

Microfluidically produced microcapsules with amphiphilic polymer conetwork shells

*Sara T. R. Velasquez, Andrea Belluati, Elena Tervoort, Iacopo Mattich, Brigitte Hertel, Sam Russell, Micael Gouveia, Clément Mugemana, André R. Studart, Nico Bruns**

Dr. S. T. R. Velasquez, Dr. A. Belluati, S. Russell, Prof. N. Bruns

Department of Chemistry, Technical University of Darmstadt, Peter-Grünberg-Straße 4, 64287 Darmstadt, Germany.

Department of Pure and Applied Chemistry, University of Strathclyde, Thomas Graham Building, 295 Cathedral Street, Glasgow G1 1XL, United Kingdom.

E-mail: nico.bruns@tu-darmstadt.de

M. Gouveia

Department of Pure and Applied Chemistry, University of Strathclyde, Thomas Graham Building, 295 Cathedral Street, Glasgow G1 1XL, United Kingdom.

Dr. B. Hertel

Department of Biology, Technical University of Darmstadt, Schnittspahnstraße 3, 64287 Darmstadt, Germany.

Dr. E. Tervoort, I. Mattich, Prof. A. Studart

Complex Materials, Department of Materials, ETH Zürich, Vladimir-Prelog-Weg 5, 8093 Zürich, Switzerland.

Dr. Clément Mugemana

Adolphe Merkle Institute, University of Fribourg, Chemin des Verdiers 4, 1700 Fribourg, Switzerland. Current address: Materials Research and Technology, Luxembourg Institute of Science and Technology, 5 Avenue des Hauts-Fourneaux, L-4362 Esch-sur-Alzette, Luxembourg

Abstract

Microcapsules with aqueous core can be conveniently prepared by water-in-oil-in-water double emulsion microfluidics. However, conventional shell materials are either based on polymers or monomers that are soluble in the oil phase, or based on hydrophobic colloidal particles. As a result, microcapsules derived from double emulsions usually feature a hydrophobic shell that is not semipermeable for water-soluble compounds. While capsules with semipermeable hydrogel shells have been demonstrated, these may exhibit poor mechanical properties and lack the robustness required in many applications. In this study, amphiphilic polymer conetworks (APCNs) based on poly(2-

hydroxyethyl acrylate)-*linked by*-polydimethylsiloxane (PHEA-*l*-PDMS) are introduced as a new class of wall materials in double emulsion microcapsules. These APCNs are mechanically robust silicone hydrogels that are swellable and permeable to water, and are soft and elastic in the dry and swollen states. Thus, the microcapsules can be dried and rehydrated multiple times or shrunken in sodium chloride salt solutions without getting damaged. Moreover, the APCNs are semipermeable for hydrophilic organic compounds, while being impermeable for macromolecules and colloids. Thus, they can be loaded with macromolecules or nanoparticles during microfluidic formation, and with organic molecules after capsule synthesis. Uptake into and release from the capsules were studied with the model compounds fluorescein and fluorescently labelled dextran. Moreover, the microcapsules served as microreactors for catalytically active platinum nanoparticles that decomposed hydrogen peroxide. Finally, the surface of APCN microcapsules can be selectively functionalized with a cholesterol-based linker that non-covalently binds to the hydrophobic domains of the APCN. Thus, APCN microcapsules represent versatile and broadly applicable capsules that could find application for the controlled delivery of drugs, as microreactors for synthesis, or even as scaffolds for synthetic cells.

Keywords: Microfluidic double emulsion, Microcapsules, Amphiphilic polymer conetworks, Silicone hydrogels, Micro- and nanoreactors, Lego-inspired glass capillary microfluidic device

Introduction

Microfluidic devices allow preparation of water-in-oil-in-water (W/O/W) double emulsions with defined droplet sizes. In these double emulsions, an oil layer separates a water-filled compartment from the surrounding bulk water. If the oil layer contains compounds that can cure and solidify, the double emulsion droplet can be converted into a microcapsule in which a thin shell surrounds a liquid aqueous interior.¹⁻⁷ These microcapsules are useful for several applications, including drug or fragrance delivery,^{1, 6, 8} cosmetics and food additives encapsulation,¹ as microreactors for enzymes,⁹ or as a shell for artificial cells.^{5, 9} Double emulsion capsules have also been used to encapsulate nanoparticles, for instance, TiO₂ and ZnO nanoparticles, to create catalytic systems that can degrade organic pollutants.¹⁰

Shell materials of these microcapsules can be synthetic or natural polymers, or colloidal particles that stabilize the oil phase. These components or their precursors must be soluble in the oil phase, namely an organic solvent that is not miscible with water. Thus, they are usually hydrophobic polymers, hydrophobic monomers, hydrophobic colloidal particles, or mixtures thereof. As a result, double emulsion microcapsule walls are also hydrophobic and, therefore, impermeable for water or water-soluble compounds, unless the capsule wall is micro- or nanoporous. However, a shell that is semipermeable for water-soluble compounds is essential for many applications. These include, for example, applications requiring slow release of hydrophilic cargo from the inside of the capsules, or the transport of water-soluble substrates to reach the catalysts within capsule microreactors. One possibility to create more polar shells is to use polymers that are soluble in water and in organic solvents, such as poly(ethylene glycol) (PEG). Indeed, hydrogel microcapsules could be prepared by polymerization of PEG macrocrosslinkers, such as α,ω - dimethacrylate-terminated PEG.^{9, 11} However, when dried, PEG hydrogels lose their elasticity and, therefore, it is difficult to dry such hydrogel microcapsules without damaging the capsules. Other approaches to create double emulsion microcapsules that allow for transport of hydrophilic compounds across their shell have been proposed. For example, capsules with a permeable self-healing shell have been prepared using a dynamically-crosslinked polymer network that can seal holes formed upon capsule cracking.¹² In other instances, permeable capsules have been made through phase separation of polymers during UV-induced polymerization of the middle oil fluid,¹³

or by packing colloids in the middle phase to form colloidosomes with intrinsically microporous shells.¹⁴ However, such microcapsules usually lack mechanical stability and toughness, and may show limited functionalization capability.

Amphiphilic polymer conetworks (APCNs) can potentially address several of the drawbacks of currently available shell materials. APCNs are composed of chemically crosslinked hydrophilic and hydrophobic polymer chain segments, and are exquisite materials with unique properties.¹⁵⁻²⁰ They are hydrogels that also swell in organic solvents. As the covalent crosslinks hinder macroscopic demixing of the chain segments of opposite polarity (i.e. macroscopic spinodal phase separation), APCNs possess nanophase-separated morphologies that are often co-continuous over a broad range of compositions,²¹⁻³⁶ thereby allowing for diffusion of dissolved molecules across the material. This makes them semipermeable and suitable for membrane³⁷⁻⁴² and drug-delivery applications.⁴³⁻⁴⁶ Moreover, they are transparent,^{24, 47-49} biocompatible,^{46, 50-55} and possess good mechanical properties, including elasticity when swollen and when dry,^{24, 36, 53, 56-61} lending themselves mechanically superior to other hydrogels. APCNs are used in every-day life as a material for extended-wear soft contact lenses,⁶²⁻⁶⁵ and have been explored as biomaterials for the encapsulation of cells,^{60, 66, 67} and for many other applications. Importantly, a common synthesis strategy towards APCNs is to copolymerize a hydrophobically masked monomer with a hydrophobic crosslinker, followed by conversion of the hydrophobic precursor network into an amphiphilic polymer conetwork by cleavage of the masking groups.^{16, 22, 24, 68, 69} Thus, the monomer mixture is soluble in organic solvents, and therefore fully compatible with the oil phase of double emulsions.

Here, we introduce APCNs as shell material for double emulsion-derived microcapsules. The type of APCN that we selected to prepare double emulsion microcapsules is poly(2-hydroxyethyl acrylate)-*linked by*-polydimethylsiloxane (PHEA-*l*-PDMS), a material which has been of long-standing research interest for our and other research groups. These APCNs are elastic materials,⁶¹ and have been investigated for applications including: semipermeable membranes,²⁴ as matrix for phase transfer reactions of enzymes in organic solvents^{70, 71} and supercritical CO₂,⁷² as light-responsive membranes,⁴¹ controlled release antimicrobial coatings,⁷³ as matrix for luminescent solar concentrators,^{48, 49, 74} as

material for colorimetric (bio)sensors,⁷⁵⁻⁷⁷ and as self-sealing and puncture resistant breathable membranes.⁷⁸ Additionally, PHEA-*l*-PDMS APCNs can be functionalized post polymerization by using the active ester pentafluorophenyl acrylate as an additional comonomer,^{77,79} or they can be mechanically reinforced by incorporation of peptide blocks between the PDMS segments and the crosslinking points.⁶¹ Previously, PHEA-*l*-PDMS APCNs have been studied as coating on surfaces,²⁴ as freestanding films and membranes,²⁴ as well as solid microparticles,⁷¹ but not as capsules.

PHEA-*l*-PDMS microcapsules were prepared in a Lego®-inspired microfluidic double emulsion device^{80, 81} and were loaded with platinum nanoparticles (PtNPs) as active catalysts during their microfluidic preparation. Inspired by the swelling and deswelling of pollen grains in response to various hydration levels,⁸² the ability of capsules to recover after having been dried and rehydrated was studied. Moreover, the capsules' ability to osmotically shrink was examined by exposing them to high salt concentrations. The capsules are semipermeable for small water-soluble compounds but are impermeable for encapsulated macromolecules and colloids. This feature was harnessed to make microreactor capsules for the decomposition of hydrogen peroxide by the encapsulated PtNPs. Furthermore, the capsules' outer surface could be stably and selectively functionalized with a PEG₃₀₀₀-cholesterol linker, whereby the cholesterol was inserted into the hydrophobic domains of the APCN.

Results and discussions

The APCN double emulsion microcapsules were prepared using a Lego®-inspired glass capillary microfluidic device developed by the group of Vladisavljević,^{80, 81} which offers a greatly simplified approach to double emulsion microfluidics compared to manually assembled glass capillary devices and allows the use of hydrophobic monomers. The device consists of two plastic blocks that can be easily joined together and separated using a Lego-inspired stud-and-hole coupling system that aligns the incorporated glass capillaries. The plastic blocks host two round glass capillaries inside a coaxially aligned round outer capillary.⁸⁰ Figure 1 schematically shows the configuration of the capillaries and the overall experimental set-up for the preparation of double emulsion microcapsules. One syringe

pump delivered, in two separate channels, the water-based inner phase and the middle oil phase, which contained toluene as water-immiscible solvent, as well as the hydrophobic monomer 2-(trimethylsilyloxy)ethyl acrylate (TMS-HEA), the hydrophobic macromolecular crosslinker α,ω -dimethacrylate-terminated PDMS (MA-PDMS-MA) and a photoinitiator for free radical polymerization, in a 50:50 wt% composition of PHEA and PDMS. A second syringe pump delivered the 2 wt% of PVA -based outer phase. W/O/W double emulsions were formed in the microcapillary device and collected in a vial, which was irradiated with UV-light to initiate the polymerization and to form hydrophobic polymer conetworks in the oil phase. They were then converted into PHEA-*l*-PDMS amphiphilic polymer conetworks by cleaving the TMS groups in an isopropanol-water mixture.

The success of the double emulsification process and the size of the resulting APCN capsules depended on the diameters of the injection and collection capillary openings, the distance between the tip of the capillaries, and the flow rates of the three phases. The distance between the capillaries was 150 μm and the diameter of the inner capillary and the collector were set to 100 and 350 μm , respectively. The flow rates were optimized for the given distance between capillaries to obtain double emulsion microcapsules, as examined by microscopy. The flow rate of the outer phase varied in the range 50 – 80 mL h^{-1} , the flow rate of the middle phase varied between 4 - 6 mL h^{-1} , and the flow rate of the inner phase was set to values between 2.5 - 3 mL h^{-1} . It was not possible to form double emulsions if the inner capillary and collector were too close or if the speed of the middle and inner phases were in the same order of magnitude.

The microscopy image in Figure 1C shows an example of the capsules after the polymerization and TMS-cleavage step. In this typical batch, spherical APCN microcapsules with an outer diameter of $412 \pm 23 \mu\text{m}$ and a shell thickness of $59 \pm 14 \mu\text{m}$ were obtained, when water-swollen. However, the capsule size could vary slightly with each batch. The shell of each capsule had a slightly asymmetric thickness, which is a commonly observed phenomenon for double emulsion microcapsules as the inner phase sinks within the oil phase shell before curing due to gravity, solvent evaporation and the difference in flow speeds between the inner and middle phases.⁸³⁻⁸⁵




Figure 1. Schematic depiction of the Lego®-inspired glass capillary microfluidic device and the experimental set-up used to produce double emulsion APCN microcapsules. A) Microfluidic formation of a double emulsion with a solution of monomer, macromolecular crosslinker, and photoinitiator in toluene as the oil middle phase, and an aqueous inner phase that optionally contained Pt nanoparticles, as well as an aqueous outer phase that contained polyvinyl alcohol (PVA) as surface active polymer. The double emulsion was irradiated with UV light to synthesize a hydrophobic polymer conetwork in the oil phase. B) Conversion of the hydrophobic precursor conetwork into a PHEA-*l*-PDMS APCN by cleavage of the TMS groups in a water-isopropanol mixture. C) Optical microscope image of APCN double emulsion microcapsules suspended in water. (The depicted microcapsules were prepared with PtNPs in the inner phase.) Scale bar: 200 μm .

The shell of the capsules is optically transparent, which indicates that no macroscopic phase separation occurred during the synthesis of the APCNs, which would have resulted in turbid materials.²⁴ As PHEA and PDMS chain segments in the APCNs are not miscible, nanophase separation is expected to occur. The phase separation within the shell was confirmed by differential scanning calorimetry (DSC) of the APCN microcapsules, which revealed two glass transition temperatures, at -123 °C, corresponding to PDMS,⁸⁶ and 4 °C, corresponding to PHEA^{87, 88} (Figure S1a). Thermogravimetric analysis under a nitrogen atmosphere indicated a mass loss with an onset at 150 °C and mass loss of 7% until 265 °C, after which the main mass loss proceeded over a relatively large temperature range up to 470 °C (Figure S1b). The observed two-step mass loss corresponds most likely to the PHEA and PDMS chain segments of the APCN. Moreover, when PtNPs were present in the microcapsules, the mass loss in TGA experiments extended to above 550 °C. Attenuated total reflection Fourier-transform infra-red (ATR FT-IR) spectra of dried APCN microcapsules show no evidence of the absorption bands at 1637 and 837 cm⁻¹ (Figure S2), indicating that the TMS group was cleaved off and that PHEA chain segments formed.

Inspired by the dehydration and hydration of pollen grains, the drying and subsequent recovery of the microcapsules in water were studied through different drying-swelling cycles. One advantage of PHEA-*l*-PDMS over other microcapsule wall materials is that the APCNs are soft and flexible in both the swollen and dry states. Figure 2 shows microscopy images of the capsules before, during, and after completing four drying-wetting cycles with water. The experiment reveals that the APCN microcapsules exhibit remarkable robustness even under the high stresses developed in the drying and rehydration processes. In the fully hydrated state, the capsules had a diameter of 266 ± 11 μm (Table S1). When dried, they became deflated and bowl-shaped, most likely because the inner cavity of the capsules dried up and the capsule wall bulged inwards. After incubation in water for 20 minutes, the capsules recovered to a full spherical shape of the same size as before drying (Table S1). This process could be repeated at least four times. No damage to the capsules was visible after each dehydration-rehydration cycle, indicating good recovery of the swollen APCN capsules, most likely because of the elastic nature of the capsule shell. In the microscopy images, the dry capsules seem to have cracks on

their surface. However, scanning electron microscopy (SEM) images (Figure 3 and Figure S3) show that they are just wrinkles generated during drying. In the SEM images, the surface of the dry capsules after each of the drying steps appears smooth without any cracks or other defects, and the bowl-shape of the deflated capsules can be clearly seen. This confirms that the capsules remained intact during the drying process and that the water inside of the capsules had left them by diffusing through the capsule wall.




Figure 2. Transmission light microscopy images of hydrated and dry APCN microcapsules over four hydration and dehydration cycles. A-D) Hydrated microcapsules in water: A) As prepared, B) After the first dehydration-rehydration cycle, C) After the second dehydration-rehydration cycle, D) After the third dehydration-rehydration cycle. E-H) Dry microcapsules in air: E) After first dehydration, F) After second dehydration, G) After third dehydration, H) After fourth dehydration. The depicted microcapsules were prepared with PtNPs in the inner phase. Scale bars = 200 µm.




Figure 3. SEM images of dry APCN microcapsules after first dehydration. A) 100 x magnification. B) 300 x magnification. The depicted microcapsules were prepared with PtNPs in the inner phase.

Confocal laser scanning microscopy (CLSM) was used to quantify the thickness of the capsule wall (**Error! Reference source not found.**). To this end, the capsules were fluorescently stained with Nile Red (NR) to highlight their polymeric shell. When hydrated, the capsule wall was 25 - 30 μm thick. When the capsules were dried, they adopted the bowl-like shape which made an exact measurement of wall thickness difficult. Apparently, the thickness of the capsule wall increased to 55 – 85 μm , which corresponds to approx. two times the wall thickness, which would be expected when the shell bulges. **Error! Reference source not found.**d-f shows the dry capsules after different numbers of dehydration-rehydration cycles. No cracks or other damage to the shell were observed, confirming the remarkable robustness and the mechanical resilience of the APCN capsules.

Hydrated APCN microcapsules shrank when placed in a saturated salt solution, such as brine (Figure 4), most likely because the water diffused out of the capsules in response to the osmotic pressure across the capsule wall. The shrinking process took about 20 min until the size of the capsules stabilized, with the capsule diameter decreasing from $263 \pm 32 \mu\text{m}$ to $172 \pm 40 \mu\text{m}$. Moreover, shrinkage changed the shape of the capsules from spherical to bowl-like morphology.




Figure 4. Shrinking of APCN microcapsules in saturated sodium chloride solution as observed by light microscopy. A) Capsules in water before the addition of brine. B) Capsules after 20 minutes in a brine solution. The depicted microcapsules were prepared with PtNPs in the inner phase. Scale bars = 200 μm .

The permeability of the microcapsule shell was studied using fluorescent dyes of different sizes (Figure 5 and Supporting Information Videos). A small molecule like fluorescein (340 Da) could diffuse into the capsules, as shown in the supporting information video V1 and Figure S5. However, FITC-labelled dextran (40 kDa) did not diffuse into the cavity (**Error! Reference source not found.**). Similarly, when FITC-labelled dextran was encapsulated in the inner cavity during capsule formation, the macromolecular cargo did not diffuse out of the capsules (**Error! Reference source not found.**). Thus, small molecules such as fluorescein permeated through the APCN capsule wall, while the APCN was impermeable to the macromolecular dextran. As 40 kDa dextran has a radius of 4.5 nm,⁸⁹ the microcapsules should likewise retain similarly-sized colloids.




Figure 5. Impermeability of APCN microcapsules for macromolecules. A-C) CLSM micrographs of Nile Red-stained APCN microcapsules with FITC-Dextran (40 kDa) outside the capsules after 30 min incubation. The depicted microcapsules were prepared with PtNPs in the inner phase. D-E) APCN microcapsules loaded with FITC-Dextran 40 kDa during microfluidic double emulsion capsule

preparation. A, D) FITC channel; B, E) Nile Red channel; C, F) Overlay (F: with transmission channel). Scale bars = 200 μm . The solid particles in A-C are either out-of-focus microcapsules or single emulsion microparticles that formed when one of the fluid phases was empty during microfluidic emulsification.

The influence of dehydration-rehydration cycles on the permeability of the microcapsule shell was studied with encapsulated fluorescein as a model compound. NR-labelled empty capsules were incubated for 30 min in a fluorescein solution to load them with the fluorescent dye, then centrifuged, quickly washed, and resuspended in water. Encapsulated fluorescein was then allowed to diffuse out of the capsules for 10 min. The capsules were sedimented by mild centrifugation, the supernatant was collected, and its fluorescence was measured. To normalize the fluorescence of released fluorescein to the concentration of capsules in the sample, the microcapsules were resuspended in water and collected to measure their NR fluorescence (Figure 6, Entry: 0 Rehydration cycles; Figure S6). The same fluorescein uptake and release procedure was carried out with APCN microcapsules that had been dried and rehydrated for one or more cycles (Figure 6 **Error! Reference source not found.**). The experimental results show that dried and rehydrated microcapsules released more fluorescein than the never dried ones. However, the release did not increase with increasing number of drying-rehydration cycles. As it can be assumed that the amount of fluorescein released after a fixed amount of time is proportional to the permeability of the shell, the results suggest that the permeability increased once upon drying and rehydration and remained constant in the subsequent cycles. Two possibilities could account for these results. Either the first drying induced small defects in the capsule shell that do not enlarge or increase in number in further drying events. However, such defects are not observed in the SEM images of the capsules, and it is also unlikely that additional drying steps would not damage the shell further. Alternatively, the arrangement of the hydrophilic PHEA and the hydrophobic PDMS domains in the APCN might change upon the first drying and rehydration step, for example by increasing the co-continuity of the two polymer phases in the APCN, thereby making it easier for the water-dissolved fluorescein to diffuse through the water-swollen microcapsule shell.




Figure 6. Release of fluorescein from APCN microcapsules over several dehydration-rehydration cycles. The capsules were stained with Nile Red, and the fluorescence of fluorescein in the surrounding liquid was normalized over Nile Red fluorescence which is directly proportional to the concentration of capsules. Data shown as mean of $n = 3$ measurements \pm S.D.

One possible application of APCN microcapsules is as microcompartments for chemical reactions.⁹⁰ To explore this potential application, the capsules were loaded with platinum nanoparticles (PtNPs) that are catalysts, for example, for the decomposition of hydrogen peroxide into oxygen and water.⁹¹ PtNPs were added to the inner aqueous phase during capsule formation by microfluidic double emulsification. The catalytic activity of the PtNP-containing APCN microcapsules was measured indirectly by a competition assay with myoglobin (Mb) that acts as a peroxidase^{92, 93} and that was added to the outside of the capsules (Figure 7A). Mb uses hydrogen peroxide to oxidize Amplex Red (AR) to the fluorescent resorufin. The presence of Mb in the suspension of NP-loaded capsules meant that H_2O_2 would be either used to oxidize AR or decomposed by the PtNPs without production of fluorescence.^{94, 95} The NP-loaded capsules partially quenched the activity of myoglobin (Figure 7B), indicating that the PtNPs decomposed hydrogen peroxide. Interestingly, this happened even though the enzyme had easier access to the substrates because hydrogen peroxide did not have to cross a polymer shell before reaching the enzyme.⁹⁶ In the absence of Mb, the catalyst-loaded capsules were even able to counteract the non-catalyzed oxidation of AR with H_2O_2 .⁸⁹ Overall, it can be concluded that H_2O_2 can diffuse through the

shell of the microcapsules and that the PtNPs inside of the APCN microcapsules are catalytically active in decomposing H_2O_2 . This demonstrates that the capsules act as microreactors for the nanoparticles.




Figure 7. PtNP-loaded APCN microcapsules as microreactors for the catalytic decomposition of H_2O_2 . A) Schematic depiction of the activity assay. To assess the H_2O_2 -degradation, a competitive fluorometric assay was carried out in which myoglobin catalyzes the conversion of Amplex Red into resorufin under the consumption of H_2O_2 . B) Results of the H_2O_2 decomposition assay. Microcapsules loaded with PtNPs (MC-Pt) and Microcapsules without PtNPs (empty MC) in the presence and absence of Mb on the outside of the capsules, as well as several control reactions. The AR-less condition acts as negative control and shows the background fluorescence of the assay. Values as mean \pm SD, $n = 3$. *: $p < 0.05$, ***: $p < 0.001$, ****: $p < 0.0001$.

While some molecules like fluorescein and hydrogen peroxide diffuse through the microcapsule shell and others, such as the lipophilic dye Nile Red homogeneously distribute throughout the whole thickness of the APCN wall, the outside of the shell might be selectively functionalized with a hydrophobic moiety attached to a hydrophilic macromolecule. The hydrophobic moiety should act as an anchor that enters into the hydrophobic domains on the surface of the APCN, while the hydrophilic macromolecule hinders deep penetration into the APCN due to its bulkiness. To illustrate such a functionalization strategy, APCN microcapsules were incubated in a Cy5-PEG3500-cholesterol (CyPC) solution. This molecule contains a hydrophobic cholesterol anchor that is usually used for insertion into lipid and block copolymer membranes. The PEG is hydrophilic and acts as a spacer to ensure water solubility, and the Cy5 is a fluorescent moiety.

After incubation of APCN microcapsules in a solution of CyPC and subsequent purification of the capsules, the microcapsules remained fluorescent. This indicates that CyPC was retained after centrifugation, washing in water, and resuspension of the capsules in water (Figure 8A). CLSM micrographs show that the fluorescence was localized on the outside of the APCN shell (Figure 8B). Thus, CyPC did not diffuse through the whole membrane but selectively stained a thin outer layer of the capsule wall. The selective modification of the capsule surface with PEG-cholesterol should also allow the outer surface of the capsules to be decorated with other useful moieties, for example, functional groups for click chemistry to attach biomolecules.⁹⁷⁻⁹⁹




Figure 8. Surface functionalization of APCN microcapsules with Cy5-PEG₃₅₀₀-cholesterol. A) Graph showing the fluorescence emission (660-690 nm) of the capsules in the absence of Cy5-PEG₃₅₀₀-cholesterol, capsules in solution with Cy5-PEG₃₅₀₀-cholesterol, and capsules purified from this solution by centrifugation, washing, and resuspension in water. Values shown as mean \pm SD, n = 3. B-D) CLSM image of APCN capsules functionalized with Cy5-PEG₃₅₀₀-cholesterol: B) Cy5 channel, C) transmission channel, D) overlay. The depicted microcapsules were prepared with PtNPs in the inner phase. Scale bars = 200 μ m.

Conclusions

Mechanically robust microcapsules with water-swallowable and semi-permeable shells can be prepared by microfluidic double emulsification using PHEA-*l*-PDMS APCNs as wall materials. By polymerizing a hydrophobically masked monomer with a PDMS-based macromolecular crosslinker, it became possible to create silicon hydrogels that are templated by the oil phase of the double emulsion, and therefore form the shell of the microcapsules. These APCNs greatly expand the material scope of double emulsion

microcapsules. For example, the APCN microcapsules can be dried and rehydrated multiple times without damage. They are semipermeable for water and small water-soluble compounds while retaining macromolecules in their inside. Moreover, they can host catalytically active nanoparticles and thereby serve as microreactors or be selectively modified with a suitable linker on their surface. Thus, APCN microcapsules should be useful for a variety of applications that involve encapsulation and controlled release of active compounds such as drugs or fragrances. Alternatively, they could be used as catalytically active building blocks for molecular systems engineering or as compartments for the preparation of artificial cells. Furthermore, APCNs are transparent, so that the capsules could also be used as adaptable optical materials such as microlenses.

Materials

α,ω -methacryloxypropyl-terminated poly(dimethylsiloxane) (MA-PDMS-MA, viscosity 50-90 cSt, molecular weight = 4500 – 5500 g mol⁻¹) was purchased from ABCR (Germany). 2-Hydroxyethyl acrylate, triethylamine, chlorotrimethylsilane, photoinitiator bis(2,4,6-trimethylbenzoyl)-phenylphosphineoxide (Irgacure 819), poly(vinyl alcohol) (PVA; M_w 31000 – 50000, 87 – 89 % hydrolyzed), dibenzocyclooctyne-Cy5 (Cy5-DBCO), 10-acetyl-3,7-dihydroxyphenoxazine (Amplex Red), Nile Red, 35% H₂O₂, FITC-Dextran (40 kDa), sodium fluorescein, myoglobin from equine heart and all inorganic salts for PBS and analytical grade solvents were purchased from Sigma-Aldrich. NanoXact Platinum Nanoparticles – Bare (Citrate) (5 nm, 0.05 mg mL⁻¹ in aqueous 2 mM sodium citrate) (TEM Figure S7) were bought from Biozol, Germany. Cholesterol- PEG₃₅₀₀-azide was purchased from Broadpharmc (USA). All reagents were used as received unless otherwise stated.

Methods

Differential scanning calorimetry: Prior to analysis by DSC, all samples were dried overnight under vacuum at 50 °C. Approximately, 10 mg of material was weighed into an aluminium DSC pan and sealed non-hermetically with an aluminium lid. The sample pan was then loaded into a Mettler Toledo DSC1. The sample and reference were heated from -150 to 150 °C at a scan rate of 10 °C min⁻¹ and the

resulting heat flow response was monitored. The sample was re-cooled to $-150\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$ and then reheated again to $150\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$, all at $10\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C min}^{-1}$. Nitrogen was used as the purge gas, at a flow rate of 150 mL min^{-1} . The glass transition temperatures were determined from the transition mid-points of the second heating curve.

Attenuated total reflection – Fourier transform infrared spectroscopy: Prior to analysis by DSC, all samples were dried overnight under vacuum at $50\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$. The measurements were performed in a Bruker Alpha II FTIR in absorbance mode.

Thermogravimetric analysis: Prior to analysis by TGA, all samples were dried overnight under vacuum at $50\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$. Approximately, 10 mg of material was added into a pre-tared open aluminum pan and loaded into a Mettler Toledo TGA2. The sample was then heated at a rate of $10\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C min}^{-1}$ from $25\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$ to $350\text{ }^{\circ}\text{C}$ during which time the change in sample weight was recorded. Nitrogen was used as the sample purge gas, at a flow rate of 150 mL min^{-1} .

Light microscopy: Microcapsules were imaged in transmission using a LEICA light microscope using LAS AF software, with magnifications of x5, x10, and x20. The samples were placed on glass slides for imaging.

Confocal laser scanning microscopy: Confocal laser scanning microscopy was carried out using a Leica TSC SP8 confocal microscope equipped with an HC PL FLUOTAR 10x/0.30 DRY objective. For Nile Red labeling, $500\text{ }\mu\text{L}$ of capsules were mixed with $10\text{ }\mu\text{L}$ of a 1 mM solution of Nile Red in water without further purification. Afterward, $20\text{ }\mu\text{L}$ of MC suspension were placed in an 8-well chamber slide (Nunc ® Lab-Tek) with $200\text{ }\mu\text{L}$ of distilled water. When required, $10\text{ }\mu\text{L}$ of either fluorescein (2 mM) or FITC-Dextran 40 kDa (10 mg ml^{-1}) were added to the chamber slide. Imaging of the samples was performed by exciting each pixel line of the confocal scan sequentially (Fluorescein, FITC: ex. 488 nm , em. $505\text{--}525\text{ nm}$; Nile Red: ex. 561 nm , em. $570\text{--}590\text{ nm}$; Cy5: ex. 635 nm , em. $660\text{--}690\text{ nm}$). Time runs were acquired at 3 frames per minutes, 580 seconds.

Scanning electron microscopy: Before SEM imaging, the samples were sputtered with a 6 nm layer of Pt using a CCU-010 (Compact Coating Unit), Safematic GmbH, CH . Scanning electron microscopy

was carried out on a Leo 1530, Zeiss GmbH, Germany, using the secondary electron detector (SE detector) at an acceleration voltage of 3 kV.

Monomer preparation

Synthesis of TMS-HEA: The TMS-HEA was prepared according to a previously reported procedure.⁶¹

Microcapsule preparation

The microcapsules were prepared using a microfluidic three-way Lego-inspired device⁸⁰ connected to two individually controlled syringe pumps (Pump 33 DDS, Harvard Apparatus), one used for two syringes. Borosilicate round capillary tubes without filament were obtained from Sutter Instrument. Capillaries with an outer diameter of 2.00 mm and an inner diameter of 1.56 mm were used as outer capillaries. Tapered end inner capillaries were prepared by a micropipette puller from capillaries with an outer diameter of 1.00 mm and an inner diameter of 0.58 mm. The tapered end was grazed against abrasive paper to adjust the opening to the desired diameter, which was measured by optical light microscopy. The size of the capillaries were optimized. The inner capillary needed to have a diameter of 30-45 μm , with the collection capillary having a diameter 100-150 μm of the inner capillary. The emitters were hydrophobized with a solution of 5wt % ODTMS, 0.5 wt %, n-butyl amine, and toluene they were exposed for four hours then rinsed and dried.¹⁰⁰

Experiments were carried out at room temperature in air, i.e., without any measures to keep oxygen out of the system. The outer phase contained 2 wt% of PVA in MilliQ water. To this end, a stock solution of PVA was prepared by placing 10 wt% of PVA in MilliQ water at 80 °C overnight and further diluting with MilliQ water to 2 wt%. The middle phase contained the mixture of monomers to obtain PDMS-*l*-PHEA APCNs. 6150 mg (32.7 mmol) TMS-HEA were mixed with 3740 mg (0.374 mmol) MA-PDMS-MA, 660 μL of toluene, and 55 mg (1.31 mmol) photoinitiator. The inner phase contained either MilliQ water, 10 mg mL^{-1} FITC-Dextran 40 kDa in MilliQ water, or 1 wt% PtNP in MilliQ water. The outer phase had a speed of 50 – 80 mL h^{-1} , the middle phase 4 – 6 mL h^{-1} , and the inner phase 2.5 – 3 mL h^{-1} . The polymerization happened through the irradiation of the outflow before collecting them in a glass vial. The polymerization was done from the top, using a UV-lab lamp with no filter, which was kept in

a closed box while the capsules were collected in a glass vial, the irradiation was performed during 5 min during the collection. The capsules were collected in a glass vial, transferred into a 15 ml centrifugation flask, centrifuged at 4000 rpm (Centrifuge Z 306, Hermle Labortechnik GmbH), and resuspended in water. This process was repeated three times to remove PVA. Then, the capsules were left in a 1:1 isopropanol-water mixture, which was exchanged two times to cleave off the TMS groups from the polymer network and to remove toluene, yielding PHEA-*l*-PDMS APCNs with a 50:50 wt% composition of PHEA and PDMS, in analogy to the synthesis of PHEA-*l*-PDMS APCN films in our previous publications.^{24, 61, 70} Some APCN capsules were further stained with Nile Red. To this end, 20 μ L of the capsule suspension was added to 1 μ L of 1 mM Nile Red in a vial and mixed it in a vortex mixer for 90 s.

Microcapsules dehydration/rehydration process

100 μ L of the capsule suspension was placed on a glass slide in a vacuum oven for 30 min at 60 °C, 100 mbar. After removing the slide from the oven, the microcapsules were imaged as described in the main text. To rehydrate them, 100 μ l MilliQ water was added to the capsules on the microscopy slide. The capsules were left at room temperature for 20 min before further characterization. The drying-rehydration cycle was repeated up to four times.

Microcapsule shrinkage in NaCl solution

The capsule shrinkage in brine was measured by adding 100 μ L capsule suspension, the supernatant was removed, into 10 mL saturated NaCl solution in microscope slide wells and leaving the capsules submerged at room temperature until they stabilized (around 20 min). The capsules were imaged during this process by transmission light microscopy.

Fluorescein release

Non-dehydrated capsules

20 μ L of the NR-labelled microcapsule suspension were centrifuged (1 minute, 2000 x g) and resuspended in in a 1.5 mL Eppendorf centrifugation tube containing 1 mL of a 2 mM fluorescein

solution in MilliQ water and incubated for 30 min at room temperature. During this time, fluorescein diffuses into the capsules so that they become loaded with the fluorescent dye. Afterwards, the microcapsules were centrifuged (2000 x g). The supernatant was removed from the pellet, which was quickly (<10 seconds) washed to remove leftover unencapsulated fluorescein and then resuspended in 700 μ L MilliQ water, incubating for 10 min to allow the diffusion of fluorescein to the outside. They were centrifuged again and their supernatant was quickly transferred into a 96-well plate (triplicate wells per each sample, 200 μ L). Finally, the batches of pelleted capsules were resuspended in 700 μ L water each and the fluorescence of Nile Red was measured (triplicate wells per each sample, 200 μ L). A measurement of the ratio of fluorescein (ex. 495 nm, em. 505 – 525 nm) / Nile Red (ex. 561 nm, em. 570 – 590 nm) fluorescence (normalization of fluorescein signal against number of capsules, using the same pelleted capsules with their respective supernatant) was performed after 10 min on a Tecan Spark microplate reader. A scheme of the protocol is shown in Figure S6.

Dehydrated capsules

1 mL of the NR-labelled microcapsule suspension was placed on a microscopy slide, and the capsules were dried at 60 °C, 100 mbar for 30 min in the vacuum oven. The dehydrated NR-labelled capsules were then rinsed from the microscopy slide into 1 mL MilliQ water, left to rehydrate (see above), then 20 μ L were centrifuged again and resuspended in 1 mL of a 2 mM fluorescein solution in MilliQ water and incubated for 30 min at room temperature. The measurement proceeded in the same way as the non-dried capsules. The aliquot that was not incubated with fluorescein was dried and rehydrated again, up to 3 cycles.

Catalytic activity

For each analysis, 10 μ l of capsule suspension was added to wells in a 96-well plate. 5 μ l of a 10 mg mL⁻¹ Mb solution in PBS, 5 μ L of a 0.3% H₂O₂ solution in water, 10 μ L of a 100 μ M Amplex Red solution in PBS (or equivalent PBS volumes) were added to each well, and the total volume was filled to 200 μ L with PBS buffer. The different mixtures were incubated for 15 min at room temperature. The fluorescence emission measurements were performed using a Tecan Spark microplate reader (three wells per sample, excitation: 570 nm, emission 570 – 590 nm).

Modification of the capsule surface with Cy5-PEG-cholesterol

10 mg cholesterol-PEG₃₅₀₀-azide was incubated with 12.11 mg Cy5-DBCO (final molar ratio 1:5) in 1 ml PBS for one hour, then dialyzed overnight against 1 L PBS with a dialysis tube (regenerated cellulose, 1000 MWCO; Spectrapor, Spectrum), obtaining Cy5-PEG-cholesterol (CyPG). 10 µl of the CyPG solution were added to 50 µl of microcapsule suspension. Fluorescence measurements (ex. 645 nm, em. 660 – 690 nm) were performed immediately after adding the CyPG and after the capsules had been isolated by centrifugation (2000 x g) and resuspension in water, on a Tecan Spark microplate reader. The experiment was run in triplicates. Additionally, the capsules were imaged by CLSM to image the fluorophore distribution in the capsule wall.

Acknowledgments

We thank Dr. Goran Vladislavljević (Loughborough University, UK) for introducing us to the Lego-inspired microfluidic device, for providing us with one and for guiding us in setting it up in our labs. The project received funding from the Partnership for International Research and Education (PIRE) Bio-inspired Materials and Systems, supported by the U.S. National Science Foundation under Grant No. OISE 1844463 and the Swiss National Science Foundation under Grant No IZPIP0_177995. Moreover, this work benefitted from support from the Swiss National Science Foundation through the National Center of Competence in Research (NCCR) Bio-Inspired Materials (Grant No 51NF40-182881). Furthermore, this project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement No 101032493 (AB) and funding from the Mac Robertson postgraduate travel scholarship awarded in 2020 by the University of Glasgow and University of Strathclyde (STRV).

References

1. S. S. Datta, A. Abbaspourrad, E. Amstad, J. Fan, S.-H. Kim, M. Romanowsky, H. C. Shum, B. Sun, A. S. Utada, M. Windbergs, S. Zhou and D. A. Weitz, *Advanced Materials*, 2014, **26**, 2205-2218.
2. J.-W. Kim, S. H. Han, Y. H. Choi, W. M. Hamonangan, Y. Oh and S.-H. Kim, *Lab on a Chip*, 2022, **22**, 2259-2291.

3. M. Duran, A. Serrano, A. Nikulin, J.-L. Dauvergne, L. Derzsi and E. Palomo del Barrio, *Materials & Design*, 2022, **223**, 111230.
4. P. W. Chen, R. M. Erb and A. R. Studart, *Langmuir*, 2012, **28**, 144-152.
5. Z. Liu, F. Fontana, A. Python, J. T. Hirvonen and H. A. Santos, *Small*, 2020, **16**, 1904673.
6. Y. Zheng, Z. Wu, L. Lin, X. Zheng, Y. Hou and J.-M. Lin, *Lab on a Chip*, 2021, **21**, 4311-4329.
7. T. Y. Lee, T. M. Choi, T. S. Shim, R. A. M. Frijns and S.-H. Kim, *Lab on a Chip*, 2016, **16**, 3415-3440.
8. S. Russell and N. Bruns, *Macromol. Rapid Commun.*, 2023, **44**, 2300120.
9. G. Michielin and S. J. Maerkl, *Scientific Reports*, 2022, **12**, 21391.
10. J. Liu, H. Chen, X. Shi, S. Nawar, J. G. Werner, G. Huang, M. Ye, D. A. Weitz, A. A. Solovev and Y. Mei, *Environmental Science: Nano*, 2020, **7**, 656-664.
11. C. Nam, J. Yoon, S. A. Ryu, C.-H. Choi and H. Lee, *ACS Appl. Mater. Interfaces*, 2018, **10**, 40366-40371.
12. D. G. Moore, T. A. Moser, P. A. Rühls and A. R. Studart, *Advanced Materials Interfaces*, 2018, **5**, 1800813.
13. E. Loiseau, P. A. Rühls, A. Hauser, F. Niedermair, G. Albrecht and A. R. Studart, *Langmuir*, 2018, **34**, 205-212.
14. J. S. Sander and A. R. Studart, *Langmuir*, 2011, **27**, 3301-3307.
15. C. S. Patrickios and T. K. Georgiou, *Curr. Opin. Colloid Interface Sci.*, 2003, **8**, 76-85.
16. G. Erdodi and J. P. Kennedy, *Prog. Polym. Sci.*, 2006, **31**, 1-18.
17. L. Mespouille, J. L. Hedrick and P. Dubois, *Soft Matter*, 2009, **5**, 4878-4892.
18. C. S. Patrickios, in *Amphiphilic Polymer Co-networks: : Synthesis, Properties, Modelling and Applications*, ed. C. S. Patrickios, The Royal Society of Chemistry, Cambridge, UK, 2020, DOI: 10.1039/9781788015769-00001, pp. 1-14.
19. C. S. Patrickios and K. Matyjaszewski, *Polym. Int.*, 2021, **70**, 10-13.
20. A. Ramazani, A. Dabbaghi and F. Gouranlou, *Curr. Org. Chem.*, 2018, **22**, 362-369.
21. K. Sueveg, A. Domjan, G. Vanko, B. Ivan and A. Vertes, *Macromolecules*, 1998, **31**, 7770-7775.
22. J. Scherble, R. Thomann, B. Ivan and R. Mülhaupt, *J. Polym. Sci., Part B: Polym. Phys.*, 2001, **39**, 1429-1436.
23. A. Domján, G. Erdödi, M. Wilhelm, M. Neidhöfer, K. Landfester, B. Iván and H. W. Spiess, *Macromolecules*, 2003, **36**, 9107-9114.
24. N. Bruns, J. Scherble, L. Hartmann, R. Thomann, B. Iván, R. Mülhaupt and J. C. Tiller, *Macromolecules*, 2005, **38**, 2431-2438.
25. K. Yamamoto, E. Ito, S. Fukaya and H. Takagi, *Macromolecules*, 2009, **42**, 9561-9567.
26. C. N. Walker, K. C. Bryson, R. C. Hayward and G. N. Tew, *ACS Nano*, 2014, **8**, 12376-12385.
27. Y. Shi, H. Schmalz and S. Agarwal, *Polymer Chemistry*, 2015, **6**, 6409-6415.
28. X. H. Zhang, K. Kyriakos, M. Rikkou-Kalourkoti, E. N. Kitiri, C. S. Patrickios and C. M. Papadakis, *Colloid. Polym. Sci.*, 2016, **294**, 1027-1036.
29. K. Yamamoto, E. Ito and Y. Mori, *Macromol. Symp.*, 2019, **385**, 1800181.
30. T. Stumphauer, G. Kasza, A. Domján, A. Wacha, Z. Varga, Y. Thomann, R. Thomann, B. Pásztói, T. M. Trötschler, B. Kerscher, R. Mülhaupt and B. Iván, *Polymers*, 2020, **12**, 2292.
31. L. Bensi, I. Viran, F. Katzenberg and J. C. Tiller, *Macromol. Chem. Phys.*, 2021, **222**, 2000292.
32. S. A. Wilhelm, M. Maricanov, V. Brandt, F. Katzenberg and J. C. Tiller, *Polymer*, 2022, **242**, 124582.
33. D. E. Apostolides, C. S. Patrickios, T. Sakai, M. Guerre, G. Lopez, B. Améduri, V. Ladmiral, M. Simon, M. Gradzielski, D. Clemens, C. Krumm, J. C. Tiller, B. Ernould and J.-F. Gohy, *Macromolecules*, 2018, **51**, 2476-2488.
34. D. E. Apostolides, C. S. Patrickios, M. Simon, M. Gradzielski, A. Blanazs, C. Mussault, A. Marcellan, N. Alexander and C. Wesdemiotis, *Polymer Chemistry*, 2023, **14**, 201-211.

35. C. Mugemana, P. Grysan, R. Dieden, D. Ruch, N. Bruns and P. Dubois, *Macromol. Chem. Phys.*, 2020, **221**, 1900432.
36. C. Mugemana, G. Mertz, P. Grysan, R. Dieden and D. Ruch, *Macromol. Chem. Phys.*, 2023, **224**, 2200456.
37. S. Shamlou, J. P. Kennedy and R. P. Levy, *J. Biomed. Mater. Res.*, 1997, **35**, 157-163.
38. F. E. Du Prez, E. J. Goethals, R. Schue, H. Qariouh and F. Schue, *Polym. Int.*, 1998, **46**, 117-125.
39. J. Tobis, L. Boch, Y. Thomann and J. C. Tiller, *J. Membr. Sci.*, 2011, **372**, 219-227.
40. H. Zhang, Y. Zhang, L. Li, S. Zhao, H. Ni, S. Cao and J. Wang, *Chem. Eng. Sci.*, 2014, **106**, 157-166.
41. K. Schöller, S. Küpfer, L. Baumann, P. M. Hoyer, D. de Courten, R. M. Rossi, A. Vetushka, M. Wolf, N. Bruns and L. J. Scherer, *Adv. Funct. Mater.*, 2014, **24**, 5194-5201.
42. S. Ulrich, L. F. Boesel and N. Bruns, in *Amphiphilic Polymer Co-networks: Synthesis, Properties, Modelling and Applications*, ed. C. S. Patrickios, The Royal Society of Chemistry, Cambridge, UK, 2020, DOI: 10.1039/9781788015769-00331, pp. 331-363.
43. J. P. Kennedy, G. Fenyvesi, R. P. Levy and K. S. Rosenthal, *Macromol. Symp.*, 2001, **172**, 56-66.
44. Y. Yuan, A.-K. Zhang, J. Ling, L.-H. Yin, Y. Chen and G.-D. Fu, *Soft Matter*, 2013, **9**, 6309-6318.
45. J. Xu, L. Zhang, Y. Zhang, T. Li and G. Huo, *J. Biomater. Sci., Polym. Ed.*, 2014, **25**, 121-135.
46. A. K. S. Chandel, C. U. Kumar and S. K. Jewrajka, *ACS Appl. Mater. Interfaces*, 2016, **8**, 3182-3192.
47. N. Bruns and J. C. Tiller, *Macromolecules*, 2006, **39**, 4386-4394.
48. C.-S. Huang, K. Jakubowski, S. Ulrich, S. Yakunin, M. Clerc, C. Toncelli, R. M. Rossi, M. V. Kovalenko and L. F. Boesel, *Nano Energy*, 2020, **76**, 105039.
49. C.-S. Huang, S. Yakunin, J. Avaro, X. Kang, M. I. Bodnarchuk, M. Liebi, X. Sun, R. M. Rossi, M. V. Kovalenko and L. F. Boesel, *Adv. Energy Mater.*, 2022, **12**, 2200441.
50. J. P. Kennedy, *J. Macromol. Sci., Pure Appl. Chem.*, 1994, **A31**, 1771-1790.
51. R. Blezer, T. Lindhout, B. Keszler and J. P. Kennedy, *Polym. Bull. (Berlin)*, 1995, **34**, 101-107.
52. D. Chen, J. P. Kennedy, M. M. Kory and D. L. Ely, *J. Biomed. Mater. Res.*, 1989, **23**, 1327-1342.
53. J. Kang, G. Erdodi and J. P. Kennedy, *J. Polym. Sci., Part A: Polym. Chem.*, 2007, **45**, 4276-4283.
54. H. Wang, C. Zhang, J. Wang, X. Feng and C. He, *ACS Sustainable Chem. Eng.*, 2016, **4**, 3803-3811.
55. S. Liu, M. Dong, Z. Zhang and G. Fu, *Polym. Adv. Technol.*, 2017, **28**, 1065-1070.
56. D. Park, B. Keszler, V. Galiatsatos and J. P. Kennedy, *J. Appl. Polym. Sci.*, 1997, **66**, 901-910.
57. I. S. Isayeva, A. N. Gent and J. P. Kennedy, *J. Polym. Sci., Part A: Polym. Chem.*, 2002, **40**, 2075-2084.
58. J. Xu, D. A. Bohnsack, M. E. Mackay and K. L. Wooley, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.*, 2007, **129**, 506-507.
59. M. Vamvakaki and C. S. Patrickios, *Soft Matter*, 2008, **4**, 268-276.
60. G. Guzman, T. Nugay, I. Nugay, N. Nugay, J. Kennedy and M. Cakmak, *Macromolecules*, 2015, **48**, 6251-6262.
61. S. T. R. Velasquez, D. Jang, P. Jenkins, P. Liu, L. Yang, L. T. J. Korley and N. Bruns, *Adv. Funct. Mater.*, 2022, **32**, 2207317.
62. P. C. Nicolson and J. Vogt, *Biomaterials*, 2001, **22**, 3273-3283.
63. Z. Mutlu, S. Shams Es-haghi and M. Cakmak, *Adv. Healthcare Mater.*, 2019, **8**, 1801390.
64. S. Diamanti, in *Amphiphilic Polymer Co-networks: Synthesis, Properties, Modelling and Applications*, ed. C. S. Patrickios, The Royal Society of Chemistry, 2020, DOI: 10.1039/9781788015769-00263, p. 0.
65. G. Guzman, S. S. Es-haghi, T. Nugay and M. Cakmak, *Adv. Healthcare Mater.*, 2017, **6**, 1600775.

66. I. S. Isayeva, B. T. Kasibhatla, K. S. Rosenthal and J. P. Kennedy, *Biomaterials*, 2003, **24**, 3483-3491.
67. J. Kang, G. Erdodi, J. P. Kennedy, H. Chou, L. Lu and S. Grundfest-Broniatowski, *Macromol. Biosci.*, 2010, **10**, 369-377.
68. B. Ivan, J. P. Kennedy and P. W. Mackey, *Polym. Prepr. (Am. Chem. Soc., Div. Polym. Chem.)*, 1990, **31**, 217-218.
69. B. Iván, J. P. Kennedy and P. W. Mackey, in *ACS Symp. Ser.*, American Chemical Society, Washington, DC, 1991, vol. 469, pp. 203-212.
70. N. Bruns and J. C. Tiller, *Nano Lett.*, 2005, **5**, 45-48.
71. G. Savin, N. Bruns, Y. Thomann and J. C. Tiller, *Macromolecules*, 2005, **38**, 7536-7539.
72. N. Bruns, W. Bannwarth and J. C. Tiller, *Biotechnol. Bioeng.*, 2008, **101**, 19-26.
73. J. C. Tiller, C. Sprich and L. Hartmann, *J Control Release*, 2005, **103**, 355-367.
74. C.-S. Huang, X. Kang, R. M. Rossi, M. V. Kovalenko, X. Sun, H. Peng and L. F. Boesel, *Journal of Materials Chemistry A*, 2021, **9**, 25974-25981.
75. M. Hanko, N. Bruns, J. C. Tiller and J. Heinze, *Anal. Bioanal. Chem.*, 2006, **386**, 1273-1283.
76. M. Hanko, N. Bruns, S. Rentmeister, J. C. Tiller and J. Heinze, *Anal. Chem.*, 2006, **78**, 6376-6383.
77. S. Ulrich, A. Osypova, G. Panzarasa, R. M. Rossi, N. Bruns and L. F. Boesel, *Macromol. Rapid Commun.*, 2019, DOI: 10.1002/marc.201900360, 1900360.
78. M. Rother, J. Barmettler, A. Reichmuth, J. V. Araujo, C. Rytka, O. Glaied, U. Pieleles and N. Bruns, *Advanced Materials*, 2015, **27**, 6620-6624.
79. S. Ulrich, A. Sadeghpour, R. M. Rossi, N. Bruns and L. F. Boesel, *Macromolecules*, 2018, **51**, 5267-5277.
80. M. V. Bandulasena, G. T. Vladislavljević and B. Benyahia, *J. Colloid Interface Sci.*, 2019, **542**, 23-32.
81. N. Leister, G. T. Vladislavljević and H. P. Karbstein, *J. Colloid Interface Sci.*, 2022, **611**, 451-461.
82. E. Katifori, S. Alben, E. Cerda, D. R. Nelson and J. Dumais, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 2010, **107**, 7635-7639.
83. G. Nurumbetov, N. Ballard and S. A. F. Bon, *Polym Chem-Uk*, 2012, **3**, 1043.
84. W. Shi, J. E. Didier, D. E. Ingber and D. A. Weitz, *ACS Applied Materials & Interfaces*, 2018, **10**, 31865-31869.
85. W. Zhang, L. Qu, H. Pei, Z. Qin, J. Didier, Z. Wu, F. Bobe, D. E. Ingber and D. A. Weitz, *Small*, 2019, **15**, 1903087.
86. A. C. M. Kuo, in *Polymer Data Handbook*, ed. J. E. Mark, Oxford University Press, New York, USA, 1999, pp. 411-435.
87. I. Yildirim, P. Sungur, A. C. Crecelius-Vitz, T. Yildirim, D. Kalden, S. Hoepfener, M. Westerhausen, C. Weber and U. S. Schubert, *Polymer Chemistry*, 2017, **8**, 6086-6098.
88. B. Aran, M. Sankır, E. Vargün, N. D. Sankır and A. Usanmaz, *J. Appl. Polym. Sci.*, 2010, **116**, 628-635.
89. V. Maffei, A. Belluati, I. Craciun, D. Wu, S. Novak, C.-A. Schoenenberger and C. G. Palivan, *Chemical Science*, 2021, **12**, 12274-12285.
90. A. Belluati, I. Craciun, C. E. Meyer, S. Rigo and C. G. Palivan, *Curr. Opin. Biotechnol.*, 2019, **60**, 53-62.
91. R. Serra-Maia, M. Bellier, S. Chastka, K. Tranhuu, A. Subowo, J. D. Rimstidt, P. M. Usov, A. J. Morris and F. M. Michel, *ACS Appl. Mater. Interfaces*, 2018, **10**, 21224-21234.
92. P. George and D. H. Irvine, *Biochem. J.*, 1952, **52**, 511-517.
93. C. Guo, R. J. Chadwick, A. Foulis, G. Bedendi, A. Lubskyy, K. J. Rodriguez, M. M. Pellizzoni, R. D. Milton, R. Beveridge and N. Bruns, *ChemBioChem*, 2022, **23**, e202200197.
94. I. Vlasova, *Molecules*, 2018, **23**, 2561.

95. D. Dębski, R. Smulik, J. Zielonka, B. Michałowski, M. Jakubowska, K. Dębowska, J. Adamus, A. Marcinek, B. Kalyanaraman and A. Sikora, *Free Radical Biol. Med.*, 2016, **95**, 323-332.
96. A. Belluati, I. Craciun, J. Liu and C. G. Palivan, *Biomacromolecules*, 2018, **19**, 4023-4033.
97. R. Luo, K. Göpfrich, I. Platzman and J. P. Spatz, *Adv. Funct. Mater.*, 2020, **30**, 2003480.
98. S. Jimaja, A. Belluati, R. J. Chadwick, C. Glynn, M. Chami, D. Happel, H. Kolmar and N. Bruns, *ChemRxiv*, 2023, DOI: 10.26434/chemrxiv-2023-c3nhg.
99. A. Belluati, I. Harley, I. Lieberwirth and N. Bruns, *ChemRxiv*, 2022, DOI: 10.26434/chemrxiv-2022-njntj.
100. D. G. Moore, J. V. A. Brignoli, P. A. Ruhs and A. R. Studart, *Langmuir*, 2017, **33**, 9007-9017.

Author contributions

Dr. S. T. R. Velasquez: Conceptualization, methodology, investigation, formal analysis, data curation, writing – original draft, visualization, funding acquisition.

Dr. A. Belluati: Conceptualization, methodology, investigation, formal analysis, data curation, writing – original draft, visualization, funding acquisition.

Dr. B. Hertel: Investigation, writing – review & editing.

Dr. E. Tervoort: Investigation, writing – review & editing.

I. Mattich: Investigation, writing – review & editing.

S. Russell: Investigation, formal analysis, writing – review & editing.

M. Gouveia: Investigation, writing – review & editing.

C. Mugemana: Conceptualization, investigation, writing – review & editing.

Prof. A. R. Studart: Conceptualization, methodology, resources, writing – review & editing.

Prof. N. Bruns: Conceptualization, methodology, resources, supervision, writing – review & editing, project administration, funding acquisition.

Competing interests

The authors declare no competing interests.

Data availability

The datasets generated and analyzed during the current study are available in the University of Strathclyde's Pure repository, [PERSISTENT WEB LINK TO DATASETS]. (Please note: The data will be made available on Strathclyde's Pure repository once the article is accepted for publication, and the DOI will be added to this statement during the production stage of the manuscript.)