

# Communication

# Light-triggered, Self-immolative Nucleic Acid-drug Nanostructures

Xuyu Tan, Ben B Li, Xueguang Lu, Fei Jia, Clarissa Santori, Priyanka Menon, Hui Li, Bohan Zhang, Jean J Zhao, and Ke Zhang J. Am. Chem. Soc., Just Accepted Manuscript • Publication Date (Web): 29 Apr 2015 Downloaded from http://pubs.acs.org on April 30, 2015

# **Just Accepted**

"Just Accepted" manuscripts have been peer-reviewed and accepted for publication. They are posted online prior to technical editing, formatting for publication and author proofing. The American Chemical Society provides "Just Accepted" as a free service to the research community to expedite the dissemination of scientific material as soon as possible after acceptance. "Just Accepted" manuscripts appear in full in PDF format accompanied by an HTML abstract. "Just Accepted" manuscripts have been fully peer reviewed, but should not be considered the official version of record. They are accessible to all readers and citable by the Digital Object Identifier (DOI®). "Just Accepted" is an optional service offered to authors. Therefore, the "Just Accepted" Web site may not include all articles that will be published in the journal. After a manuscript is technically edited and formatted, it will be removed from the "Just Accepted" Web site and published as an ASAP article. Note that technical editing may introduce minor changes to the manuscript text and/or graphics which could affect content, and all legal disclaimers and ethical guidelines that apply to the journal pertain. ACS cannot be held responsible for errors or consequences arising from the use of information contained in these "Just Accepted" manuscripts.



# Light-triggered, Self-immolative Nucleic Acid-drug Nanostructures

Xuyu Tan,<sup>†</sup> Ben B. Li,<sup>§</sup> Xueguang Lu,<sup>†</sup> Fei Jia,<sup>†</sup> Clarissa Santori,<sup>†</sup> Priyanka Menon,<sup>†</sup> Hui Li,<sup>‡</sup> Bohan Zhang,<sup>‡</sup> Jean J. Zhao,<sup>§</sup> Ke Zhang<sup>†‡\*</sup>

<sup>†</sup>Department of Chemistry and Chemical Biology, Northeastern University, Boston, MA 02115, USA

<sup>‡</sup>Institute of Chemical Biology and Nanomedicine, Hunan University, Changsha 410081, China

<sup>8</sup>Department of Cancer Biology, Dana Farber Cancer Institute, Boston, MA 02215, USA, and Department of Biological Chemistry and Molecular Pharmacology, Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA 02215, USA

Supporting Information Placeholder

**ABSTRACT:** The simultaneous intracellular delivery of multiple types of payloads, such as hydrophobic drugs and nucleic acids, typically requires complex carrier systems. Herein, we demonstrate a self-deliverable form of nucleic acid-drug nanostructure that is comprised almost entirely of payload molecules. Upon light activation, the nanostructure sheds the nucleic acid shell, while the core, which consists of prodrug molecules, disintegrates *via* an irreversible self-immolative process, releasing free drug molecules and small molecule fragments. We demonstrate that the nanostructures exhibit enhanced stability against DNase I compared with free DNA, and that the model drug (camptothecin) released exhibits similar efficacy as free, unmodified drugs towards cancer cells.

In recent years, it has been demonstrated that specific arrangements of nucleic acids into unique three-dimensional architectures can give rise to unusual properties absent for linear or circular forms of the nucleic acid.<sup>1-9</sup> For example, spherical nucleic acids (SNAs), which are typically comprised of a dense DNA shell surrounding a gold nanoparticle core, show high levels of cellular uptake,<sup>10</sup> enhanced binding with complementary strands,11 and increased DNA stability against enzymatic degradation.<sup>12</sup> These properties have been shown to result from the packing and orientation of the oligonucleotides on the surface of the gold nanoparticles, and are not directly related to the metallic core.<sup>13</sup> Indeed, SNAs with different core compositions (poly-mers,<sup>14</sup> lipids,<sup>15</sup> silica,<sup>16</sup> metal oxides,<sup>17</sup> and quantum dots<sup>18</sup>) or even those lacking a core<sup>12</sup> all exhibit similar physiochemical and biological properties. Thus, through arrangement of the DNA strands, many problems associated with nucleic acid delivery, especially co-carrier-induced cytotoxicity and immunogenicity, can be bypassed.

The rapid endocytosis of SNAs also makes them suitable for delivery applications.<sup>20-22</sup> It is hypothesized that the co-delivery of nucleic acids and small molecule drugs can allow one to independently access gene and protein targets, thereby circumventing drug resistance, which one-dimensional therapeutic strategies cannot address.<sup>23</sup> Payload molecules such as platinum (IV) prodrugs<sup>24</sup> and doxorubicin<sup>25</sup> have been delivered to cells *via* cova-

lent attachment to either the terminus of the oligonucleotides or the gold nanoparticle surface. In these systems, however, the cores of the nanoparticles do not play a significant role but contribute to a non-bioresorbable metallic mass. Naturally, for applications where the gold core is not utilized, it is advantageous to convert the core to a reservoir for payload molecules. Herein, we construct and test a drug-cored nucleic acid nanostructure containing hydrophobic chemotherapeutic agents. Such carrier-free, single entity agent retains many of the unique properties of the SNA while offering benefits including precise drug loading ratio,<sup>26</sup> improved drug solubility,<sup>27,28</sup> and spatiotemporally controlled release.<sup>29</sup>

In order to create a drug core, we designed and synthesized a DNA-camptothecin (CPT) amphiphile (Scheme 1). It consists of three CPT molecules connected to a phenol-based self-immolative linker. The phenol group is capped with a photolabile 2-nitrobenzyl ether moiety, to which DNA strands are attached. **Scheme 1.** Schematics of the DNA-drug nanostructures assembled from photolabile DNA-drug amphiphiles.



The amphiphilicity of the DNA-CPT conjugate allows it to assemble into micellar nanostructures (of different morphologies, depending on DNA size and assembly condition, *vide infra*) in an aqueous environment. The 2-nitrobenzyl group can be cleaved by UV light (365 nm) or *via* a two-photon mechanism,<sup>30,31</sup> releasing the DNA from the nanostructure and leaving a de-capped selfimmolative drug core, which can then rapidly undergo a spontaneous and irreversible degradation process,<sup>32</sup> to generate free CPT molecules. We expect this method to be relatively general

with regard to the kind of drug molecules because many chemotherapeutic drugs are hydrophobic.



**Figure 1.** (A) Multiplex gel images of the  $DNA_{20}$ -CPT conjugate and free Cy3-DNA<sub>20</sub> (1% agarose, 0.5x TBE) before (left) and after (right) UV treatment. The top of the gel lanes is marked with a dashed line. (B) Release kinetics of the  $DNA_{20}$ -CPT conjugate as a function of light exposure times (365 nm, 10 mJ•s<sup>-1</sup>cm<sup>-2</sup>). (C) Reverse-phase HPLC chromatograms of the  $DNA_{20}$ -CPT conjugate before (top) and after (bottom) light exposure, showing the conjugate peak splitting into two, which match the elution times of free DNA and CPT. (D) Multiplex gel images (5% agarose, 0.05x PBS) of DNA-drug conjugates (red) or free DNA (green) in the absence (left) or presence (right) of 2 mM Mg<sup>2+</sup>. The top of the gel lanes is marked with a dashed line. From left to right:  $DNA_{17}$ -CPT,  $DNA_{16F}$ ,  $DNA_{13}$ -CPT,  $DNA_{12F}$ ,  $DNA_{9}$ -CPT,  $DNA_{8F}$ ,  $DNA_{5}$ -CPT, and  $DNA_{4F}$ .

The successful synthesis of the linker is confirmed by Matrix-Assisted Laser Desorption Ionization-Time of Flight Mass Spectrometry (MALDI-ToF MS, 395.0 Da  $[M+Na]^+$ , calc. 396.1 Da), NMR, and IR (Figures S1-2). CPT molecules are attached to the linker by forming carbonate linkages between the CPT 4hydroxyl group and the linker's three benzyl alcohol groups. Although singly and doubly modified linkers are formed, the yield for the triply modified linker (linker-CPT<sub>3</sub>) is satisfactory (ca. 30%), and impurities can be easily removed by HPLC. The mass of the product is determined by MALDI-ToF MS  $(m/z=1518.9 \text{ Da } [M+Na]^+$ , calc. 1518.4 Da, Figure S3). Next, azide-modified DNA strands of various lengths (5, 9, 13, 17 and 20 bases, Table S1) are attached to linker-CPT<sub>3</sub> by Cu(I)catalyzed click chemistry, followed by HPLC purification. The DNA strand with 20 bases (DNA<sub>20</sub>) is labeled with a Cy3 dye at the 5' end to enable tracking by fluorescence and UV-Vis spectroscopy. The UV-Vis spectrum of the DNA<sub>20</sub>-CPT conjugate shows three absorption maxima at 260, 370, and 551 nm, which are indicative of the presence of DNA, CPT, and Cy3, respectively (Figure S4). The molar ratio of CPT: Cy3 is calculated based on free CPT and Cy3 extinction coefficients (19.9 L mmol<sup>-1</sup> cm<sup>-1</sup> and 136 L mmol<sup>-1</sup> cm<sup>-1</sup>) to be 3.4:1, which is close to 3:1. The conjugate is also characterized by agarose gel electrophoresis (Figure 1A). Multiplex gel imaging (Cy3 and Cy2 excitation/emission filters applied) shows a single band emitting both Cy3 (green) and CPT (red) fluorescence. These results indicate that the DNA-CPT conjugate is successfully synthesized and purified. The molecular purity of the conjugate ensures a constant DNA: drug molar ratio, which is important for consistency in drug formulation and efficacy.<sup>33</sup> In addition, the conjugate can mask the toxicity of the chemotherapeutic agent before it is released at targeted site by light triggering.

The photocleavage and self-immolation reactions are visualized by gel electrophoresis. The  $DNA_{20}$ -CPT conjugate is first electrophoresed for 30 min (free Cy3-DNA<sub>20</sub> used as a control), and thereafter UV light (365 nm, 10 mJ·s<sup>-1</sup>cm<sup>-2</sup>) is applied for 5 min, followed by another 30 min of electrophoresis. After the



**Figure 2.** TEM images (stained by 2% uranyl acetate) of (A) the DNA<sub>5</sub>-CPT conjugate prepared from PBS buffer, and (B) the DNA<sub>20</sub>-CPT conjugate prepared from PBS buffer with 5 mM MgCl<sub>2</sub>.

initial run, the conjugate shows nearly the same migration distance as the free Cy3-DNA<sub>20</sub> strand (Figure 1A). However, UV treatment causes the conjugate to split into two bands: a green band, which traveled the same overall distance as the free Cy3-DNA<sub>20</sub>, and a broad, slower-migrating red band, which correlates with free CPT.

In order to determine the kinetics of the payload release, we used reverse-phase HPLC to monitor the extent of drug and DNA released as a function of UV exposure times. Without UV exposure, a single peak was observed at both Cy3 (548 nm) and CPT (350 nm) channels. With only 1 min of UV irradiation (365 nm, 10 mJ·s<sup>-1</sup>cm<sup>-2</sup>), ca. 73% of the conjugate is cleaved, but to reach >90% cleavage, 8 min of light irradiation is required (Figure 1B). Two new peaks are observed following UV treatment, and their elution times match that of free CPT and DNA (Figures 1C, S5). MALDI-ToF MS also confirms that the DNA<sub>20</sub> released gains an extra ca. 190 Da of mass compared with the free azide-Cy3-DNA<sub>20</sub>, which is mass of the phenyl aldehyde residue of the cleaved linker. Of note, we did not observe a two-stage release profile, i.e. DNA released first followed by CPT, despite the fact that the release of free CPT requires an additional step (the selfimmolation process, Scheme S3). It is likely that the time scale of the HPLC analysis is much longer than that of the selfimmolation reaction.

Next, we investigated how the DNA-CPT conjugates can selfassemble to form micellar nanostructures in solution. Agarose gel electrophoresis (5%, 0.05x PBS buffer) of the DNA5-CPT conjugate shows a sharp band corresponding to a much higher MW compared with free DNA5, which indicates the formation of selfassembled structures (Figure 1D). The number-average hydrodynamic diameter  $(D_{h(n)})$  of the nanostructure is  $32\pm13$  nm as determined by Dynamic Light Scattering (DLS, Figure S8). Transmission Electron Microscopy (TEM) shows that the DNA<sub>5</sub>-CPT conjugate assembled into a spherical morphology with a dry-state diameter of 28±5 nm (Figure 2A). The MW of the aggregates decreases with increasing DNA length, presumably due to reduced aggregation numbers resulting from increased amphiphile head group volume. When the DNA strand is longer than 9 bases, the migration rate of the conjugate becomes identical to that of free DNA, which indicates that micelle formation is no longer thermodynamically favorable. However, in the presence of 2-5 mM divalent Mg<sup>2+</sup> ion, which is within the physiological range for Mg<sup>2+</sup> concentration,<sup>34</sup> self-assembly takes place even for DNA20-CPT (longest DNA tested), as indicated by agarose gel 1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49 50

51

52

53

54

55

56

57

58

59 60 electrophoresis (Figure S9). This is likely because divalent Mg<sup>2+</sup> ions are able to bind with the charged DNA phosphate groups and bridge different strands, and thereby attenuate the entropy penalty to form higher order, densely packed DNA nanostructures. Interestingly, the mode of packing for the DNA20-CPT conjugate is different from that of smaller conjugates. The hydrodynamic diameter  $(D_{h(n)})$  of the assembled structure is 22±8 nm as determined by DLS (Figure S8). TEM reveals that rod-like nanostructures have formed. The rods appear to be relatively rigid, with length on the order of ca. 53±14 nm and cross-section diameter approximately 8±1 nm (Figure 2B). It is possible that the rods are formed by stacking circularly arranged DNA<sub>20</sub>-CPT conjugates in a vertical fashion, which results a cylindrical morphology.<sup>35</sup> The fact that longer hydrophilic segments give rise to rod-like structures appears to be against the common rules of amphiphilic block copolymer assembly; however, tunable attractive interactions mediated by ions between the hydrophilic segments of different chains are oftentimes ignored in canonical theories.<sup>36,37</sup> Nonetheless, these morphological results are preliminary, and additional characterization is needed to fully rule out artifacts resulting from TEM sample preparation and imaging. Accordingly, a more detailed self-assembly study is planned.

A hallmark feature for SNAs is their resistance to nuclease degradation. This property stems from the high local sodium ion concentration and steric inaccessibility to the enzyme.<sup>38</sup> It is of interest to study whether the packing of the DNA-CPT conjugate can also lower the rate of DNA degradation by nucleases. Because nucleic acid sequences with a length of 18-25 bases are particularly useful for gene regulation applications,<sup>39</sup> we focused on the DNA<sub>20</sub>-CPT conjugate. We synthesized a dabcyl-modified complementary strand for DNA<sub>20</sub>-CPT, and hybridized it to preformed, Cy3-modified DNA<sub>20</sub>-CPT nanostructure. The dabcyl quencher quenches the fluorescence of Cy3 when the duplex is formed. Upon introduction of DNase I (a nuclease with preference for phosphodiester linkages adjacent to pyrimidine nucleo-



**Figure 3.** (A) Schematic of the DNA stability assay against DNase I. (B) Kinetics of the enzymatic degradation of  $DNA_{20}$ -CPT and free Cy3-DNA<sub>20</sub> duplexes (100 nM), expressed as Cy3 fluorescence as a function of time upon DNase I introduction.

tides), the Cy3 fluorophores are released and an increase in fluorescence can be observed (Figure 3A). We found that the initial rate of duplex degradation for the DNA<sub>20</sub>-CPT nanostructures is approximately 60% of that for the free duplexes, and the time needed for half degradation is *ca*. 4.5 times longer (Figure 3B).

After establishing that the DNA-drug nanostructures exhibit SNA-like properties, we next characterized these nanostructures *in vitro* for light-activated cytotoxicity, using the breast cancer cell line SK-BR-3 as a model system. Confocal microscopy confirmed that DNA<sub>20</sub>-CPT nanostructures can be taken up by SK-BR-3 cells following 6 h of incubation (1  $\mu$ M) (Figure 4A). In order to assess the efficacy of the DNA-drug nanostructure, we first determined the proper dosage of UV light to minimize UV-induced cell death. SK-BR-3 cells were irradiated with 0.5-4.5 min of UV light (365 nm, 10 mJ•s<sup>-1</sup>cm<sup>-2</sup>) in the absence of drug, and cell viability assays were carried out after 24 h (Figure S10).

Under these conditions, photocytotoxicity is undetectable (cell viability near 100%). We next investigated whether a non-cell killing dose of UV light can activate the cytotoxicity of the DNAdrug nanostructure. SK-BR-3 cells were first treated with DNA<sub>20</sub>-CPT or free CPT, and after 6 h, UV light was applied. Non-UVtreated cells were used as controls. Because some extent of cell uptake has occurred within the initial 6 h of drug treatment, the CPT is expected to be released both intracellularly and extracellularly. The DNA<sub>20</sub>-CPT exhibited much reduced toxicity compared with free CPT in the absence of UV light (IC<sub>50</sub> 13  $\mu$ M vs. 330 nM), as expected from the chemical modification and packing of CPT (Figure 4B). Furthermore, the addition of UV irradiation did not increase the cytotoxicity of free CPT. On the other hand, the cell-killing efficacy of the DNA20-CPT conjugate was significantly amplified by UV treatment, which resulted in similar levels of toxicity as that of free CPT control (IC<sub>50</sub> 360 nM). These results suggest that the DNA-CPT conjugates can achieve controlled cytotoxicity by light triggering.



**Figure 4.** (A) Confocal microscopy image of SK-BR-3 cells following incubation with DNA<sub>20</sub>-CPT nanostructures (1  $\mu$ M) for 6 h (CPT channel). (B) Cytotoxicity measurement of CPT and DNA<sub>20</sub>-CPT nanoparticles in the absence and presence of UV. Error bars denote standard error of mean from three independent experiments.

In summary, we have demonstrated that nucleic acid/drug nanostructures can be achieved by taking advantage of the amphiphilicity of nucleic acid-drug conjugates. The nanostructures resulting from the solution assembly exhibit unique properties often found with densely arranged nucleic acid nanostructures, such as rapid cell uptake and enhanced nuclease stability, which makes these structures suitable as carrier-free delivery platforms. Furthermore, the photolabile DNA-CPT nanostructures show localized, light-controlled cytotoxicity, providing a favorable therapeutic window for potential clinical applications.

# ASSOCIATED CONTENT

#### **Supporting Information**

Materials and methods, additional characterization data. This material is available free of charge via the Internet at http://pubs.acs.org.

# AUTHOR INFORMATION

### **Corresponding Author**

k.zhang@neu.edu

#### Notes

The authors declare no competing financial interests.

# ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The authors thank William Fowle at the NEU Biology Department for help with the TEM. Financial support from Northeastern University start-up, NEU-DFCI seed grant, and NSF CAREER award (1453255) is gratefully acknowledged.

## REFERENCES

- Walsh, A. S.; Yin, H.; Erben, C. M.; Wood, M. J.; Turberfield, A. J. ACS Nano 2011, 5, 5427.
- (2) Rush, A. M.; Thompson, M. P.; Tatro, E. T.; Gianneschi, N. C. ACS Nano 2013, 7, 1379.
- (3) Zheng, J.; Zhu, G.; Li, Y.; Li, C.; You, M.; Chen, T.; Song, E.; Yang, R.; Tan, W. ACS Nano 2013, 7, 6545.
- (4) Conway, J. W.; Madwar, C.; Edwardson, T. G.; McLaughlin, C. K.; Fahkoury, J.; Lennox, R. B.; Sleiman, H. F. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2014, 136, 12987.
- (5) Lu, X.; Watts, E.; Jia, F.; Tan, X.; Zhang, K. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2014, 136, 10214.
- (6) Lin, C.; Jungmann, R.; Leifer, A. M.; Li, C.; Levner, D.; Church, G. M.; Shih, W. M.; Yin, P. Nat. Chem. 2012, 4, 832.
- (7) Tian, C.; Li, X.; Liu, Z.; Jiang, W.; Wang, G.; Mao, C. Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. 2014, 53, 8041.
- (8) Lau, K. L.; Hamblin, G. D.; Sleiman, H. F. Small 2014, 10, 660.
- (9) Zhang, K.; Zhu, X.; Jia, F.; Auyeung, E.; Mirkin, C. A. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2013, 135, 14102.
- (10) Giljohann, D. A.; Seferos, D. S.; Patel, P. C.; Millstone, J. E.; Rosi, N. L.; Mirkin, C. A. *Nano Lett.* **2007**, *7*, 3818.
- (11) Lytton-Jean, A. K.; Mirkin, C. A. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2005, 127, 12754.
- (12) Cutler, J. I.; Zhang, K.; Zheng, D.; Auyeung, E.; Prigodich, A. E.; Mirkin, C. A. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2011, 133, 9254.
- (13) Cutler, J. I.; Auyeung, E.; Mirkin, C. A. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2012, 134, 1376.
- (14) Chen, X. J.; Sanchez-Gaytan, B. L.; Hayik, S. E. N.; Fryd, M.; Wayland, B. B.; Park, S. J. Small 2010, 6, 2256.
- (15) Banga, R. J.; Chernyak, N.; Narayan, S. P.; Nguyen, S. T.; Mirkin, C. A. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2014, 136, 9866.
- (16) Young, K. L.; Scott, A. W.; Hao, L.; Mirkin, S. E.; Liu, G.; Mirkin, C. A. Nano Lett. 2012, 12, 3867.
- (17) Zhang, C.; Macfarlane, R. J.; Young, K. L.; Choi, C. H.; Hao, L.; Auyeung, E.; Liu, G.; Zhou, X.; Mirkin, C. A. Nat. Mater. 2013, 12, 741.
- (18) Wu, X. A.; Choi, C. H.; Zhang, C.; Hao, L.; Mirkin, C. A. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2014, 136, 7726.
- (19) Ibricevic, A.; Guntsen, S. P.; Zhang, K.; Shrestha, R.; Liu, Y.; Sun, J. Y.; Welch, M. J.; Wooley, K. L.; Brody, S. L. Nanomed. Nanotechnol. Biol. Med. 2013, 9, 912.
- (20) Patel, P. C.; Giljohann, D. A.; Daniel, W. L.; Zheng, D.; Prigodich, A. E.; Mirkin, C. A. *Bioconjugate Chem.* **2010**, *21*, 2250.
- (21) Choi, C. H.; Hao, L.; Narayan, S. P.; Auyeung, E.; Mirkin, C. A. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A. 2013, 110, 7625.
- (22) Hamblin, G. D.; Carneiro, K. M. M.; Fakhoury, J. F.; Bujold, K. E.; Sleiman, H. F. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2012, 134, 2888.
- (23) Wang, Y.; Gao, S.; Ye, W. H.; Yoon, H. S.; Yang, Y. Y. Nat. Mater. 2006, 5, 791.
- (24) Dhar, S.; Daniel, W. L.; Giljohann, D. A.; Mirkin, C. A.; Lippard, S. J. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2009, 131, 14652.
- (25) Alexander, C. M.; Hamner, K. L.; Maye, M. M.; Dabrowiak, J. C. *Bioconjugate Chem.* 2014, 25, 1261.
- (26) Cheetham, A. G.; Zhang, P.; Lin, Y. A.; Lock, L. L.; Cui, H. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 2013, 135, 2907.
- (27) Larson, N.; Ghandehari, H. Chem. Mater. 2012, 24, 840.
- (28) Duncan, R. Nat. Rev. Cancer 2006, 6, 688.
- (29) Chan, J. M.; Zhang, L.; Tong, R.; Ghosh, D.; Gao, W.; Liao, G.; Yuet, K. P.; Gray, D.; Rhee, J. W.; Cheng, J.; Golomb, G.; Libby, P.; Langer, R.; Farokhzad, O. C. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **2010**, *107*, 2213.
- (30) Pelliccioli, A. P.; Wirz, J. Photochem. Photobiol. Sci. 2002, 1, 441.
- (31) McKinnon, D. D.; Brown, T. E.; Kyburz, K. A.; Kiyotake, E.; Anseth, K. S. *Biomacromolecules* 2014, 15, 2808.
- (32) Haba, K.; Popkov, M.; Shamis, M.; Lerner, R. A.; Barbas, C. F., 3rd; Shabat, D. Angew. Chem. Int. Ed. 2005, 44, 716.
- (33) Chen, Z. P.; Zhang, P. C.; Cheetham, A. G.; Moon, J. H.; Moxley, J. W.; Lin, Y. A.; Cui, H. J. Control Release 2014, 191, 123.

- (34) Swaminathan, R. Clin. Biochem. Rev. 2003, 24, 47.
- (35) Lin, Y. A.; Cheetham, A. G.; Zhang, P.; Ou, Y. C.; Li, Y.; Liu, G.; Hermida-Merino, D.; Hamley, I. W.; Cui, H. ACS Nano 2014, 8, 12690.
- (36) Mai, Y. Y.; Eisenberg, A. Chem. Soc. Rev. 2012, 41, 5969.
- (37) Borisov, O. V.; Zhulina, E. B. Macromolecules 2002, 35, 4472.
- (38) Seferos, D. S.; Prigodich, A. E.; Giljohann, D. A.; Patel, P. C.; Mirkin, C. A. *Nano Lett.* **2009**, *9*, 308.
- (39) He, L.; Hannon, G. J. Nat. Rev. Genetics 2004, 5, 522.

58

59 60

