$\cdot$  HROM, 8602

vote

## tructural requirements for the electron capturing properties of ecdysones

E. POOLE and E. D. MORGAN\* Pepartment of Chemistry, Keele University, Keele, Staffs. ST5 5BG (Great Britain) Received July 10th, 1975)

The ecdysones are a group of polyhydroxy sterols with a  $5\beta$ -cholest-7-en-6-one framework represented by Formula I. In insects and crustaceans they play an important role as hormones controlling moulting. Over fifty ecdysones have been identified in arthropods and plants, differing chiefly in the number and position of the hydroxyl groups<sup>1</sup>. Their presence in very small quantities in arthropods demands a very sensitive technique for their determination as hormones. It has been found by chance that they can be detected at the picogram level with an electron capture detector after conversion of hydroxyl groups to trimethylsilyl (TMS) ethers for gas chromatography<sup>2,3</sup>. This high sensitivity to detection could not have been predicted, and to find the scope of the technique, the electrophore (the portion of the molecule responsible for electron adsorption) has been identified.



Formula I (d)  $R_1, R_3$  = H  $R_2 = O - 1$ (b)  $R_1, R_2 = OH$   $R_3 = H$ (c)  $R_1, R_3 = OH$   $R_2 = H$ 

Steroids generally are not sensitive to an electron capture detector, and are onverted to suitable derivatives, such as halogen-containing silyl ethers or acyl sters to make them sufficiently sensitive for detection at low levels<sup>4.5</sup>. The first five ompounds of Table I indicate the sensitivity of typical sterols to electron capture etection, expressed as least detectable amount (LDA) producing a signal-to-noise atio of 2, using a Pye Model 84 gas chromatograph, with <sup>63</sup>Ni electron capture deector, with pulse width 0.75  $\mu$ sec, pulse period 50  $\mu$ sec, pulse height 47-60 V and deector oven at 300°. The column oven was adjusted for each compound to produce the

\* To whom correspondence should be addressed.

## **TABLE I**





same peak width at half height on a 3-ft. column of  $2\%$  OV-101 on Gas-Chrom Q with a flow-rate of nitrogen of 85 ml/min.

No specific sensitivity is shown by  $5\alpha$ -cholestan-6-one or  $5\alpha$ -cholestan-7-en-6-one, but introduction of the  $14\alpha$ -hydroxyl group or its silyl ether gives a sharp increase in sensitivity (about 1,300 fold in the case of the  $14\alpha$ -TMS ether). The  $2\beta$ ,3 $\beta$ di-TMS-5 $\alpha$  (or  $\beta$ )-cholest-7-en-6-ones are 40 times more sensitive to detection than cholest-7-en-6-one, although the two trimethylsilyl ether groups are remote from the unsaturated ketone. Similarly,  $2\beta$ ,  $3\beta$ ,  $14\alpha$ -tri-TMS-5 $\alpha$  (or  $\beta$ )-cholest-7-en-6-one is some six times more sensitive than  $14\alpha$ -TMS-5 $\alpha$ -choiest-7-en-6-one. Thus, in the ecdysones, the electrophore is not simple, involving the 7-en-6-one group, the  $14\alpha$ -hydroxyl and smaller contributions from groups further removed from the ketone. There is no evidence that the weakly electron-capturing groups in the side chain exert an influence on the electrophore.

It has been previously noted that two or more groups which are not electron absorbing by themselves, when conjugated can confer electron-absorbing propertie. on the molecule<sup>6-3</sup>. Small further increases in electron-capture sensitivity with sub stituents remote from the conjugated group were attributed to electronic interaction across the saturated steroid framework<sup>7,8</sup>. To the best of our knowledge, the ecdysone possess the most sensitive conjugated steroid electrophore vet described.

A molecule can capture thermal electrons by two basic mechanisms<sup>9</sup>, boti temperature dependent:

 $AB + e^- \rightarrow AB^$ non-dissociative  $AB + e^- \rightarrow A \cdot + B^-$  dissociative



Fig. 1. Plot of In  $\left(\frac{AF}{S} - \frac{b_0}{b}T_0^2\right)$  against  $\frac{1}{T}$  for ecdysone penta-TMS ether (cf. ref. 9).

A plot of ln ( $[AF/S]$  [ $b_0/b$ ]  $T^{3/2}$ ) against 1/T (Fig. 1) for ecdysones has a positive slope (where  $A =$  peak area in cm<sup>2</sup>,  $F =$  gas flow-rate in ml/min,  $S =$  chart speed in cm/min,  $b_0$  = standing current in A in the detector in the presence of pure carrier gas,  $b =$  standing current with column at operating temperature, and T is detector oven temperature in  $K$ ). This indicates a non-dissociative capture mechanism<sup>9-11</sup>, in agreement with the finding of Durbin et  $al$ <sup>12</sup> that conjugated electrophores capture electrons in a non-dissociative manner. The peak area measured by the detector decreases with increasing detector oven temperature, and for maximum sensitivity, the lowest practical detector temperature should be used. For the analysis of ecdysones as their TMS ethers, a detector temperature of  $300^{\circ}$  and column temperature of 270–  $280^\circ$  is the best compromise. Under these conditions we have observed no loss in detector sensitivity in over one year of constant use.

The available evidence indicates that arthropods convert cholesterol and phytosterols to ecdysones by sequences which involve the early introduction of the unsatur ited ketone and C-14 hvdroxyl groups<sup>13,14</sup>. The electron capture method therefore provides an excellent means of detecting all the compounds in the later stages of ecdysone synthesis and is insensitive to other unrelated sterols.

## **CKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

We wish to thank Dr. M. J. Thompson for a gift of samples of trihydroxychol $e$  t-7-en-6-ones, Dr. D. H. S. Horn for  $2\beta$ ,  $3\beta$ ,  $14\alpha$ -trihydroxy- $5\beta$ -pregn-7-en-6, 20c one, and acknowledge the financial support of the Overseas Development Ad-<sup>n</sup> inistration.

## **REFERENCES**

- I D. H. S. Horn, in M. Jacobson and D. G. Crosby (Editors), Naturally Occurring Insecticides. Marcel Dekker, New York, 1971, p. 333.
- 2 C. F. Poole, E. D. Morgan and P. M. Bebbington, J. Chromatogr., 104 (1975) 172.
- 3 D. W. Borst and J. D. O'Connor, Steroids, 24 (1974) 637.
- 4 H. J. van der Molen, Ann. Chim. Res., 2 (1970) 279.
- 5 E. D. Morgan and C. F. Poole, J. Chromatogr., 104 (1975) 351.
- 6 J. E. Lovelock, P. G. Simmonds and W. J. A. VandenHeuvel, Nature (London), 197 (1963) 249.
- 7 A. Zlatkis and J. E. Lovelock, Clin. Chem., 11 (1965) 259.
- 8 J. E. Lovelock, in L. Augenstein (Editor), Physical Processes in Radiation Biology, Academic Press, New York, 1964.
- 9 W. E. Wentworth and E. Chen, J. Gas Chromatogr., 5 (1967) 170.
- 10 D. J. David, Gas Chromatography Detectors, Wiley-Interscience, New York, 1974, p. 98.
- 11 B. C. Pettitt, P. G. Simmonds and A. Zlatkis, J. Chromatogr. Sci., 7 (1969) 645.
- 12 D. E. Durbin, W. E. Wentworth and A. Zlatkis, J. Amer. Chem. Soc., 92 (1970) 5131.
- 13 M. N. Galbraith, D. H. S. Horn, E. J. Middleton and J. A. Thomson, Chem. Commun., (1973) 203.
- 14 M. N. Galbraith, D. H. S. Horn and E. J. Middleton, Aust. J. Chem., 27 (1974) 1087.