



Protein microarray spots are modulated by patterning method, surface chemistry and processing conditions



Kathryn F.A. Clancy^{a,b}, Sebastien Dery^b, Veronique Laforte^{b,c,d}, Prasad Shetty^a,
David Juncker^{b,d,*}, Dan V. Nicolau^{a,*}

^a Department of Bioengineering, McGill University, Montreal, Canada

^b Department of Biomedical Engineering, McGill University, Montreal, Canada

^c Department of Neurology and Neurosurgery, McGill University, Montreal, Canada

^d McGill University and Génome Québec Innovation Center, Montreal, Canada

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Protein microarray
Inkjet printing
Pin printing
Micro-contact printing
Microarray spot

ABSTRACT

The uniformity of the protein patterns, their shape, and the contrast between the fluorescence signal of the pattern and the background, critically modulate the quantitative accuracy of the microarray-derived data. While significant research focused on the identification of the factors that impact the protein microarray patterns, these studies usually have focused on the optimization of one set of these factors, e.g., how the spot uniformity is affected by different additives, or by different surfaces. However, the complex interaction between proteins, carrier fluids, surfaces, and patterning methodologies used would suggest a systematic and more comprehensive study that considers all these parameters, as well as their inter-relationship. The present work compared the patterning of two fluorescently-tagged proteins, i.e., IgG, BSA, on surfaces with different hydrophobicity and chemistry, and printed by inkjet, pin, and microcontact printing (μ CP). The quantification of the spot size regularity, its morphology, the signal intensity and its distribution within spots were used to assess the quality of a specific printing method, on a specific surface, with a specific solute of the printed protein. It was found that the optimal uniformity for both droplet-based methods depend on surface chemistry, with glass slides modified with 3-Glycidioxypropyl-dimethoxymethyl silane (GPS) and 3-(Aminopropyl)-triethoxy silane (APTES) exhibiting the greatest uniformity, while uniformity of the μ CP patterns was relatively independent of the surface chemistry. For the inkjet and pin printing, the largest fluorescence signal and contrast with the background was found on APTES modified glass slides, whereas for the μ CP the fluorescence signal increased with increasing hydrophilicity.

1. Introduction

Microarrays are widely-used analytical tools for drug discovery (Kumble, 2007), biomarker detection (Lee et al., 2008), and diagnosis (Babel et al., 2009; Harwanegg and Hiller, 2005). Owing to the critical role of proteins in physiological processes and health conditions, coupled with the emergence of alternative methods for sequencing DNA not available for proteins protein-based microarrays constitute an attractive technology for protein quantification (Anderson et al., 2011; Bergeron et al., 2015; Müller and Nicolau, 2005). While microarray technology is, arguably, its largest ‘market’, protein patterning was used for several decades for various applications, in particular for cell engineering, e.g., stem cell constructs (Deforest and Tirrell, 2015), immunoaffinity-based circulating tumor cell capture (Launiere et al.,

2012), neuronal cell networks (Nicolau et al., 1999b), but also for on chip enzyme microreactors (Qu et al., 2004), controlling the motion of cytoskeletal filaments on molecular motor tracks (Nicolau et al., 1999a) and for the analysis of protein-analyte interactions (Ricoult et al., 2014; Romanov et al., 2014). Despite this large variety of applications, and despite the wide range of technologies available, finding the optimum conditions for protein patterning still requires extensive experimentation (Vasina et al., 2009), largely due to the very complex interaction of proteins with surfaces (Hanson et al., 2017).

For protein microarrays, the appropriate parameters of the primary protein layer, i.e., consistent spot size, uniformity within and between spots, and morphology (Barbulovic-Nad et al., 2006) are critical to enable an efficient and uniform binding of the secondary analyte, which in turn results in a correct readout and high quality of microarray data.

* Corresponding authors.

E-mail addresses: david.juncker@mcgill.ca (D. Juncker), dan.nicolau@mcgill.ca (D.V. Nicolau).

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bios.2018.09.027>

Received 30 June 2018; Received in revised form 5 September 2018; Accepted 6 September 2018

Available online 07 September 2018

0956-5663/ © 2018 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

To improve its performance, which depends on the minimization of the variability of technological parameters, microarray technology, a high throughput technology par excellence, relied on an ever-increasing automation and standardization, and on image analysis based on (i) the output patterned spots adhering to the expected size and morphology, and (ii) their reproducibility. However, these advances in robotics and scanner precision, which led to a large increase in the throughput of microarray data, cannot by themselves address the sheer complexity and multitude of the physical and chemical processes involved that lead to still noisy and imprecise microarray data (Moran-Mirabal et al., 2007; Saeed et al., 2003). Indeed, the many interrelated input parameters e.g., the deposition technique, the surface chemistry and hydrophobicity of the substrate, the physico-chemical properties of the carrier fluid, the drying process, the microenvironment, which all modulate the spot size, morphology and uniformity, also add to the inherent complexity of protein interactions with surfaces (Angulo, 2008; Askounis et al., 2015; Austin and Holway, 2011a; Barbulovic-Nad et al., 2006; Bergeron et al., 2015; Cui et al., 2012; Dufva, 2005; Ivanova et al., 2006; Moran-Mirabal et al., 2007; Mujawar et al., 2014, 2013, 2012; Yunker et al., 2011). In a previous protein microarray study systematically evaluating different buffer and slide chemistries, it was found that the analyte binding signal was tightly correlated to the of signal of antibody (IgG) deposited on the surface (Bergeron, 2015), indicating that the protein binding signal can serve as a proxy for microarray performance.

To this end, we investigated how the deposition method, i.e., physical transfer to the target surface using pin, inkjet and microcontact printing, the properties of the carrier fluid, i.e., various compositions of the buffers and wash solutions, the properties of the immobilizing surface, i.e., chemistry, contact angle, as well as the nature of the protein, i.e., IgG and BSA, affect the quality of the resulting primary protein pattern inferred from the spatial distribution of fluorescence signal. The parameters compared in this work include the size and morphology of the resulting spot, as well as signal intensity and the spatial distribution of protein, i.e., uniformity, within a microarray spot.

2. Materials and methods

2.1. Reagents

A standard phosphate buffered saline (PBS) solution was used as a diluent for all printing methods. Additionally, a PBS solution with 2,3-butanediol/2M betaine (PBSbb) was used with the inkjet and pin printing methods. The concentrations of additives in the printing buffers have been described elsewhere (Bergeron et al., 2015).

2.2. Proteins

Purified fluorophore-conjugated IgG (Cy5 Goat Anti-Rabbit IgG (H + L), from Life Technologies), and fluorophore-conjugated BSA (Alexa Fluor® 647), from Molecular Probes have been used for protein microarrays.

2.3. Surfaces

Glass slides (Fisher Scientific) were functionalized with 3-Glycidoxypropyl-dimethoxymethyl silane (GPS), Trichloro(octyl) silane (OTS), 3-(Aminopropyl)-triethoxy silane (APTES), and Trichloro(1H,1H,2H,2H-perfluorooctyl) silane (PFS). Glass slides have been also treated by plasma to produce hydrophilic glass surfaces (P).

Contact angles were measured with a goniometer (OCA 15 EC, Dataphysics).

2.4. Inkjet printing

A non-contact piezo-microarrayer (Nanoplotter 2.0, GeSiM) with a single nozzle was used to deposit 0.4 nL of protein solution on target surfaces to create 8 × 8 arrays with a pitch of 200 μm between spots, for a total of 16 spots per concentration, per replicate slide (Supplementary Figure SI 1). All printing was performed at room temperature and 65% humidity.

2.5. Pin printing

Contact pin printing used a customized Nanoplotter 2.1 microarrayer (GeSiM, Germany) equipped with collimator (Parallel Synthesis, Santa Clara, CA). Four custom made silicon quill pins (Laforte et al., 2013) were used simultaneously to create 5 × 5 arrays of replicate 63–74 pL spots with a pitch of 200 μm for a total of 100 spots per concentration, per replicate slide (Supplementary Figure SI 1).

2.6. Micro-contact printing (μCP)

A patterned silicon wafer was used to fabricate flat, 15 μm-wide square masters with a pitch of 75 μm between square posts. Poly(dimethylsiloxane) (PDMS) stamps (Supplementary Figure SI 4) replicating the masters were inked with 10 μl of the fluorophore conjugated protein solution, rinsed, dried and then used for printing by placing a 25 mg weight placed on top.

2.7. Image acquisition and analysis

Fluorescent images were obtained using an Agilent G2565CA microarray scanner at a 2 μm × 2 μm resolution. The raw image files were first segmented based on predefined search areas, then automatic thresholding was performed, and the spots outside of the expected area were eliminated.

The cross-section of the fluorescence signal across a spot was quantified (Fig. 1A) by estimating a ‘coffee-ring’ ratio’, CRR (Fig. 1B), i.e., the ratio between the number of pixels found in the outer 50% of the spot vs. the number of pixels within the inner 50% of the spot. CRR values of −1, 0 and +1, represents the ‘coffee-ring’ morphology, a perfectly even distribution of the fluorescent pixels within the spot, and the ‘bull’s eye’ morphology, respectively (Supplementary Information, Glossary).

A comprehensive description of the methods and materials used is provided in the Supplementary Information section.

3. Results and discussion

3.1. Microarray deposition techniques

While a multitude of deposition technologies have been proposed for the fabrication of microarrays, e.g., pin printing (Austin and Holway, 2011b), ink jet printing (McWilliam et al., 2011), microcontact printing (Renault et al., 2002), electrospray deposition (Avseenko et al., 2002), laser ablation (Ivanova et al., 2002; Nicolau et al., 2010), arguably only the pin and jet printing technologies have received wide spread usage in the fabrication of high throughput microarrays, due to their technological simplicity and capacity for automation.

Indeed, pin printing, which was the pioneer microarray technology (Schna et al., 1995), and which even led to a very high density protein printing based on Atomic Force Microscopy (Lee et al., 2004) relies on the contact between a pin, wetted with the analyte solution, and the target surface. The delivery of a solution by pin printing is based on capillary forces (Štulík, 2011). The advantages of pin printing are its simplicity, and the spatial precision for the spot deposition, while its disadvantages are the contact, at times deleterious, between the pin and the substrate, and the complex process of transfer of the fluid from the




Fig. 1. Conceptual illustration of the image acquisition analysis and the parameters quantifying the protein deposition within a spot. **A.** The analysis focuses on a set of microarray spots with digitized intensities able to measure the fluorescence intensity profile across the spot. Scale bars are 200 μm . **B.** Calculation methodology for ‘coffee-ring’ ratio, from various intensity profiles across the spot, from the coffee-ring, to bull’s eye pattern, respectively. The spatially uniform distribution of the intensity first layer of the protein will result in a uniform binding of the second analyte.

pin to the substrate.

By contrast, in inkjet printing (McWilliam et al., 2011) only the droplets of analyte solution get in contact with the target surface, after being ejected from a nozzle (Barbulovic-Nad et al., 2006). In piezoelectric inkjet printing, a change in voltage alters the pressure in the liquid reservoir and results in droplet formation (Romanov et al., 2014). The advantages of inkjet printing are the very precise calibration of the volume of the droplets, lack of contact between the dispenser and the target surface (Romanov et al., 2014), and the independence of the delivery from surface properties; and its disadvantages, compared with those of pin printing, are the higher technological complexity and lower precision in spot positioning and shape.

Microcontact printing (μCP) makes use of a polydimethylsiloxane (PDMS) stamp to print several spots in parallel directly to the surface (Bernard et al., 1998), and therefore is different from the pin (or contact) and inkjet printing in that it is not a serial, but a parallel technique. The process of μCP involves first the creation of a stamp with the desired pattern on which the protein solution is then adsorbed. Transfer of the solution from the patterned stamp surface to the substrate surface is performed via conformal physical contact and does not require the use of viscous protein solutions (Michel et al., 2001), but is constrained to transferring from a low to a high energy surface, unless humidified microcontact printing is used (Ricoult, 2014). Additionally, μCP , which is capable of printing high resolution, high contrast protein patterns (Filipponi et al., 2016), has the advantage of a soft contact between the carrier, i.e., the stamp, and the target surface. μCP has however the disadvantage of difficult washing of the PDMS stamps, and thus the difficulty of printing high density arrays.

Given the extensive use of pin and inkjet printing in microarray fabrication, as well as the promise of μCP , but also the large differences between the parameters specific to each of these deposition methods, a comprehensive mapping of the quality of protein microarray patterns produced by these techniques is fully justified, and perhaps overdue.

3.2. Input parameters modulating the patterns of protein microarrays

Aside of the physico-chemical processes specific to the used printing technology, the input parameters that also modulate the spot size, morphology and uniformity have three sources: (i) the deposited protein, (ii) the carrier fluid; and (iii) the surface on which the protein is deposited (Bergeron et al., 2015; Ivanova et al., 2006; Moran-Mirabal

et al., 2007; Mujawar et al., 2014, 2013, 2012). These three classes of input parameters have been analyzed as follows.

3.2.1. Protein parameters

3.2.1.1. Molecular shape and molecular weight. It was observed (Mujawar et al., 2012) that IgG, with a longer, Y-shaped molecule, produces more uniform spots than BSA, which has a more spherical molecular shape (Supplementary Information, Figure S11). This is somehow counterintuitive, as layers comprising spherical objects are expected to be more compact (Yunker et al., 2011), thus more uniform. However, the molecular shape relevant to the interaction between the protein and the adsorption surface is the result of the envelope of the molecule by an object with very large radius, i.e., infinite for a geometrically-perfect flat surface, rather than the molecular shape derived from atom-level resolution mapping (Nicolau et al., 2013). Also, both the molecular surface and the molecular surface-to-volume ratio are in a near-univoque relationship with the molecular weight of the protein (Nicolau et al., 2013), which are 150–170 kDa, and 66 kDa, for IgG and BSA, respectively. This results in an actual surface-to-volume ratio, for a near-flat surface (average roughness of 2 nm), of approximately $2 \cdot 10^{-3} \text{ nm}^{-1}$ for IgG and approximately $5 \cdot 10^{-3} \text{ nm}^{-1}$ for BSA (Nicolau et al., 2013). Consequently, and relative to their overall molecular weight, IgG appears to be more compact than BSA, but the flexibility of the molecular conformation, in particular when the protein is in contact with an adsorbing surface, could have an overriding influence.

3.2.1.2. Hydrophobicity and distribution of charges. Other, perhaps more important protein molecular parameters than the molecular surface, weight, and shape, impact on the final structure of the protein layers on surfaces, such as hydrophobicity and distribution of charges. It was found (Nicolau et al., 2014) that only the hydrophobicity manifested on the protein molecular surface is relevant to protein immobilization on surfaces, with the rest of, inner, bulk hydrophobicity having no statistical relevance. The hydrophobicity manifested on the protein molecular surface, both in terms of area and absolute value, is considerably higher for IgG than it is for BSA. Indeed, the hydrophobic areas are approximately 200, and 2 \AA^2 , for IgG and BSA, respectively; and the ratio of hydrophobic/total area are approximately 0.2 and 0.02 for IgG and BSA, respectively (Nicolau et al., 2014). In contrast with hydrophobicity, which is involved in strong, but short




Fig. 2. Printing of proteins on different surfaces of varying chemistries by pin and inkjet printing, and by μCP . A. Schematic illustrating the molecular structure of silane-functionalized glass surfaces, together with their respective contact angles. The contact angle of plasma-treated glass surface is very close to zero. B. Representative images of pin (top), inkjet (middle) and μCP (bottom) printing of 25 $\mu\text{g}/\text{ml}$ of BSA on each surface. Scale bars are 100 μm . C. Spot size resulting from μCP , inkjet, and pin printing on plasma-treated glass (P), or GPS-, APTES-, OTS- and PFS-functionalized glass of increasing hydrophobicity (from left to right). D. Mean fluorescence of IgG and BSA spots (25 $\mu\text{g}/\text{ml}$) printed on plasma treated glass (P), GPS-, APTES-, OTS-, and PFS-functionalized glass slides by μCP , inkjet, and pin printing. Note: neither inkjet- nor pin-printing was performed on simply plasma-treated glass slides.

range interactions with the surface, charges will operate through electrostatic interactions, which are weaker, but long range. Consequently, the overall, bulk charges (modulated by the pH of the carrier fluid), rather than those on the molecular surface, will be more relevant to protein immobilization. In that regard, IgG and BSA are again very different, with their isoelectric points at 7.3 ± 1.2 , and 4.65, respectively.

To conclude, IgG and BSA are both largely used in protein arrays, for very different functions, but they are also very different in molecular properties, thus constituting valuable case studies.

3.2.2. Parameters of the carrier fluid

To investigate the importance of buffer conditions, IgG and BSA in either PBS or PBSbb have been deposited on organosilane-functionalized surfaces. For inkjet printing, there was no noteworthy difference in the size, or eccentricity of the spots between the two different buffers (Supplementary information Figure SI 4A-B). A more detailed study for the pin printing, also involving the impact of the protein concentration, led to the same conclusion (Supplementary information Figures SI 5 A-D, and SI 6 A-D). However, large increases in the average fluorescence intensity, and a decrease in the ‘coffee-ring’ ratio (reflecting an increase in uniformity of fluorescence across a spot) were observed for the PBSbb buffer compared with PBS. This provides evidence that hygroscopic additives present in PBSbb increase protein adsorption and decrease the variation of protein density within the spot, which is consistent with previous reports (Bergeron et al., 2015; Dufva, 2005). Moreover, the increase in the fluid viscosity has two follow-up effects. First, a higher viscosity delays the drying process, thereby increasing reaction time with the surface. Second, a higher viscosity will result in a lower diffusivity of the proteins, and therefore will delay their movement towards the edge of the spot. The overlaps of these phenomena

result in an increased protein adsorption to the surface and uniformity of deposition.

The impact of the pH of the carrier fluid has possibly important impact on protein adsorption (Nicolau et al., 2014; Ostuni et al., 2001). For instance, the neutral pH of the buffers used in this study is close to the pI of the IgG (7.3) resulting in a near perfect balance between the positive and negative charges of the protein. For BSA however, with a pI at 4.65, the neutral pH will result in a net negative charge of the protein. Consequently, electrostatic interactions will have a smaller impact on the adsorption of a protein with charges in equilibrium, e.g., IgG, which will present a more pronounced propensity for adsorption on hydrophobic surfaces. Conversely, these interactions will play a stronger role for the adsorption of charged proteins, e.g., BSA, in particular if the adsorbing surface present complementary charging.

The optimization of the wash buffer was also performed. For all surfaces tested, the use of the PBST wash buffer decreased the eccentricity and variability of signal intensity within the spot by both droplet-based techniques when compared to washing the slide with simply PBS (Supplementary information SI 7–10). Consequently, in all further analysis comparing inkjet and pin printing, the results are from protein solutions in PBSbb washed with PBST.

3.2.3. Surface parameters

While an increased hydrophobicity of the surface increases the protein adsorption (Ostuni et al., 2003), it also contributes to protein denaturation, via strong hydrophobic interactions with the hydrophobic ‘core’ of the adsorbed proteins (Hanson et al., 2017; Nicolau et al., 2014). Conversely, hydrophilic surfaces preserve better the protein conformation on the expense of decreased overall protein adsorption (Ostuni et al., 2001).

Self-assembled monolayers (SAMs) are commonly used to change

the physical and chemical properties of a surface by the modification of the chemical groups on the surface. Organosilanes are a widely used for glass or silicon following plasma activation surfaces, since they can form monolayers on multiple surfaces with free hydroxyl groups (Awskiuk et al., 2013; Glass et al., 2011). They are composed of a surface reactive group at one end that chemically binds to the hydroxylated surfaces, a hydrocarbon chain of varying length, and then terminate with a functional group at the other end (Fig. 2A). The terminating functional group is chosen based on the desired application of the surface, e.g., it can promote biomolecular immobilization on the surface, either by physical adsorption, and/or covalent binding, or conversely, it can minimize biomolecule interaction, e.g., a non-fouling surface (Chiu et al., 2010; Kannan et al., 2006).

3.3. Output parameters of the protein pattern

3.3.1. Spot size

To enable the fully automated analysis and quantification of microarray images, the geometrical aspects of the spots should follow an expected shape and be highly reproducible in size (Draghici et al., 2003). Beyond just data processing, the reproducibility of the primary protein spot size ensures that there is an equal spot surface area accessible to secondary biomolecules for binding, with further beneficial impact on the reliability of detection.

Both droplet-based techniques produced spots with distinctly different characteristics. First, as expected, the spot sizes resulting from pin and inkjet printing were considerably larger than those obtained by μ CP (Fig. 2B,C). Second, the spot size resulting from both droplet-based techniques was in an inverse relationship with the contact angle of the surface, whereas for μ CP, the spot size does not depend on surface hydrophobicity (Fig. 2C). This general trend with droplet-based techniques agrees with previous investigations into the relationship between the size of a droplet and the target surface (Mujawar et al., 2013; Vafaei and Podowski, 2005). The size of the spot produced by μ CP is determined by the conformational contact of the calibrated stamp to the surface, whereas for the droplet-based techniques the spot size is dependent on the shape of the droplet on the surface, which, in turn, is dependent of the surface tension of the adsorbing surface.

Due to the large differences in sizes of the spots produced by droplet techniques, on one side, and μ CP on the other, the analysis will treat these cases separately.

In the present study, the automatic segmentation of the spots from the background was aided by *a priori* information on the expected spot size. The printing that produced a consistent spot size meant that any fluorescent artifacts on the slide outside of the expected size range could be automatically removed from analysis. Therefore, the automatic spot segmentation and analysis is aided when there is a limited expected size range of the printed spots. To quantify the regularity of spot size, the relative standard deviation of the spot size was calculated by dividing the standard deviation from each triplicate measurement by its mean spot size, i.e., relative standard deviation = (standard deviation)/mean.

Spot size regularity, i.e., the ratio between the standard deviation of the spot size by its mean (Supplementary information, Glossary), is dependent on the surface hydrophobicity and the protein concentration (Supplementary Figure SI 11). In general, the size variability increases as the surface hydrophobicity increases, which can be statistically attributed to a decrease in spot size, and subsequent quantification errors. Using this metric, the inkjet printing presents a lower variation in the relative standard deviation compared to pin printing (with the exception of PFS surfaces). These observations can be explained by the use of more than one pin in pin printing, as compared to the single nozzle used in inkjet printing (Supplementary Figure SI 5, SI 6, and SI 12).

3.3.2. Signal intensity

The quantification of the protein surface concentration on each

surface was performed by measuring the intensity of the fluorescence signal of the two different fluorescent-labelled proteins. As expected, for each protein, the surface, and method used, the mean fluorescence intensity decreased with the decrease of the concentration of protein in solution (Fig. 2D, and Supplementary information, Figs. S1–S13). For both droplet-based techniques, the spots presented the highest mean intensity of BSA and IgG on APTES slides than on any other substrate (Fig. 2D). This observation supports the evidence that using APTES is an efficient surface modification method to promote protein immobilization (Anand et al., 2010; Awskiuk et al., 2012, 2013).

The fluorescence signal of IgG and BSA patterns on the hydrophilic GPS-functionalized surfaces using the droplet-based techniques was particularly low (Fig. 2D). Because previous works have found that proteins can form covalent bonds with the GPS epoxide group, the low level of immobilization on GPS surfaces could be a result of the slow reaction kinetics at neutral pH (Awskiuk et al., 2012) and short incubation time (two hours).

Interestingly, the adsorption of both IgG and BSA on the hydrophobic OTS and PFS surfaces is lower than on the hydrophilic APTES surface, likely due to the differences in their surface chemistry. The hydrophobic OTS substrate is composed of a long hydrocarbon chain that will minimally bind with the hydrophilic molecular surface of proteins (Russo et al., 2011). Additionally, the binding with the bulky hydrocarbon chain of OTS lowers the entropy of proteins remaining in solution by means of steric hindrance (Russo et al., 2011). Also, PFS is commonly used to create water and oil-repellent surfaces and to prevent PDMS from irreversibly adhering to another layer of PDMS when replicating a PDMS pattern (Glass et al., 2011; Pujari et al., 2014). Previous studies have shown that these surface modifications prevent the non-specific adsorption of proteins, e.g., BSA, streptavidin, R-phycoerythrin, to the surface (Kim et al., 2011; Kira et al., 2009; Takashi et al., 2005). These observations offer explanations for the low immobilization levels for BSA and IgG on both OTS and PFS surface.

In contrast with the droplet-based techniques, the spots produced by μ CP showed a decrease in mean intensity as the contact angle of the surface increased (Fig. 2D). This confirms that μ CP in dry conditions has the greatest transfer efficiency from a low-energy (hydrophobic) PDMS stamp to a high-energy (hydrophilic) substrate (Romanov et al., 2014).

3.3.3. Spot morphology

For the majority of microarray investigations, the analysis of the spot quality is qualitatively determined based on the spot circularity and/or by calculating the percent standard deviation of the fluorescence signal, i.e., the standard deviation of fluorescence within the spot divided by the mean fluorescence (Bergeron et al., 2015; Bietsch et al., 2004; Moran-Mirabal et al., 2007; Mujawar et al., 2013). However, the limitations of these metrics include the possible human bias, and that the percent standard deviation does not provide any information on the type of spot inhomogeneity. Consequently, a more comprehensive analysis is warranted.

The uneven deposition of protein solutions during the drying process can result in “coffee-ring” spots, i.e., higher deposition at the contact line; or ‘bull’s eye’ spots, i.e., higher deposition of solutes in the center of the spot (Fig. 3). The evaporation of a droplet on a solid surface is governed by gravity, hydrodynamic flow, Marangoni flow (if a temperature or concentration gradient arises during drying), and the pinning at the liquid-air interface, i.e., the contact line (Erbil, 2012). The ‘coffee-ring’ spots result when the evaporating droplet has a pinned contact line, high evaporation rate at the surface of the droplet, and/or when there is a suppressed Marangoni flow (Hu and Larson, 2006). Conversely, rapid evaporation and the absence of a pinned contact line results in increased deposition in the middle of the spot (a ‘bull’s eye’ feature).

The eccentricity, defined as the ratio of the distance between the center of a spot and its major axis length (Supplementary information, Glossary), quantifies the deviation of a spot shape from a perfect circle.




Fig. 3. Fluorescence signal intensity profiles and corresponding ‘coffee-ring’ ratios of printed protein spots. A. Profiles representing the intensity profile across protein spots of 25 $\mu\text{g/ml}$ of IgG and BSA printed on silane-functionalized glass by inkjet (blue) and pin printing (green). B. CRR values of IgG and BSA (25 $\mu\text{g/ml}$) spots printed on silane-functionalized glass by inkjet (blue) and pin printing (green). Error bars represent the standard errors. (For interpretation of the references to color in this figure legend, the reader is referred to the web version of this article).

An eccentricity value of zero represents a perfect circle with a constant radius around the central axis, and a value of one represents a line.

A significant increase in the eccentricity of the spots has been observed, for both droplet-based methods, for those printed on hydrophobic surfaces (OTS and PFS), as opposed to those printed on hydrophilic ones (GPS and APTES). Inkjet printing on the GPS surface produced spots with significantly lower eccentricity than on any other surface. In addition, spot eccentricity increased with surface hydrophobicity. For pin printing, there was no significant difference in the eccentricity between hydrophilic surfaces, although eccentricity did significantly increase on hydrophobic surfaces. Between the two droplet-based techniques, pin printing produced significantly more eccentric circles than inkjet printing on all substrates, except PFS (Fig. 3). The fact that pin printing produces less circular spots, may be the result of the square footprint of the silicon pin touching the surface while depositing a droplet. The eccentricity measure for both methods did not significantly differ across protein concentration (Supplementary information Figure SI 6).

3.3.4. Spot uniformity

The uniformity of the fluorescence within a spot was dependent, in a complex manner, on the droplet-based printing method, surface properties (as presented in Fig. 3), and the concentration of the protein in solution (Fig. 4 for OTS surfaces, and Supplementary information Figures SI 7–10, in the context of analysing the effect of the washing conditions).

For both droplet-based methods, the delineation of the spot edge, i.e., image contrast, was the highest on the APTES surface, followed by the GPS one. As the hydrophobicity of the surface increases, the receding of the inkjet droplet from the initial contact line to the center is apparent by a shallow slope of the signal intensity that creates a less defined spot edge. In addition to the surface properties impacting the delineation of the spot edge, the contrast of the spot was clearer for the inkjet than for pin printing due to a steeper slope of the intensity profile. The inkjet printing of BSA on hydrophobic surfaces (OTS and PFS) exhibited a quasi-step-wise fluorescent pattern (Fig. 4 and Supplementary Figure SI 9–10). It was argued (Askounis et al., 2015) that this drying morphology is due to a ‘stick-slip’ mechanism that, like in the ‘coffee-ring’ pattern, is the result of pinning at the liquid-air interface. However, the process differs from the ‘coffee-ring’ morphology since the contact line is pinned at one side only. As evaporation occurs, a critical contact angle is reached and the droplet recedes to a new liquid-air interface line towards the immobilized contact line. This process results in a pattern comprising concentric rings, or the ‘half-moon’ morphology. Also the pattern is more pronounced on

hydrophobic surfaces that have a higher critical contact angle (Askounis et al., 2015).

The plateau of the fluorescent intensity profile, or its minimal curvature, was again dependent on the droplet printing method, the surface properties, and the concentration of the protein in solution. The pin printing produced spots with the smoothest profile on APTES, while inkjet printing produced the smoothest profile on the GPS surface. Interestingly, the profiles of the BSA spots were smoother than those for IgG on the hydrophilic surfaces, whereas the opposite was observed on hydrophobic surfaces.

On hydrophilic surfaces, i.e., APTES and GPS, a positive ‘coffee-ring’ ratio, CRR, indicating a ‘bull’s eye’ spot morphology, was regularly produced by both droplet-based methods (Fig. 3). Based on the CRR, the inkjet printing produced more uniform spots on hydrophilic surfaces than those produced by pin printing. Conversely, on hydrophobic surfaces, i.e., OTS and PFS, the spot morphology was dependent on the method used (Figs. 3 and 4). Inkjet printing produced a positive CRR of higher value, pointing to an even more pronounced ‘bull’s eye’ morphology than that observed on hydrophilic surfaces. The pin printing patterns are characterised by a negative CRR when dilute protein solutions were printed on hydrophobic surfaces, exhibiting a ‘coffee-ring’ spot morphology. The strength of the CRR as a metric to measure differences in the type of spot homogeneity is evident by the fact that it can delineate between, and quantifies of the differences in signal irregularities that would be difficult to decipher by the human eye alone.

The fact that pin printing creates a negative ‘coffee-ring’ ratio on hydrophobic surfaces could be the result of the transfer of proteins from the edge of the pin. In pin printing, the pin touches the substrate, then transfers the droplet on the surface. The volume of this droplet is governed by the contact angle of the substrate. On a substrate with a higher contact angle, the resulting droplet has a smaller contact area with the surface than the area that the pin head originally contacted. At high protein solution concentrations this results in a very small spot of high intensity within the printed spot. This spot morphology would normally be considered ‘bull’s eye’-like, however, it has a zero, or negative ‘coffee-ring’ ratio because the number of pixels in this very small spot within the overall spot are not large enough to offset all the pixels in the outer 50% of the spot. A separate spot morphology at lower protein concentrations on OTS and PFS presents a concentric circle or ‘half-moon’ pattern that explains the resulting negative ‘coffee-ring’ ratio.

The relative standard deviation (RSD) of the signal intensity is another metric used to quantify its uniformity (Diehl et al., 2001). Based on the RSD, the PFS surface induced the highest signal non-uniformity for printing of both proteins, by both droplet-based methods, and for all




Fig. 4. Fluorescent intensity profiles of spots printed with inkjet (A) and pin (B) printing on an OTS-functionalized surface for various BSA concentrations. C. ‘Coffee-ring’ ratio of 1.0 µg/ml to 50 µg/ml BSA solution printed on OTS-functionalized surface by inkjet and pin printing. D. Detail of intensity profile for low concentrations of BSA for pin printing.




Fig. 5. Uniformity analysis of protein spots printed by μ CP compared to the droplet-based techniques. A. Fluorescent intensity profile of BSA spots (50 μ g/ml) printed on a plasma-treated glass using μ CP, from high resolution image. Spot size variability (B) and ‘coffee-ring’ ratio (C) of BSA (50 μ g/ml) spots printed by μ CP on plasma-treated glass surface; and of BSA (25 μ g/ml) of inkjet and pin printed on APTES-functionalized slides.

concentrations of proteins in solution. The RSD, like the CRR, was dependent on the protein concentration. Instances where the RSD was high were due to the large signal intensity differences between replicate trials, i.e., slide-to-slide variations. The calculation of RSD within each slide would provide further information on intra-slide variations, but still would not provide any information regarding the inhomogeneity within a spot.

3.3.5. Spot analysis for micro-contact printing

The μ CP technique was analyzed separately because the resulting spots were approximately a hundred times smaller than those resulting from the droplet-based techniques. The results (Fig. 5) show that a relatively uniform protein layer is produced, with a high contrast between the signal and the background. However, the top of the profile is not smooth, suggesting that more protein is transferred at the one edge of the PDMS, possibly due to the uneven pressure applied to the stamp.

The uniformity of the μ CP spots was superior on a plasma-treated glass surface when compared to the spots resulting from the droplet-based techniques on the APTES surface (Supplementary information, Figure SI 14, for all surfaces; and Figure SI 13). As presented in Fig. 5, the uniformity of the μ CP spots, based on spot size variability and the ‘coffee-ring’ ratio, was comparable to the droplet-based techniques.

3.4. Overall comparison of spot parameters

The price for the elegance and simplicity of microarray technology is the high phenomenological complexity of the processes involved in protein patterning on surfaces. Additionally, the technological input variables have very different nature. For instance, the deposition methods and the proteins are ‘classes’ of experimental variables, whereas the concentration of the proteins in solution can be numerically quantified. Other input variables, e.g., surfaces, can be partially compared using one important, but not exclusive, parameter, e.g., surface hydrophobicity quantified by their contact angle. The complexity of the phenomenological processes and technological input variables involved in microarray fabrication asked, by necessity, a combinatorial experimentation approach. Indeed, in this study, six input technological variables, i.e., deposition methods (3), proteins (2), protein concentrations (7), buffers (2) surfaces (5), and washing solutions (2), have been mapped to assess the performance of various combinations of the microarray technological process. The mapping of these technological variables resulted in more than 800 separate experiments, each with at least five replicates to ensure the statistical relevance of the results. The comprehensive nature of the mapping of the input variables is mirrored by the variety of the technological

output variables for microarray fabrication, which quantifies its performance, namely spot size, size variability, eccentricity, mean intensity, coffee ring ratio, contrast, and smoothness. To this end, in order to synthetically assess the modulation of microarray protein spots by input technological parameters, IgG and BSA protein patterns produced by inkjet, pin, and μ CP, on silane-functionalized and plasma-treated glass, have been analyzed versus the seven process performance output variables.

For a synthetic comparison, all of the investigated parameters were integrated into a radar chart to visualise their impact on the key performance parameters of microarray protein patterns (Fig. 6). The spot size and eccentricity values used for comparison are based on the printing with a 12.5 μ g/ml solution, as these values were the most consistent with regard to these two performance criteria. The results from the 25 μ g/ml solution were used to compare the mean intensity values since below this concentration μ CP resulted in very low values. Since there was no clear trend for the ‘coffee-ring’ ratio, or spot size variability with concentration, the value of each of these variables was added across concentrations for each method to produce the resulting value used for comparison. The qualitative measurements of smoothness and contrast observed in the intensity profiles of the 25 μ g/ml spots were given a value of 1–4, wherein 1 represented a profile without significant intensity for comparison, and 4 represented the best method on that surface. For variables where a number close to zero reflected a better printing method, i.e., ‘coffee-ring’ ratio and eccentricity, the quantified value was subtracted from 1, and therefore a higher value represents better performance. The spot size is the one variable where the value was used for direct comparison and does not reflect one method being better than another. All quantitative values were normalized to 1. The results of this comparison are presented in Fig. 6.

Inkjet printing produced spots with a higher contrast between the spot and background signal, on all surfaces, as compared to pin printing, as demonstrated by a steeper slope of their profile of the fluorescence signal. The size of the spots produced by inkjet printing was more uniform than those produced by pin printing. Also, the necessity of having multiple pins to enable higher throughput increases the variability between spots. On hydrophobic surfaces pin printing produced ‘coffee-ring’ spots, whereas inkjet printing produced ‘bull’s eye’ spots. The smoothness of the fluorescent profile and the cumulative ‘coffee-ring’ ratio across concentrations were comparable for both pin and inkjet printing demonstrating that the two methods produce spots of similar uniformity during the deposition process.

The use of the hygroscopic additives betaine and 2,3-butanediol increased the circularity, uniformity, and mean fluorescence intensity of the spots printed using a droplet-based method, as previously

range of surfaces compared to pin printing, largely because the deposition of the protein solution does not depend on the substrate surface. μ CP was also shown to produce quality spots that are much smaller than what either inkjet, or pin printing, are capable. However, the high transfer efficiency of the μ CP was limited to hydrophilic, high energy surfaces, consistent with prior results (Ricoult et al., 2014).

Whereas other factors, such as secondary biomolecule binding and microenvironment conditions, could affect the final efficacy of the microarray, the strong correlation between immobilized protein and binding signal suggests that the strongest and most homogeneous signals generally lead to the best performing microarrays. This work introduces a systematic approach for the assessment of the quality of spot microarrays and the results presented can be used as a methodological template for the optimization of the development of future protein microarrays. Depending on the specific microarray application, future work is needed to further study, using similar procedures as detailed here, the impact of input parameters on the secondary microarray pattern, so that the best combination of the printing method, surface and carrier fluid can be chosen.

Acknowledgements

The research was supported by a Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council (NSERC) Discovery Project No 238925, and by a fellowship provided by McGill Institute for Advanced Materials (MIAM).

Appendix A. Supporting information

Supplementary data associated with this article can be found in the online version at doi:10.1016/j.bios.2018.09.027.

References

- Anand, G., Sharma, S., Dutta, A.K., Kumar, S.K., Belfort, G., 2010. Conformational transitions of adsorbed proteins on surfaces of varying polarity. *Langmuir* 26 (13), 10803–10811.
- Anderson, K.S., Sibani, S., Wallstrom, G., Qiu, J., Mendoza, E.A., Raphael, J., Hainsworth, E., Montor, W.R., Wong, J., Park, J.G., Lokko, N., Logvinenko, T., Ramachandran, N., Godwin, A.K., Marks, J., Engstrom, P., LaBaer, J., 2011. Protein microarray signature of autoantibody biomarkers for the early detection of breast cancer. *J. Proteome Res.* 10 (1), 85–96.
- Angulo, J., 2008. Polar modelling and segmentation of genomic microarray spots using mathematical morphology. *Image Anal. Stereol.* 27 (2), 107–124.
- Askounis, A., Sefiane, K., Koutsos, V., Shanahan, M.E., 2015. Effect of particle geometry on triple line motion of nano-fluid drops and deposit nano-structuring. *Adv. Colloid Interface Sci.* 222, 44–57.
- Austin, J., Holway, A.H., 2011a. Contact printing of protein microarrays. *Methods Mol. Biol.* 785, 379–394.
- Austin, J., Holway, A.H., 2011b. Contact printing of protein microarrays. *Methods Mol. Biol.* 379–394.
- Avseenko, N.V., Morozova, T.Y., Ataullakhanov, F.I., Morozov, V.N., 2002. Immunoassay with multicomponent protein microarrays fabricated by electrospray deposition. *Anal. Chem.* 74 (5), 927–933.
- Awskiuk, K., Bernasik, A., Kitsara, M., Budkowski, A., Petrou, P., Kakabakos, S., Prauzner-Bechcicki, S., Rysz, J., Raptis, I., 2012. Spectroscopic and microscopic characterization of biosensor surfaces with protein/amino-organosilane/silicon structure. *Colloids Surf. B Biointerfaces* 90, 159–168.
- Awskiuk, K., Budkowski, A., Psarouli, A., Petrou, P., Bernasik, A., Kakabakos, S., Rysz, J., Raptis, I., 2013. Protein adsorption and covalent bonding to silicon nitride surfaces modified with organo-silanes: comparison using AFM, angle-resolved XPS and multivariate ToF-SIMS analysis. *Colloids Surf. B Biointerfaces* 110, 217–224.
- Babel, I., Barderas, R., Díaz-Urriarte, R., Martínez-Torrecuadrada, J.L., Sánchez-Carbayo, M., Casal, J.I., 2009. Identification of tumor-associated autoantigens for the diagnosis of colorectal cancer in serum using high density protein microarrays. *Mol. Cell. Proteom.* 8 (10), 2382–2395.
- Barbulovic-Nad, I., Lucente, M., Sun, Y., Zhang, M., Wheeler, A.R., Busmann, M., 2006. Bio-microarray fabrication techniques—a review. *Crit. Rev. Biotechnol.* 26 (4), 237–259.
- Bergeron, S., Laforte, V., Lo, P.S., Li, H., Juncker, D., 2015. Evaluating mixtures of 14 hygroscopic additives to improve antibody microarray performance. *Anal. Bioanal. Chem.* 407 (28), 8451–8462.
- Bernard, A., Delamarche, E., Schmid, H., Michel, B., Bosshard, H.R., Biebuyck, H., 1998. Printing patterns of proteins. *Langmuir* 14 (9), 2225–2229.
- Bietsch, A., Hegner, M., Lang, H.P., Gerber, C., 2004. Inkjet deposition of alkanethiolate monolayers and DNA oligonucleotides on gold: evaluation of spot uniformity by wet etching. *Langmuir* 20 (12), 5119–5122.
- Chiu, C.S., Lee, H.M., Gwo, S., 2010. Site-selective biofunctionalization of aluminum nitride surfaces using patterned organosilane self-assembled monolayers. *Langmuir* 26 (4), 2969–2974.
- Cui, L., Zhang, J., Zhang, X., Huang, L., Wang, Z., Li, Y., Gao, H., Zhu, S., Wang, T., Yang, B., 2012. Suppression of the coffee ring effect by hydrosoluble polymer additives. *ACS Appl. Mater. Interfaces* 4 (5), 2775–2780.
- Deforest, C.A., Tirrell, D.A., 2015. A photoreversible protein-patterning approach for guiding stem cell fate in three-dimensional gels. *Nat. Mater.* 14 (5), 523–531.
- Diehl, F., Grahlmann, S., Beier, M., Hoheisel, J.D., 2001. Manufacturing DNA microarrays of high spot homogeneity and reduced background signal. *Nucleic Acids Res.* 29 (7).
- Draghici, S., Lenhart, S., Safer, H., Maini, P., Etheridge, A., Gross, L., 2003. *Data Analysis Tools for DNA Microarrays*. Chapman and Hall/CRC, New York.
- Dufva, M., 2005. Fabrication of high quality microarrays. *Biomol. Eng.* 22 (5–6), 173–184.
- Erbil, H.Y., 2012. Evaporation of pure liquid sessile and spherical suspended drops: a review. *Adv. Colloid Interface Sci.* 170 (1–2), 67–86.
- Filipponi, L., Livingston, P., Kašpar, O., Tokárová, V., Nicolau, D.V., 2016. Protein patterning by microcontact printing using pyramidal PDMS stamps. *Biomed. Micro.* 18 (1), 1–7.
- Glass, N.R., Tjeung, R., Chan, P., Yeo, L.Y., Friend, J.R., 2011. Organosilane deposition for microfluidic applications. *Biomicrofluidics* 5 (3), 36501–365017.
- Hanson, K.L., Fulga, F., Dobroiu, S., Solana, G., Kaspar, O., Tokarova, V., Nicolau, D.V., 2017. Polymer surface properties control the function of heavy meromyosin in dynamic nanodevices. *Biosens. Bioelectron.* 93, 305–314.
- Harwaneg, C., Hiller, R., 2005. Protein microarrays for the diagnosis of allergic diseases: state-of-the-art and future development. *Clin. Chem. Lab. Med. CCLM/FESCC* 43 (12), 1321–1326.
- Hu, H., Larson, R.G., 2006. Marangoni effect reverses coffee-ring depositions. *J. Phys. Chem. B* 110 (14), 7090–7094.
- Ivanova, E.P., Wright, J.P., Pham, D., Filipponi, L., Viezzoli, A., Nicolau, D.V., 2002. Polymer microstructures fabricated via laser ablation used for multianalyte protein microassay. *Langmuir* 18 (24), 9539–9546.
- Ivanova, E.P., Wright, J.P., Pham, D.K., Brack, N., Pigram, P., Alekseeva, Y.V., Demyashev, G.M., Nicolau, D.V., 2006. A comparative study between the adsorption and covalent binding of human immunoglobulin and lysozyme on surface-modified poly(tert-butyl methacrylate). *Biomed. Mater.* 1 (1), 24–32.
- Kannan, B., Castellino, K., Chen, F.F., Majumdar, A., 2006. Lithographic techniques and surface chemistries for the fabrication of PEG-passivated protein microarrays. *Biosens. Bioelectron.* 21 (10), 1960–1967.
- Kim, D.J., Lee, J.M., Park, J.G., Chung, B.G., 2011. A self-assembled monolayer-based micropatterned array for controlling cell adhesion and protein adsorption. *Biotechnol. Bioeng.* 108 (5), 1194–1202.
- Kira, A., Okano, K., Hosokawa, Y., Naito, A., Fuwa, K., Yuyama, J., Masuhara, H., 2009. Micropatterning of perfluoroalkyl self-assembled monolayers for arraying proteins and cells on chips. *Appl. Surf. Sci.* 255 (17), 7647–7651.
- Kumble, K.D., 2007. An update on using protein microarrays in drug discovery. *Expert Opin. Drug Discov.* 2 (11), 1467–1476.
- Laforte, V., Olanrewaju, A., Juncker, D., 2013. Low-cost, high liquid volume silicon quill pins for robust and reproducible printing of antibody microarrays. In: *Proceedings of the 17th International Conference on Miniaturized Systems for Chemistry and Life Sciences, MicroTAS*, pp. 485–487.
- Launier, C., Gaskill, M., Czaplewski, G., Myung, J.H., Hong, S., Eddington, D.T., 2012. Channel surface patterning of alternating biomimetic protein combinations for enhanced microfluidic tumor cell isolation. *Anal. Chem.* 84 (9), 4022–4028.
- Lee, H.J., Wark, A.W., Corn, R.M., 2008. Microarray methods for protein biomarker detection. *Analyst* 133 (8), 975–983.
- Lee, K.B., Kim, E.Y., Mirkin, C.A., Wolinsky, S.M., 2004. The use of nanoarrays for highly sensitive and selective detection of human immunodeficiency virus type 1 in plasma. *Nano Lett.* 4 (10), 1869–1872.
- McWilliam, I., Kwan, M.C., Hall, D., 2011. Inkjet printing for the production of protein microarrays. *Methods Mol. Biol.* 345–361.
- Michel, B., Bernard, A., Bietsch, A., Delamarche, E., Geissler, M., Juncker, D., Kind, H., Renault, J.P., Rothuizen, H., Schmid, H., Schmidt-Winkel, P., Stutz, R., Wolf, H., 2001. Printing meets lithography: soft approaches to high-resolution patterning. *IBM J. Res. Dev.* 45 (5), 697–719.
- Moran-Mirabal, J.M., Tan, C.P., Orth, R.N., Williams, E.O., Craighead, H.G., Lin, D.M., 2007. Controlling microarray spot morphology with polymer liftoff arrays. *Anal. Chem.* 79 (3), 1109–1114.
- Mujawar, L.H., Kuerten, J.G.M., Siregar, D.P., van Amerongen, A., Norde, W., 2014. Influence of the relative humidity on the morphology of inkjet printed spots of IgG on a non-porous substrate. *RSC Adv.* 4 (37), 19380–19388.
- Mujawar, L.H., Norde, W., van Amerongen, A., 2013. Spot morphology of non-contact printed protein molecules on non-porous substrates with a range of hydrophobicities. *Analyst* 138 (2), 518–524.
- Mujawar, L.H., van Amerongen, A., Norde, W., 2012. Influence of buffer composition on the distribution of inkjet printed protein molecules and the resulting spot morphology. *Talanta* 98, 1–6.
- Müller, U.R., Nicolau, D.V. (Eds.), 2005. *Microarray Technology and Its Applications*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- Nicolau, D.V., Ivanova, E.P., Fulga, F., Filipponi, L., Viezzoli, A., Dobroiu, S., Alekseeva, Y.V., Pham, D.K., 2010. Protein immobilisation on micro/nanostructures fabricated by laser microablation. *Biosens. Bioelectron.* 26 (4), 1337–1345.
- Nicolau, D.V., Paszek, E., Fulga, F., Nicolau, D.V., 2014. Mapping hydrophobicity on the protein molecular surface at atom-level resolution. *PLoS One* 9 (12).

- Nicolau, D.V., Paszek, E., Fulga, F., Nicolau Jr, D.V., 2013. Protein molecular surface mapped at different geometrical resolutions. *PLoS One* 8 (3).
- Nicolau, D.V., Suzuki, H., Mashiko, S., Taguchi, T., Yoshikawa, S., 1999a. Actin motion on microlithographically functionalized myosin surfaces and tracks. *Biophys. J.* 77 (2), 1126–1134.
- Nicolau, D.V., Taguchi, T., Taniguchi, H., Tanigawa, H., Yoshikawa, S., 1999b. Patterning neuronal and glia cells on light-assisted functionalised photoresists. *Biosens. Bioelectron.* 14 (3), 317–325.
- Ostuni, E., Chapman, R.G., Holmlin, R.E., Takayama, S., Whitesides, G.M., 2001. A survey of structure-property relationships of surfaces that resist the adsorption of protein. *Langmuir* 17 (18), 5605–5620.
- Ostuni, E., Grzybowski, B.A., Mrksich, M., Roberts, C.S., Whitesides, G.M., 2003. Adsorption of proteins to hydrophobic sites on mixed self-assembled monolayers. *Langmuir* 19 (5), 1861–1872.
- Pujari, S.P., Scheres, L., Marcelis, A.T., Zuilhof, H., 2014. Covalent surface modification of oxide surfaces. *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. Engl.* 53 (25), 6322–6356.
- Qu, H., Wang, H., Huang, Y., Zhong, W., Lu, H., Kong, J., Yang, P., Liu, B., 2004. Stable microstructured network for protein patterning on a plastic microfluidic channel: strategy and characterization of on-chip enzyme microreactors. *Anal. Chem.* 76 (21), 6426–6433.
- Renault, J.P., Bernard, A., Juncker, D., Michel, B., Bosshard, H.R., Delamar, E., 2002. Fabricating microarrays of functional proteins using affinity contact printing. *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* 41 (13), 2320–2323.
- Ricoult, S.G., Nezhad, A.S., Knapp-Mohammady, M., Kennedy, T.E., Juncker, D., 2014. Humidified microcontact printing of proteins: universal patterning of proteins on both low and high energy surfaces. *Langmuir* 30 (40), 12002–12010.
- Romanov, V., Davidoff, S.N., Miles, A.R., Grainger, D.W., Gale, B.K., Brooks, B.D., 2014. A critical comparison of protein microarray fabrication technologies. *Analyst* 139 (6), 1303–1326.
- Russo, P.A., Ribeiro Carrott, M.M.L., Mourão, P.A.M., Carrott, P.J.M., 2011. Tailoring the surface chemistry of mesocellular foams for protein adsorption. *Colloids Surf. A: Physicochem. Eng. Asp.* 386 (1), 25–35.
- Saeed, A.I., Sharov, V., White, J., Li, J., Liang, W., Bhagabati, N., Braisted, J., Klapa, M., Currier, T., Thiagarajan, M., Sturn, A., Snuffin, M., Rezantsev, A., Popov, D., Ryltsov, A., Kostukovich, E., Borisovsky, I., Liu, Z., Vinsavich, A., Trush, V., Quackenbush, J., 2003. TM4: a free, open-source system for microarray data management and analysis. *Biotechniques* 34 (2), 374–378.
- Schena, M., Shalon, D., Davis, R.W., Brown, P.O., 1995. Quantitative monitoring of gene expression patterns with a complementary DNA microarray. *Science* 270 (5235), 467–470.
- Štulík, J., 2011. In: Štulík, J. (Ed.), *BSL3 and BSL4 Agents: Proteomics, Glycomics, and Antigenicity*. Wiley-Blackwell, Weinheim.
- Takashi, T., Takumi, H., Takeo, M., Yuzo, K., Guo-Jun, Z., Takashi, F., Iwao, O., 2005. Hybridization of deoxyribonucleic acid and immobilization of green fluorescent protein on nanostructured organosilane templates. *Jpn. J. Appl. Phys.* 44 (7S), 5851.
- Vafaei, S., Podowski, M.Z., 2005. Analysis of the relationship between liquid droplet size and contact angle. *Adv. Colloid Interface Sci.* 113 (2–3), 133–146.
- Vasina, E.N., Paszek, E., Nicolau Jr, D.V., Nicolau, D.V., 2009. The BAD project: data mining, database and prediction of protein adsorption on surfaces. *Lab a Chip* 9 (7), 891–900.
- Yunker, P.J., Still, T., Lohr, M.A., Yodh, A.G., 2011. Suppression of the coffee-ring effect by shape-dependent capillary interactions. *Nature* 476 (7360), 308–311.