# **BHIMADZU**

# Seamless automated sample preparation and analysis of DUID samples using high-resolution DIA QTOF library screening

Elies Zarrouk<sup>1</sup>; Alan Barnes<sup>2</sup>; Stephane Moreau<sup>3</sup>; Neil Loftus<sup>2</sup>; Sylvain Dulaurent<sup>1</sup>; Souleiman El Balkhi<sup>1</sup>; Franck Saint-Marcoux<sup>1</sup> <sup>1</sup>CHU Limoges, Limoges, France; <sup>2</sup>Shimadzu Corporation, Manchester, UK; <sup>3</sup>Shimadzu Europa GmbH, Duisburg, Germany

## Overview

A fully automated sample preparation and quantitative analysis for screening Driving Under the Influence of Drugs, Alcohol and Medicines samples (commonly used acronyms include DRUID/DUID/DUI) was initially developed for blood and tested for oral fluid analysis using a high resolution QTOF LC-MS/MS instrument coupled with a CLAM-2030 sample preparation station.

## . Introduction

Oral fluid has several key advantages in testing for Driving Under the Influence of Drugs, Alcohol and Medicines samples (in this work referred to as DUID). It is non-invasive, rapid, observed sampling at the time of the traffic stop or crash. In this work, a method was developed to evaluate an automated sample preparation station integrated with a high resolution QTOF LC-MS/MS to evaluate a method developed for emergency screening.

### 2. Materials and Methods



Figure 1 Schematic representation of the automated screening platform for DUID sample analysis.

### Sample preparation

Samples for DUID analysis were submitted for a cocaine, amphetamine and opioid panel screen (CAO Panel). Oral fluid was sampled using a dry swab (FLOQSwab) and afterwards placed in 2 mL phosphate buffer. Prior to analysis, swabs were sonicated (5 min) then heads centrifuged (5 min 3000 rpm).

### Automated sample preparation platform; CLAM-2030 (Shimadzu, Japan)

• 20  $\mu$ L methanol added to activate the sample filter, 50  $\mu$ L of sample, 20  $\mu$ L internal standard mixture (stable isotope labelled), 90 µL acetonitrile. The sample was mixed at 1900 rpm (2 min), filtered (2 min, 0.45 µm filter pore size) then directly injected (5 µL) on to the LCMS/MS system.

### High Resolution QTOF Mass spectrometry; LCMS-9030 (Shimadzu, Japan)

- MS and DIA-MS/MS analysis; MS scan m/z 70-1000; 100 msecs
  - DIA-MS/MS mass scans m/z 40-1000; 25 msecs for each precursor isolation window; isolation width 20 Da; collision energy spread 5-55V; 36 mass scan events. Scan cycle time 0.975 second (36 mass scan in total).

## 3. Results

### 3.1 Automated screening applied to oral fluids in DUID

A batch of oral fluid samples was submitted for DUID screening using a targeted triple quadrupole LC-MS/MS method (previously validated for blood, plasma and serum samples) and tested against a high resolution QTOF LC-MS/MS analysis. The clinical request focused on a targeted CAO panel (cocaine, amphetamines and opioids).



Figure 2 The automated sample preparation method was tested against a CAO panel request (targets included 6-MAM, amphetamine, benzoylecgonine, cocaine, ecgonine methylester, MDA, MDEA, MDMA, methamphetamine and morphine). The oral fluid blank matrix was spiked with a CAO panel over a concentration of 0.5-100 ng/mL (the 50 ng/mL calibration standard is shown on the left). As one example, a patient sample is also shown on the right highlighting the detection of benzoylecgonine, cocaine, ecgonine methylester.

Target CAO panel	Rt (mins)	Formula	QTOF LCMS-9030	Triple quadrupole LCMS-8050
			Quantitation m/z	MRM transitions m/z
6-MAM	3.901	C19H21NO4	328.1543	328.20>165.20
Amphetamine	3.647	C9H13N	136.1121	136.20>91.10
Benzoylecgonine	4.843	C16H19NO4	290.1387	290.20>168.25
Cocaine	5.283	C17H21NO4	304.1543	304.00>182.15
Ecgonine methylester	1.108	C10H17NO3	200.1281	200.20>182.20
MDA	3.883	C10H13NO2	180.1019	180.20>105.15
MDEA	4.409	C12H17NO2	208.1332	208.20>163.20
MDMA	4.124	C11H15NO2	194.1176	194.20>163.10
Methamphetamine	3.914	C10H15N	150.1277	150.20>91.10
Morphine	3.310	C17H19NO3	286.1438	286.20>152.10
			Automated processing	QuEChERS sample preparation

### Method assessment

- The automated sample preparation method was tested against a validated triple quadrupole LC-MS/MS method using an established, validated, routinely used QuEChERS protocol.
- Both methods used the corresponding stable isotope labelled internal standards (D3) or D5 depending on the target) and the same LC conditions with a Shim-pack Velox Biphenyl column chemistry.
- As one example of repeatability, in a 48h batch analysis peak area variance for cocaine-D3 was 4.6% RSD and mass accuracy error was less than 5 ppm (n=90 patient samples).



Figure 4 Library verification for benzoylecgonine detected in oral fluid patient sample analysis. In this example, the Wiley data repository was also used for a compound identification (despite different instruments and different CE values there is high value in each library providing further evidence for compound identification).

To help review data quickly with a high reporting confidence the LabSolutions Insight software can be configured to show color-based flagging to highlight correspondence with mass accuracy, isotope matching score, retention time and library similarity score.

- tested against an automated sample preparation method using the CLAM-2030 integrated with the LCMS-9030 high resolution LC-MS/MS system for the emergency analysis of oral fluids in DUID cases. For the patient sample group tested there was close agreement between the two methods (regression analysis between the two methods resulted in a slope equal to 0.96).
- The key advantages in using a high-resolution LC-MS/MS in emergency screening relate to high reporting confidence (accurate mass error, isotope distribution score, retention time and product ion MS/MS spectra from in house library repositories or third-party data bases) and retrospective data analysis to search for suspect screening.

Disclaimer: The products and applications in this presentation are intended for Research Use Only (RUO). Not for use in diagnostic procedures.