DeepSTORM3D: dense 3D localization microscopy and PSF design by deep learning
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An outstanding challenge in single-molecule localization microscopy is the accurate and precise localization of individual point emitters in three dimensions in densely labeled samples. One established approach for three-dimensional single-molecule localization is point-spread-function (PSF) engineering, in which the PSF is engineered to vary distinctively with emitter depth using additional optical elements. However, images of dense emitters, which are desirable for improving temporal resolution, pose a challenge for algorithmic localization of engineered PSFs, due to lateral overlap of the emitter PSFs. Here we train a neural network to localize multiple emitters with densely overlapping Tetrapod PSFs over a large axial range. We then use the network to design the optimal PSF for the multi-emitter case. We demonstrate our approach experimentally with super-resolution reconstructions of mitochondria and volumetric imaging of fluorescently labeled telomeres in cells. Our approach, DeepSTORM3D, enables the study of biological processes in whole cells at timescales that are rarely explored in localization microscopy.

Determining the nanoscale positions of point emitters forms the basis of localization microscopy techniques such as single-particle tracking1-3, (fluorescence) photoactivated localization microscopy (f)PALM4-6, stochastic optical reconstruction microscopy (STORM)7 and related single-molecule localization microscopy (SMLM) methods. These techniques have revolutionized biological imaging, revealing cellular processes and structures at the nanoscale. Notably, most samples of interest extend in three dimensions, necessitating three-dimensional (3D) localization microscopy.

In a standard microscope, the precise z position of an emitter is difficult to ascertain because the change of the PSF near the focus is approximately symmetric. Furthermore, outside of this focal range (≤± 350 nm for a high numerical aperture imaging system), the rapid defocusing of the PSF reduces the signal-to-noise ratio (SNR), causing localization precision to quickly degrade. One method to extend the useful z range and explicitly encode the z position is PSF engineering4-10. Here an additional optical element, for example a phase mask, is placed in the emission path of the microscope, modulating the image formed on the detector (Fig. 1a); the axial position can then be recovered via image processing using a theoretical or experimentally calibrated PSF model11-16.

In practically all applications, it is desirable to be able to localize nearby emitters simultaneously. For example, in super-resolution SMLM experiments, the number of emitters localized per frame determines temporal resolution. In tracking applications, PSF overlap from multiple emitters often precludes localization, potentially biasing results in emitter-dense regions. The problem is that localizing overlapping emitters poses a great algorithmic challenge even in two-dimensional (2D) localization and much more so in 3D. Specifically, encoding the axial position of an emitter over large axial ranges (>3 μm) requires the use of laterally large PSFs, for example the Tetrapod10,17 (Fig. 1b), increasing the possibility of overlap. Consequently, while a variety of methods have been developed to cope with overlapping emitters for the in-focus, standard PSF18-20, a recent comparison of state-of-the-art software revealed that performance in high-density 3D localization situations is far from satisfactory, even for top-performing algorithms.

Deep learning has proven to be adept at analyzing microscopic data21-27, especially for single-molecule localization, handling dense fields of emitters over small axial ranges (<1.5 μm)28-30 or sparse emitters spread over larger ranges31. Moreover, an emerging application is to jointly design the optical system alongside the data processing algorithm, enabling end-to-end optimization of both components31-37. Here we present DeepSTORM3D, consisting of two fundamental contributions to high-density 3D localization microscopy over large axial ranges. First, we employ a convolutional neural network (CNN) for analyzing dense fields of overlapping emitters with engineered PSFs, demonstrated with the large-axial-range Tetrapod PSF10,17. Second, we design an optimal PSF for 3D localization of dense emitters over a large axial range of 4 μm. By incorporating a physical simulation layer in the CNN with an adjustable phase modulation, we jointly learn the optimal PSF (encoding) and associated localization algorithm (decoding). This approach is highly flexible and easily adapted for any 3D SMLM dataset parameters (emitter density, SNRs and z range). We quantify the performance of the method by simulation and demonstrate the applicability to 3D biological samples (mitochondria and telomeres).

Results

Dense 3D localization with DeepSTORM3D. To solve the high-density localization problem in 3D, we trained a CNN that receives a 2D image of overlapping Tetrapod PSFs spanning an axial range of 4 μm and outputs a 3D grid with a voxel size of 27.5×27.5×33 nm3 (Fig. 1c). For architecture details and learning hyper-parameters see Supplementary Notes 2.1 and 4. To compile a list of localizations, we apply simple thresholding, local maximum finding and local averaging on the output 3D grid (Supplementary Note 5).
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The results are shown in Fig. 2. As evident in both the field of view (FOV) (for the definition of density see Supplementary Note 7) as we are unaware of any other methods capable of localizing overlapping Tetrapod PSFs. To quantitatively compare our method with MP solely in terms of density, we simulated emitters with high signal-to-noise ratio (30,000 signal counts, 150 background counts per pixel) at ten different densities ranging from 1 to 75 emitters per $13 \times 13 \mu m^2$ field of view (FOV) (for the definition of density see Supplementary Note 1). The results are shown in Fig. 2. As evident in both the Jaccard index\(^{11}\) (see Supplementary Note 6) and the lateral/axial localization precision per emitter.

We compare our method to a fit-and-subtract-based matching pursuit (MP) approach\(^{49}\) (see Supplementary Note 7) as we are unaware of any other methods capable of localizing overlapping Tetrapod PSFs. To quantitatively compare our method with MP solely in terms of density, we simulated emitters with high signal-to-noise ratio (30,000 signal counts, 150 background counts per pixel) at ten different densities ranging from 1 to 75 emitters per $13 \times 13 \mu m^2$ field of view (FOV) (for the definition of density see Supplementary Note 1). The results are shown in Fig. 2. As evident in both the Jaccard index\(^{11}\) (see Supplementary Note 6) and the lateral/axial root mean square error (RMSE) (Fig. 2a), the CNN achieves remarkable performance in localizing high-density Tetrapods. In the single-emitter (very low density) case, where the performance of the CNN is bounded by the discretization on the 3D grid, the RMSE of the MP localization is lower (better). This is because for a single emitter, MP is equivalent to a continuous maximum likelihood estimator (MLE) (Supplementary Note 7), which is asymptotically optimal\(^{50}\), whereas the CNN’s precision is bounded by pixilation of the grid (half voxel of $13.75 \text{ nm}$ in $xy$ and $16.5 \text{ nm}$ in $z$). However, quickly beyond the single-emitter case, the CNN drastically outperforms MP at both high and low SNR (see Supplementary Note 7.3). A similar result was obtained when compared to a leading single-emitter fitting method\(^{51}\) applicable also for the multiple-emitter case\(^{11}\) (see Supplementary Note 8.2). Furthermore, to put our method in context with other existing approaches, we tested DeepSTORM3D on the EPFL Double Helix high-density challenge\(^{52}\) obtaining favorable results (see Supplementary Note 8.1).

Next, we validated our method for super-resolution imaging of fluorescently labeled mitochondria in COS7 cells (Fig. 3 and Supplementary Videos 1–3). We acquired 20,000 diffraction-limited frames of a $50 \times 30 \mu m^2$ FOV and localized them using the CNN in $\approx 3 \text{ h } 20 \text{ m}$, resulting in $\approx 360,000$ localizations. The Tetrapod PSF was implemented using a fabricated fused-silica phase mask (see Supplementary Note 9.1) and the CNN was trained solely on simulations matching the experimental conditions (see Supplementary Note 4.1). The estimated resolution was $\approx 40 \text{ nm}$ in $xy$ and $\approx 50 \text{ nm}$ in $z$ (see Supplementary Note 9.3). To visually evaluate localization performance in a single frame (Fig. 3a), we regenerated the corresponding 2D low-resolution image and overlaid the recovered image on top of the experimental frame (Fig. 3a and Supplementary Video 1). As seen in the overlay image, the emitter PSFs (3D positions) are faithfully recovered by the CNN. Emitters with an extremely low number of signal photons were ignored. For further acceleration in acquisition time see Supplementary Note 9.2.

**Optimal PSF design for dense 3D imaging.** The Tetrapod is a special PSF that has been optimized for the single-emitter case by Fisher information maximization\(^{10,17}\). However, when considering the multiple-emitter case, an intriguing question arises: what is the optimal PSF for high-density 3D localization over a large axial range? To answer this question we need to rethink the design metric; extending the Fisher information criterion\(^{32}\) to account for emitter density is not trivial and while it is intuitive that a smaller-footprint PSF would be preferable for dense emitters, it is not clear how to mathematically balance this demand with the requirement for high localization precision per emitter.

Our PSF design logic is based on the following: as we have already established that a CNN yields superior reconstruction for high-density 3D localization, we are interested in a PSF (encoder) that would be optimally localized by a CNN (decoder). Therefore, in contrast to a sequential paradigm where the PSF and the localization algorithm are optimized separately, we adopt a co-design approach (Fig. 4a). To jointly optimize the PSF and the localization CNN, we introduced a differentiable physical simulation layer, which is parametrized by a phase mask that dictates the microscope’s PSF. This layer encodes 3D point sources to their respective low-resolution 2D image (see Supplementary Note 3). This image is then fed to the localization CNN, which decodes it and recovers the underlying 3D source positions. During training, the net is presented with simulated point sources at random locations (projected on a fine grid) and using the difference between the CNN recovery and the simulated 3D positions quantified by our loss function (see Supplementary Note 4.2), we optimize both the phase mask and the localization CNN parameters in an end-to-end fashion using the backpropagation algorithm\(^{36}\) (see Supplementary Note 3.3 and Supplementary Video 4). The learned PSF (Fig. 4b) has a small
**Fig. 2 | Comparison to MP.**

**a**, Performance comparison of a trained CNN (black) and the MP approach (red) in both detectability (Jaccard index) and in precision (lateral\axial RMSE). Matching of points was computed with a threshold distance of 150 nm using the Hungarian algorithm. Each data point is an average of \( n = 100 \) simulated images. Average s.d. in Jaccard index was \( \approx 6\% \) for both methods and average s.d. in precision was \( \approx 6 \) nm for the CNN and \( \approx 15 \) nm for MP. **b**, Example of a simulated frame of density 0.124 \( \text{emitters} \ \mu\text{m}^{-2} \) alongside 3D comparisons of the recovered positions by MP (middle) and by the CNN (right). Scale bar, 2 \( \mu\text{m} \).

**Fig. 3 | Super-resolution 3D imaging over a 4 \( \mu\text{m} \) z range.**

**a**, Representative experimental frame (top) and rendered frame from the 3D recovered positions by the CNN overlaid on top (bottom). Scale bar, 5 \( \mu\text{m} \). **b**, Super-resolved image of mitochondria spanning a \( \approx 4 \) \( \mu\text{m} \) z range rendered as a 2D histogram, where \( z \) is encoded by color. Scale bar, 5 \( \mu\text{m} \). **c**, Zoom in on white rectangle (i) in **b**. Scale bar, 0.5 \( \mu\text{m} \). **d**, Relative intensity averaged along the shorter side of the white rectangle in **c**, **e** XZ cross-section of white rectangle (ii) in **b**. Scale bar, 0.5 \( \mu\text{m} \). **f**, Relative intensity along the dashed white line in **e**. The experiment was repeated independently for \( n = 3 \) cells, twice analyzing 20,000 frames and once analyzing 10,000 frames all leading to similar performance.
lateral footprint, which is critical for minimizing overlap at high densities. The learned phase mask twists in a spiral trajectory causing the PSF to rapidly rotate throughout the axial range, a trait that was previously shown to be valuable for encoding depth8.

To quantify the improvement introduced by our new PSF, we first compared it to the Tetrapod PSF in simulations. Specifically, we trained a similar reconstruction net for both the Tetrapod and the learned PSF using a matching training set composed of simulated continuous 3D positions along with their corresponding 2D low-resolution images. The learned PSF performs similarly to the Tetrapod PSF for low emitter densities (Fig. 4d–f). However, as the density goes up (higher than $\approx 0.2$ emitters $\mu m^2$), the learned PSF outperforms the Tetrapod PSF in both localization precision (Fig. 4e,f) and in emitter detectability (Jaccard index) (Fig. 4d). This result is not surprising, as the learned PSF has a smaller spatial footprint and hence it is less likely to overlap than the Tetrapod (Fig. 4c). For further analysis of the learned PSF see Supplementary Note 10.

**Volumetric telomere imaging and tracking.** Next, we demonstrate the superiority of the new PSF experimentally by imaging fluorescently labeled telomeres (DsRed-hTRF1) in fixed U2OS cells. The cell contains tens of telomeres squeezed in the volume of a nucleus with $\approx 20 \mu m$ diameter (Fig. 5a,b). From a single snapshot focused inside the nucleus, the CNN outputs a list of 3D positions of telomeres spanning an axial range of $\approx 3 \mu m$. Using the Tetrapod PSF snapshot, the Tetrapod-trained CNN was able to recover 49 out of 62 telomeres with a single false positive, yielding a Jaccard index...
of 0.77 (Fig. 5d). In comparison, using the learned PSF snapshot, the corresponding CNN was able to recover 57 out of the 62 telomeres with only two false positives, yielding a Jaccard index of 0.89 (Fig. 5e). The recovered positions were compared to approximated ground-truth 3D positions (Fig. 5c), obtained by axial scanning and 3D fitting (see Supplementary Note 12 and Supplementary Video 5). The precision of both PSFs was calibrated experimentally using a z-scan of a fluorescent microsphere (see Supplementary Note 10.4 and Supplementary Video 6).

To qualitatively compare the recovered list of localizations to the acquired snapshot, we fed this list to the physical simulation layer and generated the matching 2D low-resolution image (Fig. 5d,e). As verified by the regenerated images, the 3D positions of the telomeres are faithfully recovered by the CNNs. Moreover, the misses in both snapshots were either due to local aberrations and/or an extremely low number of signal photons (see Supplementary Note 13.1 for more experimental results).

Finally, a great advantage facilitated by our scan-free learned PSF is increased volumetric temporal resolution. To demonstrate the full capability of our method for dense multiparticle localization, we simultaneously tracked 48 telomeres, diffusing within the volume of a live mouse embryonic fibroblast (MEF) cell, at 10 Hz over 50 s (Fig. 6). Such a measurement can provide information on 3D nuclear rotation (Fig. 6a and Supplementary Video 7) and heterogeneity in motion type (Fig. 6b–d), at timescales that are typically unexplored by volumetric localization microscopy51.

**Discussion**

In this work we demonstrated 3D localization of dense emitters over a large axial range, both numerically and experimentally. The described network architecture exhibits excellent flexibility in dealing with various experimental challenges, for example low signal-to-noise ratios and optical aberrations. This versatility is facilitated in three ways: (1) the net was trained solely on simulated...
Attaining a sufficiently large training dataset has thus far been a major limitation for most applications of CNNs. With this limitation in mind, the application of CNNs to single-molecule localization would seemingly be an ideal one, as each emitter’s behavior should be approximately the same. This uniformity is broken, however, by spatially varying background, sample density and variable emitter size in biological samples (Supplementary Note 4.1), all of which diversify datasets and necessitate relevant training data. By implementing an accurate simulator (Supplementary Note 3), we have shown that it is possible to build a robust network entirely in silico, generating arbitrarily large, realistic datasets with a known ground truth to optimize nets. This aligns with our previous work in 2D SMLM.10

For super-resolution reconstructions using the Tetrapod PSF, the simulator was particularly important due to the highly variable SNR of emitters in the sample. Here, our net was able to selectively localize emitters even in very dense regions by focusing on those with a high SNR (Fig. 3). To optimize a PSF while simultaneously training the net, the simulator was also essential, as it would be prohibitively time consuming to experimentally vary the PSF, while recording and analyzing images to train the net.

A notable aspect of our optimization approach is that the optimized PSF is found by continuously varying the pixels of an initialized mask, while evaluating the output of the localization net, thus the final result represents a local minimum (Fig. 4). By changing the initialization conditions, we have recognized several patterns that indicate how the optimal PSF varies with the experimental conditions, namely, density, axial range and SNR (see Supplementary Note 2.2). Some of the recurrent features are intuitive: for example, in dense fields of emitters with limited SNR, the optimized PSFs have a small footprint over the designed axial range, enabling high density and compacting precious signal photons into as few pixels as possible. What distinguishes the net PSFs over predetermined designs is the utilization of multiple types of depth encoding, namely, simultaneously employing astigmatism, rotation and side lobe movement (Fig. 4), all of which have been conceived of and implemented previously, but never simultaneously.

This work, therefore, triggers many possible questions and research directions regarding its capabilities and limitations. For example, how globally optimal is the resulting PSF? Similarly, how sensitive is the resulting PSF and its performance to different loss functions, CNN architectures, initializations (for example with an existing phase mask) and the sampled training set of locations? Currently, it is unclear how each of these components affects the learning process, although we began to partially answer them in simulations (see Supplementary Notes 2.2 and 10). Finally, the co-design approach employed here paves the way to a wide variety of interesting applications in microscopy, where imaging systems have traditionally been designed separately from the processing algorithm.

Fig. 6 | Volumetric tracking of telomeres in live MEF cells. a, 3D trajectories of tracked telomeres on top of the first experimental snapshot. White sticks mark the starting point and color encodes time. AX and AY projections are plotted in gray. Scale bar, 2 μm. b, Example trajectory of a telomere (white box in a) with a large mean displacement. c, Example trajectory of a telomere (white box in a) with a small mean displacement. d, Mean squared displacement (MSD) of the trajectories in b and c. Shaded area marks one s.d. The experiment was repeated independently for n=10 MEF cells all showing similar characteristics and performance.
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**Methods**

**Sample preparation.** COS7 cells were grown for 24 h on cleaned 22 × 22 mm, 170-μm thick coverslips in a six-well plate in DMEM with 1 g/l - glucose (low glucose), supplemented with fetal bovine serum, penicillin–streptomyocin and glutamine at 37°C and 5% CO2. Cells were fixed with 4% paraformaldehyde and 0.2% glutaraldehyde in PBS (pH 4.6) for 45 min, washed and incubated in 0.3 M glycine/PBS solution for 10 min. The coverslips were transferred into a clean six-well plate and incubated in a blocking solution for 2 h (10% goat serum, 3% BSA, 2.2% glycerine and 0.1% Triton-X in PBS, filtered with 0.45-μm PVDF filter unit, Millex). The cells were then immunostained overnight with anti TOMM20-AF647 (Abcam, ab209606) 1:230 diluted in blocking buffer and washed five times with PBS. Cover glasses (22 × 22 mm, 170 μm thick) were cleaned in an ultrasonic bath with 5% Decon90 at 60°C for 30 min, then washed with water, incubated in ethanol absolute for 30 min and sterilized with 70% filtered ethanol for 30 min.

U2OS cells were grown on cleaned 0.18-mm coverslips in a 12-well plate in DMEM with 1 g/l - glucose (low glucose), supplemented with fetal bovine serum, penicillin–streptomyocin and glutamine at 37°C and 5% CO2. The day after cells were transfected with a plasmid encoding the fluorescently tagged telomeric repeat binding factor 1 (DsRed-hTRF1)51 using Lipofectamine 3000 reagent. At 24 h after transfection, cells were fixed with 4% paraformaldehyde for 20 min, washed three times with PBS and attached to a slide together with mounting medium.

**STORM Imaging.** For super-resolution imaging, a polydimethylsiloxane chamber was attached to a glass coverslip containing fixed COS7 cells. Blinding buffer (100 μM mercaptoethanol, 200 μM sodium lactate and 3% OxyFluro (Sigma, A50059), modified from Nahidiazar et al.12, was then added and a glass coverslip was placed on top to prevent evaporation. Low-intensity illumination for recording diffraction-limited images was applied using a Topica laser (640 nm), on the Nikon Ti imaging setup described previously and recorded with an EMCCD (Xon, Andor) in a standard imaging setup. For super-resolution blinding using the Topas Fibre, high-intensity (I/W at the back of the objective lens) 640 nm laser was applied using a 638 nm, 2.000 mW red dot laser module, whose beam shape was cleaned using a 25-μm pinhole (Thorlabs) in coordination with low-intensity (<5 mW) 405 nm light. Emission light was filtered through a 300-nm long pass dichroic and a 630-nm long pass (Chroma), projected through a 4f system containing the dielectric Tetrox plate phase mask (see Supplementary Note 9.1) and imaged on a Prime95s Photometrics camera.

**Super-resolution image rendering.** Before rendering the super-resolution image (Fig. 3b), we first corrected for sample drift using the ThunderSTORM ImageJ Fiji plugin52. Afterward, we rendered 3D localizations as a 2D average shifted histogram, with color encoding the z position.

**Telomere imaging.** For telomere imaging in fixed cells, the 4f system consisted of two f/15 cm lenses (Thorlabs), a linear polarizer (Thorlabs) to filter out the light that is polarized in the unmodulated direction of the LC-SLM, a 1920 × 1080 pixel LC-SLM (PLUTO-VIS, Holoeye) and a mirror for beam-steering. A sCMOS camera (Prime95, Photometrics) was used to record the data. The sample was illuminated with 561-nm fiber-coupled laser light source (iChrome MLE, Ticopta). The excitation light was reflected up through the microscope objective by a multibandpass dichroic filter (TRF98902-EM ET-405/488/561/647 nm Laser Quad Band Set, Chroma). Emission light was filtered by the same dichroic and also filtered by another 617-nm band pass filter (F02-617/73, Semrock).

For volumetric telomere tracking in live cells, images were recorded with an EMCCD camera (Andor iXON), exposure time of 100 ms and EM-gain of 170. The sample was illuminated at ≈2 kW cm−2 with 561 nm light from a fiber-coupled laser (iChrome MLE, Ticopta). All movies were recorded for 50 s (500 frames).

**CNN architecture.** In summary, our localization CNN architecture is composed of three main modules. First, a multiscale context aggregation module processes the input 2D low-resolution image and extracts features with a growing receptive field using dilated convolutions5. Second, an upsampling module increases the lateral resolution of the predicted volume by fourfold. Finally, the last module refines the depth and lateral position of the emitters and outputs the predicted vacancy grid. For more details regarding the architecture see Supplementary Note 2.

**Statistics and reproducibility.** The STORM experiment was repeated independently for n = 3 cells, twice analyzing 20,000 frames and once analyzing 10,000 frames, all leading to similar performance. The fixed telomere experiment was repeated independently for n = 10 U2OS cells all showing similar characteristics and performance. The live telomere experiment was repeated independently for n = 10 MEF cells all showing similar characteristics and performance.

**Reporting Summary.** Further information on research design is available in the Nature Research Reporting Summary linked to this article.

**Data availability**

The data that support the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

**Code availability**

Code is made publicly available at https://github.com/EliasNehme/DeepSTORM3D.
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