Published in final edited form as:

J Am Chem Soc. 2012 September 26; 134(38): 15832–15839. doi:10.1021/ja3054095.

Single Plasmonic Nanoparticle Tracking Studies of Solid Supported Bilayers With Ganglioside Lipids

Laura B. Sagle[†], Laura K. Ruvuna[†], Julia M. Bingham[◇], Chunming Liu[‡], Paul S. Cremer[‡], and Richard P. Van Duyne^{†,*}

[†]Department of Chemistry, Northwestern University, 2145 Sheridan Road, Evanston, IL 60208, United States

[‡]Department of Chemistry, Texas A&M University, 3255 TAMU College Station, TX 77843, United States

[◇]Department of Chemistry, Saint Xavier University, 3700 West 103rd Street, Chicago, IL 60655, United States

Abstract

Single particle tracking experiments were carried out with gold nanoparticle-labeled solid supported lipid bilayers (SLBs) containing increasing concentrations of ganglioside (GM₁). The negatively charged nanoparticles electrostatically associate with a small percentage of positively charged lipids (ethyl phosphatidylcholine) in the bilayers. The samples containing no GM₁ show random diffusion in 92% of the particles examined with a diffusion constant of $4.3 (\pm 4.5) \times 10^{-9}$ cm²/sec. In contrast, samples containing 14% GM₁ showed a mixture of particles displaying both random and confined diffusion, with the majority of particles, 62%, showing confined diffusion. Control experiments support the notion that the nanoparticles are not associating with the GM₁ moieties, but instead most likely confined to regions in between the GM₁ clusters. Analysis of the root mean squared displacement plots for all of the data reveal decreasing trends in the confined diffusion constant and diameter of the confining region versus increasing GM₁ concentration. In addition, a linearly decreasing trend is observed for the percentage of randomly diffusing particles versus GM₁ concentration, which offers a simple, direct way to measure the percolation threshold for this system, which has not previously been measured. The percolation threshold is found to be 22% GM₁ and the confining diameter at the percolation threshold only ~50 nm.

INTRODUCTION

Single particle tracking experiments utilizing plasmonic nanoparticles have gained popularity in recent years for studying biological phenomena ranging from the motion of motor proteins to membrane fusion in live cells.^{1,2} Unlike fluorescence dyes, plasmonic nanoparticles have large scattering cross sections and do not photobleach or blink, which allow for measurements over long time periods.³ Single particle tracking has proven particularly useful for studying cellular membranes, since it enables direct characterization of the type of motion of different components in the membrane.^{4,5} For example, single particle tracking of lipids in cellular membranes have greatly increased our understanding of the steps involved in membrane fusion as well as lipid-cytoskeleton interactions.^{6,7} In addition, single particle tracking has been used to study protein-protein interactions in

* Author to whom correspondence should be addressed. Tel: 847-491-3516, Fax: 847-491-7713, vanduyne@northwestern.edu.

SUPPORTING INFORMATION AVAILABLE: Details on FRAP measurements and various control experiments described in the Results section are available free of charge at <http://pubs.acs.org>.

membrane environments.⁸ These measurements have allowed for a better understanding of the compartmentalization of proteins in the cell membrane.^{9, 10}

One of the more prominent ganglioside lipids present in the plasma membranes of mammalian cells, GM₁ is a receptor for both cholera toxin and *E. coli* heat-labile enterotoxin.^{11, 12} The binding of cholera toxin involves all five B subunits of the protein binding GM₁ and has been extensively studied as a multivalent binding system in cellular membranes.^{13–15} Interestingly, unlike other multivalent binding systems in which an increase in binding strength is observed (the K_d value is smaller) with an increase in ligand concentration,¹⁶ the cholera toxin-GM₁ system shows the opposite effect. Mainly, the binding of cholera toxin actually decreases with increasing GM₁ concentration.^{17, 18} A systematic study of cholera toxin binding to GM₁ was recently carried out using solid supported lipid bilayers (SLB's), a cell membrane mimetic.¹⁹ A model was introduced in which the higher GM₁ concentrations induce clustering of the gangliosides in the bilayer. This clustering of GM₁ within the SLBs is believed to inhibit the binding of cholera toxin. Additional studies using AFM and fluorescence imaging also lend substantial weight to the idea of GM₁ clustering.^{20–23}

In addition to the recruitment of bacterial and viral toxins, GM₁ has also been implicated as one of the key components present in lipid rafts domains of cellular membranes, which have a profound influence on cell signaling and trafficking.^{24–26} Clusters rich in GM₁ that form in membranes are often modeled as liquid ordered phases, with substantially reduced mobility of their constituent lipids.²⁷ In addition, the clusters promote lipid segregation, with little exchange of lipids between phases.²⁸ Thus, increasing the GM₁ concentration in a membrane will eventually lead to a percolation threshold, in which the GM₁ clusters are the major component and the fluid phase becomes discontinuous. This has a significant effect on the cell's ability to interact and respond to its environment, since protein components in the fluid part of the membrane are then isolated from each other. Phase behavior of many different types of mixed lipid bilayer systems, such as the liquid/gel phase DMPC/DSPC²⁹, liquid/solid phase DPPC/LigGalCer³⁰ and DMPC/cholesterol^{31, 32} have been carried out using techniques such as NMR, ESR, and DSC. Recently, fluorescence recovery after photobleaching (FRAP) has been used to study the connectivity of different components in a mixed lipid bilayer and provided a measurement of the percolation threshold of these systems.^{33, 34} Unfortunately, trends observed using FRAP are often a result of many underlying mechanisms and further modeling is often required to understand the percolation behavior of the system. Alternatively, a more direct way of measuring a percolation threshold in a mixed lipid system is to carry out single particle tracking studies, in which the molecule being tracked is only soluble in one component of the mixture.

Herein, we wish to revisit fundamental questions concerning the percolation threshold in mixed lipid bilayers containing increasing concentrations of GM₁ using a single nanoparticle tracking system which can simultaneously measure the position of the nanoparticle (with ± 7 nm precision) as well as the plasmonic spectrum. To our knowledge, a fundamental study of percolation and phase behavior of bilayers containing GM₁ using single particle tracking has not been carried out. The SLBs used here are composed of 0.1% ethyl phosphatidyl choline (EPC), a positively charged lipid that attracts the negatively charged citrate-capped gold nanoparticles. Since particle tracking experiments are able to characterize the type of motion present, it was expected that GM₁ clustering would produce differences in the observed diffusion of these positively charged lipids. In agreement with the GM₁ clustering model, most of the particles observed in the SLBs containing more than 5% GM₁ showed confined motion, in stark contrast to the particles examined in SLBs with no GM₁. As depicted in Figure 1, the data presented herein indicates that the motion of the lipids in bilayers containing >5% GM₁ is confined by the GM₁ clusters themselves. A plot

of percent confined particles vs. GM₁ concentration shows a linear trend and offers a direct measurement of percolation threshold. This percolation threshold is defined as the GM₁ concentration needed to have 100% confined particles. A plot of percent confined particles vs. GM₁ concentration shows this value at 22%. In addition, a linear trend in the diameter of the confining region vs. GM₁ concentration yields a diameter of only 50 nm at the percolation threshold, which is 2–5x the size of a typical membrane protein. Lastly, a decreasing trend observed for the diffusion constants of the confined particles with increasing GM₁ concentration agrees with the notion that diffusion decreases at barriers to the GM₁ clusters.

EXPERIMENTAL METHODS

Small Unilamellar Vesicles (SUV) and Gold Nanoparticle-Labeled Solid Supported Bilayers

SUV's were made from 1-palmitoyl-2-oleoyl-*sn*-glycero-3-phosphocholine (POPC), 1-palmitoyl-2-(12-[(7-nitro-2-1,3-benzoxadiazol-4-yl)amino]dodecanoyl)-*sn*-glycero-3-phosphocholine (NBDPE) and 1,2-dipalmitoyl-*sn*-glycero-3-ethylphosphocholine (EPC), which were all purchased from Avanti Polar Lipids (Alabaster, AL) and ganglioside GM₁, which was purchased from Matreya LLC (Gap, PA). SUV's were prepared by vesicle extrusion, which has been described in detail elsewhere.^{35, 36} Briefly, this process involved the evaporation of a lipid-chloroform solution under a stream of nitrogen followed by vacuum desiccation for 4 hours. The lipids were then rehydrated in phosphate buffered saline (PBS) solution, which consisted of 10 mM sodium phosphate, 150 mM NaCl, and 0.2 mM sodium azide. The pH of the PBS solution was adjusted to 7.4 with small amounts of 1M HCl. The total concentration of the lipids in solution was 1.0 mg/mL. After several freeze-thaw cycles, the solutions were extruded through a polycarbonate filter (Whatman) with 100 nm pores. The size of the resulting SUV's was confirmed to be 70–80 nm by dynamic light scattering using a Brookhaven Instruments 90Plus Particle Size Analyzer.

Solid supported bilayers (SLBs) were formed by incubating the 1.0 mg/mL lipid vesicle solution on glass coverslips (Corning, NY, 22×22 mm, No. 2), which were cleaned with boiling 7x detergent and incubated at 500 °C for 5 hours. Bilayer formation was assumed to be complete after 10 minute incubations at room temperature. The SLB's were washed with copious amounts of DI water to remove vesicles not associated with the glass coverslip. The SLB's were then incubated with a solution of 100 nm citrate capped gold colloids (Ted Pella #157113) that was diluted 10x for ca. 1 hour. The gold-labeled SLB's were then washed with DI water to remove non-associated nanoparticles.

Fluorescence Recovery After Photobleaching (FRAP)

Confirmation of SLB formation was carried out using FRAP. FRAP experiments were done with a 2.5 W mixed gas argon/krypton ion laser (Stabilite 2018, Spectra Physics). Lipid bilayers were irradiated at 488 nm with 100 mW of power for 2 seconds. A bleach spot was made on the bilayer using a 10× objective and fluorescence recovery of the bleached spots were measured as a function of time. The mobile fraction and the half-time of recovery $t_{1/2}$ of NBDPE lipids were determined from single exponential fitting of fluorescence recovery curves. The lateral diffusion coefficient of NBDPE lipids is calculated as follows:³⁷

$$D = \frac{w^2}{4t_{1/2}} \gamma_D \quad (1)$$

where w is the radius of the circle disk profile of the bleaching light, and γ_D is a correction factor that depends on the bleach time and the geometry of the laser beam. The value of γ_D

and w used were 1.2 and 17.7 μm respectively. Fitting the data shown in Figure S2a, (see Supplemental Section) bilayers containing no GM_1 , resulted in a diffusion coefficient of $2.5 \times 10^{-8} \text{ cm}^2/\text{sec}$ and 100% mobile fraction. Fitting of the data shown in Figure S2b, bilayers containing 8% GM_1 , yielded a diffusion coefficient of $1.9 \times 10^{-8} \text{ cm}^2/\text{sec}$ and 91% mobile fraction.

Single Particle Tracking

As shown in Figure 2, single particle tracking experiments were carried out with an inverted microscope (Nikon, Eclipse Ti-U) equipped with a dark-field condenser (Nikon, NA = 0.8–0.95) and a 100x variable aperture oil immersion objective (Nikon, NA 0.5–1.3) which was set to NA = 0.5 to collect only the scattered light from the gold nanoparticles. The scattered light from all the nanoparticles in the field of view (80×80 microns) was collected and sent through an acoustic-optical tunable filter (Gooch and Housego, His-300 Hyperspectral Imaging System) which has continuously tunable transmission from 500 nm to 800 nm and a spectral bandwidth of 1 to 6 nm. The scattered light was then directed into an EM-CCD camera (Princeton Instruments, proEM512) and the images stored and analyzed using the LightView (Princeton Instruments) and Matlab (Mathworks, Inc.) software. This allows for one to not only track moving particles with time, but also for the simultaneous collection of the visible spectra. The bandwidth for these experiments was set to 3 nm and the time resolution of the measurements, 62 milliseconds, was determined by the shutter of the EM-CCD camera plus the readout time. The spatial resolution was determined by approximating the point spread function of a still particle as a 2-dimensional Gaussian function and measuring the standard deviation in the centroid of the Gaussian over 300 frames of data (see Figure S3).³⁸ Briefly, a linescan of a still particle in the x direction was fit to a Gaussian function at each frame. The variance for the centroid of the Gaussian was then calculated for all 300 frames of data. Likewise a linescan of the same particle in the y direction was fit to a Gaussian function at each frame and the variance calculated for the centroid over 300 frames. The variance in 2 dimensions was then calculated according to:

$$\sigma_{xy} = \sigma_x \sigma_y / (\sigma_x + \sigma_y) \quad (2)$$

and the standard deviation associated with determining the center of the 2 dimensional Gaussian, which determines the spatial resolution, was taken as the square root of the variance. The measured spatial resolution was found to be 6.7 nm. Single nanoparticle trajectories were obtained by marking the x–y centroid position of each particle at each intensity image over time using Matlab.

As noted above, instrumentation recently developed in our laboratory allows for the measurements involved to not only track particles in real time, but also acquire a visible spectrum of each particle.³⁹ The gold nanoparticles used herein contain plasmon resonances in the visible region, which are very sensitive to the local index of refraction.^{40, 41} Thus, tracking both the LSPR spectral features and motion of the nanoparticles should allow for complex biological interactions to be discerned. To obtain LSPR spectra, the intensities collected for the nanoparticles in the field of view from 500 to 800 nm was divided by a spectrum collected with no sample (dark) and the full lamp intensity over the same wavelength values and timescales in Matlab. Representative LSPR spectra for the gold nanoparticles used are shown in Figures 3 and 4.

RESULTS

Single nanoparticle trajectories were collected in thirty to forty different areas of SLB samples containing no GM_1 . Each 80×80 micron area contained several moving nanoparticles enabling the acquisition of close to 100 different trajectories. It is important to

note that many of the nanoparticles in the field of view (approximately 20–40%) were stationary and it was assumed that these particles were bound to the glass via defects present in the SLBs. Of the particles examined, 92% showed random diffusion, with the other 8% of particles displaying confined diffusion. Due to defects in the bilayer, the small amount of confined diffusion observed here could be the result of particles trapped between two defect sites. The trajectories and mean squared displacement plots of three representative particles is shown in Figure 3. The plots for the particles shown are linear, indicating the diffusion is random, Brownian motion and can be fit to the expression, $\langle r^2 \rangle = 4Dt$, where $\langle r^2 \rangle$ is the mean squared displacement, D is the diffusion constant and t is time lag. Fitting the plots shown in Figure 3 with a linear regression yields diffusion constants of 8.0×10^{-9} , 2.8×10^{-9} , 6.5×10^{-9} cm²/sec for particles 1, 2 and 3 respectively. Taking into account all the particles (at different GM₁ concentrations) that also showed the same linear behavior, an average value of the diffusion constant was found to be $4.3 (\pm 4.5) \times 10^{-9}$ cm²/sec. This value is consistent with other literature studies, which used single particle tracking of 50 nm gold nanoparticles on SLBs and fall within the range of 1×10^{-8} to 1×10^{-9} cm²/sec.^{42–44} Additionally, Figure 3c shows LSPR spectra of corresponding particles whose trajectories are shown in 3a.

Next, gold nanoparticles electrostatically bound to bilayers containing 1%, 3%, 5%, 8%, 10% and 14% GM₁ were measured. For each concentration of GM₁, more than 40 particle trajectories were analyzed and a linearly increasing trend in the number of confined particles was observed. However, even with SLBs containing significant concentrations of GM₁, a considerable amount of particles showed Brownian diffusion with diffusion constants similar to what was observed in the samples containing no GM₁. It is assumed that the density of GM₁ throughout the SLB is not uniform and that there were simply no GM₁ clusters in the near vicinity of these randomly diffusing particles. The resulting trajectories and mean squared displacement plots for three particles in SLBs containing 10% GM₁ are shown in Figure 4. As shown in Figure 4b, the raw data is fit to the following expression for confined diffusion:

$$\langle r^2 \rangle = \langle r_c^2 \rangle [1 - A_1 \exp(-4A_2 Dt / \langle r_c^2 \rangle)] \quad (3)$$

where $\langle r_c^2 \rangle$ is the square of the confined radius with which the particles themselves are confined (which is the asymptotic value), A_1 and A_2 are geometric factors relating to the shape of the confining region, and D is the diffusion constant for the confined particle.⁴³ The average diffusion constant and confined diameter obtained from fitting the root mean squared displacement plots shown in Figure 4 are 9.5×10^{-9} cm²/sec and 834 nm respectively. The value of confined diameter measured here, is considerably larger than that obtained for a GM₁ cluster using atomic force microscopy (20–200 nm), and even that which was reported for a lipid raft (100–200 nm).^{45, 46} Thus, it is reasonable to assume these particles are in fact bound to the positively charged lipids themselves and not the GM₁ moieties.

Nevertheless, several control experiments were carried out to confirm that the particles measured were indeed electrostatically bound to the bilayers, and not associating with the GM₁ moieties. In the first control experiment, images were taken of gold nanoparticles bound to the SLBs containing no GM₁ with and without salt in solution. If the particles are electrostatically bound to the bilayers, this interaction should be screened to some degree by adding salt. Figure S4 (Supplemental Materials) does show significantly fewer particles bound to the bilayers in the presence of salt in the solution. The next control experiment investigated the binding of negatively charged nanoparticles to bilayers both with and without positively charged lipid. Figure S5 (Supplemental Materials) describes a set of images taken with bilayers varying only in positively charged lipid composition. Although

most of the images comparing bilayers with and without positively charged lipid show greater numbers of nanoparticles in the former, it was sometimes observed that a comparable number of charged nanoparticles would reside at the bilayer surface in the sample without positively charged lipids. However, these nanoparticles would quickly go out of the field of view, making particle tracking for 300 frames difficult. Thus, this dissociation from the bilayers containing no positively charged lipid offers additional proof of this electrostatic interaction between nanoparticles and the bilayer. The third control experiment was performed to look at the localized surface plasmon resonance (LSPR) spectra of the particles in H₂O, bound to SLB's containing no GM₁, and bound to SLB's containing 10% GM₁. The LSPR spectra of these particles are extremely sensitive to the refractive index of the surrounding media and should be a measure of how the particles are associating and interacting with the SLBs. As shown in Figure S6, the maximum in the LSPR spectrum does shift slightly upon binding SLBs, but no further shift is observed when binding to SLBs containing GM₁, also supporting the notion that the particles themselves are not associating with GM₁. Lastly, we wished to confirm that the binding of the nanoparticles to the SLBs is not affected by the size or capping agent of the particles. Thus, single particle tracking experiments were carried out using 50 nm citrate-capped gold nanoparticles purchased from CABOT (instead of Ted Pella) with SLBs containing 1% GM₁. This data showed diffusion constants for both the confined and randomly diffusing particles to be similar to that observed with the Ted Pella particles, $1.1 (\pm 1.3) \times 10^{-8}$ and $6.5 (\pm 6.1) \times 10^{-9}$ cm²/sec respectively. In addition, the percent randomly diffusing particles, 86%, is also similar to what was observed with the Ted Pella particles.

The parameters obtained from fitting the root mean squared displacement plots for all the particles measured in bilayers containing 0%, 1%, 3%, 5%, 8%, 10% and 14% GM₁ are shown in Table 1. As shown in column 3 of Table 1, the percentage of randomly diffusing particles decreases with GM₁ concentration in a linear fashion. The diffusion constants for the randomly diffusing particles, column 4, show little change with increasing GM₁ in the bilayers. In contrast, diffusion constants for confined particles show a marked decrease with GM₁ concentration. Lastly, the diameter of the confining region for the confined particles also shows a decreasing trend with GM₁ concentration. To further illustrate the trends observed in columns 5 and 6 of Table 1, histogram plots were generated which tallied the diffusion constants and confining diameter for each confined particle at all the GM₁ concentrations measured, Figure 5.

DISCUSSION

McConnell and coworkers⁴⁷ first established in 1975 that biological membranes consist of many components that can exist in a variety of phases. The connection between the existence of liquid condensed regions in membranes and their possible effects on cellular processes relies on their ability to compartmentalize membrane components through selective permeability and reduced mobility. Indeed, several recent studies involving FRAP, single particle tracking, and fluorescence correlation spectroscopy show greatly decreased mobility in clustered domains.^{48, 49} Additionally, selective permeability of lipids and membrane components in and out of raft-like domains has also been studied extensively.^{28, 50} Our results support a model of GM₁ clustering into domains at concentrations above 5% GM₁. Moreover, the nanoparticles associated with the lipids in the fluid phase are not observed to partition into the GM₁ clusters, indicating selective permeability. Instead, the GM₁ clusters themselves act as barriers to the nanoparticles whose motion is confined to smaller domains of the fluid phase at high concentrations of GM₁. This notion is supported by all the trends shown in Table 1 with increasing GM₁ concentrations; increasing amounts of confined particles, decreasing diameters for the confining regions and a decrease in the diffusion constants of the confined particles.

If the function of a cluster with decreased mobility is to physically compartmentalize the membrane components and control, to some degree, membrane partitioning, the interconnectivity of the condensed and liquid phase is extremely important for cellular function. A parameter that describes the connectivity of two phases that make up a membrane is the percolation threshold. Below the percolation threshold, the fluid phase, making up the majority of the bilayer, is interconnected and consists of small island-like structures of GM₁-rich domains.⁵¹ At and above the percolation threshold, this fluid phase is broken up by the GM₁-rich domains, creating an obstacle to a membrane component soluble in the fluid phase that is attempting to diffuse from one part of the membrane to another. In the simple model membrane systems studied here, anomalous diffusion was observed in less than 1% of the particles examined, and in order to focus on the majority of the particles, these data were excluded from the paper. Therefore, 99% of the particles examined simply showed either random or confined diffusion, making the analysis quite straightforward. It is also important to note that the timescales of the measurements described herein are quite short (only 3 seconds) and possibly not long enough to observe events involving hopping between adjacent domains. Since the particles are restricted solely to the fluid phase without GM₁, a percolation threshold value is defined as the concentration of GM₁ needed to have 100% confined particles. Thus, if all of the fluid phase particles are confined, the clusters containing GM₁ must be interconnected. Percolation threshold values have been obtained for mixed bilayer systems, typically using FRAP, but these values rely on a knowledge of the geometry of the confining region as well as the geometry of the bleach spot.^{29, 52, 53} Our value of percolation threshold does not rely on *a priori* knowledge of the growth of the confining regions and their geometry and is therefore a more direct measurement. The value for percolation threshold for this system is simply obtained from plotting the % randomly diffusing particles versus GM₁ concentration. As shown in Figure 6, this plot shows a linear trend and through linear extrapolation, a percolation threshold value of 22% is obtained. This value is similar to what has been observed using FRAP with mixed bilayer systems containing liquid and gel phase lipids, such as DLPC/DSPC and DMPC/DSPC, which are also believed to segregate into domains.²⁹ The percolation threshold value of 22% GM₁ is higher than that observed in biological cells, with a value of 10–12% GM₁ observed in neurons being the highest.⁵⁴ However, it should be noted that the GM₁ moieties are most likely asymmetrically distributed among the two leaflets of the membrane giving rise to higher concentrations on the outer surface of the cell.⁵⁵ It should also be noted that there is a growing number of studies that show using charged probe molecules can affect the distribution and mobility of lipids within the bilayer.^{49, 56, 57} In addition, cells contain other ganglioside components, such as GM₂, GM₃ and GD₃, that would most likely co-cluster with GM₁ creating larger clusters from smaller concentrations of GM₁.^{11, 58} This somewhat low percolation threshold value is often associated with the solid-like and fluid-like domains being asymmetric.^{59, 60} The value for percolation threshold obtained herein describes the amount of GM₁ required to inhibit the movement of a membrane component confined to the mobile phase.

Another interesting question addresses the size of these confining regions at the percolation threshold that perhaps contain membrane proteins vital for cellular function. Below the percolation threshold, the fluid phase, making up the majority of the bilayer, is interconnected and consists of small island-like structures of GM₁-rich domains (similar to what has previously been observed for metallic films). As expected, the confined diameter for the particles in the fluid phase is reduced as more GM₁ are added to the bilayer, increasing the surface area of the solid phase. A plot of the average confined diameter for the particles versus GM₁ concentration shows a steeply descending linear trend (see Figure 7). Extrapolation of this line to the percolation threshold value yields a confined diameter of only 50 nm. Given the large error in measuring this value on a per particle basis, the value of the confined diameter at the percolation threshold most likely varies between 0 and 200 nm.

Even so, this value is the same order of magnitude of membrane protein complexes and indicates a surprisingly restricted fluid phase.

The last trend of interest shown in Table 1 is the diffusion constant values for confined particles decreases with increasing GM₁ concentrations. This trend is further illustrated in Figure 5a, where the histograms center around smaller values at higher GM₁ concentrations. Saxton *et al* have calculated that lateral diffusion in the fluid phase should slow down in a linear fashion as more solid obstacles are added.⁶¹ Interestingly, a linearly decreasing trend is observed here, but only for the confined particles. The randomly diffusing particles, even at high concentrations of GM₁, still show diffusion constants similar to those with no GM₁ present, possibly indicating that the GM₁ clusters are not evenly dispersed throughout the bilayers. This notion is also supported by the possibility of an asymmetric distribution of domains suggested by the low percolation threshold value. In addition, AFM and fluorescence microscopy measurements of GM₁ domains in phosphatidylcholine bilayers made through vesicle fusion also support this idea.²³ The linearly decreasing trend in diffusion coefficients with increasing concentrations of an immiscible phase has been observed previously when the two phases have drastically different mobilities.⁶² Thus, the linear trend observed is in agreement with the notion that the GM₁ clusters have substantially reduced mobility. This is also in agreement with single molecule measurements showing that the lipid molecules within GM₁ clusters are significantly less mobile.⁶³ For particles confined in the fluid phase, as the GM₁ concentration is increased, larger amounts of immobile clusters appear, which take up a larger percentage of surface area. In turn, the fluid phase contains a smaller surface area, with each confined particle surrounded by an increased solid phase boundary. The slowed diffusion measured for particles in smaller confined regions is in agreement with both experimental and theoretical results, and supports the existence of a boundary layer around the solid-like obstacles.^{33, 64, 65} Thus, the data indicates that the GM₁ clusters most likely contain boundary regions in contact with the fluid phase where diffusion is considerably slower.

CONCLUSIONS

This study reports single particle tracking experiments for gold nanoparticle labeled SLBs containing increasing concentrations of GM₁. The SLBs used in this paper are a model system for a cellular membrane containing many different components whose communication relies, to a large degree, on membrane fluidity. Upon addition of increasing amounts of GM₁ to the SLBs, higher percentages of particles showed confined diffusion. Since it has been shown that GM₁ clusters exist in SLBs containing greater than 5% GM₁, our data indicates that these particles are most likely confined to the regions between GM₁ clusters. Values for the diffusion constants for both random and confined particles as well as an estimate of the radius of the confined region are obtained from root mean squared displacement plots. The data show that although the diffusion constants for the randomly diffusing particles does not significantly change upon addition of GM₁, both the diffusion constants and the confined radius markedly decrease with GM₁ concentration for the confined particles. One question of biological importance is the concentration of GM₁ needed to produce a bilayer in which the fluid phase is no longer interconnected, resulting in confined behavior for all of its constituents, and is referred to as the percolation threshold. A plot of the percent of randomly diffusing particles versus GM₁ concentration shows a simple linear trend, which when extrapolated to 0% randomly diffusing particles gives a percolation threshold value of 22% GM₁. When a plot of confined diameter versus GM₁ concentration is extrapolated to the value of 22%, it is revealed that the confined diameter of the fluid phase at the percolation threshold is only ~50 nm. Thus, at the percolation threshold, membrane components in the fluid phase are drastically confined to regions that are the same order of magnitude as the membrane proteins themselves.

This single particle tracking study can be expanded to further explore membrane fluidity and binding interactions using SLBs in which the motion of the nanoparticle and its LPSR spectrum can be simultaneously monitored. In addition, aggregation of peripheral membrane components in real time can be studied through both their diffusion trajectories and LSPR spectral features.

Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

Acknowledgments

RPVD thanks the National Science Foundation (EEC-0647560, CHE-1025947, HDTRA1-09-1-0007) and PSC thanks the National Institute of Health (GM070622) for funding.

References

1. Cai D, Verhey KJ, Meyhofer E. *Biophysical Journal*. 2007;201a–202a. [PubMed: 17040991]
2. Floyd DL, Ragains JR, Skehel JJ, Harrison SC, van Oijen AM. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA*. 2008; 105(40):15382–15387. [PubMed: 18829437]
3. Nallathamby PD, Lee KJ, Xu XHN. *Acs Nano*. 2008; 2(7):1371–1380. [PubMed: 19206304]
4. Saxton MJ, Jacobson K. *Annual Review of Biophysics and Biomolecular Structure*. 1997; 26:373–399.
5. Garcia-Saez AJ, Schwille P. *BBA-Biomembranes*. 2010; 1798(4):766–776. [PubMed: 19796630]
6. Wessels L, Elting MW, Scimeca D, Weninger K. *Biophys J*. 2007; 93(2):526–538. [PubMed: 17449662]
7. Brown FLH, Leitner DM, McCammon JA, Wilson KR. *Biophysical Journal*. 2000; 78(5):2257–2269. [PubMed: 10777724]
8. Fujiwara T, Ritchie K, Murakoshi H, Jacobson K, Kusumi A. *J Cell Biol*. 2002; 157(6):1071–1081. [PubMed: 12058021]
9. Simson R, Sheets ED, Jacobson K. *Biophysical Journal*. 1995; 69(3):989–993. [PubMed: 8519998]
10. Day CA, Kenworthy AK. *BBA-Biomembranes*. 2009; 1788(1):245–253. [PubMed: 19041847]
11. Mocchetti I. *Cellular and Molecular Life Sciences*. 2005; 62(19–20):2283–2294. [PubMed: 16158191]
12. Chen JC, Chang YS, Wu SL, Chao DC, Chang CS, Li CC, Ho TY, Hsiang CY. *J Ethnopharmacol*. 2007; 113(2):233–239. [PubMed: 17624704]
13. Holmgren J, Lonnroth I, Mansson JE, Svennerholm L. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*. 1975; 72(7):2520–2524. [PubMed: 1058471]
14. Merritt EA, Sarfaty S, Vandenakker F, Lhoir C, Martial JA, Hol WGJ. *Protein Science*. 1994; 3(2): 166–175. [PubMed: 8003954]
15. Blank N, Schiller M, Krienke S, Wabnitz G, Ho AD, Lorenz HM. *Immunology and Cell Biology*. 2007; 85(5):378–382. [PubMed: 17325693]
16. Yang TL, Baryshnikova OK, Mao HB, Holden MA, Cremer PS. *J Am Chem Soc*. 2003; 125(16): 4779–4784. [PubMed: 12696896]
17. MacKenzie CR, Hiram T, Lee KK, Altman E, Young NM. *Journal of Biological Chemistry*. 1997; 272(9):5533–5538. [PubMed: 9038159]
18. Lencer WI, Chu SHW, Walker WA. *Infection and Immunity*. 1987; 55(12):3126–3130. [PubMed: 3679546]
19. Shi JJ, Yang TL, Kataoka S, Zhang YJ, Diaz AJ, Cremer PS. *J Am Chem Soc*. 2007; 129(18): 5954–5961. [PubMed: 17429973]
20. Reed RA, Shipley GG. *Biophys J*. 1996; 70(3):1363–1372. [PubMed: 8785291]
21. Thompson TE, Allietta M, Brown RE, Johnson ML, Tillack TW. *Biochim Biophys Acta*. 1985; 817(2):229–237. [PubMed: 4016104]

22. Wang R, Shi J, Parikh AN, Shreve AP, Chen LH, Swanson BI. *Colloids Surf B Biointerfaces*. 2004; 33(1):45–51.
23. Yuan CB, Johnston LJ. *Biophys J*. 2001; 81(2):1059–1069. [PubMed: 11463647]
24. Korade Z, Kenworthy AK. *Neuropharmacology*. 2008; 55(8):1265–1273. [PubMed: 18402986]
25. Pike LJ. *Journal of Lipid Research*. 2009; 50:S323–S328. [PubMed: 18955730]
26. Simons K, Ikonen E. *Nature*. 1997; 387(6633):569–572. [PubMed: 9177342]
27. Kaiser HJ, Lingwood D, Levental I, Sampaio JL, Kalvodova L, Rajendran L, Simons K. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA*. 2009; 106(39):16645–16650. [PubMed: 19805351]
28. Kahya N, Scherfeld D, Bacia K, Poolman B, Schwille P. *J Biol Chem*. 2003; 278(30):28109–28115. [PubMed: 12736276]
29. Vaz WLC, Melo ECC, Thompson TE. *Biophys J*. 1989; 56(5):869–876. [PubMed: 2605301]
30. Almeida PFF, Vaz WLC, Thompson TE. *Biochemistry*. 1992; 31(31):7198–7210. [PubMed: 1643051]
31. Vist MR, Davis JH. *Biochemistry*. 1990; 29(2):451–464. [PubMed: 2302384]
32. Sankaram MB, Thompson TE. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA*. 1991; 88(19):8686–8690. [PubMed: 1656453]
33. Almeida PFF, Vaz WLC, Thompson TE. *Biochemistry*. 1992; 31(29):6739–6747. [PubMed: 1637810]
34. Vaz WLC, Almeida PFF. *Curr Opin Struct Biol*. 1993; 3(4):482–488.
35. Brian AA, McConnell HM. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America-Biological Sciences*. 1984; 81(19):6159–6163.
36. Cremer PS, Groves JT, Kung LA, Boxer SG. *Langmuir*. 1999; 15(11):3893–3896.
37. Axelrod D, Koppel DE, Schlessinger J, Elson E, Webb WW. *Biophysical Journal*. 1976; 16(9):1055–1069. [PubMed: 786399]
38. Yildiz A, Forkey JN, McKinney SA, Ha T, Goldman YE, Selvin PR. *Science*. 2003; 300(5628):2061–2065. [PubMed: 12791999]
39. Bingham JM, Willets KA, Shah NC, Andrews DQ, Van Duyne RP. *J Phys Chem C*. 2009; 113(39):16839–16842.
40. Willets KA, Van Duyne RP. *Annu Rev Phys Chem*. 2007; 58:267–297. [PubMed: 17067281]
41. Sagle LB, Ruvuna LK, Ruemmele JA, Van Duyne RP. *Nanomedicine*. 2011; 6(8):1447–1462. [PubMed: 22026381]
42. Lee GM, Ishihara A, Jacobson KA. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*. 1991; 88(14):6274–6278. [PubMed: 1712486]
43. Sheets ED, Lee GM, Simson R, Jacobson K. *Biochemistry*. 1997; 36(41):12449–12458. [PubMed: 9376349]
44. Pinaud F, Michalet X, Iyer G, Margeat E, Moore HP, Weiss S. *Traffic*. 2009; 10(6):691–712. [PubMed: 19416475]
45. Coban O, Burger M, Laliberte M, Ianoul A, Johnston LJ. *Langmuir*. 2007; 23(12):6704–6711. [PubMed: 17477552]
46. Hancock JF. *Nat Rev Mol Cell Bio*. 2006; 7(6):456–462. [PubMed: 16625153]
47. Wu SHW, McConnell HM. *Biochemistry*. 1975; 14(4):847–854. [PubMed: 163646]
48. Simons K, Vaz WLC. *Annu Rev Biophys Biomol Struct*. 2004; 33:269–295. [PubMed: 15139814]
49. Burns AR, Frankel DJ, Buranda T. *Biophys J*. 2005; 89(2):1081–1093. [PubMed: 15879469]
50. Rietveld A, Simons K. *BBA-Rev-Biomembranes*. 1998; 1376(3):467–479.
51. Morris JE, Coutts TJ. *Thin Solid Films*. 1977; 47(1):3–65.
52. Bar LK, Barenholz Y, Thompson TE. *Biochemistry*. 1997; 36(9):2507–2516. [PubMed: 9054556]
53. Schram V, Lin HN, Thompson TE. *Biophys J*. 1996; 71(4):1811–1822. [PubMed: 8889158]
54. Saqr HE, Omran O, Dasgupta S, Yu RK, Oblinger JL, Yates AJ. *J Neurochem*. 2006; 96(5):1301–1314. [PubMed: 16441517]
55. Shreve AP, Howland MC, Sapuri-Butti AR, Allen TW, Parikh AN. *Langmuir*. 2008; 24(23):13250–13253. [PubMed: 19007257]

56. Kasbauer M, Junglas M, Bayerl TM. *Biophys J*. 1999; 76(5):2600–2605. [PubMed: 10233074]
57. Klymchenko AS, Duportail G, Demchenko AP, Mely Y. *Biophys J*. 2004; 86(5):2929–2941. [PubMed: 15111409]
58. Livingston PO, Ritter G, Calves MJ. *Cancer Immunol Immun*. 1989; 29(3):179–184.
59. Xia W, Thorpe MF. *Phys Rev A*. 1988; 38(5):2650–2656. [PubMed: 9900674]
60. Garboczi EJ, Thorpe MF, Devries MS, Day AR. *Phys Rev A*. 1991; 43(12):6473–6482. [PubMed: 9904996]
61. Saxton MJ. *Biophys J*. 1982; 39(2):165–173. [PubMed: 7052153]
62. Saxton MJ. *Biophys J*. 1987; 52(6):989–997. [PubMed: 3427202]
63. Lagerholm BC, Weinreb GE, Jacobson K, Thompson NL. *Annu Rev Phys Chem*. 2005; 56:309–336. [PubMed: 15796703]
64. Saxton MJ. *Biophys J*. 1989; 56(3):615–622. [PubMed: 2790141]
65. Blackwell MF, Whitmarsh J. *Biophys J*. 1990; 58(5):1259–1271. [PubMed: 19431774]

Figure 1. Schematic of how nanoparticle movement changes in bilayers composed of no GM₁ lipids (a) vs. bilayers containing >5% GM₁ lipids (b). Nanoparticles electrostatically bound to bilayers containing >5% GM₁ display confined motion that is restricted to the distance between GM₁ clusters. The bilayers are composed of phosphocholine (POPC), Ethyl phosphatylcholine (EPC), nitrobenzoxadiazol phosphoserine (NBDPE) and ganglioside (GM₁). For simplicity, GM₁ molecules in the lower leaflet are not drawn.

Figure 2.

The setup used to carry out single nanoparticle tracking experiments. Samples are mounted on an inverted microscope and viewed through a 100x oil immersion objective. A dark field condenser is placed on top of the sample so that only the scattered light is measured. The scattered light at all wavelengths then passes through the objective, a coupling lens and into a set of acousto-optical tunable filters (AOTF) where only one wavelength of light goes through to the EMCCD camera at a given time. This allows for the simultaneous acquisition of the particles position as well as the scattering spectrum.

Figure 3.

Trajectories of three particles in bilayers without GM₁(a). Plot of root mean squared displacement vs. time lag (b), and LSPR spectra (c) for the three particles shown in (a). The LSPR spectra were obtained with the particle trajectories simultaneously by scanning the AOTF from 500 to 800 nm as the particles are moving. The LSPR spectra were further smoothed using a Loess polynomial regression function. The root mean squared displacement plots of all three particles show a clear linear trend indicating their motion is Brownian.

Figure 4.

Trajectories of three particles in bilayers with 10% GM₁ (a). Plot of root mean squared displacement vs. time lag (b), and LSPR spectra (c) for the three particles shown in (a). The dashed line through the points plotted in b) is the fit to the equation: $\langle r^2 \rangle = \langle r_c^2 \rangle [1 - A_1 \exp(-4A_2Dt/\langle r_c^2 \rangle)]$, which is typically used to describe confined motion. In the above expression, $\langle r_c^2 \rangle$ is the asymptotic value where r_c is the radius of the confining region, D is the diffusion constant in cm^2/sec , and A_1 and A_2 are factors relating to the geometry of the confining region. The LSPR spectra were further smoothed using a Loess polynomial regression function.

Figure 5.

Series of histogram plots showing how the diffusion constant of the confined particles decreases with increasing GM₁ concentration (a). Histogram plots showing a decreasing trend in the confined radius with increasing GM₁ concentration (b). Histogram plots for 0% and 1% GM₁ are not shown since the number of confined particles was small.

Figure 6.

Plot of percent confined particles Vs GM₁ concentration shows a linear trend. It is expected that at the percolation threshold, 100% of the particles would show confined behavior, thus the percolation threshold is defined as the GM₁ concentration at 0% randomly diffusing particles. Linear extrapolation (dashed line) through the points reveals a percolation threshold value of 22% GM₁.

Figure 7.

Plot of confined diameter for the particles exhibiting confined behavior Vs GM₁ concentration shows a linear trend. Linear extrapolation (dashed line) through the points reveals a confined diameter of only 50 nm at the percolation threshold.

Table 1

Measured Diffusion Parameters For Individual Particles

GM ₁ Concentration	Number of Particles Measured	Percent Random Diffusion	Diffusion Constant, Random (cm ² /sec)	Diffusion Constant, Confined (cm ² /sec)	Confined Diameter (nm)
0%	95	92%	$4.3 (\pm 4.5) \times 10^{-9}$	$1.3 (\pm 0.8) \times 10^{-8}$	1300 (± 1100)
1%	63	84%	$3.8 (\pm 3.9) \times 10^{-9}$	$2.0 (\pm 0.7) \times 10^{-8}$	1100 (± 1100)
3%	81	77%	$9.6 (\pm 5.6) \times 10^{-10}$	$1.1 (\pm 0.5) \times 10^{-8}$	1500 (± 410)
5%	45	56%	$2.9 (\pm 4.4) \times 10^{-9}$	$7.9 (\pm 3.9) \times 10^{-9}$	870 (± 470)
8%	51	59%	$2.1 (\pm 4.5) \times 10^{-9}$	$9.6 (\pm 8.3) \times 10^{-9}$	680 (± 570)
10%	43	42%	$2.3 (\pm 2.8) \times 10^{-9}$	$1.7 (\pm 1.4) \times 10^{-10}$	820 (± 500)
14%	52	38%	$9.4 (\pm 6.7) \times 10^{-10}$	$1.8 (\pm 1.8) \times 10^{-10}$	560 (± 210)