

Rapid LC/TOF MS for Analytical Screening of Drugs in the Clinical Research Lab

Authors

Adam Barker^{1,2},
Frederick G. Strathmann³,
Natalie N. Rasmussen⁴,
and Carrie J. Adler⁴

¹ ARUP Institute for Clinical
and Experimental Pathology,
Salt Lake City, UT

² Department of Pathology,
University of Utah,
Salt Lake City, UT

³ NMS Labs
Willow Grove, PA

⁴ Agilent Technologies, Inc.
Santa Clara, CA

Abstract

Immunoassay-based techniques have historically been the analytical method of choice for drug screening in clinical research. Presumptive detection of the analyte of interest in a biological specimen is most often reflexed to more specific, confirmatory testing that typically uses gas or liquid chromatography (GC or LC) coupled to tandem mass spectrometry (MS/MS). However, incorrect presumptive immunoassay results requiring additional testing are a common issue that may have substantial downstream consequences for laboratory operations and total costs. To combat this problem, an analytical LC/TOF MS method, including 84 drugs and metabolites, has been developed for drug screening, improving overall data quality.

Introduction

Immunoassay-based techniques, which are relatively fast and simple, have historically been the analytical method of choice to screen urine specimens for drugs. Samples containing the analytes of interest are reflexed to more specific, confirmatory testing that most often uses GC or LC coupled to MS/MS. Incorrect presumptive immunoassay results are common problems that may have significant downstream consequences. As an alternative to the immunoassay technique, a rapid LC/TOF MS analytical method including 84 drugs and metabolites was developed. LC/TOF MS has several advantages over MS/MS, where large numbers of drugs are identified in a condensed analysis window, and presumptive testing results are sufficient. In addition, LC/TOF MS as a presumptive assay reduces the reliance on antibody availability and performance. It is also less costly than continually buying commercial immunoassay kits, and it is less complex to add additional compounds without substantial workflow modifications or the use of independent test kits. This study demonstrates the successful use of a rapid LC/TOF MS method as a replacement for immunoassay-based techniques, resulting in better data quality and the inclusion of creatinine quantification for specimen validity assessment by LC/TOF MS.

Experimental

LC configuration and parameters

Configuration				
Agilent 1290 Infinity II high speed pump (G7120A)				
Agilent 1290 Infinity II multisampler (G7167A)				
Agilent 1290 Infinity multicolumn thermostat (G7116B)				
Needle wash	Acetonitrile			
Autosampler temperature	4 °C			
Injection volume, positive	2 µL			
Injection volume, negative	5 µL			
Analytical column	Agilent InfinityLab Poroshell 120 SB-C8, 2.1 × 50 mm, 2.7 µm, LC column (p/n 689775-906T)			
Column temperature	75 °C			
Mobile phase A, positive	5 mM ammonium formate in water, pH 3.5			
Mobile phase B, positive	0.1 % Formic acid in acetonitrile			
Mobile phase A, negative	0.1 % Acetic acid in water			
Mobile phase B, negative	Methanol			
Flow rate	1 mL/min			
Gradient	Positive mode		Negative mode	
	Time (min)	%B	Time (min)	%B
	0.00	2	0.00	15
	1.25	95	1.25	95
Re-equilibration time	0.5 minutes			

LC/TOF mass spectrometer configuration and parameters

Configuration	
Agilent 6550 iFunnel Q-TOF LC/MS (Operated in TOF mode)	
Ionization mode	Positive and negative
Drying gas temperature	250 °C
Drying gas flow	15 L/min
Nebulizer pressure	60 psi
Sheath gas temperature	400 °C
Sheath gas flow	12 L/min
Nozzle voltage, positive	0 V
Nozzle voltage, negative	0 V, 500 V at 0.8 minutes
Capillary voltage	3,500 V
Fragmentor voltage	125 V
Skimmer Voltage	65 V
Octopole RF	750 V
Mass range	100 to 1,000 <i>m/z</i>
Acquisition rate	4 spectra/second
Detector rate	2 GHz, extended dynamic range
Reference mass flow rate Agilent 1260 isocratic pump	0.5 mL/min
Reference masses, positive	121.0509 and 922.0098
Reference masses, negative	119.0360 and 980.0163

Chemicals and reagents

Optima grade methanol and acetonitrile were from Fisher Scientific (Hampton, NH). Glacial acetic acid and formic acid were purchased from MilliporeSigma (Saint Louis, MO). Clinical Laboratory Reagent Water (CLRW) was from a Milli-Q Advantage A10 system manufactured by MilliporeSigma. Stock standards for drugs, metabolites, and deuterated internal standards were purchased from Cerilliant Corporation (Round Rock, TX). Creatinine was purchased from MilliporeSigma, and creatinine-d3 was purchased from CDN Isotopes (Pointe-Claire, Quebec, Canada). The creatinine reference standard was purchased from NIST (Gaithersburg, MD). A reference mass solution and a low-concentration tuning mix were from Agilent Technologies (Santa Clara, CA).

Sample preparation

Three separate sample preparations were used to detect all compounds of interest and to quantify creatinine. For a complete list of included compounds, polarities, retention times, target concentrations, and internal standards, see Table 1.

Table 1. Analytes and associated internal standards.

Analyte	Internal standard	Target (ng/mL)	Retention time (min)	Polarity
2-Hydroxyethylflurazepam	Diazepam-d ₅	200	1.291	Positive
3-Hydroxycotinine	Morphine-d ₃	100	0.432	Positive
6-Monoacetylmorphine (3)*	6-monoacetylmorphine-d ₆	300	1.025	Positive
7-Aminoclonazepam*	Meperidine-d ₄	200	1.146	Positive
Alprazolam*	Alpha-hydroxyalprazolam-d ₅	200	1.320	Positive
Amitriptyline (8)	Meperidine-d ₄	100	1.262	Positive
Amobarbital	Phenobarbital-d ₅	200	0.995	Negative
Amphetamine	Methamphetamine-d ₅	300	0.723	Positive
Anabasine	Morphine-d ₃	100	0.370	Positive
alpha-Hydroxyalprazolam	alpha-Hydroxyalprazolam-d ₅	200	1.266	Positive
alpha-Hydroxymidazolam	alpha-Hydroxyalprazolam-d ₅	200	1.274	Positive
alpha-Hydroxytriazolam	alpha-Hydroxyalprazolam-d ₅	200	1.270	Positive
Benzoylcegonine*	Benzoylcegonine-d ₃	150	1.079	Positive
Buprenorphine-glucuronide	Phenobarbital-d ₅	200	0.885	Negative
Buprenorphine*	Meperidine-d ₄	5	1.216	Positive
Butalbital	Phenobarbital-d ₅	200	0.910	Negative
Carisoprodol	Diazepam-d ₅	100	1.291	Positive
Chlordiazepoxide	alpha-Hydroxyalprazolam-d ₅	200	1.249	Positive
Clomipramine	Diazepam-d ₅	200	1.312	Positive
Clonazepam	alpha-Hydroxyalprazolam-d ₅	200	1.278	Positive
Cocaine	Benzoylcegonine-d ₃	150	1.150	Positive
Codeine (1)	Morphine-d ₃	300	0.942	Positive
Cotinine*	Morphine-d ₃	100	0.847	Positive
Desalkylflurazepam	Diazepam-d ₅	200	1.303	Positive
Desipramine	Meperidine-d ₄	100	1.262	Positive
Diazepam	Diazepam-d ₅	200	1.357	Positive
Doxepin*	Meperidine-d ₄	100	1.233	Positive
EDDP (8)	Meperidine-d ₄	150	1.270	Positive
Ethyl glucuronide	Phenobarbital-d ₅	500	0.182	Negative
Ethyl sulfate*	Phenobarbital-d ₅	500	0.182	Negative
Fentanyl*	Norfentanyl-d ₅	2	1.229	Positive
Flurazepam	alpha-Hydroxyalprazolam-d ₅	200	1.241	Positive
Hydrocodone (1)	6-monoacetyl morphine-d ₆	300	1.029	Positive
Hydromorphone (2)	Morphine-d ₃	300	0.420	Positive
Imipramine	Meperidine-d ₄	100	1.278	Positive
Lorazepam	alpha-Hydroxyalprazolam-d ₅	200	1.274	Positive
Lorazepam glucuronide	Phenobarbital-d ₅	200	0.978	Negative
MDA	Methamphetamine-d ₅	500	0.909	Positive

* QC analyte; (no.) isobaric compounds

Positive mode preparation (10× dilution)

Calibrator, quality control (QC) materials, and samples (100 µL) were aliquoted into a 96-well plate. Resorufin glucuronide in IMCSZyme rapid hydrolysis buffer was added to each well, followed by IMCSZyme β-glucuronidase, as previously described⁵. The plate was briefly centrifuged to force contents to the bottom, then incubated at 65 °C for 15 minutes. After incubation, 20 µL of internal standard working stock was added. This was then diluted with 880 µL of 98:2 5 mM ammonium formate in water, pH 3.5 (mobile phase A, positive mode), and 0.1 % formic acid in Optima acetonitrile (mobile phase B, positive mode). To gather liquid to the bottom of the well, the plate was centrifuged briefly.

Negative mode preparation (10× dilution)

Calibrator, QC materials, and patient specimen (10 µL) were aliquoted into a 96-well plate, and 5 µL of internal standard working stock was added. Specimens were diluted with 85 µL of 85:15 0.1 % acetic acid in CLRW and methanol, and centrifuged briefly to gather liquid to the bottom of the well.

Creatinine sample preparation (50× dilution)

Calibrator, QC materials, and patient samples (10 µL) were aliquoted into a 96-well plate, followed by 10 µL of creatinine-d₃ internal standard. A diluent of 500 µL 98:2 positive mode mobile phase A:mobile phase B was used. To gather liquid to the bottom of the well, the plate was centrifuged briefly.

Analyte	Internal standard	Target (ng/mL)	Retention time (min)	Polarity
MDEA	Methamphetamine-d ₅	500	1.071	Positive
MDMA	Methamphetamine-d ₅	500	1.013	Positive
Meperidine	Meperidine-d ₄	50	1.158	Positive
Meprobamate	Meperidine-d ₄	100	1.162	Positive
Methadone	Diazepam-d ₅	150	1.299	Positive
Methamphetamine (6)*	Methamphetamine-d ₅	300	1.013	Positive
Methylphenidate (5)	Meperidine-d ₄	No screen	1.137	Positive
Midazolam	alpha-Hydroxyalprazolam-d ₅	200	1.266	Positive
Morphine (2)*	Morphine-d ₃	300	0.287	Positive
Naloxone (3)	6-monoacetyl morphine-d ₆	No screen	0.893	Positive
N-desmethylpentadol	Meperidine-d ₄	100	1.121	Positive
Nicotine	Morphine-d ₃	100	0.266	Positive
Nitrazepam	alpha-Hydroxyalprazolam-d ₅	200	1.266	Positive
Norbuprenorphine-glucuronide	Phenobarbital-d ₅	300	0.462	Negative
Norbuprenorphine	Meperidine-d ₄	300	1.179	Positive
Norclomipramine (N-desmethylclomipramine)	Diazepam-d ₅	200	1.303	Positive
Nordiazepam	Diazepam-d ₅	200	1.312	Positive
Nordoxepin (desmethyldoxepin)	Meperidine-d ₄	100	1.224	Positive
Norfentanyl	Norfentanyl-d ₅	2	1.100	Positive
Norhydrocodone (2)	6-Monoacetyl morphine-d ₆	300	1.009	Positive
Normeperidine (5)	Meperidine-d ₄	50	1.137	Positive
Nornicotine	Morphine-d ₃	100	0.258	Positive
Noroxycodone (7)	Morphine-d ₃	300	0.967	Positive
Noroxymorphone	Morphine-d ₃	300	0.283	Positive
Nortriptyline (9)	Meperidine-d ₄	100	1.270	Positive
N-Desmethyl tramadol (4)	Meperidine-d ₄	200	1.133	Positive
O-Desmethyl tramadol (4)	6-Monoacetyl morphine-d ₆	200	1.029	Positive
Oxazepam*	alpha-Hydroxyalprazolam-d ₅	200	1.266	Positive
Oxazepam glucuronide	Phenobarbital-d ₅	200	0.952	Negative
Oxycodone	6-Monoacetyl morphine-d ₆	100	1.000	Positive
Oxymorphone (7)	Morphine-d ₃	100	0.345	Positive
PCP*	Meperidine-d ₄	25	1.220	Positive
Pentobarbital	Phenobarbital-d ₅	200	0.995	Negative
Phenobarbital*	Phenobarbital-d ₅	200	0.732	Negative
Phentermine (6)	Methamphetamine-d ₅	100	1.038	Positive
Protriptyline (9)	alpha-Hydroxyalprazolam-d ₅	100	1.270	Positive
Ritalinic acid*	Methamphetamine-d ₅	100	1.054	Positive
Secobarbital	Phenobarbital-d ₅	200	1.029	Negative

* QC analyte; (no.) isobaric compounds

Data analysis

Data acquisition was performed using MassHunter Acquisition Software (B.08.00). Data were analyzed using MassHunter Quantitative Analysis Software (B.08.00) and Qualitative Analysis Software (B.07.00). Target concentrations were matched to the respective immunoassays. The presence of the 84 drugs and metabolites was determined based on quantification above the target, accurate mass (within 7 ppm), and retention time match (within ± 0.010 minutes). Table 1 provides concentration targets and approximate retention times. For both positive and negative modes, a single-point calibration at the target was forced through the origin to determine positive or negative. QC materials representing each drug class were at 50 % (negative control) and 125 % (positive control) of the targets. All analytes were normalized to 1 of 11 internal standards, nine in positive mode, and two in negative mode. To ensure that hydrolysis was adequate, resorufin and resorufin glucuronide were analyzed in Qualitative Analysis. All replicates of the positive QC were qualitatively positive, and all replicates of the negative QC were qualitatively negative with all compounds identified. Carryover was <0.1 % for all compounds tested using an increased sample followed by an undetected control sample.

Creatinine quantification

A 5-point calibration curve was used for creatinine with calibrators at 20, 100, 200, 300, and 400 mg/dL. QC materials were run to verify calibration with targets of 27.5, 87.7, 232.5, and 360.1 mg/dL. Due to high concentrations of creatinine in urine and the highly sensitive instrument, the first isotope of creatinine was used to determine the concentration in each sample.

Analyte	Internal standard	Target (ng/mL)	Retention time (min)	Polarity
Tapentadol	Meperidine-d ₄	100	1.129	Positive
Tapentadol-O-sulfate (7.5 ~13 ppm)	Diazepam-d ₅	200	1.104	Positive
Temazepam	Diazepam-d ₅	200	1.312	Positive
$\Delta 9$ -COOH-THC glucuronide*	11-nor-9-COOH-THC-d ₃	20	1.198	Negative
Tramadol	Meperidine-d ₄	200	1.133	Positive
Triazolam	Diazepam-d ₅	200	1.324	Positive
Zolpidem*	Meperidine-d ₄	20	1.187	Positive
Creatinine	Morphine-d ₃	20 mg/dL	0.177	Positive
Internal standard	Working stock concentration (ng/mL)	Final concentration in sample (ng/mL)		
Norfentanyl-d ₅	1,000	20	1.096	Positive
THC-COOH-d ₃	2,000	10	1.257	Negative
Morphine-d ₃	2,000	40	0.283	Positive
Benzylocogonine-d ₃	2,000	40	1.079	Positive
Diazepam-d ₅	2,000	40	1.357	Positive
6-Acetylmorphine-d ₆	2,000	40	1.021	Positive
Medperidine-d ₄	2,000	40	1.154	Positive
α -Hydroxyalprazolam-d ₅	2,000	40	1.266	Positive
Phenobarbital-d ₅	4,000	20	0.724	Negative
Methamphetamine-d ₅	8,000	160	0.930	Positive
Creatinine-d ₃	5,200	52 mg/dL	0.177	Positive

* QC analyte; (no.) isobaric compounds

Results and discussion

Table 2 provides a summary of positive and negative results using either LC/MS/MS or LC/Q-TOF MS as the confirmatory method. To test method performance, 420 individual biological specimens originally screened by immunoassay with reflex to confirmation by MS were analyzed.

EMIT false positives

Each drug class analyzed by immunoassay had at least one false positive in the sample set, except for PCP, THC, and tramadol. MDMA had the highest number of false positives, with all 50 positives failing to confirm by LC/MS/MS. In addition, all seven samples that screened positive for meperidine failed to confirm. Overall, of the 420 biological specimens with analytes present by immunoassay, 117 failed to confirm by more specific MS methods, indicating false positive immunoassay results.

LC/TOF MS false positives

No false positive LC/TOF MS results were identified in this set of specimens based on either LC/MS/MS or LC/TOF MS confirmation.

EMIT false negatives

The LC/TOF MS assay found an additional 44 positives:

- 22 Benzodiazepines
- Nine opiates
- Five ethanol markers
- Four THCs
- Two each of cocaine and barbiturates

LC/TOF MS false negatives

The LC/TOF MS method failed to detect one sample in buprenorphine, ethanol markers, and opiates due to concentrations below the established target.

Table 2. Sensitivity and specificity for immunoassay and LC/TOF MS using either LC/TOF MS or LC/MS/MS as the confirmatory method.

Drug class	Immunoassay				LC/TOF MS			
	TP	TN	FP	FN	TP	TN	FP	FN
Amphetamines	50	350	20	20	50	370	0	0
Barbiturates	7	711	1	2	9	411	0	0
Benzodiazepines	66	328	4	22	87	333	0	0
Buprenorphine	12	203	1	0	12	203	0	1
Cannabinoids	90	326	0	4	94	326	0	0
Carisoprodol	3	212	1	0	3	213	0	0
Cocaine	18	399	1	2	20	400	0	0
Ethanol glucuronide	35	380	0	5	41	378	0	1
Fentanyl	38	175	3	0	38	178	0	0
MDMA	0	370	50	0	0	420	0	0
Meperidine	0	209	7	0	0	216	0	0
Methadone	24	395	1	0	24	396	0	0
Opiates	171	240	3	6	177	243	0	0
Oxycodone	92	321	4	3	93	326	0	1
PCP	0	420	0	0	0	420	0	0
Tapentadol	1	205	9	0	1	215	0	0
Tramadol	18	198	0	0	18	198	0	0
Zolpidem	3	201	12	0	3	213	0	0

TP = true positive; TN = true negative; FP = false positive; FN = false negative

Nicotine

Approximately half of the 579 biological samples (275, 47.4 %) screened positive by LC/TOF MS for nicotine and at least two of its metabolites. These samples were neither screened by EMIT nor confirmed by an LC/MS/MS method, as no available panels used in the comparison study included either nicotine or its metabolites.

Quantitative creatinine performance characteristics

Creatinine quantification in urine by LC/TOF MS was performed with calibrators covering the entire analytical measurement range from 20 to 400 mg/dL, $R^2 \geq 0.999$. Accuracy and

precision studies demonstrated acceptable standard deviations and assay agreement with the Jaffe method. Inter- and intra-assay imprecision of less than 3 % at two QC levels were demonstrated. Carryover was calculated to be 0.02 %. Comparison between the Jaffe method and LC/TOF MS for all 420 patient samples yielded a slope of 0.91 and a correlation coefficient of 0.96. It is believed that this is the first time the first carbon isotope of creatine, $^{13}\text{CC}_3\text{H}_7\text{N}_3\text{O}$, was used to quantify a highly concentrated analyte while allowing standardized sample preparation methods for low concentration analytes.

Conclusion

This Application Note presents an investigation into the replacement of immunoassay-based drug screening and creatinine quantitation by a rapid LC/TOF MS screen with higher specificity and accuracy than existing analytical methods. The LC/TOF MS method was found to be a sensitive and more specific way to screen for drugs, and to provide creatinine quantitation. Further research is needed before implementation in a clinical setting.

www.agilent.com/chem

For Research Use Only. Not for use in diagnostic procedures.

This information is subject to change without notice.

© Agilent Technologies, Inc. 2018
Printed in the USA, August 21, 2018
5994-0189EN

