

December 2020

Encapsulation and Stabilization of Biomacromolecules

Whitney Blocher Blocher McTigue
University of Massachusetts Amherst

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.umass.edu/dissertations_2



Part of the [Other Chemical Engineering Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Blocher McTigue, Whitney Blocher, "Encapsulation and Stabilization of Biomacromolecules" (2020).
Doctoral Dissertations. 1998.
<https://doi.org/10.7275/18409683> https://scholarworks.umass.edu/dissertations_2/1998

This Open Access Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Dissertations and Theses at ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst. It has been accepted for inclusion in Doctoral Dissertations by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst. For more information, please contact scholarworks@library.umass.edu.

ENCAPSULATION AND STABILIZATION OF BIOMACROMOLECULES

A Dissertation Presented

by

WHITNEY C. BLOCHER MCTIGUE

Submitted to the Graduate School of the
University of Massachusetts Amherst in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

September 2020

Department of Chemical Engineering

© Copyright by Whitney C. Blocher McTigue 2020

All Rights Reserved

ENCAPSULATION AND STABILIZATION OF BIOMACROMOLECULES

A Dissertation Presented

by

WHITNEY C. BLOCHER MCTIGUE

Approved as to style and content by:

Sarah L. Perry, Chair

Cynthia Baldwin

Ashish Kulkarni

Shelly Peyton

Michael Henson, Interim Department Head
Department of Chemical Engineering

DEDICATION

To my wonderful husband for being the support to make this a reality and to my mom for being the inspiration to take on this project.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my advisor, Sarah L. Perry, for her years of amazing support.

I want to thank Kathryn Rahlwes for her friendship and encouragement throughout this journey. You have been an amazing muse and helped me keep the delicate balance of being both a scientist and a person.

I wish to express my appreciation to all my friends and family who have supported me through this. A special thank you to those who have adventured with me: Matt Downing, Kelsey Keenan, Josh Baez Vigo, Seth Frisby, Ray Trammel, and Casey Lee-Trimble.

Finally, but not least, I would like to extend my gratitude to my dad for being a motivation to complete this degree and for being an example that it is possible to achieve such an accomplishment and make a difference. Watching you finish your Ph.D. spurred me to become the second generation of “Doctah Blochah.” I would not be the out of the box or creative thinker without you.

ABSTRACT

ENCAPSULATION AND STABILIZATION OF BIOMACROMOLECULES

SEPTEMBER 2020

WHITNEY C. BLOCHER MCTIGUE, B.A., CLARKSON UNIVERSITY

Ph.D., UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AMHERST

Directed by: Professor Sarah L. Perry

Recent work in the area of protein encapsulation has turned away from traditional methods of sequestration toward gentler, purely aqueous techniques. Among them, complex coacervation has become a topic of discussion. Complex coacervation is an all-aqueous liquid-liquid phase separation phenomenon dominated by electrostatic interactions and entropic gains. The use of coacervates as protein encapsulants has garnered much attention, but there has been little headway in determining a set of design rules. We considered coacervation between two oppositely-charged polypeptides and a biomacromolecule cargo to investigate the effects of changing aspects of the coacervating polymers and/or various solution parameters. We characterized the level of encapsulation and partitioning of three different model proteins as a function of ionic strength, pH, polymer chain length, and polymer charge density. Our results highlighted the importance of electrostatic interactions in driving protein uptake into the coacervate phase. While intuitive effects such as increasing protein charge facilitating uptake and increased salt concentration decreasing uptake due to electrostatic screening effects, we determined that the net charge and the distribution of charges on both the protein and the polymers dominated protein incorporation. For example, the presence of a cluster of cationic residues on the surface of lysozyme resulted in several orders of magnitude

higher protein incorporation than was observed for serum albumin and hemoglobin, which have a more isotropic distribution of charges. We confirmed this trend, comparing the encapsulation of two variants of caspase-6 with the variant with a cationic charge patch yielding a higher encapsulation efficiency than the other.

In addition to facilitating aqueous encapsulation of proteins, we hypothesize that complex coacervation can help to enhance the thermal stability of protein cargo through a combination of physical crowding and “soft” chemical interactions that mimic the naturally crowded environment of the cytosol. We tested this hypothesis using two model viruses, porcine parvovirus (PPV), a non-enveloped virus, and bovine viral diarrhea virus (BVDV), an envelope-virus. Accelerated aging studies at 60°C over the course of seven days demonstrated that coacervate encapsulation allowed PPV to retain more than three log higher levels of activity as compared to free virus in solution. For BVDV we did not observe significant stabilization, although we posit that this may be due to the presence of the envelope, which might already provide such protection. Overall, these preliminary results, obtained without considering the chemistry of the polymers, indicate the potential for using complex coacervation to enhance the shelf life of vaccines and biologics. This work sets the stage for future efforts geared towards understanding the specific ways in which the coacervate environment can affect protein and/or virus activity, including the potential for solvent removal.

These results for PPV indicate the potential uses of complex coacervates in applications such as drug delivery and therapeutics. However, the applicability of complex coacervates is not limited to the liquid phase. We explored the ability to electrospin solid fibers of a two-protein heteroprotein coacervate. These results give

useful insight as to how therapeutic protein-containing complex coacervates might be formulated and then processed for applications such as advanced wound dressings.

Beyond protein encapsulation, we explored the kinetics of binary complex coacervation utilizing a liquid handling robot. We were able to monitor the complexation of two peptides over time through turbidity measurements. These data described how factors such as system asymmetry and the addition of buffer or salt play critical roles in the complexation of two peptides. We also examined the phase behavior of more complex systems of two industrial polymers and a mixture of surfactants. Together, we garnered a broader understanding of the phase space of complexation with an emphasis on high throughput formulation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	v
ABSTRACT	vi
LIST OF TABLES	xv
LIST OF FIGURES	xvi
CHAPTER	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Motivation	2
2. COMPLEX COACERVATION	4
2.1 Abstract	4
2.2 Introduction	4
2.3 Coacervation-Based Mimicry of the Intracellular Environment	6
2.4 Complex Coacervate Phase Behavior	7
2.4.1 Characterization	8
2.4.2 Stoichiometry	8
2.4.3 Effect of pH	10
2.4.4 Effect of Salt	12
2.4.5 Effect of Temperature	14
2.4.6 Thermodynamic Phase Diagrams	15
2.4.7 Kinetically Trapped Materials and Precipitation	16
2.5 Molecular Design	17
2.5.1 Chirality	17
2.5.2 Branching and Molecular Topology	20
2.5.3 Hierarchical Structure	20
2.6 Applications	22
2.6.1 Encapsulation	23
2.6.2 Delivery Platforms	25
2.6.3 Bioinspired Adhesives	29
2.6.4 Protocells and Membraneless Organelles	31
2.6.5 Nano / Bioreactors	33
2.6.6 Sensing	34
2.6.7 Layer-by-Layer Films	37

2.6.8	Solid Polyelectrolyte Complexes.....	38
2.7	Conclusion	38
3.	LEARNING FROM NATURE: ENCAPSULATING PROTEINS	40
3.1	Abstract.....	40
3.2	Introduction.....	41
3.2.1	The Challenge of Protein Encapsulation.....	43
3.3	Complex Coacervation, Phase Behavior, and Biomimicry	46
3.3.1	The Effect of Charge Stoichiometry and Ionic Strength	48
3.3.2	Charge Patterning.....	51
3.3.3	Hierarchical Structure	53
3.4	Complex Coacervates Incorporating Proteins	55
3.4.1	Electrostatics: The Role of Protein Charge.....	55
3.4.2	Protein Encapsulation and Release	64
3.4.3	Measuring Protein Concentration	65
3.4.4	Encapsulation Efficiency, Partitioning, and Loading	68
3.5	Defining Protein Stability	69
3.5.1	Measuring Protein Stability	70
3.5.2	Differential Scanning Calorimetry (DSC)	72
3.5.3	Circular Dichroism (CD) Spectroscopy	74
3.5.4	Determining Kinetic Stability.....	76
3.6	Learning from Nature	77
3.6.1	Tuning the Environment for Protein Uptake	77
3.7	Summary and Outlook.....	80
3.8	Acknowledgements.....	81
4.	ENCAPSULATION OF BIOLOGICAL MOIETIES IN TERNARY COMPLEX COACERVATES	82
4.1	Abstract.....	82
4.2	Examination of the Effects of the Environment on the Ability of Complex Coacervates to Encapsulate Cargo.....	83
4.3	Materials and Methods.....	86
4.3.1	Materials	86
4.3.2	Peptide Synthesis	86
4.3.3	Preparation of Stock Solutions.....	87

4.3.4	Coacervate Formation	88
4.3.5	Turbidimetry and Optical Microscopy.....	88
4.3.6	Quantifying Protein Encapsulation and Partitioning	89
4.3.7	Determination of Net Charge and Isoelectric Point.....	91
4.3.8	Calculation of the Radial Distribution Function for Charged Residues	91
4.3.9	Statistical Analysis.....	92
4.4	Tuning the Microenvironment.....	92
4.4.1	Protein Encapsulation as a Function of Coacervate Charge Stoichiometry ..	93
4.4.2	Effect of pH.....	96
4.4.3	Effect of Salt	100
4.4.4	Effect of Peptide Chain Length.....	105
4.4.5	Protein Charge Patchiness.....	110
4.4.6	Effect of Charge Patterning	112
4.4.7	Correlating Physical Properties and Protein Encapsulation.....	117
4.5	Conclusions.....	120
4.6	Acknowledgements.....	121
5.	ENCAPSULATION, ACTIVITY, AND THERMAL STABILITY OF ENCAPSULATED CASPASE-6 IN TERNARY COMPLEX COACERVATES.....	122
5.1	Motivation for Protein Encapsulation.....	122
5.1.1	Target of Interest.....	123
5.1.2	Quantifying Encapsulation.....	124
5.1.3	Assaying Casp6 Activity.....	125
5.1.4	SDS-PAGE	126
5.2	Results and Discussion	126
5.2.1	Encapsulating Caspase-6	126
5.2.2	Activity of Free and Encapsulated Caspase-6	129
5.2.3	Free and Encapsulated Casp6 SDS-PAGE	132
5.3	Conclusions.....	134
5.4	Acknowledgements.....	134
6.	THERMAL STABILITY AND ACTIVITY OF ENCAPSULATED VIRUSES IN TERNARY COMPLEX COACERVATES	135
6.1	Abstract.....	135
6.2	Introduction.....	136
6.3	Materials and Methods.....	140
6.3.1	Materials	140
6.3.2	Virus Production, Purification, and Titration	141

6.3.3	Formation of Virus Complex Coacervates	142
6.3.4	Virus Complex Coacervates Characterization and Quantification	143
6.3.5	Virus Thermal Stability Study	144
6.4	Results and Discussion	145
6.4.1	Virus Encapsulation.....	145
6.4.2	Thermal Stability of Encapsulated Virus versus Free Virus.....	154
6.5	Conclusions.....	159
6.6	Acknowledgements.....	159
7.	ELECTROSPINNING HETEROPROTEIN COMPLEX COACERVATES	161
7.1	Electrospinning Complex Coacervates	161
7.2	Materials and Methods.....	162
7.3	Results of Electrospinning Heteroprotein Coacervates	165
7.4	Conclusions.....	166
7.5	Acknowledgements.....	168
8.	KINETICS OF BINARY COMPLEXATION BETWEEN OPPOSITELY CHARGED POLYPEPTIDES	169
8.1	Abstract.....	169
8.2	Introduction.....	170
8.3	Materials and Methods.....	172
8.3.1	Materials	172
8.3.2	Peptide Synthesis	173
8.3.3	Coacervate Preparation	175
8.3.4	Turbidity Analysis	177
8.3.5	Data Analysis	178
8.4	Results and Discussion	179
8.4.1	Coacervation by Hand and by Machine.....	179
8.4.2	Exploring the Effect of Sequence in the Presence of Buffer	188
8.4.3	Is This Just Diffusion? Chain Length of Polypeptides	193
8.4.4	Effect of Salt	197
8.5	Conclusions.....	203
8.6	Acknowledgements.....	204
9.	TERNARY SYSTEMS BETWEEN TWO OPPOSITELY CHARGES POLYMERS AND AN ANIONIC SURFACTANT	205
9.1	Introduction.....	205
9.2	Materials	206

9.3	Turbidity Analysis	206
9.4	Experimental Results and Discussion	207
9.4.1	Ternary Systems with PSS and PDADMAC	207
9.4.2	Order of Addition.....	214
9.4.3	Effect of Salt	214
9.4.4	Adding in a Neutral Surfactant	216
9.4.5	Effect of Temperature.....	217
9.5	Conclusions.....	217
9.6	Acknowledgements.....	217
10.	CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE WORK	219
10.1	Conclusions.....	219
10.2	Future Work	222
10.2.1	Changing the Charge Block and Charge Fraction of Selected Peptides	222
10.2.2	Phase Space with a Ternary System	224
10.2.3	Explore the Activity and Stability of Biologics in Complex Coacervates using Freeze-Drying.....	227
10.3	Summary	227
APPENDICES		
A.	SUPPLEMENT PROTEIN ENCAPSULATION DATA.....	229
A.1	Background Subtraction.....	233
A.2	MATLAB Code for pI Calculations	234
A.3	MATLAB Script for Pair-Wise Interaction Calculations	240
B.	MATHEMATICS AND CODE FOR THE MODELING AND FITTING OF BINARY COACERVATE SYSTEMS WITH CALCULATED HALF TIMES.....	247
B.1	Gaussian Fits.....	249
B.2	Plotting and Determining Kinetics.....	250
B.3	Reynolds and Péclet Number Calculations.....	251
B.3.1	Calculating the Reynolds Number	251
B.3.2	Calculating the Péclet Number	252
B.3.3	Characteristic Time for Diffusive Mixing	253
B.4	MATLAB Script	254
C.	PROTOCOLS	263
C.1	Bradford Assay	263

C.1.1	Safety	263
C.1.2	Materials	263
C.1.3	Standard Curve.....	263
C.1.4	Making Samples for the Standard Curve	264
C.1.5	Encapsulating BSA (Protein) and Running the Bradford Assay	264
C.2	MTT Assay	265
C.2.1	Safety	265
C.2.2	Set-Up	265
C.2.3	Stocks.....	266
C.2.4	Running Experiments.....	267
C.2.5	Clean-Up.....	270
C.3	Caspase-6 Assay	270
C.3.1	Safety	270
C.3.2	Materials	270
C.3.3	Caspase-6 Activity Buffer pH 7.5.....	271
C.3.4	Preparation of Samples	271
C.3.5	Assay.....	271
C.4	SDS-PAGE Gel.....	271
C.4.1	Safety	271
C.4.2	Materials	272
C.4.3	Sample Prep	272
C.4.4	Running Gel.....	272
D.	PROTEIN AND ENZYME SEQUENCES	274
D.1	Introduction.....	274
D.2	Proteins	274
D.2.1	Bovine Serum Albumin	274
D.2.2	Hen Egg White Lysozyme	275
D.2.3	Human Hemoglobin.....	275
D.3	Virus Proteins.....	276
D.3.1	PPV Virus Protein 1	276
D.3.2	PPV Virus Protein 2.....	276
D.3.3	BVDV Envelope Protein.....	277
D.4	Enzymes.....	280
D.4.1	Full Caspase-6.....	280
D.4.2	Δ N D179 CT	280

D.4.3 ΔN D179 CT R42-44A	281
BIBLIOGRAPHY	282

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
3.1. List of encapsulated proteins, the polyelectrolyte(s) used, the reported encapsulation efficiency (EE), and citation.	70
5.1. Accelerated aging temperature chart.	123
6.1. Model virus properties including size, isoelectric point (pI), and related human viruses.	146
6.2. Accelerated aging study chart.	156
8.1. Molecular sequence for poly(lysine-co-glycine) or poly(glutamate-co-glycine), denoting lysine or glutamate with an X, peptides with degree of polymerization N = 50.	174
A.1. Table of counter-ions, molecular weights and polydispersity index (PDI) of polypeptides. PDI was found using gel permeation chromatography (GPC). Polypeptides of chain length 50 were made in house, while N = 100, 400, and 800 were purchased from Alamanda Polymers.	229
A.2. Table of calculated net charge for the various proteins and peptides used in this study as a function of pH.	230
A.3. Table of the calculated number of positive and negative charges for the various proteins used in this study as a function of pH.	231
A.4. Table of physical parameters for the model proteins bovine serum albumin (BSA), human hemoglobin (Hb), and hen egg white lysozyme (HEWL) used in this study. These results match closely to those calculated using other computational tools such as ProtParam.	231
B.1. Average half times of 10 mM salt concentrations with (EG) ₂₅ /(KG) ₂₅	248
B.2. Polycation, polyanion, order of addition, type of salt, salt concentration, half time, its standard deviation and elapsed time with its standard deviation for systems with no added buffer.	248
B.3. Table of counter-ions, molecular weights with (M _{wc}) and without (M _w) the counter-ions, and polydispersity index (PDI) of polypeptides. PDI was found using gel permeation chromatography (GPC). Polypeptides of chain length 50 were made in house, while N = 100, 400, and 800 were purchased from Alamanda Polymers.	249
D.1. Amino acids and their corresponding 1-letter symbols.	274

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure	Page
<p>2.1. (a) Phase separation of 100 mg/mL Z-Cat-C10, a catechol-containing zwitterionic surfactant inspired by mussel foot protein-5 (mfp-5) in 4-mm-diameter glass test tubes. The turbid dispersions of coacervate droplets (left) and the bulk-separated phases showing the denser coalesced coacervate phase on the bottom (middle and right). The tilted tube (right) indicates the fluidity of both phases (right). (b) Cryo-TEM image of the interface between the dense coacervate phase (CoA) and the equilibrium solution (EqS). White arrows indicate same small aggregates found in both phases. (c) Optical micrographs showing the time course of the coalescence of coacervates composed of Z-Cat-C10. The 16 min, 4 s image shows coalescence of two droplets. Figure adapted with permission from Ref. [1] (Ahn, <i>et al.</i>, <i>Nature Commun.</i>, (2015), 6, 8663.).....</p>	9
<p>2.2. Turbidity plot as a function of mole fraction poly(allylamine hydrochloride) p(AH) at pH 6.5 where both p(AH) and poly(acrylic acid sodium chloride) (pAA) are fully charged (black circles) and pH 8.5 where p(AH) is only half charged (blue squares). Data are shown for no salt conditions (open symbols) and 100 mM NaCl (closed symbols). All samples were prepared at 1 mM total monomer concentration and complexes were prepared by adding pAA to solution containing p(AH) and the desired salt concentration. Figure adapted with permission from Ref. [13] (Perry <i>et al.</i>, <i>Polymers</i>, (2014), 6, 1756-1772.).....</p>	10
<p>2.3. Plots of turbidity showing a comparison of (a) a series of mono and divalent salts. (b) A plot of turbidity vs. ionic strength for the salts shown in (a). Additional comparisons of a series of (c) a series of sodium halide salts and (d) other monovalent sodium salts. All samples were prepared at 1 mM total monomer concentration, 50/50 mol% pAA/p(AH) ratio at pH 6.5 and complexes were prepared by adding pAA to solution containing p(AH) and the desired salt concentration. Figure adapted with permission from Ref. [13] (Perry <i>et al.</i>, <i>Polymers</i>, (2014), 6, 1756-1772.).....</p>	14
<p>2.4. Schematic representation of a series of thermodynamic phase diagrams, or binodal curves, as a function of salt concentration and polymer concentration (for a given stoichiometry, solution pH, and temperature), defining the boundary between the two-phase region of coacervation (beneath the curve) and the single-phase solution region (above the curve). The critical point is indicated at the highest point of each curve. The dashed tie line defines the equilibrium concentration for a coexisting coacervate and supernatant phase. Increasing polymer chain length can drive an increase in the width of the two-phase region, as indicated by the arrow. Similar trends have been observed for increasing polymer charge density.....</p>	16
<p>2.2. (a) Bright-field optical micrographs showing the liquid coacervates or solid precipitates resulting from the stoichiometric electrostatic complexation of <i>L</i>, <i>D</i>, or racemic (<i>D,L</i>) poly(lysine) (single letter abbreviation K) with <i>L</i>, <i>D</i> or racemic (<i>D,L</i>) poly(glutamate) (single letter abbreviation E) at a total residue concentration of 6 and 100 mM NaCl, pH 7.0. Complexes are formed from pLK + pLE, pDK + pLE, p(<i>D,L</i>)K + pLE,</p>	

pLK + pDE, pDK + pDE, p(D,L)K + pDE, pLK + p(D,L)E, pDK + p(D,L)E, p(D,L)K + p(D,L)E. Liquid coacervate droplets are only observed during complexation involving a racemic polymer. Scale bars are 25 μm . Figure adapted with permission from Ref. [2] (Perry *et al.*, *Nature Commun*, (2015), 6, 6052.). (b) Secondary structure of each residue vs. time for various 1 μs MD simulations of 10-amino acid polypeptide pairs. “A” denotes simulations containing non-homochiral peptides of poly(glutamate) (PGlu, blue), with a specified number of continuous *L* amino acids in the center of the chain, in complex with a homochiral poly(*L*-lysine) (PLys, red). The structures of PLys and PGlu are shown at 0, 400, 700, and 1000 ns for each pair. Figure adapted from Ref. [3] (Hoffmann *et al.*, *Soft Matter*, (2015), 11, 1525-1538.) with permission from The Royal Society of Chemistry.....18

2.6. Architectural schemes of various hierarchically-structured coacervate-based materials including (a) bulk coacervates, (b) coacervate-corona micelles, (c) coacervate-core micelles, (d) coacervate-core vesicles (also known as polyion complex vesicles, or PICsomes), and triblock copolymer coacervate hydrogels with both (e) spherical and (f) hexagonal coacervate geometries.21

2.7. (a) Plot of changes in turbidity as a function of the ratio of negative-to-positive residues on the protein. The grey shaded region corresponds to proteins that do not undergo phase separation. Figure adapted with permission from Ref. [25] (Obermeyer *et al.*, *Soft Matter*, (2016), 12, 3570-3581). (b) Encapsulation of bovine serum albumin (BSA) into a coacervate. Positively-charged poly(*L*-lysine) (PLys) is added to the negatively-charged protein to form an intermediate complex. Negatively-charged poly(*D,L*-glutamate) (PGlu) is then added to form the complex coacervate. Figure adapted with permission from Ref. [16] (Black *et al.*, *ACS Macro Lett*, (2014), 3, 1088-1091).24

2.8. (a) Comparison of H&E (scale bar is 1 mm) and α -actinin (scale bar is 50 μm) stained tissues for infarcted myocardium receiving treatments of saline, [PEAD:Heparin], free FGF2 and FGF2 coacervate. Application of the coacervate FGF2 formulation significantly reduced the infarct area, preventing ventricular dilation and preserving cardiac fibers, compared with the other treatment strategies. α -actinin stained tissues demonstrate enhanced preservation of cardiomyocytes in the infarct zone for the FGF2 coacervate treatment. Figure adapted with permission from Ref. [87]. (Chu *et al.*, *Biomaterials*, (2013), 34, 1747-1756.) (b) Adhesive complex coacervate adhesive analysis on skull surface (left) and CD68 immunoreactivity (green) associated with adhesive (red). Scale bars represent 500 μm . Figure adapted with permission from Ref. [67]. (Winslow *et al.*, *Biomaterials*, (2010), 31, 9373-9381.)28

2.9. (a) Differential interface contrast (DIC) and fluorescence micrographs of a HeLa cell expressing Ddx4^{YFP}. Ddx4^{YFP} forms dense, spherical organelles in the nucleus. Cells were stained with antibodies to visualize nucleoli, PML bodies, nuclear speckles, and Cajal bodies. Figure adapted with permission from Ref. [9]. (Nott *et al.*, *Mol. Cell*, (2015), 57, 936-947.) (b) Time-lapse imaging of a nuclear body assembly in transiently transfected HeLa cells expressing Nephhrin intracellular domain (NCID). Scale bar represents 5 μm . Figure adapted with permission from Ref. [10]. (Pak *et al.*, *Mol. Cell*,

(2016), 63, 72-85.) (c) Representative images of the morphological changes in *in vitro* droplets of wild-type (WT) and G156E FUS during an “aging” experiment over 8 hr. Figure adapted with permission from Ref. [113]. (Patel *et al.*, *Cell*, (2015), 162, 1066-1077).33

2.10. (a) Schematic illustration of enzyme activities during the reversible reaction using lambda protein phosphate (LPP) enzyme and protein kinase A (PKA) with adenosine diphosphate (ADP), adenosine triphosphate (ATP) and EDTA resulting in the formation and dissolution of a coacervate phase. Figure adapted with permission from Ref. [91]. (Aumiller and Keating, *Nat. Chem.*, (2015), 8, 129-137.) (b) UV-vis spectra demonstrating the encapsulation of CMDex-Fe₃O₄ (left), CMDex-Co₃O₄ (middle) and gold (right) nanoparticles in poly(lysine)-adenosine triphosphate (PLys-ATP) droplets with accompanying optical images of the magnetic CMDex-Fe₃O₄ nanoparticle system and a TEM micrograph of encapsulated gold nanoparticles. (c) Plots of the change in concentration of (top) 2,2-azino-bis(3-ethylbenzothiazoline-6-sulfonic acid) (ABTS) and b-NADPH (bottom) as a function of time in both the presence (closed circles) and absence (open circles) of catalytic coacervate droplets. Figures adapted with permission from Ref. [40]. (Koga, *Nat. Chem.*, (2011), 3, 720-724.) (d) UV-vis spectra (top) and plot of the time-dependent changes in the normalized peak intensities (bottom) for the selective catalytic degradation of methylene blue compared with rhodamine B dye as a result of selective uptake into coacervate microdroplets formed from titania nanosheets, poly(diallyldimethylammonium) chloride, and ATP. Figure adapted with permission from Ref. [96]. (Lv *et al.*, *Chem. Commun.*, (2015), 51, 8600-8602.)35

2.11. (a) Structure of the ligand 1,11-bis(2,6-dicarboxypyridin-4-yloxy)-3,6,9-trioxaundecane (L₂EO₄) and the diblock copolymer poly(N-methyl-2-vinyl-pyridinium iodide)-b-poly(ethylene oxide) (P2MVP₄₁-PEO₂₀₅), along with a schematic representation of the formation of the corresponding Eu/Gd-complex coacervate-core micelles (C3Ms). (b) Luminescent emission intensity and nuclear magnetic resonance dispersion profiles of Eu/Gd-C3Ms at different Eu³⁺/Gd³⁺ ratios. Figure adapted with permission from Ref. [124]. (Wang *et al.*, *Chem. Commun.*, (2013), 49, 3736.) (c) Schematic of the lamellar poly(styrene-*b*-2-vinylpyridine) (PS-QP2VP) photonic gel and its two possible behaviors (swelling/ contraction) in protein solutions. (d) Photos of PS-QP2VP photonic gels after soaking in 1% protein solutions in 10 mM Tris buffer overnight. Scale bar is 1 mm. Reprinted with permission from Fan *et al.*, (2014). Responsive Block Copolymer Photonics Triggered by Protein–Polyelectrolyte Coacervation. *ACS Nano*, 8(11), 11467–11473. Copyright 2014. American Chemical Society. Ref. [123].36

3.1. Overall schematic of using complex coacervates as a nature inspired method for protein encapsulation with compartmentalization, crowding, and soft interactions as biomimetic features.41

3.2. Different encapsulation methods for proteins. From the top, moving clockwise: complex coacervates, coacervate micelles, water-in-oil-in-water (W/O/W) emulsions, oil-in-water (O/W) emulsions, polymer microspheres, liposomes, and nanogels.44

3.3. Generic depiction of a coacervation phase diagram showing the binodal phase boundary as a function of salt and polymer concentration at a specified polymer charge ratio, pH, and temperature. Samples prepared in the two-phase region beneath the binodal curve (red dot) will phase separate into the polymer-poor supernatant and polymer-rich coacervate phases along a tie-line (dashed line). Above the binodal curve is the single-phase region where no phase separation is observed.....	47
3.4. (a) A plot of turbidity as a function of the charge fraction of the polycation at pH 6.5 and 8.5. All samples were prepared at 1 mM total monomer concentration, 50/50 mol% poly(acrylic acid sodium salt) (pAA)/poly(allylamine hydrochloride) (pAH). Complexes were prepared by adding pAA to a solution containing a mixture of pAH. (Reprinted with permission from Ref [13]. Copyright 2014 Open Access from Polymers.) (b) pH dependence of the turbidity and system state for hyaluronic acid (0.1 g/L) and β -lactoglobulin (1 g/L) mixture with respect to pH in 25 mM NaCl, upon addition of acid. (Reprinted with permission from Ref. [168]. Copyright 2016 Soft Matter.).....	49
3.5. (a) A plot of Debye length as a function of ionic strength. (b) A plot of turbidity as a function of ionic strength for a series of chloride salts, investigating the effects of various cations. All samples were prepared at 1 mM total monomer concentration, 50/50 mol% poly(acrylic acid sodium salt) (pAA)/poly(allylamine hydrochloride) (pAH) ratio at pH 6.5. Complexes were prepared by adding pAA to a solution containing a mixture of pAH and the desired quantity of salt. (Reprinted with permission from Ref. [13]. Copyright 2014 Open Access from Polymers.)	51
3.6. (a) Plot of salt resistance versus charge fraction using poly(glutamate) with patterned cationic poly(lysine-co-glycine), as described in (b). (Reprinted with permission from Ref [331]. Copyright 2019 Open Access from ACS Central Science.) (c) Entropic gains as a function of charged block size determined using isothermal titration calorimetry. Schematic depiction of the differences in counterion localization for different patterns of charge for (d) polyelectrolytes (Reprinted with permission from Ref. [330]. Copyright 2017 Open Access from Nature Communications.) and (e) polyampholytes. (Madinya, <i>et al.</i> , Sequence-dependent self-coacervation in high charge-density polyampholytes. <i>Mol. Syst. Des. Eng.</i> 2020. – Reproduced by permission of The Royal Society of Chemistry. Ref. [329].).....	53
3.7. Representations of (a) bulk coacervates, (b) coacervate-core micelles (CCMs), and (c) coacervate-core vesicles (PICsomes). Bulk coacervates utilize homopolymers, while coacervate-core micelles and vesicles more typically use diblock copolymers.	54
3.8. Identification of predictive parameter for globular protein coacervation. Plot of changes in turbidity as a function of the ratio of negative-to-positive residues on the protein. Variation in charge ratio was achieved by acetylation of protein surface residues. The grey shaded region corresponds to proteins that do not phase separate ($\alpha < 1.1$). The other proteins tested include: trypsin, α -amylase, β -lactoglobulin, bovine serum albumin, cytochrome P450BM3, and mCherry. Open triangle data from Blocher McTigue and Perry for lysozyme in a ternary system. (Adapted with permission from Ref. [25]. Copyright 2016 Soft Matter.).....	58

3.9. Overview of how complex coacervation works in a ternary system with two oppositely charged polyelectrolytes and a protein of interest.....	59
3.10. (a) Plot of the concentration of hen egg white lysozyme (HEWL) in the supernatant (dashed black) and coacervate (solid blue) as a function of the charge fraction of the polycation. (Blocher McTigue and Perry, Design Rules for Encapsulating Proteins into Complex Coacervates. <i>Soft Matter</i> 2019, 15, 3089–3103. – Reproduced by permission of The Royal Society of Chemistry. Ref. [320]) (b) Plot of the concentration of protein in the supernatant (expressed as a percentage of the control system without polyelectrolytes) as a function of the charge fraction of the polyanion F^- for positively-charged lysozyme (net charge of +7) and anionic lysozyme created by succinylation (net charge of -7) in complex with poly(acrylic acid) (PAA) and poly(allylamine hydrochloride) (PAH) at pH in the range of 7 – 7.4. The optimum values of F^- for each protein can be identified from the minima on the graph. $F_{opt}^- = 0.65$ for lysozyme and $F_{opt}^- = 0.55$ for succinylated lysozyme. (Reprinted with permission from Ref. [277]. Copyright 2019 Open Access from Biomacromolecules.)	61
3.11. Theoretical charge calculations of (a) BSA and (d) lysozyme. Calculated values for the isoelectric point (pI) for each protein is indicated with filled circles, experimental data shown with open diamonds. The insets show 3D renderings of molecular models of BSA and HEWL showing the distribution of positive (blue) and negative (red) charges on the protein surface. Encapsulation efficiency of (b) BSA and (e) lysozyme with increasing pH from 6 to 8. Encapsulation efficiency of (c) BSA and (f) lysozyme for different charged patterned peptides. (++) or (--) indicates a fully charged polycation or anion, respectively, with a total length of 50 charged amino acids while a single (+) or (-) indicates a half charged polycation or polyanion, respectively, as an alternating copolymer of charged or neutral amino acids. (Blocher McTigue and Perry, Design Rules for Encapsulating Proteins into Complex Coacervates. <i>Soft Matter</i> 2019, 15, 3089–3103.. – Reproduced by permission of The Royal Society of Chemistry. Ref. [320].).....	64
3.12. (a) Schematic depiction of a DSC thermogram. The dashed line represents the midpoint of the curve, which is used to determine the T_m . (b) CD spectra as a function of wavelength for BSA in solution and encapsulated in a complex coacervate of poly(lysine) and poly(glutamate) at a ratio of 0.05 BSA to total polypeptide. (Reprinted with permission from Black, <i>et al.</i> , Protein encapsulation via polypeptide complex coacervation. <i>ACS Macro Lett.</i> 2014, 3 (10). Copyright 2014 from the American Chemical Society. Ref. [16].) (c) CD signal at 222 nm corresponding to the α -helical structure of lysozyme in solution and encapsulated in poly(lysine)/poly(glutamate) coacervates as a function of temperature. The dashed line represents the approximate midpoint of the curve, which corresponds to T_m	73
3.13. Theoretical charge calculations for two isoforms of β -lactoglobulin, (a) BLG-A and (b) BLG-B. The calculated value of the pI for BLG-A and BLG-B was 4.6 and 4.7, respectively (filled circles). Experimental values of the pI from the literature reported 5.1 and 5.2, respectively (open diamonds). (c) Proportion of BLG-A (red) and BLG-B (blue) into the coacervate phase mixing lactoferrin and BLG-A + B at pH 5.50 and 5.75. (Reprinted from Tavares, <i>et al.</i> , Selective coacervation between lactoferrin and the two	

isoforms of beta-lactoglobulin. *Food Hydrocolloids* 2015, 48, 238–247, with permission from Elsevier. Ref. [391]).....78

3.14. Electrostatic potential contours (-0.5 (red) and +0.5 (blue) kT/e) for BSA (upper) at pH 5.6 and BLG dimer (lower) at pH 5.0. The charges are distributed around BSA, while BLG has a distinct negatively charged patch on the top and positive patch on the bottom. (Reprinted with permission from Xu, *et al.*, Protein Purification by Polyelectrolyte Coacervation: Influence of Protein Charge Anisotropy on Selectivity. *Biomacromolecules* 2011, 12 (5), 1512–1522. Copyright 2011 from the American Chemical Society. Ref. [165].).....79

4.1. Structural rendering of the model proteins bovine serum albumin (BSA), the tetrameric form of human hemoglobin (Hb), and hen egg white lysozyme (HEWL) highlighting the location and distribution of charged residues. Negatively-charged glutamate and aspartate residues are shown in red. Positively-charged histidine, lysine, and arginine are shown in blue. The listed isoelectric point (pI) was obtained from theoretical calculations based on the Henderson-Hasselbalch equation.85

4.2. Plots of turbidity as a function of the charge fraction of the polycation for coacervates of K_{50} and E_{50} in the presence and absence of (a) BSA, (c) Hb, and (e) HEWL in 10 mM HEPES, pH 7.0. The inset optical micrographs show the liquid coacervate droplets formed at the peak in turbidity for the system. The corresponding plots of protein concentration in the supernatant (dashed black) and coacervate (solid) as a function of the charge fraction of the polycation for (b) BSA, (d) Hb, and (f) HEWL. A decrease in protein concentration in the supernatant phase is matched by an increase in the protein concentration in the coacervate phase over the range of mole fractions indicated by turbidity. Lines connecting data points are a guide to the eye. Error bars are the standard deviation of the reported average, including propagated error.94

4.3. Plots of maximum encapsulation efficiency (a-c) and maximum partition coefficient (d-f) as a function of solution pH for BSA (red, pI = 5.5), Hb (light blue, pI = 9.0), and HEWL (dark blue, pI = 11.7), respectively. Coacervates were prepared using $N = 50$ polymers with no added salt and 10 mM buffer. An asterisk (*) denotes $p < 0.05$, and error bars are the standard deviation of the reported average, including propagated error.....97

4.4. Plots of turbidity as a function of pH for (a) BSA, (b) Hb, and (c) HEWL at pH 6.0, 7.0, and 8.0. Increasing pH is shown by a change in color from light to dark. In each case, we observed a decrease in the range of charge stoichiometries over which phase separation, as well as a shift towards higher cationic charge fractions with increasing pH. Lines connecting data points are a guide to the eye. Error bars are the standard deviation of the reported average.....98

4.5. Plots of concentration vs. cationic charge fraction for both the supernatant (open circles) and the coacervate phases (colored squares) at pH 6.0 (a, c, e) and pH 8.0 (b, d, f) for BSA (a, b), Hb (c, d), and HEWL (e, f). We observed a decrease in the amount of protein taken up into the coacervate phase going from pH 6.0 to 8.0 for Hb and HEWL,

as the solution pH shifts closer to the pI of the protein, while the opposite trend is observed for BSA, which has an acidic pI. Lines connecting data points are a guide to the eye. Error bars are the standard deviation of the reported average. Quantification of the maximum partitioning and encapsulation efficiency is shown in Figure 4.3.99

4.6. Encapsulation efficiency and partition coefficient of (a, d) BSA, (b, e) Hb, and (c, f) HEWL as a function of NaCl concentration. Initially, there is a decrease in the encapsulation efficiency of the proteins into the coacervate phase, then, when 150 mM NaCl is added, the efficiency begins to increase again for BSA and HEWL. An opposite trend is observed for Hb.....101

4.7. Plots of turbidity as a function of increasing NaCl concentration for (a) BSA, (b) Hb, and (c) HEWL. Increasing salt concentration is shown by a change in color from light to dark. We observed an increase in the range of charge stoichiometries over which phase separation was observed with increasing salt concentration, as salt ions can facilitate charge neutralization of polymer complexes over a wider range of polymer ratios than is possible in the absence of added salt. Lines connecting data points are a guide to the eye. Error bars are the standard deviation of the reported average.102

4.8. Plots of the concentration of BSA for both the supernatant (open circles) and the coacervate phases (colored squares) as a function of the cationic charge fraction at (a) 50 mM, (b) 100 mM, (c) 150 mM, and (d) 200 mM NaCl. We observed a decrease in the amount of protein taken up into the coacervate phase with increasing salt concentration, as seen with HEWL in Figure 4.10. Lines connecting data points are a guide to the eye. Error bars are the standard deviation of the reported average. Quantification of the maximum partitioning and encapsulation efficiency is shown in Figure 4.6.103

4.9. Plots of the concentration of Hb for both the supernatant (open circles) and the coacervate phases (colored squares) as a function of the cationic charge fraction at (a) 50 mM, (b) 100 mM, (c) 150 mM, and (d) 200 mM NaCl. We observed very little protein uptake into the coacervate phase in the presence of added salt, resulting in the appearance of significant error due to propagation of uncertainty through our calculations. Lines connecting data points are a guide to the eye. Error bars are the standard deviation of the reported average. Quantification of the maximum partitioning and encapsulation efficiency is shown in Figure 4.6.104

4.10. Plots of the concentration of HEWL for both the supernatant (open circles) and the coacervate phases (colored squares) as a function of the cationic charge fraction at (a) 50 mM, (b) 100 mM, (c) 150 mM, and (d) 200 mM NaCl. We observed a decrease in the amount of protein taken up into the coacervate phase with increasing salt concentration, as seen for BSA in Figure 4.8. Lines connecting data points are a guide to the eye. Error bars are the standard deviation of the reported average. Quantification of the maximum partitioning and encapsulation efficiency is shown in Figure 4.6.105

4.11. Plots of maximum encapsulation efficiency (a-c) and maximum partition coefficient (d-f) as a function of the degree of polymerization of the complexing polymers for BSA (red), Hb (light blue), and HEWL (dark blue), respectively. Coacervates were prepared

with no added salt and 10 mM buffer, pH = 7.0. An asterisk (*) denotes $p < 0.05$, and error bars are the standard deviation of the reported average, including propagated error.....106

4.12. Plots of turbidity as a function of increasing polypeptide chain length for (a) BSA, (b) Hb, and (c) HEWL. Increasing chain length is shown by a change in color from light to dark. We observed an increase in the range of charge stoichiometries over which phase separation was observed with increasing chain length. Lines connecting data points are a guide to the eye. Error bars are the standard deviation of the reported average.....107

4.13. Plots of the concentration of BSA for both the supernatant (open circles) and the coacervate phases (colored squares) as a function of the cationic charge fraction with increasing polypeptide chain length (a) $N = 100$, (b) $N = 400$, and (c) $N = 800$. Lines connecting data points are a guide to the eye. Error bars are the standard deviation of the reported average. Quantification of the maximum partitioning and encapsulation efficiency is shown in Figure 4.11.....108

4.14. Plots of the concentration of Hb for both the supernatant (open circles) and the coacervate phases (colored squares) as a function of the cationic charge fraction with increasing polypeptide chain length (a) $N = 100$, (b) $N = 400$, and (c) $N = 800$. Lines connecting data points are a guide to the eye. Error bars are the standard deviation of the reported average. Quantification of the maximum partitioning and encapsulation efficiency is shown in Figure 4.11.....109

4.15. Plots of the concentration of HEWL for both the supernatant (open circles) and the coacervate phases (colored squares) as a function of the cationic charge fraction with increasing polypeptide chain length (a) $N = 100$, (b) $N = 400$, and (c) $N = 800$. We observed a decrease in the amount of protein taken up into the coacervate phase compared with $N = 50$ (Figure 4.2f) with increasing chain length. Lines connecting data points are a guide to the eye. Error bars are the standard deviation of the reported average. Quantification of the maximum partitioning and encapsulation efficiency is shown in Figure 4.11.....110

4.16. 3D bar plot depictions of the radial distribution function $g(r)$ with respect to the charged amino acids in (a) BSA, (b) Hb, and (c) HEWL. The arrows in (c) indicate the residues associated with the identified charge patch.112

4.17. Encapsulation efficiency and partition coefficient of (a, d) BSA, (b, e) Hb, and (c, f) Hb as a function of peptide system. Four peptide systems are used: pLK_{50}/pRE_{50} , $pLK_{50}/(EG)_{25}$, $(KG)_{25}/pRE_{50}$, and $(KG)_{25}/(EG)_{25}$. Each protein shows different trends and preference for different encapsulant peptides. BSA prefers the homopolypeptide to be oppositely charged with a patterned polypeptide with a negative charge, while HEWL and Hb prefer both polypeptides to be homogeneous with a preference that the negative polypeptide be homogeneous.....113

4.18. Plots of turbidity as a function of increasing polypeptide charge content for (a) BSA, (b) Hb, and (c) HEWL. The polypeptide systems are denoted: K_{50}/E_{50} as $++/--$,

$K_{50}/(EG)_{25}$ as $++/-$, $(KG)_{25}/E_{50}$ as $+/-$, and $(KG)_{25}/(EG)_{25}$ as $+/-$. We observed a decrease in the turbidity signal as the overall charge on the polypeptides decreased from K_{50}/E_{50} (fully charged) to $(KG)_{25}/(EG)_{25}$ (half charged). Lines connecting data points are a guide to the eye. Error bars are the standard deviation of the reported average.114

4.19. Plots of the concentration of BSA for both the supernatant (open circles) and the coacervate phases (colored squares) as a function of the cationic charge fraction for systems with different amounts of polypeptide charge (a) $K_{50}/(EG)_{25}$, (b) $(KG)_{25}/E_{50}$, and (c) $(KG)_{25}/(EG)_{25}$. We observed the highest levels of protein uptake into the coacervate phase when a fully charged cationic polypeptide was used, and the lowest when a half-charged cationic peptide used, indicating favorable interactions between the anionic BSA and the cationic polypeptide. Lines connecting data points are a guide to the eye. Error bars are the standard deviation of the reported average. Quantification of the maximum partitioning and encapsulation efficiency is shown in Figure 4.17.115

4.20. Plots of the concentration of Hb for both the supernatant (open circles) and the coacervate phases (colored squares) as a function of the cationic charge fraction for systems with different amounts of polypeptide charge (a) $K_{50}/(EG)_{25}$, (b) $(KG)_{25}/E_{50}$, and (c) $(KG)_{25}/(EG)_{25}$. We observed the highest levels of protein uptake into the coacervate phase when a fully charged anionic polypeptide was used, and the lowest when a half-charged anionic peptide used, indicating favorable interactions between the cationic Hb and the anionic polypeptide. Lines connecting data points are a guide to the eye. Error bars are the standard deviation of the reported average. Quantification of the maximum partitioning and encapsulation efficiency is shown in Figure 4.17.116

4.21. Plots of the concentration of HEWL for both the supernatant (open circles) and the coacervate phases (colored squares) as a function of the cationic charge fraction for systems with different amounts of polypeptide charge (a) $K_{50}/(EG)_{25}$, (b) $(KG)_{25}/E_{50}$, and (c) $(KG)_{25}/(EG)_{25}$. We observed the highest levels of protein uptake into the coacervate phase when a fully charged anionic polypeptide was used, and the lowest when a half-charged anionic peptide used, indicating favorable interactions between the cationic HEWL and the anionic polypeptide. Lines connecting data points are a guide to the eye. Error bars are the standard deviation of the reported average. Quantification of the maximum partitioning and encapsulation efficiency is shown in Figure 4.17.117

4.22. Plots of (a) maximum encapsulation efficiency and (b) maximum partition coefficient as a function of the absolute difference between the pI and pH and plots of (c) encapsulation efficiency and (d) partition coefficient as a function of absolute net charge. The dashed lines are guides for slopes for two different regimes. Coacervates were prepared using $N = 50$ polymers with no added salt and 10 mM buffer. Error bars are the standard deviation of the reported average, including propagated error.119

5.1. Turbidity of (a) Casp6 and (c) Casp6mut as a function of charge fraction of K_{50}/E_{50} at pH 7.0 in 10mM HEPES with corresponding optical micrographs of samples prepared at the peak turbidity condition for (b) Casp6 and (d) Casp6mut confirming complex coacervation. Error bars represent the standard deviation.127

5.2. Concentration of (a) Casp6 and (b) Casp6mut as a function of charge fraction of K_{50}/E_{50} at pH 7.0 in 10mM HEPES. Error bars represent the propagated error.	128
5.3. Encapsulation efficiency (blue left axis) and partition coefficient (red right axis) of Casp6 and Casp6mut in K_{50}/E_{50} at pH 7.0 in 10 mM HEPES buffer. Error bars represent the propagated error.	129
5.4. Casp6 activity shown as fluorescence intensity (in relative fluorescent units, RFU) from the cleavage of a VEID fluorogenic substrate as a function of time for encapsulated (solid blue) and free (black dashed) Casp6 at (a) 0 h, (b) 4 h, (c) 24 h, (d) 72 h, and (e) 168 h. The decreasing Casp6 activity as a function of time can be observed as a decrease in the slope of the data going from (a) to (e). Error bars represent the standard deviation of N=6.	130
5.5. Fluorescence intensity (in relative fluorescent units, RFU) from the 10 min point in the activity assay shown in Figure 5.4 as a function of Casp6 aging time at room temperature for both encapsulated (solid blue) and free (black dashed). Error bars represent the standard deviation of N=6.	131
5.6. SDS-PAGE of free and encapsulated Casp6 at 0 h, 4 h, 24 h, 72 h, and 168 h. In the free Casp6 samples, bands can be seen just below 30 kDa, below 20 kDa, and above 15 kDa. As the time increases, the band just below 30 kDa becomes darker, while the band above 15 kDa fades. For encapsulated Casp6 samples, the samples were trapped in the loading portion of the gel.	132
6.1. Schematic depiction of virus encapsulation via electrostatic complexation with charged polypeptides to form complex coacervate droplets.	147
6.2. (a,d) Brightfield optical micrographs, (b,e) fluorescent micrographs, and the (c,f) composite overlay of the brightfield and fluorescent images of NHS-Rhodamine tagged (a-c) PPV- and (d-f) BVDV-containing coacervates.	149
6.3. Turbidity of encapsulated virus. (a) PPV coacervates, and (b) BVDV coacervates. All data points are the average of three separate tests and error bars represent the standard deviation.	150
6.4. Live virus titration. (a-c) Encapsulated PPV, and (d,e) encapsulated BVDV. (a,d) $4 \log_{10}$ (MTT ₅₀ /mL), (b&e) $5 \log_{10}$ (MTT ₅₀ /mL), and (c) $6 \log_{10}$ (MTT ₅₀ /mL). All data points are the average of three separate tests and error bars represent the standard deviation.	151
6.5. Partition coefficient. (a-c) Encapsulated PPV, and (d,e) encapsulated BVDV. (a,d) $4 \log_{10}$ (MTT ₅₀ /mL), (b,e) $5 \log_{10}$ (MTT ₅₀ /mL), and (c) $6 \log_{10}$ (MTT ₅₀ /mL). All data points are the average of three separate tests and error bars represent the standard deviation.	152

6.6. Recovery of live (a-c) PPV and (d-e) BVDV in coacervate at different virus loadings. All data points are the average of three separate tests and error bars represent the standard deviation.....	153
6.7. Thermal stability of free and encapsulated virus for (a) PPV and (b) BVDV. All data points are the average of three separate tests and error bars represent the standard deviation.....	155
6.8. The infectivity loss of free and encapsulated (a) PPV and (b) BVDV. All data points are the average of three separate tests and error bars represent the standard deviation. The lifetime of encapsulated and free PPV is 14 and 4 days, respectively, 60°C. The lifetime of encapsulated and free BVDV is 24 and 92 hr, respectively, at 40°C.....	156
6.9. Cytotoxicity of polypeptides pRE ₄₀₀ and pLK ₄₀₀ , and complex coacervates made of the same in an MTT assay for (a) PK-13 cells and (b) BT-1 cells.	158
7.1. Schematic of electrospinning cargo-loaded complex coacervates based on a ternary system of K ₅₀ , E ₅₀ , and BSA.....	162
7.2. Schematic of electrospinning a heteroprotein complex coacervate from BLG and LF.....	162
7.3. Photograph of a centrifuged sample of 20 mg/mL BLG/LF coacervates at pH 6.0 in a 15 mL centrifuge tube.....	163
7.4. Scanning electron micrographs of electrospun complex coacervates of (a) BLG/LF with no salt and (b) 5 mM NaCl. (c) Optical micrograph of electrospun complex coacervates of BLG/LF with 7.5 mM NaCl on aluminum foil.....	167
8.1. Stoichiometry experiment showing turbidity as a function of the mole fraction of cation present for coacervates of (EG) ₂₅ /(KG) ₂₅ prepared “by hand” pipetting and vortexing (black), “fully mixed” samples prepared by the liquid handling robot using a 96 well plate, followed by aliquotting into a 384 well plate for analysis (grey), and samples prepared by the liquid handling robot directly into a 384 well plate named “Neg. First” with the negative polyelectrolyte added first (red) or “Pos. First” with the positive polyelectrolyte added first (blue). Error bars represent the standard deviation of N = 27.....	180
8.2. Plots of the evolution of turbidity as a function of the charge fraction of polycation and time for the complexation of (EG) ₂₅ /(KG) ₂₅ at pH 7.0 in water for samples where the (a) concentrated (EG) ₂₅ was mixed into dilute (KG) ₂₅ , (“positive first”) and the opposite case (c) where the concentrated (KG) ₂₅ was added into dilute (EG) ₂₅ (“negative first”). Plot of peak location versus time traces for the turbidity plots (b) (KG) ₂₅ added first and (d) (EG) ₂₅ added first. Schematic representations of poor mixing shown in (b) and (d). Black symbols indicate the characteristic times for sample equilibration, with diamonds marking the half times and black squares marking the elapsed time. Elapsed times for (a) and (b) are 80 min and 85 min, respectively. Error bars represent the standard deviation of N = 27.....	184

8.3. Plots of turbidity versus charge fraction illustrating dependence of length. Positive added first for E_N/K_N systems with (a) $N = 50$, (b) $N = 100$, (c) $N = 400$, and (d) $N = 800$. In all cases, the stoichiometric curves are broader than peptides whose chains are half charged. Elapsed time was (a) 65 min, (b) 80 min, (c) 45 min, and (d) 35 min. Error bars represent the standard deviation of $N = 27$.	185
8.4. Plots of turbidity versus charge fraction illustrating dependence of length. Negative added first for E_N/K_N systems with (a) $N = 50$, (b) $N = 100$, (c) $N = 400$, and (d) $N = 800$. In all cases, the stoichiometric curves are broader than peptides whose chains are half charged. Elapsed time was (a) 65 min, (b) 85 min, (c) 65 min, and (d) 60 min. Error bars represent the standard deviation of $N = 27$.	186
8.5. Plots of turbidity versus charge fraction dependence of symmetry between patterned peptides showing the positive peptide added first with (a) $(EG)_{25}/(KG)_{25}$, (b) $(E_2G_2)_{12}/(K_2G_2)_{12}$, (c) $(E_4G_4)_6/(K_4G_4)_6$, and (d) $(E_8G_8)_3/(K_8G_8)_3$. Elapsed time was (a) 80 min, (b) 60 min, (c) 80 min, and (d) 55 min. Error bars represent the standard deviation of $N = 27$.	187
8.6. Plots of turbidity versus charge fraction dependence of symmetry between patterned peptides showing the negative peptide added first with (a) $(EG)_{25}/(KG)_{25}$, (b) $(E_2G_2)_{12}/(K_2G_2)_{12}$, (c) $(E_4G_4)_6/(K_4G_4)_6$, and (d) $(E_8G_8)_3/(K_8G_8)_3$. Elapsed time was (a) 85 min, (b) 40 min, (c) 80 min, and (d) 55 min. Error bars represent the standard deviation of $N = 27$.	188
8.7. Plots of the evolution of turbidity as a function of the charge fraction of polycation and time for the complexation of $(EG)_{25}/(KG)_{25}$ at pH 7.0 in water for samples where the (a) concentrated $(EG)_{25}$ was mixed into dilute $(KG)_{25}$, (“positive first”) and the opposite case (c) where the concentrated $(KG)_{25}$ was added into dilute $(EG)_{25}$ (“negative first”) in 10 mM HEPES buffer. The elapsed time for sample equilibration was determined to be 30 min for (a) and 70 min for (b). Error bars represent the standard deviation of $N = 27$.	190
8.8. Plots of the evolution of turbidity as a function of the charge fraction of polycation and time for the complexation of E_{50} and $(KG)_{25}$. (a) Shows the addition of $(KG)_{25}$ first and (c) shows the addition of E_{50} first. (b) Shows the addition of $(KG)_{25}$ first and (d) shows the addition of E_{50} first. In the presence of 10 mM HEPES. When the patterned polyelectrolyte is added first in the presence of buffer, there is a shift toward equilibrium, whereas there is little to no shift when the homopolymer is added first. Elapsed time is (b) 85 min and (d) 15 min in the presence of 10 mM HEPES and (a) 65 min and (c) 75 min with no buffer. Error bars represent the standard deviation of $N = 27$.	192
8.9. Plot of turbidity versus charge fraction showing the complexation of K_{50} and $(EG)_{25}$. (a) Shows the addition of K_{50} first and (b) shows the addition of $(EG)_{25}$ of first in 10 mM HEPES. When the patterned polyelectrolyte is added first, there is a shift toward equilibrium, whereas there is little to no shift when the homopolymer is added first. Elapsed time for (a) and (b) was 20 min and 70 min, respectively. Error bars represent the standard deviation of $N = 27$.	193

8.11. Plots of turbidity versus cationic charge fraction showing the complexation of K_{50} with (a, c) $(EG)_{25}$ and (b, d) E_{100} . Data where the positive polymer was added first are shown in (a, b), while those corresponding to experiments where the negative polymer was added first are in (c, d). Elapsed time was (a) 80 min, (b) 70 min, (c) 65 min, and (d) 65 min. Error bars represent the standard deviation of $N = 27$.	194
8.12. Plots of turbidity versus cationic charge fraction showing the complexation of E_{50} with (a, c) $(KG)_{25}$ and (b, d) K_{100} . Data where the positive polymer was added first are shown in (a, b), while those corresponding to experiments where the negative polymer added first are in (c, d). Elapsed time is (a) 65 min, (b) 60 min, (c) 75 min, and (d) 60 min. Error bars represent the standard deviation of $N = 27$.	195
8.13. Average elapsed time of adding the negative polyelectrolyte and positive polyelectrolyte first as a function of polypeptide lengths $N = 50, 100, 400,$ and 800 with no buffer present. Error bars represent the propagated error.	196
8.14. Plots of turbidity versus charge fraction of lysine showing the effect of different salts on the $(EG)_{25}/(KG)_{25}$ system. Shown is the positive peptide added first with 10 mM of (a) KBr, (b) KCl, (c) NaBr, and (d) NaCl. Elapsed time was (a) 5 min, (b) 25 min, (c) 5 min, and (d) 50 min. Error bars represent the standard deviation of $N = 27$.	199
8.15. Plots of turbidity versus charge fraction of lysine showing the effect of different salts on the $(EG)_{25}/(KG)_{25}$ system. Shown is the negative peptide added first with 10 mM of (a) KBr, (b) KCl, (c) NaBr, and (d) NaCl. Elapsed time was (a) 5 min, (b) 90 min, (c) 65 min, and (d) 75 min. Error bars represent the standard deviation of $N = 27$.	200
8.16. The (a) average elapsed time of $(EG)_{25}/(KG)_{25}$ with varying salts at 10 mM and (b) the effect of increasing salt concentration with KBr using the same system. Error bars represent the propagated error.	201
8.17. Half time as a function polypeptide length. Error bars represent the propagated error.	201
8.18. The (a) half time of $(EG)_{25}/(KG)_{25}$ with varying salts at 10 mM and (b) the effect of increasing salt concentration with KBr using the same system. Error bars represent the propagated error.	202
9.1. (a) Texapon-PSS-PDADMAC system with no added salt. Precipitates are seen throughout the entire diagram except along the Texapon-PSS side (left side of diagram) where no complexation was seen. (b) A mixture of precipitates and potential complex coacervates were seen throughout the entire space when 1.6 M KBr was added.	208
9.2. (a) Turbidity of Texapon-PSS-PDADMAC in the absence of salt. (b) Turbidity of the same system with 1.6 M KBr.	210
9.3. Optical micrographs of (a) Texapon in KBr and (b) NaCl.	211
9.4. Lutensit-PSS-PDADMAC system with no added salt (a) and 1.6 M KBr (b).	212

9.5. Lutensit-PSS-PDADMAC turbidity with no added salt (a) and 1.6 M KBr (b).	213
9.6. Turbidity results of Texapon (b) and Lutensit (b) in the absence of salt and switching the order of PSS and PDADMAC.	215
9.7. Mixed surfactant system with PSS and PDADMAC at (a) 4°C, (b) room temperature, and (c) 37 °C.	218
10.1. Charge block repeat units for block sizes of 2, 4, 8, and 16 with alternating blocks of neutral and charged amino acids.....	223
10.2. Charge fraction of potential peptides with fractions of 0.2, 0.4, 0.6, and 0.8 depicting the fraction of charged amino acids in the chain.	223
10.3. Asymmetrical sequences of potential peptides with varying block sizes of neutral and charged peptides.....	224
10.4. Example of a polyampholyte system for encapsulation of charged cargo using complex coacervation.	224
10.5. Ternary plots showing (a) turbidity and (b) the ratio of coacervate to supernatant absorbance with the charge fraction of poly(<i>D,L</i> -glutamate) ₅₀ (pRE ₅₀) on the left side, the charge fraction of poly(<i>L</i> -lysine) ₅₀ (pLK ₅₀) on the bottom, and the charge fraction of hen egg white lysozyme (HEWL) on the right.....	226
A.1. Plot of Coomassie dye absorbance (corresponding to protein concentration) for HEWL-containing samples prepared using different orders of polymer addition (HEWL/E ₅₀ /K ₅₀ vs. HEWL/K ₅₀ /E ₅₀) for different compositions of K ₅₀ and E ₅₀ in 10 mM HEPES, pH 7.0. Error bars are the standard deviation of the reported average.	229
A.2. Plots of net protein charge as a function of pH for (a) BSA (pI = 5.5), (b) Hb (pI = 9.0), and (c) HEWL (pI = 11.7). The calculated value for the pI is indicated with a circle. Experimental values reported in the literature are shown with a diamond (pI = 5.5 for BSA, ⁵⁰⁴ and pI = 11.3 for HEWL ⁵⁰⁵). Plots of net polymer charge as a function of pH for (d) K ₅₀ (pKa = 10.45) and (e) E ₅₀ (pKa = 4.32). The calculated value for the pKa is indicated with a square. K ₅₀ has a calculated charge of 49.998 to 49.751 from pH 6-8 and E ₅₀ has a calculated charge of -49.022 to -50.010 from pH 6-8. The grey boxes indicate the pH range that we used for experiments.....	230
A.3. Plots of Coomassie dye absorbance for polymer-only supernatant and coacervate samples as a function of the charge fraction of the polycation for coacervates of K ₅₀ and E ₅₀ , in the absence of protein in 10 mM HEPES, pH 7.0. Lines connecting data points are a guide to the eye. Error bars are the standard deviation of the reported average.	232
A.4. 3D bar plot depiction of the radial distribution function $g(r)$ with respect to the charged amino acids in the full assembly Hb.	232

A.5. Plots of encapsulation efficiency (a,c) and partition coefficient (b,d) as a function of net charge per number of residues (a,b), and the ratio of positive to negative charges (c,d). Error bars are the standard deviation of the reported average.....	233
B.1. Turbidity comparison of complexation of (KG) ₂₅ /(EG) ₂₅ with (black) and without (blue) 10 mM HEPES. (a) Complexation of (KG) ₂₅ /(EG) ₂₅ varying the cationic mole fraction of (KG) ₂₅ and (b) 50/50 mole ratio of (KG) ₂₅ /(EG) ₂₅ as a function of increasing NaCl concentration. The salt resistance for the no buffer sample was determined to be 42 mM NaCl, while the sample with 10 mM HEPES had a salt resistance of 36 mM NaCl. Experiments were done in triplicate with three aliquots of each sample read three times each to calculate the standard deviation at each point. Error bars represent the standard deviation of N = 27.	247
C.1. Representation of MTT well plates for peptide controls. Blue is for pLK, green for pRE, orange for the coacervate of pLK/pRE, and grey for the control. The pink wells have only media to help prevent evaporation in sample wells. M denotes media and columns 2 through 9 are a serial dilution.....	269