



E-ISSN: 2320-7078

P-ISSN: 2349-6800

JEZS 2019; 7(1): 470-475

© 2019 JEZS

Received: 02-11-2018

Accepted: 05-12-2018

**Mekala Lakshman**

Professor and Head,  
Department of Veterinary  
Pathology College of  
Veterinary Science,  
Rajendranagar, Hyderabad  
PV Narsimha Rao  
Telangana Veterinary  
University (PVNRTVU)  
Hyderabad, Telangana  
State, India

## Application of conventional electron microscopy in aquatic animal disease diagnosis: A review

**Mekala Lakshman****Abstract**

The conventional Electron Microscopy {(EM -Transmission Electron Microscope(TEM) and Scanning Electron Microscope (SEM)} is one of the gold standard techniques to study the patho-morphological changes in cells of different diseases in the field of life science. Examination of tissues / cells under EM is otherwise called as "cell pathology" which deals with all membranous structural deviations, localization of disease etiological agents (bacteria, virus, fungi, rickettesia like organisms (ROL's), mycoplasma and parasitic infections). Visualization of localized and /or attached pathogens and therapeutic nanoparticles in different structures of the cells of aquatic animals is possible only with EM studies. Despite of accessibility to various laboratory techniques for accurate diagnosis and specific pathogen identification but, the EM technique is having its significance to support all molecular techniques due to the meticulous observation of all sub-cellular structural changes in response to the disease causing agents which target different structures in a cell or group of cells. The conventional EM is a multi-stepped, time consuming and expertise technique which needs to have continuous practice and up-date. In general, aquatic animal diseases are wide range beginning from nutritional, bacterial, viral, neoplastic, parasitic, RLO and many other conditions are being recorded all over the Globe. Most of the diseases are being diagnosed on the basis of pathognomonic lesions and conventional lightmicroscopy (LM) techniques like histopat hology (HP), immunohistochemistry (ICH) or immunocytochemistry (ICC) and flow cytometry (FCM). Advanced diagnostic tools like qRT-PCR techniques, Genomics and Proteomics were also being used. But demonstration of minute pathogens like virus and sub cellular structural alterations due to disease process are possible only with EM.

**Keywords:** Aquatic animals, TEM, SEM, LM, IHC, HP, FCM, qRT-PCR, RLO

**1. Introduction**

The conventional Electron Microscopy (TEM and SEM) is one of the gold standard techniques to study the patho-morphological changes of cells / tissues in different diseases in the field of life science. Examination of tissues / cells under EM is otherwise called as "cell pathology" which deals with all membranous structural deviations, localization of disease etiological agents (bacteria, virus, fungi, rickettesia like organisms (ROL's), mycoplasma and parasitic infections). Visualization of localized and /or attached pathogens and therapeutic nanoparticles in different structures of the cells of aquatic animals is possible only with EM studies. Despite of accessibility to various laboratory techniques for accurate diagnosis and specific pathogen identification but, the EM technique is having its significance to support all molecular techniques due to meticulous observation of all sub-cellular structural changes in response to the disease causing agents which target different structures in a cell or group of cells. The conventional EM is a multi-stepped, time consuming and expertise technique which needs to have continuous practice and up-date <sup>[1, 11]</sup>. In general, aquatic animal diseases are wide range beginning from nutritional, bacterial, viral, neoplastic, parasitic, RLO and many other conditions are being recorded all over the Globe. Most of the diseases are being diagnosed on the basis of pathognomonic lesions and conventional lightmicroscopy (LM) techniques like histopat hology (HP), immunohistochemistry (ICH) or immunocytochemistry (ICC) and flow cytometry (FCM). Advanced diagnostic tools like qPCR techniques, Genomics and Proteomics were also being used. But demonstration of minute pathogens like virus, and sub cellular structural alterations due to disease process are possible only with EM though it is time consuming but is specific and accurate with high resolution <sup>[11, 12, 14]</sup>.

**2. Introduction to Electron Microscopy (EM)**

Electron Microscopy (EM) is a dynamic specialized tool to study the sub cellular structures and surface morphology of biological and non biological specimens by using a beam of electrons <sup>[2-4, 7]</sup>.

**Correspondence****Mekala Lakshman**

Professor and Head,  
Department of Veterinary  
Pathology College of  
Veterinary Science,  
Rajendranagar, Hyderabad  
PV Narsimha Rao  
Telangana Veterinary  
University (PVNRTVU)  
Hyderabad, Telangana  
State, India

In Light Microscopy (LM) visible light and optical (glass) lenses are used as a source of illumination to magnify the specimens (10 to 1,000). EM operates in a vacuum and electron beam (e.g.,  $\lambda = 0.005$  nm) will act as a source of light to magnify the processed specimen through electromagnetic lenses when compared to the wavelengths of visible light (e.g.,  $\lambda = 400$  nm to 700 nm) [3]. In EM, resolving power is inversely proportional to the wavelength. In other words, increasing the velocity of electrons results in a shorter wavelength and increased resolution [5]. Research in the development of electron microscopes began in the year 1920s. Under the guidance of Max Knoll, Ernst Ruska began work on the development of electron lenses (Germany, 1928). The first functional TEM was developed in the early 1930s by Ruska for which he was honored with Nobel Prize in Physics in 1986 [3]. Early EM studies primarily focused on the optical behavior of electron beams under various conditions. Thus, no biological applications were initially envisioned. However, due to the superior magnifying power of an EM it soon became clear that they could be applied to the study various biological specimens [9, 19]. Presently EM remains an important and significant tool in diagnostic ultrastructural pathology besides physical and material science [6, 8, 10, 12-14, 17]. There are two basic types of electron microscopes (TEM and SEM) were invented within the same decade (SEM was invented by Manfred von Ardenne in 1938), but they differ fundamentally in their usage [8]. In brief, the TEM projects electrons through an ultrathin section of the specimen and produces a two dimensional image (up to 1000 kx) while SEM generates three dimensional image (up to 100 kx) image with the help of secondary electrons. Extreme high magnifications above 200,000 are rarely used by biologists (5). EM allows investigators to detect the specimens in much greater detail than those examined under LM. Conventional electron microscopy is used today in many research laboratories, which are attached with computers to make a digital photography with CCD (charge coupled device) which makes analysis easy [8, 9]. There is ample evidence in the published literature that EM has significantly contributed to our understanding of the ultrastructure of a variety of specimens, including those of pathogenic and nonpathogenic agents [16].

### **3. Resin embedding method protocols (multi-stepped protocol)**

Specimen preparation for TEM includes eight major steps (multi-stepped): slicing & cleaning, primary fixation, washing, secondary fixation, dehydration, infiltration with a transitional solvent & resin and embedding, polymerization, sectioning and staining [12].

#### **3.1 Slicing and cleaning the surface of the specimen**

Proper cleaning of the surface to remove variety of unwanted deposits if any (not removed may get permanently fixed) otherwise impossible to remove later (3). Bozzola and Russell suggested that the specimen should be quickly washed or rinsed in a suitable buffered solution (physiological pH) by the way of gentle swiping or washing for three times for 10 minutes at room temperature. The size of the specimen should be in mm<sup>3</sup>.

#### **3.2 Primary fixation or stabilization of the specimen**

There are various stabilizers / fixatives (Aldehydes, osmium tetroxide, tannic acid, or thiocarbonylhydrazide) are available to achieve this step [3, 12, 16]. For all biological samples including

poultry simple chemical fixation is advocated (6.8 to 7.3 pH and 0.1M PBS/cacodylate buffer based 2.5% EM grade glutaraldehyde solution, 10 times to the volume of tissue) and can be stored at room temperature or 4<sup>0</sup> C for overnight / few hours / few days / few weeks / few months [3,12, 16].

#### **3.3 Washing /Rinsing of the specimen**

In order to remove excess fixative from the samples, the specimen should be thoroughly washed twice or thrice with 0.1 M PBS/cacodylate buffer (pH 7.3) for 20 minutes [3, 12].

#### **3.4 Secondary fixation / postfixation / staining of the specimen**

Secondary fixation is crucial to stain the specimen (block color) and to protect the specimen during other steps employed such as embedding, sectioning. This step also helps in avoiding artifacts and helps in conductivity of electrons to generate quality image [12]. All biological samples can be successfully stabilized for TEM investigation by post fixation with 1% aqueous osmium tetroxide or 0.1M cacodylate buffer (pH 7.3) for 1 to 2 hrs at room temperature (rehydration). It is important to realize that no fixation procedure is ideal; any type of fixation is likely to cause some alterations in the specimen [3, 12].

#### **3.5 Dehydration of the specimen**

The rehydrated sample should be dehydrated in a graded series of ethanol. More specifically, the following protocol is useful: A series of 50, 70, 80, 90, and 99.9 percent ethanol, each for 45 minutes at room temperature [12]. If time does not permitting these can be stopped at 70 percent and stored at 4<sup>0</sup>C. This process allows the water in the samples to be slowly exchanged through liquids with lower surface tensions [3, 9].

#### **3.6 Infiltration of the specimen with a transitional solvent**

The ethanol is not miscible with the plastic embedding medium hence it should be replaced with another intermediary solvent like propylene oxide is necessary [3, 12]. Immersion in propylene oxide twice for 20 minutes at room temperature under fume hood on orbital shaker. Alternatively 1:1, 1:2 and 1:3 ratio of ethanol and resin can be used each for 30 minutes finally replaced with pure resin for overnight and keep it in 4<sup>0</sup>C [12]. This process facilitates better sectioning and EM details will be more clear [3, 9, 12].

#### **3.7 Infiltration with resin and embedding of the specimen**

All biological specimens can be embedded in a variety of different media depending on the purpose (conventional TEM or immuno TEM). For conventional TEM, the epoxy resin EMBed, araldite or LR white or Durcupan ACM are quite suitable. Next day of post transitional step, the specimens should be immersed in a freshly prepared pure resin and left for 2 hrs at room temperature followed by embedding (free of air bubbles), block making and keep it for polymerization at 50<sup>0</sup>C to 60<sup>0</sup>C for 48 to 72 hrs. Store the prepared blocks (samples) in desiccator for 3-5 days or place it for 1-2 weeks at room temperature which will improve the subsequent trimming and sectioning quality as the resin blocks continue to harden during this time [3, 12].

#### **3.8 Sectioning and staining of the specimen**

The procedure of cutting of the specimens into semi-thin and ultrathin slices (sections) is known as microtomy and ultramicrotomy, respectively [3, 12]. Semi thin sections (about

600 to 800 nm) should typically be stained with toluidine blue for 1 min on a hot plate (70<sup>0</sup> C to 90<sup>0</sup> C), examined under LM, and used for identifying the specimen within the resin block before proceeding with ultramicrotomy. Ultrathin sections (about 50 nm to 60 nm) should typically be stained with saturated uranyl acetate (20 minutes) followed by lead citrate (for 5 minutes) [3, 12].

As mentioned before, TEM sample preparation is multi-stepped; every step can virtually affect the quality of the final electron micrograph. It is therefore important that the expert should plan and execute meticulously. I believe that these procedures involve a significant time commitment and require knowledge, patience and skills that come only through practice. It is important to note that most of the chemicals used in EM are dangerous. All steps should be under fume hood on orbital shaker. Bozzola and Russell wrote an laudable chapter on safety in the EM laboratory. They emphasized on the importance of training in the proper usage of all equipments and reagents in the EM laboratory. They also mentioned that the investigator must be aware of potential hazards such as fire, chemical, electrical, and physical harm associated with these items. EM facilities usually offer training and orientation programs all over the world. In my opinion it is exceedingly recommend not only for the apprentice in EM (first learning) but also for the experienced investigator (continuous learning).

#### **4. Scanning electron microscopy**

Scanning Electron Microscopy (SEM) is also a powerful tool for investigation of surface structures and multiple pathogen interactive studies of samples. This technique is advantageous to observe a large area of field at different focal points [6, 12]. SEM also facilitates relatively wide range of the magnification allowing the investigator to easily focus in/on an area of interest on a specimen that was initially scanned at a lower magnification. Furthermore, the 3-D images may be more appealing to the human eye than the 2-D images (obtained with TEM). Therefore, an investigator may find it easier to interpret SEM images. Finally, the number of steps involved for preparing specimens for SEM investigation is lower and less time consuming than the TEM sample preparation. However, SEM specimen preparation harbors various risk factors that can easily distort the integrity and ultrastructure of the sample. The basic steps involved in SEM sample preparation include thin slicing, surface cleaning, stabilizing the sample with a fixative, washing /rinsing, dehydrating, drying, mounting of the specimen on a metal holder over double sided carbon conductivity tape, and coating the sample with a layer of a material (e.g., gold, gold-palladium or platinum) that is electrically conductive [3, 12]. Because each of these steps are crucial and will affect the outcome of the study, they are described in more detail below. The first four steps are essentially the same as those described for TEM specimen preparation. These steps are therefore only briefly mentioned below.

##### **4.1 Slicing and cleaning of the surface of the specimen**

As discussed earlier, the best way to clean the surface of biological samples from contaminants is to carefully washed or rinsed. The sample size should in cm<sup>3</sup> [11, 12].

##### **4.2 Fixation / Stabilizing of the specimen**

All biological samples can be chemically prefixed by immersing the specimens in a 2.5% glutaraldehyde solution

prepared in 0.1 M PBS /cacodylate buffer (pH 7.3) and stored as that of TEM samples [3, 12].

##### **4.3 Washing / rinsing of the specimen**

In order to remove excess glutaraldehyde from the samples, should be subjected to a thorough washing or rinsing procedure in 0.1 M PBS /cacodylic acid buffer (pH 7.3) as explained for TEM sample preparation [3, 12].

##### **4.4 Dehydrating of the specimen**

The dehydration process of a biological sample needs to be done very carefully. It is typically performed with either a graded series of acetone or ethanol. The protocol that proved most suitable for dehydrating the biological specimens for SEM includes the immersion of the specimens in 50, 70, 80, 90 and 100 percent acetone, respectively (dried with CaCl<sub>2</sub>) of each for 45 minutes at room temperature under fume hood on orbital shaker. This process allows the water in the samples to be slowly exchanged through liquids with lower surface tensions [3, 6, 9, 12]

##### **4.5 Drying of the specimen**

The scanning electron microscope also operates in a vacuum, for which specimens must be dry otherwise the sample will be destroyed in SEM chamber. Many electron microscopists consider a procedure called the Critical Point Drying (CPD) as the gold standard for SEM specimen drying by using liquid carbon dioxide in which specimen is dried without structural damage [3, 9]. It is very important to follow exact instructions of the manufacturer of the CPD apparatus, to avoid significant structural alterations. In my experience, I tried a specimen drying process called Simple Desiccation (SD) and also Vacuum Desiccation (VD), which are giving superior results as excellent as that of CPD [12]. This technique is essentially a simple air-drying procedure after fixation, rinsing, and dehydration of the specimens. SD/VD is risky as the specimen may collapse, flatten, or shrink or be rolled and become uncontrollable under these conditions [3, 9, 12]. Although SD / VD is faster and cheaper, this method is like “walking on a tight rope.” For an EM beginner, I would suggest that the safer method is CPD. I would like to recommend the same procedure (But I have performed it only few times by using liquid carbon dioxide as the transitional fluid).

##### **4.6 Mounting of the specimen**

After complete drying of the samples, they must be mounted on metallic (Aluminum) stubs using a double sided sticky carbon conductivity tape. It is important that the investigator first decides about the best orientation of the specimen to be mounted before placing on carbon conductivity tape. A re-orientation proves difficult and can result in significant damage to the sample. If it is not properly stuck to the tape a drop of pure silver paste can be used for its adherence [12].

##### **4.7 Sputtering (coating) of the specimen**

The idea of coating the specimen is to increase its conductivity in the SEM and to prevent the build-up of high voltage charges on the specimen by conducting the charge to the ground [3]. Typically, specimens are coated with a thin layer of (approximately 20 nm to 30 nm) a conductive metal (e.g., gold, gold-palladium, or platinum) for 180 seconds. In the Ruska Lab's, (College of Veterinary Science, PVNRTVU, Hyderabad, T.S), using gold, and found it most suitable [3, 12] to guarantee best results (i.e., to achieve an even layer of


metal coating over the sample), one should carefully follow the instructions of the sputter coater manufacturer. It is important to remember that each step has to be performed to perfection in order to achieve quality images that can be interpreted without the influence of artifacts caused by specimen handling.

### 5. Results of some of the fish diseases and localization of nano particles

The demonstration of minute pathogens like virus, and sub cellular structural alterations due to disease process are possible with Electron Microscopy (EM) only which is rapid (direct samples), specific, and accurate with high resolution [2-4]. At this juncture it is necessary to value every tool used in the field of diseases diagnosis. Recently reviewed different aquatic animal pathogens were like abdominal dropsy from freshwater fishes, pop-eye disease, trematode and cestode infestations from marine fishes, White Spot Syndrome Virus (WSSV) and luminescent vibriosis from crustaceans and necrotic patches, yellow spot disease, pink line syndrome, white line syndrome, white plague, black band disease, tissue lesion, ring line syndrome and abnormal growth from corals have been reported from Andaman and Nicobar Islands. It is

interesting to find that the pathogens like virus, bacteria, fungi and parasites were reported from these aquatic animals in the Island ecosystem. The available information is sparse on the aquatic animal diseases itself, few authors listed out all the possible diseases which would serve as a base for further studies in future [1, 18]. Besides this pathogenic bacteria, mycoplasma, aflatoxin pathogens probiotics and therapeutic nano-particle (Fig. 1, 2 and 3), attachment or localisation with host cells (epithelial cells of respiratory gastrointestinal and reproductive tracts) ROL's attachment / localisation gill cells (Fig. 4 and 5) and spores of *Enterocytozoon hepatopenaei* (Fig. 6, 7 and 8) was studied and are being demonstrated in different experimental specimens and also in samples of natural out breaks by using standard procedures followed for EM studies at Ruska Labs [12]. Viruses can be demonstrated under EM in different specimens like host tissue, experimental cell lines, tissue homogenates, experimental embryonic fluids, stool, tracheal swabs; intestinal fragments. Complexity of multiple pathogen interaction with host cell or experimental cell lines is possible only through EM by adopting different methods used for EM specimen preparation like resin embedding method and direct electron microscopy (rapid preparation/negative staining technique) [11, 12, 14, 17].


**Figures:** Transmission Electron Microscopy Images:



**Fig 1**

**Fig 2**

**Fig 3**




**Fig 4**

**Fig 5**

### Transmission Electron Micrographs of Cat fish Testis showing:

**Fig 1:** Normal cell junction with normal Nucleus and Mitochondria, **Fig 2:** Altered cell junctions and localization of CuSO<sub>4</sub>- NP, **Fig 3:** Altered nuclear membrane, vacuolated cytoplasm and altered Mitochondria. Transmission Electron Micrographs of Shrimp Gills showing: **Fig 4 and 5:** Intracytoplasmic Rickettsia like organisms (RLOs) appears to pleomorphic in shape and also are found in phagolysosomes and also free in the cytoplasm.

**Figures:** Scanning Electron Microscopy Images:



**Fig 6**

**Fig 7**

**Fig 8**

**Fig 6, 7 and 8:** Are Spores of *Enterocytozoon hepatopenaei*. The spores were appear in smooth surface of the spore wall with dent-like curvature

## 6. Conclusions and future outlook <sup>[11, 12]</sup>

A descriptive approach of interactions between pathogens and host cells besides an exhaustive ultrastructural examination of different types of biological samples would not be possible without the electron microscope (EM). Both TEM and SEM have proven over the years to be valuable paraphernalia in this regard. Although TEM generates a different set of electron images than SEM, and thus provides different scientific data, the combination of these two methods in a single investigation can be extremely powerful besides other advanced techniques. Each technique will create its own milestones in the field of science hence; no technique should undermine the other. As per my experience, EM is not an easy technique unless one should train and gained handful experience to become expert which is possible with continuous practice. But, any biologist essentially a pathologist should have a complete idea about EM techniques to narrate healthy and diseased cells. EM techniques are gaining pivotal importance in cancer biology, tissue culture biology, toxicological studies and many other emerging and challenging fields. There are many possibilities that an investigator may not get usable electron micrographs for interpretation, the reason behind this is the specimen preparation for EM is a multi-stepped procedure; a single mistake in one of these steps will affect all remaining steps, and outcome of an entire work will go futile exercise. Despite the risk factors involved, TEM and SEM techniques will provide fascinating images of biological specimens, in particular the smallest free-living and self-replicating life forms on planet Earth. Finally, I wish that diversified specialists should enter the field of electron microscopy as this would allow exchanging of exigent ideas and thoughts. There are many new recent advances in electron imaging technology providing numerous new tools for viewing and characterizing pathogens (e.g., TEM with 3D tomography, Cryo EM and STEM). This should be enough reason to attract young scientists who develop an interest in “playing” with these powerful machines and applying the generated data to the fields of life science and pathology.

## 7. References

1. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/283680257>. 11 Jan, 2016.
2. Bondad-Reantaso MG, McGladdery SE, Iain East and Subasinghe RP. Asia Diagnostic Guide to Aquatic Animal Diseases. FAO Fisheries Technical paper 402/2 FAO and NACA, Rome, 2001, 65-66.
3. Bozzola JJ, Russell LD. Electron Microscopy. 2nd Ed, Jones and Bartlett Publishers Inc. Boston, 1992, 19-45, 72- 144.
4. Office International Des Epizooties, Diagnostic Manual for Aquatic Animal Diseases. 3<sup>rd</sup> Ed 12, Rue De Prony, 75017 Paris, France, 2000, 1-281.
5. Dykstra MJ, Reuss LE. Biological Electron Microscopy, Kluwer Academic Plenum Publishers, New York, 2003, 123-137.
6. Flegler SL, Heckman JW Jr. and Klomparens KL. Scanning and Transmission Electron Microscopy: An introduction, 3<sup>rd</sup> Ed, Oxford University press, New York. 1995. 1-225.
7. Goldsmith CS, Miller SE. Modern uses of electron microscopy for detection of viruses. Clin. Microbiol Rev. 2009; 22:552-563.
8. Hagenau F, Hawkes PW, Hutchison JL, Satiat-Jeunemaitre B, Simon GT and Williams D B. Microscopy and Microanalysis. 2003; 9:96.
9. Heath JP. Dictionary of Microscopy, John Wiley & Sons Ltd., Chichester, England, 2005, 1-357.
10. Lickfeld KG. Elektronenmikroskopie. Eugen Ulmer Publisher, Stuttgart, Germany, 1979.
11. Lakshman M. Electron Microscopy as a tool in research and disease diagnosis. Lead paper compendium published in presented in IAVP annual conference XXXI, held at Ananad, Gujarat, India, 2014, 139-160.
12. Lakshman M. Diagnostic Electron Microscopy (EM) for Avian Diseases - An Overview. International J of Sci. and Res. 2017; 6(5):1478-1483.
13. Nasser Hajibagheri MA. Electron Microscopy Methods and Protocols; In: Methods in Molecular Biology. Humana press volume Totowa, NJ, 2005.
14. Rosai, Erlanson. A Realistic Approach to the Use of Electron Microscopy and their Ancillary Diagnostic Techniques in Surgical Pathology. American J of Surg. Path. 1995; 19:247- 250.
15. Saravanan K, Baruah A, Praveenraj J, Anuraj A, Angel JRJ, Thakur VR, et al. Overview of aquatic animal diseases in Andaman and Nicobar Islands. J. Immunol. Immunopathol. 2015; 17(1):7-24.
16. Stadtlander CT KH. Microscopy and Microanalysis. 2003; (9):269.
17. Spurr AR. A low viscosity epoxy resin embedding medium for electron microscopy. J of Ultrastructural Res. 1969; 26:31-43.
18. Valel FF, Correia AC, Matos B, Moura Nunes JF, Alves

- de Matos AP. Applications of transmission electron microscopy to virus detection and identification. *Microscopy: Science, Technology, Applications and Education*, 2010, 128-136.
19. Zhang Ying, Hung Tao, Song Jingdong, He Jinsheng. Electron microscopy: Essentials for viral structure, morphogenesis and rapid diagnosis. *Science China*. 2013; 56(5):421- 430.