

Single-molecule imaging of protein-surface adsorption mechanisms

Shannon Kian Zareh and Y. M. Wang

*Department of Physics, Washington University in St. Louis,
St. Louis, MO, 63130*

Controlled surface adsorption of proteins is important for making devices such as protein-based biosensors and protein microarrays; on the other hand, uncontrolled accumulation of proteins on surfaces causes protein fouling, which is usually undesirable [1]. In general, whenever proteins contact surfaces, controlling protein-surface adsorption is necessary to ensure minimal perturbation to the protein concentration and protein properties in solution. For this reason, it is necessary to identify and quantify forces responsible for protein-surface binding.

Current belief holds that protein-surface adsorption is caused by intrinsic protein-surface interaction forces that include electrostatic forces, van der Waals attraction forces, and hydration forces between protein molecules and surfaces. Extrinsic protein deposition-associated forces that occur during the initial contact between protein solution and artificial surfaces – such as deposition-induced fluid-flow forces on proteins and air-water-surface-protein interface interaction forces – are generally not thought to affect the rate of protein-surface association except by delivering proteins to surfaces for intrinsic protein-surface binding to occur [2]. A physical description of the effects of flow forces and air-water-surface-protein interface interaction forces on protein-surface adsorption is given in supporting materials I.

In order to precisely distinguish between the forces responsible for protein-surface adsorption, it is necessary to image the adsorption processes of individual proteins. Prior studies on protein-surface binding were almost all bulk ensemble measurements in which the concentration of surface-adsorbed proteins could be measured, but the various forces responsible for the measured surface adsorption could not be distinguished [3]. To address this issue, we used the Total Internal Reflection Fluorescence (TIRF) microscopy imaging method to record the interaction of single streptavidin-Cy3 molecules with hydrophobic and hydrophilic fused-silica surfaces in real time. Images of both adsorbed proteins and 3D diffusing proteins at the surfaces were captured to reveal the adsorption pathways and kinetics. If intrinsic protein-surface interaction forces are the main cause of protein-surface interaction, the surface-adsorbed proteins are in a dynamic equilibrium, and concentration of proteins on the surface should be independent of time. And for observation intervals longer than the mean dissociation time of the proteins from the surface, binding locations of the proteins should change.

Figure 1 (A) illustrates our streptavidin-Cy3 protein deposition method. Both flow forces and air-water interface forces are present and contribute to protein-surface adsorption. Since hydrophobic surfaces are known to yield higher protein-surface adsorption than hydrophilic surfaces [4], the surface in Fig. 1 (A) to (C) was treated to be hydrophobic with a $\approx 90^\circ$ water contact angle by dipping clean fused-silica chips into a 5% dichlorodimethylsilane in chloroform solution for 10 sec.

Figure 1 (B) is a superposed image of proteins adsorbed on the surface (small diffraction-limited dots of < 500 nm in size) and diffusing near the surface (large blurs of > 500 nm in size) immediately after deposition (red) and one hour after deposition (green). There is no Cy3 bleaching in Figure 1 (B), due to oxygen scavenging [5]. The orange dots are superpositions of green and red proteins and represent adsorbed proteins immediately after deposition that don't dissociate from the surface even after hours and thus are irreversibly adsorbed. These irreversibly adsorbed proteins do not dissociate and thus do not change bound location with time, contrary to what is expected for adsorption induced by intrinsic protein-surface forces. Could there be strong localized binding sites on the surface that cause the irreversible binding? The concentration of irreversibly bound proteins increases with protein concentration up to complete coverage, indicating that all portions of the surface can bind proteins irreversibly. However, regardless of the initial protein concentration, the irreversibly bound proteins concentration on the surface is independent of time, contrary to what would be expected if strong binding sites induced irreversible binding. Thus, the irreversible adsorption of these proteins must be caused by forces associated with the initial deposition process.

The single-colored small dots in Fig. 1 (B) are proteins that adsorbed on the surface for a mean time of ≈ 200 ms only (6 imaging frames of 30 ms each), as shown in the montage in Fig. 1 (C). The mean number of these proteins in Fig. 1 (B) is two (2 red dots and 2 green dots), and the bound locations changed with time. These observations are consistent with reversible adsorptions caused by intrinsic protein-surface interaction forces. The larger patches of blurs are 3D diffusing proteins close to the surface and not bound to the surface. Proof that these blurs are 3D diffusing molecules is provided in supporting materials II.

Of all the proteins in image (Fig. 1 B), 32 molecules are orange, irreversibly adsorbed, by deposition-associated forces; 2 are green or red, reversibly adsorbed, by intrinsic protein-surface interaction forces; and ≈ 30 are red or green 3D diffusing proteins that are not adsorbed to the surface at the time of the exposure. These results show that the main cause of protein-surface adsorption is extrinsic forces associated with the protein-deposition process, which account for $32/(32+2=34) \approx 94\%$ of the total surface-adsorbed proteins at all times. The intrinsic protein-surface interaction forces are responsible for only $2/34 \approx 6\%$ of the total adsorption. The majority of 3D diffusing proteins to surfaces do not bind to the surface: only $\approx 2/(30/\text{frame} \times 6 \text{ frames} = 180) \approx 1\%$ proteins that encounter the surface reversibly bind to it.

The above results show that even for the most “sticky” hydrophobic surface, the dominating forces in protein-surface adsorption are not intrinsic protein-surface binding




Figure 1: (A) Schematic of our protein deposition method. Five microliters of nanomolar streptavidin-Cy3 molecules (dots) in 0.5 X TBE solution were deposited onto a fused-silica surface by pipette. A coverslip flattened the droplet for imaging. (B) Superposed TIRF image of the fused-silica surface immediately after deposition (red) and one hour after deposition (green). The overlapped red and green dots (orange) are the irreversibly adsorbed molecules caused by extrinsic deposition-associated forces (orange solid arrows). The single colored red and green molecules (solid green and red arrows) are reversibly adsorbed molecules caused by intrinsic protein-surface interactions forces. The large green and red blurs are 3D diffusing molecules near the surface that were not adsorbed (dashed red and green arrows). Exposure time is 5 ms. (C) Montage of a reversibly bound molecule diffusing towards, binding to, and dissociating from the surface imaged with 33 Hz imaging rate and 28 ms exposure time. The large blurs in images 2 and 8 of the montage are the incoming and outgoing molecule, respectively. The dissociation time of this molecule is 5 frames \approx 140 ms. (D) 3D diffusing proteins to a hydrophilic surface. Note that there are no adsorbed proteins on the surface. Exposure time is 28 ms. Scale bar for all images is 1 μ m.

forces. For hydrophilic surfaces that are believed to be less “sticky” to proteins, how does protein-surface adsorption change? The fused-silica chip was processed to render it hydrophilic in oxygen plasma for 2 minutes. We observed complete elimination of streptavidin-surface adsorption on hydrophilic fused-silica surfaces (Fig. 1 D), where only 3D diffusion proteins were present near the surface. This result indicates the potential of hydrophilic surfaces to prevent protein-surface fouling.

Our results, which show that a protein deposition process is responsible for almost all surface-protein adsorption, indicate that protein deposition forces must be taken into consideration in the interpretation of protein-surface adsorption studies. Therefore prevention of undesired protein fouling and protein-surface adsorption in fluidic devices depends on control of the deposition process, rather than regulation of the protein-surface intrinsic interaction potential. The observation that surface-adsorption of proteins can be avoided with hydrophilic surfaces has important implications for prevention of protein fouling.

Supporting material:

I. The effect of protein-deposition forces on protein-surface adsorption. The two proposed protein-deposition associated forces are (a) flow force and (b) air-water-surface interface force.

(a) Flow force: A typical flow rate for the pipette-deposition of proteins in Fig. 1 (A) is $v \approx 0.02$ m/s, which results in flow force on the protein of diameter $a = 5$ nm of $F_{\text{flow}} = 6\pi\eta av = 2$ pN [6], where $\eta = 10^{-3}$ Pa·s is water viscosity. For simplicity we assume that the flow is laminar, and proteins flow at the same speed as the fluid until they run into the surface. After encountering the surface, the flow component towards the surface exerts force on the proteins and further pushes them closer to the surface. This force adds extra energy to proteins on top of thermal energy to overcome energy barriers between the proteins and the surfaces for binding. The flow force energy can be estimated to be flow force multiplied by a reasonable protein traveling distance of 1 nm towards the surface after contact: $E_{\text{flow}} = F_{\text{flow}} \times 1\text{nm} \approx 0.01$ eV (1.6×10^{-21} J), which is on the same order of magnitude as thermal energy at room temperature of 0.025 eV (4×10^{-21} J).

(b) Air-water-surface interface force: Proteins can accumulate on water surfaces at the air-water interface before deposition [7]. When these water-surface proteins encounter the fused-silica surface, the interaction between the proteins and the fused-silica surface is modified by the air-water interface effect and thus should have different interaction energy from that with water effect after the deposition.

Additional single molecule studies can identify which of the above deposition forces above contributes more to the deposition force-induced protein-surface adsorption.

II. Proof that the large blurs are 3D diffusing proteins in solution. In order to verify that the large blurs in Fig. 1 (B), (C), and (D) are 3D diffusing molecules, the intensity profiles of the blurs are fit to Gaussian functions to obtain the standard deviation (SD) as a measure of the spread of the diffusing molecules. If the molecules are 3D diffusing molecules, then the SD should increase with exposure time. The penetration depth of TIRF evanescent light is a few hundred nanometers, so for this study we chose short exposure times such that proteins do not diffuse beyond the penetration depth for complete capture of the 3D diffusing molecules during exposure. With the calculation of $\langle x^2 \rangle = 2D_3t$, where $\langle x^2 \rangle$ is the mean square displacement of 3D diffusing molecules, $D_3 \approx 10^8$ nm²/s is the 3D diffusion

coefficient for streptavidin with 5 nm diameter, and t is the exposure time, then the appropriate exposure time t should be in the sub-millisecond range such that $\langle x^2 \rangle$ is less than the TIRF evanescent light imaging distance of a few hundred nanometers.

Figure 2 (A), (B), and (C) show representative 3D diffusing molecules with increasing exposure times of 0.3 ms, 0.7 ms, and 1 ms, respectively. It is obvious that the size of the molecule increases with exposure time. Figure 2 (D) shows the SD distribution of the molecules' intensity profiles, and the mean SD values increase with exposure time. This observation proves that the observed molecules are indeed 3D diffusing streptavidin-Cy3 molecules at the surface.

References

- [1] A. L. Zydney, C.-C. Ho, *Biotechnology and Bioengineering* 83, 537 (2003).
- [2] T. M. Squires, R. J. Messinger, S. R. Manalis, *Nature Biotechnology* 26, 417 (2008).
- [3] T. S. Tsapikouni, Y. F. Missirlis, *Materials Science and Engineering B* 152, 2 (2008).
- [4] J. N. Israelachvili, *Intermolecular and surface forces* (Academic Press, 1992), second edn.
- [5] A. Yildiz, *et al.*, *Science* 300, 2061 (2003).
- [6] H. C. Berg, *Random walks in Biology* (Princeton University Press, 1993).
- [7] Y. Deng, Y. Y. Zhu, T. Kienlen, A. Guo, *Journal of the American Chemical Society Communications* 128, 2768 (2006).




Figure 2: Images of representative single 3D diffusing molecules with exposure times of (A) 0.3 ms, (B) 0.7 ms, and (C) 1 ms. The spread of the molecules increases with exposure time and the SD values are 135 nm (A), 180 nm (B), and 204 nm (C), respectively. (D) SD distribution of Gaussian fit to the 3D diffusing molecules' intensity profiles for exposure times of 0.3 ms (red), 0.7 ms (blue), and 1 ms (yellow). The SD values are 139.5 ± 3.6 nm (mean \pm standard error of the mean), 173.3 ± 4.2 nm, and 194.5 ± 5.2 nm, respectively. The mean of the SD distribution increases with exposure time, indicating that the observed molecules indeed are 3D diffusing molecules. Scale bar, 1 μ m.