



HAL
open science

Small angle neutron scattering study of globular proteins confined in porous carbons

Balázs Nagy, Ajna Tóth, Irina Savina, Sergey Mikhalovsky, Lyuba Mikhalovska, Isabelle Grillo, Erik Geissler, Krisztina László

► **To cite this version:**

Balázs Nagy, Ajna Tóth, Irina Savina, Sergey Mikhalovsky, Lyuba Mikhalovska, et al.. Small angle neutron scattering study of globular proteins confined in porous carbons. *Carbon*, 2016, 106, pp.142-151. 10.1016/j.carbon.2016.04.081 . hal-01349420

HAL Id: hal-01349420

<https://hal.science/hal-01349420>

Submitted on 27 Jul 2016

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

SMALL ANGLE NEUTRON SCATTERING STUDY OF GLOBULAR PROTEINS CONFINED IN POROUS CARBONS

Balázs Nagy,¹ Ajna Tóth,¹ Irina Savina,² Sergey Mikhalovsky,^{2,3} Lyuba
Mikhalovska,² Isabelle Grillo,⁴ Erik Geissler,⁵ Krisztina László^{1*}

¹Department of Physical Chemistry and Materials Science, Budapest University of
Technology and Economics, H-1521 Budapest, Hungary

²School of Pharmacy and Biomolecular Sciences, University of Brighton, Brighton,
BN2 4GJ, United Kingdom

³School of Engineering, Nazarbayev University, Astana, 010000, Republic of
Kazakhstan

⁴Institut Laue Langevin, 71 avenue des Martyrs - CS 20156 - 38042 Grenoble Cedex
9, France

⁵Université Grenoble Alpes and CNRS, LIPhy, F-38000 Grenoble, France

Abstract

This article reports measurements of the concentration distribution of two model proteins adsorbed from aqueous solution by two different high surface area carbons, using small angle neutron and X-ray scattering (SANS and SAXS). The proteins investigated were bovine serum albumin (67 kDa), and bovine pancreatic trypsin inhibitor (BPTI), also known under the name aprotinin (6.5 kDa). The two carbon substrates were C1, an open structured carbon aerogel derived from a resorcinol–formaldehyde polymer aerogel, and C2, a commercial nanoporous carbon from

*Corresponding author. E-mail: *klaszlo@mail.bme.hu

MAST Carbon (UK). Although both C1 and C2 possess a high proportion of pores that are either closed or inaccessible to low temperature nitrogen vapour, the size distribution of the accessible pores is broad enough to accommodate BSA molecules. In C1, which is hydrophobic, the BSA molecules migrate individually into pores that are compatible with their size, whereas BPTI forms clusters having the same size as BSA. With C2, the hydrophilic internal surface limits the adsorption efficiency. The strong adhesion of proteins to hydrophilic surfaces prevents diffusion of either molecule into the micro- and nanopores. In this sample both BSA and BPTI form large clusters. These observations have relevance in biomedical applications, such as haemoperfusion or as a medium for protein storage.

1. Introduction

The way in which biomolecules adsorb and migrate on solid surfaces, notably on porous substrates, is the focus of converging interests from investigations into protein conformation, [1-4] physical adsorption processes,[5,6,7] and medical applications.[8,9] Activated carbons are a class of porous substrates that have been widely employed for many centuries as general adsorbents. They are also invaluable as adsorbents of small molecules in numerous applications related to public health, such as drinking water purification, personnel protection, etc. More recently their range of uses has extended to medical applications, notably for purification of bio-fluids. Treatment of patients suffering from acute poisoning, drug overdose, hepatic coma, or metabolic disturbances removes toxins from the bloodstream by circulating the patient's blood through an adsorbent, usually activated carbon or resins. Such haemoperfusion procedures extract small to medium sized molecules that tend to be more difficult to remove by conventional haemodialysis. The adsorbent material may

be coated or immobilized to prevent fine particles from entering the patient's blood. [8,9] In such applications the size of the adsorbent pores relative to that of the target toxin is of critical importance, as many toxins are proteins of a size that excludes them from micropores. Carbons with larger pore size are required.

Adsorption techniques yield overall information on the amount of a target molecule adsorbed in a substrate, but say little about how the molecules are distributed inside it. By contrast, small angle X-ray scattering (SAXS), [10] and more particularly small angle neutron scattering (SANS), [11,12] are non-destructive techniques that can detect the spatial structure and organisation of molecules adsorbed inside a porous medium. [5] Such studies are of particular interest for biomolecules, where the conformation is not necessarily the same as in solution. In applications involving extraction and storage of proteins, for example, little is known of how associative behaviour or the uptake and release mechanisms affect the mobility of the adsorbate and the retention capacity of the porous medium. [5] For a fuller understanding of how a model protein is adsorbed in porous carbons of different pore size distribution, different surface chemistry and different hydrophobicity, both approaches are desirable. For clarity, this account is separated into two parts: the first part is a companion article [13], which describes the macroscopic adsorption measurements. The present paper focuses on the scattering results.

2. Experimental

2.1. Materials

Two porous carbons were studied: a carbon aerogel (C1), obtained from the resorcinol-formaldehyde polycondensation reaction [12,14], and a commercial medical grade porous carbon prepared from phenol formaldehyde resin (C2) (MAST

Carbon, UK) [15-17]. Neither sample C1 nor sample C2 was coated. The probe proteins were bovine serum albumin (BSA, molecular weight 66.1 kDa) supplied by Calbiochem, and bovine pancreatic trypsin inhibitor (BPTI, molecular weight 6.5 kDa), also known under the name aprotinin (Sigma-Aldrich). The solubility of BSA in deionized water is 40 g/L.¹ BPTI is also soluble both in H₂O and D₂O at 20°C (>30 g/L).[18] For the SANS measurements stock protein solutions at 10 g/L were prepared on site at the Institut Laue-Langevin in 99.7% D₂O with no added buffer. The pH of the stock solution, measured with a pH meter, was 6.9. The value of pD is accordingly pD= 6.9+0.4= 7.3.[19] For the SANS measurements on BSA in acid conditions, 7.5 mL of the stock solution and its pH were adjusted to ~2.8 (pD=3.2) by adding 10 µL of a tenfold diluted solution of DCl in D₂O.

2.2. Adsorption measurements

The principal characteristics of the carbons obtained from the nitrogen adsorption isotherms at -196 °C [13] are reproduced in the tables below. **Table 1** lists the surface area S_{SAS} measured in the present work by SANS and SAXS, together

Table 1. Measurements from SAS, nitrogen adsorption and pycnometry [13]

Sample	S_{SAS}^a	S_{BET}	V_{tot}	$V_{0.95}^b$	V_{μ}	d_C^c	pH
	m ² /g		cm ³ /g			g/cm ³	
C1	1784	847	1.69	0.80	0.34	0.075	8.6
C2	2630	1248	1.27	0.96	0.50	0.44	6.6

^a see Supplementary Information, ^b $V_{0.95}$: pore volume at $p/p_0=0.95$; ^c macroscopic density from He pycnometry.

¹ https://www.sigmaaldrich.com/content/dam/sigmaaldrich/docs/Sigma/Product_Information_Sheet/a4919pis.pdf (retrieved 15/04/2016)

with the apparent surface area S_{BET} calculated from the BET model [20]. The total pore volume (V_{TOT}) was derived from the amount of vapour adsorbed at $p/p_0 \rightarrow 1$, assuming that the pores are then filled with liquid adsorbate. Similarly, the pore volume was determined at $p/p_0 = 0.95$ ($V_{0.95}$), just before the sharp increase of the isotherms. The micropore volume V_{μ} was determined using the Dubinin-Raduskevich (DR) model [21]. The pore size distribution (PSD) was calculated using quenched solid density functional theory (QSDFT) [22]. Slit pores were assumed. **Table 2** shows the incremental surface areas and volumes deduced from these models.

Table 2. Incremental surface area $S=S_{\text{BET}}-S_d$ and pore volume $V=V_{\text{total}}-V_d$

	BSA			BPTI	
	C1		C2	C1	C2
	unbuffered pH 6.9	pH3	unbuffered pH 6.9		
limiting pore width ^a (Å)	40	40	40	24.2	24.2
S (m ² /g)	203	203	105	279	125
V (cm ³ /g)	1.20	1.20	0.87	1.41	0.80

^a smallest effective dimension of the free protein, or cluster (Supplementary Information)

2.3. Methods: SANS and SAXS

The SANS measurements were made on the D11 instrument at the Institut Laue Langevin, Grenoble, at incident wavelength $\lambda=7.8$ Å, with wavelength spread $\Delta\lambda/\lambda=0.1$. The carbon samples were powdered and placed in contact with either D₂O

or the protein solution in D₂O. Both protein solutions were prepared in 99.7% D₂O at concentration 10 g/L, without buffer or added salt. The conditions applied here were identical to those in the uptake measurements in the saturation range of the isotherms.[13] After incubation overnight prior to the measurement the slurries were transferred to flat quartz cells of 2 mm path length. The dry carbon powders were contained in 1 mm quartz cells.

Since the intensity of the amorphous scattering peak of water at 2.0 Å⁻¹ defines the amount of water present in the samples, measurements at wider angles were also made on the D16 instrument at wavelength 4.74 Å. For this instrument, the samples were contained in cylindrical low boron content glass cells of outer diameter 5 mm. Corrections for incoherent scattering were made using the expression [23]

$$I(q) = I_s(q)/T_s - I_b(q)T_s(1-T_b)/[T_b(1-T_s)] \quad (1)$$

where $I(q)$, $I_s(q)$ and $I_b(q)$ are the normalized scattering intensities of the total signal, of the sample and of the background, respectively, and where T_s and T_b are the corresponding transmission factors. (Expression (1) is recommended in SANS measurements, where attenuation of the incident beam occurs through scattering, in contrast to SAXS, where the attenuation is dominated by absorption.) Intensities were normalised with respect to a standard detector calibration supplied by the Institut Laue-Langevin. In Eq. 1, q is the transfer wave number $q=(4\pi/\lambda)\sin(\theta/2)$, λ is the incident wavelength and θ is the scattering angle.

SAXS measurements, made at the French CRG beam line BM02 of the European Synchrotron Radiation Facility, Grenoble, were used as a reference to estimate the incoherent neutron scattering intensity from the dry carbon samples.

3. Results and discussion

3.1. Bulk protein solutions

3.1.1. BSA

The conformation of BSA is sensitive to external conditions such as pH [24,25]. Below pH 4.7, the isoelectric point of BSA,[2] the electrostatic interactions force the molecule into an extended shape. In this investigation the measurements on BSA were conducted at pH 6.9, as well as at pH 2.8.

Figure 1 shows the SANS response of bulk solutions of BSA in D₂O at pH 6.9. In dilute solutions of neutral polymers the low q response can usually be approximated by the Debye expression for the scattering intensity from particles of radius of gyration R_G ,

$$I(q)=I(0) \exp[-(qR_G)^2/3] \quad (2)$$




Figure 1. SANS response of BSA in D₂O at pH 6.9, after subtraction of the D₂O signal. The maxima are due to residual electrostatic repulsion in the salt-free solutions. Inset: Guinier plot of the SANS response from the 10 g/L and 2.2 g/L solution of BSA (lower data set). In both cases the radius of gyration is $R_G = 27.6 \text{ \AA}$.

The difference between the experimental curves in the intermediate wave vector range q of Fig. 1 and the monotonic variation expressed in Eq. 2 stems from electrostatic repulsion between the molecules. The repulsion gives rise to interparticle structure in the form of a correlation peak, the position of which, q_{max} , defines the mean distance of separation between the proteins, $d \approx 2\pi/q_{max}$. When d is larger than the outer diameter of the coil $2R$ (i.e., non overlapping conditions), q_{max} varies with the concentration c as $c^{1/3}$ [26]. (For simplicity, in this paper we represent the protein shape as a solid sphere, for which $R=(5/3)^{1/2}R_G$.) With decreasing concentration the correlation peak disappears and the response in the region $qR_G < 1$ reverts to Eq 2. At very low q , additional scattering may arise due to a small fraction of larger clusters in the solution.

To minimise the principal effects of the interparticle structure [27, 28], and for consistency with the measurements of the proteins adsorbed inside the carbons, we apply Eq. 2 to the data in the q -range above q_{max} taken from the region $1 \leq qR_G \leq 2$. The inset of Figure 1 displays the data in the Guinier representation $\log[I(q)]$ vs q^2 . This representation yields acceptable fits both for the 10 g/L and the 2.2 g/L BSA solutions. The identical values obtained for the two concentrations, $R_G=27.6 \text{ \AA}$, are also consistent with measurements reported in the literature [29– 31]. If we assume the globular BSA molecules to be uniform spheres of external radius R , then $R=35.6 \text{ \AA}$, which, in spite of the oversimplification of the uniform sphere model, is in reasonable agreement with the measured hydrodynamic radius of BSA, $R_H=34.8 \text{ \AA}$. [32] We recall that in measuring R_G the range of q in the Guinier approximation is generally stated to be $qR_G \leq 1$. In practice, the range of validity depends on the form factor $P(q)$ of the particle, and can extend well beyond this limit. [33] To access the information below the correlation peak, we adopt the separability approximation for

the scattered intensity

$$I(q) = S(q) P(q) \quad (3)$$

together with the expression for the structure factor due to Posselt et al. [34]

$$S(q) = 1 / \{1 + 3p[\sin(qD) - qD\cos(qD)] / (qD)^3\} \quad (4)$$

where p is a parameter that describes the strength of the interparticle repulsion and D is the mean interparticle distance. With $D=140 \text{ \AA}$ and 232 \AA respectively for the 10 g/L and 2.2 g/L BSA solutions, the Guinier representation of $P(q) = I(q)/S(q)$ yields an identical value for R_G in the region $0.24 \leq qR_G \leq 1$ to that in the region $1 \leq qR_G \leq 2$, shown in the inset of Figure 1.

The extrapolated scattering intensity $I(0)$ in Eq. 2 yields M_w , the weight-average molecular weight of the polymer. For a dilute solution of polymers of mass M_w at concentration c , $I(0)$ is defined by

$$I(0) = K^2 c M_w / N_A \quad (5)$$

where $K^2 = (\Delta\rho V_P)^2$ is the neutron scattering contrast between the polymer and the solvent, and N_A is Avogadro's number. V_P is the dry molar volume of the protein, and

$$\Delta\rho = (\rho_{D_2O} - \rho_{BSA}) \quad (6)$$

is the difference in scattering length density between the protein and the surrounding D_2O .

According to Nossal et al. [30], for BSA in D_2O at pH=5.53, $V_P = 0.734 \text{ cm}^3/\text{g}$, and the value of $\Delta\rho^2$ is

pH 5.53:
$$\Delta\rho^2 = 13.0 \times 10^{20} \text{ cm}^{-4} \quad (7)$$

With this value of $\Delta\rho^2$ and the extrapolated intensity $I(0) = 0.85 \text{ cm}^{-1}$ from the inset of Figure 1, the apparent molecular weight for the BSA in the 10 g/L solution is

$$M_w = 73 \text{ kDa} \quad (8a)$$

Similarly, for the solution at 2.2 g/L, where $I(0) = 0.181 \text{ cm}^{-1}$, Eq. 5 yields

$$M_w = 71 \text{ kDa} \quad (8b)$$

These estimates of M_w are sensitive to the scattering length density ρ_{BSA} . The discrepancy between the results in Eq. 8 and the known molecular weight of BSA, 66.1 kDa, reflects the change in ρ_{BSA} due to ionisation of the protein when the pH exceeds the pKa of the acid groups. (BSA possesses two pKa values, 5.7 and 6.8 [25].) In the protein solution with D_2O , exchangeable protons are replaced by deuterium, and consequently ionisation of the dissolved BSA involves the loss of a deuteron and hence a reduction in the value of ρ_{BSA} . This change increases the contrast $\Delta\rho^2 = (\rho_{\text{D}_2\text{O}} - \rho_{\text{BSA}})^2$ with respect to the surrounding D_2O . The resulting overestimate of M_w of BSA at pH 6.9 in Eq. 8 can be brought into line with the known molecular weight by resetting $\Delta\rho^2$ to

$$\begin{aligned} \text{pH 6.9:} \quad \Delta\rho^2 &= 72 \times 13.0 \times 10^{20} / 66.1 \\ &= 14.16 \times 10^{20} \text{ cm}^{-4} \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

These measurements incidentally imply that in solution the BSA molecules are present as monomers.

At low pH, both the state of ionisation and the conformation of BSA in solution differ from that prevailing at pH 6.9. Earlier measurements by SANS [31] and birefringence [32] showed that at low pH the shape of BSA is elongated.[35, 36] This elongation is the consequence of the protonated (/deuterated) state of the protein that occurs already at moderately low pH, which imposes a proxy polyelectrolyte character on the molecule. The flexibility of the BSA molecule, which stems from its high degree of hydration, allows its conformation to accommodate when the ionic environment is modified.[37] **Figure 2** shows the SANS response of BSA in solution at pH 2.8. The increased radius of gyration (Fig. 2 inset) reflects the elongated conformation. The stretched cylindrical shape gives rise to the reduced slope in the

region $1/L < q < 1/r_0$, where L is the length of the cylinder and r_0 its radius, and to the shoulder at $q \approx 0.1 \text{ \AA}^{-1}$. The latter feature indicates that the cross-sectional radius r_0 of the cylinder is approximately $1/q \approx 10 \text{ \AA}$.




Figure 2. SANS response of 10 g/L solution of BSA in D_2O at pH 2.8, after subtraction of the D_2O signal; inset: Guinier plot of data from the range $0.001 \leq q^2 \leq 0.002 \text{ \AA}^{-2}$.

The Guinier plot in the inset of Figure 2 yields $R_G = 39.9 \text{ \AA}$ and $I(0) = 0.685 \text{ cm}^{-1}$ for the extrapolated intensity. With the contrast factor of Eq.6, the resulting mass is $M_w = 58.9 \text{ kDa}$, i.e., lower than the known molecular weight. Below the isoelectric point of BSA (pH 4.7) [2], however, the ionisation that occurred at high pH is now reversed: at pH 2.8 deuterons recombine with the acidic groups, thereby enhancing ρ_{BSA} and decreasing $(\rho_{D_2O} - \rho_{BSA})^2$. Correction for deuteron condensation on the BSA at pH 2.8 accordingly requires that $\Delta\rho^2$ be reset to

pH 2.8:
$$\Delta\rho^2 = 58.9 \times 13.0 \times 10^{20} / 66.1 = 11.6 \times 10^{20} \text{ cm}^{-4} \quad (10)$$

3.1.2. BPTI

For the lower molecular weight protein BPTI, all SANS measurements were made at pH 6.9. The high isoelectric point (≈ 10.5) of this molecule [38] implies that in physiological pH conditions its degree of ionization is small. As observed also by Appavou et al. [39], no sign of a correlation peak is visible in the signal from the solution (**Figure 3**), confirming the absence of ionization of this molecule in solution. The radius of gyration (Fig. 3 inset), $R_G = 9.8 \text{ \AA}$, is somewhat smaller than that reported in ref. [39], where buffer solutions were employed. As the present samples were prepared without buffer, however, adsorption of ions from the solution does not occur and the conditions governing the hydration layer can be different. These measurements thus represent the undecorated BPTI molecule. It is notable that, just as with BSA, the q range in the Guinier representation over which the value of R_G remains constant extends up to $qR_G = 2$.




Figure 3. SANS response from a 10 g/L BPTI solution in D_2O . Inset: Guinier plot from the low q region. This system displays no correlation peak.

From the inset of Fig. 3, the extrapolated intensity for the 10 g/L solution is

$I(0)=0.0417 \text{ cm}^{-1}$. Insertion of these values into Eq. 3 yields for the value of K

$$K= 2.03 \times 10^{10} \text{ cm/g} \quad (11)$$

This lies close to the average of the range of K values listed in reference [39] observed during the pressure cycle in D_2O . **Table 3** summarizes the values of the contrast factor K for BSA and BPTI.

Table 3: Neutron scattering contrast factor $K=\Delta\rho V_p$ of proteins in D_2O

protein	pH 6.9	pH 5.53	pH 2.8	Acetic acid-D buffer
	(cm/g)			
	this work	[30]	this work	[39]
BSA	2.76×10^{10}	2.65×10^{10}	2.50×10^{10}	-
BPTI	2.03×10^{10}	-	-	$1.72\text{-}2.90 \times 10^{10}$

3.2. SANS measurements of protein solutions in the carbon matrices

3.2.1. BSA

In the SANS measurements of the two nanoporous carbons in equilibrium with the D_2O solutions of BSA (**Figures 4 and 5**), the scattering length density ρ of the D_2O solvent approximately matches that of the signal from the carbon in the micropore ($q > 0.3 \text{ \AA}^{-1}$) and mesopore size range ($0.01 < q < 0.3 \text{ \AA}^{-1}$). Since ρ_C and $\rho_{\text{D}_2\text{O}}$ are similar, the intensity $I(q) = (\rho_C - \rho_{\text{D}_2\text{O}})^2 S(q)$ is small, where $S(q)$ is the structure factor of the carbon and $(\rho_C - \rho_{\text{D}_2\text{O}})^2$ is the contrast factor between the carbon and the D_2O . At lower q ($< 0.01 \text{ \AA}^{-1}$), however, the signal of the carbons containing D_2O alone displays strong residual scattering with power law behaviour of the form $I(q) \propto q^{-p}$, where the exponent is $p=4.0$ in C1, and $p \approx 3$ in C2. Power law responses with $p \geq 3$ are the signature of surface scattering [40,41]. The strong surface scattering feature of

C1_D₂O in Fig. 4 arises from a discontinuity in the contrast factor at an interface, i.e., a layer between the carbon surface and the D₂O where the value of ρ is smaller than ρ_C . This could either be a material layer with high proton density or a void layer resulting from incomplete wetting of the carbon by the D₂O. The strongly hydrophobic surface of C1, as concluded from the water uptake isotherms [13], points to the latter explanation [40, 41]. Confirmation of this interpretation is found in Fig. 4, which shows how the SANS response changes when BSA is added to the solution: when the proteins adsorb on the walls of the larger pores, the discontinuity in the contrast factor $(\rho_C - \rho)^2$ decreases between the carbon and the medium adjacent to the interface, and the surface scattering feature disappears.




Figure 4. SANS response of carbon aerogel C1 with D₂O alone (o), and same sample with D₂O and BSA at pH 6.9 (x). The flat signal at high q is the contribution from D₂O.

Carbon C2 in D₂O alone also displays a steep slope in the low q range (**Figure 5**), but its weaker power law slope (-2.95 ± 0.1) lies at the threshold between volume scattering and scattering from very rough surfaces [41]. The low q responses of the

samples containing BSA also differ qualitatively from those of sample C1: in this case the protein signal adds to, rather than subtracts from, that of the carbon-water system. In C2, therefore, the contrast mismatch at low q is not the result of poor wetting, as in C1, where, in the contrast factor $(\rho_C - \rho)^2$, $\rho \approx 0$. Instead, it reflects the presence of surface groups associated with protons, which lower the neutron scattering length density. The difference in surface composition of the two carbons is reflected both in the difference of their surface pH (Table 1), and in their water vapour isotherms [13]. C2 exhibits much higher water uptake throughout the isotherm. The surface of C2 is therefore more hydrophilic than that of C1. These observations are consistent with the substantially larger incoherent scattering intensity in the dry C2 sample (0.011 cm^{-1}), an unmistakable indicator of higher hydrogen content.




Figure 5. SANS response of sample C2 containing (o): pure D₂O, and (x): BSA in D₂O. The signal from the bulk solution (10 g/L) of BSA in D₂O (+) is shown for comparison. The D₂O signal has not been subtracted from these responses.

Figure 6 shows the scattering signals from BSA in carbon C1 and C2, after subtraction of the response from D₂O. As in the insets of Figures 1-3, the data are

plotted in the Guinier representation $\log I(q)$ vs q^2 . Comparison of the values of R_G obtained from the fits to the data in the region above q_{max} ($q > 0.01 \text{ \AA}^{-1}$) with those in solution indicates that in C1 at pH 6.9 BSA is present as a monomer, while in C2 the much larger radius of gyration is characteristic of aggregates.




Figure 6. Guinier plots of the scattering intensity $I(q)$ at pH 6.9 (after subtraction of the D_2O signal) in the q -region above q_{max} : (a) BSA in the carbon aerogel C1; (b) in the MAST carbon C2. The extrapolated intensities of these curves are $I(0)=0.24 \text{ cm}^{-1}$ for BSA in C1, and $I(0)=5.0 \text{ cm}^{-1}$ for BSA in C2.

At pH 2.8, the situation is similar. In C1, BSA displays a region of exponential decay in the Guinier representation of **Figure 7a** with a slope corresponding to $R_G=24.9 \text{ \AA}$, i.e., similar to that at pH 6.9, but notably smaller than in free solution at pH 2.8. Here again, however, the radius of gyration is consistent with BSA in the form of a monomer. In C2, by contrast, the SANS curve appears featureless (**Figure 7b**), being dominated by the power law response at low q . The lower curve in Figure 7b shows the same data after subtraction of the asymptotic power law curve of slope - 2.9. Two features are revealed, a broad maximum at $q \approx 0.0065 \text{ \AA}^{-1}$, and a weak shoulder at $q \approx 0.026 \text{ \AA}^{-1}$. The latter feature possesses a short region that can be

analyzed in a Guinier representation (**Figure 7c**). The value found for R_G , 41.8 Å, however, is significantly larger than in C1. To determine whether this component is a monomer or an oligomer requires an estimate of its mass.




Figure 7. a) Guinier plot of the scattering intensity $I(q)$ of BSA at pH 2.8 in the carbon aerogel C1; the extrapolated intensity of the linear behaviour is $I(0)=0.197 \text{ cm}^{-1}$. **b)** Total intensity $I(q)$ of BSA at pH 2.8 in carbon C2; lower curve: same data after subtraction of low- q asymptotic power law. **c)** Guinier plot of the data of BSA at pH 2.8 in carbon C2 in the region of the inflection at $q_{\text{max}}=0.026 \text{ \AA}^{-1}$ in the

difference curve of Figure 7b.

To estimate the mass and aggregation number n of the BSA clusters in the carbon host we employ a model, based on the following assumptions. Protein clusters, each of mass $M_c = nM_W$, are assumed to adsorb on the internal surfaces of the carbon in a random two-dimensional array, with a local order that gives rise to the correlation peak at q_{max} in the scattering pattern. With a triangular array of side $2\pi/q_{max}$ the number of clusters adsorbed on an area S of the sample can thus be evaluated, and hence the concentration of the proteins in the sample that contribute to the correlation peak. Thus

$$c = M_c q_{max}^2 S d_C f / [4\pi^2(\sqrt{3}/2)] \quad (12)$$

where d_C is the density of the carbon powder and f its filling factor in the sample cell. Elimination of the concentration c from Eqs. 5 and 12 yields for the mass M_c of the clusters

$$M_c = [2\pi N_A / (K q_{max})] \times [\sqrt{3} I(0) / (2S f d_C)]^{1/2} \quad (13)$$

Eq. 13 contains six parameters. K is determined for BSA either from Eq. 9 or 10, d_C is listed in Table 1, while S is the incremental mesopore surface area available to particles of diameter $2R$ (**Table 2**). The filling factor f of the carbon particles in the carbon-water slurry is estimated by comparing the intensity of the characteristic scattering peak at 2.0 \AA^{-1} from the water in the sample with that in pure D_2O . For C1, the resulting value is $f=0.26$, while for C2, $f=0.35$.

Each of the six parameters in the above model is known with a precision of better than 10%. A larger uncertainty, however, is associated with the estimate of the available surface area S (Table 2), which is derived from the adsorption isotherms of nitrogen molecules. [13] For the protein molecules, which are much bulkier than

nitrogen, account must be taken of the fact that in the narrowest of the accessible pores, [44] adsorbed proteins are in contact with both walls of the slit. Second and further layers of proteins can be accommodated only in wider slits, which are less numerous. The effective available surface area may thus be expressed as

$$S_{eff} = S/\sigma \quad (14)$$

where the reduction factor σ ($1 < \sigma < 2$) is a descriptor of the pore size distribution: $\sigma - 1$ is the fraction of accessible pores that can accommodate no more than one protein layer. Its value is found by comparing M_c calculated from Eq. 13 with the expected mass of the protein clusters, using the appropriate contrast factor (Eq. 9 or 10). Thus, for BSA adsorbed in C1 at pH 6.9, where $q_{max}=0.061 \text{ \AA}^{-1}$ and $I(0)=0.24 \text{ cm}^{-1}$, the apparent mass of the BSA cluster is

$$M_{c \text{ app}} = 51.5 \text{ kDa} \quad (15)$$

Likewise, for BSA adsorbed in C1 at pH 2.8, where $q_{max}=0.056 \text{ \AA}^{-1}$ and $I(0)=0.197 \text{ cm}^{-1}$ the apparent mass of the BSA cluster is

$$M_{c \text{ app}} = 56.1 \text{ kDa} \quad (16)$$

The evidence from the radius of gyration indicates that in both cases the aggregation number is 1 (i.e., $M_c = 66.1 \text{ kDa}$). For consistency with this condition, the surface reduction factor must take the value

$$\sigma = 1.5 \pm 0.1 \quad (17)$$

In other words, in about one half ($\sigma-1=0.5$) of the incremental surface area the adsorbed BSA molecules are either in contact with both walls or, by occupying just one wall, prevent a second layer from forming. Although this model is simplistic, the physically plausible value found for σ suggests that it captures the basic features of the correlation peak. The consistency of these findings is evidence that the mass and the radius of gyration of the adsorbed BSA aggregates in C1 are those of a single

BSA molecule, both at pH 2.8 and at pH 6.9. The aggregation number of the BSA clusters in C1 is therefore $n = 1$. The finding that the radius of gyration of BSA in C1 is independent of pH is striking. It suggests that the induced polyelectrolyte character of BSA, which causes it to expand in solution, disappears when the molecule is adsorbed in the carbon pores. In view of the basic nature of this carbon, it seems probable that the excess protons, which in free solution accrete to the basic groups, migrate to the pore walls.

For BSA in carbon C2 at pH 6.9, the value of M_c found in the same way (still assuming $\sigma = 1.5$) is 1.16 MDa, i.e., 17 times the mass of the BSA monomer. These results are listed in **Table 4**. In C2 the situation is thus different from in C1. At pH 6.9, BSA forms large clusters, rather than adsorbing as a monomer. At pH 2.8, by contrast, the correlation peak in the SANS response (**Figure 7b**) is not immediately apparent, being masked by the strong scattering signal at low q from the C2 carbon matrix. Subtraction of the low q asymptotic behaviour (lower curve, Figure 7b) reveals a shoulder at $q_{\max} \sim 0.026 \text{ \AA}^{-1}$, in addition to a broad distribution of diffuse low density clusters. The Guinier plot of the poorly resolved shoulder (**Figure 7c**) is open to greater error, but in this case both the cluster mass $M_c = 120 \text{ kDa}$, and the radius of gyration $R_G = 41.8 \text{ \AA}$ are consistent with BSA dimers, i.e., the aggregation number is $n=2$ (Table 4). For consistency, all values of M_c of the adsorbed proteins in Table 4 are calculated taking $\sigma = 1.5$.

The radius of gyration of the BSA molecules adsorbed in the pores of C1 suggests that they are slightly compressed with respect to their size in free solution. In C2, where the BSA clusters contain about 17 monomers, the density of packing $3M_c/(4\pi R^3)$ (assuming solid spheres with $R=(5/3)^{1/2}R_G$) is only slightly lower than that inside the free monomer in solution. This suggests that the monomer-monomer

interaction is weakly repulsive. These findings yield the following estimate for the fractal dimension d_f of the clusters,

$$d_f = \log(\text{mass ratio}) / \log(\text{size ratio}) = \log(19) / \log(99.4/35.6) \approx 2.87. \quad (18)$$

This value is consistent with the slope $-d_f$ of the scattering curves in the high q region of Figures 1 and 2. Such a steep slope of the scattering function of BSA reflects the relatively dense internal structure of the BSA molecule.

Table 4

Characteristics of BSA and BPTI aggregates from SANS results

Condition with D ₂ O	q_{max}	$I(0)$	M_c	R_G	$n^{(a)}$
	\AA^{-1}	cm^{-1}	kDa	\AA	
BSA solution pH 6.9 (10 g/L)	0.031	0.885	66.1 ^(b)	27.6	1
BSA solution pH 2.8	0.027	0.685	66.1 ^(b)	38.9	1
BSA in C1 pH 6.9	0.061	0.24	63.1 ^(c)	24.9	1
BSA in C2 pH 6.9	0.048	5.0	1250 ^(c)	77	17
BSA in C1 pH 2.8	0.056	0.197	68.7 ^(c)	24.9	1
BSA in C2 pH 2.8	0.026	0.531	120±15 ^(c)	41.8	2
BPTI solution	-	0.0417	6.51 ^(b)	9.8	1
BPTI in C1 pH 6.9	0.048	0.149	73.2 ^(c)	23.5	11
BPTI in C2 pH 6.9	0.0071	2.03	1170 ^(c)	122	175

^(a) aggregation number, n ; ^(b) $M_c = M_w$, ^(c) $\sigma = 1.5$

3.2.2. BPTI

Measurements of the BPTI molecules adsorbed in the carbons were made only at pH 6.9. The SANS response of BPTI in C1 is shown in the Guinier representation in **Figure 8a**. With the correlation peak $q_{max}=0.048 \text{ \AA}^{-1}$ and the extrapolated intensity $I(0)=0.149 \text{ cm}^{-1}$, Eq. 13 yields for this system (still assuming $\sigma=1.5$)

$$M_c=73.2 \text{ kDa} \quad (19)$$




Figure 8. a) Guinier plot of the scattering intensity $I(q)$ of BPTI in the carbon aerogel C1; the extrapolated intensity of the linear behaviour is $I(0)=0.149 \text{ cm}^{-1}$, with $R_G=23.5 \text{ \AA}$; **b)** Total intensity $I(q)$ of BPTI in carbon C2; lower curve: same data after subtraction of low q asymptote.

The above estimated value of M_c assumes that the contrast factor K^2 for BPTI in the carbon remains the same as in free solution (Eq. 11). The apparent fractal dimension of the BPTI clusters, calculated according to Eq. 19, is

$$d_f \approx 2.5 \quad (20)$$

This packing, which is more open than that of BSA, is consistent with a branched like arrangement of the BPTI monomers.

For BPTI in C2, as with BSA in C2, the total scattering curve (**Figure 8b**)

displays no clearly resolved correlation peak. At low q the response exhibits power law behaviour with a slope of approximately -2.9. Subtraction of the power law yields the lower curve in Figure 8b, with a maximum at $q_{max}=0.00708 \text{ \AA}^{-1}$. In a Guinier representation similar to Figure 8a (not shown) these data yield $I(0)=2.93 \text{ cm}^{-1}$, with $R_G=122 \text{ \AA}$, which corresponds to an aggregation number $n=175$. The internal concentration of these clusters is much smaller than those in C1. They are the counterpart of the similar broad peak noted above at $q \approx 0.0065 \text{ \AA}^{-1}$ in Figure 7b.

3.3. Protein concentration distribution

The above model counts only those protein molecules that contribute to the correlation peak in the SANS response. However, clusters of proteins occupying pores that are too large to be detected by the measurements, and molecules that do not possess the local order assumed in the model, also contribute to the total concentration. The concentration c defined in Eq. 12 is therefore not the total concentration of protein adsorbed in the carbons. The total concentration must be estimated from the whole scattering curve.

The overall protein distribution can be found by using the q -dependent intensity ratios $u_1(q)=I_{C_D2O}(q)/I_C(q)$ and $u_2(q)=I_{C_protein_D2O}(q)/I_C(q)$ to derive the concentration distribution $c(q)$ of the proteins in reciprocal space (see Supplementary Information). In these ratios the numerators are respectively the signal from a carbon sample containing D₂O and the same carbon sample with the protein solution, while the denominator is that of the dry carbon. For BSA at pH 6.9, the result (**Figure 9**) shows, firstly, that segments larger than about $2\pi/0.31 \approx 20 \text{ \AA}$ do not penetrate into either carbon, and, secondly, that in C2 the smaller pores (higher q range) are substantially less populated than those in C1.

Closely similar results are found for pH 2.8. The mean concentration of BSA inside the carbon samples (in g/mL) can then be found from the second moment of this concentration distribution

$$\langle c \rangle = \int_0^{q_{max}} c(q)q^2 dq / \int_0^{q_{max}} q^2 dq \quad (21)$$

where $q_{max} = 0.31 \text{ \AA}^{-1}$ is the point of cut-off in Figure 9 imposed by steric exclusion. Finally, multiplication by the available volume V in each sample (Table 2) yields the total BSA content in the carbons. Thus

for C1, $\langle c \rangle V = 0.40 \text{ g/g}$

and for C2, $\langle c \rangle V = 0.14 \text{ g/g}$.




Figure 9. Concentration distribution $c(q)$ of BSA in the C1 and C2 carbon particles (see Supplementary Information). The cut-off at high q occurs in both samples at $q \approx 0.31 \text{ \AA}^{-1}$. The trend $c(q) \rightarrow 0$ at $q < 0.01 \text{ \AA}^{-1}$ in C1 is an artefact from the excess surface scattering of C1 in pure D_2O . Continuous lines are guides for the eye.

Table 5 compares the above findings with the direct measurements of protein adsorption from reference [13]. The total amount of protein adsorbed by the carbons found from SANS is in semi-quantitative agreement with the direct findings. In these

estimates, however, it should be recalled, firstly, that precise equality of the filling factors of the corresponding dry and wet carbons is difficult to achieve, and secondly, the region close to the cut-off point q_{max} , which contributes the most to the second moment (Eq. 21), is the region of greatest uncertainty in $c(q)$. Nevertheless, the concentration distributions $c(q)$ obtained by this method offer an indicator of the real distribution of the proteins in the sample.

Table 5. Protein adsorption capacity of carbons C1 and C2

Sample	adsorbed BSA (direct measurement)	adsorbed BSA (SANS)	adsorbed BPTI (direct measurement)	adsorbed BPTI (SANS)
	<i>g/g</i>			
C1 in water pH 6.9 (unbuffered)	0.42	0.38	1.1	0.60
C2 in water pH 6.9 (unbuffered)	0.09	0.16	0.27	0.16
C1 pH 3	0.28	0.42	-	
C2 pH 3	0.07	0.08	-	

Although the nitrogen adsorption measurements of ref. [13] show that in both of the dry carbons C1 and C2 the pore sizes are sufficient to accommodate single BSA molecules, the present observations indicate that the hydrophobic carbon C1 absorbs BSA more readily than the hydrophilic C2. The latter result appears at first sight to contradict observations according to which BSA becomes less mobile and

more strongly attached to hydrophilic surfaces than to hydrophobic surfaces [6, 45]. Strong adhesion, however, hinders the diffusion of proteins in small pores: when the BSA solution enters the hydrophilic C2 carbon, the proteins penetrate no farther than the pore entrance, where they are immediately immobilised, blocking access to other molecules. In C1, by contrast, where adhesive forces are weaker because of the absence of polar groups, the proteins diffuse more freely inside the pores and occupy the available surface area. The difference in hydrophilic character between C1 and C2 is sufficient to explain their different adsorption capacities.

4. Conclusions

BSA is adsorbed by both the carbon aerogels C1 and C2, the former of which has a higher mesopore content. In spite of its larger BET surface area, the adsorption capacity of C2 for both BSA and BPTI is only about a quarter of that of C1. The SANS observations indicate that clusters of proteins may form in the pores. In C1, the aggregation number for BSA is $n=1$, i.e., the protein is adsorbed in the form of monomers, with a slightly compressed radius of gyration. In the same carbon at pH 2.8, the extended conformation adopted in free solution by BSA at low pH does not occur: in the basic environment of carbon C1 the indirect polyelectrolyte character of this molecule induced by the pH disappears as the excess proton amount is transferred to the pore walls. In C2 the aggregation number for BSA is larger, about 17, confirming the aggregated state of the protein. For the smaller BPTI molecule, the aggregation number is of the order of 10 in C1, and more than an order of magnitude greater in C2. The model employed to obtain these results is based on the incremental surface area S of the carbon deduced from the nitrogen adsorption measurements. Owing to the size of the proteins, this surface area is further diminished by a factor σ ,

where σ^{-1} is the fraction of pores of width that accommodate no more than one layer of protein molecules. The finding here that $\sigma \sim 1.5$ in the carbon C1 implies that in about 50% of the incremental surface the proteins are in contact with both walls.

In the hydrophilic carbon sample C2, both proteins form aggregates. The comparison of these two carbons implies that the greater adsorption capacity of C1 is in part attributable to its wider pores, but also to weak adhesion of the proteins to the hydrophobic surfaces, which allows them to migrate inside the pores. In C2, by contrast, the proteins are immobilised by their strong attraction to the hydrophilic surface, thus blocking access to and preventing penetration into the smaller pores. This finding illustrates the important role of surface chemistry in the adsorption of proteins in porous substrates.

Acknowledgements

We are grateful to the Institut Laue-Langevin, Grenoble, France for access to the D11 and D16 instruments and also to the European Synchrotron Radiation Facility for access to the French CRG beam line BM02. Financial support from the Marie Curie International Research Staff Exchange Scheme (ENSOR, Grant No. 269267), the Marie Curie Reintegration grant, PERG08-GA-2010-276954, and OTKA K109558 is acknowledged. AT recognizes the support of TÁMOP 4.2.4. A/1-11-1-2012-0001 “National Excellence Program – Elaborating and operating an inland student and researcher personal support system”. The project was subsidized by the European Union and co-financed by the European Social Fund.

References

[1] Riccardi E, Wang JC, Liapis AI. Protein adsorption in porous adsorbent particles: a multiscale modeling study on inner radial humps in the concentration profiles of adsorbed protein induced by nonuniform ligand density distributions. *J Sep Sci.* 2009;

32(18):3084-98

- [2] Ge S, Kojio K, Takahara A, Kajiyama T. Bovine serum albumin adsorption onto immobilized organotrichlorosilane surface: influence of the phase separation on protein adsorption patterns. *Journal of Biomaterials Science. Polymer Edition* 1998; 9: 131–150.
- [3] Bales RC, Hinkle SR, Kroeger TW, Stocking K, Gerba CP. Bacteriophage adsorption during transport through porous media: chemical perturbations and reversibility *Environ. Sci. Technol.*, 1991; 25 (12): 2088–2095
- [4] Kisler JM, Stevens GW, O'Connor AJ. Adsorption of proteins on mesoporous molecular sieves. *Mater.Phys.Mech.* 2001; 4:89-93
- [5] Koshari SHS, Wagner NJ, Lenhoff AM. Characterization of lysozyme adsorption in cellulosic chromatographic materials using small-angle neutron scattering, *J. Chromatogr. A.* 2015; 1399: 45–52.
- [6] Jeyachandran YL, Mielczarski E, Rai B, Mielczarski JA. Quantitative and Qualitative Evaluation of Adsorption/Desorption of Bovine Serum Albumin on Hydrophilic and Hydrophobic Surfaces *Langmuir* 2009; 25(19): 11614–11620.
- [7] Lazzara TD, Mey I, Steinem C, Janshoff A. Benefits and Limitations of Porous Substrates as Biosensors for Protein Adsorption *Anal.Chem.* 2011; 83: 5624-5630
- [8] Sandeman S, Petersson M, Wiezell S, Howell C, Phillips G, Zheng Y, Tennison S, Kozynchenko O, Mikhalovsky S Characterising Nanoporous Carbon Adsorbents for Biological Application to Chronic Kidney Disease. *Journal of Biomaterials and Tissue Engineering* 2012; 2: 40–47.
- [9] Howell CA, Sandeman SR, Phillips GJ, Mikhalovsky SV, Tennison SR, Rawlinson AP, Kozynchenko OP. Nanoporous activated carbon beads and monolithic columns as effective hemoadsorbents for inflammatory cytokines. *Int. J. Artif. Organs* 2013; 36: 624-32.
- [10] László K, Czakkel O, Dobos G, Lodewyckx P, Rochas C, Geissler E. Water vapour adsorption in highly porous carbons as seen by small and wide angle X-ray scattering. *Carbon* 2010; 48; 1038 –48.
- [11] Radlinski AP, Mastalerz M, Hinde AL, et al., Application of SAXS and SANS in evaluation of porosity, pore size distribution and surface area of coal. *International Journal of Coal Geology* 2004; 59: 245 – 271
- [12] László K, Czakkel O, Demé B, Geissler E. Simultaneous adsorption of toluene

- and water vapor on a high surface area carbon. *Carbon* 2012; 50: 4155 – 62.
- [13] Nagy B, Tóth A, Savina I, Mikhalovsky S, Mikhalovska L, Geissler E, László K. Adsorption of Globular Proteins by High Surface Area Porous Carbons (in preparation)
- [14] Tennison RS. Phenolic-resin-derived activated carbons. *Applied Catalysis A* 1998; 173: 289-311.
- [15] Gun'ko VM, Meikle ST, Kozynchenko OP, Tennison SR, Ehrburger-Dolle F, Morfin I, Mikhalovsky SV. Comparative Characterization of Carbon Adsorbents and Polymer Precursors by Small-Angle X-ray Scattering and Nitrogen Adsorption Methods *J. Phys. Chem. C* 2011; 115: 10727–10735.
- [16] Gun'ko VM, Turov VV, Kozynchenko OP, Nikolaev VG, Tennison SR, Meikle ST, Snezhkova EA, Sidorenko AS, Ehrburger-Dolle F, Morfin I, Klymchuk DO, Mikhalovsky SV Activation and structural and adsorption features of activated carbons with highly developed micro-, meso- and macroporosity *Adsorption* 2011; 17: 453–460.
- [17] Gun'ko VM, Turov VV, Kozynchenko OP, Nikolaev VG, Tennison SR, Meikle ST, Snezhkova EA, Sidorenko AS, Ehrburger-Dolle F, Morfin I, Klymchuk DO, Mikhalovsky SV. Activation and structural and adsorption features of activated carbons with highly developed micro-, meso- and macroporosity *Adsorption* 2011; 17: 453–460.
- [18] Budayova-Spano M, Lafont S, Astier J-P, Ebel C, Veessler S. Comparison of solubility and interactions of aprotinin (BPTI) solutions in H₂O and D₂O. *Journal of Crystal Growth* 2000; 217; 311–319.
- [19] Glasoe PK, Long FA. Use of glass electrodes to measure acidities in deuterium oxide *J. Phys. Chem.* 1960; 64: 188–190.
- [20] Brunauer S, Emmett P, Teller E. Adsorption of gases in multimolecular layers. *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 1938; 60: 309–319.
- [21] Dubinin MM, Radushkevich LV. Equation of the Characteristic Curve of Activated. Charcoal. *Proc. Acad. Sci. USSR Phys. Chem. Sect.* 1947; 55: 331–337.
- [22] Landers J, Gor GY, Neimark AV. Density functional theory methods for characterization of porous materials. *Colloids Surfaces A Physicochem. Eng. Asp.* 2013; 437: 3–32.
- [23] Horkay F, Hecht A-M, Mallam S, Geissler E, Rennie AR. Microscopic and macroscopic thermodynamic observations in swollen poly(dimethyl siloxane)

- networks. *Macromolecules* 1991; 24: 2896-2902.
- [24] El Kadi N, Taulier N, Le Huérou JY, Gindre M, Urbach W, Nwigwe I, Kahn PC, Waks M. Unfolding and Refolding of Bovine Serum Albumin at Acid pH: Ultrasound and Structural Studies. *Biophys J.* 2006; 91: 3397–3404.
- [25] Sadler PJ, Tucker A. pH-induced structural transitions of bovine serum albumin Histidine pK, values and unfolding of the N-terminus during the N to F transition. *Eur. J. Biochem.* 1993; 212: 811-817.
- [26] Nierlich M, Williams CE, Boué F, Cotton JP, Daoud M, Farnoux B, Jannink G, Picot C, Moan M, Wol C, Rinaudo M, de Gennes PG. Small angle neutron scattering by semi-dilute solutions of polyelectrolyte. *J. Physique (Paris)* 1979; 40: 701-704.
- [27] Hayter JB, Penfold J. An analytic structure factor for macroion solutions, *Molecular Physics* 1981; 42:109-118.
- [28] Kotlarchyk M, Chen SH. Analysis of small angle neutron scattering spectra from polydisperse interacting colloids. *J. Chem. Phys.* 1983; 79: 2461-2469.
- [29] Squire PG, Moser P, O’Konsky CT. Hydrodynamic properties of bovine serum albumin monomer and dimer. *Biochemistry* 1968; 7: 4261-4272.
- [30] Nossal R, Glinka CJ, Chen SH. SANS Studies of Concentrated Protein Solutions. I. Bovine Serum Albumin Biopolymers 1986; 25: 1157-1175.
- [31] Bendedouch D, Chen SH. Structure and Interparticle Interactions of bovine serum albumin in solution studied by small-Angle neutron scattering *J. Phys. Chem.* 1983; 87: 1473-1477.
- [32] Wright AK, Thompson MR. Hydrodynamic structure of bovine serum albumin determined by transient electric birefringence. *Biophys. J.* 1975; 15 (2 Pt 1): 137–141
- [33] Serdyuk IN, Zaccai NR, Zaccai J. *Methods in Molecular Biophysics: Structure, Dynamics, Function*, Cambridge University Press, 2007. ISBN: 9780511276118
- [34] Posselt D, Pederson JS, Mortensen K. A SANS investigation on absolute scale of a homologous series of base-catalysed silica aerogels *J. Non-Cryst. Solids* 1992; 145: 128-132
- [35] Carter DC, Ho JX. Structure of Serum Albumin. *Adv. Protein Chem.* 1994; 45: 153-203.
- [36] Santos SF, Zanette D, Fischer H, Itri R. A systematic study of bovine serum albumin (BSA) and sodium dodecyl sulfate (SDS) interactions by surface tension and small angle X-ray scattering. *J. Coll. Interf. Sci.* 2003; 262: 400-8.
- [37] Kamal JKA, Zhao L, Zewail AH. Ultrafast hydration dynamics in protein

- unfolding: Human serum albumin. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* 2004; 101: 13411-13416.
- [38] Fritz H, Wunderer G. Biochemistry and applications of aprotinin, the kallikrein inhibitor from bovine organs. *Arzneim.-Forsch./Drug Res.* 1983; 33 (I) Nr. 4: 479-494.
- [39] Appavou MS, Gibrat G, Bellissent-Funel MC. Influence of pressure on structure and dynamics of bovine pancreatic trypsin inhibitor (BPTI): Small angle and quasi-elastic neutron scattering studies. *Biochimica et Biophysica Acta* 2006; 1764: 414-423
- [40] Porod G. In: Kratky O, Glatter O, editors. *Small Angle X-ray Scattering*. London: Academic (1982).
- [41] Pfeifer P. Fractal dimension as working tool for surface-roughness problems. *Applications of Surface Science* 1984; 18: 146-164.
- [42] Leon y Leon CA, Radovic LR. Interfacial chemistry and electrochemistry of carbon surfaces. In: Thrower PA, editor. *Chemistry and Physics of Carbon*, 24; 213-310: Marcel Dekker (1994)
- [43] László K, Czakkel O, Josepovits K, Rochas C, Geissler E. Influence of surface chemistry on the SAXS response of polymer-based activated carbons. *Langmuir* 2005; 21: 8443-8451.
- [44] Mascotto S, Kuzmicz D, Wallacher D, Siebenbürger M, Clemens D, Risse S, Yuan J, Antonietti M, Ballauff M. Poly(ionic liquid)-derived nanoporous carbon analyzed by combination of gas physisorption and small-angle neutron scattering *Carbon* 2015; 82: 425–435
- [45] Rabe M, Verdes D, Seeger S. Surface-induced spreading phenomenon of protein clusters. *Soft Matter* 2009; 5: 1039–1047.

Supplementary Information

SANS of dry carbons C1 and C2, and protein distribution inside them.

a) SANS measurements of the dry carbons

The differences in structure between the two dry samples C1 and C2 are illustrated by their SANS responses $I(q)$ shown in **Figure S1**. In C2, the increased intensity in the region $q > 0.1 \text{ \AA}^{-1}$ is the signature of its higher micropore content. In C1, the knee in the spectrum of at $q \approx 0.03 \text{ \AA}^{-1}$ defines the resolution threshold below which the micropores become too small to be detected and only large scale, low density, averages can be seen. The insets in Figure S1 show the Porod scattering regime in the high q range where the intensity varies as

$$I(q) = \kappa q^{-4} + b \quad (\text{S1})$$

which determines the internal surface area of the carbon samples, S_{SAS} [S1]. In Eq. S1




Figure S 1. SANS response of dry samples C1 and C2. Insets: plots of $I(q)q^4$ vs q^4 showing the intercept κ of the asymptotic linear region at $q^4=0$. Owing to the low SANS intensity at high q in sample C1, the data shown in the corresponding inset is that measured by SAXS in an identical sample.

the Porod final slope, κ , is proportional to the internal surface area of the carbon and b is a constant signal from the disorder of the carbon atoms in the amorphous sample. The values of κ are the intercepts at $q^4=0$ in the plot $I(q)q^4$ vs q^4 , displayed in the

insets of Figure S1. The resulting values S_{SAS} , listed in Table 1 of the main text, show that S_{SAS} is about twice as large as S_{BET} . This difference between S_{SAS} and S_{BET} indicates that a large fraction of narrow or closed pores are inaccessible to low temperature nitrogen [S2, S3].

b) Determination of the correlation peak position q_{max} .

In the model used for calculating the aggregation number of the clusters in the carbon samples, the position of the correlation peaks q_{max} is resolved from the shoulders in Figure 7 in the main text. This is done by subtracting the low q response below the shoulder feature in each case (**Figure S2**).




Figure S2. SANS response of the carbon samples (a) C1 and (b) C2 containing BSA at pH 6.9 from Figs. 4 and 5, after subtracting the low q response.

c) Estimation of the distribution and total amount of BSA in the carbon samples.

The SANS signal from the dry carbon and that containing D_2O can be expressed as

$$I_{C_{dry}}(q) = \rho_c^2 S(q) \quad (\text{S2})$$

and

$$I_{C_{D2O}}(q) = (\rho_C - \rho_{D2O})^2 S(q) \quad (\text{S3})$$

where ρ_C and ρ_{D2O} are respectively the scattering length densities of the carbon and D_2O , and $S(q)$ is the structure factor of the carbon. [S4] Since the carbon matrix is rigid, we assume that $S(q)$ is invariant, whether the pores are filled with air or with water. (This assumption is not trivial, since it also requires that the filling factors of

the dry and wet samples be the same.) Eqs. S3 and S2 give

$$\begin{aligned} u_1(q) &= \frac{I_{C_{D2O}}(q)}{I_{C_{dry}}(q)} \\ &= \frac{(\rho_C - \rho_{D2O})^2}{\rho_C^2} \end{aligned} \quad (S4)$$

Similarly, considering the protein solution inside the carbon as a continuous medium, we have

$$u_2(q) = \frac{[\rho_C - \rho_{solution}(q)]^2}{\rho_C^2}$$

Hence

$$\rho_{solution}(q)/\rho_{D2O} = \frac{[1 - \sqrt{u_2(q)}]}{[1 - \sqrt{u_1(q)}]} \quad (S5)$$

Eq. S5 and the expression for the scattering length density of the solution then yield the concentration $c(q)$ of the protein in the solution

$$\rho_{solution}(q) = [1 - c(q)V_P] \rho_{D2O} + c(q)V_P \rho_{protein} \quad (S6)$$

For BSA at pH 6.9, we take $\Delta\rho = \rho_{D2O} - \rho_{BSA} = 3.76 \times 10^{10} \text{ cm}^{-2}$, and $V_P = 0.734 \text{ cm}^3/\text{g}$.

With $\rho_{D2O} = 6.083 \times 10^{10} \text{ cm}^{-2}$, expression S6 yields

$$\rho_{solution}(q)/\rho_{D2O} = [1 - 0.454c(q)].$$

Hence

$$c(q) = 2.20[1 - \rho_{solution}(q)/\rho_{D2O}] \quad (S7)$$

For the BSA solutions at pH 2.8, the corresponding relationship using Eq. 10 yields

$$\rho_{solution}(q)/\rho_{D2O} = [1 - 0.411c(q)]$$

and accordingly

$$c(q) = 2.435[1 - \rho_{solution}(q)/\rho_{D2O}] \quad (S8)$$

The variation of $c(q)$ in each of the carbons is shown for pH 6.9 in **Figure 9** of the main text. It is recalled that the increase in $\rho_{solution}(q)/\rho_{D2O}$, and the corresponding decrease in $c(q)$ in C1 in the region $q < 0.01 \text{ \AA}$ are artefacts due to the uncompensated surface scattering from this sample when immersed in D_2O . This discrepancy at low q , however, has negligible effect on the average concentration of BSA in the sample, which is obtained from the second moment,

$$\langle c \rangle = \int c(q)q^2 dq / \int q^2 dq \quad (S9)$$

The upper limit of the integrals is taken to be the point at which $c(q)$ vanishes ($q \approx 0.31 \text{ \AA}^{-1}$, i.e., the region that is available to the BSA molecules. The values found in

this way for the average concentration of BSA in the solutions are

$$\langle c \rangle_{C1} = 0.317 \text{ g/cm}^3$$

and

$$\langle c \rangle_{C2} = 0.187 \text{ g/cm}^3.$$

The available pore volume of the carbons into which the BSA molecules can penetrate is then the incremental volume of pore size greater than the diameter of the BSA molecule, listed in Table 2. Thus, for C1, the available with $w > 40 \text{ \AA}$ is

$$V = 1.20 \text{ cm}^3/\text{g}$$

while for C2

$$V = 0.87 \text{ cm}^3/\text{g}$$

This yields finally for the mass of BSA adsorbed in the carbon

$$\langle c \rangle V = 0.38 \text{ g/g for C1}$$

and

$$\langle c \rangle V = 0.16 \text{ g/g for C2.}$$

For BPTI, the same approach requires knowledge of both K and V_P . From Eq. 8, and taking $V_P = 0.698 \text{ cm}^3/\text{g}$, the mean value of the data in Appavou [S5], it follows that

$$\rho_{\text{solution}}(q)/\rho_{\text{D2O}} = [1 - 0.364c(q)],$$

$$\text{which yields } c(q) = 2.75 [1 - \rho_{\text{solution}}(q)/\rho_{\text{D2O}}] \quad (\text{S10})$$

Integration of these curves gives, with the values of V from Table 2 of the main text,

$$\text{C1P2} \quad \langle c \rangle = 0.4288 \text{ g/mL, hence } \langle c \rangle V = 0.60 \text{ g/g}$$

$$\text{C2P2} \quad \langle c \rangle = 0.1998 \text{ g/mL, hence } \langle c \rangle V = 0.16 \text{ g/g}$$

Owing to the approximations involved in the above approach, agreement with the direct measurements of the saturation load m_{BSA} adsorbed from solution (Table 2) is only semi-quantitative. These results nevertheless show that the average concentration of BSA $\langle c \rangle$ in both carbons is some 20 – 30 times greater than in the original BSA-D₂O solution (0.01 g/cm^3). Finally, we note that the maximum concentrations observed in Figure 9 (ca. 0.7 g/cm^3) are comparable with the internal concentration c_0 of the solvated BSA molecule, listed in Table 3 ($0.5\text{-}0.7 \text{ g/cm}^3$).

For BSA in C1 at pH 2.8 the integrated concentration is 0.4243 g/mL .

This gives for the protein load in the carbon $0.4242 \times 1.20 \text{ g/g} = 0.51 \text{ g/g}$




Figure S3. Distribution of protein concentration in samples C1 and C2 at pH 2.8.

BSA in C2 at pH 2.8, $\langle c \rangle = 0.108$ g/mL,

Hence load = $0.108 \times 0.742 = 0.080$ g/g

References for Supplementary Information

[S1] Porod G. In *Small Angle X-ray Scattering*. Kratky O, Glatter O, Eds; Academic Press: New York (1983).

[S2] László K, Geissler E. Surface chemistry and contrast-modified SAXS in polymer-based activated carbons. *Carbon* 2006; 44: 2437–2444.

[S3] Nagy B, Tóth A, Savina I, Mikhalovsky S, Mikhalovska L, Geissler E, László K. Adsorption of Globular Proteins by High Surface Area Porous Carbons (in preparation)

[S4] László K, Czakkell O, Dobos G, Lodewyckx P, Rochas C, Geissler E. Water vapour adsorption in highly porous carbons as seen by small and wide angle X-ray scattering. *Carbon* 2010; 48: 1038–1048.

[S5] Appavou MS, Gibrat G, Bellissent-Funel MC. Influence of pressure on structure and dynamics of bovine pancreatic trypsin inhibitor (BPTI): Small angle and quasi-elastic neutron scattering studies. *Biochimica et Biophysica Acta* 2006; 1764: 414-423.