

NANOPARTICLE SURFACE ACTIVITY: UNDERSTANDING, MEASURING, AND INTEGRATING IT INTO DOSIMETRY

Dhimiter Bello, Sc.D., M.Sc.
Assoc. Professor, Exposure Biology

Work Environment Department
College of Health Sciences
UMass Lowell

Visiting Scientist, Harvard School of Public Health
Molecular & Integrative Physiological Sciences
Department of Environmental Health



The CHALLENGE

THE VIAL



THE FILTER



Outline

- ◆ Surface in Inhalation Dosimetry
 - Surface Area & Activity
 - Bench top Technologies and Options
- ◆ Surface in ENM Exposure Assessment
 - Gaps & Needs
- ◆ Near Real-time monitoring of SAR and SAc


Dose Metrics: A Historical Perspective

MASS
($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$)

RESPIRABLE
FIBERS
(f/m^3)


Viable & Total
Microorganisms
($\#/ \text{m}^3$)

Departing from Mass (OR NOT?)



Maynard & Kuempel 2005


SURFACE AREA METRIC



Maynard & Kuempel 2005

Surface Area as a Dose Metric

$$\text{DOSE} = f(\text{SURFACE AREA, SURFACE ACTIVITY})$$













Physicochemical & Morphological Properties Influencing Toxicity

- Size Distribution
- *Surface Area*
- *Surface Chemistry*
- Surface Charge
- Bulk Chemical Composition
- *Metals & Impurities*
- Morphology
- *Crystallinity*
- Biopersistence
- Metal Leaching....

28 Properties in all (ICON 2007)

- Surfaces are NOT equal!
- Multiple parameters related to surface properties (SP)!
- How to measure these surface properties?
- How do these measures relate to biology/toxicology?

Next generation ENM: Safer-by design



- (1) Sotiriou et al., *Curr Opin Chem Eng* **2011**, 1, 3 – 10
- (2) Xia et al., *ACS Nano* **2011**, 5, 1223 – 1235
- (3) Napierska et al., *Particle and Fibre Toxicology* **2010**, 7,39
- (4) eleki et al., *Chem. Mater.* **2009**, 21, 2094–2100
- (5) Sotiriou et al., *Adv. Funct. Mater.* **2010**, 20, 4250–4257

Impurities & Bioactivity

Doping of SiO_2 NPs with MeOx NP or Me^{n+}




FIGURE 2. ROS concentrations in human lung epithelial cells after

Limbah et al ES&T 2007 41

CB + Fe_2O_3 :
Synergistic ROS generation





Figure 1
Illustration of events following concurrent endocytosis of both carbon black nanoparticles and Fe_2O_3 nanoparticles.

Guo et al PFT 2009

Oxidative stress – An important mechanism of NP toxicity



Nel et al. Science 311, 622 (2006)

Oxidative stress (OS) has been recognized in vivo and in vitro systems as one such major pathway and is being explored for ENM toxicity screening purposes (Nel *et al.* 2006; Xia *et al.* 2006; Borm *et al.* 2007; Ayres *et al.* 2008; Rogers *et al.* 2008; Bello *et al.* 2009; Lu *et al.* 2009; Meng *et al.* 2009).

Examples illustrate the importance of material composition, electronic structure, bonded surface species (e.g., metal-containing), surface coatings (active or passive), and solubility, including the contribution of surface species and coatings and interactions with other environmental factors

System		Markers (of Oxidative Stress)
<i>In vitro</i>	Cell free System	Measure ROS generation DTT assay DCFH-DA assay EPR/ESR
	Cellular System	Cell viability/Mitochondrial dysfunction ROS – DCFH-DA assay Activation of pro-inflammatory pathway Inflammatory factors, cytokine production Redox enzyme expression (HO-1, SOD) DNA damage/cell mutagenesis/proliferation Luciferase Reporter, Cyt C
<i>In vivo</i>	Inhalation	Similar to Cellular system
	Oral Administr.	GSH depletion
	Skin irritation	Hematological, biochemical
	Aquatic animals	and pathologic change

ROS - *Reactive oxygen species* ; DTT-*Dithiothreitol*; DCFH-DA-*Dichlorofluorescein diacetate*; HO-1; *Heme oxygenase-1*; SOD-*superoxide dismutase*; GSH-*Glutathione*; EPR-*Electron paramagnetic resonance*; ESR-*Electron spin resonance*

Approaches

Acellular

◆ ESR/EPR

- Spin trapping with select agents (e.g. DMPO)

◆ DTT

- Colorimetric

◆ DCFH

- Fluorescence (RO₂, RO, OH, HOCl and ONOO but not O₂⁻, and H₂O₂)

◆ FRAS

- Human Serum - Colorimetric







Fig. 1. Mechanism of DCF Assay

ANALYTICAL APPROACH TO DETERMINE THE DEGREE OF OXIDATIVE STRESS EXERTED BY NANOPARTICLES IN HUMAN BLOOD SERUM BY FERRIC REDUCTION ACTIVITY OF SERUM (FRAS ASSAY)



Oxidatively Damaging Nanoparticles
 +
 Human Blood Serum
 (containing endogenous antioxidants
 e.g. VIT.E, VIT.C)




[Fe(III)(TPTZ)₂]³⁺

TPTZ-2,4,6-Tripyridyl-1,3,5zine

RED

+ ROOH
 3
 radical



[Fe(II)(TPTZ)₂]²⁺, λ_{max} = 593 nm

BLUE

Efficacy of Simple Short-Term *in Vitro* Assays for Predicting the Potential of Metal Oxide Nanoparticles to Cause Pulmonary Inflammation

Senlin Lu,^{1,2} Rodger Duffin,¹ Craig Poland,¹ Paul Daly,¹ Fiona Murphy,¹ Ellen Drost,¹ William MacNee,¹ Vicki Stone,³ and Ken Donaldson¹

¹University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, UK; ²School of Environmental and Chemical Engineering, Shanghai University, Shanghai, China;

³Napier University, Edinburgh, UK




Figure 7. DCFH fluorescence plotted against inflammatory response as measured by PMN number for 100 nm Al₂O₃ nanoparticles at 100 μg/cm²/mL surface area dose.





Figure 6. Relationship between free radical activity (EPR signal intensity) and inflammatory response *in vivo*.

Oxidative Stress vs. Inflammation



Rushton et al 2010

PMN # / cm²

DCFH




ESR




AMcell -ESR
 $R^2=0.95$

Luciferase Activity



$R^2=0.88$

FRAS vs ESR



Bello D, unpublished data





FIGURE 1. Effect 0.01U of HRP on DCFH oxidation of blanks (no nanomaterials involved) under different conditions (sequence of events and dispersion conditions). The label on the X-axis reflects actual sequence of events. HRP is undoubtedly involved in DCFH oxidation and the magnitude of the effect spans approximately an order of magnitude compared to blanks without HRP, depending on the experimental conditions. Pal et al 2011 Dose-Response

(A)



(C)




ENMs

- F_purified
- F_Refined
- F_Soot
- MWCNT_I
- MWCNT_L
- MWCNT_M1
- MWCNT_M
- MWCNT_M
- MWCNT_M
- MWCNT_M
- MWCNT_M
- MWCNT_M
- MWCNT_M
- MWCNT_S
- N110
- N550
- N990
- nAg
- nAl2O3
- Silica
- SWCNHs-ox
- SWCNT_L
- SWCNT_S
- TiO2_mA
- TiO2_mR
- TiO2_nA
- TiO2_nR

ENMs

- MWCNT_L
- MWCNT_M2
- MWCNT_M6
- MWCNT_M7
- MWCNT_M8
- MWCNT_M9
- MWCNT_S
- SWCNHs-ox
- SWCNT_L
- SWCNT_S



sBOD (μmol TEU Eq./m²)

umiller_ben@umil.edu

Comparison of FRAS & DCFH for the 28 ENM

N=28

		FRAS	
		Positive (21/28)	Negative (7/28)
DCFH	Positive (10/28)	10	0
	Negative (18/28)	11	7

Pal et al 2013 J Nano Research

Table 5 Comparison of intracellular oxidative stress elicited by ENMs (GSH assay) with acellular oxidative stress (via DCFH and FRAS)

Nanomaterials Evaluated	Acellular assay responses		Cellular response
	DCFH	FRAS	
CB N-550	-	+	+
SWCNT_S	++	++	++
MWCNT_M1	-	+	+
MWCNT_I	-	+	++
SWCNHs-ox	+	++	+++
TiO ₂ _nA	-	+	++
Silica	-	-	-

(-) Indicates a response below the blank value (a negative response)

(+) Indicates a slightly positive ENM response relative to the overall response scale (between 10 and 50 percentile)

(++) Indicates a moderately positive ENM response relative to the overall response scale (between 50 and 75 percentile)

(+++)
(+++)
(+++)

Indicates highly positive ENM response relative to the overall response scale (between 75 and 95 percentile)

Acellular vs. Intracellular GSH/GSSG

Pal et al 2014
J Nano Research

Table 2: Relationship between FRAS and DCFH responses and transition metal content in tested ENMs examined via Spearman Correlation Coefficients (r values) and Partial Correlation (SSA controlled).


ENMs Set	Assay	Transition metal						
		Fe	Cr	Co	Mo	Mn	Zn	Ni
28 ENMs (Spearman)	FRAS	0.57**	0.67**	0.67*	0.59**	0.53**	-----	0.51**
	DCFH	0.50*	0.67**	0.67**	0.57**	0.63**	-----	0.54**
28 ENMs (Partial)	FRAS	-----	0.48*	0.67**	-----	-----	-----	-----
	DCFH	-----	-----	0.36*	-----	-----	-----	-----

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level; **Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level

Pal et al J Nano Research 2013


Oxidative Stress vs. Inflammation

FRAS vs. Inflammation




Bello Unpublished data; PMN data: Alison Elder, U. Rochester

Physicochemical Properties & FRAS Oxidative Stress



$$\text{BOD (TEUs)} = 0.75 * \text{SSA (m}^2\text{g}^{-1}) + 0.418 * T_{\text{Me}} \text{ (ppm)}; R^2=0.93$$


Bello, Hsieh et al 2010 Nanotoxicology



BOD ~ with SSA and the total content of Redox-active metals

Hsieh, Bello et al 2013


Distribution of FRAS BOD Values of 145 Tested ENMs



1. BOD is expressed as Trolox equivalent units. (TEUs , $\mu\text{mol L}^{-1}$).
2. Total antioxidant capacity of normal blood serum is $535 \pm 15 \mu\text{mol L}^{-1}$ TEUs.
3. 1000 TEUs BOD, near complete depletion of the antioxidants pool (5mg/mL).
4. 15 TEUs = The non-significant BOD
5. 25% of ENM <15 TEUs

Hsieh et al 2013 Small


Between-Class Variations in BOD



Hsieh, Bello et al, Small 2013


Within-Class Variation in BOD, CNTs

Hsieh, Bello et al Small 2013




Metal Oxides

TiO₂



Hsieh, Bello et al Small 2013


Effect of CNT OD size on BOD



Surface Activity of narrow CNTs is much higher than for larger CNTs

Hsieh, Bello et al 2011 Nanotoxicology

Surface Activity vs. ENM Class




Outline

- ◆ Surface in Inhalation Dosimetry
 - Surface Area & Activity
 - Bench top Technologies and Options
- ◆ **Surface in ENM Exposure Assessment**
 - Gaps & Needs
- ◆ Near Real-time monitoring of SAR and SAC

Table 3 Range of arithmetic means of particle number concentration (#/cm³) of particles <100 nm and surface area concentration (μm²/cm³) during nano- and non-nano-activities for the various subcategories

Activity	Range of arithmetic means during activity	
	Number conc. by SMPS (particles/cm ³)	Surface area concentration by LQ1-DC (μm ² /cm ³)
Production—commercial scale		
Nano-activity (=A)	1,661–39,087 (n = 12)	25–74 (n = 8)
No activity (=B)	1,339–23,566 (n = 8)	21–69 (n = 8)
Production—non-commercial scale		
Nano-activity (=A)	3,887–21,441 (n = 7)	43–129 (n = 6)
No activity (=B)	2,040–12,919 (n = 7)	35–93 (n = 3)
Down-stream use—commercial scale		
Nano-activity (=A)	6,272–7,8376 (n = 9)	17–88 (n = 11)
No activity (=B)	6,242–32,515 (n = 7)	18–51 (n = 10)
Down-stream use—non-commercial scale		
Nano-activity (=A)	234–380,494 (n = 57)	36–173 (n = 13)
No activity (=B)	199–34,507 (n = 55)	27–147 (n = 10)


Exposures to ENM by Task



Brouwer et al J Nanoparticle Res 2013, 15, 2090

Surface Area vs. Number Concentration

NSAM



- <100 nm & ALVEOLAR
- >100 nm & TB
- 200-1000 nm & ACTIVE SA (LQ1-DC)


SMPS

Brouwer et al Journal of Nanoparticle Research, 2013 15(11);



DOI:10.1007/s11051-013-2090-7

dhimiter_bello@uml.edu


ENM Exposures



Nanoparticle Emissions from Commercial Photocopiers







Day n1




Day n3

Morphology & Chemistry



Ultrafine (PM <0.1 μm), 5.21 ug/m³
 Elements, 0.47 ug/m³



Important Real-World Lessons

- ◆ NP Exposures are often to MIXTURES
- ◆ PCM Properties along the life cycle of NEPs may be DIFFERENT from input ENMs
 - Toxicological properties – likely DIFFERENT (by how much & what direction?)
- ◆ Multi-metric approach – necessary
 - Sufficient ?
 - Interpretation ?
- ◆ Exposure- dose equivalency for in vitro or in vivo work...
 - mass, number, surface area, elemental composition, ?,

Outline

- ◆ Current Metrology & Exposure Monitoring for ENM
- ◆ Surface Area
- ◆ Surface Activity – what does it tell us?
 - Benchtop Technologies and Options
 - Validity of the Concept
- ◆ Near Real-time monitoring of SAr and SAc

Nanodevices (FP7 project)

<http://www.nano-device.eu/index.php?id=328>

No.	Name of Device	WP	Measured physical metric	Type of nanoparticles	Particle size range	Ability to separate ENP from background
1	Low-cost total active surface area monitor	6	Total active surface area	Any	10 nm - 3 µm	No
2	NanoGuard	7	Number concentration, size distribution, morphology finger print	Any	<20 nm - 450 nm	to be determined
3	Real-Time CNT Monitor	8	Number concentration	CNTs	all CNT sources	Yes
4	Personal Nano-sampler	8	Mass concentration and size distribution of target ENP	Any	2 nm - 5 µm	No, only by further offline chemical analysis
5	Sampler/Preseparator for aerosol fraction deposited in the anterior nasal region	8	depending on the metrics of the used monitor	Compact isometric particles and agglomerates	5 nm - 400 nm	No, only by further offline chemical analysis
6	Sampler/Preseparator for aerosol fraction deposited in the gas exchange region	8	depending on the metrics of the used monitor	Compact isometric particles and agglomerates	20 nm - 5 µm	No, only by further offline chemical analysis
7	NanoDevice	9	Particle number and size	Any (no corrosive particles)	10 nm - 27 µm	Yes
8	MEMS-based airborne nanoparticle sensor	10	Mass concentration & chemical composition	Any, but no CNTs	5 nm - 300 nm	Yes
9	Catalytic Activity Aerosol Monitor (CAAM)	11	Catalytic activity concentration	Any with catalytic activity	No limitation in principle	Yes
10	CNT-detect	12	mass concentration	CNTs	all CNT sources	Yes

(Click for more information)

1. [Low-cost total active surface area monitor](#)
2. [NanoGuard](#)
3. [Real-Time CNT Monitor](#)
4. [Personal Nano-sampler](#)
5. [Sampler/Preseparator for aerosol fraction deposited in the anterior nasal region](#)
6. [Sampler/Preseparator for aerosol fraction deposited in the gas exchange region](#)
7. [NanoDevice](#)
8. [MEMS-based airborne nanoparticle sensor](#)
9. [Catalytic Activity Aerosol Monitor \(CAAM\)](#)
10. [CNT-detect](#)

Near-Real Time ROS Is Almost Here

Development and testing of an online method to measure ambient fine particulate Reactive Oxygen Species (ROS) based on the 2',7'-dichlorofluorescein (DCFH) assay

L. E. King and R. J. Weber






Fig. 4. Schematic of online $PM_{2.5}$ ROS measurement approach using a mist chamber particle collection system and fluorometric probe.








3 min cycle

Figure 6: Schematic of the PILS. A PM + steam mixture is cooled creating supersaturated conditions. Particles serve as condensation nuclei and grow into droplets large enough ($d_{ae} > 1 \mu\text{m}$) for collection at an impaction plate. DTT + F⁻ enters above the plate and a continuous liquid flow is pumped downstream for electrochemical measurement of DTT consumption.

Direct On-filter FLD detection



CONCLUSIONS

- ◆ Surface activity appears to integrate across multiple PCM parameters, including surface area
- ◆ Therefore, it is a critical parameter to capture, preferably in near-real time
- ◆ Additional parameter to SA
- ◆ The challenge- to develop the right technology

My Collaborators



Prof. P.
Demokritou, HSPH



Prof. E. Rogers
UMass Lowell



Prof. D. F. Schmidt
UMass Lowell



Prof. P. Gaines
UMass Lowell



Prof. J Mead,
UMass Lowell



Prof. B Wardle,
MIT



Prof. J Isaacs,
NEU



Dr. D.
Brouwer, TNO




Prof. Redlich, Yale

Questions?



Monitoring NP Exposures, Instrumentation



Personal Samplers

◆ Personal size selective impactors

- Naneum Aerosol PS 300
- Several miniaturized impactors

◆ Quazi Personal Real-Time Monitors

- Philips **NanoTracer** (10-300 nm, TNC, SD)
- DiSCmini (Matter-Aerosol Inc.)



BOD Correlates Well with TELI in *E-Coli*





Table 2. Correlation Coefficients between TELI-Based Toxicity Endpoints with Other Toxicity Endpoints^a


Correlation coefficient	TELI _{MAX}	Slope _{TELI}	TELI50	NOTEL _{TELI}
NOTEL (mg/L)	-0.51 (-0.4)	-0.04 (-0.4)	-0.20 (-0.2)	0.40 (0.2)
EC50 (mg/L)	-0.82 (-1.0)	0.39 (0.4)	-0.61 (-0.8)	0.78 (0.8)
BOD ($\mu\text{mol/L}$)	0.98 (1.0)	-0.63 (-0.4)	0.80 (0.8)	-0.95 (-0.8)



^aThe values shown are Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients, the values inside the parentheses are Spearman's rank-order correlation coefficients.

Guo & Gu et al 2011 EST

[dx.doi.org/10.1021/es200455p](https://doi.org/10.1021/es200455p) | *Environ. Sci. Technol.* 2011, 45, 5410–5417



Inhalation Toxicology

International Forum for Respiratory Research

Publication details, including instructions for authors and subscription information:
<http://www.informaworld.com/smpp/title~content=t713657711>


Evaluating the Toxicity of Airborne Particulate Matter and Nanoparticles by Measuring Oxidative Stress Potential - A Workshop Report and Consensus Statement

Jon G. Ayres^a; Paul Borm^b; Flemming R. Cassee^c; Vincent Castranova^d; Ken Donaldson^e; Andy Ghio^f; Roy M. Harrison^g; Robert Hider^h; Frank Kellyⁱ; Ingeborg M. Kooter^j; Francelyne Marano^k; Robert L. Maynard^l; Ian Mudway^m; Andre Nelⁿ; Constantinos Sioutas^o; Steve Smith^p; Armelle Baeza-Squiban^k; Art Choⁿ; Sean Duggan^q; John Froinesⁿ

^a Liberty Safe Work Research Centre, Foresterhill Road, Aberdeen, Scotland, United Kingdom

“Toxicity Screening tests for new nanomaterials products are urgently needed. Whilst recognizing that oxidative stress potential may not be predictive of all possible adverse outcomes, tests based upon oxidative potential maybe an invaluable tool for initial screening and classification of the relative biohazard of such materials.”

Biological Oxidative Stress




Key Metric : Biological Oxidative Stress

- Ascorbic acid
- Tocopherol
- Folate

- Catalase

What SAMPLE TYPE do we use to check for this Oxidative Stress????



Exposure and Biokinetics of Nanosized Particles

—> Confirmed routes
- - -> Potential routes


Exposure Media




Uptake Pathways



Translocation and Distribution



Secretory Pathways



THEREFORE SERUM IS THE RELEVANT SAMPLE TYPE

Translocation rates are largely unknown!