

# RNAi screening for fat regulatory genes with SRS microscopy


Meng C Wang<sup>1,2,6</sup>, Wei Min<sup>3,5,6</sup>, Christian W Freudiger<sup>3,4</sup>, Gary Ruvkun<sup>2</sup> & X Sunney Xie<sup>3</sup>

Identification of genes regulating fat accumulation is important for basic and medical research; genetic screening for those genes in *Caenorhabditis elegans*, a widely used model organism, requires *in vivo* quantification of lipids. We demonstrated RNA interference screening based on quantitative imaging of lipids with label-free stimulated Raman scattering (SRS) microscopy, which overcomes major limitations of coherent anti-Stokes Raman scattering microscopy. Our screening yielded eight new genetic regulators of fat storage.

Obesity has reached epidemic proportions globally and is a major risk factor for chronic diseases, such as type-2 diabetes, cardiovascular diseases and hypertension. To better prevent and treat obesity and its associated metabolic disorders, it is necessary to understand the regulatory mechanisms of fat accumulation and distribution at both cellular and organism levels. Genomic screening for fat-storage modulators has been carried out in several single-cell or multicellular organisms, including *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*, *Caenorhabditis elegans*, *Drosophila melanogaster* and *D. melanogaster* S2 cells<sup>1–5</sup>. *C. elegans* has proven to be a promising multicellular organism for high-throughput genomic studies partly because of its small size, well-developed genetic tools and ease of handling.


Lipid analysis in *C. elegans* has been performed by traditional biochemical approaches, fixation and staining, fluorescence imaging of live worms through vital dye feeding and most recently via label-free coherent anti-Stokes Raman scattering (CARS) microscopy<sup>6</sup>. However, all of these approaches have serious limitations. Biochemical assays require extraction of lipids from more than  $5 \times 10^3$  worms and subsequent time-consuming chromatography analysis<sup>6</sup>, which cannot be easily carried out on the genomic scale. The organic solvents used in the fixation protocol often disrupt and interfere with the structure of lipid-storage compartments. Analysis after feeding with vital dyes, such as Nile Red and boron-dipyrromethene (BODIPY), is rather indirect and is

complicated by unpredictable dye-incorporation efficiency and the lack of a linear relationship between the observed signal and the actual lipid quantity. Several studies have revealed inaccuracy



**Figure 1** | Visualization of cellular fat storage in lipid droplets using SRS microscopy. (a) Experimental scheme of label-free SRS microscopy for *in vivo* lipid imaging. PMT, photomultiplier tube. (b–d) YFP fluorescence images (b–d), SRS signals (e–g) and merged images (h–j) of HEK 293 cells expressing YFP-tagged perilipin A (b,e,h), ADFP (c,f,i) and LSDP5 (d,g,j). Scale bars, 1  $\mu$ m.

<sup>1</sup>Department of Molecular and Human Genetics and Huffington Center on Aging, Baylor College of Medicine, Houston, Texas, USA. <sup>2</sup>Department of Molecular Biology, Massachusetts General Hospital, and Department of Genetics, Harvard Medical School, Boston, Massachusetts, USA. <sup>3</sup>Department of Chemistry and Chemical Biology, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts, USA. <sup>4</sup>Department of Physics, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts, USA. <sup>5</sup>Present address: Department of Chemistry, Columbia University, New York, New York, USA. <sup>6</sup>These authors contributed equally to this work. Correspondence should be addressed to X.S.X. (xie@chemistry.harvard.edu), M.C.W. (wmeng@bcm.tmc.edu) or W.M. (wm2256@columbia.edu).



**Figure 2** | Imaging fat accumulation and distribution in *C. elegans* by SRS microscopy. (a,b) SRS signals revealed fat storage in intestine (arrow), hypodermis (asterisk), early embryos in the uterus (arrowhead) and cellular nuclei (labeled with “n”). (c) Subcellular fat accumulation in a pool of droplets observed by SRS microscopy. (d–f) Two-photon-excited fluorescence from Nile Red staining (d), SRS signals (e) and the overlaid images of these two signals (f). (g–i) BODIPY staining of two distinct groups of subcellular organelles with weaker (asterisk) and stronger (arrow) fluorescence signals (g), (SRS) image of the same organelles (h), and overlap of BODIPY and SRS signals (i). (j,k) CARS images showing strong signals in the intestinal cell nuclei owing to nonresonant background (j) and SRS image of the same worm with dark nuclei in the intestinal cells (k). (l–p) CARS and SRS images of the same worm taken at a Raman shift of  $2,845\text{ cm}^{-1}$  resonant with  $\text{CH}_2$  stretching mode (l,m) and a Raman shift of  $2,796\text{ cm}^{-1}$  off-resonant (o,p). Cross-section profiles of the regions marked by gray lines in l and m are shown in n. Scale bars,  $50\text{ }\mu\text{m}$ .


the  $\text{CH}_2$  vibrational mode. After passing through the sample, the forward-going pump beam was selectively transmitted through a filter and focused onto a silicon (Si) photodiode. The output current of the photodiode was fed into a lock-in amplifier to extract the stimulated Raman loss (SRL) signal of the pump beam precisely at 10 MHz. The SRL output from the amplifier was next fed back into the microscope and provided images of lipid in the sample. The SRL signal intensity was proportional to the concentration of targeted species.

We at first examined SRS lipid signals in living HEK 293 cells and confirmed their origin from cellular lipid droplets. The PAT family proteins, perilipin A, adipose differentiation-related protein (ADFP) and LSDP5 are well-conserved lipid droplet-associated proteins that localize to the droplet surface<sup>8</sup> (Fig. 1b–d). We found that cellular SRS signals corresponded exclusively to lipid droplets that were highlighted by the YFP-tagged PAT proteins (Fig. 1b–j) or probed by BODIPY fluorescence (Supplementary Fig. 1). Thus, using SRS microscopy we indeed detected cellular fat storage in lipid droplets specifically.

We next applied SRS microscopy to image fat storage in live worms (Fig. 2). At lower magnification, we observed fat distribution in the entire organism. The SRS signal had the highest intensity in the intestine, suggesting it was the primary site for fat storage (Fig. 2a). We detected weaker signals in the hypodermis, the oocyte and early stage embryos in the uterus (Fig. 2a,b). Inside a cell, the nucleus is known to be the organelle with the lowest fat accumulation. Consistently, the SRS signal was absent in the intestinal-cell nucleus (Fig. 2b), confirming a high

of vital-dye staining methods in live worms<sup>6</sup>. CARS microscopy is a label-free imaging technique, but CARS signals exhibit non-resonant background that limits detection sensitivity and creates imaging artifacts<sup>7</sup>. In addition, CARS signals have a complicated nonlinear relationship to analyte concentration<sup>7</sup>.

Stimulated Raman scattering (SRS) microscopy can be used to excite and detect the  $\text{CH}_2$  stretching vibration of fatty acid chains, which enables label-free three-dimensional lipid visualization with high sensitivity and specificity<sup>7</sup>. In brief, two ultrafast laser pulse trains, pump and Stokes, were spatially and temporally overlapped and coupled into a laser-scanning microscope (Fig. 1a). The Stokes beam had a fixed wavelength at 1,064 nm and was intensity modulated at 10 MHz. To image lipids, the pump beam was tuned into 817 nm, with the energy difference between the pump and the Stokes beams resonant with the vibrational energy of the  $\text{CH}_2$  stretching mode. At the laser focus, a portion of energy was transferred from the pump pulse (intensity loss) to the Stokes pulse (intensity gain), owing to the nonlinear Raman interaction with



**Figure 3** | RNAi screening of new fat storage regulatory genes based on *in vivo* lipid quantification using label-free SRS microscopy. (a–c) Fat was visualized by SRS in the wild-type worm (a), the *daf-2(e1370)* mutant (b) and the transgenic worm intestinally overexpressing the *K04A8.5* lipase (c) under same imaging conditions. (d) Quantification of fat content by SRS ( $n = 5$  worms) and thin-layer chromatography–gas chromatography (TLC/GC) ( $n = 5 \times 10^3$  worms). (e) SRS signal increase compared to the control for genes that resulted in a fat content increase of more than 25% when inactivated by RNAi ( $P < 0.0001$ ,  $n = 5$  worms). Control, worms fed with bacteria containing empty vectors. All the experiments were performed twice independently. Results from one experiment are shown. (f) Normal fat accumulation as observed in the RNAi hypersensitive strain, *nre-1(hd20)lin-15b(hd126)*, fed with empty vector-containing bacteria (control). (g–i) SRS images of three candidate worms. Scale bars, 50  $\mu$ m. Error bars, s.d.

selectivity of the SRS method for lipid imaging *in vivo*. The spatial resolution of SRS is similar to that of two-photon–excited fluorescence microscopy<sup>7</sup>. We detected fat accumulation in subcellular compartments using SRS microscopy at higher magnification (Fig. 2c).

Nile Red fluorescence in live worms fed with this vital dye emits most intensely from gut granules<sup>6</sup>. We found that Nile Red fluorescence in the intestine was largely nonoverlapping with SRS signals (Fig. 2d–f), suggesting that gut granules are normally not fat storage compartments. BODIPY lipid probes were more reliable vital dyes than Nile Red in most systems such as cell culture (Supplementary Fig. 1). However, when fed to live worms, BODIPY fluoresced in both gut granules and lipid droplets (Fig. 2g–i). The latter signals localized together with SRS lipid signals, but their intensities were much weaker than those of nonlipid fluorescence from gut granules (Fig. 2g–i). Thus, lipid quantification based on BODIPY staining in live worms will be misleading because the brightest fluorescence was not lipid related.

Label-free CARS microscopy overcomes the above complications associated with fluorescent dye staining<sup>9,10</sup>. However, when compared to SRS imaging on the same worm, the CARS signals

had much higher background from structures unrelated to lipids (Fig. 2j–m and Supplementary Fig. 2), which caused difficulties in image interpretation and lipid quantification. For example, the germline region containing undifferentiated germ cells had little lipid accumulation, which was therefore absent of SRS signals (Fig. 2m,n) but had high background in CARS microscopy (Fig. 2l,n). Unlike the CARS signal, the SRS signal was linear to the substance concentration and did not exhibit a nonresonant background (Fig. 2m,n,p), which will allow straightforward quantification of fat content via *in vivo* imaging.

To confirm the quantification ability of SRS imaging for *in vivo* application, we compared wild-type worms, an insulin receptor mutant, *daf-2(e1370)* that is known to have increased fat storage<sup>5</sup> and worms overexpressing a lipase gene that have reduced fat content<sup>11</sup> (Fig. 3a–d). We imaged 2-d-old young adults and calculated the mean SRS signal intensity. Compared to the wild type, the *daf-2(e1370)* mutants had 3.2-fold greater fat storage (Fig. 3b,d), and the lipase transgenic worms had 31% fat content (Fig. 3c,d). In parallel, we separated lipids extracted from  $\sim 5 \times 10^3$  worms using thin-layer chromatography, *trans*-esterized to fatty acid methyl esters and quantified by gas chromatography. The *in vivo* SRS and the *in vitro* thin-layer chromatography–gas chromatography quantification provided similar results for each of the three phenotypes (Fig. 3d), suggesting SRS imaging is a reliable and quantitative method for assaying fat phenotypes of *C. elegans*. In contrast, the quantification based on CARS signals did not reveal a difference in fat storage between the wild type and the mutants (Supplementary Fig. 3). Although there are sophisticated techniques for quantitative CARS imaging, the background-free chemical contrast of SRS microscopy offers pronounced advantage particularly for large-scale genomic screening.

We next performed RNAi screening using this label-free SRS method, which allowed us to search for fat storage regulatory genes under physiological conditions. Membrane receptors and nuclear receptors are crucial in transducing signaling of growth factors, cytokine and hormones, and there is precedent for their involvement in the regulation of fat storage, such as insulin receptor, leptin receptor and PPAR gamma<sup>12</sup>. To identify additional fat storage regulatory genes, we picked RNAi clones that target 36 cell-surface receptor genes and 236 nuclear hormone receptor genes in *C. elegans*. To enhance RNAi, especially in neurons, we used the RNAi hypersensitive strain, *nre-1(hd20)lin-15b(hd126)*<sup>13</sup> to knock down these genes. We screened 2-d-old young adults for their fat content in 8-well imaging chambers using SRS microscopy. Of the 272 genes we screened for, we discovered 9 genes whose inactivation increased fat content more than 25% (Fig. 3e–i and Supplementary Fig. 4).

All identified genes, except the insulin/IGF-1 receptor, *daf-2*, were new regulators of fat storage whose roles in fat metabolism are largely unknown. Each identified gene has a human homolog and is broadly expressed in multiple tissues including neurons (Supplementary Table 1). *gcy-28* is a worm homolog of human natriuretic peptide receptor. In the human, natriuretic peptides are cardiac hormones, which can induce lipid mobilization and oxidation in adipose tissue<sup>14</sup>. Consistently, we found that *gcy-28* inactivation increased worm fat content by 34% (Fig. 3e and Supplementary Fig. 4). We predict that other newly identified genes might also regulate mammalian fat metabolism.





