



## Scale-up of affinity chromatography for purification of enzymes and other proteins

Tingyue Gu<sup>a,\*</sup>, Kuang-Hsin Hsu<sup>a</sup>, Mei-Jywan Syu<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Department of Chemical Engineering, Ohio University, Athens, OH 45701, USA

<sup>b</sup> Department of Chemical Engineering, National Cheng Kung University, Tainan 70101, Taiwan, ROC

Received 27 January 2003; accepted 8 April 2003

### Abstract

Affinity chromatography uses biospecific binding usually between an antibody and an antigen, an enzyme and a substrate or other pairs of key-lock type of matching molecules. Due to its high selectivity, it is able to purify proteins and other macromolecules from very dilute solutions. In this work, a general rate model for affinity chromatography was used for scale-up studies. Parameters for the model were estimated from existing correlations, or from experimental results obtained on a small column with the same packing material. As an example, Affi-Gel with  $4.5 \mu\text{mol cm}^{-3}$  Cibacron Blue F-3GA as immobilized ligands covalently attached to cross-linked 6% agarose was used for column packing. Cibacron Blue F-3GA was also used as a soluble ligand in the elution stage. Two separate cases were studied. One involved a bovine serum albumin solution, and the other hen egg white lysozyme solution. Satisfactory scale-up predictions were obtained for a 98.2 ml column and a 501 ml column based on a few experimental data obtained on a 7.85 ml small column.

© 2003 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

**Keywords:** Affinity chromatography; Rate model; Scale-up; Parameter estimation

### 1. Introduction

Affinity chromatography is a powerful tool for the purification of biological macromolecules such as enzymes, antibodies, and antigens. Because it uses biospecific binding between immobilized ligands and macromolecular solutes, affinity chromatography is also regarded as biospecific adsorption. A typical affinity chromatography operation involves three stages. In the frontal adsorption stage, a feed containing a target chemical, say an enzyme, and impurities is pumped into the column. Only the target enzyme will bind strongly with the column while impurities usually do not bind or bind only non-specifically, and thus weakly, through side-effect mechanisms such as hydrophobic interaction or ion-exchange. They can be easily removed in the washing stage. The target enzyme is eluted out in the elution stage.

Trial-and-error and experience combined with a few simple and rough scale-up rules are often used for the scale-up of affinity chromatography [1]. Some of the rules were discussed by Snyder et al. [2]. The particle size, column length, and flow rate are the main parameters of these empirical or semi-empirical relationships. Kang and Ryu [3] proposed

dimensional scale-up of the affinity chromatography column in the radial and axial direction for an immunoglobulin separation system. Knox and Pyper [4] did an extensive study on column overload. Martin del Valle and Galan [5] studied the kinetic and mass-transfer effects in affinity chromatography. Vunnum and Cramer [6] investigated how modulators influenced protein elution profiles in metal affinity chromatography. The simple scale-up rules, however, may be not accurate enough [1]. Instead of using these rough scale-up rules, a rate model can be used to predict chromatograms of a larger column before it is built or purchased with better accuracy. In this work, a general rate model was used for scale-up.

### 2. Model formulation

The following basic assumptions are needed to formulate the rate model: (1) the column is isothermal, (2) the packing particles are considered spherical and possess the same size, (3) the diffusion in the radial direction is negligible, (4) there is no convective flow inside particle macropores, (5) the packing density is even along the column length, and (6) the mass-transfer and kinetic parameters are constant.

The second-order kinetics is commonly used to describe the interactions between a macromolecule and an immobi-

\* Corresponding author. Tel.: +1-740-593-1499; fax: +1-740-593-0873.  
E-mail address: [gu@ohio.edu](mailto:gu@ohio.edu) (T. Gu).

**Nomenclature**

$A$	dimensionless column holdup area for a breakthrough curve
$b$	constant in Langmuir isotherm
$Bi$	Biot number for mass-transfer
$C_0$	feed concentration of a solute, $\max \{C_f(t)\}$ ( $\text{mol l}^{-1}$ )
$C_b$	concentration of a solute in the bulk-fluid phase ( $\text{mol l}^{-1}$ )
$c_b$	$C_b/C_0$
$C_f$	feed concentration profile of a component ( $\text{mol l}^{-1}$ )
$C_p$	concentration of a solute in the stagnant-fluid phase inside particle macropores ( $\text{mol l}^{-1}$ )
$C^\infty$	adsorption saturation capacity based on unit volume of particle skeleton ( $\text{mol l}^{-1}$ )
$C_p^*$	concentration of a solute in the solid phase of particles based on unit volume of particle skeleton ( $\text{mol l}^{-1}$ )
$c_p$	$C_p/C_0$
$c_p^*$	$C_p^*/C_0$
$c^\infty$	$C^\infty/C_0$
$d$	diameter of a molecule ( $\text{\AA}$ )
$d_c$	inner diameter of a column (cm)
$d_p$	macropore diameter of a particle
$D_b$	axial dispersion coefficient ( $\text{m}^2 \text{s}^{-1}$ )
$D_m$	intraparticle molecular diffusivity ( $\text{m}^2 \text{s}^{-1}$ )
$D_p$	effective diffusivity in particle macropores ( $\text{m}^2 \text{s}^{-1}$ )
$Da^a$	Damköhler number for adsorption
$Da^d$	Damköhler number for desorption
$F^{\text{ex}}$	size exclusion factor of a solute
$k$	film mass-transfer coefficient of a solute ( $\text{m s}^{-1}$ )
$k_a$	adsorption rate constant
$k_d$	desorption rate constant
$L$	column length (cm)
$M$	molecular weight of a solute
$N_s$	number of components
$Pe_L$	Peclet number of axial dispersion for a solute
$Q$	mobile phase volumetric flow rate ( $\text{m}^3 \text{s}^{-1}$ )
$R$	radial coordinate for a particle in cylindrical coordinate system
$Re$	Reynolds number
$R_p$	particle radius (m)
$r$	$R/R_p$
$Sc$	Schmidt number
$Sh$	Sherwood number
$t$	dimensional time ( $t = 0$ is the moment a sample enters a column) (s)
$t_0$	retention time of a very small molecule (s)
$t_d$	retention time of completely excluded large molecules, e.g. blue dextran (s)

$v$	interstitial velocity ( $\text{m s}^{-1}$ )
$V_{e0}$	elution volume at retention time $t_0$ (l)
$V_{ed}$	elution volume at retention time $t_d$ (l)
$z$	$Z/L$
$Z$	column axial coordinate in cylindrical coordinate system

**Greek letters**

$\varepsilon_b$	bed void volume fraction
$\varepsilon_p$	particle porosity
$\varepsilon_p^a$	accessible particle porosity
$\eta$	dimensionless group
$\lambda$	ratio of the solute molecular diameter to the pore diameter
$\mu$	mobile phase viscosity (Pa s)
$\rho$	density of solvent ( $\text{kg m}^{-3}$ )
$\tau$	dimensionless time
$\tau_{\text{imp}}$	dimensionless time duration for a rectangular pulse of a feed
$\tau_{\text{tor}}$	pore tortuosity
$\xi$	dimensionless constant

**Subscript**

$i$	component $i$
-----	---------------

**Superscript**

*	concentration of a solute in the solid of particles
---	---

lized affinity ligand,

$$P_i + L \xrightleftharpoons[k_{di}]{k_{ai}} P_i L \quad (1)$$

where  $P_i$  represents component  $i$  (a macromolecule in the mobile phase) and  $L$  is the immobilized ligand. The rate equation for Eq. (1) is as follows:

$$\frac{\partial C_{pi}^*}{\partial t} = k_{ai} C_{pi} \left( C_i^\infty - \sum_{j=1}^{N_s} C_{pj}^* \right) - k_{di} C_{pi}^* \quad (2)$$

If the reaction rates are relatively large compared to the mass-transfer rates, then instant adsorption/desorption equilibrium can be assumed. Both sides of Eq. (2) can be set to zero, which subsequently gives the Langmuir isotherm with the Langmuir equilibrium constant  $b_i = k_{ai}/k_{di}$  for component  $i$ .

Using dimensionless groups  $Da_i^a = L(k_{ai}C_{0i})/v$  and  $Da_i^d = Lk_{di}/v$  that are defined as the Damköhler numbers for adsorption and desorption, respectively, Eq. (2) can be nondimensionalized as follows:

$$\frac{\partial c_{pi}^*}{\partial \tau} = Da_i^a c_{pi} \left( c_i^\infty - \sum_{j=1}^{N_s} \frac{C_{0j}}{C_{0i}} c_{pj}^* \right) - Da_i^d c_{pi}^* \quad (3)$$

Among various methods for elution, an inhibitor or an inexpensive soluble ligand can be used in the mobile phase for the elution stage. A binding reaction in the bulk-fluid and the stagnant fluid inside macropores of the particles between macromolecule  $P$  (component 1) and soluble ligand  $I$  (component 2) typically follows the second-order kinetics,



where  $k_{a2}$  and  $k_{d2}$  are the adsorption and desorption constants for  $P$  and  $I$ , and  $PI$  (component 3) denotes the complex formed from the binding of  $P$  and  $I$ . For affinity chromatography involving only one kind of macromolecule in specific binding, Eq. (1) can be rewritten as,



In some cases, large molecules such as  $P$  and  $PL$  cause the size exclusion effect that may not be negligible [7]. Therefore, in the model used in this work, an accessible macropore volume fraction for component  $i$ ,  $\varepsilon_{pi}^a$ , is used to define a size exclusion factor  $F_i^{\text{ex}}$  such that  $\varepsilon_{pi}^a = F_i^{\text{ex}} \varepsilon_p$ . The  $F_i^{\text{ex}}$  value is between zero and one.

The general rate model can be written as follows:

(1) Bulk-fluid phase governing equation:

$$\begin{aligned} -D_{bi} \frac{\partial^2 C_{bi}}{\partial Z^2} + v \frac{\partial C_{bi}}{\partial Z} + \frac{\partial C_{bi}}{\partial t} \\ + \frac{3k_i(1 - \varepsilon_b)}{\varepsilon_b R_p} (C_{bi} - C_{pi, R=R_p}) \\ - f(i)(k_{a2} C_{b1} C_{b2} - k_{d2} C_{b3}) = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

where  $f(i) = -1$  is for components 1 and 2 ( $i = 1, 2$ ), and  $f(i) = 1$  is for component 3 ( $i = 3$ ).

(2) Particle phase governing equation:

$$\begin{aligned} g(i)(1 - \varepsilon_p) \frac{\partial C_{pi}^*}{\partial t} + \varepsilon_{pi}^a \frac{\partial C_{pi}}{\partial t} \\ - \varepsilon_{pi}^a D_{pi} \left[ \frac{1}{R^2} \frac{\partial}{\partial R} \left( R^2 \frac{\partial C_{pi}}{\partial R} \right) \right] \\ - f(i) \varepsilon_{pi}^a (k_{a2} C_{p1} C_{p2} - k_{d2} C_{p3}) = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

$$\frac{\partial C_{p1}^*}{\partial t} = k_{a1} C_{p1} (C_1^\infty - C_{p1}^*) - k_{d1} C_{p1}^* \quad (8)$$

in which  $g(i) = 1$  for  $i = 1$ , and  $g(i) = 0$  for  $i = 2$  and 3 (i.e. only component 1 binds with the immobilized ligand). In Eqs. (6) and (7), the  $f(i)$  terms are automatically zero before the elution stage because there is no soluble ligand in the feed causing  $C_{b2}$ ,  $C_{b3}$ ,  $C_{p2}$  and  $C_{p3}$  to be zero. In Eq. (8),  $C_{p1}^*$  represents concentration [ $PL$ ]. Using the following dimensionless groups,

$$\begin{aligned} c_{bi} &= \frac{C_{bi}}{C_{0i}}, \quad c_{pi} = \frac{C_{pi}}{C_{0i}}, \quad c_{pi}^* = \frac{C_{pi}^*}{C_{0i}}, \quad c_1^\infty = \frac{C_1^\infty}{C_{01}}, \\ r &= \frac{R}{R_p}, \quad z = \frac{Z}{L}, \quad Pe_{Li} = \frac{vL}{D_{bi}}, \quad Bi_i = \frac{k_i R_p}{\varepsilon_{pi}^a D_{pi}}, \\ \eta_i &= \frac{\varepsilon_{pi}^a D_{pi} L}{R_p^2 v}, \quad \xi_i = \frac{3Bi_i \eta_i (1 - \varepsilon_b)}{\varepsilon_b}, \quad \tau = \frac{vt}{L}, \\ Da_1^a &= \frac{L(k_{a1} C_{01})}{v}, \quad Da_1^d = \frac{Lk_{d1}}{v}, \\ Da_2^a &= \frac{L(k_{a2} C_{02})}{v}, \quad Da_2^d = \frac{Lk_{d2}}{v} \end{aligned}$$

Eqs. (6)–(8) can be transformed into dimensionless forms as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} -\frac{1}{Pe_{Li}} \frac{\partial^2 c_{bi}}{\partial z^2} + \frac{\partial c_{bi}}{\partial z} + \frac{\partial c_{bi}}{\partial \tau} + \xi_i (c_{bi} - c_{pi, r=1}) \\ - f(i) \left( Da_2^a c_{b1} \frac{C_{01}}{C_{0i}} c_{b2} - Da_2^d \frac{C_{03}}{C_{0i}} c_{b3} \right) = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

$$\begin{aligned} g(i)(1 - \varepsilon_p) \frac{\partial c_{pi}^*}{\partial \tau} + \varepsilon_{pi}^a \frac{\partial c_{pi}}{\partial \tau} \\ - f(i) \varepsilon_{pi}^a \left( Da_2^a c_{p1} \frac{C_{01}}{C_{0i}} c_{p2} - Da_2^d \frac{C_{03}}{C_{0i}} c_{p3} \right) \\ - \eta_i \left[ \frac{1}{r^2} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \left( r^2 \frac{\partial c_{pi}}{\partial r} \right) \right] = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

$$\frac{\partial c_{p1}^*}{\partial \tau} = Da_1^a c_{p1} (c_1^\infty - c_{p1}^*) - Da_1^d c_{p1}^* \quad (11)$$

Note that  $C_{03}$  is replaced by  $C_{01}$  for the nondimensionalization of the concentrations of component 3 such that  $C_{b3} = c_{b3} C_{01}$  and  $C_{p3} = c_{p3} C_{01}$  since  $C_{03}$  is unknown before simulation.

The following initial and boundary conditions are needed for the model:

- **Initial conditions:** At  $\tau = 0$ ,  $c_{bi} = c_{bi}(0, z) = 0$ ,  $c_{pi} = c_{pi}(0, r, z) = 0$ .
- **Boundary conditions:** At  $z = 0$ ,  $\partial c_{bi} / \partial z = Pe_{Li} [c_{bi} - C_{fi}(\tau) / C_{0i}]$ ; and at  $z = 1$ ,  $\partial c_{bi} / \partial z = 0$ ; at  $r = 0$ ,  $\partial c_{pi} / \partial r = 0$ ; and at  $r = 1$ ,  $\partial c_{pi} / r = Bi_i (c_{bi} - c_{pi, r=1})$ .

$C_{fi}(\tau)$  is the feed concentration profile of component  $i$ .  $C_{fi}(\tau) / C_{0i} = 0$  is for all the three components except in the following dimensionless time periods: (a) during the frontal adsorption (sample loading) stage ( $0 \leq \tau \leq \tau_{\text{imp}}$ ) in which  $C_{f1}(\tau) / C_{01} = 1$  and, (b) during the elution stage with a soluble ligand solution feed ( $\tau \geq \tau_{\text{shift}}$ ) in which  $C_{f2}(\tau) / C_{02} = 1$ . If there is no soluble ligand used in elution,  $C_{f2}(\tau) / C_{02} = 0$ . The  $\tau_{\text{imp}} \leq \tau \leq \tau_{\text{shift}}$  period is the washing period in which there is no protein or soluble ligand in the mobile phase.

The model above was solved numerically. The finite element method was used for the discretization of Eq. (9), and the orthogonal collocation method for Eq. (10). The resultant ODE (Ordinary Differential Equation) system was solved using an ODE solver called VODE by Brown et al. [8].

### 3. Parameter estimation

Parameters for the model may be divided into the following three types. Physical dimensions such as column length and diameter can be easily measured with precision. Binding parameters, bed void volume fraction, and particle porosity are not readily available. A few experiments are needed to obtain these estimations. Mass-transfer coefficients can be obtained by using existing correlations. For convenience, subscript *i* in symbols was omitted in this section since parameter estimation must be carried out for each individual component.

#### 3.1. Bed void fraction and particle porosity

The bed void fraction ( $\varepsilon_b$ ) can be obtained from experimental data according to the following relationship [7],

$$t_d = \frac{L}{v} = \frac{0.25\pi d_c^2 L \varepsilon_b}{Q} \quad (12)$$

where  $t_d$  is the retention time of completely excluded molecules (such as blue dextran),  $v$  is calculated using Eq. (13):

$$v = \frac{4Q}{\pi d_c^2 \varepsilon_b} \quad (13)$$

The  $\varepsilon_p$  value can be calculated using Eq. (14) from the retention time of a nonbinding solute ( $t_0$ ) whose molecular weight is smaller than the lower exclusion limit of the porous particle [7]:

$$t_d = \frac{t_0}{1 + (1 - \varepsilon_b)(\varepsilon_p/\varepsilon_b)} \quad (14)$$

Since the elution volume is more stable than the retention time for a solute in different runs for low-pressure systems, it is used instead of retention time. Eqs. (12) and (14) are rewritten as:

$$V_{ed} = t_d Q = 0.25\pi d_c^2 L \varepsilon_b \quad (15)$$

$$V_{ed} = \frac{V_{e0}}{1 + (1 - \varepsilon_b)(\varepsilon_p/\varepsilon_b)} \quad (16)$$

where  $V_{ed}$  and  $V_{e0}$  are the elution volumes corresponding to retention times  $t_d$  and  $t_0$ , respectively.

#### 3.2. The adsorption saturation capacity ( $C^\infty$ )

The classical batch adsorption method [9] can be used to obtain  $C^\infty$ . Boyer and Hsu [10] studied stirred batch systems for the adsorption of several proteins on adsorbents prepared with different Cibacron Blue concentrations. However, their experimental  $C^\infty$  values were not based on the unit volume of particle skeleton, but based on the unit volume of a buffered adsorbent including particle porosity. This means their values could not be directly used in this work if particle density was not easily or accurately obtained

for conversion. It was more convenient to use the so-called column method below to obtain isotherm parameters.

By varying  $C_0$  values to get different  $A$  values, isotherm parameters  $C^\infty$  and  $b$  can be calculated using Eq. (17), assuming that there is no size exclusion effect [7],

$$A = \frac{(1 - \varepsilon_b)(1 - \varepsilon_p)((bC^\infty)/(1 + bC_0)) + (1 - \varepsilon_b)\varepsilon_p + \varepsilon_b}{\varepsilon_b} \quad (17)$$

In Eq. (17),  $A$ , the dimensionless area (dimensionless concentration multiplied by dimensionless time) above the concentration profile and below the dimensionless concentration unity line corresponds to the column holdup capacity.

#### 3.3. The Damköhler number for adsorption

In this work, the determination of  $Da^a$  for the frontal adsorption stage was done by fitting model simulations with experimental breakthrough curves obtained from a small column. The  $Da^a$  value for the elution stage was also obtained from curve-fitting using an experimental elution profile.

#### 3.4. The Damköhler number for desorption

The Damköhler number for desorption is defined by the following equation:

$$Da^d = \frac{Lk_d}{v} \quad (18)$$

where  $k_d$  represents the desorption rate constant.  $Da^d$  can also be obtained from  $Da^a$  by the following relationship:

$$Da^d = \frac{Da^a}{bC_0} \quad (19)$$

#### 3.5. The Peclet number

The Peclet number can be evaluated from Eq. (20) [7]:

$$Pe_L = \frac{0.1L}{R_p \varepsilon_b} \quad (20)$$

#### 3.6. The $\eta$ number

To estimate the dimensionless constant  $\eta$ , which is expressed by the following equation:

$$\eta = \frac{\varepsilon_p^a D_p L}{R_p^2 v} \quad (21)$$

the intraparticle diffusivity ( $D_p$ ) and the accessible particle porosity ( $\varepsilon_p^a$ ) are needed. Yau et al. [11] used the following correlation to obtain  $D_p$ :

$$D_p = \frac{D_m(1 - 2.104\lambda + 2.09\lambda^3 - 0.95\lambda^5)}{\tau_{tor}} \quad (22)$$

in which  $\lambda = d/d_p$ . The tortuosity factor  $\tau_{\text{tor}}$  varies from about 1.5 to over 10. A reasonable range for many commercial porous solids is about 2–6 [12].  $d$  and  $d_p$  are the molecular diameter of the solute and the particle pore diameter, respectively. Larsson [13] reported that 6% cross-linking agarose supports have a pore diameter around 300 Å. If molecules are assumed spherical,  $d$  can be calculated from the following equation [14]:

$$d = 1.44M^{1/3} \quad (23)$$

where  $M$  is the molecular weight. Molecular diffusivities can be calculated using the following equation [15]:

$$D_m (\text{cm}^2 \text{s}^{-1}) = 2.74 \times 10^{-5} M^{-1/3} \quad (24)$$

### 3.7. The Biot number for mass-transfer

The evaluation of the Biot number ( $Bi$ ) for mass-transfer:

$$Bi = \frac{kR_p}{\varepsilon_p^a D_p} \quad (25)$$

requires the value of the film mass-transfer coefficient  $k$ . Several correlations can be employed to obtain  $k$  in terms of the Sherwood number  $Sh$ . The following equation presented by Wilson and Geankoplis [16] seems suitable:

$$Sh = \frac{1.09(ReSc)^{1/3}}{\varepsilon_b} \quad (0.0015 < Re < 55) \quad (26)$$

in which  $Sh = k(2R_p)/D_m$  and the Schmidt number  $Sc = \mu/\rho D_m$ . The Reynolds number in Eq. (26) is defined as  $Re = (2R_p)(v\varepsilon_b)\rho/\mu$  which uses the superficial velocity  $v\varepsilon_b$ . Eq. (26) gives:

$$k = 0.687v^{1/3} \left( \frac{\varepsilon_b R_p}{D_m} \right)^{-2/3} \quad (27)$$

### 3.8. Size-exclusion factor

The size-exclusion factor for a component ( $F^{\text{ex}}$ ) can be determined from elution volumes [17]. Because lysozyme and BSA are relatively small enzymes their size-exclusion effects were not considered in this work. Thus,  $F^{\text{ex}} = (\varepsilon_{pi}^a)/\varepsilon_p = 1$ .

## 4. Materials and experimental methods

Two common enzymes were chosen as examples in two separate case studies: hen egg white lysozyme (MW 13,930) and bovine serum albumin (BSA) (MW 67,000). The adsorbent used in this work was Affi-Gel with  $4.5 \mu\text{mol cm}^{-3}$  Cibacron Blue F-3GA covalently attached to cross-linked 6% agarose with an average wet particle diameter of 225  $\mu\text{m}$  (Bio-Rad Laboratories, Richmond, CA). In the elution stage, Cibacron Blue F-3GA was also used as soluble ligands. It should be noted that there might be other elution methods

for the adsorbent such as changing ionic strength, pH and adding chemicals that can weaken binding. The proteins and Cibacron Blue F-3GA were from Sigma Chemical Co. (St. Louis, MO). Blue dextran (FW 2,000,000) and glycine (FW 75.07) were used for determinations of  $t_d$  and  $t_0$ . They were purchased from Sigma and Fisher Scientific (Pittsburgh, PA), respectively. A 20 mM potassium phosphate, pH 7.0, buffer was prepared by mixing 20 mM solutions of mono- and dibasic potassium phosphate to obtain the required pH at 4 °C. This 20 mM buffered was present during all the three stages of affinity chromatography experiments. The washing stage used 20 mM NaCl in the buffer, and the elution stage used 2 mM Cibacron Blue F-3GA in the buffer unless otherwise specified. All chromatography experiments were conducted in a 4 °C cold room.

Three glass columns purchased from Kontes Glass Co. (Vineland, NJ) packed with different bed dimensions (10 cm  $\times$  1 cm i.d., 20 cm  $\times$  2.5 cm i.d., and 31.5 cm  $\times$  4.5 cm i.d.) were employed. Their bed volumes were 7.85, 98.2, and 501 ml, respectively. Effluent fractions were collected using a Model 2110 fraction collector from Bio-Rad. The chromatograms were plotted from the results of a concentration analysis using a Beckman DU 640 Spectrophotometer (Beckman Instrument, Fullerton, CA) against an appropriate buffer blank.

## 5. Results and discussion

### 5.1. Experimental results from the small 7.85 ml column

Elution volumes were obtained through a simple zonal (pulse) analysis using a mixture of blue dextrin and glycine on the 7.85 ml small column. Eqs. (15) and (16) were then used to calculate bed voidage and particle porosity. The results are listed in Table 1. Particle tortuosity  $\tau_{\text{tor}}$  was given a typical value of 4.

Two experimental breakthrough curves were obtained on the 7.85 ml column for lysozyme with feed concentrations of 1 mg ml<sup>-1</sup> and 2 mg l<sup>-1</sup> at a flow rate of 0.1 ml min<sup>-1</sup>, respectively. Eq. (17) was then used to calculate  $C^\infty$  and  $b_1$  values. Their values for BSA were obtained in the same fashion. The  $C^\infty$  and  $b_1$  values for the two proteins are shown in Table 2. It is interesting to note that the molar-based  $C^\infty$  value for BSA is considerably smaller than that for lysozyme. It is most likely because BSA is several times larger than lysozyme in molecular size. Thus, the accessibility of immobilized ligands for BSA may be hampered by its larger size.

Table 1  
Parameter values of the small affinity chromatography bed

$\varepsilon_b$	$\varepsilon_p$	$L$ (cm)	$d_c$ (cm)	$V_b$ (cm <sup>3</sup> )	$R_p$ (mm)
0.41	0.58	10	1	7.85	0.1125

Table 2  
Langmuir isotherm parameters

Parameters	Lysozyme	BSA
$C^\infty$ (M)	$4.41 \times 10^{-3}$	$4.81 \times 10^{-4}$
$b_1$ ( $M^{-1}$ )	$1.18 \times 10^6$	$1.42 \times 10^6$

One of the two breakthrough curves used to calculate  $C^\infty$  and  $b_1$  values for lysozyme, i.e. the  $C_{0i} = 1 \text{ mg ml}^{-1}$  curve was fitted with the model by adjusting the  $Da_1^d$  value as shown in the frontal adsorption part of Fig. 1.  $Da_1^d$  was cal-

culated from the  $Da_1^d$  value and the  $b_1$  value using Eq. (19). Because the soluble ligands used for elution were the same as the immobilized ligands in this work, it was somewhat reasonable to assume that  $b_2$  could take the  $b_1$  value assuming that immobilized ligands had the same affinity with solutes as free ligands in the mobile phase. The  $Da_2^a$  value could then be obtained from curve-fitting of an elution stage profile using the general rate model together with the  $Da_2^d$  value which was related to the  $Da_2^a$  value based on Eq. (19) once the  $b_2$  value became known. Results from parameter sensitivity analysis showed that  $Da_2^d$  is quite insensitive. Fig. 1 shows




Fig. 1. Fitting of experimental data points with model calculated results for lysozyme on the small 7.85 ml column at  $0.1 \text{ ml min}^{-1}$ .

Table 3  
Parameter values used in Fig. 1

Parameters	General data	Lysozyme ( $i = 1$ )	Cibacron Blue ( $i = 2$ )	Complex ( $i = 3$ )	Comment
$L$ (cm)	10				
$d_c$ (cm)	1				
$V_b$ ( $\text{cm}^3$ )	7.85				
$R_p$ (mm)	0.1125				
$\tau_{\text{tor}}$	4				Vendor Assigned
$\varepsilon_b$	0.41				Table 1
$\varepsilon_p$	0.58				Table 1
$d_p$ ( $\text{\AA}$ )	300				[13]
$Q$ ( $\text{ml min}^{-1}$ )	0.1				
$v$ ( $\text{cm min}^{-1}$ )	0.311				Eq. (13)
$\tau_{\text{imp}}$	50				
$\tau_{\text{shift}}$	70				
$\tau_{\text{max}}$	130				
$M_i$		13930	772	14702	
$C_{0i}$ (M)		$7.18 \times 10^{-5}$	0.002	$7.18 \times 10^{-5}$	
$d_i$ ( $\text{\AA}$ )		34.65	13.21	35.28	Eq. (23)
$\lambda_i$		0.115	0.044	0.118	
$D_{mi}$ ( $\text{cm}^2 \text{ min}^{-1}$ )		$6.83 \times 10^{-5}$	$1.97 \times 10^{-4}$	$6.71 \times 10^{-5}$	Eq. (24)
$D_{pi}$ ( $\text{cm}^2 \text{ min}^{-1}$ )		$1.30 \times 10^{-5}$	$4.48 \times 10^{-5}$	$1.27 \times 10^{-5}$	Eq. (22)
$k_i$ ( $\text{cm min}^{-1}$ )		0.028	0.057	0.028	Eq. (27)
$C_i^\infty$ (M)		$4.41 \times 10^{-3}$	0	0	Table 2
$Da_i^a$		1.828	55.71	0	
$Da_i^d$		0.022	0.024	0	Eq. (19)
$Pe_{Li}$		217.0	217.0	217.0	Eq. (20)
$\eta_i$		1.911	6.589	1.866	Eq. (21)
$Bi_i$		42.02	24.72	42.51	Eq. (25)




Fig. 2. Comparison between experimental results and model predictions for lysozyme on the 98.2 ml column at  $1 \text{ ml min}^{-1}$ .

the curve-fitting results of frontal adsorption, washing and elution stages. Parameter values used for Fig. 1 are given in Table 3. In Table 3,  $\tau_{\text{shift}}$  denotes dimensionless time when the elution stage starts and  $\tau_{\text{max}}$  denotes the dimensionless time when model calculation is terminated. The difference

between  $\tau_{\text{shift}}$  and  $\tau_{\text{imp}}$  is the dimensionless time duration of the washing stage. In Fig. 1, at  $\tau = 50$ , lysozyme feeding stopped and was followed by a buffer washing stage until  $\tau = 70$  when the soluble ligand (Cibacron Blue F-3GA) solution was introduced to start the elution stage. After a delay,




Fig. 3. Comparison between experimental results and model predictions for lysozyme on the 501 ml column at  $1 \text{ ml min}^{-1}$ .




Fig. 4. Comparison between experimental results and model predictions for lysozyme on the 501 ml column at  $8 \text{ ml min}^{-1}$ .




Fig. 5. Comparison between experimental results and model predictions for BSA on the 501 ml column at  $8 \text{ ml min}^{-1}$ .

the sharp soluble ligand mobile phase breakthrough curve (like a step-change) and the elution peak both appeared.

### 5.2. Scale-up predictions

With the parameters obtained from the small 7.85 ml column, scale-up predictions were made for lysozyme separation on the 98.2 ml column and the 501 ml column. Their bed volumes are 12.5 and 63.8 times that of the 7.85 ml column, respectively. Figs. 2–4 show the comparisons of predicted concentration profiles with experimental data points at different operating conditions. The results are surprisingly good. Similar results were obtained for BSA on the 501 ml column as shown in Fig. 5.

## 6. Conclusions

This work demonstrated that the general rate model predicted the concentration profiles for several runs using lysozyme and BSA on the 98.2 and 501 ml columns under different operating conditions very well. The concentration profiles of the frontal adsorption, washing, and elution stages could be predicted without a posteriori experimental data from the two columns. The rate model and the parameter estimation protocol used in this study can be used for the scale-up of affinity chromatography using soluble ligands for elution. Only a couple of experimental runs are needed on a small column in order to obtain the model input parameters that cannot be estimated using existing correlations. The Windows executable version of the simulation software used in this work is available free of charge to any researchers by contacting the corresponding author.

## References

- [1] Arnold FH, Blanch HW, Wilke CR. Analysis of affinity separations I: predicting the performance of affinity adsorbents. *Chem Eng J Biochem Eng J* 1985;30:b9–23.
- [2] Snyder LR, Glejch JL, Kirkland JJ. *Practical HPLC method development*. New York: Wiley; 1988.
- [3] Kang KA, Ryu DDY. Studies on scale-up parameters of an immunoglobulin separation system using protein A affinity chromatography. *Biotechnol Prog* 1991;7:205–12.
- [4] Knox JH, Pyper HM. Framework for maximizing throughput in preparative liquid-chromatography. *J Chromatogr* 1986;363:1–30.
- [5] Martin del Valle EM, Galan MA. Specific and nonspecific adsorption in affinity chromatography. Part II. Kinetic and mass transfer studies. *Ind Eng Chem Res* 2001;40:377–83.
- [6] Vunnum S, Cramer S. IMAC: nonlinear elution chromatography of proteins. *Biotech Bioeng* 1997;54:373–90.
- [7] Gu T. *Mathematical modeling and scale-up of liquid chromatography*. Berlin: Springer; 1995.
- [8] Brown PN, Byrne GD, Hindmarsh AC. VODE: a variable coefficient ODE solver. *SIAM J Sci Stat Comput* 1989;10:1038–51.
- [9] Skidmore GL, Horstmann BJ, Chase HA. Modeling single-component protein adsorption to the cation exchanger S Sepharose FF. *J Chromatogr* 1990;498:113–28.
- [10] Boyer PM, Hsu JT. Effects of ligand concentration on protein adsorption in dye-ligand adsorbents. *Chem Eng Sci* 1992;47:241–51.
- [11] Yau WW, Kirkland JJ, Bly DD. *Modern size exclusion liquid chromatography*. New York: Wiley; 1979.
- [12] Satterfield C. *Mass transfer in heterogeneous catalysis*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press; 1970.
- [13] Larsson PO. Support materials for affinity chromatography. In: Kline T, editor. *Handbook of affinity chromatography*. New York: Marcel Dekker; 1993.
- [14] Gu T, Zheng Y. A study of the scale-up of reversed-phase liquid chromatography. *Sep Purif Technol* 1999;15:41–58.
- [15] Polson A. Some aspects of diffusion in solution and a definition of a colloidal particle. *J Phys Colloid Chem* 1950;54:649–58.
- [16] Wilson EJ, Geankoplis CJ. Liquid mass transfer at very low Reynolds numbers in packed beds. *Ind Eng Chem Fundam* 1966;5:9–17.
- [17] Li Z, Gu Y, Gu T. Mathematical modeling and scale-up of size exclusion chromatography. *Biochem Eng J* 1998;2:145–55.