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Figure S1. Different sizes of AuNPs that were characterized by TEM (the first column), UV-Vis spectroscopy (the second column), and DLS analysis (the third column). (A) 2 nm; (B) 8 nm; (C) 13 nm; (D) 30 nm; and (E) 60 nm.
**Figure S2.** Absorbance at 650 nm ($A_{650}$) of different sized AuNPs (ranging from 2 nm to 60 nm) in the presence of TMB (0.1 mg/mL) and H$_2$O$_2$ (0.25 M). The Au amount for each size of AuNPs was identified to be 2 µg. Error bars represent three parallel samples.

**Figure S3.** Absorbance at 650 nm ($A_{650}$) of the catalytic reaction stimulated by AuNPs (2 nm) under varied Au amounts (0.1, 0.25, and 0.5 µg) in the presence of different concentrations of H$_2$O$_2$ (from 100 to 500 mM) and TMB (0.1 mg/mL). The mixtures were incubated for 10 min at 37 °C before collecting the absorbance under a microplate reader.
Figure S4. Absorbance at 650 nm ($A_{650}$) of the catalytic reaction stimulated by AuNPs (2 nm) under varied Au amounts (ranging from 0.1 to 2 µg) in the presence of H$_2$O$_2$ (0.5 M) and TMB (0.1 mg/mL). The mixtures were incubated for 10 min at 37 °C before collecting the absorbance under a microplate reader. Error bars represent three parallel samples.

Figure S5. (A) Size distribution and concentration of native Exos were measured by nanoparticle tracking analysis (NTA). (B) A representative photograph of Exos observed using NTA.
Figure S6. A TEM image of Exo@Au synthesized without DSPE-PEG-SH engineering.

Figure S7. Zeta potential analysis of these vesicles, including native Exos, Exo-DSPE, and Exo@Au. Each group was performed with three parallel samples.
Figure S8. UV-Vis absorption spectra of Exo@Au produced from varied concentrations of HAuCl₄ (0.05, 0.1, 0.2, 0.5, and 1 mM) and NaBH₄ (250 µM). Inset: corresponding colored picture of the Exo@Au. From left to right: 0.05, 0.1, 0.2, 0.5, and 1 mM.

Figure S9. UV-Vis absorption spectra of Exo@Au produced from varied concentrations of Exos (0.01, 0.02, 0.05, 0.1, and 0.2 mg/mL), HAuCl₄ (1 mM) and NaBH₄ (250 µM).
**Figure S10.** Absorbance at 650 nm ($A_{650}$) of the resultant Exo@Au nanozyme (prepared with different HAuCl$_4$ concentrations: 0.05, 0.1, 0.2, 0.5, and 1 mM) in the presence of TMB (0.1 mg/mL) and H$_2$O$_2$ (0.5 M). Each group was performed with three parallel samples.

**Figure S11.** A kinetic study to measure the catalytic property of Exo@Au and AuNPs at 37 °C for 35 min. The both groups were added with the same Au amount (2 μg).
Table S1. Linear curves were fitted from a kinetic study of Exo@Au with varied concentrations.

| Exo@Au (Au content: µg) | Linear fitting equation          | $R^2$ |
|-------------------------|----------------------------------|-------|
| 0.25                    | $Y = 0.00253 X + 0.0706$         | 0.996 |
| 0.5                     | $Y = 0.00478 X + 0.113$          | 0.999 |
| 1                       | $Y = 0.00958 X + 0.185$          | 0.997 |
| 1.5                     | $Y = 0.0147 X + 0.294$           | 0.997 |
| 2                       | $Y = 0.0225 X + 0.522$           | 0.992 |
| 2.5                     | $Y = 0.0284 X + 0.786$           | 0.988 |

Figure S12. The absorbance at 650 nm of Exo@Au-catalytic products collected at 25 min, resulting in a linear pattern ranging from 0.5 to 2.5 µg. Each group was performed with three parallel samples.
Figure S13. A kinetic study of the catalytic reaction of Exo@Au (Au: 2.5 µg) with different concentrations of TMB (0, 0.0104, 0.0208, 0.0416, 0.0832, 0.1248, 0.1664, 0.2080 mM) in NaAc-CA buffer (pH = 5.5) at 37 °C. The curves were fitted with Michaelis-Menten equation. Error bars indicated the mean standard deviation of four parallel samples for each case (n = 4).

Figure S14. The catalytic performance of Exo@Au (Au content: 1 µg) was measured at varied time points for 4 days. Each group was performed with three parallel samples.
Figure S15. Protein levels of CD63 on HepG2 Exos with different concentrations by NAISA. Error bars indicated the mean standard deviation of three parallel samples for each case (n = 3).

Figure S16. Protein levels of (A) CD63, (B) CEA, (C) GPC-3, and (D) PD-L1 on HepG2 Exos were fitted as concentration-response curves, resulting in a good linear pattern. Error bars indicated the mean standard deviation of three parallel samples for each case (n = 3).
Figure S17. Statistical analysis of AuNP numbers on each Exo for specific protein markers in the immuno-gold assays. A mixture of Exos and pure AuNPs served as a control. Error bars represent the mean standard deviation of multiple Exos (n = 10) for each case.

Figure S18. Representative TEM micrographs of (A) LO2 Exos, (B) MCF-7 Exos, and (C) HeLa Exos.
### Table S2. Basic information of the healthy donors and hepatitis B patients.

| Healthy Characteristic | Gender | Age | Hepatitis B Characteristic | Gender | Age |
|------------------------|--------|-----|---------------------------|--------|-----|
| Donor 1                | Male   | 31  | Patient 1                | Male   | 47  |
| Donor 2                | Female | 51  | Patient 2                | Female | 33  |
| Donor 3                | Male   | 29  | Patient 3                | Male   | 50  |
| Donor 4                | Male   | 27  | Patient 4                | Male   | 31  |
| Donor 5                | Female | 30  | Patient 5                | Female | 29  |
| Donor 6                | Male   | 41  | Patient 6                | Male   | 53  |
|                        |        |     | Patient 7                | Male   | 29  |
|                        |        |     | Patient 8                | Male   | 65  |
|                        |        |     | Patient 9                | Female | 24  |
|                        |        |     | Patient 10               | Female | 28  |
|                        |        |     | Patient 11               | Male   | 36  |
|                        |        |     | Patient 12               | Female | 28  |

### Table S3. Basic information of the HCC patients that had been diagnosed clinically.

| HCC Characteristic | Gender | Age | Stage I | Stage II | Stage III | Stage IV |
|--------------------|--------|-----|---------|----------|-----------|----------|
| Patient 1          | Female | 36  | ✓       |          |           |          |
| Patient 2          | Male   | 53  |         | ✓        |           |          |
| Patient 3          | Male   | 35  |         | ✓        |           |          |
| Patient 4          | Female | 42  |         |          | ✓         |          |
| Patient 5          | Male   | 61  |         |          | ✓         |          |
| Patient 6          | Female | 63  |         |          |           | ✓        |
| Patient 7          | Female | 54  |         |          |           | ✓        |
| Patient 8          | Male   | 42  |         |          | ✓         |          |
| Patient 9          | Male   | 31  |         |          | ✓         |          |
| Patient 10         | Female | 35  |         |          | ✓         |          |
| Patient 11         | Female | 40  |         |          | ✓         |          |
| Patient 12         | Female | 37  |         |          | ✓         |          |
Figure S19. Profiling of CD63 and HER2 in clinical serum samples collected from healthy donors (n = 6), patients with hepatitis B (n = 12), and patients with HCC (n = 12). (i) CD63 and (ii) HER2 profiling were performed using (A) NAISA and (B) ELISA. Heat maps of protein profiles for each sample respectively obtained using (A) NAISA and (B) ELISA. *P < 0.05, ns = no significant difference.

Figure S20. PCA for discrimination of different serum samples by (A) NAISA and (B) ELISA.
### Table S4. Comparison of the existing methods for exosomal protein detection.

| Methods                  | Interaction         | Specificity | Target signal | Linearity range | Reproducibility | Reference |
|--------------------------|---------------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------|
| Aptamer/AuNP biosensor   | Protein-aptamer binding | Good        | Absorbance    | 0-12.8 (μg/mL)  | Good            | 15        |
| ELISA                    | Protein-antibody binding | Good        | Absorbance    | 10⁶-10⁸ (Particles/mL) | Good            | 18        |
| Nano-plasmonic sensor    | Protein-antibody binding | Good        | Transmission spectra | 10⁴-10⁶ (Particles/mL) | Medium          | 18        |
| Microfluidic system      | Protein-antibody binding | Good        | Fluorescence signal | —               | Poor            | 19        |
| NIR luminescent nanosensor | Protein-aptamer binding | Good        | Near-infrared afterglow | —               | Medium          | 22        |
| SERS spectra             | Protein-antibody binding | Good        | Scattering signals | 10⁶-10⁸ (Particles/mL) | Medium          | 25        |
| NAISA                    | Protein-antibody binding | Good        | Absorbance    | 13.75-220 (μg/mL) | Good            | Our method |

