

CRC Handbook
of
Chromatography:
Drugs

Volume IV

CRC Handbook of Chromatography: Drugs

Volume IV

Editor
Ram N. Gupta, Ph.D.
Professor

Department of Pathology
McMaster University
and

Head, Toxicology
Department of Laboratory Medicine
St. Joseph's Hospital
Hamilton, Ontario, Canada


Editors-in-Chief

Gunter Zweig, Ph.D.
President
Zweig Associates
Arlington, Virginia
(Deceased)

Joseph P. Sherma, Ph.D.
Professor of Chemistry
Lafayette College
Easton, Pennsylvania



CRC Press, Inc.
Boca Raton, Florida



Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

(Revised for volumes 3-6)

Gupta, Ram N.

CRC handbook of chromatography

Includes bibliographies and index.

1. Drugs—Analysis. 2. Chromatographic analysis

I. Gupta, Ram N. II. Sunshine, Irving.

RS189.D79 1989 615'.19015 81-10157

ISBN 0-8493-3030-0 (set)

ISBN 0-8493-3091-2 (v.3)

ISBN 0-8493-3092-0 (v.4)

ISBN 0-8493-3093-9 (v.5)

ISBN 0-8493-3094-7 (v.6)

This book represents information obtained from authentic and highly regarded sources. Reprinted material is quoted with permission, and sources are indicated. A wide variety of references are listed. Every reasonable effort has been made to give reliable data and information, but the author and the publisher cannot assume responsibility for the validity of all materials or for the consequences of their use.

All rights reserved. This book, or any parts thereof, may not be reproduced in any form without written consent from the publisher.

Direct all inquiries to CRC Press, Inc., 2000 Corporate Blvd., N.W., Boca Raton, Florida, 33431.

© 1989 by CRC Press, Inc.

International Standard Book Number 0-8493-3030-0 (set)

International Standard Book Number 0-8493-3091-2 (v.3)

International Standard Book Number 0-8493-3092-0 (v.4)

International Standard Book Number 0-8493-3093-9 (v.5)

International Standard Book Number 0-8493-3094-7 (v.6)

Library of Congress Card Number 81-10157

Printed in the United States

CRC Series in Chromatography

Editors-in-Chief

Gunter Zweig, Ph.D. and Joseph Sherma, Ph.D.

General Data and Principles

Gunter Zweig, Ph.D. and
Joseph Sherma, Ph.D.

Lipids

Helmut K. Mangold, Dr. rer. nat.

Hydrocarbons

Walter L. Zielinski, Jr., Ph.D.

Carbohydrates

Shirley C. Churms, Ph.D.

Inorganics

M. Qureshi, Ph.D.

Drugs

Ram Gupta, Ph.D.

Phenols and Organic Acids

Toshihiko Hanai, Ph.D.

Terpenoids

Carmine J. Coscia, Ph.D.

Amino Acids and Amines

S. Blackburn, Ph.D.

Steroids

Joseph C. Touchstone, Ph.D.

Polymers

Charles G. Smith,
Norman E. Skelly, Ph.D.,
Carl D. Chow, and Richard A. Solomon

Pesticides and Related Organic Chemicals

Joseph Sherma, Ph.D. and
Joanne Follweiler, Ph.D.

Plant Pigments

Hans-Peter Köst, Ph.D.

Nucleic Acids and Related Compounds

Ante M. Krstulovic, Ph.D.

CRC SERIES IN CHROMATOGRAPHY

SERIES PREFACE

The fat-soluble photosynthetic pigments present in plants and algae, including chlorophylls, carotenoids, and related pigments, comprise an important class of compounds with an extensive literature. Dr. Köst and his co-authors have done an admirable job in searching out and organizing much of the critical chromatographic data and methodology in the present volume.

Because of the chemical nature of these prenillipid compounds, liquid chromatography is preferred for their isolation, separation, and determination. The most widely used methods include low pressure column LC, paper chromatography, TLC, and, most recently, HPLC. All of these methods are covered by Dr. Köst.

Chromatography was "invented" in the early 1900s by Michael Tswett, a Russian botanist and plant physiologist who first applied liquid-solid chromatography on a column of chalk to resolution of the complex natural mixture of yellow and green chloroplast pigments in the extracts of leaves he was studying. On a personal note, I was fortunate to work with Dr. Harold Strain for five summers at the Argonne National Laboratory when I first began to teach. Dr. Strain was one of the first important American chromatography experts and used all variations of liquid chromatography extensively in his studies of photosynthetic pigments. My experience with Dr. Strain set the foundation for my lifelong career of research and writing in chromatography.

Readers of this Handbook are asked to contact the Series Editor if they find errors or omissions in coverage as well as with suggestions for future volumes and authors within the Handbook of Chromatography series.

Joseph Sherma

PREFACE

The phenomenal growth in the application of liquid chromatographic (LC) techniques for the determination of drugs in pharmaceutical preparations and in biological fluids has continued in the first half of this decade. In the mid to late 1970s, a large number of papers were published describing gas chromatographic (GC) procedures for the drug groups anticonvulsants and antidepressants. In the last few years, a large number of publications have appeared describing LC procedures for the same drugs.

There have been a number of improvements in the LC instrumentation and column technology. Variable wavelength absorbance detectors are now available which match fixed wavelength detectors in sensitivity. Some of these detectors allow monitoring of absorbance at multiple wavelengths. A number of manufacturers now market photo diode array absorbance detectors which allow instant absorbance scanning over a wide wavelength range of any eluting peak, check peak purity, and complement component separation by mathematical manipulation of absorbance data of incomplete chromatographic separation. There are also improvements in the design of electrochemical detectors. Multielectrode detectors are now available which require little maintenance and allow ultra-high sensitivity. Fluorescence detectors with monochromators and high energy power sources have also become available. However, use of lasers as power sources for fluorescence detectors is not yet common.

A number of manufacturers market on-line sample preparation systems, samplers allowing precolumn derivatization, and efficient postcolumn reactors. Although instrumentation for narrow bore LC is commercially available, this technique has not yet been commonly applied for the determination of drugs. There is improved quality control in the manufacture of columns. For convenience, cartridge-type columns and fittings requiring no tools have become available. Good quality silica-based columns can now be purchased at economical prices from general suppliers. However, polymer-based columns have failed to gain popularity and are relatively more expensive than silica-based columns because of limited sales.

In general, GC is now the preferred technique only when the required sensitivity is not available with an LC procedure for the determination of a particular drug. However, separation of widely different compounds is more efficiently accomplished with temperature programming GC analysis than by solvent programming LC analysis. Thus, considerable GC retention data of drugs with the use of capillary columns have been published for the identification of an unknown drug in a given matrix. However, the use of capillary columns for the determination of drugs has not been as widespread as was anticipated. The nitrogen detector is now the most widely used detector for the GC determination of drugs. Gas chromatography-mass spectrometry remains the ultimate standard to confirm the identification of an unknown drug.

There has been a further decline in the popularity of thin-layer chromatography in the past few years. In the majority of the laboratories, drugs of abuse are now screened by immunoassay for improved sensitivity and convenience.

The purpose of this handbook is to provide a reference source and summaries of different chromatographic techniques published in refereed journals during the past 6 years. When the number of publications of a given drug was numerous, only recent papers were selected, even if they described only the modification of the original key publications. Despite the size of this work, a number of publications or drugs might have been missed as the literature search was carried out manually. In some cases, copies of the required papers could not be obtained. A number of publications could not be included as they were either theoretical or did not provide information compatible with the format of this handbook.

There is a significant difference between the present volumes and Volumes I and II of this handbook. For a number of drugs, e.g., cyclosporine, the chromatographic parameters of a number of publications are identical. However, they differ in the sample preparation techniques.

Therefore, detailed summaries of extraction procedures have now been provided for comparison of the different publications for the determinations of a given drug.

I am grateful to Dr. Gillian Luxton, Head of the Clinical Chemistry Laboratory, St. Joseph's Hospital for her encouragement to accept this project and for providing all the required facilities.

Mrs. S. Rogers and Mrs. J. Maragno of this hospital library made a special effort to get copies of the published papers from different sources.

Mrs. D. Thompson, Director of the hospital pharmacy, arranged to get information from the Drug Information Center in Toronto.

Miss Maelly Lew went to different libraries to get the information in emergency situations when a paper under review would refer to earlier papers.

I thank Miss Elisa Capretta, Mrs. Mary Bruce, Miss Rhita Gilners, and Miss Abha Gupta for preparing this manuscript.

Mrs. Diane Kirshenblat provided moral support when there was a temptation to abandon the project.

I am grateful to Ms. Sandy Pearlman, Director of Editing and Mrs. Amy Skallerup, Senior Editor, CRC Press for their help during the early phases of manuscript preparation.

Mr. J. C. Richardson, Senior Coordinating Editor, had the difficult task of making this manuscript uniform within the constraints of space limitations. I thank him for his courteous response to my various suggestions and changes.

Finally, I thank my family members, who tolerated my absence for more than a year.

Ram N. Gupta
December, 1986

THE EDITORS-IN-CHIEF

Gunter Zweig, Ph.D., received his undergraduate training at the University of Maryland, College Park, where he was awarded the Ph.D. in biochemistry in 1952. Two years following his graduation, Dr. Zweig was affiliated with the late R. J. Block, pioneer in paper chromatography of amino acids. Zweig, Block, and Le Strange wrote one of the first books on paper chromatography, which was published in 1952 by Academic Press and went into three editions, the last one authored by Gunter Zweig and Dr. Joe Sherma, the co-Editor-in-Chief of this series. *Paper Chromatography* (1952) was also translated into Russian.

From 1953 to 1957, Dr. Zweig was research biochemist at the C. F. Kettering Foundation, Antioch College, Yellow Springs, Ohio, where he pursued research on the path of carbon and sulfur in plants, using the then newly developed techniques of autoradiography and paper chromatography. From 1957 to 1965, Dr. Zweig served as lecturer and chemist, University of California, Davis and worked on analytical methods for pesticide residues, mainly by chromatographic techniques. In 1965, Dr. Zweig became Director of Life Sciences, Syracuse University Research Corporation, New York (research on environmental pollution), and in 1973 he became Chief, Environmental Fate Branch, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) in Washington, D.C. From 1980 to 1984 Dr. Zweig was Visiting Research Chemist in the School of Public Health, University of California, Berkeley, where he was doing research on farmworker safety as related to pesticide exposure.

During his government career, Dr. Zweig continued his scientific writing and editing. Among his works are (many in collaboration with Dr. Sherma) the now 11-volume series on *Analytical Methods for Pesticides and Plant Growth Regulators* (published by Academic Press); the pesticide book series for CRC Press; co-editor of *Journal of Toxicology and Environmental Health*; co-author of basic review on paper and thin-layer chromatography for *Analytical Chemistry* from 1968 to 1980; co-author of applied chromatography review on pesticide analysis for *Analytical Chemistry*, beginning in 1981.

Among the scientific honors awarded to Dr. Zweig during his distinguished career were the Wiley Award in 1977, the Rothschild Fellowship to the Weizmann Institute in 1963/64; and the Bronze Medal by the EPA in 1980.

Dr. Zweig authored or co-authored over 80 scientific papers on diverse subjects in chromatography and biochemistry, besides being the holder of three U.S. patents. In 1985, Dr. Zweig became president of Zweig Associates, Consultants in Arlington, Va.

Following his death on January 27, 1987, the Agrochemicals Section of the American Chemical Society posthumously elected him a Fellow and established the Gunther Zweig Award for Young Chemists in his honor.

Joseph Sherma, Ph.D., received a B.S. in Chemistry from Upsala College, East Orange, N.J., in 1955 and a Ph.D. in Analytical Chemistry from Rutgers University in 1958, carrying on his thesis research in ion exchange chromatography under the direction of the late William Rieman III. Dr. Sherma joined the faculty of Lafayette College in September, 1958, and is presently Charles A. Dana Professor and Head of the Chemistry Department.

Dr. Sherma, independently and with others, has written over 300 research papers, chapters, books, and reviews involving chromatography and other analytical methodology. He is editor for residues and trace elements of the *Journal of the Association of Official Analytical Chemists* and a member of the advisory board of the *Journal of Planar Chromatography*. He is a consultant on analytical methodology for many companies and government agencies.

Dr. Sherma has received two awards for superior teaching at Lafayette College and the 1979 Distinguished Alumnus Award from Upsala College for outstanding achievements as an educator, researcher, author, and editor. He is a member of the ACS, Sigma Xi, Phi Lambda Upsilon, SAS, AIC, and AOAC. Dr. Sherma's current interests are in quantitative TLC, mainly applied to clinical analysis, pesticide residues, and food additives.

THE EDITOR

Ram N. Gupta, Ph.D., is Head of Toxicology in the Department of Laboratory Medicine at St. Joseph's Hospital and Professor in the Department of Pathology at McMaster University in Hamilton, Ontario, Canada.

Dr. Gupta received his M.Sc. degree in 1962 and Ph.D. degree in 1963 in Organic Chemistry from McMaster University. He continued working in the Chemistry Department of McMaster University as a Research Associate until 1971 when he moved to the Department of Pathology at the same university.

Dr. Gupta has been elected as a fellow of the Chemical Institute of Canada. He is a member of the American Chemical Society, American Association of Clinical Chemists, Canadian Society of Clinical Chemists, and the Association of Clinical Biochemists (U.K.). He is the author of more than 40 scientific publications.

His present research interests are the development of chromatographic procedures for the assay of drugs and other biochemicals in biological fluids.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Organization of Tables	1
Drug Tables	3
Index	365

ORGANIZATION OF TABLES AND EXPLANATION OF ABBREVIATIONS

Gas Chromatography (GC)

Specimen: Cerebrospinal fluid (CSF); not available (NA). The number in parenthesis refers to milliliters of plasma or serum used for the preparation of sample extract unless stated otherwise. There is no indication when volumes of other specimens are different from that of plasma or serum.

Extraction: In this column, the extraction procedure is given a number and the corresponding procedure is described at the end of the table for the extraction of plasma or serum unless indicated otherwise. Any difference in the extraction procedure of another type of specimen is not indicated.

Column: Columns are made of glass or fused silica unless noted otherwise. Length is given in meters and inner diameter in millimeters.

Packing: The number in the parenthesis shows the mesh size of the support. The film thickness of the capillary columns is given in μm and indicated by a footnote.

Gas: Gas flow, if given in units other than milliliters per minute, has been indicated by a footnote.

DET: Detector. Flame ionization detector (FID); nitrogen phosphorous detector (NPD); also, alkali flame ionization detector; thermionic sensitive detector; or nitrogen specific detector; electron capture detector (ECD); electron-impact mass spectrometer (MS-EI); chemical ionization mass spectrometer (MS-CI); negative ion chemical ionization mass spectrometer (MS-NCI). Any other detector used and the reagent gas used for chemical ionization, if different from the carrier gas, are indicated by footnotes.

RT min: Retention time in minutes of the title drug. It may be the retention time of the parent drug or its derivative. A dash “—” indicates that the title drug is not determined in the procedure under review, whereas NA indicates that the retention time is not available.

Internal Standard: The names of the compounds used as internal standards are given in full. Any abbreviation used to describe the internal standard is explained by a footnote. A dash “—” indicates that no internal standard was used in the procedure. The retention time in minutes is given in parenthesis as it appears in the chromatogram. It may be of the parent compound or its derivative. The retention time when the internal standard is an isotropically labelled drug is considered the same as of the drug itself.

Deriv: Derivative. This column indicates the type of derivative formed at some stage of the sample preparation. The details of derivatization reagent and procedure are included in the corresponding extraction procedure. A dash “—” indicates that no derivative was prepared.

Other Compounds: Metabolites of the parent drug or other similar or unrelated drugs when determined simultaneously with the title drug are listed in this column. Their retention times are given in parenthesis.

Ref: Reference.

Liquid Chromatography (LC)

This includes column liquid chromatography, high pressure liquid chromatography, and high performance liquid chromatography (see under GC for the explanation of common columns).

Column: Columns are made of steel unless noted otherwise. Length is in centimeters and inner diameter in millimeters.

Packing: Packing is described by the trade names as used by the authors. Footnotes indicate if a precolumn, a guard column, or a temperature other than ambient were used.

Elution: The eluting solvent is given a number and the corresponding solvent is described at the end of the table. The procedure is isocratic unless indicated as gradient. The conditions for gradient elution are described with the description of the elution solvent.

Flow Rate: Flow rate given in other units has been changed to milliliter per minute; a footnote indicates that only the pump pressure is given. Detector (DET); absorbance (ABS). Wavelength (nm) for absorbance detection is given. Two numbers are given when the absorbance is monitored simultaneously at two different wavelengths. A footnote indicates a programmed change of absorbance wavelength. Fluorescence (FL). The first number in the parenthesis is the excitation wavelength (nm), and the second, the emission wavelength. Other detectors are described without the use of abbreviations. Potentials for electrochemical detectors and procedures involving post-column reactors are indicated by footnotes.

Thin-Layer Chromatography (TLC)

See under GC and LC for the explanation of common columns.

Plate: Unless otherwise noted, plates are made of glass. Laboratory indicates that the plates have been coated by the authors in their laboratory.

Layer: High performance thin-layer chromatography (HPTLC).

Solvent: Developing solvent is given a number which is described at the end of the table.

Post-Separation Treatment: (sp) The plate is sprayed with the described reagent. (D) The plate is dipped in the described reagent. (E) The plate is exposed to the vapors of the described reagent.

Det: Detection. Qualitative detection is indicated as visual. Wavelength (nm) for short or long wave UV lamp is given when fluorescence or quenching of fluorescence is observed under UV light. When the plate is scanned with the densitometer for quantitative determination of drug concentration, the mode of scanning is indicated as reflectance, transmission or reflectance/transmission for simultaneous mode. Wavelength (nm) for scanning and for fluorescence scanning, the excitation (first) and emission (second) are given.

CADRALAZINE

Liquid Chromatography

Specimen (mℓ)	Extraction	Column (cm × mm)	Packing (μm)	Elution	Flow (mℓ/min)	Det. (nm)	RT (min)	Internal Standard (RT)	Other compounds (RT)	Ref.
Plasma (1)	I-1	25 × 4 6	LiChrosorb RP 8 (10) ^a	E-1	2.7	ABS (254)	5.5	CGP 24751 (13)	—	1
Plasma, urine (2, 1)	I-2	25 × 4	LiChrosorb RP-8 (10) ^{a,b}	E-2	2.7	ABS (254)	6	c (9.2)	d	2

^a Protected by a precolumn (50 × 3.2 mm) packed with Perisorb RP-8 (30 to 40 μm).

^b Column temp = 30°C.

^c N-ethyl-N-2-hydroxyethyl-(3-4,5-trimethoxy) benzamide.

^d Chromatographic separation of various metabolites is shown.

Extraction — I-1. The sample was spiked with 0.5 mℓ of the internal standard solution 1 μg/mℓ in 0.005 M sulfuric acid, diluted with 1 mℓ of water, and extracted with 6 mℓ of chloroform-ethanol (95:5, v/v). The organic layer was back extracted into 0.5 mℓ of 0.09 M KCl/HCl buffer, and 100 μℓ of the aqueous phase were injected.

I-2. The sample was spiked with 1 mℓ of the internal standard solution (621 ng/mℓ is phosphate buffer, pH 7.4), the mixture diluted to 5 mℓ with pH 7.4 phosphate buffer and extracted twice with 6 mℓ portions of chloroform. The combined organic layers were evaporated to dryness under a stream of nitrogen. The residue was reconstituted with 2 mℓ of methanol and the solution again evaporated under nitrogen. The residue was dissolved in 100 μℓ of methanol, 50 μℓ of 0.05 M sulfuric acid added and 50 μℓ of this solution were injected.

Elution — E-1. Acetonitrile-0.1 M phosphate buffer, pH 6 (15:85).

E-2. Acetonitrile-0.1 M phosphate buffer, pH 6 (15:85).

REFERENCES

1. Hauffe, S. A. and Dubois, J. P., Determination of cadralazine in human plasma and urine by high-performance liquid chromatography, *J. Chromatogr.*, 290, 223, 1984.
2. Crolla, T., Santini, F., Visconti, M., and Pifferi, G., High-performance liquid chromatographic separation of cadralazine from its potential metabolites and degradation products. Quantitation of the drug in human plasma and urine, *J. Chromatogr.*, 310, 139, 1984.

CAFFEINE

Gas Chromatography

Specimen (mℓ)	Extraction (m × mm)	Column (m × mm)	Packing (mesh)	Oven temp (°C)	Gas (mℓ/min)	Det. (min)	RT (min)	Internal standard (RT)	Deriv.	Other compounds (RT)	Ref.
Plasma (0.05)	I-1	1.5 × 2	3% SP-1000 Chromosorb W (100/120)	210	N ₂ (20)	FID	9	7-Ethyltheophylline (7.2)	—	—	1
Plasma, urine (0.02, 1)	I-2	1.8 × 2	1.8% OV-17 Chromosorb W (100/120)	240	He (30)	NPD	1.3	N-Methylphenothiazine (2.1)	—	—	2
Urine (2)	I-3	2 × 2.5	3% OV-17 Chromosorb W (NA)	195	N ₂ (25)	NPD	4.4	Mepivacaine (8.7)	—	—	3

Liquid Chromatography

Specimen (mℓ)	Extraction (cm × mm)	Column (cm × mm)	Packing (μm)	Elution	Flow (mℓ/min)	Det. (nm)	RT (min)	Internal standard (RT)	Other compounds (RT)	Ref.
Plasma, serum (0.1)	I-4	25 × 4.6	Ultrasphere-ODS (5)	E-1	1.0	ABS (254)	8.8	β-Hydroxyethyltheo- phylline (5.7)	Theophylline (5.2) Theobromine (4)	4
Blood, plasma, urine (0.1)	I-5	15 × 4.6	Perkin-Elmer-C ₁₈ (5)	E-2	NA	ABS (276)	6.8	8-Chlorotheophylline (8.8)	Dimethyluric acid (1.9) 3-Methylxanthine (2.1) 1,3-Dimethyluric acid (2.4) 3,7-Dimethylxanthine (3.8)	5
Plasma (1)	I-6	30 × 4	μ-Bondapak-C ₁₈ (10)*	E-3	1.0	ABS (273)	9	—	—	6

Plasma (0.5)	I-7	25 × 4	LiChrosorb Si 60 (5)	E-4	2.0	ABS (280)	3.5	7-Ethyltheophylline (3.0) 1,3,7-Trimethyl uric acid (12)	Theobromine (5) Theophylline (6.5) Paraxanthine (8)	7
Beans	I-8	NA	Fine Pak C ₁₈ (5)	E-5	1.2	ABS (272)	7.5	—	—	8
Plasma (0.1)	I-9	10 × 8	Radial-Pak C ₁₈ (4) ^b	E-6	2.7	ABS (273)	8	β-Hydroxyethyltheo- phylline (5.3)	Theophylline (4.6) Paraxanthine (4.1)	9
Urine (0.05)	I-10	30 × 7.5	BioGel TSK-20 (10)	E-7	0.8	ABS (254)	—	Benzoyloxyurea (41)	Theobromine (2.8) 5-Acetylamino-6- amino-3-methylura- cil (16.2)	10
Urine (0.2)	I-11	25 × 4.6	Hypersil-ODS (5)	E-8 Gra- dient	1.5	ABS (280)	16.7	Proxiphylline (18)	1-Methylxanthine (32) Uric acid (3.6) 7-Methyl uric acid (5.3) 7-Methylxanthine (6) 1-Methyl uric acid (6.8) 3-Methylxanthine (7.2) 1-Methylxanthine (8.6) 1,3-Dimethyluric acid (9.5) Theobromine (9.7) 1,7-Dimethyluric acid (12) 1,7-Dimethylxanthine (12.7) Theophylline (13.5)	11, 12

CAFFEINE (continued)

Thin-Layer Chromatography

Specimen (m ℓ)	Extraction	Plate (Manufacturer)	Layer (mm)	Solvent	Post-separation treatment	Det (nm)	Rf	Internal standard (Rf)	Other compounds (Rf)	Ref.
Plasma (1)	1:12	10 \times 20 cm; (Merck)	Silica gel F ₅₄ (0.25)	S-1	—	Visual (254)	0.67	—	Theophylline (0.57) 1,7-Dimethylxanthine (0.48)	13

^a The column was protected by a precolumn packed with Cerasil-C₁₈ (37 to 50 μ m)

^b Protected by a Guard-Pak CN cartridge

Extraction — I-1. The sample was diluted to 0.25 m ℓ with water, spiked with 100 μ ℓ solution of the internal standard (24 μ mol/ ℓ in methanol) and extracted with 2 m ℓ of chloroform. The organic layer was evaporated under a stream of nitrogen. The residue was dissolved in 25 μ ℓ chloroform-methanol (9:1) of which 20 μ ℓ was spotted on a 20 \times 20 cm silica gel 60 F₅₄ (0.25 mm) thin-layer plate. This plate was developed with ethyl acetate-methanol-ammonia (80:20:1.5) to a height of 10 cm. The caffeine and the internal standard areas were marked under UV and scraped off the plate. The scraping were quantitatively collected and eluted with 40 to 50 μ ℓ methanol-water (9:1); and 2 to 3 μ ℓ of this eluate are injected.

I-2. The sample was spiked with 50 μ ℓ of the internal standard solution (1 μ g/m ℓ in ethanol), 0.2 m ℓ of 6 M KOH and 100 mg of sodium sulfate added and the mixture extracted with 4 m ℓ of diethyl ether. The ether layer was dried over anhydrous sodium sulfate and evaporated in a stream of nitrogen. The residue was dissolved in 100 μ ℓ of ethanol and 1 μ ℓ of this solution was injected.

I-3. Urine (2 m ℓ) was made alkaline with 0.2 m ℓ of ammonia buffer, pH 9.5, 0.1 m ℓ of the internal standard solution (100 μ g/m ℓ in water) was added, and the mixture was applied to an Extrelut-1 column. After 5 min, the column was eluted with 6 m ℓ of dichloromethane-methanol (9:1). The eluate was evaporated under nitrogen at 40°C. The residue was dissolved in 0.2 m ℓ of ethyl acetate and 1 μ ℓ was injected.

I-4. The sample was mixed with 100 μ ℓ of 0.2 N HCl and 75 μ ℓ of the internal standard solution (5 μ g/m ℓ in water) and the mixture was extracted with 12 m ℓ of chloroform-2-propanol (80:20). The organic phase was evaporated at 50°C under a stream of nitrogen. The residue was reconstituted with 100 μ ℓ of mobile phase and 25 μ ℓ were injected.

I-5. The sample was mixed with 1.2 g of ammonium bicarbonate and 100 μ ℓ of the internal standard solution (20 μ g/m ℓ in 0.9% sodium chloride solution) and extracted twice with 8 m ℓ portions of chloroform-isopropanol (85:15). The combined organic extracts were evaporated under a stream of nitrogen at 50°C. The residue was reconstituted in 500 μ ℓ of the mobile phase and aliquots of 80 μ ℓ were injected with an autosampler.

I-6. The sample was treated with an equal volume of 0.15 M barium hydroxide. After mixing for 2 min, 1 m ℓ of 5% zinc sulfate was added. After mixing and centrifugation aliquots of clear supernatant were injected.

I-7. To 0.5 m ℓ of plasma were added 0.2 g of ammonium sulfate, 100 μ ℓ of an aqueous solution containing 5 nmol of 7-ethyltheophylline, and 5 nmol of 1,3,7-trimethyluric acid and the mixture was extracted with 10 m ℓ of chloroform-isopropanol (1:1, v/v). The organic layer was evaporated under a stream of nitrogen at 70°C. The residue was dissolved in 0.5 m ℓ of the mobile phase. Aliquots of this solution were injected with an autosampler.

I-8. Extraction is carried out on line with the use of a supercritical fluid extraction technique.

I-9. The sample and 0.1 mL of the internal standard solution (10 µg/mL in 0.1 M phosphate buffer, pH 4) were applied to a prewashed (2 mL methanol, 2 mL water) 1-mL Bond-Elut C₁₈ column. After standing for 1 min, the solution was drawn through the column. After 2 min, the column was washed with 2 mL of water and eluted with 400 µL of acetone. The eluate was evaporated under nitrogen at 55°C, the residue reconstituted in 150 µL of mobile phase. Aliquots of 15 µL were injected.

I-10. The urine sample (50 µL) was treated with 50 µL of 0.1 M sodium hydroxide. After 10 min at room temp, 50 µL of 0.1 M HCl and 100 µL of the internal standard solution (1 mg/mL in water) were added. An aliquot of 20 µL of this mixture was injected.

I-11. The urine sample (200 µL), 50 µL of the internal standard solution (200 mg/L in water), 200 µL of 0.1 M tetrabutyl ammonium hydrogen sulfate, and 100 µL of pH 11 buffer solution (0.1 M sodium carbonate-0.1 M sodium bicarbonate, 90:10) were vortex mixed before and after the addition of 0.5 g ammonium sulfate. The mixture was extracted by vortex-mixing with 5 mL of ethyl acetate-chloroform-isopropanol (45:45:10). The organic layer was evaporated to dryness at 45°C under a stream of air. The residue was dissolved in 500 µL of 1% tetrahydrofuran, pH 4.8 and 50 µL of this solution was injected.

I-12. The sample was forced through a Sep-Pack C₁₈ cartridge which was then washed with 5 mL of 0.1 M sodium acetate and eluted with 5 mL of acetonitrile. The elute was evaporated at 35°C. The residue was dissolved in 200 µL of acetonitrile, aliquots of which were spotted on a TLC plate. The plate was developed and visualized under short UV light.

Elution — E-1. Acetonitrile-85% phosphoric acid-water (130:0.5:870)

E-2. Acetonitrile-isopropanol-acetic acid-water (4:4:1:91)

E-3. Methanol-water (30:70)

E-4. Dichloromethane-methanol containing ammonium formate (0.2 g/100 mL) and formic acid (15 mL/100 mL) (975:25)

E-5. Methanol-water (55:45)

E-6. Methanol-1% acetic acid (17:83)

E-7. 0.1% Acetic Acid

E-8. (A) 1% Tetrahydrofuran in 10 mM acetate buffer, pH 4.8 (B) 15% Acetonitrile + 1% tetrahydrofuran in 10 mM acetate buffer, pH 4.8. Isocratic A for 5 min, stepwise gradient of 5, 10, and 2% increase in B per min; each step being pumped for 5 min.

Solvent — S-1. Dichloromethane-isopropanol-acetic acid (105:15:1)

REFERENCES

1. **Hulshoff, A.**, Determination of caffeine in small plasma samples by gas-liquid chromatography with thin-layer chromatographic sample clean-up, *Anal. Lett.*, 12, 1423, 1979.
2. **Hirai, T. and Kondo, H.**, Determination of caffeine in human plasma and urine by gas chromatography using nitrogen phosphorus-detector, *Anal. Sci.*, 1, 191, 1985.
3. **Delbeke, F. T., and Debackere M.**, Simple and rapid method for the determination of caffeine in urine using Extrelut-1 columns, *J. Chromatogr.*, 278, 413, 1983.
4. **Haughey, D. B., Greenberg, R., Schaaf, S. F., and Lima, J. J.**, Liquid chromatographic determination of caffeine in biologic fluids, *J. Chromatogr.*, 229, 387, 1982.
5. **Stavric, B., Klassen, R., and Gilbert, S. G.**, Automated high-performance liquid chromatographic assay for monitoring caffeine and its metabolites in biological fluids of monkeys consuming caffeine, *J. Chromatogr.*, 310, 107, 1984.