

This is an *Accepted Manuscript*, which has been through the Royal Society of Chemistry peer review process and has been accepted for publication.

Accepted Manuscripts are published online shortly after acceptance, before technical editing, formatting and proof reading. Using this free service, authors can make their results available to the community, in citable form, before we publish the edited article. This Accepted Manuscript will be replaced by the edited, formatted and paginated article as soon as this is available.

You can find more information about *Accepted Manuscripts* in the **Information for Authors**.

Please note that technical editing may introduce minor changes to the text and/or graphics, which may alter content. The journal's standard <u>Terms & Conditions</u> and the <u>Ethical guidelines</u> still apply. In no event shall the Royal Society of Chemistry be held responsible for any errors or omissions in this *Accepted Manuscript* or any consequences arising from the use of any information it contains.



www.rsc.org/advances

1	Validated assay for the evaluation of multiple glucuronidation
2	activities in human liver microsomes via liquid
3	chromatography-tandem mass spectrometry
4	Rong Shi, Yuanyuan Yang, Jie Zhong, Tianming Wang, Yueming Ma*
5	Department of Pharmacology, Shanghai University of Traditional Chinese Medicine, Shanghai, China
6	
7	ABSTRACT:
8	A sensitive and high-throughput liquid chromatography-tandem mass spectrometry
9	system was developed and validated for the simultaneous determination of major
10	human hepatic UDP-glucuronyltransferase forms in human liver microsomes. The
11	analytes were detected using a triple-quadrupole mass spectrometer equipped with an
12	electrospray ionization source in the negative ion and selected reaction monitoring
13	modes. The method provided satisfactory linear concentration range, accuracy,
14	precision, and stability. The developed method was successfully applied to the

enzyme kinetic study of estradiol 3-O-glucuronidation, 4-methylumbelliferone
O-glucuronidation, propofol O-glucuronidation, and 3-azido-3-deoxythymidine
glucuronidation in human liver microsomes.

18 Key words: probe substrate; glucuronidation activities; LC-MS/MS; human
19 liver microsomes

20

# 21 INTRODUCTION

Phase two metabolism of the primary conjugation reaction with glucuronic acid is considered as a fundamental mechanism to detoxify and eliminate lipophilic waste chemicals from the body. UDP-glucuronyltransferase (UGT) enzymes are metabolic enzymes that catalyze glucuronic acid transfer from cofactor UDP-glucuronic acid to

<sup>\*</sup> Correspondence to: Professor Yueming Ma (Tel: +86-21-51322386, Fax: +86-21-51322386, E-mail: mayueming\_117@hotmail.com)

particular endogenous substances and exogenous drugs; thus,
 β-D-glucopyranosiduronic acids (glucuronides) were formed [1–3]. Predicting
 potential drug-drug interactions is important and is done by studying the effect of
 drugs on UGT activities.

5 Methods based on determining metabolic reactions by detecting metabolite formation 6 of probe substrate via liquid chromatography (LC) [4] or LC-tandem mass spectrum 7 (LC-MS/MS) have been used for the evaluation of UGT activities [5–8]. In these 8 methods, the activity of one UGT subtype was measured once [4-6], whereas the 9 other was measured at a long-run time, which lasted for 15 min [7]. Alternatively, a 10 relative quantification was performed using the calibration curves of the probe parent 11 through the activity of several UGT subtypes that was measured one at a time [8]. The 12 limitations of these methods hindered their application for the quick evaluation of 13 multiple UGT-subtype activities. Therefore, a selective and efficient method should be 14 established to determine the activity of multiple UGT subtypes.

15 In human liver, two families of UGT (UGT1 and UGT2) are known. In the human 16 UGT1 family, UGT1A1 is an important isoform for the glucuronidation of 17 endogenous compounds (such as estradiol), whereas UGT1A9 is involved in the 18 glucuronidation of many drugs, including bulky phenols, flavonoids, and 19 anthraxquinones. UGT2B7 from the human UGT2 family is an important isoform 20 involved in the glucuronidation of steroids and has been regarded as one of the most 21 important UGT isoforms. It participates in the glucuronidation of various compounds, 22 different including steroid hormones (androsterone, epitestosterone), 23 carboxylic-nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs, fatty acid, and anticarcinogens 24 (all-trans retinoic acid) [9, 10]. In the present study, we investigated a battery of 25 validated assays for the simultaneous assessment of multiple UGT activities expressed 26 in human liver microsomes. We succeeded in its application to studies regarding the 27 enzyme kinetics of estradiol 3-O-glucuronidation (for UGT1A1), propofol O 28 -glucuronidation (for UGT1A9), 3-azido-3-deoxythymidine glucuronidation (for 29 UGT2B7), and 4-methylumbelliferone O-glucuronidation (for UGT isoforms) in 30 HLMs.

# 1 **EXPERIMENT**

## 2 Chemicals

3 Estradiol was purchased from the National Institute for the Control of Pharmaceutical 4 and Biological Products (Beijing, China). Propofol, 4-methylumbelliferone (4-MU), 5 3-azido-3-deoxythymidine (AZT), estradiol 3-glucuronide (3-EG), uridine 6 diphosphate glucuronic acid (UDPGA), coumarin-3-carboxylic acid, D-glucaric acid 7 1,4-lactone monohydrate, and alamethicin were supplied by Sigma Chemical Co. (St. 8 Louis, MO, USA). Propofol glucuronide (PG), 3-azido-3-deoxythymidine glucuronide 9 (AZTG) and 4-methylumbelliferone glucuronide (4-MUG) was obtained from 10 Toronto Research Chemicals (North York, Ontario, Canada). Chromatogram-grade 11 acetonitrile was purchased from Merck (Darmstadt, Germany). HPLC water was 12 purified using a MilliQ water system (Millipore, Bedford, MA, USA). 13 Chromatogram-grade acetic acid was provided by Tedia Company Inc. (USA). 14 Chromatogram-grade aceticacid and ammonium acetate were provided by Tedia 15 Company Inc. (USA). Other chemical reagents were analytically pure. Pooled HLMs 16 were purchased from the Research Institute for Liver Diseases (Shanghai, China).

## 17 Microsomal incubation

18 Incubation was done in linear form with respect to time and protein concentration. 19 The incubation mixtures contained HLMs, MgCl<sub>2</sub> (10 mM), alamethicin (25  $\mu$ g/mL), 20 saccharic acid-1,4-lactone (5 mM), tris-HCl buffer (50 mM, pH 7.4), and individual 21 substrate (estradiol, propofol, AZT, or 4-MU). The reaction was initiated by adding 22 UDPGA. After a few minutes of incubation at 37 °C, the reaction was terminated by 23 adding the same volume of cold methanol containing an internal standard (IS, 24 coumarin-3-carboxylic acid, 100 ng/mL). Each individual incubation medium (in the 25 same volume) was pooled and centrifuged at 17,000 g for 10 min. The supernatant 26 was diluted with the same amount of pure water for LC-MS/MS analyses.

## 27 LC-MS/MS condition

28 An LC-MS/MS system consisted of a Shimadzu Prominence UFLCXR system

1 (Shimadzu, Japan) coupled to a Thermo Scientific TSQ Quantum Ultra 2 triple-quadrupole mass spectrometer controlled by Xcalibur software (Version 3 1.0.2.65 SP2, Thermofisher Scientific, San Jose, CA, USA). LC separations were 4 achieved using a Hypersil Gold  $C_{18}$  (100 mm  $\times$  2.1 mm, 5 µm) with a guard column 5  $(10 \text{ mm} \times 2.1 \text{ mm}, 5 \text{ }\mu\text{m})$  under a binary gradient, which were (A) 0.1% acetic acid, 6 and 0.5 mM ammonium acetate in water and (B) acetonitrile  $(0 \rightarrow 1.0 \text{ min: } 20\%$ 7  $B \rightarrow 20\%$  B; 1.0 min $\rightarrow$  5.0 min: 20%  $B \rightarrow 90\%$  B; 5.1 min $\rightarrow$  7.0 min: 20%  $B \rightarrow 20\%$  B) 8 at a flow rate of 0.25 mL/min and at a temperature of 30 °C.

9 The mass spectrometer was operated using a heated electrospray ionization source in 10 the negative ion mode with selective reaction monitoring (SRM). The spray voltage 11 was 3500 V, and the vaporizer and capillary temperatures were both 300 °C. Sheath 12 and auxiliary gas pressures were 40 and 5 arb, respectively. The collision gas was 13 argon, and the collision pressure was set at 1.5 mTorr. The peak widths of Q1 and Q3 14 were 0.7 Da. The instrumental parameters of LC-MS/MS analysis of the four analytes 15 and IS were shown in Table 1.

Compound	Precursor ion	Product ion	SRM Collision Energy	Retention time	Tube lens
3-EG	447.0	271.3	48	4.3	158
4-MUG	351.3	175.1	28	3.1	93
PG	353.2	177.2	26	4.9	93
AZTG	442.0	125.0	25	2.2	99
IS	189.1	117.3	20	3.7	46

16 Table 1 Instrument method of LC–MS/MS analyses for	or the analyte
---	----------------

3-EG: estradiol 3-glucuronide; 4-MUG: 4-methylumbelliferone glucuronide; PG:
propofol glucuronide; AZTG: 3-azido-3-deoxythymidine glucuronide; IS: internal
standard.

20

## 21 Method validation

#### 22 Specificity

23 The specificity of the method was tested using six different lots of incubation matrix,

2 been introduced any interference.

## 3 Calibration curve, precision, and accuracy

4 A known amount of individual analyte (3-EG, 4-MUG, PG, or AZTG) was added to 5 the incubation system. After sample preparation, each individual sample of the same 6 volume was pooled and centrifuged at 17,000 g for 10 min. The lowest concentration 7 in the calibration curve was defined as the lower limit of quantification (LLOQ) with 8 an accuracy of 80% to 120% and a precision of no more than 20%, which was 9 determined at a signal-to-noise ratio of more than 10. The highest concentration in the 10 calibration curve was defined as the upper limit of quantification (ULOQ) with an 11 accuracy of 85% to 115%, and a precision of no more than 15% was set based on the 12 highest possible detecting concentration of the sample and the quantitative linear 13 range of the instrument. The correlation coefficient ( $R \ge 0.99$ ) was necessary. 14 Calibration curves (y = a + bx) were established using weighted linear least-square 15 regression of peak area ratios (y) of the analyte to their IS versus the analyte in seven 16 different concentrations (x) of the standard samples.

The quality control (QC) samples at three different concentration levels (0.02, 0.08, and 3.58  $\mu$ M for 3-EG; 0.06, 0.24, and 10.75  $\mu$ M for 4-MUG; 0.02, 0.08, and 3.58  $\mu$ M for PG; 0.16, 0.64, and 28.67  $\mu$ M for AZTG, n = 5 for each concentration) were used to determine the intra-day and inter-day precision and accuracy of the method in five replicates within the same day or over three consecutive days. Relative standard deviation (RSD) and relative error (RE) were set to calculate the accuracy and the precision of the method required within 15%.

## 24 Extraction recovery and matrix effect

Extraction recovery and matrix effect were determined at QC levels. The percentage recovery of each analyte was estimated as the ratio of analyte/IS peak area spiked before the extraction to analyte/IS spiked post-extraction. The matrix effect was investigated by comparing the peak response of the blank incubation system spiked with analytes (A) with that of pure standard solution containing equivalent amounts of 1 the compounds (B). The ratio  $(A/B \times 100)\%$  was used to evaluate the matrix effect.

## 2 **Dilution integrity experiment**

3 Dilution integrity experiment was performed with five replicate samples prepared at 4 nominal concentrations of ULOQ in an incubated system. These samples were diluted 5 16- and 64-fold by using a blank matrix. The diluted samples were analyzed, and the 6 mean concentrations were compared with the nominal value after the dilution factor 7 was applied.

### 8 **Stability**

9 Stability experiments were performed on five replicates to evaluate post-extracted
10 stability at an autosampler condition (4 °C for 24 h) and long-term stability (-80 °C
11 for 14 d) at QC levels. To meet the acceptance criteria, RE (%) should be within ±
12 15%.

#### 13 Method application

14 The enzyme kinetics of estradiol 3-O-glucuronidation, 4-methylumbelliferone 15 O-glucuronidation, propofol O-glucuronidation, and 3-azido-3-deoxythymidine 16 glucuronidation were determined in HLMs. Incubations of the mixture containing 17 each substrate (8  $\mu$ M to 160  $\mu$ M for estradiol, 10  $\mu$ M to 640  $\mu$ M for 4-MU, 1.5  $\mu$ M to 18  $600 \mu$ M for propofol, or 0.375  $\mu$ M to 4 mM for AZT), HLMs (0.1 mg/mL for estradiol, 19 0.1 mg/mL for 4-MU, 0.5 mg/mL for propofol, or 0.1 mg/mL for AZT) were 20 performed as previously described. After preincubation at 37 °C for 5 min, the 21 reaction was initiated by the addition of UDPGA (7 mM for estradiol, 3 mM for 22 4-MU, 5 mM for propofol or AZT). The mixture was incubated at 37 °C for a few 23 minutes (30 min for estradiol, 15 min for 4-MU, 20 min for propofol or AZT), and 24 then the reaction was terminated and analyzed. The kinetic parameters of 25 glucuronidation by HLMs were obtained by fitting the data to a Michaelis-Menten 26 model or to substrate inhibition models using a GraphPad Prism software (version 27 5.00, GraphPad Software, San Diego, CA, USA) based on the Akaike information 28 criterion.

# 1 Results

# 2 Validation of the method

# 3 Specificity

4 Typical SRM chromatograms of blank incubation matrix spiked with standards and 5 IS, a blank incubation matrix, and a pooled incubation sample are shown in Fig. 1. No 6 significant endogenous interferences were observed at retention times of the analytes 7 and IS.



8

9 chromatogram of estradiol-3-glucuronide Fig. 1. LC-MS/MS (3-EG), 10 4-methylumbelliferone glucuronide (4-MUG), propofol glucuronide (PG), 11 3-azido-3-deoxythymidine glucuronide (AZTG), and internal standard (IS) in the liver 12 microsomal sample: (A) a drug-free blank sample, (B) a blank sample spiked with 13 sample after incubation standards, and (C) а practice of estradiol, 4-methylumbelliferone, propofol, and 3-azido-3-deoxythymidine 14

15

# 16 Calibration curve and LLOQ

17 The calibration curves, correlation coefficients, linear ranges, and LLOQ of 3-EG,

- 18 4-MUG, PG, and AZTG in HLMs are listed in Table 2.
- 19 Table 2 Calibration curve, linear range, and LLOQ for 3-EG, 4-MUG, PG, and AZTG

Commonwed	Colibration ourse			IIOO(M)
Compound	Calibration curve	r	Linear range(µwi)	$LLOQ(\mu M)$

3-EG	y = -0.00142 + 0.378x	0.996	0.01-5.12	0.01
4-MUG	y = -0.00285 + 0.208x	0.997	0.08-40.96	0.08
PG	<i>y</i> =-0.00112+1.062 <i>x</i>	0.996	0.01-5.12	0.01
AZTG	y = -0.00043 + 0.030x	0.996	0.03-15.36	0.03

1 3-EG: estradiol 3-glucuronide; 4-MUG: 4-methylumbelliferone glucuronide; PG:

2 propofol glucuronide; AZTG: 3-azido-3-deoxythymidine glucuronide.

3

# 4 **Precision and accuracy**

5 Tables 3 and 4 present the results for intra- and inter-day precision and accuracy of the

6 method for 3-EG, 4-MUG, PG, and AZTG. These results reveal that the precision and

7 accuracy of the assay were within the acceptable range.

8 Table 3 Intra-day precision and accuracy for 3-EG, 4-MUG, PG, and AZTG from QC

9 samples.  $(n = 5, \text{mean} \pm \text{sd})$ 

Compounds	Norminal concentration (µM)	Measured concentration (µM)	Precision RSD (%)	Accuracy percent error (%)
	0.02	$0.02 \pm 0.002$	11.2	1.70
3-EG	0.08	$0.08 \hspace{0.2cm} \pm \hspace{0.2cm} 0.005$	6.67	-3.92
	3.58	$3.63 \pm 0.152$	4.17	1.82
	0.06	$0.059 \pm 0.005$	7.77	-2.36
4-MUG	0.24	$0.24 \hspace{0.2cm} \pm \hspace{0.2cm} 0.012$	5.15	0.95
	10.75	$10.69 \hspace{0.2cm} \pm \hspace{0.2cm} 0.402$	3.76	-0.59
DC	0.02	$0.019 \pm 0.002$	10.0	-5.99
PO	0.08	$0.082 \hspace{0.2cm} \pm \hspace{0.2cm} 0.006$	7.17	-3.53
	3.58	$3.69 \pm 0.088$	2.38	7.02
	0.16	$0.16 \pm 0.014$	9.07	-0.95
AZTG	0.64	$0.62 \hspace{0.2cm} \pm \hspace{0.2cm} 0.025$	4.12	-11.5
	28.67	$29.7 \pm 1.126$	3.79	7.14

10 3-EG: estradiol 3-glucuronide;4-MUG: 4-methylumbelliferone glucuronide; PG:

11 propofol glucuronide; AZTG: 3-azido-3-deoxythymidine glucuronide; IS: internal

12 standard

13

14 Table 4 Inter-day precision and accuracy for 3-EG, 4-MUG, PG, and AZTG from QC

Compounds	Norminal concentration (uM)	Measured concentration (µM)	n Precision RSD (%)	Accuracy percent error
	0.02	$0.019 \pm 0.001$	5.31	3.28
3-EG	0.08	$0.085 \pm 0.004$	4.54	5.83
	3.58	$3.49 \pm 0.095$	2.71	-2.62
	0.06	$0.058 \pm 0.003$	4.83	-3.19
4-MUG	0.24	$0.24 \pm 0.016$	6.89	-0.64
	10.75	$10.55 \hspace{0.1 in} \pm \hspace{0.1 in} 0.37$	3.46	-0.64
	0.02	$0.020 \pm 0.002$	11.7	10.1
PG	0.08	$0.080 \pm 0.003$	3.50	-0.01
	3.58	$3.49 \hspace{0.2cm} \pm \hspace{0.2cm} 0.205$	5.87	-2.73
	0.16	$0.15 \hspace{0.2cm} \pm \hspace{0.2cm} 0.015$	9.56	-4.09
AZTG	0.64	$0.64 \hspace{0.2cm} \pm \hspace{0.2cm} 0.047$	7.33	-0.71
	28.67	$28.1 \pm 0.91$	3.24	-1.97

1 samples. ( $n = 5 \times 3$ , mean  $\pm$  sd)

2 3-EG: estradiol 3-glucuronide; 4-MUG: 4-methylumbelliferone glucuronide; PG:

3 propofol glucuronide; AZTG: 3-azido-3-deoxythymidine glucuronide.

4

# 5 Extraction recovery and matrix effect

6 The extraction recoveries and matrix effects determined for 3-EG, 4-MUG, PG, and 7 AZTG are shown in Table 5. The average recoveries of the investigated targets ranged 8 from 55.7% to 102.3%, and the RSD values were all 11.2% (n = 5). The matrix effect 9 of all analytes was found to be within the range of 93.1% to 107%, and the RSD 10 values were all below 9.6% (n = 5). These results showed that ion suppression or 11 enhancement from HLMs matrix was negligible for the present condition.

12 Table 5 Recovery and matrix effect for 3-EG, 4-MUG, PG, and AZTG from QC

13 samples.  $(n = 5, \text{mean} \pm \text{sd})$ 

Compounds	Nominal concentration	Recovery (%)	Matrix effect (%)	
	(µM)	$(\text{mean} \pm \text{sd})$	$(\text{mean} \pm \text{sd})$	
3-EG	0.02	$64.5 \pm 6.23$	$93.6 \pm 8.96$	

	0.08	81.4 ±	6.44	$105 \pm 8.21$
	3.58	77.7 ±	0.77	$94.4 \pm 6.61$
	0.06	$102.3 \pm$	9.10	$93.2 \hspace{0.2cm} \pm \hspace{0.2cm} 5.82$
4-MUG	0.24	97.6 ±	1.79	$107 \pm 4.46$
	10.75	$97.3$ $\pm$	2.35	$95.4 \hspace{0.2cm} \pm \hspace{0.2cm} 7.28$
	0.02	55.7 ±	6.25	$99.9 \hspace{0.2cm} \pm \hspace{0.2cm} 6.89$
PG	0.08	$57.8 \pm$	1.89	$98.1 \pm 5.13$
	3.58	59.9 ±	2.46	$102 \pm 7.06$
	0.16	$64.5 \pm$	6.23	$94.7 \hspace{0.2cm} \pm \hspace{0.2cm} 4.82$
AZTG	0.64	81.4 ±	6.44	$105 \pm 7.71$
	28.67	77.7 ±	0.77	$95.3 \pm 7.45$

1 3-EG: estradiol 3-glucuronide; 4-MUG: 4-methylumbelliferone glucuronide; PG:

2 propofol glucuronide; AZTG: 3-azido-3-deoxythymidine glucuronide.

3

# 4 **Dilution integrity**

5 Dilution integrity experiments were carried out in five replicates by 16- and 64-fold 6 dilutions with blank incubation matrix, and the assay precision and accuracy were 7 tested. The accuracy was within  $\pm$  7.65%, and the precision was less than 9.4%. The 8 determined concentration of the sample after 16- or 64-fold dilution was still in the 9 range of quantification.

## 10 Stability

Stability tests were carried out at various conditions that the samples may experience.
Results demonstrated that 3-EG, 4-MUG, PG, and AZTG were stable at the autosampler condition for 24 h and at -80 °C for 14 d after post extract. Data are not shown.

# 15 Method application

16 The developed method was applied to study the enzyme kinetics of estradiol 17 3-O-glucuronidation, 4-methylumbelliferone O-glucuronidation, propofol 18 O-glucuronidation, and 3-azido-3-deoxythymidine glucuronidation in HLMs. The 19 concentration-velocity of 4-MU, propofol, and AZT adheres to Michaelis–Menten kinetics. However, estradiol exhibited substrate-inhibition kinetics (Fig. 2). Apparent K<sub>m</sub> for 4-MUG, PG, and AZTG were 96.37  $\pm$  12.4, 92.0  $\pm$  9.05, and 646  $\pm$  55.5  $\mu$ M, respectively. V<sub>max</sub> for 4-MUG, PG, and AZTG were 348.4 $\pm$ 15.1, 228.6  $\pm$  6.3, and 1.18 $\pm$ 0.03 nmol/min/mg protein, respectively. Apparent K<sub>m</sub>, V<sub>max</sub>, and Ki for estradiol were 43.74 $\pm$ 18.36  $\mu$ M, 2707 $\pm$ 781.7 pmol/min/mg protein, and 40.19 $\pm$ 16.0  $\mu$ M, respectively.



7

8 Fig. 2. Kinetics of estradiol 3-O-glucuronidation, 4-methylumbelliferone 9 O-glucuronidation, propofol O-glucuronidation, 3-azido-3-deoxythymidine 10 glucuronidation. (n = 3, mean  $\pm$  sd).

11

# 12 **DISCUSSION**

Physiological and pathological factors and concomitant drugs can significantly contribute to the changes in UGT activities and can further influence the elimination of drugs in vivo. Therefore, a highly efficient method should be used to evaluate UGT activities in biological systems (e.g., hepatocytes, liver slices, or microsomes) to study changes in phase two metabolism more effectively.

The method for quantification of probe substrate metabolites to evaluate the activity of metabolic enzymes had been widely used in drug metabolism. Several methods, such as LC and LC-MS/MS, are currently used to determine UGT activities.

1 Moreover, several methods were reported for the determination of glucuronidation of 2 estradiol, 4-MU, propofol, and AZT [4-6]. An assay for the quantification of 3 glucuronides formed from four probe substrates was used to detect the activities of 4 UGT, but the complete run lasted for 15 min [7]. Another reported method showed 5 that the simultaneous determination of glucuronides formed from six probe substrates 6 was used to detect activities of UGT. However, the quantitative accuracy of 7 glucuronides was limited because of the relative quantification by the calibration 8 curves of their respective parent probe [8]. These problems limit the application of 9 these methods in a high-throughput study of the activities of multiple UGT isoforms.

Estradiol is considered an excellent marker of UGT1A1 activity in the liver [12], and propofol has been proposed as a suitable probe for human UGT1A9 [6, 13]. Moreover, AZT is primarily catalyzed by UGT2B7 [14]; meanwhile, 4-MU, a nonspecific probe substrate for UGT isoforms, is often used to investigate multiple UGT activities [7, 15]. Therefore, estradiol, propofol, AZT, and 4-MU were used to evaluate the multiple glucuronidation activities in HLMs for this experiment.

16 In this study, we established a method for the evaluation of UGT isoform activities 17 wherein the substrates were separately incubated, and the mixed detection of 18 glucuronidation products was done via LC-MS/MS analysis. During the development 19 of this method, chromatographic conditions, particularly the composition of the 20 mobile phase, were optimized to achieve good sensitivity and peak shape, as well as a 21 relatively short run time. Acetonitrile provided better separation than methanol and 22 thus selected as the organic phase. A good peak shape could be achieved by adding 23 0.5 mmol/L ammonium acetate into the mobile phase. The use of acetic acid could 24 achieve higher response signals for AZTG than formic acid. Finally, a mobile phase 25 consisting of acetonitrile, 0.5 mmol/L ammonium acetate, and 0.1% acetic acid 26 (gradient elution) was used in this experiment. To optimize ESI conditions for 3-EG, 27 4-MUG, PG, AZTG, and IS, quadrupole full scan ESI mass spectra were obtained in 28 the positive and negative modes by infusing approximately 200 ng/mL solution of the 29 analytes in acetonitrile/water (50/50, v/v). ESI in positive and negative ion modes 30 were tested, and the results showed that these compounds conferred predominant

1 single-charged deprotonated precursor  $[M-H]^{-1}$  in negative ions mode (ESI). 2 Compared with other reported methods [7, 8], our method can simultaneously 3 evaluate major UGT isoform activities within a short run time (7 min) and can be 4 carried out in a high-throughput study of the activities of multiple UGT isoforms in 5 HLMs. The procedure may also be useful for screening potential UGT inducers or 6 inhibitors as well as for evaluating the UGT activities by using other models. The 7 established method was applied to the kinetic investigation of estradiol 8 3-O-glucuronidation, 4-methylumbelliferone O-glucuronidation, propofol 9 O-glucuronidation, and 3-azido-3-deoxythymidine glucuronidation. In the present 10 study, the kinetic experimental results were in accordance with previous reports [6, 9].

# 11 CONCLUSIONS

12 In this research, we established a method for the simultaneous quantification of 13 glucuronidation products of four substrates, which provided satisfactory linear 14 concentration range, accuracy, precision, and stability. The current assay can be 15 effectively used to rapidly assess the activities of multiple UGT subtypes in HLMs. 16 These findings indicate the possibility of further increasing the analytical throughput.

# 17 Acknowledgements

The authors are grateful for the financial support from Program for Shanghai Innovative Research Team in University (2009), "085" First-Class Discipline Construction of Science and Technology Innovation (085ZY1205) and Xinglin scholar (2013).

1	Ref	erence
2	1)	Miners JO, Mackenzie PI, Knights KM. The prediction of drug-glucuronidation parameters
3		in humans: UDP-glucuronosyltransferase enzyme-selective substrate and inhibitor probes for
4		reaction phenotyping and in vitro-in vivo extrapolation of drug clearance and drug-drug
5		interaction potential. Drug Metab Rev. 42(20110) 196–208.
6	2)	Di Marco A, D'Antoni M, Attaccalite S, Carotenuto P, Laufer R. Determination of drug
7		glucuronidation and UDP-glucuronosyltransferase selectivity using a 96-well radiometric
8		assay. Drug Metab Dispos. 33(2005) 812–819.
9	3)	Kiang TK, Ensom MH, Chang TK. UDP-glucuronosyltransferases
10		and clinical drug-drug interactions. Pharmacol Ther. 106(2005) 97-132.
11	4)	Yu C, Ritter JK, Krieg RJ, Rege B, Karnes TH, Sarkar MA. Effect of chronic renal
12		insufficiency on hepatic and renal udp-glucuronyltransferases in rats. Drug Metab
13		Dispos. 34(2006): 621–627.
14	5)	Mano Y, Usui T, Kamimura H. Comparison of inhibition potentials of drug against
15		zidovudine glucuronidation Drug Metab Dispos. 35(2007) 602-606.
16	6)	Liang SC, Ge GB, Liu HX, Shang HT, Wei H, Fang ZZ, Zhu LL, Mao YX, Yang L.
17		Determination of propofol UDP-glucuronosyltransferase (UGT) activities in hepatic
18		microsomes from different species by UFLC-ESI-MS. J Pharm Biomed Anal. 54(2011)
19		236–241.
20	7)	Donato MT, Montero S, Castell JV, Gómez-Lechón MJ, Lahoz A. Validated assay for
21		studying activity profiles of human liver UGTs after drug exposure: inhibition and induction
22		studies. Anal Bioanal Chem. 396(2010) 2251-2263.
23	8)	Gagez AL, Rouguieg-Malki K, Sauvage FL, Marquet P, Picard N. Simultaneous evaluation
24		of six human glucuronidation activities in liver microsomes using liquid
25		chromatography-tandem mass spectrometry. Anal Biochem. 427(2012) 52-59.
26	9)	Liu HX, He YQ, Hu Y, Liu Y, Zhang JW, Li W, Wang ZT, Yang L.
27		Determination of UDP-glucuronosyltransferase UGT2B7 activity in human liver microsomes
28		by ultra-performance liquid chromatography with MS detection. J Chromatogr B Analyt
29		Technol Biomed Life Sci. 870(2008) 84–90.
30	10)	Mackenzie P, Little JM, Radominska-Pandya A. Glucosidation of hyodeoxycholic acid by
31		UDP-glucuronosyltransferase 2B7. Biochem Pharmacol. 65(2003) 417-421.
32	11)	Ji HY, Lee H, Lim SR, Kim JH, Lee HS. Effect of efavirenz on UDP-glucuronosyltransferase
33		1A1, 1A4, 1A6, and 1A9 activities in human liver microsomes. Molecules. 17(2012)
34		851–860.
35	12)	Sato Y, Nagata M, Kawamura A, Miyashita A, Usui T. Protein quantification of
36		UDP-glucuronosyltransferases 1A1 and 2B7 in human liver microsomes by LC-MS/MS and
37		correlation with glucuronidation activities. Xenobiotica. 42(2012) 823-829.
38	13)	Shimizu M, Matsumoto Y, Tatsuno M, Fukuoka M. Glucuronidation of propofol and its
39		analogs by human and rat liver microsomes. Biol Pharm Bull. 26(2003) 216-219.
40	14)	Williams JA, Hyland R, Jones BC, Smith DA, Hurst S, Goosen TC, Peterkin V, Koup
41		JR, Ball SE. Drug-drug interactions for UDP-glucuronosyltransferase substrates: a
42		pharmacokinetic explanation for typically observed low exposure (AUCi/AUC) ratios. Drug

43 Metab Dispos. 32(2004) 1201–1208.

1	15)	Zhao JW,	Wang G	H, Chen M,	Cheng LH, Ji X	Q. Deme	ethylze	ylaste	ral exł	ibits strong
2		inhibition	towards	UDP-glucu	ronosyltransferase	(UGT)	1A6	and	2B7.	Molecules.
3		17(2012)94	469–9475.							
4										



A faster and more accurate LC-MS/MS method was established for the activity determination of multiple UGT isoforms in HLMs.