'Assessment of fluoride exposure by GCMS: successes achieved and hard lessons learnt'

Michael Blackburn European Bioanalysis Forum 13th Open Symposium November 2020

ARCINOVA

Introduction: why a fluoride assay

There are several volatile anaesthetics containing fluorine

e.g. sevoflurane, methoxyflurane, isoflurane.

Issues with nephrotoxicity of fluoride based anaesthetics were first reported in the 1960s A result of increased fluoride exposure following metabolism

e.g. demethylation of methoxyflurane following cyp P450 oxidative metabolism





F-

Since then every new volatile F based anaesthetic has been extensively tested for its potential to undergo metabolism, increase plasma F concentrations and thereby induce nephrotoxicity



Fluoride toxicity: background

Studies with rodents showed changes in renal function could occur following intravenous dosage of inorganic Fluoride



When peak F concentrations reach: <40μM (760ng/mL): no abnormalities observed
50-80μM (1 to 1.6μg/mL): sub clinical toxicity observed
mild toxicity observed between 90-120μM and overt nephrotoxicity with
peak fluoride was observed at concentrations 80 - 175μM (1.6 to 3.3 μg/mL).
While this is does not give the whole picture of anaesthetic fluoride toxicity,
Need an analytical method capable of measuring plasma free F at 10μM or lower



Free fluoride - analytical methods

Initial testing on site using ion chromatography (Dionex ICS)



Cal H – 1µg/mL Limit of Quantification

Cal A – 20µg/mL Upper limit tested



Fluoride -endogenous levels and detection limits

- LOQ of 1µg/mL with IC with a long incubation time and run time – undesirable for a clinical trial with large sample numbers
- Toxicity of fluoride observed at 50µM (~1µg/mL), the LOQ needs to be reduced to ensure a margin for patient safety
- Endogenous free fluoride levels in plasma vary according to diet, fluorination, ingestion of F containing dental products etc.
 literature values around 17ng/mL in plasma

(Sener et al., 2007, measured using an ion sensitive electrode)





Chromatographic method for fluoride

Possible method based on that of Tsuda et al., 2016

Derivatisation of free fluoride to trimethylfluorosilane using TMCS (trimethyl chlorosilane) as a derivatising agent



 $(CH_3)_3SiCl + H_2O$ $(CH_3)_3SiOH + HCl$ $(CH_3)_3SiOH + H_+ + F_ (CH_3)_3SiF + H_2O$

(reaction equation from Tsuda et al., 2016)

El mass spectrum of derivatised F vs NIST library spectrum

Molecular ion at m/z 92 (TMFS) Major fragment at 77 (loss of CH_3)

Selected 77 as quantifier ion 92 as qualifier ion

Use acetaldehyde as an internal standard Quantifier m/z 44 Qualifier m/z 29



Sample preparation for plasma (Tsuda method was headspace in urine)

Free fluoride being analysed as a marker for **potential nephrotoxicity Endogenous assay** using a calibration line in **surrogate matrix** (water) **Quality control samples** prepared in **sample matrix** (human plasma)

2 major steps:

1) delipidation and deproteination

dilute sample with water and acidify add dichloromethane & vortex remove aqueous supernatant

2) Fluoride derivitisation and extraction

addition of internal standard in solvent add TMCS in dichloromethane incubate to derivatise; spin and transfer lower layer to a GC vial

Plasma volume for clinical study 1mL Preclinical study 0.5 mL



GCMS System



Agilent 5977 MSD Detector extractor El source with 7890 GC oven

Heated inlet , split injection 5:1

Agilent DB Wax UI GC column 30 x 0.25mm 0.5μm film thickness

PEG based stationary phase for improved retention of polar compounds



Photo: Agilent



Analytical conditions



On	Setpoint	Actual	
Flow	1 mL/min	1 mL/min	
Pressure	7.3614 psi	7.4 psi	
Average Velocity	36.354 cm/sec	(Initial): 0 min	
Holdup Time	1.3754 min	He @ 45 °C Oven Out: MSD	
		30 m x 250 μm x 0.25 μm	
Constant Flow	•		

Gerstel MPS Autosampler

10uL syringe, mode;

sandwich with solvent above

Injection volume 1.5uL

2 washes: methanol and methanol/DCM 1:1

Total cycle time 7.5 minutes

Heated Inlet 200°C Split mode Helium flow 1mL/minute

45°C 1 minute 45 - 65°C at 7.5 °C/minute 65 - 180°C at 35°C/minute



GCMS chromatograms showing qualifier ions



Ratio of fluoride quantifier to qualifier should be between 2.9 - 4.3: 1



Validated assay calibration curve

Analytical Run 27 analyzed on 14-Jan-2019 Calibration Standards for Fluoride (ng/mL) Regression Method = LINEAR - Weighting Factor = 1/X**2 Response = Slope * Conc + Intercept Slope = 0.0013726 Intercept = 0.0032104 R-Squared = 0.9853 (Study 165064B4)





z + t 🖟 🖬 🗷

Fluoride

Blank plasma showing endogenous fluoride



GCMS LLOQ = 20ng/mL or approx. 1μ M/mL

Endogenous values were generally at or a little below LLOQ: e.g. scan one values were extrapolated to 8-12 ng/mL

Blank plasma spiked to 4 nominal QC/Val levels at 25, 55, 105, 155 ng/mL



Typical assay performance

	Curve Number	A&P LLOQ 26.0 ng/mL	A&P QCL 45.0 ng/mL	A&P QCM 102 ng/mL	A&P QCH 137 ng/mL
	9	~19.4	37.5	90.6	136
		21.7	39.1	95.2	126
		*184	~~20.7	~~19.4	~~201
		24.2	42.6	97.6	137
		28.5	43.7	97.4	140
		26.9	44.5	93.2	132
Mean		24.1	38.0	82.2	145
S.D.		3.71	8.91	30.9	27.7
%CV		15.39	23.45	37.59	19.10
%Theoretical		92.69	84.44	80.59	105.84
%Bias		-7.31	-15.56	-19.41	5.84
n		5	6	6	6
* Grubbs Test Outlier					
~ > 25%Bias					
~~ > 20%Bias					

• Acceptance criteria for this assay were expanded at 4/6/20-25% due to the unusual nature of the assay and consistent with data obtained during method development and pre-validation

 Analytical range truncated as accuracy dropped >200ng/mL (saturation of derivatisation = underestimation of nominal values?)
 Could not increase TMCS level – contains F



Effect of dilution & non-parallel results

Method was validated into production.

During validation dilution was verified using plasma QCs spiked with fluoride standard Samples could be diluted 2 & 5 fold with water

However similar dilution of INCURRED samples > ULOQ gave a non linear response Samples diluted with water gave an overestimate of original concentration

Dilution Toverestimate



Effect of dilution & non-parallel results

Method was validated into production.

During validation dilution was verified using plasma QCs spiked with fluoride standard Samples could be diluted 2 & 5 fold with water

However similar dilution of INCURRED samples > ULOQ gave a non linear response Samples diluted with water gave an overestimate of original concentration



Release of free fluoride into the sample F⁻ from bound form in fluorinated organics or increased efficiency of derivatisation process?

Non parallel assay: dilution effect

Dilution

Solution: dilute sample with plasma matrix & not water to maintain molality, environment of sample





Non parallel assay: dilution effect

Dilution

Solution: dilute sample with plasma matrix & not water to maintain molality, environment of sample

Overestimate



However dilution plasma contains fluoride. Need to Assay dilution plasma for F first (or spike if <LOQ) & correct the measured diluted value for the additional spiked plasma

e.g. 2 fold dilution of plasma with plasma of nominal 28ng/mL Results in a correction of the diluted value from 240 to 210 ng/mL



Internal standard effect

Attempted to find an internal standard which could be derivatised

We tried Br⁻ but this did not behave like F⁻ (did not derivatise)

Selected acetaldehyde (used by Tsuda et al).





This is not derivatised and does not track the analyte through the method Lost extraction of acetaldehyde during production sample analysis



Internal standard effect

Attempted to find an internal standard which could be derivatised

We tried Br but this did not behave like F (did not derivitise)

Selected acetaldehyde (used by Tsuda et al).





This is not derivatised and does not track the analyte through the method Lost extraction of acetaldehyde during production sample analysis SOLUTION

Had to modify solvent in which the IS was added from methanol to dichloromethane and subsequently retest the assay

The reason for this was mysterious:

dichloromethane crossed the thin emulsion layer more easily?



conclusions



F-

- Development of a volatile F containing compound required a fluoride assay as well as PK assay for drug to monitor potential for nephrotoxicity
- GCMS of a TMCS derivative allowed quantitation of free fluoride to clinically relevant concentrations
- The assay had a limited analytical range (saturation of TMCS?) and used a calibration curve in surrogate and spiked matrix QCs
- When diluting samples, consider the effect of the diluent on the sample, particularly for ionic analytes and derivatisation reactions
- Dilution of incurred samples had to be modified
- Select internal standard with care to track your procedure as far as possible

And expect the unexpected



acknowledgements

Janine Morsman Sheryl Atkinson Stuart McDougall Paige Bellis Hannah Gent Jonathan Charlton









references

Sener et al., (2007) Fluoride levels of human plasma and breast milk European Journal of Dentistry Vol. 1 pp 21-23

Kharasch E.d. et al., (2006) New insights into the mechanism of methoxyfluorane Nephrotoxicity and implications for anaesthetic development. *Anaesthesiology 105 pp. 726 - 736*

Tsuda Y et al., (2016) Measurement of fluoride in human urine by headspace Gas chromatography-mass spectrometry. *Biomedical Research on Trace Elements* 27 (1) pp. 15-22

Thank you for your attention