

Journal of Chromatography, 337 (1985) 443

Biomedical Applications

Elsevier Science Publishers B.V., Amsterdam — Printed in The Netherlands

CHROMBO. 2395

Letter to the Editor

Quantitative analysis of (3-methoxy-4-sulphoxyphenyl)ethylene glycol (MHPG sulphate) in human urine

Reply to Murray and Davies

Sir,

We thank Drs. Murray and Davies for their reaction to our communication on the direct determination of MHPG sulphate [1]. There is no doubt about the sensitivity of the method used by Murray et al. [2].

In fact the method needs to be very sensitive because of the low recovery of the extraction procedure and the perhaps not complete fluoridation of MHPG sulphate, at least in our hands. Therefore, after hydrolysis of the sulphate conjugate we fluoridated MHPG itself and used dissolved MHPG piperazine (Sigma) as a reference standard.

Besides this, our method does not require very complex and expensive equipment, nor a laboratory licensed for radioactive activities. The overall standard deviation of about 20% is high, but results in volunteers do not seem to differ much from that found by other authors, Murray et al. included [1]. This should, however, not be compared with a simple test-retest reliability.

Although our method has some disadvantages we think it can be used in clinical research.

*Department of Psychiatry,
Free University, Valeriusclinic,
Valeriusplein 9, 1075 BG Amsterdam
(The Netherlands)*

R.E. THIEME*
P.C.N. EICHHOLTZ
D. BINKHUYZEN

1 P.C.N. Eichholtz, D. Binkhuyzen and R.E. Thieme, *J. Chromatogr.*, 305 (1984) 438—441.

2 G. Murray, T.A. Baillie and D.S. Davies, *J. Chromatogr.*, 143 (1977) 541—551.

(Received October 10th, 1984)