Published in final edited form as:

J Am Chem Soc. 2008 January 30; 130(4): 1466–1476. doi:10.1021/ja0775927.

Molecular Engineering of Supramolecular Scaffold Coatings that Can Reduce Static Platelet Adhesion

Aryavarta M. S. Kumar[†], Sona Sivakova[‡], Justin D. Fox[‡], Jennifer E. Green[†], Roger E. Marchant^{†,‡,*}, and Stuart J. Rowan^{†,‡,§,*}

[†] Center for Cardiovascular Biomaterials, Department of Biomedical Engineering, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland OH 44106 USA

[‡] Department of Macromolecular Science and Engineering, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland OH 44106 USA

[§] Department of Chemistry, Case Western Reserve University, Cleveland OH 44106 USA

Abstract

Novel supramolecular coatings that make use of low molecular weight ditopic monomers with guanine end groups are studied using fluid tapping AFM. These molecules assemble on highly oriented pyrolytic graphite (HOPG) from aqueous solutions to form nano-sized banding structures whose sizes can be systematically tuned at the nano-scale by tailoring the molecular structure of the monomers. The nature of the self-assembly in these systems has been studied through a combination of the self-assembly of structural derivatives and molecular modeling. Furthermore, we introduce the concept of using these molecular assemblies as scaffolds to organize functional groups on the surface. As a first demonstration of this concept, scaffold monomers that contain a monomethyl triethyleneglycol branch were used to organize these “functional” units on a HOPG surface. These supramolecular grafted assemblies have been shown to be stable in biologically-relevant environments and even have the ability to significantly reduce static platelet adhesion.

Keywords

nanopattern; nanotechnology; surface assembly; supramolecular polymerization; surface thrombosis; biomaterial coating

Introduction

Supramolecular chemistry at the interface plays a defining role in the “bottom-up” approach to nanoarchitectures which have a myriad of potential technological applications in areas such as nanoelectronics, biological coatings, and catalytic processes.^{1,2} In designing new solid-liquid interfacial (surface) assemblies, both surface-adsorbate and adsorbate-adsorbate interactions need to be taken into account.³ For instance, designing the correct interactions between a molecule and a surface can be critical in creating ordered surface assemblies. Thus designing the appropriate surface-adsorbate interactions can be a powerful tool in controlling the nature of the molecular surface assembly. For example, long alkyl chains are known to form highly ordered (epitaxial) surface assemblies commensurate with the ordered lattice of graphite.^{4,5} In addition, tailoring the supramolecular interactions (such as hydrogen bonding, alkyl-alkyl interactions etc.) between the molecules (adsorbates) can also be employed to tune

---

stuart.rowan@case.edu, roger.marchant@case.edu.

the nature of the resulting stable ordered surface assemblies. By manipulating both surface-adsorbate and adsorbate-adsorbate interactions, a number of groups have studied the potential of physisorbed compounds to facilitate molecular assembly on ordered surfaces.^{2,6,7}

One class of supramolecular motifs that has received attention in the area of self-assembly over the years is the nucleobases.^{8,9} Of particular interest are guanine derivatives, which have the ability to interact with themselves or with complementary motifs through the use of Watson-Crick binding and/or Hoogsteen binding. For example, when guanine and its derivatives are adsorbed on a graphite surface, the resulting aggregates can form ordered tapes or monolayers that can make use of guanine-guanine interactions,^{10,11} in addition to surface-adsorbate interactions.

In recent years, a number of groups have investigated the potential of using oligonucleotides to self-assemble 2D arrays and use those as scaffolds to display a range of functionalities.¹² Recently, we initiated a program aimed at investigating the potential of assembling supramolecular polymers, derived from low-molecular weight nucleobase-endcapped monomers, on a surface¹³ as a way to organize functional groups at the nano-scale (Figure 1) and as such act as molecular-scale surface scaffolds. In this manuscript, we report for the first time the realization of this concept. Using triethylene glycol monomethyl ether (TEG) groups attached to low molecular weight monomers, these supramolecular scaffold-organized TEG surfaces exhibit reduced protein absorption and platelet adhesion. To further back up the nature and mechanism of this scaffold assembly a series of model compounds (without the TEG units) have been prepared and studied allowing a better understanding of how these systems assemble on highly oriented pyrolytic graphite (HOPG).

The thromboresistance of biomaterial coatings is determined by its interaction with plasma proteins and platelets.¹⁴ The most abundant plasma proteins, albumin, immunoglobulin, and fibrinogen, constitute the main adsorbed components on hydrophobic surfaces within microseconds of contact with blood.¹⁵ Typically, over a period of time, an exchange process (Vroman effect) results in an increase in the proportion of thrombogenic proteins such as fibrinogen, kininogen, and factor XII on the surface.¹⁶ The hydrophobic nature of the surface causes adsorbed proteins to denature, exposing peptide residues such as RGD that bind to specific platelet receptors such as GPIIb/IIIa (CD41/CD61). This sequence of events begins surface-induced thrombosis and causes many significant complications in implanted devices.¹⁷ Healthy blood vessels provide a model to understand the prevention of surface-induced thrombosis. The glycocalyx on endothelial cells that line the lumen of blood vessels presents membrane proteins and carbohydrates that actively prevent thrombosis by creating a hydrated layer¹⁸ at the surface which acts to reduce non-specific protein adsorption, protein denaturation, and platelet adhesion. Thus, coatings that present groups that can mimic the hydrated layer most likely will have an improved thromboresistance and blood biocompatibility.

A well known strategy for creating protein resistant surfaces involves utilizing surface bound polyethylene glycol (PEG) chains.^{19,20,21,22} While a general theory of how PEG prevents protein adsorption is still being developed, it is currently thought that a hydrated PEG chain provides both osmotic (solvation of PEG chains) and entropic (conformational entropy of PEG chains) penalties that can be large enough to disfavor the hydrophobic interaction between proteins and the hydrophobic surface.^{19,20c,23} Thus, in order for surface bound PEG to work effectively to prevent protein adhesion it needs to be solvated with water molecules. Modeling studies suggest that when surface bound PEG is hydrated it preferentially forms a random coil 'helical' structure (gauche-trans-gauche).^{18,23b,24} Thus, it has been proposed that PEG needs to be able to form these helical conformations in order to hydrate effectively and therefore prevent protein adhesion.^{19,23b} For example, proteins are repelled when grafted PEG chains

form helical conformations on Au surfaces at high density.²⁵ However, on Ag surfaces, PEG chains are much more densely packed forcing the chains into an extended all *trans*-conformation, preventing hydration, which in turn allows protein adsorption. At the other extreme, low densities of surface bound PEG cannot create a uniform hydrated layer and will not prevent protein adsorption. Thus, controlling both the density and conformation of presented PEG chains is important in creating a coating that repels proteins. Covalent grafting of PEG, including the use of PEG functionalized SAMs,²⁶ has been extensively utilized by a number of groups to produce surfaces with different densities of PEG.²⁷ Additionally, a range of processing steps have allowed grafting on surfaces that do not normally have the proper chemical functionality for covalent grafting.^{26b,27a,28,29} An alternative approach of surface attachment uses physisorbed assemblies, including Langmuir-Blodgett films,^{15,30} that present PEG from the surface.³¹ In particular, one of us has used surfactant-like polymers to assemble on a surface and display functional groups.³² While initial studies were carried out on HOPG this approach was found to work on a variety of hydrophobic surfaces allowing presentation of biofunctional groups that in turn can influence biological processes. However, even though high densities of functional groups have been obtained, precisely controlling the surface density and lateral placement of functional groups has remained a challenge. A tunable supramolecular surface scaffold that presents PEG chains could more precisely control surface density and could allow more accurate mechanistic studies of protein adsorption on PEG surfaces to be conducted.

Results and Discussion

In order to create self-assembling molecular scaffolds, which are able to present functional groups from a surface, a better understanding of what role the different structural components within these monomers play in the surface self-assembly is required. In a previous communication,¹³ we showed that ditopic monomers, consisting of either C₁₂ or C₁₈ linear alkyl chains with guanine peptide nucleic acid (PNA) end groups could result in the formation molecular-sized bands on HOPG when adsorbed from a water:DMSO solution. Building on this preliminary work and with the goal of further understanding the nature and mechanism of the surface self-assembly processes a series of simple model compounds (**G_{1n}G**) was designed and synthesized. These model monomers are comprised of three components, a hydrocarbon core with *n* (= 8, 10, 12, 18) methylene groups, to enhance adsorption onto a hydrophobic surface in the presence of an aqueous medium, the guanine end groups, to facilitate adsorbate-adsorbate interactions through hydrogen bonding, and peptide nucleic acid (PNA)³³ chains primarily used to link the hydrocarbon cores and the guanine moieties. These monomers were prepared by reacting commercially available benzyl carbamate (Cbz) protected guanine-PNA groups with 1,8-diaminooctane (*n*=8), 1,10-diaminodecane (*n*=10), 1,12-diaminododecane (*n*=12), or 1,18-diaminooctadecane (*n*=18) using standard peptide coupling conditions to produce **G(Cbz)_{1n}G(Cbz)** (Scheme 1). The guanine moieties were then deprotected using H₂ gas with a Pd/C catalyst to produce **G_{1n}G** (15–25% overall yield). The structures for the materials were confirmed by NMR and MALDI-MS.

As the monomers were not water soluble, surface self-assembly experiments were carried out by introducing a small amount (ca. 5 μ L) of a DMSO monomer solution (0.94–5.4 mM, 1–5 μ g/mL) into a water droplet (ca. 20 μ L) on HOPG. A 1 mL fluid cell was then placed on top of the HOPG and images of the surface were captured using a fluid tapping AFM setup at ambient temperature. All the monomers adsorbed on the surface within seconds, as measured by a change in surface roughness relative to bare HOPG, but no order was observed. However, upon addition of enough water to fill the 1 mL cell (yielding an overall concentration of the monomers of about 4.7–27 nM and diluting the DMSO to ca. 0.5%), two sets of linear band patterns were observed in all samples: a molecular-sized set of bands with widths < 5 nm and a larger set of bands with widths between 5–7 nm. The widths of the molecular-sized bands

were dependant on the length of the hydrocarbon core in the assembling monomer. For example, **G18G**, **G10G**, **G12G**, and **G18G** had widths of 3.2 ± 0.1 , 3.5 ± 0.1 , 3.8 ± 0.1 , and 4.8 ± 0.1 nm respectively (Figure 2a–d, Table 1) as measured by power spectrum and cross sectional analyses. Thus, the band widths of molecular-sized bands in the **G1_nG** assemblies can be simply tuned by changing the hydrocarbon length (*n*). On the other hand, the widths of the larger bands, which showed more variability (multiple widths between 5–7 nm are observed) within the same monomer experiment, showed no correlation with the size of the monomers. These larger assemblies form distinctly separate domains from assemblies composed of molecular-sized bands. To date we have not been able to identify the exact nature of these “larger” bands, although it is possible that either they consist of multi-layers or hemi-micellar assemblies.³⁴

Images captured at larger scan sizes (> 500 nm) showed that there were many linear band assemblies that spanned areas as small as 50 nm and as large as 2 μ m (see Supp. Info.). The linear bands in each domain were offset from each other by a multiple of 60° suggesting epitaxial alignment of the molecules along the three axes of symmetry in the HOPG lattice (Figure 3). Between the majority of the domains, amorphous boundary regions (arrow in Figure 3a) are observed where the linear bands do not connect and the assembly cannot continue growing because of interference from adjacent domains. Additionally, the presence of multiple domains suggests that there are multiple sites of nucleation.

The focus of this current research is the creation of tunable self-assembling molecular scaffolds. Thus, the fact that tailoring the molecular structure allowed the width of molecular-sized bands to be tuned suggests that these assemblies, rather than the larger band assemblies, are potential candidates for molecular scaffolds. Interestingly, as the length of the hydrocarbon core in the monomers increased the prevalence of the larger bands in the surface assemblies decreased. For instance, **G18G** and **G10G** assemblies were composed mostly of larger bands with very few domains of molecular-sized bands. However, molecular-sized bands were found to occupy a significantly larger proportion of the surface in **G12G** coatings and were even more ubiquitous in **G18G** coatings. As a result, the two latter monomers are better suited to create tunable scaffold coatings and thus, these monomers became the major focus of this research.

Based on the molecular design of **G1_nG**, it was expected that hydrogen bonding, most likely through guanine-guanine interactions, would play a role in the surface assembly. Thus, the surface assembly of two controls, a monomer with reduced hydrogen bonding capability (**G(Cbz)12G(Cbz)**) and 1,12-diaminododecane, were characterized. **G(Cbz)12G(Cbz)** is a precursor to **G12G** and is protected at the guanine C(2) exo-amino site by a Cbz group resulting in greatly reduced Watson-Crick hydrogen bond interactions. Fluid tapping mode imaging of HOPG coated with **G(Cbz)12G(Cbz)** revealed only the large bands (5–7 nm widths) and amorphous domain boundary regions, with no sign of the molecular-sized bands. This suggests that blocking the Watson-Crick face of the guanine, greatly reduces the tendency of **G(Cbz)12G(Cbz)** to self-assemble into stable molecular-sized bands. The second control, 1,12-diaminododecane, adsorbed on the HOPG surface however it also did not form the molecular-sized bands suggesting the importance of having guanine end groups for the desired tunable band spacings observed in the **G1_nG** assemblies.

The above results suggest that the hydrogen bonding ability of the guanine is important to the formation of the molecular-sized bands. The question then becomes how the guanine is self-assembling on the surface. From the literature it is known that guanine and its 9-substituted derivatives form linear tape-like structures, in solution,^{9,11,35} the solid state^{9,11,36} and on surfaces.^{9,10,11,37} Two major guanine motifs have been identified/proposed. The first is a non-dipole guanine motif (Figure 4a), which has been observed in STM images of guanine monolayers^{10a} on graphite and proposed in the crystal structures of some guanine derivatives.

³⁸ This guanine motif forms centrosymmetric repeat units, centered between the two guanines (G1 and G2 in Figure 4a), along the hydrogen bonded chain. As a result of this symmetry there is no net dipole in this motif. When the R group on N(9) is bulky or in the crystal structures of some guanine derivatives,³⁸ the guanine moieties can instead form a different guanine tape motif (Figure 4b), presumably, on account of the steric repulsions between adjacent R groups.^{10b,11} In this case the motif is no longer centrosymmetric and this results in a net dipole along the entire structure (arrow in Figure 4b). These two known guanine motifs became the starting point for molecular modeling studies with the goal of developing a better understanding of how the **G_{1n}G** molecules may be arranging within the molecular-sized bands.

Molecular modeling of all the **G_{1n}G** monomers, using the consistent valence force field (CVFF, class I forcefield) in DISCOVER, were carried out on a modeled graphene surface and in a simulated aqueous environment (distance dependent dielectric $\epsilon_r = 80$). The first set of modeling experiments were carried out on **G₁₂G** using either of the two guanine motifs shown in Figure 4a and 4b (see Supp. Info.). However, the resulting modeled assemblies suggested the formation of bands with widths of ca. 3.4 nm that did not match observed 3.8 nm bands measured by AFM. Thus, other possible guanine motifs were investigated. Interestingly, a double stranded guanine tape motif (Figure 4c) was found that resulted in assemblies with modeled band widths that more correctly predicted the observed 3.8 nm bands (Figure 5a) and was of lower calculated energy than the models of either of the previously described motifs. This centrosymmetric double stranded motif is comprised of guanine dimers formed through the Watson-Crick faces of two guanine moieties. This dimeric motif is extended into a tape through additional nucleobase hydrogen bonding through the exo-NH₂ and N(7) on the Hoogsteen face of adjacent guanine dimers moieties. While two of the exo-amino hydrogens (* in Figure 4c) are in close proximity, modeling indicates that these atoms are separated by 3 Å with no van der Waals overlap.

It is possible that the PNA-Boc groups within the **G₁₂G** assemblies sterically hinder the formation of the guanine motif shown in Figure 4a. There are potentially a number of reasons why the double stranded motif appears to be more energetically favored over the motif in Figure 4b. These include better packing efficiency on the surface, enhanced surface-absorbate interactions, as well as the lack of a dipole in the double stranded guanine tape.

Models of the **G₁₈G** and **G₁₀G** assemblies using this double stranded guanine motif also showed lower modeled energies than the models using the motifs in Figure 4a and 4b. In addition, the models also predicted the banding patterns to be 3.4 and 3.6 nm, respectively, which matches much better with the observed AFM patterns (3.2 and 3.5 ± 0.1 nm, respectively) than the models using the other two guanine motifs.

In all of the previous models the hydrocarbons are close packed, presumably to maximize packing efficiencies. Interestingly, molecular modeling of **G₁₈G** assemblies with close packed alkyl chains (Figure 5b) suggested a band spacing of 4.5 nm, which is significantly less than the observed 4.8 ± 0.1 nm by AFM. Further modeling studies found that a more open hydrocarbon arrangement (Figure 5c) not only yielded a better prediction (4.9 nm) of the observed band spacing, but was also lower in energy than the close packed structure. Models of **G₁₈G**, **G₁₀G** and **G₁₂G** in the open alkyl arrangement, however, all had higher modeled energies than the models of their alkyl close packed assemblies. Furthermore, the predicted band spacings from these open arrangements were much larger than the experimentally observed ones. Thus, there seems to be a change in the arrangement of hydrocarbons going from small hydrocarbons ($n=8, 10, 12$) to the larger one ($n=18$). The exact reason for this change in hydrocarbon arrangement is not known although based on the model (Figure 5c), it appears that the Boc groups play an important role. In the open arrangement of **G₁₈G** the Boc group is adsorbed onto the graphite surface and there appears to be hydrogen bonding between

the amide N-Hand carbamate C=O of adjacent molecules. In the more close packed arrangement (Figure 5b) the Boc groups sit on top of the molecules and there is no amide-carbamate hydrogen bonding.

Thus to further investigate the influence of the PNA-Boc linker group on the surface self-assembly a number of different ditopic guanine monomer derivatives were studied. A first set of experiments were carried out on monomers in which the Boc protecting groups had been removed. If, as suggested above, the Boc groups play a role in aiding the formation of the “open” conformation in **G1₁₈G**, then it would be expected that removing its Boc groups should result in a significant change in the band spacing. However, if **G1₁₂G** is already in the “closed” conformation as modeling suggests then removal of the Boc groups from this monomer would not significantly affect its assembly. Standard Boc deprotection chemistry (trifluoroacetic acid) was used to generate **G2₁₂G** from **G1₁₂G** and **G2₁₈G** from **G1₁₈G**. The removal of the two hydrophobic Boc groups, not surprisingly makes **G2₁₂G** and **G2₁₈G** more water soluble. As such, this has consequences for the surface assembly from aqueous environments. A higher monomer concentration (11–17 μ M, in DMSO yielding an overall concentration of 55–85 nM after addition of water) was needed before ordered assemblies on the surface could be observed. Additionally, the bands were less stable compared to **G1_nG** monomer assemblies, making the **G2_nG** assemblies more prone to disruption by the AFM probe. AFM experiments of **G2₁₂G** on HOPG assembled into molecular-sized bands with 3.8 ± 0.2 nm repeats, the same widths observed in **G1₁₂G** assemblies, indicating the Boc groups do not significantly alter the spacing of the molecular-sized bands in this system. Models confirm these findings, as there is no change in band spacing or monomer arrangement once the Boc groups are removed (see Supp. Info.). On the other hand, when **G2₁₈G** was assembled on HOPG it was found to form band spacings of 4.5 ± 0.2 nm. Interestingly, this corresponds to a close packed alkyl arrangement (see Supp. Info.). This suggests that the Boc groups in **G1₁₈G** play a role in aiding the assembly of the C₁₈ hydrocarbon core into the open arrangement. Removal of the Boc groups did not seem to affect the assembly of larger bands (5–7 nm) as they were still observed.

To examine the effect that the PNA linker group has on the assembly of these systems **G3G** (Figure 6a), which is simply a ditopic guanine endcapped dodecane with no PNA linker groups, was designed and synthesized. These monomers were synthesized in 23% overall yield by reacting guanine(Cbz) acetic acid³⁹ with 1,12-diaminododecane, using standard peptide coupling conditions, followed by hydrogenation. Like **G1_nG**, **G3G** assembled into epitaxially aligned molecular-sized bands however, unlike **G1_nG**, different molecular-sized banding spacings, namely 2.5 ± 0.1 nm and 3.4 ± 0.1 nm, were observed within different domains in the same experiment (Figure 6b). It should be noted that while some of the domains appear to have offsets that are at slightly different angles (offset by $\sim 5^\circ$) from normal epitaxial angles this is most likely as consequence of disruption from the AFM tip due to repeated scanning, possibly suggesting that **G3G** domains are less stable than the **G1_nG** domains.

Molecular modeling was again used to help understand the arrangement of the molecules within these molecular-sized band assemblies. Assemblies of **G3G** were modeled using all three surface guanine motifs outlined in Figure 4 (see Supp. Info.). A model using the guanine motif in Figure 4a had bands that matched the 2.5 nm band spacing, and a model using the double stranded guanine motif (Figure 4c) had modeled band widths that matched the observed 3.4 nm band spacing with the latter having a lower energy. Not surprisingly, it is difficult to model two or more different guanine motifs within the same domain as the alignment of the molecules changes because of the nature of the different guanine-guanine interactions. Thus, it is not surprising that each domain of **G3G** has only a single band width and is not composed of both 2.5 and 3.4 nm bands. These experiments suggest that the PNA linker in **G1_nG** prevents the formation of the guanine tape in Figure 4a, presumably on account of steric repulsions, thus only allowing the system to assemble through one guanine motif, namely the double stranded

assembly. This is an important consideration if regular repeatable banding structures are targeted for the surface scaffolds.

One of the strengths of our monomer scaffold design is, potentially, the ability to tune the assembly by combining different sized monomers. For example, since our models predicted that both **G1₁₂G** and **G1₁₈G** formed the double stranded guanine motif, the two different monomers would be expected to assemble together within the same assembly. However, modeling studies suggested structures that contained both **G1₁₂G** and **G1₁₈G** within one band are not favored on account the length mismatch (6 methylene groups) of these monomers. Thus, the only way to ensure that both of the chain-end guanines are involved in hydrogen bonding is for the different monomers (**G1₁₂G** and **G1₁₈G**) to phase-separate into different bands (Figure 7), resulting in a surface assembly which contains two different sized banding patterns within the same domain. Since there is no hydrogen bonding specificity between the different monomers, the order of bands is expected to be random. The relative surface concentration of two different monomer species was also investigated, as it is well known that longer n-

Using procedures similar to those described previously, premixed monomer solutions with varying molar ratios of **G1₁₂G** and **G1₁₈G** were used in surface assembly experiments. Four representative phase images (Figures 8a-d) qualitatively show the change in surface assembly that results as the molar ratio of the monomers **G1₁₈G** : **G1₁₂G** is changed from 1:12 to 2:1. Nanophase separation of the two monomers is indeed observed in all these cases resulting in two different molecular-sized band widths (3.9 ± 0.1 and 4.5 ± 0.1 nm most likely, correspond to bands formed by **G1₁₂G** and **G1₁₈G** respectively) that occur within the same domain. When compared to the observed characteristic single monomer assemblies (Figure 2c-d), the band width of **G1₁₂G** in the combined assembly is within experimental error of the observed 3.9 nm, while the assigned 4.5 nm is 0.3 nm shorter than the open arrangement (Figure 5c) **G1₁₈G** band spacing. However, the 4.5 nm band spacing does match with the **G1₁₈G** assembly that has a close packed hydrocarbon arrangement (Figure 5b). This suggests that in combined assemblies of **G1₁₂G** and **G1₁₈G**, not only does the difference in size of the hydrocarbon cores result in nanophase separation of the molecules, but the arrangement of **G1₁₂G** seems to influence the packing arrangement of the hydrocarbons in **G1₁₈G**. This then suggests a possible explanation for the 4.5 nm **G1₁₈G** bands. The presence of **G1₁₂G** molecules, which adopt a close packed hydrocarbon arrangement, induce the **G1₁₈G** to adopt a similar close packing structure that more closely resembles the structural and geometric requirements of the smaller assembly.

This leads to an interesting question, namely what happens to the assemblies when a large excess of one of the monomers is present. For example, Figure 9 shows a larger area AFM image of the assembly in which a small amount of **G1₁₈G** is assembled with a large excess of **G1₁₂G** (ratio 1:12). In this case regions of wider banding patterns (4.5 nm) are observed within a smaller banding pattern (3.9 nm) matrix. This suggests that as there is not enough **G1₁₈G** to form a complete single band, the **G1₁₈G** phase segregates within a **G1₁₂G** band, presumably to minimize the energy penalties required to fit the larger monomer into the smaller banding assembly. These are regions of nanophase separated **G1₁₈G** span up to 50 nm, which from the modeled distances corresponds to a band containing *ca.* 63 molecules.

At the other extreme, mixtures of the two monomers with ratios skewed towards **G1₁₈G**, such as the 12:1 experiments (Figure 8e-f), result in the self-assembly of molecular-sized bands of 4.8 nm. This is consistent with the lower concentration of **G1₁₂G** not have as much of an influence on the **G1₁₈G** assembly. In regions where the **G1₁₂G** appears to be present (box in Figure 8f), more disorder is observed than in regions of the assembly that only seem to contain **G1₁₈G** (Figure 8e).

Quantitatively, the surface coverage of each monomer within the different ratio assemblies was calculated and plotted. Interestingly, there is a linear trend with a slope of 1.0 that correlates the ratio of the solution mole fractions to the ratio of the surface mole fractions of the two monomers (Figure 8g) which suggests a Langmuir-like correlation.⁴⁰ Even though each methylene group that is commensurate with the HOPG lattice generates 6.28 kJ/mol of free energy,^{5,41} there was no observed preference for the surface adsorption of **G1₁₈G** over **G1₁₂G**.¹³ As both monomers have two guanine moieties, this suggests that the guanine PNA-HOPG and the guanine-guanine interactions are playing a significant role in the assembly.

All studies discussed to date were carried out at 28 °C. However, in order for these assemblies to be utilized in bioenvironments, they have to be stable at physiological temperatures. Thus, to probe the thermal stability of these assemblies in more detail, imaging studies of the **G1₁₈G** coatings were carried out at temperatures (50 °C) much higher than would be required under physiological conditions. Linear band patterns were observed with coatings that were assembled at room temperature and imaged at 50 °C, an indication that these nano-assemblies are stable at this temperature (Figure 10a). In addition, studies were carried out to see if **G1₁₈G** would assemble at 50°C. Thus, the HOPG surface with a water droplet on it was heated to 50 °C, this was followed by addition of the DMSO monomer solution to the water droplet before water (at 50 °C) was used to fill the fluid cell. Linear bands were again observed (Figure 10b) indicating that the intermolecular interactions that favor linear band assemblies are strong enough to both nucleate and assemble at 50°C.

With the goal of using these assemblies to create oligo(ethylene glycol) covered surfaces, **G4G**, a monomer structurally similar to **G1₁₂G** with a triethylene glycol monomethyl ether (TEG) side chain was designed. The short chain TEG was chosen to demonstrate the concept of the scaffold coating in part for ease of synthesis. In our proof-of-concept design, TEG is anchored from a tertiary amine that is located at the center of the hydrocarbon core that is flanked by two guanine PNA-Boc groups. The synthesis of **G4G** is outline in scheme 2. Iodo-TEG⁸² was reacted with the protected bis(hexamethylene) triamine⁴² (**5**) to yield **6**. After deprotection the resulting diamine (**7**) was converted in to **G4G**, in 10% overall unoptimized yield from **5**, using procedures similar to those used to access the **G1_nG** monomers.

The assembling ability of **G4G** was investigated using the procedures previously described, however, on account of the increased water solubility of **G4G**, higher concentrations (8–13 mM in DMSO) of the monomer were used. AFM fluid tapping mode images showed that **G4G** adsorbed immediately on HOPG as measured by a change in surface roughness. After diluting the DMSO with water, it took several minutes to an hour before linear bands were observed. Comparatively, **G1_nG** band assemblies were observed almost immediately after dilution of DMSO with water. This may have to do with the greater water solubility of **G4G** or perhaps that the tertiary amine, which is presumably protonated at neutral pH, reduces the stability of the surface-adsorbate interactions. After a few hours, however, both epitaxial molecular-sized and larger bands were observed. The molecular-sized bands had widths of 3.8 ± 0.1 nm and are similar in width to the molecular-sized bands observed with **G1₁₂G** (Figure 11a–b). As is observed in the **G1₁₂G** case, the majority of the bands on the **G4G**-coated surface are the molecular-sized ones.

From our the studies mentioned above (e.g Figures 2, 8 and 9) it is believed that the dark bands in the AFM phase images correspond to the hydrocarbon segments and the lighter bands correspond to the PNA-Boc-nucleobase segments. Thus, it was expected that the TEG side group should be presented in the center of the darker band in the images. However, no sign of the TEG could be distinguished on AFM scans. This is possibly a consequence of the TEG being too small and flexible relative to any other part of the coating hindering detection by the AFM tip.

Molecular modeling of **G4G** (Figure 12b) using a double stranded motif and a close packed arrangement similar to **G1₁₂G** shows modeled bands of 3.9 nm that match the observed band spacing. However, by adding an attachment point (the tertiary nitrogen) for the TEG, the number of core atoms between guanine PNA moieties changes from being even in **G1₁₂G** to being odd in **G4G**. As a result, the molecules close pack in a slightly different arrangement compared to **G1₁₂G** (Figure 12a–b). In this case, a pseudo centrosymmetric assembly is predicted for the **G4G**, in which adjacent double stranded guanine motifs run anti-parallel with respect to each other, where as in **G1₁₂G** they run parallel. Indeed, there have been many other reports of assemblies of small molecules that produce different packing arrangements for even and odd core atom parities.^{7b,7d,43} Modeling also suggests that the TEG groups are not large enough to completely cover the hydrophobic scaffold coating. Calculations from the models suggest a density of 0.32 TEG groups/nm².

If **G4G** has assembled on the surface as indicated by the models then the HOPG has TEG groups supramolecularly grafted on to it. Thus, if the assembly is stable under biologically relevant conditions, this TEG-coating of the HOPG should impart some effect on protein adhesion to the surface. However, as mentioned before the models suggest the TEG units do not completely cover the hydrophobic surface thus close to complete prevention of protein adhesion is not expected. None-the-less, if this material shows any effect in hindering platelet adhesion then derivatives which present an increased density of functional units, either by using higher molecular weight PEG side-chains or dendritic carbohydrate side-chains,⁴⁴ could result in more dramatic effects being observed. Thus, initial studies to probe the biological effect of the current assembly were carried out and used static platelet adhesion. Platelets act indirectly as a marker for plasma protein adsorption and are a critical step in surface-induced thrombosis. Thus, four surfaces, bare HOPG, **G1₁₂G**-coated HOPG, **G4G**-coated HOPG and **6**-coated HOPG were prepared at room temperature and incubated with platelet rich plasma (PRP). The samples were then fixed with paraformaldehyde, tagged with fluorescein isothiocyanate (FITC) labeled anti-CD41a, which binds to the active site of the α subunit (GPIIb) of the GPIIb/IIIa platelet receptor, and mounted on slides. Between each step, the surfaces were washed three times with phosphate buffered saline (PBS) in order to remove any non-adherent platelets. Figure 13a–e shows representative epifluorescence optical microscopy images (400 $\times$) of platelets adhering from the PRP solution to (a) bare HOPG, (b) **G1₁₂G**-coated HOPG, (c) **G4G**-coated HOPG, and (d–e) **6**-coated HOPG. The percent surface coverage of the platelets was calculated using a threshold analysis. Static platelet adhesion on both the bare HOPG and the **G1₁₂G** coating were statistically equivalent with $34.6 \pm 5.6\%$, $37.6 \pm 6.7\%$ surface platelet coverage respectively (Figure 13f). These coatings are both hydrophobic and adhesion of a relatively large quantity of platelets was expected. However, surface platelet coverage on the **G4G** coating was $20.8 \pm 2.6\%$ which is statistically significant compared to either the bare HOPG ($p=0.014$) or the **G1₁₂G** coating ($p=0.007$). The reduction in static platelet adhesion on **G4G** is consistent with the TEG side chain creating hydrated patches that repel plasma proteins and platelets. On all three surfaces, different morphologies of adherent platelets were observed, which likely represent different stages of platelet activation.

To understand the effect that the supramolecular network has in creating a uniform coating of TEG, surface studies of **6**, a synthetic precursor of **G4G** which does not have guanine-PNA end groups, were compared with **G4G**. **6** adsorbed onto HOPG, but no band assemblies were observed and the adsorbed material was not stable to AFM fluid tapping mode imaging (see Supp. Info.), suggesting that the extensive hydrogen bonding mediated by the guanine-PNA units plays an important role in stabilizing **G4G**-assemblies on HOPG. Static platelet adhesion studies on **6**-coated HOPG showed an average platelet coverage over the sample of $28.4 \pm 9.2\%$ (Figure 13f). The large standard deviation comes from the heterogeneous platelet coverage in this systems, some regions had platelet coverage similar to bare HOPG (Figure 13c) while other regions had platelet coverage closer to **G4G** surfaces (Figure 13d). These

platelet adhesion results suggest that the guanine-PNA units in the **G4G** coatings help to present TEG side chains more uniformly. Thus, while it seems that the adsorption of TEG monomers on HOPG can influence platelet adhesion, studies with this control compound suggest that, with guanine-PNA end groups a supramolecular network is important to create a uniform and well-defined coating.

Conclusions

In these studies, tunable surface assemblies have been created using low molecular weight ditopic monomers on a HOPG surface. The assemblies are composed of bands with widths that can be systematically varied by simply changing the length of the core hydrocarbon unit. Furthermore, this concept has been extended into using these assemblies as scaffolds to supramolecularly graft groups (in this case TEG) onto HOPG. These grafted assemblies have been shown to be stable in biologically-relevant environments and have even shown the ability to influence biological processes, namely static platelet adhesion. This concept of using the surface assemblies as scaffolds is potentially a very versatile one in which a wide range of biologically-active (or other functionalities) can be envisaged, opening the door to systematic, facile functionalization of a surface using a simple dip coating process.

Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

Acknowledgements

Funding for this research was provided by NIH grants EB-002067 and NIBIB-EB-001466, Case MSTP grant T32 GM07250, and NSF grant MWN DMR-0602869.

References

- (a) Ryu DY, Shin K, Drockenmuller E, Hawker CJ, Russell TP. *Science* 2005;308:236–239. [PubMed: 15821087] (b) Michl J, Magnera TF. *Proc Natl Acad Sci* 2002;99:4788–4792. [PubMed: 11959931] (c) Schönherr H, Paraschiv V, Zapotoczny S, Crego-Calama M, Timmerman P, Frank CW, Vancso GJ, Reinhoudt DN. *Proc Natl Acad Sci* 2002;99:5024–5027. [PubMed: 11929980] (d) Russell TP. *Science* 2002;297:964–967. [PubMed: 12169722] (e) Leclère P, Surin M, Jonkheijm P, Henze O, Schenning APHJ, Biscarini F, Grimsdale AC, Feast WJ, Meijer EW, Müllen K, Brédas JL, Lazzaroni R. *Eur Polym J* 2004;40:885–892.
- (a) Palermo V, Liscio A, Gentilini D, Nolde F, Müllen K, Samorì P. *Small* 2007;3:161–167. [PubMed: 17294488] (b) Puigmartí-Luis J, Minoia A, Uji-i H, Rovira C, Cornil J, De Feyter S, Lazzaroni R, Amabilino DB. *J Am Chem Soc* 2006;128:12602–12603. [PubMed: 17002326] (c) Xu H, Norsten TB, Uzun O, Jeoung E, Rotello VM. *Chem Comm* 2005:5157–5159. [PubMed: 16228020]
- (a) Barth JV, Costantini G, Kern K. *Nature* 2005;437:671–679. [PubMed: 16193042] (b) Badin MG, Bashir A, Krakert S, Strunskus T, Terfort A, Wöll C. *Angew Chem Int Ed* 2007;46:3762–3764. (c) Li SS, Yan HJ, Wan LJ, Yang HB, Northrop BH, Stang PJ. *J Am Chem Soc* 2007;129:9268–9269. [PubMed: 17622151]
- (a) Leunissen ME, Graswinckel WS, van Enckevort WJP, Vlieg E. *Cryst Growth Des* 2003;4:361–367. (b) Stepanow S, Lin N, Barth JV, Kern K. *Chem Comm* 2006:2153–2155. [PubMed: 16703138]
- Groszek AJ. *Proc Roy Soc Lond A* 1970;314:473–498.
- (a) Barth JV, Weckesser J, Cai C, Günter P, Bürgi L, Jeandupeux O, Kern K. *Angew Chem Int Ed* 2000;39:1230–1234. (b) Tao F, Bernasek SL. *J Am Chem Soc* 2005;127:12750–12751. [PubMed: 16159239] (c) Griessl SJH, Lackinger M, Jamitzky F, Markert T, Hietschold M, Heckl WM. *Langmuir* 2004;20:9403–9407. [PubMed: 15461536] (d) Kim K, Matzger AJ. *J Am Chem Soc* 2002;124:8772–8773. [PubMed: 12137511] (e) Qian P, Nanjo H, Yokoyama T, Suzuki TM. *Chem Commun* 1999:1197–1198. (f) Nath KG, Ivasenko O, Miwa JA, Dang H, Wuest JD, Nanci A, Perepichka SF, Rosei F. *J Am Chem Soc* 2006;128:4212–4213. [PubMed: 16568980] (g) Hips KW, Scudiero L,

- Barlow DE, Cooke MP Jr. *J Am Chem Soc* 2002;124:2126–2127. [PubMed: 11878961] (h) Theobald JA, Oxtoby NS, Phillips MA, Champness NR, Beton PH. *Nature* 2003;424:1029–1031. [PubMed: 12944962] (i) Canas-Ventura ME, Xiao W, Wasserfallen D, Müllen K, Brune H, Barth JV, Fasel R. *Angew Chem Int Ed* 2007;46:1814–1818. (j) Baker RT, Mougous JD, Brackley A, Patrick DL. *Langmuir* 1999;15:4884–4891. (k) Stevens F, Beebe TP Jr. *Langmuir* 1999;15:6884–6889. (l) Hecht S. *Angew Chem Int Ed* 2003;42:24–26. (m) Yablon DG, Ertas D, Fang H, Flynn GW. *Isr J Chem* 2003;43:383–392. (n) Cox JK, Eisenberg A, Lennox RB. *Curr Opin Coll Inter Sci* 1999;4:52–59. (o) Gong JR, Yan HJ, Yuan QH, Xu LP, Bo ZS, Wan LJ. *J Am Chem Soc* 2006;128:12384–12385. [PubMed: 16984166]
7. (a) De Feyter S, De Schryver FC. *Chem Soc Rev* 2003;32:139–150. [PubMed: 12792937] (b) De Feyter S, Larsson M, Schuurmans N, Verkuil B, Zorinians G, Gesquière A, Abdel-Mottaleb MM, Esch Jv, Feringa BL, van Stam J, De Schryver FC. *Chem Eur J* 2003;9:1198–1206. (c) Gesquière A, Jonkheijm P, Hoebein FJM, Schenning APHJ, De Feyter S, De Schryver FC, Meijer EW. *Nano Letters* 2004;4:1175–1179. (d) Furukawa S, Tahara K, De Schryver FC, Van der Auweraer M, Tobe Y, De Feyter S. *Angew Chem Int Ed* 2007;46:2831–2834. (e) Mamdouh W, Uji-i H, Ladislav JS, Dulcey AE, Percec V, De Schryver FC, De Feyter S. *J Am Chem Soc* 2006;128:317–325. [PubMed: 16390161]
8. (a) Seeman NC. *Trends Biotechnol* 1999;17:437–443. [PubMed: 10511701] (b) Li Y, Tseng YD, Kwon SY, D’Espaux L, Bunch JS, McEuen PL, Luo D. *Nature Mater* 2004;3:38–42. [PubMed: 14704783] (c) Xu S, Dong M, Rauls E, Otero R, Linderroth TR, Besenbacher F. *Nano Lett* 2006;6:1434–1438. [PubMed: 16834424]
9. Sivakova S, Rowan SJ. *Chem Soc Rev* 2005;34:9–21. [PubMed: 15643486]
10. (a) Sowerby SJ, Edelwirth M, Heckl WM. *J Phys Chem B* 1998;102:5914–5922. (b) Kelly REA, Kantorovich LN. *J Mater Chem* 2006;16:1894–1905.
11. Gottarelli G, Masiero S, Mezzina E, Pieraccini S, Rabe JP. *Chem Eur J* 2000;6:3242–3248.
12. (a) Winfree E, Liu F, Wenzler LA, Seeman NC. *Nature* 1998;394:539–544. [PubMed: 9707114] (b) Park SH, Yin P, Liu Y, Reif JH, LaBean TH, Yan H. *Nano Lett* 2005;5:729–733. [PubMed: 15826117] (c) Zheng J, Constantinou PE, Micheel C, Alivisatos AP, Kiehl RA, Seeman NC. *Nano Lett* 2006;6:1502–1504. [PubMed: 16834438] (d) Garibotti AV, Knudsen SM, Ellington AD, Seeman NC. *Nano Lett* 2006;6:1505–1507. [PubMed: 16834439] (e) Ding B, Seeman NC. *Science* 2006;314:1583–1585. [PubMed: 17158323] (f) Lin C, Liu Y, Yan H. *Nano Lett* 2007;7:507–512. [PubMed: 17298017]
13. Kumar AMS, Sivakova S, Marchant RE, Rowan SJ. *Small* 2007;3:783–787. [PubMed: 17385210]
14. (a) Horbett TA. *Cardiovasc Path* 1993;2:137s–148s. (b) Sharma CP. *J Biomater Appl* 2001;15:359–381. [PubMed: 11336389]
15. Swalen JD, Allara DL, Andrade JD, Chandross EA, Garoff S, Israelachvili J, McCarthy TJ, Murray R, Pease RF, Rabolt JF, Wynne KJ, Yu H. *Langmuir* 1987;3:932–950.
16. (a) Vroman L, Adams AL. *Surf Sci* 1969;16:438–446. (b) Hudson SD, Jung HT, Percec V, Cho WD, Johansson G, Ungar G, Balagurusamy VSK. *Science* 1997;278:449–452.
17. Ratner BD. *J Biomed Mater Res* 1993;27:283–287. [PubMed: 8360198]
18. Vogel EA. *Adv Colloid Interface Sci* 1998;74:69–117. [PubMed: 9561719]
19. Lee JH, Lee HB, Andrade JD. *Prog Polym Sci* 1995;20:1043–1079.
20. (a) Prime KL, Whitesides GM. *Science* 1991;252:1164–1167. (b) Prime KL, Whitesides GM. *J Am Chem Soc* 1993;115:10714–10721. (c) Sigal GB, Mrksich M, Whitesides GM. *J Am Chem Soc* 1998;120:3464–3473.
21. (a) Malmsten M, Emoto K, Van Alstine JM. *J Coll Interf Sci* 1998;202:507–517. (b) Vadgama P. *Annu Rep Prog Chem, Sect C: Phys Chem* 2005;101:14–52. (c) Tokumitsu S, Liebich A, Herrwerth S, Eck W, Himmelhaus M, Grunze M. *Langmuir* 2002;18:8862–8870. (d) Capadona JR, Collard DM, García AJ. *Langmuir* 2003;19:1847–1852. (e) Snellings GMBF, Vansteenkiste SO, Corneillie SI, Davies MC, Schacht EH. *Adv Mater* 2000;12:1959–1962.
22. Harris, JM. *Poly(ethylene glycol) Chemistry: Biotechnical and Biomedical Applications*. Plenum; New York: 1992.
23. (a) Wang RY, Himmelhaus M, Fick J, Herrwerth S, Eck W, Grunze M. *J Chem Phys* 2005;122:164702.1–164702.6. [PubMed: 15945694] (b) Wang RLC, Jürgen Kreuzer H, Grunze M. *Phys Chem Chem Phys* 2000;2:3613–2622.

24. Wang RLC, Kreuzer HJ, Grunze M. *J Phys Chem B* 1997;101:9767–9773.
25. (a) Harder P, Grunze M, Dahint R, Whitesides GM, Laibinis PE. *J Phys Chem B* 1998;102:426–436. (b) Feldman K, Hähner G, Spencer ND, Harder P, Grunze M. *J Am Chem Soc* 1999;121:10134–10141.
26. (a) Credo GM, Boal AK, Das K, Galow TH, Rotello VM, Feldheim DL, Gorman CB. *J Am Chem Soc* 2002;124:9036–9037. [PubMed: 12148992] (b) Zhu XY, Jun Y, Staarup DR, Major RC, Danielson S, Boiadjev V, Gladfelter WL, Bunker BC, Guo A. *Langmuir* 2001;17:7798–7803. (c) Sanyal A, Norsten TB, Uzun O, Rotello VM. *Langmuir* 2004;20:5958–5964. [PubMed: 16459616] (d) Zou S, Zhang Z, Förch R, Knoll W, Schönherr H, Julius Vancso G. *Langmuir* 2003;19:8618–8621. (e) Garcia-Lopez JJ, Zapotoczny S, Timmerman P, van Veggel FCJM, Vancso GJ, Crego-Calama M, Reinhoudt DN. *Chem Commun* 2003:352–353.
27. (a) Jo S, Park K. *Biomaterials* 2000;21:605–616. [PubMed: 10701461] (b) Papra A, Gadegaard N, Larsen NB. *Langmuir* 2001;17:1457–1460. (c) Yang Z, Galloway JA, Yu H. *Langmuir* 1999;15:8405–8411.
28. Chen H, Zhang Z, Chen Y, Brook MA, Sheardown H. *Biomaterials* 2005;26:2391–2399. [PubMed: 15585242]
29. Ghosh P, Amirpour ML, Lackowski WM, Pishko MV, Crooks RM. *Angew Chem Int Ed* 1999;38:1592–1595.
30. Ulman, A. *An Introduction to Ultrathin Organic Films from Langmuir-Blodgett to Self-Assembly*. Academic Press; San Diego: 1991. (b) Peng JB, Barnes GT, Gentle IR. *Adv Colloid Interface Sci* 2001;91:163–219. [PubMed: 11392356]
31. (a) Vacheethasane K, Wang S, Qiu Y, Marchant RE. *J Biomater Sci Polym Ed* 2004;15:95–110. [PubMed: 15027845] (b) Tae G, Lammertink RGH, Kornfield JA, Hubbell JA. *Adv Mater* 2003;15:66–69. (c) Kim K, Kim C, Byun Y. *J Biomed Mater Res* 2000;52:836–840. [PubMed: 11033568]
32. (a) Holland NB, Qiu Y, Ruegsegger M, Marchant RE. *Nature* 1998;392:799–801. [PubMed: 9572137] (b) Ruegsegger MA, Marchant RE. *J Biomed Mater Res* 2001;56:159–167. [PubMed: 11496830] (c) Sagnella S, Anderson E, Sanabria N, Marchant RE, Kottke-Marchant K. *Tissue Engin* 2005;11:226–236. (d) Larsen CC, Kligman F, Kottke-Marchant K, Marchant RE. *Biomaterials* 2006;27:4846–4855. [PubMed: 16762410] (e) Larsen CC, Kligman F, Tang C, Kottke-Marchant K, Marchant RE. *Biomaterials* 2007;28:3537–3548. [PubMed: 17507089]
33. Nielson PE. *Acc Chem Res* 1999;32:624–630.
34. (a) Wanless EJ, Davey TW, Ducker WA. *Langmuir* 1997;13:4223–4228. (b) Nishimura S, Scales PJ, Biggs SR, Healy TW. *Coll Surf A* 1995;103:289–298. (c) Manne S, Cleveland JP, Gaub HE, Stucky GD, Hansma PK. *Langmuir* 1994;10:4409–4413. (d) Fuhrhop JH, Wang T. *Chem Rev* 2004;104:2901–2937. [PubMed: 15186184]
35. (a) Gottarelli G, Masiero S, Mezzina E, Spada GP. *Helv Chim Acta* 1998;81:2078–2092. (b) Giorgi T, Grepioni F, Manet I, Mariani P, Masiero S, Mezzina E, Pieraccini S, Saturni L, Spada GP, Gottarelli G. *Chem Eur J* 2002;8:2143–2152. (c) Yoshikawa I, Yanagi S, Yamaji Y, Araki K. *Tetrahedron* 2007;63:7474–7481.
36. (a) Forman SL, Fetting JC, Pieraccini S, Gottarelli G, David JT. *J Am Chem Soc* 2000;122:4060–4067. (b) Thewalt U, Bugg CE, Marsh RE. *Acta Cryst* 1971;B27:2358–2363. (c) Calzolari A, Di Felice R, Molinari E, Garbesi A. *Physica E* 2002;13:1236–1239.
37. (a) Srinivasan R, Murphy JC, Fainchtein R, Patabiraman N. *J Electroanal Chem Interfacial Electrochem* 1991;312:293–300. (b) Tao NJ, Shi Z. *J Phys Chem* 1994;98:1464–1471. (c) Otero R, Schöck M, Molina LM, Løegsgaard E, Stensgaard I, Hammer B, Besenbacher F. *Angew Chem Int Ed* 2005;44:2270–2275.
38. (a) Thewalt U, Bugg CE, Marsh RE. *Acta Cryst* 1970;B26:1089–1101. (b) Thewalt U, Bugg CE, Marsh RE. *Acta Cryst* 1971;B27:2358–2363.
39. (a) Dueholm KL, Egholm M, Behrens C, Christensen L, Hansen HF, Vulpius T, Petersen KH, Berg RH, Nielson PE, Buchardt O. *J Org Chem* 1994;59:5767–5773. (b) Thomson SA, Josey JA, Cadilla R, Gaul MD, Hassman CF, Luzzio MJ, Pipe AJ, Reed KL, Ricca DJ, Wiethe RW, Noble SA. *Tetrahedron* 1995;51:6179–6194.

40. Masel, RI. Principles of Adsorption and Reaction on Solid Surfaces. John Wiley & Sons, Inc.; New York: 1996. p. 235-254.
41. Findenegg GH, Liphard M. Carbon 1987;25:119–128.
42. Curphey TJ. J Org Chem 1979;44:2805–2807.
43. Fang H, Giancarlo LC, Flynn GW. J Phys Chem B 1998;102:7421–7424.
44. Zhu J, Marchant RE. Biomacromolecules 2006;7:1036–1041. [PubMed: 16602718]

Figure 1.

Concept of organized functional groups arranged through surface supramolecular polymerization. Monomers are initially in solution followed by adsorption and assembly to form linear band structures that present side groups in an ordered array on a hydrophobic surface.

Figure 2. AFM phase images of a) **G18G**, b) **G10G**, c) **G12G**, and d) **G18G** molecular sized bands on HOPG. Band spacing increases with increasing length of the hydrocarbon core.

Figure 3.

a) AFM phase image of $G_{112}G$ domains offset by 60° (angular measurement). Domain boundary defects exist where the different domains meet (arrow). The angular offset of the domains suggests epitaxial assembly along the b) symmetric axes of the HOPG lattice. c) 2-D fourier transform of AFM image showing epitaxial organization of domains.

Figure 4.

a) Non-dipole guanine motif with centrosymmetric interactions (i.e. center of symmetry between G1 and G2 indicated by dot), b) dipole tape motif with net dipole (arrow), and c) dimer motif with C(2) exo amino hydrogens (*) separated by 3 Å.

Figure 5. Energy minimized molecular models of a) **G12G** in a close packed arrangement, b) **G18G** in a close packed arrangement, and c) **G18G** in an open hydrocarbon arrangement. Modeled band spacing (nm) and unit cell (box) for each proposed arrangement is also shown.

Figure 6.

a) Chemical structure of **G3G**. b) AFM phase image of multiple domains of **G3G** ('brighter' areas) forming molecular sized bands with widths of 2.5 nm (arrows) and 3.4 nm (circle). Surface coverage is incomplete with surrounding 'darker' regions having an amorphous phase.

Figure 7.

Concept of G1₁₈G (light) and G1₁₂G (dark) combined assembly into molecular sized bands. Molecules will favor phase separation on account of mismatched guanines when they assemble in the same band.

Figure 8.

AFM phase images of two monomer $G_{18}G : G_{12}G$ assemblies with solution molar ratios a) 1:12, b) 1:2, c) 1:1, d) 2:1, and e-f) 12:1. Surface concentration of monomer bands matches the solution concentration. e) $G_{18}G$ bands with minimal $G_{12}G$ produce bands of 4.8 nm. f) $G_{12}G$ (box) introduces defects into the $G_{18}G$ assembly. g) The ratio of surface mole fraction of $G_{18}G$: surface mole fraction of $G_{12}G$ (X_{surf}) vs. the ratio of solution mole fraction of $G_{18}G$: solution mole fraction of $G_{12}G$ (X_{sol}) is plotted and shows a Langmuir-like correlation with a slope of 1.0.

Figure 9.

AFM phase image of 1:12 **G₁₈G** : **G₁₂G** surface assembly on HOPG. Nanophase separated regions of **G₁₈G** are up to 50 nm. Bands with both monomers produce band defects (box). There is also a type of boundary domain defect (oval).

Figure 10.

AFM phase images of **G1₁₈G** coating captured at 50°C showing presence of linear band assemblies. a) Coating assembled at room temperature and then heated to 50°C and b) assembly created at 50°C.

Figure 11.

A comparison of the AFM phase images of a) $G1_{12}G$, forming 3.8 nm bands, and b) $G4G$, forming 3.8 nm bands. The 3.8 nm widths of both these assemblies suggests the molecules in both assemblies are arranging similarly.

Figure 12. Energy minimized molecular models of a) **G1₁₂G**, and b) **G4G** with modeled bands that match the observed band spacings. Change in number of core atoms changes packing arrangement of molecules so that adjacent guanine motifs run parallel in a) and anti-parallel in b).

Figure 13.

Epifluorescence optical microscopy (400 ×) images showing static platelet adhesion on a) bare HOPG, b) **G1₁₂G**-coated HOPG, c) **G4G**-coated HOPG, d-e) **6**-coated HOPG. f) Platelet surface coverage (%) vs. surfaces (n=5) demonstrating reduction in static platelet adhesion to $20.8 \pm 2.6\%$ on **G4G** coating relative to bare HOPG ($p=0.014$) and the **G1₁₂G** coating. (n=5, $p=0.007$). **6**-coated HOPG had a large standard deviation due to regions that adhere platelets d) similar to bare HOPG and e) similar to **G4G**-coated HOPG.

Scheme 1.

Synthesis of $\mathbf{G}_1\mathbf{G}$ ($n=8, 10, 12, 18$) and deprotection to generate $\mathbf{G}_2\mathbf{G}$ ($n=12, 18$). These ditopic monomers have a $-(\text{CH}_2)_n$ - hydrocarbon core flanked by guanine end groups (R).

Scheme 2.
Synthesis of **G4G**

Table 1

Summary of observed and modeled results from single monomer studies.

M	L (nm)	W_{obs} (nm)	W_{mod} (nm)
G1 ₈ G	3.6	3.2 ± 0.1	3.4
G1 ₁₀ G	3.9	3.5 ± 0.1	3.6
G1 ₁₂ G	4.2	3.8 ± 0.1	3.8
G1 ₁₈ G	4.8	4.8 ± 0.1	4.9
G2 ₁₂ G	4.2	3.8 ± 0.2	3.8
G2 ₁₈ G	4.8	4.5 ± 0.2	4.4
G3G	3.4	2.5 ± 0.1	2.5
		3.4 ± 0.1	3.4
G4G	4.4	3.8 ± 0.1	3.8

Summary of end-to-end length (L) of monomers (M) in extended conformation (from molecular modeling), width of observed bands (W_{obs}) on HOPG from AFM phase images, and width of modeled bands (W_{mod}) in energy minimized models.