CHROM. 23 574

### Short Communication

# Electrophoretic mobility and dissociation constants of tripeptides evaluated by isotachophoresis

Takeshi Hirokawa\*, Ryuji Sugino and Yoshiyuki Kiso

Applied Physics and Chemistry, Faculty of Engineering, Hiroshima University, Kagamiyama 1, Higashi-Hiroshima 724 (Japan)

(Received April 23rd, 1991)

#### ABSTRACT

Ionic mobilities and dissociation constants of twenty peptides (seventeen tripeptides and a few oligoglycines) were evaluated on the basis of the observed isotachophoretic qualitative indices  $R_E$  in the pH range 8.1–9.5 by the use of a least-squares method. Good correlation was obtained among the mobilities of amino acids, dipeptides and tripeptides when the clay ball model and the conventional formula weight were adopted.

#### INTRODUCTION

Ionic mobility and dissociation constants of ionic substances are the essential physico-chemical constants for the theoretical treatment of electrophoresis, including separation optimization. As discussed previously [1], isotachophoresis itself is a useful method for the evaluation of the mobility, dissociation constant and ion-pair formation constant when the pH dependence of the qualitative indices are measured accurately and data reduction software is available. The unique feature of the method in comparison with conventional techniques is that a sample mixture can be treated and the necessary amount for the measurement is very small (less than 1  $\mu$ mol).

As reviewed by Pospichal *et al.* [2], the number of samples for which the mobility has been obtained is not more than about 500. We have evaluated a considerable number of absolute mobilities  $(m_0)$  and  $pK_a$  values by the use of isotachophoresis, including those of 25 amino acids [3] and 28 dipeptides [4].

In this work, the  $m_0$  and  $pK_a$  values of twenty peptides (seventeen tripeptides and a few oligoglycines) were evaluated on the basis of the observed isotachophoretic qualitative indices  $R_E$  in the pH range 8.1–9.5. The least-squares method was used, utilizing a simulation technique of the isotachophoretic steady state. The correlation of the mobility among amino acids, dipeptides and tripeptides is briefly discussed on the basis of the clay ball model [4] and the conventional formula weight dependence.

#### EXPERIMENTAL

#### Samples

The twenty peptides used are summarized in Table I together with their abbreviations and formula weights. Oligoglycines were purchased from Tokyo Kasei Kogyo (Tokyo, Japan) and the other peptides from Sigma (St. Louis, MO, USA). Sample solutions (5 mM) were prepared by dissolving these dipeptides in distilled water. When the

#### TABLE I

PEPTIDE SAMPLES, ABBREVIATIONS AND MOLECULAR WEIGHTS

Peptide	Abbreviation	Molecular weight
L-Alanyl-L-alanyl-L-alanine	(Ala) <sub>3</sub>	231.2
DL-Alanylglycylglycine	AlaGlyGly	203.2
DL-Alanyl-DL-leucylglycine	AlaLeuGly	259.3
Diglycine	(Gly) <sub>2</sub>	132.1
Triglycine	(Gly) <sub>3</sub>	189.2
Tetraglycine	(Gly) <sub>4</sub>	246.2
Pentaglycine	(Gly) <sub>5</sub>	303.3
Hexaglycine	(Gly) <sub>6</sub>	360.3
Glycylglycyl-L-isoleucine	GlyGlyIle	245.3
Glycylglycyl-D-leucine	GlyGlyLeu	245.3
Glycylglycyl-L-phenylalanine	GlyGlyPhe	279.3
Glycylglycyl-L-valine	GlyGlyVal	231.3
Glycyl-L-histidylglycine	GlyHisGly	269.3
Glycyl-DL-leucyl-DL-alanine	GlyLeuAla	259.3
Glycyl-L-leucyl-L-tyrosine	GlyLeuTyr	351.4
Glycyl-L-prolyl-L-alanine	GlyProAla	243.3
Glycyl-D-phenylalanyl-		
L-phenylalanine	GlyPhePhe	369.4
L-Leucylglycylglycine	LeuGlyGly	245.3
DL-Leucylglycyl-DL-phenylalanine	LeuGlyPhe	335.4
L-Leucyl-L-leucyl-L-leucine	(Leu) <sub>3</sub>	357.5
L-Seryl-L-seryl-L-serine	(Ser) <sub>3</sub>	279.3

solubility was low, a small amount of sodium hydroxide solution was added. The internal standards used to correct the asymmetric potential of PGD [5] were butyric acid, glycine and diglycine.

#### Operational electrolyte system

The leading electrolyte was 10 mM hydrochloric acid and the pH of leading electrolyte (pH<sub>L</sub>) was adjusted to 8.10 (No. 1) and 8.41 (No. 2) by adding tris(hydroxymethyl)aminomethane, 8.80 (No. 3) and 8.92 (No. 4) by adding 2-amino-2-methyl-1,3-propanediol and to 9.50 (No. 5) by adding ethanolamine. The above pH<sub>L</sub> range was determined on the basis that the pK<sub>a</sub> values of dipeptides are in the range ca. 8–9 [4] and the pK<sub>a</sub> values of tripeptides will not be much different from these values. All of the leading electrolytes contained 0.1% of hydroxypropylcellulose (HPC) to suppress electrode reactions and electroendosmosis.

The terminating electrolytes used were 10 mM  $\beta$ -alanine and 10 mM glycine. The pH of the

terminating electrolyte was adjusted to ca. 10 by adding barium hydroxide in order to reduce the dilution effect caused by  $HCO_3^-$  [6,7]. pH measurements were carried out using a Horiba Model F7ss expanded pH meter.

Isotachopherograms were obtained using a Shimadzu IP-2A isotachophoretic analyser equipped with a potential gradient detector (PGD). The temperature was thermostated at 25°C. The PTFE separating tube used was 40 cm  $\times$  0.5 mm I.D. The driving current applied was 50  $\mu$ A. Fig. 1 shows typical isotachopherograms for several peptides observed with the use of electrolyte system No. 3 (pH<sub>L</sub> = 8.8).

The computer program SIPS-LSQ developed by us was used for the evaluation of  $m_0$  and/or  $pK_a$ . The method is based on the simulation of an isotachophoretic zone to evaluate the isotachophoretic qualitative indices  $R_E$ ; the difference between the observed and the simulated  $R_E$  values was minimized by varying  $m_0$  and/or  $pK_a$  repeatedly. The program was written in Fortran 77. A typical calculation took 1 min on an NEC PC-9801RA microcomputer (80386–80387, clock 20 MHz).

#### **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

#### Evaluated mobility and $pK_a$

The observed  $R_{\rm E}$  values are summarized in Table II together with the  $R_{\rm E}$  values of the internal standards. The asymmetric potential of PGD was corrected using mainly the simulated values for butyric acid [5]. The step heights in the isotachopherogram might be decreased by the dilution effect of carbonate from the terminating zone [6,7]. Therefore, the observed  $R_{\rm E}$  values might be affected to some extent, although not seriously.

Table III summarizes the absolute mobility  $(m_0)$ and  $pK_a$  values for twenty peptides at 25°C evaluated by the least-squares method using the  $R_E$ values in Table II. The mean deviation between the observed and the best-fitted  $R_E$  values was 0.5–1.5% (maximum 2.4% for GlyPhePhe). Table III also shows the mobility and  $pK_a$  values of the constituent amino acids of the peptides and the internal standards. The  $pK_a$  values of oligopeptides were considerably different from those of the constituent amino acids [3]. However, the  $pK_a$  values of homologous oligopeptides of  $(Gly)_2-(Gly)_6$  were



Fig. 1. Observed isotachopherograms of butyric acid,  $(Gly)_2$ , AlaGlyGly, LeuGlyGly, LeuGlyPhe,  $(Gly)_3$ ,  $(Ser)_3$ ,  $(Ala)_3$ ,  $(Leu)_3$ ,  $(Gly)_4$ ,  $(Gly)_5$  and  $(Gly)_6$ . Butyric acid (But) and  $(Gly)_2$  were the internal standards. The leading electrolyte was 10 mM hydrochloric acid buffered by ammedial at pH<sub>L</sub> = 8.80. The terminator was 10 mM glycine (pH  $\approx$  10 by adding barium hydroxide).

#### TABLE II

OBSERVED  $R_{\rm E}$  VALUES OF PEPTIDES AT DIFFERENT pH<sub>L</sub> VALUES

Sample	Electrolyte system and $pH_L$				
	No. 1, 8.10	No. 2, 8.41	No. 3, 8.80	No. 4, 8.92	No. 5, 9.50
β-Ala <sup>a</sup>	19.69	15.83	9.67	8.98	5.15
(Ala) <sub>3</sub>	5.49	4.67	4.22	4.09	3.95
AlaGlyGly	4.86	4.21	3.73	3.71	3.40
AlaLeuGly	5.72	5.01	4.40	4.30	4.10
Butyric acid <sup>a</sup>	2.43	2.43	2.43	2.43	2.42
Gly <sup>a</sup>	10.77	8.75	5.64	5.27	3.37
$(Gly)_2^a$	4.19	3.64	3.09	3.00	2.70
(Gly) <sub>3</sub>	4.29	3.91	3.49	3.42	3.22
(Gly) <sub>4</sub>	4.91	4.35	3.97	3.89	3.61
(Gly) <sub>5</sub>	5.50	4.74	4.38	4.31	4.03
(Gly) <sub>6</sub>	5.88	5.07	4.72	4.65	4.51
GlyGlyIle	5.12	4.58	4.19	4.12	3.88
GlyGlyLeu	5.10	4.66	4.21	4.11	3.83
GlyGlyPhe	4.95	4.59	4.17	4.08	3.83
GlyGlyVal	4.95	4.59	4.05	3.97	3.73
GlyHisGly	5.47	4.74	4.18	4.07	3.87
GlyLeuAla	5.72	4.97	4.48	4.36	4.06
GlyLeuTyr	6.15	5.34	4.67	4.59	4.03
GlyProAla	6.13	5.21	4.39	4.24	3.95
GlyPhePhe	6.13	5.07	4.39	4.61	4.45
LeuGlyGly	5.04	4.48	4.11	4.09	4.04
LeuGlyPhe	5.54	4.88	4.60	4.58	4.54
(Leu) <sub>3</sub>	5.64	5.21	5.05	4.94	4.90
(Ser) <sub>3</sub>	4.22	3.93	3.89	3.75	3.95

<sup>*a*</sup> Standards or terminators for  $R_{\rm E}$  evaluation: the simulated  $R_{\rm E}$  values are listed.

almost identical with each other. It should be noted that the possible divalent ion of GlyLeuTyr was not taken into account in the present evaluation and therefore the evaluated  $m_0$  and  $pK_a$  values of GleuLeuTyr might contain considerable errors.

## Determination of mobility of oligopeptides by the clay ball model

We have reported previously a simple equation to calculate the mobilities of dipeptides from those of the constituent amino acids [4], based on the assumption that the ions are spherical and the ionic volume of the dipeptides is equal to the sum of the volumes of the constituent amino acids, as if two clay balls merged into a larger ball. This model was applied to calculate the absolute mobilities of oligopeptides (ABC...), where A, B, C,... denote the constituent amino acids. The Stokes radii of the oligopeptides ( $r_{ABC...}$ ) and the mobilities ( $m_{ABC...}$ ) can be described on the basis of the present assumption as

$$r_{ABC...} = [3(V_A + V_B + V_C + ...)/4\pi]^{1/3}$$
  
=  $(r_A^3 + r_B^3 + r_C^3 + ...)^{1/3}$  (1)

and

$$m_{\rm ABC...} = (m_{\rm A}^{-3} + m_{\rm B}^{-3} + m_{\rm C}^{-3} + ...)^{1/3}$$
 (2)

For oligoglycines  $(Gly)_n$  (n = 2-6), the absolute mobilities calculated by the use of eqn. 2 were  $29.7 \cdot 10^{-5}$ ,  $25.9 \cdot 10^{-5}$ ,  $23.6 \cdot 10^{-5}$ ,  $21.9 \cdot 10^{-5}$  and

#### TABLE III

ABSOLUTE MOBILITIES  $(m_0)$  AND  $pK_a$  VALUES OF PEPTIDES, THE CONSTITUENT AMINO ACIDS AND THE INTERNAL STANDARDS

Sample	<i>m</i> <sub>0</sub>	<i>m</i> <sub>0</sub>	
	Observed	Estimated	
(Ala) <sub>3</sub>	22.2	22.3	8.245
AlaGlyGly	25.0	24.5	8.254
AlaLeuGly	21.3	21.3	8.272
(Gly) <sub>3</sub>	26.1	25.9	8.102
(Gly) <sub>4</sub>	23.3	23.6	8.142
(Gly) <sub>5</sub>	21.2	21.9	8.167
(Gly) <sub>6</sub>	19.3	20.6	8.107
GlyGlyIle	21.9	22.3	8.096
GlyGlyLeu	21.9	22.1	8.116
GlyGlyPhe	21.9	22.3	8.041
GlyGlyVal	22.6	23.0	8.125
GlyHisGly	22.5	23.0	8.279
GlyLeuAla	21.1	21.3	8.259
GlyLeuTyr <sup>a</sup>	21.0	17.1	8.405
GlyProAla	22.5	20.9	8.492
GlyPhePhe	19.7	20.2	8.216
LeuGlyGly	21.5	22.1	7.992
LeuGlyPhe	19.3	20.0	7.938
(Leu) <sub>3</sub>	17.6	18.3	7.730
(Ser) <sub>3</sub>	22.0	23.3	7.385
	$m_0$		pK <sub>a</sub>
Butyric acid	33.8		4.820
Glycine	37.4		9.780
(Gly) <sub>2</sub>	31.5		8.400
$\beta$ -Alanine	30.8		10.241
Ala	32.2		9.857
Gly	37.4		9.780
Ileu	26.7		9.765
Leu	26.4		9.728
Phe	26.9		9.262
Val	28.4		9.710
Tyr	20.0		8.405
	40.0		10.189
Ser	33.6		9.302

" Analysed as a monovalent anion.

20.6  $\cdot$  10<sup>-5</sup> cm<sup>2</sup> V<sup>-1</sup> s<sup>-1</sup>. The mean deviation was 3.6%. Although the maximum deviation for (Gly)<sub>6</sub> of 6.3% may suggest that the estimate for the higher oligopeptides will be poor, the clay ball model gives a simple rule for calculating rough mobilities of such peptides. The good feature of this model is the applicability to heterogeneous oligopeptides as described previously [4]. The mean deviation for the

twenty oligopeptides except for GlyLeuTyr was 1.2%. The worst deviation was found for GlyProAla and (Ser)<sub>3</sub> as -7.3 and 5.9%, respectively. By the least-squares method for the nineteen peptides, the following equation between the observed  $m_0$  and the estimated  $m_{ABC...}$  was obtained:

$$m_0 = 1.076 m_{\rm ABC...} - 2 \cdot 10^{-5} \tag{3}$$

The coefficient in eqn. 3 suggests that the estimated  $m_{ABC...}$  values were slightly underestimated in comparison with the observed values and the situation was the same as for dipeptides. The correlation coefficient between the observed  $m_0$  and the estimated  $m_{ABC...}$  values was 0.95 and the mean deviation between the estimated and the observed  $m_0$  values was 1.8%.

On the other hand, it has been well established that the mobility can be correlated with formula weight. For all of the oligopeptides treated, the following equation was obtained by the leastsquares method:

$$m_0 = (293.2/\sqrt{FW} + 3.78) \cdot 10^{-5} \, cm^2 \, V^{-1} \, s^{-1} \quad (4)$$

where  $m_0$  is the absolute mobility of the monovalent ion and FW the formula weight. The mean deviation between the estimated and the observed mobilities was 3.5% for the twenty peptides. The deviation for (Leu)<sub>3</sub> and GlyLeuTyr was as high as -9.6% and 7.5%, respectively. If these were omitted, the mean deviation decreased to 2.9%. By the least-squares, method for the nineteen peptides, the following equation between the observed  $m_0$  and the estimated  $m_{ABC...}$  values was obtained when eqn. 4 was used:

$$m_0 = 0.989 m_{\rm ABC...} - 2.3 \cdot 10^{-6} \tag{5}$$

The correlation coefficient was 0.89.

For oligoglycines, a better mobility was obtained by the use of the conventional formula weight. The following equation expresses the mobility of oligoglycines,  $Gly_n$  (n = 1-6):

$$m_0 = (291.39/\sqrt{FW} + 4.66) \cdot 10^{-5} \,\mathrm{cm}^2 \,\mathrm{V}^{-1} \,\mathrm{s}^{-1}$$
 (6)

The mean deviation for  $(Gly)_n$  (n = 1-6) was 2.2% and the correlation coefficient was 0.992.

#### REFERENCES

- 1 T. Hirokawa and Y. Kiso, J. Chromatogr., 252 (1982) 33.
- 2 J. Pospichal, P. Gebauer and P. Bocek, Chem. Rev., 89 (1989) 419.

- 3 T. Hirokawa, T. Gojo and Y. Kiso, J. Chromatogr., 369 (1986) 59.
- 4 T. Hirokawa, T. Gojo and Y. Kiso, J. Chromatogr., 390 (1987) 201.
- 5 T. Hirokawa, M. Nishino, N. Aoki, Y. Kiso, Y. Sawamoto, T. Yagi and J. Akiyama, J. Chromatogr., 271 (1983) D1.
- 6 Th. P. E. M. Verheggen, J. C. Reijenga and F. M. Everaerts, J. Chromatogr., 260 (1983) 471.
- 7 T. Hirokawa, T. Taka, Y. Yokota and Y. Kiso, J. Chromatogr., 555 (1991) 247.