

Supplementary Fig. 1 | Compression of ELASTicized human brain tissue. A 4.5-mm-thick ELASTicized human brain cortical block showing resistance to a compression by 11 times. λ, compression strain. Scale bar, 1 cm. Experiment was repeated two times with similar results.

Supplementary Fig. 2 | Tissue size changes by ELASTicization. (**a**) Representative photos of mouse (*n* = 6 samples) and human (*n* = 4 samples) brain slices before and after ELASTicization and in two different RI-matching media. The mouse sample was perfused, fixed, and cleared using the SHIELD protocol, and the archived human sample that was long-term fixed in a formalin solution was permeabilized with an ionic detergent before ELASTicization. Surrounding hydrogels were left to help identify the sample shapes in RI-matching media. Scale bars, 5 mm. (**b**) Quantification of the tissue sizes (mean with SE; $n = 6$ samples for mouse, $n = 4$ samples for human).

Supplementary Fig. 3 | The degree of lateral expansion by compression. (**a**) A 2.5-mm-thick ELASTicized mouse brain slice was manually compressed between two glass plates. The sample was first gently compressed to 2 mm to make the sample surfaces in full contact with the plates, and then further compressed to 1 mm. Representative images from four repeated samples are shown. Scale bar, 5 mm. (**b**) A comparison of the relative surface areas between compression to 2 mm and 1 mm ($n = 4$ samples). The plot shows mean with SE.

Supplementary Fig. 4 | The cyclic compression device. (**a**) Photos of sample bags before (left) and after patterning with grooves (middle) and after heat-fusion with wings to firmly attach the bag to the device (right). (**b**) A CAD drawing of the cyclic compression device with annotations for the parts. (**c**) A photo of a complete device during its operation. A computer CPU fan was attached to the stepper motor for cooling.

Supplementary Fig. 5 | Depth-wise immunoreactivity by cyclic compression. (**a**,**b**) Representative optical cross-sections showing depth-wise staining agreement of double-GFAP stained ELASTicized human samples (repeated three times). Two anti-GFAP antibodies conjugated with either Alexa Fluor 488 (clone 2E1; 644704, BioLegend) or Alexa Fluor 594 (clone GA5; 8152, Cell Signaling Technologies) were used. Scale bars, 200 µm. (**a**) Compression-stained GFAP-488 vs. passive-stained GFAP-594. (**b**) Simultaneous passively stained GFAP-488 vs. GFAP-594 (repeated three times). (**c**) Normalized relative intensity between GFAP-488 cyclic compression staining and GFAP-594 passive staining of 1.5-mm-thick ELASTicized human tissue (*n* = 3) remained nearly constant throughout the depth of tissue (red) (average coefficient of variation = 1.66%). No statistically significant difference was found between the average normalized relative intensity agreements of the compressed samples in the treatment group and that of the passively double-stained GFAP-488 / GFAP-594 control group (blue, *n* = 3) based on a two-tailed student t test $(t = 1.34, P = 0.253)$. Both of these groups displayed statistically significantly larger relative signal intensity agreement than the agreement between randomly generated "noise" images (purple, *n* = 3) and the control group passively stained GFAP-594 images (vs. control, *t* = 27.2, ****P* = 1.09 × 10−5; vs. treatment, *t* = 21.2, ****P* = 2.95 × 10−5). Plots are means with 95% confidence intervals. (**d**) Representative optical cross-sections comparing anti-GFP compression stained signal to endogenously expressed GFP signal throughout the depth of an ELASTicized mouse tissue of 1-mm thickness (repeated three times). Scale bars, $200 \mu m$.

Supplementary Fig. 6 | A comparison of immunolabeling depths among thinning methods. The same images in **Figure 3h** for Ctrl, St, and St/Co are shown to compare with a result by cyclic compression. The same sample preparation and image acquisition settings were used for all cases. Cyclic compression was performed by manual sixfold compression with a cycling of 50-s compression and 10-s release. Experiment was repeated two times with similar results.

Supplementary Fig. 7 | Rapid immunolabeling of a whole cerebral organoid using cyclic compression. A whole ELASTicized organoid was stained with anti-vimentin antibody, anti-MAP2 antibody, and DAPI. The stained organoid was cut in half, and one cut surface was imaged to show structural integrity and full antibody penetration through the whole thickness. Experiment was not repeated. Scale bar, 200 µm.

Supplementary Fig. 8 | Images of mouse brain tissues labeled with antibodies and dyes before and after ELASTicization. Antibody and lectin catalog numbers are shown in parentheses. Experiment was repeated two times with similar results. Scale bar (adjusted to match the original tissue dimensions), $50 \mu m$.

Supplementary Table 1. Tissue sample preparation and image acquisition setting.

Supplementary Table 1. (*continued***)**

Supplementary Table 1. (*continued***)**

a Final thicknesses are presented in original dimensions before sample processing and ELASTicization. **b** All the same solutions were used for each procedure, unless otherwise noted. The solution compositions and detailed protocols are described in the first section of the Online Methods.

^c Note that a coverslip was used with the objective designed for use without coverslip. However, only the sample surfaces were imaged where aberration minimally affects imaging. Alternatively, no noticeable axial signal decay was detected based on depth-wise intensity of autofluorescence signal under a constant laser power.

^d Note that the RIs between sample and objective immersion media mismatch, in addition to the use of a coverslip (see c above). Despite such suboptimal imaging conditions, two images before and after a compression test were obtained with identical imaging settings and sample orientations, which makes any possible aberrations present similarly in both images for a fair comparison.

Supplementary Table 2. Antibody and probe compatibility with ELASTicized mouse brain.

^a Abcam (Cambridge, MA, USA).

b BioLegend (San Diego, CA, USA).

^c MilliporeSigma (Burlington, MA, USA).

^d Cell Signaling Technologies (Danvers, MA, USA).

^e EnCor Biotechnology (Gainesville, FL, USA).

^f Life Technologies (Carlsbad, CA, USA).

^g Aves Labs (Tigard, OR, USA).

h Novus Biologicals (Centennial, CO, USA).

ⁱ Vector Laboratories (Burlingame, CA, USA).

^j Compatibility with SHIELD-protected samples before ELASTicization.

^k Compatibility with SHIELD-protected samples after ELASTicization.

Supplementary Table 3. A summary of reagents used for labeling archived human brain specimens.

a Synaptic Systems (Goettingen, Germany).

b UC Davis/NIH NeuroMab Facility (Davis, CA, USA).

^c Antibody compatibility experiment with one 200-m-thick ELASTicized human section piece.

^d Double-immunolabeling of an ELASTicized 1-mm-thick human sample.

^e Antibody delivery speed experiment with one ELASTicized 1-mm-thick human sample.

^f Stretching-related deformation with two or three ELASTicized 1-mm-thick human samples.

^g Immunolabeling of one ELASTicized 5-mm-thick human sample in a blocking solution.

h Passive staining for comparisons of depth-wise immunolabeling qualities.

ⁱ Staining with cyclic compression for a comparison of depth-wise immunolabeling qualities.