Published in final edited form as:

J Am Chem Soc. 2013 December 18; 135(50): 19033–19038. doi:10.1021/ja411060p.

Understanding the Photophysics of the Spinach-DFHBI RNA Aptamer-Fluorogen Complex to Improve Live Cell RNA Imaging

Kyu Young Han^{†,‡}, Benjamin J. Leslie^{†,‡}, Jingyi Fei[‡], Jichuan Zhang[§], and Taekjip Ha^{†,‡,||,*}

[†]Howard Hughes Medical Institute, Urbana, IL 61801, United States

[‡]Department of Physics and Center for the Physics of Living Cells, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Urbana, IL 61801, United States

[§]Department of Materials Science and Engineering, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Urbana, IL 61801, United States

^{||}Institute for Genomic Biology, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Urbana, IL 61801, United States

Abstract

The use of aptamer-fluorogen complexes is an emerging strategy for RNA imaging. Despite promise for cellular imaging and sensing, the low fluorescence intensity of the Spinach-DFHBI RNA aptamer-fluorogen complex hampers its utility in quantitative live-cell and high-resolution imaging applications. Here we report that illumination of the Spinach-fluorogen complex induces photoconversion and subsequently fluorogen dissociation, leading to fast fluorescence decay and fluorogen concentration-dependent recovery. The fluorescence lifetime of Spinach-DFHBI is 4.0 ± 0.1 ns irrespective of the extent of photoconversion. We detail a low-repetition illumination scheme that enables us to maximize the potential of the Spinach-DFHBI RNA imaging tag in living cells.

INTRODUCTION

RNA has important roles in various cellular and developmental processes. It not only functions as a passive intermediary in protein production based on genetic information but also is a post-transcriptional regulator of gene expression.¹ Fluorescence imaging is one of the most valuable tools for studying these diverse functions of RNA by enabling direct visualization of RNA molecules in the cell and providing temporal and spatial information.² For example, it has been used to characterize transcription, transport, localization, translation and degradation of mRNA³ and to reveal critical roles played by noncoding RNA.⁴

Several RNA imaging techniques have been developed, of which the most widely used are fluorescence *in situ* hybridization (FISH) with organic dye-labeled oligonucleotide probes in fixed cells⁵ and fluorescent protein-fused RNA binding proteins in living cells.^{6–8} In particular, the MS2 system has been widely used for *in vivo* labeling of transcripts containing repeated stem-loops, which are specifically bound by a coat protein of

*Corresponding Author: tjha@illinois.edu.

The authors declare no competing financial interests.

ASSOCIATED CONTENT

Supporting Information. Experimental details, notes on fluorescence decay in a freely diffusing solution and on measurement of recovery rates and Figures S1 – S5. This material is available free of charge via the Internet at <http://pubs.acs.org>.

bacteriophage MS2 fused to a green fluorescent protein (GFP).⁶ These two techniques each have a key limitation in their utility. RNA FISH has single-RNA sensitivity, but is largely limited to fixed cells. MS2 systems are used in live cells, but high background fluorescence from unbound GFP limits its sensitivity. So-called “split-GFP” approaches significantly decrease background signals,^{8,9} but at a considerable cost to fluorescence intensity of assembled GFP fluorophores.¹⁰ While these techniques are complementary, a single technique that combines the sensitivity of FISH with live-cell capabilities would be valuable.

Recently, a simple and powerful method was introduced that facilitates RNA detection. A nontoxic and membrane-permeable nonfluorescent GFP chromophore analog, DFHBI (3,5-difluoro-4-hydroxy-benzylidene imidazolinone) or fluorogen, binds to a genetically encoded RNA aptamer called “Spinach,” eliciting green fluorescence (Figure 1a).¹¹ Indeed, Spinach was successfully implemented to visualize ribosomal RNA in living mammalian cells,¹¹ and to sense intracellular metabolites and protein expression by means of modular aptamers.¹² This fluorescent tag motivates potential applications to quantitative imaging of low-abundance RNA targets.

However, under cellular imaging conditions Spinach shows greatly reduced fluorescence compared to what is expected based on its nominal brightness which is reported to be similar to that of green fluorescent protein.^{11,13} Here we present a plausible mechanism to explain its limited fluorescence intensity and show that this fluorogen-aptamer complex has novel properties distinct from typical fluorescent proteins. Exploiting its underlying photo-physical properties, we demonstrate that > 5-fold higher total photon flux and 10-fold higher steady state fluorescence intensity can be obtained by low-repetition illumination in living *E. coli*.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Chemical synthesis of DFHBI

DFHBI was synthesized from 4-hydroxy-3,5-difluorobenzaldehyde as a starting reagent following the procedure of Paige and coworkers (see the SI for details).¹¹

Preparation of Spinach RNA aptamer

DNA coding for the Spinach aptamer was cloned into the pET28a plasmid (Novagen). Spinach was subsequently transcribed *in vitro* from the T7 promoter using MEGAshortscript T7 Kit (Ambion) according to the protocol provided by the manufacturer. Then the transcribed RNA was buffer-exchanged with a P-6 micro bio-spin column (Bio-Rad) three times into storage buffer (10 mM Tris-HCl, pH 7.5, 0.1 mM EDTA and 10 mM KCl) to remove free, unincorporated nucleotides. The Spinach RNA was then folded in 40 mM HEPES buffer (pH 7.5) with 125 mM KCl by incubating at 90 °C for 2 minutes and slowly cooling down to room temperature. At 65 °C, MgCl₂ was supplemented to a final concentration of 5 mM, and cooling was resumed.¹¹ For experiments that require attachment of Spinach to surfaces, a biotin-labeled DNA oligonucleotide (5'-TTATCCGCTCACAATTCCCATTG-biotin-3', Integrated DNA Technologies) was annealed to Spinach 5'-end, by directly mixing the biotin-DNA with Spinach during folding as described above.

Surface immobilization of GFP and Spinach

A flow chamber was prepared on a PEG (polyethylene glycol) coated coverslip with a low density of biotin-PEG (Laysan Bio).¹⁴ Neutravidin (0.2 mg/mL, Thermo Scientific) was incubated for 5 min and washed away with 1× PBS buffer (Lonza #17-517Q). Freshly

folded biotinylated Spinach aptamer (10 nM) was incubated for 10 min in an imaging buffer consisting of 40 mM HEPES (pH 7.5) with 125 mM KCl and 5 mM MgCl₂.¹¹ Then various concentrations of DFHBI (50 μ L) in the same buffer was loaded to the chamber for the measurements. The surface density of the immobilized RNA was roughly 5–20 molecules per focal volume. In the case of fluorescent proteins, recombinant *Aequorea coerulescens* GFP (rAcGFP1) was purchased from Clontech and used without further purification. The spectral properties of rAcGFP1 (hereinafter simply GFP) are reported to be similar to those of enhanced GFP.¹⁵ To immobilize GFP to the PEG surface, a biotinylated rabbit polyclonal anti-GFP antibody (Rockland Immunochemicals) was incubated on Neutravidin-coated flow chambers for 5 min and then washed out. After incubating GFP (5 nM) in the flow chamber for 10 min, unbound excess proteins were flushed before measurements were taken.

Fluorescence intensity and lifetime measurements

We used a custom built confocal microscope to detect fluorescence of GFP and Spinach, unless specified otherwise.¹⁶ A diode laser (473 nm, CNI laser) was used to illuminate the sample, and the illumination time and level of light intensity were controlled by acousto-optical filters (MT200-A0.5-VIS, AA Opto-Electronic). The fluorescence lifetime measurements were performed by the same microscope with an ultrafast laser (MaiTai HP, Spectra Physics) and a time correlated single photon counting module (SPC630, Becker Hickl).¹⁷ Please refer to the SI for more information.

Binding and unbinding kinetics measurements

The fluorescence increase was recorded with a fluorometer (Cary Eclipse) after rapidly mixing 40 nM of Spinach with different concentrations of DFHBI in a cuvette (80 μ L). The excitation and emission wavelengths were 460 nm and 510 nm, respectively. The illumination intensity was estimated to be 1–5 W/cm². The fluorescence intensity followed a single exponential time course.

Live cell imaging in *E. coli*

Rosetta (DE3) competent cells (Novagen) were transformed with pET28c-tRNA^{Spinach} (provided by Prof. Samie Jaffrey) which encodes a Spinach aptamer inserted into the tRNA^{Lys3} sequence. Cultures were grown overnight with shaking in Luria Broth (LB) containing 50 μ g/mL kanamycin at 37 °C. Then aliquots of the static culture were added to 5 mL LB containing 1 mM IPTG to reach OD₆₀₀ = 0.4 and induced at 37 °C. After 2.5 h, 100 μ L aliquots of cells were added to individual wells of 8-well Lab-Tek chamber (NUNC #155411) coated with poly-lysine and cells were allowed to adhere for 30 min at 25 °C. Cell-coated surfaces were gently washed two times with 200 μ L modified minimal M9CA broth (Teknova #M8011) with glycerol supplemented with 1 mM IPTG, and then incubated for 30 min at 25 °C in 200 μ L M9CA containing 1 mM IPTG and 100 μ M DFHBI. We used a home-built epi-illumination microscope to image live cells with an oil immersion objective lens (NA = 1.4, UPlanSApo 100x, Olympus) and an EMCCD camera (iXon DU-897, Andor). The illumination time of 473 nm light was synchronized to clock signals of the camera and controlled by a custom program. Image analysis was performed using MATLAB (MathWorks) and ImageJ (NIH) software.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Fast fluorescence intensity decay and recovery of the Spinach-DFHBI complex

Figure 1b shows typical fluorescence intensity time traces of the surface immobilized fluorescent protein and Spinach at high density coverage under a focused laser beam. While periodically turning on and off blue laser light (473 nm) with 0.2 kW/cm² of excitation

intensity (I_{exc}), the fluorescence signal was monitored by confocal microscopy at room temperature. As expected, the fluorescence intensity of GFP decreases slowly and does not recover in subsequent pulses. It has been well known that GFP's signal drop comes from irreversible photobleaching¹⁸ and/or photoconversion to a long-lived dark state.¹⁹

In contrast, applying the same excitation scheme to Spinach in the presence of excess DFHBI (5 μM), the initially bright fluorescence of the Spinach-DFHBI complex shows fast decay to a significantly reduced fluorescence level ($< 5\%$ of the initial level) within 2 seconds. Remarkably, after switching off the excitation light for a few seconds, a subsequent pulse reveals that the fluorescence signal is recovered back to 85–95% of the initial signal. This indicates that the fluorescence loss of Spinach-DFHBI is not due to fast, irreversible photobleaching but instead is caused by reversible conversion to a nonfluorescent state and that the signal recovery occurs spontaneously without light.

Power-dependent fluorescence decay

We next examined how the excitation intensity I_{exc} affects fluorescence decay (Figure 2a). The fluorescence decay of GFP becomes faster at higher I_{exc} and its decay rate (k_{off}) increases linearly with I_{exc} (Fig. 2b). For Spinach, however, k_{off} exhibits weaker dependence on I_{exc} , i.e., it changes only two-fold, from 11.7 to 21.2 s^{-1} , when I_{exc} increases 25-fold, from 0.2 to 5 kW/cm^2 , a range of I_{exc} commonly used in confocal microscopy and single molecule imaging (Figure 2b). The very weak dependence of fluorescence decay rate on I_{exc} suggests that fluorescence loss requires at least two steps, the first, light-dependent step already saturating at our typical I_{exc} values and the second, light-independent step.

In free solution, fluorescence decay would be difficult to detect because of replenishment of fluorescently active species from outside the excitation volume via diffusion. This was indeed the case for GFP (Figure 2c). For Spinach-DFHBI, however, photoconversion is very efficient, saturating even at moderate I_{exc} values (Figure 2a), and as a result, we could observe significant fluorescence decays even without immobilization (Figure 2c). To achieve the same degree of fluorescence decay for GFP, we had to use 1000-times higher I_{exc} (Figure 2c and Figure S1). This set of measurements in free solution further indicates that the weak dependence of fluorescence decay kinetics of immobilized Spinach-DFHBI on I_{exc} is due to a saturation of the highly efficient photoconversion process (please see the SI for further discussion).

Fluorescence lifetime of the Spinach-DFHBI complex

We examined the time-resolved fluorescence of the Spinach-DFHBI complex in two different ways to gain further insights. First, the fluorescence lifetime was measured when $> 80\%$ of the complex is photoconverted after 8 seconds of illumination (Figure 3, top left). Second, the fluorescence lifetime was measured during 20 ms pulse of illumination time every 2 s to ensure collecting fluorescence mainly from the bright molecular complex before photoconversion (Figure 3, top right). Here we used 0.5 μM Spinach and 0.5 μM DFHBI free in solution. As depicted in Figure 3, both cases exhibit a single exponential decay with fluorescence lifetime $\tau_f = 4.0 \pm 0.1$ ns, that is, regardless of the extent of photoconversion, and it is 1.5-times longer than that of GFP ($\tau_f = 2.7$ ns). This suggests that the photoconverted species does not accumulate to a high degree to be detected based on the fluorescence lifetime. The concentration of DFHBI does not greatly affect the fluorescence lifetime of the Spinach-DFHBI complex (Figure S2).

[DFHBI]-dependent fluorescence recovery

These characteristic behaviors of the Spinach-DFHBI complex may be attributed to (i) reversible photoconversion as previously proposed,²⁰ (ii) fluorogen exchange,¹¹ or (iii) a

combination of both. To further clarify the mechanism, we next determined the fluorescence recovery rate as a function of fluorogen concentration. If the Spinach-DFHBI complex is photoconverted to a nonfluorescent state in which the fluorogen is still bound to the RNA aptamer, thermal or light-induced recovery to a fluorescent state would be independent of [DFHBI]. Instead, the recovery rate (k_{on}) displays a strong dependence on [DFHBI]; k_{on} changes from 0.08 to 2.0 s^{-1} as [DFHBI] increases from 1 to $200 \text{ }\mu\text{M}$ (Figure 4), in disagreement with a previous proposal²⁰ where the reported recovery rate was constant at $\sim 0.0027 \text{ s}^{-1}$ independent of DFHBI concentration. This discrepancy results from the fact that we used immobilized RNA in excess of DFHBI whereas in the latter case, fluorescence recovery measured the replenishment rate of the fluorescent Spinach-DFHBI complex in a freely diffusing solution (please see the SI for detailed discussion). The sub-linear behavior of the recovery rate in Figure 4b might be attributed to altered spectral properties of the Spinach-DFHBI complex at high concentrations of DFHBI although its molecular mechanism remains unclear (Figure S3).

Binding-unbinding kinetics

Next we examined how fast fluorogen exchange occurs in the Spinach-DFHBI complex. Mixing the Spinach RNA with DFHBI in a quartz cuvette, the fluorescence change was monitored with very low light level ($< 1 - 5 \text{ W/cm}^2$) to minimize complications arising from photoconversion. Figure 5a shows that the fluorescence signal rises mono-exponentially, giving the observed rate constant (k_{obs}). A linear fit to k_{obs} vs. concentration of Spinach and DFHBI directly provides the binding rate constant, k_{bind} (slope), and the unbinding rate constant, k_{unbind} (intercept) in Figure 5b. The obtained $k_{\text{bind}} = 6.2 \pm 0.1 \times 10^4 \text{ M}^{-1}\text{s}^{-1}$ and $k_{\text{unbind}} = 2.4 \pm 0.1 \times 10^{-2} \text{ s}^{-1}$ yield dissociation equilibrium constant, $K_D = 390 \text{ nM}$ which is in good agreement with previous studies.^{11,20} Here, k_{bind} of Spinach-DFHBI is well within the range of typical small molecule-RNA aptamer interactions, which vary from $10^3 \text{ M}^{-1}\text{s}^{-1}$ to $10^6 \text{ M}^{-1}\text{s}^{-1}$.²¹

Notice that the dissociation time ($1/k_{\text{unbind}}$) is very long, that is, once Spinach binds to DFHBI, it stays as a complex for $> 40 \text{ s}$ under low light level or in the absence of light. Also, [DFHBI]-dependence of the recovery rate in low concentrations gives a bimolecular reaction rate, $4.9 \pm 0.3 \times 10^4 \text{ M}^{-1}\text{s}^{-1}$ that corresponds well to k_{bind} (Figure 4b inset). This confirms that the fluorescence recovery is mainly due to a bimolecular reaction between Spinach and DFHBI rather than a spontaneous recovery of the photoconverted complex.

Fluorescence signal gain with low-repetition illumination and its application to *E. coli* imaging

The limited time duration of fluorescence of the Spinach-DFHBI can be mitigated by low-repetition illumination. Here the fluorescence intensity was monitored under continuous wave (CW) illumination or under a pulsed illumination (50 ms pulse width) with a repetition rate varying from 2 Hz to 0.2 Hz (Figure 6a). A similar scheme has been applied in fluorescence microscopy to attain high fluorescence yield from organic dyes and fluorescent proteins where the repetition rates were from 0.1 kHz to 100 kHz to allow dark state relaxation.²²

To demonstrate the concept, we transformed *E. coli* with plasmids expressing Spinach and imaged them in the presence of $100 \text{ }\mu\text{M}$ DFHBI (Figure 6b).¹¹ Time-lapse fluorescence microscopy shows that the fluorescence signal of *E. coli* under CW illumination rapidly drops to $< 10 \%$ of the initial intensity within 0.2 s (Figure 6c), whereas pulsed illumination at 0.2 Hz repetition rate retains the fluorescence signal much better by ensuring sufficient recovery time between successive pulses (Figure 6d). This phenomenon holds true for immobilized Spinach RNA aptamers as well (Figure S4). We further quantified the data by

plotting the fluorescence time trajectories of a single cell (Figure 6e) and 40 cells averaged (Figure 6f). The accumulated fluorescence intensity, representing the total photon flux, is 5.7-fold higher at 0.2 Hz than with CW illumination for the same 2 s of total illumination time (Figure 6g). The steady state intensity is about 10 fold higher at 0.2 Hz compared to CW illumination (Figure 6e,f). Although the lower repetition rate gives higher fluorescence signal gain (Figure 6h), there is a tradeoff in imaging speed. Different RNA aptamers selected for higher k_{bind} may allow even higher imaging speed. Additionally, pulsed illumination with longer pulse widths is not effective in gaining higher signal, and needs more recovery time probably because shorter pulses (10 – 50 ms) minimizes the photoconversion process (Figure 6i).

Photophysical model of the Spinach-DFHBI complex

Based on our results, we can rule out the possibilities that Spinach undergoes reversible photoconversion without fluorogen exchange [model (i)] or efficient fluorogen exchange without photoconversion [model (ii)]. A study of a malachite green RNA aptamer has shown that the fluorogen can go through significant changes in their conformation and electronic structure upon illumination.²³ In the case of photoswitchable proteins, photoisomerization is known to be strongly involved with the formation of the dark state,²⁴ where an accompanying change in the configuration of fluorescent proteins leads to the conversion of a (fluorescent) deprotonated state to a (nonfluorescent) protonated state.²⁵ We confirmed that after 405 nm illumination the absorbance of free DFHBI decreases with its spectrum showing a red-shifted band and an enhanced high-energy band (Figure S5a). This is very similar to the spectroscopic features of GFP chromophore and its analogs indicating that *cis/trans* photoisomerization occurs for DFHBI.²⁶ For these reasons, it is tempting to suggest that the photoconversion of the Spinach-DFHBI complex may also be related to the *cis/trans* photoisomerization although a definite conclusion should await further studies.^{20,27}

To account for the unique photophysical behavior of Spinach we propose an alternative model as follows (Figure 7): Upon illumination of the Spinach-DFHBI complex, the bound DFHBI undergoes photoisomerization with a fast kinetic rate (k_{off}^*). It is possible that the photoisomerized complex before unbinding is already completely dark. However, because of the lifetime measurements shown in Figure 3, we can rule out the possibility that a partially quenched photoisomerized complex accumulates significantly under our experimental conditions. Photoisomerization results in fast unbinding (k_{unbind}^*) of the photoisomerized fluorogen, in contrast to the long-lived binding of DFHBI under very low or no illumination. Such accelerated unbinding could be caused by two factors: first, since the RNA aptamer was selected based on its binding affinity to the ground-state of DFHBI, its binding affinity to a photoisomerized DFHBI may not be optimal. Second, the Spinach aptamer might also change its conformation to accommodate photoisomerized DFHBI, a phenomenon observed in photoconverting fluorescent proteins, which could greatly decrease or even abolish binding. Rapid dissociation of photoisomerized DFHBI allows Spinach to binds to a new ground-state DFHBI from solution, restoring fluorescence. This could also explain why we could not identify the photoisomerized product via fluorescence lifetime (Figure 3) and fluorescence excitation spectrum (Figure S5b). It is also possible that light-induced fluorescence decay we observed here may be related to the recently reported RNA folding problem of Spinach.²⁸

CONCLUSION

It was reported that the basic fluorescence properties of the Spinach-DFHBI complex are similar to those of enhanced GFP.¹¹ This seems plausible given the similar ways in which the scaffolds of GFP and the Spinach RNA aptamer make a nonfluorescent chromophore

fluorescent through structural reinforcement involving specific hydrogen bonding and π -stacking interactions. However, our results show that the different nature of the RNA aptamer endows unique properties, i.e. fast fluorescence decay and [DFHBI]-dependent recovery attributed to photoconversion accompanied by accelerated unbinding. Use of pulsed illumination greatly increases the steady state fluorescence intensity and total photon flux of the Spinach-DFHBI. Combined with signal amplification by attaching many repeats of the RNA aptamer to a target RNA,²⁹ this pulsed excitation scheme may allow cellular RNA imaging at the single RNA level with high signal to noise ratio. Our study may also provide insights on how to improve the fluorescence properties of the Spinach-DFHBI complex as well as various fluorogenic dye-RNA aptamers.^{29,30}

Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

Acknowledgments

We thank Dr. Sung Chul Bae for providing the 473 nm laser and Prof. Samie R. Jaffrey for providing the pET28c-tRNA^{Spinach} plasmid. Funding was provided by NIH (GM065367 and AI083025) and NSF (PHY0822613). T. H. is an investigator of Howard Hughes Medical Institute.

References

1. Krol J, Loedige I, Filipowicz W. *Nat Rev Genet.* 2010; 11:597. [PubMed: 20661255] Guttman M, Rinn JL. *Nature.* 2012; 482:339. [PubMed: 22337053]
2. Martin KC, Ephrussi A. *Cell.* 2009; 136:719. [PubMed: 19239891]
3. Moore MJ. *Science.* 2005; 309:1514. [PubMed: 16141059] Fusco D, Accornero N, Lavoie B, Shenoy SM, Blanchard JM, Singer RH, Bertrand E. *Curr Biol.* 2003; 13:161. [PubMed: 12546792] Shav-Tal Y, Darzacq X, Shenoy SM, Fusco D, Janicki SM, Spector DL, Singer RH. *Science.* 2004; 304:1797. [PubMed: 15205532] Golding I, Cox EC. *Proc Nat Acad Sci USA.* 2004; 101:11310. [PubMed: 15277674] Darzacq X, Shav-Tal Y, de Turris V, Brody Y, Shenoy SM, Phair RD, Singer RH. *Nat Struct Mol Biol.* 2007; 14:796. [PubMed: 17676063]
4. Engreitz JM, Pandya-Jones A, McDonel P, Shishkin A, Sirokman K, Surka C, Kadri S, Xing J, Goren A, Lander ES, Plath K, Guttman M. *Science.* 2013; 341:767.
5. Lawrence JB, Singer RH, Marselle LM. *Cell.* 1989; 57:493. [PubMed: 2541917] Femino A, Fay FS, Fogarty K, Singer RH. *Science.* 1998; 280:585. [PubMed: 9554849] Raj A, van den Bogaard P, Rifkin SA, van Oudenaarden A, Tyagi S. *Nat Methods.* 2008; 5:877. [PubMed: 18806792]
6. Bertrand E, Chartrand P, Schaefer M, Shenoy SM, Singer RH, Long RM. *Mol Cell.* 1998; 2:437. [PubMed: 9809065]
7. Daigle N, Ellenberg J. *Nat Methods.* 2007; 4:633. [PubMed: 17603490]
8. Ozawa T, Natori Y, Sato M, Umezawa Y. *Nat Methods.* 2007; 4:413. [PubMed: 17401370]
9. Valencia-Burton M, McCullough RM, Cantor CR, Broude NE. *Nat Methods.* 2007; 4:421. [PubMed: 17401371]
10. Kerppola TK. *Nat Rev Mol Cell Biol.* 2006; 7:449. [PubMed: 16625152]
11. Paige JS, Wu KY, Jaffrey SR. *Science.* 2011; 333:642. [PubMed: 21798953]
12. Paige JS, Nguyen-Duc T, Song W, Jaffrey SR. *Science.* 2012; 335:1194. [PubMed: 22403384] Song W, Strack RL, Jaffrey SR. *Nat Methods.* 2013; 10:873. [PubMed: 23872791]
13. Strack RL, Jaffrey SR. *Curr Opin Chem Biol.* 2013; 17:651. [PubMed: 23746618]
14. Roy R, Hohng S, Ha T. *Nat Methods.* 2008; 5:507. [PubMed: 18511918]
15. Day RN, Davidson MW. *Chem Soc Rev.* 2009; 38:2887. [PubMed: 19771335]
16. Han KY, Kim SK, Eggeling C, Hell SW. *Nano Lett.* 2010; 10:3199. [PubMed: 20698637]
17. Han KY, Wildanger D, Rittweger E, Meijer J, Pezzagna S, Hell SW, Eggeling C. *New J Phys.* 2012; 14

18. Patterson GH, Knobel SM, Sharif WD, Kain SR, Piston DW. *Biophys J*. 1997; 73:2782. [PubMed: 9370472]
19. Dickson RM, Cubitt AB, Tsien RY, Moerner WE. *Nature*. 1997; 388:355. [PubMed: 9237752]
20. Wang P, Querard J, Maurin S, Nath SS, Le Saux T, Gautier A, Jullien L. *Chem Sci*. 2013; 4:2865.
21. Kulshina N, Baird NJ, Ferre-D'Amare AR. *Nat Struct Mol Biol*. 2009; 16:1212. [PubMed: 19898478] Wang TJ, Hoy JA, Lamm MH, Nilsen-Hamilton M. *J Am Chem Soc*. 2009; 131:14747. [PubMed: 19778045]
22. Donnert G, Eggeling C, Hell SW. *Nat Methods*. 2007; 4:81. [PubMed: 17179937] Dean KM, Lubbeck JL, Binder JK, Schwall LR, Jimenez R, Palmer AE. *Biophys J*. 2011; 101:961. [PubMed: 21843488]
23. Nguyen DH, DeFina SC, Fink WH, Dieckmann T. *J Am Chem Soc*. 2002; 124:15081. [PubMed: 12475353]
24. Chudakov DM, Feofanov AV, Mudriku NN, Lukyanov S, Lukyanov KA. *J Biol Chem*. 2003; 278:7215. [PubMed: 12496281] Andresen M, Stiel AC, Trowitzsch S, Weber G, Eggeling C, Wahl MC, Hell SW, Jakobs S. *Proc Nat Acad Sci USA*. 2007; 104:13005. [PubMed: 17646653]
25. Tolbert LM, Baldrige A, Kowalik J, Solntsev KM. *Acc Chem Res*. 2012; 45:171. [PubMed: 21861536] Dedecker P, De Schryver FC, Hofkens J. *J Am Chem Soc*. 2013; 135:2387. [PubMed: 23317378]
26. Voliani V, Bizzarri R, Nifosi R, Abbruzzetti S, Grandi E, Viappiani C, Beltram F. *J Phys Chem B*. 2008; 112:10714. [PubMed: 18671358]
27. Addison K, Conyard J, Dixon T, Page PCB, Solntsev KM, Meech SR. *J Phys Chem Lett*. 2012; 3:2298.
28. Strack RL, Disney MD, Jaffrey SR. *Nat Methods*. 2013; 10:1219. [PubMed: 24162923]
29. Babendure JR, Adams SR, Tsien RY. *J Am Chem Soc*. 2003; 125:14716. [PubMed: 14640641]
30. Sparano BA, Koide K. *J Am Chem Soc*. 2007; 129:4785. [PubMed: 17385867] Constantin TP, Silva GL, Robertson KL, Hamilton TP, Fague K, Waggoner AS, Armitage BA. *Org Lett*. 2008; 10:1561. [PubMed: 18338898] Sando S, Narita A, Hayami M, Aoyama Y. *Chem Commun*. 2008:3858. Lee J, Lee KH, Jeon J, Dragulescu-Andrasi A, Xiao F, Rao J. *ACS Chem Biol*. 2010; 5:1065. [PubMed: 20809562]

Figure 1.

(a) The binding of GFP-like fluorogen (DFHBI) to RNA aptamer (Spinach) activates green fluorescence upon 473 nm illumination. (b) Fluorescence time traces of GFP (green) and Spinach (red) immobilized to a surface subjected to light being turned on and off periodically (blue, $I_{\text{exc}} = 0.2 \text{ kW/cm}^2$). The Spinach-DFHBI complex shows fast fluorescence decay and reversible recovery in the dark whereas GFP displays irreversible fluorescence decay at this time scale.

Figure 2.

Fluorescence time traces (a) and decay rates (b) of the immobilized GFP and Spinach-DFHBI complex as a function of I_{exc} . The fluorescence intensity is normalized to maximum value at the highest I_{exc} and the decay rate (k_{off}) is an inverse of half-life. [DFHBI] = 5 μM . (c) Fluorescence intensity time traces of Spinach free in solution (solid lines). The dotted line (red) is for GFP free in solution at $I_{\text{exc}} = 160 \text{ kW/cm}^2$.

Figure 3.

Time-resolved fluorescence of the Spinach-DFHBI complex. Fluorescence lifetime was measured when the degree of photoconversion is maximized (Spinach CW, top left) or minimized (Spinach pulsed, top right). However, both result in the same decay rate, $\tau_f = 4.0$ ns. For comparison, the decay curves of GFP (green line; $\tau_f = 2.7$ ns) and DFHBI-only solution (gray dotted line; $\tau_f < 80$ ps) are shown.

Figure 4. [DFHBI]-dependent fluorescence time traces (a) and recovery rates (b) of the Spinach-DFHBI complex. Inset: The recovery rate at low [DFHBI] with a linear fit (red line).

Figure 5. Binding-unbinding kinetics of the Spinach-DFHBI complex. (a) A fluorescence time-profile when 40 nM Spinach was mixed with 200 nM DFHBI under very low light level. The red line is a mono-exponential fit. (b) The binding (k_{bind}) and unbinding (k_{unbind}) kinetic rates from linear fit (red solid line) of k_{obs} .

Figure 6.

Fluorescence signal gain from living *E. coli* expressing Spinach with low-repetition illumination. (a) Illumination scheme of CW and pulsed mode. (b) Spinach and DFHBI are necessary to image bright fluorescence from *E. coli*. Scale bar; 5 μ m. Time lapse fluorescence images of *E. coli* under CW (c) and pulsed illumination (d) with the same peak intensity (~ 100 W/cm²). [DFHBI] = 100 μ M, Scale bar; 5 μ m. (e) Fluorescence intensity traces from a single cell marked by white arrows in (c) and (d). (f) Repetition rate dependent fluorescence intensity traces averaged over many cells ($n > 40$). (g) Cumulative fluorescence intensity at various repetition rates. (g) Cumulative fluorescence intensity after 2 s of total illumination time. CW data is marked by a black square dot. Inset: Summed images of single *E. coli* (scale bar; 1 μ m). (i) The longer pulse illumination ($T_{on} = 5$ s) leads to less signal gain and longer recovery time.

Figure 7.

Proposed model of the Spinach-DFHBI complex fluorescence behavior. The two isomers of DFHBI are depicted on the bottom.