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#### Abstract

Free fatty acids (FFA) are basic and indispensable components of medicinal plants. Many researches indicate that the efficacy of medicinal plant requires the presence of FFA. In the present study, ultrasonic-assisted extraction of FFA from Swertia species was optimized by response surface methodology (RSM), ensuring the highest FFA recoveries. A novel pre-column fluorescence labelling method using 2-(5-benzoacridine)ethyl- $p$-toluenesulfonate (BAETS) as a labelling reagent has been developed for highly sensitive and selective analysis of FFA by HPLC with fluorescent detection (FLD) and online mass spectrometry identification. RSM was also employed to optimize the fluorescence labelling of FFA. HPLC separation of 17 FFA derivatives was carried out on a reversed-phase Hypersil BDS C 8 column ( $4.6 \times 200 \mathrm{~mm}, 5 \mu \mathrm{~m}$, Agilent Co.) with a gradient elution. The detection limits and quantifications were as low as 0.60 and $1.22 \mathrm{ng} \mathrm{mL}^{-1}$, respectively. FFA analysis from nine Swertia species was performed by the newly developed method, and the FFA composition of these Swertia samples was first reported.
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## Introduction

Swertia species belonging to the Gentianaceae family are well-known for their multiple properties for the treatment of hepatic, choleric, inflammatory, malarial, and diarrheal diseases. Swertiamarin and mangiferin flavonoids, iridoid glycosides, dimeric xanthones, and triterpenoids have all been shown to be the active components [1, 2]. Fatty acids play an important role in the prevention and treatment of coronary artery disease, hypertension, atherosclerosis, diabetes, arthritis, other inflammatory and autoimmune disorders, and cancer [3-6]. More researches indicate that free fatty acids (FFA) are indispensable components for the efficacy of medicinal plants [7-9]. Thus, accurate determination of FFA is not only of vital importance for the safe use of Swertia species, but also imperative for quality control.

FFA show little UV absorption and no fluorescence response, and are often present at a low level in plants. Thus, accurate analysis of them using absorptiometry is fairly difficult. The mostly used methods for FA determination are gas chromatography (GC) or GC/MS analysis coupled with diazomethane or silylation [10, 11]. However, the methods based on GC have several limitations in their applications to FFA analysis. For example, the high temperatures used in GC are harmful to the thermally unstable components like unsaturated FA derivatives [12]. Methylation with diazomethane is a hazardous procedure and should be avoided in routine analysis due to the explosiveness, toxicity and carcinogenicity of the reagents. In
contrast with GC methods, HPLC method coupled with derivatization can overcome some problems such as tailing peaks and low detector sensitivity, by the formation of less polar compounds, which can be more easily analyzed by LC [13, 14]. The strategy of pre-column derivatization has been widely used to improve the detection sensitivity and selectivity. Many pre-column labelling reagents have been developed for analysis of the compounds with carboxy groups such as the bromoalkyl reagents, diazomethane reagents and sulfonate reagents [15-18], but these labelling reagents have many disadvantages in their applications such as low detection sensitivity, short detection wavelengths, poor stability, tedious analytical procedures, and so on [19-21]. Recently, we described a new dual-sensitive probe 2-(5-benzoacridine) ethyl-p-toluenesulfonate (BAETS) for bile acids and triterpenic acids determination, and analysis using BAETS shows not only excellent fluorescent sensitivity but also high MS ionizable efficiency [22, 23]. In the present study, a novel HPLC method using BAETS as a fluorescent labelling reagent was applied for highly selective and sensitive determination of FFA in medicinal plants. Response surface methodology was utilized to optimize the derivatization reaction between BAETS and FFA. Moreover, quantitative analysis of FFA in the nine Swertia species including the flower, stem and root are first reported.

## Experimental Section

Chemicals and Standards
All free fatty acid standards were purchased from Sigma Corporation (St Louis, MO, USA). Water was purified by a Milli-Q system (Millipore, Bedford, MA, USA). Acetonitrile of HPLC grade was obtained from Yucheng Chemical Reagent (Shandong Province, China). $\mathrm{N}, \mathrm{N}$-dimethylformamide (DMF), chloroform and potassium carbonate $\left(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{CO}_{3}\right)$ were of analytical grade purchased from Shanghai Chemical Reagent Co. (Shanghai, China). All other reagents used were of analytical grade quality unless otherwise stated.

## Samples

Swertia angustifolia (S. angustifolia) was collected from the western region of Nepal (elevation 3,200 m), S. mussotii from Yushu County, Qinghai province (elevation $4,100 \mathrm{~m}$, China), S. racemosa from the southeast region of Tibet (elevation 3,400 m, China), S. chirayita from Nagarkot (elevation, $3,300 \mathrm{~m}$, Nepal), $S$. nervosa from the east region of Tibet (elevation $3,300 \mathrm{~m}$, China), S. franchetiana from Yushu County, Qinghai province (elevation 4,200 m,

China), S. verticillifolia from Cuona of the Tibet Autonomous Region (elevation $4,100 \mathrm{~m}$, China), S. phragmitiphylla from the southeast region of Tibet (elevation $4,000 \mathrm{~m}$, China), and $S$. kingii from the south region of Tibet (elevation $3,800 \mathrm{~m}$, China). The flower, root, and stem of Swertia samples were dehydrated, milled, sized ( $60 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ ) and kept at $-20^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ until use.

## Equipment

The ultrasonic-assisted extractions of FFA from Swertia plants were carried out using an ultrasonic cleaner (SB5200 DTD, 40 kHz , Xinzhi Biotech Co., Ningbo, China). All chromatographic analyses were performed on an Agilent 1100 Series high-performance liquid chromatography/ mass spectrometer (HPLC-MSD ion Trap SL, a complete LC-MS/MS), which consists of a vacuum degasser (model G1322A), a quaternary pump (model G1311A), an autosampler (model G1329A), a thermostated column compartment (model G1316A), and a fluorescence detector (model G1321A). The mass spectrometer 1100 Series LC/ MSD Trap-SL (ion trap) from Bruker Daltonnik (Bremen, Germany) was equipped with an atmospheric pressure chemical ionization (APCI) source (in positive ion mode). The determination of fluorescence excitation and emission spectra were performed on a 650-10S fluorescence spectrophotometer (Hitachi, Japan). The mobile phase was filtered through a $0.2-\mu \mathrm{m}$ nylon membrane filter (Alltech, Deerfiled, IL, USA).

## Preparation of Standard Solutions

The BAETS reagent solution $\left(1 \times 10^{-2} \mathrm{~mol} / \mathrm{L}\right)$ was obtained by dissolving 22.15 mg of DBCETS in 5 mL DMF. BAETS solutions with different concentrations were obtained by diluting the stock solution. A mixed standard stock solution containing 17 FFA was prepared in DMF with the concentration of $1.0 \times 10^{-4} \mathrm{~mol} / \mathrm{L}$ for each fatty acid. Working standard solutions for calibration curves were prepared by diluting the mixed standard stock solution with DMF.

Optimization of FFA Extraction and Derivatization
Reaction

A software Design-Expert 7.1.3 Trial (State-Ease, Inc., Minneapolis MN, USA) was dedicated to experimental designs and generate contour plots. The Box-Behnken design (BBD) from response surface methodology was used for optimization of FFA extraction from Swertia species and the derivatization reaction between BAETS and FFA. The main parameters affecting FFA extraction were extraction temperature, time and solid-liquid ratio,
and for the derivatization reaction, the main parameters were derivatization time, temperature and amount of BAETS (mole ratio of BAETS to fatty acids). BBD was also employed to evaluate the effects and interactions of the condition variables. The FFA content or the peak area of the labeled fatty acids was taken as the response, $Y$. The model proposed for response ( $Y$ ) was:
$Y=\beta_{0}+\sum_{i=1}^{n} \beta_{i} X_{i}+\sum_{i=1}^{n} \beta_{i i} X_{i}^{2}+\sum_{1 \leq i \leq j}^{n} \beta_{i j} X_{i} X_{j}$
Where $Y$ represents the response variable, $n$ is the numbers of variables, $\beta_{0}$ is the constant term, $\beta_{i}$, $\beta_{i i}$ and $\beta_{i j}$ represents the coefficient of the first order terms, quadratic terms, and interaction terms, respectively.

## Preparation of Sample Solutions

The prepared Swertia sample ( 0.5 g ) was added to 10 mL chloroform in a volumetric flask. The sample mixture was extracted for 70 min in an ultrasonic bath at $67{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. After extraction, the sample mixture was filtered through a $0.2 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ membrane filter for the next analysis.

## Derivatization

The derivatization was performed following the procedure below: (1) $50 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ standard solution, $100 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ BAETS reagent solution, $60 \mathrm{mg} \mathrm{K} \mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{CO}_{3}$ and $150 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ DMF were placed in a vial, respectively; (2) the vial was sealed and placed in a water bath at $94{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ for 35 min ; (3) the mixture was cooled to room temperature and diluted for HPLC analysis.

## HPLC-MS Conditions

HPLC separation of FA derivatives was carried out on a reversed-phase Hypersil BDS C 8 column $(4.6 \times 200 \mathrm{~mm}$, $5 \mu \mathrm{~m}$, Agilent Co.) with a gradient elution. The mobile phase A was $30 \%$ acetonitrile containing $0.1 \%$ ammonium formate and B was $100 \%$ acetonitrile. The mobile phase solutions were degassed and filtered through a $0.45-\mu \mathrm{m}$ filter and pumped at a flow rate of $1 \mathrm{~mL} / \mathrm{min}$ and the column temperature was set at $35^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The injection volume was $10 \mu \mathrm{~L}$. The fluorescence excitation and emission wavelengths were set at $\lambda_{\text {ex }} 272 \mathrm{~nm}$ and $\lambda_{\mathrm{em}} 505 \mathrm{~nm}$, respectively. The gradient elution program was as follows: $0 \mathrm{~min}=50 \% \mathrm{~B}, 40 \mathrm{~min}=92 \% \mathrm{~B}, 45 \mathrm{~min}=100 \% \mathrm{~B}$, and $50 \mathrm{~min}=100 \% \mathrm{~B}$. Before injecting the next sample, the column was equilibrated with the initial mobile phase for 10 min . MS conditions: ion source type, atmospheric pressure chemical ionization (APCI source); nebulizer pressure 60 psi; dry gas temperature, $350^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; dry gas flow,
$5.0 \mathrm{~L} / \mathrm{min}$; Vap temperature, $350{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; capillary voltage, $3,500 \mathrm{~V}$; corona current, $4,000 \mathrm{nA}$ (pos).

## Validation of Analytical Method

The method was validated for linearity, limits of detection and quantification (LOD and LOQ), reproducibility, precision (inter-day and intra-day precision) and accuracy. Standard solutions containing 17 FFA were prepared and diluted to appropriate concentrations for construction of the calibration curves. The 17 FFA solutions at 6 different concentrations were injected in triplicate, and the calibration curves were constructed by plotting the peak areas versus the concentrations of each FFA. LOD and LOQ were defined as the compound concentration that produced a signal-to-noise ratio of $3(\mathrm{~S} / \mathrm{N}=3)$ and $10(\mathrm{~S} / \mathrm{N}=3)$, respectively. The method repeatability was evaluated by consecutively injecting a $10-\mu \mathrm{L}$ standard sample $(n=6)$ and measuring the relative standard deviations (R.S.D.) for peak area and retention time. The inter- and intra-day variability was investigated to evaluate the precision of the proposed method. The accuracy of the method was determined by the $\%$ recovery method. The \% recovery of the analyte was obtained by spiking a known amount of FFA standards to Swertia samples.

## Results and Discussion

## Optimization of Free Fatty Acid Extraction

The preparation of crude extracts from plants is also a key aspect in the qualitative and quantitative analysis of chemical constituents present in medicinal plants. Before response surface methodology (RSM) optimization, we tried several organic solvents including $n$-hexane, petroleum ether, chloroform and a mixture of chloroform, methanol and water [24]. Results indicated that chloroform gave the highest FFA recovery. The extraction temperature, time and solid-liquid ratio were chosen for further optimization by RSM based on the significant effect on the extraction yield. The three factors and lower, middle and upper design points for RSM in coded and uncoded values are shown in Table 1. In RSM, natural variables are transformed into coded variables that have been defined as dimensionless with a mean zero and the same spread or standard deviation. Multiple regression equations below were generated relating response variable to uncoded levels of the independent variables.

$$
\begin{aligned}
Y= & 1179+148 X_{1}+17 X_{2}-4.8 X_{3}-66 X_{1}^{2}-27 X_{2}^{2} \\
& -80 X_{3}^{2}-27.4 X_{1} X_{2}+35.6 X_{1} X_{3}-31.02 X_{2} X_{3}
\end{aligned}
$$

Table 1 The Box-Behnken design matrix of three test variables in coded and natural units along with the observed responses (total FFA content)

| Run | Independent variable |  | Total FFA <br> content |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
|  | $X_{1}\left(\right.$ Temperature, $\left.{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$ | $X_{2}($ Time, <br> min) | $X_{3}$ (Solid- <br> liquid ratio) | $\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{g})$ |
| 1 | $30(-1)^{\mathrm{a}}$ | $40(-1)$ | $22.5(0)$ | 912 |
| 2 | $70(+1)$ | $40(-1)$ | $22.5(0)$ | 1,221 |
| 3 | $30(-1)$ | $90(+1)$ | $22.5(0)$ | 1,009 |
| 4 | $70(+1)$ | $90(+1)$ | $22.5(0)$ | 1,197 |
| 5 | $30(-1)$ | $65(0)$ | $15(-1)$ | 903 |
| 6 | $70(+1)$ | $90(+1)$ | $15(-1)$ | 1,156 |
| 7 | $30(-1)$ | $65(0)$ | $30(+1)$ | 822 |
| 8 | $70(+1)$ | $65(0)$ | $30(+1)$ | 1,238 |
| 9 | $50(0)$ | $40(-1)$ | $15(-1)$ | 1,034 |
| 10 | $50(0)$ | $90(+1)$ | $15(-1)$ | 1,115 |
| 11 | $70(+1)$ | $65(0)$ | $15(-1)$ | 1,164 |
| 12 | $50(0)$ | $90(+1)$ | $30(+1)$ | 1,050 |
| 13 | $50(0)$ | $65(0)$ | $22.5(0)$ | 1,156 |
| 14 | $50(0)$ | $65(0)$ | $22.5(0)$ | 1,213 |
| 15 | $50(0)$ | $65(0)$ | $22.5(0)$ | 1,188 |
| 16 | $50(0)$ | $65(0)$ | $22.5(0)$ | 1,131 |
| 17 | $50(0)$ | $65(0)$ | $22.5(0)$ | 1,213 |

[^1]The results of analysis of variance (ANOVA) showed the regression model was highly significant $(P<0.001)$. The total determination coefficient ( $R^{2}$ ) was 0.96 , indicating a reasonable fit of the model to the experimental data. The three-dimensional surface plots and twodimensional contour plots were drawn to illustrate the main and interactive effects of the independent variables on the dependent one (Fig. 1). Figure 1a shows the effect of extraction time and temperature on FFA extraction yield. Both extraction temperature and time have positive effect on FFA content. By increasing the extraction temperature or time, the FFA yield increased and reached a maximum value. Figure 1 b depicts the influence of extraction temperature and solid-liquid ratio on extraction yield. The interaction of temperature and solid-liquid ratio have positive effect on the FFA yield. The FFA content increased with the solid-liquid ratio and reached up to a maximum value. Similarly, Fig. 1c clearly presented the combined effect of extraction time and solidliquid ratio on FFA yields. The optimal conditions given by the model were extraction temperature of $67^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, extraction time of 70 min and solid-liquid ratio of 20.5 . Under the proposed conditions, the FFA content was $1,251 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{g}(n=3)$, which was in very good agreement


Fig. 1 The 3D response surface and 2D contour plots of total FFA content affected by extraction time (min), extraction temperature $\left({ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$ and solid-liquid ratio
with the predicted value. These optimal extraction conditions ensured the highest FFA recoveries within the shortest extraction time.

Fig. 2 The representative derivatization scheme of BAETS with C18 fatty acids


Table 2 The Box-Behnken design matrix of three test variables in coded and natural units along with the observed responses (peak area)
a Natural units (coded)

| Run | Independent variable |  |  | Peak area |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | $X_{1}($ BAETS ratio $)$ | $X_{2}\left(\right.$ Temperature, $\left.{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$ | $X_{3}$ (Time, min$)$ |  |
| 1 | $8(+1)^{\text {a }}$ | $80(-1)$ | $30(0)$ | 1,647 |
| 2 | $8(+1)$ | $90(0)$ | $20(-1)$ | 3,678 |
| 3 | $3(-1)$ | $100(+1)$ | $30(0)$ | 2,966 |
| 4 | $5.5(0)$ | $100(+1)$ | $40(+1)$ | 4,325 |
| 5 | $8(+1)$ | $100(+1)$ | $30(0)$ | 3,283 |
| 6 | $3(-1)$ | $80(-1)$ | $30(0)$ | 1,296 |
| 7 | $5.5(0)$ | $90(0)$ | $30(0)$ | 4,304 |
| 8 | $5.5(0)$ | $90(0)$ | $30(0)$ | 4,265 |
| 9 | $5.5(0)$ | $80(-1)$ | $20(-1)$ | 1,843 |
| 10 | $5.5(0)$ | $80(-1)$ | $40(+1)$ | 2,131 |
| 11 | $8(+1)$ | $90(0)$ | $40(+1)$ | 4,291 |
| 12 | $5.5(0)$ | $90(0)$ | $30(0)$ | 4,270 |
| 13 | $5.5(0)$ | $90(0)$ | $30(0)$ | 4,458 |
| 14 | $3(-1)$ | $90(0)$ | $40(+1)$ | 3,658 |
| 15 | $5.5(0)$ | $90(0)$ | $30(0)$ | 4,180 |
| 16 | $5.5(0)$ | $100(+1)$ | $10(-1)$ | 2,940 |
| 17 | $3(-1)$ | $90(0)$ | $20(-1)$ | 2,678 |

## Optimization of the Derivatization Reaction

Derivatization optimization is one key step for the precolumn derivatization strategy, which ensures the sufficient labelling of the analyzed components. The derivatization scheme for BAETS with the representative C 18 fatty acids is presented in Fig. 2. Based on a previous study [22], DMF and $60 \mathrm{mg} \mathrm{K} 2_{2} \mathrm{CO}_{3}$ were used as the best co-solvent and catalysts, respectively. The main conditions including derivatization temperature, time and amount of BAETS (mole ratio of BAETS to FFA) were chosen for further optimization by employing a three-level, three-variable Box-Behnken design (BBD) from response surface methodology (RSM). Seventeen experiments (Table 2) from BBD were randomly performed. By applying multiple regression analysis methods on the experimental data in Table 2, the predicted model was obtained by a secondorder polynomial function, given as follows:

$$
\begin{aligned}
Y= & 4295+287.6 X_{1}+824.7 X_{2}+408.1 X_{3}-615.5 X_{1}^{2} \\
& -1381.7 X_{2}^{2}-103.7 X_{3}^{2}-8.64 X_{1} X_{2}-91.4 X_{1} X_{3} \\
& +274.1 X_{2} X_{3}
\end{aligned}
$$

The experimental data were analyzed by analysis of variance (ANOVA). The low probability ' $P$ ' value of $<0.001$ indicated a high significance of the regression model. The coefficient of determination $\left(R^{2}\right)$ was 0.98 , indicting a reasonable fit of the model to the experimental data. The three-dimensional surface plots and two-dimensional contour plots in Fig. 3 were the graphical representations of regression function. They explained the type of interactions between two tested variables, and the relationships between responses and experiment level. Figure 3 a describes the combined effect of molar ratio of BAETS to free fatty acids and derivatization temperature on the derivatization yields. Both temperature and amount of BAETS have positive effects on the derivatization reaction. As shown in Fig. 3a, the peak area increased with the temperature and reached a maximum value, and a further increase in the derivatization temperature had a slight effect on the peak area. The derivatization yield increased rapidly with the amount of BAETS and reached a maximum value, and the further increase of BAETS


Fig. 3 The 3D response surface and 2D contour plots of derivatization yield (expressed in terms of peak area) affected by derivatization temperature $\left({ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)$, derivatization time (min) and molar ratio of BAETS to FFA
resulted in a small decrease in the derivatization yield. Similarly, Fig. 3b vividly shows the effect of derivatization time and amount of BAETS on the response, and Fig. 3c presents the effect of derivatization time and temperature on the response.

The prediction optimization values were calculated using the second-order polynomial equation. The optimal conditions obtained by calculating the regression equation were as follows: molar ratio of BAETS to FFA $=4.6$; derivatization temperature $=94.4^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$; and derivatization time $=35.2 \mathrm{~min}$. To test validity of response surface analysis method, the derivatization was carried out under the optimal condition and peak area was $4,380(n=3)$, which was close to the theoretical predicted value of 4,466 , indicating that the experimental design model may better reflect the derivatization parameters.

## HPLC Separation Optimization and Mass Spectrometry Identification

The first step in developing a HPLC method is to select an analytical column. Various analytical columns including Hypersil $\mathrm{C}_{18}(200 \mathrm{~mm} \times 4.6 \mathrm{~mm}, 5 \mu \mathrm{~m})$, Hypersil BDS $\mathrm{C}_{8} \quad(200 \mathrm{~mm} \times 4.6 \mathrm{~mm}, \quad 5 \mu \mathrm{~m})$, Hypersil BDS $\mathrm{C}_{18}$ ( $200 \mathrm{~mm} \times 4.6 \mathrm{~mm}, \quad 5 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ ), and Spherisorb $\mathrm{C}_{18}$ ( $200 \mathrm{~mm} \times 4.6 \mathrm{~mm}, 5 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ ) were investigated, and results showed that a Hypersil BDS $\mathrm{C}_{8}(200 \mathrm{~mm} \times 4.6 \mathrm{~mm}$, $5 \mu \mathrm{~m}$ ) gave the best resolution compared to other columns. Retention factor, tailing factor and pH of the mobile phase were evaluated for different proportions of acetonitrilecontaining aqueous solvents. Eluent A ( $30 \%$ acetonitrile containing $0.1 \%$ ammonium formate) and Eluent B ( $100 \%$ acetonitrile) offered good resolution, peak shape and better retention times of 17 FFA derivatives. The best flow rate of mobile phase and column temperature were found to be $1.0 \mathrm{ml} / \mathrm{min}$ and $35^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, respectively. The representative chromatography for 17 FFA standards is shown in Fig. 4a.

Chromatographic peaks were simultaneously identified by retention time and online post-column mass spectrometry in positive mode. The mass spectrometry data for all of derivatized FFA are shown in Table 3. The mass spectrometry data indicated that FFA derivatives exhibited intense quasi-molecular ion peak of $[\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{H}]^{+}$. The MS, MS/MS and cleavage mode for the typical C18 derivative are shown in Fig. 5. As expected, C18 derivative produced an intense molecular ion peak at $m / z 556.4$, and the specific fragment ions at $m / z 290.5, m / z 272.5, m / z 311.4$ and 246.5 . Although other endogenous acidic compounds present in samples were presumably co-extracted and derivatized by BAETS, no interference was observed due to the highly specific parent mass-to-charge ratio and the characteristic product ions.

Fig. 4 The representative chromatograms for 17 FFA standards (a), and the stem, root and flower of Swertia nervosa (b-d) HPLC conditions: FA derivatives separation was carried out on a reversed-phase Hypersil BDS C 8 column $(4.6 \times 200 \mathrm{~mm}, 5 \mu \mathrm{~m})$; the mobile phase A was $30 \%$ acetonitrile containing $0.1 \%$ ammonium formate and B was $100 \%$ acetonitrile; the fluorescence excitation and emission wavelengths were set at $\lambda_{\text {ex }} 272 \mathrm{~nm}$ and $\lambda_{\text {em }} 505 \mathrm{~nm}$, respectively


## Method Validation

The results for the method validation are shown in Table 3. The linearity of an analytical method is its ability, within a definite range, to obtain results directly proportional to the concentrations of the analyte in the sample. The correlation
coefficients were found to be $>0.9994$, indicating excellent linearity. As presented in Table 3, the proposed method offered the low LOD of $0.60-1.11 \mathrm{ng} \mathrm{mL}^{-1}$ and LOQ of $1.22-3.41 \mathrm{ng} \mathrm{mL}^{-1}$, which are significantly lower than the common methods based on GC [25, 26]. The high detection sensitivity would enable us to accurately analyze the

Table 3 Linear regression equations, correlation coefficients, LOD, LOQ, reproducibility of retention time and peak area, and accuracy

| FAA | MS data | $Y=A X+B^{\mathrm{b}}$ | $r$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{LOD}^{\mathrm{c}} \\ & (\mathrm{ng} / \mathrm{mL}) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{LOQ}^{\mathrm{d}} \\ & (\mathrm{ng} / \mathrm{mL}) \end{aligned}$ | Repeatability R.S.D (\%) ( $n=6$ ) |  | Accuracy ( $n=3$ ) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Retention time | Retention time | Recovery | R.S.D (\%) |
| C10 | $443.9$ | $Y=44.60 X+12.26$ | 0.9999 | 0.60 | 1.55 | 0.04 | 1.60 | 92.8 | 2.7 |
| C11 | $457.9$ | $Y=39.71 X+7.81$ | $0.9997$ | 1.00 | 2.41 | 0.02 | 2.05 | 96.4 | 1.8 |
| C12 | 471.9 | $Y=43.43 X+16.20$ | 0.9998 | 0.77 | 1.80 | 0.01 | 1.65 | 101.4 | 2.5 |
| C13 | 486.0 | $Y=44.10 X+15.24$ | 0.9995 | 0.74 | 1.90 | 0.01 | 1.95 | 97.1 | 2.4 |
| C18:3 | $552.2$ | $Y=61.86 X+24.06$ | 0.9997 | 0.48 | 1.22 | $0.03$ | 1.25 | 99.6 | 1.8 |
| C22:6 | 600.4 | $Y=37.62 X+6.54$ | 0.9999 | 1.11 | 2.77 | 0.04 | 1.40 | 95.7 | 1.1 |
| C14 | 500.0 | $Y=34.53 X+5.40$ | 0.9998 | 0.97 | 3.03 | 0.03 | 1.75 | 93.1 | 1.5 |
| C18:2 | $554.3$ | $Y=48.73 X+35.83$ | 0.9996 | 0.89 | 2.60 | 0.03 | 1.30 | 100.1 | 1.7 |
| C15 | $514.0$ | $Y=29.33 X+8.31$ | $0.9997$ | $1.05$ | 3.18 | $0.06$ | 1.25 | 93.7 | 1.4 |
| C16 | 528.4 | $Y=54.03 X+41.47$ | 0.9995 | 0.63 | 2.18 | 0.01 | 1.60 | 92.3 | 2.4 |
| C18:1 | 555.5 | $Y=90.23 X+18.75$ | 0.9994 | 0.69 | 2.06 | 0.02 | 1.20 | 102.4 | 1.6 |
| C17 | 542.1 | $Y=46.29 X+9.22$ | 0.9996 | 1.07 | 3.23 | 0.02 | 2.01 | 98.1 | 1.0 |
| C18 | 556.4 | $Y=41.84 X+9.06$ | 0.9999 | 0.95 | 3.20 | 0.04 | 1.25 | 100.6 | 1.4 |
| C19 | 570.1 | $Y=47.78 X+9.09$ | 0.9999 | 1.06 | 3.41 | 0.05 | 1.55 | 96.6 | 2.3 |
| C20 | 584.0 | $Y=33.57 X+1.69$ | 0.9998 | 0.91 | 3.05 | 0.02 | 1.10 | 93.2 | 2.5 |
| C21 | 598.1 | $Y=59.64 X+15.82$ | 0.9997 | 0.87 | 2.87 | 0.04 | 1.40 | 104.5 | 1.7 |
| C22 | 613.5 | $Y=113.89 X+25.54$ | 0.9998 | 0.78 | 2.49 | 0.03 | 1.15 | 99.1 | 1.3 |

a Mass spectrometry
b $X$ Injected amount (pmol) $Y$ Peak area
${ }^{\text {c }}$ Limit of detection, $\mathrm{S} / \mathrm{N}=3$, per $10 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ injection volume
${ }^{\text {d }}$ Limit of quantification $\mathrm{S} / \mathrm{N}=10$, per $10 \mu \mathrm{~L}$ injection volume


Fig. 5 MS spectra of the representative C18 fatty acid derivative and the cleavage mode of protonated molecular ion

FFA in medicinal plants where usually very low content of FFA is expected. The reproducibility of retention time and peak area were obtained with R.S.D. values lower than
0.05 and $2.05 \%$, respectively. The experimental accuracies were found to be in the range of $92.3-104.5 \%$, which indicated the excellent accuracy of the proposed method.
Table 4 The content of free fatty acids in nine Swertia species [Mean value $\pm$ S.D. (standard deviation)]

| Swertia species | Organs | Free fatty acid content ( $\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{g}$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | UFFA ${ }^{\text {a }}(\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{g})$ | TFFA ${ }^{\text {b }}(\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{g})$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | C10 | C13 | C18:3 | C14 | C18:2 | C15 | C16 | C18:1 | C18 | C20 | C21 | C22 |  |  |
| Swertia racemosa | Stem | $20.3 \pm 0.8$ | $6.5 \pm 0.4$ | $29.2 \pm 0.4$ | $11.3 \pm 0.4$ | $105.3 \pm 1.6$ | $7.6 \pm 0.1$ | $254.9 \pm 3.8$ | $10.8 \pm 0.5$ | $23.1 \pm 1.2$ | $11.7 \pm 0.4$ | $1.4 \pm 0.1$ | $11.5 \pm 0.8$ | $145.3 \pm 2.7$ | $638.8 \pm 5.1$ |
|  | Root | $38.1 \pm 1.9$ | $30.5 \pm 0.9$ | $44.5 \pm 0.5$ | $31.7 \pm 0.3$ | $209.1 \pm 3.2$ | $11.3 \pm 0.3$ | $361.3 \pm 4.1$ | $50.0 \pm 1.8$ | $135.4 \pm 3.4$ | $77.8 \pm 0.5$ | $6.1 \pm 0.7$ | $31.5 \pm 1.3$ | $304.0 \pm 5.3$ | $1332 \pm 17.0$ |
|  | Flower | $59.3 \pm 2.3$ | $42.2 \pm 1.3$ | $149.2 \pm 3.8$ | $5.3 \pm 0.2$ | $194.1 \pm 2.6$ | $3.1 \pm 0.0$ | $223.4 \pm 2.9$ | $41.4 \pm 1.3$ | $26.1 \pm 1.3$ | $25.1 \pm 1.0$ | $-^{\text {d }}$ | $63.6 \pm 3.4$ | $384.8 \pm 4.9$ | $1218 \pm 15.3$ |
| Swertia angustifolia | Stem | $122.0 \pm 3.7$ | $9.0 \pm 0.6$ | $20.2 \pm 0.7$ | $10.7 \pm 0.8$ | $60.7 \pm 0.5$ | $6.6 \pm 0.1$ | $127.7 \pm 2.0$ | $20.0 \pm 0.6$ | $20.9 \pm 0.9$ | $11.1 \pm 0.7$ | $-{ }^{\text {d }}$ | $9.4 \pm 0.6$ | $101.0 \pm 3.3$ | $519.8 \pm 9.7$ |
|  | Root | $11.1 \pm 0.8$ | $+^{\text {c }}$ | $11.2 \pm 0.4$ | $4.7 \pm 0.7$ | $122.3 \pm 2.7$ | $2.7 \pm 0.4$ | $167.1 \pm 2.2$ | $16.8 \pm 0.8$ | $21.3 \pm 1.4$ | $8.3 \pm 0.4$ | $-{ }^{\text {d }}$ | $13.4 \pm 1.4$ | $150.4 \pm 6.1$ | $529.5 \pm 7.8$ |
|  | Flower | $53.5 \pm 0.6$ | $44.7 \pm 2.6$ | $12.5 \pm 0.7$ | $-{ }^{\text {d }}$ | $38.6 \pm 0.4$ | $4.4 \pm 0.5$ | $223.7 \pm 1.9$ | $37.0 \pm 1.7$ | $27.2 \pm 0.5$ | $31.2 \pm 0.2$ | $-{ }^{\text {d }}$ | $13.8 \pm 0.5$ | $88.1 \pm 2.6$ | $575.1 \pm 8.5$ |
| Swertia chirayita | Stem | $34.8 \pm 1.1$ | $3.36 \pm 0.1$ | $11.0 \pm 0.4$ | $9.6 \pm 0.8$ | $9.3 \pm 0.7$ | $2.7 \pm 0.1$ | $280.4 \pm 3.3$ | $29.5 \pm 0.4$ | $110.1 \pm 3.1$ | $43.6 \pm 3.3$ | $7.9 \pm 0.2$ | $18.1 \pm 0.7$ | $49.8 \pm 3.2$ | $610.2 \pm 10.3$ |
|  | Root | $32.9 \pm 2.0$ | $+^{\text {c }}$ | $+^{\text {c }}$ | $63.5 \pm 2.5$ | $12.0 \pm 0.8$ | $5.9 \pm 0.2$ | $344.4 \pm 2.9$ | $40.9 \pm 0.5$ | $52.3 \pm 1.5$ | $31.2 \pm 1.2$ | $-{ }^{\text {d }}$ | $24.0 \pm 1.2$ | $53.0 \pm 1.5$ | $660.4 \pm 9.5$ |
|  | Flower | $6.2 \pm 0.1$ | $18.6 \pm 0.8$ | $+^{\text {c }}$ | $16.4 \pm 0.8$ | $9.1 \pm 0.2$ | $2.7 \pm 0.1$ | $377.4 \pm 4.2$ | $55.1 \pm 1.3$ | $89.7 \pm 3.3$ | $130.6 \pm 4.2$ | $9.7 \pm 0.8$ | $44.2 \pm 2.5$ | $64.3 \pm 2.5$ | $824.3 \pm 9.8$ |
| Swertia verticillifolia | Stem | $37.1 \pm 0.4$ | $+^{\text {c }}$ | $40.9 \pm 0.4$ | $9.0 \pm 0.4$ | $157.1 \pm 2.0$ | $5.3 \pm 0.2$ | $218.3 \pm 2.6$ | $14.2 \pm 1.9$ | $34.8 \pm 1.6$ | $10.9 \pm 1.3$ | $-{ }^{\text {d }}$ | $19.0 \pm 2.3$ | $212.3 \pm 4.1$ | $759.2 \pm 12.6$ |
|  | Root | $52.6 \pm 1.7$ | $+^{\text {c }}$ | $15.9 \pm 0.2$ | $19.8 \pm 0.7$ | $301.6 \pm 4.5$ | $2.3 \pm 0.6$ | $380.1 \pm 4.0$ | $42.6 \pm 1.4$ | $49.4 \pm 1.5$ | $2.0 \pm 0.1$ | $-{ }^{\text {d }}$ | $8.8 \pm 0.4$ | $360.1 \pm 4.6$ | $1235 \pm 15.9$ |
|  | Flower | $57.6 \pm 0.6$ | $6.9 \pm 0.1$ | $7.2 \pm 0.2$ | $3.8 \pm 0.1$ | $70.5 \pm 0.8$ | $9.7 \pm 0.5$ | $274.4 \pm 2.5$ | $44.7 \pm 0.8$ | $53.6 \pm 2.4$ | $83.8 \pm 2.7$ | $-{ }^{\text {d }}$ | $45.9 \pm 3.6$ | $122.3 \pm 3.9$ | $782.7 \pm 12.3$ |
| Swertia nervosa | Stem | $39.4 \pm 0.5$ | $13.2 \pm 0.8$ | $27.9 \pm 0.3$ | $6.4 \pm 0.2$ | $95.6 \pm 2.7$ | $20.5 \pm 0.5$ | $245.4 \pm 3.4$ | $23.5 \pm 1.2$ | $29.2 \pm 0.3$ | $14.1 \pm 1.2$ | - ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | $7.9 \pm 0.2$ | $147.0 \pm 4.0$ | $670.3 \pm 11.0$ |
|  | Root | $33.9 \pm 1.4$ | $+^{\text {c }}$ | $31.0 \pm 0.4$ | $-{ }^{\text {d }}$ | $256.0 \pm 3.1$ | $16.6 \pm 0.3$ | $229.3 \pm 2.6$ | $19.3 \pm 0.7$ | $20.5 \pm 0.8$ | $16.7 \pm 2.4$ | $-{ }^{\text {d }}$ | $13.7 \pm 0.9$ | $306.2 \pm 3.6$ | $943.6 \pm 7.8$ |
|  | Flower | $34.7 \pm 1.9$ | $25.8 \pm 1.9$ | $29.1 \pm 0.3$ | $-{ }^{\text {d }}$ | $120.1 \pm 1.6$ | $6.6 \pm 0.1$ | $176.4 \pm 2.0$ | $31.1 \pm 1.3$ | $13.3 \pm 0.9$ | $23.6 \pm 0.9$ | $-{ }^{\text {d }}$ | $33.8 \pm 0.3$ | $180.4 \pm 2.1$ | $675.1 \pm 6.6$ |
| Swertia phragmitiphylla | Stem | $12.9 \pm 0.6$ | $+^{\text {c }}$ | $40.8 \pm 0.5$ | $17.6 \pm 0.8$ | $108.7 \pm 2.8$ | $10.9 \pm 0.2$ | $131.4 \pm 2.9$ | $35.8 \pm 1.1$ | $33.4 \pm 2.4$ | $29.9 \pm 1.3$ | $-{ }^{\text {d }}$ | $23.3 \pm 1.2$ | $185.3 \pm 2.5$ | $630.2 \pm 11.1$ |
|  | Root | $1.4 \pm 0.2$ | $+^{\text {c }}$ | $27.4 \pm 0.9$ | $12.7 \pm 0.5$ | $152.6 \pm 3.0$ | $6.6 \pm 0.5$ | $77.6 \pm 1.5$ | $93.0 \pm 1.6$ | $53.0 \pm 3.6$ | $75.4 \pm 1.7$ | - ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | $11.3 \pm 0.3$ | $273.0 \pm 4.1$ | $784.2 \pm 10.2$ |
|  | Flower | $+^{\text {c }}$ | $+^{\text {c }}$ | $150.4 \pm 3.1$ | $25.9 \pm 0.9$ | $91.4 \pm 1.5$ | $14.7 \pm 0.2$ | $162.0 \pm 2.0$ | $138.4 \pm 1.2$ | $101.4 \pm 4.5$ | $85.8 \pm 2.6$ | $-{ }^{\text {d }}$ | $22.9 \pm 0.5$ | $380.2 \pm 5.9$ | $1173 \pm 14.7$ |
| Swertia kingii | Stem | $39.5 \pm 1.5$ | $+^{\text {c }}$ | $51.3 \pm 0.4$ | $4.6 \pm 0.2$ | $170.8 \pm 2.7$ | $6.8 \pm 0.1$ | $412.9 \pm 6.6$ | $47.8 \pm 1.5$ | $59.0 \pm 0.6$ | $34.5 \pm 2.2$ | - ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | $17.5 \pm 1.2$ | $269.9 \pm 4.6$ | $1114 \pm 13.6$ |
|  | Root | $17.7 \pm 0.7$ | $+^{\text {c }}$ | $29.7 \pm 0.8$ | $11.8 \pm 0.6$ | $165.7 \pm 1.9$ | $13.2 \pm 1.1$ | $210.0 \pm 3.0$ | $23.5 \pm 0.5$ | $41.8 \pm 2.3$ | $14.7 \pm 1.0$ | $-{ }^{\text {d }}$ | $4.1 \pm 0.1$ | $218.8 \pm 3.1$ | $751.1 \pm 6.4$ |
|  | Flower | $21.4 \pm 0.3$ | $+^{\text {c }}$ | $13.4 \pm 0.3$ | $9.2 \pm 0.4$ | $49.2 \pm 1.7$ | $5.9 \pm 0.3$ | $108.2 \pm 1.4$ | $21.0 \pm 0.7$ | $22.8 \pm 1.0$ | $16.5 \pm 0.8$ | $-{ }^{\text {d }}$ | $24.2 \pm 0.8$ | $83.5 \pm 2.6$ | $375.5 \pm 10.1$ |
| Swertia mussotii | Stem | $29.4 \pm 0.2$ | $+^{\text {c }}$ | $24.0 \pm 0.4$ | $9.0 \pm 0.6$ | $60.6 \pm 0.9$ | $14.1 \pm 0.7$ | $352.2 \pm 4.6$ | $27.7 \pm 0.3$ | $40.2 \pm 2.3$ | $21.2 \pm 2.1$ | $-{ }^{\text {d }}$ | $20.7 \pm 0.4$ | $112.2 \pm 2.5$ | $711.6 \pm 8.8$ |
|  | Root | $82.6 \pm 2.4$ | $+^{\text {c }}$ | $43.2 \pm 1.4$ | $4.2 \pm 0.2$ | $393.4 \pm 5.1$ | $8.0 \pm 0.4$ | $424.4 \pm 5.1$ | $56.2 \pm 0.4$ | $55.5 \pm 1.7$ | $46.6 \pm 1.2$ | $-{ }^{\text {d }}$ | $28.1 \pm 0.3$ | $492.7 \pm 6.3$ | $1635 \pm 20.6$ |
|  | Flower | $68.4 \pm 0.8$ | $18.6 \pm 0.2$ | $42.0 \pm 1.9$ | $10.1 \pm 0.4$ | $351.6 \pm 4.2$ | $2.4 \pm 0.3$ | $379.3 \pm 2.1$ | $117.2 \pm 2.0$ | $49.7 \pm 3.4$ | $118.8 \pm 2.8$ | - ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | $61.0 \pm 4.8$ | $510.8 \pm 7.6$ | $1732 \pm 21.7$ |
| Swertia franchetiana | Stem | $28.1 \pm 1.2$ | $6.5 \pm 0.1$ | $90.3 \pm 1.0$ | $+^{\text {c }}$ | $324.5 \pm 4.1$ | $3.7 \pm 0.2$ | $269.5 \pm 3.2$ | $25.9 \pm 1.4$ | $16.6 \pm 1.1$ | $6.8 \pm 0.6$ | $-{ }^{\text {d }}$ | $12.3 \pm 2.2$ | $440.7 \pm 8.9$ | $1225 \pm 17.2$ |
|  | Root | $53.5 \pm 1.8$ | $3.9 \pm 0.0$ | $60.8 \pm 0.7$ | $+^{\text {c }}$ | $294.9 \pm 3.7$ | $3.2 \pm 0.8$ | $277.3 \pm 4.5$ | $22.6 \pm 1.6$ | $25.3 \pm 3.2$ | $16.9 \pm 1.2$ | $-{ }^{\text {d }}$ | $2.1 \pm 0.2$ | $378.2 \pm 4.5$ | $1138 \pm 19.9$ |
|  | Flower | $27.1 \pm 0.9$ | $43.6 \pm 0.5$ | $235.4 \pm 2.9$ | $+^{\text {c }}$ | $105.4 \pm 2.3$ | $2.2 \pm 0.0$ | $208.4 \pm 3.2$ | $18.9 \pm 0.3$ | $8.8 \pm 0.6$ | $16.3 \pm 0.8$ | $-{ }^{\text {d }}$ | $16.5 \pm 2.3$ | $359.7 \pm 4.8$ | $1046 \pm 15.4$ |

[^2]Springer AOCS \%

The intra- and inter-day precision (expressed in terms of \% R.S.D.) were found to be in the range of 1.1-4.3 and $3.5-5.6 \%$, respectively, which demonstrated the good precision of the established method.

## Sample Analysis

The newly established analytical method was subsequently applied to simultaneous determination of 17 FFA in nine Swertia species including root, stem and flower (27 samples). All samples were analyzed using the optimized derivatization conditions and HPLC conditions. Each sample was analyzed in triplicate to determine the mean content $(\mu \mathrm{g} / \mathrm{g})$ and experiment results are presented in Table 4. Figure 4b-d shows the representative chromatograms for FFA in the stem, root and flower from Swertia nervosa. The FFA content variances in nine Swertia species were significant. Swertia angustifolia and Swertia mussotii represented the samples with the highest and lowest FFA content. The total FFA contents in stem, root and flower were ranged from 519.8 to $1,225 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{g}$, from 529.5 to $1,635 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{g}$, and from 575.1 to $1,732 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{g}$, respectively. The most abundant FFA in Swertia plant was C16 with a content ranging from 77.8 to $424.4 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{g}$, and the next FFA was C18:2 with a content range of $60.8-393.4 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{g}$. The main unsaturated FFA in order of content were C18:2, C18:3 and C18:1.

## Conclusion

This work reported a novel HPLC-FLD method coupled with pre-column derivatization using BAETS as a labelling reagent for FFA determination in medicinal plants. RSM was employed to optimize the FFA extraction and derivatization reaction ensuring the highest FFA recoveries within the shortest extraction time and the sufficient labelling of the analyzed components. The developed method here was capable of providing higher detection sensitivity and selectivity than the common methods based on GC. The FFA composition analysis in nine Swertia species was performed using the established method.
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