

# The current state of single-cell proteomics data analysis

Christophe Vanderaa<sup>1</sup> and Laurent Gatto<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Computational Biology and Bioinformatics Unit (CBIO), de Duve Institute,  
UCLouvain, Belgium

Email: laurent.gatto@uclouvain.be

## Abstract

Sound data analysis is essential to retrieve meaningful biological information from single-cell proteomics experiments. This analysis is carried out by computational methods that are assembled into workflows, and their implementations influence the conclusions that can be drawn from the data. In this work, we explore and compare the computational workflows that have been used over the last four years and identify a profound lack of consensus on how to analyze single-cell proteomics data. We highlight the need for benchmarking of computational workflows, standardization of computational tools and data, as well as carefully designed experiments. Finally, we cover the current standardization efforts that aim to fill the gap and list the remaining missing pieces, and conclude with lessons learned from the replication of published single-cell proteomics analyses.

Keywords: mass spectrometry, proteomics, single-cell, data analysis, reproducible research.

## 1 Introduction

Conducting a principled data analysis is not trivial, especially when technologies and the data they generate increase in complexity at a fast pace. This is particularly true for mass spectrometry (MS)-based single-cell proteomics (SCP) data analysis. Several hurdles need to be overcome in order to extract biologically meaningful information from these complex data [61]. Numerous methods exist to correct for technical issues, and each method has its respective advantages and drawbacks. In this review article, we show that the variety of available methods to process proteomics data

and the current lack of computational standards has led to a great heterogeneity in SCP data analysis practices. This computational heterogeneity is a reflection of the technical heterogeneity since MS-based SCP has undergone many improvements. For instance, two sample preparation strategies currently co-exist: SCP by label-free quantification (LFQ) and multiplexed SCP [31, 47, 13]. Multiplexing strategies include isobaric labelling, using tandem mass tags (TMT), or non-isobaric labelling, using mass differential tags for relative and absolute quantification (mTRAQ) [41, 17]. Several chips have been developed starting with the nanoPOTS chip [70], followed by the N2chip [65], the proteoCHIP [27], or the microfluidic SciProChip [24]. Efforts have also focused on automation of the sample processing and reported the successful integration of robot handlers such as the Mantis [41], the OT-2 [35] or the CellenOne [27, 33, 65] dispensing devices. Several MS instruments have been used such as orbitraps or time of flight instruments [40, 6, 17] Furthermore, new acquisition strategies are implemented such as data independent acquisition mode [14, 17, 15, 6, 24], prioritized data acquisition [26], or increased precursor sampling and identification transfer [62, 66] that all allow for reduced missing values. Finally, several groups reported the acquisition of post-translational modifications, further increasing the biological resolution of the technology [40? ]. This technical heterogeneity is thoroughly justified and benchmarked; each publication demonstrates the added value of its experimental workflow. As the field demonstrates its potential, efforts are made to make the technology broadly accessible and standardized through detailed protocols [41, 33, 26, 17] or by replacing custom-built material with commercially available devices [35, 57]. Several groups performed a thorough fine-tuning of experimental and instrumental parameters to better understand their impact on analytical performance [56, 9, 51]. The current state of the field and the opportunities to push the SCP technology to its full potential are regularly being discussed, sparking the interest of a growing community [34, 52, 45, 31, 47, 13, 49, 48, 46]. These efforts however mostly focus on the technical aspects of the technology and overlook the current computational practices.

In this review, we provide a computational perspective to the discussion and examine the current approaches and practices for analysing SCP data, specifically focusing on quantitative data processing. The first section highlights the current heterogeneity in SCP data processing. The next section covers the existing tools that bring a solution to the current hurdles. Finally, the last section provides several guidelines on how to improve SCP data analysis practices.

## 2 Quantitative data processing lacks consensus

Proteomics data analysis encompasses three main tasks: spectral data processing, quantitative data processing and downstream data analysis. Spectral data processing identifies and quantifies the peptides from the acquired MS spectra. Assigning peptide sequences to MS spectrum was spotlighted as an important challenge for SCP data analysis [46] and several groups have contributed to methodological and software improvements. For instance, Yu et al. extended the match between run (MBR) algorithm from MaxQuant to TMT data, taking advantage of the quantification data present in unidentified MS2 spectra [67]. The `iceR` package also propagates information across runs. The algorithm dramatically improves peptide identification and outperforms MBR [30]. Unfortunately, `iceR` is only applicable to label-free data. Another approach to improve peptide identification is to increase the confidence of matching by re-scoring. Re-scoring uses the annotations generated by the search engines such as the deviation between expected and measured elution times or  $m/z$ , the peptide length, or the ion charge [59], to update the score or probability that measured spectra correctly match spectra from a theoretical or empirical spectral library. DART-ID, a Bayesian framework to update posterior error probabilities based on an accurate estimation of elution times, has been applied to SCP data and showed a significant increase in the number of identified spectra [8]. Others have also improved the Percolator re-scoring algorithm for SCP experiments [20, 19], although the measured improvements were subtle. While these developments considerably improve the quality of spectrum identification, no dedicated developments in quantitative data processing have been reported.

Quantitative data processing plays a critical role to overcome many technical artefacts and to satisfy downstream analysis requirements. It consists of several steps. Quality controls ensure the analysed data are composed of reliable information and remove features of low quality that could otherwise compromise the validity of the results. Aggregation combines peptide level data into protein level data. Log-transformation shapes the data so that the quantitative values follow normal distributions. Imputation generates estimates for missing values. Finally, normalization and batch correction aim to remove technical differences between samples and are essential to avoid biased results. Each of these steps is implemented using different methods. For instance, many methods exist for missing value imputation: replace by zero, replace with random values sampled from an estimated background distribution, replace by values estimated from the K-nearest neighbours (KNN), . . . The imputation methods have different underlying assumptions that have been extensively reviewed in the bulk proteomics field [5], but further research is required to assess whether these

assumptions remain valid or not for SCP data. Besides choosing the right method, finding a correct sequence of steps is another challenge. For instance, batch effects influence missing data and vice versa [61]. It has been suggested to correct for batch effects before imputation [16], but batch correction methods such as ComBat [29] break with highly missing data as in SCP data.

As of today, developing computational workflows for SCP quantitative data processing requires expert knowledge. We refer to “computational workflow” or “computational pipeline” as the sequence of steps and methods that process quantification data for downstream statistical testing or visualization. Computational workflows are built from scratch and their development often lacks an explicit rationale. Since we lack systematic comparisons, benchmarks or guidelines, the processing approaches become fundamentally different between publications. To illustrate our claim, we review the computational approaches from several studies that shaped the SCP landscape since 2018 (Table 1). These studies present significant contributions to the field and showcase applications on actual single cells (as opposed to bulk lysate dilutions). Five studies supplemented their publication with material allowing to repeat, at least partially, their computational analysis. Three studies from the Slavov Lab provide the R code and the data required to fully repeat their results [53, 33, 17]. The code is however poorly documented and difficult to re-use by other labs. Schoof et al. also offer the data used to repeat their study and distribute their computational workflow as a documented python library, `sceptre` [44]. Their library heavily relies on `scanpy`, a popular python library for scRNA-Seq analysis [64]. Finally, Brunner et al. provide a python script that also relies on `scanpy`, but it lacks an explicit link with the input data [6]. Based on the available material (scripts for [53, 44, 6, 33, 17] or the methods section for the others), we constructed Figure 1. We divide the workflow steps in 7 general categories and further group the different steps depending on whether they are applied at the precursor/peptide to spectrum match (PSM) level, peptide level, protein level or implicitly embedded in an MS data preprocessing software.

Several conclusions can be drawn from Figure 1. First, one publication corresponds to one workflow. This variability cannot be explained solely by different experimental protocols. The computational pipelines by Schoof et al. and Specht et al. differ substantially, while their TMT-based acquisition protocols are closely related [53, 44], and the computational pipeline by Liang et al. for processing LFQ data [35] is more similar to the TMT processing workflow of Williams et al. than its LFQ alternative. Moreover, some publications provide a minimalistic computational workflow, with only 3 steps, while others perform extensive processing, with 20 steps. These observations highlight the lack of consensus and the need to identify critical steps in computational pipelines.

**Table 1: Overview of influential SCP studies.** These studies were published between 2018 and 2022. MaxQuant, FragPipe, Proteome Discoverer (PD), and DIA-NN are software tools to conduct peptide identification and quantification. The peptide identification is performed by underlying search engines such as Andromeda, MS-GF+, MSFragger or SEQUEST. Multiplexing relies on TMT or mTRAQ labelling while no labelling implies an LFQ approach. Some publication link to associated computational scripts to reproduce the analysis that were written either in python or R. The throughput is expressed in number of cells retained after sample quality control, if any (Figure 1A).

Study	Publication date	Raw data analysis	Labeling	Script	Throughput	Reference
Zhu et al. 2018	Sep 2018	MaxQuant/Andromeda	—	—	6	[69]
Budnik et al. 2018	Oct 2018	MaxQuant/Andromeda	TMT-10	—	190	[7]
Dou et al. 2019	Oct 2019	MS-GF+,MASIC	TMT-10	—	72	[18]
Zhu et al. 2019	Nov 2019	MaxQuant/Andromeda	—	—	28	[71]
Cong et al. 2020	Jan 2020	MaxQuant/Andromeda	—	—	4	[10]
Tsai et al. 2020	May 2020	MaxQuant/Andromeda	TMT-11	—	104	[56]
Williams et al. 2020, LFQ	Aug 2020	MaxQuant/Andromeda	—	—	17	[63]
Williams et al. 2020, TMT	Aug 2020	MaxQuant/Andromeda	TMT-11	—	152	[63]
Liang et al. 2020	Dec 2020	FragPipe/MSFragger	—	—	3	[35]
Specht et al. 2021	Jan 2021	MaxQuant/Andromeda	TMT-11,TMT-16	R	1,490	[53]
Cong et al. 2021	Feb 2021	PD/SEQUEST	—	—	6	[11]
Schoof et al. 2021	Jun 2021	PD/SEQUEST	TMT-16	Python	2,025	[44]
Woo et al. 2021	Oct 2021	MaxQuant/Andromeda	TMT-16	—	108	[65]
Brunner et al. 2022	Feb 2022	DIA-NN	—	Python	231	[6]
Leduc et al. 2022	Mar 2022	MaxQuant/Andromeda	TMT-18	R	1,556	[33]
Woo et al. 2022	Mar 2022	MaxQuant/Andromeda	—	—	155	[66]
Webber et al. 2022	Apr 2022	PD/SEQUEST	—	—	28	[62]
Derks et al. 2022	Jul 2022	DIA-NN	mTRAQ-3	R	155	[17]

Second, some processing steps are applied at the peptide level or at the protein level. For instance, Budnik et al. perform normalization at the peptide level, whereas Dou et al. perform normalization at protein level (Figure 1I). A clear pattern is that most pipelines process the data at the protein level, which is questionable since processing data at an earlier stage could avoid the propagation of technical artefacts to the protein data [32, 54]. Third, a great majority of the methods are taken from bulk proteomics. We foresee that developing new methods that account for the properties inherent to single-cell data would significantly improve the workflows. For instance, batch correction could benefit from dedicated single-cell methods as the strong dependency between batch effects and missing data requires robust and tailored models [61]. Horizontal integration of samples from different batches is an active field of research in single-cell omics [3] that will probably be beneficial to the SCP community.

Figure 1 highlights the need for a better understanding on how to process and model SCP data. Identifying which workflows perform best or demonstrating whether a new workflow improves performance requires thorough computational benchmarking. The scRNA-Seq field already offers tools for method benchmarking that could readily be used for SCP applications [55, 25]. In order to run these tools, the computational workflows should be accessible to the benchmarking software. Another key consideration is that benchmarking datasets are required to enable an objective comparison between computational pipelines. While many SCP datasets are available from public sources, these data are provided as different formats. Proper benchmarking necessitates a standardization of the computational pipelines and the data. In the next section, we cover the recent developments that attempt to harmonize quantitative data processing for SCP.

### 3 Current solutions for quantitative data processing

We recently published an R/Bioconductor package called `scp` [61] (Table 2). First, `scp` is thoroughly documented as we want to facilitate its re-use. Second, it is designed as a modular tool where each processing step, such as those defined in Figure 1 can easily be chained, and returns a consistent and standardized output format. Third, the software is part of the Bioconductor project [28] that is well known for exemplary coding practices and promotes long term maintenance. Fourth, `scp` can be integrated with other tools that rely on `QFeatures` and `SingleCellExperiment`, two data structures widely used for proteomics and single-cell data analysis, respectively [22, 1]. Finally, `scp` is maintained and improved to include the current state-of-the-art methods. For instance, it reimple-




Figure 1: (Continued on the following page.)

Figure 1: **Overview of quantitative data processing workflows.** **A-H** The workflows are split into 8 categories represented by different colours. Each category contains a set of methods that are represented by different shapes (see Table S1 for a description of the methods). Each point indicates which method (column) is implemented in which publication (row). Some methods are used in several workflows (points align vertically) and some workflows used several methods (points align horizontally). **I** Summary of the sequence of processing steps for each workflow. Depending on the workflow, the processing steps are implicitly executed by the MS data software and applied at the PSM/precursor, peptide or protein level. Colours and shapes follow the structure from the previous panels. Each horizontal line represents a workflow and should be read from left to right.

---

ments functionality from the SCoPE2 script released by Specht et al. [53]. Next to `scp`, Schoof et al. developed `sceptre`, a python module that implements their computational workflow [44] (Table 2). The code is well documented, modular and relies on `scanpy` [64], a python data structure equivalent to `SingleCellExperiment`. The tool however lacks flexibility as it was developed primarily to offer a reproducible data analysis environment. Minor code refactoring could overcome this lack of flexibility.

Computational solutions require data in order to develop, test and benchmark individual methods and complete workflows. We therefore also recently developed another R/Bioconductor package, `scpdata`, that distributes curated SCP datasets ready for analysis [61] (Table 2). The datasets were retrieved from published work and are accessible using a single command. The standardization effort provides an thoroughly annotated and consistent data structure, facilitating data analysis with tools such as `scp`. Furthermore, `scpdata` relies on Bioconductor’s storage services, `ExperimentHub` [39], that offers cloud-based data access. Easy access and consistent formats enable method development on a variety of different datasets, avoiding dataset-specific over-fitting. `scpdata` can also be used for benchmarking, although ground truths are missing to perform accuracy validation.

Standardized data processing tools allow going beyond the reproduction of existing SCP data analyses, it enables their replication. While reproduction allows others to regenerate the same results using the same software or computational setup, replication uses different software or analysis methods to generate the same, or equivalent results. Replication, therefore, consolidates our trust in previous work. Although a replicable analysis does not imply the results are correct, it guarantees

the results do not rely on undocumented steps or on software peculiarities. For instance, we have shown that the SCoPE2 analysis script by Specht et al. could be fully replicated using `scp` and `scpdata` [53, 61]. Replication efforts further have beneficial side effects. Replication can highlight hurdles that prevent accurate data analysis. Continuing with the SCoPE2 example, our replication study identified batch effects and missing data, and their dependence, as prominent challenges that future SCP computational tools will need to tackle. Another beneficial side effect is that replication studies are easily repurposed for demonstration. As part of this overview, we offer a website, *SCP.replication*, with replication studies that demonstrate the analysis of SCP data using the `scp` and `scpdata` packages (Table 2). It contains several replication articles, spanning TMT and LFQ protocols, and DDA and DIA data. We also converted the replication material into openly available workshop material. The workshop can be run without prior installation requirements thanks to the Orchestra platform supported by the Bioconductor project.

## 4 Different workflows lead to different results

To illustrate the impact of data processing on the analysis outcome, we compare two computational workflows: SCoPE2, released by Specht et al., and SCEPTRE<sup>1</sup>, released by Schoof et al. We retrieved the data from `scpdata` and recreated both pipelines with `scp`. SCEPTRE uses a custom implementation for batch correction that is provided by the `sceptre` library. Thanks to two R packages, `reticulate` [58] and `zellkonverter` [68], we could easily integrate the python utilities to `scp`. We then ran the two workflows on the two datasets and compared the results in Figure 2 and Figure 3. Both the cell type consistency, given by the silhouette widths (Figure 2A and Figure 3A), and the within cell type correlation distributions (Figure 2B and Figure 3B) are affected by the computational workflow. The effect is most visible on the principal component analysis (PCA) plots for the Specht et al. 2021 dataset (Figure 3D, E). The data processed with the SCEPTRE workflow are organized in a horseshoe shape in lower dimensions. This effect is commonly attributed to the presence of a latent continuous variable or gradient, and a careful data exploration revealed the presence of residual batch effects (Figure 4D). Unsupervised clustering of the processed protein data leads to different groups, even though we used identical methods and parameters (Figure 2C and Figure 3C). The number of identified clusters differs between the data processed by SCoPE2 and SCEPTRE.

---

<sup>1</sup>We use `sceptre` (all lowercase) to refer to the python library, and we use SCEPTRE (uppercase “SC”) to refer to the computational workflow.

Furthermore, some clusters from one workflow are scattered throughout clusters from the other workflow. Unsupervised clustering is used to identify groups of cells from which to infer a functional state. So, different clustering results can lead to different biological interpretation. To objectively quantify the performance improvement between the two workflows, we need controlled designs with known expectations. Benchmarking efforts using mixture designs have already been performed for scRNA-Seq [55]. Tian et al. acquired both intact single cells and diluted bulk lysates from 3 cell lines mixed at different proportions and different quantities. These data were used to assess the ability of computational pipelines to retrieve the original design. However, increased performance of a computational workflow on a single data set is not sufficient. Different types of SCP data exist (LFQ and TMT data, DDA and DIA data, orbitrap and time of flight data, . . .) and computational workflows may not generalize well for all SCP protocols and data. In other words, we do not expect a single computational workflow to perform optimally for all SCP datasets as different workflows may focus on different characteristics in the data, such as the pattern of missing values. Therefore, strengths and weaknesses of computational pipelines need to be identified and documented. To evaluate this, a community effort could replicate the mixture design using the different SCP protocols as already seen for scRNA-Seq [38]. This approach would allow to further assess robustness of the workflows on different types of SCP data. Although published SCP datasets are available and, as demonstrated above, they can be processed using standardized software, we are still lacking the data needed to quantify the performance of computational workflows.

## 5 Lessons learned from replication of SCP data analysis

When building the replication studies, we faced several practical challenges regarding the computational analysis of SCP data. In this section, we provide several recommendations that we hope will help practitioners to improve and facilitate future SCP data analyses. While several of these lessons are applicable to bulk proteomics, we focus on SCP examples here.

### 5.1 Complex analyses require suitable tools

Several search engines for raw MS data identification have been applied to SCP data: MaxQuant/Andromeda, SEQUEST, MS-GF+, MSFragger (Table 1). While MaxQuant/Andromeda is by far the most popular among those search engines, several authors observed that it was the worst performing tool in the context of SCP [59, 35, 57, 11]. These observations indicate that one should compare the

## Dataset: schoof2021




Figure 2: **Impact of quantitative data processing workflows on the Schoof et al. 2021 dataset.** All results presented in this figure were computed from the protein data processed by the corresponding workflow. **A** The silhouette widths provide a measure of cell type consistency. Cell types are defined based on the known labels provided with the data. The silhouettes were computed using the Jaccard similarity on the shared nearest neighbour graph ( $K = 15$ ). **B** Pearson correlations are computed between all cells with the same cell type label and provide a measure of protein quantification consistency. **C** Unsupervised clustering is performed using Louvain clustering [?] on a shared nearest neighbour graph ( $K = 15$ ). The heatmap illustrates the cell distributions across the clustering results computed from the SCoPE2 and the SCEPTRE workflow. Frequency is given as the number of cells. **D,E** The first 2 principal components of the protein data. Colours indicate the cell type labels.

## Dataset: specht2021




Figure 3: **Impact of quantitative data processing workflows on the Specht et al. 2021 dataset.** All results presented in this figure were computed from the protein data processed by the corresponding workflow. **A** The silhouette widths provide a measure of cell type consistency. Cell types are defined based on the known labels provided with the data. The silhouettes were computed using the Jaccard similarity on the shared nearest neighbour graph ( $K = 15$ ). **B** Pearson correlations are computed between all cells with the same cell type label and provide a measure of protein quantification consistency. **C** Unsupervised clustering is performed using Louvain clustering [?] on a shared nearest neighbour graph ( $K = 15$ ). The heatmap illustrates the cell distributions across the clustering results computed from the SCoPE2 and the SCEPTRE workflow. Frequency is given as the number of cells. **D,E** The first 2 principal components of the protein data. Colours indicate the cell type labels.

results of several search engines in order to maximize the number of reliable spectrum identifications. Moreover, all search engines applied to SCP data so far have been developed for bulk proteomics data. Boekweg et al. showed that SCP data have different spectral properties compared to bulk proteomics data and, hence, the field would benefit from new search engines developed specifically for SCP data [4]. Quantitative data processing is also carried out using different analysis software. Spreadsheet-based and graphical user-drive software are currently predominant. However, method development is facilitated by programming languages such as R and python. Utilizing programming languages involves a steep learning curve and is often limited to expert data analysts, but it offers access to more advanced methods and is a direct and proven solution for assessable, replicable and re-usable computational analyses. Finally, an important criterion when choosing software is its maintenance activity. It has recently been shown that software accuracy best correlates with the author’s commitment to its maintenance [21].

## 5.2 Consistent input formats facilitate data analysis

Formatting input data is a time-consuming and error-prone task when performing data analysis. To limit this hurdle, `scp` and `sceptre` implement functionality to read structured data tables. `sceptre` is designed to read Proteome Discoverer tables and requires plate annotations and FACS data. `scp` is more generic and has been used to read tables from MaxQuant, Proteome Discoverer, DIA-NN and requires a sample annotation table. Both implementations require consistent inputs, as provided by software that export consistent output tables. Conversely, sample annotation tables depend on the experimenter. When building the `scpdata` packages, we realized that annotation tables are often lacking and hence needed to be created from the methods section or from the file names. In other cases, annotations were available through different files and required heavy data wrangling. This process is labor-intensive and error-prone. We suggest creating consistent annotation tables where each row represents a sample (single-cell, TMT carrier, negative control, ...) and columns represent technical or biological variables [23]. These variables are then used during statistical modelling to distinguish biological and technical variability. The annotation tables also require thorough documentation of the information each column contains. Consistent input formats streamline data analysis, facilitate the evaluation of the experimental design (Figure 4B and C), and provide the information needed for principled data modelling.

### 5.3 Beware of confounding effects

All experiments are prone to technical variability and noise, but a good design of experiment and principled data analysis can disentangle this undesired technical variability from the desired biological variability. This is also the case for bulk proteomics, but the technical challenges are exacerbated when dealing with single-cell data [61]. Real-life SCP experiments require the acquisition of over hundreds or thousands of cells spread across many MS runs. Each acquisition run is prone to technical factors that influence the quantification results. For instance, the MS signal drift arises from a continuous distortion of the signal between sequential runs, as already described for bulk proteomics [16]. Figure 4A confirms that MS drift is also present in SCP data. Differences between cells over acquisition time are higher than the differences between cell types at each time point. A careful design of experiment has spread the two cell types over time and hence the biological effects can be decoupled from MS drift thanks to batch correction or statistical modelling. Neglecting this technical effect can have dramatic consequences. As an example, Figure 4B depicts an SCP experiment where single cells are blocked at one of 4 different cell division stages. Unfortunately, these 4 categories were acquired sequentially, confounding desired biological and unwanted technical sources of variation, and impairing deconvolution of the technical and the biological variability. When conducting multiplexed experiments, one must keep in mind that the labels also influence single-cell quantification [44]. This effect was overlooked in Figure 4C where each TMT tag is assigned to only one cell type. Again, this impairs computational modelling of the TMT effects although in this case the biological variance is more important than the variance associated with the TMT label.

To overcome such confounding effect, it is crucial to carefully design an experiment using an adequate statistical blocking scheme and collect data about any technical factors that may influence the results of an experiment (such as LC-MS/MS maintenance, the type of instrument used, the multiplexing labels, the sample preparation batch, the lab that performed the experiment or cell culture batch), that can interact with known biological factors should also be gathered, such as cell line, subject ID or treatment condition. Single cells should then be randomized across all the identified factor levels. [44, 53, 41, 23]. Unfortunately, technical constraints may not allow for randomized designs. For instance, precious samples from patients may need to be processed on-the-fly. Hence, the patient identity and their clinical phenotype will inevitably be correlated with other technical factors. In scRNA-Seq, pseudo-bulking has been successfully applied to perform differential expression analysis when the experimental condition is correlated with the subject. Pseudo-bulking consist in aggregating cells belonging to the same individual after identification and separation of the

cell (sub-)populations [37, 12]. However, how to aggregate proteomics data is still to be explored. Another alternative is to use linear mixed models. Although these models are computationally more expensive, they overcome the need for aggregation by modelling protein estimates from the peptide data [? ]. Finally, dedicated efforts are required to better monitor and control batch effects in SCP data.

Finally, it is important to validate the batch correction and exclude residual batch effects. For instance, we observed that the cell types in the Specht et al. 2021 dataset cannot be separated in lower dimensions when processed by the SCeptre pipeline. This is because most of the variability is explained by residual batch effects (Figure 4D) indicating that the batch correction method implemented in SCeptre is not suited for this dataset. We recommend exploring the effect of technical variables in lower dimension to offer an intuition on residual batch effects. Batch correction assessment can be adapted from bulk proteomics, such as comparing correlations within batches and within conditions or correlations between unrelated peptides and peptides from the same protein. We refer to [16] for a thorough discussion.

#### 5.4 Quantitative data processing depends on downstream analyses

The purpose of quantitative data processing is to prepare the data for downstream analyses. Downstream analyses process data into interpretable statistical results that in turn can lead to new biological knowledge. Several approaches have successfully been applied to SCP data. Dimension reduction condenses the data in fewer variables. These data embeddings are often used for data visualization, clustering or trajectory analysis. Differential abundance or differential detection tests identify proteins whose abundance are statistically different given a distribution model between experimental conditions or cell clusters. For the latter, significant proteins are called marker proteins that can be used to perform cell type identification. Trajectory analysis infers differentiation or response tracks in the data by estimating a pseudo-timeline. It was recently speculated that SCP technologies enable the study of direct protein regulatory interactions, opening the analysis to the discovery of new regulatory mechanisms using an untargeted approach [50]. Quantitative data processing and downstream analysis could also be combined in a single statistical framework. While no such methods have been developed for SCP data yet, there are several examples from the scRNA-Seq field that could be adapted to SCP. For instance, scVI [36] or ZINB-WaVE [42] implement a modelling procedure that performs normalization, batch correction, imputation and dimension reduction as part of the same fitting process. Furthermore, scVI offers a Bayesian approach to perform




Figure 4: **Confounding effects cause undesired variability.** **A** MS drift for the KLLEGEESR peptide in the Specht et al. 2021 dataset [53]. The peptide data was processed using `scp` according to the script provided along the original paper up to log-transformation (Figure 1I). The batch index is ordered by time of acquisition. The MS drift is highlighted by a grey line computed using LOESS. **B** PCA plot that replicates the results by Brunner et al. [6]. The protein data was processed using `scp` as an R alternative to the python script provided along the original paper (Figure 1I). Shapes represent the cell cycle stage; colours represent the day of acquisition. **C** PCA plot that replicates the results by Williams et al. [63]. The protein data was processed using `scp` according to the workflow described in the Methods section of the original paper (Figure 1I). Shapes represent the cell type; colours represent the TMT label. **D** Same as Figure 3D, but coloured according to the MS acquisition batch ( $n = 149$  batches).

hypothesis testing directly from the estimated model parameters. While these compelling modelling procedures get rid of many processing steps, they still require a thorough sample quality control and feature selection. Whatever the chosen downstream method is, quantitative data processing workflows must match the underlying assumptions and data distributions. For instance, dimension reduction using PCA requires data imputation, but dimension reduction using non-iterative partial least squares (NIPALS) offers a similar alternative that is robust against missing values, hence does not require imputation [2, 61]. Quantitative values need to be batch-corrected when running a t-test otherwise the results will become biased and inaccurate. However, when using linear regression, technical factors can be directly included as part of the model and do not require previous batch correction [43].

## 6 Concluding remarks

While standardized SCP protocols are applied outside the pioneering labs [41, 33, 35, 57], computational workflows to process SCP data still lack any form of standardization. The overwhelming diversity of pipelines makes it difficult to make informed decisions as how to analyse SCP data. We provide important guidelines to orient the design of the data analysis. First, SCP designs and data analyses are complex, and analysis tools should be carefully chosen. Second, robust data analysis relies on consistent and standardized data formats. Standardized data structures should facilitate sample annotation biological and technical factors that influence data acquisition. Third, accounting for batch effects is essential to avoid assigning biological discoveries to technical variation, especially for SCP experiments, comprising ever-increasing numbers of single cell samples. Finally, the processing of quantitative data highly depends on the research question at hand and, hence, on the downstream analysis to perform. It is not possible to define a good computational workflow without defining the task to accomplish.

More work is required to offer clear answers on how to set up optimal SCP experimental designs and associated computational pipeline. The field still lacks understanding of the impact of each processing step on the final results. Workflows are still built based on empirical and arbitrary decisions. As the technology gains in momentum and more groups start to embrace SCP, setting more complex designs, standardized and benchmarked computational pipelines are needed to guarantee sound data interpretation. Indeed, strong data analyses principles and frameworks will enable the technology to reach its full potential. Low quality results generated by flawed analysis practices could

penalize the field instead of incentivize for better analysis. `scp/scpdata` and `sceptre` represent strong foundations that can support computational benchmarking efforts.

**Conflict of Interest Statement** The authors have no relevant affiliations or financial involvement with any organization or entity with a financial interest in or financial conflict with the subject matter or materials discussed in the manuscript. This includes employment, consultancies, honoraria, stock ownership or options, expert testimony, grants or patents received or pending, or royalties.

**Acknowledgments** This work was funded by a research fellowship of the Fonds de la Recherche Scientifique-FNRS.

**Data Availability Statement** All data used to create the figures in this article are available from the `scpdata` package [60]. The R code to reproduce the figures is available at: <https://github.com/UCLouvain-CBIO/2022-scp-data-analysis>.

## References

- [1] Robert A Amezquita, Aaron T L Lun, Etienne Becht, Vince J Carey, Lindsay N Carpp, Ludwig Geistlinger, Federico Marini, Kevin Rue-Albrecht, Davide Risso, Charlotte Sonesson, Levi Waldron, Hervé Pagès, Mike L Smith, Wolfgang Huber, Martin Morgan, Raphael Gottardo, and Stephanie C Hicks. Orchestrating single-cell analysis with bioconductor. *Nat. Methods*, 17(2):137–145, February 2020.
- [2] M Andrecut. Parallel GPU implementation of iterative PCA algorithms. *J. Comput. Biol.*, 16(11):1593–1599, November 2009.
- [3] Ricard Argelaguet, Anna S E Cuomo, Oliver Stegle, and John C Marioni. Computational principles and challenges in single-cell data integration. *Nat. Biotechnol.*, pages 1–14, May 2021.
- [4] Hannah Boekweg, Daisha Van Der Watt, Thy Truong, S Madisyn Johnston, Amanda J Guise, Edward D Plowey, Ryan T Kelly, and Samuel H Payne. Features of peptide fragmentation spectra in Single-Cell proteomics. *J. Proteome Res.*, December 2021.

- [5] Lisa M Bramer, Jan Irvahn, Paul D Piehowski, Karin D Rodland, and Bobbie-Jo M Webb-Robertson. A review of imputation strategies for isobaric Labeling-Based shotgun proteomics. *J. Proteome Res.*, 20(1):1–13, January 2021.
- [6] Andreas-David Brunner, Marvin Thielert, Catherine Vasilopoulou, Constantin Ammar, Fabian Coscia, Andreas Mund, Ole B Hoerning, Nicolai Bache, Amalia Apalategui, Markus Lubeck, Sabrina Richter, David S Fischer, Oliver Raether, Melvin A Park, Florian Meier, Fabian J Theis, and Matthias Mann. Ultra-high sensitivity mass spectrometry quantifies single-cell proteome changes upon perturbation. *Mol. Syst. Biol.*, 18(3):e10798, March 2022.
- [7] Bogdan Budnik, Ezra Levy, Guillaume Harmange, and Nikolai Slavov. SCoPE-MS: mass spectrometry of single mammalian cells quantifies proteome heterogeneity during cell differentiation. *Genome Biol.*, 19(1):161, October 2018.
- [8] Albert Tian Chen, Alexander Franks, and Nikolai Slavov. DART-ID increases single-cell proteome coverage. *PLoS Comput. Biol.*, 15(7):e1007082, July 2019.
- [9] Tommy K Cheung, Chien-Yun Lee, Florian P Bayer, Atticus McCoy, Bernhard Kuster, and Christopher M Rose. Defining the carrier proteome limit for single-cell proteomics. *Nat. Methods*, December 2020.
- [10] Yongzheng Cong, Yiran Liang, Khatereh Motamedchaboki, Romain Huguet, Thy Truong, Rui Zhao, Yufeng Shen, Daniel Lopez-Ferrer, Ying Zhu, and Ryan T Kelly. Improved Single-Cell proteome coverage using Narrow-Bore packed NanoLC columns and ultrasensitive mass spectrometry. *Anal. Chem.*, 92(3):2665–2671, February 2020.
- [11] Yongzheng Cong, Khatereh Motamedchaboki, Santosh A Misal, Yiran Liang, Amanda J Guise, Thy Truong, Romain Huguet, Edward D Plowey, Ying Zhu, Daniel Lopez-Ferrer, and Ryan T Kelly. Ultrasensitive single-cell proteomics workflow identifies >1000 protein groups per mammalian cell. *Chem. Sci.*, 12(3):1001–1006, 2021.
- [12] Helena L Crowell, Charlotte Soneson, Pierre-Luc Germain, Daniela Calini, Ludovic Collin, Catarina Raposo, Dheeraj Malhotra, and Mark D Robinson. Muscat detects subpopulation-specific state transitions from multi-sample multi-condition single-cell transcriptomics data. *Nat. Commun.*, 11(1):6077, November 2020.

- [13] Claudia Ctorteka and Karl Mechtler. The rise of single-cell proteomics. *Analytical Science Advances*, 2(3-4):84–94, April 2021.
- [14] Claudia Ctorteka, Gabriela Krššáková, Karel Stejskal, Josef M Penninger, Sasha Mendjan, Karl Mechtler, and Johannes Stadlmann. Comparative proteome signatures of trace samples by multiplexed Data-Independent acquisition. *Mol. Cell. Proteomics*, page 100177, November 2021.
- [15] Claudia Ctorteka, Karel Stejskal, Gabriela Krššáková, Sasha Mendjan, and Karl Mechtler. Quantitative accuracy and precision in multiplexed Single-Cell proteomics. *Anal. Chem.*, 94(5):2434–2443, February 2022.
- [16] Jelena Čuklina, Chloe H Lee, Evan G Williams, Tatjana Sajic, Ben C Collins, María Rodríguez Martínez, Varun S Sharma, Fabian Wendt, Sandra Goetze, Gregory R Keele, Bernd Wollscheid, Ruedi Aebersold, and Patrick G A Pedrioli. Diagnostics and correction of batch effects in large-scale proteomic studies: a tutorial. *Mol. Syst. Biol.*, 17(8):e10240, August 2021.
- [17] Jason Derks, Andrew Leduc, Georg Wallmann, R Gray Huffman, Matthew Willetts, Saad Khan, Harrison Specht, Markus Ralser, Vadim Demichev, and Nikolai Slavov. Increasing the throughput of sensitive proteomics by plexDIA. *Nat. Biotechnol.*, page 2021.11.03.467007, July 2022.
- [18] Maowei Dou, Jeremy Clair, Chia-Feng Tsai, Kerui Xu, William B Chrisler, Ryan L Sontag, Rui Zhao, Ronald J Moore, Tao Liu, Ljiljana Pasa-Tolic, Richard D Smith, Tujin Shi, Joshua N Adkins, Wei-Jun Qian, Ryan T Kelly, Charles Ansong, and Ying Zhu. High-Throughput single cell proteomics enabled by multiplex isobaric labeling in a nanodroplet sample preparation platform. *Anal. Chem.*, 91(20):13119–13127, October 2019.
- [19] William E Fondrie and William S Noble. Machine learning strategy that leverages large data sets to boost statistical power in Small-Scale experiments. *J. Proteome Res.*, February 2020.
- [20] William E Fondrie and William S Noble. Mokapot: Fast and flexible semisupervised learning for peptide detection. *J. Proteome Res.*, 20(4):1966–1971, April 2021.
- [21] Paul P Gardner, James M Paterson, Stephanie McGimpsey, Fatemeh Ashari-Ghomi, Sinan U Umu, Aleksandra Pawlik, Alex Gavryushkin, and Michael A Black. Sustained software develop-

- ment, not number of citations or journal choice, is indicative of accurate bioinformatic software. *Genome Biol.*, 23(1):56, February 2022.
- [22] Laurent Gatto and Christophe Vanderaa. *QFeatures: Quantitative features for mass spectrometry data*. URL <https://github.com/RforMassSpectrometry/QFeatures>. R package version 1.5.3.
- [23] Laurent Gatto, Ruedi Aebersold, Juergen Cox, Vadim Demichev, Jason Derks, Edward Emmott, Alexander M Franks, Alexander R Ivanov, Ryan T Kelly, Luke Khoury, Andrew Leduc, Michael J MacCoss, Peter Nemes, David H Perlman, Aleksandra A Petelski, Christopher M Rose, Erwin M Schoof, Jennifer Van Eyk, Christophe Vanderaa, John R Yates, III, and Nikolai Slavov. Initial recommendations for performing, benchmarking, and reporting single-cell proteomics experiments. July 2022.
- [24] Sofani Tafesse Gebreyesus, Asad Ali Siyal, Reta Birhanu Kitata, Eric Sheng-Wen Chen, Bayarmaa Enkhbayar, Takashi Angata, Kuo-I Lin, Yu-Ju Chen, and Hsiung-Lin Tu. Streamlined single-cell proteomics by an integrated microfluidic chip and data-independent acquisition mass spectrometry. *Nat. Commun.*, 13(1):37, January 2022.
- [25] Pierre-Luc Germain, Anthony Sonrel, and Mark D Robinson. pipecomp, a general framework for the evaluation of computational pipelines, reveals performant single cell RNA-seq preprocessing tools. *Genome Biol.*, 21(1):227, September 2020.
- [26] R Gray Huffman, Andrew Leduc, Christoph Wichmann, Marco di Gioia, Francesco Borriello, Harrison Specht, Jason Derks, Saad Khan, Edward Emmott, Aleksandra A Petelski, David H Perlman, Juergen Cox, Ivan Zanoni, and Nikolai Slavov. Prioritized single-cell proteomics reveals molecular and functional polarization across primary macrophages. March 2022.
- [27] David Hartlmayr, Claudia Ctortocka, Anjali Seth, Sasha Mendjan, Guilhem Tourniaire, and Karl Mechtler. An automated workflow for label-free and multiplexed single cell proteomics sample preparation at unprecedented sensitivity. April 2021.
- [28] Wolfgang Huber, Vincent J Carey, Robert Gentleman, Simon Anders, Marc Carlson, Benilton S Carvalho, Hector Corrada Bravo, Sean Davis, Laurent Gatto, Thomas Girke, Raphael Gottardo, Florian Hahne, Kasper D Hansen, Rafael A Irizarry, Michael Lawrence, Michael I Love, James MacDonald, Valerie Obenchain, Andrzej K Oleś, Hervé Pagès, Alejandro Reyes, Paul Shannon,

- Gordon K Smyth, Dan Tenenbaum, Levi Waldron, and Martin Morgan. Orchestrating high-throughput genomic analysis with bioconductor. *Nat. Methods*, 12(2):115–121, February 2015.
- [29] W Evan Johnson, Cheng Li, and Ariel Rabinovic. Adjusting batch effects in microarray expression data using empirical bayes methods. *Biostatistics*, 8(1):118–127, January 2007.
- [30] Mathias Kalxdorf, Torsten Müller, Oliver Stegle, and Jeroen Krijgsveld. IceR improves proteome coverage and data completeness in global and single-cell proteomics. *Nat. Commun.*, 12(1):4787, August 2021.
- [31] Ryan T Kelly. Single-cell proteomics: Progress and prospects. *Mol. Cell. Proteomics*, 19(11):1739–1748, November 2020.
- [32] Cosmin Lazar, Laurent Gatto, Myriam Ferro, Christophe Bruley, and Thomas Burger. Accounting for the multiple natures of missing values in Label-Free quantitative proteomics data sets to compare imputation strategies. *J. Proteome Res.*, 15(4):1116–1125, April 2016.
- [33] Andrew Leduc, R Gray Huffman, and Nikolai Slavov. Droplet sample preparation for single-cell proteomics applied to the cell cycle. March 2022.
- [34] Ezra Levy and Nikolai Slavov. Single cell protein analysis for systems biology. Technical Report e26965v1, PeerJ Preprints, May 2018.
- [35] Yiran Liang, Hayden Acor, Michaela A McCown, Andikan J Nwosu, Hannah Boekweg, Nathaniel B Axtell, Thy Truong, Yongzheng Cong, Samuel H Payne, and Ryan T Kelly. Fully automated sample processing and analysis workflow for Low-Input proteome profiling. *Anal. Chem.*, 93(3):1658–1666, January 2021.
- [36] Romain Lopez, Jeffrey Regier, Michael B Cole, Michael I Jordan, and Nir Yosef. Deep generative modeling for single-cell transcriptomics. *Nat. Methods*, 15(12):1053–1058, December 2018.
- [37] Aaron T L Lun and John C Marioni. Overcoming confounding plate effects in differential expression analyses of single-cell RNA-seq data. *Biostatistics*, 18(3):451–464, July 2017.
- [38] Elisabetta Mereu, Atefeh Lafzi, Catia Moutinho, Christoph Ziegenhain, Davis J McCarthy, Adrián Álvarez-Varela, Eduard Batlle, Sagar, Dominic Grün, Julia K Lau, Stéphane C Boutet, Chad Sanada, Aik Ooi, Robert C Jones, Kelly Kaihara, Chris Brampton, Yasha Talaga, Yohei Sasagawa, Kaori Tanaka, Tetsutaro Hayashi, Caroline Braeuning, Cornelius Fischer, Sascha

- Sauer, Timo Trefzer, Christian Conrad, Xian Adiconis, Lan T Nguyen, Aviv Regev, Joshua Z Levin, Swati Parekh, Aleksandar Janjic, Lucas E Wange, Johannes W Bagnoli, Wolfgang Enard, Marta Gut, Rickard Sandberg, Itoshi Nikaido, Ivo Gut, Oliver Stegle, and Holger Heyn. Benchmarking single-cell RNA-sequencing protocols for cell atlas projects. *Nat. Biotechnol.*, 38(6): 747–755, June 2020.
- [39] Martin Morgan and Lori Shepherd. *ExperimentHub: Client to access ExperimentHub resources*, 2022. R package version 2.5.0.
- [40] Benjamin C Orsburn, Yuting Yuan, and Namandjé N Bumpus. Single cell proteomics using a trapped ion mobility Time-of-Flight mass spectrometer provides insight into the post-translational modification landscape of individual human cells. February 2022.
- [41] Aleksandra A Petelski, Edward Emmott, Andrew Leduc, R Gray Huffman, Harrison Specht, David H Perlman, and Nikolai Slavov. Multiplexed single-cell proteomics using SCoPE2. *Nat. Protoc.*, page 2021.03.12.435034, October 2021.
- [42] Davide Risso, Fanny Perraudeau, Svetlana Gribkova, Sandrine Dudoit, and Jean-Philippe Vert. A general and flexible method for signal extraction from single-cell RNA-seq data. *Nat. Commun.*, 9(1):284, January 2018.
- [43] Matthew E Ritchie, Belinda Phipson, Di Wu, Yifang Hu, Charity W Law, Wei Shi, and Gordon K Smyth. limma powers differential expression analyses for RNA-sequencing and microarray studies. *Nucleic Acids Res.*, 43(7):e47, April 2015.
- [44] Erwin M Schoof, Benjamin Furtwängler, Nil Üresin, Nicolas Rapin, Simonas Savickas, Coline Gentil, Eric Lechman, Ulrich auf Dem Keller, John E Dick, and Bo T Porse. Quantitative single-cell proteomics as a tool to characterize cellular hierarchies. *Nat. Commun.*, 12(1):745679, December 2021.
- [45] Nikolai Slavov. Unpicking the proteome in single cells. *Science*, 367(6477):512–513, January 2020.
- [46] Nikolai Slavov. Driving single cell proteomics forward with innovation. *J. Proteome Res.*, 20(11):4915–4918, November 2021.
- [47] Nikolai Slavov. Single-cell protein analysis by mass spectrometry. *Curr. Opin. Chem. Biol.*, 60: 1–9, February 2021.

- [48] Nikolai Slavov. Increasing proteomics throughput. *Nat. Biotechnol.*, 39(7):809–810, July 2021.
- [49] Nikolai Slavov. Scaling up single-cell proteomics. *Mol. Cell. Proteomics*, page 100179, November 2021.
- [50] Nikolai Slavov. Learning from natural variation across the proteomes of single cells. *PLoS Biol.*, 20(1):e3001512, January 2022.
- [51] Harrison Specht and Nikolai Slavov. Optimizing accuracy and depth of protein quantification in experiments using isobaric carriers. *J. Proteome Res.*, 20(1):880–887, January 2021.
- [52] Harrison Specht, Guillaume Harmange, David H Perlman, Edward Emmott, Zachary Niziolek, Bogdan Budnik, and Nikolai Slavov. Automated sample preparation for high-throughput single-cell proteomics. August 2018.
- [53] Harrison Specht, Edward Emmott, Aleksandra A Petelski, R Gray Huffman, David H Perlman, Marco Serra, Peter Kharchenko, Antonius Koller, and Nikolai Slavov. Single-cell proteomic and transcriptomic analysis of macrophage heterogeneity using SCoPE2. *Genome Biol.*, 22(1):50, January 2021.
- [54] Adriaan Sticker, Ludger Goeminne, Lennart Martens, and Lieven Clement. Robust summarization and inference in proteome-wide label-free quantification. *Mol. Cell. Proteomics*, 19(7):1209–1219, July 2020.
- [55] Luyi Tian, Xueyi Dong, Saskia Freytag, Kim-Anh Lê Cao, Shian Su, Abolfazl JalalAbadi, Daniela Amann-Zalcenstein, Tom S Weber, Azadeh Seidi, Jafar S Jabbari, Shalin H Naik, and Matthew E Ritchie. Benchmarking single cell RNA-sequencing analysis pipelines using mixture control experiments. *Nat. Methods*, 16(6):479–487, June 2019.
- [56] Chia-Feng Tsai, Rui Zhao, Sarah M Williams, Ronald J Moore, Kendall Schultz, William B Chrisler, Ljiljana Pasa-Tolic, Karin D Rodland, Richard D Smith, Tujin Shi, Ying Zhu, and Tao Liu. An improved boosting to amplify signal with isobaric labeling (iBASIL) strategy for precise quantitative single-cell proteomics. *Mol. Cell. Proteomics*, 19(5):828–838, May 2020.
- [57] Chia-Feng Tsai, Pengfei Zhang, David Scholten, Kendall Martin, Yi-Ting Wang, Rui Zhao, William B Chrisler, Dhvani B Patel, Maowei Dou, Yuzhi Jia, Carolina Reduzzi, Xia Liu, Ronald J Moore, Kristin E Burnum-Johnson, Miao-Hsia Lin, Chuan-Chih Hsu, Jon M Jacobs,

- Jacob Kagan, Sudhir Srivastava, Karin D Rodland, H Steven Wiley, Wei-Jun Qian, Richard D Smith, Ying Zhu, Massimo Cristofanilli, Tao Liu, Huiping Liu, and Tujin Shi. Surfactant-assisted one-pot sample preparation for label-free single-cell proteomics. *Commun Biol*, 4(1): 265, March 2021.
- [58] Kevin Ushey, JJ Allaire, and Yuan Tang. *reticulate: Interface to 'Python'*, 2022. <https://rstudio.github.io/reticulate/>, <https://github.com/rstudio/reticulate>.
- [59] Daisha Van Der Watt, Hannah Boekweg, Thy Truong, Amanda J Guise, Edward D Plowey, Ryan T Kelly, and Samuel H Payne. Benchmarking PSM identification tools for single cell proteomics. August 2021.
- [60] Christophe Vanderaa and Laurent Gatto. `scpdata: Single cell proteomics data package` [internet]. version 1.3.2. Bioconductor; 2021. Available from <https://bioconductor.org/packages/release/data/experiment/html/scpdata.html>.
- [61] Christophe Vanderaa and Laurent Gatto. Replication of single-cell proteomics data reveals important computational challenges. *Expert Rev. Proteomics*, pages 1–9, October 2021.
- [62] Kei G I Webber, Thy Truong, S Madisyn Johnston, Sebastian E Zapata, Yiran Liang, Jacob M Davis, Alexander D Buttars, Fletcher B Smith, Hailey E Jones, Arianna C Mahoney, Richard H Carson, Andikan J Nwosu, Jacob L Heninger, Andrey V Liyu, Gregory P Nordin, Ying Zhu, and Ryan T Kelly. Label-Free profiling of up to 200 Single-Cell proteomes per day using a Dual-Column nanoflow liquid chromatography platform. *Anal. Chem.*, April 2022.
- [63] Sarah M Williams, Andrey V Liyu, Chia-Feng Tsai, Ronald J Moore, Daniel J Orton, William B Chrisler, Matthew J Gaffrey, Tao Liu, Richard D Smith, Ryan T Kelly, Ljiljana Pasa-Tolic, and Ying Zhu. Automated coupling of nanodroplet sample preparation with liquid Chromatography-Mass spectrometry for High-Throughput Single-Cell proteomics. *Anal. Chem.*, 92(15):10588–10596, August 2020.
- [64] F Alexander Wolf, Philipp Angerer, and Fabian J Theis. SCANPY: large-scale single-cell gene expression data analysis. *Genome Biol.*, 19(1):15, February 2018.
- [65] Jongmin Woo, Sarah M Williams, Lye Meng Markillie, Song Feng, Chai-Feng Tsai, Victor Aguilera-Vazquez, Ryan L Sontag, Ronald J Moore, Dehong Hu, Hardeep S Mehta, Joshua

- Cantlon-Bruce, Tao Liu, Joshua N Adkins, Richard D Smith, Jeremy C Clair, Ljiljana Pasa-Tolic, and Ying Zhu. High-throughput and high-efficiency sample preparation for single-cell proteomics using a nested nanowell chip. *Nat. Commun.*, 12(1):6246, October 2021.
- [66] Jongmin Woo, Jeremy C Clair, Sarah M Williams, Song Feng, Chia-Feng Tsai, Ronald J Moore, William B Chrisler, Richard D Smith, Ryan T Kelly, Ljiljana Paša-Tolić, Charles Ansong, and Ying Zhu. Three-dimensional feature matching improves coverage for single-cell proteomics based on ion mobility filtering. *cels*, 0(0), March 2022.
- [67] Sung-Huan Yu, Pelagia Kyriakidou, and Jürgen Cox. Isobaric matching between runs and novel PSM-Level normalization in MaxQuant strongly improve reporter Ion-Based quantification. *J. Proteome Res.*, 19(10):3945–3954, October 2020.
- [68] Luke Zappia and Aaron Lun. *zellkonverter: Conversion Between scRNA-seq Objects*, 2021. URL <https://github.com/theislab/zellkonverter>. R package version 1.5.0.
- [69] Ying Zhu, Jeremy Clair, William B Chrisler, Yufeng Shen, Rui Zhao, Anil K Shukla, Ronald J Moore, Ravi S Misra, Gloria S Pryhuber, Richard D Smith, Charles Ansong, and Ryan T Kelly. Proteomic analysis of single mammalian cells enabled by microfluidic nanodroplet sample preparation and ultrasensitive NanoLC-MS. *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed Engl.*, 57(38):12370–12374, September 2018.
- [70] Ying Zhu, Paul D Piehowski, Rui Zhao, Jing Chen, Yufeng Shen, Ronald J Moore, Anil K Shukla, Vladislav A Petyuk, Martha Campbell-Thompson, Clayton E Mathews, Richard D Smith, Wei-Jun Qian, and Ryan T Kelly. Nanodroplet processing platform for deep and quantitative proteome profiling of 10-100 mammalian cells. *Nat. Commun.*, 9(1):882, February 2018.
- [71] Ying Zhu, Mirko Scheibinger, Daniel Christian Ellwanger, Jocelyn F Krey, Dongseok Choi, Ryan T Kelly, Stefan Heller, and Peter G Barr-Gillespie. Single-cell proteomics reveals changes in expression during hair-cell development. *Elife*, 8, November 2019.

## Internet resources

Table 2: List of SCP data, computational and didactic resources.

	Tool	Language	Description and link
<b>Data</b>	<code>scpdata</code>	R	R/Bioconductor package providing published SCP datasets ready for analysis in R. <a href="https://bioconductor.org/packages/release/data/experiment/html/scpdata.html">https://bioconductor.org/packages/release/data/experiment/html/scpdata.html</a>
<b>Processing</b>	<code>scp</code>	R	R/Bioconductor package to process quantitative SCP data, supporting all steps and methods depicted in Figure 1. <a href="https://bioconductor.org/packages/release/bioc/html/scp.html">https://bioconductor.org/packages/release/bioc/html/scp.html</a>
	<code>sceptre</code>	Python	Python package extending the functionalities of Scanpy to analyse multiplexed SCP data. It implements the Schoof et al. 2021 workflow in Figure 1. <a href="https://github.com/bfurtwa/Sceptre">https://github.com/bfurtwa/Sceptre</a>
<b>Reproduction</b>	SCP.replication	R	Website with 8 SCP data analysis articles that replicate published studies. <a href="https://uclouvain-cbio.github.io/SCP.replication">https://uclouvain-cbio.github.io/SCP.replication</a>
	SCEptre notebooks	Python	Code repository containing a set of jupyter notebooks that reproduce the results presented in Schoof et al. 2021. <a href="https://github.com/bfurtwa/SCEptre/tree/master/Schoof_et_al/code">https://github.com/bfurtwa/SCEptre/tree/master/Schoof_et_al/code</a>
	SlavovLab code	R	Set of code repositories that reproduce the results published by the Slavov lab. <a href="https://github.com/Single-cell-proteomics">https://github.com/Single-cell-proteomics</a>
	Brunner code	Python	Code repository with a jupyter notebook to reproduce the results in Brunner et al. 2022. <a href="https://github.com/theislab/singlecell_proteomics">https://github.com/theislab/singlecell_proteomics</a>
<b>Tutorials</b>	SCP workshop	R	Online tutorial with hands-on exercises. <a href="https://lgatto.github.io/QFeaturesScpWorkshop2021">https://lgatto.github.io/QFeaturesScpWorkshop2021</a>

## Supplementary information

### Supplementary tables

Table S1: **Description of SCP data processing methods.**

Step	Method	Description
Sample quality control	Failed runs	Remove samples that belong to an MS acquisition that failed based on the number of PSMs.
	Missing data	Remove samples that contain too many missing values. Too many is defined by the authors either using the percentage missing value per cell or the number of identified proteins per cell.
	Median CV	Remove samples for which the median coefficient (CV) of variation is higher than a user provided threshold. CVs are computed from peptides belonging to the same proteins and CVs per cell across proteins are summarised using the median.
	MAD sum intensity	Remove samples for which the total protein signal intensity per cell falls outside the median absolute deviation (MAD). Briefly, the summed intensities are computed for each cell. The median of the absolute differences between the summed intensities and the computed median is the MAD. All cells that have their summed intensity higher than the median plus MAD or lower than the median minus MAD are removed.
	Grubb's test	Iteratively remove outlying cells based on the ratio of the absolute deviation to the mean of all cells and the standard deviation. Outlying cells are removed based on a significance threshold ( $\alpha = 0.05$ ).
Feature quality control	Contaminants and decoys	Remove identified peptides that match the contaminant and/or the decoy database.
	Empty signal	Remove features for which no signal is recorded across all single cells.
	FDR filtering	Remove peptides or proteins that have an associated false discovery rate (FDR) greater than a user provided threshold, usually 1%. FDR is computed by the search engine during peptide identification.

Table S1: **Description of SCP data processing methods.**

Step	Method	Description
	Missing data	Remove peptides or proteins that contain too many missing values. Too many is defined by the authors either using the percentage missing value per feature or the number of cells the feature was identified in.
	Unique peptides per protein	Remove proteins that were identified and quantified from less than 2 unique peptides.
	Spectral purity	Remove PSMs that have a low spectral purity, that is the proportion of signal from the identified peptide compared to signal from background or co-eluting peptide. Spectral purity is computed by the search engine during peptide identification.
	Sample to carrier ratio	Remove the PSMs for which the ratio between the average intensity across single-cells over the signal in the carrier channel is higher than a user provided threshold, usually 10%.
Imputation	KNN	Missing values are imputed using the k-nearest neighbours (KNN) averaging. In other words, for each cell, the missing value for a protein is replaced with the average intensity of K most similar cells (in Euclidean space) for which that protein is not missing. K is defined by the user or optimized by maximizing the silhouette width between known cell types.
	zero	Missing values are replaced by a zero value.
	Normal distribution	Missing values are replaced by values sampled from a normal distribution. The mean of the distribution is defined as the global mean of non-missing values downshifted by a user provided value, and the standard deviation of the distribution is set by the user as well.
Log-transform	log2	Replace quantitative values by the $\log_2$ of the values.
	log1p	Replace quantitative values by the $\ln$ of the values with a pseudo count of one.

Table S1: **Description of SCP data processing methods.**

Step	Method	Description
Aggregation	Random selection	Pick one feature to represent the aggregated feature. This method was used to aggregate PSMs to charged peptides. In this context there are about 0.1% of charged peptides that originate from more than one PSM.
	Summed	Combine quantitative data from multiple features by summing their intensities.
	Top N	Combine quantitative data from multiple features by summing intensities of the N most intense features.
	Median	Combine quantitative data from multiple features by taking the median of their intensities.
	iBAQ	intensity based absolute quantification (iBAQ) combines peptides into protein quantifications by summing the peptide intensities divided by the number of theoretically observable peptides.
	maxLFQ	Protein quantifications are computed from peptide quantification using delayed normalization and maximal peptide ratio extraction. See [?] for detailed information on the method.
Normalization	Sample median	Quantitative values for each single cell are divided or subtracted by the median for that cell.
	Feature mean	Quantitative values for each feature are divided or subtracted by the mean for that feature.
	Feature median	Quantitative values for each feature are divided or subtracted by the median for that feature.
	Total	Quantitative values for each feature are divided or subtracted by the median for that feature.
	Quantile	Quantitative values are transformed so that the quantile distribution are aligned between all single cells.

Table S1: **Description of SCP data processing methods.**

Step	Method	Description
	standardization	Quantitative values for each feature are subtracted by the average and divided by the standard deviation.
Batch correction	Reference	For all cells within a batch and for each feature, the quantitative data are divided or subtracted by the reference samples within that run.
	Median	For all cells within a batch and for each feature, the quantitative data are divided or subtracted by the median values within that run.
	ComBat	Batch effects are removed using linear regression with an Empirical Bayes framework. The method models the quantifications of each protein with respect to a batch factor as well as the biological factors to protect from correction.
	limma	This method is very similar to ComBat. It allows for more than one batch factors.
Other	Isotope impurity correction	The signal associated to a label is corrected by removing the signal associated to impurities from the other labels. This is performed using a compensation matrix provided by the label manufacturer or from theoretical isotopic composition. This is only applicable for multiplexed experiments.
	Quantification thresholding	Any quantitative value below a user provided threshold is set to be missing. See [9] for more detailed information on how to set the threshold.
	S/N computation	Convert MS signal intensities to signal-to-noise ratio (S/N). The noise signal is estimated by the spectrum quantification software.