

شبكة المعلومات الجامعية التوثيق الإلكتروني والميكروفيلو

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم





MONA MAGHRABY



شبكة المعلومات الجامعية التوثيق الإلكتروني والميكروفيلو



شبكة المعلومات الجامعية التوثيق الالكتروني والميكروفيلم



MONA MAGHRABY



شبكة المعلومات الجامعية التوثيق الإلكترونى والميكروفيلم

جامعة عين شمس التوثيق الإلكتروني والميكروفيلم قسم

نقسم بالله العظيم أن المادة التي تم توثيقها وتسجيلها علي هذه الأقراص المدمجة قد أعدت دون أية تغيرات



يجب أن

تحفظ هذه الأقراص المدمجة بعيدا عن الغبار



MONA MAGHRABY





Development of Multi-residues Method for Pesticide Residues Analysis in Essential Oils Using Chromatographic Technique

Thesis Submitted By

Mahmoud Samir Mohamed El Saied

M. Sc. in chemistry / Faculty of Science / Ain Shams University 2017

For the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in chemistry (Ph. D.) Chemistry Department - Faculty of Science Ain Shams University

Under Supervision of

Prof. Dr. Mohamed Mahmoud Mohamed Abo-Aly

Chemistry Department, Faculty of Science, Ain Shams University.

Prof. Dr. Mona Abd El Aziz Khorshed

Chief Researcher and Technical Manager - Central Lab of Residue Analysis of Pesticides and Heavy Metals in Food - Agriculture Research Center





Approval Sheet

Development of Multi-residues Method for Pesticide Residues Analysis in Essential Oils Using Chromatographic Technique

A Thesis Submitted By Mahmoud Samir Mohamed El Saied For Ph. D. Degree in chemistry

This thesis has been approved by:

| Prof. Dr. Mohamed Mahmoud Mohamed Abo-Aly Department of Chemistry, Faculty of Science, Ain shams Universit |
|---|
| Signature: |
| Prof. Dr. Mona Abd-El Aziz Khorshed |
| Professor, Central Laboratory of Residue Analysis of Pesticides and |
| Heavy Metals in Food, Agricultural Research Center Signature : |
| |
| Prof. Dr. Rageb Ryad Amin El Sakka |
| Associate Professor of radiation chemistry -Egyptian atomic energy authority |
| Signature: |
| • Dr. Mohamed Fathy Attallah |
| Professor of radiation chemistry - Nahda University |
| Signature: |
| Head of Chemistry Department |
| Prof Dr. |
| Signature: |

Acknowledgment

The author expresses his thanks to graceful and merciful God for helping him in making this manuscript comes to the truth.

The author wishes to express his deep gratitude and thanks to **Prof. Dr Mohamed Mahmoud Mohamed Abo-Aly,** Professor of Inorganic

Chemistry, Faculty of Science, Ain shams University for his supervision,

continues encouragement and valuable comments throughout the work and

for his revising the manuscript.

The author also wishes to express deep thanks to **Prof Dr. Mona Abd El Aziz Khorshed** Chief Researcher and Technical Manager, Central Lab
of Residue Analysis of Pesticides and Heavy Metals in Food, Agricultural
Research Center, Ministry of Agriculture and Land Reclamation, for his
great effort, suggestion of the subject (problem) of this thesis, and assistance
for his kind help and assistance through the course of the work and for his
revising the manuscript.

Thanks, and appreciation to all the staff members and technicians of Central Laboratory of Residue Analysis of Pesticides and Heavy Metals in Foods, Agricultural Research Center, Ministry of Agriculture, and Land Reclamation.

My special thanks to my father, my mother, my brother, my lovely wife Aya, and my kids (Mariam and Sarah) for giving me inspiration, confidence, and patience throughout the period of investigation.

Mahmoud Samir Mohamed El Saied

Abstract



ABSTRACT

Orange oil is considered as the largest produced essential oil worldwide due to its unique properties. Pesticide residues in orange oil are expected to be much higher than the original fruit due to orange peel's cold-pressing during orange oil production. These residues may cause various health problems if consumed. The purpose of our study was to develop, optimize and compare four multi-residues extraction methods (dilution, QuEChERS, ethyl acetate, and mini-Luke) for analysis of 387 pesticides in orange oil using LC-MS/MS and GC-MS/MS. To our knowledge, this is the first report on the use of ethyl acetate and the mini-Luke method for the analysis of orange oil. The comparison was based on recoveries, matrix effect, and the amount of co-extract matrix. The optimum mean recoveries were obtained by the ethyl acetate method, which successfully analyzes 371 out of 387 pesticides with acceptable recovery (70-120%). It also showed a narrow recovery distribution in the range of 90-110% for 69% of all studied pesticides. Regarding the matrix effect, the QuEChERS method gave the highest number of pesticides with an insignificant matrix effect (80-120%) for both LC and GC amenable pesticides. The least amount of co-extract matrix components according to GC-MS/MS scan and gravimetric analysis has been achieved by the QuEChERS method.

In conclusion, the Ethyl acetate method gives acceptable recovery for a wide range of pesticides with a narrow recovery distribution and a moderate amount of co-extract matrix. While the QuEChERS method provides better selectivity and cleaner extract but with a narrow scope and less precision.

A monitoring program has been conducted to analyze the pesticide residues content in the orange oil sample that has been produced in Egypt using the ethyl acetate method. Thirty five orange oil samples have been analyzed and found to contain several pesticides (at least 15 pesticides) in each sample with various classes. The risk assessment to these pesticide levels couldn't be evaluated due to the absence of MRL. The risk of this pesticide depends mainly on the manufacture dilution factor in each application.

Keywords: multi-residue extraction methods; Orange oil; Liquid chromatography; Gas chromatography; Tandem mass spectrometry, Pesticide residues.

Aim of the work

| 1. | Introduction | 1 |
|---------|--|------|
| 1.1. | Essential oils | 1 |
| 1.2. | Orange oil | 3 |
| 1.3. | Pesticides and their Health Problems | 3 |
| 1.4. Cl | nemical and physical properties of orange oil | . 4 |
| 1.5. | Instruments used for pesticide residues analysis | . 5 |
| 1.5.1. | High-pressure liquid chromatography (HPLC) | . 5 |
| 1.5.2. | Gas chromatography | . 7 |
| 1.5.3. | Mass spectrometry | . 8 |
| 1.5.4. | Quadrupole | .10 |
| 1.6. | Matrix effect | . 14 |
| 1.6.1. | Matrix effect in LC-MS/MS | 15 |
| 1.6.2. | Electrospray ionization (ESI) | .15 |
| 1.6.3. | Matrix effect in GC-MS/MS | .17 |
| 1.7. | Ways to compensate for matrix effect | 18 |
| 1.8. | Extraction methods | 19 |
| 2. | Materials and Methods | .22 |
| 2.1. | Chemicals and reagents | .22 |
| 2.2. | Standard preparation | .22 |
| 2.3. | Apparatus | .23 |
| 2.4. | Sample preparation | .24 |
| 2.4.1. | QuEChERS method. | .25 |
| 2.4.2. | Dilution method | .25 |
| 2.4.3 | Mini-Luke method | .26 |

| 2.4.4. | Ethyl acetate method | 27 |
|---------------|---|-----|
| 2.5. | Instrumentation and conditions | 27 |
| 2.5.1. | LC-MS/MS | 27 |
| 2.5.2. | GC-MS/MS | 29 |
| 2.6. | Recoveries | 31 |
| 2.7. | Matrix effect and amount of co-extracted matrix | .31 |
| 3. | Results and discussion | .33 |
| 3.1. | Optimization of sample extraction methods | .33 |
| 3.1.1. | Optimization of QuEChERS method | .33 |
| 3.1.2. | Optimization of Dilution method | .36 |
| 3.1.3. method | Modification of mini-Luke method and Ethyl acetate d | .38 |
| 3.1.4. | Recoveries comparison for the studied methods | .39 |
| 3.2. | Matrix effect comparison for the studied methods | .42 |
| 3.2.1. | Matrix effect for LC-MS/MS | .42 |
| 3.2.2. | Matrix effect for GC-MS/MS | .43 |
| 3.3. | Amount of co-extracted matrix for the studied methods | .45 |
| 3.3.1. | Scan test using GC-MS/MS | .45 |
| 3.3.2. | Gravimetric test | 46 |
| 3.3.3. | Simplicity comparison between the studied methods | .47 |
| 3.4. sample | Monitoring of pesticide residues in commercial orange oil | .60 |
| 4. | Summary and Conclusion | 65 |
| 5 | Reference | 67 |

LIST OF FIGURES

| Figure | Figure Title | Page |
|--------|--|------|
| 1 | Fig.1: Different methods for extracting essential oil a: Water distillation b: Steam distillation c: Cold pressing | 2 |
| 2 | Fig.2: A schematic of an HPLC system | 6 |
| 3 | Fig.3: A schematic of GC system | 8 |
| 4 | Fig.4: A typical mass spectrum | 9 |
| 5 | Fig.5: linear quadrupole mass analyzer | 11 |
| 6 | Fig.6: diagram for AB Scix 4000qtrap triple quadrupole | 12 |
| 7 | Fig.7: Scan Modes in Triple Quadrupole Mass Spectrometer spectrometer | 14 |
| 8 | Fig. 8: Illustration of Electrospray ionization process | 16 |
| 9 | Fig. 9: A Schematic flow for matrix enhancement effect | 18 |
| 10 | Fig. 10: Graphical comparison of the recoveries obtained by the QuEChERS method with and without water addition | 36 |
| 11 | Fig. 11. Graphical comparison of the recoveries of LC amenable pesticides obtained by the dilution method | 37 |
| 12 | Fig. 12. Graphical comparison of the recoveries of LC amenable pesticides obtained by the dilution method | 38 |
| 13 | Fig. 13. Graphical comparison of the recoveries obtained by the studied extraction methods | 40 |

| Figure | Figure Title | Page |
|--------|--|------|
| 14 | Fig. 14. The relation between pesticide recoveries and Kow for each studied method | 41 |
| 15 | Fig. 15. Graphical comparison of the ME obtained by the studied extraction methods using LC-MS/MS | 43 |
| 16 | Fig. 16. Graphical comparison of the ME obtained by the studied extraction methods using GC-MS/MS | 45 |
| 17 | Fig. 17. Full scan chromatograms of orange oil blank extract by GC-MS/MS using the studied methods | 46 |
| 18 | Fig. 18. Amount of co-extracted matrix (mg/mL) for the studied methods | 47 |
| 19 | Fig. 19. Graphical representation of the steps and time required for each studied method | 48 |

LIST OF TABLES

| Table | Table Title | Page |
|-------|---|------|
| 1 | Table 1 Gradient elution program for LC-MS/MS | 29 |
| 2 | Table 2 Matrix effect indication terms | 32 |
| 3 | Table 3 Recoveries at 0.05µg/ml for 48 represented pesticides intended for method optimization | 34 |
| 4 | Table 4 Recoveries at 500 µg kg -1, RSD, Log Kow and matrix effects in orange oil for the studied methods. | 49 |
| 5 | Table 5 pesticides name, Log Kow, No. of positive pesticide along with pesticides highest, lowest and average concentration | 63 |
| 6 | Table 1S Names, chemical class, formula, molecular weight, CAS No. and stock solvent for the target pesticides | 80 |
| 7 | Table 2S Retention time and mass parameter for the target pesticides analysed by LC-MS/MS | 103 |
| 8 | Table 3S Retention time and mass parameter for the target pesticides analysed by LC-MS/MS | 120 |

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Abbreviations Synonyms

ACN Acetonitrile

amu atomic mass unit

API Atmospheric Pressure Ionization

CAD collision gas

CE Collision Energy
CI Chemical ionization

CUR Curtain Gas

CXP Cell Exit Potential

DC direct-current

DP Declustering Potential

DW Deionized water

E Extreme

EI Electron ionization

EO Essential oil

EP Entrance Potential

ESI Electrospray ionization

EU Europe union

FAB Fast atom bombardment

GC-MS/MS

Gas Chromatography Coupled with
Triple Quadrupole Mass Spectrometry

HPLC High-pressure liquid chromatography

IS Ion spray

ISO International Organization for Standardization

K_{ow} Octane-water partion coefficient

LC-MS/MS Liquid Chromatography Coupled with

Triple Quadrupole Mass Spectrometry

M Medium

m/z mass-to-charge ratio

MALDI Matrix-assisted laser desorption/ionization