



Title	Prediction of Relative Retention Value of the Individual Molecular Species of Diacyl Glycerolipid on High Performance Liquid Chromatography
Author(s)	TAKAHASHI, Koretaro; HIRANO, Tsugihiko
Citation	北海道大學水産學部研究彙報, 38(4), 398-404
Issue Date	1987-11
Doc URL	http://hdl.handle.net/2115/23976
Type	bulletin (article)
File Information	38(4)_P398-404.pdf



[Instructions for use](#)

Prediction of Relative Retention Value of the Individual Molecular Species of Diacyl Glycerolipid on High Performance Liquid Chromatography

Koretaro TAKAHASHI* and Tsugihiko HIRANO**

Abstract

The relative retention value of the individual molecular species of acetyldiglyceride derived from phosphatidylcholine on reverse phase high performance liquid chromatography was considered to be dependant principally on the addition theorem of chemical potentials of the two fatty acid residues.

It was demonstrated that the chemical potential of each fatty acid residue is equivalent to the relative retention potential of each fatty acid residue; and that the addition of the relative retention potentials of the two fatty acid residues denoted the logarithm of the relative retention value, the relative retention time of each individual molecular species of acetyldiglyceride.

Martin formulated the formulae¹⁾:

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta\mu_B/R \cdot T &= \Delta\mu_A/R \cdot T + \Delta\mu_X/R \cdot T & [1] \\ \log(\alpha_B/\alpha_A) &= \Delta\mu_X/R \cdot T & [2]\end{aligned}$$

where A and B are members of a homologous series differing by the functional group X ; $\Delta\mu_X$ is the difference in chemical potential of the group X in the chromatographic system. R is the gas constant; and T is the absolute temperature. If we consider α_A as the partition coefficient of the standard molecular species and α_B as the partition coefficient of each molecular species, α_B/α_A will correspond to the relative retention value, the relative retention time (RRT) of each molecular species. So from formula [2],

$$\log(\alpha_B/\alpha_A) = \log RRT = \Delta\mu_X/R \cdot T$$

should hold. Under most of the chromatographic system, T is constant. Therefore, $1/R \cdot T$ will also be constant.

$$\therefore \log RRT \propto \Delta\mu_X \quad [3]$$

From the aforementioned aspect, formula [1] can be rewritten as follows:

$$\Delta\mu_B = \Delta\mu_A + \Delta\mu_X \quad [4]$$

This formula [4] can be expanded to cover

$$\Delta\mu_{DG} = \Delta\mu_{FA_1} + \Delta\mu_{FA_2} \quad [5]$$

where DG is the diacylglycerolipid and FA_1 and FA_2 are the fatty acid residues of DG . From formulae [3], [4] and [5],

* Laboratory of Food Chemistry I, Faculty of Fisheries, Hokkaido University
(北海道大学水産学部食品化学第一講座)

** Hitachi Hokkai Semiconductor Ltd.
(日立北海セミコンダクタ函館工場)

$$\log RRT_{DG} = \log RRT_{FA_1} + \log RRT_{FA_2} \quad [6]$$

can be obtained. So by calculating the relative retention potential of the individual fatty acid residue, it is possible to predict the relative retention value ($\equiv RRT$) of the individual molecular species of *DG*.

This idea was demonstrated by comparing the theoretically determined relative retention potential of the individual molecular species of *DG* and also the empirically determined one.

Methods

The *RRT* data of acetyldiglyceride^{2,3}, obtained by acetylation subsequent to phospholipase C hydrolysis of soybean phosphatidylcholine (PC), egg yolk PC, and PC from five kinds of fish muscle were reviewed. The relative retention potential of each fatty acid residue of the acetyldiglyceride, i.e., the *DG*, was calculated as follows:

From the identified monoacid *DG* molecular species,

$$\log RRT_{FA} = (\log RRT_{DG}) / 2 \quad [7]$$

and from the identified diacid *DG* molecular species,

$$\begin{array}{l} \log RRT_{FA_1} = \log RRT_{DG} - \log RRT_{FA_2} \\ \text{(Unknown)} \qquad \qquad \qquad \text{(Known)} \end{array} \quad [8]$$

or,

$$\begin{array}{l} \log RRT_{FA_2} = \log RRT_{DG} - \log RRT_{FA_1} \\ \text{(Unknown)} \qquad \qquad \qquad \text{(Known)} \end{array} \quad [9]$$

The theoretically determined relative retention potential of the individual *DG* molecular species that denotes $\log RRT_{DG} = \log RRT_{FA_1} + \log RRT_{FA_2}$ (each term is calculated from formulae [7], [8] and [9]) was compared with the empirically determined one.

The "Q" value examination proposed by Dean and Dixon⁴) was employed in order to minimize the error of *RRT*.

Results

Table 1 shows the theoretically determined relative retention potential of each fatty acid residue of the *DGs* that have been reviewed^{2,3}. For example, from the *RRT* data^{2,3}) of (22:6)(22:6), that is, 44.1, 44.2, 44.3, 44.6, 46.2, all of these could be employed for the mean value calculation according to the "Q" value examination⁴). In this case, the mean value of *RRT* would become 44.6 and the relative retention potential of 22:6 fatty acid residue was calculated as $(\log 44.6) / 2 = 0.8247$ (See formula [7]). In the same way, the relative retention potential of 20:5 fatty acid residue was calculated as $(\log 37.3) / 2 = 0.7859$, therefore, the relative retention potential of (20:5)(22:6) can be predicted as $0.8247 + 0.7859 = 1.611$. The actual relative retention potential of (20:5)(22:6) was 1.613, as shown in Table 2. The relative error of the retention potential will be $(1.613 - 1.611) / 1.611 = 0.12\%$ in case of (20:5)(22:6). A retention potential of 16:0 was calculated as follows. The mean value of the *RRT* of (16:0)(20:5) was 92.7^{2,3}); and, the relative retention potential of this molecular species was $\log 92.7 = 1.967$. Accordingly, from

Table 1. Relative retention potential of the fatty acid residues of acetyldiglyceride on reverse phase high performance liquid chromatography.*

Fatty acid residue	Relative retention potential	Fatty acid residue	Relative retention potential
14:0	1.023	16:2	0.8670
15:0	1.102	17:2	0.9850
16:0	1.181	18:2 ω 6	0.9757
17:0	1.229	18:3 ω 3	0.8580
18:0	1.347	20:4 ω 6	0.9090
20:0	1.484	22:4	1.027
16:1 ω 9	0.9985	20:5 ω 3	0.7859
17:1	1.081	22:5	0.9261
18:1 ω 9	1.142	22:6 ω 3	0.8247
20:1	1.313		
24:1	1.638		

* Relative retention time of (16:0)(22:6) is regarded as 100. Equipment, Hitachi 638-50; Shodex RI monitor; column, LiChrosorb RP-18 (250×8 mm; tandem); solvent, isopropanol/acetone/methanol/acetonitrile (1:1:3:4, v/v); flow, 1.5 ml/min; column temperature, ambient.

formula [8], the relative retention potential of 16:0 can be calculated as $1.967 - 0.7859 = 1.181$. Incidentally, the relative retention potential of (16:0)(22:6) can be predicted as $1.181 + 0.8247 = 2.006$ and the actual relative retention potential of (16:0)(22:6) was 2.000 (See Table 2). All of the relative retention potentials of the fatty acid residues in Table 1 were calculated in the same manner. From the calculated retention potential of the fatty acid residues shown in Table 1, the relative retention potential of the individual molecular species of *DG* was theoretically predicted and it was compared with the empirically determined one as shown in Table 2. Though there are small errors between the theoretically determined retention potential and the empirically determined one, the validity of this idea is well demonstrated.

Discussion

As it is obvious from the theory of Martin¹⁾, formulae [1] and [2] should hold for all of the partition chromatographic systems. It then follows that formulae [6], [7], [8] and [9] should also hold for all of the partition chromatographic systems of *DG* lipid molecular species regardless of the analytical condition employed for the chromatography. By introducing the *RRT* data of the dinitrobenzoyl derivatives from PC presented by Takamura *et al.*⁵⁾ and Kito *et al.*⁶⁾, instead of the acetyl derivatives that have been discussed in this study, it was also demonstrated that the theoretically determined relative retention potential of this derivative coincides well with the empirically determined one as shown in Table 3. This shows that not only

TAKAHASHI & HIRANO: Prediction of glycerolipid on HPLC

Table 2. Comparison of the predicted and the empirically determined relative retention potential of the individual molecular species of acetyldiglyceride.*

Molecular species of acetyldiglyceride	Predicted relative retention potential	Empirically determined relative retention potential	Relative error (%)
(20:5)(20:5)	1.572	1.572	**
(20:5)(22:6)	1.611	1.613	0.12
(22:6)(22:6)	1.649	1.649	**
(18:3)(22:6)	1.683	1.688	0.30
(20:4)(20:5)	1.695	1.719	1.42
(22:5)(20:5)	1.712	1.712	**
(20:4)(22:6)	1.734	1.722	0.69
(22:5)(22:6)	1.751	1.746	0.29
(18:2)(20:5)	1.762	1.788	1.48
(16:1)(20:5)	1.784	1.784	**
(18:2)(22:6)	1.800	1.825	1.39
(14:0)(20:5)	1.809	1.809	**
(16:1)(22:6)	1.823	1.824	0.01
(18:2)(18:3)	1.834	1.848	0.76
(20:4)(22:5)	1.835	1.869	1.85
(14:0)(22:6)	1.848	1.843	0.27
(22:4)(22:6)	1.852	1.852	**
(22:5)(22:5)	1.852	1.894	2.27
(18:2)(20:4)	1.885	1.917	1.70
(15:0)(20:5)	1.888	1.891	0.16
(17:2)(20:4)	1.894	1.894	**
(18:2)(22:5)	1.906	1.900	0.05
(17:1)(22:6)	1.906	1.906	**
(16:1)(20:4)	1.908	1.918	0.52
(17:2)(22:5)	1.911	1.895	0.84
(16:1)(22:5)	1.925	1.900	1.30
(15:0)(22:6)	1.927	1.927	**
(18:1)(20:5)	1.928	1.945	0.88
(14:0)(22:5)	1.949	1.915	1.74
(18:2)(18:2)	1.951	1.981	1.54
(18:1)(22:6)	1.966	1.966	**
(16:0)(20:5)	1.967	1.967	**
(16:1)(18:2)	1.974	2.000	1.32
(18:1)(18:3)	1.999	1.999	**
(14:0)(18:2)	1.999	2.000	0.05
(16:0)(22:6)	2.006	2.000	0.29
(16:0)(18:3)	2.039	2.030	0.88
(16:0)(16:2)	2.048	2.048	**
(18:1)(20:4)	2.051	2.064	0.29
(17:0)(22:6)	2.053	2.067	0.68

Table 2 (continued).

Molecular species of acetyldiglyceride	Predicted relative retention potential	Empirically determined relative retention potential	Relative error (%)
(18 : 1)(22 : 5)	2.068	2.067	0.05
(16 : 0)(20 : 4)	2.090	2.090	**
(20 : 1)(20 : 5)	2.099	2.098	0.05
(16 : 0)(22 : 5)	2.107	2.080	1.28
(18 : 1)(18 : 2)	2.117	2.137	0.94
(18 : 0)(20 : 5)	2.133	2.137	0.19
(20 : 1)(22 : 6)	2.138	2.138	**
(18 : 1)(16 : 1)	2.140	2.137	0.14
(16 : 0)(18 : 2)	2.157	2.148	0.42
(14 : 0)(18 : 1)	2.165	2.155	0.46
(18 : 0)(22 : 6)	2.172	2.172	**
(16 : 0)(16 : 1)	2.179	2.172	0.32
(18 : 0)(18 : 3)	2.205	2.184	0.95
(17 : 0)(18 : 2)	2.204	2.204	**
(16 : 0)(22 : 4)	2.208	2.126	3.71
(15 : 0)(18 : 1)	2.244	2.245	0.04
(18 : 0)(20 : 4)	2.256	2.254	0.09
(16 : 0)(17 : 1)	2.262	2.245	0.75
(18 : 1)(18 : 1)	2.283	2.281	0.09
(18 : 2)(20 : 1)	2.289	2.274	0.66
(16 : 0)(18 : 1)	2.323	2.321	0.09
(14 : 0)(20 : 1)	2.336	2.335	≒0
(16 : 0)(16 : 0)	2.362	2.328	1.44
(18 : 0)(22 : 4)	2.374	2.283	3.83
(24 : 1)(20 : 5)	2.424	2.424	**
(18 : 2)(20 : 0)	2.460	2.460	**
(18 : 0)(18 : 1)	2.489	2.480	0.36
(16 : 0)(20 : 1)	2.494	2.480	0.56

* Relative retention time of (16 : 0)(22 : 6) is regarded as 100.

Analytical conditions are the same as in Table 1.

** Relative retention potentials of the fatty acid residues shown in Table 1 are calculated from the log RRTs of these molecular species as explained in the text.

chromatographic conditions such as the column, the solvents, the analytical temperature (as long as it is constant), but also the type of derivative does not matter for the proposed idea, while the value itself of the relative retention potential of each fatty acid residue has to be calculated each time for each chromatographic condition.

The idea proposed in this study can be expanded to cover the partition chromatographic system of triglyceride. This will be reported at a later date.

TAKAHASHI & HIRANO: Prediction of glycerolipid on HPLC

Table 3. Comparison of the predicted and the empirically determined relative retention potential of the individual molecular species of dinitrobenzoyl derivative of diacylglycerolipid i.e. diglyceride (DG).*

	Molecular species of dinitrobenzoyl derivative of DG	Predicted relative retention potential	Empirically determined relative retention potential	Relative error (%)
A	(16:1)(22:6)	2.080	2.090	0.49
	(18:1)(22:6)	2.225	2.225	**
	(16:1)(16:1)	2.238	2.238	**
	(16:0)(22:6)	2.243	2.243	**
	(18:1)(22:4)	2.414	2.405	0.37
	(16:0)(22:4)	2.431	2.431	**
	(18:1)(18:1)	2.529	2.529	**
	(16:0)(18:1)	2.547	2.555	0.33
	(16:0)(16:0)	2.564	2.583	0.73
B	(16:1)(20:5)	2.190	2.190	**
	(18:2)(20:5)	2.210	2.223	0.60
	(16:1)(22:6)	2.241	2.230	0.47
	(18:2)(22:6)	2.260	2.260	**
	(16:0)(20:5)	2.305	2.305	**
	(18:1)(20:5)	2.305	2.305	**
	(16:0)(22:6)	2.356	2.356	≐0
	(16:0)(16:0)	2.534	2.534	**
C	(18:2)(18:2)	2.243	2.243	**
	(16:0)(20:4)	2.332	2.332	**
	(18:1)(18:2)	2.394	2.389	0.18
	(18:0)(20:4)	2.490	2.490	≐0
	(18:1)(18:1)	2.544	2.544	**
	(16:0)(18:1)	2.564	2.566	0.09
	(18:0)(18:2)	2.571	2.571	**
	(16:0)(16:0)	2.583	2.583	**

* Relative retention time of (12:0)(12:0) is regarded as 100.

** Relative retention potentials of the fatty acid residues are calculated from the log RRTs of these molecular species.

A: Calculated from the data of Takamura *et al.*⁵⁾

Equipment, Hitachi 655-15; Hitachi 638-41 UV monitor; column, Ultrasphere ODS (250 × 4.6 mm); solvent, acetonitrile/isopropanol (4:1, v/v); flow, 1.0 ml/min; column temperature, 25°C.

B: Same condition as A except that the solvent system used is methanol/isopropanol (95:5, v/v).

C: Calculated from the data of Kito *et al.*⁵⁾

Same condition as A though the analyzed date is different.

Acknowledgment

Thanks are due to Professors M. Hatano, T. Takagi and K. Takama for their advices.

References

- 1) Martin, A.J.P. (1950). Some theoretical aspects of partition chromatography. *Biochem. Soc. Symposia*, (Cambridge, England), 3, 4-20.
- 2) Takahashi, K., Hirano, T., Takama, K. and Zama, K. (1982). Molecular species of fish muscle lecithin. *Bull. Japan. Soc. Sci. Fish.*, 48, 1803-1814.
- 3) Takahashi, K. (1985). A novel approach for the identification of lipid molecular species. Application of high performance liquid chromatography on fish muscle lecithin molecular species analysis. *Mem. Fac. Fish. Hokkaido Univ.*, 32, 245-330.
- 4) Dean, R.B. and Dixon, W.J. (1951). Simplified statistics for small numbers of observations. *Anal. Chem.*, 23, 636-638.
- 5) Takamura, H., Narita, H., Urade, R. and Kito, M. (1986). Quantitative analysis of polyenoic phospholipid molecular species by high performance liquid chromatography. *Lipids*, 21, 356-361.
- 6) Kito, M., Takamura, H., Narita, H. and Urade, R. (1985). A sensitive method for quantitative analysis of phospholipid molecular species by high performance liquid chromatography. *J. Biochem.*, 98, 327-331.