

Supplementary Information

Table S1: Statistics corresponding to Fig. 2a.

	Mean 1	Mean 2	Mean Diff.	95.00% CI of diff.	Summary	Adjusted P Value	q	DF
10⁷ CD63 vs. 10⁷ plain	0.314	-0.282	0.596	-0.1303 to 1.323	ns	0.1417	2.213	35
10⁴ vs. 10⁷ plain	0.225	-0.282	0.507	-0.2191 to 1.234	ns	0.2625	1.884	35
10⁵ vs. 10⁷ plain	0.788	-0.282	1.070	0.3436 to 1.796	**	0.0018	3.973	35
10⁶ vs. 10⁷ plain	2.510	-0.282	2.792	2.065 to 3.518	****	<0.0001	10.37	35
10⁷ vs. 10⁷ plain	5.717	-0.282	6.000	5.273 to 6.726	****	<0.0001	22.28	35

Dunnett's multiple comparisons test
alpha = 0.05

Table S2: Statistics corresponding to Fig. 2b. All conditions included a background of 10⁸ CD63 liposomes.

	Mean 1	Mean 2	Mean Diff.	95.00% CI of diff.	Summary	Adjusted P Value	t	DF
10⁵ vs. 0	0.532	0.124	0.409	-0.6538 to 1.471	ns	>0.9999	1.195	11
10⁶ vs. 0	1.757	0.124	1.633	0.5707 to 2.696	**	0.0029	4.774	11
10⁷ vs. 0	4.781	0.124	4.658	3.595 to 5.720	****	<0.0001	13.62	11
10⁸ vs. 0	8.690	0.124	8.566	7.504 to 9.629	****	<0.0001	25.04	11
10⁸ ACE2 vs. CD63	8.690	8.353	0.337	-0.8511 to 1.525	ns	>0.9999	0.8805	11

Bonferroni's multiple comparisons test
alpha = 0.05

Table S3: Statistics corresponding to Fig. 3b.

Sample	ACE2	aVSV-G
P value	0.0051	0.0481
P value summary	**	*
One- or two-tailed P value?	Two-tailed	Two-tailed
t, df	t=4.294, df=6	t=2.475, df=6
F, DFn, Dfd	18.44, 1, 6	6.125, 1, 6
Mean of column Spike	1.208	0.8885
Mean of column VSV-G	0.03922	2.04
Difference between means (Spike - VSV-G) ± SEM	1.168 ± 0.2721	-1.152 ± 0.4654
95% confidence interval	0.5027 to 1.834	-2.291 to -0.01306

Table S4: Descriptive statistics for each pool for spike-liposome sample pooling. Positive samples or pools are highlighted in gray.

		n	Mean	Std. Dev.	S.E.M.	Lower 95% CI	Upper 95% CI
6 samples/pool	a-f	3	0.396	0.241	0.139	-0.203	0.996
	g-l	3	4.130	0.186	0.107	3.670	4.590
3 samples/pool	a, b, c	3	-0.103	0.215	0.124	-0.637	0.432
	d, e, f	3	0.312	0.218	0.126	-0.229	0.853
	g, h, i	3	4.520	0.410	0.236	3.510	5.540
	j, k, l	3	-0.146	0.499	0.288	-1.390	1.090
Individual samples	a	3	0.188	0.169	0.098	-0.233	0.608
	b	3	0.193	0.049	0.028	0.071	0.315
	c	3	-0.365	0.059	0.034	-0.510	-0.220
	d	3	0.167	0.469	0.271	-0.997	1.330
	e	3	-0.126	0.124	0.071	-0.433	0.181
	f	3	-0.431	0.084	0.048	-0.639	-0.223
	g	2	0.405	0.066	0.047	-0.189	0.999
	h	3	4.930	0.146	0.084	4.570	5.300
	i	3	-0.163	0.153	0.088	-0.542	0.217
	j	2	-0.170	0.055	0.039	-0.665	0.324
	k	3	-0.023	0.134	0.077	-0.355	0.310
	l	3	0.344	0.350	0.202	-0.525	1.210

Table S5: Descriptive statistics for each pool for Spike-pseudotyped lentivirus sample pooling. Positive samples or pools are highlighted in gray.

		n	Mean	Std. Dev.	S.E.M.	Lower 95% CI	Upper 95% CI
6 samples/pool	a-f	3	1.250	0.080	0.046	1.050	1.450
	g-l	3	0.552	0.172	0.100	0.124	0.980
3 samples/pool	a, b, c	3	2.040	0.088	0.051	1.820	2.260
	d, e, f	3	0.232	0.126	0.073	-0.082	0.546
	g, h, i	3	0.516	0.102	0.059	0.263	0.770
	j, k, l	3	0.248	0.376	0.217	-0.685	1.180
Individual samples	a	3	0.192	0.172	0.099	-0.234	0.618
	b	6	-0.047	0.868	0.354	-0.958	0.864
	c	3	3.710	0.523	0.302	2.420	5.010
	d	3	0.454	0.184	0.106	-0.003	0.910
	e	3	0.445	0.203	0.117	-0.060	0.950
	f	3	0.076	0.278	0.160	-0.613	0.765
	g	3	0.433	0.388	0.224	-0.530	1.400
	h	3	0.430	0.188	0.109	-0.037	0.898
	i	3	-0.229	0.299	0.172	-0.971	0.513
	j	3	-0.455	0.366	0.211	-1.360	0.455
	k	3	-0.269	0.246	0.142	-0.880	0.343
	l	3	0.001	0.216	0.124	-0.534	0.537

Table S6: Oligonucleotide and primer sequences. Name indicates distinct sequences, and colors indicate complementary regions that hybridize in our assay.

Name	Modification	Sequence (5'-3')	Annotation
Universal Anchor	3' Cholesterol-TEG	TGGAATTCTCGGGTGCCAAGGGAAT TC GTAACGATCCAGCTGTCACT	Detection adhesion sequence Co-anchor adhesion sequence
Universal Co-Anchor	5' Cholesterol-TEG	AGTGACAGCTGGATCGTTAC	Anchor adhesion sequence
Detection Oligo	N/A	GAATTCCTTGGCACCCGAGAATTCCA TGAAGGAAGCGGTGAGATTTCACA GTTGTCGCTGGATCCATCGGTTGTTC TTCTTGAAGTGATTACAGGCCAACCT GCTATTCAGTCAGTCAGTCAGTCAGT	Anchor adhesion sequence Detection sequence
FRK1 Forward Primer	N/A	CGGTCAGATTTCAACAGTTGTC	
FRK1 Reverse Primer	N/A	AATAGCAGGTTGGCCTGTAATC	

Table S7: Statistics corresponding to Fig. S3.

	ACE2 Beads	aCD63 Beads
Pearson r	0.9976	0.9027
95% confidence interval	0.8879 to 1.000	-0.4410 to 0.9980
R squared	0.9953	0.8148
P (two-tailed)	0.0024	0.0973
P value summary	**	ns

Fluorescence vs. Liposome Number Correlation
alpha = 0.05

Table S8: Statistics corresponding to Fig. S5.

	Mean 1	Mean 2	Mean Diff.	95.00% CI of diff.	Summary	Adjusted P Value	q	DF
0 vs. 10⁵	0.021	0.575	-0.554	-1.386 to 0.2781	ns	0.2685	1.736	25
0 vs. 10⁶	0.021	1.992	-1.971	-2.803 to -1.139	****	<0.0001	6.175	25
0 vs. 10⁷	0.021	5.063	-5.042	-5.874 to -4.210	****	<0.0001	15.8	25
0 vs. 10⁸	0.021	8.986	-8.965	-9.797 to -8.133	****	<0.0001	28.09	25

Dunnett's multiple comparisons test
alpha = 0.05




Figure S1: Nanoparticle tracking analysis measurements of three independently fabricated batches of liposomes show highly reproducible size distribution and concentration. Each colored line represents the average of five technical replicate measurements of an independent batch of liposomes. Liposomes were 125.9 ± 27.3 nm in diameter and were comparable in size to SARS-CoV-2, which are 60-140 nm in diameter⁴⁰.




Figure S2: DNA-directed patterning to verify oligonucleotide labeling of liposomes. **a** DiO liposomes labeled with cholesterol-tagged oligonucleotides bind, via hybridization, to specific regions of a glass slide where the complementary oligonucleotide has been patterned, in this case an array of $141 \mu\text{m}$ by $141 \mu\text{m}$ squares. **b** There is no evidence of nonspecific binding of unlabeled DiO liposomes to DNA patterned arrays. Scale bar = $100 \mu\text{m}$.




Figure S3: Capture of fluorescent spike-liposomes onto ACE2 beads or aCD63 beads. Mean fluorescent intensity was strongly correlated with spike-liposome number for ACE2 beads ($r^2 > 0.99$, $p = 0.002$), whereas for aCD63 beads, there was no significant correlation ($r^2 = 0.81$, $p = 0.097$). Pearson's correlation; error bars represent SEM. Dashed lines indicate least-squares five-parameter logistic curve fits ($r^2 = 0.91$ and 0.28 for ACE2 and aCD63 beads, respectively). For detailed statistical information, see Table S7.




Figure S4: qPCR signal as a function of sample volume (after sample processing). A 50x increase in sample volume results in an 8-fold (3 cycle) decrease in signal, demonstrating that our method is more sensitive to the total amount, rather than the concentration, of target nanoparticles in a sample. Semilog least-squares fit: $r^2 = 0.97$; error bars indicate SEM.




Figure S5: Detection of 1×10^6 spike-liposomes in background of 1×10^8 plain liposomes. We spiked a dilution series of spike-liposomes (1×10^5 – 1×10^8 particles) into a solution of 1×10^8 plain liposomes (20 μ L total volume), incubated the resulting solution with 500 fmol of oligonucleotide label, and captured spike-liposomes onto 1×10^6 ACE2 beads. Error bars represent SEM; ns: not significant, ****: $p < 0.0001$, one-way ANOVA with Dunnett’s multiple comparisons test, with $n = 6$ independent replicates, each with $n = 3$ technical replicates. For detailed statistical information, see Table S8.




Figure S6: qPCR signal from 1×10^7 spike-liposomes captured on ACE2 beads in a background of CD63 liposomes. dCt, the difference between a sample containing liposomes and a no-liposome control, decreases by less than one cycle with the addition of 10^8 CD63-liposomes. This decrease is monotonic with an increasing number of background liposomes. Semilog least-squares fit: $r^2 = 0.67$; error bars indicate SEM.




Figure S7: Flow cytometry analysis showing percentage of cells infected with VSV-G, Spike and Spike-VSV-G chimera pseudotyped lentivirus. Representative plots show side scatter versus ZsGreen, the fluorescent reporter found in the lentiviral backbone (FITC channel). For each virus, we selected conditions where 5-40% of the cells were infected (zsGreen⁺ cells). Under the same conditions, infection of 293T-hACE2 cells with Spike-VSV-G resulted in a higher number of infected cells (33.8%) in comparison to WT Spike (8.07% infected cells).




Figure S8: Lenti-X standard curve. This standard curve was used to calculate RNA copy number as a function of threshold cycle for spike- and VSV-G-pseudotyped lentivirus samples processed and analyzed in parallel. Semilog least-squares fit: $r^2 = 0.96$; error bars indicate SEM.




Figure S9: qPCR signal for individual samples in spike-liposome sample pooling experiment. All samples were processed, including those known to be negative based on an earlier pooling round, for confirmation. Negligible background signal was observed for all samples not containing spike liposomes (a-g, i-l). All samples contained 1×10^7 CD63 liposomes per μL . Positive samples and pools, those containing at least one sample with spike liposomes ($1 \times 10^6/\mu\text{L}$), produced a signal at least 8-fold higher than the threshold of 0.5 dC_T. n = 3 technical replicates; error bars indicate SEM.




Figure S10: qPCR signal for individual samples in Spike-pseudotyped lentivirus sample pooling experiment. All samples were processed, including those known to be negative based on an earlier pooling round, for confirmation. Negligible background signal was observed for all samples not containing spike liposomes (a,b,d-l). Negative individual samples contained $4.02 \times 10^6/\mu\text{L}$ EVs, while positive individual samples contained $4.02 \times 10^6/\mu\text{L}$ EVs and 20 pfu/ μL Spike-VSV-G-pseudotyped lentivirus. Positive samples and pools, those containing at least one sample with Spike-VSV-G lentivirus, produced a signal higher at least 1.5-fold higher than the threshold of 0.6 dC_T. n = 3 technical replicates; error bars indicate SEM.