

## Determining the Differences in Image-resolutions of Single-particle CryoTEM Datasets Acquired with Indirect-electron and Direct-electron CMOS Cameras

Dalaver H. Anjum<sup>1\*</sup>, Mohamed A. Sobhy<sup>2</sup>, Ali R. Behzad<sup>1</sup>, Fahad Rashid<sup>2</sup>, Rachid Sougrat<sup>1</sup>, and Samir M. Hamdan<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> King Abdullah University of Science & Technology (KAUST), Core Labs, Thuwal, Saudi Arabia

<sup>2</sup> Laboratory of DNA Replication and Recombination, Biological and Environmental Sciences and Engineering Division, King Abdullah University of Science and Technology (KAUST), Thuwal, Saudi Arabia

\* Corresponding author: dalaver.anjum@kaust.edu.sa


Single-particle cryoTEM techniques have revolutionized the field of structural biology because they can now provide 3-dimensional (3d) images of proteins and biological complexes at near atomic-resolutions [1]. Arguably speaking, this unprecedented progress is made possible only after the replacement of charged-coupled devices (CCD) cameras with complementary metal oxide semiconductor (CMOS) cameras [2]. CMOS cameras for TEMs are more attractive because they intrinsically possess higher speed for recording the images than their CCD counterparts. Second, they are available in both indirect-electron (with-Scintillator) and direct-electron (without-Scintillator) configurations for the detection of electrons. Direct-electron cameras are indeed superior to indirect cameras because the former possess close-to-ideal optical parameters i.e. quantum detective efficiency (QDE) and modular transfer function (MTF). Hence they are also suitable for recording cryoTEM images even under ultra-low electron dose ( $\leq 1 \text{ e}^-/\text{\AA}^2$ ) conditions. It is, however, desirable to determine a performance-based comparison for these cameras and that is why it was the objective of work presented in this report.

This comparison is done by applying the single-particle analysis (SPA) on recombinant Protocatechuate 3,4-dioxygenase (3,4-PCD) protein which is taken from *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* expressed in competent *Escherichia coli* strain. This protein is an oligomer of a relative molecular weight of 587 KDa and is responsible for the biodegradation of aromatic compounds by catalyzing the essential ring-opening step. Data were acquired with a Titan G<sup>2</sup> Krios microscope which was housing both indirect-electron and direct-electron CMOS cameras of models OneView and K2, respectively. Oneview was installed at the pre-GIF location and while K2 was installed behind GIF-Quantum of model 968. The datasets were acquired with LatitudeS that was available in Gatan Microscopy Suite. All datasets received an electron dose of  $\sim 50 \text{ e}^-/\text{\AA}^2$  per image at the object pixel size of  $0.5 \text{ \AA}$ . They were then aligned and reconstructed with Relion [3]. The number of particles that went into the reconstructions of datasets in both cases were  $\sim 10,000$  particles. Typical OneView and K2 acquired images of 3,4-PCD protein along with their fast-Fourier transforms (FFTs) are shown in Figure A and B, respectively. At same pixel-size, K2-acquired images had three times larger field-of-view than that of OneView-acquired images. The estimation of resolution from as-acquired images was done by locating the salient features in their FFTs. For instance, vitreous ice ring at around  $3.7 \text{ \AA}$  in the FFT of K2-acquired image was used as landmark for their resolution limit and whereas the extent of Thon rings in the FFTs of OneView-acquired images was taken as resolution limit of those images. It was thus found out that the K2-acquired images contained three times better resolution limit than OneView-acquired images. Resolution maps generated from OneView data and K2 data are shown in Figure (C) and (D), respectively. It can be noticed from there that the resolution-maps exist in a range unlike mere a number for the case of as-acquired images and furthermore this range was found out to be  $4\text{-}4.5 \text{ \AA}$  and  $11\text{-}20 \text{ \AA}$  for K2 and OneView, respectively. In summary, FFT-analysis of as-acquired images enables determining qualitative spatial-resolution only and whereas the resolution-maps generated from

reconstructed data give an accurate and quantitative information on it. In conclusion, under similar TEM-settings, K2 camera outperforms OneView camera about four times for SPA applications.

#### References:

- [1] Y Cheng et al., *Cell* **161** (2015) p. 438.
- [2] D Contrato et al., *Physics Procedia* **37** (2012) p. 1504.
- [3] SHW Scheres, *Methods in Enzymology* **579** (2016) p. 125.



**Figure 1.** CryoTEM image in (A) is acquired with OneView and while the image in (B) is acquired with K2. Rings in the inserted FFTs represent their resolution. Resolution maps of 3,4-PCD proteins shown in (C) and (D) are generated from the processed OneView and K2 datasets.