

Overview

• **Purpose**: To examine the total number and quality of positive lipid identifications in human whole blood samples across different MS platforms and acquisition modes, and analysis using automated software.

- Methods: Lipid extracts from technical replicate samples were analyzed by UHPLC-MS/MS using the same LC method, but different acquisition modes on a Waters Synapt G2S*i* QTOF (HDDIA [aka HDMS^E], HDDDA and DDA), and a Thermo Q-Exactive Orbitrap (DDA). Data was processed using SimLipid software.
- **Results**: The QTOF-HDDDA method resulted in the largest number of total lipid identifications, but the QTOF-DDA method resulted in the largest number of identifications with Full-Acyl IDentifications (FAID).

Introduction

Automated identifications of various lipid species are critical for untargeted or "macrolipidomic" profiling. Software can match analytical data to extensive libraries of spectra, but different instruments employing different technologies and different acquisitions modes can influence the ability to match spectra with library references. For this exercise, whole blood was examined due to its complex lipid profile and potential use of this matrix for biomarker discovery through dried blood spots.

Methods

Chemicals, Materials and Instruments

All chemicals and solvents, including chloroform, methanol, isopropanol, acetonitrile, formic acid and ammonium formate were purchased from Thermo-Fisher Scientific. The column was a Waters Aqcquity UPLC CSH C18 with dimensions 1.7um x 2.1mm x 150mm. The instruments used were a Waters Synapt G2S*i* QTOF mass spectrometer coupled to a Waters UPLC I-class system, and a Thermo Q-Exactive Orbitrap mass spectrometer coupled to a Dionex UltiMate 3000 UHPLC system.

Sample Preparation and UHPLC Settings

Lipids were extracted from the whole blood (50uL) of a healthy 26-year old male volunteer in quadruplicate using 2:1 chloroform:methanol containing 500pmol of diheptadecanoyl phosphatidylcholine as the internal standard. Extracts were dried and reconstituted in 100uL 65:35:5 isopropanol:acetonitrile:water +0.1% formic acid. The samples were analyzed using UHPLC-MS/MS on the Waters and Thermo/Dionex systems using a multi-step, reversedphase gradient consisting of A: 60:40 acetonitrile:water and B: 90:10 isopropanol:acetonitrile, both with 10mM ammonium formate and 0.1% formic acid. The flow was set at 250uL/min, the column was kept at 45°C, sample tray at 4°C, and injection volume was 10uL.

Tandem Mass Spectrometry and Data Analysis

The Waters QTOF mass spectrometer was operated in positive ESI, spray voltage 2.5kV, high-resolution mode (continuum; approx. 55,000 res in HD, 42,000 res non-HD), scan range m/z 50 \rightarrow 1000, under three different acquisition modes: 1) QTOF-HDDIA (HDMS^E) with scan frequency 0.2sec and Transfer Cell collision energy ramp $20V \rightarrow 50V$; 2) QTOF-HDDDA for top-5 ions with scan frequency 0.1sec and transfer cell collision energy ramps $20V \rightarrow 30V$ at low mass, and $30V \rightarrow 50V$ at high mass; 3) QTOF-DDA for top-5 ions with the same scan frequency and collision energy ramps as HDDDA. All QTOF-MS data was lock-mass corrected using a dedicated spray infusing leucine enkephalin (m/z 556.2771).

The Thermo Q-Exactive mass spectrometer was operated in positive ESI, spray voltage 2.5kV, 35,000 resolution in MS and 17,500 resolution in MS/MS, scan range m/z 70 \rightarrow 1000, DDA for top-5 ions and normalized collision energy of 17.5 (QE-DDA). QE-DDA MS data was lock-mass corrected using diisooctyl phthalate (m/z 391.28421).

An inclusion list was generated from the QTOF-HDDIA experiment and was used in QTOF-HDDDA, QTOF-DDA and QE-DDA experiments, which included *m/z* values for 758 precursor ions. Data analysis was completed using SimLipid software (PREMIER Biosoft, CA, USA) and Ad-Hoc analyses on peak area integration and repeatability were completed using Waters MassLynx and Thermo Xcalibur software.

Comparing Automatic Identifications in the Macrolipidomic Profiles of Human Whole Blood Across UHPLC-MS/MS Platforms and Acquisition Modes

Juan J. Aristizabal Henao¹, Ningombam Sanjib Meitei², Dan Chalil¹, Richard W. Smith³ & Ken D. Stark¹ ¹Laboratory of Nutritional Lipidomics, Department of Kinesiology, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, ON, Canada ²PREMIER Biosoft, Palo Alto, CA, USA

³University of Waterloo Mass Spectrometry Facility, Department of Chemistry, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, ON, Canada

Lipid Class	Sub Class	Acquisition Mode				_ v
		QTOF- HDDIA	QTOF- HDDDA	QTOF- DDA	QE- DDA	_ ຮຶ້ 400¬
PC	Diacylglycerophosphocholines	69	268	400	104	
PC	1-alkyl,2-acylglycerophosphocholines	38	77	114	42	a
⊃C	Monoacylglycerophosphocholines	14	17	21	14	<u></u>
⊃C	1-(1Z-alkenyl),2-acylglycerophosphocholines	7	44	67	7	ji voo
ЪС	Dialkylglycerophosphocholines	5	16	22	4	
С	1-acyl,2-(1Z-alkenyl)-glycerophosphocholines	0	4	7	1	
С	1-acyl,2-alkylglycerophosphocholines	1	2	7	0	a 200-
С	1Z-alkenylglycerophosphocholines	1	2	3	0	σ
С	Monoalkylglycerophosphocholines	2	2	2	0	
С	Oxidized glycerophosphocholines	0	0	3	0	. 전 100년
ΡE	Diacylglycerophosphoethanolamines	16	164	95	34	<u>ā</u> ' * T
ΡE	1-(1Z-alkenyl),2-acylglycerophosphoethanolamines	6	35	8	10	
ΡE	Monoacylglycerophosphoethanolamines	0	9	0	6	 40-
ΡE	1-alkyl,2-acylglycerophosphoethanolamines	1	35	0	1	
ΡE	Dialkylglycerophosphoethanolamines	0	2	0	0	
ΡE	1-acyl,2-alkylglycerophosphoethanolamines	1	1	0	0	a 20-
Έ	Oxidized glycerophosphoethanolamines	4	4	5	5	8 2 0 7
PS	Diacylglycerophosphoserines	7	25	25	12	
<u>ו</u>	Diacylglycerophosphoinositols	0	7	0	0	L L
PG	Dialkylglycerophosphoglycerols	1	3	0	0	⊃ ∩⊸
PG	Diacylglycerophosphoglycerols	1	0	0	0	Z
PA	Diacylglycerophosphates	4	67	0	0	
PA	Monoacylglycerophosphates	0	1	0	0	Q
Sterols	Steryl esters	6	4	5	5	·
ГAG	Triacylglycerols	631	906	474	433	PC, diacylglycerop
Fotal		815	1695	1258	678	Diacylglycerophosp





