Protein quantification methods: Advantages and limitations.

Adams Benjamin*

Department of Chemical Engineering, Imperial College, London, United Kingdom

Proteins are an essential class of macromolecules that play vital roles in various biological processes, including enzymatic reactions, cell signaling, and structural support. As such, the accurate quantification of protein levels in biological samples is of great importance for many research fields, including proteomics, biochemistry, and molecular biology. In this article, we will discuss the various methods used for the quantification of biological samples in proteins, including their advantages and limitations. One of the most commonly used methods for protein quantification is the Bradford assay. This method utilizes the binding of Coomassie Brilliant Blue dye to basic amino acid residues in the protein, resulting in a shift in the dye's absorbance spectrum. The amount of protein present in the sample can then be quantified by measuring the absorbance of the dye-protein complex at 595 nm. The Bradford assay is relatively easy to perform, inexpensive, and can be used to quantify a broad range of protein concentrations. However, it can be affected by interfering substances present in the sample, such as detergents, reducing agents, and other contaminants, which can lead to inaccurate quantification results [1].

Another popular method for protein quantification is the Lowry assay. This method involves the reduction of copper ions in the presence of the protein, resulting in the formation of a complex between the protein and the reduced copper ions. The formation of this complex can be detected by measuring the absorbance of the resulting solution at 750 nm. The Lowry assay is more sensitive than the Bradford assay, allowing for the detection of smaller amounts of protein in the sample. However, it is also more susceptible to interference from other substances present in the sample, which can lead to inaccurate quantification results [2].

The BCA assay, or bicinchoninic acid assay, is another widely used method for protein quantification. This assay is based on the reduction of Cu^{2+} ions by protein in an alkaline environment to form a complex with bicinchoninic acid, resulting in a color change that can be detected spectrophotometrically at 562 nm. The BCA assay is more sensitive than the Bradford assay and has a lower detection limit, making it suitable for the quantification of low concentrations of protein. However, like the other methods, it can be affected by interfering substances present in the sample [3].

A newer method for protein quantification is the Qubit fluorometric assay. This assay utilizes fluorescent dyes that bind specifically to proteins and emit a signal that can be detected using a fluorometer. The Qubit assay is highly sensitive and specific, allowing for the accurate quantification of proteins in complex biological samples, including serum, plasma, and cell lysates. However, it is also more expensive than the other methods and requires specialized equipment, making it less accessible to some researchers. In addition to these traditional methods, there are also newer methods for protein quantification that utilize mass spectrometry-based approaches, including selected reaction monitoring (SRM) and multiple reaction monitoring (MRM). These methods rely on the detection of specific peptides derived from the target protein, allowing for the accurate quantification of protein levels in complex biological samples with high specificity and sensitivity. However, they also require specialized equipment and expertise, making them less accessible to some researchers [4].

The accurate quantification of protein levels in biological samples is essential for many research fields, including proteomics, biochemistry, and molecular biology. There are several traditional methods for protein quantification, including the Bradford, Lowry, and BCA assays, which are widely used due to their ease of use and low cost. However, these methods can be affected by interfering substances present in the sample, leading to inaccurate quantification results [5].

References

1. Sivaramaiah S, Raveendra Reddy P. Direct and derivative spectrophotometric determination of zinc with 2, 4-dihydroxybenzaldehyde isonicotinoyl hydrazone in potable water and pharmaceutical samples. J Anal Chem. 2005;60(9):828-32.
2. Teixeira LS, Rocha FR, Korn M, et al. Flow-injection solid-phase spectrophotometry for the determination of zinc in pharmaceutical preparations. Anal Chim Acta. 1999;383(3):309-15.
3. Matíes R, Jiménez F, Arias JJ, et al. Spectrofluorimetric determination of zinc with 1, 2, 4-trihydroxyanthraquinone in pharmaceutical preparations. Anal Lett. 1997;30(11):2059-70.
4. Moody RR, Taylor RB. Determination of zinc in pharmaceutical preparations by atomic absorption spectrophotometry. J Pharm Pharmacol. 1972;24(11):848-52.
5. Vani DS, Subudhi KS, Shivaramaiah S, et al. Direct and Derivative Spectrophotometric Determination of Zn (II) in Pharmaceuticals. Chem Sci Trans. 2013;2:513-23.

***Correspondence to:** Adams Benjamin, Department of Chemical Engineering, Imperial College, London, United Kingdom, E-mail: benjamin.adams@imperial.ac.uk

***Received:** 26-Mar-2023, Manuscript No. AACBC-22-97772; **Editor assigned:** 27-Mar-2023, PreQC No. AACBC-22-97772(PQ); **Reviewed:** 11-Apr-2023, QC No. AACBC-22-97772; **Revised:** 16-Apr-2023, Manuscript No. AACBC-22-97772(R); **Published:** 22-Apr-2023, DOI:10.35841/aacbc-7.2.142*

***Citation:** Benjamin A. Protein quantification methods: Advantages and limitations. J Clin Bioanal Chem. 2023;7(2):142*