

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | Page |
|---|-------------|
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENT | iii |
| ABSTRACT (ENGLISH) | iv |
| ABSTRACT (THAI) | vi |
| TABLE OF CONTENTS | viii |
| LIST OF TABLES | xvii |
| LIST OF FIGURES | xx |
| LIST OF SCHEAME | xxvi |
| ABBREVIATIONS AND SYMBOLS | xxvii |
| PART I | 1 |
| DEVELOPMENT OF FLOW INJECTION ANALYSIS FOR THE DETERMINATION OF SOME BIOACTIVE COMPOUNDS FROM MEDICINAL PLANTS AND PHARMACEUTICAL FORMULATIONS | |
| CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION | 2 |
| 1.1 The First Generation-Flow Injection Analysis (FIA) | 2 |
| 1.1.1 Principle of FIA | 2 |
| 1.1.2 FIA Instrumentation | 3 |
| 1.1.3 Dispersion in the FIA | 6 |
| 1.1.4 Optimization of an FIA System | 8 |
| 1.2 Flow Injection Analysis of Arbutin in Medicinal Plants and Pharmaceutical Formulations | 10 |
| 1.2.1 Arbutin | 10 |
| 1.2.2 Previous Analytical Methods for Arbutin Determination | 11 |
| 1.3 Flow Injection Analysis of Curcuminoids in Medicinal Plants and Pharmaceutical Formulations | 14 |
| 1.3.1 Curcuminoids | 14 |
| 1.3.2 Chemical Constituents in Turmeric | 14 |

| | Page |
|--|-------------|
| 1.3.3 Medicinal Uses and Pharmacology of Turmeric | 15 |
| 1.3.4 Cosmetics Uses | 16 |
| 1.3.5 Previous Analytical Methods for Curcuminoids Determination | 16 |
| 1.4 Research Aims | 19 |
| CHAPTER II EXPERIMENTAL | 20 |
| 2.1 Flow Injection Analysis of Arbutin in Medicinal Plants and Pharmaceutical Formulations | 20 |
| 2.1.1 Instruments and Apparatus | 20 |
| 2.1.2 Chemicals and Reagents | 21 |
| 2.1.3 Flow Injection Apparatus | 21 |
| 2.1.4 Standard, Reagents and Sample Preparations | 22 |
| 2.1.5 Evaluation of the Proposed Flow Injection Manifold | 24 |
| 2.1.6 Recommended Procedure | 25 |
| 2.2 Flow Injection Analysis of Curcuminoids in Medicinal Plants and Pharmaceutical Formulations | 26 |
| 2.2.1 Instruments and Apparatus | 26 |
| 2.2.2 Chemicals and Reagents | 26 |
| 2.2.3 Flow Injection Apparatus | 27 |
| 2.2.4 Preparation of Standard, Reagents and Samples | 28 |
| 2.2.5 Chemical Reaction | 29 |
| 2.2.6 Recommended Procedure | 30 |
| CHAPTER III RESULTS AND DISCUSSION | 31 |
| 3.1 Flow Injection Analysis of Arbutin in Medicinal Plants and Pharmaceutical Formulations | 31 |
| 3.1.1 Preliminary Study | 31 |
| 3.1.2 Manifold Design | 31 |
| 3.1.3 Absorption Spectra of Arbutin | 33 |
| 3.1.4 Chemical Reaction | 34 |
| 3.1.5 Delivery Order of Reagent and Sample | 35 |

| | Page |
|---|-------------|
| 3.2.6.4 The pH Effect of Buffer Solution | 57 |
| 3.2.7 Optimization of Manifold Parameters | 60 |
| 3.2.7.1 The Effect of Mixing Coil Diameter and Length | 60 |
| 3.2.7.2 The Effect of Flow Rate | 61 |
| 3.2.7.3 The Effect of Injection Volume | 62 |
| 3.2.8 Summary of the Optimum Conditions | 63 |
| 3.2.9 Analytical Characteristics for Curcuminoids Determination | 63 |
| 3.2.9.1 Linearity of Calibration Curve | 64 |
| 3.2.9.2 Sensitivity, Detection Limit and Quantification Limit | 65 |
| 3.2.9.3 Precision and Accuracy | 65 |
| 3.2.10 Analytical Applications | 67 |
| 3.2.11 Flow Injection Analysis of Curcuminoids | 70 |
| CHAPTER IV CONCLUSIONS | 71 |
| 4.1 Flow Injection Analysis of Arbutin in Medicinal Plants and Pharmaceutical Formulations | 71 |
| 4.2 Flow Injection Analysis of Curcuminoids in Medicinal Plants and Pharmaceutical Formulations | 73 |
| PART II | 75 |
| SEQUENTIAL INJECTION ANALYSIS WITH LAB-AT-VALVE FOR THE DETERMINATION OF SOLASODINE | |
| CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION | 76 |
| 1.1 The Second Generation-Sequential Injection Analysis (SIA) | 76 |
| 1.1.1 Principle of Measurement and Basic Instrumentation of SIA | 77 |
| 1.1.2 Dispersion in the SIA | 79 |
| 1.1.3 Software | 80 |
| 1.2 Sequential Injection Analysis with Lab-at-Valve (SI-LAV) for the Determination of Solasodine | 82 |
| 1.2.1 Steroidal Glycoalkaloids (Solasodine) | 82 |
| 1.2.2 Chemical Structure of Glycoalkaloids | 82 |

| | Page |
|---|-------------|
| 1.2.3 Beneficial Effects of Glycoalkaloids | 84 |
| 1.3 Previous Analytical Methods for Solasodine Determination | 84 |
| 1.4 Research Aims | 86 |
| CHAPTER II EXPERIMENTAL | 87 |
| 2.1 Sequential Injection Analysis with Lab-at-Valve (SI-LAV) for the Determination of Solasodine | 87 |
| 2.1.1 Instruments and Apparatus | 87 |
| 2.1.2 Chemicals and Reagents | 88 |
| 2.1.3 Sequential Injection Apparatus | 88 |
| 2.1.4 Preparation of Standard, Reagents and Samples | 89 |
| 2.1.5 Sequential Injection Analysis Method | 90 |
| 2.1.6 Experimental Protocol | 91 |
| CHAPTER III RESULTS AND DISCUSSION | 94 |
| 3.1 Sequential Injection Analysis with Lab-at-Valve (SI-LAV) for the Determination of Solasodine | 94 |
| 3.1.1 Preliminary Study | 94 |
| 3.3.1.1 Spectral Characteristics | 95 |
| 3.1.2 Sequential Injection Manifold Design | 95 |
| 3.1.3 Optimization of the Experimental Parameters | 96 |
| 3.1.3.1. Aspiration Order of Reagents and Sample | 96 |
| 3.1.3.2 Sample, Reagent and Organic Solvent Aspiration Volumes Optimizations | 98 |
| 3.1.3.2.1 Organic Solvent Aspiration Volume | 98 |
| 3.1.3.2.2 Sample and Reagent Volumes | 99 |
| 3.1.3.2.3 Volume of Sending Sample to Detector | 99 |
| 3.1.3.3. Flow Rate | 101 |
| 3.3.3.3.1 Optimization of Sample and Reagents Flow Rates | 101 |
| 3.3.3.3.2 Flow Rate of Sending Sample to Detector | 102 |

| | Page |
|---|-------------|
| 3.3.3.3.3 The Effect of Methyl Orange Concentration | 102 |
| 3.1.3.4. Mixing Coil Length and Internal Diameter | 103 |
| 3.1.4 Analytical Characteristics | 104 |
| 3.1.4.1 Linearity of Calibration Graph | 104 |
| 3.1.4.2 Detection limit and Quantification Limit | 105 |
| 3.1.4.3 Precision and Accuracy | 105 |
| 3.1.5 Application | 107 |
| CHAPTER IV CONCLUSION | 110 |
| 4.1 Sequential Injection Analysis with Lab-at-Valve (SI-LAV) for the Determination of Solasodine | 110 |
| PART III | 112 |
| DEVELOPMENT AND VALIDATION OF MICROFLUIDIC SYSTEMS FOR DETERMINATION OF DRUG RESIDUES IN HONEY SAMPLES COUPLES WITH CHEMILUMINESCENCE DETECTOR AND LIQUID CHROMATOGRAPHY-MASS SPECTROMETRY | |
| CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION | 113 |
| 1.1 The Third Generation-Microfluidic Systems as Micro Total Analysis (μ TAS) or Lab-on-a Chip Technique | 113 |
| 1.1.1 Lab-On-a-Chip | 113 |
| 1.1.1.1 Chip Materials and Fabrication Technologies | 114 |
| 1.1.1.2 Advantages of LOCs | 114 |
| 1.1.1.3 Disadvantages of LOCs | 115 |
| 1.1.2 Molecularly Imprinted Polymers (MIPs) | 115 |
| 1.1.2.1 Theory of Molecularly Imprinted Polymers | 115 |
| 1.1.2.2 Molecular Imprinting Strategies and Procedures | 116 |
| 1.1.2.3 Parameters of MIP Syntheses | 117 |
| 1.1.2.3.1 Template | 117 |
| 1.1.2.3.2 Functional Monomers | 117 |

| | Page |
|--|-------------|
| 1.1.2.3.3 Cross-Linkers | 119 |
| 1.1.2.3.4 Solvents (Porogens) | 119 |
| 1.1.2.3.5 Initiators | 119 |
| 1.1.3 Chemiluminescence | 121 |
| 1.1.3.1 Theory of Chemiluminescence | 121 |
| 1.2 Development and Validation of Microfluidic Systems for Determination of Drug Residues in Honey Samples Coupled with Chemiluminescence Detector and Liquid Chromatography-Mass Spectrometry | 126 |
| 1.2.1 Drug Residues (Chloramphenicol) | 126 |
| 1.2.2 Previous Analytical Methods for Chloramphenicol Residue Determination | 127 |
| 1.3 Research Aims | 130 |
| CHAPTER II EXPERIMENTAL | 131 |
| 2.1 Microflow Chemiluminescence Sensor for Determination of Chloramphenicol in Honey Based On Molecularly Imprinted Polymer | 131 |
| 2.1.1 Instruments and Apparatus | 131 |
| 2.1.2 Chemicals and Reagents | 132 |
| 2.1.3 Microfluidic Device Design and Instrumentation | 132 |
| 2.1.4 Standard, Reagents and Sample Preparations | 134 |
| 2.1.5 Procedures | 135 |
| 2.2 LC-MS/MS on Microfluidic Device for Confirmatory of Chloramphenicol Determination in Honey Samples Based On Molecular Imprinted Polymers | 137 |
| 2.2.1 Chromatographic Evaluation of MIPs Chloramphenicol | 137 |
| 2.2.2 LC-MS/MS Instrumentation | 137 |
| CHAPTER III RESULTS AND DISCUSSION | 139 |
| 3.1 Microflow Chemiluminescence Sensor for Determination of Chloramphenicol in Honey Samples Based on Molecularly Imprinted Polymer | 139 |


| | Page |
|--|-------------|
| 3.2.4.1.1 High Performance Liquid Chromatography (CAP-MIP Column) | 161 |
| 3.2.4.1.2 LC-MS/MS (CAP-MIP on Chip) | 162 |
| 3.2.4.2 Sensitivity, Detection Limit, Quantification Limit | 163 |
| 3.2.4.2.1 High Performance Liquid Chromatography (CAP-MIP Column) | 163 |
| 3.2.4.2.2 LC-MS/MS (CAP-MIP on Chip) | 163 |
| 3.2.4.3 Precision and Accuracy | 164 |
| 3.2.4.3.1 High Performance Liquid Chromatography (CAP-MIP Column) | 164 |
| 3.2.4.3.2 LC-MS/MS (CAP-MIP on Chip) | 164 |
| 3.2.5 Analytical Applications | 164 |
| CHAPTER IV CONCLUSIONS | 166 |
| 4.1 Microflow Chemiluminescence Sensor for Determination of Chloramphenicol in Honey Samples Based on Molecularly Imprinted Polymer | 166 |
| 4.2 LC-MS/MS on Microfluidic Device for Confirmatory of Chloramphenicol Determination in Honey Samples Based on Molecular Imprinted Polymers | 168 |
| SUGGESTION FOR FURTHER WORK | 168 |
| REFERENCES | 170 |
| APPENDIX | 179 |
| CURRICULUM VITAE | 181 |
| LIST OF PUBLICATIONS | 187 |

LIST OF TABLES

| Table | | Page |
|-------|---|------|
| 1 | Effect of 4-AP and hexacyanoferrate (III) concentrations on sensitivity | 37 |
| 2 | Effect of flow rate of reaction and carrier stream on sensitivity | 39 |
| 3 | Effect of mixing coil length on sensitivity | 40 |
| 4 | Effect of injection volume on sensitivity | 41 |
| 5 | The optimum conditions for determination of arbutin | 42 |
| 6 | The effect of interferences on the peak height (mV) of 20.0 $\mu\text{g mL}^{-1}$ arbutin standard solution | 45 |
| 7 | Intra-day and inter-day variability of the FI spectrophotometric determination of arbutin | 46 |
| 8 | Comparison of accuracies for arbutin determination by FIA and HPLC methods | 47 |
| 9 | Comparison of the proposed FI method with selected earlier reported methods | 48 |
| 10 | Effect of aspiration order of reagents and sample | 55 |
| 11 | Effect of alkaline media added to hexacyanoferrate (III) solution | 56 |
| 12 | Effect of 4-AP and hexacyanoferrate (III) solutions | 58 |
| 13 | Effect of pH of borate buffer solution on sensitivity | 59 |
| 14 | Effect of mixing coil length on sensitivity | 60 |
| 15 | Effect of flow rate of carrier and reagent streams on sensitivity | 62 |
| 16 | Effect of injection volume on sensitivity | 63 |
| 17 | The optimum condition for determination of curcuminoids content | 64 |
| 18 | Analytical characteristics for curcuminoids determination | 64 |
| 19 | Precision of FI method | 66 |
| 20 | Accuracy of proposed FIA method for determination of curcuminoids | 68 |

| Table | Page |
|--|-------------|
| 21 Comparative determination of total curcuminoids using the proposed FIA method and spectrophotometric method | 69 |
| 22 Aspiration order of reagents and sample | 97 |
| 23 Effect of chloroform volume | 98 |
| 24 Effect of sample volume | 99 |
| 25 Effect of methyl orange volume | 99 |
| 26 Effect of flow rate of sample and reagent on sensitivity | 101 |
| 27 Effect of mixing coil length and internal diameter on sensitivity | 103 |
| 28 Precision study for solasodine | 106 |
| 29 Percentage recovery of solasodine content in <i>Solanum</i> species by the SIA-LAV proposed method | 107 |
| 30 Comparative determination of solasodine contents in various <i>Solanum</i> species using the SIA-LAV method and the spectrophotometric method | 108 |
| 31 Comparison of the proposed method with selected earlier reported methods | 109 |
| 32 Effect of H ₂ SO ₄ concentration | 143 |
| 33 Effect of Ru(bipy) ₃ ²⁺ and Ce(IV) concentrations | 144 |
| 34 Effect of flow rate | 146 |
| 35 Effect of sample volume | 147 |
| 36 Effect of reagent volume | 148 |
| 37 The binding characteristics of the MIP in the microfluidic device | 149 |
| 38 The optimum conditions for the determination of chloramphenicol residue | 150 |
| 39 Precision study for chloramphenicol | 154 |
| 40 Analytical recovery of chloramphenicol added to honey sample solution | 154 |
| 41 MIP-SPME conditions of CAP from (3.10×10 ⁻² μmol L ⁻¹) and THAP (2.80×10 ⁻² μmol L ⁻¹) using the MIP poly(DAM-EGDMA) as sorbent | 157 |

| Table | | Page |
|--------------|---|-------------|
| 42 | Comparison of the molecularly imprinted polymer analytical figures of merit of the proposed method with monolith C ₁₈ column HPLC method | 165 |



ลิขสิทธิ์มหาวิทยาลัยเชียงใหม่
Copyright© by Chiang Mai University
All rights reserved

LIST OF FIGURES

| Figure | | Page |
|--------|--|------|
| 1 | Typical representation of a FIA system, where a defined volume of sample is injected into a continuously flowing carrier stream which is merged with a stream of reagent. The ensuing transient generation of product is monitored by a suitable detector (D) | 3 |
| 2 | Schematic diagram of a typical flow injection analysis manifold. P is a pump, C and R are carrier and reagent lines respectively, S is sample injection, MC's are mixing coils, D is a flow through detector, and W is the waste line. The lower portion of the diagram indicates some typical instrument options available for reagent and carrier propulsion, sample injection, sample-reagent mixing, and various detection modes | 4 |
| 3 | Schematic drawing of a peristaltic pump | 5 |
| 4 | Schematic drawing of injection sample system | 5 |
| 5 | The dispersion process typical of FIA system | 8 |
| 6 | Chemical structure of arbutin in this study | 10 |
| 7 | Chemical structures of curcumin, demethoxycurcumin and bis-demethoxycurcumin | 15 |
| 8 | Proposed FI manifold; R1, Borate buffer solution; R2, 4-AP; R3, potassium hexacyanoferrate; P1 and P2, pump; I, injection vale; C, a glass tube packed with silica C ₁₈ as a mini-column; MC, mixing coil reactor; D, detector; R, recorder; W, waste | 22 |
| 9 | Schematic configuration of the FIA system: A; carrier stream of borate buffer solution, B; 1.0×10^{-1} mol L ⁻¹ 4-AP solution, C; 1.0×10^{-3} mol L ⁻¹ potassium hexacyanoferrate (III) solution, P; peristaltic pump, I; injection valve, RC; reaction coil, D; detection, R; recorder, W; waste | 27 |

| Figure | | Page |
|---------------|--|-------------|
| 10 | FI configurations tested for arbutin determination: (a) borate buffer solution was used as a carrier stream and 4-AP and hexacyanoferrate (III) solution were used as the reagent streams; (b) 4-AP solution was used as the carrier streams while the reagent stream were borate buffer and hexacyanoferrate (III) solutions; P1 and P2, pump; I, injection valve; C, a glass tube packed with silica C ₁₈ as a mini-column; MC, mixing coil reactor; D, detector; R, recorder; W, waste | 33 |
| 11 | The product presents an absorption maximum at 514 nm (a) whereas the arbutin exhibits its absorption maximum at 308 nm (b) | 34 |
| 12 | Effect of (a) 4-AP concentration and (b) hexacyanoferrate (III) concentration on the sensitivity of calibration curve (n = 3) of 1 - 15 µg mL ⁻¹ arbutin standard solutions | 37 |
| 13 | Effect of flow rate of (a) reaction and (b) carrier streams on the sensitivity of calibration curve (n = 3) of 1 - 15 µg mL ⁻¹ arbutin standard solutions | 39 |
| 14 | Effect of mixing coil on the sensitivity of calibration curve (n = 3) of 1 - 15 µg mL ⁻¹ arbutin standard solutions | 40 |
| 15 | Effect of injection volume on the sensitivity of calibration curve (n = 3) of 1 - 15 µg mL ⁻¹ arbutin standard solutions | 41 |
| 16 | FI grams of arbutin standard | 43 |
| 17 | Calibration curve of arbutin standard | 43 |
| 18 | Schematic configuration of the FIA system: R1; carrier stream of borate buffer solution, R2; 4-AP solution, R3; potassium hexacyanoferrate (III) solution, P; peristaltic pump, I; injection valve, MC; reaction coil, D; detection, R; recorder, W; waste | 52 |

| Figure | Page |
|--|-------------|
| 19 | 53 |
| Absorption spectra of (a) curcuminoids (λ 425 nm) and (b) curcuminoids and 4-AP and potassium hexacyanoferrate in an alkaline solution (λ 456 nm) | |
| 20 | 56 |
| The effect of alkaline media added to potassium hexacyanoferrate (III); (a) Na_2CO_3 , (b) NaOH and (c) KOH | |
| 21 | 58 |
| Effect of 4-AP concentrations and hexacyanoferrate (III) concentrations on the mean of sensitivity (slope) of $1\text{-}15 \mu\text{g mL}^{-1}$ curcuminoids standard solutions | |
| 22 | 59 |
| The effect of the pH of the carrier stream | |
| 23 | 61 |
| The influence of the tubing length for making the mixing coil | |
| 24 | 62 |
| The effect of flow rate for carrier stream (a) and reagent stream (b) | |
| 25 | 63 |
| The influence of injection volume on absorbance sensitivity | |
| 26 | 65 |
| Calibration curve of curcuminoids in over the ranges $5 - 20 \mu\text{g mL}^{-1}$ | |
| 27 | 66 |
| Precision of FI method | |
| 28 | 78 |
| Schematic diagram showing a simple SIA manifold, where A, B and C, represent analyte and reagent reservoirs | |
| 29 | 79 |
| (i) and (ii) schematic diagram showing the pump operating in reverse to aspirate a zone of reagent followed by sample. (iii) Formation of a zone of product upon reversal of flow and propulsion toward the detector | |
| 30 | 83 |
| (a) Solasodine and (b) Solanidine | |
| 31 | 88 |
| Schematic diagram of SIA system with LAV | |
| 32 | 95 |
| Absorption spectra of solasodine complex solution (b) and reagent blank solution (a) | |
| 33 | 97 |
| Effect of Sequence order of the SIA-LAV system for the semi-automated liquid-liquid extraction of solasodine: A, Chloroform; B, methyl orange; and C, sample | |
| 34 | 98 |
| The influence of the organic solvent volume (chloroform) | |

| Figure | | Page |
|---------------|---|-------------|
| 35 | The influence of the solasodine volume | 100 |
| 36 | The influence of the methyl orange volume | 100 |
| 37 | The flow rates of sending sample to detector | 102 |
| 38 | The effect of methyl orange concentration | 103 |
| 39 | The effect of mixing coil length | 104 |
| 40 | Typical SI-grams and calibration graph of solasodine: a = 10, b = 20, c = 30, d = 40, e = 50, f = 60 $\mu\text{g mL}^{-1}$ respectively | 105 |
| 41 | Principle of molecular imprinting | 116 |
| 42 | The function monomers used in the non-covalent approach | 118 |
| 43 | The cross-linkers used for molecular imprinting | 118 |
| 44 | Chemical structures of selected chemical initiators | 120 |
| 45 | Jablonski diagram to show electronic states of a molecule absorbing and emitting light. Where S_0 : ground singlet state, S_1 , S_2 : excited singlet states, T_1 , T_2 : excited triplet state, IC: internal conversion, ISC: intersystem crossing, F: fluorescence, P: phosphorescence. | 121 |
| 46 | Schematic showing the different chemiluminescence reaction mechanisms (direct and indirect chemiluminescence) | 123 |
| 47 | Chemical structure of chloramphenicol | 126 |
| 48 | (a) Schematic diagram of dimension on the micro-channel on chip. (b) Schematic diagram of micro flow sensor on chip for determination of chloramphenicol (P_1 , P_2 , P_3 : Fusion 100 micro-syringe pump) | 133 |
| 49 | Schematic diagram of dimension on chip | 138 |
| 50 | Structure of chloramphenicol used in this work and molecularly imprinted polymer procedure | 140 |
| 51 | The CL intensity of sample with effect of adsorption comparison between DAM and MAA monomers synthesis for micro flow sensor on chip for determination of chloramphenicol ($3.09 \times 10^{-3} \mu\text{mol L}^{-1}$ of chloramphenicol) | 141 |

| Figure | Page |
|--|-------------|
| 52 Scanning electron micrographs of the MIPs by photopolymerization method (a) DAM and (b) MAA monolith | 142 |
| 53 Effect of H ₂ SO ₄ concentration | 143 |
| 54 The effects of reagent concentration (a) Ru(bipy) ₃ ²⁺ and (b) Ce(IV) in 1.0 × 10 ⁻¹ mol L ⁻¹ H ₂ SO ₄ | 145 |
| 55 The effects of flow rate | 146 |
| 56 The effects of sample volume | 147 |
| 57 The effects of reagent volume | 148 |
| 58 Calibration curve of chloramphenicol in over the range 1.55 × 10 ⁻⁴ to 3.10 × 10 ⁻³ μmol L ⁻¹ | 151 |
| 59 Precision of the proposed method in concentration of (a) 1.55 × 10 ⁻⁴ μmol L ⁻¹ and (b) 1.55 × 10 ⁻³ μmol L ⁻¹ chloramphenicol | 153 |
| 60 Extracted sample equilibrium profile of CAP for SPME | 156 |
| 61 Extraction and desorption flow rate profile of CAP for SPME | 156 |
| 62 Retention factors (<i>k</i>) of CAP (3.10 × 10 ⁻² μmol L ⁻¹) and THAP (2.80 × 10 ⁻² μmol L ⁻¹) as marker, on the different MIPs columns using mixture of acetonitrile/water or methanol/water as mobile phase | 158 |
| 63 Imprinting factors (IF) of CAP (3.10 × 10 ⁻² μmol L ⁻¹) and THAP (2.80 × 10 ⁻² μmol L ⁻¹) as marker, on the different MIPs columns using mixture of acetonitrile/water or methanol/water as mobile phase | 159 |
| 64 Chromatograms of CAP and THAP in honey sample (a) without spiked standard and passed SPME, (b) with spiked standard, and (c) with spiked standard passed SPME. Concentration of CAP (3.10 × 10 ⁻² μmol L ⁻¹) and THAP (2.80 × 10 ⁻² μmol L ⁻¹) were added | 160 |
| 65 Full scan ESI mass spectrum of CAP residue from honey sample (MS/MS) | 161 |

| Figure | | Page |
|--------|---|------|
| 66 | Linear calibration graph obtained under the optimal conditions for determination of chloramphenicol over the range 3.72×10^{-4} - $7.44 \times 10^{-3} \mu\text{mol L}^{-1}$ | 162 |
| 67 | Linear calibration graph obtained under the optimal conditions for determination of chloramphenicol over the range 7.75×10^{-4} - $6.20 \times 10^{-3} \mu\text{mol L}^{-1}$ | 163 |

LIST OF SCHEMES

| Scheme | | Page |
|--------|---|------|
| 1 | Assumed scheme of reaction between 4-AP and arbutin and formation of a highly colored quinoneimine | 35 |
| 2 | Assumed scheme of reaction between curcuminoids and 4-AP and formation of a highly colored quinoneimine | 54 |

ลิขสิทธิ์มหาวิทยาลัยเชียงใหม่
Copyright© by Chiang Mai University
All rights reserved

ABBREVIATIONS AND SYMBOLS

| | |
|------------------|--|
| AU | absorbance unit |
| CL | chemiluminescence |
| cm | centimeter |
| °C | degree celsius |
| DI | deionize water |
| ESI | electron electrospray ionization |
| EtOAc | ethyl acetate |
| EU | europium union |
| FIA | flow injection analysis |
| g | gram |
| GC | gas chromatography |
| h | hour |
| HPLC | high performance liquid chromatography |
| H ₂ O | water |
| i.d. | internal diameter |
| k | capacity or retention factor |
| kg | kilogram |
| L | liter |
| LAV | lab at valve |
| LOC | lab on a chip |
| LOD | limit of detection |
| LOQ | limit of quantitation |
| M | molar (mol L ⁻¹) |
| MC | mixing coil |
| MeOH | methanol |
| mg | milligram |
| min | minute |
| MIP | molecularly imprinted polymer |

| | |
|-------------------|-------------------------------------|
| mL | milliliter |
| mm | millimeter |
| MRPL | minimum required performance limit |
| MS | mass spectrometry |
| mV | millivoltage |
| n | number of measurement |
| NIP | non imprinted polymer |
| nm | nanometer |
| No. | number |
| pH | $-\log [H^+]$ |
| PMT | photomultiplier tube |
| PTFE | polytetrafluoroethylene |
| R.S.D | relative standard deviation |
| $Ru(bipy)_3^{2+}$ | tris(2,2'-bipyridyl) ruthenium (II) |
| S.D | standard deviation |
| sec | second |
| SIA | sequential injection analysis |
| SPME | solid phase micro extraction |
| TLC | thin layer chromatography |
| UV | ultraviolet |
| v/v | volume by volume |
| w/v | weight by volume |
| μg | microgram |
| μL | microliter |
| μm | micrometer |
| % | percentage |
| λ | wavelength |
| σ | standard deviation |