

Which Raman spectroscopy methods scale for high-throughput biology?

We're applying Raman spectroscopy to high-throughput biology, and we've found that realizing its potential is difficult in practice. We want feedback — positive, negative, and inconclusive — from people who've used these techniques.

Published Jul 7, 2026



Arcadia Science

DOI: 10.57844/arcadia-pcd5-kbze

Purpose

On paper, Raman spectroscopy is close to ideal for biology. Raman provides information about a sample's chemical composition while offering properties that make its application to biology easy: label-free, information-rich, easy sample prep, minimally damaging, and can be used with water-containing samples. All of this suggests that Raman should be widely used in high-throughput biological data acquisition.

In practice, there's a gap between its potential and its use. We've run into a set of common challenges: fluorescence can bury the weak Raman signal, biological spectra are broad and overlapping, excitation light can damage what we're measuring, and keeping cells alive and comparable across runs is difficult.

We're now assessing how to overcome these issues by improving our hardware, experimental design, and data processing. There are known strategies to mitigate each of these problems, but it's unclear which ones are most impactful and practicable. We're seeking feedback from people with hands-on experience overcoming the limitations of Raman spectroscopy to help us prioritize our next steps.

Motivation

We've spent the past two years developing spontaneous and coherent Raman spectroscopy for biological research at Arcadia. Our interest is in label-free, sensitive techniques with low sample preparation complexity that we can use for applications like high-throughput phenotyping. We built and applied a low-cost, open-source spontaneous Raman spectrometer [1] [2], automated it for throughput [3], and benchmarked commercial instruments and excitation wavelengths for phenotyping algae [4] [5]. We've detected chemical perturbation of protein structures [6], imaged single live yeast cells and their mutants with stimulated Raman (SRS) and coherent anti-Stokes Raman (CARS) [7] [8], shown that run-to-run batch effects can dominate strain-level signal [9], built a model to predict and simulate spectra [10], and outlined where Raman might speed up therapeutic discovery [11]. Throughout this work, we've encountered the familiar challenges of Raman spectroscopy in biology.

As we move from exploration to application of this technology, we're now deciding how to refine our hardware, experimental design, and processing methods. This pub lays out the challenges we find most limiting, summarizes the approaches we've seen proposed in the literature to address each one, with our current read on their pros and cons, and asks for input from people who've actually built or applied these techniques. We also know that some of the real answers to our questions may be "it depends" on the sample and the question of interest. We'd still like to know how others at this intersection are thinking about the same issues, what factors into their decisions, and what works and doesn't work for specific problems.

Challenges applying Raman to biological questions

Five problems account for most of the difficulty we've encountered applying Raman to biology, and the literature documents them as well [12]. Some are intrinsic to Raman; others come specifically from working with living or biological material.

Fluorescence

Endogenous fluorophores emit broadly and efficiently, often orders of magnitude more strongly than the Raman signal, so their background can swamp the sharp Raman bands. NAD(P)H, flavins, and porphyrins contribute in many cells, and in photosynthetic cells, chlorophyll dominates the background under visible excitation [12]. We've compared different excitation wavelengths on *Chlamydomonas reinhardtii* at 473, 532, and 785 nm, and observed that the visible lines drove a sample fluorescence background, while at 785 nm the glass substrate contributed its own [5].

Open questions

- If you've tried shifted excitation Raman difference spectroscopy (SERDS), did you notice issues with motion between frames, or artifacts in the difference spectra?
- If you've tried time-gated Raman, did you find it effective for biological samples, and did you have any issues with synchronizing the laser excitation source and detector? Was it difficult to source the specialized components and did they have reliable performance?

Weak scattering

Only about one in 10^7 incident photons scatters inelastically, so spontaneous Raman can yield weak signals [13]. Signal-to-noise improves with integration time and laser power, but only as the square root of the photons collected (shot-noise limit), and a living sample tolerates only so much of either, so the achievable signal-to-noise is bounded. We've tested surface-enhanced Raman scattering (SERS) [11] and drop coating deposition Raman (DCDR) to an extent to mitigate these issues.

Open questions

- If you've worked with SERS, how do you ensure reproducibility across substrates and measurements? Do you have a reliable supplier for substrates/nanoparticles (NPs) or do you make them

in-house? What kinds of NPs, substrates, and functionalization strategies are best suited for looking at cell metabolites?

- If you've worked with coherent Raman (CRS), do you use a commercial or a homebuilt system, and how reliable is it? What types of biological questions and samples do you find CRS is uniquely useful for?

Chemical complexity and band overlap

Cells and tissue are chemically heterogeneous and largely amorphous rather than ordered or crystalline, so their bands are often broad and overlapping; unmixing and assignment can be difficult [12]. Sharp, well-separated reference spectra tend to come from high-purity, well-ordered standards, which are well represented in the literature and spectral databases but don't always resemble what we measure in living samples. Also, Raman also doesn't report chemical composition evenly: band intensities follow scattering cross-sections, and when excitation overlaps an electronic transition, resonance enhancement can raise a few modes by orders of magnitude. Label-free doesn't mean unbiased, so we care as much about what a spectrum doesn't show as about the peaks it does.

Open questions

- If you use vibrational tags, how specific do you need them to be? Do you have broad and narrow tags that you can use for semi-untargeted spectroscopy? Do you have concerns about them altering native behaviors or structures of your target biology?
- If you look at living cells in particular, which sample preparations give the best-resolved peaks?

Sample alteration

The excitation light that produces the signal can also heat, bleach, or photochemically alter the sample. Shorter, higher-energy wavelengths tend to do the most damage, though longer near-infrared wavelengths might also alter the sample, especially by heating.

Open questions

- If you've used quantum-enhanced SRS, did you find the signal increase worth it, given the specialized hardware requirements? What does your system look like? Do you acquire full-spectrum data, or only at specific wavenumbers?
- We typically see the formation of G bands from amorphous or graphitic carbon after clear damage has occurred, but what are the key early markers for sample alteration in biological samples?

Constrained and variable measurement conditions

Keeping cells alive and physiologically intact over a long acquisition, or reaching tissue below the surface, tends to conflict with the geometry and dose that yield the best signal. Run-to-run batch effects, especially due to environment fluctuations or specific setups, can also dominate the biological differences we're trying to measure [9]. We've developed methods to assess the prevalence of batch effects and are carefully characterizing our instruments and experimental setups day to day using calibration standards.

Open questions

- If you've used spatially offset Raman (SORS), have you tried it with typical substrates for biological samples (e.g., Petri dishes, multiwell plates)? Did it work?
- If you've tried using optical tweezers with Raman, what was your aim in your study, and how long does a complete acquisition take for a single sample versus enough replicates for robust conclusions?

Mitigation strategies

There are multiple proposed solutions to some of the issues we outlined above. We group them below by the problem they address, established and emerging methods together ([Table 1](#)). While we've already used some of these, our specific

implementations could be improved or modified. Others on this list we've read about more than we've run, and that's where outside experience would help us most; we've found no clear consensus in literature.

Challenge	Mitigation strategy	Benefits	Potential issues
Fluorescence	Longer-wavelength excitation (785, 830, 1064 nm)*	Excites away from most electronic transitions, reducing fluorescence	Loss of Raman signal (ν^4 dependence); lower detector sensitivity in the NIR
	UV Raman [†]	Excites away from most electronic transitions and adds resonance enhancement for proteins and nucleic acids	Photodamage; specialized UV optics; narrow set of targets
	SERDS (shifted-excitation difference) [†]	Differencing two closely spaced excitations removes the background, which doesn't shift with excitation	Two sequential acquisitions; sensitive to motion or bleaching between frames
	Time-gated Raman [†]	Fast gate collects fast Raman and rejects nanosecond-lifetime fluorescence	Needs costly specialized pulsed lasers and time-resolved detectors; the short gate also rejects some of the Raman signal, so acquisitions are longer
Weak scattering	SERS*, and its tip-enhanced	Plasmonic enhancement	Substrate and hot-spot reproducibility;

Challenge	Mitigation strategy	Benefits	Potential issues
	variant (TERS)	greatly increases sensitivity, down to single molecules at best ; TERS adds nanoscale spatial resolution	quantification and assignment challenges; difficulty delivering nanostructures to the target
	Resonance Raman*	Exciting into an electronic absorption strongly enhances specific chromophores such as carotenoids and hemes	Only resonant species are enhanced; needs matched excitation; can drive bleaching and excite fluorescence
	Coherent Raman (CARS, SRS)*	Coherent driving amplifies signal by orders of magnitude over spontaneous Raman, enabling fast, label-free imaging	Non-resonant background (CARS) ; few commercial systems, so often homebuilt and finicky to align temporally and spatially; high peak power easily burns or photodamages samples
	Stimulated Raman photothermal (SRP)	Reads the photothermal effect of the SRS process rather than intensity	Early-stage; adds a probe beam and its detection

Challenge	Mitigation strategy	Benefits	Potential issues
		loss, boosting modulation depth significantly	
Chemical complexity and band overlap	Silent region tags [†]	Places a sharp, specific band in the silent region, which can be used to tag molecules and track metabolism	Needs a small vibrational label, so no longer strictly label-free
Sample alteration	Quantum-enhanced SRS (squeezed light)	Lowers the noise floor below the shot-noise limit, so the same signal-to-noise is reached at lower laser power, with less photodamage	Specialized hardware, modest signal improvement, needs optimization across spectrum
Constrained and variable measurement conditions	SORS (spatially offset Raman) [†]	Collecting light offset from the illumination point preferentially samples layers beneath the surface (e.g., container)	Works on powders, tablets; less ideal for many cell preps
	Optical-tweezers Raman	Holds single cells/particles in physiological suspension for measurement,	One cell at a time; trapping setup

Challenge	Mitigation strategy	Benefits	Potential issues
		avoiding substrate and holder background	

Table 1. **Overview of challenges with Raman spectroscopy, mitigation strategies, and their possible benefits and issues.**

* = strategies that we have implemented or explored, but would still value feedback on

† = strategies we're especially interested in trying in the near future

Other directions we're watching address the challenges above: compressive and single-pixel Raman, spatial heterodyne Raman, and waveguide-enhanced (on-chip) Raman for speed and compactness; transmission Raman for bulk samples; and deep-learning denoising and fluorescence removal. We're also already applying Raman in parallel with other imaging or spectroscopy methods (e.g., fluorescence-lifetime imaging microscopy, FLIM, and brightfield) to provide complementary or confirmatory information, and with other sample processing steps (e.g., liquid chromatography-mass spectrometry, LC-MS).

What we're optimizing for

We're building toward discovery at scale, and this shapes which solutions are practical for us. We realize Raman spectroscopy is somewhat of a generalist chemistry tool in a field that often prioritizes specialist instruments; we believe its strengths and the high-dimensional chemical information it yields make it uniquely useful for high-throughput biology.

We include this section on our company's unique considerations so readers understand why certain solutions might work in some cases, but not for us. We hope the following goals can add context and help guide any feedback you leave on this pub.

Reproducibility at scale

We care about results that hold up across samples, days, and operators, not a single demonstration. For hardware, an unstable, homebuilt rig that only its builder can run is hard to scale, and we weigh robustness and reproducibility heavily, sometimes more than peak performance. In terms of processing, many methods are used in literature and analysis software (e.g., for baseline fitting, denoising, smoothing, normalization, peak finding, signal-to-noise quantification, etc.), but few people consider how robust their results are. In both cases, people often report what worked (in their hands) for a specific experiment; we're interested in what works consistently, robustly, and across implementations.

Untargeted discovery

Much of our work is label-free phenotyping meant to surface novel phenotypes. Methods that rely on strong prior knowledge or targeted labels reintroduce the problem of deciding in advance what you'll see, the same constraint tagging imposes. We lean heavily on machine learning, which readily latches onto batch structure instead of biology, so reproducibility across runs is critical.

Throughput

Scaling to many samples means experimental design and strategy are paramount. Ideally, we want to routinely acquire data on hundreds or thousands of samples, so we're looking for ways to streamline sample prep and acquisition while maintaining signal.

Substrates

The substrates and containers typically used in biological research are often poor for Raman. Polystyrene plates and glass-bottom multiwells add their own bands and background signal, so we often use mirror-finish stainless steel plates instead. All-quartz or CaF_2 substrates are ideal optically but expensive at scale, and we'd rather not replate everything for every measurement, so the practical question is if and where the workable middle ground exists.

Cost and openness

Our open-science mandate pushes us toward approaches that others can afford and reproduce. The less a method depends on costly hardware, the more useful it

is to the people who might build on our work.

Weigh in!

We're aiming to scale this technique and are deciding how to do so. If you've worked with any of these strategies, especially on a biological or biochemical investigation, we'd value your perspective. Please comment on this pub with your experience, including positive, negative, and inconclusive results. Point us to work we've missed, and tell us where our understanding is off. You can comment on specific questions in-line above, or overall at the bottom of this page.

Pub preparation

We used Grammarly Enterprise to help match Arcadia's style. We also used Claude (Opus 4.8) to help copy-edit draft text to match Arcadia's style, to help clarify and streamline text that we wrote, and to get feedback on how we could better tailor our draft to serve our audience and goals.

Contributors (A–Z)

- **Megan L. Hochstrasser:** Editing
- **James Kraemer:** Supervision
- **David G. Mets:** Critical feedback
- **Sunanda Sharma:** Conceptualization, Writing

References

1. Navas-Moreno M, Chan JW. (2018). Laser Tweezers Raman Microspectroscopy of Single Cells and Biological Particles. http://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4939-7680-5_13
2. Avasthi P, Bigge BM, Braverman B, Essock-Burns T, Lane R, Mets DG, Patton AH, York R. (2024). Raman spectroscopy enables rapid and inexpensive exploration of biology. <https://doi.org/10.57844/arcadia-085e-3ecf>

3. Braverman B, Mets DG, Sharma S. (2025). DIY Raman spectroscopy for biological research. <https://doi.org/10.57844/arcadia-cd7e-443b>
4. Braverman B, Kolb I, Mets DG, Sharma S. (2025). AutoOpenRaman: Low-cost, automated Raman spectroscopy. <https://doi.org/10.57844/arcadia-7vbd-n3ry>
5. Essock-Burns T, Kolb I, Lane R, Mets DG, Sharma S. (2025). Comparison of spontaneous Raman spectrometers. <https://doi.org/10.57844/arcadia-b670-4291>
6. Mets D, Sharma S. (2026). Multi-wavelength Raman mapping of unicellular algae. <https://doi.org/10.57844/arcadia-qcgh-g28u>
7. Bulow C, Futia R, Kolb I, Mavrici D, Mets D, Sharma S. (2026). Spontaneous Raman spectroscopy detects chemical perturbation of protein structure. <https://doi.org/10.57844/arcadia-f4fe-ep62>
8. Bulow C, Essock-Burns T, Sharma S. (2026). Coherent Raman imaging of live, unfixed *Schizosaccharomyces pombe* and mutants *dea2* and *pdf1*. <https://doi.org/10.57844/arcadia-xemg-d6wv>
9. Bulow C, Essock-Burns T, Sharma S. (2026). Coherent Raman imaging of live, unfixed *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* and mutants *aah1Δ* and *rad6Δ*. <https://doi.org/10.57844/arcadia-mxf9-th4q>
10. Cheveralls K, Kolb I, Mets D. (2026). Leave-one-batch-out cross-validation reveals strong batch effects in Raman spectroscopy of yeast cultures. <https://doi.org/10.57844/arcadia-xdmk-yq0w>
11. Golden J, Khorana R. (2026). SpectraLoRA: A graph neural network to predict simulated and experimental Raman spectra. <https://doi.org/10.57844/arcadia-kn60-kxsk>
12. Chou S, Kolb I, Mets D, Sharma S. (2026). Raman spectroscopy may assist natural therapeutic discovery. <https://doi.org/10.57844/arcadia-2mmy-8h28>
13. Butler HJ, Ashton L, Bird B, Cinque G, Curtis K, Dorney J, Esmonde-White K, Fullwood NJ, Gardner B, Martin-Hirsch PL, Walsh MJ, McAinsh MR, Stone N, Martin FL. (2016). Using Raman spectroscopy to characterize biological materials. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nprot.2016.036>
14. McCreery RL. (2000). Raman Spectroscopy for Chemical Analysis. <https://doi.org/10.1002/0471721646>
15. Westley C, Fisk H, Xu Y, Hollywood KA, Carnell AJ, Micklefield J, Turner NJ, Goodacre R. (2017). Real Time Monitoring of Enzyme Catalysed Reactions using Deep UV Resonance Raman Spectroscopy. <https://doi.org/10.1002/chem.201701388>

16. Shreve AP, Cherepy NJ, Mathies RA. (1992). Effective Rejection of Fluorescence Interference in Raman Spectroscopy Using a Shifted Excitation Difference Technique.
<https://doi.org/10.1366/0003702924125122>
17. Kögler M, Heilala B. (2020). Time-gated Raman spectroscopy – a review.
<https://doi.org/10.1088/1361-6501/abb044>
18. Han XX, Rodriguez RS, Haynes CL, Ozaki Y, Zhao B. (2022). Surface-enhanced Raman spectroscopy. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s43586-021-00083-6>
19. Kurouski D. (2017). Advances of tip-enhanced Raman spectroscopy (TERS) in electrochemistry, biochemistry, and surface science.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vibspec.2016.06.004>
20. Pérez-Jiménez AI, Lyu D, Lu Z, Liu G, Ren B. (2020). Surface-enhanced Raman spectroscopy: benefits, trade-offs and future developments.
<https://doi.org/10.1039/d0sc00809e>
21. Llansola-Portoles MJ, Pascal AA, Robert B. (2022). Resonance Raman: A powerful tool to interrogate carotenoids in biological matrices.
<http://doi.org/10.1016/bs.mie.2022.03.068>
22. Bartkowiak A, Szczesny-Malysiak E, Dybas J. (2025). Tracking heme biology with resonance Raman spectroscopy.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bbapap.2025.141065>
23. Freudiger CW, Min W, Saar BG, Lu S, Holtom GR, He C, Tsai JC, Kang JX, Xie XS. (2008). Label-Free Biomedical Imaging with High Sensitivity by Stimulated Raman Scattering Microscopy.
<https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1165758>
24. Evans CL, Xie XS. (2008). Coherent Anti-Stokes Raman Scattering Microscopy: Chemical Imaging for Biology and Medicine.
<https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.anchem.1.031207.112754>
25. Brzozowski K, Korona W, Nowakowska A, Borek-Dorosz A, Pieczara A, Orzechowska B, Wislocka-Orlowska A, Schmitt M, Popp J, Baranska M. (2024). Coherent Raman spectroscopy: Quo vadis?.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vibspec.2024.103684>
26. Zhu Y, Ge X, Ni H, Yin J, Lin H, Wang L, Tan Y, Prabhu Dessai CV, Li Y, Teng X, Cheng J. (2023). Stimulated Raman photothermal microscopy toward ultrasensitive chemical imaging. <https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.adi2181>
27. Kuzmin AN, Pliss A, Lim C, Heo J, Kim S, Rzhetskii A, Gu B, Yong K, Wen S, Prasad PN. (2016). Resonance Raman Probes for Organelle-Specific Labeling in Live Cells. <https://doi.org/10.1038/srep28483>

28. Casacio CA, Madsen LS, Terrasson A, Waleed M, Barnscheidt K, Hage B, Taylor MA, Bowen WP. (2021). Quantum-enhanced nonlinear microscopy. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-021-03528-w>
29. Terrasson A, Mauranyapin NP, Casacio CA, Grim JQ, Barnscheidt K, Hage B, Taylor MA, Bowen WP. (2024). Fast biological imaging with quantum-enhanced Raman microscopy. <https://doi.org/10.1364/oe.523956>
30. Nicolson F, Kircher MF, Stone N, Matousek P. (2021). Spatially offset Raman spectroscopy for biomedical applications. <https://doi.org/10.1039/d0cs00855a>