Journal of Chromatography, 332 (1985) 189–194 Elsevier Science Publishers B.V., Amsterdam — Printed in The Netherlands

# CHROMSYMP. 624

# ENERGY EFFECTS IN THE RETENTION OF AROMATIC ACIDS IN LIQUID CHROMATOGRAPHY

### T. HANAI

Gasukuro Kogyo Inc., 237-2 Sayamagahara, Iruma 358 (Japan) (First received March 25th, 1985; revised manuscript received May 13th, 1985)

### SUMMARY

The reversed-phase liquid chromatographic behaviour of phenols and aromatic acids was studied using an octadecyl-bonded silica gel as the stationary phase and acidic acetonitrile-water mixtures as the mobile phase. The retentions of these compounds can be predicted from their Van der Waals volumes and energy effects. The energy effects are classified according to  $\pi$  and hydrogen-bonding energies. The inclusion of dissociation constants, derived from Hammett's equation, in the above approach makes it possible to predict the retention times of ionized aromatic acids.

### INTRODUCTION

Several approaches have been used to develop systems for the prediction of retention times in reversed-phase liquid chromatography. These have included alkyl chain length, connectivity index, number of double bonds, localization and delocalization energies, Hansch's  $\pi$  constants and Rekker's hydrophobic fragmental constants. Of these parameters, Rekker's hydrophobic fragmental constants (log *P* values)<sup>1</sup> were useful for predicting the retention times of several groups of compounds in systems with octadecyl-bonded silica gels as the stationary phase and pH-controlled acetonitrile–water mixtures as the mobile phase<sup>2-5</sup>.

However, each group of compounds required individual standard compounds in order to obtain the constants of the equations that were used for the calculation of the retention time, the resolution and the concentration of acetonitrile as an organic modifier. This meant that if a compound had two or more different types of substituents, the retention time predicted from one set of equations was often far from the observed value. The system based on the partition coefficient between octanol and water was, therefore, not adequate for producing an optimized system for mixtures of different types of compounds. Further investigations have used basic physico-chemical parameters such as Van der Waals volumes,  $\pi$ -energies, hydrogenbonding energies and dissociation constants. In systems with octadecyl-bonded silica gels and pH-controlled acetonitrile-water mixtures, the retention times of non-ionizable compounds, such as *n*-alkanes, polyaromatic hydrocarbons, alkylbenzenes and halogenated benzenes, have been well predicted from the Van der Waals volume and  $\pi$ -energy effects<sup>6,7</sup>. The retention of phenols has been calculated from the following equation:

$$\log k' (\text{Ar-OH}) = \log k' (\text{VWV}) - \log k' (\pi) - \log k' (\text{HB})$$

where log k'(Ar-OH) is the capacity ratio of a substituted phenol, log k'(VWV) is obtained from the Van der Waals volume, log  $k'(\pi)$  is the  $\pi$ -energy effect of a phenyl group and log k'(HB) is the hydrogen bonding effect of the hydroxy group of phenol<sup>8</sup>. This approach has now been applied to produce an optimization system for aromatic acids in liquid chromatography.

# EXPERIMENTAL

The details of the instrument used were described previously<sup>5</sup> and the chemicals used are listed in Table I. The octadecyl-bonded silica gel column was an ERC-1000, kindly donated by ERMA Optical Works (Tokyo, Japan). The column temperature was 40°C. The Van der Waals volumes were calculated by Bondi's method<sup>9</sup> and the values of the energy effect of phenols were obtained from a previous paper<sup>8</sup>.

### **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

The log k' values measured are listed in Table I together with the values of the energy effect. The relationship between log k' and Van der Waals volumes was linear. However, the slopes for the different groups of compounds were not exactly the same, e.g., hydrophobic groups had higher slopes. The difference in slopes could be explained by enthalpy effects<sup>10</sup>. The energy effect of each compound could easily be calculated if a linear relationship between Van der Waals volumes and log k' values for n-alkanes could be obtained. However, the retention times of n-alkanes were very long with eluents containing low concentrations of an organic modifier. Thus, such plots could not be obtained easily for aromatic acids, the retention times of which were relatively short. Therefore, a linear relationship for alkylphenols between their log k' values and their Van der Waals volumes was first obtained. The capacity ratios of n-alkanes were then calculated from their Van der Waals volumes and from the values of the energy effect of phenols.

The slope of the linear relationship for *n*-alkanes was further adjusted by the addition of the enthalpy effect<sup>10</sup>. The difference between the observed energy effect of phenols and the reference values was less than 5%. The energy effect of aromatic acids was obtained from the last equation and their log k' values. The values are given in Table I.

The hydrogen-bonding energy effect of a carboxyl group of benzoic acid is about 2 kcal/mole higher than that of a phenolic hydroxy group. The difference between the energy effects of benzoic acid and phenylacetic acid is about 2 kcal/mole, and that between phenylacetic acid and 3-phenylpropionic acid or 4-phenylbutyric acid is small. A similar result was obtained for indole acids. In addition, the retention times of ionized aromatic acids were predicted from their log P values and their dissociation constants<sup>11,12</sup>. This equation was modified to

$$k' = (k'_{\text{max}} + k'_{\text{min}} K_{a}/[H^{+}])/(1 + K_{a} / [H^{+}])$$

where the maximum capacity ratios  $(k'_{max})$  were calculated from their Van der Waals volumes and their energy effects instead of their log P values. The p $K_a$  values were calculated from a modified Hammett equation<sup>12</sup>. The minimum capacity ratios  $(k'_{min})$ , *i.e.*, the capacity ratios of totally ionized acids, were close to zero and could not be predicted, so the values were obtained experimentally in the eluent of pH 7.000. The result is shown in Fig. 1.



Fig. 1. Predicted and observed capacity ratios of aromatic acids at pH 4.500. Experimental conditions: column, ERC-1000 (ODS), 15 cm  $\times$  6.0 mm I.D.; eluent, 0.05 *M* sodium phosphate (pH 4.500) containing 25% of acetonitrile; column temperature, 40°C. The numbers adjacent to the symbols are the same as in Table I. The two lines on either side of the central line indicate a 10% error (n = 21).

The difference between the predicted and observed capacity ratios was 10%. The error for 3,4- and 3,5-dimethylbenzoic acids (Nos. 25 and 26 in Fig. 1) was more than 10%, but the error for 3,4-dimethylbenzoic acid should depend on the value of the  $\pi$ -energy effect but not the dissociation constant.

The following equation was obtained between the predicted and observed capacity ratios:

$$k'_{obs} = a/k'_{pre} + b$$

where  $k'_{obs}$  and  $k'_{pre}$  are the observed and predicted capacity ratios, respectively, and constants *a* and *b* are 1.132 and -0.2038, respectively. The correlation coefficient (n = 21) was 0.990 and the average error was 4.78%. Only 3,5-dichlorobenzoic acid (No. 36 in Fig. 1) had an error of more than 10%. However, the error for this acid at pH 1.900 was very small, and therefore should be due to the dissociation constant.

TABLE I

# COMPOUNDS STUDIED AND THEIR PHYSICAL PARAMETERS

Experimental conditions: column, ERC-1000 (ODS), 15 cm  $\times$  6.0 mm I.D.; eluent, 0.05 M phosphoric acid in acetonitrile-water mixtures; column temperature, 40°C. 

| Compound                       | *AMA  | ¥.    | pKa***   | log k'<br>% aceto | nitrile |        |        |        | ĘŶ    |
|--------------------------------|-------|-------|----------|-------------------|---------|--------|--------|--------|-------|
|                                |       |       |          | 20                | 25      | 30     | 35     | 40     | 1     |
| 1 Phenol                       | 53.88 | 7.883 | <b> </b> |                   | 0.5186  | 1      | 0.2738 | 1      | 7.963 |
| 2 2-Methylphenol               | 65.03 | 8.259 | -        | 1.086             | 0.8723  | 0.6924 | 0.5691 | 0.4596 | 8.410 |
| 3 3-Methylphenol               | 65.03 | T     |          | 1.040             | 0.8242  | 0.6932 | 0.5137 | 0.4047 | 8.643 |
| 4 4-Methylphenol               | 65.03 | 8.704 | ÷        | 1.038             | 0.8248  | 0.6922 | 0.5094 | 0.4027 | 8.653 |
| 5 2,3-Dimethylphenol           | 76.18 | 9.116 | 1        | 1.393             | 1.143   | 0.9872 | 0.7851 | 0.6526 | 9.197 |
| 6 2,4-Dimethylphenol           | 76.18 | I     | 1        | 1.427             | 1.172   | 1.013  | 0.8058 | 0.6713 | 9.057 |
| 7 2,5-Dimethylphenol           | 76.18 | 9.013 | ł        | 1.427             | 1.172   | 1.015  | 0.8127 | 0.6734 | 9.045 |
| 8 2,6-Dimethylphenol           | 76.18 | 8.524 | ł        | 1.409             | 1.174   | 1.026  | 0.8320 | 0.7047 | 8.984 |
| 9 3,4-Dimethylphenol           | 76.18 | 9.762 | T        | 1.320             | 1.067   | 0.9725 | 0.7007 | 0.5714 | 9.570 |
| 10 3,5-Dimethylphenol          | 76.18 | 9.489 |          | 1.385             | 1.126   | 0.9615 | 0.7487 | 0.6179 | 9.337 |
| 11 2,3,5-Trimethylphenol       | 87.33 | 9.851 | 1        | 1.735             | 1.449   | 1.259  | 1.020  | 0.8979 | 9.844 |
| 12 2,3,6-Trimethylphenol       | 87.33 | 9.360 | 1        | 1.717             | 1.454   | 1.270  | 1.047  | 0.8986 | 9.844 |
| 13 2,4,6-Trimethylphenol       | 87.33 | 9.175 | 1        | 1.758             | 1.487   | 1.303  | 1.072  | 0.9208 | 9.644 |
| 14 2,3,5,6-Tetramethylphenol   | 98.48 | 10.13 | I        | ł                 | Ι       | I      | 1.263  | 1.092  | 10.46 |
| 15 2-Ethylphenol               | 75.26 | 9.192 | 1        | 1.487             | 1.232   | 0.9985 | 0.8647 | 0.7259 | 8.627 |
| 16 3-Ethylphenol               | 75.26 | I     | I        | 1.490             | 1.155   | 0.9902 | 0.7800 | 0.6426 | 8.946 |
| 17 4-Ethylphenol               | 75.26 | 9.122 | 1        | 1.432             | 1.168   | 0.9994 | 0.7858 | 0.6466 | 8.946 |
| 18 Benzoic acid                | 65.36 | ł     | 4.200    | 0.8271            | 0.6065  | 0.4489 | 0.2794 | 0.1557 | 10.00 |
| 19 2-Methylbenzoic acid        | 76.51 | I     | I        | 1.140             | 0.8853  | 0.7058 | 0.5117 | 0.3712 | 10.76 |
| 20 3-Methylbenzoic acid        | 76.51 | I     | 4.270    | 1.216             | 0.9444  | 0.7507 | 0.5399 | 0.3957 | 10.51 |
| 21 4-Methylbenzoic acid        | 76.51 | ł     | 4.340    | 1.177             | 0.9263  | 0.7516 | 0.5248 | 0.3803 | 10.61 |
| 22 2,4-Dimethylbenzoic acid    | 87.66 | ł     | ł        | 1.535             | 1.228   | 1.007  | 0.7733 | 0.6084 | 11.27 |
| 23 2,5-Dimethylbenzoic acid    | 87.66 | ł     | 1        | 1.356             | 1.231   | 1.007  | 0.7715 | 0.6092 | 11.43 |
| 24 2,6-Dimethylbenzoic acid    | 87.66 | I     | 1        | 1.137             | 0.8348  | 0.7064 | 0.5068 | 0.3740 | 13.00 |
| 25 3,4-Dimethylbenzoic acid    | 87.66 | 1     | 4.440    | 1.225             | 1.209   | 0.9072 | 0.7315 | 0.5674 | 11.62 |
| 26 3.5-Dimethylbenzoic acid    | 87.66 | I     | 4.340    | 1.456             | 1.288   | 1.050  | 0.8032 | 0.6334 | 11.16 |
| 27 2,4,6-Trimethylbenzoic acid | 98.81 | 1     | I        | 1.527             | 1.228   | 1.011  | 0.7782 | 0.6125 | 13.44 |
| 28 4-Ethylbenzoic acid         | 86.74 | I     | 4.350    | 1.598             | 1.284   | 1.049  | 0.8090 | 0.6310 | 10.85 |

| 29 2-Chlorobenzoic acid  | 74.84  | I | I     | 0.9933 | 0.7629 | 0.5878  | 0.4075  | 0.2691  | 11.09 |
|--|--------|---|-------|--------|--------|---------|---------|---------|-------|
| 30 3-Chlorobenzoic acid  | 74.84  | T | 3.380 | 1.011  | 1.082  | 0.7626  | 0.6548  | 0.5016  | 9.715 |
| 31 4-Chlorobenzoic acid  | 74.84  | I | 3.960 | 1.370  | 1.097  | 0.8897  | 0.6700  | 0.5135  | 9.419 |
| 32 2,4-Dichlorobenzoic acid  | 84.32  | ł | I     | 1.587  | 1.289  | 1.067   | 0.8306  | 0.6585  | 10.30 |
| 33 2,5-Dichlorobenzoic acid  | 84.32  | I | I     | 1.489  | 1.206  | 0.9944  | 0.7687  | 0.6032  | 10.70 |
| 34 2,6-Dichlorobenzoic acid  | 84.32  | I | ı     | 1.049  | 0.8365 | 0.6796  | 0.4977  | 0.3669  | 12.48 |
| 35 3,4-Dichlorobenzoic acid  | 84.32  | ł | 3.600 | 1.847  | 1.517  | 1.258   | 0.9914  | 0.8063  | 9.223 |
| 36 3,5-Dichlorobenzoic acid  | 84.32  | 1 | 3.460 | 1.929  | 1.588  | 1.338   | 1.077   | 0.8818  | 8.791 |
| 37 2-Bromobenzoic acid   | 77.96  | I | 1     | 1.077  | 0.8317 | 0.6490  | 0.4595  | 0.3215  | 11.35 |
| 38 3-Bromobenzoic acid   | 77.96  | 1 | 3.810 | 1.470  | 1.175  | 0.9595  | 0.7300  | 0.5647  | 9.641 |
| 39 4-Bromobenzoic acid   | 77.96  | Ι | 3.980 | 1.505  | 1.195  | 0.9792  | 0.7475  | 0.5821  | 9.522 |
| 41 2-Chlorophenylacetic acid   | 85.07  | I | Ι     | 1.188  | 0.9203 | 0.7209  | 0.5165  | 0.3676  | 12.34 |
| 42 4-Chlorophenylacetic acid   | 85.07  | 1 | 4.216 | 1.364  | 1.081  | 0.8601  | 0.6359  | 0.4739  | 11.57 |
| 42 Phenylacetic acid   | 79.55  | - | 4.300 | I      | 0.6309 | I       | ł       | I       | 12.88 |
| 43 2-Tolylacetic acid  | 86.74  | I | ł     | 1.144  | 0.8849 | 0.6904  | 0.4916  | 0.3478  | 12.83 |
| 44 3-Tolylacetic acid  | 86.74  | 1 | 4.325 | 1.233  | 0.9625 | 0.8761  | 0.5503  | 0.4017  | 12.51 |
| 45 4-Phenyl-n-butylic acid   | 96.05  | 1 | 4.719 | 1.517  | 1.212  | 0.9807  | 0.7441  | 0.5714  | 13.05 |
| 46 L( + )-Mandelic acid  | 80.18  | I | 3.380 | 0.2384 | 0.0492 | -0.0804 | -0.2516 | -0.3393 | 16.03 |
| 47 trans-Cinnamic acid   | 82.32  | I | 4.380 | 1.263  | 0.9754 | 0.7629  | 0.5476  | 0.3906  | 11.56 |
| 48 4-Methylcinnamic acid   | 93.47  | ļ | 4.492 | 1.650  | 1.314  | 1.060   | 0.8171  | 0.6241  | 12.08 |
| 49 3-Phenyl-n-propionic acid   | 86.04  | Ι | 4.579 | 1.190  | 0.9200 | 0.7323  | 0.5281  | 0.3782  | 12.49 |
| 50 Indole-3-acetic acid  | 91.65  | 1 | 4.750 | 0.8907 | 0.6270 | 0.2058  | 0.2384  | 0.1023  | 15.42 |
| 51 Indole-3-propionic acid   | 114.11 | I | ł     | 1.214  | 0.9130 | 0.6889  | 0.4650  | 0.3003  | 18.19 |
| 52 Indole-3-butylic acid   | 121.34 | I | ł     | 1.492  | 1.153  | 0.8953  | 0.6511  | 0.4584  | 18.44 |
| 53 Hippuric acid   | 96.15  | 1 | ł     | 0.2225 | 0.0116 | -0.1430 | -0.3132 | -0.4259 | 19.31 |
| Void volume (elution volume of Na <sub>2</sub> NO <sub>3</sub> , ml) |        |   |       | 1.950  | 1.992  | 1.860   | 1.926   | 1.800   |       |
|  |        |   |       |        |        |         |         |         |       |
| Dead volume of instrument (ml)                                       |        |   |       | 0.067  | 0.116  | 0.067   | 0.116   | 0.067   |       |
|  |        |   |       |        |        |         |         |         |       |

\* Van der Waals volume calculated by Bondi's method<sup>9</sup>.
\*\* Energy effect (kcal/mol) from ref. 8.
\*\*\* Dissociation constant from ref. 12.
§ Energy effect obtained from the observed log k' values.

### CONCLUSION

The retention times of aromatic acids with an eluent of given pH can be obtained from their Van der Waals volumes, energy effects and dissociation constants. The remaining difficulty is the substituent effect in estimating the energy effect. Hammett's  $\sigma$  and Taft's  $\sigma^*$  constants did not bear a linear relationship to their log k' values. Hammett's  $\sigma$  constant was useful only for calculating the dissociation constant, even though the estimated dissociation constants for multi-substituted compounds were uncertain because not many data have been reported.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I thank to Mr. A. Gyukurogi for technical assistance.

### REFERENCES

- 1 R. F. Rekker, The Hydrophobic Fragmental Constant, Elsevier, Amsterdam, 1977.
- 2 T. Hanai, Chromatographia, 12 (1979) 77.
- 3 T. Hanai, K. C. Tran and J. Hubert, J. High Resolut. Chromatogr. Chromatogr. Commun., 4 (1981) 454.
- 4 T. Hanai, K. C. Tran and J. Hubert, J. Chromatogr., 239 (1982) 527.
- 5 T. Hanai and J. Hubert, J. High Resolut. Chromatogr. Chromatogr. Commun., 6 (1983) 20.
- 6 T. Hanai and J. Hubert, J. Chromatogr., 290 (1984) 197.
- 7 T. Hanai and J. Hubert, J. Chromatogr., 291 (1984) 81.
- 8 T. Hanai and J. Hubert, J. Chromatogr., 302 (1984) 89.
- 9 A. Bondi, J. Phys. Chem., 68 (1964) 441.
- 10 T. Hanai and J. Hubert, Chromatographia, 19 (1985) 266.
- 11 T. Hanai, K. C. Tran and J. Hubert, J. Chromatogr., 239 (1982) 385.
- 12 T. Hanai and J. Hubert, J. High. Resolut. Chromatogr. Chromatogr. Commun., 7 (1984) 524.