

Copyright is owned by the Author of the thesis. Permission is given for a copy to be downloaded by an individual for the purpose of research and private study only. The thesis may not be reproduced elsewhere without the permission of the Author.

APPLICATION OF ELECTROSPRAY MASS SPECTROMETRY TO THE ANALYSIS OF LIPIDS

A THESIS PRESENTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF PHILOSOPHY IN FOOD TECHNOLOGY AT MASSEY
UNIVERSITY

BY

CARMEN NORRIS

2000

Abstract

This work investigated the application of electrospray mass spectrometry (MS) to the elucidation of lipid structure, especially related to milkfat. This was the first time that the instrument in our laboratory had been used for this purpose.

Standard samples of triacylglycerols (TAGs) were prepared in 1,2 dichloroethane: acetonitrile:formic acid (63:35:2) at approximately 0.005 mg/mL and were then used to optimise and quantify the ion signal (response) generated by the Perkin Elmer Sciex API300 electrospray mass spectrometer. Both MS and tandem MS experiments were performed. In the spectra, the TAG molecule was seen as an ammonium ion adduct $(M+NH_4)^+$. It was found that the relative responses of diacylglycerol (DAG) ions, formed during front end fragmentation of the $(M+NH_4)^+$ ion, depended on the position of the 'lost' fatty acid on the glycerol backbone and its carbon number, with the former rather than the latter being the more critical. This information enabled the fatty acid esterified to the sn2 carbon of the glycerol backbone to be identified, and also demonstrated that it was possible to identify each of the fatty acids in a TAG molecule accurately by molecular and DAG ion identification. MS/MS experiments were performed on DAG ions, rather than parent ions, to identify and measure the response of acylium ions generated during collision-assisted dissociation (CAD). In contrast to the response of the DAG ions above, it was found that the response of these acylium ions was dependent on their carbon number and degree of saturation rather than the position that the fatty acid had held on the glycerol backbone. Optimal voltage settings for analysis of TAGs by infusion MS were obtained, which gave good quality spectra and ample amounts of molecular and DAG ions. With this information, a novel liquid chromatography-mass spectrometry (LC-MS) method, which was able to characterise the TAGs in a number of complex lipid samples, was developed. The method was used to elucidate differences in the TAG structure of different bovine milkfats and also differences in fat from milk of various mammalian species.

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank the NZDRI, particularly Dr Jeremy Hill, Section Manager, Food Science Section, for the opportunity to pursue a higher degree. This work was supported in part by funding from the Foundation for Research, Science and Technology (contract DRI801)

A huge thankyou goes to my principal supervisor, Alistair MacGibbon (NZDRI) for his endless enthusiasm, tolerance of countless interruptions to his own work and of course for the wonderful CTC spreadsheet which has made interpretation of the mass spectra so much easier!

I am very grateful to my Massey University supervisor Mike Taylor, for his guidance, particularly during the writing up stage of the project and the thoroughness with which he reviewed my work.

It would not have been possible for me to carry out this course of study without the support, love and encouragement from my partner Jacob. He mihi nui ki a koe Jacob mo to aroha me to awhina i ahau i tenei mahi, Kia Ora.

I also wish to thank my friends and colleagues in the Food Science section in particular:

Nick Robinson for his considerable help with the LC part of this work, and the many, many helpful discussions on lipid chemistry.

Don Otter who patiently taught me how to use the mass spectrometer, and without whose encouragement, I probably would not have embarked on this course of study.

Suzie Finnigan for her help with the HPLC analyses and the vagaries of Word.

Bertram Fong and Kerianne Higgs for their assistance with many of the diagrams found in this document.

Andrea Mare for her considerable assistance with the formatting and checking of this document.

Finally I would like to acknowledge the tolerance and constant good humour of my children, Richard, Taiawhio and Jacob-I am very privileged to have three such wonderful sons.

Table of Contents

1	Introduction	1
1.1	Aim	1
1.2	Background	2
1.2.1	Lipids in Milk.....	2
	Phospholipids	2
	Neutral Lipids.....	3
1.2.2	Lipid Separation Techniques.....	4
	HPLC	4
	Gas Chromatography	5
1.2.3	Mass Spectrometry	6
	The Mass Analyser.....	6
	Sample Inlet.....	7
	The Ion Source	8
1.3	Summary.....	15
2	Research Methodology.....	17
2.1	Instrumentation	17
2.1.1	Mass Spectrometry	17
2.1.2	HPLC	17
2.2	Methodology.....	18
2.2.1	Analysis of Lipid Standards and Fats and Oils by Infusion MS and Infusion MS/MS	18
	Analysis of TAGs	18
	Analysis of Fatty Acids.....	18
	Analysis of Cholesterol	19
	Analysis of Standard Phospholipids	19
	Analysis of Sphingomyelin and Sphingosine	20
	Analysis of Gangliosides.....	20
2.2.2	Analysis of Natural Fats and Oils by LC-MS and LC-MS/MS	21
2.3	Other Analytical methods	23
2.3.1	SFC.....	23
2.3.2	HPLC	23
2.3.3	Fatty Acid Methyl Ester (FAME) Analysis	23
3	Results and Discussion	24
3.1	Neutral Lipid Standards.....	24
3.1.1	Method Development.....	24
	Infusion MS and MS/MS of TAG Standards.....	24
	Infusion MS of Fatty Acids.....	26
	Infusion MS and MS/MS of Cholesterol and Cholesteryl Palmitate.....	26

3.1.2	Analysis of Non-polar Lipid Standards by Infusion MS and Infusion MS/MS.....	27
	TAG Standards by Infusion MS.....	27
	Analysis of TAG Standards by Infusion MS/MS	34
	Analysis of Free Fatty Acids by Infusion MS	35
	Analysis of Cholesterol and Cholesteryl Palmitate by Infusion MS.....	36
3.2	Polar Lipids.....	37
3.2.1	Method Development.....	37
	Infusion MS and MS/MS of Polar Lipids	37
3.2.2	Analysis of Phospholipids by Infusion MS and Infusion MS/MS	38
	Phospholipids	38
	Sphingomyelin	43
	Sphingosine	44
	Gangliosides	44
3.3	Simple Fats and Oils	45
3.3.1	Method development	46
	Infusion MS and Infusion MS/MS of Fats and Oils	46
	LC-MS of Simple Fats and Oils	46
3.3.2	Analysis of Simple Fats and Oils.....	49
	Analysis of Cocoa Butter and Coconut Oil by Infusion MS and Infusion MS/MS	49
	Analysis of Cocoa Butter and Coconut Oil by LC-MS..	52
3.4	Milkfat.....	54
3.4.1	Method Development.....	55
	Solvent Selection.....	55
	Maximising the Response of the Molecular Ion.....	56
3.4.2	Analysis of a Range of Milkfat Samples.....	56
	Analysis of Bovine Milkfat by LC-MS.....	56
	Analysis of Friesian and Jersey Milkfat by LC-MS.....	59
	Analysis of Milkfats Collected at Different Times During the Season by LC-MS.....	60
	Analysis of Milkfat from Different Species by LC-MS ..	62
4	Conclusions	66
5	Bibliography	68

Appendix 1	Instrument	72
Appendix 2	Mass Spectra of 1,2 Dipalmitoyl sn Glycero-3-phosphocholine ...	79
Appendix 3	Mass Spectra of L- α -Lysophosphatidoyl Ethanolamine	80
Appendix 4	Mass Spectra of 1,2 Distearoyl sn Glycero-3-phosphoethanolamine	82
Appendix 5	Mass Spectra of Sphingomyelin/Sphingosine	84
Appendix 6	Mass Spectra of Gangliosides	86
Appendix 7	Mass Spectra of Coconut Oil and ELSP Trace of Coconut Oil	88
Appendix 8	Mass Spectra and ELSD Trace of Cocoa Butter	92
Appendix 9	Mass Spectrum and ELSD Trace of Bovine Milkfat	94
Appendix 10	FAME Results: Milkfat from Different Mammalian Species. SFC Results: Seasonal Survey	98
Appendix 11	Mass Spectra and ELSD Traces of Milkfat from Different Mammalian Species	100

Nomenclature

Common Names of Fatty Acids and their Carbon Numbers

<i>Carbon number</i>	<i>Systematic name</i>	<i>Common name</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>Molecular weight</i>
4:0(B)	butanoic	butyric		88.11
6:0	hexanoic	caproic		116.16
8:0	octanoic	caprylic		144.21
10:0	decanoic	capric		172.27
12:0	dodecanoic	lauric		200.32
14:0	tetradecanoic	myristic		228.38
16:0(P)	hexadecanoic	palmitic		256.43
16:1	hexadec-9-enoic	palmitoleic	7	254.41
17:0	heptadecanoic	margaric		270.46
18:0(S)	octadecanoic	stearic		284.48
18:1	octadec-6-enoic	petroselenic		282.47
18:1(O)	octadec-9-enoic (<i>cis</i>)	oleic	9	282.47
18:1(E)	octadec-9-enoic (<i>trans</i>)	elaidic	9	282.47
18:1	octadec-11-enoic (<i>trans</i>)	vaccenic	7	282.47
18:1	12-hydroxy-octadec-9-enoic	ricinoleic	9	298.47
18:2	octadeca-9,12-dienoic	linoleic	6	280.45
18:2c	octadeca-9,11-dienoic	conjugated linoleic		280.45
18:3c	octadeca-9,11,13-trienoic	claeostearic		278.44
18:3	octadeca-9,12,15-trienoic	linolenic (alpha)	3	278.44
18:3	octadeca-6,9,12-trienoic	gamma linolenic	6	278.44
18:5	octadecapentaeonic			274.4
20:0	eicosanoic	arachidic		312.54
20:1	eicos-9-enoic	gadoleic		310.52
20:4	eicosa-5,8,11,14-tetraenoic	arachidonic	6	304.47
20:5	eicosa-5,8,11,14,17-pentaenoic	EPA	3	302.46
22:1	docos-11-enoic	cetoleic		338.58
22:1	docos-13-enoic	erucic	9	338.58
22:4	docosa-7,10,13,16-tetraenoic	adrenic	6	332.53
22:5	docosa-7,10,13,16,19-pentaenoic	clupadonic	3	330.51
22:6	docosa-4,7,10,13,16,19-hexaenoioc	DHA	3	328.50
23:0	docosanoic			354.6
24:0	tetracosanoic	lignoceric		368.65
25:1	pentacosenoic			380.70

The triacylglycerols are abbreviated in the text as groups of individual fatty acids *e.g.* 16:0, 18:1, 18:0. Common triacylglycerols have been further abbreviated using the singly letter designations shown in the table above, *e.g.* POS for 1-palmitoyl-2-oleoyl-3-stearoylglycerol.

Diglycerols follow a similar pattern of abbreviation.

Unless stated no specific regioisomers are implied by the order of the nomenclature.