



*JOURNAL OF CHROMATOGRAPHY  
LIBRARY - volume 57*

*retention and selectivity  
in liquid chromatography*

*prediction, standardisation and  
phase comparisons*

*edited by  
Roger M. Smith*

ELSEVIER

*JOURNAL OF CHROMATOGRAPHY LIBRARY—volume 57*

# ***retention and selectivity in liquid chromatography***

*prediction, standardisation and phase comparisons*

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

*JOURNAL OF CHROMATOGRAPHY LIBRARY—volume 57*

# *retention and selectivity in liquid chromatography*

*prediction, standardisation and phase comparisons*

*edited by*

***Roger M. Smith***

*Department of Chemistry, Loughborough University of Technology, Loughborough,  
Leicestershire LE11 3TU, UK*



**ELSEVIER**

**Amsterdam — Lausanne — New York — Oxford — Shannon — Tokyo 1995**

ELSEVIER SCIENCE B.V.  
Sara Burgerhartstraat 25  
P.O. Box 211, 1000 AE Amsterdam, The Netherlands

ISBN 0-444-81539-2

© 1995 Elsevier Science B.V. All rights reserved.

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior written permission of the publisher, Elsevier Science B.V., Copyright & Permissions Department, P.O. Box 521, 1000 AM Amsterdam, The Netherlands.

Special regulations for readers in the U.S.A. – This publication has been registered with the Copyright Clearance Center Inc. (CCC), Salem, Massachusetts. Information can be obtained from the CCC about conditions under which photocopies of parts of this publication may be made in the U.S.A. All other copyright questions, including photocopying outside of the U.S.A., should be referred to the Publisher.

No responsibility is assumed by the publisher for any injury and/or damage to persons or property as a matter of products liability, negligence or otherwise, or from any use or operation of any methods, products, instructions or ideas contained in the material herein.

This book is printed on acid-free paper.

Printed in The Netherlands

# *Contents*

<b>Chapter 1. Retention prediction based on molecular structure .....</b>	<b>1</b>
R.M. Smith	
1.1 Introduction .....	1
1.2 Structure and retention .....	2
1.2.1 Chromatographic functional group contributions .....	3
1.2.2 Related prediction studies.....	4
1.3 Functional group effects on retention indices.....	5
1.3.1 Retention prediction based on <i>n</i> -alkanes and <i>n</i> -alkylbenzenes.....	6
1.3.2 Retention prediction based on alkan-2-ones .....	8
1.4 Prediction of retention indices based on alkyl aryl ketones.....	11
1.4.1 Monofunctional compounds .....	13
1.4.1.1 Aromatic functional groups.....	13
1.4.1.2 Aliphatic functional groups .....	15
1.4.1.3 Relationship between substituent indices and octanol–water partition substituent increments.....	19
1.4.2 Polyfunctional compounds .....	21
1.4.2.1 General prediction model .....	23
1.4.2.2 <i>Meta</i> and <i>para</i> groups .....	29
1.4.2.3 <i>Ortho</i> -substituents .....	32
1.4.3 CRIPES and expert systems .....	33
1.4.4 Comparisons with published retention values.....	38
1.5 Other retention index prediction studies.....	40
1.5.1 Retention prediction based on polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons .....	41
1.6 Conclusion.....	43
1.7 Acknowledgements.....	43
1.8 Appendix 1.1: Coefficients of regression equations for the effect of eluent on parent, aromatic and aliphatic substituent indices .....	44
1.9 References .....	45
 <b>Chapter 2. Retention prediction of pharmaceutical compounds.....</b>	 <b>47</b>
K. Valkó	
2.1 Introduction .....	47
2.2 Definition and determination of retention.....	48
2.3 Dependence of retention on the column and mobile phase composition .....	50
2.4 Correlation of retention parameters to the molecular parameters obtained by molecular modelling .....	53
2.5 Retention prediction based on topological matrix and information theory .....	60
2.6 Retention prediction based on the hydrophobicity of drugs .....	62

2.7	Retention prediction based on empirical increment values.....	68
2.8	Retention prediction based on experimental retention values, thermodynamic considerations with multiparameter approaches .....	76
2.9	Applications of retention predictions of pharmaceutical compounds .....	87
2.10	Acknowledgements.....	90
2.11	References .....	90
 <b>Chapter 3. Retention index scales used in high-performance liquid chromatography .....</b>		
	R.M. Smith	93
3.1	Introduction .....	93
3.1.1	Relative retention times .....	94
3.1.2	Internal and external standards .....	95
3.1.3	Retention indices .....	97
3.2	Retention index scales in chromatography .....	98
3.2.1	Gas chromatography .....	99
3.2.2	Supercritical fluid chromatography .....	100
3.2.3	Liquid chromatography .....	103
3.2.4	Micellar electrokinetic chromatography .....	105
3.3	Retention index scales in high-performance liquid chromatography .....	107
3.3.1	<i>n</i> -Alkanes .....	107
3.3.2	<i>n</i> -Alkylbenzenes .....	109
3.3.3	Alkan-2-ones .....	109
3.3.4	Alkyl aryl ketones .....	111
3.3.5	1-Nitroalkanes .....	115
3.3.6	Polynuclear aromatic hydrocarbons.....	115
3.3.7	Miscellaneous retention index scales.....	116
3.3.7.1	Phenolic esters.....	116
3.3.7.2	Aliphatic esters.....	117
3.3.7.3	Other retention index scales .....	118
3.3.8	Comparisons between retention index scales.....	118
3.4	Applications of retention index scales .....	122
3.4.1	Reproducibility and transferability of retention indices.....	122
3.4.2	Identification .....	125
3.4.3	Characterization of separation systems.....	125
3.4.3.1	Column hold-up volume.....	126
3.4.3.2	Stationary phase characterization .....	127
3.4.3.3	Mobile phase characteristics .....	133
3.4.4	Lipophilicity and biological activity.....	135
3.4.5	Structure-retention relationships.....	137
3.5	Conclusions .....	139
3.6	References .....	140

<b>Chapter 4. Application of retention indices for identification in high performance liquid chromatography .....</b>	<b>145</b>
R.M. Smith	
4.1 Introduction .....	145
4.2 Advantages and problems.....	145
4.3 Pharmaceuticals and toxicological drug samples.....	147
4.3.1 Toxicological drug analysis.....	147
4.3.1.1 Studies based on the alkan-2-ones.....	148
4.3.1.2 Studies based on the alkyl aryl ketones .....	149
4.3.1.3 Studies based on the 1-nitroalkanes .....	156
4.3.2 Drug metabolites .....	156
4.4 Natural products .....	157
4.4.1 Fungal metabolites.....	157
4.4.1.1 Mycotoxins.....	158
4.4.1.2 Other fungal metabolites .....	159
4.4.2 Plant products.....	160
4.4.2.1 Spices and flavour components.....	161
4.4.2.2 Plant toxins.....	162
4.4.2.3 Gliadins .....	163
4.4.3 Lichen constituents .....	163
4.4.4 Other natural products .....	164
4.5 Environmental samples.....	164
4.5.1 Chlorinated compounds.....	164
4.5.2 PAH and aromatic hydrocarbons.....	165
4.6 Miscellaneous samples .....	165
4.7 Conclusions .....	165
4.8 Appendix 1: Reported retention indices in HPLC .....	166
4.9 References .....	167
 <b>Chapter 5. Application of nitroalkanes and secondary retention index standards for the identification of drugs.....</b>	<b>171</b>
M. Bogusz	
5.1 Introduction .....	171
5.2 The use of HPLC as a standardized identification method in toxicology .....	173
5.2.1 Standardization of retention using straight phase silica .....	173
5.2.2 Standardization of retention using reversed phase silica .....	175
5.2.2.1. The concept of secondary standards for retention index scale	183
5.2.2.2 Assessment of identification potentials of a HPLC/RI system	199
5.2.2.3 Influence of a biological matrix on the identification potential of a HPLC/RI system .....	203
5.2.3 Standardization of detection for toxicological screening procedures ....	204
5.3 References .....	205



<b>Chapter 6. Identification using retention indices in gradient HPLC.....</b>	<b>209</b>
P. Kuronen	
6.1 Introduction .....	209
6.2 Problems of reversed-phase columns .....	210
6.3 Selection of a retention index standard.....	213
6.4 Principles of gradient elution.....	215
6.5 Chromatographic behaviour of retention index standards .....	217
6.5.1 Isocratic conditions.....	217
6.5.2 Gradient elution .....	219
6.6 Retention indices in qualitative identification .....	221
6.6.1 Calculation of retention indices .....	221
6.6.2 Reproducibility of gradient retention indices .....	223
6.6.3 Confirmation of identification .....	228
6.7 Conclusions .....	230
6.8 References .....	230
<b>Chapter 7. Characterization of retention and selectivity in reversed-phase LC using interaction indices.....</b>	<b>235</b>
P. Jandera	
7.1 Introduction .....	235
7.2 Interaction indices as the descriptors of retention .....	236
7.2.1 Retention in binary mobile phases.....	238
7.2.2 Retention in ternary mobile phases.....	243
7.3 Calibration of the scale of interaction indices .....	247
7.4 Prediction of the retention under changing mobile phase composition using interaction indices.....	250
7.5 Interaction indices and the selectivity of separation .....	253
7.5.1 Non-homologous compounds.....	253
7.5.2 Homologous and oligomeric series.....	255
7.6 Conclusions .....	263
7.7 Glossary of the terms.....	264
7.8 References .....	266
<b>Chapter 8. Lipophilic and polar indices .....</b>	<b>269</b>
P. Jandera	
8.1 Introduction .....	269
8.2 Retention in homologous series as the basis of lipophilic and polar indices .....	269
8.3 Molecular structure and lipophilic and polar indices.....	274
8.3.1 $\Delta n_c$ and $\Delta q$ indices as the descriptors of the lipophilicity and polar- ity of solutes .....	274
8.3.2 Structural contributions to lipophilic and polar indices .....	276
8.4 Prediction of retention using lipophilic and polar indices .....	279
8.4.1 Selection of the reference calibration homologous series.....	279
8.4.2 Precision of the predicted retention data .....	279
8.5 Characterization of selectivity using lipophilic and polar indices .....	283

8.5.1	Binary mobile phases.....	283
8.5.2	Ternary mobile phases.....	287
8.5.3	Gradient elution.....	290
8.6	Conclusions.....	292
8.7	Glossary of the terms.....	292
8.8	References.....	294
<b>Chapter 9.</b>	<b>Solvent selectivity.....</b>	<b>297</b>
	S.D. West.....	297
9.1	Introduction.....	297
9.2	Experimental.....	299
9.2.1	Chemicals and reagents.....	299
9.2.2	Instrumentation.....	299
9.2.3	Determination of retention data.....	299
9.2.4	Selection of solvents and solutes.....	300
9.3	Results and discussion.....	
9.3.1	Prediction of retention and resolution with steroids.....	301
9.3.1.1	Retention indices as a function of volume fraction of strong solvent.....	301
9.3.1.2	Prediction of retention indices for steroids.....	302
9.3.1.3	Prediction of resolution of steroid mixtures.....	303
9.3.1.4	Optimization of resolution of steroid mixtures.....	307
9.3.1.5	Resolution and the solvent selectivity triangle concept.....	309
9.3.2	Retention and selectivity studies with benzene derivatives.....	311
9.3.2.1	Retention index variation with solvent selectivity.....	311
9.3.2.2	Resolution and the solvent selectivity triangle.....	311
9.3.2.3	Prediction of resolution.....	314
9.3.2.4	HPLC resolution as a function of retention index differences.....	314
9.3.2.5	Preadjustment of retention indices for prediction of resolution.....	318
9.3.3	Reasons for failure of the solvent selectivity triangle.....	320
9.3.4	Extension of theory to gas chromatography.....	323
9.3.4.1	Prediction of resolution.....	323
9.3.4.2	McReynolds constants and resolution.....	324
9.3.4.3	Application of the selectivity triangle to the characterization of GC stationary phase selectivity.....	326
9.3.5	Characterization of RP-HPLC selectivity with adjusted retention indices.....	327
9.3.5.1	Calculation of adjusted retention indices.....	327
9.3.5.2	Probes for characterization of RP-HPLC solvent selectivity.....	329
9.3.5.3	Quantitative prediction of resolution with any RP solvent.....	331
9.4	Conclusions.....	334
9.5	Acknowledgments.....	335
9.6	References.....	335

<b>Chapter 10. Retention and selectivity for polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons in reversed-phase liquid chromatography .....</b>	<b>337</b>
L.C. Sander and S.A. Wise	
10.1 Introduction .....	337
10.2 Stationary phase characteristics affecting selectivity in RPLC.....	338
10.2.1 Phase type.....	338
10.2.2 Isomer separations .....	341
10.2.3 Assessing column shape selectivity .....	343
10.2.4 Pore size effects.....	346
10.2.5 Bonding density.....	349
10.2.6 Bonded phase length.....	350
10.2.7 Mobile phase composition.....	352
10.2.8 Temperature.....	353
10.3 Retention indexes .....	357
10.3.1 Retention index data.....	358
10.3.2 Length-to-breadth ratio.....	360
10.3.3 Planar and non-planar PAHs .....	364
10.3.4 Methyl-substituted PAHs.....	365
10.4 Summary.....	368
10.5 References .....	368
<b>Chapter 11. Comparison of novel stationary phases.....</b>	<b>371</b>
J.J. Pesek and E.J. Williamsen	
11.1 Introduction.....	371
11.1.1 Characteristics for the ideal reversed-phase HPLC stationary phase.....	371
11.2 Characterization techniques.....	372
11.2.1 Spectroscopic techniques.....	372
11.2.1.1 IR methods .....	372
11.2.1.2 NMR methods .....	374
11.2.1.3 ESCA methods .....	375
11.2.2 Thermal methods .....	376
11.2.3 Elemental analytical methods .....	376
11.2.4 Chromatographic characterization .....	377
11.3 Monomeric octadecyl silica.....	378
11.3.1 Separation mechanisms for ODS phases .....	378
11.3.2 ODS limitations and adjustments.....	379
11.3.2.1 Different bonded phase-silica linkages.....	381
11.3.2.2 Differences in ODS columns.....	383
11.4 Novel silica phases .....	383
11.4.1 Non-C <sub>18</sub> alkane phases .....	383
11.4.2 Materials containing other functional groups .....	385
11.4.2.1 Cyanopropyl-bonded phases .....	385
11.4.2.2 Amine and phenyl phases.....	385
11.4.2.3 Non-alkyl phases bonded through a reactive olefin.....	385
11.4.2.4 Polymer bonded phases.....	388

11.4.2.5 Liquid crystal phases .....	388
11.4.3 Chiral phases .....	390
11.4.3.1 Ligand exchange chromatography.....	390
11.4.3.2 Direct enantiomeric separation.....	391
11.4.3.3 Pirkle phases .....	391
11.4.3.4 Protein phases .....	392
11.4.3.5 Organometallic phases .....	393
11.5 Non-silica-based stationary phases.....	393
11.5.1 Alumina-based stationary phases.....	393
11.5.1.1 Monomeric alumina phases.....	393
11.5.1.2 Polymeric alumina phases .....	395
11.5.2 Carbon-based zirconia.....	395
11.5.3 Polymer-based stationary phases .....	397
11.6 Conclusion.....	399
11.7 References .....	399
<b>Chapter 12. Multivariate characterization of RP-HPLC stationary phases.....</b>	<b>403</b>
A. Bolck and A.K. Smilde	
12.1 Introduction .....	403
12.2 Multivariate characterization .....	404
12.2.1 Some basic multivariate statistical concepts .....	405
12.2.1.1 Data matrices; centering and scaling .....	406
12.2.1.2 Visualization of data.....	407
12.2.2 Principal component analysis .....	410
12.2.2.1 The concept of principal component analysis .....	410
12.2.2.2 The calculation of the principal components.....	412
12.2.2.3 A least squares interpretation of principal component analysis.....	414
12.2.3 A principal component example .....	415
12.2.4 Three-way analysis .....	417
12.2.5 A three-way analysis example .....	420
12.3 Marker selection .....	422
12.3.1 The choice of markers .....	423
12.3.1.1 The determinant criterion .....	423
12.3.1.2 The induced variance criterion.....	423
12.3.1.3 Principal component analysis.....	424
12.3.1.4 Marker selection and three-way analysis.....	425
12.3.2 A marker selection example .....	425
12.4 Predictions.....	428
12.4.1 Ordinary least squares (OLS).....	429
12.4.2 Partial least squares (PLS).....	432
12.4.2.1 PLS1.....	432
12.4.2.2 PLS2.....	433
12.4.2.3 PLS predictions .....	434
12.4.3 PLS predictions and marker selection .....	434

12.4.4 A PLS example.....	435
12.5 Practical examples.....	438
12.5.1 Calibration of octadecyl modified stationary phases of different batches .....	439
12.5.2 Calibration of stationary phases of different types .....	443
12.6 Appendix A .....	445
A.1 Rank .....	445
A.2 Spectral decomposition .....	446
A.3 The singular value decomposition (SVD).....	446
12.7 References .....	447
<b>Subject Index .....</b>	<b>451</b>

## *Preface*

This book grew out of a long standing interest in the ways in which retention and the selectivity of separation in liquid chromatography are dependent on the structure of the analyte and on changes in the mobile and stationary phases. These relationships are at the heart of an understanding of the operation of liquid chromatography and of the ways in which the chromatographer can manipulate the conditions of a separation to achieve the analysis of a complex sample.

The factors involved in these processes are complex and even 90 years after the pioneering work of Tswett are still not fully understood. Any progress is linked to the development of an understanding of the physical chemical process of solvation and the physicochemical nature of the stationary and mobile phases. Chromatography is also a valuable practical analytical method and much can be learnt by studying relative interactions and by comparing the behaviour of analytes with different chemical structures under different separation conditions. To achieve this objective, techniques for recording relative retentions are needed so that results can be reproduced in different laboratories or by different operators.

However, liquid chromatography has a notoriously poor transferability, the same high versatility which enables separations to be precisely optimized also means that small changes between systems can alter the separations. This book addresses some of the ways in which these problems have been overcome to enable retention predictions, identifications and the characterization of the properties of mobile and stationary phases, to be carried out. The work owes much to studies in gas chromatography, in particular the work of Kováts in providing a retention index scale and of Rohrschneider and McReynolds on the comparison of stationary phases.

A theme which leads through the different chapters is the value of relative measurements. Most obviously in the descriptions of the different retention index scales in liquid chromatography and their application to the identification of a wide range of analytes. The indices also form the basis of one of the studies on retention prediction, the other relating retention to the contribution of analytes to partition coefficients. Related methods have been used to compare analytes and their interaction properties. The final group of chapters investigates methods for the comparison of mobile and stationary phases not just by using a simple solvent strength parameter but by examining the comparative interaction of the phases to different types of analytes either in terms of their shapes or physical properties.

Bringing these chapters together enables the different approaches to be compared and illustrates the values of each. Hopefully, this will stimulate further research or different approaches for this is by no means the full description of the mechanism of retention. Much more still needs to be done, in particular to understand how complex molecules behave. In this case, the chromatographic behaviour of the analyte under different conditions may itself provide valuable information about the physical properties of the analyte.

I would like to thank many of the contributors for useful and interesting discussion of their work and the stimulation it has provided for our own studies. I would also thank my research and project students at Loughborough University of Technology, who have contributed to our own studies in this field. In the same way that their individual contributions have together built our overall study, so I hope that the chapters of this book will contribute to an overall greater understanding of the retention process in liquid chromatography.

*Roger M. Smith*  
May 1994

## *List of Contributors*

- M. BOGUSZ *Institut für Rechtsmedizin, Medizinische Fakultät, Rheinisch-Westfälische Technische Hochschule Aachen, Pauwelsstrasse 30, D-5100, Germany*
- A. BOLCK *Faculty of Mathematics and Natural Sciences, University Centre for Pharmacy, University of Groningen, Antonius Deusinglaan 2, 9713 AW Groningen, The Netherlands*
- P. JANDERA *Department of Analytical Chemistry, University of Pardubice, Faculty of Chemical Technology, Nám. Legií 565, 532 10 Pardubice, Czech Republic*
- P. KURONEN *Department of Chemistry, P.O. Box 6 (Vuorikatu 20), University of Helsinki, FIN-00014 Helsinki, Finland*
- J.J. PESEK *Department of Chemistry, San Jose State University, San José, CA 95192-0101, USA*
- L.C. SANDER *Chemical Science and Technology Laboratory, Organic Analytical Research Division, National Institute of Standards and Technology, Gaithersburg, MD 20899-0001, USA*
- A.K. SMILDE *Laboratory for Analytical Chemistry, Nieuwe Achtergracht 166, 1018 WV Amsterdam, The Netherlands*
- R.M. SMITH *Department of Chemistry, Loughborough University of Technology, Loughborough, Leicestershire, LE11 3TU, UK*
- K. VALKÓ *Department of Physical Sciences, Wellcome Research Laboratories, Langley Court, Beckenham, Kent, BR3 3BS, UK*
- S.D. WEST *North American Environmental Chemistry Laboratory, Dow-Elanco, P.O. Box 68955, 9410 Zionsville Road, Indianapolis, IN 46268-1053, USA*
- E.J. WILLIAMSEN *Department of Chemistry, San Jose State University, San José, CA 95192-0101, USA*
- S.A. WISE *Chemical Science and Technology Laboratory, Organic Analytical Research Division, National Institute of Standards and Technology, Gaithersburg, MD 20899-0001, USA*



This Page Intentionally Left Blank

## CHAPTER 1

# *Retention prediction based on molecular structure*

Roger M. Smith

*Department of Chemistry, Loughborough University of Technology, Loughborough,  
Leicestershire, LE11 3TU, UK*

### 1.1 INTRODUCTION

The retention of a particular analyte in a reversed-phase liquid chromatographic system is dependent on many factors, the structure of the analyte, the nature and chemistry of the stationary phase, the composition of the mobile phase and the temperature. Some of these factors are reasonably well understood, at least on an empirical level, and chromatographers can manipulate eluent composition and even temperature to alter retentions in a predictable manner.

However, the effect of the chemical structure of the analyte on retention is probably the least well described parameter. Most chromatographers recognise the broad influence of polarity and size and their effect on hydrophobicity but not the detailed impact of the addition of a methoxyl, carboxamide or other functional group. Nor in most cases is it possible to predict the composition of the eluent required to result in a predetermined retention (capacity) factor ( $k$ ). Instead the experimental conditions to achieve a particular retention are usually selected by analogy with related compounds or from experience of analysing a wide range of samples. Most analytical methods in liquid chromatography are then refined on a trial and error basis.

However, in recent years two methods to aid the chromatographer in refining a separation have become available. The first requires no knowledge of the structure of the analyte. A computer programme, often an expert system, uses the retention factors of the components of a mixture from a gradient or isoelutotropic set of separations to propose an eluent mixture, which is predicted to provide optimal resolution or overall run times. These techniques include systems such as Drylab, PESOS, ICOS, and DIAMOND, which are based on prediction and mapping methods, and chemometric techniques, including iteration and Simplex optimization methods. These methods have been well reviewed in recent years [1–3]. Future developments are likely to see the expert systems being sup-

plemented by neural networks, which should enable them to “learn” about the properties of a particular column and instrument, before making their predictions [75].

In most assays the structure of the analyte is known and the second approach has been to predict the retention from the molecular structure. This can be carried out directly by the summation of the retention properties of the structural components or by deriving a physical property, such as the octanol–water distribution coefficient ( $\log P$ ), which can then be related to retention by comparison with analytes of known value [3]. As the structures of any impurities or metabolites in a sample are often known, it should also be possible to predict the optimum conditions for their resolution from the main components. This approach has the potential for true prediction as it can propose initial chromatographic conditions, designed from the start to achieve a particular separation. Two different but closely related aspects of this approach form the subject of this and the following chapters.

The recent literature also includes numerous papers on retention prediction which related retentions under one set of conditions with those using a different proportion of modifier or temperature. For example, changes in retention with mobile phase composition have been recently discussed by Valko *et al.* [4]. A second closely related area has been the selection of robust methods that although they may not be optimized to give the maximum resolution, nevertheless provide methods which are less susceptible to small changes in eluent composition, temperature and or different columns [5,6]. In real life situations this may be an important consideration if the method is to form part of an official method or is required for long-term studies of the stability or quality of a product. Again computer assistance has been provided for the selection of testing conditions and the evaluation of the results.

## 1.2 STRUCTURE AND RETENTION

The concept that the retention of an analyte in gas or liquid partition chromatography can be expressed as the summation of factors related to its skeleton and individual functional groups was originally proposed by Martin [7]. He suggested that the retention of a analyte can be expressed by the summation of contributions from each of the structural components, alkyl-chains, aromatic rings and functional groups. These substituent values are related to their effects on other equilibria and are recognised as examples of a linear free-energy relationship. The early work in this area on gas-liquid chromatography and thin-layer chromatography have been reviewed by Kaliszan [8,9].

These concepts have led to a wide range of studies, which have examined the effect of the different substituents on the retention of an analyte in liquid chromatography. These quantitative structure–retention relationships (QSRR) studies have encompassed physical properties, topological indices, and additive functions and have been reviewed in detail [8–12]. Similar concepts have long been used for the prediction and calculation of octanol–water partition coefficients ( $\log P$ ) in quantitative structure-activity relationship (QSAR) studies which are important in relating biological activity to structural features. Hansch and Leo [13] have shown that the  $\log P$  can be calculated by the summation of a value for a parent compound with contributions for each substituent ( $\pi$  constants) and a

similar approach based on fragmental ( $f$ ) constants has been used by Rekker [14]. There is often a good correlation between the octanol-water partition coefficients and chromatographic retention and numerous studies have used HPLC techniques to measure effective  $\log P$  values [10,12,15]. The technique works well if a group of analytes are structurally related but compounds of different structural types may show a poorer correlation.

However, comparatively relatively little use has been made of the  $\pi$  or  $f$  constants to calculate  $\log P$  values for retention prediction. In a series of studies, Jinno and Kawasaki [16–18] predicted the retention factors of alkylbenzenes and substituted aromatic compounds. More recently, the relationship has been used by Valko and co-workers [19] as the basis of a retention prediction system (see Chapter 2). This work has formed the basis of a computer program, which also incorporates the ability to handle partially ionized analytes. Some of the advantages and limitations of this method have recently been evaluated by Fekete *et al.* [20].

An alternative approach for the prediction of retentions in liquid chromatography is to use the summation of retention increments, which have been determined by comparison of substituted and unsubstituted analytes. These can be expressed either as functional group contributions (Section 1.2.1) or retention index increments (Sections 1.3–1.5). This approach has also been examined in other branches of chromatography. Peng *et al.* [21] have examined the prediction of the retention indices of analytes, based on their molecular structure on an apolar column in gas chromatography. The number of atoms, the aromatic increment and the group retention functions (GRF) were all important. They used a combination of the number of carbon atoms, carbon atom equivalents, and group retention factors for substituents and functional groups. They took into account the effects of rings, *iso* and *neo*-carbons and found that predicted and experimental values were within  $\pm 3\%$ . In a second paper, they examined these effects for separations on polar columns [22]. A similar approach has also been reported by Evans and co-workers [23] based on the molecular weights and selectivity indices of the analytes.

### 1.2.1 Chromatographic functional group contributions

A frequently applied approach, to relate retention to changes in structure, has been the functional group contribution ( $\tau$ ) to the logarithm of the retention factor. The values of  $\tau$  are determined by comparison of the retention of substituted analytes with the corresponding unsubstituted analyte (Eq. 1.1).

$$\tau_x = \log k_{R-X} - \log k_{R-H} \quad (1.1)$$

The measurement and application of group contributions have been comprehensively reviewed by Smith [24]. The magnitude of the contributions for individual functional groups differ with the eluent composition and their magnitude usually decreases significantly with increased organic modifier. The contributions also differ with different organic modifiers in the mobile phase. However, these parameters have not been widely used for retention prediction because few studies have examined the relationship between mobile phase composition and the magnitude of the contribution. The contributions were

frequently deliberately extrapolated to 100% water as the eluent to give composition independent values ( $\tau_0$ ), which were then compared with other physical parameters.

Probably the most widely investigated functional group change in retention with structure is the methylene group contribution. Numerous studies of homologous series [24] have shown that there is a systematic change in the logarithm of the retention factor with the carbon number. This change is usually similar for all homologous series, irrespective of the other groups present. For example, Figge and co-workers [25] reported a constant change for a series of homologous analytes, *n*-alkanes, *n*-alkenes, *n*-alkylbenzenes, fatty acid methyl esters, alkan-3-ones, 2-*n*-alkyl-pyridines, 1-*n*-alkanols. This relationship also forms the basis of most retention index series and is discussed further in Chapter 3.

A difficulty with many of the retention studies, such as the functional group contributions, which are based on retention factors ( $k$ ), is that the increments are very dependent of the experimental conditions, such as temperature and the eluent composition. Frequently these have not been closely controlled and the resulting retention values are often unique to that individual system of mobile phase and column. Many of these problems of reproducibility and transferability between systems can be overcome by using relative retention measurements, such as retention indices (see Chapter 3). A retention index scale effectively compares the increment for a functional group with the corresponding methylene increment in the same system. Both should be similarly affected by the small changes in the strength of the eluent and by temperature, so that retention index based group contributions should be almost independent of the eluent composition and of the make of stationary phase. Unless there are changes in the relative interactions between the methylene or other functional groups and the stationary phase, the retention increments should be largely independent of the brand of stationary phase and carbon loading of the columns, even though these differences can significantly effect retention factors ( $k$ ).

### 1.2.2 Related prediction studies

In an extensive series of studies, Jandera has examined the description of the interaction of an analyte in terms of lipophilicity ( $n_{ce}$ ) and polarity interaction indices ( $q$ ). The values of these terms for a number of functional groups have been determined by comparison with the retentions of the homologous *n*-alkylbenzenes. This work has been recently reviewed [26] and is described in more detail in Chapters 7 and 8.

Galusko proposed that it should be possible to predict the retention of a compound based on the summation of the effects of the bond dipoles and partial molar volumes of the substituents [27]. This system has now been developed into ChromDream, a computer-based prediction system [28]. Their model is based on a two-layer continuum model of reversed-phase chromatography and the differences in molecular solvation energies in the two phases. The retention of an analyte is described by Eq. (1.2), in which  $V_i$  are the increments of the partial molar volume fragments in water and  $G_{e,s,j,H_2O}$  are the increments of energy of interaction of bond dipoles with water.  $a$ ,  $b$  and  $c$  are the parameters of the reversed-phase system and depend on the column and phase ratio and are characteristic of the stationary layer and mobile phase.

$$\ln k_x = a(\sum_i V_i)^{2/3} + b(\sum_j \Delta G_{e.s.j,H_2O}) + c \quad (1.2)$$

The values of  $a$ ,  $b$  and  $c$  for a particular separation system have to be determined by using reference compounds. The parameters  $a$  and  $b$  are related to differences in the surface tension and dielectric permeability of the sorbent surface layer and mobile phase, respectively, and can be related to differences between stationary phases. The programme gave accurate predictions over a range of eluent composition for a wide range of aromatic analytes. However, the model does not take stereochemical and intramolecular interactions into account and discrepancies were found for *ortho*-disubstituted analytes.

A common approach for retention correlation has been to relate a range of physical parameters related to structure, such as shape and connectivity parameters, to retention factors using multivariate analysis [9,10]. The resulting regression equations can then be used for retention prediction. However, although the correlations are frequently excellent, the addition of new model compounds to the data set will often markedly change the coefficients and even cause the significant terms to change. Thus although the regressions can "predict" the retention of analytes that are included in the original model data set, they frequently fail to predict accurate retentions for new compounds. A conceptual problem is that there is often no clear connection between the properties that are used as terms in the regression and structural or physical properties, which are generally accepted as being significant in liquid chromatography. The correlation may be valid but only because the parameters are also indirectly related to a parameter of relevance. This purely chemometric approach has been reviewed [9,11] but the real prediction power appears to be limited.

### 1.3 FUNCTIONAL GROUP EFFECTS ON RETENTION INDICES

Retention indices, which are determined by logarithmic interpolation between the retention factors of a series of homologous standards, provide a reproducible mode of retention measurement (Chapter 3). They can form the basis of reliable and transferable retention comparisons. In comparison to functional group contributions, they are more independent of the eluent composition and stationary phase. Functional group or substituent increments ( $I_{S,X}$ ) can be determined as the differences between the retention index of a parent compound ( $I_{R-H}$ ) and those of substituted derivatives ( $I_{R-X}$ ) (Eq. 1.3).

$$I_{S,X} = I_{R-X} - I_{R-H} \quad (1.3)$$

As the functional group index increments are not related to the absolute retention times but to the methylene group contribution ( $I_{S,CH_2} = 100$ ) by definition) they should be largely independent of eluent composition. If interactions occur between multiple substituents, the differences between the simple summation of the contributions from the individual groups and the experimental retention index value, are defined as the interaction index  $I_i$ .

Because of the range of polarities of analytes in HPLC, a number of different retention index scales have become established ([29], Chapter 3). The most frequently employed scales have often also been used for retention prediction. As each scale is based on the methylene increment, the results should be equivalent but small differences might be ex-

pected from changes in separation conditions. The *n*-alkanes and *n*-alkylbenzenes are both highly retained and have been used for non-polar analytes (Section 1.3.1). The alkyl aryl ketones (Section 1.4) cover a wide range of polar and non-polar analytes and have formed the basis of a major prediction study (Section 1.4). The more rapidly eluted alkan-2-ones have been used primarily for the prediction of drugs and their metabolites (Section 1.3.2). Although the 1-nitroalkanes have a similar polarity, no prediction studies have been carried out with these standards. Some prediction work has used a retention index scale based on standards with increasing numbers of aromatic rings (Section 1.5).

### 1.3.1 Retention prediction based on *n*-alkanes and *n*-alkylbenzenes

Morishita *et al.* [30] determined the retention index increments for four aryl substituents using the *n*-alkane scale (Table 1.1a). The values of the increments reflected the expected hydrophobicities, although the methyl group increment ( $\delta I = 89.3$ ) was lower than the nominal value for a methylene group ( $\delta I = 100$ ) and may have reflected hyperconjugation with the ring. The relative magnitudes of the increments corresponds to those obtained in later studies on the alkyl aryl ketone scale [31].

They also studied the interactions between two substituents on the aromatic ring, by measuring the difference between the experimental indices and the calculated values obtained by the summation of substituent increments (Table 1.1b). The increments for inter-

TABLE 1.1

SUBSTITUENT AND INTERACTION INCREMENTS OF RETENTION INDICES BASED ON THE *n*-ALKANE SCALE

(a) Substituent increment  $\delta I_X = I_{Ar-X} - I_{Ar-H}$ . For comparison, substituent index  $I_{S,Ar-X}$  values are given from the regression equations based on alkyl aryl ketone retention index scale [31]

Functional group	Substituent increment ( $\delta I_X$ )	$I_{S,Ar-X}$ [31]
CH <sub>3</sub>	89.3	104
NO <sub>2</sub>	-61.9	-87
OH	-195.7	-290
NH <sub>2</sub>	-213.6	-302

(b) Interaction increments between substituents on an aromatic ring. Calculated as the differences between experimental retention index and summed index values for substituents and parent

Groups		Interaction increment ( $\delta I_{I,X-Y}$ )		
X	Y	2-Y	3-Y	4-Y
CH <sub>3</sub>	CH <sub>3</sub>	-12.7	3.7	5.0
CH <sub>3</sub>	OH	-11.1	-24.5	-24.1
CH <sub>3</sub>	NH <sub>2</sub>	-24.7	-24.3	-23.5
CH <sub>3</sub>	NO <sub>2</sub>	-27.4	-2.5	-19.2
NH <sub>2</sub>	NO <sub>2</sub>	140.8	84.5	48.8

Based on Morishita and co-workers [30]. Conditions: column, Partisil ODS-3; eluent, methanol-water (70:30).

actions between methyl groups were small ( $\delta I = -13$  to  $5$ ) but between amino and nitro groups much larger changes were observed. The *ortho*-nitro substituent ( $\delta I = 141$ ) on aniline had a major effect and increased the retention by considerably more than the *meta*- or *para*-substituents ( $\delta I = 85$  and  $49$ , respectively) suggesting that hydrogen-bonding was occurring between the *ortho*-groups. Using the index increments for the substituents and interactions, they calculated the predicted retention indices for a number of trisubstituted aromatic compounds and found a good correspondence with experimental values. The deviations were between  $-14$  and  $+10$  units; for example, 3,5-dimethylaniline  $I_{\text{calc}} = 163$  and  $I_{\text{obs}} = 166$ ; 2-methyl-4-nitroaniline,  $I_{\text{calc}} = 79$  and  $I_{\text{obs}} = 80$ .

A similar approach was subsequently used in a study of sulphur compounds by Möckel [32]. He compared the retention of a series of homologous thiols and alcohols with the corresponding alkanes and determined the retention index increments for the replacement of a methylene group by a hydroxyl (OH) group ( $-510$  to  $-519$ ) or thiol (SH) groups ( $-180$  to  $-206$ ) (the values increased slightly with chain length) using methanol-water (70:30). Slightly confusingly, the retention indices of the parent compounds in this paper were based on the number of non-hydrogen skeletal atoms (C plus S) so that the replacement increment for the thiol group in heptylthiol ( $I = 599$ ) was calculated as  $599 - 800 [(C_7 + S) \times 100 = -201]$ . These replacement values correspond to substituent increments for hydroxyl of  $I_{\text{OH}} = -410$  to  $-419$  units and for thiol of  $I_{\text{SH}} = -80$  to  $-106$  units. Thioethers (R-S-R) had retentions similar to the monothiols. The increments for the hydroxyl group were similar to those found later for the aliphatic hydroxyl ( $I_{\text{S, R-OH}} = -362$  in methanol-buffer (50:50), see Table 1.7) using the alkyl aryl ketone scale.

The retentions of the alkylpolysulphides (R-S<sub>n</sub>-R) were also examined [32]. When a methylene group in tetradecane ( $I = 1400$ ) was replaced by a sulphur atom to give hexyl-heptyl sulphide ( $I = 1060$ ) the retention decreased markedly. A second replacement by a sulphur atom gave dihexyl disulphide with a similar retention but as the proportion of sulphur atoms in the chain was increased further, the polarity decreased to eventually give dipropyl octasulphide ( $I = 1259$ ) and dimethyl dodecasulphide ( $I = >1400$ ). These changes were explained as the initial formation of a local polar centre and then an increase in retention as the non-polar polysulphide replaced the methylene groups.

In subsequent studies, Möckel and co-workers [33] determined the coefficients, which related the retention indices of homologous analytes to the number of carbon atoms ( $n_{\text{C}}$ ) (Eq. 1.4).

$$I_{\text{K}} = A + Bn_{\text{C}} \quad (1.4)$$

They used these values to demonstrate that for most homologues the change ( $B$ ) in the retention index on the  $n$ -alkane scale on the addition of a methylene group was close to 100 units. However, smaller values were found for Ph-(CH<sub>2</sub>)<sub>n</sub>-Ph (88.99 units) and R-S<sub>9</sub>-R (78.84 units). The  $A$  term indicated the effect of the functional group. A comparison of the saturated and unsaturated hydrocarbons suggested that the addition of an olefinic group increased retention by 61.85 units but an acetylene group decreased retention markedly ( $A = -265.96$ ). These increments were translated into "chromatographic free energy" changes. They also found a linear relationship for each series between retention index and calculated total surface area. In a subsequent study [34] they reported the cor-