Molecularly-guided spatial proteomics captures single-cell identity of the healthy and

diseased nervous system

Sayan Dutta[1,2#], Marion Pang[1#], Gerard M. Coughlin[1,2], Sirisha Gudavalli[1], Michael L.

Roukes[1,3,4], Tsui-Fen Chou[1], Viviana Gradinaru[1,2,5]*

[1]Division of Biology and Biological Engineering, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, CA

91125

[2]Aligning Science Across Parkinson's (ASAP) Collaborative Research Network, Chevy Chase,

MD 20815

[3]Division of Physics, Mathematics, and Astronomy, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena,

CA 91125

[4]Division of Engineering and Applied Science, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, CA

91125

[5]Howard Hughes Medical Institute, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, CA 91125

[#]Contributed equally

*Corresponding author: Viviana Gradinaru (viviana@caltech.edu)

ORCIDs:

Sayan Dutta: 0000-0003-3577-2193

Marion Pang: 0000-0002-0158-2976

Gerard M. Coughlin: 0000-0003-0644-4721

Sirisha Gudavalli: 0009-0003-9091-8666

Michael L. Roukes: 0000-0002-2916-6026

Tsui-Fen Chou: 0000-0003-2410-2186

Viviana Gradinaru: 0000-0001-5868-348X

Abstract

Single-cell spatial proteomics (scSP) holds substantial potential for profiling healthy and

diseased tissues. The emerging method of molecularly-guided unbiased scSP has mostly been

applied to peripheral somatic tissues. Here, we optimize and apply scSP to the healthy and

diseased mammalian brain, using molecularly-guided laser capture microdissection and

unbiased mass spectrometry. We systematically evaluate the effects of tissue fixation, marker

staining, and sample input size on proteome coverage and quantitative accuracy. We

benchmark this workflow by profiling region-specific neuronal proteomes and describing the

response of non-neuronal cells to acute brain injury. Across these applications, we integrate

complementary transcriptomic resources to evaluate cross-modality trends and refine neuronal

proteomic results by filtering out protein signals likely arising from non-neuronal cells, an

essential consideration in heterogeneous tissues such as the brain. Finally, we leverage this

approach to resolve proteomic differences between dopaminergic neuron subpopulations with

differential vulnerability to Parkinson's disease and to uncover disease-specific disruptions in α-

synuclein-aggregate-bearing single dopaminergic neurons. Together, these data demonstrate

the utility of scSP in neuroscience research for understanding fundamental biology and the

molecular drivers of neurological conditions.

Introduction

The central nervous system (CNS) is characterized by molecularly heterogeneous

neuronal cells that are spatially organized into distinct subpopulations defined by cell identity

and functional states [1]. Alongside neuronal subpopulations, the mosaic coexistence of glial cells

(i.e., astrocytes, microglia, and oligodendrocytes) also contributes to this intrinsic complexity.

Resolving such heterogeneity is critical for understanding both the healthy nervous system as

well as diseases with sparse pathology[2,3], requiring approaches that preserve spatial

information while enabling molecular profiling at the single-cell resolution. Moreover, human

nervous system samples from diseased subjects and small brain regions are often fixed for

archiving and available only in limited quantities, making fixation- and single-cell-compatible

approaches especially valuable.

Numerous single-cell analysis techniques have been employed to study brain cell types

and neurological diseases in a spatially resolved context, although most have focused on

transcriptomic insights[4-6]. Protein-focused spatial methods have allowed multiplexed detection

of predefined protein targets while preserving spatial context, providing valuable insights into

nervous system biology at the single-neuron level[7-9]. Such approaches are particularly powerful

for hypothesis-driven analyses, enabling targeted interrogation of known markers across

complex tissues and offering functional insights not always evident at the transcript level.

Complementary spatial mass spectrometry (MS)-based methods enable unbiased, discovery-

scale proteomic profiling directly from brain tissue and have yielded promising insights in

neuroscience[2,10-12]; however, these studies have thus far relied on region-level sampling and

have not been applied at single-cell resolution. In parallel, recent advances in MS sensitivity and

low-input sample preparation have now made it possible to approach single-cell proteomic

measures[13-18]. Recent studies have demonstrated that imaging-guided sample selection,

combined with laser-capture microdissection (LCM) or laser ablation and ultrasensitive MS, can

recover discovery-scale proteomes with spatial context from individual cells in archival fixed

peripheral tissue such as liver and pancreas[19,20]. Despite recent technical advances,

molecularly-guided, unbiased single-cell spatial proteomics has not yet been applied to the

mammalian nervous system.

Here, we address this gap by presenting a molecularly-guided LCM-based single-cell

spatial proteomics (scSP) workflow optimized for paraformaldehyde-fixed brain tissue. We show

that unbiased scSP can be applied to interrogate molecular heterogeneity within the mammalian

CNS. We explore the potential and constraints of this approach by studying region-specific

neuronal identities and describing neuroimmune alterations following focal brain injury. These

findings are contextualized within established biological frameworks and through integrative

multi-omics analyses, in which single-cell transcriptomic data inform refinement of cellular-origin

of proteomic assignments and enable cross-omics comparisons such as regional expression

trends between cortex and substantia nigra pars compacta (SNpc). Finally, we apply this

platform to define proteomic signatures associated with dopaminergic subtype vulnerability and

α-synuclein (αSyn) pathology in a mouse model of Parkinson's disease (PD), highlighting the

broader translational potential of LCM-based scSP for studying disease mechanisms *in vivo*.

Results

Molecularly-guided single-cell spatial proteomics (scSP) enables robust proteomic

profiling across fixation conditions, staining parameters, and input sample sizes

For unbiased mapping of the proteome from single cells of fixed brain tissue, we

adapted[20,21] a workflow that integrates molecularly-guided selection of micro-tissue samples for

downstream proteomic analysis **(Fig. 1A)**. Our workflow begins with tissue fixation, and cryo-

sectioning at 30 µm, followed by immunofluorescent (IF) or RNA-fluorescence in-situ

hybridization (FISH) staining to label cells of interest, facilitating marker or pathology-guided

selection for proteomic analysis. Targeted cells are then precisely isolated using LCM and

processed using a sample preparation workflow optimized for low-input, single-cell proteomic

analysis[21,22].

Before employing stain-guided isolation and processing of samples from fixed tissue, we

first assessed whether tissue fixation impacts downstream proteome coverage or introduces

bias in detected peptides. Bulk comparison of mouse brain fresh-frozen and fixed tissue,

acquired using data-dependent acquisition (DDA), revealed largely overlapping proteome

coverage, with 2,024 shared proteins, 175 unique to fixed tissue, and 155 unique to frozen

tissue **(Fig. 1B)**. Although statistical testing identified significant differences and the overall log

protein abundance correlation was moderate (R^2 = 0.70; **Fig. 1B, bottom**), no evidence of

systematic extraction bias from any cellular compartment was observed between conditions

(Supp. Fig. 1A).

We next extended this approach to determine whether IF or RNA-FISH staining

protocols introduce measurable proteomic bias. Cortical tissue was stained using anti-NeuN

antibody as a representative protein marker **(Fig. 1C)** and FISH probes targeting glutamate

decarboxylase 1 and 2 (GAD1+GAD2) mRNA as a representative RNA marker **(Fig. 1D)**.

Comparative analysis was first performed at the bulk proteomic level (using DDA) and

subsequently at the single-neuron level using data-independent acquisition (DIA). For both IF-

and RNA-FISH-stained samples, bulk proteomes **(Supp. Fig. 1B, 1D)** and single-cell proteomes

(Fig. 1, C, D, Supp. Fig. 1C, 1E) showed substantial overlap with their respective unstained

controls, with comparable protein identifications per cell. Proteins detected uniquely in bulk

tissue by IF and RNA-FISH were predominantly low-abundance species, consistent with

stochastic sampling effects inherent to DDA rather than systematic staining-related bias **(Supp.**

Fig. 1B, 1D). Log protein abundance values for single-cell analysis were strongly correlated

between stained and control samples (R^2 = 0.97 for IF; R^2 = 0.96 for HCR), indicating minimal

staining-induced bias **(Fig. 1C, 1D)**. Together, these results demonstrate that our IF and RNA-

FISH protocols do not introduce systematic bias in proteome coverage or protein abundance

and therefore can be confidently employed to define cellular populations within tissues of

interest from fixed tissue without compromising the integrity of downstream proteomic

measurements.

Next, we evaluated the impact of sample size on proteome coverage and quantification,

given that spatial proteomic investigation of the CNS might require samples larger than a single

cell in an ROI, or a combination of multiple ROIs. To probe the effect of varying ultra-low input

material size, tissue samples corresponding to increasing neuronal cell-body counts were

isolated from NeuN stained mice cortex by LCM (due to the finite resolution of cold laser

ablation, the effective excised areas were smaller than the nominal cut regions): single cells

(~800 μm^2), ~3 cells (2,000 μm^2), ~6 cells (5,000 μm^2), ~12 cells (10,000 μm^2), and ~25 cells

(20,000 μm^2) **(Fig. 1E, Supp. Fig. 2A-C)**. All samples were analyzed using a previously

optimized 1-hour LC-MS gradient with DIA[22,23], which was specifically tuned for single-cell

inputs. Notably, single-cell samples (n = 20 single cells) yielded consistently high proteome

depth, with up to ~2,200 proteins quantified from an individual neuron and protein identifications

increased with sampled area but plateaued beyond 10,000 μm^2 **(Fig. 1F)**. A similar pattern was

observed for the peptide quantification **(Supp. Fig. 2D)**. Higher coefficients of variation (CVs) in

single-cell samples relative to larger sampled areas from the cortex **(Fig. 1G)** likely reflects

biological heterogeneity unmasked at single-cell resolution.

Because single-cell measurements operate in a lower signal-to-noise regime than multi-

cell samples, we next assessed whether protein abundance scales proportionally with sampled

area. Protein abundance was modeled using a log-log scaling relationship, where the slope β_1

represents the scaling exponent. After removal of contaminants **(Supp. Fig. 2E)**, the mean

value of β_1 across all proteins (gray lines) was 1.02 **(Fig. 1H)**, indicating near-linear scaling

between sampled area and measured abundance. This behavior was consistent across low-,

medium-, and high-abundance proteins (e.g., Plxnb1, Ndufs2, and Gapdh, respectively; **Fig.**

1H). In contrast, contaminants such as keratins exhibited high variability across sample sizes

(Supp. Fig. 2, E-F), consistent with sample preparation artifacts rather than biological effects.

Together, these results indicate that, after accounting for contaminants, protein abundance

measurements scale proportionally with input material and are not detectably biased by sample

size.

Finally, we examined whether single-cell sampling selectively biases protein detection.

Analysis of proteins across different sample areas revealed that only 5 proteins were uniquely

detected in single-cell samples, whereas 182 proteins were consistently detected in all larger

sampled areas but absent from single-cell measurements **(Supp. Fig. S2G)**. No significant

functional enrichment was observed among the proteins specific to single cells. An abundance-

rank plot shows the distribution of these proteins **(Fig. 1I)**, with single-cell-specific proteins

spanning a wide dynamic range, indicating that single-cell samples can detect a broad range of

proteins without abundance bias. Proteins missing from single-cell samples (shown in white)

were predominantly low-abundance proteins, consistent with the expectation that these proteins

fall below detection thresholds in single-cell samples due to MS sensitivity limitations. Therefore,

although proteome coverage at the single-cell level remains limited by low signal-to-noise, the

use of DIA mitigates stochastic sampling effects relative to DDA. Collectively, these findings

establish LCM-based scSP as a robust and quantitatively unbiased approach for proteomic

characterization of individual neurons, motivating its application to biologically and spatially

defined neuronal populations in subsequent analyses.

Single-cell spatial proteomics reveals region-specific neuronal proteomes

We applied LCM-based scSP to characterize neuronal subtypes from distinct brain

regions **(Fig. 2A)**. PFA-fixed coronal brain slices from adult mice were immunostained with the

pan-neuronal marker anti-NeuN to enable molecularly-guided micro-dissection of single

neuronal cell bodies from the cortex (approximately from layers IV-V of the primary motor

cortex) and the substantia nigra pars compacta (SNpc) for subsequent proteomic profiling. We

identified approximately 2,000 proteins on average per cell (n= 40 cortex, 60 SNpc single cells;

Fig. 2B). Violin plots show comparable protein abundance CV distributions between cortex and

SNpc, with median CV values centered around ~50–60% in cortex and ~45–50% in SNpc, and

extended distribution tails reflecting the presence of highly variable proteins **(Fig. 2C)**. We

identified 3574 protein groups present in both neuronal populations, with an additional 85

proteins exclusively detected in cortical neurons and 346 in SNpc neurons **(Fig. 2D)**. Proteins

detected exclusively in one region may reflect biologically meaningful regional specificity. For

example, Icam5 and Slc6a3 (DAT), proteins known to be highly expressed in cortical neurons

and SNpc, respectively, were identified in the cortex-specific and SNpc-specific protein sets.

Unsupervised principal component analysis (PCA) revealed two distinct clusters, highlighting

significant molecular differences between cortical and SNpc neurons **(Fig. 2E)**. Among the 3574

proteins identified in both groups, 99 proteins exhibited more than two-fold upregulation in

cortical neurons and 345 proteins in SNpc neurons. This analysis identified multiple regionally

selective proteins, including Camk2a, Gria3, Homer1, and Slc17a7 in cortical neurons, whereas

SNpc neurons were enriched for Th, Ddc, Sncg, Calb2, Aldh1a1, and Akr1b7. To validate these

proteomic findings, we cross-referenced some of the identified proteins with in-situ hybridization

(ISH) gene expression data from the Allen Brain Atlas[24] **(Supp. Fig. 3)** and performed IF

validation **(Fig. 2G)**. Additionally, we plotted MS-derived intensity values, which showcase the

heterogeneity in protein expression at the individual cell level **(Fig. 2G)**. Together, these results

demonstrate that LCM-based scSP robustly resolves region-specific neuronal proteomes at

single-cell resolution.

Single-cell transcriptomics informs data processing and refinement of neuronal

proteomic assignments

202   Single-cell-level proteomics lacks standardized processing and normalization

workflows[25,26]. In addition to the presence of substantial missing values within datasets due to

the minute amount of starting material, single-cell measurements are characterized by reduced

signal-to-noise ratios, making quantitative comparisons particularly sensitive to pre-processing

strategies. To address this issue, various normalization and data imputation strategies are often

applied during analysis[27-29]. Here, we compared peptide-level directLFQ normalization[30] with a

protein-level median-based normalization strategy incorporating minimum-value imputation

(20% of minimum) to evaluate whether one approach performs better on single-cell spatial

proteomics datasets. The median-based normalization approach incorporating imputation

increased the number of differentially expressed proteins (DEPs) identified between cortex and

SNpc relative to directLFQ and produced a skewed distribution, with more proteins classified as

upregulated in cortex **(Fig. 3, A-B)**. However, unsupervised PCA demonstrated improved

separation of cortical and SNpc samples using directLFQ compared to the median-based

normalization approach **(Fig. 3, C-D)**. Although many established regional markers showed

concordant regulation across both approaches, a subset of proteins exhibited discordant

directionality. To resolve this conflict, we used cross-omics comparison with single-cell

transcriptomics datasets to assess these two normalization strategies. For this, we used the 10x

scRNA-seq dataset of the mouse whole-brain transcriptomic dataset from Allen Brain Atlas[31]

and extracted the dopaminergic neurons within the midbrain transcriptomic dataset,

corresponding to our SNpc proteomics cells, and IT–ET (intratelencephalic and

extratelencephalic) glutamatergic neurons within the MOp (primary motor cortex) dataset,

corresponding to our cortical proteomics cells. We observed clear separation of the cell clusters

and identification of region-specific enriched genes **(Supp. Fig. 4)**, some of which we also

identified and validated in our proteomics datasets **(Fig. 2)**.

226   We compared cortex-to-SNpc transcript ratios derived from single-cell transcriptomic

227 data with proteomic $\log_2$ fold changes, focusing on directionality rather than effect size, as a

228 pragmatic benchmark for evaluating normalization strategies **(Supp. Table 2)**. While transcript-

229 protein correlations are known to be limited at single-cell resolution due to post-transcriptional

230 regulation, protein stability, temporal delays, and stochastic gene expression[32-34], consistent

231 regional trends across modalities provide a useful reference for assessing whether proteomic

232 processing preserves biologically plausible signal structure. Using directLFQ normalization, we

233 identified 234 gene-protein pairs with consistent up- or down-regulation and 25 pairs with

234 opposite directionality, corresponding to ~80% directional agreement and a higher correlation

235 (R^2 = 0.51). In contrast, the median-based normalization approach incorporating minimum-value

236 imputation yielded 164 same-direction and 144 opposite-direction pairs, corresponding to ~40%

237 agreement and a lower correlation (R^2 = 0.36) **(Fig. 3, E-G)**. These results highlight that

238 normalization strategy substantially influences downstream biological interpretation, and that

239 leveraging orthogonal omics data provides a principled framework for evaluating single-cell

240 proteomics processing methods. Consequently, we adopted directLFQ as the normalization

241 approach for all subsequent analyses.

242   Closer inspection of a small subset of proteins (~5.8%) that show disagreement in

243 single-cell transcriptomic directionality following directLFQ normalization **(Fig. 3G)**, revealed that

244 several corresponded to proteins of non-neuronal origin, including MBP (oligodendrocyte

245 marker) and GFAP (astrocytic marker). Because our isolation strategy relied on laser

246 microdissection rather than membrane-enclosed methods for intact single cells (i.e., cultured

247 cells or separation by cell sorting), complete exclusion of proteome contributions from

248 neighboring cells is impossible to achieve. These contaminating proteins can confound

249 investigation of cell type-specific proteomes. To systematically address this issue, we integrated

250 single-cell transcriptomic data from a publicly available Drop-seq mouse dataset (Dropviz)[35] to

251 assign a probable cellular origin to the DEPs (**Supp. Table 3**). Proteins with higher neuronal

252 transcript counts, including those exclusively detected in neurons, or with neuronal counts within

253 50% of any non-neuronal cell type (empirically defined threshold, given the LCM isolation is

254 neuron-targated) were classified as 'neuronal'. Proteins with zero neuronal transcript counts

255 were flagged as exclusively 'non-neuronal' (17 in SNpc and 6 in cortex; **Fig. 3H, left**). DEPs with

256 transcripts detected in both neuronal and non-neuronal cells, but with neuronal counts less than

257 50% of any of the non-neuronal cell types, were classified as mixed and assigned lower

258 confidence due to ambiguity in assigning cell-type origin. Interestingly, ~39% of SNpc DEPs

259 were classified as 'mixed' or 'non-neuronal', compared to ~22% for cortical DEPs, suggesting a

greater infiltration of one or more non-neuronal cell types within the SNpc neuronal regions

compared to the cortex. In 'mixed' DEPs, we observed substantial mRNA counts across multiple

non-neuronal cell types, including astrocytes, microglial and oligodendrocytes, preventing

confident assignment to a single non-neuronal class **(Fig. 3H, right)**. However, parallel IF

results **(Fig. 3I)** identified that astrocytes were the most disproportionately enriched non-

neuronal population in SNpc relative to cortex, implicating them as the primary contributor to the

non-neuronal component of the SNpc proteome DEP hits. Plotting the correlation of

transcriptomic abundance of DEPs in neurons and astrocytes further supports this (**Fig. 3J**, gray

area indicates DEPs of 'mixed' and 'non-neuronal' origin).

Taken together, these results indicate that single-cell transcriptomics can be integrated

with scSP both to evaluate differential expression trends across modalities and to

probabilistically assign cellular origin to proteomic signals, an especially critical consideration in

complex tissues such as the CNS. In subsequent analyses, this framework is leveraged to

refine cell-type attribution and biological interpretation of proteomic changes across multiple

spatial and cellular analyses.

Single-cell spatial proteomics of non-neuronal cells in the CNS can capture markers of

neuroinflammation

Glial cells are essential for maintaining CNS homeostasis, providing structural support,

regulating neuronal function, and modulating inflammatory responses[36,37]. Given their

importance, we next asked whether non-neuronal cell types could be reliably distinguished and

profiled using our approach, focusing initially on astrocytes. Brain sections were immunostained

with the astrocytic marker GFAP together with NeuN to enable selective isolation of non-

overlapping astrocyte and neuron populations **(Fig. 4A)**. Across both cell types, we identified

3,104 protein groups, including 185 proteins uniquely detected in astrocytes and 416 uniquely

detected in neurons **(Fig. 4B)**. PCA revealed cell-type-specific clustering of astrocytes and

neurons **(Fig. 4C)**. Differential abundance analysis identified multiple lineage-specific proteins

(Fig. 4D): neuron-enriched proteins included Bsn, Sncb, Syn1, and Dlg4, whereas astrocyte-

enriched proteins included Fabp7, Vim, Anxa2, and GFAP. Integration with transcriptomic

datasets confirmed that neuronal DEPs corresponded predominantly to neuron-enriched

transcripts, while astrocyte-upregulated DEPs showed enrichment in astrocytic transcripts **(Fig.**

4E).

We next applied LCM-based scSP to investigate neuroinflammation following acute brain

injury using a stab wound injury (SWI) model[38], which induces rapid neuronal loss along the

needle track and formation of a surrounding glial scar **(Fig. 4, F-G)**. GFAP⁺ astrocytes were

isolated from the peri-lesional region and compared with GFAP⁺ astrocytes from the

contralateral, uninjured hemisphere. Both groups had comparable protein counts per cell, with

422 proteins uniquely detected in the injured side and 512 in the uninjured side. Unsupervised

PCA revealed separation between injured and control astrocytes **(Supp. Fig 5, A-C)**. Proteomic

analysis revealed significant upregulation of proteins associated with astrocytic activation,

including Aldh1l1 and GFAP **(Fig. 4H)**, with increased GFAP abundance evident at the single-

sample level **(Fig. 4I)**.

Notably, acute SWI induces robust microglial activation and ramification near the injury

site **(Supp. Fig. 5D)**, and we detected several microglial inflammatory markers (e.g., AIF1,

CD68, CD11b, C1qa) in the micro-dissected astrocytic samples, which we validated via IF

(Supp. Fig. 5, E-F), indicating that microglial populations could be amenable to LCM-based

scSP. We therefore attempted to profile microglia in control brain tissue using AIF1/Iba1

labeling. However, this proved technically challenging, likely due to the small size of microglial

cell bodies, necessitating methodological refinements such as thinner tissue sections and

reduced LCM capture areas.

Together, these results demonstrate that LCM-based scSP enables robust, cell-type-

resolved proteomic profiling of glial populations *in situ* and provides a powerful framework for

studying region-specific neuroinflammatory responses, including reactive gliosis, an essential

pathological feature of stroke, traumatic brain injury, and neurodegenerative disease.

Proteomic profiling of Parkinson's disease-vulnerable ventral SNpc neurons reveals

basal molecular differences within closely related dopaminergic subpopulations

Building on our cortex-SNpc comparison, we next asked whether LCM-based scSP

could resolve proteomic differences between molecularly defined neuronal populations that are

highly similar in anatomy and function and inaccessible to bulk approaches. We focused on

dorsal and ventral neuronal subpopulations of SNpc, the latter of which selectively degenerate

in PD[4,39]. To isolate these populations, we employed dual immunostaining for TH to label SNpc

dopaminergic neurons and annexin A1 (Anxa1) to selectively mark the ventral tier population[40],

enabling comparison of TH⁺/Anxa1⁺ ventral neurons with TH⁺/Anxa1⁻ dorsal neurons **(Fig. 5A)**.

We identified 3,370 protein groups common to both Anxa1⁺ and Anxa1⁻ neurons, with an

additional 126 proteins uniquely detected in Anxa1⁺ neurons and 225 uniquely detected in

Anxa1⁻ neurons (n = 15–17 single neurons per group; **Fig. 5B**). PCA failed to robustly separate

the two populations, possibly due to their anatomical and functional proximity **(Fig. 5C)**.

Therefore, we used relaxed statistical thresholds (p < 0.1, FC ≥ 1.5) to identify 370 proteins

significantly upregulated in Anxa1$^+$ neurons and 189 enriched in Anxa1$^-$ neurons **(Fig. 5D)**. The

dataset was enriched for canonical neuronal proteins, including synaptic, cytoskeletal, and

neurotransmission-related markers such as Map2, Camk2a, Th, Stmn3, Vamp1, Cadps2, Calb1,

and Aldh1a1, confirming neuronal identity at the proteomic level. Within the neuronal proteome,

Anxa1 itself was differentially regulated, as expected **(Fig. 5E)**. Notably, Aldh1a1 was enriched

in ventral-tier neurons, whereas Calb1 was elevated in dorsal-tier neurons; these proteins have

been previously implicated in dopamine metabolism and calcium homeostasis, respectively, and

could be associated with differential vulnerability of SNpc subpopulations **(Fig. 5E)**. These

findings were validated by IF **(Fig. 5F, Supp. Fig. 6)** and are consistent with prior trascriptomics

reports[40,41]. Together, these results demonstrate that LCM-based scSP can resolve subtle yet

biologically meaningful proteomic differences between closely related neuronal subpopulations,

providing complementary insight to transcriptomic approaches[42] for dissecting cell type-specific

mechanisms underlying selective neuronal vulnerability in PD and related disorders.

Single-cell spatial proteomics identifies proteins and pathways altered in pS129-αSyn

inclusion-bearing neurons in a murine model of Parkinson's disease

Deciphering molecular-level insights selectively from the small, spatially restricted

neuronal populations that harbor pathogenic protein inclusions in neurodegenerative disorders

such as PD remains challenging. For example, in human post-mortem samples from patients

with PD or dementia with Lewy bodies, only ~1-2% of neurons contain mature Lewy bodies[3],

and even in inducible murine models, inclusion-bearing neurons typically comprise only a

fraction of the local SNpc population[43]. A recent study used spatial transcriptomics to map

molecular alterations in pathology-enriched brain regions[44]; however, proteomic changes at the

single-cell level have not been investigated. To address this, we applied LCM-based scSP to a

murine model of PD, modeling the symptomatic stage of parkinsonism using direct injection of

pathogenic αSyn preformed fibrils (PFFs)[45-47]. Adult C57 mice received intrastriatal injections of

sonicated mouse PFFs, and brain tissue was collected 6 months later. IHC confirmed αSyn

aggregates marked by pS129-αSyn in a fraction of surviving SNpc neurons **(Fig. 6A)**, and these

inclusions also stained positive for canonical pathology markers such as ubiquitin and p62

(Supp. Fig. 7).

Aggregate-containing (Agg$^+$) and non-aggregate-containing (Agg$^-$) neurons **(Fig. 6A)**

were laser-captured from PFF-injected mice nigral tissue dual-labeled for a dopaminergic

marker (TH) and anti-pS129-αSyn antibody, with non-aggregate neurons collected from the

PBS-injected contralateral control side of the same animals. On average, we detected ~2,000

unique proteins per individual neuron **(Fig. 6B)** and ~4300 protein groups across both neuronal

populations, with 703 proteins exclusive to Agg⁻ neurons and 214 proteins to Agg⁺ neurons

(Fig. 6C). Unsupervised dimensionality reduction resolved the two neuronal groups into distinct

clusters, with Agg⁺ neurons showing markedly higher variability **(Fig. 6D)**. Analysis of DEPs

(Fig. 6E) and pathway enrichment analysis of the DEPs using KEGG, a curated compendium of

experimentally validated molecular networks[48], revealed strong overrepresentation of pathways

related to "Parkinson's disease," "Oxidative phosphorylation," "Metabolic pathways," and the

"Ribosome" **(Fig. 6F)**. Consistently, gene ontology enrichment across cellular components,

molecular functions, and biological processes yielded overlapping categories **(Supp. Fig. 8)**.

Mapping the altered proteins onto the KEGG Parkinson's disease pathway highlighted multiple

nodes along established pathogenic routes **(Supp. Fig. 9)**. Dysregulation of the ubiquitin-

proteasome system was evident, marked by increased abundance of several proteasomal

subunits (e.g., PSMB5, PSMA7) in Agg⁺ neurons together with reduced levels of the familial PD-

linked deubiquitinase UCHL1 **(Fig. 6G)**. Mitochondrial dysfunction also emerged prominently,

reflected by widespread downregulation of subunits from respiratory chain complexes I-V.

Notably, numerous ribosomal proteins (RPL and RPS families) were decreased in Agg⁺

neurons. Network analysis further identified a connected module of ribosome-associated RNA-

binding proteins, including several spliceosome components **(Supp. Fig. 10)**, suggesting

coordinated perturbation of translational and RNA-processing machinery. These results support

multi-pathway alterations in αSyn aggregate-containing neurons in this model of Parkinsonism.

Together, these findings illustrate how LCM-based scSP enables proteome-wide

interrogation of rare, pathology-defined neuronal subpopulations *in vivo*, offering a powerful

framework to single-cell resolution analysis of proteomic states associated with

neurodegenerative diseases.

Discussion

Laser capture microdissection-based spatial proteomics has emerged as a key method

for studying complex biological systems, enabling interrogation of deep proteomic complexity

while preserving tissue context[49,50]. To date, spatial proteomics at the single-cell level has only

been applied to peripheral somatic tissues with comparatively lower cellular diversity or spatial

complexity[19,51], and application to the brain remains challenging due to its cellular and

architectural complexity. Here, we apply LCM-based single-cell spatial proteomics (scSP) to

multiple neuroscience use cases, demonstrating its performance as an unbiased, discovery-

oriented platform for single-cell proteomic analysis of the nervous system. We show that

molecularly-guided spatial proteomics enables robust and quantitative profiling of CNS cells

across sample fixation conditions, staining modalities, and sampling area, extending to the

single-cell regime. A key methodological advantage of this approach is its compatibility with

established imaging modalities, including protein-based IF and mRNA-based FISH **(Fig. 1C-D,**

Supp. Fig. 1B-C). Large-scale transcriptomic studies have established mRNA expression as a

robust cell-type marker, and in some cases, such as for synaptically localized proteins (e.g.,

GAD1 in inhibitory neurons), mRNA-based labeling more effectively visualizes neuronal cell

bodies than antibody staining, which often preferentially labels distal processes. Using this

framework, we successfully resolved brain region-specific neuronal populations **(Fig. 2E)** and

identified multiple high-confidence cell-type-specific protein markers **(Fig. 2, Supp. Fig. 4)**,

supported by orthogonal histological and transcriptomic ISH evidence.

The increasing availability of well-annotated large-scale single-cell transcriptomic

atlases, particularly for mouse and human brain[24,52], provides a valuable and accessible

resource for comparative multi-omics analyses and validation. These atlases can also enable

evaluation of analytical strategies in single-cell proteomics. In this study, we leveraged

transcriptomic data to assess the impact of different protein data processing approaches and

observed that directLFQ-based normalization substantially improved agreement with

transcriptomic trends compared to commonly used global imputation and median normalization

strategies in these sparse, tissue-derived single-cell conditions **(Fig. 3, A-G).** Moreover, we

used transcriptomics to assign confidence in cell-type origin of proteomics hits **(Fig. 3, J, Supp.**

Fig. 4). This refinement is particularly important in heterogeneous tissues such as the brain,

where low-input spatial sampling can capture proteins originating from neighboring or

intermingled cells and processes. Together, these observations highlight the potential of

transcriptomics-informed comparisons as a pragmatic means of benchmarking and refining

single-cell proteomics analysis pipelines. Incomplete concordance between transcriptomic and

proteomic measurements, consistent with prior studies[34,53,54], underscores the complementary

nature of the two modalities and highlights opportunities for insights from proteomics that are

not accessible through transcriptomics alone.

Analysis of neuroimmune responses in the stab wound injury (SWI) model provided

additional methodological insights into integrating proteomic and transcriptomic data analyses.

We observed substantial overlap between our proteomic hits and a recent SWI transcriptomic

study[38], with comparable fold changes for most shared targets, including Anxa3, B2m, Dhrs1,

S100a6, Npl, Ptpn6, Isg15, C1qa, and C1qc. In contrast, CD68, a key inflammatory marker,

showed greater enrichment at the protein level (~6-fold) **(Supp. Fig. S5F)** in our dataset

compared to transcriptomic measurements (~2.5-fold). This disparity likely reflects localized

accumulation of CD68 protein near the stab wound injury axis, from which our samples were

collected, whereas corresponding mRNA signals are more spatially diffused, as reported

previously[38]. Consistent with this, spatial imaging of selected targets in the same study revealed

pronounced differences between mRNA and protein localization, further reinforcing that

transcriptomic and proteomic measurements provide complementary, rather than

interchangeable, information.

Together, these findings highlight the depth and specificity enabled by LCM-based

molecularly-guided scSP, positioning this approach as a powerful framework for studying

neurodegenerative diseases such as PD, where selective neuronal vulnerability and sparse,

mosaic pathology pose persistent challenges to mechanistic understanding. Although SNpc

neuronal subtypes have been extensively characterized at the transcriptomic level[42], their

proteomic organization and its relationship to vulnerability remain largely unexplored. Our

analysis reveals many proteomic differences between ventral and dorsal SNpc neurons,

including alterations in proteins related to dopamine oxidation[55], such as Aldh1a1 (**Fig. 5, E–F**),

suggesting proteomic specializations that may contribute to differential susceptibility, although

further work will be required to define the underlying mechanisms.

Within our dataset examining proteomic changes in sparsely populated, aggregate-

containing neurons, we observed enrichment of gene ontology terms (**Supp. Fig. 8**) and KEGG

pathways (**Supp. Fig. 9**) associated with PD in aggregate-associated differentially expressed

proteins (DEPs), supporting the biological robustness of the dataset. These DEPs pointed

toward coordinated disruption of proteasomal and mitochondrial pathways (**Fig. 6G**), reflected

by widespread alterations in their core subunits, two systems that represent central mechanistic

pillars of PD biology[56]. Aggregated αSyn is known to impair proteasomal degradation

(McNaught and Jenner 2001, Thibaudeau, Anderson et al. 2018) and directly interacts with

mitochondrial membranes[57,58], leading to respiratory dysfunction. Consistent with this, we

observed reduced levels of the PD-associated deubiquitinase Uchl1[59], indicative of sustained

proteostasis failure. Similar proteasomal and mitochondrial alterations were also detected in

single-cell proteomics data from an orthogonal PFF-induced PD model in the regenerative spiny

mouse[60], suggesting these responses possibly represent conserved features of αSyn pathology.

In parallel, we detected reduced abundance of multiple ribosomal proteins, indicating

compromised translational capacity. This aligns with prior reports of ribosomal dysfunction and

clinical observations of reduced RPL and RPS subunits in PD patient brains[61,62], although these

studies were conducted at the bulk tissue level. Together, the combined disruption of translation

and ubiquitin–proteasome function suggests a potential decoupling between transcript

abundance and protein clearance, underscoring the importance of proteomic analyses for

accurately defining neuronal state in PD.

Several previous studies have characterized proteomic alterations in PD patient tissue

and preclinical models using bulk approaches[63-65]. Bulk and single-cell approaches may exhibit

pathway-level convergence; however, the specific proteins underlying these signatures can

differ. For example, direct comparison of our DEPs with a recent bulk proteomic study[63] using a

similar experimental paradigm revealed limited overlap, likely reflecting the whole-tissue nature

of bulk analysis. In contrast, a more substantial overlap was observed with human Lewy body

interactor proteins reported by Killinger et al.[66], providing validation of our neuron-enriched

readouts, given that Lewy bodies are restricted to neurons in PD patients. The limited

concordance with bulk datasets is consistent with the inherent non-specificity of whole-tissue

measurements, including contributions from non-neuronal cell types and dilution of disease-

relevant signals in tissues where pathology is confined to a subset of 1-2% neurons[3]. By

resolving proteomes at the level of individual dopaminergic neurons, our single-neuron analysis

overcomes limitations from tissue-averaged measurements. Notably, dimensionality-reduction

analysis (**Fig. 6D**) revealed a compact cluster of aggregate-free neurons, whereas aggregate-

containing neurons exhibited substantial divergence, suggesting heterogeneous stress

responses elicited by αSyn pathology that are only resolvable through single-cell approaches

and further highlighting the scope of scSP.

Several limitations of the LCM-based scSP approach should be considered, particularly

when applied to the brain. First, the complex and intermingled architecture of the brain can lead

to proteomic contamination. For example, we detected astrocytic proteins in SNpc neuronal

samples **(Fig. 2, Fig. 5)**, and microglial proteins in isolated ramified astrocytes in SWI samples

(Fig. 4, Supp. Fig. 5, D-F). Contaminating proteins may also originate from closely related cell

types, such as different neuronal subpopulations. For instance, in our dopaminergic subtype

analysis, Anxa⁻ samples showed significant non-zero proteomic intensity values for Anxa1 **(Fig.**

5E), unlike the near-zero expression levels of SNpc markers such as TH or Sncg in spatially

separated cortical samples **(Fig. 2G)**. This is notable given prior transcriptomic analyses[40] and

IF imaging indicating that Anxa⁻ SNpc neurons exhibit undetectable (not just low) Anxa1

expression **(Fig. 5A, 5F)**. Such effects likely arise from overlapping cells or processes within the

target ROI, particularly along the Z-axis, where precise isolation of neuronal cell bodies is

inherently challenging. Related to this, proteins predominantly localized to neuronal processes

or synapses are underrepresented in single-cell samples compared to larger ROI samples

reflecting an intrinsic limitation of cell-body based isolation strategies for cells with complex

structures.

Second, sample variability remains a challenge; high coefficient of variations (CVs) and

missing values were observed, as is typical for single-cell studies[26,67]. This is particularly

important when distinguishing biological or disease-specific differences from variability

introduced by methodological heterogeneity. To improve downstream biological interpretability,

we purposefully omitted features not present in at least 40% of samples in at least one group

(see Methods). While small sample sizes can therefore be sufficient to detect protein differences

with large effect sizes (e.g., **Fig. 4**), especially given histology-guided rather than blind isolation

of cells, larger sample sizes will likely be required to resolve more subtle differences.

In contexts where cell-specific heterogeneity is driven by biological factors or disease

states, disentangling these limitations from technical variability is a challenge, underscoring the

need to balance sensitivity and interpretability. Ongoing advances in MS sensitivity, reduced

costs for single-cell processing, and continued methodological and analytical improvements in

LCM are expected to further enhance the utility of LCM-based scSP for CNS studies. In this

study, as discussed above, integration with orthogonal transcriptomic datasets provided

additional context to distinguish biologically meaningful heterogeneity from low-input or technical

effects. In addition, although not applied here, machine learning-based strategies, such as those

used in deep visual proteomics[19,21,49,68], could further improve cell selection by minimizing

overlap among histology-positive neurons and enhancing cell annotation throughput.

In summary, this work establishes single-cell spatial proteomics (scSP) as a powerful

approach for studying the nervous system, enabling investigation of diverse biological questions

and disease states, and provides a foundation for continued technical and analytical refinement.

Materials and Methods

Post-mortem tissue processing: All mouse procedures were approved by the

Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC) at the California Institute of Technology.

Animals were euthanized using a sodium pentobarbital overdose and subjected to transcardial

perfusion with chilled PBS. Brains were either collected and flash frozen using a dry ice-ethanol

bath, or perfusion was continued with 4% (w/v) paraformaldehyde (PFA) in PBS to fix the brain.

Fixed brains were then collected and kept for 24-48 hr in PFA solution and subsequently

cryoprotected at 4°C in a solution containing 30% (w/v) sucrose for 72 hr. Brains were flash-

frozen in O.C.T. Compound (Scigen, #4586) using a dry ice-ethanol bath and kept at -70 °C until

sectioning. Brain sections were obtained using a cryostat (Leica Biosystems) and collected in 1x

PBS. Sections were stored at 4°C in PBS (supplemented with 0.02% Azide) for short-term

storage or at - 20°C in cryoprotectant (Bioenno Lifesciences, 006799-1L) for longer

preservation. Detailed protocol available at 10.17504/protocols.io.14egn1j4yv5d/v1.

Mouse αSyn PFF preparation: Recombinant mouse αSyn PFFs were produced as

previously outlined[60]. In summary, αSyn monomer was produced in E. coli BL21 (DE3) cells

utilizing the pT7-7 vector and subsequently purified through size-exclusion chromatography

(Cytiva) and anion-exchange chromatography on a HiPrep Q HP 16/10 column (Cytiva).

Endotoxin was eliminated using endotoxin-reduction resin (Thermo Fisher Scientific, #88277),

resulting in preparations with <0.02 EU/µg. Monomeric αSyn (5 mg/mL in PBS) was filter

sterilized with a 0.22 µm filter and incubated at 37 °C with continuous agitation at 1,000 rpm to

facilitate fibril formation. Following the elimination of remaining monomer via centrifugation, the

resultant fibrils were resuspended in PBS at a concentration of 5 mg/mL, aliquoted into 25 µL

portions, and preserved at –80 °C. Prior to injection, fibrils were sonicated with a cup-horn

sonicator (Qsonica Q700) to generate short PFF fragments suitable for *in vivo* seeding. Detailed

protocol available at 10.17504/protocols.io.14egn1j4yv5d/v1.

Intracranial stereotaxic surgery: Mice were group housed under controlled conditions,

maintained on a 13/11-hour light/dark cycle at ambient temperatures ranging from 71 to 75°F,

with humidity levels between 30% and 70%. Stereotaxic surgery was performed as described

previously [60]. Before surgery, animals were anesthetized using isoflurane, and the animal was

secured on the stereotaxic frame (Kopf Instruments). For the stab wound injury (SWI)

experiment, a needle tip (26 gauge) insertion was performed at the coordinates 0.25 AP, -2 ML,

-3 DV and left in place for 5 minutes. For PFF injection, 1.5uL of 5mg/mL sonicated PFF was

injected at the coordinates 0.25 AP, -2 ML, -3 DV and PBS was injected into the contralateral

hemisphere of the same animal as a control. Following the injection, the scalp was closed using

non-absorbable nylon sutures (Ethicon #NW3353). Animals were allowed to recover on a

heating pad and monitored for health concerns regularly for the next few days. SWI and PFF-

injected animals were culled 7 days and 24 weeks post-injection, respectively, to collect the

brain as described above. Detailed protocol available at 10.17504/protocols.io.14egn1j4yv5d/v1.

Immunofluorescence (IF) staining: For IF staining, 30 μm or 35 μm (**Supp. Fig. 1,**

B,D) free-floating brain sections were blocked with 10% (v/v) normal donkey serum in PBS

supplemented with 1% Triton-X100 (% v/v) (1% PBST) for 90 min and then incubated with

primary antibody solution prepared in 0.3% PBST supplemented with 1% (v/v) normal donkey

serum overnight at 4°C. After washing in PBS (3 x 10 min), the sections were incubated with

secondary antibodies (in 0.3% PBST with 1% NDS) conjugated with Alexa fluorophores

(Jackson ImmunoResearch Laboratories, 1:500 dilution) for 90 min at room temperature and

then washed 3 x 10 min in PBS. The tissues were mounted on glass slides or UV-treated metal

frame slides with PET membranes (Leica Microsystems, #76463-322) for confocal imaging and

laser capture microdissection, respectively. Glass slides were allowed to dry overnight and

sealed with a coverslip using mounting media (Thermo Fisher Scientific, #P36970). The

following primary antibodies were used for IF staining: anti-tyrosine hydroxylase (EMD Millipore,

AB152, RRID:AB_390204, 1:1000; #MAB318, RRID:AB_2313764, 1:1000); anti-GFAP

(Abcam, #ab4674, RRID:AB_304558, 1:1000), anti-Iba1 (FUJIFILM Wako Pure Chemical

Corporation, #019-19741, RRID:AB_839504, 1:1000), anti-CD11b (Thermo Fisher Scientific,

RRID:AB_467108, #14-0112-82, 1:500), anti-CD68 (Thermo Fisher Scientific,

RRID:AB_11151139, #14-0688-82, 1:500), anti-NeuN (Cell Signaling Technology, #94403,

RRID:AB_2904530, 1:1000; Abcam, #ab104224, RRID:AB_10711040, 1:1000) , anti-

Anxa1(Thermo Fisher Scientific, #71-3400, RRID:AB_2533983, 1:250), anti-Aldh1a1 (Thermo

Fisher Scientific, #PA5-17943, RRID:AB_10977372, 1:250), anti-Calb1 (Swanth, #CB38a-

200uL, RRID:AB_3107026, 1:500), anti-gamma-synuclein (Genetex, #GTX110483, 1951959,

1:500), anti-Camk2a (Abcam, #ab52476, RRID:AB_868641, 1:500), anti-pSer129-αSyn

(EP1536Y) (Abcam, #ab51253, RRID:AB_869973, 1:500), anti-Ubiquitin (Proteintech, #80992-

1-RR, RRID:AB_2923694, 1:500), anti-p62/SQSTM1 (Proteintech, #18420-1-AP,

RRID:AB_10694431, 1:500). Detailed protocol available at

10.17504/protocols.io.14egn1j4yv5d/v1.

Hybridization chain reaction (HCR): Split initiator probes[69] against *Itpr1, Gad1*, and

Gad2 were designed **(Supp. Table 4)** according to Jang *et al.*[70] and ordered from Integrated

DNA Technologies. All washes and incubations were performed at room temperature and with

gentle shaking unless otherwise stated. All wash and incubation buffers were prepared from

RNase-free reagents. Free-floating sections of the mouse brain were permeabilized in 1x PBS

with 0.1% Triton-X100 for 1 hr. Sections were then incubated for 1 hr at 37 °C in a probe

hybridization buffer consisting of 2x SSC, 10 % ethylene carbonate (Sigma-Aldrich, #E26258),

and 10% dextran sulfate (Sigma-Aldrich, #3730). Following equilibration in hybridization buffer,

the samples were incubated for 16 hr at 37 °C in pre-warmed fresh hybridization buffer plus 2

nM of each probe. After probe hybridization, sections were washed twice for 30 min in stringent

wash buffer (2x SSC, 30% ethylene carbonate) at 37 °C, then twice for 30 min in 5x SSC with

0.1 % Tween-20 (Sigma-Aldrich, #P1379), and then incubated in HCR amplification buffer (2x

SSC, 10% ethylene carbonate) for 1 hr. Alexa Fluor 647 or 488-conjugated hairpins (Molecular

Technologies) were heated to 95 °C for 90 s, then cooled to room temperature for 30 min in the

dark. Following equilibration in amplification buffer, the tissue was incubated in amplification

buffer with 60 nM hairpins for 16 hr. After HCR amplification, the samples were washed twice for

30 min each in 5x SSC with 0.1 % Tween-20, followed by two washes in 1x PBS for 10 min.

Sections were stored in 1x PBS at 4 °C until use. Detailed protocol available at

10.17504/protocols.io.14egn1j4yv5d/v1.

Confocal Imaging: Images were acquired using (i) a spinning disk confocal microscope

(Andor, Oxford Instruments), using a 10x, 0.30 NA air objective or 25x, 0.95 NA water-

immersion objective, operated with Fusion software (v2.3.0.44) and visualized using Imaris

software(v9.5.1, Oxford Instruments, RRID: SCR_007370) and (ii) a Zeiss LSM 880 (Zeiss),

using a 25x, 0.8 NA water-immersion objective or 10x, 0.45 NA air objective, operated with Zen

Black (v2.3) and visualized using Zen Blue (v2.5).

Laser-capture micro-dissection (LCM): Regions of interest were mounted on PET

membranes (Leica Microsystems, #76463-322) and excised using a gravity-driven collection

system by a Leica LMD7000 and LMD7. Laser settings are included in **Supp. Table 5**. The cut

tissue was collected in a 0.65 mL Low Binding Tube cap (Sorenson SafeSeal, #11300;

Eppendorf LoBind, # 0030108434) containing 10 µL of lysis buffer consisting of 50 mM

triethylammonium bicarbonate (TEAB) (Thermo Scientific, #90114) and 0.2% n-Dodecyl-beta-

Maltoside (DDM) (Thermo Scientific, #89903). Upon collecting, the tube was vortexed upside

down for 30 seconds and centrifuged at 13,000 x g for 1 minute at 25°C. The sample was then

stored at -80°C until further processing. Detailed protocol available at

10.17504/protocols.io.14egn1j4yv5d/v1.

Sample preparation for mass spectrometry: Stored samples were thawed and

vortexed for 30 seconds in an inverted position with an additional 10 µL of lysis buffer to ensure

optimal recovery of the tissue. The sample was then centrifuged at 13,000 x g for 1 minute at

25°C and transferred into a LoBind 384-well PCR plate (Eppendorf, #0030129547). The plate

was heated for two hours at 70°C in a QuantStudio™ Real-Time PCR machine with the heated

lid set to 85°C for sample lysis and protein denaturation. Following lysis, the plate was

centrifuged at 1000 x g for 1 minute and allowed to cool to room temperature. Proteolytic

digestion was carried out using a mix of trypsin (Promega, #V5280) and Lys-C (Wako

Chemicals, # 125-05061). 1 µL of the digestion mix containing 4 ng of each enzyme was added

to each sample. The plate was then incubated at 37°C overnight. Following digestion, samples

were centrifuged at 1000 x g for one minute, and digestion was quenched with 0.5 µL of

aqueous buffer comprising 2% acetonitrile and 4% formic acid. Detailed protocol available at

10.17504/protocols.io.14egn1j4yv5d/v1.

LC-MS/MS analysis: Peptides were separated on an Aurora Ultimate UHPLC Column

(25cm by 75µm, 1.7µm C18, AUR3-25075C18, IonOpticks) with column temperature maintained

at 50°C. 5 µL of each sample was loaded directly onto the analytical column to maximize

sensitivity. The LC system (Vanquish Neo UHPLC, Thermo Scientific) was coupled to an

Orbitrap Exploris 480 mass spectrometer (Thermo Scientific) with a Nanospray Flex ion source

(Thermo Scientific). Peptides were separated using a 60-min gradient at a flow rate of 0.22

µL/min.

For αSyn aggregate-bearing SNpc neurons, the same LC system was coupled to an

Orbitrap Astral mass spectrometer (Thermo Scientific) equipped with an EasySpray ion source,

with the column maintained at 55°C. These samples were analyzed using a 19.5-min gradient at

a flow rate of 0.2 µL/min. Detailed LC gradients for both platforms are provided in the **Supp.**

Table 6.

Xcalibur software (Thermo Scientific) was used for method implementation and data

acquisition on both mass spectrometers. Data-dependent acquisition (DDA) on the Orbitrap

Exploris 480 was performed in positive ion mode (spray voltage 1.6 kV, ion transfer tube at

300°C). Full MS1 scans were acquired over a m/z range of 375-1200 at a resolution of 60,000

with a cycle time of 3 seconds. The maximum injection time was set to auto, and the normalized

AGC target was set to 300%. Precursor ions with charges ranging from +2 to +6 were

selectively targeted for fragmentation using a minimum intensity threshold of 5e3. Dynamic

exclusion was set to exclude after one acquisition, with a 45-second exclusion duration and 10

ppm mass tolerance. MS2 scans were acquired in the Orbitrap at 60,000 resolutions with an

isolation window of 1.6 m/z, HCD collision energy set at 28%, and an auto-adjusted maximum

injection time. The normalized AGC target was set at 200%.

Data-independent acquisition (DIA) on the Orbitrap Exploris 480 was performed in

positive ion mode (spray voltage 1.6 kV, ion transfer tube at 300°C) using parameters adapted

from Matzinger *et al.*[23]. Briefly, MS1 full scans were acquired with a range of 375-1200 m/z and

a resolution of 120,000. The maximum injection time was set to auto, and the normalized AGC

target was set to 300%. MS2 scans were acquired at 60,000 resolutions with a maximum

injection time of 118 ms and AGC target of 75%.

For the Orbitrap Astral, DIA was performed in positive ion mode (spray voltage 1.8 kV,

ion transfer tube at 275 °C). MS1 spectra were acquired at 240,000 resolution across a scan

range of 400-800 m/z with an injection time and an AGC target of 500%. MS2 spectra were

acquired on the Astral analyzer with an 80-ms injection time and an AGC target of 800%.

Comprehensive DDA/DIA parameters and mass spectrometer settings for both mass

spectrometers are listed in the **Supp. Table 6**. Detailed protocol available at

10.17504/protocols.io.14egn1j4yv5d/v1.

Mass spectrometry data analysis and statistics: RAW files obtained in DDA mode

were processed in Proteome Discoverer 2.5 (Thermo Fisher Scientific) using the SequestHT[71]

search algorithm with Percolator validation. Data was searched against the mouse reference

database from Uniprot (SwissProt database, downloaded 27 September 2024, 17232

sequences). Lys-C and Trypsin were selected, allowing for a maximum of two missed cleavages

and peptide lengths between seven and 30 amino acids. The mass tolerance for precursor ions

was set at 20 ppm, while the fragment mass tolerance was defined as 0.1 Da. INFERYS

Rescoring was used in automatic mode, and Percolator was used for search validation based

on q-values with a strict false discovery rate (FDR) of 1% at the spectrum level[72,73].

Carbamidomethylation of cysteine residues was designated as a static modification, and

oxidation of methionine residues was considered a dynamic modification. A minimum number of

1 peptide sequence (unique and razor) was required for protein identification. Strict parsimony

was used to group proteins. Data was exported from PD2.5 and used for further analysis.

RAW files acquired in DIA mode were processed with DIA-NN (version 2.1) [74] using a

library-free search with FASTA digest enabled and deep learning–based predictions for spectra

and retention times. Default DIA-NN parameters were used unless otherwise specified, with the

precursor *m/z* range restricted to 400–800 and a maximum of two missed cleavages allowed.

Precursor FDR cutoff was set to 1.0%. Resulting protein- and peptide-level outputs (in parquet

format) were imported into Python for downstream analysis using single-cell analysis packages

scanpy[75] and *scpviz*[76]*,* with additional analysis and visualization performed using general-

purpose scientific Python libraries documented in the repository README **(Supp. Table 1)**.

Proteins meeting a stringent confidence threshold (PG.Q.Value < 0.01) were designated as high

confidence and retained for subsequent analyses. Additional filtering required proteins to be

quantified in at least 40% of samples within at least one group per comparison (e.g., region or

condition). Proteins lacking valid gene annotations or exhibiting non-unique abundance profiles

were excluded, as isoform-level redundancy combined with sparse peptide support resulted in

unreliable quantification. Protein abundances were normalized using directLFQ[30] which was

adopted as the primary normalization strategy. For comparison, an alternative normalization

approach involving global imputation to 20% of the minimum observed intensity followed by

median normalization was evaluated but not used for downstream analyses. Statistical analysis,

sample clustering based on principal component analysis, and volcano plots were generated

utilizing scpviz. Kolmogorov-Smirnov (KS) normality test was used to test the distribution for

whether proteins unique to certain conditions lay within the original sample distribution (rank plot

shown in Fig. 1I). Differences in mean protein and peptide counts between conditions were

evaluated using Student's *t*-test. Protein abundance was plotted using GraphPad Prism (v9.5.1,

http://www.graphpad.com, RRID: SCR_002798).

705   **Transcriptomics data analysis and multi-omics comparison:** Single-cell RNA

sequencing (scRNA-seq) data were obtained from the Allen Brain Cell Atlas mouse whole-brain

cell-type atlas (10x Genomics v3) [24,31]. Data processing and quality control were performed as

previously described by Yao et al.[31], including stringent filtering based on gene detection

thresholds, quality control metrics, and doublet scores. The resulting curated scRNA-seq

datasets were used directly for downstream analyses. Processed datasets from WMB-10Xv3-

Isocortex-1, WMB-10Xv3-Isocortex-2, and WMB-10Xv3-MB were combined, with cells selected

based on supertype annotations corresponding to cortical ("CTX") and midbrain dopaminergic

populations ("*-VTA"). Additional filtering retained cells whose region-of-interest acronyms

matched MOp (motor cortex) or MB (midbrain). Cells annotated as "L5 NP CTX Glut" and "SNr"

were excluded, as these populations do not correspond to the neuronal subtypes analyzed in

the proteomics experiments. Regions were annotated by mapping MOp to cortex and MB to

SNpc. Transcriptomic data were converted to AnnData format and analyzed using Scanpy,

including dimensionality reduction and visualization using uniform manifold approximation and

projection (UMAP).

720   For multi-omics analysis, proteomics data were imported and processed using scpviz as

described above. The protein-level AnnData object (.prot) from the pAnnData structure was

used to enable direct integration with transcriptomic analyses. Differentially expressed proteins

(DEPs) and genes were identified using a fold-change threshold of at least two and a

significance cutoff of p < 0.05 based on Student's t-test. Concordance between transcriptomic

and proteomic changes was assessed by comparing the directionality of differential expression,

categorizing features as consistently upregulated, consistently downregulated, or oppositely

regulated across the two modalities.

To assess the cell-type origin of DEPs, we queried corresponding genes against Drop-

seq transcriptomic datasets using the DropViz portal. DEP gene lists were entered as query

genes, and the relevant brain region was selected as either the frontal cortex or substantia

nigra, as appropriate. Major cell classes were preselected, including astrocytes, neurons,

oligodendrocytes, endothelial cells, and microglia/macrophages. When multiple clusters were

present within a given cell class, the cluster most relevant to the experimental context was

selected (e.g., SN Neuron_Th [#4] for SNpc dopaminergic neurons and FC

Neuron_Layer5_Parm1 [#7] for cortical neurons). Natural log–transformed expression values

were extracted and plotted in correlation plots using GraphPad Prism.

Bioinformatics and enrichment analyses: Gene ontology (GO) analysis comparing

fixed and frozen tissue was performed using string-db[77]. For the αSyn PFF experiment, pathway

enrichment analysis was conducted using ShinyGO (v0.85.1;

http://bioinformatics.sdstate.edu/go/, RRID:SCR_019213) with Kyoto Encyclopedia of Genes

and Genomes (KEGG; http://www.kegg.jp, RRID:SCR_012773) as the reference database.

Analyses were performed for mouse genes (GRCm39), applying an FDR cutoff of 0.05, pathway

size limits of 5–5,000 genes, and reporting the top 10 enriched pathways. Enrichment results

were visualized as hierarchical enrichment trees and KEGG pathway maps.

GO enrichment analysis was additionally performed using Metascape (https://metascape.org,

RRID:SCR_016620), with annotations spanning biological process (BP), molecular function

(MF), and cellular component (CC). Enrichment was assessed using a minimum overlap of

three genes, a P-value cutoff of 0.01, and all genes as background. GO term visualization was

carried out using Cytoscape (v3.10.3; https://cytoscape.org, RRID:SCR_003032).

Protein–protein interaction (PPI) networks were generated using STRING (https://string-db.org,

RRID:SCR_005223), using the full STRING network with experimentally supported interactions

only, highest confidence threshold (0.9), and MCL clustering.

Figures and figure legends

Figure 1

Figure 1: Validation and optimization of marker-guided spatial single-cell proteomics in

CNS tissue: (A) Schematic overview of the LCM-based scSP workflow. Mouse brain tissue is

fixed, cryosectioned, and stained with the desired marker panel, followed by LCM of regions of

interest, lysis, digestion, and LC–MS analysis (Created in BioRender. Pang, W. (2025)

https://BioRender.com/q97z901). **(B)** Comparison of proteomic profiles obtained from fresh-

frozen and fixed bulk cortical tissue, showing protein identification overlap (top) and high

correlation of log-transformed protein abundances between conditions (bottom). n = 3 animals

(C) Effect of IF staining on scSP: representative NeuN-stained mouse cortical section. Scale

bar: 50 µm (left, top), overlap of protein identifications between IF-stained samples and

unstained (PBS) controls (left, bottom), and correlation of log protein abundances,

demonstrating minimal staining-induced bias (right). (n = 10 cells from IF-stained tissue, n = 9

from control tissue) **(D)** Effect of RNA-FISH mRNA staining on protein abundance, showing (i) a

representative cortical RNA-FISH image targeting GAD transcripts, (ii) protein identification

overlap, and (iii) abundance correlations relative to unstained controls, indicating negligible

impact of RNA-FISH on proteomic measurements. (n = 7 cells from FISH-stained tissue, n = 9

cells from control tissue). Scale bar: 50 µm **(E)** Representative NeuN-stained cortical regions

corresponding to approximately 1, 3, 6, 12, and 25 neuronal cell bodies (800, 2,000, 5,000,

10,000, and 20,000 µm²; n = 20, 10, 7, 3, and 3, respectively). **(F)** Number of high-confidence

proteins (q < 0.01) identified across sampled areas. **(G)** Coefficients of variation (CVs) of protein

abundances across sampled areas, showing increased variability at the single-cell level,

consistent with greater biological heterogeneity compared to larger cortical regions. **(H)** Log–log

scaling of protein abundance as a function of sampled area, with a mean scaling exponent $\beta_1 \approx$

1.02, indicating near-linear scaling across proteins spanning low to high abundance (e.g.,

Plxnb1, Ndufs2, Gapdh). **(I)** Abundance–rank quantile and raincloud analyses showing proteins

uniquely detected in single-cell samples and those absent only from single-cell datasets, with

single-cell-specific proteins spanning a broad dynamic range, while proteins missing from

single-cell measurements were predominantly low-abundance species.

Figure 2

Figure 2: Characterization of CNS neuronal subpopulations using LCM-based scSP: (A)

Schematic representation of the cortex and SNpc brain regions selected for comparison using

LCM-based scSP. Representative confocal microscopy images showing immunostaining of

neuronal cell bodies in the cortex and SNpc. Neurons are labeled with anti-NeuN. Created in

BioRender. Dutta, S. (2026) https://BioRender.com/t68m928 (modified). Scale bar: 100 μm. **(B)**

Protein counts from isolated single-cell samples obtained from cortical and SNpc regions using

LCM-based scSP. (n= 60 cells for cortex; 40 cells for SNpc). **(C)** CVs of protein abundances for

the groups showing comparable variance of around 50% for both groups. **(D)** Overlap of

identified proteins between cortical and SNpc samples and proteins uniquely identified in each

group. **(E)** Unsupervised PCA plot of protein intensities from the two sample groups showing

cluster separation of single-cell samples from the cortex and SNpc. **(F)** Distribution of

differentially expressed proteins (DEPs) between the cortex and SNpc. Proteins significantly

upregulated in each neuron type are highlighted, revealing region-specific protein markers. **(G)**

Corresponding IF validation using anti-TH, anti-gamma synuclein, and anti-Camk2α antibodies

to indicate protein expression distribution. The respective bar graphs illustrate the label-free

quantification (LFQ) mass spectrometry intensity levels of these marker proteins in each single-

cell sample.

Figure 3

Figure 3: Single-cell transcriptomics informs data processing and refinement of neuronal

proteomic assignments. (A–B) Distribution of DEPs between cortical and SNpc neurons using

directLFQ quantification (A) or imputation (20% minimum value) followed by global median

normalization (B), highlighting increased DEP detection and cortex-skewed upregulation with

imputation. **(C–D)** Unsupervised PCA of single-neuron proteomes demonstrates improved

separation of cortical and SNpc samples using directLFQ (C) compared to imputed data (D).

(E–F) Cross-omics comparison of proteomic log$_2$ fold changes with single-cell transcriptomic

cortex-to-SNpc ratios, color-coded by concordant upregulation, concordant downregulation, and

opposite directionality, reveals higher concordance and correlation using directLFQ. **(G)**

Quantification of agreement between proteomic and transcriptomic directionality shows higher

overall concordance for directLFQ relative to imputed normalization. **(H)** Classification of DEPs

based on Drop-seq transcriptomic enrichment using DropViz (i) classifies proteins as neuronal,

mixed, or non-neuronal. (ii) Stratification of mixed DEPs into confidence groups based on the

highest transcript levels among astrocytes, microglia, and oligodendrocytes, possible

contributors to background signal in SNpc proteomes. **(I)** IF staining of astrocytes, microglia,

and oligodendrocytes reveals greater astrocytic density in SNpc compared to cortex, confirming

astrocytes as major contributors to non-neuronal DEPs in SNpc samples. Scale bar 100 μm. (J)

Correlation plot of neuronal and astrocytic transcript abundance for DEPs visualizes cell-type-

specific expression patterns. Gray shaded area indicates DEPs of possible astrocytic origin.

Figure 4

Figure 4. Single-cell spatial proteomics of astrocytes capture cell-type identity and

neuroinflammatory activation. (A) Representative IF images of mouse brain sections stained

for NeuN (neurons) and GFAP (astrocytes), enabling selective laser capture. Scale bars, 50 μm.

(B) Venn diagram showing overlap and cell-type-specific protein groups identified across single

neurons and astrocytes. (n= 14 cells for neuron; 5 cells for astrocyte) **(C)** Unsupervised PCA of

single-cell proteomic profiles demonstrates clear separation between neuronal and astrocytic

samples. **(D)** Volcano plot depicting differentially abundant proteins between astrocytes and

neurons. Representative neuron-enriched and astrocyte-enriched proteins are annotated. **(E)**

Integration of proteomic differential abundance with Drop-seq transcriptomic data, comparing

astrocyte- and neuron-enriched proteins against corresponding astrocytic and neuronal

transcript expression, respectively (shaded area highlights potential non-specific DEPs). **(F)**

Schematic of the acute stab wound injury (SWI) model, illustrating the injury site. Created in

BioRender. Dutta, S. (2026) https://BioRender.com/kye7fc7 (modified). **(G)** Representative IF

images of NeuN and GFAP in uninjured control tissue and at the SWI site. Scale bars, 100 μm.

(H) Differential abundance analysis of single astrocytes isolated from the peri-lesional SWI

region compared with astrocytes from contralateral uninjured tissue (n= 5 cells for uninjured; 5

cells for SWI). Proteins associated with astrocyte activation are highlighted. **(I)** Quantification of

mass spectrometry-derived GFAP intensities across neurons and astrocytes from uninjured and

SWI conditions, showing increased GFAP abundance in reactive astrocytes.

Figure 5

Figure 5: Proteomic differences between dorsal and ventral SNpc dopaminergic neuron

subpopulations determined by scSP. (A) Schematic and representative IF image illustrating

dual labeling of SNpc dopaminergic neurons with TH (green) and Anxa1 (white) to distinguish

ventral-tier (TH+/Anxa1+) from dorsal-tier (TH+/Anxa1−) neurons. Scale bar, 100 µm. Created in

BioRender. Dutta, S. (2026) https://BioRender.com/t5i05fp (modified). **(B)** Venn diagram

showing overlap of identified protein groups across TH+/Anxa1+ and TH+/Anxa1− single

neurons, with population-specific proteins indicated (n = 18 cells for Anxa+; 15 cells for Anxa-).

(C) PCA of profiles from Anxa1+ and Anxa1− dopaminergic neurons **(D)** Differential protein

abundance between Anxa1+ and Anxa1− neurons, highlighting top proteins enriched in each

sample group. **(E)** Protein abundance distributions for Anxa1, Calb1, and Aldh1a1 in Anxa1+ and

Anxa1− neurons, illustrating differential expression between the groups. **(F)** Representative IHC

validation of higher expression of Aldh1a1 in the ventral SNpc neurons and lower or absent

staining in the dorsal tier. Scale bar, 100 µm.

Figure 6

Figure 6. Proteomic profiling of α-synuclein aggregate–bearing SNpc neurons in a

murine Parkinson's disease model. (A) Experimental overview and representative IF showing

dopaminergic SNpc neurons labeled with TH and pathogenic phosphorylated α-synuclein

(pS129-αSyn) aggregates, enabling identification and laser capture of aggregate-containing

(Agg⁺) and non-aggregate (Agg⁻) neurons following intrastriatal injection of αSyn preformed

fibrils (PFFs). Created in BioRender. Dutta, S. (2026) https://BioRender.com/s7wcjyf (modified).

(B) Number of proteins identified per single neuron in Agg⁺ and Agg⁻ populations (mean ± SD).

(n= 12 cells for Agg+; 7 cells for Agg-) **(C)** Venn diagram showing overlapping and uniquely

detected proteins between Agg⁺ and Agg⁻ neurons. **(D)** Unsupervised PCA of single-cell

proteomes, illustrating separation and increased variability of Agg⁺ neurons. **(E)** Volcano plot of

differential protein abundance between Agg⁺ and Agg⁻ neurons (log$_2$ fold change versus –log$_{10}$

p value), with selected differentially abundant proteins annotated. **(F)** KEGG pathway

enrichment analysis of differentially abundant proteins showing top 10 implicated pathways. **(G)**

Pathway-focused volcano plots illustrating differential regulation of proteins associated with the

proteasome, mitochondrial oxidative phosphorylation, metabolic pathways, and the ribosome in

Agg$^+$ neurons relative to Agg$^-$ neurons.

Acknowledgments

This research was funded in part by Aligning Science Across Parkinson's (ASAP-020495 to

V.G.) through the Michael J. Fox Foundation for Parkinson's Research (MJFF), the NIH

R01MH136394 to M.L.R and T-F. C., Wellcome Leap Fellowship (through its Delta Tissue

program) to M.L.R., and A*STAR National Science Scholarship (BS-PhD) to M.P. V.G. is an

Investigator of the Howard Hughes Medical Institute. For the purpose of open access, the

authors have applied a CC BY public copyright license to all Author Accepted Manuscripts

arising from this submission.

We thank the CNSI Advanced Light Microscopy/Spectroscopy Facility at UCLA and Leica

Biosystems for access to the LCM instruments.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare no competing financial interests.

Author contributions:

S.D. conceived the overall study. S.D. and M.P. designed the experiments, performed LCM

sample collection, data analysis, and visualization, and prepared the manuscript with input from

all authors. S.D. conducted stereotaxic surgery, tissue processing, immunohistology staining,

Drop-seq analysis, and imaging. M.P conducted proteomics sample preparation, mass

spectrometry data acquisition, and all proteomics data processing and analysis, as well as

single-cell transcriptomics data analysis. G.M.C. designed and processed samples for RNA-

FISH experiments. S.G. assisted with tissue processing, staining, and data visualization plots.

M.L.R. advised on single-cell proteomics experiments and instrumentation. T-F.C. supervised

proteomics experiments and data analysis. V.G. supervised the overall study and advised on

experimental design.

Data Availability

The data, code, protocols, and key lab materials used and generated in this study are listed in a

Key Resource Table alongside their persistent identifiers (**Supp. Table 1**). The proteomics

datasets are available on MassIVE MSV000100704 or ProteomeXchange PXD074008.

Code Availability

All analysis scripts used in this study at available at https://github.com/gnaprs/scSP_CNS-

preprint.

References

1. Herculano-Houzel, S. (2009). The human brain in numbers: a linearly scaled-up primate brain. Front Hum Neurosci *3*, 31. 10.3389/neuro.09.031.2009.

2. Hondius, D.C., Koopmans, F., Leistner, C., Pita-Illobre, D., Peferoen-Baert, R.M., Marbus, F., Paliukhovich, I., Li, K.W., Rozemuller, A.J.M., Hoozemans, J.J.M., and Smit, A.B. (2021). The proteome of granulovacuolar degeneration and neurofibrillary tangles in Alzheimer's disease. Acta Neuropathol *141*, 341-358. 10.1007/s00401-020-02261-4.

3. Harding, A.J., and Halliday, G.M. (2001). Cortical Lewy body pathology in the diagnosis of dementia. Acta Neuropathol *102*, 355-363. 10.1007/s004010100390.

4. Kamath, T., Abdulraouf, A., Burris, S.J., Langlieb, J., Gazestani, V., Nadaf, N.M., Balderrama, K., Vanderburg, C., and Macosko, E.Z. (2022). Single-cell genomic profiling of human dopamine neurons identifies a population that selectively degenerates in Parkinson's disease. Nat Neurosci *25*, 588-595. 10.1038/s41593-022-01061-1.

5. Piwecka, M., Rajewsky, N., and Rybak-Wolf, A. (2023). Single-cell and spatial transcriptomics: deciphering brain complexity in health and disease. Nat Rev Neurol *19*, 346-362. 10.1038/s41582-023-00809-y.

6. Zhong, J., Tang, G., Zhu, J., Wu, W., Li, G., Lin, X., Liang, L., Chai, C., Zeng, Y., Wang, F., et al. (2021). Single-cell brain atlas of Parkinson's disease mouse model. J Genet Genomics *48*, 277-288. 10.1016/j.jgg.2021.01.003.

7. Yang, L., Ball, A., Liu, J., Jain, T., Li, Y.M., Akhter, F., Zhu, D., and Wang, J. (2022). Cyclic microchip assay for measurement of hundreds of functional proteins in single neurons. Nat Commun *13*, 3548. 10.1038/s41467-022-31336-x.

8. Zhang, D., Rubio Rodriguez-Kirby, L.A., Lin, Y., Wang, W., Song, M., Wang, L., Wang, L., Kanatani, S., Jimenez-Beristain, T., Dang, Y., et al. (2025). Spatial dynamics of brain development and neuroinflammation. Nature *647*, 213-227. 10.1038/s41586-025-09663-y.

9. Chen, C., McDonald, D., Blain, A., Sachdeva, A., Bone, L., Smith, A.L.M., Warren, C., Pickett, S.J., Hudson, G., Filby, A., et al. (2021). Imaging mass cytometry reveals generalised deficiency in OXPHOS complexes in Parkinson's disease. NPJ Parkinsons Dis *7*, 39. 10.1038/s41531-021-00182-x.

10. Jung, S.Y., Choi, J.M., Rousseaux, M.W., Malovannaya, A., Kim, J.J., Kutzera, J., Wang, Y., Huang, Y., Zhu, W., Maity, S., et al. (2017). An Anatomically Resolved Mouse Brain Proteome Reveals Parkinson Disease-relevant Pathways. Mol Cell Proteomics *16*, 581-593. 10.1074/mcp.M116.061440.

947   11.   Zhu, Y., Dou, M., Piehowski, P.D., Liang, Y., Wang, F., Chu, R.K., Chrisler, W.B., Smith,
948   J.N., Schwarz, K.C., Shen, Y., et al. (2018). Spatially Resolved Proteome Mapping of
949   Laser Capture Microdissected Tissue with Automated Sample Transfer to Nanodroplets.
950   Mol Cell Proteomics *17*, 1864-1874. 10.1074/mcp.TIR118.000686.

951   12.   Griesser, E., Wyatt, H., Ten Have, S., Stierstorfer, B., Lenter, M., and Lamond, A.I.
952   (2020). Quantitative Profiling of the Human Substantia Nigra Proteome from Laser-
953   capture Microdissected FFPE Tissue. Mol Cell Proteomics *19*, 839-851.
954   10.1074/mcp.RA119.001889.

955   13.   Budnik, B., Levy, E., Harmange, G., and Slavov, N. (2018). SCoPE-MS: mass
956   spectrometry of single mammalian cells quantifies proteome heterogeneity during cell
957   differentiation. Genome Biol *19*, 161. 10.1186/s13059-018-1547-5.

958   14.   Zhu, Y., Piehowski, P.D., Zhao, R., Chen, J., Shen, Y., Moore, R.J., Shukla, A.K., Petyuk,
959   V.A., Campbell-Thompson, M., Mathews, C.E., et al. (2018). Nanodroplet processing
960   platform for deep and quantitative proteome profiling of 10-100 mammalian cells. Nat
961   Commun *9*, 882. 10.1038/s41467-018-03367-w.

962   15.   Schoof, E.M., Furtwangler, B., Uresin, N., Rapin, N., Savickas, S., Gentil, C., Lechman,
963   E., Keller, U.A.D., Dick, J.E., and Porse, B.T. (2021). Quantitative single-cell proteomics
964   as a tool to characterize cellular hierarchies. Nat Commun *12*, 3341. 10.1038/s41467-
965   021-23667-y.

966   16.   Brunner, A.D., Thielert, M., Vasilopoulou, C., Ammar, C., Coscia, F., Mund, A., Hoerning,
967   O.B., Bache, N., Apalategui, A., Lubeck, M., et al. (2022). Ultra-high sensitivity mass
968   spectrometry quantifies single-cell proteome changes upon perturbation. Mol Syst Biol
969   *18*, e10798. 10.15252/msb.202110798.

970   17.   Gebreyesus, S.T., Siyal, A.A., Kitata, R.B., Chen, E.S., Enkhbayar, B., Angata, T., Lin,
971   K.I., Chen, Y.J., and Tu, H.L. (2022). Streamlined single-cell proteomics by an integrated
972   microfluidic chip and data-independent acquisition mass spectrometry. Nat Commun *13*,
973   37. 10.1038/s41467-021-27778-4.

974   18.   Ctortecka, C., Hartlmayr, D., Seth, A., Mendjan, S., Tourniaire, G., Udeshi, N.D., Carr,
975   S.A., and Mechtler, K. (2023). An Automated Nanowell-Array Workflow for Quantitative
976   Multiplexed Single-Cell Proteomics Sample Preparation at High Sensitivity. Mol Cell
977   Proteomics *22*, 100665. 10.1016/j.mcpro.2023.100665.

978   19.   Rosenberger, F.A., Thielert, M., Strauss, M.T., Schweizer, L., Ammar, C., Madler, S.C.,
979   Metousis, A., Skowronek, P., Wahle, M., Madden, K., et al. (2023). Spatial single-cell

mass spectrometry defines zonation of the hepatocyte proteome. Nat Methods *20*, 1530-
1536. 10.1038/s41592-023-02007-6.

20. Xiang, P., Liyu, A., Kwon, Y., Hu, D., Williams, S.M., Velickovic, D., Markillie, L.M.,
Chrisler, W.B., Pasa-Tolic, L., and Zhu, Y. (2023). Spatial Proteomics toward Subcellular
Resolution by Coupling Deep Ultraviolet Laser Ablation with Nanodroplet Sample
Preparation. ACS Meas Sci Au *3*, 459-468. 10.1021/acsmeasuresciau.3c00033.

21. Mund, A., Coscia, F., Kriston, A., Hollandi, R., Kovacs, F., Brunner, A.D., Migh, E.,
Schweizer, L., Santos, A., Bzorek, M., et al. (2022). Deep Visual Proteomics defines
single-cell identity and heterogeneity. Nat Biotechnol *40*, 1231-1240. 10.1038/s41587-
022-01302-5.

22. Pang, M., Jones, J.J., Wang, T.Y., Quan, B., Kubat, N.J., Qiu, Y., Roukes, M.L., and
Chou, T.F. (2024). Increasing Proteome Coverage Through a Reduction in Analyte
Complexity in Single-Cell Equivalent Samples. J Proteome Res.
10.1021/acs.jproteome.4c00062.

23. Matzinger, M., Muller, E., Durnberger, G., Pichler, P., and Mechtler, K. (2023). Robust
and Easy-to-Use One-Pot Workflow for Label-Free Single-Cell Proteomics. Anal Chem
95, 4435-4445. 10.1021/acs.analchem.2c05022.

24. Lein, E.S., Hawrylycz, M.J., Ao, N., Ayres, M., Bensinger, A., Bernard, A., Boe, A.F.,
Boguski, M.S., Brockway, K.S., Byrnes, E.J., et al. (2007). Genome-wide atlas of gene
expression in the adult mouse brain. Nature *445*, 168-176. 10.1038/nature05453.

25. Lazar, C., Gatto, L., Ferro, M., Bruley, C., and Burger, T. (2016). Accounting for the
Multiple Natures of Missing Values in Label-Free Quantitative Proteomics Data Sets to
Compare Imputation Strategies. J Proteome Res *15*, 1116-1125.
10.1021/acs.jproteome.5b00981.

26. Vanderaa, C., and Gatto, L. (2023). Revisiting the Thorny Issue of Missing Values in
Single-Cell Proteomics. J Proteome Res *22*, 2775-2784.
10.1021/acs.jproteome.3c00227.

27. Stelloo, S., Alejo-Vinogradova, M.T., van Gelder, C., Zijlmans, D.W., van Oostrom, M.J.,
Valverde, J.M., Lamers, L.A., Rus, T., Sobrevals Alcaraz, P., Schafers, T., et al. (2024).
Deciphering lineage specification during early embryogenesis in mouse gastruloids
using multilayered proteomics. Cell Stem Cell *31*, 1072-1090 e1078.
10.1016/j.stem.2024.04.017.

28. Bubis, J.A., Arrey, T.N., Damoc, E., Delanghe, B., Slovakova, J., Sommer, T.M., Kagawa,
H., Pichler, P., Rivron, N., Mechtler, K., and Matzinger, M. (2025). Challenging the Astral

mass analyzer to quantify up to 5,300 proteins per single cell at unseen accuracy to

uncover cellular heterogeneity. Nat Methods *22*, 510-519. 10.1038/s41592-024-02559-1.

29.   Webel, H., Niu, L., Nielsen, A.B., Locard-Paulet, M., Mann, M., Jensen, L.J., and

Rasmussen, S. (2024). Imputation of label-free quantitative mass spectrometry-based

proteomics data using self-supervised deep learning. Nat Commun *15*, 5405.

10.1038/s41467-024-48711-5.

30.   Ammar, C., Schessner, J.P., Willems, S., Michaelis, A.C., and Mann, M. (2023). Accurate

Label-Free Quantification by directLFQ to Compare Unlimited Numbers of Proteomes.

Mol Cell Proteomics *22*, 100581. 10.1016/j.mcpro.2023.100581.

31.   Yao, Z., van Velthoven, C.T.J., Kunst, M., Zhang, M., McMillen, D., Lee, C., Jung, W.,

Goldy, J., Abdelhak, A., Aitken, M., et al. (2023). A high-resolution transcriptomic and

spatial atlas of cell types in the whole mouse brain. Nature *624*, 317-332.

10.1038/s41586-023-06812-z.

32.   Taniguchi, Y., Choi, P.J., Li, G.W., Chen, H., Babu, M., Hearn, J., Emili, A., and Xie, X.S.

(2010). Quantifying E. coli proteome and transcriptome with single-molecule sensitivity in

single cells. Science *329*, 533-538. 10.1126/science.1188308.

33.   Fulcher, J.M., Markillie, L.M., Mitchell, H.D., Williams, S.M., Engbrecht, K.M., Degnan,

D.J., Bramer, L.M., Moore, R.J., Chrisler, W.B., Cantlon-Bruce, J., et al. (2024). Parallel

measurement of transcriptomes and proteomes from same single cells using

nanodroplet splitting. Nat Commun *15*, 10614. 10.1038/s41467-024-54099-z.

34.   Darmanis, S., Gallant, C.J., Marinescu, V.D., Niklasson, M., Segerman, A., Flamourakis,

G., Fredriksson, S., Assarsson, E., Lundberg, M., Nelander, S., et al. (2016).

Simultaneous Multiplexed Measurement of RNA and Proteins in Single Cells. Cell Rep

14, 380-389. 10.1016/j.celrep.2015.12.021.

35.   Saunders, A., Macosko, E.Z., Wysoker, A., Goldman, M., Krienen, F.M., de Rivera, H.,

Bien, E., Baum, M., Bortolin, L., Wang, S., et al. (2018). Molecular Diversity and

Specializations among the Cells of the Adult Mouse Brain. Cell *174*, 1015-1030 e1016.

10.1016/j.cell.2018.07.028.

36.   Allen, N.J., and Barres, B.A. (2009). Neuroscience: Glia - more than just brain glue.

Nature *457*, 675-677. 10.1038/457675a.

37.   Zuchero, J.B., and Barres, B.A. (2015). Glia in mammalian development and disease.

Development *142*, 3805-3809. 10.1242/dev.129304.

38.   Koupourtidou, C., Schwarz, V., Aliee, H., Frerich, S., Fischer-Sternjak, J., Bocchi, R.,

Simon-Ebert, T., Bai, X., Sirko, S., Kirchhoff, F., et al. (2024). Shared inflammatory glial

1048   cell signature after stab wound injury, revealed by spatial, temporal, and cell-type-
1049   specific profiling of the murine cerebral cortex. Nat Commun *15*, 2866. 10.1038/s41467-
1050   024-46625-w.

1051   39.   Gaertner, Z., Azcorra, M., Dombeck, D.A., and Awatramani, R. (2022). Molecular
1052   heterogeneity in the substantia nigra: A roadmap for understanding PD motor
1053   pathophysiology. Neurobiol Dis *175*, 105925. 10.1016/j.nbd.2022.105925.

1054   40.   Azcorra, M., Gaertner, Z., Davidson, C., He, Q., Kim, H., Nagappan, S., Hayes, C.K.,
1055   Ramakrishnan, C., Fenno, L., Kim, Y.S., et al. (2023). Unique functional responses
1056   differentially map onto genetic subtypes of dopamine neurons. Nat Neurosci *26*, 1762-
1057   1774. 10.1038/s41593-023-01401-9.

1058   41.   Poulin, J.F., Zou, J., Drouin-Ouellet, J., Kim, K.Y., Cicchetti, F., and Awatramani, R.B.
1059   (2014). Defining midbrain dopaminergic neuron diversity by single-cell gene expression
1060   profiling. Cell Rep *9*, 930-943. 10.1016/j.celrep.2014.10.008.

1061   42.   Poulin, J.F., Gaertner, Z., Moreno-Ramos, O.A., and Awatramani, R. (2020).
1062   Classification of Midbrain Dopamine Neurons Using Single-Cell Gene Expression
1063   Profiling Approaches. Trends Neurosci *43*, 155-169. 10.1016/j.tins.2020.01.004.

1064   43.   Henderson, M.X., Cornblath, E.J., Darwich, A., Zhang, B., Brown, H., Gathagan, R.J.,
1065   Sandler, R.M., Bassett, D.S., Trojanowski, J.Q., and Lee, V.M.Y. (2019). Spread of
1066   alpha-synuclein pathology through the brain connectome is modulated by selective
1067   vulnerability and predicted by network analysis. Nat Neurosci *22*, 1248-1257.
1068   10.1038/s41593-019-0457-5.

1069   44.   Goralski, T.M., Meyerdirk, L., Breton, L., Brasseur, L., Kurgat, K., DeWeerd, D., Turner,
1070   L., Becker, K., Adams, M., Newhouse, D.J., and Henderson, M.X. (2024). Spatial
1071   transcriptomics reveals molecular dysfunction associated with cortical Lewy pathology.
1072   Nat Commun *15*, 2642. 10.1038/s41467-024-47027-8.

1073   45.   Volpicelli-Daley, L.A., Kirik, D., Stoyka, L.E., Standaert, D.G., and Harms, A.S. (2016).
1074   How can rAAV-alpha-synuclein and the fibril alpha-synuclein models advance our
1075   understanding of Parkinson's disease? J Neurochem *139 Suppl 1*, 131-155.
1076   10.1111/jnc.13627.

1077   46.   Volpicelli-Daley, L.A., Luk, K.C., Patel, T.P., Tanik, S.A., Riddle, D.M., Stieber, A.,
1078   Meaney, D.F., Trojanowski, J.Q., and Lee, V.M. (2011). Exogenous alpha-synuclein fibrils
1079   induce Lewy body pathology leading to synaptic dysfunction and neuron death. Neuron
1080   *72*, 57-71. 10.1016/j.neuron.2011.08.033.

1081   47.   Chung, H.K., Ho, H.A., Perez-Acuna, D., and Lee, S.J. (2019). Modeling alpha-
1082   Synuclein Propagation with Preformed Fibril Injections. J Mov Disord *12*, 139-151.
1083   10.14802/jmd.19046.
1084   48.   Kanehisa, M., Furumichi, M., Sato, Y., Matsuura, Y., and Ishiguro-Watanabe, M. (2025).
1085   KEGG: biological systems database as a model of the real world. Nucleic Acids Res *53*,
1086   D672-D677. 10.1093/nar/gkae909.
1087   49.   Nordmann, T.M., Anderton, H., Hasegawa, A., Schweizer, L., Zhang, P., Stadler, P.C.,
1088   Sinha, A., Metousis, A., Rosenberger, F.A., Zwiebel, M., et al. (2024). Spatial proteomics
1089   identifies JAKi as treatment for a lethal skin disease. Nature *635*, 1001-1009.
1090   10.1038/s41586-024-08061-0.
1091   50.   Method of the Year 2024: spatial proteomics. (2024). Nat Methods *21*, 2195-2196.
1092   10.1038/s41592-024-02565-3.
1093   51.   Rosenberger, F.A., Madler, S.C., Thorhauge, K.H., Steigerwald, S., Fromme, M.,
1094   Lebedev, M., Weiss, C.A.M., Oeller, M., Wahle, M., Metousis, A., et al. (2025). Deep
1095   Visual Proteomics maps proteotoxicity in a genetic liver disease. Nature *642*, 484-491.
1096   10.1038/s41586-025-08885-4.
1097   52.   Ding, S.L., Royall, J.J., Sunkin, S.M., Ng, L., Facer, B.A., Lesnar, P., Guillozet-
1098   Bongaarts, A., McMurray, B., Szafer, A., Dolbeare, T.A., et al. (2016). Comprehensive
1099   cellular-resolution atlas of the adult human brain. J Comp Neurol *524*, 3127-3481.
1100   10.1002/cne.24080.
1101   53.   Jiang, Y.R., Zhu, L., Cao, L.R., Wu, Q., Chen, J.B., Wang, Y., Wu, J., Zhang, T.Y., Wang,
1102   Z.L., Guan, Z.Y., et al. (2023). Simultaneous deep transcriptome and proteome profiling
1103   in a single mouse oocyte. Cell Rep *42*, 113455. 10.1016/j.celrep.2023.113455.
1104   54.   de Sousa Abreu, R., Penalva, L.O., Marcotte, E.M., and Vogel, C. (2009). Global
1105   signatures of protein and mRNA expression levels. Mol Biosyst *5*, 1512-1526.
1106   10.1039/b908315d.
1107   55.   Doorn, J.A., Florang, V.R., Schamp, J.H., and Vanle, B.C. (2014). Aldehyde
1108   dehydrogenase inhibition generates a reactive dopamine metabolite autotoxic to
1109   dopamine neurons. Parkinsonism Relat Disord *20 Suppl 1*, S73-75. 10.1016/S1353-
1110   8020(13)70019-1.
1111   56.   Poewe, W., Seppi, K., Tanner, C.M., Halliday, G.M., Brundin, P., Volkmann, J., Schrag,
1112   A.E., and Lang, A.E. (2017). Parkinson disease. Nat Rev Dis Primers *3*, 17013.
1113   10.1038/nrdp.2017.13.

1114   57.   Moon, H.E., and Paek, S.H. (2015). Mitochondrial Dysfunction in Parkinson's Disease.
1115   Exp Neurobiol *24*, 103-116. 10.5607/en.2015.24.2.103.

1116   58.   Wang, X., Becker, K., Levine, N., Zhang, M., Lieberman, A.P., Moore, D.J., and Ma, J.
1117   (2019). Pathogenic alpha-synuclein aggregates preferentially bind to mitochondria and
1118   affect cellular respiration. Acta Neuropathol Commun *7*, 41. 10.1186/s40478-019-0696-4.

1119   59.   Bishop, P., Rocca, D., and Henley, J.M. (2016). Ubiquitin C-terminal hydrolase L1 (UCH-
1120   L1): structure, distribution and roles in brain function and dysfunction. Biochem J *473*,
1121   2453-2462. 10.1042/BCJ20160082.

1122   60.   Dutta, S., Pang, M., Donahue, R.R., Chou, T., Seifert, A.W., and Gradinaru, V. (2025).
1123   Parkinson's disease modeling in regenerative spiny mice (Acomys dimidiatus) captures
1124   key disease-relevant behavioral, histological, and molecular signatures. bioRxiv.
1125   https://doi.org/10.1101/2025.11.06.687049.

1126   61.   Garcia-Esparcia, P., Hernandez-Ortega, K., Koneti, A., Gil, L., Delgado-Morales, R.,
1127   Castano, E., Carmona, M., and Ferrer, I. (2015). Altered machinery of protein synthesis
1128   is region- and stage-dependent and is associated with alpha-synuclein oligomers in
1129   Parkinson's disease. Acta Neuropathol Commun *3*, 76. 10.1186/s40478-015-0257-4.

1130   62.   Jang, Y., Pletnikova, O., Troncoso, J.C., Pantelyat, A.Y., Dawson, T.M., Rosenthal, L.S.,
1131   and Na, C.H. (2023). Mass Spectrometry-Based Proteomics Analysis of Human
1132   Substantia Nigra From Parkinson's Disease Patients Identifies Multiple Pathways
1133   Potentially Involved in the Disease. Mol Cell Proteomics *22*, 100452.
1134   10.1016/j.mcpro.2022.100452.

1135   63.   Ma, S.X., Seo, B.A., Kim, D., Xiong, Y., Kwon, S.H., Brahmachari, S., Kim, S., Kam, T.I.,
1136   Nirujogi, R.S., Kwon, S.H., et al. (2021). Complement and Coagulation Cascades are
1137   Potentially Involved in Dopaminergic Neurodegeneration in alpha-Synuclein-Based
1138   Mouse Models of Parkinson's Disease. J Proteome Res *20*, 3428-3443.
1139   10.1021/acs.jproteome.0c01002.

1140   64.   Ping, L., Duong, D.M., Yin, L., Gearing, M., Lah, J.J., Levey, A.I., and Seyfried, N.T.
1141   (2018). Global quantitative analysis of the human brain proteome in Alzheimer's and
1142   Parkinson's Disease. Sci Data *5*, 180036. 10.1038/sdata.2018.36.

1143   65.   Werner, C.J., Heyny-von Haussen, R., Mall, G., and Wolf, S. (2008). Proteome analysis
1144   of human substantia nigra in Parkinson's disease. Proteome Sci *6*, 8. 10.1186/1477-
1145   5956-6-8.

1146   66.   Killinger, B.A., Marshall, L.L., Chatterjee, D., Chu, Y., Bras, J., Guerreiro, R., and
1147   Kordower, J.H. (2022). In situ proximity labeling identifies Lewy pathology molecular

1148   interactions in the human brain. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A *119*.

1149   10.1073/pnas.2114405119.

1150   67.   Gatto, L., Aebersold, R., Cox, J., Demichev, V., Derks, J., Emmott, E., Franks, A.M.,

1151   Ivanov, A.R., Kelly, R.T., Khoury, L., et al. (2023). Initial recommendations for performing,

1152   benchmarking and reporting single-cell proteomics experiments. Nat Methods *20*, 375-

1153   386. 10.1038/s41592-023-01785-3.

1154   68.   Bhatia, H.S., Brunner, A.D., Ozturk, F., Kapoor, S., Rong, Z., Mai, H., Thielert, M., Ali, M.,

1155   Al-Maskari, R., Paetzold, J.C., et al. (2022). Spatial proteomics in three-dimensional

1156   intact specimens. Cell *185*, 5040-5058 e5019. 10.1016/j.cell.2022.11.021.

1157   69.   Choi, H.M.T., Schwarzkopf, M., Fornace, M.E., Acharya, A., Artavanis, G., Stegmaier, J.,

1158   Cunha, A., and Pierce, N.A. (2018). Third-generation in situ hybridization chain reaction:

1159   multiplexed, quantitative, sensitive, versatile, robust. Development *145*.

1160   10.1242/dev.165753.

1161   70.   Jang, M.J., Coughlin, G.M., Jackson, C.R., Chen, X., Chuapoco, M.R., Vendemiatti, J.L.,

1162   Wang, A.Z., and Gradinaru, V. (2023). Spatial transcriptomics for profiling the tropism of

1163   viral vectors in tissues. Nat Biotechnol *41*, 1272-1286. 10.1038/s41587-022-01648-w.

1164   71.   Eng, J.K., McCormack, A.L., and Yates, J.R. (1994). An approach to correlate tandem

1165   mass spectral data of peptides with amino acid sequences in a protein database. J Am

1166   Soc Mass Spectrom *5*, 976-989. 10.1016/1044-0305(94)80016-2.

1167   72.   Zolg, D.P., Gessulat, S., Paschke, C., Graber, M., Rathke-Kuhnert, M., Seefried, F.,

1168   Fitzemeier, K., Berg, F., Lopez-Ferrer, D., Horn, D., et al. (2021). INFERYS rescoring:

1169   Boosting peptide identifications and scoring confidence of database search results.

1170   Rapid Commun Mass Spectrom, e9128. 10.1002/rcm.9128.

1171   73.   Kall, L., Canterbury, J.D., Weston, J., Noble, W.S., and MacCoss, M.J. (2007). Semi-

1172   supervised learning for peptide identification from shotgun proteomics datasets. Nat

1173   Methods *4*, 923-925. 10.1038/nmeth1113.

1174   74.   Brenes, A.J. (2024). Calculating and Reporting Coefficients of Variation for DIA-Based

1175   Proteomics. J Proteome Res *23*, 5274-5278. 10.1021/acs.jproteome.4c00461.

1176   75.   Wolf, F.A., Angerer, P., and Theis, F.J. (2018). SCANPY: large-scale single-cell gene

1177   expression data analysis. Genome Biol *19*, 15. 10.1186/s13059-017-1382-0.

1178   76.   Pang, M. (2025). scpviz: v0.5.2-alpha. Zenodo.

1179   77.   Szklarczyk, D., Nastou, K., Koutrouli, M., Kirsch, R., Mehryary, F., Hachilif, R., Hu, D.,

1180   Peluso, M.E., Huang, Q., Fang, T., et al. (2025). The STRING database in 2025: protein

1181   networks with directionality of regulation. Nucleic Acids Res *53*, D730-D737.

1182   10.1093/nar/gkae1113.