphaea colorata* leaf tissue, (F) *Capsella bursa-pastoris* leaf tissue, and (G) *Capsella bursa-pastoris* stem tissue. Different letters denote statistically significant variation (Student's *t* test, $P < 0.05$) and error bars represent standard error.

Extended Data Fig. 3 Maize anther scRNA-seq. (A) Box plots of total UMIs per cell by

cluster. (B) Cell isolation method (Biosorter vs. Hana) for each cell. (C) Box plots of correlation

values with LCM tapetal data for each cell by cluster. (D) Box plots of correlation values with

LCM meiocyte data for each cell by cluster. (E) Box plots of correlation values with LCM other

somatic cell types (middle layer, endothecium, epidermis) for each cell by cluster. (F) Box plots

of percent plastid transcripts for each cell by cluster. The horizontal lines within the box plots

represent the median value, the lower and upper bounds of the box plots represent the first and

third quartiles, whiskers extend to 1.5x the interquartile range, and all other points are outliers.

Extended Data Fig. 4 Maize anther scRNA-seq marker gene expression. (A-C) Single-cell
RNA-seq violin plots showing expression of tapetal marker genes across the six clusters. (D-F)
Single-cell RNA-seq violin plots showing expression of meiocyte marker genes across the six
clusters. (G-I) Single-cell RNA-seq violin plots showing expression of endothecium marker
genes across the six clusters. (J-L) Single-cell RNA-seq violin plots showing expression of
epidermis marker genes across the six clusters.

EXTENDED DATA TABLES

Extended Data Table 1. CEL-seq primer sequences (Hashimshony et al 2016) for library

construction.

Name	Sequence
1s	GCCGGTAATACGACTCACTATAGGGAGTTCTACAGTCCGACGATCNNNNNNNNNNAGACTCTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTV
2s	GCCGGTAATACGACTCACTATAGGGAGTTCTACAGTCCGACGATCNNNNNNNNNNAGCTAGTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTV
3s	GCCGGTAATACGACTCACTATAGGGAGTTCTACAGTCCGACGATCNNNNNNNNNNAGCTCATTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTV
4s	GCCGGTAATACGACTCACTATAGGGAGTTCTACAGTCCGACGATCNNNNNNNNNNAGCTTCTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTV
5s	GCCGGTAATACGACTCACTATAGGGAGTTCTACAGTCCGACGATCNNNNNNNNNNCATGAGTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTV
6s	GCCGGTAATACGACTCACTATAGGGAGTTCTACAGTCCGACGATCNNNNNNNNNNCATGCATTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTV
7s	GCCGGTAATACGACTCACTATAGGGAGTTCTACAGTCCGACGATCNNNNNNNNNNCATGTCTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTV
8s	GCCGGTAATACGACTCACTATAGGGAGTTCTACAGTCCGACGATCNNNNNNNNNNCACTAGTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTV
9s	GCCGGTAATACGACTCACTATAGGGAGTTCTACAGTCCGACGATCNNNNNNNNNNCAGATCTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTV
10s	GCCGGTAATACGACTCACTATAGGGAGTTCTACAGTCCGACGATCNNNNNNNNNNTCACAGTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTV
11s	GCCGGTAATACGACTCACTATAGGGAGTTCTACAGTCCGACGATCNNNNNNNNNNAGGATCTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTV
12s	GCCGGTAATACGACTCACTATAGGGAGTTCTACAGTCCGACGATCNNNNNNNNNNAGTGCATTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTV
13s	GCCGGTAATACGACTCACTATAGGGAGTTCTACAGTCCGACGATCNNNNNNNNNNAGTGTCTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTV
14s	GCCGGTAATACGACTCACTATAGGGAGTTCTACAGTCCGACGATCNNNNNNNNNNTCCTAGTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTV
15s	GCCGGTAATACGACTCACTATAGGGAGTTCTACAGTCCGACGATCNNNNNNNNNNTCTGAGTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTV
16s	GCCGGTAATACGACTCACTATAGGGAGTTCTACAGTCCGACGATCNNNNNNNNNNTCTGCATTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTV
17s	GCCGGTAATACGACTCACTATAGGGAGTTCTACAGTCCGACGATCNNNNNNNNNNTCGAAGTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTV
18s	GCCGGTAATACGACTCACTATAGGGAGTTCTACAGTCCGACGATCNNNNNNNNNNTCGACATTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTV
19s	GCCGGTAATACGACTCACTATAGGGAGTTCTACAGTCCGACGATCNNNNNNNNNNTCGATCTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTV
20s	GCCGGTAATACGACTCACTATAGGGAGTTCTACAGTCCGACGATCNNNNNNNNNNGTACAGTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTV
21s	GCCGGTAATACGACTCACTATAGGGAGTTCTACAGTCCGACGATCNNNNNNNNNNGTACCATTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTV
22s	GCCGGTAATACGACTCACTATAGGGAGTTCTACAGTCCGACGATCNNNNNNNNNNGTACTCTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTV
23s	GCCGGTAATACGACTCACTATAGGGAGTTCTACAGTCCGACGATCNNNNNNNNNNGTCTAGTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTT

TTTV

24s GCCGGTAATACGACTCACTATAGGGAGTTCTACAGTCCGACGATCNNNNNNNNNNGTCTCATTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTT
TTTV

25s GCCGGTAATACGACTCACTATAGGGAGTTCTACAGTCCGACGATCNNNNNNNNNNGTTGCATTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTT
TTTV

26s GCCGGTAATACGACTCACTATAGGGAGTTCTACAGTCCGACGATCNNNNNNNNNNGTGACATTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTT
TTTV

27s GCCGGTAATACGACTCACTATAGGGAGTTCTACAGTCCGACGATCNNNNNNNNNNGTGATCTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTT
TTTV

28s GCCGGTAATACGACTCACTATAGGGAGTTCTACAGTCCGACGATCNNNNNNNNNNACAGTGTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTT
TTTV

29s GCCGGTAATACGACTCACTATAGGGAGTTCTACAGTCCGACGATCNNNNNNNNNNACCATGTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTT
TTTV

30s GCCGGTAATACGACTCACTATAGGGAGTTCTACAGTCCGACGATCNNNNNNNNNNACTCTGTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTT
TTTV

31s GCCGGTAATACGACTCACTATAGGGAGTTCTACAGTCCGACGATCNNNNNNNNNNACTCGATTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTT
TTTV

32s GCCGGTAATACGACTCACTATAGGGAGTTCTACAGTCCGACGATCNNNNNNNNNNACGTACTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTT
TTTV

33s GCCGGTAATACGACTCACTATAGGGAGTTCTACAGTCCGACGATCNNNNNNNNNNACGTTGTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTT
TTTV

34s GCCGGTAATACGACTCACTATAGGGAGTTCTACAGTCCGACGATCNNNNNNNNNNACGTGATTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTT
TTTV

35s GCCGGTAATACGACTCACTATAGGGAGTTCTACAGTCCGACGATCNNNNNNNNNNCTAGACTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTT
TTTV

36s GCCGGTAATACGACTCACTATAGGGAGTTCTACAGTCCGACGATCNNNNNNNNNNCTAGTGTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTT
TTTV

37s GCCGGTAATACGACTCACTATAGGGAGTTCTACAGTCCGACGATCNNNNNNNNNNCTAGGATTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTT
TTTV

38s GCCGGTAATACGACTCACTATAGGGAGTTCTACAGTCCGACGATCNNNNNNNNNNCTCATGTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTT
TTTV

39s GCCGGTAATACGACTCACTATAGGGAGTTCTACAGTCCGACGATCNNNNNNNNNNCTCAGATTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTT
TTTV

40s GCCGGTAATACGACTCACTATAGGGAGTTCTACAGTCCGACGATCNNNNNNNNNNCTTCGATTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTT
TTTV

41s GCCGGTAATACGACTCACTATAGGGAGTTCTACAGTCCGACGATCNNNNNNNNNNCTGTACTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTT
TTTV

42s GCCGGTAATACGACTCACTATAGGGAGTTCTACAGTCCGACGATCNNNNNNNNNNCTGTGATTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTT
TTTV

43s GCCGGTAATACGACTCACTATAGGGAGTTCTACAGTCCGACGATCNNNNNNNNNNTGAGACTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTT
TTTV

44s GCCGGTAATACGACTCACTATAGGGAGTTCTACAGTCCGACGATCNNNNNNNNNNTGCAACTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTT
TTTV

45s GCCGGTAATACGACTCACTATAGGGAGTTCTACAGTCCGACGATCNNNNNNNNNNTGCATGTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTT
TTTV

46s GCCGGTAATACGACTCACTATAGGGAGTTCTACAGTCCGACGATCNNNNNNNNNNTGCAGATTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTT
TTTV

47s GCCGGTAATACGACTCACTATAGGGAGTTCTACAGTCCGACGATCNNNNNNNNNNTGTCACTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTT
TTTV

48s GCCGGTAATACGACTCACTATAGGGAGTTCTACAGTCCGACGATCNNNNNNNNNNTGTCGATTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTT
TTTV

49s GCCGGTAATACGACTCACTATAGGGAGTTCTACAGTCCGACGATCNNNNNNNNNNTGGTACTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTT

TTTV

50s GCCGGTAATACGACTCACTATAGGGAGTTCTACAGTCCGACGATCNNNNNNNNNNGACATGTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTT
TTTV

51s GCCGGTAATACGACTCACTATAGGGAGTTCTACAGTCCGACGATCNNNNNNNNNNGATCACTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTT
TTTV

52s GCCGGTAATACGACTCACTATAGGGAGTTCTACAGTCCGACGATCNNNNNNNNNNGATCTGTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTT
TTTV

53s GCCGGTAATACGACTCACTATAGGGAGTTCTACAGTCCGACGATCNNNNNNNNNNGATCGATTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTT
TTTV

54s GCCGGTAATACGACTCACTATAGGGAGTTCTACAGTCCGACGATCNNNNNNNNNNGAGTACTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTT
TTTV

55s GCCGGTAATACGACTCACTATAGGGAGTTCTACAGTCCGACGATCNNNNNNNNNNAGACAGTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTT
TTTV

56s GCCGGTAATACGACTCACTATAGGGAGTTCTACAGTCCGACGATCNNNNNNNNNNAGACCATTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTT
TTTV

57s GCCGGTAATACGACTCACTATAGGGAGTTCTACAGTCCGACGATCNNNNNNNNNNAGTGAGTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTT
TTTV

58s GCCGGTAATACGACTCACTATAGGGAGTTCTACAGTCCGACGATCNNNNNNNNNNAGGAAGTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTT
TTTV

59s GCCGGTAATACGACTCACTATAGGGAGTTCTACAGTCCGACGATCNNNNNNNNNNAGGACATTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTT
TTTV

60s GCCGGTAATACGACTCACTATAGGGAGTTCTACAGTCCGACGATCNNNNNNNNNNCAACAGTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTT
TTTV

61s GCCGGTAATACGACTCACTATAGGGAGTTCTACAGTCCGACGATCNNNNNNNNNNCAACCATTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTT
TTTV

62s GCCGGTAATACGACTCACTATAGGGAGTTCTACAGTCCGACGATCNNNNNNNNNNCAACTCTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTT
TTTV

63s GCCGGTAATACGACTCACTATAGGGAGTTCTACAGTCCGACGATCNNNNNNNNNNCACTCATTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTT
TTTV

64s GCCGGTAATACGACTCACTATAGGGAGTTCTACAGTCCGACGATCNNNNNNNNNNCACTTCTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTT
TTTV

65s GCCGGTAATACGACTCACTATAGGGAGTTCTACAGTCCGACGATCNNNNNNNNNNCAGAAGTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTT
TTTV

66s GCCGGTAATACGACTCACTATAGGGAGTTCTACAGTCCGACGATCNNNNNNNNNNCAGACATTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTT
TTTV

67s GCCGGTAATACGACTCACTATAGGGAGTTCTACAGTCCGACGATCNNNNNNNNNNTCACCATTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTT
TTTV

68s GCCGGTAATACGACTCACTATAGGGAGTTCTACAGTCCGACGATCNNNNNNNNNNTCACTCTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTT
TTTV

69s GCCGGTAATACGACTCACTATAGGGAGTTCTACAGTCCGACGATCNNNNNNNNNNTCCTCATTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTT
TTTV

70s GCCGGTAATACGACTCACTATAGGGAGTTCTACAGTCCGACGATCNNNNNNNNNNTCCTTCTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTT
TTV

71s GCCGGTAATACGACTCACTATAGGGAGTTCTACAGTCCGACGATCNNNNNNNNNNTCTGTCTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTT
TTTV

72s GCCGGTAATACGACTCACTATAGGGAGTTCTACAGTCCGACGATCNNNNNNNNNNGTCTTCTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTT
TTTV

73s GCCGGTAATACGACTCACTATAGGGAGTTCTACAGTCCGACGATCNNNNNNNNNNGTTGAGTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTT
TTTV

74s GCCGGTAATACGACTCACTATAGGGAGTTCTACAGTCCGACGATCNNNNNNNNNNGTTGTCTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTT
TTTV

75s GCCGGTAATACGACTCACTATAGGGAGTTCTACAGTCCGACGATCNNNNNNNNNNGTGAAGTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTT

TTTV

76s GCCGGTAATACGACTCACTATAGGGAGTTCTACAGTCCGACGATCNNNNNNNNNNACAGACTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTT
TTTV

77s GCCGGTAATACGACTCACTATAGGGAGTTCTACAGTCCGACGATCNNNNNNNNNNACAGGATTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTT
TTTV

78s GCCGGTAATACGACTCACTATAGGGAGTTCTACAGTCCGACGATCNNNNNNNNNNACCAACTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTT
TTTV

79s GCCGGTAATACGACTCACTATAGGGAGTTCTACAGTCCGACGATCNNNNNNNNNNACCAGATTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTT
TTTV

80s GCCGGTAATACGACTCACTATAGGGAGTTCTACAGTCCGACGATCNNNNNNNNNNACTCACTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTT
TTTV

81s GCCGGTAATACGACTCACTATAGGGAGTTCTACAGTCCGACGATCNNNNNNNNNNCTCAACTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTT
TTTV

82s GCCGGTAATACGACTCACTATAGGGAGTTCTACAGTCCGACGATCNNNNNNNNNNCTTCACTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTT
TTTV

83s GCCGGTAATACGACTCACTATAGGGAGTTCTACAGTCCGACGATCNNNNNNNNNNCTTCTGTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTT
TTTV

84s GCCGGTAATACGACTCACTATAGGGAGTTCTACAGTCCGACGATCNNNNNNNNNNCTGTTGTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTT
TTTV

85s GCCGGTAATACGACTCACTATAGGGAGTTCTACAGTCCGACGATCNNNNNNNNNNTGAGTGTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTT
TTTV

86s GCCGGTAATACGACTCACTATAGGGAGTTCTACAGTCCGACGATCNNNNNNNNNNTGAGGATTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTT
TTTV

87s GCCGGTAATACGACTCACTATAGGGAGTTCTACAGTCCGACGATCNNNNNNNNNNTGTCTGTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTT
TTTV

88s GCCGGTAATACGACTCACTATAGGGAGTTCTACAGTCCGACGATCNNNNNNNNNNTGGTTGTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTT
TTTV

89s GCCGGTAATACGACTCACTATAGGGAGTTCTACAGTCCGACGATCNNNNNNNNNNTGGTGATTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTT
TTTV

90s GCCGGTAATACGACTCACTATAGGGAGTTCTACAGTCCGACGATCNNNNNNNNNNGAAGACTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTT
TTTV

91s GCCGGTAATACGACTCACTATAGGGAGTTCTACAGTCCGACGATCNNNNNNNNNNGAAGTGTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTT
TTTV

92s GCCGGTAATACGACTCACTATAGGGAGTTCTACAGTCCGACGATCNNNNNNNNNNGAAGGATTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTT
TTTV

93s GCCGGTAATACGACTCACTATAGGGAGTTCTACAGTCCGACGATCNNNNNNNNNNGACAACTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTT
TTTV

94s GCCGGTAATACGACTCACTATAGGGAGTTCTACAGTCCGACGATCNNNNNNNNNNGACAGATTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTT
TTTV

95s GCCGGTAATACGACTCACTATAGGGAGTTCTACAGTCCGACGATCNNNNNNNNNNGAGTTGTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTT
TTTV

96s GCCGGTAATACGACTCACTATAGGGAGTTCTACAGTCCGACGATCNNNNNNNNNNGAGTGATTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTTT
TTTV

801 **Extended Data Table 2**. Uniquely indexed RNA PCR primer sequences from Illumina.

802 Barcodes are underlined.

Name	Sequence
RP1	AATGATACGGCGACCACCGAGATCTACACGTTCAGAGTTCTACAGTCCGA
RPI_6	CAAGCAGAAGACGGCATACGAGATATTGGCGTGACTGGAGTTCCTTGGCACCCGAGAATTCCA

RPI_11   CAAGCAGAAGACGGCATACGAGAT<u>GTAGCC</u>GTGACTGGAGTTCCTTGGCACCCGAGAATTCCA

RPI_28   CAAGCAGAAGACGGCATACGAGAT<u>CTTTTG</u>GTGACTGGAGTTCCTTGGCACCCGAGAATTCCA

RPI_29   CAAGCAGAAGACGGCATACGAGAT<u>TAGTTG</u>GTGACTGGAGTTCCTTGGCACCCGAGAATTCCA

803
804

 SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

DETAILED PROTOCOL

Enzyme Purification (Adapted from Kanaya and Uchida 1981)

- Wash 50 mL suspended ω-aminohexyl–agarose beads in water three times.

- Wash beads in 0.1M borax, pH 9.0 three times.

- Separately, dissolve sodium metaperiodate in 6 mL water to a final concentration of 0.2M
and add 488 mg GMP.

- Incubate solution at room temperature in the dark for 1 h with gentle mixing.

- Resuspend the washed agarose beads in 0.1M borax, pH 9.0 to a total volume of 36 mL.

- Add 6 mL solution containing oxidized GMP to agarose beads and incubate at room
temperature with gentle mixing for 2-4 hours.

- Slowly add 136 mg of solid sodium borohydride to the reaction and gently mix the
solution at 4□ for 1 hour with the cap loosened to allow ventilation.

- Wash the coupled GMP beads three times each with 0.1M borax, then water, then 1M
sodium chloride.

- Load GMP beads into a FPLC column (ex. Superdex 200 10/300; Cytiva) and store in 1
M sodium chloride at 4□ until ready for enzyme purification.

- Extra beads can be stored in a sealed container in 1M sodium chloride.

- Resuspend enzymes at 10X concentration (12.5% w/v Cellulase-RS and 4% w/v
Macerozyme R10) in RNase binding buffer (RBB; 150 mM NaCl, 10 mM citrate, pH
7.0)

- Load 4 mL of GMP beads in a gravity flow column and equilibrate with RBB at 4□, then
pass enzyme mix through column.

- Collect flow-through and run through the pre-equilibrated GMP-agarose FPLC column at
4□ using a peristaltic pump.

- Collect fractions and pool those with A280 absorbance >0.1.

- Concentrate pooled enzymes with an Amicon Ultra-15 Centrifugal Filter Unit, MWCO
30 kDa (MilliporeSigma) at 4□ until a 1:10 dilution of the enzyme blend has an 0.75
absorbance at A280.

- Purified enzymes can be mixed 1:1 with glycerol and stored at -20□.

Primer Master Mix (100 µL per well)

- Mix 1687.5 µL 10 mM dNTP solution and 225 µL 10% TritonX-100 in 7713 µL water.

- Dispense 96.25 µL of this solution into each well of a 96-well plate.

- Add 3.75 µL of each 50 µM barcoded oligo[dT] CEL-Seq2 primer into separate wells.

- Vortex well and spin at 400 x *g* for 30 seconds. This is the Primer Plate for aliquoting
Primer Master Mix into sample plates and should be stored at -80□.

• When prepping for cell isolation, aliquot 0.8 µL of each Primer Master Mix into wells of
a new 96-well plate. Do this transfer in a cold room to reduce evaporation.
• Seal plate with AlumnaSeal and spin at 400 x *g* for 30 seconds.
• Store sample plates at -80☐ until ready for cell isolation.
848

Fixed scRNA-Seq Cell Isolation
• Dissect fresh tissue (~25 mm^2) into 50 µL ice cold Farmer's Solution (3:1 100%
Ethanol:Glacial acetic acid) in 100 µL 8-strip PCR tubes for two hours. Make sure tissue
is submerged.
• Pipette out Farmer's Solution, add 50 µL ice cold 0.1X Phosphate Buffered Saline (PBS)
for five minutes, repeat once.
• Pipette out 0.1X PBS, add 27 µL 20 mM MES and 3 µL 10X purified enzyme, mix well.
Make sure tissue is submerged.
• Digest tissue at 50☐ for 90 minutes.
• Pipette enzyme solution and tissue up and down ten times to further dissociate cells.
• Transfer enzyme/cell solution to a glass microscope slide with tape on either end to act as
a spacer.
• Place a second glass microscope slide on the first and move the two slides back and forth
ten times to further dissociate the cells. Confirm that the cells are dissociated with a
microscope.
• Add 50 µL 0.1X PBS to each slide to wash and collect the cells into 1 mL 0.1X PBS on
ice.
• Add 7 µL SYBR Green I Nucleic Acid Gel Stain (diluted 1:1000) to solution, let incubate
on ice for 20 minutes.
• Filter solution through a 40 µm nylon cell strainer into a 50 mL Falcon tube.
• Wash strainer with an additional 2 mL 0.1X PBS.
• Isolate cells into 96-well plates containing 0.8 µL Primer Master Mix with a Hana Single
Cell Dispenser or a BioSorter.
• Seal plates with AlumaSeal and spin at 400 x *g* for 30 seconds then store at -80☐.
873

CEL-Seq2 Library Preparation (Adapted from Hashimony *et al.*, 2016)
Keep samples on ice unless otherwise noted
DAY 1
• Incubate plate with cells and Primer Master Mix at 65☐ for 3 minutes, spin at 400 x *g*,
incubate again at 65☐ for 3 minutes, place on ice.
• To the side of each well (to minimize bubbles) add 0.7 µL of reverse transcription mix
(8:2:1:1 of Superscript IV 5X Buffer, 100 mM DTT, RNase Inhibitor, Superscript IV).
• Spin plate at 400 x *g* for 30 seconds, lightly vortex, then spin again.

• Incubate plate at 42□ for 2 minutes, 50□ for 15 minutes, 55□ for 10 minutes then place
on ice.
• Pool samples by row into 8-strip tubes, reducing 96 samples to eight.
• To each tube add 4.6 µL exonuclease I mix (2.5 µL of 10X Exonuclease I Buffer, 2.1 µL
Exonuclease I).
• Incubate plate at 37□ for 20 minutes, 80□ for 10 minutes then place on ice.
• Add 44.28 µL (1.8X volume) of pre-warmed RNAClean XP beads, mix well, and
incubate at room temperature for 15 minutes.
• **Bead Wash:**
o Place sample on magnetic rack until the liquid clears then discard the supernatant,
careful not to disturb or pipette up the beads.
o Add 100 µL of freshly made 80% ethanol, incubate 30 seconds, remove ethanol.
o Repeat previous step once more.
o Remove all ethanol and let beads dry for ~5 minutes.
• Elute with 7 µL RNase-free water and incubate for two minutes at room temperature then
mix via pipette.
• Add 3 µL second strand synthesis mix (2.31 µL Second Strand Reaction dNTP-free
Buffer, 0.23 µL 10 mM dNTPs, 0.08 µL DNA ligase, 0.3 µL DNA polymerase I, 0.08 µL
RNase H).
• Incubate at 16□ for 4 hours.
• Pool the eight samples into a single tube.
• Add 66 µL of bead binding buffer (2.5 M NaCl, 20% PEG 8000) and 30 µL pre-warmed
Ampure XP beads (1.2X volume) to pooled samples, mix well, and incubate for 15
minutes at room temperature.
• Bead Wash, elute with 6.4 µL RNase-free water and incubate for two minutes at room
temperature then mix via pipette.
• Add 9.6 µL of MegaScript T7 IVT mix (1:1:1:1:1:1 of CTP solution, GTP solution, UTP
solution, ATP solution, 10X Reaction Buffer, T7 Enzyme Mix), incubate at 37□ for 13-
16 hours.
911
DAY 2
• Place sample on magnetic rack for 5 minutes and transfer sample without beads into new
100 µL tube.
• Add 28.8 µL (1.8X volume) of pre-warmed RNAClean XP beads and incubate at room
temperature for 15 minutes.
• Bead Wash, elute with 6.5 µL of RNase-free water and incubate for two minutes at room
temperature then mix via pipette.
• Assess the amplified RNA quality and quantity with an RNA Pico 6000 chip on an
Agilent 2100 BioAnalyzer.

921		o Expect a primer peak (~150 bp), but the majority of the sequence distribution
922		should be between 200-1000 bp.
923	•	Samples can be stored at -80□.
924		
925		
926		DAY 3
927	•	Add 1.5 µL of priming mix (9:5:1 of RNase-free water, 10 mM dNTPs, 1M tagged
928		random hexamer primer) to sample and incubate at 65□ for 5 minutes then place on ice.
929	•	Add 4 µL of reverse transcription mix (4:2:1:1 of First Strand Buffer, 0.1 M DTT,
930		RNaseOUT, SuperScript II) then incubate at 25□ for 10 minutes, 42□ for 1 hour, and
931		70□ for 10 minutes then place on ice.
932	•	In a new 8-strip tube, add 5.5 µL of sample to 21 µL of final PCR master mix with
933		Illumina TruSeq Small RNA PCR primer (RP1) and Index Adaptor (RPI "X") (6.5 µL
934		RNase-free water, 12.5 µL Ultra II Q5 Master Mix, 1 µL of 10 µM RP1, 1 µL of 10 µM
935		RPI "X").
936	•	Optional Amplification Optimization:
937		o Transfer 5 µL of sample and PCR mix to new 8-strip tube and add 0.5 µL SYBR
938		Green I Nucleic Acid Gel Stain (diluted 1:5000)
939		o Run qRT-PCR with SYBR-sample subset (98□ for 30 seconds, then 25 cycles of
940		98□ for 10 seconds, 65□ for 30 seconds, and 72□ for 60 seconds, and finish with
941		72□ for 10 minutes) to see how many amplification cycles are needed.
942		o Based on the qRT amplification plot, the optimal number of cycles is at the
943		transition from exponential phase to non-exponential phase (the point at which the
944		curve starts to plateau).
945		o We found 13 cycles to be the optimal number of cycles for all our samples.
946	•	Amplify sample at 98□ for 30 seconds, then X cycles of 98□ for 10 seconds, 65□ for 30
947		seconds, and 72□ for 60 seconds, and finish with 72□ for 10 minutes.
948	•	Add 26.5 µL, or 20.5 µL if subset removed for optimization, (1.0X volume) of Ampure
949		XP beads to sample and incubate at room temperature for 15 minutes.
950	•	Bead Wash, elute with 25 µL RNase-free water and incubate for two minutes at room
951		temperature then mix via pipette.
952	•	Add 25 µL (1.0X volume) of Ampure XP beads and incubate at room temperature for 15
953		minutes.
954	•	Bead Wash, elute with 10 µL RNase-free water and incubate for two minutes at room
955		temperature then mix via pipette.
956	•	Assess cDNA product with an Agilent BioAnalyzer High Sensitivity DNA chip.
957		o Sequences should be evenly distributed between 200-1000 bp.
958		o Expected concentration should be ~1 ng/µL.
959		o Additional size selection with Ampure SPRIselect beads should be applied if a
960		sizeable primer peak (<200 bp) is present.

• Samples can then be stored at -80☐.

Materials and Reagents

ω-Aminohexyl–Agarose beads (Sigma-Aldrich #A6017)

Guanosine monophosphate (GMP; Santa Cruz Biotechnology #295032)

Borax (Sigma-Aldrich #71997)

Sodium metaperiodate (Chem-Impex #30205)

Sodium borohydride (Sigma-Aldrich #71320)

Sodium chloride (Invitrogen #AM9759)

Amicon Ultra-15 Centrifugal Filter Unit, MWCO 30 kDa (MilliporeSigma #Z717185)

Axygen Low Profile 8-Strip PCR Tubes (Fisher Scientific #14-223-505)

Farmer's Solution (3:1 100% Ethanol:Glacial Acetic Acid)

Poly(ethylene glycol) (Sigma-Aldrich #89510)

Phosphate-buffered saline (PBS; Sigma-Aldrich #P4417)

SYBR Green I Nucleic Acid Gel Stain (Invitrogen #S7563)

Cellulase-RS (Sigma-Aldrich #C0615)

Macerozyme R10 (Sigma-Aldrich #P2401)

40 μm Nylon cell strainer (Corning #07-201-430)

50 mL Falcon Centrifuge tube (Corning #352098)

96-well LoBind PCR plate (Invitrogen #0030129512)

Deoxynucleotide (dNTP) Solution Mix (New England Biolabs #N0447L)

Triton X-100, 10% in water (Sigma-Aldrich #93443)

AlumaSeal CS Sealing Film (Excel Scientific #FCS-25)

Superscript IV Reverse Transcriptase (ThermoFisher Scientific #18090050)

Exonuclease I (New England Biolabs #MO293)

Second Strand Synthesis (dNTP-free) Reaction Buffer (New England Biolabs #B6117S)

DNA Polymerase I (New England Biolabs #M0209)

E. coli DNA Ligase (New England Biolabs #M0205)

RNase H (New England Biolabs #M0297)

Agencourt Ampure XP (Beckman Coulter #A63880)

Agencourt RNAClean XP (Beckman Coulter #A63987)

SPRIselect (Beckman Coulter #B23317)

MegaScript T7 Transcription Kit (Invitrogen #AM1334)

Superscript II Reverse Transcriptase (Invitrogen #18064014)

RNaseOUT Recombinant Ribonuclease Inhibitor (Invitrogen #10777019)

NEBNext Ultra II Q5 Master Mix (New England Biolabs #M0544L)

Illumina TruSeq Small RNA PCR Primer (RP1)

Illumina TruSeq Small RNA PCR Index Adaptors (RPI "X")

RNase-free water (Invitrogen #10977023)

Agilent RNA 6000 Pico Kit (Agilent Technologies #5067-1513)

Agilent DNA High Sensitivity Kit (Agilent Technologies #5067-4626)
1002

<u>Instruments</u>
Gravity column (ex. Kontes Flex-Column; Kimble Chase, Vineland, NJ, USA)
FPLC column (ex. Superdex 200 10/300 FPLC; Cytiva, Marlborough, MA, USA)
Peristaltic pump (ex. Minipuls 2; Gilson Medical Electronics, Middleton, WI, USA)
Spectrophotometer (ex. Nanodrop; ThermoFisher Scientific, Waltham, MA, USA)
BioSorter (Union BioMetrica, Holliston, MA, USA) or Hana Single Cell Dispenser (Namocell,
Mountain View, CA, USA)
BioAnalyzer 2100 (Agilent Technologies, Santa Clara, CA, USA)

1016
1017