High-resolution mass spectrometry as an alternative detection method to tandem mass spectrometry for the analysis of endogenous steroids in serum

Federico Ponzetto¹, Julien Boccard^{2,3}, Norbert Baume¹, Tiia Kuuranne¹, Serge Rudaz^{2,3}, Martial Saugy⁴, Raul Nicoli^{1*}

Abstract

Recently, steroid hormones quantification in blood showed a promising ability to detect testosterone doping and interesting complementarities with the urinary module of the Athlete Biological Passport (ABP). In this work, an ultra-high pressure liquid chromatography-high-resolution mass spectrometry (UHPLC-HRMS) method was developed for the quantification of eleven endogenous steroids in serum. The performance of the full scan and targeted SIM acquisition modes was evaluated and compared to the performance of tandem mass spectrometry (MS/MS). Passing-Bablok regressions and Bland-Altman plots were assessed for each analyte of interest, and concentration values measured by HRMS showed high correlation with the ones obtained by MS/MS for all target hormones, with low absolute differences in the majority of cases. A slight decrease in terms of sensitivity was observed with HRMS in both acquisition modes, but performing an analysis of variance multiblock orthogonal partial least squares (AMOPLS) on the dataset obtained with all three methods revealed that only 0.8% of the total variance was related to instrumentation and acquisition methods. Moreover, the evaluation of the testosterone administration effect over time highlighted testosterone itself and dihydrotestosterone as the most promising biomarkers of exogenous testosterone administration. This conclusion

suggests that HRMS could provide suitable performance for blood steroid analysis in the anti-doping field.

Keywords: testosterone, doping, serum, UHPLC-HRMS, AMOPLS

1. Introduction

The detection of testosterone (T) abuse in sport is currently achieved through the steroidal module of the Athlete Biological Passport (ABP). The so-called “steroid profile” was implemented in 2014, and it is obtained from urinary concentrations of six endogenous anabolic androgenic steroids (EAAS) measured by gas chromatography-tandem mass spectrometry (GC-MS(/MS)). It consists of longitudinal monitoring, with individual reference intervals calculated by a Bayesian adaptive model, of five ratios known to be potentially altered following the administration of synthetic forms of EAAS: androsterone/testosterone (A/T), androsterone/etiocholanolone (A/Etio), 5 α -androstane-3 α ,17 β -diol/5 β -androstane-3 α ,17 β -diol (5 α Adiol/5 β Adiol), 5 α -androstane-3 α ,17 β -diol/Epitestosterone (5 α Adiol/E) and the most important, testosterone/epitestosterone (T/E) [1]. Although this new approach clearly improved detection capabilities in comparison with the previous population threshold criterion of T/E > 4, it still suffers from major drawbacks. These include the large presence in the urine matrix of both endogenous (e.g., metabolism, ethnicity) and exogenous (e.g., ethanol, bacterial contamination) confounding factors, which can influence either the quantification of the urinary steroid profile or its interpretation [2], and the

difficulty of detecting doping in individuals with a genetic polymorphism for UGT2B17 enzyme activity [3-6] and/or in athletes who have been administered T gel and patch formulations [7].

In the last few years, several studies have been conducted with the aim of improving steroid abuse detection capabilities. At first, major efforts were focused on the identification, by means of GC-MS(/MS) platforms, of new urinary biomarkers of EAAS abuse to be added to the panel of ratios included in the steroid profile [8-11]. Then, research broadened and oriented to UHPLC-MS/MS methods as well, as this type of technique is faster, more sensitive and capable of detecting phase II metabolites of steroid hormones in their intact form [12-14], unlike GC-MS analysis which always requires a derivatization step, eventually preceded by a hydrolysis step. More recently, high-resolution mass spectrometry (HRMS) has also been used to provide innovation in the context of steroid analysis. Indeed, holistic approaches such as metabolomics (defined as steroidomics [15]), allowed the untargeted evaluation of a large number of compounds, thus also representing a promising strategy for the discovery of new biomarkers and metabolites for anti-doping purposes [16, 17]. Nevertheless, the use of HRMS platforms by anti-doping laboratories for screening analyses is constantly increasing [18-21], even if their use for quantification purposes is still not widespread.

In the anti-doping field, both endogenous and exogenous steroids have been traditionally analyzed in urine, but a first attempt of endogenous steroid analysis in blood was recently conducted [22]. The blood matrix is clearly more difficult to manipulate/contaminate than urine, and quantitative analysis of target compounds in

blood represents a real snapshot of athlete physiological status, a key aspect for possibly better discriminating doping from pathologies. In addition, the study of steroid metabolism in blood could also be particularly relevant to explain diseases associated with a possible malfunction in steroidogenesis, in particular steroid metabolism enzymes (e.g. congenital adrenal hyperplasia, CAH) as well as in environmental sciences to better understand the mode of action of endocrine disrupting chemicals. On the other hand, the blood matrix also raises some concerns in the context of sports drug testing: its sampling is more invasive compared to urine, the collected volume is significantly lower and more accurate conditions for transportation and storage are needed.

In this work, a UHPLC-HRMS method was developed for the quantification of 11 endogenous steroid hormones in serum, including major androgens, progestogens and corticoids. The performance of the full scan (FS) and targeted selected ion monitoring (t-SIM) acquisition modes was evaluated and compared to that of UHPLC-MS/MS obtained in a previous work using samples from a testosterone clinical study [22]. Furthermore, in addition to quantitative performance, the ability to describe the exogenous testosterone administration by the three acquisition methods was also evaluated by means of an ANOVA-based multivariate statistical analysis.

2. Materials and methods

2.1 Study samples

Serum samples used for the method comparison were obtained from a T administration clinical trial (Swissmedic protocol n° 155/11) with 19 healthy male volunteers, who were administered twice with a T transdermal patch (Testopatch® 2.4 mg/24 h, Pierre Fabre Pharma GMBH, Freiburg, Germany) followed by T undecanoate capsules (Andriol Testocaps®, Essex Chemie AG, Luzern, Switzerland). The detailed description of the study is presented elsewhere [7].

2.2 Chemicals and reagents

Available standards of endogenous steroids were purchased from Lipomed (Arlesheim, Switzerland), Cerilliant (Round Rock, TX, USA), Steraloids (Newport, RI, USA) and Sigma-Aldrich (Buchs, Switzerland), while all labeled internal standards (IS) were provided by the Australian Government National Measurement Institute (Pymble, Australia). Methanol (MeOH) was purchased from Macron Fine Chemicals (Deventer, Netherlands), and acetonitrile (ACN) ULC/MS (> 99%) and formic acid (FA) ULC/MS (99%) were supplied by Biosolve BV (Valkenswaard, Netherlands). Charcoal-dextran stripped human serum was obtained from Dunn Labortechnik GmbH (Asbach, Germany). Deionized water was obtained by a Milli-Q®-grade system (Millipore, USA) and was used for the preparation of all buffers and solutions.

Analytes and IS mixture solutions were prepared in MeOH at appropriate concentrations and used for the preparation of calibration samples in depleted serum. Linear calibration curves were created for each analyte (weighting 1/x) to measure

steroid concentration, and calibration samples were used for the extraction of lower limits of quantification (LLOQ) and accuracy values of the method. Details concerning the composition and concentration of the calibration samples and IS mixtures are given in Supplementary Material Tables S1 and S2.

2.3 Sample preparation and UHPLC conditions

All the details concerning the extraction protocol and chromatographic conditions have been described in [22]. Briefly, a supported liquid extraction SLE+ 400 μ L (Biotage, Uppsala, Sweden) in a 96 well-plate format was used to extract steroid hormones. Each serum sample (200 μ L) was spiked with 20 μ L of the IS mixture, diluted with 200 μ L of water and then agitated for few minutes. Then, 400 μ L of sample were loaded on each well and positive pressure of 3 psi was applied for 30 seconds to facilitate sample adsorption; after 5 minutes, the elution was carried out by adding 700 μ L of DCM to each well and applying a pressure of 3 psi for 1 minute. After evaporation, 10 μ L of reconstituted extracts were injected on a UPLC chromatographic system (Waters, Milford, MA, USA) equipped with an Ethylene Bridged Hybrid (BEH) C₁₈ column (100 x 2.1 mm, 1.7 μ m; Waters) set at 30°C and a pre-column. The mobile phases consisted of (A) 0.1% formic acid in water and (B) 0.1% formic acid in ACN, and the flow rate was set at 400 μ L/min. The gradient started linearly from 2% to 25% B over 0.5 min, followed by an increase to 58% B over 5.5 min and by a further increase to 98% B over 2 min; the column was then re-equilibrated for 3 min at initial conditions.

2.4 MS conditions

1. MS/MS analysis

The UPLC system was coupled to a Xevo-TQ S triple quadrupole MS/MS system from Waters working in ESI positive and selected reaction monitoring (SRM) mode. The detailed instrumental UHPLC-MS/MS conditions (SRM transitions, ESI conditions, cone voltages and collision energies) are described in a previous article [22].

2. HRMS analysis

HRMS analyses were performed by coupling the UPLC system to a Q Exactive Plus mass spectrometer (Thermo Fisher Scientific, Waltham, MA, USA). Mass calibration (<3 ppm) was performed once a week using the Pierce® LTQ Velos ESI Positive Ion Calibration standard mixture (Thermo Fisher Scientific) containing *n*-butylamine, caffeine, MRFA (peptide of Met-Arg-Phe-Ala acetate salt) and Ultramark 1621. Detection of the targeted steroids was performed in positive ESI in both FS and t-SIM acquisition modes. The heated ESI source (HESI II) was used with a probe heater temperature of 425°C, and the sheath gas and auxiliary gas pressures were set to 50 and 15 arbitrary units, respectively. The sweep gas flow was set to 3 arbitrary units. The ion spray voltage was set to 4.5 kV, the capillary temperature to 250°C and the S-Lens RF level was 55%. FS mass spectra were acquired using a mass resolution of 70,000 (full width at half maximum, FWHM) at *m/z* 200, with a maximum IT fill time of 250 ms and the automatic gain control (AGC target) set to 1e⁶. The acquired mass range was from *m/z*

200 to 600. The t-SIM acquisition mode was also performed using a mass resolution of 70,000 FWHM, with a maximum IT fill time of 250 ms and the AGC target set to $5e^4$. An isolation window of 0.4 m/z was set, and the maximum number of precursor ions to be multiplexed in a scan event (MSX count) was from 2 to 8, depending on the proximity of the analytes in terms of retention times. All extracted chromatograms were obtained using an extraction window of 10 ppm.

2.5 Comparison of quantitative performance

The comparison between HRMS and MS/MS methods was performed employing two different approaches. First, the correlation of the steroid concentrations obtained with the two methods was evaluated using the Passing-Bablok regression together with Bland-Altman plots; the latter helped evaluate the bias, as they correspond to regression residual plots. Then, a multivariate data analysis, involving analysis of variance multiblock orthogonal partial least squares (AMOPLS), was applied to simultaneously investigate signal variations related to the different experimental factors, i.e., inter-individual, temporal and method-related sources of variability, and their potential interactions. Indeed, AMOPLS allows the reliability of experimental effects to be objectively evaluated using a specific effect-to-residual ratio. The aim of this second approach was not to provide an absolute evaluation of the variations caused by the different quantification methods but to fairly compare and establish the relative impact of each source of variability in the obtained dataset. Random permutations of the design matrix simulate data under the null hypothesis (i.e., no effect), and the values obtained can be compared to the experimental value. AMOPLS

models were computed under the MATLAB 8 environment (The MathWorks, Natick, MA, USA) and compared to a series of 10^3 random permutations.

3. Results and discussion

1. Optimization of HRMS conditions

The chromatographic conditions were already optimized in a previous study [22] allowing a satisfactory separation of the analytes, especially in the case of 11-deoxycortisol and corticosterone, which had the same exact mass and close retention times. In this work, the method development was mainly focused on the optimization of HRMS conditions. Details of the detection parameters are presented in Table 1 for the target analytes and in Supplementary Material Table S3 for the labeled internal standards (IS). First, all the ESI source parameters were tuned to obtain the best sensitivity. As DHT proved to have the lowest ionization efficiency among the 11 analytes, it was chosen as the target compound, and direct infusion of a DHT standard in MeOH at 1 $\mu\text{g/mL}$ was performed. In addition, this compound had already been highlighted as a promising biomarker of testosterone administration in serum [22].

Then, the first investigated acquisition mode was the FS. The scan range was set from 200 to 600 m/z , allowing the detection of all steroid hormone ions and their potential adducts; the resolution, AGC target and Maximum IT were optimized with the aim of obtaining a sufficient number of acquisition data points over each chromatographic peak. For that, a target range of 10-15 data points was set for acquisition. An example chromatogram for 17 α OH-progesterone at 1 ng/mL obtained in FS mode is shown in Figure 1A, where 16 data points over the peak were obtained with a resolution of 70,000 FWHM. Because some of the target steroids, such as epitestosterone, progesterone and DHT, are known to be at a very low concentration in serum, a t-SIM experiment was also evaluated with the aim of enhancing sensitivity. For this purpose,

preliminary experiments using a single t-SIM event were carried out during the whole chromatographic run. For this experiment, an inclusion list containing m/z values of all target hormones and relative internal standards ions was created, and the acquisition was performed setting the multiplexing (MSX) count to 1. As shown in Figure 1B, this strategy was not satisfactory to obtain a sufficient number of data points across the peak, also compromising sensitivity. Indeed, in the retention time window where 17 α OH-progesterone eluted (from 5 to 5.5 min), three other analytes, as well as their respective IS, were detected, reaching a total of 8 compounds (see Table 1). This meant that in this specific time window, after each FS event, only one of the 8 present ions was allowed to enter the C-Trap and be analyzed, resulting in a limited number of acquisitions in t-SIM mode for all the compounds in this time period (7 points under the peak in the case of Figure 1B). To resolve this issue, a different t-SIM experiment was then performed making use of the MSX function, depending on the number of compounds co-eluting in the same time window. MSX values from 2 (only the target analyte and its internal standard) up to 8 (four analytes and their relative IS) were selected (see Table 1). After each FS event, the ions of all co-eluting multiplexed compounds were accumulated in the C-trap and subsequently analyzed. This second strategy proved to be efficient, allowing a number of acquisition points similar or equal to the FS acquisition for all target steroids. As observed in Figure 1C, by applying an MSX count of 8, it was possible to obtain a very satisfactory peak shape with approximately 16 data points for 17 α OH-progesterone with the multiplexed t-SIM acquisition mode.

Concerning sensitivity, the t-SIM acquisition provided an increased signal to noise (S/N) ratio, in particular for DHT, one of the two blood markers of T administration previously highlighted: a significant increase in the S/N from 9 to 32 RMS (root mean square) was observed passing from FS to multiplexed t-SIM, despite no remarkable augmentation of peak area. For analytes with a low concentration and/or poor ionization in the ESI source, the t-SIM acquisition mode could, therefore, represent the optimal solution for quantification purposes, assuming the utilization of MSX count.

2. Comparison of quantitative performance

Once the HRMS conditions were optimized, 491 serum samples collected during a testosterone administration clinical study were prepared and analyzed using both of the developed UHPLC-HRMS and UHPLC-MS/MS methods. For comparison purposes, concentrations of 11 target steroids were measured by means of the three different acquisition modes: FS, multiplexed t-SIM and SRM.

Epitestosterone, progesterone and deoxycorticosterone were present in serum at very low concentrations (below 100 pg/mL), and it was not possible to detect them with the HRMS platform; therefore, they were discarded for the following comparison.

3.2.1 Assay correlation

For each of the 8 sufficiently concentrated compounds, Passing-Bablok regressions [23] and Bland-Altman plots [24, 25] were assessed, using MS/MS values as a reference method. The plots obtained for T and DHT are presented in Figures 2 and 3,

respectively, and discussed herein in more detail, while the graphs for all remaining compounds are shown in Supplementary Material Figures S1-S6.

For the Passing-Bablok regression, the parameters that were evaluated were the slope, the intercept, and the determination coefficient (R^2). For the Bland-Altman plots, the percentage of samples with a difference of measured concentrations between $\pm 20\%$ (arbitrary acceptability range [26]) was evaluated. In both cases, the T concentration measured with the HRMS method correlated well with MS/MS. In the t-SIM vs SRM plot (Figure 2A), the samples were less spread than in the FS vs SRM plot (Figure 2B), resulting in a better determination coefficient; this dispersion of the samples is more pronounced in the high concentration region. Moreover, a slope value close to one was found for both regressions, while the obtained intercept had a negative value in both cases, suggesting a minor underestimation of T concentration with both HRMS methods. According to the Bland-Altman plots, for a high percentage of samples (99.6% and 93.9%, respectively), measured T concentration differences were within the acceptability limits arbitrarily defined for both t-SIM (Figure 2C) and FS (Figure 2D); mean biases of -3.615% and 0.298% were observed comparing MS/MS measurements with the t-SIM and FS results, respectively.

In Figure 3, the plots of the DHT measurement comparison are presented. Looking at Passing-Bablok regressions, similar results to T were obtained, demonstrating a good correlation between different quantification results, considering slope values close to one and satisfactory R^2 for both HRMS methods (0.9328 t-SIM, 0.9013 FS). On the other hand, there was a lower percentage of samples within the acceptability limits (82.7% t-SIM, 73.5% FS) and a higher mean bias from SRM quantification (6.48% t-SIM, 6.89%

FS) evaluating Bland-Altman plots. For concentrated analytes such as T, HRMS measurements appear to be a valuable alternative to classical MS/MS experiments. However, the higher dispersion of samples in Bland-Altman plots in the low concentration region suggests that HRMS measurements are slightly less sensitive than MS/MS. This could be an issue for the less concentrated analytes such as DHT, especially when FS acquisition is considered. In this context, the t-SIM acquisition mode could reduce the gap with MS/MS quantification, thanks to a significant increase in sensitivity.

To further investigate this aspect, calibration curves were constructed and LLOQ values were estimated for all steroid hormones with both the FS and t-SIM developed methods. First, several regression models were tested to select the most suitable and simple response function. Because the hypothesis of variance homogeneity was rejected, the simplest regression model without data transformation, based on the least squares method, could not be retained. Therefore, the best weighting factor was chosen taking into account the relationship between the logarithm of the natural variance and the concentration as described elsewhere [27]. For each analyte, the specially selected weighting factor was the inverse of the concentration raised to the λ th power ($1/x^\lambda$), λ being the slope of the line fitted to the data on the logarithm scale. Hence, the mean selected weighting factor was round off the inferior unit and determined to be $1/x$. Then, the lowest concentration at which the back-calculated concentration of the calibration curves exhibited a precision that did not exceed 20% of the CV and accuracy within 20% of the nominal concentration was evaluated. This approach, in accordance with official guidelines such as the FDA [28], permitted

obtaining the LLOQ values shown in Table 2 together with those of the reference MS/MS method. The accuracy and repeatability details for all target analytes at all concentration levels are presented in Supplementary Material Tables S4 and S5.

3.2.2 Multivariate data analysis

In addition to the classical comparison of the analytical methods for each of the measured target compounds discussed above, a more global approach has also been applied to evaluate the quality of the measurements obtained using HRMS. A multivariate data analysis method based on ANOVA and PLS, namely AMOPLS, which was recently proposed for the analysis of omics data generated from designed experiments [29], was used for proper data analysis accounting for both the highly multivariate structure of the data and the study design. Indeed, multifactorial experiments, such as the analysis of clinical study samples, generate data simultaneously altered by several sources of variation. The systematic strategy proposed herein is particularly well suited to gather information on the potential effects of experimental factors and their interactions, and it was demonstrated to be a relevant tool to disentangle the influences of specific factors or interactions in multifactorial experiments, with a simplified interpretation of signal variations based on specific sets of scores and loadings related to each effect.

Two separate AMOPLS models were therefore computed based on the combination of quantitative data from the 8 steroid hormones measured by all three analytical methods in blood control samples and samples collected after transdermal and oral T administrations. Unit variance scaling was applied to analyte concentration variations, avoiding their impact in intensity range. The main effects of the three experimental factors taken into account for this study, namely inter-individual variability (*Volunteer* factor, 19 levels), longitudinal signal variations (*Time* factor, 16 levels) and differences due to the quantification strategy (*Method* factor, 3 levels), as well as their first-order interactions (*Volunteer*Time*, *Volunteer*Method* and *Time*Method*) were included in the models.

Concerning the transdermal administration, as a first investigation of signal variations, the relative contribution related to each effect and interactions (expressed as sum of squares) was computed to obtain the following values: *Volunteer* 29.7%, *Time* 38.6%, *Method* 0.8%, *Volunteer*Time* 28.9%, *Volunteer*Method* 0.8%, *Time*Method* 0.2% and Residuals 1.0%. These results, shown in Figure 4A, clearly highlight the strong influence of the inter-individual variability in the measured steroids levels, together with marked alterations during the temporal follow-up. Interestingly, the cumulative proportion of signal variations due to the different quantification strategies (SRM and HRMS in both FS and t-SIM modes) was very low (main effect+interactions <2%).

Random permutations of the experimental design were then carried out to evaluate the statistical significance of the results. The comparison with random designs highlighted the main effect due to the *Time* factor as the only significant structured source of variation in the dataset ($p < 0.01$). Notably, despite an important proportion

of total variability related to the *Volunteer* factor, all the other ANOVA terms were declared non-significant ($p > 0.05$). This may be because inter-individual variations are related to biological noise. While no major structure emerges from these uncoordinated differences, these results also confirmed that the very low contribution related to the *Method* factor was statistically negligible. Total inter-individual variability is obtained by summing the main effect of the *Volunteer* factor (differences between individuals on average over all time points) and the interaction effect between *Volunteer* and *Time* (differences between the evolutions over time).

Predictive components related to the *Time* factor were then further investigated to highlight trends in the sample distributions (Supplementary Material Figure S7A). The most important temporal pattern was associated with a circadian modulation of steroid levels, clearly visible on the first latent variable associated with the *Time* factor (47.9%). This pattern confirms the results previously obtained by MS/MS and was mainly associated with androstenedione, DHEA, corticosterone, cortisol, and 11-deoxycortisol. Additionally, the effect of T transdermal intake was observable on the second component associated with the *Time* factor (30.3%) (Figure 4B), characterized by a marked increase until 12 h after administration and a slow decrease until 48 h. The major biomarkers associated with this trend were T and DHT.

In the same fashion as transdermal administration, differences due to inter-individual and temporal variability were responsible for the largest variations of the dataset of the oral testosterone undecanoate (TU) intake, as illustrated by the relative sum of squares related to each effect in Figure 5A: *Volunteer* 26.5%, *Time* 31.3%, *Method* 0.6%, *Volunteer*Time* 35.7%, *Volunteer*Method* 0.9%, *Time*Method* 0.4% and *Residuals*

4.5%. According to random permutations, the only significant effect was related to the *Time* factor ($p < 0.01$), while all other effects were deemed non-significant ($p > 0.05$). Investigating the *Time* factor (Supplementary Material Figure S7B), similarly to the transdermal administration, a circadian rhythm was found as the major source of variability (53.5% of the *Time* factor), with marked modulations of DHEA, corticosterone, cortisol, and 11-deoxycortisol. Moreover, the effect of oral T administration was observed on the second component related to the *Time* factor (18.6%, Figure 5B). Altered levels of T, DHT and androstenedione were associated with an increase of the temporal trajectory after 2 and 4 h and a return to the basal situation.

Taking all this information, these results are perfectly in line with our previous study based on multiway modeling [22], highlighting the marked impact of inter-individual differences and intra-day variations. The decomposition of the different sources of variability can constitute an objective basis for the selection of biomarkers less affected by these factors. The data mining strategy was able to efficiently decompose the different sources of variation and investigate the impact of T administration in the presence of confounders or other experimental factors, a situation commonly found in the anti-doping routine analysis.

4. Conclusions

Measurement of endogenous steroid hormones in serum has been recently proven to be an interesting complementary strategy to the current urinary steroid profile for the detection of steroid-related doping abuse. In this research study, the potential of HRMS analysis in this context was evaluated by developing an UHPLC-HRMS method for the quantification of some of the most important endogenous steroids in serum related to testosterone metabolism. Its analytical performance was then compared to that of an already validated UHPLC-MS/MS method by analyzing serum samples collected during a testosterone clinical study. The results showed that for the 8 analytes that were detected with all three employed acquisition methods, concentration values measured by HRMS strongly correlated with the ones measured by MS/MS. Only in the case of low concentration steroids, such as DHT and 11-deoxycortisol, was a higher dispersion of samples in Bland-Altman plots observed in the low concentration region. This was probably due to a sensitivity gap between HRMS and MS/MS, which could be partially counterbalanced by the multiplexed t-SIM approach. The evaluation of HRMS performance was also investigated with a complementary approach based on ANOVA decomposition and multivariate analysis. Among the factors of variability, the AMOPLS showed that the influence of quantification *Method* was negligible (<2% of the total variance) in both transdermal and oral administration datasets, hence giving a biological description of testosterone intake fully in accordance with already published research based on UHPLC-MS/MS quantification.

This study noted the suitability of UHPLC-HRMS systems for the quantification of endogenous steroid hormones in serum (Quan), confirming this matrix as a promising aid to improve steroid abuse detection in the anti-doping field. In addition, the possibility to acquire data in HRMS FullScan mode opens the way to untargeted studies (Qual) for new metabolites identification. Qual-Quan acquisition will be of great usefulness, in particular in the anti-doping context, where most of WADA accredited laboratories are increasing their investments on HRMS instruments.

Acknowledgments

This study was supported by the FIFA Medical Assessment and Research Centre (F-MARC). Julien Boccard and Serge Rudaz thank the Swiss National Science Foundation for its financial support (project N° 31003A_166658).

References

- [1] Endogenous Anabolic Androgenic Steroids, Measurement and Reporting, Technical Document TD2016EAAS (2016) World Anti-doping Agency (WADA), Montreal. <http://www.wada-ama.org>. Accessed September 2016.
- [2] T. Kuuranne, M. Saugy, N. Baume, Confounding factors and genetic polymorphism in the evaluation of individual steroid profiling, *Br. J. Sports. Med.* 48 (2014) 848-855.
- [3] J. Jakobsson-Schulze, J. Lundmark, M. Garle, I. Skilving, L. Ekstrom, A. Rane, Doping Test Results Dependent on Genotype of Uridine Diphospho-Glucuronosyl Transferase 2B17, the Major Enzyme for Testosterone Glucuronidation, *J. Clin. Endocr. Metab.* 93 (2008) 2500-2506.
- [4] A. Rane, L. Ekstrom, Androgens and doping tests: genetic variation and pit-falls, *Brit. J. Clin. Pharmacol.* 74 (2012) 3-15.
- [5] E. Strahm, J.E. Mullen, N. Garevik, M. Ericsson, J.J. Schulze, A. Rane, L. Ekstrom, Dose-dependent testosterone sensitivity of the steroidal passport and GC-C-IRMS analysis in relation to the UGT2B17 deletion polymorphism, *Drug Test. Analysis* 7 (2015) 1063-1070.
- [6] P. Martin-Escudero, J. Munoz-Guerra, N. Del Prado, M. Galindo Canales, M. Fuentes Ferrer, S. Vargas, A.B. Soldevilla, E. Serrano-Garde, F. Miguel-Tobal, M. Maestro de las Casas, C. Fernandez-Perez, Impact of the UGT2B17 gene deletion on the steroid profile of an athlete, *Physiol. Rep.* 3 (2015) doi: 10.14814/phy2.12645.

- [7] F. Badoud, J. Boccard, C. Schweizer, F. Pralong, M. Saugy, N. Baume, Profiling of steroid metabolites after transdermal and oral administration of testosterone by ultra-high pressure liquid chromatography coupled to quadrupole time-of-flight mass spectrometry, *J. Steroid. Biochem.* 138 (2013) 222-235.
- [8] P. Van Renterghem, P. Van Eenoo, W. Van Thuyne, H. Geyer, W. Schanzer, F.T. Delbeke, Validation of an extended method for the detection of the misuse of endogenous steroids in sports, including new hydroxylated metabolites, *J. Chrom. B* 876 (2008) 225-235.
- [9] P. Van Renterghem, P. Van Eenoo, F.T. Delbeke, Population based evaluation of a multi-parametric steroid profiling on administered endogenous steroids in single low dose, *Steroids* 75 (2010), 1047-1057.
- [10] P. Van Renterghem, P. Van Eenoo, P.E. Sottas, M. Saugy, F.T. Delbeke, Subject-based steroid profiling and the determination of novel biomarkers for DHT and DHEA misuse in sports, *Drug Test. Analysis* 2 (2010) 582-588.
- [11] P. Van Renterghem, P. Van Eenoo, P.E. Sottas, M. Saugy, F.T. Delbeke, A pilot study on subject-based comprehensive steroid profiling: novel biomarkers to detect testosterone misuse in sports, *Clin. Endocrinol.* 75 (2011) 134-140.
- [12] A. Fabregat, O.J. Pozo, J. Marcos, J. Segura, R. Ventura, Use of LC-MS/MS for the open detection of steroids metabolites conjugated with glucuronic acid, *Anal. Chem.* 85 (2013) 5005-5014.

- [13] A. Kotronoulas, A. Fabregat, I. Alfonso, T. Parella, J. Segura, R. Ventura, J. Joglar, O.J. Pozo, Synthesis and characterization of 6 β -hydroxyandrosterone and 6 β -hydroxyetiocholanolone conjugated with glucuronic acid, *Drug Test. Analysis* 7 (2015) 247-252.
- [14] A. Kotronoulas, J. Marcos, J. Segura, R. Ventura, J. Joglar, O.J. Pozo, Ultra high performance liquid chromatography tandem mass spectrometric detection of glucuronides resistant to enzymatic hydrolysis: implications to doping control analysis, *Anal. Chim. Acta* 895 (2015) 35-44.
- [15] J. Boccard, F. Badoud, E. Grata, S. Ouertani, M. Hanafi, G. Mazerolels, P. Lantéri, J.L. Veuthey, M. Saugy, A steroidomic approach for biomarkers discovery in doping control, *Forensic Sci. Int.* 213 (2011) 85-94.
- [16] J. Boccard, F. Badoud, N. Jan, R. Nicoli, C. Schweizer, F. Pralong, J.L. Veuthey, N. Baume, S. Rudaz, M. Saugy, Untargeted profiling of urinary steroid metabolites after testosterone ingestion: opening new perspectives for antidoping testing, *Bioanalysis* 6 (2014) 2523-2536.
- [17] M. Raro, M. Ibanez, R. Gil, A. Fabregat, E. Tudela, K. Deventer, R. Ventura, J. Segura, J. Marcos, A. Kotronoulas, J. Joglar, M. Farré, S. Yang, Y. Xing, P. Van Eenoo, E. Pitarch, F. Hernandez, J.V. Sancho, O.J. Pozo, Untargeted metabolomics in doping control: detection of new markers of testosterone misuse by ultrahigh performance liquid chromatography coupled to high-resolution mass spectrometry, *Anal. Chem.* 87 (2015) 8373-8380.

- [18] F. Badoud, E. Grata, L. Perrenoud, L. Avois, M. Saugy, S. Rudaz, J.L. Veuthey, Fast analysis of doping agents in urine by ultra-high-pressure liquid chromatography-quadrupole time-of-flight mass spectrometry I. Screening analysis, *J. Chrom. A* 1216 (2009) 4423-4433.
- [19] A. Musenga, D.A. Cowan, Use of ultra-high pressure liquid chromatography coupled to high resolution mass spectrometry for fast screening in high throughput doping control, *J. Chrom. A* 1288 (2013) 82-95.
- [20] E.N. Ho, W.H. Kwok, A.S. Wong, T.S. Wan, High resolution accurate mass screening of prohibited substances in equine plasma using liquid chromatography--Orbitrap mass spectrometry, *Drug Test. Analysis* 5 (2013) 509-528.
- [21] J.C. Dominguez-Romero, J.F. Reyes, F.J. Lara-Ortega, A. Molina-Diaz, Screening and confirmation capabilities of liquid chromatography-time-of-flight mass spectrometry for the determination of 200 multiclass sport drugs in urine, *Talanta* 134 (2015) 74-88.
- [22] F. Ponzetto, F. Mehl, J. Boccard, N. Baume, S. Rudaz, M. Saugy, R. Nicoli, Longitudinal monitoring of endogenous steroids in human serum by UHPLC-MS/MS as a tool to detect testosterone abuse in sports, *Anal. Bioanal. Chem.* 408 (2016) 705-719.
- [23] H. Passing, L. Bablok, A new biometrical procedure for testing the equality of measurements from two different analytical methods. Application of linear regression procedures for method comparison studies in clinical chemistry, Part I, *J. Clin. Chem. Clin. Biochem.* 21 (1983) 709-720.

- [24] D.G. Altman, J.M. Bland, Measurements in medicine: the analysis of method comparison studies, *The Statistician* 32 (1983) 307-317.
- [25] J.M. Bland, D.G. Altman, Statistical methods for assessing agreement between two methods of clinical measurement, *Lancet*. 1 (1986) 307-310.
- [26] D. Giavarina, Understanding Bland Altman analysis, *Biochem. Med. (Zagreb)* 25 (2015) 141-151.
- [27] S. Rudaz, S. Souverain, C. Schelling, M. Deelers, A. Klomp, A. Norris, B. Ariano, J.-L. Veuthey, Development and validation of a heart-cutting LC-MS method for the determination of process related substances in cetirizine material, *Anal. Chim. Acta* 492 (2003) 271-282.
- [28] Food and Drug Administration, Guidance for Industry. Bioanalytical Method Validation, FDA, Center for Drug Evaluation and Research. Rockville, 2001.
- [29] J. Boccard, S. Rudaz, Exploring Omics data from designed experiments using Analysis of Variance Multiblock Orthogonal Partial Least Squares, *Anal. Chim. Acta* 920 (2016) 18-28.

Tables

Table 1 - Description of target analytes and detection parameters

Analyte	Elemental Composition	Retention Time [min]	Observed Ion Mass (monoisotopic) [m/z]	Theoretical Ion Mass (monoisotopic) [m/z]	Mass Error [ppm]	MSX Count*	Time Window [min]
Testosterone	C ₁₉ H ₂₈ O ₂	4.61	289.12579	289.21621	0.93	2	4.1 - 4.7
Epitestosterone	C ₁₉ H ₂₈ O ₂	5.31	289.21582	289.21621	1.35	8	4.6 - 5.5
Androstenedione	C ₁₉ H ₂₆ O ₂	5.13	287.20026	287.20056	0.84	8	4.6 - 5.5
Progesterone	C ₂₁ H ₃₀ O ₂	6.85	315.23157	315.23186	0.54	2	6.2 - 7.2
17 α -Hydroxyprogesterone	C ₂₁ H ₃₀ O ₃	5.26	331.22641	331.22677	1.27	8	4.6 - 5.5
DHEA	C ₁₉ H ₂₈ O ₂	5.10	271.20535 [°]	271.20564 [°]	0.96	8	4.6 - 5.5
DHT	C ₁₉ H ₃₀ O ₂	5.60	291.23175	291.23186	1.10	2	5.3 - 5.7
Corticosterone	C ₂₁ H ₃₀ O ₄	3.63	347.22122	347.22169	0.72	3	3.1 - 4.1
Cortisol	C ₂₁ H ₃₀ O ₅	2.77	363.21619	363.21660	1.57	2	2.3 - 3.0
Deoxycorticosterone	C ₂₁ H ₃₀ O ₃	4.86	331.22638	331.22677	1.09	2	4.5 - 5.0
11-Deoxycortisol	C ₂₁ H ₃₀ O ₄	3.77	347.22124	347.22169	1.01	3	3.1 - 4.1

* Also taking into account the deuterated internal standard for each target analyte

[°] [M-H₂O]⁺

Table 2 - Estimated lower limit of quantification (LLOQ) for target analytes with FS and t-SIM acquisition modes in comparison with the MS/MS method

Compound	LLOQ [pg/mL]		
	FS	t-SIM	MS/MS[22]
Testosterone	100	50	20
Epitestosterone	100	50	20
Androstenedione	100	50	50
17 α -Hydroxyprogesterone	500	250	100
Progesterone	100	50	15
DHEA	500	500	500
DHT	500	250	50
Corticosterone	100	100	100
Cortisol	1000	1000	1000
Deoxycorticosterone	500	250	25
11-Deoxycortisol	250	250	25

Figures captions

Figure 1 Chromatograms of 17 α -hydroxyprogesterone obtained with three different HRMS acquisition modes: (A) Full scan, (B) t-SIM without multiplexing and (C) t-SIM with MSX count of 8

Figure 2 Passing-Bablok regressions and Bland-Altman plots for the comparison of testosterone quantification results. (A, B) t-SIM vs SRM and (C, D) FS vs SRM

Figure 3 Passing-Bablok regressions and Bland-Altman plots for the comparison of DHT quantification results. (A, B) t-SIM vs SRM and (C, D) FS vs SRM

Figure 4 AMOPLS modeling for transdermal administration data (30.3% of explained variance): (A) relative contributions of *volunteer*, *time* and *method* effects and their interactions; (B) score and loadings plots of predictive component related to the *time* factor. C: control, P: patch.

Figure 5 AMOPLS modeling for oral administration data (18.6% of explained variance): (A) relative contributions of *volunteer*, *time* and *method* effects and their interactions; (B) score and loadings plots of predictive component related to the *time* factor. C: control, O: oral.

Figure 1

Figure 4

Figure 5