SCCWRP #676

Evaluation of triproline and tri- α -methylproline chiral stationary phases retention and enantioseparation associated with hydrogen bonding

Wenjian Lao^a and Jay Gan^b

ABSTRACT

In this study, to demonstrate preparation strategy and improve understanding of chiral recognition mechanisms, triproline chiral stationary phases (CSPs) were evaluated with a series of analytes classified as having none, one, two or three H-bond donors. The average retention factors and mobile phase strength generally followed none < one < two < three hydrogen bond donors. The average solvent volume ratio (Hr stands for average hexane volume ratio in the mobile phase, Hp_r for heptane, ACN_r for acetonitrile, or H₂O_r for water) normalized chromatographic parameters calculated for di-, tri-, tetra-, penta-, hexa-, and decaproline CSPs facilitated the characterization of properties associated to the H-bond donor categorization. The H_T of triproline CSP were 1.0, 0.96 and 0.88 for analyte of none, one and two hydrogen bond donors with hexane/2-propanol mobile phase, respectively. The number of hydrogen bond donors in an analyte was found to be a primary factor in influencing the retention and enantioseparation in the normal phase and polar organic modes. Two H-bond acceptor solvents methyl tert-butyl ether and ethyl acetate increased chiral separation on oligoproline CSPs for some compounds. The role of carbondonor hydrogen bonding at the H atom of proline asymmetric center was implied through testing a tri-αmethylproline stationary phase. On oligoproline CSPs, three factors including adjacent hydrogen bond acceptor and carbon-donor, and a rigid proline residue chain were recognized as important for contributing to the broad enantioselectivity. The a hydrogen atom on chiral center of stationary phase was found to play a crucial role in enantiomeric discrimination.

Due to distribution restrictions, the full-text version of this article is available by request only.

Please contact pubrequest@sccwrp.org to request a copy.

^aSouthern California Coastal Water Research Project, Costa Mesa, CA

^bDepartment of Environmental Sciences, University of California, Riverside, CA