Automated Analysis of Spines from Confocal Laser Microscopy Images: Application to the Discrimination of Androgen and Estrogen Effects on Spinogenesis
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Introduction

Dendritic spines (i.e., postsynaptic structures) of neurons form synaptic contacts that are involved in neuronal computational processes. Visualization and analysis of spines is of critical importance to elucidate physiological changes of morphological plasticity (Matsuzaki et al. 2004; Harvey et al. 2008), as well as effects of various hormones and pharmacological agents (Mukai et al. 2007; Ogiue-Ikeda et al. 2008). The combination of laser-scanning confocal microscopy/2-photon microscopy and fluorescent dye has allowed us to collect large bodies of neuronal image data (van Pelt et al. 2001), namely tens of dendrites and several tens of thousands of spines residing on dendrites of a single neuron.

Conventional methods using manual tracing software such as NeuroLucida (MicroBrightField) are time-consuming and are not suitable for the analysis of large data sets. Recently a number of techniques with varying degrees of automation have been introduced (Dima et al. 2002; Streekstra and van Pelt 2002; Al-Kofahi et al. 2003; He et al. 2003). However, most of those studies are devoted to extracting the dendrites from neuronal images. Manual counting of spines is the most time-consuming part of the entire analysis and has not been yet replaced by an efficient automated measure. Therefore, introduction of a new automatic analysis of neuronal structure including spines will greatly enhance progress of research in the area.

Here, we developed a new software, Spiso-3D, to extract spines as well as dendrites in neuronal image based on their geometrical features (Lindeberg 1990; Schmitt et al. 2004), a completely different approach to the ray-bursting method (Wearne et al. 2005; Rodriguez et al. 2008). Our “geometric method” utilizes scale-free shape-dependent analysis, making it less dependent on brightness in the image. For example, spines are located by pixels that have negative products of eigenvalues calculated from the Hessian matrix of the image. On the other hand, the ray-bursting method mainly exploits information of brightness to define boundaries of dendrites and spines. As Spiso-3D is a Java-based program, it will readily operate on a PC using relatively limited computational resources. Furthermore, here we demonstrate the successful application of Spiso-3D to the analysis of the different effects elicited by androgen and estrogen on spinogenesis of hippocampal neurons.

Materials and Methods

Experimental Protocols

Animals

Adult male Wistar rats (3 months old) were purchased from Saitama Experimental Animals Supply (Japan). The experimental procedure of this research was approved by the Committee for Animal Research of the University of Tokyo.

Acute Hippocampal Slices and Treatments with Sex Steroids

Adult male rats were deeply anesthetized with ethyl ether and decapitated. The left hippocampus is removed from the brain and placed in artificial cerebrospinal fluid (ACSF) at 4 °C. ACSF consisted of (mM): 124 NaCl, 5.0 KCl, 1.25 NaH2PO4, 2.0 MgSO4, 2.0 CaCl2, 22 NaHCO3, 10 glucose and was equilibrated with 95% O2/5% CO2. Hippocampal slices of 400 μm thick are prepared with a vibratome (Dosaka). Slices are then transferred into an incubating chamber containing ACSF held at 25 °C for 2 h for recovery. These acute slices were then incubated with testosterone, dihydrotestosterone, or estradiol (Sigma) for 2 h. Slices were then prefixed with 4% paraformaldehyde in phosphate-buffered saline at 4 °C for 2–4 h.

Visualization of Neuronal Cells by Fluorescent Dye

Neurons in hippocampal slices were visualized by injection of Lucifer Yellow under a microscope (E600FN, Nikon) equipped with an infrared camera (C2-400-79H, Hamamatsu Photonics) and a 40× water immersion lens (Nikon). Dye injection was performed with a glass electrode whose tip is filled with 5% Lucifer Yellow for 15 min, using
Axopatch 200B (Axon Instruments). Approximately 5 neurons within 100–200 μm depth from the surface of slice were injected. Slices were then fixed again with 4% paraformaldehyde overnight.

**Imaging with Confocal Laser Microscopy**

The imaging was performed from sequential z-series scans with LSM5 PASCAL confocal microscope (Carl Zeiss) or equivalent microscope at high zoom (3.0) with a 63× water immersion lens, NA 1.2 (Zeiss). The applied zoom factor (3.0) yield 23 pixels per 1 μm. The confocal lateral resolution was approximately 0.26 μm. The resolution limits are regarded to be sufficient to allow the determination of the density of spines. For Lucifer Yellow, the excitation and emission wavelengths were 488 nm and 515 nm, respectively. For analysis of spines, 3D image was then deconvoluted using AutoDeblur software (MicroCybernetics). To perform unbiased selection of hippocampal CA1 neurons, somas of neurons were sampled along pyramidal layers with the optical fractionation, in which they are apart by roughly 200 μm. Dendrites were selected with concentric spherical probes centered on the soma (modified Sholl analysis). We selected secondary dendrites in the stratum radiatum lying between 100 and 250 μm from the soma because in hippocampal CA1 pyramidal neurons, sex-steroid effects are most prominent in these secondary dendrites (100–200 μm apart from the soma) rather than basal dendrites in the stratum oriens or apical dendrites in the lacunosum-moleculare (Murakami et al. 2006).

Typically in total, 25–60 dendritic segments (50–80 μm length) from 12–30 neurons in 6–15 slices from 3–5 animals, and total 1200–3500 spines were analyzed for each experimental condition. Density and morphology of dendritic spines were analyzed by tracing neurons with Spiso-3D.

**Semiautomated Detection by Spiso-3D**

Desired machine resource is as follows: A PC-AT compatible with CPU: Intel Pentium 4 (clock speed 3.2 GHz); RAM: 3 GB or higher, OS: Windows XP and Windows 7. All programs are written in Java (ver 6.1) and Java 3D under developmental environment Eclipse (Sun Microsystems). Memory available for Eclipse should be allocated at 1.44 GB (maximum) to ensure smooth calculation. After launching Eclipse, Spiso program is started by selecting the program name that appears under ”Run.”

**Setting Parameters**

Entering parameters is necessary for following calculation. Scale factors for confocal image (e.g., micrometers per pixel in X-Y-Z direction) are entered by the user here.

**Creating Max XY Projection of the Image**

Opening the deconvoluted confocal image (must be converted into tiff), press the button ”Max XY.” The images are integrated in Z direction and Max XY projection image appears on the screen.

**Tracing the Dendrite**

Appropriate scale factor for dendrite tracing is then selected (σ in Fig. 5). Typical value for σ is 2.4. Pressing the bar ”dendrite,” elapsed time is indicated on the screen. Typical analysis time is a few minutes for an image with 20–30 stacks of 1024 × 300 pixels. After several iterations of the process the best-fit results are obtained (Fig. 6A). In some cases, disconnected dendrites are obtained as a result, then connect the dendrites manually to single dendrite.

**Locating Spines**

After changing the tab for ”spine,” setting the parameters for spine is done here (sensitivity is S in Fig. 3). Pressing the bar ”spine,” elapsed time is indicated on the screen. Typical analysis time is some minutes for an image with 20–30 stacks of 1024 × 300 pixels. The process will be iterated until the best-fit results are obtained (Fig. 6B). While counting the spines in the reconstructed images, the correction of position and verification of spines were aided by observation of the images in consecutive Z stacks. If necessary, position and/or diameters of spines can be manually corrected (Fig. 6C).

**Displaying Fitted Parameters**

In addition to images superimposed with the fitted dendrites and spines, the results obtained by Spiso can be exported to an Excel format (Supplementary Fig. S1). The results include the density of spines on the dendrite and the distribution of spines classified by spine head diameter.

If desired, 3D image of reconstructed dendrite with spines can be shown in another window.

**Results and Discussion**

**Theoretical Results**

**Scale Transformation**

We employed scale-free analysis using scale-space transformation. Scale-space analysis smoothes noise and structures smaller than objects of interest by convoluting images with a scale factor (σ) in Gaussian kernel (for theoretical description, see Lindeberg 1990 or Schmitt et al. 2004).

\[
I*K(\sigma) = \int I(x) \exp \left(-\frac{(x-x')^2}{2\sigma^2}\right) dx',
\]

\[
K(\sigma) = N \exp \left(-\frac{(x-x')^2}{2\sigma^2}\right).
\]

For dendrites, a scale factor of 0.5–2 μm was used, while for spines, a scale factor of 0.01–0.2 μm was used.

**Dendrite Tracing**

Following scale transformation, the dendritic structure was extracted from the 3D image by tracing. Using a Max XY projection image generated from a stack of confocal images, the centeredness of the dendrite was calculated and connected to form a linear structure. To this end, the total brightness function \( f(x) \) in the Max XY projection image is expanded using polynomials in divided lattices within the linear structure (Krisian et al. 2000).

Then a series of peaks of the brightness function \( f(x) \) are found, called the ridge line. On the ridge line, \( O(x) \) is given an extremum of \( f(x) = 0 \) or \( \lambda_{\text{max}} \) because the gradient of the tangential direction of the ridge line should be zero and derivatives in normal direction must be negative, taking a local maximum. By connecting these peaks, the center line of the dendrite can be obtained.

Next, the diameter of nodes in the dendrite was calculated from the image. Equally distant points for both side A and B from the point of \( x \), in normal direction of the center line of the dendrite are found and unit vectors OA and OB are drawn. To determine the boundary of the dendrite, then \( \tau \), the boundary product for \( e_{OA}, e_{OB} \):

\[
\tau=(e_{OA} \cdot \text{grad} f_A) \cdot (e_{OB} \cdot \text{grad} f_B),
\]

can be defined (Fig. 1).

The distance from point O to A(r) or B(r), is changed within the range of 0.1–5.0 μm, yielding boundary product \( \tau(r) \). Among peaks of \( \tau(r) \), the nearest peak to the center point O is defined as the end point of the diameter of the node. The diameter of the node should be obtained by doubling the distance between the end point and the center point O.
Reconstruction of 3D Dendrite by Pattern Matching
To reconstruct the dendrite 3-dimensionally, dendrite nodes from Max XY projection are pattern-matched with XY in the Z direction $(Z_i)$. The pixel brightness at the center of each node $(X_p, Y_p)$ is compared in all images. The node center is assigned to the $Z_i$ plane, where maximum pixel brightness at $(X_i, Y_i)$ is observed. The diameter of dendrite node in 3D is the same as the diameter of the dendrite node determined in Max XY projection. After matching all nodes, matched nodes are connected, thereby 3-dimensionally reconstructing the dendrite.

Spine Determination
To determine spines, we use Hessian tensor that is obtained as second derivatives from Taylor expansion of the spine brightness function $I(x)$. The spine brightness function is obtained after subtraction of the traced dendrite from $I(x)$. $(x)$ can be expressed in the following via Taylor expansion:

$$I(x+\varepsilon u) = I(x) + \varepsilon \frac{\partial I}{\partial x}(u) + \frac{1}{2} \varepsilon^2 \frac{\partial^2 I}{\partial x^2}(u) + \cdots$$

The above procedures are iterated for 0.01 values are stored as candidates for the spine center point.

$\phi_A = (\text{grad} I_{A+1}) \cdot (\text{grad} I_{A-1})$

where $\Lambda + 1$ and $\Lambda - 1$ is the 4 nearest neighbors in $X$ or $Y$ direction of pixel $\Lambda (x, y)$ (Fig. 2). Pixels with at least one in 4 negative $\phi_A$ values are stored as candidates for the spine center point.

The above procedures are iterated for 0.01 at step of 0.01. One spine area consists of many candidate points for spine center (Fig. 2D,E). The candidates for spine center are collected as spine center detection image, which is then digitized as the distance image (Fig. 2F). To create the digitized distance image, the minimum number of pixels to reach the center pixel from perimeter pixels is assigned on each pixel. The perimeter (edge) pixel is assigned to be 1. The true center C of spine can be determined as the pixel that has a maximum number (Fig. 2F). In this way, the spine center detection is carried out for each slice plane.

Determination of Spine Diameter
Once candidates for the spine center point are determined, a "radius detection image" showing the putative spine region is created, which we use to calculate the spine radius. To generate the radius detection image, we first calculate $||\text{grad} I_{C}||$, the norm of grad $I_C$ at the point where 2 eigenvalues of diagonalized Hessian tensor are both negative. Pixels with nonzero $||\text{grad} I_{C}||$ are regarded as candidate spine region points (Fig. 3). These procedures are iterated for 0.01 at step of 0.01. Identified candidate spine region points are assembled into radius detection image which is then digitized to create the distance image. To create the distance image, the minimum number of pixels to reach the center pixel from the perimeter pixels is assigned on each pixel (Fig. 3E). Finally, spine diameter is determined by combining the spine center detection image (Fig. 2F) with Fig. 3E, by superimposing both the center Cs. The combined image is again digitized to create the distance image. The maximum distance number $R$ (assigned for the center C) is adopted as a spine radius (a spine diameter $D = 2R$) (Fig. 3F). The same procedure is carried out for each $Z$ stack of slice $(Z_i)$, e.g., $XY$ plane. However, since distances allocated to each pixel (1,2,3,...) are not precise enough, the calculated radius value is adjusted. If at least one of the adjoining 8 neighboring pixels of the pixel with the maximum
If all 8 neighboring pixels have the value of \( R \) minus 1 \((R - 1)\), the radius is adjusted to \( R \) minus 0.5 \((R - 0.5)\). With this standard, we attempted to reflect various shapes of spines, which are difficult to approximate by using circles to model the spine.

### Integration of Spines in 3D Direction

Once spine diameters are determined for each stack \( XY(Z_i) \), identified spines along \( Z \) axis originally belonging to the same spine are grouped 3-dimensionally (Fig. 4). Identified spines whose center-to-center distance are less than \( R_j \) \((j\) stands for \( Z_j \)) with overlap of at least one pixel in \( XY \) brightness are assigned as the same spine. If the overlaps of brightness in spine regions along \( Z \) direction are separated more than 2 stacks \((1 \mu m \) in physical distance in the current study), they are considered to belong to different spines. Then, the gravity center is taken as a new spatially weighted spine center.

\[
O_z = \frac{\sum r_i x_i}{\sum r_i}
\]

The largest radius within the group is adopted as a spine radius.

\[
R_{\text{max}} = \max(R_1, R_2, \ldots, R_n)
\]

Accordingly, the diameter of spine is \( D = 2R_{\text{max}} \). The entire analysis process of a dendrite and its spines are summarized in Fig. 5. The obtained results of the dendrite and spine analysis can be exported to an Excel format (Supplementary Fig. S1).

### Final Manual Correction of Spines

The calculated spine is displayed on each plane as a circle overlaid on the original image with diameter \( D = 2R_{\text{max}} \) (Fig. 6). Typically, a small fraction of identified spines need manual correction of diameters \((<15\%)\). The diameter of spine in the reconstructed image is corrected by observation of the original image in consecutive single plane and adjusting the \( R_{\text{max}} \) radius of the calculated result to the original image. Some pseudo-spines may be detected \((<2\%)\) since spines typically have a neck shorter than 6 \( \mu m \). Pseudo-spines are erased if they are further than 8 \( \mu m \) from the dendritic center.

Our method of spine identification can also detect filopodium, a form of dendritic protrusions found in neurons at the developmental stage of the brain, which lacks an apparent head \((0.1 - 0.2 \mu m)\). Filopodium can also be easily excluded by manual inspection since the population of filopodia may be less than 1% of the total spines in the adult brain.
Less than a 2% difference in spine assessment was observed using our described automated methods compared with manual counting using Neurolucida (e.g., one of 50 spines along one sampled dendrite) (see Fig. 7).

**Figure 3.** Spine diameter determination. (A) Spine center detection image. Eigenvalues of Hessian matrix are calculated at each pixel. “λ” indicates a pixel where 1) eigenvalues $\lambda_1$ and $\lambda_2$ are both negative and 2) $|\lambda_1\lambda_2| > S$ ($S$: sensitivity set in the Spiso program by user). “k” indicates pixel with $\lambda_1\lambda_2 \leq S$. (B) Image of information of spines. “λ” pixels are marked for spine center candidates, while “k” pixels are omitted. (C) Gradient vector image in Figure 2C. (D) By superimposing (B) and (C), the connected area in gradient vector image with “λ” pixel inside is defined as “spine.” The spine pixels are indicated as stripe pixels. (E) The radius detection image. To create the digitized distance image, the minimum number of pixels to reach the center pixel from the perimeter pixel is assigned on each pixel. (F) Spine diameter is determined by combining the spine center detection image (Fig. 2F) with Figure 3E, by superimposing both center C. The combined area is again digitized to create the distance image. The maximum distance number $R$ (assigned for the center C) is adopted as a spine radius (a spine diameter $d = 2R$).

**Figure 4.** Integration of spines. Spines found on each plane along Z axis originally belonging to the same spine are grouped 3-dimensionally. If XY brightness overlaps at least one pixel, and spines whose distance between centers are less than $R$ ($R$ stands for Z) is assigned as the same spine. For example, the spines within circle A in this figure are grouped as one spine. If the overlaps of brightness in spine regions along Z direction are separated more than 2 stacks (1 μm in physical distance in the current study, e.g., spine area within circle B), they are considered to belong to another spine.

**Spine Neck Length Calculation**

Neck length of each spine can also be determined by using coordinates of the spine center and the center of dendrite node (Supplementary Fig. S2).

**Demonstration Movie of Spiso-3D Action**

A demonstration of Spiso-3D is provided in Supplementary Material.

**Experimental Results**

**Successful Application of Spiso-3D to Distinguish the Different Effects of Androgen and Estrogen on Enhanced Spinogenesis in Hippocampal Neurons**

Synaptic modulation of hippocampal neurons by neurosteroids has attracted much attention because of their effects on memory-related function (Baulieu 1997; Mukai et al. 2007; Ogiue-Ikeda et al. 2008). Interestingly, androgen and estrogen are endogenously synthesized in hippocampal neurons (Kawato et al. 2002; Hojo et al. 2004; Kretz et al. 2004), and they have rapid effects on synaptic plasticity (Mukai et al. 2007; Hatanaka et al. 2009). Using Spiso analysis on spine head diameter, we clearly distinguished the different effects of testosterone (T, 10 nM), dihydrotestosterone (DHT, 10 nM), and 17β-estradiol (E2, 1 nM) on dendritic spines of hippocampal CA1 pyramidal neurons in acute hippocampal slices (Fig. 7). These sex hormones rapidly (within 2 h) increased the total spine density from 0.97 spines/μm to 1.28 (T), 1.32 (DHT), and 1.34 (E2), respectively (Fig. 7A). While the effects of T, DHT,
and E2 treatment on total spine density were indistinguishable, closer examination spine head diameter revealed marked differences in the distribution of spine head diameter between T, DHT, and E2 treatments (Fig. 7B, C). To distinguish different responses in spine subpopulations, spines were classified into 3 categories according to their head diameters: 1) a small-head spine, which has head diameter ($D$) between 0.2 and 0.4 μm, 2) a middle-head spine, which has head diameter between 0.4 and 0.5 μm, and 3) a large-head spine, which has head diameter between 0.5 and 1.0 μm. DHT treatment was found to increase large- and middle-head spines, whereas T increased large- and small-head spines. In contrast, E2 treatment increased only small-head spines (Fig. 7B, C).

The observed differences in the effects of the hormones on spine subpopulations may have functional implications, for example, large-head spines may contain more α-amino-3-hydroxy-5-methyl-4-isoxazolepropionic acid (AMPA) receptors since spine-head size positively correlates with the density of AMPA-type glutamate receptors (Kopec et al. 2007; Shinohara et al. 2008). Since the induction of long-term potentiation (LTP) is dependent on the density of AMPA receptors in spines (Kopec et al. 2007; Shinohara et al. 2008), increased density of AMPA receptors in large-head spines could facilitate LTP. Increased density of large-head spines following DHT treatment could potentially facilitate LTP induction, in contrast to T, which only moderately increased large-head spines or E2 that had no effect on the density of large-head spines.

These findings demonstrate the importance of the consideration of spine diameter to distinguish different types of neurotrophic effects. Although manual determination of spine diameter is labor intensive, the newly developed Spiso-3D software provides a sensitive and specific method for the rapid automated determination of spine density. As a control, we also performed analysis of these spine data for T, DHT, and E2 using Neurolucida software, and we obtained results almost identical to those by Spiso-3D within 2% error (Fig. 7D). However, spine numbers might be underestimated or overestimated with Neurolucida, if one need to count very many spine numbers due to human counting error. Since the majority of spines (>95%) had a distinct head and neck, stubby spines (long filamentous protrusion with no distinguishable head, less than 3%), and filopodium (protrusion without a distinguishable head, less than 0.1%) did not significantly contribute to overall changes. Our approach of automated spine analysis will be particularly useful for analysis of involvement of intracellular kinase signaling in spinogenesis, such as MAPK, PKA, PKC, PI3K, CaMKII, or calcineurin (Hatanaka et al. 2009) because considerable amount of data to analyze are necessary to
investigate multiple pathways in systematic fashion to reveal entire molecular underpinnings of spinogenesis.

**Application of Spiso-3D for the Analysis of Abnormal Spines**

Various spinal abnormalities are described in human neuropsychiatric disorders (Williams et al. 1980; Hinton et al. 1991) or genetically manipulated mice (Bhatt et al. 2009) (see Supplementary Fig. S3). For example, in fragile X syndrome, spine neck length is elongated roughly 3- to 8-fold (Hinton et al. 1991), while overexpression of the structural protein drebrin resulted in a loss of spine heads and roughly 2- to 4-fold increase in spine neck length (Mizui et al. 2005). Furthermore, LIM kinase knockout mice were found to have roughly 50--60% reduction in spine-head size (Meng et al. 2002) (Supplementary Fig. S3). Quantitative classification of the types of spine abnormalities will contribute to the understanding of the mechanisms of spine formation and/or maintenance as well as potentially aid in the development of therapeutic interventions for psychiatric illnesses. However, to date, few studies quantitatively investigated these spine abnormalities, partly due to the lack of a systematic analysis method such as Spiso-3D, which allows the efficient analysis of large sets of data.

**Conclusion**

We achieved construction of automated software, Spiso-3D, which is effective in precise and quantitative dendritic spine analysis. The software determines spines using not only brightness but also geometric features of the neuronal images, leading to the accurate identification of spines. Furthermore, in comparison to currently used manual software such as Neurolucida, Spiso-3D considerably reduces human errors and experimenter labor. Using Spiso-3D, we discriminated between the different effects of steroid hormones (DHT, T, and E2) on hippocampal spinogenesis. These methods will help to analyze vast amounts of dendritic spines in neurons in the mammalian cerebral cortex.

**Supplementary Material**

Supplementary material can be found at: http://www.cercor.oxfordjournals.org/.
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