

### Screening Mycotoxins on Sorghum Grain via Superficially Porous Particle Columns

Andrew Harron, Arianne Soliven, Conner McHale, Stephanie Schuster Advanced Materials Technology, Wilmington, DE 19810

#### Overview

- Why SPP?
- High throughput screening

   Speed, selectivity and sensitivity
- Qualitative results
- Summary/Conclusions

   <10 minutes screening</li>

High resolution LC and MS are important

#### Ē

### SPP Technology

#### HALO 90 Å, 2.7 μm





Superficially Porous Particle (SPP)



Fully Porous Particle (FPP)

#### J.J. DeStefano, T.J. Langlois, & J.J. Kirkland, J. Chromato. Sci., 2008, 46(3), 254-260





1



### **Mycotoxins**

- Secondary metabolites of fungi
  - Low molecular weight
  - Toxic in low concentrations
  - Chemically and thermally stable during food processing
  - Term first used in 1962 after 100,000 turkey chicks died after eating peanut meal contaminated with aflatoxins
- Major mycotoxins
  - Aflatoxins, citrinin, ergot alkaloids, fumonisins, ochratoxins, patulin, trichothecenes, and zearalenone



# Sorghum - our grain of choice

- Drought tolerant
- 3 different lots were blinded
  - animal feed
  - human consumption











Fungal infection





Fungal infection













Fungal infection









-



Secondary mycotoxicosis



# Screening Methodology

## Simple, fast and highly sensitive:

- Sample Preparation UNADULTERATED
  - Pressure, liquid, temp
  - Small scale 'ASE' approach for sample preparation



# Screening Methodology

## Simple, fast and highly sensitive:

#### Column separation

- Superficially porous particle technology
- PFP and C18 selectivities
- Column dimensions: 2 μm *d*<sub>p</sub>, 2.1 × 50 mm, 90Å

Temperature: 60 °C Flow rate: 400 μL/min Injection volume: 0.5 μL Mobile Phase A: 0.1% formic acid and 5 mM ammonium formate in water Mobile Phase B: : 0.1% formic acid and 5 mM ammonium formate in methanol Gradient method

## Standard separation - EIC



## Standard separation EIC



## Screening 3 grains - TIC



# Identification: Exact Mass Confirmation



## Selectivity Differences



Unique advantages with different retention behavior

- C18 is not a 'universal' column
- Mitigates difference in ion suppression/enhancement
- Matrix effects differ with PFP and C18

## Mycotoxin screening

Compound	Formula	Precursor ion	Sample A	Sample B	Sample C
Citrinin	$C_{13}H_{14}O_5$	251.0860	Υ	Y	N/D
Nivalenol	$C_{15}H_{20}O_{7}$	313.1235	N/D	Y	Y
Aflatoxin B1	$C_{17}H_{12}O_{6}$	313.0662	N/D	Υ	Y
Aflatoxin B2	$C_{17}H_{14}O_{6}$	315.0820	N/D	Y	N/D
Zearalenone	$C_{18}H_{22}O_5$	319.1491	Y	Y	Y
Aflatoxin M1	$C_{17}H_{12}O_7$	329.0604	Y	N/D	Y
Aflatoxin G1	$C_{17}H_{12}O_7$	329.0601	N/D	Y	Y
Fumonisin B1	C <sub>34</sub> H <sub>59</sub> NO <sub>15</sub>	722.3868	Y	N/D	N/D

## Conclusion

< 10 minutes screened mycotoxins in sorghum
 <ul>
 High resolution and speed is critical
 No universal separation column
 » PFP and C18 selectivity differences

# Acknowledgements

- USDA for the grains
- The team at AMT

# EXTRA SLIDES

#### Superficially Porous Technology



Dr. Joseph Jack Kirkland May 24, 1925 – October 30, 2016

HPLC Pioneer One of the founders of HPLC conference



150 peer reviewed publications 28 patents 8 books on HPLC Educated > 5000 people Innovations Zipax, 1969 Permaphase, 1972 Zorbax, 1972 Zorbax-Rx, 1988 StableBond, 1989 Poroshell, 2000 HALO, 2006



#### Ē

### Milestones in Fused-Core<sup>®</sup> History



Columns: 4.6 x 50 mm, FPP C18, 5 μm FPP C18, 3.5 μm FPP C18, 1.8 μm HALO C18, 2.7 μm

Solute: naphthalene Mobile phase: 60% ACN/40% water 24 °C

