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Thesis Summary

Pre-workout supplements (PWS), like most nutritional supplements, are classified by the Therapeutic Goods Administration (TGA) in Australia as complementary medicines and are therefore subject to much less stringent regulation compared to pharmaceuticals. Complementary medicines (also known as 'traditional' or 'alternative' medicines) include vitamin, mineral, herbal, aromatherapy and homoeopathic products.

PWS comprise a group of sports supplements purported to provide consumers with a boost in athletic performance facilitated by the inclusion of stimulatory compounds usually of plant origin. Typically, PWS are multi-component in nature generally containing caffeine, an amine-based central nervous system (CNS) stimulant, taurine, β-Alanine and creatine (Eudy et al., 2013). The stimulants cause cardiovascular stress when combined with exercise (Haller et. al, 2002). The increase in PWS-related adverse effect reports correlates with the increased use/prevalence in the community.

The overall goal of this thesis was to determine the amounts of stimulants in PWS, both the biogenic amines derived from *Citrus aurantium* (CA) extracts as well as caffeine and its dimethylxanthine (DMX) derivatives. Research questions have been put forward relating to the components within PWS and whether they comply with any guidelines or regulatory limits and whether differences are evident between PWS made in Australia compared to overseas. To address these questions, the aims were to develop two HPLC protocols for the quantitation of 1) adrenergic amines present in CA-containing PWS and 2) caffeine and DMXs in PWS. These were the first protocols to implement a single quadrupole mass detector (QDa) for rapid mass confirmation in-line with UV-Vis detection on a reverse phase-high performance chromatography (RP-HPLC) system for detection of these compounds.
It was hypothesised that the caffeine content in overseas-manufactured PWS would be higher than locally-produced PWS. This was found not to be the case and, in fact, variations in caffeine content were minimal across the sample set. Significant discrepancies were found, however, between determined levels of caffeine in some products and that stated on their label.

A highlight of this study was the development of a RP-HPLC protocol able to resolve the isobaric isomers, theophylline (TP) and paraxanthine (PX), not normally demonstrated in other similar reported methods. PX, though not a constituent of CA, was found in one of the overseas PWS. Conclusive answers to the research questions were limited by the small sample size of CA-containing PWS in this study. For example, no significant differences in synephrine levels between locally and internationally manufactured PWS were observed in this pilot study. Furthermore, when the active compounds were labelled as a ‘proprietary blend’ this posed a challenge to accurately compare the quantities of the key ingredients. Future research into the quantification of these amines and other synthetic stimulants on a hydrophilic interaction liquid ion chromatography (HILIC) could result in greater sensitivity of the methods especially when coupled to a mass detector.
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Chapter 1  Introduction
1.1 Pre-workout Supplements – Background, Use and Regulation

Pre-workout supplements (PWS) are multi-ingredient sports supplements used not only by individuals to improve performance, but have been playing a more prominent role in the general population to improve alertness (Hoffman et al., 2009). *Ephedra sinica* (ES) extracts contain sympathomimetic, ephedrine and was one of the most popular CNS stimulant before it was banned in 2004 - after it was correlated with adverse cardiovascular effects (Gurley, Steelman, & Thomas, 2015). *Acacia rigidula* (AR) was another popular stimulant that was banned in 2014, due to its active ingredient’s structural similarities to methamphetamine (Pawar et al., 2014). *Citrus aurantium* (CA) is also used in dietary weight-loss supplements due to the purported thermogenic activity of its key component, synephrine (Bell et al., 2004). For example a U.S. population study found that CA-containing supplements have been gaining popularity as a method of boosting energy and improving health alongside multi-vitamins in the adolescent and young adult population (Bailey, 2014). Disturbingly however, increased numbers of reports of adverse effects to the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) have raised concerns about the use and abuse of PWS consumption. The most notable case report was reported by Eliason et al. (2012) where two U.S. military soldiers died from cardiac arrest after taking a PWS containing 1,3-dimethylamine (DMAA). Unlike pharmaceuticals, these products do not require manufacturers to provide unequivocal evidence for the efficacy of their product and are often perceived to be safe for consumption (Hung et al., 2011).

PWS usually contain a blend of amino acids and stimulants from plant extracts represented with the key composition set out in Table 1. Appendices 1-8 provide examples of PWS labels selected for analysis in this study. Difficulties in obtaining an accurate picture of PWS ingredients stems from relaxed legal requirements for labelling of ingredients for complimentary medicines as well as in the inclusion of components as ‘proprietary blends’. For example, the ingredient *Panax notoginseng*, labelled in Gold standard Preworkout (Optimum Nutrition), was identified as *American ginseng extract* in Muscle Prime (Allmax Nutrition). While Table 1 includes ingredients from only 8 selected PWS there are literally hundreds of PWS formulations available, some made in Australia and others from overseas sources where manufacturing standards may be less stringent. Many PWS contain phytochemicals with distinctive CNS or cardiovascular stimulant properties. Although some
of the plant extracts from which these derive may have been tested individually, the safety and/or efficacy of the combination of plant extracts has not been established.

β-Alanine was found to be a common ingredient in many PWS. β-Alanine is a nonessential amino acid produced in the liver and obtained from protein rich foods in the diet. The basis for its use in PWS is that it is a substrate, along with histidine, for carnitine formation in muscle cells (Caruso et al., 2012). Carnitine’s main role is to facilitate the transport of medium to long chain fatty acids into the mitochondria however, due to the basicity of the imidazole ring; it also provides intramuscular buffering thereby preventing acidosis during prolonged muscle contractions. Another common ingredient found in PWS is creatine, another amino acid-derived compound produced by the kidneys and liver to serve as a high energy phosphate reservoir for skeletal muscle cells.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ingredients</th>
<th>360Rage™</th>
<th>Beast Mode™</th>
<th>DyNO™</th>
<th>Ergo Blast™</th>
<th>Gold standard PW™</th>
<th>Kardio Fire™</th>
<th>Muscle Prime™</th>
<th>Pump HD™</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BCAA</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B alanine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-tyrosine</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arginine</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citrulline Malate</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpha Lipoic Acid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-Acetyl-Cysteine</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creatine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taurine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caffeine anhydrous</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grape Seed extract</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maritime Pine Tree Bark extract</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toothed Clubmoss extract</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higenamine HCl</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raspberry ketone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olumbago zeylanica extract</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Echinacea purpurea extract</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhodiola root extract</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astragalus membranaceus extract</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panax notoginseng extract</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA extract</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-enzyme Q 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cordyceps</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawthorne Berry extract</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ginko Biloba Extract</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selenium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niacin (Vit. B3)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitamin B6</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitamin B12</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitamin C</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maltodextrin</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural and Artificial flavourings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 ingredient formulation of Ephedra-free dietary supplements
Earlier this decade, reports of PWS consumption by individuals outside the athletic performance arena surfaced. For example, workers engaged in occupations involving long (or late-night) shifts were taking advantage of the stimulatory effects of PWS to prolong alertness (Simmons, 2013). Management of the Bowen Basin mine in Western Australia banned the use of PWS, “JACK3D”, because of the perceived risks involved in concurrently operating heavy machinery and/or reduced decision-making ability (Duffy, 2012).

For a large segment of the general population, the desire to lose weight via consumption of weight-loss or ‘fat-burning’ supplements have expanded the sale of CA-containing supplements into this very lucrative market. Many of the individuals in this segment of the community may be overweight or obese; currently taking prescription medication; or are of an older age and already predisposed to cardiovascular diseases. These factors heightened the risk and thus a need for reliable and unbiased research into the safety and efficacy of the individual compounds in PWS was warranted. There needs to be a greater focus on the potential interactions between PWS additives and/or medications.
1.1.1 Common Herbal Extracts Found in PWS

1.1.1.1 Ephedra Sinica (ES)

_Ephedra sinica_ has been used in traditional Chinese medicine for many centuries and is the botanical source of ephedrine alkaloids, pseudoephedrine, norpseudoephedrine and norephedrine. These CNS-active compounds resemble epinephrine (as well as amphetamine) in structure and this is likely responsible for their similarity in pharmacological effects.

Ephedra was an ingredient in PWS for around 10 years (1994-2004) and during this time experienced considerable controversy. A full historical review of ephedra use in the USA has been documented (Palamar, 2011). Despite the purported claims for ergogenic and health benefits of ephedra-containing PWS, a concerning number of adverse effects, led to its prohibition in 2004 by the FDA (Gurley, Steelman, & Thomas, 2015). The range of reported adverse events included cardiac arrhythmias (Dwyer, Allison, & Coates, 2005; Haller, 2000), myocardial infarction (Haller, 2000; Smith et al., 2014), strokes (Bouchard et al., 2005; Haller, Jacob, & Benowitz, 2002; Holmes & Tavee, 2008), seizures (Kockler, McCarthy, & Lawson, 2001; Moawad, Hartzell, Biega, & Lettieri, 2006) and rhabdomyolysis (Rhidian, 2011; Stahl, Borlongan, Szerlip, & Szerlip, 2006). Due to the complex nature of the PWS formulations, it was difficult to directly link ephedra to these adverse effects, although an increasing number of emergency medicine cases reported were strongly correlated with use of ephedra-containing PWS.

![Figure 1 Photograph of Ephedra Sinica](image)
1.1.1.2 *Acacia rigidula* (AR)

The *Acacia* genus contains over 50 different species containing various amines and alkaloids. *Acacia rigidula* (AR) grows predominantly in the southern regions of Texas, USA. Based on the current literature, there have not been any reports of its use in traditional medicine. A study in 1998 has reported the presence of a phenethylamine-type compound, \(N\)-methyl-\(\beta\)-phenethylamine (\(N\)-MePEA) and \(N\)-methyltyramine (\(N\)-MeTYR) (Clement, Goff, & Forbes, 1998).

In recent years, AR extracts have been commonly listed on PWS labels as stimulatory ingredients. The increased use and lack of information on AR extracts in PWS led the U.S. FDA to establish a method for the quantitative determination of biogenic amines, phenethylamine (PEA), tyramine and tryptamine derivatives (Pawar, Grundel, Fardin-Kia, & Rader, 2014). The study conducted by Pawar et al. on AR analysis contrasted their findings with those of Clement et al. and found that 20 of the 21 supplements tested had high amounts of PEA. Importantly, PEA does occur naturally in AR or extracts thereof. Worryingly, \(\beta\)-methylphenylethylamine (BMPEA), a positional isomer of methamphetamine was found in 9 of the 21 samples with amounts ranging from 963 \(\mu\)g/g to 60,500 \(\mu\)g/g and it was likely to have been misidentified as amphetamine in 1998. There is no safety data on the biological effect of the BMPEA in humans (Pawar et al., 2014). Since this study was concluded, AR-containing products were banned in 2015 by both the FDA and TGA on the basis that products containing AR have not previously been consumed as a food and lacked substantial safety evidence (Upadhyay, 2014).

1.1.1.3 *Citrus aurantium* (CA)

*Citrus aurantium* (CA) is known common as names such as bitter orange, sour orange, Seville orange, chongcao, and neroli. The plant has its origins in tropical Asia and has been used in traditional Chinese medicines. The main volatile components in the flowers and peel of CA are the flavonoids, hesperidin and naringin whereas the non-volatile alkaloid components include synephrine, octopamine and tyramine (Pellati, Benvenuti, Melegari, & Firenzuoli, 2002). Synephrine acts as a \(\alpha\)-adrenergic agonist, with some \(\beta_3\)-adrenergic agonist properties (Astrup, 2000). \(\beta_3\)- receptors are found mainly on adipose tissue, and regulate lipolysis and thermogenesis (Ferrer-Lorente, Cabot, Fernández-López, & Alemany, 2005). This was the basis for the purported CA efficacy as a weight-loss agent. Animal studies have shown that
synephrine significantly reduced food intake in rats (Verpeut, Walters, & Bello, 2013). On the other hand, pilot studies conducted by Greenway et al. failed to demonstrate a significant difference between the treatment and control groups for food intake, appetite ratings or body composition (Greenway et al., 2006). To date there is a lack of evidence to support the use of CA in appetite control and weight loss in humans (Onakpoya, Davies, & Ernst, 2011). The pharmacological effects will be further discussed later in this chapter.
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1.1.2 Current Regulations of PWS in Australia (TGA) Compared to Overseas

Pre-workout supplements are considered complementary medicines, under the Therapeutic Goods Act of 1989 as it contains herbal material (i.e. plant extracts) (Therapeutic Goods Administration, 2013). The Therapeutic Goods Administration (TGA) is a sub-group of the Australian Government Department of Health responsible for regulating the supply and export of therapeutic goods. These goods include prescription medicines, complementary medicines, vaccines, vitamins and minerals (including supplements) medical devices, blood and blood products. A complementary medicine is defined by the TGA as a therapeutic good consisting wholly or principally of 1 or more designated active ingredients, each of which has a clearly established identity and a traditional use. The TGA employs a risk-based (watch and wait) approach to regulation of complementary medicine whereby products containing herbal materials that present a higher risk, must be registered with the Australian Register of Therapeutic Goods (ARTG). Lower-risk substances may be found on the TGA’s registry of ‘Substances which can be used as a Listed Medicine’. These may be classified as active, component or excipient and may have further restrictions on their use such as that mentioned for caffeine and synephrine.
The TGA also conducts post-market regulatory monitoring of products to ensure safety for consumption via a two-tiered system whereby registered medicines are tested by the TGA for quality, safety & efficacy whereas listed ingredients are only tested for quality and safety not efficacy. Where an Australian-made product produces unexpected or undesirable side effects, the product may be reported to the TGA. When the TGA receives a report from a consumer of an adverse effect following consumption of a PWS, for example, they will conduct an investigation. This includes sending a sample to a laboratory for a quantitative component analysis (TGA, 2016b) which, depending on their workload, can take up to 6-12 months. The TGA may, following their investigations, consider enforcing the discontinuation of the product (that is, if the company and or product still exists). It is estimated that only a fraction of adverse effects are ever reported and often reports are made directly to the manufacturer. In the latter case, there is a disincentive for the company to relay the report to the TGA.

Since the TGA also regulates the importation of PWS and ingredients therein, products entering Australia are subject to scrutiny upon arrival into the country. In reality, due to limitations on staff and/or time, only the larger import quantities are usually checked. However, with the increased popularity of ‘online stores’ consumers may not necessarily know the origin of the product. TGA scrutiny can be side-stepped by having small product orders mailed directly to consumers. The TGA regularly posts updates on adulterated and discontinued products (TGA, 2016a). However, this method of reporting may be inefficient as general consumers do not necessarily know where to look for such information.

In Australia, medicines, poisons and therapeutic goods are regulated under the Therapeutic Goods Act (1989), and in particular, the Poisons Standard (November 2016) being the legislative instrument. Within this framework substances are classified into schedules which help determine how medicines and poisons are made available to the public (https://www.legislation.gov.au/Details/F2016L00036) (Gill, 2016). Schedules are ranked according to the level of regulatory control required such that Schedule 1 (medicines that are not in use), Schedule 2 (pharmacy medicines) to Schedule 10 (dangerous substances that are prohibited for sale) (Figure 3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not in use</td>
<td>Pharmacy medicine</td>
<td>Pharmacist only medicine</td>
<td>Prescription only medicine</td>
<td>Caution</td>
<td>Poison</td>
<td>Dangerous Poison</td>
<td>Controlled Drug</td>
<td>Prohibited Substance</td>
<td>Prohibited for sale</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 3 Scheduling of medicines and poisons implemented by the TGA of Australia. Comprehensive breakdown and explanation is shown in Appendix 9.*
Amphetamine is classified as a Schedule 8 substance (drugs of addiction) while ephedrine, for example, a Schedule 4 substance (restricted prescribed substance) (Australian Government Department of Health, 2015) (Gill, 2016).

Synephrine is classed as a Schedule 4 substance with a recommended daily dose (RDD) of 30 mg. A therapeutic dose in treatment of hypotension, as defined by the Poison Standard of Australia was about 300 mg daily and there was little evidence of harmful effects at 30 mg in a daily dose (Gill, 2015). The scheduling of synephrine was considered in 2002 when CA extracts were first advertised with manufacturer’s claims of enhanced metabolite support and weight loss (National Drugs and Poisons Schedule Committee, 2003). At that time approximately 1000 products listed in the ARTG containing synephrine ranging from 2 µg to over 31 mg.

Octopamine was banned as an ergogenic aid in competitive sports by the World Anti-Doping Agency (WADA) in 2002 however, despite this; octopamine has yet to be considered for scheduling due to a lack of reported adverse effects. Octopamine is present in lower concentrations compared to synephrine in CA extracts. Octopamine is been shown to act as a monoamine neurotransmitter in invertebrates, but its role in vertebrates is uncertain (Roeder, 1999). Many dietary supplements (including PWS) that contain octopamine have been shown to raise blood pressure (Haller, Benowitz, & Jacob, 2005). Tyramine, on the other hand, has not been subject to a ban by WADA nor any other sporting associations. There are currently no legislative restrictions relating to either tyramine or octopamine.

In 2011, Health Canada conducted a health risk assessment (HRA) report on the use of synephrine, octopamine and caffeine as well as the peel of CA. Like the TGA, Health Canada also employs a risk-based approach in evaluating safety and efficacy of products. Evidence for the results derived from a single six-week study which concluded that at the maximum RDD of 320 mg caffeine and 40 mg synephrine participants did not show harmful effects (Colker, Klalman, Torina, & Perlis, 1999). The study involved 20 subjects with a body-mass index of >25 kg/m² where they were sub-divided 3 groups: group A, ingested 975 mg CA extract, 528 mg caffeine and 900 mg of St. John’s wort; group B was a placebo; and group C served as a control without any supplement intervention. The diets and exercise sessions were controlled and the amount of body weight change was measured. This study had a few limitations, one, was the small sample size of overall patients per group. 20 individuals is a miniscule representation of the human population. Besides that, there was a statement on
conducting laboratory tests within the results of their study but there was no further discussion or description on the vital signs of their patients during the study. Apart from that, there were no discussions on the variability of the health of the individuals apart from a body-mass index of >25 kg/m². The study would have been improved had specific exclusion criteria for their patients been included. Based on this study however, the HRA report concluded that a dose of up to 50 mg/day p-synephrine was not likely to trigger a cardiovascular event. In addition, they concluded that, for healthy individuals, the use of less than 40 mg/day of synephrine in conjunction with 320 mg/day of caffeine was classified as low risk. It should be noted that this health risk assessment was funded by the company and conducted by Stohs, a known advocate and senior scientist for AdvantraZ® (CA extract) (Bloomberg Business, 2015; Stohs, et al., 2011; Stohs, Preuss, & Shara, 2011, 2012).

In contrast to Canada’s safety assessment of PWS, in 2013, the Federal Institute for Risk Assessment (BfR) of Germany assessed the risks of PWS and weight-loss supplements containing both synephrine and caffeine. The BfR looked at the quantities of synephrine and caffeine contained therein and noted a high level of variability in suggested doses between products. As both these constituents are known to affect the cardiovascular system, their combined consumption posed a higher risk to consumers. The German BfR established a maximum safe dosage of synephrine of 25.7 mg (The Federal Insitute for Risk Assessment, 2013). Since CA extracts also contain other stimulants aside from synephrine, such as octopamine and tyramine, further cardiovascular effects such as increased heart rate and blood pressure would be expected to occur.

According to the BfR, many of the products assessed contained more than the maximum safe dosage of 25.7 mg thereby breaching the regulation. On this basis, the BfR classified sports supplements, such as PWS as unsafe for human consumption. Moreover, since the target market was likely individuals undergoing physical exertion, the added strain on the cardiovascular system was higher. Moreover, adverse effects from the use of weight-loss supplements containing CA would be amplified and pose a greater risk for an overweight, ageing population with likely pre-existing cardiovascular problems (The Federal Insitute for Risk Assessment, 2013).

Caffeine, another prominent inclusion in PWS, is the only methylxanthine subject to specific product labelling requirements – the details of which vary depending on country of manufacturing origin. In the US, for example, only added caffeine must be listed as an ingredient while in Australia products containing caffeine are required to state the amount and
also carry a warning. Currently no recognised health-based guide for acceptable caffeine intake exists, although Food Standards Australia and New Zealand (FSANZ) recommends a maximum daily caffeine limit in caffeinated foods or beverages of 95 mg/day for children (aged 5-12) and 210 mg/day for adults (approximately 3 cups of coffee per day) (Smith et al., 2000). In Australia however, the composition of PWS and other dietary supplements, classified as complementary medicines, is regulated by the Therapeutic Goods Administration.

A recent review on caffeine toxicity suggested that undeclared herbal components in most supplements could expose consumers to an increased risk of caffeine toxicity (Musgrave, Farrington, Hoban, & Byard, 2016). Since there is a degree of overlap in the stimulatory effects of caffeine and dimethylxanthines (DMX), the total effect is likely additive (Fredholm, 2011). These combined circumstances make it difficult for individuals to keep track of their caffeine intake which may lead to potential adverse effects from overconsumption. Such increased PWS consumption beyond athletes and fitness enthusiasts into recreational use by the general population (Gibson, 2014), and concomitant the increased adverse health reports may result in more stringent caffeine content/ labelling requirements leading to an increased demand for analysis of products.
1.2 Structural and Chemical Properties of Key Stimulants in PWS

The two key stimulant groups within PWS of interest for this research are the amphetamine-like compounds within CA, synephrine, octopamine and tyramine; and caffeine with its dimethyl derivatives.

1.2.1 Amphetamine-like Compounds

Table 2 summarises the key physicochemical properties of our compounds of interest and compares their similarity to amphetamine and ephedrine. The compounds mentioned in the table can be classed as substituted phenethylamines where the variations in molecular bonding results in different chemical and physical properties. Like amphetamine and ephedrine, synephrine is a phenethylamine however distinctly containing one phenol hydroxyl group absent in the banned compounds. In fact, they are structurally in between the natural catecholamine and the banned amphetamine compounds. Synephrine contains a total of two hydroxyl groups, positioned in B (ring) and W (side chain), as well as a methyl group on position Y. This correlates with its high degree of polar surface area. Octopamine has similarly substituted hydroxyl groups at position B and W but lacks the methyl group on position Y (on the amine nitrogen). Tyramine has a hydroxyl group substituted only on position B. As expected all the compounds have basic pKa values (between 8.55 for and 10.4 for tyramine).

The similarity in structure of these compounds have led many researchers to hypothesise similar pharmacological outcomes (Broadley, 2010; Chen et al., 1981; Clement et al., 1998; Gibbons, 2012; Liles et al., 2006; Oberlender & Nichols, 1991; Pawar et al., 2014). Synephrine and octopamine, predominantly exists as the naturally occurring p-synephrine and p-octopamine, with the hydroxyl group located on the para-position on the benzene ring of the molecule (Mattoli et al., 2005; Pellati, et al., 2005; Rossato et al., 2010).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compound</th>
<th>Formula</th>
<th>MW</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>logP</th>
<th>pKa</th>
<th>Polar surface area (PSA) (Å²)</th>
<th>Rotatable bonds</th>
<th>Hydrogen bond donors</th>
<th>Hydrogen bond acceptors</th>
<th>Stereo-centres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Synephrine</td>
<td>C_{9}H_{13}NO_{2}</td>
<td>168.2</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>CH₃</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>9.46</td>
<td>40.46</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyramine</td>
<td>C_{8}H_{11}NO</td>
<td>137.2</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>10.41</td>
<td>46.20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Octopamine</td>
<td>C_{8}H_{11}NO_{2}</td>
<td>153.2</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>-0.59</td>
<td>9.64</td>
<td>66.48</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epinephrine</td>
<td>C_{9}H_{13}NO_{2}</td>
<td>183.2</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>-0.54</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>72.72</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nor-epinephrine</td>
<td>C_{9}H_{13}NO_{2}</td>
<td>169.2</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>-1.26</td>
<td>8.58</td>
<td>86.70</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amphetamine</td>
<td>C_{9}H_{13}N</td>
<td>135.2</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>CH₃</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>9.90</td>
<td>26.02</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ephedrine</td>
<td>C_{10}H_{15}NO</td>
<td>165.2</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>CH₃</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>CH₃</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>9.65</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.2.2 Caffeine and Dimethylxanthines

Methylxanthines such as, caffeine (1,3,7-trimethylxanthine), theobromine (3,7-dimethylxanthine), and theophylline (1,3-dimethylxanthine) are distinguished by variations in the number and position of methyl groups around the xanthine ring (coupled pyrimidinedione and imidazole ring structure) (Talik, Krzek, & Ekiert, 2012) shown in Table 3. While many methylxanthines are of plant origin and found in foods and beverages such as coffee, teas, yerba mate and cocoa, paraxanthine (1,7-dimethylxanthine), is a metabolic product of caffeine degradation in humans and is not found in plants (Orru et al., 2013).

Table 3 Chemical properties of caffeine and DMX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compound</th>
<th>Formula</th>
<th>MW</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>log P</th>
<th>pKa</th>
<th>Polar Surface area (PSA) (Å²)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caffeine</td>
<td>C₈H₁₀N₄O₂</td>
<td>194.2</td>
<td>CH₃</td>
<td>CH₃</td>
<td>CH₃</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>58.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theobromine</td>
<td>C₇H₈N₄O₂</td>
<td>180.2</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>CH₃</td>
<td>CH₁</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>67.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraxanthine</td>
<td>C₇H₈N₄O₂</td>
<td>180.2</td>
<td>CH₃</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>CH₁</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>10.76</td>
<td>67.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theophylline</td>
<td>C₇H₈N₄O₂</td>
<td>180.2</td>
<td>CH₃</td>
<td>CH₃</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8.81</td>
<td>69.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.3 Pharmacological Properties of Key Stimulants in PWS.

1.3.1 Pharmacodynamics of The Adrenergic Amines in CA

Synephrine is commonly identified as the active component of CA and acts primarily as an α-adrenergic receptor (αARs) agonist (de Oliveira et al., 2013; Pellati et al., 2002). Functional studies showed that synephrine had agonist activity specific on the α_{1A}-AR subtype but showed some antagonism for the pre-synaptic α_{2A} and α_{2C}-ARs present in nerve terminals (Ma et al., 2010). Other studies that tested the binding affinities of synephrine reported that p-synephrine had overall lower affinity for αARs compared to m-synephrine (Brown et al., 1988; Hibino, Yuzurihara, Kase, & Takeda, 2009; Hwa & Perez, 1996). The presence of hydroxyl groups at the β-carbon (position W in Table 2 Chemical properties of different amphetamine-like compounds) increases its polarity and thus reduces its ability to cross the blood brain barrier (BBB). This would decrease the likelihood of synephrine affecting central nervous system (CNS) activity (Brunton, Lazo, & Parker, 2005).

Synephrine, like ephedrine, is also known to act as a β-adrenoceptor (βAR) agonist, specifically on β_{3}-AR (Arch, 2002; Carpene et al., 1999) which can result in increased lipolysis and basal metabolic rate producing the net effect of weight loss (Haaz et al., 2006). To date there is little clinical evidence to support synephrine’s thermogenic properties. A study in mice, conducted in 2008, demonstrated that neither CA extracts (5 g/kg and 10 g/kg standardised to contain 2.5% synephrine) nor an orally-administered dose of p-synephrine (300 mg/kg) significantly increased body temperature (Arbo et al., 2008). Arbo et al. (2009) also showed that there was a lower weight gain in rats that were administered 30 and 300 mg/kg of p-synephrine for 28 consecutive days compared to the controls. However, these results may not be necessarily transferable to humans as a double blind, placebo controlled trial in humans involving a dietary supplement containing 21 mg of synephrine and 304 mg of caffeine coupled with an exercise regime did not significantly increase thermogenic effect during exercise (Haller et al., 2005).
Synephrine is a chiral molecule and it exists in a $S$ (+)-form and a $R$ (-)-form. A study by Jordan et al., determined that $S$ (+)-synephrine was 1 to 2 orders of magnitude less active than the $R$ (-)-synephrine on $\beta_1$-adrenoceptors in guinea-pig atria (Jordan, Midgley, Thonoor, & Williams, 1987). Brown et al., described the level of activity of $S$ (+)-synephrine to be less active than the $R$ (-)-synephrine on the $\alpha_1$-adrenoceptors on a rat aorta. It should be noted that these studies may not appropriately represent the receptor binding properties of synephrine enantiomers in humans. The determination of the enantiomeric composition of pharmaceuticals and nutraceuticals is important to understand the pharmacology of the synephrine component of CA-containing PWS. There are no current studies published that determine the specific synephrine enantiomers present in CA extracts or CA-containing PWS.

Octopamine was first identified in the posterior salivary glands of an octopus (Octopus vulgaris) from which its name derives. It is also present in plants, invertebrates and vertebrates (David & Coulon, 1985) as well as plants such as the fruit of CA. It plays a significant role in neurotransmitter activity for invertebrates similar to the physiological activity of adrenaline in mammals (Roeder, 1999). Non-naturally occurring $m$-octopamine is the most potent amongst its isomers followed by $p$-octopamine, which is 10-fold less potent than $m$-octopamine.

Octopamine was found to act as a $\beta_1$-adrenergic receptor agonist ($EC_{50}$ of $3.1 \pm 0.4\mu$M (Kleinau et al., 2011)) as well as a $\beta_3$-adrenergic receptor agonist (present in adipocytes (Carpene et al., 1999)). Moreover, there was no apparent $\beta_2$-receptor binding up to a concentration of 6.7 $\mu$M while allosterically inhibiting other $\beta_2$ agonists such as isoprenaline. $m$-Octopamine, in particular, is also an $\alpha$-adrenergic receptor agonist that is suggested to be one hundredth of the potency of noradrenaline to increase blood pressure (Fregly, Kelleher, & Williams, 1979) due to its higher $\alpha_1$ adrenergic receptor affinity (6-fold less than noradrenaline) compared to $\alpha_2$-adrenergic receptor affinity (150-fold less potent than noradrenaline) (Brown et al., 1988).
Tyramine can be naturally found in common dietary sources such as chocolate, aged cheese, aged meat and certain fruits and vegetables as well as in alcoholic beverages. (Ziegleder et al., 1992). Similar to noradrenaline, tyramine indirectly acts as a sympathomimetic amine. These amines have weak actions on adrenoceptors, but are transported by the neuronal noradrenaline transporter (NET). In the nerve terminal, the amines are taken up into synaptic vesicles by the vesicular monoamine transporter (VMAT) to release noradrenaline into the cytosol.

The established mechanism for vascular effects of trace amines is that they behave by indirectly acting as sympathomimetic amines by stimulating the release of noradrenaline from sympathetic neurons (Broadley et al., 2009). To support the indirect mechanism of action of tyramine and other trace amines, reserpine treatment was used on isolated tissue and in vivo. Reserpine is a drug used for the control of high blood pressure by reducing the amount of noradrenaline from vesicular stores of sympathetic neurons. The treatment reduces the responses to sympathetic nerve stimulation and the indirect effects of trace amines (Burn & Rand, 1958). In rats, pressor effects due to ephedrine were caused by a direct effect on α-adrenoceptors, whereas tyramine showed indirect stimulation (Liles et al., 2006). The effects of directly acting sympathomimetic amines, such as noradrenaline and isoprenaline, are increased by chronic treatment with reserpine, due to the up regulation of the adrenoceptors (Chess-Williams, Grassby, Broadley, & Sheridan, 1987). Reserpine causes the release and breakdown of noradrenaline (NA) as well as depleting neurons of NA. Thus, no response to the indirectly acting sympathomimetics after reserpine could be obtained. Reserpine depletes the neurones of noradrenaline which results in no downregulation of receptors. Hence, the increase in receptor activity would increase the response of directly acting drugs (Chess-Williams et al., 1987).

Synephrine, octopamine and tyramine can be described as trace amines which interact with trace amine associated receptors (TAARs). The initial discovery of a new family of G protein-coupled receptors (GPCRs) was based on the pharmacological profile of its prototypical receptor, trace amine-associated receptors (TAAR1), this set of GPCRs was later termed TAARs (Borowsky et al., 2001). These receptors are expressed in both rats and humans, with only slight variations in response to drugs, due to their low homology (Wainscott et al., 2007). The receptors are intracellular in contrast to adrenergic receptors, which are located on the cell surface membrane (Xie et al., 2008).
The TAAR1 receptor has structural similarities to rhodopsin/β-adrenergic receptor family that responds to tyramine and β-phenylethylamine (Barak et al., 2008). The amount of data on the receptor binding properties of synephrine and octopamine are currently limited.

1.3.2 Pharmacokinetics of Adrenergic Amines in CA

Interestingly trace amounts of synephrine are produced in humans, possibly as a degradation product of the catecholamines – to which they share structural similarity. (Watson et al., 1990). A portion of cytosolic noradrenaline is deaminated by monoamine oxidases (MAO) whereas some is released into synaptic cleft to act on post-synaptic receptors. MAO inhibitors (MAOI) prevent inactivation of the transmitter displaced from the vesicles within the terminal. MAO inhibition enhances the action of tyramine as it is normally degraded by gastrointestinal tract and liver MAO before entering the systemic circulation. The occurrence of dietary tyramine-provoked hypertensive crisis is a well-known interaction associated with irreversible MAO-A inhibition (Chen, Swope, & Dashtipour, 2007).

Referring to metabolic pathways, synephrine is not degraded by catechol-o-methyltransferases. The substitutions on the α-carbon block oxidation by MAO. However, synephrine lacks an α-carbon ligand resulting in degradation via MAO. The oxidation of synephrine and octopamine by MAO results in the production of p- and m-hydroxymandelic acid as well as hydrogen peroxide which could result in oxidative stress (Grandy, 2007) (Figure 4). The plasma half-life of m-synephrine is two to three hours (Haaz et al., 2006). Experiments show synephrine undergoes phase 2 metabolism, glucuronidation and sulfation (Ibrahim, Couch, Williams, Fregly, & Midgely, 1985). A study in 1983 that investigated the composition of urine after oral ingestion of synephrine found that 47% sulphated synephrine, 30% hydroxymandelic acid, 12% conjugated synephrine and 6% hydroxyphenylglycol sulphate was produced (Ibrahim et al., 1985). Another study, investigating enantiomeric differences for synephrine showed that 20-50% of synephrine ingested was excreted in conjugated R (-)-synephrine form, and 10% as S(+)synephrine (Kusu, Matsumoto, Arai, & Takamura, 1996).
In-vitro studies have shown that both $m$- and $p$-synephrine isomers are taken up by Caco-2 cells, suggesting that they can be absorbed by the gastrointestinal tract at an equal rate (Rossato et al., 2010). However, poor bioavailability of synephrine has been observed in a human study involving the oral ingestion of 5.5 mg of synephrine. The peak plasma concentration of the subjects was less than 1 ng/mL (Haller et al., 2005).

CA extracts contain flavonoids, specifically 6’, 7’-di-hydroxy-bergamotin, a P4503A4 selective antagonist (Fugh-Berman & Myers, 2004). As cytochrome P4503A4 metabolises a majority of existing drugs, for example, MAOI antidepressants, it is not advisable to also take CA-containing PWS (Fugh-Berman & Myers, 2004). The use of MAOI would impair the metabolism of synephrine and potentially cause hypertension due to its prolonged vasoconstriction (Grandy, 2007).

Figure 4 The degradation pathway of trace amines. MAO represents the monoamine oxidases; ADH represents the aldehyde dehydrogenase; PNMT represents the phenylethanolamine-N-methyl transferase
1.3.3 Pharmacology of Caffeine and Dimethylxanthine Derivatives

Reports that caffeine increases endurance performance and/or recovery (Hodgson Randell, & Jeukendrup, 2013; Leveritt et al., 2012; Santos et al., 2014; Stadheim et al., 2013), likely gave further impetus to caffeine being marketed as an ergogenic aid in PWS. Caffeine consumption and the increased risk of cardiovascular diseases depend on a number of factors such as the variability of population, dose, confounding factors and/or low statistical power of the studies (Zulli et al., 2016). Since there is overlap in the stimulatory effects of caffeine and DMX, the total effect is likely additive (Fredholm, 2011). These combined effects make it difficult for individuals to keep track of their total stimulant intake which may lead to potential adverse effects from stimulant overconsumption.

Caffeine has a dose-dependent effect on the CNS which includes mood enhancement, wakefulness, insomnia, seizures and anxiety. These CNS effects derive from the antagonism of the adenosine receptors that are present in the brain. However, caffeine’s haemodynamic effects are attributed to the antagonism of the adenosine receptors, A1 and A2 (Figure 5). This includes increased heart rate, elevated blood pressure and peripheral and coronary vasoconstriction (Benowitz, 1990). Caffeine is also known to inhibit cAMP-mediated phosphodiesterase which leads to the accumulation of the second messenger; cyclic adenosine monophosphate (cAMP) enhances the effect of biogenic amine stimulation at adrenergic receptors. The mobilization of intracellular calcium by activation of γ-aminobutyric acid (GABA) neurotransmission (Riksen, Rongen, & Smits, 2009).

Caffeine has been shown to decrease blood flow to the cerebral, mesenteric and hepatic system. It also produces a diuretic effect via inhibiting antidiuretic hormone (ADH) which increasing glomerular filtration which results in higher water and sodium excretion (Benowitz, 1990). Higher doses of 400 mg/day caffeine would cause bronchodilation, hypokalaemia from the movement of intracellular calcium, hyperglycaemia and lipolysis (Monteiro, Alves, Oliveira, & Silva, 2016). Chronic use of caffeine with daily doses exceeding 300 mg can lead to a dose-dependent tolerance, which increases the risk of hypokalaemia which may cause ventricular arrhythmias (Shi et al, 1990; Goldfarb, 2014).
Caffeine is recognised to potentiate the cardiovascular and CNS effects of other stimulants which contain plant-derived α- and β-adrenergic agonists such as those from the *Ephedra species* (ephedrine, pseudoephedrine, norephedrine and methylephedrine) (Brown, Porter, Ryder, & Branch, 1991; Haller, Jacob, & Benowitz, 2004; Lake, Rosenberg, & Quirk, 1990).

TP and TB are present in coffee, tea and cola beverages albeit in lower concentrations than caffeine. However, PX is the main metabolite of caffeine in humans and is not naturally found in plants (Orru et al., 2013). TP is often used as a bronchodilator but its use is restricted by a narrow therapeutic range of 5-20 µg/mL (Mitenko & Ogilvie, 1973), where adverse effects are known to occur above 20 µg/mL. TB has fewer CNS effects than caffeine and TP, but has been reported to be a potent cardiovascular stimulant (Monteiro et al., 2016).

The physiological effects of PX are not as well explored but it may increase skeletal muscle contraction (Hawke, Allen, & Lindinger, 2000). Orru et al., showed that in rats, PX has a stronger locomotor activating effect than caffeine or the two other main metabolites of caffeine, TP and TB. As previously described for caffeine, the locomotor activating doses of PX more efficiently counteract the locomotor depressant effects of an adenosine A (1) than an adenosine A (2A) receptor agonist. Ex vivo experiments demonstrated that PX, but not caffeine, can induce cGMP accumulation in the rat striatum. These findings suggest that the inhibition of the cGMP-preferring phosphodiesterase (PDE) is involved in the locomotor activating effects following the
acute administration of PX (Orru et al., 2013). There was a considerably lower amount of attention given to PX for efficacy research compared to caffeine.

The challenge associated with PWS quantitation include content inconsistency, labelling inadequacies, product adulteration and contamination, combination of plant extracts with little evidence of safety. A study in 2013 found that caffeine quantity varies considerably between brands of ephedra-free dietary supplements sold in the USA (Kole & Barnhill, 2013). Furthermore, some products fail to provide an adequate indication of the exact quantity of caffeine in the product (Foster et al., 2013). This would potentially be harmful to users that metabolise caffeine at a slower rate or who may be prescribed stimulants (i.e. Adderall® and Ritalin®) or MAOI.
1.4 Quantitative Analysis of Components in PWS

Chromatography is a physical method of separation which exploits a compound’s polarity. Analytes of interest partition between two phases, stationary or mobile, according to their affinity for that phase (Heftmann, 2004). Chromatography can be categorised by either the type of physical chromatographic bed (column or planar); the choice of mobile phase (either gas or liquid); or the separation mechanism (ion-exchange, size-exclusion, solubility etc.). Gas chromatography (GC), pioneered by Martin & Synge in 1941, is suitable for separating complex mixtures of volatile components, however derivatisation is often necessary to volatilise non-volatile analytes. In addition, highly polar compounds (such as amines) are not easily analysed with GC. Liquid chromatography (LC), on the other hand, has no sample volatility issues, is suitable for polar compounds and faster analyses are possible with generally shorter columns.

High Pressure Liquid Chromatography (HPLC) instruments are capable of pumping solvent to a limit of around 5,000 psi depending on system robustness. HPLC, was introduced in the 1980s, is now one of the most widely used analytical instrumental techniques (Heftmann, 2004). Ultra-high Pressure LC (or UPLC) systems are capable of achieving higher pressures (up to around 15,000 psi) resulting in fast run times and higher resolution, However UPLC systems are understandably costlier. In LC analyses, normal-phase separation uses a polar stationary phase chemistry, whilst reverse-phase employs a packing material coated usually with a non-polar, hydrocarbon substance such as phenylhexane or octadecane (C18). The latter is preferable for a wider range of polarity compounds and is less expensive in terms of solvent usage creating less organic waste. Therefore, for the separation of the analytes of interest in this study – a set of charged amines as well as non-polar components, reversed-phase (RP-HPLC), was selected as the ideal choice keeping in mind instrumentation limitations.
Figure 6 depicts a typical HPLC system consisting of mobile phase pump, a degasser which removes gasses from solvent, an injector, the column and a detector.

The most common mobile phase for modern HPLC is generally a mixture of water, methanol or acetonitrile. The percentage of these components is held constant throughout the entire run is termed an isocratic elution protocol. When the composition of the mobile phase changes over the course of the run, however, it is called a gradient elution profile. Increasing the organic component generally increases the elution strength of the mobile phase. Additives to the mobile phase such as buffers or tetrahydrofuran (THF) are often required to improve the analyses. A more detailed description of these and the theory of chromatography will be presented in Chapter 2.

Once separated, analytes exit the column and enter the detector. In the case of a UV-absorbing analyte, such as amphetamine-like compounds and xanthines in this study, a UV detector is employed. Selecting the most suitable wavelength for analysis is not always as simple as determining the maximum wavelength ($\lambda_{\text{max}}$) especially in multi-component analyses due to co-elution issues. There are many different types of detectors available for HPLC analysis – the choice of which may depend on availability, although certain detectors are more suitable for some purposes over others. Electrochemical detectors are highly sensitive and based on detecting electrical currents generated from a reduction/oxidation of the analyte. They are often employed in catecholamine and neurotransmitter analyses. UV detectors generally require a chromophore for analyte detection such as an aromatic ring or conjugated double bond system. Photodiode array detectors (PDA) are UV-based detectors but differ from the simpler UV detectors by the position of the beam splitter. By placing the splitter after the sample, all wavelengths can be detected simultaneously which provides a wealth of spectral data. This is advantageous especially if the ideal wavelengths are not known.
The detectors mentioned so far are considered non-destructive in nature, thus samples may be collected for further analysis. Mass spectrometry (MS), though a destructive technique is used to determine the mass of the analyte (up to 4 decimal places in some instances) and can unambiguously confirm structure. In MS, analytes are volatilised on entry to the detector, followed by ionisation and fragmentation. Charged ions then travel towards the mass detector via a magnetic field which deflects the ions such that the lighter species travel on a different trajectory to the heavier ones thus forming the basis of separation. A single set of magnets is termed a ‘single quadrupole’ instrument. Combining multiple sets of magnets in series (for example, a ‘triple-quadrupole’ instrument) facilitates vast improvements in analytical power. The key to structure determination in this technique lies in the fragmentation of parent sample ions. Unique fragmentation patterns for individual compounds become like fingerprints then as a means of structure confirmation. A comprehensive review of HPLC detectors is beyond the scope of this thesis. Scott presents an excellent though not recent review on chromatographic detection techniques (Scott, 1996). Thus the combination of LC-MS is a powerful tool for both separation and detection of analytes in a sample matrix.

A typical chromatogram is a plot of an intensity of absorption versus retention time. Ideally each analyte peak should be sharp and symmetrical and completely resolved to baseline with no obvious co-elution issues. Achieving this however involves a considerable amount of trial and error. Optimisation refers to the process of determining the most ideal conditions that produce the best separation and is often a balance in terms of time and cost efficiency. When developing HPLC methods from scratch, many factors contribute to the final optimised method including column chemistry/parameters, mobile phase selection, pH, column temperature, flow rate, gradient optimisation, purity of samples, sample matrix etc. Additional chemicals, or modifiers, are often included in HPLC analyses and enhance retention and/or separation. The type of solvent or modifier used can greatly influence the selectivity and retention factor for the analyte in question (Dolan, 2008).
Sample preparation is often required to remove contaminants in complex matrices such as PWS. The two sample preparation methods that will be explored in Chapter 2 are liquid-liquid extraction (LLE) and solid phase extraction (SPE). LLE involves the phase separation of an analyte between two immiscible liquids. These typically comprise an organic solvent, such as dichloromethane or ethyl acetate and an aqueous phase. For basic components, such as the amines in this analysis, the polarity of the molecules is manipulated by adjusting the pH of the aqueous phase to firstly pKa +2 to force them into the organic phase and later pKa -2 to allow phase transfer back into the aqueous phase for further analysis. SPE is a separation process by which the compounds of interest in a liquid mixture are immobilized on a silica-based packing material before being eluted off. SPE has the advantage of reducing the amount of sample required for analysis as well as the amount of solvent used in the process. SPE has a large variety of sorbent material, which allows better matching of the phase for the analytes. Therefore it was possible to develop a procedure isolating a larger range of compounds.
1.4.1 HPLC Analysis of Active Components of CA in Dietary Supplements

Several studies have been conducted on the determination of phenethylamine alkaloids present in CA-containing dietary supplements. Those which related to the chromatographic determination of phenethylamine alkaloids were reviewed by Pellati & Benvenuti (2007). In this review, however, they focused on the detection of *citrus* alkaloids that are present in dietary supplements rather than in common foods, drinks and plant material. These methods included GC and GC-mass spectrometry (GC-MS) (Cabezas et al., 2013; Marchei, Pichini, Pacifici, Pellegrini, & Zuccaro, 2006; Rossato et al., 2010); capillary electrophoresis (CE) (Avula, Upadapalli, & Khan, 2005; Chizzali, Nischang, & Ganzera, 2011; Liu, Cao, Zheng, & Chen, 2008; Luo, Tan, Xu, Yang, & Yang, 2008); thin layer chromatography (TLC) (Bagatela, Lopes, Cabral, Perazzo, & Ifa, 2015; Shawky, 2014); ion exchange liquid chromatography (Niemann & Gay, 2003; Tang et al., 2006; Thevis, Koch, Sigmund, Thomas, & Schanzer, 2012); and UPLC (Kim, Kwak, Ahn, & Park, 2014). The most common method for adrenergic amine analysis in CA was on RP-HPLC (Table 4) (Beyer, Peters, Kraemer, & Maurer, 2007; Di Lorenzo et al., 2014; Viana et al., 2013; Viana et al., 2015; Wang & Zhao, 2015). Further background of these methods will be discussed in Chapter 4. However, the above mentioned approaches to adrenergic amine determination in CA-containing PWS involved extensive sample preparation, long run times and/or the use of non-volatile mobile phases which were incompatible with mass spectral detection.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compound analysed</th>
<th>Sample preparation</th>
<th>Stationary phase</th>
<th>Mobile phase</th>
<th>Detection</th>
<th>Accuracy</th>
<th>Limits of Quantitation &amp; Detection</th>
<th>Author</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>synephrine, octopamine, tyramine, N-methyltyramine, hordenine</td>
<td>Sonication with 0.1% HClO₄</td>
<td>Luna C18 column (150 mm x 3.0 mm, 5 µm)</td>
<td>ACN/20mM borate buffer (pH 8.8) (20:80, v/v), with 10mM sodium 1-hexanol sulphate</td>
<td>UV, 224 nm</td>
<td>97.7-104.0% (syn), 98.9-99.6% (oct), 95.9-117% (tyr), 90.7-103% (nmt), 99.1-107% (hor)</td>
<td>LOQ: 300 µg/g in raw plant material</td>
<td>(Roman et al., 2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>synephrine, octopamine, tyramine, N-methyltyramine, hordenine</td>
<td>Sonication with methanol/DMGSO (1:1)</td>
<td>Synergy Hydro-RP column (250 mm x 4.6 mm, 4 µm)</td>
<td>0.1 Sodium acetate buffer (pH 5.5)/ACN</td>
<td>UV, 280 nm</td>
<td>98.0-103%</td>
<td>LOD: 0.03 µg/mL (syn), 0.02 µg/mL (oct), 0.05 µg/mL (tyr), 0.05 µg/mL (nmt), 0.05 µg/mL (hor)</td>
<td>(Avula, Upadypalli, Navarrete, &amp; Khan, 2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>synephrine, octopamine, tyramine</td>
<td>Sonication with 0.1M HCl</td>
<td>Spherigel C18 column (250 mm x 4.6 mm, 4 µm)</td>
<td>Aqueous solution of 32mM 1ethyl-3-methylimidazolidinium tetrafluoroborate [EMIM][BF4]</td>
<td>UV, 273 nm</td>
<td>93.3-101.3% (syn), 74.4-103.2% (oct), 80.0-101.5% (tyr)</td>
<td>LOD: 0.2 µg/mL (syn), 0.1 µg/mL (oct), 0.1 µg/mL (tyr)</td>
<td>(Tang et al., 2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>synephrine, octopamine, tyramine, N-methyltyramine, hordenine</td>
<td>Sonication with water</td>
<td>pre-column derivation (A): Luna C18 column (250 mm x 4.6 mm, 5 µm), Direct RPLC</td>
<td>A. methanol/water (55:45, v/v), gradient.</td>
<td>λex = 455 nm, λem = 440 nm</td>
<td>A: 99.5-101.3%; RSD=0.8-1.2%; B: 98.7-102.6%; RSD=1-2.3%</td>
<td>LOD: A=0.05-0.07 pmol, B=0.21-1.04 pmol, LOQ: A=0.17-0.23 pmol, B=0.7-3.47 pmol</td>
<td>(Gatti &amp; Lotti, 2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>synephrine, octopamine, tyramine, N-methyltyramine, hordenine</td>
<td>Sonication with water</td>
<td>magnetic stirring</td>
<td>LiChrograph RP-18 column (250 mm x 4.4 mm, 5 µm)</td>
<td>Aqueous SDS-SDS in ACN</td>
<td>UV, 224 nm</td>
<td>Average RSD values &lt;15%</td>
<td>LOD: 1.8-7.5 ng/mL, LOQ: 6.0-25 ng/mL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>synephrine</td>
<td>Sonication with water</td>
<td>magnetic stirring</td>
<td>Xterra RP18 column (150 mm x 4.6 mm, 5 µm)</td>
<td>Water (5 mM SDS)/ACN gradient</td>
<td>UV, 210 nm</td>
<td>101.0%</td>
<td>LOD: 0.01 µg/mL, LOD: 0.23 µg/mL (syn), 0.46 µg/mL (oct), 0.1 µg/mL (tyr)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>synephrine, octopamine, tyramine</td>
<td>Sonication with 0.3% HCl</td>
<td>HyperClone C18 BDS 1 column (100 mm x 4.6, 3 µm)</td>
<td>water (3 mM SDS): ACN/methanol (3 mM SDS)</td>
<td>UV, 210 nm</td>
<td>97.5-102.0%</td>
<td>LOD: 0.8 µg/mL (syn), 0.62 µg/mL (oct), 0.8 µg/mL (tyr)</td>
<td>(Gaueru et al., 2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synephrine</td>
<td>Magnetic stirring with dilute mobile phase</td>
<td>YMC phenyl column (250 mm x 3.0 mm, 5 µm)</td>
<td>0.1M sodium acetate/acetic acid (pH 4.8) with ethylamine and 2% CAN</td>
<td>UV, 255 nm</td>
<td>85-102%</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Hurlbut et al., 1998)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syneprine</td>
<td>Magnetic stirring with dilute mobile phase</td>
<td>Zorbax 300-SCX column (250 mm x 4.6 mm, 5 µm)</td>
<td>0.4M Sodium phosphate buffer (pH 3.0)/water/ACN (50:35:15, v/v)</td>
<td>UV, 205-210 and 225 nm</td>
<td>93.2-97.5%</td>
<td>LOQ: 0.016 µg</td>
<td>(Niemann &amp; Gay, 2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synephrine</td>
<td>Sonication at ambient temperature</td>
<td>OA-5000 column (250 mm x 4.6 mm, 5 µm)</td>
<td>acetonitrile 1 mM copper (II) acetate and 20 mM ammonium acetate (pH 6.6)/methanol (99:1, v/v)</td>
<td>MS, 1.0V</td>
<td>selectivity: 1.23 Resolution: 1.09</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(Kuri, Matsumoto, &amp; Takamura, 1995)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>synephrine, octopamine, tyramine, N-methyltyramine, hordenine</td>
<td>Sonication at ambient temperature</td>
<td>FFF and sonication techniques</td>
<td>Discovery HS F5 (200 mm x 4.6 mm, 5 µm)</td>
<td>water (10 mM SDS) (pH 2.5) / acetonitrile (72.28, v/v)</td>
<td>UV, 220 nm</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>LOD: 4.2 ng (syn), 3.5 ng (oct), 5.9 ng (tyr),5.5 ng (nmt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>positional isomers of synephrine</td>
<td>Sonication in water</td>
<td>Discovery HS F5 (150 mm x 4.6 mm, 5 µm)</td>
<td>10 mM ammonium acetate in water: ammonium acetate in methanol (70:30, v/v)</td>
<td>UV, 220 nm</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>LOD: 31 ng (p-synephrine), 10 ng (n-synephrine), 33 (m-synephrine), 50 (m-synephrine)</td>
<td>(Santana et al., 2007)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For the analysis of charged, basic species such as synephrine, octopamine and tyramine (Table 5), with relatively high pKa’s ranging from 8.9 to 10.5, conditions must be in place to either neutralise them or introduce a modifier such as an ion pair reagent (IPR) in order to achieve good peak shape. Unlike dissociated acids, which, due to their negative charge, elute rapidly, protonated bases would often have long retention times and poor peak shape. This retention behaviour is due to the interaction of the positively charged amine with residual silanol groups on the silica surface of the stationary phase not coated with the non-polar adsorbed material. One method of suppressing silanol ion formation is to use IPR such as sodium dodecyl sulphate (SDS) which binds to the silanol groups resulting in improved peak shape and retention behaviour. A number of studies incorporated IPRs for the detection of Citrus amines (Ganzera, Lanser, & Stuppner, 2005; Penzak et al., 2001; Putzbach, Rimmer, Sharpless, & Sander, 2007; Roman, Betz, & Hildreth, 2007; Tang et al., 2006). Ganzera et al. reported a method for the simultaneous detection of alkaloids in CA and ES. The samples were extracted with 0.37% hydrochloric acid via sonication. The column used was a HyperClone C18 BDS 1 column (100 mm x 4.6 mm, 3 µm), with a gradient elution of mobile phase A, 3 mM aqueous SDS (pH 4.0); B, 0.1% phosphoric acid containing 3 mM SDS; C, acetonitrile/methanol (2:1, v/v) at a flow rate of 1 mL/min. The UV detection was at 210 nm. The dietary supplements containing CA contained 0.08-3.05% of synephrine whilst octopamine and tyramine were found to be below the limits of detection (LOD). This method was sensitive but the use of the IPR hindered the use of mass detection.

Table 5 Comparison of chemical properties of synephrine, octopamine and tyramine

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compounds</th>
<th>Molecular Formula</th>
<th>Molecular Mass (g/mol)</th>
<th>pKa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Synephrine</td>
<td>( C_{9}H_{13}NO_{2} )</td>
<td>167.2</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Octopamine</td>
<td>( C_{8}H_{11}NO_{2} )</td>
<td>153.2</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyramine</td>
<td>( C_{9}H_{11}NO )</td>
<td>137.2</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Use of IPRs, however, is usually prohibitive with MS detectors since they lower the selectivity and decrease reproducibility. An alternative is to derivatise the sample used by Gatti et al. (2012) for the analysis of primary phenethylamines in supplements using pre-column derivatization with fluorescence detection and in contrast to direct RP-LC with fluorescence detection. The chromatographic separation after pre-derivatization with O-phthaldialdehyde (OPA) was performed with a Phenomenex Luna 5 µm C18 column (250 mm x 4.6 mm) using methanol and sodium acetate buffer (pH 5.5) by gradient elution fluorescence detection, the total run time was 55 minutes. The study concluded that the derivatization method yielded recovery ranging from 99.5-101.3% with RSD ranging from 0.8 to 1.2% (Gatti et al., 2012; Liu et al., 2009). However, derivatization protocols are time consuming, subject to introduced additional impurities and/or cause ion-suppression for mass detection (Qi et al., 2014). However, these methods also used IPRs for amine retention. HPLC-quadrupole MS is a selective and sensitive method, but is more suited to quantify known compounds that are available as pure reference standards. HPLC coupled to triple quadrupole tandem MS (MS/MS) or HPLC coupled to an ion trap MS (MSn) is a better set up for unknown compounds. HPLC-MS/MS has been applied to the detection of ephedrine alkaloids and synephrine in dietary supplements (Gay, Niemann, & Musser, 2006; Putzbach et al., 2007; Santana, Sharpless, & Nelson, 2008).
1.4.2 HPLC Analysis of Caffeine & Derivatives

Several analytical methods have been used for the analysis and quantification of caffeine and DMX. These methods include gas chromatography (GC), gas chromatography-mass spectrometry (GC-MS) (Shrivas & Wu, 2007), capillary electrophoresis (CE) (Chen, et al., 2010; Meinhart et al., 2010; Uysal et al., 2009), thin layer chromatography (TLC) (Aranda & Morlock, 2007; Ford et al., 2005), and UPLC (Vaclavik et al., 2014; Venhuis et al., 2014; Zacharis et al., 2013). Based on a recent review (Monteiro et al., 2016), RP-HPLC is the most common analytical method used for caffeine and DMX analysis. Table 6 shows a small representation of the current methods available for caffeine analysis in supplements and biological fluids.

Most methods of DMX separation in biological fluids and foods do not separate PX and TP (Bispo et al., 2002; Hasegawa et al., 2009; Kanazawa et al., 2000; Martinez-Lopez et al., 2014; Thomas et al., 2004). It has been noted that the three DMX isomers are difficult to separate in RP-HPLC (Randon et al., 2010). The three DMX are configurational isomers, have identical masses and are challenging to differentiate analytically without derivatization. Further developments for a HPLC/UV-MS method used in our studies will be discussed in chapter 4.

Table 6 Comparison of methods for caffeine analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compound Analyzed</th>
<th>Sample Preparation</th>
<th>Stationary Phase</th>
<th>Mobile Phase</th>
<th>Detection</th>
<th>Accuracy</th>
<th>Author</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caffeine, TB, TP</td>
<td>Filtered using filter paper and Soxhlet extraction</td>
<td>Bondesi C18</td>
<td>methanol-water-acetic acid</td>
<td>UV 273 nm</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>(Bispo et al., 2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caffeine, TB, TP</td>
<td>Dissolve in water and filtered with filter paper</td>
<td>Li-Chirophor 100 RP-18 (244 mm x 4.4 I.d., 5 μm)</td>
<td>water, ethanol, acetic acid</td>
<td>UV 273 nm</td>
<td>94% to 106%</td>
<td>(de Aragao, Veloso, Bispo, Ferreira, &amp; de Andrade, 2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caffeine, TB, TP</td>
<td>N/A extracted with 4 mL of hexane/isopropanol vortexed and centrifuged (10 mins, 10,500 rpm)</td>
<td>Phenomenex Luna C18 (150 mm x 4.6 mm, 3 μm)</td>
<td>0.1 vol% formic acid/CH₃OH (92.5:7.5, v/v)</td>
<td>UV 272 nm</td>
<td>90% and 108%</td>
<td>(Zacharis et al., 2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caffeine, Taurine</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kinetex C18 (4.6 x 250 mm, 5 μm)</td>
<td>water/methanol/acetic acid (75:20:5, v/v/v)</td>
<td>Mass spectrometry</td>
<td>70.1 and 94.4%</td>
<td>(Marchei, Pellegrini, Pacifici, Palmi, &amp; Pichini, 2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caffeine, TB, TP</td>
<td></td>
<td>Phenomenex Luna C18 (150 mm x 4.6 mm, 3 μm)</td>
<td>water/methanol</td>
<td>UV 272 nm</td>
<td>95 and 104.5%</td>
<td>(Martinez-Lopez et al., 2014)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1.5 Research Questions

1. Do CA-containing PWS comply with the 30 mg per dose limit of synephrine set by the TGA of Australia?
2. Is there a discrepancy in synephrine concentrations between overseas sourced and locally manufactured PWS?
3. Are the levels of caffeine measured in a range of CA-containing PWS products, consistent with that listed on their labels?

1.6 Hypotheses

1. It is hypothesised that pre-workout supplements containing CA as a labelled ingredient contain levels of synephrine higher than the 30 mg/dose limit set by the TGA,
2. It is hypothesized that pre-workout supplements sourced from overseas will have higher amounts of synephrine compared to locally available PWS.
3. It is hypothesized that levels of caffeine in pre-workout supplements labelled to contain CA are higher than that listed on their labels.

1.7 Aims

The primary aim of this thesis was to quantitatively determine the amounts of synephrine, octopamine, and tyramine in range of CA-containing PWS by HPLC with UV-MS detection. A secondary aim was to determine the amounts of caffeine and DMX present in PWS with HPLC-UV/MS.
Chapter 2  General Methods
2.1 General Principles of Chromatography

Successful chromatography requires that parameters which affect the passage of molecules through a column be measured, known as elution. The distribution of analytes in chromatography can be expressed in terms of the equilibrium of the analyte between two phases whereby:

$$[A]_{\text{mobile}} \leftrightarrow [A]_{\text{stationary}}$$

Where the equilibrium constant, $K_{eq}$ can be expressed as

$$K_{eq} = \frac{[A]_{\text{stationary}}}{[A]_{\text{mobile}}}$$

Such that, at low concentrations of A, the concentration of A in the mobile phase is directly proportional to that in the stationary phase. These quantities, however, are difficult to measure. (Note overloading the column leads to a disproportionate amount of A in one phase and decreased column efficiency). Alternatively the capacity factor, $K'_eq$ (the ratio of the moles of A in each phase) provides a means of incorporating volume and also time into an equation developed for determining the amount of time an analyte spends in the stationary phase or retention factor, k (see below). These quantities, including void volume/time and retention volume/time are more easily determined from the chromatography. A full mathematical derivation was expanded by Mikes (2011).

The key goal in most chromatographic analysis is obtaining optimum resolution of each analyte of interest to facilitate accurate quantification. Achieving this requires understanding of the factors that influence resolution. Resolution (R) can be represented by the following equation which relates resolution to other key metrics in chromatography such as efficiency (N), selectivity ($\alpha$) and retention factor (k) (Heftmann, 2004). Several equations for resolution in LC have been described, varying in their degree of complexity and discussed here. A simplified equation is presented in Equation 1 which assumes that the value of k (and $\alpha$) for both analytes are similar:

$$R = \frac{\sqrt{N}}{4} \cdot (a - 1) \cdot \frac{k_1}{1 + k_{avg}}$$

(Equation 1)
The $k$ and $\alpha$ of the column are influenced by pH and in the strength of the mobile phase. Efficiency and resolution depend on the variations of column size, packing material and internal dimensions and flow rate. $k_1$ is the retention factor of the first product and $k_{avg}$ is the average retention factor of the first product multiple sample set.

The retention factor ($k$) is a unitless measure of a compound’s retention on a chromatographic system such that:

$$k = \frac{V_R - V_0}{V_0} = \frac{t_R - t_0}{t_0} \quad \text{(Equation 1.1)}$$

where $V_R$ is the analyte’s retention volume, $V_0$ is the volume of the mobile phase in the chromatographic system. $t_R$ represents the retention time of the analyte, and $t_0$ is the elution time of an unretained component, known as the column dead time. ($t_0$ can also be described as $t_M$ (according to International Union of Pure and Applied Chemistry, IUPAC, terminology). Changes in $k$ result in the largest effect on resolution since $R$ is proportional to $k$ ($R \propto k/(1-k)$, see Eq. 1).

Figure 7 Diagrammatic representation of a chromatogram depicting the relationship between retention time ($t_R$) and the column dead time ($t_0$).
Unreliable chromatography ensues with retention factors of less than 1 since analytes are unlikely to be retained. Conversely, k values over 10 means longer run times and lower peak heights. Thus an optimum value for k is around 5, although k values within the range of between 1 to 10 are satisfactory. k can easily be determined from the $t_R$ of each analyte knowing the dead time of the system. One of the easiest ways to modify the retention factor is to alter the mobile composition by increasing the organic component. This coaxes the hydrophobic component of the analyte back into the mobile phase from the stationary phase thereby eluting earlier. Since k is not influenced by small changes in flow rate nor column dimensions, this is often one of the first parameters to optimise and useful for modifying a method developed on a different system (Dorsey, Cooper, Wheeler, Barth, & Foley, 1994).

Selectivity ($\alpha$) is the ability of the chromatographic system to discriminate between two different analytes. It is defined as the ratio of corresponding retention factors, expressed as:

$$\alpha = \frac{k_1}{k_2}$$

(Equation 1.2)

Where $k_2$ and $k_1$ are the retention factors of two analytes.

At a value of 1 the two analytes are co-eluting thus, by definition, selectivity values are always greater than 1 and should be as high as possible. The higher the value the greater the distance between the apices of the two peaks.

Selectivity is a factor of the chemistry of analyte, mobile and stationary phases, so modifications in all these factors can be performed to optimise selectivity. For example, changing the organic solvent from methanol to acetonitrile, changing the pH of the mobile phase, changing the column chemistry or altering the column temperature.
Efficiency is a measure of the degree of peak broadening produced by a particular column. Peak broadening is caused by dispersion forces on the analytes as they transverse the system resulting in their typical Gaussian shape. It can be expressed mathematically as in Equation 1.3:

\[ N = 16 \left( \frac{t_R}{w} \right)^2 \text{ or } N = 5.55 \left( \frac{(t_R)^2}{(w_{1/2})^2} \right) \]  \hspace{1cm} (Equation 1.3)

where \( t_R \) is the retention time, \( w \) is the peak width of the baseline, \( w_{1/2} \) is the width of peak at half height of peak.

Efficiency is expressed as the number of theoretical plates \( (N) \) (Heftmann, 2004). Theoretical plates was a concept originating from fractional distillation and applied to chromatography. It was a concept whereby the entire column can be thought of as consisting of discrete sections, whereby the analytes can equilibrate. In lay terms, the higher the number of plates, the greater the equilibration and the narrower peak shape. \( N \) depends on column dimensions, but for a typical column of 4.6µm diameter of 100 mm length acceptable values of \( N \) would be between 5000 - 8000. \( N \) is inversely proportional to the space between the plates or plate height. Note that the latter is often referred to as the Height Equivalent or Theoretical Plate or HETP (Dorsey et al., 1994). Values of efficiency are often given for quoting the efficiency of a particular column. Predetermined values may be in place in a quality control setting such that when the column efficiency passes below a set value, the column use is terminated.

Band broadening is a phenomenon that decreases the efficiency of the separation, which results in poor peak resolution and overall chromatographic performance. The Van Deemter equation was described to understand the main factors that result in a loss of column efficiency. The equation relates the HETP of the column to the various kinetic parameters during mobile phase flow. It was described as the following:

\[ HETP = A + B \frac{u}{u} + C u \]  \hspace{1cm} (Equation 2)

Where \( A \) is the Eddy-diffusion parameter, \( B \) is the diffusion coefficient of eluting particles, \( C \) is the mass transfer coefficient of the analyte between mobile and stationary phase, and \( u \) is the linear velocity of the mobile phase.
Eddy diffusion describes the variations in mobile phase flow or analyte flow path within the column. The variations in an analyte flow ‘path’ are caused by the lack of homogeneity in the column packing material and particle size. A well-packed column with smaller stationary particle size is ideal to minimise Eddy Diffusion.

The diffusion coefficient can determine the extent of band broadening resulting from analyte molecules contained in the injection solvent dispersing within the tubing of the HPLC. The amount of analyte dispersion is influenced by the length and internal diameter of the tubing as well as the internal volume of the detector flow cell. Increasing the flow rate of the method will reduce the effect of the diffusion coefficient.

Mass transfer occurs due to stagnation of mobile phase within the porous surfaces of the packing material of the stationary phase. Band broadening also occurs when the analyte molecules adsorb to the pores of the stationary phase at varying rates. These effects may be reduced by decreasing the size of the packing material and lowering the flow of the mobile phase.
2.2 Developing a Systematic Work Flow

Chromatographic method development can often be time-consuming and difficult whereby the typical approach is to select a combination of solvents, pH, buffer and column as a starting point, making adjustment to the composition until a suitable method is selected. The systematic workflow outlined in Figure 8 below, was used to develop the methods set out in Chapters 3 and 4.

**Figure 8 Diagram of method development workflow**

Factors such column chemistry, strength of organic solvents, temperature and pH were evaluated to determine the most effective experimental parameters to achieve resolution. The best conditions producing optimum values for these parameters were used to refine the chromatography.

Finally, a single-laboratory validation was conducted. The following method section describes experimental procedures which apply equally to both analytical experiments, such as solid phase extraction of samples (sample clean-up). In cases where specific methodology applicable to one or the other experiments apply, these more specific protocols may be found within their respective chapters, for example, Chapter 3 - HPLC detection of amphetamine-like compounds and Chapter 4 - HPLC detection of caffeine.
2.2.1 Sample Preparation

An essential aspect for obtaining good chromatography is to ensure the sample injected into the HPLC system is free from unwanted contaminants that may interfere with the chromatography. The challenge of sample preparation for PWS is the complexity of its matrix. Most PWS contain a mixture of ingredients in a ‘proprietary blend’. A problem with proprietary blends is that the FDA does not monitor the PWS labels to guarantee specific amounts of ingredients are present. Common ingredients generally found in PWS are caffeine, creatine, arginine, taurine, β-Alanine, and phosphate (Eudy et al., 2013). In addition, other non-active ingredients include colouring, flavourings and bulk powders with a wide range of physicochemical properties. Figure 9 shows an example of a typical label of a PWS supplement containing CA. Two sample preparation techniques were explored based on their conventional use and straightforward approach.

![Figure 9 Example of a typical PWS supplement label](image-url)
2.2.1.1 Liquid- Liquid Extraction (LLE)

LLE was first trialled, during the early stages of project method development, as it was a relatively cheap and simple technique (Figure 10)

![Diagrammatic representation of the LLE method used](image)

Figure 10 Diagrammatic representation of the LLE method used

Powdered PWS sample (1 g) was dissolved in a total of 10 mL of MilliQ water and 5M sodium hydroxide (NaOH), where the pH was adjusted to 12. This ensured the trace amines were in a neutral state. The mixture was sonicated for 30 minutes to completely dissolve the components. The solution was then placed into a separating funnel. Ethyl acetate (10 mL) was used to extract the amines. The aqueous layer was discarded and the remaining organic phase was kept. Then, 1 mL of 1M hydrochloric acid and 9mL of water was added to the solution to protonate the retained amines. Upon separation of solvent layers, the organic layer was discarded and the aqueous layer was evaporated to dryness at room temperature (24°C). The dried residue was then reconstituted with 1.5 mL methanol and aliquoted for HPLC analysis.

The LLE method was subject to poor repeatability and reproducibility and this, coupled with long sample preparation time, limitations to the selectivity and difficulties with emulsions, made a rapid analysis of PWS difficult. For this reason, it was decided to turn to a much more consistent and robust method of sample preparation such as solid phase extraction.
2.2.1.2 Solid Phase Extraction (SPE)

The Oasis PRIME HLB (3 mL, 60 mg cartridge, Waters, Ireland) cartridges were selected because they were especially suitable for basic compound analysis such as the amphetamine like compounds of interest in CA-containing supplements. These cartridges were also suitable for the extraction of xanthines. The workflow is set out in Figure 11.

CA-containing PWS (1 g) was weighed and 10 mL of MilliQ water was added. The mixture was sonicated under ambient temperature for 30 minutes. MilliQ water was used to wash polar impurities away whilst an acetonitrile: methanol mixture (90:10, v/v) was used to elute the non-polar components within PWS into 2 mL HPLC vial. Samples were evaporated to dryness prior to reconstitution in mobile phase and stored at 4°C before subsequent HPLC analysis. Each supplement sample was prepared in triplicate. This method of sample clean-up was found to have a high degree of specificity with the SPE sorbent, producing a more consistent yield, and using less solvent per sample compared to LLE.
2.2.2 Stationary Phase Selection

The column selection was made based on the specific analyte being considered. For example, columns best able to retain charged amines, such as the amphetamine-like compounds, must be stable at high pH and able to maximise aromatic interactions between the analyte and the stationary phase particle coating. During method development, access to a wide range of columns can be a limiting factor with budget constraints. In these cases, developing skills in optimising the parameters such as those discussed in section 2.1 is essential.

The choices of columns available for this study was narrowed down to a Xselect CSH phenyl-hexyl (3.5 µm, 4.6 x 100 mm, i.d., Waters, Ireland), Xselect HSS T3 (5 µm, 3.0 x 150 mm, i.d., Waters, Ireland) and Xbridge BEH C18 (2.5 µm, 3.0 x 100 mm, i.d., Waters, Ireland).

Table 7 Comparison of column chemistry and dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ligand and Particle Type</th>
<th>CSH Phenyl-Hexyl</th>
<th>BEH C18</th>
<th>HSS T3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Particle Size (µm)</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pH range</td>
<td>1-11</td>
<td>1-12</td>
<td>2-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperature limit (°C)</td>
<td>45-60</td>
<td>45-80</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>General purpose alternative selectivity ligand that provides π-π interactions with polyaromatic compounds, increased loading capacity for basic compound</td>
<td>General purpose column ideally suited for method development due to extreme pH stability and applicability to the broadest range of compound classes.</td>
<td>Aqueous mobile-phase compatible column designed for exceptional polar compound retention.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The column packing materials listed in Table 7 for each column consisted of a Charged Surface Hybrid (CSH), Ethylene Bridged Hybrid (BEH), and High Strength Silica (HSS) proprietary to Waters (Waters, 2016). The HSS and BEH columns chemistry were C18 although with different pH and temperature resistances due to their respective end-capping. However, the phenyl-hexyl chemistry of the CSH column has advantages in aromatic compounds retention such as an increased π-π interaction (Gibson & Fowler, 2014). Further specific developments of the column chromatography will be discussed in Chapter 3 and 4.

2.2.3 Mobile Phase Selection

The organic mobile phases trialled during method development, acetonitrile and methanol, are commonly used in LC. Acetonitrile is a stronger solvent compared to methanol and this fact can be exploited during the optimisation process. Both solvents have low absorbance at typical analysis wavelengths for UV detection with acetonitrile having a UV cut-off wavelength of 200 nm while that for methanol is 240 nm. An increase in the organic content of the mobile phase of 10% will decrease the retention factor, k, for each analyte by a factor of 2 to 3. In addition, organic modifiers have different viscosities. A less viscous mobile phase is desirable as it reduces the backpressure of the chromatographic system. Further discussions on the impact of mobile phase selection will be detailed in their respective results section (Chapter 3 & 4).

2.2.4 pH Modifiers in Mobile Phase

As mentioned, many RP-HPLC experiments are maintained at low pH (around 2-3) to minimise silanol ionisation. Unfortunately, at such low pH values, amphetamine-like compounds (pKa > 9), would be positively charged and interact with the negatively charged silanol groups on the stationary phase increasing retention and causing peak tailing. Acidic modifiers such as trifluoroacetic acid (TFA) and formic acid (FA) were used to decrease the pH of the mobile phases reducing charged silanol group interactions. However, the acidity of TFA is greater than formic acid. The impact of acid as a pH modifier will be explored further in Chapter 4.
Retention of basic analytes is still possible using a method such as ion-pair reagents which overcomes these unwanted silanol interactions. It was important to identify pH modifiers that would overcome these interactions while being compatible with QDa mass detection. As a result, ammonium hydroxide was selected for the separation of our amphetamine-like compounds discussed in Chapter 3.

2.2.5 Apparatus and Materials

All experiments were carried out using an Alliance e2695 (Waters, Ireland) separations module with a quaternary solvent system, equipped with auto-sampler, 100 μL injection loop, column oven, model 2489 UV/Vis Detector (Waters, Ireland) in series with an Acquity quadrupole diode array (QDa) mass detector (Figure 12). Empower V3 software was used for data acquisition and processing. Samples were filtered through a 0.45-micron filter prior to solid phase extraction (Oasis PRIME HLB, 3 mL, 60 mg cartridge, Waters, Ireland). Synephrine, octopamine, tyramine, phenylephrine, caffeine, TP, TB, PX and etofylline were obtained from Sigma-Aldrich (Sydney, Australia). HPLC grade Optima methanol, Optima acetonitrile and Optima grade formic acid were from Fisher Scientific (Geel, Belgium). HPLC grade water from a Milli-Q system (Millipore, Bedford, MA, USA) was used. All chemicals were of analytical grade suitable for LC-MS.

Figure 12 Representative Alliance e2695 set up paired to a UV/Vis detector and a QDa detector
2.3 Method Validation

The validation process aims to demonstrate that the analytical method being developed is fit for purpose. In a quality assurance setting, there are specific regulatory requirements that must be demonstrated for a method to be considered valid (ICH Expert Working Group, 1994). A complete method validation involves inter-laboratory testing with more than one laboratory. However, access to other laboratories is often not possible and certainly beyond the scope of this study. Validation involves a demonstration of reliable results and an acceptable degree of repeatability. The validation parameters are set by the International Conference On Harmonisation Of Technical Requirements For Registration Of Pharmaceuticals For Human Use (ICH Expert Working Group, 1994) was the chosen guideline for this study.

The validation parameters determined were as follows:

2.3.1 Selectivity

Selectivity is the ability to distinguish between the analyte being measured and other substances present. Selectivity was confirmed by the use of UV-detection and QDa-MS by incorporating a starting condition blank as well as a dietary supplement blank (not containing any of the analytes being measured).

2.3.2 Precision

Intra-day and inter-day assay precision, reported as relative standard deviation (RSD %) of standard peak areas and were calculated based on the equation:

\[ RSD \% = \frac{\text{Standard deviation}}{\text{mean}} \times 100 \]

Intra-assay precision was determined by analysing three different concentrations (5, 50, and 100 µg/mL) of the internal standard (IS) from each method in triplicate on the same day. Inter-day precision was determined based on analysing these concentrations over three separate days.
2.3.3 Accuracy

Accuracy was determined by evaluating spiked PWS with 3 concentrations of standards calculating RSD % between the mean values.

2.3.4 Linearity

For each run, 6 standard concentrations were prepared and analysed with three independent injections. Concentrations ranged between 5 µg/mL – 100 µg/mL. Linear regressions were generated on 3 separate days using the standards to IS peak area ratios by weighted (1/x²) least-squares linear regression. Calibration curve equation and correlation coefficients (r²) were calculated. The acceptance criteria for acceptable calibration curve were r² of 0.99 or better.

2.3.5 Limit of Detection and Limit of Quantification

Determination of the limits of detection (LOD), limits of quantitation (LOQ), intra-assay and inter-assay precision were performed according to outlined in the International Conference on Harmonization of Technical Requirements for Registration of Pharmaceuticals for Human Use (ICH Q2 (R1), 2005). The calibration curves were obtained by plotting the area of base peak of extracted chromatogram against the internal standard. Limits of detection (LOD) and limits of quantitation (LOQ) were determined based on their respective signal-to-noise ratio (S/N) where the desired S/N for the LOD is between 3 or 2:1, whereas the desired S/N for the LOQ is 10:1.
2.3.6 S/N Determination Within the Empower 3 Software.

In 2009, the United States Pharmacopeia (USP) defined Signal-to-Noise (S/N) as:

\[ S/N = \frac{2h}{hn} \]  

(Equation 3)

Where \( h \) is the height of the peak corresponding to the component and \( hn \) is the difference between the largest and smallest noise values observed over a distance equal to at least 5 times the width at half-height of the peak. This approach does not compensate for local systematic drift. Basically, if the noise within this system increases, the S/N decreases which could result in larger LOD and LOQ values. Therefore, it is important to use the most representative noise value possible. To reduce the effects of drift, peak-to-peak noise calculation was done on the Empower 3 software. The peak-peak noise determines the best-fit line regression line to the noise and calculates the residual amount for each data point.

Peak-to-Peak noise was determined by the inclusion of a custom field (see below) in the ‘Noise and Drift’ tab of the processing method. A noise interval of 60 points ensures it is at least a minimum of five times the width at half height of the peak of interest (Figure 13). The noise was determined in a peak-free region of the chromatogram to abide to the USP S/N time range.

![Figure 13 Empower 3 software window of noise and drift calculation](image-url)
To determine the appropriate S/N within the method, a custom field was defined to determine the USP Signal-to-Noise. The custom field formula was:

\[
\frac{S}{N} = 2 \times \text{Height} \times \frac{\text{Scale to } \mu V}{\text{Peak to peak noise}}
\]

Figure 14 shows this formula and the appropriate custom field parameters in the Empower 3 Edit Custom Field window. The S/N was calculated for each individual analyte peak found with each subsequent analysis.
2.3.7 The Theory of Internal Standard Use

An internal standard (IS) is a known amount of a compound (different from the analyte) that is added to the unknown sample. The signal of the analyte is compared with signals from the IS to find out how much analyte is present. An ideal IS should be chemically similar to the analytes of interest, yet should have a chromatographic peak well separated from the analytes. This is so that uncontrolled matrix effects such as a change in analyte signal might have a similar effect on the IS.

To use an IS, we prepared a known mixture of standard and IS to measure the relative response of the two compounds. The area ($A$) under each peak is proportional to the concentration ($C$) of the compounds injected. However, the detector generally has a different intensity to each component of the same injected concentrations of the analyte ($x$) and the IS. The magnitude of difference of area found is known as the response factor ($F$). This is shown in equation 2.

\[ \frac{A_x}{C_x} = F \cdot \frac{A_{IS}}{C_{IS}} \]  

Equation 3

The equations above use a single mixture to find the response factor. To reduce the effects of experimental error, a multipoint calibration curve is preferred. Equation 3 is rearranged so that the variables of the equation can be plotted on a graph, where the gradient of the graph will be the response factor (Equation 3.1).

\[ \frac{A_x}{A_{IS}} = F \cdot \frac{C_x}{C_{IS}} \]  

Equation 3.1

Further application of the internal standard method will be discussed in Chapter 3, where phenylephrine is used as an internal standard to the method.
Chapter 3  Development of a Rapid HPLC-MS Protocol for Synephrine, Octopamine and Tyramine in CA Extracts in Pre-workout Supplements
3.1 Background

Concomitant with the increased popularity of CA-containing PWS in the community is the need for assessing the safety and efficacy of the components therein, especially in light of reports of their adverse effects. PWS are, by nature, complex matrices which require a selective and sensitive means of quantifying the active constituents. A review of techniques for the separation, subsequent detection and finally quantification of the amphetamine-like compounds in PWS has already been discussed in Chapter 1.

The most common method for separation of the adrenergic amines in CA was found to be RP-HPLC paired to a UV detector (Beyer et al., 2007; Di Lorenzo et al., 2014; Viana et al., 2013; Viana et al., 2015; X. L. Wang & Zhao, 2015). HPLC stationary phases are made of C18 bounded to silica, where the basic amines could interact with the silanol ions, resulting in poor peak shape and retention (Neue et al., 2004). HPLC methods of CA amine separation with ion-pair reagents were used to improve retention of charged amines and improve peak shape (Di Lorenzo et al., 2014; Ganzera et al., 2005; Penzak et al., 2001; Putzbach et al., 2007; Roman et al., 2007).

Di Lorenzo et al., developed a method to measure the amount of active amines in dietary supplements containing CA. HPLC analysis was carried out with a LiChrospher RP-18 column (250 mm x 4 mm, 5 µm), with a 30 minute gradient elution at 1 mL/min with mobile phases: A, 2.9 g/L sodium dodecyl sulphate (SDS) in water at pH 4.2; B, 2.9 g/L SDS: ACN (62:38, v/v). UV detection was set at 224 nm. The analytical recovery of the amines ranged from 85.9% to 108.4% and the LOD: 1.8-7.5 ng/mL LOQ: 6.0-25 ng/mL. The use of the SDS IPR prevented the potential use of MS.
Santana et al. (2008) developed two LC methods for the baseline separation and quantitative determination of $p$-synephrine and $m$-synephrine. The incorporation of MS assisted in confirming the identity of the resolved isomers. The chromatography involved a Supelco Discovery HS-F5 (pentafluorophenyl) column (150 mm x 4.6 mm, 5 µm); mobile phase A= 10 mmol/L ammonium acetate in water; B= ammonium acetate in methanol; A/B= 70/30; at a flow rate of 1 mL/min. UV detection was set at 220 nm. The method resulted in a linear range of 0.001-11.318 µg of $p$-synephrine with LOD of 11 ng. The tandem MS set up had gradient conditions as above but with a flow rate of 0.5 mL/min with the detection and quantification was carried out with the use of ESI-MRM/MS/MS. The linear range for this set up was 0.005- 10 ng with an LOD of 0.005 ng. The results showed that $m$-synephrine was not detected in any of the tested dietary supplements. The study concluded that the LC/UV method was a more convenient method to use as a general screening method, while the LC/MS/MS method was more suited to a confirmatory method for verifying the presence of particular synephrine structural isomers in dietary supplements.

The aforementioned approaches to adrenergic amine determination in CA-containing PWS either involved extensive sample preparation, long run times and/or the use of non-volatile mobile phases. Concern for the increasing consumption of stimulant-containing dietary supplements in the general population (Eichner & Tygart, 2016) drives the need of an analytical method that is rapid, sensitive and cost effective.

The aim of this study was to develop a rapid, accurate and simple HPLC-UV/MS method for the determination and quantification of the synephrine, octopamine and tyramine in CA-containing PWS.
3.2 Experimental

3.2.1 Chemicals and Reagents

The chemicals and reagents used in this chapter are detailed in General Methods (Chapter 2). The five PWS selected were MusclePrime (AllMax Nutrition) (A); Gold Standard Preworkout (OptimumNutrition) (B); 360Rage (360°Cut Performance Supplements) (C); ErgoBlast (ErgoGenix) (D) and PumpHD (BPISports) (E). The matrix blank was a PWS without CA, Beast Mode (Beast Sport’s Nutrition). The PWS samples A, C and D were purchased online (manufactured in the USA) while samples B and E were sourced from a local health store in South-East Queensland, Australia.

3.2.2 Standard and Sample Preparation

Stock solutions (1 mg/mL) were prepared for all standards as well as internal standard (IS) and stored at 4°C until analysis. Phenylephrine (m-synephrine) was selected as IS since it is a positional isomer of synephrine and not naturally found in CA extracts (Pellati & Benvenuti, 2007). A linear dilution was prepared for each standard between 5 µg/mL to 100 µg/mL for all standards. The results of concentrations outside this linear range will be discussed in section 3.4.1. The PWS samples were prepared using the SPE method detailed in Chapter 2.
3.3 Method Development

According to the method development process depicted in Figure 8 (Chapter 2), by changing various parameters such as different column chemistries, mobile phase composition, temperature and gradient combinations, an optimised method for quantifying the adrenergic stimulants in PWS was achieved. The details of this process are outlined in the following sections to attain the best conditions for separation.

3.3.1 Effect of Column Chemistry

Two chromatographic columns were compared; an Xbridge C18 (2.5 µm, 3.0 mm x 100 mm, i.d., Waters, Ireland) and an Xselect CSH phenyl-hexyl (3.5µm, 4.6 mm x 100mm, i.d., Waters, Ireland). These were selected based on their ability to interact with aromatic amines.

To compare the effect on analyte retention of the two columns a series of 100 µg/mL standard mix (including IS) injections were run using an initial mobile phase gradient A: H2O + 0.1% NH4OH: 95 – 0% and B: ACN + 0.1% NH4OH: 5 – 100% over a period of 20 minutes with a flow rate of 1 mL/min at 30°C.

![Comparison of column chemistry: (A) Xselect CSH phenylhexyl (3.5 µm, 4.6 x 100 mm, i.d.) and (B) Xbridge C18 (2.5 µm, 3.0 x 100 mm, i.d.). The standard compounds are represented by: (a) Octopamine; (b) Synephrine; (c) Tyramine; (d) Phenylephrine](image-url)
The elution order of the amines from the two columns was octopamine, followed by synephrine, phenylephrine and finally tyramine (Figure 15). This was as expected from their clogP values. The results are summarised in Table 8.

Table 8 Summary of effects of column chemistry on CA amines

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compound</th>
<th>RT on Phenyl-hexyl column (mins)</th>
<th>RT on C18 column (mins)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Octopamine</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synephrine</td>
<td>5.61</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phenylephrine</td>
<td>Not detected*</td>
<td>5.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyramine</td>
<td>7.55</td>
<td>6.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*May have co-eluted with synephrine

The phenyl functional group of the phenyl-hexyl column introduce the potential for additional molecular interactions such as π-π interactions (Yang, Fazio, Munch, & Drumm, 2005). These effects most likely explain the increased RT for the analytes on the phenyl-hexyl column.

It was noted that the peaks observed on the phenyl-hexyl chromatogram were broader than those seen on the C18 chromatogram. Peak broadening can occur due to factors such as eddy diffusion, longitudinal diffusion and mass transfer, as mentioned in the previous chapter. Since the length of the column and instrument set up are similar, the two factors that would cause the broadening were eddy diffusion and mass transfer. Eddy diffusion is a term used to describe the variations in mobile phase flow and the analyte flow path within the chromatographic column represented in Figure 16. It is often related to the quality of the column packing. The larger particle size of the phenyl-hexyl column could have led to eddy diffusion effects and thus broader peaks observed in the chromatogram.
The particle size of the phenyl-hexyl column (3.5µm) is larger than the C18 column (2.5µm). The difference in particle size could affect the rate of adsorption of the amines based on the various flow paths of the amines such that larger particles could cause a slowing down as the analytes traverse the column. If this was the case, one would expect the retention time for analytes on the phenyl hexyl column to be longer. This is indeed the case and therefore eddy diffusion could be an additional factor explaining the longer retention time on the phenyl-hexyl column.
Mass transfer is dependent on the porosity of the stationary phase, where the amines could interact with the stationary phase at different rates of adsorption (Figure 17).

![Diagram of analyte interaction on stationary phase pore (sourced: Crawford Scientific)](image)

The pore diameter for both columns was 130Å, but the internal diameter of the phenyl hexyl column (4.6mm) was larger than the C18 column (3.6mm). The smaller diameter of the packing material caused an increase in linear velocity within the column. The increased linear velocity would have reduced the rate of mass transfer in the C18 column, therefore decreasing peak broadening.

Importantly it was noted that a separate peak for phenylephrine was not observed in the phenyl-hexyl chromatogram. Since \( p \)-synephrine and phenylephrine (\( m \)-synephrine) are geometric isomers, it was likely that the broad synephrine peak in the phenyl column was a result of the co-elution of phenylephrine and \( p \)-synephrine.

On the basis of the above observations of greater peak resolution, decreased amount of peak broadening and its ability to separate the two synephrine isomers, the Xbridge BEH C18 was selected as the preferred column for this analysis.
3.3.2 Effect of pH

The question being investigated here was really which effect most influenced the chromatography: either the unwanted silanol interactions incurred at a high pH or that due to having charged amines at a low pH. To answer this question three different pH values were tested as to their effect on chromatography– the details of which are set out in Table 9.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>pH</th>
<th>% Buffer/Modifier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.1% Formic acid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.1% NH₄OH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.15% NH₄OH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 18 shows a direct correlation between an increase in pH with an increased retention as well as peak resolution. It can be seen from the results that the separation of amines by RP-HPLC, is enhanced using a mobile phase pH higher than the amines’ pKa. As mentioned in Chapter 1, by maintaining pH above their pKa, the majority of the population of basic amines will be unionised which reduces interactions with the any exposed silanol groups on the stationary phase, reducing peak tailing and asymmetry (Calabuig-Hernandez, Garcia-Alvarez-Coque, & Ruiz-Angel, 2016). Note that many HPLC columns, however, are not stable at high pH. The ethylene bridged hybrid (BEH) particles of the Xbridge enable pH resistance at high pH (Waters, 2016).

In summary, ammonium hydroxide (NH₄OH) was chosen as the most suitable pH modifier.
Figure 18 Chromatographs achieved from the three pH conditions: (A) 0.1% Formic acid adjusted to pH 3; (B) (Red) 0.1% Ammonium hydroxide adjusted to pH 10 (Black) 0.15% Ammonium hydroxide adjusted to pH 11.
However, use of ammonium hydroxide must be carefully considered. For example, a study by Wang et al. described studies on column oxidative dimerization of anilines to form azo and hydazo species (Wang et al., 2011). They similarly used an Xbridge C18 column with ammonia as the modifier but could be duplicated on multiple columns capable of higher pH including Gemini NX C18 column, (Phenomenex, Torrance, CA). They concluded that coupling reactions are most likely caused by the oxidative reagents formed by the complexation of unknown elements on the surface of the Xbridge stationary phase and ammonia in the high pH aqueous mobile phase. A paper by Myers proposed a possible mechanism of the on-column reaction of N-nitrosation that occurs with analytes containing primary and secondary amines (such as these adrenergic amines) when ammonium hydroxide is used as an organic modifier (Myers et al., 2013). The ammonia was established to be the source of nitroso nitrogen occurring at the stainless steel column frit and the metal ablated from the frit. The process was thought to be initiated by removal of the chromium oxide protective film from the stainless steel by acetonitrile (Myers et al., 2013). It was suggested not to subject the working column to extreme pH of more than 12 as it could lead to shorter column life.

In summary, ammonium hydroxide was selected as the pH modifier, controlled to pH 11 as it was suitable for the determination of amines with minimal peak broadening and was compatible with MS detection due to its volatile nature.
3.3.3 Effect of Organic Modifier

The extent to which the type of organic solvent and concentration thereof had on retention time was investigated. Acetonitrile was compared with methanol to see which produced the best chromatography.

The initial gradient of mobile phases A: H₂O + 0.15% NH₄OH: 95 – 0% and B: Organic Modifier + 0.15% NH₄OH: 5 – 100% over a period of 10 minutes, with a flow rate of 1.5 mL/min at 35°C. Figure 19 shows the different chromatography achieved when changing between acetonitrile and methanol. Acetonitrile was observed to increase peak symmetry compared to methanol. This may be explained by the fact that methanol is protic (Harris, 2016). This could influence the way the mobile phase interacts with the silica surface and target components. Acetonitrile on the other hand, has lower viscosity would reduce the back pressure and often results in slightly better peak shape (Castells & Castells, 1998). The separation between tyramine and phenylephrine however was smaller when using acetonitrile (Figure 19). This is likely due to the higher elution strength of acetonitrile compared to methanol (Castells & Castells, 1998).

Notwithstanding the above, acetonitrile was selected as the organic modifier because of its ability to resolve the compounds with minimal band spread and interference. A 2% (v/v) concentration of acetonitrile at starting conditions and gradient shift to 65% (v/v) was shown to completely resolve the compounds without interference from other components in the supplements.
Figure 19  Chromatographs achieved from the two organic modifiers: (A) Acetonitrile as an organic modifier and (B) Methanol as the organic modifier. The standard compounds are represented by: (a) Octopamine; (b) Synephrine; (c) Tyramine; (d) Phenylephrine
3.3.4 Effect of Temperature

Optimising the column temperature is an important step in HPLC method development. The previously selected gradient was trialled with different column temperatures, ranging from 25°C to 40°C. Figure 20 shows a representative diagram of the effects of temperature on the peak formed by octopamine. The retention time of the compounds decreased with the increase in temperature. The higher the temperature resulted in faster exchange of analytes between mobile phase and stationary phase (Harris, 2016). This would likely result in the decreased rate of adsorption between the stationary phase and the amines.

It was observed that when the temperature increased, the peak shape improved. The difference the gradient elution between 35° and 40° were the peak shape. The higher temperature reduces the viscosity of the organic phase, which would allow for a greater flow rate within the column (Harris, 2016). The effect of the ‘mass transfer’ at 40°C is lower, as the internal flow rate increases, resulting in less peak broadening. The increased peak symmetry and reduced retention times lead to the selection of 40°C as the preferred temperature for the gradient method.

![Chromatogram of octopamine peak at different temperatures on Xbridge column at 242 nm](image)

*Figure 20 Chromatogram of octopamine peak at different temperatures on Xbridge column at 242 nm*
3.3.5 Optimisation of UV-Vis Spectra

Based on the literature, the typical UV wavelength for the amines in CA ranges between 210-255 nm and 273-280 nm as mentioned in Chapter 1. It was determined that the $\lambda_{\text{max}}$ = 236 nm and 290 nm for synephrine on the spectrophotometer. A representative diagram is shown in Figure 21 as the $\lambda_{\text{max}}$ was similar for octopamine and tyramine.

![Representative diagram of the $\lambda_{\text{max}}$ determined for synephrine, where $\lambda_{\text{max}}$ = 290 nm and 236 nm](image)

However, a Photo-diode array (PDA) was later used to further validate the optimal UV spectra. Contrary to the literature and the initial scan, the optimal UV for the amines was determined to be 242 nm for the amines of interest as shown in Figure 22. A possible inference for this shift in $\lambda_{\text{max}}$ was the different chemical environments of standards in the two detectors. It should be noted that the standards were determined with a gradient elution with acetonitrile and NH$_4$OH as organic and pH modifiers whilst detected with the PDA. The pH of standards were at pH of 11 whilst being analysed on the PDA, the pH was not recorded but was assumed to be lower during the spectrophotometer analysis. The pH of the sample solution could have caused a shift in the equilibrium of the amines (Babic, Horvat, Pavlovic, & Kastelan-Macan, 2007). The temperature was 35°C on the PDA analysis whereas the temperature of the spectrophotometer was at 25°C. It has been noted that an increase in temperature can cause a decrease in maximum wavelength absorption due to the changes in $\pi$-electron transition at different temperatures (Yang et al., 2004).
Figure 22 UV detection on a PDA at pH 11 and 35°C where λ_{max} = 242nm for all amines
3.3.6 Optimisation of QDa Mass Detection

Mass spectrometry (MS) has become an essential tool in analytical and pharmaceutical research (D’Hondt, Gevaert, Wynendaele, & De Spiegeleer, 2016). However, factors that limit the widespread use of MS are the high purchasing and operating costs. A high degree of expertise is needed for the optimisation and interpretation of MS data. The QDa is a miniature quadrupole-based MS that is compatible with chromatographic systems. The detector is pre-optimised without the sample specific adjustments typical of traditional mass spectrometers (detailed in Chapter 1). A problem with working with a PWS matrix is the potential co-elutions from other compounds. Unlike other UV detectors, the use of a mass detector minimises the risk of unexpected co-elutions by determining compounds via its specific mass.

Figure 23 shows the order of elution were octopamine (RT= 1.5 mins), synephrine (RT= 2.5 mins) and tyramine (RT= 5.4 mins). The IS eluted between synephrine and tyramine at 4.1 minutes. Peaks were completely resolved with limited background interference. A starting condition blank was used to monitor signs of carryover from high concentration standards/samples.

![Matrix Blank](image1)

![Standards](image2)

Figure 23 Chromatograph of matrix blank and standards in a matrix blank with the elution order of Octopamine (t = 1.5 mins), Synephrine (t = 2.5 mins), Phenylephrine (t= 4.0 mins) and Tyramine (t = 4.4 mins).
One of the manipulable parameters of the QDa was the cone voltage. The cone voltages of 1 V-30 V were trialled and are shown in Figure 24. The cone voltage of the mass detector was optimised to 15 V where it had the best mass detection with the least amount of in-source fragmentation.

Figure 24 3D chromatographs of synephrine at different cone voltages; 1 V (a); 5 V (b); 15 V (c); 20 V (d); 30 V (e). m/z= 150 (front) and m/z= 168 (back) were observed.
During the optimisation procedure, the positive ion mode, producing \([\text{M+H}]^+\), was preferred over the negative ion mode (\([-\text{M-H}^-]\)) for these basic compounds due to the greater signal intensity of amines when detected in positive ion mode. Selectivity of the method was confirmed by comparing the elution of external standards to a mix of standards into a dietary supplement blank.

The extra dimension of \(m/z\) on the Z-axis is a rapid output that aids in identifying and confirming the presences of the biogenic amines based on their specific masses. The mass spectra of the amines are represented in Figure 25. The mass of each compound was observed; there was a noticeable consistent fragmentation of 18 \(m/z\) for all compounds except for tyramine which had a mass fragment of 17 \(m/z\). Octopamine had a mass of 136 and 154 \(m/z\); synephrine and phenylephrine had a mass fragment of 150 and 168 \(m/z\); and tyramine was 138 and 121 \(m/z\). The fragmentation of synephrine, phenylephrine and octopamine was likely a result of a \([\text{M+H} - \text{H}_2\text{O}]^+\) ion cleavage on the \(\beta\)-carbon resulting in the loss of a \(m/z = 18\). However, the fragmentation of tyramine was likely due to a loss of a \(\text{NH}_3\) on the alpha carbon, resulting in \([\text{M+H} - \text{NH}_3]^+\) \((m/z = 121)\). This was attributed to the ability of the \(p\)-hydroxyl group to stabilise the transition state on the pathway to the formation of the ion (Zhao, Shoeib, Siu, & Hopkinson, 2006).

![Mass spectra of the detected standards on a QDa with observed fragmentation occurring](image-url)
A representative 3-dimensional (3D) chromatographic plot depicting the mass to charge ratio \((m/z)\) vs intensity for each analyte is presented in Figure 26. A MS scan was used to determine the presence of any contaminant or other compounds within the analytical range of 100 Da to 300 Da. A well-resolved separation was observed between the two synephrine geometric isomers, \(m\)-synephrine (phenylephrine) and \(p\)-synephrine, which has not been commonly observed in other studies (Roman et al., 2007; Santana et al., 2008). These isobaric amines are difficult to resolve chromatographically due to their similar structures physical/chemical properties as well as identical masses \((m/z\ 168.1)\) ((Table 5), Chapter 1).
Figure 27 depicts the combined representation of PWS A which had been spiked with 100 µg/mL of each standard plus internal standard. Peak broadening, was observed in the case of synephrine. This suggests a degree of dispersion known as ‘overloading’ was present for synephrine. This seems understandable since synephrine is the major adrenergic stimulant in CA.

A peak at a RT of 5.1 minutes, thought to be caffeine was detected in the PWS sample and subsequently supported by a mass of m/z 195.1. Other peaks were detected at 4.6 minutes, 4.7 minutes and 5.07 minutes; however, since their masses were greater than 300 Da, they were not detected in the total ion chromatogram (TIC). These peaks could potentially correspond to other compounds such as β-Alanine and other amino acids, also commonly found in PWS. Similar mass fragmentation was observed in the detected amines; this adds a confirmatory element to the chromatographic data found.
Figure 27 (A) Chromatograph of standards in a CA-containing PWS sample with the elution order of Octopamine ($t = 1.5$ mins), Synephrine ($t = 2.5$ mins), Phenylephrine ($t = 4.0$ mins) and Tyramine ($t = 4.4$ mins). (B) 3D plot of the standards present in the matrix blank. (C) Mass fragments of sample at 15 V.
3.3.7 Optimised HPLC Conditions for CA Separation

Based on the optimised chromatographic and detection parameters, the final chromatographic conditions were determined. The optimised conditions are summarised in the Table 10 below:

*Table 10 Summary of optimised HPLC conditions*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Optimisation parameter</th>
<th>Selected conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Column</td>
<td>Xbridge BEH C18 (2.5 µm, 3.0 x 100 mm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organic modifier</td>
<td>Acetonitrile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flow rate</td>
<td>1.5 mL/min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pH</td>
<td>11 adjusted with NH₄OH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperature</td>
<td>40°C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UV (λ)</td>
<td>242 nm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass detection range (TIC)</td>
<td>100-300 Da</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The column used was an Xbridge C18 (2.5 µm, 3.0 x 100 mm, i.d., Waters, Ireland) protected by a guard column (Xbridge C18, 2.5µm, 3.0 x 20mm i.d., Waters, Ireland). The components were separated using a gradient elution protocol where mobile phase A consisted of water, mobile phase B of acetonitrile, and mobile phase C of H₂O with 1% NH₄OH. All solvents were pH adjusted to 11. The flow rate was maintained at 1.5 mL/min while the column temperature was set to 40°C and sample temperature was set at 25°C. The run time was 10 minutes under gradient conditions (Table 11) based on the retention time of tyramine (the most non-polar of the constituents under investigation). The injection volume was 10 µL. There was a 5-minute delay between injections and UV detection was at 242 nm. Data acquisition with the QDa mass detector was performed in positive mode under the following conditions: total ion current (TIC) between m/z 100-300; capillary voltage, 3.5kV; cone voltage, 15V. Single Ion Recording (SIR) was set for positive mode masses of synephrine (168.2 m/z), IS (168.2 m/z), octopamine (154.1 m/z) and tyramine (138.2 m/z).

*Table 11 HPLC separation gradient used for UV-MS analysis of caffeine and derivatives*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time(min)</th>
<th>Mobile phase A (Water) (%)</th>
<th>Mobile phase B (ACN) (%)</th>
<th>Mobile phase C (Water + 1% NH₄OH) (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial Conditions</td>
<td>83.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>83.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.50</td>
<td>83.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.4 Analytical Validation of CA by HPLC/UV

The method validation parameters, described in Chapter 2 (Section 2.3) were in accordance with the ICH guidelines (ICH Expert Working Group, 1994).

3.4.1 Linearity, LOD, LOQ

Linearity was determined as a linear regression using the least-square method on a set of dilutions for each standard solution with phenylephrine as the internal standard. The results are shown in Table 12. The linear ranges of the amines were 5 µg/mL to 100 µg/mL. Poor linearity was observed outside this range, and the representative linearity curves of concentrations at 2 µg/mL and 200 µg/mL are found in Appendix 10-12. An intra-day 6-point standard curve for each analyte, the slope and y-intercept, correlation coefficient \( r^2 \) and RSD % of the standard curve were determined based on the parameters described in Chapter 2. Figure 28 depicts the standard curves for of synephrine, octopamine and tyramine. The correlation coefficients were synephrine \( r^2 = 0.998 \pm 0.002 \), octopamine \( r^2 = 0.999\pm0.001 \) and tyramine \( r^2 = 0.997\pm0.003 \).

Limits of detection (LOD) and Limits of Quantitation (LOQ) were determined, as described in Chapter 2, based on the signal-to-noise ratio (S/N) of the standards at their lowest concentration of 5.0µg/mL (Table 12). The LOD determined for synephrine octopamine and tyramine were 1.64 µg/mL, 1.50 µg/mL and 0.45 µg/mL, respectively. The LOQ ranged from 5.45 µg/mL, 5.00 µg/mL and 1.51 µg/mL for synephrine, octopamine and tyramine.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standards</th>
<th>Calibration range (µg/mL)</th>
<th>Linearity Equation</th>
<th>Correlation coefficient ( r^2 )</th>
<th>LOD (µg/mL)</th>
<th>LOQ (µg/mL)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Synephrine</td>
<td>5.0-100</td>
<td>( y = 2.6228x + \frac{0.971}{0.998} )</td>
<td>0.998 ± 0.002</td>
<td>1.637</td>
<td>5.457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Octopamine</td>
<td>5.0-100</td>
<td>( y = 1.636x - \frac{0.6659}{0.999\pm0.001} )</td>
<td>0.999±0.001</td>
<td>1.501</td>
<td>5.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyramine</td>
<td>5.0-100</td>
<td>( y = 1.4786x - \frac{4.9618}{0.997\pm0.003} )</td>
<td>0.454</td>
<td>1.514</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.4.2 Accuracy & Precision

Data presented in Table 13 was used to determine the accuracy of the method. The accuracy for the spiked samples varied from 77% to 107%, with standard deviations ranging from 0.1% to 9.4%. These values were acceptable according to the ICH, however further improvements were made. A matrix blank consisting of a PWS without CA was spiked at three concentration levels to check for the presence of peaks with similar retention times to the test analytes in PWS. Apart from synephrine, lower accuracy was observed at lower concentrations such as 5 µg/mL which was at the LOD, this could potentially impact the LOQ of this pilot method. This could be due to operator error during sample spiking as the available low volume pipette could vary in accuracy. Decreased accuracy was also observed at the higher end of the concentration range. This could be a result of column over-loading at 100 µg/mL.
Table 13 also depicts the results of the intra-day and inter-day precision and extraction recovery experiments. The intra-day precision was calculated to be between the range of 2.1-4.1% for synephrine, 2.9-3.0% for octopamine, and 1.4 to 5.3% for tyramine. The inter-day precision data for synephrine was found to be between 1.5- 13.5%, 2.4-7.5% for octopamine and 1.5-5.2% for tyramine. RSD% values less than 15% are acceptable under the FDA guidelines for pharmaceutical determination. However, the 13.5% variation for synephrine at LOD could be improved by using a higher amount of spiked standard or increasing the LOD amount.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standards</th>
<th>Spiked amounts (µg/mL)</th>
<th>Intra-day precision (RSD %)</th>
<th>Inter-day precision (RSD %)</th>
<th>Recovery (%) (mean ± SD)</th>
<th>Accuracy (%) (mean ± SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Synephrine</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>102.8 ± 3.3</td>
<td>105 ± 9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>100.6 ± 0.2</td>
<td>101 ± 1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>93 ± 0.3</td>
<td>90 ± 0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Octopamine</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>87 ± 10.8</td>
<td>77 ± 9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>112 ± 7.9</td>
<td>107 ± 1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>132 ± 0.2</td>
<td>80 ± 0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyramine</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>82 ± 0.5</td>
<td>91 ± 0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>102 ± 1.0</td>
<td>106 ± 2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>106 ± 0.5</td>
<td>91 ± 0.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.4.3 Recovery

A matrix blank was used to determine the amount of analyte recovered after sample preparation (PWS without CA). 10 samples (n= 10) were prepared, spiked with standard solutions and extracted with the sample preparation method. Each concentration of both sets were analysed in 3 replicates. The percent recovery was calculated by comparing the peak areas of the corresponding standard solutions to the calibration curve (Figure 28). The extraction recovery showed values between 93 to 102% for synephrine, 87 to 132% for octopamine, and 82 to 106% for tyramine amines. The yield recoveries above 100% could potentially be caused by pipetting inconsistencies. Increasing the sample size could help reduce the effects of these errors. At lower concentrations, the amounts of analyte recovered were lower than the higher spiked concentrations except for synephrine. This could possibly be due to loss during sample preparation (Poole, 2003). This could be resolved by using a higher concentration of non-polar solvent during the sample preparation.
3.5 Quantification of Adrenergic Amines in CA-containing PWS.

Table 14 details the quantities of adrenergic amines determined in the PWS samples per gram as well as per respective serving size. The $p$-synderpine content within the PWSs analysed varied from 0.15 mg/g to 0.89 mg/g; octopamine on average 0.16 mg/g; and tyramine averaged at 0.4 mg/g. The concentration of $p$-synderpine was in agreement with other reported methods of between 0.001 mg/g to 8.65 mg/g (Avula, Upparapalli, Navarrete, et al., 2005; Ganzera et al., 2005; Marchei et al., 2006; Pellati & Benvenuti, 2007; Pellati et al., 2002; Roman et al., 2007; Slezak et al., 2007).

A standard reference material of CA (SRM 3258) contained 8.65 mg/g of synephrine, 0.14 mg/g of octopamine and 0.026 mg/g of tyramine (Putzbach et al., 2007). The ratios of biogenic amine found within were used as a reference to contrast with the analysed supplements. The difference in concentration of $p$-synderpine determined was likely due to the lack of uniformity and lot-lot variability of PWS manufacturing (Slezak et al., 2007)

Supplement B (360Rage) and D (ErgoBlast) had the highest amount of octopamine of 44 mg/serve. In Australia, there are currently no legal maximum limits for octopamine concentration in dietary supplements octopamine is found naturally in CA extracts in amounts between 0.12 mg/g to 0.8 mg/g (Sander et al., 2008). It was evident that it was not in agreement to the ratios found in a SRM. The high amount of octopamine determined in this study suggests it may have been added rather than from that within the plant extract. Octopamine is a banned substance for use in athletic competitions due to its stimulatory properties whereas synephrine is a monitored substance (World Anti-doping Agency, 2015).

Tyramine is not listed on any of the labels of the supplements tested. The highest amount of tyramine quantified in the tested PWS was 0.69 mg/g (PumpHD). The FDA suggests an acceptance level between 100-800 mg/g, and a toxicity level over the amount of 1080 mg/kg tyramine intake (Nout, 1994). Tyramine has been used as an experimental tool to study the mechanisms of noradrenaline release from sympathetic neurones and as an index of peripheral sympathetic nerve function (Broadley, 2010). Note the quantified levels of tyramine are higher than the ones present in the previously mentioned SRM 3258. It is possible that tyramine determined in this supplement was also added to enhance the overall stimulatory effect of the PWS.
Table 14 Synephrine, Octopamine and Tyramine content in PWS (mg/g) (mean ± RSD %)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Samples</th>
<th>Amount of amines found in PWS (mg/g) (mean ± RSD %)</th>
<th>Amount of amines found in PWS (mg/serve) (mean ± RSD %)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Synephrine</td>
<td>Octopamine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>(MusclePrime)</td>
<td>0.25 ± 9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>(Gold-Standard Preworkout)</td>
<td>0.31 ± 5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>(360Rage)</td>
<td>0.15 ± 2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>(ErgoBlast)</td>
<td>0.70 ± 1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>(PumpHD)</td>
<td>0.89 ± 1.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.6 Conclusion

A simple, rapid procedure to determine levels of synephrine, octopamine and tyramine in CA-containing PWS has been presented. The procedure involved a HPLC-UV/MS method with a total run time of 10 minutes on a C18 Xbridge column. Neither extensive derivatization nor sample preparation procedures were required. The amounts of synephrine found were 0.25 – 0.89 mg/g comparable to other studies ranging from 0.001 mg/g to 8.65 mg/g (Avula, Upparapalli, Navarrete, et al., 2005; Ganzera et al., 2005; Marchei et al., 2006; Pellati & Benvenuti, 2007; Pellati et al., 2002; Roman et al., 2007; Slezak et al., 2007). However, octopamine and tyramine were found in higher amounts than standard reference materials at 8.9 mg/g and 0.69 mg/g.

It was difficult to compare the exact amount of octopamine and tyramine as most of the CA was labelled under a proprietary blend. Octopamine is a doping substance that is illicit in sport when detected in urine. According to Thevis et al. (2012), octopamine was eluted at concentrations at an order of magnitude less from the consumed amount. The LOD/LOQ determined for this method is such that its usability could also be extended to PWS screening for concentrations of octopamine and synephrine in biological matrices such as urine for doping analyses as it was in agreement to Thevis et al. (2012).
Chapter 4  A Rapid HPLC-MS Protocol for Caffeine and Dimethylxanthines in Pre-workout Supplements
## 4.1 Background

Significant stimulatory effects from the consumption of PWS is provided by the xanthine component, specifically caffeine (1,3,7-trimethylxanthine) and the 3 dimethylxanthines (DMX). These compounds have become an accepted and prevalent dietary constituent for many people and, with increasing evidence of adverse effects arising from overconsumption, regulatory bodies have sought to impose limits on their incorporation into foods and supplements. Caffeine is the only methylxanthine subject to specific product labelling requirements – the details of which vary depending on country of manufacturing origin. In Australia products containing caffeine are required to state the amount and also carry a warning. A recent review on caffeine toxicity suggested that undeclared herbal components in most supplements could expose consumers to an increased risk of caffeine toxicity (Musgrave et al., 2016). The multi-stimulant component nature of PWS is a potential factor contributing to the delay in attributing specific adverse effects to one compound or another. Such increased PWS consumption beyond athletes and fitness enthusiasts into recreational use by the general population (Gibson, 2014), and concomitant the increased adverse health reports may result in more stringent caffeine content/labelling requirements leading to an increased demand for analysis of products and/or biological samples. It is therefore important to develop an accurate, rapid, cost-effective, sensitive and transferrable method for the detection and quantification of caffeine and the DMX isomers that may be suitable for both supplement and biological matrices.

A number of analytical methods have been used for the analysis and quantification of caffeine and its DMX derivatives. A search of the literature revealed that RP-HPLC-UV was the most common analytical method used for caffeine and DMX analysis. Beauchamp et al. sourced 9 caffeine-containing PWS products using LC–quadrupole time-of-flight MS (QTOF/MS) using an Agilent Poroshell C-18 column (2.1 x 100 mm, 2.7 µm), on a 12 minute gradient of water and acetonitrile adjusted with 0.05% formic acid, was used to identify and quantify substances in the PWS samples. The average caffeine recovery was 88.25 ± 13.41% compared to the labelled caffeine content (Beauchamp et al., 2016). The additional use of a TIC confirmed the absence of any other stimulants based on their current database of 45 amphetamines and 8 phenethylamines. Chromatography conducted by the Beauchamp method was...
performed on a UPLC system which, while sensitive, has high setup and operating costs. A more cost effective method of caffeine and DMX analysis is HPLC-UV which is likely responsible for the prevalence of published methods using this technique. Recent studies suggested good chromatographic results, approaching that seen in UPLC, can be achieved on a HPLC system by using stationary phases with small particle size such as 2 µm (DeStefano, Boyes, Schuster, Miles, & Kirkland, 2014; Swartz, 2005).

A number of researchers, however, have noted difficulty in separating the three DMX isomers by RP-HPLC (Randon et al., 2010). The three DMX are configurational isomers (Figure 2, Chapter 1) and therefore have identical masses. This presents a challenge for analytical separation without involving costly and time-consuming derivatization protocols. Most methods which involve separation of caffeine in food do not report the separation of paraxanthine (PX) and theophylline (TP) (Bispo et al., 2002; Hasegawa et al., 2009; Kanazawa et al., 2000; Martinez-Lopez et al., 2014; Thomas et al., 2004). This may be because PX is not derived from plant products. Bispo et al., developed a method to determine caffeine, TB and TP in beverages and urine samples using HPLC-UV. The method involved a Bondesil C18 column with a methanol-water-acetic acid gradient at 0.7 mL/min and UV detection at 273 nm. The LOD was 0.1 pg/mL for all three methylxanthisines. This method was versatile enough to be used for levels up to 350 µg/mL of caffeine, 32 µg/mL of TB and 47 µg/mL of TP. This method did not involve additional sample derivatization but was not specific for PX, the main metabolite of caffeine. The incorporation of mass detection would enhance structure confirmation for the DMX derivatives, especially when present in a urine matrix. Our strategy, employing a RP-HPLC system with combined UV and in-line QDa mass detector aimed to confirm the identity and masses of all four compounds without derivatisation. Additionally, we aimed to achieve sufficiently high sensitivity as to allow the method to be transferable between various matrices, either biological matrices or supplements

The aim of this present study was to develop a rapid and adaptable HPLC-UV/MS method for the determination and quantification of caffeine and its DMX derivatives, paraxanthine (PX), theobromine (TB) and theophylline (TP) and apply it to the analysis of these compounds in a variety of Australian-manufactured and overseas-sourced PWS.
4.2 Experimental

4.2.1 Chemicals and Reagents

The chemicals and reagents used in this chapter are detailed in General Methods (Chapter 2, section 2.2). The 5 PWS selected were KardioFire (A); 360Rage (360°Cut Performance Supplements) (B); PumpHD (BPISports) (C); MusclePrime (AllMax Nutrition) (D) and DyNO (RSP Nutrition) (E). The PWS samples A, B and D were purchased online (manufactured in the USA) while samples C and E were sourced from a local health store in South-East Queensland, Australia.

4.2.2 Standard Preparation

Stock solutions (1 mg/mL) were prepared for all standards as well as internal standard (IS) and stored in 4°C until analysis. Etofylline (7-(2, hydroxyethyl) theophylline) is a synthetic structural analogue of the natural methylxanthines and has been used in previous chromatographic methods (Buyuktuncel, 2010; Johansson, Gronrydberg, & Schmekel, 1993; Kanazawa et al., 2000; Naline, Flouvat, Advenier, & Pays, 1987; Nirogi, Kandikere, Shukla, Mudigonda, & Ajjala, 2007). A linear dilution was prepared for each standard between 1 µg/mL and 200 µg/mL. The results of concentrations outside this linear range will be discussed in section 4.4.1. The PWS samples were prepared using the SPE method detailed in Chapter 2.
4.3 Method Development

Following the method development process depicted in Figure 8 (Chapter 2), various parameters such as different column chemistries, mobile phase composition, temperature and gradient combinations were optimised prior to the quantification of xanthines in PWS.

The details of this process are outlined in the following sections to attain the best conditions for separation.

4.3.1 Effect of Column Chemistries

To compare the effect on analyte retention of the two columns a series of 100µg/mL standard mix injections were run using an initial mobile phase gradient A) 0.1% Formic Acid: 95 – 0% and B) 0.1% Formic Acid: 5 – 100% over a period of 10 minutes with a flow rate of 1mL/min at 30°C. The two columns tested were a T3 HSS C18 column (5 µm, 3.0 x 150 mm, i.d.) and a Xselect CSH phenyl-hexyl (3.5 µm, 4.6 x 100 mm, i.d.). The phenyl-hexyl column showed higher resolution than the C-18 column. This could be due to increased π-π interaction that allows superior retention (Gibson & Fowler, 2014).
Figure 29 Comparison of columns: (A) Xselect CSH phenylhexyl (3.5µm, 4.6 x 100mm, i.d.) and (B) T3 HSS C18 (5 µm, 3.0 x 150 mm, i.d.). The standard compounds are represented by: (a) TB; (b) PX; (c) TP; (d) caffeine

The elution order of the xanthines from the two columns was TB, PX, TP followed by caffeine (Figure 29). The results of the chromatography are summarised in Table 15. The order correlates well with the predicted order of elution given the dielectric for each compound (See, Table 3 of Chapter 1).

Table 15 Summary of effects of column chemistry on Caffeine and DMX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compound</th>
<th>RT on Phenyl-hexyl column (mins)</th>
<th>RT on HSS T3 column (mins)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theobromine</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>4.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraxanthine</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>5.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theophylline</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>5.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caffeine</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>7.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The peaks observed on the C18 chromatogram were broader than those seen on the phenyl-hexyl. As previously discussed, a number of factors could contribute to peak broadening. The particle size of the C18 column (5 µm) was larger than the particle size of the phenyl-hexyl (3.5 µm) column. Eddy diffusion could explain the observed peak broadening since the larger particle size of the C18 column could result in a slower rate of analyte flow.

An increased RT was observed for the analytes on the phenyl-hexyl column. The phenyl functional group of the phenyl-hexyl column could introduce potential π-π stacking interactions which would cause analytes to be retained longer on the phenyl-hexyl column (Yang et al., 2005). However, there are additional factors that could explain the longer retention time in the C18 column. The pore diameters for both columns were 130 Å, but the internal diameter of the phenyl hexyl column (4.6 mm) was larger than the C18 column (3.0 mm). The smaller internal diameter of the packing material would have resulted in a slightly higher flow rate in the C18 column to decrease peak broadening. However, the C18 column was longer (150 mm) than the phenyl-hexyl column (100 mm). The 50 mm difference in column length could increase the rate of interaction between stationary phase and xanthines in the C18 column.

Both columns were able to partially separate the isomers, TP and PX. However, further developments will be discussed in later sections of this chapter. On the basis of the observed shorter retention times and decreased amount of peak broadening, the Xselect phenyl-hexyl column was selected as the preferred column for this analysis.
4.3.2 Effect of pH

Caffeine and the DMXs have two to three of its four nitrogen bonds methylated, and can only serve as a weak hydrogen bond acceptor. The conjugate acid of caffeine has a pKa of -0.16, which means at acidic pH, a majority of the caffeine species will be in the deprotonated form. In contrast to the analysis of the amines, caffeine and DMX are neutral at pH 2. The two acidic modifiers trifluoroacetic acid (TFA) and formic acid (FA) were tested to confirm which would produce superior chromatography.

Better peak resolution was observed with TFA (Figure 30). The retention of the xanthines with the two pH modifiers was relatively similar. However, TFA also causes ion suppressing effects during MS which results in signal reduction (Annesley, 2003). For this reason, formic acid was selected as an alternative modifier to TFA as it was a volatile modifier capable of producing good peak shape at pH 3.

Figure 30 Chromatographs of caffeine and dimethylxanthine adjusted to pH 3 (0.1% formic acid) and pH 2 (0.1% TFA). The standard compounds are represented by: (a) TB; (b) PX; (c) TP; (d) caffeine
4.3.3 Effect of Sampling Rate

The sampling rate of the UV-Vis detector produced interesting results on peak resolution. Studies based on the accuracy of the numerical integration of peak area report that at least 10 data points per second were required when a Gaussian peak was digitized (Wahab et al., 2016).

The results from an initial sampling rate of 1 point/second are shown in Figure 31. This was the default sampling rate used in earlier investigations for xanthine analysis producing relatively broad, non-Gaussian peaks for all the analytes. However, when the sampling rate was increased to 40 points/second, there was a noticeable increase in peak resolution and symmetry. A detailed description of the theory of data acquisition is beyond the scope of this study however for a description of the importance of sampling rate has been reported by Wahab et. al (2016). With the increased improvement in peak shape of the analytes, a sampling rate of 40 points/second was used for further optimisation steps.

![Figure 31 Chromatographs of caffeine and DMX at 1 point/sec and 40 point/sec](image-url)
4.3.4 Effect of Organic Modifier

The extent to which the type of organic solvent and concentration thereof had on retention time was investigated. Acetonitrile was compared with methanol to see which produced the best chromatography. Etofylline was added to the standard mix of caffeine and DMX to observe the changes in resolution with organic modifier use.

Figure 32 shows the differences in chromatography produced by changing between methanol and acetonitrile. A narrower peak width was observed for TP and PX when using acetonitrile compared to methanol. More hydrogen bonds occur between methanol and TP/PX which allowed greater separation between the two compounds. A 15% (v/v) amount of methanol at starting conditions and gradient shift to 60% (v/v) was shown to completely resolve the compounds without interference from other components in the supplements.

Figure 32 Chromatographs achieved from the two organic modifiers: (A) Acetonitrile as an organic modifier and (B) methanol as the organic modifier. The standard compounds are represented by: (a) TB; (b) PX; (c) TP; (d) caffeine; (e) efofyline
4.3.5 Effect of Temperature

Optimising the column temperature is an important step in HPLC method development. The previously selected gradient was trialled with different column temperatures, ranging from 20°C to 35°C. Figure 33 shows a representative diagram of the effects of temperature on the peak formed by caffeine. It was observed that there was a decrease in retention time and improvement in peak shape as the temperature increased. The higher temperature reduces the viscosity of the organic phase, which would allow for a greater flow rate within the column (Harris, 2016). However, at 35°C, the separation between TP and PX decreased. This could be caused by the decreased rate of mass transfer of the two isomers on the stationary phase with the increased laminar flow. However, further improvements on temperature optimisation could be achieved by plotting the separation factor (k) values and comparing it based on the resolution equation (R) (Equation 1, Chapter 2).

As a result of the good peak symmetry, capability to separate TP and PX and reduced retention times, 30°C was the preferred temperature for the gradient method.

*Figure 33 Chromatogram of the effect of temperature on the separation of caffeine on phenyl-hexyl column*
4.3.6 Optimisation of the UV-Vis Detector
Based on a search of the literature, the most prevalent wavelength for the analysis of caffeine in dietary chromatography ranged between 270 nm and 280 nm as mentioned in Chapter 1. The maximum wavelength ($\lambda_{\text{max}}$) for caffeine was determined for caffeine and DMX on a Beckman UV spectrophotometer and found to be 272 nm. (Data not shown)

4.3.7 Representative Chromatograms
Figure 34 shows the order of elution was TB, PX, TP, etofylline and caffeine with the retention times of 3.8, 4.7, 5.0, 5.4 and 6.3 minutes respectively. Peaks were completely resolved with limited background interference. A water blank was used to monitor signs of carryover from high concentration standards/samples.

![Representative chromatograms](image)

*Figure 34 Representative chromatograms or caffeine and DMX standards at high concentrations of (100 µg/mL) (top); chromatogram of caffeine present in pre-workout supplement A (middle); and chromatogram of caffeine, TP and PX present. The approximate retention times: TB= 3.7 min, PX= 4.6 min, TP= 4.9 min, etofylline (I.S.) = 5.3 min and caffeine= 6.2 min. On phenyl-hexyl column at $\lambda$=272 nm.*
Selectivity of the method was confirmed by UV-detection and QDa-MS by injecting a starting condition blank and a dietary supplement blank. Representative 3-dimensional (3D) chromatographic plot depicting the additional dimension of mass to charge ratio (m/z) is presented in Figure 35, where the standards are colour coded into the following; caffeine (red); IS (blue); TB, TP, and PX (green). The m/z aids in identifying and confirming the presence of the methylxanthenes by specific masses.

The specific masses detected at the apex of individual compounds (Figure 36) were detected simultaneous to the UV spectra (Figure 37). TIC was used to describe the presence of any minor components that were overlooked within the range of 100Da to 600 Da. The SIR was set to the masses of m/z 181.1, for the detection of TB, TP and PX; m/z 195.1 for the detection of caffeine; and m/z 225.1 for the detection of etofylline. The method showed well-resolved separation between PX and TP, not commonly observed in other studies (Bispo et al., 2002; Hasegawa et al., 2009; Kanazawa et al., 2000; Martinez-Lopez et al., 2014; Thomas et al., 2004). These isobaric DMXs are difficult to resolve due to their chemical similarities and identical mass (m/z 181.1).

Since PX is not derived from plants and therefore not expected in PWS, its detection was not specifically determined. Whilst this is most likely true in the case of PWS, developing a rapid method which does resolve these compounds provides a distinct advantage in specificity as well as being adaptable to biological matrices.
Figure 36 Mass detected at individual peaks of compounds, TB, PX, TP, etofylline, and caffeine

Figure 37 Chromatogram of standards (top) coupled with the Total Ion Chromatogram (TIC) scanning from a range of 100 Da to 600 Da (middle) and Single Ion recording (SIR) of respective compounds
4.3.8 Optimised HPLC/UV-MS Procedure

Based on the optimised chromatographic and detection parameters, the final chromatographic conditions were determined. The optimised conditions are summarised in the Table 16 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Optimisation parameter</th>
<th>Selected conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Column</td>
<td>Xselect CSH phenyl-hexyl (3.5 µm, 4.6 x 100 mm)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organic modifier</td>
<td>Methanol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flow rate</td>
<td>1 mL/min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pH</td>
<td>3.0 adjusted with formic acid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperature</td>
<td>30°C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UV (λ)</td>
<td>272 nm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass detection range</td>
<td>100-600 Da</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16 Summary of optimised HPLC conditions

The chromatographic column used was an Xselect CSH phenyl-hexyl (3.5 µm, 4.6 x 100 mm, i.d., Waters, Ireland) protected by a guard column (Xselect CSH phenyl-hexyl 3.5µm, 4.6 x 20 mm). The components were separated using a gradient elution protocol where mobile phase A consisted of a mixture of water with 0.1% formic acid whilst mobile phase B comprised methanol with 0.1% formic acid. Both solvents were pH adjusted to 4.5.

The flow rate was maintained at 1 mL/min while the column temperature was set to 30°C and sample temperature was set at 25°C. The run time was 10 minutes under gradient conditions (Table 17) based on the retention time of caffeine (the most non-polar of the constituents under investigation). There was a 3-minute delay between injections and UV detection was at 272 nm.
Data acquisition with the QDa mass detector was performed in positive mode under the following conditions: total ion current (TIC) between $m/z$ 100-600; capillary voltage, 3.5 kV; cone voltage, 15 V. Single Ion Recording (SIR) was set for positive mode masses of caffeine (195.1), IS (225.2) and respective derivatives (181.5).

Table 17 HPLC separation gradient used for UV-MS analysis of caffeine and derivatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time(min)</th>
<th>Mobile phase A (Water + 0.1% Formic Acid) (%)</th>
<th>Mobile phase B (Methanol + 0.1% Formic Acid) (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4 Method Validation

The method validation parameters were highlighted in the Methods chapter (Section 2.3). Where the method was validated according to the ICH guidelines (ICH Expert Working Group, 1994)

4.4.1 Linearity

Linearity was determined using the least-square method (linear regression) for each of the standards. The assay showed linearity between the range 1 µg/mL to 200 µg/mL as reported in Table 18. The loss of analyte beyond 0.1 µg/mL was amplified and resulted in poor linearity, whereas concentration of 500 µg/mL resulted in peak overload and poor correlation coefficient (data not shown). Figure 38 shows a chromatogram of the xanthines at 8 concentration levels. Standards were injected at the beginning of each sample injection sequence and after every 10 sample injections, and at the end of each sequence. This provided an intra-day 8-point standard curve generated with each analyte, the slope and y-intercept, correlation coefficient ($r^2$) and %RSD of the standard curve (Figure 38). Linearity was observed in this range for each compound (correlation coefficients ($r^2$) ≥ 0.9998 for all except for TB which had an $r^2$ ≥ 0.9914). The deviation TB’s correlation coefficient could be an issue of one concentration point (50 µg/mL) (Figure 39). This could be a result of a random error cause by improper pipetting.

![Figure 38 Chromatograph of caffeine and 3 DMX standards at 8 different concentrations](image)
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Figure 39 Intra-day 8 point standard curve for TB. Points represent average of 3 replicates

4.4.2 Detection and Quantification Limits

LOD and LOQ were determined based on their respective signal-to-noise ratio (S/N) of the standards at their lowest concentration of 0.1 µg/mL, where the desired S/N for the LOD is 3:1, whereas the desired S/N for the LOQ is 10:1 (Table 18). The LOD of the 3 DMX ranged from 0.02 to 0.4 µg/mL whereas the LOD determined for caffeine was 2.1 µg/mL and LOQ of 6.5 µg/mL. The higher LOD of caffeine would suggest that the concentrations of less than 5 µg/mL were not suitable for linear calibration. However, this could be improved by avoiding low volume pipette injection, as there could be potential loss of caffeine at 1µg/mL. The reported amounts of caffeine and its DMX derivatives found in urine, ranged from 2 µg/mL to 15 µg/mL, which give potential for this method to be used for caffeine analysis in biological fluids (Buyuktuncel, 2010). The LOD and LOQ also make this method suitable for caffeine doping analysis in sport where 12 µg/mL of caffeine is considered a doping agent when this amount is found in urine (Del Coso, Muñoz, & Muñoz-Guerra, 2011).

Table 18 LOD/ LOQ for caffeine and derivatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standards</th>
<th>Calibration range (µg/mL)</th>
<th>Correlation coefficient ($r^2$)</th>
<th>LOD (µg/mL)</th>
<th>LOQ (µg/mL)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caffeine</td>
<td>0.1-200</td>
<td>0.999±0.002</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>6.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etofylline</td>
<td>0.1-200</td>
<td>0.999±0.001</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraxanthine</td>
<td>0.1-200</td>
<td>0.999±0.002</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theobromine</td>
<td>0.1-200</td>
<td>0.991±0.004</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theophylline</td>
<td>0.1-200</td>
<td>0.999±0.003</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4.3 Precision

The repeatability was determined by preparing 8 replicates of standards at 100µg/mL. The results are reported in Table 19 with the %RSD. Repeatability, according to the association of analytical chemists (AOAC) should not exceed 1.25% RSD, our repeatability values were considered satisfactory for the retention times as indicated by %RSD range of 0.06 – 0.25%, peak height ranging from 1.11 -1.14% and also the peak area indicated by the %RSD range of 0.40-0.59%. This indicates that for a single-laboratory assay acceptable precision was achieved. However, additional validation by incorporating ‘between laboratory’ testing for parameters such as intermediate precision would be further strengthen the overall validation of this method.

Table 19 Intra-day precision assay of standard and analytical recovery of IS in samples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analyte</th>
<th>Repeatability ( n = 8, mean)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RT (min)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caffeine</td>
<td>6.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraxanthine</td>
<td>4.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theobromine</td>
<td>3.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theophylline</td>
<td>5.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etofylline</td>
<td>5.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4.4 Accuracy

Within-batch accuracy evaluations were determined by spiking PWS with etofylline (IS). Accuracy was assessed using 3 concentrations (5, 25 and 50 µg/mL) of IS on 3 separate days. The standards were prepared in triplicate at each level of concentration. The quantitative recoveries are shown in Table 20 where the recoveries ranged from 81.8 – 89.2%, with %RSD 0.5 – 2.57%. The recoveries obtained after solid phase extraction at different concentrations showed that there were only slight variations within supplements and the results obtained for intra-assay accuracy based on etofylline were satisfactory (ICH Expert Working Group, 1994).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of Spiked IS (µg/mL)</th>
<th>Determined amount of IS (µg/mL)</th>
<th>Recovery of IS (%) (mean ± S. D., n=3)</th>
<th>%R.S.D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>81.78 ± 5.30</td>
<td>2.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>89.20 ± 1.89</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>88.19 ± 5.17</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 20 Analytical recovery of etofylline (IS) spiking in PWS*
4.5 Determination of Caffeine and DMX in PWS samples

The RP-HPLC-UV/MS method described was used for the quantitative determination of caffeine and DMX in a set of PWS samples. The results are shown in Table 21 as mean and standard deviation (S.D.) of three replicate samples in the same batch. The concentration of caffeine quantified ranged from 9.89 mg/g size to 25.30 mg/g size. TB was present in products A, D and E. TP and PX were present (at low levels) only in supplement C, which did not contain TB.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Products</th>
<th>Caffeine (mg/g)</th>
<th>Theobromine (mg/g)</th>
<th>Theophylline (mg/g)</th>
<th>Paraxanthine (mg/g)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A (KardioFire)</td>
<td>20.10 ± 1.81</td>
<td>1.12 ± 0.15</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B (360Rage)</td>
<td>15.70 ± 1.53</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C (PumpHD)</td>
<td>25.30 ± 1.21</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0.31± 0.02</td>
<td>0.03 ± 0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D (MusclePrime)</td>
<td>9.89± 0.39</td>
<td>2.57 ± 5.77</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E (DyNO)</td>
<td>24.00 ± 0.16</td>
<td>3.03 ± 0.10</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A comparison was made between the levels of caffeine and DMX in the sample set of PWS and that found on their labels (if present) (Table 22). The amount of caffeine determined was calculated to reflect per serving quantity to compare directly with the labelled dose which varied from 7 g to 19 g. Caffeine was not listed on the label of product A despite containing 201 mg of caffeine. Products B and C listed caffeine to be present as part of a proprietary blend where 157 mg of caffeine was found in product B and 192 mg of caffeine was found in product C. The labels of the products D and E listed caffeine in the form of ‘caffeine anhydrous’ as 100 mg and 300 mg respectively, the amount of caffeine determined in product D was 188 mg/dose while 180 mg/dose was found in product E.
Table 21 clearly shows evidence of the presence of PX in one of the randomly selected PWS, albeit in low amounts. Since it is a primary metabolite of caffeine and found in much higher levels than caffeine in plasma or urine samples, separation from TP was imperative to avoid over estimation of TP. While a complete understanding of the physiological effects of PX are not well researched reports of increased skeletal muscle contractility have been described (Hawke et al., 2000; Orru et al., 2013). An additional source of TP and PX could be attributed by the actions of filamentous fungi. Hakil et.al observed the demethylation of caffeine to TP via the Aspergillus and Penicillium genus strains of fungi (Hakil, Denis, Viniegra-González, & Augur, 1998). PumpHD contains Theobroma cacao extracts likely to be the source of caffeine. Potential degradation of caffeine to these DMX compounds could occur during the storing or processing phase of product manufacturing. The purity and potential co-elution of the compounds were monitored by tracking the masses found in the leading, apex and tailing of each peak. The advantage of incorporating a quadrupole mass detector can be observed in the form of peak purity at the apex in Figure 35. Mass spectral data was used to identify the components with unique masses in the mixture such as caffeine (m/z 195.2) and etofylline (m/z 225.2). However, confirming the presence of the isobaric DMX (m/z 181.2) required combining completely resolved peaks from UV data and mass detection.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Products</th>
<th>Amount of Caffeine Quantified (mg/mL)</th>
<th>Caffeine listed on the label (mg) (per serving size)</th>
<th>Actual amount of caffeine (mg)(per serving size)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A (KardioFire)</td>
<td>20.10 ± 1.81</td>
<td>Not listed</td>
<td>201.44 ± 18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B (360Rage)</td>
<td>15.70 ± 1.53</td>
<td>Proprietary Blend</td>
<td>156.96 ± 15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C (PumpHD)</td>
<td>25.30 ± 1.21</td>
<td>Proprietary Blend</td>
<td>189.60 ± 9.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D (MusclePrime)</td>
<td>9.89 ± 0.39</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>187.89 ± 7.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E (DyNO)</td>
<td>24.00 ± 0.16</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>179.86 ± 1.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.6 Application and Usability of the Method

The FDA takes a liberal approach to the control of caffeine content and labelling in dietary supplements whereby caffeine is only required to be listed as an ingredient. In some other countries such as Australia, however, caffeine-containing dietary supplements, such as PWS, fall outside the jurisdiction of the Food Standards Code of Australia and often contain amounts that would otherwise breach the Code (For example, an energy drink is allowed to have a maximum of 80 mg/serving) ("Australia New Zealand Food Standards Code – Standard 2.9.4 – Formulated supplementary sports foods," 2016). Instead, as complementary medicines, these products are regulated by the TGA and must state the quantity per dose as well as carry a safety warning for vulnerable populations such as those under 18 years or who are pregnant. As highlighted in Table 22, the supplement with the highest caffeine content (201 mg) (Supplement A) did not list caffeine on its label. Furthermore, for those products that quoted specific amounts, much higher levels of caffeine were detected (except for supplement E).

PX was specifically found in supplement C albeit in low levels, which was surprising since, as previously mentioned, it is not a plant based compound. Understandably, no specific listings for any of the DMX were present on the PWS labels - manufacturers having no such requirement to do so by either the FDA or the TGA. Caffeine is often mentioned as part of a ‘proprietary blend’ where only the weight of the total blend is required to be listed (U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA), 1994). The discrepancy between the stated quantities and those quantified here not only makes it difficult for people to discern their total daily stimulant intake but also raises concerns for the public health and safety of consumers due to the potential for adverse effects. This analysis highlights a discrepancy between labelled and actual caffeine content and provides support for an argument for tighter regulation.
4.7 Conclusion

We have developed a simple, rapid procedure to determine levels of caffeine and the three DMX derivatives, TB, PX and TP in PWS. The procedure involved a HPLC-UV/MS method that has a total run time of 10 minutes. Recently, a number of studies used HPLC (Andrews et al., 2007; Hadad, Salam, Soliman, & Mesbah, 2012; Haller, Duan, Benowitz, & Jacob, 2004; Roman, Hildreth, & Bannister, 2013; Thomas et al., 2004) and UPLC (Beauchamp et al., 2016; Hasegawa et al., 2009) to quantify the amount of caffeine specifically in dietary supplements, caffeine powders and weight loss supplements and found the caffeine content in the products analysed were variable to that quoted on their labels. Our results are in agreement with the trends reported in those studies. Note that the HPLC methods mentioned above were subject to long run times compared to our short run time of 10 minutes. For high throughput analyses, this translates to a considerable cost saving without compromising sensitivity. The sensitivity reported in this method confers potential applicability to supplements as well as biological matrices. However, further improvement of the LOD and LOQ of caffeine is required to improve the sensitivity of the method. To our knowledge, this is the first implementation of a mass-detector on a HPLC method specific to determining caffeine in PWS.
Chapter 5  Discussions, Future Directions and Conclusion
5.1 General Discussion

The overall goal of this thesis was to determine the amounts of selected stimulants in PWS, both the biogenic amines derived from CA extracts as well as caffeine and its DMX derivatives. To achieve these aims, two HPLC-UV/MS protocols were developed. Details of the development and optimisation were discussed in Chapter 3 and Chapter 4 for the detection of biogenic amines and the detection of caffeine and DMX derivatives in PWS respectively. Usability of and limitations to these methods are discussed later in this chapter.

These analytical protocols were developed to answer the following research questions:

1) Do CA-containing PWS comply with the 30 mg per dose limit of synephrine set by the TGA?
2) Is there a discrepancy in synephrine concentrations between overseas sourced and locally manufactured PWS?
3) Are the levels of caffeine measured in a range of CA-containing PWS products, consistent with that listed on their labels?

Research question one was answered by determining the amounts of synephrine found in CA-containing PWS and comparing them to the maximum limit of 30 mg/serve limit set by the TGA. The concentrations of synephrine in all five PWS found were between 1.06 to 8.30 mg/serve. Hence, all PWS supplements tested did not exceed this regulated amount.

The levels of synephrine measured in Australian-made and internationally sourced PWS were compared. The highest concentration of synephrine was found in a locally made PWS (PumpHD) (8.30 mg/serve), whereas the lowest concentration of synephrine was found in an internationally sourced PWS (360Rage) at 1.06 mg/serve. A larger sample size was needed to form a trend between the discrepancies of Australian and internationally made PWS.
Finally, the amount of caffeine and its DMX derivatives were determined and contrasted between local and internationally manufactured PWS. The average caffeine content within all PWS was quite similar despite country of origin. Interestingly, a locally made PWS contained traces of TP and PX. These were likely formed during the manufacturing process.

The remainder of this chapter is devoted to a general discussion of the methods developed, their use and limitations and an interpretation of the results of the research in terms of relevance and future directions.
5.1.1 Adrenergic Amines Found in CA-containing PWS

Synephrine, as the main biogenic amine in CA, is classed as a Schedule 4 substance (prescription only medicine) in Australia with a RDD of 30 mg. PWS are considered complementary medicines and their importation and use is regulated by the TGA. A rise in popularity of this type of product for recreational use has been accompanied by an increase in adverse health reports and prompted warnings by regulatory bodies. Therefore, there was a need to investigate whether the amounts of synephrine in CA-containing PWS meet the 30 mg RDD and if there was a discrepancy between locally and internationally sourced PWS.

Once developed, the validated HPLC-UV/MS protocol was used to determine the levels of adrenergic amines, synephrine, tyramine and octopamine in a selection of PWS. These included MusclePrime (AllMax Nutrition) (A); Gold Standard Preworkout (OptimumNutrition) (B); 360Rage (360°Cut Performance Supplements) (C); ErgoBlast (ErgoGenix) (D) and PumpHD (BPISports) (E). A matrix blank (Beast Mode (Beast Sport’s Nutrition) was included which lacked CA and could help eliminate matrix-borne errors in the extraction protocol. The PWS samples A, C and D were purchased online (manufactured in the USA) while samples B and E were manufactured in Australia.

The chromatography involved a gradient elution over a fast, 10-minute run time (A: water and B: acetonitrile, adjusted to pH 11 with 0.1% ammonium hydroxide) on an Xbridge BEH C18 column. Detection was facilitated with use of a UV/Vis-detector (242 nm) coupled with mass confirmation via an in-line single quadrupole (QDa) mass detector in positive electrospray ionisation (ESI) scan mode. This method proved to be successful in achieving an important feature or reduced analysis time, making it suitable for high-throughput analyses. Additionally, improved chromatography was achieved by using a less common approach to the analysis of adrenergic amines - the inclusion of a basic modifier at high pH. The increase mobile phase pH of 11 meant the use of IPRs was avoided which translates to cost saving for initial IPR purchase as well as eliminating the long equilibration times that accompany IPR use. Furthermore, since ammonium hydroxide is volatile, it is suitable for LC-MS, unlike IPRs. We also showed how the novel implementation of QDa mass detection was able enhances structure confirmation of the adrenergic amines.
Calibrations for each compound were linear between the range 5 \( \mu g/mL \) to 100 \( \mu g/mL \) with determination coefficients \((r^2)\) greater than 0.997. The intra-day precision was calculated to be between the range of 2.1-4.1\% for synephrine, 2.9-3.0\% for octopamine, and 1.4 to 5.3\% for tyramine. According to the FDA guidelines for pharmaceutical determination, RSD\% values of less than 15\% were considered satisfactory (FDA, 2013). The accuracy was determined by adding a known amount of standard to a blank matrix according to the ICH standards guidelines. In this analysis, the accuracy of all the amines was between 77-105\%. A majority of the accuracy values were acceptable. In the case of octopamine and tyramine there was a trend for lower accuracy at the LOD (5 \( \mu g \)) as well as the higher range of 100 \( \mu g/mL \) (80\%). This could possibly be due to loss during sample preparation or simply experimental error in technique. This former could be improved by using a higher concentration of non-polar solvent (ACN) during the sample preparation to aid in the retention of the compounds during the SPE process.

Table 23 summarises the amount (reported as mg/g) of synephrine, octopamine and tyramine found in our tested PWS and compared against the concentrations obtained in a standard reference material (SRM 3258) by Putzbach et al. (Putzbach et al., 2007).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compounds of interest</th>
<th>Concentration of amines found in samples (mg/g) (mean ±RSD %)</th>
<th>Yield from SPE (%)</th>
<th>Amount of amines found in SRM 3258 (mg/g)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synephrine</td>
<td>0.25 ± 0.31</td>
<td>0.15 ± 0.9</td>
<td>0.70 ± 0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Octopamine</td>
<td>0.10 ± 0.46</td>
<td>0.28 ± 0.4</td>
<td>8.90 ± 0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyramine</td>
<td>0.10 ± 0.52</td>
<td>0.28 ± 0.3</td>
<td>0.28 ± 0.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*PWS highlighted in red were Australian-made products
The concentrations of biogenic amines in certified standard reference materials were presented in mg/g of a standardized source of a CA fruit. The ratios of the biogenic amine within the standard were approximately 10: 01: 0.02 (mg/g) for synephrine: octopamine: tyramine (Putzbach et al., 2007). Thevis et al. measure a similar ratio of biogenic amines in a single CA extract where the ratios were 5: 0.09: 0.03 (mg/g) (Thevis et al., 2012). We reported our findings in mg/g of supplement where the exact quantities of CA extract added were unknown. When contrasted to our findings, it was evident that the ratios of biogenic amines found were significantly higher for octopamine and tyramine, but lower for synephrine.

To compare concentrations of actives between PWS samples, we calculated according to their serving size (Table 24)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Samples</th>
<th>Amount of amines found in PWS (mg/serve) (mean ± RSD %)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Synephrine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A (MusclePrime)</td>
<td>4.69 ± 9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B (Gold Standard Preworkout)</td>
<td>3.11 ± 5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C (360Rage)</td>
<td>1.06 ± 2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D (ErgoBlast)</td>
<td>3.49 ± 1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E (PumpHD)</td>
<td>8.30 ± 1.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*PWS highlighted in red were Australian-made products

Levels of p-synephrine were in line with other reported methods of between 0.001 mg/g to 8.65 mg/g (Avula, Upparapalli, Navarrete, et al., 2005; Ganzera et al., 2005; Marchei et al., 2006; Pellati & Benvenuti, 2007; Pellati et al., 2002; Roman et al., 2007; Slezak et al., 2007). PumpHD, an Australian-made PWS, had the highest levels of synephrine (8.3mg/ serve), whereas the lowest level of synephrine (1.06mg/ serve) was found in 360Rage, an internationally manufactured PWS. A much larger sample size would be required for testing before any trend or conclusion could be made in relation to comparing Australian to overseas-made PWS. There would also be scope to test locally sourced and internationally sourced variants of the same brand to observe the discrepancies between them. After recalculating the amounts found in our analysis to its respective serving size, it was observed that all synephrine found did not exceed the TGA’s RDD of 30 mg/serve.
Octopamine was detected in high concentrations (44 mg/serve) in one locally-made PWS (Gold standard Preworkout) and one made overseas-made PWS (ErgoBlast). Octopamine was found in CA extracts in amounts between 0.12 mg/g to 0.8 mg/g (Sander et al., 2008). The high level of octopamine determined was not in line with the apparent ratio of the biogenic amines found in the SRM and thus in these PWS suggests it may have been added rather than simply being present as a component of CA. Currently, there no legal limits or RDDs for octopamine use in dietary supplements in Australia although, due to its stimulatory properties, it is a banned substance in athletic competitions (World Anti-doping Agency, 2015). WADA has not stated a specific acceptable level of octopamine above which penalties apply. With further improvements to sensitivity for detection biological matrices, this method could find use in the quantification of octopamine in the anti-doping arena.

Tyramine, while not listed on any PWS labels was detected in all samples tested. The highest level of tyramine quantified was 0.69 mg/g in a locally made PWS. However, when calculated to its serving size, the concentration of tyramine is 6.9 mg/serve, higher than some synephrine found in the other PWS. Tyramine has been attributed to microbial decarboxylases on amino acids such as tyrosine during handling and packaging or during the preparation of these PWS (Farah, 2012). PumpHD specifically uses Theobroma cacao seed extract, which is prepared by roasting Theobroma cacao seeds. This process could release and increase the amount of amino acid decarboxylation, attributing to the higher amount of tyramine. Like octopamine, there are no current restrictions on the maximum limits for tyramine in supplements.
5.1.2 Caffeine and DMX Found in PWS

In Australia, manufacturers are required to list caffeine on product labels however there are no set maximum limits for PWS. For food additives however, the FSANZ has set the RDD for caffeine to 210 mg/day (approximately 3 cups of coffee/day). For the accurate quantification of total stimulants in PWS, one must include caffeine and its DMX derivatives in the analysis. In addition, since some products do provide actual levels of caffeine on their labels, comparisons were made of the measured levels.

To address the third research question a rapid HPLC-UV/MS protocol was developed and validated for the quantification of caffeine and DMX in locally and overseas made PWS.

The chromatography involved a gradient elution over a fast, 10-minute run time (A: water and B: acetonitrile, adjusted to pH 4.5 with 0.1% formic acid) on a CSH phenyl-hexyl column, detected with a UV/Vis-detector (272 nm) coupled with mass confirmation on a QDa mass detector in positive ESI mode. Repeatability, according to the AOAC should not exceed 1.25% RSD ((AOAC), 2012), our repeatability values were considered satisfactory for the retention times as indicated by %RSD range of 0.06 – 1.14% These results are in line with the standards set out by ICH for acceptable single-laboratory assay precision. However, additional validation by incorporating ‘between laboratories’ testing would strengthen the overall validation of this method.

The quantitative recoveries ranged from 81.8 – 89.2%, with %RSD 0.5 – 2.57% which is satisfactory according to the ICH guidelines. However, yield improvements are indicated given noticeable losses during the sample preparation. This could be improved by using a higher concentration of non-polar solvent (ACN) during the sample preparation.
Table 25 shows the content of caffeine and DMX (mg/g) in the sample PWS. How these four compounds are introduced into the PWS depends on whether they’re part of a plant extract or a separate additive. For example, if from plant origin, then PX should not be expected to be present. Interestingly PX was found in one locally-made PWS (PumpHD) albeit at low levels. While a complete understanding of the physiological effects of PX are not well researched reports of increased skeletal muscle contractility have been described (Hawke et al., 2000; Orru et al., 2013). An additional source of TP and PX could be attributed by the actions of filamentous fungi. Hakil et al. observed the demethylation of caffeine to TP via the Aspergillus and Penicillium genus strains of fungi (Hakil et al., 1998). PumpHD contains Theobroma cacao extracts likely to be the source of caffeine. Potential degradation of caffeine to these DMX compounds could occur during the storing or processing phase of product manufacturing.

Table 25 Caffeine and methylxanthine content in PWS (mean +/- SD) (mg/g PWS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Products</th>
<th>Caffeine (mg/g)</th>
<th>Theobromine (mg/g)</th>
<th>Theophylline (mg/g)</th>
<th>Paraxanthine (mg/g)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>20.10 ± 1.81</td>
<td>1.12 ± 0.15</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>15.70 ± 1.53</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>25.30 ± 1.21</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0.31 ± 0.02</td>
<td>0.03 ± 0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>9.89 ± 0.39</td>
<td>2.57 ± 5.77</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>24.00 ± 0.16</td>
<td>3.03 ± 0.10</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*PWS highlighted in red were Australian-made products*
Comparison of measured caffeine to labelled quantities if present was made by adjusting to serving size (Table 26).

### Table 26 Amount of caffeine present compared to its PWS label

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Products</th>
<th>Amount of Caffeine Quantified (mg/mL)</th>
<th>Caffeine listed on the label (mg) (per serving size)</th>
<th>Actual amount of caffeine* (mg)(per serving size)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A (KardioFire)</td>
<td>20.10 ± 1.81</td>
<td>Not listed</td>
<td>201.44 ± 18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B (360Rage)</td>
<td>15.70 ± 1.53</td>
<td>Proprietary Blend</td>
<td>156.96 ± 15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C (PumpHD)</td>
<td>25.30 ± 1.21</td>
<td>Proprietary Blend</td>
<td>189.60 ± 9.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D (MusclePrime)</td>
<td>9.89 ± 0.39</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>187.89 ± 7.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E (DyNO)</td>
<td>24.00 ± 0.16</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>179.86 ± 1.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Average 181.15 ±9.03 RSD %

**PWS highlighted in red were Australian-made products**

Interestingly, despite the country of manufacture of the PWS, the average caffeine content was quite similar with a relatively low RSD%. Noticeably however the amount per serving size is just under the RDD of a maximum of 210 mg per day mentioned above. The implication for consumers is that it is likely, with so many other sources of caffeine in the modern diet that over consumption may regularly occur. In addition, two or more servings of the PWS per day can easily raise caffeine consumption into dangerously high levels.

In some instances, there are discrepancies between measured product content from that stated on product labels. This finding is consistent with other studies which found similar differences (Beauchamp et al., 2016; Gurley et al., 2004).
The protocol successfully separated TP and PX. As explained earlier, TP and PX are isobaric isomers that differ in the position of a methyl group (as with TB). The difficulty this presents to the analyst is reflected in the paucity of studies which show their clear resolution. Researchers often explain this omission by the absence of PX in food and plants. The use of the QDa mass detector aided in the confirmation of these isomers during quantitation in PWS supplements however this was only possible once peak resolution has been achieved. Since PX was detected in one of the supplement (C), it is clear that attention should be given to this analyte regardless of its origin. Otherwise levels of TP could be overestimated. It is possible that PX has been specifically added in order to increase the overall stimulatory effect of caffeine in PWS. Further testing in a higher sample number is required to confirm whether this was a ‘one-off’ finding in PWS formulations or a more common practice.

Apart from its reliability and fast run time, this method has the potential for applicability to both commercial products and biological fluids since it completely resolves the isobaric compounds, TP and PX. However, further improvements and validations are required by conducting validations on a larger sample size. Since the typical caffeine content in urine is in the range 2 µg/mL to 15 µg/mL, there is scope for this method to be transferrable to the analysis of caffeine and its metabolites in biological fluids. This would be of benefit to sporting regulatory bodies, such as Australian sport anti-doping agency (ASADA) or WADA, where screening is conducted for particularly for caffeine levels above 12 µg/mL. However, by only measuring caffeine in the urine and not its metabolites, underestimation of caffeine content originally consumed is likely.
5.2 Limitations

A number of limitations should be mentioned. First and foremost, the number of PWS selected was too small for any trends or conclusions to be drawn with respect to comparing locally made to overseas manufactured products. A much larger sample size would be required to draw such conclusions. Notwithstanding the above, the results obtained from this pilot data could be used to justify further work extending the scope for a much larger sample set. In addition, the batch of supplements were sourced in 2015 but had not surpassed their expiry date. There was still potential for component degradation could result in an under determination of the analytes as the nature of handling and storage of PWS prior to purchase was unknown.

An improvement for the quantification of caffeine and DMX could have been in the way in which the IS (etofylline) was used. In this protocol only, the IS was used for analyte recovery determination during sample preparation rather than the normal function in calibration to account for variability due to analyte losses in storage or treatment for example.

The QDa mass detector was able to scan the masses of compounds ranging from 100Da to 1300Da. The benefits of linking the LC system to the QDa detector were the enhanced ability to confirm structure identity. While single-quadruple magnet systems such as this are unable to reach anywhere near the degree of accurate mass detection or range of structure detection possible with more complex, tandem MS systems, they can be a powerful tool when used as a mass detection tool. Fragmentations can be tracked with a confidence level of ±0.1 Da. This is not satisfactory for many analyses. However their comparative cheaper cost makes them an attractive option depending on the requirements for use.

Additional experimental errors may have occurred during the sample preparation phase. It was evident that the analytical recoveries after the SPE were especially low at lower concentrations. This indicates a problem with small volume delivery. This could be improvements to technique, adjusting to larger volumes or by further validating the SPE method protocol by optimising the organic elution phase. The use of a centrifugation and extraction method could have been beneficial to the determination of stimulants due to the complex matrix of the PWS.
5.3 Future Directions for the Analysis of Stimulants in PWS

To improve the sensitivity of the amphetamine-like compound protocol, Hydrophilic Interaction Chromatography (HILIC) could be used. HILIC has been used in the analysis of small polar compounds such as pharmaceutical, toxins, plant extracts and other compounds important to food and pharmaceutical industries. (Jandera, 2011; Karatapanis, Fiamenos, & Stalikas, 2011; McCalley & Neue, 2008).

A small number of studies have used HILIC as a means of separation for ephedrine and synephrine. A first study by Heaton, investigated the suitability of bare silica HILIC as an alternative to conventional RP-HPLC for the fast chromatographic separation of ephedrine isomers. The study reported the effects of chromatographic parameters including the proportion of acetonitrile, buffer, pH and the column temperature in HILIC separation (Heaton et al., 2012). Faster retention times and symmetrical peaks were achieved on the HILIC method over HPLC conditions coupled with the advantage of MS compatibility.

This was followed by a more comprehensive study by Jovanovic et al who investigated parameters such as mobile phase and other process parameters on HILIC separation of ephedrine and synephrine (Jovanović, Rakić, Ivanović, & Jančić–Stojanović, 2015). The method successfully separated the diasteroisomers, ephedrine and pseudoephedrine as well as the positional isomers of synephrine and phenylephrine. However, the linear calibration was not reported and the correlation coefficients were \( r^2 = 0.990 \) could be improved by optimising the range of standards used. Sakai et al used a zwitterionic monolith column paired to an electrochemical detection system. The authors demonstrated the use of electron capture dissociation (ECD) in HILIC with a LOD of 3.7 pg (Sakai et al., 2016). Future work implementing a HILIC column, for the analysis of the adrenergic amines within CA should be undertaken and compared to the current method to improve the sensitivity in detecting these compounds in PWS or biological matrices.
Further analytical studies could be undertaken to detect other synthetic stimulants, not of plant origin but reported to be present in recently released PWS. These reports describe banned supplements containing novel synthetic stimulants – many of which lack appropriate evidence for safety in humans (Archer et al., 2015; Cohen, 2012; Venhuis et al., 2014). Synthetic stimulants such as DMAA, amphetamine and methamphetamine analogues have often been sold as a compound within herbal extracts. DMAA (C₇H₁₇N) is an aliphatic amine with a pharmacophoric structure similar to amphetamine (Figure 40). Its sympathomimetic mechanism of action is similar to amphetamine. A study conducted in 2013, was the first to characterise the oral pharmacokinetic profile of DMAA, where it was found that DMAA did not impact heart rate, blood pressure or body temperature (Schilling, Hammond, Bloomer, Presley, & Yates, 2013). However, this short-term study only involved eight healthy men providing blood samples collected over a 24 hour period. One subject was excluded due to reported abnormal DMAA levels.

![1,3-Dimethylamylamine (DMAA) and Amphetamine](image)

Figure 40 Structural similarities between DMAA and amphetamine

A challenge with detecting DMAA and its analogues by the common technique of UV spectrophotometry is their lack of a chromophore. In addition, their presence in PWS is often masked by claims that they are constituents of natural plant extracts and so are not listed individually. For example, DMAA has been labelled as present in geranium oil (Zhang, Woods, Breitbach, & Armstrong, 2012), methamphetamine analogue, N, α-diethylphenylethylamine (DEPEA) labelled as dendrobium orchid (Cohen, Travis, & Venhuis, 2014) and 1,3-dimethylbutylamine (DMBA) was marketed as an extract of Pouchung tea (Cohen, Travis, & Venhuis, 2015).
Finally, receptor binding studies for these adrenergic amines are quite limited, which limits a more complete understanding of their pharmacology. As mentioned in chapter 1, synephrine has been described to be an α-AR agonist (Carpene et al., 1999). However, the specific subtypes of α-adrenoceptor binding have yet to be explored. This presents a clear gap in knowledge and an opportunity for the investigation into the receptor binding properties of these amines using either cell-based and or tissue-based experiments. Computational approaches such as molecular docking and dynamics could search for unique features of the receptor subtypes which may help explain any observed differences in binding and/or function. Molecular dynamic simulations could be used to computationally derive the binding affinities and compared to the known proposed (α1-, α1-, β2-, β3-) adrenergic and trace amine-associated receptor 1 (TAAR-1).
5.4 Concluding Remarks

The aims and research questions have been addressed by the development of two rapid, accurate and validated HPLC protocols for the quantitation of 1) adrenergic amines present in CA-containing PWS and 2) caffeine and DMX present in PWS. To the best of my knowledge, these methods were the first to implement a QDa detector for rapid mass detection in-line with UV detection on a RP-HPLC system for quantification of these compounds. Levels of synephrine in both locally and overseas- made PWS were compliant with the TGA’s regulation of a limit of 30 mg/serve. A greater sample size of CA-containing PWS is likely required to determine any real differences in synephrine levels between locally and overseas-made PWS.

It was hypothesised that the amounts of caffeine found in overseas made PWS would be higher than locally sourced PWS. This was not the case however, significant variability was observed in the levels of caffeine found in both locally and overseas made PWS when compared to the stated quantity on its label. A further highlight of this study was the development of a method with the ability to resolve the isobaric isomers, TP and PX. PX was also found in one of the overseas supplement albeit in small amounts. It was noted that when the compounds were present as a ‘proprietary blend’ this poses an obstacle to accurately compare the quantities of the key ingredients with their labels. Future research into the quantification of these amines and other synthetic stimulants on a HILIC could result in greater sensitivity of the methods especially when coupled to a mass detector.
References

Australia New Zealand Food Standards Code – Standard 2.9.4 – Formulated supplementary sports foods (2016).

AOAC (2012). Guidelines For Dietary Supplements And Botanicals. AOAC International.


Australia New Zealand Food Standards Code – Standard 2.9.4 – Formulated supplementary sports foods (2016).


Chizzali, E., Nischang, I., & Ganzera, M. (2011). Separation of adrenergic amines in *Citrus aurantium* L. var. amara by capillary electrophoresis using a


National Drugs and Poisons Schedule Committee. (2003). *Proposed Changes/Additions To Parts 1 To 3 And Part 5 Of The Standard For The Uniform Scheduling of Drugs And Poisons.*


or herbal remedies: a review. *Anal Bioanal Chem*, 406, 6767-6790. doi: 10.1007/s00216-014-8159-z


Appendices

Appendix 1: Muscle Prime (Allmax Nutrition) label

![Muscle Prime Label Image]

**Supplement Facts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serving Size (1 scoop):</th>
<th>19 g</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Servings Per Container:</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount Per Serving</th>
<th>% DV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Calories</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calories from Fat</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Fat</td>
<td>0 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cholesterol</td>
<td>0 mg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sodium</td>
<td>0 mg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potassium</td>
<td>220 mg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Carbohydrate</td>
<td>4 g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dietary Fiber</td>
<td>0 g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugars</td>
<td>0 g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protein</td>
<td>0 g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitamin A</td>
<td>0 mg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitamin C</td>
<td>60 mg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitamin E</td>
<td>7.5 IU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calcium</td>
<td>200 mg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>0 mg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niacin</td>
<td>20 mg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitamin B6</td>
<td>0.6 mg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitamin B12</td>
<td>6 mcg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnesium</td>
<td>200 mg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selenium</td>
<td>60 mcg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MUSCLEPRIME® CORE-FACTOR**

- BCAA Blend: 1,800 mg
- L-Theanine: 400 mg
- L-Valine: 200 mg
- L-Isoleucine: 200 mg
- Beta-Alanine (as CarnoSyn®): 200 mg

**SYN-OCT® STIM-FACTOR**

- L-Arginine: 1,700 mg
- L-Taurine: 1,650 mg
- N-Acetyl L-Carnitine: 1,000 mg

**GLH. FACTOR**

- L-Arginine: 1,350 mg
- L-Arginine: 1,350 mg
- L-Histidine: 1,350 mg
- L-Isoleucine: 1,350 mg
- L-Leucine: 1,350 mg
- L-Valine: 1,350 mg
- L-Taurine: 1,350 mg
- N-Acetyl L-Carnitine: 1,000 mg
- Beta-Alanine (as CarnoSyn®): 200 mg

**POS-ION FACTOR (K⁺•Ca⁺•Mg⁺)**

- Potassium: 600 mg
- Calcium: 600 mg
- Magnesium: 600 mg

**ANTI-OX FACTOR**

- Vitamin C: 600 mg
- Alpha Lipoic Acid: 60 mg
- N-Acetyl L-Carnitine: 60 mg
- L-Taurine: 60 mg
- L- Carnitine: 60 mg
- N-Acetyl L-Cysteine: 60 mg

*Percent Daily Values (PDV) are based on a 2,000 calorie diet.*

**ALLERGY ALERT:** Manufactured in a facility that processes the following allergens: milk, soy, wheat, eggs and peanuts.
## Appendix 2 Gold standard Preworkout (Optimum Nutrition) label

![Gold Standard Preworkout label](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serving Size: 1 Scoop (10 g)</th>
<th>2 Scoops (20 g)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% Daily Value</td>
<td>% Daily Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calories:</td>
<td>% Daily Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Carbohydrate:</td>
<td>% Daily Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 g</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitamin D (as Cholecalciferol):</td>
<td>% Daily Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 IU</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thiamin (as Thiamin HCl):</td>
<td>% Daily Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 mg</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niacin (as Nicotinamide):</td>
<td>% Daily Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 mg</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitamin B6 (as Pyridoxine HCl):</td>
<td>% Daily Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 mg</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folic Acid:</td>
<td>% Daily Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 mcg</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitamin B12 (as Cyanocobalamin):</td>
<td>% Daily Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 mcg</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potassium Phosphate:</td>
<td>% Daily Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 mg</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rye Maltodextrin:</td>
<td>% Daily Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90 g</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creatine Monohydrate:</td>
<td>% Daily Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 g</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analogen Fructose Blend:</td>
<td>% Daily Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 mg</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Compounds*</td>
<td>% Daily Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 g</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beta-Alanine (as Creatine):</td>
<td>% Daily Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 g</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy &amp; Focus Complex*</td>
<td>% Daily Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 g</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antioxidants:</td>
<td>% Daily Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175 mg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citrus Bioflavonoids:</td>
<td>% Daily Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 mg</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| *Percent Daily Values are based on a 2,000 calorie diet. † Daily Value not established.

OTHER INGREDIENTS: Natural & Artificial Flavors, Citric Acid, Malic Acid, Citrus Pectin, Calcium Pantothenate, Guar Gum (Green Tea and/or Coffee Bean), Gum Blend (Cellulose Gum, Xanthan Gum, Carbomer), Sucrose, Tartaric Acid, Acetaminophen Potassium, FD&C Yellow #5, FD&C Blue #2.

DIRECTIONS: Mix each scoop with 8-8 oz of water and consume 20-30 minutes before training. Start with 1 scoop or less to assess your tolerance.

DO NOT EXCEED 2 SCOOPS PER DAY.
Appendix 3: 360Rage (360°Cut Performance Nutrition) label
Appendix 4: ErgoBlast (Ergo Genix) label

![ErgoBlast Label]

### Supplement Facts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Amount per Serving</th>
<th>%DV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vitamin B6 (as Pyridoxine Hydrochloride)</td>
<td>20 mg</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitamin B12 (as Cyanocobalamin)</td>
<td>66 mcg</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zinc (as Zinc Arginate Chelate)</td>
<td>10 mg</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sodium (as Sodium Citrate)</td>
<td>24 mg</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creatine HCl (Conv-Creat®)</td>
<td>1,000 mg</td>
<td>†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agranine Sulfate (AgranMax®)</td>
<td>500 mg</td>
<td>†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ErgoStim Blend:</td>
<td>1,500 mg</td>
<td>†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-Acetyl L-Tyrosine, Caffeine Anhydrous, L-Tyrosine, Mucuna Pruriens Extract (L-Dopa), Theobromine, N-Methyltyramine Hydrochloride, Higenamine Hydrochloride, Guarana Seed Extract, Ubidecarenone (Co-Q10), Huperzine 1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Amount of Caffeine Per Serving: 300 mg

* Percent Daily Values are based on a 2,000 calorie diet.  † Daily Value not established
Appendix 5: PumpHD (BPI Sports) label
## Supplement Facts

**Serving Size:** 1 Scoop (14.4 g)  
**Servings Per Container:** 45

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nutrient</th>
<th>Amount Per Sering</th>
<th>% DV*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Calories</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Carbohydrates</td>
<td>7 g</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitamin B1 (as Thiamine Hydrochloride)</td>
<td>60 mg</td>
<td>4000%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitamin B2 (as Riboflavin)</td>
<td>7 mg</td>
<td>412%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niacin (as Nicotinamide)</td>
<td>6 mg</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitamin B6 (as Pyridoxine Hydrochloride)</td>
<td>4.2 mg</td>
<td>210%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitamin B12 (as Methylcobalamin)</td>
<td>280 mcg</td>
<td>4667%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calcium (as Silicate and Phosphate)</td>
<td>66 mg</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnesium (as Oxide)</td>
<td>71 mg</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sodium (as Phosphate)</td>
<td>157 mg</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potassium (as Phosphate)</td>
<td>46 mg</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mass & Endurance Blend with Muscle Volumizing Agents**  
Glycerol MonoStearate, L-Arginine Alpha-Ketoglutarate 2:1, CarnoSyn® Beta Alanine, Agmatine Sulfate, Citrinulin PF® (Patented bark extract).

**Neurostimulating Co-Factors**  
Choline Bitartrate, L-Tyrosine, Bacopa Monniera (leaf), Ginkgo Biloba (leaf).

**Energy & Intensity Blend with High Potency B-Complex**  
Coffeea Robusta (bean), Nelumbo Nucifera (seed) Extract, Vitamin B1 (Thiamine HCl), Vitamin B2 (as Riboflavin), Vitamin B3 (Nicotinamide), Vitamin B6 (Pyridoxine HCl), Vitamin B12 (Methylcobalamin).

*Percent Daily Value Based on a 2000 Calorie Diet  
**Daily Value Not Established

**Other Ingredients:** Glucose Polymers, Citric Acid, Natural & Artificial Flavors, Sodium Citrate, Sucralose, Purple Carrot Extract (for color), Acesulfame Potassium.
Appendix 7: KardioFire (Panthera Pharma) label

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supplement Facts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Serving Size: 10 GMS (1 scoop)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serving / container: 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Carbohydrate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protein</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kardio Matrix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carnosyn Beta Alanine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2:1:1 L-Leucine, L-Valine, L-Isoleucine)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-Glutamine</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fire Matrix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>625 mg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percent Daily Value are based on a 2000 calories diet. +Daily Value not established

Other Ingredients:
Citrice Acid, Natural And Artificial Color, Sucralose, Artificial Flavour
Appendix 8: DyNO (RSP Nutrition) label

![DyNO Label Image]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount Per Serving</th>
<th>% Daily Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vitamin C (as Calcium Ascorbate)</td>
<td>60 mg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitamin B3 (as Niacin)</td>
<td>75 mg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitamin B6 (as Pyridoxine HCl)</td>
<td>.5 mg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folic Acid</td>
<td>200 mcg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitamin B12 (as Cyanocobalamin)</td>
<td>6 mcg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitamin B5 (as D-Calcium Pantothenate)</td>
<td>10 mg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calcium (as Dicalcium Phosphate)</td>
<td>64 mg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citrulline Malate</td>
<td>2,000 mg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beta Alanine (CarnoSyn™)</td>
<td>2,000 mg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agmatine Sulfate (AgmaMAX™)</td>
<td>500 mg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Blend</td>
<td>1,670 mg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taurine, L-Glycine, L-Tyrosine, N-Acetyl L-Tyrosine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceleration Matrix</td>
<td>516 mg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caffeine Anhydrous, Dicaffeine Malate (Infinergy™), Phenylethylamine Hydrochloride, N-Methyltyramine Hydrochloride, Higenamine Hydrochloride, Black Pepper Fruit Extract (BioPerine®), Rutacarpine, Rhodiola Root</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Percent Daily Values are based on 2,000 calories diet
† Daily value not established

Other Ingredients:
- Natural Flavors, Sucralose, Silicon Dioxide, Citric Acid, Acesulfame Potassium, and Red #40

CAUTION: Product contains 400mg of pure Caffeine
**Appendix 9: Scheduling 1-10 that is currently implemented by the Therapeutic Goods Administration of Australia**

| Schedule 1 | This Schedule is intentionally blank. |
| Schedule 2 | **Pharmacy Medicine** – Substances, the safe use of which may require advice from a pharmacist and which should be available from a pharmacy or, where a pharmacy service is not available, from a licensed person. |
| Schedule 3 | **Pharmacist Only Medicine** – Substances, the safe use of which requires professional advice but which should be available to the public from a pharmacist without a prescription. |
| Schedule 4 | **Prescription Only Medicine, or Prescription Animal Remedy** – Substances, the use or supply of which should be by or on the order of persons permitted by State or Territory legislation to prescribe and should be available from a pharmacist on prescription. |
| Schedule 5 | **Caution** – Substances with a low potential for causing harm, the extent of which can be reduced through the use of appropriate packaging with simple warnings and safety directions on the label. |
| Schedule 6 | **Poison** – Substances with a moderate potential for causing harm, the extent of which can be reduced through the use of distinctive packaging with strong warnings and safety directions on the label. |
| Schedule 7 | **Dangerous Poison** – Substances with a high potential for causing harm at low exposure and which require special precautions during manufacture, handling or use. These poisons should be available only to specialised or authorised users who have the skills necessary to handle them safely. Special regulations restricting their availability, possession, storage or use may apply. |
| Schedule 8 | **Controlled Drug** – Substances which should be available for use but require restriction of manufacture, supply, distribution, possession and use to reduce abuse, misuse and physical or psychological dependence. |
| Schedule 9 | **Prohibited Substance** – Substances which may be abused or misused, the manufacture, possession, sale or use of which should be prohibited by law except when required for medical or scientific research, or for analytical, teaching or training purposes with approval of Commonwealth and/or State or Territory Health Authorities. |
| Schedule 10 | **Substances of such danger to health as to warrant prohibition of sale, supply and use** - Substances which are prohibited for the purpose or purposes listed for each poison. |
Appendix 10: Calibration curve of synephrine from concentrations 2 \( \mu g/mL \) to 200 \( \mu g/mL \). \( r^2 = 0.9129 \)

Appendix 11: Calibration curve of octopamine from concentrations 2 \( \mu g/mL \) to 200 \( \mu g/mL \). \( r^2 = 0.9061 \)

Appendix 12: Calibration curve of tyramine from concentrations 2 \( \mu g/mL \) to 200 \( \mu g/mL \). \( r^2 = 0.87217 \)