Published in final edited form as:

J Am Chem Soc. 2012 May 16; 134(19): 8046–8049. doi:10.1021/ja302183w.

Silica Microparticles as a Solid Support for Gadolinium-Phosphonate Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI) Contrast Agents

Alexandra K. Duncan[†], Piper J. Klemm[‡], Kenneth N. Raymond[‡], and Christopher C. Landry^{†,*}

[†]Department of Chemistry, University of Vermont, Burlington, Vermont 05405, United States

[‡]Department of Chemistry, University of California, Berkeley, California 94720, United States

Abstract

Particle-based MRI contrast agents have been the focus of recent studies, primarily due to the possibility of preparing multimodal particles capable of simultaneously targeting, imaging, and treating specific biological tissues *in vivo*. In addition, particle-based MRI contrast agents often have greater sensitivity than commercially available, soluble agents due to decreased molecular tumbling rates following surface immobilization, leading to increased relaxivities. Mesoporous silica particles are particularly attractive substrates due to their large internal surface areas. In this study, we immobilized a unique phosphonate-containing ligand onto mesoporous silica particles with a range of pore diameters, pore volumes, and surface areas, and Gd(III) ions were then chelated to the particles. Per-Gd(III) ionic relaxivities ranged from approximate 2 to 10 mM⁻¹s⁻¹ (37 °C, 60 MHz), compared to 3.0 – 3.5 mM⁻¹s⁻¹ for commercial agents. The large surface areas allowed many Gd(III) ions to be chelated, leading to per-particle relaxivities of 3.3 × 10⁷ mM⁻¹s⁻¹, which is the largest value measured for a biologically-suitable particle.

Magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) is a non-invasive diagnostic technique that provides high-resolution, three-dimensional images of anatomic soft tissue.^{1,2} Gd(III) complexes are widely used to increase the sensitivity of the technique, allowing images of early stages of disease to be collected.^{3–6} The large number of unpaired electrons in the Gd(III) ion leads to increased proton relaxivities, with most commercial Gd(III) complexes producing values of ~ 3.0 mM⁻¹s⁻¹ at 37 °C and 60 MHz. Interest in improved resolution and diagnosis^{7,8} has motivated research into new ligands and hybrid materials as components in new contrast agents. Gd(III) chelators have been conjugated to a variety of scaffolds⁹ including nanoparticles,^{10–12} dendrimers,^{13,14} proteins,^{15,16} viral capsids,¹⁷ silica particles,^{18–21} zeolites,³⁵ as well as other hybrid materials.²² Recent reports have shown that grafting Gd(III) chelates onto a solid support can provide a highly efficient imaging agent with a large per-Gd(III) relaxivity, and also delivers large quantities of the contrast agent to a single location through surface modification with tissue-targeting biomolecules.^{19–21,23} Mesoporous materials have shown much promise in the field, as their large surface areas allow many Gd(III) chelators to be functionalized onto each particle. Mesoporous materials have also been shown to increase the sensitivity of MR probes *in vivo*.^{19–21} An important feature of these materials is the ability to control water exchange to the metal center, due to

*Corresponding Author. christopher.landry@uvm.edu. Fax: +1 802 656 8705.

ASSOCIATED CONTENT

Supporting Information. Experimental details, additional characterization including scanning electron micrographs, and relaxometric data. This material is available free of charge via the Internet at <http://pubs.acs.org>.

the porous nature of the support. Control of water exchange is important because it is directly related to relaxivity. The relaxivities of commercial complexes are often restricted by slow water exchange.

Lanthanide ions readily complex with carboxylates,^{24a} hydroxypyridinones,²⁴ and alkoxides.²⁵ Many studies have illustrated the use of phosphorus-containing ligands to sequester Ln(III) ions,^{26–32} and diphosphonate ligands have been shown to be efficient materials for the removal of lanthanide ions over a range of pH values.^{29–32} The ligand "NDP₂" (imidodi(methanediphosphate)) has been shown to be a highly efficient Gd(III) chelator, even compared to the diethylenetriamine pentaacetate (DTPA) ligand used in the commercial agent Magnevist.²⁹ In designing a solid-based contrast agent, an additional benefit of using NDP₂ as a Gd(III) ligand is that it can easily be appended onto silica supports.

Our procedure for modifying silica particles was similar to that described by Shkrob *et al.*, who described modifying the surface through reaction of surface silanols with aminopropyl triethoxysilane followed by reaction with methylene bis(phosphonic dichloride) in the presence of triethylamine (Scheme 1).²⁹ We compared three types of mesoporous silica particles, called "APMS" (acid-prepared mesoporous silica), as supports for the NDP₂ ligand. APMS has previously been shown to be non-toxic and non-immunogenic.²² The synthesis is straightforward, requires less than 2 hours, and can be scaled up to 800 g in a single batch and 3 kg in multiple batches. Sample **1** was prepared as previously described,^{19,23,33} leading to a material with an average pore diameter of 36 Å (Table 1 and Figure 1). Sample **2** was prepared by resuspending calcined **1** in water overnight, which increases the number of silanol groups on the surface. Based on water vapor physisorption isotherms, rehydroxylation can cause as much as a four-fold increase in the number of silanol groups.³⁴

Although the physical properties of **1** and **2** were similar, the larger number of silanols should increase the number of NDP₂ ligands on the surface and ultimately also increase the per-particle Gd relaxivity. To prepare sample **3**, the synthesis of the silica particles was altered by heating the reaction mixture for a slightly longer time than for sample **1** and by letting the reaction mixture cool slowly to room temperature rather than quenching it in an ice bath. These changes led to a material with a smaller surface area than sample **1** (690 vs. 790 m²/g) but a significantly larger average pore diameter (55 vs. 36 Å) (Table 1).

After modifying the three samples, ion exchange with GdCl₃ led to the immobilization of Gd(III). Upon functionalization, the surface area, pore volume, and average pore diameter of all three samples decreased, indicating that the ligand had been successfully attached to the pore surfaces. Although the synthesis method makes characterization of the Gd(III) coordination environment difficult, Scheme 1 shows a proposed structure consistent with similar literature syntheses. In this structure, 1–2 water molecules are able to interact with the paramagnetic Gd(III) ion. As shown in Table 1, the per-Gd relaxivities of all three samples were higher than the commercially available complexes Gd-DOTA and Gd-DTPA, which are currently used as MRI contrast agents. This lends support to the influence of the phosphonate ligand on relaxivity, as well as the idea that an increased number of water molecules may be coordinated to the metal ion. However, the relaxivity values for **3** were especially notable, with $r_1 \approx 3$ times higher and $r_2 \approx 5 - 7$ times higher than the corresponding values for commercial agents.

As reports have demonstrated,^{18c,d} relaxivity values for mesoporous silica materials are dependent on pore diameter. Water molecules are able to move more freely within larger pore materials, increasing both inner and outer sphere relaxivity. Thus, for porous solids

with comparable levels of ligand and Gd modification, the material with a larger average pore diameter should show higher relaxivity values. The difference in per-Gd and per-particle relaxivities between **1** and **2** is less obvious, because they have similar measured pore diameters after functionalization and should have approximately the same water diffusion values. In sample **2**, rehydroxylation did lead to increased surface functionalization with the NDP₂ ligand; however, the amount of Gd(III) captured in this sample was less than in **1**. Thus the per-particle relaxivities of **2** are slightly less than **1** (1.7 vs. 3.3×10^7 mM⁻¹s⁻¹), while the decreased local motion of the Gd complexes resulting from molecular crowding led to a slightly increased per-Gd relaxivity (6.0 vs. 4.6 mM⁻¹s⁻¹). Finally, a comparison of the per-particle relaxivities measured in this study to a variety of types of materials and complexes found in the literature (Figure 2) shows that while the per-Gd relaxivities are similar, the larger particle diameter and surface area of APMS allows more Gd to be immobilized, producing higher per-particle relaxivities.

In conclusion, we have developed a new class of biologically suitable MRI contrast agents that capitalize on the strong binding affinity of the NDP₂ ligand and the large internal surface area (exceeding 600 m²/g) of mesoporous silica. The per-Gd relaxivities were significantly higher than those of commercially available contrast agents, and the per-particle relaxivities were among the highest values measured in the literature. Because APMS is non-toxic, non-immunogenic, and excreted over time, these are exciting new materials for future *in vivo* studies.

Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

Acknowledgments

This work was funded by the National Institutes of Health under grant numbers T32ES0071, 1R41-CA126155-01A1, and HL069832. The authors would like to thank Professor Christopher J. Chang (University of California, Berkeley) for use of a 60 MHz relaxometer and Professor Jeremy L. Steinbacher (Canisius College) for helpful discussions.

REFERENCES

1. Ananta JS, Godin B, Sehti R, Moriggi L, Liu X, Serda RE, Krishnamurthy R, Bolskar RD, Helm L, Ferrari M, Wilson LJ, Decuzzi P. *Nat. Nanotechnol.* 2010; 5:815–821. [PubMed: 20972435]
2. Wong, W.; Chan, KW. Gadolinium complexes as MRI contrast agents for diagnosis. In: Huang, C., editor. *Rare Earth Coordination Chemistry: Fundamentals and Applications*. 1st Ed. Asia: Wiley; 2010. p. 407–433. John Wiley & Sons (Asia) 2010, p. 407–410.
3. Caravan P, Ellison JJ, McMurry TJ, Lauffer RB. *Chem. Rev.* 1999; 99:2293–2352. [PubMed: 11749483]
4. Major JL, Meade TJ. *Acc. Chem. Res.* 2009; 42:893–903. [PubMed: 19537782]
5. Port M, Idee JM, Medina C, Robic C, Sabatou M, Corot C. *Biometals.* 2008; 21:469–490. [PubMed: 18344005]
6. Raymond KN, Pierre VC. *Bioconj. Chem.* 2005; 16:3–8.
7. Caravan P. *Chem. Soc. Rev.* 2006; 35:512–523. [PubMed: 16729145]
8. Werner EJ, Datta A, Jocher CJ, Raymond KN. *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* 2008; 45:8568–8580.
9. Mastarone DJ, Harrison VSR, Eckermann AL, Parigi G, Luchinat C, Meade TJ. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 2011; 133:5329–5337. [PubMed: 21413801]
10. Song Y, Xu X, MacRenaris KW, Zhang X-Q, Mirkin CA, Meade TJ. *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* 2009; 48:9143–9147.
11. (a) Manus LM, Mastarone DJ, Waters EA, Zhang X-Q, Schultz-Sikma EA, MacRenaris KW, Ho D, Meade TJ. *Nano Lett.* 2010; 10:484–489. [PubMed: 20038088] (b) Alric C, Taleb J, Le Duc G,

- Mandon C, Billotey C, Meur-Herland AL, Brochard T, Vocanson F, Janier M, Perriat P, Roux S, Tillement O. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 2008; 130:5908–5915. [PubMed: 18407638] (c) Reynolds CH, Annan N, Beshah K, Huber JH, Shaber SH, Lenkinski RE, Wortman JA. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 2000; 122:8940–8945.
12. Howes P, Green M, Bowers A, Parker D, Varma G, Kallumadil M, Hughes M, Warley A, Brain A, Botnar R. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 2010; 132:9833–9842. [PubMed: 20572665]
13. (a) Floyd WC III, Klemm PJ, Smiles DE, Kohlgruber AC, Pierre VC, Mynar JL, Fréchet JMJ, Raymond KN. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 2011; 133:2390–2393. [PubMed: 21294571] (b) Klemm PJ, Floyd WC III, Smiles DE, Fréchet JMJ, Raymond KN. *Contrast Media & Mol. Imaging.* 2012; 7:95–99. (c) Klemm PJ, Floyd WC III, Andolina CM, Fréchet JMJ, Raymond KN. *Eur. J. Inorg. Chem.* 2012
14. (a) Nwe K, Diane M, Henry BL, Regino CAS, Brechbiel MW. *J. Inorg. Biochem.* 2011; 105:722–727. [PubMed: 21463567] (b) Nwe K, Bryant LH Jr, Brechbiel MW. *Bioconjugate Chem.* 2010; 21:1014–1017.
15. Liepold LO, Abedin MJ, Buckhouse ED, Frank JA, Young MJ, Doubblas T. *Nano Lett.* 2009; 9:4520–4526. [PubMed: 19888720]
16. (a) Shapiro MG, Szablowski JO, Langer R, Jasanoff. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 2009; 131:2484–2486. [PubMed: 19199639] (b) Yang JJ, Yang J, Wei L, Zurkiya O, Yang W, Li S, Zou J, Zhou Y, Wilkins Maniccia AL, Mao H, Zhao F, Malchow R, Zhao S, Johnson J, Hu Z, Krogstad E, Liu Z-R. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 2008; 130:9260–9267. [PubMed: 18576649] (c) Lee S-M, Song Y, Hong BJ, MacRenaris KW, Mastarone DJ, OHalloran TV, Meade TJ, Nguyen ST. *Angew. Chem. Int. Ed.* 2010; 49:1–6.
17. (a) Datta A, Raymond KN. *Acc. Chem. Res.* 2009; 42:938–9474. [PubMed: 19505089] (b) Garimella P, Datta A, Romanini DW, Raymond KN, Francis MB. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 2011; 133:14704–14709. [PubMed: 21800868]
18. (a) Liu G, Tse NMK, Hill MR, Kennedy DF, Drummond CJ. *Aust. J. Chem.* 2011; 64:617–624. (b) Lee JE, Lee N, Kim H, Kim J, Choi SH, Kim JH, Kim T, Song IC, Park SP, Moon WK, Hyeon T. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 2010; 132:552–557. [PubMed: 20017538] (c) Carniato F, Tei L, Cossi M, Marchese L, Botta M. *Chem.-Eur. J.* 2010; 16:10727–10734. [PubMed: 20669190] (d) Carniato F, Tei L, Dastru W, Marchese L, Botta M. *Chem. Commun.* 2009; 10:1246–1248.
19. Steinbacher JL, Lathrop SA, Cheng K, Hillegass JM, Kauppinen RA, Mossman BT, Landry CC. *Small.* 2010; 6:2678–2682. [PubMed: 21069757]
20. Taylor KML, Kim JS, Rieter WJ, An H, Lin W, Lin W. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 2008; 130:2154–2155. [PubMed: 18217764]
21. Vivero-Escoto JL, Taylor-Pashow KML, Huxford RC, Della Rocca J, Okoruwa C, An H, Lin W, Lin W. *Small.* 2011; 7:3519–3528. [PubMed: 22069305]
22. (a) Tu C, Ma X, Pantazis P, Kauzlarich SM, Louie AY. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 2010; 132:2016–2023. [PubMed: 20092250] (b) Bridot J-L, Faure A-C, Laurent S, Riviere C, Billotey C, Hiba B, Janier M, Jossierand V, Coll JL, Vander Elst L, Muller R, Roux S, Perriat P, Tillement O. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 2007; 129:5076–5984. [PubMed: 17397154] (c) Shao Y-Z, Liu L-Z, Song S-Q, Cao R-H, Liu H, Cui CY, Li X, Bie MJ, Li L. *Contrast Media Mol. Imaging.* 2011; 6:110–118. [PubMed: 21504064] (d) Morimoto H, Minato M, Nakagawa T, Sato M, Kobayashi Y, Gonda K, Takeda M, Ohuchi N, Suzuki N. *J. Sol-Gel Sci. Technol.* 2011; 59:650–657. (e) Zhang X, Brynda M, Britt RD, Carroll EC, Larsen DS, Louie AY, Kauzlarich SM. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 2007; 129:10668–10669. [PubMed: 17691792]
23. Hillegass JM, Blumen SR, Cheng K, MacPherson MB, Alexeeva V, Lathrop SA, Beuschel SL, Steinbacher JL, Butnor KJ, Ramos-Niño ME, Shukla A, James TA, Weiss DJ, Taatjes DJ, Pass HI, Carbone M, Landry CC, Mossman BT. *Int. J. Cancer.* 2011; 129:233–244. [PubMed: 20830711]
24. (a) Franklin SJ, Raymond KN. *Inorg. Chem.* 1994; 33:5794. (b) Werner EJ, Avedano S, Botta M, Hay BP, Moore EG, Aime S, Raymond KN. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 2007; 129:1870–1871. [PubMed: 17260995] (c) Xu J, Franklin SJ, Wisenhunt DW Jr, Raymond KN. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 1995; 117:7245–7246. (d) Pierre VC, Botta M, Aime S, Raymond KN. *Inorg. Chem.* 2006; 45:8355–8364. [PubMed: 16999435] (e) Cohen SM, Petoud S, Raymond KN. *Chem. Eur. J.* 2000; 7:272–279. [PubMed: 11205020]
25. Bunzli J-CG, Piguet C. *Chem. Rev.* 2002; 102:1897–1928. [PubMed: 12059257]

26. Stryganyuk G, Shalapska T, Voloshinovskii A, Gektin A, Krasnikov A, Zazubovich S. J. Lumin. 2011; 131:2027–2035.
27. Robic C, Catoen S, Goltstein DM-C, Idee J-M, Port M. Biometals. 2011; 24:759–768. [PubMed: 21390525]
28. Herlinger AW, Ferrar JR, Chiarizia R, Horwitz EP. Polyhedron. 1997; 16:1843–1854.
29. Shkrob IA, Tisch AR, Marin TW, Muntean JV, Kaminski MD, Kropf JA. Indust. & Chem. Eng. Chem. Res. 2011; 50:4686–4696.
30. Yantasee W, Fryxell GE, Addleman RS, Wiacek RJ, Koonsiripaiboon V, Pattamakomsan K, Sukwarotwat V, Xu J, Raymond KN. J. Hazad. Mater. 2009; 168:1233–1238.
31. Yantasee W, Fryxell GE, Porter GA, Pattamakomsan K, Sukwarotwat V, Chouyyok W, Koonsiripaiboon V, Xu J, Raymond KN. Nanomed. 2010; 6:1–8.
32. Griffith CS, Reyes MDL, Scales N, Hanna JV, Luca V. ACS Appl. Mater. Interf. 2010; 2:3436–3446.
33. Gallis, KW.; Landry, CC. U.S. Patent 2002. p. 6334988(b) Landry, CC.; Nassivera, TW. U.S. Patent Appl. 20090220791.
34. Naono H, Hakuman M, Tanaka T, Tamura N, Nakai K. J. Coll. Interf. Sci. 2000; 225:411–420.
35. (a) Balkus, KJ., Jr; Sherry, AD.; Young, SW. U.S. Patent. 5,122,363. 1992. (b) Young SW, Qing F, Rubin D, Balkus KJ, Engel JS, Lang J, Dow WC, Mutch JD, Miller RA. Journal of Magnetic Resonance Imaging. 1995; 5:499–508. [PubMed: 8574032] (c) Bresinska I, Balkus KJ Jr. J. Phys. Chem. 1994; 98:12989–12994.

Figure 1.
 N_2 physisorption isotherm and pore size distribution (inset) for unmodified and modified versions of **1**.

Figure 2.

Comparison of relaxivities values obtained in this study to literature values. Note the linear axis for per-Gd values and the logarithmic axis for per-particle values. All data are taken at 1.41T except (a) 3T, (b) 0.73T.

Scheme 1.

Synthesis of $\text{NDP}_2\text{-Gd}$ complexes within porous silica particles.

Table 1

Physical Properties and Relaxivities of Porous Silica Particles.

Sample	as-made			functionalized			per-Gd relaxivity		per-particle relaxivity	
	d_{pore} (Å)	S_{ABET} (m ² /g)	V_{pore} (cm ³ /g)	d_{pore} (Å)	S_{ABET} (m ² /g)	V_{pore} (cm ³ /g)	r_1 (mM ⁻¹ s ⁻¹)	r_2 (mM ⁻¹ s ⁻¹)	r_1 (mM ⁻¹ s ⁻¹ × 10 ⁷)	r_2 (mM ⁻¹ s ⁻¹ × 10 ⁷)
1	36	790	0.87	33	380	0.41	4.6	15	3.3	11
2	39	780	0.65	34	350	0.35	6.0	17	1.7	5.0
3	55	690	0.97	45	380	0.56	10	23	2.4	5.4
Gd-DOTA²	-	-	-	-	-	-	3.0	3.3	-	-
Gd-DTPA²	-	-	-	-	-	-	3.5	3.9	-	-