Interactions of hydrophilic quantum dots with defect-free and defect containing supported lipid membranes
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ABSTRACT

Quantum dots (QDs) are semiconductor nanoparticles with unique optical and electronic properties, whose interest as potential nano-theranostic platforms for imaging and sensing is increasing. The design and use of QDs requires the understanding of cell-nanoparticle interactions at a microscopic and nanoscale level. Model systems such as supported lipid bilayers (SLBs) are useful, less complex platforms mimicking physico-chemical properties of cell membranes. In this work, we investigated the effect of topographical homogeneity of SLBs bearing different surface charge in the adsorption of hydrophilic QDs. Using quartz-crystal microbalance, a label-free surface sensitive technique, we show significant differences in the interactions of QDs onto homogeneous and inhomogeneous SLBs formed following different strategies. Within short time scales, QDs adsorb onto topographically homogeneous, defect-free SLBs is driven by electrostatic interactions, leading to no layer disruption. After prolonged QD exposure, the nanomechanical stability of the SLB decreases suggesting nanoparticle insertion. In the case of inhomogeneous, defect containing layers, QDs target preferentially membrane defects, driven by a subtle interplay of electrostatic and entropic effects, inducing local vesicle rupture and QD insertion at membrane edges.

1. Introduction

The potential use of nanoparticles in nanomedicine as drug/gene delivery, phototherapy and bioimaging agents depends on the understanding and control over nanoparticle-cell interactions [1,2]. The complexity of cell membranes makes artificial lipid bilayers convenient models to understand the interactions with nanoparticles at a fundamental level. Among lipid membrane models, solid-supported membranes such as supported lipid bilayers (SLBs) and supported vesicle layers (SVLs) are very useful approaches since their formation is rather straightforward, they retain in vivo membrane properties and are amenable to be studied by high resolution surface-sensitive techniques at a multiscale level [3,4]. Mechanistic understanding of the interaction of nanoparticles with model cell membranes is a subject of intensive research and entails a systematic study to dissect the role of physico-chemical parameters of both membranes and nanoparticles, i.e., chemical composition, lateral organization, nanoparticle size and shape, among others [5,6]. For instance, particles in the nano/meso scale range (50–500 nm) partition onto a different lipid phase depending on their size as a result of elastic energy minimization [7]. A very relevant property is surface charge, which is supposed to play a dominant role in early-stage nanoparticle uptake driven by long-range electrostatic interactions [8]. Yet, controversial studies regarding the effect of anionic and cationic nanoparticles (whether adsorption or insertion takes place and whether anionic or cationic charge induce more or less disruption) with oppositely charged membranes have been reported [9–11] indicating that electrostatic interactions are not the only ingredient taking part in early-stage of lipid membrane-nanoparticle interactions. From a thermodynamic viewpoint, the driving force for nanoparticle insertion into lipid membranes is dominated by the hydrophobic effect. Particles bearing hydrophobic groups in their surface functionalities minimize water-exposed hydrophobic surface area by inserting into the
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2.1. Materials and methods

2.1. Materials used

Solutions of 1,2-dioleoyl-sn-glycero-3-phosphocholine (DOPC) and 1,2-dioleoyl-3-trimethylammonium-propane (DOTAP) lipids dissolved in chloroform were purchased from Avanti Polar Lipids (Alabaster, AL, USA). TRIS buffer was prepared with TRIS base powder ≥ 99.8% (VWR Chemicals), KCl ≥ 99% (VWR Chemicals), and HCl 37% solution (VWR chemicals). The TRIS buffer solution (pH 8.0) used for the hydration of the dried lipid films was prepared by dissolving 10 mM TRIS and 150 mM KCl in milliQ water with a resistivity of 18.2 MΩ cm at 25 °C until being used. Hydrophilic CdTe QDs with hydrophilic functionalization rendering the particles negatively charged in the buffer used. Specifically, we followed in real-time and in situ the formation of homogeneous and inhomogeneous DOPC, DOTAP or DOPC:DOTAP SLBs and subsequent interactions with QDs using complementary surface-sensitive techniques, namely quartz crystal microbalance with dissipation monitoring (QCM-D) and atomic force microscopy (AFM). We use the terms homogeneous and inhomogeneous to refer to the fact that the formed SLB is topographically homogeneous or inhomogeneous. For the formation of homogeneous SLBs we employed two different methodologies, vesicle rupture and solvent exchange, and assessed the degree of QDs layer disruption by nanomechanical mapping. Inhomogeneous SLBs were obtained by vesicle adsorption and rupture onto rougher substrates. Significant differences in QD-membrane interaction QCM-D responses were observed from homogeneous and inhomogeneous supported lipid membranes. The former displayed QD adsorption and minor layer disruption or change in nanomechanical properties. In the case of inhomogeneous supported membranes, the degree of inhomogeneity was assessed using the energy dissipation provided by QCM-D as a descriptor. The larger the dissipation — and thus the amount of layer defects —, the stronger QD layer disruption, inducing vesicle rupture and QD insertion at patch boundary edges.

2.2. Lipid vesicle and QD solution preparation

Commercial solutions of DOPC, DOTAP, and a prepared mixture of DOPC:DOTAP (molar ratio 1:1) in chloroform were dried under a continuous mild flow of N2. To avoid any residues of solvent, the lipid films were kept under low pressure overnight. The films were then hydrated with fresh filtered TRIS buffer to 2 mg/mL under continuous stirring for 45 min, in a temperature-controlled water bath at T = 37 °C (well above the melting temperatures of DOPC Tm ~ 16.5 °C [17] and DOTAP Tm ~ 11.5 °C [18]). Unilamellar vesicles were formed by extrusion through polycarbonate filters with pore size 100 nm for 25 passes. The extruded solutions were then diluted in TRIS buffer for obtaining a working concentration of 0.5 mg/mL.

QDs dispersions were freshly prepared prior to each experiment. For this purpose, QDs (in powder form) were dispersed in the working buffer at 0.2 mg/mL and sonicated for 5 min just before the injection onto supported lipid layers, minimizing the probability of QD aggregation.

2.3. Solvent assisted lipid bilayer formation

A recently developed method based on solvent exchange and termed solvent assisted lipid bilayer (SALB) formation has emerged as a versatile alternative for forming supported lipid bilayers on diverse material substrates such as SiO2 [19] and Au [20,21]. SALB does not require the formation of lipid vesicles and enables fabricating SLBs on substrates that do not possess strong enough adhesion energy for promoting the rupture of vesicles [22]. During SALB the lipid molecules are dissolved in an organic solvent and the solvent is exchanged by an aqueous buffer at low controlled rate. Upon solvent exchange, the lipid molecules undergo a series of lyotropic phase transitions (monomers, micelles, vesicles) in the bulk. After the solvent exchange process is completed, lipid vesicles in the bulk coexist with SLBs formed at the solid–liquid interface. As thoroughly reviewed by Cho and co-workers, successful SLB formation requires an optimized choice of the organic solvent, the lipid concentration and the flow rate [19]. Based on previous reported results we have used a flow rate of 100 μL/min and 0.5 mg/mL lipid concentration in isopropanol. In our experiments, lipids dissolved in chloroform were dried and redisolved in isopropanol.

2.4. Dynamic light scattering and zeta potential measurements

Vesicle diameters, polydispersity, and zeta potential ζ were determined by means of dynamic light scattering (DLS) (Malvern Zetasizer Nano ZS, Malvern, UK). The values of these parameters for the systems under study are displayed in Table S1 in the Supplementary Material. The mean diameters of vesicles consisting of pure DOPC, pure DOTAP, and DOPC:DOTAP mixtures range between 112 and 125 nm, and the maximum recorded polydispersity value is 0.18 suggesting that vesicle dispersions are rather homogeneous in size. As expected, the zeta-potential values indicate that DOPC vesicles are zwitterionic in the used buffer, while both DOTAP and DOPC:DOTAP vesicles are positively charged, the former bearing a stronger positive charge. The CdTe QDs diameter was estimated to be d ~ 7 nm, which is consistent regarding the core size and the functionalization groups, and their zeta potential in the used buffer ζ ~ ~ 24 mV as obtained from DLS measurements.
2.5. Quartz crystal microbalance with dissipation monitoring

QCM-D measurements were carried out in a Qsense E4 instrument (Biolin Scientific, Gothenburg, Sweden), which enables simultaneous monitoring of frequency and dissipation changes, \( \Delta f/n \) and \( \Delta D/n \), with \( n \) the overtone number. SiO\(_2\)-coated quartz sensors were cleaned by immersion for 2 h in a solution of 2% sodium dodecyl sulfate (SDS) in milli-Q water, then rinsed in milli-Q water and dried with \( N_2 \). The Au-coated quartz sensors were cleaned by immersion for 5 min in a 5:1:1 mixture of milli-Q water, ammonia and hydrogen peroxide heated at 75 °C, then rinsed in milli-Q water and dried with \( N_2 \). Shortly prior to the beginning of the QCM-D measurements, the sensors were exposed to UV-light using a UV-ozone cleaner (Bioforce Nanosciences, Wetzlar, Germany) for 15 min and their water contact angle measured before their introduction into the QCM-D modules. The changes in \( \Delta f/n \) and \( \Delta D \) were monitored at five different overtones (from 3rd to 11th) and QCM-D experiments were performed at 37 ± 0.02 °C.

The experiments were carried out as follows. First, a baseline with pure TRIS buffer was established. Lipid vesicles were then injected over the different types of sensor chips. After reaching a stable supported lipid membrane layer, a rinsing step with buffer was performed, followed by the addition of CdTe QDs. All additions were carried out at a flow rate of 50 \( \mu \)L/min. For the SALB experiments, a baseline was firstly established in buffer during 10–15 min. Afterwards, TRIS buffer was exchanged with pure isopropanol until complete solvent exchange takes place and a new stable baseline is achieved. Then, the lipids dissolved in isopropanol at 0.5 mg/mL were injected for 15 min, followed by TRIS buffer replacement for 15 min. All the injections were carried out at a flow rate of 100 \( \mu \)L/min.

2.6. Atomic force microscopy (AFM)

AFM quantitative imaging (QI) and force spectroscopy measurements were performed using a Nanowizard 3 AFM (Bruker, Nano GmbH, Berlin, Germany). All the measurements were performed in TRIS buffer (10 mM TRIS, 150 mM KCl, pH 8) at room temperature. Triangular silicon nitride MLCT-F cantilevers (Bruker, Nano GmbH, Berlin, Germany) with quoted cantilever length of \( L \sim 85 \mu \text{m} \), resonance frequency \( f \sim 125 \text{kHz} \), nominal spring constant \( k \sim 0.6 \text{ N/m} \) and nominal tip radius of 20 nm were used. The AFM cantilever was calibrated in buffer against a clean glass slide [23]. For AFM measurements, SLB samples were always kept hydrated and transferred from the QCM-D modules to the AFM liquid cell to minimize possible dewetting. QI images were taken at different scan sizes using a pixel sampling of 200 \( \times \) 200, cantilever speed of 25 \( \mu \text{m/s} \), and setpoint force of 500 pN. Force mapping was recorded by using a force setpoint of 5 nN and approach speed of 1.0 \( \mu \text{m/s} \). AFM measurements were carried out at room temperature (\( T \sim 20 ^\circ \text{C} \) ) keeping the volume of the buffer constant. Samples for which time-dependent measurements were carried out were kept hydrated in the dark at \( T \sim 20 ^\circ \text{C} \).

2.7. Contact angle measurements

Water contact angle (WCA) measurements were carried out using an Attension ThetaLite (Biolin Scientific, Gothenburg, Sweden) based on the sessile drop method. A small drop (3 \( \mu \text{L} \) of milli-Q water was deposited onto clean, UV-ozone treated flat SiO\(_2\)-coated and Au-coated sensors and the shape of the drop formed on the surface was evaluated. The contact angle of a 3 \( \mu \text{L} \) droplet of ultrapure water was measured for 10 s using a recording speed of 20 frames/s. All water contact angles (WCA) were measured at room temperature. Both surfaces were hydrophilic with WCA values between 25° and 34° for Au surfaces, and < 5° for SiO\(_2\) surfaces.

3. Results and discussion

3.1. QDs interactions with homogeneous -defect free- supported lipid bilayers

Supported lipid bilayers (SLBs) of zwitterionic DOPC, positively charged DOTAP, and an equimolar mixture DOPC:DOTAP were formed on flat SiO\(_2\)-coated quartz crystal sensors using two different methodologies: i) vesicle adsorption and rupture (VAR), ii) solvent exchange (SALB). Fig. 1 shows the QCM-D frequency and dissipation changes of the 9th overtone, \( \Delta f/n \) and \( \Delta D \), during the VAR and SALB processes on SiO\(_2\) surfaces, followed by the addition of hydrophobic CdTe QDs. Let us start by discussing the formation of SLBs by VAR (Fig. 1 A, B, panels labelled as 1), whose pathway depends strongly on the electrostatic interactions between the underlying solid surface and the vesicles. In the case of zwitterionic DOPC vesicles, the formation of SLBs requires a critical number of vesicles adsorbed on SiO\(_2\), as reflected in the minimum in the \( \Delta f/n \) signal (maximum in \( \Delta D \)). After adsorption to SiO\(_2\), the frequency shift signal increases (mass gain) and the dissipation decreases back reaching small plateau values, indicating that vesicles fuse and rupture releasing the entrapped water and forming a thin and rigid bilayer, as previously reported in the literature [24,25]. In our measurements, rupture took place reaching small \( \Delta f/n \) and \( \Delta D \) plateau values, followed by a slow and continuous decrease in frequency and increase in dissipation, most likely due to layer restructuration and continuous adsorption of few vesicles that could still be present in the bulk, as observed in previous vesicle adsorption and rupture studies [26]. Upon addition of DOPC:DOTAP vesicles the SLB formation pathway changes, displaying smaller values of \( \Delta f/n \) minimum (\( \Delta D \) maximum) and thus less contacts between adhered vesicles being necessary to yield rupture. For pure DOTAP vesicles, instead of displaying a maximum, \( \Delta f/n \) decreases monotonically reaching plateau values consistent with the formation of a homogeneous lipid bilayer, \( \Delta f/n \sim 25 \text{ Hz} \) and \( \Delta D < 1 - 10^{-6} \) [26] (see Table S2 in the Supplementary Material). DOTAP vesicles are positively charged (largest zeta potential) and their rupture takes place spontaneously upon adsorption driven by the strong electrostatic interaction with the SiO\(_2\) surface.

 Panels C and D in Fig. 1 display the \( \Delta f/n \) and \( \Delta D \) responses during the SALB process and subsequent addition of QDs. A complete overview of the SALB process by QCM-D can be found in Fig. S1 of the Supplementary Material. For the sake of better display, we have restricted ourselves to the steps that involve the addition of lipids dissolved in isopropanol and the subsequent exchange of isopropanol by the TRIS buffer. The former shows a small decrease in frequency (\( \Delta f/n \sim 4.1 \pm 0.2 \text{ Hz} \) equivalent to the adsorption of lipid monomers at the solid-buffer interface, while for the latter the resulting \( \Delta f/n \) and \( \Delta D \) plateaus are consistent with homogeneous SLBs and agree well with their VAR counterparts (see Table S2 in the Supplementary Material). We have used the \( \Delta D \) values and the overtone dispersion as benchmarks for evaluating the degree of homogeneity of the formed supported bilayers. For both layers formed by VAR and SALB \( \Delta D \lesssim 1 \times 10^{-4} \) and overtones overlap for \( \Delta f/n \) and \( \Delta D \) final plateaus (example in Fig. S1) indicating that the resulting layers are homogeneous.

After the formation of the supported lipid bilayers, a solution of 0.2 mg/mL hydrophilic -COOH-terminated CdTe QDs in TRIS buffer (10 mM TRIS, 150 mM KCl, pH 8) was injected over the sensor surfaces with a rate of 50 \( \mu \text{L/min} \) for 10 min. For a better comparison of the different QDs-lipid layers interactions, \( \Delta f/n \) and \( \Delta D/n \) were reset to zero before the particle’s injection (see panels labelled as 2 in Fig. 1). The QDs concentration was selected based on previous results on non-specific interactions between homogeneous SLBs formed by vesicle rupture and hydrophilic CdTe QDs [27]. The adsorption of QDs on positively charged SLBs (i.e. DOTAP and DOPC:DOTAP layers) is characterized by large changes in \( \Delta f/n \) (mass increase), while the dissipation signal \( \Delta D \) barely changes, indicating that QDs adsorb onto the SLBs and form rigid, non-dissipative layers. For zwitterionic DOPC bilayers, no
significant changes in $\Delta f$ and $\Delta D$ plateau values were observed upon addition of the QDs. DOPC SLBs formed by vesicle rupture are not fully homogeneous and a slight increase in frequency (decrease in dissipation) can be detected, indicating QDs disrupt the supported membrane layer and eventually insert in the SLBs. The influence of layer inhomogeneity on QDs interactions will be assessed in Section 3.2. A complete overview of $\Delta f$ and $\Delta D$ changes upon QDs addition can be found in Table 1.

The QD mass adsorbed on the SLBs was calculated using the Sauerbrey relation $\Delta m = -C \frac{\Delta f}{n}$, with $C$ being the Sauerbrey constant $C = 17.7 \text{ ng/cm}^2 \text{ Hz}$ [28]. The Sauerbrey relation is valid for thin, rigid layers whose oscillation is well coupled to that of quartz. In the case of pure DOTAP or DOPC:DOTAP layers, the $\Delta D/\Delta f$ ratio observed for QDs adsorption is well below $4 \times 10^{-7}$ Hz, which is a well-established criterion for Sauerbrey applicability [29]. Fig. 2 depicts the QDs areal mass adsorbed as a function of the zeta potential of the original lipid vesicle suspensions. For SLBs formed by both VAR and SALB, the larger the positive surface charge, the larger adsorption, confirming that QDs adsorption is primarily driven by electrostatic interactions. The adsorption of QDs onto DOPC:DOTAP SLBs formed by SALB is less pronounced than for their VAR SLB counterparts. This difference in adsorption could be indicative of the SALB process resulting into more asymmetric bilayers. In DOPC:DOTAP mixtures, positively charged DOTAP lipid molecules are attracted to the negatively charged SiO$_2$ surface as compared to DOPC ones, thus resulting in an SLB where the lower leaflet has a DOPC:DOTAP molar ratio higher than 1, while the upper leaflet has a molar ratio below 1. When negative QDs are added, they are exposed to the upper leaflet, resulting in weaker interactions with the head groups present in the upper leaflet.

Fig. 3 shows representative AFM topographic images of homogeneous DOPC:DOTAP SLBs formed by VAR on SiO$_2$ recorded by QI-mode imaging at low force setpoint (Fig. 3A) and then evaluated as a function of time after exposure to QDs (Fig. 3 B-D). The supported bilayer seems quite homogeneous and rather defect-free. Force spectroscopy in a mapping mode was carried out to assess the membrane nanomechanics,
associated to the lateral organization, before and after addition of QDs. At long tip-surface vertical separation, no interaction is observed when the AFM tip approaches the SLB-covered SiO$_2$ surface until $d \sim 5-6$ nm, when repulsive interactions between the tip and the lipid molecules take over. From that point, the supported lipid layer is elastically compressed until the AFM tip punctures through the bilayer, reflected as the jump-in event in the approaching force distance curve. The vertical force at which this discontinuity takes place corresponds to the maximum force that the bilayer is able to withstand before breaking, commonly referred to as the breakthrough force ($F_b$) [30,31]. The frequency of force curves showing the above-described event in the mapped areas is similar before and after QDs adsorption. As a matter of fact, the shape of the curves barely changes (Fig. 3D), and the statistical analysis shows very similar breakthrough forces before and after QDs adsorption (Fig. 3C). After a certain time ($t < 16$ h) QDs at the used concentration do not significantly affect the nanomechanical stability of homogeneous supported lipid membranes. After prolonged exposure to QDs, we find that the breakthrough force decreases and thus the SLBs become laterally less organized. In fact, the probability of QD insertion into the bilayer likely might increase with time; however, we cannot rule out the role of possible flip-flop and bilayer degradation with time in the nanomechanical stability of the SLBs. Upon tip retraction, it is observed that the adhesion force increases with time. Adhesion between the tip and the SLB depends strongly on the approach velocity and the phase of the bilayer [32]. In our case, the approach velocity was kept constant and lipids within the bilayer are both in the liquid disordered phase at the measuring temperature. We are thus inclined to ascribe these changes to

Fig. 2. Mass per unit area of hydrophilic CdTe QDs adsorbed onto homogeneous SLBs vs zeta-potential ($\zeta$) of suspended vesicles of the same composition in bulk at 37 °C. Pure DOPC (blue), pure DOTAP (red), or DOPC:DOTAP (green). Supported lipid bilayers are represented by squares when formed by the VAR method, and by triangles when formed by the SALB method. (For interpretation of the references to colour in this figure legend, the reader is referred to the web version of this article.)

Fig. 3. Homogeneous DOPC:DOTAP SLBs (obtained by VAR) before and after addition of hydrophilic CdTe QDs monitored by QI-AFM as a function of time. AFM topographical images and examples of force vs. distance curves registered for (A) DOPC:DOTAP SLB, (B) after the addition of QDs (3 h), (C) after 16 h incubation, (D) after washing by buffer exchange, respectively. Scale bar: 2 µm. (E) Boxplot distribution of the corresponding breakthrough force values obtained from a statistical analysis of the approach part of multiple force vs distance curves (800 $< N < 1600$). (F) Adhesion values obtained from the retract part of the force curves.
partial insertion of the QDs, which would increase the disorder of the bilayer and thus induce a higher adhesion, as observed for SLBs with anaesthetic molecules that partition into the bilayer and increase the area per lipid [32].

3.2. QDs interactions with inhomogeneous -defect containing- supported lipid bilayers

In order to form inhomogeneous SLBs, SiO$_2$ surfaces with larger surface roughness (RMS = 1.2 ± 0.4 nm) were used, based on recent findings reporting that nanoscale roughness strongly impacts the formation of homogeneous supported lipid bilayers [33]. Fig. 4 shows representative $\Delta f/n$ and $\Delta D$ vs time responses upon the formation of inhomogeneous supported lipid membranes after the adsorption of DOPC:DOTAP and DOTAP vesicles and subsequent interactions with QDs. Unlike for homogeneous SLBs, both $\Delta f/n$ and $\Delta D$ reach larger plateau values (in absolute value) and more importantly, the overtone signals do not overlap, indicating the presence of defects within the supported membranes that contribute to energy dissipation, i.e., unruptured vesicles and/or lipid patches with exposed edges. Upon the addition of QDs, the $\Delta f/n$ and $\Delta D$ responses follow opposite behavior, $\Delta f/n$ decreases (mass increases) reaching a stable plateau value, while $\Delta D$ displays a re-entrant behavior, with a fast small increase, followed by a large rapid decrease and a stable plateau. Overall, the mass over the sensor increases due to QD adsorption driven by electrostatic attraction ($\Delta f/n$ increases in absolute value), yet rendering the layers more rigid and less dissipative as revealed by the fact that final $\Delta D$ response decreases and that final overtone plateau overlap. This pattern of behavior can be rationalized as follows. Upon addition, the QDs first adsorb on the supported membranes by electrostatic attraction, and when present, also adsorb defects where membrane curvature is enhanced, such as small unruptured vesicles or bilayer patch edges yielding less dissipative layers by (local) vesicle rupture or edge insertion. In the case of DOPC:DOTAP mixtures, the overall frequency changes after QD addition are smaller than in DOTAP systems due to weaker electrostatic attraction. In turn, final dissipation plateau values are double for DOPC:DOTAP, indicating less efficient vesicle rupture due to weaker electrostatic attraction in the early stage of interaction and thus the presence of more layer defects such as unruptured vesicles, lipid multilayers and bare SiO$_2$ surface.

An alternative view of the QCM-D results for homogeneous and inhomogeneous SLBs can be seen in Fig. 5, which shows scaled frequency and dissipation shifts, $-\Delta f_{n}/f_{n}$ and $-\Delta D_{n}/\pi$, as a function of the overtone number n. These two quantities account for the forces on the quartz (scaled with the quartz inertia) due to the adsorption of the lipids and QDs, the former being the inertial force, which is in phase with the quartz acceleration and the latter the friction force, which is in phase with the quartz velocity [34]. The formation of homogeneous films oscillating rigidly with the quartz surface is characterized by both quantities being overtone independent and by $\Delta D_{n}/\pi < -\Delta f_{n}/f_{n}$ [34]. In the case of homogeneous SLBs, the criterion is met for both quantities before and after QD addition. In the case of inhomogeneous SLBs, $-\Delta f_{n}/f_{n}$ first display clear overtone-dependent behavior. This phenomenon tends to weaken upon addition of QDs and is associated with less dissipative layers, which both guarantee a re-organization of the biomolecular layer.

Fig. 6 illustrates how the topography of the supported lipid membrane affects the hydrophilic QDs interactions with SLBs by comparing the change in dissipation on homogeneous and inhomogeneous supported membranes. The larger the dissipation of the underlying SLB (larger number of defects), the larger changes observed in this quantity upon QD addition. Likewise, the larger the dissipation of the SLB, the larger the decrease in frequency, confirming that QDs target primarily defects (see, for example, Fig. S2 in the Supplementary Material). In all cases, these changes lead to a dissipation decrease, where final values reach those we can find for classical homogeneous lipid bilayers. The insets in Fig. 6 display examples of AFM topography for DOPC:DOTAP and DOTAP SLBs corresponding to different values of dissipation obtained by QCM-D. Compared to homogeneous SLBs, inhomogeneous SLBs exposed to QDs exhibit a more complex topography, namely patches consisting of membrane multilayers (see ~~~Material). On homogeneous (defect-free) supported membranes adsorption of QDs is electrostatically driven, the dissipation plateau does not change and the nanomechanical response is quite similar. On inhomogeneous supported membranes the interaction with QDs results from an interplay between initial electrostatic attraction and defect targeting. QDs target defect sites with enhanced curvature such as intact supported vesicles and exposed supported membrane edges. It has been reported that when QDs adsorb onto vesicles, strong adhesion takes over and wrapping of the vesicle membrane around the particle occurs, leading pore formation and lysis of the vesicles [35]. Supramolecular assembly of nanoparticles-lipid complexes driven by electrostatic and hydrophobic...
interactions has been shown for polyoxometalate nanoparticles leading to collapse of lipid vesicles and to lipid desorption [36]. In our case, vesicle rupture into supported lipid bilayers and multilayers took place within the timescale of the experiment, and subsequently added QDs were most likely inserted into the defects of the inhomogeneous supported membrane layers.

Overall, the addition of QDs has contributed to reducing the dissipation by i) vesicle rupture and formation of single bilayers and multilayers and ii) expulsion of buffer trapped within defects. A closer inspection of the patch boundary in both types of inhomogeneous SLBs after QD addition reveals that the layer thickness at the edges perimeter is higher, especially in case of DOTAP layers (see images in Fig. S4 of the Supplementary Material). The localized height increase can be attributed to CdTe QDs inserting into the edge of the lipid bilayer patch. Reference experiments showed that QDs do not adsorb to the bare SiO₂ surfaces due to electrostatic repulsion, indicating preferential interactions with the bilayer patch boundary (see Fig. S5 panel A in the Supplementary Material). Conversely, adsorption is observed on bare Au as shown in Fig. S5 panel B by QCM-D measurements and corresponding AFM images of the Au sensor where adsorption has taken place (Fig. S5 panel C). For a better visualization of QDs, they have been further adsorbed on an ultraflat Au surface resulting from template stripped chips from Platypus Technologies (Fig. S5 panel D).

We have compared the interactions of QDs onto DOPC and DOPC:DOTAP membranes formed on Au-coated quartz sensors, where, unlike for SiO₂ surfaces, adhesive energy is not strong enough to overcome the bending threshold for vesicle rupture and an intact vesicle layer is favored [22,37]. Fig. 7 shows a comparison of the QCM-D Δf/n and ΔD responses upon DOPC and DOPC:DOTAP vesicle adsorption on Au-coated quartz sensors and subsequent addition of hydrophilic CdTe QDs. Both types of lipid vesicles exhibit a monotonous decrease of Δf/n and increase of ΔD reaching large stable plateau values with non-overlapping overtones, indicating the formation of intact supported vesicle layers. The plateau values are larger in the case of DOPC vesicles, suggesting the presence of more intact, unruptured vesicles. Upon QDs addition, the ΔD signal decreases in both types of layers, QDs yield less dissipative layers by inducing local vesicle rupture. Noteworthy, the Δf/n response displays an opposite pattern of behaviour, increasing for DOPC layers and decreasing for DOPC:DOTAP ones. When vesicles rupture, they release the buffer entrapped and form supported lipid bilayers and multilayers on the Au surface. The mass loss (represented by a Δf/n increase) is counterbalanced by QD adsorption (represented by a Δf/n decrease) in the case of DOTAP containing membranes due to attractive interactions. For pure DOPC membranes, vesicles are targeted and locally ruptured by QDs, releasing a larger amount of water. However, due to repulsive interactions with the (locally) formed SBs QDs do not adsorb onto the resulting bilayers.

4. Conclusions

We have used QCM-D to monitor the interactions between hydrophilic, negatively charged CdTe quantum dots with solid-supported lipid bilayers (SLBs) focusing on the effect of SLB surface charge and topographical inhomogeneities. Two different strategies were carried out to form SLBs, namely vesicle adsorption and rupture (VAR), and solvent assisted lipid bilayer formation (SALB). AFM was used as a complementary tool to confirm the two last points.

The formation pathway of homogeneous bilayers (ΔD ≤ 0.5·10⁻⁶) on a SiO₂ surface using VAR depends strongly on the vesicle’s zeta potential. The more positively the vesicles are charged (DOPC < DOPC:DOTAP < DOTAP), the fewer adsorbed vesicles required for fusion and rupture, eventually rupturing immediately upon adsorption in the case of positively charged DOTAP vesicles. SALB using the same kind of lipids yielded values of frequency and dissipation responses similar to those by
VAR and commensurate with the formation of homogeneous, rigid SLBs onto SiO₂ surfaces. Concerning the adsorption of QDs, the proportionality observed between frequency shifts and the vesicles zeta potential indicates that the interaction is driven by electrostatic attractions, while the stability of the dissipation signals within the timescale of the QCM-D experiments suggests that QDs adsorb and do not (globally) disturb the supported bilayers. QDs adsorbed onto DOPC:DOTAP SLBs formed by SALB and VAR points towards the more asymmetric character of the former. AFM topographical imaging confirm topographically homogeneous bilayers, displaying similar nanomechanical responses before and after QD addition. After prolonged QD exposure, the nanomechanical stability of the SLBs decreases and the adhesion strength between the SLB and the AFM tip increases, due to an enhanced probability of bilayer reorganization and of nanoparticle insertion.

The presence of inhomogeneities in SLBs was evaluated using the QCM-D dissipation values and overtone dispersion as descriptors. The differences in frequency and dissipation changes upon QDs addition with respect to their homogeneous SLB counterparts reveal that, apart from electrostatic interactions, QDs interactions with inhomogeneous SLBs are also driven by defect targeting. As a matter of fact, the more inhomogeneous the SLB, the more QDs adsorb, inducing vesicle rupture and insertion at patch edges, as revealed by AFM imaging.

These results show the importance of supported membrane topography in the interactions with nanoparticle and provide experimental evidence that, apart from electrostatic attraction, nanoparticle interactions are also modulated by the presence of defects, i.e., unruptured vesicles and edges with enhanced curvature. The information provided can motivate further studies on fundamental mechanisms for defect-mediated QD uptake in more complex biological environments and help towards the design of nanoparticles with specific cytotoxic effects.
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