Preliminary Evaluation of Median Lethal Concentrations of Stöber Silica Particles with Various Sizes and Surface Functionalities Towards Fibroblast Cells

Cecilia Galindo Gonzalez,^a Gisela Solange Alvarez,^b Daniela Edhit Camporotondi,^b Maria Lucia Foglia,^b Carole Aimé,^a Luis Eduardo Diaz,^b Thibaud Coradin,^a Martin Federico Desimone^b

^aSorbonne Universités, UPMC Univ Paris 06, CNRS, UMR 7574, Laboratoire de Chimie de la Matière Condensée de Paris, 75005 Paris, France ; e-mail: thibaud.coradin@upmc.fr

^bIQUIMEFA-CONICET. Facultad de Farmacia y Bioquímica, Universidad de Buenos Aires, Junín 956 Piso 3°, (1113), Ciudad Autónoma de Buenos Aires, Argentina ; e-mail: desimone@ffyb.uba.ar

Abstract: The application of silica particles in the biomedical field has experienced a great development in recent years, especially in the design of nanoparticles having homogeneous size, structure and amenable to specific grafting. In this way, it becomes possible to control the interaction of nanoparticles with cells in order to meet the requirements for desired applications. This work explores the cytotoxicity of silica particles of various sizes and surface functionality towards L929 fibroblast cells. In particular, the median lethal concentration of the different silica particles has been established. Preliminary investigations of silica nanoparticles prepared by the Stöber method with sizes ranging from 100 nm to 500 nm showed that the largest particles are less harmful for the cells. Moreover, cytotoxicity towards L929 fibroblasts was mainly observed for bare particles, whereas sulfonate-, amine- and thiol-grafted particles had less detrimental effects. This shows the key influence of particle surface curvature and chemistry on nanomaterials cytotoxicity.

Keywords Median lethal concentrations; Silica particles; Fibroblast cells; Cytotoxicity

1.Introduction

The potentialities of silica nanoparticles for biological applications have now been well-identified, including molecular and gene delivery [1,2], small animals and cell imaging [3], photodynamic therapy [4], biomaterials surface functionalization [5] and hydrogels reinforcement [6,7]. Currently, strategies for optimizing drug loading, stealthiness, cell targeting as well as controlled release properties are being developed at a fast rate [8-10]. In

parallel, *in vitro* evidences are being accumulated about silica particle interactions with living cells, including cytotoxicity [11], internalization [12] and degradation [13]. All of these have reported significant variations as a function of particle size [14], shape [15] and porosity [16] but also of culture medium [17,18], testing methods [19] and celltypes [20]. Indeed the presence of (bio)-organic molecules over or within the particles, necessary to introduce biofunctionality, further increases the complexity of the processes [21,22].

In this perspective, we have examined here the effect of silica nanoparticles on the viability of fibroblast cells. Pure amorphous silica nanoparticles are usually considered as the more benign nanoscale oxides [23] although some recent investigations suggest possible toxicity for 20 nm colloids at relatively low dose (20 mg.L⁻¹-0.3 mM) [24]. As a matter of fact, it is somehow difficult to establish a comparison between various studies, especially concerning silica particle cytotoxicity towards mammalian cells [25-28]. Hence, we have tried to evaluate here the median lethal concentration LC₅₀, i.e. the concentration necessary to kill half the members of a cell population after a defined time. We have studied the effect of particle size and functionalization, including sulfonate functions whose effect on nanoparticle cytotoxicity was never reported so far, on L929 fibroblast cells as representatives of mammalian tissue cells.

2. Materials and Methods

2.1 Silica Nanoparticles Synthesis and Characterization

All silica nanoparticles (SiNP) were synthesized using the Stöber method [29]. Basically,

tetraethoxysilane (TEOS) and deionized water were added under stirring to 100 mL of ethanol. Ammonia (30 wt% in water) was then slowly added and the mixture was left under stirring during 48 h. The TEOS:H₂O:NH₃ volume ratios (in mL) of (3.5 : 5.4 : 8), (3.5 : 3.5 : 6.7) and (3.7 : 3.4 : 3.1) were used to obtain silica nanoparticles with diameters of 500 nm (SiNP-500-OH), 300 nm (SiNP-300-OH) and 100 nm (SiNP-100-OH), respectively.

Surface grafting of amine (-NH₂) group, thiol function (-SH) and its oxidation into sulfonate (-SO₃⁻) was performed using aminopropyltriethoxysilane and mercaptopropyltrimethoxysilane, respectively (**Scheme 1**), as described elsewhere [30-32].

Scheme 1 Preparation of silica nanoparticles (SiNP-OH) and their surface modification by amine (SiNP-NH₂), thiol (SiNP-SH) and sulfonate (SiNP-SO₃⁻) groups

The mean diameter and hydrodynamic radius of the nanoparticles were determined by Transmission Electron Microscopy (TEM, JEOL 1011 electron microscope operating at 100 kV) and Dynamic Light Scattering (DLS, BI ZetaPlus Brookhaven instrument). The zeta potential of nanoparticles was measured in deionized water using the same equipment.

2.2 Cytotoxicity Assays on Fibroblast Cells

L-929 mouse fibroblast cells, derived from normal sub-cutaneous areolar and adipose tissue, were seeded in 24-wells culture plates at a density of 2×10^4 cells per well in 1 mL of Minimum Essential Medium Non-essential Amino Acid (MEM-NEAA) supplemented with 10 % fetal bovine and 1 % (v/v) Penicillin/Streptomycin mixture under a CO₂ (5 %) atmosphere and at 37 °C for different times. After overnight incubation, the medium was replaced with MEM-NEAA without fetal bovine serum and incubated at 37 °C in order to induce cell cycle arrest. After 4 h, cells were treated with 1, 5, 10, 25 and 50 mM silica particle suspensions and incubated at 37 °C for 24 h and 96 h.

As an indicator of cell viability, mitochondrial redox activity was assessed *via* reduction of the MTT reagent. This colorimetric assay is based on the ability of the mitochondrial dehydrogenase enzymes of living cells to convert 3-(4,5-dimethylthiazol-2-yl)-2,5-diphenyl-tetrazolium bromide (MTT) into an insoluble formazan. At the above mentioned culture times, 900 μ l of MEM-NEAA and 100 μ l of MTT solution ($5 \text{ mg} \cdot \text{mL}^{-1}$ in PBS) were added to each sample and incubated for 4 h at 37 °C, under a CO₂ (5 %) atmosphere. Medium was withdrawn through aspiration and cultured fibroblast cells were treated with 1 mL of ethanol 99.5 % for 15 minutes. The absorbance at 570 nm was measured using a UV-Visible spectrophotometer. Readings were converted to cell number using a calibration standard curve. In all cases results are expressed as mean SD from triplicates experiments.

2.3 Statistical Analysis

The data are means $\pm$ SE. The differences were analyzed using two-way ANOVA, followed by

Bonferroni multiple comparisons test. $p < 0.05$ was considered significant.

3 Results and Discussion

Silica particles of various sizes and surface chemistry were obtained using the Stöber process followed by surface grafting via silanization. Mean particle diameters were 540 ± 30 nm (SiNP-500), 290 ± 20 nm (SiNP-300) and 95 ± 15 nm (SiNP-100) as determined by TEM (**Fig. 1**). DLS studies performed in deionized water indicated good dispersion of all particles independently of their size and surface functionalization, except for SiNP-100-NH₂ for which large aggregates were detected, indicating poor colloidal stability. In parallel, the ζ value in water was -20 ± 5 mV for all particles except for amine-bearing particles whose ζ value was 15 ± 5 mV independently of their size.

Fig. 1 TEM images of silica nanoparticles with diameters of 100 nm (SiNP-100-OH), 300 nm (SiNP-300-OH) and 500 nm (SiNP-500-OH)

We investigated the effects of size, surface chemistry, concentration and exposure time. First, it was observed that the toxicological effects of the SiNPs strongly depend on the

exposure time. After 24h, in most conditions, the cells exposed to bare silica particles grow at a similar or even higher (see SiNP-500-OH) level than the control cells that were not exposed to particles (**Fig. 2**). In contrast, after this delay, the effect of surface functionalization was apparent, especially for the amine- and sulfonate-modified 300 nm silica particles at all concentrations. However, none of these situations led to the death of half the cell population so that the experiments were continue up to 96 h.

Fig. 2 Effect of nanoparticle concentration, size, functionalization after a 24h exposure time on L929 cells. Two-way ANOVA, double interaction. * Significantly different from: $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$ and *** $p < 0.001$

After this time, more pronounced cytotoxic effects allowed the estimation of the LC₅₀ values for some of the SiNPs (**Fig. 3**).

Fig. 3 Effect of nanoparticle concentration, size, functionalization after a 96h exposure time on L929 cells. Two-way ANOVA, double interaction. * Significantly different from: $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$ and *** $p < 0.001$

Considering bare particles, it is possible to determine that the size has also a strong effect on the viability. LC₅₀ value ranges between 10 mM and 25 mM for SiNP-100-OH particles, between 5 and 10 mM for SiNP-300-OH and between 25 and 50 mM for SiNP-500-OH (**Table 1**). Interestingly, the evolution of toxicity with particle diameter is different depending on the surface chemistry. Hence 100 nm thiol-modified particles have limited impact on cells but their cytotoxicity increases with increasing diameter, whereas SO₃⁻ and NH₂ -modified particles are less toxic for a 500 nm diameter. Overall, in the case of 100 nm particles all surface modifications increased the LC₅₀, as compared to unmodified SiNPs. For amine-modified particles (SiNP-100-NH₂) the LC₅₀ is between 25 and 50 mM, while for thiol-modified particles (SiNP-100-SH) and sulfonate-modified particles (SiNP-100-SO₃⁻) the LC₅₀ is higher than 50 mM. These differences between bare and functionalized particles are also observed for 500 nm particles although the difference is not significant for thiol-modified particles (SiNP-500-SH), while amine-modified particles (SiNP-100-NH₂) and sulfonate-modified particles (SiNP-500-SO₃⁻) are less toxic. A different situation is observed for 300 nm particles where only thiol-modified particles (SiNP-300-SH) have a higher LC₅₀ than SiNP-300-OH.

As a general trend, and after 96 h exposure, bare particles showed the highest toxicity towards L929 compared to surface-modified ones, especially for 100 and 500 nm particles. This observation is in good agreement with a recent report suggesting that isolated silanol groups are mainly responsible for silica particle toxicity [33]. As surface modification through silanization decreases the amount of free silanols, an increase in LC₅₀ could be expected.

Table 1 Median lethal concentration LC₅₀ for 2.10⁴ fibroblast cells exposed to various silica particles after 96 h exposure

Size (nm)	Surface functionality			
	OH	SH	SO ₃	NH ₂
100	10–25mM	>50mM	>50mM	25–50mM
300	5–10mM	>50mM	5–10mM	5–10mM
500	25–50mM	10–25mM	>50mM	>50mM

The observation of non-monotonous variation of LC₅₀ value with bare silica particle diameter is worth being discussed. When analyzing size effect on nanotoxicity, the systems must be considered at two scales. When considering the whole particle population (per g or mole of silica), larger particles have lower specific surface area, i.e. lower total surface contact with cells. Moreover, the density of the free silanol groups is related to the surface curvature of the particle, i.e. their density decreases with increasing diameter [34]. Hence, cytotoxicity is expected to decrease with increasing diameter. However, when considering each particle individually, their surface increases with particle diameter. An important consequence is that the amount of molecules (medium proteins, membrane components) per particle that can be adsorbed increases with its size. Therefore, larger particles may interact more strongly with cells. Thus it can be suggested that the minimum LC₅₀ value obtained for 300 nm silica particles results from the balance of the two effects.

Coming to the comparison of the various surface functionalization, it is difficult to

interpret all data in detail. Nevertheless, one may notice that sulfonate- and amine- modified particles behave similarly to bare silica particles in terms of influence of size on LC₅₀. Hence it suggests that these functions do not induce specific interactions with L929 cells. The case of thiol groups is different as LC₅₀ decreases with increasing particle size. As the number of thiol groups per particles increase with particle size, it is possible to propose that this function has a detrimental effect on cell viability, although lower than that of silanols. Indeed other parameters such as aggregation state and possible protein adsorption from the culture medium can contribute to the complexity of the observed effects [18].

4 Conclusions

This work has explored the cytotoxicity of silica particles towards L929 fibroblast cells. In particular, it was possible to evaluate the median lethal concentrations for different particle size and surface chemistry. This parameter is important for the development of nanomaterials for biomedical applications but is scarcely found in the literature.

From the analysis of the results, it was found that cellular response to SiNPs is exposure time and concentration dependent. Indeed, increasing silica particles concentration will also increase the effect produced and the extent of cytotoxicity. In addition, surface modification can drastically change cellular response to nanoparticles. The mammalian cells show high sensitivity to surface modification of the particles but our results suggest that organic groups efficiently screen the detrimental interaction of cell membrane with silanol groups. Based on a compromise in terms of particle size and concentration, it was possible to

obtain nanomaterials with low impact on considered mammalian cells. Indeed, these studies must now be extended to *ex vivo* and *in vivo* environments where the living tissues can have a significant impact on the cytotoxicological effects [35]. In parallel further formulation/processing steps are now necessary to favor particles permeation or integration on/within relevant biomaterials.

Acknowledgments Maria Lucia Foglia is grateful for their doctoral fellowship granted by the National Research Council (CONICET). C. Galindo-Gonzalez thanks the TECSAN program of the French ANR for funding her post-doc. The authors would like to acknowledge the support of grants from the University of Buenos Aires UBA- CYT 20020110100081 and from Agencia Nacional de Investigaciones Científicas y Técnicas PICT 2012-1441 (to M.F.D). M.F.D. and T.C. thank the Argentina-France MINCYT-ECOS-Sud (project A12S01) and CONICET-CNRS programs for financial support.

References

1. Slowing II, Vivero-Escoto JL, Wu CW, Lin VSY (2008) Mesoporous silica nanoparticles as controlled release drug delivery and gene transfection carriers. *Adv Drug Deliv Rev* 60(11):1278–1288
2. Foglia ML, Alvarez GS, Catalano PN, Mebert AM, Diaz LE, Coradin T et al (2011) Recent patents on the synthesis and application of silica nanoparticles for drug delivery. *Recent Patents Biotechnol* 5(1):54–61

3. Wang K, He X, Yang X, Shi H (2013) Functionalized silica nanoparticles: a platform for fluorescence imaging at the cell and small animal levels. *Acc Chem Res* 46(7):1367–1376
4. Ohulchanskyy TY, Roy I, Goswami LN, Chen Y, Bergey EJ, Pandey RK et al (2007) Organically modified silica nanoparticles with covalently incorporated photosensitizer for photodynamic therapy of cancer. *Nano Lett* 7(9):2835–2842
5. Hu Y, Cai K, Luo Z, Jandt KD (2010) Layer-by-layer assembly of β -estradiol loaded mesoporous silica nanoparticles on titanium substrates and its implication for bone homeostasis. *Adv Mater* 22(37):4146–4150
6. Desimone MF, Helary C, Rietveld IB, Bataille I, Mosser G, Giraud-Guille MM et al (2010) Silica-collagen bionanocomposites as three-dimensional scaffolds for fibroblast immobilization. *Acta Biomater* 6(10):3998–4004
7. Heinemann S, Coradin T, Desimone MF (2013) Bio-inspired silica-collagen materials: applications and perspectives in the medical field. *Biomater Sci* 1:688–702
8. Rosenholm JM, Sahlgren C, Linden M (2010) Towards multifunctional, targeted drug delivery systems using mesoporous silica nanoparticles - opportunities & challenges. *Nanoscale* 2(10):1870–1883
9. Vallet-Regi M, Colilla M, Gonzalez B (2011) Medical applications of organic-inorganic hybrid materials within the field of silica-based bioceramics. *Chem Soc Rev* 40(2):596–607
10. Yang P, Gai S, Lin J (2012) Functionalized mesoporous silica materials for controlled drug delivery. *Chem Soc Rev* 41(9):3679– 3698
11. Ahamed M (2013) Silica nanoparticles-induced cytotoxicity, oxidative stress and apoptosis in cultured A431 and A549 cells. *Human Exp Toxicol* 32(2):186–195

12. Shapero K, Fenaroli F, Lynch I, Cottell DC, Salvati A, Dawson KA (2011) Time and space resolved uptake study of silica nanoparticles by human cells. *Mol BioSyst* 7(2):371– 378
13. Quignard S, Mosser G, Boissiere M, Coradin T (2012) Long- term fate of silica nanoparticles interacting with human dermal fibroblasts. *Biomaterials* 33(17):4431–4442
14. Rabolli V, Thomassen LCJ, Princen C, Napierska D, Gonzalez L, Kirsch-Volders M et al (2010) Influence of size, surface area and microporosity on the in vitro cytotoxic activity of amorphous silica nanoparticles in different cell types. *Nanotoxicology* 4(3):307– 318
15. Huang X, Teng X, Chen D, Tang F, He J (2010) The effect of the shape of mesoporous silica nanoparticles on cellular uptake and cell function. *Biomaterials* 31(3):438–448
16. Lin YS, Haynes CL (2010) Impacts of mesoporous silica nanoparticle size, pore ordering, and pore integrity on hemolytic activity. *J Amer Chem Soc* 132(13):4834–4842
17. Lin YS, Abadeer N, Haynes CL (2011) Stability of small mesoporous silica nanoparticles in biological media. *Chem Commun* 47(1):532–534
18. Drescher D, Orts-Gil G, Laube G, Natte K, Veh RW, Osterle W et al (2011) Toxicity of amorphous silica nanoparticles on eukaryotic cell model is determined by particle agglomeration and serum protein adsorption effects. *Anal Bioanal Chem* 400(5):1367– 1373
19. Fede C, Selvestrel F, Compagnin C, Mognato M, Mancin F, Reddi E et al (2012) The toxicity outcome of silica nanoparticles (Ludox®) is influenced by testing techniques and treatment modalities. *Anal Bioanal Chem* 404(6–7):1789– 1802
20. Chang JS, Chang KLB, Hwang DF, Kong ZL (2007) *In vitro* cytotoxicity of silica nanoparticles at high concentrations strongly depends on the metabolic activity type of the cell line. *Environ Sci Technol* 41(6):2064–2068

21. Yu T, Malugin A, Ghandehari H (2011) Impact of silica nanoparticle design on cellular toxicity and hemolytic activity. *ACS Nano* 5(7):5717–5728
22. Lin IC, Liang M, Liu TY, Jia Z, Monteiro MJ, Toth I (2012) Effect of polymer grafting density on silica nanoparticle toxicity. *Bioorg Med Chem* 20(23):6862–6869
23. Brunner TJ, Wick P, Manser P, Spohn P, Grass RN, Limbach LK et al (2006) In vitro cytotoxicity of oxide nanoparticles: comparison to asbestos, silica, and the effect of particle solubility. *Environ Sci Technol* 40(14):4374–4381
24. Jiang W, Mashayekhi H, Xing B (2009) Bacterial toxicity comparison between nano- and micro-scaled oxide particles. *Environ Pollut* 157(5):1619–1625
25. Eom HJ, Choi J (2009) Oxidative stress of silica nanoparticles in human bronchial epithelial cell, Beas-2B. *Toxicol Vitro* 23(7):1326–1332
26. Shi Y, Yadav S, Wang F, Wang H (2010) Endotoxin promotes adverse effects of amorphous silica nanoparticles on lung epithelial cells in vitro. *J Toxicol Environ Health - Part A: Curr Issues* 73(11):748–756
27. Stayton I, Winiarz J, Shannon K, Ma Y (2009) Study of uptake and loss of silica nanoparticles in living human lung epithelial cells at single cell level. *Anal Bioanal Chem* 394(6):1595–1608
28. Akhtar MJ, Ahamed M, Kumar S, Siddiqui H, Patil G, Ashquin M et al (2010) Nanotoxicity of pure silica mediated through oxidant generation rather than glutathione depletion in human lung epithelial cells. *Toxicology* 276(2):95–102
29. Stöber W, Fink A, Bohn E (1968) Controlled growth of monodisperse silica spheres in the micron size range. *J Colloid Interface Sci* 26(1):62–69
30. Badley RD, Ford WT, McEnroe FJ, Assink RA (1990) Surface modification of colloidal

silica. Langmuir 6(4):792–801

31. Wu J, Silvent J, Coradin T, Aimé C (2012) Biochemical investigation of the formation of three-dimensional networks from DNA-grafted large silica particles. Langmuir 28(4):2156–2165
32. Aimé C, Mosser G, Pembouong G, Bouteiller L, Coradin T (2012) Controlling the nano-bio interface to build collagen-silica self-assembled networks. Nanoscale 4(22):7127–7134
33. Zhang H, Dunphy DR, Jiang X, Meng H, Sun B, Tarn D et al (2012) Processing pathway dependence of amorphous silica nanoparticle toxicity: colloidal vs pyrolytic. J Amer Chem Soc 134:15790–15804
34. Kamiya H, Mitsui M, Takano H, Miyazawa S (2000) Influence of particle diameter on surface silanol structure, hydration forces, and aggregation behavior of alkoxide-derived silica particles. J Amer Ceram Soc 83(2):287–293
35. Park YH, Kim JN, Jeong SH, Choi JE, Lee SH, Choi BH, et al. (2010) Assessment of dermal toxicity of nanosilica using cultured keratinocytes, a human skin equivalent model and an *in vivo* model. Toxicology 267(1–3):178–181