Published in final edited form as:

Macromol Biosci. 2015 December ; 15(12): 1679–1686. doi:10.1002/mabi.201500245.

Long-term Controlled Protein Release from Poly(ethylene glycol) Hydrogels by Modulating Mesh Size and Degradation

X. Tong,

Department of Orthopaedic Surgery, Stanford University, CA, 94305 (USA)

S. Lee,

Department of Materials Science and Engineering, Stanford University, CA, 94305 (USA)

L. Bararpour, and

Department of Bioengineering, Stanford University, CA, 94305 (USA)

Prof. F. Yang

Departments of Orthopaedic Surgery and Bioengineering, Stanford University, CA, 94305 (USA)

F. Yang: fanyang@stanford.edu

Abstract

Poly(ethylene glycol) (PEG)-based hydrogels are popular biomaterials for protein delivery to guide desirable cellular fates and tissue repair. However, long-term protein release from PEG-based hydrogels remains challenging because the conjugation of biological molecules requires specific chemical groups that may reduce bioactivity. Here, a PEG-based hydrogel platform is reported, which allows efficient loading of proteins via physical entrapment with optimal mesh size; long-term controlled protein release is achieved by tuning hydrogel degradation. Protein release over time is measured for bovine serum albumin (BSA) and basic fibroblastic growth factor (bFGF). No protein is released from non-degradable PEG hydrogels, confirming efficient loading via physical entrapment. Incorporating hydrolytically degradable structures increase the hydrogel swelling ratio and mesh size, enabling sustained protein release over two months (90% of BSA released by day 60). bFGF released from our hydrogel over 35 days continue to stimulate cell proliferation to a level comparable to that induced by fresh bFGF. Importantly, this platform does not require the chemical modification of loaded proteins, and protein release can be controlled by tuning mesh size over time through degradation. This platform may therefore serve as a versatile tool for the long-term delivery of a wide range of proteins for drug-delivery and tissue-engineering applications.

Graphical abstract

A PEG-based hydrogel platform is developed to allow long-term controlled protein release.

No protein is released from non-degradable PEG hydrogels, confirming efficient loading via physical entrapment. Degradation of hydrogels increasing swelling ratio and mesh size enables sustained protein release. bFGF released from hydrogel over 35 days continue to stimulate cell proliferation comparable to fresh bFGF.

Keywords

controlled protein release; hydrogels; poly(ethylene glycol); mesh size; degradation

1. Introduction

Tissue development is guided by the orchestrated function of biological cues in a spatially and temporally controlled manner^[1]. Thus, the controlled release of cues, such as protein cues, offers a powerful tool to aid tissue repair by promoting the processes that underlie desirable cellular fates^[2]. The delivery of epidermal growth factor and transforming growth factor has been shown to accelerate wound healing^[3]. Bone morphogenetic proteins have been widely used to promote bone regeneration^[4], while fibroblast growth factors and vascular endothelial growth factor (VEGF) potentially accelerate angiogenesis^[5].

To deliver these biological signals *in situ*, previous studies employed either systemic administration or oral delivery. However, these approaches generally result in low efficiency due to the large molecular size, poor absorption, and short half-life of growth factors^[2b]. Biomaterials-based drug delivery platforms therefore hold great promise for enhancing tissue repair by recapitulating the soluble-factor environment that is present during normal tissue development. The activity of these proteins usually depends on their concentration, which necessitates their long-term and sustained release from the delivery material^[6]. Of the various biomaterial-based platforms developed for protein delivery, hydrogels have been widely used due to their tissue-like water content, injectability, and tunability^[7]. Polyethylene glycol (PEG) hydrogels are particularly attractive due to their biocompatibility^[8] and biological inertness^[9].

Prolonged release from PEG-based hydrogels has been achieved via chemical conjugation of biomolecules to the hydrogel network through hydrolytically or enzymatically degradable linkages^[10]. These chemical linkages may be designed with high specificity for

In contrast, physical entrapment inside the hydrogel network is a more facile method to incorporate proteins within hydrogel networks that does not require protein modification. Protein release is based only on passive diffusion through the hydrogel network^[8]. The rate of protein release depends upon mesh size and upon the homogeneity of the hydrogel network. To achieve efficient protein loading and prolonged release, the mesh size of the network should be smaller than the hydrodynamic radius of the protein(s) of interest, but most current hydrogels have mesh sizes that are too large^[7b, 14]. Since PEG is bioinert and repulses proteins, entrapped proteins are likely to be released in bursts, with >80% of the cargo released within a few hours of encapsulation^[7b, 14]. Protein release is also sensitive to heterogeneity in the hydrogel network, which occurs when monomers crosslink in a random sequence. Linear PEG materials, such as PEG-diacrylate and PEG-dimethacrylate, are most commonly used for forming PEG hydrogels through a chain-growth radical polymerization. The intrinsic high dispersity of the polymerization degree from this radical polymerization typically yields heterogenous crosslinking density and network meshes, which results in poor control over protein release^{[15]-[16]}. In contrast, step-growth polymerization involves crosslinking between end groups of multi-arm PEG molecules. Since the crosslinks are pre-defined as the cores of the multi-arm molecules, the hydrogel networks constructed through this method exhibit more defined structures, increased homogeneity, and increased control over mesh size^[14a, 17].

Macromol Biosci. Author manuscript; available in PMC 2016 December 01.

2. Results

2.1. Modulation of hydrogel mesh size

To study the relationship between mesh size and hydrogel composition, we used the equilibrium swelling ratio on day 1 to calculate mesh size in the hydrogel. Mesh size increased when increasing the number average molecular weight between crosslinking points (M_n) increased, while the presence of degradable linkages did not alter mesh size (Figure. 2). For example, increasing M_n from 2.5 kDa to 4.0 kDa in ND hydrogels increased mesh size from 4.92 ± 0.07 nm to 5.95 ± 0.01 nm ($p < 0.0001$), while the 2.5K-ND, 2.5K-MPE, and 2.5K-MAE hydrogels had comparable mesh sizes of 4.92 ± 0.07 nm, 5.12 ± 0.03 nm, and 5.01 ± 0.10 nm respectively ($p > 0.2$) (Figure. 2). For both 2.5 kDa and 4 kDa hydrogels. In addition, mesh size decreased with increasing PEG concentration (Figure. 2).

2.2. Tunable hydrogel degradation

We examined the effects on hydrogel degradation via varying the hydrolytic degradation of PEG crosslinks, molecular weight, and PEG concentration. Degradation was monitored by measuring the hydrogel swelling ratio over time. When M_n and PEG concentration were kept constant, hydrogels with MAE linkage showed the fastest degradation, both in hydrogels with M_n of 4K (Figure 3A) and 2.5K (Figure 3B). In contrast, the corresponding MPE and ND hydrogels maintained stable swelling ratios up to 77 days (Figure 3A, B), indicating minimal degradation. Hydrogel degradation was also influenced by PEG molecular weight (Figure 3A, B). For example, 4K-MAE degraded in 24 days (Figure 3A), while 2.5K-MAE persisted for 74 days (Figure 3B). Changing PEG concentration also influenced hydrogel degradation (Figure 3C). For the 2.5K-MAE hydrogel, increasing the PEG concentration from 5% to 20% slowed hydrogel degradation, with complete hydrogel degradation over 46 days and 74 days, respectively.

2.3. Controlled BSA release

We then measured cumulative protein release from PEG hydrogels with varying mesh size and degradation using BSA as a model protein. For non-degradable (ND) hydrogels, mesh size can be reduced by decreasing PEG M_n from 4K-ND to 2.5K-ND (Figure 2). We observed a corresponding decrease in accumulative BSA release from 2.5K-ND hydrogels (58%; Figure 4A) than in 4K-ND hydrogels (27%) by day 67 (Figure 4B). Incorporating a rapidly degradable linkage (MAE) into the hydrogels led to faster protein release, with $>90\%$ cumulative BSA release by day 67 from 2.5k-MAE hydrogels (Figure 4A, B). In contrast, incorporation of the degradable linkage MPE only mildly changed protein release compared to ND controls (Fig 4A, B). Lower PEG MW and slower degradation led to delayed BSA release (Figure 4A, B), as did higher PEG concentrations (Figure 4C). For example, 5% (w/v) 2.5K-MAE hydrogels released $\sim 74\%$ protein in 24 h, but 7 days and 28 days were required to release the same amount of BSA from 10% (w/v) and 20% (w/v) hydrogels, respectively (Figure 4B,C).

2.4. Sustained bFGF release with retained functionality

To determine whether encapsulated proteins retain their biological activity throughout the processes of hydrogel formation, incubation, and degradation, bFGF was loaded into 2.5K-MAE hydrogels, and released protein was collected over time. Similar to the trends for BSA release (Figure 4), enzyme-linked immunosorbance assay indicated sustained bFGF release over 35 days (Figure 5A). The biofunctionality of released protein was also determined by adding released bFGF to hADSCs and measuring the resulting cell proliferation. bFGF released from 2.5K-MAE hydrogels stimulated hADSCs proliferation at 144–203%, which is comparable to the level of freshly prepared bFGF (10 ng/ml) (Figure 5B). Taken together, these results confirm that 2.5K-MAE hydrogels enable the sustained release of biologically active bFGF over 35 days.

3. Discussion

Here, we have demonstrated a facile approach to control protein release from PEG hydrogels by modulating mesh size and degradation (Figure 1). Hydrogels with small mesh size were obtained via thiol-ene step growth polymerization. Changing hydrogel concentration and molecular weight are convenient handles for tuning mesh size. However, previous studies often considered the relationship between hydrogel mesh size and theoretical protein diffusivity but neglected the hydrodynamic radius of the protein cargo, which was often smaller than the hydrogel mesh^[7a, 7b]. Previous studies using hydrogels with mesh sizes above the size of BSA (~14×4×4 nm)^[18] resulted in a burst (>60%) release of BSA release within an hour, and the remaining protein escaped the hydrogels in a few days^[7b]. These results highlight the need for hydrogels with smaller mesh to allow more gradual protein release. In the present investigation, we decreased hydrogel mesh size to 4.92 nm, comparable to the size of BSA, by increasing the hydrogel concentration to 20% (w/v) and decreasing M_n to 2.5 kDa (Figure 2). As a result, BSA was physically entrapped in the hydrogel, with only 30% release after 67 days (Figure 4B). In contrast, hydrogels with larger mesh (5.95 nm) obtained from hydrogels with M_n of 4.0 kDa displayed lower protein retention (58% release) (Figure 4A). Hydrogels with smaller mesh retained BSA for up to 2 months. It was noted that BSA was not completely caged in hydrogels even with an average mesh size smaller than the radius of BSA. This was due to that although a step-growth polymerization was utilized to increase the homogeneity, but there will still be some unavoidable defect due to the possible in-complete reaction of the functional groups and self-loop formation^[19], as well as the disperse of the molecular weight distribution of PEG macromers.

To release the entrapped protein, hydrogels need to be degraded over time and thus enlarge the mesh size for controlled protein release. Hydrogel degradation triggered by hydrolysis or enzymes have been previously employed to promote protein release^[7b, 14a, 20]. However, the initial mesh size of hydrogels are often larger than loaded proteins, which led to burst release even without degradation^[7b]. We designed our hydrogels to have initial mesh size smaller than loaded proteins, and incorporated various degradable structures to allow tunable protein release (Figure 1A). The degradation rate of an ester linkage can be tuned by changing the number of methylene residuals between an ester and a thiol ether^[21]. Therefore, we expect

MPE linkages containing two methylene residuals between an ester and a thiol ether will yield an intermediate degradation rate, while MAE linkages, which contain only one methylene, would degrade more rapidly. Our results show that MPE hydrogels displayed a stable swell ratio that was similar to those calculated for hydrogels with non-degradable linkages (Figure 3A,B); this effect may be due to the hydrophobicity of norbornene, which slows ester hydrolysis^[21a]. MAE hydrogels degraded efficiently, as indicated by the increase of swell ratio over time (Fig 3), and 4K-MAE hydrogels (Figure 3A) underwent a more rapid increase in swell ratio than 2.5K-MAE hydrogels (Figure 3B), indicating faster degradation. Accordingly, faster degradation was accompanied by faster BSA release; 4K-MAE hydrogels released BSA in 38 days (Figure 4A), while 2.5K-MAE hydrogels needed 59 days (Figure 4B). These results suggest that more ester linkages between crosslink points (two in 4K-MAE hydrogels and one in 2.5K-MAE hydrogels) may also accelerate degradation and protein release. In addition, hydrogels with lower initial PEG concentrations degraded more rapidly (Figure 3C), and released protein faster (Figure 4C). It should be noted that although ester is good for introducing hydrolytic degradation for protein release, the control over degradation rate is still limited as shown in our study. To achieve a broader range of degradation and protein release, alternative degradable structures may be introduced, such as carbamate, with a hydrolysis half-life could be modulated from hours to months^[7c, 10c].

Hydrogels with degradable linkages released their cargo when the protein passed through the enlarged mesh created by degradation (Figure 1B). MAE-containing hydrogels released >90% of the loaded BSA (Figure 4), indicating high efficiency of protein release. Previous studies have used the total amount of released protein rather than the initial loaded protein amount to calculate release percentage^[22]. This may lead to overestimate of the efficiency of protein release by not taking into account of the unreleased proteins. Faster degradation was accompanied by faster BSA release; 4K-MAE hydrogels released BSA in 38 days (Figure 4A), while 2.5K-MAE hydrogels needed 59 days (Figure 4B). Thus, although hydrogel degradation has been widely used to control protein release^[7b, 14a], mesh size should be considered when tuning degradation. For example, decreasing the initial PEG concentration to accelerate degradation also resulted in larger mesh size (Figure 2), which led to fast protein release (Figure 4C). Decreasing the concentration of 2.5K-MAE hydrogel to 5 % (w/v), which showed a degradation period of 46 days, caused the release of 70% of the loaded BSA within 24 hours due to the large initial mesh size (7.63 nm). But with concentration of 10 % (w/v), which leads to a decreased mesh size (5.85 nm), 2.5K-MAE hydrogel could then release 75% of the BSA over 7 days. Thus, to achieve sustainable long-term release, an appropriate initial mesh size and degradation rate are both essential.

To achieve prolonged protein release from hydrogels, molecules that possess protein-binding affinity such as heparin or short peptides with specific binding affinity for the target proteins have been incorporated^[23]. However, such strategies only apply to proteins for which specific binding structures are available. In contrast, our method relies only on physical entrapment and no specific interactions are required for protein loading/release as the entrapment and release of loaded cargo is solely controlled by hydrogel mesh size and degradation. Thus, our method is more versatile and can be applicable for controlling release of a broad range of proteins.

Here, we have chosen thiol-ene addition chemistry for hydrogel crosslinking due to its high efficiency and homogeneity^[24]. We also chose this crosslinking mechanism because previous studies have used it for protein encapsulation in hydrogels, and showed minimum interference with protein bioactivity^[14a, 25]. Similarly, we demonstrated that bFGF encapsulated in our hydrogels retained its biofunctionality after release (Figure 5B). Although a relatively high amount of bFGF was released in the first few hours, possibly because the hydrodynamic radius of bFGF is smaller ($\sim 3\text{--}4\text{ nm}$ ^[26]) than that of BSA, sustained release was observed over the following month (Figure 5A). In contrast to strategies for protein delivery that require chemical conjugation^[10b] or the incorporation of affinity structures to increase specificity^[27], our approach only required physical entrapment of proteins of interest in PEG hydrogels (Figure 1), and thus our strategy is likely appropriate for a broad range of biomedical applications. Chemical conjugation strategies need to be designed specifically for different biomolecules given the available modifiable functional groups, and may easily induce loss of bioactivity^{[12] [13]}. Our strategy can circumvent these limitations as the entrapment and release of loaded cargo is solely controlled by hydrogel mesh size and degradation. Although we only employed photo-initiated thiol-ene addition in the present study, other methods, including redox-initiated radical addition^[28] and Michael addition^[7b], may expand the utility of our approach. It is also important to consider that some proteins of interests may possess free thiol groups that can interfere with the thiol chemistry based crosslinking, thus other crosslinking methods may be used, such as Dias-Alder coupling^[10b]. Further, other degradation strategies rather than the hydrolysis such as photodegradation^[29] and enzymatic degradation^[14a] may also be employed to induce changes of hydrogel mesh size. The concept of achieving sustained protein release via controlling hydrogel mesh size and degradability may be broadly applicable using other polymers and hydrogels.

4. Conclusions

We demonstrated an approach for controlling protein release from PEG hydrogels by controlling mesh size and degradation. By developing hydrogels with controllable mesh size through step growth polymerization, protein could be physically entrapped in hydrogel with small meshes. Tunable degradation was introduced by incorporating various degradable structures, thus yielding sustained protein release over 1 month with retained bioactivity. Since this approach only employed the physical processes of entrapment and degradation, it could be a very versatile method for delivering a broad range of proteins for diverse biomedical applications.

5. Experimental Section

Materials

Eight-arm PEG (MW $\sim 10\text{ kDa}$) was purchased from JenKem Technology USA. Linear PEG-diol (MW $\sim 1.5\text{ kDa}$), p-toluenesulfonic acid, mercaptoacetic acid, and 3-mercaptopropionic acid were purchased from Sigma-Aldrich USA. Lithium phenyl-2,4,6-trimethylbenzoylphosphinate (LAP) was synthesized as previously reported^[30]. All other reagents and solvents were obtained from Fisher Scientific unless otherwise noted.

Synthesis of PEG monomers

Eight-arm PEG-norbornene (PEG8NB), 8-arm PEG-thiol (PEG8SH), and linear PEG-dithiol (PEG2SH) were synthesized as previously reported^[24, 31]. Eight-arm PEG mercaptopropionic ester (PEG8MPE) was synthesized by reacting 8-arm PEG with mercaptopropionic acid in toluene. Briefly, 5.0 g eight-arm PEG was dissolved in 150 mL toluene, followed by the addition of 34 mg p-toluenesulfonic acid. After adding 1.74 mL 3-mercaptopropionic acid, the solution was refluxed overnight. The azeotropic mixture was collected periodically. After cooling the solution to room temperature, the product was precipitated in ice-cold diethyl ether. Eight-arm PEG mercaptoacetic ester (PEG8MAE) was synthesized by reacting 8-arm PEG with mercaptoacetic acid following the same procedure as for PEG8MPE. Linear PEG mercaptopropionic ester (PEG2MPE) and linear PEG mercaptoacetic ester (PEG2MAE) were synthesized via the protocols used for PEG8MPE and PEG8MAE.

Preparation of hydrogels

To examine the effects of PEG mesh size and degradability on protein release, we synthesized six PEG polymers (Table 1). Specifically, we synthesized PEG hydrogels with 2.5 kDa and 4.0 kDa average molecular weight between crosslinking points (M_n). For each PEG M_n , we further varied PEG degradability with three degradable linkages: a non-degradable linkage (ND), mercaptopropionic ester (MPE), and mercaptoacetic ester (MAE) (Table 1). All PEG monomers were dissolved in phosphate-buffered saline (PBS) with 0.05% (w/v) LAP at a concentration of 20% (w/v) before use. To make PEG hydrogels with 4.0 kDa M_n and ND linkages (4K-ND; this naming strategy was used to designate the other five PEG polymers) PEG8NB solution was mixed with PEG2SH at a volume ratio of 5:3 and exposed to ultraviolet light at 4 mW/cm² for 5 min. Other hydrogels were fabricated via following similar procedures. To make lower-concentration hydrogels (15% (w/v), 10% (w/v), and 5% (w/v)), a 20% (w/v) monomer solution was further diluted in PBS (with 0.05% (w/v) LAP) and crosslinked under ultraviolet light.

Calibration of PEG concentration

All hydrogels were prepared in a cylindrical mold using a volume of 50 μ L per sample. Wet weight was measured directly after hydrogel formation. All hydrogels were incubated in deionized water overnight at room temperature to remove un-reacted PEG monomers, then lyophilized. Dry weight was then measured and divided by the wet weight to determine the calibrated PEG hydrogel concentration.

Swelling ratio

Hydrogels were prepared (50 μ L each) and incubated in a 48-well plate filled with 500 μ L PBS per well at room temperature. Wet weight was measured at a predetermined time. The swelling ratio (Q) of hydrogels was calculated using Equation 1:

$$Q = \frac{W_{\text{wet}} / \rho_{\text{gel}}}{W_{\text{dry}} / \rho_{\text{PEG}}} \quad (1)$$

where W_{wet} is the wet weight of the hydrogel at each time point, W_{dry} is the dry weight of the hydrogel calculated by multiplying the hydrogel wet weight by the calibrated PEG concentration, and ρ_{PEG} and ρ_{gel} are the density of PEG and the hydrogel, respectively, which were defined as 1.12 g/cm³ and 1.01 g/cm³, respectively, according to the literature^[32].

Calculation of mesh size

To reach equilibrium for swelling, hydrogels were incubated in PBS overnight after preparation. Mesh size (ξ) was calculated using Equation 2, in accordance with^[33]:

$$\xi = v_2^{-1/3} (\bar{r}_0^2)^{1/2} \quad (2)$$

where v_2 is the volume fraction of polymers in the hydrogels that have reached equilibrium in swelling (equal to the reciprocal of Q) and $(\bar{r}_0^2)^{1/2}$ is the root-mean-squared end-to-end distance of the polymer chain in the unperturbed state, which can be calculated using Equation 3, in accordance with^[34]:

$$(\bar{r}_0^2)^{1/2} = l C_\infty^{1/2} n^{1/2} \quad (3)$$

where l is the average bond length, C_∞ is the characteristic ratio of the polymer ($l = 0.154$ nm, $C_\infty^{1/2} = 4.0$ ^[34]), and n is the number of bonds in the chain, calculated as $3M_c/M_r$, where $\bar{M}_c$ was calculated from the Flory-Rehner equation (Equation 4) and M_r is the molecular weight of the repeating unit, which is 44 for PEG.

$$\frac{1}{\bar{M}_c} = \frac{2}{\bar{M}_c} - \frac{\bar{v}_1 (\ln(1 - v_2) + v_2 + \chi_1 v_2^2)}{v_2^{1/3} - v_2/2} \quad (4)$$

In Equation 4, $\bar{v}_1$ is the specific volume of the polymer (ρ_s/ρ_p), V_1 is the molar volume of the solvent (18 cm³/mol for water), χ_1 is the polymer-solvent interaction parameter (0.426 for PEG-water,^[34]), and v_2 is the polymer volume fraction in the equilibrium swollen hydrogel (the reciprocal of the swell ratio).

Quantifying protein release

BSA was used as a model protein to characterize the profile of release from the PEG hydrogels. BSA was dissolved in PBS (with 0.05% (w/v) LAP) at concentration of 20 mg/mL. PEG monomers were dissolved in the BSA solution, and the hydrogels were prepared using the protocol described above, at a volume of 50 μ L each. BSA-laden hydrogels were incubated in a 96-well plate filled with 200 μ L PBS. At each time point, the supernatant was collected and 200 μ L of fresh PBS were added back to the wells. The BSA concentrations in the hydrogel precursor solution (PEG monomers and BSA) and in the collected supernatant were measured with the Bio-Rad Protein Assay according to the

manufacturer's instructions. The amount of BSA protein released from the hydrogels at each time point was calculated by measuring the concentration in the collected supernatant and multiplying that amount by the total volume. Cumulative release was determined by summing the total amounts released over time. The total BSA loaded into each hydrogel was calculated by multiplying the concentration in the hydrogel precursor solution by the volume of each gel (50 μ L). The fraction of released BSA was calculated by dividing the cumulative release by the initial loading amount.

To characterize bFGF release, bFGF was added to the BSA-containing PEG monomer solution described above at a concentration of 2.5 μ g/mL. Hydrogels were prepared at a volume of 50 μ L each and incubated in a 96-well plate filled with 200 μ L PBS. The supernatant was collected at predetermined time points and 200 μ L of fresh PBS were added back to the wells. The concentration of bFGF in the collected supernatant was measured via enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay (PeproTech Human FGF-basic Standard ELISA Development Kit) according to the manufacturer's instructions.

Cell proliferation

Human adult adipose-derived stem cells (ADSCs) were isolated from excised human adipose tissue with informed consent as previously described^[35]. ADSCs were expanded for 4 passages in high glucose DMEM supplemented with 5 ng/mL basic fibroblast growth factor (bFGF), 100 U/mL penicillin, and 0.1 mg/mL streptomycin. hADSCs (passage 4) were used to monitor the biofunctionality of bFGF released from our PEG hydrogels. hADSCs were cultured in a 96-well plate (3000 cells/well) one day before the sample solution was added. After removing the old medium, 100 μ L of bFGF-containing solution collected from the hydrogels (or control solution) were added to the well, as were 100 μ L of cell culture medium composed of high-glucose Dulbecco's Modified Eagle's Medium (Gibco), 10% fetal bovine serum (Gibco), and 100 U/mL penicillin/streptomycin (Gibco). PBS was used as a negative control, and fresh bFGF solution (10 ng/mL) in PBS was used as a positive control. Cells were cultured at 37 °C and 5% CO₂ for 72 h. Cell proliferation was measured with the CellTiter 96® Aqueous One Solution Cell Proliferation Assay (Promega) according to the manufacturer's instructions.

Statistics

All experiments were performed in quadruplicate. Data are presented as mean $\pm$ standard deviation. Statistical analysis was performed using one-way analysis of variance with Tukey's correction for multiple comparisons (α = 0.05) to compare all groups. The threshold for significance was set at $p < 0.05$.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank NIH R01DE024772-01, National Science Foundation CAREER award program (CBET-1351289), California Institute for Regenerative Medicine (Grant #TR3-05569), Stanford Chem-H Institute New Materials for Applications in Biology and Medicine Seed Grant, Stanford Child Health Research Institute, and Alliance for Cancer Gene Therapy for funding. S. L. would like to thank Stanford Bio-X Graduate Fellowship for support.

References

1. a) Richardson TP, Peters MC, Ennett AB, Mooney DJ. *Nat. Biotechnol.* 2001; 19:1029. [PubMed: 11689847] b) Chen R, Mooney D. *Pharm. Res.* 2003; 20:1103. [PubMed: 12948005] c) Tabata Y. *Tissue Eng.* 2003; 9(Suppl 1):S5. [PubMed: 14511467]
2. a) Babensee J, McIntire L, Mikos A. *Pharm. Res.* 2000; 17:497. [PubMed: 10888299] b) Tayalia P, Mooney DJ. *Adv. Mater.* 2009; 21:3269. [PubMed: 20882497] c) Vo TN, Kasper FK, Mikos AG. *Adv. Drug Del. Rev.* 2012; 64:1292.
3. a) Schultz G, Clark W, Rotatori DS. *J. Cell. Biochem.* 1991; 45:346. [PubMed: 2045428] b) Mustoe T, Pierce G, Thomason A, Gramates P, Sporn M, Deuel T. *Science.* 1987; 237:1333. [PubMed: 2442813]
4. Wang EA, Rosen V, D'Alessandro JS, Bauduy M, Cordes P, Harada T, Israel DI, Hewick RM, Kerns KM, LaPan P. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences.* 1990; 87:2220.
5. a) Cross MJ, Claesson-Welsh L. *Trends Pharmacol. Sci.* 2001; 22:201. [PubMed: 11282421] b) Gerber HP, Vu TH, Ryan AM, Kowalski J, Werb Z, Ferrara N. *Nat. Med.* 1999; 5:623. [PubMed: 10371499]
6. Chen RR, Silva EA, Yuen WW, Brock AA, Fischbach C, Lin AS, Guldberg RE, Mooney DJ. *The FASEB Journal.* 2007; 21:3896. [PubMed: 17644610]
7. a) Anseth KS, Metters AT, Bryant SJ, Martens PJ, Elisseeff JH, Bowman CN. *J. Control. Release.* 2002; 78:199. [PubMed: 11772461] b) Zusiak SP, Leach JB. *Biotechnol. Bioeng.* 2011; 108:197. [PubMed: 20803477] c) Ashley GW, Henise J, Reid R, Santi DV. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences.* 2013; 110:2318.
8. Lin C-C, Anseth KS. *Pharm. Res.* 2009; 26:631. [PubMed: 19089601]
9. a) Lee JH, Kopecek J, Andrade JD. *J. Biomed. Mater. Res.* 1989; 23:351. [PubMed: 2715159] b) Desai NP, Hubbell JA. *J. Biomed. Mater. Res.* 1991; 25:829. [PubMed: 1833405]
10. a) Yang C, Mariner PD, Nahreini JN, Anseth KS. *J. Controlled Release.* 2012; 162:612. b) Koehler KC, Alge DL, Anseth KS, Bowman CN. *Biomaterials.* 2013; 34:4150. [PubMed: 23465826] c) Santi DV, Schneider EL, Reid R, Robinson L, Ashley GW. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences.* 2012; 109:6211.
11. Roberts MJ, Bentley MD, Harris JM. *Adv Drug Deliv Rev.* 2002; 54:459. [PubMed: 12052709]
12. Yang K, Basu A, Wang M, Chintala R, Hsieh MC, Liu S, Hua J, Zhang Z, Zhou J, Li M, Phyu H, Petti G, Mendez M, Janjua H, Peng P, Longley C, Borowski V, Mehlig M, Filpula D. *Protein Eng.* 2003; 16:761. [PubMed: 14600206]
13. Kubetzko S, Sarkar CA, Plückthun A. *Mol. Pharmacol.* 2005; 68:1439. [PubMed: 16099846]
14. a) Aimetti AA, Machen AJ, Anseth KS. *Biomaterials.* 2009; 30:6048. [PubMed: 19674784] b) Bal T, Kepsutlu B, Kizilel S. *J. Biomed. Mater. Res. A.* 2014; 102:487. [PubMed: 23505227]
15. a) Lin-Gibson S, Jones RL, Washburn NR, Horkay F. *Macromolecules.* 2005; 38:2897. b) Waters DJ, Engberg K, Parke-Houben R, Hartmann L, Ta CN, Toney MF, Frank CW. *Macromolecules.* 2010; 43:6861. [PubMed: 21403767]
16. Weber LM, Lopez CG, Anseth KS. *J. Biomed. Mater. Res. A.* 2009; 90A:720.
17. Elbert DL, Pratt AB, Lutolf MP, Halstenberg S, Hubbell JA. *J. Controlled Release.* 2001; 76:11.
18. Squire PG, Moser P, O'Konski CT. *Biochemistry.* 1968; 7:4261. [PubMed: 5750167]
19. a) Metters A, Hubbell J. *Biomacromolecules.* 2005; 6:290. [PubMed: 15638532] b) Akagi Y, Matsunaga T, Shibayama M, Chung U-i, Sakai T. *Macromolecules.* 2009; 43:488.
20. Wen J, Anderson SM, Du J, Yan M, Wang J, Shen M, Lu Y, Segura T. *Adv. Mater.* 2011; 23:4549. [PubMed: 21910141]
21. a) Schoenmakers RG, van de Wetering P, Elbert DL, Hubbell JA. *J. Control. Release.* 2004; 95:291. [PubMed: 14980777] b) Zusiak SP, Leach JB. *Biomacromolecules.* 2010; 11:1348. [PubMed: 20355705]
22. a) Leach JB, Schmidt CE. *Biomaterials.* 2005; 26:125. [PubMed: 15207459] b) Weber LM, Lopez CG, Anseth KS. *Journal of Biomedical Materials Research Part A.* 2009; 90A:720.

23. a) Pike DB, Cai S, Pomraning KR, Firpo MA, Fisher RJ, Shu XZ, Prestwich GD, Peattie RA. *Biomaterials*. 2006; 27:5242. [PubMed: 16806456] b) Lin CC, Anseth KS. *Adv. Funct. Mater.* 2009; 19:2325. [PubMed: 20148198]
24. Fairbanks BD, Schwartz MP, Halevi AE, Nuttelman CR, Bowman CN, Anseth KS. *Adv. Mater.* 2009; 21
25. McCall JD, Anseth KS. *Biomacromolecules*. 2012; 13:2410. [PubMed: 22741550]
26. Eriksson AE, Cousens LS, Weaver LH, Matthews BW. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. 1991; 88:3441.
27. Benoit DSW, Anseth KS. *Acta Biomater.* 2005; 1:461. [PubMed: 16701827]
28. Cole MA, Jankousky KC, Bowman CN. *Polymer Chemistry*. 2013; 4:1167. [PubMed: 23565125]
29. Kloxin AM, Kasko AM, Salinas CN, Anseth KS. *Science*. 2009; 324:59. [PubMed: 19342581]
30. Fairbanks BD, Schwartz MP, Bowman CN, Anseth KS. *Biomaterials*. 2009; 30:6702. [PubMed: 19783300]
31. Anderson SB, Lin C-C, Kuntzler DV, Anseth KS. *Biomaterials*. 2011; 32:3564. [PubMed: 21334063]
32. Eliassi A, Modarress H, Mansoori GA. *J. Chem. Eng. Data*. 1998; 43:719.
33. Canal T, Peppas NA. *J. Biomed. Mater. Res*. 1989; 23:1183. [PubMed: 2808463]
34. Merrill EW, Dennison KA, Sung C. *Biomaterials*. 1993; 14:1117. [PubMed: 8130315]
35. Lai JH, Kajiyama G, Smith RL, Maloney W, Yang F. *Sci. Rep*. 2013; 3:3553. [PubMed: 24352100]

(A) Hydrogel modulation **(B) Protein loading and release** **Figure 1.**

Strategy for controlling protein release from PEG hydrogels by tuning mesh size and degradation. (A) Chemical structures of PEG monomers with tunable molecular weight and hydrolytic degradation profiles. Terms and abbreviations are defined in sections 2.2 and 2.3. (B) Physical entrapment of protein cargo in hydrogels with mesh size smaller than the hydrodynamic radius of the protein of proteins, and release is triggered as hydrogels degrade.

Figure 2.

Hydrogel mesh size depends on molecular weight (2.5 KDa vs. 4 KDa), degradable linkages (ND, MPE, MAE, see section 2.3 for a definition of the polymer naming convention) and PEG concentration (5% to 20%) (w/v). All hydrogels were swelled in PBS overnight to reach equilibrium. Mesh size was calculated using the equilibrium swelling ratio on day 1. Data are presented as mean $\pm$ standard deviation (n=4).

Figure 3.

Hydrogel swelling over time depends on PEG molecular weight, degradable linkages and concentration. Increased hydrogel degradation corresponds to increased hydrogel swelling ratio. (A) Swelling ratio of hydrogels (20% w/v) with M_n of 4 kDa. (B) Swelling ratio of hydrogels (20% w/v) with M_n of 2.5 kDa. (C) Swelling ratio of 2.5K-MAE hydrogels of varying PEG concentration. Data are presented as mean $\pm$ standard deviation (n=4). Red arrows, time points after which the hydrogels were completely degraded.

Figure 4. Tunable cumulative BSA release over time via varying PEG molecular weight, degradable linkages and concentration. (A) Profiles of BSA release from PEG hydrogels (20% w/v) with M_n of 4 kDa. (B) Profiles of BSA release from PEG hydrogels (20% w/v) with M_n of 2.5 kDa. (C) Profiles of BSA release hydrogels with varying PEG concentration and M_n of 2.5 kDa. Data are presented as mean $\pm$ standard deviation (n=4). Red arrows, time points after which the hydrogels were completely degraded.

Figure 5.

Sustained protein release over 1 month with retained biological activity. Release kinetics (A) and biological activity (B) of bFGF released from 2.5K-MAE hydrogels over 1 month. (A) Concentration bFGF released into supernatant over 35 days. (B) Biological activity of released bFGF was verified by quantifying its ability to stimulate cell proliferation of hADSCs. Data are presented as fold increase normalized to the proliferation of hADSCs cultured without bFGF (negative control (Neg ctr), black bar). * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$,

*** $p < 0.001$, and **** $p < 0.0001$ relative to the negative control. Positive control (Pos ctr), freshly prepared 10 ng/mL bFGF. All data are presented as mean $\pm$ standard deviation (n=4).

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Summary of hydrogel monomers and characteristics. Terms and abbreviations are defined in sections 2.2 and 2.3.

Table 1

Group	M_n (kDa)	PEG monomers (molar ratio)	Number of ester groups between crosslinks	Number of methylene groups between thiol ether and ester	Expected degradation
2.5K-ND	2.5	PEG8NB / PEG8SH (1:1)	0	0	None
2.5K-MPE	2.5	PEG8NB / PEG8MPE (1:1)	1	2	Intermediate
2.5K-MAE	2.5	PEG8NB / PEG8MAE (1:1)	1	1	Fast
4K-ND	4.0	PEG8NB / PEG2SH (5:3)	0	0	None
4K-MPE	4.0	PEG8NB / PEG2MPE (5:3)	2	2	Intermediate
4K-MAE	4.0	PEG8NB / PEG2MAE (5:3)	2	1	Fast