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Aggregate removal is a key determinant of product safety.

It is also an important contributor to process economy.
   It may increase the difficulty of process development.
   It may limit the selection of polishing methods for a given antibody.
   It may increase purification costs.
The simplest and most direct method of aggregate removal is size exclusion chromatography (SEC). It offers the additional benefit of exchanging the product into a buffer ready for chromatography by a subsequent method.

But, SEC is slow, provides poor capacity, requires disproportionately large columns that require superior packing skills, and requires large buffer volumes.

This has created strong interest in adsorptive chromatography methods for aggregate removal.
Aggregate removal

The limitation with adsorptive methods is that their selectivity is not directly related to protein size.

Aggregates tend to be retained more strongly by adsorptive methods than non-aggregated proteins, presumably because they participate in a larger number of interactions with the solid phase.

But, variations in charge distribution from one clone to another, and between aggregated and non-aggregated forms of the product, make the degree of separation unpredictable.
Aggregate removal

What if…
there was a buffer additive with an effect proportional to protein size?

Would it be compatible with adsorptive chromatography methods?

Would it enhance the ability of adsorptive methods to separate aggregates from non-aggregated antibody?

Would it meet regulatory requirements for processing human-injectable products?
Nonionic organic polymers are often used as antibody precipitating agents.

Polyethylene glycol (PEG) is one example.

PEG is nontoxic (conjugated to therapeutic proteins), USP, protein-stabilizing, and cheap.
Nonionic polymers and proteins

PEG is preferentially excluded from protein surfaces. This creates a pure water hydration sheath around the protein. The discontinuity between the pure water sheath and the PEG-concentrated bulk solvent is thermodynamically unfavorable.

When proteins come into contact in a solution of PEG, they share some hydration water with each other, thereby releasing some back to the bulk solvent. They also present a smaller surface than the combined surface area of the individual proteins. Both phenomena are thermodynamically favorable, and tend to stabilize the association between the proteins.
Nonionic polymers and proteins

Preferential exclusion of PEG
Nonionic polymers and proteins

Since protein surface area is proportional to protein size, the magnitude of the effect of nonionic organic polymers is proportional to protein size.
PEG and ion exchange

Does the exclusionary effect carry over to ion exchange?
PEG and ion exchange

Does the exclusionary effect carry over to ion exchange?

[Graph showing the effect of PEG and NaCl on the separation of IgG isoforms.]
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**PEG and ion exchange**

Does the size selectivity carry over to ion exchange?
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**Graphical Representation**

- **RESOURCE® S/Q**
  - 10% PEG-6000

- **Samples**
  - RPE: rPhycoerythrin
  - MAb: Murine IgG_{2a}
  - TRF: Transferrin
  - BSA: bovine albumin
  - ACT: alpha-chymotrypsin
  - LYS: Lysozyme

**Reference**

Gagnon et al, 1996, *J. Chromatogr.* **743** 51
**PEG and ion exchange**

Aggregate separation by anion exchange

**Buffers:**
- A1: 10 mM NaPO₄, pH 7.5
- B1: 500 mM NaPO₄, pH 7.5
- A2, B2: same as above but both containing 7.5% PEG-4600.

**Equipment:**
- RESOURCE® Q 20 CV LG
- A to B
- 3 mL/min, 565 cm/hr
- Chimeric IgG₁ (a)

**Results:**
- Without PEG:
- With PEG:

---
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PEG and ion exchange

Aggregate separation by cation exchange

Buffers: A1: 10 mM Na citrate, pH 6.0  B1: 200 mM Na citrate, pH 6.0
A2,B2: same as above but both containing 7.5% PEG-4600.
Does the exclusionary effect carry over to hydroxyapatite?

![Graph showing [NaPO₄] at Peak Ctr vs % PEG-4600]

- CHT™ Type I, 20 µm
- 5 x 25 mM
- A: 10 mM PO₄, pH 7
- B: 500 mM PO₄
- 20 CV LG, A to B
- 1.0 mL/min
- 300 cm/hr

Legend:
1. mlgM
2. chimeric IgG₁ (a)
3. chimeric IgG₁ (b)
PEG and hydroxyapatite

Aggregate separation on hydroxyapatite

Buffers: A1: 10 mM NaPO₄, pH 7.0  B1: 500 mM NaPO₄, pH 7.0
A2,B2: same as above but both containing 3.75% PEG-4600.
A3,B3: same as above but both containing 5.625% PEG-4600.
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1.0 mL/min
300 cm/hr
chimeric IgG₁ (a)
PEG and hydroxyapatite

Aggregate separation on hydroxyapatite, chimeric IgG₁ (a)
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PEG and hydroxyapatite

Aggregate separation on hydroxyapatite

Buffers: A1: 10 mM NaPO₄, pH 7.0  B1: 500 mM NaPO₄, pH 7.0  
A2,B2: same as above but both containing 3.75% PEG-4600.  
A3,B3: same as above but both containing 5.625% PEG-4600.  
A4,B4: same as above but both containing 7.5% PEG-4600.

CHT I, 20 μm  
5 x 25 mm  
20 CV LG, A to B  
1.0 mL/min  
300 cm/hr  
chimeric IgG₁ (b)
**PEG and hydroxyapatite**

Aggregate separation on hydroxyapatite, chimeric IgG₁ (b)

![Graph showing aggregate separation](image)
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PEG and hydroxyapatite

Aggregate separation on hydroxyapatite, chimera (a) vs (b)

Solid line: Chimeric IgG1 (a)
Broken line: Chimeric IgG1 (b)
**NaCl and hydroxyapatite**

Aggregate separation on hydroxyapatite, NaCl gradient

- CHT I, 20 μm
- 5 x 50 mm
- A: 10 mM PO$_4$, pH 7
- B: 10 mM PO$_4$, 1.5 M NaCl, pH 7
- 20 CV LG, A to B
- 1.0 mL/min
- 300 cm/hr
- chimeric IgG$_1$ (a)
Buffers: A1: 10 mM NaPO₄, pH 7.0  B1: 500 mM NaPO₄, pH 7.0
A3 = A1. B3: same as B1 except containing 7.5% PEG-6000.
PEG, NaCl, and hydroxyapatite

Aggregate separation on hydroxyapatite, chimeric IgG₁ (a)

[Graph showing separation of aggregates and monomers with [NaCl] at Peak Ctr and % PEG-6000]
What to expect with other contaminants

Host cell proteins are generally smaller than IgG. PEG should increase their retention to a lesser degree. This should give better clearance in cases where they normally elute before IgG.

DNA, endotoxin, and virus are generally larger than IgG. PEG should increase their retention to a greater degree. This should give better clearance in cases where they normally elute after IgG.
Method development

Including PEG in only the gradient endpoint buffer simplifies screening and method development.

It is also more “generic” in the sense of accommodating a wider diversity of antibodies.

It also appears to give better results. The aggregate experiences a higher concentration of PEG than the earlier eluting monomer, thereby compounding aggregate retention and the degree of separation.

This approach also leaves the monomer fraction with a lower concentration of PEG to remove.
Method development

Effectivity of different PEG sizes

Approximate range of PEG concentration vs PEG molecular weight for enhancement of aggregate separation. The red trace indicates recommended starting concentrations where PEG is applied as described in the previous slide.
Method development

**Ion exchange**

At the chosen pH, run a 10 CV linear gradient to 0.5M NaCl, 7.5% PEG-6000.*

Determine salt concentration at the point where antibody monomer is completely eluted.

Rerun the gradient to end at that salt concentration + 20%, 7.5% PEG-6000 (no need to add PEG to the equilibration buffer).

Adjust conditions as desired and convert to step gradient or flow-through format.

* or higher percentage of lower MW PEG
Method development

Hydroxyapatite
At the chosen pH, run a 10 CV linear gradient to 0.5M NaPO₄, 7.5% PEG-6000.*

Determine phosphate concentration at the point where antibody monomer is completely eluted.

Rerun the gradient to end at that phosphate concentration + 20%, 7.5% PEG-6000 (no need to add PEG to the equilibration buffer).

Adjust conditions as desired and convert to step gradient or flow-through format.

* or higher percentage of lower MW PEG
Method development

Scouting chromatograms, hydroxyapatite

Buffers: A1: 10 mM NaPO₄, pH 7.0  B1: 500 mM NaPO₄, 7.5% PEG-4600, pH 7.0
A2 identical to A1. B2: 250 mM NaPO₄, 7.5% PEG-4600, pH 7.0
Method development

Hydroxyapatite (optional)
If a sodium chloride gradient has been used to enhance aggregate removal, measure the NaCl concentration at the point where antibody monomer is completely eluted.

Run the gradient to end at that sodium chloride concentration + 20%, 7.5% PEG-6000* (no need to add PEG to the equilibration buffer).

Adjust conditions as desired and convert to step gradient or flow-through format.

* or higher percentage of lower MW PEG
How to remove PEG

PEG is inert to most adsorption mechanisms.

It is easily removed by binding the protein of interest to the solid phase of choice and letting the PEG flow through.

Low molecular weight PEG may be removed by diafiltration or size exclusion chromatography.
Negative features of PEG

PEG depresses antibody solubility.

PEG increases buffer viscosity:
   Higher backpressure
   Lower protein diffusivity

Residual high molecular weight PEG may alter selectivity of analytical HPSEC.
Conclusions

PEG imposes a “size discriminating” selectivity on ion exchange and hydroxyapatite chromatography.

This dramatically enhances aggregate removal efficiency and should enhance removal of other important contaminants classes, especially including viral particles.
Conclusions

While PEG’s size discrimination ability is technically secondary to the primary selectivity of the solid phase, it is functionally dominant.

Thus it produces roughly equivalent enhancement on both anion and cation exchangers. The magnitude of enhancement is greater on hydroxyapatite, but the sizing factor is still apparent.

These results demonstrate that PEG functions similarly over a wide range of pH and conductivity, and suggest that it will probably improve aggregate clearance with other mixed mode methods.
Conclusions

On hydroxyapatite, PEG/phosphate gradients offer better aggregate clearance than NaCl gradients at fixed low phosphate concentration.

Combination PEG/NaCl gradients at fixed phosphate offer better clearance than NaCl gradients at fixed phosphate, but NaCl depresses the magnitude of enhancement compared with PEG/phosphate gradients.

These results suggest that PEG provides double enhancement on hydroxyapatite by acting cooperatively with both its phosphoryl cation exchange and calcium metal affinity binding mechanisms.
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