Photochemical ‘In-Air’ Combinatorial Discovery of Antimicrobial Copolymers
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Abstract: There is an urgent need to identify new, non-traditional antimicrobials. The discovery of new polymeric antimicrobials is limited by current low-throughput synthetic tools meaning limited chemical space is explored. Here we employ photo-chemical ‘in-air’ RAFT polymerization with microwell plates, using liquid handling robots to assemble large libraries of cationic polymers, without the need for degassing or purification steps, facilitating transfer to screening. Several lead polymers are identified including a copolymer with propylene glycol side chains with significantly enhanced antimicrobial activity, and increased therapeutic window. Mechanistic studies showed this polymer was bacteriostatic and surprisingly did not lyse the cell membranes, implying an alternative mode of action. This versatile method, using simple robotics, will help develop new biomaterials with emergent properties.

Combinatorial methods are widely employed in small-molecule chemistry to identify previously unknown leads against well-characterized targets, and includes concepts such as fragment-based design.1,2 Commercial compound libraries are available with >5000 members and repurposing of known drugs is underpinned by screening.3 In the discovery of polymer biomaterials, there are the additional variables of monomer, molecular weight, and architecture. This provides vast chemical space to be explored, presenting a challenge and opportunity.4 Polymers for gene delivery have been successfully identified using combinatorial condensation polymerization,5,6 but there was molecular weight heterogeneity. Alexander, Langer and Anderson have developed automated high-throughput screens for polymer surfaces enabling discovery of polymer surfaces for resisting bacterial attachment7 or the culture of stem cells.8 However, for soluble polymers intended to interface with cells/proteins, well-defined materials are required with control of Mw to enable selection and tuning of the final properties.9,10 Controlled radical (CRP) or ionic polymerization requires inert atmospheres and sealed vials, and in the case of ionic polymerizations rigorously anhydrous conditions, adding complexity and time due to processing. Schubert and Hoogenboom have used automated synthesizers for polymerizations, but such protocols require a precipitation/isolation step limiting the potential of the libraries.11–13 To truly use combinatorial polymer methods to discover ‘drug-like’ materials the synthetic and handling methods should be compatible with the industry standard, 96-, 384- and 1536-well plates used in biomedical screening with liquid handling robotics.12

To address the combinatorial challenge, air tolerant CRP methods are emerging. Chapman et al. used glucose oxidase for in situ degassing in 96-well plate format RAFT polymerizations13 and this approach has also been applied to ATRP formulations.14 Light mediated polymerizations15 enable the trapping/removal of oxygen species using organic16 and inorganic17 photo-redox catalysts. Trithiocarbonates can also be used as intrinsic photoredox catalysts in RAFT, without the need for supplemental catalysts which is appealing for biomedical screening.18 Recently, Boyer and co-workers used photo-RAFT in 96-well plates to screen star polymers for binding to a model lectin, facilitating the design of new binders.19 However, there are limited examples of application to urgent biomedical materials screening challenges, such as new antimicrobials to combat resistance.20 Cationic polymers have been employed as antimicrobial agents, inspired by antimicrobial peptides21 with broad spectrum activity and slow emerging resistance.22 The most active antimicrobial polymers are not homopolymers, but require a complex balance of charge and hydrophobicity/phlicity by incorporation of comonomers.23–26 Their rational design is typically based on targeting membrane lysis, but it is becoming apparent that bacteria aggregation and hence interruption of signalling27–29 pore-formation29, DNA binding30 and interrupting metabolic processes31 are associated with polycations. Structure-function maps, to phenotype (bacteria killing), but also to understand mechanism are needed to generate data sets to enable ab initio materials design.7

Here we present combinatorial cationic photo-polymer screening for new antimicrobial biomaterials. The intrinsic photo-RAFT method19 is adapted to enable automation, scalability and ease of use in ‘open’ reaction vessels of a 96 well plate, using liquid handling robots, Figure 1A. A photo-RAFT agent 2-cyano-2-propyl dodecylthiocarbonate is used with a tertiary amine (triethanolamine (TEOA)), to degas the solvent (DMSO) enabling polymerization to proceed under a blue LED light. 2-(Dimethylamino)ethyl methacrylate (DMAEMA) was chosen as the cationic component based on our previous work showing it has potent anti-mycobacterial activity. In this study, there did not appear to be a molecular weight effect of the DPs tested (between 100 and 1000) therefore DP 75 was chosen.22,33 Figure 1B and Table 1 show results of three parallel DMAEMA polymerizations in 96-well plates targeting degrees of polymerization of 25, 50 and 100. Each achieved >95 % conversion and comparable molecular weight distributions confirming reproducible synthesis in the small reaction volumes (<200 µL). The procedure was validated further by running 60 parallel in-air polymerizations of DMAEMA within a single plate. Five wells were then chosen by an independent party for SEC analysis, Figure 1C. Comparable molecular weights and distributions were obtained, confirming precise control over the reaction and homogeneity across all the mini-reaction vessels (wells).
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To eliminate toxic samples from the library, a heat map was used which gives a colorometric output (blue to pink). Several of these 'hits' appeared to not give lower MIC values than the homopolymer once tested in full dilution series, justifying the hit to lead approach. These observations highlight a key benefit of screening to identify non-linear trends that can be missed in low-throughput testing. The most active copolymer contained 15 wt% poly(propylene glycol)methacrylate (PPGMA) with an MIC of 15 μg.mL⁻¹, compared to 250 μg.mL⁻¹ for homo-PDMAEMA. Interestingly, this is not the most hydrophobic copolymer (LogP values in Supp. Info.) suggesting that a membrane insertion/disruption mechanism might not be operating. This would not have been predicted based on LogPs alone.

To validate these findings P(DMAEMA(85%)-co-PPGMA(15%)) were resynthesized to various degrees of polymerization (DP30 – 240) to give a panel of ‘pure’, well-defined polymers (SEC traces, Figure 3A). Similar MIC values were obtained as in the initial screen, but the shortest polymers (DP30) were identified to be least active, Figure 3B. Membrane integrity assays were undertaken to probe if membrane lysis has occurred. Figure 3C shows confocal microscopy images of E. coli incubated under various conditions. PDMAEMA at 2 × MIC shows only red bacteria, consistent with the ‘dead’ control (Figure 3D) and at 0.5 × MIC a mixture of red/green are seen supportive of PDMAEMA homopolymers killing E. coli by a lytic mechanism. However, P(DMAEMA(85%)-co-PPGMA(15%)) at a concentration above (2 ×) MIC gave a mixture of red and green bacteria, showing there is less membrane lysis than the PDMAEMA homopolymers even though these are more active (lower MIC). This shows that the co-monomer is not simply increasing activity by more membrane interaction with the membrane but possibly other mechanisms are involved.

Table 1. Characterization of three repeats of three DPs of PDMAEMA.

| Well code | [M]:[CTA] (%) | M₈(SEC) (g.mol⁻¹) | M₈/M₅ (g.mol⁻¹⁻¹) |
|-----------|----------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| C3        | 150 95        | 22900             | 1.66              |
| C6        | 50 96         | 17200             | 1.57              |
| C9        | 25 98         | 9500              | 1.33              |
| E3        | 100 96        | 22100             | 1.63              |
| E6        | 50 95         | 16800             | 1.60              |
| E9        | 25 95         | 9000              | 1.37              |
| G3        | 100 96        | 23200             | 1.61              |
| G6        | 50 97         | 17300             | 1.49              |
| G9        | 25 98         | 9400              | 1.33              |

* Determined by ¹H NMR against an internal mesitylene standard. ** Determined by the [M]:[CTA] ratio and conversion, assuming 100% CTA efficiency.

Traditional polymerization methods are limited in their chemical and compositional space meaning the ‘sweet spots’ in copolymer libraries can be overlooked. Here, eight comonomers were chosen to be copolymerized with DMAEMA, including a mixture of hydrophobic and hydrophilic substituents, at four densities (5, 10, 15, 20 mol%) with three repeats, within 96-well plates to give a combinatorial library of 108 distinct polymers in DMSO, Figure 2 (left column) prepared in a single day. Drug screening is routinely conducted in 1–5% DMSO to aid solubilization, here sampling followed by dilution in appropriate buffer/media resulted in [DMSO] < 5 wt%, which controls showed did not affect assays. A series of functional screens were undertaken and results indicated as a heat map. Figure 2 (green indicates desirable outcome, red indicates sample is excluded). To eliminate toxic materials, ovine red blood cell haemolysis (Figure 1A) was conducted at 1 mg.mL⁻¹. All 108 polymers had haemolysis below 2% and no haemagglutination, hence all passed. To screen for antimicrobial activity, the resazurin reduction assay (Fig 1A) was used which gives a colorometric output (blue to pink). *Escherichia coli* and *Mycobacteria smegmatis* were used to represent Gram negative and Mycobacteria (which includes *M. tuberculosis*). The MIC₉₀ (minimum concentration to stop growth of 99% of organisms) of homo-PDMAEMA is 250 μg.mL⁻¹ and 31.3 μg.mL⁻¹ against *E. coli* and *M. smegmatis*, respectively. Copolymers were added to the bacteria at 0.5 × MIC₉₀ of PDMAEMA to enable selection of copolymers that were at least two-fold more active. Against *M. smegmatis* there were few ‘hits’, potentially due to the complex mycobacterial cell walls which are rich in mycolic acids and glycans which can ‘shield’ the membrane. However, the *E. coli* screen identified several ‘hits’, with copolymers of MMA, iPMA, cHMA and PPGMA inhibiting *E. coli* growth at 0.5 × MIC₉₀ of the parent homopolymer.

These ‘hits’ were tested across a wider concentration range to establish their MIC₉₀ (Figure 2, right column). Hydrophobic comonomers tended to lower the MIC₉₀. MMA copolymers had a sweet spot for activity at 15 wt% with more/less reducing all antimicrobial activity. Similarly, iPMA/cHMA copolymers were active at 5 and 10 wt% but not at higher incorporation levels. Several of the ‘hits’ appeared did not give lower MIC₉₀ values than the homopolymer once tested in full dilution series, justifying the hit to lead approach. These observations highlight a key benefit of screening to identify non-linear trends that can be missed in low-throughput testing. The most active copolymer contained 15 wt% poly(propylene glycol)methacrylate (PPGMA) with an MIC of 15 μg.mL⁻¹, compared to 250 μg.mL⁻¹ for homo-PDMAEMA. Interestingly, this is not the most hydrophobic copolymer (LogP values in Supp. Info.) suggesting that a membrane insertion/disruption mechanism might not be operating. This would not have been predicted based on LogPs alone.
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lysis. Confocal microscopy suggested increased bacterial aggregation in response to the copolymer, but not the homopolymer. Aggregation is known to modulate bacterial responses in their environment, and the copolymers might be influencing their colonizing behavior to limit growth via a feedback mechanism. 27,35

To determine if the bacteria were being killed by the copolymers, or if their growth were being inhibited, the MBC (minimum bactericidal concentration) was determined. For PDMAEMA homopolymers the MBC is the same as the MIC 99 suggesting membrane lysis is the mode of action as would be expected for traditional cationic polymers. For the copolymer the MBC actually increased to > 1000 μg.mL −1 , showing it was less effective at killing and lysing bacteria membranes than the homopolymer. This suggested that we have identified a mechanism whereby we have identified a unique copolymer that inhibits E. coli growth potentially due to aggregation, and not physical damage of the cell membrane. Bactericidal and bacteriostatic mechanisms are both valid in terms of antimicrobial therapy 26 with front lines drugs having one or both of these properties. The polymers were also evaluated for cytotoxicity against a mammalian cell line (A549) (Supp. Info.). Incorporation of PPGMA comonomers slightly decreased cell viability relative to the PDMAEMA after 24 hours. However, due to the increased antimicrobial activity the PPGMA copolymers have a larger window of activity.

In summary, we have developed a rapid, scalable and simple approach to identify emergent antimicrobial properties of copolymer libraries through the use of in-air polymerization coupled to liquid handling robots in 96-well plates. A screening and selection process enabled identification of hits within a 108-member copolymer library resulting in copolymers of oligo(propylene glycol) being identified with 16-fold increased activity compared to PDMAEMA homopolymers. Crucially, PPGMA was not the most hydrophobic comonomer tested, and non-linear relationships were observed between comonomer

| Comonomer | mol% | 1 | 2 | 3 | Hit? | MIC cop<sub>pp</sub> (μM) |
|-----------|------|---|---|---|------|-----------------|
| MMA       | 5    | 1 | 1 | 1 | ✓    | 250             |
|           | 10   | 1 | 1 | 1 | ✓    | 500             |
|           | 15   | x | x | x | x    | x               |
|           | 20   | x | x | x | x    | x               |
| EMA       | 5    | 1 | 1 | 1 | ✓    | 250             |
|           | 10   | 1 | 1 | 1 | ✓    | 250             |
|           | 15   | x | x | x | x    | x               |
|           | 20   | x | x | x | x    | x               |
| iPMA      | 5    | 1 | 1 | 1 | ✓    | 125             |
|           | 10   | 1 | 1 | 1 | ✓    | 250             |
|           | 15   | x | x | x | x    | x               |
|           | 20   | x | x | x | x    | x               |
| cHMA      | 5    | 1 | 1 | 1 | ✓    | 125             |
|           | 10   | 1 | 1 | 1 | ✓    | 125             |
|           | 15   | x | x | x | x    | x               |
|           | 20   | x | x | x | x    | x               |
| HEMA      | 5    | 1 | 1 | 1 | ✓    | 15.3            |
|           | 10   | 1 | 1 | 1 | ✓    | 15.3            |
|           | 15   | x | x | x | x    | x               |
|           | 20   | x | x | x | x    | x               |
| DEGMA     | 5    | 1 | 1 | 1 | ✓    | 15.3            |
|           | 10   | 1 | 1 | 1 | ✓    | 15.3            |
|           | 15   | x | x | x | x    | x               |
|           | 20   | x | x | x | x    | x               |
| PEGMA     | 5    | 1 | 1 | 1 | ✓    | 62.5            |
|           | 10   | 1 | 1 | 1 | ✓    | 62.5            |
|           | 15   | x | x | x | x    | x               |
|           | 20   | x | x | x | x    | x               |
| PPGMA     | 5    | 1 | 1 | 1 | ✓    | 31.3            |
|           | 10   | 1 | 1 | 1 | ✓    | 31.3            |
|           | 15   | x | x | x | x    | x               |
|           | 20   | x | x | x | x    | x               |

Figure 2 Library structure, haemolysis at 1 mg.mL −1 and antimicrobial activity against E. coli at 125 μg.mL −1 (0.5 × MIC 99 of homopolymer (PDMAEMA)).

Figure 3. A) SEC of P(DMAEMA(85%)-co-PPGMA(15%)) copolymers. B) MIC 99 of PDMAEMA compared to P(DMAEMA(85%)-co-PPGMA(15%)) copolymers. C-H) Fluorescence microscopy of E. coli upon exposure to varying concentrations of PDMAEMA and P(DMAEMA(85%)-co-PPGMA(15%)). Green channel shows intact membranes, red is damaged membranes.
composition and activity. This material was shown to have a distinct mechanism of action, inhibiting bacterial growth rather than lysing the cell membranes. Such a material would not have been identified using conventional 1-vial/1-polymer methods; furthermore this process accelerates the discovery of new complex materials with emergent biological interactions.

Experimental Section

See the experimental section in the supporting information for synthetic, characterisation, microbiology and cell culture details.
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Non-traditional antimicrobial discovery. A library-oriented approach for in-air photo-RAFT polymerization is employed to create a library of cationic polymers, which were screened to identify leads with antimicrobial activity. The most active polymers were found to be bacteriostatic, rather than membrane lytic, and the most active were not the most hydrophobic implying a new mechanism of action and leads for new antimicrobial agents.