### Focused Ultrasound in Drug Delivery and Nanomedicine

Brian O'Neill, PhD AAPM Annual Meeting July 2014

Thanks to: Nathan MacDannold, BWH Kathy Ferrara, UCD Natalya Rapoport, U. Utah



### Motivation

- Delivering drugs exclusively to localized areas of disease should increase effectiveness and reduce side effects
- Nanoparticle drug carriers hold promise, but relying on natural targeting and drug release has failed to produce the expected results
- Focused ultrasound has advantages for "remote control" in tissue: deep penetration, accuracy on the mm scale, non-ionizing, feedback

### **Course Outline**

- Mechanisms of Ultrasound-Material Interaction
- Ultrasound Alteration of Tissue Properties
  - Enhanced Delivery via Hyperthermia
  - BBB Disruption via Stable Cavitation
- Ultrasound Release from Drug Carriers
  - Induced Release from micelles and liposomes
  - Induced Release from microbubbles
  - Release from phase-change nanodroplets

#### Focused Ultrasound (HIFU or FUS)

- Diagnostic ultrasound: 1-2 cycle pulses (time resolution), 1-15 MHz (spatial resolution)
- Therapeutic ultrasound: 10<sup>3</sup>-10<sup>4</sup> cycle pulses, 0.2-3 MHz
- Focused ultrasound: beam is directed to diffraction limited spot ie. width ~ wavelength by geometry (single element), or electronic shift of phase (multiple element array)
- With sound speed ~ 1.5 mm/us, 1MHz ultrasound has wavelength 1.5 mm, so this is beam waist
- length depends on transducer diameter, for f=D, length~7 mm
- Intensity at focus is:

$$I_f = TAP / area = I_{xducer} \times D^2 / d^2$$

- For InSightec D = 15 cm, so focusing factor is  $10^4$
- $I_{xducer} = 3 \text{ W/cm}^2$ , so  $I_f < 3x10^4 \text{ W/cm}^2$



#### Effects of Focused Ultrasound

#### Thermal effects

Hyperthermia (40-45 °C) -> altered blood flow, gene upregulation, inflammation, apoptosis
Thermal Ablation (50+ °C) -> cell death through necrosis
Thermal Dose:

$$TD_{43} = \int R^{T(t)-43} dt ; R \approx 4 (T < 43) |2(T > 43)$$

**Thermal Conduction:** 

 $\rho c \dot{T}(\boldsymbol{x}, t) = \dot{Q}(\boldsymbol{x}, t) + k \nabla^2 T - w_b c_b \Delta T_b$ 

### Effects of Focused Ultrasound

#### **Mechanical effects**

Cavitation (combination with bubbles)

 $MI \propto p_r/f^{0.5}$ 

$$\omega_{0} = \frac{1}{R_{0}} \left( \frac{3\gamma P_{0}}{\rho_{0}} \left( 1 + \sigma \dots \right) \right)^{0.5}$$

Sonoporation and sonolysis -> cell membrane damage Sonochemistry -> ROS production

Radiation force/shear -> mechanotransduction, bioeffects

$$F = \alpha \frac{I(r)}{c_{v}}$$

Other??

#### **Therapeutic Effects**



### **HIFU-Enhanced Transport**

- Working with ultrasound only very attractive because clinical translation of device is much easier
- Idea is that tissue transport properties (diffusion, permeability) are altered by HIFU
- 5+ years of work on mouse and rabbit models to understand mechanism

#### Pulsed-HIFU treatment



O'Neill, et al., JMRI 2013

#### **Treatment Results**



# Transport at 24 hours (conclusion: thermal effect)



# Ultrasound-mediated targeted drug delivery in the brain<sup>†</sup>

Nathan McDannold

Dept. Radiology, Brigham & Women's Hospital, Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA

<sup>†</sup>used with permission



#### **Blood-brain barrier (BBB)**



#### BBB disruption with focused ultrasound

- Low-power, pulsed exposures
- Combined with ultrasound contrast agent (Optison, Definity)
- Temporary (~hours), localized, non-invasive





#### BBB disruption with Focused Ultrasound

- Occurs due to mechanically-induced changes and/or stimulation to vasculature
- Caused by microbubble/US interaction
- Not due to heating
- Exact mechanism(s) not known



#### Electron microscopy study: tight junctions

Results: # TJ proteins reduced after BBBD; restored at 4h



Sheikov et al. Ultras. Med Biol (2008)

## BBB disruption with focused ultrasound

Mechanical interaction between US, microbubbles, and vessel walls results in:

- Transient disassembly of tight junction proteins
- Stimulation of active transport

At higher exposure levels, inertial cavitation occurs, leading to vessel damage



#### Electron microscopy study: active transport



N. Sheikov et al. Ultrasound Med. Biol. 2008

## BBB disruption with focused ultrasound

#### Small animal studies:

- Reliably induce BBB disruption without tissue damage
- Deliver a range of molecules to the brain, including therapeutics
- Improve outcomes in animal disease models

Glioma, Alzheimer's





Alzheimer's model mouse Endogenous IgG (green) +Trypan blue bound to Amyloid plaque (red)

#### Characterizing BBBD with dynamic contrast enhanced MRI



J. Park et al. J Control Release. 2012



#### Summary of therapeutic agents delivered via FUS-BBBD

#### Chemotherapy

BCNU, methotrexate, doxorubicin, liposomal doxorubicin

#### Antibodies

Herceptin, BAM10 (Alzheimer's)

#### Nanoparticles

Magnetic nanoparticles Gold nanoparticles

#### Neuroprotective agent

BDNF, GDNF (Parkinson's, stroke, traumatic brain injury)

#### Viruses

siRNA for Htt (Huntington's disease)

#### Cells

Neural precursor cells (stem cells) Natural killer cells

#### Nothing!

BBBD *alone* might help Alzheimer's disease, induce neurogenesis



# FUS Induced Release from Nanoparticles

- Two general approaches: Thermal and Mechanical
- Thermal: Competes with many other modalities: RF, laser, AMF
- Relies of heat sensitive liposomes, heat sensitive polymers – maybe reversible Mechanical: based on cavitation
- Microbubbles, nanodroplets not reversible

### Thermally sensitive liposomes

Liposomes are spherical lipid bilayers that can be used for carrying hydrophilic drugs Problem: either too leaky or too stable Sol'n: Lipid bilayers undergo gel to liquid phase transition with temperature dependent on composition. Leaky during transition due to phase mismatch

LTSL: developed at Duke, now used many places

Mills & Needham, BBA Biomembranes, 2005; 1716(2):77–96

### Thermal sensitive polymeric NPs

Many kinds of nanoparticles built of polymers as drug carriers – generally slow diffusion

Some polymers undergo conformational phase change that alters solubility in water (expansion, collapse, micelle formation, disassociation...)

Huge potential, barely scratching surface





### Ablation + long circulating LTSL<sup>†</sup>

16 element annular array (IMASONIC)
3 MHz center frequency
14 MPa PPP, -7.7 MPa PNP
7 s CW, single spot >65 °C

<sup>†</sup>used with permission



### <sup>64</sup>Cu-LCL – no US





### MRgFUS + <sup>64</sup>Cu-LCL





#### **Complexation of Cu(II) and Dox within liposomes**

**Problem:** Even liposomal doxorubicin has substantial cardiac toxicity and dose cannot exceed 500 mg/m<sup>2</sup> in lifetime.

### Solution: Create a doxorubicin salt that is very stable in circulation



Kheirolomoom et al Molecular Pharmaceutics



#### **Complex of Cu(II) & Dox with liposomes**



#### Ferrara lab **Tumor growth** UNIVERSITY OF 5500 --- Control - e - Control+US 4500 Tumor growth, % ---- CuDox-LTSLs - - CuDox-LTSLs+US 3500 2500 US 1500 \*\*\* 500 2 -500 10 20 30 40 50 200 250 Day post treatment 120 100 Survival, % 80 Treat 2x/week, 4 weeks, -----Control 6 mg/kg 60 -CuDox-LTSLs 40 CuDox-LTSLs+US 20 \* p<0.05 compared to control P<0.001 compared to control \*\*\* 0 50 200 250 0 100 150 Day post treatment Kheirolomoom et al, JCR 2013



# Why do we favor thermally-sensitive nanoparticles?



%ID delivered depends on volume insonified, time of insonation 100 **Diameter** 10 ■ 0.5 cm %ID 1 **1** cm  $\Box 2 \text{ cm}$ 0.1 ■ 4 cm 0.01 0.3 0.7 4.0 1.0 2.0 Time insonation (hrs)

Assumes 5% blood volume in tumor 10 sec tumor blood refresh 5 L blood volume

#### **Non-Thermal Release**

Release driven via pressure changes, cavitation – rapid release, no change in T
Types include drug loaded microbubbles, gas containing liposomes, liposomes attached to microbubbles, phase shifting 'nanodroplets'
The latter are PFC with bulk liquid-gas transitions around body temperature that

are held together by Laplace pressure:  $\Delta P = \frac{2\sigma}{R}$ 

# Liposomes or oil carriers on bubbles





Nanodroplets<sup>†</sup> (Courtesy of N. Rapoport, U. of Utah) Versatile structures with properties that depend on the core and shell compositions



<sup>†</sup>used with permission

### Ultrasound effect on the nanodroplet

Scheme of the ultrasound-induced drug release



### **Ovarian Carcinoma Model**

 Chemotherapy by PTX/PFP/PEG-PLLA nanodroplets and ultrasound



Rapoport, N. et al., J Control Release 2009; 138(3): 268-276

### MRgFUS

- Small Animal LabFUS System (Image Guided Therapy, Inc.)
  - 16-element annular transducer, f = 3 MHz,  $r_c = 3.5 \text{ cm}$



Rapoport, N. et al., J Control Release 2011; 153(1): 4-15

### Treatment monitoring: MR Thermometry



#### **Ultrasound Parameters**

- •3-MHz
- •P = 3.4 MPa
- •1 x 3 mm focal spot
- •Grid trajectory, 4 x 5

mm

•5 minute sonication time



#### Coronal slice orientation



### MR thermometry response

### Maximum temperature projection in time





#### **MR** Parameters

- •SegEPI sequence, EPI=3
- •2x2x3 mm (ZFI to 1x1x3mm)
- •1.3 seconds
- •TR/TE = 60/10 ms
- •Flip angle = 15°
- •752 Hz/pixel

•Referenceless reconstruction



### **Tumor Resolution**



Tumor cells were transfected with RFP; only viable cells generated fluorescence

### Growth Curves Pancreatic Cancer



### Lifespan results

Treatment Group	Average Life Span, weeks (mean ± std)
Control (N=7)	$3.5 \pm 0.5$
No injection, MRgFUS (N=6)**	4.8 ± 2.3
Empty droplets, MRgFUS (N=6)**	3.5 ± 2.1
PTX droplets, no MRgFUS (N=7)	$7.0 \pm 0.8$
PTX droplets, MRgFUS (CW, injection- MRgFUS time=8 hrs, N=8)***	$10.3 \pm 1.6$

\*\*Mice that died within several days after treatment (P>4.2 MPa) were excluded

\*\*\*Survivors (N=2 for the grid trajectory) were excluded

### **Results** Courtesy of N. Rapoport, U. of Utah

- PTX-loaded nanodroplets + MRgFUS dramatically decrease pancreatic tumor growth
- MR guidance improves treatment outcome
  - Detailed anatomic visualization
  - Tumor targeting and treatment planning
  - Real-time MR temperature imaging
- Treatment success is a function of ultrasound parameters
- In the absence of drug, hyperthermic conditions could increase perfusion and inflammation thus accelerating tumor growth.

### **Study Participants**

Natalya Rapoport Allison Payne Christopher Dillon Jill Shea Roohi Gupta

University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah, USA

#### Understanding Ultrasound/Drug Synergy

- Going beyond the anecdotal evidence
- Look at thermal, mechanical interactions independently
- Understand biological mechanism
- Clues to what drugs might work best

1.4 **HIFU Treatment with Drugs** MTS measure of cell viability 0.4 0.6 0.8 1.0 1.2 (Sonodynamic Therapy?) 0.2 control 0.0 Ultrasound 0 0 0 0 3 5 3 5 3 5 3 5 pressure (MPa) Drug (20uM) RB1 RB2 RB3 Control 100 Viability on day 3 (%) 80 ■ HIFU duty cycle = 0% 60 ■ HIFU duty cycle = 30% ■ HIFU duty cycle = 50% 40 20 0 0.5 control 0 0.1 0.2 0.3 0.4 0.6 0.7 0.8 0.9 1.0 [Doxorubicin], ug/mL, N=8

Four Hours after Treatment, N=3

### 'Sonodynamic Therapy'

Four Hours after Treatment, N=3



### Conclusions

Use of ultrasound to alter tissue properties or drive release from nanocarriers is a very promising approach to targeted drug delivery Challenges: need to visualize the target before you can hit it (metastatic disease problem)

- regular ultrasound limitations: no penetration in air, little through bone

### **Potential Areas for Application**

Cancer – large or infiltrative tumor

Cardiac – plaques or thrombii

- Neuro target drugs to specific sites of the brain, spine
- Orthopedic joints, near surface bone lesions
- Ophthalmology drugs to the retina, through cornea

Others?