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Cryo EM Micrograph of Single Particles
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What is Observed
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Main Assumptions

1) All particles in the specimen have identical structure

2) All are linked by 3D rigid body transformations (rotations, translations)

3) Particle images are interpreted as a “signal” part (= the projection of the common structure) plus “noise”

*Important requirement:* even angular coverage, without major gaps.
How to Get Even Angular Coverage

CAT - scan
- beam rotating
- patient stationary

Electron Tomography
- molecule rotating
- beam stationary

Single particle reconstruction
- molecule "rotating"
- beam stationary
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Particle Picking
Particle Picking
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Automated Particle Picking

Example: CCF-based with local normalization

(i) Define a reference (e.g., by averaging projections over full Eulerian range);
(ii) Paste reference into array with size matching the size of the micrograph;
(iii) Compute CCF via FFT;
(iv) Compute locally varying variance of the micrograph via FFT (Roseman, 2003);
(v) “Local CCF” = CCF/local variance
(vi) Peak search;
(vii) Window particles ranked by peak size;
(viii) Fast visual screening.

Advantage of local CCF: avoid problems from background variability
Performance

Particle Selection Efficiency Plot (Sym. Mask)
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Many algorithms exist.

Recent review (current state of the art):
Classification of Images

- EM images of protein are very noisy and, therefore, the primary process of single-particle analysis is the classification of images according to their Euler angles, the images in each classified group then being averaged to reduce the noise level (Frank et al., 1978; van Heel and Frank, 1981).

- Classification methods are divided into those that are “supervised” and those that are “unsupervised”:
  
  - Supervised: divide or categorize according to similarity with “template” or “reference”. Example for application: projection matching
  
  - Unsupervised: divide according to intrinsic properties. Example for application: find classes of projections presenting the same view

Note: explained in Frank book, chapter 3.
Classification

Supervised Classification

Unsupervised Classification

Template or references images
Unsupervised Classification (Clustering)

• Classification deals with “objects” in the space in which they are represented.

• For instance, a 64x64 image is an “object” in a 4096-dimensional space since in principle each of its pixels can vary independently. Let’s say we have 8000 such images. They would form a cloud with 8000 points in this space.

• Unsupervised classification is a method that is designed to find clusters (regions of cohesiveness) in such a point cloud.
Dimensonality Reduction

• Role of Multivariate Statistical Analysis (MSA): find a space (“factor space”) with reduced dimensionality for the representation of the “objects”. This greatly simplifies classification.

• Reason for the fact that the space of representation can be much smaller than the original space: resolution limitation (neighborhoods behave the same), and correlations due to the physical origin of the variations (e.g., movement of a structural component is represented by correlated additions and subtractions at the leading and trailing boundaries).

• MSA very similar to Principal Component Analysis (PCA).

• Self-Organizing Map (SOM) and Topology-Representing Network (TRN) are neural net based approaches to dimensionality reduction.
Factor Space / Principal Components:

Find new coordinate system, tailored to the data
Example
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Eigenimages Extracted from Data (MSA)

Note: explained in Frank book, chapter 4.
Expansion in Factor Space

Avrg + F1
Avrg + F1+F2
Avrg + F1+F2+F3
Hierarchical Ascendant Classification

Note: Many other clustering techniques exist…
3D Reconstruction

Projection Theorem:

The 2D Fourier transform of the 2D projection of a 3D density is a central section of the 3D Fourier transform of the density perpendicular to the direction of projection.
3D Reconstruction

Projection Theorem:

The 2D Fourier transform of the 2D projection of a 3D density is a central section of the 3D Fourier transform of the density perpendicular to the direction of projection.

This holds in Fourier Space.

DeRosier & Klug, Nature 217 (1968) 133
Angular Reconstitution

Real Space:

Common Line Projection Theorem

Two different 2D projections of the same 3D object always have a 1D line projection in common.

Fig. 11. The angular reconstitution technique is based on the common line projection theorem stating that two different two-dimensional (2D) projections of the same 3D object always have a one-dimensional (1D) line projection in common. From the angles between such common line projections, the relative Euler-angle orientations of set projections can be determined a posteriori (van Heel, 1987). For an entirely asymmetric particle like this 50S ribosomal subunit, at least three different projections are required to solve the orientation problem. For details see main text.

Sinograms

Determine relative orientations with common lines!

Fig. 13. Sinograms and sinogram correlation functions. This illustration provides a graphical overview of the relations between a 2D class average (noise-reduced projection images), their ‘sinograms’, and the sinogram correlation function between two sinograms. The images shown here (a, b) are class averages deduced from a large data set of Herpes Simplex Virus Type 1 (HSV1) cryo-EM images. Each line of the sinogram images (c, d) is generated from the 2D projection image by summing all 1D lines of the 2D images, from top to bottom, after rotation of the image over angles ranging from 0° to 360°. Equivalently, the lines of the sinograms are 1D projections of the 2D images in all possible directions ranging from 0° to 360°. Each point of the sinogram correlation function contains the correlation coefficient of two lines of the two sinograms one is comparing (e).

Angular Reconstitution

1) *Unsupervised* classification, to determine classes of particles exhibiting the same view
2) Unsupervised <-> Reference-free
3) Average images in each class -> class averages
4) Determine common lines between class averages
   • stepwise (van Heel, 1967)
   • simultaneously (Penczek et al., 1996)

**Issues:**
• unaveraged images are too noisy
• resolution loss due to implicit use of view range
• handedness not defined – tilt or prior knowledge needed
Reference-Based Projection Matching

Systematically generated projections of existing reconstruction

Reference <-> supervised

Stack of projections (2D aligned) × Experimental projection (+ 2D alignment) = Stack of rotational CCF's

max 2 remaining Euler angles

adapted from an image by Joachim Frank
Reference-Based Projection Matching
Angular Coverage

good

poor
What if Particles are Aligned with Grid?
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Solution: Tilt of Specimen
Random Conical Tilt

© Joachim Frank
Random Conical Tilt

• Premise: all particle exhibit the same view
• Take same field first at theta ~50 degrees, then at 0 degrees [in this order, to minimize dose]
• Display both fields side by side
• Pick each particle in both fields
• Align particles from 0-degree field

This yields azimuths, so that data can be put into the conical geometry
• Assign azimuths and theta to the tilted particles
• Proceed with 3D reconstruction
Random Conical Tilt for Multiple Orientations

1) Find a subset (view class) of particles that lie in the same orientation on the grid: *unsupervised classification of 0-degree particles*

2) Missing cone problem: *do several random conical reconstructions, each from a different subset (view class), find relative orientations, then make reconstruction from merged projections set.*
Missing Cone Artifacts

Reconstruction Using top view

Reconstruction Using side view
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Reconstruction Algorithms

(a) Fourier interpolation  
(b) Weighted back-projection  
(c) Iterative algebraic reconstruction
Fourier Interpolation

Obtain samples on a regular Cartesian grid in 3D Fourier space by interpolation between Fourier values on oblique 2D grids (central sections) running through the origin, each grid corresponding to a projection.
Fourier Interpolation

Sample points of adjacent projections are increasingly sparse as we go to higher resolution:

Speed (high) versus accuracy (low). Can be used in the beginning phases of a reconstruction project.
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Back Projection

Simple back-projection: Sum over “back-projection bodies”, each obtained by “smearing out” a projection in the viewing direction:
Weighted back-projection: as before, but “weight” the projections first by a function that is tailored to the angular distribution of directions (R* weighting, in X-ray terminology), then inverting the Fourier transform.

For general geometries, the weighting function is more complicated, and has to be computed every time.

Weighted back-projection is fast, but does not yield the “smoothest” results. It may show strong artifacts from angular gaps.
Iterative Algebraic Reconstruction

The discrete algebraic projection equation is satisfied, one angle at a time, by adjusting the densities of a starting volume. As iterations proceed, each round produces a better approximation of the object.

The algorithm comes in many variants. It allows constraints to be easily implemented.

It produces a very smooth reconstruction, and is less affected by angular gaps.
Comparison (w/ Missing Cone)

Original object

Simple back-projection

Weighted back-projection

Iterative algebraic reconstruction
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Sources for Limited Resolution

• Instrumental: partial coherence (envelope function)
• Particles with different height all considered having same defocus (envelope function)
• Numerical: interpolations, inaccuracies
• Failure to exhaust existing information
• Conformational diversity
Conformational Diversity: Heterogeneous Particle Population

Current approach: assume all conformers are "similar". Treat problem in first approximation as a problem with a single conformer. Then try different models as references to see if population segregates.
Example: Low Occupancy of Ternary Complex
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Problem Solved by Supervised Classification
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The Reconstruction Process

1. Collect Data & Digitize
2. Select Particles
3. Preliminary 3D Model
4. Refine 3D Model

Power Spectrum/CTF Parm.
Typical Refinement - SPIDER
Typical Refinement - IMAGIC

- Initial 3D Model
- Projections
- Multiple Reference Alignment
- New 3D Model
- Orientation by Common-Lines
- Classify & Average
- Principle Component Analysis
- Particles
Typical Refinement - EMAN

- Initial 3D Model
- Projections
- New 3D Model
- Classify Particles
- Align & Average Classes
- Particles
Preliminary Model
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Projections
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Classification
2D Alignment

Resampling the objects in Polar coordinate. The given density objects are expanded in Fourier series:

\[
 f(r, \beta) = \sum_m \hat{f}_m(r)e^{im\beta} \\
 g(r, \beta) = \sum_n \hat{g}_n(r)e^{in\beta}
\]

**Idea**: Rotate both objects, while translate one object along the positive x axis, until match is found.
2D Alignment
2D Alignment

The correlation function is a function of 2 rotations and 1 distance:

\[ c(\phi, \phi'; \rho) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} f(\phi) \cdot g(\phi'; \rho) \]

Here:

\[ f(\phi)(r, \beta) = \sum_m \hat{f}_m(r) e^{im(\beta - \phi)} \]
\[ g(\phi'; \rho)(r, \beta) = \sum_n \hat{g}_n(r') e^{in(\beta' - \phi')} \]

The correlation function becomes:

\[ c(\phi, \phi'; \rho) = \sum_{m,n} e^{i(m\phi + n\phi')} I_{mn}(\rho) \]

Where:

\[ I_{mn}(\rho) = \int_0^{2\pi} e^{-im\beta} \left( e^{-in\beta'} \hat{g}_n(r') \right) d\beta \cdot \hat{f}_m(r) \cdot r dr \]

The 2D Fourier transform of correlation function:

\[ \hat{c}(m, n; \rho) = I_{mn}(\rho) = 2\pi \int_0^{\infty} (\hat{h}_{r,\rho}^n)_m \hat{f}_m(r) r dr \]
2D Alignment

For each $\rho$, update Max. Corre. value + corresp. $\phi$ and $\phi'$

Compute Correlation
\[ c(\phi, \phi'; \rho) = \text{FFT}^{-1}_{2D}(\hat{c}) \]

Compute Fourier Transform of Correlation
\[ \hat{c}(m, n; \rho) = 2\pi \int_0^{\infty} (\hat{h}_{r,\rho}^n) \hat{f}_m(r) r \, dr \]

Precomputing $\hat{h}_{r,\rho}^n(m)$

For each $\rho$, update

Rotate $\phi$

Rotate $\phi'$
Translate $\rho$

Particle Image
\[ f(r, \beta) \]

Reference Image
\[ g(r, \beta) \]

FFT$_{1D}$ $\hat{f}_m(r)$

FFT$_{1D}$ $\hat{g}_n(r)$

$\rho + 1$
Class Averages
Iteration 1
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Iteration 2
Iteration 3
Iteration 4
GroEL Reconstruction at 6.5Å
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Comparison with Xtal Structure

Cryo-EM

X-ray

Cryo-EM with ribbon
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Caveat: Model Bias
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Caveat: Model Bias
Caveat: Model Bias

- **Base**
- **Noisy (~10% contrast)**
- **Align to**
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Caveat: Model Bias
Caveat: Model Bias

better reference model and more iterations!
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CTF Correction
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CTF Correction
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CTF Correction
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CTF Correction - SPIDER

Defocus 1

Defocus 2

Defocus 3
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Resources

Textbook: