Published in final edited form as:

Polym Degrad Stab. 2012 September 1; 97(9): 1686–1689. doi:10.1016/j.polymdegradstab.2012.06.017.

Impact of ionizing radiation on physicochemical and biological properties of an amphiphilic macromolecule

Li Gu^a, Kyle Zablocki^b, Linda Lavelle^c, Stanko Bodnar^c, Frederick Halperin^c, Ike Harper^c, Prabhas V. Moghe^b, and Kathryn E. Uhrich^{a,b,*}

^aRutgers, The State University of New Jersey, Department of Chemistry and Chemical Biology, 610 Taylor Road, Piscataway, New Jersey 08854, United States

^bRutgers, The State University of New Jersey, Department of Biomedical Engineering, 599 Taylor Road, Piscataway, New Jersey 08854, United States

^cSterile Process Technology, Johnson & Johnson, 1000 Route 202 Bldg. 930 East, Raritan, New Jersey, 08869, United States

Abstract

An amphiphilic macromolecule (AM) was exposed to ionizing radiation (both electron beam and gamma) at doses of 25 kGy and 50 kGy to study the impact of these sterilization methods on the physicochemical properties and bioactivity of the AM. Proton nuclear magnetic resonance and gel permeation chromatography were used to determine the chemical structure and molecular weight, respectively. Size and zeta potential of the micelles formed from AMs in aqueous media were evaluated by dynamic light scattering. Bioactivity of irradiated AMs was evaluated by measuring inhibition of oxidized low-density lipoprotein uptake in macrophages. From these studies, no significant changes in the physicochemical properties or bioactivity were observed after the irradiation, demonstrating that the AMs can withstand typical radiation doses used to sterilize materials.

Keywords

amphiphilic macromolecule; electron beam radiation; gamma radiation; oxLDL inhibition; stability

1. Introduction

Amphiphilic macromolecules (AMs) can self-assemble into micelles in aqueous media due to their amphiphilicity. Given the micellization behaviour of AMs, they are capable of encapsulating hydrophobic molecules in the micelle inner core and transporting the molecular cargo within the aqueous environment[1–9]. An amphiphilic macromolecule (AM) (Figure 1) previously developed by Uhrich et al. is composed of a hydrophobic, alkylated mucic acid backbone and hydrophilic poly(ethylene glycol) (PEG) coupled to the

© 2012 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

*Corresponding author: Dr. Kathryn E. Uhrich, Department of Chemistry and Chemical Biology, Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, 610 Taylor Road, Piscataway, NJ 08854, United States, Tel.: +1 732 445 0361, Fax: +1 732 445 7036, keuhrich@rutgers.edu.

Publisher's Disclaimer: This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final citable form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

hydrophobic core via an ester bond[10]. This AM has been demonstrated as a nano carrier for water-insoluble drugs and *in vitro* evaluation for systemic delivery was also performed[11–13]. The AM has also been incorporated into liposomes by electrostatic and hydrophobic interactions with lipids. The formulation of these AM-lipid complexes results in increased biocompatibility, ability to load and deliver anti-cancer therapeutics, and preferential uptake in cancer cells[14]. By chemically incorporating oligoethylenimines into the AM backbone, cationic AMs can be obtained with capabilities to complex with and deliver siRNA *in vitro*[15]. In addition to these drug delivery applications, AMs have also demonstrated unique properties in the management of atherosclerosis, a main trigger for cardiovascular disease[16]. The AM has been tested as a therapeutic agent to inhibit the atherosclerotic cascade by inhibiting the uptake of oxLDL in macrophages[17–20]. To optimize the inhibition effectiveness, other AMs with modified structures have also been synthesized and tested[16]. Due to the broad biomedical applications of these AMs, they could potentially be developed into a medical device or drug and therefore, must be rendered sterile.

Common sterilization methods include heat sterilization[21,22], chemical sterilization[23,24], sterile filtration[25,26], and ionizing sterilization[27–30]. Heat sterilization usually requires high temperatures (120 °C) which could possibly lead to decomposition or degradation of AMs[21,22,31,32]. Chemical sterilization requires high concentrations of reactive sterilants, such as hydrogen peroxide, or ozone, which could lead to potential oxidative reaction with the AM[23,33,34]. Sterile filtration is a convenient and efficient way to sterilize samples; however, it requires a filtration membrane which will absorb highly viscous drug components or nanoparticles[25,26,35]. Ionizing sterilization includes electron beam (e-beam) and gamma radiation. Gamma radiation uses Cobalt-60 to continuously emit gamma rays with a high penetrating effect. Electron beam radiation is generated as electrons from a high-energy accelerator, and has a higher dose rate but less penetration than gamma radiation. As both e-beam and gamma sterilization methods use ionizing energy to irradiate samples without inducing high temperature or using chemical sterilants, these methods were chosen to test the stability of AMs to typical sterilizing conditions. Despite their positive attributes, both e-beam and gamma radiation exposure can cause slight degradation due to the high energy of the ionizing source[24,28,36].

In this work, both e-beam and gamma radiation are used to irradiate the AM in powder form to study the effect of both sterilization methods on the AM properties. The AM was exposed to each irradiation process at target doses of 25 kGy and 50 kGy, as 25 kGy is a typical sterilization dose and 50 kGy is a typical maximum processing dose[30]. After the exposures, proton nuclear magnetic resonance (¹H-NMR) spectroscopy was performed to determine the impact on chemical structure of the AM. Gel permeation chromatography (GPC) was used to investigate changes in molecular weight. Dynamic light scattering (DLS) was utilized to determine the impact on micelle behaviour of AM. *In vitro* oxLDL uptake inhibition studies were then performed to determine the impact on the inhibiting activity of AMs in macrophages.

2. Materials and Methods

2.1 Materials

All chemicals and reagents were purchased from Sigma-Aldrich (Milwaukee, WI) and used as received.

2.2 Sample Preparation

The AM (Figure 1) was synthesized using previous methods[10]. In short, mucic acid was acylated with lauroyl chloride followed by coupling with mono-hydroxy PEG. The AM

powder (2.5 g) was divided into five BD Falcon 5 mL polystyrene round-bottom tubes (12 × 75 mm style; BD Bioscience Discovery Labware, Bedford, MA), one was for the untreated control and another four were for the radiation exposures. All the samples were stored at 4 °C for 24 h prior to being sent to Johnson & Johnson Sterile Process Technology (SPT) for radiation processing. After exposure, samples were stored at 4 °C for 24 h until physicochemical and biological characterization studies were performed in triplicate.

2.3 Radiation Exposure

Gamma irradiation was conducted in a Cobalt-60 source MDS Nordion Gamma Cell 220 Research irradiator at SPT. The temperature during exposure ranged from 30 °C to 37 °C with a dose rate of approximately 0.002 kGy/s for a maximum of 9 h. Samples for e-beam irradiation were processed under ambient conditions in the Mevex 5 MeV, 2kW electron beam linear accelerator. Samples were placed upright in an Ethafoam® jig and presented single-sided to the beam. Doses for both of the radiation processes were 25 kGy and 50 kGy. The dose rate for e-beam was approximately 12.5 kGy/s. The temperature ranged from 38 °C (25 kGy) to 55 °C (50 kGy) during the e-beam exposures. Samples designated as controls were not exposed to ionizing radiation.

2.4 Physicochemical Characterization

Proton nuclear magnetic resonance (¹H NMR) spectra were obtained using a Varian 500 MHz spectrometer. AM samples (10–15 mg) were dissolved in deuterated chloroform. Each spectrum was an average of 16 scans. Molecular weights (M_w) were determined using gel permeation chromatography (GPC) with respect to PEG standards (Sigma-Aldrich) on a Waters Stryagel® HR 3 THF column (7.8 × 300 mm). The Waters LC system (Milford, MA) was equipped with a 2414 refractive index detector, a 1515 isocratic HPLC pump, and 717 plus autosampler. Samples (10 mg/mL) were prepared in THF and filtered using 0.23 µm pore PTFE syringe filters (Fisher Scientific). Dynamic light scattering (DLS) analysis was carried out on a Zetasizer nanoseries nano ZS90 (Malvern instruments). Samples (1–2 mg/mL) were prepared in HPLC water and filtered using 0.23 µm pore size PTFE syringe filters (Fisher Scientific).

2.5 Cell Culture

Peripheral blood mononuclear cells (PBMC) were isolated from human buffy coats (Blood Center of New Jersey, East Orange, NJ) by density gradient centrifugation over Ficoll-Paque. Monocytes were selected by plastic adherence as follows. PBMCs suspended in Roswell Park Memorial Institute (RPMI) 1640 medium (ATCC) with 10% fetal bovine serum were incubated in 96-well plates for 4 h. Non-adherent cells were removed by washing three times with phosphate-buffered saline, and adherent cells were cultured for 7 days in RPMI supplemented with 10% fetal bovine serum, 1% penicillin/streptomycin and 50 ng/mL macrophage colony-stimulating factor (M-CSF) (PeproTech) for differentiation into macrophages. Media was changed every 2–3 days.

2.6 oxLDL Uptake by PBMC Macrophages

PBMC macrophages were co-incubated with 10 µg/mL of 3,3'-dioctadecyloxacarbocyanine (DiO) labelled oxLDL (Kalen Biomedical; Montgomery Village, MD) and AM (10^{-6} M) for 24 h in RPMI 1640. Cells were fixed with and counterstained with Hoechst 33342 prior to epifluorescent imaging on a Nikon Eclipse TE2000-S. oxLDL uptake was quantified using ImageJ and normalized to cell count. Results are the average of three experiments performed in biological triplicate.

2.7 Statistical Analysis

Statistical analysis was performed with Student t-tests using SigmaStata software. Differences were considered significant at $p < 0.05$ by pairwise comparison with Dunnett's post hoc test.

3. Results and Discussion

The AM powder remained a white solid after both radiation processes. To determine the impact of the ionizing radiation (e-beam and gamma radiation) on the physicochemical properties and bioactivity of the AM, ^1H NMR, GPC, and DLS were used to measure the changes in chemical structure, molecular weight and micelle behaviour, respectively.

Weight-average molecular weight (M_w) is a parameter to determine polymer degradation or intermolecular cross-linking after the radiation processes. As shown in Table 1, the M_w of irradiated AMs showed no significant differences against the control, indicating no degradation or intermolecular cross-linking caused by irradiation. ^1H NMR spectroscopy was used to determine changes in the chemical structure. The main peaks of the mucic acid backbone, PEG, and alkyl chains appeared identical to controls after the radiation exposure. Based on the ^1H NMR and M_w data the chemical structure and molecular weight of AM were not affected by radiation exposure.

Micellar size is an important property when using AMs as therapeutic delivery vehicles. Micelles of non-treated AMs are about 11.5 nm in size, which is usually within the ideal range for drug delivery[6,10]. As shown in Table 1, no significant differences ($p < 0.05$) were discovered between the irradiated samples and control, indicating that neither of the e-beam and gamma radiation methods had significant impact on the micellar size of the AM. The zeta potential of the micellar AM correlates to the anionic nature of AM, which plays an important role when AM inhibits the oxLDL uptake in macrophages[16–18]. Hence, zeta potential is a key parameter when predicting activity of AMs in treating atherosclerosis. As shown in Table 1, zeta potentials of irradiated AM samples display no significant differences compared to control ($p < 0.05$). According to the DLS data of irradiated and non-treated AMs, neither e-beam nor gamma irradiation affect the micellar behaviour of AM in aqueous media.

Besides the physicochemical properties of AMs, the ability of AMs to inhibit oxLDL uptake in macrophages was also studied. PBMC macrophages were co-incubated with oxLDL and AMs for 24 h. Basal condition (Figure 2) was performed as incubation without oxLDL or AMs, whereas the oxLDL condition (Figure 2) was performed as incubation with oxLDL only. Both of these conditions are shown as controls along with the untreated AMs. oxLDL uptake in PBMC for radiated AMs was quantified and normalized to the cell counts of oxLDL conditions (Figure 2). As shown in Figure 2, both untreated AMs and irradiated AMs inhibited around 70% oxLDL uptake in macrophages, showing no significant differences between untreated and irradiated AMs. Hence, the abilities of all radiated AMs to inhibit oxLDL uptake in macrophages were not altered through the radiation exposure. This finding also demonstrates that the overall AM properties were not impacted by the exposure to both radiation processes.

4. Conclusion

The potential of developing AM into an implantable device dictates that AM should be compatible with a sterilization process such as ionizing radiation. In this study, the AM composition, molecular weight, micelle behaviour, and biological activity are not substantially affected by exposure to e-beam and gamma radiation (25 and 50 kGy).

Therefore, e-beam or gamma radiation with doses up to 50 kGy can be suitable for sterilizing AM. In future work, more AM derivatives should be irradiated and monitored by the physicochemical and biological tests.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like thank the National Institutes of Health (NIH R01HL107913-01) for financial support and Dr. Bryan Langowski for critical advice and review of this manuscript.

References

1. Hu X, Jing X. Biodegradable amphiphilic polymer-drug conjugate micelles. *Expert Opin Drug Deliv.* 2009; 6:1079–90. [PubMed: 19645633]
2. Huo M, Zhang Y, Zhou J, Zou A, Yu D, Wu Y, et al. Synthesis and characterization of low-toxic amphiphilic chitosan derivatives and their application as micelle carrier for antitumor drug. *Int J Pharm.* 2010; 394:162–73. [PubMed: 20457237]
3. Jun YJ, Jadhav VB, Min JH, Cui JX, Chae SW, Choi JM, et al. Stable and efficient delivery of docetaxel by micelle-encapsulation using a tripodal cyclotriphosphazene amphiphile. *Int J Pharm.* 2012; 422:374–80. [PubMed: 22079718]
4. Kedar U, Phutane P, Shidhaye S, Kadam V. Advances in polymeric micelles for drug delivery and tumor targeting. *Nanomedicine.* 2010; 6:714–29. [PubMed: 20542144]
5. Sahu A, Bora U, Kasoju N, Goswami P. Synthesis of novel biodegradable and self-assembling methoxy poly(ethylene glycol)-palmitate nanocarrier for curcumin delivery to cancer cells. *Acta Biomater.* 2008; 4:1752–61. [PubMed: 18524701]
6. Torchilin VP. Structure and design of polymeric surfactant-based drug delivery systems. *J Control Release.* 2001; 73:137–72. [PubMed: 11516494]
7. Wang YC, Li Y, Sun TM, Xiong MH, Wu J, Yang YY, et al. Core-shell-corona micelle stabilized by reversible cross-linkage for intracellular drug delivery. *Macromol Rapid Commun.* 2010; 31:1201–6. [PubMed: 21590876]
8. Zhan C, Li B, Hu L, Wei X, Feng L, Fu W, et al. Micelle-based brain-targeted drug delivery enabled by a nicotine acetylcholine receptor ligand. *Angew Chem Int Ed Engl.* 2011; 50:5482–5. [PubMed: 21542074]
9. Zupancich JA, Bates FS, Hillmyer MA. Synthesis and self-assembly of RGD-functionalized PEO-PB amphiphiles. *Biomacromolecules.* 2009; 10:1554–63. [PubMed: 19397290]
10. Tian L, Yam L, Zhou N, Tat H, Uhrich KE. Amphiphilic Scorpion-like Macromolecules: Design, Synthesis, and Characterization. *Macromolecules.* 2004; 37:538–43.
11. Djordjevic J, Barch M, Uhrich KE. Polymeric micelles based on amphiphilic scorpion-like macromolecules: novel carriers for water-insoluble drugs. *Pharm Res.* 2005; 22:24–32. [PubMed: 15771226]
12. Harmon AM, Uhrich KE. In Vitro Evaluation of Amphiphilic Macromolecular Nanocarriers for Systemic Drug Delivery. *Journal of Bioactive and Compatible Polymers.* 2009; 24:185–97.
13. Tao L, Uhrich KE. Novel amphiphilic macromolecules and their in vitro characterization as stabilized micellar drug delivery systems. *J Colloid Interface Sci.* 2006; 298:102–10. [PubMed: 16403508]
14. Harmon AM, Lash MH, Sparks SM, Uhrich KE. Preferential cellular uptake of amphiphilic macromolecule–lipid complexes with enhanced stability and biocompatibility. *Journal of Controlled Release.* 2011; 153:233–9. [PubMed: 21510986]
15. Sparks SM, Waite CL, Harmon AM, Nusblat LM, Roth CM, Uhrich KE. Efficient intracellular siRNA delivery by ethyleneimine-modified amphiphilic macromolecules. *Macromol Biosci.* 2011; 11:1192–200. [PubMed: 21793212]
16. Iverson NM, Sparks SM, Demirdirek B, Uhrich KE, Moghe PV. Controllable inhibition of cellular uptake of oxidized low-density lipoprotein: structure-function relationships for nanoscale amphiphilic polymers. *Acta Biomater.* 2010; 6:3081–91. [PubMed: 20170758]

17. Chnari E, Lari HB, Tian L, Uhrich KE, Moghe PV. Nanoscale anionic macromolecules for selective retention of low-density lipoproteins. *Biomaterials*. 2005; 26:3749–58. [PubMed: 15621265]
18. Chnari E, Nikitzuk JS, Uhrich KE, Moghe PV. Nanoscale anionic macromolecules can inhibit cellular uptake of differentially oxidized LDL. *Biomacromolecules*. 2006; 7:597–603. [PubMed: 16471936]
19. Wang J, Plourde NM, Iverson N, Moghe PV, Uhrich KE. Nanoscale amphiphilic macromolecules as lipoprotein inhibitors: the role of charge and architecture. *Int J Nanomedicine*. 2007; 2:697–705. [PubMed: 18203436]
20. York AW, Zablocki KR, Lewis DR, Gu L, Uhrich KE, Prud'homme RK, et al. Kinetically Assembled Nanoparticles of Bioactive Macromolecules Exhibit Enhanced Stability and Cell-Targeted Biological Efficacy. *Adv Mater*. 2012
21. Mann A, Kiefer M, Leuenberger H. Thermal sterilization of heat-sensitive products using high-temperature short-time sterilization. *J Pharm Sci*. 2001; 90:275–87. [PubMed: 11170021]
22. Zuidam NJ, Lee SS, Crommelin DJ. Sterilization of liposomes by heat treatment. *Pharm Res*. 1993; 10:1591–6. [PubMed: 8290471]
23. Bounoure F, Fiquet H, Arnaud P. Comparison of hydrogen peroxide and peracetic acid as isolator sterilization agents in a hospital pharmacy. *Am J Health Syst Pharm*. 2006; 63:451–5. [PubMed: 16484519]
24. Kroeze RJ, Helder MN, Roos WH, Wuite GJ, Bank RA, Smit TH. The effect of ethylene oxide, glow discharge and electron beam on the surface characteristics of poly(L-lactide-co-caprolactone) and the corresponding cellular response of adipose stem cells. *Acta Biomater*. 2010; 6:2060–5. [PubMed: 19944190]
25. Jorntitz MW, Soelkner PG, Meltzer TH. Sterile filtration--a review of the past and present technologies. *PDA J Pharm Sci Technol*. 2002; 56:192–5. [PubMed: 12181803]
26. Lakey JR, Smith ME, Fetterhoff TJ, Cavanagh TJ, Wright MJ, Dwulet FE. Sterile filtration of collagenase solution: effect of filter membrane composition on enzyme recovery. *Transplant Proc*. 1998; 30:347. [PubMed: 9532070]
27. Loo SC, Ooi CP, Boey YC. Influence of electron-beam radiation on the hydrolytic degradation behaviour of poly(lactide-co-glycolide) (PLGA). *Biomaterials*. 2005; 26:3809–17. [PubMed: 15626429]
28. Merkli A, Heller J, Tabatabay C, Gurny R. Gamma sterilization of a semi-solid poly(ortho ester) designed for controlled drug delivery--validation and radiation effects. *Pharm Res*. 1994; 11:1485–91. [PubMed: 7855057]
29. Valdes-Diaz G, Rodriguez-Calvo S, Perez-Gramatges A, Rapado-Paneque M, Fernandez-Lima FA, Ponciano CR, et al. Effects of gamma radiation on phase behaviour and critical micelle concentration of Triton X-100 aqueous solutions. *J Colloid Interface Sci*. 2007; 311:253–61. [PubMed: 17383669]
30. Zygoura PD, Paleologos EK, Kontominas MG. Effect of ionising radiation treatment on the specific migration characteristics of packaging-food simulant combinations: effect of type and dose of radiation. *Food Addit Contam Part A Chem Anal Control Expo Risk Assess*. 2011; 28:686–94. [PubMed: 21400321]
31. Alexandrou G, Chrissafis K, Vasiliadis L, Pavlidou E, Polychroniadis EK. Effect of heat sterilization on surface characteristics and microstructure of Mani NRT rotary nickel-titanium instruments. *Int Endod J*. 2006; 39:770–8. [PubMed: 16948662]
32. Chaturvedi PR, Patel NM, Lodhi SA. Effect of terminal heat sterilization on the stability of phospholipid-stabilized submicron emulsions. *Acta Pharm Nord*. 1992; 4:51–5. [PubMed: 1515053]
33. Dias FN, Ishii M, Nogaroto SL, Piccini B, Penna TC. Sterilization of medical devices by ethylene oxide, determination of the dissipation of residues, and use of Green Fluorescent Protein as an indicator of process control. *J Biomed Mater Res B Appl Biomater*. 2009; 91:626–30. [PubMed: 19530160]
34. Pietrzak WS. Effects of ethylene oxide sterilization on 82: 18 PLLA/PGA copolymer craniofacial fixation plates. *J Craniofac Surg*. 2010; 21:177–81. [PubMed: 20098181]

35. Schroeder HG. Sterile filtration: process optimization through real compliance. PDA J Pharm Sci Technol. 2003; 57:393–8. [PubMed: 14765554]
36. Karadag E, Uzum OB, Saraydin D, Guven O. Dynamic swelling behaviour of gamma-radiation induced polyelectrolyte poly(AAm-co-CA) hydrogels in urea solutions. Int J Pharm. 2005; 301:102–11. [PubMed: 16019170]

\$watermark-text

\$watermark-text

\$watermark-text

Fig. 1.
Structure of AM

Fig. 2. oxLDL uptake in PBMC macrophages after radiation exposure at 25 kGy and 50 kGy. No significant differences were observed against the non-irradiated controls ($p < 0.05$).

Table 1Molecular weight and micelle behavior of AM (mean $\pm$ standard deviation).

	Control	e-beam 25 kGy	e-beam 50 kGy	gamma 25 kGy	gamma 50 kGy
M_w (Da)	6300 $\pm$ 200	6200 $\pm$ 120	6100 $\pm$ 110	6000 $\pm$ 150	6400 $\pm$ 190
Sizes (nm)	11.5 $\pm$ 0.92	12.2 $\pm$ 2.2	10.9 $\pm$ 1.6	11.6 $\pm$ 1.2	12.0 $\pm$ 1.2
Zeta potential (mV)	-19.8 $\pm$ 3.1	-19.0 $\pm$ 2.8	-18.5 $\pm$ 2.0	-19.6 $\pm$ 2.7	-20.2 $\pm$ 3.4

No significant difference between irradiated samples and control was found ($p < 0.05$)