

Tissue Standards for Aging Research

Abstract:

A good loading control is critical for accurate comparison of tissue protein levels in aged and young tissue. After reviewing the literature we discovered that the housekeeping proteins commonly used in Western analysis had significant drawbacks. The purpose of this study was to evaluate the linearity and reproducibility of common housekeeping proteins tubulin, actin, and GAPDH compared to measures of total protein staining using Direct Blue and Stain Free gels. We found that measurements of total protein staining were superior to housekeeping proteins for use as a loading control in young and old mouse, liver, heart, and brain. Among the total protein staining methods, Stain Free gels were superior to Direct Blue. **The best overall loading control in all tissues, at both ages, was the Stain Free method.**

Abbreviations

CoV, coefficient of variation; R^2 , coefficient of determination

Keywords

Aging research, Data normalization, Housekeeping proteins, Loading control, Protein electrophoresis, Protein standards, Stain-Free technology, Total protein blot stain, Western blotting

1. Introduction

Proteomics is rapidly changing the way we define gross biological changes; and we use gene expression profiling to tract expression of particular proteins in animals as they age. These experiments typically entail preparing tissue or cell lysates from mice of various ages, and analyzing them by Western blotting. The intensity of a Western signal is then compared in animals of various ages. Although this seems like a straightforward analysis, the key to getting sound data should be no surprise—is a good loading control.

What are the properties of a “good” loading control? It must show whether each lane has loaded the same amount of tissue or cell lysate; and, for our experiments, it must be unaffected by aging and experimental conditions. It also must be simple to use and not interfere with downstream applications. It should be expressed uniformly in various tissues; the signal intensity must rise linearly in the range of extract loaded (difficult if the loading control is a highly expressed housekeeping gene and the protein of interest is expressed at a low level); the molecular weight must differ enough from the target protein that the bands are distinct, and yet similar enough to correct for possible differences in transfer efficiency. Finally, the control and experimental proteins should share the same subcellular compartment.

During our literature search for the best loading control we found that the most oft used control for loading typically entails normalizing to a Western signal from one of three common housekeeping proteins. While some studies have suggested that, in principle, normalizing to any housekeeping protein has multiple drawbacks (Neill, 2009, Ruan and Lai, 2007), most studies have examined the applicability of each of the housekeeping proteins individually.

Actin has often been used as a standard housekeeping protein and its linearity was comparable to reversible ponceau staining for total protein in colon, liver and kidney (Romero-Calvo et al. , 2010). Studies have demonstrated that in some tissues such as the retina, spinal cord, and skeletal muscle it has the smallest variation among housekeeping proteins, while in other tissues, even closely related tissues such as the brain, it has the highest variation among housekeeping proteins (Calvo et al. , 2008, Colella et al. , 2012). This was confirmed by another group where researchers found that brain lysates using actin as a loading control revealed both high variation and poor linearity (Aldridge et al. , 2008). Others have argued that actin performs poorly when comparing samples between different animals or tissue culture conditions, because of the high variation based upon both animal sex, injury, and biochemical stimuli (Derks et al. , 2008, Liu and Xu, 2006, Ruan and Lai, 2007). It also performed poorly in tissue culture, and as increasing amounts of human breast adenocarcinoma blotted, actin demonstrated no correlation between blot level and protein levels (Dittmer and Dittmer, 2006).

GAPDH is another highly used housekeeping protein, however caution should be used when studying protein degradation, as we do, since GAPDH is a targeted autophagy substrate and levels will be artificially reduced when autophagy is stimulated (Cuervo and Dice, 2000, Derks, Muller, 2008, Kaushik et al. , 2011, Kaushik and Cuervo, 2008). Because GAPDH is a glycolytic enzyme, levels may also be altered by conditions that increase glycolytic enzymes, i.e., the Warburg effect (Ferguson et al. , 2005). In studies of brain tissue GAPDH levels had virtually no correlation with protein levels (Aldridge, Podrebarac, 2008). In contrast, others have found GAPDH to have low levels of variation in brain tissue, but unacceptable levels in other tissues such as spinal cord or skeletal muscle (Calvo, Moreno-Igoa, 2008). Its signal also saturates early in tissue culture. Compared to Coomassie staining for total protein, GAPDH signals saturate very early at 5µg of human squamous cell carcinoma cell lysate(Welinder and

Ekblad, 2011). It also shows variability dependent upon cell density, GAPDH increased up to 3-fold with increasing cell confluence (Greer et al. , 2010).

Tubulin completes the list of highly used housekeeping proteins. Caution should be used when studying aging as tubulin levels are known to change with age and phosphorylation of tubulin increases with age which may affect both the location of the band on a gel and antibody binding (Ding and Kopchick, 2011, Hungen et al. , 1981). Overall when comparing multiple tissues, tubulin demonstrated the highest variability (Ferguson, Carroll, 2005). Tubulin is an excellent loading control in some tissues, but has very high variation in other tissues (Calvo, Moreno-Igoa, 2008). Tubulin also performed poorly in tissue culture being highly dependent on cell confluence (Greer, Honeywell, 2010).

Finally, there are methods measuring total protein levels. Some are fluorescent based systems such as Stain Free blotting. Compared to densitometry based measurements using Coomassie blue, amido black, or India ink staining , which have a more limited linear range due to saturation constraints imposed by Beer's Law, fluorescent based systems may have an enhanced linear range (Rees and Laurence, 1955). Additionally, Coomassie blue staining demonstrates variability in protein binding and hence higher intrinsic variation (Gürtler et al. , 2013).

To explore these issues we carefully compared the reliability of three popular single protein loading controls: GAPDH, tubulin, and actin, with two Western-based methods of "staining" gels or blots for total protein. This is the largest side by side comparison of housekeeping proteins to total protein staining. Moreover, it is the first to examine these different types of loading controls in multiple tissues. And finally, it is the first study to examine the reliability of these loading control techniques in aging tissues.

2. Materials and Methods

2.1 Tissue Lysates

Mice were housed in controlled temperature rooms with 12-h light/dark cycles with food and water provided ad libitum. All protocols were approved by the University of Iowa Animal Care and Use Committee (ACURF #0609196). Healthy mice determined by visual observation and necropsy used as controls in previous work (Glenn et al. , 2008, Mallinger et al. , 2011, Nelson et al. , 2007) and were anesthetized with Xylocaine/Ketamine, and perfused with cold PBS plus EDTA-free protease inhibitors (Complete, Roche, Alameda, CA). Organs were quick-frozen on dry ice, then 2 mL FLAG lysis buffer, 50 mM Tris pH 7.4, 150 mM NaCl, 1mM EDTA, 1% Triton X-100 containing EDTA-free protease inhibitors plus 0.5% antifoam agent was added per mg of dry weight. The mixture was homogenized on ice, with twenty strokes of a Polytron homogenizer set on "20" power, and spun at 16,000 x G for 50 minutes, to separate the debris. Supernatant was removed and samples frozen in aliquots, at -80°C. The protein concentration of lysate was determined by the Bradford protein assay (Bio-Rad, Hercules, CA). For analysis, samples were thawed, diluted to 1 mg/ml in Laemmli buffer with 10% 2-mercaptoethanol, and resolved by 4-15% SDS-PAGE Criterion Stain-Free gels (Bio-Rad).

2.2 Western Blot Analysis

Gels were transferred to PVDF membranes with a Trans-Blot turbo transfer system (Bio-Rad). Blots were blocked 1 h with 5% nonfat dry milk; then, primary antibody was applied for 1

h at room temperature or overnight at 4 °C. Blots were washed four times with TBS containing 0.1% Triton X-100 and then incubated with peroxidase-conjugated secondary antibody (goat anti-rabbit or goat anti-mouse, 1:10,000; Jackson ImmunoResearch (West Grove, PA) for 1 h at room temperature. Primary antibodies were α -Tubulin (monoclonal, 1:1,000; Sigma T5168), β -Actin (monoclonal, 1:1,000 Sigma A1978) or GAPDH (monoclonal, 1:500; Millipore Mab 3474). Bands were visualized using enhanced chemiluminescence (Perkin Elmer). Images were captured on an Epi-Chemi³ system (UVP, Upland CA). Bands were quantified by Image J software.

2.3 On-blot Total Protein Analysis

For Direct Blue staining, blots were equilibrated in 40% EtOH, 10% acetic acid, and stained with 0.8 mg/ml Direct Blue 71 (Sigma) in 40% EtOH, 10% acetic acid, as described by Hong et al (Hong et al. , 2002, Hong et al. , 2000). For analysis by the Stain Free system, gels and blots were analyzed by the Gel Doc EZ Imager system (Bio-Rad). Image Lab (Bio-Rad) software was used to quantify protein concentration in samples visualized by Direct Blue staining and Stain Free gels.

2.4 Statistical Analysis

To compare young to old tissue, samples from three young male mice (6 months) and three old male mice (18 months) were tested separately. Each mouse sample was run in triplicate on the same 18-well gel, such that no sample was consistently run at the gel edge. At least three gels were run, yielding an n = 27 for both young and old samples. To determine, which protein loading control had changed with age, we determined P values of the sample means using an unpaired, two tailed, students T test.

For linearity analysis, tissue lysates from three young male mice were pooled. Samples containing 10, 20, and 40 μ g of lysate were run in triplicate on the same 12-well gel. Each gel was derived from one tissue type. At least three gels were run for each tissue yielding an n = 9 for the samples. Linear regression analysis to determine the best linear, non-proportional, fit was performed using Excel software.

3. Results

The brain, heart, and liver of three young and old mice were our sources of tissue. These organs were chosen, in part, because they are large and so yield a good amount of lysate. Moreover, each organ responds to aging with distinct gene expression changes: the heart changes significantly, the brain changes moderately, and the liver, comparatively little (Zahn et al. , 2007). Since many studies focus on proteins expressed at relatively low levels, we loaded our gels with moderate amounts of lysate, containing 10, 20, or 40 μ g of protein. This amount allows low-abundance proteins to be transferred and detected in a linear manner without dangers of oversaturation(Mollica et al. , 2009). We used the lowest reported the concentration of antibody, and the shortest possible exposure time, as this is been shown to give most linear results(Dittmer and Dittmer, 2006).This linear curve of various proteins levels also served as our titration curve. Western blots of tubulin, actin, and GAPDH--all housekeeping proteins stably expressed in the aging heart, liver and brain (Zahn, Poosala, 2007), were compared to total protein staining of blots using Direct Blue or Stain Free gels to find the most reliable loading control. α -tubulin was

chosen rather than β -tubulin because it is more abundant in the heart and liver (Lewis et al. , 1985).

For each potential control, we assessed three parameters: 1) the coefficient of variation or CoV, which is the standard deviation of a set of values, divided by the mean--a dimensionless term expressed as percent; 2) the mean difference total signal intensity in young vs. old mice, P values from the unpaired, two tailed, students T test were used to demonstrate which methods perform the best in aging tissue (Derks, Muller, 2008, Gürtler, Kunz, 2013); and 3) the coefficient of determination (R^2), which reflects the goodness of fit of a regression analysis. Because Beer's law is a logarithmic relationship, a linear fit can only be assumed for discrete sections. Hence we chose to use a linear, non-proportional curve fit which other researchers have shown to give more accurate results (Mollica, Oakhill, 2009, Pitre et al. , 2007). Each parameter allows us to consider distinct aspects of each control. For example, a control should be reproducible; thus, on a Western, the intensity of duplicate samples should have a low coefficient of variation (CoV). Since we study aging, samples derived from young and old tissues containing the same amount of total protein, should have equal mean intensity of the loading control. To assess this we arbitrarily set the mean value for young tissue lysate at 1 and calculated fractional change in the mean value for old tissue. Finally, we want our loading control to be useful as a semi-quantitative normalization factor, so we measured the R^2 value. To do this the mean intensities of Western bands loaded at 10, 20 and 40 μ g protein/lane were plotted; and linear regression was used to determine the best fit the R^2 values. The closer the R^2 value to 1.00, the better the control. Using these parameters, we assessed how each control performed in each tissue.

To demonstrate the variation in housekeeping proteins in different tissues we ran a demonstration blot containing 40 μ g of protein from two young and old mice and stained by all of the techniques used in this study. All of the gels used in this study used a single tissue. To visually highlight the remarkable variability in housekeeping protein staining in multiple tissues that we and others described, we ran a demonstration blot. This demonstration blot was to visually reveal the poor performance of tubulin and actin as housekeeping proteins when multiple tissues were compared. This was a demonstration blot, so only a 12 well blot was used with duplicate samples was used, and no Image J analysis or statistical studies were done (Figure 1).

Westerns probing for α -tubulin revealed that α -tubulin was abundant in samples from the brain but not the heart, and scarce in those from the liver (Figure 1), consistent with reports suggesting the amount of soluble tubulin differs by >50-fold in mouse liver and brain (Miller et al. , 1987). β -actin appeared to be abundant in the brain but less so in the liver, and absent in the heart, consistent with others' reports (Ferguson, Carroll, 2005). Only GAPDH was readily detected in all three tissues; however, the expression level was not uniform, consistent with reports that each tissue has a distinctive pattern of GAPDH expression (Zhu et al. , 2008a, Zhu et al. , 2008b).

In liver extracts, the mean tubulin intensity from old mice was almost three fold higher than from young mice; and for both young and old, the CoV of the signal was high. The mean actin signal intensity was also higher in older livers (36%), though the actin CoV was low in both young and old livers. In contrast the mean signal intensities for GAPD, Direct Blue, and Stain Free did not vary with age. The GAPDH signal, however, had a high CoV in old liver (30%), making it unacceptable as a loading control. In contrast, both methods of determining total protein rendered low CoV values (14 to 22%). Moreover, the banding patterns on the gels and

blots were unaffected by age. The P values were best for the Stain Free method. In contrast the P values were the worst for actin, where there was a statistically significant difference between young and old tissues. Overall, in the liver, measurement of total protein by both Direct Blue and Stain Free gels appeared to be the best loading control for comparing young and old hepatic tissue (Table 1).

In liver extracts assessed over a range of protein concentrations, the change in signal intensity of tubulin, actin, GAPDH, Direct Blue, and Stain Free was quite reasonable, as shown by the R^2 values in Table 2. In contrast, the CoV for tubulin, actin, GAPDH, and Direct Blue were high. The high CoVs, were in part due to saturation of the housekeeping protein signal, or in the case of Direct Blue in saturation of some the more abundant protein bands. Only the Stain Free method yielded a small coefficient of variation, over the linear range examined. Hence, when examined over a range of protein concentrations Stain Free staining provides the most linear and proportional loading control in the liver (Table 2). When taken together with the results of comparison of young and old tissue, the Stain Free method was the best loading control for the liver.

In the heart the tubulin signal again increased significantly in the old tissue (2.4 fold), and had a high CoV, regardless of age. The actin signal also again increased moderately, by 40%, in older heart tissue, enough to exclude it as a loading control. Additionally, the CoV for the actin signal was very high in young tissue. Though GAPDH had a small CoV, the signal decreased by 5% in the old heart. The banding pattern revealed by the Direct Blue and Stain Free methods was the same in young and old heart tissue. However, the Direct Blue staining intensity decreased by 13% in older samples and had the highest coefficient of variation. The signal from the Stain Free method was unchanged in young and old heart and had a small CoV, demonstrating it again was the best loading control for comparing young and old cardiac tissue (Table1). The P values obtained where the best for the Stain Free method. The worst performance was by tubulin with where the difference between young and old tissue almost reached statistical significance with a P value of 0.07.

In the heart extracts assessed over a range of protein concentrations the signals from actin, Direct Blue, and stain free all had reasonable R^2 values. In contrast, signals from tubulin and GAPDH had extremely low R^2 values, in part because high expression saturated the signal, so the change in signal intensity was not linear. Tubulin, actin, and GAPDH also had high CoVs. In contrast, both Direct Blue and stain free had low CoVs, making them reasonable loading controls for comparing heart extracts (Table 2). However the poor performance of Direct Blue in young and old tissues limits its use a loading control in the heart. Overall the Stain Free method was the best loading control for heart tissue.

In the brain, assessments of young and old tissue yielded markedly different results. Although the mean tubulin signal again changed the most, this time the expression in older tissue declined (13%), which may reflect loss of α -tubulin isoforms and increase in β -tubulin isoforms (Hungen, Chin, 1981). Additionally, the CoV for tubulin was 28% for both ages. The expression patterns of actin, GAPDH, Direct Blue, and Stain Free were uniform. Additionally, the CoV of all four controls was small, ranging from 6 to 17%, making these equally acceptable as loading controls for the brain. The P values obtained where the best for the Stain Free method. The worst performer in the brain was GAPDH, the P value though poor at 0.32 was not statistically significant.

In brain extracts, low R^2 values were only found for the concentration curves of tubulin, GAPDH, Direct Blue, and Stain Free. The CoV was only acceptable for the Stain Free method, making it the only acceptable method for controlling for brain extracts.

4. Discussion

Studying protein expression in aging tissue can be particularly difficult. Transcriptional profiling of aging tissue indicates significant heterogeneity, with some tissues have little or no changes, while others have dramatic changes (Zahn, Poosala, 2007). Unfortunately there has not been a similar study examining the protein levels. However the results from the transcriptional profiling suggest that there may be a significant heterogeneity among different tissues with age. This is the first study to determine which is the best loading control for aging tissues.

In summary, staining for total protein was the best method for quantifying the amount of lysate loaded. Total protein staining has another advantage, for aging researchers, as will it also measure extracellular protein such as that found in the extracellular matrix. This allows one to examine changes in secreted matrix proteins, a potentially significant source variation in aging (Frantz et al. , 2010, Kurtz and Oh, 2012).

Other groups have come to similar conclusions comparing Westerns of housekeeping proteins to various methods for staining for total protein in cell lysates. Some of the variations in housekeeping protein levels may be due to methods of stripping, or time of exposure to antibody (Colella, Chegenii, 2012). Some studies recommended optimizing each the conditions for the use of each housekeeping protein to determine which housekeeping protein is the appropriate control (Ruan and Lai, 2007).

Total protein stains do not require such an optimization. Staining for total protein has another advantage: the relatively nonspecific probing reveals the overall degradation and quality of a lysate. Among the two methods studied for measuring total proteins there is additional consideration that favors the Stain Free method. The Stain Free signal is florescent, generated by UV light; Direct Blue is a stain, the signal generated by absorbent light. The signal of absorbing stains is saturated at lower concentrations than those of fluorescing stains, such that absorbent light comparisons are generally accurate when signals differ by less than an order of magnitude (Hong, Yoo, 2000, Miller et al. , 2006, Rees and Laurence, 1955). However generating and measuring a fluorescence signal requires additional equipment, a disadvantage for the Stain Free method. Stain Free signals, on the other hand, depend on protein fluorescence and can compare differences of up to two orders of magnitude (Gürtler, Kunz, 2013, Ladner et al. , 2004).

This is the first study to look at such a comprehensive comparison of Stain Free technology to housekeeping proteins. Some of the published literature on Stain Free gels is only descriptive and does not compare Stain Free gels to other methods (Posch et al. , 2013). Another study found Stain Free gels to be superior to the single housekeeping protein studied, GAPDH, but only examined a single tissue culture cell line (Gürtler, Kunz, 2013). Another study found Stain Free gels to be give the best results but only compared it to one alternative from of total protein staining, Sybro Ruby, and one housekeeping protein, actin, in a single tissue, the retina (Colella, Chegenii, 2012). Finally, one study compared Stain Free gels to two methods of total protein staining and to two housekeeping proteins but only examined a single tissue, the brain (Aldridge, Podrebarac, 2008).

Overall, we found that Stain Free gels yielded the lowest CoV, highest R^2 , smallest mean signal variation, making them the best choice for our studies on aging. Moreover, our

careful analysis revealed that the oft used practice of normalizing to Western signals of **housekeeping proteins** is not recommended. If one insists on this method, however, normalizing to a GAPDH signal is the best choice because it varies relatively little (Aldridge, Podrebarac, 2008, Calvo, Moreno-Igoa, 2008, Dittmer and Dittmer, 2006, Ferguson, Carroll, 2005). Still, it would be a poor control for our studies because the GAPDH expression levels change in aging tissue (Hachinohe et al. , 2013). Additionally, compared to using Western analysis of a housekeeping protein, using measurements of total protein are less affected by experimental conditions, cell cycle, or cell density (Greer, Honeywell, 2010, Gürtler, Kunz, 2013, Liu and Xu, 2006, Ruan and Lai, 2007). **The best overall loading control in all tissues, at both ages, was the Stain Free method.**

References

- Aldridge GM, Podrebarac DM, Greenough WT, Weiler IJ. The use of total protein stains as loading controls: an alternative to high-abundance single-protein controls in semi-quantitative immunoblotting. *J Neurosci Methods*. 2008;172:250-4.
- Calvo AC, Moreno-Igoa M, Manzano R, Ordovas L, Yague G, Olivan S, et al. Determination of protein and RNA expression levels of common housekeeping genes in a mouse model of neurodegeneration. *PROTEOMICS*. 2008;8:4338-43.
- Colella AD, Chegenii N, Tea MN, Gibbins IL, Williams KA, Chataway TK. Comparison of Stain-Free gels with traditional immunoblot loading control methodology. *Analytical Biochemistry*. 2012;430:108-10.
- Cuervo AM, Dice JF. Age-related decline in chaperone-mediated autophagy. *J Biol Chem*. 2000;275:31505-13.
- Derks NM, Muller M, Gaszner B, Tilburg-Ouwens DT, Roubos EW, Kozicz LT. Housekeeping genes revisited: different expressions depending on gender, brain area and stressor. *Neuroscience*. 2008;156:305-9.
- Ding J, Kopchick JJ. Plasma biomarkers of mouse aging. *Age*. 2011;33:291-307.
- Dittmer A, Dittmer J. Beta-actin is not a reliable loading control in Western blot analysis. *Electrophoresis*. 2006;27:2844-5.
- Ferguson RE, Carroll HP, Harris A, Maher ER, Selby PJ, Banks RE. Housekeeping proteins: a preliminary study illustrating some limitations as useful references in protein expression studies. *PROTEOMICS*. 2005;5:566-71.
- Frantz C, Stewart KM, Weaver VM. The extracellular matrix at a glance. *Journal of cell science*. 2010;123:4195-200.
- Glenn KA, Nelson RF, Wen HM, Mallinger AJ, Paulson HL. Diversity in tissue expression, substrate binding, and SCF complex formation for a lectin family of ubiquitin ligases. *J Biol Chem*. 2008;283:12717-29.

342 Greer S, Honeywell R, Geletu M, Arulanandam R, Raptis L. Housekeeping genes; expression
343 levels may change with density of cultured cells. *J Immunol Methods*. 2010;355:76-9.
344 Gürtler A, Kunz N, Gomolka M, Hornhardt S, Friedl AA, McDonald K, et al. Stain-Free
345 technology as a normalization tool in Western blot analysis. *Analytical Biochemistry*.
346 2013;433:105-11.
347 Hachinohe M, Yamane M, Akazawa D, Ohsawa K, Ohno M, Terashita Y, et al. A reduction in
348 age-enhanced gluconeogenesis extends lifespan. *PLoS One*. 2013;8:e54011.
349 Hong H-Y, Yoo G-S, Choi J-K. Detection of Proteins on Blots Using Direct Blue 71. *The*
350 *Protein Protocols Handbook* 2002. p. 387-92.
351 Hong HY, Yoo GS, Choi JK. Direct Blue 71 staining of proteins bound to blotting membranes.
352 *Electrophoresis*. 2000;21:841-5.
353 Hungen K, Chin RC, Baxter CF. Brain Tubulin Microheterogeneity in the Mouse During
354 Development and Aging. *Journal of Neurochemistry*. 1981;37:511-4.
355 Kaushik S, Bandyopadhyay U, Sridhar S, Kiffin R, Martinez-Vicente M, Kon M, et al.
356 Chaperone-mediated autophagy at a glance. *Journal of cell science*. 2011;124:495-9.
357 Kaushik S, Cuervo AM. Chaperone-mediated autophagy. *Methods Mol Biol*. 2008;445:227-44.
358 Kurtz A, Oh S-J. Age related changes of the extracellular matrix and stem cell maintenance.
359 *Preventive Medicine*. 2012;54, Supplement:S50-S6.
360 Ladner CL, Yang J, Turner RJ, Edwards RA. Visible fluorescent detection of proteins in
361 polyacrylamide gels without staining. *Analytical Biochemistry*. 2004;326:13-20.
362 Lewis SA, Lee MG, Cowan NJ. Five mouse tubulin isotypes and their regulated expression
363 during development. *J Cell Biol*. 1985;101:852-61.
364 Liu NK, Xu XM. beta-tubulin is a more suitable internal control than beta-actin in western blot
365 analysis of spinal cord tissues after traumatic injury. *J Neurotrauma*. 2006;23:1794-801.
366 Mallinger A, Wen HM, Dankle GM, Glenn KA. Using a Ubiquitin Ligase as an Unfolded
367 Protein Sensor. *Biochemical and Biophysical Research Communications*. 2011.
368 Miller FD, Naus CC, Durand M, Bloom FE, Milner RJ. Isotypes of alpha-tubulin are
369 differentially regulated during neuronal maturation. *J Cell Biol*. 1987;105:3065-73.
370 Miller I, Crawford J, Gianazza E. Protein stains for proteomic applications: Which, when, why?
371 *PROTEOMICS*. 2006;6:5385-408.
372 Mollica JP, Oakhill JS, Lamb GD, Murphy RM. Are genuine changes in protein expression
373 being overlooked? Reassessing Western blotting. *Anal Biochem*. 2009;386:270-5.
374 Neill US. All data are not created equal. *J Clin Invest*. 2009;119:424.
375 Nelson RF, Glenn KA, Zhang Y, Wen H, Knutson T, Gouvion CM, et al. Selective cochlear
376 degeneration in mice lacking the F-box protein, Fbx2, a glycoprotein-specific ubiquitin ligase
377 subunit. *J Neurosci*. 2007;27:5163-71.
378 Pitre A, Pan Y, Pruett S, Skalli O. On the use of ratio standard curves to accurately quantitate
379 relative changes in protein levels by Western blot. *Anal Biochem*. 2007;361:305-7.
380 Posch A, Kohn J, Oh K, Hammond M, Liu N. V3 Stain-free Workflow for a Practical,
381 Convenient, and Reliable Total Protein Loading Control in Western Blotting. *Journal of Visual*
382 *Experiments*. 2013:e50948.
383 Rees VH, Laurence DJ. The correspondence with Beer's law for the optical density of stained
384 protein patterns on filter paper as a function of surface protein concentration. *Clin Chem*.
385 1955;1:329-44.

Romero-Calvo I, Ocon B, Martinez-Moya P, Suarez MD, Zarzuelo A, Martinez-Augustin O, et al. Reversible Ponceau staining as a loading control alternative to actin in Western blots. *Anal Biochem.* 2010;401:318-20.

Ruan W, Lai M. Actin, a reliable marker of internal control? *Clin Chim Acta.* 2007;385:1-5.

Welinder C, Ekblad L. Coomassie staining as loading control in Western blot analysis. *Journal of proteome research.* 2011;10:1416-9.

Zahn JM, Poosala S, Owen AB, Ingram DK, Lustig A, Carter A, et al. AGEMAP: a gene expression database for aging in mice. *PLoS Genet.* 2007;3:e201.

Zhu J, He F, Hu S, Yu J. On the nature of human housekeeping genes. *Trends Genet.* 2008a;24:481-4.

Zhu J, He F, Song S, Wang J, Yu J. How many human genes can be defined as housekeeping with current expression data? *BMC Genomics.* 2008b;9:172.




Figure 1: Total protein staining provides an accurate means to compare protein levels in young and old tissue. 40ug of protein from two young (1,2) and two old(1,2) mice tissue were separate on SDS-PAGE gels and probed with indicted antibodies or stained with Direct blue, or UV fluoresced to image the Stain Free gel. Asteriks (*) indicate nonspecific bands.

428

	Tissue	Liver		Heart		Brain	
	Age	Young	Old	Young	Old	Young	Old
Tubulin	Mean	1.0	2.8	1.0	2.4	1.0	.87
	Cov	.31	.39	.48	.36	.28	.28
	P	.053		.070		.57	
Actin	Mean	1.0	1.4	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
	Cov	.18	.23	.42	.25	.13	.17
	P	.027		.27		1.0	
GAPDH	Mean	1.0	1.0	1.0	.95	1.0	1.1
	CoV	.19	.30	.20	.14	.14	.06
	P	1.00		.74		.32	
Direct Blue	Mean	1.0	1.0	1.0	.87	1.0	.99
	CoV	.14	.20	.22	.36	.09	.17
	P	1.00		.59		.93	
Stain Free	Mean	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
	CoV	.20	.22	.18	.15	.15	.17
	P	1.00		1.00		1.00	

Table 1: Total protein as measured by Stain Free gels has the lowest Co, the most consistent mean total values, as assessed by P values, between young and old tissue. CoV, the coefficient of variation, is a measure of the relative magnitude of standard deviation. It is the standard deviation divided by the mean. We used the unpaired, two tailed students t test to compare the means of the young and old samples. The P value is the probability, expressed as a decimal, that the mean values of the young and old tissue are the same.

429

430

Tissue	Tubulin		Actin		GAPDH		Direct Blue		Stain Free	
	R ²	CoV	R ²	CoV	R ²	CoV	R ²	CoV	R ²	CoV
Liver	.99-1.00	.21-.46	.94-.99	.12-.27	.96-.99	.18-.54	.95-1.0	.16-.65	.96-1.00	.12-.18
Heart	.01-.99	.20-.65	.98-.99	.12-.36	.82-1.0	.31-.39	.88-.99	.13-.20	.97-.99	.11-.15
Brain	.94-.99	.08-.41	.01-.05	.24-.79	.92-1.0	.11-.38	.97-1.0	.25-.38	.98-.99	.11-.14

Table 2: Total protein as measured by Stain Free gels is the most linear standard as assessed by low CoV and high R². CoV, the coefficient of variation, is a measure of the relative magnitude of standard deviation. It is the standard deviation divided by the mean.

431