

BIOSENSING

Biosensing

International Research and Development

JEROME SCHULTZ

University of California, Riverside, CA, U.S.A.

MILAN MRKSICH

University of Chicago, IL, U.S.A.

SANGEETA N. BHATIA

University of California, San Diego, CA, U.S.A.

DAVID J. BRADY

Duke University, Durham, NC, U.S.A.

ANTONIO J. RICCO

Stanford University, Los Gatos, CA, U.S.A.

DAVID R. WALT

Tufts University, Medford, MA, U.S.A.

and

CHARLES L. WILKINS

University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, AR, U.S.A.



A C.I.P. Catalogue record for this book is available from the Library of Congress.

ISBN-10 1-4020-4057-1 (HB)
ISBN-13 978-1-4020-4057-3 (HB)
ISBN-10 1-4020-4058-X (e-book)
ISBN-13 978-1-4020-4058-0 (e-book)

Published by Springer,
P.O. Box 17, 3300 AA Dordrecht, The Netherlands.

www.springer.com

This document was sponsored by the National Science Foundation (NSF) and other agencies of the U.S. Government under awards from the NSF (ENG-0104476) and the Army Research Office (DAAD19-03-1-0067) awarded to the World Technology Evaluation Center, Inc. The government has certain rights in this material. Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the United States Government, the authors' parent institutions, or WTEC, Inc.

Copyright to electronic versions by WTEC, Inc. and Springer except as noted. The U.S. Government retains a nonexclusive and nontransferable license to exercise all exclusive rights provided by copyright. All WTEC final reports are distributed on the Internet at <http://www.wtec.org>. Some WTEC reports are distributed on paper by the National Technical Information Service (NTIS) of the U.S. Department of Commerce.

Printed on acid-free paper

All Rights Reserved
© 2006 Springer

No part of this work may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, microfilming, recording or otherwise, without written permission from the Publisher, with the exception of any material supplied specifically for the purpose of being entered and executed on a computer system, for exclusive use by the purchaser of the work.

Printed in the Netherlands.

WTEC Panel on International R&D in Biosensing

Jerome Schultz (chair)
University of California, Riverside, CA, U.S.A.
Milan Mrksich (vice-chair)
The University of Chicago, Chicago, IL, U.S.A.
Sangeeta N. Bhatia
University of California, San Diego, CA, U.S.A.
David J. Brady
University of California, Riverside, CA, U.S.A.
Antonio J. Ricco
Los Gatos, CA, U.S.A.
David R. Walt
Tufts University, Medford, MA, U.S.A.
Charles L. Wilkins
University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, AR, U.S.A.

Abstract

This report reviews international research and development activities in the field of biosensing. Biosensing includes systems that incorporate a variety of means, including electrical, electronic, and photonic devices; biological materials (e.g., tissue, enzymes, nucleic acids, etc.); and chemical analysis to produce detectable signals for the monitoring or identification of biological phenomena. This is distinct from “biosensors” that employ only biological materials or mechanisms for sensing. In a broader sense, the study of biosensing includes any approach to detection of biological elements and the associated software or computer identification technologies (e.g., imaging) that identify biological characteristics. Topics covered include the national initiatives, interactions between industry and universities, technology and manufacturing infrastructure, and emerging applications research. The panel’s findings include the following: Europe leads in development and deployment of inexpensive distributed sensing systems. Europe also leads in integration of components and materials in microfabricated systems. Europe and Japan both have much R&D on DNA array technology, but the impact is likely to be only incremental. The United States leads in surface engineering applied to biosensing and in integration of analog-digital systems. Both Europe’s and Japan’s communication infrastructures are better suited for networked biosensing applications than those of the United States. Integrated biosensing research groups are more common in Europe and Japan. Additional findings are outlined in the panel’s executive summary.

WTEC MISSION

WTEC provides assessments of foreign research and development in selected technologies under awards from the National Science Foundation, the Office of Naval Research, and other agencies. Formerly part of Loyola College's International Technology Research Institute, WTEC is now a separate non-profit research institute. Michael Reischman, Deputy Assistant Director for Engineering, is NSF Program Director for WTEC. Sponsors interested in international technology assessments and related studies can provide support for the program through NSF or directly through separate grants to WTEC.

WTEC's mission is to inform U.S. scientists, engineers, and policymakers of global trends in science and technology. WTEC assessments cover basic research, advanced development, and applications. Panels of typically six technical experts conduct WTEC assessments. Panelists are leading authorities in their field, technically active, and knowledgeable about U.S. and foreign research programs. As part of the assessment process, panels visit and carry out extensive discussions with foreign scientists and engineers in their labs.

The WTEC staff helps select topics, recruits expert panelists, arranges study visits to foreign laboratories, organizes workshop presentations, and finally, edits and disseminates the final reports.

Executive Editor: Dr. Marvin Cassman, Former Director, National Institute of General Medical Sciences, NIH

Series Editor: Dr. R.D. Shelton, President WTEC

WORLD TECHNOLOGY EVALUATION CENTER, INC. (WTEC)

R.D. Shelton, President

Y.T. Chien, Vice President for Research

Michael DeHaemer, Vice President for Development

Geoffrey M. Holdridge, Vice President for Government Services

Roan E. Horning, Vice President for Operations

Bobby A. Williams, Director of HR and Disbursements

Laura Pearson, Director of Administration

Patricia Johnson, Editor

Advance work by Hassan Ali and Nick Clemens

FOREWORD

We have come to know that our ability to survive and grow as a nation to a very large degree depends upon our scientific progress. Moreover, it is not enough simply to keep abreast of the rest of the world in scientific matters. We must maintain our leadership.¹

President Harry Truman spoke those words in 1950, in the aftermath of World War II and in the midst of the Cold War. Indeed, the scientific and engineering leadership of the United States and its allies in the twentieth century played key roles in the successful outcomes of both World War II and the Cold War, sparing the world the twin horrors of fascism and totalitarian communism, and fueling the economic prosperity that followed. Today, as the United States and its allies once again find themselves at war, President Truman's words ring as true as they did a half-century ago. The goal set out in the Truman Administration of maintaining leadership in science has remained the policy of the U.S. Government to this day: Dr. John Marburger, the Director of the Office of Science and Technology (OSTP) in the Executive Office of the President made remarks to that effect during his confirmation hearings in October 2001.²

The United States needs metrics for measuring its success in meeting this goal of maintaining leadership in science and technology. That is one of the reasons that the National Science Foundation (NSF) and many other agencies of the U.S. Government have supported the World Technology Evaluation Center (WTEC) and its predecessor programs for the past 20 years. While other programs have attempted to measure the international competitiveness of U.S. research by comparing funding amounts, publication statistics, or patent activity, WTEC has been the most significant public domain effort in the U.S. Government to use peer review to evaluate the status of U.S. efforts in comparison to those abroad. Since 1983, WTEC has conducted over 50 such assessments in a wide variety of fields, from advanced computing, to nanoscience and technology, to biotechnology.

The results have been extremely useful to NSF and other agencies in evaluating ongoing research programs, and in setting objectives for the

¹ Remarks by the President on May 10, 1950, on the occasion of the signing of the law that created the National Science Foundation. *Public Papers of the Presidents* 120: p. 338.

² http://www.ostp.gov/html/01_1012.html.

future. WTEC studies also have been important in establishing new lines of communication and identifying opportunities for cooperation between U.S. researchers and their colleagues abroad, thus helping to accelerate the progress of science and technology generally within the international community. WTEC is an excellent example of cooperation and coordination among the many agencies of the U.S. Government that are involved in funding research and development: almost every WTEC study has been supported by a coalition of agencies with interests related to the particular subject at hand.

As President Truman said over 50 years ago, our very survival depends upon continued leadership in science and technology. WTEC plays a key role in determining whether the United States is meeting that challenge, and in promoting that leadership.

Michael Reischman
Deputy Assistant Director for Engineering
National Science Foundation

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Foreword	i
Table of Contents	iii
List of Figures	vii
List of Tables.....	ix
Preface.....	xi
Executive Summary	xiii
1. Infrastructure Overview	
<i>Jerome Schultz</i>	
Introduction to the Study.....	1
History of Biosensing Development	5
Technology Drivers	7
Enablers of Biosensing Technologies.....	9
Biosensing Infrastructure/Investment Trends in the United States	11
Biosensing Infrastructure/Investment Trends in Europe.....	18
Biosensing Infrastructure/Investment Trends in Japan	23
Summary	27
References.....	28
2. Optical Biosensing	
<i>David R. Walt</i>	
Introduction.....	31
Surface-Based Optical Biosensing	33
Biosensing Arrays	34
Inexpensive and Distributed Sensors	35
Nanostructured Materials.....	37
Application of Molecular Biology to Optical Biosensing.....	39
General Observations	40
References.....	42
3. Electro-Based Sensors and Surface Engineering	
<i>Milan Mrksich</i>	
Introduction.....	45
Overview of R&D Activities	46
Underlying Technical Themes	48
Relative Strengths of Regional Programs	50
Key Factors for Future Development.....	51
Observations and Conclusions	52
References.....	52

4. Cell and Tissue-Based Sensors*Sangeeta N. Bhatia*

Introduction	55
Scope of Cell-Based Sensors	55
Key Science/Technology Issues.....	59
Summary	64
Conclusions.....	64
Recommended Reading	65

5. Mass Spectrometry and Biosensing Research*Charles L. Wilkins*

Introduction.....	67
Mass Spectrometry Background	68
Mass Spectrometry Research in Europe	72
Mass Spectrometry Research in Japan.....	75
Conclusions.....	75
References.....	76

6. Microfabricated Biosensing Devices: MEMS, Microfluidics, and Mass Sensors*Antonio J. Ricco*

Introduction.....	79
Definitions and Scope	80
R&D: Drivers, Trends, and Challenges	81
Microfluidic Systems.....	91
Mass Sensing: Mature Quartz and Evolving Silicon Technologies.....	93
Summary Findings: General Trends and Specific Opportunities.....	99
Conclusion: Important Targets for BioMEMS	103
References.....	103

7. Information Systems for Biosensing*David J. Brady*

Information System Challenges in Biosensing	107
Biosensing Information Systems in the United States	110
Biosensing Information Systems in Europe.....	113
Biosensing Information Systems in Japan	115
Opportunities.....	115
References.....	116

APPENDICES

A. Panel Biographies.....	121
B. Site Reports—Europe and Australia	
Biacore Sweden	127
Cranfield University at Silsoe.....	129
DiagnoSwiss	135
Dublin City University.....	137
Eberhard Karls University Tübingen	140
École Normale Supérieure (ENS)	147
École Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne (EPFL), Institute of Biomolecular Sciences.....	150
École Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne (EPFL), Institute of Molecular and Biological Chemistry	152
Griffith University, Gold Coast Campus	158
Institute for Chemical and Biochemical Sensors (ICB).....	160
Linköping University	165
Oxford Glycosciences (UK), Ltd.	173
Potsdam University	175
Ruprecht-Karls University Heidelberg	180
Swiss Federal Institute of Technology (ETH), Zürich, Department of Chemistry.....	188
Swiss Federal Institute of Technology (ETH), Zürich, Physical Electronics Laboratory.....	192
University of Cambridge.....	195
University of Manchester Institute of Science and Technology (UMIST)	198
University of Neuchâtel	201
University of Regensburg	208
University of Twente MESA+ Institute	211
University of Twente Laboratory of Biosensors	216
The University of Warwick.....	218
C. Appendix C. Site Reports—Japan	
Initium, Inc.....	221
Japan Advanced Institute of Science and Technology (JAIST).....	226
Kyushu University	230
Matsushita Electric Industrial Co., Inc. (National/Panasonic).....	232
The National Institute of Advanced Industrial Science and Technology (AIST) Kansai (Osaka) Center	237
National Institute of Advanced Industrial Science and Technology (AIST) Tsukuba Central, Research Center of Advanced Bionics.....	240

National Institute of Advanced Industrial Science and Technology (AIST), Tsukuba Central, Division of Biological Resources and Functions Biosensing Technology Research Group	243
National Rehabilitation Center for Persons with Disabilities	245
RIKEN (Wako Main Campus), Discovery Research Institute, Bioengineering Laboratory	249
RIKEN (Wako Main Campus), Frontier Research Program, Local Spatio-Temporal Functions Laboratory	254
Tokyo Institute of Technology, Graduate School of Bioscience and Biotechnology	258
Tokyo University of Agriculture and Technology, Department of Biotechnology	262
University of Tokyo, Department of Chemistry	279
University of Tokyo, School of Pharmaceutical Sciences	282
D. NIH Grants Related to Biosensing, CY 2002	284
E. NSF-Sponsored Projects Related to Biosensing, CY2002	299
F. DOD/DARPA Programs Related to Biosensing	312
G. U.S. Army Research Office-Funded Projects Related to Biosensing, as of March 2004	314
H. U.S. Department of Energy Research Related to Biosensing (1999)	317
I. European Union 6th Framework Programme (2002–2006)	320
J. Europe and Japan Patents Related to Biosensing, 1999–2003	328
K. Bibliometric Study of World Biosensors Research, 1997–2002	362
L. Glossary	384

LIST OF FIGURES

1.1	First “enzyme” electrode—an electrode system for continuous monitoring in cardiovascular surgery.....	6
1.2	A simplified matrix that can lead to a variety of combinations of molecular recognition elements and transducers to produce biosensors.	7
1.3	Evolutions of the confluence of technologies as related to biosensing in the field of clinical analytical chemistry.....	10
1.4	Subcutaneous glucose sensor 1 mm wide under development by Medtronic/MiniMed Corp.....	10
1.5	Fluorescence pattern on an array chip for identifying DNA fragments.	11
1.6	Growth of the biotechnology industry in Berlin-Brandenburg region	22
1.7	Product areas for the biotechnology industry in Berlin-Brandenburg region	22
1.8	Cooperative Research Center at TUAT.	24
1.9	Tokyo University of Technology’s Katayanagi Advanced Research Laboratories building.	25
2.1	Examples of holographic biosensing before and after a test.....	35
2.2	Inexpensive optical sensor for testing integrity of meat packaging	36
2.3	Nanoparticle array localized surface plasmon resonance spectroscopy (LSPR) spectroscopy and nanostructured gold materials on a substrate provide local enhancement in the plasmon resonance.....	37
2.4	Porous Si particles can be fabricated and used to sense analytes.....	38
2.5	A fluorescent indicator for protein phosphorylation in living cells	40
3.1	Oligo(ethylene glycol)-terminated self-assembled monolayers.....	49
4.1	Cell-based sensing. Cells sense extracellular species via membrane-bound or nuclear receptors.....	56
4.2	Control of cell physiology using micropatterning	60
4.3	Integration of microtechnology and biological species	63
4.4	Automation and parallel screening	63

5.1	A miniaturized cylindrical ion trap with a commercial ion trap for comparison.....	69
5.2	A miniaturized time-of-flight mass spectrometer showing the sample probe, the end cap, and the coaxial detector.....	71
5.3	Laser ablation MS through scanning near-field optical spectroscopy (SNOM) tips	73
6.1	System architecture and chip photograph of an integrated MEMS multisensor.....	83
6.2	Artist's concept of a "diving board" microcantilever biosensor developed at the University of California, Berkeley, and Oak Ridge National Laboratory	85
6.3	MEMS space bioreactor system developed by the Institute of Microtechnology at the University of Neuchâtel.....	85
6.4	Metal nanowires and nanowalls grown at 925°C in a process utilizing gold surface diffusion and aggregation at nodes	89
6.5	Schematic of a microfluidic system developed by ACLARA BioSciences	92
6.6	Glass microchip with arrangement of microchannels to accomplish "two-dimensional" protein separations	94
6.7	A particle-type-specific piezoelectric biosensor developed at Cambridge University.....	97
6.8	Scanning electron micrograph of a microfluidic channel containing a series of micromachined pipets.....	102
7.1	Baltes group multifunctional chemical sensor on a chip	114

LIST OF TABLES

ES.1	Comparative Patterns in Funding of Biosensing R&D and Commercialization, by Region	xvii
ES.2	Comparison of U.S., Japanese, and European R&D Activities in Biosensing	xix
1.1	Key Members of the WTEC Team and Their Roles in the Biosensing Study	3
1.2	History of Chemical and Biological Sensors	6
1.3	Potential Near-Term Nanotechnology with CBRE Impact.....	12
1.4	EU Sixth Framework Programme, Research Budget	20
1.5	Comparison of Infrastructure Development in Biosensing R&D: U.S., Europe, and Japan	28
2.1	Optical Based Sensing	42
4.1	Comparison of International Research in Cell-Based Sensors	64
5.1	Typical Parameters for Miniature Mass Analyzers	70
5.2	Comparison of Research in Mass Spectrometry Applied to Biosensing.....	76

PREFACE

This report was prepared by the World Technology Evaluation Center (WTEC), a nonprofit research institute funded by grants and other awards from most of the Federal research agencies. Among other studies, WTEC has provided peer reviews by panels of U.S. experts of international research and development (R&D) in more than 55 fields since 1989. In 2002, WTEC was asked by several agencies to assess international R&D in biosensing. This report is the final product of that study.

We would like to thank our distinguished panel of experts, who are the authors of this report, for all of their efforts to bring this study to a successful conclusion. We also are very grateful to our foreign hosts for their generous hospitality, and to the participants in our preliminary workshop on U.S. biosensing R&D. Of course, this study would not have been possible without encouragement from our sponsor representatives: Bruce Hamilton, Fred Heineken, Elbert Marsh, Deborah Young, Fil Bartoli, and Vijay Jain of the National Science Foundation (NSF); Christine Kelley, Joan Harmon, Dick Swaja, Mollie Sourwine, and Stephen Green of the National Institutes of Health (NIH); John Hines and Steve Davison of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA); Dan Schmoldt of the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA); and Micheline Strand of the U.S. Army Research Office (ARO).

This report covers a broad spectrum of material on the subject, so it may be useful to give a preview here. The Executive Summary was prepared by the chair, Jerome Schultz, with input from all the panelists. The chapters in the body of this report present the panel's findings in an analytical organization by subdiscipline. Appendix A provides the biographies of the panelists. Appendices B and C contain the panel's individual reports on each site visited in Europe and Japan, which form a chronological or geographic organization of much of the material. Appendices D-H present information on U.S. Government sponsored projects in the field. Appendix I presents biosensing program information from the European Union 6th Framework Programme (2002–2006). Appendix J lists recent biosensing-related patents filed by organizations that hosted the panel's site visits in Europe and Japan.

To complement the qualitative assessment by peer review, Appendix K is a quantitative bibliometric study of international biosensors research for 1997-2002. This work was performed by Grant Lewison of the City University, London, for WTEC. Finally, a glossary is provided as Appendix L.

All the products of this project are available at <http://www.wtec.org>. The full-color electronic version of this report is particularly useful for viewing

some of the figures that do not reproduce well in black and white. Also posted at this site are the slideshows from two workshops held for this project, which contain considerable additional information on biosensing R&D in the United States and abroad.

Roan Horning
WTEC, Inc.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Jerome S. Schultz

The long-standing U.S. national interest in biosensing has encompassed broad requirements for reliable and sensitive sensing systems for medical diagnostics, environmental monitoring, and food safety assurance. National demands on biosensing systems have expanded and taken on a new urgency in the wake of the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks and the anthrax attacks that followed.

In a broad sense, the study of biosensing includes any approach to detection of biological elements and the associated software or computer identification technologies (e.g., imaging) that identify biological characteristics. *Biosensing systems* incorporate a variety of means, including electrical, electronic, and photonic devices; biological materials such as tissue, enzymes, and nucleic acids; and chemical analysis, to produce detectable signals for the monitoring or identification of biological phenomena. This is distinct from *biosensors* that employ only biological materials or mechanisms for sensing. Biosensing is finding a growing number of applications in a wide variety of areas, including biomedicine; food production and processing; and detection of bacteria, viruses, and biological toxins for bio-warfare defense.

In late May 2002, the World Technology Evaluation Center (WTEC) embarked on a study to assess research and development activities related to biosensing in the United States and worldwide, under the sponsorship of the National Science Foundation (NSF), the National Institutes of Health (NIH), the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) and the Army Research Office (ARO). The goals of this study are to gather information and disseminate it to government decisionmakers, the research community, and the public on worldwide status and trends in biosensing R&D, and to critically analyze and compare the research in the United States with that being pursued in Japan, Europe, or other major industrialized countries. The information gathered through this study is intended to serve the purposes of identifying good ideas worth exploring in U.S. R&D programs; clarifying research opportunities and requirements for progress in the field; identifying opportunities for international collaboration; and

evaluating the position of foreign research programs relative to those in the United States.

To achieve these goals, WTEC recruited a panel of seven experts in the field (see biographies in Appendix A) to carry out a series of three major tasks designed to deliver the maximum amount of quality information to the sponsors and the public within the constraints of time and resources:

1. Host a workshop of members of the U.S. biosensing R&D community to characterize the state of the art and current trends in biosensor technologies in the United States. [The WTEC Biosensing Study U.S. R&D Overview Workshop was held at NIH in Bethesda, MD, on 3–4 December 2002.]
2. Conduct site visits to gather first-hand information from many of the world's best university and industrial laboratories in biosensing research. [The WTEC panelists conducted site visits to laboratories in Europe, Australia, and Japan during January and March 2003.]
3. Report back findings in both a public forum and in writing to the U.S. sponsors, the scientific community, and the public at large. [The WTEC Workshop on Biosensing in Europe, Japan, and the United States was held on 13 May 2003 at the Bethesda, MD, Marriott Hotel.]

This report, the final phase of the study, details and analyzes the results of the WTEC biosensing panel's literature review, U.S. survey, and Europe and Japan site visits. It is available to the public on the Web at www.wtec.org/biosensing, as well as in print.

PRINCIPAL FINDINGS

Infrastructure

Biosensing research has exploded dramatically in recent years. Both NIH and NSF sponsored over 200 projects related to biosensing in 2002. Appendixes D and E lists these projects as examples of ongoing research, ranging from surface chemistry to intelligent agents, and Appendixes F-H give an insight into the depth and breadth of work funded by the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA), ARO, and the Department of Energy (DOE).

Expansion of research activity has been facilitated by major technological breakthroughs in the fields of microelectronics, microfabrication, surface science, photonics, and information sciences. In current terminology, "Bio-Nano-Info" has become a new paradigm for the convergence of research in the fields of biotechnology, nanotechnology, and information technology. In the United States, NSF has recognized this trend of connecting bio-nano-info in its report, *Converging Technologies*

for Improving Human Performance (Roco and Bainbridge 2003). Further evidence for the overlap of fields are DARPA programs in BioComputational Systems, Bio-Molecular Microsystems (SIMBIOSYS), and Nanostructure in Biology.

Because of this technological convergence, it is difficult to separate out the human, technical, and financial resources that are being allocated to biosensing systems alone. Along with the multidisciplinary nature of the science advancing biosensing R&D, it is clear that Japan and Europe are increasingly building collaborative efforts to carry out biosensing projects; in some cases the teams are industrial/academic; in others, government/academic. It also appears there is an escalating interest in commercialization of biosensing technologies, and several large new biosensing-related R&D facilities are being built. A manifestation of these infrastructure trends is seen in various program initiatives in the United States, Europe, and Japan.

In Europe, an indicator of future goals and plans for research is provided by the EU's Sixth Framework Programme solicitations for 2002–2006 (see summary in Appendix I). Although, this framework document does not explicitly identify biosensing technologies as a program element, one can find references to biosensing systems under these program areas:

- Life Sciences, genomics, and biotechnology for health
- Information Society technologies
- Nanotechnologies and nanosciences, knowledge-based multifunctional materials, and new production processes and devices

The projected budget for these topics is about \$7 billion, and about \$1 billion of these funds will probably relate directly to biosensing systems.

Another feature of the European approach to building a research and commercial capability relating to biosensing products is the organization of collaborative partnerships between academic research centers and companies. For example, in the Berlin-Brandenburg region there are three Max Planck Institutes and two Fraunhofer Institutes located near the University of Potsdam that actively work on several collaborative projects. There are approximately 100 companies in this consortium with interests in diagnostics, biotechnology, and software that will accelerate the transfer of biosensing systems into the marketplace.

In Japan, the universities the WTEC panel visited all had programs relating biotechnology, nanotechnology, and computers. For example, the fields of interest stated by the President of the Tokyo University of Agriculture and Technology are (1) Biotechnology, (2) Information and Communications Technologies, (3) Environmental Science and Resource Science, and (4) Nanotechnology. This university has an extensive

program of providing incubator facilities to promote technology transfer from the university to industry.

WTEC visits to various universities confirmed that a major change is underway in the ability of universities in Japan to interact with industry, as many state-owned institutions will be released from central government control in the next few years. This has resulted in a significant increase in patent application activity by Japanese faculty. Another example of the trend for the direct connection of university and corporate research is the new School of Bionics at the Tokyo University of Technology. A new US\$250 million building with 15,000 m² of space opened in April 2003 to house industrial/academic research projects along with the traditional academic research and academic facilities. Four floors of the new facility were to be occupied by corporate research laboratories who will co-sponsor research in the institute. The university also plans to have a degree program in technology management.

There is extensive collaboration in Japan between government laboratories and academia. Visits to government laboratories indicate significant national spending, despite Japanese economic hardship. This suggests acceptance of the idea that technology is essential for future economic success.

To complement the WTEC panel's literature review, public forums, and first-hand observations of international biosensing research and development, this report includes in Appendix K a bibliometric study of international biosensors research in the period 1997–2002 that underscores the high activity in this field based on the number and quality of published biosensor studies in this period, particularly in the United States, Europe, and Japan.

Table ES.1 summarizes the key observations by the WTEC panel concerning the patterns of infrastructure development for biosensing in the United States, Europe, and Japan, to highlight the unique approaches and relative strengths of these regions.

TECHNOLOGY HIGHLIGHTS FROM SITE VISITS

In two separate, one-week rounds of visits in early 2003, the WTEC panel toured 40 premier research establishments in Europe, Australia, and Japan that have a focus or known activities in biosensing and related areas. These visits included universities, industry laboratories, and government research centers: 23 facilities in Europe and Australia, and 17 in Japan. The capabilities listed below reflect not a detailed analysis but rather highlights of first-hand interviews and observations of programs in the laboratories the panel visited. Site reports are included in Appendix B (Europe and Australia) and Appendix C (Japan) of this report.

Table ES.1
Comparative Patterns in Funding of Biosensing R&D and Commercialization, by Region†

	United States	Europe	Japan
Research Focus	Fundamental science: Academia, national labs Applied science & engineering: small companies, national labs, large companies	Applied Science & engineering: academia, national labs, small & large companies	Fundamental science, engineering
Teaming mechanisms	Individual investigators, interdisciplinary interactions	Multidisciplinary teams	Individual investigators, interdisciplinary teams
Types of collaboration	International collaborations	Multinational teams, major EU support	National focus
Support for new technology areas	Federal support to open new technology areas: MEMS, microfluidics, nanotechnology	Generally follow U.S. lead into new technology areas	Generally follow U.S. lead, but industry has a longer time horizon than the U.S.
Academic support for applications focus in R&D	Nonuniform support	Strong support	Widespread support
Support for technology transfer to industry, commercialization	Federal government, individual entrepreneur, venture* support	Local government support, national government support, academic admin. support	National government support and increasing university emphasis

† Bold indicates particular strength /emphasis

* In good economic times

Europe

- Highly automated 2D-gel ICAT (mass spectrometry) techniques are used to carry out high-throughput protein analysis at Oxford GlycoSciences (Dr. Christian Pohlff).
- A combination of lab-on-a-chip technologies and mass spectroscopy are used to tackle the challenging characterization of the proteome at the University of Twente, MESA+ Institute (Professor David Reinhoudt).
- Live cell analysis with the Biacore Procel fluorescence detection/microfluidic system is well established at Biacore in Uppsala, Sweden.
- Reflectometric interference spectroscopy is used for low-cost and highly miniaturized biosensing arrays at the Institute of Physical and Theoretical Chemistry, University of Tübingen (Professor Gunter Gauglitz).
- Low-energy electron point-source (LEEPS) microscopy appears to be leading towards resolutions of features below 1 nm at Ruprecht-Karls University Heidelberg (Professor Michael Grunze).
- Lipid bilayer vesicles and lipid nanotube-vesicle-networks are being investigated for encapsulation and support of reconstituted biological functions such as receptors, synaptic vesicles, and signal-transduction systems/pathways at Linköping University (Professor Ingemar Lundstrom).

Japan

- Uniform, nano-sized (50–100 nm), lipid-covered (containing fusion proteins) ferromagnetic particles produced by *magnetospirillum magneticum* are used as unique components of biosensors at Tokyo University of Agriculture and Technology, Department of Biotechnology and Life Science (Professor Tadashi Matsunaga).
- Ferrocenyl naphthalene diimide (FND) is being used as a DNA hybridization indicator to enable charge transfer to microelectrodes producing an electrochemical signal proportional to the amount of target DNA at Kyushu University (Professor Shigeori Takanaka).
- Confocal microscopic imaging of molecular events in single living cells is being achieved by protein constructs of biorecognition molecules with fluorescent proteins at the University of Tokyo, Department of Chemistry (Professor Yoshi Umezawa).
- A thermal lens microscope technique has been perfected to measure concentrations in the zepto-mole range, or about 50–100 molecules,

on biochips at the School of Engineering, University of Tokyo (Professor T. Kitamori).

- Novel methods are being used to synthesize photo-induced electron transfer (PET) of organic species that are incorporated in the design of new sensing materials at the Graduate School of Pharmaceutical Sciences, University of Tokyo (Professor Kazuya Kikuchi).

COMPARATIVE REGIONAL STRENGTHS IN KEY BIOSENSING AREAS

The WTEC panel collected a vast amount of information from a preliminary literature review, the initial U.S. workshop, site visits to Europe and Japan, and the final workshop to report on and receive feedback from the research community about the study findings. Based on this information, the panel has made a comparative assessment of the status of biosensing research in Europe and Japan relative to that in the United States. Table ES.2 compares for each of the key areas of biosensing that are discussed in chapters 2 through 7 the panel's evaluation of the knowledge bases, work to date/in progress, and the relative approaches/strengths of the worldwide biosensing field generally, with a summary assessment of which region(s) lead the area.

Table ES.2.
Comparison of U.S., Japanese, and European R&D Activities in Biosensing

Area	Subarea	Topic	Knowledge Base	Work to Date	Leading Region
Optical Biosensing (see Chapter 2)		Arrays	Patterning Surface chemistry	Extensive, mature	U.S.
		Interferometric, label-free	Surface plasmon resonance Interference	Old method, but ongoing efforts	Europe
		Cheap, distributed sensors	Screen printing Optical transduction	New and promising	Europe

Table ES.2.
Comparison of U.S., Japanese, and European R&D Activities in
Biosensing

Area	Subarea	Topic	Knowledge Base	Work to Date	Leading Region
		Nano-technology	New signaling mechanisms New materials	Metal particles	U.S.
		Molecular biology	Genetic engineering Cell biology	Well-developed technology being applied to biosensing	U.S.>Europe>Japan
		Integration	Engineering, Chemistry, Computer science	Team science and engineering	Europe
Electro-Based Sensors (see Chapter 3)	Materials	Reagents	Advanced	Mature	U.S., Europe
		Electrodes	Advanced	Mature	All
	Surface Engineering	Surface chemistry	Advanced	Substantial	U.S., Europe
		Immob./Pattern	Advanced	Substantial	U.S., Europe
	Transduction Strategies	Conventional	Advanced	Substantial	All
		Nanoscale	Early	Beginning	U.S.>Europe, Japan
	Systems	Arrays	Intermediate	Beginning	U.S.>Europe
		Integration	Intermediate	Substantial	Europe>Japan, U.S.
Cell- and Tissue-based Sensors (see Chapter 4)	Transduction Strategies	Electrical	Early	Beginning	All
		Optical	Intermediate	Progressing	U.S., Europe
	Interface Engineering	Surface chemistry	Advanced	Substantial	U.S., Europe
		Cell function	Early	Progressing	U.S., Europe
	Integration	Micro-technology	Intermediate	Substantial	Europe>Japan, U.S.
		Commercialization	Drug discovery Diagnostics	Progressing Little	U.S. None

Table ES.2.
Comparison of U.S., Japanese, and European R&D Activities in
Biosensing

Area	Subarea	Topic	Knowledge Base	Work to Date	Leading Region
Mass Spectrometry (MS) (see Chapter 5)	Mass sensors, MEMS, and microfluidics	Mass sensors	Excellent	Europe, U.S., Japan	Equally advanced, commercialized
	Mass spectrometric methods	Compact instrument development	Excellent, but problems remain	Europe, U.S.	Europe, U.S.
		Portable MS development	Excellent, but problems remain	Europe, U.S.	Europe, U.S.
		Novel MS interface	Excellent, but problems remain	Europe, U.S.	Europe, U.S.
		Proteomics	Excellent; very active research area	Europe, U.S.	Europe, U.S.
Micro-fabricated Biosensing Devices: MEMS, Microfluidics, and Mass Sensors (see Chapter 6)	MEMS	Biosensing components	Advanced	Extensive	U.S.~ Japan ~ Europe
		Integrated systems	Incomplete	Significant	Europe
		Integration of biomaterials	Minimal	Isolated examples	Europe, U.S.
	Microfluidics	Discrete devices	Advanced	Extensive	U.S.
		Integrated systems	Incomplete	Minor	Europe ~U.S.> Japan
	Mass sensors	Piezo devices	Advanced	Extensive	None
		Si cantilevers	Incomplete (esp. liquid operation)	Significant (dry) Minor (wet)	U.S. ~ Europe
		Integrated biomaterials	Incomplete	Significant	Europe ~Japan

Table ES.2.
Comparison of U.S., Japanese, and European R&D Activities in Biosensing

Area	Subarea	Topic	Knowledge Base	Work to Date	Leading Region
	Nanotechnology	“Top-down” (nanofab)	Incomplete	Significant	U.S. > Europe
		“Bottom-up” (molec. organized materials)	Incomplete	Extensive	U.S. Japan, Europe
		Integration into complex (bio) systems	Incomplete	Little	Europe ~ U.S.
Information Systems for Biosensing (see Chapter 7)		Algorithms	Geometric segmentation	Theoretical/early experiments	U.S.
		Communications	Ad hoc and infrastructure	3G wireless and open spectra	U.S.—ad hoc; Japan—infrastructure; Europe—applications development
		System Integration	CMOS and MEMS/ Microfluidics	Lab on a chip demos	U.S.—MEMS, microfluidics; Europe—integrated electronics

The WTEC panel’s conclusions regarding the relative strengths in Europe, Japan, and the United States of biosensing R&D may be summarized as follows:

- Europe leads in development and deployment of inexpensive distributed sensing systems.
- Europe also leads in integration of components and materials in microfabricated systems.
- Europe and Japan both have much R&D on DNA array technology, but the impact is likely to be only incremental.
- The United States leads in surface engineering applied to biosensing and in integration of analog-digital systems.

- Both Europe's and Japan's communication infrastructures are better suited for networked biosensing applications than those of the United States.
- Integrated biosensing research groups are more common in Europe and Japan.

CONCLUSIONS

Among the significant overall trends and emerging opportunities that the WTEC biosensing panel identified are the following:

- Increasing pervasiveness of systems on a chip and other integrated systems approaches
- Growth of microfluidic/micromechanical systems
- Emergence of molecular receptor engineering
- Development of sensor networks and advanced logistical strategies

There is also a general trend towards the development of biosensors as a low-cost, commodity-like technology that will find application in a wide variety of consumer products.

In addition to these trends, the U.S. research community has identified several broad requirements and goals for ongoing development of the field of biosensing systems:

- Rapid, inexpensive, and broad based tests for detection and identification of toxic materials and organisms
- Standards for validation and comparison of technologies
- Methods that can be fielded as sentinels in the environment to monitor food, water, soil, and air quality
- Improved sampling and preprocessing techniques
- System automation for unskilled operators

REFERENCES

Roco, M.C., and W.S. Bainbridge, eds. 2003. *Converging technologies for improving human performance: Nanotechnology, biotechnology, information technology and cognitive science*. Dordrecht; Boston, Mass.: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

CHAPTER 1

INFRASTRUCTURE OVERVIEW

Jerome Schultz

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

Biosensing technologies comprise portable devices and systems used for identifying, monitoring, and controlling biological phenomena. Most of these technologies have come into use just in the last two decades; nevertheless, biosensing already garners major academic, government, and industry R&D funding; relies on highly sophisticated multidisciplinary technology; and enjoys well developed and growing markets. Prior to September 11, 2001, U.S. biosensing development was driven primarily by the requirements of medical diagnostics, environmental monitoring, and food safety assurance. Since September 11, worries about anthrax, smallpox, and or other biological “weapons” in the hands of terrorists have elevated the prominence of biosensing as a component of bio-warfare defense. Adding to the rapidly growing significance of biosensing is its place in the remarkable convergence of advanced bio-, nano-, and infotechnologies in a totally new scientific paradigm.

With these trends as background, in May 2002, five U.S. government agencies asked the World Technology Evaluation Center (WTEC) to investigate states of the art and trends in biosensing research and development worldwide in comparison to the United States. The National Science Foundation (NSF), National Institutes of Health (NIH), United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) and Army Research Office (ARO) intend for this biosensing study to

- aid government policymakers, the research community, and the public to identify good ideas worth exploring in U.S. R&D programs
- note technical, educational, and infrastructure requirements and prospects for better progress in the field

- ascertain opportunities for international and interdisciplinary collaboration
- identify ways to shorten the lead time for deploying new biosensing technologies emerging from the lab
- evaluate the status and funding of foreign research programs relative to those in the United States

The study's sponsors identified particular applications of interest to be *healthcare* (biomedicine), the *environment*, the *food industry*, and *defense* against the threats of chemical and biological agents. The sponsors further identified the following specific technical issues to be addressed:

- nucleic acid sensors and DNA chips and arrays
- organism- and cell-based biosensors
- bioelectronics and biometrics
- biointerfaces and biomaterials, biocompatibility, and biofouling
- integrated, multimodality sensors and sensor networks
- system issues, including signal transduction, data interpretation, and validation
- novel sensing algorithms, e.g., non-enzyme-based sensors for glucose, or mechanical sensors for prosthetics
- related issues in bio-MEMS and bio-NEMS (microelectromechanical and nanoelectromechanical systems), possibly including actuators

Approach and Methodology

To execute the biosensing study, WTEC recruited a panel of seven U.S. experts in the field, chaired by Professor Jerome Schultz, then of the University of Pittsburgh, now at University of California, Riverside. The panelists each represent distinct areas of specialization in the biosensing field. Table 1.1 lists the panelists and their areas of focus for the study, along with others who helped arrange, conduct, and evaluate the site visits. Panelists' biographies are provided in Appendix A.

With the goals and team established, the WTEC panelists carried out the study in four phases:

1. *Establish baseline information on U.S. activities* as a benchmark for the worldwide assessment by hosting a workshop of members of the U.S. biosensing R&D community. The WTEC Biosensing Study U.S. R&D Overview Workshop was held at NIH in Bethesda, MD, on 3–4 December 2002. Participants provided an overview of recent trends and advances in biosensing technology development in the

areas identified by the sponsors; addressed the barriers for translating these technologies into the marketplace; and identified several general needs and applications that should be addressed in future R&D plans and programs. Proceedings of the workshop are available online at [wtec.org / biosensing / proceedings /](http://wtec.org/biosensing/proceedings/).

2. *Conduct site visits to gather first-hand information* from a number of the world's best university and industrial laboratories in biosensing research. The WTEC panelists conducted two week-long series of site visits to 23 laboratories in Europe and Australia and 17 laboratories in Japan during January and March 2003, respectively. Site reports of those visits are included in this report as Appendixes B and C and are also listed by name in the Table of Contents of this report.

Table 1.1.
Key Members of the WTEC Team and Their Roles in the Biosensing Study

Name	Organization	Assignment	Technical Focus
Jerome Schultz	University of Pittsburgh	Panel chair	Infrastructure
Milan Mrksich	The University of Chicago	Panel vice chair	Electrochemical/surface treatment
David Walt	Tufts University	Panel member	Optical sensing
Sangeeta Bhatia	University of California, San Diego	Panel member	Biological/cellular sensing
Charles Wilkins	University of Arkansas	Panel member	Mass spectrometry
Antonio Ricco	ACLARA BioSciences	Panel member	Microfluidics
David Brady	Duke University	Panel member	Data fusion/system integration
Fred Heineken	NSF/Engineering	Sponsor/Observer	
Christine Kelley	NIH, Institute for Biomedical Imaging and Bioengineering (NIBIB)	Sponsor/Observer	
Hassan Ali	WTEC	Support staff	