

Lab on a Chip

Devices and applications at the micro- and nanoscale

Accepted Manuscript

This article can be cited before page numbers have been issued, to do this please use: E. Hedberg, J. Sebastián-Azcona, F. Ribet, V. Hernandez-Santana, G. Stemme, A. Diaz Espejo and N. Roxhed, *Lab Chip*, 2026, DOI: 10.1039/D6LC00201C.



This is an Accepted Manuscript, which has been through the Royal Society of Chemistry peer review process and has been accepted for publication.

Accepted Manuscripts are published online shortly after acceptance, before technical editing, formatting and proof reading. Using this free service, authors can make their results available to the community, in citable form, before we publish the edited article. We will replace this Accepted Manuscript with the edited and formatted Advance Article as soon as it is available.

You can find more information about Accepted Manuscripts in the [Information for Authors](#).

Please note that technical editing may introduce minor changes to the text and/or graphics, which may alter content. The journal's standard [Terms & Conditions](#) and the [Ethical guidelines](#) still apply. In no event shall the Royal Society of Chemistry be held responsible for any errors or omissions in this Accepted Manuscript or any consequences arising from the use of any information it contains.

ARTICLE

Capillary microsampling enables on-site collection and storage of plant sap

Ellinor Hedberg^a, Jaime Sebastián-Azcona^b, Federico Ribet^a, Virginia Hernandez-Santana^b,
Göran Stemme^a, Antonio Diaz Espejo^b and Niclas Roxhed,^{* a,c}

Received 00th January 20xx,
Accepted 00th January 20xx

DOI: 10.1039/x0xx00000x

Plant sap analysis typically relies on destructive sampling and immediate freezing, limiting field deployment and longitudinal studies. We introduce a minimally invasive microfluidic device that extracts sap from the stem of *Solanum lycopersicum* and dries it in situ, enabling storage analogous to dried blood spots in humans. Using both artificial phytohormone mixtures and tomato sap, we assessed the stability of dried samples stored at room temperature for up to seven days and observed no substantial degradation of key phytohormones. Device performance was further validated in a paired sampling experiment, showing strong agreement with a conventional stem severing method for tZR and ABA quantification. These findings demonstrate that dried sap sampling via a microfluidic device provides a practical, field ready alternative to destructive methods, supporting repeated sampling from the same plant and enabling longitudinal metabolic monitoring.

Introduction

Collecting plant samples in the field is a widely used approach to evaluate both crop nutritional status and gain insight into the physiology of plants. Metabolic profiling, including the assessment of responses to biotic and abiotic stressors, can be achieved by analysing plant phytohormonal concentrations. Even at very low concentrations, these signalling molecules exert a significant influence on the plant physiological state¹⁻⁴.

When collecting samples for phytohormonal or metabolomic analysis, the sampling strategy and subsequent handling are critical determinants of the quality of the obtained results⁵. Several conventional approaches are used to extract plant sap, with the choice depending both on the plant species and the sap type of interest. Examples include pressing/crushing tissue⁶, making incisions in self-bleeding plants, applying EDTA treatments to prevent sieve element blockage by P-proteins³, aphid stylectomy to extract pure phloem sap⁷, centrifugation⁸ or application of external pressure^{9,10}.

In collected samples, enzymes can cause degradation of metabolites or other analytes of interest. To prevent this, the standard approach is to freeze the sample, thereby halting the enzymatic activity. Freezing can be achieved through lyophilization (freeze-drying) or by using liquid nitrogen (fresh-frozen)¹¹⁻¹⁴. An alternative approach has been suggested, which involves drying samples at room temperature. For example, cornflower petals subjected to this method exhibited low water

activity, a parameter closely related to enzymatic activity, compared to hot-air convective drying and lyophilization¹⁵⁻¹⁷. Equally important as sample collection are the subsequent storage and transport conditions, which must be carefully controlled to ensure sample stability^{5,12,14}. Successful metabolomic analysis requires an optimized protocol for sample collection, a reproducible sampling procedure, and robust transport and storage conditions.

Inspired by human sampling, dried blood spot (DBS) microsampling has become a common procedure for easy blood sample collection and long-term storage. Due to the low enzymatic activity in dried samples, proteins can remain stable for up to 30 years with minimal destruction of the analyte and only minor changes in detection levels¹⁸⁻²⁰. Hormones²¹ and metabolites²² have also been successfully analysed in DBS samples, with hormones shown to remain stable for four weeks at room temperature and up to a year in cold storage²¹.

Thus, DBS enables easy sampling procedures without greatly compromising the analyte integrity. Given that plant sap functions as the transport medium for phytohormones and metabolites in a manner that could be seen as somewhat analogous to the human blood stream, we hypothesize that a paper-based drying approach could be applied to plant sap for the analysis of phytohormones.

Here we show a microsampling device that combines the approach of drying plant sap samples in room temperature, similar to the approach of DBS, using a sampling procedure that allows for sample collection in a more low-invasive manner compared to conventional approaches. The microsampling device consists of a microfluidic channel connected to a paper matrix enclosed in a plastic case. This configuration allows for quick and easy sap sampling, with minimal manual intervention, and with integrated sample drying inside the plastic casing through a vent.

^a Department of Micro and Nanosystems, KTH Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm, Sweden.

^b Plant Ecophysiology and Irrigation Group, Instituto de Recursos Naturales y Agrobiología de Sevilla (IRNAS, CSIC), Sevilla, Spain.

^c MedTechLabs, Karolinska University Hospital, Solna, Sweden.



Experimental

The microfluidic sampling device

The microfluidic sampling device is manufactured from two hydrophilic (DI water contact angle $<12^\circ$), sheets of plastic (Xerox type C laser printing transparency, Xerox) that are bonded together with a double-sided adhesive (8132LE, 3M, Digi-key) with thickness $50\ \mu\text{m}$. The hydrophilic plastic has been previously evaluated and implemented in a variety of capillary microfluidic devices²³⁻²⁷. The thickness of the adhesive layer determines the geometries and the height of the capillary inlet channel, needle and collection chamber. The adhesive keeps

chamber, there is a storage paper (601-N, Sartorius, VWR) with dimensions (5.5 mm, 8.5 mm, 0.19 mm) used to collect and store the sample, Figure 1B. The storage paper is placed between the layers and not attached, which enables easy removal of the paper through de-lamination of the plastic and subsequent analysis of the collected sap. The section of the paper closest to the inlet channel has a needle-like shape that protrudes 0.4 mm into the microfluidic channel to ensure that low volume samples reach the collection chamber via the channel and thereby enables filling of the storage paper, Figure 1C. The inlet needle has a width of 6.5 mm and a curved tip with a radius of 0.6 mm, this to ensure puncturing of the plant stem




Figure 1. A) Microfluidic sampling device inserted into tomato stem. Below is a schematic of the extraction procedure of sap being collected in the device.

i) Device insertion into stem. ii) Capillary pre-filling of needle, the large surface area of the needle in contact with the plant enables greater sap extraction. iii) Capillary filling of the storage matrix. iv) Sample collection complete. B) Schematic overview of the device layers and lamination steps of the fabrication. C) 3D and exploded view of the sampling device. D) Volume collection distribution used to determine the extracted sap volume based on visually observing the filling characteristics. E) Gravimetrically measured mass difference upon collection of plant sap into fully filled microsampling devices. F) Evaporation curve obtained from microfluidic devices evaluated through gravimetric measurements of mass loss over time. The evaporated mass of water is plotted against time for $n = 4$ devices. The average evaporation time is $0.05\ \text{mg}/\mu\text{L}$, which for water is approximately $0.05\ \mu\text{L}/\text{min}$. The non-linear and linear range are separated with a grey line. This indicates the evaporation from water that has adhered to the device when filling it up (non-linear range) and evaporation from inside the device (linear range). Values presented as average \pm SD. G) The paired sampling strategy and analysis steps. The sampling is conducted by first sampling with the microsampler followed by destructive sampling through cutting using a scalpel. The microfluidic sample is directly removed from the plastic casing and placed in -80°C until further analysis. The destructive sample is placed in liquid nitrogen followed by centrifugation and pipetting of the extracted sap onto storage paper. The sample is then stored in -80°C until further analysis. UHPLC-QQ-MS analysis is conducted on the samples to enable phytohormonal concentration comparisons.

the two hydrophilic plastic layers sandwiched around the storage paper and provides structural integrity to the device, enabling puncturing of the plant stem. In the collection

but also avoiding clogging of the inlet channel with plant tissue, creating a biopsy-punch effect and preventing liquid flow, Figure 1A-C. All components were designed in Adobe Illustrator



and cut from the corresponding materials using a CO₂ laser cutter (VLS 2.3, Universal Laser Systems).

Phytohormonal stability in different storage conditions

To evaluate the effect of drying plant sap samples in a paper matrix, an experiment was conducted with both artificial sap samples with a mixture of phytohormones of known concentrations (PHM) and samples collected from tomato plants (*Solanum lycopersicum*, Tres Cantos) grown from seeds. The tomatoes were grown to approximately 30 cm in a sunny location in a south facing window and outdoors when good weather conditions allowed for it. Phytohormones: 3 Indoleacetic acid (IAA) (I3750 Sigma-Aldrich), Abscisic acid (ABA) (A4906 Sigma-Aldrich), Salicylic acid (SA) (247588 Sigma-Aldrich), trans-zeatin riboside (tZR) (6025-53-2 Olchemim) and Jasmonic acid (JA) (3572-66-5 Olchemim) were used to evaluate the PHM stability upon drying. The phytohormones were mixed to make a solution with concentrations determined from a preliminary experiment. In the preliminary experiments the microfluidic device was evaluated to determine if phytohormones could be detected in a sap sample stored in a paper matrix, and in what concentrations. From the evaluated phytohormones, IAA, SA, ABA, tZR and JA were determined to be the ones with the most relevance for these experiments as well as showing good detectability. The concentrations for each of the phytohormones were selected based on the concentration they had in the preliminary study multiplied with a factor of five to ensure good readings away from limit-of-detection.

The selected phytohormones were mixed to their determined concentrations (IAA 0.05 pmol/μL, ABA 0.5 pmol/μL, SA 0.5 pmol/μL, tZR 0.5 pmol/μL and JA 0.5 pmol/μL), and 7 μL of the PHM was pipetted onto Sartorius 601-N filter paper with dimensions (5.5 mm, 8.5 mm, 0.19 mm), same as the papers in the microfluidic device. Five of the paper pieces were immediately placed in Eppendorf tubes and stored at -80°C until analysis. The rest were left in room temperature for drying for 20 min, 140 min, 5 h, 24 h and 7 days. The PHM and the individual phytohormone components were stored in -80°C and 4°C for 10 days to compare their stability in liquid form over time, Figure S1.

As a biological comparison to the PHM samples, the cultivated tomato plants were sampled by insertion of the microfluidic device into the stem. The sampling was made at the fourth node from the top of the plant, and this was the same for all the plants where possible. If not possible, for example due to the shape of the plant and the size of the stem at that location, sampling was done as close to that point as possible. Once filled, the devices were removed from the stems and left at room temperature for the same time intervals as the artificial phytohormone samples. The storage paper was removed from the device and placed in an Eppendorf tube prior to storage at -80°C until further analysis. Three tomato plants were also sampled using a stem severing method in which a piece of the stem was cut and placed in an eppendorf tube followed by

centrifugation in a table top centrifuge to extract sap. The collected sap was stored in liquid form at -80°C until analysis.

Device accuracy measurements

To evaluate the accuracy of the sampling approach an experimental setup was established with paired sampling on the same plant using both the microfluidic device and a stem severing approach to directly compare the methods.

36 tomato plants (*Solanum lycopersicum*, Tres Cantos) were placed in a greenhouse with temperature and humidity controls (HC253, Campbell Scientific) and plant lights (The Jackson Nemesis 250W, The Jungle) to ensure good growth conditions. Plants were kept in methacrylate boxes with dimensions 34x37x57 cm³ to ensure controlled environments. The plants were sampled at three different time points with five replicates for four days (exception at three time points where three or four plants were sampled instead of five), creating a total of 72 samples. The sampling was carried out by first using the sampling device followed by destructive sampling of cutting a piece of the plant for sap extraction close to the sampling site from the device to keep the samples as similar as possible. Approximately 8 cm of the stem was cut from the plant close to the incision site of the device. The plant section was placed in liquid nitrogen and the frozen plant samples were placed in Eppendorf tubes and spun in a tabletop centrifuge (for 60-75 seconds) at 12,000 rpm. The liquid obtained was aspirated and 7 μL placed on the same paper matrix as in the devices used for the microfluidic sampling. These samples were then placed in -80°C. The microfluidic samples were collected by inserting the needle at the second node of the plant from the top, and once the devices had filled with liquid they were opened and the storage paper was placed in an Eppendorf tube and stored in -80°C until analysis. Figure 1G shows a schematic overview of the sampling process.

The volumes extracted with the microfluidic sampling devices varied as indicated in the metadata, Supplemental data "Sap and PHM samples - raw data", where the collected volume was determined by visual inspection and comparison to the calibration experiment with devices filled with known volumes to indicate the filling, Figure 1D. The volumes have been accounted for in the analysis by normalizing to the collected volume range.

The drying times for the storage paper in the microfluidic devices when evaluated with DI water are presented in Figure 1F and Supplementary Figure S4. The average evaporation rate is 0.05 μL/min for all devices. The first 20 minutes show a clear non linear behaviour, this corresponds to evaporation of water that has adhered to the surface of the device when filling and potentially evaporation from the inlet channel. The linear range, where the evaporation rate is calculated, corresponds to evaporation from the storage paper matrix. This means that on average it takes approximately 2 hours for the devices to dry.

Mass spectrometry analysis

All samples (artificial phytohormones and PHM in liquid form stored in fridge and freezer as controls; PHM dried in paper in a



time series; sap samples dried in paper in a time series; destructive sap samples stored in liquid form; and sap samples collected using paired sampling with a destructive method and the sampling device stored on paper) were analyzed using UHPLC-QQQ-MS/MS.

Extraction of the sap samples from the storage paper was done using the following protocol. 400 μL ice cold 60% acetonitrile (ACN) and 2 μL of isotopically labeled internal standard mix was added to the samples followed by shaking in mixer mill at 30 Hz for 10 min. The samples were then centrifuged at 14,000 rpm for 10 min at 4°C. After centrifugation, 350 μL of the supernatant was transferred to new vials and dried using speedvac at 40°C for 1 h, followed by room temperature for 1 h and storage overnight at -70°C. The samples were dissolved in 43 μL 20% acetonitrile and 10 μL was analyzed with UHPLC-QQQ-MS/MS, a 1290 Infinity Binary LC System coupled to a 6495 Triple Quad LC/MS System with Jet Stream and Dual Ion Funnel technologies (Agilent Technologies). Metabolite separation was performed with a Acquity UPLC CSH C18 RP column (150 x 2.1 mm, particle size of 1.7 μm), with a column temperature of 40°C, and a flow rate of 0.25 ml/min. The mobile phases were A: 0.01% formic acid in Milli-Q H₂O, and B: 0.01% formic acid in 100% acetonitrile. The quantification was carried out in Agilent MassHunter Workstation Software Quantitative (Agilent Technologies). Solvents used: methanol, HPLC-grade was obtained from Fischer Scientific, and acetonitrile, hypergrade for LC-MS LiChrosolv was obtained from Merck²⁸.

Results and discussion

Rapid low-invasive microsampling

The microfluidic sampling device, Figure 1A, enables easy and rapid collection of plant sap directly from the stem of tomato plants. We collected samples using more than 50 devices in total, with a collection time < 1 min per device. The device is designed to collect a total of 8 μL of liquid, determined by the geometry of the device and absorbance of the selected paper matrix, Figure 1B and C shows the device layers and 3D view of the geometries. The filling time and collected volume can vary depending on several factors, for example: plant size, texture, and the selected sampling location.

The storage paper holds a maximum of 7 μL , the remaining 0.5 μL is the volume of the needle/capillary channel and an additional 0.5 μL which collects around the edges of the storage paper in the collection chamber. The volume collected in the storage paper can be visually determined by observing the liquid filling and the corresponding colour shift in the wetted paper matrix. If the sampled plant does not have a lot of readily available sap, enabling a fully filled device, the visual indication of the colour shift can be used to determine the collected volume. The accuracy of the device was determined using gravimetric measurements combined with visual observation of volume filling, Figure 1D and E. At volumes above 5 μL the device reaches saturation, meaning that the collected volumes cannot be reliably separated from one another. At lower

volumes the spread through wetting of the paper can cause greater spans of visually observed filling for the same volume. To account for these variations, a min/max approach has been taken for the analysis where the curve presented in Figure 1D has been used to define a max, min, and average volume collected, Supplementary Figure S2 presents the detected phytohormonal concentrations with error bars indicating the max and min concentrations in this range. Additionally, a gravimetric evaluation was conducted through collection of sap visually indicating 100% filling, i.e. a volume range of 4.5 - 8 μL . By gravimetric evaluation of the collected mass, it could be determined that the average mass collected was 5.4 mg, with a standard deviation of 0.87 mg. This corresponds to a coefficient of variation of approximately 16%, Figure 1E. For the pipetted volumes the CV% varies from approximately 30% for the greatest distributions at 1-2 μL down to 0% for the largest volumes that are always accurately recorded as fully filled, Supplementary Figure S3.

Phytohormones are stable when dried in paper

To evaluate the phytohormonal stability over time, artificial phytohormones of known concentrations were evaluated side by side with plant sap samples collected using the microfluidic device. Three tomato plants were also sampled using a destructive stem severing method as a control, stored in liquid form. The collection papers in which the phytohormone mixture (PHM) or plant sap from the device sampling was collected, were left at room temperature for drying for 0 min, 20 min, 140 min, 5 h, 24 h and 7 days. Figure 2A shows the detected concentrations over time. The phytohormone JA could be detected in the PHM but was below limit of detection in the device plant sap samples and was thus excluded from further analysis. The analytes extracted and evaluated using the device have differing hydrophilicities. However, a more directed evaluation is required to determine matrix effects and potential binding selectivity to certain compounds in the device and how elution protocols could affect the detected concentrations. The individually detected phytohormones in the PHM, Figure 2A(left), are all stable over time, with no major concentration reductions seen even after 7 days. MS/MS analysis enabled reliable detection of phytohormones in sap samples at low attomole concentrations, Figure 2A(right). These samples generally presented more variability, both over time and between replicates compared to the PHM samples, thus pointing to variations between plant individuals and/or displayed variations in the accuracy of the microfluidic sampler.






Figure 2. Phytohormonal storage stability on paper and sample concentrations. A) Phytohormone concentrations over time in the artificial PHM (left) and in plant sap samples extracted with the microfluidic device as well as destructive samples collected at time point 0 min using a stem severing method and stored in liquid form (right). B) Correlation plots showing the linear regression and 95% CI (in green) for the paired microfluidic device and destructive samples. C) A difference vs average Bland-Altman analysis plot for each of the evaluated phytohormones for microfluidic vs destructive samples. D) Paired destructive and microfluidic samples, the lines indicate the destructive and device sample originating from the same plant.

The destructive samples collected from tomato plants through centrifugation at time point 0 min presented concentrations similar to the device samples. Although the 0 min destructive samples do not always display similar concentrations as the 0 min device sample counterpart for all the phytohormones, the destructive samples remain within the expected range when looking at all samples combined.

The phytohormone tZR, Figure 2Ai-ii, is relatively stable over time, with no major deviations observed over the evaluated

days, indicating that the phytohormone can be reliably dried and stored in paper.

IAA present a large drop in concentration after the first 20 min in the plant sap sample, Figure 2Aiv, this can in part be attributed to the high variability of the concentrations at sampling time 0 min. The distribution of IAA concentrations are similar from 140 min to 24 h for all triplicates. However, the greater variability compared at time points 0 min and 20 min, indicates that the IAA concentrations vary quite a lot between individual plant samples. Since the same effect cannot be seen



in the artificial PHM, Figure 2Aiii, this could be attributed to individual differences between plants or potentially enzymatic effects in the plant sap, degrading the endogenous plant sample while not showing the same effects in the artificial counterpart. Since the drying time for the devices is approximately 2 hours, this correlate with the observation that IAA concentrations vary more before this timepoint and is reduced after when the enzymatic effect should be lower.

ABA concentrations show a main deviating sample at time point 0 min for the plant sap samples, Figure 2Avi. There is variability seen in most ABA sap samples, but they are quite consistent although more dispersed than in the PHM samples.

SA shows more fluctuating concentrations in the sap samples, and the increase at 24 h and 7 days indicates variability in the stability of the phytohormone and/or individual differences between plants, Figure 2Aviii. In the PHM, differences can be observed for SA that indicate issues with fully dissolving the phytohormone, leading to greater variations between samples, Figure 2Avii.

Device accuracy - comparing destructive and device sampling

To evaluate the accuracy of the device, an experimental setup was established with paired sampling of the same plant using both the device and a destructive centrifugation approach, Figure 1G.

36 plants were sampled over four days. First, the microfluidic sampling device was used, followed by cutting a piece of the plant close to the microdevice sampling site to keep the samples as similar as possible. By obtaining a paired measurement from the same plant using both these methods, we could compare the sampling methodologies and evaluate the accuracy of the sampler. In the pairwise comparison, Figure 2D, the destructive samples are generally higher in concentration compared to the microfluidic device samples.

For tZR, high concentrations of the destructive samples correspond with high concentrations from the microsampler and vice versa, with similar values across both methods, Figure 2Di. IAA show greater variability for the sampling methods and not a clear pattern between the high vs. low measurements from the two approaches, Figure 2Dii. ABA display a clear difference where destructive samples are consistently higher in concentration than their microfluidic counterpart, Figure 2Diii. However, the pairs correlate with high destructive sample concentrations pairing with the higher device concentrations. The variability of the SA samples is greater than that of the ABA and tZR samples, and more similar to IAA. The destructive samples are generally higher in concentration than the microfluidic device samples but the correlation between high and low values between the sampling approaches is not as prominent as for ABA, Figure 2Div.

To further compare the two sampling procedures, a Bland Altman analysis and a linear regression correlation analysis were conducted, Figure 2B-C. The Bland-Altman analysis was conducted through a pairwise comparison of the destructive method as control with the microfluidic device sampling approach as the comparative method. The destructive and

device samples were taken as pairs, therefore the comparison reduce potential errors that can arise from two different individuals and rather only evaluates the sampling approach, Figure 2C.

The Bland-Altman analysis clearly display that both ABA and SA show a bias in favour of the destructive method, as was also observed in Figure 2D where the concentrations from the destructive sampling are generally higher than the device sample concentrations. However, the samples (except for two points for ABA and one for SA) are within the 95% CI in Figure 2Ciii, iv. With the knowledge of the under-representation of the device for these phytohormones, appropriate adjustments could be made to create a standard curve for determination of the concentrations from the microfluidic device. In Figure 2B, the correlation analysis show ABA samples following a linear distribution ($p < 0.0001$), with no evidence of deviation from linearity (runs test $p = 0.44$), compared to SA where no clear correlation ($p = 0.545$) can be seen. For tZR the linear regression analysis revealed a linear relationship between destructive and device samples ($p < 0.0001$), and no evidence of deviation from linearity (runs test $p = 0.21$). IAA show a negative linear relationship ($p = 0.014$), however a low R^2 indicates weak associations, this introduces complexity in attempting to create a conversion factor between the two approaches, Figure 2Ci,ii. Thus, ABA and tZR appear to be the two phytohormones that provide the most accurate concentrations from the microfluidic sampler when compared to the destructive sampling approach.

The degree of similarity when comparing the destructive stem severing approach to the microfluidic sampler, varies between the tested phytohormones. Some phytohormonal concentrations are underrepresented in the sampling device (ABA and SA) whereas others show similar concentrations using both approaches (tZR and IAA) but with no clear pattern between high and low concentrations (IAA and SA). The trend observed for all phytohormones excluding IAA, is that their concentrations can be translated between the sampler and the control method to some degree, where tZR and ABA present the most consistent relationships to enable such conversions. To enable a good use of the microfluidic sampler, a conversion factor or standard curve should be developed that can be used to translate a detected concentration in the microfluidic sampler to the concentration as detected in the destructive samples.

Conclusions

We present a microfluidic sampling device that, in a low-invasive manner, can be used to collect and store a sap sample for seven days with minimal phytohormone degradation. The results indicate a possibility of implementing the method of collecting samples in analytical grade paper and drying them as an on-site sampling approach, removing the need for freezing and the specialized shipping associated with such procedures.

The main limitation of the microfluidic sampler is the variability in the collected volume. To address this, modifications to the design are required to increase accuracy in the collected volume and thus the concentrations in the dried



paper matrix. For example, a different storage paper could be used that can absorb larger quantities of sap and thereby make clearer distinctions about visual filling of different volumes. The length of the device can be extended to allow for a larger wicking area and thus provide the same benefit as a different material selection. Introducing a metering capability to ensure that a specific volume is always collected could be implemented, with the limitation of biological variance between different plant individuals. Some plant individuals allow for the extraction of large volumes (up to 15 μL) whereas others only allow for 1–2 μL . By having a set metering capability, the variability would be significantly reduced, but the number of samples collected would be reduced as well. Potentially a combination could be envisioned as the best approach where volumes below a certain volume can be visually determined and a metering capability that has a cut-off at the defined highest volume extraction.

Future evaluations should also consider the aspect of in-field sampling in different environments, such as tropical settings or greenhouses with high humidity that would affect the drying process and thereby potentially cause degradation of analytes. The drying time in a laboratory environment is on average 2 hours. With increasing humidity this can be expected to increase as well. The drying speed of DBS has been shown to depend on the relative humidity (RH) of the surrounding environment, and the analyte distribution is altered based on RH, leading to a reduced homogeneity²⁹. It can therefore be expected that a similar effect would occur for the sap samples drying in environments with increased RHs. To what extent and what analytes are affected is a highly relevant and natural extension for future validations of this device for useability in real life environments.

The device presents new opportunities for longitudinal monitoring of plants over time, an approach that has had major successes in both health care and patient centric sampling settings for humans. Underlying patterns of disease have been discovered, and new understandings of human physiology and potential inter-individual variability has been gained^{30,31}. Having the same opportunities for measurements in plants could enable a better understanding of temporal changes in the phytohormonal fingerprint, provide a means of environmental monitoring and allow for easy and rapid sample collection in the field for a variety of experimental evaluations.

Author contributions

Ellinor Hedberg: Formal analysis, Investigation, Methodology, Validation, Visualization, Writing - Original draft, Writing - Review & editing. Jaime Sebastián-Azcona: Investigation, Validation. Virginia Hernandez-Santana: Investigation. Federico Ribet: Methodology. Antonio Diaz Espejo: Resources, Investigation. Göran Stemme: Conceptualization, Supervision. Niclas Roxhed: Conceptualization, Supervision, Writing - Review & editing.

Conflicts of interest

EH, FR, GS, NR are inventors of pending patent applications on plant microsampling devices.

Declarations

The LC-MS/MS image in Figure 1G was created using Biorender.com

Funding

This work was funded by the European Union Horizon 2020 project WATCHPLANT (grant agreement N°101017899).

Data availability

The data supporting this article have been included as part of the Supplementary Information. Supplementary information: Figure S1, S2, S3, S4 and Dataset 1,2.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank the Swedish national infrastructure SciLifeLab and access to Swedish Metabolomics Centre, Umeå, Sweden, for carrying out the phytohormonal analyses presented in this paper, and collaborators at Instituto Tecnológico de la Energía (ITE).

Notes and references

- W. H. O. Ernst, *The Science of the Total Environment*, 1995, 176, 15–24.
- E. Eymar, C. Cadahia, A. Sanchez and D. Lopez-Vela, *Communications in Soil Science and Plant Analysis*, 2000, 31, 1225–1248.
- N. Killiny, *Plant Signaling and Behavior*, 2019, 14,.
- A. Santner, L. I. A. Calderon-Villalobos and M. Estelle, *Nature chemical biology*, 2009, 5, 301–307.
- H. K. Kim and R. Verpoorte, *Phytochemical Analysis*, 2009, 21, 4–13.
- M. Farneselli, E. H. Simonne, D. W. Studstill and F. Tei, *Journal of Plant Nutrition*, 2006, 29, 1975–1982.
- W. F. Tjallingii, *Journal of Experimental Botany*, 2006, 57, 739–745.
- Q. Yu, C. Tang, Z. Chen and J. Kuo, *The New Phytologist*, 1999, 143, 299–304.
- M. Flajšman, S. Mandelc, S. Radišek and B. Javornik, *Bioprotocol*, 2017, 7, e2172–e2172..
- J. López-Portillo, F. W. Ewers, R. Méndez-Alonzo, C. L. Paredes López, G. Angeles, A. L. Alarcón Jiménez, A. L. Lara Domínguez and M. del Carmen Torres Barrera, *American Journal of Botany*, 2014, 101, 1013–1022.
- N. A. ElNaker, M. Daou, M. A. Ochsenkühn, S. A. Amin, A. F. Yousef and L. F. Yousef, *Scientific Reports*, 2021, 11,.
- E. Karakas, P. Ferrante, R. Schafleitner, G. Giuliano, A. R. Fernie and S. Alseekh, *Current Protocols*, 2023, 3,.
- R. Powers and E. Riekeberg, *F1000Research*, 2017, 6,.
- M. A. Salem, L. P. D. Souza, A. Serag, A. R. Fernie, M. A. Farag, S. M. Ezzat and S. Alseekh, *Metabolites*, 2020, 10,.
- L. Fernandes, S. Casal, J. A. Pereira, J. A. Saraiva and E. Ramalhosa, *Brazilian Journal of Food Technology*, 2018, 21,.
- R. Drapron, *Properties of Water in Foods: in Relation to Quality and Stability*, Springer, 1985, pp. 171–190.



ARTICLE

Journal Name

- 17 C. P. Sherwin and T. P. Labuza, Water properties of food, pharmaceutical, and biological materials, 2006, 343–62.
- 18 N. Grüner, O. Stambouli and R. S. Ross, Journal of Visualized Experiments, 2015,.
- 19 B. S. Frey, D. E. Damon and A. K. Badu-Tawiah, Mass Spectrometry Reviews, 2020, 39, 336–370.
- 20 J. Björkesten, S. Enroth, Q. Shen, L. Wik, D. M. Hougaard, A. S. Cohen, L. Sörensen, V. Giedraitis, M. Ingelsson, A. Larsson, M. Kamali-Moghaddam and U. Landegren, Molecular and Cellular Proteomics, 2017, 16, 1286–1296.
- 21 N. Grecsó, A. Zádori, I. Szécsi, Ákos Baráth, Z. Galla, C. Bereczki and P. Monostori, PLoS ONE, 2020, 15,.
- 22 K. Li, J. C. Naviaux, J. M. Monk, L. Wang and R. K. Naviaux, Metabolites, 2020, 10,.
- 23 G. Lenk, S. Sandkvist, A. Pohanka, G. Stemme, O. Beck and N. Roxhed, Bioanalysis, 2015, 7, 2085–2094.
- 24 J. Hauser, G. Lenk, J. Hansson, O. Beck, G. Stemme and N. Roxhed, Analytical chemistry, 2018, 90, 13393–13399.
- 25 J. Hauser, G. Lenk, S. Ullah, O. Beck, G. Stemme and N. Roxhed, Analytical chemistry, 2019, 91, 7125–7130.
- 26 J. Hauser, G. Kylberg, M. Colomb-Delsuc, G. Stemme, I.-M. Sintorn and N. Roxhed, Lab on a Chip, 2020, 20, 4186–4193.
- 27 J. Hauser, M. Dale, O. Beck, J. M. Schwenk, G. Stemme, C. Fredolini and N. Roxhed, Analytical Chemistry, 2022, 95, 1350–1358.
- 28 J. Šimura, I. Antoniadi, J. Šíroká, D. e. Tarkowská, M. Strnad, K. Ljung and O. Novák, Plant physiology, 2018, 177, 476–489.
- 29 G. Lenk, J. Hansson, O. Beck, N. Roxhed, Bioanalysis, 2015, 7, 1977–1985.
- 30 X. Shen, R. Kellogg, D. J. Panyard, N. Bararpour, K. E. Castillo, B. Lee-McMullen, A. Delfarah, J. Ubellacker, S. Ahadi, Y. Rosenberg-Hasson et al., Nature biomedical engineering, 2024, 8, 11–29.
- 31 S. M. Schüssler-Fiorenza Rose, K. Contrepolis, K. J. Moneghetti, W. Zhou, T. Mishra, S. Mataraso, O. Dagan-Rosenfeld, A. B. Ganz, J. Dunn, D. Hornburg et al., Nature medicine, 2019, 25, 792–804.

View Article Online
DOI: 10.1039/D6LC00201C

Open Access Article. Published on 24 April 2026. Downloaded on 4/25/2026 9:05:02 AM.
This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 3.0 Unported Licence.



Lab on a Chip Accepted Manuscript

Data availability statement

The data supporting this article has been included as part of the Supplementary information. Supplementary Information: Document “Sap and PHM samples - raw data.xlsx”

