

CHEMICAL PROFILING OF EXHALED BREATH FROM CYSTIC FIBROSIS SUBJECTS USING COMPREHENSIVE TWO- DIMENSIONAL GAS CHROMATOGRAPHY

By

Mohammad Asif Iqbal

A thesis submitted for the

Degree of Doctor of Philosophy (Science)

University of Technology Sydney

January 2021

CERTIFICATE OF AUTHORSHIP AND ORIGINALITY

CERTIFICATE OF AUTHORSHIP AND ORIGINALITY

I certify that the work in this thesis has not previously been submitted for any other degree/s nor has it been submitted as part of the requirements for a degree/s except as fully acknowledged within the text.

I also certify that the thesis has been written by me. Any help that I have received in my research work and the preparation of the thesis itself has been acknowledged. In addition, I certify that all the information sources and literature used are indicated in the thesis.

This research is supported by an Australian Government Research Training Program.

Production Note:

Signature removed prior to publication.

Signature of student:

DATE: 4/01/2021

DEDICATION

To my parents

And

My younger brother and his everyday struggle to survive through terminal illness

Love you and always with you until I am alive

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Firstly, thanks and regards to my primary supervisor, Dr. Shari L. Forbes for her continuous support and for sharing her knowledge. I am also grateful to Dr. Tapan Rai (my second primary supervisor), Dr. Katie Nizio (co-supervisor), Dr Maiken Ueland (co-supervisor), and Dr Peter G Middleton (external supervisor) for their great support all throughout my PhD study. I am especially grateful to all the participants of my study both from the outpatient Cystic Fibrosis Clinic, Westmead Hospital and from the Faculty of Science, University of Technology Sydney. Without their generous participation the project wouldn't be possible. I am also grateful to my co-workers in the Gas Chromatography Lab here in UTS. In particular, Amber Brown, Nicole Cattarossi, and Vitor Cesar Taranto. In addition, my special thanks for technical staff; Dr. Ronald Shimmon, Dr Regina V. Taudte, and Dr. Dayanne Bordin. I am also very fortunate to be a part of such a lovely research group and have so many fun memories.

Finally, I am thankful to my family, especially my lovely wife Ayesha and a beautiful boy (Zyad) we are blessed with. Her relentless support and numerous sacrifices made this PhD battle possible. I am also asking forgiveness for not giving enough time to my wife, my boy, my brother, and above all my parents. I do feel guilty of that.

Most importantly, my gratitude to the Australian Government and the Taxpayers, because it is their money allocated to me as tuition fee waivers and living allowances. Without that I can't even dream of pursuing this PhD degree.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Contents

CERTIFICATE OF AUTHORSHIP AND ORIGINALITY	ii
DEDICATION	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	iv
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	v
LIST OF TABLES	x
LIST OF FIGURES.....	xii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND SYMBOLS	xv
PUBLICATIONS.....	xvii
CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS.....	xvii
AWARDS	xvii
ABSTRACT	xviii
Chapter 1: INTRODUCTION.....	2
1.1. Cystic fibrosis.....	3
1.1.1. Cause and mechanism of cystic fibrosis	3
1.1.2. Prevalence and mortality in Australia	4
1.1.3. Major health complications in cystic fibrosis	5
1.1.4. Lung infections associated with cystic fibrosis.....	5
1.1.5. Common diagnostic techniques for lung infections.....	6
1.2. Exhaled breath analysis.....	7
1.2.1. Volatile organic compounds in exhaled human breath.....	7
1.2.2. Exhaled breath analysis in lung infection	8
1.3. Common analytical techniques for breath volatiles	10
1.3.1. Sampling devices	10
1.3.2. Extraction techniques.....	12

1.3.3. Chromatographic analysis	14
1.4. Research aims and objectives.....	18
Chapter 2: OPTIMISATION OF SPUTUM SAMPLING	21
2.1. Introduction.....	21
2.2. Materials and Method	22
2.2.1. Sample collection	22
2.2.2. Sample extraction.....	23
2.2.3. GC×GC-TOFMS analysis of sputum samples	24
2.2.4. Processing of raw data	25
2.2.5. Principal component analysis.....	26
2.3. Results and Discussion.....	27
2.3.1. Optimisation of basic SPME parameters	27
2.3.2. Evaluation of SPME extraction technique	29
2.3.3. Evaluation of the multivariate analysis	31
2.4. Conclusion.....	32
Chapter 3: OPTIMISATION OF BREATH SAMPLING	34
3.1. Introduction.....	34
3.2. Materials and Method	34
3.2.1. Recruitment of subjects.....	35
3.2.2. Sampling devices	36
3.2.3. Extraction techniques.....	39
3.2.4. GC×GC-TOFMS analysis of breath VOCs	40
3.2.5. Processing of raw data	42
3.2.6. Principal component analysis.....	42
3.3. Results and Discussion.....	42
3.3.1. Evaluation of sampling devices	42
3.3.2. Evaluation of extraction techniques.....	45

3.4. Conclusion.....	48
Chapter 4: COMPARISON OF BREATH PROFILES BETWEEN CF SUBJECTS WITH LUNG INFECTIONS AND HEALTHY CONTROLS	50
4.1. Introduction.....	50
4.2. Materials and Method	52
4.2.1. Collection of breath samples	52
4.2.2. Extraction of VOCs present in breath samples	53
4.2.3. GC×GC-TOFMS analysis of samples extracted using SPME	53
4.2.4. Processing of raw data	53
4.2.5. Multivariate analysis	54
4.3. Results and Discussion.....	55
4.3.1. Population characteristics.....	55
4.3.2. Volatile organic compounds detected in breath samples	56
4.3.3. Univariate comparison of breath profiles.....	60
4.3.4. Multivariate comparison of breath profiles	64
4.3.5. Most discriminating breath VOCs between CF subjects and healthy controls	69
4.4. Conclusion.....	75
Chapter 5: COMPARISON OF VOCS BETWEEN SPUTUM & BREATH SAMPLES FROM CF SUBJECTS	78
5.1. Introduction.....	78
5.2. Materials and Method	79
5.2.1. Sample collection	79
5.2.2. Extraction of VOCs.....	80
5.2.3. GC×GC-TOFMS analysis of samples.....	80
5.2.4. Data processing and statistical analysis	80
5.2.5. Principal component analysis.....	81
5.2.6. Linear discriminant analysis	81

5.3. Results and Discussion.....	82
5.3.1. Anthropometric data and sputum culture results of CF subjects	82
5.3.2. VOCs detected in sputum and breath samples	83
5.3.3. Principal component analysis.....	89
5.3.4. Linear discriminant analysis	93
5.3.5. VOCs common between sputum and breath samples: general characteristics and report on literature.....	96
5.4. Conclusion.....	97
Chapter 6: COMPARISON OF BREATH PROFILES FROM CF SUBJECTS WITH DIFFERENT LUNG INFECTIONS.....	100
6.1. Introduction.....	100
6.2. Materials and Method	101
6.2.1. Sample collection	101
6.2.2. Extraction of VOCs.....	102
6.2.3. GC×GC-TOFMS analysis of samples.....	102
6.2.4. Data processing and statistical analysis	102
6.2.5. Linear discriminant analysis	103
6.3. Results and Discussion.....	103
6.3.1. Infection status of CF subjects	103
6.3.2. List of detected VOCs	105
6.3.3. Linear discriminant analysis	106
6.3.4. The finding of this study in the context of relevant literature.....	109
6.4. Conclusion.....	113
Chapter 7: CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS	115
7.1. Conclusions	115
7.2. Future directions.....	118
REFERENCES.....	121
APPENDIX A: CF SUBJECTS INFORMATION SHEET AND CONSENT FORM	149

APPENDIX B: HEALTHY CONTROLS INFORMATION SHEET AND CONSENT FORM	154
APPENDIX C: CAS NUMBER OF ALL CHEMICALS NAMED IN THIS STUDY	159
APPENDIX D: ANTHROPOMETRIC DATA OF CF SUBJECTS	171
APPENDIX E: ANTHROPOMETRIC DATA OF HEALTHY CONTROLS	174
APPENDIX F: LUNG INFECTION STATUS OF INDIVIDUAL CF SUBJECTS ...	176
APPENDIX G: DETAILS OF MEDICATIONS FOR INDIVIDUAL CF SUBJECTS	181
APPENDIX H: THREE DIMENSIONAL (3D) SCORES PLOT OF THE PCAS PERFORMED IN CHAPTER 4	186

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1: GC×GC-TOFMS parameters for the analysis of VOCs	25
Table 2.2: Results of HS-SPME method optimisation experiments	28
Table 2.3: Volatile organic compounds detected in sputum samples and vial blanks	30
Table 3.1: Anthropometric characteristics of the study populations.....	35
Table 3.2: List of breath samples collected for the evaluation of sampling devices	42
Table 3.3: Results of Tedlar bag®-SPME method optimization experiments.....	46
Table 4.1: Inclusion/exclusion criteria for sampling.....	52
Table 4.2: Sample count for breath samples collected from CF subjects and controls ..	53
Table 4.3: Anthropometric characteristics of the study populations.....	55
Table 4.4: Additional characteristics of the CF populations (n=65)	56
Table 4.5: List of VOCs detected in breath samples.....	58
Table 4.6: Relative abundance and detection frequencies of VOCs between CF and control breath. Order 1 to 16 present VOCs with higher abundance in control breath, while the remaining VOCs have higher abundance in CF breath. The VOCs with higher detection frequencies in control breath are in bold.	62
Table 4.7: List of VOCs statistically different between study groups as determined using Student's <i>t-test</i>	66
Table 4.8: List of VOCs most discriminating between CF and control breath. VOCs detected more frequently in CF breath are highlighted in grey shades.	70
Table 4.9: List of VOCs associated CF subjects and the results of literature search.....	74
Table 5.1: Anthropometric characteristics of the study populations.....	82
Table 5.2: Sputum culture results of individual CF subjects	82
Table 5.3: List of compounds detected in sputum and breath samples collected from CF subjects. Compounds shaded in grey are common in both sample types, while tan and blue highlights indicate compounds detected only in sputum and breath samples, respectively.	84
Table 5.4: List of VOCs common between sputum and breath samples	97

Table 6.1: Lung infection status of individual CF subjects	103
Table 6.2: List of VOCs detected in breath samples collected from CF subjects.....	105

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.1: CF airways and digestive system [source: (Trivedi, 2013)]	3
Figure 1.2: (a) 1 L Tedlar® breath sampling bag (SKC Inc., USA); (b) TO-Can Canister with RAVE Valve (Restek Corp., USA); and (c) Bio-VOC™ breath sampler (Markes International Limited, UK).....	11
Figure 1.3: (a) A glass sorbent tube packed with three different sorbent materials (50 mg of each: Tenax® TA (60/80 mesh, Restek, USA), Carbopack™ B (60/80 mesh, Supelco, USA), and Carbopack™ X (40/60 mesh, Supelco, USA) (Iqbal and Kim, 2014, Iqbal et al., 2014a, Iqbal et al., 2014b); (b) Stainless steel sorbent tube packed with 100 mg Tenax® TA (Markes International Limited, UK); and (c) Extraction and thermal desorption of VOCs using SPME technique (adopted from (Rust, 2018))......	13
Figure 1.4: The typical set-up of a GC×GC system (image courtesy of Katelynn Perrault)	16
Figure 1.5: (a) 1D total ion current (TIC) plot of a sputum profile obtained through SPME-GC×GC-TOFMS technique; (b) 2D contour plot, where every dot represents an individual compound; and (c) 3D surface plot. The intensity of instrumental response is represented by the colour gradient (blue to red) in Figure b and c [This is the 3D view of the same sputum sample].	17
Figure 2.1: (a) Extraction of VOCs in the headspace of sputum and (b) blank vial samples	23
Figure 2.2: GC×GC–TOFMS system used for the analysis of sputum samples.....	24
Figure 2.3: Diagram showing the incubation of the same sputum sample at different durations (10, 30, and 60 minutes) and the extraction of VOCs with different SPME fibers.....	28
Figure 2.4: PCA scores plot prepared using pre-processed GC×GC-TOFMS peak area data obtained from sputum samples and blank SPME vials	32
Figure 3.1: Breath sample collection using the Bio-VOC™ breath sampler	36
Figure 3.2: (a) 1 L Tedlar® breath sampling bag; (b) Exhalation in to bag; (c) Sorbent tube extraction of breath samples.....	38
Figure 3.3: SPME extraction of breath samples collected in to 1 L Tedlar® bag	40

Figure 3.4: TD–GC×GC–TOFMS-unit for the analysis of breath samples collected by STs.....	41
Figure 3.5: The average concentration of benzene in the breath samples collected from five healthy control subjects using two different breath sampling devices (Bio-VOC™ breath sampler vs Tedlar® bag).	43
Figure 3.6: PCA scores plot prepared using pre-processed TD-GC×GC-TOFMS peak area data: (a) Bio-VOC™ breath samples vs background air and (b) Tedlar® bag breath samples vs background air	44
Figure 3.7: PCA scores plot prepared using pre-processed GC×GC-TOFMS peak area data obtained from breath samples collected in Tedlar® bags and extracted using: (a) SPME fibres and (b) Sorbent tubes.	47
Figure 4.1: Number distribution of VOCs detected in breath samples categorised into different compound classes according to their chemical composition.....	60
Figure 4.2: PCA scores plot of breath profiles obtained from CF subjects and healthy controls. The plot was prepared using 81 VOCs detected in breath profiles.	65
Figure 4.3: PCA scores plot of breath profiles obtained from CF subjects and healthy controls. The plot was prepared using 26 VOCs which were statistically significant between study groups as determined using a Student's <i>t</i> -test.	67
Figure 4.4: Linear discriminant scores of CF subjects and healthy controls	68
Figure 5.1: Comparison between sputum and breath profiles based on their chemical composition with compound classes in X-axis and the percentage (%) value of each class between sputum and breath samples in Y-axis.	88
Figure 5.2: PCA scores plots prepared: (i) using all detected VOCs (total 132, both sputum and breath profiles were used), (ii) using only breath VOCs (total 56), (iii) using only sputum VOCs (total 100).	90
Figure 5.3: PCA scores plots prepared using the VOCs common between both sputum and breath samples (total 24 VOCs): (a) both profiles together, (b) only breath profiles, and (c) only sputum profiles.	92
Figure 5.4: LD scores of CF subjects from two contrasting groups: (a) LDA performed using all breath VOCs and (b) LDA performed using all sputum VOCs.	93

Figure 5.5: LD scores of subjects from two contrasting groups (PA-positive vs PA-negative) when LDAs were performed using the 24 VOCs common between sputum and breath profiles: (a) sputum and breath profiles applied together, (b) only breath profiles used, and (c) only sputum profiles were used. 95

Figure 6.1: LD scores of subjects from PA-positive and PA-negative groups 107

Figure 6.2: LD scores obtained from CF breath profiles: (a) PA-negative vs No species CF subjects and (b) PA-positive vs No species CF subjects..... 108

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND SYMBOLS

(Listed alphabetically)

ACFDR	Australian Cystic Fibrosis Data Registry
BAL	Bronchoalveolar lavage
CAR	Carboxen
CF	Cystic fibrosis
CFTR	Cystic fibrosis transmembrane conductance regulator
DMS	Dimethyldisulfide
DVB	Divinylbenzene
EBC	Exhaled breath condensate
GC×GC	Comprehensive two-dimensional gas chromatography
GC×GC-TOFMS	Comprehensive two-dimensional gas chromatography time-of-flight mass spectrometry
GC-FID	Gas chromatography flame ionisation detection
GC-MS	Gas chromatography mass spectrometry
GC-TOFMS	Gas chromatography time-of-flight mass spectrometry
HCN	Hydrogen cyanide
HS-SPME	Headspace–solid-phase microextraction
IMR-MS	Ion-molecule reaction mass spectrometry
IMS	Ion mobility spectrometry
LDA	Linear discriminant analysis
LD	Linear discriminant
LOOCV	Leave-one-out cross-validation
NMR	Nuclear magnetic resonance
PDMS	Polydimethylsiloxane
ppb	Parts-per-billion
PTR-MS	Proton transfer reaction mass spectrometry

SIFT-MS	Selected ion flow tube mass spectrometry
SPME	Solid phase microextraction
STs	Sorbent tubes
TB	Tuberculosis
VAP	Ventilator-associated pneumonia
VOCs	Volatile organic compounds

PUBLICATIONS

1. Forensic decomposition odour profiling: A review of experimental designs and analytical techniques. MA Iqbal, KD Nizio, M Ueland, SL Forbes. *TrAC Trends in Analytical Chemistry* **91**, 2017, 112-124.
2. Recent advances in the estimation of post-mortem interval in forensic taphonomy. MA Iqbal, M Ueland, SL Forbes *Australian Journal of Forensic Sciences*, **52**, 2020, 107-123.

CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS

1. Poster presentation in the 24th Australian Society of Medical Research (ASMR) NSW ANNUAL SCIENTIFIC MEETING held by Australian Society for Medical Research during 6th June 2016 at Powerhouse Museum, Sydney, Australia.
2. Co-presented in the Combined Health Science Conference Sydney New Horizons held during 21st November 2016 at the University of Technology Sydney, Australia.
3. Poster presentation in the 35th Combined Health Science Conference Sydney New Horizons 2018, 19-20 November 2018, Kolling Institute, St Leonards, Australia.

AWARDS

1. Winner of April 2017 Paper of the Month for SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL AND PHYSICAL SCIENCES (MAPS), University of Technology Sydney.

ABSTRACT

Chronic lung infections are the leading cause of death in subjects with cystic fibrosis (CF). To date, sputum culture is the most common technique for the diagnosis of lung infections in adult CF subjects. However, it requires several days or longer to obtain culture results. Therefore, a rapid diagnostic technique for lung infections would significantly improve CF healthcare. During recent decades, exhaled breath analysis has attracted interest as a rapid and non-invasive tool for the diagnosis of non-communicable diseases such as cancers and heart diseases. However, there is limited progress in the diagnosis of infectious diseases such as lung infections in CF subjects using volatile organic compounds (VOCs) as biomarkers of infection.

In this study, sputum and breath samples were collected from CF subjects and healthy controls (only breath) and profiled for VOCs using comprehensive two-dimensional gas chromatography time-of-flight mass spectrometry (GC×GC–TOFMS). Multivariate analyses (e.g. principal component analysis and linear discriminant analysis (LDA)) were then performed to allow differentiation between: (i) CF subjects and healthy controls and (ii) CF subjects with/without *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* infections and those with no known lung infections as confirmed using their sputum culture results. This study identified a set of 16 VOCs which allowed differentiation between CF subjects and healthy controls. In particular, healthy controls were classified with 98% accuracy, while CF subjects were classified with 92% accuracy. It is important to note that all of the CF subjects that participated in this study are significantly different from control groups, not only in terms of their lung infection status but also in terms of numerous other factors (e.g. diet, lifestyle, medications, and other health complications). These factors can also impact the breath profiles obtained from the study group (CF subjects).

The analysis of matching sputum and breath samples collected from CF subjects provided a set of 24 core VOCs common between both sample types. LDA performed using these VOCs provided accurate classification of CF subjects according to their lung infection status (i.e. CF subjects with/without *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* infection). The outcome of LDA also showed that these common VOCs have better classification accuracy than the entire profile of the VOCs detected in sputum and breath samples. Finally, the comparison of breath profiles between CF subjects with/without *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* infection and those with no known lung infection showed that it is also

possible to allow differentiation between these contrasting groups using breath VOCs profiles.