[TECHNICAL NOTE]

ALTERNATIVE SOLVENTS FOR THE REVERSED-PHASE SEPARATION OF PROTEINS

Hillary B. Hewitson, Thomas E. Wheat, Diane M. Diehl

INTRODUCTION

The reversed-phase separation of proteins is a useful analytical technique that is used in a variety of applications and at various stages of the biopharmaceutical development process. Acetonitrile has been the solvent of choice because of good peak shape and resolution. It also minimizes viscosity while providing transparency at low UV wavelengths for sensitive detection. Other organic solvents have been used for either improved recovery or different selectivity, but there has been little need for changing the routine use of acetonitrile.

Recently, however, a combination of economic, social, and environmental factors has created an acute shortage of acetonitrile accompanied by a substantial price increase. It is, therefore, necessary to examine more closely the solvent options for reversed-phase protein separations. It is especially important to quickly make wise choices that meet the financial requirements without sacrificing the quality of the separations.

Several organic solvents were evaluated. The test mixture of proteins used in the evaluation represents a wide range of properties, including molecular weights from 10 kD to 150 kD, isoelectric points from 4.5 to above 10, and eluting anywhere from 20% to well-above 50% acetonitrile. Three monoclonal antibodies were also used as test samples. The effect of temperature and pressure were observed and summarized for each of these solvents.



EXPERIMENTAL

Samples

Protein Mixture (in 0.1% CF_3COOH in 5% ace	etonitrile)
Ribonuclease A, bovine pancreas:	0.08 mg/mL
Cytochrome <i>c</i> , horse heart:	0.11 mg/mL
Albumin, bovine serum:	0.40 mg/mL
Myoglobin, horse heart:	0.25 mg/mL
Enolase, baker's yeast:	0.43 mg/mL
Phosphorylase <i>b</i> , rabbit muscle:	1.18 mg/mL
Mixture of monoclonal antibodies (murine, c	himeric, and fully
humanized): $\sim 0.5 \text{ mg/m}$ in $0.1\% \text{ CE}_{\circ} \text{COOH}$	

Chromatographic Conditions

LC System:	Waters ACQUITY UPLC [®] System							
^o	PEEK-Si	l Needle	(PN/2050	00507)				
	Flow res	strictor (P	N/20500	0547)				
	Peptide	Mixer (PN	1/205000	0403)				
Column:	ACQUIT	Y UPLC B	EH300 C.	4,				
	1.7 μm,	2.1 mm >	< 50 mm					
Column Temp.:	40 °C o	r 80 °C, a	as indicate	ed				
Sample Temp.:	4 °C							
Flow Rate:	200 μL/min.							
Mobile Phase A:	0.1% CF_3COOH in DI water							
Mobile Phase B:	0.1% CF	0.1% CF ₃ COOH in indicated solvent						
Weak Needle Wash:	0.1% CF ₃ COOH in 5% Acetonitrile 600 μ l							
Strong Needle Wash:	0.1% CF	0.1% CF₃COOH in 75% Acetonitrile 200 μl						
Injection Volume:	3.3 μL,	Partial Lo	ор					
Detection:	UV (TU	V), 220 n	m					
Gradient:	Time	% A	% B	Curve				
	00.00	80.0	20.0	-				
	29.06	28.6	71.4	6				
	31.60	28.6	71.4	1				
	49.60	80.0	20.0	1				



Figure 1. The separation of a mixture of proteins representing a wide range of properties in a variety of solvents at 40 $^{\circ}C$.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A standard mixture of proteins was separated using a gradient of increasing acetonitrile. The acetonitrile was replaced with alcohols of progressively longer chain length as shown in Figure 1. A blend of acetonitrile and isopropanol was included in the series, as this mixture has often been used in the past. The blend has lower viscosity than isopropanol while retaining improved resolution and recovery. Methanol gave wide, asymmetrical peaks and did not elute all the proteins within the standard gradient. Ethanol did give a reasonable separation with increased retention compared to acetonitrile. Replacing seventy percent of the acetonitrile with IPA gave good separation with slightly less retention for all of the proteins. Using 100% IPA resulted in even less retention for the proteins, and with reduced resolution for some proteins, such as Phosphorylase *b*.

Increasing the temperature for the analysis resulted sharper peaks and reduced retention for all proteins, as shown in Figure 2. While methanol was not a reasonable choice at 40 °C, it gave acceptable peak shape within the standard gradient at 80 °C. The rest of the standard proteins shifted to lower retention at the higher temperature and generally gave narrower peaks. The shift to lower retention could compromise the analysis of polar proteins, but this gradient uses 20% organic as the initial conditions. The gradient could be modified to lower starting organic concentration as required for the least retained proteins. The same series of experiments was repeated with a mixture of monoclonal antibodies as show in Figure 3. The same patterns are observed as with the protein standard mixture. Methanol is unacceptable for these proteins, even at the highest temperature. Isopropanol appears to give the best peak shape and resolution.



Figure 2. The separation of a mixture of proteins representing a wide range of properties at 80 °C in a variety of solvents.



Figure 3. Separation of a mixture of monoclonal antibodies with different solvents.

In the experiments comparing different solvent combinations and temperatures, with both the protein standard mixture and the monoclonal IgG's, there is little or no evidence of selectivity changes. This suggests that the solvent substitutions may be made as convenient without the need for extensive re-development of methods. Re-validation would, of course, be required for regulated methods.

[TECHNICAL NOTE]

The major challenge in replacing acetonitrile with an alcohol is the relatively high viscosities associated with water-alcohol mixtures. Some combination of increased temperature and reduced flow rate can be used to manage the higher pressures. Table 1 shows the approximate system pressures for an ACQUITY UPLC system, fitted with a pressure restrictor and peptide mixer, for the different solvent and temperature combinations, all tested at 0.2 mL/min. The relative pressures will be the same on all systems so this table is a useful guide for making substitutions. Isopropanol gives almost three times the back pressure of acetonitrile. Raising the temperature from 40-80 °C reduces the pressure for all solvents by about 20%. Regardless of the solvents and temperatures tested, the ACQUITY UPLC system has sufficient pressure capacity to handle the separation. While the flow restrictor was installed and used for single variable testing of all solvents, its use above 10k PSI will likely result in leaks at the fittings of the restrictor, and is therefore not recommended for use with isopropanol or ethanol.

ļ	la	b	ι	е	I.	E	st	im	al	ed	p	re	SSI	ure	es	Wİ	th	٧ð	ari	ou	s	SO	lve	en	ts.	

Mobile Phase B	Temp (°C)	Initial PSI	Highest PSI	% B at Highest PSI
	40	4800	4800	20
100% ACN	80	3900	3900	20
100% MaOH	40	5800	6700	45
TOO% MEON	80	4900	5500	45
	40	7000	10300	60
100 % E(0H	80	5700	8000	60
	40	6300	8200	55
1:5 IPA:ACIN	80	5100	6400	55
	40	7600	13600	70
100 /0 IPA	80	6100	11200	70

CONCLUSIONS

Alcohol-based mobile phases can be substituted for acetonitrile in reversed phase chromatography of proteins. Isopropanol is much superior to methanol for this purpose. Elevating the temperature of the separation improves peak shape in all the solvents and for all the samples tested. There is little change in selectivity with the different solvents. These guidelines provide a straightforward approach to mitigating the effects of the acetonitrile shortage on routine reversed-phase chromatography of proteins.

www.waters.com

Austria and European Export (Central South Eastern Europe, CIS and Middle East) 43 1 877 18 07, Australia 61 2 9933 1777, Belgium 32 2 726 1000, Brazil 55 11 4134 3788, Canada 1 800 252 4752 x2205, China 86 10 5293 6688, CIS/Russia +497 727 4490/290 9737, Czech Republic 420 2 617 1 1384 Denmark 45 46 59 8080, Finland 358 9 5659 6288, France 33 1 30 48 72 00, Germany 49 6196 400600, Hong Kong 852 29 64 1800 Hungary 36 1 350 5086, India and India Subcontinent 91 80 2837 1900, Ireland 353 1 448 1500, Italy 39 02 265 0983, Japan 81 3 3471 7191 Korea 82 2 6300 4800, Mexico 52 55 5524 7636, The Netherlands 31 76 508 7200, Norway 47 6 384 60 50, Poland 48 22 833 4400 Puerto Rico 1 787 747 8445, Singapore 65 6273 7997, Spain 34 93 600 9300, Sweden 46 8 555 11 500, Switzerland 41 56 676 70 00 Taiwan 886 2 2543 1898, United Kingdom 44 208 238 6100

All other countries: Waters Corporation U.S.A. 1 508 478 2000/1 800 252 4752

Waters

THE SCIENCE OF WHAT'S POSSIBLE.™



© 2009 Waters Corporation, Waters, The Science of What's Possible, UPLC, ACQUITY, and ACQUITY UPLC are trademarks of Waters Corporation.

Waters Corporation 34 Maple Street Milford, MA 01757 U.S.A. T: 1 508 478 2000 F: 1 508 872 1990 www.waters.com

June 2009 720003056EN KK-PDF