View metadata, citation and similar papers at core.ac.uk

brought to you by CORE

provided by CLoK

uclan
University of Central Lancashire

Article

Selective extraction of proteins and other macromolecules from biological samples using molecular imprinted polymers

Stevenson, D, EL-Sharif, H and Reddy, Subrayal M

Available at http://clok.uclan.ac.uk/15732/

Stevenson, D, EL-Sharif, H and Reddy, Subrayal M (2016) Selective extraction of proteins and other macromolecules from biological samples using molecular imprinted polymers. Bioanalysis, 8 (21). pp. 2255-2263. ISSN 1757-6180

It is advisable to refer to the publisher's version if you intend to cite from the work.
http://dx.doi.org/10.4155/bio-2016-0209

For more information about UCLan's research in this area go to
http://www.uclan.ac.uk/researchgroups/ and search for <name of research Group>.

For information about Research generally at UCLan please go to
http://www.uclan.ac.uk/research/

All outputs in CLoK are protected by Intellectual Property Rights law, including Copyright law. Copyright, IPR and Moral Rights for the works on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. Terms and conditions for use of this material are defined in the http://clok.uclan.ac.uk/policies/

CLoK
Central Lancashire online Knowledge
www.clok.uclan.ac.uk

CLoK
University of Central Lancashire's Institutional Repository

1 **Selective extraction of proteins and other macromolecules from**

2 **biological samples using molecular imprinted polymers**

3 **Derek Stevenson*,[1], Hazim F EL-Sharif[1] & Subrayal M Reddy[2]**

4 **[1]Chemistry Department, University of**

5 **Surrey, Guildford, Surrey, GU2 7XH, UK**

6 **[2]Chemistry Division, University of**

7 **Central Lancashire, Preston, Lancashire,**

8 **PR1 2HE, UK**

9 ***Author for correspondence:**

10 **d.stevenson@surrey.ac.uk**

11

Background

The determination of drugs, metabolites and biomarkers in biological samples continues to present one of the most difficult challenges to analytical scientists. Matrices such as plasma, serum, blood, urine or tissues for example, usually contain the analyte(s) of interest at low concentration in the presence of many other components which may interfere directly or indirectly with the accurate determination of species and concentration. Historically, the most common methods have involved some form of extraction or isolation such as liquid-liquid extraction (LLE), solid phase extraction (SPE) or protein precipitation. For a recent review of sample preparation methods for bioanalysis, see [1]. This includes comments on costs, automation, and miniaturisation with an overall focus on productivity.

Accurate quantitative measurement over the last 40 years has traditionally been carried out by chromatography, mainly high performance liquid chromatography (HPLC) and occasionally gas chromatography (GC). Although a range of detectors has been available for both, most typically, HPLC used ultraviolet (UV) and GC used flame ionisation and then both have used mass spectrometry (MS). Sample preparation has been usually by a variant of LLE, SPE or protein precipitation [2]. As the need for greater sensitivity has been a constant challenge, sophisticated and more selective methods of sample preparation have been explored. One of the most attractive of these has been the use of immobilised antibodies [3] to selectively extract drugs and metabolites in a typical

35 SPE format. Many examples have been published but the approach has been
36 limited by a number of factors such as cost and uncertainty of antibody
37 production as well as stability of the antibodies. Significant developments
38 overcoming the coupling of MS to HPLC and its subsequent widespread use has
39 meant that the demands on sample preparation have been reduced. As drugs
40 and metabolites are typically small molecular mass organic compounds greater
41 selectivity and sensitivity could be achieved by the end step measuring
42 technique, and there has indeed been wide uptake of this technology especially
43 in the pharmaceutical industry.
44

45 **Molecularly imprinted polymers**

46 Nevertheless, within the bioanalytical community the interest in the advantages
47 offered by selective extraction have remained. Molecularly imprinted polymers
48 (MIPs) have been suggested as an alternative to immobilised antibodies in a
49 number of areas including bioanalysis [4] as these are potentially much cheaper
50 to synthesise and more stable than biological antibodies. MIPs have been the
51 subject of numerous reviews [5, 6] so the basic principles will only be
52 summarised here. Briefly, the preparation involves a reaction mixture containing
53 the analyte (the so-called template molecule), a functional monomer, a cross-
54 linking agent and an initiator in a suitable solvent. The MIP is formed around the
55 template. The template is subsequently removed leaving cavities that can
56 selectively rebind the template. The aim is to create a reagent (MIP) that can
57 selectively bind the analyte, in a similar way to an antibody. Immobilized

58 antibodies can be very specific but they are inherently quite fragile molecules,
59 particularly when exposed to organic solvents, pH values of more than 2-3 units
60 from neutral and/or heat. They can also be quite time-consuming to produce, in
61 many cases requiring repeated dosing to animals, with no certainty that useful
62 antibodies will eventually be obtained. In contrast, MIPs are produced rapidly in
63 the chemistry laboratory and use well-established synthetic routes which lead to
64 comparatively lower production costs. They are more stable over a wider pH
65 range and can be used with a broader range of solvents. This potentially also
66 offers the advantage that they could be re-usable, further lowering the costs.
67
68 Many papers and reviews have been written on the optimisation of conditions,
69 different methods of characterisation and different uses of MIPs [7-9]. In many
70 cases, the MIPs will only perform their selective capture if they are in the solvent
71 used for their preparation. The importance of buffer conditioning has been
72 emphasised [9]. For example, MIPs have been proposed as offering advantages
73 as columns for HPLC, SPE [2, 3, 10, 11], capillary electrophoresis [12] and
74 electrochromatography, replacing antibodies in enzyme-linked immunosorbent
75 assay (ELISA) tests [13], artificial enzymes or receptors, recognition elements
76 within sensors [14], selective drug delivery, catalysts and to aid crystallization
77 [15]. The area of SPE has attracted most attention and new approaches are still
78 being reported in this area. The development of nanoparticles has led to
79 molecular imprinting onto the surface of magnetic nanoparticles [16] followed by
80 solid phase microextraction (SPME) or ultrasonic assisted SPME [17-19] and

81 matrix dispersant SPME [20, 21]. MIPs which are integrated with magnetic
82 nanoparticles offers the added advantage of a simple separation using a magnet
83 following the selective template (analyte) binding/extraction step. Ding *et al.* 2014
84 [22] has written a recent review on surface imprinting technologies for nano-
85 MIPs. This described both small and large molecule templates in two different
86 sections. Examples of biomacromolecules that have been imprinted include
87 lysozyme, bovine haemoglobin, human haemoglobin, amylase and bovine serum
88 albumin (BSA) as well as virus particles.
89
90 The preponderance of reviews on the use of MIPs for separation science has led
91 to a review of reviews [23]. Nonetheless the use of commercially available MIPs
92 using validated methods for bioanalysis is not considered commonplace. Li *et al.*
93 2014 [24] has written an extensive review on macromolecules concentrating on
94 proteins, carbohydrates, DNA, viruses and cells. The review contrasts the
95 development of small molecular mass versus macromolecule templates.
96 Progress with the latter has been slower and unremarkable. Several commercial
97 companies are producing MIPs for SPE mainly for small molecular mass analytes
98 such as drugs and pesticides. These however are not commonplace.
99
100 Many of the applications published in scientific literature consider only the
101 comparison of a MIP with a non-imprinted polymer (NIP), along with comparisons
102 of a very small number of other related compounds as evidence of a MIP effect.
103 Studies looking at the rebinding of the analyte to the MIP compared to a NIP are

104 commonplace. In many applications the MIPs will often only work satisfactorily
105 when the rebinding is carried out in the solvent in which the MIP was
106 synthesised, typically organic solvents. This is a considerable drawback when the
107 need is to extract from aqueous biological fluids such as plasma, serum, urine,
108 tissue extracts and faeces. It is also unsuitable for most macromolecules of
109 biological interest as they are not stable in organic solvents. Biologicals (greater
110 than 1000 Da) are metastable and can undergo intra-molecularly-induced
111 changes in conformation depending on their chemical environment. They
112 therefore need to be exposed to less harsh polymerisation conditions compared
113 with the imprinting of small and robust molecules (less than 700 Da) the latter
114 inherently possessing less degrees of freedom in molecular arrangement. MIP
115 preparations for biologicals have therefore focused on the use of water-
116 compatible polymers, namely hydrogels based on using acrylamide (AAm) as a
117 functional monomer [25-27] and the repertoire extended more recently using a
118 combination of acrylo-based functional monomers to polymerise in the presence
119 of a second (more biocompatible) polymer including polyethylene glycol (PEG)
120 and chitosan [28]. Chitosan is a derivative of chitin (extracted from crustacean
121 species), and is produced by deacetylation of chitin under alkaline conditions. At
122 around physiological pH and below, chitosan is positively charged. Thus in
123 addition to the generally accepted hydrogen bonding interactions and cavity fit
124 offered by MIPs, the presence of positive charge offers an additional
125 (electrostatic) anchor for the imprinting of proteins.
126

MIPs for extraction/enrichment of macromolecules

One area of growing interest in bioanalysis has been in the preparation of MIPs to peptides, proteins or other large biomolecules [29, 30]. The changing nature of drug development suggests that macromolecules are increasingly being proposed as new therapeutic agents or indeed as biomarkers for a range of diseases. Novel approaches for their reliable accurate measurement is thus of growing interest. In many cases the macromolecules will be present in biological fluids at low concentrations so the application of MIPs for selective extraction to allow pre-concentration and clean-up is a very attractive approach. The development of such MIPs using protein templates was reviewed [31]. The latter review was focused on sensors but the methods used to prepare the MIPs should be a useful guide for their eventual application in selective enrichment or other applications. The review discussed template selection, bulk compared with surface imprinting, the use of whole protein or epitopes, solvent conditions used for imprinting, the choice of monomers and cross-linkers, procedures for template removal as well as the sensor development aspects, Many of the examples of MIPs for proteins use a low degree of cross-linking to give soft hydrogels rather than the highly cross-linked rigid gels used for small molecule imprinting. The advantages of using surface imprinting when preparing protein MIPs has been described in ref [32]. This review included sections on SPE, mainly of small molecular mass analytes. The use of carbon nanofibres, nanodiamonds, fullerenes, carbon nanotubes, graphene and graphene oxide were evaluated by

149 ref [33] as possible materials for isolation and pre-concentration of proteins and
150 where MIPs can improve selectivity.
151
152 There have been several reviews of the use of MIPs for SPE. For example,
153 Augusto *et al.* 2013 [34] considered the merits of immunoaffinity, MIPs,
154 aptamers, carbon nanotubes and other nanomaterials. These give numerous
155 examples of the use of MIPs to extract small molecular mass compounds but
156 generally give few examples of macromolecule extraction. SPE can be carried
157 out in several formats. Examples include a conventional small syringe packed
158 with the MIP, coated fibres, capillaries, surface coated particles, coated stir bars,
159 membranes, magnetic beads and nanoparticles [35]. All have advantages and
160 disadvantages and these were evaluated. Hu *et al.* 2013 also emphasised that
161 the major obstacles include the difficulty of finding optimised conditions for
162 selective extraction, compatibility with aqueous solutions and the low number of
163 binding sites obtained [35].
164
165 Schirhagl *et al.* 2014 [36] reviewed the particular approaches to imprinting large
166 biomolecules and highlighted the advantages of using more flexible polymers
167 than the rigid polymers used for small molecules. The review covered methods of
168 synthesis, template removal, applications using various methods (optical,
169 electrical and mass sensitive) of signal production in sensors, separation science
170 and possibilities in drug discovery. The article concluded that selectivities

171 obtained for large biomolecules are still not as good as those for small drug like
172 molecules.
173
174 One interesting approach recently reported was the use of a surface imprinted
175 polymer using myoglobin as the template [37]. The MIP allowed selective capture
176 and release of the target using temperature, rather than the much more
177 widespread use of a change of solvent or pH.
178
179 The basic principle of using a selective extraction followed by desorption into a
180 chromatograph with an MS detector or other instrumental technique is attractive,
181 as accurate measurement and a high degree of specificity or identification can be
182 achieved. Again the evidence quoted in scientific literature for a MIP effect is
183 often that the macromolecule is extracted with greater recovery from the MIP
184 than the NIP and selectivity to similar molecules in terms of molecular mass,
185 function or isoelectric potential. Conclusive evidence of a molecular imprinting
186 effect has been questioned [38]. Although comparison of MIP to NIP is some
187 evidence of a MIP effect the non-specific binding to the NIP does suggest that
188 further studies such as structural characterization would be helpful. Non-specific
189 binding will prove to be a particular obstacle to widespread acceptance when
190 complex samples such as biofluids are processed. Ultimately, the crucial point is
191 not whether the selective capture is an effect requiring specific interactions at
192 specific points on the polymer; rather, it is whether or not MIP-based selective

193 extraction provides improvement in the analytical methods developed. This would
194 then need widespread uptake to become completely convincing.
195 This article will review recent examples in the development of the use MIPs for
196 selective extraction or enrichment of proteins and other large biomolecules
197 appropriate to biological samples. A very extensive collection of articles
198 describing the preparation or use of MIPs in all their applications is listed online
199 [39]. The majority of applications of MIPs are in the area of separation science or
200 sensors. The reality that there are few examples of methods based on MIPs for
201 selective extraction of macromolecules suggests something of an unmet need
202 here.
203
204 **Examples of extraction/enrichment of macromolecules using MIPs (see**
205 **also Table 1)**
206 Qadar *et al.* 2014 [40] developed MIPs to the nonapeptide progastrin releasing
207 peptide (ProGRP), a possible biomarker for small cell lung cancer. A range of
208 acrylamide monomers were evaluated in the SPE format with fractions analysed
209 by HPLC-UV. Selectivity was checked against 4 other peptides. In a follow up
210 paper [41] this group applied the optimised protocol to enrich the peptide from
211 fortified serum. The limit of detection from the optimised protocol was reported to
212 be about 600 pM. The elution protocol used 80% acetonitrile as elution solvent.
213 The MIP retained the targeted peptide more than the NIP, which nonetheless
214 does show non-specific binding. Importantly an example showed a much cleaner
215 chromatogram for the MIP compared with the NIP. Although a nonapeptide rather

216 than a protein, this paper illustrates the potential of a method based on selective
217 SPE with a MIP followed by LC-MS for an important low abundance biomarker.
218 There are several other examples of polypeptide MIPs [30, 40, 42, 43]. Shinde *et*
219 *al.* 2012 [44] described how an SPE MIP format could distinguish between
220 sulpho- and phosphorylated peptides. Fractions were analysed by HPLC and
221 matrix assisted laser desorption ionisation (MALDI) to confirm the elution fraction
222 contents.
223
224 Qin *et al.* 2009 [45] showed the possibility of enriching lysozyme from aqueous
225 and biological samples – in this case egg white. *N*-(4-vinyl)-benzyl iminodiacetic
226 acid (VBIDA) was co-polymerized with *N*-isopropylacrylamide (NiPAm) and AAm
227 in the presence of copper (Cu^{2+}) ions. Greater adsorption capacity was shown for
228 the lysozyme template than for several other proteins (cytochrome C (CytC),
229 ribonuclease A (RNase A), ovalbumin, bovine haemoglobin (BHb), BSA, and
230 glucose oxidase). A gel electrophoresis figure showed enrichment of the
231 lysozyme from diluted egg white. There is growing interest in incorporating metal
232 ions (through complexation) to improve the binding affinity of MIP for a target
233 protein [46]. The electron donating effect of amino groups of the protein to the
234 metal centre offers an additional anchor point for the protein to dock within the
235 vicinity of the cavity.
236
237 Gao *et al.* 2010 [47] prepared a surface modified MIP to lysozyme using
238 methacrylic acid (MAA) as functional monomer and hydroxyethylmethacrylate

239 (HEMA)/ *N*-vinylpyrrolidone (VNP) as cross-linked microspheres. Although
240 biological samples were not evaluated, dynamic binding curves clearly illustrated
241 the delayed elution of the lysozyme compared to bovine haemoglobin.
242
243 Gai *et al.* 2010 and 2011 [48, 49] prepared MIPs to BHb and lysozyme. The
244 lysozyme MIP was surface imprinted and showed greater selectivity for the
245 lysozyme compared with BHb, myoglobin, BSA, Trypsin inhibitor (TI) and CytC.
246 The BSA MIP similarly showed greater selectivity in adsorption experiments,
247 potentially applicable as a sample preparation/enrichment method. Non-specific
248 binding to NIP was also shown which could lessen the use of such a MIP for
249 accurate measurement.
250
251 Dan *et al.* 2013 [28] reported MIPs to ovalbumin using the polysaccharide
252 chitosan and acrylamide as monomers and described extensive optimisation of
253 synthesis. Selectivity was ascertained by comparing MIP rebinding with the non-
254 cognate proteins BSA, BHb and lysozyme. They also looked at surface
255 morphology using several techniques. Gels using chitosan and acrylic acid (AA)
256 and MAA showed the best potential but non-selective binding to NIP and
257 selectivity to other proteins still needs addressing. Biological samples were not
258 evaluated.
259
260 Wan *et al.* 2015 [50] showed how a polydopamine MIP surface imprinted on
261 nanoparticles could enrich lysozyme spiked diluted egg white samples. The MIP

262 was compared to NIP and cross reactivity studies versus five proteins (RNase A,
263 BHb, BSA, trypsin and CytC) demonstrated preferential binding to the target
264 protein. Samples were analysed using MALDI-TOF.
265
266 Deng *et al.* 2011 [51] prepared a monolithic MIP to BSA using a freeze thawing
267 polymerisation method with acrylamide as the monomer. Both HPLC and SPE
268 demonstrated a greater retention for the BSA versus Hb. A gel electrophoresis
269 plate showed a SPE extract enriched with the target protein compared to
270 carbonic anhydrase, lysozyme, BSA, and trypsin. The MIP column showed the
271 BSA, the NIP column showed none of the aforementioned proteins.
272
273 Lin et al. 2013 [52] described the selective extraction of horseradish peroxidise
274 (HRP) from spiked human serum samples. Dopamine was the functional
275 monomer used for MIP preparation. Although the paper was mainly concerned
276 with a monolithic HPLC column it also described the use of the MIP approach in
277 SPME format. It showed a gel electrophoresis plate with significantly enriched
278 HRP.
279
280 Namatozola *et al.* 2014 [53] used AAm to prepare MIPs for human serum
281 albumin (HSA) and IgG. Part of their article described the evaluation using SPE.
282 Comparison of MIP and NIP shows a slightly increased recovery in the elution
283 fraction for the imprinted protein particularly for the IgG. For both MIPs much of

284 the protein was eluted in load and wash fractions suggesting very low selective
285 binding capacities within the MIP.
286
287 Solemani *et al.* 2012 [54] described the preparation of a BSA MIP under the
288 conditions normally used for small molecule analytes. They evaluated the MIP in
289 SPE format, optimising the flow rate, the effect of pH, ionic strength, sample
290 volume and different ratios of methanol/acetonitrile on elution. After optimisation
291 with standard solutions, more challenging solutions such as serum, urine, whey
292 and milk were applied. MIPs were compared with NIPs for recovery. It should be
293 noted that elution fractions from the SPE columns were evaluated by UV-Vis
294 spectrophotometry not by chromatography or MS. The possibility of denaturation
295 of the BSA during MIP synthesis or the analytical protocol cannot be discounted
296 and could be evaluated by, for example, using circular dichroism spectroscopy to
297 assess the nature of the protein during and following the MIP production process
298 [55, 56].
299
300 Liu *et al.* 2014 [57] prepared MIPs for extraction of HSA using porcine serum
301 albumin as a dummy template with methacrylate monomers. The aim of this work
302 was to selectively extract high abundance protein that was not the analyte of
303 interest, thereby enhancing the detection limits of low abundance proteins of
304 interest. Much higher binding affinity for the desired protein was obtained
305 compared with β-lactoglobulin, CytC or ribonuclease B. The use of a dummy
306 template was common with small molecule SPE. It involved the use of a

structural analogue of the target analyte to form the MIP. To date it is much less common with macromolecules.

An example of virus imprinting was shown by Sykora *et al.* 2015 [58] where preliminary results indicated the synthesis of surface MIPs to a *Human Norovirus* strain. They pointed out some of the difficulties of this type of work. Quite apart from the problem of biomolecule stability, the need to use large amounts of pathogenic virus in the MIP synthesis stage restricts this type of work. This issue was overcome by using a genetically modified virus-like particle as the template. The paper showed a much larger binding to the MIP compared with the NIP. Field emission scanning electron microscopy pictures were also shown as evidence of MIP structure.

Comments

Sample preparation includes trying to isolate the analyte to improve detection limits, especially if the analyte is at very low concentration when there is plenty of sample. It can also include trying to remove matrix components that interfere even if they do not give a direct signal to the detector, for example ion suppression in MS.

In contrast to MIPs, antibodies are extensively used commercially especially in clinical (bio) chemistry laboratories. There are examples where MIPs have been shown to replace antibodies in clinical tests [13, 59]. So their increasing use for

330 selective extraction of macromolecules is anticipated. Whether it will be for
331 special applications or widespread depends on the reality of commercially
332 developing suitable products. The virtues of combining immunoaffinity sample
333 preparation with MS detection have been highlighted in a special issue of
334 Bioanalysis especially in the overview given by Ackerman [60]. The advantages
335 offered by biological antibodies will be potentially superseded if suitable MIPs can
336 be reliably produced. The attraction of specific analyte capture, trace enrichment
337 from a large volume and then release into a small volume of liquid compatible
338 with injection into an LC-MS is clear. The use of antibodies for this is increasing.
339 If this type of procedure could be achieved with MIPs this would be an even more
340 attractive approach.
341
342 With proteins and other large biomolecules analyte stability is a problem, so
343 aqueous based SPE protocols are essential. Several papers look at morphology
344 or cavity size, but to be of use to bioanalysts with real measurements to make
345 and defend this ultimately depends on how clean the samples are and the
346 reproducibility of results that is demanded by the end user. One of the drawbacks
347 with the use of MIPs has been the reality that they are not yet as specific as
348 biologically developed antibodies. Whereas K_d values for antibody-antigen
349 interactions are of the order of 10^{-9} M, the majority of MIP-antigen interactions
350 are still at the 10^{-6}-10^{-7} M range, However, recently Piletsky's group has
351 developed a technique for the mass production of nanosized MIPs (plastic
352 antibodies) reporting K_d values matching biological antibodies [61]. When used

353 as reagents for SPE followed by a specific and sensitive end-step such as LC-
354 MS the lack of high affinity MIPs is less of a drawback. Potentially they can offer
355 enough selectivity in extraction to provide a clean enough sample for the
356 chromatography or other measurement. The reality that there are currently few
357 examples of this approach suggests it is worthy of more effort.
358
359 Peptides are not as challenging because they are more stable than proteins and
360 also less expensive in terms of requiring a relatively large amount of template.
361 Other similar approaches for selective extraction have also been developed. The
362 use of aptamers (short single stranded DNA or RNA molecules) has been
363 reviewed by [62, 63] including their use in SPE format. The importance of
364 measuring new therapeutic agents or small abundance protein biomarkers
365 means that the quest for improved methods of selective enrichment/clean-up will
366 continue. Other areas where MIPs may show promise include virus imprinting
367 [64-66] where preliminary experiments showed that tobacco mosaic virus could
368 be imprinted using polyallylamine.
369
370 Difficulties such as the need for a large amount of template for MIP synthesis,
371 reliable and complete template removal, minimisation of non-specific binding, a
372 reasonable shelf-life and commercial availability of quality controlled products
373 that are suitable for rebinding in aqueous solutions still need to be overcome.
374 Nonetheless the approach of selective (enough) extraction followed by HPLC-MS

375 is an attractive proposition in bioanalysis. Hence, the development and validation
376 to regulatory authority guidelines of macromolecule MIPs is tentatively awaited.
377
378 **Conclusions**
379 Molecularly imprinted polymers offer an alternative approach to biological
380 antibodies for selective capture reagents in bioanalytical chemistry. Most of the
381 developments in MIPs have involved small molecules particularly drugs and
382 metabolites. Although several different applications have been proposed, none
383 have come into widespread routine use in laboratories. Use as selective sorbents
384 for SPE have been the most promising area. Even in this area, uptake has been
385 slow. This is in part due to the advent of techniques such as LC-MS seemingly
386 requiring less rigorous sample preparation requirements. It is also, in part,
387 caused by the nature of the technique. If you develop a product that is specific to
388 only one drug or class of drug – it is not going to attract a big market. However
389 generic protocols would be helpful here.
390
391 There is growing interest in accurate measurement of proteins and other
392 macromolecules or biological entities such as viruses. These are being
393 introduced as new drugs or being validated as biomarkers both for drug efficacy
394 and diagnostics. Not surprisingly, MIPs are being produced to macromolecules
395 and are now being evaluated for use in sensors and for sample preparation.
396 Selective extraction both for analytical and preparative purposes is worthy of
397 more research as there are few examples of macromolecule determination in

398 biological samples. Methods proposed will need to be subject to the rigorous
399 validation protocols required by regulatory authorities, not just publication in
400 academic journals.
401
402 **Future Perspectives**
403 The determination of large molecules in biological fluids will continue to be an
404 area of growing importance. Problems with determining intact macromolecules
405 will present greater challenges than for small molecules not least due to their lack
406 of stability. Improvements in the preparation of macromolecular MIPs are
407 needed. This will facilitate investigations into the use of such selective reagents
408 for improved methods of sample preparation. These could then be utilised along
409 with methods such as LC-MS to provide accurate quantification at low
410 concentrations in biological fluids.
411
412 **Keywords**
413 Proteins, Macromolecules, Selective extraction, Molecular imprinted polymers,
414 Antibody mimics, Bioanalysis
415

416 **Table 1 – Example of analytes imprinted within a varied mix of matrices and**
417 **monomer/cross-linker combinations.**

Analyte	Matrix	Monomer	Cross-linker	Validation	Ref
BHb	Aqueous buffers	AAm	MBAA	MIP vs NIP Selectivity vs BSA	[49]
Lysozyme	Aqueous and diluted egg white	NiPAm/AAm	MBAA	MIP vs NIP Selectivity vs BSA, Mb, BHb, TI, CytC	[48]
Ovalbumin	Aqueous non-biological	Chitosan/AA,AAm, MAA	MBAA	MIP vs NIP Selectivity vs BSA, BHb, lysozyme	[28]
ProGRP	Aqueous non-biological	EAMA	DVB	MIP vs NIP Selectivity vs 3 other poly peptides	[40, 41]
Lysozyme	Aqueous buffers	VBDIA/ NiPAm/AAm Plus Cu ions	MBAA	MIP vs NIP Selectivity vs CytC, RNasaA, OB, BSA, Hb, GOx	[45]
Lysozyme	Aqueous and diluted egg white	Dopamine	Not reported	MIP vs NIP and selectivity vs CytC, RNase A, BHb, BSA, CytC	[50]
HPR	Spiked human serum	Dopamine	PETA	HSA, IgG, Trf and other serum proteins	[52]
HSA, IgG	Aqueous buffers	AAm	MBAA	MIP vs NIP	[53]
BSA	Aqueous buffers	AAm	MBAA	MIP vs NIP and selectivity vs CA, lysozyme, BSA, and trypsin	[51]
BSA	Aqueous buffers, serum, urine	2VP	EGDMA	MIP vs NIP	[54]

Acrylamide (AAm); Acrylic acid (AA); Methylacrylic acid (MAA); N-(2-Aminoethyl methacrylamide hydrochloride (EAMA); N-isopropylacrylamide (NiPAm); Divinyl benzene (DVB); N,N-methylenebisacrylamide (MBAA); N-(4-vinyl)-benzyl iminodiacetic acid (VBIDA); 2-vinylpyridine (2VP); Cytochrome C (CytC); Bovine haemoglobin (BHb); Bovine serum albumin (BSA); Myoglobin (Mb); Trypsin inhibitor (TI); Glucose oxidase (GOx); Carbonic Anhydrase (CA); Ovalbumin (OB); Pentaerythritol triacrylate (PETA); Horseradish peroxidase (HPR); Transferrin (Trf); Ribonuclease A (RNase A); Ethylene glycol dimethylacrylate (EGDMA).

Executive Summary

Background

- The measurement of drugs, metabolites and endogenous compounds is a very challenging area for Analytical Chemists. The most common methods involve some form of extraction to give sample clean up and pre-concentration. This is then followed by injection into a gas or liquid chromatograph and measurement using a variety of detectors but most commonly nowadays mass spectrometry.
- As demands for better sensitivity are a challenge methods of selective extraction have been explored. One of the most attractive of these has been the use of immobilised antibodies to selectively extract drugs and metabolites using solid phase extraction.

Molecularly Imprinted Polymers

- MIPs are synthetic polymers formed around a template molecule (the analyte). These are then used as reagents to selectively rebind the analyte during sample preparation. They are much cheaper than biological antibodies and are more stable.
- There are many literature applications using MIPs to extract small molecular mass drugs and metabolites but they are not in common use in industrial laboratories.

MIPs for extraction/enrichment of macromolecules

- With the development of macromolecules as candidate drugs and biomarkers there has been increased interest in developing selective extraction to large molecules.
- The use of soft gels, where the MIPs are formed in aqueous solutions is much more applicable to biomolecules which are generally not stable in other solvents.

Examples of extraction/enrichment of macromolecules using MIPs

- Examples of selective binding of a number of macromolecules are given. These include peptides and polypeptides, lysozyme, bovine haemoglobin, bovine serum albumin, ovalbumin, horseradish peroxidise, human serum albumin, and viruses.

Comments

- The combination of selective extraction along with HPLC-MS to measure macromolecules is very attractive.
- However there are as yet few examples where this has been achieved with MIPs as opposed to biological antibodies.
- There are some questions as to whether or not a MIP effect is as selective as desired.

Conclusions

463 - Use of selective extraction is an area likely to grow as more
464 macromolecular drug candidates and biomarkers are developed.
465

References

1. Soltani S, Jouyban A. Biological sample preparation: attempts on productivity increasing in bioanalysis. *Bioanalysis*. 6(12), 1691-1710 (2014).

2. Stevenson D. Bioanalysis through the ages. *Bioanalysis*. 3(24), 2681-2683 (2011).

3. Stevenson D. Immuno-affinity solid-phase extraction. *J. Chromatogr. B*. 745(1), 39-48 (2000).

4. Hjerten S, Liao JL, Nakazato K, Wang Y, Zamaratskaia G, Zhang HX. Gels mimicking antibodies in their selective recognition of proteins. *Chromatographia*. 44(5-6), 227-234 (1997).

5. Bowen JL, Manesiotis P, Allender CJ. Twenty years since ‘antibody mimics’ by molecular imprinting were first proposed: A critical perspective. *Molecular Imprinting*. 1, 35-40 (2013).

6. EL-Sharif HF, Stevenson D, Warriner K, Reddy SM. Hydrogel-Based Molecularly Imprinted Polymers for Biological Detection. In: *Advanced Synthetic Materials in Detection Science*. Reddy SM (Ed.), The Royal Society of Chemistry, UK, 75-115 (2014).

7. Beltran A, Borrull F, Cormack PAG, Marce RM. Molecularly-imprinted polymers: useful sorbents for selective extractions. *TrAC*. 29(11), 1363-1375 (2010).

8. El-Sharif HF, Phan QT, Reddy SM. Enhanced selectivity of hydrogel-based molecularly imprinted polymers (HydroMIPs) following buffer conditioning. *Anal. Chim. Acta*. 809(0), 155-161 (2014).

9. EL-Sharif H, Hawkins DM, Stevenson D, Reddy SM. Determination of protein binding affinities within hydrogel-based molecularly imprinted polymers (HydroMIPs). *Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys*. 16(29), 15483-15489 (2014).

10. Stevenson D. Molecular imprinted polymers for solid-phase extraction. *TrAC*. 18(3), 154-158 (1999).

11. Martin-Esteban A. Molecularly-imprinted polymers as a versatile, highly selective tool in sample preparation. *TrAC*. 45, 169-181 (2013).

12. Moreno-Gonzalez D, Lara FJ, Gamiz-Gracia L, Garcia-Campana AM. Molecularly imprinted polymer as in-line concentrator in capillary electrophoresis

498 coupled with mass spectrometry for the determination of quinolones in bovine
499 milk samples. *J. Chromatogr. A.* 1360, 1-8 (2014).

500 13. Chianella I, Guerreiro A, Moczko E *et al*. Direct Replacement of Antibodies
501 with Molecularly Imprinted Polymer Nanoparticles in ELISA-Development of a
502 Novel Assay for Vancomycin. *Anal. Chem*. 85(17), 8462-8468 (2013).

503 14. Fatoni A, Numnuam A, Kanatharana P, Limbut W, Thavarungkul P. A novel
504 molecularly imprinted chitosan-acrylamide, graphene, ferrocene composite
505 cryogel biosensor used to detect microalbumin. *Analyst*. 139(23), 6160-6167
506 (2014).

507 15. Saridakis E, Khurshid S, Govada L *et al*. Protein crystallization facilitated by
508 molecularly imprinted polymers. *PNAS*. 108(27), 11081-11086 (2011).

509 16. Arabi M, Ostovan A, Ghaedi M, Purkait MK. Novel strategy for synthesis of
510 magnetic dummy molecularly imprinted nanoparticles based on functionalized
511 silica as an efficient sorbent for the determination of acrylamide in potato chips:
512 Optimization by experimental design methodology. 154, 526-532 (2016).

513 17. Arabi M, Ghaedi M, Ostovan A, Tashkhourian J, Asadallahzadeh H.
514 Synthesis and application of molecularly imprinted nanoparticles combined
515 ultrasonic assisted for highly selective solid phase extraction trace amount of
516 celecoxib from human plasma samples using design expert (DXB) software.
517 *TalantaUltrason. Sonochem*. 33, 67-76 (2016).

518 18. Asfaram A, Ghaedi M, Dashtian K. Rapid ultrasound-assisted magnetic
519 microextraction of gallic acid from urine, plasma and water samples by HKUST-1-
520 MOF-Fe3O4-GA-MIP-NPs: UV–vis detection and optimization study. *Ultrason.*
521 *Sonochem*. 34, 561-570 (2017).

522 19. Asfaram A, Ghaedi M, Dashtian K. Ultrasound assisted combined molecularly
523 imprinted polymer for selective extraction of nicotinamide in human urine and
524 milk samples: Spectrophotometric determination and optimization study.
525 *Ultrason. Sonochem*. 34, 640-650 (2017).

526 20. Arabi M, Ghaedi M, Ostovan A. Development of dummy molecularly
527 imprinted based on functionalized silica nanoparticles for determination of
528 acrylamide in processed food by matrix solid phase dispersion. *Food Chem*. 210,
529 78-84 (2016).

530 21. Cai Q, Yang Z, Chen N, Zhou X, Hong J. Selective capture and rapid
531 identification of Panax notoginseng metabolites in rat faeces by the integration of
532 magnetic molecularly imprinted polymers and high-performance liquid
533 chromatography coupled with orbitrap mass spectrometry. *J. Chromatogr. A*.
534 1455, 65-73 (2016).

535 22. Ding X, Heiden PA. Recent Developments in Molecularly Imprinted
536 Nanoparticles by Surface Imprinting Techniques. *Macromol. Mater. Eng*. 299(3),
537 268-282 (2014).

538 23. Cheong WJ, Yang SH, Ali F. Molecular imprinted polymers for separation
539 science: A review of reviews. *J. Sep. Sci*. 36(3), 609-628 (2013).

540 24. Li S, Cao S, Whitcombe MJ, Piletsky SA. Size matters: Challenges in
541 imprinting macromolecules. *Progress in Polymer Science*. 39(1), 145-163 (2014).

542 25. Hawkins DM, Stevenson D, Reddy SM. Investigation of protein imprinting in
543 hydrogel-based molecularly imprinted polymers (HydroMIPs). *Anal. Chim. Acta*.
544 542(1), 61-65 (2005).

545 26. Hawkins DM, Ellis EA, Stevenson D, Holzenburg A, Reddy SM. Novel critical
546 point drying (CPD) based preparation and transmission electron microscopy
547 (TEM) imaging of protein specific molecularly imprinted polymers (HydroMIPs). *J.*
548 *Mater. Sci*. 42(22), 9465-9468 (2007).

549 27. Hawkins DM, Trache A, Ellis EA *et al*. Quantification and confocal imaging of
550 protein specific molecularly imprinted polymers. *Biomacromolecules*. 7(9), 2560-
551 2564 (2006).

552 28. Dan R, Wang Y, Du L *et al*. The synthesis of molecular imprinted chitosan-
553 gels copolymerized with multiform functional monomers at three different
554 temperatures and the recognition for the template ovalbumin. *Analyst*. 138(12),
555 3433-3443 (2013).

556 29. Hu J, Mao X, Cao S, Yuan X. Recognition of Proteins and Peptides: Rational
557 Development of Molecular Imprinting Technology. *Polymer Science Series a*.
558 52(3), 328-339 (2010).

559 30. Bossi A, Bonini F, Turner APF, Piletsky SA. Molecularly imprinted polymers
560 for the recognition of proteins: The state of the art. *Biosens. Bioelectron*. 22(6),
561 1131-1137 (2007).

562 31. Whitcombe MJ, Chianella I, Larcombe L *et al*. The rational development of
563 molecularly imprinted polymer-based sensors for protein detection. *Chem. Soc.*
564 *Rev*. 40(3), 1547-1571 (2011).

565 32. Chen L, Xu S, Li J. Recent advances in molecular imprinting technology:
566 current status, challenges and highlighted applications. *Chem. Soc. Rev*. 40(5),
567 2922-2942 (2011).

33. Chen H, Zhang Z, Cai R *et al*. Molecularly imprinted electrochemical sensor based on amine group modified graphene covalently linked electrode for 4-nonylphenol detection. *Talanta*. 115(0), 222-227 (2013).

34. Augusto F, Hantao LW, Mogollon NGS, Braga SCGN. New materials and trends in sorbents for solid-phase extraction. *TrAC*. 43, 14-23 (2013).

35. Hu Y, Pan J, Zhang K, Lian H, Li G. Novel applications of molecularly-imprinted polymers in sample preparation. *TrAC*. 43, 37-52 (2013).

36. Schirhagl R. Bioapplications for Molecularly Imprinted Polymers. *Anal. Chem*. 86(1), 250-261 (2014).

37. Wen L, Tan X, Sun Q, Svec F, Lv Y. “Smart” molecularly imprinted monoliths for the selective capture and easy release of proteins. *J. Sep. Sci*, 1-7 (2016).

38. Verheyen E, Schillemans JP, van Wijk M, Demeniex M, Hennink WE, van Nostrum CF. Challenges for the effective molecular imprinting of proteins. *Biomaterials*. 32(11), 3008-3020 (2011).

39. Mike Whitcombe w. MIPdatabase.com. MIPdatabase.com. 2016 (2015).

40. Qader AA, Urraca J, Torsetnes SB, Tonnesen F, Reubsaet L, Sellergren B. Peptide imprinted receptors for the determination of the small cell lung cancer associated biomarker progastrin releasing peptide. *J. Chromatogr. A*. 1370, 56-62 (2014).

*41. Rossetti C, Qader AA, Halvorsen TG, Sellergren B, Reubsaet L. Antibody-Free Biomarker Determination: Exploring Molecularly Imprinted Polymers for Pro-Gastrin Releasing Peptide. *Anal. Chem*. 86(24), 12291-12298 (2014).

42. Helling S, Shinde S, Brosseron F *et al*. Ultratrace Enrichment of Tyrosine Phosphorylated Peptides on an Imprinted Polymer. *Anal. Chem*. 83(5), 1862-1865 (2011).

43. Li Q, Shen F, Zhang X *et al*. One-pot synthesis of phenylphosphonic acid imprinted polymers for tyrosine phosphopeptides recognition in aqueous phase. *Anal. Chim. Acta*. 795, 82-87 (2013).

44. Shinde S, Bunschoten A, Kruijtzer JAW, Liskamp RMJ, Sellergren B. *Imprinted Polymers Displaying High Affinity for Sulfated Protein Fragments. Angewandte Chemie-International Edition.* 51(33), 8326-8329 (2012).

45. Qin L, He X, Zhang W, Li W, Zhang Y. Macroporous Thermosensitive Imprinted Hydrogel for Recognition of Protein by Metal Coordinate Interaction. *Anal. Chem*. 81(17), 7206-7216 (2009).

602 46. EL-Sharif HF, Yapati H, Kalluru S, Reddy SM. Highly selective BSA imprinted
603 polyacrylamide hydrogels facilitated by a metal-coding MIP approach. *Acta*
604 *Biomaterialia*. 28(0), 121-127 (2015).

605 47. Gao B, Fu H, Li Y, Du R. Preparation of surface molecularly imprinted
606 polymeric microspheres and their recognition property for basic protein lysozyme.
607 *J. Chromatogr.* B. 878(21), 1731-1738 (2010).

608 48. Gai Q, Qu F, Zhang Y. The Preparation of BHb-Molecularly Imprinted Gel
609 Polymers and Its Selectivity Comparison to BHb and BSA. *Sep. Sci. Technol*.
610 45(16), 2394-2399 (2010).

611 49. Gai Q, Qu F, Zhang T, Zhang Y. The preparation of bovine serum albumin
612 surface-imprinted superparamagnetic polymer with the assistance of basic
613 functional monomer and its application for protein separation. *J. Chromatogr. A*.
614 1218(22), 3489-3495 (2011).

615 50. Wan W, Han Q, Zhang X, Xie Y, Sun J, Ding M. Selective enrichment of
616 proteins for MALDI-TOF MS analysis based on molecular imprinting. *Chem.*
617 *Commun*. 51(17), 3541-3544 (2015).

618 *51. Deng QL, Li YL, Zhang LH, Zhang YK. Molecularly imprinted macroporous
619 monolithic materials for protein recognition. *Chinese Chemical Letters*. 22(11),
620 1351-1354 (2011).

621 52. Lin Z, Wang J, Tan X *et al*. Preparation of boronate-functionalized
622 molecularly imprinted monolithic column with polydopamine coating for
623 glycoprotein recognition and enrichment. *J. Chromatogr*. A. 1319, 141-147
624 (2013).

625 53. Nematollahzadeh A, Lindemann P, Sun W, Stute J, Luetkemeyer D,
626 Sellergren B. Robust and selective nano cavities for protein separation: An
627 interpenetrating polymer network modified hierarchically protein imprinted
628 hydrogel. *J. Chromatogr*. A. 1345, 154-163 (2014).

629 54. Soleimani M, Ghaderi S, Afshar MG, Soleimani S. Synthesis of molecularly
630 imprinted polymer as a sorbent for solid phase extraction of bovine albumin from
631 whey, milk, urine and serum. *Microchemical Journal*. 100, 1-7 (2012).

632 55. Kryscio DR, Fleming MQ, Peppas NA. Conformational studies of common
633 protein templates in macromolecularly imprinted polymers. *Biomed.*
634 *Microdevices.* 14(4), 679-687 (2012).

635 56. Kryscio DR, Fleming MQ, Peppas NA. Protein Conformational Studies for
636 Macromolecularly Imprinted Polymers. *Macromolecular Bioscience.* 12(8), 1137-
637 1144 (2012).

638 57. Liu J, Deng Q, Tao D *et al*. Preparation of protein imprinted materials by
639 hierarchical imprinting techniques and application in selective depletion of
640 albumin from human serum. *Scientific Reports.* 4, 5487 (2014).

641 *58. Sykora S, Cumbo A, Belliot G *et al*. Virus-like particles as virus substitutes to
642 design artificial virus-recognition nanomaterials. *Chem. Commun*. 51(12), 2256-
643 2258 (2015).

644 59. Bedwell TS, Whitcombe MJ. Analytical applications of MIPs in diagnostic
645 assays: future perspectives. *Anal. Bioanal. Chem*. 408(7), 1735-1751 (2016).

646 60. Ackermann BL. Immunoaffinity MS: adding increased value through hybrid
647 methods. *Bioanalysis*. 8(15), 1535-1537 (2016).

648 61. Canfarotta F, Poma A, Guerreiro A, Piletsky S. Solid-phase synthesis of
649 molecularly imprinted nanoparticles. *Nat. Protoc.* 11(3), 443-455 (2016).

650 62. Du F, Alam MN, Pawliszyn J. Aptamer-functionalized solid phase
651 microextraction-liquid chromatography/tandem mass spectrometry for selective
652 enrichment and determination of thrombin. *Anal. Chim. Acta.* 845, 45-52 (2014).

653 63. Pichon V, Brothier F, Combes A. Aptamer-based-sorbents for sample
654 treatment-a review. *Anal. Bioanal. Chem*. 407(3), 681-698 (2015).

655 64. Bolisay LD, Culver JN, Kofinas P. Molecularly imprinted polymers for tobacco
656 mosaic virus recognition. *Biomaterials*. 27(22), 4165-4168 (2006).

657 65. Bolisay LD, Culver JN, Kofinas P. Optimization of virus imprinting methods to
658 improve selectivity and reduce nonspecific binding. *Biomacromolecules*. 8(12),
659 3893-3899 (2007).

660 66. Bolisay LD, Kofinas P. Imprinted Polymer Hydrogels for the Separation of
661 Viruses. *Macromol. symp*. 291-292, 302-306 (2010).

662

663
664 **Highlights**

665 41 This paper shows a peptide MIP spiked into serum

666 51 This paper shows an enriched SPE trace on gel electrophoresis

667 58 This paper shows the possibility for virus imprinting.

668