

Rapid Determination of Ethynylestradiol (17 α EE2) to 15 pg/L in wastewater using Thermo Scientific EQuan MAX Plus LC-MS on-line SPE and Thermo Scientific Q Exactive Focus hybrid quadrupole-Orbitrap mass spectrometer

Neville Llewellyn¹; Gary Woffendin¹; Olaf Scheibner²; Jonathan Beck³; Thermo Fisher Scientific, London, UK; ²Thermo Fisher Scientific, Dreieich, Germany³Thermo Fisher Scientific, San Jose, CA, USA.

ABSTRACT

Purpose: To demonstrate the feasibility of using a Thermo Scientific™ Q Exactive™ Focus hybrid quadrupole-Orbitrap™ mass spectrometer with the Thermo Scientific™ EQuan MAX Plus™ LC-MS on-line solid phase extraction system to achieve the EU Water Framework LoD for 17 α Ethynylestradiol (35 pg/L) and provide confirmation.

Methods: EQuan MAX Plus LC-MS on-line SPE High Resolution Accurate Mass using Parallel Reaction Monitoring

Results:

- Excellent quantitation and confirmation performance
- LoD - 15 pg/L
- LoQ - 29 pg/L
- Analysis in under 30 minutes - approximately 30 x faster than current methods
- Potential chromatographic resolution of 17 α EE2 and 17 β -EE2

INTRODUCTION


The occurrence and effects of endocrine disrupting compounds (EDCs), particularly mixtures, in aquatic environments is a significant concern¹. Of the many EDCs, 17 α EE2 is recognised as possessing the greatest estrogenic potency and risk to freshwater ecosystems and drinking water resources².

Due to its environmental significance, 17 α EE2 was incorporated into the EU Water Framework Directive, with a stipulated Limit of Detection of 35 pg/L, which presents a significant analytical challenge.

Current methods generally involve large-volume SPE; normal phase SPE clean up and size exclusion fractionation, which take considerable time, expense, and sampling logistics³ (Figure 1).

The aim of this work is to assess the feasibility and performance of using a 5 mL sample on-line solid phase extraction and a Q Exactive Focus hybrid quadrupole-Orbitrap mass spectrometer for the determination of 17 α EE2 at the WFD LoD of 35 pg/L⁴.


Figure 1. Typical workflow for steroid estrogen analysis.



MATERIALS AND METHODS

Liquid Chromatography

Liquid chromatography separations were carried out on the EQuan™ UHPLC system including binary analytical pump, CTC autosampler, quaternary loading pump and column compartment; see Figure 2.



Mass Spectrometry


The MS analysis was performed on a Thermo Scientific Q Exactive Focus hybrid quadrupole-Orbitrap bench-top high resolution mass spectrometer using heated electrospray ionization (HESI). Acquisition and quantitation was performed using Parallel Reaction Monitoring (PRM) where MS/MS data were collected at a resolving power of 70,000 (FWHM m/z 200) in negative polarity; see Figure 3.

The following parameters were used:
 Ionization mode: Negative HESI; Scan Mode (PRM): 195.1705 m/z; Ion source: HESI-II;
 Spray voltage (KV): -3.0; Heated capillary temp (°C): 275; S-lens RF level: 50.0; Heater temp (°C): 400

Figure 2. Q Exactive Focus hybrid quadrupole-Orbitrap Mass Spectrometer, showing EQuan MAX Plus LC-MS On-Line SPE System



Figure 3. Parallel Reaction Monitoring with the Q Exactive Focus Mass Spectrometer.



LCMS Analysis

Calibration and method performance


17 α EE2 calibration standards were prepared in LCMS grade water with 5% LCMS grade methanol; 5 mL volumes were used for analysis and the calibration was carried out using external standardisation. Calibrants were prepared at 25, 100, 200, 400, 800, and 1600 pg/L

To assess the limit of detection (LOD) and limit of quantitation (LOQ), the 100 pg/L standard was run six times and the standard deviation used to derive the performance data.

Acquisition, Processing and Confirmation

The data were acquired, process and confirmed using TraceFinder 4.1 software. Data were confirmed using the accurate mass of the MS2 fragment ions, see Figure 4.

Figure 4. PRM Confirmation Workflow



Method Application

To assess the performance of the method on real-world samples, a sample of wastewater effluent from a treatment works in Glasgow (UK) was analysed; prior to analysis the sample was diluted with 5% LCMS grade methanol to match the composition of the calibration standards.

Results - Calibration and method performance

A typical calibration plot for EE2 is shown in Figure 5 showing excellent linearity with an R² value of 0.9998; also shown is the chromatogram for the 25 pg/L standard.





Figure 5. External calibration plot for 17 α Ethynylestradiol and chromatogram for the 25 pg/L standard



Results - Limit of Detection and Quantitation

The standard deviation (SD) of six replicates of the 100 pg/L standard was used to calculate LoD and LoQ.


The RSD for the six replicates was 3.4%. The LoD was derived using 4.65 x SD and the LoQ as 9 x SD.

Run 1	98
Run 2	94
Run 3	96
Run 4	89
Run 5	96
Run 6	97
Mean	95
RSD	3.4%
LOD	15
LOQ	29

Results - Method Application

Figure 7 shows a confirmed peak for 17 α EE2 in wastewater effluent at a concentration of 462 pg/L, which is typical of the range reported in the scientific literature².


Figure 7. Confirmed detection for 17 α EE2 in treated waste water at 462 pg/L



Suspected detection of 17 β -EE2

Closer examination of the MS2 spectra for the second peak in the effluent chromatogram shows that the ion masses for the second peak are identical to those of 17 α EE2, though in slightly different ratios, see Figure 8.

Figure 8. Suspected detection for 17 β -EE2 in treated waste water at Rt 20.20 minutes



DISCUSSION/CONCLUSIONS

Using external calibration and PRM acquisition, the initial results have shown excellent method performance both in terms of quantitation and confirmation using MS2 fragment ions, and in speed of analysis compared to traditional approaches.

With external calibration the limit of detection and quantitation was determined at 15 pg/L and 29 pg/L respectively. It is planned to further improve the robustness of the method using deuterated internal standards and to extend the scope of the method to cover other steroid estrogens cited in the EU Water Framework Directive: estrone and 17 β -estradiol.

If the duration of current methods (see Figure 1) is assumed to be in the order of 10 hours, then the method described is approximately 30 times faster, which has implications in terms of sampling logistics, capital expense and maintenance, as well as expense of consumables.

Lastly, though yet to be confirmed, the chromatographic resolution of the methods appears to be able to differentiate between 17 α EE2 and 17 β -EE2. If this is indeed the case and present methods do not differentiate between the two isomers then current analysis programmes could be potential to over estimating the concentration of 17 α EE2 by approximately 100%.

REFERENCES

- Thrupp, T.J.; Runnalls, T.J.; Scholze, M.; Kugathas, S.; Kortenkamp, A.; Sumpter, J.P. (2018). The consequences of exposure to mixtures of chemicals: Something from 'nothing' and 'a lot from little when fish are exposed to steroid hormones. Sci. Tot. Env. 6119-620.
- Runnalls, T.J.; Margiotta-Casaluci L., Kugathas S.; Sumpter J.P. (2010). Pharmaceuticals in the aquatic environment: steroids and anti-steroids as high priorities for research. Hum. Ecol. Risk. Assess., 19 pp. 1318-1338
- The determination of steroid estrogens in waters using chromatography and mass spectrometry (2008); Standing Committee of Analysts; https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/316788/steroids20_2107605.pdf
- EU Water Frame Work Directive. http://ec.europa.eu/environment/water/water-framework/index_en.html