

Incorporating fluorescent dyes and quantum dots into magnetic microbeads for immunoassays

Shawn P. Mulvaney, Hedi Mattoussi, and Lloyd J. Whitman

Naval Research Laboratory, Washington, D.C., USA

BioTechniques 36:602-609 (April 2004)

Microbeads that are both paramagnetic and fluorescently labeled are commercially available in colors spanning the visible spectrum. Although these commercial beads can be bright, polydispersity in both size and fluorescent intensity limit their use in quantitative assays. Very recently, more monodisperse beads have become available, but their large size and surface properties make them less than ideal for some bioassay applications. Here we describe methods to customize commercial nonfluorescent magnetic microparticles with fluorescent dyes and quantum dots (QDs) without affecting their magnetic or surface chemical properties. Fluorescent dyes and 3.3-nm diameter CdSe/ZnS QDs were sequestered within 0.8- μ m diameter magnetic beads by swelling the polystyrene matrix of the bead in organic solvent, letting the chromophores partition, and then collapsing the matrix in polar solvents. Chromophore incorporation has been characterized using both UV-visible absorption spectroscopy and fluorescence microscopy, with an average of 3×10^8 rhodamine 6G molecules/bead and 6×10^4 QDs/bead. The modified beads are uniform in size and intensity, with optical properties comparable to currently available commercial beads. Immunoassay results obtained with our custom fluorescent magnetic microbeads are consistent with those obtained using conventional magnetic microbeads.

INTRODUCTION

Magnetic microbeads are used in a variety of biotechnology applications, most notably for cell sorting and assay separations (1–4). Magnetic microbeads are commercially available from numerous sources and are commonly composed of iron oxide nanocrystals embedded within a spherical polystyrene matrix. Beads can be readily purchased with a variety of biocompatible surface terminations, such as $-\text{CH}_3$, $-\text{NH}_2$, or $-\text{COOH}$, that are suitable for further conjugation with functional biochemical ligands and receptors (e.g., antibodies and oligonucleotides).

Recently, magnetic beads have been adapted as labels for biochemical binding assays with a variety of detection schemes (5–12). For example, giant magnetoresistive (GMR) (8–15) and Hall sensors (16,17) are two magneto-electronic devices that can be used to sense the weak magnetic fields generated by a magnetic microbead. Although

such devices can be sensitive to single beads, the sensors are complicated to fabricate, and their use for quantitative detection requires magnetically monodispersed beads.

Alternatively, optical detection of microbead labels can be an off-the-shelf approach to reading the results of binding assays. The Naval Research Laboratory (Washington, D.C., USA) has been developing a highly specific and sensitive biosensor system using magnetic immunobeads as both optically detected reporter labels and as transducers for magnetic force discrimination (10). In the Force Discrimination Biosensor (FDB) system, capture antibodies (Abs) are immobilized on a transparent substrate. The sample is then introduced, and analyte specific to the Ab is captured. Magnetic microbeads functionalized with secondary Abs specific to a different epitope on the analyte are then introduced to complete labeling of the captured antigen. Finally, a magnetic force is applied that

is too weak to rupture the immunochemical complexes, but strong enough to remove beads bound to the substrate by nonspecific interactions (18). The concentration of the analyte is determined by optically recording the fraction of beads retained on the substrate following magnetic force discrimination. For approximately 1- μ m diameter beads, off-the-shelf microscopy components (e.g., an inverted optical microscope and frame grabbing software) can be used for rapid image acquisition and bead counting.

Although quantitative assays using magnetic microbead labels can be performed by particle counting using off-the-shelf optics, a relatively expensive objective is required to achieve sufficient magnification and resolution for beads approximately 1 μ m in diameter. One solution to this limitation would be the use of fluorescent magnetic beads, which would enable individual beads to be imaged with lower magnification optics and offer the potential for photon counting that would not require resolving individual beads. In general, the addition of fluorescence should be useful in applications employing submicron magnetic particles, enabling routine detection with optical systems commonly available in biochemistry laboratories. Unfortunately, to our knowledge, there are few commercial sources of beads that are both fluorescent and magnetic. Although such commercial beads are generally bright and available with fluorophores spanning the visible spectrum, we have found them to be too polydisperse in both size and fluorescent intensity to use in quantitative assays. Very recently, more monodisperse fluorescent beads have become available, but their large size and high nonspecific binding with our substrates make them less than ideal for our immunoassay applications.

Here we describe methods to load commercial magnetic microbeads with fluorophores and quantum dots (QDs). We have successfully entrapped several fluorescent dyes and 3.3-nm diameter QDs in SeraMag[®] beads, which are relatively monodisperse 0.8- μ m diameter paramagnetic particles. We compare the properties of the different chromophore loaded beads and investigate their use as labels in a sandwich immunoassay.

Report Documentation Page				Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188	
Public reporting burden for the collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to a penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number.					
1. REPORT DATE 2004		2. REPORT TYPE		3. DATES COVERED 00-00-2004 to 00-00-2004	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Incorporating fluorescent dyes and quantum dots into magnetic microbeads for immunoassays				5a. CONTRACT NUMBER	
				5b. GRANT NUMBER	
				5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	
6. AUTHOR(S)				5d. PROJECT NUMBER	
				5e. TASK NUMBER	
				5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Naval Research Laboratory, 4555 Overlook Avenue SW, Washington, DC, 20375				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)				10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)	
				11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)	
12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release; distribution unlimited					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES					
14. ABSTRACT					
15. SUBJECT TERMS					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT Same as Report (SAR)	18. NUMBER OF PAGES 6	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT unclassified	b. ABSTRACT unclassified	c. THIS PAGE unclassified			

MATERIALS AND METHODS

SeraMag beads, 0.8 μm in diameter, were obtained from Seradyn (Indianapolis, IN, USA). Encapsulated magnetic microbeads loaded with Dragon Green dye (no. L010212B) and Compel™ beads, 8.4 μm in diameter, loaded with Dragon Green dye (no. 030516A) were purchased from Bangs Laboratories (Fisher, IN, USA). For the remainder of the paper the beads are referred to as follows: “S” for SeraMag beads, “B1” for Bang’s encapsulated magnetic microbeads, and “B2” for Bang’s Compel microbeads. Dichloromethane (CH_2Cl_2), methanol (CH_3OH), and ethanol ($\text{CH}_3\text{CH}_2\text{OH}$) were purchased from Fisher (Houston, TX, USA), rhodamine 6G (R6G) and coumarin 334 were purchased from Aldrich (Milwaukee, WI, USA), Alexa Fluor® 568 was obtained from Molecular Probes (Eugene, OR, USA), and europium (III) thenoyltrifluoroace-

tonate trihydrate was obtained from Acros (Geel, Belgium). CdSe/ZnS QDs, 3.3 nm in diameter and capped with trioctylphosphine oxide (TOPO), were prepared as previously described (with an expected quantum yield of 40%–60%) (19,20).

S beads were washed with ethanol five times in a ratio of 500 μL beads:2 mL ethanol, using magnetic retention during exchange of the ethanol aliquots. The beads were then resuspended in ethanol and stored at 4°C. Prior to chromophore incorporation, washed beads were sonicated for 10 min to resuspend. Fluorescent dye (e.g., 16.7 mM R6G) was dissolved in dichloromethane, and 500 μL each of washed beads, dye solution, and dichloromethane were mixed in a 1.5-mL microfuge tube. The tube was capped, placed in a Styrofoam microfuge tube holder, and shaken on a Vortex-Genie® for 1 h. The beads were magnetically retained in the tube while the supernatant was removed (and saved

for analysis). Finally, the beads were washed three times in methanol, twice in water, and stored at 4°C.

QD entrapment was achieved in a similar manner for the fluorescent dyes using a slightly different reagent mixture. Because TOPO-capped QDs flocculate in the presence of ethanol (19,20), the ethanol was first removed from a 200- μL bead sample, and the beads were resuspended in 200 μL of dichloromethane. This bead solution was then mixed in a microfuge tube with 1000 μL of 2 μM QDs in dichloromethane. The process continued via shaking as described above.

Optical micrographs were collected on an inverted Zeiss Axiovert® 100 microscope (Carl Zeiss, Gottingen, Germany) in either transmission mode or fluorescence using a mercury lamp and Zeiss filter sets no. 2 (for QDs: excitation 365 nm, emission LP420 nm), no. 5 (for coumarin 334 and Dragon Green: excitation 395–440 nm, emis-

sion LP470 nm), no. 10 (for coumarin 334 and Dragon Green: excitation 450–490 nm, emission 515–565 nm), and no. 14 (for R6G: excitation 510–560 nm, emission LP590 nm). Images were collected with a Roper Scientific CoolSNAP-PROcTM thermally cooled,

monochrome charge-coupled device (CCD) camera (Roper Scientific, Trenton, NJ, USA).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

S beads are core-shell particles made with a polystyrene core, a layer of maghemite nanocrystals, and an outer shell of polystyrene. Our methodology for incorporating fluorescent dyes and QDs into the beads is adapted from literature reports of fluorescent dye entrapment in polymer matrices (21–23). As discussed in these reports, these methods physically sequester the chromophore within the matrix. In our case, encapsulation is achieved by swelling the polystyrene bead matrix in an organic solvent (often dichloromethane), letting the chromophores partition into the polystyrene, and then collapsing the swollen bead in polar solvents (methanol, followed by water). The chromophores are thereby trapped inside the polystyrene beads; no detectable leaching has been observed. An advantage of this approach is that the bead surface

chemistry is nominally unaffected, remaining amenable to further functionalization for binding assays.

Transmission and fluorescent gray-scale micrographs of S beads encapsulated with R6G, coumarin 334, or QDs are displayed in Figure 1. For comparison, commercial beads that are both fluorescent and magnetic are also shown in Figure 1. Bead lots with uniform luminescence can be made from each of the chromophores, but the intensity of the luminescent signal per bead varies depending on the chromophore's affinity for the polystyrene matrix and the solvent used. It is important to note that photobleaching occurs for dye-loaded beads. For example, R6G beads photobleach after 15 min of continuous excitation with a mercury lamp (5 mW power at sample).

Uniform luminescence is a key criterion for the custom beads to be suitable for use as immunoassay labels. We have characterized the chromophore loading levels using both UV-visible absorption spectroscopy and fluorescence microscopy. The absolute amount of dye entrapped per bead lot can be determined




Figure 1. Transmission and fluorescence optical micrographs of S beads after incorporation of chromophores. Transmission are shown on the left, and fluorescence on the right for R6G (A and B), coumarin 334 (C and D), and QDs (E and F). For comparison, commercial beads that incorporate Dragon Green are also shown: B1 (G and H) and B2 (I and J). Micrographs were taken with a 100× 1.3 Plan Neofluar[®] objective (Carl Zeiss). Note that because of the small depth of field at this magnification, there is some variance in the apparent size of the beads, caused by variance in the focal plane with respect to the center of each bead. S, SeraMag beads; B1, Bang's encapsulated magnetic microbeads; B2, Bang's Compel microbeads; R6G, rhodamine 6G; QD, quantum dots.




Figure 2. Histograms of the intensity distributions among different fluorescent magnetic microbeads. S, SeraMag beads; B1, Bang's encapsulated magnetic microbeads; B2, Bang's Compel microbeads; R6G, rhodamine 6G; QD, quantum dots.

Table 1. Rhodamine 6G Incorporation into S Beads

Trial (No.)	Starting R6G Solution			Recovered Dye Solution			Amount of Dye Retained (mM)	R6G Molecules/ Bead ($\times 10^8$)
	Absorbance (527 nm)	Concentration (μM)	Dilution Adjustment (mM)	Absorbance (527 nm)	Concentration (μM)	Dilution Adjustment (mM)		
1	0.962	7.57	5.68	0.446	3.54	2.65	3.03	3.03
2				0.376	2.99	2.24	3.44	3.45
3				0.322	2.57	1.93	3.51	3.52
4	0.922	7.26	5.44	0.351	2.80	2.10	3.34	3.34
5				0.399	3.17	2.38	3.06	3.06
6				0.290	2.32	1.74	3.70	3.71
Mean	0.942			0.364				3.35
SD	0.028			0.056				0.27

R6G, Rhodamine 6G; S, SeraMag beads.

by comparing the absorbance of each dye solution before and after the encapsulation procedure and by calculating the concentration-dependence of the absorbance as follows. For R6G, the absorbance (A) of four known concentrations (C , in μM) was measured and fit linearly ($R^2 = 0.99$),

$$A = (0.128 \mu\text{M}^{-1})C - 0.007$$

The number of molecules entrapped can then be calculated from the total volume of each sample (1.5 mL) and its dilution. Beads incorporating R6G

were the brightest beads made, with an average of 3×10^8 R6G molecules/ bead, as detailed in Table 1.

The absolute number of beads present in a sample volume can be calculated based on the fraction of each bead composed of magnetic material (40% by volume), and the starting bead concentration (50 mg/mL) (<http://www.seradyn.com>). If 40% of the bead volume is maghemite (4.9 g/cm³), and 60% is polystyrene (1.05 g/cm³), then each 0.8- μm diameter bead should weigh 6.93×10^{-13} g. Our

protocol uses 500 μL of beads washed in ethanol, corresponding to a bead concentration of 12.5 mg/mL, or 9.02×10^9 beads per lot. Using the absolute amount of chromophore entrapped per bead lot, the average chromophore loading per bead can therefore be determined (Table 1). Note that bead retention during the washing steps is not perfect, so the estimated number of beads per sample represents an upper bound. Furthermore, the UV-visible spectroscopy is done with small volumes of organic solvent, and there is uncertainty associated with the accuracy and reproducibility of pipeting these liquids. Overall, we estimate the uncertainty of the loading to be 15%.

The quantity of QDs incorporated into the beads can be estimated in an analogous manner utilizing the absorbance peak at 230 nm, with the resulting linear calibration,

$$A = (0.0092 \text{ nM}^{-1})C + 0.0474$$

In this case, each sample started with a 200 μL aliquot of washed bead solution (12.5 mg/mL) and a total reaction volume of 1100 μL . As detailed in Table 2, an average of 69,000 QDs was incorporated in each bead. The lower number of QDs incorporated per bead compared with R6G molecules is not surprising given their much larger size.

Although the analysis of chromophore solutions by absorption spectroscopy demonstrates that consistent average loading levels per bead lot can be achieved, it does not indicate the level of uniformity among beads within a lot. Therefore, individual beads were characterized by dispersing them on a glass slide and collecting the fluores-




Figure 3. Histograms of the size distributions among different fluorescent magnetic microbeads. S, SeraMag beads; B1, Bang's encapsulated magnetic microbeads; B2, Bang's Compel microbeads.

Table 2. CdSe/ZnS Quantum Dot Incorporation into S Beads

Trial (No.)	Starting QDs Solution			Recovered QDs Solution			No. QDs Retained ($\times 10^{14}$)	QDs/Bead ($\times 10^4$)
	Absorbance (230 nm)	Concentration (nM)	Dilution Adjustment (μ M)	Absorbance (230 nm)	Concentration (nM)	Dilution Adjustment (μ M)		
1	0.657	66.3	2.05	0.437	42.4	1.61	3.30	9.16
2	0.664	67.0	2.08	0.445	43.2	1.64	2.92	6.85
3	0.613	61.5	1.91	0.449	43.7	1.65	1.67	4.63
Mean	0.645			0.444				6.88
SD	0.028			0.006				2.27

QD, quantum dot; S, SeraMag beads.

cence signal with a CCD camera. The brightness of each bead was recorded as the 8-bit pixel intensity (0–255) after subtracting the local background. Comparisons were made between S beads labeled with R6G and QDs and commercial fluorescent-magnetic microbeads (B1 and B2). As shown in Figure 2, the S-R6G loaded beads are typically two times more uniform than ones incorporating QDs. Compared to the B1

beads, the S-R6G and S-QD beads are about four and two times more uniform, respectively.

Figure 2 also shows differences in the average raw intensity of each bead type, suggesting overall differences in brightness. However, the total amount of light emitted from each bead depends on a number of factors, including the total amount of chromophore incorporated (a function of the bead size), the absorption coefficient of the chromophore, and the quantum yield of the chromophore. In practice, however, the optical characteristics of magnetic beads made as we describe is more likely to depend on the bead size, bead surface chemistry, and instrumentation requirements for the assay rather than on the optical physics. A full exploration of all the factors that affect bead brightness is beyond the scope of this work.

The difference in brightness and uniform intensity of the B1 beads compared with the two types of S beads can be partially explained by the relative polydispersity in their size. Based on optical micrographs, the average diameter of the B1 beads was $2.19 \pm 0.98 \mu\text{m}$ compared with $0.80 \pm 0.12 \mu\text{m}$ for the S beads (Figure 3). B2 beads have recently be-

come available and address some of the shortcomings of the B1 beads related to polydispersity. This new class of bead is currently available in three diameters, 2.7, 6.0, and $8.4 \mu\text{m}$, with the $8.4\text{-}\mu\text{m}$ bead available labeled with Dragon Green dye. These dyed beads show better monodispersity in size and intensity (Figures 2 and 3) than both S and B1 beads. However, the extremely large size of the B2 beads and their high nonspecific binding with our substrates make them unsuitable for use in FDB immunoassays (data not shown).

To confirm that our chromophore incorporation process is compatible with the subsequent functionalization and use, we have conjugated the S-R6G beads with Abs (for *Bacillus anthracis*) and used them for a FDB sandwich immunoassay (10). As illustrated in Figure 4, the microbead labels bind to target [sonicated *B. anthracis* spores, 10^3 colony-forming units (cfu)/mL] captured onto the functionalized substrate. The distinguishing feature of this assay is that a magnetic force is then applied to remove beads bound to the substrate by weak nonspecific interactions, thereby reducing assay background and increasing both the sensitivity and specificity of the assay. By comparing fluorescent optical micrographs of the substrate before and after application of the discriminating force (Figure 4, B and D, and C and E, respectively), the fraction of the beads retained—proportional to the target concentration—can be determined. Note that we have not observed any qualitative change in the response of chromophore-modified beads to the magnetic field gradient used for force discrimination, indicating that the modification chemistry does not lead to appreciable loss of




Figure 4. The use of fluorescently modified S beads in a magnetic force discrimination immunoassay. (A) Illustration of the assay (not to scale). (B–E) Fluorescence micrographs ($128 \times 96 \mu\text{m}^2$) of the substrate before and after application of the discriminating force, respectively, showing the detection of (B and C) 0 cfu/mL and (D and E) 10^3 cfu/mL *Bacillus anthracis*. The image (inset) in panel E is from a comparable assay performed with conventional beads using transmission microscopy. S, SeraMag beads; cfu, colony-forming units.

magnetic material. Assay results obtained with the fluorescent microbeads are consistent with those obtained with conventional beads using transmission microscopy (Figure 4E, inset). In this case, the fraction of beads retained above background with fluorescent beads was $16\% \pm 3\%$ versus $20\% \pm 3\%$ with the original beads. Although these experiments were all performed with high-magnification optics, the ease of using fluorescence to identify beads demonstrates the feasibility of using a lower magnification optical system for bead detection. (We are currently fabricating such a system.)

In conclusion, the ability to use magnetic microbeads for both separation and detection makes them a valuable tool for a wide range of biotechnology applications. The addition of fluorescence to magnetic microbeads not only simplifies their optical detection, but offers additional multiplexing and "bar-coding" possibilities. Commercial sources exist that provide beads that are both fluorescent and magnetic, but limitations exist in homogeneity, fluorescent dyes incorporated, and bead sizes available. We have described a simple method to custom modify polystyrene-based magnetic microbeads to give uniform fluorescence signatures without affecting the magnetic or surface chemical properties. We have found that a variety of chromophores spanning the visible spectrum can be incorporated into submicron diameter particles, with R6G producing our best beads. The chromophores are physically entrapped within the polystyrene matrix, with no evidence of leaching. This general method should give researchers flexibility to fluorescently customize whichever magnetic microbeads are best for their applications.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We are grateful to Christina Cole and Alicia Scribner for their assistance with the immunoassays. This work was supported by the Office of Naval Research and the Joint Science and Technology Panel for Chemical Biological Defense through the U.S. Army. S.P.M. would also like to acknowledge the National Research Council Research Associateship Program.

REFERENCES

1. Melville, D., F. Paul, and S. Roath. 1975. Direct magnetic separation of red-cells from whole blood. *Nature* 255:706.
2. Patolsky, F., Y. Weizmann, E. Katz, and I. Willner. 2003. Magnetically amplified DNA assays (MADA): sensing of viral DNA and single-base mismatches by using nucleic acid modified magnetic particles. *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* 42:2372-2376.
3. Choi, J.-W., T.M. Liakopoulous, and C.H. Ahn. 2001. An on-chip magnetic bead separator using spiral electromagnets with semi-encapsulated permalloy. *Biosens. Bioelectron.* 16:409-416.
4. Choi, J.-W., C.H. Ahn, S. Bhansali, and H.T. Henderson. 2000. A new magnetic bead-based, filterless bio-separator with planar electromagnet surfaces for integrated bio-detection systems. *Sens. Actuators B Chem.* 68:34-39.
5. Weizmann, Y., F. Patolsky, E. Katz, and I. Willner. 2003. Amplified sensing and immunosensing by the rotation of functional magnetic particles. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 125:3452-3454.
6. Richardson, J., P. Hawkins, and R. Luxton. 2001. The use of coated paramagnetic particles as a physical label in a magneto-immunoassay. *Biosens. Bioelectron.* 16:989-993.
7. Richardson, J., A. Hill, R. Luxton, and P. Hawkins. 2001. A novel measuring system for the determination of paramagnetic particle labels for use in magneto-immunoassays. *Biosens. Bioelectron.* 16:1127-1132.
8. Baselt, D.R., G.U. Lee, M. Natesan, S.W. Metzger, P.E. Sheehan, and R.J. Colton. 1998. A biosensor based on magnetoresistance technology. *Biosens. Bioelectron.* 13:731-739.
9. Edelstein, R.L., C.R. Tamanaha, P.E. Sheehan, M.M. Miller, D.R. Baselt, L.J. Whitman, and R.J. Colton. 2000. The BARC biosensor applied to the detection of biological warfare agents. *Biosens. Bioelectron.* 14:805-813.
10. Lee, G.U., S. Metzger, M. Natesan, C. Yanavich, and Y.F. Dufrêne. 2000. Implementation of force differentiation in the immunoassay. *Anal. Biochem.* 287:261-271.
11. Rife, J.C., M.M. Miller, P.E. Sheehan, T.M. Tamanaha, and L.J. Whitman. 2003. Design and performance of GMR sensors for the detection of magnetic microbeads in biosensors. *Sens. Actuators A Phys.* 107:209-218.
12. Baselt, D.R., G.U. Lee, and R.J. Colton. 1996. Biosensor based on force microscope technology. *J. Vac. Sci. Technol. B* 14:789-793.
13. Cziraki, A., M. Koteles, L. Peter, J. Kupay, J. Padar, L. Pogany, I. Bakonyi, M. Uhlemann, et al. 2003. Correlation between interface structure and giant magnetoresistance in electrodeposited Co-Cu/Cu multilayers. *Thin Solid Films* 433:237-242.
14. Luby, S., E. Majkova, A. Debnarova, R. Senderak, V. Ac, and B. Anwarzai. 2003. Effect of magnetic flux distribution on GMR in Ag/Co multilayers. *Thin Solid Films* 433:243-246.
15. Pattanaik, G.R., D.K. Pandya, and S.C. Kashyap. 2003. Effect of process parameters on GMR in electrodeposited Cu-Co nanogranular thin films. *Thin Solid Films* 433:247-251.
16. Rahm, M., J. Raabe, R. Pulwey, J. Bibergger, W. Wegscheider, D. Weiss, and C. Meier. 2002. Planar hall sensors for micro-hall magnetometry. *J. Appl. Phys.* 91:7980-7982.
17. Johnson, M. 1998. Hybrid ferromagnetic-semiconductor devices. *J. Vac. Sci. Technol. A* 16:1806-1811.
18. Lee, G.U., L.A. Chrisey, and R.J. Colton. 1994. Direct measurement of the forces between complementary strands of DNA. *Science* 266:771-773.
19. Mattoussi, H., J.M. Mauro, E.R. Goldman, G.P. Anderson, V.C. Sundar, F.V. Mikulec, and M.G. Bawendi. 2000. Self-assembly of CdSe-ZnS quantum dot bioconjugates using an engineered recombinant protein. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 122:12142-12150.
20. Mattoussi, H., J.M. Mauro, E.R. Goldman, T.M. Green, G.P. Anderson, V.C. Sundar, and M.G. Bawendi. 2001. Bioconjugation of highly luminescent colloidal CdSe-ZnS quantum dots with an engineered two-domain recombinant protein. *Phys. Stat. Sol. B* 224:277-283.
21. Levitus, M., J.L. Bourdelande, G. Marques, and P.F. Armendia. 1999. Fluorescence anisotropy of dyes included in crosslinked polystyrene. *J. Photochem. Photobiol. A Chem.* 126:77-82.
22. Tauer, K., H. Kaspar, and M. Antonietti. 2000. Equilibrium swelling of colloidal polymeric particles with water-insoluble organic solvents. *Colloid Polym. Sci.* 278:814-820.
23. Han, M., X. Gao, J.Z. Su, and S. Nie. 2001. Quantum-dot-tagged microbeads for multiplexed optical coding of biomolecules. *Nat. Biotechnol.* 19:631-635.

Received 30 September 2003; accepted 6 January 2004.

Address correspondence to Lloyd J. Whitman, Naval Research Laboratory, Code 6177, Washington, DC 20375-5342 USA. e-mail: whitman@nrl.navy.mil