


Johannes Mathes

Protein Adsorption to Vial Surfaces

Quantification, Structural and Mechanistic Studies



Cuvillier Verlag Göttingen
Internationaler wissenschaftlicher Fachverlag

Dissertation zur Erlangung des Doktorgrades
der Fakultät für Chemie und Pharmazie
der Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München

Protein Adsorption to Vial Surfaces –
Quantification, Structural and Mechanistic Studies

Johannes Maximilian Mathes

aus
Oberviechtach

2010

Bibliografische Information der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet über <http://dnb.d-nb.de> abrufbar.

1. Aufl. - Göttingen : Cuvillier, 2010

Zugl.: München, Univ., Diss., 2010

978-3-86955-481-5


Erklärung

Diese Dissertation wurde im Sinne von § 13 Abs. 3 bzw. 4 der Promotionsordnung vom 29. Januar 1998 von Herrn Prof. Dr. Wolfgang Frieß betreut.

Ehrenwörtliche Versicherung

Diese Dissertation wurde selbständig, ohne unerlaubte Hilfe erarbeitet.

München, am 29. Juni 2010


Johannes Mathes

Dissertation eingereicht am 29. Juni 2010

1. Gutachter: Prof. Dr. Wolfgang Frieß

2. Gutachter: Prof. Dr. Gerhard Winter

Mündliche Prüfung am 27. Juli 2010

© CUVILLIER VERLAG, Göttingen 2010

Nonnenstieg 8, 37075 Göttingen

Telefon: 0551-54724-0

Telefax: 0551-54724-21

www.cuvillier.de

Alle Rechte vorbehalten. Ohne ausdrückliche Genehmigung des Verlages ist es nicht gestattet, das Buch oder Teile daraus auf fotomechanischem Weg (Fotokopie, Mikrokopie) zu vervielfältigen.

1. Auflage, 2010

Gedruckt auf säurefreiem Papier

978-3-86955-481-5

Acknowledgements

Foremost, I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my supervisor Prof. Dr. Wolfgang Frieß, who gave me the opportunity to work in the fascinating field of protein pharmaceuticals. I hold his valuable advice, his scientific guidance, and the inspiring discussions in high regard. Also, many thanks for the pleasant working atmosphere in the group.

I want to thank the leader of the chair, Prof. Dr. Gerhard Winter, for providing such excellent working conditions and his continuous efforts for the excellent technical equipment in the laboratories.

I am much obliged to the cooperating companies:

I am thankful for the generous material and scientific support which SCHOTT AG provided. I wish to thank the whole department FTV-1 in Mainz, with its head Dr. Uwe Rothhaar, for kindly welcoming and supporting me during this project. I am indebted to Volker Scheumann, who kindly performed the AFM and ToF-SIMS measurements. Also, I would like to thank Heike Koglin for ToF-SIMS measurements. Dr. Klaus Bange is acknowledged for his scientific contribution.

I am deeply indebted to Dr. Holger Roehl, also from SCHOTT AG. Thank you for all your support in the course of this thesis. Special thanks for your introduction to ToF-SIMS analytics and PCA. I have many fond memories of my days in Mainz; thank you for your friendship.

Merck Serono is gratefully acknowledged for the generous material support. I would like to thank Dr. Daniel Schwartz for his support within the project. Also, I am grateful to Dr. Mirelle Krier and Dr. Friedrich Rippmann for their introduction to molecular modeling.

From the IFOS institute in Kaiserslautern, I want to thank Dr. Michael Wahl for his high interest in the subject and for conducting the measurements in the ToF-SIMS project. Furthermore, I want to express my sincere thanks to Dr. Birgit Merz and Dr. Rolf Merz for conducting the XPS measurements.

From the Departments of Chemistry and Pharmacy of the LMU Munich, I would like to thank Dr. Sebastian Guenther for his introduction to XPS analysis, Tina Reuter for the gas sorption measurements, and Dr. Steffen Schmidt for taking the high quality SEM pictures.

I am very grateful to my lab partner Imke Leitner for the nice time in our lab and for the outstanding assistance whenever I needed help.

Thanks are also extended to the assisting students Julia Miller, Katrin Schaffenroth, Laura Liekmeier, Christiane Krettek, and Wolfgang Gulbins for the excellent job they did in their internships.

I want to thank all my former Munich colleagues for the outstanding working climate. Particularly, I want to mention Virginie, Miriam, Katja, Melanie, Frank, Lars, and Cornelius. Thanks for your support, for your friendship, and for the good times we spent together.

Outside the university, special thanks go to Carolin, Brian, and Susan.

My parents, my grandmother, my sister Carolin with André and Cecilia, and my parents-in-law, I want to thank for their encouragement and great support in all the years.

Finally, I want to sincerely thank my wife Sylvia and my daughter Elena. Heartfelt thanks for your encouragement over the past years, for your endless patience, and for your love!

For my parents,
for my wife Sylvia,
and for my daughter Elena

Table of Contents

Chapter 1

Introduction and Objectives of the Thesis

1	INTRODUCTION	2
1.1	Adsorption of Therapeutic Proteins on Solid Surfaces	2
1.2	Recombinant Proteins and their Formulation	3
1.3	Immunogenicity of Proteins.....	4
1.4	Glass – a Primary Packaging Material for Parenteral Dosage Forms	4
1.5	Surface Modifications of Glass Containers for Parenteral Pharmaceuticals.....	5
1.6	Protein Adsorption at the Solid Liquid Interface.....	6
1.7	Factors Influencing the Adsorption of Therapeutic Proteins on Solid Surfaces	9
1.8	Characterization of Protein Adsorption on Solid Surfaces.....	11
2	OBJECTIVES OF THE THESIS	13
3	REFERENCES.....	14

Chapter 2

Development of Sensitive Methods for the Quantification of Protein Adsorption to Pharmaceutical Containers

1	INTRODUCTION	22
2	MATERIALS AND METHODS.....	25
2.1	Materials	25
2.1.1	Protein Formulation	25
2.1.2	Glass Vials and Closure Systems.....	25
2.1.3	Chemicals / Excipients.....	25
2.1.4	Test Tubes	26
2.2	Methods	26
2.2.1	SE-HPLC	26
2.2.2	UV Spectroscopy	26

2.2.3	Fluorescence Spectroscopy	26
2.2.4	Micro BCA™ Protein Assay Kit	27
2.2.5	Calbiochem Non Interfering Protein Assay	27
2.2.6	Analysis of Total Organic Carbon	27
2.2.7	Surface Tension Measurements	28
3	RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	28
3.1	Development and Optimization of a Standardized Quantification Method	28
3.1.1	Determination of Fluorescence Properties of IgG1 and h-IgG	28
3.1.2	Validation of a New SE-HPLC Method for Sensitive IgG Quantification	30
3.1.3	Validation of a New Total Organic Carbon Analysis Method for Sensitive IgG Quantification	33
3.1.4	Sensitivity of the New Methods in Comparison with Commercial Standard Assays	36
3.2	Development of a Standardized IgG Adsorption Quantification Assay for Glass Containers	38
3.2.1	Desorption Buffer and Timeframe of Desorption Process	38
3.2.2	Rinsing Buffer and Number of Rinsing Steps	39
3.2.3	Timeframe of Adsorption Process.....	41
3.3	IgG1 Adsorption on Glass Vials – Comparison of SE-HPLC and TOC Method	43
4	CONCLUSIONS	44
5	REFERENCES.....	45

Chapter 3

Influence of Vial Surface Properties on IgG1 Adsorption

1	INTRODUCTION	50
2	MATERIALS AND METHODS	55
2.1	Materials	55
2.1.1	Protein Formulation	55
2.1.2	Glass Vials and Closure Systems.....	55
2.1.3	Chemicals / Excipients	56
2.2	Methods	56
2.2.1	Argon Corona Discharge Plasma Treatment of Glass Surfaces	56
2.2.2	Contact Angle Measurements	57
2.2.3	UV Spectroscopy	57
2.2.4	Adsorption Method.....	58
2.2.5	Size Exclusion High Performance Liquid Chromatography	58

2.2.6	Time of Flight Secondary Ion Mass Spectrometry.....	58
3	RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	59
3.1	Influence of Surface Free Energy on IgG1 Adsorption	59
3.2	Persistence of Plasma-Mediated Surface Hydrophilicity and Related IgG1 Adsorption Properties after Vial Storage.....	68
3.3	Tensiometric Investigation of Protein-Covered Glass Surface.....	69
3.4	Influence of pH on Glass Properties Affecting IgG1 Adsorption	71
3.4.1	Influence of pH on the Elemental Glass Composition.....	73
3.4.2	Influence of pH on the Glass Surface Free Energy.....	76
4	CONCLUSIONS	79
5	REFERENCES.....	80

Chapter 4

Influence of the Protein Formulation on IgG Adsorption to Vials

1	INTRODUCTION	84
2	MATERIALS AND METHODS.....	87
2.1	Materials	87
2.1.1	Protein Formulation	87
2.1.2	Glass Vials and Closure Systems.....	88
2.1.3	Glass Powder.....	88
2.1.4	Chemicals / Excipients	88
2.2	Methods.....	89
2.2.1	Calculation of Ionic Strength	89
2.2.2	Isoelectric Focusing.....	90
2.2.3	Electrophoretic Mobility Measurements by Dynamic Laser Light Scattering.....	90
2.2.4	Determination of the Hydrodynamic Diameter by Dynamic Laser Light Scattering.....	90
2.2.5	UV Spectroscopy	91
2.2.6	Adsorption Process	91
2.2.7	Size Exclusion High Performance Liquid Chromatography	91
3	RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	92
3.1	Influence of Charge on IgG Adsorption – Formulation Parameters pH and Ionic Strength.....	92
3.1.1	Charge Characterization of IgG and Glass Surface	92
3.1.2	Impact of the Formulation pH on IgG Adsorption.....	95

3.1.2.1	The Adsorbed Quantity as a Function of pH	95
3.1.2.2	Electrostatic Interactions within the Adsorption Interface	99
3.1.3	Impact of the Formulation Ionic Strength on IgG Adsorption.....	102
3.1.4	IgG1 Monomer Size as a Function of pH and Ionic Strength	106
3.1.5	Discussion of Other Driving Forces and Influencing Factors	107
3.2	Influence of Formulation Excipients Including “Hofmeister Considerations”	109
3.2.1	Influence of the Ionic Strength-Determining Salt Type.....	109
3.2.2	Influence of Sugars and Polyols	112
3.2.3	Influence of Surfactants	114
4	CONCLUSIONS	118
5	REFERENCES.....	120

Chapter 5

Modeling of IgG1 Adsorption to Vials – Isotherm Considerations and Affinity Aspects

1	INTRODUCTION	128
2	MATERIALS AND METHODS.....	131
2.1	Materials	131
2.1.1	Protein Formulation	131
2.1.2	Glass Vials and Closure Systems.....	131
2.1.3	Chemicals / Excipients	131
2.2	Methods	132
2.2.1	UV Spectroscopy	132
2.2.2	Adsorption Process for Isotherm Determination.....	132
2.2.3	Size Exclusion High Performance Liquid Chromatography	132
2.2.4	(Non-) Linear Curve Fitting.....	133
2.2.5	Quartz Crystal Microbalance Measurements	133
3	RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	134
3.1	Fitting of IgG1 Adsorption Isotherms Determined on Borosilicate Glass.....	134
3.2	QCM Kinetic Measurements of IgG1 Adsorption.....	138
3.3	Isotherms of IgG1 Adsorption on Different Container Surfaces	139
4	CONCLUSIONS	143
5	REFERENCES.....	144

Chapter 6

Advanced Investigations on Adsorbed IgG1 Molecules with XPS and ToF-SIMS

1	INTRODUCTION	148
2	MATERIALS AND METHODS	151
2.1	Materials	151
2.1.1	Protein Formulation	151
2.1.2	Chemicals / Excipients	151
2.1.3	Glass Preparation	151
2.2	Methods	152
2.2.1	X-Ray Photoelectron Spectroscopy	152
2.2.2	Time of Flight Secondary Ion Mass Spectrometry.....	152
2.2.3	Adsorption Process and Sample Preparation.....	152
2.2.4	Principal Component Analysis	153
3	RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	153
3.1	XPS Investigations of IgG1, Blank Glass Vials and IgG1 Adsorbates.....	153
3.2	ToF-SIMS Investigations of IgG1, Blank Glass, and IgG1 Adsorbates.....	161
4	CONCLUSIONS	172
5	REFERENCES.....	173

Chapter 7

Structural Stability Investigations and Atomic Force Microscopy Imaging of IgG1 Adsorbed on Borosilicate Glass

1	INTRODUCTION	178
2	MATERIALS AND METHODS	180
2.1	Materials	180
2.1.1	Protein Formulation and Including Excipients	180
2.1.2	Glass Powder.....	180
2.1.3	Glass Vials / Glass Vial Bottoms	181
2.2	Methods	181
2.2.1	Static Laser Light Scattering	181
2.2.2	Scanning Electron Microscopy (SEM)	181

2.2.3	Specific Surface Area Analysis	182
2.2.4	Adsorption Process	182
2.2.5	UV Spectroscopy	183
2.2.6	Size Exclusion High Performance Liquid Chromatography (SE-HPLC).....	183
2.2.7	Fluorescence Spectroscopy	184
2.2.8	Fourier Transform Infrared Spectroscopy (FT-IR)	185
2.2.9	Enzyme-Linked Immunosorbent Assay (ELISA)	185
2.2.10	Sodium Dodecyl Sulfate Polyacrylamide Gelelectrophoresis (SDS-PAGE)	186
2.2.11	Atomic Force Microscopy (AFM)	186
3	RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	187
3.1	Physical Characterization of Glass Particles.....	187
3.2	Adsorption Studies of IgG1 on Glass Particles – Differences between Vial and Particle Surface	190
3.3	IgG Stability and Structural Studies	192
3.3.1	Stability Studies on IgG1	192
3.3.1.1	SDS-PAGE	193
3.3.1.2	SE-HPLC	193
3.3.1.3	Intrinsic and Extrinsic Steady State Fluorescence	195
3.3.1.4	FT-IR	198
3.3.2	Structural Investigations of IgG1 Directly on the Surface of Glass Particles	201
3.3.2.1	Secondary Structure (FT-IR)	201
3.3.2.2	Tertiary Structure (Intrinsic and Extrinsic Steady State Fluorescence)	203
3.3.3	Structural Studies on Desorbed IgG1	204
3.3.3.1	SDS-PAGE of Surfactant-Desorbed IgG1	205
3.3.3.2	Aggregation / Fragmentation (SE-HPLC) of pH-Desorbed IgG1	206
3.3.3.3	Secondary Structure (FT-IR) of pH-Desorbed IgG1	207
3.3.3.4	Tertiary Structure (Intrinsic and Extrinsic Steady State Fluorescence) of pH-Desorbed IgG1	208
3.3.3.5	Biological Activity and Structural Integrity of pH-Desorbed h-IgG	210
3.4	Atomic Force Microscopy Investigations on Glass Vial Bottoms	212
4	CONCLUSIONS	221
5	REFERENCES.....	222

Chapter 8

Summary of the Thesis.....	229
----------------------------	-----

APPENDIX

List of Abbreviations	233
Curriculum Vitae.....	237

Chapter 1

Introduction and Objectives of the Thesis

Abstract

The adsorption of therapeutic proteins on a variety of surface types, e.g. from the production line and the storage containers through to administration equipment, has shown to cause severe problems which should not be underestimated. Among them is the loss of content but also the potential of severe protein structural changes, accompanied by the risk of therapy failure or immunological reactions. Protein pharmaceuticals play an important role in today's pharmacotherapy. Aside from common coatings or the use of plastic equipment, which is increasing in use, borosilicate glass is still the material of choice for the primary packaging of parenteral drugs. Against this background, a general summary on the phenomenon of protein adsorption on solid surface is given in the introductory chapter. Aside from external factors as, e.g. temperature, the adsorption of proteins generally depends on three main components which are the protein itself, the sorbent surface, and the surrounding liquid. The driving forces, whose interplay determines the overall adsorption process, are pointed out. Moreover, a short overview on adsorption quantification procedures and on approaches to identify the structural changes upon adsorption is provided.

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Adsorption of Therapeutic Proteins on Solid Surfaces

The understanding of adsorption of recombinant therapeutic proteins on various kinds of surfaces, e.g. in the course of up-stream and down-stream processing, fill and finish, storage, or administration is crucial in the pharmaceutical industry. In addition, it has been well known for a long time that proteins adsorb to glass and plastic, which can result in a reduced dose reaching the patient [1,2]. Table 1 gives some striking examples of protein loss to a selection of different surfaces. This summary underlines fatal consequences which potentially arise from adsorption, especially from solutions of low concentration. One of the most intensively investigated proteins of clinical relevance in this regard is insulin [2-5].

The main problem arises from the protein loss in solution. Without other optimizations, one approach to handle this problem is an appropriate increase of the starting concentration. Closely related to this is the inevitable financial effort for the surplus of the active ingredient. Moreover, the formulation can be adequately adapted with respect to the parameters pH and ionic strength or by the addition of suitable excipients. However, changes in the formulation are limited by the necessary conservation of protein stability on the one hand and an adequate biocompatibility on the other hand. Only in very rare cases will the protein itself be subject to changes with the intention to reduce its adsorption tendency. Another option is the selection of appropriate container material that has

Table 1: Selected examples for the adsorptive loss of therapeutic protein to different surfaces utilized during the production process, storage, or administration.

Protein	Surface	Concentration	Protein loss	Reference
Insulin	Glass bottle	30 U/l	52% after 5 min	[2]
Secretin	Siliconized glass container	40 CHR Units/ml	20%	[6]
Cetrorelix	Glass and plastic vials	0.2 - 0.4 µg/ml	30% after 2 h	[7]
Factor VIII	PVC mini bag	146 IU/ml	Approx. 60% after 48 h	[8]
Interleukin 2	Silicone rubber catheter tubing	50 - 100 µg/ml	Approx. 90% activity loss after 24 h	[9]
Salmon calcitonin and bovine serum albumin	Glass and polypropylene	25 - 150 µg/ml	30 - 75% after 12 h	[10]

low binding properties for the respective protein. However, a universal and at the same time stable coating countervailing protein adsorption has not been found to this day. Additional problems can arise from the adsorption of proteins on solid surface. One of the major difficulties is the structural instability of the proteins, and adsorption may result in unfolding and aggregation phenomena. Both are critical with regard to an increasing potential of causing immunogenicity problems (see below). It is particularly worrisome that these entities, once formed through contact with the interface, may get back into the bulk solution, a process which may possibly be facilitated by collision with dissolved molecules [11]. Thus, an extensive study of the different factors involved in the adsorption process is essential for selecting the right actions to avoid or at least to reduce the above-mentioned serious consequences.

1.2 Recombinant Proteins and their Formulation

Recombinant proteins play an important role in modern pharmacotherapy, and special requirements are needed for the formulation of these protein-based active ingredients. In the majority of cases, proteins are administered parenterally as an aqueous solution. Either the aqueous solution is the stored dosage form or a freeze-dried product is reconstituted prior to administration. In order to preserve the biological activity of the proteins, the formulation must ensure the integrity of the protein conformation while also retaining a wide range of functional groups from degradation. A multiplicity of excipients can be considered, of which buffers, sugars, polyols, amino acids, salts, and surfactants play the most important role. In terms of protein stability, the most critical factors are the pH value and the ionic strength [12]. The mechanism of stabilizing the protein structure by means of general protein stabilizers, such as sugars, is explained by the theory of preferential exclusion/interaction, discussed by Timasheff and coworkers [13-15], in which the protein molecule preferentially interacts with either water or the excipient molecules. Surfactants protect the protein from surface-mediated unfolding or aggregation. They also prevent the protein molecules from reaching the solution/air or the solution/packaging container interface [16]. Through this, concentration-dependent phenomena and the range of the critical micelle concentration (CMC) as a typical lower limit for the formulation concentration can be explained. Direct interactions between surfactant and protein molecules, especially with hydrophobic side chains, are an issue as well [17,18]. In the absence of unfolding, interactions between protein molecules are reduced. However, if the surfactant preferentially binds to the more hydrophobic unfolded state, the free energy of the denatured state would be lowered, and this state would be thermodynamically stabilized by the surfactant. Thus, the addition of surfactant can result in both stabilization and destabilization of a protein. Moreover, a chaperon-like effect of the surfactants, which promotes refolding of protein molecules, is discussed [19,20].

1.3 Immunogenicity of Proteins

The risk of immunogenicity reactions associated with therapeutic proteins should not be underestimated. By breaking the immune tolerance, therapy may fail, or an autogenic protein with an essential biological activity may be inactivated. A dramatic example in this regard is the sudden appearance of erythroblastopenia in erythropoietin-medicated patients, which occurred in temporal relation to a formulation change [21]. This crisis has encouraged scientific researchers, companies, and administration agencies (FDA, EMEA) to elucidate such relationships.

Sources affecting the immune response can be roughly categorized by either treatment or processing-related factors [22]. Treatment-related factors involve the immune tolerance of the patient as well as the dosing schedule, the route of administration, and treatment duration. Processing-related factors include intrinsic protein properties, such as sequence, three-dimensional structure, and glycosylation pattern but also the whole manufacturing process, container closure, as well as storage and handling [23,24]. The presence of aggregates, which are typically formed during processing and storage, has received particular attention [25]. Especially protein aggregates have shown to increase immunogenicity due to their size together with newly formed recognition patterns, analogous to virus-like arrays, which may be specifically recognized by the immune system [25].

1.4 Glass – a Primary Packaging Material for Parenteral Dosage Forms

From the beginning of the 20th century, primary packaging (vials, ampoules, carpules, and syringes) for liquid parenteral dosage forms or lyophilisates mainly consists of borosilicate glass because of its high chemical resistance, formability, and tightness. This circumstance has hardly changed with regard to contemporary protein pharmaceuticals. Hence, today's packaging materials were virtually developed several decades ago for low molecular weight active pharmaceutical ingredients. For some time, polymeric materials have been gaining ground in the primary packaging sector because of their high break resistance, their excellent drainability, and solvent resistance [26]. However, these advantages are accompanied by a considerable permeability for oxygen and humidity [27].

Overall, vials, ampoules, and syringes are, for the most part, made out of glass tubes. Due to the manufacturing process of both the glass tube and the primary packaging container, the surface of the glass exhibits a different composition than the bulk material [28]. The surface of the glass resembles a fire-polished material, featuring roughness in the sub-nanometer scale. An influence of surface roughness on protein adsorption, which should be taken into consideration when in the nanometer scale, is therefore assumed to be negligible [29]. However, defects from the manufacturing process as well as corrosion reac-

tions may lead to a significant roughening of the surface [30,31]. Furthermore, it has to be considered, that in the pharmaceutical field, glass containers are commonly cleaned, rinsed, and then subjected to a heat sterilizing or depyrogenizing step at 180 - 350°C directly before filling. This treatment can have a significant impact on the nature of the outermost glass surface due to the removal of contaminants or the alteration of the chemical glass composition. Although glass basically features high resistance, its surface chemically reacts with the liquid formulation. Thereby, the pH value is of particular importance. In an acidic medium, an exchange of H^+ or H_3O^+ with the mobile cations Na^+ or other network modifiers, such as K^+ , Mg^{2+} , or Ca^{2+} , occurs. As a consequence of the alkali or earth alkali release, the pH value in the solution increases. This can appreciably affect the stability of the respective biomolecule. On the other hand, hydroxyl ions of a basic solution are able to break up siloxane bonds, leading to a degradation of the glass matrix. Thereupon, $Si(OH)_4$ or larger moieties all the way up to glass particles, as well as all other glass components such as boron or aluminum, can get into the drug solution. Through the autoprotolysis of water, the contact of glass with a solution at pH 7 equals a combined mechanism comprising a simultaneous acidic and alkaline attack. For kinetic reasons, the acidic attack predominates in the beginning and leads to an increase in the OH^- concentration, whereupon an alkaline degradation can be triggered.

1.5 Surface Modifications of Glass Containers for Parenteral Pharmaceuticals

There are numerous ways to modify a glass surface, such as coatings or chemical modifications pursuing protective or different functional goals [32]. However, only a few are applied in the pharmaceutical industry. Among them, primarily the coating with silicon oil (siliconization) is of higher relevance [33]. This kind of hydrophobization is often applied to prefilled syringes as a lubricant for the rubber plunger in order to facilitate ease of movement within the barrel. Moreover, by adjusting the surface hydrophobicity, the drainability of the containers is improved and the glass surface stability with regard to the aforementioned corrosion effects is increased. However, siliconization, which is inevitably associated with increased hydrophobic interactions, may be associated with an increased protein adsorption on the container surface [34]. Furthermore, despite the application of a thermal baking process, silicon oil may partially detach from the surface and get into the solution [35]. It is discussed that the formed droplets induce protein aggregation [36]. A recently developed plasma polymerization step could improve the deposition of hydrophobic layers on glass [37]. Another surface modification is a quartz-like inner coating, which drastically reduces the amount of ions dissolved from the glass [38]. Several other surface coatings, among them coatings on the basis of polyethylene

glycol (PEG), are described in literature to reduce protein adsorption on a wide range of materials, e.g. glass, plastic, and metal [39,40]. PEG chains form an extremely polar and well-hydrated surface that is free of charges in aqueous media. Hence, van-der-Waals interactions and (possibly) electrostatic and hydrophobic interactions are minimized. Polysaccharides and phospholipids are discussed as alternatives [41].

1.6 Protein Adsorption at the Solid Liquid Interface

Proteins are intrinsically surface-active and tend to accumulate at interfaces. The individual steps involved in the adsorption process of a protein molecule at solid liquid interface, as well as its detachment, are schematically depicted in Figure 1. One can differentiate between:

- ① The transport of the protein molecule from the solution towards the surface by diffusion and convection, influenced by the electrostatic potential of the solid surface.
- ② The interaction of the protein with the surface. Protein attachment is driven by a decrease of the Gibbs energy in the system. Theoretically, the adsorption of a protein per se is a reversible step, whereas in practice, mostly irreversibility is observed. The reason behind this phenomenon is that proteins usually interact with the solid surface through a plethora of contact regions at the same time, depending on, for example,




Figure 1: Schematic representation of the mechanism of protein adsorption on a solid surface (adapted from Norde and Haynes [42]).

their amino acid composition, their size, and their overall physical and chemical properties. Thereby, already changes in the proteins' secondary or tertiary structure can emerge.

- ③ The optimization of the protein - surface binding. Over time, the number of interaction points is further increased with the possibility of simultaneous molecular restructuring. Especially on hydrophobic surfaces, alterations of the proteins' secondary and tertiary structure often arise, caused by hydrophobic interactions.
- ④ Desorption and the diffusion back into the solution. This is less probable for unfolded proteins than for native ones due to a high number of interaction points with the surface and a more stable binding after protein unfolding.

The driving forces which facilitate protein adsorption were discussed by many authors [43-45]. They are basically equivalent to the forces that also account for the formation and the persistence of the proteins' three-dimensional structure. Regardless of the mechanism and the kinetics of the adsorption step, protein adsorption can only take place if the Gibbs energy G of the system decreases, provided that the temperature and pressure are constant [43]. The relation is depicted in Equation 1.

$$\Delta_{ads} G = \Delta_{ads} H - T \cdot \Delta_{ads} S < 0 \quad (1)$$

Therein, H , S , T , and Δ_{ads} equal the enthalpy, the entropy, the absolute temperature, and the change in each thermodynamic function through the adsorption process, respectively. For a basic understanding of the adsorption process, it is important to know how different kinds of interactions affect $\Delta_{ads} G$ [45]. In the following, the most important interaction types are outlined briefly.

(a) Interaction between electrical double layers (electrostatic interactions)

Both the protein molecules and the sorbent surface are electrostatically charged. In an aqueous medium, they are surrounded by counter ions which neutralize surface charges and by which means an electrical double layer is formed. Electrostatic interactions basically follow the Coulomb law. For systems that consist of multiply charged biomolecules and solid substrates, the resulting total electrostatic energy is equivalent to the sum of every single Coulomb pair [44].

(b) Changes in the hydration state (hydrophobic interactions)

Nonpolar groups are generally forced back from the aqueous system since favorable interactions such as hydrogen bonding towards water molecules are largely or completely missing. The overall hydrophobic surface area of proteins with water contact

decreases through the adsorption of such groups to solid surfaces. Furthermore, the entropy in the system increases because the ordered orientation of water molecules in the proximity of the hydrophobic areas is also forced back. Thus, dehydration resembles a driving force for adsorption. The principle of hydrophobic interactions is also reflected in the three-dimensional structure of proteins. While hydrophilic patches are directed outwards, i.e. towards the aqueous phase, hydrophobic residues largely shield themselves in the interior of the protein from hydrophilic interactions. As a final result, the adsorption tendency dramatically increases with increasing hydrophobicity of the protein surface [46] or with an increasing share of the hydrophobic protein interior in interaction with the solid surface after a possible protein unfolding step.

(c) Dispersion interactions

Dispersive interactions, also known as London forces, are attractive forces. They are based on the permanent electron density fluctuation of an atom species which, in turn, polarizes the electron system of another species. Dispersive forces cannot be saturated but are rather additive in nature. These forces are the dominating ones among the three van-der-Waals force components: London forces, Keesom forces (interactions between permanent electric moments), and Debye forces (interactions between permanent and induced dipoles) [44].

The actual binding energies of the above interaction components vary significantly. According to Auterhoff, ion-ion interactions amount to 5 - 80 kJ/mol, depending on the permittivity of the surrounding medium, whereas dipole - dipole interactions and H-bonds add up to 1 - 30 kJ/mol. In comparison, dispersive interactions and hydrophobic interactions amount to approx. 2 kJ per mol methylene group [47]. According to Norde, the contribution from the hydrophobic amino acid dehydration inside the proteins is approx. 9.2 kJ/mol/nm² with regard to hydrophobic interactions [43].

It was described above that hydrophobic protein structures are largely located inside the proteins, although hydrophobic amino acids on the surface area of proteins are not exceptional. Nevertheless, hydrophilic areas are mainly located at the protein's interface to the aqueous medium. This stabilizes the ordered α -helical and β -sheet structures. When the protein comes in contact with a hydrophobic surface, the hydrophobic interactions inside the proteins lose their influence on the three-dimensional structure, and hydrophobic patches turn out from the interior of the protein towards the sorbent surface [43]. The promotion of protein unfolding and aggregation through hydrophobic surfaces was shown for insulin [48] and β -lactoglobulin [49]. Also the wetting behavior of the surface, which is strongly associated with its contact angle and its hydrophobicity, directly affects the adsorbed amount of protein and the extent of structural alterations [50]. But ordered protein structures may also get notably lost when new hydrogen bonds are built

towards a polar interface. As a result, the conformational entropy of the protein increases and, as a consequence, adsorption increases as well [51]. In this regard, Arai and Norde observed appreciable adsorption of the structurally less stable α -lactalbumin on a hydrophilic surface of the same electrical charge [52]. If both electrostatic attraction and hydrophobic interactions were missing, adsorption was mainly mediated through the entropy gain of adsorption-induced unfolding.

1.7 Factors Influencing the Adsorption of Therapeutic Proteins on Solid Surfaces

Protein adsorption is a highly complex process. With regard to therapeutic protein pharmaceuticals, the extent of adsorption, as well as the structural stability and the irreversibility, predominantly depend on three key components, which are the protein, the solid surface, and the formulation composition. Norde classified proteins into “hard proteins” and “soft proteins” according to their adsorption behavior [53]. The former adsorb on hydrophilic surfaces only under electrostatic attraction. On the contrary, soft proteins are structurally more labile and adsorb on hydrophilic surfaces, even in the case of electrostatic repulsive conditions under structural reorientation. Besides stability factors, basic chemical properties of the proteins are of particular importance (see Table 2). The factors on the part of the sorbent surface chemistry, which influence the adsorption process, were for the most part already mentioned above in connection with the adsorption driving

Table 2: A selection of important factors influencing the adsorption behavior of proteins on solid surfaces.

Protein	Sorbent surface	Formulation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Surface distribution of amino acids • Molecule size • 3D-structure in solution • (Net) charge and sign / location of protein IEP • Charge distribution on the protein surface • Protein stability 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chemical composition • Hydrophilicity / hydrophobicity • Interfacial energy • Charge (sign) • Charge density • Electron donor and acceptor potentials • Sterical influences (surface roughness) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • pH value • Buffer type • Ionic strength • Polarity / dielectric constant • Excipients (like sugars, polyols and surfactants)

forces. Among others, these are charge, interfacial energy, and chemical composition. But also sterical properties in terms of surface roughness have shown to exert influence on the amount of protein bound [54].

Various studies demonstrate that the composition of the protein formulation, especially the pH value of the aqueous solution, is of supreme importance for the adsorption behavior. Provided a constant ionic strength, several protein adsorption studies denoted in literature exhibit pH-dependent adsorption maxima in the area of the isoelectric point of the respective protein [55-57]. This is typically explained by the increased protein stability, hence, by less space required per molecule at this pH, and by decreased electrostatic repulsion among the protein molecules, resulting in a denser packing on the surface. According to the common adsorption theory, the incorporation of charges in the defined contact area of a protein and the surface is energetically very unfavorable [43], and consequently, maximum adsorption would be most likely reached if free charges of the protein and the surface exactly compensated each other. Therefore, an adsorption maximum at a pH different from the protein isoelectric point (IEP) is suggested. Another approach which could explain such an observation is provided by Xu *et al.*, who argued that adsorption at conditions with an oppositely charged protein and surface increases due to an increased adsorption irreversibility [58]. The ionic strength of the protein formulation affects the aforementioned electrostatic interactions. For example, a high salt content can screen pronounced intermolecular repulsion forces and hence lead to an increased adsorbed amount of protein [59]. Besides, adsorption can be diminished by 15 - 90% through the addition of a surfactant, such as polysorbate 20, depending on the type of surfactant, its concentration, as well as the surface properties [60,61]. Sugars and polyols, which are often added to protein solutions, were described to show less or no adsorption-reducing effect [62]. However, it is feasible to reduce the adsorption of the API-protein by the addition of another indifferent protein such as human serum albumin (HSA) due to a competitive adsorption effect, as concluded by Lassen and Malmsten for an IgG and fibrinogen [63].

Proteins represent a very heterogeneous group of biomolecules, and generalizations concerning their adsorption behavior are difficult. For example, proteins were described to adsorb in larger quantities on hydrophobic surfaces than on hydrophilic ones [46,64]. However, the opposite result was observed as well [46,65]. Furthermore, the protein net charge is not always determining, and proteins can bind strongly on surfaces wearing the same net charge as the protein [66,67]. Finally, the adsorption behavior of an unknown protein on the surface of interest cannot be reliably predicted.