

Short Communication

Open Access

## Quantum dots – a versatile tool in plant science?

Frank Müller<sup>1,2</sup>, Andreas Houben<sup>1</sup>, Peter E Barker<sup>3</sup>, Yan Xiao<sup>3</sup>, Josef A Käs<sup>2</sup> and Michael Melzer\*<sup>1</sup>

Address: <sup>1</sup>Institute of Plant Genetics and Crop Plant Research (IPK), 06466 Gatersleben, Germany, <sup>2</sup>University of Leipzig, Faculty of Physics and Geosciences, Leipzig, Germany and <sup>3</sup>National Institute of Standards and Technology, Gaithersburg, Maryland 20899, USA

Email: Frank Müller - frank.mueller@physik.uni-magdeburg.de; Andreas Houben - houben@ipk-gatersleben.de; Peter E Barker - peter.barker@nist.gov; Yan Xiao - yan.xiao@nist.gov; Josef A Käs - jkaes@physik.uni-leipzig.de; Michael Melzer\* - melzer@ipk-gatersleben.de

\* Corresponding author

Published: 15 June 2006

Received: 10 February 2006

*Journal of Nanobiotechnology* 2006, 4:5 doi:10.1186/1477-3155-4-5

Accepted: 15 June 2006

This article is available from: <http://www.jnanobiotechnology.com/content/4/1/5>

© 2006 Müller et al; licensee BioMed Central Ltd.

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/2.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

### Abstract

An optically stable, novel class of fluorophores (quantum dots) for *in situ* hybridisation analysis was tested to investigate their signal stability and intensity in plant chromosome analyses. Detection of hybridisation sites *in situ* was based on fluorescence from streptavidin-linked inorganic crystals of cadmium selenide. Comparison of quantum dots (QDs) with conventional detection systems (Alexa 488) in immunolabeling experiments demonstrated greater sensitivity than the conventional system. In contrast, detection of QDs in *in situ* hybridisation of several plant chromosomes, using several high-copy sequences, was less sensitive than Alexa 488. Thus, semiconductor nanocrystal fluorophores are more suitable for immunostaining but not for *in situ* hybridisation of plant chromosomes.

### Background

Quantum dots (QDs) have been introduced as a promising new tool in life sciences, because of their unique optical properties [1]. They are highly stable during excitation and have characteristic absorption and emission spectra [2]. The emission peak of these nanoparticles is comparatively narrow and the dots fluoresce brighter than organic fluorescent dyes. Thus particle visibility is enhanced and weaker laser intensity is required for the imaging process. QDs can be excited using different wavelengths from UV up to the emission wavelength. Hence it is possible to excite simultaneously QDs emitting at different wavelengths potentially facilitating a simpler handling of multicolor-labelled samples.

Initial attempts to synthesize semiconductor crystals resulted in QDs trapped in glass [2-4]. Later, nanoparticles

were developed that could be dispersed in various solvents and whose surface could be derivatized. After hydrophilic coating of QDs with mercaptoacetic acid, dehydroipoic acid or other reagents, nanocrystals became applicable in biology [5]. The core of the quantum dot particle is composed of a mixture of cadmium and selenide. This sphere, having a diameter of 20 to 55 Å [6], is coated with 1–2 monolayers of ZnS measuring 3,1 Å.

Proteins, antibodies, DNA or other molecules of interest can be attached to QDs allowing a wide range of applications in life sciences [7]. The complete QD-streptavidin conjugate has a diameter of 10 to 15 nm [8]. Hence quantum dots have been employed in live cell imaging [1,9], diagnostic and therapeutic purposes [10], immunohistochemistry [11] and in fluorescence *in situ* hybridisation (FISH) experiments [12,13]. However, until now there

have been no reports of applications of QDs in plant research [14,15]. In order to test whether the application of nanoparticle techniques could improve the sensitivity of *in situ* hybridisation on plant chromosomes, we conducted a range of comparative test experiments. In addition QDs were employed for immunolabelling of tissue sections.

## Materials and methods

### Material

For *in situ* hybridisation of young seedlings of *Allium fistulosum* samples were pre-treated in iced water for 24 h, fixed in ethanol-glacial acetic acid (3:1, v/v) for 2 days at 4 °C and stored at 4 °C in 70% ethanol. The ethanol/acetic acid-fixed material was prepared as described in [16]. Alternatively, root meristems were fixed for 30 min in freshly prepared 4% (w/v) formaldehyde solution containing phosphate-buffered saline (PBS, pH 7.3), washed for 45 min in PBS and digested at 37 °C for 25 min in a mixture of 2.5% pectinase, 2.5% cellulase Onozuka R-10 and 2.5% pectolyase Y-23 (w/v) dissolved in PBS prior to slide preparation.

### Fluorescence in situ hybridisation (FISH)

The generation of probes specific for the *A. fistulosum* non-coding satellite sequence [17] was performed as described by [18]. A plasmid VER17 [19] encoding part of the 18S, the 5.8S, most of the 25S and the internal transcribed spacers of *Vicia faba* 45S rRNA, was used as a rDNA-specific probe.

*In situ* hybridisation probes were labelled by nick translation with digoxigenin-11-dUTP or biotin-16-dUTP. FISH was carried out according to [20]. For combined probing of rDNA and non-coding satellite DNA, *in situ* hybridisation was performed using 20 ng of digoxigenin-labeled 45S rDNA and 20 ng of biotin-labelled satellite DNA per slide. Hybridisation sites of the digoxigenin- or biotin-labelled probes were detected using the conventional detection systems, anti-digoxigenin-rhodamine antibody, or streptavidin-Alexa 488 respectively, each at a concentration of 2 µg/ml. In parallel, hybridisation sites of the biotin-labelled probe were detected by using 20 pM QD 565 streptavidin conjugate (Quantum Dot Corporation, USA). The incubation times were 1 h for Alexa 488 and Rhodamine, each, and 2 h for QD565. Working solutions of QDs and antibodies were prepared either in 4 × SSC, 1% BSA, 0.1% Tween 20 or Borate buffer (50 mM boric acid H<sub>3</sub>BO<sub>3</sub>, pH 6.0 or 7.0). After final washing steps and dehydration, the tissues were mounted in antifade medium containing 10 µg/ml DAPI. Fluorescence signals were recorded electronically with a confocal Laser-Scanning-Microscope LSM 510 META (Carl Zeiss Jena GmbH, Jena, Germany) by using laser line 488 for Alexa 488, 543 for rhodamine and 364 for DAPI and QD 565 excitation.

Additionally a cooled CCD-camera attached to a standard fluorescence microscope (BX61, Olympus) was used. The image manipulations were performed with the program Adobe Photoshop.

### Immunolabelling of sectioned material

One mm<sup>2</sup> leaf sections of *Zea mays* were fixed for 3 h at room temperature in 50 mM cacodylate buffer (pH 7.2), containing 0.5% (v/v) glutaraldehyde and 2.0% (v/v) formaldehyde after short vacuum-infiltration. After the fixation the samples were dehydrated in stepwise fashion by adding progressively increasing concentrations of ethanol and concomitantly lowering the temperature (PLT) using an automated freeze substitution unit (AFS, Leica, Benzheim, Germany). The steps used were as follows: 30% (v/v), 40% (v/v) and 50% (v/v) ethanol for 1 h each at 4 °C; 60% (v/v) and 75% (v/v) ethanol for 1 h each at -15 °C; 90% (v/v) ethanol and two times 100% (v/v) ethanol for 1 h each at -35 °C. The samples were subsequently infiltrated with Lowycryl HM20 resin (Plano GmbH, Marburg, Germany) by incubating them in the following mixtures: 33% (v/v), 50% (v/v) and 66% (v/v) HM 20 resin in ethanol for 4 h each and then 100% (v/v) HM 20 overnight. Samples were transferred into gelatine capsules, incubated for 3 h in fresh resin and polymerized at 35 °C for 3 days under indirect UV light. 0.5 µm thick sections of the embedded plant tissue were cut with a diamond knife using an Ultramicrotome (Leica Microsystems AG, Wetzlar, Germany) and mounted on slides at 60 °C. These sections were washed for 3 × 5 minutes in PBS + 1% BSA at room temperature (RT) and blocked for 20 minutes in PBS + 3% BSA at RT. An antibody from rabbit against CF1 (catalytic portion of the chloroplast H<sup>+</sup>-ATP synthase), against chloroplasts [21], and afterwards an anti-rabbit IgG-Biotin conjugate (30 min, both diluted in PBS + 1% BSA, RT) was attached. The secondary antibody was detected with the quantum dot 565-streptavidin conjugate. Each step except blocking was followed by washing as previously described.


### Transmission electron microscopy

An aliquot of the QD 565 streptavidin conjugate at a concentration of 0.2 nM was pipetted onto a formvar-coated grid. The grids were pre-treated with poly-L-lysine to increase the binding of the particles. After one minute the grid was drained onto paper and one droplet of 4% uranyl acetate was added. After 15 s the draining procedure was repeated and the grids were air dried. Images were recorded using a Zeiss EM 902 A electron microscope (Carl-Zeiss GmbH, Oberkochen, Germany), equipped with a Megaview III CCD camera (Soft Imaging System, Münster, Germany).

## Results and discussion

To test whether the unique optical properties of QDs could be used to improve the signal intensity and stability of *in situ* hybridised probes, chromosomes were hybridised with different types of high copy sequences. Using the conventional detection system (Alexa 488, rhodamine), strong hybridisation signals of the biotin-labelled *A. fistulosum* satellite or digoxigenin-labelled 45S rDNA were detectable at the expected chromosomal sites (Fig. 1a). After confirming the suitability of the probes and of the hybridisation procedure, the same conditions were used to test the suitability of quantum dot technology for detection of *in situ* hybridised probes. Therefore, instead of detecting the biotinylated probe by streptavidin-Alexa 488 we employed a QD 565-streptavidin conjugate. However, when visualised by both types of fluorescence microscopes, QDs revealed only very weak hybridisation signals, while the anti-digoxigenin-rhodamine detected 45S rDNA control signals were always clearly visible (Fig. 1b).

To monitor the quality of the QD conjugate employed for the *in situ* hybridisation experiments, the same QDs were used for immunolabelling of leaf sections of *Zea mays* with the anti-CF1 antibody. Confocal laser scanning microscopy imaging revealed a strong and CF1-specific immunolabelling of chloroplasts (Fig. 2a). The emission spectrum peaks at 565 nm, hence demonstrating the functionality of the QDs tested for immunohistochemistry (Fig. 2b). In parallel, anti-CF1 signals were detected using an Alexa 488 streptavidin conjugate as control. To com-




**Figure 1**

(a) Somatic chromosome and nuclei of *Allium fistulosum* after DAPI staining and fluorescence *in situ* hybridization with labelled non-coding satellite sequences (green signals for Alexa 488) and 45S rDNA (red signals for rhodamine) using conventional detection systems. (b) *A. fistulosum* chromosomes after *in situ* hybridisation with the same probes. The biotinylated non-coding satellite probe was detected with QD 565 streptavidin conjugate (green signal, arrowed) yielding only very weak and few signals. In contrast, the conventional antibody detection of 45s rDNA loci (in red) resulted in a strong hybridization signal.

pare the stability of Alexa 488 and QD 565-signals, both probes were laser scanned repeatedly 100 times. Immunofluorescence of nanocrystal fluorophores was significantly brighter and more photostable (Fig. 2c) than the organic fluorophore Alexa 488, as previously demonstrated in similar applications [2].

To improve the performance of quantum dots in *in situ* hybridisation the following strategies were tested: (1) instead of fixation in an ethanol : acetic acid solution, plant material was fixed in freshly prepared 4% paraformaldehyde for 25 min; (2) to increase the accessibility of chromosomes, different pepsin treatments were used and nuclei were prepared without cytoplasm and (3) 50 mM borate buffer (at pH 6.0 or pH 7.0) was used instead of 2 × SSC. In addition, (4) the concentration of the QD working solution was increased up to ten-fold which resulted in strong background fluorescence (data not shown). (5) Hybridisation of plant chromosomes using the same conditions as those published for mammalian chromosomes using quantum dot-based detection of *in situ* hybridised probes [13] were also tried out. Although a number of different possibilities were tested, none of these changes resulted in significantly improved quantum dot-based *in situ* hybridisation signals in plants. Further, no improvement in *in situ* hybridisation site detection was obtained with a QD 605 streptavidin conjugate or by using a rabbit anti-biotin antibody detected by a QD 565 anti-Rabbit IgG conjugate (both: Quantum Dot Corporation, USA). Additionally, similar results were obtained for detection of labeled 45S rDNA on chromosomes of *Arabidopsis thaliana* and *Nicotiana tabacum* using quantum dots.

Why was the signal detection of *in situ* hybridised probes via quantum dots comparatively lower on the chromosomes of plants when the application of this technique to mammalian chromosomes was efficient? We suspect that lack of labels on chromosomes could be due to sterical hinderance of the rather large quantum dots into the more densely packed plant chromatin, compared to animal chromatin [22]. Further, the formamide treatment required for *in situ* hybridisation of chromosomes causes considerable changes in the chromatin structure [23], which could negatively influence the accessibility of chromatin. Measurement of the size of the quantum dots revealed a diameter of 15 nm per dot (Fig. 3), whereas that of Alexa 488-streptavidin is only 0.6 nm, suggesting a much greater capability to penetrate chromatin. Notably, a size dependence on the accessibility of immunoreactants in fixed chromatin was discussed for immunogold markers [24]. These results suggested that, for sterical reasons, the immunolabelling of plant chromosomes could be performed with 1.4 nm Nanogold-labelled antibodies, but not with 10 nm gold-labelled antibodies.




**Figure 2**

(a) Immunolabelled section of a resin-embedded *Zea mays* leaf using a CFI- antibody and subsequent signal detection by a combination of an anti-rabbit IgG- Biotin/quantum dot 565-streptavidin conjugate. Note the strongly labelled chloroplasts. White cross indicates position of the signal used for determination of the fluorescence spectrum. (b) The graph shows the emission wavelengths versus their intensity in arbitrary units. (c) Comparison of stability of QD 565 versus Alexa 488 signals indicates a high stability of QD-based signals. Leaf sections immunolabelled with CFI-antibody detected by QD 565-streptavidin conjugate or Alexa 488-streptavidin conjugate and laser scanned 100 times.

In summary, while quantum dot-based immunodetection is a promising new tool in plant science, it seems that problems of handling the nanocrystals occur in FISH experiments with plant chromosomes. We suggest that these large semiconductor nanocrystal fluorophores suffer from steric hinderances which preclude their use in *in situ* hybridisation to plant chromatin.

## Acknowledgements



**Figure 3**

Transmission electron micrograph of the QD 565 streptavidin conjugate after negative staining reveals a particle size of 15 nm. Further enlarged quantum dots are shown in square inset.

I would like to thank Twan Rutten for general help and Jeremy Timmis for critical reading of the manuscript. We are grateful to Bernhard Claus, Katrin Kumke and Sylvia Marschner for excellent technical assistance.

Certain commercial entities, equipment, or materials may be identified in this paper in order to describe an experimental procedure or concept adequately. Such identification is not intended to imply recommendation or endorsement by the National Institute of Standards and Technology, nor is it intended to imply that the entities, materials, or equipment are necessarily the best available for the purpose.

## References

1. Michalet X, Pinaud FF, Bentolila LA, Tsay JM, Doose S, Li JJ, Sundaresan G, Wu AM, Gambhir SS, Weiss S: **Quantum dots for live cells, in vivo imaging, and diagnostics.** *Science* 2005, **307**:538-44.
2. Jaiswal JK, Simon SM: **Potentials and pitfalls of fluorescent quantum dots for biological imaging.** *Trends Cell Biol* 2004, **14**:497-504.
3. Ekimov AI, Onuschenko AA: **Quantum Size Effect in the Optical-Spectra of Semiconductor Micro-Crystals.** *Soviet Physics Semiconductors-USSR* 1982, **16**:775-778.
4. Mattoussi H, Kuno MK, Goldman ER, Anderson GP, Mauro JM: **Colloidal Semiconductor Quantum Dot Conjugates in Biosensing.** In *Optical Biosensors: Present and Future* Edited by: Taitt CAR. Washington: Elsevier Science B; 2002.
5. Murray CB, Norris DJ, Bawendi MG: **Synthesis and Characterization of Nearly Monodisperse CdSe (E = S, Se, Te) Semiconductor Nanocrystallites.** *Journal of the American Chemical Society* 1993, **115**:8706-8715.
6. Dabbousi BO, Rodriguez-Viejo J, Mikulec FV, Heine JR, Mattoussi H, Ober R, Jensen KF, Bawendi MG: **(CdSe)ZnS core-shell quantum dots: Synthesis and characterization of a size series of highly luminescent nanocrystallites.** *Journal of Physical Chemistry B* 1997, **101**:9463-9475.
7. Goldman ER, Anderson GP, Tran PT, Mattoussi H, Charles PT, Mauro JM: **Conjugation of luminescent quantum dots with antibodies using an engineered adaptor protein to provide new reagents for fluoroimmunoassays.** *Anal Chem* 2002, **74**:841-847.
8. Watson A, Wu X, Bruchez M: **Lighting up cells with quantum dots.** *Biotechniques* 2003, **34**:302-303.

9. Jaiswal JK, Mattoussi H, Mauro JM, Simon SM: **Long-term multiple color imaging of live cells using quantum dot bioconjugates.** *Nat Biotechnol* 2003, **21**:47-51.
10. Åkerman ME, Chan WC, Laakkonen P, Bhatia SN, Ruoslahti E: **Nanocrystal targeting in vivo.** *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 2002, **99**:12617-21.
11. Ness JM, Akhtar RS, Latham CB, Roth KA: **Combined tyramide signal amplification and quantum dots for sensitive and photostable immunofluorescence detection.** *J Histochem Cytochem* 2003, **51**:981-987.
12. Pathak S, Choi SK, Arnheim N, Thompson ME: **Hydroxylated quantum dots as luminescent probes for in situ hybridization.** *Journal of the American Chemical Society* 2001, **123**:4103-4104.
13. Xiao Y, Barker PE: **Semiconductor nanocrystal probes for human metaphase chromosomes.** *Nucleic Acids Res* 2004, **32**:e28.
14. Liang RQ, Li W, Li Y, Tan CY, Li JX, Jin YX, Ruan KC: **An oligonucleotide microarray for microRNA expression analysis based on labeling RNA with quantum dot and nanogold probe.** *Nucleic Acids Res* 2005, **33**:e17.
15. Stewart CN Jr: **Monitoring the presence and expression of transgenes in living plants.** *Trends Plant Sci* 2005, **10**(8):390-396.
16. Saunders VA, Houben A: **The pericentromeric heterochromatin of the grass *Zingera biebersteiniana* (2n = 4) is composed of Zbcen1-type tandem repeats that are intermingled with accumulated dispersedly organized sequences.** *Genome* 2001, **44**:955-961.
17. Barnes SR, James AM, Jamieson G: **The organisation, nucleotide sequence, and chromosomal distribution of a satellite DNA from *Allium cepa*.** *Chromosoma* 1985, **92**:185-192.
18. Pich U, Fritsch R, Schubert I: **Closely related *Allium* species (Alliaceae) share a very similar satellite sequence.** *Plant Systematics and Evolution* 1996, **202**:255-264.
19. Yakura K, Tanifuji S: **Molecular cloning and restriction analysis of EcoRI-fragments of *Vicia faba* rDNA.** *Plant Cell Physiol* 1983, **24**:1327-1330.
20. Houben A, Field BL, Saunders V: **Microdissection and chromosome painting of plant B chromosomes.** *Methods Cell Sci* 2001, **23**:115-124.
21. Teige M, Melzer M, Suess KH: **Purification, properties and in situ localization of the amphibolic enzymes D-ribulose 5-phosphate 3-epimerase and transketolase from spinach chloroplasts.** *Eur J Biochem* 1998, **252**:237-244.
22. Greilhuber J: **Why Plant Chromosomes Do Not Show G-Bands.** *Theoretical and Applied Genetics* 1977, **50**:121-124.
23. Solovei I, Cavallo A, Schermelleh L, Jaunin F, Scasselati C, Cmarko D, Cremer C, Fakan S, Cremer T: **Spatial preservation of nuclear chromatin architecture during three-dimensional fluorescence in situ hybridization (3D-FISH).** *Experimental Cell Research* 2002, **276**:10-23.
24. Schroeder-Reiter E, Houben A, Wanner G: **Immunogold labeling of chromosomes for scanning electron microscopy: a closer look at phosphorylated histone H3 in mitotic metaphase chromosomes of *Hordeum vulgare*.** *Chromosome Res* 2003, **11**:585-96.

Publish with **BioMed Central** and every scientist can read your work free of charge

"BioMed Central will be the most significant development for disseminating the results of biomedical research in our lifetime."

Sir Paul Nurse, Cancer Research UK

Your research papers will be:

- available free of charge to the entire biomedical community
- peer reviewed and published immediately upon acceptance
- cited in PubMed and archived on PubMed Central
- yours — you keep the copyright

Submit your manuscript here:  
[http://www.biomedcentral.com/info/publishing\\_adv.asp](http://www.biomedcentral.com/info/publishing_adv.asp)

