Published in final edited form as:

J Org Chem. 2011 August 19; 76(16): 6584–6591. doi:10.1021/jo200835y.

Synthesis, Characterization, and Applications of Hemifluorinated Dibranched Amphiphiles

Maria Cristina Parlato¹, Jun-Pil Jee¹, Motti Teshite¹, and Sandro Mecozzi^{1,2,*}

¹School of Pharmacy, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison, WI 53705

²Department of Chemistry, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison, WI 53705

Abstract

Here we describe the synthesis, the physicochemical and preliminary pharmaceutical assessment of a novel class of hemifluorinated dibranched derivatives ($M_1diH_xF_y$). These novel compounds have the remarkable ability of completely stopping the Ostwald ripening commonly associated with nanoemulsions. The developed synthesis is modular and it allows easy incremental structural variations in the fluorophilic (fluorous chains)-, lipophilic (alkyl spacer head)- and hydrophilic (polar head) domains. Furthermore, the synthesis can be easily scaled-up and highly pure compounds can be readily obtained through silica gel and fluoro-silica gel column chromatography, without any need to use HPLC or other time-consuming techniques. Surface properties like micelle formation, critical aggregation concentration (CAC) and emulsion stability studies demonstrated the different behavior of dibranched hemifluorinated surfactant ($M_1diH_xF_y$) with respect to that of single chain semifluorinated analogues (M_zF_y). Remarkably, the new polymer $M_1diH_3F_8$ drastically slowed the ripening of nanoemulsions of the commonly used fluorinated anesthetic sevoflurane over a period of more than one year. During this time, the nanodroplet size did not increase to more than 400 nm. This result is very promising for inducing and maintaining general anesthesia through intravenous delivery of volatile anesthetics, eliminating the need for the use of large and costly vaporizers in the operating room.

Introduction

Fluorinated amphiphiles have unique physico-chemical properties including high surface tension activity, thermal and chemical stability, and biological inertness.^{1,2} The fluorous moiety is characterized by both high hydro- and lipophobicity. Furthermore, linear fluorocarbons are rigid rods due to the size of the fluorine atom. All these properties allow fluorinated amphiphiles to form better-organized and more stable self-assembling systems than their hydrocarbon counterpart.^{1–12} Also, important from a biological standpoint, the high lipophobicity of fluorous chains mostly prevents the fusion of these molecules with biological membranes, therefore strongly reducing their hemolytic activity and acute toxicity when compared to their hydrocarbon analogues. Fluorocarbons are not metabolized *in vivo* and are eventually excreted unmodified.¹³ Due to these unique physicochemical and biological properties, fluorinated amphiphiles are one of the most promising and innovative tools for the construction of drug-delivery devices and other biomedical applications.

smecozzi@wisc.edu.

Supporting Information

Plots for CAC determination by surface tension measurements and electron microscopy procedures and images. This material is available free of charge via the internet at <http://pubs.acs.org>.

Intravenous delivery of fluorinated volatile anesthetics with little or no aqueous solubility has been a focus area of pharmaceutical research for over 40 years due to the potential for pharmacodynamics improvements. However, the peculiar properties of fluorous molecules prevented a quick solution to the problem of finding formulations able to stabilize fluorous anesthetics in water. For instance, the use of lipid-based emulsions only allowed formulations containing up to 3.6% of sevoflurane, a concentration not sufficient for medical applications as an intravenous anesthetic.¹⁴ We originally proposed the possibility of using semifluorinated surfactants for the intravenous delivery of the commonly used class of fluorinated volatile anesthetics.^{15,16} We found that by using linear diblock copolymers such as the simple M_5F_{13} polymer (Figure 1), we were able to solubilize up to 25% of sevoflurane in water.

In vivo testing of these fluorous emulsions showed that both induction and recovery from intravenous emulsified halogenated anesthetics are more rapid than with administration as a vapor.¹⁶ Additionally, the intravenous administration of fluorinated ethers has promising implications regarding end-organ protection against ischemia and reperfusion injury.^{17,18} This preconditioning is found to be a separate pharmacologic response from the drug effects that result in general anesthesia. Therefore, the potential clinical applications of intravenous emulsified fluorinated anesthetics may well extend beyond the operating room.¹⁹ Sevoflurane, a moderately water-soluble highly fluorinated ether, used for induction and maintenance of general anesthesia, is the preferred agent in clinical anesthesia due to less irritation to mucous membranes when compared to other fluorous ethers with anesthetic properties such as isoflurane and desflurane.^{20,21} The affinity of fluorinated anesthetics for fluorophilic molecules prompted the investigation of the emulsification of sevoflurane using a semi-fluorinated surfactant M_5F_{13} (Fig. 1) with the fluorinated and FDA-approved additive perfluorooctylbromide to slow ripening. This new formulation allowed the emulsification of considerable amount of sevoflurane, up to 25% v/v, by exploiting the greater solubility of the anesthetic in a fluorous phase. This was a significant improvement (six-fold increase) over the maximum amount of sevoflurane that can be emulsified in classic lipid emulsion (intralipid) 3.46% v/v.⁶ Our formulations have the ability of inducing general anesthesia by intravenous injection in rats,¹⁶ and in dogs²² combined with a rapid recovery profile without causing acute toxicity. Nevertheless, the sevoflurane/fluoropolymer emulsions were susceptible to fast particle size growth. For any emulsion formulation to become clinically useful, the particle droplet size must be under 500 nm and have a shelf life of eighteen months. The addition of perfluorooctyl bromide as a secondary component did slow the ripening, but unfortunately the droplet size was over 500 nm after just 30 days. Limiting ripening is fundamental to provide an effective and convenient mean of inducing anesthesia in human patients. This problem led us to design a new class of fluorinated surfactants that could provide extended emulsion stability.

Results and Discussion

Our design started from considering the structure of the nanoparticles in our emulsions. The original surfactant M_5F_{13} **2** (Fig. 1) consisted of a large poly (ethylene glycol) of an average molecular weight of 5,000 attached to a relatively small rigid perfluorocarbon. Thus, presumably, the surfactant chains would coat the fluorous nanoparticle composed of the anesthetic **1** and the additive **2** by binding the fluorous chain to the inner fluorous core. The distance between the various surfactant molecules on the surface of the nanoparticle would then be dictated by the sterical hindrance of the large poly(ethylene glycol) moieties. In the case of the original polymer M_5F_{13} the large PEG would prevent tight packing of the surfactant around each nanoparticle (Fig. 2).

Loose packing between the surfactant molecules surrounding the nanoparticles would then allow anesthetic molecules to diffuse into the aqueous phase and contribute to the growing of bigger particles by the Ostwald ripening effect. We reasoned that by reducing the PEG size and by increasing the volume of the fluororous moiety we might surround each droplet with a more dense, less penetrable polymeric layer and, as a consequence, reduce the rate of diffusion of the anesthetic out of the nanoparticles (Fig. 2). According to this design, we selected a PEG with an average molecular weight of 1000 as opposed to the PEG 5000 of the original polymer, and we transformed the single fluorocarbon chain we used in M_5F_{13} in two hemifluorinated chains connected to the PEG polar chain through a glycerol moiety. In addition, we introduced a small hydrocarbon segment between the two fluororous chains and the glycerol moiety to provide some flexibility to the surfactant fluororous moieties.

We herein describe the synthesis, the preliminary physicochemical, and pharmaceutical assessments of this new class of nonionic dibranched derivatives $M_1diH_xF_y$ (Fig. 1). The number following the letter M indicates the molecular weight of the PEG. Thus, M_5 indicates a methyl-capped poly(ethylene glycol) of average molecular weight of 5,000. The number after the H indicates the number of carbon atoms composing the hydrocarbon segment, while the number after the F indicates the number of carbon atoms in the fluorocarbon chains. All these new surfactants were able to slow the ripening of sevoflurane emulsions, in comparison with the original linear diblock copolymers. Remarkably, the new polymer $M_1diH_3F_8$ drastically slowed nanoparticle ripening and stabilized sevoflurane emulsions over one year with droplet size under 400 nm.

Synthesis

A series of fluorinated 1,2-di-*O*-alkyl glycerol-PEG amphiphiles have been synthesized in gram scale and with high purity. The final surfactants were easily purified by silica gel and fluoro-silica gel column chromatography without requiring further purification by HPLC. Their molecular structures follow a modular design that allows incremental structural variations. This design involves two small hydrocarbon chains ending with a fluorocarbon functionality. The two mixed hydrocarbon/fluorocarbon chains are then connected through a glycerol unit to a PEG (MW 1100) polar head. The various polymers in this series differ in the size of both the fluororous chain and the hydrocarbon spacer. We have used two different fluorocarbons, containing six and eight fluorinated carbons, respectively. The hydrocarbon spacer between the PEG moiety and the terminal perfluoroalkyl group contains either three, or five or ten methylene group. These structural features are expected to influence the fluorophilic/lipophilic/hydrophilic balance and, consequently, physico-chemical and biological properties such as nanoparticle permeability and nanoemulsion stability.

While the synthesis of dialkyl-semifluorinated amphiphiles is documented in the literature, the synthesis of PEG-containing fluororous surfactants is challenging. Our main constraint was dictated by the need for gram-scale synthesis in order to produce enough amphiphile as needed for physico-chemical characterization and for all pharmaceutical and biological studies. The synthesis and purification of compounds containing fluororous moieties can be very problematic due to their unusual reactivities, hydrophobicity, and lipophobicity, which can lead to difficulties in handling, solubilization, and purification of reagents and intermediates of reaction. All these issues are exacerbated if fluororous compounds containing reactive functionalities directly attached to the strongly electron-withdrawing fluororous chains are used in the synthesis. In fact, the electron-withdrawing property of fluorocarbons will greatly reduce the reactivity of these molecules. To improve on the reactivity of fluororous intermediates, we resorted to the use of short, up to eight carbon atoms, fluororous chains, containing a small hydrocarbon spacer between reactive functionalities and the fluororous tails (synthetic scheme 1). The next task consisted in identifying the conditions for

a quick and easy way of purifying the PEG-containing semifluorinated polymeric surfactants. Unfortunately, a mixture of different fluorinated amphiphilic PEG derivatives can't be purified by using common laboratory techniques such as silica gel column chromatography or precipitation when the PEG moiety is large compared to the hydrophobic/fluorophilic moieties. Then, the only possibility of avoiding time-consuming and expensive purification techniques such as preparative HPLC, resides in the possibility of pushing to completion all reactions run on PEG-containing molecules and purify the final product.

The synthesis of the di-*O*-alkylglycerol precursor **7** has been reported in the literature²³ and was performed by alkylation under phase-transfer-catalysis conditions of benzyl-protected *rac*-1-*O*-benzylglycerol using perfluoroalkyl mesylates, followed by hydrogenolysis for removal of the benzyl protecting group. Purification of compounds **7** would require a tedious purification by silica gel chromatography because of the close proximity of the mesyl alcohol **6** and derivative **7** *R*_Fs. For this reason, we proceeded to the following hydrogenolysis after just a quick filtration on a silica gel pad. The deprotected derivatives **8a–e** could then be easily purified from other impurities by simple silica gel column chromatography.

Several of the partially fluorinated alcohols **11** with the general structure $C_mF_{2m+1}(CH_2)_nOH$ were not commercially available. They were synthesized from 9-decen-1-ol or 4-penten-1-ol following a procedure reported in the literature.^{24,25} A sequence of redox and radical reactions is used in the synthesis of these alcohols (synthetic scheme 2).

In the last step for the synthesis of the amphiphiles (Synthetic Scheme 1), the glycerol derivatives **8** were coupled with polyethylene glycol monomethyl ether (MW 1100) methanesulfonate ester by following a procedure developed in our laboratory.⁸ The reactions were monitored by ¹HNMR spectroscopy. As shown by FT-MALDI spectra, a small amount of polyethylene glycol monomethyl ether was present in the final compound, possibly deriving from hydrolysis of the polymeric methanesulfonate ester during the coupling step. This impurity was easily removed by Fluoro Flash silica gel chromatography, while ordinary silica gel chromatography allowed the removal of fluorinated alcohols and other side products. All steps of synthetic schemes 1 and 2 have been performed in gram scale with high purity (as shown from both HPLC and mass spectrometry analysis) and in good yields.

Physicochemical Characterization

All synthesized surfactants were highly soluble in water at room temperature, and the solutions were clear. Interestingly, $M_1diH_3F_8$ gave a high viscosity solution that was, however, still suitable for emulsion preparation. Fluorinated surfactants are characterized by higher hydrophobicity and start to aggregate at a relatively lower concentration than the corresponding hydrogenated compounds. Furthermore, they form better organized and more stable structures than their hydrocarbon counterparts. Such interesting properties mainly result from the stiff structure of the fluorocarbon chain, which is bulkier and more rigid than a hydrocarbon.¹ We initially expected amphiphiles **4a–e** to form micelles in aqueous solution. Dynamic light scattering was applied to measure the average size of the amphiphilic aggregates in solution. The particle size data are summarized in Table 1. Interestingly, the size of the aggregates made by the various polymers radically changes based on very small changes in the structure of the polymers. For instance, the average nanoparticle size doubles when $M_1diH_3F_8$ is used in place of $M_1diH_3F_6$. The aggregate size reaches the remarkable value of about 113 nm with $M_1diH_{10}F_8$. In comparison, the micellar aggregate made by a linear diblock copolymer such as M_1F_{13} is just 17 nm, as expected. The much larger size of the aggregates made by the di-branched polymers suggests that aggregates other than micelles are actually formed. The size and shape formed by self-

assembling amphiphiles is dictated by the ratio of the volumes between the hydrophilic moiety and the hydrophobic moiety. In the case at hand, a relatively small PEG (MW 1100, corresponding to 25 ethylene glycol units) is attached to a wide hydrophobic tail composed of two different chains. This combination may in principle lead to the formation of various aggregates, from cylindrical micelles to vesicles and bilayer structures in general. A transmission electron microscopy study of the aggregates made by polymer M1diH10F6 in aqueous solution showed a variety of particles of different size and shape, suggestive of the formation of various bilayer structures (see supporting information). It is important to recognize that the ability of a surfactant to form either a micelle or other structures does not have any effect on its ability in stabilizing a nanoemulsion. As a matter of fact, the same geometric features that in polymer M1diH10F6 make impossible the formation of micelles, namely a relatively small hydrophilic head and a wide hydrophobic tail, are also the reasons why we expected an improved stabilization of the corresponding nanoemulsions. Wider hydrophobic and fluorophilic tails would pack better around the fluorophilic nanodroplets, and a smaller PEG (from M5 to M1) would reduce the spaces between the polymeric chains surrounding the nanodroplets, thus reducing the diffusion of the anesthetic out of the nanodroplet core.

The critical aggregate concentrations (CAC) of the new polymers were estimated by measuring the surface tension of polymer solution at various concentrations. Increasing the concentration of the polymer under the CAC leads to a linear decrease in the surface tension. When the CAC is reached, the surface tension does not change anymore and a plateau value is reached. The CAC can be quickly estimated by the intersection between the plateau line and the line formed by the points in which a linear decrease in surface tension is observed. The CAC data presented in Table 1 clearly show the influence of small changes in the polymer structure on the kind of aggregates that is formed in aqueous solution. This solution behavior, agrees with what is known on different nonionic surfactants.^{26,27}

Emulsion stability

In a previous article¹⁶ we have reported on a novel anesthetic intravenous formulation composed of 1) 20 % w/v of a semifluorinated surfactant, 2) 10 % v/v perfluorooctyl bromide (PFOB) a FDA-approved fluorosurfactant additive and 3) 20% v/v of a fluorinated anesthetic. This formulation could be emulsified and the corresponding nanoemulsion could be used for the intravenous delivery of the volatile anesthetic. The additive perfluorooctyl bromide increased the stability of the emulsion due to its fluorophilicity and its reduced water solubility. In principle, the slow diffusion of this secondary less water-soluble component will lead to a heterogeneous distribution with smaller droplets enriched in the less soluble component and larger droplets enriched in the more soluble component. However, the osmotic pressure will limit composition differences between droplets and equilibrium will eventually be reached. This same formulation has been used for studying the stability of nanoemulsions formed by the new polymers M_zdiH_xF_y. Dynamic light scattering was used to measure the change in size of the droplets with time. The linear diblock copolymer M1F13 was used as benchmark.

As show in Figure 3, the emulsions formed by the new di-branched polymers initially show a similar trend to that observed with M1F13. However, after an initial equilibration time, the nanoparticles size stabilized and ripening was reduced.

The observed trends show that Ostwald ripening is still causing an increase in the nanoparticle size, but there is an impressive decrease in the rate of particle growth. The growing rate was higher for polymers with larger intermediate alkyl chain, while it was smaller for polymers with larger fluorinated chains. As shown in Figure 3, the new polymer

M₁diH₃F₈ very remarkably slowed the ripening and stabilized sevoflurane emulsions over one year. Furthermore, the droplet size stayed under 400 nm and there was no visual evidence of either phase separation or sedimentation. In comparison, the linear diblock copolymers M₅F₁₃ and M₁F₁₃ showed droplet sedimentation after only thirty and sixty days respectively. These stability studies were reproduced with three more identical emulsions containing M₁diH₃F₈, which were followed in terms of nanoparticle size for one year. All emulsions showed identical stability. Thus, the use of dibranched semifluorinated surfactants allowed us to prepare nanoemulsions that are stable for extended times. The stability of these emulsions is consistent with a shelf life acceptable for clinical uses.

Conclusions

A novel class of hemifluorinated dibranched PEG-based surfactants was synthesized. The purification of PEG-containing fluorinated molecules can be very difficult. The value of the developed synthesis lies in the possibility of obtaining surfactants in gram scale and with high purity by using simple purification techniques such as simple silica gel and Fluoro Flash silica gel column chromatography. The synthesis of these surfactants has been developed with a modular approach, which easily allows incremental structural variations in the fluorophilic, the hydrophobic, and the hydrophilic domains. The relative ratio of the three molecular domains affects the hydrophobic/hydrophilic balance leading to the possibility of tuning physico-chemical (stability, fluidity/rigidity, permeability) and biological properties.

Surface properties such as the critical aggregate concentration and the nanoemulsion stability were found to be affected by both the size of the perfluorinated tail and the hydrogenated spacer, demonstrating the peculiar behavior of dibranched hemifluorinated surfactants with respect to single chain perfluorinated analogues. All the newly synthesized dibranched surfactants were able to stabilize nanoemulsions containing the fluorinated anesthetic sevoflurane and the additive perfluorooctyl bromide better than linear diblock copolymers such as M₁F₁₃. Remarkably, the new polymer M₁diH₃F₈ dramatically slowed the ripening and stabilized sevoflurane emulsions over one year with droplet size under 400 nm. Stabilization of nanoemulsions for an extended period of time is usually very difficult. The fact that the new polymers were able to achieve exactly this feat is indicative of their potential for clinical uses.

Experimental

Dry reactions were performed under argon using dry solvents and reagents. Perfluorooctyl iodide, 1-iodoperfluorohexane and perfluoroalcohols were purchased from SynQuest Laboratories. Methylene chloride and tetrahydrofuran were dried by flowing through alumina-containing columns. Acetonitrile, dry diethyl ether, and methanol were used as provided. Column chromatography: silica gel 60 (Merck, 70-23 mesh), fluorous flash silica gel (Merck, 70-23 mesh).

HPLC chromatograms for product purity determination were obtained using a Jordi RP-DVB column with particle size of 5 μm and pore size of 1000 Å. The solvent gradient started at 10% acetonitrile/90% water and increased to 100% acetonitrile over 25 min. The flow rate was 1 ml/min.

General procedures for perfluorinated alcohols 11c-e^{24,25}

(10e) Perfluorooctyl iodide (3.28 g, 6.00 mmol), NaHCO₃ (431 mg, 5.04 mmol) and 85% Na₂S₂O₄ (1.03 g, 5.04 mmol) was added at 0°C to a solution of 9-decen-1-ol (787 mg, 5.04 mmol) in CH₃CN (15 ml) and deionized H₂O (5 ml). This mixture was stirred for 4h at

room temperature. The mixture was diluted with deionized H₂O and then extracted with dichloromethane. The organic layers were washed with saturated aqueous NaCl and then dried over MgSO₄. After filtration and rotary evaporation of the solvent, the residue was used as a crude compound in the next step.

¹HNMR (CDCl₃) δ 1.27–1.41 (8H, m), 1.53–1.58 (4H, m), 2.01–2.07 (2H, m), 3.64 (2H, t, J=6.8 Hz, H1), 4.91–5.02 (2H, m), 5.76–5.86 (1H, m).

11e

The crude compound (5.04 mmol) was dissolved in glacial acetic acid (3 ml), then zinc dust was added (988 mg, 15.12 mmol) and the mixture was stirred for 16 h at room temperature. After filtration and evaporation of the solvent, the residue was purified by column chromatography (EtOAc/n-hexane 30%) to yield the desired compound as a white solid (2.36 g, 75%).

¹HNMR (CDCl₃) δ 1.29–1.37 (12H, m), 1.53–1.63 (4H, m), 1.98–2.11 (2H, m), 3.64 (2H, 6.8 Hz).

10c

¹HNMR (CDCl₃): δ 1.64–1.73 (2H, m, H3), 1.74–1.99 (2H, m, H2), 2.73–3.01 (1H, m, H5), 3.72 (2H, t, J = 6.4 Hz, H1), 4.35–4.42 (1H, m, H4).

11c

4-Penten-1-ol and perfluorooctyl iodide, white solid, 83% yield. ¹HNMR (CDCl₃) δ 1.44–1.51 (2H, m), 1.59–1.67 (4H, m, H2), 2.01–2.08 (2H, m), 3.69 (2H, t, J=6.4 Hz).

10d

¹HNMR (CDCl₃) δ 1.26–1.43 (8H, m), 1.55–1.58 (4H, m), 1.73–1.89 (2H, m), 3.62–3.67 (2H, m), 4.09–4.13 (2H, m), 4.31–5.37 (1H, m).

11d

9-decen-1-ol and 1-iodoperfluorohexane, pale oil, 80% yield. ¹HNMR (CDCl₃) δ 1.18–1.23 (12H, m), 1.44–1.56 (4H, m), 1.90–1.97 (2H, m), 3.54 (2H, 6.8 Hz).

General procedure for Mesyl Derivatives 6a–e

Mesyl chloride (1.3 eq.) was added at 0°C to a solution of alcohol **11** in dry DCM and Et₃N (2.4 eq.). The reaction mixture was allowed to warm up to room temperature and was then stirred under argon for 16 h. The mixture was diluted with dichloromethane and washed with water. The organic layers were dried over MgSO₄. After filtration and evaporation of the solvent, the residue was used in the next step without further purification. Quantitative yield (from ¹HNMR). **6c,d,e** white solids, **6a,b** pale oils.

6a—¹HNMR (CDCl₃) δ 1.80–2.24 (2H, m), 2.60–2.28 (2H, m), 2.94 (3H, s), 4.23 (2H, t J=6.40 Hz).

6b—¹HNMR (CDCl₃) δ 2.05–2.13 (2H, m), 2.19–2.32 (2H, m), 3.05 (3H, s), 4.32 (2H, t J=5.8 Hz).

6c—¹HNMR (CDCl₃) δ 1.49–1.57 (2H, m, H3), 1.63–1.71 (2H, m, H4), 1.77–1.84 (2H, m, H2), 2.03–2.16 (2H, m, H5), 3.01 (3H, s, CH₃), 4.25 (2H, t J= 6.4 Hz, H1).

6d— ^1H NMR (CDCl_3) δ 1.30–1.40 (12H, m, H3, H4, H5, H6, H7, H8), 1.56–1.63 (2H, m, H9), 1.72–1.79 (2H, m, H2), 1.98–2.12 (2H, m, H10), 3.03 (3H, s, CH_3), 4.23 (2H, t J = 6.4 Hz, H1).

6e— ^1H NMR (CDCl_3) δ 1.29–1.40 (12H, m, H3, H4, H5, H6, H7, H8), 1.56–1.62 (2H, m, H9), 1.71–1.78 (2H, m, H2), 1.98–2.12 (2H, m, H10), 3.00 (3H, s, CH_3), 4.23 (2H, t J = 6.8 Hz, H1).

Benzylated glycerol Derivatives $\text{Bn-diH}_x\text{F}_y$

To a solution of $\text{F}_y\text{H}_x\text{OMs}$ **6** (11 mmol) and **5** (5.5 mmol) in 35 ml of Et_2O were added a solution of 12N KOH (20 ml) and $\text{Bu}_4\text{N}(\text{HSO}_4)$ (0.05 eq). The mixture was heated for 48h under reflux conditions. The aqueous phase was extracted with Et_2O and the combined organic phases were washed, dried, and rotaryevaporated. The residue was purified by silica gel chromatography (petroleum ether/ethyl acetate 7:3).

7a—Pale oil, 85% yield. Mass (MALDI) calculated for $[\text{C}_{28}\text{H}_{24}\text{F}_{26}\text{O}_3 + \text{Na}]^+$: 925.12025; found 925.12452; R_F = 0.72 (Hexane/EthylAcetate 7:3 v/v); ^1H NMR (CDCl_3): δ 1.81–1.91 (4H, m), 2.08–2.26 (4H, m), 3.47–4.53 (9H, m), 4.54 (2H, s), 7.25–7.36 (5H, m); ^{13}C NMR (CDCl_3) δ 21.0 (d), 27.9 (t), 69.0, 69.8, 70.1, 71.2, 73.5(2C), 79.0 (2C), 109.0 (2C), 111.4 (2C), 114.1 (2C), 116.1 (2C), 119.0 (2C), 121.8 (2C), 127.6 (2C), 127.8, 128.4 (2C), 138.5; ^{19}F NMR (CDCl_3): δ –82.4 (3F), –115.5 (2F), –123.0 (2F) –124.0 (2F), –124.4 (2F), –127.4 (2F).

7b—White solid, 83% yield. Mass (MALDI) calculated for $[\text{C}_{32}\text{H}_{24}\text{F}_{34}\text{O}_3 + \text{Na}]^+$: 1125.10747, found 1125.10391; R_F = 0.72 (Hexane/EthylAcetate 7:2 v/v); ^1H NMR (CDCl_3): δ 1.81–1.90 (4H, m), 2.08–2.26 (4H, m), 3.47–4.54 (9H, m), 4.55 (2H, s), 7.24–7.36 (5H, m); ^{13}C NMR (CDCl_3) δ 21.2 (d), 28.1 (t), 69.2, 69.3, 70.1, 71.2, 70.2, 71.5, 73.7, 78.5 (2C), 109.0 (2C), 111.4 (2C), 114.1 (2C), 116.1 (2C), 119.0 (2C), 121.8 (2C), 127.9 (2C), 127.8, 128.0, 128.6 (2C), 138.4; ^{19}F NMR (CDCl_3): δ –81.4 (3F), –115.5(2F), –122.4 (2F), –122.5 (2F), –123.4 (2F), –123.6 (2F), –124.3 (2F), –127.1 (2F).

7c, 7d, 7e crude compounds were filtered through a pad of silica gel and used in the next step.

General procedure for hydrogenolysis

To a solution of BndiH_xF_y **7** (7.2 mmol) in ethanol (50 ml) and acetic acid (0.7 ml) was added Pd/C (0.85 g of a 19% mixture) and the reaction mixture was stirred under hydrogen atmosphere (1.5 atm) at room temperature for 48h. The mixture was then filtered, the solvent was rotaryevaporated and the residue was purified by silica gel chromatography. (petroleum ether/ethyl acetate 6:4).

8a—Pale oil, 75% yield over two steps. Mass (MALDI) calculated for $[\text{C}_{21}\text{H}_{18}\text{F}_{26}\text{O}_3 + \text{Na}]^+$: 835.0733, found 835.07218. R_F = 0.50 (hexane/ethyl acetate 6:4 v/v); ^1H NMR (CDCl_3): δ 1.85–1.93 (4H, m), 2.10–2.26 (4H, m), 3.50–3.75 (9H, m); ^{13}C NMR (CDCl_3) δ 20.9 (d), 27.8 (t), 61.6, 63.9, 68.6, 70.1, 71.1, 72.2, 80.2, 108.8 (m, 2C), 110.8 (m, 2C), 113.6 (m, 2C), 115.9 (m, 2C), 118.7 (m, 2C), 121.6 (m, 2C); ^{19}F NMR (CDCl_3): δ –82.1 (3F), –115.5 (2F), –123.0 (2F) –124.0 (2F), –124.2 (2F), –127.2 (2F).

8b—White solid, 70% yield over two steps Mass (MALDI) calculated for $[\text{C}_{25}\text{H}_{18}\text{F}_{34}\text{O}_3 + \text{Na}]^+$: 1035.06052, found 1035.06595. R_F = 0.53 (hexane/ethyl acetate 6:4 v/v); ^1H NMR (CDCl_3): δ 1.74–1.83 (4H, m), 2.00–2.13 (4H, m), 3.44–3.62 (9H, m); ^{13}C NMR (CDCl_3) δ 21.1 (d), 28.0 (t), 62.7, 69.1, 69.1, 70.2, 71.2 (2C), 79.4 (2C), 108.8

(m, 2C), 111.0 (m, 2C), 113.7 (m, 2C), 116.1 (m, 2C), 118.7 (m, 4C), 121.6 (m, 2C), 128.3 (2C); ^{19}F NMR (CDCl_3): δ -81.9 (3F), -115.2 (2F), -122.5 (2F), -122.7 (4F) -123.6 (2F), -124.2 (2F), -127.1 (2F).

8c—White solid, 50% yield over two steps. Mass (MALDI) calculated for $[\text{C}_{29}\text{H}_{26}\text{F}_{34}\text{O}_3+\text{Na}]^+$: 1091.12312, found 1091.12278; R_F = 0.52 (hexane/ethyl acetate 6:4 v/v); ^1H NMR (CDCl_3): δ 1.37–1.44 (4H, m), 1.52–1.61 (8H, m), 1.92–2.05 (4H, m), 2.62–2.65 (m, 1H) 3.38–3.67 (9H, m). ^{13}C -NMR (CDCl_3): δ 20.0, 25.7, 25.8, 29.3, 29.7, 30.6, 30.8, 31.1, 62.7, 69.9, 71.0, 71.2, 79.0; 106.3 (m, 2C), 108.6 (m, 2C), 110.9 (m, 2C), 113.8 (m, 2C), 115.8 (m, 2C), 118.7 (m, 4C), 121.3 (m, 2C); ^{19}F NMR (CDCl_3): δ : -81.9 (3F), -115.4 (3F), -122.6 (6F), -124.0 (2F), -124.4 (2F), -127.0 (2F).

8d—White solid, 30% yield over two steps. Mass (MALDI) calculated for $[\text{C}_{35}\text{H}_{46}\text{F}_{26}\text{O}_3+\text{Na}]^+$: 1031.2924, found 1031.28853. R_F = 0.51 (hexane/ethyl acetate 6:4 v/v); ^1H NMR (CDCl_3): δ 1.17–1.38 (24H, m), 1.48–1.51 (8H, m), 1.86–2.00 (4H, m), 2.8 (1H, broad peak), 3.30–3.62 (9H, m). ^{13}C NMR (CDCl_3): δ 20.8, 25.9, 26.1, 26.2, 29.1, 29.3 (2C), 29.4 (3C), 29.5, 29.6, 29.7, 30.1, 30.6, 30.8, 31.1 (t), 62.7, 70.4, 70.8, 71.7, 78.8 (2C), 108.6 (m, 2C), 111.2 (m, 2C), 113.8 (m, 2C), 115.8 (m, 2C), 118.8 (m, 4C), 121.3 (m, 2C); ^{19}F NMR (CDCl_3): δ : -82.2 (3F), -115.5 (2F), -123.0 (2F), -124.1 (2F), -124.8 (2F), -127.4 (2F).

8e—Pale oil, 33% yield over two steps. Mass (Maldi) calculated for $[\text{C}_{39}\text{H}_{46}\text{F}_{34}\text{O}_3+\text{Na}]^+$: 1231.27963, found 1231.284153. R_F = 0.53 (hexane/ethyl acetate 6:4 v/v); ^1H NMR (CDCl_3): δ 1.17–1.38 (24H, m), 1.47–1.51 (8H, m), 1.86–2.01 (4H, m), 2.8 (1H, broad peak), 3.33–3.62 (9H, m). ^{13}C NMR (CDCl_3): δ 20.2, 26.2, 29.2, 29.3 (2C), 29.4 (2C), 29.5 (2C), 29.6 (2C), 29.7 (2C), 30.2, 30.7, 31.0, 31.2, 63.1, 70.5, 71.0, 71.9, 78.7 (2C), 3333333 m, 2C), 108.5 (m, 2C), 110.7 (m, 2C), 113.6 (m, 2C), 115.8 (m, 2C), 118.7 (m, 4C), 121.2 (m, 2C); ^{19}F NMR (CDCl_3): δ : -81.8 (3F), -115.2 (2F), -122.5 (2F), -122.6 (4F), -123.9 (2F), -124.4 (2F), -127.0 (2F).

General procedure for the synthesis of amphiphiles 4a–e

To a solution of PEG(MW=1100)-mesylate (0.0032 mmol 1eq) and alcohol (0.0048 mmol, 1.5 eq.) was added NaH (0.015, 5eq.). The reaction mixture was refluxed under argon and the monitored throughout the complete disappearance of the methyl group in the methanesulfonate functionality by NMR (36 h). The mixture was cooled down, filtered and the solvent evaporated. The residue was purified by silica gel chromatography (dichloromethane/methanol 9:1) then by Fluoro flash column chromatography (gradient: from 100% water to 100% acetonitrile). Yield 50% after purification.

4a—Mass (MALDI) dispersion around 2079.96541; R_F = 0.62 (dichloromethane/methanol 9:1 v/v); ^1H NMR (CDCl_3): δ 1.65–1.90 (4H, m); 2.10–2.27 (4H, m), 3.38 (s, 3H), 3.38–3.57 (9H, m); 3.58–3.83 (m, PEG); ^{19}F NMR (CDCl_3): δ -81.3 (3F), -114.9 (2F), -122.5 (2F), -123.4 (2F) -124.0 (2F), -126.7 (2F).

4b—Mass (MALDI) dispersion around 2105.50589; R_F = 0.62 (dichloromethane/methanol 9:1 v/v); ^1H NMR(CDCl_3): δ 1.82–1.90 (4H, m); 2.10–2.26 (4H, m), 3.38 (s, 3), 3.38–3.57 (9H, m); 3.58–3.83 (m, PEG); ^{19}F NMR (CDCl_3): δ -81.7 (3F), -114.8 (2F), -122.2 (2F), -122.4 (4F), -123.6 (2F), -125.1 (2F), -126.5 (2F).

4c—Mass (MALDI) dispersion around 2249.69621; R_F = 0.61 (dichloromethane/methanol 9:1 v/v); ^1H NMR (CDCl_3): δ 1.43–1.49 (4H, m), 1.57–1.66(8H, m), 2.03–2.12(4H, m), 3.82

(s, 3H), 3.38–3.57 (9H, m), 3.58–3.83 (m, PEGm); ^{19}F NMR (CDCl_3): δ –81.7 (3F), –117.3 (2F), –124.7 (2F), –124.7 (4F) –125.6 (2F), –126.4 (2F), –129.4 (2F).

4d—Mass (MALDI) dispersion around 2257.89399; R_F = 0.62 (dichloromethane/methanol 9:1 v/v); ^1H NMR (CDCl_3): δ 1.24–1.43 (28H,m); 1.52–1.63 (4H, m), 1.98–2.18 (4H, m), 3.38 (s, 3H), 3.38–3.57 (9H, m); 3.58–3.83 (m, PEG); ^{19}F NMR (CDCl_3): δ –81.2 (3F), –114.2 (2F), –122.4 (2F), –123.0 (2F) –124.0 (2F), –126.6 (2F).

4e—Mass (MALDI) dispersion around 2257.89399; R_F = 0.62 (dichloromethane/methanol 9:1 v/v); ^1H NMR(CDCl_3): δ 1.20–1.42 (28H,m); 1.54–1.61 (4H, m), 2.02–2.06 (4H, m), 3.38 (s, 3H), 3.38–3.57 (9H, m); 3.58–3.83 (m, PEG); ^{19}F NMR (CDCl_3): δ –81.2 (3F), –114.8 (2F), –122.1 (2F), –122.3 (4F) –123.1 (2F), –123.6 (2F), –126.5 (2F).

Preparation of polymer micelles

Micelles were prepared using the solvent evaporation method. Polymer was dissolved in 1 mL of methanol to achieve a final concentration of 1.0×10^{-3} M. Methanol was evaporated at 65 °C under reduced pressure on a rotary evaporator to produce a thin film of polymer. The thin film was rehydrated with 1 ml of Millipore water heated at 65°C with gentle agitation, and the flask was rotated at room temperature for 10 min. Sample was then filtered through 0.45 μm nylon syringe filters to remove any insoluble precipitate.

Particle size analyzing of polymer micelles

Particle size analysis of polymer micelles was performed by using dynamic light scattering (Zetasizer Nano ZS, Malvern) on the micellar solutions. Each particle size analysis was run at room temperature and repeated three times. Data are reported as Z-average diameters.

Critical Aggregate Concentration

All surface tension vs concentration plots are reported in the supplementary information for this article.

Preparation of M_5F_{13} stock solution

(94.7 mg) was dissolved in 25 ml Millipore water. Ten solutions at concentrations ranging from 6.77×10^{-4} M to 1.2×10^{-10} M were prepared by serial dilution of the stock solution. All solutions were transferred to 20 ml disposable scintillation vials. After each solution was prepared, it was heated in a water bath at 40°C for 2 hours. After further 24 hours of equilibration at room temperature the solutions were used for surface tension measurements.

The following concentrations were used for the other polymers surface tension measurements.

M_1F_{13} (33.8 mg) was dissolved in 25ml Millipore water. Nine solutions were prepared with a concentration ranging from $7.59 \times 10^{-4}\text{M}$ to $7.59 \times 10^{-11}\text{M}$.

$\text{M}_1\text{diH}_3\text{F}_6$ (16.9 mg) was dissolved in 25ml Millipore water. Twelve solutions were prepared with a concentration ranging from $8.92 \times 10^{-5}\text{M}$ to $4.46 \times 10^{-11}\text{M}$.

$\text{M}_1\text{diH}_3\text{F}_8$ (18.5 mg) was dissolved in 25ml Millipore water. Twelve solutions were prepared with a concentration ranging from $3.57 \times 10^{-4}\text{M}$ to 1.78×10^{-9} M.

$\text{M}_1\text{diH}_5\text{F}_8$ (19.2 mg) was dissolved in 25ml Millipore water. Eleven solutions were prepared with a concentration ranging from 8.92×10^{-5} M to $2.43 \times 10^{-9}\text{M}$.

$\text{M}_1\text{diH}_{10}\text{F}_8$ (20.4 mg) was dissolved in 25ml Millipore water. Thirteen solutions were prepared with a concentration ranging from 3.57×10^{-5} M to $1.78 \times 10^{-9}\text{M}$.

Surface tension measurements

A tensiometer equipped with a circulator for constant temperature control was used to measure surface tension. A custom round rod made of platinum with a diameter of 1.034 mm and wetted length of 3.248 mm was used. First the rod was submerged into absolute alcohol and flame dried for 4 sec. This same procedure was repeated after 4 minutes after which the rod was hung on the instrument and allowed to cool for 5 min without touching any surface. The surface tension of Millipore water was measured to make sure that the vial and rod were fully cleaned before running any polymer solution measurements. The measurements were started only after the measured surface tension value of Millipore water remained within 0.2 μ m of the pure water standard value. The surface tension measurements were run from the less concentrated solution to the more concentrated solution. The surface tension at each concentration was measured four times.

Nanoemulsion preparation

Five hundred milligram of polymer was solubilized in normal saline solution (11.9 ml). Normal saline solution was made with 0.9% (w/w) of sodium chloride. Sevoflurane (Abbott Labs., N. Chicago, IL, 3.4 ml) and perfluorooctyl bromide (SynQuest Laboratories, Inc., Alachua, FL, 1.7 ml) were added to the polymer solution. The biphasic final total volume was 17 ml. The mixture was homogenized with a high speed homogenizer for 1 min at 21000 rpm at room temperature. The crude emulsion made with the homogenizer was then continuously homogenized with a microfluidizer for 1 min under 5000 psi at 15 °C, achieved with a cooling bath. The resulting nanoemulsions were stored in 15 ml plastic tubes at 4°C.

Emulsion particle size analysis

The emulsion particle size was measured by dynamic light scattering. The emulsions were diluted by a factor of 300 by adding 20 μ l of the emulsion to 3.0 ml of Millipore water. Each particle size analysis was run for 5 min at room temperature and repeated three times. The particle diameters were analyzed through Gaussian analysis and reported as volume-weighted average diameters. Emulsions were stored at 4°C. The emulsion particle size was analyzed at days 0, 1, 2, 4, 14, 21, 28, and then every two weeks up to 357 days if no phase separation occurred. Day 0 is when the nanoemulsions were initially prepared.

Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

Acknowledgments

The work described in this article was supported by NIG grant NIGMS 079375 to SM. J.-P. J. acknowledges support from the Korean Research Foundation (KRF-2008-357-E00065).

References

1. Gladysz, JA.; Curran, DP.; Horvath, IT. Handbook of Fluorous Chemistry. Wiley-VCH; Weinheim: 2004.
2. Kirsch, P. Modern Fluoroorganic Chemistry. Wiley-VCH; Weinheim: 2004.
3. Rosen BM, Wilson CJ, Wilson DA, Peterca M, Imam MR, Percec V. Chem Rev. 2009; 109:6275–6540. [PubMed: 19877614]
4. Kraft MP, Riess JG. Chem Rev. 2009; 109:1714–1792. [PubMed: 19296687]
5. Riess JG. Curr Op Coll Int Sci. 2009; 14:294–304.
6. Sawada H. Prog Polym Sci. 2007; 32:509–533.
7. Krafft MP, Riess JG. Act Chim. 2006; 301:88–92.

8. Gladysz, John A. *Science*. 2006; 313:1249–1250. [PubMed: 16946059]
9. Krafft MP. *J Pol Sci A*. 2006; 44:4251–4258.
10. Krafft MP, Muller P, Maaloum M, Schmutz M, Goldmann M, Fontaine P. *Self-Assembly*. 2003:367–373.
11. Tomalia, Donald A. *Nature Materials*. 2003; 2:711–712.
12. Amis EJ, Hu N, Seery TAP, Hogen-Esch TE, Yassini M, Hwang F. *Adv Chem*. 1996; 248:278–302.
13. Krafft MP, Riess JG. *J Polym Sci*. 2007; 45:1185–1198.
14. Zhou J, Luo N, Liang X, Liu J. *Anesth Analg*. 2006; 102:129–34. [PubMed: 16368817]
15. Hoang KC, Mecozzi S. *Langmuir*. 2004; 20:7347–7350. [PubMed: 15323471]
16. Fast JP, Perkins MG, Pearce RA, Mecozzi S. *Anesthesiology*. 2008; 109:651–656. [PubMed: 18813044]
17. Hu ZY, Luo NF, Liu J. *Can J Anesth*. 2009; 56:115–125. [PubMed: 19247759]
18. Chiari PC, Pagel PS, Tanaka K, Krolikowski JG, Ludwig LM, Trillo RA, Puri N, Kersten JR, Warltier DC. *Anesthesiology*. 2004; 101:1160–1166. [PubMed: 15505452]
19. Raphael J, Lynch C. *Can J Anaesth*. 2009; 56:91–5. [PubMed: 19247755]
20. Rudolph U, Antkowiak B. *Nat Rev Neurosci*. 2004; 5:709–20. [PubMed: 15322529]
21. Preckel B, Bolten J. *Best Pract Res Clin Anaesthesiology*. 2005; 19:331–348.
22. Johnson RA, Simmons KT, Fast JP, Schroeder CA, Pearce RA, Albrecht RM, Mecozzi S. *J Pharm Sci*. 2011; 100:2685–2692. [PubMed: 21246564]
23. Ravily V, Gaentzler S, Santaella C, Vierling P. *Helvetica Chimica Acta*. 1996; 79:405–425.
24. Takai K, Takagi T, Baba T, Kanamori T. *J Fluor Chem*. 2004; 125:1959–1964.
25. Gopala P, Andruzzi L, Li X, Ober CK. *Macromol Chem Phys*. 2002; 203:1573–1583.
26. Matsuoka K, Yonekawa A, Ishii M, Honda C, Endo K, Moroi Y, Abe Y, Tamura T. *Colloid Polym Sci*. 2006; 285:323–330.
27. Sadtler VM, Giulieri F, Krafft MP, Riess JG. *Chem Eur J*. 1998; 4:1952.

Figure 1.

Structures of the volatile anesthetic sevoflurane, the additive perfluorooctyl bromide, the polymer series M_zF_y and the new polymer series $M_1diH_xF_y$. The number following the letter M indicates the molecular weight of the PEG. Thus, M5 indicates a methyl-capped poly(ethylene glycol) of average molecular weight of 5,000. The number after the H indicates the number of carbon atoms composing the hydrocarbon segment, while the number after the F indicates the number of carbon atoms in the fluorocarbon chains.

Figure 2.

Rational design of stable nanoemulsions. A. The original polymer composed of a large poly(ethylene glycol) and a single small fluorocarbon chain can self-assemble around the fluororous nanoparticle only in a loose manner, leaving spaces for the diffusion of the anesthetic out of the nanoparticle. The diffused anesthetic would then contribute to the growing of larger nanoparticles by the Ostwald ripening effect. B. The newly designed polymers composed of a smaller PEG and a larger two-chains fluororous moiety is able to better surround the fluororous nanoparticle and strongly reduce the amount of anesthetic that can diffuse out.

Figure 3.

Change in the particle sizes of fluoropolymer-based emulsions with time. Particle size was measured over 357 days. Data represent means $\pm$ standard deviation ($n = 3$). Closed squares: M₅F₁₃ based emulsion; opened squares: M₁F₁₃ based emulsion; closed circles: M₁diH₃F₆ polymer based emulsion; opened circles: M₁diH₃F₈ based emulsion; closed triangles: M₁diH₅F₈ polymer based emulsion; opened triangles: M₁diH₁₀F₆ based emulsion; closed diamonds: M₁diH₁₀F₈ based emulsion. Data for the last three emulsions are shown in red. These emulsions led to phase separation after 50 days. Accordingly, particle size measurement was halted after that time. All emulsions contain 20% of sevoflurane, 10% of perfluorooctyl bromide and are prepared in saline (0.9% w/w NaCl).

Synthetic scheme 1.

Synthetic scheme 2.

Table 1

Polymer	Particle size (nm) ^a	CAC (M)
M ₁ F ₁₃	17.17 ± 1.85	5.50 × 10 ⁻⁷
M ₅ F ₁₃	17.23 ± 3.73	7.94 × 10 ⁻⁷
M ₁ diH ₃ F ₆	36.45 ± 1.64	9.91 × 10 ⁻⁶
M ₁ diH ₃ F ₈	80.53 ± 7.93	6.11 × 10 ⁻⁶
M ₁ diH ₅ F ₈	81.48 ± 15.17	5.45 × 10 ⁻⁶
M ₁ diH ₁₀ F ₆	83.66 ± 13.58	Not available
M ₁ diH ₁₀ F ₈	112.93 ± 1.83	7.22 × 10 ⁻⁷

^a Particle sizes of fluoropolymer-based aggregates. Data represent means ± standard deviation. Each measurement was repeated three times (n =3)