

## Rapid Detailed Comparison of Polymer Samples by T-Wave Ion Mobility

Kirsten Craven  
Waters Corporation, Manchester, UK

### APPLICATION BENEFITS

- Rapid data collection
- Polymer “fingerprinting”
- Polymer backbone architecture confirmation

### WATERS SOLUTIONS

SYNAPT® G2-S HDMS™

T-Wave™

MassLynx® Software v4.1

DriftScope™ v2.5

### KEY WORDS

Polymer Analysis, ion mobility mass spectrometry (IMMS), 3D fingerprinting, branched polymers

### INTRODUCTION

Polymers are typically very complex materials, requiring several analytical techniques to fully characterize them. Since the introduction of softer ionization techniques, Electrospray Ionization and Matrix Assisted Laser Desorption Ionization, mass spectrometry has increasingly been adopted by the industry to provide additional and complementary information about a sample.

Mass spectrometry can be used to identify many features of a polymer, including end groups, molecular weight distribution, backbone architecture, and repeat unit chemistry. Confirming the chemistry and architecture of a polymer is important because it has a direct impact on its physical properties, for example, density, strength, viscosity, and glass transition temperature. The physical properties of a polymer affect the industrial application that it can be used for.

These industrial applications are becoming increasingly sophisticated, demanding increasingly complex chemistries and as a consequence more advanced analytical techniques. When ion mobility is coupled with mass spectrometry, an additional mode of separation can be achieved that is capable of differentiating ions according to their shape, size, mass-to-charge ratio, and charge state. This means minor changes in a synthetic polymer are more likely to be identified.

The mobility plots generated by T-Wave™ ion mobility separations and mass spectrometry can be used as a “fingerprint” to rapidly characterize a sample.<sup>1</sup> This application note demonstrates how data can be collected, samples compared, and tools to help identify any difference.

## EXPERIMENTAL

### Sample preparation

The polyethylene glycol (PEG) samples were first dissolved in 50:50 acetonitrile:water before further dilution and the addition of sodium iodide to produce the following:

250 ppb characterized PEG 1000 and 25 ppb sodium iodide

250 ppb uncharacterized PEG and 25 ppb sodium iodide.

### MS conditions

MS system:	SYNAPT G2-S HDMS
Ionization mode:	ESI positive
Infusion rate:	10 $\mu\text{L}/\text{min}$
Acquisition time:	5 mins
Scan time:	1 sec
Capillary voltage:	3.2 kV
Sample cone:	50 V
Extraction cone:	5.0 V
Source temp:	120 $^{\circ}\text{C}$
Desolvation temp.:	500 $^{\circ}\text{C}$
Cone gas:	Nitrogen, 20 L/hr
Desolvation gas:	Nitrogen, 500 L/hr

### LockSpray™ conditions

Compound:	Leucine enkephalin
Mass:	$m/z$ 556.2771
Flow rate:	20 $\mu\text{L}/\text{min}$
Capillary voltage:	3 kV
Collision energy:	6.0 V

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A fully characterized linear PEG 1000 sample (structure shown in Figure 1) was infused into the Waters® SYNAPT G2-S at 10  $\mu\text{L}/\text{min}$ . Figure 2 is a mobility plot generated by DriftScope Software. It shows mass-to-charge ratio on the X-axis, drift time on the Y-axis, and ion intensity is represented by color. The data show a series of ions running diagonally across the mobility plot. The drift time of an ion is determined by a number of factors including size, shape, and charge,<sup>2</sup> typically referred to as a collision cross section (CCS) measurement and reported in  $\text{\AA}^2$ . The larger the ion, the longer it will take to drift through the ion mobility cell.<sup>2</sup>

DriftScope has a peak detection function, which will identify ions above a selected threshold. These ions have been identified with a black spot in Figure 2.




Figure 1. Poly ethylene glycol repeat unit and end groups.




Figure 2. Mobility plot of a fully characterized linear PEG 1000 sample.

The 3D size of a polymeric ion is governed by several factors: the monomer units, their 3D arrangement, the backbone connectivity, and the cation(s).<sup>3</sup> Therefore, when drift time, ion intensity, and exact mass measurements are combined, the resulting mobility plots are distinctive and could be considered as a “fingerprint” for a polymer sample.

DriftScope Software allows users to export peak detection lists and overlay the results from different samples. Figure 3 shows five samples overlaid. We can see that the data points sit in the same place. This means that the exact mass, ion intensity, and collision cross section area are consistent from sample to sample.




Figure 3. Five PEG 1000 samples overlaid in DriftScope.

Figure 4 is a comparison between the fully characterized linear PEG sample and an uncharacterized PEG sample. The uncharacterized sample showed a similar ion distribution of singly and doubly charged ions, with a mass difference of 44 Da, consistent with the ethylene glycol repeat unit. A very quick visual inspection of the mobility plot revealed significant differences. The singly charged ion series had slightly different masses but the drift time of the ions are closely related, therefore their 3D size must be similar.

The doubly charged ion series is the region of most difference between the samples. The most interesting observation about these ions is the drift time. The uncharacterized sample had a much shorter drift time for ions with a comparable  $m/z$  value. This tells us the doubly charged ions in the uncharacterized sample must be more compact.




Figure 4. Mobility plot of the fully characterized PEG 1000 (identified with black spots) and an uncharacterized PEG 1000 sample (identified with white spots).

To gain more information about the samples MS/MS experiments were performed. Precursor ions were chosen with the minimum difference in  $m/z$ , to make the results as comparable as possible. Figure 5 shows the two MS/MS spectra; in both spectra ion series were observed with a mass difference of 44 Da. This confirmed the presence of ethylene glycol repeat units in both samples. The most interesting difference in the results was not the change in mass of the ions generated but the pattern. This indicates that the difference between the two PEG samples was not the backbone architecture but with the different end groups. To confidently interpret the MS/MS spectrum it is important to understand the fragmentation mechanism of the polymer.




Figure 5. MS/MS spectra of the characterized linear PEG and uncharacterized PEG sample.

Figure 6 shows an annotated MS/MS spectrum of the fully characterized linear PEG sample. Two series of ions have been labeled, both series have a 44 mass unit difference. Due to the symmetry of the molecule both fragmentation pathways can happen at either end of the polymer. The proposed fragmentation pathways for each series of ions are shown in Figure 7.




Figure 6. MS/MS spectrum of the characterized linear PEG 1000.



## CONCLUSIONS

Samples were simply dissolved and a cationizing agent added, before infusing directly into the SYNAPT G2-S for just five minutes. Differences between the samples were identified by visual inspection of the mobility plot, followed by more detailed MS/MS analysis. Interpretation of the MS/MS results indicated the uncharacterized sample was branched rather than linear. The ion series that allowed this conclusion to be drawn was clearly visible in the mobility plot but not in the traditional mass spectrum.

A polymer's physical properties can be affected by the backbone architecture, and as a consequence the industrial applications it can be used for. The ability to confirm the connectivity of a polymer is a vital part of research and development, as well as quality control in a manufacturing environment.

## References

1. S Trimpin, DE Clemmer. *Anal Chem.* (2008) 80: 9073-9083.
2. An Introduction to Waters T-Wave Devices, Unique Technology for Advanced MS Capabilities. Waters white paper. no. 7200004177en. April, 2012.
3. J Hoskins, S Trimpin, S Grayson. *Macromolecules.* (2011) 44: 6915.

# Waters

THE SCIENCE OF WHAT'S POSSIBLE.®

Waters, SYNAPT, MassLynx, and The Science of What's Possible are registered trademarks of Waters Corporation. HDMS, DriftScope, T-Wave, and LockSpray are trademarks of Waters Corporation. All other trademarks are the property of their respective owners.

©2013 Waters Corporation. Produced in the U.S.A.  
August 2013 720004777en AG-PDF

**Waters Corporation**  
34 Maple Street  
Milford, MA 01757 U.S.A.  
T: 1 508 478 2000  
F: 1 508 872 1990  
[www.waters.com](http://www.waters.com)

