

Abstract: Mycotoxins are common agricultural contaminants that are heavily regulated worldwide. These regulations require analysis of not individual, but panels of toxins. The high number of analytes required per test leads to the common problem of unresolved peaks in HPLC and HPLC-Mass Spectrometry (LC-MS) analyses. While LC-MS remains a powerful technique for the deconvolution of overlapping signals, there exists alternative strategies to improve these analytical methods. In this work, HPLC columns with unique chemistries were assessed for their ability to differentiate a panel of 12 mycotoxins. Each column demonstrated significantly different selectivity and elution order, making this strategy a viable route for peak deconvolution. Depending on the given panel of mycotoxins, a change in column chemistry may result in greater resolution, and facilitate new methods by which laboratories can adhere to strict regulations on mycotoxins.

Methods: Three column chemistries were chosen for the simultaneous analysis of 12 mycotoxins. The Cholester column stationary phase consisted of a cholesterol moiety, the π NAP column contained a napthylene functional group as the stationary phase, and the PBr column contained a phenyl bromide stationary phase.

Chromatographic Conditions- Flow rate 0.5mL/min, Temperature 40°C, Injection Volume 5µL, Mobile Phase A (Water, 2mM ammonium formate, 0.1% formic acid), Mobile Phase B (Methanol,2mM ammonium formate, 0.1% formic acid). Cholester Column- Gradient; 0-7min 30-53%B, 7-11.5min 53-56%B. πNAP Column- Gradient; 0-5min 30-70%B, 5-10min 70-85%B. PBr Column- 0-1min 30-60%B, 1-3min 60-70%B, 3-8min 70-80%B



Figure 1: Cholester Column

Conclusions: Each of the three columns tested exhibited significant differences in selectivity and retention. Overall, the π NAP Column demonstrated superior resolution for the 12 mycotoxins tested. These results can be used an inference for each column's affinity for particular structures, and a selection guide for future applications which may contain differing toxins or other small molecules.

Results:

LC-MS Analysis of Mycotoxins - Unique Stationary Phases for Alternative Selectivity

Alex Levine, Ph.D. Nacalai USA; San Diego, CA Stephen Kurzyniec, Shimadzu; Carlsbad, CA Toshi Ono, Nacalai USA; San Diego, CA Tsunehisa Hirose, Nacalai Tesque; Kyoto Japan

Equipment

Mass Spectrometer: Shimadzu LC-MS 8060 LC Pump A: Shimadzu Nexera X2 LC-30AD LC Pump B: Shimadzu Nexera X2 LC-30AD Autosampler: Nexera X2 SIL-30AC Column Oven: CTO-20AC Solvent Degasser: DGU-20ASR Acquisition Software: Lab Solutions

Figure 2: πNAP Column

Acknowledgments: Thank you to Stephen Kurzyniec and Shimadzu for the assistance in method development and access to the LC-MS instrumentation.





Innovations for Life Sciences

Instrument Conditions

Ionization Mode: ESI Nebulizing Gas: Nitrogen 3L/min Heating Gas Flow: Air 10L/min Interface Temp: 300C DL Temp: 250C Heat Block Temp: 400C Drying Gas Flow: Nitrogen 10L/min Collision Gas: Argon 270kPa

Compound MRM Transitions Collision Energy

3 -10
-25
-10
-25
-25
-20
-25
-35
-35
-35
-25
-15

2-Aflatoxin G2 **3-Aflatoxin G1** 4-Aflatoxin B2 **5-Aflatoxin B1** 6-HT-2 **7-T2** 8-Fumonisin B1 9-Fumonisin B3 **10-Fumonisin B2 11-Ocratoxin A 12-Zearalenone**

Contact: alex@nacalaiusa.com, (858)-404-0403



