



This is a repository copy of *Confocal/two-photon microscopy in studying colonisation of cancer cells in bone using xenograft mouse models.*

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:
<http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/130910/>

Version: Submitted Version

Article:

Allocca, G., Kusumbe, A.P., Ramasamy, S.K. et al. (1 more author) (2016)
Confocal/two-photon microscopy in studying colonisation of cancer cells in bone using xenograft mouse models. BoneKEy Reports, 5.

<https://doi.org/10.1038/bonekey.2016.84>

Reuse

Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



eprints@whiterose.ac.uk
<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/>

1 **Title: Confocal/two-photon microscopy in studying colonisation of cancer cells in bone**
2 **using xenograft mouse models**

3

4 Gloria Allocca¹, Anjali P. Kusumbe², Saravana K. Ramasamy^{3,4}, Ning Wang^{1*}

5

6 Affiliations:

7 ¹ The Mellanby Centre for Bone Research, Department of Oncology and Metabolism, The
8 University of Sheffield, Sheffield S10 2RX, UK

9 ² Kennedy Institute of Rheumatology, University of Oxford, Roosevelt Drive, Headington,
10 Oxford OX3 7FY, UK

11 ³ Integrative Skeletal Physiology group, Institute of Clinical Sciences, Imperial College
12 London, London, W12 0NN, UK

13 ⁴ MRC Clinical Sciences Centre, Du Cane Road, London, W12 0NN, UK

14

15 *Corresponding author and address for reprint requests:

16 Dr Ning Wang

17 The Mellanby Centre for Bone Research

18 Department of Oncology and Metabolism

19 The University of Sheffield

20 Beech Hill Road, Sheffield, S10 2RX

21 UK

22 Phone: (+44) 0114 2159216

23 Fax: (+44) 0114 271 2475

24

25 **Running title:** Confocal/two-photon in bone oncology research

26

1 **Abstract**

2 Confocal and two-photon microscopy has been widely used in bone research to not only
3 produce high quality, three-dimensional (3D) images but also to provide valuable structural
4 and quantitative information. In this article, we describe step-by-step protocols for confocal
5 and two-photon microscopy to investigate earlier cellular events during colonisation of
6 cancer cells in bone using xenograft mouse models. This includes confocal/two-photon
7 microscopy imaging of paraformaldehyde (PFA) fixed thick bone sections and frozen bone
8 samples.

9

10 **Keywords**

11 Confocal, two-photon microscopy, cancer metastasis, bone

12

1 **Introduction**

2 Confocal and two-photon microscopy have been widely used to visualise and track biological
3 events, from the cellular to the molecular level, with the main advantage being able to
4 produce 3D images of thick sample specimens. This provides exciting possibilities to study
5 cellular interactions and microstructures when imaging optically dense tissue such as bone.

6 The first confocal microscope was developed by Marvin Minsky in 1955 ¹ and was widely
7 applied in biological research after its commercial availability in early 1980s ². In a confocal
8 microscope, the laser beam is focused by the objective lens into a focal volume within a
9 fluorescent specimen. All emitted fluorescent light from the focal plane will be recollectd
10 by the objective lens, focused at the confocal pinhole and passed to the detector, whilst
11 fluorescent light emitted from objects not in focal plane (out-of-focus signal) will hit the
12 edge of the pinhole and be physically blocked from reaching the detector. Therefore,
13 sharper images with better contrast and higher resolution could be achieved using a
14 confocal microscope, compared to the commonly used wide-field fluorescence microscope
15 (Figure 1A). Since the first application in studying human cranial bone microstructure by
16 Alan Boyde in 1990 ³, confocal microscopy has become a powerful tool in research related
17 to the skeletal system, such as assessment of bone microdamage under physiological and
18 pathological conditions ⁴⁻⁶. Confocal microscopy has also provided opportunities to
19 investigate bone cell-to-cell interactions in three-dimension, which is particular important
20 for research involving osteocytes and osteoblasts ⁷⁻¹¹. More recently using revised and
21 improved bone processing strategy, a significant progress has been made in the imaging of
22 the bone marrow microenvironment and particularly the vasculature in bone. This technical

1 advance led to the identification of a specialized blood vessel subtype (namely type H) in
2 bone, which forms a niche for osteoprogenitors and thereby regulates bone formation ¹²⁻¹⁴.

3 The principle of the two-photon effect was proposed in 1930s by Maria Göppert-Mayer and
4 confirmed in 1961 by Wolfgang Kaiser ¹⁵. During conventional excitation using confocal
5 microscopy, a fluorescent molecule absorbs a single excitation photon with higher energy
6 level and shorter wavelength than emission. For example, a photon of 488nm wavelength is
7 used to excite GFP molecule to emit a 509nm photon. In contrast, in two-photon
8 microscopy, two longer wavelength exciting photons are used to excite the same
9 fluorescent molecule, when these two photons are concentrated or 'fused' in a small
10 volume of specimen (<1 f litre) within a short time period (scale of attoseconds) ¹⁶. In theory,
11 a GFP molecule could be excited by two 976nm photons with half the amount of energy of
12 one 488nm photon ¹⁶. This means the operating wavelength is in the near-infrared range. In
13 addition, as the two-photon effect only occurs at the focal point, the excitation outside the
14 focal plan is limited and hence physically cutting out-of-focus signals with the pinhole is no
15 longer necessary (Figure 1B). All of these offer advantages compared to confocal microscopy,
16 including reduced scattering, enhanced depth penetration, lower phototoxicity, and the
17 ability to excite multiple fluorescent markers with a single excitation wavelength. As bone
18 structures heavily scatter lights and the high collagen content generates second-harmonic
19 signals (SHG), these advantages won two-photon microscopy increasing popularity in
20 research of cellular activities and interactions within bone and marrow, particularly in
21 identifying the haematopoietic stem cell niche and detecting bone metastasis-initiating cancer
22 cells in bone ¹⁷⁻²³.

1 In this article, using the detection of breast cancer cell bone colonisation by confocal and
2 two-photon microscopy as a representative example, we will describe a step-by-step
3 methodology, from sample preparation to data analyses, used to investigate cellular events
4 in frozen and fixed/decalcified mouse bone samples *ex vivo* (See schematic outline, Figure 2).
5 Advantages and limitations of this technology is also discussed to guide the reader as to
6 which is the most appropriate for their research question.

7

1 **Materials and methods**

2 This methodology, developed for use with the Zeiss LSM510 NLO Upright multiphoton
3 microscope, allows the visualization the 3D structure of frozen/fixed samples of calcified
4 bones and the detection of fluorescent lipophilic dyes labelled cancer cells within the bone
5 marrow, providing essential information on the seeding of cancer cells *in vivo*.

6 1. Cancer cell preparation and inoculation

7 On the day of inoculation, breast cancer cells are pre-labelled with fluorescent lipophilic
8 membrane dyes (Vybrant DiD, Dil and CM-Dil, Life Technologies Ltd, Paisley, UK) to facilitate
9 the detection of single cells in the bone microenvironment by multiphoton microscopy. One
10 advantage of using these lipophilic dyes is being able to detect dormant cells as these cell
11 membrane dyes are diluted to nondetectable concentrations in proliferating cells^{20-22, 24, 25}.

12 Cancer cells are firstly washed with PBS, trypsinized by 0.15% Trypsin-EDTA for 3-5 minutes,
13 at 37°C at 5% CO₂. Cells are removed with appropriate media containing 10% FBS and
14 centrifuged for 5 minutes at 200g. The cell pellet is re-suspended at a concentration of
15 1×10^6 cells/ml in serum free medium for Vybrant DiD labelling or in Hanks' balanced salt
16 solution (HBSS) for Vybrant CM-Dil. Five microliter cell-labeling solution is added per
17 milliliter of cell suspension and incubated at 37°C for 20 minutes (Vybrant DiD) or 5 minutes
18 followed by 15 minutes on ice (Vybrant CM-Dil). Following the incubation, the cell
19 suspension is centrifuged at 200g for 5 minutes. The supernatant is discarded and the cell
20 pellet is re-suspended in PBS. The washing in PBS is repeated three times. Labelled cancer
21 cells are then resuspended at 1×10^5 cells/mL in PBS for the following intra-cardiac or intra-
22 venous inoculations in immunocompromised mice (100µL/mouse). The cell suspension

1 should be kept on ice and filtered with 40µm cell strainer prior injection to prevent
2 clumping of cells that could cause an embolism ²⁶.

3 **Note:** Unlike DiD and Dil, CM-Dil is a Dil derivative and can be retained in cells throughout
4 fixation, permeabilization and paraffin embedding procedure.

5

6 2.1 Frozen bone sample preparation

7 As previous studies suggested, breast cancer cells locate preferentially in long bones in
8 murine models, tibias and femurs were therefore collected for *ex vivo* two-photon
9 microscopy examination ^{20, 27}. Other bone samples (e.g. ribs) can also be used for
10 confocal/two-photon microscopy examination but extra care should be taken to maintain
11 consistency of sample orientation while sectioning, which is important for comparison of
12 different samples.

13 Immediately after animal euthanasia, long bones were dissected free of soft tissue and
14 snap-frozen in liquid nitrogen. The frozen bones were then embedded in Bright Cryo-M-Bed
15 (Bright Instrument Co. Ltd, Huntingdon, UK) and frozen in sample blocks. The embedded
16 tissue blocks are then trimmed longitudinally to expose bone marrow area using a Bright
17 OTF Cryostat with a 3020 microtome (Bright Instrument Co. Ltd, Huntingdon, UK) (Figure
18 3A). The cutting angle of the blade is set to 22 degrees in order to obtain an even surface
19 crucial to allow optimal imaging of the bone structure. However, the optimal setting of
20 cutting angle could be various depend on different instruments. The bone was placed with
21 the exposed marrow surface inside an uncoated, 35mm glass bottom microwell dish
22 (MatTek Corporation, Ashland, USA) and a coverslip was applied to keep it tightly attaching

1 to the surface of glass bottom (Figure 3B). Using an upright multiphoton microscope (Zeiss
2 LSM510 NLO, Carl Zeiss Inl, Cambridge, UK) the glass bottom dish has to be placed upside
3 down, with the exposed bone marrow surface facing upwards (Figure 3C). For long scans,
4 ensure to keep the sample moist.

5 **Note:** Keeping similar orientations of samples in the blocks is strongly advised. For example,
6 right tibias are placed in blocks with the right fibula facing the right side of the block and the
7 opposite direction is used for the left limb.

8

9 2.2 Fixed/decalcified bone sample preparation

10 Extreme calcification causes opacity and hinders processing of bone tissue preventing its
11 analysis by high-resolution optical imaging. Though extensive and long decalcification steps
12 enable ergonomic tissue handling, these steps mask epitopes of antigens limiting the
13 optimal immunohistochemical analysis. We have recently revised and improved the bone
14 processing strategy, which involves short decalcification, and thick bone sectioning
15 combined with confocal microscopy enables bone imaging at a resolution never achieved
16 before. The methodology provides a novel approach to explore the structural, spatial and
17 morphological components of the bone marrow microenvironment under physiological and
18 pathological conditions. These technical advancements have led to the characterization of
19 distinct vessel subtypes in bone ¹²⁻¹⁴. Here, we report this advanced methodology that will
20 provide a platform to close several major knowledge gaps and will therefore greatly
21 facilitate future analyses focusing on the bone marrow. We describe this methodology to
22 acquire high quality images of the bone tissue in a stepwise manner.

1

2 In this procedure, freshly isolated bone tissue is fixed immediately using a 4%
3 paraformaldehyde solution for 4 hours at room temperature. The fixed bones are washed in
4 Phosphate Buffered Saline (PBS) and subjected to short decalcification using 0.5M Ethylene
5 Diamine Tetra Acetate (EDTA) solution for 24-48 hours. Decalcified bones are washed
6 thoroughly in PBS and incubated in cryoprotectant solution (20% sucrose and 2% Polyvinyl
7 Pyrrolidone) for 24 hours. Following cryoprotection, bones are suspended in gelatin based
8 embedding solution for 30minutes before being embedded and kept in an ultrafreezer for
9 freezing. The embedding solution composed of 8% gelatin, 20% sucrose and 2% PVP works
10 better than OCT in this protocol. The frozen samples are cut using a cryotome to get tissue
11 sections of appropriate thickness. These cryosections can be further used for
12 immunohistochemical studies to understand the bone marrow microenvironment. The
13 comprehensive methodology from collecting fresh bone tissues to cryosectioning and
14 immunostaining has been described previously²⁸.

15

16 3. Imaging bone samples with confocal/two-photon microscopy

17 *Basic microscope settings*

18 The bone structure can be visualised by second harmonic generation using a Chameleon
19 laser at 900nm (Coherent, Santa Clara, CA.), while Vybrant-DiD labelled cancer cells can be
20 visualised using a 633nm HeNe laser and Vybrant Dil/CM-Dil with a 543nm HeNe laser. The
21 configuration settings and beam paths for different channels are shown in Figure 4A. The
22 second-harmonic generation is detected with BP390-465 (blue, pseudocoloured white in

1 image Figure 4B), Vybrant-Dil/CM-Dil with BP 565–615 (orange/red, pseudocoloured pink in
2 image Figure 4B) and Vybrant-DiD with BP 650–710 (far red, pseudocoloured red in image
3 Figure 4B).

4 **Note:** As multiphoton microscopy has the ability to excite multiple fluorescent markers with
5 a single excitation wavelength, two-photon excitation can be set at 820 nm and multiple
6 fluorescence can be detected using the following: BP435-485 to detect blue (SHG), BP 500–
7 550 to detect green (GFP), and BP 650–710 to detect far-red (DiD)²³. However, this will
8 increase the energy level of photon and hence higher risk of photobleaching.

9 **Note:** Multiphoton work has potential hazard to the eyes depending on laser light
10 wavelength and beam intensity. Damage to the retina can be caused by light within the
11 wavelength range of 400-1400nm, therefore safety goggles must be worn at all times during
12 the procedure.

13 *Visualisation of the specimen with transmitted light*

14 Ensuring that the specimen is flat against the glass bottom dish is crucial for obtaining high
15 quality image of the specimen. Transmitted light is used to visualise the specimen prior to
16 the scanning with the multiphoton laser, via ensuring even focus at all extremities of the
17 specimen and clear vision of both borders of the growth plate.

18 *Setting up the Z-stack*

19 Once the focus on the specimen has been set using transmitted light, visualise the tissue
20 with the Chameleon laser set at 900nm. Adjust the focus up and down until the bone
21 disappears from view to set a temporary upper and bottom boundaries, using the
22 continuous scan function. Move the focal plane to the middle between the two boundaries

1 and set as zero level where the bone should appear brightest. In the Z-stack setting panel
2 (see note), reset the upper and bottom boundaries depending on the desired depth of the
3 Z-stack scan. For a Z-stack in depth of 70µm, upper and bottom boundaries are set at 35 µm
4 above and below the focal plane (zero level) respectively, with 2µm interval between each
5 scan levels.

6 **Note:** The depth of a z-stack should be determined by the weakest laser used in the protocol.
7 At 100% power, the 543nm HeNe laser (for DiI/CM-DiI) could typically achieve acceptable
8 image quality at depth of 70µm, while 633nm HeNe laser (for DiD) could reach 100µm,
9 when used for imaging bone specimens. Although two-photon excitation can in theory
10 image at depths up to 1mm²⁹, good quality image of bone structure can only be achieved
11 up to 130µm with SHG and the Chameleon laser at 900nm.

12 *Setting up a tile scan*

13 Once satisfied with the z stack setting, move the position beacon to the middle of the
14 specimen. A tile of 5x6 mosaics (an area of 2104µm x 2525µm) is required to cover the
15 growth plate and the metaphysis region of a tibia. It is recommended to check the four
16 corner of the tile to determine if the z-stack boundaries are appropriate for the entire bone,
17 adjusting the z settings if necessary. Reposition the beacon to the middle of the tile and
18 focus at zero plane. The other lasers can then be switched on and a low resolution test tile
19 scan could be run to check the settings and presence of tumour cells in the bone.

20 **Note:** It is strongly recommended to use low resolution scanning and maximal scanning
21 speed during the set up stage, i.e. using a frame size of 256 and a mean pixels depth of 1, to
22 quicken this procedure and reduce the potential of photobleaching. Although two-photon

1 microscopy has the general advantage of reduced photobleaching, high-order
2 photobleaching is still observed within the focal volume²⁹.

3 *Imaging the bone*

4 To achieve high quality image within the shortest time period, change the frame size to 512,
5 mean pixel depth to 4 and use the maximum speed of scanning (Figure 5A). Prior to the
6 beginning of the scan, correct settings and detailed configuration should be loaded in a
7 Multi Time Series (MTS) software. These include database to store temporary files and the
8 reconstructed tile z-stack image, configuration of laser settings, depth and pixels of the scan,
9 z-stack and tile location. Principal steps and settings of MTS software are shown in Figure 5B.
10 Typically, a scan of 2104µm x 2525µm for 70µm depth using two lasers will take
11 approximately 3 hours and 30 minutes, while using 3 lasers will take up to 6 hours
12 depending on the instrument.

13

14 4. Image analysis using Volocity 3D Image Analysis Software

15 Analysis of the 3D reconstructed, tile z-stack scans can be performed using a range of
16 different software packages, such as the commercially available Volocity 3D Image Analysis
17 (PerkinElmer, Cambridge, UK) or the freely downloadable ImageJ (<https://imagej.nih.gov/ij/>).

18 In this methodology, we use Volocity 3D Image Analysis Software to carry out 3D analysis of
19 the scanned tibias. Under the '3D Opacity' mode, the software could be used to provide
20 qualitative data via applying pseudocolour (i.e. white colour for calcified bone tissue by SHG)
21 and adjusting brightness and contrast for different channels (Figure 6A). Under 'extended
22 focus' model, the software could provide quantitative data, i.e. quantifying objectives and

1 measuring distances between objectives. Upon setting up the quantification protocol, the
2 function 'Find object' was used to identify bone and tumour cells. Objectives detected with
3 900nm multiphoton laser with a minimum size of $500 \mu\text{m}^3$ were considered as bone, while
4 objectives detected by the 633nm HeNe laser with a minimum size of $250 \mu\text{m}^3$ and intensity
5 threshold between 90 and 255 were considered Vybrant-DiD labelled breast cancer cells
6 (Figure 6B & 6C). Objectives were quantified within a defined region of interest (ROI) and
7 their distance to the nearest bone surface and to the nearest tumour cell was calculated
8 using the 'Measure distance' option of the software, in addition to the default
9 measurements such as size and signal intensity of the objectives (Figure 6D). Finally, all the
10 quantitative data can be exported as comma-separated values (CSV) file for further
11 statistical analysis.

12

1 **Discussion**

2 In this manuscript, we have described step-by-step protocols to be used in confocal and
3 two-photon microscopy in cancer bone metastasis research using mouse models.

4 This method holds a number of advantages over other available techniques for bone
5 imaging. These advantages include: 1. The method generates high-resolution 3D image of
6 the bone microenvironment to understand the spatial and temporal arrangement of
7 multiple cell types within the bone tissue. 2. The thick tissue sections maintain intact
8 structure and cellular morphology, which is essential to understand phenotypic changes in
9 bone structure in genetic studies. 3. The high quality reproducible images generated using
10 this protocol can be used for quantification studies as the method shows low levels of
11 background while maintaining optimal tissue and cellular morphology.

12 In addition to the techniques related to confocal and two-photon microscopy, good
13 fluorescent labelling techniques are equally important for high quality imaging. It is
14 important to choose the right labelling dyes appropriate to the nature of samples and
15 equipment of laser sources. A panel of the most commonly used fluorescent markers for
16 bone research using confocal and two-photon microscopy are listed in table 1. This will
17 facilitate the readers to decide the choice in usage of confocal or two-photon microscopy,
18 together with considering beneficial factors such as lower phototoxicity and multi-
19 fluorescence excitation by two-photon microscopy. However, deeper penetration depth by
20 two-photon, widely accepted as 6-fold deeper than confocal microscopy using the same
21 sample and fluorophores²⁹, will not be achieved in thick bone specimens due to their dense
22 nature. In our practice, penetration depth below 150µm by two-photon laser and SHG could

1 provide optimal images for bone structure, which is not significantly superior to the
2 maximum depth (~100µm) that confocal microscopy could achieve.

3 Although the methodology is highly advantageous, it has to be used in combination with
4 other advanced techniques such as micro-CT, PET etc to better understand the bone
5 structure. The limitations associated with using this procedure are: 1. This procedure does
6 not provide dynamic data, which limits our understanding of dynamic processes in bone.

7 Although intravital imaging is achieved in cranium, live imaging more dynamic endochondral
8 skeletons is still a milestone need to be achieved³⁰. 2. The procedure is unsuitable for
9 quantifying secretory or chemokines in bone. 3. As the procedure involves imaging of thick
10 tissue sections, it is necessary to analyze serial sections and number of samples to verify the
11 phenotypic changes in bone structure. 4. The procedure costs are higher than other
12 techniques due to the high purchase costs of appropriate laser sources and high running
13 costs for longer scanning time.

14 In conclusion, confocal/two-photon microscopy is a powerful research tool for studying
15 cellular interactions and microstructures in murine bone models. Understanding working
16 principle, background, advantages and limitations of this technique, could help users to
17 adjust and improve their own protocol for applying confocal/two-photon microscopy to
18 cancer bone metastasis research, using our methodology as a reference.

19

1 **Acknowledgement**

2 We thank Professor Ingunn Holen and Ms Anne Fowles for critical reading of this manuscript
3 and insightful scientific discussion.

4

1 **Conflict of Interest**

2 All authors state that they have no conflicts of interest.

3

4

1 **References:**

- 2 1. Minsky M. Memoir on Inventing the Confocal Scanning Microscope. *Scanning*. 1988;10:128-
3 38.
- 4 2. Lee K, Yeung H. Application of Laser Scanning Confocal Microscopy in Musculoskeletal
5 Research. In: Qin L, Genant HK, Griffith JF, Leung KS, editors. *Advanced Bioimaging Technologies in*
6 *Assessment of the Quality of Bone and Scaffold Materials*. Berlin: Springer Berlin Heidelberg; 2007. p.
7 173-89.
- 8 3. Boyde A, Hendel P, Hendel R, Maconnachie E, Jones SJ. Human cranial bone structure and
9 the healing of cranial bone grafts: a study using backscattered electron imaging and confocal
10 microscopy. *Anatomy and embryology*. 1990;181(3):235-51.
- 11 4. Fazzalari NL, Forwood MR, Manthey BA, Smith K, Kolesik P. Three-dimensional confocal
12 images of microdamage in cancellous bone. *Bone*. 1998;23(4):373-8.
- 13 5. O'Brien FJ, Taylor D, Dickson GR, Lee TC. Visualisation of three-dimensional microcracks in
14 compact bone. *Journal of anatomy*. 2000;197 Pt 3:413-20.
- 15 6. Zarrinkalam KH, Kuliwaba JS, Martin RB, Wallwork MA, Fazzalari NL. New insights into the
16 propagation of fatigue damage in cortical bone using confocal microscopy and chelating
17 fluorochromes. *European journal of morphology*. 2005;42(1-2):81-90.
- 18 7. Kamioka H, Honjo T, Takano-Yamamoto T. A three-dimensional distribution of osteocyte
19 processes revealed by the combination of confocal laser scanning microscopy and differential
20 interference contrast microscopy. *Bone*. 2001;28(2):145-9.
- 21 8. Nesbitt SA, Horton MA. Fluorescence imaging of bone-resorbing osteoclasts by confocal
22 microscopy. *Methods in molecular medicine*. 2003;80:259-81.
- 23 9. Ramires PA, Giuffrida A, Milella E. Three-dimensional reconstruction of confocal laser
24 microscopy images to study the behaviour of osteoblastic cells grown on biomaterials. *Biomaterials*.
25 2002;23(2):397-406.

- 1 10. Sugawara Y, Kamioka H, Honjo T, Tezuka K, Takano-Yamamoto T. Three-dimensional
2 reconstruction of chick calvarial osteocytes and their cell processes using confocal microscopy. *Bone*.
3 2005;36(5):877-83.
- 4 11. Akkiraju H, Bonor J, Nohe A. An Improved Immunostaining and Imaging Methodology to
5 Determine Cell and Protein Distributions within the Bone Environment. *The journal of histochemistry*
6 *and cytochemistry : official journal of the Histochemistry Society*. 2016;64(3):168-78.
- 7 12. Kusumbe AP, Ramasamy SK, Adams RH. Coupling of angiogenesis and osteogenesis by a
8 specific vessel subtype in bone. *Nature*. 2014;507(7492):323-8.
- 9 13. Ramasamy SK, Kusumbe AP, Wang L, Adams RH. Endothelial Notch activity promotes
10 angiogenesis and osteogenesis in bone. *Nature*. 2014;507(7492):376-80.
- 11 14. Kusumbe AP, Ramasamy SK, Itkin T, Mae MA, Langen UH, Betsholtz C, et al. Age-dependent
12 modulation of vascular niches for haematopoietic stem cells. *Nature*. 2016;532(7599):380-4.
- 13 15. Kaiser W, Garrett CGB. Two-Photon Excitation in $\text{CaF}_2:\text{Eu}^{2+}$. *Physical Review Letters*.
14 1961;7(6):229-31.
- 15 16. Kawakami N, Flugel A. Knocking at the brain's door: intravital two-photon imaging of
16 autoreactive T cell interactions with CNS structures. *Seminars in immunopathology*. 2010;32(3):275-
17 87.
- 18 17. Malide D, Metais JY, Dunbar CE. Dynamic clonal analysis of murine hematopoietic stem and
19 progenitor cells marked by 5 fluorescent proteins using confocal and multiphoton microscopy. *Blood*.
20 2012;120(26):e105-16.
- 21 18. Sano H, Kikuta J, Furuya M, Kondo N, Endo N, Ishii M. Intravital bone imaging by two-photon
22 excitation microscopy to identify osteocytic osteolysis in vivo. *Bone*. 2015;74:134-9.
- 23 19. Xie Y, Yin T, Wiegraebe W, He XC, Miller D, Stark D, et al. Detection of functional
24 haematopoietic stem cell niche using real-time imaging. *Nature*. 2009;457(7225):97-101.
- 25 20. Wang N, Docherty FE, Brown HK, Reeves KJ, Fowles AC, Ottewell PD, et al. Prostate cancer
26 cells preferentially home to osteoblast-rich areas in the early stages of bone metastasis: evidence

1 from in vivo models. Journal of bone and mineral research : the official journal of the American
2 Society for Bone and Mineral Research. 2014;29(12):2688-96.

3 21. Wang N, Reeves KJ, Brown HK, Fowles AC, Docherty FE, Ottewell PD, et al. The frequency of
4 osteolytic bone metastasis is determined by conditions of the soil, not the number of seeds;
5 evidence from in vivo models of breast and prostate cancer. Journal of experimental & clinical
6 cancer research : CR. 2015;34:124.

7 22. Wang N, Docherty F, Brown HK, Reeves K, Fowles A, Lawson M, et al. Mitotic quiescence, but
8 not unique "stemness," marks the phenotype of bone metastasis-initiating cells in prostate cancer.
9 FASEB journal : official publication of the Federation of American Societies for Experimental Biology.
10 2015;29(8):3141-50.

11 23. Lawson MA, McDonald MM, Kovacic N, Hua Khoo W, Terry RL, Down J, et al. Osteoclasts
12 control reactivation of dormant myeloma cells by remodelling the endosteal niche. Nature
13 communications. 2015;6:8983.

14 24. Price TT, Burness ML, Sivan A, Warner MJ, Cheng R, Lee CH, et al. Dormant breast cancer
15 micrometastases reside in specific bone marrow niches that regulate their transit to and from bone.
16 Science translational medicine. 2016;8(340):340ra73.

17 25. Pece S, Tosoni D, Confalonieri S, Mazzarol G, Vecchi M, Ronzoni S, et al. Biological and
18 molecular heterogeneity of breast cancers correlates with their cancer stem cell content. Cell.
19 2010;140(1):62-73.

20 26. Dai J, Hensel J, Wang N, Kruithof-de Julio M, Shiozawa Y. Mouse models for studying
21 prostate cancer bone metastasis. BoneKEy reports. 2016;5:777.

22 27. Ottewell PD, Wang N, Brown HK, Reeves KJ, Fowles CA, Croucher PI, et al. Zoledronic acid
23 has differential antitumor activity in the pre- and postmenopausal bone microenvironment in vivo.
24 Clinical cancer research : an official journal of the American Association for Cancer Research.
25 2014;20(11):2922-32.

- 1 28. Kusumbe AP, Ramasamy SK, Starsichova A, Adams RH. Sample preparation for high-
2 resolution 3D confocal imaging of mouse skeletal tissue. *Nature protocols*. 2015;10(12):1904-14.
- 3 29. Ustione A, Piston DW. A simple introduction to multiphoton microscopy. *Journal of*
4 *microscopy*. 2011;243(3):221-6.
- 5 30. Turcotte R, Alt C, Mortensen LJ, Lin CP. Characterization of multiphoton microscopy in the
6 bone marrow following intravital laser osteotomy. *Biomedical optics express*. 2014;5(10):3578-88.

7

8

1 **Titles and legends to figures**

2 **Figure 1.** Working principle of confocal and multiphoton microscopy. **(A)** In a confocal
3 microscope, all emitted fluorescent light from the focal plane focused at the confocal
4 pinhole and passed to the detector, whilst out-of-focus signal will hit the edge of the pinhole
5 and be physically blocked from reaching the detector. **(B)** In two-photon microscopy, the
6 two-photon effect only occurs at the focal point, therefore out-of-focus signal is limited and
7 no pinhole is needed.

8

9 **Figure 2.** Schematic outline. The step-by-step methodology will be described in details in
10 steps of cancer cell preparation, bone specimen preparation (frozen and fixed sample
11 respectively), confocal/two-photon microscopy imaging, and image analysis.

12

13 **Figure 3.** Preparation of the specimen. **(A)** Long bones should be collected snap frozen and
14 embedded in Bright Cryo-M-Bed and bone marrow exposed a Bright OTF Cryostat with a
15 3020 microtome. **(B)** The specimen is placed in a glass bottom dish with the exposed
16 marrow surface facing downwards on the dish, specimen need to be hold in place with a
17 coverslip, as shown in real and schematic. **(C)** Using an upright microscope the dish
18 previously prepared should be placed facing upwards and onto a microscopy slide which
19 hold it in place, as shown in real and schematic.

20

21 **Figure 4.** Configuration settings to scan bone and tumour cells labelled with Vybrant-CM-Dil
22 and Vybrant-DiD. Beam paths for the different channels are shown in **(A)**. Mouse tibia scan



1 in which breast cancer cells labelled with Vybrant-CM-DiI (yellow arrows) and Vybrant-DiD
2 (green arrows) are visible.


3

4 **Figure 5.** Control panel and example of Multi Time Series (MTS) software. The optimal
5 settings are shown in **(A)** while **(B)** is an example of MTS software and a summary of the
6 crucial steps for its setting prior the scan of the specimen.

7

8 **Figure 6.** Image analysis using Volocity 3D Image Analysis Software. **(A)** A 3D reconstruction image
9 of tibia specimen after pseudocolour applied (white colour for calcified bone tissue by SHG)
10 and brightness/contrast adjusted, under the '3D Opacity' mode. **(B)** Under the 'extended
11 focus' model, region of interest (ROI) can be selected with a free hand tool. **(C)** The function
12 'Find object' was used to identify bone and tumour cells. The settings for identifying tumour
13 cells labelled with DiD are objectives with a minimum size of $250 \mu\text{m}^3$ and intensity
14 threshold between 90 and 255. **(D)** Distance from identified tumour cells to the nearest
15 bone surface and to the nearest tumour cell can also be calculated, using the 'Measure
16 distance' option.

A**B**



Mice are euthanized & tibias are dissected free of soft tissue



Frozen section preparation



Fixed/decalcified section preparation



Confocal/two-photon imaging






Image processing & data analysis

A

Exposed bone marrow

Cryo-M-Bed

B



Bluetack

Coverslip

Glass

Glass bottom dish

Tibia with exposed growth plate facing downward



C

Microscope objective


Glass bottom dish with bone

Plastic dish


Glass slide

A**B**

A



B



1. Select the **image database** where to save the reconstructed image
2. Select the **temporary database**



1. Load the **configuration** previously saved
2. **Edit location and create a tile of 5x6**



1. Check that the **current position** matches with your setting
2. Check that 30 **locations** are loaded
3. 'All locations' and 'ZstackXY' have to be **selected**
4. **Update**
5. **Start**




A**B****C****D**

Table 1. Spectra of commonly used fluorescent markers for bone research using confocal and two-photon microscopy

	Two-photon excitation (nm)	Confocal excitation (nm)	Emission (nm)
eBFP	780	380	440
eCFP	860-920	433	475
eGFP	880-930	488	509
tdTomato	900-1000	554	581
DsRed	930-990	557	592
mCherry	900-1000	587	610
FITC	780-800	494	520
Texas Red	780-920	595	615
Hoechst	780	350	461
DAPI	700	358	461
Dil	700	549	565
DiD	780-820	644	665
DiO	780-830	484	501
Alizarin complexone	900	530-560	580
Calcein	780-900	495	515
Tetracycline	800	390	550
Bone collagen (SHG)	820-900	N/A	450