

Comparative prospects of imaging methods for whole-brain mammalian connectomics

Logan Thrasher Collins,^{1,*} Todd Huffman, Randal Koene²

¹Washington University in St. Louis, Department of Biomedical Engineering

²Carboncopies Foundation

*Corresponding author

Abstract: Mammalian whole-brain connectomes at nanoscale synaptic resolution are a crucial ingredient for holistic understanding of brain function. Imaging these connectomes at sufficient resolution to densely reconstruct cellular morphology and synapses represents a longstanding goal in neuroscience. Although the technologies needed to reconstruct whole-brain connectomes have not yet reached full maturity, they are advancing rapidly enough that the mouse brain might be within reach in the near future. Detailed exploration of these technologies is warranted to help plan projects with varying goals and requirements. Whole-brain human connectomes remain a more distant goal yet are worthy of consideration to orient large-scale neuroscience program plans. Here, we quantitatively compare existing and emerging imaging technologies that have potential to enable whole-brain mammalian connectomics. We perform calculations on electron microscopy (EM) techniques and expansion microscopy coupled with light-sheet fluorescence microscopy (ExLSFM) methods. We consider techniques from the literature that have sufficiently high resolution to identify all synapses and sufficiently high speed to be relevant for whole mammalian brains. Each imaging modality comes with benefits and drawbacks, so we suggest that attacking the problem through multiple approaches could yield the best outcomes. We offer this analysis as a resource for those considering how to organize efforts towards imaging whole-brain mammalian connectomes.

Introduction:

Connectomics at nanoscale resolution presents a major technical challenge due to the tremendous amounts of image data involved.^{1,2} To reach sufficient resolution for accurately reconstructing fine neurites and synapses, voxel dimensions on the order of just a few of tens of nanometers are needed. But with the recent completion of the adult *Drosophila* brain connectome³ and ventral nerve cord connectome,^{4,5} it seems that the age of whole-brain connectomics has arrived. Projects with the eventual goal of mapping a whole-brain mouse connectome have recently launched, which has prompted discussions about the eventual goal of human brain connectomics. However, the *Drosophila* brain volume is only 0.08 mm³ while the mouse brain has a volume of around 500 mm³ and the human brain has a volume in the range of 1200000 mm³.^{2,6,7} That is, the mouse brain has a volume of about 6250 times larger compared with the *Drosophila* brain while the human brain has a volume of about another 2400 times greater still compared with the mouse brain. Dramatic increases in imaging throughput will be necessary for whole-brain mammalian connectomics endeavors.

In this analysis, we quantitatively compare emerging methodologies used for imaging connectomes with a focus on the capabilities needed for the mouse brain and the human brain. The details of our calculations are available in the **Supplemental Information** (located after references). While computational image processing represents an adjacent challenge for connectomics, we here focus primarily on imaging techniques except where computational analysis directly constrains image acquisition parameters. We work under the assumption that parallel image processing developments will contribute vital new capabilities in a timely manner. In general, mammalian connectomics requires microscopy techniques featuring both high resolution and speed. Electron microscopy (EM) has thus far been the principal imaging method utilized in connectomics research since it achieves nanoscale resolution, though it suffers from slow acquisition speeds even with substantial investment into ameliorating the issue.^{1,8,9} Expansion microscopy coupled with light-sheet fluorescence microscopy (ExLSFM)¹⁰⁻¹² represents a promising alternative route that might attain similar resolution while increasing imaging speed, but this approach is still in early stages of development compared to EM. Tavakoli et al. recently showed that it is indeed possible to perform dense neuronal reconstruction using a 16-fold ExM approach and spinning-disk confocal microscopy,¹³ yet there does not yet exist a high-throughput pipeline for ExM connectomics. While

we would argue it is likely that such an ExM-based pipeline may be developed in the relatively near future, the existing high-throughput EM pipeline is currently the most reliable near-term path to whole mouse brain acquisition. Distinct imaging technologies will offer complementary capabilities for large-scale connectomics projects.

To facilitate broad comparisons across different modalities, our analysis makes a number of simplifying assumptions. Firstly, we assume voxel size is roughly proportional to resolution because many key studies do not report actual resolution (e.g. as measured by Fourier shell correlation or similar). We thus are able to use voxel size as a common metric of comparison. Since voxel size often is not directly proportional to resolution, these numbers should be thought of as best-case scenarios. We furthermore assume that isotropic voxel size of less than 20 nm or non-isotropic voxel size of less than $15 \times 15 \times 50$ nm (<15 nm lateral, <50 nm axial) has the potential for connectomic traceability (in the case of ExM, this is effective voxel size). However, it is important to realize that traceability is largely dependent on factors such as signal-to-noise ratio, contrast, the uniformity of the sample's staining and/or expansion, the integrity of the sample's ultrastructure. In serial section forms of EM, there is also the problem of losing or damaging a fraction of the slices, breaking the continuity of neuronal processes.¹⁴ We generally assume that samples have been prepared with sufficient precision to minimize damage, noise, staining issues, and section loss though we do consider that baseline levels of these factors can delineate hard limits to achievable image quality. In the section on ExLSFM, we speculatively combine a state-of-the-art technique called pan-ExM-t (which can reach 24-fold expansion)¹¹ with light-sheet microscopes from other publications. An exception to this is our discussion of Wang et al.'s "volumetric imaging of biological specimens via photochemical sectioning" method, where our speculation instead involves standard 4.5-fold expansion¹⁵ to reach the assumed effective voxel size for nanoscale reconstruction since their microscope's actual voxel size was quite small. We choose light-sheet microscopes which could hypothetically achieve the aforementioned voxel sizes if their actual voxel sizes were divided by the expansion factors of 24 or 4.5. We assume that the expansion process introduces minimal distortions and minimal defects as well as that the fluorescent labeling is of sufficient quality to allow the direct application of this expansion factor. It should be noted that this assumption is not always true; ExM can introduce long-range distortions and expanded gels may experience damage during handling. Inconsistent demarcation of cellular boundaries is also an issue, though pan-ExM-t¹¹ and new membrane labeling methods^{13,16} have substantially improved this situation. Since expanded mammalian brains may be too large for imaging as intact objects (e.g. a 24-fold expanded human brain could be over 3.5 meters in length), they will need to be sectioned either before or after expansion. Imperfect sectioning of expanded tissues could cause loss of important information as well. While we suggest that all of these issues might be conquered by sufficient optimization effort, they should still certainly be kept in mind when comparing the imaging modalities.

Though it is not the focus of this analysis, computational processing of image data may also prove a limiting factor for connectomics. Some potential areas of difficulty include the transmission bandwidth of image data moving from the detector to a storage device, the massive amount of computer memory needed to store the raw image data of whole mammalian brains (which may exceed 60 exabytes for a single human brain), compute time for stitching and aligning images, and compute time for segmentation and synapse identification.¹⁷ Fully automated segmentation algorithms will furthermore be necessary for tracing the neurons and glia of whole mammalian brains and this problem has not yet been solved.¹ Contributions across many fields of research will be necessary to overcome these challenges. Nonetheless, we are optimistic that successes in data acquisition may drive enough interest in connectomics that the necessary computational methods will be developed.

Electron microscopy:

EM represents a central method used in connectomics studies and has so far been the only technique that has facilitated computational reconstruction of complete whole-brain connectomes (*C. elegans* and *D. melanogaster*).^{3,18,19} It involves sectioning (or milling) a sample into very thin slices and sequentially imaging each slice with an electron microscope. The most commonly used EM methods in connectomics are serial-section transmission electron microscopy (ssTEM) (**Figure 1A**), serial block-face electron

microscopy (SBEM) (**Figure 1B**), and focused ion beam scanning electron microscopy (FIB-SEM) (**Figure 1C**).²⁰ Extensive engineering efforts have gone toward increasing the throughput of these core techniques. Some important advances in the area include multibeam scanning electron microscopy (multiSEM),²¹ automated tape-collecting ultramicrotomy scanning electron microscopy (ATUM-SEM),²² gas cluster ion beam scanning electron microscopy (GCIB-SEM),²³ and parallelized automated ssTEM.⁹ These approaches have shown success for small volumes (i.e. up to the 1 mm³ scale) and may be amenable to parallelization for higher throughput, albeit at very high monetary costs. Indeed, some investigators have suggested industrial facilities with hundreds of electron microscopes working in parallel to map entire mammalian brains. Constructing and maintaining such facilities would probably cost hundreds of millions to billions of dollars, so further increases in the throughput of individual instruments may still be necessary. Nonetheless, EM brings a long history of connectomics successes and scaling it up for the mouse brain connectome has been suggested as feasible within the coming decades.²




Figure 1 Simplified depictions of the mechanisms of (A) Serial-section transmission electron microscopy (ssTEM) (B) serial block-face scanning electron microscopy (SBEM), and (C) Focused ion beam scanning electron microscopy (FIB-SEM). For more details on these technologies, their use in connectomics, and how they have been modified for improved throughput, see excellent reviews by Titze et al.²² and by Peddie et al.²⁴

How fast are current EM methods for imaging brain tissue? (**Table 1**) In a landmark study by Yin et al., a 1 mm³ volume of brain tissue was imaged in 6 months (4×4×40 nm voxels) using a system consisting of 6 parallelized and fully automated ssTEM microscopes.⁹ The authors built this system by incorporating several custom hardware modifications into commercially available JEOL 1200EXII 120 kV TEMs as well as by developing a software framework to facilitate a consistent automation process. Each microscope cost about \$125K and the hardware modifications on each added a further \$125K to the cost (\$250K per customized microscope). As such, the total cost of the system of 6 microscopes was about \$1.5M. Another example of a 1 mm³ acquisition comes from Shapson-Coe et al. where ATUM was used to section the tissue and a multiSEM instrument (4×4×33 nm voxels) was used to image the tissue over the course of 326 days (10.516 months).^{25,26} The price of the multiSEM instrument was about \$4M for the version used by Shapson-Coe et al., which utilized 61 beams.²⁷ It should be noted that an even faster 91 beam multiSEM is also commercially available for about \$6M. These investigations represent the first steps into millimeter-scale EM connectomics and will serve as a foundation for future advances in the field.

EM throughput may continue to grow over time as new technologies are developed. A promising direction involves cutting relatively thick sections of around 500 nm, imaging them using GCIB-SEM (an ionic milling method which uses an improved type of ion beam), and then computationally stitching

reconstructions of the thick sections.^{23,28} Of note, this method is likely compatible with multiSEM. Thick sections are much easier to handle and cause less difficulty in computational reconstruction downstream than ultrathin 30-40 nm sections, so the technique has potential to enhance connectomics workflows. Zheng et al. recently developed another new technique called beam deflection TEM (bdTEM), which has been shown to substantially improve upon the throughput of the Yin et al. study described earlier.²⁸ Beam deflection allows scanning of the electron beam over nine image tiles without moving the stage, thus eliminating eight out of nine stage movements and speeding up imaging overall. With the same type of camera, the bdTEM microscopes can each image tissue (3.6×3.6×45 nm voxels) much faster than those of the Yin et al. study. The authors estimate that if the four microscopes were to run at 65% uptime, they could together image 1 mm³ in 37 days. Also retrofitted from JEOL 1200EXII 120 kV TEMs, each of the custom bdTEMs cost about \$500K. Four of these were constructed at the Princeton facility described by Zheng et al. (about \$2M total cost). Future innovations have potential to continue improving the throughput of EM instruments.

Table 1 Comparison of parameters from key publications and preprints involving high-throughput EM methods for connectomics.

Study	Yin et al. ⁹ (2020)	Shapson-Coe et al. ²⁵ (2021)	Zheng et al. ²⁸ (2022)
Imaging speed per microscope (mm³/month)	0.0278	0.0951	0.3 (projected)
Cost per microscope	\$250,000	\$4M	\$500,000
Voxel size (nm)	4×4×40	4×4×33	3.6×3.6×45
Time to image mouse brain per 1 microscope	1500 years	438 years	139.6 years
Time to image human brain per 1 microscope	3.6M years	1.05M years	333333 years
Time to image mouse brain with \$100M of microscopes	3.75 years with 400 microscopes	17.5 years with 25 microscopes	0.69 years with 200 microscopes
Time to image human brain with \$100M of microscopes	9000 years with 400 microscopes	42061 years with 25 microscopes	1667 years with 200 microscopes

Light-sheet fluorescence microscopy with expansion microscopy:

Coupling LSFM with ExM represents a promising up-and-coming approach for mammalian brain connectomics. LSFM utilizes specialized lenses to generate a thin sheet of laser light and excite fluorophores across a planar region of tissue.²⁹ Alternatively, LSFM can utilize a rapid laser scanning approach to construct a sheet of light along the axis of the scan. In either case, an objective lens to collect light for the detector is placed perpendicular to the light sheet. The instrument translates the sheet (or the sample itself) along this perpendicular axis to collect a stack of images for reconstruction into a 3D volume. For most samples, LSFM requires tissue clearing to minimize scattering of the light. Fortunately, ExM clears tissue by virtue of volumetric dilution, so expanded tissues are translucent and amenable to LSFM.³⁰ ExLSFM is a serendipitous union of technologies, combining increased resolution with the speed necessary to reconstruct large volumes.




Figure 2 (A) Tissue expansion physically enlarges tissue after infusion with a swellable hydrogel and addition of pure water. More details on expansion microscopy (ExM) can be found in excellent reviews by Truckenbrodt³⁰ and Wen et al.³¹ (B) Expansion light-sheet fluorescence microscopy (ExLSFM) in an axially swept light-sheet microscopy (ASLM) configuration. More details on light-sheet fluorescence microscopy (LSFM) can be found in an excellent review by Stelzer et al.²⁹

Although ExLSFM has not yet reached a point where it is widely used in dense neural circuit mapping, it represents the subject of intensive research and seems on the cusp of feasibility as a tool for connectomics (**Table 2**). As mentioned earlier, Tavakoli et al. successfully achieved dense neuronal reconstruction of 16-fold expanded tissue imaged with a spinning-disk confocal microscope.¹³ They imaged a 16-fold expanded piece of tissue (with a pre-expansion volume of 0.00095 mm^3) over the course of 6.5 hours. This is too slow for mammalian brain connectomics since 1 mm^3 would take 6841.9 hours or 9.37 months. It is plausible that applying LSFM instead of spinning-disk confocal microscopy could greatly accelerate this type of imaging. However, since their spinning-disk confocal setup had much better axial and lateral resolution than is achievable by the faster types of LSFM (discussed in following paragraphs), the expansion factor would likely need to be somewhat higher to still facilitate dense reconstruction. With respect to this point, another method by M'Saad et al. called pan-ExM of tissue (pan-ExM-t) has achieved 24-fold expansion as well as clear enough staining of proteins to delineate cellular boundaries in a fashion that somewhat resembles EM.¹¹ While M'Saad et al.'s expansion technique was not used in combination with LSFM, it seems plausible that this will be a next step. Furthermore, in the case of lattice light-sheet microscopy (LLSM), a standard 4.5-fold expansion factor¹⁵ might be sufficient. A recently developed staining technique by Shin et al. has also shown the capacity to strongly label membranes in expanded and iteratively expanded brain tissue samples.¹⁶ This staining technique has high potential to improve the traceability of brain tissue in the context of ExM. As will be discussed subsequently, certain LSFM setups can image at sufficiently small voxel sizes that 24-fold expansion or even 4.5-fold expansion perhaps along with membrane labeling have potential to produce EM-like resolution.

What kinds of ExLSFM will be useful for imaging mammalian connectomes? LLSM has received a great deal of attention,³²⁻³⁴ but it usually suffers from extremely small field of view (FOV) and working distance limitations which may make it unsuitable for whole-brain mammalian connectomics, especially in the context of expanded samples.^{35,36} (Small FOV vastly slows imaging due to volumetric scaling). However, Wang et al. developed a promising workaround in a recent study on ExM with LLSM (ExLLSM): a photodegradable hydrogel and a UV light sheet for photochemical sectioning. In this way, large tissue volumes were rapidly reconstructed through sequential ExLLSM imaging followed by controlled photodegradation of the imaged layers, effectively extending the “working distance” of the ExLLSM. They named this method volumetric imaging of biological specimens via photochemical sectioning (VIPS). Wang et al. demonstrated the potential of their technology by imaging a mouse olfactory bulb of $9.4 \times 6.4 \times 4.3 \text{ mm}$ (258.7 mm^3) volume after 2-fold expansion in 10 days at an actual voxel size of $56 \times 56 \times 135 \text{ nm}$ ($28 \times 28 \times 67.5 \text{ nm}$ effective voxel size post-expansion). Although successful for reconstructing axons, this was insufficient for reconstruction of some dendrites and synapses. As such, we

will assume that 4.5-fold expansion³⁷ would be sufficient for full nanoscale connectome reconstruction since this reaches $12.4 \times 12.4 \times 30$ nm non-isotropic voxel size (see introduction for more details on our assumptions). With 4.5-fold expansion instead of 2-fold expansion, the same volume of 258.7 mm^3 should take about 113.9 days to image (since the volume would be about 11.39 times larger). At this imaging speed, VIPS has promise for whole-brain mammalian connectomics, particularly if the method can be improved further. Another valuable approach may come in the form of axially swept light-sheet microscopy (ASLM) (**Figure 2A-B**). In particular, Chakraborty et al. demonstrated cleared-tissue axially swept light-sheet microscopy (ctASLM), which was able to image 1 mm^3 volumes at 425 nm isotropic step size (voxel size) over the course of 17.6 minutes.³⁸ If coupled with 24-fold expansion from pan-ExM-t, this would result in effective 17.7 nm isotropic voxels and would take 13824 times longer to image (about 169 days) due to the larger volume. With an extension of the ctASLM design called signal improved ultrafast light-sheet microscopy (SIFT), Prince et al. were able to improve the imaging speed to roughly 1 mm^3 per 9.4 minutes while maintaining 425 nm voxels.³⁹ Once again, if coupled with 24-fold expansion from pan-ExM-t, this would result in effective 17.7 nm isotropic voxels and would once again take 13824 times longer to image (about 90 days) due to the volume increase. It seems that the dawn of scalable ExLSFM connectomics may arrive soon given the ongoing convergence of rapidly advancing ExM and LSFM technologies.

We should also mention a highly publicized advance wherein a recent Allen Institute effort constructed a LSFM microscope called ExA-SPIM (expansion-assisted selective plane illumination microscopy), which is specially designed to rapidly image large volumes of expanded tissue at moderate voxel sizes of at best $1000 \times 1000 \times 2500$ nm.⁴⁰ Though the ExA-SPIM is very fast due to its massive FOV and working distance and it can reach an imaging rate of 50 cm^3 per day, even 24-fold expansion would only give effective voxel size of $41.67 \times 41.67 \times 104.17$ nm. This is likely insufficient to achieve the resolution necessary for nanoscale connectomics. Because of this drawback, we will not include ExA-SPIM in our tabular comparison of ExLSFM methods for whole-brain mammalian connectomics.

Barcoding neurons by expressing unique mixtures of fluorophores or by using multi-round imaging of sequences of distinct fluorophores has been proposed as a way to mitigate the need for extremely high resolution in connectomics.^{10,41,42} Feasibility of dense connectomics through a combination of Brainbow and sequential barcode methods has been supported by computational modeling on simulated data.^{10,41} However, the literature is lacking in quantitative metrics as to how exactly much these contrast mechanisms might mitigate the need for high resolution. We suggest prioritizing further quantitative investigations into the degree that color contrast and barcodes may allow for connectomics imaging at coarser voxel size. It should also be noted that sequential barcodes multiply the acquisition time since they generally necessitate multiple rounds of imaging, though this is fortunately a linear increase rather than an exponential one. Regardless of its effect on imaging time, adding color contrast and neuronal barcodes will likely improve segmentation accuracy, particularly since existing single-color datasets are still subject to time-consuming manual proofreading steps.^{3,25}

Table 2 Comparison of parameters from key publications and preprints involving high-throughput LSFM methods as hypothetically combined with either standard 4.5-fold expansion¹⁵ or 24-fold pan-ExM-t expansion as described by M'Saad et al.'s preprint¹¹ and also possibly with the membrane stain from Shin et al.'s preprint.¹⁶

Hypothetical combined study	Wang et al. ⁴³ (2024) with 4.5-fold expansion	Chakraborty et al. ³⁸ (2019) with 24-fold expansion ¹¹	Prince et al. ³⁹ (2023) with 24-fold expansion ¹¹
Actual imaging speed per microscope (mm^3/month)	802	2536	3707

Cost per microscope	\$300,000	\$120,000	\$104,000
Effective voxel size (nm) after expansion	12.4×12.4×30	17.7×17.7×17.7	17.7×17.7×17.7
Time to image expanded mouse brain per 1 microscope	4.7 years	227 years	155 years
Time to image expanded human brain per 1 microscope	11363 years	545000 years	373000 years
Time to image expanded mouse brain with \$100M of microscopes	0.014 years with 333 microscopes	0.273 years with 833 microscopes	0.162 years with 962 microscopes
Time to image expanded human brain with \$100M of microscopes	34 years with 333 microscopes	654 years with 833 microscopes	388 years with 962 microscopes

Discussion:

Making comparisons across the landscape of connectome imaging technologies represents a difficult endeavor because distinct methods involve different technical challenges. Furthermore, some degree of extrapolation is necessary to take into account the rapid development of emerging but not yet fully tested imaging pipelines. Nonetheless, careful examination of existing and emerging technologies can yield useful insights. EM and ExLSFM have their own unique pros and cons (**Table 3**). EM benefits from a long history of technology development for connectomics applications and has a strong existing infrastructure for high-throughput connectomics pipelines. ExLSFM represents an emerging modality that has only recently been considered for connectomics, yet it has a speed advantage over EM and opens doors to using multiplexed fluorescent markers for simultaneously probing the brain's molecular information.¹⁰ Each of these technologies deserves consideration in the context of mammalian connectomics, though developing multiple imaging modalities in parallel will likely prove the best route in the end.

Imaging mammalian connectomes represents a grand challenge. Despite this, new enabling technologies are rapidly maturing. *C. elegans* and *Drosophila* connectomes have already transformed the practice of neurobiology and led to a wide variety of advances in the field. Coupled with computational modeling, mammalian connectomes could provide unprecedented insights into cognition, emotion, and brain disease. They may inform the design of AI, robotics, and brain-computer interfaces.⁴⁴ Our imaging technologies are drawing mouse connectomes closer. Mapping the human connectome remains a more distant goal, yet paradigm-shifting advances such as synchrotron x-ray microtomography methods^{45,46} and/or massive parallelization may still bring such a goal into reach sometime in the future. We anticipate that mammalian connectomes will facilitate dramatically transformative insights, improving biomedicine and maybe even helping us better understand what it means to be human.

Table 3 Overview of some advantages and some disadvantages of EM and ExLSFM.

	Advantages	Disadvantages
EM:	Well-established technology Track record for invertebrate connectomes High resolution Established membrane staining methods	Slow speed even with advances Involves lots of destructive slicing or milling steps Not easily compatible with molecular labeling MultiSEM instruments are very expensive
ExLSFM	Higher speed Compatible with molecular labeling Compatible with barcoding Less slicing needed	Less well-established technology Lack of connectomics track record Less established membrane staining methods Imperfect expansion might damage cellular features

References:

1. Motta, A., Schurr, M., Staffler, B. & Helmstaedter, M. Big data in nanoscale connectomics, and the greed for training labels. *Curr. Opin. Neurobiol.* **55**, 180–187 (2019).
2. Abbott, L. F. *et al.* The Mind of a Mouse. *Cell* **182**, 1372–1376 (2020).
3. Dorkenwald, S. *et al.* Neuronal wiring diagram of an adult brain. *bioRxiv* 2023.06.27.546656 (2023) doi:10.1101/2023.06.27.546656.
4. Takemura, S. *et al.* A Connectome of the Male *Drosophila* Ventral Nerve Cord. *bioRxiv* 2023.06.05.543757 (2023) doi:10.1101/2023.06.05.543757.
5. Marin, E. C. *et al.* Systematic annotation of a complete adult male *Drosophila* nerve cord connectome reveals principles of functional organisation. *bioRxiv* 2023.06.05.543407 (2023) doi:10.1101/2023.06.05.543407.
6. Zheng, Z. *et al.* A Complete Electron Microscopy Volume of the Brain of Adult *Drosophila melanogaster*. *Cell* **174**, 730–743.e22 (2018).
7. Cosgrove, K. P., Mazure, C. M. & Staley, J. K. Evolving Knowledge of Sex Differences in Brain Structure, Function, and Chemistry. *Biol. Psychiatry* **62**, 847–855 (2007).
8. Mikula, S. Progress Towards Mammalian Whole-Brain Cellular Connectomics. *Frontiers in Neuroanatomy* vol. 10 62 at <https://www.frontiersin.org/article/10.3389/fnana.2016.00062> (2016).
9. Yin, W. *et al.* A petascale automated imaging pipeline for mapping neuronal circuits with high-throughput transmission electron microscopy. *Nat. Commun.* **11**, 4949 (2020).
10. Yoon, Y.-G. *et al.* Feasibility of 3D Reconstruction of Neural Morphology Using Expansion Microscopy and Barcode-Guided Agglomeration. *Frontiers in Computational Neuroscience* vol. 11 at <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fncom.2017.00097> (2017).
11. M'Saad, O. *et al.* All-optical visualization of specific molecules in the ultrastructural context of brain tissue. *bioRxiv* 2022.04.04.486901 (2022) doi:10.1101/2022.04.04.486901.
12. Lillvis, J. L. *et al.* Rapid reconstruction of neural circuits using tissue expansion and light sheet microscopy. *Elife* **11**, e81248 (2022).
13. Tavakoli, M. R. *et al.* Light-microscopy based dense connectomic reconstruction of mammalian brain tissue. *bioRxiv* 2024.03.01.582884 (2024) doi:10.1101/2024.03.01.582884.
14. Lee, K. *et al.* Convolutional nets for reconstructing neural circuits from brain images acquired by serial section electron microscopy. *Curr. Opin. Neurobiol.* **55**, 188–198 (2019).
15. Asano, S. M. *et al.* Expansion Microscopy: Protocols for Imaging Proteins and RNA in Cells and Tissues. *Curr. Protoc. Cell Biol.* **80**, e56 (2018).
16. Shin, T. W. *et al.* Dense, Continuous Membrane Labeling and Expansion Microscopy Visualization of Ultrastructure in Tissues. *bioRxiv* 2024.03.07.583776 (2024) doi:10.1101/2024.03.07.583776.
17. Kovačević, N. *et al.* A Three-dimensional MRI Atlas of the Mouse Brain with Estimates of the

- Average and Variability. *Cereb. Cortex* **15**, 639–645 (2004).
18. Winding, M. *et al.* The connectome of an insect brain. *Science (80-.)*. **379**, eadd9330 (2023).
 19. Cook, S. J. *et al.* Whole-animal connectomes of both *Caenorhabditis elegans* sexes. *Nature* **571**, 63–71 (2019).
 20. Kubota, Y., Sohn, J. & Kawaguchi, Y. Large volume electron microscopy and neural microcircuit analysis. *Front. Neural Circuits* **12**, 98 (2018).
 21. Eberle, A. L. & Zeidler, D. Multi-Beam Scanning Electron Microscopy for High-Throughput Imaging in Connectomics Research. *Frontiers in Neuroanatomy* vol. 12 112 at <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnana.2018.00112> (2018).
 22. Titze, B. & Genoud, C. Volume scanning electron microscopy for imaging biological ultrastructure. *Biol. Cell* **108**, 307–323 (2016).
 23. Hayworth, K. J. *et al.* Gas cluster ion beam SEM for imaging of large tissue samples with 10 nm isotropic resolution. *Nat. Methods* (2019) doi:10.1038/s41592-019-0641-2.
 24. Peddie, C. J. *et al.* Volume electron microscopy. *Nat. Rev. Methods Prim.* **2**, 51 (2022).
 25. Shapson-Coe, A. *et al.* A connectomic study of a petascale fragment of human cerebral cortex. *bioRxiv* 2021.05.29.446289 (2021) doi:10.1101/2021.05.29.446289.
 26. Shapson-Coe, A. *et al.* A petavoxel fragment of human cerebral cortex reconstructed at nanoscale resolution. *Science (80-.)*. **384**, eadk4858 (2024).
 27. Graham, B. J. *et al.* High-throughput transmission electron microscopy with automated serial sectioning. *bioRxiv* 657346 (2019) doi:10.1101/657346.
 28. Zheng, Z. *et al.* Fast imaging of millimeter-scale areas with beam deflection transmission electron microscopy. *bioRxiv* 2022.11.23.517701 (2022) doi:10.1101/2022.11.23.517701.
 29. Stelzer, E. H. K. *et al.* Light sheet fluorescence microscopy. *Nat. Rev. Methods Prim.* **1**, 73 (2021).
 30. Truckenbrodt, S. Expansion Microscopy: Super-Resolution Imaging with Hydrogels. *Anal. Chem.* **95**, 3–32 (2023).
 31. Wen, G., Leen, V., Rohand, T., Sauer, M. & Hofkens, J. Current Progress in Expansion Microscopy: Chemical Strategies and Applications. *Chem. Rev.* **123**, 3299–3323 (2023).
 32. Chen, B. *et al.* Lattice light-sheet microscopy: Imaging molecules to embryos at high spatiotemporal resolution. *Science (80-.)*. **346**, (2014).
 33. Gao, R. *et al.* Cortical column and whole-brain imaging with molecular contrast and nanoscale resolution. *Science (80-.)*. **363**, eaau8302 (2019).
 34. Liu, T.-L. *et al.* Observing the cell in its native state: Imaging subcellular dynamics in multicellular organisms. *Science (80-.)*. **360**, (2018).
 35. Tsai, Y.-C. *et al.* Rapid high resolution 3D imaging of expanded biological specimens with lattice light sheet microscopy. *Methods* **174**, 11–19 (2020).
 36. Shi, Y., Daugird, T. A. & Legant, W. R. A quantitative analysis of various patterns applied in lattice light sheet microscopy. *Nat. Commun.* **13**, 4607 (2022).
 37. Park, H.-E. *et al.* Scalable and Isotropic Expansion of Tissues with Simply Tunable Expansion Ratio. *Adv. Sci.* **6**, 1901673 (2019).
 38. Chakraborty, T. *et al.* Light-sheet microscopy of cleared tissues with isotropic, subcellular resolution. *Nat. Methods* **16**, 1109–1113 (2019).
 39. Prince, M. N. H. *et al.* Signal Improved ultra-Fast Light-sheet Microscope (SIFT) for large tissue imaging. *bioRxiv* 2023.05.31.543002 (2023) doi:10.1101/2023.05.31.543002.
 40. Glaser, A. *et al.* Expansion-assisted selective plane illumination microscopy for nanoscale imaging of centimeter-scale tissues. *bioRxiv* 2023.06.08.544277 (2023) doi:10.1101/2023.06.08.544277.
 41. Chen, S., Loper, J., Zhou, P. & Paninski, L. Blind demixing methods for recovering dense neuronal morphology from barcode imaging data. *PLOS Comput. Biol.* **18**, e1009991 (2022).
 42. Shen, F. Y. *et al.* Light microscopy based approach for mapping connectivity with molecular specificity. *Nat. Commun.* **11**, 4632 (2020).
 43. Wang, W. *et al.* Nanoscale volumetric fluorescence imaging via photochemical sectioning. *bioRxiv* 2024.08.01.605857 (2024) doi:10.1101/2024.08.01.605857.

44. Collins, L. T. The case for emulating insect brains using anatomical “wiring diagrams” equipped with biophysical models of neuronal activity. *Biol. Cybern.* **113**, 465–474 (2019).
45. Kuan, A. T. *et al.* Dense neuronal reconstruction through X-ray holographic nano-tomography. *Nat. Neurosci.* **23**, 1637–1643 (2020).
46. Stampfl, A. P. J. *et al.* SYNAPSE: An international roadmap to large brain imaging. *Phys. Rep.* **999**, 1–60 (2023).

Supplemental information:

Comparative prospects of imaging methods for whole-brain mammalian connectomics

Logan Thrasher Collins,^{1,*} Todd Huffman, Randal Koene,²

¹Washington University in St. Louis, Department of Biomedical Engineering

²Carboncopies Foundation

*Corresponding author

Supplemental calculations:

Electron microscopy:

Yin et al. (2020)¹

Raw numbers listed in the paper:

Total acquisition time: ~6 months

Total volume: ~1 mm³

Number of microscopes running in parallel: 6

Voxel size: 4×40×40 nm

Cost per microscope: \$250000 (\$125000 for microscope plus \$125000 for modifications)

Imaging speed per microscope (mm³/month) calculation:

$1 \text{ mm}^3 / 6 \text{ months} / 6 \text{ microscopes} = 0.0278 \text{ mm}^3/\text{month}$

Time to image mouse brain per 1 microscope calculation:

$500 \text{ mm}^3 / (0.0278 \text{ mm}^3/\text{month}) = 18000 \text{ months}$

$18000/12 = 1500 \text{ years}$

Time to image human brain per 1 microscope calculation:

$1200000 \text{ mm}^3 / (0.0278 \text{ mm}^3/\text{month}) = 4.3165 \times 10^7 \text{ months}$

$(4.3165 \times 10^7)/12 = 3.5971 \times 10^6 \text{ years (rounded to 3.6M years)}$

Time to image mouse brain with \$100M of microscopes calculation:

Number of microscopes is $\$10^8/\$250000 = 400$ microscopes

$500 \text{ mm}^3 / (400 \cdot 0.0278 \text{ mm}^3/\text{month}) = 44.964 \text{ months}$

$(44.964)/12 = 3.747 \text{ years (rounded to 3.75 years)}$

Time to image human brain with \$100M of microscopes calculation:

Number of microscopes is $\$10^8 / \$250000 = 400$ microscopes
 $1200000 \text{ mm}^3 / (400 \cdot 0.0278 \text{ mm}^3/\text{month}) = 1.0791 \times 10^5$ months
 $(1.0791 \times 10^5) / 12 = 8992.8$ years (rounded to 9000 years)

Shapson-Coe et al. (2021)²

Raw numbers listed in the paper (and elsewhere as noted):

Total acquisition time: 326 days

Total volume: $\sim 1 \text{ mm}^3$

Number of microscopes running in parallel:

Voxel size: $4 \times 40 \times 33 \text{ nm}$

Cost per microscope: $\$4000000$, see table 1 of “High-throughput transmission electron microscopy with automated serial sectioning”³ for multibeam SEM prices.

Imaging speed per microscope (mm^3/month) calculation:

$326 \text{ days} / 31 = 10.5161$ months

$1 \text{ mm}^3 / 10.5161 \text{ months} / 1 \text{ microscope} = 0.0951 \text{ mm}^3/\text{month}$

Time to image mouse brain per 1 microscope calculation:

$500 \text{ mm}^3 / (0.0951 \text{ mm}^3/\text{month}) = 5257.6$ months

$5257.6 / 12 = 438.1353$ years (rounded to 438 years)

Time to image human brain per 1 microscope calculation:

$1200000 \text{ mm}^3 / (0.0951 \text{ mm}^3/\text{month}) = 1.2618 \times 10^7$ months

$(1.2618 \times 10^7) / 12 = 1.0515 \times 10^6$ years (rounded to 1.05×10^6 years)

Time to image mouse brain with \$100M of microscopes calculation:

Number of microscopes is $\$10^8 / \$4000000 = 25$ microscopes

$500 \text{ mm}^3 / (25 \cdot 0.0951 \text{ mm}^3/\text{month}) = 210.3049$ months

$(210.3049) / 12 = 17.5254$ years (rounded to 17.5 years)

Time to image human brain with \$100M of microscopes calculation:

Number of microscopes is $\$10^8 / \$4000000 = 25$ microscopes

$1200000 \text{ mm}^3 / (25 \cdot 0.0951 \text{ mm}^3/\text{month}) = 5.0473 \times 10^5$ months

$(5.0473 \times 10^5) / 12 = 42061$ years

Zheng et al. (2021)⁴

Raw numbers listed in the paper (and elsewhere as noted):

Projected acquisition time to image 1 mm^3 with 4 microscopes in parallel: 37 days (assuming 65% uptime)

Number of microscopes running in parallel: 4

Voxel size: $3.6 \times 3.6 \times 45 \text{ nm}$

Cost per microscope: $\$500000$

Imaging speed per microscope (mm^3/month) calculation:

$37 \text{ days} / 31 = 1.1935$ months for 1 mm^3

$1.1935 \text{ months}/\text{mm}^3 / 4 \text{ microscopes} = 0.2984 \text{ months}/\text{mm}^3/\text{microscope}$

(rounded to $0.3 \text{ mm}^3/\text{month}$ for 1 microscope)

Time to image mouse brain per 1 microscope calculation:

$500 \text{ mm}^3 / (0.3 \text{ mm}^3/\text{month}) = 1666.7 \text{ months}$
 $1666.7/12 = 139.6336 \text{ years (rounded to 139.6 years)}$

Time to image human brain per 1 microscope calculation:

$1200000 \text{ mm}^3 / (0.3 \text{ mm}^3/\text{month}) = 4000000 \text{ months}$
 $4000000/12 = 333333.33 \text{ years (rounded to 333333 years)}$

Time to image mouse brain with \$100M of microscopes calculation:

Number of microscopes is $\$10^8/\$500000 = 200$ microscopes
 $500 \text{ mm}^3 / (200 \cdot 0.3 \text{ mm}^3/\text{month}) = 8.333 \text{ months}$
 $(8.333)/12 = 0.6944 \text{ years (rounded to 0.69 years)}$

Time to image human brain with \$100M of microscopes calculation:

Number of microscopes is $\$10^8/\$500000 = 200$ microscopes
 $1200000 \text{ mm}^3 / (200 \cdot 0.3 \text{ mm}^3/\text{month}) = 20000 \text{ months}$
 $(20000)/12 = 1666.7 \text{ years (rounded to 1667 years)}$

Expansion light-sheet fluorescence microscopy**Wang et al. (2024)****Raw numbers listed in the paper (and elsewhere as noted):**

Number of microscopes running in parallel: 1
 Voxel size: $56 \times 56 \times 135 \text{ nm}$
 Cost per microscope: \$???
 Acquisition speed: $9.4 \times 6.4 \times 4.3 \text{ mm}$ (after 2-fold expansion) per 10 days

Effective voxel size with 7-fold expansion⁵ calculation:

$56 \times 56 \times 135 \text{ nm} / 4.5 = 12.44 \times 12.44 \times 30 \text{ nm voxels} = 4645.6 \text{ nm}^3 \text{ volume per voxel}$

Imaging speed per microscope (mm^3/month) calculation

$(9.4)(6.4)(4.3) \text{ mm}^3 / (10 \text{ days}) = 1 \cdot (25.87 \text{ mm}^3/\text{day})(31 \text{ days per month})$
 $= 801.97 \text{ mm}^3/\text{month (rounded to } 802 \text{ mm}^3/\text{month)}$

Time to image 4.5-fold expanded mouse brain per 1 microscope calculation:

$(500 \text{ mm}^3 \cdot 4.5^3) / (801.97 \text{ mm}^3/\text{month}) = 56.81 \text{ months}$
 $56.81/12 = 4.734 \text{ years (rounded to 4.7 years)}$

Time to image 4.5-fold expanded human brain per 1 microscope calculation:

$(1200000 \text{ mm}^3 \cdot 4.5^3) / (801.97 \text{ mm}^3/\text{month}) = 13635 \text{ months}$
 $(13635)/12 = 11363 \text{ years}$

Time to image 4.5-fold expanded mouse brain with \$100M of microscopes calculation:

Number of microscopes is $\$10^8/\$300000 = 333$ microscopes
 $(500 \text{ mm}^3 \cdot 4.5^3) / (333 \text{ microscopes} \cdot 801.97 \text{ mm}^3/\text{month}) = 0.171 \text{ months}$
 $0.171/12 = 0.0142 \text{ years (rounded to 0.014 years)}$

Time to image 4.5-fold expanded human brain with \$100M of microscopes calculation:

Number of microscopes is $\$10^8/\$300000 = 333$ microscopes

$(1200000 \text{ mm}^3 \cdot 4.5^3) / (333 \text{ microscopes} \cdot 801.97 \text{ mm}^3/\text{month}) = 409.46 \text{ months}$
 $409.46/12 = 34.12 \text{ years (rounded to 34 years)}$

Chakraborty et al. (2019)⁶

Raw numbers listed in the paper (and elsewhere as noted):

Number of microscopes running in parallel: 1

Voxel size: $425 \times 425 \times 425 \text{ nm}$, see passage in Chakraborty et al.'s Methods "*an isotropic step size of $0.425 \mu\text{m}$ and 18% overlap between stacks for faithful stitching*" and their Supplementary Table 6.

Cost per microscope: \$120000, see Chakraborty et al.'s Supplementary Table 5.

Acquisition speed: 17.6 minutes per mm^3 , see passage in Chakraborty et al.'s Methods "*Imaging a 1-mm^3 volume using ctASLM took 17.6 min*".

Effective voxel size with 24-fold expansion⁷ calculation:

$425 \text{ nm isotropic}/24 = 17.7 \text{ nm isotropic voxels}$

Imaging speed per microscope (mm^3/month) calculation:

$1 \text{ mm}^3/17.6 \text{ minutes} = 1 \cdot (44640 \text{ minutes per month} / 17.6)$

$= 2536.36 \text{ (rounded to } 2536 \text{ mm}^3/\text{month})$

Time to image 24-fold expanded⁷ mouse brain per 1 microscope calculation:

$(500 \text{ mm}^3 \cdot 24^3) / (2536 \text{ mm}^3/\text{month}) = 2725.6 \text{ months}$

$2725.6/12 = 227.1293 \text{ years (rounded to 227 years)}$

Time to image 24-fold expanded⁷ human brain per 1 microscope calculation:

$(1200000 \text{ mm}^3 \cdot 24^3) / (2536 \text{ mm}^3/\text{month}) = 6.5413 \times 10^6 \text{ months}$

$(6.5413 \times 10^6)/12 = 5.4511 \times 10^5 \text{ years (rounded to } 5.45 \times 10^5 \text{ years)}$

Time to image 24-fold expanded⁷ mouse brain with \$100M of microscopes calculation:

Number of microscopes is $\$10^8/\$120000 = 833 \text{ microscopes}$

$(500 \text{ mm}^3 \cdot 24^3) / (833 \text{ microscopes} \cdot 2536 \text{ mm}^3/\text{month}) = 3.272 \text{ months}$

$3.272/12 = 0.2727 \text{ years (rounded to } 0.273 \text{ years)}$

Time to image 24-fold expanded⁷ human brain with \$100M of microscopes calculation:

Number of microscopes is $\$10^8/\$120000 = 833 \text{ microscopes}$

$(1200000 \text{ mm}^3 \cdot 24^3) / (833 \text{ microscopes} \cdot 2536 \text{ mm}^3/\text{month}) = 7852.7 \text{ months}$

$7852.7/12 = 654.3942 \text{ years (rounded to } 654 \text{ years)}$

Prince et al. (2023)⁸

Raw numbers listed in the paper (and elsewhere as noted):

Number of microscopes running in parallel: 1

Voxel size: $425 \times 425 \times 425 \text{ nm}$, see passage in Prince et al.'s paper "*The axial step size is determined by the lateral pixel size at the image space. For instance, the measured magnification of SIFT in water is 15.28x, which gives a lateral image pixel size of $0.425 \mu\text{m}$* " and their Supplementary Table 3. Slightly better magnifications were possible in other immersion media, but we have chosen to use the value for water since expanded tissues are typically filled with pure water.

Cost per microscope: \$104000 as found through direct personal correspondence with the authors.

Acquisition speed: $5.5 \times 3.6 \times 3.5 \text{ mm}^3 / 13.91 \text{ hours}$, see passage in Prince et al.'s paper "*although the total pfAT of imaging $5.5 \times 4.6 \times 3.5 \text{ mm}^3$ mouse hind-paw for SIFT and traditional ASLM are 7.63 and 30.55*

hours respectively, the total imaging time for SIFT and traditional ASLM are 13.91 and 40.48 hours respectively”.

Effective voxel size with 24-fold expansion⁷ calculation:

425 nm isotropic/24 = 17.7 nm isotropic voxels

Imaging speed per microscope (mm³/month) calculation:

$(5.5)(3.6)(3.5) \text{ mm}^3 / 13.91 \text{ hours} = 69.3 \text{ mm}^3 / 13.91(60) = 0.083 \text{ mm}^3 / \text{minute}$
 $= (0.083 \text{ mm}^3)(44640 \text{ minutes per month}) = 3706.6 \text{ (rounded to } 3707 \text{ mm}^3 / \text{month)}$

Time to image 24-fold expanded⁷ mouse brain per 1 microscope calculation:

$(500 \text{ mm}^3 \cdot 24^3) / (3707 \text{ mm}^3 / \text{month}) = 1864.6 \text{ months}$
 $1864.6 / 12 = 155.3817 \text{ years (rounded to } 155 \text{ years)}$

Time to image 24-fold expanded⁷ human brain per 1 microscope calculation:

$(1200000 \text{ mm}^3 \cdot 24^3) / (3707 \text{ mm}^3 / \text{month}) = 4.475 \times 10^6 \text{ months}$
 $(4.475 \times 10^6) / 12 = 3.7292 \times 10^5 \text{ years (rounded to } 3.73 \times 10^5 \text{ years)}$

Time to image 24-fold expanded⁷ mouse brain with \$100M of microscopes calculation:

Number of microscopes is $\$10^8 / \$104000 = 962 \text{ microscopes}$
 $(500 \text{ mm}^3 \cdot 24^3) / (962 \text{ microscopes} \cdot 3707 \text{ mm}^3 / \text{month}) = 1.9382 \text{ months}$
 $1.9382 / 12 = 0.1615 \text{ years (rounded to } 0.162 \text{ years)}$

Time to image 24-fold expanded⁷ human brain with \$100M of microscopes calculation:

Number of microscopes is $\$10^8 / \$120000 = 962 \text{ microscopes}$
 $(1200000 \text{ mm}^3 \cdot 24^3) / (962 \text{ microscopes} \cdot 3707 \text{ mm}^3 / \text{month}) = 4651.8 \text{ months}$
 $4651.8 / 12 = 387.6467 \text{ years (rounded to } 388 \text{ years)}$

Supplemental references:

1. Yin, W. *et al.* A petascale automated imaging pipeline for mapping neuronal circuits with high-throughput transmission electron microscopy. *Nat. Commun.* **11**, 4949 (2020).
2. Shapson-Coe, A. *et al.* A connectomic study of a petascale fragment of human cerebral cortex. *bioRxiv* 2021.05.29.446289 (2021) doi:10.1101/2021.05.29.446289.
3. Graham, B. J. *et al.* High-throughput transmission electron microscopy with automated serial sectioning. *bioRxiv* 657346 (2019) doi:10.1101/657346.
4. Zheng, Z. *et al.* Fast imaging of millimeter-scale areas with beam deflection transmission electron microscopy. *bioRxiv* 2022.11.23.517701 (2022) doi:10.1101/2022.11.23.517701.
5. Park, H.-E. *et al.* Scalable and Isotropic Expansion of Tissues with Simply Tunable Expansion Ratio. *Adv. Sci.* **6**, 1901673 (2019).
6. Chakraborty, T. *et al.* Light-sheet microscopy of cleared tissues with isotropic, subcellular resolution. *Nat. Methods* **16**, 1109–1113 (2019).
7. M’Saad, O. *et al.* All-optical visualization of specific molecules in the ultrastructural context of brain tissue. *bioRxiv* 2022.04.04.486901 (2022) doi:10.1101/2022.04.04.486901.
8. Prince, M. N. H. *et al.* Signal Improved ultra-Fast Light-sheet Microscope (SIFT) for large tissue imaging. *bioRxiv* 2023.05.31.543002 (2023) doi:10.1101/2023.05.31.543002.