

Investigating cationic and zwitterionic successive multiple ionicpolymer layer coatings for protein separation by capillary electrophoresis

Laura Dhellemmes, Laurent Leclercq, Henry Frick, Alisa Höchsmann, Norbert Schaschke, Christian Neusüß, Hervé Cottet

▶ To cite this version:

Laura Dhellemmes, Laurent Leclercq, Henry Frick, Alisa Höchsmann, Norbert Schaschke, et al.. Investigating cationic and zwitterionic successive multiple ionicpolymer layer coatings for protein separation by capillary electrophoresis. Journal of Chromatography A, 2024, 1720, pp.464802. 10.1016/j.chroma.2024.464802 . hal-04605815

HAL Id: hal-04605815 https://hal.science/hal-04605815

Submitted on 8 Jun 2024

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.

1	Investigating cationic and zwitterionic successive multiple ionic-
2	polymer layer coatings for protein separation by capillary
3	electrophoresis
4	
5	
6 7	Laura Dhellemmes ¹ , Laurent Leclercq ¹ , Henry Frick ² , Alisa Höchsmann ² , Norbert Schaschke ² , Christian Neusüß ² , Hervé Cottet ^{1*}
8	
9	¹ IBMM, University of Montpellier, CNRS, ENSCM, Montpellier, France
10	² Faculty of Chemistry, Aalen University, Aalen, Germany
11	
12	Corresponding Author
13 14	* Tel: +33-4-6714-3427; fax: +33-4-6763-1046. E-mail address: <u>herve.cottet@umontpellier.fr</u> . Address: Pôle Chimie Balard Recherche, IBMM – UMR 6247, 1919 route de Mende, 34293 Montpellier, France.

16 HIGHLIGHTS

- Coatings with higher molar mass PDADMAC lead to higher separation efficiency
- Polyanion molar mass does not impact separation efficiency
- 19 PDADMAC/PSS multilayer coatings are more durable than a monolayer of PDADMAC
- PDADMAC/PSS coatings with more than 5 layers lead to lower separation efficiency
- EOF modulation was possible using coatings with a polyzwitterionic last layer

23 **ABSTRACT**

24

Successive multiple ionic-polymer layers (SMILs) have long since proved their worth 25 26 in capillary electrophoresis as they ensure stable electroosmotic flow (EOF) and relatively high separation efficiency. Recently, we demonstrated that plotting the plate height (H) 27 against the solute migration velocity (u) enabled a reliable quantitative evaluation of the 28 29 coating performances in terms of separation efficiency. In this work, various 30 physicochemical and chemical parameters of the SMIL coating were studied and optimized 31 in order to decrease the slope of the ascending part of the *H* vs u curve, which is known to be controlled by the homogeneity in charge of the coating surface and by the possible 32 residual solute adsorption onto the coating surface. 33 SMILs based on poly(diallyldimethylammonium chloride) (PDADMAC) and poly(sodium styrene sulfonate) 34 (PSS) were formed and the effect of each polyelectrolyte molar mass and of the number of 35 36 polyelectrolyte layers (up to 21 layers) was studied. The use of polyethylene imine as an 37 anchoring first layer was considered. More polyelectrolyte couples based on PDADMAC, 38 polybrene, PSS, poly(vinyl sulfate), and poly(acrylic acid) were tested. Finally, zwitterionic polymers based on the poly(α -L-lysine) scaffold were synthesized and used as the last layer 39 of SMILs, illustrating their ability to finetune the EOF, while maintaining good separation 40 efficiency. 41

- 42
- 43
- 44

Keywords: Polyelectrolyte multilayers, protein separation, separation efficiency, capillary
 electrophoresis, zwitterionic polymers

47

1. Introduction

Polyelectrolyte multilayers are thin films consisting of electrostatically bonded 51 polyelectrolytes of alternating charges which find applications in many different fields 52 ranging from healthcare to energy and materials [1]. As such, they may also be used in 53 capillary electrophoresis (CE), where coatings are commonly used to limit solute interaction 54 55 with the capillary wall [2-4]. Katayama et al. were the first to introduce these successive multiple ionic-polymer layers (SMILs) for the separation of basic proteins by CE [2]. A 3-layer 56 polybrene (PB)/dextran sulfate (DS)/PB SMIL coating resulted in highly efficient peaks, 57 similarly to more commonly used neutral coatings, as well as excellent endurance and 58 stability to rinsing and changes in pH [2]. Since then, many different SMIL coatings have 59 been developed and applied to protein separation, with some of the most commonly used 60 polyelectrolytes PΒ [2,5-8], polyethylene (PEI) 61 being imine [9,10], poly(diallyldimethylammonium chloride) (PDADMAC) [9,11,12], DS [2,5,8,10], and 62 63 poly(sodium styrene sulfonate) (PSS) [5,9,11-13]. They are semipermanent coatings, which do not need to be present in the background electrolyte (BGE), like dynamic coatings, and 64 65 are easier to prepare and regenerate than covalently bound ones.

Different coating stabilities and separation performances may be achieved 66 depending on the nature of the polyelectrolyte couple [5,8,9]. A systematic study on the 67 influence of polyelectrolyte nature has shown that both the polycation and polyanion have 68 an impact on separation efficiency and coating stability. Over 20 couples were studied for 69 70 the separation of model proteins in acetic acid MS compatible buffer, finding that PDADMAC was the best choice of polycation and poly(L-lysine citramide) (PLC) for the 71 polyanion, with (PDADMAC/PLC)_{2.5} coatings resulting in up to 126×10^3 plates/m and 72 excellent repeatability over 100 runs ($(RSD(t_m) = 0.1\%)$ [9]. Moreover, physico-chemical 73 74 conditions such as construction buffer, background electrolyte (BGE) ionic strength and pH have been shown to impact both electroosmotic flow (EOF) and separation efficiency 75 76 [9,11,14-16]. Adding salt to the construction buffer resulted in increased stability of the 5layer PDADMAC/PSS SMIL coating as well as thicker layers [11,16,17]. Thick coatings are 77 78 generally thought to be advantageous as they increase the distance between the solute and the silanol groups present in the silica wall [4], however they may also result in more solute 79

diffusion within the coating [18]. Coating thickness may also be varied by modifying the number of deposited layers, as was studied by Bekri et al., who found that 5-layer SMILs led to higher separation efficiency and repeatability than 1- and 21-layer ones for three different polyelectrolyte systems [9]. Coatings with a lower number of layers also displayed better stability to changes in pH [8].

Besides SMILs, other commonly used semipermanent capillary coatings are neutral 85 polymers, including polyethylene oxide (PEO), poly(vinyl alcohol) (PVA), polyacrylamide, and 86 87 cellulose derivatives [19]. Their hydrophilicity helps to reduce sample interaction with the capillary wall, and they also strongly suppress the EOF which can be useful for certain 88 applications, but they are often less stable than charged polymers [20]. Another approach is 89 90 to use zwitterions, molecules which contain an equal number of positive and negative charges, conferring them antifouling properties [21-23]. Semipermanent zwitterionic 91 coatings may be based on double-chained zwitterionic surfactants which form stable 92 93 bilayers on the capillary wall [24], or polyzwitterions may be synthetized and statically adsorbed onto the capillary. Polyzwitterions have been successfully applied onto planar 94 surfaces and nanoparticles to limit protein adsorption for biomedical applications [25-27], 95 but few cases of noncovalent polyzwitterionic coatings for use in CE have been reported 96 97 [28,29]. Covalent polyzwitterionic coatings are more common, but require in situ chemical 98 reactions to be implemented [30-34].

99 The objective of this work was to optimize the separation performance of 100 PDADMAC/PSS SMIL coatings by changing polyelectrolyte molar mass and nature as well as 101 the number of layers. PEI was tested as the first layer and newly synthesized polyzwitterions 102 as the last layer to further reduce interactions between proteins and the capillary surface. 103 All the coatings were systematically evaluated by plotting plate heights H against migration 104 velocities u obtained by performing separations at different voltages, with n=5 repetitions 105 for each one. This provides valuable information about the kinetic behavior of the 106 separations, enabling a ranking of coating performances. It also allows the impact of the different SMIL parameters described above on separation efficiency to be determined. 107

108

109 2. Materials and Methods

110 **2.1. Chemicals**

2-[4-(2-hydroxyethyl)piperazin-1-yl]ethane sulfonic acid (HEPES), acetic acid, and 111 methyl 3-(dimethylamino)propionate were purchased from Sigma-Aldrich (Saint-Quentin 112 113 Fallavier, France). N,N-dimethylglycine ethyl ester, 4-(dimethylamino)butyric acid hydrochloride, N-methylmorpholine (NMM) and 4-(4,6-Dimethoxy-1,3,5-triazin-2-yl)-4-114 methylmorpho-linium chloride (DMTMM) were purchased from Tokyo Chemical Industry 115 116 (TCI). Propan-1,3-sultone from Thermo Fisher Scientific, and deuterated solvents from Deutero. All other solvents and chemicals were obtained from the usual commercial sources 117 and used as received unless otherwise noted. The model proteins, Carbonic Anhydrase I 118 from human erythrocytes (CA, purity not indicated by the supplier), Trypsin Inhibitor from 119 120 Flycine max (soybean) (TI, purity not indicated by the supplier), Myoglobin from equine skeletal muscle (Myo, purity \geq 95%), Ribonuclease A from bovine pancreas (RNAse A, purity 121 \geq 60%), β -lactoglobulin A from bovine milk (β -lac A, purity \geq 90%), and Lysozyme from 122 chicken egg white (Lyz, purity \geq 90%) were purchased from Sigma-Aldrich (Saint-Quentin 123 Fallavier, France). Ultrapure water was obtained using a MilliQ system from Millipore 124 (Molsheim, France). Poly(α -L-lysine) hydrochloride (PLL; average MW 66 × 10³ g/mol) with a 125 polydispersity index (PDI) between 1.0 – 1.2 was purchased from Alamanda Polymers. 126 Poly(diallyldimethylammonium chloride) (PDADMAC, high molar mass MW $4 \times 10^{5} - 5 \times 10^{5}$ 127 g/mol, and low molar mass MW 1 \times 10⁵ g/mol), 20% m/m and 35% m/m in water, 128 respectively, were purchased from Aldrich (Lyon, France). Poly(styrene sulfonate) (PSS, MW 129 5×10^{3} g/mol; 29 × 10³ g/mol; 7 × 10⁴ g/mol; 148 × 10³ g/mol; 330 × 10³ g/mol) were 130 purchased from Acros Organics (Geel, Belgium). PB (MW 15×10^3 g/mol), PAA (MW 2×10^4 131 g/mol and 97 \times 10³ g/mol), PVS (MW 17 \times 10³ g/mol), and PEI (MW 75 \times 10⁴ g/mol) were 132 purchased from Sigma-Aldrich (Saint-Quentin Fallavier, France). 133

134

135 **2.2. Zwitterion synthesis**

Briefly, the zwitterionic building blocks equipped with a carboxylic acid function were synthesized by quaternization of the tertiary amino function of set of ω -dimetylamino carboxylic acids with systematically increasing chain length using propan-1,3-sultone. For this, the methyl or ethyl ester protected ω -dimetylamino carboxylic acids (1 eq.) were dissolved in acetone. Upon addition of propan-1,3-sultone (1.1 eq.) the mixture was heated
to 50 °C overnight producing the zwitterions as a colorless precipitate, respectively. To
generate the free carboxylic acid function, the esters were hydrolyzed in 6 M hydrochloric
acid at 70 °C yielding the zwitterionic building blocks as quaternary ammonium chlorides
fully characterized by ¹H- und ¹³C-NMR spectroscopy as well as CE-MS analysis. ¹H- and ¹³CNMR spectra were recorded on Bruker DRX-500 NMR spectrometer.

146

147 **2.3. Functionalization of the PLL**

Briefly, PLL was dissolved in H₂O/MeOH 1:1 v/v at a concentration of 10 mg/mL. The 148 zwitterions were also dissolved in $H_2O/MeOH$ 1:1 v/v and deprotonated with NMM (2 eq.). 149 The solution of the deprotonated zwitterion and the coupling reagent DMTMM (1:1 molar 150 151 ratio) were added to the PLL solution in the desired stoichiometric ratio under vigorous 152 stirring. The reaction was allowed to proceed overnight at room temperature followed by dialysis against 0.5 M sodium perchlorate for 48 hours. The dialyzed polymer was lyophilized 153 for 48 hours and obtained as colorless solid. The degree of functionalization was determined 154 from the ratio of the integrals of the signals of the a α -CH protons of the Lys residues of PLL 155 and the signals of the zwitterionic moieties by ¹H NMR. The final derivatized polymers are 156 157 represented in Fig. 1.

158

159 **2.4. Capillary coating procedure**

Acetic acid 2 M (pH 2.2) was used as the BGE and 20 mM HEPES with 10 mM NaOH 160 (pH 7.4) as the construction buffer. Polyelectrolyte and zwitterion solutions (3 gL⁻¹) were 161 prepared by dissolving or diluting the polyelectrolytes in HEPES, at least one night before 162 the first use. The polycation and zwitterion solutions were kept in the freezer while the 163 164 polyanions could be kept in the fridge. The protein mix was prepared from individual solutions of proteins stored in water at a higher concentration, which can be kept in the 165 freezer for several months without degradation. Equal amounts of each stock solution were 166 mixed, adding acetic acid at a higher concentration in order to obtain the final mix in acetic 167 acid 2 M, where each protein is at 0.2 gL^{-1} . The protein mix was placed in an oven for 30 168

minutes at 37°C in order to reach more stable protein conformations [35]. The SMIL 169 coatings were prepared by preconditioning the silica capillary with 1 M NaOH for 10 min, 170 then flushing with water for 5 min and HEPES for 10 min. Next, the polyelectrolyte solutions 171 172 were flushed for 7 min each, followed by 3 min of HEPES, starting with the polycation and alternating with the polyanion, until the desired number of layers was reached. After the 173 last HEPES flush, wait 5 min and flush with water for 3 min, with BGE for 10 min and wait for 174 another 5 min before starting analyses. All flushes were performed at 930 mbar. Using 175 different HEPES vials after the polycation and the polyanion rinses helps to reduce cross-176 177 contamination between polyelectrolytes. The vials should be filled to a level such that the 178 electrodes do not come into contact with the polyelectrolyte solutions. For the zwitterionic 179 coatings, the final polycation rinse was replaced with a polyzwitterion solution rinse for the 180 same amount of time. SMILs are designated by (A/B)_i, where A refers to the polycation, B 181 the polyanion, and *i* the number of bilayers.

182

183 **2.5. Capillary electrophoresis**

Analyses were performed on Agilent 7100 CE (Waldbronn, Germany). Fused silica 184 capillaries of 50 µm in inner diameter, 357 µm in outer diameter and cut to 40 cm total 185 186 length (31.5 cm to the detector) or 60 cm total length (51.5 cm to the detector) were from Composite Metal Servies (Photon Lines, France). Applied voltages were between -25 kV and 187 188 -10 kV for the 40 cm capillaries, and between -30 kV and -10 kV for the 60 cm ones. A 5 min flush with BGE was done between each run. 0.001% v/v DMF in acetic acid 2 M was injected 189 190 before the proteins to serve as the EOF marker. Then, the protein mix with each protein at 0.2 gL⁻¹ in BGE was injected. The injection parameters were adjusted depending on the 191 capillary length (30 mbar, 4 s for the 40 cm capillaries, and 30 mbar, 6 s for the 60 cm ones). 192 The cassette and tray temperatures were set at 25 °C and the detection wavelength was 214 193 nm. Plate heights H were calculated from the capillary length to the detector I, the 194 migration times $t_{m_{e}}$ and the widths at half height δ measured with the CEval software 195 available at [https://echmet.natur.cuni.cz/] [36]: 196

197
$$H = \frac{l}{5.54 \left(\frac{t_m}{\delta}\right)^2} \tag{1}$$

199 **3. Results and discussion**

200 **3.1. Influence of polyelectrolyte molar mass**

201 3.1.1. PDADMAC molar mass

202 Polyelectrolyte molar mass has not been as extensively studied as other 203 experimental conditions, yet it is an important aspect to consider. In the current study, a mix of five model proteins was separated on (PDADMAC/PSS)_{2.5} coated capillaries using 204 either PDADMAC MW 4.5 \times 10⁵ g/mol or MW 1 \times 10⁵ g/mol both with PSS MW 7 \times 10⁴ 205 g/mol. Separations were done at five electric field strengths and the resulting plate heights 206 H were plotted against solute migration velocity u following a previously described protocol 207 [12,35,37]. Briefly, this method allows to evaluate and to rank the coating performances in 208 209 terms of separation efficiency. As in chromatography, the flatter the H vs u curve, the better 210 the separation efficiency and performances. The following equation was used to model the 211 experimental points:

$$H = A + \frac{B}{u} + pu$$

where *A* is a constant term which includes extra-column effects such as injection, detection, and capillary coiling; $\frac{B}{u}$ is due to axial diffusion and can be written as $\frac{2D}{u}$, where *D* is the analyte diffusion coefficient determined by Taylor dispersion analysis [35]; and *p* is the slope in the ascending linear part of the curve. *p* is controlled both by possible analyte adsorption on the coating surface and by electroosmotic fluctuations along the capillary due to charge inhomogeneity [38].

(2)

As seen in Fig. 2 for the analysis of a mixture of 5 proteins (CA, TI, Myo, RNAse and Lyz) dissolved in the BGE, the coatings made from high molar mass PDADMAC (MW 4.5 × 10^5 g/mol; average $p(10^{-3}s) = 1.92 \pm 0.28$) led to much flatter *H vs u* curves than those made from lower molar mass PDADMAC (MW 1 × 10^5 g/mol; average $p(10^{-3}s) = 15.75 \pm 2.23)$, indicating lower dependence on electric field strength and overall better separation efficiency. Plate heights below 8 µm correspond to at least 125×10^3 plates/m. One possible explanation is that the polycation molar mass can affect the structure of the SMIL coating and its homogeneity in charge. This behavior was observed for all the proteins, which seems to exclude the possible contribution of solute adsorption to the slope. Recently, we demonstrated that the presence of surface defects and / or charge inhomogeneities disrupts locally the EOF which generates hydrodynamic perturbations, and consequently leads to higher *H vs u* slopes [38].

These results are consistent with data from the literature which found that coating 231 capillaries with high molar mass PDADMAC (MW 4.28×10^5 g/mol) and high ionic strength (*I* 232 = 0.5 M) led to optimal surface coverage, as indicated by the more stable and pH-233 independent EOF compared to MW 3×10^4 g/mol PDADMAC at I = 0.005 M [39]. The EOF 234 magnitude was much lower when MW 1×10^4 g/mol PDADMAC was used [40]. Similarly, Pei 235 and Lucy studied coatings prepared from 5 different molar masses of PDADMAC, finding 236 that only high molar mass PDADMAC (MW 2-3.5 \times 10⁵ g/mol and MW 4-5 \times 10⁵ g/mol) 237 maintained a stable EOF through buffer rinse cycles (pH 9.5), while the lower molar masses 238 (MW 1-2 \times 10⁵ g/mol, 75 \times 10³ g/mol and 85 \times 10² g/mol) quickly desorbed from the 239 capillary wall [41]. 240

241 **3.1.2. PSS molar mass**

Much less attention has been paid to the molar mass of the polyanions used in SMILs 242 compared to polycations. To complete the study, five different molar masses of PSS were 243 used in (PDADMAC/PSS)_{2.5} SMILs with MW 4.5 \times 10⁵ g/mol PDADMAC. Fig. 3 reveals that 244 245 the *H* vs u plots for each PSS molar mass are quite similar, with variations in slope below 30% for CA. Similar results were found for the other proteins (see Table SI1). Therefore, it is 246 apparent that polyanion molar mass has much less impact on separation efficiency 247 compared to polycation molar mass. This may be because the polyanion is only used in 248 intermediate layers and not as the first layer, which may impact film stability, or as the last 249 layer, which is in contact with the proteins. More investigations about polycation and 250 polyanion nature are discussed in Section 3.3. 251

252

253 **3.2. Impact of number of layers of PDADMAC/PSS coatings**

254 **3.2.1. Comparing SMIL and monolayer coatings**

To highlight the advantage of SMIL coatings over single-layer coatings, a durability 255 study was carried out, whereby five successive series of separations (125 runs) were 256 performed on the same capillary without regeneration. Both separation efficiency and intra-257 258 capillary reproducibility were higher for the PDADMAC/PSS SMIL coating compared to the monolayer PDADMAC one (see Fig. 4 and Table SI2). This is also the case for PB/PSS SMILs 259 compared to PB (see Fig. 6B). Thus, it appears that SMIL coatings are most robust to 260 261 successive rinses compared to monolayer ones, which lead to more variations in plate heights across several series of measures. This is coherent with other work which showed 262 263 that multilayer coatings exhibit much higher separation efficiency [2,11], repeatability 264 [17,41,42], and stability to alkaline rinses [13,16] than monolayers.

265 **3.2.2.** Impact of number of layers and nature of the first layer of SMILs

266 Some papers dealing with the structure of polyelectrolyte multilayers report that 267 using a high molar mass polyelectrolyte with high charge density such as PEI as the first layer of a SMIL coating is advantageous as it serves to anchor the coating [43]. Hence, PEI 268 was tested as the first layer in 5-, 11-, and 21-layer PDADMAC/PSS coatings. H vs u curves 269 270 were determined for each system, showing that the (PDADMAC/PSS)_{2.5} coating led to the highest separation efficiency (see Fig. 5). Using PEI as the first layer, as well as increasing the 271 number of layers to 11, doubled the average slopes. (PDADMAC/PSS)_{10.5} was not able to 272 273 form a stable film (the slopes were at least 20 times higher than the for the other coatings, 274 see Table SI3). For 11- and 21-layer coatings, though, the use of PEI as the first layer did improve separation efficiency as well as repeatability (see Fig. SI1), perhaps because the 275 anchoring effect prevailed over polyelectrolyte nature. Indeed, when used as monolayer 276 coatings, PDADMAC led to more stable EOF compared to PEI [16], and PEI was found to be 277 the worst out of seven polycations used in combination with a range of polyanions in terms 278 279 of separation efficiency [9]. Bekri et al. achieved stable coatings with 21 layers using different polyelectrolytes, but also determined the 5-layer coating to be the best in terms of 280 281 separation efficiency and migration time repeatability [9].

282

283 **3.3. Studying different polyelectrolyte couples**

Next, SMILs made from different combinations of polycations and polyanions were 284 tested. Fig. 6A compares the *H* vs u plots for different polyanions used in combination with 285 286 PDADMAC. The nature of polyanion has a very low impact on the H vs u plots, with a 287 relatively low 17% variation of the slopes between the couples (see Table SI4), and with a slightly better performance for PSS. These results indicate that the coatings lead to similar 288 surface homogeneity. According to our previously developed model, this corresponds to just 289 0.9% of coating defects, assuming that the defects are of opposite charge to the rest of the 290 coating, and to 0.6% assuming that one of the zones is neutral [38]. As for PSS, PAA molar 291 mass does not seem to have a significant influence on separation efficiency. The similarity 292 293 between the different polyanions used with PDADMAC is coherent with the previous section which showed that polyanion molar mass had little effect on CE performance. 294

295 When PB is used as the polycation, the variations in the plate height between polyelectrolyte couples increase, namely due to the higher slope of the (PB/PAA MW 97 × 296 10³ g/mol)_{2.5} system (see Fig. 6B). Other work had shown that PAA was one of the worst 297 polyanions in terms of separation efficiency [5,9]. Only the high molar mass PAA was used 298 since polyanion molar mass does not appear to be significant. However, the slopes remain 299 relatively low compared to the coatings made from PDADMAC MW 1×10^5 g/mol shown in 300 Fig. 2B, even though the molar mass of PB is much lower (MW 1.5×10^4 g/mol). This may be 301 302 due to differences in structure between PDADMAC and PB, whose higher charge density causes it to form thinner films [44]. Likewise, the polyanions cover a range of molar masses 303 (MW 2 \times 10⁴ g/mol for PAA to over MW 17 \times 10⁴ g/mol for PVS) but this does not affect 304 separation efficiency much, perhaps because the experimental conditions have been 305 previously optimized, leading to high CE performance regardless of the choice of 306 polyelectrolyte couple. Some of the main differences compared to earlier studies is placing 307 the injected samples in BGE rather than water, ensuring proper protein conservation, and 308 309 limiting cross-contamination between vials [35].

310

311 **3.4.** Testing zwitterionic polyelectrolytes as the last layer of SMILs

To further investigate the impact of polyelectrolyte nature on CE performance, novel coatings based on zwitterionic polymers were implemented. Three zwitterions of the

sulfobetaine family were synthesized (see experimental section) and grafted onto the ε -314 amino functions of the Lys residues of PLL in different amounts. The resulting compounds 315 (13 in total) were used as the last layer of PDADMAC/PSS coatings and tested for the 316 317 separation of model proteins using the usual model. Fig. 7A shows the EOFs obtained for the 318 different coatings, which decrease as the % derivatization increases, while the different 319 zwitterion types (1 to 3) behave similarly independent from the length of alkyl chain. This is 320 consistent with the idea that the overall surface charge is reduced as more zwitterions, 321 containing positive and negative charges, are introduced into the last polyelectrolyte layer. 322 The EOF magnitude of the 70% derivatized zwitterion 1 was very close to the proteins' electrophoretic mobilities (24 to 32 TU, where 1 TU = 10^{-9} m²V⁻¹s⁻¹), so no proteins were 323 324 visible in positive or negative polarities. For the 88% and 99% derivatized zwitterions, the EOF was very slow, and was measured with a negative polarity, while the protein 325 separations had to be performed with positive electric fields in order to be visible. 326

The zwitterionic coatings' separation abilities were evaluated in Fig. 7B, which shows 327 results close to the (PDADMAC/PSS)_{2.5} coating except for the higher percentages of 328 derivatization. Zwitt3-63%, Zwitt1-88%, and Zwitt3-99% led to much higher plate heights 329 (see Fig. SI2), while Zwitt1-70% could not analyze any proteins. For these highly zwitterionic 330 coatings, the polarity had to be changed and the order of proteins was inverted, and so CA, 331 appearing last, was not able to be detected in a reasonable amount of time. This work 332 333 demonstrates the ability of zwitterionic derivatization to modulate the EOF, which could be 334 interesting for certain applications. Indeed, capillary coatings have been used in CE-mass spectrometry (MS), where slower EOF is preferred to achieve better resolution [4]. For 335 example, a quaternized diethylaminoethyl dextran (DEAEDq)/PLC coating generating an EOF 336 of -43.3 TU was used to separate and identify four glycoforms of ribonuclease B [5]. 337 Therefore, zwitteration of cationic coatings offers an alternative way of reducing the EOF. 338

The zwitterionic polymers were also used in all the layers of the SMIL coating instead of PDADMAC, but this led to unstable films with poor migration time repeatability (not shown). When PDADMAC was used as the first layer, PDADMAC(PSS/zwitt)₂ led to similar results to the (PSS/zwitt)_{2.5} coatings with only slightly modified EOF. This reinforces once again the higher importance of both the first and last layer compared to the intermediate layers in the SMIL coating. In another approach, several polycations were modified with

poly(ethylene glycol) (PEG) and added on top of (PDADMAC/PSS)₂ coatings, effectively 345 reducing the EOF to as low as 2 TU with 11% derivatized MW 5×10^3 g/mol poly(allylamine) 346 347 hydrochloride) (PAH) [37]. The modified polymers led to similar separation efficiency compared to the unmodified ones $(200 \times 10^3 \text{ plates/m and } 263 \times 10^3 \text{ plates/m, respectively,})$ 348 for Lyz) [37]. The difference is even lower between (PDADMAC/PSS)₂zwitt3-11%_{0.5} and 349 $(PDADMAC/PSS)_{2.5}$ for the same protein $(316 \times 10^3 \text{ plates/m and } 311 \times 10^3 \text{ plates/m})$ 350 respectively). The best zwitterionic coating in the current work, (PDADMAC/PSS)2zwitt1-351 17%, led to plate heights as low as 2.7 μ m, which is equivalent to 375 × 10³ plates/m. Hence, 352 using polymers with up to 20% of zwitterions as the last layer of (PDADMAC/PSS)_{2.5} coatings 353 354 provides separations as efficient as the typical SMILs while reducing the EOF by up to 3 TU.

355

356 **Conclusions**

357 In this paper, SMIL coating characteristics were examined in order to determine the optimal conditions for protein separation by CE. A large amount of data, 975 runs in total 358 performed on 31 different capillaries, enabled H vs u curves to be plotted, leading to 359 quantitative comparisons between coatings. The widely used PDADMAC/PSS combination 360 was assessed, varying polyelectrolyte molar mass and the number of deposited layers. 361 PDADMAC molar mass was shown to greatly impact separation efficiency, while that of PSS 362 had little influence. The best number of layers in the coating was 5, above which separation 363 364 efficiency decreased, and under which coating durability was affected. The use of PEI as the 365 first layer improved coating stability when the coating was more than 11 layers thick but did not improve the separation for a 5-layer coating. The effect of polyelectrolyte nature was 366 also investigated, with different combinations of PB or PDADMAC with the polyanions PAA, 367 PVS, and PSS leading to similar separation efficiencies, with the exception of (PB/PAA)_{2.5} 368 which was notably worse. Overall, (PDADMAC/PSS)_{2.5} appears to be the best choice in terms 369 of separation efficiency and preparation time, reaching 326×10^3 plates/m. In addition, 370 371 novel zwitterionic polymers were implemented as the last layer of PDADMAC/PSS SMILs, 372 leading to similar separation efficiency when the percentage of derivatization was not too high. Most interestingly, they were able to modulate the EOF while preserving good CE 373 performance, which could be promising for improving resolutions in CE-MS applications. 374

Declaration of competing interest

- 377 The authors declare no conflict of interest.
- 378

379 Acknowledgments

380 This work was realized within the scope of a PRCI in collaboration with German partners

from the University of Aalen, Germany (ANR-DFG SMIL E, ANR-20-C E 92-0021-01).

382

383 Supporting Information

384 Please find supplementary material provided with this file.

385

386 **References**

J.A. Jaber, J.B. Schlenoff, Recent developments in the properties and applications of
 polyelectrolyte multilayers, Current Opinion in Colloid & Interface Science. 11 (2006) 324–
 329. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cocis.2006.09.008.

H. Katayama, Y. Ishihama, N. Asakawa, Stable Cationic Capillary Coating with
 Successive Multiple Ionic Polymer Layers for Capillary Electrophoresis, Anal. Chem. 70
 (1998) 5272–5277. https://doi.org/10.1021/ac9805221.

I. Hajba, A. Guttman, Recent advances in column coatings for capillary
electrophoresis of proteins, TrAC, Trends Anal. Chem. 90 (2017) 38–44.
https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trac.2017.02.013.

C. Huhn, R. Ramautar, M. Wuhrer, G.W. Somsen, Relevance and use of capillary
coatings in capillary electrophoresis–mass spectrometry, Anal. Bioanal. Chem. 396 (2010)
297–314. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00216-009-3193-y.

L. Leclercq, M. Morvan, J. Koch, C. Neusüß, H. Cottet, Modulation of the 399 [5] electroosmotic mobility using polyelectrolyte multilayer coatings for protein analysis by 400 capillary electrophoresis, Anal. (2019) 152-161. 401 Chim. Acta. 1057 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aca.2019.01.008. 402

R. Haselberg, G.J. de Jong, G.W. Somsen, Capillary electrophoresis of intact basic
proteins using noncovalently triple-layer coated capillaries, J. Sep. Sci. 32 (2009) 2408–2415.
https://doi.org/10.1002/jssc.200900164.

406 [7] T. Isemura, F. Kitagawa, K. Otsuka, Separation of complex mixtures of fluorobenzoic 407 acids capillary electrophoresis, J. Sep. Sci. 32 (2009)381-387. by https://doi.org/10.1002/jssc.200800549. 408

K.E. Swords, P.B. Bartline, K.M. Roguski, S.A. Bashaw, K.A. Frederick, Assessment of
polyelectrolyte coating stability under dynamic buffer conditions in CE: Electrodriven
Separations, J. Sep. Sci. 34 (2011) 2427–2432. https://doi.org/10.1002/jssc.201100044.

412 [9] S. Bekri, L. Leclercq, H. Cottet, Polyelectrolyte multilayer coatings for the separation of proteins by capillary electrophoresis: Influence of polyelectrolyte nature and multilayer 413 414 crosslinking, Journal of Chromatography Α. 1399 (2015) 80-87. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chroma.2015.04.033. 415

[10] F. Kitagawa, M. Kamiya, Y. Okamoto, H. Taji, S. Onoue, Y. Tsuda, K. Otsuka,
Electrophoretic analysis of proteins and enantiomers using capillaries modified by a
successive multiple ionic-polymer layer (SMIL) coating technique, Anal. Bioanal. Chem. 386
(2006) 594–601. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00216-006-0438-x.

420 [11] T.W. Graul, J.B. Schlenoff, Capillaries Modified by Polyelectrolyte Multilayers for
421 Electrophoretic Separations, Anal. Chem. 71 (1999) 4007–4013.
422 https://doi.org/10.1021/ac990277I.

- 423 [12] L. Leclercq, C. Renard, M. Martin, H. Cottet, Quantification of Adsorption and
 424 Optimization of Separation of Proteins in Capillary Electrophoresis, Anal. Chem. 92 (2020)
 425 10743–10750. https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.analchem.0c02012.
- R. Nehmé, C. Perrin, H. Cottet, M.-D. Blanchin, H. Fabre, Stability of capillaries coated
 with highly charged polyelectrolyte monolayers and multilayers under various analytical
 conditions—Application to protein analysis, J. Chromatogr. A. 1218 (2011) 3537–3544.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chroma.2011.03.040.
- 430 [14] S. Roca, L. Dhellemmes, L. Leclercq, H. Cottet, Polyelectrolyte Multilayers in Capillary
 431 Electrophoresis, ChemPlusChem. 87 (2022). https://doi.org/10.1002/cplu.202200028.
- 432 [15] A. Quinn, G.K. Such, J.F. Quinn, F. Caruso, Polyelectrolyte Blend Multilayers: A
 433 Versatile Route to Engineering Interfaces and Films, Adv. Funct. Mater. 18 (2008) 17–26.
 434 https://doi.org/10.1002/adfm.200700472.
- [16] R. Nehmé, C. Perrin, H. Cottet, M. Blanchin, H. Fabre, Influence of polyelectrolyte
 capillary coating conditions on protein analysis in CE, Electrophoresis. 30 (2009) 1888–1898.
 https://doi.org/10.1002/elps.200800688.
- [17] R. Nehmé, C. Perrin, H. Cottet, M.D. Blanchin, H. Fabre, Influence of polyelectrolyte
 coating conditions on capillary coating stability and separation efficiency in capillary
 electrophoresis, Electrophoresis. 29 (2008) 3013–3023.
 https://doi.org/10.1002/elps.200700886.

[18] P. Lavalle, V. Vivet, N. Jessel, G. Decher, J.-C. Voegel, P.J. Mesini, P. Schaaf, Direct
Evidence for Vertical Diffusion and Exchange Processes of Polyanions and Polycations in
Polyelectrolyte Multilayer Films, Macromolecules. 37 (2004) 1159–1162.
https://doi.org/10.1021/ma035326h.

446 [19] C.A. Lucy, A.M. MacDonald, M.D. Gulcev, Non-covalent capillary coatings for protein
447 separations in capillary electrophoresis, Journal of Chromatography A. 1184 (2008) 81–105.
448 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chroma.2007.10.114.

449 [20] J. Horvath, V. Dolník, Polymer wall coatings for capillary electrophoresis,
450 Electrophoresis. 22 (2001) 644–655. https://doi.org/10.1002/1522451 2683(200102)22:4<644::AID-ELPS644>3.0.CO;2-3.

452 [21] C. Zhang, J. Yuan, J. Lu, Y. Hou, W. Xiong, H. Lu, From neutral to zwitterionic poly(α453 amino acid) nonfouling surfaces: Effects of helical conformation and anchoring orientation,
454 Biomaterials. 178 (2018) 728–737. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biomaterials.2018.01.052.

455 [22] J.B. Schlenoff, Zwitteration: Coating Surfaces with Zwitterionic Functionality to
456 Reduce Nonspecific Adsorption, Langmuir. 30 (2014) 9625–9636.
457 https://doi.org/10.1021/la500057j.

458 [23] A. Erfani, J. Seaberg, C.P. Aichele, J.D. Ramsey, Interactions between Biomolecules
459 and Zwitterionic Moieties: A Review, Biomacromolecules. 21 (2020) 2557–2573.
460 https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.biomac.0c00497.

461 [24] J.M. Cunliffe, N.E. Baryla, C.A. Lucy, Phospholipid Bilayer Coatings for the Separation
462 of Proteins in Capillary Electrophoresis, Anal. Chem. 74 (2002) 776–783.
463 https://doi.org/10.1021/ac015627u.

464 [25] A. Reisch, J. Hemmerlé, J.-C. Voegel, E. Gonthier, G. Decher, N. Benkirane-Jessel, A.
465 Chassepot, D. Mertz, P. Lavalle, P. Mésini, P. Schaaf, Polyelectrolyte multilayer coatings that
466 resist protein adsorption at rest and under stretching, J. Mater. Chem. 18 (2008) 4242.
467 https://doi.org/10.1039/b808467j.

468 [26] J. Ladd, Z. Zhang, S. Chen, J.C. Hower, S. Jiang, Zwitterionic Polymers Exhibiting High
469 Resistance to Nonspecific Protein Adsorption from Human Serum and Plasma,
470 Biomacromolecules. 9 (2008) 1357–1361. https://doi.org/10.1021/bm701301s.

471 [27] Z.G. Estephan, P.S. Schlenoff, J.B. Schlenoff, Zwitteration As an Alternative to
472 PEGylation, Langmuir. 27 (2011) 6794–6800. https://doi.org/10.1021/la200227b.

473 [28] F. Cao, L. Tan, L. Xiang, S. Liu, Y. Wang, Application of the copolymers containing
474 sulfobetaine methacrylate in protein separation by capillary electrophoresis, J. Biomater.
475 Sci., Polym. Ed. 24 (2013) 2058–2070. https://doi.org/10.1080/09205063.2013.823072.

476 [29] L. Chen, L. Tan, S. Liu, L. Bai, Y. Wang, Surface modification by grafting of poly(SBMA477 co -AEMA)- g -PDA coating and its application in CE, J. Biomater. Sci., Polym. Ed. 25 (2014)
478 766–785. https://doi.org/10.1080/09205063.2014.905030.

[30] Y.-X. Zhang, H. Hu, Y. Chen, H.-L. Cong, Y.-Q. Shen, B. Yu, Preparation and Evaluation
of Zwitterionic Polymer Coated Capillary Columns for Analysis of Proteins by Capillary
Electrophoresis, Integrated Ferroelectrics. 199 (2019) 77–84.
https://doi.org/10.1080/10584587.2019.1592600.

483 [31] C. Wang, C.A. Lucy, Oligomerized Phospholipid Bilayers as Semipermanent Coatings
484 in Capillary Electrophoresis, Anal. Chem. 77 (2005) 2015–2021.
485 https://doi.org/10.1021/ac0489622.

486 [32] W. Jiang, J.N. Awasum, K. Irgum, Control of Electroosmotic Flow and Wall
487 Interactions in Capillary Electrophosesis Capillaries by Photografted Zwitterionic Polymer
488 Surface Layers, Anal. Chem. 75 (2003) 2768–2774. https://doi.org/10.1021/ac020665e.

[33] E. Mansfield, E.E. Ross, C.A. Aspinwall, Preparation and Characterization of CrossLinked Phospholipid Bilayer Capillary Coatings for Protein Separations, Anal. Chem. 79
(2007) 3135–3141. https://doi.org/10.1021/ac0618829.

492 [34] L. Pei, C.A. Lucy, Polymerized phospholipid bilayers as permanent coatings for small
493 amine separations using mixed aqueous/organic capillary zone electrophoresis, Journal of
494 Chromatography A. 1267 (2012) 80–88. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chroma.2012.07.017.

[35] L. Dhellemmes, L. Leclercq, A. Höchsmann, C. Neusüß, J.-P. Biron, S. Roca, H. Cottet,
Critical parameters for highly efficient and reproducible polyelectrolyte multilayer coatings
for protein separation by capillary electrophoresis, Journal of Chromatography A. 1695
(2023) 463912. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chroma.2023.463912.

499 [36] https://echmet.natur.cuni.cz/, (n.d.).

[37] S. Roca, L. Leclercq, P. Gonzalez, L. Dhellemmes, L. Boiteau, G. Rydzek, H. Cottet, 500 501 Modifying last layer in polyelectrolyte multilayer coatings for capillary electrophoresis of 502 proteins, Journal of Chromatography Α. 1692 (2023) 463837. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chroma.2023.463837. 503

504 [38] L. Dhellemmes, M. Leitner, A. Höchsmann, L. Leclercq, C. Neusüß, M. Martin, A. 505 Ebner, H. Cottet, Dual contributions of analyte adsorption and electroosmotic 506 inhomogeneity to separation efficiency in capillary electrophoresis of proteins [Manuscript 507 to be submitted for publication], (n.d.).

[39] Y. Wang, P.L. Dubin, Capillary Modification by Noncovalent Polycation Adsorption:
Effects of Polymer Molecular Weight and Adsorption Ionic Strength, Anal. Chem. 71 (1999)
3463–3468. https://doi.org/10.1021/ac990146k.

511 [40] E. Córdova, J. Gao, G.M. Whitesides, Noncovalent Polycationic Coatings for 512 Capillaries in Capillary Electrophoresis of Proteins, Anal. Chem. 69 (1997) 1370–1379. 513 https://doi.org/10.1021/ac9604321.

[41] L. Pei, C.A. Lucy, Insight into the stability of poly(diallydimethylammoniumchloride)
and polybrene poly cationic coatings in capillary electrophoresis, J. Chromatogr. A. 1365
(2014) 226–233. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chroma.2014.09.013.

517 [42] R. Haselberg, F.M. Flesch, A. Boerke, G.W. Somsen, Thickness and morphology of 518 polyelectrolyte coatings on silica surfaces before and after protein exposure studied by Chim. 779 519 atomic force microscopy, Anal. Acta. (2013) 90–95. 520 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aca.2013.03.066.

[43] M. Lösche, J. Schmitt, G. Decher, W.G. Bouwman, K. Kjaer, Detailed Structure of
Molecularly Thin Polyelectrolyte Multilayer Films on Solid Substrates as Revealed by
Neutron Reflectometry, Macromolecules. 31 (1998) 8893–8906.
https://doi.org/10.1021/ma980910p.


525 [44] T. Nylander, Y. Samoshina, B. Lindman, Formation of polyelectrolyte–surfactant 526 complexes on surfaces, Advances in Colloid and Interface Science. 123–126 (2006) 105–123. 527 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cis.2006.07.005.

528

529

FIGURES

530



531

Figure 1. Structure of PLL derivatized with zwitterionic moieties. *i* = 1 to 3, designates the type of

533 zwitterion 1 to 3. j = 400 - k and k ranging from 32 - 396 indicate the composition of the randomly

derivatized PLL. The counterion chloride was exchanged against perchlorate.

535





Figure 2. Influence of PDADMAC MW 4.5 \times 10⁵ g/mol (**A**) and MW 1 \times 10⁵ g/mol (**B**) on the *H* vs u 537 representations for the separation of 5 model proteins on a 5-layer PDADMAC/PSS SMIL coating, 538 539 using PSS MW 7 ×10⁴ g/mol. Error bars are ± one SD on n = 5 repetitions. Experimental conditions: 5-540 layer SMIL coated capillary terminating with the polycation PDADMAC. Capillary: 40 cm (31.5 cm to the detector) x 50 µm I.D. BGE: 2 M acetic acid, pH 2.2. Flush before each run: BGE 1 bar, 5 min. 541 542 Hydrodynamic injection: 30 mbar, 4 s. Sample mixture: 0.2 g/L of each protein in BGE. Hydrodynamic co-injection of 0.001% v/v DMF in BGE: 30 mbar, 3 s. Temperature: 25°C. Applied voltages: -25 kV, -543 544 20 kV, -15 kV, -12.5 kV, -10 kV. For the coating procedure, see section 2.4. p and constant are calculated from average values of H and u over 5 runs for each voltage. Error is \pm one standard 545 546 deviation of values determined with the jackknife resampling method. For PDADMAC MW 4.5 \times 10⁵ 547 g/mol, CA: $p(10^{-3}s) = 1.94 \pm 0.28$, constant (μ m) = 2.32 ± 0.22; TI: : $p(10^{-3}s) = 2.35 \pm 0.13$, constant $(\mu m) = 4.69 \pm 0.12$; Myo: : $p(10^{-3}s) = 1.97 \pm 0.27$, constant (μm) = 2.02 ± 0.16; RNAse A: $p(10^{-3}s) = 1.97 \pm 0.27$, constant (μm) = 2.02 ± 0.16; RNAse A: $p(10^{-3}s) = 1.97 \pm 0.27$, constant (μm) = 2.02 ± 0.16; RNAse A: $p(10^{-3}s) = 1.97 \pm 0.27$, constant (μm) = 2.02 ± 0.16; RNAse A: $p(10^{-3}s) = 1.97 \pm 0.27$, constant (μm) = 2.02 ± 0.16; RNAse A: $p(10^{-3}s) = 1.97 \pm 0.27$, constant (μm) = 2.02 ± 0.16; RNAse A: $p(10^{-3}s) = 1.97 \pm 0.27$, constant (μm) = 2.02 ± 0.16; RNAse A: $p(10^{-3}s) = 1.97 \pm 0.27$, constant (μm) = 2.02 ± 0.16; RNAse A: $p(10^{-3}s) = 1.97 \pm 0.27$, constant (μm) = 2.02 ± 0.16; RNAse A: $p(10^{-3}s) = 1.97 \pm 0.27$, constant (μm) = 2.02 ± 0.16; RNAse A: $p(10^{-3}s) = 1.97 \pm 0.27$, constant (μm) = 2.02 ± 0.16; RNAse A: $p(10^{-3}s) = 1.97 \pm 0.27$, constant (μm) = 2.02 ± 0.16; RNAse A: $p(10^{-3}s) = 1.97 \pm 0.27$, constant (μm) = 2.02 ± 0.16; RNAse A: $p(10^{-3}s) = 1.97 \pm 0.27$, constant (μm) = 2.02 \pm 0.16; RNAse A: $p(10^{-3}s) = 1.97 \pm 0.27$, constant (μm) = 2.02 ± 0.16; RNAse A: $p(10^{-3}s) = 1.97 \pm 0.27$, constant (μm) = 2.02 ± 0.16; RNAse A: $p(10^{-3}s) = 1.97 \pm 0.27$, constant (μm) = 2.02 \pm 0.16; RNAse A: $p(10^{-3}s) = 1.97 \pm 0.27$, constant (μm) = 2.02 \pm 0.16; RNAse A: $p(10^{-3}s) = 1.97 \pm 0.27$, constant (μm) = 2.02 \pm 0.16; RNAse A: $p(10^{-3}s) = 1.97 \pm 0.27$, constant (μm) = 2.02 \pm 0.16; RNAse A: $p(10^{-3}s) = 1.97 \pm 0.27$, constant (μm) = 2.02 \pm 0.16; RNAse A: $p(10^{-3}s) = 1.97 \pm 0.27$, constant (μm) = 2.02 \pm 0.16; RNAse A: $p(10^{-3}s) = 1.97 \pm 0.27$, constant (μm) = 2.02 \pm 0.16; RNAse A: $p(10^{-3}s) = 1.97 \pm 0.27$, constant (μm) = 2.02 \pm 0.16; RNAse A: $p(10^{-3}s) = 1.97 \pm 0.27$, constant (μm) = 2.02 \pm 0.16; RNAse A: $p(10^{-3}s) = 1.97 \pm 0.27$, constant (μm) = 2.02 \pm 0.16; RNAse A: $p(10^{-3}s) = 1.97 \pm 0.27$, constant (μm) = 2.02 \pm 0.27 \pm 0.27, constant (μm) = 2.02 \pm 0.27 \pm 0.27, constant (μm) = 2.02 \pm 0.27 \pm 0.27 \pm 0.27 \pm 0.27 \pm 0.27, constant (μm) = 2.02 \pm 548 1.62 ± 0.07 , constant (µm) = 2.58 ± 0.04 ; Lyz: $p(10^{-3}s) = 1.72 \pm 0.13$, constant (µm) = 1.74 ± 0.06 . For 549 PDADMAC MW 1 \times 10⁵ g/mol, CA: $p(10^{-3}s) = 17.45 \pm 0.14$, constant (µm) = 3.12 \pm 0.13; TI: $p(10^{-3}s) =$ 550 13.32 ± 0.16 , constant (µm) = 3.63 ± 0.20 ; Myo: $p(10^{-3}s) = 17.89 \pm 0.64$, constant (µm) = 2.63 ± 0.47 ; 551 RNAse A: $p(10^{-3}s) = 16.71 \pm 0.56$, constant (µm) = 0.95 ± 0.46; Lyz: $p(10^{-3}s) = 13.37 \pm 0.93$, constant 552 $(\mu m) = 2.10 \pm 0.81.$ 553



554

Figure 3. Influence of PSS molar mass on the H vs u representations for CA on a 5-layer 555 PDADMAC/PSS SMIL coating, using PDADMAC MW 4.5 × 10⁵ g/mol. Experimental conditions as in 556 Fig. 2. *p* and *constant* are calculated from average values of *H* and *u* over 5 runs for each voltage. 557 Error is \pm one standard deviation of values determined with the jackknife resampling method. For 558 PSS MW 5 × 10³ g/mol: $p(10^{-3} \text{ s}) = 2.40 \pm 0.61$, constant (µm) = 1.79 ± 0.55; PSS MW 29 × 10³: $p(10^{-3} \text{ s}) = 2.40 \pm 0.61$, constant (µm) = 1.79 ± 0.55; PSS MW 29 × 10³: $p(10^{-3} \text{ s}) = 2.40 \pm 0.61$, constant (µm) = 1.79 ± 0.55; PSS MW 29 × 10³: $p(10^{-3} \text{ s}) = 2.40 \pm 0.61$, constant (µm) = 1.79 ± 0.55; PSS MW 29 × 10³: $p(10^{-3} \text{ s}) = 2.40 \pm 0.61$, constant (µm) = 1.79 ± 0.55; PSS MW 29 × 10³: $p(10^{-3} \text{ s}) = 2.40 \pm 0.61$, constant (µm) = 1.79 ± 0.55; PSS MW 29 × 10³: $p(10^{-3} \text{ s}) = 2.40 \pm 0.61$, constant (µm) = 1.79 ± 0.55; PSS MW 29 × 10³: $p(10^{-3} \text{ s}) = 2.40 \pm 0.61$, constant (µm) = 1.79 ± 0.55; PSS MW 29 × 10³: $p(10^{-3} \text{ s}) = 2.40 \pm 0.61$, constant (µm) = 1.79 ± 0.55; PSS MW 29 × 10³: $p(10^{-3} \text{ s}) = 2.40 \pm 0.61$, constant (µm) = 1.79 ± 0.55; PSS MW 29 × 10³: $p(10^{-3} \text{ s}) = 2.40 \pm 0.61$, constant (µm) = 1.79 \pm 0.55; PSS MW 29 × 10³: $p(10^{-3} \text{ s}) = 2.40 \pm 0.61$, constant (µm) = 1.79 \pm 0.55; PSS MW 29 × 10³: $p(10^{-3} \text{ s}) = 2.40 \pm 0.61$, constant (µm) = 1.79 \pm 0.55; PSS MW 29 × 10³: $p(10^{-3} \text{ s}) = 2.40 \pm 0.61$, constant (µm) = 1.79 \pm 0.55; PSS MW 29 × 10³: $p(10^{-3} \text{ s}) = 2.40 \pm 0.61$, constant (µm) = 1.79 \pm 0.55; PSS MW 29 × 10³: $p(10^{-3} \text{ s}) = 2.40 \pm 0.61$, constant (µm) = 1.79 \pm 0.55; PSS MW 29 × 10³: $p(10^{-3} \text{ s}) = 2.40 \pm 0.61$, constant (µm) = 1.79 \pm 0.55; PSS MW 29 × 10³: $p(10^{-3} \text{ s}) = 2.40 \pm 0.61$, constant (µm) = 1.79 \pm 0.55; PSS MW 29 × 10³: $p(10^{-3} \text{ s}) = 2.40 \pm 0.61$, constant (µm) = 1.79 \pm 0.55; PSS MW 29 × 10³: $p(10^{-3} \text{ s}) = 2.40 \pm 0.61$, constant (µm) = 1.79 \pm 0.55; PSS MW 29 × 10³: $p(10^{-3} \text{ s}) = 2.40 \pm 0.55; PSS MW 29 × 10³: <math>p(10^{-3} \text{ s}) = 2.40 \pm 0.55; PSS MW 29 × 10³: <math>p(10^{-3} \text{ s}) = 2.40 \pm 0.55; PSS MW 29 × 10³: <math>p(10^{-3} \text{ s}) = 2.40 \pm 0.55; PSS MW 29 × 10³: <math>p(10^{-3} \text{ s}) = 2.40 \pm 0.55; PSS MW 29 × 10³: <math>p(10^{-3} \text{ s}) = 2.40 \pm 0.50 \pm 0.55; PSS MW 29 × 10³: <math>p(10^{-3} \text{ s}) = 2.40 \pm 0.50 \pm 0.55; PSS MW 29 × 10³: <math>p($ 559 s) = 2.09 \pm 0.05, constant (µm) = 2.92 \pm 0.04; PSS MW 70 \times 10³ g/mol: p (10⁻³ s) = 1.94 \pm 0.28, 560 constant (μ m) = 2.32 ± 0.22; PSS MW 148 × 10³ g/mol: p (10⁻³ s) = 3.25 ± 0.79, constant (μ m) = 1.21 ± 561 0.78; PSS MW 330 × 10^3 g/mol: p (10^{-3} s) = 3.81 ± 1.47, constant (µm) = 0.53 ± 1.07. 562





Figure 4. Superposition of five successive series of separations of five model proteins on a 5-layer 565 566 PDADMAC/PSS SMIL coating (A) and a single layer PDADMAC coating (B). PDADMAC MW 4.5×10^5 g/mol and PSS MW 7 × 10^4 g/mol were used. *H vs u* curves shown for Myo. Error bars are ± one SD 567 568 on n = 5 repetitions. Experimental conditions as in Fig. 2. p and constant are calculated from average values of H and u over 5 runs for each voltage. Error is \pm one standard deviation of values 569 determined with the jackknife resampling method. For $(PDADMAC/PSS)_1$, CA: $p(10^{-3} s) = 2.38 \pm 0.56$, 570 constant (μ m) = 4.02 ± 0.42; TI: $p(10^{-3} s) = 2.85 \pm 0.28$, constant (μ m) = 6.35 ± 0.19; Myo: $p(10^{-3} s) =$ 571 1.55 ± 0.38, constant (μ m) = 3.95 ± 0.21; RNAse A: p (10⁻³ s) = 0.79 ± 0.14, constant (μ m) = 4.67 ± 572 0.14; Lyz: $p(10^{-3} \text{ s}) = 1.09 \pm 0.18$, constant (μ m) = 3.13 ± 0.12. For (PDADMAC/PSS)_{2.5}, CA: $p(10^{-3} \text{ s}) =$ 573 1.87 ± 0.32, constant (μ m) = 2.53 ± 0.26; TI: p (10⁻³ s) = 2.35 ± 0.13, constant (μ m) = 4.69 ± 0.12; 574 Myo: $p(10^{-3} \text{ s}) = 1.97 \pm 0.27$, constant (µm) = 2.02 ± 0.16; RNAse A: $p(10^{-3} \text{ s}) = 1.33 \pm 0.67$, constant 575 $(\mu m) = 2.83 \pm 0.57$; Lyz: $p(10^{-3} s) = 1.72 \pm 0.13$, constant $(\mu m) = 1.74 \pm 0.06$. 576



577

Figure 5. Influence of the number of layers and the use of PEI as the first layer on the *H vs u* representations for the separation of 5 model proteins on PDADMAC/PSS SMIL coatings, shown for CA. PDADMAC MW 4.5×10^5 g/mol and PSS MW 7×10^4 g/mol were used. Experimental conditions as in Fig. 2.






Figure 6. Influence of polyanion nature on the *H vs u* representations for the analysis of Lyz on monolayer and 5-layer SMIL coatings, using PDADMAC MW 4.5×10^5 g/mol (A) or PB (B) as the polycation. PSS MW 7×10^4 g/mol was used. Experimental conditions as in Fig. 2. Data for other proteins is shown in Table SI4.




Figure 7. Impact of zwitterionic last layer on EOF (**A**) and separation efficiency for CA (**B**). PDADMAC MW 4.5 × 10^5 g/mol and PSS MW 7 × 10^4 g/mol were used. Each coating is made of (PDADMAC/PSS)₂(polyzwitterion)₁. Experimental conditions: Capillary: 60 cm (51.5 cm to the detector) x 50 µm I.D. BGE: 2 M acetic acid, pH 2.2. Flush before each run: BGE 1 bar, 5 min. Hydrodynamic injection: 30 mbar, 6 s. Sample mixture: 0.2 g/L of each protein in BGE. Hydrodynamic co-injection of 0.001% v/v DMF in BGE: 30 mbar, 3 s. Temperature: 25°C. Applied voltages: -30 kV, -25 kV, -20 kV, -15 kV, -10 kV. For the coating procedure, see Section 2.4.

597

589

598

LIST OF CAPTIONS

600	Figure 1. Structure of PLL derivatized with zwitterionic moieties. $i = 1$ to 3, designates the
601	type of zwitterion 1 to 3. $j = 400 - k$ and k ranging from 32 - 396 indicate the composition of
602	the randomly derivatized PLL. The counterion chloride was exchanged against perchlorate.

Figure 2. Influence of PDADMAC MW 4.5 \times 10⁵ g/mol (**A**) and MW 1 \times 10⁵ g/mol (**B**) on the 603 *H vs u* representations for the separation of 5 model proteins on a 5-layer PDADMAC/PSS 604 SMIL coating, using PSS MW 7 $\times 10^4$ g/mol. Error bars are ± one SD on n = 5 repetitions. 605 Experimental conditions: 5-layer SMIL coated capillary terminating with the polycation 606 PDADMAC. Capillary: 40 cm (31.5 cm to the detector) x 50 µm I.D. BGE: 2 M acetic acid, pH 607 2.2. Flush before each run: BGE 1 bar, 5 min. Hydrodynamic injection: 30 mbar, 4 s. Sample 608 mixture: 0.2 g/L of each protein in BGE. Hydrodynamic co-injection of 0.001% v/v DMF in 609 BGE: 30 mbar, 3 s. Temperature: 25°C. Applied voltages: -25 kV, -20 kV, -15 kV, -12.5 kV, -10 610 kV. For the coating procedure, see section 2.4. p and constant are calculated from average 611 values of H and u over 5 runs for each voltage. Error is \pm one standard deviation of values 612 determined with the jackknife resampling method. For PDADMAC MW 4.5 \times 10⁵ g/mol, CA: 613 $p(10^{-3}s) = 1.94 \pm 0.28$, constant (µm) = 2.32 ± 0.22; TI: : $p(10^{-3}s) = 2.35 \pm 0.13$, constant (µm) 614 = 4.69 ± 0.12; Myo: : $p(10^{-3}s) = 1.97 \pm 0.27$, constant (µm) = 2.02 ± 0.16; RNAse A: $p(10^{-3}s) =$ 615 1.62 ± 0.07 , constant (µm) = 2.58 ± 0.04 ; Lyz: $p(10^{-3}s) = 1.72 \pm 0.13$, constant (µm) = 1.74 \pm 616 0.06. For PDADMAC MW 1 \times 10⁵ g/mol, CA: $p(10^{-3}s) = 17.45 \pm 0.14$, constant (µm) = 3.12 ± 617 0.13; TI: $p(10^{-3}s) = 13.32 \pm 0.16$, constant (µm) = 3.63 ± 0.20; Myo: $p(10^{-3}s) = 17.89 \pm 0.64$, 618 constant (μ m) = 2.63 ± 0.47; RNAse A: $p(10^{-3}s) = 16.71 \pm 0.56$, constant (μ m) = 0.95 ± 0.46; 619 Lyz: $p(10^{-3}s) = 13.37 \pm 0.93$, constant (µm) = 2.10 ± 0.81. 620

Figure 3. Influence of PSS molar mass on the H vs u representations for CA on a 5-layer 621 PDADMAC/PSS SMIL coating, using PDADMAC MW 4.5×10^5 g/mol. Experimental conditions 622 as in Fig. 2. p and constant are calculated from average values of H and u over 5 runs for 623 each voltage. Error is ± one standard deviation of values determined with the jackknife 624 resampling method. For PSS MW 5 × 10^3 g/mol: $p(10^{-3} s) = 2.40 \pm 0.61$, constant (µm) = 1.79 625 ± 0.55 ; PSS MW 29 $\times 10^{3}$: $p(10^{-3} \text{ s}) = 2.09 \pm 0.05$, constant (µm) = 2.92 ± 0.04 ; PSS MW 70 626 $\times 10^{3}$ g/mol: p (10⁻³ s) = 1.94 ± 0.28, constant (µm) = 2.32 ± 0.22; PSS MW 148 $\times 10^{3}$ g/mol: p 627 $(10^{-3} \text{ s}) = 3.25 \pm 0.79$, constant (µm) = 1.21 ± 0.78; PSS MW 330 × 10^{3} g/mol: p (10^{-3} s) = 3.81 628 \pm 1.47, constant (µm) = 0.53 \pm 1.07. 629

Figure 4. Superposition of five successive series of separations of five model proteins on a 5-630 layer PDADMAC/PSS SMIL coating (A) and a single layer PDADMAC coating (B). PDADMAC 631 MW 4.5 × 10^5 g/mol and PSS MW 7 × 10^4 g/mol were used. *H vs u* curves shown for Myo. 632 Error bars are \pm one SD on n = 5 repetitions. Experimental conditions as in Fig. 2. p and 633 constant are calculated from average values of H and u over 5 runs for each voltage. Error is 634 \pm one standard deviation of values determined with the jackknife resampling method. For 635 $(PDADMAC/PSS)_1$, CA: $p(10^{-3} s) = 2.38 \pm 0.56$, constant (µm) = 4.02 ± 0.42; TI: $p(10^{-3} s) =$ 636 2.85 ± 0.28, constant (μ m) = 6.35 ± 0.19; Myo: p (10⁻³ s) = 1.55 ± 0.38, constant (μ m) = 3.95 ± 637 0.21; RNAse A: $p(10^{-3} \text{ s}) = 0.79 \pm 0.14$, constant (μ m) = 4.67 \pm 0.14; Lyz: $p(10^{-3} \text{ s}) = 1.09 \pm$ 638 0.18, constant (μ m) = 3.13 ± 0.12. For (PDADMAC/PSS)_{2.5}, CA: p (10⁻³ s) = 1.87 ± 0.32, 639 *constant* (μ m) = 2.53 ± 0.26; TI: *p* (10⁻³ s) = 2.35 ± 0.13, *constant* (μ m) = 4.69 ± 0.12; Myo: *p* 640 $(10^{-3} \text{ s}) = 1.97 \pm 0.27$, constant (µm) = 2.02 ± 0.16; RNAse A: $p(10^{-3} \text{ s}) = 1.33 \pm 0.67$, constant 641 $(\mu m) = 2.83 \pm 0.57$; Lyz: $p(10^{-3} s) = 1.72 \pm 0.13$, constant $(\mu m) = 1.74 \pm 0.06$. 642

Figure 5. Influence of the number of layers and the use of PEI as the first layer on the *H vs u* representations for the separation of 5 model proteins on PDADMAC/PSS SMIL coatings, shown for CA. PDADMAC MW 4.5×10^5 g/mol and PSS MW 7 $\times 10^4$ g/mol were used. Experimental conditions as in Fig. 2. Figure 6. Influence of polyanion nature on the *H vs u* representations for the analysis of Lyz on monolayer and 5-layer SMIL coatings, using PDADMAC MW 4.5×10^5 (A) or PB (B) as the polycation. PSS MW 7×10^4 g/mol was used. Experimental conditions as in Fig. 2. Data for other proteins is shown in Table SI4.

651 Figure 7. Impact of zwitterionic last layer on EOF (A) and separation efficiency for CA (B). PDADMAC MW 4.5 \times 10⁵ g/mol and PSS MW 7 \times 10⁴ g/mol were used. Each coating is made 652 of (PDADMAC/PSS)₂(polyzwitterion)₁. Experimental conditions: Capillary: 60 cm (51.5 cm to 653 the detector) x 50 μ m I.D. BGE: 2 M acetic acid, pH 2.2. Flush before each run: BGE 1 bar, 5 654 min. Hydrodynamic injection: 30 mbar, 6 s. Sample mixture: 0.2 g/L of each protein in BGE. 655 Hydrodynamic co-injection of 0.001% v/v DMF in BGE: 30 mbar, 3 s. Temperature: 25°C. 656 Applied voltages: -30 kV, -25 kV, -20 kV, -15 kV, -10 kV. For the coating procedure, see 657 Section 2.4. 658