Functionalized Lanthanide Oxide Nanoparticles for Tumor Targeting, Medical Imaging, and Therapy
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Abstract: Recent progress in functionalized lanthanide oxide (Ln₂O₃) nanoparticles for tumor targeting, medical imaging, and therapy is reviewed. Among the medical imaging techniques, magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) is an important noninvasive imaging tool for tumor diagnosis due to its high spatial resolution and excellent imaging contrast, especially when contrast agents are used. However, commercially available low-molecular-weight MRI contrast agents exhibit several shortcomings, such as nonspecificity for the tissue of interest and rapid excretion in vivo. Recently, nanoparticle-based MRI contrast agents have become a hot research topic in biomedical imaging due to their high performance, easy surface functionalization, and low toxicity. Among them, functionalized Ln₂O₃ nanoparticles are applicable as MRI contrast agents for tumor-targeting and nontumor-targeting imaging and image-guided tumor therapy. Primarily, Gd₂O₃ nanoparticles have been intensively investigated as tumor-targeting T₁ MRI contrast agents. T₂ MRI is also possible due to the appreciable paramagnetic moments of Ln₂O₃ nanoparticles (Ln = Dy, Ho, and Tb) at room temperature arising from the nonzero orbital motion of 4f electrons. In addition, Ln₂O₃ nanoparticles are eligible as X-ray computed tomography contrast agents because of their high X-ray attenuation power. Since nanoparticle toxicity is of great concern, recent toxicity studies on Ln₂O₃ nanoparticles are also discussed.
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1. Introduction

Medical imaging plays an important role in the pre-detection, diagnosis, and treatment of tumors [1]. Among the currently available medical imaging techniques, magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) allows whole-body imaging and outstanding microscopic tissue contrast and image resolution to reveal morphological and anatomical details of tissues [2,3]. As imaging agents, various nanoparticles have been developed due to their remarkable physical and chemical properties, which are superior to those of small molecules [4–7]. Moreover, nanoparticles can be easily surface-functionalized for advanced imaging and tumor targeting [8,9]. They can also provide longer blood circulation times than small molecules, which is conducive to tumor targeting and drug delivery to specific tumor cells [10,11].

Lanthanide oxide (Ln₂O₃) nanoparticles (Ln = Gd, Tb, Dy, and Ho) are of special interest because they have appreciable magnetic moments at room temperature, which is useful for MRI [12–15], and high X-ray attenuation power, which is useful for X-ray computed tomography (CT) [16–18]. In addition, surface-modified Ln₂O₃ nanoparticles exhibit improved properties, such as high-water proton spin relaxivities, high colloidal stabilities, and low toxicities [12–14]. For in vivo applications, nanoparticles should have an ultrasmall particle diameter (<3 nm) to allow their excretion from the body via the urinary system after...
intravenous injection [19,20]. Ln$_2$O$_3$ nanoparticles meet such requirements, displaying excellent MRI and CT imaging properties at ultrasmall particle diameters [12–15].

The development of tumor-targeting Ln$_2$O$_3$ nanoparticles is challenging. Especially when compared with commercial molecular Gd-chelates [21–23], Gd$_3$O$_3$ nanoparticles are more efficient longitudinal relaxation promoters [12–15] because their longitudinal relaxivity ($r_1$) values are higher than those (i.e., 3–5 s$^{-1}$mM$^{-1}$) [21–23] of commercial molecular MRI contrast agents. Therefore, Gd$_3$O$_3$ nanoparticles can provide very high contrast $T_1$ MR images and thus, are ideal candidates for tumor-targeting $T_1$ MRI contrast agents. In particular, their $r_1$ value is optimal at ultrasmall nanoparticle size (1.0–2.5 nm) [24,25]. Meanwhile, other Ln$_2$O$_3$ nanoparticles (Ln = Dy, Tb, and Ho) are eligible as $T_2$ MRI contrast agents [12,13,15].

Nanoparticles alone accumulate nonspecifically in tumors via passive targeting, i.e., the enhanced permeability and retention (EPR) effect [26]. The accumulation amount and specificity to tumors can be enhanced by active targeting, which is commonly achieved by modifying contrast agents with tumor-targeting ligands that can selectively bind to receptors overexpressed on tumor-cell membranes. Such tumor-targeting ligands include small molecules, such as arginylglycylaspartic acids (Arg-Gly-Asp or RGDs) [27–29] and folate acid [30,31], peptides, such as chlorotoxin (CTX) [32,33], and biological molecules, such as antibodies [34]. Nanoparticles can provide a flexible platform to attach tumor-targeting ligands, thereby improving their specificity and effectiveness for tumor treatment. In addition, anticancer drugs can also be attached to nanoparticle surfaces for chemotherapy. Generally, in this type of treatment, most anticancer drugs cannot differentiate between tumor and normal cells, causing toxic side effects [35,36]. However, such side effects can be minimized or eliminated by delivering drugs via tumor-targeting nanoparticles. However, the cytotoxicity and biocompatibility of lanthanides during and after endocytosis by cells are still largely unknown, although numerous reports describe lanthanides as relatively non-toxic elements [37,38].

The main purpose of this review is to provide an insight into tumor imaging and image-guided tumor therapy using functionalized (i.e., tumor-targeting ligand-conjugated) Ln$_2$O$_3$ nanoparticles. First, nanoparticle synthesis methods, surface-modification, tumor-targeting ligand conjugation, and various experimental analyses for Ln$_2$O$_3$ nanoparticles are introduced. Second, physicochemical properties, such as particle diameters and magnetic properties, and imaging properties, including relaxivities, are discussed. Third, recent developments of tumor-targeting $T_1$ MRI contrast agents based on Gd$_3$O$_3$ nanoparticles that were applied in tumor imaging and image-guided tumor therapy and Ln$_2$O$_3$ nanoparticle-based $T_2$ MRI and CT contrast agents are discussed. Finally, recent progress in the knowledge of the toxicity of Ln$_2$O$_3$ nanoparticles is discussed. Overall, this review provides an overview of the recent progress in functionalized Ln$_2$O$_3$ nanoparticles applied in tumor imaging and therapy.

2. Synthesis and Surface Functionalization of Ln$_2$O$_3$ Nanoparticles

Among the various methods currently available for the synthesis of ultrasmall Ln$_2$O$_3$ nanoparticles, the synthesis in a polyol solvent is preferred for biomedical applications because ultrasmall nanoparticles are obtained (average particle diameter = 2.0 nm) and subsequent surface coating of the nanoparticles with hydrophilic and biocompatible ligands can be performed in one pot [17,31]. A general reaction scheme for the polyol synthesis is provided in Figure 1.
Nanoparticle contrast agents possess an additional advantage over molecular agents because cancer-targeting ligands and drugs can be easily attached to the nanoparticle surfaces. Small molecular ligands are less efficient in providing good colloidal stability to nanoparticles compared with polymer ligands, which is due to the presence of many hydrophilic binding groups in the polymers for attachment to the nanoparticles [39–43]. In addition, hydrophilic polymers can provide higher $r_1$ values than small molecular ligands [39–41] because they can attract more water molecules around the nanoparticles. Examples of these polymers are polyacrylic acid (PAA), polymethyl vinyl ether-alt-maleic acid (PMVEMA), and polyacrylic acid-co-maleic acid (PAAMA) having numerous COOH groups (Figure 1) [39–41], which can serve as anchor groups of functional molecules, such as cancer-targeting ligands and drugs. For example, RGD-conjugated PAA-coated Gd$_2$O$_3$ nanoparticles were reported by Ho et al. [44] (Figure 2).

Ln$_2$O$_3$ nanoparticles can also be synthesized in organic solvents via the thermal decomposition method. The synthesized nanoparticles can be further coated with hydrophilic ligands and then conjugated with cancer-targeting ligands. For example, CTX-poly(ethylene glycol)-N-(trimethoxysilylpropyl) ethylenediamine triacetic acid silane-coated Gd$_2$O$_3$ nanoparticles (CTX-PEG-TETT-Gd$_2$O$_3$) were reported by Gu et al. [45] as tumor-targeting contrast agents (Figure 3). Here, the biocompatible poly(ethylene glycol) (PEG) layer is known to stabilize the Gd$_2$O$_3$ nanoparticles, enhance blood circulation blood times, and improve colloidal stability [11].
Figure 2. Two-step synthesis of RGD-PAA-Gd$_2$O$_3$ nanoparticles. (a) Step 1: PAA-Gd$_2$O$_3$ nanoparticles and (b) step 2: conjugation of RGD with PAA-Gd$_2$O$_3$ nanoparticles. EDC = N-(3-dimethylaminopropyl)-N’-ethylcarbodiimide, NHS = N-hydroxysuccinimide, and UGNP = ultrasmall gadolinium oxide nanoparticle. Adapted with permission from [44], The Royal Society of Chemistry, 2020.

Figure 3. Schematic illustration for the synthesis of CTX-PEG-TETT-Gd$_2$O$_3$ nanoparticles. TETT = N-(trimethoxysilylpropyl) ethylenediamine triacetic acid trisodium salt and OA = oleic acid. Reproduced from [45], The Royal Society of Chemistry, 2014.

3. Physicochemical Characterization

Various experimental techniques can be used to characterize the synthesized Ln$_2$O$_3$ nanoparticles [17,31], as summarized in Table 1. The particle diameters, the hydrodynamic diameters of nanoparticles dispersed in water, and the crystal structure of the nanoparticles can be measured using a high-resolution transmission electron microscope (HRTEM) operating at high acceleration voltages (~200 kV), a dynamic light scattering (DLS) particle size analyzer, and a powder X-ray diffraction (XRD) spectrometer, respectively. The
attachment of ligands on the nanoparticle surfaces can be investigated by recording Fourier transform-infrared (FT-IR) absorption spectra using powder samples; powder samples may be pelletized in KBr for easy handling and acquisition of good signal-to-noise ratios using a small number of powder samples. The amount of surface-coating ligand can be estimated according to thermogravimetric analysis (TGA) curves. The elemental analysis (EA) can also be used to investigate the surface-coating amount and ligand composition (C/H/O/N/S) in metal oxide nanoparticles because metal oxide nanoparticles hardly decompose during EA. The Ln-concentration in an aqueous nanoparticle suspension can be determined using an inductively coupled plasma atomic emission spectrometer (ICPAES). The in vitro cellular cytotoxicity of the ligand-coated Ln$_2$O$_3$ nanoparticles can be measured using various cell viability assay techniques, such as trypan blue dye exclusion staining, methylthiazoly tetrazolium (MTT) reduction, and water-soluble tetrazolium salt (WST) assay [46]. Cell viability measurements are generally performed using more than two cell lines to obtain consistent and reliable results because the cell viabilities generally depend on the cell lines. Magnetization (M) values of the nanoparticles can be estimated by recording M versus applied field (H) (M-H) curves at room temperature using a vibrating sample magnetometer (VSM). Net M values of the nanoparticles without ligand can be obtained using the net mass of the nanoparticles determined via TGA. For MRI contrast agents, $r_1$ and the transverse relaxivity ($r_2$) represent their ability to act as $T_1$ or $T_2$ MRI contrast agents. To measure the $r_1$ and $r_2$ values, longitudinal ($T_1$) and transverse ($T_2$) relaxation times are measured using an MRI scanner. The $T_1$ relaxation time measurements can be conducted using an inversion recovery method. For the $T_2$ relaxation times, the Carr–Purcell Meiboom–Gill pulse sequence can be used for multiple spin-echo measurements. The $r_1$ and $r_2$ values are then estimated from the slopes of the plots of 1/$T_1$ and 1/$T_2$ versus the Ln-concentration, respectively. In vivo $T_1$ or $T_2$ MR images can be obtained using an MRI scanner after intravenous injection of an aqueous nanoparticle suspension sample. In addition, the X-ray attenuation power of Ln$_2$O$_3$ nanoparticles, which is higher than those of commercial iodine CT contrast agents, can be measured by recording phantom images using a CT scanner, and in vivo CT images can be obtained using a CT scanner after intravenous injection of an aqueous nanoparticle suspension sample.

Table 1. Summary of physicochemical characterization.

| Properties                  | Technique 1 | Properties                  | Technique 1 |
|-----------------------------|-------------|-----------------------------|-------------|
| Particle diameter           | HRTEM       | Hydrodynamic diameter       | DLS         |
| Crystal structure           | XRD         | Ligand surface coating      | FT-IR absorption, EA |
| Ligand surface-coating amount | TGA, EA | Metal concentration in water | ICPAES     |
| Cellular cytotoxicity       | MTT, WST    | Magnetization               | VSM         |
| Reliability ($r_1$ and $r_2$) | MRI        | MR image                    | MRI         |
| X-ray attenuation power     | CT          | CT image                    | CT          |

$^1$ HRTEM = high-resolution transmission electron microscope; DLS = dynamic light scattering; XRD = X-ray diffraction; FT-IR = Fourier transform-infrared; EA = elemental analysis; TGA = thermogravimetric analysis; ICPAES = inductively coupled plasma atomic emission spectrometry; MTT = methylthiazoly tetrazolium; WST = water-soluble tetrazolium salt; VSM = vibrating sample magnetometer; MRI = magnetic resonance imaging; CT = computed tomography.

4. Physicochemical and Imaging Properties

4.1. Particle Diameters and Surface Coatings

The imaging properties of nanoparticles depend on their particle and hydrodynamic diameters. Ln$_2$O$_3$ nanoparticles synthesized via the polyol method generally have ultra-small diameters (average particle diameter = 2.0 nm) [39–44]. Figure 4a–c shows various HRTEM images of Gd$_2$O$_3$ nanoparticles [44,47,48]. Both particle and hydrodynamic diameters follow a log-normal function distribution; therefore, average particle and hydrodynamic diameters can be obtained by fitting the log-normal distribution function to the observed particle and hydrodynamic diameter distributions, respectively. The insets in Figure 4c show a nanoparticle suspension sample exhibiting laser light scattering (i.e., Tyndall effect) due to the collision of the nanoparticle colloids with the passing laser light,
whereas triple-distilled water shows no light scattering [44]. This experiment shows the good colloidal dispersion of the nanoparticles in aqueous media.

**Figure 4.** (a–c) HRTEM images [44,47,48]. Arrows and circles indicate nanoparticles. Insets in (c) show a magnified image of a nanoparticle (top right) and laser light scattering (i.e., Tyndall effect) due to the collision of the nanoparticles with a passing laser light, whereas triple-distilled water shows no light scattering, confirming the good colloidal dispersion of nanoparticles in aqueous media (bottom left). Reproduced from [44,47,48]. Copyright 2020 The Royal Society of Chemistry [44]; Copyrights 2018 Wiley [47,48].

Due to the ultrasmall particle diameters, the XRD patterns of nanoparticle powder samples are generally broad and amorphous [49,50]. Nevertheless, upon performing a TGA from room temperature to high temperatures (>500 °C), sharp peaks corresponding to the (222), (400), (440), and (622) planes of a highly crystallized form of Ln2O3 having cubic structure are observed [50]. Examples of XRD patterns of ligand-coated Gd2O3 nanoparticles recorded before (i.e., as-prepared) and after TGA [44,47] are provided in Figure 5. The peak positions and the estimated cell constants of the TGA-analyzed samples are well consistent with those given in the literature [51]. The sharp peaks observed in the XRD patterns after TGA are due to the particle size growth and subsequent crystallization of the nanoparticles (Figure 5a,b), which was confirmed by Kattel et al. on the basis of HRTEM images [50,52].

**Figure 5.** XRD patterns of (a) cRGD-Gd2O3 nanoparticles [47] and (b) RGD-PAA-Gd2O3 nanoparticles [44] before (i.e., as-prepared; bottom figures) and after TGA (top figures). Adapted from [44,47]. Copyright 2020 The Royal Society of Chemistry [44]; Copyright 2018 Wiley [47].

Surface coating of Ln2O3 nanoparticles with hydrophilic and biocompatible ligands is essential for their biomedical applications. The surface coating can be investigated by recording FT-IR absorption spectra. An FT-IR absorption spectrum of PAA-coated Gd2O3 nanoparticles is provided as an example at the bottom of Figure 6a [39], along with an FT-IR absorption spectrum of PAA (Mw = 5100 Da) at the top of the same figure as a reference. The spectrum of the PAA-coated Gd2O3 nanoparticles exhibited a series of bands stemming from PAA, such as C–H stretching (2930 cm⁻¹), COO⁻ antisymmetric
stretching (1550 cm$^{-1}$), and COO$^-$ symmetric stretching vibrations (1400 cm$^{-1}$). The PAA and the nanoparticle were bonded through a coordination bonding between Gd$^{3+}$ on the nanoparticle surface as a hard acid and the COO$^-$ group of PAA as a hard base [53–55]. In this case, a stable nanoparticle colloid was formed in aqueous media because of the multiple bonding between many COO$^-$ groups of PAA (each PAA has ~54 COO$^-$ groups) and a nanoparticle. On this basis, the bonding between PAA and the Gd$_2$O$_3$ nanoparticle surface was proposed, as displayed in Figure 6b. Another example of surface coating on Gd$_2$O$_3$ nanoparticles is provided in Figure 6c, which displayed the FT-IR absorption spectra of RGD, PAA (M$_w$ = 1800 Da), PAA-Gd$_2$O$_3$, and RGD-PAA-Gd$_2$O$_3$ powder samples [44]. The presence of a C=O stretching band (1553 cm$^{-1}$) of PAA in the FT-IR absorption spectrum of PAA-Gd$_2$O$_3$ nanoparticles confirmed the PAA surface coating on the Gd$_2$O$_3$ nanoparticles. This band was red-shifted by 144 cm$^{-1}$ compared with free PAA (1697 cm$^{-1}$), which can be attributed to the coordination bonding between the COO$^-$ groups of PAA and the Gd$^{3+}$ of the Gd$_2$O$_3$ nanoparticles. As mentioned above, each PAA can form many coordination bonds with each Gd$_2$O$_3$ nanoparticle via a hard acid (Gd$^{3+}$)–hard base (COO$^-$) interaction [53–55]. The N–H bending vibration at 1544 cm$^{-1}$ and the C–N stretching vibration at 1390 cm$^{-1}$ of RGD [56] appeared in the FT-IR absorption spectrum of the RGD-PAA-Gd$_2$O$_3$ nanoparticles, confirming the successful conjugation of RGD to PAA in the PAA-Gd$_2$O$_3$ nanoparticles via amide bond formation.

![Figure 6](image_url)

**Figure 6.** (a) FT-IR absorption spectra of PAA-coated Gd$_2$O$_3$ nanoparticles and free PAA sodium salt (M$_w$ = 5100 Da) and (b) surface-coating structure of PAA on the Gd$_2$O$_3$ nanoparticle surface [39]. (c) FT-IR absorption spectra of PAA (M$_w$ = 1800 Da), PAA-Gd$_2$O$_3$ nanoparticles, RGD, and RGD-PAA-Gd$_2$O$_3$ nanoparticles [44]. The lowercase letters “s”, “ss”, “as”, and “b” indicate stretch, symmetric stretch, antisymmetric stretch, and bend, respectively. Adapted from [39,44]. Copyrights 2018 and 2020 The Royal Society of Chemistry, respectively.

The EA can also be used to investigate the surface coating of nanoparticles. For example, in carbon-coated Gd$_2$O$_3$ nanoparticles (C@Gd$_2$O$_3$), the C/H/O content, in which H mostly stems from hydrocarbons and -OH groups and O mostly stems from -OH groups on the carbon-coating layer, was determined to be 28.1/3.2/26.5 in wt% [57]. The sum
of these wt% is 57.8%, which is fairly consistent with the 56.5% estimated from the TGA curve (Figure 7). As can be seen in Figure 7, the remaining 37.0% corresponds to the mass wt% of Gd$_2$O$_3$ in the C@Gd$_2$O$_3$ nanoparticles. By performing a grafting density analysis [58], the wt% can be converted into the number of ligands grafted onto each nanoparticle surface [47,48].

![Figure 7. TGA curve of the powder sample of C@Gd$_2$O$_3$ nanoparticles. Adapted from [57]. Copyright 2019 Elsevier.](image)

### 4.2. Magnetic Properties

To obtain high $r_1$ and $r_2$ values for enhanced MR contrast images, the nanoparticles must exhibit large M values at room temperature [59,60]. Figure 8a,b shows the M–H curves of Ln$_2$O$_3$ nanoparticles (Ln = Gd, Tb, Ho) [41,43]. Similar to the corresponding bulk materials [61–63], all of the nanoparticle samples are paramagnetic (i.e., no hysteresis, zero coercivity, zero remanence, and low M values) and exhibit appreciable unsaturated M values up to the measured H values at 300 K. From the mass-corrected M–H curve, the net M value of the Gd$_2$O$_3$ nanoparticles, which corresponds to the nanoparticles without ligands, at 2.0 T was estimated to be 1.71 emu/g. This appreciable value is due to the high 4f-electron spin magnetic moment ($s = 7/2$) of Gd$^{3+}$ having seven unpaired 4f electrons. Meanwhile, other Ln$_2$O$_3$ nanoparticles (Ln = Tb and Ho) exhibit net M values of 3.8 and 4.1 emu/g at 1.8 T (Figure 8b), respectively, which result from high 4f-electron spin-orbital magnetic moments, i.e., $J = 6$ for Tb$^{3+}$ and $J = 8$ for Ho$^{3+}$. The slightly higher M value of the Ho$_2$O$_3$ nanoparticles compared with that of the Tb$_2$O$_3$ nanoparticles is due to the higher atomic magnetic moment ($\mu = 10.60 \mu_B$) of Ho$^{3+}$ compared with that of Tb$^{3+}$ ($= 9.72 \mu_B$) [64], where $\mu_B$ is the Bohr magneton.

![Figure 8. (a) M–H curve of Gd$_2$O$_3$ nanoparticles at $T = 300$ K [41]. (b) M–H curves of Ln$_2$O$_3$ nanoparticles, Ln = (i) Tb and (ii) Ho at $T = 300$ K [43]. Net M values of Ln$_2$O$_3$ nanoparticles without ligands were used in the plots. Adapted from [41,43]. Copyrights 2020 and 2021 MDPI.](image)
4.3. MR Imaging Properties: \( r_1 \) and \( r_2 \) Values

The \( r_1 \) and \( r_2 \) values are affected by the number of water molecules around the nanoparticles and the distance between them and, therefore, depend on the water-attracting ability of the ligands around the nanoparticles \([59,60,65]\). Accordingly, surface-coating ligands should be properly selected. \( \text{Gd}_2\text{O}_3 \) nanoparticles act as positive (\( T_1 \)) MRI contrast agents due to the high spin magnetic moment of \( \text{Gd}^{3+} \) \((s = 7/2)\); they have high \( r_1 \) values and \( r_2/r_1 \) ratios close to one \([39–41]\) (\( T_1 \) MRI contrast agents exhibit low \( r_2/r_1 \) ratios, whereas \( T_2 \) MRI contrast agents have high \( r_2/r_1 \) ratios \([23]\)). The \( r_1 \) and \( r_2 \) values of PAAMA-coated \( \text{Gd}_2\text{O}_3 \) nanoparticles at 3.0 T MR field were determined to be 40.6 and 63.4 s\(^{-1}\) mM\(^{-1}\) \((r_2/r_1 = 1.56)\), respectively, using the \( 1/T_1 \) and \( 1/T_2 \) plots versus Gd-concentration depicted in Figure 9 \([40]\). This \( r_1 \) value is approximately 10 times higher than those \([21–23]\) of commercial molecular \( T_1 \) MRI contrast agents, such as Dotarem, ProHance, Gadovist, Magnevist, and Omniscan \([21,22]\). The \( r_1 \) value also depends on the particle diameter of \( \text{Gd}_2\text{O}_3 \) nanoparticles, for which the optimal value was suggested to be 1.0 to 2.5 nm \([24]\). The observed particle diameter of the PAAMA-coated \( \text{Gd}_2\text{O}_3 \) nanoparticles is within this size range. As a reference, the \( r_1 \) and \( r_2 \) values of Gadovist as a commercial molecular agent are provided at the bottom of Figure 9, which shows that this nanoparticle sample is more powerful than Gadovist as a \( T_1 \) MRI contrast agent. On the other hand, other \( \text{Ln}_2\text{O}_3 \) nanoparticles \((\text{Ln} = \text{Tb}, \text{Dy}, \text{and Ho})\) show appreciable to high \( r_2 \) values and negligible \( r_1 \) values with very large \( r_2/r_1 \) ratios \([66]\). Therefore, these nanoparticles are suitable as \( T_2 \) MRI contrast agents. The \( r_2 \) values of these nanoparticles increased with increasing the MR field \([66]\) because \( r_2 \) is proportional M\(^2\) \([59,60]\). Therefore, these nanoparticles are expected to provide appreciable \( T_2 \) MR contrast images at high MR fields. For example, PAA-coated \( \text{Ln}_2\text{O}_3 \) nanoparticles \((\text{Ln} = \text{Tb} \text{ and Ho})\) exhibit appreciable \( T_2 \) MR contrast images at 9.4 T MR Field \([43]\). For comparison, this \( T_2 \) contrast is lower than that of superparamagnetic iron oxide nanoparticles possessing high saturation magnetizations \((50–80 \text{ emu/g})\) and high \( r_2 \) values \([67,68]\).

![Figure 9. \( r_1 \) and \( r_2 \) values of PAAMA-coated \( \text{Gd}_2\text{O}_3 \) nanoparticles \([40]\). Adapted from \([40]\). Copyright 2021 MDPI.](image)

5. In Vivo Imaging

5.1. Tumor-Targeting \( T_1 \) MRI Contrast Agents

\( \text{Gd}_2\text{O}_3 \) nanoparticles are the most widely applied \( \text{Ln}_2\text{O}_3 \) nanoparticles as in vivo tumor-targeting \( T_1 \) MRI contrast agents because of the high spin magnetic moment \((s = 7/2)\) of \( \text{Gd}^{3+} \) \((^8\text{S}_{7/2})\), which is the largest value among the elements in the periodic table and thus provides very high \( T_1 \) MR contrast. Therefore, various studies on the synthesis and application of tumor-targeting \( \text{Gd}_2\text{O}_3 \) nanoparticles have been reported, which are discussed below according to the type of tumor-targeting ligands used.

5.1.1. Chlorotoxin (CTX)

Gu et al. developed a mouse brain tumor-targeting contrast agent using CTX as a tumor-targeting ligand \([45]\). CTX is a peptide consisting of a 36-amino acid sequence...
found in the venom of the deathstalker scorpion [69]. CTX preferentially binds to glioma cells, enabling the development of therapeutic and diagnostic protocols for several types of tumors [70]. In this study, CTX-PEG-TETT-coated Gd$_2$O$_3$ nanoparticles with a core diameter of 3.46 nm and $r_1$ value of 8.41 s$^{-1}$ mM$^{-1}$ at 7.0 T were applied to tumor-targeting imaging in vivo. Figure 10 shows a series of in vivo T$_1$ MR images of mice with brain glioma tumor after mice tail intravenous injection of PEG-TETT-Gd$_2$O$_3$ and CTX-PEG-TETT-Gd$_2$O$_3$ nanoparticle samples at the same Gd dose (6 mg Gd/kg). The PEG-TETT-Gd$_2$O$_3$ nanoparticles slightly improved the contrast of glioma sites (labeled with arrows) compared with the preinjection image. However, the CTX-PEG-TETT-Gd$_2$O$_3$ nanoparticles exhibited highly enhanced T$_1$ MR images in brain tumors (labeled with arrows) after injection, clearly supporting that the CTX-PEG-TETT-Gd$_2$O$_3$ nanoparticles act as a tumor-targeting T$_1$ MRI contrast agent.

**Figure 10.** T$_1$ MR images of mice brains with C6 glioma before and after (15 min, 60 min, and 24 h) intravenous injection of PEG-TETT-Gd$_2$O$_3$ and CTX-PEG-TETT-Gd$_2$O$_3$ nanoparticle samples into mice tails at 7.0 T. Tumor sites are indicated with arrows. Adapted from [45]. Copyright 2014 The Royal Society of Chemistry.

5.1.2. Cyclic RGD (cRGD)

Ahmad et al. investigated Gd$_2$O$_3$ nanoparticles that were directly conjugated with cRGDs [47]. Prior to measuring in vivo T$_1$ MR images to confirm tumor targeting, an in vitro cellular incubation experiment was conducted with cRGD-Gd$_2$O$_3$ nanoparticles to confirm the internalization of the nanoparticles in the tumor cells, which is particularly important in the case of tumor theragnosis. To investigate this, human brain glioma (U87MG) tumor cells were incubated with cRGD-Gd$_2$O$_3$ nanoparticles (0.01 mM Gd). Untreated cells as a control group are shown in Figure 11a. The treated cells exhibited different surface morphologies from that of the control cells due to nanoparticle attachment on the tumor cell surfaces (Figure 11b). The internalization of cRGD-Gd$_2$O$_3$ nanoparticles in the tumor cells was confirmed by analyzing the TEM images of the cells, where no cRGD-Gd$_2$O$_3$ nanoparticles were found in the TEM image of the control cells (Figure 11c), whereas they were found in the treated tumor cells (Figure 11d). In addition, an energy-dispersive X-ray (EDX) spectroscopy analysis of the circled region in Figure 11d confirmed the presence of Gd (Figure 11e), supporting the internalization of cRGD-Gd$_2$O$_3$ nanoparticles in the U87MG tumor cells.
To demonstrate the occurrence of in vivo tumor targeting via T<sub>1</sub> MRI, a sample solution containing cRGD-Gd<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> nanoparticles was injected into the tail vein of a U87MG tumor-bearing mouse inoculated into the liver (injection dose = ~0.1 mmol Gd/kg) [47]. T<sub>1</sub> MR images were obtained before and after injection (Figure 12a). As shown in the figure, tumor targeting was confirmed via positive contrast enhancement in the liver tumor 5 min after injection, indicating the accumulation of the nanoparticles in the tumor. Figure 12b shows a color map of the middle T<sub>1</sub> MR image depicted in Figure 12a, in which the contrast enhancement in the liver tumor (i.e., the widely spread brighter part) can be clearly observed. The signal-to-noise ratios (SNRs) of the three regions of interest (ROIs) in the liver, i.e., the normal region (filled square), the tumor region (filled circle), and the necrotic region (filled triangle), as labeled in the inserted T<sub>1</sub> MR image, are plotted versus time in Figure 12c. The T<sub>1</sub> contrast enhancement in the liver tumor was approximately three times higher than in the normal region of the liver, as shown in the percentage SNR plots in Figure 12d. These results suggest that the cRGD-Gd<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> nanoparticles act as a tumor-targeting T<sub>1</sub> MRI contrast agent.

5.1.3. TAT Peptide

Ahmad et al. explored the tumor-imaging application of transactivator of transcription (TAT) peptide-conjugated Gd<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> nanoparticles [48]. The TAT peptide, which contains 48–57 fragments of the basic domain of the human immunodeficiency virus type 1 TAT protein, exhibits cell-penetrating properties [71]. To date, various nanomaterials grafted with TAT peptides have been applied in gene delivery, drug delivery, and tumor-cell imaging [72–74]. Ahmad et al. observed a greater accumulation of TAT peptide-grafted Gd<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> nanoparticles in tumor cells than in normal cells in a mouse via T<sub>1</sub> MRI in vivo [48]. The TAT peptide allowed cell penetration of the nanoparticles during circulation through angiogenesis via the EPR effect [26,75].
Figure 12. (a) T1 MR images of a U87MG tumor-bearing nude mouse in the liver before and after intravenous injection (arrows indicate the tumor region). (b) Color map of the middle T1 MR image in (a), showing the widely spread liver tumor (brighter region). (c) Plots of the SNRs of the ROIs in the normal, tumor, and necrosis parts of the liver versus time. (d) Plots of the percentage SNRs in the normal, tumor, and necrosis parts of the liver versus time; percentage SNR = ([SNR (time)-SNR (Pre)]/SNR (Pre)) × 100. Adapted from [47]. Copyright 2018 Wiley.

5.1.4. Linear RGD

Recently, Ho et al. synthesized highly stable Gd2O3 nanoparticles coated with PAA and then conjugated with linear RGD (Figure 2) to target tumors by binding to αvβ3 and αvβ5 integrins, which are overexpressed in tumor angiogenic sites and tumor cells [44]. The RGD-PAA-Gd2O3 nanoparticles accumulated at the tumor sites, showing enhanced T1 contrast at the tumor sites after injection (Figure 13). This result was probably due to the combination of various outstanding properties of the RGD-PAA-Gd2O3 nanoparticles, such as the delivery of hundreds of Gd atoms per nanoparticle to the tumor site, tumor-targeting ability, and ultrasmall size, which provides them with good transport properties during circulation through blood vessels and tumor-cell penetration. This study indicated that the RGD-PAA-Gd2O3 nanoparticles are applicable to in vivo tumor diagnosis.

5.2. MRI-Guided Therapy

One of the main advantages of Gd2O3 nanoparticles as T1 MRI contrast agents is that they can be used for MRI-guided therapy. For example, Le Duc et al. developed gadolinium-based nanoparticles encapsulated in a polysiloxane shell and then grafted with diethylenetriaminepentaacetic dianhydride for nanoparticle colloidal stabilization [76]. They used the nanoparticles for tumor therapy using X-ray microbeam radiation [77,78], which improved the survival of mice against an aggressive brain tumor. The efficacy of this treatment depended on how accurately MRI contrast agents locate the tumor position and shape. In the T1 MR images recorded a few minutes after intravenous injection, the delineation of the tumor was clearly distinguished from normal tissues in a rat brain as
shown in Figure 14, and X-ray microbeam radiation was then conducted to kill the brain tumor cells.

**Figure 13.** T1 MR images before and 20 min after (labeled “post 20 min”) intravenous injection into the mouse tail: the bright contrast at the tumor (labeled with arrows) was due to the accumulation of nanoparticles at the tumor site. Adapted from [44]. Copyright 2020 The Royal Society of Chemistry.

**Figure 14.** T1-weighted images of the brain of a rat having intracerebral 9L gliosarcoma (9LGS) before and after (5, 20, and 45 min) intravenous injection of gadolinium-based nanoparticles. Adapted from [76]. Copyright 2011 American Chemical Society.

### 5.3. T2-Weighted MRI

Recently, Ln2O3 (Ln = Tb, Dy, and Ho) nanoparticles with appreciable $r_2$ and negligible $r_1$ values, suitable for T2 MRI were developed [42,43,50,66,79,80]. For example, PAA-coated Ln2O3 (Ln = Tb and Ho) nanoparticles exhibited appreciable $r_2$ values at 3.0 T MR field (3.19 s$^{-1}$ mM$^{-1}$ for Ln = Tb and 1.44 s$^{-1}$ mM$^{-1}$ for Ln = Ho), enhanced $r_2$ values at 9.4 T MR field (16.40 s$^{-1}$ mM$^{-1}$ for Ln = Tb and 9.20 s$^{-1}$ mM$^{-1}$ for Ln = Ho) [43], and negligible $r_1$ values at all MR fields. With such $r_1$ and $r_2$ values, only the exclusive induction of T2 relaxations by the nanoparticles occurs at all MR fields. The appreciable T2 MR contrast enhancements at 9.4 T MR field confirmed the effectiveness of the nanoparticles as T2 MRI contrast agents at high MR fields in vivo [43]. Dy2O3 nanoparticles constitute another example with application in T2 MRI. Thus, D-glucuronic acid-coated Dy2O3 nanoparticles exhibited T2 MR contrast enhancements in a mouse liver at 3.0 T MR field in vivo [79] (Figure 15a), proving the potential of Dy2O3 nanoparticles as T2 MRI contrast agents. Recently, Yue et al. investigated carbon-coated Dy2O3 nanoparticles as a new class of T2 MRI contrast agent at 3.0 T MR field [80]. The nanoparticles were nearly non-toxic via an in vitro cellular cytotoxicity assay. The presence of numerous hydroxyl groups on the carbon-coating layer conferred the colloidal nanoparticles with stability in aqueous media. The nanoparticles exhibited T2 contrast enhancement in the mice kidneys after intravenous administration, acting as a T2 MRI contrast agent (Figure 15b).
images of the mice kidneys (indicated with arrows) as a function of time before and after intravenous injection of an aqueous solution of carbon-coated Dy$_2$O$_3$ nanoparticles into the mouse tail [80]. Figure 15a), proving the potential of Dy$_2$O$_3$ nanoparticles as T2 MRI contrast agents. Re-Adapted from [79,80]. Copyrights 2012 Elsevier and 2020 MDPI.

5.4. CT Imaging

Lanthanide elements exhibit higher X-ray attenuation coefficients [16] than iodine, which is currently used as a CT contrast agent in its organic molecular forms. Consequently, Ln$_2$O$_3$ nanoparticles can be applied as CT contrast agents [17,18,81,82]. For example, an aqueous solution of Gd$_2$O$_3$ nanoparticles coated with iodine compounds was used to investigate CT imaging in vivo [81]. Brighter contrast enhancements were observed in mouse bladder (labeled B in Figure 16a) after intravenous tail injection. The X-ray absorption in the ROI of the bladder (indicated by a small, dotted circle in Figure 16a) indicated that the contrast reached a maximum at ~30 min after injection and then decreased with time (Figure 16b), suggesting that the sample solution was excreted through the bladder as urine. This result showed that an aqueous solution of Gd$_2$O$_3$ nanoparticles might serve as a CT contrast agent.

Figure 15. (a) A series of 3.0 T in vivo T$_2$ MR images: coronal views of kidneys and liver (labeled as “K” and “L”, respectively) before and after intravenous injection of an aqueous solution of D-glucuronic acid-coated Dy$_2$O$_3$ nanoparticles into the mouse tail [79]. (b) In vivo coronal 3.0 T T$_2$ MR images of the mice kidneys (indicated with arrows) as a function of time before and after intravenous injection of an aqueous solution of carbon-coated Dy$_2$O$_3$ nanoparticles into the mouse tail [80]. Adapted from [79,80]. Copyrights 2012 Elsevier and 2020 MDPI.

Figure 16. (a) In vivo CT images of a mouse bladder (labeled B) and (b) plot of the X-ray absorption of the ROI in the bladder (indicated by the small, dotted circle in (a)) before and after intravenous injection of an aqueous sample into the mouse tail [81]. Adapted from [81]. Copyright 2015 Springer Nature.

6. Ln$_2$O$_3$ Nanoparticle Toxicity

As shown in Figure 17a, bare Gd$_2$O$_3$ nanoparticles exhibit toxicities in both NCTC1469 normal and U87MG tumor-cell lines, whereas PAA-coated Gd$_2$O$_3$ nanoparticles are nearly non-toxic up to 500 µM Gd with cell viabilities of ~93% in DU145, ~99% in NCTC1469, and ~80% in U87MG cell lines (Figure 17b) [83]. Other PAA-coated Ln$_2$O$_3$ nanoparticles (Ln = Dy, Tb, and Ho) also exhibit very low cytotoxicities in both DU145 and NCTC1469 cell lines (Figure 17c-e) [42,43], showing good biocompatibilities. These examples demonstrate
that Ln$_2$O$_3$ nanoparticles must be well protected with water-soluble and biocompatible ligands for biomedical applications.

Figure 17. In vitro cytotoxicities of (a) uncoated Gd$_2$O$_3$ nanoparticles in NCTC1469 and U87MG cell lines and (b) PAA-coated Gd$_2$O$_3$ nanoparticles in DU145, NCTC1469, and U87MG cell lines [83]. PAA-coated Ln$_2$O$_3$ nanoparticles (Ln = (c) Dy, (d) Tb, and (e) Ho) in DU145 and NCTC1469 cell lines [42,43]. Adapted from [42,43,83]. Copyrights 2018, 2020 and 2021 The Royal Society of Chemistry, Wiley & MDPI.

Lanthanides are relatively non-toxic elements [37,38]. For example, for lanthanide chlorides, the lethal dose causing the death of 50% of a group of 10 animals (LD50) is higher than 10 and 450 mg per kg bodyweight for intravenous and intraperitoneal injections, respectively [84]. In the case of Ln$_2$O$_3$ nanoparticles, other properties, either alone or in concert, must be considered to evaluate the possible toxic effects of the nanoparticles. These properties include chemical composition, doping, hydrodynamic size, shape, redox properties, tendency for aggregation, composition of the shell or coating material, surface modifications, colloidal stability, solubility, biodegradability, concentration, and duration of exposure [85]. Although several studies have investigated the toxicity of lanthanide-based...
nanoparticles having different properties, such as chemical composition, size, surface ligands, and lanthanide concentration [86–88], the lack of literature data has prevented drawing firm conclusions for the assessment of the potential toxicity of Ln$_2$O$_3$ nanoparticles. Furthermore, several aspects of the biological interaction of Ln$_2$O$_3$ nanoparticles in living systems still need to be unveiled. For example, despite in vitro cytotoxicity studies being conducted using various cell cultures, these studies did not provide information about long-term safety and cytotoxicity [89,90], for which in vivo cytotoxicity studies would be needed.

Nevertheless, several important conclusions can be extracted from the currently available literature data. In the case of biomedical applications, Ln$_2$O$_3$ nanoparticles are usually introduced into the body by intravenous injections and circulated by the bloodstream primarily to organs, such as the liver and spleen, kidneys, heart, lungs, and brain [91]. The possible retention or uptake in blood and organs strongly depends on the surface properties of the nanoparticles. Ligand coating can promote the interaction of the Ln$_2$O$_3$ nanoparticles with the cell membranes, favoring the internalization of the nanoparticles by various types of cells. However, biologically inert coating ligands, such as PEG, may prolong the circulation in the bloodstream of nanoparticles [11]. In addition, nanoparticle size is an important factor for the excretion route [92,93]. Thus, nanoparticles smaller than 3 nm can be excreted by renal filtration [19,20], whereas those larger than 3 nm are enclosed by a phagocyte system. As a part of the immune system, the phagocyte system is composed of several types of phagocytic cells in the reticular tissue within the body, whose main function is to remove undesired species, such as bacteria, viruses, and foreign materials, including nanoparticles.

The toxicity of Ln$_2$O$_3$ nanoparticles differs depending on the lanthanide ions. For example, Er$_2$O$_3$ shows higher toxicity than Gd$_2$O$_3$ and La$_2$O$_3$ and is highly toxic to zebrafish embryos at a concentration of 50 ppm Er, causing significant mortality and morphological malformations [93]. Meanwhile, the toxicity of Gd$_2$O$_3$ nanoparticles is primarily attributed to the release of Gd$^{3+}$ ions [94–96]. The toxicity of Gd$^{3+}$ ions has been addressed not only for Gd$_2$O$_3$ nanoparticles but also for a variety of molecular Gd$^{3+}$-chelates. In the case of Gd$_2$O$_3$ nanomaterials, Eu$^{3+}$-doped Gd$_2$O$_3$ (Gd$_2$O$_3$:Eu$^{3+}$) nanotubes can adversely affect bone marrow stromal cells (BMSCs) [97]. Yang et al. reported the application of $^{152}$Sm-doped Gd(OH)$_3$ nanorods as a potential MRI contrast agent [98]. In vitro cell toxicity tests revealed that Gd(OH)$_3$ nanorods have no toxic effect on cellular proliferation and viability. Furthermore, an in vivo toxicity test using Kunming mice showed that injection up to 100 mg/kg of Gd(OH)$_3$ nanorods had no toxic effect up to 150 days after exposure. However, this in vivo test investigated the short-term toxic effect of Gd(OH)$_3$ nanorods. In contrast, the long-term toxicity of clinically used Gd$^{3+}$-chelates was reported. When used in patients with severely compromised kidney function, Gd$^{3+}$-chelates promoted the development of nephrogenic systemic fibrosis (NSF), which is a rare disease affecting different parts of the body that can lead to thickening or hardening of the skin and deposits [99] (Figure 18). Moreover, NSF is a progressive condition that can be fatal because it may cause multiple organ failure [99–102]. Gd$^{3+}$ retention in the body, which is greater with linear structured Gd$^{3+}$-chelates than with macrocyclic structured Gd$^{3+}$-chelates, was demonstrated to be associated with NSF.

Compared with clinically used Gd$^{3+}$-chelates, the toxicity of Ln$_2$O$_3$ nanoparticles, including Gd$_2$O$_3$ nanoparticles, has been less explored. For instance, the extent, mechanism, chemical form, and clinical implications of chronic lanthanide retention for Ln$_2$O$_3$ nanoparticles remain unknown. Therefore, more comprehensive investigations are required to improve our understanding of Ln$_2$O$_3$ nanoparticle toxicity and its clinical importance. In this context, the development of new experimental techniques may play a significant role in unveiling lanthanide nanotoxicity. For example, nanotoxicogenomics [103], which uses DNA microarray technologies to investigate the impact of nanoparticles on global gene expression profiles of cells and tissues, has emerged as a new field of toxicology to provide new and important insights into the toxicity of Ln$_2$O$_3$ nanoparticles.
As reviewed here, further intensive research is essential to achieve the ultimate goal of using Ln$_2$O$_3$ nanoparticles for tumor-targeting diagnosis and therapy and nontumor-targeting medical imaging. In addition, sophisticated toxicological and pharmacological improvements are required to demonstrate the safety of nanoparticle formulations prior to clinical trials. We hope that this review will guide the future development of biomedical applications of Ln$_2$O$_3$ nanoparticles.
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