Intravital high-resolution optical imaging of individual vessel response to photodynamic treatment
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Abstract. Intravital imaging using confocal microscopy facilitates high-resolution studies of cellular and molecular events in vivo. We use this, complemented by Doppler optical coherence tomography (OCT), to assess blood flow in a mouse dorsal skin-fold window chamber model to image the response of individual blood vessels to localized photodynamic therapy (PDT). Specific fluorescent cell markers were used to assess the effect on the vascular endothelial cell lining of the treated vessels. A fluorescently tagged antibody against an endothelial transmembrane glycoprotein (CD31) was used to image endothelial cell integrity in the targeted blood vessel. A cell permeability (viability) indicator, SYTOX Orange, was also used to further assess damage to endothelial cells. A fluorescently labeled anti-CD41 antibody that binds to platelets was used to confirm platelet aggregation in the treated vessel. These optical techniques enable dynamic assessments of responses to PDT in vivo, at both the vascular endothelial cell and whole vessel levels. © 2008 Society of Photo-Optical Instrumentation Engineers. [DOI: 10.1117/1.2965545]
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Here, using Visudyne single-photon PDT in the window chamber model13, we investigated in detail the vascular-PDT response in vivo at the single blood vessel and vascular endothelial cell levels. As shown in Fig. 1a, a transparent window is surgically placed into the dorsal skin of nude mice to allow direct visualization and PDT treatment of the blood vessels. The thickness of the tissue in the chamber is ~400 μm.

In vascular-targeted PDT, the endothelial cells lining the luminal surface are believed to be the primary target, the killing of which stimulates the vascular response. The damaged endothelium releases procoagulant as well as vasoactive factors, leading to vasoconstriction and/or blood flow stasis.

We and our collaborators have recently reported successful closure of individual blood vessels in both the chorioallantoic membrane (CAM) model and the dorsal window chamber model using two-photon PDT with highly-targeted focal light irradiation. Here, using Visudyne single-photon PDT in the window chamber model, we investigated in detail the vascular-PDT response in vivo at the single blood vessel and vascular endothelial cell levels. As shown in Fig. 1a, a transparent window is surgically placed into the dorsal skin of nude mice to allow direct visualization and PDT treatment of the blood vessels. The thickness of the tissue in the chamber is ~400 μm.

In order to examine the effects of treatment on the vascular endothelial cells, we injected a fluorescently labeled monoclonal antibody (Invitrogen, Burlington, Ontario, Canada) against platelet endothelial cell adhesion molecule-1 (PECAM-1, also referred as CD31) into the tail vein. This mAb reacts with CD31, a transmembrane glycoprotein of the immunoglobulin superfamily that plays an important role in cell-cell adhesion, and is also involved in angiogenesis. It is expressed constitutively on endothelial cells and at lower density on platelets, neutrophils, monocytes, and a subset of T cells.

Using excitation of the fluorophore fluorescein isothiocyanate (FITC) conjugated to anti-CD31 (0.8 mg/kg) with an argon-ion laser (488 nm, 10× objective, NA 0.5) coupled to a confocal microscope (LSM 510 Meta NLO; Carl Zeiss, Toronto, Ontario, Canada), we could obtain high-resolution images of the endothelial lining in vivo at the cellular level. The elongated cells shown in Fig. 1c are the individual endothelial cells lining a blood vessel [Fig. 1b].

To assess the PDT response, a small region (80 × 80 μm) of an artery, marked by the white box in Fig. 2a, was irradiated by raster scanning with a 488 nm laser beam (5× objective, spot size 1.2 μm) 15 min after intravenous injection of 2.5 mg/kg body wt. of Visudyne. At this time, the photosensitizer is primarily in the vasculature. The red closure of the abnormal choroidal neovascularization is the clinical goal, using the photosensitizer Visudyne (QLT, Inc., Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada). In vascular-targeted PDT, the endothelial cells lining the luminal surface are believed to be the primary target, the killing of which stimulates the vascular response. The damaged endothelium releases procoagulant as well as vasoactive factors, leading to vasoconstriction and/or blood flow stasis.
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Fig. 1. Nude mouse (NCRNU-M) with transparent dorsal window and vascular pattern shown in insert (scale bar 1 mm); Confocal images of endothelial cells labeled with FITC conjugated anti-CD31: (b) showing a 60×6 μm diameter artery (scale bar 200 μm); (c) demonstrating individual endothelial cells lining a blood vessel (scale bar 50 μm).
fluorescence of Visudyne was imaged during treatment using a 650 – 710 nm bandpass filter. A light dose of 451 J/cm$^2$, incident intensity 101 mW cm$^{-2}$, pixel dwell time 1.60 ms was deposited in the marked region of a 40 ± 4 μm diameter artery, resulting in complete shrinkage in the targeted region [Fig. 2(b)] during the 6 min irradiation. [Video 1]. The light dose at which the artery begins to constrict corresponds to 260 J cm$^{-2}$.

In order to image the endothelial cell response in this region, 50 min following PDT, we injected the FITC-labeled antibody intravenously (0.8 mg/kg). As seen in Figs. 2(c) and 2(d) this showed specific binding to the endothelial cells on either side of the treated region, but absence of binding in the irradiated region. (These images were acquired using the 488 nm laser set to 5 times lower power so that there was minimal additional PDT effect.) Following this, a cell permeability indicator, SYTOX Orange, was injected intravenously (2 mM/kg). This enters cells with compromised plasma membrane but is excluded from live cells. Selective staining can be seen in the treated region [Figs. 2(e) and 2(f)] indicating endothelial cell damage. Figure 2(g) also shows that the endothelial cell lining of the artery is no longer intact. This confirms our previous in vitro results and other reports of endothelial cell rounding and disruption of cell monolayers following PDT. In addition, Chen et al. showed that the endothelial intracellular gaps formed after PDT are due to microtubule depolarization.

Subsequent to endothelial denudation, platelet adherence to the subendothelium and exposed media occurs. In order to confirm this in vivo, we injected a fluorescently labeled anti-CD41 antibody (BD Biosciences, Mississauga, Ontario, Canada) that reacts with glycoprotein (gp) IIb that reacts with glycoprotein (gp) IIb/IIIa (also called integrin αIIbβ3 chain) and associates with the integrin β3 chain (gpIIa or CD61) to form the gpIIb/IIIa (CD41/CD61) complex. CD41/CD61 is expressed on platelets, megakaryocytes, and early hematopoietic progenitors. The integrin complex binds to fibronectin, fibronectin, vitronectin, von Willebrand factor, and thrombospondin. Figure 3(a) shows two 20 ± 4 μm diameter veins that were locally treated with PDT. Figure 3(b) shows the treated regions immediately after treatment. A phycoerythrin labeled CD41 antibody was injected 50 min following PDT, and Fig. 3(c) shows platelet aggregation and shedding selectively in the treated regions. The thrombus in the irradiated veins was monitored in real time for 1 h (see Video 2).

![Video 1](http://dx.doi.org/10.1117/1.2965545.1)
We also used Doppler OCT (DOCT) to record blood flow pre- and post-irradiation in the targeted and nearby vessels. For this, a 24-kHz swept laser source, scanning 1260 to 1360 nm was used to map the tissue structure with a spatial resolution of 10 μm, and the Doppler frequency shift induced by moving red blood cells was used to measure the flow velocity. Figures 3(a) and 3(c) show, respectively, pre- and 2 h post- and 16 h post-irradiation images. The blood flow recorded by DOCT (shown in red) is overlaid on the respective confocal microscope images. With a 75° Doppler angle, the peak velocity pre-PDT in the targeted artery was 812 ± 122 μm s⁻¹, changing to 3282 ± 492, 1539 ± 231, and 0 μm s⁻¹ immediately after, 2 h later, and 16 h post-irradiation, respectively. The marked increase in blood flow velocity immediately after PDT could be due to narrowing of the lumen following vasoconstriction. Two hours later, the blood flow decreased but was still faster than pre-PDT. This could be due to platelet aggregation in the treated region. No blood flow was detected 16 h later in the treated artery or in the feeding artery.

In summary, we have demonstrated the feasibility and utility of intravital confocal microscopy combined with DOCT to image single-vessel responses to PDT. Previous in vivo vascular-targeted PDT generally irradiated a large region of tissue, comprising multiple arteries and veins. Here, we localized the damage selectively in a single targeted vessel. This can also be done using two-photon PDT. Using in vivo imaging tools; we showed that the localized-PDT response is similar to that reported in previous studies when large areas were irradiated. We plan now to use these techniques to examine the photosensitizer and light dose responses of single blood vessels to localized PDT and, in particular, how this depends on the vessel type and diameter and the irradiation geometry. The goal is to provide information to help optimize two-photon PDT of AMD, including targeting of feeder vessels. With the two-photon illumination, excitation in the z direction is limited to ~20 μm, whereas it extends throughout the entire z length in case of one-photon illumination.

Similar approaches could be used to investigate and understand the effects of other treatments such as focal photothermal or photochemical treatments.
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