

List of Figures

Figure 1.1 a) Schematic representation of homopolymers and copolymers. Individual monomer species are shown as 'A' and 'B'. b) Schematic of common polymer skeletal structures. (pg. 18)

Figure 1.2 Mechanisms of polymer degradation, the green area represents polymer, red represents the erosion zone, adapted from Mathiowitz *et al.* (pg. 21)

Figure 1.3 Schematic diagram illustrating the key benefits of PEGylation of protein based drug molecules. (pg. 24)

Figure 1.4 Formula of PLGA degradation yielding lactic acid (Felix Simonovsky, University of Washington, Engineering). (pg. 25)

Figure 1.5 Example of drug release through a) a reservoir b) within a matrix c) polymer degradation, d) cleavage of drug from a polymer backbone, e) solvent exposure, f) osmotic pressure water permeation, g) osmotic delivery, h) liposome release and i) external stimulus mediated release, adapted from Langer, 1990. (pg. 27)

Figure 1.6 Repeat dose profile from an injection of drug X, and an ideal drug delivery profile from controlled release system. (pg. 29)

Figure 1.7 Cumulative profiles of the *in vitro* release of stomach produced protein intrinsic factor (IF) and vitamin B12 from IF-Vit B12 complex-loaded microspheres. (pg. 30)

Figure 1.8 Schematic of a transdermal patch containing a drug reservoir. (pg. 32)

Figure 1.9 Schematic of stent implantation. A balloon catheter (blue) has a metallic drug coated stent placed over it before inflation inside the vessel. (pg. 33)

Figure 1.10 a) Antibiotic eluting PMMA hip spacer (wound drainage tube at the top of the spacer is to monitor drug release. b) Elution of antibiotics gentamicin (purple) and vancomycin (green) for 13 days postoperatively. (pg. 35)

Figure 1.11 Fibroblast cell line NIH3T3 was cultured for 72 hrs shown at a) $\times 200$ and b) $\times 2000$ magnification. Showing good cell attachment and growth. (pg. 36)

Figure 1.12 Flow diagram of signalling pathway causing a biological response, adapted from Ratner 1995. (pg. 39)

Figure 1.13 a) Schematic diagram of common surface analytical techniques applied for the chemical and structural characterisation of biomedical devices. b) Table comparing and contrasting the information obtained from various surface analytical techniques adapted from Kannan *et al.* (pg. 41/42)

Figure 1.14 Total ion image and the ion at m/z 543 which is a characteristic ion for the corticosteroid prednisolone represented as an ion image of an 800×800 μm area. (pg. 44)

Figure 1.15 ToF-SIMS depth profile of a model DES film showing for a 200×200 μm area the drug sirolimus (red) and PLGA (green) from an a) xy, b) xyz and a c) xyz representation with an increase in PLGA transparency. (pg.46)

Figure 1.16 XPS C1s spectrum of a) PHEMA (---) microspheres loaded with the drug dextran (—), nondegraded dex-HEMA microspheres (*) and dex-HEMA microspheres (◆) degraded for 5.7 months (pH 7.4, 37C) plotted. b) PHEMA (black line) and dextran (●) are plotted with mixtures of PHEMA and dextran in ratios of 20/80 (blue), 40/60 (red), 60/40 (green) and 80/20 (purple) displayed. (pg 47)

Figure 1.17 *In situ* AFM of 60.5×60.5 μm regions of a poly(orthoester) film containing BSA over a 90 minute period showing the degradation of the film and release of protein particles. (pg. 49)

Figure 1.18 Schematic diagram of a microarray formation by a) contact (pin transfer) and b) non-contact (ink-jet) printing. The autofluorescence from a 576 polymer microarray printed in triplicate on a standard glass slide. (pg. 51)

Figure 1.19 Mapping of cell behaviour to surface chemistry using arrays a) ToF-SIMS of homopolymers labelled 1 and 16. Suggesting variation in secondary ion intensity for the ions highlighted between the two polymers will cause difficulty in prediction of surface chemistry for all polymers tested. b) A multivariate partial least squares regression (PLS) model used to analyse and predict cell/material interactions by correlating ToF-SIMS spectra to their biological performance (colony formation frequency). Linear correlation of predicted versus measured colony formation frequency. Middle table: functionalities determined to promote or inhibit hES colony formation. (pg. 52)

Figure 2.1 Graphical summary of the information content verses scale of different surface analytical techniques. (Reproduced with permission from Alex Shard, National Physical Laboratory ©). (pg. 67)

Figure 2.2 Schematic of a spin caster where the black ring represents the o-ring and the grey square represents the positioning of a silicon wafer. a) Incorrect positioning of wafer, b) correct positioning. (pg. 69)

Figure 2.3 Spin casting speed against the ellipsometrically derived thickness for a PLA layer spun cast for 60 s from chloroform onto a piranha solution cleaned silicon wafer. (pg. 70)

Figure 2.4 Schematic representation of the collision cascade in the sample for analysis caused by exposure to energetic primary ion bombardment (red). (pg. 72)

Figure 2.5 Schematic diagram showing reflectron design ToF – SIMS operation. © IONTOF. (pg. 74)

Figure 2.6 a) Shows a peak derived with the bunched mode of operation and b) shows burst alignment, for the CN^- ion in the negative spectrum for a microsphere system. Corresponding total ion images from each scan are also displayed from a $500 \mu\text{m}^2$ area taken at 256×256 pixel resolution raster. (pg. 77)

Figure 2.7 Positive ToF-SIMS spectrum of a thin film of PLA with characteristic ions tabulated. **M** represents the repeating unit of PLA ($\text{C}_3\text{H}_4\text{O}_2$), the mass has been calculated based on the sum of the precise mass of each element (to 2 d.p.). (pg. 79)

Figure 2.8 Schematic diagram of dual beam depth profiling. Adapted from IONTOF ©. (pg. 81)

Figure 2.9 Schematic of the timing used in interlaced mode showing one cycle of sputtering and analysis. Adapted from Iltgen *et al.* (pg. 82)

Figure 2.10 Schematic diagram of damage caused to a gold substrate by Ga, and C_{60} primary ion sources, also indicating difference in sputter yield and sub-surface damage. (pg. 83)

Figure 2.11 a) A survey scan and b) a high resolution scan of pure PLA, the numbering on the PLA structure locates the 3 carbon atoms in each repeating unit. (pg. 86)

Figure 2.12 a) Schematic illustration of photoelectrons being released from the core level. b) Schematic of an XPS spectrometer (Axis Ultra with delay-line detector) Kratos Analytical, Manchester©. c) Schematic of electron detection after

hemispherical separation reproduced from Kratos Analytical, Manchester©.
(pg. 88)

Figure 2.13 a) PCA and b) MCR modelling described graphically. (pg. 92)

Figure 2.14 a) Schematic diagram of an ellipsometer, b) a schematic diagram of the polarisation of light that is compared before and after travelling through the film. (pg. 93)

Figure 2.15 Schematic of Stokes and Anti-Stokes scattering. (pg. 96)

Figure 2.16 Example Raman spectra plotting intensity vs. wavenumber for four drugs. (pg. 97)

Figure 2.17 Raman instrument schematic (WITec CRM200, WITec Ulm, Germany). (pg. 98)

Figure 2.18 Schematic representation of a typical AFM. (pg. 100)

Figure 3.1 Molecular structure of coronene. (pg. 108)

Figure 3.2 Representational AFM images for a $10 \times 10 \mu\text{m}$ area of a (a) solvent cleaned and a (b) piranha solution cleaned silicon wafer with a 28.6% (w/w) codeine/PLA blend film deposited at 4,000 RPM for 60 s. (pg. 113)

Figure 3.3 Film thickness of PLA and PLA/codeine blends determined using ellipsometry. (pg. 114)

Figure 3.4 Ellipsometrically derived composition from the EMA model (as described in 3.2.2) against the known solution composition of PLA and PLA/codeine ranging from 0% to 28.6% (w/w) codeine. (pg. 115)

Figure 3.5 Molecular structure of a) PLA and b) codeine with elemental ratios tabulated. (pg. 116)

Figure 3.6 Observed XPS surface nitrogen elemental composition (%), (○) against drug loading (%), (w/w). Solution concentration based on uniform distribution of the bulk loading (- - -) is also plotted. An average loss of $56.3\% \pm 5.9$ from the calculated to the observed nitrogen concentration is observed at the surface. (pg. 117)

Figure 3.7 a) XPS depth profile from coronene etched 28.6% drug loaded film showing C1s (□), O1s (○), N1s $\times 10$ (Δ), Si2p (◇) and the calculated nitrogen concentration assuming uniform drug distribution $\times 10$ (—) through film thickness. b) Nitrogen atomic concentration for 2.4% (◇, —), 9.1% (□, —) and 28.6% (Δ, —) with corresponding nominal concentration through thickness plotted. (pg. 119)

Figure 3.8 a) XPS spectra of C 1s region of the 28.6% drug loading at depth = 0 nm b) and depth = 8 nm charge corrected to the C-C at 285 eV. The model fit (—), the XPS trace (●), PLA components (— —) and codeine components (****) are plotted. c) Pure PLA control sample at depth = 0 nm d) and depth = 32 nm e) Functional composition of the C 1s region of the 28.6% drug loading plotted. Codeine component C-C (◇), C-O (□) and C-N (○). All PLA components are denoted by (Δ). Within the bulk of the film the actual codeine loading ranges between 30 and 35% (w/w codeine:PLA). (pg.121)

Figure 3.9 Positive ion ToF-SIMS spectra of a) PLA and b) codeine reference samples. (pg. 123/124)

Figure 3.10 a) Comparison of PLA indicating secondary ion fragments intensity variation in the transient region of depth profiles. b) Normalised ion intensities for m/z 127 (◆) and m/z 55 (■) subtracted from unity and compared to the normalised Si^+ intensity for a 10 mg/ml solution of 28.6% (w/w) codeine/PLA. (pg. 125)

Figure 3.11 ToF-SIMS ion intensity normalised to total ion counts for the m/z 300 codeine molecular ion for drug loadings ranging from 0% to 28.6% (w/w). (pg. 127)

Figure 3.12 Representative ToF-SIMS depth profile of a 28.6% codeine loaded binary blend film measuring 91 nm in thickness, Si m/z 28 (◇), PLA m/z 55 (Δ) and codeine m/z 44 (□). (pg.128)

Figure 3.13 Depth profiles of 2.4% (×), 4.7% (×), 9.1% (□), 16.8% (Δ) and 28.6% (◇) (w/w) codeine. (pg. 129)

Figure 4.1 Schematic representation of the a) bilayers and b) trilayer films produced in this study with red layers indicating PLA/codeine film, green layers indicate HPMC film and the silver layer represents the piranha solution cleaned silicon substrate. (pg. 136)

Figure 4.2 a) ToF-SIMS depth profile showing ions of significance for a bilayer film of codeine/PLA cast on top of a HPMC film onto a silicon wafer. The contaminant sodium is also displayed and values indicate ellipsometrically derived layer thickness. b) Ion images taken from the XZ axis with interfaces marked by arrows, the overlay shows codeine (red), PLA (green) and HPMC (blue). c) Ion images taken in the XY axis for two adjacent scans summed from the top layer and the bottom layer. (pg. 138)

Figure 4.3 a) ToF-SIMS depth profile showing ions of significance for a multilayer film where HPMC is cast onto a codeine/PLA film cast on a piranha solution cleaned silicon wafer. The contaminant sodium is also displayed and values indicate ellipsometrically derived layer thickness. b) Ion images taken from the XZ axis with interfaces marked by arrows, the overlay shows codeine (red), PLA (green) and HPMC (blue). c) Ion images taken in the XY axis for two adjacent scans summed from the top layer and the bottom layer. (pg. 142)

Figure 4.4 a) ToF-SIMS depth profile showing ions of a multilayer film with alternating layers of HPMC above and below a codeine/PLA film, all three layers are cast on top of a piranha solution cleaned silicon wafer. The contaminant sodium is also displayed and values indicate ellipsometrically derived layer thickness. b) Ion images taken from the XZ axis with interfaces marked by arrows, the overlay shows codeine (red), PLA (green) and HPMC (blue). c) Ion images taken in the XY axis for two adjacent scans summed from the top, middle and the bottom layers. Explanation for the increased secondary ion counts can be found in Appendix 1. (pg. 145)

Figure 4.5 a) ToF-SIMS depth profile showing ions of a multilayer film with alternating layers of codeine/PLA above and below a HPMC film, all three layers are cast on top of a piranha solution cleaned silicon wafer. The contaminant sodium is also displayed and values indicate ellipsometrically derived layer thickness. b) Ion images taken from the XZ axis with interfaces marked by arrows, the overlay shows codeine (red), PLA (green) and HPMC (blue). c) Ion images taken in the XY axis for two adjacent scans summed from the top, middle and the bottom layers. (pg. 148)

Figure 5.1 Schematic of a double emulsion production method. (pg. 157)

Figure 5.2 Schematic diagram of analytical methods applied to the microsphere samples. (pg. 158)

Figure 5.3 SEM analysis of w/o/w lysozyme PLGA microspheres shown at a) $\times 110$ and b) $\times 900$ magnification. (pg. 159)

Figure 5.4 Negative ToF-SIMS spectrum of the surface of PLGA lysozyme microspheres from a mass of 0 to 100. (pg. 160)

Figure 5.5 ToF-SIMS imaging of the surface of a microsphere measuring 149 μm in diameter showing the secondary ion image generated from the diagnostic anions identified within the ToF-SIMS spectra, for a) PLGA (m/z 71/73 and

87/89), b) PVA (m/z 59), c) lysozyme (m/z 26 and 42) and d) an overlay showing PLGA (green), PVA (blue) and lysozyme (red). (pg. 162)

Figure 5.6 ToF-SIMS surface analysis of a range of w/o/w microspheres showing an overlay of PLGA (green), PVA (blue) and lysozyme (red). (pg. 163)

Figure 5.7 a) ToF-SIMS of a microsphere before sputtering b) after 28 s, c) 56 s and d) 84 s of sputtering. e) Secondary electron image of the resulting microsphere. f) AFM height image 1st order plane fitted of an 8 μm^2 area at the top of a microsphere before and g) after sputtering. Corresponding 3rd order flattened AFM height images, and a line scan (indicated) are also shown. (pg. 165/166)

Figure 5.8 a) A confocal Raman map indicating PLGA as green and lysozyme as red, showing large pores, void spaces and protein adsorbed to the wall of the pore and concentrated pores measuring ~ 2 μm in diameter. b) An interpolated 3D representation of the protein distribution within a 40 μm^2 area of a microsphere showing from 20 μm (top of image) to 30 μm (bottom of image) of the microsphere bulk. (pg. 168)

Figure 5.9 ToF-SIMS of a sectioned microsphere showing a) lysozyme (CNO^-), b) PLGA ($\text{C}_3\text{H}_3\text{O}_2^-$, $\text{C}_3\text{H}_5\text{O}_2^-$, $\text{C}_3\text{H}_3\text{O}_3^-$ & $\text{C}_3\text{H}_5\text{O}_3^-$), and c) an overlay showing lysozyme (red), PLGA (green) and PVA ($\text{C}_2\text{H}_3\text{O}_2^-$ blue). (pg. 169)