Published in final edited form as:

Anal Bioanal Chem. 2013 October ; 405(25): 8131–8136. doi:10.1007/s00216-013-7260-z.

Fast quantification of amino acids by microchip electrophoresis-mass spectrometry

Xiangtang Li^{1,3}, Dan Xiao^{1,*}, Talia Sanders², Paul B. Tchounwou², and Yi-Ming Liu^{3,*}

¹College of Chemistry, Sichuan University, Chengdu 610065, China

²Department of Biology, Jackson State University, 1400 Lynch St., Jackson, MS 39217, USA

³Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry, Jackson State University, 1400 Lynch St., Jackson, MS 39217, USA

Abstract

A fast microchip electrophoresis–nano electrospray ionization-mass spectrometric method (MCE-nanoESI-MS) was developed for analysis of amino acids in biological samples. A glass /PDMS hybrid microchip with a monolithic nanoESI emitter was used in the platform. The proposed MCE-nanoESI-MS analytical method showed high separation efficiency for amino acids. Base-line separation of an amino acid mixture containing Lys, Arg, Val, Tyr, and Glu was completed within 120 s with theoretical plate numbers of >7500. The method was applied to study cellular release of excitatory amino acids (i.e. Asp and Glu) under chemical stimulations. Linear calibration curves were obtained for both Asp and Glu in a concentration range from 1.00 to 150.0 μ M. Limits of detection were found to be 0.37 μ M for Asp and 0.33 μ M for Glu (S/N =3). Assay repeatability (RSD, n=6) was 4.2% and 4.5%, for Asp and Glu at 5.0 μ M, respectively. In the study of cellular release, PC-12 nerve cells were incubated with alcohol at various concentrations for 1 hour. Both extra- and intracellular levels of Asp and Glu were measured by the proposed method. The results clearly indicated that ethanol promoted the release of both Asp and Glu from the cells.

Keywords

Microchip electrophoresis; mass spectrometry; amino acid analysis

Introduction

Microfluidic devices have been gaining a broad interest in chemical and biological applications [1]. Coupled with selective and sensitive mass spectrometric detection (MS) these devices have a great potential in bioanalytical applications [2–4]. Microchip electrophoresis (MCE), a miniaturized format of capillary electrophoresis (CE) performed on a microfluidic chip, offers high separation efficiency, high through-put sampling, and many advantageous microfluidic features. Because of the low flow rate of the effluent from MCE separations (normally at ~ 25 nL /min) coupling MCE with mass spectrometric detection is very different from and technically more difficult than coupling other microfluidic devices where liquid flows are generated and controlled by using syringe (or air pressure) pumps. In the majority of these works electrospray ionization (ESI)–MS was employed by virtue of the simplicity of the interface. Various electrospray configurations,

*Corresponding authors: Prof. Dan Xiao, +86 28 12345678; xiaodan@scu.edu.cn Prof. Yi-Ming Liu, +1-601-979-3491; yiming.liu@jsums.edu.

including spraying from the flat end of the microchip and monolithically integrated ESI emitter, two independent emitters, and a multinozzle emitter array in glass microchips were reported [5–8]. Integrated polymer SU-8 and poly(dimethylsiloxane) (PDMS) membrane-based microfluidic emitter were recently fabricated and evaluated [9, 10]. More details on coupling of microfluidic devices with MS can be found in recent reviews [11, 12].

Amino acid analysis is an important analytical application in biomedical research, clinical practice, and industrial process. Levels of intracellular excitatory amino acids have been intensively studied due to their association with various medical conditions [13–17]. Aspartic acid (Asp) and glutamic acid (Glu) are excitatory neurotransmitters in the central nervous system that work to stimulate brain [18]. Numerous studies have shown that ethanol influences Asp and Glu release in various brain regions [19–25]. There has been a continued interest in the development of reliable, rapid and accurate methods for the determination of amino acids from cellular release for diagnostic and research purposes [26–28]. Quantification of excitatory amino acids by HPLC [29–31], capillary electrophoresis (CE) [32–36], microfluidic techniques [37,38] has been reported. As far as we know, in spite of all the advantages quantification of amino acids by MCE-MS has not been reported so far.

We herein report the development of an MCE-MS method for analysis of amino acids. A glass /PDMS hybrid microchip with a monolithic nanoESI emitter was deployed. An auxiliary channel intercepting with the MCE separation channel at an angle of 45° was integrated into the microchip transporting a make-up fluid (MUF) generated by a syringe pump at ~100 nL /min to facilitate the MCE-MS coupling. The proposed MCE-MS method was evaluated for fast separation of amino acids. The separation efficiency, assay reproducibility, detection sensitivity, and linearity of the signal-concentration relationship were investigated. Further, this method was applied in studying excitatory amino acid release by PC-12 cells exposed to ethanol.

Experimental section

Reagents and Materials

PDMS pre-polymer and the curing agent were purchased from Dow Corning (Midland, MI). Fused silica capillaries (254 µm ID, 360 µm OD) were obtained from Polymicro Technologies(Tucson, AZ). Glass slides were obtained from Silicon Valley Microelectronics (Santa Clara, CA). Hexamethyldisilazane (HMDS) was from Ultra Pure Solutions (Castroville, CA). Amino acids were purchased from Sigma–Aldrich Chemical (St. Louis, MO). All reagents used were of analytical grade. Milli-Q water was used throughout the work. All solutions were filtered through a nylon 0.22 µm syringe filter before use.

Microchip Fabrication

Design of the microchip is shown in Fig. 1A. The chip was composed of a PDMS cover and a glass substrate bearing the channels. The procedure used to create channels was similar to that we reported previously [39]. Briefly, a design on a photomask with microchannels was transferred onto the glass substrate by means of UV exposure. The channels (60 µm wide and 20 µm deep) were etched into the substrate in a well-stirred bath containing diluted HF/ NH₄F/HCL. To create a PDMS cover, HMDS was applied onto a silicon wafer with a pipette. The wafer was spun at 2000 rpm for 30 seconds to completely dry off the liquid. A mixture of PDMS pre-polymer and curing agent (10:1) was degassed under vacuum. A small amount of the mixture was applied onto the silicon plate and spun at 2000rpm for 50s to obtain a thin layer of ~100µm in thickness. At this time, a platinum electrode was placed at the location as shown in Fig. 1A. After 2 hour curing at 50°C, a cofferdam (~2 mm deep) was placed on top of the first layer of the PDMS cover, and filled with the pre-polymer mixture, but leaving a ~5mm long section on the cover's edge uncovered. After 3 hour

curing, the PDMS cover was removed from the silicon plate. Access holes of 3-mm-diameter were drilled on the PDMS cover at channel terminals, forming four reservoirs. The microchip was made by bonding the glass substrate and the PDMS cover together through heating for 5 min via an air plasma cleaner (10.5 W and 500mTorr, Harrick Plasma, Ithaca, NY). The nanoESI emitter was formed at a corner of the microchip by ~100 μ m PDMS cover and beveled glass substrate as shown in Fig. 1B.

MCE-nanoESI-MS assay

The system consisted of an ion trap mass spectrometer equipped with an ESI source and a syringe pump (LCQ Deca, ThermoFinnigan, San Jose, CA), the microchip prepared above, and a multichannel high voltage power supply. The syringe pump was used for MUF delivery. Xcalibur software (ThermoFinnigan) was used to control the mass spectrometer and process MS data. House-written software was used for controlling the potentials applied to the microchip for MCE operations. MS detection parameters were optimized in positive mode and selected as follows: ion source voltage, 0V; a relative collision energy of 25% was used for MS/MS experiments with an isolation width of 1.0 u and the activation time was set at 30 ms. The microchip was placed on a XYZ-translational stage and positioned in front of the MS orifice (the nanoESI emitter tip was about 1 mm away from the orifice) as shown in Fig. 1C. To inject sample, potentials of 450 V, 400 V, 0 V, and 600 V were applied at reservoirs 1, 2, and 3 and pt (as labeled in Fig. 1A) for 15 s, respectively. After sample injection, the potentials were changed to 3050V, 1600V, 1600V, and 1500V, respectively to start the MCE-MS assay. At the same time, MS data acquisition was also started. MCE running buffer was a mixture of methanol /water (1:1) containing 25mM acetic acid / ammonium acetate buffer at pH 4.3. Make-up fluid was the same buffer at a flow rate of 100 nL /min.

Study on release of excitatory amino acids from PC-12 cells exposed to ethanol

PC-12 cells were cultured in complete RPMI medium supplemented with 10% heat inactivated horse serum and 5% FBS. Cells were routinely sub-cultured every 4–5 days. To investigate the ethanol effects on release of excitatory amino acids, 50 μ L cell suspension (2×10^6 cells /mL in PBS solution) was added to 150 μ L PBS solution containing ethanol at 0, 0.1, 0.5, 0.7, and 1.0% (v/v) and incubated for 1.0 hr. at 37°C. After incubation, cells were spun down. The PBS supernatant was completely transferred to another vial for analysis. The cell pellet was suspended in 100 μ L PBS and sonicated. After centrifugation at 10000 rpm for 10 min, the supernatant was collected and diluted 50 times with PBS solution. All samples were filtered through a 0.22 μ m membrane filter prior to MCE-MS analysis.

Safety considerations

All high voltage connections were carefully shielded and Instrument and electrically conductive parts were grounded.

Results and Discussion

Microchip Design and Fabrication

We recently reported a microchip design that integrated a pressure-driven make-up flow into the MCE-MS system to facilitate the MCE-MS coupling [40]. To improve the separation efficiency, the channel features were fabricated in a glass substrate in this work. In addition, a monolithic nanoESI emitter was deployed. To achieve stable nano-electrospray, tip surface area of the nanoESI emitter must be minimal. Therefore, a corner of the glass substrate (i.e. the fluidic exit of the microchip) was beveled before the channels were etched. The PDMS cover was also fabricated by using the multilayer soft lithography technique [41] to make it very thin (~100 μ m) at the section of the emitter tip. The combined thickness of the emitter

(i.e. beveled glass substrate and the thin PDMS cover) was <250 μm which was well suited for nano-electrospray. It was found in this work the monolithic emitter such made was very efficient to generate nano-electrospray from flows at flow rates at the 100 nL/min level. The emitter was also durable. In a test of 1 hour continuous spraying, repeatability of MS background signals (RSD) was 2.7% ($n = 100$), indicating a stable nanoESI process was achieved during this extended time period.

MCE-nanoESI-MS analysis of amino acids

To evaluate the proposed MCE-MS analytical platform for amino acid analysis, a mixture of 5 amino acids, including Lys, Arg, Val, Tyr, and Glu was analyzed with the MS detector set for full scan from m/z 80 to m/z 250. Figure 2 shows the TIC electropherogram obtained. As can be seen, the 5 amino acids were base-line separated within 120 s. The electrophoretic peaks were very narrow, indicating high separation efficiency. Theoretical plate numbers ($N = 16 (t_R/w_b)^2$) were calculated to be >7,500 for all of the compounds separated. Analytical figures of merit were studied for analysis of amino acids, taking Asp and Glu as model analytes. Standard curves were prepared by analyzing a series of standard mixtures of Asp and Glu at various concentrations ranging from 1.00 to 150 μM . Transitions m/z 134 88 and m/z 148 102 were used for quantification of Asp and Glu, respectively. The following calibration curves based on peak height versus analyte concentration were obtained:

$$\text{Asp} \quad Y = 0.240 X + 0.052 \quad r^2 = 0.998$$

$$\text{Glu} \quad Y = 0.319 X + 0.022 \quad r^2 = 0.997$$

where Y was peak height, X was analyte concentration in μM . Detection limits ($S/N = 3$) were estimated to be 0.37 and 0.33 μM for Asp and Glu, respectively. This assay sensitivity is comparable with those of HPLC-MS methods, but far better than those of CE-MS methods [42]. Although it's not as sensitive as the CE methods with laser induced fluorescence (LIF) or electrochemical detection (ECD) [28, 32–36], the present method has the capability of peak identification because MS detection offers structural information of the compounds detected, which is essential in many cases of analyzing biological samples. Assay repeatability was determined by repeatedly analyzing two standard mixtures of Asp and Glu (5.0 and 50.0 μM each, respectively) for six times. The results are summarized in Table 1. Relative standard deviations (RSD) were 4.2% and 4.5% for Asp and Glu at 5.0 μM , respectively. Reproducibility of the migration times (RSD, $n=6$) were 1.70% for Asp and 1.57% for Glu. As far as we know, there have been no reports on quantification of amino acids by using a MCE-MS method [28].

Release of Asp and Glu from PC-12 cells exposed to ethanol

Although ethanol effects on glutamate release in various brain regions were studied intensively [19–25], no reports have been seen on similar *in vitro* studies with neuronal models. We applied the present MCE-MS/MS method to study ethanol-stimulated release of Asp and Glu from PC-12 cells. Cells were incubated with PBS containing ethanol at concentrations ranging from 0 to 1% (v/v) for 1 hr. The results from a trypan blue assay of the cell cultures confirmed that no changes in cell viability were caused by the incubation. After incubation, cells were spun down and the supernatant was collected and analyzed to determine the extracellular levels of Asp and Glu. The cells were re-suspended in PBS and lysed by sonication for quantification of intracellular Glu and Asp. A typical

electropherogram obtained from these analyses is shown in Fig. 3. The MS detector was set for selected ion monitoring (m/z 134 and 148), and thus very clean electropherograms were obtained. From the TIC electropherogram (Fig. 3A), Asp and Glu were well separated within 120 s. Peak identities were confirmed by the MS² spectra (Fig. 3D & 3E). The analytical results of both intra- and extracellular Glu and Asp levels are summarized in Fig. 4. As can be seen, the extracellular levels of both Glu and Asp increased as ethanol concentration increased while the intracellular levels decreased. These results clearly indicated that ethanol promoted the release of Asp and Glu from the PC-12 cells.

Conclusions

A microchip electrophoresis-nano-electrospray ionization-mass spectrometric method (MCE-nanoESI-MS) was developed for fast quantification of amino acids. New features of the microfluidic chip used in the MCE-MS platform included an easy-to-make monolithic nano-electrospray emitter. By the proposed MCE-MS method, base-line separation of Lys, Arg, Val, Tyr, and Glu was achieved within 120 s, which was much faster than the absolute majority of separations reported previously for amino acids. Limits of detection were found to be 0.37 μ M for Asp and 0.33 μ M for Glu (S/N = 3). The method was employed to study the release of Asp and Glu from PC-12 cells exposed to ethanol. It was found that ethanol promoted cellular release of both amino acids, and further, the influence was concentration dependent. This work showed that the proposed MCE-nanoESI-MS method might have a potential for fast quantification of amino acids in various applications.

Acknowledgments

Financial support from US NIH (GM089557 to YML and G12MD007581-15 to PBT) is gratefully acknowledged.

References

- [1]. Yager P, Edwards T, Fu E, Helton K, Nelson K, Tam MR, Weigl BH. *Nature*. 2006; 442:412–418. [PubMed: 16871209]
- [2]. Baker CA, Roper MG. *Analytical chemistry*. 2012; 84:2955–2960. [PubMed: 22384846]
- [3]. Chen Q, Wu J, Zhang Y, Lin JM. *Analytical chemistry*. 2012; 84:1695–1701. [PubMed: 22242916]
- [4]. Mellors JS, Jorabchi K, Smith LM, Ramsey JM. *Analytical chemistry*. 2010; 82:967–973. [PubMed: 20058879]
- [5]. Mao P, Gomez-Sjoberg R, Wang D. *Analytical chemistry*. 2013; 85:816–819. [PubMed: 23252432]
- [6]. Chambers AG, Ramsey JM. *Analytical chemistry*. 2012; 84:1446–1451. [PubMed: 22220742]
- [7]. Dayon L, Jossierand J, Girault HH. *Physical chemistry chemical physics: PCCP*. 2005; 7:4054–4060. [PubMed: 16474869]
- [8]. Iannaccone JM, Jakubowski JA, Bohn PW, Sweedler JV. *Electrophoresis*. 2005; 26:4684–4690. [PubMed: 16278909]
- [9]. Nordman N, Sikanen T, Aura S, Tuomikoski S, Vuorensola K, Kotiaho T, Franssila S, Kostianen R. *Electrophoresis*. 2010; 31:3745–3753. [PubMed: 21077242]
- [10]. Sun X, Kelly RT, Tang K, Smith RD. *Analytical chemistry*. 2011; 83:5797–5803. [PubMed: 21657269]
- [11]. Kleparnik K. *Electrophoresis*. 2013; 34:70–85. [PubMed: 23161493]
- [12]. Flangea C, Serb A, Sisu E, Zamfir AD. *Biochimica et biophysica acta*. 2011; 181:513–535. [PubMed: 21704187]
- [13]. Cai Z, McCaslin PP. *Neurochemical research*. 1992; 17:803–808. [PubMed: 1353614]
- [14]. Aronica E, Nicoletti F, Canonico PL. *Functional neurology*. 1990; 5:15–20. [PubMed: 2169447]
- [15]. Przewlocki R. *European journal of pharmacology*. 2004; 500:331–349. [PubMed: 15464044]

- [16]. Sattler, R.; Rothstein, JD. Handbook of experimental pharmacology. 2006. p. 277-303.
- [17]. Kawamata M, Omote K. Pain. 1996; 68:85–96. [PubMed: 9252003]
- [18]. Brown JA, Nijjar MS. Molecular and cellular biochemistry. 1995; 151:49–54. [PubMed: 8584013]
- [19]. Aschner M, Mutkus LA, Allen JW. Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences. 2001; 939:23–27. [PubMed: 11462775]
- [20]. Brodie MS, Scholz A, Weiger TM, Dopico AM. Alcoholism, clinical and experimental research. 2007; 31:1625–1632.
- [21]. Ward RJ, Colivicchi MA, Allen R, Schol F, Lallemand F, de Witte P, Ballini C, Corte LD, Dexter D. J Neurochem. 2009; 111(5):1119–1128. [PubMed: 19765190]
- [22]. Deng C, Li KY, Zhou C, Ye JH. Neuropsychopharmacology. 2009; 34(5):1233–1244. [PubMed: 18784647]
- [23]. Chefer V, Meis J, Wang G, Kuzmin A, Bakalkin G, Shippenberg T. Addict Biol. 2011; 16(2): 229–237. [PubMed: 21182572]
- [24]. Santofimia-Castaño P, Salido GM, Gonzalez A. Brain Res. 2011; 1402:1–8. [PubMed: 21679931]
- [25]. Ding ZM, Engleman EA, Rodd ZA, McBride WJ. Alcohol Clin Exp Res. 2012; 36(4):633–40. [PubMed: 22017390]
- [26]. Jeong JS, Kim SK, Park SR. Electrophoresis. 2012; 33(14):2112–2121. [PubMed: 22821486]
- [27]. Kaspar H, Dettmer K, Gronwald W, Oefner PJ. Anal Bioanal Chem. 2009; 393(2):445–452. [PubMed: 18843484]
- [28]. Ou G, Feng X, Du W, Liu X, Liu BF. Anal Bioanal Chem. 2013 DOI 10.1007/s00216-013-6830-4.
- [29]. Hyzinski-Garcia MC, Vincent MY, Haskew-Layton RE, Dohare P, Keller RW Jr. Mongin AA. Journal of neurochemistry. 2011; 118:140–152. [PubMed: 21517854]
- [30]. Kuribayashi K, Kitaoka Y, Kumai T, Munemasa Y, Kitaoka Y, Isenoumi K, Motoki M, Kogo J, Hayashi Y, Kobayashi S, Ueno S. Brain research. 2006; 1071:34–41. [PubMed: 16443199]
- [31]. Sarchielli P, Alberti A, Floridi A, Gallai V. Journal of the neurological sciences. 2002; 198:9–15. [PubMed: 12039657]
- [32]. O'Shea TJ, Weber PL, Bammel BP, Lunte CE, Lunte SM, Smyth MR. Journal of chromatography. 1992; 608:189–195. [PubMed: 1430021]
- [33]. Li H, Yan ZY. Biomedical chromatography: BMC. 2010; 24:1185–1192. [PubMed: 20954209]
- [34]. Vyas CA, Rawls SM, Raffa RB, Shackman JG. Journal of pharmacological and toxicological methods. 2011; 63:119–122. [PubMed: 20708699]
- [35]. Wang C, Zhao S, Yuan H, Xiao D. Journal of chromatography B, Analytical technologies in the biomedical and life sciences. 2006; 833:129–134.
- [36]. Kristensen HT. Journal of pharmaceutical and biomedical analysis. 1998; 18:827–838. [PubMed: 9919985]
- [37]. Cellar NA, Burns ST, Meiners JC, Chen H, Kennedy RT. Analytical chemistry. 2005; 77:7067–7073. [PubMed: 16255611]
- [38]. Rathnasingham R, Kipke DR, Bledsoe SC Jr. McLaren JD. IEEE transactions on bio-medical engineering. 2004; 51:138–145. [PubMed: 14723503]
- [39]. Zhao S, Li X, Liu YM. Analytical chemistry. 2009; 81:3873–3878. [PubMed: 19382810]
- [40]. Li X, Zhao S, Liu YM. J. Chromatogr. A. 2013 in press. DOI: 10.1016/j.chroma.2013.02.031.
- [41]. Unger MA, Chou HP, Thorsen T, Scherer A, Quake SR. Science. 2000; 288:113–116. [PubMed: 10753110]
- [42]. Otter DE. Br. J. Nutr. 2012; 108(Suppl 2):S230–237. [PubMed: 23107533]

Fig.1. Microchip design and experimental set-up: (A) a schematic diagram of the microchip and system set-up in this study, (B) a microscopic image of a monolithic nanoESI emitter prepared in this work; (C) a picture of the MCE-MS analytical platform.

Fig.2.

MCE-MS separation of an amino acid mixture containing Lys, Arg, Val, Tyr, and Glu (50.0 μ M each). MCE conditions: MCE separation channel, 3.5cm long $\times$ 60 μ m wide $\times$ 20 μ m deep; pinched electrokinetic injection of sample; running buffer, 25 mM ammonium acetate /acetic acid buffer (pH 4.3) in methanol /water (1:1). MS detection conditions: make-up flow at 100 nL /min, capillary temperature 220 $^{\circ}$ C, sheath gas 20 arbitrary units (au), auxiliary gas, 0 au, positive ion mode, full scan from m/z 80 – 250. Peak identification: Lys (R_t 1.07), Arg (R_t 1.27), Val (R_t 1.49), Tyr (R_t 1.72), and Glu (R_t 1.88).

Fig.3. Electropherograms from the proposed MCE-MS quantification of Asp and Glu in PC-12 cells: (A) TIC of m/z 134 and 148; (B) extracted mass electropherogram of m/z 134 for Asp from (A); (C) extracted mass electropherogram of m/z 148 for Glu from (A); (D) and (E) MS² spectra of Asp and Glu, respectively, verifying the peak identities. MCE-MS conditions were as in Fig. 2.

Fig.4. Ethanol influence on Asp and Glu release from PC-12 cells: extracellular (A) and intracellular (B) Asp and Glu levels in PC-12 cultures exposed to ethanol (at various concentrations) for 1 hr. MCE-MS assay conditions were as in Figure 2. * $p < 0.05$, $n = 3$.

Table 1

Repeatability study of the proposed MCE-MS assay.

Standard Mixture	Added (μM)		Measured (μM)		RSD (%)	
	Asp	Glu	Asp	Glu	Asp	GLu
#1	5.0	5.0	4.8	5.1	4.2	4.5
			5.0	4.7		
			5.2	5.1		
			5.1	4.8		
			4.7	4.7		
			5.2	5.2		
#2	50.0	50.0	52.1	50.3	4.3	3.3
			50.1	47.3		
			49.5	49.4		
			54.9	52.0		
			52.4	49.8		
			49.5	51.5		