

Technical University of Munich | Chair of Biomedical Physics  
Boltzmannstraße 11 | 85748 Garching

BY ELECTRONIC SUBMISSION  
*JoVE*

Garching, 14<sup>th</sup> June 2019

RE: Manuscript revision “3D imaging of soft-tissue samples using an X-ray specific staining method and nanoscopic computed tomography” by Madleen Busse and co-authors

Dear Review Editor, Phillip Steindel,

Thank you for accommodating an efficient review of our manuscript. We were pleased to read the general positive responses of the reviewers and thank them for their constructive comments.

Please find below our point-by-point response to the reviewers' comments (in bold). We have modified the manuscript to clarify the addressed issues and included the reviewers' suggestions. We list these modifications, where appropriate, in the text below.

Please note that we submitted two revised version of the manuscript including line numbers as communicated via email.

The file ‘60251\_R0\_051419\_MBusse’ has the final reference list included, and therefore, no track changes are present. The file ‘60251\_R0\_051419\_track changes\_MBusse’ does not have the final reference list but includes all the changes made to the manuscript as part of the review. We would like to kindly ask you to forward the revised file to the reviewers in conjunction with the point-by-point response, as we refer in our answers to line numbers in the manuscript (with respect to file ‘60251\_R0\_051419\_MBusse’).

We hope that our amendments fulfill yours and the reviewers' expectations and that you may now consider our manuscript suitable for publication in *JoVE*.

Sincerely yours,

Madleen Busse  
(on behalf of all co-authors)

## POINT-BY-POINT RESPONSE

### EDITOR'S REMARKS TO AUTHOR:

#### General:

1. Please take this opportunity to thoroughly proofread the manuscript to ensure that there are no spelling or grammar issues.

**We have taken the opportunity to thoroughly proofread the manuscript and have edited the following spelling and grammar issues:**

**page 3, line 98: 'histopathological' has been changed to 'histopathological' and 'charcaterization' has been changed to 'characterization'**

**page 3, line 121: 'Centrifuge Tube' has been to 'centrifuge tube'**

**page 3, line 132: 'Centrifuge Tube' has been to 'centrifuge tube'**

**page 4, line 133: 'Centrifuge Tube' has been to 'centrifuge tube'**

**page 10, line 397: 'an result' has been changed to 'a result'**

2. Please revise lines 187-192, 207-211, 273-279, 293-296, and 263-268 to avoid previously published text.

**We thank the editor for outlining text that is closely related to the previously published text. We assume that the editor meant lines 363-368 instead of 263-268. Please find below the changes made to the manuscript.**

**page 5, lines 187-192: The paragraph 'Note: The overview CT data were acquired with the 0.39x camera objective and an exposure time of 2s per projection with an effective pixel size of 12µm. This overview CT data were used to identify the ROI for the high-resolution CT scan, which was selected using the integrated scout and scan software tool of the ZEISS Xradia 500 Versa. The high-resolution CT data were acquired with the 4x objective and an exposure time of 15s per projection with an effective pixel size of 3.3µm.' has been rewritten to avoid previously published text. At the same time, the commercial language has been removed from the text (see comment 3 from the editor below). Please find below the rewritten paragraph (page 5, lines 190-197):**

**'Note: The acquisition parameters for the overview CT scan were chosen for best image quality. As such the 0.39x camera objective was chosen to cover the whole**

sample within the field of view (FOV). This resulted in an effective pixel size of 12  $\mu\text{m}$ . The exposure time of 2s per projection provided a good signal to noise ratio. The ROI for the high-resolution CT scan was identified using the microCT data from the overview scan. MicroCT scanners often incorporate an integrated software tool, which allows for the precise selection of the determined ROI. For the high-resolution CT data, the 4x camera objective was chosen resulting in an effective pixel size of 3.3  $\mu\text{m}$ . Here, an exposure time of 15s per projection was needed.'

page 5, lines 207-211: The following text 'Note: The X-ray nanoCT measurements were performed with an in-house developed nanoCT system that consists of a novel nanofocus X-ray source (prototype nanotube, Excillum, Sweden)<sup>23</sup> and a single-photon counting detector (PILATUS 300K-W 20 Hz, Dectris, Switzerland)<sup>24,25</sup>. The lens-free device is based on mere geometrical magnification and can generate 3D data with resolutions down to 100nm<sup>10</sup>. However, nanoCT systems are commercially available such as the Xradia Ultra 810 from Zeiss<sup>26</sup>.' has been rewritten. At the same time, the commercial language has been removed from the text (see comment 3 from the editor below). The citations associated with materials used for the experiment have been removed from the reference list and are now linked to the Table of Materials. Please find below the rewritten paragraph (page 5, lines 212-215):

'Note: The X-ray nanoCT scanner has been developed in-house. The lens-free instrument is equipped with a nanofocus X-ray source and a single-photon counting detector. 3D data with resolutions down to 100nm can be generated<sup>10</sup>. Generally, nanoCT systems including those with X-ray optics are commercially available and not limited to the described nanoCT scanner.'

page 7, lines 273-279: The paragraph 'Note: For this voxel size, the field of view (FOV) of a single CT measurement is given by approximately 560  $\mu\text{m}$  in the direction perpendicular to the rotation axis (horizontal) and 75  $\mu\text{m}$  in the direction of the rotation axis (vertical). However, the FOV can be extended along the rotation axis by combining multiple scans at different vertical positions to a larger volume. Furthermore, the possibility of local tomography measurements allows for larger sample diameters perpendicular to the rotation axis than given by the FOV of a global CT measurement. The exposure time per image was 4s resulting in a total acquisition time per data set of approximately 3.5h.' has been rewritten to avoid previously published text. Please find below the rewritten paragraph (page 7, lines 289-296):

**‘Note: A single CT measurement acquired at 400 nm voxel size has a FOV of 75  $\mu\text{m}$  in the direction of the rotation axis (vertical) and approximately 560  $\mu\text{m}$  in the direction perpendicular to the rotation axis (horizontal). To investigate larger volumes, an extension of the FOV along the rotation axis can be achieved by combining multiple scans at different vertical positions. Additionally, local tomography scans can be performed to measure samples with a larger sample diameter perpendicular to the rotation axis than given by the FOV of a global CT scan. The nanoCT data was acquired with an exposure time of 4 s per projection. As such the total acquisition time per data set was approximately 3.5 h.’**

**page 7, lines 293-296: The following text ‘Note: The minimum intensity projection slices shown in Figure 3 were generated by calculating the minimum value for each pixel in 18 adjacent slices, which corresponds to a virtual slice thickness of approximately 7  $\mu\text{m}$ . The volume rendering of the nanoCT data shown in Figure 4 were generated with Avizo Fire 8.1 (Thermo Fisher Scientific).’ has been altered. At the same time, the commercial language has been removed from the text (see comment 3 from the editor below). Please find below the rewritten paragraph (page 8, lines 309-313):**

**‘Note: Figure 3 evaluates the obtained nanoCT data with corresponding histological sections, which were approximately 7  $\mu\text{m}$  thick. Therefore, minimum intensity projection slices of 18 adjacent nanoCT slices with a virtual thickness of approximately 7  $\mu\text{m}$  were generated by means of calculating the minimum value for each pixel in the relevant slices. A visualization software was used to render the volume of the nanoCT data, which is displayed in Figure 4.’**

**page 9, lines 363-368: The following text ‘Here, the aspect of the low intrinsic attenuation properties of soft tissue for typically used X-ray energies of laboratory-based microCT systems, which consists of mainly carbon, hydrogen, oxygen and nitrogen<sup>31</sup> and the low concentration of eosin used for staining were seen as the limiting factor. The sensitivity levels required for X-ray CT imaging were not met with regards to the high atomic number element bromine ( $Z = 35$ )<sup>31</sup>, of which one eosin molecule holds four bromide atoms being covalently bound to the fluorescein core.’ has been rewritten to avoid previously published text. Please find below the rewritten paragraph (page 9, lines 380-386):**

**‘On the one hand, this can be attributed to the low intrinsic attenuation properties of soft tissue for typically used X-ray energies of laboratory-based microCT systems. Usually, soft tissue is composed of mainly carbon, hydrogen, oxygen and nitrogen<sup>34</sup>, and therefore, does not result in contrast enhancement. On the other**

hand, the low concentration of eosin used for staining was the limiting factor. Even though one eosin molecule holds four bromide atoms (high atomic number element bromine with  $Z = 35^{34}$ ), the sensitivity levels required for X-ray CT imaging were not met.'

3. JoVE cannot publish manuscripts containing commercial language. This includes trademark symbols (<sup>TM</sup>), registered symbols (<sup>®</sup>), and company names before an instrument or reagent. Please limit the use of commercial language from your manuscript and use generic terms instead. All commercial products should be sufficiently referenced in the Table of Materials and Reagents. For example: Eppendorf, Zeiss, Pilatus, etc.

**page 4, line 152: 'an Eppendorf Tube' has been deleted and the new term 'a conical sample container' was inserted**

**page 4, line 155: 'an Eppendorf Tube' has been deleted and the new term 'a conical sample container' was inserted**

**page 4, line 160: 'an Xradia 500 Versa from Zeiss' has been deleted and the new term 'a microCT scanner' was inserted**

**page 4, lines 163 and 164: The entire sentence 'The microCT scanner is commercially available<sup>22</sup>.' has been deleted from the manuscript to remove commercial language. Therefore, also reference 22 (Germany, Z. ZEISS product information: ZEISS Xradia 510 Versa <<https://www.zeiss.com/microscopy/int/products/x-ray-microscopy/zeiss-xradia-510-versa.html>> (April 10, 2019).) has been deleted from the manuscript. This reference has been added to the Table of Materials.**

**page 5, lines 193-195: The sentence 'This overview CT data were used to identify the ROI for the high-resolution CT scan, which was selected using the integrated scout and scan software tool of the ZEISS Xradia 500 Versa.' has been rewritten to avoid commercial language. The changes are 'The ROI for the high-resolution CT scan was identified using the microCT data from the overview scan. MicroCT scanners often incorporate an integrated software tool, which allows for the precise selection of the determined ROI.'**

**page 5, lines 205-206: The sentence 'The volume renderings of the microCT data shown in Figure 1 and 2 were generated with Avizo Fire 8.1 (Thermo Fisher Scientific).' has been altered to 'The volume renderings of the microCT data shown in Figure 1 and 2 were generated using a visualization software.'**

**page 5, lines 212-215: The following paragraph contained several commercial language phrases, which were all deleted. The rewritten paragraph reads as follows: ‘Note: The X-ray nanoCT scanner has been developed in-house. The lens-free instrument is equipped with a nanofocus X-ray source and a single-photon counting detector. 3D data with resolutions down to 100nm can be generated<sup>10</sup>. Generally, nanoCT systems including those with X-ray optics are commercially available and not limited to the described nanoCT scanner.’ The references 23-25 have been deleted from the manuscript as they hold commercial language in the title. These references have been added to the Table of Materials.**

**page 6, lines 237-238: The following sentence was deleted to remove commercial language from the manuscript ‘In case of the mouse kidney VOIs, a Bal-TEC CPD 030 with CO<sub>2</sub> as drying agent was used.’**

**page 8, lines 313-314: The sentence ‘The volume rendering of the nanoCT data shown in Figure 4 were generated with Avizo Fire 8.1 (Thermo Fisher Scientific).’ has been rewritten to ‘A visualization software was used to render the volume of the nanoCT data, which is displayed in Figure 4.’**

**page 8, line 336: To avoid commercial language, the sentence ‘Both data sets were acquired with the Xradia Versa 500 microCT using identical acquisition parameters.’ has been changed to ‘Both microCT data sets were acquired using identical acquisition parameters.’**

**Protocol:**

**1. For each protocol step/substep, please ensure you answer the “how” question, i.e., how is the step performed? Alternatively, add references to published material specifying how to perform the protocol action. If revisions cause a step to have more than 2-3 actions and 4 sentences per step, please split into separate steps or substeps.**

**Specific Protocol steps:**

**1. 3.4: This step is fairly vague; please either include specific computational steps or do not highlight.**

**To our understanding, the specific protocol step 3.4 contains already a very detailed description on the individual steps undertaken to process the data set. Including the individual computational instructions for each step by means of introducing the computational code used, would go beyond the scope of this manuscript. It should be noted that each acquired data set has its own challenges with respect to data processing, which can be addressed in different ways**

**depending on the reconstruction software and image processing tools used. Therefore, we have chosen to not highlight this section.**

Figures:

1. Please obtain explicit copyright permission to reuse any figures from a previous publication. Explicit permission can be expressed in the form of a letter from the editor or a link to the editorial policy that allows re-prints. Please upload this information as a .doc or .docx file to your Editorial Manager account.

**The authors have gained permission from PNAS to reuse the material from the figures of the previous publication. The communication was done via email exchange. To upload a .docx file, the content of the email was copied into Word. The requested document has been uploaded to the Editorial Manager account. The original email can be forwarded to the editor upon request.**

Discussion:

1. Discussion: As we are a methods journal, please revise the Discussion to explicitly cover the following in detail in 3–6 paragraphs with citations:

- a) Critical steps within the protocol
- b) Any modifications and troubleshooting of the technique
- c) Any limitations of the technique

**The discussion consists of 6 paragraphs, which focus all on the described method addressing to the authors understanding the desired points mentioned above. However, the authors have added some additional information to outline some further limitations of the technique. The changes to the manuscript are listed below:**

**page 10, line 407-414: ‘It should be noted that the overall staining time and volume of the staining solution needed might request some adaptations depending on the nature of the sample. Nevertheless, the eosin-based staining protocol is suitable for whole-organ staining, which then enables high resolution microCT imaging of whole organs. Shrinkage artifacts due to the solvent ethanol, which was used to keep the sample moist during the microCT measurements, were not observed. Additional preparation steps are required for nanoCT imaging, which allows for the investigation of smaller tissue pieces retrieved from the original sample.’**

**page 10, line 407-414: ‘The application of histological counter staining is currently limited to the H-stain. Other standard histological counter stainings such as periodic acid Schiff’s base, Elastica van Gieson or Gomorri silver have to be evaluated as well as the compatibility with immunohistological techniques needs to be tested.’**

References:

1. Please do not abbreviate journal titles.

**The authors have added the full journal titles to all entries where appropriate under references instead of using abbreviated journal titles. Since the references are linked directly to a reference management software, the individual changes had to be incorporated directly into the manuscript. The individual changes have not been listed here.**

2. Please do not include product manuals in the references; these can be linked to in the Table of Materials.

**The references 22-26 as well as 33 and 34, which are linked to a product were deleted from the manuscript. They are now linked to the Table of Materials where appropriate.**

Table of Materials:

1. Please ensure the Table of Materials has information on all materials and equipment used, especially those mentioned in the Protocol.

**The authors added the mentioned detector and X-ray source as part of the nanoCT scanner to the Table of Materials and deleted the direct product link from the manuscript (see section 2 and 3 under general remarks above). The references, which are cited when stating these devices, have been added where appropriate, as well as some links to other nanoCT scanners, which are commercially available.**

2. Please remove trademark (™) and registered (®) symbols from the Table and Materials.

**All trademark (™) and registered (®) symbols have been removed from the Table of Materials.**

**A revised Table of Materials (JoVE\_Materials\_revised\_MBusse\_2019) has been uploaded as part of the revised submission.**



REVIEWER #1 (COMMENTS):

Manuscript Summary:

I welcome the idea to implement the presented workflow by Madleen Busse and co-authors as a JoVE video tutorial. I already read the original 2018 PNAS paper "Three-dimensional virtual histology enabled through cytoplasm-specific X-ray stain for microscopic and nanoscopic computed tomography" with high interest and I am convinced that the presented workflow is of broad interest for the biological imaging community.

The presented paper is the detailed technical workflow description for the 2018 PNAS paper. As such, there are many redundancies to the PNAS paper including most of the figures, but also some novel and more detailed information on the technical workflow. As stated in the "Criteria for Publication" on the JoVE webpage this is in line with the scope of the journal. I don't know about the copyright issues with previously published figures, but as the JoVE webpage states "We do not republish data or results without the express permission of the original publisher" I will not comment on this issue, as I take for granted that the two publishers resolve any copyright issues and conflicts of interest.

**The authors have gained permission from PNAS to reuse the figure material from the original article. A written statement from the PNAS editorial office has been submitted as part of the revision process.**

The language and presentation style is generally good, and the presented protocol is detailed enough to make it fully reproducible. I thus look forward to see this paper as a video presentation. I have no major criticism to address, just a couple of suggestions for minor/discretionary revisions:

**We thank reviewer 1 for the overall positive response. We have addressed all the comments expressed by reviewer 1 and hope that the reviewer finds our manuscript now suitable for publication in JoVE.**

Page 3, Line 80: Rephrase "X-ray active", by for example "X-ray dense" or "radiodense", to me "X-ray active" is misleading as it could be mistaken as "emitting X-rays"

**page 2, line 80: The wording 'X-ray active contrast agent' has been rephrased to 'staining agents, which enhance the X-ray attenuation contrast.' With reference to 'X-ray active' the authors have removed active from the sentence on page 2, line 87 to avoid confusing.**

Page 4, Line 82: References 14-19: In my opinion this is not the best set of references

concerning contrast-enhancement for microCT imaging. Some rather important papers are missing here (like the Mizutani and Suzuki 2012 paper, "X-ray microtomography in biology", or the Johnson et al. 2006 paper "Virtual histology of transgenic mouse embryos for high-throughput phenotyping"), while some of the listed papers (e.g. Pauwels et al) are very exploratory without performing systematic tests or providing substantial (=useful!) data to characterize the tested stains.

**We acknowledge the reviewer's comment to expand the introduction with regards to contrast enhancement for microCT imaging. The authors have extended the manuscript within the introduction section accordingly (page 2, line 82) and have added the suggested references by the reviewer to the reference list. Those together with additional references are listed below showing the reference number the reference has in the revised manuscript:**

- (20) Degenhardt, K., Wright, A. C., Horng, D., Padmanabhan, A. & Epstein, J. A. Rapid 3D phenotyping of cardiovascular development in mouse embryos by micro-CT with iodine staining. *Circulation: Cardiovascular Imaging*. 3 (3), 314-322, (2010).
- (21) Dullin, C. et al.  $\mu$ CT of ex-vivo stained mouse hearts and embryos enables a precise match between 3D virtual histology, classical histology and immunochemistry. *PLOS ONE*. 12 (2), e0170597, (2017).
- (22) Jeffrey, N. S., Stephenson, R. S., Gallagher, J. A. & Cox, P. Micro-computed tomography with iodine staining resolves the arrangement of muscle fibres. *Journal of Biomechanics*. 44 189-192, (2011).
- (23) Johnson, J. T. et al. Virtual Histology of Transgenic Mouse Embryos for High-Throughput Phenotyping. *PLOS Genetics*. 2 e61, (2006).
- (24) Leszczyński, B. et al. Visualization and Quantitative 3D Analysis of Intraocular Melanoma and Its Vascularization in a Hamster Eye. *International Journal of Molecular Sciences*. 19 (2), 332, (2018).
- (25) Mizutani, R. & Suzuki, Y. X-ray microtomography in biology. *Mircon*. 43 104-115, (2012).

This publication provides by no means a complete library on all work that has been done within this field of research. Therefore, only a small selection of some research papers can be presented. We hope that the expanded list of references is representing now better the diversity of the field.

Page 4, Line 121: It would be very interesting to know the exact pH of the fixative as the authors mention that acidic fixation is critical.

**The authors thank the reviewer for the interest in the pH value. The fixative solution without acetic acid has a neutral pH of 7, whereas the acidified fixative solution has a pH value of approximately 3. The authors have included that detail to the note of**

**the specific protocol step 1.1 on page 3, lines 126-127 ‘During acidification the pH of the fixative solution is changing from neutral to approximately 3.’**

Page 5, Line 178: I am not sure whether "anchorage" is the correct term here. Maybe consider rephrasing by "the sample is wrapped in cellulose paper soaked with 70% ethanol..."

**We thank the reviewer for the critical view and acknowledge the helpful suggestion. The sentence ‘If the sample holder does not allow to hold solvent at the bottom, the anchorage of a cellulose paper soaked with 70% (v/v) ethanol is suitable.’ has been rewritten to ‘If the sample holder does not allow to hold solvent at the bottom, a cellulose paper moistened with 70% (v/v) ethanol can be placed in the sample holder.’ and is now at page 5, lines 180-181 in the manuscript.**

Page 6, Line 211: Maybe rephrase " nanoCT Systems" by "nanoCT systems including X-ray optics"

**page 5, line 214-215: The sentence ‘However, nanoCT systems are commercially available such as the Xradia Ultra 810 from Zeiss<sup>26</sup>.’ has been altered to ‘Generally, nanoCT systems including those with X-ray optics are commercially available and not limited to the described nanoCT scanner.’**

Page 6, Line 217: Maybe rephrase "reflecting-light microscope" by "stereomicroscope"

**page 6, line 220: The wording ‘reflecting-light microscope’ has been rephrased to ‘stereomicroscope’.**

Page 9, Line 319: It would be very interesting at this point to get some quantitative information on staining intensity and contrast (intensity values of stained tissue either in HU or linear attenuation  $\mu$ ). This would allow comparing staining intensity to other contrast agents such as Lugols, PTA, or OsO<sub>4</sub>.

**The authors acknowledge the reviewer’s suggestion and the ability to provide quantitative information with respect to staining intensity and contrast, which would be indeed very beneficial. However, this challenge is not that easily solved. Even though the acquisition parameters might be identical for each measurement, the X-ray flux differs (quite often even during one measurement, whereby multiple flat field projections during one measurement can address this issue). Therefore, a calibration holding different concentrations of the staining solution becomes necessary for each measurement. The implementation of a calibration can be challenging with respect to space for the sample holder and the available FOV. A second aspect concerns the reliable and reproducible preparation of the**

calibration solutions, especially if no standards are commercially available. As a last aspect, it should be mentioned that it would be rather a range of intensity values for different tissue types, as biological samples (even though they might be the same type) differ e.g. in size, shape and appearance. On a molecular level this could mean that one kidney holds more cytoplasm proteins and peptides compared to a second kidney sample (in case of the eosin stain). To gain a statistical significance, a lot of tissue samples must be measured to get to know that range of intensity values. Thus, getting quantitative information with respect to staining intensity and contrast has to be addressed in further studies.

Page 10, Line 360: Remove "2D", as slices have a certain thickness of several microns and thus are also 3D.

**page 9, line 378: We acknowledge the reviewer's concern raising from the statement. Thus, we have removed '2D' from the text.**

Page 19: I don't understand those text fragments?

**The authors do not understand this comment by the reviewer. The commented manuscript has 12 pages, and therefore, page 19 does not exist. The authors checked the manuscript carefully for 'text fragments' but could not find any.**

## REVIEWER #2 (COMMENTS):

### Manuscript Summary:

The manuscript presents a protocol for staining of a fixed sample in brominated eosin in preparation for micro-CT and nano-CT imaging on commercial sources, and shows data from both. This type of work is important to this nascent field, and therefore would best be done in a way that will draw in users and demonstrate the technique's value. Their presented figures, both new and adapted from their 2018 paper, show the typical output of their full image acquisition pipeline with a comparison in resolution to classical histology. This protocol lowers the barrier to entry for labs interested in sample staining for soft-tissue micro/nano-CT and 3D histology at large, while familiarizing new potential users with the technology and its capabilities. The inclusion of imaging parameters, including detailed information on the field of view and resolution of acquired projections, particularly helps in this endeavor. The steps laid out for staining with eosin, micro-CT image acquisition, and nano-CT image acquisition are both straightforward and easy to follow in their written form, but areas regarding custom sample holders and staining prep will inevitably be made even clearer with the generation of the video protocol. However, the protocol's sole focus on cytoplasmic staining, as well as the presentation of some of the figures limits the power of this method for relating directly to histopathology.

**We thank reviewer 2 for the suggestions made and the points of concerns raised. We have addressed all the comments expressed by reviewer 2 and hope that the reviewer finds our manuscript now suitable for publication in JoVE.**

### Major Concerns:

In the development of this new application of CT to the histological interpretation of 3D images, it is valuable to see what can be done with cytoplasmic staining. However, due to the proposed utility of the method in histopathological analysis, it is critical to show both nuclear and cytoplasmic staining. In lieu of a secondary nuclear stain, it might be more informative to label this protocol as a step towards full histopathological analysis and not a complete accomplishment of it. In addition, the authors' choice to use minimum intensity projections over a 7 micron thickness for visualizing their nano-CT data in comparison to histology needs to be better explained. Additionally, it is important to show the advantages of nano-CT namely higher resolution, which would benefit from the showing of single slice results and its limitations.

**The authors thank the reviewer for the critical statement, which puts emphasis on 'cytoplasmic staining only', which has been exactly what the authors tried to implement, since an X-ray suitable staining agent, which enhances the attenuation contrast by specifically targeting the cytoplasm has not been described so far. Thus, a first step towards a multiple staining approach is the development of individual staining agents and/or staining procedures. In a second step, these**

individual staining methods might be joined to allow for simultaneous visualization of different cellular compartments. Furthermore, staining a large *ex vivo* biological sample (such as a whole organ) is quite challenging compared to a few micrometers thick histological section.

The authors have nowhere in their manuscript stated that the described method is able to do ‘a full histopathological analysis’ nor that it is a ‘complete accomplishment of it’. We have also not intended to reflect that view. The authors rather see 3D X-ray histology as a tool, which will support the pathologist as it will allow to non-destructively investigate the provided sample in 3D prior to further histopathological investigations. This can be e.g. read in the long abstract of the manuscript on page 2, lines 45-48 ‘Thereby, soft-tissue morphology with a similar detail level as the corresponding histological light microscopy images is reproduced. Deeper insights into the 3D configuration of tissue structures are achieved without impeding further investigations through histological methods.’ Here, the authors emphasize that additional histopathological investigations are possible. The authors state this also as ‘full compatibility with histopathology’ (e.g. page 2, line 85), which is not be confused with ‘full histopathological analysis’ or ‘complete accomplishment of it’.

The second aspect concerns the minimum intensity projections. The reviewer most likely refers to page 9, lines 357-359 ‘(b) Minimum intensity projection slice derived from the same nanoCT data set shown in (a) with a virtual slice thickness of approximately 7µm, which allows for clear visualization of the cell nuclei.’ being part of the figure caption related to Figure 3. Panel (a) of Figure 3 shows one individual nanoCT slice, which is approximately 400 nm thick. The individual slice thickness of one nanoCT slice is explicitly stated on page 9, lines 367-370 ‘The nanoCT image ... with a voxel size of approximately 400nm.’ Thus, individual nanoCT slices are shown within the manuscript. A more detailed explanation on how and why the virtual slice thickness of approximately 7µm was processed is given in the protocol’s note on page 8, lines 310-313 ‘Figure 3 evaluates the obtained nanoCT data with corresponding histological sections, which were approximately 7µm thick. Therefore, minimum intensity projection slices of 18 adjacent nanoCT slices with a virtual thickness of approximately 7µm were generated by means of calculating the minimum value for each pixel in the relevant slices.’ The why has been added to the revised manuscript, which hopefully makes this aspect clearer. Furthermore, the discussion at page 10, lines 422-428 ‘The nanoCT slice with a virtual thickness of approximately 400nm (Figure 3a) compares already very well with the histological section (Figure 3c), which was derived from the corresponding soft-tissue sample. Considering the approximate thickness of a histological section with 7-10µm, the generation of minimum intensity projection slices of the nanoCT data (Figure 3b), which correspond to a virtual thickness of approximately 7µm, allows for a better comparison with the histological section

**(Figure 3c).’ is explaining the why again. With this, we hope to ease the reviewer’s concern with respect to the minimum intensity projections.**

The primary applications of the data shown are in the realm of histopathology. In short, the design of the protocol and more importantly the interpretation of resultant data would benefit from greater awareness of the basic needs of histopathological diagnostics, whose basics include the ability to see all cellular components at once – especially nuclei.

**The authors thank the reviewer for the critical thoughts with respect to the primary application in histopathology. The authors have made quite some efforts to gain the pathologists interest and have developed a strong and mutual relationship with the department of pathology. As such the basic needs of histopathological diagnostics are known to the authors and we do think that our described staining method meets the requirements to allow histopathological diagnostics – especially in the comparative approach. The authors have not expressed their wish to solely use their method for histopathological diagnostics in the manuscript. We rather see 3D X-ray histology as a tool, which will support the pathologist as it will allow to non-destructively investigate the provided sample in 3D prior to further histopathological investigations.**

**After all, a histological stain quite often also targets only one specific cellular compartment and a second stain is needed to highlight another. It should be also noted that not every stain is compatible with each other. The classical standard H&E stain does also not visualize ‘all cellular compartments at once’ as they only highlight the nuclei and the cytoplasm. This is also achieved with the X-ray eosin stain, whereby the cell nuclei are indirectly highlighted. Thus, the histopathologist can navigate through the sample and will be able to identify volumes of interest that need to be investigated further in 2D using histopathological methods including immunohistological methods. At last, histology has surely a historical advantage as time and experience have mastered several valuable staining procedures, which still must evolve for computed tomography.**

Additionally, a clearer definition of what is meant by non-destructive imaging would be appropriate. One of the greatest strengths of CT, in any of its forms, is the preservation of the original sample being imaged for easier overlay work with other imaging modalities or analysis tools. It would be beneficial to emphasize the need for cutting the sample in between performing the micro-CT and nano-CT pipelines as well as to elaborate on alternative mechanisms for long-term sample storage after initial image acquisition.

**We acknowledge the reviewer’s concern. The staining method itself is suitable to stain whole organs completely and homogenously, which is an issue for several contrast agents currently available for CT and also standard histology. During the microCT investigations the stained mouse kidney stayed intact. It is correct that**



for the nanoCT investigations, which provide the highest resolutions and sub-cellular structural information, the whole organ had to be sectioned and CPD was applied. As suggested by the reviewer, we clarified this point by adding an additional sentence to the discussion (page 10, lines 409-414):

**‘Nevertheless, the eosin-based staining protocol is suitable for whole-organ staining, which then enables high-resolution microCT imaging of whole organs. Shrinkage artifacts due to the solvent ethanol, which was used to keep the sample moist during the microCT measurements, were not observed. Additional preparation steps are required for nanoCT imaging, which allows for the investigation of smaller tissue pieces retrieved from the original sample.’**

With reference to the long-term sample storage after initial image acquisition, the authors have not encountered any problems. Maybe the reviewer is thinking of the storage above ethanol, which is not the case for the long-term storage. Once the sample has been imaged at the microCT and the data is of the desired quality, most of the sample is forwarded to histopathology, where the sample is embedded into paraffin and processed accordingly. Any leftovers of the paraffin block allow for long-term storage. The remaining sample is CPD tried, and therefore, stored in a desiccator for long-term use. Here, only the drying agent needs to be renewed when necessary to keep the samples free from moisture.

To that extent an additional note has been added to the manuscript referring to the special protocol step 3.1.1 (page 6, lines 225-227):

**‘Note: The other halve of the mouse kidney was transferred to histopathology, where the sample was embedded into paraffin and processed accordingly to yield the typical histological sections as seen in Figure 3c and d.’**

The small fields of view of nano CT indicates that joining fields would be valuable. A more investigative study could quantitate the effect of sample size on resolution. The answer to this question affects the power of potentially focusing in on one area of a larger sample for nanoCT. To what extent is this possible?

The authors thank the reviewer for showing interest in scanning larger samples, which is to some extent possible. A detailed description can be found in the manuscript on page 7, lines 289-296 ‘Note: A single CT measurement acquired at 400nm voxel size has a FOV of 75µm in the direction of the rotation axis (vertical) and approximately 560µm in the direction perpendicular to the rotation axis (horizontal). To investigate larger volumes, an extension of the FOV along the rotation axis can be achieved by combining multiple scans at different vertical positions. Additionally, the FOV of a local tomography measurement compared to



a global CT measurement offers the advantage to measure samples with a larger sample diameter perpendicular to the rotation axis.' It should be noted that the effective resolution for a specific measurement is not only depending on the sample size but also on several other factors such as the scattering properties of the sample and the sample stability during the measurement. Therefore, a general quantitative statement about the resolution depending on the sample size cannot be provided. We hope that this explanation is satisfying and answers the reviewer's question.

Cell membranes clearly visible in the lumen of the tubules were not detectable using nano-CT, which should have adequate resolution for them to be represented. This might be an effect of contrast adjustment in the figure itself and would be beneficial to correct in the JOVE video.

We acknowledge the reviewer's statement with reference to the brush border. It is correct that these are not visible within the lumen of the tubules on the corresponding nanoCT slices. Evidence that the structures were present and stained show the corresponding histological sections (Figure 3c and d). The authors are aware of this and can ensure that contrast adjustment has been carefully checked. One explanation is seen in the rather low sensitivity level of CT, i.e. a certain amount of staining agent is needed to visualize structural details. The authors think that for the cilia this threshold is not met. Thus, the authors emphasize within the long abstract of the manuscript that the CT measurements provide a similar level of detail as the corresponding histological light microscopy images, e.g. page 2, lines 45-46 'Thereby, soft-tissue morphology with a similar detail level as the corresponding histological light microscopy images is reproduced.' To that extent the authors have also revised the sentence on page 3, lines 95-98 'A comparative analysis of the nanoCT slices with corresponding histological light microscopy images confirms the reproduction of the same tissue architecture on a microscopic level in 2D, enabling histopathological characterization of the tissue sample.' to 'A comparative analysis of the nanoCT slices with corresponding histological light microscopy images confirms the reproduction of tissue architecture with similar detail on a microscopic level in 2D, enabling histopathological characterization of the tissue sample.' Furthermore, the difference has been stated in the caption of Figure 3 (page 9, 358-361) '(b) Minimum intensity projection slice derived from the same nanoCT data set shown in (a) with a virtual slice thickness of approximately 7  $\mu\text{m}$ , which allows for clear visualization of the cell nuclei. (c) Representative histological section displaying thick ascending limbs of the loop of Henle with clear visualization of cell nuclei and brush border.'

The samples are wedged inside of a tube rather than in a solid medium such as paraffin,

with saturated ethanol to theoretically keep the sample from shrinkage. A picture of this arrangement and an indication of the purposes of details of the design, in the figure legend, would be valuable, alongside representation in the video protocol.

**The authors thank the reviewer for the statement concerning the mounting of the soft-tissue sample in an appropriate sample holder. The first aspect asks for an explanation why the sample is not embedded in a solid medium such as paraffin and instead stored in a tube above 70% (v/v) ethanol. Considering the sample movement, the embedding in paraffin might look beneficial. However, the preparation of the paraffin block limits the user in the size of the sample, which can be investigated. Secondly, the authors wanted to minimize further impacts on the sample. To embed the soft-tissue sample in paraffin, several steps including a dehydration series in ethanol and often immersion in isopropanol must be performed. Followed by immersion in xylol and infiltration of the paraffin overnight. This might affect the overall image quality with respect to CT. Despite that, the ability to measure the sample in a ‘hydrated state’ is rather seen as an advantage over other techniques that need embedding of the sample, which as described above for histopathology involves several chemical steps.**

**The second aspect concerns the design of the sample holder. Here, the authors wanted to simply provide an example how that sample holder could look like. Therefore, the authors write in the manuscript (page 4, line 167) ‘In case of the stained mouse kidney: ...’, which follows the general actions for this specific protocol step (page 4, lines 165-167) ‘Mount the soft-tissue sample to an appropriate sample holder. Ensure a tight fit of the sample on the sample holder to prevent the sample from moving during the X-ray CT measurements.’ Thus, the user is free to decide on the design, which enables the user to accommodate the specific needs concerning their samples and instruments (The sample holder area in a microCT scanner varies between instruments, which would result in a different sample holder design.). An important requirement is that the sample must keep its position within the sample holder during the measurement. As this specific protocol step is part of the video protocol, the authors do not think that a specific figure is needed here.**

Ethanol can be associated with shrinkage and sample movement during a scan could cause resolution problems. A paragraph addressing these concerns, along with explanations of chosen imaging parameters such as projection acquisition time could be beneficial to a new audience.

**The authors acknowledge the concern of the reviewer with respect to shrinkage associated with ethanol. However, the authors have not observed any shrinkage of the sample – especially with reference to the high-resolution microCT scan, which**

lasted several hours, the sample stayed intact during the CT measurements. As the soft-tissue sample has to be kept moist at all times, otherwise the sample is affected severely due to degradation artifacts, the solvent ethanol seems a good choice as it is also the dehydration solvent used later in the preparation for further investigations in histopathology and with the nanoCT. The authors have added an extra sentence to the notes of the specific protocol step 2.1 (page 5, lines 181-182) 'It should be noted that shrinkage artifacts due to the solvent ethanol were not observed.' Additionally, the authors have included a sentence with the desired information in the discussion (page 10, lines 411-412) 'Shrinkage artifacts due to the solvent ethanol, which was used to keep the sample moist during the microCT measurements, were not observed.'

As to the acquisition parameters, the authors have stated the acquisition parameters used in case of the stained mouse kidney in the protocol, e.g. the specific protocol step 2.1 (page 5, lines 187-188) 'In case of the presented microCT data: Acquire the scan at a peak voltage of 50kV, a current of 3.5W using 1601 projections equally distributed over 360°.' and (page 5, lines 190-197) 'Note: The acquisition parameters for the overview CT scan were chosen for best image quality. As such the 0.39x camera objective was chosen to cover the whole sample within the field of view (FOV). This resulted in an effective pixel size of 12µm. The exposure time of 2s per projection provided a good signal to noise ratio. The ROI for the high-resolution CT scan was identified using the microCT data from the overview scan. MicroCT scanners often incorporate an integrated software tool, which allows for the precise selection of the determined ROI. For the high-resolution CT data, the 4x camera objective was chosen resulting in an effective pixel size of 3.3µm. Here, an exposure time of 15s per projection was needed.' As every sample has its own requirements to achieve best image quality, the stated acquisition parameters serve as an example only.

Minor Concerns:

The resolution of the histology pictures is poor. A higher resolution photo would be more appropriate representation of what typical histology looks like.

**We acknowledge the comment by the reviewer. The authors provided images with 400 dpi for initial submission. To ensure high resolution throughout production, the authors have submitted each figure as vector image file (.svg) as part of the revised submission.**

Lines 159-161 The following sentence is confusing: "The X-ray microCT measurements were performed with an Xradia 500 Versa from Zeiss, 160 which offers next to overview

CT measurements the performance of high-resolution CT measurements down to 1µm." what does "next to overview" mean? What is the point?

**We acknowledge the reviewer's concern raising from the statement. With overview scan the authors refer to the possibility to image the whole sample within the FOV. Despite that the microCT used by the authors has two further objectives installed, which enable high-resolution scans allowing to focus in on one area of the sample (Selection of volumes of interest is possible.). Generally, local (higher resolution) CT measurements are possible with voxel sizes down to approximately 1µm next to global (overview or lower resolution) CT measurements. The revised sentence (page 4, lines 160-163) has been rewritten to 'The X-ray microCT measurements were performed with a microCT scanner, which offers next to overview CT measurements (Ability to image the entire sample within the field of view (FOV).) the performance of high-resolution CT measurements (Ability to focus in on one desired volume of interest (VOI) of the very same sample.) down to 1µm.'**

Line 230ff Critical Dry Point is unfamiliar to most pathologists who may want to use the procedure. Please explain the reasons for its use and the principles, with citations, in appropriate detail somewhere.

**The authors acknowledge the reviewer's suggestion with reference to the CPD methodology. For the nanoCT investigations, which provide the highest resolutions and sub-cellular structural information, smaller tissue pieces retrieved from the original sample were critically point dried (CPD). This has been necessary to ensure that the sample can be mounted to the sample holders of the nanoCT, is not moving during the measurement and can be positioned very close to the X-ray source to allow for best geometrical magnification (The nanoCT setup is based on mere geometrical magnification, which is defined as the distance (source-detector) over distance (sample-source)). The application of CPD enables the complete dehydration of the tissue sample by exchanging the solvent (here ethanol) with the drying agent (here CO<sub>2</sub>). This drying technique was first introduced by Anderson (1) to preserve the 3D structure of biological specimens for electron microscopy. An overview of the technique is provided by Bray (2).**

- (1) Anderson, T. F. Techniques for the preservation of three-dimensional structure in preparing specimens for the electron microscope. *Transactions of the New York Academy of Sciences*. 13, 130–133 (1951).
- (2) Bray, D. Critical Point Drying of Biological Specimens for Scanning Electron Microscopy in *Supercritical Fluid Methods and Protocols*. Methods in Biotechnology, Williams J.R., Clifford A.A. (eds), vol 13., 235-243 (Humana Press, 2000).

As suggested by the reviewer, we added the following paragraph to the specific protocol step 3.1.4 citing the two references listed above (page 6, lines 239-247):


**‘Note: The application of CPD enables the complete dehydration of the tissue sample by exchanging the solvent (here ethanol) with the drying agent (here CO<sub>2</sub>). This has been necessary to ensure that the sample can be mounted to the sample holders of the nanoCT, is not moving during the measurement and can be positioned very close to the X-ray source to allow for best geometrical magnification (The nanoCT setup is based on mere geometrical magnification, with the magnification factor being defined as the source-to-detector distance over the source-to-sample distance). The drying technique was first introduced by Anderson to preserve the 3D structure of biological specimens for electron microscopy<sup>28</sup>. An overview of the technique is provided by Bray<sup>29</sup>.’**

Line 370 Eosin saturation is not "set". It is a property.

**We thank the reviewer for pointing out the importance of precise wording. The sentence on page 9, lines 388-389 ‘. A limitation is here the maximum solubility of eosin in water, which is set to 30 % (w/v) in an aqueous solution.’ has been altered to ‘A limitation is here the maximum solubility of eosin in water, which is 30 % (w/v) in an aqueous solution.’**

Line 416 What do "diffusion rings" look like as related to histology? How large is "large" for a sample?

**The authors thank the reviewer for the questions. The authors have inserted Scheme 1 below to illustrate ‘diffusion rings’ (red dotted lines) within an object. A diffusion ring is a visual mark that indicates how far the stain has diffused into the object with a certain concentration. Generally, the contrast enhancement within one diffusion ring is homogeneous but can vary between different diffusion rings as illustrated in the scheme. Diffusion rings can occur due to different reasons, e.g. the concentration of the stain is too low, and therefore, staining stops at a certain point causing a diffusion ring. Interactions on molecular level between the stain and the tissue can create a diffusion ring. It should be noted that the scheme is an illustration only. Thus, the concentration gradient e.g. could be also inverted. Not every ‘marked zone’ within a sample is a diffusion ring. Regarding the stained mouse kidney, the differently contrast enhanced areas within the tissue sample are here attributed to structural differences, which accumulate different amounts of staining agent.**



**Scheme 1. Illustration of diffusion rings (red dotted lines) within an object. The concentration of the staining agent within one diffusion ring is homogeneously distributed and varies between diffusion rings.**

With reference to size, the authors have investigated samples of several centimeters in size. The biggest samples so far had dimensions of (5cm x 3cm x 3cm) and could be completely and homogeneously stained within 24 hours. It should be noted that size is not the only requirement to achieve complete and homogeneous staining. As each specimen is different, the protocol might need adjustment. The authors have emphasized that issue e.g. in the specific protocol step 1.2 on page 4, lines 143-146 ‘Note: The eosin y staining solution has a concentration of 30% (w/v) in distilled water. Choose the volume of the staining solution in such a way that the sample is completely covered by the staining solution and allow the sample to move freely within the sample container. The incubation time may differ for other samples and has to be adjusted accordingly.’ Additionally, it is addressed in the discussion on page 10, lines 407-409 ‘It should be noted that the overall staining time and volume of the staining solution needed might request some adaptations depending on the nature of the sample.’