

Journal of Visualized Experiments

Diffuse optical spectroscopy for the quantitative assessment of acute ionizing radiation induced skin toxicity using a mouse model --Manuscript Draft--

Manuscript Number:	JoVE53573R3
Full Title:	Diffuse optical spectroscopy for the quantitative assessment of acute ionizing radiation induced skin toxicity using a mouse model
Article Type:	Methods Article - JoVE Produced Video
Keywords:	Diffuse optical spectroscopy, biomarkers, microvasculature, nude mouse, hemoglobin, oxygen saturation, ionizing radiation
Manuscript Classifications:	5.1: Diagnosis; 97.74: Optics
Corresponding Author:	Lee Chin University of Toronto Toronto, Ontario CANADA
Corresponding Author Secondary Information:	
Corresponding Author E-Mail:	lee.chin@sunnybrook.ca
Corresponding Author's Institution:	University of Toronto
Corresponding Author's Secondary Institution:	
First Author:	Lee Chin
First Author Secondary Information:	
Other Authors:	Elina Korpela
	Anthony Kim
	Darren Yohan
	Carolyn Niu
	Brian Wilson
	Stanley Liu
Order of Authors Secondary Information:	
Abstract:	Acute skin toxicities from ionizing radiation (IR) are a common side effect from therapeutic courses of external beam radiation therapy (RT) and negatively impact patient quality of life and long term survival. Advances in our understanding of the biological pathways associated with normal tissue toxicities has allowed for the development of interventional drugs, however, current response studies are limited by a lack of quantitative metrics for assessing the severity of skin reactions. Here we present a diffuse optical spectroscopic (DOS) approach that provides quantitative optical biomarkers of skin response to radiation. We describe the instrumentation design of the DOS system as well as the inversion algorithm for extracting the optical parameters. Finally, to demonstrate clinical utility, we present representative data from a pre-clinical mouse model of radiation induced erythema and compare the results with a commonly employed visual scoring. The described DOS method offers an objective, high through-put evaluation of skin toxicity via functional response that is easily translatable to the clinical setting.
Author Comments:	
Additional Information:	
Question	Response

If this article needs to be filmed by a certain date to due to author/equipment/lab availability, please indicate the date below and explain in your cover letter.	
If this article needs to be "in-press" by a certain date to satisfy grant requirements, please indicate the date below and explain in your cover letter.	

April 13th, 2015

Dear Sir / Madame,

Please find attached the original manuscript "*Diffuse optical spectroscopy for the quantitative assessment of acute ionizing radiation induced skin toxicity using a mouse model*". The methods described in this article provide an objective and quantitative technique for evaluating radiation-induced skin toxicity in mice. Furthermore, the relative simplicity, robustness and portability of the described diffuse optical spectroscopy instrumentation is easily translatable to the radiation therapy setting for potential clinical trials. We believe the described technique will be of significant interest to readers working on translational research evaluating novel drugs / therapies and hope that our work meets the high standards of the articles published in the **Journal of Visualized Experiments**. Please don't hesitate to contact me if you have any questions regarding the submitted manuscript. We look forward to your response.

Sincerely,



Lee Chin, PhD, MCCPM
Medical Physicist, Odette Cancer Centre
Assistant Professor, University of Toronto, Department of Radiation
Oncology
2075 Bayview Avenue, T Wing, TG-217
Toronto, ON, Canada, M4N 3M5
Phone: 416 480 6100 x2806
Email: lee.chin@sunnybrook.ca

TITLE:

Diffuse optical spectroscopy for the quantitative assessment of acute ionizing radiation induced skin toxicity using a mouse model

AUTHORS:

Chin, Lee (Corresponding Author)
Department of Radiation Oncology,
University of Toronto,
Toronto, Canada
Department of Physics,
Ryerson University,
Toronto, Canada
lee.chin@sunnybrook.ca

Korpela, Elina
²Department of Medical Biophysics,
University of Toronto,
Toronto, Canada
elina.korpela@mail.utoronto.ca

Kim, Anthony
⁵Department of Radiation Oncology
University of Toronto
Toronto, Canada
anthony.kim@sunnybrook.ca

Yohan, Darren
Toronto, Canada
Department of Physics,
Toronto, Canada
dyohan@ryerson.ca

Niu, Carolyn
³Ontario Cancer Institute / Campbell Family Institute for Cancer Research,
Toronto, Canada
jcarolyn@uhnres.utoronto.ca
Wilson, Brian C
Department of Medical Biophysics,
University of Toronto,
Toronto, Canada
wilson@uhnres.utoronto.ca

Liu, Stanley K
⁵Department of Radiation Oncology,
University of Toronto,
Toronto, Canada

Department of Medical Biophysics,
University of Toronto,
Toronto, Canada
stanley.liu@sunnybrook.ca

CORRESPONDING AUTHOR:

Chin, Lee
Department of Radiation Oncology,
University of Toronto,
Toronto, Canada
Department of Physics,
Ryerson University,
Toronto, Canada
lee.chin@sunnybrook.ca

KEY WORDS:

Diffuse optical spectroscopy, biomarkers, microvasculature, nude mouse, hemoglobin, oxygen saturation, ionizing radiation

SHORT ABSTRACT:

We present a diffuse optical spectroscopic (DOS) approach that provides quantitative optical biomarkers of skin response to radiation. We describe DOS instrumentation design, optical parameters extraction algorithms and the animal handling procedures required to yield representative data from a pre-clinical mouse model of radiation induced erythema.

LONG ABSTRACT:

Acute skin toxicities from ionizing radiation (IR) are a common side effect from therapeutic courses of external beam radiation therapy (RT) and negatively impact patient quality of life and long term survival. Advances in the understanding of the biological pathways associated with normal tissue toxicities have allowed for the development of interventional drugs, however, current response studies are limited by a lack of quantitative metrics for assessing the severity of skin reactions. Here we present a diffuse optical spectroscopic (DOS) approach that provides quantitative optical biomarkers of skin response to radiation. We describe the instrumentation design of the DOS system as well as the inversion algorithm for extracting the optical parameters. Finally, to demonstrate clinical utility, we present representative data from a pre-clinical mouse model of radiation induced erythema and compare the results with a commonly employed visual scoring. The described DOS method offers an objective, high through-put evaluation of skin toxicity via functional response that is translatable to the clinical setting.

INTRODUCTION:

Technological improvements in radiation therapy (RT) planning and delivery now allow for highly conformal therapeutic doses to be delivered to the tumor region, while simultaneously sparing normal surrounding structures. Yet, acute and sometimes severe toxicities are unavoidable when the high dose target is in close proximity to the skin. If severe enough, the

resulting normal tissue damage can negatively affect the RT treatment outcome and patient quality of life^{1,2}.

Despite the detrimental consequences, present management of radiation skin erythema remains nonspecific, employing creams or ointments that ignore the underlying biological mechanisms leading to damage. These approaches are based upon minimizing symptoms rather than the cause. Moreover, the timing and administration of interventional therapies is complicated by the qualitative and subjective nature of radiation skin injury assessment. While several recognized organizations (RTOG, EORTC) provide visual grading recommendations, institutions vary in their choice of preferred scoring, thereby obscuring comparisons of normal tissue toxicities for the purposes of meta-analyses. Further, such grading systems are crude and prone to inter-observer variability, such that differences in radiation injury severity may be indiscernible in studies evaluating toxicity reduction strategies.

Rather than visually describing the degree of erythema in irradiated skin, an alternative approach is to measure parameters that quantitatively describe the underlying physiological changes that occur in the organ. Blood hemoglobin (Hb), tissue oxygen saturation (StO₂) or oxygenated hemoglobin (oxyHb) levels have been used as proxies for irradiation-induced erythema in mice³⁻⁶. Following irradiation, total Hb levels undergo fluctuations, but oxyHb or StO₂ undergo a characteristic early sharp rise, followed by a fall and another more persistent rise^{3,6}. When irritants are used to induce skin erythema, vascular oxyHb levels directly correlate with the severity of the local erythema and inflammation⁷.

Diffuse optical spectroscopy (DOS) employs near-infrared light to provide functional information on the biochemical and microstructural components of vital tissues components. This quantitative, non-invasive optical technology offers a method to measure the cytokine-induced vasodilation in blood vessels that occur during erythema via functional surrogates of Hb concentration and StO₂. Recent studies comparing DOS measured parameters with controlled clinical scoring methods⁸⁻¹¹ indicate the potential of the technique for overcoming the limitations inherent to current grading systems.

Here we describe an in-house, portable, DOS system that employs functional surrogates for quantitatively detecting differences in radiation-induced skin toxicity in a pre-clinical mouse model⁵. The described platform may provide a means of standardized erythema scoring with high sensitivity for early detection and subtle differentiation of interventional drug response. Moreover, with only minor adaptations, the instrumentation may eventually be employed clinically for real-time bedside monitoring.

PROTOCOL:

The following methods are in accordance with the guidelines of the Sunnybrook Research Institute Animal Care Ethics Committee.

1. Diffuse Reflectance Spectroscopy System

1.1 Collect diffuse reflectance spectra using a handheld, fiberoptic probe and portable spectroscopic acquisition system that has been previously described (Kim et al. 2010) and is briefly reviewed in Figure 1 (and related captions) for completeness^{1,2}.

2. Preparation of mouse model of acute radiation skin damage

2.1. Order 6-week old mice (preferably hairless, such as athymic or SKH-1) and allow them to acclimate in the animal facility for a week before starting experiments. Reserve at least 3 mice for a non-irradiated control group and 5 mice for an irradiated group.

2.2. Before baseline DOS measurements and irradiation, label the mice using ear punches or permanent marker markings on the tail. If mice are not nude, remove the hair on a 2 cm by 2 cm patch of flank skin, but this may cause skin irritation.

3. Diffuse Optical Spectroscopy Data Acquisition

3.1. Turn on the power supply to the electronics.

3.2. For mouse skin, set the signal parameters for the acquisition software by typing in 25 ms for collection time, 25 for signal averages and 1 for boxcar filter width. These parameters offer a reasonable balance between acquisition time and signal to noise.

3.3. Using custom programmed acquisition software, automatically acquire a background reading, R_{bg} (LED off) and diffuse reflectance at two source-detector separation distances, R_{meas} (260 μm , 520 μm) by clicking the “Acquire” button. The total acquisition time is ~ 2 s.

3.4. Switch off all fluorescent room lights by pressing on the room light switch before performing measurements.

NOTE: Fluorescent room light interfere with the detected signal (these lights produce a time-varying light intensity and thus it is difficult to subtract as a background signal). Although incandescent bulbs may be employed keep the lights at a distance from the DOS probe to avoid high background levels (and poor signal to noise).

4. Animal anesthesia and baseline DOS measurements

4.1. Prepare the anesthesia machine by ensuring that all connections are intact and liquid isoflurane level is adequate. Use an anesthesia induction chamber with an attached tube and nose cone that can be taped down to a sterilized, softly padded surface within comfortable reach of the DOS probe.

4.2. Anaesthetize one cage of mice at a time in the induction chamber by inducing with 4% isoflurane for 30 s. Lower the isoflurane amount to 2% for the next 2 min. Verify that the mouse is anaesthetized by observing no response from pinching a toe of the hind limb.

4.3. Quickly move one mouse onto the sterilized DOS probing area, place it on its side, fasten its snout into the nose cone and open the nose cone tubing to the flow of anesthesia (2% isoflurane).

NOTE: If the procedure takes longer than 1 – 2 min, apply vet ointment on the eyes to prevent dryness.

4.4. Before acquiring mouse skin measurements, sterilize the probe by wiping with 70% ethanol. Do not sterilize the skin.

4.5. Place the probe gently on the flank skin making sure to avoid dispersing the local vasculature. Hold the probe by hand for the duration of the measurement.

4.6. Acquire reflectance data by probing a flank skin area of about 2 cm by 2 cm (the area to be irradiated) by following the 5-dot formation on a die. Keep this probing pattern, area, probe pressure and body side (left or right) consistent for all subsequent measurements.

NOTE: The complete scan takes approximately 60 s. Probe pressure should be just enough to obtain a scan without dispersing local vasculature.

4.7. Move the mouse into a recovery cage, and move the next mouse over to the DOS probing area. Repeat steps 4.2 – 4.6 until all mice have been measured. Do not leave an animal unattended until it has regained sufficient consciousness to maintain sternal recumbency.

5. Animal irradiation

NOTE: This protocol requires the use of an irradiator, and animal preparation may need to be adjusted to meet the needs of the irradiator device. During irradiation, only the small area of flank skin should be exposed to the radiation beam. The irradiator should be located in a sterile facility and appropriate cage sterilization should be observed when returning mice to their sterile housing area.

5.1. Prepare the anesthesia machine (as in steps 4.1 – 4.2) and anaesthetize one mouse at a time in the induction chamber before preparing it for irradiation.

5.2. Remove the mouse from the induction chamber, gently pinch the flank skin and place tape over and below the stretched skin, forming a flap.

5.3. Place the mouse onto a plexiglass stage and cover the body with a custom lead jig (a working design is a rectangular box with the bottom and at least one end open, along with a side window to allow flank skin to be pulled through). Pull the skin flap through the jig window and gently tape the flap onto the stage.

NOTE: The custom lead jig is small enough to immobilize the mouse. If the custom jig does not completely immobilize the mouse, then use additional restrainers and/or administer ketamine (80-100 mg/kg) and xylazine (10-12.5 mg/kg) via intraperitoneal injection to keep the mouse immobilized throughout the entire irradiation procedure.

5.4. Place the plexiglass stage with the jig and mouse into the irradiator. Determine the settings (skin distance from x-ray source, voltage, duration and amperage) and deliver the desired dose (e.g. 11 cm from a 160 kVp x-ray source for 2.5 min with 6.3 mA). NOTE: Use CAUTION with the x-ray source by following machine use guidelines to avoid burns and DNA damage.

NOTE: Athymic nude mice develop moist desquamation around 14 days post irradiation in response to 35 Gy, but only minor patchy desquamation with 17 Gy.

5.5. Take the apparatus and mouse out of the irradiator, remove the shielding, remove the tape and place it into an individual recovery cage. Return the mouse to its normal shared cage after it has recovered from the anesthesia. Repeat steps 5.2 – 5.4 for all mice, and perform a sham operation on control mice.

5.6. After irradiation, house the animals in their regular conditions. If signs of pain emerge (e.g. hunched posture), administer 0.1 mg/kg buprenorphine subcutaneously. If weight loss exceeds 20% of normal body mass, house it separately in its own cage and provide high-nutrient food.

6. Follow up DOS measurements

6.1. Monitor and measure skin reaction intensity using the quantitative DOS technique. For example, in addition to baseline, data can be gathered 6, 9 and 12 days following irradiation.

6.2. Set up DOS equipment and calibrations as described in section 3. Prepare the anesthesia machine and acquire DOS measurements as described in section 4.

7. Post-Acquisition Processing

NOTE: All steps in the following section are performed using a custom program created in a high performance software environment. Standardized naming conventions for each spectral acquisition file are employed to allow for batch processing. All steps are illustrated in Figure 2.

7.1. Subtract the baseline (noise floor) from all the measured spectra including the background reading.

7.2. Subtract the background reading, R_{bg} (LED off), obtained in Step 3.3 from the measurement spectrum, R_{meas} .

NOTE: For the remainder of this article all spectra are assumed to be noise floor and background subtracted and referred to as R_{corr} .

7.3. Convert R_{corr} to absolute reflectance, R_{abs} , as described in references [1,2] in Section 1.

7.3.1. Obtain relative reflectance measurements, R_{rel} , in Intralipid-20% phantoms (Fresenius Kabi, Sweden) phantoms with increasing 3% aliquot fractions up to 48% (i.e. 3%,6%,9%...48%) and create of plot of R_{rel} versus Intralipid concentration.

7.3.2. Generate an absolute plot of R_{abs} versus μ_s' using the diffusion equation for reflectance.¹⁴

7.3.3. Match the peak of both curves and adjust the R_{rel} x-axis to match the R_{abs} x-axis

7.3.4. At a given wavelength and source-detector separation, scale the y-axis using:

$$Scale(L, r) = \frac{\langle R_{dt}(us' \in V) \rangle}{\langle R_{meas}(us' \in V) \rangle}$$

NOTE: In the following section, all fitting of measurements will refer to R_{abs} .

8. Spectral Data Fitting

NOTE: The following section outlines the theory and fitting algorithm utilized for extracting functional parameters of mice skin. For all theory employed, refer to the following articles¹⁴⁻¹⁸ and references therein. All equations are assumed to be programmed in a high end scientific software environment (containing pre-programmed modules) commonly used in physics or engineering labs.

8.1. Program a function that describes the absorption spectrum, $\mu_a(\lambda)$ of skin as the sum of relevant individual chromophores in the spectral range of interest using the equation: $\mu_a(\lambda) = H_b [StO_2 \mu_a^{\text{oxyHb}}(\lambda) + (1 - StO_2) \mu_a^{\text{deoxyHb}}(\lambda)]$. Here, H_b is the total hemoglobin concentration (g/L), while StO_2 is the unitless oxygen saturation ranging from 0 to 1.

8.2. Obtain oxy, $\mu_a^{\text{oxyHb}}(\lambda)$, and deoxy, $\mu_a^{\text{deoxyHb}}(\lambda)$, hemoglobin spectra (stored as text files) from the on-line collection of Prahl¹⁹.

8.3. Program a function that describes the scattering spectrum of skin, $\mu_s'(\lambda) = A \left(\frac{\lambda}{\lambda_0} \right)^{-k}$, using a power law dependence, where A (cm^{-1}) is the value of μ_s' at $\lambda_0 = 1$ nm and k is a medium dependent power factor¹⁶.

8.4. Program a mathematical function for the forward model of diffuse reflectance based on equations from reference [14] that incorporate the spectral equations from Steps 8.2-8.3 into the forward model function (i.e. $R(r, \mu_a(\lambda), \mu_s'(\lambda)) = R(r, H_b, StO_2, A, k)$).

NOTE: While various models exist, the steady-state diffusion theory equation provides a simple and accurate description of the light distribution in tissue.

8.5. Program a function that squares the difference between the forward modeled reflectance spectra from Section 8.4 and the measured reflectance spectra.

8.6. Iteratively change H_b , StO_2 , A , and k until the least squares difference function in Section 8.5 is smallest. MatLab's `lsqcurvefit` can be used to automatically perform this step.

8.7. Repeat steps 8.5-8.6 to obtain DOS parameters (H_b , StO_2 , A , and k) for all measured reflectance data sets.

8.8. Plot the relative change in DOS parameter with the corresponding unique baseline measurement using the average of each mouse's set of 3 – 5 normalized probe spot measurements. These plots are created using MatLab's `plot` command.

9. Visual radiation dermatitis scoring period

9.1. Monitor and score skin reaction intensity using a qualitative grading scale (see Douglas and Fowler grading scale²⁰) after irradiation every 48 h (one may also observe changes 3 h – 24 h

following irradiation). Two blinded investigators are ideal. Acquiring photographs with a hand-held camera and reference scale (i.e. ruler) may help with evaluations.

9.2. Plot the median of each group at each time point. Compare groups at specific time points or the median overall areas under each curve.

9.3. After mice have been followed to the point of skin healing that is desired (e.g. 4 weeks), euthanize the mice by cervical dislocation.

REPRESENTATIVE RESULTS

The DOS reflectance technique provides an objective alternative to traditional qualitative methods of evaluating radiation induced skin toxicity. Visual changes in skin appearance following toxic doses of radiation present as alterations in both the magnitude and shape of the measured reflectance spectra. Both are related to functional changes in the underlying cellular microstructure and physiological tissue state. In this section, representative results from previously published work by Yohan et al. 2014⁵ are reviewed.

Figure 3 (left) show representative spectra (thin blue lines) measured at a 260 μm source-separation in an athymic mouse model of skin erythema 6 days after 40 Gy irradiation. Compared to pre-irradiation (Fig. 3, right panel), differences in the spectral shape at $\sim 550\text{-}650$ nm are observed, likely due to an increase in oxygenated hemoglobin. A small rise in absolute reflectance is also seen that is correlated to an increase in tissue scattering power. The observed spectra on day 6 following irradiation correlated to a visual skin score of 0.75.

An evaluation of post irradiation reflectance changes at select wavelengths does not make use of the complete reflectance spectrum and also carries the potential issue of noise sensitivity. However, fitting the complete spectrum allows the entire data set to be converted into intuitive optical biomarkers (H_b , StO_2). Figure 3 show the resulting fits (solid green line) of the measured data (thin noisy line) using the equations presented in Section 4. Excellent agreement is observed, confirming that the choice of basis chromophores and scattering shape adequately describe the mouse skin model.

Due to the non-invasive and self-calibrating nature of the DOS system, measurements can be conveniently performed over multiple days in different lighting conditions. Figure 4 shows relative changes in skin StO_2 for various time-points (6, 9, 12 days) in an irradiated mouse cohort ($n=8$) while Figure 5 shows the corresponding qualitative skin reaction scores. A progressive increase in StO_2 is observed that is statistically different compared to pre-irradiation values over all 3 days ($p < 0.05$). These trends mirror the visually observed increases in skin damage severity that peak at day 12 (average score of ~ 3) demonstrating the potential of StO_2 as a visual scoring surrogate (Figure 5).

It should be noted that no statistically significant changes were seen for any of the returned optical biomarkers for the non-irradiated control group ($n=3$) over the 12 days measured (data not shown). Changes in A and k can also be monitored over time (Figure 6), and these indicate that the scattering properties of the skin are changing in response to the radiation.

FIGURE LEGENDS

Figure 1: DOS instrumentation.

a) Schematic of the diffuse reflectance measurement geometry. b) Fiber-optic probe: The optical probe consists of a linear array of 200 μm core optical fibers that are bundled into an 18 gauge metal needle and spaced 260 μm apart. Two source fibers are coupled to two broadband light emitting diodes while a detection fiber is connected to an optical spectrometer. By sequentially turning on each of the sources, the spectrometer can collect diffuse reflectance at distances of 260 μm and 520 μm from each of the source fibers. c) Complete DOS system including laptop, attached fiber-optic probe and optic box: An automated data acquisition program is used to drive the sequential collection of spectra. The electronics are housed in an acquisition box that connects to the fiberoptic probe via SMA connectors.

Figure 2: Spectral processing.

All x-axis scales are in nm: a) Raw relative spectra, the baseline is the reading approximately between 900 – 1000 nm and approximately equal to the background signal b) Relative background reading c) Background and baseline subtracted relative spectra d) Absolutely calibrated spectrum following scaling of processed spectra shown in c)

Figure 3: Typical white light reflectance spectra of non-irradiated (left) and irradiated (right) mouse skin 6 days post irradiation.

Excellent agreement between measurement (noisy blue) and fits (solid green) were typically observed. Two key differences were seen between the two groups: 1) an overall increase in absolute reflectance and 2) a distinct change in spectral shape between 550 – 600 nm. With permission from Yohan et al 2014⁵.

Figure 4: Change in the oxygenation fraction of mouse skin following 40 Gy irradiation.

The baseline-normalized mean difference between the two groups (per mouse) is significant for Days 6 (Box 1), 9 (Box 2) and 12 (Box 3). With permission from Yohan et al 2014⁵.

Figure 5: Average qualitative skin reactions scores (n=8) as a function of days following 40 Gy irradiated mice skin. Adapted from Yohan et al 2014⁵.

Figure 6: Relative changes in A and k of mouse skin following 40 Gy irradiation on Days 6 (Box 1), 9 (Box 2) and 12 (Box 3).

The change in A (left side) and k (right side) on Day 6 (Box 1, left and right sides) was found to be significant ($p < 0.026$). With permission from Yohan et al 2014⁵.

DISCUSSION:

A DOS approach for quantitatively assessing radiation skin toxicities using optical biomarkers has been presented. Visual skin toxicity scoring systems require expert training and even then are prone to inter-observer variability and subjectivity. The DOS system and analysis software is simple to use, requires minimal training and returns objective functional parameters for interpreting physiological changes in skin. Furthermore, instead of describing the appearance of a skin lesion as a single parameter, DOS provides a wealth of information in spectral shape, optical properties and functional / microstructural parameters that offer an added degree of sensitivity and specificity not available in current qualitative scoring methods. Sections 1 and 7

highlight the main processing steps for obtaining absolute spectral data that can be utilized for quantitative fitting of optical biomarkers. Background and baseline subtraction are vital to allow the user to perform the DOS measurements under normal lighting conditions. Section 8 provides the necessary models and equations needed to describe athymic mice before and after x-ray irradiation. Here, the choice of appropriate absorbers is vital for an accurate description of the measured spectra. It is advised that the user thoroughly investigate in the literature the key absorbers that dominate the wavelength range and tissue of interest used in a given study prior to constructing an optical biomarker fitting model. Finally, Sections 3-5 describe the handling of the athymic mice during DOS acquisition. To avoid disrupting the local vasculature, use gentle force to place the DOS probe on the mouse skin surface..

While relatively inexpensive compared to hyperspectral camera systems^{3,4}, a clear limitation of the described DOS approach is the use of a point probe for measuring diffuse reflectance. This reflectance geometry necessitates gentle contact with the skin and has the potential to introduce measurement uncertainty by dispersing the vasculature if consistent probe-skin pressure is not employed. Future designs of the DOS probe may incorporate a pressure sensor to maintain consistent results. Further, while the use of close source-detector separation (< 2-3 mm) allows for optical probing depths specific to the skin surface, the improved specificity comes at a loss of spatial resolution compared to 2D hyperspectral imaging. To minimize this limitation, a 5 point quadrant scan that captures the overall irradiated volume was employed. Despite the lack of spatial resolution, previous work in mice⁵ has shown the ability of optical biomarkers averaged over a sparse area to differentiate not only irradiated and non-irradiated skin but also the impact of skin sparing interventional drugs such as Vasculotide⁶.

It should be noted that while the overall system design can be modified for different skin models, the underlying basis spectra and scattering shape may need to be optimized. Specifically, while oxy- and deoxy-Hb well describe an athymic mouse model, the application of the same model to darker skin may require the addition of melanin for optimal fitting. In addition, extension of the DOS bandwidth to higher wavelengths > 950 nm would necessitate the addition of water, which dominates at higher wavelengths. Furthermore, animal models with different skin thicknesses may require a different source-detector separation to optimize depth sensitivity. Lastly, the hairless feature makes algorithms simpler. Although non-hairless models may be optimal for certain research questions, they will require hair removal before DOS measurements, and skin irritation from this process may affect results. For research where total immune function is crucial, an immunocompetent hairless mouse (e.g. SKH-1) may serve as a better model due to its euthymic nature.

Important considerations for DOS probe measurements are consistent room temperature and estimation of the irradiated area. Temperature fluctuations can affect tissue Hb and StO₂ levels. Measuring a group of 3 non-irradiated animals at each data collection time may serve as a baseline to which unintended environmental fluctuations in parameter values can be normalized. Additionally, the irradiated area may be difficult to estimate (if skin flap preparations were not consistent) before damage begins to manifest visually around day 5 (40 Gy). If using black permanent marker to dot the boundaries of the radiation-exposed skin, avoid excessive ink use to prevent ink smudging, which can compromise readings.

An added feature of the system is the ability to separate absorption from scattering properties. While alternative hyperspectral imaging systems also provide the ability to monitor oxyHb and Hb concentration, the free-space geometry of hyperspectral imaging is unable to resolve scattering changes. This limitation may result in inaccuracies in the returned oxyHb, Hb and StO₂ parameters if significant changes in scattering occur due to erythema (redness). Further, monitoring of scattering changes using DOS may provide additional optical biomarkers for erythema evaluation. As shown in Figure 6, the initial results from Yohan et al (2014) indicate that A and k demonstrate a temporal trend following ionizing radiation that does not correlate with trends observed from other alternative methods such as visual scoring systems. This indicates that scattering changes do not manifest in a visually descriptive manner and may in fact be describing a separate biological process. Therefore, compared to alternative methods, DOS provides a high resolution for superficial scattering changes, an avenue for investigating novel skin damage biomarkers that may be separate from the usual Hb-based measurements.

Although our model employs a large single radiation dose (rather than multiple small fractionated doses that are used in the clinical setting), this mimics the pathophysiology of acute human skin radiotoxicity²¹. It is envisioned that with further optimization, DOS may provide a quantitative approach for automated and standardized scoring of radiation induced skin reactions. After mastering this technique, future applications may include monitoring differences between skin sparing therapeutics (e.g. comparing oxyHb levels between a control and experimental treatment for skin radioprotection, or for wound healing promotion). While ideal for high-throughput drug screening in animal models, the DOS system is potentially adaptable to the clinical environment due to ease of usability and the ability to measure in normal lighting conditions. In this case, the probe design may require minor modifications with slightly larger optode separations to account for the increased thickness of human skin. A clinical DOS system would allow for on-line evaluation of interventional therapies that could minimize painful skin reactions and improve patient comfort and compliance. In the future, it may be interesting to expand DOS-based quantification to the features of chronic radiation induced skin damage (e.g. fibrosis).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS:

This work was supported by research grants awarded to SKL from Abbott CARO (Canadian Association of Radiation Oncologists) Uro-Oncologic Radiation Awards and the Alan E. Tiffin Foundation. EK was supported by the Frederick Banting and Charles Best Canada Graduate Scholarship, the Scace Graduate Fellowship in Prostate Cancer Research and Paul Starita Graduate Student Fellowship.

DISCLOSURES:

The authors have nothing to disclose.

REFERENCES:



1. Hall, E. J. and Giaccia, A. J. *Radiobiology for the Radiologist*, J.B. Lippincott Company, Philadelphia, (2011)
2. Ryan, J. L. Ionizing Radiation: The Good, the Bad, and the Ugly *J Invest Dermatol* **132**, 985-993 DOI: 10.1038/jid.2011.411 [doi]. (2012).

3. Chin, M.S., *et al* Hyperspectral imaging for early detection of oxygenation and perfusion changes in irradiated skin *J Biomed Opt.* **17**(2):02601013 DOI: 10.1117/1.JBO.17.2.026010. [doi] (2012).
4. Chin, M.S., *et al* Skin perfusion and oxygenation changes in radiation fibrosis. *Plast. Reconstr. Surg.* **131** (4), 707-716 [doi]: 10.1097/PRS.0b013e3182818b94 (2013).
5. Yohan, D. *et. al*. Quantitative monitoring of radiation induced skin toxicities in nude mice using optical biomarkers measured from diffuse optical reflectance spectroscopy. *Biomed. Opt. Express.* **5** (5), 1309-1320 DOI: 10.1364/BOE.5.001309 [doi]. (2014).
6. Korpela, E. *et. al*. Vasculotide, an Angiopoietin-1 mimetic reduces acute skin ionizing radiation damage in a preclinical mouse model. *BMC Cancer* **14**, 614, DOI:10.1186/1471-2407-14-614 [doi] (2014)
7. Stamatas, G.N. & Kollias, N. *In vivo* documentation of cutaneous inflammation using spectral imaging. *J. Biomed. Opt.* **12** (5), 051603 DOI: 10.1117/1.2798704. [doi] (2007).
8. Turesson, I., Nyman, J., Holmberg, E., Oden, A. Prognostic factors for acute and late skin reactions in radiotherapy patients. *Int. J. Radiat. Oncol. Biol. Phys.* **36**, 1065-1075 (1995).
9. Rizza, L., D'Agostino, A., Girlando, A., & Puglia, C. Evaluation of the effect of topical agents on radiation-induced skin disease by reflectance spectrophotometry. *J. Pharm. Pharmacol.* **62** (6), 779-785 DOI: 10.1211/jpp.62.06.0015. [doi] (2010).
10. Wells, M., *et al*. Does aqueous or sucalfate cream affect the severity of erythematous radiation skin reactions? A randomised controlled trial. *Radiother. Oncol.* **73** (2), 153-162 DOI: 10.1016/j.radonc.2004.07.032. [doi] (2004).
11. Denham, J.W. & Hauer-Jensen, M. The radiotherapeutic injury—a complex 'wound'. *Radiother. Oncol.* **63** (2), 129-145 DOI: 10.1016/S0167-8150(02)00060-9. [doi] (2002).
12. Kim, A., Roy, M., Dadani, F., and Wilson, B. C. A fiberoptic reflectance probe with multiple source-collector separations to increase the dynamic range of derived tissue optical absorption and scattering coefficients. *Opt. Express* **18**, 5580-5594 DOI: 10.1364/OE.18.005580 [doi]. (2010).
13. Kim, A., Khurana, M., Moriyama, Y., and Wilson, B. C. Quantification of in vivo fluorescence decoupled from the effects of tissue optical properties using fiber-optic spectroscopy measurements. *J. Biomed. Opt.* **15**, 067006 DOI: 10.1117/1.3523616 [doi] (2010).
14. Farrell, T.J., Patterson, M.S., Wilson, B.C. A diffusion theory model of spatially resolved, steady-state diffuse reflectance for the noninvasive determination of tissue optical properties in vivo. *Med. Phys.* **19**(4):879-88 (1992)
15. Finlay J.C., Foster T.H. Hemoglobin oxygen saturations in phantoms and in vivo from measurements of steady-state diffuse reflectance at a single, short source-detector separation. *Med Phys.* **31**(7), 1949-59 DOI: 10.1118/1.1760188. [doi] (2004).
16. Mourant, J.R., Fusilier, T., Boyer, J., Johnson, T.M., and Bigio I.J. Predictions and measurements of scattering and absorption over broad wavelength ranges in tissue phantoms. *Appl Opt*, **36**, 949-957 (1997).
17. Corlu, A., *et. al*. Uniqueness and wavelength optimization in continuous-wave multispectral diffuse optical tomography. *Opt. Lett.* **28**, 2339-2341 DOI: 10.1364/OL.28.002339 [doi] (2003).

18. Chin, L., Lloyd, B., Whelan, W. M. and Vitkin, A. Interstitial point radiance spectroscopy of turbid media. *J App Physics* **105**, 102025 DOI: 10.1063/1.3116132 [doi] (2009).
19. Prahl, S. Tabulated Molar Extinction Coefficient for Hemoglobin in Water <http://omlc.ogi.edu/spectra/hemoglobin/summary.html>.
20. Douglas, B.G. and Fowler, J.F.. The effect of multiple small doses of X rays on skin reactions in the mouse and a basic interpretation. *Radiat. Res.* **178** (2), AV125-AV138 (1976).
Williams, J.P. et al. Animal models for medical countermeasures to radiation exposure. *Radiat. Res.* **173** (4), 557-578 DOI: 10.1667/RR1880.1 [doi] (2010).

Figure

[Click here to download Figure: Figure 1.jpg](#)



Figure

[Click here to download Figure: Figure 2.jpg](#)






Figure
[Click here to download Figure: Figure 3.jpg](#)



Figure

[Click here to download Figure: Figure 4.jpg](#)




Figure
[Click here to download Figure: Figure 5.jpg](#)






Figure
[Click here to download Figure: Figure 6.jpg](#)



Material/Equipment	Company
Nude mice	e.g. Charles River
Small animal irradiator	e.g. Faxitron X-Ray Corp.
Animal anaesthesia	
Lead jig and plexiglass stage	Custom made
Medical tape	
Permanent marker/ear puncher	
Matlab	Mathworks Inc., Natick, MA
Labview	National Instruments, Vaudreuil-Dorian, QB
DOS system	
Optical multiplexer	Ocean Optics, Dunedin, FL
Spectrometer	Ocean Optics, Dunedin, FL
White light source	Ocean Optics, Dunedin, FL
Intralipid-20%	Kabi Pharmacia, New York, NY
Reflectance standard	INO, Quebec City, QB

Catalog Information

Comments

Athymic nude Crl:NU(NCr)-Foxn1nu, or immunocompetent nude Crl:SKH1-Hrhr
Faxitron CP160

If using isoflurane vaporizer machine
If irradiator device exposes whole an

With StatisticsToolbox

Model MPM-2000
Model S200
Model LS-1

with induction chamber, need tube and nose cone

imal body to radiation, lead shielding must be used to expose only the skin flap



1 Alewife Center #200
Cambridge, MA 02140
tel. 617.945.9051
www.jove.com

ARTICLE AND VIDEO LICENSE AGREEMENT

Title of Article:

Differential optical spectroscopy for the quantitative assessment of acute ionizing radiation

Author(s):

Lee C. Chin et al.

Item 1 (check one box): The Author elects to have the Materials be made available (as described at <http://www.jove.com/publish>) via: ☐ Standard Access ☐ Open Access

Item 2 (check one box):



The Author is NOT a United States government employee.



The Author is a United States government employee and the Materials were prepared in the course of his or her duties as a United States government employee.



The Author is a United States government employee but the Materials were NOT prepared in the course of his or her duties as a United States government employee.

ARTICLE AND VIDEO LICENSE AGREEMENT

1. **Defined Terms.** As used in this Article and Video License Agreement, the following terms shall have the following meanings: “**Agreement**” means this Article and Video License Agreement; “**Article**” means the article specified on the last page of this Agreement, including any associated materials such as texts, figures, tables, artwork, abstracts, or summaries contained therein; “**Author**” means the author who is a signatory to this Agreement; “**Collective Work**” means a work, such as a periodical issue, anthology or encyclopedia, in which the Materials in their entirety in unmodified form, along with a number of other contributions, constituting separate and independent works in themselves, are assembled into a collective whole; “**CRC License**” means the Creative Commons Attribution-Non Commercial-No Derivs 3.0 Unported Agreement, the terms and conditions of which can be found at: <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/legalcode>; “**Derivative Work**” means a work based upon the Materials or upon the Materials and other pre-existing works, such as a translation, musical arrangement, dramatization, fictionalization, motion picture version, sound recording, art reproduction, abridgment, condensation, or any other form in which the Materials may be recast, transformed, or adapted; “**Institution**” means the institution, listed on the last page of this Agreement, by which the Author was employed at the time of the creation of the Materials; “**JoVE**” means MyJoVE Corporation, a Massachusetts corporation and the publisher of *The Journal of Visualized Experiments*; “**Materials**” means the Article and / or the Video; “**Parties**” means the Author and JoVE; “**Video**” means any video(s) made by the Author, alone or in conjunction with any other parties, or by JoVE or its affiliates or agents, individually or in collaboration with the Author or any other parties, incorporating all or any portion of the Article, and in which the Author may or may not appear.

2. **Background.** The Author, who is the author of the Article, in order to ensure the dissemination and protection of the Article, desires to have the JoVE publish the Article and create and transmit videos based on the Article. In furtherance of such goals, the Parties desire to memorialize in this Agreement the respective rights of each Party in and to the Article and the Video.

3. **Grant of Rights in Article.** In consideration of JoVE agreeing to publish the Article, the Author hereby grants to JoVE, subject to **Sections 4 and 7** below, the exclusive, royalty-free, perpetual (for the full term of copyright in the Article, including any extensions thereto) license (a) to publish, reproduce, distribute, display and store the Article in all forms, formats and media whether now known or hereafter developed (including without limitation in print, digital and electronic form) throughout the world, (b) to translate the Article into other languages, create adaptations, summaries or extracts of the Article or other Derivative Works (including, without limitation, the Video) or Collective Works based on all or any portion of the Article and exercise all of the rights set forth in (a) above in such translations, adaptations, summaries, extracts, Derivative Works or Collective Works and (c) to license others to do any or all of the above. The foregoing rights may be exercised in all media and formats, whether now known or hereafter devised, and include the right to make such modifications as are technically necessary to exercise the rights in other media and formats. If the “Open Access” box has been checked in **Item 1** above, JoVE and the Author hereby grant to the public all such rights in the Article as provided in, but subject to all limitations and requirements set forth in, the CRC License.

ARTICLE AND VIDEO LICENSE AGREEMENT

4. **Retention of Rights in Article.** Notwithstanding the exclusive license granted to JoVE in **Section 3** above, the Author shall, with respect to the Article, retain the non-exclusive right to use all or part of the Article for the non-commercial purpose of giving lectures, presentations or teaching classes, and to post a copy of the Article on the Institution's website or the Author's personal website, in each case provided that a link to the Article on the JoVE website is provided and notice of JoVE's copyright in the Article is included. All non-copyright intellectual property rights in and to the Article, such as patent rights, shall remain with the Author.

5. **Grant of Rights in Video – Standard Access.** This **Section 5** applies if the "Standard Access" box has been checked in **Item 1** above or if no box has been checked in **Item 1** above. In consideration of JoVE agreeing to produce, display or otherwise assist with the Video, the Author hereby acknowledges and agrees that, Subject to **Section 7** below, JoVE is and shall be the sole and exclusive owner of all rights of any nature, including, without limitation, all copyrights, in and to the Video. To the extent that, by law, the Author is deemed, now or at any time in the future, to have any rights of any nature in or to the Video, the Author hereby disclaims all such rights and transfers all such rights to JoVE.

6. **Grant of Rights in Video – Open Access.** This **Section 6** applies only if the "Open Access" box has been checked in **Item 1** above. In consideration of JoVE agreeing to produce, display or otherwise assist with the Video, the Author hereby grants to JoVE, subject to **Section 7** below, the exclusive, royalty-free, perpetual (for the full term of copyright in the Article, including any extensions thereto) license (a) to publish, reproduce, distribute, display and store the Video in all forms, formats and media whether now known or hereafter developed (including without limitation in print, digital and electronic form) throughout the world, (b) to translate the Video into other languages, create adaptations, summaries or extracts of the Video or other Derivative Works or Collective Works based on all or any portion of the Video and exercise all of the rights set forth in (a) above in such translations, adaptations, summaries, extracts, Derivative Works or Collective Works and (c) to license others to do any or all of the above. The foregoing rights may be exercised in all media and formats, whether now known or hereafter devised, and include the right to make such modifications as are technically necessary to exercise the rights in other media and formats. For any Video to which this **Section 6** is applicable, JoVE and the Author hereby grant to the public all such rights in the Video as provided in, but subject to all limitations and requirements set forth in, the CRC License.

7. **Government Employees.** If the Author is a United States government employee and the Article was prepared in the course of his or her duties as a United States government employee, as indicated in **Item 2** above, and any of the licenses or grants granted by the Author hereunder exceed the scope of the 17 U.S.C. 403, then the rights granted hereunder shall be limited to the maximum rights permitted under such

statute. In such case, all provisions contained herein that are not in conflict with such statute shall remain in full force and effect, and all provisions contained herein that do so conflict shall be deemed to be amended so as to provide to JoVE the maximum rights permissible within such statute.

8. **Likeness, Privacy, Personality.** The Author hereby grants JoVE the right to use the Author's name, voice, likeness, picture, photograph, image, biography and performance in any way, commercial or otherwise, in connection with the Materials and the sale, promotion and distribution thereof. The Author hereby waives any and all rights he or she may have, relating to his or her appearance in the Video or otherwise relating to the Materials, under all applicable privacy, likeness, personality or similar laws.

9. **Author Warranties.** The Author represents and warrants that the Article is original, that it has not been published, that the copyright interest is owned by the Author (or, if more than one author is listed at the beginning of this Agreement, by such authors collectively) and has not been assigned, licensed, or otherwise transferred to any other party. The Author represents and warrants that the author(s) listed at the top of this Agreement are the only authors of the Materials. If more than one author is listed at the top of this Agreement and if any such author has not entered into a separate Article and Video License Agreement with JoVE relating to the Materials, the Author represents and warrants that the Author has been authorized by each of the other such authors to execute this Agreement on his or her behalf and to bind him or her with respect to the terms of this Agreement as if each of them had been a party hereto as an Author. The Author warrants that the use, reproduction, distribution, public or private performance or display, and/or modification of all or any portion of the Materials does not and will not violate, infringe and/or misappropriate the patent, trademark, intellectual property or other rights of any third party. The Author represents and warrants that it has and will continue to comply with all government, institutional and other regulations, including, without limitation all institutional, laboratory, hospital, ethical, human and animal treatment, privacy, and all other rules, regulations, laws, procedures or guidelines, applicable to the Materials, and that all research involving human and animal subjects has been approved by the Author's relevant institutional review board.

10. **JoVE Discretion.** If the Author requests the assistance of JoVE in producing the Video in the Author's facility, the Author shall ensure that the presence of JoVE employees, agents or independent contractors is in accordance with the relevant regulations of the Author's institution. If more than one author is listed at the beginning of this Agreement, JoVE may, in its sole discretion, elect not take any action with respect to the Article until such time as it has received complete, executed Article and Video License Agreements from each such author. JoVE reserves the right, in its absolute and sole discretion and without giving any reason therefore, to accept or decline any work submitted to JoVE. JoVE and its employees, agents and independent contractors shall have

ARTICLE AND VIDEO LICENSE AGREEMENT

full, unfettered access to the facilities of the Author or of the Author's institution as necessary to make the Video, whether actually published or not. JoVE has sole discretion as to the method of making and publishing the Materials, including, without limitation, to all decisions regarding editing, lighting, filming, timing of publication, if any, length, quality, content and the like.

11. **Indemnification.** The Author agrees to indemnify JoVE and/or its successors and assigns from and against any and all claims, costs, and expenses, including attorney's fees, arising out of any breach of any warranty or other representations contained herein. The Author further agrees to indemnify and hold harmless JoVE from and against any and all claims, costs, and expenses, including attorney's fees, resulting from the breach by the Author of any representation or warranty contained herein or from allegations or instances of violation of intellectual property rights, damage to the Author's or the Author's institution's facilities, fraud, libel, defamation, research, equipment, experiments, property damage, personal injury, violations of institutional, laboratory, hospital, ethical, human and animal treatment, privacy or other rules, regulations, laws, procedures or guidelines, liabilities and other losses or damages related in any way to the submission of work to JoVE, making of videos by JoVE, or publication in JoVE or elsewhere by JoVE. The Author shall be responsible for, and shall hold JoVE harmless from, damages caused by lack of sterilization, lack of cleanliness or by contamination due to the making of a video by JoVE its employees, agents or independent contractors. All sterilization, cleanliness or decontamination procedures shall be solely the responsibility of the Author and shall be undertaken at the Author's

expense. All indemnifications provided herein shall include JoVE's attorney's fees and costs related to said losses or damages. Such indemnification and holding harmless shall include such losses or damages incurred by, or in connection with, acts or omissions of JoVE, its employees, agents or independent contractors.

12. **Fees.** To cover the cost incurred for publication, JoVE must receive payment before production and publication the Materials. Payment is due in 21 days of invoice. Should the Materials not be published due to an editorial or production decision, these funds will be returned to the Author. Withdrawal by the Author of any submitted Materials after final peer review approval will result in a US\$1,200 fee to cover pre-production expenses incurred by JoVE. If payment is not received by the completion of filming, production and publication of the Materials will be suspended until payment is received.

13. **Transfer, Governing Law.** This Agreement may be assigned by JoVE and shall inure to the benefits of any of JoVE's successors and assignees. This Agreement shall be governed and construed by the internal laws of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts without giving effect to any conflict of law provision thereunder. This Agreement may be executed in counterparts, each of which shall be deemed an original, but all of which together shall be deemed to be one and the same agreement. A signed copy of this Agreement delivered by facsimile, e-mail or other means of electronic transmission shall be deemed to have the same legal effect as delivery of an original signed copy of this Agreement.

A signed copy of this document must be sent with all new submissions. Only one Agreement required per submission.

CORRESPONDING AUTHOR:

Name: LEE CHIN
Department: Radiation Oncology
Institution: University of Toronto
Article Title: DIFFUSE OPTIC SPECTROSCOPY FOR THE QUANTITATIVE MEASUREMENT OF PLATELET-LIKE RADIATION-INDUCED (PLR) ...
Signature: [Signature] Date: April 15, 2015

Please submit a signed and dated copy of this license by one of the following three methods:

- 1) Upload a scanned copy of the document as a pdf on the JoVE submission site;
- 2) Fax the document to +1.866.381.2236;
- 3) Mail the document to JoVE / Attn: JoVE Editorial / 1 Alewife Center #200 / Cambridge, MA 02139

For questions, please email submissions@jove.com or call +1.617.945.9051

Editorial Comments:

- Passive voice is used in the second part of step 4.5; this should be changed to imperative tense.

The second part of step 4.5 has been changed to imperative tense:

“Place the probe gently on the flank skin making sure to avoid dispersing the local vasculature. Hold the probe by hand for the duration of the measurement.”

- “Animal use concern: The Note after 5.3 indicates that mice sometimes regain consciousness and "wiggle free" during irradiation. Veterinary reviewers are likely to question the lack of anesthesia maintenance during this procedure, so the authors should be prepared to offer experimental justification and appropriate documentation to support this practice.”

Step 5.3 and the subsequent NOTE have been modified to clarify the use of restrainers and anesthesia during the irradiation procedure. Step 5.3 now emphasizes the importance of using a custom lead jig that also immobilizes the mouse (added: “The custom lead jig should be small enough to immobilize the mouse.”). The subsequent NOTE now describes the measures that ensure that the mouse is immobilized during the procedure through additional restraints or ketamine administration (added to NOTE: “If the custom jig does not completely immobilize the mouse, then use additional restrainers and/or ketamine administration to keep the mouse immobilized throughout the entire irradiation procedure.”).

- Please take this opportunity to thoroughly proofread your manuscript to ensure that there are no spelling or grammar issues. Your JoVE editor will not copy-edit your manuscript and any errors in your submitted revision may be present in the published version.

Done

- If your figures and tables are original and not published previously, please ignore this comment. For figures and tables that have been published before, please include phrases such as “Re-print with permission from (reference#)” or “Modified from..” etc. And please send a copy of the re-print permission for JoVE’s record keeping purposes.

Done. The original permission email has been attached.

* JoVE reference format requires that DOIs are included, when available, for all references listed in the article. This is helpful for readers to locate the included references and obtain more information. Please note that often DOIs are not listed with PubMed abstracts and as such, may not be properly included when citing directly from PubMed. In these cases, please manually include DOIs in reference information.

Done

Reviewer 1 Comments:

- The figure legends should be understandable without reading the main text. This is not the case in Figure 4 where the legend should mention what the three boxes mean. Also, figure 6 is not at all mentioned in the main text and the legend should describe better what the boxes represent.

We have improved the resolution of the figure and also clarified the legend caption in Figure 4:

Figure 4: Change in the oxygenation fraction of mouse skin following 40 Gy irradiation. The baseline-normalized mean difference between the two groups (per mouse) is significant for Days 6 (Box 1), 9 (Box 2) and 12 (Box 3). With permission from Yohan et al 2014⁵.

We have added a statement to the last paragraph of the Results section alluding to Figure 6: “Changes in A and k can also be monitored over time (Figure 6), and these indicate that the scattering properties of the skin are changing in response to the radiation.”

Reviewer 3 Comments:

- Major Concerns: How about the chronic response of ionizing radiation induced skin toxicity, does it can be quantitative assessed by diffuse optical spectroscopy?

Chronic radiation toxicity is the primary concern during cancer radiotherapy, and this is currently scored subjectively as well. Late radiation skin toxicity is clinically characterized by telangiectasia and fibrosis, which are not as amenable to characterization by DOS as the strong inflammatory response in acute skin toxicity. In our manuscript, we cite Chin et al, 2013 (REF 4), who evaluated tissue oxygenation and total hemoglobin both acutely and up to 56 days post irradiation. They found that the skin was slightly hypoperfused (as determined by a modest decrease in total hemoglobin) by the 56-day timepoint, suggesting that a more robust DOS measure than hemoglobin may be needed to quantify chronic toxicity. Characterizing a new target (e.g. fibrosis) would be outside of the scope of this methodology. To point out this potential avenue, we have added a statement to the last Discussion paragraph: “In the future, it may be interesting to expand DOS-based quantification to the features of chronic radiation induced skin damage (e.g. fibrosis).” Even still, our method may be beneficial by predicting acute

radiation skin toxicity *very early on* in treatment so that appropriate interventions can be applied.

- Minor Concerns: For clinical translation, any differences between human skin and mouse skin involved in this study?

In the 3rd Discussion paragraph, we already highlight the variables that would need to be considered when applying DOS to other skin types (accounting for melanin in various skin colours, variable skin thickness, and hair removal). In our final Discussion paragraph, we additionally state that when applying DOS to human skin, “the probe design may require minor modifications with slightly larger optode separations to account for the increased thickness of human skin”, highlighting the major structural difference between mouse and human skin.

Furthermore, our experimental model employs a single large fraction of radiation applied to murine skin, which is known to mimic the pathophysiology of accelerated severe human acute radiotoxicity (Williams et al, 2010). We agree that this is not completely representative of the clinical situation where patients are typically irradiated daily over several weeks. However, we are planning to use our DOS system to monitor acute skin reaction in human patients undergoing radiotherapy, and validate our preclinical findings. We have added a statement to the last Discussion paragraph to address this aspect of our model: “Although our model employs a large single radiation dose (rather than multiple small fractionated doses that are used in the clinical setting), this mimics the pathophysiology of acute human skin radiotoxicity²¹.”)

LONG ABSTRACT:

-“... skin toxicity via functional response that is easily translatable to the clinical setting...” **Remove “easily”**

INTRO:

-last paragraph: bedside (not “bed side”)

METHODS:

4.2 – “pinching a toe on the hind limb”. **Change on→of**

4.4 – **Moved the sentence** “Do not sterilize the skin” **from step 4.5 to 4.4.**

5.1 – “4.1-4.3.” **Change 4.3→4.2**

REPRESENTATIVE RESULTS:

-1st paragraph: “...both the magnitude and shape of the measured reflectance spectra,*** which are related..” **Change*** to period.**

DISCUSSION:

-1st paragraph: “The DOS system and analysis software is simple to use*** requires minimal training and returns objective functional parameters for interpreting physiological changes in skin.” **Add comma to *****

-1st paragraph: “Sections 1 and 7 highlights the main processing steps...” **Remove “s”**

-1st paragraph: “Finally, Section*** 3-5 describes...” **Add “s” to ***, and remove “s”**

-1st paragraph: “Care must be made to avoid disrupting the local vasculature by only gently placing the DOS probe on the mouse surface.” **Reword : “To avoid**

disrupting the local vasculature, use gentle force to place the DOS probe on the mouse skin surface."

-2nd paragraph: "Despite the lack of spatial resolution, previous work in mice⁵ **have** shown" **Change to "has"**

-3rd paragraph: "the application of the same model to dark skinned mice skin may require" **Change to "darker skin" (to accommodate non-murine models)**

-5th: "As shown in Figure 6, the initial results from **Ref [5]** indicate that A and **K...**"

Change to Yohan et al 2014; use lowercase "k"

-5th: end with period.

REFERENCES:

-last one remove extra "n" from "annd"

-add to end: 21. "Williams et al 2010"

21. Williams, J.P. et al. Animal models for medical countermeasures to radiation exposure. *Radiat. Res.* **173** (4), 557-578 DOI: 10.1667/RR1880.1 [doi] (2010).

Supplemental File (as requested by JoVE)

[Click here to download Supplemental File \(as requested by JoVE\): Figure permissions email.htm](#)

Supplemental File (as requested by JoVE)

[Click here to download Supplemental File \(as requested by JoVE\): 53573_SW.docx](#)