Dear Author

Please use this PDF proof to check the layout of your article. If you would like any changes to be made to the layout, you can leave instructions in the online proofing interface. Making your changes directly in the online proofing interface is the quickest, easiest way to correct and submit your proof. Please note that changes made to the article in the online proofing interface will be added to the article before publication, but are not reflected in this PDF proof.

If you would prefer to submit your corrections by annotating the PDF proof, please download and submit an annotatable PDF proof by clicking [here](#) and you'll be redirected to our PDF Proofing system.

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Acta Biomaterialia

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/actbio

Self-assembling as regular nanoparticles dramatically minimizes photobleaching of tumour-targeted GFP

Ugutz Unzueta^{a,b,c,1,*}, Mònica Roldán^{d,h,1}, Mireia Pesarrodonà^{b,c,e,2}, Raul Benítez^{g,h},
Alejandro Sánchez-Chardi^f, Oscar Conchillo-Solé^e, Ramón Mangués^{a,b},
Antonio Villaverde^{b,c,e,*}, Esther Vázquez^{b,c,e,*}

^a Institut d'Investigacions Biomèdiques Sant Pau, Hospital de la Santa Creu i Sant Pau, 08025 Barcelona, Spain

^b CIBER de Bioingeniería, Biomateriales y Nanomedicina (CIBER-BBN), C/ Monforte de Lemos 3-5, 28029 Madrid, Spain

^c Departament de Genètica i de Microbiologia, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, Bellaterra, 08193 Barcelona, Spain

^d Unitat de Microscòpia Confocal. Servei d'Anatomia Patològica, Institut Pediàtric de Malalties Rares (IPER), Hospital Sant Joan de Déu, Esplugues de Llobregat, Barcelona, Spain

^e Institut de Biotecnologia i de Biomedicina, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, Bellaterra, 08193 Barcelona, Spain

^f Departament de Biologia Evolutiva, Ecologia i Ciències Ambientals, Facultat de Biologia, Universitat de Barcelona, Av. Diagonal 643, 08028 Barcelona, Spain

^g Biomedical Engineering Research Center and Automatic Control Department, Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya, Av. Eduard Maristany 16, 08019 Barcelona, Spain

^h Institut de Recerca Sant Joan de Déu, Santa Rosa 39-57, 08950 Esplugues de Llobregat, Spain

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 14 June 2019

Revised 29 November 2019

Accepted 3 December 2019

Available online xxx

Keywords:

Nanoparticles
Fluorescent proteins
Photostability
Self-assembling
Tumour targeting

ABSTRACT

Fluorescent proteins are useful imaging and theranostic agents, but their potential superiority over alternative dyes is weakened by substantial photobleaching under irradiation. Enhancing protein photostability has been attempted through diverse strategies, with irregular results and limited applicability. In this context, we wondered if the controlled oligomerization of Green Fluorescent Protein (GFP) as nanoscale supramolecular complexes could stabilize the fluorophore through the newly formed protein-protein contacts, and thus, enhance its global photostability. For that, we have here analyzed the photobleaching profile of several GFP versions, engineered to self-assemble as tumour-homing nanoparticles with different targeting, size and structural stability. This has been done under prolonged irradiation in confocal laser scanning microscopy and by small-angle X-ray scattering. The results show that the oligomerization of GFP at the nanoscale enhances, by more than seven-fold, the stability of fluorescence emission. Interestingly, GFP nanoparticles are much more resistant to X-ray damage than the building block counterparts, indicating that the gained photostability is linked to enhanced structural resistance to radiation. Therefore, the controlled oligomerization of self-assembling fluorescent proteins as protein nanoparticles is a simple, versatile and powerful method to enhance their photostability for uses in precision imaging and therapy.

Statement of significance

Fluorescent protein assembly into regular and highly symmetric nanoscale structures has been identified to confer enhanced structural stability against radiation stresses dramatically reducing their photobleaching. Being this the main bottleneck in the use of fluorescent proteins for imaging and theranostics, this protein architecture engineering principle appears as a powerful method to enhance their photostability for a broad applicability in precision imaging, drug delivery and theranostics.

© 2019 Acta Materialia Inc. Published by Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

Abbreviations: NPs, Nanoparticles; BBs, Building Blocks; FDHM, Full Duration at Half Maximum; DLS, Dynamic Light Scattering; SAXS, Small Angle X-ray Scattering; SDS, Sodium Dodecyl Sulphate.

* Corresponding authors.

E-mail addresses: unzueta@santpau.cat (U. Unzueta), antonio.villaverde@uab.es (A. Villaverde), esther.vazquez@uab.es (E. Vázquez).

¹ Equally contributed.

² Present address: Institute for Research in Biomedicine (IRB Barcelona), The Barcelona Institute of Science and Technology, Barcelona 08028, Spain.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actbio.2019.12.003>

1742-7061/© 2019 Acta Materialia Inc. Published by Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

Please cite this article as: U. Unzueta, M. Roldán and M. Pesarrodonà et al., Self-assembling as regular nanoparticles dramatically minimizes photobleaching of tumour-targeted GFP, Acta Biomaterialia, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actbio.2019.12.003>

1. Introduction

Among the catalogue of fluorescent proteins with applicability in biomedicine [1], GFP has been widespread explored for therapeutic uses in vitro and in vivo, including full body and tissue imaging. In oncology, lighting up tumours and metastatic foci is appealing for image-assisted surgery [2,3], an application for which GFP has been specifically adapted by the incorporation of tumour-homing peptides [4–8]. Although GFP (and other fluorescent proteins) presents advantages over fluorescent dyes and quantum dots [5], photobleaching, namely the fading of fluorescent emission during light excitation [9], impairs the optical detection of tumoral tissues at low emission levels such as those expected in micrometastasis [10–12]. High-quality imaging and quantitative analyses of fluorescence signals demand robust fluorescence emission [13]. In this context, different approaches have been explored to improve the photostability of fluorescent proteins [14–16], including directed molecular evolution and protein engineering [17], association with metals [18], or manipulation of cell culture media composition [16,19].

In recent studies, we have engineered peptide-tagged recombinant GFP versions, that self-assemble as nanoparticles (NPs) of sizes ranging from 12 nm to 60 nm [20–22], to successfully deliver small molecular weight drugs [23] and human pro-apoptotic factors [24] to metastatic cancer stem cells, in colorectal cancer animal models. The biodistribution of these materials, as determined by fluorescence detection, is highly specific and it fulfils the high standards required for both, drug delivery and imaging [10]. These proteins are internalized in target cells but not in normal organs. Then, the main tumour and metastatic foci selectively become highly fluorescent [10]. In this context, we wondered if the controlled self-assembling of GFP as regular nanoscale oligomers, sustained by the novo formed protein-protein contacts, might increase the photostability of the protein, making it more suitable for theranostics than the standard unassembled forms. If so, protein engineering aimed to promote the formation of nanoscale supramolecular complexes could be a versatile and promising approach to reduce photobleaching of protein dyes. In this study, we have examined several tumour-homing GFP versions that spontaneously self-assemble as protein-only nanoparticles, with different size and structural stability, regarding their resistance to radiation stress.

The comparison of GFP-based NPs with the unassembled versions of the respective forming protein building blocks (BBs) has revealed that the formation of macromolecular complexes is a powerful and versatile approach to enhance photostability and structural stability of protein imaging tools for theranostics.

2. Materials and methods

2.1. Protein design, production and purification

The synthetic genes encoding modular proteins (GFP-H6, T22-GFP-H6 and A5-GFP-H6) have been designed in-house and were provided by Geneart (ThermoFisher) cloned into pET22b (Novagen). Gene encoding for R9-GFP-H6 modular protein was produced in-house by directed mutagenesis and cloned into pET21b (Novagen). T22 (MRRWCYRKCYKGYCRKCR), R9 (MRRRRRRRRR) and A5 (MRLVSYNGIIFFLK) are amino terminal peptide tags that act as tumour targeting agents, binding CXCR4 (T22 and R9, [10,21]) and CD44 (A5, [25]) cell surface proteins respectively (supplementary data 1). Being cationic, they also promote self-assembling of the fusion protein as nanoparticles. All recombinant vectors were transformed and encoding proteins produced in *Escherichia coli* BL21 (Novagen) for A5-GFP-H6 and GFP-H6, Origami B (Novagen) for T22-GFP-H6 and Rosetta (Novagen) for R9-GFP-H6 upon addition of 0.1 mM isopropyl β -D-1-thiogalactopyranoside (IPTG)

overnight at 16 °C for A5-GFP-H6, at 20 °C for T22-GFP-H6 and GFP-H6 and at 25 °C for R9-GFP-H6. Cell pellets were then harvested by centrifugation (10 min at 5000g) and resuspended in wash buffer (20 mM Tris, 500 mM NaCl, 10 mM imidazole; pH8) in presence of protease inhibitors (Complete EDTA free, Roche) for further purification. Cell disruption was performed at 1200 psi in a French Press (Thermo) and protein containing supernatants separated by centrifugation (45 min at 20,000g) for immobilized metal affinity chromatography (IMAC) purification in an Äkta pure system (GE Healthcare), using Hitrap Chelating HP columns (GE Healthcare). Proteins were eluted by a linear gradient of elution buffer (20 mM Tris, 500 mM NaCl, 500 mM imidazole; pH 8) and purified proteins dialyzed against carbonate buffer (166 mM NaCO₃H; pH 8) for GFP-H6 and A5-GFP-H6, carbonate with salt buffer (166 mM NaCO₃H, 333 mM NaCl; pH 8) for T22-GFP-H6 and Tris dextrose buffer (20 mM Tris + 5% dextrose; pH 8) for R9-GFP-H6. Purified protein purity and identity was then analyzed by SDS-PAGE electrophoresis and further Western-blot immunodetection using anti-His monoclonal antibodies (Santa Cruz Biotechnology), and protein integrity determined by MALDI-TOF mass spectrometry (Bruker). Finally, protein concentration was determined by Bradford's assay. The self-assembling proteins T22-GFP-H6, A5-GFP-H6 and R9-GFP-H6 were found as NPs after purification. Protein building blocks (BBs) were obtained from NPs by disassembling upon addition of sodium dodecyl sulphate (SDS) to 0.1% for 1 h. NPs and BBs for SAXS analysis of T22-GFP-H6 and A5-GFP-H6 were isolated using a Size-exclusion chromatography with a Superdex 200 Increase 10/300 GL column.

2.2. Dynamic light scattering (DLS)

Volume size distribution of self-assembled protein nanoparticles and SDS-mediated disassembled BBs were analyzed by DLS at 633 nm in a Zetasizer nano (Malvern Instruments). All samples were analyzed in triplicate at the same concentration (1 mg/mL) and pH (pH 8) to avoid any concentration of pH-dependent variations.

2.3. Size exclusion chromatography (SEC)

Hydrodynamic size distribution of self-assembled protein nanoparticles was determined by size exclusion chromatography upon injection of 200 µg protein sample in a Superdex 200 increase 10/300GL column (GE Healthcare) using an Äkta purifier system (GE Healthcare). Samples were run in their respective buffers supplemented with 0.1 mM ZnCl₂ to avoid losing nanoparticles coordinating divalent cations.

2.4. Fluorescence emission

Specific fluorescence emission was measured at 510 nm in a Varian Cary Eclipse Fluorescence spectrophotometer (Agilent Technologies) upon excitation at 488 nm, and relative fluorescence percentages were determined and related to control GFP-H6 protein. GFP-H6 protein showed a specific fluorescence of 840 fluorescence units mg/mL when measured in its respective buffer in a 1 cm light path quartz cuvette and the detector was set at medium voltage and excitation and emission slits were set at 5 nm. All fluorescent data were measured at the same moment to avoid device-age related variances and were further normalized by molar concentration for comparison purposes.

2.5. Electron microscopy (EM)

Size and shape of NPs were determined by EM at nearly native state with two rapid techniques and observed with high resolution

electron microscopes [26]. Drops of 3 μL of NPs at 0.25 mg/mL were directly deposited on silicon wafers (Ted Pella Inc.) for 1 min, excess of liquid blotted with filter paper, air dried, and immediately observed without coating with a high resolution in-lens secondary electron detector in a field emission scanning electron microscope (FESEM) Zeiss Merlin (Zeiss) operating at 1 kV. For negative staining, drops of 3 μL of the same three samples were directly deposited on 200 mesh carbon-coated copper grids (Electron Microscopy Sciences) for 30 s, excess blotted with filter paper, contrasted with 3 μL of 1% uranyl acetate (Polysciences Inc.) for 1 min, blotted again and observed in a transmission electron microscope (TEM) Jeol 1400 (Jeol Ltd.) working at 80 kV and equipped with a GatanOrius SC200 CCD camera (Gatan Inc.) [26]. For each sample and technique, representative images of different fields were captured at high magnifications (from 100,000 $\times$ to 600,000 $\times$).

2.6. Confocal laser scanning microscopy (CLSM) and photobleaching measurements

Photobleaching measurements were performed with a Leica TCS SP8 STED 3 $\times$ (Leica Microsystems) using a Plan-Apochromatic 63 $\times$ objective (NA 1.4, oil). GFP-based structures were illuminated with a 20 mW argon laser 488 nm at a 20% AOTF output and detected on a 500 to 550 nm spectral bandwidth. The laser illumination occurred without intermittence and each measurement was repeated at least four times using the same settings for all samples. Fluorescence intensity image size was fixed to 512 by 512 pixels with 12 bits of dynamic range, and the confocal pinhole was 2 AU diameter. For a 1600-Hz line scan rate, the total time between frames was 337 ms for 5 min. In the study area, 4 ROIs of 30 μm^2 were selected to show the MFI in the region in relation to time. All NPs and BBs samples were compared at the same molar concentration and pH in order to avoid any concentration or pH-dependent variations. Data from all studies were analysed using the LAS X software (Leica Microsystems).

2.7. Small-angle X-ray scattering (SAXS)

Radiation damage to protein samples was measured by evaluating progressive changes in SAXS profiles after multiple frames at 1–2 s of exposure at 12.4 keV ($\lambda = 1 \text{ \AA}$) without attenuation recorded in the non-crystalline diffraction (NCD) beamline at ALBA synchrotron Light Source (Cerdanyola del Valles, Spain) using an imXPAD-S1400 photon-counting detector (imXPAD) placed at 5.9 m from the sample. Samples were measured in a Teflon cell with 25 μm thickness mica windows and 3 mm path length and radiation damage data was analysed by Microsoft Excel software (Microsoft).

2.8. Molecular modelling

Models were constructed as presented elsewhere [20]. Interface residues were determined by selecting those residues exposed to the surface of the protein in the monomer which surface accessibility changes in the NP. Those residues with 40% or more surface accessibility were considered exposed as recommended in Had-dock procedures [27]. Surface accessibility was calculated using the Naccess [28] program.

2.9. Statistical methods

Data were tested for normality and homogeneity of variances with Shapiro-Wilk and Levene tests, respectively. Confocal microscopy measurements are expressed as mean and standard error ($\bar{x} \pm \text{SE}$) and have been represented using SigmaPlot 10.0 software. Pairwise comparisons between protein groups were determined by

paired t-tests also using SigmaPlot 10.0, and significant differences were assumed at $p < 0.05$.

Pixelwise analysis of fluorescent decay has been done over 12-bit grayscale images of size 512 $\times$ 512 pixels with a physical pixel size of 0.181 μm . From each experiment, samples of 525 pixels from a regular grid were fitted against one-, two- and stretched exponential time decay models to their pixel intensity. A two-exponential model $ae^{-bt} + ce^{-dt} + e$ was selected using SSE and adjusted R-squared as goodness-of-fit parameters. From the fitted function, we obtained the Full Duration at Half Maximum (FDHM) as the time at which the fluorescence intensity decreased half of its initial amplitude. Differences in decay stability were then characterized using the distribution of FDHM among conditions. The comparison of the FDHM between parental GFP-H6 and NPs was found to be statistically significant in all cases ($p < 0.001$, two-sided Wilcoxon rank sum test). A non-parametric test was applied since the samples were not normally distributed ($p < 0.001$, Kolmogorov-Smirnov test). Similarly, comparison between each NPs and their respective SDS-mediated BBs was found to be statistically significant ($p < 0.001$, two-sided Wilcoxon rank sum test).

3. Results

GFP-H6 is a fluorescent fusion protein that remains unassembled, sizing around 5–6 nm (Fig. 1A), compatible with the occurrence of the dimer, the most common form of recombinant GFP [29,30]. T22-GFP-H6, A5-GFP-H6 and R9-GFP-H6 are modular GFP-H6 derivatives that spontaneously self-assemble, upon purification, as regular NPs of sizes ranging from 12 nm (T22-GFP-H6) to 56 nm (A5-GFP-H6) (Fig. 1A–C). They only differ in the amino acid sequence of the amino terminal peptide, which is highly cationic in the case of T22 and R9, and moderately cationic in the case of A5. These three peptides are completely unrelated in sequence and in source [10,21,25]. When treated with 0.1% SDS, NPs disassembled as BBs of sizes comparable to that of the parental GFP-H6 (Fig. 1A), with exception of R9-GFP-H6. This protein was not completely disassembled and remained partially organized as supramolecular structures, sizing 9 nm (Fig. 1A), probably because of the high cationic load of the N-terminal peptide. All the tested modular proteins resulted fluorescent as NPs and as SDS-released BBs, allowing the exploration of their photostability under radiation stresses. The specific emission intensities were comparable to that of the parental GFP-H6 (Fig. 1A), being the fluorescence of the protein materials lower, in any case, than that of the unassembled GFP-H6. This fact excluded a potential enhancement of the fluorescence mediated by intermolecular protein-protein contacts in the NPs, which might interfere with photostability analyses. All NPs were also structurally stable and similarly fluorescent in a range of different physiological pH values, showing only low fluorescence reduction and moderate particles aggregation (only for A5-GFP-H6 NPs) at pH=6.5, the lowest expected pH for a physiological media (Supplementary Figure 1).

In the first step, solutions of GFP NPs were irradiated with a 20 mW argon laser at 488 nm, under a confocal microscope, to evaluate photobleaching of nanostructured GFP and to compare the differential rate of fluorescence extinction of NPs, SDS-released BBs and parental control GFP-H6. As observed (Fig. 2A), the rate of fluorescence decay was much slower in all NPs than in their respective SDS-generated BBs, which occurred at values comparable to those of control GFP-H6. When comparing to the parental GFP-H6, the photostability of GFP was generically enhanced in all oligomers by factors ranging from 2.5 to 7.7 (Table 1). However, when comparing to the SDS-generated BBs, R9-GFP-H6 NPs showed only a 2-fold factor of improved stability (Table 1, Fig. 2A), fitting with the fact that the true BBs of this protein were not obtained. The

Fig. 1. Structure and architecture of protein NPs. (A) Modular organization and hydrodynamic size of T22-GFP-H6, A5-GFP-H6 and R9-GFP-H6 self-assembled protein nanoparticles (NPs) measured by DLS. SDS-disassembled BBs are also indicated. The parental GFP-H6 protein used as a control has been also analyzed in presence and absence of SDS. All data are expressed as $\bar{x} \pm SE$, and pdi indicates the polydispersity index. Relative sizes of boxes are only indicative. Precise information about the constructs can be found elsewhere [10,21,58] and supplementary data. Average fluorescence emission relative to GFP-H6 (in%) is indicated for each protein sample, in red or green typography. (B) Electron microscopy (FESEM-top and TEM-bottom) images of purified T22-GFP-H6, A5-GFP-H6 and R9-GFP-H6 nanoparticles showing their cyclic nanostructure. Two magnifications are presented (see insets), equivalent in all images. Scale bars indicate 25 nm. (C) Size exclusion chromatography profiles of T22-GFP-H6, A5-GFP-H6 and R9-GFP-H6 NPs (in blue). Parental GFP-H6 protein profile is indicated (in red) as a reference to identify peaks corresponding to non-assembled BBs. (For interpretation of the references to colour in this figure legend, the reader is referred to the web version of this article.)

Fig. 2. Protein nanoparticles photostability. (A) Photobleaching curves for T22-GFP-H6, A5-GFP-H6 and R9-GFP-H6 NPs and BBs. GFP-H6 is added as a control in all the measures. Data was recorded by confocal laser microscopy upon excitation at 488 nm by a 20 mW argon laser during subsequent frames. Orange dashed lines indicate 50% of photobleaching while pink dashed lines indicate 75% of photobleaching. The initial intensities of fluorescence were assumed as 100%. (B) Graphical quantification of 50% (left) and 75% (right) photobleaching times for different protein samples. Red dashed line indicates photobleaching times corresponding to control GFP-H6 protein. * indicates $p < 0.01$ and ** indicates $p < 0.001$. (For interpretation of the references to colour in this figure legend, the reader is referred to the web version of this article.)

Fig. 3. Nanoparticles fluorescence decay analysis. (A) Double exponential fitting of parental GFP-H6 fluorescence decay analyzed at pixel level. Average adjusted R-squared for all protein samples are indicated in the inset as goodness of fit parameter. (B) Graphical quantification of Full Duration at Half Maximum (FDHM) for different protein samples analyzed at pixel level. ** indicates $p < 0.001$. (For interpretation of the references to colour in this figure legend, the reader is referred to the web version of this article.)

increased photostability of the nanostructured forms of GFP was fully supported by the longer time periods required to reach both 50% and 75% of fluorescence reduction, compared to SDS-generated BBs, with statistically significant differences (Fig. 2B). At that point and to exclude any protocol-related protein mixing problems, BBs and NPs of the model T22-GFP-H6, immobilized in polyacrylamide, were also analyzed, rendering results that fully validated our previous data (Supplementary Fig. 2). Also, the impact of divalent cation that coordinate the assembling of NPs or the presence of SDS over the photostability of the samples was discarded by comparing

EDTA-generated BBs (in which divalent cations have been removed by EDTA and no SDS was present) with SDS-generated BBs (which still contained divalent cations and SDS was also present). In this context, no significant differences were observed with control GFP-H6 (Supplementary Figure 3).

Then, in order to further study the fluorescence decay of our protein samples, pixel intensity data were fitted against different exponential decay models, including single exponential ($a \cdot \exp(-b \cdot t)$), stretched exponential ($a \cdot \exp(-b \cdot t^c)$) or double exponential ($a \cdot \exp(-b \cdot t) + c \cdot \exp(-d \cdot t) + e$), being the double exponential decay

Fig. 4. Structural stability of protein nanoparticles. Radiation damage over (A) control GFP-H6 protein or over (B) T22-GFP-H6 and A5-GFP-H6 protein nanoparticles (NPs) and building blocks (BBs) measured by progressive changes (indicated between red dashed line) observed over Small Angle X-ray scattering curves upon exposition at 12.4 keV light source during subsequent frames. (For interpretation of the references to colour in this figure legend, the reader is referred to the web version of this article.)

Table 1
Comparative photostability (shown as enhancement factor) of engineered GFP proteins.

	GFP-H6 BB ^a	NP	BB BB	NP
T22-GFP-H6	1.06	7.72	–	5.42
A5-GFP-H6	1.08	2.54	–	2.34
R9-GFP-H6	2.85	5.49	–	1.93

^a Fold reduction of 50% photobleaching in NPs compared to either the parental GFP-H6 (GFP-H6 column) or to the BB version of each protein (BB column) upon SDS-mediated disassembly.

which showed similar fluorescence decay rate as in SDS-generated BBs. An exception was R9-GFP-H6 BBs, which being still partially organized as 9 nm supramolecular structures did not completely reached the low photostability of the parental GFP-H6 (Fig. 3B).

In a recent study [31], biophysical analyses of related protein NPs (in particular T22-DITOX-H6 and T22-GFP-H6, [32]) were suggestive of an enhanced structural stability of the oligomeric versions of such proteins, measured through resistance to thermal stress. We wondered if such robustness, presumably acquired through self-assembling, might be related to the photostability described in the present study. To address this question, we comparatively analyzed the X-ray radiation damage in SAXS on NP and BB forms of T22-GFP-H6 and A5-GFP-H6, the two proteins in which the disassembling protocol efficiently resulted in BBs. As observed (Fig. 4), the assembled forms of both proteins were less vulnerable to damage produced by radical modification upon X-ray radiation over time than their unassembled counterparts. The detectable alteration of scattering intensities at low angles suggested the propensity of BBs to aggregate upon radiation damage, a common

Fig. 5. BB interfaces in T22-GFP-H6 NPs. Two contiguous T22-GFP-H6 monomers of T22-GFP-H6 NPs are depicted in transparent surface representation of an *in silico* modelled NP. Interface residues (those supporting cross-molecular BB contacts) are presented as sticks, and residues known to affect the fluorescence of the protein are shown as spheres. Note the interaction and global proximity between them. In the inset, an overview of the full NP.

structural alteration catalyzed by amino acid modification though OH radicals [33]. Under the same radiation dose, the nanostructured GFP did not undergo observable macromolecular aggregation. In this sense, in our nanoparticle model, regions susceptible to radiation damage (with high content on Cys, Met, Phe, Tyr, Trp, Pro, His and Leu) are protected from solvent upon oligomerization (Supplementary Table 1). These data confirm that oligomeric forms of the protein are less sensitive to radiation stresses than the unassembled versions probably due to a reduced solvent exposure of oxygen-reactive amino acids. Also in this context, the analysis of T22-GFP-H6 model (Fig. 5) shows that the region of interaction between the monomers is very close and contain several amino acids described to be relevant in the generation of fluorescence. It is known that mutations in His 148, Met154, Val164, Ile167, Ser202, Thr 203 and Glu222 (marked as spheres in Fig. 5) induce changes in GFP fluorescence [34–38]. Therefore, this fact points out that NP formation modifies the local environment of these amino acids that are important for the GFP chromophore formation, and therefore, self-assembling impacts on its stability under intense light irradiation.

4. Discussion

Fluorescent proteins are exploited as molecular probes in bioimaging [1,39] to report gene expression [40,41], to dissect intracellular structures [42] and to determine intracellular localization and interactions at single molecule resolution [43,44]. They are also promising to develop protein-based NPs for cell-targeted drug delivery in cancer, as they can be incorporated in the BBs for theranostic purposes [45]. In this context, NPs are usually functionalized with specific ligands of cell surface receptors for cell-targeted drug delivery [46–48]. However, the applicability of nanostructured vehicles as drug carriers has been so far compromised by an only limited success in reaching a good biodistribution of the drug. In most cases, only around 1% of the administered material accumulates in the target site, while the rest distributes among healthy tissues [49,50]. This landscape is not sufficient to enhance the therapeutic index of a free cytotoxic compound, such as those used in oncology [51], and it is also insufficient to fulfil the requirements of a precise theranostic agent. In recent studies we have engineered a peptide-tagged recombinant GFP, that self-assembles as NPs of 12 nm [20,22], to successfully deliver small molecular weight drugs [23] and

human pro-apoptotic factors [24] to metastatic cancer stem cells, in colorectal cancer animal models. The biodistribution of this material, as determined by fluorescence detection, is very selective and it fulfils the high standards required for both, drug delivery and imaging [10]. The protein, in an assembled and fluorescent form, is architectonically stable in circulation (Supplementary Figure 4) [11] and is only found inside target cells, either in the main tumour or in metastatic foci [10], but not in normal organs. Therefore, these nanostructured GFP show enormous potential in preclinical drug trials and in diagnostic formulations, both in cell culture and *in vivo* since targeted fluorescent NPs can be used to specifically deliver fluorescent proteins and conjugated drugs into target cells for precision imaging and theranosis. This fact prompted us to investigate the photostability of the protein fluorophore when GFP is organized as regular oligomeric NPs.

A self-assembling GFP, forming NPs of 12 nm in size, has been engineered to target CXCR4⁺ tumour cells for the fusion to a CXCR4-binding peptide, namely T22. This nanostructured complex, biodistributes with exquisite precision upon intravenous injection in colorectal cancer mouse models, in which more than 85% of total detected fluorescence is accumulated specifically in tumoral tissues (including small metastatic foci) [10,11]. This construct and derivatives are, therefore, extremely efficient for theranosis [23,24]. Then, we wanted to determine their photostability compared to regular GFP versions to evaluate if the controlled oligomerization might have a positive effect in the robustness of fluorescence emission. We initially anticipated a decrease in the specific fluorescence, since in the NPs, the close GFP-GFP contacts [20] could cause substantial self-quenching. This has been recently demonstrated in GFP-loaded HBV-like NPs, where the distance between the internally localized GFP molecules strongly influenced their fluorescence signal [5]. However, in the current platform, the GFP fluorescence was not affected by self-assembling, as the engineered GFP variants were equally emitting as NPs or BBs (Fig. 1A). The fusion of a cationic peptide at the amino terminus of GFP had only a moderate impact on fluorescence, which was reduced up to about 70–90% of the parental GFP-H6 (Fig. 1A). In addition, the pH of the physiological media had no significant influence over both, the self-assembling and specific fluorescence of the protein samples, and they were also architectonically stable in human serum. This is important when protein NPs are designed for *in-vivo* imaging (Supplementary Figs. 1 and 4). Importantly, photobleaching was dramatically reduced in oligomerized GFP compared to BB versions (Figs. 2 and 3), stressing the unanticipated positive impact of self-assembling in keeping the stability of the emitted fluorescence. Data also suggest that the observed fluorophore stability under laser irradiation is related to a globally enhanced protein structural stability, since the radiation damage over NP forms of GFP is clearly reduced over the parental unassembled GFP-H6 or the BB versions (Fig. 4). In this context, both synchrotron X-ray beams and laser light induce photodamage to structurally similar fluorescent proteins resulting in loss of absorbance and fluorescence, a fact known to be influenced by the chromophore's local environment [52]. As an additional observation, the molecular weight of the target protein or protein complex influences the radiation damage in small-angle X-ray scattering with a protective effect [53]. In this context, recombinant GFP shows a tendency to uncontrolled multimerization and aggregation [54] and some oligomerizing GFP variants have shown affected fluorescence, photobleaching and blinking, depending on oligomer size [55]. It is well known that several residues involved in the chromophoric properties of GFP are close to the GFP dimer interface, which has been postulated as one of the contact sites between GFP BBs to form toroid NPs as those described here [20]. These observations and concepts would account for the particular differences observed in NPs performance and stability of fluorescent NPs versus GFP monomers or dimeric BBs

under electromagnetic radiation. Importantly, in the *in silico* models of T22-GFP-H6 NPs, that perfectly fit the morphometric nanoscale evaluation of the material [20,22], the GFP residues involved in fluorescence participate or are in close proximity to the BB interfaces (Fig. 5). This observation accounts for the enhanced stability of GFP promoted by its controlled oligomerization in form of NPs.

5. Conclusions

The administration of oligomeric GFP as cell-targeted NPs in cancer imaging, therapy and theranostic contexts, benefits from a multiplexed presentation of the tumoral cell ligand (here modelled by T22, A5 or R9), what favours cell internalization [56]. The nanoscale architecture of GFP also results in a highly selective biodistribution upon systemic administration, as it allows escaping from renal filtration [11] and the identification of small metastatic foci because of the longer circulation time [10]. We have here proved that in addition, the nanostructure of GFP NPs, easily regulatable by the manipulation of divalent cations [57], enhances the structural stability and photostability of the system. Therefore, being photobleaching a major obstacle in the application of GFP and other fluorescent proteins in imaging and theranosis, the controlled oligomerization of fluorescent proteins appears as a powerful method to enhance their photostability for their use in precision imaging and therapy.

Declaration of Competing Interest

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

CRediT authorship contribution statement

Ugutx Unzueta: Writing - original draft, Writing - review & editing. **Mònica Roldán:** Writing - original draft, Writing - review & editing. **Mireia Pesarrodona:** Writing - original draft, Writing - review & editing. **Raul Benitez:** Writing - original draft, Writing - review & editing. **Alejandro Sánchez-Chardi:** Writing - original draft, Writing - review & editing. **Oscar Conchillo-Solé:** Writing - original draft, Writing - review & editing. **Ramón Mangués:** Writing - original draft, Writing - review & editing. **Antonio Villaverde:** Writing - original draft, Writing - review & editing. **Esther Vázquez:** Writing - original draft, Writing - review & editing.

Acknowledgments

This study has been funded by the **Agencia Estatal de Investigación** (AEI) and **Fondo Europeo de Desarrollo Regional** (FEDER) (grant **BIO2016-76063-R**, AEI/FEDER, UE), **AGAUR** (2017SGR-229) and **CIBER-BBN** (project VENOM4CANCER) granted to AV, ISCIII (PI15/00272 co-founding FEDER) granted to EV and **CIBER-BBN** (project NANOSCAPE) granted to UUE. Protein production and DLS measurements have been partially performed by the ICTS "NANBIOSIS", more specifically protein production by the Protein Production Platform of CIBER-BBN/IBB (<http://www.nanbiosis.es/unit/u1-protein-production-platform-ppp/>) and nanoparticle size analysis by the Biomaterial Processing and Nanostructuring Unit (<http://www.nanbiosis.es/portfolio/u6-biomaterial-processing-and-nanostructuring-unit/>). We are indebted to the Servei de Microscòpia of the UAB for excellent technical service. UU is supported by PERIS program from the health department of la Generalitat de Catalunya. R.B. was supported by research grant **SAF2017-8819-C3** from the Spanish

Ministry of Science Innovation and Universities. AV received an ICREA ACADEMIA award. EV, RM and AV are co-founders of NANOLIGENT, devoted to develop antitumoral drugs based on proteins.

Supplementary materials

Supplementary material associated with this article can be found, in the online version, at doi:[10.1016/j.actbio.2019.12.003](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actbio.2019.12.003).

References

- [1] E.A. Rodriguez, R.E. Campbell, J.Y. Lin, M.Z. Lin, A. Miyawaki, A.E. Palmer, X. Shu, J. Zhang, R.Y. Tsien, The growing and glowing toolbox of fluorescent and photoactive proteins, *Trends Biochem. Sci.* 42 (2017) 111–129.
- [2] R.M. Hoffman, Application of GFP imaging in cancer, *Lab. Invest.* 95 (2015) 432–452.
- [3] V. Ntziachristos, J.S. Yoo, G.M. van Dam, Current concepts and future perspectives on surgical optical imaging in cancer, *J. Biomed. Opt.* 15 (2010) 066024.
- [4] R.M. Hoffman, The multiple uses of fluorescent proteins to visualize cancer in vivo, *Nat. Rev. Cancer* 5 (2005) 796–806.
- [5] S.E. Kim, S.D. Jo, K.C. Kwon, Y.Y. Won, J. Lee, Genetic assembly of double-layered fluorescent protein nanoparticles for cancer targeting and imaging, *Adv. Sci.* 4 (2017) 1600471.
- [6] S. Yano, K. Takehara, S. Miwa, H. Kishimoto, H. Tazawa, Y. Urata, S. Kagawa, M. Bouvet, T. Fujiwara, R. Hoffman, Fluorescence-guided surgery of a highly-metastatic variant of human triple-negative breast cancer targeted with a cancer-specific GFP adenovirus prevents recurrence, *Oncotarget* 7 (2016) 75635–75647.
- [7] C.A. Metildi, S. Kaushal, C.S. Snyder, R.M. Hoffman, M. Bouvet, Fluorescence-guided surgery of human colon cancer increases complete resection resulting in cures in an orthotopic nude mouse model, *J. Surg. Res.* 179 (2013) 87–93.
- [8] S. Miyamoto, S. Sperry, T. Yamashita, N.P. Reddy, B.W. O'Malley Jr., D. Li, Molecular imaging assisted surgery improves survival in a murine head and neck cancer model, *Int. J. Cancer* 131 (2012) 1235–1242.
- [9] J. Lippincott-Schwartz, G.H. Patterson, Development and use of fluorescent protein markers in living cells, *Science* 300 (2003) 87–91.
- [10] U. Unzueta, M.V. Cespedes, N. Ferrer-Mirallès, I. Casanova, J. Cedano, J.L. Corchero, J. Domingo-Espin, A. Villaverde, R. Mangués, E. Vázquez, Intracellular CXCR4(+) cell targeting with T22-empowered protein-only nanoparticles, *Int. J. Nanomed.* 7 (2012) 4533–4544.
- [11] M.V. Cespedes, U. Unzueta, W. Tatkiwicz, A. Sanchez-Chardi, O. Conchillo-Sole, P. Alamo, Z. Xu, I. Casanova, J.L. Corchero, M. Pesarrodona, J. Cedano, X. Daura, I. Ratera, J. Veciana, N. Ferrer-Mirallès, E. Vázquez, A. Villaverde, R. Mangués, In vivo architectonic stability of fully de novo designed protein-only nanoparticles, *ACS Nano* 8 (2014) 4166–4176.
- [12] M.V. Cespedes, U. Unzueta, P. Alamo, A. Gallardo, R. Sala, I. Casanova, M.A. Pavon, M.A. Mangués, M. Trias, A. Lopez-Pousa, A. Villaverde, E. Vázquez, R. Mangués, Cancer-specific uptake of a liganded protein nanocarrier targeting aggressive CXCR4+ colorectal cancer models, *Nanomedicine* 12 (2016) 1987–1996.
- [13] A.V. Mamontova, A.P. Grigoryev, A.S. Tsarkova, K.A.L.A.M. Bogdanov, Struggle for Photostability: Bleaching Mechanisms of Fluorescent Proteins, *Russ. J. Bioorg. Chem.* 43 (2017) 9.
- [14] C. Zhang, J.B. Konopka, A photostable green fluorescent protein variant for analysis of protein localization in *Candida albicans*, *Eukaryot. Cell.* 9 (2010) 224–226.
- [15] B.T. Bajar, E.S. Wang, A.J. Lam, B.B. Kim, C.L. Jacobs, E.S. Howe, M.W. Davidson, M.Z. Lin, J. Chu, Improving brightness and photostability of green and red fluorescent proteins for live cell imaging and FRET reporting, *Sci. Rep.* 6 (2016) 20889.
- [16] A.M. Bogdanov, E.A. Bogdanova, D.M. Chudakov, T.V. Gorodnichenova, S. Lukyanov, K.A. Lukyanov, Cell culture medium affects GFP photostability: a solution, *Nat. Methods* 6 (2009) 859–860.
- [17] C. Kiss, J. Temirov, L. Chasteen, G.S. Waldo, A.R. Bradbury, Directed evolution of an extremely stable fluorescent protein, *Protein Eng. Design Select* 22 (2009) 313–323.
- [18] Y. Fu, J. Zhang, J.R. Lakowicz, Metal-enhanced fluorescence of single green fluorescent protein (GFP), *Biochem. Biophys. Res. Commun.* 376 (2008) 712–717.
- [19] A.V. Mamontova, A.M. Bogdanov, K.A. Lukyanov, Influence of cell growth conditions and medium composition on EGFP photostability in live cells, *BioTechniques* 58 (2015) 258–261.
- [20] F. Rueda, M.V. Cespedes, O. Conchillo-Sole, A. Sanchez-Chardi, J. Seras-Franzoso, R. Cubarsi, A. Gallardo, M. Pesarrodona, N. Ferrer-Mirallès, X. Daura, E. Vázquez, E. García-Fruitos, R. Mangués, U. Unzueta, A. Villaverde, Bottom-Up instructive quality control in the biofabrication of smart protein materials, *Adv. Mater.* 27 (2015) 7816–7822.
- [21] M.T. de Pinho Favaro, N. Serna, L. Sanchez-Garcia, R. Cubarsi, M. Roldán, A. Sanchez-Chardi, U. Unzueta, R. Mangués, N. Ferrer-Mirallès, A.R. Azzoni, E. Vázquez, A. Villaverde, Switching cell penetrating and CXCR4-binding activities of nanoscale-organized arginine-rich peptides, *Nanomedicine* (2018).
- [22] M. Pesarrodona, E. Crosas, R. Cubarsi, A. Sanchez-Chardi, P. Saccardo, U. Unzueta, F. Rueda, L. Sanchez-Garcia, N. Serna, R. Mangués, N. Ferrer-Mirallès, E. Vázquez, A. Villaverde, Intrinsic functional and architectonic heterogeneity of tumor-targeted protein nanoparticles, *Nanoscale* 9 (2017) 6427–6435.

- [23] M.V. Cespedes, U. Unzueta, A. Avino, A. Gallardo, P. Alamo, R. Sala, A. Sanchez-Chardi, I. Casanova, M.A. Mangues, A. Lopez-Pousa, R. Eritja, A. Villaverde, E. Vazquez, R. Mangues, Selective depletion of metastatic stem cells as therapy for human colorectal cancer, *EMBO Mol.Med.* (2018).
- [24] M. N.C. Serna, L. Sánchez-García, U. Unzueta, R. Sala, A. Sánchez-Chardi, F. Cortés, N. Ferrer-Mirallès, R. Mangues, E. Vázquez, A. Villaverde, Peptide-based nanostructured materials with intrinsic proapoptotic activities in CXCR4+ solid tumors, *Adv. Funct. Mater.* 27 (2017) 1700919.
- [25] M. Pesarrodona, N. Ferrer-Mirallès, U. Unzueta, P. Gener, W. Tatkiwicz, I. Abasolo, I. Ratera, J. Veciana, S. Schwartz Jr., A. Villaverde, E. Vazquez, Intracellular targeting of CD44+ cells with self-assembling, protein only nanoparticles, *Int. J. Pharm.* 473 (2014) 286–295.
- [26] O. Cano-Garrido, E. García-Fruitos, A. Villaverde, A. Sanchez-Chardi, Improving biomaterials imaging for nanotechnology: rapid methods for protein localization at ultrastructural level, *Biotechnol. J.* 13 (2018) e1700388.
- [27] S.J. de Vries, A.D. van Dijk, M. Krzeminski, M. van Dijk, A. Thureau, V. Hsu, T. Wassenaar, A.M. Bonvin, HADDOCK versus HADDOCK: new features and performance of HADDOCK2.0 on the CAPRI targets, *Proteins* 69 (2007) 726–733.
- [28] S.J.H.J.M. Thornton, "NACCESS", Computer Program. Department of Biochemistry and Molecular Biology, University College London, 1993.
- [29] I. Gautier, M. Tramier, C. Durieux, J. Coppey, R.B. Pansu, J.C. Nicolas, K. Kemnitz, M. Coppey-Moisano, Homo-FRET microscopy in living cells to measure monomer-dimer transition of GFP-tagged proteins, *Biophys. J.* 80 (2001) 3000–3008.
- [30] R.E. Campbell, O. Tour, A.E. Palmer, P.A. Steinbach, G.S. Baird, D.A. Zacharias, R.Y. Tsien, A monomeric red fluorescent protein, *PNAS* 99 (2002) 7877–7882.
- [31] J.M. Sanchez, L. Sanchez-Garcia, M. Pesarrodona, N. Serna, A. Sanchez-Chardi, U. Unzueta, R. Mangues, E. Vazquez, A. Villaverde, Conformational conversion during controlled oligomerization into nonamylogenic protein nanoparticles, *Biomacromolecules* 19 (2018) 3788–3797.
- [32] L. Sanchez-Garcia, N. Serna, P. Alamo, R. Sala, M.V. Cespedes, M. Roldan, A. Sánchez-Chardi, U. Unzueta, I. Casanova, R. Mangues, E. Vázquez, A. Villaverde, Self-assembling toxin-based nanoparticles as self-delivered antitumoral drugs, *J. Controlled Release* 274 (2018) 81–92.
- [33] S.D. Maleknia, C.Y. Ralston, M.D. Brenowitz, K.M. Downard, M.R. Chance, Determination of macromolecular folding and structure by synchrotron x-ray radiolysis techniques, *Anal. Biochem.* 289 (2001) 103–115.
- [34] B. Campanini, B. Pioselli, S. Raboni, P. Felici, I. Giordano, L. D'Alfonso, M. Collini, G. Chirico, S. Bettati, Role of histidine 148 in stability and dynamics of a highly fluorescent GFP variant, *Biochim. Biophys. Acta* 1834 (2013) 770–779.
- [35] A. Natarajan, S. Subramanian, F. Srien, Comparison of mutant forms of the green fluorescent protein as expression markers in Chinese hamster ovary (CHO) and *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* cells, *J. Biotechnol.* 62 (1998) 29–45.
- [36] S.S. Liu, X. Wei, X. Dong, L. Xu, J. Liu, B. Jiang, Structural plasticity of green fluorescent protein to amino acid deletions and fluorescence rescue by folding-enhancing mutations, *BMC Biochem.* 16 (2015) 17.
- [37] R. Heim, D.C. Prasher, R.Y. Tsien, Wavelength mutations and posttranslational autoxidation of green fluorescent protein, *PNAS* 91 (1994) 12501–12504.
- [38] G. Jung, J. Wiehler, A. Zumbusch, The photophysics of green fluorescent protein: influence of the key amino acids at positions 65, 203, and 222, *Biophys. J.* 88 (2005) 1932–1947.
- [39] A. Miyawaki, Y. Niino, Molecular spies for bioimaging—fluorescent protein-based probes, *Mol. Cell* 58 (2015) 632–643.
- [40] M. Yang, E. Baranov, A.R. Moossa, S. Penman, R.M. Hoffman, Visualizing gene expression by whole-body fluorescence imaging, *PNAS* 97 (2000) 12278–12282.
- [41] C.H. Contag, M.H. Bachmann, Advances in in vivo bioluminescence imaging of gene expression, *Annu. Rev. Biomed. Eng.* 4 (2002) 235–260.
- [42] S.J. Sahl, S.W. Hell, S. Jakobs, Fluorescence nanoscopy in cell biology, *Nat. Rev. Mol. Cell Biol.* 18 (2017) 685–701.
- [43] S. Duwe, E. De Zitter, V. Gielen, B. Moeyaert, W. Vandenberg, T. Grotjohann, K. Clays, S. Jakobs, Van Meervelt, P. Dedeker, Expression-enhanced fluorescent proteins based on enhanced green fluorescent protein for super-resolution microscopy, *ACS Nano* 9 (2015) 9528–9541.
- [44] S. Shashkova, M.C. Leake, Single-molecule fluorescence microscopy review: shedding new light on old problems, *Biosci. Rep.* 37 (2017).
- [45] E. Vazquez, R. Mangues, A. Villaverde, Functional recruitment for drug delivery through protein-based nanotechnologies, *Nanomedicine* 11 (2016) 1333–1336.
- [46] V.J. Yao, S. D'Angelo, K.S. Butler, C. Theron, T.L. Smith, S. Marchio, J.G. Gelovani, R.L. Sidman, A.S. Dobroff, C.J. Brinker, A.R.M. Bradbury, W. Arap, R. Pasqualini, Ligand-targeted theranostic nanomedicines against cancer, *J. Controlled Release* 240 (2016) 267–286.
- [47] J.M. Caster, A.N. Patel, T. Zhang, A. Wang, Investigational nanomedicines in 2016: a review of nanotherapeutics currently undergoing clinical trials, *Wiley Interdiscipl. Rev. Nanomed. Nanobiotechnol.* 9 (2017).
- [48] A. David, Peptide ligand-modified nanomedicines for targeting cells at the tumor microenvironment, *Adv. Drug. Deliv. Rev.* 119 (2017) 120–142.
- [49] R. Duncan, R. Gaspar, Nanomedicine(s) under the microscope, *Mol. Pharm.* 8 (2011) 2101–2141.
- [50] A.J.T. Stefan Wilhelm, Qin Dai, Seiichi Ohta, Julie Audet, Harold F. Dvorak, Warren C.W. Chan, Analysis of nanoparticle delivery to tumours, *Nat. Rev. Mater.* 1 (2016).
- [51] N. Serna, L. Sanchez-Garcia, U. Unzueta, R. Diaz, E. Vazquez, R. Mangues, A. Villaverde, Protein-based therapeutic killing for cancer therapies, *Trends Biotechnol.* 36 (2018) 318–335.
- [52] V. Adam, P. Carpentier, S. Violot, M. Lelimosin, C. Darnault, G.U. Nienhaus, D. Bourgeois, Structural basis of X-ray-induced transient photobleaching in a photoactivatable green fluorescent protein, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 131 (2009) 18063–18065.
- [53] J.B. Hopkins, R.E. Thorne, Quantifying radiation damage in biomolecular small-angle X-ray scattering, *J. Appl. Crystallogr.* 49 (2016) 880–890.
- [54] A. Schrödel, A. de Marco, Characterization of the aggregates formed during recombinant protein expression in bacteria, *BMC Biochem.* 6 (2005) 10.
- [55] G. Vamosi, N. Mucke, G. Muller, J.W. Krieger, U. Curth, J. Langowski, K. Tóth, EGFP oligomers as natural fluorescence and hydrodynamic standards, *Sci. Rep.* 6 (2016) 33022.
- [56] U. Unzueta, M.V. Cespedes, E. Vazquez, N. Ferrer-Mirallès, R. Mangues, A. Villaverde, Towards protein-based viral mimetics for cancer therapies, *Trends Biotechnol.* 33 (2015) 253–258.
- [57] H. Lopez-Laguna, U. Unzueta, O. Conchillo-Sole, A. Sanchez-Chardi, M. Pesarrodona, O. Cano-Garrido, E. Voltà, L. Sánchez-García, N. Serna, P. Saccardo, R. Mangues, A. Villaverde, E. Vazquez, Assembly of histidine-rich protein materials controlled through divalent cations, *Acta Biomater.* (2018).
- [58] M. Pesarrodona, Y. Fernandez, L. Foradada, A. Sanchez-Chardi, O. Conchillo-Sole, U. Unzueta, Z. Xu, M. Roldán, S. Villegas, N. Ferrer-Mirallès, S. Schwartz Jr., U. Rinas, X. Daura, I. Abasolo, E. Vazquez, A. Villaverde, Conformational and functional variants of CD44-targeted protein nanoparticles bio-produced in bacteria, *Biofabrication* 8 (2016) 025001.