

Chem Mater. Author manuscript: available in PMC 2010 March 2.

Published in final edited form as:

Chem Mater. 2009 March 2; 21(6): 1108-1115. doi:10.1021/cm802972d.

Hydrophobic Effects in the Critical Destabilization and Release Dynamics of Degradable Multilayer Films

Renée C. Smith¹, Amy Leung², Byeong-Su Kim², and Paula T. Hammond^{2,*}

¹Joint Harvard-MIT Division of Health Sciences and Technology, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 77 Massachusetts Avenue, Cambridge, MA 02139

²Department of Chemical Engineering, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 77 Massachusetts Avenue, Cambridge, MA 02139 United States

Abstract

Recent research has highlighted the ability of hydrolytically degradable electrostatic layer-by-layer films to act as versatile drug delivery systems capable of multi-agent release. A key element of these films is the potential to gain precise control of release by evoking a surface-erosion mechanism. Here we sought to determine the extent to which manipulation of chemical structure could be used to control release from hydrolytically degradable layer-by-layer films through modification of the degradable polycation. Toward this goal, films composed of poly(β-amino ester)s, varying only in the choice of diacrylate monomer, and the model biological drug, dextran sulfate, were used to ascertain the role of alkyl chain length, steric hindrance, and hydrophobicity on release dynamics. Above a critical polycation hydrophobicity, as determined using octanol:water coefficients, the film becomes rapidly destabilized and quickly released its contents. These findings indicate that in these unique electrostatic assemblies, hydrolytic susceptibility is dependent not only on hydrophobicity, but a complex balance between hydrophobic composition, charge density, and stability of electrostatic ion pairs. Computational determination of octanol:water coefficients allowed for the reliable prediction of release dynamics. The determination of a correlation between octanol:water coefficient and release duration will enables advanced engineering to produce custom drug delivery systems.

Keywords

polyelectrolyte multilayers; layer by layer; drug delivery; hydrophobicity; octanol:water coefficient

Introduction

The advent of medical prosthetic implants has revolutionized the field of medicine, enabling the treatment of previously debilitating disorders. Surgical implantation of prosthetic devices such as coronary stents, intraocular lenses, and urinary catheters are a few of the most successful medical approaches applied in clinical treatment, to date. Nevertheless, these devices are associated with significant postoperative complications and subsequent morbidity¹. To lower the incidence of pathology, drug delivery coatings for medical prostheses have emerged as an active area of research and development. While various methods to coat medical implants for localized drug delivery exist, most rely on diffusion based release from a bulk matrix and do not enable the engineering of drug release profiles. Moreover, state-of-the-art coatings are still limited to the elution of a single therapeutic that can withstand the relatively harsh processing

conditions necessary for fabrication. The versatility, mild aqueous processing conditions, and compositional diversity of layer by layer (LbL) assembled films represents a powerful means to overcome these limitations and construct superior drug delivery coatings.

Layer-by-layer assembly has enabled the creation of conformal thin films with sequential and controlled release capabilities^{2, 3}. To extend the capabilities of this approach, it is desirable to work with a family of polymers which can be compositionally varied to achieve a broad range of degradation rates, mechanical properties, and biocompatibility with simple modifications in monomer choice. In conventional hydrolytically degradable polymer films, the design rules have been thoroughly explored⁴; however, the parameters which influence the degradation and stability behavior in electrostatically assembled multilayer films have not been closely examined and are not well understood. To date, there has been no systematic study exploring the impact of chemical composition on release dynamics in this promising and rapidly expanding set of new drug carrier systems; therefore, no correlation between hydrolytically degradable polymer structure, charge density, and release exist to allow for rational design. In examining these properties, a framework for understanding the nature of degradation in hydrolytically degradable layer-by-layer films has been created, generating a knowledge base and rubric for fabrication of films uniquely tailored for their given applications. Utilization of these tools will expand the scope of degradable multilayer films to applications such as microreactors, bioMEMs, agriculture, tissue engineering, and basic scientific research.

Electrostatic LbL deposition utilizes ionic interactions to form stable films with nanometer scale control of composition through the alternating adsorption of oppositely charged species⁵. LBL films have the ability to incorporate a wide variety of materials, including functional polymers, inorganic nanoparticles, enzymes, small molecules, proteins, polysaccharides, nucleic acids, and carbon nanotubes $^{6-16}$. The ability to create uniform, conformal coatings at room temperature via a mild aqueous process has fueled the emergence of polyelectrolyte multilayer films in biological applications. A great deal of research has recently focused on the use of polyelectrolyte multilayers as drug delivery vehicles. Caruso, Voegel, and others have highlighted the ability of these films to serve as effective gene and protein delivery vehicles⁶, ¹¹, ¹², ¹⁷–²³. Moreover, Rubner, Thierry, and coworkers have pioneered the release of small molecule therapeutics from these systems 12, 24, 25. Still, most research utilizes nondegradable films, which rely on drug diffusion from the bulk polymer matrix, and do not take advantage of the controlled release associated with top down degradation of LBL films. Unlike traditional polymer-based delivery systems, polyelectrolyte multilayer films are constructed one nanoscale layer at a time, alternating between polymer and therapeutic. In this manner, a drug delivery coating can be constructed with precise control over film architecture such that degradation via surface erosion will enable drug release in the inverse order of assembly. As a result, highly tailored release profiles can be achieved. To address this issue, Hammond and coworkers have created hydrolytically degradable polyelectrolyte multilayer films composed of a poly(α -amino ester) and polyanion26. Poly(α amino ester)s are cationic polymers produced through Michael addition polymerization of diacrylate and amine monomers. These polymers were first introduced by Lynn, et al. and have shown promise in gene delivery and as tissue engineering scaffolds27⁻³⁰. A library of 2,350 poly(α-amino ester) has been constructed31. Hydrolytically degradable LbL films, composed of a poly(α -amino ester), and poly(styrenesulfonate) or the anticoagulant, heparin sulfate, were initially studied. Films were shown to undergo surface erosion by the hydrolysis of the poly (α-amino ester) and subsequent release of the polyanion 32. Wood et al. demonstrated multicomponent release from hydrolytically degradable films by showing that heparin sulfate and the model drug, dextran sulfate, could be released sequentially or concurrently depending on the presence or absence of a cross-linked barrier layer2.

Recently, Zhang et al. proved that the release kinetics of hydrolytically degradable LBL films were dependent on the chemical structure of the polycation 33, 34. Three poly (α -amino esters), varying only in alkyl chain length of the diacrylate monomer, were used to show that increasing hydrophobicity could alter the release kinetics of the synthetic polyanion, poly(styrene sulfonate) (SPS). Films composed of each of the three polycations with SPS were found to have unique release profiles and films constructed of multiple polycations were found to have release profiles intermediate between those constructed of a single polycation³⁵. While this study demonstrated the versatility of LBL delivery systems, there remains much more to understand to fully utilize chemical composition to tune release, particularly with respect to the diverse range of biological molecules that can be released using this approach. Work, herein, sought to understand the extent to which structural manipulation could be used to control release of a model biomacromolecule, dextran sulfate, from hydrolytically degradable LBL films. Dextran sulfate (DS) is a good model system due to its similarity to glycosaminoglycans and proteins in macromolecular structure and hydrophobicity. A series of polymers from the poly(α-amino ester) family was investigated by varying the diacrylate monomer used in the polymerization. Diacrylate moieties were altered based on alkyl chain length, steric hindrance, and hydrophobicity. Each polymer was examined for growth, degradation, and release of dextran sulfate from LbL films. Nine polymers were examined in total. These studies revealed a correlation between release dynamics and the octanol:water coefficient (LogP) of the diacrylate monomer. This correlation indicated that there is actually an optimum in hydrophobicity with respect to sustained release kinetics due to LbL film destabilization at high degrees of hydrophobicity. The destabilization of multilayers beyond the optimum was rapid and marked, and highly reproducible. The finding of a correlation between LogP and sustained release profiles will enable the creation of custom drug delivery coatings specifically designed to address the necessary biological, chemical, and mechanical requirements of a given application. Furthermore, this paper presents an observation of multilayer destabilization as a systematic function of hydrophobic content and charge density for the first time.

Experimental Methods

Materials

All monomers were purchased from Dajac Laboratories, Inc. (Feasterville, PA), except 1,4 butanediol diacrylate, 1,6 hexanediol diacrylate, and 4,4-trimethylenedipiperidine, which were obtained from Alfa Aesar (Ward Hill, MA). Poly (sodium 4styrenesulfonate) (SPS, $M_n=70,\!000$) and dextran sulfate ($M_n=8,\!000$) were purchased from Sigma Aldrich (St. Louis, MO). Dulbecco's PBS buffer and glass substrates were obtained from VWR Scientific (Edison NJ). Linear polyethyleneimine (LPEI, $M_n=25,\!000$) and $^{14}\text{C-dextran}$ sulfate sodium salt (100 $\mu\text{Ci}, 1.5 \, \text{mCi/g}, Mn=8000$) was purchased from Polysciences, Inc (Warrington, PA). and American Radiolabeled Chemicals, Inc, respectively.

Synthesis

Poly(α -amino esters) were synthesized as previously described²⁹. Briefly, in a typical experiment, a solution of 4,4-trimethylenedipiperidine (34.1mmol) in anhydrous THF (50mL) was added to the diacrylate monomer (34.1mmol) dissolved in anhydrous THF (50mL). The reaction mixture was stirred for 48 hours at 50 °C under nitrogen. After 48 hours, the reaction was cooled to room temperature and precipitated in cold stirring hexanes. Polymers were collected and dried under vacuum prior to NMR and GPC analysis. The resulting polymer molecular weights along with their identification, based on diacrylate monomer, can be viewed in Figure 1.

Film Fabrication

LBL films were constructed on $1.5~\rm cm^2$ glass substrates using a Carl Ziess HSM series programmable slide stainer. The glass substrates were plasma etched in oxygen using a Harrick PDC-32G plasma cleaner on high RF power for 5 minutes to generate a uniform, negatively charged surface prior to deposition. After loading onto the robotic arm, the glass substrate was dipped into a 2mM aqueous polycation solutions for 10 minutes and then washed with agitation for 10, 20, and 30 seconds in three different water baths to remove all physically absorbed polymer. This process was repeated with the 2mM polyanion solution to form a bilayer. All degradable polymer films were constructed on ten bilayers of linear polyethylenimine and poly (styrene sulfonate) to ensure uniform adhesion of degradable layers to the surface. These films were constructed from a pH 4.2 solution of LPEI and pH 4.7 solution of SPS. Degradable films were prepared with 10mM polymer solutions in 100 mM acetate buffer at pH 5.0 to avoid the conditions at which poly (α -amino ester)s degrades rapidly. Following deposition, the films were dried thoroughly under a stream of dry nitrogen.

Release Studies

Release profiles were investigated by monitoring the release of ¹⁴C-dextran sulfate and the degradation of non-radiolabeled films. For drug release experiments, 20 bilayer radiolabeled $films\ were\ constructed\ using\ ^{14}C\ - dextran\ sulfate\ solution.\ The\ radiolabled\ deposition\ solutions$ were prepared by combining ¹⁴C-dextran sulfate (1.5 mCi/g, Mn = 8,000), unlabeled dextran sulfate ($M_n = 8,000$), and 100 mM acetate buffer to yield a total concentration of dextran sulfate (unlabeled plus labeled) to 2 mg/mL (1 µCi/mL 14C). After fabrication, each twenty bilayer film was immersed in 30 mL phosphate buffer solution (pH 7.4, 137 mM NaCl, 2.7 mM KCl, 10 mM Na₂HPO₄). A 1 mL sample was extracted at various time points and analyzed via scintillation counting. Scintillation counting was performed on a Tri-carb liquid scintillation counter (Model U2200) and the amount of radiolabel in each sample vial was measured using ¹⁴C protocol. Degradation vials were tightly capped between sample extractions to prevent evaporation of the buffer solution. Raw data (disintegrations per minute, DPM) were converted to micrograms (μ g) of drug released using the conversion factor 2.2×10^6 DPM = 1 μCi, the specific radioactivity of the drug, and knowledge of the ratio of total drug to labeled drug in the deposition solution. Degradation studies were performed with nonradiolabled 20 bilayer films. Films were immersed in 20 mL phosphate buffer solution (PBS) in a screw top glass vial and tightly sealed. At various times, films were removed, dried thoroughly under a stream of dry nitrogen, and thickness was measured using profilometry at five predetermined locations on the film surface. Profilometry measurements were performed on a Tencor 21profilometer. Following measurements, films were reimmersed in buffer solutions and resealed. All release and degradation studies were performed in triplicate. Surface morphology of LbL film was observed by using Nanoscope IIIa AFM microscope (Digital Instruments, Santa Barbara, CA) in tapping mode in air. All surface roughness measurements are root mean squared measurements.

Calculation of Octanol:Water Coefficient

Octanol: water coefficients used in this work were an average of well known computational models based on group contribution approaches 36, 37. In general, these methods break compounds into atoms/fragments that are associated with a given constant determined from a database of structures. Correction factors are used to account for atom/fragment interactions. These estimated values are summed to produce the octanol:water coefficient in logarithmitic form (LogP). The eight methods utilized differ in both database and computational constants used, which lead to differences in logP values ³⁸. Based on previous approaches in the literature, the average was calculated to provide a "consensus" value (S1); this has been shown to lead to better stability of prediction 37, 39. Advanced Chemical Development, Inc., ALOGPS 2.1,

and Actelion open access software were used to calculate LogP. The following computational models were used in LogP determination: ALOGPS, IALogP, AB/LogP, miLogP, KOWWIN, XLogP, ACD/LogP, and CLogP39.

Results and Discussion

Poly(α -amino ester)s composed of 4,4-trimethylenedipiperidine and diacrylate monomers varying in alkyl chain length, steric bulkiness, and other modulators of hydrophobicity were synthesized to explore the impact of structure. Polymers were named based on their diacrylate monomer, which were grouped according to the aspect of structural control the monomers were used to explore. All monomers were placed in at least one of three categories: alkyl chain length (A), steric bulkiness (B), and mechanistic character (C). Mechanistic character refers to the mechanism of film degradation. The structure of the diacrylate monomers and the molecular weights of their corresponding polymers can be seen in Figure 1.

The molecular weights of the poly (α -amino esters) range from 6,000–20,000 g/mol. These differences can be attributed to the fact that molecular weight in step-growth polymerization is highly dependent on stoichiometry and monomer reactivity. Attempts were made to modulate reaction time and stoichiometry to create polymers with similar molecular weights; however, this could not be achieved for all polymers. To determine the effect of molecular weight differences, release studies were performed on dextran sulfate containing multilayers of Poly A2 with M_n of 6,000 and 16,000 g/mol, as shown in Figure 2. Because no differences in release kinetics were observed, it was assumed that small differences in molecular weight between the poly(α -amino ester)s would not substantially affect their degradation and release dynamics; polymers were studied as synthesized.

Although, numerous methods to control degradation of polymers exist, modulation of hydrophobicity has proven to be an effective regulator of degradation rate for polyesters. Hydrophobicity can control degradation via a number of mechanisms, many of which are a result of reduced exposure to water. In short, the local concentration of water around the scissile bond able to undergo hydrolytic cleavage is decreased with increasing hydrophobicity; because ester hydrolysis is dependent on the effective water concentration, the degradation rate of polyesters can be modulated in this manner. Furthermore, increasing steric bulk around esters can make the bonds less susceptible to hydrolysis. Both methods of controlling degradation rate were utilized to determine the extent to which structural modulation could be used to control degradation of films.

Effect of Alkyl Chain Length on Release

To determine the extent to which local hydrophobicity around the ester could be used to control release, four polymers with varying alkyl chain length were investigated. The polymers examined Poly AB1, A2, A3, and A4 contained 3, 4, 6, and 9 methylene units respectively. Drug release and degradation profiles of these polymers can be seen in Figure 3. As expected, altering alkyl chain length extends dextran sulfate release; however the most hydrophobic polymer, Poly A4, did not exhibit the longest release as anticipated. (Poly A4/DS)₂₀ films were found to be unstable, with 80% of the total amount of dextran sulfate released in less than 10 hours.

Previous research has highlighted the influence of hydrophobicity on the rate of hydrolysis for poly(α -amino ester)s33, 40. Zhong et al. showed that for a series of hyperbranched poly(α -amino ester)s more hydrophobic polymers degrade at a slower rate40. Additionally, Lynn showed that erosion of films composed of a poly (α -amino ester) and polystyrene sulfonate was dependent on hydrolysis of the polymer backbone by utilizing polyamide structural analogs of the poly(α -amino ester)s. Films composed of the polyamides, which contained

amide linkages instead of esters, did not erode under physiologically relevant conditions33. The paper concluded that polymer chain scission via hydrolysis of the ester bonds is necessary for surface erosion of the films; however, Poly A4, which is very hydrophobic, is unlikely to have completely hydrolyzed over the timescale necessary to explain the rapid release of DS from (Poly A4/DS)₂₀, especially since more hydrophilic polymers degraded over several days It is improbable that the rapid release kinetics of (Poly A4/DS)₂₀ is due to chemical degradation of Poly A4.

Thus to ascertain whether (Poly A4/DS)₂₀ films were in fact undergoing an abnormal destabilization phenomenon via bulk erosion or normal surface erosion, film degradation and surface roughness were monitored by profilometry. Here, bulk erosion is defined as degradation that occurs throughout the polymer matrix or includes more than the surface of the film. All films except (Poly A4/DS)₂₀ were found to be surface eroding with fairly linear degradation profile and constant roughness profiles (S2). For (Poly A4/DS)₂₀, 40% of total film thickness was removed within 24 hours, while the remaining film did not fully degrade after 240 hours. Reduced film stability may be attributed to reduced ionic interaction resulting from the low charge density of Poly A4. This suggests that alkyl chain modulation can be used to control release within a certain charge density threshold, at which point it exhibits a maximum release time. If this is the case, chemical control of release via the addition of hydrophobic units is mediated by loss of polymer charge density and the ability of the polymer to form sufficient ionic crosslinks to maintain film stability.

Effect of Steric Bulk on Release

To investigate the effect of steric bulk on the release kinetics of hydrolytically degradable LbL films, three polymers, varying only in the substitution on the diacrylate monomers were explored. The effects of bulkiness were studied using poly AB1, B2, and B3. Poly AB1 is composed of 1,3 propanediol diacrylate and trimethylenedipiperidine (diamine used in all polymer) and serves as a control, since it has no substitution on the α -carbon of the diacrylate. Poly B2 has intermediate branching with two methyl groups on the α -carbon, and Poly B3 is the bulkiest of the series, with an ethyl and benzoate moiety. The drug release and degradation profiles of (Poly AB1/DS)₂₀, (Poly B2/DS)₂₀, and (Poly B3/DS)₂₀ can be viewed in figure 4. As anticipated, change in steric bulk does alter release. However, while the release duration increased from Poly AB1 to Poly B2 as expected, the most hindered polymer, Poly B3, had the fastest release rate. In fact, (Poly B3/DS)₂₀ films were found to be unstable; more than 80% of the total amount of dextran sulfate was released in \leq 8 hours.

To determine if (Poly B3/DS)₂₀ films were undergoing bulk erosion due to destabilization or normal surface erosion, film degradation and surface roughness were monitored. Both (Poly AB1/DS)₂₀ and (Poly B2/DS)₂₀ had fairly linear degradation profiles and steady roughness profiles, which are characteristic of surface erosion. However, almost 50% of the (Poly B3/ DS)₂₀ film eroded within the first 4 hours. The remaining film persisted for more than 250 hours indicating that surface erosion was not occurring, since normal surface erosion (top down chemical degradation) would have yielded degradation kinetics similar to those observed in the first four hours. The reduced film stability of Poly B3 may be attributed to its steric bulkiness, which might interfere with the ability to form ionic crosslinks. Since ionic crosslinks are noncovalent in nature, they are subject to exchange with free ions in the solution. Traditionally, polyelectrolyte multilayer films are stabilized by the myriad ionic cross-links that form on each polymer chain; however, in hydrolytically degradable LBL films, which erode via chemical degradation of the polycation, the number of ionic cross-links per chain is constantly being reduced by chain breakdown from ester hydrolysis. If sterics hinder the allowed conformational space of the polymer enough to greatly reduce the number of ionic cross-links formed per repeat unit and the number is further reduced by chain cleavage, the

film stability might be compromised. Thus, it appears that the use of steric hindrance to control release rate is limited by the ability of the polymer to form sufficient ionic cross-links to maintain film stability.

Interestingly, in both (Poly A4/DS)₂₀ and (Poly B3/DS)₂₀ films, a thin slowly degrading film remained after total dextran sulfate release. Based on film degradation profiles, it can be hypothesized that some type of structural rearrangement, such as phase separation, is occurring in these films. The presence of a white precipitant remaining on the substrate after complete release is also suggestive of a phase segregation process in which the dextran sulfate escapes from the film. This analysis suggests that films were immediately destabilized, leading to reorganization of polymer within the film as water-soluble dextran sulfate was released into the bath; presumably, following this rearrangement and major film disruption, the poly(α -amino ester), which is not soluble in pH 7.4 water even at low to moderate molecular weights, remains to a large extent immobilized to the substrate surface as a residue. If phase separation occurred in this setting, charge shielding of the poly(α -amino ester) by ions in solution would allow a dense film to remain on the substrate. The hydrophobic nature of Poly A4 and Poly B3 would result in a very slowly degrading film consisting primarily of the poly(α -amino ester).

To assess the possibility of a phase separation mechanism, AFM measurements of (Poly AB1/ DS)₂₀, as a control, and (Poly A4/DS)₂₀ during degradation in PBS at 25°C were taken over a time course relevant for Poly A4 degradation and can be seen in Figure 5. At time zero, (Poly A4/DS)₂₀ films were fairly uniform with slight surface roughness, 8% of the total film thickness; however at six hours, holes on the order of 71 nm - 57% of the total film thickness - formed (S3). At twelve hours, channels appeared and the film became highly irregular. Then at 24 hours, well after DS release is complete, a relatively smooth film with few holes remained. This same morphology persisted for 48 hours (S4). In contrast, (Poly AB1/DS)₂₀ films start out fairly smooth, 3% of total film thickness, are swollen at six hours, and flatten out as the film continues to degrade. The findings for (Poly A4/DS)₂₀ correlate with a phase segregation mechanism of film destabilization, and are consistent with the analysis of roughness over time. The root mean square roughness of (Poly A4/DS)₂₀ and (Poly B3/DS)₂₀ films were monitored over the time of complete drug release (S2). Additional details of the erosion AFM study are provided in Supplemental Information. (Poly AB1/DS)₂₀ was used as an example of surface erosion more typically observed in these films. Significant changes in roughness were observed for both (Poly A4/DS)₂₀ and (Poly B3/DS)₂₀, two of the systems which undergo rapid destabilization. After just four hours of immersion in PBS buffer, (Poly A4/DS)₂₀ films had a roughness of greater than 30% of the total film thickness and (Poly B3/DS)₂₀ films reach a roughness of almost 50% of total film thickness in 12 hours. The gross changes in film morphology probably account for the short drug release times for (Poly A4/DS)₂₀ and (Poly B3/DS)₂₀ films, as the soluble DS is released via bulk diffusion from the destabilized films.

Determination of Boundaries

Investigation of alkyl chain length and steric bulkiness suggest that charge density and hindrance to the formation of ionic crosslinks may serve as limiting phenomena in the structural control of release dynamics. The similar morphological changes observed for both (Poly A4/DS)₂₀ and (Poly B3/DS)₂₀ suggest a common mechanism for destabilization. In both polymer series, the general hydrophobicity of the polymer is increased. Therefore, it can be hypothesized that film destabilization is caused by a hydrophobicity limit, beyond which film deconstruction and phase segregration occurs. Though the limits of charge density and degree of ionic crosslinks have been documented in LbL film adsorption, hydrophobic film disruption has yet to be shown⁴¹. To assess the validity of the hydrophobic effect on multilayers, octanol:water coefficients were calculated for Poly A4 and B3. Octanol: water coefficients are partition coefficients for solutes in octanol versus water, and are often expressed with the logarithmic

scale as LogP. The LogP is a distinct physiochemical property of a molecule and used as the standard scale for lipophilicity. In fact LogP calculations are widely used to determine pharmacological endpoints, bioconcentration, soil sorption coefficients, and biodegradation rate. While simple experimental methods to determine LogP exist and can be readily applied to many chemicals, they can be difficult or even impossible to perform for certain molecules and macromolecules⁴², and theoretical calculations can also present challenges³⁶. For this reason, computational models, which serve as reliable predictive models, are heavily used. In this study, eight widely acclaimed and readily available models of octanol:water coefficients were utilized, to avoid biases that could arise from use of a single method. Using these models, the hydrophobicity of Poly A4 and B3 were found to be similar, indicating that hydrophobicity alone could account for the observed film instability.

To clarify the mechanism of destabilization, and ascertain whether the effect is due to loss in charge density or increase in chain hydrophobicity, polymers C1 and C2 were examined. Poly C1, a fluorinated version of Poly A3 with a LogP similar to Poly A4 and B3, was used to determine if hydrophobicity alone could destabilize the multilayer films. Since (Poly A3/ DS)₂₀ was found to be stable, and the charge density of A3 and C1 are essentially the same, the destabilization of (Poly C1/DS)₂₀ films indicate a mechanism based on hydrophobicity. The release kinetics of multilayers containing Poly C1 can be seen in Figure 6. Films constructed of (Poly C1/DS)₂₀ were unstable and released more than 80% of the total amount of the dextran sulfate in less than 8 hours, suggesting that hydrophobicity does cause film instability. Still, the effect of sterics and charge density could not be ruled out, so to determine their role, Poly C2 was also investigated as a component in the multilayer films. Poly C2 has a LogP similar to Poly AB1, but its bulkiness and backbone charge density are similar to Poly A4 and B3 respectively. (Poly C2/DS)₂₀ films did not undergo destabilization, as shown in Figure 6. The relative contributions of charge density and alkyl chain length were clarified by investigating the mechanism clarification (C) series of polymers. Specifically, Poly C1 has the same charge density as Poly A3, which forms stable films. However, Poly C1 has a greater octanol:water coefficient and is thus more hydrophobic than Poly A3. Films composed of Poly C1 and dextran sulfate were unstable, indicating that hydrophobicity alone can destabilize films. To determine if charge density was responsible for the destabilization of Poly A4, films composed of Poly C2 were constructed. Poly C2 is more hydrophilic than Poly A4, but has a charge density. Poly C2 films were stable, proving that the charge density alone could not disrupt film stability.

Therefore structural manipulation can only be used to alter release in hydrolytically degradable LBL films to the extent that polymer hydrophobicity helps to induce film destabilization. Since LogP proved to be an important indicator for film instability, release duration versus LogP was plotted for all of the systems to examine the significance of LogP in the release predictions. The resulting graph in Figure 7 shows a strikingly clear trend between LogP and release with increasing LogP corresponding to increased release duration until film instability occurs at LogP \geq 3.8. As illustrated, increasing LogP resulted in a predictive increase in release duration until a certain threshold value. Beyond this point, hydrolysis of the poly(α -amino ester) no longer dominated the erosion process. At values higher than the threshold, the films become destabilized by the extent of polymer hydrophobicity. The presence of a trend for each computational method was determined. Though slight differences existed, all methods yielded the same general trend; therefore averaged values were used to provide a consensus for logP values and generate a master curve.

To ascertain if Poly A3 served as the true peak of release before destabilization and test the accuracy of the trend, Poly C3 was examined. Poly C3 is composed of a cyclohexanedimethyl diacrylate and has a LogP of 3.1. Films constructed of (Poly C3/DS)₂₀ were found to have a release duration lower than (Poly A3/DS)₂₀, but did not exhibit film destabilization.

Additionally, (Poly C3/DS) $_{20}$ films fell within the trend, suggesting that once a certain logP is reached some degree of hydrophobic destabilization occurs leading to reduced release duration. Ongoing research is focused on elucidating morphological changes in systems with LogP greater than 3.8. The correlations in Figure 7 suggest that logP can be used to predict the release duration of poly (α –amino ester)s in LbL films, irrespective of diacrylate monomer structure, and that these relationships can potentially be generalized to include a number of different counterpolyanions.

Conclusions

Traditional drug delivery coatings are limited by the elution of a single therapeutic, diffusion based release characteristics, and often harsh processing conditions. Polyelectrolyte multilayer films represent a versatile technology for the creation of simple, conformal drug delivery coatings that enable one to engineer release dynamics based on chemical composition as well as thin film heterostructure. Recent research has highlighted the ability of hydrolytically degradable films to deliver a broad range of therapeutics and attain complex release profiles through the selection of film architecture and utilization of top down degradation associated with surface erosion. Still, the formation of an effective delivery system hinges upon the ability to selectively control drug release profiles. Examination of film release dynamics, degradation, and stability as it relates to steric bulk, charge density and hydrophobicity is unprecedented in the literature. Towards establishment of a framework for degradable multilayer film design, the effect of chemical composition on drug delivery properties in hydrolytically degradable, polyelectrolyte multilayer films was investigated. To determine the effect of chemical structure, several poly(α -amino esters, varying only in the diacrylate monomer used in the polymerization, were used to ascertain the role of hydrophobicity, steric hindrance, and charge density on release dynamics. Small changes in hydrophobicity led to substantial increases in release duration until a critical hydrophobicity of the degradable polycation was reached, upon which major film destabilization and rapid release occurred.

A novel correlation between LogP and release duration was revealed. Indeed LogP was found to be a key indicator of release duration and film stability in these systems. Release duration was found to increase proportionally with LogP until a threshold value, at which films becomes rapidly destabilized, was reached. Destabilization was hypothesized to result from phase segregation of very hydrophobic degradable cation and the hydrophilic polyanion. Thus, release dynamics are not only dependent on hydrolytic susceptibility but a complex balance between hydrophobic composition, charge density, and stability of electrostatic ion pairs. Utilization of LogP as a predictive tool for release duration will allow for the selection of polymers based on biological, chemical, and mechanical properties with an understanding of the effect on drug release. The determination of a logP release duration correlation will allow the creation of polymers based on the specific demands of the application and implantation site. This correlation and in-depth exploration of the interactions that drive hydrophobic instability in these films may have far reaching implications in electrostatically assembled thin films in general.

Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank Dr. Kris Wood, Dr. Kris Stokes, Helen Chuang, and Mara MacDonald for general laboratory training and research advice. This work made use of the Shared Experimental Facilities supported in part by the MRSEC Program of the National Science Foundation under award number DMR 02–13282, the Robert Langer laboratory, and the Institute for Soldier Nanotechnology (ISN). Financial support for this work is gratefully

acknowledged from the Deshpande Center grant 009216–1 and the National Institutes of Health grant 1-R01-AG029601-01. R. C. Smith is thankful for a Bell Labs Graduate Research Fellowship.

References

1. Wu P, Grainger DW. Drug/device combinations for local drug therapies and infection prophylaxis. Biomaterials 2006;27(11):2450–2467. [PubMed: 16337266]

- Wood KC, Chuang HF, Batten RD, Lynn DM, Hammond PT. Controlling interlayer diffusion to achieve sustained, multiagent delivery from layer-by-layer thin films. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America 2006;103(27):10207–10212. [PubMed: 16801543]
- 3. Wood KC, Zacharia NS, Schmidt DJ, Wrightman SN, Andaya BJ, Hammond PT. Electroactive controlled release thin films. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America 2008;105(7):2280–2285. [PubMed: 18272499]
- 4. Gopferich A. Mechanisms of polymer degradation and erosion. Biomaterials 1996;17(2):103–114. [PubMed: 8624387]
- Decher G. Fuzzy nanoassemblies: Toward layered polymeric multicomposites. Science 1997;277 (5330):1232–1237.
- Voegel JC, Decher G, Schaaf P. Polyelectrolyte multilayer films in the biotechnology field. Actualite Chimique 2003;11–12:30–38.
- 7. Jessel NB, Schwinte P, Donohue R, Lavalle P, Boulmedais F, Darcy R, Szalontai B, Voegel JC, Ogier J. Pyridylamino-beta-cyclodextrin as a molecular chaperone for lipopolysaccharide embedded in a multilayered polyelectrolyte architecture. Advanced Functional Materials 2004;14(10):963–969.
- 8. Zhang JT, Chua LS, Lynn DM. Multilayered thin films that sustain the release of functional DNA under physiological conditions. Langmuir 2004;20(19):8015–8021. [PubMed: 15350066]
- 9. Hammond PT. Form and function in multilayer assembly: New applications at the nanoscale. Advanced Materials 2004;16(15):1271–1293.
- 10. Yu AM, Liang ZJ, Caruso F. Enzyme multilayer-modified porous membranes as biocatalysts. Chemistry of Materials 2005;17(1):171–175.
- 11. Jessel N, Oulad-Abdeighani M, Meyer F, Lavalle P, Haikel Y, Schaaf P, Voegel JC. Multiple and time-scheduled in situ DNA delivery mediated by beta-cyclodextrin embedded in a polyelectrolyte multilayer. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America 2006;103(23):8618–8621. [PubMed: 16735471]
- 12. Tang ZY, Wang Y, Podsiadlo P, Kotov NA. Biomedical applications of layer-by-layer assembly: From biomimetics to tissue engineering. Advanced Materials 2006;18(24):3203–3224.
- Loh KJ, Kim J, Lynch JP, Kam NWS, Kotov NA. Multifunctional layer-by-layer carbon nanotubepolyelectrolyte thin films for strain and corrosion sensing. Smart Materials & Structures 2007;16(2): 429–438.
- 14. Zhong Y, Whittington CF, Haynie DT. Stimulated release of small molecules from polyelectrolyte multilayer nanocoatings. Chemical Communications 2007;14:1415–1417. [PubMed: 17389977]
- 15. Kim BS, Park SW, Hammond PT. Hydrogen-bonding layer-by-layer assembled biodegradable polymeric micelles as drug delivery vehicles from surfaces. Acs Nano 2008;2(2):386–392. [PubMed: 19206641]
- 16. Lvov Y, Ariga K, Kunitake T. Layer-by-Layer Assembly of Alternate Protein Polyion Ultrathin Films. Chemistry Letters 1994;12:2323–2326.
- 17. Khopade AJ, Caruso F. Stepwise self-assembled poly(amidoamine) dendrimer and poly (styrenesulfonate) microcapsules as sustained delivery vehicles. Biomacromolecules 2002;3(6): 1154–1162. [PubMed: 12425651]
- Lvov Y, Ariga K, Ichinose I, Kunitake T. Assembly of Multicomponent Protein Films by Means of Electrostatic Layer-by-Layer Adsorption. Journal of the American Chemical Society 1995;117(22): 6117–6123.
- 19. Lynn DM. Layers of opportunity: nanostructured polymer assemblies for the delivery of macromolecular therapeutics. Soft Matter 2006;2:269–273.

20. Meyer F, Ball V, Schaaf P, Voegel JC, Ogier J. Polyplex-embedding in polyelectrolyte multilayers for gene delivery. Biochimica Et Biophysica Acta-Biomembranes 2006;1758(3):419–422.

- Borden MA, Caskey CF, Little E, Gillies RJ, Ferrara KW. DNA and polylysine adsorption and multilayer construction onto cationic lipid-coated microbubbles. Langmuir 2007;23(18):9401–9408.
 [PubMed: 17665937]
- 22. Dierich A, Le Guen E, Messaddeq N, Stoltz JF, Netter P, Schaaf P, Voegel JC, Benkirane-Jessel N. Bone formation mediated by synergy-acting growth factors embedded in a polyelectrolyte multilayer film. Advanced Materials 2007;19(5) 693-+
- 23. Dimitrova M, Arntz Y, Lavalle P, Meyer F, Wolf M, Schuster C, Haikel Y, Voegel JC, Ogier J. Adenoviral gene delivery from multilayered polyelectrolyte architectures. Advanced Functional Materials 2007;17(2):233–245.
- 24. Berg MC, Zhai L, Cohen RE, Rubner MF. Controlled drug release from porous polyelectrolyte multilayers. Biomacromolecules 2006;7(1):357–364. [PubMed: 16398536]
- Thierry B, Kujawa P, Tkaczyk C, Winnik FM, Bilodeau L, Tabrizian M. Delivery platform for hydrophobic drugs: Prodrug approach combined with self-assembled multilayers. Journal of the American Chemical Society 2005;127(6):1626–1627. [PubMed: 15700982]
- 26. Vazquez E, Dewitt DM, Hammond PT, Lynn DM. Construction of hydrolytically-degradable thin films via layer-by-layer deposition of degradable polyelectrolytes. Journal of the American Chemical Society 2002;124(47):13992–13993. [PubMed: 12440887]
- Anderson DG, Tweedie CA, Hossain N, Navarro SM, Brey DM, Van Vliet KJ, Langer R, Burdick JA. A combinatorial library of photocrosslinkable and degradable materials. Advanced Materials 2006;18(19) 2614-+
- Little SR, Lynn DM, Puram SV, Langer R. Formulation and characterization of poly (beta amino ester) microparticles for genetic vaccine delivery. Journal of Controlled Release 2005;107(3):449– 462. [PubMed: 16112767]
- Lynn DM, Langer R. Degradable poly(beta-amino esters): Synthesis, characterization, and selfassembly with plasmid DNA. Journal of the American Chemical Society 2000;122(44):10761– 10768
- Zugates GT, Peng WD, Zumbuehl A, Jhunjhunwala S, Huang YH, Langer R, Sawicki JA, Anderson DG. Rapid optimization of gene delivery by parallel end-modification of poly(beta-amino ester)s. Molecular Therapy 2007;15(7):1306–1312. [PubMed: 17375071]
- 31. Anderson DG, Lynn DM, Langer R. Semi-Automated Synthesis and Screening of a Large Library of Degradable Cationic Polymers for Gene Delivery. Angew. Chem. Int. Ed 2003;42:3151–3158.
- 32. Wood KC, Boedicker JQ, Lynn DM, Hammon PT. Tunable drug release from hydrolytically degradable layer-by-layer thin films. Langmuir 2005;21(4):1603–1609. [PubMed: 15697314]
- 33. Zhang JT, Fredin NJ, Janz JF, Sun B, Lynn DM. Structure/property relationships in erodible multilayered films: Influence of polycation structure on erosion profiles and the release of anionic polyelectrolytes. Langmuir 2006;22(1):239–245. [PubMed: 16378427]
- 34. Zhang JT, Fredin NJ, Lynn DM. Erosion of multilayered films fabricated from degradable polyamines: Characterization and evidence in support of a mechanism that involves polymer hydrolysis. Journal of Polymer Science Part a-Polymer Chemistry 2006;44(17):5161–5173.
- 35. Zhang J, Lynn DM. Multilayered films fabricated from combinations of degradable polyamines: Tunable erosion and release of anionic polyelectrolytes. Macromolecules 2006;39(26):8928–8935. [PubMed: 19043614]
- 36. Klopman G, Zhu H. Recent methodologies for the estimation of N-octanol/water partition coefficients and their use in the prediction of membrane transport properties of drugs. Mini-Rev. Med. Chem. FIELD Full Journal Title:Mini-Reviews in Medicinal Chemistry 2005;5(2):127–133.
- 37. Tetko IV, Gasteiger J, Todeschini R, Mauri A, Livingstone D, Ertl P, Palyulin VA, Radchenko EV, Zefirov NS, Makarenko AS, Tanchuk VY, Prokopenko VV. Virtual computational chemistry laboratory design and description. J. Comput.-Aided Mol. Des 2005;19(6):453–463. [PubMed: 16231203]
- 38. Livingstone David J. Theoretical property predictions. Curr Top Med Chem FIELD Full Journal Title:Current topics in medicinal chemistry 2003;3(10):1171–1192.

39. VCCLAB. Virtual Computational Chemistry Laboratory. VCCLAB, Virtual Computational Chemistry Laboratory. 2005. http://www.vcclab.orghttp://www.vcclab.org

- 40. Zhong ZY, Song Y, Engbersen JFJ, Lok MC, Hennink WE, Feijen J. A versatile family of degradable non-viral gene carriers based on hyperbranched poly(ester amine)s. Journal of Controlled Release 2005;109(1–3):317–329. [PubMed: 16081184]
- 41. Schoeler B, Kumaraswamy G, Caruso F. Investigation of the influence of polyelectrolyte charge density on the growth of multilayer thin films prepared by the layer-by-layer technique. Macromolecules 2002;35(3):889–897.
- 42. Taskinen J, Yliruusi J. Prediction of physicochemical properties based on neural network modelling. Adv. Drug Delivery Rev 2003;55(9):1163–1183.

Figure 1.

Reaction scheme for the synthesis of the poly (β -amino ester)s and the diacrylate monomers used. Dashed lines indicate hydrolyzable bonds. Letters are used to designate the categories of monomers investigated. All monomers with A were used in the examination of alkyl chain length, B stands for steric bulk, and C for mechanism clarification. In categories A and B, increasing number corresponds to greater alkyl chain length or bulk, respectively. Polymer number average molecular weights (Mn) determined via GPC and are included in the table.




Figure 2. Effect of Poly A2 molecular weight on the release of 14 C-dextran sulfate from (Poly A2/Dextran Sulfate)₂₀ films. PolyA2 with M_n s of 6,100 and 16,000 were examined. Release studies were performed at 25°C in PBS buffer.




Figure 3. Effect of alkyl chain length on 14 C-dextran sulfate release and film degradation. Release and degradation studies were performed on (Poly X/Dextran Sulfate) $_{20}$ films at 25°C in PBS buffer. A) Normalized release of 14 C-dextran sulfate versus time. Release was normalized by the total amount of dextran sulfate released for each system. B) Normalized film height of (Poly X/Dextran Sulfate) $_{20}$ over time. Films were normalized by the film height a time zero.




Figure 4.Effect of steric bulk on ¹⁴C-dextran sulfate release and film degradation. Release and degradation studies were performed on (Poly X/Dextran Sulfate)₂₀ films at 25°C in PBS buffer. A) Normalized release of ¹⁴C-dextran sulfate versus time. Release was normalized by the total amount of dextran sulfate released for each system. B) Normalized film height of (Poly X/Dextran Sulfate)₂₀ over time. Films were normalized by the film height a time zero.




Figure 5. Atomic force microscopy images of (Poly A4/Dextran Sulfate) $_{20}$ (top) and (Poly A/B1 / Dextran Sulfate) $_{20}$ (bottom) films after 0, 6, 12, and 24 hours in PBS buffer at 25°C.




Figure 6. Release of 14 C-dextran sulfate release versus time. Release studies were performed on (Poly X/ Dextran Sulfate)₂₀ films at 25°C in PBS buffer and release was normalized by the total amount of dextran sulfate released for each system.




Figure 7.Correlation between LogP, release duration, and proposed dissolution mechanism in (Poly X/Dextran Sulfate)₂₀ films. Data labels indicate the corresponding polymer for each observed release time.