Syracuse University **[SURFACE](https://surface.syr.edu/)**

[Chemistry - Faculty Scholarship](https://surface.syr.edu/che) Chemistry - Faculty Scholarship College of Arts and Sciences

4-25-2009

Accelerated Oxidation of Epinephrine by Silica Nanoparticles

Zhimin Tao Syracuse University

Gang Wang Syracuse University

Jerry Goodisman Syracuse University

Tewodros Asefa Syracuse University

Follow this and additional works at: [https://surface.syr.edu/che](https://surface.syr.edu/che?utm_source=surface.syr.edu%2Fche%2F36&utm_medium=PDF&utm_campaign=PDFCoverPages)

Part of the Chemistry Commons

Recommended Citation

Tao, Zhimin; Wang, Gang; Goodisman, Jerry; and Asefa, Tewodros, "Accelerated Oxidation of Epinephrine by Silica Nanoparticles" (2009). Chemistry - Faculty Scholarship. 36. [https://surface.syr.edu/che/36](https://surface.syr.edu/che/36?utm_source=surface.syr.edu%2Fche%2F36&utm_medium=PDF&utm_campaign=PDFCoverPages)

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the College of Arts and Sciences at SURFACE. It has been accepted for inclusion in Chemistry - Faculty Scholarship by an authorized administrator of SURFACE. For more information, please contact surface@syr.edu.

pubs.acs.org/Langmuir © 2009 American Chemical Society

Accelerated Oxidation of Epinephrine by Silica Nanoparticles

Zhimin Tao, Gang Wang, Jerry Goodisman, and Tewodros Asefa*

Department of Chemistry, Syracuse University, 111 College Place, Syracuse, New York 13244

Received March 19, 2009. Revised Manuscript Received April 25, 2009

We have measured the influence of mesoporous silica (MCM-41 and SBA-15) nanoparticles and dense silica nanoparticles on epinephrine oxidation, a pH-dependent reaction, whose rate is small in acidic or neutral solutions but much greater at higher pH. The reaction was measured by monitoring adrenochrome at 480 nm, the product of epinephrine oxidation. In distilled water (dH₂O) with no particles present, the oxidation of epinephrine occurs slowly but more rapidly at higher pH. The presence of MCM-41 or silica spheres does not accelerate the oxidation, but SBA-15 does, showing that the difference in the structures of nanomaterials leads to differing effects on the epinephrine oxidative process. In phosphate buffered saline (PBS, pH = 7.4), epinephrine undergoes a much quicker oxidation, and, in this case, the presence of SBA-15 and MCM-41 makes it even more rapid. Silica spheres have no noticeable influence on the oxidation in PBS or in dH_2O . The possibility that the catalytic effect of mesoporous silica nanoparticles (MSN) could result from the residue of templating chemicals, however, can be excluded due to the postsynthesis calcinations. Experiments with dithionite, added either earlier than or at the same time as the epinephrine addition, show that fast oxidation takes place only when dithionite and epinephrine are simultaneously added into **PRS** solution. This confirms a vital role of oxygen radicals (probably \cdot O₂) in the oxidation of epinephrine. These PBS solution. This confirms a vital role of oxygen radicals (probably \cdot O₂) in the oxidation of epinephrine. These
oxygen radicals are likely to form and accumulate within the phosphate buffer or in the presence of MS the three kinds of silica nanoparticles applied, we note that mesoporous SBA-15 and MCM-41 materials own much larger surface area than solid silica particles do, whereas MCM-41 possesses a much narrower pore size (0.4-fold) than SBA-15. It seems, therefore, that large surface area, characteristic mesoporosity, and surface structures aid in the deposit of oxygen radicals inside MSN particles which catalyze the enjoephrine oxidation in a favorable phosphate of oxygen radicals inside $\frac{1}{k}$ particles, which catalyze the epinephrical phosphate ph

Introduction

A family of biogenic amines, catecholamines take major mals when sensing unexpected stimuli from either external or internal environment.^{1,2} Chemically, cate cholamines are a group of hormones, biosynthesized from tyrosine and phenylalanine via hydroxylation to produce, among others, dopamine, norepinephrine, and epinephrine.³ All these hormones contain catechol and amine moieties as implied in the name. Among them, epinephrine (also known as adrenalin) is the most potent agonist to adrenergic receptors in a variety of cells.⁴⁻⁷ Once bound to a
cell enjoyphing transmits peuronal signals to G-protein coupled cell, epinephrine transmits neuronal signals to G-protein coupled intracellular enzymatic reactions. As a consequence, a large number of cyclic adenosine monophosphates are produced to activate glycogen phosphorylases, which further accelerate glycogenolysis and liberate glucoses into the bloodstream.⁵⁻⁷ This
sudden burst of energy finally stimulates the body to make a sudden burst of energy finally stimulates the body to make a spontaneous decision—to fight or flight.

A continual alternation of stress and depression, which accu- $\frac{1}{1}$ dates a high level of eninenhrine puts our lives at high risks of mulates σ is equivalently depined on the σ

tumorigenesis and cardiac dysfunction.^{8,9} Besides, a recent find-
ing suggested that this hormone could sabotage cancer treatment by inactivating the pro-apoptotic proteins.¹⁰ Thus, the regulation of epinephrine production in order to either sustain a normal physical condition or reinforce cancer therapy becomes demanding as well as challenging.

The mission of epinephrine as a neurotransmitter can be aborted due to its oxidation. However, under physiological conditions ($pH = 7.4$), the autoxidation of epinephrine proceeds very slowly, although its rate can be escalated by an increase in nH. The oxidation produces O_o and H_oO_o as intermediates $\frac{1}{2}$ and adrenochrome at the end $\frac{11}{2}$ - W ith superoxides present epinephrine oxidation involves a cyclization of the quinone moiety.¹³ This step promotes the formation of more reactive oxygen species and appears more dominant at higher pH. 13 It is oxygen species and appears more dominant at nigher pH. 11 is
well-known that Ω_2 reacts with H.O. at neutral or basic nH to well-known that \cdot O₂ reacts with H₂O₂ at neutral or basic pH to give \cdot OH (+ O₂ + OH⁻), which may be the active species in enjugarhering oxidation 14 (In acid solutions \cdot O₂ becomes HO₂. epinephrine oxidation. (In acid solutions, \cdot O₂ becomes HO₂ \cdot ,
which reacts with H₂O₂ to give \cdot OH + O₂ + H₂O 14 Many epinephrine oxidation.¹⁴ (In acid solutions, $\cdot O_2$ ⁻ becomes HO₂ \cdot , which reacts with H_2O_2 to give \cdot OH + O₂ + H₂O.)¹ Many
enzymes notably catechol oxidase and amine oxidase are known enzymes, notably catechol oxidase and amine oxidase, are known

^{*}Corresponding author. E-mail: tasefa@syr.edu (T.A.); Tel: 1-315-443-

⁽¹⁾ Lodish, H.; Berk, A.; Zipursky, L; Matsudaira, P.; Baltimore, D.; Darnell, J. $\text{Molecular Cell Biology}, \text{4th ed.}; \text{W. H. Freeman Press: New York}, \text{1999}.$
(2) Eichelman, B. S. Annu, Rev. Med. 1990, 41–149–158

⁽²⁾ Eichelman, B. S. Annu. Rev. Med. ¹⁹⁹⁰, ⁴¹, 149–158.

⁽³⁾ Blaschko, H. Br. Med. Bull. ¹⁹⁷³, ²⁹, 105–109.

⁽⁴⁾ Furchgott, R. F. Pharmacol, Rev. ¹⁹⁵⁹, ¹¹, 429–441.

⁽⁵⁾ Rizza, R. A.; Cryer, P. E.; Haymond, M. W.; Gerich, J. E. J. Clin. Invest
1980 65 682-689 **1980**, 65, 682–689.
(6) Minneman, K. P.; Pittman, R. N.; Molinoff, P. B. *Annu. Rev. Neurosci.* **1981**,
4 419–461

⁴, 419–461.

E.; McDonald, P. G.; Stefanek, M.; Sood, A. K. *Nat. Rev. Cancer* 2006, 6, 240–248.
(9) Tang, W.; Weil, M. H.; Sun, S.; Noc, M.; Yang, L.; Gazmuri, R. J.
Circulation 1995, 92, 3089–3093.

Circulation 1995, 92, 3089-3093.

(10) Sastry, K. S.; Karpova, Y.; Prokopovich, S.; Smith, A. J.; Essau, B.; Gersappe, A.; Carson, J. P.; Weber, M. J.; Register, T. C.; Chen, Y. Q.; Penn, R. B.; Kulik, G. J. Biol. Chem. 2007, 282, 14094-14100.

Kulik, G. *J. Biol. Chem.* **2007**, 282, 14094–14100.
(11) Misra, H. P.; Fridovich, I. *J. Biol. Chem.* 1972, 247, 3170–3175.
(12) Babior, B. M.: Kinnes, B. S. *Rhod* 1976, 47, 461–471

⁽¹²⁾ Babior, B. M.; Kipnes, R. S. Blood ¹⁹⁷⁶, ⁴⁷, 461–471.

⁽¹³⁾ Alhasan, R.; Njus, D. Anal. Biochem. 2008, 381, 142-147. (14) Ross, A. B.; Mallard, W. G.; Heiman, W. P.; Buxton, G. V.; Hule, R. E.; Neta, P. *NDRL-NIST Solution Kinetics Database, version 3.0*, 1998, Notre Dame
Radiation Laboratory and National Institute of Standards and Technology Radiation Laboratory and National Institute of Standards and Technology, Gaithersburg, MD.

organic and inorganic compounds and materials.^{15,16}
Mesonorous silica nanoparticles (MSN) are a group of nano-

Mesoporous silica nanoparticles (MSN) are a group of nano-
sized spherical or rod-like silica particles with different porous structures, varying in their pore volume, wall thickness, and surface area. Their unique mesopores with large internal space make these nanomaterials widely applicable to catalysis, biosensing, and, in particular, drug delivery.¹⁷⁻²⁰ We report here the accelerated oxidation of enjugaching in the presence of two MSN. accelerated oxidation of epinephrine in the presence of two MSN, SBA-15 and MCM-41. In order to emphasize the effect of mesoporous structure on the oxidative reaction, silica microspheres (SMS) were also tested in this study as a control. $s_{\rm F}$ such the study as a control.

Experimental Section

Materials and Methods. Epinephrine was purchased from Sigma-Aldrich (St. Louis, MO). Cetyltrimethylammonium bromide (CTAB), tetraethylorthosilicate (TEOS), and poly(ethylene mide)-block-poly(butylene oxide)-block-poly(ethylene oxide)-
(P123 EO₂₈PO₂₈EO₂₉) were obtained from Sigma-Aldrich So-(P123, $EO_{20}PO_{70}EO_{20}$) were obtained from Sigma-Aldrich. So-
dium dithionite (MW 174.11) was purchased from Fluka, UK. Working solutions (1.0 M) were freshly made in distilled water (dH₂O) under argon shield. Phosphate-buffered salt solution ($1 \times$ PBS, without Mg^{2+} and Ca^{2+} , pH = 7.4) was purchased from Mediatech (Herndon, VA). When studying the pH effect on epinephrine oxidation, all water solutions with different pH values were first prepared $2\times$ higher in [H⁺] (by making different NaOH or HCl solutions) and then immediately mixed with the equal amount of 250 μ M epinephrine at time zero. The same mixture with no addition of epinephrine was tested to confirm the mixture with no addition of epinephrine was tested to confirm the

Synthesis of Mesoporous Silica Nanomaterials. MCM-41
and SBA-15 type mesoporous silica nanospheres (MSN) were synthesized by supramolecular self-assembly.²¹⁻²⁴ SBA-15 was
synthesized as reported by using P123 in acidic solution as a synthesized as reported by using P123 in acidic solution as a template.^{21,22} Typically, a solution of $EO_{20}PO_{70}EO_{20}/2 M HCl/$ tetraethoxysilane $(TEOS)/H_2O = 2.60:4.25:15$ (mass ratio) was stirred at 40 °C for 20 h and then aged at 80 °C for another 24 h. The solution was then filtered and the solid was washed with 24 h. The solution was then filtered, and the solid was washed with a large amount of water resulting in "as-synthesized" SBA-15. The synthesis of MCM-41 was done by following a reported procedure with minor modification.^{23,24} 4.0 g (1.1 mmol) CTAB
was dissolved in 960 mL of Millipore water and then mixed was dissolved in 960 mL of Millipore water and then mixed with 14 mL of 2.0 M NaOH solution. The solution was moderately stirred at 80 °C for 30 min; stirring was followed by the addition of 22.6 mL (101.2 mmol) TEOS. After stirring for another 2 h at 80 °C, the solution was filtered and the precipitate was rinsed with Millipore water $(4 \times 80 \text{ mL})$ followed precipitate was rinsed with Millipore water (4×80 mL), followed
by rinsing with ethanol (4×80 mL) and drying in the oven at by rinsing with ethanol (4 \times 80 mL) and drying in the oven at 80 °C. For both SBA and MCM materials, the as-synthesized samples were calcined to remove the template at 600 °C for 6 h samples were calcined, to remove the template, at $600 \degree C$ for 6 h with a heating ramp of 1 °C/min, followed by a cooling ramp of $2 °C/min$.

- Iwado, A.; Chikuma, M.; Saito, Y. Catal. Commun. 2007, 9, 224–228.
(16) Ryan T. P.; Miller D. M.; Aust S. D. *J. Biochem. Toxical* 2006, 8, 33–39.
- (16) Ryan, T. P.; Miller, D. M.; Aust, S. D. J. Biochem. Toxicol. ²⁰⁰⁶, ⁸, 33–39. (17) De, M.; Ghosh, P. S.; Rotello, V. M. Adv. Mater. ²⁰⁰⁸, ²⁰, 1–17.
- (18) Slowing, I. I.; Trewyn, B. G.; Giri, S.; Lin, V. S.-Y. Adv. Funct. Mater. ²⁰⁰⁷, ¹⁷, 1225–1236.
- (19) Trewyn, B. G.; Giri, S.; Slowing, I.; Lin, V. S.-Y. Chem. Commun. ²⁰⁰⁷,
- (20) Vallet-Regi, M.; Balas, F.; Arcos, D. Angew. Chem., Int. Ed. 2007, 46, 7548–
- (21) Zhao, D.; Feng, J.; Huo, Q.; Melosh, N.; Fredrickson, G. H.; Chmelka, B.
F.; Stucky, G. D. *Science* 1998, 279, 548–552.
(22) Zhao, D. Y. Huo, O. S. Feng, J. J.: Chmelka, B. F. Stucky, G. D. *J. Am*
- (22) Zhao, D. Y.; Huo, Q. S.; Feng, J. L.; Chmelka, B. F.; Stucky, G. D. J. Am. Chem. Soc. 1998, 120, 6024–6036.
(23) Kresge, C. T.; Leonowicz, M. E.; Roth, W. J.; Vartuli, J. C.; Beck, J. S.
- (24) Huh S: Wiench J. W.: Yoo J. C.: Pruski, M.: Lin, V. S., Y. Chem. Mater.

Figure 1. Transmission electron micrographs of (A) calcined MCM-41, (B) calcined SBA-15, and (C) silica nanospheres.

Synthesis of Dense Silica Nanomaterials. Dense silica Stöber method.²⁵⁻²⁷ Typically, 5.84 g of TEOS was added to 10 mL of 5 M ammonia solution (30 wt %) in a mixture of 10 mL of 5 M ammonia solution ($30 \text{ wt } \%$) in a mixture of 50 mL ethanol and 3.6 g Millipore water under stirring to allow the hydrolysis of TEOS. After stirring for 12 h, a colloidal solution of silica spheres was obtained. The solution was centrifuged at 6500 rpm for 5 min and the supernatant was dumped. The precipitate was then redispersed in a mixture of 20 mL Millipore water and 20 mL ethanol. The centrifugation and redispersing process was repeated several times to remove any unreacted chemicals. The rerepeated several times to remove any anti-cover entertains the resulting silica microspheres were dried before further modification.

Results and Discussion

Synthesis and Characterizations of Nanoparticles. The synthesis of MCM-41 or SBA-15 was achieved by following the procedures reported in refs $21-24$. The synthesis was followed by calcinations to remove the template leading to the formation of calcinations to remove the template, leading to the formation of ordered mesoporous silica nanoparticles (MSN). The transmission electron microscopy (TEM) images (Figure $1A$, B) show that the MCM-41 nanomaterials are rather regular spherical nanoparticles of ∼600 nm diameter, while the SBA-15 materials are irregularly shaped particles of various sizes. These two kinds are irregularly shaped particles of various sizes. These two kinds measurements, and both showed type IV isotherms with steep capillary condensation steps (Supporting Information Figure S1), confirming the presence of particles with highly uniform mesopores. For MCM-41, measured BET surface area was $1143 \text{ m}^2/\text{g}$. pores. For MCM-41, measured BET surface area was 1143 m /g.
Porosity by the Barrett-Joyner-Halenda (BJH) method exhibits
average pore diameter of 28.4 Å and cumulative pore volume of average pore diameter of 20.4 A and cumulative pore volume of $0.91 \text{ cm}^3/\text{s}$. For SRA-15 nanomaterials, the measured surface area 0.91 cm
is 883 m is 883 m²/g, the average pore width is 63.8 Å, and the cumulative
pore volume is 1.10 cm³/g. These results are summarized in pore volume is 1.10 cm³/g. These results are summarized in pore volume is 1.10 cm⁻/g. These results are summarized in
Supporting Information Table S1. Thus compared to SRA-15 MCM-41 has a bigger surface area but smaller pore volume and width. Spherical silica nanoparticles were synthesized by following the procedure stated in the Experimental Section. After adjustment of ammonia concentrations, it produced quite symmetrical silica spheres with a diameter of \sim 300 nm (Figure 1C). metrical silica spheres with a diameter of ∼300 nm (Figure 1C).
The nitrogen physisorption measurement detected a surface area $T_{\rm c}$ nitrogen physisorption measurement detected a surface as surface as surface as surface as surface as surface areas of $T_{\rm c}$

(26) Shi, Y.-L.; Asefa, T. Langmuir ²⁰⁰⁷, ²³, 9455–9462.

⁽²⁴⁾ Huh, S.; Wiench, J. W.; Yoo, J. C.; Pruski, M.; Lin, V. S.-Y Chem. Mater. ²⁰⁰³, ¹⁵, 4247–4256.

⁽²⁵⁾ Stöber, W; Fink, A.; Bohn, E. J. Colloid Interface Sci. 1968, 26, 62-69.

⁽²⁷⁾ Asefa, T.; Shi, Y.-L. J. Mater. Chem. ²⁰⁰⁸, ¹⁸, 5604–5614.

Figure 2. (A) UV absorption spectrum for epinephrine for concentrations of $20-240 \mu M$. (B) Band intensities for epinephrine as functions of epinephrine concentration with fits. $\bullet = 195-205$ nm, \blacksquare = 210-290 nm, \blacktriangle = 270-290 nm. Linear fits are given for the first two, whereas the third is fit to two intersecting lines.

of 11 m /g. Such a small value reflects the nonporosity of SMS
nanoparticles, corroborating their solid-cored structure

UV-vis Spectra of Epinephrine. We first investigate the
spectra of epinephrine in solutions using $I.V-vis$ spectrophotospectra of epinephrine in solutions, using UV-vis spectrophotometry. Different concentrations of epinephrine (20–240 μ M) in dH₂O were freshly prepared and immediately scanned at wavelengths from 800 to 200 nm. Results are shown in Figure 2A. In each spectrum, two absorbance peaks can be observed, one at \sim 200 nm and the other at \sim 280 nm. In addition, one absorbance ∼200 nm and the other at ∼280 nm. In addition, one absorbance shoulder was evident, in the wavelength region 210-230 nm. All the spectra are concentration-dependent, showing stronger intensity resulting from higher concentration of epinephrine. However, changing concentration also produces a small shift in the wavelength of the absorbance peak. Because of the shift of the peak, we report here integrated absorbance over a band, i.e., the sum of intensities for a number of wavelengths, in lieu of the absorbance at a single wavelength. In Figure 2B, the summed intensities for $195-205$ nm (11 intensities), $210-230$ nm
(21 intensities) and $270-290$ nm (21 intensities) are plotted as (21 intensities), and $270-290$ nm (21 intensities) are plotted as functions of epinephrine concentration.

For the $195-205$ nm band, the sum of intensities (diamonds) first increases with addition of epinephrine, but then apparently reaches a plateau. The plateau is associated with an instrumental limitation. We therefore fit the sum of intensities covering $195-205$ pm into a two-line function of lepinephrine \int (e.g. EPD). See associated with σ 205 nm into a two-line function of [epinephrine] (i.e., [EP]): $S_{195-205}$ (the sum of intensities) = 0.250 [EP] (for [EP] \langle 129.6 μ M) and $S_{195-205} = 32.4$ (for [EP] $\geq 129.6 \,\mu$ M). Only the slope of the first line is used in later measurements. For the 210-230 nm and $270-290$ nm bands (squares and triangles), the integrated intensities increased with $[EP]$ over the entire concentration range. The fitting of the sum of intensities for each individual band vs [EP] into a linear function passing through zero gives: for the $\frac{210-230 \text{ nm}}{270-290 \text{ nm}}$ band, $S_{210-230} = 0.121$ [EP] $(r^2 = 0.979)$; and for the $270-290 \text{ nm}$ band, $S_{\text{max}} = 0.044$ [EP] $(r^2 = 0.983)$. Therefore 210–230 nm band, $S_{210-230} = 0.121$ [EP] $(r^2 = 0.979)$; and for the 270–290 nm band, $S_{270-290} = 0.044$ [EP] $(r^2 = 0.983)$. Therefore,

Scheme 1. Mechanism of Epinephrine Oxidation, Undergoing the Sequential Loss of One Electron to Generate Adrenchrome as the Final Product^{13,31}

except for the instrumental limitation, the integrated intensities
for each band demonstrated proportionality to [EP]. Since the ratio of any two of the three variables $(S_{195-205}, S_{210-230},$ and S_{tree} are any tremains unchanged these three absorbances very likely $S_{270-290}$) remains unchanged, these three absorbances very likely result from the same epinephrine species, which prevails in the freshly made epinephrine solutions.

pH-Dependent Oxidation Rate of Epinephrine. Extensive
studies on transient free radical forms of catecholamines have studies on transient free radical forms of catecholamines have enabled a good understanding of in situ oxidation of epinephrine to adrenochrome through a sequential one-electron loss, although it is possible that other intermediate steps also exist.^{11-13,28-30}
Scheme-1 illustrates, the oxidative process of enjugarhetine Scheme 1 illustrates the oxidative process of epinephrine
to produce adrenchrome. Instead of reacting directly with O_2 dissolved in solutions, epinephrine is much more liable to be oxidized by the hydroxyl radical $(\cdot$ OH, a product of the reaction oxidized by the hydroxyl radical (\cdot OH, a product of the reaction
of O₂⁻ and H₂O₂) to form *o*-semiquinone radical.¹¹⁻¹⁶ Under
neutral or acidic conditions, the production of O₂⁻ and so- $\frac{1}{2}$ and $\frac{1}{2}$ of them commutation changes $\frac{1}{2}$ generated \cdot OH is very low, which results in a very slow oxidation
of eninenhrine. Conversely, in alkaline solutions, active Ω -C can $\frac{1}{2}$ Conversely in alkaline solutions, active Ω_0 can be formed quickly, followed by its quick reduction to H_1 . that further reacts with Ω ⁻ to produce Ω . Moreover as the further reacts with O_2 to produce O/H . Moreover, as the original product adrenochromes are unstable in alkali medium due to their easy reaction with OH^- . These processes add up to a
ranid oxidation of eninenhrine at elevated nH . It has been rapid oxidation of epinephrine at elevated pH. It has been reported that the rate of epinephrine oxidation at $pH = 8$ is almost four times higher than that at $pH = 4^{31}$.
We thus examine the pH effect on the oxidation rates of

We thus examine the pH effect on the oxidation rates of epinephrine, by monitoring the absorbance of the generated adrenochrome at 480 nm over time.^{13,32} A series of 125 μ M
solutions of enjugative in dH-Q with different pH (pH = 1-12) solutions of epinephrine in dH₂O with different pH (pH = $1-12$) was prepared. The pH was adjusted by additions of either HCl or NaOH. Absorbance readings were taken every 5 s for 30 min, and the results are shown in Figure 3. At acidic conditions, the production of adrenochrome is minimal (Figure 3A,B). The gradual decrease in intensity, which appears similar in most of these conditions, may be due to the drift in the instrument. However, the decrease over the first few minutes likely represents. an induction time, required for the formation of \cdot OH to oxidize an induction time, required for the formation of \cdot OH to oxidize
the eninephrine. For a quantitative measure of the eninephrine oxidation, we obtain linear fits to only the data for $t \ge 200$ s. oxidation, we obtain linear fits to only the data for $t \ge 200$ s.
This gives the slopes $(\times 10^{-7} \text{ s}^{-1})$; $-3.12 + 0.07 \text{ (}r^2 = 0.85)$ This gives the slopes $(\times 10^{-7} \text{ s}^{-1})$: -3.12 ± 0.07 ($r^2 = 0.85$), -4.85 ± 0.11 ($r^2 = 0.87$), 0.37 ± 0.08 ($r^2 = 0.07$), -0.88 ± 0.07

⁽²⁸⁾ Borg, D. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. ¹⁹⁶⁵, ⁵³, 829–836.

⁽²⁹⁾ Ball, E. G.; Chen, T.-T. J. Biol. Chem. 1933, 102, 691-719.
(30) Adak, S.; Bandyopadhyay, U.; Bandyopadhyay, D.; Banerjee, R. K.

 $Biochemistry$ 1998, 37, 16922–1693.

(31) Parnass S. M.; Banghman, V. L.; Miletich D. J.; Albrecht, R. F. (31) Parnass, S. M.; Baughman, V. L.; Miletich, D. J.; Albrecht, R. F. Anesthesiology ¹⁹⁸⁷, ⁶⁷, A280.

⁽³²⁾ Heacock, R. A. Chem. Rev. ¹⁹⁵⁹, ⁵⁹, 181–237.

Figure 3. Absorbance of adrenochrome (product of epinephrine oxidation) at 480 nm as a function of time. The different plots correspond to different pH of the original epinephrine solutions. The slopes of the plots give the rate of epinephrine oxidation. (A) \circ = pH 1, \triangle = pH 2, ∇ = pH 3, \blacklozenge = pH 4, \blacklozenge = pH 5, \Box = pH 6; $(B) \Box = pH 6, \triangle = pH 7, \nabla = pH 8, \nabla = pH 9; (C) \nabla = pH 9, \blacksquare =$ $pH 10. \Delta = pH 11. \blacklozenge = pH 12.$ \mathbf{r} 1, \mathbf{r} \mathbf{r}

 $(r^2 = 0.36)$, -0.13 ± 0.09 $(r^2 = 0.01)$, and 3.65 ± 0.13 $(r$
for solutions at $nH = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5$, and 6, respectively for solutions at pH = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6, respectively. At pH = $f = 10$ (Figure 3B,C), the absorbance at 480 nm first declines a little
hit, but then increases linearly with time. (Note the difference in bit, but then increases linearly with time. (Note the difference in scale between Figures 3A,B,C). As before, the initial drop could secale between Figures 3.3.3.3.
Be due to an induction time required to generate active oxygen be due to an induction time required to generate an induction g

 r^2 values are all greater than 0.98); in all cases, the bottom of the V was at \sim 220 s, suggesting that a certain fixed time is required for the fast oxidization of epinephrine to begin under these neutral or weakly alkaline conditions. The slopes after the minimum, when [adrenochrome] increases linearly with time, were $(\times 10^{-6} \text{ s}^{-1})$
1.20, 3.68, 3.51, and 2.53 for the solutions of $nH = 7, 8, 9$, and 10. 1.20, 3.68, 3.51, and 2.53 for the solutions of $pH = 7, 8, 9$, and 10, representing an order-of-magnitude increase in rate over the slopes at non-acidic conditions.

In solution with $pH = 11$ (Figure 3C), the production of adrenochrome drops off initially and then quickly increases, showing the rapid oxidization of epinephrine. Later, it declines again, probably due to the instability of high concentrations of adrenochrome in this solution. Further evidence for the destruction of adrenochrome is the shape of the plot for pH 11. Excluding the first decreasing part before oxidation occurs, we fit the increasing part of the data to a cubic, i.e., [Intensity] = $(-9.6 \times 10^{-9}y^2 + (2.2 \times 10^{-5}y - 3.4 \times 10^{-3} (75 < t < 1030 \text{ s})^2 = 0.991$ 10^{-9} $t^2 + (2.2 \times 10^{-5})t - 3.4 \times 10^{-3}$ $(75 \le t \le 1030 \text{ s}, t$
The rate of adrenochrome production is then equal The rate of adrenochrome production is then equal to $(2.2 \times$ The rate of adrenochrome production is then equal to (2.2 \times 10⁻⁵ – 1.9 \times 10⁻⁸ t) s⁻¹, much higher than those at smaller pH. At nH = 12 the oxidation of enjnephrine starts immediately. After a $pH = 12$, the oxidation of epinephrine starts immediately. After a sharp increase, the production of adrenochrome slows down abruptly, so that the concentration almost levels off. By fitting these data to a two-line function, we get the slope for the rapid oxidation 3.3×10^{-5} and the slope for the slow one 9.9 \times
 10^{-7} (overall r^2 value = 0.95). The apparent "slow oxidation" 10^{-7} (overall r^2 value = 0.95). The apparent "slow oxidation" is really a net rate of production of adrenochrome, i.e., its rate of production minus that of destruction. These results show that the oxidation of epinephrine is highly pH-dependent, and the rate of adrenochrome production is clearly higher at higher pH. It is worth noting that the mathematical fitting we have conducted helps to quantitatively interpret oxidation profiles of epinephrine under various conditions. In particular, the slope calculated from each fitting represents the oxidation rate of epinephrine and makes the comparisons between different catalysts easier.

Effect of Silica Nanoparticles on Epinephrine Oxidation. In the following experiments, we measure the rates of epinephrine oxidation in dH_2O with or without silica nanoparticles. 10 mg/mL SBA-15, MCM-41, or silica spheres were individually dispersed in $dH₂O$ and sonicated until well-suspended. Each suspension was then centrifuged, and the resulting supernatant was mixed with 125 μM freshly prepared epinephrine solution and instantly
collected for the spectroscopic scap. Our previous studies on drug collected for the spectroscopic scan. Our previous studies on drug were not sufficient to remove all nanoparticles from the supermatant.³³ Therefore, these experiments measure epinephrine oxi-
dation in the presence of these silica papoparticle residues

dation in the presence of these silica nanoparticle residues.
The results are shown in Figure 4. The absorbance at 480 nm was fit to a linear function of t in each case, with the slope giving the rate of enjnephrine oxidation. The different intercents in the rate of epinephrine oxidation. The different intercepts in the beginning of oxidation reveal the "pseudo-adsorption" due to the scattering of 480 nm radiation from the nanoparticle residues; only the slopes are significant. In the absence of nanoparticles, epinephrine (solid curve) oxidizes to adrenochrome at a rate of $(10.00 \pm 0.07) \times 10^{-7}$ s⁻¹ ($r^2 = 0.98$).
With particles present the oxidation rate becomes (9.76 + 0.06) \times chrome at a rate of $(10.00 \pm 0.07) \times 10^{-7}$ s⁻¹ ($r^2 = 0.98$).
With particles present, the oxidation rate becomes $(9.76 \pm 0.06) \times 10^{-7}$ s⁻¹ ($r^2 = 0.99$) for MCM-41 addition (long-dashed curve) 10^{-7} s⁻¹ (r)
(15.74 + 1) 10 s ($r = 0.99$) for MCM-41 addition (long-dashed curve),
 $(15.74 \pm 0.08) \times 10^{-7}$ s⁻¹ ($r^2 = 0.99$) for SBA-15 addition

(batched curve) and (9.89 + 0.10) $\times 10^{-7}$ s⁻¹ ($r^2 = 0.96$) for silica (15.74 \pm 0.08) \times 10 \cdot s \cdot (r = 0.99) for SBA-15 addition
(hatched curve) and $(9.89 \pm 0.10) \times 10^{-7}$ s⁻¹ (r ² = 0.96) for silica sphere addition (short-dashed curve). Obviously, the presence of $MCM₋₄₁$ or silica spheres does not accelerate the ovidation. \mathbf{A} or silica spheres does not accelerate the oxidation, \mathbf{A}

⁽³³⁾ Tao, Z.; Xie, Y.; Toms, B.; Goodisman, J.; Asefa, T. Manuscript Sub-

Figure 4. Absorbance at 480 nm due to adrenochrome as a function of time for epinephrine solutions without (solid line) and with silica nanoparticles. Long-dashed line $=$ addition of MCM-41, hatched line = addition of SBA-15, short-dashed line = addition α silica spheres. of silica spheres.

whereas SBA-15 exhibits an exceptional ability to enhance the oxidation rate of epinephrine to adrenochrome (by 57.4%), although all the oxidations proceed very slowly in dH_2O . The same experiments done with no epinephrine show that the slopes of absorbance at 480 nm vs t (due to nanoparticles) are essentially
zero for all nanoparticles (data not shown) zero for all nanoparticles (data not shown).
We next examine the oxidation of epinephrine in PBS, with or

without silica nanoparticles. The experiments were performed the same as the above, except dH_2O was replaced with PBS solutions. Results are shown in Figure 5. With no nanoparticles added (hatched line), epinephrine oxidizes much more quickly in PBS than in dH_2O . The absorbance due to the produced adrenothrome increases at a rate of 5.04×10^{-5} s⁻¹, over 50 times higher
than in dH₂O. This enhancement of oxidation rate could be due to than in dH_2O . This enhancement of oxidation rate could be due to the weak acidity of $dH_2O(pH = 6)$; as we have shown, oxidation is slower at lower pH. The higher ionic strength in PBS solutions ~ 0.15 M, as in physiological condition) may contribute to this increased oxidation velocity as well. The addition of silica spheres (short-dashed line) leads to a rate of oxidation of epinephrine to adrenochrome of 5.19×10^{-5} s⁻¹, so there is no sign of silical spheres accelerating the oxidation in PRS. However, with either spheres accelerating the oxidation in PBS. However, with either MCM-41 (solid line) or SBA-15 (long-dashed line) nanoparticles present, the oxidation is clearly enhanced. These curves cannot be fit by straight lines, since the apparent rates decrease with time. The later reductions in the rate of production of adrenochrome. reflect the instability of this product in these solutions. By fitting each absorbance vs t into a quadratic form, we find [Intensi-
tyl_{nesis} $=(-1.42 \times 10^{-8})t^2 + (9.61 \times 10^{-5})t + 8.16 \times 10^{-3}(t^2))$ ty] $_{MCM} = (-1.42 \times 10^{-8})t^2 + (9.61 \times 10^{-5})t + 8.16 \times 10^{-3}(t^2)$
0.99) and Untensityles $_{\odot} = (-1.39 \times 10^{-8})t^2 + (8.60 \times 10^{-5})t^2$ $V_{\text{MCM}} = (-1.42 \times 10^{-3})t + (9.01 \times 10^{-3})t + 8.10 \times 10^{-6}t$

0.99) and [Intensity]_{SBA} = $(-1.39 \times 10^{-8})t^2 + (8.60 \times 10^{-5})t +$

1.68 $\times 10^{-2}(t^2 > 0.99)$ Thus in the presence of MCM-41 and 1.68×10^{-2} ($r^2 > 0.99$). Thus, in the presence of MCM-41 and
SBA-15, the oxidative reaction of enjugating to adrenochrome occurs at a rate of $(9.61 \times 10^{-5} - 2.84 \times 10^{-8} t)$ s⁻¹ and $(8.60 \times 10^{-5} - 2.78 \times 10^{-8} t)$ s⁻¹ respectively. The initial rates are 9.61 \times $10^{-5} - 2.78 \times 10^{-8} t$ s⁻¹, respectively. The initial rates are 9.61 \times
 10^{-5} s⁻¹ and 8.60 \times 10⁻⁵ s⁻¹, both higher than that for epinephrine oxidation in PBS with no nanoparticles. The same experiments done without epinephrine show that the slopes of absorbance at 480 nm vs t in PBS (due to nanoparticles) are
essentially zero (data not shown) essentially zero (data not shown).
To further investigate the accelerated oxidation of epinephrine

by MSN in PBS and/or dH_2O , we perform experiments in which $\frac{1}{2}$ dithionite is added into eninephrine solutions in different time dithionite is added into epinephrine solutions in different time solutions in different time solutions in different time solutions in \mathbf{r}_i

Figure 5. Absorbance of adrenochrome at 480 nm as a function of time, from epinephrine solutions in PBS, with and without silica nanoparticles. Hatched line $=$ no particles, short-dashed line $=$ $\frac{1}{2}$ is the particle contribution in the particles, short-dashed line = $SBA-15$ SBA-15.

Figure 6. Absorbance of adrenochrome at 480 nm as a function of time, from solutions of dithionite $+$ epinephrine. Dotted curve $=$ $dH₂O$ with dithionite added 5 min before epinephrine, long-dashed curve = dH_2O with dithionite and epinephrine added simultaneously, short-dashed curve = PBS with dithionite added 5 min before epinephrine, solid curve $=$ PBS with dithionite and epi- $\frac{1}{2}$ before ended simultaneously. nephrine added simultaneously.

sequences. Sodium dithionite ($Na_2S_2O_4$) is well-known to con-
sume O_2 molecules rapidly in aqueous solutions, producing sume σ_2 molecules expensive rapidly in aqueous solutions, producing intermediates, including \cdot O₂^{-34,35} In the present experiments, dithionite was first dissolved in dH.O at a high concentration dithionite was first dissolved in dH₂O at a high concentration (1 M) and then diluted into dH_2O or PBS solutions (final concentration $[S_2O_4^{2-}] = 500 \mu M$, either 5 min prior to, or
simultaneously with the addition of 125 uM enjagnheime Results simultaneously with, the addition of 125μ M epinephrine. Results
are shown in Figure 6. Time zero corresponds to the addition of are shown in Figure 6. Time zero corresponds to the addition of epinephrine. In dH_2O , dithionite added 5 min before (dotted curve) or at the same time as (long-dashed curve) the epinephrine addition prevents production of adrenochrome (which was lowaddition prevents production of adrenochrome (which was low in any case). However, in PBS solutions, rapid oxidations, rapid oxidation of \mathcal{L}

⁽³⁴⁾ Creutz, C.; Sutin, N. Inorg. Chem. 1974, 13, 2041-2043.

⁽³⁵⁾ Tao, Z.; Goodisman, J.; Souid, A.-K. *J. Phys. Chem. A* 2008, 112, 1511–1518.

epinephrine occurs when epinephrine is added concurrently with dithionite (solid curve), whereas epinephrine is not oxidized if it is added 5 min after the dithionite addition. The addition of dithionite alone to either dH_2O or PBS gives no rise in the absorbance at 480 nm (data not shown). Since 500 μ M dithionite absorbance at 480 nm (data not shown). Since 500μ M dithionite
can seavenge dissolved Ω_2 in seconds and simultaneously generate radical intermediates like $\cdot O_2^{-35,36}$ this result confirms that,
rather than O₂ molecules oxygen radicals are responsible for rather than O_2 molecules, oxygen radicals are responsible for the rapid oxidation of epinephrine in a phosphate buffer environment. Concomitantly, it suggests that the accelerated epinephrine oxidations with MSN present in PBS are due to the formation and accumulation of reactive oxygen species by the nanoparticles. Apparently, MCM-41 or SBA-15 silica nanoparticles, but not silica spheres, provide a hotbed for oxygen radicals. In dH_2O , the epinephrine oxidation is not accelerated by dithionite, even when it is added simultaneously with epinephrine. A possible explanation for this is that dithionite generates, in addition to oxygen radicals that should be able to execute the epinephrine oxidation, Framing that should be able to execute the epinephrine otherwise, ers ey and the contract in the meteoral comment, meet com fact, the measured pH of a 500 μ M dithionite solution in dH₂O is 3.7 ± 0.1 3.7 ± 0.1 .

Conclusions

We have measured the influence of mesoporous silica (MCM-41 and SBA-15) nanoparticles and dense silica nanoparticles on epinephrine oxidation, a pH-dependent reaction whose rate is small in acidic or neutral solutions but much larger at higher pH. While MCM-41 or silica spheres do not accelerate the oxidation in $dH₂O$, SBA-15 does, showing that the difference in the structures of nanomaterials leads to differing effects on the epinephrine oxidation. In contrast to MCM-41, SBA-15 has a unique microporosity and interconnectivity in the mesopore walls, which contributes to a substantial part of total surface area.³⁶

(36) Ryoo, R.; Ko, C. H. J. Phys. Chem. B 2000, 104, 11465-11471.

This feature could lead to more trapping of oxygen radicals inside the mesoporous channel, significantly enhancing the oxidation of epinephrine even in weak acid. In PBS solutions, the presence of SBA-15 and MCM-41 makes the oxidation even more rapid. Silica spheres have no noticeable influence on the oxidation in either PBS or dH_2O . The possibility that the catalytic effect of MSN could result from the residue of templating chemicals, however, can be excluded, since residues are removed by the postsynthesis calcinations. Experiments with dithionite, added either earlier than or at the same time as the epinephrine addition, show that fast oxidation takes place only when dithionite and epinephrine are simultaneously added into PBS solution. This confirms a vital role of oxygen radicals $(nroshh|y,0,-)$ in the oxidation of eninenhrine. These radicals (probably $\cdot O_2$) in the oxidation of epinephrine. These
oxygen radicals are likely to form and accumulate within the phosphate buffer or in the presence of mesoporous silica nanoparticles. Comparing the three kinds of silica nanoparticles applied, we note that mesoporous SBA-15 and MCM-41 materials own much larger surface area than solid silica particles do, whereas MCM-41 possesses a much narrower pore size $(0.4$ -fold) than SBA-15. It seems, therefore, that large surface area plus characteristic mesoporosity and surface structures aid in the generation and deposit of oxygen radicals inside MSN particles, which catalyze the epinephrine oxidation $\frac{1}{2}$ in a favorable phosphate environment in a favorable phosphate environment.

Acknowledgment. The authors are grateful to the U.S. National Science Foundation Grant (NSF), CAREER Grant CHE- 0645348 and NSF DMR-0804846, for the partial financial support of this work. We also thank Ms. Xiao Guan for her assistance with Scheme 1 in the paper. with Scheme 1 in the paper.

Supporting Information Available: Nitrogen gas adsorption isotherms and pore size distributions of the mesoporous and dense silica nanospheres. This material is available free of charge via the Internet at $\frac{http://pubs.acs.org.}{http://pubs.acs.org.}$