

Journal of Chromatography B, 706 (1998) 342–346

**IOURNAL OF CHROMATOGRAPHY B** 

Short communication

# Determination of allantoin in bovine milk by high-performance liquid chromatography

K.J. Shingfield\*, N.W. Offer

*Department of Grassland and Ruminant Science*, *SAC*, *Auchincruive*, *Ayr*, *Scotland KA*<sup>6</sup> <sup>5</sup>*HW*, *UK*

Received 15 August 1997; received in revised form 30 October 1997; accepted 31 October 1997

## **Abstract**

Determination of allantoin in bovine milk based on high-performance liquid chromatography (HPLC) is described. Following dilution and filtration, milk samples were analysed directly. Separation and quantification of allantoin was achieved using a Spherisorb 5 NH<sub>2</sub> column (250×4.6 mm ID), acetonitrile–water (90:10, v/v) mobile phase at a flow-rate<br>of 2.0 ml min<sup>-1</sup>, temperature 20°C and monitoring the effluent at 214 nm. Total analysis time was 10 between-day variability were less than 3%. Advantages of improved retention and separation of allantoin, and less complicated sample preparation exist over current methods.  $\circ$  1998 Elsevier Science B.V.

*Keywords*: Allantoin

strated strong relationships between purines entering excretion could potentially form the basis of an the duodenum and the excretion of their metabolites, on-farm diagnostic of microbial protein supply in purine derivatives (PD) in the urine [1,2]. Since, lactating dairy cows [5,6]. dietary nucleic acids are almost entirely degraded in Measurements of allantoin in bovine milk have the rumen [3], purines available for absorption are been based on colorimetric analysis [6,7], the princiassumed to be microbial in origin. Consequently, ple of which is to hydrolyse allantoin to glyoxylic urinary PD excretion has been suggested as a non- acid, which in the presence of phenylhydrazine leads invasive index of microbial protein supply. Quantify- to the formation of an hydrazone [8]. However, this ing urinary PD excretion for a dairy cow is compli- approach is subject to criticism due to a lack of cated by the requirement for a total urine collection, specificity [5,8]. In recent years, measurements of while its assessment from spot urine samples appears allantoin in biological fluids have been performed by

**1. Introduction** to be unreliable [4]. PDs are also secreted in milk, with allantoin being quantitatively the most impor-Recent studies in ruminant species have demon- tant [5,6]. Therefore measurements of milk allantoin

isocratic [9–11] or gradient HPLC methodologies  $\overline{\text{``Corresponding author. Present address: Department of Animal}$  [12] based exclusively on reversed-phase  $\overline{C}_{18}$ 

Nutrition, Institute of Animal Production, Agricultural Research stationary phases. Methods developed specifically for Centre of Finland, Jokioinen FIN-31600, Finland. milk [10,13] are often unsatisfactory due to poor

retention and separation of allantoin. This paper min prior to sample injection. Sample injection

pump Model P100, UV detector Model 200, data-jet dissolving 0.0158 g of allantoin in one litre of 90% integrator (Spectra Physics Limited, Herts, UK) and (v/v) aqueous  $CH_3CN$  resulting in a concentration of automatic injector Model 232 (Gilson Medical Elec- 0.1 mM and stored at 4°C for one month. Additional automatic injector Model 232 (Gilson Medical Electronics, Middleton, WI, USA) fitted with a 60 ml 0.05 and 0.025 m*M* standard solutions were prepared loop. Separation was achieved using a 5  $\mu$ m daily by dilution of stock standard with 90% (v/v)<br>Spherisorb amino HPLC column (250×4.6 mm ID) aqueous CH<sub>2</sub>CN. Daily calibration was performed Spherisorb amino HPLC column (250 $\times$ 4.6 mm ID) aqueous CH<sub>3</sub>CN. Daily calibration was performed preceded by a normal-phase guard column (10 $\times$ 4.6 following triplicate injections of all standard solupreceded by a normal-phase guard column  $(10\times4.6$ mm ID; Phase Separations Limited, Clwyd, Wales, tions. Quantification was achieved by regression UK).

Allantoin standard assayed above 98% was sup- Milk samples were homogenised using a T1500 plied by Phase Separations Limited. HPLC grade homogeniser (Ystral, Dottingen, Germany). Five water and far UV grade acetonitrile were supplied by hundred µl aliquots of milk were diluted with 4.5 ml Rathburn Chemicals Limited (Walkerburn, Scotland, of HPLC grade acetonitrile and vortex-mixed for 15 UK). S. A 2 ml aliquot of this mixture was passed through  $\mathbf{s}$ . A 2 ml aliquot of this mixture was passed through

Mobile phase was prepared by the addition of 100 ml HPLC grade water to 900 ml of acetonitrile. After passing through a  $0.2 \mu m$  PTFE filter (Anachem, **3. Results and discussion** Bedfordshire, UK), the mobile phase was thoroughly degassed under a vigorous stream of helium for 10 3.1. *Chromatographic separation* min. The flow of helium was reduced to a steady stream during analysis. During the initial stages of method development

mobile phase was monitored at 214 nm. Allantoin trile–water resulted in the best compromise between eluted at 3.47 min. Mobile phase flow was reversed allantoin retention and analytical run time. Standard after 4 min. Column backflushing continued for 4 and sample chromatograms are shown in Figs. 1 and min to remove longer eluting compounds from the 2, respectively. column. The flow of mobile phase was restored for 2 Peak identification was performed by the addition

describes a simple and precise isocratic method volume was  $60 \mu$ . Separation of allantoin was based on an amino stationary phase for the quantita-<br>tive determination of allantoin in bovine milk.<br>Peak purity was assessed by comparison of allantoin Peak purity was assessed by comparison of allantoin UV spectra (range 190 to 600 nm, at 4 nm intervals) in standards with milk samples. Column dead time **2. Experimental** was determined using chloroform.

## 2.1. *Instrumentation* 2.5. *Allantoin standard preparation*

Analysis was performed using an isocratic HPLC Stock allantoin standard solution was prepared by

## 2.2. *Reagents* 2.6. *Sample preparation*

a 13 mm disposable syringe filter containing a 0.45 2.3. *Mobile phase preparation* members are more preparation multiple phase preparation members and performance (HPLC Technology, Cheshire, UK) into a HPLC vial.

the effects of mobile phase composition on allantoin 2.4. *Chromatographic conditions* retention were evaluated. Increasing the proportion of acetonitrile contained in the mobile phase in-Chromatography was achieved under isocratic creased allantoin retention time and capacity factor conditions at a flow-rate of 2.0 ml min<sup>-1</sup>. Eluted (Table 1). Mobile phase containing 90:10 acetoni-

Table 1 Influence of mobile phase composition on allantoin retention time (min)

Mobile phase composition acetonitrile-water $(v/v)$	Allantoin retention time (min)	Allantoin capacity factor $(k')^a$
30:70	1.55	0.57
50:50	1.87	0.89
70:30	1.98	1.01
80:20	2.73	1.77
90:10	3.49	2.54
95:5	4.34	3.40

<sup>a</sup> Calculated as:  $k' = (t_r - t_o)/t_o$  [14] where: *k*<sup>*'*</sup> is the compound capacity factor;  $t_o$  is the column dead time (determined as 0.99 min, assuming that chloroform is not retained on the column);  $t<sub>r</sub>$  is the compound retention time (min).

was assessed to check for chemical interference. resulted in capacity factors below 0.7. In the current Comparison of allantoin standard UV spectra with work, employing an amino stationary phase to peaks identified as allantoin in milk samples indi- achieve chromatography lead to a substantial incated close spectral matches (Fig. 3). Consequently, crease in capacity factor to 2.54, which could peaks corresponding to allantoin in milk samples potentially be increased. Increases in allantoin rewere assumed to be pure and devoid of interference tention time and capacity factor resulted in improved due to co-eluting peaks. Separation compared to existing techniques based on

Poor retention and separation of allantoin remains  $C_{18}$  stationary phases. the main drawback with existing HPLC techniques [9–12]. Allantoin capacity factors for these methods 3.2. *Accuracy of the method* typically fall short of the ideal 1 to 10 range [14].

of allantoin standard to milk samples. Peak purity most suitable stationary phases for allantoin analysis,

Data provided by Hicks [15] indicated that even the Two calibration curves (range in concentration of  $2.0-8.0$  and  $10-50$  µmol  $1^{-1}$ , respectively) were





Absorbance @ 214 nm



Fig. 3. UV spectra of allantoin in a calibration standard and bovine milk sample.

prepared to evaluate the relationships between peak standard addition were linear for both compounds, were constructed by performing quadruplicate in-<br>unidentified compounds present in milk. Since re-( $\pm$ 5.9) over the concentration ranges of 2.0–8.0 and of allantoin in milk using existing techniques in-<br>10–50  $\mu$ mol l<sup>-1</sup>, respectively. Applying the standard volves complicated sample defatting and deproteinisships between peak area and added allantoin con- prior to analysis. centration were linear with regression coefficients Reproducibility assessed by performing five repliabove 0.96. cate injections of five milk samples within a day, for

Comparison of standard and sample peak area responses to allantoin addition (regression gradient) indicated recoveries of 97.2 and 99.6% for allantoin

In complex extraction procedures, it is essential to<br>use an internal standard [12]. Two internal standards<br>allopurinol [12] and phenobarbitone [16] were evalu-<br>and after allantoin addition, and A is the quantity of allant ated. Although peak area responses obtained by added.

area and allantoin concentration. Calibration curves their use was precluded due to co-elution with jections at five allantoin additions. Regression equa- coveries of allantoin added to milk approached tions for standards were calculated as  $y=2886$  100%, the inability to use an internal standard was  $(\pm 34.5)x+38$  ( $\pm 2.1$ ) and  $y=2655$  ( $\pm 17.8)x-149$  not considered a major disadvantage. Determination addition method to milk gave equations of  $y=2805$  ing procedures prior to analysis. Since allantoin  $(\pm 189.9)x+13271$   $(\pm 2805)$  and  $y=2644$  added to milk was quantitatively recovered, the  $(\pm 82.1)x+6767$  ( $\pm 597$ ). In all instances, relation- current method allows simple sample preparation





three consecutive days indicated between-day and support from the Scottish Office Agriculture and within-day coefficients of variation of 1.7 and 2.2%, Fisheries Department. respectively. Precision of the current method compares well with existing techniques which utilise  $C_{18}$ stationary phases [10,13]. Detection limits were **References** determined at a signal-to-noise ratio of 3:1, and corresponded to an allantoin concentration of  $1 \mu$ mol corresponded to an allantoin concentration of 1  $\mu$ mol [1] X.B. Chen, F.D.De.B. Hovell, E.R. Ørskov, D.S. Brown, Br.<br>
1<sup>-1</sup>. In order to preserve the analytical column, guard columns were replaced after 100 sample inject

production level, which is in agreement with values of between 159 and 237  $\mu$ mol  $1^{-1}$  reported by [5] D. Giesecke, L. Ehrentreich, M. Stangassinger, F. Ahrens, J. Giesecke, a. Ehrentreich, M. Stangassinger, F. Ahrens, Giesecke et al. [5]. Allantoin concentrations in  $\mu$ mol  $1^{-1}$  [5,17]) but are much lower than urinary  $\mu$ mol  $1^{-1}$  [5,17]) but are much lower than urinary  $\mu$ mol  $\mu$ mol  $\mu$ <sup>-1</sup> (5,17) but are much lower than urinar concentrations which typically range between 0.7 (1985) 141. and 29.4 m*M* [4].<br>
<sup>[8]</sup> E.G. Young, C.F. Conway, J. Biol. Chem. 142 (1942) 839.<br>
<sup>1</sup> (9] W. Tiermeyer, D. Giesecke, Anal. Biochem 123 (1982) 11.

A sensitive and precise method has been de-<br>veloped to quantify allantoin in bovine milk with<br>advantages of: (i) simple sample preparation, (ii) [10] R. Rosskopf, H. Rainer, D. Giesecke, Arch. Anim. Nutr. 41<br>(1991) 411. prolonged column lifetime due to backflushing and (1992) 1337. (iii) improved retention and separation of allantoin [12] J. Balcells, J.A. Guada, J.M. Peiro, D.S. Parker, J. Chroma-<br>
togr. 575 (1992) 153. togr. 575 (1992) 153.<br>[13] W. Tiermeyer, M. Stohrer, D. Giesecke, J. Dairy Sci. 67] W. Tiermeyer, M. Stohrer, D. Giesecke, J. Dairy

The authors would like to thank Mr. K. McIssac 428.<br>
[16] R. Dennis, C. Dezelak, J. Grime, Acta Pharm. Hungarica 57 for technical assistance during this work. K.J. Shing-  $(1987)$  267. field gratefully acknowledges the Ministry of Ag- [17] J. Balcells, D.S. Parker, C.J. Seal, Comp. Biochem. Physiol. riculture, Fisheries and Food for provision of finan- 101B (1992) 633. cial support during this work. SAC receives financial

- 
- 
- 
- 
- 
- 
- 
- 
- 
- 
- [11] M.T. Diez, M.J. Arin, J.A. Resines, J. Liq. Chromatogr. 15
- 
- (1984) 723.
- [14] J.W. Dolan, L.R. Synder, Troubleshooting LC systems, **Acknowledgements Humana Press, Clifton, New Jersey, 1989.** 
	- [15] M. Hicks, L.S. Wong, R.O. Day, Anal. Biochem. 210 (1993)
	-
	-