Material–tissue Interfaces: The Role of Surface Properties and Processes
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The introduction of a foreign material into living tissue—intentionally as in biomedical applications (implants, prostheses, drugs) or unintentionally as when minerals or fibers are inhaled—results in the creation of interfaces between the material and the surrounding tissue. This article identifies and discusses the possible role of material surface properties and molecular processes occurring at such interfaces. For kinetic and thermodynamic reasons, surfaces are different from the corresponding bulk of the material, and contain reactive (unsaturated) bonds, which in turn lead to the formation of surface reactive layers (e.g., surface oxides on metals) and adsorbed contamination layers. The encounter with the biological environment leads to further surface reactions modifying the surface, and to the adsorption of water, ions, and biomolecules, which are continuously exchanged. The exact nature of the dynamic, adsorbed water, ions, and biomolecule coating in turn influences the behavior of cells approaching the material surface, and hence the tissue response. — Environ Health Perspect 102(Suppl 5):41-45 (1994)
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Introduction

Imagine that a cavity were created in bone, soft tissue, or blood without initially perforating the remaining tissue. If the cavity were filled with a foreign material, an interface would have been created between the native tissue and the foreign material (Figure 1). The tissue consists of a variety of molecules—water, oxygen, negative and positive ions, proteins, and other biomolecules, which may be built up into larger structures such as cells and cell membranes. The foreign material could consist of individual atoms, molecules, or larger polymeric structures. These biological and nonbiological structures meet and interact at the interface. This article discusses some of the events likely to occur at the interface, in particular how they are influenced by, and connected to, the surface properties of the foreign material.

The Material Surface

The surface of a material is a termination of an extended, three-dimensional structure, and thus generally represents an increase in energy, the surface energy. On the atomic scale this energy is present as unbounded (unsaturated or "dangling") bonds. If there is a reactive environment such as air or water at a metal surface, the bonds react in much less than a second to form new bonds and compounds, thus lowering the surface energy. Therefore, a material surface usually has a different chemical composition from its bulk, as for example the oxide overlayers on almost all metals.

Hydroxylated ceramic surfaces provide a second example. Even macroscopically inert surfaces such as gold or diamond have a tendency to lower their surface energy by suitable terminations on the atomic scale. For example, diamond may terminate by C—H bonds at the surface.

If a surface thus stabilized is placed in a new environment, it is likely to react again to lower further the energy of the system. There is thus a built-in thermodynamic driving force for reactions of various kinds at tissue-material interfaces. Only in two exceptional cases do no reactions occur: either when the separated material and tissue systems have the lowest thermodynamic state, or when kinetic barriers prevent all possible reactions (1-3).

Titanium, which is used for dental implants (4) and in orthopedic devices (5,6) provides a specific example. When fresh titanium is exposed to air it reacts rapidly with atmospheric oxygen to form a surface oxide which is typically a few nanometers thick. The composition and thickness of this oxide layer have been extensively analyzed (7-15), for a variety of treatment conditions. The oxide stoichiometry is approximately TiO$_2$ (7,14,15). For oxidation temperatures <200°C, the oxide appears amorphous and glass-like, while thicker oxides formed at elevated temperatures or by electrochemical oxidation are more crystalline (8,10,11).

The surface is never perfectly clean TiO$_2$ for the TiO$_2$-terminated surface tends to bind molecules or atoms from the surroundings as a monomolecular layer. Typically it picks up hydrocarbons present as low-level impurities in the ambient air (8,16). Figure 2 shows spectra that represent the chemical composition of the outermost atomic layers recorded by X-ray photoemission spectroscopy (XPS or ESCA) of different titanium surfaces. Combining the information from these spectra with other similar information, and with measurements of oxide thickness, etc., gives a fairly realistic picture of a real surface meeting the tissue environment (Figure 3).

Processes at the Material–tissue Interface

The chemical constituents and pH, for example, of the biological environment

---

Figure 1. The implantation of a foreign material in any tissue will create an interface between the material and the biological system.
influence the interaction at the surface (1,3,17) (Figure 4). If the material is a metal, degradation by corrosion may result in release of metal ions from the oxidized metal surface into solution, which may then migrate throughout the biological system, potentially producing negative systemic effects such as allergic reactions. This has been demonstrated in animal experiments (18), and in humans (19), with metal ions such as Ni, Cr, Al, and V.

Even if dissolution of ions does not occur, the surface may be attacked by the tissue by an oxidative process if the oxide layer, instead of remaining passive, becomes thicker via anion or cation transport through the oxide layer. This can occur in the presence of oxygen radicals and peroxy species, or certain complex-forming ions in the biological environment (20,21), or catalyzing species that accelerate oxidation. If oxide growth occurs in vivo, as has been demonstrated experimentally (22,23), it may be accompanied by inclusion of ions present in the bioliquid (as indicated for Ca and P in Figure 4). Thus, the surface of the material, and its interface with the tissue, may be very dynamic and may undergo continuous remodeling. Biodegradable materials constitute an extreme and intentional case of this event—the whole material eventually is dissolved. In the other extreme, like bone anchored devices, the requirement is a stable, yet fully tissue-integrated device, which may require an initial or continuous microscopic remodeling of the surface, but at a rate that has a negligible effect on the macroscopic dimensions of the implant (Figure 5).

The material surface is, in relation to the tissue, a foreign chemical species that has reactive sites, such as unsaturated chemical bonds, which can either be the main constituents of the surface or impurities that have become incorporated in it. The termination of polymer chains on polymer surfaces also may be reaction sites, which can interact with reactive groups, for example, on protein and carbohydrate molecules.

Reactions between a biomolecule and the material surface may lead to a permanent or temporary bond formation, which are either weak (1), of van der Waals or hydrogen bonding type, or stronger ionic or covalent bonds (7). In contrast, interactions may be so strong that, for example, proteins are reversibly or irreversibly denatured by formation of multiple bonds with the surface, accompanied by breaking of internal bonds within the protein (24-26). Such interaction might lead to total dissociation of the biomolecules, as is frequently seen with smaller molecules like O₂, H₂, H₂O, and hydrocarbons on metal and oxide surfaces (27). It also may lead to catalytic action that irreversibly modifies the protein conformation and composition,
even if it is eventually released from the surface.

The molecular events at the material–tissue interface involve small molecules, like water, which can dissociate to OH-groups or bind to the surface by hydrogen bonds. They also involve larger molecules like proteins, which sometimes denature (Figure 6). This hydration and protein layer is dynamic and surface specific since different surfaces will develop very different coatings in the same tissue, because of their different chemical properties.

Eventually the larger structures like cells, which have lower mobility, will reach the surface with its organic overlayer (Figure 6). Since both the cell membrane with its coating of biomolecules and the material surface are dynamic, they can exchange proteins, ions, and other substances, and form a complex and dynamic interface. Depending on the nature of the material surface and its organic coating, cells react differently to different biomaterials. They may experience the surface as a serious perturbation and react violently inducing an inflammatory response; if the surface is experienced as “tissue-like,” no reactions or only mild ones may occur.

The connection between microscopic events and properties at the atomic and molecular levels at the tissue–material interface and the macroscopic events and structures are depicted in Figure 5. The surface-specific reactions form a dynamic surface coating of molecular dimensions, which eventually interacts with the cells and their sensors, which in turn react in different ways depending on the exact nature of the original surface. Figure 7 schematically outlines a time–space scenario along these lines for the case of a bone-anchored implant.

**Surface Characterization and Preparation**

Surface characterization and controlled surface preparation, both on the atomic scale, are vital ingredients in any research effort to improve our understanding of the material–tissue interface and the processes occurring there. It is possible to analyze the outermost atomic layer(s) of a material with a sensitivity of down to 0.1 to 1% of a monolayer; the composition of the surface can be prepared with a similar degree of control. This constitutes an invaluable base for systematic studies of the material–tissue interface.

**Research Needs and Opportunities**

Although the ideas and suggestions developed below are intended to be applicable to implantable medical devices, they could apply to any type of material–tissue interactions.

The biomaterial–tissue interface is, as a research field, still in its infancy; and because little factual knowledge exists, much effort goes into formulating the central problems and questions and into developing better research methods. The need for knowledge from many different disciplines, which usually do not communicate with each other, is an obvious problem. Some key questions for the ongoing and future research are (3):

- Which biomolecules are adsorbed in the first monomolecular layer on the biomaterial surface?
- What type of bonding keeps the biomolecules to that surface? How strong are the bonds? Which part(s) of the adsorbed biomolecules is (are) involved in the bonding?
- Is the conformation of these biomolecules changed and if so, is the conformational change reversible or irreversible?
- Which molecules are bound in the second and third layer, etc., and how are they bound to each other?
- Is there a continuous exchange, over time, of the molecules adsorbed at the surface, and what are the time scales for such exchange?
- How close to the surface can cells come? Is there always a layer of extracellular components that separate cells from the surface?
- How does the surface influence cell differentiation and activity?
- How is information communicated between cells and biomaterial surfaces in vivo?
- How are water and hydrated ions structured at the interface and how do they bind to the surface? How does water bonding influence protein bonding, etc.?

- How does the chemical composition of the surface influence the biological response? What is the role of surface contamination?
- How important is the microstructure and topography of the surface?

It is evident that the implantation of a biomaterial device results in a series of coupled events, starting with the initial preparation of the implant. The surface properties of the implant may influence the later interface evolution as a "memory effect" by determining the nature of the water layer, which in turn determines the protein-surface and cell surface interactions. These interactions eventually determine the ultimate success or failure of the implant.

A research program addressing these issues will involve adsorption studies of water and proteins with kinetic methods, with a variety of spectroscopic methods of atomic resolution, microscopic methods to obtain the bonding, orientation, and structure of water and proteins on the surface, etc. Simplified model systems of simple molecules and well-characterized surfaces as well as complex mixtures of biomolecules and heterogeneous surfaces will be employed. Cell level interaction studies are necessary, as well as real in vivo experiments. Some studies will concentrate on static situations (snap-shot pictures); others
Figure 7. An artist’s attempt to capture some of the complexity involved in the interaction between a material and living tissue, exemplified here by a titanium implant in bone. Note the wide range of dimensions and time scales that are relevant.

The scenario outlined above could equally well have started from the highest complexity, the in vivo situation, then approached the molecular level situation in descending order of complexity and length scales. The mutual interaction between research efforts at all these levels of complexity and size eventually will allow us to draw a real, rather than hypothetical, interface scenario like the one in Figure 7.

REFERENCES

1. Kasemo B, Lausmaa J. Surface science aspects on inorganic biomaterials. CRC Crit Rev Biocomp 2:335–380 (1986).
2. Kasemo B, Lausmaa J. Biomaterials from a surface science perspective. In: Surface Characterization of Biomaterials (Ratner BD, ed). New York: Elsevier, 1988;1–12.
3. Kasemo B, Lausmaa J. The biomaterial-tissue interface and its analogues in surface science and technology. In: The Bone-Biomaterials Interface (Davies JE, ed). Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1991;19–32.
4. Brånemark P-I, Zarb GA, Albrektsson T, eds. Tissue Integrated Prostheses: Osseointegration in Clinical Practice. Chicago: Quintessence, 1985.
5. Luckey HA, Kubli F Jr, eds. Titanium alloys in surgical implants. ASTM Special Technical Publications, Vol 796. Philadelphia: American Society for Testing and Materials, 1983.
6. Williams DF. Titanium as a metal for implantation. J Med Eng Technol 1:266–270 (1977).
7. Lausmaa J, Kasemo B, Mattson H. Surface spectroscopic characterization of titanium implant materials. Appl Surface Sci 44:133–146 (1990).
8. Lausmaa J. Surface oxides on titanium: preparation, characterization and biomaterial properties. University of Gothenburg, 1991. Ph.D. dissertation.
9. Ask M, Lausmaa J, Kasemo B. Preparation and surface spectroscopic characterization of oxide films on Ti6Al4V. Appl Surface Sci 35:283–301 (1988–1989).
10. Ask M, Rolander U, Lausmaa J, Kasemo B. Microstructure and morphology of surface oxide films on Ti6Al4V. J Mater Res 5:1662–1667 (1990).
11. Rådegran G, Lausmaa J, Rolander U, Mattsson L, Kasemo B. Preparation of ultra-thin oxide windows on titanium for TEM analysis. J Electron Microsc Techn 19:99–106 (1991).
12. Lausmaa J, Kasemo B, Mattson H, Odelius H. Multi-technique surface characterization of oxide films on electropolished and anodically oxidized titanium. Appl Surface Sci 45:189–200 (1990).
13. Smith DC, Pilliar RM, Menton JB, Mclntyre NS. Dental implant materials. II. Preparative procedures and surface spectroscopic studies. J Biomed Mater Res 25:1069–1084 (1991).
14. Healy KE, Ducheyne P. Hydration and preferential molecular adsorption on titanium in vitro. Biomaterials 13:553–561 (1992).
15. Maeusli PA, Bloch PR, Geret V, Steinemann SG. Surface characterization of titanium and titanium alloys. In: Biological and Biomechanical Performance of Biomaterials (Christel P, Meunier A, Lee AJC, eds). Amsterdam:Elsevier, 1986;57–62.
16. Kasemo B, Lausmaa J. Biomaterial and implant surfaces: on the role of cleanliness, contamination, and preparation procedures. J Biomed Mater Res 22(A2):145–158 (1988).
17. Kasemo B, Lausmaa J. Biomaterial and implant materials: a surface science approach. Int J Oral Maxillofac Surg 3:247–259 (1988).
18. Woodman JL, Jacobs JJ, Galante JO, Urban RM. Metal-ion release from titanium-based prosthetic segmental replacements of long bones in baboons: a long-term study. J Orthop Res 1:421–430 (1984).
19. Jacobs JJ, Skipor AK, Black J, Urban RM, Galante JO. Release and excretion of metal in patients who have a total hip-replacement component made of titanium-base alloy. J Bone Joint Surg 73-A:1475–1486 (1991).
20. Tengvall P, Lundström I. Physicochemical considerations of titanium as a biomaterial. Clin Mater 9:115–134 (1992).
21. Healy KE, Ducheyne P. The mechanism of passive dissolution of titanium in a model physiological environment. J Biomed Mater Res 26:319–338 (1992).
22. McQueen D, Sundgren J-E, Ivarsson B, Lundström I, af Ekenstam B, Svensson A, Brånenmark P-I, Albrektsson T. Auger electron spectroscopic studies of titanium implants. In: Clinical applications of biomaterials (Lee AJC, Albrektsson T, Brånenmark P-I, eds). New York:John Wiley & Sons, 1982;179–185.
23. Sundgren J-E, Bodó P, Lundström I. Auger electron spectroscopic studies of the interface between human tissue and implants of titanium and stainless steel. J Colloid Interface Sci 110:9–20 (1986).
24. Andrade JD, ed. Protein Adsorption, Surface and Interfacial Aspects of Biomedical Polymers, Vol 2. New York: Plenum Press, 1985.
25. Ivarsson B, Lundström I. Physical characterization of protein adsorption on metal and metal oxide surfaces. CRC Crit Rev Biocomp 2:1–96 (1986).
26. Lundström I. Protein conformation at surfaces. In: Oral Interfacial Reactions of Bone, Soft Tissue and Saliva (Glantz P-O, Leach SA, Ericson T, eds). Oxford:IRL Press, 1985;9–23.
27. King DA, Woodruff DP, eds. The Chemical Physics and Heterogeneous Catalysis of Solid Surfaces, Vols 1–4, Amsterdam: Elsevier, 1983.