Published in final edited form as:

Free Radic Biol Med. 2016 December ; 101: 85–92. doi:10.1016/j.freeradbiomed.2016.09.028.

Imaging of radicals following injury or acute stress in peripheral nerves with activatable fluorescent probes

Haiying Zhou^a, Ying Yan^b, Xueping Ee^b, Daniel A. Hunter^b, Walter J. Akers^{a,1,2}, Matthew D. Wood^{b,1}, and Mikhail Y. Berezin^{a,1,2}

Walter J. Akers: akersw@wustl.edu; Matthew D. Wood: woodm@wudosis.wustl.edu; Mikhail Y. Berezin: berezinm@wustl.edu

^aDivision of Radiation Sciences, Department of Radiology, Washington University School of Medicine, 660 South Euclid Avenue, St. Louis, MO 63110, USA

^bDivision of Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery, Department of Surgery, Washington University School of Medicine, 660 South Euclid Avenue, St. Louis, MO 63110, USA

Abstract

Peripheral nerve injury evokes a complex cascade of chemical reactions including generation of molecular radicals. Conversely, the reactions within nerve induced by stress are difficult to directly detect or measure to establish causality. Monitoring these reactions *in vivo* would enable deeper understanding of the nature of the injury and healing processes. Here, we utilized near-infrared fluorescence molecular probes delivered via intra-neural injection technique to enable live, *in vivo* imaging of tissue response associated with nerve injury and stress. These initially quenched fluorescent probes featured specific sensitivity to hydroxyl radicals and become fluorescent upon encountering reactive oxygen species (ROS). Intraneurally delivered probes demonstrated rapid activation in injured rat sciatic nerve but minimal activation in normal, uninjured nerve. In addition, these probes reported activation within sciatic nerves of living rats after a stress caused by a pinprick stimulus to the abdomen. This imaging approach was more sensitive to detecting changes within nerves due to the induced stress than other techniques to evaluate cellular and molecular changes. Specifically, neither histological analysis of the sciatic nerves, nor the expression of pain and stress associated genes in dorsal root ganglia could provide statistically significant differences between the control and stressed groups. Overall, the results demonstrate a novel imaging approach to measure ROS in addition to the impact of ROS within nerve in live animals.

Correspondence to: Walter J. Akers, akersw@wustl.edu; Matthew D. Wood, woodm@wudosis.wustl.edu; Mikhail Y. Berezin, berezinm@wustl.edu.

¹indicates these authors contributed equally to the manuscript and are co-senior authors.

²Division of Radiation Sciences, Department of Radiology, Washington University School of Medicine, 4515 McKinley Avenue, St. Louis, MO 63110, USA

Conflict of Interest:

No benefit of any kind will be received either directly or indirectly by the author(s). The authors declare no competing financial interests.

Publisher's Disclaimer: This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final citable form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

Graphical abstract

Keywords

ROS; fluorescence; iFOS; imaging; peripheral nerve; stress; axons; nerve histomorphometry

1. INTRODUCTION

Acute physical and psychological stress activates the sympathetic nerve system (i.e. “flight or fight” response) to facilitate rapid preparation of an animal’s body for efforts to minimize injury and pain. Characteristic elements of this response to stress include a pressor reflex, increased heart rate and blood pressure, alongside elevated neuro excitability in muscle tissues [1]. Yet, while elements of this response provide useful functions, select mediators of the stress can have deleterious consequences to the nervous system through promotion of cellular damage and inflammation.

Potent mediators of the stress response are molecular radicals, including reactive oxygen species (ROS), which signal a diverse range of biological processes and the type of stress [2, 3]. Whereas radical signaling plays an essential role in cellular functions, endogenous mechanisms that normally repair oxidative damage can be overwhelmed by excess accumulation of ROS leading to oxidative damage of lipids, proteins, and nucleic acids. Damage to these essential cellular components is associated with a range of conditions and diseases including cancer, aging, and inflammation [4]. Indeed, even psychological stress has been shown to cause oxidative damage to nuclear DNA [5–7]. Beyond direct damage to cellular components, ROS is a potent immune and inflammatory modulator. Radical damage from ROS is associated with multiple diseases within the neurological spectrum: Alzheimer’s disease [8], multiple sclerosis [9], amyotrophic lateral sclerosis [10], and post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) [11]. Oxidative stress is also implicated as an initiating factor in numerous peripheral neuropathies including chemotherapy-induced peripheral neuropathy [12] and diabetic neuropathy [13]. Yet, the role of oxidative stress associated with the onset of these peripheral neurological conditions, including stress, has been challenging to fully establish as causal as its measurement requires sensitive assays that have not been amenable to *in vivo* use.

The full implications of radical accumulation in peripheral nerves are not completely understood as methods to monitor ROS dynamically and locally are underdeveloped. Blood flow to the peripheral nervous system is highly regulated through semi-permeable nerve-blood barriers, which decrease the sensitivity of serum marker measurements [14, 15]. In addition, current preclinical techniques are unable to provide direct assessment of toxic radicals within peripheral nerves. Damage to lipids, proteins, and nucleic acids can be readily measured in *ex vivo* tissues [16, 17] and through numerous sensitive assays relying on blood or serum [18, 19]. but tissue-specific and serial monitoring of radical expression in real time is not readily available due to the short half-life of ROS [2]. This inability to monitor ROS dynamically within a tissue of interest hinders evaluations of treatments intended to minimize the damage and demonstrate causal evidence of disease progression or submission. Traditional visible activatable imaging probes (i.e. dihydrodichlorofluorescein, dihydrorhodamine) are unsuitable for *in vivo* applications due to interference from tissue autofluorescence as well as low photon penetration. Recently near-infrared (NIR) activatable probes from the class of hydrocyanines suitable for ROS monitoring in live animals were proposed[20] and utilized for *in vivo* imaging of ischemia [21], acute lung injury [22], uncontrolled gut inflammation [23], and inflammation associated with implants [24].

In this work, we have developed an imaging approach for detecting ROS in the nerve tissue of live animal models using NIR activatable probes to evaluate an acute stress response. A focused NIR probe library was generated to provide a rationale selection of imaging agents. Considering chemical and biological properties of nerve tissues, we selected a probe that would allow for the semi-quantitative measurement of ROS generation within nerve. The presented imaging approach was sensitive enough to measure ROS activation in the nerve tissue following a relatively mild, acute stressful event. The observed fluorescent signals were detected despite minimal changes to sensory neurons and their axons within the peripheral nervous system (PNS), representing a potentially powerful tool for uncovering biological mechanisms underlying the onset of pathologies.

2. EXPERIMENTAL

2.1. Materials and methods

General Information—Common solvents and reagents for synthesis were purchased from Sigma-Aldrich, Alfa Aesar, or TCI America and used without further purification. Dyes 1,1',3,3',3',3'-hexamethylindotricarbocyanine (HITC) was purchased from Exciton, IRDye800CW from LI-COR Biosciences, ADS740WS was obtained from American Dye Source, LS851 was prepared in the lab according to a standard cyanine synthesis procedure [25]. Reduced hydrocyanines HITC-H, IRdye800CW-H, ADS740WS-H, and LS851-H were prepared according to a previously published procedure [20]. NMR spectra were recorded at room temperature on a Varian 400 MHz system in dimethyl sulfoxide (DMSO) with tetramethylsilane (TMS) as an internal standard (unless noted otherwise). Milli-Q water (Millipore) was used throughout this work. The compounds were analyzed using LC/MS-ESI analysis in the positive mode conducted on a Shimadzu 2010 A LC/MS system equipped with a UV/Vis detector at different wavelengths using a reversed-phase C-18 Vydac column (model 218TP, 4.6×50 mm) at a flow rate of 0.7 mL/min with a gradient of

10–95% acetonitrile in water (both solvent contained 0.1 % trifluoroacetic acid (TFA). UV/Vis spectra of samples were recorded on a DU 640 spectrophotometer (Beckman Coulter). Steady state fluorescence spectra were recorded on a Fluorolog-3 spectrofluorometer (Horiba Jobin Yvon).

Hydrocyanines synthesis, general procedure—To produce activatable non-fluorescent hydrocyanine dyes for ROS detection, each dye (0.028 mmol) was dissolved in methanol (7 mL) and put on ice. Sodium borohydride (NaBH_4) (0.113 mmol) was added to methanol (0.5 mL) on ice and the NaBH_4 solution was added dropwise to the dye-methanol solution with stirring. The reaction was monitored by the disappearance of the maximum absorption band using UV/Vis spectroscopy. The reaction was then warmed to room temperature (r.t.) with stirring over 20 minutes. The solvent was removed under vacuum to yield the final product.

Optical properties—For calculating the concentration from the absorption spectra, molar absorptivities of hydrocyanine probes were measured in a quartz cuvette with a known concentration of the dye in the original, oxidized form according to the formula

$$\epsilon_{red} = \epsilon_{ox} \frac{A_{395}^{after} - A_{395}^{before}}{A_{768}^{after} - A_{768}^{before}}$$

Where ϵ_{red} is the molar absorptivity of the ROS probe in ethanol, $\text{M}^{-1}\text{cm}^{-1}$, ϵ_{ox} is the molar absorptivity of the dye, that was measured using standard weight method and power plot, A_{768} – is the absorption at 768 nm before and after reduction, A_{395} - is the absorption at 395 nm before and after reduction. The molar absorptivity for HITC-H is $68,000 \text{ M}^{-1}\text{cm}^{-1}$ and $159,600 \text{ M}^{-1}\text{cm}^{-1}$ for HITC.

NIR integrated Fluorescence Overpotential Spectroscopy (iFOS)—The sensitivity of the dye to ROS was performed spectroelectrochemically using an in-house built iFOS technique [26] modified for NIR studies with a light-emitting diode (LED) 725 nm (Thorlabs) as the source of excitation. The method combines spectroscopic measurements with an electrochemical method of oxidation to measure the threshold oxidation potential of leucodyes. The three-electrode electrochemical cell was comprised of a polystyrene cuvette with a glassy carbon working electrode ($d = 2 \text{ mm}$, CH Instruments), Pt-wire counter electrode, and Ag/AgCl reference electrode filled with a filling solution comprised of 3M NaCl and saturated AgCl (Princeton Applied Research). The electrodes were inserted in a custom designed and made on a 3D printer (MarketBot) plastic cap to fit the cuvette. Prior to each experiment, the electrodes were cleaned electrochemically in anhydrous ethanol by applying 10 cycles of an alternating potential from -1.0 V to $+1.0 \text{ V}$ with 100 mV/sec . All measurements were run against ferrocene to set the scale. The potential range was scanned from -0.5 V to 2.3 V vs ferrocene. Ferrocene cyclic voltammetry scan in iFOS is shown in Figure S1, Supplementary Information).

Threshold oxidation potential measurements of probes—For the threshold oxidation potential measurements, 2 mL of ethanol, 100 μ L of hydrocyanine solution in ethanol, 200 μ L of supporting electrolyte Sodium hexafluorophosphate (NaPF_6) (100 mM in ethanol) were mixed together in a 4 mL plastic cuvette. First, absorption spectra were recorded to determine the concentrations of the dyes in the cuvette using molar absorptivities of the hydrocyanine dyes at 395 nm. Second, the argon was bubbled through the solution for 10–15 sec to remove traces of air. Finally, fluorescence intensity recorded at the wavelengths close to the maximum of fluorescence was synchronized with the applied potential.

2.2. Animal experimental design and procedures

All animal surgeries were conducted in compliance with the Washington University Institutional Animal Studies Committee and NIH guidelines. Animals were housed in a central animal care facility and provided with food (PicoLab rodent diet 20, Purina Mills Nutrition International) and water ad libitum. A total of 24 adult male Sprague-Dawley rats (200–250 g, Charles River Laboratories) were randomized to one of three studies for a total of eight groups.

Injection preparation—The reduced dye was synthesized as described above, protected under argon, and kept in -80°C . It was used for imaging studies within a week after preparation. The resuspension of the dye to form an injectable imaging solution was performed within 4 hours of animal injection. For that, the dye was first re-suspended in DMSO to reach 5 mM concentration. The solution was further diluted with ethanol to 2.5 mM and kept as stock solution. The dyes readily dissolved in this medium (50:50 vol. DMSO:ethanol) at this concentration without any visible precipitate. The stock solution was then filtered through syringe filters, pore size 0.45 μm (Millipore) to provide 2.5 mM sterilized stock solution. After that, 80 μL of the filtered stock solution, 400 μL of polyethylene glycol (PEG-400), and 1520 μL of Milli-Q water (resistivity 18.2 $\text{M}\Omega\cdot\text{cm}$) were mixed in a vial to make a final injectable solution at 100 μM dye concentration ready for injection. Imaging was always performed with a freshly prepared solution within less than 4 hours after preparation.

Model of acute stress—Rats were restrained and received an intraperitoneal (IP) injection of saline (0.9% NaCl in water) (100 μL). This procedure was used 30 mins or 24 hours before the imaging studies to measure ROS within nerve and/or other tissue analysis. This procedure results in a mild amount of acute psychological stress and physical pain (somatic and visceral) to the animals [27]. The control group were handled but received no IP injection before the additional procedures.

Study A: Probe delivery—This study considered intraneural probe delivery approach to administer quenched hydrocyanine ROS probe into peripheral nerves. Three groups of rats were utilized in this arm of the study. In Group 1 (diffuse injection; $n=2$), a needle of microsyringe (Hamilton, 26 G) was inserted the length of the nerve under the epineurial sheath and probe injected gradually as the syringe was drawn through the tissue. This technique sought to maximize delivery and distribution of the imaging probe throughout the

tissue. In Group 2 (point injection; n=1), the needle was inserted into a single small area under the epineurial sheath and probe injected. This technique intended to minimize physical trauma to the nerve while still administering dye that could diffuse throughout the nerve. In Group 3 (injection control; n=2), a needle was inserted the length of the nerve under the epineurial sheath with injection of saline (40 μ L) instead of probe.

The presence of ROS within peripheral nerve was detected by macroscopic imaging of anesthetized rats with imaging probes injected into the sciatic nerve. Rats were anesthetized using a cocktail of ketamine (75 mg/kg, Fort Dodge Animal Health) and dexmedetomidine (0.5 mg/kg, Pfizer Animal Health) given subcutaneously. Procedures were conducted with aseptic technique using an operating microscope. The right hindquarter was shaved and prepped with betadine, skin divided parallel to the femur, and the biceps femoris muscle split. Under 10–25x magnification using sterilized micro-instruments, the sciatic nerve was exposed to include the sciatic notch proximally and its trifurcation to tibial, peroneal, and sural nerves distally. The probe (1 mM, 40 μ L) was injected just under the epineurial sheath of the nerve and imaged (methods below). Following imaging, rats were euthanized with injections of somnasol (150 mg/kg, IP, Delmarva Laboratories).

Study B: In vivo imaging of ROS in nerve in an acute stress model—This study served to demonstrate the ability of the imaging probes to detect ROS within nerve under acute stress utilizing two groups. Group 4 (Stressed; n=4) rats were restrained and received an IP injection of saline (100 μ L) 24 hours before procedures to measure ROS within nerve. Group 5 (Control; n=4) received no IP injection before these imaging procedures. The presence of elevated ROS within peripheral nerve was detected by macroscopic imaging of anesthetized rats with imaging probes injected into the sciatic nerve. Rats were anesthetized and imaged 24 hours after treatments. Following imaging, rats were euthanized and the sciatic nerve and nerve roots L4 and L5 dorsal root ganglia (DRG) were harvested and flash frozen (-70°C) for further analysis.

Study C: Additional analysis of ROS immediately following acute stress—This study served to detect other changes to nerve due to acute stress utilizing two groups. Group 6 (stressed; n=4) rats were restrained and received an IP injection of saline (100 μ L) 30 mins before procedures to measure gene expression changes with DRG (L4 & L5). Group 7 (control; n=4) received no IP injection before these procedures. Group 8 (normal; n=4) served as controls, with no sham procedures performed while nerve and DRG were harvested.

Imaging and image analysis—Immediately after imaging probe injection (within an hour), the nerve and surrounding tissue were imaged using a fluorescence-enabled dissecting microscope (Olympus MVX10) under brightfield and NIR illumination (Cy7 filtercube, Semrock). Image acquisitions were performed using MetaMorph ver. 7.1.0.0 (Molecular Devices). Images were standardized according to magnification (6.3X), exposure time, and orientation. Image analysis was conducted using ImageJ software (Figure S2, Supplementary Information).

2.3. Histology

Sciatic nerve was harvested after imaging and underwent histomorphometric analysis as previously described [28]. Briefly, nerve was harvested and stored in 3% glutaraldehyde (Polysciences Inc.). The nerves were post-fixed in 1% osmium tetroxide and serially dehydrated in ethanol and toluene. The nerves were then embedded in epoxy (Polysciences), and sectioned on an ultramicrotome into 1 μ m cross sections. Slides were counter-stained with 1% toluidine blue dye. The slides were then analyzed at 1000x on a Leitz Laborlux S microscope. The Leco IA32 Image Analysis System (Leco) was utilized to quantify myelinated axon number, density, and myelin width. All analysis was done by an observer blinded to the experimental groups.

2.4. qRT-PCR of gene expression

DRG were harvested from the L4 and L5 nerve roots to assess gene changes within neurons and their axons composing the sciatic nerve. RNA was extracted using Trizol (Life Technologies), chloroform and RNeasy Mini Kit (Qiagen) according to manufacturer's instructions and pooled for each animal from the L4 and L5 DRG. RNA concentration was determined on a NanoDrop 1000 Spectrophotometer (Thermo Scientific) and purity and integrity were assessed on an Agilent 2100 Bioanalyser RNA 6000 using an Agilent Nano total RNA Kit (Agilent Technologies). Genomic DNA contamination was removed through treatment with gDNA Wipeout Buffer (Qiagen) at 42°C for 2 mins. RNA was then reverse transcribed into complementary DNA per manufacturer's instructions for the High Capacity RNA to DNA by RT2 First Strand Kit (Qiagen). A panel of genes associated with pain and stress was chosen for analysis. This panel was selected based on known gene changes in DRG following nerve constriction (a pain and stress model) to sciatic nerve using microarray [29], RNA-seq [30] and text mining [31] studies. These genes included: protachykinin-1 (*Tac1*), neuropeptide Y (*Npy*), calcitonin gene-related peptide (*Cgrp*), vascular intestinal peptide (*Vip*), Pituitary adenylate cyclase-activating polypeptide (*Pacap*), Galanin (*Gala*), nerve growth factor (*Ngf*), neurotrophic tyrosine kinase receptor type 1 (*Ntrk1*), interleukin-6 (*Il6*), and POU domain, class 4, transcription factor 1 (*Pou4f1*). These genes were examined following applicable treatments described for each group (groups 4–7) with normalization of expression to a housekeeping gene, β -actin (*Actb*) [32]. PCR arrays were performed on a Step One Plus thermocycler (Applied Biosystems) and the data analyzed on Step One Software ver. 2.2.2 (Applied Biosystems). To estimate the mRNA concentrations, the differences in gene expression levels between two different samples were calculated using the comparative delta crossover threshold (Ct) method. An absolute value of 2 or greater was selected as the minimum criteria for a significant difference in expression levels between groups.

Statistical Analysis—All data were compiled as mean $\pm$ standard deviation. Data was tested for normality using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test. An unpaired, two-tailed Student's *t*-test was used to compare data sets. A significance level of $p < 0.05$ was used in all statistical tests performed.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1. Selection of ROS probes

Imaging of ROS levels in tissue requires fluorescent probes with suitable redox potentials (sensitivity) and reactivity. Overly sensitive probes will result in fluorescent activation by endogenous reactive species, while probes with low sensitivity will be non-activated and remain not fluorescent. Given the same sensitivity, probes with higher reactivity are expected to produce stronger signal. For the probe selections, quantitative measurements of sensitivity and reactivity were performed using a recently described iFOS system [26] modified for NIR measurements. In this method, electrochemical oxidation of the non-fluorescent molecules converts them into fluorescent molecules. This conversion is recorded as a function of the applied electrochemical potential. Quantitative parameters derived using this method are Threshold Oxidation Potential (E_g^t) that reflects the sensitivity of the probe toward oxidation and Reactivity (R): ($R = F/c$) that describes the kinetic ability of the probes to be oxidized under electrochemical conditions. Graphic description of these parameters is shown in Figure 2.

The iFOS graphs of the four prepared NIR activatable probes (see structures in Figure 1) are presented in Figure 3. It appears from the results plotted that all compounds showed E_g^t values in the narrow range 1.38–1.46 V vs ferrocene, significantly higher potential than for the previously measured commercial visible ROS probes, such as dihydroxyfluorescein (−0.04V) and dihydrorhodamine-6G (+0.45V). High E_g^t values of the NIR probes made them sensitive only to strong radicals, such as hydroxyls (redox potential of the common ROS is given in Table S1, Supplementary Information). Commercially available IRDye800CW-H was the most sensitive among the studied probes with the $E_g^t = +1.38$ V. However, HITC-H was the most reactive providing twice more signal than IRDye800CW-H or other dyes. In the selection of the probe, we also envisioned that due to its hydrophobic properties, HITC-H and the product of its activation HITC, will not leak from the nerve after interfascicular injection. Hence, for all in vivo studies, HITC-H was selected.

3.2. Optimization of the delivery

We have previously demonstrated intrafascicular injection of cyanine dyes, which did not cause toxicity to the animal or chemical damage to the nerves [33]. To determine a delivery technique of the probe to nerve, we considered two microinjection techniques: diffuse vs point injection. A diffuse technique could maximize distribution of the probe but potentially causes additional tissue damage, while a point injection could minimize tissue damage but may under-distribute the probe within the tissue. Following administration of the probe within nerve using these techniques, the probe signal intensity and location was measured by fluorescence imaging within an hour. In general, the signal generated by the probe from the nerve was >4x background levels (measured by the average intensity at the region of interest (ROI), see Supplementary Information Fig. S2) reflecting a combination of nerve's autofluorescence, dye's residual fluorescence, and activation of the probe by endogenous oxidation activity in the nerve tissue (Figure 4). As expected, the diffuse injection resulted in unintended activation of probe throughout the entire region of nerve where the microsyringe passed (Figure 4, upper panel). Conversely, the point injection resulted in the local

accumulation of the probe while still permitting the probe to flow longitudinally within the nerve ~0.5–1.0 cm (Figure 4, middle panel). Significantly higher level of emission along the entire nerve (nerve to surrounding tissue ratio 6.21 vs 1.34), suggested an activation of the probe by ROS upon delivery. The autofluorescence of the nerve evaluated by the injection of saline into the nerve and comparing to the surrounding tissue was marginal (Ratio nerve/surrounding tissue = 1.29; Figure 4, lowest panel). Therefore, moving forward, we measured ROS within nerves using the point injection technique as it minimized unintended probe activation from normal response to physical damage.

3.3. Imaging of acute stress

Having established the appropriate technique to introduce the probe to nerve, we examined an animal model of acute stress. The effect of acute stress on the PNS is complex and associated with gene expression changes [27] and activation of cytokines, prostanooids and other mediators of inflammation [34]. Within the PNS, upregulated ROS acutely sensitize nociceptors [35], which can activate the “fight and flight” response but can occasionally lead to painful inflammatory conditions. Systematic studies of acute stress, such as caused by physiological stimuli or induced somatic and visceral pain, have identified certain mediators which modify ROS generation including corticotropin-releasing hormone (CRH) [36]. In the CNS, this hormone activates autonomic and endocrine functions that down-regulate immune responses [34]. Peripheral sensory afferent type C fibers and postganglionic sympathetic nerves also express CRH [37]. In contrast to the brain, peripheral CRH exerts pro-inflammatory effects [34]. Specifically, it enhances the expression of nitric oxide synthase to promote nitric oxide production [38] and ROS that induce mast cell degranulation [39].

To generate an acute, psychologically-stressful event, rats were given an IP injection of saline. Twenty four hours following this acute stress event, rat nerve demonstrated robust probe signal compared to unstressed rat nerve (Figure 5). Significantly larger nerve to background ratios from the stressed animals were observed: ratio=6.21 (Figure 5, upper panel) vs non-stressed (ratio =1.31) (Figure 5, lower panel), indicating a substantial increase of ROS in the nerve tissue following acute stress.

3.4. Histological analysis shows minimal changes to nerve after acute stress

To determine how the sciatic nerve was affected by the stressful event, more common biological outcome metrics were considered. Quantitative histology of the nerve 24 hours after acute stress was measured immediately following imaging. While the injection of probe and fluid had an impact on the myelinated fiber spacing, major morphological features to nerve remained unchanged (Figure 6, upper panel).

The morphology of the nerve after the acute stress had statistically identical parameters to Control group nerves, indicating that the stress did not induce any alterations to nerve morphology with no evidence of injury (Figure 6, lowest panel). The differences in the total number of myelinated axons, myelinated axon density, and myelin width were overall unremarkable. A small variability in the morphometric parameters is expected, as a result of natural biological variability between animals.

3.5. Gene expression analysis detects minimal changes to nerve after acute stress

In addition, gene expression changes were measured in sensory neurons (DRG), which project axons in the sciatic nerve. These gene changes were measured shortly after the stressful event (30 mins) as well as at the time (24 hours) corresponding with the observed ROS signal following the stressful event. A panel of genes associated with pain and stress (Table 1) was chosen for analysis according to the literature reports of most common alterations associated with neural damage [29–31]. While most genes in the DRG were unchanged in expression following the stressful event, nerve growth factor (NGF) gene expression was decreased immediately following the stress (30 mins) before returning to normal expression levels. This observation is congruent with other reports, where circulating and brain NGF levels undergo significant variations after exposure to stressful events [40] (also reviewed [41]). Therefore, the described ROS imaging approach with activatable fluorescent probes offers an opportunity to observe minimal discrete changes to tissue that could go overlooked using more common outcome metrics.

4. CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE WORK

Acute stress in rats caused by intraperitoneal injection of saline caused a significant increase in intraneural ROS as measured and visualized in sciatic nerves of living rat 24 hours after the stress. The effect was visualized *in vivo* using a novel approach consisting of near-infrared fluorescence molecular probes directly injected into peripheral nerves. The probes demonstrated rapid activation in nerve after injection and reported significantly higher activation after acute stress. Other techniques such as histomorphometry and gene expression analysis for pain and stress associated genes had minimal ability to detect changes to nerve shortly after acute stress, and with an exception of *Ngf* expression in DRG, which was elevated shortly after acute stress before returning to basal levels. Overall, the results suggest an imaging approach with activatable fluorescent probes can be used for evaluation and monitoring acute stress in animal models. The described technique will facilitate discovery of new neuroprotective interventions to reduce the damaging effects of physical, psychological and pharmacological stress on the nervous system. Improvements over the intrafascicular injection route described here such as non-invasive topical delivery [42] and minimally invasive injectable nerve-targeted [43] fluorescent reporters are currently under investigation as more clinically viable options.

Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

Acknowledgments

We thank NCI/NIH CA198419 (MB), NSF Research Infrastructure Improvement Award # IIA-1355406 for the financial support and the Washington University Optical Spectroscopy Core Facility (NIH 1S10RR031621-01) for assisting with the optical measurements.

List of abbreviations

CNS central nervous system

PNS	peripheral nervous system
NIR	near-infrared
ROS	reactive oxygen species
HITC	1,1',3,3',3',3'-hexamethylindotricarbocyanine
HITC-H	reduced, activatable form of HITC
DMSO	dimethyl sulfoxide
TMS	tetramethylsilane
TFA	trifluoroacetic acid
IP	intraperitoneal
DRG	dorsal root ganglia
NGF	nerve growth factor
LC/MS-ESI	liquid chromatography mass spectrometer electron spray ionization
ROI	region of interest
iFOS	integrated Fluorescence Overpotential Spectroscopy
CRH	corticotropin-releasing hormone

References

1. Whyte KA, Hogg RC, Dyavanapalli J, Harper AA, Adams DJ. Reactive oxygen species modulate neuronal excitability in rat intrinsic cardiac ganglia. *Auton Neurosci*. 2009; 150(1–2):45–52. [PubMed: 19442588]
2. Radak, Z.; Suzuki, K.; Higuchi, M.; Balogh, L.; Boldogh, I.; Koltai, E. Free Radical Biol Med. Physical exercise, reactive oxygen species and neuroprotection.
3. Suzuki N, Mittler R. Reactive oxygen species-dependent wound responses in animals and plants. *Free Radical Biol Med*. 2012; 53(12):2269–2276. [PubMed: 23085520]
4. Jacobs AH, Tavitian B. IN consortium. Noninvasive molecular imaging of neuroinflammation. *J Cereb Blood Flow Metab*. 2012; 32(7):1393–415. [PubMed: 22549622]
5. Adachi S, Kawamura K, Takemoto K. Oxidative damage of nuclear DNA in liver of rats exposed to psychological stress. *Cancer Res*. 1993; 53(18):4153–5. [PubMed: 8364908]
6. Barascu A, Le Chalony C, Pennarun G, Genet D, Imam N, Lopez B, Bertrand P. Oxidative stress induces an ATM-independent senescence pathway through p38 MAPK-mediated lamin B1 accumulation. *Embo J*. 2012; 31(5):1080–94. [PubMed: 22246186]
7. Kalogeris T, Baines CP, Krenz M, Korthuis RJ. Cell biology of ischemia/reperfusion injury. *Int Rev Cell Mol Biol*. 2012; 298:229–317. [PubMed: 22878108]
8. Parajuli B, Sonobe Y, Horiuchi H, Takeuchi H, Mizuno T, Suzumura A. Oligomeric amyloid beta induces IL-1beta processing via production of ROS: implication in Alzheimer's disease. *Cell Death Dis*. 2013; 4:e975. [PubMed: 24357806]
9. Friese MA, Schattling B, Fugger L. Mechanisms of neurodegeneration and axonal dysfunction in multiple sclerosis. *Nat Rev Neurol*. 2014; 10(4):225–38. [PubMed: 24638138]

10. Pollari E, Goldsteins G, Bart G, Koistinaho J, Giniatullin R. The role of oxidative stress in degeneration of the neuromuscular junction in amyotrophic lateral sclerosis. *Front Cell Neurosci*. 2014; 8:131. [PubMed: 24860432]
11. Wilson CB, McLaughlin LD, Ebenezer PJ, Nair AR, Francis J. Valproic acid effects in the hippocampus and prefrontal cortex in an animal model of post-traumatic stress disorder. *Behav Brain Res*. 2014; 268:72–80. [PubMed: 24675160]
12. Di Cesare Mannelli L, Zanardelli M, Failli P, Ghelardini C. Oxaliplatin-induced neuropathy: oxidative stress as pathological mechanism. Protective effect of silibinin. *J Pain*. 2012; 13(3):276–84. [PubMed: 22325298]
13. Feldman EL. Oxidative stress and diabetic neuropathy: a new understanding of an old problem. *J Clin Invest*. 2003; 111(4):431–3. [PubMed: 12588877]
14. Kanda T. Biology of the blood-nerve barrier and its alteration in immune mediated neuropathies. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry*. 2013; 84(2):208–12. [PubMed: 23243216]
15. Kiernan JA. Vascular permeability in the peripheral autonomic and somatic nervous systems: controversial aspects and comparisons with the blood-brain barrier. *Microsc Res Tech*. 1996; 35(2):122–36. [PubMed: 8923447]
16. Jun HJ, Woolfenden S, Coven S, Lane K, Bronson R, Housman D, Charest A. Epigenetic Regulation of c-ROS Receptor Tyrosine Kinase Expression in Malignant Gliomas. *Cancer Res*. 2009; 69(6):2180–2184. [PubMed: 19276365]
17. Thomsen LL, Miles DW, Happerfield L, Bobrow LG, Knowles RG, Moncada S. Nitric oxide synthase activity in human breast cancer. *Br J Cancer*. 1995; 72(1):41–4. [PubMed: 7541238]
18. Thusu, K.; Abdel-Rahman, E.; Dandona, P. Measurement of Reactive Oxygen Species in Whole Blood and Mononuclear Cells Using Chemiluminescence. In: Armstrong, D., editor. *Free Radical and Antioxidant Protocols*. Humana Press; Totowa, NJ: 1998. p. 57-62.
19. Dikalov S, Griendling KK, Harrison DG. Measurement of reactive oxygen species in cardiovascular studies. *Hypertension*. 2007; 49(4):717–27. [PubMed: 17296874]
20. Kundu K, Knight SF, Willett N, Lee S, Taylor WR, Murthy N. Hydrocyanines: A Class of Fluorescent Sensors That Can Image Reactive Oxygen Species in Cell Culture, Tissue, and In Vivo. *Angew Chem Int Ed Engl*. 2009; 48(2):299–303. [PubMed: 19065548]
21. Magalotti S, Gustafson TP, Cao Q, Abendschein DR, Pierce RA, Berezin MY, Akers WJ. Evaluation of inflammatory response to acute ischemia using near-infrared fluorescent reactive oxygen sensors. *Mol Imaging Biol*. 2013; 15(4):423–30. [PubMed: 23378226]
22. Zhou, H.; He, S.; Gunsten, S.; Brody, S.; Akers, W.; Berezin, M. CLEO: Applications and Technology. Optical Society of America; 2014. NIR fluorescent contrast agents for detection of inflammation of lungs in vivo. AM2P.1
23. Lin PW, Myers LES, Ray L, Song SC, Nasr TR, Berardinelli AJ, Kundu K, Murthy N, Hansen JM, Neish AS. *Lactobacillus rhamnosus* blocks inflammatory signaling in vivo via reactive oxygen species generation. *Free Radical Biol Med*. 2009; 47(8):1205–1211. [PubMed: 19660542]
24. Suri S, Lehman SM, Selvam S, Reddie K, Maity S, Murthy N, García AJ. In vivo fluorescence imaging of biomaterial-associated inflammation and infection in a minimally invasive manner. *J Biomed Mater Res A*. 2015; 103(1):76–83. [PubMed: 24616254]
25. Gustafson TP, Cao Q, Achilefu S, Berezin MY. Defining a polymethine dye for fluorescence anisotropy applications in the near-infrared spectral range. *Chemphyschem*. 2012; 13(3):716–23. [PubMed: 22302715]
26. Wang ST, Zhegalova NG, Gustafson TP, Zhou A, Sher J, Achilefu S, Berezin OY, Berezin MY. Sensitivity of activatable reactive oxygen species probes by fluorescence spectroelectrochemistry. *Analyst*. 2013; 138(15):4363–9. [PubMed: 23736882]
27. Ryabinin AE, Wang YM, Finn DA. Different levels of Fos immunoreactivity after repeated handling and injection stress in two inbred strains of mice. *Pharmacol Biochem Behav*. 1999; 63(1):143–51. [PubMed: 10340535]
28. Hunter DA, Moradzadeh A, Whitlock EL, Brenner MJ, Myckatyn TM, Wei CH, Tung TH, Mackinnon SE. Binary imaging analysis for comprehensive quantitative histomorphometry of peripheral nerve. *J Neurosci Methods*. 2007; 166(1):116–24. [PubMed: 17675163]

29. Xiao HS, Huang QH, Zhang FX, Bao L, Lu YJ, Guo C, Yang L, Huang WJ, Fu G, Xu SH, Cheng XP, Yan Q, Zhu ZD, Zhang X, Chen Z, Han ZG, Zhang X. Identification of gene expression profile of dorsal root ganglion in the rat peripheral axotomy model of neuropathic pain. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 2002; 99(12):8360–8365. [PubMed: 12060780]
30. Perkins JR, Antunes-Martins A, Calvo M, Grist J, Rust W, Schmid R, Hildebrandt T, Kohl M, Orengo C, McMahon SB, Bennett DLH. A comparison of RNA-seq and exon arrays for whole genome transcription profiling of the L5 spinal nerve transection model of neuropathic pain in the rat. *Mol Pain*. 2014; 10:7–7. [PubMed: 24472155]
31. Jamieson DG, Moss A, Kennedy M, Jones S, Nenadic G, Robertson DL, Sidders B. The pain interactome: Connecting pain-specific protein interactions. *PAIN*. 2014; 155(11):2243–2252. [PubMed: 24978826]
32. Thellin O, Zorzi W, Lakaye B, De Borman B, Coumans B, Hennen G, Grisar T, Igout A, Heinen E. Housekeeping genes as internal standards: use and limits. *J Biotechnol*. 1999; 75(2–3):291–5. [PubMed: 10617337]
33. Gustafson TP, Yan Y, Newton P, Hunter DA, Achilefu S, Akers WJ, Mackinnon SE, Johnson PJ, Berezin MY. A NIR Dye for Development of Peripheral Nerve Targeted Probes. *Med Chem Commun*. 2012; 3(6):685–690.
34. Chrousos GP. The Hypothalamic–Pituitary–Adrenal Axis and Immune-Mediated Inflammation. *N Engl J Med*. 1995; 332(20):1351–1363. [PubMed: 7715646]
35. Kidd BL, Urban LA. Mechanisms of inflammatory pain. *Br J Anaesth*. 2001; 87(1):3–11. [PubMed: 11460811]
36. Harris RBS. Chronic and acute effects of stress on energy balance: are there appropriate animal models? *Am J Physiol*. 2015; 308(4):R250–R265.
37. Udelsman R, Harwood JP, Millan MA, Chrousos GP, Goldstein DS, Zimlichman R, Catt KJ, Aguilera G. Functional corticotropin releasing factor receptors in the primate peripheral sympathetic nervous system. *Nature*. 1986; 319(6049):147–150. [PubMed: 3001536]
38. Nezi, M.; Mastorakos, G.; Mouslech, Z. Corticotropin Releasing Hormone And The Immune/Inflammatory Response. In: De Groot, LJ.; Beck-Peccoz, P.; Chrousos, G.; Dungan, K.; Grossman, A.; Hershman, JM.; Koch, C.; McLachlan, R.; New, M.; Rebar, R.; Singer, F.; Vinik, A.; Weickert, MO., editors. *Endotext*. South Dartmouth (MA): 2000.
39. Cao J, Papadopoulou N, Kempuraj D, Boucher WS, Sugimoto K, Cetrulo CL, Theoharides TC. Human mast cells express corticotropin-releasing hormone (CRH) receptors and CRH leads to selective secretion of vascular endothelial growth factor. *J Immunol*. 2005; 174(12):7665–75. [PubMed: 15944267]
40. von Richthofen S, Lang UE, Hellweg R. Effects of different kinds of acute stress on nerve growth factor content in rat brain. *Brain Res*. 2003; 987(2):207–213. [PubMed: 14499965]
41. Aloe L, Alleva E, Fiore M. Stress and nerve growth factor: Findings in animal models and humans. *Pharmacol Biochem Behav*. 2002; 73(1):159–166. [PubMed: 12076735]
42. Jorge LL, Feres CC, Teles VE. Topical preparations for pain relief: efficacy and patient adherence. *J Pain Res*. 2011; 4:11–24.
43. Park MH, Hyun H, Ashitate Y, Wada H, Park G, Lee JH, Njiojob C, Henary M, Frangioni JV, Choi HS. Prototype nerve-specific near-infrared fluorophores. *Theranostics*. 2014; 4(8):823–33. [PubMed: 24955143]

Research Highlights

- An activatable near-infrared fluorescent probe was activated in the presence of strong radicals in the nerve tissue of rats.
- The activation was stronger after exposing the rat to acute stress.
- Histomorphometry of the sciatic nerve and gene analysis for a variety of stress and pain markers were unable to identify the stress.
- The presented approach with fluorescent activatable probes can be used for measuring reactive oxygen species in the nerve tissue of live animals as a response to the stressful event.

Figure 1. Structures of the synthesized NIR activatable probes
HITC-H and LS851-H are hydrophobic molecules; ADS740WS-H and IRDye 800CW-H are hydrophilic due to the presence of sulfonate groups

Figure 2. Principle of measurements of an ROS probe activation using iFOS

Threshold oxidation potential (E_G^T) reflects the sensitivity of the probes toward oxidation. Reactivity (R) reflects the level of the probes activation $R=(F-F_0)/c$ where F is the fluorescence at the maximum measured oxidation potential, F_0 – starting fluorescence, c – concentration of the probe. Example is given for dihydroxyfluorescein.

Figure 3. iFOS of the tested activatable probes

The signal was normalized to the same concentration (1 μ M of the probe) and initial fluorescence at -0.5 V. Calculated E_g^t and R values: $E_g^t(\text{HITC-H}) = +1.41$ V, $R_{\text{HITC-H}} = 8.3$; $E_g^t(\text{LS851-H}) = +1.40$ V, $R_{\text{LS851-H}} = 5.5$; $E_g^t(\text{ADS740WS-H}) = +1.46$ V, $R_{\text{ADS740WS-H}} = 3.3$; $E_g^t(\text{IRdye800CW-H}) = +1.38$ V, $R_{\text{IRdye800CW-H}} = 2.6$. Excitation 725 nm, electrochemical ramp 4.5×10^{-3} V/s, total recording time 610 s, solvent ethanol supporting electrolyte NaPF_6 (100 mM in ethanol)

Figure 4. Activation of HITC-H after interfascicular delivery into sciatic nerve

Upper panel diffuse injection, (nerve to surrounding tissue ratio = 6.21). Middle panel, point injection, (ratio = 1.34). Lowest panel, diffuse saline injection (ratio = 1.29). Images were taken within 1 hr from the probe delivery

Figure 5. Effect of acute stress on HITC-H activation in sciatic nerves

Upper panel: stress induced by a point injection of saline ip leads to strong activation of the probe (ratio =6.21), Lower panel: no activation is observed in control (non-stressed) mice (ratio =1.31). Images were collected 24 h after the stress.

Figure 6. Morphology of sciatic nerves after acute stress

Upper row: histological micrographs. *Normal*: sciatic nerve of non-stressed mice with no injection of the probe. *Stressed*: stressed sciatic nerve 24 h following stress, harvested immediately after imaging. *Control*: sciatic nerve harvested immediately after imaging the probe injected into nerve, no stress. Stained with osmium tetroxide, counterstained with toluidine blue. Obj. 40x, overall magnification 400x. Lower row: corresponding histomorphometric analysis of sciatic nerve cross-sections after acute stress, where no differences were noted compared to control and normal.

Scheme 1.

Synthesis of NIR activatable probes hydrocyanines sensitive to ROS

Table 1
Relative DRG gene expression changes following acute stress (fold change vs normal DRG)

Gene of Interest	Experimental Groups (Mean±SD)			Statistics (n=4 per group, p value)	
	Control	Stress 30 mins	Stress 24 hrs	Stress vs Control, 30 mins	Stress vs Control, 24 hrs
Neuropeptides					
<i>Tac1</i>	1±0.07	1.07±0.1	1.17±0.2	NS	NS
<i>Npy</i>	1±0.4	0.7±0.4	0.82±0.88	NS	NS
<i>Cgrp</i>	1±0.08	1.04±0.07	1.01±0.2	NS	NS
<i>Vip</i>	1±0.6	1.04±0.2	1.08±0.2	NS	NS
<i>Pacap</i>	1±0.1	1.1±0.09	1.3±0.13	NS	NS
<i>Galanin</i>	1±0.1	0.95±0.26	1.08±0.17	NS	NS
Neurotrophic factors and Receptors					
<i>Ngf</i>	1±0.13	(-2.44)±1.29	1±0.2	0.039	NS
<i>Ntrk1</i>	1±0.1	1.05±0.1	1.02±0.14	NS	NS
Proinflammatory Cytokine					
<i>Il6</i>	1±0.2	0.87±0.1	1±0.3	NS	NS
Transcription factor involved in cell damage and apoptosis					
<i>Pou4f1</i>	1±0.16	1±0.07	0.9±0.04	NS	NS