

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

Setup and Calibration of a Suite of State-of-the Art Microrheology Techniques

A thesis presented in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Science in Physics
at Massey University, Palmerston North, New Zealand

Bradley William Mansel

2011

ABSTRACT

Microrheology is the study of the flow and deformation of fluids on the micrometre scale. It has many benefits over the use of traditional rheometers to measure the mechanical properties of fluids. Microrheology has small sample sizes, can extract information about the underlying heterogeneities, often has a lower setup cost, can measure to higher frequencies and can measure the viscoelasticity of in-vivo samples. Work has been carried out to setup and calibrate four different microrheology techniques, namely: diffusing wave spectroscopy, dynamic light scattering, multiple particle tracking and probe laser tracking with a quadrant photodiode and optical traps. This resulted in the ability to measure the viscoelastic properties of a material over approximately eight orders of magnitude, with nanometre resolution on the most sensitive technique; diffusing wave spectroscopy. The link between free Brownian motion and a particle diffusing in a harmonic potential was used to calibrate the trap strength of the optical tweezers, enabling a comparison of three different trap calibration techniques. Calibration of the trap strength in optical tweezers resulted in a good agreement between different methods, although, the power spectral density method proved easier to implement and more accurate over the range of laser powers, making it the superior method to use. To illustrate the power of microrheology techniques, the mechanical properties of standard viscous and viscoelastic fluids were first compared. Also organelles in pollen tubes were tracked to simply and accurately measure properties of a complex biological system in-vivo.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There would be no way that this would have been possible without the help of many people! So here we go!

Bill Williams, it has been awesome having you as a supervisor, your never ending enthusiasm, encouragement and knowledge has made this a great experience! So cheers Bill!!! Oh and thanks for all those beers and food in Wellington, I didn't forget.

Steven Keen (aka Meaty) I learned a huge amount about optical tweezers and working in the lab in general, thanks so much for that!

Philip Patty, your help with the light scattering experiments was awesome; I really learned a lot from you, many thanks!

Lisa Kent, thank- you for the help with the DNA and pollen tubes, hopefully the DNA will be stretched soon.

Yacine Hemar, thank-you for originally setting up the DWS, it's still going strong; we have only slightly modified it.

Erich Schuster, cheers for thesis racing dude, well done for winning!

Mum and Dad (Baldrick), thank-you for all the support and encouragement in my studies it has been greatly appreciated!

Matt, thanks for help with the pollen tube work.

The rest of Bill's group you have been great to work with, cheers guys!

Thank-you to all my friends and family for the support, a special thanks to James (aka J Billo) and the Wells and Young's Brewing Company for the Thursday night Crest, Palmy would not be the same without discussing the world at large over a beer reviewed by drinkpedia.org as: Imagine war, pestilence, famine and death abjectly tossed into a blender with a pint of sour milk. Imagine all the worst things in the world mixed with the dregs from a septic tank and you still wouldn't come close to understanding how gut-wrenchingly vile Crest actually is. Simply put, it is the most disgusting beer I have ever tasted in my entire life.

CONTENTS

Abstract	1
Acknowledgements	2
Table of Figures.....	5
1 Introduction.....	8
2 Theory	8
2.1 Rheology	8
2.2 Microrheology	9
3 Techniques	13
3.1 Dynamic Light Scattering.....	13
3.1.1 Experimental Setup	14
3.1.2 Extracting the MSD from correlation data	15
3.2 Diffusing Wave Spectroscopy.....	16
3.2.1 Experimental Setup	16
3.2.2 Extracting the MSD from DWS Correlation and Intensity Data.....	18
3.2.3 Optimizing Light Scattering Experiments	18
3.2.4 Advantages and Disadvantages of Light Scattering Techniques.....	24
3.3 Results: Light Scattering Optimisation.....	25
3.4 Multiple Particle Tracking.....	26
3.4.1 Experimental Setup	27
3.4.2 Advantages Disadvantages	27
3.4.3 Extracting Information about Spatial Homogeneity	27
3.4.4 Two Point Microrheology Analysis	29
3.5 Optimising MPT	30
3.5.1 Tracking Software	30
3.5.2 Error Analysis	36
3.5.3 Optimising Experimental Setup for Microscope Based Experiments.....	40
3.6 QPD Measurements Using Optical Traps	48
3.6.1 Microrheology Using Optical Tweezers.	50
4 Optical Tweezers Trap Stiffness Calibration	51
4.1.1 Drag Method.....	51
4.1.2 Variance Method.....	53
4.1.3 Power Spectral Density Method.....	54
5 Experimental Methods	56

5.1	Experimental Details	57
5.1.1	Diffusing Wave Spectroscopy.....	57
5.1.2	Dynamic Light Scattering.....	57
5.1.3	Multiple Particle Tracking.....	58
5.1.4	Optical Tweezers	58
5.2	Pollen Tube Growth Medium	58
6	Results and Discussion.....	59
6.1	Comparison of Different Microrheology Methods.....	59
6.2	Trap Stiffness Calculation.....	62
7	Tracking Application: Hebe Speciosa Pollen Tubes	63
7.1	Introduction	63
7.2	Results: Pollen Tube Organelle Tracking.....	66
8	Conclusions	67
9	Further work	68
10	Bibliography.....	69
11	Appendix:	71
11.1	Camera Information.....	71
11.2	Piezoelectric Stage Information.....	71
11.3	Correlator Information.....	71

TABLE OF FIGURES

<i>Figure 1: Extract from: Dasgupta, 2004 , sketch showing the MSD of a viscoelastic medium.</i>	11
<i>Figure 2: Plot showing the frequency range accessible using different techniques.</i>	13
<i>Figure 3: Schematic of DLS apparatus used.</i>	15
<i>Figure 4: Schematic representing DWS setup.</i>	17
<i>Figure 5: Plot showing the angle dependence of the scattering intensity for a 0.5 micron polystyrene particle immersed in water.</i>	20
<i>Figure 6: Effects of total measurement time on noise in the correlation function.</i>	22
<i>Figure 7: Comparison of cross and auto correlation for DLS of water, 500nm particles. Spikes in the auto correlation data are due to after pulsing effects.</i>	22
<i>Figure 8: MSD plot for different correlators for diffusing wave spectroscopy.</i>	23
<i>Figure 9: Plot showing effects of different correlator for dynamic light scattering of 500nm polystyrene particles embedded in water. Little difference can be seen between the two correlators.</i>	24
<i>Figure 10: Plot showing particle size and viscosity dependence of the MSD measured using both dynamic light scattering and diffusing wave spectroscopy.</i>	26
<i>Figure 11: A Van Hove plot of particles in water, a homogenous medium, as can be seen by a good agreement to a Gaussian fit.</i>	28
<i>Figure 12: Extract from [16], showing the physical origin of the displacements of particles in the cytoplasm.</i>	28
<i>Figure 13: (a) A 3 dimensional plot of the intensity and position of pixels in an image. (b) A plot of the kernel. (c) The cross correlation of the image and kernel. (d) Centroid calculation. Obtained from: [26].</i>	33
<i>Figure 14: (A) Bias versus signal to noise for a 5 micron target, showing centroid and cross correlation (COR). (B) Standard deviation versus signal to noise. Extracted from Cheezum 2001 [25].</i>	35
<i>Figure 15: Histogram output of the sub pixel centroid algorithm. No significant pixel bias is shown as the plot is overall flat.</i>	37

Figure 16: Output from centroid tracking, plotted in pixels to check that the mask size is correct and to ensure artefacts are not being tracked...... 38

Figure 17: A plot of particle x position verses time, this gives a simple check for large scale drift and oscillations...... 39

Figure 18: Comparison of different cameras, for further information on the specifications refer to the Appendix...... 41

Figure 19: Schematic of the microscope and optical tweezers apparatus. Image sourced from Stephen Keen and modified...... 42

Figure 20: Schematic showing the relation between a particles mean position and the Allan Variance. It can be seen that in a perfect experiment, with no drift, the Allan variance decreases for the duration of the experiment, but where drift is present the Allan variance has a minimum corresponding to when the effects of sampling statistics and drift are balancing out. 44

Figure 21: The Allan variance for an optically trapped particle. A minimum can be seen at approximately 2 seconds corresponding to the optimum time duration to run an experiment. 45

Figure 22: Allan variance for a particle electrostatically adhered to the cover slip. The large amount of drift present in the stage is revealed by the minimum being at approximately 0.01 seconds compared to 2 seconds for an optically trapped particle. 45

Figure 23: The PSD for a 1.86 micron silica particle held using an optical trap in water. The black line shows a good fit to a Lorentzian, as expected for a trapped particle. Measured using a quadrant photodiode (QPD). The plateau, that can be seen around 10,000 Hz, is most likely due to resolution limit of the QPD. Inertial effects would only be expected at frequencies greater than around 100,000 Hz...... 47

Figure 24: The PSD for a 1.86 micron silica particle electrostatically adhered to the coverslip. PSD measured using a QPD. No distinct spikes in the signal can be seen, indicating good mechanical isolation of the microscope...... 48

Figure 25: Picture showing a particle optically trapped, undertaking Brownian motion, with an interference pattern displayed on a QPD below. Image sourced from Stephen Keen. 50

Figure 26: Displacements of a trapped particle as an oscillatory flow is applied by oscillating the stage. Data recorded at 80 kHz for 10 seconds. 52

Figure 27: Graph showing the effect of laser power on the MSD of 1.86 micron probe particles. 54

Figure 28: Plot showing the agreement of measurements between multiple techniques in water (open circles) and 62% glycerol water mixture (open squares). 60

Figure 29: a) MSD for 2.2 wt% 900kDA PEO, a fit to a double power law with exponents of 0.42 and 0.89 shows a good agreement as expected. B) MSD for 4 wt% 900 kDA PEO, a fit to a double power law with exponents of 0.4 and 0.9 shows an excellent agreement. 60

Figure 30: MSD plot for 4 wt% PEO showing an agreement between data obtained using DWS MPT and 2 point analysis. 61

Figure 31: Storage (red) and loss (blue) moduli for a 4 per cent PEO solution. 61

Figure 32: Storage (red) and loss (blue) for 2.2 per cent PEO solution. 62

Figure 33: Graph showing trap stiffness measurements for various techniques over a range of laser powers. 63

Figure 34: A pollen tube from a Hebe Speciosa. 64

Figure 35: Extract from Cai and Creston 2010, a schematic showing the cytoplasmic streaming of various organelle and vesicles inside a pollen tube with reference to its distance from the tip. 65

Figure 36: Extract from Cai and Creston 2010 showing a schematic of the theorised mechanics of organelle transport at the apex. 65

Figure 37: Extract from Romagnoli 2007, table showing the measured speeds of mitochondria and golgi vesicles along microtubules (MT) and actin filaments (AF). 65

Figure 38: Graph showing the measured vesicle motion in the pollen tube. Each track represents the movement of a vesicle over 10 seconds. 66

Figure 39: A three dimensional Van Hove correlation function for data obtained from tracking organelle in a Hebe Speciosa pollen tube. 67