Electronic Supplementary Material (ESI) for Biomaterials Science. This journal is © The Royal Society of Chemistry 2019

Supplementary Information

Colorectal distribution and retention of polymeric nanoparticles following incorporation into a thermosensitive enema

Mélanie Melo, Rute Nunes, Bruno Sarmento, José das Neves



Figure S1. Sol-gel transition temperature for different concentrations of poloxamer 407 in water as determined by rheological measurements. Results are presented as mean \pm SD (*n*=3). Dashed line represents linear regression from data for poloxamer 407 in water. Blue symbols included in the graph are for mean values previously reported in the literature, namely by BASF,¹ Wang *et al.*,² Edsman *et al.*,³ Veyries *et al.*,⁴ Charruea *et al.*,⁵ Ricci *et al.*,⁶ and Zeng *et al.*⁷

Table S1. Sol-gel transition temperature and time for poloxamer 407 at 15% (*w/v*) in plain water or in presence of different buffers/excipients. Results are presented as mean \pm SD (*n*=3). No significant differences were found when comparing with the polymer at 15% (*w/v*) in plain water (*p*<0.05).

Composition	Sol-gel transition temperature (°C)		Sol-gel transition
	Magnetic bar	Rheological	time (min)
	immobilization	measurements	
P407 + water	29 ± 2	$\textbf{29.9} \pm \textbf{1.1}$	3.1 ± 0.3
P407 + citrate buffer ^a	29 ± 1	$\textbf{28.2}\pm\textbf{0.3}$	$\textbf{3.1}\pm\textbf{0.7}$
P407 + NaP buffer ^a	30 ± 1	$\textbf{28.1} \pm \textbf{0.5}$	$\textbf{2.9}\pm\textbf{0.7}$
P407 + water + 2% (<i>w/v</i>) glycerin	$\textbf{30}\pm\textbf{3}$	$\textbf{28.4} \pm \textbf{0.6}$	$\textbf{3.3}\pm\textbf{0.3}$
P407 + water + 5% (w/v) glycerin	29 ± 2	$\textbf{28.0} \pm \textbf{0.6}$	$\textbf{2.6}\pm\textbf{0.2}$
P407 + water + 0.1% (<i>w/v</i>) sorbic acid	29 ± 1	$\textbf{28.7} \pm \textbf{0.9}$	$\textbf{3.2}\pm\textbf{0.8}$
P407 + NaP buffer ^a + 5% (<i>w/v</i>) glycerin	29 ± 1	28.9 ± 0.8	$\textbf{3.2}\pm\textbf{0.3}$

P407: poloxamer 407; NaP: sodium phosphate; a 10 mM, pH 7.0.



Figure S2. Appearance of NPs-in-thermo containing different concentration of plain PLGA NPs (*w/w*) at 20 °C (left) and 37 °C (right). Tubes in the right image were flipped in order to highlight the consistency of formulations at body temperature.



Figure S3. Toxicity potential of PLGA NPs and PLGA-Cy7.5 NPs to Caco-2 cells as tested using the LDH release assay and the MTT reduction assay. Data presented as mean \pm SD (*n*=3). Dotted horizontal lines at 20%, 70% and 100% were included for reference.

Table S2. Properties of DPV-loaded NPs-in-thermo (1% (w/v) in particles and 0.04% in drug (w/v)), DPV-in-thermo (0.04% in free drug (w/v)), and NPs-in-thermo containing 0.2% (w/v) Cy7.5:NPs (total of 1% (w/v) in particles). Results are presented as mean \pm SD (n=3).

Properties	Thermosensitive enemas formulations			
	Dapivirine-loaded NPs	Free dapivirine	Cy7.5:NPs	
Sol-gel transition temperature (°C)				
Magnetic bar immobilization	27 ± 1	31 ± 3	28 ± 1	
Rheological measurements	28 ± 2	30 ± 5	29 ± 1	
Sol-gel transition time (min)	$\textbf{1.5}\pm\textbf{0.2}$	$\textbf{2.1}\pm\textbf{0.3}$	1.8 ± 0.3	
Viscosity (mPa.s)				
@20 °C/shear rate=40 s ⁻¹	26 ± 6	37 ± 11	19 ± 3	
@37 °C/shear rate=40 s ⁻¹	$\textbf{1,729} \pm \textbf{435}$	$\textbf{1,}\textbf{433}\pm\textbf{609}$	$\textbf{1,638} \pm \textbf{322}$	
Osmolality (mOsm/kg)	478 ± 7	459 ± 12	441 ± 8	
рН	7.1 ± 0.1	7.0 ± 0.2	7.1 ± 0.1	



Figure S4. Fluorescence signal obtained from **(a)** full body, live animals in supine position, and **(b)** excised colorectal tissues at 6 h following administration. All images presented as the superimposition of black & white photos and NIR signal distribution. Values in heat map scales are presented in $p.cm^2.s^{-1}.\mu W^{-1}$.

Supplementary references

- BASF SE. Poloxamers as Gelling Agents for Topical Formulations. Available at URL: https://products.basf.com/documents/pim;save/en/8878972414421.Poloxamers%20as%20Gell ing%20Agents%20in%20Topical%20Formulations.pdf (last accessed Nov 22, 2018).
- 2. P. Wang and T. P. Johnston, J. Appl. Polym. Sci., 1991, 43, 283-292.
- 3. K. Edsman, J. Carlfors and R. Petersson, *Eur. J. Pharm. Sci.*, 1998, **6**, 105-112.
- 4. M. L. Veyries, G. Couarraze, S. Geiger, F. Agnely, L. Massias, B. Kunzli, F. Faurisson and B. Rouveix, *Int. J. Pharm.*, 1999, **192**, 183-193.
- 5. C. Charrueau, C. Tuleu, V. Astre, J. L. Grossiord and J. C. Chaumeil, *Drug Dev. Ind. Pharm.*, 2001, **27**, 351-357.
- 6. E. J. Ricci, M. V. Bentley, M. Farah, R. E. Bretas and J. M. Marchetti, *Eur. J. Pharm. Sci.*, 2002, **17**, 161-167.
- 7. N. Zeng, G. Dumortier, M. Maury, N. Mignet and V. Boudy, *Int. J. Pharm.*, 2014, **467**, 70-83.