

1 Advantages of on-line SPE coupled with UPLC/MS/MS
2 for determining the fate of pesticides and
3 pharmaceutical compounds

4

5 Anne Togola, Nicole Baran, Charlotte Coureau

6 Bureau de recherches géologiques et minières (French Geological Survey), Laboratory
7 division, 3 avenue Claude Guillemin, 45060 Orléans Cedex 02, France.

8

9 **Corresponding Author**

10 Anne Togola

11 Tel (+33)238643836

12 Fax (+33)238643925

13 a.togola@brgm.fr

14 **Abstract**

15 Laboratory experimentation is essential for our understanding of the fate and behaviour of
16 pollutants. Many analytical techniques exist, but they all have disadvantages either in terms
17 of sensitivity or of selectivity. The number of samples that can be analysed, the low volume
18 of samples available during the experiment and the need to identify different degradates are
19 all obstacles that new techniques are able to overcome. The work presented here
20 summarizes progress in the field of metrology as concerns on-line solid phase extraction
21 technology coupled with liquid chromatography followed by tandem mass spectrometry
22 detection. Recently developed analytical techniques were validated for both 18 pesticides
23 and their degradates and 17 pharmaceuticals and their degradates. Limits of quantification
24 from 20 to 70 ng.L⁻¹ for pharmaceuticals and from 15 to 25 ng.L⁻¹ for pesticides and
25 metabolites have been obtained, with linearity range up to 1 µg.L⁻¹. The limits of
26 quantification of a few ng per litre, the possibility of working on less than 1 mL of sample and
27 the simultaneous quantification of the target products and their transformation products are
28 all advantages that are demonstrated by two environmental applications. The first application
29 concerns the evaluation of ecotoxicological effects of pesticides on aquatic organisms
30 exposed in mesocosms. The second application aims to determine the adsorption constants
31 of pharmaceutical molecules on soils and river sediments. For both applications, the
32 robustness, range of linearity and limit of quantification of the developed analytical methods
33 satisfy the requirements for laboratory experiments conducted under controlled conditions.
34 Specific constraints generated by this type of experiment (adding CaCl₂ for the adsorption
35 study and filtration of the water coming from the mesocosms) were not found to limit the use
36 of on-line SPE. These 2 preliminary studies show that new experimental fields are possible
37 thanks to on-line solid phase extraction coupled with liquid chromatography.

38

39 **Keywords**

40 On-line-SPE, pesticides, pharmaceutical, experiment, monitoring

41

42 **1 Introduction**

43 Improved analytical techniques and stricter European regulations have led to an increased
44 oversight of water in recent years. The presence in surface and groundwater of pesticides
45 and emerging compounds has been confirmed [1-4]. This presence consequently raises
46 several questions concerning both their toxicity for ecosystems and humans if the water
47 resource is used as a source of drinking water, and the reasons for their presence in
48 hydrosystems. Due to the vast number of compounds involved, the substances to be studied
49 as a priority must be determined. Their ecotoxicological effect should be one of the criteria
50 taken into consideration when they are ranked. At the same time, the fate of these
51 substances must be studied and the risk of their transfer to surface- and groundwater must
52 be assessed.

53
54 Many complex mechanisms that depend on the physicochemical properties of both the
55 molecules and their host environment govern the fate of organic compounds in the
56 environment. In soil, sorption and degradation processes not only govern the mobility of
57 molecules toward groundwater, but also reduce the quantity of migrating molecules. By
58 carrying out experiments under controlled laboratory conditions, the importance of these two
59 processes and the key parameters affecting them can be studied.

60 For the adsorption of organic molecules, adsorption isotherms are therefore developed to
61 determine the partition coefficient between the liquid and solid phases. The standard OECD
62 (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development) protocol for pesticides has been
63 the reference for many years [5] and also serves as a basis for the study of other organic
64 substances. This guideline recommends using chromatographic techniques, which can be
65 coupled with mass spectrometry, or liquid scintillation counting when radiolabelled
66 substances are used. The use of ^{14}C -labelled molecules to determine adsorption isotherms is
67 therefore fairly common. This method makes it possible to carry out precise, rapid and
68 inexpensive analyses while working with relatively low concentrations. However, aside from
69 the fact that this technique requires that the laboratory and personnel be certified for handling
70 this type of products, there are few ^{14}C -labelled substances on the market vs. the number of
71 potential organic contaminants. Custom synthesis of ^{14}C -radiolabelled compounds can be
72 particularly expensive. Furthermore, the study of mixtures of molecules in order to determine
73 whether they might compete with one another requires numerous experiments because
74 several labelled molecules cannot be used simultaneously. These considerations might
75 represent an obstacle. This is particularly crucial in environmental studies where not only the
76 parent molecule, but also its metabolites and/or transformation products, are studied. In the
77 same way, it is sometimes more relevant to test the behaviour of mixed rather than individual

78 substances either because a mixture of pesticides is registered or because several
79 molecules are used together according to farming practices.

80

81 Unlabelled molecules can be used, but this can be more constraining because heavier
82 extraction and analytical techniques must be employed. Moreover, the limits of quantification
83 might be higher and require working with higher concentration ranges than with ¹⁴C-labelled
84 molecules. Last but not least, the analytical uncertainty is greater.

85

86 For toxicity, experiments that aim to determine the chronic and long-term toxic effects of
87 compounds require working at low concentrations of mixtures of chemicals [6]. Numerous
88 conditions must be taken into consideration, which multiplies the number of analyses that
89 must be carried out and therefore the cost of assessments. Few ecotoxicological studies
90 therefore use real exposure values. Most simply use theoretical values, which are, in some
91 cases, distorted by molecular degradation and the appearance of degradation products [6].
92 Methods that are easy to carry out, robust and inexpensive are therefore needed in order to
93 increase the relevance and the representativity of ecotoxicological studies.

94

95 Water samples can be analysed directly without sample pretreatment. Lin and Gan [7]
96 injected supernatants after filtering them on Whatman 0.45- μ m glass microfiber filters.
97 Concentrations in the μ g L⁻¹ range can be determined for some rather sensitive molecules
98 using these analytical methods. Despite the increased sensitivity of spectrometric methods, it
99 is sometimes necessary to lower this limit. For that, a pre-concentration step using cartridges
100 (Solid Phase Extraction) is usually necessary.

101

102 Classical off-line SPE techniques are therefore used but require large quantities of samples
103 and/or high concentrations, in some cases very different from environmental conditions, e.g.
104 500 μ g L⁻¹ [8]. Drillia et al. [9], studying the adsorption of 6 pharmaceutical molecules in 2
105 soils, used an off-line SPE system with 50 mL of solution and initial concentrations of
106 between 1 and 12 mg L⁻¹. Fenet et al. [10], studying the adsorption of carbamazepine and 2
107 of its metabolites on 2 soils, worked with concentrations ranging between 250 and 3,000 μ g
108 L⁻¹.

109

110 On-line SPE makes it possible to combine a first step that entails the loading of the sample
111 into an extraction cartridge with a second step that couples cartridge elution and
112 chromatographic separation, followed by detection, usually by mass spectrometry. There are
113 various configurations for this application [11].

114

115 On-line SPE was first used to detect compounds in plasma or urine [12]. In the last decades,
116 environmental applications have multiplied, both for monitoring compounds like
117 organophosphorous compounds and their degradation products in rivers [13, 14] and for
118 detecting broad ranges of chemicals in aquatic environments [15]. To our knowledge,
119 however there are very few examples of on-line SPE coupled with liquid chromatography
120 being used to determine the adsorption constants of organic molecules [16] and none as our
121 knowledge to assess the ecotoxicological effects.

122

123 The aim of this study is therefore to determine to what extent the use of on-line SPE coupled
124 with UPLC/MS-MS is suitable for environmental laboratory studies for polar organic
125 molecules such as pesticides or emerging compounds. To do this, two environmental
126 applications having different constraints and requirements in terms of results were
127 considered. The first application is part of a pesticide ecotoxicity study and the second
128 involves the assessment of the risk of leaching of pharmaceutical products by means of
129 adsorption studies. For each application, the analytical method developed is first described
130 and evaluated for its performance (accuracy, robustness), after which the results obtained
131 are judged for their suitability regarding the requirements of the type of study involved.

132 **2 Materials and Methods**

133 **2.1 Materials**

134 Analytical standards (purity >98%) were supplied by Dr. Ehrenstorfer (VWR International,
135 Fontenay sous Bois, France) and Sigma Aldrich (Saint Quentin Fallavier, France). HPLC-
136 grade formic acid (98%), acetonitrile and water were supplied by Avantor Performance
137 Materials (Deventer, Netherlands). Individual solutions containing 500 mg L⁻¹ of the target
138 compounds were prepared in methanol and stored in the dark at -18 °C. Standard mixtures
139 were prepared – one containing 10 mg L⁻¹ for each compound in methanol, and working
140 solutions at 1 mg L⁻¹ and 10 µg L⁻¹ in natural water for calibrations. For pesticide analyses,
141 D₆-mecoprop, D₆-isoproturon and D₁₀-simazine were used as surrogate standards – 30 µL of
142 a solution mix (containing 5 mg L⁻¹ of each compound) were added to each 1.5-mL water
143 sample. For the analysis of pharmaceutical compounds, D₅-oxazepam, D₆-sulfamethoxime,
144 D₃-ibuprofen and D₅-diazepam were used. A working solution was prepared containing 250
145 µg L⁻¹ of each standard except for D₃-ibuprofen (2,000 µg L⁻¹). One hundred microliters of the
146 solution were added to each 1-mL water sample.

147 **2.2 Instrumentation and analysis**

148 The on-line SPE system consists of a standalone 515 pump hooked up to the ACQUITY
149 UPLC system by a Rheodyne switching valve. The sample is injected with a 2777
150 autosampler equipped with a 2-mL syringe and loaded through the cartridge via the 515
151 pump, with a water flow rate of 2 mL min⁻¹. During this loading step, the valve switches to
152 "waste" at the cartridge outlet. During elution, the valve switches to direct the mobile phases
153 through the cartridge, then the analytical column and the detection system. The 515 pump is
154 off at this time (Figure 1). Analyses were done with a Waters Quattro Premier XE triple
155 quadrupole mass spectrometer (Guyancourt, France). Waters also supplied the extraction
156 cartridge (Oasis®HLB, 2.1 x 20 mm, 25 µm) and the HSS T3 analytical column (2.1 × 150
157 mm, 1.7 µm).

158 A sample volume of 500 µL was injected. The water for sample loading was adjusted to pH
159 3.4 with acetic acid. The mobile phase was composed of Solvent A (0.05 % formic acid in
160 water) and solvent B (0.05 % formic acid in acetonitrile) at a constant flow of 0.4 mL.min⁻¹.
161 The gradient was programmed to increase the amount of solvent B from an initial 0 %
162 (maintained for 1 min) to 100 % in 7.5 min, stabilize at 100 % for 3 min, and return to the
163 initial conditions (0 % B) in 0.3 min. These conditions were maintained for 5 min.

164 Mass spectrometry was done with a triple quadrupole fitted with an ESI interface and
165 controlled by MassLynx software. Typical interface conditions were optimized for maximum
166 intensity of the precursor ions as follows: cone gas and desolvation (drying gas) N₂ flows
167 were set at 800 and 50 L.h⁻¹, respectively, and source block and desolvation temperatures
168 were 150 and 400 °C, respectively. The ESI polarity ionisation mode was set individually for
169 each target compound. Positive and negative polarity modes were used simultaneously
170 during the same analytical run. Argon was used as the collision gas at a pressure of 3.7 10⁻³
171 mBar. MRM transitions were selected and tuned individually for each analyte. To optimize
172 the mass spectrometer, a 500 µg.L⁻¹ standard solution of each analyte was infused directly.
173 The specific and intense product ions of each target analyte were used for quantification, and
174 a secondary product ion was used as a qualifier ion for confirmatory purposes. The optimal
175 conditions for each pesticide and pharmaceutical product are summarized in tables 1 and 2.

176 Calibration curves were obtained by a weighted (1/x) linear least square regression.
177 Calibration samples were treated like environmental samples. A standard curve was
178 acquired at the beginning and at the end of each measurement series. The first
179 measurement of standards was used for quantification and the second was used as quality
180 control. Procedural blanks consisting of nanopure water and blank samples consisting of
181 nanopure water with surrogate standards were used in every sequence in order to reveal any

182 analytical interference or possible carryover. Sensitivity and accuracy of the measurements
183 are controlled after each twenty-samples series by injection of quality control samples at low
184 level (limit of quantification) and intermediate level (100 ng/L).

185

186 **2.3 Ecotoxicological study**

187 The aim of this study was to assess and compare the structural and functional effects of
188 current and alternative wheat crop protection programs on aquatic macro invertebrates using
189 outdoor pond mesocosms. Four exposure scenarios were defined according to the type of
190 crop protection program and the geographical location of treated fields. In order to determine
191 the treatment-related effects on the structure of macro invertebrate communities and on litter
192 breakdown, researchers must characterize the exposure of the test systems to the different
193 substances. The experiment is described in detail in Auber et al. [17]. A list of the 18
194 compounds studied is given in table 1. The pesticides belong to various chemical classes
195 (ureas, azole, sulfonylureas, hydroxybenzotrioles, etc.) having different chemical properties.

196 Over a period of 18 months, samples were collected 24 h after each treatment and every
197 three weeks, regardless of the treatment, in order to obtain information on pesticide residue
198 levels. More than 700 water samples were collected (250 mL) and frozen at -20 °C until
199 extraction and analysis. One and a half millilitres of each sample was filtered (GFF, 0.45 µm)
200 and 30 µL of the surrogate solution was added before analysis.

201

202 **2.4 Adsorption experiments**

203 **2.4.1 Molecules and solids studied**

204 For this specific study, three pharmaceutical molecules that are included in the list of 17 that
205 can be analysed simultaneously with the method developed (Table 2) were tested –
206 carbamazepine, sulfamethoxazole and oxazepam. They were chosen because they are
207 frequently detected in the ground- and surface waters of the "Val d'Orléans" (the left bank of
208 the Loire River between Guilly and the confluence of the Loiret River near Orleans, France)
209 [18]. Indeed, from March 2008 until July 2010, carbamazepine, oxazepam and
210 sulfamethoxazole were quantified, respectively, in 89, 93 and 68 % of samples coming from
211 2 rivers and one well tapping groundwater, with maximum concentrations of 91, 120 and 68 ng
212 L⁻¹ (n = 53 for each site). These molecules are among the most quantified of the 30 that are
213 sought.

214 Three agricultural soils and two river sediments were collected in the hydrosystem. Their
215 particle size distribution and physicochemical characteristics are given in table 3. All of the
216 soils are predominantly sandy with water pH varying between 6.3 and 7.7. Soil D has the
217 highest cation exchange capacity, although it is still relatively low for a soil (10.6 meq/100 g).

218

219 **2.4.2 Adsorption isotherms**

220 Experimental isotherms were determined using the batch equilibrium method (OECD test
221 guideline 106; OECD, 2000). The liquid to solid ratio used for the sorption study was 2 - 5 g
222 of soil or sediment (air dried and sieved to 2 mm) for 10 mL of solution. The temperature was
223 set at 20 °C. Solutions of three molecules at concentrations of around 0.25, 0.64, 1.28, 6.35
224 and 25.5 µg L⁻¹ were prepared in CaCl₂ at 0.01 M. A solution containing only carbamazepine
225 was also prepared at similar concentrations. The experiments (mixture of molecules or
226 carbamazepine alone) were done in triplicate. The experimental isotherms were fitted using
227 the Freundlich equation:

$$228 \quad C_s = K_f \times C_e^{nF} \quad (1)$$

229 where C_s is the adsorbed concentration (mg kg⁻¹), C_e is the equilibrium concentration in the
230 solution (mg L⁻¹), K_f is the Freundlich coefficient (sorption constant in L kg⁻¹) and nF
231 (dimensionless) is the characteristic sorption coefficient. Sorption was then normalized with
232 regard to the organic carbon fraction of the soil (f_{oc} in %) by calculating the coefficient K_{oc} (L
233 kg⁻¹) using the equation:

$$234 \quad K_{oc} = \frac{K_f}{f_{oc}}$$

235 **3 RESULTS and DISCUSSION**

236 **3.1 Analytical aspects and method validation**

237 **3.1.1 Analytical method**

238 The chromatographic and spectrometric methods used were similar to classical ones. On the
239 other hand, the on-line SPE step needed to be optimized [19]. The main criteria to be
240 optimized were the loading time (here 1 min), the 515 pump flow rate and the nature of the
241 loading water. Due to the differences in the physicochemical properties of the molecules
242 studied, tests were run at pH 7, 3.4 and 2. Effects were evaluated in terms of signal
243 enhancement. For neutral compounds, such as azoles and strobine, there was no significant

244 impact of the pH. A distinct improvement was achieved with pH 3.4 for ureas, sulfonylureas
245 and hydroxybenzotrioles. The same assay was done for pharmaceuticals and pH 3.4 was
246 also retained because of a positive effect on ibuprofen and naproxen metabolites without any
247 negative effect on the other compounds. This improvement is also observed in off-line SPE
248 for ionic molecules where samples are acidified prior to extraction [20]. Acidifying the loading
249 water eliminates the need to acidify each individual sample prior to analysis as is done for
250 off-line SPE extractions, which is much less constraining.

251 Concerning elution conditions, the only noteworthy modification to the classical methods was
252 a shorter column rinsing time with 100 % acetonitrile (2 min vs. 5 min) in order to avoid
253 crushing the cartridge and inter-sample contamination. This robustness was verified by
254 injecting a blank after samples containing very high contents. To recondition the cartridge
255 with water at pH 3.4, the 515 pump was restarted 3 min before the end of the analysis.

256
257 The use of on-line SPE requires that there be no suspended matter in the water samples.
258 Samples from mesocosms where suspended matter appeared during the experiments were
259 therefore filtered (0.45 μm polyacrylate syringe filter). Previous laboratory tests showed that
260 the molecules under consideration did not adsorb on the filter. For analyses carried out to
261 determine adsorption isotherms, the samples were centrifuged (2,500 rpm for 20 min) before
262 surrogates were added and they were injected. The centrifuging is efficient enough to
263 eliminate any suspended matter that might alter the chromatography system. Filtration was
264 therefore not necessary.

265

266 **3.1.2 Linearity and Limits of Quantification**

267 Quantification was carried out by plotting the peak area of an analyte and its respective
268 internal standard against the corresponding analyte–internal standard concentration ratio.
269 The limit of quantification (calculated from calibration standard, with a signal to noise ratio
270 above 10:1) for 500 μL of injected sample is 20 ng L^{-1} for all of the pharmaceutical
271 substances except naproxen, o-desmethyl naproxen, diclofenac and ibuprofen, for which the
272 limit is 70 ng L^{-1} .

273 For the study of pesticide compounds, the limits of quantification (calculated from calibration
274 standard, with a signal to noise ratio above 10:1) for 500 μL of injected sample are between
275 15 and 25 ng L^{-1} , with the higher values being for hydroxybenzotrioles (bromoxynil and
276 ioxynil). The simultaneous analysis of molecules that have different physicochemical
277 properties entails compromises that affect these two molecules in particular.

278 Due to the preliminary on-line extraction step, the linearity ranges of these methods (Tables
279 1 and 2) are narrower than those of methods involving classical injections. The samples must
280 therefore be diluted. Since the entire procedure is meant to be rapid (< 20 min), in the cases
281 presented here, for which the measured concentrations were predictable, the dilution factors
282 were estimated and diluted samples were injected simultaneously with the raw samples.

283

284 **3.1.3 Robustness**

285 One of the main advantages of this technique is its robustness to the aging of cartridge and
286 matrix variability. This was evaluated based on the response (in terms of peak area) of the
287 internal standards added to each sample. Within a given analytical series (75 to 100
288 samples), variability is 10 % and 11.5 % for simazine d10 and isoproturon d6, respectively.
289 For several analytical series spread over 1 year (which corresponds to about 700 samples
290 and more than 3,000 injections), this variability is between 15 % and 19 %, which is similar to
291 the variability measured with off-line SPE and LC/MS/MS analyses [20]. The slight variations
292 of the concentrations of major ions in the matrix (mesocosm water) can contribute to this
293 method reliability, together with the fact that the calibration is done in the matrix. The use of
294 extraction tracers also makes it possible to increase the robustness of the method.
295 Combined to quality control samples, the gravimetric adding of tracer mix guarantees the
296 correct quantification of compounds.

297 Use of multiple tracers allows to enhance the range of compounds that can be measured by
298 online SP combined to LC/MS. Huntscha et al. [15] developed a self-made mixed-bed
299 multilayer extraction cartridge in order to increase the range of molecules that can be
300 extracted with this technique. Combining this with the use of 50 isotope-labelled compounds
301 as an internal standard mixture, they obtained extraction yields of between 80 and 110 %.

302

303 **3.1.4 Effect of the composition of the matrix**

304 According to OECD guidelines [5], laboratory experiments require the use of CaCl₂. The
305 effect of adding calcium chloride was determined by comparing the slopes of two calibrations
306 – one done in spring water and the other in CaCl₂ 0.01 M. The ratio between the two slopes
307 is between 85 and 110 %, depending on the compound, which shows that CaCl₂ has little
308 effect on analytical performance. The chromatographic peak resolution is not affected by this
309 modification (Figure 2). The calibration ranges associated with these experiments have
310 therefore been determined in CaCl₂ 0.01 M.

311

312 **3.2 Results of monitoring ecotoxicological experiments**

313 Eighteen pesticides and degradates were monitored during the experiments. As an example,
314 figure 3 shows isoproturon dissipation and the formation of its degradates.

315 In our study, monitoring pesticide compound concentrations with a short time step revealed
316 the fleeting appearance of degradation products, including those of isoproturon (Fig. 2). The
317 replicates shown correspond to experimental replicates (3 mesocosms for each exposure
318 scenario).

319 The detection of the onset, even for a relatively short period of a few weeks, of
320 monodesmethyl-isoproturon is particularly interesting. Indeed, this substance is recognized
321 as a major metabolite of isoproturon. Isoproturon's two metabolites are rarely quantified in
322 water. Despite the very lengthy monitoring of a spring that is the outlet of a karstic system
323 (476 samples collected between 1998 and 2006), rapid water circulation and exchanges
324 between surface- and groundwater, monodesmethyl-isoproturon was detected only twice.
325 Didismethyl-isoproturon has never been detected [21]. In addition, European regulations
326 recommended that particular attention should be paid to the protection of aquatic organisms
327 [223].

328 Average Exposure Concentrations (AEC) were calculated for each compound and each
329 scenario (Table 4) and could be correlated with effects on populations of exposed organisms
330 [17]. The identification of new compounds resulting from the degradation of parent
331 compounds is important (e.g. mono-desmethyl-isoproturon) as these can, in some cases,
332 explain unexpected ecotoxicological effects.

333

334 **3.3 Adsorption isotherms of pharmaceutical products**

335

336 For all three of the molecules studied simultaneously, adsorption isotherms (Figure 4) show
337 that the order of decreasing adsorption is the same and depends on the material: soil D > soil
338 C > soil B ~ sediment B > sediment C.

339 Likewise, for a given soil, the adsorption constant decreases as follows: Oxazepam >
340 Carbamazepine (> Sulfamethoxazole). For sulfamethoxazole, the results are unsatisfactory
341 since the behaviour of the substance seems to be concentration-dependant (higher
342 adsorption than the 2 others molecules for low concentrations and lower adsorption for high
343 concentrations). A reliable estimation of the adsorption constant cannot be proposed here.
344 Lin and Gan [7] showed, on 2 soils, that sulfamethoxazole adsorption is limited and even

345 considered to be negligible (concentrations in the supernatant similar to initial
346 concentrations). As the analysis of the substance is not difficult, the inconsistencies can, a
347 priori, be attributed to the intrinsic properties of the substance. Additional tests are needed in
348 order to describe the fate of sulfamethoxazole. Although adsorption data are available for
349 carbamazepine, there is little data available for the two other substances. For our soils, the
350 average K_{oc} values are 425 +/- 58 and 1098 +/- 141 L kg⁻¹ for carbamazepine and oxazepam,
351 respectively, when considered as a mixture. The carbamazepine adsorption constant is 471
352 +/- 119 L kg⁻¹ when the molecule was studied alone.

353 Drillia et al. [9], working with a soil that had an organic carbon content of 0.31 %, reported K_{oc}
354 values of 132 +/- 2.7 kg L⁻¹ for carbamazepine and 62.2 +/- 21.6 kg L⁻¹ for sulfamethoxazole.
355 Fenet et al. [10] determined carbamazepine adsorption constants of 158 and 309 kg L⁻¹,
356 respectively, for a European "reference" soil and an agricultural soil receiving waste water
357 effluents. Carbamazepine K_{foc} values of between 136 and 187 for 3 agricultural soils have
358 been reported [22]. Working on a river sediment, Löffler et al. [23] demonstrated a higher
359 adsorption of oxazepam than carbamazepine, in agreement with our results on both
360 sediments.

361 The agreement of our experimental data with literature data obtained using other protocols
362 (¹⁴C molecules, off-line SPE) validates the use of on-line SPE for this type of data acquisition.
363 For soils, the very low variability observed for the triplicates (for the mixture or for
364 carbamazepine alone) further validates this method. The greater variability observed for
365 sediments is not attributed to the analytical method but might be related to the heterogeneity
366 of the material.

367 **4 Conclusions**

368 This work describes 2 fully-automated methods based on on-line SPE/LC/MS/MS to
369 determine concentrations of pharmaceuticals and pesticides in the constraining context of
370 experimental studies. Their robustness and sensitivity are adequate considering the
371 requirements of these applications. The similarity of off- and on-line approaches makes the
372 transfer of methodologies between the two techniques easier and opens up the field to many
373 other method transpositions. The major role of surrogates is one of the key factors behind
374 the effectiveness of this approach and must not be overlooked. A compromise must be found
375 between increasing analytical performance and limiting costs, all the while considering
376 availability issues.

377 The results of our preliminary applications on pesticides and pharmaceuticals and the
378 agreement of our experimental data with those of other studies validate the use of on-line
379 SPE for the acquisition of experimental data.

380 For ecotoxicological studies, monitoring enables the correlation of observed biological effects
381 and the measured occurrence of pollutants. This approach makes it possible to determine
382 the fate of pollutants in mesocosms, including their dissipation, bioavailability and the
383 appearance of degradates, by accurately measuring their concentrations in systems.

384 Given the range of concentrations that these techniques can handle (several nanograms per
385 litre), adsorption experiments can be carried out at concentrations much lower than those
386 reported in the literature. The use of higher concentrations with on-line SPE would require
387 numerous dilutions and therefore greatly increase preparation time and increase
388 uncertainties in measurements, thus making this method less advantageous. Although the
389 use of lower concentrations might make it more difficult to compare results with those of
390 other studies, it enables us to work at levels that are environmentally more realistic.

391 The automation of the system makes it possible to treat more samples. While some time is
392 saved on sample preparation, even more is saved by the automatic sequencing of
393 extraction/analysis and result reprocessing. This enables us to foresee numerous future
394 environmental applications using this approach.

395 Concerning the range of molecules that can be analysed with this technique, the main
396 limitation is the small number of phases available for the on-line extraction step. This means
397 that multi-residue extractions result, in some cases, in very low yields, partially resolved by
398 the use of isotope-labelled compounds as internal standard, but with an important increase of
399 the analytical cost and dependant of the availability of those standards.

400 For the cartridge elution system using mobile-phase solvents, it is necessary to use solvents
401 that are compatible with the analytical column and the detector, which limits the solvent
402 mixtures that can be used. Eluents well-suited for the elution of ionic exchange cartridges
403 cannot therefore be used with this type of analytical set-up (sodium or ammonium hydroxide,
404 strong acid, etc.).

405

406 A wide range of molecules can however be analysed using this methodology, including both
407 pesticide compounds and new compounds like pharmaceuticals, hormones, polar endocrine
408 disrupting chemicals, etc. The growing need for experimental data – both for ecotoxicological

409 studies and for studies of the fate and behaviour of emerging compounds – might be more
410 easily satisfied with this methodology.

411

412

413 **Acknowledgments:**

414 This work was partly funded by the Scientific Division of BRGM. The results for pesticides
415 were obtained during the EMERITAT project, funded by the French Ministry of Ecology,
416 Energy, Sustainable Development and the Sea through its “Pesticides” research program.

417 **References**

- 418 1. Lapworth DJ, Baran N, Stuart ME, Ward RS (2012) Emerging organic contaminants in
419 groundwater: A review of sources, fate and occurrence. *Environ Pollut* 163, 287-303
- 420 2. Farre M, Perez S, Kantiani L, Barcelo D (2008): Fate and toxicity of emerging pollutants, their
421 metabolites and transformation products in the aquatic environment. *Trends Anal Chem* 27,
422 991-1007
- 423 3. Loos R, Locoro G, Comero S, Contini S, Schwesig D, Werres F, Balsaa P, Gans O, Weiss S, Blaha
424 L, Bolchi M, Gawlik BM (2010): Pan-European survey on the occurrence of selected polar
425 organic persistent pollutants in ground water. *Water Res* 44, 4115-4126
- 426 4. Houtman CJ (2010): Emerging contaminants in surface waters and their relevance for the
427 production of drinking water in Europe. *J Integr Environ Sci* 7, 271-295
- 428 5. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (2000): Guideline for the testing
429 of chemicals, Section 1: Physical-Chemical properties Test No. 106: Adsorption -Desorption
430 Using a Batch Equilibrium Method, pp. 44
- 431 6. Forbes VE, Forbes TL (1994). *Ecotoxicology in Theory and Practice*. Chapman and Hall Ltd.,
432 London
- 433 7. Lin K, Gan J (2011): Sorption and degradation of wastewater-associated non-steroidal anti-
434 inflammatory drugs and antibiotics in soils. *Chemosphere* 83, 240-246
- 435 8. Murillo-Torres R, Duran-Alvarez JC, Prado B, Jimenez-Cisneros BE (2012): Sorption and
436 mobility of two micropollutants in three agricultural soils: A comparative analysis of their
437 behavior in batch and column experiments. *Geoderma* 189, 462-468
- 438 9. Drillia P, Stamatelatos K, Lyberatos G (2005): Fate and mobility of pharmaceuticals in solid
439 matrices. *Chemosphere* 60, 1034-1044
- 440 10. Fenet H, Mathieu O, Mahjoub O, Li Z, Hillaire-Buys D, Casellas C, Gomez E (2012):
441 Carbamazepine, carbamazepine epoxide and dihydroxycarbamazepine sorption to soil and
442 occurrence in a wastewater reuse site in Tunisia. *Chemosphere* 88, 49-54
- 443 11. Mallet CR, Mazzeo JR, Neue U (2001): Evaluation of several solid phase extraction liquid
444 chromatography/tandem mass spectrometry on-line configurations for high-throughput
445 analysis of acidic and basic drugs in rat plasma. *Rapid Commun Mass Spectrom* 15, 1075-
446 1083
- 447 12. Moser C, Zoderer D, Luef G, Rauchenzauner M, Wildt L, Griesmacher A, Seger C (2012):
448 Simultaneous online SPE-LC-MS/MS quantification of six widely used synthetic progestins in
449 human plasma. *Anal Bioanal Chem* 403, 961-972
- 450 13. Céspedes R, Skryjová K, Raková M, Zeravik J, Fránek M, Lacorte S, Barceló D (2006):
451 Validation of an enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay (ELISA) for the determination of 4-

- 452 nonylphenol and octylphenol in surface water samples by LC-ESI-MS. A collection of Papers
453 Presented at the 1st Workshop of the European Union: Analysis and Removal of
454 Contaminants from Wastewaters for the Implementation of the Water Framework Directive -
455 1st EMCO 2005 70, 745-751
- 456 14. Lacorte S, Barcelo D (1995): Détermination of organophosphorus pesticides and their
457 transformation products in river waters by automated online solid phase extraction followed
458 by thermospray liquid chromatography mass spectrometry. *J. Chromatogr A* 712, 103-112
- 459 15. Huntscha S, Singer HP, McArdell CS, Frank CE, Hollender J (2012): Multiresidue analysis of 88
460 polar organic micropollutants in ground, surface and wastewater using online mixed-bed
461 multilayer solid-phase extraction coupled to high performance liquid chromatography-
462 tandem mass spectrometry. *J. Chromatogr A* 1268, 74-83
- 463 16. Enevoldsen R, Juhler RK (2010): Perfluorinated compounds (PFCs) in groundwater and
464 aqueous soil extracts: using inline SPE-LC-MS/MS for screening and sorption characterisation
465 of perfluorooctane sulphonate and related compounds. *Anal Bioanal Chem* 398, 1161-1172
- 466 17. Auber A, Roucaute M, Togola A, Caquet T (2011): Structural and functional effects of
467 conventional and low pesticide input crop-protection programs on benthic
468 macroinvertebrate communities in outdoor pond mesocosms. *Ecotoxicology* 20, 2042-2055
- 469 18. Joigneaux E 2011: Etat qualitatif des eaux de la nappe du val d'Orléans : impact du
470 changement climatique et gestion durable de la ressource, PhD thesis, Université d'Orléans,
471 BRGM, France.
- 472 19. Berho C, Togola A, Coureau C, Ghestem JP, Amalric L (2013): Applicability of polar organic
473 compound integrative samplers for monitoring pesticides in groundwater. *Environ Sci Pollut*
474 *Res Int*, doi: 10.1007/s1135601315081
- 475 20. Gervais G, Brosillon S, Laplanche A, Helen C (2008): Ultra-pressure liquid chromatography-
476 electrospray tandem mass spectrometry for multiresidue determination of pesticides in
477 water. *J Chromatogr A* 1202, 163-172
- 478 21. Baran N, Lepiller M, Mouvet C (2008): Agricultural diffuse pollution in a chalk aquifer (Trois
479 Fontaines, France): influence of pesticide properties and hydrodynamic constraints. *J Hydrol*,
480 pp. 56-69
- 481 22. Environment commission (2002): Review report for the active substance isoproturon
482 Finalised in the Standing Committee on Plant Health at its meeting on 7 December 2001 in
483 view of the inclusion of isoproturon in Annex I of Directive 91/414/EEC.
- 484 23. Calisto V, Esteves VI (2012): Adsorption of the antiepileptic carbamazepine onto agricultural
485 soils. *J Environ Monit* 14, 1597-1603
- 486 24. Löffler D, Rombke J, Meller M, Ternes TA (2005): Environmental Fate of Pharmaceuticals in
487 Water/Sediment Systems. *Environ Sci Technol* 39, 5209-5218
488





Figure 1: online SPE/UPLC/MS/MS set-up



494
495
496

Figure 2:

497
498




Figure 3: Monitoring of isotretinoin and two degradates, concentrations in mesocosms. Results of the 3 replicates of the same scenario are shown

499
500
501
502
503
504




Figure 4: adsorption isotherms of oxazepam and carbamazepine studied as a mixture (with sulfamethoxazole) and carbamazepine studied alone

505
 506
 507
 508
 509
 510

	chemical group	linear range ng.L ⁻¹	retention time (min)	Quantifier			Qualifier			Internal standard		
				Ionization	Transition	cone Voltage	Collision Energy	Ionization	Transition		cone Voltage	Collision Energy
Simazine D10 (SIM d10)	surrogate	250	4,08	ESI +	> 212,0	> 137,0	20	ESI +	> 212,0	> 104,9	25	
Isoproturon D6 (IPU d6)	surrogate	250	4,47	ESI +	> 213,1	> 77,9	18	ESI +	> 213,1	> 171,0	15	
Isoproturon-didesmethyl	degradate	15-500	4,11	ESI +	> 179,1	> 137,0	12	ESI +	> 179,1	> 93,9	20	IPU d6
Metsulfuron methyl	sulfonyl urea	15-500	4,17	ESI +	> 382,0	> 167,0	15	ESI -	> 379,9	> 139,0	16	IPU d6
Isoproturon-monomesmethyl	degradate	15-500	4,30	ESI +	> 193,1	> 93,9	20	ESI +	> 193,1	> 151,1	12	IPU d6
Mesosulfuron methyl	sulfonyl urea	15-500	4,37	ESI +	> 504,1	> 182,0	20	ESI -	> 502,1	> 347,0	15	IPU d6
Iodosulfuron methyl	sulfonyl urea	15-500	4,41	ESI +	> 507,8	> 167,0	18	ESI -	> 506,2	> 139,0	22	IPU d6
Isoproturon	urea	15-500	4,48	ESI +	> 207,0	> 71,9	15	ESI +	> 207,0	> 164,8	15	IPU d6
Bromoxynil	hydroxybenzotrioles	25-500	4,52	ESI -	> 275,8	> 79,0	25	ESI -	> 273,8	> 79,0	25	IPU d6
Ioxynil	hydroxybenzotrioles	25-500	4,81	ESI -	> 369,7	> 127,0	30	ESI -	> 369,7	> 215,0	25	IPU d6
Prochloraz	Azole	15-500	4,95	ESI +	> 378,0	> 309,9	10	ESI +	> 376,0	> 307,8	10	SIM d10
Cyprodinil	Pyrimidine	15-500	4,97	ESI +	> 226,1	> 92,8	35	ESI +	> 226,1	> 108,0	25	SIM d10
Azoxystrobin	Strobin	15-500	4,98	ESI +	> 403,9	> 372,0	15	ESI +	> 403,9	> 329,1	30	SIM d10
Epoxiconazole	azole	15-500	5,01	ESI +	> 329,9	> 120,8	18	ESI +	> 329,9	> 140,8	18	SIM d10
Boscalid	Anilide	15-500	5,07	ESI +	> 342,9	> 307,0	19	ESI +	> 342,9	> 271,5	32	SIM d10
Flusilazole	azole	15-500	5,15	ESI +	> 316,1	> 165,0	25	ESI +	> 316,1	> 247,2	15	SIM d10
Tebuconazole	azole	15-500	5,16	ESI +	> 307,9	> 70,0	27	ESI +	> 307,9	> 124,7	31	SIM d10
Napropamide	amide	15-500	5,19	ESI +	> 271,8	> 171,1	18	ESI +	> 271,8	> 198,9	13	SIM d10
Metconazole	azole	15-500	5,38	ESI +	> 320,0	> 69,9	20	ESI +	> 320,0	> 124,8	40	SIM d10
Prosulfocarb	thiocarbamate	15-500	5,97	ESI +	> 251,8	> 90,7	20	ESI +	> 251,8	> 128,0	12	SIM d10

511

512 Table 1 : Target pesticides and their optimized MS/MS parameters

513

514

Compounds	group	linear range ng.L ⁻¹	retention time (min)	Quantifier			Qualifier			Internal standards		
				Ionization	Transition	cone Voltage	Collision Energy	Ionization	Transition		cone Voltage	Collision Energy
Oxazepam d5 (OXZ d5)	surrogate	250	9.08	ESI +	292,0 > 246,0	30	20	ESI +	292,0 > 214,0	30	20	
Sulfamethoxime d6 (SFX d6)	surrogate	250	8.12	ESI +	317.2 >	35	22	ESI +	317.2 >	35	22	
Ibuprofen d3 (IBU d3)	surrogate	2000	11.77	ESI -	208.0 >	25	7		>			
Diazepam d5 (DZP d5)	surrogate	250	10.72	ESI +	290.2 >	35	22	ESI +	290.2 >	35	30	
O Desmethylnaproxen	degradate	70-5000	8.23	ESI -	215,0 >	25	12	ESI +				IBU d3
Fenofibric acid	hypolipemiant	20-1000	11.54	ESI -	317.2 >	25	10	ESI +	319,0 >	30	16	OXZ d5
Naproxen	AINS	70-5000	10.22	ESI -	228.9 >	25	7	ESI -	228.9 >	25	15	DZP d5
Gemfibrozil	hypolipemiant	20-1000	12.60	ESI -	249.2 >	25	13	ESI -	249.2 >	25	10	DZP d5
Ibuprofen	AINS	70-5000	11.79	ESI -	205.1 >	25	7	ESI +				IBU d3
Ketoprofen	AINS	20-1000	10.11	ESI -	252.9 >	25	8	ESI +	255.3 >	30	12	DZP d5
Furosemide	diuretics	20-5000	8.67	ESI -	329.2 >	35	15	ESI -	329.2 >	35	20	DZP d5
Bezafibrate	hypolipemiant	20-1000	10.26	ESI -	360.3 >	30	17	ESI +	384.4 >	35	17	OXZ d5
Diclofenac	AINS	20-5000	11.58	ESI -	294,0 >	25	12	ESI -	296.1 >	25	12	DZP d5
1 hydroxy ibuprofen	degradate	20-1000	8.81	ESI -	221.1 >	25	7	ESI -	221.1 >	25	12	IBU d3
2 hydroxy ibuprofen	degradate	20-1000	8.11	ESI -	221.1 >	25	8	ESI +				IBU d3
Oxazepam	antidepressant	20-1000	9.11	ESI +	287,0 >	30	20	ESI +	287,0 >	30	14	OXZ d5
Atenolol	Beta-blockers	20-5000	4.44	ESI +	267.3 >	30	18	ESI +	267.3 >	30	23	OXZ d5
Metoprolol	Beta-blockers	20-5000	6.18	ESI +	268.3 >	35	18	ESI +	268.3 >	35	18	OXZ d5
Sulfamethoxazole	antibiotic	20-1000	7.38	ESI +	253.9 >	30	26	ESI +	253.9 >	30	17	SFX d6
Carbamazepine	anti-epileptic	20-1000	8.81	ESI +	237,0 >	25	18	ESI +	237,0 >	25	33	SFX d6
Trimethoprim	antibiotic	20-5000	5.44	ESI +	291.1 >	42	24	ESI +	291.1 >	42	24	SFX d6

515

516 Table 2 : Target pharmaceuticals and their optimized MS/MS parameters

517

	clay (%)	silt (%)	sand %	organic carbon (%)	pH water	pH KCl	CEC (meq/100g)
sediment B	1.2	3.6	94.9	0.163	7.74	7.06	1.92
Sediment C	0.4	2.1	97.4	0.053	7.52	6.66	1.10
Soil B	4.6	9.6	85.2	0.373	6.17	5.05	2.52
Soil C	7.9	16.2	75.1	0.506	6.64	5.73	4.82
Soil D	15.1	25.3	57.8	1.055	6.33	5.46	10.65

518

519 **Table 3. Soil and river sediment characteristics**

520

521 **Table 4.** Mean (\pm standard error) Average Exposure Concentration ($\mu\text{g l}^{-1}$) for each active ingredient and for the different wheat crop protection programs
 522 scenario 1 to 4). From [16].

523

Active ingredient	Scenario			
	1	2	3	4
Azoxystrobin	1.49 \pm 0.13	1.60 \pm 0.11		
Bifenthrin	0.046 \pm 0.004	0.046 \pm 0.020		
Iodosulfuron-methyl	0.25 \pm 0.01	0.28 \pm 0.03		
Mesosulfuron-methyl	0.47 \pm 0.01	0.37 \pm 0.03		
Metconazole	1.53 \pm 0.16	1.71 \pm 0.21		
Prochloraz	0.47 \pm 0.02	0.74 \pm 0.03		
Bromoxynil			0.19 \pm 0.02	0.20 \pm 0.03
Cyprodynil			74.20 \pm 4.5	49.10 \pm 4.4
Ioxynil			0.12 \pm 0.02	0.12 \pm 0.02
Prosulfocarb			2.87 \pm 0.18	1.86 \pm 0.09
Diflufenican	0.67 \pm 0.01	0.57 \pm 0.04	0.10 \pm 0.005	0.12 \pm 0.008
Isoproturon	12.90 \pm 0.22	6.20 \pm 0.26	4.90 \pm 1.1	3.10 \pm 0.06
Epoxiconazole	0.83 \pm 0.07	0.89 \pm 0.04	0.27 \pm 0.04	0.20 \pm 0.05




Figure 1: online SPE/UPLC/MS/MS set-up




Figure 2 ; Chromatograms of pharmaceutical compounds obtained by online SPE/UPLC/MS/MS




Figure 3: Monitoring of isoproturon and two degradates, concentrations in mesocosms. Results of the 3 replicates of the same scenario are shown




Figure 4: adsorption isotherms of oxazepam and carbamazepine studied as a mixture (with sulfamethoxazole) and carbamazepine studied alone

	chemical group	linear range ng.L ⁻¹	retention time (min)	Quantifier			Qualifier			Internal standard		
				ionization	Transition	cone Voltage	Collision Energy	Ionization	Transition		cone Voltage	Collision Energy
Simazine D10 (SIM d10)	surrogate	250	4,08	ESI +	> 212,0	35	20	ESI +	> 212,0	104,9	35	25
Isoproturon D6 (IPU d6)	surrogate	250	4,47	ESI +	> 213,1	30	18	ESI +	> 213,1	171,0	30	15
Isoproturon-didesmethyl	degradate	15-500	4,11	ESI +	> 179,1	30	12	ESI +	> 179,1	93,9	30	20
Metsulfuron methyl	sulfonyl urea	15-500	4,17	ESI +	> 382,0	25	15	ESI -	> 379,9	139,0	25	16
Isoproturon-monodesmethyl	degradate	15-500	4,30	ESI +	> 193,1	25	20	ESI +	> 193,1	151,1	25	12
Mesosulfuron methyl	sulfonyl urea	15-500	4,37	ESI +	> 504,1	35	20	ESI -	> 502,1	347,0	30	15
Iodosulfuron methyl	sulfonyl urea	15-500	4,41	ESI +	> 507,8	30	18	ESI -	> 506,2	139,0	30	22
Isoproturon	urea	15-500	4,48	ESI +	> 207,0	30	15	ESI +	> 207,0	164,8	30	15
Bromoxynil	hydroxybenzotrioles	25-500	4,52	ESI -	> 275,8	40	25	ESI -	> 273,8	79,0	40	25
loxynil	hydroxybenzotrioles	25-500	4,81	ESI -	> 369,7	40	30	ESI -	> 369,7	215,0	40	25
Prochloraz	Azole	15-500	4,95	ESI +	> 378,0	20	10	ESI +	> 376,0	307,8	20	10
Cyprodinil	Pyrimidine	15-500	4,97	ESI +	> 226,1	30	35	ESI +	> 226,1	108,0	30	25
Azoxystrobin	Strobin	15-500	4,98	ESI +	> 403,9	30	15	ESI +	> 403,9	329,1	30	30
Epoxiconazole	azole	15-500	5,01	ESI +	> 329,9	33	18	ESI +	> 329,9	140,8	33	18
Boscalid	Anilide	15-500	5,07	ESI +	> 342,9	30	19	ESI +	> 342,9	271,5	30	32
Flusilazole	azole	15-500	5,15	ESI +	> 316,1	35	25	ESI +	> 316,1	247,2	35	15
Tebuconazole	azole	15-500	5,16	ESI +	> 307,9	33	27	ESI +	> 307,9	124,7	33	31
Napropamide	amide	15-500	5,19	ESI +	> 271,8	26	18	ESI +	> 271,8	198,9	26	13
Metconazole	azole	15-500	5,38	ESI +	> 320,0	37	20	ESI +	> 320,0	124,8	37	40
Prosulfocarb	thiocarbamate	15-500	5,97	ESI +	> 251,8	25	20	ESI +	> 251,8	128,0	25	12

Table 1 : Target pesticides and their optimized MS/MS parameters

Compounds	group	linear range ng.L ⁻¹	retention time (min)	Quantifier			Quantifier			Internal standards		
				Ionization	Transition	cone Voltage	Collision Energy	Ionization	Transition		cone Voltage	Collision Energy
Oxazepam d5 (OXZ d5)	surrogate	250	9.08	ESI +	292.0 > 246.0	30	20	ESI +	292.0 > 214.0	30	20	
Sulfamethoxime d6 (SFX d6)	surrogate	250	8.12	ESI +	317.2 >	35	22	ESI +	317.2 >	35	22	
Ibuprofen d3 (IBU d3)	surrogate	2000	11.77	ESI -	208.0 >	25	7		>			
Diazepam d5 (DZP d5)	surrogate	250	10.72	ESI +	290.2 >	35	22	ESI +	290.2 >	35	30	
O Desmethylnaproxen	degradate	70-5000	8.23	ESI -	215.0 >	25	12	ESI +				IBU d3
Fenofibric acid	hypolipemiant	20-1000	11.54	ESI -	317.2 >	25	10	ESI +	319.0 >	30	16	OXZ d5
Naproxen	AINS	70-5000	10.22	ESI -	228.9 >	25	7	ESI -	228.9 >	25	15	DZP d5
Gemfibrozil	hypolipemiant	20-1000	12.60	ESI -	249.2 >	25	13	ESI -	249.2 >	25	10	DZP d5
Ibuprofen	AINS	70-5000	11.79	ESI -	205.1 >	25	7	ESI +				IBU d3
Ketoprofen	AINS	20-1000	10.11	ESI -	252.9 >	25	8	ESI +	255.3 >	30	12	DZP d5
Furoseamide	diuretics	20-5000	8.67	ESI -	329.2 >	35	15	ESI -	329.2 >	35	20	DZP d5
Bezafibrate	hypolipemiant	20-1000	10.26	ESI -	360.3 >	30	17	ESI +	384.4 >	35	17	OXZ d5
Diclofenac	AINS	20-5000	11.58	ESI -	294.0 >	25	12	ESI -	296.1 >	25	12	DZP d5
1 hydroxy ibuprofen	degradate	20-1000	8.81	ESI -	221.1 >	25	7	ESI -	221.1 >	25	12	IBU d3
2 hydroxy ibuprofen	degradate	20-1000	8.11	ESI -	221.1 >	25	8	ESI +				IBU d3
Oxazepam	antidepressant	20-1000	9.11	ESI +	287.0 >	30	20	ESI +	287.0 >	30	14	OXZ d5
Atenolol	Beta-blockers	20-5000	4.44	ESI +	267.3 >	30	18	ESI +	267.3 >	30	23	OXZ d5
Metoprolol	Beta-blockers	20-5000	6.18	ESI +	268.3 >	35	18	ESI +	268.3 >	35	18	OXZ d5
Sulfamethoxazole	antibiotic	20-1000	7.38	ESI +	253.9 >	30	26	ESI +	253.9 >	30	17	SFX d6
Carbamazepine	anti-epileptic	20-1000	8.81	ESI +	237.0 >	25	18	ESI +	237.0 >	25	33	SFX d6
Trimethoprim	antibiotic	20-5000	5.44	ESI +	291.1 >	42	24	ESI +	291.1 >	42	24	SFX d6

Table 2 : Target pharmaceuticals and their optimized MS/MS parameters

	clay (%)	silt (%)	sand %	organic carbon (%)	pH water	pH KCl	CEC (meq/100g)
sediment B	1.2	3.6	94.9	0.163	7.74	7.06	1.92
Sediment C	0.4	2.1	97.4	0.053	7.52	6.66	1.10
Soil B	4.6	9.6	85.2	0.373	6.17	5.05	2.52
Soil C	7.9	16.2	75.1	0.506	6.64	5.73	4.82
Soil D	15.1	25.3	57.8	1.055	6.33	5.46	10.65

Table 3. Soil and river sediment characteristics

Active ingredient	Scenario			
	1	2	3	4
Azoxystrobin	1.49 ± 0.13	1.60 ± 0.11		
Bifenthrin	0.046 ± 0.004	0.046 ± 0.020		
Iodosulfuron-methyl	0.25 ± 0.01	0.28 ± 0.03		
Mesosulfuron-methyl	0.47 ± 0.01	0.37 ± 0.03		
Metconazole	1.53 ± 0.16	1.71 ± 0.21		
Prochloraz	0.47 ± 0.02	0.74 ± 0.03		
Bromoxynil			0.19 ± 0.02	0.20 ± 0.03
Cyprodynil			74.20 ± 4.5	49.10 ± 4.4
Ioxynil			0.12 ± 0.02	0.12 ± 0.02
Prosulfocarb			2.87 ± 0.18	1.86 ± 0.09
Diflufenican	0.67 ± 0.01	0.57 ± 0.04	0.10 ± 0.005	0.12 ± 0.008
Isoproturon	12.90 ± 0.22	6.20 ± 0.26	4.90 ± 1.1	3.10 ± 0.06
Epoxiconazole	0.83 ± 0.07	0.89 ± 0.04	0.27 ± 0.04	0.20 ± 0.05

Table 4. Mean (± standard error) Average Exposure Concentration ($\mu\text{g l}^{-1}$) for each active ingredient and for the different wheat crop protection programs scenario 1 to 4). From [16].