CHREV. 132

GAS-LIOUID CHROMATOGRAPHIC RETENTION INDICES OF 296 NON-DRUG SUBSTANCES ON SE-30 OR OV-1 LIKELY TO BE ENCOUNTERED IN TOXICOLOGICAL ANALYSES

JOHN D. RAMSEY and TERENCE D. LEE

Toxicology Laboratory, St. Georges Hospital Medical School, 9 Knightsbridge, London SWIX 7EZ (Great Britain)

and

M. DAVID OSSELTON' and ANTHONY C. MOFFAT"

Home Office Central Research Establishment, Aldermaston, Reading, Berkshire RG7 4PN (Great Britain)

(Received November 27th, 1979)

CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION

Recent advances in gas-liquid chromatography (GLC) have resulted in the widespread availability and use of highly selective detectors which enable toxicologists to detect smaller quantities of drug substances in their extracts than has previously been possible. The use of selective detectors such as the electron capture detector (ECD) for the identification of amenable compounds and the heated alkaline bead thermionic phosphorus/nitrogen detector (PND) for the detection of phosphorus and nitrogen containing compounds was anticipated to remove many of the extraneous peaks frequently observed when non-selective GLC detectors such as the flame ionization detector (FID) were used. The use of these selective detectors has indeed increased the sensitivity of detection of many drug classes, but has exchanged one set of problems for another. Hitherto undetected non-drug substances which interfere in many toxicological analyses are now observed.

One of the major groups of these interfering compounds encountered during

^{*} Present address: Home Office Forensic Science Laboratory, Shakespeare Street, Nottingham NG1 4FR, Great Eritain.

^{**} To whom correspondence should be addressed.

toxicological analyses **is the** plasticizers. The term plasticizer as used here encompasses a wide range of compounds, usually esters of alcohols and dibasic or tribasic acids, which are also used in lubricants, coatings, propellants and PVC products etc.¹. These substances have been introduced into biological samples prior to toxicological analyses from containers in which specimens were collected or stored^{$2-5$} and have also been observed to compete with drugs for protein binding sites^{6,7}.

Plasticizers exhibit retention characteristics similar to those of drugs⁸, but are by no means the onIy interfering compounds found during the GLC of toxicological extracts. Other compounds from plastics and rubber, e. g. antioxidants and plastic additives, as well as componunds naturally occurring in biological materials or which are formed as part of a putrefactive process may interfere with an analysis. Pesticides, food additives, flavours, fragrances and some scintillation chemicals are also observed from time to time. We have therefore examined the chromatographic characteristics of these interfering compounds, as well as compounds used as internal standards to allow their quick separation and identification.

The low polarity stationary phases SE-30 or OV-1 have been shown to be the most suitable for toxicological analyses⁹ and are probably the most widely used stationary phases for the routine gas chromatography of drug substances¹⁰⁻¹⁵. Therefore a compilation of retention indices for 296 of these non-drug substances likely to bc present in extracts of body fluids and tissues has been made using SE-30 or OV-I as the stationary phase to update the compilation of data for 480 drugs made by M offat¹⁶.

2. EXPERIMENTAL

GLC of compounds on OV-1 was performed using a $4 \text{ m} \times 3 \text{ mm}$ I.D. glass column in a Perkin-Elmer Fl3 gas chromatograph fitted with FLD and PND. Helium carrier gas, maintained at 50 ml/min, was split $50:50$ after leaving the column enabling chromatograms to be recorded showing the responses from two detectors simultaneously. OV-1 stationary phase $(3\frac{9}{10})$ w/w) was coated on Chromosorb W HP (SO-1GO mesh). Simultaneous detection was achieved using twin ampliiers and a dual pen recorder.

GLC of compounds on SE-30 was performed using a $1.5 \text{ m} \times 4 \text{ mm}$ I.D. glass column packed with 3% (w/w) SE-30 on Chromosorb G HP (80-100 mesh) in a Pye 104 gas chromatograph fitted with ECD and FID. Nitrogen carrier gas was maintained at 60 ml/min and the column effluent split SO:50 as above to each detector.

Even-numbered straight-chain hydrocarbons were used as references for the calculation of retention indices¹⁷. Retention times were measured from the solvent front using either an integrator or a ruler.

A magnetic card programmable calculator was used to perform a least-squares regression analysis of log retention time against retention index (carbon number **x** 100). A correlation coefficient of 0.999 was easily obtained. This method was most convenient but readily acceptable results could be obtained using semi-log graph paper. Data was obtained for compounds with retention indices between 695 and 3800. Compounds were eluted by adjusting the oven temperatures so that the retention times of compounds were between 2 and 20 min.

Published data was used to supplement this compilation with values for pesticides. This information, published as relative retention times on DC-200¹⁸ was transformed into retention indices on SE-30 **after** calibration **curves of log relative** retention times on DC-200 plotted against retention indices on SE-30 had been constructed for those compounds for which **both sets of data were available.**

Ma& spectral characterisation of some plasticizers exhibiting multiple peaks by GLC were measured using a VG Micromass 16F mass spectrometer linked with a Pye series 104 gas chromatograph.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1. *Compilation of data*

The compounds examined during this work have been classified into seven general categories (Table 1) and the abbreviations corresponding to each category have been inserted into the subsequent tables at the appropriate places. Table 2 comprises a list of retention indices for compounds arranged in alphabetical order and the same data, with exception of those giving multiple peaks, are rearranged into ascending order of retention indices in Table 3. The names of the compounds used in this study were those in the *Merck Index*¹⁹ or for the economic poisons the *Nanogen* $Index²⁰$.

Most of the data in Tables 2 and 3 were generated on the 4-m 3% OV-1 column. Thompson et $al.^{18}$ published data for 52 pesticides on the dimethylsilicone

TABLE 1

TABLE OF ABBREVIATIONS USED JN THE TABLES OF RETENTION DATA

TABLE 2

RETENTION INDICES OF 296 NON-DRUG COMPOUNDS, USING SE-30 OR OV-1 AS THE STATIONARY PHASE, ARRANGED IN ALPHABETICAL ORDER OF COMPOUND NAME $NO = No$ peak observed; $MP =$ multiple peaks, *i.e.* more than three.

TABLE 2 (continued)

(Continued on p. 190)

 $\overline{}$

TABLE 2 (continued)

J

GLC RETENTION INDICES OF NON-DRUG SUBSTANCES

TABLE 2 (continued)

(Continued on p. 192)

TABLE 2 (continued)

TABLE 2 (continued)

"From ref. 18.

"Trade name.
I Major peak.

TABLE 3

RETENTION INDICES OF 253 COMPOUNDS, USING SE-30 OR OV-1 AS THE STATIONARY PHASE, ARRANGED IN ASCENDING ORDER OF RETENTION INDEX \mathcal{L} \hat{L} \mathbb{R}^2

 $NO = No$ peak observed; $MP =$ multiple peak, *i.e.* more than three.

t,

(Continued on p. 196)

 $\ddot{}$

П

 $\ddot{}$

TABLE 3 (continued)

 $*$ From ref. 16.
 $*$ From ref. 18.

*** Trade name.

⁸ Major peak.

phase DC-200 expressed as retention ratios relative to aldrin. Seven data points from this collection were plotted as log retention ratios against known retention indices¹⁶. **The regression obtained was:**

Retention index on $SE-30 = 706$ (log retention ratio) $+ 1955$

with a correlation coefficient of 0.9993. The rest of the data were then transformed into retention indices on SE-30 using the equation above and included in Tables 2 and 3. The transformation of retention times, retention ratios and retention indices using the same, or closely related, stationary phases is therefore an easy way to compile standardised data without the need to rechromatograph every substance.

The use of retention indices for standardisation in GLC has enabled compilations of data to be made for use in toxicological analyses^{13,14,16,21}. For these **collections to be of the greatest use, it is imperative that the factors affecting the reproducibility of retention indices are recognised and precautions taken to minimise** the errors of measurement. The choice of support is an important feature²² and in **general it should be inactivated as thoroughly as possible. The effects of the residual active sites 'may be reduced by using a high-polarity phase or by using a sufficiently** high loading of stationary phase^{22,23}. High-polarity phases unfortunately give poorer reproducibility than low-polarity phases⁹ so that a good compromise is between 2 **and 5% of a low-polarity phase. The temperature is another very important feature and it has been shown by several authors that the retention index is dependent on the** temperature of the column^{21,24,25} so that the measurement of very short or very long **retention times should be avoided. Thus, to obtain reproducible results the conditions used for chromatography should not be too far removed from those used by the** workers who compiled the data. The sample size is important²⁶ since longer retention **times will be observed for polar materials as the quantity chromatographed is decreased.**

In order to compensate for different conditions in different laboratories (e.g. support, different phase loadings, temperature, etc.) Moffat¹⁶ suggested that an error factor of \pm 50 retention index units would be an acceptable limit of reproducibility **for measurements based on a standard deviation of 18 retention index units. To measure the reproducibility of results between our two laboratories, 17 compounds were randomly selected from the various chemical classes of substances in this collection and retention indices of these compounds were measured independently in each** laboratory. Despite the fact that a $4 \text{ m} \times 3 \text{ mm}$ I.D. column of $3\frac{9}{6}$ (w/w) OV-1 on Chromosorb W HP was used in one laboratory and a $1.5 \text{ m} \times 4 \text{ mm}$ I.D. column **of 3% (w/w) SE-30 on Chromosorb G HP was used in the second laboratory, the** mean interlaboratory difference between indices for the 17 compounds was \pm 13 *ietention index units, with only one outside the* \pm *50 limit (difference of 55 units).* **This supports the claims that the use of retention index measurements provides a good basis for peak identification procedures.**

For a more rigorous identification of an ester, it is possible to use the method suggested by Krishen'. This involves the hydrolysis of the ester, and subsequent chromatography of the alcohol and the acid after it has been methylated.

A total of 14 compounds did not elute under the conditions used in this work. However, the majority of compounds eluted as single peaks, although a few excep-

Fig. 1. Chromatogram of a commercial sample of isobutylcyclohexyl phthalate using FID. A, diisobutyl phthalate; **B**, isobutylcyclohexyl phthalate; C, dicyclohexyl phthalate.

tions were noted. The retention **indices of the 8 compounds giving up to three significant peaks** have been incorporated into Tables 2 and 3. In most cases, where more than one major peak was observed, the identity of the extra peaks reflected the mode of synthesis of the supposedly primary compound. For **example, three peaks were observed in the chromatogram** of isobutylcyclohexyl phthalate (Fig. 1) which were identified by mass spectrometry as diisobutyl phtbalate, isobutylcyclohexyl phthalate and dicyclohexyl phtbalate. Other examples are given in Table 4. Some compounds (a total of 44) revealed even more complex chromatograms. In cases where more than three significant peaks were observed, the compound was listed in Table 2 as having **multiple peaks and omitted from Table 3. A list of compounds chromatographing as mnltiple peaks is presented in Table 5 and an example is shown in** Fig. 2. The complex nature of some of these substances may be indicated by a "noisy baseline" rather than by distinct peaks.

TABLE 4

Peak identification (by mass spectrometry)
Octyl adipate
Dioctyl adipate
Octyldecyl adipate
Diphenylcresyl phosphate
Dicresylphenyl phosphate
Tricresyl phosphate
Diisobutyl phthalate
Dicyclohexyl phthalate
Isobutylcyclonexyl phthalate
Dibutyl sebacate
Butylbenzyl sebacate
Dibenzyl sebacate
Diisooctyl phthalate
Isooctylisodecyl phthalate
Diisodecyl phthalate

IDENTIFICATION OF SOME COMPOUNDS EXHIBITING MULTIPLE PEAKS BY GAS-LIQUID CHROMATOGRAPHY

TABLE 5

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF COMPOUNDS ELUTING AS MULTIPLE PEAKS (i.e. MORE THAN THREE)

* Trade name.

3.2. Examples of interferences by plasticizers

Plasticizers and other non-drug substances may enter biological samples from a variety of sources or may even be added inadvertently during analysis. For example, in a vertical injection system particles of a septum may be dislodged on to the top

Fig. 2. **Clwomatogram of a commercial sample of tritolyl phosphate using PND in phosphorus** mode:

of the coilumn **and** if the septum contains a plasticizer, peaks for this compound may be observed. An illustration of the presence of a plasticizer in a GLC **septum** with similar chromatographic properties to tris(isopropylpheny1) phosphate is shown **in** Fig. 3.

Fig. 3. Chromatograms obtained using PND in phosphorus mode of A, an acetone extract of a GLC **septum; B, tris(isopropylpheny1) phosphate.**

In addition to the retention index data, the properties of substituents in the molecules may be of aid in the identification of unknown peaks since in many instances the response ratio of compounds between different selective detectors can be characteristic²⁷. The FID response is dependent on the number of carbon atoms in a molecule and is quite predictable. However, the ECD response for different compounds varies widely and is dependent on the electron deficient part of the compound, and is quite difficult to predict. The PND response for a compound depends to some extent on **the.number of nitrogen or phosphorus atoms in a** molecule but also depends OQ their **environment.** i It foH&s that **by using the FID as a reference we can measure the** ECD: or PND response relative to it, thus adding another variable to measure in addition to the retention index.

The **ECD** is very sensitive to phthalate esters. For example, Fig. 4 illustrates the presence of di(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate (DEHP) as an impurity in a blood extract from a-patient who had received a transfusion of blood which bad been stored in a plastic bag. The ECD/FID response ratio was of valuable assistance in the differentiation between plasticizer peaks and the compounds of interest (benzodiazepines) since the ECD/FID ratio for DEHP differs considerably from that of benzodiazepines.

Fig. 4. Chromatograms, using both FID and ECD, of an extract of a blood sample from a patient taking flurazepam and who had had a blood transfusion. A, di(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate from the poly-(vinylchloride) transfusion bag; B, desalkylflurazepam (a metabolite of flurazepam); C, prazepam **cmternal standard); D, cholesterol.**

The heated bead PND may be made very highly selective for phosphorus containing compounds, but will retain its sensitivity to phosphorus even when optimised for its nitrogen response. Hence, by running a chromatogram with the PND optimised for phosphorus and then running the chromatogram with the detector optimised for nitrogen it may be deduced if a compound contains nitrogen or phosphorus. In addition, if a dual-detector system (PND/FID) is used,the greater sensitiv**ity** of **the PND to phosphorus** containing **compounds compared with nitrogen**

containing compounds can be recognised using the FID response as a reference. Fig. 5 il!ustrates the use of the PND/FID response ratios to reveal the phosphate impurities originating from filter paper present in a blood extract containing barbiturates (which contain nitrogen).

Tables 2 and 3 contain retention data for compounds that have been used as internal standards for the quantitative analyses of drugs_ Because of the insidious nature of pIasticizers, as shown by the above examples, it is obvious that their use as internal staridards may lead to errors.

Fig. 5. Chromatograms using FID and PND in nitrogen mode, with attenuations adjusted to give **roughly equal sized peaks for the barbiturates on both detectors, of an extract of a blood sample** containing barbiturates. The contamination from triisobutyl phosphate introduced from filter paper is apparent. A, triisobutyl phosphate; B, amylobarbitone; C, quinalbarbitone; D, C₁₉ H₄₀ (retention index marker).

4. CONCLUSIONS

Plasticizers and other non-drug substances may find their way into analytical extracts via a number of different routes. Hence the presence of these impurities may provide analytical compkations to the unsuspecting analyst. The retention indices of 296 non-drug substances have been measured on SE-30 or OV-1 to supplement collections of'previousIy published data on these non-polar stationary phases. The use of selective GLC detector response ratios may, in many instances, be of **value in differentiating between drug and non-drug substances in biological extracts. The use of pla.&izer:~ as internal standards for quantitative analyses is to be discouraged.**

5. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank Dr. M. C'. H. Oon for hetp with the mass spectral studies and Mr. S. 0. Oguike for technical assistance. Also the following for gifts of chemicals: Mr. J. P. Davies (Metal Box Co.), E. H. Foakes (Albright & Wilson Ltd.) and Dr. P. I. Donnelly (Lankro Chemicals Ltd.).

6. SUMMARY

The advent of the widespread use of selective detectors (electron capture detector, phosphorus/nitrogen detector) for gas-liquid chromatography used in toxicological analyses has revealed the presence of hitherto unseen interfering materials. These substances may be conveniently grouped into (l), anti-oxidants; (2), putrefactive and endogenous compounds; (3), pesticides; (4), food additives, flavours and fragrances; (5) plasticisers, plastic additives and vuleanising agents and (6), scintillation reagents. To facilitate the identification of these materials, retention indices on **the dimethyl silicone phases SE-30 or OV-1 have been compiled by the two laboratories to include 296 such compounds. Most gave single peaks, but some gave complex patterns indicating that they were mixtures of compounds. Of the 296 compounds, 14 did not give observable peaks, 8 gave 2 or 3 peaks and 44 gave more than 3 peaks. To determine the interlaboratory difference between retention index measurements, 17 compounds were chromatographed by both laboratories: the mean difference was** $+$ 13 retention index units with only one greater than $+$ 50 retention index units. **Examples of how these materials may be encountered during toxicological analyses are given. Data are also presented on compounds which have been used as internal standards.**

REFERENCES

- **1 A. Krishen,** *AnaL Chem.,* **43 (1971) 1130.**
- **2 O. Borga, K. M. Piafsky and O. G. Nilsen,** *Clin. Pharmacol. Ther., 22 (1977) 539.*
- *3 S. 3.* **Dickson, A. W. Missen and G. J. Down,** *Forensic Sci.,* **4 (1974) 155.**
- **4 K.** *M. Fiafsky* **and 0. Borga. Lmtcer, ii (1976) 963.**
- 5 J. T. Piechocki and W. C. Purdy, *Clin. Chim. Acta*, 48 (1973) 385.
- *6 O-* **Borga, K. M- Piafsky and 0. G. N&en, Clin_** *Phurmacol. Ther.,* **in press.**
- *7* **R. H. Cotham and D. Shand. C&n.** *Pharmacul. Ther.,* **18 (1975) 535.**
- **8 A. W. Missen and S- A. Gwyn,** *C'lin. Chem., 24 (1978) 2065.*
- *9 A. C.* **Moffat, A. H. Stead and K. W. Smalldon.** *J_ Chrumatogr., 90* **(1974) 19.**
- **10 A. H. Becketr, G. T. Tucker and A. C. Moffat, J.** *Pharm. Pharmacol., 19* **(1967)** *273.*
- **11 A. H. Beckett and A. C. Moffat,** *J. Pharm. Pharmacol., 20* **(1968) Supp.** *48s.*
- **12 B. Finkle. E. J. Cherry and D. M. Taylor,** *J. Chrumaiogr. Sci., 9* **(1971) 393.**
- **13 L. Kazyak and R. Permiwhn, J.** *Forens_ Sci.,* **15** *(1970) 346.*
- 14 **E. Marozzi, V. Gambaro, F. Lodi and A. Pariali.** Farmaco, Ed. Prat., 31 (1976) 180.
- **15 H. V. Street, J.** *Chromarogr., 29* **(1967)** *68.*
- *16 A. C.* **Moffat,** *J. Chromatogr., 113 (1975) 69.*
- *17* **E. Kovats, Netv.** *Chim. Arra. 41* **(1958) 1915.**
- 18 J. F. Thompson, J. B. Mann, A. O. Apodaca and E. J. Kantor, *J. Ass. Offic. Anal. Chem.*, 58 **(1975) 1037.**
- **19** *Merck Index,* **Merck % Co., R&way, N.J., U.S.A., 9th ed., 1976.**
- **20 Nanogen Index, Nanogen International. Freedom. Calif., U.S.A., 1975.**

 $\bar{\beta}$

 $\overline{}$

 \mathbb{R}^2

 \Box

- **21 31. Beminger and M. R. Moller,** *Ardr. Toxid..,* **37 (1977) 295.**
- 22 **J. ILlein and H. Widdecke, J.** *Chromarogr.,* **129 (1976) 375.**
- 23 J. F. K. Huber and R. G. Gerritse, *J. Chromatogr.*, 80 (1973) 25.
- 24 J. F., Ashes and J. K. Haken, *J. Chromatogr.*, 84 (1973) 231.
- **2.5 L. !i. Et&,** *Chrmnatographhin,* **7 (1974) 39_**
- 26 L. Mathiasson, J. A. Jönsson, A. M. Olsson and L. Haraldson, *J. Chromatogr.*, 152 (1978) 11.
- **27 J. KI. Baker,** *Anal. Chem., 49 (1977) 906.*