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ABSTRACT

Extracellular vesicles (EVs) mediate normal physiological homeostasis and pathological processes by facilitating intercellular communication. Research of EVs in basic science and clinical settings requires both methodological standardization and development of reference materials (RM). Here, we show insights and results of biological RM development for EV studies. We used a three-step approach to find and develop a biological RM. First, a literature search was done to find candidates for biological RMs. Second, a questionnaire was sent to EV researchers querying the preferences for RM and their use. Third, a biological RM was selected, developed, characterized, and evaluated.

The responses to the survey demonstrated a clear and recognized need for RM optimized for the calibration of EV measurements. Based on the literature, naturally occurring and produced biological RM, such as virus particles and liposomes, were proposed as RM. However, none of these candidate RMs have properties completely matching those of EVs, such as size and refractive index distribution. Therefore, we evaluated the use of nanoerythrosomes (NanoE), vesicles produced from erythrocytes, as a potential biological RM. The strength of NanoE is their resemblance to EVs. Compared to the erythrocyte-derived EVs (eryEVs), NanoE have similar morphology, a similar refractive index (1.37), larger diameter (70% of the NanoE are over 200 nm), and increased positive staining for CD235a and lipids (Di-I-ANEPPS) (58% and 67% in NanoE vs. 21% and 45% in eryEVs, respectively).

Altogether, our results highlight the general need to develop and validate new RM with similar physical and biochemical properties as EVs to standardize EV measurements between instruments and laboratories.

© 2016 The Authors. Published by Elsevier B.V. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).

1. Introduction

Extracellular vesicles (EVs) are lipid bilayer surrounded particles that contain proteins, lipids, metabolites, and nucleic acids (Yanez-Mo et al., 2015). EVs are produced by most cells, including bacteria and plant cells, making cross-kingdom communication possible (Samuel et al., 2015). EVs have active physiological and pathophysiological roles and they are functional components of intercellular communication, thereby offering possibilities in the development of therapy and diagnostics, or collectively, theranostics (Fais et al., 2016). EVs are often classified into exosomes and microvesicles based on size and the route of formation, but increasing data have revealed this to be an oversimplification, since the isolated populations are heterogeneous and have overlapping properties including size, density, and molecular markers (van der Pol et al., 2016).

The molecular content and concentrations of EVs in human body fluids have raised increasing interest for their use as biomarkers (Fais et al., 2016). A biomarker based on EVs has not yet been realized, partly due to the lack of standardization. Standardization is difficult because the calibration of instruments, the interpretation and validation of results, and the comparison of measurements require a reference material (RM) with physical properties equal to EVs. One of the most analyzed property of an EV sample is the concentration. However, the measured EV concentration depends on the physical properties of EVs, such as the size distribution and refractive index (RI), complicating the analysis, as explained below.

EVs smaller than 300 nm constitute the majority of EV population (Aatonen et al., 2014; Arraud et al., 2014; Dragovic et al., 2011, 2013; Gercel-Taylor et al., 2012; Varga et al., 2014; Yoshioka et al., 2013). Typical size distributions of EVs start at ~30 nm, show a peak at a...
diameter < 100 nm, and follow a decreasing power-law function or exponential function for diameters > 100 nm (Fraiakin et al., 2011; van der Pol et al., 2016). With the exception of transmission electron microscopy (TEM), none of the current analytical methods are able to detect the entire population of EVs (van der Pol et al., 2016). The inability to detect the smallest EVs leads to both differences and underestimation of the determined concentration. Consequently, the reported number of EVs in normal human plasma ranges from 10^4 to 10^{12} mL^{-1} (van der Pol et al., 2014a). This 8 orders of magnitude difference in EV concentrations emphasizes the need for standardization.

In flow cytometry, which is one of the most commonly used methods in EV studies (Lacroix et al., 2010), particle detection is often based on light scattering. Because the RI of silica (1.45) and polystyrene beads (1.61) is higher than the mean RI of naturally occurring EVs (~ 1.39), applying a gate on the scatter signals of silica or polystyrene beads will result in erroneous estimations of EV size and concentration (van der Pol et al., 2012, 2014b). For example, a lower size gate set with 200 nm polystyrene beads, which scatter the same amount of light as EVs of ~500 nm (Chandler et al., 2011), leads to the exclusion of EVs between 200 and 500 nm (van der Pol et al., 2014b). Since the concentration of EVs decreases with increasing diameter, a polystyrene size gate generally leads to an underestimation of the actual EV concentration.

With nanoparticle tracking analysis (NTA) the Stokes–Einstein equation is used to derive the hydrodynamic diameter of EVs from their Brownian motion (Dragovic et al., 2011). Although in NTA, the RI of EVs does not affect the measured diameter, the EV size distribution and RI do affect the measured concentration (Filipe et al., 2010), because the measured concentration depends on the brightness of the scattering particle.

Altogether, these examples emphasize the urgent need to develop RM with a similar RI and size distribution, but preferably also with a morphology (for TEM) and zeta potential (for tunable resistive pulse sensing, TRPS) similar to the studied EVs. Ultimately, also other RM properties would match those of EVs, including surface molecules or internal cargo. This is challenging because the development of an optimal RM for EV studies and the analytical methods for their detection are dependent on each other. Further, the different analytical techniques depend on different properties of EVs (Table 1). In this study, we took a three-step approach to develop RM for EV studies: a literature search was performed to find candidates for biological RM, and then EV researchers were asked for the preferences for RM and their use. Finally, we took a step forward and developed an erythrocyte-derived EV-RM, nanoerythrosomes (NanoE), and evaluated its usability.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diameter</th>
<th>Buoyancy</th>
<th>Charge</th>
<th>Concentration</th>
<th>Membrane proteins</th>
<th>Monodispersity</th>
<th>Refractive index</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Spherical shape</th>
<th>Stiffness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>200 nm</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 nm</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Dependency of the different detection techniques on EV properties and EV sample properties.

2.2. Survey of RM and Their Use in EV Studies

A questionnaire (Appendix 1) was designed to collect the following information: methods in use for the characterization and quantification of EVs, current use of RM, desired and minimal physical and biochemical requirements of RM, and opinions of other potential RM. The questionnaire was sent to 14 stakeholders from the METVES program and 32 collaborators from the Laboratory of Experimental Clinical Chemistry (Academic Medical Center, Amsterdam, Netherlands) working with EVs. Replies were collected from 11/2014 to 12/2014.

2.3. Preparation of RM from Erythrocyte Concentrates

Standard leukocyte-reduced erythrocyte concentrates were used to produce NanoE. Outdated concentrates were obtained from Sanquin (Amsterdam, The Netherlands) and the Finnish Red Cross Blood Service (Helsinki, Finland). Concentrates were handled anonymously, and only concentrates that could not be administered clinically were used as accepted by the Finnish Supervisory Authority for Welfare and Health (Valvira, Finland).

To isolate erythrocyte-derived EVs (eryEVs), 25 mL of the concentrate was diluted with 25 mL of 0.22 μm filtered calcium- and magnesium-free 1× phosphate-buffered saline (PBS [Sigma-Aldrich, St. Louis, MO, USA]) and centrifuged for 20 min at 1560 × g, room temperature (RT) without a brake (Centrifuge 5810 R, Eppendorf, Hamburg, Germany) (Varga et al., 2014). Supernatant was transferred to new tubes and centrifuged 3 times under the same settings. The obtained supernatant was centrifuged for 1 h in 100,000 × g at 4 °C (Optima™ MAX-XP Ultracentrifuge with rotor TLA-55, k-factor 66, Beckman Coulter, Brea, CA, USA), after which the pellet was washed with similar ultracentrifugation. Finally, the pellet was suspended with PBS to the initial volume and aliquoted to 100-μL aliquots for storage at −70 °C (Fig. 1A).

NanoE production was initiated by separating the erythrocytes from the concentrate: 25 mL of concentrate was diluted with 25 mL cold (+4 °C) PBS and centrifuged at 300 × g for 10 min at 4 °C without a brake (Centrifuge 5810 R). The pellet was suspended to an equal volume of cold PBS, centrifuged 1560 × g for 20 min at 4 °C without a brake (Centrifuge 5810 R). The washing was repeated 2 more times. Next, three different disruption methods were evaluated to produce NanoE: Freeze-thawing: 500 μL aliquots of erythrocytes were treated with 3 consecutive freeze–thaw cycles of 5 min in liquid nitrogen and 5 min in 37 °C water bath.

N₂ bomb treatment: 5 mL of erythrocytes were diluted with 10 mL of PBS in 50 mL Falcon tube to facilitate nitrogen access to the cells. The tubes were placed in N₂ bomb (Parr Cell Disruption Bomb, Moline, IL, USA). A pressure of 75 Psi was created using nitrogen and after
in a 50 mL Falcon tube. 30 min, the pressure was gently released and the sample was collected μ100 bath) for 1 h. After the resealing process, the NanoE were aliquoted to μ100 MOPC-21, BD Pharmingen, San Jose, CA, USA). For the Di-8-ANEPPS labeling reaction was stopped by adding 900 μL of cold PBS. The washed pellet was suspended in 100 μL of cold PBS and transferred into 10× volume of PBS. The used NTA instruments were equipped with MS73 microtip and 30 s continuous ultrasonication.

After disruption, the suspensions containing membrane fragments were diluted with an equal volume of cold PBS, and centrifuged for 1560× g at 20 min and + 4 °C without brake (Centrifuge 5810 R) to remove remaining cells and larger fragments. Remnants were washed by transferring 500 μL aliquots of supernatant to Eppendorf tubes, diluting the suspension 1:1 with cold PBS and centrifuging 10 min in 20,000× g for 10 min and + 4 °C without brake (Mikro 200R, Andreas Hettich GmbH & Co. KG, Tuttlingen, Germany). Remnants were washed 3 times by suspending the pellet in 1 mL of cold PBS. The washed pellet was suspended in 100 μL of + 37 °C PBS and transferred into 10× volume of + 37 °C PBS to allow the rescaling process at + 37 °C (water bath) for 1 h. After the rescaling process, the NanoE were aliquoted to 100 μL aliquots and stored in −70 °C.

2.4. Transmission Electron Microscopy

Samples were fixed 30 min in 0.1% (weight/volume, w/v) paraformaldehyde (Electron Microscopy Sciences, Hatfield, PA). Next, a 200-mesh EM copper grid with formvar coating (Electron Microscopy Sciences, Hatfield, PA) was placed on top of a sample (10 μL), and incubated for 7 min at RT. The grids were transferred to 1.75% uranyl acetate (product code #P3000MP [Thermo Fisher, Waltham, MA, USA]) together with Multicolor broad range protein ladder (Thermo Fisher Scientific) and stained in freshly prepared silver nitrate (0.1 g/50 mL [Sigma-Aldrich]) for 1 min. The gel was sensitized using freshly prepared sodium thiosulphate (0.02 g/100 mL) for 10 min in 20% ethanol and 10 min in water. The gel was stained in freshly prepared silver nitrate (0.1 g/50 mL [Sigma-Aldrich]) for 1 min. The gel was sensitized using freshly prepared silver nitrate (0.1 g/50 mL [Sigma-Aldrich]) for 1 min.

2.5. Nanoparticle Tracking Analysis

The same NanoE samples were measured with the instruments LM14C, NS300, and NS500 using the same settings (camera level 8, 3 videos of 90 s, 10,000-fold dilution). Analysis of the acquired videos was performed with threshold 5 and gain 10. The used NTA instruments and their specifications are listed in Table 2. LM14C was also used to study how storage affects the size distribution and the concentration of NanoE. NanoE samples were first measured with NTA immediately after preparation and then up to 10 weeks with biweekly measurements (Supplementary Fig. 1).

2.6. Flow Cytometry

NanoE and eryEVs were characterized using Apogee A50 micro (Apogee Flow Systems, Hertfordshire, UK) equipped with a 405 nm laser for measuring scatter and a 488 nm laser for measuring fluorescence. Fluorescence light was spectrally filtered by bandpass filters (525/50, 575/30), and a long pass filter (650 nm). Particles were labeled with a FITC-labeled anti-CD235a antibody (clone 11EB-7-6, Beckman Coulter, Brea, CA, USA) and a lipid dye Di-8-ANEPPS (Invitrogen, Waltham, MA, USA). For CD235A, the NanoE and eryEVs concentration was ~108 mL−1 as determined by NTA (LM14C). The labeling volume was 100 μL. Possible antibody aggregates were removed before use by centrifuging for 5 min at 18,890× g and 20 °C without brakes, and 10 μL of the antibody was used for each sample. After 30 min incubation in the dark, the labeling reaction was stopped by adding 900 μL of 0.22 μm filtered PBS. IgG1-FITC was used as an isotype control (clone MOPC-21, BD Pharmingen, San Jose, CA, USA). For the Di-8-ANEPPS labeling, 1 μL of 12.5× Di-8-ANEPPS lipid dye preparation (1 μL Di-8-ANEPPS, 6.25 μL pluronic acid (product code #P3000MP [Thermo Fisher, Waltham, MA, USA]), and 5.25 μL mQ water) was added to 200 μL samples of eryEVs and NanoE at a concentration of ~107 mL−1. As free Di-8-ANEPPS aggregates in the buffer, the amount of Di-8-ANEPPS-positive particles in the buffer without EVs was deducted from samples in data analysis. Samples were incubated for at least 30 min, RT, covered from light. For sample detection, large-angle light scattering or small-angle light scattering was used as a trigger and used voltages and thresholds were 320 and 31 for large-angle light scattering and 295 and 14 for small-angle light scattering, respectively. Samples were injected at 4.5 μL/min, data was collected for 120 s for each sample and three washing cycles were performed between the samples. NanoE and eryEVs were additionally compared to bead mixture of silica and polystyrene beads (Apogee Flow Systems).

2.7. SDS-PAGE

The protein compositions of eryEV and NanoE samples were studied by loading equal amounts of 0.3 μg of protein ([determined with bCA kit [Thermo Fisher Scientific]) together with Multicolor broad range protein ladder (Thermo Fisher Scientific) to commercial Mini-Protein TGX 10% gels (BioRad, Hercules, CA, USA). The gels were run with 180 V for 1 h in 1 × Tris/glycine/SDS buffer (BioRad). The gel was fixed (30% ethanol, 0.5% acetic acid [Merck, Kenilworth, NJ, USA]) for 1 h, after which it was rinsed for 10 min in 20% ethanol and 10 min in water. The gel was sensitized using freshly prepared sodium thiosulphate (0.02 g/100 mL [Sigma-Aldrich]) for 1 min. The gel was rinsed twice in water for 20 s and stained in freshly prepared silver nitrate (0.1 g/50 mL [Sigma-Aldrich]) for 1 min.
were prepared as mentioned before (Aatonen et al., 2014). After incubation in stopping solution (50 g/L Tris base [Merck], 2.5% acetic acid [Merck]) for 4 min. The development was stopped with incubation in 37% formaldehyde [Merck], 3 g of potassium carbonate [Sigma-Aldrich], was developed using freshly prepared development solution (70 μg/L rhodamine [Molecular Probes]) for 30 min. The gel was rinsed in water for 10 s, after which it was stored in water. The Western blots were prepared as mentioned before (Aatonen et al., 2014).

2.8. Determination of Refractive Index

The RI of NanoE and eryEVs were determined by independently measuring the diameter and the light scattering power of individual particles with NTA and solving the inverse scattering problem with Mie theory (van der Pol et al., 2014b).

2.9. Statistics

Statistical significance was determined by using two-tailed t-test (GraphPad Prism v.5.0.1.)

3. Results

3.1. Literature Search

Although several studies have characterized and described the use of monodisperse (Lacroix et al., 2010; Chandler et al., 2011; Maas et al., 2015) and bimodal (Nicolet et al., 2016) synthetic RM, the reported use of biological RM is limited (van der Pol et al., 2012; Anon., n.d.-a). The following literature search describes potential, naturally occurring sources. Here, we included particles produced only from biological material including disrupted cells and different lipid constructs (Table 4). The main difference would be their size. By maintaining cultures, the biological RM would be essentially self-generating with affordable and effortless maintenance depending on the used strain. A literature search for non-pathogenic bacteria species, which could be used as biological RM based on their size, suggested several spherically shaped (coccoid) bacteria with reported diameters of <1000 nm (Bae et al., 1972; Balkwill and Casida, 1973; Barbier et al., 1999; Lai et al., 2000; Osburn and Amend, 2011).

3.1.1. Naturally Occurring Sources for Biological RM

Submicron particles with physical and biochemical properties similar to EVs can be isolated from naturally occurring sources. These may include 1) isolated EV populations from e.g. cell cultures, 2) plasma lipoproteins, plant and marine viruses, and 3) small spherically shaped (coccoid) bacteria, or picoplankton (Table 3).

(1) Potential EV sources are in vitro cell cultures (Lazarat-Ibanez et al., 2014), cultures of Dictyostelium discoideum (Tatischeff et al., 2012), therapeutic clinical grade erythrocyte (Varga et al., 2014) and platelet (Black et al., 2015) concentrates, urine (van der Pol et al., 2014a), and outer membrane vesicles produced by bacteria (Biller et al., 2014). Here, the specific advantage is that the obtained RM have enhanced physical and biochemical similarities, including the molecular contents, with actual EVs. These EV sources are thus not only accessible and safe. Thus, well-characterized EVs would also be the perfect EV-RM candidates.

(2) Lipoproteins and viral particles from plant and marine sources are suitable as EV-RM because they have a size distribution overlapping with the bulk of EVs (Aatonen et al., 2014; Arraud et al., 2014; Dragovic et al., 2011; Dragovic et al., 2013; Gercel-Taylor et al., 2012; Varga et al., 2014; Yoshioka et al., 2013; Anon., n.d.-b, n.d.-c; Oster, 1950; van Antwerpen et al., 1999; Sawle et al., 2002; McFarlane et al., 2005) and they do have a relatively small variation in size (van Antwerpen et al., 1999; Sawle et al., 2002; McFarlane et al., 2005; Salpeter and Zilversmit, 1968; Colhoun et al., 2002). However, a major drawback of lipoproteins and viral particles is that the RI of these particles is higher than the RI of EVs, due to their high protein content, a prominent problem especially of protein-enveloped viruses. Another issue of using viral particles is their biosafety, which could be circumvented by producing virus-like particles, i.e. particles lacking the viral genome. The mass production of virus-like particles is possible in plant or insect cells (Machida and Imataka, 2015; Santi et al., 2006).

(3) Another possible source of biological RM are non-pathogenic bacteria and picoplankton, i.e. aquatic organisms of both prokaryotic and eukaryotic origin ranging between 600 nm and 2000 nm in diameter (Anon., n.d.-d). Several non-pathogenic marine bacteria and picoplankton strains exist (personal communication with representatives of Roscoff Culture Collection; Roscoff, France) and can be purchased for culturing. The benefit of cultures of non-pathogenic bacteria and picoplankton is that the cultures could be harnessed into mass production to provide two populations of particles with different size distributions. Bacteria can be used as larger particles (>600 nm) and the corresponding bacteria-derived outer membrane vesicles can be used as smaller particles (<250 nm) (Biller et al., 2014). As outer membrane vesicles have comparable physical and biochemical properties as the bacteria (Biller et al., 2014), the main difference would be their size. By maintaining cultures, the biological RM would be essentially self-generating with affordable and effortless maintenance depending on the used strain. A literature search for non-pathogenic bacteria species, which could be used as biological RM based on their size, suggested several spherically shaped (coccoid) bacteria with reported diameters of <1000 nm (Bae et al., 1972; Balkwill and Casida, 1973; Barbier et al., 1999; Lai et al., 2000; Osburn and Amend, 2011).

3.1.2. Production of Biological RM

Besides harvesting EVs as RM from naturally occurring sources, submicron particles with EV-like properties can be produced from various sources. Here, we included particles produced only from biological materials including disrupted cells and different lipid constructs (Table 4). Biological RM can be produced by disrupting cells to produce small vesicles from the fragments yielding particles with varying diameters (Marchesi and Palade, 1967; Heidrich and Leutner, 1974; Lin and Macey, 1978; Yoon et al., 2015; Jo et al., 2014). The main advantage of using such materials is that the physical and biochemical properties of the obtained RM would better resemble EVs compared to synthetic RM (Yoon et al., 2015; Jo et al., 2014). Erythrocytes are theoretically
**Naturally occurring potential biological reference materials (RM).**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RM</th>
<th>Diameter (nm)</th>
<th>Polydispersity (CV)</th>
<th>RI</th>
<th>Resemblance to EVs</th>
<th>Considerations</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>EVs from</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell lines</td>
<td>30–1000</td>
<td>&gt;20%</td>
<td>~1.38</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>EVs stable for months when stored ~ 80 °C</td>
<td>Lazaro-Ibanez et al. (2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictyostelium discoideum</td>
<td>50–300</td>
<td>35%–70%</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>EVs stable for months when stored ~ 80 °C</td>
<td>Tatischeff et al. (2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erythrocyte or platelet concentrates</td>
<td>10–350</td>
<td>&gt;20%</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>4/5</td>
<td>EVs stable for months when stored ~ 80 °C</td>
<td>Varga et al. (2014), Black et al. (2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyophilized exosomes*</td>
<td>30–100</td>
<td>&gt;20%</td>
<td>1.37–1.39</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Commercially available, can be stored for months</td>
<td>Anon. (n.d.-e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urine</td>
<td>45–500</td>
<td>35%–40%</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>EVs stable for months when stored ~ 80 °C</td>
<td>van der Pol et al. (2014a, 2014b), Tatischeff et al. (2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lipoproteins</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-density lipoproteins</td>
<td>6–15</td>
<td>&gt;–5%</td>
<td>1.45 – 1.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Must be stored under nitrogen or argon, if stored in ~ 4 °C. Can be stored at ~ 80 °C for months</td>
<td>van der Pol et al. (2014b), van Antwerpen et al. (1999), Sawle et al. (2002), McFarlane et al. (2005), Salpeter and Zilversmit (1968), Colhoun et al. (2002), Perisse et al. (2001), Wood et al. (2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-density lipoproteins</td>
<td>18–25</td>
<td>&lt;–10%</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>EVs stable for months when stored ~ 80 °C</td>
<td>van der Pol et al. (2014b), van Antwerpen et al. (1999), Sawle et al. (2002), McFarlane et al. (2005), Salpeter and Zilversmit (1968), Colhoun et al. (2002), Perisse et al. (2001), Wood et al. (2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate-density lipoproteins</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>&lt;–1.5%</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>EVs stable for months when stored ~ 80 °C</td>
<td>van der Pol et al. (2014b), van Antwerpen et al. (1999), Sawle et al. (2002), McFarlane et al. (2005), Salpeter and Zilversmit (1968), Colhoun et al. (2002), Perisse et al. (2001), Wood et al. (2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very low-density lipoproteins</td>
<td>30–80</td>
<td>&lt;20%</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>EVs stable for months when stored ~ 80 °C</td>
<td>van der Pol et al. (2014b), van Antwerpen et al. (1999), Sawle et al. (2002), McFarlane et al. (2005), Salpeter and Zilversmit (1968), Colhoun et al. (2002), Perisse et al. (2001), Wood et al. (2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chylomicrons</td>
<td>200–600</td>
<td>&gt;20%</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>EVs stable for months when stored ~ 80 °C</td>
<td>van der Pol et al. (2014b), van Antwerpen et al. (1999), Sawle et al. (2002), McFarlane et al. (2005), Salpeter and Zilversmit (1968), Colhoun et al. (2002), Perisse et al. (2001), Wood et al. (2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Viral particles from</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine virus species</td>
<td>110–130</td>
<td>&lt;20%</td>
<td>1.52–1.57</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Can be stored for months in ~ 80 °C. No safety restrictions, if particles do not contain genomic material</td>
<td>van der Pol et al. (2014b), van Antwerpen et al. (1999), Sawle et al. (2002), McFarlane et al. (2005), Salpeter and Zilversmit (1968), Colhoun et al. (2002), Perisse et al. (2001), Wood et al. (2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant virus species</td>
<td>20–85</td>
<td>&lt;20%</td>
<td>1.35–1.47**</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Can be stored for months in ~ 80 °C. No safety restrictions, if particles do not contain genomic material</td>
<td>van der Pol et al. (2014b), van Antwerpen et al. (1999), Sawle et al. (2002), McFarlane et al. (2005), Salpeter and Zilversmit (1968), Colhoun et al. (2002), Perisse et al. (2001), Wood et al. (2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cocoid-shaped organisms</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatic bacteria/picoc (phyto)plankton</td>
<td>300–1000</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1.35–1.47**</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Can be stored for months in ~ 80 °C. No safety restrictions, if particles do not contain genomic material.</td>
<td>van der Pol et al. (2014b), van Antwerpen et al. (1999), Sawle et al. (2002), McFarlane et al. (2005), Salpeter and Zilversmit (1968), Colhoun et al. (2002), Perisse et al. (2001), Wood et al. (2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nanobacteria from soil</td>
<td>200–1000</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Can be stored for months in ~ 80 °C. No safety restrictions, if particles do not contain genomic material.</td>
<td>van der Pol et al. (2014b), van Antwerpen et al. (1999), Sawle et al. (2002), McFarlane et al. (2005), Salpeter and Zilversmit (1968), Colhoun et al. (2002), Perisse et al. (2001), Wood et al. (2006)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RM were categorized according to size, polydispersity, refractive index (RI), and the resemblance to the EVs. Resemblance to EVs was scored on 1–5 points depending on whether the RM has (1) no resemblance, (2) proteins and genomic material but no lipid membrane, (3) phospholipid membrane, (4) phospholipid membrane containing proteins, or (5) phospholipid membrane containing proteins and genomic material. * = Exosomes from HansaBiomed, Tallinn, Estonia. ** = Values based on the references and the refractive index of water at 488 nm.

**Produced biological reference materials (RM).** RM were categorized according to size, polydispersity, refractive index (RI), and the resemblance to the EVs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RM</th>
<th>Diameter (nm)</th>
<th>Polydispersity (CV)</th>
<th>RI</th>
<th>Resemblance to EVs</th>
<th>Considerations</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disrupted cells</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation method A</td>
<td>~200</td>
<td>&gt;20%</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Marchesi and Palade (1967)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation method C</td>
<td>100–5000</td>
<td>&gt;20%</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Lin and Macey (1978)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation method D</td>
<td>100–3000</td>
<td>20%–35%</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Yoon et al. (2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation method E</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Jo et al. (2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lipid constructs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liposomes</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>&lt;5%</td>
<td>1.363–1.392</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Lapinski et al. (2007), Matsuizuki et al. (2000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liposomes (commercially available*)</td>
<td>100 and 500</td>
<td>&lt;20% for smaller particles, &gt;20% for bigger particles</td>
<td>Varies with used buffer</td>
<td>3–5</td>
<td>Can be stored at least 12 months</td>
<td>Anon., (n.d.-f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lipoparticles**</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>3–4</td>
<td>Can be stored for 18 months</td>
<td>Anon. (n.d.-g)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil droplets***</td>
<td>&lt;100</td>
<td>&lt;20%</td>
<td>Engineered to preferred RI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Can be stored at least 12 months</td>
<td>Anon. (n.d.-h, n.d.-i)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Resemblance to EVs was scored from 1 to 5 points depending on whether the RM has (1) no resemblance, (2) proteins and genomic material but no lipid membrane, (3) phospholipid membrane, (4) phospholipid membrane containing proteins, or (5) phospholipid membrane containing proteins and genomic material. * = Liposomes from Excytex, Zeist, The Netherlands; ** = lipoparticles from Integral Molecular, Philadelphia, PA, USA; *** = oil from Apogee Flow Systems, Hertfordshire, UK or Cargille Laboratories, Cedar Grove, NJ, USA.
methods for erythrocyte disruption were compared, and a method for NanoE production was developed (Fig. 1B). An additional advantage of using erythrocytes is that they can be used to produce two types of biological RM for comparison: 1) by disrupting the erythrocytes NanoE are formed, and 2) by harvesting the spontaneously shed eryEVs.

Biological RM can also be obtained from lipid constructs such as liposomes that are extensively used as delivery vehicles (Allen and Cullis, 2004; van der Meel et al., 2014) and their production methods are well known. Liposomes of a desired size can be prepared by ultrasonication or extrusion of the starting material through polycarbonate filters of a set pore size (Lapinski et al., 2007; Akbarzadeh et al., 2013). As the liposomes are produced from bulk material, their composition is well characterized. Especially, liposomes with a small diameter (~70 nm) prepared by extrusion have ~20% variation in size (CV, ratio of the standard deviation to the mean, expressed as percentage) (Garcia-Diez et al., 2016). An advantage of liposomes is that their RI can be manipulated during the production (Fenzl et al., 2015). Another type of RM resembling liposomes are non-infectious virus-like particles called lipoparticles, which consist of a lipid membrane constructed on top of a protein core. These lipoparticles have a well-defined diameter of ~190 nm with a narrow size distribution (CV = 13%), and they are stable during storage. On request, additional proteins could be attached to the lipoparticle surface, which will increase their biochemical similarity to EVs.

Finally, as a non-biological exception, we include oil droplets as one option of a produced RM because they would offer close similarity with EVs regarding the size and RI. As with liposomes, extrusion can be used to prepare oil droplets of a specific size from oils of commercial providers. The advantage of using oil droplets is that the RI can be designed exactly, thus improving their resemblance to EVs (personal communication with Oliver Kenyon, CEO of Apogee Flow Systems, Hertfordshire, UK and representatives of Cargille Laboratories, Cedar Grove, NJ, USA).

3.2. Survey

The literature search revealed several different types of RM, which had varying benefits and drawbacks. Therefore, the opinions of laboratories working with EVs were surveyed through a questionnaire to discover the requirements of biological RM by the end-users. A questionnaire (Appendix 1) was sent to 46 laboratories and the response rate was 44%. Flow cytometry was indicated as the most common method for EV studies (90% of the responders; Fig. 2A),

---

**Fig. 2.** Results from 46 EV laboratories based on a questionnaire asking (A) which techniques were in use for EV studies (multiple choices allowed); (B) currently used RM; (C) preferred properties for optimal RM; (D) minimal requirements for a RM; and (E) willingness to use plant viruses/marine bacteria as a RM. Values represent mean ± S.D. Published previously (in www.metves.eu), reproduced with permission. NTA = nanoparticle tracking analysis; PCR = polymerase chain reaction.
underlining the need for a RM with a size and RI distribution resembling EVs. Besides using functional assays (50%), dynamic light scattering/NTA (35%), electron microscopy (25%), and Western blotting (25%) were listed as the most commonly used techniques for EV studies (Fig. 2A). When laboratories were asked whether they have used an RM in their studies, the majority reported using synthetic RM (58%), 5% used biological RM, and 16% used both. However, 20% used no RM in their EV studies (Fig. 2B).

The laboratories were asked to rank the order of importance regarding the desired properties, i.e. the biochemical composition, monodispersity, price, refractive index, and safety. The biochemical composition (average rank of 4.33/6) and stability (average rank of 4.25/6) were indicated as the most important properties (Fig. 2C). Next, price, RI, and safety were listed with an almost equal importance (average ranks of 3.13/6, 3.21/6, and 3.20/6, respectively), whilst monodispersity was considered as the least important property (average rank of 2.90/6) (Fig. 2C). Regarding the requirements for the structural properties, 50% of the laboratories working with EVs would be satisfied if the RM would contain a phospholipid membrane, 30% would additionally require proteins, and 20% would require a phospholipid membrane and the presence of both proteins and genomic material (Fig. 2D). Finally, 60% would be willing to use plant viruses and marine bacteria as RM, provided that their biosafety can be assured (Fig. 2E).

### 3.3. NanoE Production

NanoE were selected as a biological RM candidate, based on the literature review and the survey responses. Three erythrocyte disruption methods (freeze–thaw cycles, N₂ bomb, and ultrasonication) were tested in the NanoE production. Freeze–thaw cycles did not break down the erythrocytes sufficiently, as seen in TEM micrographs (Fig. 3A), although the treatment made the erythrocytes leaky, resulting in white erythrocyte ghosts. Furthermore, the number of submicron particles was almost non-existent (Fig. 3B). Disruption using an N₂ bomb resulted in either intact or completely shattered erythrocytes (Fig. 3C), and similar to the freeze–thaw treatment, submicron particles were almost non-existent (Fig. 3D). Finally, ultrasonication disrupted erythrocytes almost completely (Fig. 3E), producing a concentration of submicron particles higher than the application of freeze–thaw cycles or an N₂ bomb (Fig. 3F). Despite using different ultrasonicators, the size distribution profile of the produced NanoE was similar (data not shown). Extending the length of the ultrasonication treatment from 30 s to 45 s decreased the final particle concentration without affecting the size distribution (Fig. 3G and H). Based on the results, an additional washing step was included in the final protocol to remove any remaining intact cells and larger cell fragments, seen especially in freeze–thaw cycle and N₂ bomb disruptions.

### 3.4. EryEVs vs. NanoE

To examine the usability of NanoE as RM, their physical and biochemical properties were compared with the naturally occurring eryEVs from the same concentrate. The morphology of eryEVs and NanoE was similar as inspected by TEM (Fig. 4A and B). Also, the RI distribution and mean RI (1.37) measured by NTA were similar for eryEVs and NanoE (Fig. 4C). The protein content of NanoE was considerably different from eryEVs as shown by SDS–PAGE (Fig. 4D). Enriched proteins in Western blotting of NanoE vs. eryEVs were, e.g. hemoglobin and Band 3 (data not shown). The size of NanoE was slightly greater than that of eryEVs: 66% of the NanoE population was larger than 200 nm, and the main population (58%) was between 200 and 400 nm, whereas only <30% of eryEVs were larger than 200 nm when determined by NTA (Fig. 4E). The difference in size distribution was also observed in flow cytometry, where a majority of NanoE were found in the same area as 180 nm silica beads in contrast to the smaller eryEVs (Fig. 4F).

Next, flow cytometry was used to determine the fraction of Di-8-ANEPPS positivity and CD235a antigen density of eryEVs and NanoE. Lipid labeling of NanoE by Di-8-ANEPPS showed a higher percentage of labeled particles compared to the eryEVs (67% vs. 45% respectively, \( p < 0.05 \), Fig. 5). Similarly, the CD235a labeling was significantly higher for NanoE than for eryEVs (58% vs. 21%, respectively, \( p < 0.0001 \), Fig. 6, fluorescence intensity 68.3 ± 21.6 vs. 40.5 ± 13.0).

### 3.5. Application of NanoE as a Biological RM to Standardize EV Measurements

To demonstrate the relevance of using a biological RM for the standardization of EV measurements, NanoE was analyzed using three different NTA instruments. The same batch of NanoE was measured using the same settings optimized for the LM14C instrument, which were then applied during measurements with NTA models NS300 and NS500. The size distribution of the detected particles was similar.
among the used NTA instruments, with the majority of particles (~60%) ranging from 200 to 400 nm in diameter (Fig. 7A). However, although the same NanoE concentrations were expected to be measured, the obtained NanoE concentrations varied ~40-fold among the different instruments (Fig. 7B).

4. Discussion and Conclusions

The development of RM for EVs is tightly intertwined with the development of the EV analysis methods as both feed each other’s advancement. Although progress has been made with different sizes of monodisperse nanoparticles (van der Pol et al., 2014b; Wang et al., 2008), the analyses of complex mixtures of polydisperse particles are challenging (van der Pol et al., 2016). The European Metrology Research Program has initiated important standardization work in anticipation of the rapid momentum of the EV research field and therefore funded METVES, a program focused on metrological characterization of EVs from body fluids. In collaboration with METVES, this study was performed by a national EV research platform funded as an initiative of a Finnish industry- and university-driven research program SalWe-GID, through which multiple end-users are interested in the EV standardization for their improved utilization. The progress in METVES on synthetic RM and the applicable methods for their analysis encouraged us to try to foresee the further needs for biological EV-resembling RM. In order to
gain information on these, a survey was launched. Based on the survey, flow cytometry and synthetic RM were indicated as the most used combination in EV studies, which underpins the problems of RM development. Especially with the combination in EV studies, the problems of RM development require ultrasonication to disrupt erythrocytes, a method previously used to produce submicron particles from lipids (Lapinski et al., 2007). Upon resealing, the produced particles resembled eryEVs regarding their morphology and RI. The larger size and the enhanced CD235a positivity may be explained by the instantaneous disruption of erythrocytes, where no selection of surface proteins occurs compared to natural EV budding (Dragovic et al., 2013). This was also supported by the differences of the total protein composition of NanoE and EryEVs. A drawback of NanoE may thus be that since they do not expose common EV surface markers such as CD9, CD63, or CD81 (Yoshioka et al., 2013; Andreu and Yanez-Mo, 2014) nor significant amounts of genomic material, they will not be applicable as RM for methods using these properties as the basis of the analysis. However, the lack of typical EV markers and expression of erythrocyte-specific marker CD235a would enable spiking of EV samples with NanoE, which might be useful in the quantification of EVs from different sources. As such, NanoE can already be utilized as an RM for NTA, TRPS, and flow cytometry.

Comparing the properties of NanoE with those indicated by the survey, NanoE have a matching RI and contain phospholipid membrane and proteins; criteria which fulfill the needs of the majority of the participating EV laboratories. Furthermore, NanoE are relatively stable, safe, and cheap to produce in large quantities from surplus clinical grade erythrocyte concentrates. Although the NanoE population cannot be described as monodisperse, out of the desired properties, monodispersity was ranked as the least important. Monodispersity could be substantially improved by additional preparative steps, thereby allowing the isolation of populations with a narrow size range using different filtration (Zinsser and Tang, 1927), chromatographic (Boing et al., 2014), microfluidics (Ashcroft et al., 2012; Lee et al., 2015), or field-flow fractionation (Petersen et al., 2014; Agarwal et al., 2015) methods. Provided that a monodisperse biological RM could be produced in the future, further characterization by methods such as small-angle X-ray scattering could be, at least hypothetically, used to generate “traceable measurements”, i.e. measurements that could ultimately be related to the SI unit (in this case “metre”) through an unbroken chain of comparisons with known uncertainties (Varga et al., 2014). More realistically, the following step in the development of similarly equivalent standards with NanoE would be the mechanical disruption of platelets or cells from immortalized cell cultures to produce biological RM that would better resemble multiple EV properties, including EV surface markers and internal cargo, and could then be utilized by multiple analytical approaches.

To demonstrate the relevance of biological RM for the standardization of EV measurements, we measured the same batch of NanoE using the same settings on different NTA instruments. The size of the analysis. However, the lack of typical EV markers and expression of erythrocyte-specific marker CD235a would enable spiking of EV samples with NanoE, which might be useful in the quantification of EVs from different sources. As such, NanoE can already be utilized as an RM for NTA, TRPS, and flow cytometry.

Fig. 5. (A) Apogee A50 dot plots showing the Di-8-ANEPPS labeling of erythrocyte-derived EVs (eryEVs) and nanoerythrosomes (NanoE) compared to negative controls; (B) datagram showing the Di-8-ANEPPS labeling of eryEVs and NanoE compared to negative control; and (C) comparison of Di-8-ANEPPS labeling of eryEVs and NanoE. Values represent mean ± S.D., n = 6, * = p < 0.05.
distribution of the detected particles was similar, but the obtained NanoE concentrations varied ~40-fold among the NTA instruments, which emphasizes the importance of using an EV-RM. The particle concentration measured by NTA is assumed to be proportional to the mean number of scattering particles in the field-of-view of the microscope, which depends on the intensity and wavelength of the illumination, collection angles of the objective, the sensitivity of the camera with the applied settings (Maas et al., 2015; Gardiner et al., 2013), the analysis software, and the brightness of the scattering particles, which in turn depends on the particle size, refractive index, and concentration (due to multiple and dependent scattering). The differences in the particle concentrations obtained with similar NTA instruments are caused by an inappropriate calibration factor between the mean number of scattering particles in the field-of-view and the provided concentration.

Fig. 6. (A) Apogee A50 dot plots showing CD235a-labeling of erythrocyte-derived EVs (eryEVs) and nanoerythrosomes (NanoE); (B) a datagram showing CD235a-labeling of eryEVs and NanoE; and (C) comparison of CD235a-labeling of eryEVs and NanoE. Values represent mean ± S.D., n = 6, *** = p < 0.0001.
and a lack of knowledge on the diameter of the smallest detectable EVs. Once the concentration of the NanoE can be measured in a traceable way, NanoE can be used to calibrate NTA instruments, i.e., relating the mean number of scattering particles in the field-of-view of NTA to the traceably measured concentration, and defining the smallest detectable EV diameter. In analogy to NTA, other instruments can be calibrated with NanoE to improve the measurement quality within each laboratory. Despite the challenges, EV quantification by particle enumeration is, in most cases, a more accurate way of comparing samples than any indirect EV quantification method such as determination of protein content. The protein content of an EV sample may be independent of the particle number and can vary with the cell activation (Aatonen et al., 2014), the used cell line (Lazaro-Ibanez et al., 2014), and the method by which the protein content is measured (Okutucu et al., 2007). Therefore, direct particle measurements should be favoured in the case of EV quantification and the expressed concentration should be coupled with the knowledge of the detection limits of the instruments/method.

A summary of the optimal properties of a biological RM is presented in Fig. 8, based on the collected information gathered during this study. However, although desirable, it is unlikely that one biological RM would be applicable, not to mention optimal, for all different measurement techniques due to the vast variation in the detection methods (Table 1). Therefore, the search for an optimal biological RM should be approached from a technical perspective, research focus, and considering the EV material. Still, the development of such materials will not be easy.

As the research on EVs progresses, and the use of EVs is pursued in clinical assays and for theranostics, it is crucial to develop various RM to enable precise and reproducible measurements. This will most likely be first achieved by the use of synthetic RM in flow cytometry and in the techniques for EV enumeration. However, the simultaneous development of biological RM would clearly provide additional benefits to the field. Where synthetic RM could be useful for instrument calibration, biological RM could be used for validation of EV measurements. By spreading the RM for common use, the repeatability of studies and the reliability of data will be increased, which in turn will increase the transparency of EV research and improve standardization. Since the discovery of new biological RM for EV studies is a laborious task, it requires the united work of all laboratories and openness. Research networks such as the MEHAD (Extracellular Vesicles in Health and Disease, COST Action BM 1202) and metrological initiatives such as those conducted by METVES, are in a crucial position to take this endeavor to the next level, but ultimately, it is the interest and responsibility of all EV researchers to make this possible.

Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>eryEVs</td>
<td>erythrocyte-derived extracellular vesicle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVs</td>
<td>extracellular vesicle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTA</td>
<td>nanoparticle tracking analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NanoE</td>
<td>nanoerythrosome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBS</td>
<td>phosphate-buffered saline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI</td>
<td>refractive index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM</td>
<td>reference material</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEM</td>
<td>transmission electron microscopy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRPS</td>
<td>tunable resistive pulse sensing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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