Reassessing Candidate Structures for NTS LC/HRMS² Features by Predicting Retention Times with Unsupervised Learning Gordian Sandberg^a, Helen Sepman^{a,b}, Isak Samsten^c and Anneli Kruve^{a,b}

OBJECTIVE

Detection of chemicals in complex mixtures with non-target screening RPLC/ESI/HRMS. Candidate structures are calculated and ranked by an iterative retention-time-prediction/candidate-structure-removal workflow increasing the portion of correct candidate structures.



WORKFLOW

Molecular descriptors (PaDEL)^[1], indicating the properties of each candidate structure (from MS² scorer **SIRIUS**^[2]), are calculated. The candidates and respective PaDEL descriptors (input data) are used for training an extreme gradient boosting machine learning model (xgbTree), which predicts the retention time (Rt) of each candidate structure. The difference between predicted Rt of the candidate structure and measured Rt of the corresponding LC/HRMS feature is used to remove the candidate structure with the Δ_{RT} iteratively.

EXAMPLE		CHO		CHO		CHO		CONH ₂		CONH ₂
	0) Molecular Descriptors	^ї сонн₂ Δ _{RT} = 0.48 min		^ї сомн₂ Δ _{RT} = 0.48 min		^ї сомн₂ Δ _{RT} = 0.63 min		Δ _{RT} = 0.70 min		$\Delta_{\rm RT} = 0.85 \rm min$
CONH ₂	PaDEL descriptors		RT		RT	CONH ₂	RT	CHO N CONH	RT	Carbamazepine epoxide
CONH ₂		$\Delta_{\rm RT}$ = 0.49 min		$\Delta_{\rm RT}$ = 0.66 min		$\Delta_{\rm RT} = 0.77 \rm min$		$\Delta_{\rm RT} = 0.80 \rm{min}$		
CONH ₂	1) Predict Retention times	CONH ₂	Δ _{RT}	CONH ₂	Δ _{RT}	N CONH ₂	Δ _{RT}			Environmental Hazard
СНО		$\Delta_{\rm RT}$ = 0.65 min		$\Delta_{\rm RT}$ = 0.72 min		$\Delta_{\rm RT}$ = 0.78 min				
CONH ₂	2) Difference	OH CONH ₂		OH CONH ₂		RES	ULTS			
\sim				$\Lambda = 1 (\Lambda)$			\//actou/ator/			





= 1.64 min $\Delta_{\rm RT}$



THEORETICAL PROOF

The correct candidate structures follow a relationship between input data (e.g. logP) and output data (retention time).





CONCLUSION

correct incorrect

correct incorrect



With this workflow it is possible to remove more incorrect than correct candidate structures. Promising theoretical results were generated and validated in two distinct studies of spiked chemicals in wastewater. MS² spectra from EAWAG on MassBank were used to test the workflow on chemicals, that were not contained in the SIRIUS training data. Although this training dataset was significantly smaller than the spiked wastewater datasets, removal efficiency was comparable or higher. This suggests, that the workflow is especially suited for structures outside the SIRIUS training set, increasing the percentage of correct candidates from 25% to 42% in the EAWAG dataset.

⁻unded by the Wallenberg Initiative Material Science for Sustainability

[1] Yap, C. W., *Comput. Chem.* **2011**, 32, 1466–1474. [2] Dührkop, K. et al., Nat. Methods 2019, 16 (4), 299–302.

5

Kruve lab

^a Department of Materials and Environmental Chemistry, ^b Department of Environmental Science, ^C Department of Computer and Systems Science, Stockholm University, Sweden