Precision analysis for standard deviation measurements of single fluorescent molecule images

Michael C. DeSantis,¹ Shawn H. DeCenzo,¹ Je-Luen Li,² and Y. M. Wang^{1,*}

¹Department of Physics, Washington University, St. Louis MO 63130, USA

²D. E. Shaw Research, New York, NY 10036, USA

(Dated: February 8, 2022)

Standard deviation measurements of single immobile or mobile fluorescent molecules can provide localization and dynamic information about the molecule that is inaccessible by conventional centroid measurements. By deconvolving the intensity profile of the molecule using standard deviation analysis, the axial position of a stationary molecule and the dynamics of a mobile molecule can be obtained. We call this method of deconvolving snapshots of single fluorescent particles the Single-Molecule Image Deconvolution (SMID) method. Here we report a study on the precision of SMID measurements. We have obtained an analytical expression for the error associated with standard deviation measurements of immobile single fluorophores imaged using an EMCCD camera. This standard deviation error is a function of the total number of detected photons, the background photon noise, and the camera pixel size, and it closely correlates with results of experimental measurements, simulations, and numerical integrations. Using this expression, we show that single-molecule standard deviation analysis offers nanometer precision and is on average 1.25 times more precise than centroid analysis under comparable imaging conditions. Standard deviation error of single defocused or mobile fluorescent molecules can be derived using the methodology presented here.

PACS numbers: 87.64.-t, 87.80.-y, 95.75.Mn, 02.60.-x

Keywords: image deconvolution, single-molecule fluorescence imaging, SMID, localization, particle tracking, standard deviation error

I. INTRODUCTION

Single-molecule fluorescence imaging has been a powerful tool in particle localization and tracking studies [1, 2, 3, 4]. In single-molecule imaging, the fluorescence intensity profile of an immobile point light source is called a point spread function (PSF, Fig. 1A). The main method to localize and track a single fluorescent molecule has been to fit the 2D fluorescence intensity profile of the particle to a Gaussian function; the centroid of the fit was the location of the particle in the imaging plane at the time of imaging. This method has been successfully applied to an array of localization and tracking measurements, where the movement of a particle in the typical milliseconds imaging timescales was slow enough to yield a "non-blurred" intensity profile that closely resembled the PSF of an immobile single fluorophore. If the motions during the exposure were larger, the image would have become more blurred, thus rendering centroid tracking difficult.

A Gaussian fit to the PSF of a single fluorophore has two fitting parameters: centroid and standard deviation (SD). The centroid and the SD are considered to be the center and the width of the PSF (Fig. 1B), respectively. In contrast to the centroid which has been extensively used for 1D and 2D localization studies, PSF SD measurements have played little role in single-molecule tracking studies other than in verifying the resolving power of the imaging setups and in data selection (PSFs with larger than diffraction-limited SDs have frequently been discarded). However, the SD of a point light source can carry additional localization and dynamic information about the particle that is inaccessible by centroid measurements: (1) for a stationary molecule, the axial location (distance away from the focal plane) of the particle can be obtained only from SD measurements [5, 6, 7]; (2)for a moving particle, regardless of exposure time, the captured image will contain additional blurring. Even when the motion is sufficiently slow during the exposure such that the intensity profile of the captured image can still be approximated by a Gaussian, the SD will nonetheless offer information about the dynamics of the particle during the exposure, while centroid values will provide only the mean position of the particle. In one recent study, SD measurements of a moving LacI-GFP in E. coli have been reported [8]; however, for both immobile and mobile single molecules, correct interpretation of the SD values requires further theoretical and experimental studies. We intend to develop an algorithm to obtain the depth information of a stationary defocused particle and the trajectory of a moving molecule by deconvolving and measuring the SD of a blurred image. We call this method Single-Molecule Image Deconvolution (SMID).

In order to achieve the full potential of SMID in biological applications, quantifying its precision by assessing the PSF SD measurement error under various experimental conditions is an important first step. The first case to study is an immobile fluorescent molecule imaged at focus. Error analysis of centroid measurements of immobile molecules has been thoroughly investigated

^{*}ymwang@wustl.edu

and applied to many systems [1, 9]. As with centroid measurements, the precision of SD measurements is affected by the experimental settings of a finite number of photons per PSF N, the standard deviation of the background noise b, and the camera's finite pixel size a. We report here an analytical expression for the PSF SD measurement error as a function of these parameters. Our SD measurements have achieved nanometer resolution, which is approximately 1.25 times higher than the precision of centroid measurements under comparable experimental conditions. This expression for the SD error will help achieve particle localization in the axial direction and discriminate sub-exposure time molecular mechanisms (each exhibiting different SD distributions) with confidence.

II. THEORY

A. Formulating SD measurement error, Δs , by χ^2 minimization

The term "standard deviation" was introduced by Pearson in his 1894 mathematical study of evolution [10] and characterized further in the following years [11]. For different collections of size N of randomly selected data from a common distribution with a theoretical standard deviation s_0 , the error associated with the SD measurement of each collection is $\sqrt{s_0/2N}$, as first calculated by Pearl in 1908 [12]. The same expression was derived more recently by Taylor using a different method [13]. In this article, we derive the SD error for a PSF, which is a collection of photons from a common distribution emitted by a point light source. We include the additional experimental effects of photon count fluctuation per PSF, background noise, and camera pixelation in our study.

We utilized the method developed by Bobroff [14] and subsequently used for centroid error analysis by Thompson, Larson, and Webb [1] to derive the error associated with SD measurements of single fluorophores. The approach uses Chi-square statistics to estimate the error associated with fitting of experimental data to expected theoretical values. In order to maintain consistency in notation for single-molecule tracking studies, we will retain the same notations used in Ref. [1]. Below, we derive the analytical solution to the PSF SD error as a function of N, a, and b beginning with one dimension and extending to two dimensions.

In 1D least squares fitting of the intensity profile of an immobile single fluorophore, $\chi^2(s)$ is proportional to the sum of squared errors between the observed photon count at pixel *i*, y_i , and the expected photon count $N_i(x, s)$, of a PSF. Here *x* and *s* are the measured position and SD of the PSF, respectively, while x_0 and s_0 are the true location and the theoretical SD of the molecule:

$$\chi^2(s) = \sum_i \frac{(y_i - N_i)^2}{\sigma_{i,photon}^2},\tag{1}$$

where $\sigma_{i,photon}$ is the expected photon count uncertainty at pixel *i* without accounting for photon-to-camera count conversion (described in the following section). In this article, we emphasize the SD error and assume that the location measurement errors are negligible, i.e. $x = x_0$ (Appendix B shows that the codependence of localization and SD errors vanishes). For simplicity, $N_i(x_0, s)$ is denoted as N_i in this article unless otherwise specified.

There are two sources for $\sigma_{i,photon}$ at pixel *i*: one is the Poisson-distributed photon shot noise of the PSF where the variance is the mean expected photon count of the pixel, $\langle N_i \rangle$, and the other is the SD of the background noise, *b*, expressed in photons. The variances of the two sources add to yield

$$\sigma_{i,photon}^2 = \langle N_i \rangle + b^2.$$
⁽²⁾

The deviation of s from s_0 , $\Delta s = s - s_0$, is obtained by setting $d\chi^2(s)/ds$ to 0, expanding N_i about s_0 , and keeping the first order term in Δs :

$$\Delta s = -\frac{\sum_{i} \frac{\Delta y_{i} N_{i}'}{\sigma_{i,photon}^{2}} \left(1 - \frac{\Delta y_{i}}{\sigma_{i,photon}^{2}}\right)}{\sum_{i} \frac{N_{i}'^{2}}{\sigma_{i,photon}^{2}} \left(1 - \frac{2\Delta y_{i}}{\sigma_{i,photon}^{2}}\right)}$$
(3)

$$\approx -\frac{\sum_{i} \frac{\Delta y_{i} N'_{i}}{\sigma_{i,photon}^{2}}}{\sum_{i} \frac{N'_{i}}{\sigma_{i,photon}^{2}}},$$
(4)

where N'_i is the derivative of N_i with respect to s evaluated at s_0 , and $\Delta y_i = N_i(x_0, s_0) - y_i$. By squaring Eq. (4) we obtain the mean squared value of Δs ,

$$\langle (\Delta s)^2 \rangle = \frac{1}{\sum_i (N_i'^2 / \sigma_{i,photon}^2)}.$$
 (5)

The root mean square of Δs , Δs_{rms} , is the PSF SD error that we calculate in this article. Appendix A shows the detailed derivation of Eq. (5) from $d\chi^2(s)/ds = 0$.

B. Modifying $\sigma_{i,photon}$ to include camera count conversion effects

When an EMCCD (Electron Multiplying Charge Coupled Device) camera is used in imaging single fluorescent molecules, the detected pixel reading is in camera counts. In converting from camera counts to photon counts, an additional variance in $\sigma_{i,photon}$ appears. Below we derive the uncertainty in photon counts, σ_i , to use in place of $\sigma_{i,photon}$ in Eq. (5) for experiments where EMCCD camera count conversions are involved.

An EMCCD camera amplifies the detected photons by converting each photon to a distribution of photoelectrons through many multiplication stages. At the final stage, one photon yields a distribution of camera counts (equivalent to the last stage photoelectron counts) with a distribution function $f(n^*)$ [15],

$$f(n^*) = \frac{1}{M} e^{-n^*/M},$$
 (6)

where n^* is the camera counts in the distribution and M is the photon multiplication factor of the camera. Here we use * to denote camera counts in order to differentiate from photon counts. The n^* distribution has a mean of M and a variance of M^2 .

At pixel *i*, the PSF photon count distribution is described by a Poisson distribution with the variance being equal to the mean. Each photon at the pixel contributes two terms to the pixel's camera count variance: the mean photon shot noise variance M^2 (variance of a single photon multiplied by the square of the multiplication factor), and the photon-to-camera count conversion variance M^2 . The total camera count variance contributed by one photon is $2M^2$; therefore, a mean of $\langle N_i \rangle$ photons yields a camera count variance of $2\langle N_i \rangle M^2$. This variance agrees with the expression in Ref. [16] where the variance in camera counts $\sigma^2_{out,camera}$ is related to the variance in photon counts $\sigma^2_{in,photon}$ by an excess noise factor F^2 ,

$$F^2 = \frac{1}{M^2} \frac{\sigma_{out,camera}^2}{\sigma_{in,photon}^2} \approx 2 \tag{7}$$

for EMCCD cameras with a large number of multiplication stages.

Background fluorescence from buffer, diffusing molecules, and electronic pixel readout noise also contribute to the total photon count at pixel *i*. Counts generated by these sources define the background noise. This variance in camera counts is the sum of the background count variance b^2M^2 , and the variance introduced by the average number of background photons, $\langle bg \rangle$, each with a variance of M^2 : $(b^2 + \langle bg \rangle)M^2$.

Summing the PSF and the background contributions, the total camera count variance at pixel i is

$$\sigma_i^{*2} = 2\langle N_i \rangle M^2 + (b^2 + \langle bg \rangle) M^2.$$
(8)

When expressed in photon counts,

$$\sigma_i^2 = \sigma_i^{*2} / M^2 = 2 \langle N_i \rangle + b^2 + \langle bg \rangle.$$
(9)

Revising Eq. (5) with the modified σ_i we have

$$\langle (\Delta s)^2 \rangle = \frac{1}{\sum_i (N_i'^2 / \sigma_i^2)}.$$
 (10)

C. Expressing Δs in photon counts

To evaluate Eq. (10) in 1D, we use a normalized Gaussian distribution

$$N_i = \frac{Na}{\sqrt{2\pi}s} e^{-(ia)^2/2s^2},$$
 (11)

where we set the location of the PSF to be at $x_0 = 0$ for simplicity and without loss in generality. We approximate the pixel summation in Eq. (10) by an integral going from negative to positive infinity, and we estimate $\langle (\Delta s)^2 \rangle$ at the two extrema of σ_i^2 : the high photon count regime where $b^2 + \langle bg \rangle$ can be neglected, and the high background noise regime where $\langle N_i \rangle$ can be neglected. In the high photon count regime,

$$\langle (\Delta s)^2 \rangle = \frac{s_0^2}{N},\tag{12}$$

and in the high background noise regime,

$$\langle (\Delta s)^2 \rangle = \frac{8\sqrt{\pi}s_0{}^3(b^2 + \langle bg \rangle)}{3aN^2}.$$
 (13)

An alternative derivation of Eq. (12) is presented in Ref. [13], although the photon-to-camera count conversion variance was not included and thus $\langle (\Delta s)^2 \rangle = s_0^2/2N$. The total 1D $\langle (\Delta s)^2 \rangle$ is the sum of Eqs. (12) and (13) (without the pixelation effect discussed below)

$$\langle (\Delta s)^2 \rangle = \frac{s_0^2}{N} + \frac{8\sqrt{\pi}s_0^3(b^2 + \langle bg \rangle)}{3aN^2}.$$
 (14)

We now calculate the effect of camera pixelation on $\langle (\Delta s)^2 \rangle$. Each photon in a PSF is associated with two variances with respect to the centroid. One is the mean variance of the PSF, s_0^2 , and the other is due to the fact that each photon is further binned into a pixel that has an intensity profile described by a uniform distribution with a width corresponding to the pixel size a. The variance of this distribution is $a^2/12$. Thus, the total variance of a photon due to pixelation is the sum of the two,

$$s_0^{\dagger 2} = s_0^2 + \frac{a^2}{12}.$$
 (15)

Under experimental conditions, the measured s should be $\sqrt{s_0^2 + a^2/12}$ and for theoretical formulations, the expected SD of a PSF should include the pixelation effect. We have verified that $s_0^{\dagger 2}$ increases with a according to Eq. (15) by simulation. For the remainder of this article, the measured PSF SD values are denoted as s_i rather than s_i^{\dagger} unless otherwise noted. Plugging Eq. (15) into Eq. (14) we have for 1D

$$\langle (\Delta s)^2 \rangle = \frac{s_0^2 + \frac{a^2}{12}}{N} + \frac{8\sqrt{\pi}(s_0^2 + \frac{a^2}{12})^{3/2}(b^2 + \langle bg \rangle)}{3aN^2}.$$
 (16)

Extending the 1D $\langle (\Delta s)^2 \rangle$ calculation to 2D where s_i represents the SD in either the x or y direction of the imaging plane, and s_{0x} and s_{0y} are the theoretical SD values in the x and y directions, respectively,

$$\langle (\Delta s_i)^2 \rangle = \frac{s_0^2 + \frac{a^2}{12}}{N} + \frac{16\pi (s_{0x}^2 + \frac{a^2}{12})^{3/2} (s_{0y}^2 + \frac{a^2}{12})^{1/2} (b^2 + \langle bg \rangle)}{3a^2 N^2},$$
(17)

where i denotes x. The derivation of Eq. (17) is provided in Appendix C.

A more accurate estimation of $\langle (\Delta s_i)^2 \rangle$ can be obtained by numerically integrating Eq. (10), incorporating the transition region between the high photon count and the high background noise regimes. The numerical integration results are shown in Fig. 2 to be consistently higher than the analytical calculation results by $\approx 15\%$.

III. METHODS

A. Experimental setup

Single-molecule imaging was performed using a Nikon *Eclipse* TE2000-S inverted microscope (Nikon, Melville, NY) attached to an iXon back-illuminated EMCCD camera (DV897ECS-BV, Andor Technology, Belfast, Northern Ireland). Prism-type Total Internal Reflection Fluorescence (TIRF) microscopy was used to excite the fluorophores with a linearly polarized 532 nm laser line (I70C-SPECTRUM Argon/Krypton laser, Coherent Inc., Santa Clara, CA) focused to a 40 $\mu m \times 20 \mu m$ region on fused-silica surfaces (Hoya Corporation USA, San Jose, CA). The incident angle at the fused-silica water interface was 64° with respect to the normal. The laser was pulsed with illumination intervals between 1 ms and 500 ms and excitation intensity between 0.3 kW/cm^2 and 2.6kW/cm². By combining laser power and pulsing interval variations we obtained 50 to 3000 photons per PSF. A Nikon 100X TIRF objective (Nikon, 1.45 NA, oil immersion) was used in combination with a 2X expansion lens. giving a pixel size of 79 nm.

At focus, the PSF image generated by a point light source with a mean emission wavelength of 580 nm and symmetric polarization has a full width at half-maximum (FWHM) of $\approx \lambda/2$ NA = 580 nm/2.9 ≈ 200 nm and theoretical $s_0 =$ FWHM/2.35 ≈ 85 nm. Including the pixelation effect [Eq. (15)], the measured PSF SD s_i^{\dagger} , for our imaging setup should be 88 nm. Due to random fluctuations in the emission polarization direction of streptavidin-Cy3 molecules attached to surfaces [17] and variations in focus between each measurement, we observed a range of s_i^{\dagger} values from 90 nm to 140 nm.

Single streptavidin-Cy3 molecules (SA1010, Invitrogen, Carlsbad, CA; 530/10 excitation, 580/60 emission) were immobilized on fused-silica surfaces by depositing 6 μ l of 0.04 nM streptavidin-Cy3 powder dissolved in 0.5X TBE buffer (45 mM Tris, 45 mM Boric Acid, 1 mM EDTA, pH 7.0). A coverslip flattened the droplet and its edges were sealed with nail polish. The fusedsilica chips were cleaned using oxygen plasma before use. We inspected for possible surface fluorescence contaminations by imaging the TBE buffer alone; no impurities were found on either the fused-silica surface or in the buffer. The immobilization of the adsorbed molecules was verified by centroid vs time measurements.

B. Data acquisition and selection

Typical movies were obtained by synchronizing the onset of camera exposure with laser illumination for different intervals. For the initial step, streptavidin-Cy3 monomers were first selected in IMAGEJ (NIH, Bethesda, MD) by examining the fluorescence time traces of the molecules for a single bleaching step [18]. For a selected monomer, the intensity values for 25×25 pixels centered at the molecule were recorded. The center 15×15 pixels of the PSF were used for 2D Gaussian fitting with peripheral pixels used for background analysis.

The intensity values of the selected molecules were first converted to photon counts (see the following section) and then fitted to the following 2D Gaussian function using a least squares curve fitting algorithm (lsqcurvefit) provided by MATLAB (The Mathworks, Natick, MA):

$$f(x,y) = f_0 \exp\left(-\frac{(x-x_0)^2}{2s_x^2} - \frac{(y-y_0)^2}{2s_y^2}\right) + \langle bg\rangle, \ (18)$$

where f_0 was the amplitude and $\langle bg \rangle$ was the mean background value. A background pixel's total count is the sum of the floor, electronic readout noise, and background fluorescence counts. For the $\langle bg \rangle$ in this article, the floor value, determined by the lowest background pixel value, has already been subtracted. With this fitting, the PSF's SD values in both the x and y directions, its measured location (x_0, y_0) , and the image's mean background value were obtained.

The selected streptavidin-Cy3 monomers were further characterized to satisfy the following conditions used for SD error analysis. (1) No stage drift was detected in centroid vs time measurements. (2) A minimum of 75 valid PSF images, each with a photon count N that fluctuated less than 20% from the mean $\langle N \rangle$, of the monomer. (3) PSFs with signal-to-noise ratios $(I_0/\sqrt{I_0 + b^2})$ larger than 2.5, where I_0 is the peak PSF photon count (total photon count minus $\langle bg \rangle$) and b^2 is the background variance in photons. (4) Mean $\langle s_x \rangle$ and $\langle s_y \rangle$ obtained by Gaussian fitting of the s_x and s_y distributions of all valid images did not differ by more than 10 nm, or $\pm 5\%$ of the mean SD value to minimize polarization effects of Cy3. (5) The mean SD values $\langle s_i \rangle$ were between 95 nm and 135 nm to minimize defocusing effects.

C. Photon gain calibration

To convert from a pixel's camera count to photons, the camera count value was divided by M. In order to obtain M for each experimental setting, the center nine pixel values of the PSF were evaluated if the molecule's average signal-to-noise ratio was greater than 3. Conversely, when the signal-to-noise ratio was less than 3, only the center pixel was used for calculation as the adjacent pixels contained too few photons for statistically accurate calculations. According to Eq. (9),

$$M = (\sigma_{N_i}^* - b^{*2})/2(\langle N_i^* \rangle - \langle bg^* \rangle), \qquad (19)$$

where $\langle N_i^* \rangle$ and $\sigma_{N_i}^*$ are the Gaussian fitted mean and standard deviation of the measured camera count distribution of pixel *i*, respectively. Here $\langle N_i^* \rangle$ is the mean camera count that includes background fluorescence and electronic noise counts. For each image, the average *M* for all nine center pixels of the PSF (or just the center pixel for PSFs with low signal-to-noise ratios) was obtained. Then, the average *M* values for all fitted PSFs in a movie were again averaged to obtain the camera's multiplication factor for this movie.

In order to verify that our method of calculating M is correct, we have simulated PSFs with low and high N, including background photon noise and confirmed that N_i follows a Poisson distribution which approaches a Gaussian at high N with variance $\langle N_i \rangle + b^2$. Including the photon-to-camera count conversion variance [Eq. (6)] in the simulation, we verified Eq. (19).

D. PSF and background simulations

Single-fluorescent-molecule PSFs were generated using the Gaussian random number generator in MATLAB. The s_{0i} of each simulated PSF was determined by the experimental means $\langle s_i \rangle$, for the simulated results in Fig. 2. The observed fluctuation in the number of photons Nwas incorporated. The generated photons of each PSF were binned into 15×15 pixels with a pixel size of 79 nm. Random background photons at each pixel were generated using the corresponding experimental background distribution function. Although the exact experimental background distributions were used for the simulations, the numerical integrations and analytical calculations were computed using the theoretical variance and the mean of all background counts, b^2 and $\langle bg \rangle$, respectively, rather than their fitted values. The background counts are primarily drawn from two types of distributions: a full Gaussian with a high mean or a truncated Gaussian with a low mean (Fig. 1C), depending on the background fluorescence level of each specific experiment. The final simulated PSFs with background noise were fitted to a 2D Gaussian [Eq. (18)] to obtain the centroid and SD values of the PSF.

For each simulated $\Delta s_{i,rms}$ data point, 1000 iterations



FIG. 1: (A) Representative images with increasing N of 151, 393, and 1891 photons of single streptavidin-Cy3 molecules. It is evident that the "blurriness" of the molecules decreases with increasing N. (B) 1D intensity profiles (circles) of the molecules in (A) and their Gaussian fits (lines). The respective 1D SD values are 195.4 nm, 140.5 nm, and 110.9 nm, and the respective deviations of the 2D SD values of the images from their means are 10.3 nm, 7.2 nm, and 2.7 nm. As expected, these deviations from the mean decrease with increasing N. The scale bar is 500 nm. (C) Background count distributions (circles) for the three molecules in (A) and their fits (lines). The histograms are simulated background distributions which reproduce those observed experimentally.

(2000 iterations for Fig. 3) were performed and the Gaussian fitted SD of the s_i distribution was the simulated $\Delta s_{i,rms}$ result.

IV. RESULTS

We report our study of 2D $\Delta s_{i,rms}$ using four different methods: (1) experimental measurements, (2) simulations, (3) numerical integrations of Eq. (10), and (4) analytical calculations using Eq. (17).

Figure 1A shows a set of single streptavidin-Cy3 molecule images with an increasing number of detected photons N. These molecules have similar mean SD $\langle s_x \rangle$ values of 110 nm, 111 nm, and 107 nm, respectively. In order to demonstrate the decreasing SD error with increasing N, each representative image was chosen such that the 2D SD value was the sum of the mean SD $\langle s_x \rangle$, and one standard deviation of of the molecule's s_x distri-



FIG. 2: Comparing $\Delta s_{x,rms}$ vs N obtained by using four different methods: experimental measurements (solid squares), simulations (circles), numerical integrations (crosses), and analytical calculations (dashed line). Each experimental $\Delta s_{x,rms}$ data point is the SD from the Gaussian fit to the s_x distribution of a single streptavidin-Cy3 monomer. For each data point, its experimental N and background distributions were used for simulation, and its experimental $\langle N \rangle$, $\langle s_i \rangle$, b, and $\langle bg \rangle$ values were used for the numerical integrations and analytical calculations. The experimental data are on average 60% higher than the analytical calculation data.

bution Δs_x (SD_{image} = $\langle s_x \rangle + \Delta s_x$). To clearly illustrate the change in the SD error, which is measured as the PSF SD minus $\langle s_x \rangle$, the 1D intensity profiles of the PSFs are plotted in Fig. 1B as opposed to their 2D intensity profiles for clarity. The 1D intensity values were obtained by averaging transverse pixel intensity values of the PSF at each longitudinal pixel *i*. It is evident that the widths of the 1D Gaussian fits decrease with increasing *N*. The measured 2D SD_{image} values deviate from their respective means, $\langle s_x \rangle$ values, by 10.3 nm, 7.4 nm, and 2.7 nm. Again as expected, when *N* increases, the 2D SD error decreases.

Figure 1C presents the background distributions associated with the molecules in Fig. 1A. The background distribution function resembles either a full or a truncated Gaussian, depending on experimental settings. The corresponding b and $\langle bg \rangle$ values for these images are 0.92 and 2.75 photons, 0.81 and 2.07 photons, and 1.48 and 1.97 photons, respectively. The lines are fits to the distribution and the histograms represent our simulated results.

Figure 2 shows $\Delta s_{x,rms}$ obtained by using experimental measurements, simulations, numerical integrations, and analytical calculations. Each experimental $\Delta s_{x,rms}$ data point is the standard deviation of the s_x distribution for a single streptavidin-Cy3 monomer. A simulation was performed for each experimental data point. The parameters were based upon experimental results including fluctuations in a PSF's total detected photons,



FIG. 3: $\Delta s_{x,rms}$ vs a/s_0 studied by simulations (circles) and analytical calculations (lower solid line) for N = 300photons, $s_0 = 120$ nm, b = 1 photon, and $\langle bg \rangle = 2$ photons. In these simulations, there were no fluctuations in N and $s_{0x} = s_{0y} = s_0$. Note that the general trend illustrates that $\Delta s_{x,rms}$ decreases with increasing pixel size. For $0.45 < a/s_0 < 0.75$, the simulated $\Delta s_{x,rms}$ results agree with the theoretical results plus 10% (dashed line). For $0.75 < a/s_0 < 1.17$, the experimental $\Delta s_{x,rms}$ results fit the theoretical results multiplied by $(0.90 + 0.27a/s_0)$ (upper solid line). At $a/s_0 > 1.17$, the experimental $\Delta s_{x,rms}$ results continue to decrease influenced by the increasing dominance of the pixel's SD. The vertical dashed line at $a/s_0 = 1.17$ is where the theoretical $\Delta s_{x,rms}$ minimum occurs, determined by differentiating Eq. (17) with respect to a.

background distribution, and the s_{0i} values determined by the mean experimental $\langle s_i \rangle$ after subtracting for the pixelation effect [Eq. (15)]. The finite bandwidth of the emission filter was also taken into consideration by varying s_0 values of each simulated PSF by 5%. Numerical integrations and analytical calculations used the same $\langle N \rangle$, s_{0i} , b, and $\langle bg \rangle$ as those in the corresponding experimental data point. For all N, the numerically integrated $\Delta s_{x,rms}$ results are $\approx 15\%$ higher than the theoretical results while the experimental results are $\approx 60\%$ higher. The simulations agree well with the experimental results at high N. As N decreases, the discrepancy reaches 30%at $N \approx 90$ photons. This discrepancy is possibly due to difficulty in obtaining the correct photon-to-camera count conversion factor M, when there are insufficient photons per pixel for statistically accurate calculations.

The above results are for our pixel size of 79 nm. For different experimental settings the pixel size will vary and affect $\Delta s_{x,rms}$. Figure 3 shows $\Delta s_{x,rms}$ vs a/s_0 studied by simulations and analytical calculations using $s_{0x} = s_{0y} = s_0 = 120$ nm, N = 300 photons, b = 1 photon, and $\langle bg \rangle = 2$ photons. As a/s_0 increases, there is an initial decline in $\Delta s_{x,rms}$ until rising at $a/s_0 \approx 0.75$. Beyond $a/s_0 \approx 0.75$, $\Delta s_{x,rms}$ increases slightly and then continues the decline again at $a/s_0 \approx 1.17$. This decline after $a/s_0 \approx 1.17$ disagrees with theory, which suggests an increase in $\Delta s_{x,rms}$ beyond the theoretical minimum of $(a/s_0)^4 = \frac{144}{\frac{9N}{4\pi(b^2+\langle bg \rangle)}+1}$ at $a/s_0 = 1.17$ (vertical dashed line). The overall decreasing $\Delta s_{x,rms}$ trend after the theoretical minimum occurs because when the pixel size increases, the measured PSF SD is increasingly affected by the width of the pixel and approaches the SD of the pixel; thus, variations among measured SD values decrease. Eventually, at sufficiently large pixel sizes where the whole PSF is contained within one pixel, the measured SD will be the SD of the pixel, inferred by the top-hat distribution function, and the measured SD error will be zero. The analytical calculation does not take this large pixelation effect into consideration; consequently, these results and those of the simulations begin to rapidly diverge.

The simulated local $\Delta s_{x,rms}$ minimum occurs at a/s_0 = 0.75, rather than at the theoretical minimum of a/s_0 = 1.17 due to the pixel size effect described above. Our experimental settings of a = 79 nm and $s_0 = 120$ nm yield $a/s_0 = 0.66$ and is close to the simulated $\Delta s_{x,rms}$ minimum. The dashed line is the theoretical result shifted up by 10%, fitting the simulated results well for $0.45 < a/s_0 < 0.75$; the upper solid line is the theoretical result multiplied by $(0.90 + 0.27a/s_0)$, fitting the rising part of the simulated $\Delta s_{x,rms}$. According to Fig. 3, a good a/s_0 range for future $\Delta s_{i,rms}$ studies should be between 0.5 and 1, as is usually the case. Future $\Delta s_{i,rms}$ studies using different pixel sizes should take this discrepancy into account as well as the difference between the simulated and the experimental results for each experimental setting (which for our study is $\approx 20\%$ at N = 300photons).

Figure 4 compares the SD measurement error $\Delta s_{x,rms}$, to the centroid measurement error Δx_{rms} , of one streptavidin-Cy3 monomer. Figure 4A shows the s_x and centroid location x distributions of the molecule. Note that the standard deviations of the distributions, measured as $\Delta s_{x,rms}$ and Δx_{rms} , differ by 1.44 nm, with the centroid measurement error Δx_{rms} being larger. Figure 4B shows experimental $\Delta s_{x,rms}$ and Δx_{rms} at various N. Δx_{rms} is consistently larger than $\Delta s_{i,rms}$ by an average 1.25 times, indicating that the resolving power of our SD analysis is greater than that of centroid analysis for equal experimental settings. Extrapolating $\Delta s_{x,rms}$ to high N, the error reaches 1.5 nm precision at $N \approx$ 5000 photons.

V. DISCUSSION AND EXTENSIONS

Here we discuss three issues: (1) causes for discrepancies between results obtained using different methods; (2) modifications to the centroid measurement error developed by Thompson, Larson, and Webb [1] to include the EMCCD camera photon conversion effects; and (3) methods to determine the SD error $\Delta s_{i,rms}$, for defocused and mobile molecules in future studies.



FIG. 4: (A) PSF SD values s_x (empty bars) and centroid locations x (solid bars) distributions of a streptavidin-Cy3 monomer with $\langle N \rangle = 1117$ photons. The standard deviations of the distributions are $\Delta s_{x,rms} = 5.22$ nm and Δx_{rms} = 6.66 nm; therefore, $\Delta s_{x,rms}$ is 1.27 times less than Δx_{rms} . (B) Experimental $\Delta s_{x,rms}$ (solid squares) and Δx_{rms} (circles) data along with their fits show that for the same experimental settings, the error in SD measurements is consistently lower than the error in centroid measurements. The error bars are the errors associated with the SD measurements of the s_x and x distributions and are $\frac{\Delta s_{x,rms}}{\sqrt{2N_{frames}}}$ and $\frac{\Delta x_{rms}}{\sqrt{2N_{frames}}}$, respectively, where N_{frames} is the number of fitted frames of the molecule. $\Delta s_{x,rms}$ is on average 1.25 times smaller than Δx_{rms} . The fits are theoretical results shifted up by certain percentages: for $\Delta s_{x,rms}$ [Eq. (17), dashed line], the theoretical values are shifted up by an average of 60%, and for Δx_{rms} [Eq. (20), solid line], the theoretical values are shifted up by an average of 42%.

A. Causes for discrepancies

Numerical integration results are consistently higher than the analytical results by 15%, while simulation results are higher than analytical results from 30% at low N to 60% at high N. There are a number of reasons for these discrepancies: (1) The analytical $\Delta s_{i,rms}$ result

[Eq. (17)] is obtained by evaluating Eq. (10) for the two limiting cases of σ_i^2 at the high photon count and high background noise regimes. The intermediate regime is absent and thus the numerical integration and simulation results are larger. (2) When N_i is expanded about s_0 , the higher order terms were neglected [Eq. (4)]. (3) In the $\Delta s_{i,rms}$ calculation (Appendix A), the N_i distribution function is assumed to be a Gaussian for all pixels of the PSF [Eq. (A1)]. This assumption will only be statistically accurate for center pixels of PSFs with high N. For peripheral pixels, especially for PSFs with low N, the N_i distribution function approaches a Poisson with a low mean, rather than a Gaussian. These different N_i distributions, which have been verified by simulation, were not considered in the analytical calculations. (4) In simulations, we attempted to model the background count distribution exactly, whereas in numerical integrations and analytical calculations, the shape of the background count distribution was not considered, and therefore did not influence the results. However, at high N, this variation can produce significant differences between simulated and calculated $\Delta s_{i,rms}$ results.

The simulation results agree well with the experimental results at high N (> 500 photons), while the discrepancy at low N increases to 30%. As N decreases, the low limit of the signal-to-noise ratio is reached and the accuracy in the determination of most parameters used for simulations decreases, such as the photon-to-camera count conversion factor M [Eq. (19)]. Thus the discrepancy between experimental and simulated results is larger at low N.

In summary, the analytical calculation of the SD measurement error expressed in Eq. (17) is a reasonable approximation for a large range of experimental parameters. When the 60% difference is corrected for, the expression is in excellent agreement with our experimental results (Fig. 4B). Future studies using this formula should be aware of the limitations and be sure to include this 60% difference from underestimation of the true error for similar a/s_0 values.

B. Modifications to centroid error analysis

The PSF centroid error expression developed by Thompson, Larson, and Webb [1] did not take the photon-to-camera count conversion variance into consideration. Additionally, the theoretical standard deviation s_0 , should be modified to include the pixelation effect $\sqrt{s_0^2 + a^2/12}$, with respect to both directions. We have modified the PSF centroid measurement error to be

$$\langle (\Delta x_{rms})^2 \rangle = \frac{2(s_{0x}^2 + \frac{a^2}{12})}{N} + \frac{8\pi (s_{0x}^2 + \frac{a^2}{12})^{3/2} (s_{0y}^2 + \frac{a^2}{12})^{1/2} (b^2 + \langle bg \rangle)}{a^2 N^2}.$$
 (20)

Note that the theoretical $\Delta s_{i,rms}$ [Eq. (17)] is $\approx \sqrt{2} =$

1.44 times less than Δx_{rms} , as demonstrated in Fig. 4B, where $\Delta s_{x,rms}$ is on average 1.25 times smaller than Δx_{rms} .

C. $\Delta s_{i,rms}$ calculation for defocused and mobile single molecules

The method for estimating SD error for stationary single molecules can be applied to molecules with other SD characteristics – defocused and moving single molecules. For these molecules, the N_i distribution function at each pixel may be different from the Gaussian assumption for stationary molecules as in Eq. (11). A new N_i distribution function for each specific case can be obtained and a new σ_i^2 formula [Eq. (9)] can be derived. Using the N_i distribution function and σ_i^2 , the SD error for these cases can be obtained following the same procedure outlined in the theory (Sec. II).

VI. CONCLUSION

In this article we introduce a new method, SMID, for single-molecule localization and tracking studies with higher temporal and spatial resolution than currently afforded by centroid measurements. The higher temporal resolution is achieved through the following mechanism: while many centroid measurements at different times are required for tracking a single molecule, SD measurement of only one image can offer insight into single-molecule dynamics at the shorter sub-exposure timescales with higher precision. While centroid analysis is based on measuring the mean location of the molecule for each image during the exposure time, measurement of the PSF SD provides a quantitative description of the molecule's spatial distribution. Consequently, the additional information extracted from this distribution constitutes improvement in spatial resolution.

Our analytical expression of the PSF SD error gives the precision for SMID measurements of single immobile fluorescent molecules. When this expression is extended to axial localization and sub-exposure time studies, the dynamics of various closely resembled biological systems investigated in vitro and in vivo can be elucidated and their underlying mechanisms differentiated. One application of SMID to a model system includes analyzing the different diffusive mechanisms of proteins on DNA [3, 19, 20] by probing the short sub-millisecond timescales using SD measurements. When the difference between the SDs measured for molecules displaying different characteristic motions is small, our error analysis will serve as a means for proper discrimination. SMID with full error analysis should be applied to all fluorescence particle tracking experiments for a more thorough description of a particle's dynamics.

Acknowledgments

We thank A. Carlsson for valuable discussions. Michael C. DeSantis is supported by a National Institutes of Health predoctoral fellowship awarded under 5T90 DA022871.

APPENDIX A:

Here we present the complete derivation of Eq. (5). We first obtain a probability distribution function for y_i . At large N of a few hundred photons, the y_i probability

distribution function at each of the center nine pixels of the PSF is a Gaussian, while at the peripheral pixels, the y_i probability distribution function is better approximated by a Poisson with a low mean. Here we assume that our N is significantly larger than 100 photons and the y_i probability distribution functions for all PSF pixels are Gaussian functions

$$f_{y_i} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma_i} \exp\left(-\frac{\Delta y_i^2}{2\sigma_i^2}\right),\tag{A1}$$

where $\Delta y_i = N_i(x_0, s_0) - y_i$ and σ_i^2 is $\sigma_{i,photon}^2$ as in Eq. (1). For Gaussian distributed y_i , we have

$$\langle \Delta y_i \rangle = 0,$$
 (A2a)

$$\langle (\Delta y_i)^2 \rangle = \sigma_i^2.$$
 (A2b)

Starting from Eq. (1) and taking a derivative with respect to s,

$$\frac{d\chi^2(s)}{ds} = \sum_i \frac{d}{ds} \frac{(y_i - N_i)^2}{\sigma_i^2} = \sum_i \frac{2(y_i - N_i)(y_i - N_i)'\sigma_i^2 - (y_i - N_i)^2 \cdot 2\sigma_i \sigma_i'}{\sigma_i^4}.$$
 (A3)

Setting the above equation to zero, we find

$$\sum_{i} \frac{2(y_i - N_i)(y_i - N_i)'}{\sigma_i^2} = \sum_{i} \frac{(y_i - N_i)^2 \cdot 2\sigma_i \sigma_i'}{\sigma_i^4}.$$
(A4)

We can simplify Eq. (A4) using the following terms:

$$y_i - N_i(s) = y_i - (N_i(s_0) + N'_i \Delta s) = -\Delta y_i - N'_i \Delta s,$$
 (A5a)
 $(y_i - N_i)' = -N'_i$ (A5b)

$$(y_i - N_i)' = -N'_i,$$

$$\sigma_i^2 = 2N_i(s) + 2b^2 = 2(N_i(s_0) + N'_i\Delta s) + 2b^2,$$
(A5b)
(A5b)
(A5c)

$$2\sigma_i \sigma_i' = 2N_i'. \tag{A5d}$$

Inserting Eqs. (A5a)-(A5d) into Eq. (A4), we obtain

$$\sum_{i} \frac{-2(\Delta y_i + N'_i \Delta s)(-N'_i)}{\sigma_i^2} = \sum_{i} \frac{(\Delta y_i + N'_i \Delta s)^2 \cdot 2N'_i}{\sigma_i^4}$$
$$\approx \sum_{i} \frac{(\Delta y_i^2 + 2\Delta y_i N'_i \Delta s) \cdot 2N'_i}{\sigma_i^4}.$$
 (A6)

Moving Δs to the left-hand side,

$$\Delta s \sum_{i} \left(\frac{N_i'^2}{\sigma_i^2} - \frac{2\Delta y_i N_i'^2}{\sigma_i^4} \right) = \sum_{i} \left(\frac{\Delta y_i^2 N_i'}{\sigma_i^4} - \frac{\Delta y_i N_i'}{\sigma_i^2} \right). \tag{A7}$$

This equation is Eq. (3). Neglecting the $\Delta y_i/\sigma_i^2$ term, we get Eq. (4).

We now take the mean square of Eq. 4. Note that the average is meant to apply to y_i only, so we have

$$\langle (\Delta s)^2 \rangle = \frac{\sum_i \frac{\Delta y_i N'_i}{\sigma_i^2} \sum_j \frac{\Delta y_j N'_j}{\sigma_j^2}}{\left(\sum_i \frac{N'^2_i}{\sigma_i^2}\right)^2} \\ = \frac{\sum_{i,j} \frac{\langle \Delta y_i \Delta y_j \rangle N'_i N'_j}{\sigma_i^2 \sigma_j^2}}{\left(\sum_i \frac{N'^2_i}{\sigma_i^2}\right)^2}.$$
 (A8)

For two different pixels, their distributions are independent, so $\langle \Delta y_i \Delta y_j \rangle = \delta_{ij} \langle (\Delta y_i)^2 \rangle = \sigma_i^2$ [see Eq. (A2b)]. This gives us Eq. (5). x (or s) is fixed when taking a partial derivative of N_i with respect to s (or x) is valid.

APPENDIX B:

Here we calculate the codependence of Δx and Δs in 1D and show that it vanishes. Thus the assumption that

Expanding $N_i(x,s)$ about (x_0,s_0) to first order $\Rightarrow N_i = N_i(x_0,s_0) + \Delta x \frac{\partial N_i}{\partial x}|_{x_0} + \Delta s \frac{\partial N_i}{\partial s}|_{s_0}$. Setting $\frac{d(\chi^2)}{ds} = \frac{d(\chi^2)}{dx} = 0$ and solving for Δs and Δx , the error associated with the *s* measurement is

$$\langle (\Delta s)^2 \rangle = \frac{\sum_i \frac{\left(\frac{\partial N_i}{\partial s}|_{s_0}\right)^2}{\sigma_i^2} + 2\frac{\left(\sum \frac{\frac{\partial N_i}{\partial x}|_{s_0}\frac{\partial N_i}{\sigma_i^2}|_{s_0}}{\sigma_i^2}\right)^2}{\frac{\left(\frac{\partial N_i}{\partial x}|_{s_0}\right)^2}{\sigma_i^2} + \frac{\left(\sum \frac{\frac{\partial N_i}{\partial x}|_{s_0}\frac{\partial N_i}{\partial s}|_{s_0}}{\sigma_i^2}\right)^2}{\sum \frac{\left(\frac{\partial N_i}{\partial x}|_{s_0}\right)^2}{\sigma_i^2}}{\frac{\sigma_i^2}{\sigma_i^2}} - \frac{\left(\sum \frac{\frac{\partial N_i}{\partial x}|_{s_0}\frac{\partial N_i}{\partial s}|_{s_0}}{\sigma_i^2}\right)^2}{\sigma_i^2}}{\left(\sum_i \frac{\left(\frac{\partial N_i}{\partial s}|_{s_0}\right)^2}{\sigma_i^2}\right)^2 - 2\left(\frac{\sum \frac{\left(\frac{\partial N_i}{\partial s}|_{s_0}\right)^2}{\sigma_i^2}(\sum \frac{\frac{\partial N_i}{\partial s}|_{s_0}\frac{\partial N_i}{\partial s}|_{s_0}}{\sigma_i^2})^2}{\frac{\sum \left(\frac{\partial N_i}{\partial s}|_{s_0}\right)^2}{\sigma_i^2}}\right) + \frac{\left(\sum \frac{\frac{\partial N_i}{\partial x}|_{s_0}\frac{\partial N_i}{\partial s}|_{s_0}}{\sigma_i^2}\right)^4}{(\sum \frac{\left(\frac{\partial N_i}{\partial s}|_{s_0}\right)^2}{\sigma_i^2}\right)^2}$$
(B1)

The cross product term $\sum_{i} \left(\frac{\frac{\partial N_i}{\partial x} |_{x_0} \frac{\partial N_i}{\partial s} |_{s_0}}{\sigma_i^2} \right) = 0$, and arriving at Eq. (5), $\langle (\Delta s)^2 \rangle = \frac{1}{\sum_i ((\frac{\partial N_i}{\partial s})^2 / \sigma_i^2)}$.

APPENDIX C:

In Appendix C we calculate the 2D $\langle (\Delta s_i^2) \rangle$. In 2D, the expected counts at pixel *i*, *j* is given by

$$N_{i,j} = \frac{Na^2}{2\pi s_x s_y} \exp\left(-\frac{(ia)^2}{2s_x^2} - \frac{(ja)^2}{2s_y^2}\right),\tag{C1}$$

where we assume that the PSF is centered at zero. Taking the derivative of N_i with respect to s_x and evaluating at s_{0x} ,

$$\langle (\Delta s_x^2) \rangle = \frac{1}{\sum_i \frac{(\frac{d(N_i)}{ds_x})^2}{\sigma_i^2}}.$$
 (C2)

Next, we approximate the summation by an integral where i and j are continuous from negative to positive infinity. There are two limits to the approximation, one being the high photon count limit and the other being the high background noise limit. At the high photon count limit, $\langle (\Delta s_x)^2 \rangle = \frac{s_{0x}^2}{N}$ after taking the photon-to-camera count conversion variance into consideration. At the high background noise limit, $\langle (\Delta s_x)^2 \rangle = \frac{16\pi s_{0x}^3 s_{0y} (b^2 + \langle bg \rangle)}{3a^2 N^2}$. Adding the two terms together and replacing s_{0i} by $\sqrt{s_{0i}^2 + a^2/12}$ to incorporate the pixelation effect, we arrive at Eq. (17).

- R. E. Thompson, D. R. Larson, and W. W. Webb, Biophysical Journal 82, 2775 (2002).
- [2] A. Yildiz, J. N. Forkey, S. A. Mckinney, T. Ha, Y. E. Goldman, and P. R. Selvin, Science **300**, 2061 (2003).
- [3] Y. M. Wang, R. H. Austin, and E. C. Cox, Physical Review Letters 97, 048302 (2006).
- [4] C. Joo, H. Balci, Y. Ishitsuka, C. Buranachai, and T. Ha, Annual Review of Biochemistry 77, 51 (2008).
- [5] M. Speidel, A. Jonas, and E.-L. Florin, Optics Letters 28 (2003).
- [6] A. van Oijen, J. Köhler, J. Schmidt, M. Müller, and G. Brakenhoff, Chemical Physics Letters 292, 183 (1998).
- [7] B. Huang, W. Wang, M. Bates, and X. Zhuang, Science 319, 810 (2008).

- [8] P. C. Blainey, A. M. van Oijen, A. Banerjee, G. L. Verdine, and X. S. Xie, Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America **103**, 5752 (2006).
- [9] A. Yildiz, M. Tomishige, R. D. Vale, and P. R. Selvin, Science **303**, 676 (2004).
- [10] K. Pearson, The Royal Society 185, 71 (1894).
- [11] K. Pearson and L. N. G. Filon, The Royal Society 191, 229 (1898).
- [12] R. Pearl, Biometrika Trust 6, 112 (1908).
- [13] J. R. Taylor, An Introduction to Error Analysis (University Science Books, 1997), 2nd ed.
- [14] N. Bobroff, Rev. Sci. Instrum. 57, 1152 (1986).
- [15] M. H. Ulbrich and E. Y. Isacoff, Nature Methods 4, 319 (2007).

- [16] J. Hynecek and T. Nishiwaki, IEEE transactions on electron devices 50, 239 (2003).
- [17] K. Adachi, R. Yasuda, H. Noji, H. Itoh, Y. Harada, and M. Yoshida, Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America 97, 7243 (2000).
- [18] Y. M. Wang, J. Tegenfeldt, W. Reisner, R. Riehn, X.-J. Guan, L. Guo, I. Golding, E. C. Cox, J. Sturm, and R. H.

Austin, Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America **102**, 9796 (2005).

- [19] S. E. Halford and J. F. Marko, Nucleic Acids Research 32, 3040 (2004).
- [20] J. Gorman and E. C. Greene, Nature Structural and Molecular Biology 15, 768 (2008).