Cut Down Your Column Cuts: Matching GC Liner Style to Matrices and Reduce Column Trimming Headaches

NEMC 2022

Operational Issues Impacting the Environmental Laboratory Industry (Session 2)

Angela Smith Henry, Ph.D. Lukas Wieder GC,MS Supplies Application Chemists Agilent Technologies, Inc.





We want to reduce analyte loss in the flow path...



Match the liner to the application





17.92 17.94 17.96 17.98 18 18.02 18.04 18.06 18.08 18.1 18.12 18.14 18.16 18.18 18.2 18.22 18.24 18.26 18.28 Counts vs. Acquisition Time (min)



3

Match the liner to the application





Do I really need a barrier in my liner?

Test plan for evaluating liner effect on column trimming frequency

<u>3 Liner Styles</u>

- Single taper liner
- Single taper with wool
- Single taper with glass frit







5

Evaluating methods with EPA 8270 short mix @ 5ppm





Liner + Column Trim Testing: GC/MS Method parameters

GC/MS Method Parameters					
Injection volume	1 μL				
Inlet	Split/splitless 280 °C;				
	Pulsed splitless 30 psi until 0.6 min;				
	Purge 50 mL/min at 0.6 min;				
	Switched septum purge 3 mL/min				
Column	Agilent J&W DB-5ms UI (30 m x 0.25 mm x				
	0.25 μm, p/n 122-5532UI)				
Column temperature	40 °C (hold for 0.5 min), 10 °C/min to 100 °C,				
program	25 °C/min to 260 °C, 5 °C/min to 280 °C, 15				
	°C/min to 320 °C (hold 2 min)				
Carrier gas and flow	Helium at 1.30 mL/min, constant flow				
rate					
Transfer line	320 °C				
temperature					
Ion source temperature	300 °C				
Quadrupole	150 °C				
temperature					
Scan	m/z 35 to 500				
Gain factor	0.4				
Threshold	0				
A/D samples	4				





Liner + Column Trim Testing: Experimental Design

Run	Sample type	Name
1	DCM blank	DCM blank
2	DFTPP tuning mix 25ppm	QC check
3	EPA 8270 short mix 20ppm	Mini-CCV
4-13	Soil matrix (10runs)	Soil matrix
14	DCM blank	DCM blank
15	DFTPP tuning mix 25ppm	QC check
16	8270 short mix 20ppm	Mini-CCV
17-26	Soil matrix (10runs)	Soil matrix
27	DCM blank	DCM blank
28	DFTPP tuning mix 25ppm	QC check
29	8270 short mix 20ppm	Mini-CCV

Passing Criteria:

DDT % breakdown <20%

Pentachlorophenol, benzidine tailing factor <2.0 DFTPP Ion ratios pass

Mini-CCV: Cal drift within ±20% for ≥70% compounds ISTD: Area of IS peak area drift within ±50%



8

How many liners and column trims occurred per liner style?

Liner Type	Average Lifetime (number of matrix injections)	Number of Liners Used Before Column Trim	Number of Column Trims Before New Column Required	
Single taper	14	2.33	1	
Wool	10	6.67	2	
Fritted	12	7	2	





How did the liners compare? Data Set 1

Data Set 2

	Number of liners before trim	Failure point			Number of liners before trim/change	Failure point	
Single taper	3	DT % breakdown (22.3%) nd pentachlorophenol TF		Single taper	2	6 CCV compounds outside ±20%	
		(2.0)		Wool	8	6 CCV compounds outside	
Wool	9	4 CCV compounds outside				±20%	
	±20%		Fritted	7	11 CCV compounds outside		
Fritted	7	7 Pentachlorophenol TF (2.0)				±20%	

Data Set 3

	Number of liners before trim	Failure point
Single taper	2	DDT %, pentachlorophenol TF, and 5 CC compounds outside ±20%
Wool	3	6 CCV compounds outside ±20%
Fritted	7	4 CCV compounds outside ±20%



Single taper liner: Detailed example

Data Set Number	Liner Number	Initial DDT Percent Breakdown	Initial CCV Failures	Notes
	1	1.4	0	New column
1	2	14.2	3	
	3	18.8	3	
	"4"	22.3	3	Trim
2	1	4.5	1	
	2	17.3	3	
	"3"	19.3	4	Trim column
		3.9	6	Replace column
	1	2.9		New column
3	2	13.3		
	"3"	35.3	5	Trim column
4	1	4.0	0	





- Not the best choice for heavy matrices
- Transfers more matrix onto column
 - Increased column trims and changes

Best choice for drinking water or other clean samples





Single taper with Wool liner: Detailed breakdown

Data set number	Liner Number	Initial DDT % breakdown	Initial CCV failures	Notes
	1	2.1	0	New column
	2	1.6	1	
	3	0.9	0	
	4	0.8	3	
	5	1.5	0	
	6	1.1	1	
	7	0.9	3	
4	8	1.7	0	
1	9	1.2	2	
	"10"	1.1	4	Trim column
3*	1	0.7	0	New Column*
	2	1.3	0	
	3	2.2	0	
	4	1.9	1	
	5	2.9	0	
	6	1.9	1	
	7	2.3	1	
	8	2.3	1	
	"9"	2.7	6	Trim column
	1	4.1	1	
4	2	6.2	1	
	3	5.4	3	
	"4"	3.8	6	Trim column
1 August 2022	1 DE256280	65 3.3	1	



- Harder to connect DDT breakdown to column health
 - Variability related to inherent variability of wool
- Better to trim early than waiting for true CCV failure

Remains a good option for heavy matrices



Single taper with Glass Frit liner: Detailed breakdown

Data Set Number	Liner Number	Initial DDT % Breakdown	Initial CCV failures	Notes
	1	0.3	0	New column
	2	0.4	0	
	3	0.7	0	
	4	2	0	
	5	2.5	1	
1	6	2.6	1	
	7	2.4	1	
	"8"	2.4	1	TF = 2.0; Trim column
	1	0.3	0	
	2	0.5	1	
	3	1.1	1	
2	4	1.5	1	
2	5	1.4	1	
	6	0.9	1	
	7	2.1	3	End at 11 CCV; Trim column
3	1	0.5	0	



- Track column health with DDT % breakdown
- Column trim frequency was very consistent

Remains a good option for heavy matrices



What about a low pressure drop liner?



Liner style	Run #1 Avg. % breakdown	% RSDs	Avg. Lifetime (over 20% at run…)	% RSDs	Avg. Star Endrir	ting Area I DDT
Single taper	5.5%	8.5%	96*	18%*	6800	11000
Single taper with wool	5.1%	15%	74	34%	7000	12000
Single taper with glass frit	10.2%	14%	87*	17%*	6000	12000
Low pressure drop single taper with wool	7.6%	30%†	100*	27%*	3150	4500
Carbofrit	>20%					

*1 or more run/liner lasted longer than a complete sequence before reaching 20% breakdown; use 106 to generate an approximate average

[†]One (or more) result is outside the standard deviation range

- Previous GC-ECD work on liner lifetime (Application note: 5994-2111EN)
 - Tracked endrin and DDT breakdown during soil matrix injections
- Low pressure drop liner areas: ~1/2 of splitless liner areas
- If liner lifetime matters most, may be the best option



5190-2

Summary

- Single taper (no barrier) liner not the best choice for heavy matrix
 - More matrix transferred onto column
 - Still great for drinking water analyses
- Reduced column trims with wool or glass fritted liner
- Fritted and wool liner remain very similar in performance
 - Fritted liner more consistent in column trim frequency









Thank you!

Any Questions?



