Supporting Information

808 nm Near-Infrared Light Controlled Dual-Drug Release and Cancer Therapy in vivo by Upconversion Mesoporous Silica Nanostructures

Yunlu Dai^a, Huiting Bi^a, Xiaoran Deng^b, Chunxia Li^{b,*}, Fei He^a, Ping'an Ma^b, Piaoping Yang^{a,*}, and Jun Lin^{b,*}

^a Key Laboratory of Superlight Materials and Surface Technology, Ministry of Education, Harbin Engineering University, Harbin, 150001, P. R. China.

^b State Key Laboratory of Rare Earth Resource Utilization, Changchun Institute of Applied Chemistry, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Changchun 130022, P. R. China. Chemicals and materials: The rare earth oxides of Y₂O₃, Gd₂O₃, Nd₂O₃, Yb₂O₃ and Tm₂O₃ (99.999%) were purchased from Science and Technology Parent Company of Changchun Institute of Applied Chemistry. Aminopropyltriethoxysilane (APTES), octadecene (ODE. 90%. technical grade), 1-(3-dimethylaminopropyl)-3ethylcarbodiimide hydrochloride (EDC), N-hydroxysuccinimide (NHS), ammonium fluoride, trifluorocaetic acid, hydroxide (H₂O₂) (30% in H₂O), Methanol, AgNO₃, oleic acid, cyclohexanone and NaN₃ were purchased from Beijing Chemical Regent Co., Ltd... Tetraethylorthosilicate (TEOS), cetyltrimethylammonium bromide (CTAB), βcyclodextrin (CD) and fluorescein isothiocyanate were purchased from Aladdin. Cis-Diamminedichloroplatinum (II) (cisplatin) was purchased from Zibo Aote Fine Chemical Factory (Shandong, China). Doxorubicin hydrochloride (DOX) was obtained from Nanjing Duodian Chemical Limited Company (China). Succinic anhydride was obtained from Sinopharm Chemical Reagent Co. Extra dry toluene, extra dry methyl sulfoxide (DMSO) and 1-adamantanemethylamine was purchased from Thermo Fisher Scientific.

Characterization: The X-ray diffraction (XRD) measurements were operated on a D8 Focus diffractometer (Bruker) with Cu Ka radiation ($\lambda = 0.15405$ nm). Transmission electron microscopy (TEM) was obtained using FEI Tecnai G2 S-Twin with a field emission gun operating at 200 kV. Fourier-transform Infrared spectra were performed on a Vertex Perkin–Elmer 580BIR spectrophotometer (Bruker) with the KBr pellet technique. Zeta potential of the mixtures was performed by Zetasizer Nano ZS (Malvern Instruments Ltd., UK). The UC emission spectra were taken on an F-7000 spectrophotometer (Hitachi) equipped using a 980 nm laser as the excitation source. The UV-vis absorption spectrum was obtained by Hitachi U-3100 spectrophotometer. Inductively Coupled Plasma (ICP) results were obtained on an iCAP 6300 of Thermo scientific. The surface temperature of the tumor site was tested by an infrared thermometer (AR300, Smart Sensor). The conclusions section should come in this section at the end of the article, before the acknowledgements.



Scheme S1. The surface functionalization of UCNPs@mSiO₂ nanoparticles.

Fourier-transform Infrared (FTIR) spectra: The FT-IR spectra of UCNPs@mSiO₂-NH₂, UCNPs@mSiO₂-DPP and UCNPs@mSiO₂-DPP-Ad and UCNPs@mSiO₂-DPP-Ad@CD were given in Figure S1. The peak appeared at 1620 cm⁻¹ can be assigned to N-H vibration. In the case of the pro-drug conjugated UCNPs@mSiO₂-DPP, the peak at 2038 cm⁻¹ deals with the N₃ group of DPP, which confirms the successful modification of DPP onto the surface of the particles.¹ And the peak at 1644 cm⁻¹ is attributed to the coordinated carboxyl group of DPP.¹ After modification with Ad, the obvious peak at 2926 cm⁻¹ is attributed to the -CH₂ stretching in the Ad structure. Due to the supramolecular interaction between Ad and β-CD, we modify the surface with β-CD to gain the UCNPs@mSiO₂-DPP-Ad@CD. The peak of 1646 can be attributed to the vibration of H-O-H of the H₂O, which is absorbed on the â-CD. Compared with the UCNPs@mSiO₂-DPP-Ad, the appeared peaks at 956 cm⁻¹ and 1060 cm⁻¹ for growth of the peaks of the UCNPs@mSiO₂-DPP-Ad@CD are ascribable to β-CD cyclic vibration, which overlay the vibration bands of Si-OH and Si-O-Si at ~1080 cm⁻¹, respectively.² These results demonstrate that we have succeeded in chemically modifying and assembling the nanoparticles.

The rough calculations process of photons absorbance of UCNPs and the UV photon needed to activate the platinum drug:

For one UCNP, the diameter is 65 nm, the superficial area can be calculated:

$$S = 4\pi r^2 = 4 \times 3.14 \times (65 \times 10^{-9}/2)^2 = 1.33 \times 10^{-14} m^2$$

The pump power is 3 W/cm², each UCNP absorbs the energy:

$$E(UCNP) = 3 \times 10^{4W} / m^2 \times 1.33 \times 10^{-14} m^2 = 4.0 \times 10^{-10} w = 4.0 \times 10^{-10} J/s$$

One-electron transfers from azide to Pt for platinum prodrug photoactivation process, which needs one UV phonon. We could calculate the energy of each 365 nm phonon:

$$e(365P) = hv = \frac{hc}{\lambda} = \frac{6.63 \times 10^{-34} \times 3 \times 10^8}{365 \times 10^{-9}} = 5.45 \times 10^{-19} J$$

If the UV upconversion quantum yield is as low as 0.001%, each UCNP could produce 4.0×10⁻¹⁵ J every second. Therefore, thousands of drug molecules are activated and released from per nanoparticles.



Figure S1. FTIR spectra of (a) UCNPs@mSiO₂-NH₂, (b) UCNPs@mSiO₂-DPP, (c) UCNPs@mSiO₂-DPP-Ad and (d) UCNPs@mSiO₂-DPP-Ad@CD.



Figure S2. N₂ absorption/desorption isotherm of the UCNPs@mSiO₂ (a), UCNPs@mSiO₂-DPP-DOX (b) and UCNPs@mSiO₂-DPP-DOX@CD (c).



Figure S3.Energy-transfer mechanisms in the core-shell-shellNaYF4:Yb0.4/Tm0.02@NaGdF4:Yb0.1@NaNdF4:Yb0.1_upconversion nanoparticle upon 808 nm diode-laser excitation.



Figure S4. (a) High angle annular dark field scanning transmission electron microscopy (HAADF-STEM) of NaYF₄:Yb_{0.4}/Tm_{0.02}@NaGdF₄:Yb_{0.1}@NaNdF₄:Yb_{0.1} nanoparticles and HAAD-STEM-EDX elemental distribution maps of (b) Y, (c) Gd and (d) Nd.



Figure S5. UC emission spectra of the NaYF₄:Yb_{0.4}/Tm_{0.02} (excitation at 980 nm, black line), NaYF₄:Yb_{0.4}/Tm_{0.02}@NaGdF₄:Yb_{0.1} (excitation at 980 nm, red line) and NaYF₄:Yb_{0.4}/Tm_{0.02}@NaGdF₄:Yb_{0.1}@NaNdF₄:Yb_{0.1} (UCNPs) (excitation at 808 nm, green line). The luminescence photograph of UCNPs under 980 nm and 808 nm laser in the dark is given in the inset. After growth of the NaNdF₄:Gd³⁺ shell, the upconversion luminescence intensity of the NaNdF⁴:Gd³⁺ coated nanoparticles under 808 nm excitation can be enhanced remarkably compared to the NaYF₄:Yb³⁺/Tm³⁺@NaGdF₄:Yb³⁺ nanoparticles under 980 nm



Figure S6. The absorption spectra of UCNPs@mSiO₂-DPP after exposed to (a) 365 nm UV and (b) 980 nm laser for different time.



Figure S7. Cell viability after being irradiated with 808 nm laser under different intensities for 30 min (10 min break after 10 min irradiation).



Figure S8. Images of digital photos of H&E stained tumor sections after 15 day treatment from different groups. UCNPs@mSiO₂-DPP-DOX@CD + 808 nm laser irradiation (a), UCNPs@mSiO₂-DPP-DOX@CD + UV irradiation (b), UCNPs-DPP-PEG in the dark (c), 808 nm laser irradiation (d) and saline (e). All the scale bars are 100 μ m



Figure S9. The images of control mouse (a) and the mouse with 808 nm laser irradiation at 3 W/cm^2 on the surface of skin for 30 min (10 min break after 10 min irradiation).



Figure S10. H&E stained images of heart, liver, spleen, lung, kidney of mice after 14 day treatment from different groups.



Figure S11. In vitro HeLa cells' relative viabilities after incubation for 24 h with free DOX and platinum prodrug at different concentrations. Group 1: 2 μ g/mL of DOX and 0.88 μ g/mL of platinum, Group 2: 1 μ g/mL of DOX and 0.44 μ g/mL of platinum, Group 3: 0.5 μ g/mL of DOX and 0.22 μ g/mL of platinum, Group 4: 0.25 μ g/mL of DOX and 0.11 μ g/mL of platinum, Group 5: 0.125 μ g/mL of DOX and 0.055 μ g/mL of platinum, respectively.



Figure S12. The upconversion luminescence imaging of UCNPs@mSiO₂-DPP-DOX@CD in the tumor site before (a) and after (b) 808 nm laser irradiation.

References:

- H. Xiao, G. T. Noble, J. F. Stefanick, R. Qi, T. Kiziltepe, X. Jing, B. Bilgicer, J. Control. Release 2014, 173, 11-17.
- P. Díez, A. Sánchez, M. Gamella, P. Martínez-Ruíz, E. Aznar, C. de la Torre, J. R. Murguía, R. Martínez-Máñez, R. Villalonga, J. M. Pingarrón, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 2014, *136*, 9116-9123.