# C9940: 3-Dimensional Transmission Electron Microscopy

Lecture 4: Methods for determination of 3D volumes from 2D experimental data

### Content

- principles
- electron tomography
- single particle analysis
- common lines
- random conical tilt



- 2D projections of an 3D object (handedness)
- high noise level (low sensitivity)
- convolution with microscope point spread functions



- 2D projections of an 3D object (handedness)
- high noise level (low sensitivity)
- convolution with microscope point spread functions





- 2D projections of an 3D object (handedness)
- high noise level (low sensitivity)
- convolution with microscope point spread functions







- 2D projections of an 3D object
- high noise level (low sensitivity)
- convolution with microscope point spread functions

n=1

n=2

# 

n=8

n=16

n=64

n=256

- 2D projections of an 3D object
- high noise level (low sensitivity)
- convolution with microscope point spread functions



**1. Different orientations** 

#### 2. Known orientations

- 3. Many particles
- 4. CTF parameters



Baumeister et al. (1999), Trends in Cell Biol., 9: 81-5.

Your sample isn't guaranteed to adopt different orientations, in which case you many need to explicitly tilt the microscope stage.

Two general ways for 3D reconstruction:

- Real space
- Fourier space

Real space reconstruction



We are going to reconstruct a 2D object from 1D projections. The principle is the similar to, but simpler than, reconstructing a 3D object from 2D projections.

Real space reconstruction



Real space reconstruction

















The reconstruction does not agree well with the projections

Potential solution: Simultaneous Iterative Reconstruction Technique

- simultaneous iterative reconstruction technique

Compute re-projections of your model.

Compare the re-projections to your experimental data. There will be differences.

Weight the differences by a fudge factor,  $\lambda$ .

Adjust the model by the difference weighted by

Repeat



- simultaneous iterative reconstruction technique





Experimental projection

Model

Here, the differences (which will be down-weighted by  $\lambda)$  are the ripples in the background.

If we didn't down-weight by  $\boldsymbol{\lambda},$  we would overcompensate, and would amplify noise.

Fourier space reconstruction



#### **Projection theorem Central section theorem**

A central section through the 3D Fourier transform is the Fourier transform of the projection in that direction.

Fourier space reconstruction



#### **Projection theorem Central section theorem**

The disadvantage is that you have To resample your central sections from polar coordinates to Cartesian space, i.e. interpolate. There are new methods to better Interpolate in Fourier space.

Converting from polar to Cartesian coordinates



 $r^*$  weighting, or "r-weighted <u>backprojection</u>"

# If you know the orientation angles for each image, you can compute a back-projection.



- 1. Different orientations
- 2. Known orientations
- 3. Many particles
- 4. CTF parameters

Two translational: Δx Three orientational (Euler angles): phi (about z axis) (theta) about y) (psi)about new z)

These are determined in 2D. These are determined in 3D.



#### http://www.wadsworth.org

# If you know the orientation angles for each image, you can compute a back-projection.



**Computer Tomography** 









We know orientations...

We have different view...





Baker et al. (1999) Microbiol. Mol. Biol. Rev. 63: 862

We are destroying the sample as we image it

Accumulated beam damage If number of views is limited  $\rightarrow$  image distorsions



Accumulated beam damage If number of views is limited  $\rightarrow$  image distorsions

If we have many identical molecules and if we can determine their orientations, we can use one exposure per molecule and use the images in the reconstruction

 $\rightarrow$  single particle analysis



Unlike the tomography data, we do not know how the orientations between individual images are related  $\rightarrow$  reference based alignment

You will record the direction of projection (the Euler angles), such that if you encounter an experimental image that resembles a reference projection, you will assign that reference projection's Euler angles to the experimental image.

Step 1: Generation of projections of the reference.



From Penczek et al. (1994), Ultramicroscopy 53: 251-70.

Assumption: reference is similar enough to the sample that it can be used to determine orientation.

Unlike the tomography data, we do not know how the orientations between individual images are related  $\rightarrow$  reference based alignment

These are determined in 2D. These are determined in 3D.





http://www.wadsworth.org





















- 1. Compare the experimental images to all of the reference projections
- 2. Fing the reference projection with which the experimental images match the best
- 3. Assign the Euler angles of that reference to the experimental image



4. Calculate a new reference

5. Project the new reference

6. Repeat from 1



## **Common lines**

Angular Reconstruction

#### Summary:

- A central section through the 3D Fourier transform is the Fourier transform of the projection in that direction
- Two central sections will intersect along a line through the origin of the 3D Fourier transform
- With two central sections, there is still one degree of freedom to relate the orientations, but a third projection (i.e., central section) will fix the relative Frank orientations of all three.



Frank, J. (2006) 3D Electron Microscopy of Macromolecular Assemblies

## **Common lines**

Angular Reconstruction

#### Summary:

- A central section through the 3D Fourier transform is the Fourier transform of the projection in that direction
- Two central sections will intersect along a line through the origin of the 3D Fourier transform
- With two central sections, there is still one degree of freedom to relate the orientations, but a third projection (i.e., central section) will fix the relative orientations of all three.



From Steve Fuller







This scenario describes a worst case, when there is exactly one orientation in the 0° image. Since the in-plane angle varies, in the tilted image, we have different views available.

#### From Nicolas Boisset

Two images are taken: one at 0° and one tilted at an angle of 45°.



Radermacher, M., Wagenknecht, T., Verschoor, A. & Frank, J. Three-dimensional reconstruction from a singleexposure, random conical tilt series applied to the 50S ribosomal subunit of *Escherichia coli*. J Microsc **146**, 113-36 (1987).

From Nicolas Boisset







- we cannot tilt the stage to 90 deg  $\rightarrow$  "missing cone"

Representation of the distribution of views, if we display a plane perpendicular to each projection direction

The missing information, in the shape of a cone, elongates features in the direction of the cone's axis.



- filling the missing cone

If there are multiple preferred orientations, or if there is symmetry that fills the missing cone, you can cover all orientations.

