

Supercritical Fluid Extraction Directly Coupled with Reversed Phase Liquid Chromatography for Quantitative Analysis of Analytes in Complex Matrices

by

Zhenyu Wang

Dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty of Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in

Chemistry

Approved:

Larry T. Taylor, Chairman

Paul R. Carlier

David G.I. Kingston

Gary L. Long

Harold M. McNair

November 29, 2004

Blacksburg, Virginia

Key words: On-line, Supercritical Fluid Extraction, Liquid Chromatography, Mass Spectrometry

Supercritical Fluid Extraction Directly Coupled with Reversed Phase Liquid Chromatography for Quantitative Analysis of Analytes in Complex Matrices

Zhenyu Wang

(ABSTRACT)

The purpose of this research was to design a simple, novel interface for on-line coupling of Supercritical Fluid Extraction (SFE) with High Performance Reversed Phase Liquid Chromatography (HP-RPLC), and to explore its ability for quantitative analysis of analytes in different matrices. First, a simple interface was developed via a single one six-port injection valve to connect the SFE and LC systems. A water displacement method was utilized to eliminate decompressed CO₂ gas in the solid phase SFE trap and connection tubes. To evaluate this novel hyphenated system, spiked polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) in a sand matrix were used as target analytes with the achievement of quantitative results. Also PAHs in naturally contaminated soil were successfully extracted and quantitatively determined by this hyphenated system. Compared to the EPA method (Soxhlet extraction followed by GC-MS), on-line SFE-LC gave precise (4-10% RSD) and accurate results in a much shorter time.

Based on this hyphenated technique, a method for the extraction and analysis of hyperforin in St. John's Wort was developed under air/light free conditions. Hyperforin is a major active constituent in the antidepressant herbal medicine — *Hypericum Perforatum* (St. John's Wort). Hyperforin is very sensitive to oxygen and light. There is no way to date to determine whether any degradation occurs during the sample-processing step in the analytical laboratory. On-line coupling of SFE-LC with UV absorbance/ electrospray ionization mass spectrometry (SFE-LC-UV/ESI-MS) provided

an air/light free extraction-separation-detection system, which addressed this issue. Mass spectral data on the extract confirmed the presence of the major degradation compounds of hyperforin (i.e. furohyperforin and two of its analogues). Thus, the degradation process must have occurred during plant drying or storage. The feasibility of quantitative extraction and analysis of hyperforin by on-line SFE-LC was made possible by optimizing the extraction pressure, temperature, and modifier content. High SFE recovery (~90%) relative to liquid-solid extraction was achieved under optimized conditions.

We then extended the interface's application to an aqueous sample by using a liquid-fluid extraction vessel. Quantitative extraction and transfer were achieved for the target analytes (progesterone, phenanthrene, and pyrene) spiked in water, as well as in real samples (urine and environmental water). During each extraction, no restrictor plugging was realized. Extraction temperature and pressure were optimized. Different amounts of salt were added to the aqueous matrix to enhance ionic strength and thus extraction efficiency. Methanol and 2-propanol were used as CO₂ modifiers. Two modifier modes were compared, e.g. dynamically mixing modifier with the CO₂ extraction fluid, and pre-spiking modifier in the extraction vessel. Surprisingly, we found pre-spiking the same amount of modifier in the vessel enhanced the recovery from ~70% to ~100% for progesterone, phenanthrene, and pyrene due to a "co-extraction effect".

The last phase of our work explored the disadvantages/limitations of this hyphenated technique through the analysis of more highly polar phenolic compounds in grape seeds. Five types of SFE trapping adsorbent materials were evaluated in an effort to enhance the collection efficiency for the polar components. Pure supercritical CO₂ was used first to remove the less polar oil in the seeds. Then methanol-modified CO₂ was

used to remove the polar components (e.g. phenolic compounds). Catechin and epicatechin (90%) were exhaustively extracted out of the de-oiled seed after 240 minutes with 40% methanol as modifier. Both singly linked (B-type) and doubly linked (A-type) procyanidins were identified by LC-ESI-MS, as well as their galloylated derivatives. Compared to the off-line SFE-LC approach, much less sample was required for extraction in the on-line method, since all the extracted components could be transferred to the LC column. Also, no extract processing/concentration step was needed in the on-line method. However, in the on-line mode, some polar compounds were lost (1) during the collection step (e.g. lower trapping efficiency on a single solid SFE trap when a high percentage modifier was used) and (2) during the water rinsing step (e.g. less retention of polar compounds on C18 trap). Therefore, this hyphenated technique is less desirable for the analysis of highly polar compounds.

This dissertation is dedicated to my wife, Ying, and my parents, Xiaoying Gong and Nian Wang.

Acknowledgements

There are many people to thank and acknowledge, and each one has helped make this achievement possible. I would like to express my most sincere gratitude to: my wife, Ying, for her love, support, and encouragement; my thesis advisor, Dr. Larry T. Taylor, not only for his guidance and direction, but also for his friendship; Dr. Mehdi Ashraf-Khorassani, the person who helped and taught me most in the lab; my committee, for their time and feedback; and the members of the Taylor research group, for their help.

Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
Abstract	ii
Acknowledgements	vi
Table of Contents	vii
List of Figures	ix
List of Tables	xii
I. Introduction and Historical Background	
1. Supercritical Fluid Extraction Technology	1
2. SFE-Chromatographic Hyphenation Techniques	2
3. SFE-HPLC Research Background	4
3.1 Interface With Introduction of CO ₂ into the LC	4
3.1.1 Fractional Transfer Interface	4
3.1.2 Total Transfer Interface	9
3.2 Interface Without Introduction of CO ₂ into the LC	11
3.2.1 Backpressure Method	11
3.2.2 Solvent Displacement Method	16
4. Summary	17
II. Design for On-line Coupling of Supercritical Fluid Extraction with Liquid Chromatography: Quantitative Analysis of Polynuclear Aromatic Hydrocarbons in Solid Matrix	
1. Introduction	21
2. Experimental Section	23
2.1 Apparatus	23
2.2 Reagents and Environmental Sample	24
2.3 Design for SFE-LC Interface	24
2.4 Extraction Procedure	27
2.5 Separation Procedure	27
3. Results and Discussion	28
3.1 Spiked Sample	28
3.2 Environmental Sample	38
4. Conclusion	40
III. Determination of Hyperforin and its degradation products in <i>Hypericum Perforatum</i> Under Air/Light-Free Environment	
1. Introduction	45
2. Experimental Section	48
2.1 Chemicals and Sample	48

2.2 SFE-LC-UV/ESI-MS Apparatus	48
2.3 Determination of Hyperforin Concentration via USE and ESE	51
2.4 Separation Procedure	53
2.5 Calibration Methods	53
3. Results and Discussion	55
3.1 Quantitative Extraction and Analysis of Hyperforin via On-line SFE-LC-UV	55
3.2 Determination of Hyperforin and its Degradation Products by on-line SFE-LC/MS	59
4. Conclusion	64
IV. Quantitative Analysis of Analytes in Aqueous Matrices via On-line Supercritical CO₂ Extraction-Liquid Chromatography	
1. Introduction	65
2. Experimental Section	70
2.1 Apparatus	70
2.2 Chemicals and Real Sample	71
3. Results and Discussion	72
3.1 Optimization of Extraction Recovery	72
3.1.1 Pure Supercritical CO ₂ as the Extraction Media	72
3.1.2 Modified Supercritical CO ₂ as the Extraction Media	78
3.1.3 Linearity	80
3.2 SFE-LC Method for the Real Samples	83
3.3 Comparison of on-line and off-line Method for the Analysis of Trace Level Sample	83
4. Conclusion	92
V. Feasibility Study for the Determination of Highly Polar Proanthocyanidins in Grape Seeds	
1. Introduction	93
2. Experimental Section	96
2.1 Apparatus	96
2.2 Chemicals and Real Sample	99
3. Results and Discussion	100
3.1 Optimization of Extraction Recovery	100
3.1.1 Extract Trapping Materials	100
3.1.2 On-line Extraction Conditions	104
3.2 Comparison of on-line and off-line SFE-LC	106
3.3 On-line SFE-LC-MS Study	111
4. Conclusion	116
VI. Conclusions	118
References	122
Vita	126

List of Figures

<u>Figure</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Page</u>
1	Schematic diagram of on-line SFE-LC interface of Unger's design.	5
2	The operation mode of Unger's on-line SFE-LC.	7
3	Schematic diagram of on-line SFE-LC of Johansen's design	10
4	Chromatogram of SFE/LC when CO ₂ entered the LC.	13
5	SFE-LC interface reported by Cortes.	14
6a	The interface position for removal of residual gas from solid phase trap by water.	25
6b	The interface position for removal of extracted analytes from trap onto LC column by LC mobile phase.	26
7a	Chromatograms of spiked PAHs sample by direct injection through 10 μ L sample loop.	29
7b	Chromatograms of spiked PAHs sample by on-line SFE-LC.	30
8	Extraction profiles for naphthalene, anthracene, and benzo[α]pyrene from spiked sample (on-line SFE-LC).	35
9a	Chromatograms of environmental sample by on-line SFE-LC: the first step extraction.	42
9b	Chromatograms of environmental sample by on-line SFE-LC: the second step extraction.	43
10	Chemical structures of hyperforin, adhyperforin, and furohyperforin.	46
11	Schematic diagram of the hyphenated SFE-LC-UV/MS system.	50
12	Chromatogram of the ultrasonic methanol extracts of St. John's Wort.	52
13	Chromatogram of the enhanced solvent extracts of St. John's Wort.	54

14	UV trace of on-line SFE-LC of St. John's Wort.	56
15	The influence of extraction temperature and CO ₂ pressure on SFE extraction efficiency.	57
16	Extracted ion mass spectra of hyperforin, adhyperforin, furohyperforin and its analogues via on-line SFE-LC-MS.	62
17	The hyperforin stability profile under natural daylight, fluorescent lamp light, and dark.	63
18	Phase separator design.	67
19	Countercurrent design.	68
20	Liquid-fluid extraction vessel.	69
21	Chromatogram of four spiked compounds via on-line SFE-RPLC.	73
22	Extraction profiles of caffeine, progesterone, phenanthrene, and pyrene.	75
23a	Analysis of blank urine sample via on-line SFE-RPLC.	84
23b	Analysis of spiked progesterone in urine sample via on-line SFE-RPLC.	85
24a	Analysis of blank natural water sample via on-line SFE-RPLC.	86
24b	Analysis of spiked phenanthrene and pyrene in natural water via on-line SFE-RPLC.	87
25	Comparison of on-line and off-line SFE-LC methods for the analysis of trace level analytes.	90
26	Chemical structures of proanthocyanidins.	95
27	Comparison of loss of analytes from five trapping materials during water rinse.	102
28	Chromatogram of on-line SFE-LC, Discovery DPA-6S as the trapping materials.	103
29	Extraction profile of catechin and epicatechin at different modifier percentages.	107

30a	Chromatogram of on-line SFE-LC grape seed extract.	108
30b	Chromatogram of off-line SFE-LC grape seed extract.	109
31	Extracted ions (288-289, 576-578 amu) from on-line SFE-LC/MS of deoiled grape seeds.	112
32	Extracted ions (574-576, 860.8-861.5 amu) from on-line SFE-LC/MS of deoiled grape seeds.	113
33	Extracted ions (440-442, 728-730, 1016-1018 amu) from on-line SFE-LC/MS of deoiled grape seeds.	114
34	Extracted ions (304-306, 456-458, 608-610 amu) from on-line SFE-LC/MS of deoiled grape seeds.	115

List of Tables

<u>Table</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Page</u>
1	Comparison of reported SFE-HPLC interface and their application.	18
2	Comparison of chromatographic parameters via on-line SFE-LC and via direct injection.	32
3	The influence of extraction temperature, CO ₂ pressure, and density on extraction efficiency.	36
4	The influence of modifier (methanol) on extraction efficiency.	37
5	Linear range, correlation coefficient, and limit of detection of SFE-LC data.	39
6	Comparison of EPA method and on-line SFE-LC for the analysis of PAH contaminated soil.	44
7	Percent recovery versus extraction temperature.	76
8	Percent recovery versus extraction pressure.	77
9	Comparison of dynamic mixing modifier mode and pre-spiked modifier mode on percent recovery.	81
10	Linear range, correlation coefficient and precision data.	82
11	Recovery and precision data for the analysis of real sample.	88
12	Comparison of time usage (per assay) of on-line and off-line SFE-LC.	91
13	SFE conditions for the extraction of grape seeds.	98
14	The influence of modifier, extraction temperature, and pressure on extraction efficiency.	105
15	Comparison of on-line and off-line methods for deoiled seeds.	110