DYNAMIC CELL ADHESION AND MIGRATION ON NANOSCALE GROOVED SUBSTRATES
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Abstract
Organised nanotopography mimicking the natural extracellular matrix can be used to control morphology, cell motility, and differentiation. However, it is still unknown how specific cell types react with specific patterns. Both initial adhesion and preferential cell migration may be important to initiate and increase cell locomotion and coverage with cells, and thus achieve an enhanced wound healing response around an implantable material. Therefore, the aim of this study was to evaluate how MC3T3-E1 osteoblast initial adhesion and directional migration are influenced by nanogrooves with pitches ranging from 150 nm up to 1000 nm. In this study, we used a multi-patterned substrate with five different groove patterns and a smooth area with either a concentric or radial orientation. Initial cell adhesion measurements after 10 s were performed using atomic force spectroscopy-assisted single-cell force spectroscopy, and demonstrated that nascent cell adhesion was highly induced by a 600 nm pitch and reduced by a 150 nm pitch. Addition of RGD peptide significantly reduced adhesion, indicating that integrins and cell adhesive proteins (e.g. fibronectin or vitronectin) are key factors in specific cell adhesion on nanogrooved substrates. Also, cell migration was highly dependent on the groove pitch; the highest directional migration parallel to the grooves was observed on a 600 nm pitch, whereas a 150 nm pitch restrained directional cell migration. From this study, we conclude that grooves with a pitch of 600 nm may be favourable to enhance fast wound closure, thereby promoting tissue regeneration.
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Introduction
The natural extracellular matrix (ECM) of living tissues is a complex system, highly organised at the macro-, micro-, and nanoscale. Hence, cells are continuously subjected to nanotopographical cues mediated by the cells’ integrins and ECM adhesion proteins. Collagen type I in bone, for example, forms fibrils with a typical banding pattern of 68 nm in width with a 3-5 nm banding depth and a 35 nm interfibrillar spacing depth (Weiner and Wagner, 1998). By interacting with their natural nano environment, cells become activated and differentiate to perform their intended function (Biggs et al., 2009; Dalby et al., 2007; Dang and Leong, 2007; Lamers et al., 2010a; Yim et al., 2007). Nowadays in tissue engineering and regenerative medicine, much effort is placed in mimicking such nanotopography on implantable biomaterials. Cells possibly recognise such topographies as a more “natural” environment, leading to fast integration of the biomaterial into the surrounding tissue (Lamers et al., 2010a; Pierres et al., 2002).

In addition to cellular differentiation, using an organised topography on implantable materials will also control the morphological and migration behaviour of cells. The latter may be employed to achieve a fast closure of the wound area over an implant surface, thereby shortening the healing time and preventing the occurrence of infections. For example, in guided tissue regeneration (GTR), membranes consisting of a highly organised array of collagen are implanted to promote fast, directional migration of cells (Behring et al., 2008). Our previous study demonstrated that cell motility and morphology are highly influenced by differences in groove dimensions (Lamers et al., 2010b). On grooves with specifically a width of 300 nm, for example, cells aligned to the groove direction and were highly motile, indicating a favourable response for GTR. On the other hand, we could not observe any motility and morphological effects on grooves narrower than 75 nm, irrespective of the applied groove depth or ridge width. Despite the studies on the influence of cellular behaviour to a wide array of nanogrooved dimensions, it is thus far unknown how specific cell types react with specific patterns. In addition, it is unknown how cell adhesive processes are involved in such directional cell migration.

To understand how cellular responses towards biomaterial structures are mediated, cell adhesion needs to be studied in detail. The initiation of cell adhesion...
is a process which is usually established within a few microseconds (Carvalho et al., 2010) and involves integrins that adhere to surface specific proteins such as fibronectin and vitronectin (Pierres et al., 2008; Siebers et al., 2005). Within 5 min, these integrins cluster to become focal adhesions (FAs), and may either disassemble or further mature into fibrillar adhesions (FBs) within 20 min (Gardel et al., 2010; Zaidel-Bar et al., 2003). The formation of such FBs may severely reduce cell motility (Coussen et al., 2002), as shown in our previous study (Lamers et al., 2010b). Such cell adhesive processes are not only important for proper integration of an implant into the surrounding tissue, but likely also influence other cellular processes such as migration, polarisation, spreading, and differentiation. Therefore, the aim of this study was to get a better understanding of the effect of nanoscale grooves on initial osteoblast adhesion within the first hour after the cells come into contact with the surface, and how this adhesion can be related to directional cell migration on the grooves.

We hypothesise that a fast adhesion of cells to grooved implants leads to increased directional migration. Ultimately, this may result in improved wound healing and tissue regeneration not only in an outside-in fashion but also at the inner surface of an implant shortly after implantation. In order to test this hypothesis, different types of cell adhesion studies were performed. The influence of nanoscale grooves ranging from a pitch of 150 nm up to 1000 nm was first studied directly after initial contact using atomic force microscopy (AFM) single cell force measurements. Next, initial cell adhesion events were followed at intervals from minutes to hours. Finally, a migration assay up to three days was performed to assess whether the initial adhesion correlated to the tissue migration potential of osteoblasts after prolonged culture.

Materials and Methods

Substrates
Prime quality 4” silicon (Si) wafers with nanogrooves were prepared using laser interference lithography (Lamers et al., 2010a). A setup was used based on the Lloyd’s interferometer, where a regular pattern was produced by interference of an incident laser beam and a mirror reflected beam (van Soest et al., 2005). The period of the interference pattern, and thus of the grating recorded in the resist layer on the substrate, is given by the equation: \( P = \lambda / (2 \sin \theta) \), where the period (\( P \)) is determined by the wavelength (\( \lambda \)) of the beam source and the angle (\( \theta \)) at which two coherent beams are interfering. With a 266 nm light source, periods of 150 nm up to 1000 nm were produced (Luttgte, 2009). A tri-layer positive resist system was spin-coated on a silicon wafer, consisting of a 13 nm thick bottom antireflective coating (BARC) DUV46 (Brewer Science, Derby, UK), a 140 nm thick positive (for PS replication) photosensitive polyvinyl-based resist PEK500 (Sumitomo Chemical, Tokyo, Japan), and a 5 nm top antireflective coating (TARC, Aquatar-6A, AZ Electronics, Wiesbaden, Germany).

After illumination and development of the resist layer, the grating was transferred to the substrate by a reactive ion etching process using a Plasmatherm 790 system (Unaxis, Utrecht, The Netherlands). An optimised method of reactive ion etching using parameters giving anisotropic etch profiles in nanoscale was used. SF6:O2 plasma chemistry gave well defined structures transferred into the silicon substrate. Using this setup, highly regular patterns were produced over areas of about 2 x 2 cm². The groove dimensions are given in Fig. 1a. In order to create multi-patterned wafers containing 5 different groove patterns and 1 flat part, five Si wafers containing different groove patterns and one smooth substrate were diced into sextant pieces and glued together to create one combined wafer (Fig. 1b,c). These wafers were not used directly, but served as templates to produce cell culture materials.

For reproduction of polystyrene (PS) replicates, 0.5 g PS dissolved in 3 mL chloroform was cast onto a 4” silicon wafer and the chloroform was evaporated overnight. PS rings (2.0 cm Ø for adhesion analysis, 3.0 cm Ø for time lapse CLSM, and 4 cm Ø for AFM adhesion measurements) were glued to substrates using a small amount of casting solution to create cell culture dishes. Substrates received a radiofrequency glow-discharge (RFGD; Harrick, Ithaca, NY, USA) treatment for 5 min in argon gas at 10⁻² bar for sterilisation and to improve wettability. The groove dimensions of the different nanopatterns were routinely verified by AFM.

AFM imaging
A multimode AFM (Nanoscope IIIa, Vecco, Santa Barbara, CA, USA) with NanoScope Analysis software (version 1.20, Vecco) was used to confirm surface topography of the nanopatterned replicates. Tapping in ambient air was performed with high aspect ratio NW-ARST-NHCR cantilevers (NanoWorld AG, Wetzlar, Germany) with average nominal spring constants of 30 Nm⁻¹ (Loesberg et al., 2007). Height images of each nanopattern were captured in ambient air at 50 % humidity at a tapping frequency of ~250 kHz. The analysed field was scanned at a rate of 0.8 Hz with 512 scanning lines.

Cell culture
The mouse MC3T3-E1 osteoblast cell line (ATCC #CRL-2593) was maintained in alpha Minimal Essential Medium without ascorbic acid (αMEM; Gibco BRL, Life Technologies, Breda, The Netherlands) supplemented with 10 % foetal calf serum (FCS; Gibco) and 0.5 mg/mL gentamicin (Gibco). Cells were cultured from passage 21 up to 25. Before the experiments, cells were detached with trypsin/EDTA (0.25 % w/v trypsin / 0.02 % EDTA), resuspended in cell culture medium, centrifuged at 1,200 rpm for 5 min, and again resuspended at the desired cell density.

For experiments under serum-reduced or serum-free conditions, cells were washed once in phosphate-buffered saline (PBS) after spinning down the cells at 1,200 rpm, centrifuged again at 1,200 rpm and resuspended in serum-reduced or serum-free αMEM.
AFM force measurements
Cells were attached to tipless AFM cantilevers (MLCT-O10, Bruker, Santa Barbara, CA, USA) by concanavalin A (ConA)-mediated linkages as described (Friedrichs et al., 2010; te Riet et al., 2007; Wojcikiewicz et al., 2003). In short, ConA-coated cantilevers were prepared as follows. Cantilevers were first cleaned by immersion in 1 M sulphuric acid (Sigma-Aldrich, Zwijndrecht, The Netherlands) for 1 h, then thoroughly rinsed with Milli-Q water, ethanol, and subsequently dried in a N$_2$-flow. Following an overnight incubation at 4 °C in biotinylated BSA (biotin-BSA, 0.5 mg/mL in 100 mM NaHCO$_3$, pH 8.6) the cantilevers were rinsed using PBS and exposed to 0.5 mg/mL streptavidin (Pierce, Rockford, IL, USA) in PBS for 30 min at 37 °C. Finally, the cantilevers were rinsed three times with 20 mM Tris, 150 mM NaCl, 1 mM CaCl$_2$, 2 mM MgCl$_2$, pH 8.0 (TSM) and incubated in biotinylated ConA (biotin-ConA, 0.4 mg/mL in TSM) for 30 min at 37 °C, then washed with TSM. Force measurements on living cells were performed in force-distance mode using a combined Catalyst BioScope AFM (Bruker) Leica confocal microscope TCS SP5 II (Leica, Mannheim, Germany). Cantilever deflection was determined from the difference in signal generated by a two-segment photodiode monitoring the reflection of a laser beam focused onto the apex of the cantilever. The spring constant of each cantilever was calibrated before use by a non-destructive thermal oscillation method (te Riet et al., 2011).

For AFM cell adhesion measurements ($n \geq 7$ cells), a cell was first adhered to the cantilever. The cantilever was pushed softly (<5 nN) onto the cell for approximately 20 s and upon retraction a positive pick up was directly observed by the microscope (Fig. 2a). From that moment, the cell was allowed to adhere strongly to the cantilever for at least 15 min. Adhesion of the cell adhered to the cantilever to the different nanostructures was subsequently measured by bringing the cell into contact with the substrate with a contact force of 1000 pN and allowing the cell to adhere for 10 s. Subsequently, the cell was retracted at a retraction speed at 12 µm/s, with subsequently a relaxing time of 2 s to give the cell time to recover (Fig. 2b) (Friedrichs et al., 2010; Weder et al., 2009). Cell adhesion experiments were performed in either 10 % serum, 1 % serum, or in serum-free conditions. Data were subsequently exported from the BioScope Catalyst by the NanoScope v8.1 software and further analysed in MATLAB in custom written software. Analysis of force-distance curves resulted in the width, work, and maximum detachment force $F_\text{max}$ of every curve (see also Fig. 2c) for statistical analysis ($n \geq 70$ curves).

RGD control
AFM force measurements were first performed with a cell in 1 % serum on grooves with a 600 nm and 1000 nm pitch. Cells were then incubated for 30 min with 250 µM RGD peptide (G1269, Sigma-Aldrich). Subsequently, force measurements were repeated in the presence of the peptide ($n \geq 40$ curves; $n=3$ cells).

Cell adhesion analysis
Cells were seeded at a cell density of 12,500 cells/cm$^2$ on flat substrates with either 10 % FCS, 1 % FCS, or without FCS ($n \geq 10$). On grooved substrates, 10 % FCS was always used. After allowing the cells to adhere for either 15, 30 or 60 min, the culture medium containing non-adhered cells was transferred into tubes. Cells in the culture medium were spun down at 1,200 rpm for 5 min, medium was removed, and 0.5 mL Milli-Q water was added in order to lyse the cells. In addition, the substrates were washed in PBS to remove medium and serum components, then 0.5 mL Milli-Q water was added, rinsed, and the cells were transferred into separate tubes. Finally, cells were lysed in a series of three freeze-thaw cycles. Subsequently, DNA

**Fig. 1.** a. Groove dimensions ± standard error of the mean. b, c. Schematic diagram of multi-patterned substrates. d, e. Cross-sections and height images of the nanopatterns created by AFM imaging.
was separated from the cell remnants by centrifugation at 1,200 rpm for 5 min. The amount of DNA was quantified using the picogreen DNA assay (Invitrogen, Paisley, UK), according to manufacturer’s protocol. Briefly, 100 μL of sample was added to 100 μL freshly prepared working solution containing picogreen in a 96-well plate (Greiner Bio-one, Alphen a/d Rijn, The Netherlands) and incubated for 5 min in the dark. The plate was read in a multiplate fluorescence reader at a wavelength of 488 nm. Cell adhesion was analysed by dividing the adhered DNA fraction from the total DNA amount (i.e. sum of DNA from adhered and non-adhered cells).

**Preferential migration**
Preferential osteoblast migration on nanogrooves was determined (n ≥ 7) using a multipatterned substrate. Cells were seeded in the substrate centre in a drop of 10 μL containing 5,000 cells for two hours for adherence. Then 1
mL medium was added over the whole substrate and cells were cultured for 3 d. Subsequently, cells were fixed in 3 % paraformaldehyde (Sigma-Aldrich) supplemented with 0.01 % glutaraldehyde (Acros, Geel, Belgium) in PBS, and incubated in PBS with 1 % triton X100 (Koch, Colnbrook, England) for 10 min. The cells were fluorescently labelled with phalloidin-Alexa 568 (1:250; Molecular Probes, Invitrogen) for filamentous (F-) actin and DAPI (1:2500) for nuclear staining in PBS supplemented with 0.1 % Tween 20 (Merck, Schuchard, Germany). Cells were imaged with a Zeiss Z1 microscope (Jena, Germany) and outward osteoblast migration was determined by Fiji software (Version 1.45b, NIH, La Jolla, USA). The migration analysis demonstrated that the migration distances of cells on the substrates were very different (range between 3 and 6 mm out-growth). Therefore, data was ranked to determine the relative migration effect of grooves on the cells with the following parameters: 1: minimal outward migration and 6: maximal outward migration.

**Statistical analysis**

For the AFM force measurements, several force-distance curves were acquired per cell on the tested substrate, showing no clear trends and a normal distribution, as was analysed with a Kolmogorov-Smirnov test. Possible autocorrelation effects were analysed with a Durbin-Watson test. Measurements performed on the same location gave similar force curves, indicating that the RGD-protein-containing serum proteins were firmly attached to the surface. Data from the AFM measurements were normalised to the results from the 1000 nm patterns. Data obtained from the experiments were statistically analysed using SPSS for Windows (SPSS 16). Data were analysed by ANOVA and post hoc Tukey testing. Probability (P) values of $P \leq 0.05$ were considered significant. Errors are mean ± SD.

Independent T-tests were performed to compare cell adhesion between two groups. Mann-Whitney U-tests were performed to compare cellular migration.

**Results**

**Nanopatterned substrates**

AFM analysis of RFGD-treated polystyrene replicates from the multi-patterned wafer confirmed that the replication quality of the groove patterns was consistent throughout the experiments (Fig. 1d,e).

**Initial cell adhesion to nanogrooved substrates**

In the presence of 1% FCS, cells demonstrated the highest $F_{\max}$ on flat and 600 nm pitch substrates and the lowest $F_{\max}$...
on a 150 nm substrate (Fig. 3). The “work” (i.e. the area enclosed by the detachment curve and baseline, which gives a measure for the strength of adhesion of the cell to the substrate, Fig. 2c) showed no significant differences.

In the presence of 10 % FCS, cells demonstrated the highest $F_{\text{max}}$ on 600 nm and 1000 nm pitch substrates and lowest force on a 150 nm pitch. For the work a similar trend was observed; on a 1000 nm pitch the detachment work was significantly higher than on a 150 nm pitch. Comparison of the serum concentration effect on cell adhesion, demonstrated that $F_{\text{max}}$ was significantly higher in the presence of 10 % FCS than in 1 % FCS. In contrast, the work was significantly higher in the presence of 1 % FCS than with 10 % FCS.

In the force-distance curves of detaching osteoblasts, step-like unbinding events (“jumps”) were observed preceded by force plateaus directly after the $F_{\text{max}}$ detachment peak (Fig. 2c). These events probably represent events of membrane tethers unbinding from the substrate. Most jump-events were observed on a substrate with 600 nm pitch, both in the presence of 1 % and 10 % FCS (Fig. 4). In addition, the highest jump forces were also determined on the 600 nm pitches, both in the presence of 1 % and 10 % FCS. The lowest jump forces were observed on the 300 nm pitch, whereas in the presence of 10 % FCS the lowest forces were observed on a flat substrate. Comparison of serum effects on cellular unbinding events demonstrated that the number of jumps were significantly higher in the presence of 10 % FCS compared to 1 % FCS, and that jump forces were significantly higher in the presence of 1 % FCS than with 10 % FCS.

Addition of the RGD blocking peptide reduced both detachment forces and work significantly, but not completely, indicating that RGD-specific integrins are the main initial adhesive source for the cells (Fig. 5).

**Adhesion maturation**

A comparison of osteoblast adhesion at 15 min showed that only on a 150 nm pitch significantly more cells adhered relative to the 600 nm pitch and the flat substrate (Fig. 6a). At 30 min, more cells adhered to substrates with a pitch of 300 nm, 600 nm and 1000 nm compared to the flat substrate. At 60 min, no significant differences in cell adhesion between the patterns were observed. It is noticeable that at 60 min more than 90 % of the cells stayed adhered, thus, differences in adhesion could not be detected anymore with high sensitivity.

Addition of different serum concentrations to the cells significantly affected cell adhesion at 15-60 min on flat substrates; cell adhesion under serum free conditions was always higher than in the presence of 1 % or 10 % FCS for all interaction times studied (Fig. 6b).
Fig. 5. Effect of 30 minutes block with RGD on cell detachment from a 600 nm and 1000 nm pitch. a. Relative maximum detachment forces. b. Work of cellular detachment. Data represent the mean ± standard deviation. *P < 0.05, †P < 0.01, ‡P < 0.001.

Fig. 6. Quantification of cell adhesion after different adhesion times. a. Fraction of adhered cells on different nanogroove dimensions. b. Influence of serum concentration on cell adhesion. Data represent the mean ± 95% confidence interval. *P < 0.05, †P < 0.01, ‡P < 0.001.
Directional cell migration
Analysis of outward osteoblast migration demonstrated that cells on the radially oriented substrates had the highest outward migration on substrates with a 600 nm pitch and the lowest migration on substrates with a 150 nm pitch (Fig. 7a,b). On the concentrically orientated substrates the highest outward migration was observed on a 300 nm pitch and lowest migration on a 600 nm pitch (Fig. 7c,d).

Discussion
The aim of the current study was to determine the influence of nanoscale grooves on initial adhesion and long-term migration of MC3T3-E1 osteoblasts, using different nanogrooved pitches with a ridge-groove ratio of 1:1 ranging from 150 nm up to 1000 nm and a flat control. The data demonstrated that submicrometer grooves, and most specifically a 600 nm pitch, induce faster initial cell adhesion, whereas at 15 min adhesion on the 600 nm pitch is restrained. AFM-assisted single-cell force spectroscopy (SCFC) proved to be very useful and predictable for standard long-term migration assays. The high initial adhesion and restrained adhesion maturation was favourable to induce a high cell motility and highly directional migration.

Regarding our study from a technical point of view, the use of a multi-patterned substrate had some important advantages over separately patterned substrates. First, replicates of substrates are produced and treated in a single step, and therefore, the variation between substrates due to, for example surface free energy (hydrophobicity), are not potentially significant factors. Secondly, cell migration is instantly comparable within one substrate. Finally, initial cellular adhesion could be studied on different nanopatterns by AFM using a single cell. Thus, statistical comparison in cell assays was free of confounding effects.

Regarding the chosen setup, several techniques can be employed to measure initial cell adhesion. For example,
Modin et al. (2006) studied initial osteoblast adhesion by using a quartz crystal microbalance with dissipation (QCM-D). However, this technique is not appropriate to analyse the adhesion strength of single cells. Also, magnetic tweezers have been used to measure forces generated during initial cell adhesion (Walter et al., 2006). A disadvantage of these techniques is their limitation in exerting maximum forces of only ~200 pN, which is mostly not enough to detach the cell. Therefore, another sensitive technique to measure initial cell adhesion forces was used in this study, i.e. AFM-assisted SCFS (Helenius et al., 2008; Muller et al., 2009). A major advantage of SCFS over other techniques is that the adhesion of a cell to a substrate can be very precisely measured over a wide practical force range, from 10 pN to 10^6 pN (Helenius et al., 2008). Thereby, SCFS provides insight into adhesion up to single ligand-receptor unbinding of a single cell interaction with a substrate controlling the first moment of contact (Helenius et al., 2008; te Riet et al., 2007). Still, the observable step-like dissociation events are probably due to the decoupling of integrin clusters. The technique likely is not sensitive enough for measuring the forces generated in single RGD-fibronectin slip/catch bonds. Thus, our use of the term “membrane tethers” rather than referring to these tethers as a single integrin or focal adhesion bond.

As far as our statistical approach is concerned, it has to be noted that measurements were not calculated per number of cells, but over the total of the curves. This analysis disregards eventual clustering of data within each cell; however is generally accepted as valid (Friedrichs et al., 2010; Puech et al. 2005). Previous research states that in this set up, it can be assumed that each of these measurements with the same cell are all different measurements of an interaction of the cell with the substrate. Our analysis of different force-distance curves shows that there is no autocorrelation within the repeated measurements within each cell, and therefore these measurements can indeed be considered as independent measurements (data not shown).

Comparison of our findings with available literature, confirmed again that cells are very sensitive and are able to respond to the smallest variations in topographical characteristics, such as topographical density, organisation and stiffness (Arnold et al., 2008; Dalby et al., 2007; Kim et al., 2009; Kunzler et al., 2007; Lamers et al., 2010a). On the other hand, our comparative study demonstrated for the first time that grooves with a pitch of 600 nm are optimal to induce both nascent cell adhesion and highly directional migration. Moreover, the jump events (representing membrane tether unbinding events) were only significantly increased on a 600 nm pitch. In contrast, a groove pitch of 150 nm reduced nascent adhesion and directional migration. These findings confirm our hypothesis that a sufficient pattern width is essential to promote a fast initial contact of the cell with a substrate, finally resulting in fast and directional migration. Strikingly though, nascent integrin adhesion on nanogrooves is not indicative for the establishment of FBs at later time points. At 15 min, cell adhesion on a 600 nm pitch was reduced, whereas it was enhanced on a 150 nm pitch. Apparently, nascent cell adhesion is promoted by groove widths of 300 nm or larger, whereas the clustering of these integrins into FBs is limited. The maturation of integrin clusters into FBs is indicative for the firmness of adhesion and an increase in FBs reduces cell motility (Zaidel-Bar et al., 2003). This possibility fully corroborates with our previous study, in which we demonstrated that upon an increase in groove width up to 300 nm, cell motility increased whereas FA length decreased (Lamers et al., 2010b). Veevers-Lowe et al. (2011) further confirmed this by demonstrating that cell migration is mediated by integrin adhesion to fibronectin, which in turn induces actin reorganisation and cell migration. In contrast, smaller nanogroove dimensions may be involved in the induction of ECM remodelling rather than cell migration (Ilic et al., 2004). The observation of high initial detachment forces on flat surfaces may be due to adhesive serum proteins such as fibronectin and vitronectin, covering the surface. At longer time points however, cell adhesion to the flat substrate was diminished compared to the grooved substrates, possibly indicating that either a high organisation of adhesive proteins or the topography itself can be essential to establish cell spreading and enhance the formation of mature FAs.

Furthermore, this study demonstrated that cell migration is not only dependent on groove pitch, but also on the direction. The 600 nm pitch induced fast and highly directional cell migration parallel to the grooves, whereas cell migration perpendicular to the 600 nm pitch was highly reduced. In contrast, the 300 nm pitch induced the highest migration perpendicular to the grooves. These findings suggest that there is a threshold for the groove width between 150 nm and 300 nm, above which the formation of mature adhesions perpendicular to the grooves is restrained, resulting in an increasing migration speed and directionality (Fujita et al., 2009). Mature FAs may preferably form in the longitudinal direction along the grooves, resulting in migration parallel to the grooves. On smaller grooves on the other hand, FA formation and maturation may occur perpendicular over several grooves, thereby initiating unidirectional migration (Hamilton et al. 2010; Fujita et al., 2009). More importantly though, our cell migration and previously reported motility data (Lamers et al., 2010b) fully corroborate with the trend observed in initial cell adhesion, indicating that the initial contact of the cell with a specific surface characteristic may determine the cell fate at later time points (Ayala et al., 2011; Geiger et al., 2009). Our previous results on the influence of nanogrooved substrates on osteoblast differentiation confirm this, because differentiation increased with increasing groove pitch (Lamers et al., 2010a).

Several groups already demonstrated that differences in serum concentration or type could highly affect cell adhesion (Fujitawa et al., 2009; Grinnell and Feld, 1979; Schmidt et al., 2011). Our study confirmed that serum greatly affects cell adhesion in addition to surface patterning. In the absence of FCS, cells adhered too strongly to the substrate to perform accurate SCFS measurements, and therefore were excluded from the study (data not shown). Serum contains adhesion-mediating proteins, such as fibronectin and vitronectin, which greatly enhance cell adhesion. However, our study demonstrated that cell adhesion was highly increased by decreasing serum concentrations, which corroborates the study by
Fujitwara et al. (2009). The extremely high adhesive forces, as observed in the absence of serum, may be resulting from small amounts of adhesive proteins that are secreted by the cells to induce a fast and highly efficient adhesion to the substrate (Grinnell and Feld, 1979). Reduced serum conditions (1 %) also resulted in an increase in cell adhesion compared to high serum conditions (10 %), however in a different manner and to a lesser extent than serum-free conditions. Since we used an MC3T3-E1 osteoblast cell-line, this increase could result from the immortalisation of the cell, however, a similar effect was observed for primary rat MSCs (data not shown). When using a high serum concentration, soluble adhesion proteins present in the culture medium may adhere to integrins on non-adhered cells, thereby reducing cell adhesion to the substrate, which is also loaded with these adhesion proteins. For confirmation, the effect of RGD on cell adhesion was analysed. RGD is a peptide repeat that is present in cell-adhesive proteins such as fibronectin and vitronectin (Humphries et al., 2006). Cells recognise the RGD-tripeptide through specific integrins (e.g. β1, β2, and β3 subunits) that reside at the cell surface and are directly linked to the actin filament via the FA-complex. Addition of RGD to the cells resulted in a highly reduced adhesion force and work, indicating that adhesive serum proteins are indeed responsible for integrin-mediated cell adhesion to the substrate, as well as the observed serum effect on initial cell adhesion. For a full confirmation, however, blocking experiments of separate different RGD-sensitive integrins should be performed (Siebers et al., 2005).

For clinical applications, finding the optimal surface topographical conditions for cells to adhere, proliferate, migrate, and finally differentiate may greatly enhance the efficacy of implant integration into the surrounding tissue (Biggs et al., 2009; McMurray et al. 2011). From a cellular point of view, the results from the current study and our previous studies (Lamers et al., 2010a; Lamers et al., 2010b; Lamers et al., 2011a) demonstrate that grooves with a pitch range of 300-1000 nm may be favourable patterns to accomplish such requirements for several reasons: (i) Initial cell adhesion, but not adhesion maturation, is enhanced on the 600 nm substrate. Osteoblasts may preferably adhere to such topographies over other cells, thereby reducing possible risks for chronic inflammatory responses by, for example, macrophages or encapsulation by fibroblasts (Kunzler et al., 2007; Liu et al., 2010); (ii) Cells become highly aligned on substrates with a pitch of 600 nm. Such a realignment may possibly result in a highly ordered ECM deposition around the implant at later time points, leading to an improved stability (Weiner and Wagner, 1998); (iii) Directional cell migration parallel to grooves with a 600 nm pitch is increased compared to the other studied substrates. This may result in a faster coverage of the implant surface resembling GTR, thereby improving bone ingrowth and reducing the risk of undesirable side-effects resulting from adhesion of other cells (Stetzer et al., 2002); (iv) Osteoblast differentiation is enhanced on substrates with a pitch of 1000 nm (Lamers et al., 2010a); (v) Moreover, the immune response can be specifically controlled by grooved substrates (Lamers et al. 2011a; Refai et al. 2004; Wojciak-Stothard et al. 1996). These advantages immediately affect the speed of wound closure and bone regeneration. Long term in vitro mineralisation studies as well as in vivo implantation studies should confirm this hypothesis.

Conclusion

In the current study, we analysed how nanoscale grooves control the adhesion and migration of MC3T3-E1 osteoblasts. The 600 nm pitch (300 nm width) highly induced initial cell adhesion and the formation of integrin to RGD-protein tethers. After 15 min, however, cell adhesion was reduced on a 600 nm pitch. In addition, cell migration parallel to the grooves was highly induced on a 600 nm pitch. From this study, we conclude that grooves with a width of 300 nm may be favourable to enhance adhesion and migration.
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Authors: Recently, we analysed the interface interactions between cells and nanogrooved surfaces (Lamers et al., 2011b) by creating cross sections through freshly frozen samples, using a novel technique, cryo DualBeam FIB-SEM. This study demonstrated that cells are able to descend into groove with a width of 150 nm. Thus far we have not been able to analyse whether cells are able to infiltrate into smaller grooves, however this would be very interesting to know as this factor can significantly affect cell adhesion and migration.

Reviewer II: The authors make reference to single tethering events and the recording of such. However, it seems unlikely that the system is suitable to monitor the slipping of single integrin bonds, and the frequency of the jumping events is extremely low. It seems more likely that these observed jumps represent the breaking of adhesion of large microscale cellular regions, such as the leading edge. Please comment.

Authors: These ‘unbinding events’ are attributed to the unbinding of adhesive units, which could be individual or small aggregates of receptors, e.g. integrins, from the substrate. In these tethering events, adhesive units are pulled away from the cell cortex at the tip of a membrane tether, which could extend over tens of microns. For further reading see, for example, Friedrichs et al. (2010).

Reviewer III: The authors state that repeated measurements on the same cell can be considered as “semi”-independent measurements”. What precisely does this term mean and how did the authors test their data for independence? It would be of interest to report on the degree of autocorrelation of measures made sequentially on the

Discussion with Reviewers

Reviewer I: Would the authors see their AFM method extended to other cell types, such as cells involved in the immune response to implants?

Authors: The AFM method is being applied to study adhesion in many cell types, for example, CHO cells, HUVEC cells, Jurkat cells, etc. A nice overview of cells being studied by single-cell force spectroscopy (SCFS) is given in Table 1 of Helenius et al. (2008). Moreover, in a previous study we analysed the effect of nanogrooves on macrophage behaviour and observed that the behaviour is very different from osteoblasts (Lamers et al., 2011a). In this particular study we observed that nanogrooves control the behaviour of the immune response both in vitro and in vivo. Possibly, the initial adhesion of an immune cell is a determining factor for controlling the immune response.

Reviewer I: Could the authors envisage the AFM method to be applied dynamically in such a way that mechanical stimulation could be measured?

Authors: The versatility of AFM could definitely open up the way to mechanically stimulate cells by nanomanipulation and study responses of cell dynamics, such as envisioned in Helenius et al. (2008).

Reviewer II: The authors state that cell adhesion is increased on wider grooves. This may be due to increased surface area as cells are able to interact with the grooves and ridges, while cellular interaction within narrower grooves may be perturbed so reducing cell/substrate contact. Have the authors established which groove widths facilitate cellular infiltration?

Authors: Recently, we analysed the interface interactions between cells and nanogrooved surfaces (Lamers et al., 2011b) by creating cross sections through freshly frozen samples, using a novel technique, cryo DualBeam FIB-SEM. This study demonstrated that cells are able to descend into groove with a width of 150 nm. Thus far we have not been able to analyse whether cells are able to infiltrate into smaller grooves, however this would be very interesting to know as this factor can significantly affect cell adhesion and migration.

Reviewer II: The authors make reference to single tethering events and the recording of such. However, it seems unlikely that the system is suitable to monitor the slipping of single integrin bonds, and the frequency of the jumping events is extremely low. It seems more likely that these observed jumps represent the breaking of adhesion of large microscale cellular regions, such as the leading edge. Please comment.

Authors: These ‘unbinding events’ are attributed to the unbinding of adhesive units, which could be individual or small aggregates of receptors, e.g. integrins, from the substrate. In these tethering events, adhesive units are pulled away from the cell cortex at the tip of a membrane tether, which could extend over tens of microns. For further reading see, for example, Friedrichs et al. (2010).

Reviewer III: The authors state that repeated measurements on the same cell can be considered as “semi”-independent measurements”. What precisely does this term mean and how did the authors test their data for independence? It would be of interest to report on the degree of autocorrelation of measures made sequentially on the
same cell to help assess whether the measurements are independent and, if not, are there any trends in the parameters. For example, do the values depend on the number of times a cell has been tested?

Authors: In order to prevent a possible problem of autocorrelation between measurements, we measured the different groove patterns in random order within each cell. Furthermore, several measurements on groove patterns were duplicated in order to confirm the absence of autocorrelation. When changes in detachment forces within these replicates were observed, the measurements were aborted and a new cell was selected for measurements. We performed a Durbin-Watson test to analyse whether the repeated measurements were independent. For force measurements in the presence of 1 % FCS, the Durbin-Watson test demonstrated that repeated measurements were fully independent (even on groove patterns). An analysis of the grooves with each cell separately showed that also the duplicated measurements did not induce any autocorrelation effect. For force measurements in the presence of 10 % FCS, however, the Durbin-Watson test demonstrated that outcomes were dependent on groove pattern. An analysis on the autocorrelation within detachment forces on each groove separately, however, demonstrated that the measurements were fully independent. The difference between the 1 % FCS and 10 % FCS groups can be explained by the differences in adhesion strength between the two groups. In addition, larger differences in adhesion forces between the grooves were observed in the presence of 10 % FCS.

Reviewer III: Could the authors discuss the fact that their methods are such that groove pitch correlates with groove depth. For example the 1000 nm pitch is \( \approx 160 \) nm deep whereas the 150 nm pitch is only \( \approx 33 \) nm deep - a five-fold difference. How should readers interpret the data? Are the effects produced by groove pitch or groove depth, or interaction of these two parameters?

Authors: We fully agree with the reviewer that ideally we would like to keep the patterns at a constant depth independent of the pitch, however due to the technical limitations this is currently not possible. In our previous study we demonstrated that groove depth increased linearly with the groove width with an average ratio of approximately 2.5 at a \( R^2 \) of 0.96 (Lamers et al., 2011a). In this study we used a multipatterned substrate with similar dimensions, and the correlation between groove depth and width is 0.92. In another recently published study we analysed the effect of groove depth on cell behaviour (Lamers et al., 2010b) and demonstrated that groove depth indeed affects cell behaviour, however, to a minor extent compared to the groove width.

Reviewer III: The effects on adhesion and migration reported by the authors are modest. Could the authors comment on the likely effects of these nanoscale features on cell behaviour when the cells simultaneously encounter microscale features.

Authors: The reported effects on initial cell adhesion are indeed modest. In vivo, tissues and organs have many different cues to which cells respond, both in the micro- and nanoscale, as well as mechanical cues. In the current study the interaction between micro- and nanoscale topographies have not been analysed. However, previously we have performed studies on the effect of cell behaviour on the interaction between nanoscale patterns and mechanical stimulation (Prodanov et al., 2009). The amount of such multifactorial models is growing and the number of these studies will further increase in the future. It would also be very interesting to analyse the combined effects of both patterns on one substrate not only in vitro, but also in vivo. Supramicrometer structures probably have more influence on the mechanical retention and initial stability on implants. In contrast, currently available literature demonstrates that submicro- or nanoscale topographies have a more significant effect on functional cell behaviour (see for example Lamers et al., 2010b and McMurray et al., 2011).
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