Potentiometric behavior of ion-selective electrodes to large cationic species modulated by decyl alcohol

Walton J. Cabrera [a], Marianne A. Kaempfe [a], Marcela D. Urzúa [b], Hernán E. Ríos [b,*]

[a] *Departamento de Química, Universidad Arturo Prat, Casilla 121, Iquique, Chile*
[b] *Departamento de Química, Facultad de Ciencias, Universidad de Chile, Casilla 653, Correo Central, Santiago, Chile*

Abstract

The effect of 1-decanol on the potentiometric response of three ion-selective electrodes to large cationic species is analyzed. The electrodes were constructed with plasticized PVC membranes. The results suggest that 1-decanol alters the ionic transport through the membrane/water interface to an extent that depends on the strength of the active ion pair. The water solubility of the cation, its molecular weight, and the size of the ion pair seem to be relevant factors in this type of behavior. The potentiometric selectivity coefficients are also dependent on the presence of 1-decanol in the membrane. These results are similar to those already described in ion-selective electrodes with membranes capable of sensing anionic benzene sulfonate-type systems. Thus, the effect of the alcohol appears to be general by affecting mainly the membrane surface polarity.

Keywords: Ion-selective electrodes; Papaverine; Procaine; Lidocaine; 1-Decanol; Doping agent

1. Introduction

In the past 15 years interest in quantifying drugs in biological fluids in a rapid and reliable way has increased substantially. The main efforts have been focused on detecting illicit drugs due to the enormous social consequences associated with their consumption [1–9]. However, the instrumentation available is very expensive and the acquisition of data is very slow [10–12]. Consequently, many efforts have been dedicated to obtaining alternative sensors as tools to solve this analytical problem.

The molecules investigated in the present work are very important in medicine, their concentration being a crucial aspect in biological media. In fact, the medical application of these active principles requires careful supervision of this variable. Ion-selective electrodes, ISE, appear as attractive devices for sensing drugs. On the other hand, in recent works the influence of doping agents such as aliphatic alcohols [13,14] and phenols [15] on the potentiometric behavior of ISE has been reported. The working hypothesis was that membrane surface polarity plays an important role, perhaps as relevant as membrane fluidity, and the reported results were consistent with the above hypothesis. However, these works were mainly focused on ISE that were able to detect anions, e.g., xanthates [13], nitrates [14], and several *p*-alkylbenzene sulfonates [15]. The aim of the present article is to test whether this effect is present in ISE that are able to detect large cations, particularly those electrodes that have been developed to detect drugs [16].

Therefore, in the present work the effect of 1-decanol on the potentiometric responses of three ion-selective electrodes [16] for sensing cations is studied. These cations were derived from drugs that contain at least one nitrogen atom, from which it is possible to obtain the respective ammonium salts. Specifically, the tetraphenylborate complexes of procaine, papaverine, and lidocaine, TPB^{-}–$RN^{+}H$, were synthesized to construct the individual PVC membrane electrodes.

* Corresponding author.
E-mail address: hrios@uchile.cl (H.E. Ríos).

2. Materials and methods

2.1. Synthesis of the complexes tetraphenylborate$^-$–RN^+H with RN = procaine, papaverine, or lidocaine

One gram of sodium tetraphenylborate, TPB^-, was dissolved in 50 ml of an HCl solution at pH 3. Another equivalent molar amount of the drug, RN, was dissolved in 20 ml of the same aqueous HCl solution at pH 3 in order to obtain the respective ammonium salts, RNH^+Cl^-. Both solutions were mixed under constant agitation to obtain a white precipitate corresponding to the complexes TPB^-–RN^+H. The solids were filtered and washed with distilled water to eliminate the excess of ionic species. Then these solids were dried under reduced pressure at 40 °C overnight. The crystals obtained were dissolved in acetone and the solutions dried with anhydrous $MgSO_4$, these solutions were then filtered, and the acetone was eliminated by rotovaporation and the solids dried under reduced pressure until constant weight. Kulapina and Barinova [16] reported a 1:1 stoichiometric relationship for this type of complex between TPB^- and RN^+H. A thin-layer chromatographic analysis showed only one product corresponding to the complexes TPB^-–RN^+H.

2.2. Membrane construction of RN^+H, the ammonium salts of procaine (Pro^+), papaverine (Pap^+), and lidocaine ($Lido^+$)

The membranes were prepared by dissolving 0.35 g of poly(vinyl chloride), PVC, with 1.14 g of di(2-ethylhexylphthalate) (DOP) and 0.01 g of the complex TPB^-–RN^+H in 20 ml of THF. As will be indicated, in some cases, the membranes contained 3 μmol/membrane of 1-decanol. These solutions were poured into 10 cm Petri dishes and the solvent was slowly and exhaustively evaporated.

2.3. Construction of the RN^+H electrodes

A small portion of the membrane was glued with a PVC/THF paste to the end of a PVC tube. The tube was then filled with an aqueous solution containing 5×10^{-3} M KCl and 5×10^{-3} M RN·HCl. An Ag/AgCl electrode was used as internal reference, whereas a double-junction Orion calomel electrode was used as outer reference electrode. The following diagram shows the cell used in the present work:

Ag/AgCl|KCl 0.005 M, RN·HCl 0.005 M ||
RN·HCl (aq)|KCl satd.|calomel.

All the measurements were performed at 25 ± 0.1 °C with a Corning Research Model 12 potentiometer. All the electrodes were tested 60 days after their first use and their responses were highly reproducible.

Tetraphenyl sodium borate (TPBNa), di(2-ethylhexylphthalate) (DOP), poly(vinyl chloride) (PVC), with an average molecular weight of 233,000, and procaine, lidocaine, and papaverine hydrochlorides were all from Aldrich, Milwaukee, WI of the highest purity available. All other reagents used were analytical grade. In order to evaluate the potentiometric selectivity coefficients, the method of fixed interference was used.

3. Results and discussion

Fig. 1 shows the potentiometric behavior of the electrodes for the different cations where the membranes were constructed in the presence and absence of 1-decanol, using DOP as plasticizer and the ion pairs TPB^-–RN^+H as active complexes. As can be seen, for procaine and lidocaine the trend is linear between 1×10^{-1} and 1×10^{-3}–10^{-4} M, whereas for papaverine, due to its lower water solubility, the linear region is found between 1×10^{-2} to 1×10^{-4} M. On the other hand, the very bulky complex TPB^-–Pap^+ presents greater steric hindrance and consequently has more difficulty in reaching the interface. As stated, papaverine hydrochloride has the lowest water solubility of the three cations studied here, while procaine and lidocaine hydrochlorides are very water-soluble. Apparently, this phenomenon is related to their molecular weight; papaverine hydrochloride is 39% heavier than lidocaine and procaine hydrochlorides, the latter having very similar molecular weights. Therefore, papaverine hydrochloride cations that eventually reach the interface have a relatively small tendency to go into the water phase as compared with lidocaine and procaine hydrochlorides.

Fig. 1 also shows a similar behavior for membranes containing just 3 μmol of 1-decanol per membrane. The slopes of the linear part of these plots are summarized in Table 1. As can be observed, their values increase when the membrane contains this aliphatic alcohol. The effect of 1-decanol on the potentiometric electrode behavior is evident and probably is due to a change in the membrane surface polarity caused by the closely packed 1-decanol molecules, which alters the transport of the complexes through a surface barrier formed by alcohol molecules. It is necessary to point out that the molar ratio



Fig. 1. Calibration curves for RN^+H. Without 1-decanol: (∀) procaine, (○) lidocaine, and (8) papaverine. With 3 μmol 1-decanol: (X) procaine, (M) lidocaine, and (Ξ) papaverine.

Table 1
Effect of 1-decanol on $d(E)/d\log([RN^+H])$

Electrode	Without 1-decanol	With 1-decanol
TPB^-–$Proc^+$	54.8 ± 0.2	60.2 ± 0.4
TPB^-–$Lido^+$	53.8 ± 0.7	57.5 ± 0.5
TPB^-–Pap^+	53.0 ± 0.9	56.0 ± 0.7



Fig. 2. Calibration curves for procaine electrode without 1-decanol at 1×10^{-3} M of interfering cations: (○) Na^+, (8) K^+, (X) NH_4^+, (M) Ca^{2+}, (Ξ) lidocaine, (χ) papaverine, and (∀) without interfering agent.

1-decanol/DOP in the membrane is close to 1:1000; thus the presence of the alcohol in the potentiometric responses of these electrodes seems to be a specific effect by affecting mainly the membrane surface polarity. This effect was already reported for xanthate [13] and *p*-alkylbenzene sulfonate [15] electrodes. All the complexes can reach the interface, but apparently steric effects and their water solubility seem to be additional factors that determine the observed potentiometric behavior.

Alternatively, in membranes without 1-decanol, some plasticizer molecules can be packed at the interface in a similar way to 1-decanol molecules, i.e., with their polar groups pointing to the water phase and their apolar moieties entering to the membrane phase. However, 1-decanol molecules can adopt a more highly ordered structure at the interface than plasticizer molecules, the latter acting mainly on the membrane fluidity. This phenomenon can explain the fact that three complexes containing the same carrier, TPB^-, produce different potentiometric responses. On the other hand, papaverine contains a weakly basic pyridine nitrogen atom, while both procaine and lidocaine contain aliphatic tertiary nitrogen atoms that are of a more basic character than that of papaverine. Apparently, depending on their strength, procaine and lidocaine TPB-ion pairs have a greater ability to reach the interface than the complex TPB–papaverine, no matter whether the membrane contains 1-decanol or not. Depending on the nature of the plasticizer, for the same active complex but with different counterions, cations or anions, different potentiometric responses are found. In fact, Campanella and co-workers, in potentiometric studies with bile salts [17], reported −58.9 mV/decade and −54.2 mV/decade for membranes constructed with the cholate salt of tetrakisdecylammonium for paradibutylphthalate and 2-ethylhexyl sebacate as plasticizers, respectively. Ríos and co-workers [13] also reported different slope values for a membrane containing the complex trioctylmethylammonium–isopropylxanthate, depending on whether they were made with dioctyladipate or dioctylphthalate.

Because the procaine electrode gave the best potentiometric responses, the interference study was done with this electrode. Fig. 2 shows the potentiometric behavior of the procaine membrane without 1-decanol for 1×10^{-3} M of different interfering cations, in all cases. As can be seen in Fig. 2, neither univalent cations such as Na^+, K^+, or NH_4^+ nor bivalent cations such as Ca^{2+} interfere with the potentiometric response of this electrode. However, a drastic effect is observed when the interfering cation is lidocaine or papaverine. In fact, the potentiometric selectivity coefficient, K_{ij}, for lidocaine is 1.43, while for papaverine it is 106.5. These values clearly show that the procaine membrane is not able to discriminate between procaine itself and these interfering cations. Moreover, in the case of papaverine, a well-known blocker of potassium ion channels in cell membranes [18], the K_{ij} value shows the ability of papaverine to associate strongly to the TPB^-, displacing procaine.

Table 2
Values of log K_{ij} for procaine electrode for different interfering cations

K_{ij}	Without 1-decanol	With 1-decanol
Na^+	−2.60	−2.60
K^+	−2.55	−2.55
NH_4^+	−2.72	−2.72
Ca^{2+}	−2.8	−2.8
$Lido^+HCl^-$	0.16	−0.17
Pap^+HCl^-	2.0	1.75
CTAB	4.38	3.36
CPyB	4.93	4.93

From plots similar to those of Fig. 2, the K_{ij} values for the same cations were obtained for the procaine electrode, whose membrane contains 3 μmol/membrane of 1-decanol. The values of log K_{ij} are summarized in Table 2. As can be seen, hydrophilic cations such as Na^+, K^+, NH_4^+, or Ca^{2+} do not show interfering ability, while lidocaine and papaverine again behave like strong interfering anions in a manner similar to membranes without 1-decanol. The K_{ij} values for the hydrophilic cations are the same as those found in membranes without 1-decanol. However, for lidocaine and papaverine hydrochlorides, the K_{ij} values are practically half those without alcohol, though for papaverine K_{ij} is even very high. Thus, the presence of 1-decanol improves the electrode selectivity, in contrast to what occurs in ISEs for detecting *p*-alkylbenzene sulfonates [14] when the interfering anions have hydrophobic character. Differences can be attributed to the strengths of the ion pairs involved in each case and probably to the different ability to cross the alcohol surface layer of those ion pairs. The interfering effect of two surfactant cations such as cetyltrimethylammonium bromide, CTAB, and cetylpyridinium bromide, CPyB, was also determined. From their K_{ij} values it can be concluded that these detergents are strong interfering agents and no effect of 1-decanol was found, at least in the CPyB case.

On the other hand, the enhancement of the selectivities of benzoate electrodes [19,20] by additives such as *p-tert*-octylphenol has been attributed to hydrogen bonding between the phenol and the anion to be sensed. However in the present case, the possibility of an interaction between 1-decanol and the cations studied here is unlikely.

From the above results it can be concluded that 1-decanol molecules, which are mainly located at the interface, alter the potentiometric response of the electrodes probably by modify-

ing the polarity of the membrane. The effect of the alcohol at interfaces affecting the potentiometric behavior of these membranes was already described in anionic systems and it seems to be general. The influence of plasticizers affecting mostly the membrane fluidity is not enough to obtain "good" potentiometric results. It appears that membrane surface polarity is a relevant factor that deserves to be more thoroughly analyzed.

Acknowledgments

The financial support of Fondecyt, Research Grant 1040646, and financial aid from the Research Department of the Universidad Arturo Prat, Research Grant DI 10201010023, are recognized. The financial support of the Department of Chemistry of the Universidad de Chile is also acknowledged. The technical assistance of Olga Césped González is gratefully acknowledged.

References

[1] D.A. Kidwell, U.S. Patent 6,780,307, 2004.
[2] M.E. Eman, A.H. Marawan, Talanta 39 (1992) 1329.
[3] L. Campanella, C. Colapicchioni, M. Tamossetti, A. Bianco, S. Dezzi, Sens. Actuat. 24–25 (1995) 188.
[4] K. Watanabe, K. Okada, H. Oda, K. Furuno, Y. Gomita, T. Katsu, Anal. Chim. Acta 316 (1995) 371.
[5] K. Watanabe, K. Okada, T. Katsu, Jpn. J. Toxicol. Environ. Health 42 (1996) 33.
[6] S.S.M. Hassan, E.M. Elnemma, Anal. Chem. 61 (1989) 2189.
[7] K. Watanabe, K. Okada, H. Oda, T. Katsu, Jpn. J. Toxicol. Environ. Health 43 (1997) 17.
[8] L. Campanella, L. Aiello, C. Colapicchioni, M. Tomassetti, J. Pharm. Biomed. Anal. 18 (1998) 117.
[9] L. Campanella, C. Colapicchioni, M. Tomassetti, S. Dezzi, J. Pharm. Biomed. Anal. 14 (1996) 1047.
[10] D.E. Moody, A.C. Spanbauer, J.L. Taccogno, E.K. Smith, J. Anal. Toxicol. 28 (2004) 86.
[11] R.E. Littleford, P. Matousek, M. Towrie, A.W. Parker, G. Dent, R.J. Lacey, W.E. Smith, Analyst 129 (6) (2004) 505.
[12] K. Clauwaert, T. Decaestecker, K. Mortier, W. Lambert, D. Deforce, C. Van Peteghem, J. Van Bocxlaer, J. Anal. Toxicol. 28 (8) (2004) 655.
[13] W.J. Cabrera, E.S. Maldonado, H.E. Ríos, J. Colloid Interface Sci. 237 (2001) 76.
[14] W.J. Cabrera, M. Urzúa, H.E. Ríos, J. Colloid Interface Sci. 265 (2003) 44.
[15] W.J. Cabrera, M. Urzúa, H.E. Ríos, J. Colloid Interface Sci. (2005), in press.
[16] E.G. Kulapina, O.V. Barinova, J. Anal. Chem. 56 (5) (2001) 457.
[17] O. Arias de Fuentes, L. Campanella, G. Crecentini, A. Falcioni, M.P. Sammartino, M. Tomassetti, J. Pharm. Biomed. Anal. 23 (2000) 89.
[18] H. Choe, Y.K. Lee, Y.T. Lee, H. Choe, S.H. Ko, C.U. Joo, M.H. Kim, G.S. Kim, J.S. Eun, J.H. Kim, S.W. Chae, Y.G. Kwak, J. Pharmacol. Exp. Therapy 304 (2) (2003) 706.
[19] T.M. Benignetti, L. Campanella, T. Ferri, Fresenious Z. Anal. Chem. 296 (1979) 412.
[20] H. Hara, S. Okazaki, T. Fujinaga, Anal. Chim. Acta 121 (1980) 119.