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It is now known that interaction between cells and their environment or between intracellular compartments is based on complex vesicular transport processes. The nature and dynamics of such processes are still a hot topic of scientific study. Progress about intracellular trafficking is currently essentially made by constant innovation in fluorescence-based techniques, now reaching single molecule resolution in living cells. In this case, fluorophore photobleaching is an issue for long term studies (over a few tens of minutes). Quantitative phase imaging techniques are conventionally used to create long-term high contrast imaging of cells, label-free.

Last year we obtained results having a localization resolution between 40 and 50 nm using a standard wave front sensor based on QWLSI. This was obtained on fixed cells, assumed not to move at all. We upgraded our set-up with our improved wave front sensing technique called QWLSI-HD (HD for High Definition), where we could multiply by 9 the number of measurement points per image and therefore decrease the phase image pixel size from 19.5 μm down to 6.5 μm [1,2]. Using this technique, we expected to reach the 1-nm resolution limit, like it was reached by other techniques such as interferometric scattering microscopy (iSCAT [3]). In addition, we worked on adding specificity to quantitative phase imaging. We trained Artificial Intelligence algorithms (based both on deep and machine learning) to recognize intracellular vesicles: mitochondria, lysosomes and endosomes. We used fluorescence imaging to train the AI algorithms. We compared performances between the algorithms and also between fixed and living samples. We conclude that training made on fixed samples does not efficiently apply to living samples.

