

High Performance Comprehensive Two-Dimensional Gas Chromatography Coupled with a High Resolution Multi-Reflecting TOFMS for Confident Non-Target Analyte Identification

Scott J. Pugh¹; Viatcheslav Artavev¹; Mark F. Merrick¹; Jack Cochran² | ¹ LECO Corporation, St. Joseph, MI USA; ² Restek Corporation, Bellefonte, PA USA

Introduction

Performing non-target analyte identification on most environmental sample matrices can be an extremely difficult task to accomplish with confidence. Being able to chromatographically separate all the possible pollutants from a complex environmental matrix is one of the major challenges for labs. High performance comprehensive two-dimensional gas chromatography is an effective tool for the separation of compounds within a complex matrix. Confident identification of non-target analytes is best accomplished with the use of high resolution mass spectrometry. Combining the separation power of two-dimensional gas chromatography, with resolving power greater than 25,000, and sub ppm mass accuracies of a high resolution multi-reflecting TOFMS is the ideal solution for confident compound identification within a complex sample matrix.

Case

Soil and wastewater effluent samples were analyzed from the treatment facility at the Penn State Office of Physical Plant, and some curious sample identifications were generated. The samples were first analyzed on a Pegasus® 4D GCxGC-TOFMS. Some major peaks of interest were identified in the wastewater effluent sample as 2-Chloro-6-methylphenyl isocyanate with good library similarity values in the mid 800's. Since the sample being analyzed was a waste water sample, it is very unlikely that an isocyanate would be present due to its reactivity to water. With this lack of confidence in the library identification of these peaks, it was decided to analyze these samples on a Pegasus GC-HRT 4D to complement the benefits of GCxGC with the mass accuracy of a high resolution TOFMS. The initial peak find of the data produced the same NIST Library identifications for the isocyanate compounds, but further investigation of the accurate mass information told a different story.

When the samples were first analyzed, the mass accuracy of the instrument was checked against the surrogates that were injected with the soil extracts. Table 1 shows a list of the surrogates analyzed along with their respective formulas and mass errors.

Table 1. List of surrogates injected in the soil extract used to check the mass accuracy of the instrument.

Surrogate	Formula	HT/4D Similarity	HRT Similarity	Molecular Ion	Mass Error (ppm)
2-Fluorophenol	C ₆ H ₅ FO	895	807	112.0319	-0.69
Nitrobenzene-D5	C ₆ D ₅ NO ₂	898	817	128.0629	0.15
2-Fluorobiphenyl	C ₁₂ H ₉ F	953	891	172.0683	0.68
PCB 18 Trichlorobiphenyl	C ₁₂ H ₇ Cl ₃	937	877	255.9608	-1.08
PCB 28 Trichlorobiphenyl	C ₁₂ H ₅ Cl ₃	943	899	255.9608	0.03
PCB 52 Tetrachlorobiphenyl	C ₁₂ H ₃ Cl ₄	925	884	289.9218	0.69
Triphenylmethane	C ₁₈ H ₁₅	866	525	244.1247	0.43
p-Terphenyl-D14	C ₁₈ D ₁₄	875	844	244.1969	0.78
Tris(1,3-dichloroisopropyl)phosphate	C ₁₈ H ₉ Cl ₆ O ₄ P	907	836	427.8834	N/A
Triphenyl phosphate	C ₁₈ H ₁₅ O ₄ P	828	811	326.0702	-2.68

Figure 1 shows the chromatogram view of Triphenylmethane as it relates to the surrounding compounds. The low similarity match value for this compound is very likely due to poor chromatographic resolution and a complex sample deconvolution.




Figure 1. Chromatogram of the surrogate Triphenylmethane displaying the complex deconvolution necessary for a good library match.

Figure 2 shows the zoomed deconvoluted spectrum of the molecular ion [C₁₈H₁₅O₄P]⁺ for the surrogate Triphenyl phosphate along with the (M-H)⁺ ion [C₁₈H₁₄O₄P]⁺. One of the isotopes of the (M-H)⁺ ion is [¹³CC₁₇H₁₄O₄P]⁺, which is displayed as m/z 326.06581. Since the ion [C₁₈H₁₅O₄P]⁺ and the isotope [¹³CC₁₇H₁₄O₄P]⁺ require a resolving power of 104,000 to properly resolve them, the mass error of -2.68 is due to the contribution of the [¹³CC₁₇H₁₄O₄P]⁺ isotope from the (M-H)⁺ ion.




Figure 2 The zoomed deconvoluted spectrum of the molecular ion [C₁₈H₁₅O₄P]⁺ for the surrogate Triphenyl phosphate along with the (M-H)⁺ ion [¹³CC₁₇H₁₄O₄P]⁺.

Now that the mass accuracy of the instrument is confirmed, confident use of the accurate mass data can be implemented for analyte identification. Figure 3 shows a zoomed in contour plot highlighting one of the isocyanate peaks in question. The peak table in Table 2 shows a good library similarity match value for the spectrum generated, but the accurate mass information associated with the formula for 2-Chloro-6-methylphenyl isocyanate indicates this is likely not the correct compound name. LECO's Formula Calculator was used next to generate the best possible formulas that correspond with the observed ion m/z 167.02453. A 2 ppm mass window was employed, and various halogens selected to be included as potential elements for the formula. Table 3 shows the results generated by the Formula Calculator.




Figure 3. Contour plot of Penn State waste water effluent sample collected on a Pegasus GC-HRT 4D

Table 2. Peak Table.

Analyte Name	Formula	Similarity	Base Mass	Expected Ion m/z	Mass Accuracy (ppm)	Peak Quality	Observed Ion m/z
2-Chloro-6-methylphenyl isocyanate	C ₈ H ₇ ClNO	832	104.04958	167.01324	67.57	0.99	167.02453

Table 3. Possible formula calculations.

Formula	Expected Ion m/z	Observed Ion m/z	Mass Delta (mDa)	Mass Accuracy (ppm)
C ₇ H ₅ CIN ₃	167.02448	167.02453	0.054	0.32
C ₇ H ₅ F ₂ NOS ₂	167.02446	167.02453	0.066	0.40
C ₇ H ₅ NO ₂ S	167.02468	167.02453	-0.150	-0.90
C ₇ H ₅ N ₂ OP	167.02430	167.02453	0.230	1.38

The next step in determining the proper formula was to compare the theoretical isotope abundances for each of the possible formulas with the experimental isotope abundances. Figure 4 shows a zoomed in portion of the deconvoluted spectrum around the molecular ion, along with a screen shot of the Mass Calculator for the formula C₇H₅CIN₃. The isotope abundances for each of the potential formulas were tabulated in Table 4. Close inspection of the isotope abundances for each of the formulas as compared to the experimental data shows a very close match to the formula C₇H₅CIN₃.




Figure 4. Deconvoluted spectrum of the unknown compound with a zoomed in portion displaying the molecular ion and its isotopes next to a screenshot of LECO's Mass Calculator for theoretical isotope abundance values.

Table 4. Isotope Abundances for each proposed formula.

Observed Ion m/z	Observed Abundance	Formula Isotope Abundances			
		C ₇ H ₅ CIN ₃	C ₇ H ₅ F ₂ NOS ₂	C ₇ H ₅ NO ₂ S	C ₇ H ₅ N ₂ OP
167.02453	100	100	100	100	100
168.02798	8.55	8.74	4.10	5.74	7.69
169.02159	32.34	32.00	0.48	4.51	0.46
170.02500	2.79	2.80	0.02	0.23	0.02

To further confirm the postulate for the formula C₇H₅CIN₃, a closer look of the (M-H)⁺ ion [C₇H₅CIN₃]⁺ and its isotopes was performed. Figure 5 displays a screen shot of the Mass Calculator, which is displaying the molecular ion for the formula C₇H₅CIN₃ and its corresponding isotopes. Figure 6 is a screen shot of the Mass Resolution Calculator, which calculates the resolving power necessary for proper separation of two specified ions. The ions selected in this figure are of the [C₇H₅³⁷CIN₃]⁺ and the [¹³CC₆H₅³⁷CIN₃]⁺ ions.

Figure 7 shows the zoomed in spectrum plot of the molecular ion with a further zoomed in plot displaying the separation of the [C₇H₅³⁷CIN₃]⁺ ion and the [¹³CC₆H₅³⁷CIN₃]⁺ ion. With the full mass range resolving power greater than 25,000 in High Resolution mode, the instrument was able to resolve the 13mDa difference between the [C₇H₅³⁷CIN₃]⁺ ion (m/z 168.01449) and the [¹³CC₆H₅³⁷CIN₃]⁺ ion (m/z 168.02798). The presence of the [C₇H₅³⁷CIN₃]⁺ ion further confirms the presence of a chlorinated isotope.




Figure 5. Screen shot of the Mass Calculator displaying the (M-H)⁺ ion and its associated isotopes.




Figure 6. Screen shot of the Mass Resolution Calculator displaying the resolving power required to separate the two specified ions.





Figure 7. Section A is a zoomed in plot of the deconvoluted spectrum of the molecular ion of the unknown compound and its associated isotopes. The ions in red are of the (M-H)⁺ ion and one of its isotopes. Section B is a further zoomed in plot of the C₇H₅³⁷CIN₃ isotope of the (M-H)⁺ ion and the ¹³CC₆H₅³⁷CIN₃ isotope of the molecular ion.

With a confident formula determined from the high resolution accurate mass data, the next step focused on some of the benefits of using GCxGC for chromatographic separation of the sample components. One of the advantages of using GCxGC for chromatographic separation is the high degree of organization based on chemical structure that can be seen in the resulting chromatogram. Components from the same class are aligned in bands based on the two separation mechanisms used. In this case, the chromatogram is organized by carbon number in the first dimension due to the use of a non-polar primary column, and by polarity in the second dimension due to the use of a polar secondary column.

Further investigation of the sample peaks within the same chromatographic band as the unknown peak show a possible similarity to a class of Methylated Benzotriazoles. Figure 8 shows the expanded contour plot of the sample highlighting the C₇H₅CIN₃ peak along with a peak identified as 4-Methyl-1H-benzotriazole. With the idea that the C₇H₅CIN₃ peak might be a chlorinated methylbenzotriazole, the next step would be to determine if this is a logical identification. Further investigation of users upstream to the treatment facility showed the use of halogenated benzotriazoles as corrosion inhibitors. It is therefore concluded that the C₇H₅CIN₃ peak in question is very likely a chlorinated methylbenzotriazole.




Figure 8. Contour plot of the waste water effluent sample showing the unknown peak in the same band as a methylbenzotriazole.

Conclusion

Confident analyte identification can be a challenging task when analyzing complex sample matrices. The use of comprehensive two-dimensional gas chromatography to help increase chromatographic resolution is a major step in tackling the problem of confident peak identification in a complex sample matrix. The use of high resolution accurate mass data is another important tool to be used for proper identification. Combining the separation power of two-dimensional gas chromatography, with resolving power greater than 25,000, and sub ppm mass accuracies of a high resolution multi-reflecting TOFMS is the ideal solution to confident compound identification within a complex sample matrix.

Acknowledgements

We would like to acknowledge and thank Frank Dorman, Adrienne Brockman, and Sarah Prebitalo from Penn State University for collecting and providing the soil and waste water sample extracts for this analysis.

