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#### Abstract

Since the pioneering works of Kaliszan (R. Kaliszan, Quantitative StructureChromatographic Retention Relationships, Wiley, New York, 1987. and R. Kaliszan, Structure and Retention in Chromatography. A Chemometric Approach, Harwood Academic, Amsterdam, 1997) no comprehensive summary is available in the field. Present review covers the period 1996 - August 2006. The sources are grouped according to the special properties of kinds of chromatography: Quantitative structure - retention relationship in gas chromatography, in planar chromatography, in column liquid chromatography, in micellar liquid chromatography, affinity chromatography and quantitative structure enantioselective retention relationships. General tendencies, misleading practice and conclusions, validation of the models, suggestions for future works are summarized for each sub-field. Some straightforward applications are emphasized but standard ones. The sources are gathered in tables and the model compounds, descriptors, predicted retention data, modeling methods and indicators of their performance, validation of models, and stationary phases are collected in the tables. Some important conclusions are: Not all physicochemical descriptors correlate the retention data strongly; the heat of formation is not related to the chromatographic retention. It is not appropriate to give the errors of Kovats indices in percentages. The apparently low values (1-3 \%) can disorient the reviewers and readers. Contemporary mean interlaboratory reproducibility of Kovats indices are about 5-10 i.u. for standard non-polar phases and 10-25 i.u. for standard polar phases. The predictive performance of QSRR models deteriorates as the polarity of GC stationary phase increases. The correlation coefficient alone is not a particularly good indicator for the model performance. Residuals are more useful than plots of measured and calculated values. There is no need to give the retention data in a form of an equation if the numbers of compounds are small. The domain of model applicability of models should be given in all cases.
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## 1. Introduction

Quantitative structure-retention relationships, QSRRs, represent a powerful tool in chromatography. What are QSRRs? The terminology is still used confusedly. Firstly 'R' may mean 'reactivity' and not retention; secondly Quantitative structure-property relationships (QSPRs) or Quantitative structure-activity relationships (QSAR) is often used instead: generally if the retention data are used as independent variables to predict properties of the molecules. Quantitative retention-activity relationship (QRAR) is also used instead of QSRR. The principal aim of QSRR is to predict retention data from the molecular structure. However, the same methodology can be used for prediction of physical properties e.g. for octanol/water partition coefficients ( $\log P$-s) from retention data. The relationships are empirical, but a firm theoretical basis can be rendered to them using linear free energy relationships (LFERs), in these special cases linear solvation energy relationships (LSERs).

QSRR is a technique for relating the variations in one (or rarely several) response variables ( $\boldsymbol{Y}$-variables) to the variations of several descriptors ( $\boldsymbol{X}$-variables), with predictive or at least explanatory purposes. $\boldsymbol{Y}$-variables are often called dependent and $\boldsymbol{X}$-variables as independent variables. One of the $\boldsymbol{Y}$ - or $\boldsymbol{X}$-variables should be related to (chromatographic) retention, the others should encode the molecular structure.

QSRRs allow the prediction of retention data of novel, not yet synthesized compounds, solely from their structural descriptors.

In many cases the precision and accuracy of the QSRR models are not sufficient for identification purposes; still the models are useful to elucidate retention mechanisms, to optimize the separation of complex mixtures or to prepare experimental designs.

One of the crucial problems is how to represent molecular structure for QSRR. Generally the descriptors encoding the molecular structure are classified as physicochemical, quantumchemical, topological, etc. descriptors. The advantage of physicochemical
descriptors is that they are generally strongly related to the retention; i.e. they correlate the retention data strongly. However, they are often not available or with relatively large errors only. The advantage of quantumchemical descriptors is that they provide insights into the mechanism of chromatographic retention on a molecular level. Their correlation is, however, weak only and their calculation is tedious and time consuming. Topological descriptors are easy to calculate with present computing facilities, but they are not necessarily related to the retention phenomena.

The second crucial problem is to select the most informative descriptors from among a large number of correlated descriptors. A lot of variable selection method has been elaborated and the proper feature selection is a key to build successful QSRR models.

Since the pioneering reviews [1,2] a lot of interesting paper appeared; new tendencies can be observed in the field. QSRR models can be used for successful classification of drugs of various compound classes and/or chromatographic columns (systems). Another interesting and increasing application of QSRRs is to test (compare) various chemometric methods. As the descriptors are highly correlated and numerous, to select the proper model building technique is not a trivial task. Moreover, many laboratories use QSRR models to demonstrate the usefulness and advantages of recently developed chemometric techniques. Similarly, QSRR models demonstrate the applicability of novel topological descriptors many times.

Although the basic book of chromatography devotes only several pages to QSRR [3], the field achieved its 'riped' phase. Figure 1 shows the steady and 'noisy' increase of papers dealing with QSRRs.

## Figure 1

The search covers the period of 1996-2006 Aug with extensive usage of 'Web of Science' and 'Scopus' data bases. The increase is not continuous; random factors also influence the number of papers dealing with structure and retention correlations.

Figure 2 illustrates the dispersion law of spreading scientific information on this special example (QSRR). The distribution is much more peaked than the normal distribution. The core journals (disseminating $50 \%$ of scientific information) can be seen from the figure 2: J . Chromatogr. A, Chromatographia, J. Liq. Chromatogr. Rel. Technol., Anal. Chim. Acta, Anal. Chem. Chemometrics Intell. Lab. Syst., J. Chem, Inf. Modeling (earlier J. Chem. Inf. Comput. Sci.).

Figure 2
The review is divided into seven parts: QSRR in Gas chromatography, Quantitative Structure Enantiomer Retention Relationships, (QSERR), QSRR in Planar Chromatography, QSRR in column liquid chromatography, QSRR in micellar chromatography, QSRR in affinity chromatography and QSRR in remaining fields.

## 2. Quantitative structure - retention relationships in gas chromatography

### 2.1 General tendencies

Alkanes, alkenes, alkylbenzenes, alcohols, ketones, aldehydes, VOCs and compounds of environmental reverence (PCBs, PCDFs, PBDEs, etc.) have been often used as model compounds (explanations for abbreviations can be found in the footnotes of tables). The Kovats retention index $(I)$ is the most popular dependent variable in QSRR studies because of its reproducibility and accuracy. Relative retention times (RRTs) are also applied many times. In some cases response factors are also predicted from molecular structure.

Best models can be built using physical properties. There is a common statement in gas chromatography that boiling point governs the retention. In fact, the volatility governs, but the vapor pressure is of exponential function of the column temperature. Hence, normal
boiling points are used as a well-defined and in many cases known quantity instead of vapor pressure. The retention index depends from the boiling points in a complicated nonlinear manner, which can be written in an exponential [4] or in a logarithmic form [5].

Multiple linear regression (MLR) is without doubt the most frequently applied technique in building QSRR models. The features and advantages of artificial neural networks (ANNs) fascinated numerous scientists. A lot of ANN study is fairly a description how to apply ANN for model building than an elaboration of a predictive model.

### 2.2 Validation of the models

Perhaps the most sensitive problem is the validation. Validation was not required in the first, exploratory phase of QSRR investigations, when the most important approach was to unravel the potential usefulness of the method. Later, the validation became crucial. As the physical background is not unambiguous, chance correlations have to be avoided. Therefore, efforts should be done to prove that the found QSRR relationships are not fortuitous but applicable for future predictions. If sufficient data are available to split the data into three sets is recommended: one is used for model selection, the second one for parameter estimation (calibration) and the third one for external validation (cross-validation is a poor alternative instead) [6].

The general practice is to split the data into training and testing sets. However, one single training set is not appropriate to make variable selection and parameter estimation (calibration) without bias. It is not (absolute) necessary to split the training set into two; resampling methods, cross-validation (CV) would also do. The cross-validation almost unbiasedly estimates the prediction error when no feature selection has been made [7], but it is heavily biased when a large amount of model selection is applied (i.e. sifting through
thousands of models). In the latter case, the indicators of the fit are deceptively overoptimistic (inflation of the cross-validated correlation coefficient) [8].

Independently from the fact, whether the training set is split into two sets or a CV has been made, the test set should be independent from the model building and parameter estimation. The process is called then as external validation [9].

An instinctive (naïve) way is to estimate the performance of a model using randomly generated variables. The same number of variables should be simulated as was calculated for prediction of retention data. The same steps should be carried out as in the real case: variable selection, parameter estimation, prediction for 'unknown' compounds. The performance indicators (correlation coefficient, prediction errors) should be compared with the same values of the real case. If the variables consisted of solely random numbers indicate approximately the same fit and prediction, the models are of little value even if physical significance can be found for its parameters.

Unfortunately, there is no agreed method how to split data set into training, calibration and test sets. Of course a lot of empirical experience was accumulated, but they are also contradictory. Some algorithms ensure that no outliers or extrapolated values are placed in the test set. However, it provides an overoptimistic performance for prediction if future samples will not be gathered according to such algorithm.

Examination of the residua is often missing from QSRR studies, i.e. nonlinear relationships are overlooked in many cases.

### 2.3 Misleading practice and conclusions

The role of temperature is sometimes described with descriptors from the molecular structure. However, the temperature dependence of retention data is determined by thermodynamic relationships and cannot be derived from structural descriptors. Similarly, the
polarity of stationary phases is related to the structure of stationary phase and not to that of solute molecules. The more polar a stationary phase the more difficult its characterization. As the polarity of stationary phase increases, the goodness of fit (the correlation) deteriorates.

The fact that ANN (or support vector machine, SVM) provides less residual error leads to the conclusion that ANN (or SVM) is better than MLR. However, less residual error can simply be the consequence of overfit. It is true; there are no accepted, correct, fair ways to compare various methods. The conclusions "Root mean square errors (RMSEs) shows the superiority of ANN over that of the MLR", or conversely "the results of MLR equation are better than the neural network ones" say not much about the power and usefulness of the methods. If the relation is nonlinear, ANN cannot be worse than MLR provided its proper usage. Even in the case of linear relationships ANN is at least as good as MLR. However, according to the principle of parsimony MLR models are recommended because of their simplicity and their physical relevance.

Considering variable selection an error is committed often in the literature. Namely, the variable selection is made linearly and then the linearly selected descriptors are used in a nonlinear model, i.e. for ANN. This is not simply an inconsequent but a malpractice. It has already been shown that it is expedient to use the same method (linear or nonlinear) for variable selection as for parameter estimation [10].

Some authors give errors in percentage for Kovats retention indices. The apparently low values (1-3\%) can disorient the reviewers and readers. The interlaboratory reproducibility for Kovats indices is about 5-10 i.u. for standard non-polar phases and 10-25 i.u. for standard polar phases i.e. $0.1-0.5 \%$ error should be achieved for a successful identification.

The domain of model applicability is rarely given for QSRR investigations though it would be essential, e.g. which boiling point range is covered, what is the retention time
domain, how far the models can be used for extrapolation, which compounds can be included and which ones should be excluded, etc.

Quantumchemical packages provide the calculations of standard heat of formation values. As a consequence many authors try to find correlations between retention and heat of formation. However, contrary to the heat of solution (heat of vaporization), the heat of formation is not related to (chromatographic) retention; at least not better than molecular mass, carbon atom numbers, chain lengths and alike. Another problem with quantumchemical packages is that they are steadily corrected and updated, reparameterized, i.e. without giving the exact version numbers the results are not reproducible.

Many authors discover fortuitous relationships again and again, e.g. slope-intercept relations or the notorious compensation effect. It is easy to prove that such a relation is a consequence of random errors unavoidably present in the measurement process. However, such a relation can be useful that a certain phenomenon belongs to the same process. Just the physical significance is questionable.

### 2.4 Suggestions for future works

Apolar or medium polar phases are recommended for further studies. Use the most persistent ones methyl- and phenylsilicones (OV-1, DB-5, etc.).

Alcohols are particularly recommended as model compounds because all major interactions can take place between alcohol molecules and molecules of the stationary phases. A possible association is concentration dependent. The alcohols participate in dispersive and polar (dipole) interactions and they exert to hydrogen bond donating and accepting abilities.

The correlation coefficient is not a particularly good indicator for the model performance. It should be emphasized that its value says nothing without the degrees of freedom ( $\mathrm{r}=0.997$ is not significant at the $5 \%$ level if $\mathrm{n}=3$ ! On the other hand $\mathrm{r}=0.300$ is significant, i.e. the
correlation is not due to random effects, if $\mathrm{n}=100$.) Therefore, phrases as 'satisfactory' or even 'excellent' correlation should be avoided. The readers should evaluate the performance and not the authors themselves.

Generally, simpler models are better according to the principle of parsimony.
Way of giving correlation equations should contain the predictive equation and indicators for the model performance ( $\mathrm{n}, \mathrm{R}, \mathrm{F}, \mathrm{S}$ ) both for training and external test sets. The indicators are n - number of solutes involved, R - multiple correlation coefficient, F - overall Fisher statistics, and S - the residual error. R and F are indeed linear indicators, but they can be calculated for the $\boldsymbol{Y}$ (measured) vs. $\boldsymbol{Y}$ (calculated) linear relationship even if the calculated $\boldsymbol{Y}$ was derived from a nonlinear model (ANN, SVM, etc.) ( $\boldsymbol{Y}$ can be any form of retention data, response factor, etc.) Residual analysis, too, is strongly recommended; residual plots are more useful than plots of measured and calculated values. If curvature, trend can be seen in the residua (against $\boldsymbol{Y}$ (calculated)) the model is not adequate. Either further, nonlinear descriptors should be involved or a nonlinear relationship.

The domain of application should be given within the models are able to predict properly (compound classes, congener series, limits, polarity of columns, etc.).

### 2.5 Summary of QSRR papers in gas chromatography

The QSRR papers in gas chromatography are gathered in table 1 covering the period of 1996-2006.

## Table 1

"Isomer cluster[ing] phenomena" have been observed for a variety of monofunctional and some multi-functional compounds, i.e. isomers containing the same carbon numbers are always located on parallel lines (different numbers of methylene groups are found on
different lines) if the Kovats indices of homologous compounds are plotted on two stationary phases of different polarity [15].

Deviations from the linear boiling point correlations indicate host-guest interactions on cyclodextrin stationary phases [24,72]; e.g. bicyclic camphene is retained behind myrcene though its boiling point is appreciably smaller.

The elution orders and coelutions of all 209 PCB congeners can be predicted using a data base and structure retention correlations and congener substitution patterns [28].

Prediction of the retention indices of any organic compounds with known boiling points became possible using a three-parameter non-linear equation:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\log I=a \log T_{\mathrm{b}}+b\left(n_{1}+\Sigma k_{\mathrm{i}} n_{\mathrm{i}}\right)+c \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\mathrm{n}_{1}$ is the serial number of homologue within corresponding series and $\mathrm{n}_{1}$ is the number of other structural fragments in the molecules. The coefficients $k_{i}$ in this equation reflect the relative alterations of molecular polarizabilities and may be estimated as ratios of refractions $k_{i}=R(D)(X) / R(D)\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right),(X$ are variable structural fragments within a group of congeners, $\left.\mathrm{R}(\mathrm{D})\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)=4.647 \mathrm{~cm}^{3} \mathrm{~mol}^{-1}\right)[5]$.

Factor analysis (FA) was performed to interpret the meaning of the descriptors included in the models [26]. Hydrocarbons were successfully classified into paraffins (P), olefins (O), naphthenes ( N ) and aromatics (A) using FA [48]. Differentiation of ketones and aldehydes has been carried out by principal component analysis (PCA) [49]. PCA, a factorial design was applied for selecting 21 representative congeners, PBDEs. The spacing of these congeners in the physicochemical domain maximizes the coverage of key factors such as molecular size and substitution pattern [94].

Using the same QSRR methodology response factors can also be predicted [39].

Theoretical prediction of gas-chromatographic retention indices could be used as an additional method for the identification of organic substances during gas-chromatographic separation [40].

The thermodynamic interpretation were given to retention time- boiling point correlations using the Trouton's rule, i.e. physical significance can be attributed to empirical QSRR equations [32]. Later the physical significance could be extended using the Trouton-Hildebrand-Everett's (THE) rule [43]. Heats of vaporization, Gibbs free energies [33] and Gibbs free energy of vaporization of one methylene group $\left(\mathrm{CH}_{2}\right)$ of $n$-alkanes [46] can be calculated from QSRR equations (boiling point correlations of retention indices). A sophisticated relationship was elaborated between retention time and carbon atom number; the related thermodynamic quantities of solvation can be calculated [41].

The semiempirical topological index can help in the elucidation of the molecular structure [47,113].

Some data sets became standards for further QSRR investigations: for apolar interactions, methyl-alkanes [59], for polar interactions, oxo compounds [49].

Partition coefficients (Kp) in a heterogeneous system consisting of two immiscible organic solvents can be successfully used for a supplementary identification parameter in qualitative GC and GC-MS analysis of organic compounds including alkyl aromatic hydrocarbons and esters, group identification of components [72].

The correlations serve as a basis for physicochemical interpretation of the topological parameters of molecules as quantities proportional to the intramolecular vibrational and rotation energies [87].

If GC-MS library search "hit list" matches the retention index of the unknown, there is a strong presumption that a correct identification can be made [119].

Quantitative prediction of normal boiling points for organic compounds using chromatographic retention times on two columns of different polarity. Only hydrocarbons on nonpolar columns gave good results with a simple linear model [126].

The only review found concerning gas chromatography was in Chinese language [146].

## 3. Quantitative structure - enantioselective retention relationships, QSERR

Enantiomer separations are difficult to predict. Present status of solution theories does not make possible an unambiguous prediction. Nevertheless, enormous amount of empirical knowledge was gathered. Commercial data bases (CHIRBASE and CHIRSOURCE) contain more than 61000 separation [3]. As large number of chiral stationary phases is available, the success rate in enantiomer separations is quite high. The efforts to rationalize chiral separation using QSRR methodology have achieved limited success only. QSERR models provide some insights into the role of various interactions, but they are not able to recognize chiral selectors for a particular separation. One of the crucial problems is the selection of suitable molecular descriptors. The other problem is that the available congener series are small, the small number of compounds involved exclude the proper validation of models. Even the elution order (whether $R$ or $S$ enantiomer elutes first) is uncertain. A QSERR can be used as an alternative method to confirm the elution order of enantiomers. The prediction of elution order can be considered as a classification study from a chemometric point of view.

### 3.1 General tendencies

Only one review is available in Chinese [172]. A common feature of QSERR investigations is that the authors attempt to use quantumchemical and 3D descriptors in linear
regression. Chiral descriptors are rarely applied. The elution order of the enantiomers can be predicted from the interaction energy calculated by molecular mechanics.

### 3.2 Misleading practice and suggestions for future works

The prediction performance of models is questionable. There is no need to give the retention data in a form of an equation, if the numbers of compounds are small. The retention data, the selectivity for enatiomeric separation ( $\alpha$ ) can be used directly for identification, for determination of absolute conformation. The conclusion that e.g. 'molecular mechanics is suitable to study chiral separation' is either trivial or not true. The small number of compounds involved in the studies cannot make proper validations feasible. Hence, validation is missing from the contributions with several exceptions.

Any model providing elution order of enantiomers has an a priori success rate of $50 \%$. Sign test and other test based on binomial distribution could show whether the predicted elution order is accidental or bear definite physiochemical relevance. As the number of compounds is generally small, careful internal validation (leave-one-out, leave-multiple-out) is recommended.

### 3.3 Summary of QSERR papers

Table 2 gathers the QSERR examinations covering the period of 1996-2006.
Table 2
One example is emphasized, where hundreds of descriptors have encoded resolution for chiral separation successfully [195].

## 4. Quantitative structure - retention relationships in planar chromatography

### 4.1 General tendencies

Wang and Zhang have summarized the developments till 1999 [1] Moreover, Cserhati and Forgacs have critically evaluated how to calculate quantitative relationships between molecular structure and retention data, and how to determine physicochemical parameters by TLC [2]. Only the sources not covered in these reviews are enumerated here.

Physicochemical parameters, topological indices, non-specific parameters, and their combinations are used generally as descriptors. QSRRs in TLC are used for prediction of retention and determination of lipophilicity (and other physicochemical constants).

As TLC is a rapid, low-cost, simple method, the best TLC systems are routinely selected for determination of the octanol/water partition coefficient and thus the lipophilicity of the molecules.

### 4.2 Misleading practice and conclusions

The prediction performance of models has not been examined. Correlations can be found frequently by chance, especially if the number of descriptors is large. As the number of substances is limited on a plate the validation of models is often missing from the contributions. The conclusions such as 'correlations can be found between lipophilicity (hydrophobicity) and retention data' are trivial or at least well-known for a long time.

### 4.3 Suggestions for future works

The plates are of limited magnitudes; hence, QSRRs can be developed for a limited number of solutes. The mobile phases can be varied more extensively than in the case of

HPLC. As the number of compounds is necessarily small careful internal validation (leave-one-out, leave-multiple-out) is recommended.

### 4.4 Summary of QSRR papers in planar chromatography

Table 3 summarizes the solutes, methods and techniques for QSRR models in TLC.

## Table 3

## 5. Quantitative structure - retention relationships in column liquid chromatography

Despite the ever increasing usage of HPLC for the separation and analysis of various compounds, drugs, metabolites, etc., the selection of chromatographic conditions is still a tedious, time-consuming procedure mainly governed by trial and error approaches. A priori knowledge of the retention time of a given solute simplifies the selection of conditions. No wonder that the mainstream is to rationalize and to predict retention data using available and interpretable descriptors.

Although linear solvation energy relationships have similarly been defined for gas and liquid chromatography data, LSER has not gained general usage in gas chromatography, but in liquid chromatography, where LSER is used to predict retention data, to predict physical properties of solutes and classify chromatographic columns. The LSER equation for liquid chromatography is as follows [221]:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\text { Solute Property }=c+e E+s S+a A+b B+v V \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

where solute property can be of any kind, e.g. $\log k^{\prime}, \log P$, etc.; E is the excess molar refraction $\left(R_{2}\right)$; S is the dipolarity/polarizability $\left(\pi_{2}{ }^{\mathrm{H}}\right)$; A is the overall hydrogen bond acidity $\left(\Sigma \alpha_{2}{ }^{H}\right)$; B is the overall hydrogen bond basicity $\left(\Sigma \beta_{2}{ }^{H}\right) ; V$ is the McGowan volume ( $V_{\mathrm{x}}$ in
$\left.\left[\mathrm{cc} \mathrm{mol}^{-3}\right]\right) ; c$ is a constant (intercept, off-set, e.g. $\log k_{\mathrm{ref}}$ ); $e, s, a, b, v$ are regression coefficients of the multilinear model. Eq. (1) has been designed to deal with transfers from one condensed phase to another. In gas chromatography instead of the McGowan volume the gas-hexadecane partition coefficient is used: $\log \left(L_{16}\right)$, which accounts for the transfers from the gas phase to a condensed phase.

LSER includes cavity formation/dispersive interactions ( $V$ ), dipolarity/polarizability interactions ( $S$ ), and hydrogen bonding interactions ( $A$ and $B$ ). The outcome of a LSER analysis is a set of regression coefficients which provide us with information about which solute-solvent interactions significantly affect the retention process. The coefficients (e, $s, a$, $b, v)$ are related to the chemical nature of the mobile and stationary phases, and their values can be determined easily. It should be mentioned that the regression coefficients are interrelated (coupled) similarly to the Abraham descriptors $(E, S, A, B, V$ or $L$ ) i.e. they do not carry independent information. Recent (unpublished) examinations on the data of ref. [221] show that two to four (on average three) independent (orthogonal) coefficient would be sufficient to represent the retention phenomenon properly (depending on the method used for determination of independent parameters). This finding has been supported by separate examinations [222].

LSER models can be applied with very large variations in chromatographic conditions. Using a relatively small set of model compounds predictions can be made well outside of the model domain. This implies that LSER models are general and indeed the LSER explanation for partitioning is generally accepted. On the other hand LSER models are typically not accurate enough for prediction purposes. LSER models contribute mainly to the general understanding of partition processes and less to optimize separations.

Linear relationships were established for a set of compounds between logarithm of retention factor $(k)$ and volume fraction of organic modifier $(\varphi)$ :

$$
\begin{equation*}
\log k=\log k_{\mathrm{w}}-S \varphi \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $S$ is the slope, and $\log k w$ is the intercept. $S$ versus $\log k w$ correlations are chemically meaningful for a non-homologous series of compounds.

The hydrophobic-subtraction model assumes that first the major contribution of hydrophobicity is subtracted from the retention in reversed-phase liquid chromatography (RP-HPLC). Such a way the remaining contributions to retention from other solute-column interactions can be established. The general formula for retention ( $k$ ) and column selectivity $(\alpha)$ is given by Snyder at al.:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\log \alpha \equiv \log k / k_{\mathrm{ref}}=\eta^{\prime} H-\sigma^{\prime} S^{*}+\beta^{\prime} A+\alpha^{\prime} B+\kappa^{\prime} C \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $k_{\text {ref }}$ - non-polar reference solute. The coefficients denote properties of the solute: $\eta$ ' hydrophobicity; $\sigma^{\prime}$ - molecular "bulkiness" or resistance to insertion of the solute into the stationary phase; $\beta^{\prime}$ - hydrogen-bond basicity; $\alpha^{\prime}$ - hydrogen-bond acidity $\kappa^{\prime}$, approximate charge (either positive or negative) on the solute molecule whereas parameters denoted by capital letters are complementary properties of columns: $H$ - hydrophobicity; $S^{*}$ - steric resistance to insertion of bulky solute molecules into the stationary phase; $A$ - column hydrogen-bond acidity, $B$ - column hydrogen-bond basicity, $C$ - column cation-exchange activity, (hence $C$ is pH dependent).

Snyder's parameters are tabulated for more than 300 columns [223]. Eq. (4) is suitable for prediction and optimization of RP-HPLC separations.

### 5.1 General tendencies

Linear solvation energy relationships (LSERs) are abundantly used for characterization of stationary phases (polymers). Another important aspect is to determine lipophilicity (hydrophobicity) parameters from retention data. The reference scale for lipophilicity (logarithm of partition coefficient denoted by $\log P$ and determined in the l-octanol-water
partition system) is accepted broadly. As the conventional determination of $\log P$ is tedious and lacks the acceptable interlaboratory reproducibility, alternative scales based on chromatographic retention have been defined to measure lipophilicity. The reversed-phase high - performance liquid chromatography, i.e the partition of a solute between a polar, aqueous mobile phase and a nonpolar stationary phase appeared to be especially suitable for lipophilicity determinations. Rational drug design have profited a lot using fast screening HPLC methods.

Fundamental relationships between chromatographic parameters are reviewed from the point of view of convenient and reliable lipophilicity measurements [298].

As theoretical basis exists to rationalize the main effects of retention many colleagues do not feel to be bounded to validate QSRR models for liquid chromatography. Since the millennium the number of validated models is increasing.

### 5.2 Misleading practice and conclusions

Statements as "the model describes the retention of ... compounds under .... conditions very well" says not much about the achievements. The description is not inevitably necessary as the retention data for these compounds under these conditions are available in tabular form. A prediction of retention data for not yet measured compounds would be a real gain. However, this should be checked and proved by cross-validation or external validation. Other valuable aims could be the rationalization of measured data and classification of column/system properties, but we should not forget that such rationalizations for the same/similar compounds are available from renowned authors abundantly. Similarly, numerous classification schemes are available, but none of them achieved general usage.

The correlation coefficients are often given without the degrees of freedom; crossvalidated correlation coefficients are also missing in many cases.

Concluding remarks as "The predicted values are in very good agreement with the experimental values" say very little about the real prediction performance, they should be avoided.

There is some ambiguity in the usage of 'test analytes' and 'test sets'. Test analytes form the training set whereas a new independent series of compound serve for testing the prediction performance. The prediction set is often called as test set in chemometrics.

The statements as "ANN predicts the retention data better than MLR method" has little relevance (see the text in gas chromatography part).

### 5.3 Suggestions for future works

The domain of model applicability is rarely given for QSRR investigations in liquid chromatography, neither. Although mobile phase concentrations are provided, which compounds can be included and which ones should be excluded from the investigations are missing.

Properly validated models should be recommended for prediction purposes. The same performance indicators (adjusted correlation coefficients, cross-validated correlation coefficients, F values, standard errors, etc) should be used for comparison.

Standardization of optimization strategies for chromatographic separation conditions would provide great benefit if using QSRR equations.

### 5.4 Summary of QSRR papers in column liquid chromatography

Table 4 summarizes the solutes, methods and techniques for QSRR models in column LC (correlation coefficients are in brackets).

Table 4

The basicity of solutes has a larger effect on the retention of the PBD-zirconia phase than of conventional bonded phases. Strong hydrogen bases and highly dipolar solutes, when compared to nonpolar ones, are less strongly retained on PBD-zirconia than on conventional phases [224].

A (good) linear correlation was obtained between the gradient retention time values and the isocratically determined $\varphi_{0}$ values for 76 structurally unrelated compounds. The constants of this linear correlation can be used to calculate chromatographic hydrophobicity index, CHI [238].

The assignment of HPLC peaks to their corresponding compounds in libraries of single compounds can be made on the basis of the correlation of the retention times with the different substituents in the variable positions of the molecule. The correlation is performed automatically by a new algorithm which is part of the computer program LIBFINDER [244].

Lipopholicity parameters, CHI and $\log k_{50}$ are moderately correlated with $\log P$ (water/octanol), and both can be used as alternative measures of lipophilicity. Analysis using the general salvation equation of Abraham shows that the solute factors that influence CHI and $\log k_{50}$ are not entirely the same as those that influence $\log P$, so that neither CHI nor $\log k_{50}$ can be used as a direct measure of $\log P$ and vice versa. However, the factors that influence CHI are qualitatively and quantitatively the same as those that influence $\log k_{50}$ [251].

Using 3D descriptors variable-reduced models resulted in considerably better predictions, although these were not as good as for those models obtained by means of classical physicalchemical descriptors [257].

QSRR investigations may reveal non-congeneric behavior of similar compounds [266], but the problem remains whether an extraordinary high lipophilicity will cause outlying biological activity or not.

Properly designed test series of analytes can be recommended for comparative studies of analytical columns. QSRRs once derived on a given column for model analytes can be used to predict the retention of other analytes of a defined structure. That in turn can facilitate the procedure of the rational optimization of chromatographic separations and can characterize modern stationary phases (systems) in an objective, quantitative manner [274].

The linear solvent strength (LSS) model + QSRR approach has been demonstrated to provide approximate, yet otherwise unattainable, a priori predictions of gradient retention of analytes based solely on their chemical formulae [302].

Solute polarity descriptor (p) is useful to transfer retention data between solvents and/or columns. The retention for any chromatographic systems (mobile phase composition) can be predicted using the five solvation descriptors (Eq. (1)), if the polarity of the column has been characterized using a small training set. Alternatively, $\log P$ and hydrogen-bond acidity data can be used for these predictions [313].

Numerous correlations of retention data with an octanol-water partition coefficient have been reported. K. Valko has reviewed lipophilicity correlations and alternative lipophilicity measures [315].

A comparison of chemometric methods based on predictive performance indicated the most important variables and that, individually, genetic algorithm selected descriptors with multiple linear regression modeling outperformed all other models [335].

## 6. Quantitative structure - retention relationships in micellar chromatography

Micellar liquid chromatography, micellar electrokinetic chromatography, micellar electrokinetic capillary chromatography, biopartitioning micellar chromatography, liposome
electrokinetic chromatography, and microemulsion electrokinetic chromatography are indexed under this heading. Although physicochemical principles of separation are different in case of electrokinetic and non-electrokinetic methods, the two types were merged here. There is no use to fragment the review further.

The separation system in micellar electrokinetic chromatography (MEKC) consists of a homogeneous distribution of charged surfactant micelles in an electrolyte solution. Provided that the velocity of the micelles in a defined direction is different to the velocity of the bulk electrolyte solution in an electric field a separation of neutral solutes is possible.

### 6.1 General tendencies

Generally correlations are searched between retention data in micellar liquid chromatoghraphy (MLC) and different measures for hydrophobicity $(\log P)$. Diverse chemical compounds, substituted benzenes, drugs, pesticides, etc. are frequently used as model compounds.

Pharmacodynamic quantities, toxicity values, bioconcentration factors can preferably be predicted with micellar chromatography. The retention often serves as independent ( $\boldsymbol{X}$ ) variable; the method sometimes called QRAR , i.e. quantitative retention- activity relationships.

### 6.2 Misleading practice and suggestions for future works

In this first phase of the research the potential of the new method is used to be revealed. Hence, chemometric methods, encoding the molecular structure and cross-validation, are rarely used. After the rationalization of measured data multivarate methods will be applied with proper validation in the near future.

### 6.3 Summary of QSRR papers in micellar chromatography

Table 5 summarizes the solutes, methods and techniques for QSRR models in micellar chromatography (correlation coefficients are in brackets).

Table 5
A migration index (MI) concept, a novel scale for measuring the hydrophobicity of neutral solutes, was extended to anionic solutes. The MI values of anionic solutes correlated very well with $\log P$, whereas the RP-HPLC retention parameter ( $\log k^{\prime}$ w), which is also used as a hydrophobicity scale, correlated very little with $\log P$ for the examined anionic solutes [341].

A measure of the hydrophobic character of such amphoteric compounds (as the studied sulfonamides), could be the values of the retention coefficient determined at pH of the isoelectric point [351].

Biopartitioning micellar chromatography (BMC) based models may be a useful to screening new chemicals in the early stage of development and to select safer chemicals [356].

The retention of compounds in MLC using Brij 35 surfactant is able to describe and predict pharmacokinetic and pharmacodynamic parameters of non-steroidal antiinflammatory drugs. QRAR model is a model which can estimate the pharmacokinetic and pharmacodynamic parameters of new compounds in vitro [359].

The chromatographic retention of any molecule in BMC, independently of its family, can be adequately described by its hydrophobicity (expressed as $\log P$ ) and its anionic and cationic total molar charge [363].

## 7. Quantitative structure - retention relationships in affinity chromatography

Affinity chromatography (AC) and immobilized artificial membrane (IAM) chromatography are indexed under this heading. Affinity chromatography where biomacromolecules form the stationary phase became an important tool in rational drug design. AC models the drug-receptor interactions. Structural requirements of specific binding sites on biomacromolecules are also revealed. Protein based stationary phases can be used for enantiomer separations (c.f. QSERR, see there) as all proteins are in fact chiral, AC can be applied to elucidate the molecular mechanism of enantioseparation on natural biopolymer stationary phases, hence rational selection of chiral columns for specific analytical separations is enhanced.

Affinity chromatography plays an important role in rational drug design because the efficiency of finding new drugs is enhanced. Moreover, it can reduce the tedious experiments of in vivo screenings. Strictly speaking refs. [377,385] do not belong to artificial membrane chromatography as no biomacromolecules form the stationary phases. However, receptor binding, affinity is modeled; hence these references are also included.

### 7.1 General tendencies

AC followed by chemometric data evaluation (searching QSRRs) provides information on both the solute molecules and the macromolecules forming the stationary phases. QSRR equations derived for selected solutes (often drugs) can be interpreted in terms of structural requirements of the specific binding sites on macromolecules. Multiple linear regression of affinity-chromatographic data increases the speed of search for new drugs. Specific highperformance affinity-chromatographic separations can be optimized by rational selection of chiral columns, the characteristics of which are provided by QSRR.

The main efforts concern to find lipohilicity measures from IAM chromatography, i.e. a lot of work is devoted to relate hydrophobicity parameters $(\log P)$ and retention date on AIM phases.

### 7.2 Misleading practice and suggestions for future works

Chemometric analysis is over and over again limited to linear regression, to search correlations. Although the way of giving correlation equations is appropriate, considerably more information could be extracted if using multivariate methods.

Calculation of descriptors encoding of the molecular structure and cross-validation are rarely used. It is easy to foreseen that multivarate methods will be applied with proper validation in the near future.

### 7.3 Summary of QSRR papers in affinity chromatography

Table 6 summarizes the solutes, methods and techniques for QSRR models in affinity chromatography.

## Table 6

Detailed reviews are available abundantly [370,374-376,383,384].
A good chromatographic model of skin permeability has been determined solely by a lipophilic property, $\log k$, which was measured on an immobilized artificial membrane column [369].

Immobilized human serum albumin (HSA) could be used to estimate plasma protein binding [372].

The IAM-retention is governed by hydrophobicity factors for carboxylic compounds, followed by electronic effects due to polarizability in second place. Moreover, it can be
concluded that the ratio of polarizability and hydrophobic effects is not the same toward IAM phases and biological membranes [381].

Negatively charged compounds bind more strongly to human serum albumin than it could be expected from the lipophilicity of the ionized species at a certain pH values. Several compounds showed stronger HSA binding than could be expected solely from their lipophilicity [382].

It is possible to classify potential drug molecules on the basis of QSRR analysis of retention data. Artificial neural network models utilize structural descriptors and predict pharmacological properties. Such a way diminishing the number of biological assays in the search for new drugs becomes possible [385].

## 8. Remaining quantitative structure - (chromatographic) retention relationship studies

Mainly ion exchange systems are gathered under this heading. Other studies cannot be easily classified into the preceding groups: supercritical chromatography, fragmental approach, etc. Therefore, general tendencies, etc. have no relevance here. In ion exchange chromatography protein retention data are predicted in several cases with advanced chemometric methods e.g. with support vector machines. Whether simpler tools would do remains unknown.

Table 7 summarizes the solutes, methods and techniques for QSRR studies, which cannot easily be categorized in the former groups.

Table 7
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Standard English transliteration was applied for names, e.g. á $\rightarrow \mathrm{a}, \mathrm{n} \rightarrow \mathrm{n}$, etc.

## Captions to figures

Figure 1
Number of scientific papers dealing with QSRR within 1996-2006.


Figure 2
1916 Occurrence (frequency) of QSRR papers versus rank ordering of scientific journals within 1917 1996-2006.
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Table 1 QSRR in gas chromatography 1996-2006

| Solutes | Descriptors | Model building | Stationary phase (SP) | Validation | Source |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Linear alkylbenzene isomers with | Balaban, Wiener, | I, MLR |  | No | [11] |
| $\mathrm{C}_{10}-\mathrm{C}_{14}$ linear alkyl chains | Electrotopological state and molecular shape indices |  |  |  |  |
| 37 organosulfur compounds (vesicants) | Quantumchemical MNDO, PM3, AM1 | MLR | three | No | [12] |
| Various examples | Homomorphic factors, topochemically equivalent increments | I, Additive schemes |  | No | [13] |
| Alkyl groups | Internal molecular energies of reactants and products | $I$, increments |  |  | [14] |
| Homologous series and their branched-chain isomers (1000) | Retention data on other SPs | $I$ | Two various | 'Relative higher accuracy' | [15] |
| Congener series of substituted benzenes, benzaldehydes and acetophenones | Different set of topological parameters | I, Correspondence factor analysis CFA | Six OV (Ohio Valley) i.e. (methyl-phenylsiloxanes) |  | [16] |
| Polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs) | Physicochemical descriptors (52): ultraviolet (UV) absorption spectra, semiempirical parameters (AM1): heat of formation, dipole moments, ionization potential and the barrier of internal rotation, GC retention times | PCA |  | No | [17] |
| N,N-Dialkylhydrazones | $T_{\mathrm{b}}$, homomorphic factors, bond angle and electron density \{I(oxo) \}, volumes, van der Waals' surface. | $I$, Simple linear | HP-1, HP-5 | Visual | $\begin{aligned} & {[18,} \\ & 19] \end{aligned}$ |
| 38 isoalkanes and 24 alkenes | substantial, important, likely and | I, MLR | Squalane, | $1.6<\mathrm{SD}<9.7$ | [20] |


|  | specific parameters, (quantumchemical) |  | citroflex, carbon black |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Aromatic analytes, positional isomers of xylenes, ethyltoluenes and diethylbenzenes |  | RRT | Fused-silica with calixarene oligomers |  | [21] |
| PAHs (70) | $T_{\mathrm{b}}$, vaporization enthalpy, molecular total energy | $I$, linear, nonlinear (Etot) | Methylsilicone, Carbopack | No | [22] |
| Anabolic steroids, stimulants and narcotics | Molecular characteristics |  |  |  | [23] |
| Low-polarity solutes (9) e.g. camphene, $\alpha$-terpinene, myrcene | $T_{\text {b }}$ | RRT, linear (0.994) | Six different modified $\alpha$-, $\beta$ and $\gamma$ cyclodextrin | No | [24] |
| Cyclic alkanes, alkenes, alcohols, esters, ketones (C4-C10, O1-O2) | Topological (8), chemical (4) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { I, CP-ANN ( } 0.892 \\ & -0.928 \text { ), SOM } \end{aligned}$ | Squalane, OV-1 | Training and test set, $35<$ RMS $<43$ | [25] |
| Alkylbenzenes (150) | Topological, geometric, electronic, no physical descriptor | I, BP-ANN | Carbowax 20M | Training and test set, $\begin{aligned} & \text { RMS(MLR)=22, } \\ & \text { RMS(ANN) }=19 \end{aligned}$ | [26] |
| Compounds from Ylang-Ylang essential oil (48) | Topological, geometric, electronic | I, MLR, PCA | DB-1, DB-wax |  | [27] |
| Flavonoids (49: flavones, Flavonols, flavanones, a chalcone) | Topological, geometric, electronic | Reciprocal RRT, <br> MLR (0.975), | Apolar column | $\mathrm{SD}=0.12$ | [28] |
| Alkenes | Conformational E, no of quaternary C atoms | $\begin{aligned} & I, \text { MLR }(0.9957- \\ & 0.9987) \end{aligned}$ | Graphitized carbon black | $7<\mathrm{SD}<14$ | [29] |
| All PCB congeners (209) | Congener substitution pattern |  |  |  | [30] |
| Monoterpenes, monoterpenoids homologues and isomers | $T_{\text {b }}$ | I, biparameter linear |  | Error $<$ interlaboratory scatter | [31] |
| Allylic alcohols and unsaturated esters | Fragments increments $n-\pi$ orbital overlap of lone pairs | I, Additive schemes | Polar and nonpolar | Deviation<3.00\% | [32] |


| Alkylbenzenes (18) | $\mathrm{C}=\mathrm{C}$ bonds $T_{\mathrm{b}}$, reciprocal $T_{\mathrm{b}}$ |  |  | $0.047<$ SD $<0.42$ | [33] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Alkylbenzenes (18) | $T_{\mathrm{b}}$, reciprocal $T_{\mathrm{b}}$ | (0.9585-0.9967) | dinonylphtalate, PEG4000, <br> Bentone 34 | $0.047<S D<0.42$ | [33] |
| Alkylbenzenes (18) | $T_{\mathrm{b}}$, | I | - " | Theoretical derivation | [34] |
| Aliphatic alcohols, aldehydes, acids and amines | Ortogonalized descriptors | PCA |  | No | [35] |
| Organic compounds, homologues, congeners | $T_{\mathrm{b}}$, structural fragments, molecular polarizabilities | $I$, linearlogarithmic | Dimethylpolysiloxane | $I \sim 5 / 10$ i.u. | [5] |
| Acyclic and cyclic alkanes, alkenes, alcohols, esters, ketones and ethers (184) | Molar volume, $T_{\mathrm{b}}$ | I, BP-ANN | Not given | Cross-validation and leave-20\%-out | [36] |
| PAHs (100) | Pseudo-conjugated $\pi$-system surface ( $\mathrm{S}(\pi)$ ) and quasi-length of carbon chain ( $\mathrm{N}^{\prime}$ ) | $I$, bilinear <br> (0.9968) | SE-52 | $7.1<$ S $<10.3$ | [37] |
| PCBs | 3D WHIM, | RRT, solubility, logKow, MLR, GA | Not given | Leave-one-out, leave-multiple-out, $\mathrm{SEC}=\mathrm{SEP}=0.023$ | [38] |
| Various organic compounds | Total energy, relative effective mass and number of carbon atoms, minimum valency on H atoms, etc | $\begin{aligned} & \text { RF ( } 0.956 \text { ), MLR, } \\ & \text { BP-ANN } \end{aligned}$ |  | Two prediction sets, 5.0<SEP<7.1 | [39] |
| Acyclic, cyclic alkanes, alkenes, dienes, ketones aldehydes ethers, aromatic hydrocarbons C3-C11 O1-O2 (381) | Informational and topological structural descriptors (16) | $I$, MLR (0.987), BP-ANN (0.990), CP-ANN (0.969) | Squalene | LOO, 10 fold CV, average RMS: 19 (BP-ANN), 22.5 (MLR), 36.1 (CPANN) | [40] |
| n-Alkanes | Backbone carbon atom number | $k$, exponential |  | Theoretical derivation | [41] |
| Alkylbenzenes (18) | $\begin{aligned} & T_{\mathrm{b}}, 1 / T_{\mathrm{b}}, \mathrm{~T} / T_{\mathrm{b}},\left(T_{\mathrm{b}}-\mathrm{T}\right),\left(1-T_{\mathrm{b}} / \mathrm{T}\right), \\ & T_{\mathrm{b}} \wedge 2,\left(T_{\mathrm{b}}-\mathrm{T}\right)^{\wedge} 2,\left(1-T_{\mathrm{b}} / \mathrm{T}\right)^{\wedge 2} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & I, \text { linear } \\ & (0.9692-0.9992) \end{aligned}$ | Silicon oil 550, dinonylphtalate, | $4.3<\mathrm{SD}<47.9$ | [42] |

Alkylbenzenes (18)
Polysubstituted alkylbenzene
isomers
$T_{\mathrm{b}}$, reciprocal $T_{\mathrm{b}}$

Indices of benzene,
monsubstituted alkylbenzenes and disubstituted alkylbenzenes

Aldehydes, ketones
Alkanes (157), cis- and trans-nalkene isomers (79)

Hydrocarbons (191)
Aldehydes, ketones

Alkanes (156) oxygen-containing organic molecules (81)
Coumarins
heat of formation, maximum valu for atomic valence, the minimum value for electronic orbital population
$T_{\mathrm{b}}, \ln T_{\mathrm{b}}, T_{\mathrm{b}}{ }^{*} \ln T_{\mathrm{b}}$
Semiempirical topological index, increments

Oblique factors
$T_{\mathrm{b}}, \mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{w}}, V_{\mathrm{m}}, R_{\mathrm{m}}, \log P$, Ind,

Weighted fragments, spectral moments
Total surface area (AT), electrotopological state index, oxygen in position 1, HOMO,

## PEG4000,

Bentone 34

| RRT, exponential | Silicon oil 550, <br> (0.9455-0.9977) <br> dinonylphtalate, |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | PEG4000, |
|  | Bentone 34 |

Bentone 34
I

RRT, MLR
DB-5
SE=16.7

| $I$ I linear, (0.9976- | DB-210 | $11.5<\mathrm{SD}<12.1$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $0.99994)$ |  |  |
| $I$, linear $(0.9901)$, | Squalane | $2.35<\mathrm{SD}<26.2$ |

Cross-validation
Comparison with
prediction by
Wiener, Randic
indices
FA, varimax, promax rotations $I$, scores, PCA, MLR (0.99901)

DB-1, DB-5, SE- GC/MS
identification
SD=0.0491

| Alkylbenzenes (32) | Boiling point, molar volume, stationary phase | I, BP-ANN | Squalane, SE- 30, PEG, | Training and test sets, <br> Relative error 3\% | [52] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| isoalkanes, dialkyl sulfates, and aliphatic amines and | $T_{\mathrm{b}}, \mathrm{NC}, V_{\mathrm{m}}, R_{\mathrm{m}}$, sum of internal rotational and vibrational energies | $I$, structural fragments |  | Molecular dynamic caculations | [53] |
| Diverse chemical compounds (152) | CODESSA descriptors (296), linear selection | Retention time, RF, MLR, nonlinear models |  | Comparison with earlier results | [54] |
| Halocarbons C1-C4, hydrocarbons C4-C6 (17) | Retention time, $R_{\mathrm{m}}$ | Virial coefficients <br> Interaction <br> energies ( 0.973 , $0.982)$ | Carbopack C |  | [55] |
| Trimethylsilyl ether derivatives of natural sterols (16) | Conventional, topological, quantum-chemical (60) | $I, \mathrm{MLR}$ (>0.9880) | SE-54, SE-52 | Relative mean errors <br> $2.88 \%, 3.24 \%$. | [56] |
| Aldehydes, ketones | $T_{\mathrm{b}}, \mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{w}}, V_{\mathrm{m}}, R_{\mathrm{m}}, \log P$, Ind, | $\begin{aligned} & I, \text { scores, PLS, } \\ & (0.990-0.995) \end{aligned}$ | HP-1, HP-50, DB-210, HPInnowax | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cross-validation } \\ & 0.975<Q^{\wedge} 2<0.990 \end{aligned}$ | [57] |
| Polychlorinated biphenyl (PCB) congeners, | New QSRR descriptors for selectivity correction | Retention time | various | SDs are 'within a chromatographic peak width' | [58] |
| Methylalkanes produced by insects (178) | Mainly topological descriptors | I, MLR | DB-1 | Internal (LOO, <br> leave- $33 \%$-out) and external (30) crossvalidation, $\mathrm{SD}=4.6$ (overall) $\mathrm{SD}=4.3$ (truncated) | [59] |
| Polychlorinated dibenzofurans (PCDFs), | Substitution pattern, positions | $I, \mathrm{MLR}$ (>0.9995) | DB-5 | SD<7 i.u. | [60] |
| Alkylbenzenes (129) | molecular graph descriptors, sequential orthogonalization | I, MLR |  | calibration and prediction sets | [61] |
| Diverse sets | Abraham type solvatochromic | gas-liquid | EGAD, THPED, | Residual analysis, | [62] |


|  | parameters (6), | partition coefficient, $\mathrm{K}(\mathrm{L})$, MLR, BP-ANN, nonlinear function | Ucon 50 HB 660 DEHPA,QBES | training, prediction sets |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Alkylphenols | Wiener, hyper-Wiener, minimum and maximum eigenvalue, Ivanciuc-Balaban, and information on distance operators | I, MLR | Not given | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{S}=37-38 \text { i.u. } \\ & \text { (biparametric); } \\ & \mathrm{S}=15-19 \text { (5-4 } \\ & \text { parametric) } \end{aligned}$ | [63] |
| Alkanes (64) | Novel molecular distance-edge vector (10 elements) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { I, MLR (0.9988- } \\ & 0.9992) \end{aligned}$ |  | Cross validation RMS(training) $=$ 5.9, $\operatorname{RMS}($ test $)=$ 7.1 | [64] |
| Alkanes, alcohols and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons. | Electronegativity-distance vector (MEDV), | I, MLR |  |  | [65] |
| Amines | Topological indices Aml, Am2, Am3, gravitational index G1. | I, MLR | Phase of various polarity (3) |  | [66] |
| Saturated and monounsaturated six- carbon aldehydes, alcohols and esters | $T_{\text {b }}$ | I | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DB-5, DB- } 1701 \text {, } \\ & \text { DB-Wax } \end{aligned}$ |  | [67] |
| Hydrocarbons and derivatives containing oxygen, nitrogen and halogens | Valence connectivity indices, $1(\chi)(v)$ Wiener, W, and Balaban, J, indices | $\log \mathrm{V}(\mathrm{g}), I$, linear, non-linear (0.9597-0.99999) | Various, PDMS, PEA, PBD, TFPS15, XF1150 | No | [68] |
| Alkanes, diverse compounds | LSER | Specific retention volumes, MLR | 18 polymers | No | [69] |
| Polychlorodibenzothiophenes PCDTs (19) | Structural features | MLR | DB-5 and DB5ms |  | [70] |
| Hydrocarbons, benzene derivatives, esters, alcohols, aldehydes, ketones and heterocyclics (110) | Molecular mass, number of vibrational modes of the molecule, molecular surface area and Balaban index | RF, MLR, BPANN |  | Mean absolute error $=0.02$ | [71] |
| Diverse C10 polar solutes from | $T_{\text {b }}$ | RRT, linear | 12 modified | $\mathrm{SD}<5.5$ | [72] |

volatile oils
PAHs (unsubstituted sixmembered fused aromatic rings, 48)

Aldehydes, ketones

100 polycyclic aromatic
hydrocarbons (PAH)s
Alkylbenzenes (129)
46 alkylbenzenes them.

Hydrocarbons
Polychlorinated dibenzofurans PCDFs
Hydrocarbons (150)

Noncyclic and monocyclic terpenes (53)
(>0.990) cyclodextrin
Electronic, geometric, topological
(e.g. electron affinity, the
difference between electron affinity and ionization potential (GAP), Wiener, and connectivity indexes, volume, surface area, length-to-breadth ratio, enthalpy of formation
Quantum-chemical method PM3. I, MLR, (0.9930- OV-1, HP-50, $12<$ SD $<19$ HOMO, LUMO, polarizability, dipole moment, solvent accessible surface area
Novel molecular distance-edge vector (6 parameters)

Molecular graph descriptors (5)
Simple set of six numeric codes
McReynolds' constant of the different stationary phases, temperature
Molecular structure
Molecular distance-edge vector
Numeric structural codes

One electronic, two geometric, two topological and one physicochemical descriptors

I
0.9975 ) PCA, CA DB-210 and HP-

Innowax
$I$, linear (0.988), Comparison with to the gas
$I$, MLR
$I$, MLR, BP-ANN
Cit.A-4, SE-30
and Carbowax 20M

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { I, BP-ANN } \\ & (0.9934) \end{aligned}$ |  | Leave-10\%-out, $\mathrm{SD}=16.5$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| MLR, (>0.98) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DB-5, SE-54, } \\ & \text { OV-101 } \end{aligned}$ | Cross-validation (0.97) |
| I, MLR (0.9874 - |  | 20.2<SD<22.9 |
| 0.9901) |  | leave-one-out cross-validation |
| I, MLR, BP-ANN | Carbowax 20 M | Training and prediction (1.88\%) sets, $\mathrm{SD}=38$ |

results of molecular polarizability index
Calibration and
prediction sets

| Alkyl aromatic hydrocarbons and esters (252) | Partition coefficients ( $K_{\mathrm{p}}$ ), group identification | $I$, linear | HP-5 | Visual | [82] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 207 halogenated hydrocarbons | CODESSA descriptors: Kier-Hall connectivity index, number of $F$ atoms, gravitation index | $\begin{aligned} & I, \text { MLR ( } 0.994 \text { - } \\ & 0.993 \text { ) } \end{aligned}$ | Methylsilicone | Leave-one-out cross-validation $0.991<\mathrm{q}<0.992$ | [83] |
| 22 amines | Novel connectivity index, mQ | $\begin{aligned} & I, \text { MLR ( } 0.9734 \text { - } \\ & 0.9733) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OV-101, OV-225 } \\ & \text { and NGA } \end{aligned}$ | Modified Jackknife's test | [84] |
| Malodorous organic sulfur compounds, thiols and thioethers 373 organic compounds | Molar refractivity and connectivity index values | Second gas-solid virial coefficient I, (0.975-0.994) | Carbopack C | Visual | [85] |
| Linear, branched alcohols with hydroxyl group on a primary, secondary, or tertiary carbon atom. | Molecular connectivity indices | $I$, MLR, BP-ANN | OV series columns | Cross-validation | [86] |
| Several groups of isomeric organic compounds | Topological (Wiener and Hosoya indices) and dynamic parameters | I, MLR |  |  | [87] |
| Chlorinated alkylarenes | Molecular dynamic parameters, | $I$, additivity schemes | Nonpolar |  | [88] |
| Various | topological | Retention times, PCA | Various |  | [89] |
| Polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons PAHs (94) | Molecular distance-edge vector (VMDE) | $\begin{aligned} & I, \text { MLR ( } 0.9928 \text { - } \\ & 0.9946 \text { ) } \end{aligned}$ |  | Leave-one-out cross validation 8.15<RMS<9.35 | [90] |
| Alkanes (48), alcohols (31) | Variable connectivity index $1 \chi \mathrm{f}$ | I, MLR (0.9933) |  | SD=14.2 | [91] |
| Alkanes | Molecular distance edge vector (MDEV)-consisting of ten elements | I, Wavelet NN (0.9996) BP-ANN |  | $\mathrm{SD}=5.06$ | [92] |
| Polychlorinated dibenzo-pdioxins | Molecular descriptors: Randic index (order 3), the Kier shape index (order 3) | Retention time (0.9950) | DB-5 | $\mathrm{SD}=0.2550$. | [93] |
| Polybrominated diphenyl ethers PDBEs | Physicochemical descriptors (40) AM1 quantumchemical, molecular | RRT, PCA, PLS | Four capillary columns | $\begin{aligned} & \text { CPSil-8, HP-1701, } \\ & \text { SP-2380,SB- } \end{aligned}$ | [94] |

mechanics, heats of formation,
frontier molecular orbital energies, atomic charges, dipole moments,
$\log P$ values, and molecular surface
areas,
Organic compounds with various functional groups

Methylalkanes produced by insects (178)
Branched alkenes
polychlorinated dibenzodioxins PCDDs
13 different classes of organic compounds

Polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons PAHs (209)
Esters, alcohols, aldehydes ketones

Alkanes, alkenes, alcohols, esthers, ketones, ethers Saturated esters (98)
$T_{\mathrm{b}}, \alpha$, heat of formation, density, various indices, inertia, HOMO. Etc.
Semi-empirical topological index
Semi-empirical topological index
molecular distance edge vector (VMDE)
molecular density, Wiener number, boiling point, polarizability and square of polarizability
Molecular electronegativity-
distance vector (MEDV)
HOMO, molecular values, number
of atoms, molecular shadow area
on the xy plane,
$T_{\mathrm{b}}, V_{\mathrm{m}}$
PM3 descriptors (Hyperchem 4.0),
topological, degree of branching

Smectic
$\begin{array}{llll}\begin{array}{lll}\text { RF, MLR, BP- } \\ \text { ANN }\end{array} & \text { Not given } & \begin{array}{l}\text { Training, prediction } \\ \text { sets; residual } \\ \text { analysis }\end{array} & \text { [95] } \\ \text { I, MLR (0.99999) }\end{array}$ DB-1 $\left.\quad \begin{array}{l}\text { SD=3.20 } \\ \text { External SD=4.6 } \\ \text { I, MLR }\end{array} \begin{array}{l}\text { Squalane, 1- } \\ \text { octadecene, } \\ \text { Apiezon-L, OV- } \\ \text { 1, DB-1 }\end{array}\right)$

|  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DC-230 and DC- } \\ & 530 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Oxo compounds (54) | Semiempirical topological index | $I$, linear (0.999) | HP-1, HP-50, DB-210, HPInnowax | $\mathrm{SD}=5.0$ | [104] |
| Chlorinated phenols |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { RRT, MLR } \\ & (0.985) \end{aligned}$ | DB-5 | $\mathrm{SD}=0.0472$ | [105] |
| Polychlorinated naphthalenes (62) | Molecular electronegativity distance vector | I, MLR (0.9912), |  | RMS=31.4, leave-one-out (0.9898) RMS=33.8 | [106] |
| Alkenes | Class distance variable (information about the branch, position of the double bonds, the number of double bonds) | I, projection pursuit | Squalane | Training and prediction sets | [107] |
| 226 series of compounds |  | $\Delta I$, additivity scheme |  | theoretical | [108] |
| Polychlorinated biphenyls, PCBs (30) | Topological parameters (Balaban index and electrotopological index | RRT, RI, linear (0.78-0.99) nonlinear | PE-5MS | Relative error=2.8\%-24.4\% | [109] |
| Disulfides (50) | Semi-empirical quantum chemical (AM1) HYPERCHEM 4.0 | $\begin{aligned} & I, \text { MLR ( } 0.976- \\ & 0.995 \text { ), RBF-NN } \end{aligned}$ | Apiezon M, OV17, Triton X-305 and PEG-1000 | Training and validation sets | [110] |
| Benzene and 12 chlorobenzenes | Mosaic and bond increments | $k, I$, additivity schemes | Agilent 6850, <br> HP-5, HP-5890, <br> HP-5840, SE-30, <br> SPB-1, Wax-10 | Training (6) test (8) absolute deviation=1.7 i.u. relative errors=0.9\% 3.5\% | [111] |
| Benzene and 12 chlorobenzenes | topological indices (first-order connectivity index, Wiener's index and Balaban index) physicochemical properties (freezing point, boiling point, refraction | $\begin{aligned} & I, \text { MLR }(0.9976- \\ & 0.9998), \text { PCA } \end{aligned}$ | Various (7) |  | [112] |


|  | index, dipole moment, density, molecular mass and vapor pressure |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Aldehydes, ketones | Xu index, atom-type-based AI topological indices (fragments) | $I, \mathrm{MLR}(\mathrm{r}>0.995)$ | HP-1, HP-50, DB-210, HPInnowax | Theoretical considerations | [113] |
| Alkanes, alkenes, esters, ketones, aldehydes, and alcohols (548) | Semi-empirical topological index, IET | $I, \mathrm{MLR}(1.0000)$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Test set (182), } \\ & \mathrm{SD}=7.7 \end{aligned}$ | [114] |
| Alkoxyl silicon chlorides | molecular topological index mXY | I, |  |  | [115] |
| Alcohols (25) | hydrogen connectivity index | I, MLR |  |  | [116] |
| homologues | number of carbon atoms nC , reciprocal $T_{\mathrm{b}}$ | nonlinear |  |  | [117] |
| branched alkanes | class distance variable | projection pursuit (PP) |  |  | [118] |
| Various (20 chemical classes) | $T_{\text {b }}$ | Lee's I | Not given |  | [119] |
| Saturated alcohols | Semi-empirical topological index | $I$, linear (0.9978) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OV-1, SE-30, } \\ & \text { OV-3, OV-7, OV- } \\ & 11, \text { OV-17, OV- } \\ & 25 \end{aligned}$ | $\mathrm{SD}=9.54$ | [120] |
| Chlorinated polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons, Cl-PAHs (18) | MNDO quantumchemical: total energy, dipole moment, net atomic charge on Cl | RRT (0.9968), Clatom position | HP-5ms |  | [121] |
| Polychlorinated naphthalenes (62) | Structural parameters | $\begin{aligned} & I, \text { MLR ( } 0.9839- \\ & 0.9880) \end{aligned}$ |  | Leave-one-out cross-validation | [122] |
| Trimethyl silyl derivatives of natural phenols and sterols | Descriptors generated with the HYPERCHEM 4.0, AMPAC 6.7 and CODESSA 2.3 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { RRT, } \\ & \operatorname{MLR}(>0.99) \end{aligned}$ | SE-54 and SE-52 | Relatieve errors: $0.01 \% 0.37 \%$ | [123] |
| Aldehydes, ketones | Semi-empirical topological index, IET | $I, \mathrm{MLR}(>0.9995)$ | HP-1, HP-50, DB-210, HPInnowax | $\mathrm{SD}=5.5$ | [124] |
| n -alkanes, 1-alkenes, and 2alkenes homologous series | Hyperchem, MOPAC, | $\Delta H, R T, ~ M L R$ | DB-1 | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{S}(\Delta \mathrm{H})=161 \\ & \mathrm{cal} / \mathrm{mol} ; \text { cross- } \end{aligned}$ | [125] |


|  |  |  |  | validation |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 271 organic compounds of diverse structures | Retention data on two phases of different polarity | $\begin{aligned} & T_{\mathrm{b}}, \\ & \text { bilinear(0.9724) } \end{aligned}$ | DB1-60W, <br> DBWAX-30N | SD=16.1 K | [126] |
| $\alpha-, \beta 1-$, and $\beta 2$-agonists | Diverse connectivity and electrotopological indices | RRT, MLR, PCA, PLS | Crosslinked methylsilicone gum, | Training and prediction set | [127] |
| CNS agents (benzodiazepines, barbiturates, phenytoin) | Calculated descriptors | $\begin{aligned} & I, \text { MLR ( } 0.983- \\ & 0.988) \end{aligned}$ | DB-5, DB-17 | Leave-one-out cross validation (0.967) and external prediction set (0.954) | [128] |
| $\mathrm{O}-$, $\mathrm{N}-$, and S-heterocyclic compounds | $T_{\mathrm{b}}$, WHIM, GETAWAY, connectivity indices, 0D constitutive descriptors | $I$, MLR, PLS | Nonpolar dimethyl polysiloxane | Cross validation | [129] |
| Polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons, PAHs | $T_{\mathrm{b}}$, molecular mass and connectivity index | $I$ (Lee's scale), linear, quadratic exponential | DB-5 | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{SD}=1.9, \text { external } \\ & \mathrm{SD}=2.4 ; 3.3 \end{aligned}$ | [130] |
| Sulfides | Atomic structure parameters molecular connectivity index topological index | $I, \operatorname{MLR}(>0.97)$ | Different polarity |  | [131] |
| Mercaptans, sulfides, thiophenes (34) | Molecular descriptors (7,8) | RT, I, MLR |  | $\mathrm{S}=0.61$ and 1.63, | [132] |
| Methane, ethane, propane, chloromethane, chlorodifluoromethane, dimethyl ether, and sulfur hexafluoride, (65) | $R_{\mathrm{m}}$, connectivity index, surface area, surface energy contribution ( $\mathrm{r} 2=0.952$ ) of the 65 different $\operatorname{lnB} 2$ s values. T | Second gas-solid virial coefficient, B2s (0.9757) | Carboxen-1000 carbon molecular sieve |  | [133] |
| Polychlorinated hydroxybiphenyls (839) | Simpler structural analogues of target compounds | Additivity scheme arithmetical operations of Is | HP-5 |  | [134] |
| 149 C3-C12 volatile organic compounds | Total information index of atomic composition IAC, Wiener number, W, solvation connectivity index, | PCA, MLR for variable selection BP-ANN | DB-1 |  | [135] |

$\left.\begin{array}{llllll} & \begin{array}{l}\text { Xlsol, number of substituted } \\ \text { aromatic C(sp2), nCaR, }\end{array} & & & \\ \begin{array}{ll}\text { Ionization potential (molecules } \\ \text { and molecular ions), topological } \\ \text { indices, inertia }\end{array} & \begin{array}{l}\text { RF (ECD), MLR } \\ \text { for variable } \\ \text { selection BP- }\end{array} & \text { DB-5 } & & \begin{array}{l}\text { Training and } \\ \text { prediction sets }\end{array} \\ \text { PCBs }\end{array} \quad \begin{array}{l}\text { ANN }\end{array}\right]$

Aliphatic alcohols
Polycyclic aromatic sulfur heterocyclic compounds, PASHs 136 polychlorinated
dibenzofurans, PCDFs
Polychlorinated dibenzo-pdioxins, PCDDs .dibenzofurans, PCDFs
Methyl-substituted alkanes produced by insects

Polychlorinated dibenzofurans, PCDFs
Organic sulfur compounds

Polychlorinated dibenzofurans, PCDFs (135) PCDFs.
Nitrogen-containing polycyclic aromatic compounds, N -PACs Sulfides and mercaptans

Polycyclic aromatic
hydrocarbons, PAHs
149 volatile organic compounds (VOCs).

Semi-empirical topological index (IET),
$\mu$, Constitutional, geometric, topological, molecular walks Number and position of chlorine substitutions, quantumchemical

## I

Total number of carbons in the backbone, the number of the multiple methyl groups attached to the carbon chain, their relative positions
Molecular structure index, group modify index
Topological descriptors, temperature

Molecular hologram
Codessa descriptors (3)
Molecular polarizability effect index (MPEI), the effective topological steric effect index (ETSEI), the number of carbon (N), Wiener three-walk path (P3) $T_{\mathrm{b}}$, connectivity indices and molecular weights
Five molecular descriptors
(CODESSA )
$\left.\begin{array}{llll}\text { Linear (>0.98) } & & \begin{array}{l}\text { Cross-validation } \\ \text { leave-one-out } \\ \text { Cross-validation }\end{array} & {[147]} \\ I, \text { nonlinear } & \text { BPX5 } & \text { Cross-validation } & {[149]} \\ I,(0.993-0.998) & \text { DB-5 } & & {[150]} \\ \begin{array}{l}\text { Subcooled liquid } \\ \text { vapor pressures } \\ \text { (PL) }\end{array} & & \begin{array}{l}\text { Average relative } \\ \text { I, BP-ANN }\end{array} & \text { DB-1 }\end{array}\right][151]$

| Alkanes, organic compounds | Topological index based on distance matrix and branch vertex of the atoms | $\begin{aligned} & I, \text { MLR (0.9919 - } \\ & 0.9922) \end{aligned}$ | Squalane, SE-30 | $\mathrm{SD}=13.7,12.0$ | [159] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Polychlorinated naphthalenes PCNs | Quantumchemical (HF/6-31G* and B3LYP/6-31G* levels), relative position of chlorine substitution | $\begin{aligned} & I, \text { MLR (0.9907-} \\ & 0.9978), 0.9983 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cross-validation } \\ & (0.9885-0.9974) \\ & 0.9979 \end{aligned}$ | [160] |
| Aromatic imines | Topologic, topographic and quantum-chemical | $I$, MLR (0.987), BP-ANN (0.940) | DB-1 | external set (0.9110.985), leave-oneout (LOO) and the leave.multiple-out (LMO) | [161] |
| Organophosphates (35) | Electrotopological state index for atom types, ETSI | $I, \mathrm{MLR}$ (>0.99) |  | Calibration, validation (0.98) sets | [162] |
| Polybrominated diphenyl ethers (209) | Wiener index, Randic index, polarity parameter, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { RRT, MLR } \\ & (0.983-0.996) \end{aligned}$ | DB-1 DB-5MS, HT-5, DB-17, DB-XLB, HT-8, CP-Sil 19 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cross-validation } \\ & (0.979-0.995) \end{aligned}$ | [163] |
| Aliphatic alcohols (35) | Electrotopological state index (En) the molecule connectivity index (MCI) | $\begin{aligned} & I, \text { MLR (0.994), } \\ & \text { PLS } \end{aligned}$ |  | Leave-one-out | [164] |
| Saturated esters (90) | Lu index, distance-based atomtype DAI topological indices | I, MLR | SE-30, OV-7, <br> DC-710, OV-25, <br> XE-60, OV-225, <br> Silar-5CP | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{SD}=10-19.3 \text { i.u- } \\ & \text { (cross validated) } \end{aligned}$ | [165] |
| Aliphatic carbonyl compounds, esters and alcohols | $T_{\mathrm{b}}$, linear temperature programmed retention index | $K_{\text {fg }}$, bilinear | Carboxen/polydi methylsiloxane | No | [166] |
| PAHs | $T_{\mathrm{b}}$, molecular mass, connectivity index, Schabron molecular size | $I$ (Lee scale), BP- <br> ANN (0.9381) | SE-52, DB-5 | validation and two testing sets (0.89390.9460 ) | [167] |
| 177 methylalkanes (insects) | Molecular tightness index, MTI, | $I, \mathrm{MLR}$ (0.99999) | DB-1 | Leave-one-out | [168] |


|  | polarizability effect index, PEI, number of carbon atoms in backbone, NC, number of the 2methyl groups (N2-CH3) number of methyl groups attached to the carbon backbone (NCH3) |  |  | cross validation, external data set. $3.7>$ SD $>4.6$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fatty acid methyl esters (FAME) | Two-dimensional fatty acid retention index system, 2D-FAI | Equivalent chain lengths, ECL, MLR | BPX-70 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Test sets } \\ & 0.002<\text { RMS }<0.012 \\ & \text { ECL units } \end{aligned}$ | [169] |
| Methylene-interrupted polyunsaturated fatty acids | Chain length, number of double bonds, position of the double bond system | Retention indices as equivalent chain lengths (ECL) | Cyanopropyl column | $\begin{aligned} & \text { RMS=0.03 ECL } \\ & \text { units } \end{aligned}$ | [170] |
| Polycyclic aromatic sulfur heterocycles, PASH alkylated dibenzothiophenes | Substitution pattern | $I$ | Methylphenylsilo xane (5\% and 50\% phenyl groups): DB5ms, DB17ms | New synthesized compounds | [171] |

[^0]LMO - leave-multiple-out (internal) cross-validation
PAH - polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbon
PCA - principal component analysis
PCB - polychlorinated biphenyls
PCDF - polychlorinated dibenzofuran
PDMS - dimethylpolysiloxane
PP - projection pursuit
PPEG - poly(ethylene glycol) (Ucon 50 HB 660 ) (U50HB),
QBES - tetra-n-butylammonium N,N-(bis-2-hydroxylethyl)-2-
aminoethanesulfonate
RBF-NN - radial basis function neural network
RF - response factors
$R_{\mathrm{m}}$ - molar refraction
RR - ridge regression
RRT - relative retention time
SD - standard deviation
SE, SEC, SEP, standard error, calibration, prediction
SOM - self-organizing map, (Kohonen network)
$T_{\mathrm{b}}$ - boiling point
THPED - N,N,N',N'-tetrakis(2-hydroxypropyl) ethylenediamine
$V_{\mathrm{m}}$ - molar volume

Table 2 QSERR examinations between 1996-2006.

| Solutes | Descriptors | Model building | Stationary phase (SP) | Source |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Chiral $\alpha$-alkyl arylcarboxylic acids (28) | Hydrogen bonding ability and aromaticity | Retention data | AD-CSP | 173] |
| Mexiletine and a series of structurally related compounds | Presence or absence of secondary hydrogen-bonding group, nonempirical descriptors | Retention data, MLR | AD-CSP | [174] |
| Racemic 3-phenyl-4-(1-adamantyl)-5-X-phenyl-?2-1,2,4-oxadiazolines | Aromatic ring substituents, electronic and bulk parameters or CoMFA descriptors | MLR, CoMFA | Pirkle-type N,N'-(S.S-dinitrobenzoyl)-1(R),2(R)diaminocyclohexane | [175] |
| 12 chiral arylcarboxylic acids | Hydrophobicity and steric volume | MLR | Immobilized human serum albumin chiral stationary phase (HSA-CSP). | [176] |
| 29 aromatic acids | Charge transfer, electrostatic, lipophilic, and dipole interactions | MLR, BP-ANN | Amylosic CSP | [177] |
| Enantiomeric amides | Chirality of the amylose backbone | Elution order | Amylosic CSP | [178] |
| Homologous series of 1,4disubstituted piperazine | Carbon number of the alkyl substituent (max. C4-C5) | Nonlinear | Chiral cellulose tris(4methylbenzoate) | [179] |
| Nonlinear data set for chiral separation | Mass (m/z) | PLS, ANN | Pirkle-type CSP | [180] |
| 14 O-ethyl O-(substituted) phenyl N -isopropyl-phosphoroamidothioates | Molecular descriptors (7) significant descriptors (4) | MLR |  | [181] |
| Chiral sulphoxides | Molecular connectivity indices, similarity and holistic descriptors (3D-WHIM) | RRT, MLR | Cellulose and amylose trisphenylcarbamates coated onto 3-aminopropyl mesoporous silica | [182] |
| O-ethyl O-(substituted) phenyl N-isopropyl phosphoroamidothioate | LUMO, interaction of hydrogen bond, $\pi-\pi$ interaction, $\log P$ and | MLR | Pirkle-type CSPs, <br> Sumichiral OA4700 | [183] |
| 42 chiral arylalkylcarbinols | 2D and 3D molecular descriptors | $\log \alpha$, MLR, ANN, CoMFA | Pirkle-type CSP | [184] |


| $\alpha$-aminophosphonates | quantum chemical (LUMO) hydrophobicity. <br> Molecular parameters (4) | $k$, MLR, FA | Phenyl carbamate derivative $\beta$-cyclodextrin bonded | [185] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Diphenyl 1-(N-benzyloxycarbonyl)aminoalkanephosphonates | $\log P$, Angle, HOMO and LUMO | $k, \mathrm{MLR}, \mathrm{FA}$ |  | [186] |
| Diphenyl 1-(N-benzyloxycarbonyl)aminoalkanephosphonates | $\log P$, Angle, $\operatorname{loc} D$ and TE | MLR | Pirkle-type | [187] |
| Various drugs, phenoxy propionic acid derivatives | Molecular descriptors (4) | MLR | Riboflavin Binding Protein (RfBP) | [188] |
| Diastereomers and enantiomers | Molecular dynamics | Addition of chiral substituents | Cyclodextrin derivatives | [189] |
| Aryl- and hetaryl-carbinols (22) | 3D descriptors descriptor based on normal mode eigenvalues (EVA) | $\log \alpha$, CoMFA, CoMSIA, PLS, (0.97-0.99) validation (0.85-0.91) | (SS)-3,5- <br> dinitrobenzoylated 1,2- <br> diphenylethane-1,2diamine | [190] |
| 5-arylhydantoins (50) | 2D and 3D molecular descriptors quantum chemical | MLR | Pirkle-type | [191] |
| Organophosponates | $V_{\mathrm{m}}, M_{\mathrm{w}}, \mathrm{H}$-bond acceptor, dipole-Z | Elution order | N -(3,5-dinitrobenzoyl)-Sleucine | [192] |
| Hydroxy acids (8)amino acids (10) | Chiral topological indices | $I$ (HP-TLC) |  | [193] |
| 2-aryloxy-2-arylacetic acids (1-$3,5-16)$, thioisostere derivative (4) | Polar, charge-transfer interactions, steric effects | $k$, Elution order, enantioseparation factors $(\alpha>2)$ | Penicillin G Acylase chiral stationary phase (PGACSP) | [194] |
| 5-arylhydantoins (50) | Dragon descriptors (557) | Selectivity, resolution, PCA, PP, UVE-PLS MLR, CART | 3R,4S-Welk-O-1 | [195] |

Notations
AD-CSP - amylose tris(3,5-dimethylphenylcarbamate)
AR-CSP - amylose tris(R-phenylethyl-carbamate)
AS- CSP - amylose tris(S-phenylethylcarbamate)
ANN - artificial neural network
$\alpha$ - chiral separation factor
BP - back-propagation
CART - classification and regression trees
CoMFA - comparative molecular field analysis
CoMSIA - comparative molecular similarity indices analysis
CSP - chiral stationary phase.
FA- factor analysis
HSA-CSP - immobilized human serum albumin CSP
$k$ - retention coefficient, (capacity factor)
LOO - leave-one-out (internal) cross-validation
LUMO - energy of lowest unoccupied molecular orbital
$M_{\text {w }}$ - molecular mass
MLR - multiple linear regression

PCA - principal component analysis
PGA-CSP - Penicillin G Acylase CSP
PLS - partial least squares
PP - projection pursuit
RfBP - riboflavin binding protein
UVE-PLS - uninformative variable elimination-PLS
$V_{\mathrm{m}}$ - molar volume

Table 3 QSRR examinations in TLC between 1996-2006.

| Solutes | descriptors | model building | Method | source |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 29 antibiotics | Hydrophobicity parameters, surface areas | Weak or no correlations | Impregnated silica and alumina supports | [198] |
| Estrone, equilin, equilenin, their $17 \alpha$-diols, $17 \alpha$-estradiol, $17 \alpha$ dihydroequilin (DHEQ), 17 $\alpha$ dihydroequilenin | Dipole moments, Randic's connectivity indices, number of H atoms | PCA, NLM | TLC, RP-HPLC, capillary GC | [199] |
| 18 nonsteroidal antiinflammatory drugs | Lipophilicity and specific hydrophobic surface area | NLM | RP-TLC, methanol (acetic acid, sodium acetate, or sodium chloride) | [200] |
| 7 monotetrazolium and 9 ditetrazolium salts | Physicochemical parameters (hydrophobic, electronic, steric) | PLS, CCA | Alumina and reversedphase (RP) alumina layers using n-hexane-1-propanol and water-1-propanol | [201] |
| 15 amino acids | Ttopological indexes, physicochemical properties (15) | $R_{\text {f }}, \mathrm{MLR}$ | Silica gel layers | [202] |
| Aryloxyaminopropanol derivatives of 1,4-piperazine | Lipophilic Hansch's constants $\pi$, the number of carbon atoms in R1 substituent | $R_{\mathrm{m}}$, linear, $\beta$-adrenolytic activity vs. $\log k$ is parabolic | TLC, HPLC | [203] |
| 7 mono- and 9 ditetrazolium salts | Steric and electronic parameters | PCA, NLM | TLC, HPLC | [204] |
| Dihydroxythiobenzanilides | Hydrophobicity, antimycotic activity, lipophilicity Hansch parameter | $\log k$, limited linear | RPTLC, acetone-water methanol-water | [205] |
| 18 flavonoids | Number of hydroxyl groups | Selectivities, sequences | Silica-diluent + polar modifier | [206] |
| O-alkyl, O-(1-methylthioethylideneamino) phosphoramidates | 17 structural parameters: topologic indices, physicochemical | MLR | RPTLC, | [207] |
| 10 ginsenosides | Topologic indices, physicochemical properties, novel | MLR | Silica gel layers <br> (chloroform-ethyl acetate, | [208] |


| Homologous series of higher <br> fatty acids, their methyl esters, <br> higher alcohols <br> Estradiol derivates | parameter "E" <br> Topological indexes based on <br> adjacency matrix, distance matrix | $R_{\mathrm{M}}, \log P($ Rekker $)$ simple <br> linear | methanol-water) | [209] |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Nicotinic acid, its derivatives
Alkyl nicotinates (MN),
nicotinamide, N-methylnicotinamide
Benzimidazole and benztriazole
derivatives

2,4-Dihydroxyphenylthioamide derivatives

Measured and calculated partition $\quad R_{\mathrm{M} 0}$, coefficients, $\log P \exp , A \log P \mathrm{~s}$, IA $\log P, \mathrm{C} \log P, \log P K o w i n$, $\mathrm{x} \log P$, topological indices

Antifungal activity

## Notations

CA - cluster analysis
FA- factor analysis
HPTLC - high-pressure TLC
$k$ - retention coefficient, (capacity factor)
MLR - multiple linear regression
NLM - non-linear mapping
PAH - polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons
PC - principal components
PCA - principal component analysis
PLS - partial least squares
$R_{\mathrm{f}}$ and $R_{\mathrm{M} 0}$, PCA
$R_{\text {Mw }}$ and $\log k_{\mathrm{w}}$, linear dependence, parabolic

RP18WF254, methanolwater
paraffin oil-impregnated silica gel plates, methanolwater
RPLC, TLC, Methanolwater
$R_{\mathrm{m}}, R_{\mathrm{M}}$ - TLC retention parameter, $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{m}}=\log \left(1 / \mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{f}}-1\right)$ RPTLC - reversed phase TLC
TLC - thin layer chromatography

Table 4 QSRR examinations in column liquid chromatography between 1996-2006.

| Solutes | Descriptors | Models | Column, mobile phase | Source |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Substituted aromatic hydrocarbons | S, A, B, V | LSER | Polybutadiene (PBD)-coated zirconia | 224 |
| 25 structurally diverse solutes | E, S, A, B, V; and water accessible $V_{\mathrm{w}}, \mu$, atomic electron excess charge | LSER, $\log k^{\prime}$ | Polyethylene-coated silica (PECSiO(2)) polyethylenecoated zirconia ( PECZrO (2)), | 225 |
| Substituted benzenes | Substituent constant ( $\pi$ ) and the total solubility parameter ( $\delta \mathrm{T}$ ) | MLR, | Various columns in several different eluents | 226 |
| Quinolones | $S_{\mathrm{w}}, \mathrm{y}$-component of $\mu, \mathrm{MM}+$ and AM1 | MLR, CA of solutes | PRP-1 column and aqueous organic solvent system | 227 |
| 31 unsubstituted 3-6-ring PAHs | Moment of inertia, | CoMFA (0.973), cross- <br> validated (0.930) | Polymeric C18 reversedphase column | 228 |
| Small peptides | Sum of the hydrophobic contributions of respective amino acid residues | MLR, PLS, retention times | Ultrasphere Octyl, Ultrasphere ODS, Polymeric reversed phase PLRP-S, Nova-pak C-18 | 229 |
| 28 alkyl (1-phenylsulfonyl) cycloalkane-carboxylates | Octanol/water partition coefficients | LSER | RP-HPLC | 230 |
| Carboxamides and oxadiazoles | MM+ and AM1 descriptors for intermolecular interaction, isomeric effect and substituent effect: $S_{\mathrm{w}}, \mathrm{x}$ component of $\mu$, $\operatorname{logP}$ and $\mu$ | MLR, Bilinear, | RP-HPLC | 231 |
| LSER solutes (nitroalkanes, substituted benzenes) | LSER descriptors: E, S, A, B, V; | $\log k^{\prime}$ or $\log k(\mathrm{w})$, <br> $\log P$ (octanole or alkane) | Poly(styrene-divinylbenzene) and immobilized artificial membrane, PRP-1 | 232 |
| 25 substituted biphenyls | Solute volume (V) and hydrogen bond basicity (B) | $S, \log k_{\mathrm{w}}(>0.99)$ | C18 column, methanol/water | 233 |


| Pesticides; triazines, | MM+ and AM1 descriptors <br> solvation energy of specific <br> site of solute solvation energy <br> and polarizability, $S_{\mathrm{w}}$ | $\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}$ | RP, methanol-water <br> acetonitrile-water. | 234 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Physicochemical parameters |  |  |  |  |$\quad$| LSER, classification, |
| :--- |
| PCA, similarity analysis |, | 8 systems |
| :--- |

20 nonsteroidal anti-
inflammatory drugs
72 substituted N -benzylidene anilines

Disubstituted N-benzylidene anilines
Selected phospholipid classes
Natural phenols in olive oils

Very diverse set of 55
compounds
29 compounds were examined under conditions using automated fast gradient methods.
Homologous series
34 solutes of widely different type

Quinolones studied. At pH 3 ,
was mainly affected by two
descriptors,
2-cyano-3-methylthio-3-

Physicochemical. parameters PCA, NLM, CA
Solute polarity, Hammett's CA, CFA constants
$\mu$, Hammett's constants, $\sigma_{\mathrm{X}}, \sigma_{\mathrm{Y}} \quad \log k$,
LSER descriptors
Configurational + conformational descriptors
62 molecular descriptors:
conventional, topological, and quantum-chemical
CHI, $\log P$
$\log k_{50}$
CHI, LSER descriptors: $\mathrm{E}, \mathrm{S}, \quad \log k_{\mathrm{c}}, \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{R}}, \log P$
A, B, V

LSER descriptors
LSER descriptors

HOMO $\mu$, MM + , AM1
semiempirical
10 structural parameters

Hydrophobic selectivity and polar selectivities PCA
$\operatorname{logk}^{\prime}$
$\log k^{\prime}$, PCA, MLR

OH ), amino (-NH2), cyano (-
CN ), phenyl (-Ph), octyl (-
C8) and octadecyl (- C18) groups
RP-HPLC246
NP: heptane and threemodifiers, tetrahydrofuran,1-octanol and ethyl acetateNP-HPLC248
RP-HPLC ..... 249
RMSE 6.8\% - 2.6 \% ..... 250
ODS column and acetonitrile ..... 251
mobile phase
20 different RP-HPLC, fast ..... 252

Widely different RP-HPLC253
Nine prepacked narrow-pore ..... 254and six wide-pore RP-HPLCvarious ligands (C18, C8,
C4, CN)
PRP-1 columns, MeOH , ..... 255
THFNot given256
substituted amino-acrylates (25) Steroids

2,4-dihydroxythiobenzanilides $\varphi$
(fungicides)
58 diverse analytes
18 substituted indoles
-(1- methylthio-ethyl ideneamino) phosphoramidate 25 structurally diverse analytes

Perhydrogenated and
Perfluorinated polyoxyethylene surfactants

Iridoid glucosides
Benzene and phenol derivatives, indazol, tiophene, caffeine, etc.
2,4-dihydroxythiobenzanilides
17 chalcones

Antimicrobial hydrazides

3D field descriptors
$\varphi$
LSER descriptors, $\log P$
Molecular connectivity indices and quantum chemical descriptors
Solute-related structural
parameters
$\log P$, LSER descriptors, simple structural descriptors Length of alkyl chain, the number of oxyethylene residues, the presence of an oxygen or sulfur atom in the molecule, Molecular electrostatic potential, molecular lipophilic potential, $\log P$ calc, $V_{\mathrm{m}}$
Free rotation around $\sigma$-bonds
$\log P$, structural- and LSER
descriptors
$\log P$,
Molecular descriptors, LSER
3D-fields


RT, SOM, PL
calibration set, test set (0.65-0.89)
$\log k^{\prime}, \log k_{\mathrm{w}}$, linear,
parabolic
$\log k^{\prime}, \log k_{\mathrm{w}}$,
k'
$k^{\prime}$, FA, CA, MLR
$\log k_{\mathrm{w}}$, column
classification
$\log \mathrm{l} \log k_{\mathrm{w}}$

NP, RP
257

RP, methanol-water or258 acetonitrile-water
Inertsil ODS3, symmetry C8,259RP-HPLC, C18 column260
Not given ..... 26
18 RP-HPLC ..... 262
RP-HPLC, methanol - water ..... 263
C18, normal diol SPs ..... 264
SG-AP,Supelcosil ABZ + ..... 265
Plus Waters Symmetry-Shield(TM) RP8. C18
Symmetry(TM)266
RP-HPLC, methanol-water ..... 267
C-8, methanol-water ..... 268

| O-aryl,O-(1-methylthioethyli-dene-amino)phosphates (13) | 8 solute-related structural parameters | $k^{\prime}$, FA, MLR | RP-HPLC | 269 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 233 very different compounds | 4 structural descriptors, $\log P$ | Solute polarity parameter (p), MLR (0.977) | RP-HPLC | 270 |
| 12 ethynyl-substituted PAHs and unsubstituted counterparts | Polarizability and subpolarity, AM1; PM3 | RT (0.967-0.984) | C18, RP-HPLC, water/acetonitrile | 271 |
| 25 substances | Structural descriptors | $\log k^{\prime}$, ANN (MLP), PLS | Polyethylene-silica and polyethylene-alumina | 272 |
| 25 substances | Structural descriptors | ANN (RBF), GRNN, PCR, polynomial PLS | Polyethylene-silica and polyethylene-alumina | 273 |
| Three test series of analytes | Reduced LSER, $\log P$ | RT | RP-HPLC | 274 |
| 14 substituted benzaldehydes | Molecular connectivity indices, LSER and quantum chemical parameters | $\log k$ | C18, RP-HPLC, methanolwater | 275 |
| Alkylbenzenes, halobenzenes, xylenes, alkanes, isoalkanes | LSER, structural | $\alpha, \log k$ | C8, C18, PBB, PYE | 276 |
| 24 steroids | 3D image | Pulse-coupled neural network: PCNN, PLS | RP-HPLC, cross-validation | 277 |
| 162 drugs | Molecular similarity | $\log k$, ANN (0.992-0.996) | RP-HPLC, cross-validation | 278 |
| pyrethroid pesticides | $\log k^{\prime}$, | $\log k, \log P$ | RP-HPLC, LOO | 279 |
| 86 diverse compounds: | $\mathrm{CHI}(\mathrm{ACN}, \mathrm{MeOH})$, hydrogen bond acidity | $\log P(0.943-0.970)$ | Fast gradient RP-HPLC | 280 |
| Hydantoin derivatives | CODESSA descriptors, AM1 | Lipophilicity (S) | RP-HPLC | 281 |
|  | main structural factors, LFER descriptors |  | RP-HPLC | 282 |
| Xanthines and derivatives | Semiempirical quantumchemical | $\log k^{\prime}$, MLR | Chromolith RP-18e | 283 |
| 45 barbituric acid derivatives | $\varphi$, substituents steric parameters | $\log k$, MLR, PCA, NLM | Amide embedded RP silica column (Discovery RPAmideC16), wateracetonitrile | 284 |
| 45 barbituric acid derivatives | $\varphi,-\varphi_{0}$, conventional and | $\log k$, MLR, asymmetry | Amide embedded RP silica | 285 |

45 barbituric acid derivatives

45 barbituric acid derivatives

20 new $\alpha$-branched phenylsulfonyl acetates

18 selected amino acids, phenylthiocarbamyl (PTC) amino acid derivatives Basic compounds related to caproctamine, dibenzylaminediamide (reversible inhibitor of acetylcholinesterase)
Drugs and model compounds

67 neutral, acidic and basic solutes
Aromatic acids
Model series, 15 analytes
quantum chemical structural
$\varphi,-\varphi_{0}$, conventional and quantum chemical structural
$\varphi,-\varphi_{0}$, conventional and quantum chemical structural

Geometric and electronic descriptors, surface area (S), ovality (O), the charge of carboxyl group (Qoc), surface area
36 molecular descriptors, $\log P$, RT, GA-ANN molecular size, shape (topological indices) Hammett $\sigma$ (electronic properties of the orthosubstituents)

Lipophilicity and acidity

LSER descriptors, and variants
$\log P, \mathrm{p} K_{\mathrm{a}}$ (partial charges of atoms)
Total $\mu$, electron excess charge of the most negatively charged atom water-accessible surface area

| 54 disubstituted benzenes | 8 molecular descriptors, PM3 semiempirical | $\log k_{\mathrm{w}}, \mathrm{MLR}, \mathrm{RBF}-\mathrm{ANN}$ | RP-HPLC | 295 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 25 , mainly substituted benzenes | LSER descriptors, $S_{\text {w }}$, | $\log k_{\mathrm{w}}, \mathrm{MLR}, \mathrm{PCA}$ | 8 RP-HPLC, CE | 296 |
| PAHs | Molecular connectivity, $\mu$ | RT, bilinear, MLR, | Training, test sets, HPLC | 297 |
| Xenobiotics | Chromatographic parameters | $\log P$, PCA | RP-HPLC | 298 |
| phenols | $\mathrm{p} K_{\mathrm{a}}$, atomic partial charges by AM1 and PM3 | RT | RP-HPLC | 299 |
| 15 diverse aromatics (training) | $\log P, \mu, S_{\text {w }}$, electron excess | RT, MLR (0.8953- | Supelcosil LP18 | 300 |
| 47 diverse compounds (test) | charge on the most negatively charged atom | 0.9870) |  |  |
| 83 structurally diverse drugs | 266 descriptors, hydrophobicity ( $\log P$ and Hy ), the size (TPC) of the molecules | $\log k_{\mathrm{w}}, \mathrm{CART}$ | Unisphere PBD column isocratic elution | 301 |
| 15 diverse aromatics (training) | $\log P, \mu, S_{\mathrm{w}}$, electron excess charge on the most negatively charged atom | RT, MLR, ANN, | RP-HPLC, methanol-water | 302 |
| 233 very different compounds | 4 descriptors, $\log P$, hydrogen bond acidity | Solute polarity parameter <br> p, MLR, (0.977) | RP-HPLC, | 303 |
| Para substituted anilides of 2,2dimethylpropanoic, benzoic and $\alpha$-phenylacetic acid | Physicochemical parameters, $\mu, \varepsilon$, topological indexes $\log P$, $\log S$, hydrogen-bond acceptor indicator (HA) and molecular mass | RT, MLR | RP-18 HPLC, methanolwater | 304 |
| Test solutes | LSER descriptors | MLR | C18, C8 columns methanol, acetonitrile, and tetrahydrofuran | 305 |
| PAHs | AM1: HOMO, LUMO, GAP hardness, polarizability, atomic charges, connectivity index, volume and surface area | $T_{\mathrm{b}}, \log P, I$, PCR, PLS (0.898-0.995) | RP-HPLC | 306 |
| 18 L-amino acids | Binding energy (Eb), $\log P$, molecular refractivity (MR), | $k, \mathrm{MLR}(>0.9)$ | RP-HPLC | 307 |

$\left.\begin{array}{lllll} & \begin{array}{l}\text { polarizability }(\alpha) \text {, total energy } \\ \text { (Et), water solubility (logS), } \\ \text { connectivity index ( } \chi \text { ) of } \\ \text { different orders and Wiener } \\ \text { index (W) }\end{array} & & & \\ & \begin{array}{l}\text { As above + hydrophilic- } \\ \text { lipophilic balance (HLB), }\end{array} & k \text {, MLR } & \text { PLS, structural } & \text { Monomeric and polymeric }\end{array}\right] 309$

18 Dihalogeno
benzoylphenylureas
101 peptide
98 peptides
Series of test analytes
Steroid analogues
Triazine herbicides, metabolites

Unsaturated alkenes, phenols, acidic and basic drugs 28 alkyl(1-phenylsulfonyl) cycloalkane carboxylates
Ricobendazole and albendazole sulfone

Aromatic acid derivatives
benzoic acid derivatives
Model series of test analytes
33 purine nucleobases
Neutral and basic compounds

Antiprotozoal meso-ionic 1,3,4-thiadiazolium-3-aminides

Sum of RTs of amino acids,
$\log V_{\mathrm{w}}, \log P$
Sum of RTs of amino acids,
$\log V_{\mathrm{w}}, \log P$
$\log P, \mu, \delta, S_{\mathrm{w}}$, hydrophobic subtraction LSER model

4descriptors

Alkyl-chain length, atomic
partial charge, $\mathrm{p} K_{\mathrm{a}}$
Ab initio quantum chemical,
B3LYP/6-31G*, AM1
$\log P$

Interaction energies, $\mathrm{MM}, \mathrm{p} K_{\mathrm{a}}$
Interaction energies, $\mathrm{MM}, \mathrm{p} K_{\mathrm{a}}$
Structural parameters of stationary phases
3D field descriptors
$\log P$,

RT, MLR

RT, MLR

RT, classification
De novo mathematical model
$k$, MLR, ANN

## $k$,

$\log k$, bilinear, (0.9747, 0.9741)
$\log k_{\mathrm{w}}, \log k$, Internal standard selection by QSRR
$\log k$,
$\log k$,
Retention data

CoMFA (0.969)
validation (0.832)
$\log k_{\mathrm{w}}, \log k$,

| encapsulated zirconia, Kromasil-C18-SiO2 |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Gradient HPLC, | 321 |
| Gradient HPLC, | 322 |
| 9 representative RP-HPLC column | 323 |
| RP-HPLC, methanol, acetonitrile, tetrahydrofuran | 324 |
| Methanol - water, Spherisorb ODS2, precolumn LC 8 | 325 |
| Graphitic carbon | 326 |
| LOO | 327 |
| C-18 column, rapid HPLC | 328 |
| RP-HPLC, | 329 |
| RP-HPLC, | 330 |
| NP, RP, CE | 331 |
| C18 column | 332 |
| Supelcosil ABZ+Plus, Discovery RP Amide C16, and Zorbax Extend C18 | 333 |
| Supelcosil ABZ+ Plus column methanol-water acetonitrile-water | 334 |

83 basic drugs

16 indole derivatives
29 nitrogen containing
heterocycles

24 nitrogen-containing heterocycles

Single- and multi-ring aromatic hydrocarbons (AH)
(O) probes

1272 molecular descriptors.

Ab initio B3LYP/6-311G**
Molecular connectivity,
Wiener, Kier flexibility,
Harary, Balaban, Zagreb indices
$\alpha$, MR, $\log P, \mu$, Etot, $\Delta H f$, molecular surface area (SM), binding energy (Eb)
Substituent effect, electronic and geometric descriptors, IP, EA
CART, stochastic Unisphere PBD column ..... 335gradient boosting randomforest, GA-MLR (0.964),
UVE-PLS
$\log k, \log k_{\mathrm{w}}(0.9796), \mathrm{S}$ ..... 336
(0.9874)
$\log k$, simple linear (0.9- LC ..... 337
1.0)
$\log k$, simple linear ( 0.8 - ..... 338
$1.0)$, multilinear ( 1.000 )
RT, PLS, GA,[3-(2,4-339
dinitroanilino)]propyl-silicacolumn

EA - electron affinity
Etot total energy
$\varepsilon$ - permittivity
FA - factor analysis
$\varphi$ - volume fraction of mobile phase
GA - genetic algorithm
GRNN - generalized regression neural networks
HOMO - energy of highest occupied molecular orbital index of hydrophobicity $\varphi_{0}=-\log k_{w} / \mathrm{S}$
IP - ionization potential
IPC - ion pair chromatography
$k, k^{\prime}$ - retention coefficient, (capacity factor)
$\log k_{\mathrm{w}}$ - intercept of the plot for $\log k^{\prime}$ vs. $\varphi$ (extrapolated to mobile phase without water)
$\log P, \log k_{o / w}$ - octanol/water partition coefficient
LOO - leave-one-out cross validation
LUMO - energy of the lowest unoccupied molecular orbital
MLR - multiple linear regression
MLP - multilayer perceptron neural networks
MR - molar refraction
$\mu$-dipole moment
NLM - non-linear mapping
NP - normal phase
ODS - octadecil silica
$p$ - solute polarity parameter (eq(1))
PAH - polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons
PCA - principal component analysis
PCR - principal components regression
$\mathrm{p} K_{\mathrm{a}}$ - dissociation constant
PLS - partial least squares
RBF - radial basis function
RP - reversed phase

RT - retention time
$S$ - slope of the plot for $\log k^{\prime}$ vs. volume fraction of mobile phase ( $\varphi$ )
SOM - self-organizing map, Kohonen network
SP - stationary phase
$S_{\text {w }}$ - solvent-accessible surface area
$T_{\mathrm{b}}$ - boiling point
UVE-PLS - uninformative variable elimination-PLS
$V_{\mathrm{m}}$ - molar volume
$V_{\mathrm{w}}$ - van der Waals volume

Table 5 QSRR examinations in micellar liquid chromatography between 1996-2006.
$\left.\begin{array}{lllll}\text { Solutes } & \text { Descriptors } & \text { Models } & \begin{array}{l}\text { Column, mobile phase, } \\ \text { surfactant }\end{array} & \text { Source } \\ \begin{array}{l}\text { Congener series of steroid } \\ \text { hormones }\end{array} & \begin{array}{l}\text { Topological i.e., connectivity } \\ \text { indices, X, steric factors }\end{array} & \text { RT, linear, multilinear }\end{array} \begin{array}{l}\begin{array}{l}\text { ODS column (RP-HPLC, }) \\ \text { sodium dodecyl sulfate (SDS)- } \\ \text { borate system and with a mixed } \\ \text { micellar solution of SDS and }\end{array} \\ \text { sodium cholate }\end{array}\right\}$

|  |  | parameters |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10 amphoteric sulfonamides | $\log P$, | $\log k$ | MLC, SDS | 351 |
| 60 aromatic compounds and 9 corticosteroids | $\log P$, LSER descriptors | $\log k^{\prime}$ | MEKC, SDS, SC, LiPFOS, C14TAB | 352 |
| $16 \beta$-blocking agents | $\log P$, | $\log k$ | MLC, SDS, n-propanol (organic modifier) | 353 |
| Phenoxy acid herbicides | Migration parameters | Toxicity | MLC, MEKC, Brij35 | 354 |
| Antihistamine drugs | Hydrophobic, electronic and steric, $k$ in BMC | Pharmacokinetic parameters | BMC, Brij35 | 355 |
| 66 organic pollutants | $\log k$, structural parameters | ecotoxicity parameters, $\log P$, PCA | BMC, Cross-validation, calibration set | 356 |
| Neutral aromatic compounds, $\beta$-blockers, and other drugs | $\log P$, LSER descriptors | $\log k, K_{\mathrm{lw}}$, | LEKC, CE, liposomes are in a buffer solution (pseudostationary phase) | 357 |
| Basic pharmaceutical substances | $\mathrm{p} K_{\mathrm{a}}, \log D$ | Fast $\log P$, PCA | MLC, monolithic silica | 358 |
| Non-steroidal antiinflammatory drugs | $\log P$, IC50 (concentration required to $50 \%$ inhibition), $\mathrm{t}_{1 / 2}$ (half-life time) | $V_{\mathrm{d}}$ (volume of distribution), CL (clearance), $\log k$ | MLC, Brij 35 | 359 |
| 85 pesticides | $\log k$, | Acute toxicity pLC50 | BMC, | 360 |
| 85 pesticides | $\log k, \log P$, | BCF, logk, | BMC, | 361 |
| $10 \beta$-blockers, 7 tricyclic antidepressants (TA), 8 steroids 12 sulfonamides | $\log P, \log P_{\text {apparent }}$ | $\log k$, | RPLC acetonitrile, MLC | 362 |
| 151 structurally unrelated solutes | $\log P$, molecular size, hydrogen bonding properties, ionization degrees | $\log k$, MLR | BMC, Brij35 | 363 |
| Benzene derivatives, heterocyclic compounds | Molecular surface area, maximum value of electron density, path four connectivity index, Mw, sum of atomic | $\log k$, MLR, ANN | MEKC, Training set | 364 |

Substituted benzenes
79 heterogeneous pesticides

## Notations

ANN - artificial neural network
$\alpha$ - polarizability
$\alpha^{\prime}$ - molar total charge of compound at a given pH value
BMC - biopartitioning micellar chromatography
C14TAB - cationic surfactant
CA - cluster analysis
CART - classification and regression tree
CE capillary electrophoresis
CHI - chromatographic hydrophobicity index
CoMFA - comparative molecular field analysis
$\delta$ - electron excess charge of the most negatively charged atom
$\delta^{\prime}$ - molar fraction of the charged form of the compound
$\delta \mathrm{T}$ - total solubility parameter
EA - electron affinity
Etot total energy
$\varepsilon$ - permittivity
FA - factor analysis
$\varphi$ - volume fraction of mobile phase
GA - genetic algorithm
GRNN - generalized regression neural networks
index of hydrophobicity $\varphi_{0}=-\log k_{\mathrm{w}} / \mathrm{S}$
IPC - ion pair chromatography
$k, k^{\prime}$ - retention coefficient, (capacity factor)
$K_{\mathrm{mw}}$ - micelle-water partition coefficient
$\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{lw}}$ - liposome-water partition coefficients
$\log k$, MLR, SVM
(09755)

LiPFOS - lithium perfluorooctane sulfonate
LEKC - liposome electrokinetic chromatography
$\log k_{\mathrm{w}}$ - intercept of the plot for $\log k^{\prime}$ vs. $\varphi$ (extrapolated to mobile phase without water)
$\log P, \log k_{0 / w}$ - octanol/water partition coefficient
MLC - micellar liquid chromatography
MECC - micellar electrokinetic capillary chromatography
MEKC - micellar electrokinetic chromatography
MI - migration index, a general hydrophobicity scale
MLR - multiple linear regression
MLP - multilayer perceptron neural networks
MR - molar refraction
$\mu$ - dipole moment
NP - normal phase
ODS - octadecil silica
p - solute polarity parameter (eq(1))
PAH - polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons
PCA - principal component analysis
$\mathrm{p} K_{\mathrm{a}}$ - dissociation constant
PLS - partial least squares
RP - reversed phase
RT - retention time
$S$ - slope of the plot for $\log k^{\prime}$ vs. volume fraction of mobile phase ( $\varphi$ )
SC - sodium cholate
SDS - sodium dodecyl sulfate

Table 6 QSRR examinations in affinity chromatography between 1996-2006.

| Solutes | Descriptors | Models | Column, protein | Source |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Antihistamine drugs | $\log k$ (IAM), electron excess charge on thealiphatic N | $\log k$ ( AGP) | $\alpha 1$-acid glycoprotein (AGP), IAM | 367 |
| 56 acidic, basic and neutral drugs | $\log k($ IAM $), \log P$, ionization of acidic groups | Brain/blood concentration, | Commercial IAM.PC.DD | 368 |
| Xenobiotics | $M_{\text {w }}, \mu, \log P, \log k($ IAM $)$ | $\log k$ (keratin), $\log K_{\mathrm{p}}$ | IAM, physical immobilization of keratin on silica support | 369 |
| Test series of drug analytes | $\log P$, structural descriptors from molecular modeling | Drug-macromolecule binding | AGP, keratin, collagen, melanin, | 370 |
| 24 test analytes | $\log P$, LSER descriptors | $\log k, \log k_{\mathrm{w}}$, MLR | Immobilized cholesterol on spherical silica gel, RP-HPLC, C18, IAM | 371 |
| 40 structurally unrelated drug | Percentage of binding | Retention | Immobilized human serum albumin (HSA) | 372 |
| Set of standards | LSER descriptors | $\begin{aligned} & \log k(\mathrm{IAM}), \mathrm{CHI}, \\ & \text { CHI(IAM) } \end{aligned}$ | Fast gradient, IAM | 373 |
| drugs | $\log P, \log k$, | $\log k(\ldots)$, | HPLC, CE, biomacromolecules | 374 |
| Drugs, standards | QSRR descriptors | Retention | Macromolecules as SP | 375 |
| Appropriately designed sets | $\log k$ ( AGP ), $\log k_{\mathrm{w}}$ | $\log K_{\mathrm{p}}, \log k(\mathrm{KER}, \mathrm{COLL}$, <br> MEL, etc.) | HAS, AGP, keratin, collagen, melanin, amylose tris (3,5dimethylphenylcarbamate) basic fatty acid binding protein | 376 |
| Series of analytes, 65 new buspirones |  | Diverse and mutually interrelated retention parameters, PCA | 9 carefully designed HPLC systems, <br> 5-HT1A serotonin receptors | 377 |
|  | $\log P$, molecular structural parameters | $\log k$ | C18, C8, IAM, AGP, PBCA, PGC | 378 |
| Antihelmintic 6,7-diarylpteridine derivatives | $\log P, \log k($ IAM $)$, | $\log k$ (IAM), IC50 | ODS, IAM.PC.DD2 | 379 |
| 11 arylpropionic acid derivatives | $\log P, \log D$ | $\log k_{\mathrm{w}}(\mathrm{IAM}), \log k_{\mathrm{w}}$ (ODS) | ODS, IAM.PC.MG | 380 |


| 32 structurally diverse drugs | $\log P, \log D, \log P$ app | $\log k$ (IAM), MLR, PLS | Phospholipids, IAM | 381 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 68 drug molecules. | CHI (IAM), $\log P$, LSER, | $\log K($ HAS $)$ | Fast gradient HPLC, HSA | 382 |
| Long fatty acids | $\log P$, total lipole | $\log k$, | Immobilized liver basic FABP | 383 |
|  |  |  | "Embedded" phases: aminopropylated silica gel, e.g. phospholipids and cholesterol, IAM's | 384 |
| Azapirone derivatives | Molecular structural | Retention parameters, BP-ANN | Rat brain serotonin 5-HT1A receptors, 14 HPLC systems | 385 |

## Notations

BP-ANN - back propagation artificial neural network
C18 - bonded octadecil silica
C8 - bonded octyl silica
CHI - chromatographic hydrophobicity index
$\varphi$ - volume fraction of mobile phase
FABP - fatty acid binding protein
HSA - human serum albumin
index of hydrophobicity $\varphi_{0}=-\log k_{w} / S$
IAM - immobilized artificial membrane
$k, k^{\prime}$ - retention coefficient, (capacity factor)
$K_{\mathrm{p}}$ - human skin permeation coefficient
$\log D-\log P$ for ionisable compounds
$\log k_{\mathrm{w}}$ - intercept of the plot for $\log k^{\prime}$ vs. $\varphi$ (extrapolated to mobile phase without water)
$\log P, \log k_{o / w}$ - octanol/water partition coefficient
$\log P$ app - apparent $\log P$
LSER - linear solvation energy relationships
MLR - multiple linear regression
$\mu$ - dipole moment
NP - normal phase
ODS - octadecil silica, C18
PCA - principal component analysis
$\mathrm{p} K_{\mathrm{a}}$ - dissociation constant
PBCA - polybutadiene-coated alumina
PGC - porous graphitic carbon
RP - reversed phase
$S$ - slope of the plot for $\log k^{\prime}$ vs. volume fraction of mobile phase ( $\varphi$ )

Table 7 remaining QSRR examinations between 1996-2006.

| Solutes | descriptors | models | Column, method | Source |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Series of sulfonamides |  | Electrophoretic mobility, <br> MLR, BP-ANN | CZE, cross-validation | 386 |
| 20 beta-diketones | 6 descriptors | I, MLR, polynoms |  | 387 |
| Proteins | Descriptors, from protein structure | RT (0.969-0.952) | Ion exchange systems, cross and external validation | 388 |
| Probe molecules | Traditional and novel molecular property descriptors | GA, PLS | Ion-exchange chromatography (IEC) | 389 |
| 19 solutes (Ala, Gly, Lys, Phe, homopeptides) | $\log P$ and specific hydrophobic surface area | PCA, NLM | TLC, impregnated alumina layers | 390 |
| o-Acetylphenyl esters | Topological | RT | Not given | 391 |
| 1-bromo-2-aryiloxyetanes and 3- aryloxypropiononitrile derivatives | 5 quantumchemical | RT, polynoms | Not given | 392 |
|  | Set of fragmental descriptors | $I, T_{\mathrm{b}}$ | GC | 393 |
| Proteins | Topological, subdivided surface area, TAE, electron-densitybased descriptors | RT, SVM | Anion exchange chromatography, training and validation sets | 394 |
| Proteins | Molecular descriptors | RT, SVM (0.943-0.994) cross-validated | Anion exchange chromatography salt-in | 395 |
| Proteins |  | RT, SVM (0.919-0.980) | Cation-exchange systems, counterions, | 396 |
|  | Number of single bonds, of double bonds, hydrophilic factor | Retention factors, BP- <br> ANN, MLR | Supercritical fluid chromatography, crossvalidation | 397 |
| Basic compounds (drugs) | Molecular interaction energies | Elution order | Ion-exchange chromatography | 398 |
| Proteins, human lactoferrin | New protein descriptors, ASP 1 | RT | Ion-exchange chromatography | 399 |
| Set of model proteins | New hydrophobicity descriptors, | RT, SVM | Hydrophobic interaction | 400 |

Notations

ASP - average surface potential
BP-ANN - back propagation artificial neural network
CHI - chromatographic hydrophobicity index
CZE - capillary zone electrophoresis
FABP - fatty acid binding protein
GA - genetic algorithm
HSA - human serum albumin
$I$ - Kovats retention index
IAM - immobilized artificial membrane
IEC - ion-exchange chromatography

LSER - linear solvation energy relationships
MLR - multiple linear regression
NLM - nonlinear mapping
ODS - octadecil silica, C18
PCA - Principal Component Analysis
PLS - partial least squares
RT - retention time
SFC - supercritical fluid chromatography
SVM - support vector machines
$S_{\mathrm{w}}$ - solvent accessible surface area
TAE - transferable atom equivalent


[^0]:    Notations
    ANN - artificial neural network
    $\alpha$ - polarizability
    BP - back-propagation
    CFA - correspondence factor analysis
    CP - counter-propagation
    DB-1-100\% dimethylpolysiloxane
    DB-5 - 5\% diphenyl and 95\% dimethylpolysiloxane
    DB-210 - trifluoropropylmethyl polysiloxane
    DB-wax - polyethyleneglycol
    DEHPA - di(2-ethylhexyl)phosphoric acid
    EGAD - polyethylene glycol adipate,
    ECL - eqivalent chain length
    FA - factor analysis
    GA - genetic algorithm
    HP-1-100\% dimethylpolysiloxane,
    HP-5 - 5\% diphenyl and 95\% dimethylpolysiloxane
    HP-50-50\% diphenyl and 50\% dimethylpolysiloxane
    HP-Innowax - polyethyleneglycol
    $I$ - Kovats retention index
    $k$ - retention coefficient, (capacity factor)
    $K_{\mathrm{fg}}$, distribution coefficients between fiber coating and gas phase
    LOO - leave-one-out (internal) cross-validation

