1

Main Manuscript for

Correlated protein modules reflecting functional coordination of interacting proteins are

uncovered by single-cell proteomics

Mo Hu [a,b,1], Yutong Zhang [a,b,c,1], Yuan Yuan [a,b,c], Wenping Ma [a,b,d], Yinghui Zheng [a,b], Qingqing Gu [e], X.

Sunney Xie [a,b]

[a] Beijing Advanced Innovation Center for Genomics, Peking University,100871 Beijing, China; [b]

Biomedical Pioneering Innovation Center, Peking University, 100871 Beijing, China; [c] Collage of

Chemistry and Molecular Engineering, Peking University, 100871 Beijing, China; [d] Peking-Tsinghua

Center for Life Sciences (CLS), Academy for Advanced Interdisciplinary Studies, Peking University,

100871, Beijing, China and [e] Changping Laboratory, Beijing, China.

[1] Mo Hu and Yutong Zhang contributed equally to this work.

* X. Sunney Xie

Email: sunneyxie@biopic.pku.edu.cn

Keywords: single-cell proteomics; correlated protein modules; mass spectrometry; protein-protein
interaction; gene ontology

20 **This PDF file includes:**

21   Main Text
22   Figures 1 to 4
23

Abstract

Single-cell proteomics has attracted a lot of attention in recent years because it offers more functional

relevance than single-cell transcriptomics. However, most work to date focused on cell typing, which has

been widely accomplished by single-cell transcriptomics. Here we report the use of single-cell proteomics

to measure the correlations between the translational levels of any pair of proteins in a single mammalian

cell. To do so, we chose label-free instead of isobaric labeling quantification for single-cell mass

spectrometry in order to minimize measurement noise. In measuring pairwise correlations among ~1,000

proteins in steady-state K562 cells, we found multiple correlated protein modules (CPMs), each

containing a group of highly positively correlated proteins that are functional interacting and collectively

involved in certain biological functions, such as protein synthesis and oxidative phosphorylation. Some

CPMs are shared across different cell types while others are cell-type specific. Although widely studied in

omics analyses, pairwise correlations are often measured by introducing perturbations to bulk samples,

which would mask the coordination of gene expression in steady-state condition. The single-cell

correlations probed in our experiment reflect intrinsic steady-state fluctuations in the absence of

perturbation. We note that observed correlations between proteins are experimentally more distinct and

functionally more relevant than those between corresponding mRNAs measured in single-cell

transcriptomics. By virtue of single-cell proteomics, functional coordination of proteins is manifested

through CPMs.

Significance Statement

In a mammalian cell, thousands of proteins are expressed, barely continuously, but at fluctuating levels

over time. Yet many proteins need to work together in order to perform a specific biological function. By

conducting accurate mass spectrometry-based proteomics of single cells, we discovered multiple protein

groups, each exhibiting positive pairwise correlations under steady-state condition. Through such

observations, it can be inferred that certain proteins are synchronized to collectively carry out specific

biological functions, such as protein synthesis. Our results demonstrate that single-cell proteomics can be

used to probe protein-protein interactions and study how proteins work together in a system-wide

approach.

Main Text

Introduction

In a living cell, abundances of proteins and mRNAs fluctuate stochastically over time or even oscillate

periodically (1, 2), hence cell-to-cell variations. This is because in a single cell there are only one or two

copies of DNA (2–4), whose transcription and translation cannot be synchronized among different cells.

On the other hand, a particular cellular function, such as protein synthesis, often requires multiple

proteins, which, if each fluctuating, need to be coordinated in order for them to work together. While bulk

measurement fails to study the ubiquitous fluctuation, the variation of mRNA abundances and protein

abundances can be revealed at single-cell level, thanks to the single-cell omics technologies. Although

the genome-wide fluctuation cannot be studied through single-cell omics in real time, the intrinsic

dynamics may be deduced through correlation analysis on single cells in steady state (5) (**Fig. 1a**).

Currently, single-cell transcriptomics study has been widely used to distinguish different types of cells.

Apart from cell typing, high-precision single-cell transcriptomics can also measure correlations in steady-

state gene expression (6, 7). However, proteins, rather than mRNAs, are direct executers of most

biological processes. Since protein abundance cannot be accurately predicted by mRNA (8–10), the

dynamics of protein abundances and their correlations can only be assessed at the protein level.

Moreover, small copy numbers of mRNA in single cells combined with limited detectability of current

technologies (11, 12) would lead to high measurement noise (**Fig. 1b**), hindering accurate correlation

measurements (**Fig. 1c**). Despite a much lower level of detectability and limited number of cells,

correlations measured at the protein level still proved to be more faithful than those measured at RNA

level (**Fig. 1c, d**).

To study the functional correlations among proteins, various methods have been developed, including

protein correlation profiling (PCP) (13–16) ,which is based on the hypothesis that interacting proteins (or

proteins in the same pathway) should be positively correlated. Also, correlation-centric approach, with

accurate quantification by mass spectrometry, proved to be powerful in capturing indirect interactions and

proteins that interact but do not co-localize (17). However, these methods all rely on perturbations and

bulk measurement where protein abundances are averaged among different cells, and cannot probe

intrinsic dynamics of steady-state cells. Therefore, system-wide single-cell proteomics is needed.

Current mass spectrometry-based single-cell proteomics studies have achieved identification and

quantification of hundreds or even thousands of proteins in a single cell using isobaric labeling (18, 19) or

label-free (20, 21) quantification. Most existing studies focus on distinguishing different types of cells (18–

20), which has been widely accomplished by single-cell transcriptomics analysis. To date, single-cell

proteomics has not been used to study proteome-wide pairwise protein correlation.

Here we report a robust mass spectrometry-based single-cell proteomic pipeline, which allowed us to

measure correlations among ~1,000 proteins in K562 cells. By measuring pairwise correlations based on

protein abundance fluctuations in homogeneous cells, we identified correlated protein modules (CPMs),

which are groups of proteins with highly positive pairwise correlations. CPMs were characterized by

enrichment of certain cellular functions and known protein complexes. Furthermore, we demonstrated

that CPMs identified from single-cell proteomic measurement could provide clearer and more solid

evidence on functional relationships among proteins than single cell RNA-seq based approach.

Results

Development of a single-cell proteomics pipeline for accurate protein correlation measurement

To measure pairwise correlations between proteins, protein abundances need to be measured accurately

in the first place. To this end, we evaluated two established methods for MS-based single-cell proteomics

analysis, *i.e.*, the MS^1-based label-free quantification and the carrier proteome-based isobaric labeling

with TMT quantification (**Fig. 2a**). We optimized these two pipelines by considering the throughput,

coverage of proteome and robustness of the quantification performance. For label-free pipeline,

commonly used gradient for single-cell proteomics ranges from 40 minutes to 2 hours. Longer gradient

generally improves the protein identification, with a penalty on the number of cells to be analyzed each

day. Here we ran single-shot LC-MS experiments at a moderate gradient (16 cells per day) to balance the

throughput and quantification accuracy. For isobaric labeling pipeline, to improve the accuracy of

measurements, real-time search (RTS) and MS^3 were used to reduce the interference from co-isolation of

other precursors. The throughput of the isobaric labeling pipeline is higher than that of the label-free

pipeline, reaching more than 100 cells each day.

Human leukemia cell line K562 was used as single-cell samples to test the performance of these two

pipelines. We first compared the number of identified proteins in each run between two methods. The

label-free pipeline identified more proteins than did the isobaric labeling pipeline (**Fig. 2b**). Compared with

the isobaric labeling pipeline, the number of proteins identified using the label-free pipeline vary more

largely across different runs, ranging from 600 to 1000 proteins each run. In MS-based proteomics, a

protein identified is not necessarily quantified. Nevertheless, with the help of match-between-runs (MBR)

method, the label-free pipeline was able to quantify more proteins compared to the isobaric labeling

pipeline. Due to the unavailability of related software, no MBR or other peptide identity propagation

methods was applied to the isobaric labeling-based quantification.

We then analyzed the coefficient of variance (CV) of protein abundances among cells, which was

substantially lower for label-free pipeline compared with isobaric labeling. Notably, there were

substantially more proteins with CV lower than 0.3 in the label-free pipeline (**Fig. 2c**). As for the

distribution of raw MS signals, the signals for quantification in single-cell channels in the isobaric labeling

pipeline (MS^3 signal-to-noise ratio) are much lower than in the label-free pipeline (MS^1 intensity) (**Fig. 2d**).

We further evaluated the performance of two pipelines in measuring pairwise correlations of protein

abundances (SI Appendix, **Fig. S1a**). The Pearson correlation coefficient of protein abundances

measured by two methods both centered around zero and symmetrically distributed from negative region

to positive region (SI Appendix, **Fig. S1b**). Ribosomal proteins were chosen to assess the quality of

measured correlation coefficient. The label-free pipeline was able to quantify more ribosomal proteins and

discover more highly positive pairwise correlations than the isobaric labeling pipeline, while the

correlations between randomly picked proteins measured by the two pipelines distributed similarly (**Fig.**

2e, f). Taken together, the label-free pipeline was selected to be used in this study.

Correlated protein modules in K562 cell line

Pairwise correlations of protein abundances were measured based on single-cell measurements of the

K562 cell line. In total, 1409 proteins were quantified in 74 cells. After removing contaminates, low-quality

proteins and outlier cells, the final dataset was established comprising 1249 proteins from 69 cells.

Pearson correlation coefficients of the abundances of these proteins centered around zero (SI Appendix,

Fig. S1b). After unsupervised hierarchy clustering based on Pearson correlation coefficients of protein

abundances, we found groups of highly positive correlated proteins, named as correlated protein modules

(CPMs). 66 CPMs were found in K562 cells, containing 546 proteins in total (**Fig. 3a**). Each CPM

contained 5 to 38 proteins. The correlation coefficients between protein pairs within a CPM, with average

values ranging from 0.29 to 0.53, was much higher than those outside CPMs (SI Appendix, **Fig. S2a**).

To examine potential functional relationships among proteins in each CPM, we compared our data with

CORUM (22) to see if CPMs represent certain protein complexes. Several subunits from the same

complex appeared in the same CPM. For example, CPM #7 contained 5 spliceosome subunits and CPM

#34 contained 4 EIF subunits. CPM #19 was almost entirely composed of T-complex proteins (5/7) and

CPM #28 mostly consisted of ribosomal proteins (37/38).

Proteins in the same CPMs tend to have the same subcellular localization, as shown by enrichment

analysis of the Gene Ontology cellular component (GOCC). For example, CPM #15 was enriched with the

ribonucleoprotein complex and telomeric region while CPM #7 was enriched with the CMG complex. Over

half of the CPMs had significant enrichment of GOCC terms.

Functional relationships indicated by the Gene Ontology biological process (GOBP), KEGG pathway (23)

and Reactome (24) pathway enrichment were highly prevalent among CPMs (**Fig. 3c,** SI Appendix, **Fig.**

S3). For example, CPM #56 was enriched with "tRNA aminoacylation (GO:0006418)" while CPM #41 was

enriched with "antigen processing and presentation (KEGG: hsa04612)". That most CPMs were

significantly enriched with GOBP terms suggests that involving in the same biological process is a major

contributor to protein correlations in steady state.

Some CPMs were enriched with multiple functions. For example, in CPM #6, TRIM28 and USP7 were

involved in "DNA demethylation (GO:0080111)" while DCD and S100A9 were related to "antimicrobial

humoral response (GO:0019730)". This implies that DNA demethylation and antimicrobial humoral

response are closely related, consistent with a previous study (25).

Finally, we studied the relationship between each protein pair within a CPM in the STRING database (26)

to see how well protein correlations reflect actual protein-protein interactions. It was found that all CPMs

except four had corresponding PPIs. Over 90% of protein pairs in CPM #56 and CPM #61 had known

PPIs in the STRING database. To further evaluate the relationship of pairwise protein correlations, CPMs

and protein-protein interactions, we calculated the fraction of known protein-protein interaction at different

correlation level between pairs of proteins in steady-state single-cells. For a pair of proteins, a larger

correlation coefficient means higher possibility that the two proteins have known interactions (**Fig. 3d**).

We also found the protein pairs within CPMs have much higher possibility to have known PPI in the

STRING database compared to a pair of proteins not in the same CPM (**Fig. 3d**), which is consistent with

the fact that CPMs reflect functional coordination of interacting proteins.

As CPM carries out specific cellular functions, correlations among CPMs may imply relationships among

different cellular activities. We defined the abundance of a CPM as the sum of the abundances of all

proteins included in that CPM. We further measured the relationship between CPMs based on the

pairwise correlations of CPM abundances. Most of the CPMs were poorly correlated, with correlation

coefficients from 0 to 0.2. However, some CPM pairs showed negative correlations lower than -0.3, which

means the abundance of one CPM goes up in a certain cell when the other one goes down. For example,

CPM #11 and CPM #57 had a negative correlation coefficient (SI Appendix, **Fig. S2b**). The 11 proteins in

CPM #11 were related to "rRNA processing (GO:0006364)" and "DNA post-replication repair

(GO:0006301)", while the 9 proteins in CPM #57 were involved in "ATP generation (GO:0006757)" and

"NADH metabolism (GO:0006734)". For cells that had high CPM #11 abundance, the abundance of CPM

#57 was rather low, consistent with a previous study reporting that ribosome biosynthesis is controlled by

fluctuation of NAD(+)/NADH ratio (27). CPM #57 was also negatively correlated with CPM #37 (SI

Appendix, **Fig. S2c)** which contains proteins TOP2A and CDK1. These two proteins were found to be

involved in regulating the circadian rhythm (28). Thus, this negative correlation suggested that CPM #57

was a circadian rhythm-dependent fluctuating CPM.

CPM is a universal feature of functional proteome

To confirm that CPM is a universal feature of functional proteome, we further examined protein

correlations in the human 293T cell line and mouse MII oocytes. The correlation map of 1150 proteins in

63 293T cells revealed 50 CPMs (SI Appendix, **Fig. S4a**). Despite the differences between K562 and

293T cell line in protein levels and in sizes of CPMs, the functions of CPMs in the two cell lines appeared

similar. For example, T-complex CPM was also found in 293T cells (SI Appendix, **Fig. S4d**) as in K562

cells. Proteins of tRNA aminoacylation module in K562 were also highly correlated in 293T, despite of

marked differences between the two cell lines in the abundance of these proteins (SI Appendix, **Fig.**

S4c). This shows that although proteins with shared function could be tuned at different levels, the

coordination of synchronized fluctuation is consistent among different types of cells.

Experiments on 137 mouse MII oocytes quantified 3422 proteins, which is about three-fold the number of

quantified proteins in regular-size mammalian cells. We discovered 86 CPMs from these proteins (SI

Appendix, **Fig. S4b**). Compared with K562 and 293T, CPMs of mouse oocytes are generally bigger in

size and tend to infer more complex biological functions. CPMs of certain protein complexes identified in

K562 and 293T cells, such as T-complex (SI Appendix, **Fig. S4d, e**), were also found in mouse oocytes,

indicating that these CPMs are conserved across different species and cell types. CPMs associated with

certain functions, such as proteasome complex, could only be identified in oocytes (SI Appendix, **Fig.**

S4f). Therefore, the modules identified from single-cells can infer cellular characteristics and are affected

by the total number of identified proteins.

CPMs reveal more functional information than CGMs and bulk proteomic approach

Similar to CPMs, correlated gene modules (CGMs) have also been reported based on pairwise

correlations of RNA expression levels via MALBAC-dt, a single-cell RNA-seq method with high

detectability and high accuracy (6). To compare the efficacy of CPM versus CGM in functional analyses,

we examined the correlation coefficients of genes that have been identified from both methods. Measured

correlation coefficients of RNAs were more concentrated around zero compared to those of proteins (**Fig.**

4a). We also found the pairwise correlation coefficients of proteins in functional modules are generally

higher than those of corresponding RNAs. For example, for ribosome module, the average correlation

coefficients among proteins is 0.55, compared with 0.32 for RNAs (**Fig. 4b**). Thus, compared to

transcripts of ribosome proteins, the correlation among ribosomal proteins are more distinguishable from

the overall pairwise correlations (**Fig. 4c**). Furthermore, some functional modules identified at the protein

level cannot be observed at the RNA level, such as CPM #11 (rRNA processing and mismatch repair)

and CPM #3 (inner mitochondrial membrane oxidation phosphorylation) (**Fig. 4d**). These differences are

likely due to the limited detectability of single-cell RNA-seq, or to the possibility that some genes with a

shared function are coordinated at post-transcriptional level but not at transcriptional level. Therefore,

CPM with higher correlation coefficients compared to CGM can provide more relevant and pointed

information on gene coordination.

In traditional proteomics study, correlation-centric analysis of proteins has been done with perturbations

and bulk measurement, as in ProteomeHD (17). We compared CPMs from single-cell analysis with those

from ProteomeHD. Although some modules, such as ribosome and T-complex, were observed in both

datasets, some biological processes like tRNA aminoacylation (CPM #56) were not found in bulk data

(**Fig**. **4e**). This shows that our method, which relies on single-cell measurement without perturbations, is

more sensitive in probing intrinsic correlations among proteins.

Discussion

High-throughput single-cell analysis has proved to be a valuable strategy for understanding the functional

mechanisms of cells and tissues (7, 29). However, identifying functional gene expression programs from

large-scale single-cell dataset has been challenging. Most methods emphasize on heterogeneity among

cells, such as principal component analysis (PCA) (30, 31) or non-negative matrix factorization (NMF)

(32). These methods can uncover the variation of gene expression and cellular activity among different

cell types, but cannot identify the networks of gene expression in homogeneous cell populations.

Nonetheless, investigating correlations on the proteome level is still pertinent. This is because while

mRNA fluctuation arises from stochastic expression of a single copy of gene in a live cell (2, 4), protein

fluctuation arises from additional variation including translation, post-translational modification and protein

degradation (9). Thus, direct measurement of protein correlation is required to uncover the intrinsic

dynamics of protein abundance in steady state. Moreover, as the copy number of proteins in single cell is

much larger than that of mRNA, measurement of protein can reveal real correlation of genes at much

higher accuracy.

Here, through global correlation analysis of single-cell proteome measured by mass spectrometry, we

revealed the functional coordination of proteins despite stochastic gene expression under steady-state

conditions. Our method probed the intrinsic fluctuations of more than a thousand of proteins and found

groups of proteins that were highly correlated. Based on functional analysis of CPMs and the

relationships between different CPMs, we discovered coordinated fluctuation for proteins involved in the

same functions, related pathways or conflicting processes, which is inaccessible by traditional single-cell

studies and bulk studies.

The functional coordination and interaction of proteins is a universal feature among different types of

cells, yet it is determined by the cellular characteristic and affected by the detectability of the protein

measuring technology. Currently, the single-cell proteomics still has limited coverage of proteome,

especially when compared to single-cell transcriptomics which can identify more than 5,000 genes in a

single cell. Therefore, while most key regulators in signaling networks, such as transcription factors, can

be readily measured by current single-cell transcriptomics, these low-abundance proteins cannot be

detected by single-cell proteomics yet.

Finally, we reclaimed the importance of accurate quantification in single-cell proteomics. Suffering from

multiple isolation events and longer cycle times, the isobaric labeling quantification pipeline had much

lower raw MS signal for quantification, leading to higher CV and less faithful measurement of correlation

coefficient. In comparison, the label-free pipeline demonstrated advantages in protein identification and

quantification. However, current label-free quantification pipeline has limited proteome coverage and cell

throughput (up to 40 cells per day (20, 33)). As the proteome coverage of single-cell proteomics

improves, we may be able to gain more functional insights from CPM, such as coregulation mechanism of

transcription factors. This possibility is showcased by our mouse oocyte dataset, where the total protein

amount per cell is about 100-fold of that in K562. Therefore, substantial effort is needed to make CPM

widely applicable to cell cultures or tissues, where much larger number of cells need to be measured and

higher proteome coverage is preferred. This is possible as sample preparation (34–36), LC separation

(37, 38), MS instrumentation (33), data acquisition (39), and informatics (40, 41) are witnessing rapid

advances. We believe that CPM is a good demonstration of single-cell omics methods for functional

annotation of the proteome.

Materials and Methods

Preparation of single cell samples

K562 cells were resuspended from culture dish by cold PBS. 293T cells were treated by trypsin for 3 min

before washed from dish by cold PBS. Then both cells were washed two more times by cold PBS. Single

cell or 10 cells were sorted to 96-well plates (Eppendorf) containing 0.5 µL 1% DDM in water by FACS

(FACSAria, BD). Then plates were stored at -80 °C before use. Oocyte-cumulus complexes were

collected from C57/6J strain mice superovulated with pregnant mare serum gonadotropin (PMSG) and

HCG injections. Hyaluronidase was used to remove cumulus cells. MII oocytes were exposed to PBS

solution. Single oocyte cell was then picked by pipetting with an aspirator tube. Then cells were stored at

-80 °C before use.

Proteomic sample preparation

We used an acoustic liquid handling workstation (Echo 525, Beckman) to increase throughput and handle

small volumes. Sorted single cells in 96-well plate or 200 µL PCR tube were digested directly by trypsin at

37 °C for 3 hours. For label-free pipeline, 4.4 µL 0.43% TFA and 1% acetonitrile in water was added to

terminate digestion (3.5 µL for oocytes). For isobaric labeling pipeline with TMTpro, channel 126C

(equivalent to 10 cells) was used as carrier; channel 127N (equivalent to 3 cells) was used as reference;

128C-130C and 131C-133C were single-cell channels; 131N and 134N were negative control channels

(no cell). 0.85 µL of 11 mM TMTpro reagent was added to plate. The plate was kept at 22 °C for 1 h.

Then 0.2 µL of 0.5% hydroxylamine was added to plate. The plate was held at 22 °C for 30 min. Then

channels of isobaric labeling were mixed with 5 µL of carrier/reference mix and 10 µL of 30% acetonitrile.

Then peptides were dried in a concentrator (LabCondo) at 45 °C. 5 µL of 0.1% TFA and 1% ACN in water

were used to resuspend the peptides.

LC-MS/MS

4 µL of the digests were injected. Peptides were separated by a commercialized high-performance

chromatography column (Aurora, IonOpticks) at 100 nL/min on a nanoflow liquid chromatography

(Ultimate 3000 RSLCnano, ThermoFisher). For label-free pipeline, the effective gradient was 70 min,

generating throughput of 16 cells per day (full gradient of 90 min). For isobaric labeling, the effective

gradient was extended to 100 min (full gradient 120 min). Details of gradient can be found in SI Appendix.

3 compensation voltages and MS^3-based quantification were used, generating throughput of 100 cells per

day at our set-up with blank control channels (which may be improved to 140 cells per day with TMTpro

18-plex reagent). Details of gradients are described in SI Appendix Supplementary Information Text.

Peptides were analyzed by a tribrid mass spectrometer (Orbitrap Eclipse, ThermoFisher) with an ion

mobility interface (FAIMS Pro, ThermoFisher). For label-free pipeline, FAIMS compensation voltages of -

55 V and -70 V were used. Cycle time of 1 s was used for both CVs. MS spectra were acquired by

Orbitrap analyzer, and MS2 spectra were acquired by linear ion trap analyzer. Max ion injection time for

MS2 was 200 ms. For isobaric labeling pipeline, FAIMS compensation voltages of -40, -60, and -80 V

were used. Cycle time of 1 s was used for all CVs. MS spectra were acquired by Orbitrap analyzer. MS^2

spectra were acquired by linear ion trap analyzer. A real-time search (RTS) node was added to decide if

MS^2 spectra were from human tryptic peptides that had been chemically labeled by TMTpro. If a peptide

was identified, a synchronous precursor selection (SPS)-MS^3 scan was acquired to quantify that peptide

in different TMTpro channels using Orbitrap as analyzer.

Proteomic data analysis

MS raw files were searched against UniProt human protein database (20286 reviewed accessions,

downloaded on April 14, 2020, for searches of mouse oocytes, a FASTA database with 17015 reviewed

accessions downloaded on July 31, 2020 were used instead) and an in-house curated contamination

database (284 accessions) by Proteome Discoverer 2.4 (ThermoFisher). For label-free quantification,

peak intensity of MS feature was used as signal of quantification and match-between-runs (MBR) feature

was used. For isobaric labeling quantification, signal-to-noise ratio of MS^3 spectrum was used as signal of

quantification.

Generation of correlated protein modules

The abundances of all proteins in quantified cells were further filtered to 1) remove cells with extremely

high level of contamination; 2) remove protein contaminants; 3) remove proteins with more than 50%

missing values in all cells; 4) remove outlier cells (by fitting to a Gaussian distribution). Protein abundance

of single cells was normalized by total protein intensity. The missing values were filled with zeros.

Pearson correlation of proteins were calculated by numpy.corrcoef of NumPy (42). The correlation map

was reordered using unweighted pair group method with arithmetic means clustering using the SciPy (43)

package. One CPM is defined as the biggest protein groups of the correlation map, who has over 80

percent of protein pairs with correlation coefficient over 0.3. List of correlated protein modules can be

found in SI Appendix, Dataset S1. We define the abundance of a CPM in a cell by summing up the

abundances of proteins included in the very CPM.

Bioinformatic analysis

Bioinformatical analysis was conducted with R. Principle component analysis was conducted by "PCA"

function in "FactoMineR" package with default parameters. Proteins whose average abundance changes

over two folds between two subpopulations with p-value < 0.05 (Wilcoxon test) were defined as

differentially expressed proteins. Gene Ontology enrichment and KEGG pathway enrichment was done

by R package "clusterProfiler" (v.4.0.2). The adjusted p-value cutoff was set as 0.05, and only GO terms

with more than 2 genes were kept for further analysis. Reactome pathway enrichment was done by R

package "ReactomePA". The p-value cutoff was set as 0.05, and only terms over 2 genes were kept.

Protein-protein interaction ratio was calculated based on R package "STRINGdb" (v.11). The combined

score cutoff was 250. The ratio value was calculated as the proportion of known PPI pairs to the total

number of protein pairs in a CPM. CORUM version 3.0 dataset was downloaded at "http://mips.helmholtz-

muenchen.de/corum/". Result of enrichment analysis of correlated protein modules can be found in SI

Appendix, Dataset S1.

Simulation of effect of detectability on measured correlation and real correlation

The simulation was conducted with R. Random RNA abundances were generated by Poisson

distributions with median of 20 copies. Random protein abundances were generated by negative bimodal

distributions with median of 10^5 and CV of 200. Then a normal-distributed random noise was added to

RNA and protein. Finally, the binominal distributed detectability was multiplied to original data. All

simulations were repeated 100 times to reduce random noise.

To assess the measurement noise of single-cell RNA analysis and single-cell proteins analysis,

simulation was conducted with R. Random RNA abundances of 1000 cells were generated by Poisson

distributions with median of 17 copies. Random protein abundances of 100 cells were generated by

negative bimodal distributions with median of $5*10^4$ and CV of 0.01. The binominal distributed

detectability was multiplied to original data.

To assess the accuracy of correlation measurement of RNA and proteins, simulation was conducted with

R. Random RNA abundances of 1000 cells were generated by Poisson distributions with median of 20

copies. Random protein abundances of 100 cells were generated by negative bimodal distributions with

median of 10^5 and CV of 0.01. Then a normally distributed random noise was added to RNA and protein.

Finally, the binominal distributed detectability was multiplied to original data. All simulations were

repeated 100 times to reduce random noise.

Comparison of CPMs with CGMs and ProteomeHD

The correlation coefficient and CGMs of 12,660 genes in 2,302 K562 cells is analyzed as described in (6).

The K562 dataset can be found at [data repository to be added]. When comparing CPMs and CGMs,

because there are multiple transcripts corresponding to the same protein, the number of proteins and

genes in **Fig. 4a** are not the same. ProteomeHD have correlation score no more than 0.3. To compare

with our Pearson correlation coefficient, ProteomeHD data was scaled by making its maximum correlation

score equal to 1.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by Beijing Advanced Innovation Center for Genomics at Peking University and

Beijing Municipal Commission of Science and Technology (Z201100005320015). We thank Alec R.

Chapman, David F. Lee, Fuchou Tang and Ge Gao for their inspiring work in gene modules by high-

precision single-cell transcriptomics. We thank Alec R. Chapman and Jiekun Yang for their involvement in

the early attempt on single-cell proteomics of our group. We thank Bogdan Budnik and Nikolai Slavov for

their help on our implementation of SCoPE-MS. We thank Xiaoran Chai and Wenjie Sun for helpful

discussions of the manuscript.

376
377   **Author Contributions:** M.H. and X.S.X. designed research; M.H., Y. Zhang, Y.Y. and Y. Zheng
378   performed research; M.H., Y. Zhang, Y.Y. and X.S.X. analyzed data; and M.H., Y. Zhang, Q.G. and
379   X.S.X. wrote the paper with the help of other authors.

381   **Competing Interest Statement:** The authors do not disclose any competing interests.

References

1. L. Cai, C. K. Dalal, M. B. Elowitz, Frequency-modulated nuclear localization bursts coordinate gene regulation. *Nature* **455**, 485–490 (2008).

2. A. J. M. Larsson, *et al.*, Genomic encoding of transcriptional burst kinetics. *Nature* **565**, 251–254 (2019).

3. Y. Taniguchi, *et al.*, Quantifying *E. coli* Proteome and Transcriptome with Single-Molecule Sensitivity in Single Cells. *Science* **329**, 533–538 (2010).

4. S. Chong, C. Chen, H. Ge, X. S. Xie, Mechanism of Transcriptional Bursting in Bacteria. *Cell* **158**, 314–326 (2014).

5. P. Langfelder, S. Horvath, WGCNA: an R package for weighted correlation network analysis. *BMC Bioinformatics* **9**, 559 (2008).

6. A. R. Chapman, *et al.*, Correlated Gene Modules Uncovered by Single-Cell Transcriptomics with High Detectability and Accuracy. *bioRxiv*, 2019.12.31.892190 (2020).

7. F. Tian, *et al.*, Genomic Architecture of Cells in Tissues (GeACT): Study of Human Mid-gestation Fetus. *bioRxiv*, 2020.04.12.038000 (2020).

8. R. Aebersold, M. Mann, Mass-spectrometric exploration of proteome structure and function. *Nature* **537**, 347–355 (2016).

9. Y. Liu, A. Beyer, R. Aebersold, On the Dependency of Cellular Protein Levels on mRNA Abundance. *Cell* **165**, 535–550 (2016).

10. F. Meissner, R. A. Scheltema, H.-J. Mollenkopf, M. Mann, Direct Proteomic Quantification of the Secretome of Activated Immune Cells. *Science* **340**, 475–478 (2013).

11. Y. Taniguchi, *et al.*, Quantifying *E. coli* proteome and transcriptome with single-molecule sensitivity in single cells. *Science* **329**, 533–538 (2010).

12. H. Specht, N. Slavov, Transformative Opportunities for Single-Cell Proteomics. *J. Proteome Res.* **17**, 2565–2571 (2018).

13. M. Mann, The Origins of Organellar Mapping by Protein Correlation Profiling. *Proteomics* **20**, 1900330 (2020).

14. J. S. Andersen, *et al.*, Proteomic characterization of the human centrosome by protein correlation profiling. *Nature* **426**, 570–574 (2003).

15. L. J. Foster, *et al.*, A Mammalian Organelle Map by Protein Correlation Profiling. *Cell* **125**, 187–199
(2006).

16. M. A. Skinnider, *et al.*, An atlas of protein-protein interactions across mouse tissues. *Cell* **184**, 4073-
4089.e17 (2021).

17. G. Kustatscher, *et al.*, Co-regulation map of the human proteome enables identification of protein
functions. *Nat Biotechnol* **37**, 1361–1371 (2019).

18. B. Budnik, E. Levy, G. Harmange, N. Slavov, SCoPE-MS: mass spectrometry of single mammalian
cells quantifies proteome heterogeneity during cell differentiation. *Genome Biology* **19**, 161 (2018).

19. H. Specht, *et al.*, Single-cell proteomic and transcriptomic analysis of macrophage heterogeneity
using SCoPE2. *Genome Biol* **22**, 50 (2021).

20. Y. Cong, *et al.*, Ultrasensitive single-cell proteomics workflow identifies >1000 protein groups per
mammalian cell. *Chem. Sci.* **12**, 1001–1006 (2021).

21. J. Woo, *et al.*, Three-dimensional feature matching improves coverage for single-cell proteomics
based on ion mobility filtering. *Cell Systems* **13**, 426-434.e4 (2022).

22. M. Giurgiu, *et al.*, CORUM: the comprehensive resource of mammalian protein complexes—2019.
Nucleic Acids Research **47**, D559–D563 (2019).

23. M. Kanehisa, S. Goto, KEGG: Kyoto Encyclopedia of Genes and Genomes. *Nucleic Acids Research*
28, 27–30 (2000).

24. A. Fabregat, *et al.*, The Reactome Pathway Knowledgebase. *Nucleic Acids Research* **46**, D649–
D655 (2018).

25. X. Chen, *et al.*, DNA methylation directly downregulates human cathelicidin antimicrobial peptide
gene (CAMP) promoter activity. *Oncotarget* **8**, 27943–27952 (2017).

26. D. Szklarczyk, *et al.*, STRING v10: protein-protein interaction networks, integrated over the tree of
life. *Nucleic Acids Res.* **43**, D447-452 (2015).

27. A. Murayama, *et al.*, Epigenetic Control of rDNA Loci in Response to Intracellular Energy Status.
Cell **133**, 627–639 (2008).

28. F. Lévi, A. Okyar, S. Dulong, P. F. Innominato, J. Clairambault, Circadian Timing in Cancer
Treatments. *Annual Review of Pharmacology and Toxicology* **50**, 377–421 (2010).

29. A. Regev, *et al.*, The Human Cell Atlas. *Elife* **6** (2017).

30. L. Yan, *et al.*, Single-cell RNA-Seq profiling of human preimplantation embryos and embryonic stem
442   cells. *Nat Struct Mol Biol* **20**, 1131–1139 (2013).

443   31. Q. Deng, D. Ramsköld, B. Reinius, R. Sandberg, Single-Cell RNA-Seq Reveals Dynamic, Random
444   Monoallelic Gene Expression in Mammalian Cells. *Science* **343**, 193–196 (2014).

445   32. D. Kotliar, *et al.*, Identifying gene expression programs of cell-type identity and cellular activity with
446   single-cell RNA-Seq. *eLife* **8**, e43803 (2019).

447   33. A. Brunner, *et al.*, Ultra-high sensitivity mass spectrometry quantifies single-cell proteome changes
448   upon perturbation. *Molecular Systems Biology* **18** (2022).

449   34. Y. Zhu, *et al.*, Nanodroplet processing platform for deep and quantitative proteome profiling of 10-
450   100 mammalian cells. *Nat Commun* **9**, 882 (2018).

451   35. Z.-Y. Li, *et al.*, Nanoliter-Scale Oil-Air-Droplet Chip-Based Single Cell Proteomic Analysis. *Anal.*
452   *Chem.* **90**, 5430–5438 (2018).

453   36. J. Woo, *et al.*, High-throughput and high-efficiency sample preparation for single-cell proteomics
454   using a nested nanowell chip. *Nat Commun* **12**, 6246 (2021).

455   37. Y. Cong, *et al.*, Improved Single-Cell Proteome Coverage Using Narrow-Bore Packed NanoLC
456   Columns and Ultrasensitive Mass Spectrometry. *Anal. Chem.* **92**, 2665–2671 (2020).

457   38. J. Stadlmann, *et al.*, Improved Sensitivity in Low-Input Proteomics Using Micropillar Array-Based
458   Chromatography. *Anal. Chem.* **91**, 14203–14207 (2019).

459   39. C. Wichmann, *et al.*, MaxQuant.Live Enables Global Targeting of More Than 25,000 Peptides.
460   *Molecular & Cellular Proteomics* **18**, 982–994 (2019).

461   40. A. T. Chen, A. Franks, N. Slavov, DART-ID increases single-cell proteome coverage. *PLOS*
462   *Computational Biology* **15**, e1007082 (2019).

463   41. S.-H. Yu, P. Kyriakidou, J. Cox, Isobaric Matching between Runs and Novel PSM-Level
464   Normalization in MaxQuant Strongly Improve Reporter Ion-Based Quantification. *J. Proteome Res.*
465   **19**, 3945–3954 (2020).

466   42. C. R. Harris, *et al.*, Array programming with NumPy. *Nature* **585**, 357–362 (2020).

467   43. P. Virtanen, *et al.*, SciPy 1.0: fundamental algorithms for scientific computing in Python. *Nat*
468   *Methods* **17**, 261–272 (2020).

Figures and Tables

Figure 1. Direct measurement of protein correlations at single-cell level reveals the intrinsic dynamics of

the cell. a. Measurement of correlations of protein abundances in single cells reveals coregulation in

steady-state gene expression. Level of mRNAs and proteins fluctuate stochastically in steady-state cells,

mostly caused by fluctuation of transcription factors (TFs). The expression of genes with similar biological

functions tend to be coregulated, resulting in highly positive correlations of the abundances of

corresponding mRNAs and proteins. Independently regulated proteins, on the other hand, will not exhibit

high correlations. These correlations can be assessed by measuring abundances of mRNAs and proteins

in many single cells. Level of mRNAs and proteins and their correlations are calculated from simulated

481   theoretical distributions without considering detectability. b. The copy number and detectability affect the

482   distribution of the measured copy number of protein and mRNA, which results in different counting errors.

483   c. Simulation of the effect of detectability on the measured correlation and real correlation in single cells

484   for mRNA. d. Simulation of the effect of detectability on the measured correlation and real correlation in

485   single cells for protein.

Figure 2. A single-cell proteomics pipeline for accurate protein correlation measurement. a. Flowchart of

pipelines we used to measure protein-protein correlations in single-cells. label-free: label-free pipeline.

TMT: isobaric labeling pipeline. b. Identified and quantified proteins from single cells by the label-free (N =

71) and TMT (N = 161) pipelines. Cells were sorted by their numbers of identified and quantified proteins.

c. Distribution of CV (in RSD) of proteins by the label-free (N = 1,257) and TMT (N = 300) pipelines. d.

Distribution of raw MS signals of quantified proteins by the label-free (N = 1,257) and TMT (N = 300)

pipelines. e. Comparison of correlation coefficients of ribosomal proteins and randomly picked proteins of

the same size. Number of proteins: label-free N = 77, TMT N = 53. f. Violin plot of correlation coefficients

of ribosomal proteins and randomly picked proteins. Number of proteins: label-free N = 77, TMT N = 53.

Figure 3. Correlated protein modules of K562 cell line by single-cell proteomics. a. Correlation map of

1,249 proteins in 69 K562 single cells. Red blocks indicate that corresponding proteins were defined as a

CPM. b. Representation of four CPMs and enriched function terms of them. c. Fraction of CPMs with

different enrichment results of Gene Ontology cellular component (GOCC), Gene Ontology biological

processes (GOBP), KEGG, Reactome and protein-protein interaction (PPI) of proteins in each CPM.

504   CPMs were categorized by their percentage of proteins in enriched functional term (enriched proteins)

505   over proteins in corresponding CPM. d. Fraction of protein pairs with known PPIs in the STRING

506   database at different levels of correlation coefficients (blue), outside CPMs (orange), and within CPMs

507   (green).

Figure 4. Correlated protein modules by single-cell proteomics shows unique characteristics. a.

Distribution of pairwise correlation coefficients of single-cell transcriptomics (*N* = 1,275) and single-cell

proteomics (*N* = 1,249). b. Comparison of protein (bottom-left) and mRNA (top-right) correlation

coefficients for the ribosome modules of K562. Correlation coefficients between proteins are generally

stronger than those between corresponding mRNAs. c. Distribution of correlation coefficients of protein

pairs (top) or RNA pairs (bottom) that within the ribosome module (N = 1,332 for proteins, N = 1,351 for

RNAs) and outside the ribosome module (N = 1,558,752 for proteins, N = 1,624,981 for RNAs). The

correlation coefficients of functional protein pairs are more distinguishable from the overall pairwise

correlations. d. Comparison of protein (bottom-left) and mRNA (top-right) correlation coefficients for the

rRNA processing and mismatch repairment and inner mitochondrial membrane oxidation phosphorylation

modules of K562. Correlation coefficients between proteins are generally stronger than those between

corresponding mRNAs. e. Comparison of correlation coefficients in CPM (bottom-left) and scaled

correlation scores from ProteomeHD (top-right) for the T-complex composition and tRNA aminoacylation

modules. CPM clearly exhibits correlations that cannot be seen in the bulk data obtained via perturbation.