

Analysis of the Nonpolar Extractables of *Asclepias speciosa*¹

R.P. ADAMS^{a,2}, M.F. BALANDRIN^a, L. HOGGE^b, W. CRAIG^c and S. PRICE^d

^aPlant Resources Institute, University Research Park, 360 Wakara Way, Salt Lake City, UT 84108, ^bPrairie Regional Laboratory, National Research Council of Canada, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Canada, ^cSaskatchewan Research Council, 30 Campus Drive, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Canada, ^dThe Standard Oil Company of Ohio (SOHIO), 3092 Broadway Ave., Cleveland, OH 44115

ABSTRACT

Asclepias speciosa is currently being evaluated as a potential hydrocarbon-producing crop. Chemical analyses of the nonpolar extractables of the above ground parts of this plant showed that pentacyclic triterpenoids and sterols account for over 90% of the refined hexane extract. In addition, low molecular weight natural rubber (*cis*-1,4-polyisoprene), of potential use as an elastomer, was obtained from the crude hexane extract.

INTRODUCTION

There is considerable interest in latex-producing plants as renewable sources of chemical feedstocks (1–11). Many species in the milkweed family (Asclepiadaceae) are known to produce copious amounts of latex, and there has recently been increasing interest in the nonpolar constituents of these latex-bearing plants as potential new industrial raw materials (1–3, 6, 7, 11–14). Plants in the milkweed genera *Calotropis* (7, 12–14), and *Asclepias* (1–3, 6, 7, 11) have been identified as candidates for domestication as hydrocarbon-producing crops and are currently under investigation by various groups throughout the world.

Asclepias syriaca L. (the common milkweed) has recently been evaluated by Buchanan and coworkers as a potential hydrocarbon-producing crop for the central and eastern USA (1–3, 6). We are currently evaluating a closely related species, *A. speciosa* Torr. (the showy milkweed), as a potential source of chemical feedstocks to be grown on western semiarid lands. We have undertaken detailed analyses of sequential hexane and methanol extracts of *A. speciosa* by means of thin layer chromatography (TLC), glass capillary gas liquid chromatography (GLC) and gas chromatography-mass spectrometry (GC-MS) (electron impact [EI] and chemical ionization [CI]), high pressure liquid chromatography (HPLC) and gel permeation chromatography (GPC). In this report, we present the results of our investigation of the hexane extractables of *A. speciosa*. Although Buchanan and coworkers succeeded in fractionating the nonpolar extractables of *A. syriaca* into general lipid classes and in obtaining semiquantitative data based on TLC scanning densitometry (3, 6), the present work on *A. speciosa* constitutes the first detailed report on the composition of the nonpolar extractables from an *Asclepias* species seriously being considered for domestication and large-scale cultivation.

EXPERIMENTAL PROCEDURES

Extraction of Plant Material

Aerial parts of *A. speciosa* in full flower were collected on July 2, 1981 from both cultivated plots and wild stands near Salt Lake City, Utah. The plants were oven-dried at 70 C, ground in a Wiley Mill, and subsequently extracted

with hexane in Soxhlet extractors for 20 hr. The solvent was then removed under reduced pressure to yield dark green semisolid hexane extracts (15).

Processing and Chemical Characterization of the Hexane Extracts

Pigments were removed from the crude hexane extracts by decolorizing with activated charcoal according to the procedure of Buchanan and coworkers (3), and natural rubber (*cis*-1,4-polyisoprene) was precipitated by the addition of acetone followed by centrifugation. Removal of the solvent in vacuo afforded yellow-orange hard waxes. These decolorized, rubber-free hexane extracts were then subjected to analysis by TLC, glass capillary GLC and GC-MS.

Analytical and preparative TLC were performed on 20 × 20 cm prescored silica gel GHLF plates (Analtech, Inc.; 0.25 mm) using hexane/ethyl ether/acetic acid (80:20:1) (3, 6) and methylene chloride/methanol/acetic acid (90:10:1) as solvent systems. Visualization for analytical TLC was accomplished under long- and shortwave UV light, followed by spraying with 50% aqueous H₂SO₄ and oven-heating at 120 C for 15 min. For preparative TLC, visualization using aqueous acid and heat was performed only on 5 × 20 cm sections of the TLC plates which were separated following development. Kedde reagent (16) was used for the specific detection of cardiac glycosides by TLC.

GLC analyses were performed with a Varian 1800 gas chromatograph equipped with a flame ionization detector (350 C) using a J & W DB-1 fused quartz capillary column (30 m × 0.32 mm id) with nitrogen as the carrier gas (18 cm/sec). All GLC analyses were performed in the split mode (25:1 split ratio) with the injector temperature at 275 C. The oven temperature was programmed from 120 to 350 C at 4 C/min, and peak areas were calculated using a Columbia Scientific Industries Supergrator-2 electronic digital integrator. All samples subjected to GLC and GC-MS analysis were dissolved in Tri-Sil 'Z' (Pierce Chemical Co.) to ensure complete silylation of all free hydroxyl and carboxyl groups.

GC-MS analyses were performed with a Finnigan Model 4000 Quadrupole Gas Chromatograph-Mass Spectrometer, taking mass spectral scans from mass 40 to mass 995 every 2 sec. Chromatographic separations were achieved using a fused silica capillary column (30 m × 0.25 mm id) coated with OV-101. All MS analyses were made in the splitless mode using He as carrier gas (40 cm/sec). The column temperature was ballistically heated from 50 to 120 C and then programmed to 300 C at 4 C/min. Compounds were identified by both EI (electron impact) and CI (chemical ionization) mass spectrometry (using methane as the ionizing gas) and by their order of elution and relative GLC retention times (17–24). The identities of all of the major components and several of the minor ones were confirmed by co-chromatography (TLC, GLC) using authentic standards (Table II).

60 MHz proton NMR spectra of the acetone-precipitated rubber were obtained on a Varian EM-360 NMR spectrom-

¹Presented in part at the 23rd Annual Meeting of the American Society of Pharmacognosy, University of Pittsburgh, PA, 1982.

²Present address: Dept. of Botany, University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX 78712.

TABLE I

Analysis of the Major Fractions of the Hexane Extract of *A. speciosa*

Extract/compound class	% of the hexane extract	% of plant ^a
Total crude hexane extract	—	3.8
Pigments ^b	11.6 ± 1.3	0.4
Natural rubber ^{c,d}	2.2 ± 0.8	0.1
Remaining hexane extractables (refined hexane extract) ^e	86.3 ± 2.4	3.3

^aAerial parts; calculated on a dry weight basis (typical values).^bDetermined by recovery after decolorization of the hexane extract with activated charcoal.^cObtained by precipitation with acetone followed by centrifugation.^dWeight average molecular weight, $M_w = 52,000$; number average molecular weight, $M_n = 32,000$; polydispersity, $M_w/M_n = 1.63$.^eAfter removal of pigments and natural rubber.

TABLE II

Analysis of the Refined Hexane Extract (minus pigments and natural rubber) of *A. speciosa* by TLC, GLC, and GC-MS

Compound	R_f^a		RR_t^b	%
	A	B		
Palmitoleic acid ^d	—	—	0.52	tr ^c
Palmitic acid ^d	—	—	0.54	tr
Linolenic acid methyl ester	—	—	0.63	tr
Margaric (heptadecanoic) acid ^d	—	—	0.64	tr
Phytol ^d	—	—	0.64	tr
Linolenic acid ^d	—	—	0.65	1
Stearic acid ^d	—	—	0.67	tr
Glycerol-1-mono-palmitate ^d	—	—	0.90	tr
C ₂₇ H ₅₆ alkane (heptacosane)	—	—	0.95	tr
Glycerol-2-mono-linolenate ^d	—	—	0.99	tr
Squalene (C ₃₀ H ₅₀)	0.89	0.92	1.00	tr
C ₂₉ H ₆₀ alkane (nonacosane)	—	—	1.05	1
C ₃₀ H ₆₂ alkane (triacontane)	—	—	1.09	tr
C ₃₁ H ₆₄ alkane (hentriacontane)	—	—	1.14	1
24-Methylene cholesterol ^d	—	—	1.18	tr
Campesterol ^d	—	—	1.19	1
Stigmasterol ^d	0.17	—	1.21	1
β -Sitosterol ^d	0.17	0.79	1.23	2
β -Amyrin ^d	0.28	0.83	1.23	1
Δ^5 -Avenasterol ^d	—	—	1.23	tr
α -Amyrin ^d	0.28	0.83	1.24	5
Ψ -Taraxasterol ^{d,e}	—	—	1.25	2
β -Amyrin acetate	0.61	0.91	1.25	11
α -Amyrin acetate	0.61	0.91	1.27	51
Ψ -Taraxasteryl acetate ^e	—	—	1.30	1
Oleanolic acid ^d	—	—	1.31	tr
Ursolic acid ^d	—	—	1.32	tr
β -Amyrin butyrate	0.73	0.91	1.34	1
α -Amyrin butyrate	0.73	0.91	1.36	2
β -Amyrin caproate	0.75	0.91	1.43	2
α -Amyrin caproate	0.75	0.91	1.44	8
β -Amyrin palmitate	0.79	0.91	1.79	tr
α -Amyrin palmitate	0.79	0.91	1.82	2
Triglycerides	0.57	0.87	2.08	tr

^aTLC conditions: silica gel GHLF; solvent system A: hexane/ethyl ether/acetic acid (80:20:1); solvent system B: methylene chloride/methanol/acetic acid (90:10:1).^bGLC conditions: see text.^cTr (trace) < 0.5%.^dSubjected to GLC and GC-MS analysis as the corresponding trimethylsilyl derivatives.^eTentative compound identifications based on MS and RR_t data (authentic standards not available).

eter using CDCl_3 as solvent and TMS as internal standard. Rubber molecular weights were determined by gel permeation chromatography (GPC) on a Hewlett-Packard 1081 B liquid chromatograph equipped with a refractive index detector and a 3388 A integrator system. A Micro Pak TSK GMH6 column was used for GPC, with polystyrene and *cis*-polyisoprene standards, using tetrahydrofuran as solvent.

Portions of the refined hexane extracts were saponified with 0.5 N ethanolic KOH using standard procedures (25). Samples of α - and β -amyirin acetate, butyrate, caproate, and palmitate were prepared by separately esterifying the free triterpene alcohols with acetic, *n*-butyric, and *n*-hexanoic anhydrides (using pyridine as catalyst) and palmityl chloride, respectively.

Using these procedures, over 90% of the constituents of both the crude and refined hexane extracts could be identified and quantitated, and the results are summarized in Tables I and II.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The crude hexane extract of *A. speciosa* typically comprises 3.5–7% of the dry weight of the plant material. Pigments account for ca. 12% of the hexane extract, whereas low molecular weight natural rubber comprises ca. 2% of the extract (Table I). Proton NMR confirmed the rubber of *A. speciosa* to be *cis*-1,4-polyisoprene, as in *A. syriaca*, *Hevea* and guayule (1). Unfortunately, the rubber of *A. speciosa* is of too low a molecular weight and is present in too small a quantity to directly substitute for *Hevea* or guayule rubbers, although it may find use in elastomeric applications.

Only very small amounts of fatty acids, alcohols, hydrocarbons (alkanes and squalene), monoglycerides and phytosterols were found in the hexane extracts (Table II). Although triglycerides are not readily quantitated by capillary GLC methods (26), TLC with triolein as standard established that only traces of triglycerides were present in these extracts (3, 6, 27). TLC analysis also confirmed the absence of significant amounts of cardiac glycosides from the hexane extract.

The major portion of the hexane extract (ca. 86%) was found to consist of derivatives of α - and β -amyirin and related pentacyclic triterpenes. Over 60% of the decolorized, rubber-free hexane extract was found to consist of α - and β -amyirin acetates, present in a ratio of ca. 5:1. Smaller amounts of the corresponding butyrate, caproate, and palmitate esters of these triterpenes were found in roughly the same ratio of α - to β -derivatives (Table II). Overall, triterpene esters account for ca. 78% of the refined hexane extract of *A. speciosa*. Unequivocal proof of the identities of these esters was obtained by chromatographic (TLC, GLC) comparison of the *A. speciosa* extractables with the corresponding semisynthetic esters prepared following saponification.

Sterols account for ca. 5% of the refined hexane extract and pentacyclic triterpenoids account for ca. 86%. Thus, over 90% of the refined hexane extract of *A. speciosa* consists of sterols and triterpenoids.

It is noteworthy that no tetracyclic triterpenoids were found in the nonpolar extracts of *A. speciosa*. This contrasts with the hexane extractables of *Euphorbia lathyris*, another hydrocarbon-producing plant considered by some to be a candidate for domestication and cultivation (4, 8, 9, 28, 29). The nonpolar extracts of *E. lathyris* were found to contain ca. 85% of both tetracyclic and pentacyclic triterpenoids, many of which were present in esterified forms (4, 8, 9, 28, 29). However, it is interesting to note that although the detailed composition of the nonpolar extractables from *A. speciosa* and *E. lathyris* differ with respect to

specific compounds, the percentage of compound classes represented appear to be very comparable in both species.

Preliminary studies using TLC and GLC have shown that the hexane extractables of *Calotropis procera* and other milkweeds such as *A. syriaca* and *A. latifolia* are qualitatively similar to those of *A. speciosa*.

As in the case of *E. lathyris* (4, 8, 9), the chemical structures and physical properties of the nonpolar extractables of *Asclepias* species (and *Calotropis procera*) make them unsuitable for direct use as conventional fuels without additional processing via catalytic conversion. However, the refined *Asclepias* nonpolar extractables may find more direct use as higher value industrial raw materials (3, 6, 7). Such applications include uses as plasticizers, as processing aids for rubber and in coatings and polish formulations (3, 6, 7). In view of these higher value applications, *Asclepias* species appear to be worthy of further crop development. In addition, advances in extraction and processing technology, and improved yields and agronomic characteristics obtained through selection and breeding, may make *Asclepias* species even more attractive as crops in the future.

Although we have already identified the main constituents of the methanol extracts of *A. speciosa* to be *myo*-inositol and sucrose (30), work is continuing to identify and quantitate other polar constituents of toxicological and/or economic importance, such as the cardiac glycosides known to occur in milkweeds (31–33). The extraction and processing of these polar constituents may yield products which will give added value to *A. speciosa* as a crop. In addition, economical detoxification of the bagasse (marc or residue) so that it can be used as an animal feed is an important consideration for the commercial development of *A. speciosa*, and work is likewise continuing in this area.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

G. A. Stone and B. Van Wagenen provided technical assistance. The helpful cooperation of the staffs of the NRC Laboratories in Canada and the SOHIO Research Center (Cleveland, OH) is acknowledged. Linda Swofford, SOHIO Research Center, provided the *cis*-polyisoprene standards and many helpful discussions.

This work was supported through research grants from the US Department of Energy (Contract No. DE-AC03-81CS84009), the Standard Oil Company of Ohio (SOHIO), and Agricultural Canada-CSP Foods Ltd. (Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, Canada).

REFERENCES

- Buchanan, R.A., I.M. Cull, F.H. Otey and C.R. Russell, *Econ. Bot.* 32:131 (1978).
- Buchanan, R.A., I.M. Cull, F.H. Otey and C.R. Russell, *Ibid.* 32:146 (1978).
- Buchanan, R.A., F.H. Otey, C.R. Russell and I.M. Cull, *JAOCS* 55:657 (1978).
- Nemethy, E.K., J.W. Otvos and M. Calvin, *JAOCS* 56:957 (1979).
- Wang, S.C., and J.B. Huffman, *Econ. Bot.* 35:369 (1981).
- Buchanan, R.A., F.H. Otey and M.O. Bagby, *Rec. Adv. Phytochem.* 14:1 (1980).
- Williams, L.R., J. Casali and V. Home, *Chem. Australia* 48:344 (1981).
- Nemethy, E.K., J.W. Otvos and M. Calvin, *Pure Appl. Chem.* 53:1101 (1981).
- Calvin, M., E.K. Nemethy, K. Redenbaugh and J.W. Otvos, *Experientia* 38:18 (1982).
- Princen, L.H., *Econ. Bot.* 36:302 (1982).
- McLaughlin, S.P., and J.J. Hoffmann, *Ibid.* 36:323 (1982).
- Erdman, M.D., and B.A. Erdman, *Ibid.* 35:467 (1981).
- Aronson, J.A., and M. Zur, *Arid Lands Newsletter* 16:10 (May, 1982).
- Peoples, T.R., and C. W. Lee, *Biomass* 2:153 (1982).
- Adams, R.P., and J.D. McChesney, *Econ. Bot.* 37 (in press).
- Krebs, K.G., D. Heusser and H. Wimmer, in *Thin-Layer Chromatography, A Laboratory Handbook*, edited by F. Stahl, 2nd edn., Springer-Verlag, Heidelberg and New York, 1969, p. 870.

17. Djerassi, C., H. Budzikiewicz and J.M. Wilson, *Tetrahedron Lett.* 7:263 (1962).
18. Budzikiewicz, H., J.M. Wilson and C. Djerassi, *J. Am. Chem. Soc.* 85:3688 (1963).
19. Knights, B.A., *J. Gas Chromatogr.* 5:273 (1967).
20. Knights, B.A., and W. Laurie, *Phytochemistry* 6:407 (1967).
21. Patterson, G.W., *Anal. Chem.* 43:1165 (1971).
22. Wilkomirski, B., and Z. Kasprzyk, *J. Chromatogr.* 103:376 (1975).
23. Homberg, E., *Ibid.* 139:77 (1977).
24. Kornfeldt, A., and L. B. Croon, *Lipids* 16:306 (1981).
25. IUPAC, *Standard Methods for the Analysis of Oils, Fats, and Derivatives*, 6th edn., Pergamon Press, New York, 1979.
26. Grob, K. Jr., *J. Chromatogr.* 205:289 (1981).
27. Privett, O.S., K.A. Dougherty and W.L. Erdahl, in *Quantitative Thin Layer Chromatography*, edited by J.C. Touchstone, John Wiley & Sons, New York, 1973, p. 57.
28. Nielson, P.E., H. Nishimura, J.W. Otvos and M. Calvin, *Science* 198:942 (1977).
29. Nielsen, P.E., H. Nishimura, Y. Liang and M. Calvin, *Phytochemistry* 18:103 (1979).
30. Adams, R.P., M.F. Balandrin and J.R. Martineau, *Dept. of Energy Report (DE-AC03-81CS84009)*, October, 1982.
31. Roeske, C.N., J.N. Seiber, L.P. Brower and C.M. Moffitt, *Rec. Adv. Phytochem.* 10:93 (1976).
32. Benson, J.M., J.N. Seiber, C.V. Bagley, R.F. Keeler, A.E. Johnson and S. Young, *Toxicon* 17:155 (1979).
33. Seiber, J.N., C.J. Nelson, and S.M. Lee, *Phytochemistry* 21:2343 (1982).

[Received December 3, 1982]
