



SSPI-CT-2003-502411

HORIZONTAL - ORG

**HORIZONTAL STANDARDS ON ORGANIC MICRO-POLLUTANTS FOR
IMPLEMENTATION OF EU DIRECTIVES ON SLUDGE, SOIL AND TREATED BIO-
WASTE**

Instrument: STREP

**Thematic Priority: PRIORITY 8.1 STREP Topic 1.5
Environmental assessment**

Deliverable D3.10.2 LAS ruggedness report

Due date of deliverable:

Actual submission date:

Start date of project: 1-10-2003

Duration: 3 years

**Organisation name of lead contractor for this
deliverable: EUROFINS Danmark A/S**

Revision [draft, 1]

Project co-funded by the European Commission within the Sixth Framework Programme (2002-2006)		
Dissemination Level		
PU	Public	PU
PP	Restricted to other programme participants (including the Commission Services)	
RE	Restricted to a group specified by the consortium (including the Commission Services)	
CO	Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)	

Disclaimer

The European Commission does not accept any liability for the information contained in this document resulting from work carried out under contract with the FP 6 program of the European Commission,. The conclusions herein reflect at this point the opinion of the authors. After consultation, it can be considered to reflect the consensus opinion of the CEN bodies involved in project HORIZONTAL. The opinions are not necessarily consistent with the views of the European Commission.

August 2006

HORIZONTAL – 13.0

LAS

**Experimental work including ruggedness test
Final report**

Rune Haller and Nis Hansen

Eurofins Danmark A/S

Acknowledgement

This work has been carried out with financial support from the following EU Member States:
UK, Germany, France, Italy, Spain, Nordic countries, Netherlands, Denmark, Austria, EU DG
XI and JRC, Ispra.

CONTENTS	Page
SUMMARY	7
1. INTRODUCTION	10
2. SCOPE AND PRINCIPLE	11
2.1 Matrices	11
2.2 Analyte	11
2.3 Internal standard	12
2.4 Calibration principle	12
2.5 Detectors	12
3. MATERIALS/SAMPLES	13
4. EXPERIMENTAL WORK	14
4.1 Separation and detection: HPLC-FLD-MSD	14
4.1.1 Isomeric separation	14
4.1.2 Homolog separation	18
4.1.3 Fluorescence detector (FLD)	20
4.1.4 Mass spectrometric detector (MSD)	20
4.2 Extraction	20
4.2.1 Experimental	21
4.2.2 Results - Extraction solvent	23
4.2.3 Results - Extraction technique	24
4.2.4 Results - Extraction time	25
4.2.5 Results - Pre-treatment	26
4.3 Clean-up methods	27
4.3.1 Experimental	27
4.3.2 Results	28
4.4 Calibration	32
4.4.1 Response factors of LAS homologues	33
4.4.2 Purity of LAS standards	35
5. CONCLUSIONS	38
6. RUGGEDNESS TEST	40
6.1 Materials	40
6.2 Experimental	40
6.2.1 Design of ruggedness test	40
6.2.2 Factors and levels of ruggedness test	41
6.3 Results	42
6.3.1 Extraction of LAS in sludge	43
6.3.2 Extraction of LAS in soil and compost	43
6.3.3 The influence of the tested factors	44
6.3.4 Other parameters	45
6.4 Consequences of ruggedness tests	47
REFERENCES	48
APPENDIX 1 Note on the calibration of LAS	
APPENDIX 2 Results – Extraction procedure	
APPENDIX 3 Results – Ruggedness test	
APPENDIX 4 Method applied in ruggedness test	

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1	Description of samples used in the study.	13
Table 2	Chromatographic settings used for isomeric separation of LAS	15
Table 3	The CV of retention time (r_t) and area of a 5,0 mg/l C10-C14 LAS standard.	17
Table 4	The CV of retention time (r_t) and area of a 0.5 mg/l C10-C14 LAS standard.	17
Table 5	Concentration of calibration standards used in tests of linearity of LAS on MSD.	17
Table 6	Chromatographic settings used for homolog separation of LAS	18
Table 7	Selected target ions for the LAS homologues including the internal standard.	20
Table 8	Design of <i>Extraction study 1</i> examining extraction techniques and extraction time based on extraction of SL-E2.	21
Table 9	Design of <i>Extraction study 2</i> examining extraction solvent, extraction technique and extraction time tested based on extraction of SL-E2.	21
Table 10	Design of <i>Extraction study 3</i> examining solvent, pre-treatment and extraction time. The extractions were based on SO-E2 and SL-E2 (freeze- and oven- dried).	22
Table 11	Design of <i>Extraction study 4</i> examining the effect of solvents on extraction efficiency of sludge sample SL-E2.	22
Table 12	Description of the clean-up procedures.	27
Table 13	Description of the collected fractions.	28
Table 14	Results from the clean-up studies.	29
Table 15	The signal to noise ratios measured on chromatograms of soil samples, SO-4 and SO-9, with and without clean-up. S/N-ratios have been calculated for both FLD and MS.	30
Table 16	LAS compounds used for calculating response factors and purities.	33
Table 17	Response factors (RF) of the C ₈ -, C ₁₁ -, C ₁₂ - and C ₁₃ -LAS homologues measured with FLD and MSD. Chromatography with isomeric separation.	34
Table 18	Response factors (RF) of the C ₈ -, C ₁₁ -, C ₁₂ - and C ₁₃ -LAS homologues measured with FLD and MSD. Chromatography with homologue separation.	35
Table 19	Purity of technical LAS mixtures.	37
Table 20	Samples used in the ruggedness tests of the LAS Horizontal Standard.	40
Table 21	Multifactorial design of which the ruggedness tests were conducted.	41
Table 22	The selected values of the two-level experimental factors.	42
Table 23	The performance of FLD and MSD based on analysis of the samples SO-4, SO- 9, CW-5, SL-11, SL-E1 and SL-E2. The symbols v and % and refers to a successful and non-successful completion of the analysis.	45
Table 24	Standard deviation (s_w), coefficient of variation (CV%) and limit of detection (LOD), calculated from the results of the ruggedness test.	46

SUMMARY

The present report describes the experimental work being carried out for the development of a horizontal standard for the determination of Linear Alkylbenzene Sulphonates (LAS) in solid matrices. The work is part of two projects: Project HORIZONTAL WP 5: Organic Contaminants, and the research project HORIZONTAL-ORG WP 3.

The work is based on the recommendations in the desk study report for LAS and Nonylphenols from January 2004 /1/. In the report it was recommended that a standard method for LAS should be based on the principle: an extraction of a dry sample, possibly a clean-up step and a measurement by HPLC using UV, fluorescence or MS detectors. Also it was recommended that several issues should be studied for the preparation of a draft method.

The present report describes the pre-normative experimental work and a ruggedness test carried out on the draft standard.

Before the beginning of the experimental work, the scope was discussed at several meetings in an ad-hoc group for LAS and nonylphenols and at workshop meetings in the sludge committee CEN/TC 308. It was decided that the scope shall include the matrices sludge, soil and compost (bio-waste).

In the report the following experiments are presented:

- The separation and detection by HPLC with fluorescence (FLD) and MS detection (MSD)
- The extraction solvent
- The extraction technique
- The pre-treatment of the sample (drying of sample)
- The clean-up procedure
- The calibration procedure

Based on the experiments the following conclusions were made:

Chromatography

Mobile phases using either ammonium acetate or sodium perchlorate as additive were compared. Based on repeatability of peak area and retention time ammonium acetate was found to be superior.

C18 and C8 HPLC columns were used. With the C18 column a separation of both isomers and homologues were obtained, with the C8 column only a separation of homologues were obtained.

Choice of solvent

The extraction efficiencies of methanol, basic methanol (0,5 M NaOH) and methanol/water (1:1) were compared in several studies. Methanol and basic methanol were found to be equally efficient and significantly better than methanol/water. As basic methanol requires a pH regulation before HPLC-analysis, the most robust and therefore the best choice of extraction solvent was found to be methanol.

Extraction technique

A comparison of reciprocating shaker, sonication in combination with reciprocating shaker,

sonication alone, reflux and soxhlet based on both methanol and basic methanol as extraction solvents was conducted. Disregarding sonication all extraction techniques were found to be equally efficient. Reciprocating shaking, being less time consuming and most easy to adapt for laboratories with many samples, was therefore chosen for the LAS Horizontal standard.

Extraction time

In parallel to the test of extraction techniques several extraction times were compared and no differences were found, which suggests that one single extraction of 30 minutes is sufficient. An additional study based on one extraction technique and three different solvents also concluded 30 minutes to be sufficient.

Pre-treatment

Freeze-drying was found to be significantly better than oven-drying regarding the recovery of LAS. Only drying by freeze-drying is therefore included in the method.

Clean-up

Two clean-up procedures on GCB and SAX columns were tested. Both clean-up procedures were found to give satisfactory recoveries, however, the removal of interfering compounds was not sufficient when detection was based on FLD. A modified GCB procedure was tested after completion of the ruggedness test. The modification resulted in a higher recovery and a cleaner extract, thereby giving a lower limit of detection.

Response factors

Pure standards of C8-, C11-, C12- and C13-LAS were analysed and compared on both FLD and MSD. A correlation between the response factors of the LAS homologues analysed on FLD and molecular weight indicated that the response factors of the LAS should be based on molar response. This difference was however only significant when comparing the C8-LAS with the other homologues, and no difference was found for the C11-, C12- and C13-LAS response factors calculated per weight. When the analysis was conducted on MSD the response factors were found to be very similar.

Purity

The purity of two technical LAS mixtures was analysed and estimated to be significantly lower than stated by the supplier.

Calibration standards

For both detectors the calibration of LAS can be based on the responses per weight, and the calibration can be based on mixtures of LAS homologues with the alkyl chain length of C10 to C14 with known or unknown distribution, however of known purity. As it may be difficult to obtain mixtures of known purity it is decided, that a mixture of the three homologues C11-, C12- and C13-LAS are used for calibration.

Ruggedness test

The 2nd draft of the LAS Horizontal Standard was subjected to a ruggedness test to examine the influence of several factors, mainly related to the extraction procedure. The ruggedness test also included an examination of other factors like HPLC column, detector and clean-up. By the ruggedness test 6 samples were tested, each for the influence of 9 factors.

The ruggedness test resulted in small adjustments of the method. The extraction time is increased from 30 to 60 minutes for soil and compost, the calibration standard is changed from the use of a commercial LAS mixture to the use of a mixture of three LAS homologues (C11, C12 and C13 LAS) of high purity (99% stated by supplier), the amount of internal standard (C8-LAS) is increased from 10 µg to 100 µg, and more information is needed about the

advantages and disadvantages of the two detectors.

These changes will be incorporated in the draft horizontal standard, together with a detailed description of the clean-up which was tested after completion of the ruggedness test.

1. INTRODUCTION

The present report describes the experimental work being carried out for the development of a horizontal standard for the determination of Linear Alkylbenzene Sulphonates (LAS) in solid matrices. The work is part of two projects: Project HORIZONTAL WP 5: Organic Contaminants, and the research project HORIZONTAL-ORG WP 3.

In the desk study report for LAS and nonylphenols /1/ it was recommended that pre-normative studies should be conducted for both groups of compounds before horizontal standards could be drafted. Also recommendations were given for the issues to be included in the further work. Further suggestions were received from interested parties commenting the desk study /2/. The desk study report and the summary of comments is published at the HORIZONTAL website <http://www.ecn.nl/horizontal/>.

The present work has been based on the desk study and the comments given. The following recommendations were presented:

- That the method will include an extraction of a dry sample, possibly a clean-up step and a measurement by HPLC using UV, fluorescence or MS detectors
- That many issues had to be studied before a draft standard for LAS could be presented

The desk study report pointed at several main issues to be studied:

- Scope – which matrices shall be included
- Sample storage
- Drying procedure
- Selection of extraction solvent
- Selection of extraction technique
- The necessity of clean-up and choice of clean-up
- Selection of HPLC-detector
- Selection of internal standard

The desk study report and results from the experimental work have been presented and discussed by an ad-hoc group formed to facilitate such discussions. The ad-hoc group have met in conjunction with standardisation meetings in the Sludge Committee CEN/TC 308/WG 1 and the Soil Committee ISO/TC 190: In Hamburg 28 August 2003, in Copenhagen 29 January 2004, in Paris 21 September 2004, in Vienna 8 March 2005 and in Madrid 21 September 2005.

In addition, the work has been presented and discussed at the workshop in HORIZONTAL-ORG held in Paris 28 – 29 April 2005, and at a working group meeting at ISO190/SC 3 held in Tokyo 11 October 2005.

The present report describes the results from the experimental work on the issues mentioned. It also includes the results from a ruggedness test carried out on the draft standard.

2. SCOPE AND PRINCIPLE

After the publication of the desk study report the scope of the method was further discussed at several working group meetings. The conclusions of these discussions are described in this chapter.

As already described in the desk study report, the method for LAS can be shortly described:

The test sample (dried sample) is extracted with methanol or 0.5M NaOH in methanol. If necessary, interfering compounds are removed from the extract by a clean-up on a suitable column. The extract is subsequently analysed by high performance liquid chromatography (HPLC) and detection by UV, fluorescence (FLD) or mass spectrometric detector (MSD).

LAS is identified from the chromatographic fingerprint of the homologues and maybe the isomers in combination with the relative retention times. The quantification is based on internal standard procedure.

2.1 Matrices

Since the start of the project Horizontal, the work has been closely related to the Commission's plan to write a new Sewage Sludge Directive, and it was therefore obvious that sludge must be part of the scope.

The potential inclusion of soil in the scope was discussed at several working group meetings in ISO/TC 190 (Soil Committee) as well as in the ad-hoc group for nonylphenols and LAS. It was the general opinion that soil shall also be included in the scope.

Other matrices like biowaste, sediments and selected solid wastes may also be analysed by the method. Among these, only biowaste (compost) is included in the scope, since the planned validation study will include sample(s) of compost and no samples of sediment and solid waste.

Therefore the standard will include sludge, soil and compost (biowaste). Other solid materials like sediment and selected solid wastes may be analysed by the method.

2.2 Analyte

The analyte is linear alkylbenzene sulfonate, sodium salt (LAS) originating from commercial products. The analyte consists of a mixture of homologues (i.e. C₁₀-LAS, C₁₁-LAS, C₁₂-LAS, C₁₃-LAS and C₁₄-LAS) with C₁₁-LAS and C₁₂-LAS as the dominant homologues. Only para-substituted LAS is included.

For each homologue many isomers are present. Theoretically C₁₀-LAS consists of 5 isomers, C₁₁-LAS of 6 isomers, C₁₂-LAS of 6 isomers, C₁₃-LAS of 7 isomers and C₁₄-LAS of 7 isomers. Thus LAS products may theoretically include up to 31 components. However, when manufacturing LAS the aromatic ring is never positioned in the terminal end of the linear alkyl. Without the 1-phenyl isomer the number of isomers is therefore reduced to 26 components /3/.

2.3 Internal standard

The method is based on the use of internal standard calculations. The internal standard is added to the test sample and is taken through the whole analytical procedure.

The internal standard used in the method is 4-octylbenzenesulfonate, in the report called C₈-LAS.

2.4 Calibration principle

For discussion at the ad-hoc group meeting in Madrid, 21 September 2005, a note about the calibration of LAS was prepared. The note is enclosed as Appendix 1.

The background for the discussion is, that a LAS standard substance with a well-defined composition is not available. However, it is possible to provide a LAS standard of well-defined purity.

Also the technical LAS products vary from one supplier to the other, and the LAS will undergo changes after being released into the environment.

It was concluded that the calibration must be based on the use of the LAS standards of known purity, even if the composition is not unambiguous.

Four possible calibration principles were described in the note and discussed at the ad hoc group meeting in Madrid. For both detectors used (FLD and MSD) knowledge about the responses of the single homologues was lacking, and no decision was taken at the meeting.

Further experiments were carried out in the laboratory as described in the present report, and on the basis of the results the following calibration was chosen:

The sum of areas of all LAS homologues and isomers is used for the calibration, taking into consideration the purity of the calibration standard. Also for the samples LAS is calculated from the sum of the areas. If the single homologue has to be determined, this will also be possible.

The calibration is further described in chapter 4.4.

2.5 Detectors

In the Desk Study report it was described, that three detectors were possible: UV detector, fluorescence detector (FLD) and mass spectrometric detector (MSD). However, it was also recommended, that due to the low specificity UV should not be used as the only detector.

The initial studies confirmed the limited specificity of the UV detector, and in a discussion paper prepared for the ad-hoc group for nonylphenols and LAS it was proposed not to include the UV detector in the draft standard. At the ad-hoc group meeting in Vienna 8 March 2005 this was accepted.

Therefore the work has included the use of two detectors: FLD and MSD.

3. MATERIALS/SAMPLES

Samples for the experimental work are collected from several sources. Four samples are so-called playground samples made available through Horizontal Work Package 1, two samples are natural samples collected in Denmark, and one sludge sample was taken from the Danish Eurofins proficiency-testing scheme. A list of samples is given in Table 1.

Table 1 Description of samples used in the study.

Sample ID	Sample description	Pre-treatment	C_{org} wgt. %	Dry matter %	Approx. LAS conc. mg/kg DM
SO-4	Clay soil, Speyer, Germany	Ball-milled and sieved < 125 µm	1.652		2
SO-9	Soil, Hagen, Germany	Ball-milled and sieved < 125 µm			3
SO-E2	Clay soil, Galten, Denmark	Sieved < 2 mm and freeze-dried			0
SL-11	Sewage sludge, electronic industry, Turin, Italy	Ball-milled and sieved < 125 µm	3.177		60
SL-E1	Sewage sludge, VKI, Hoersholm, Denmark	Freeze-dried		Ca. 100	1900
SL-E2	Sewage sludge, domestic, Vejle, Denmark. 908134	Freeze-dried		28	1700 *
CW-5	Compost, Fulda, Germany		11.45		7

* See text.

The samples SO-4, SO-9, SL-11 and CW-5 are playground samples from Horizontal Work Package 1 and a general characteristic of the samples is given in two reports /4/ and /5/.

Sample SO-E2 is a natural clayish soil taken in Denmark.

Sample SL-E1 is a freeze-dried sludge from the Danish proficiency-testing scheme.

The sample SL-E2 is a municipal sludge sample collected in Denmark. Several batches of freeze-dried sludge have been used for the experiments, and the concentration may vary from one experiment to another. However, for every experiment the same homogenized batch of freeze-dried sludge is used.

4. EXPERIMENTAL WORK

The experimental work and the results that have been gathered in order to obtain the necessary information to develop a Horizontal LAS standard is described in this chapter.

Many preliminary studies are not included in the report, however, the report contains the work that is the basis for drafting the horizontal standard method for LAS.

The experimental work has included studies of the following elements:

- The development of a LC-FLD-MSD measurement.
- Extraction. Three solvents and four extraction techniques were examined. One extraction technique and one associated extraction solvent was chosen for further work.
- Pre-treatment of the sample. The extraction efficiency of oven- and freeze-dried sample was compared.
- Clean-up. GCB and SAX columns were tested on sludge extracts.
- Calibration procedure. Response factors of LAS-homologues were established and a calibration procedure was chosen.

4.1 Separation and detection: HPLC-FLD-MSD

The analysis of LAS was based on chromatographic separation with high performance liquid chromatography (HPLC) and detection with fluorescence detector (FLD) and mass spectrometry (MSD).

The analysis of LAS was conducted with an Agilent HP1100 HPLC system consisting of autosampler, degasser, binary pump, and column oven. Two different settings of the chromatographic system were used. One set-up using a C18 column with acetonitrile in the mobile phase resulted in isomeric separation of each LAS-homologue (chapter 4.1.1), another set-up using a C8 column with methanol in the mobile phase resulted in separation of the homologues only (4.1.2). The detection was conducted with an Agilent 1046A Programmable Fluorescence Detector (4.1.3) and an Agilent 1100 MSD (4.1.4). The FLD being a non-destructive detector enabled the simultaneous use of FLD and MSD, using the FLD as the first detector. The detectors were therefore used simultaneously when possible.

4.1.1 Isomeric separation

4.1.1.1 Experimental

The separation of the isomers and the homologues of LAS were conducted with the chromatographic conditions described in Table 2. Two different mobile phase additives (sodium perchlorate and ammonium acetate) were evaluated and compared under otherwise identical chromatographic conditions. Mobile phases based on 0.01 M ammonium acetate and 0.1 M sodium perchlorate are in Table 2 referred to as *mobile phase 1* and *mobile phase 2*, respectively.

Table 2 Chromatographic settings used for isomeric separation of LAS

Column	C18, 150 x 2,0 mm, particle size 5 μ m
Mobile phase 1	A) 0.01 M ammonium acetate in water B) Acetonitrile
Mobile phase 2	A) 0.1 M sodium perchlorate (NaClO ₄) in water B) 0.1 M sodium perchlorate in acetonitrile
Solvent gradient	t (min) : 0 \rightarrow 20 \rightarrow 35 \rightarrow 36 \rightarrow 40 \rightarrow 41 \rightarrow 45 %B : 45 \rightarrow 55 \rightarrow 65 \rightarrow 95 \rightarrow 95 \rightarrow 45 \rightarrow 45
V _{Injection}	25 μ l
Flow	0.2 ml/min
Column temperature	30 $^{\circ}$ C

Examples of chromatograms obtained with the HPLC conditions of Table 2 are shown in Figure 1 and Figure 2. The chromatograms show the separation of each of the 5 LAS homologues (C₁₀-C₁₄ LAS) into 3-4 chromatographic peaks, which represent the respective isomers of each homologue. Sodium perchlorate is not compatible with a mass spectrometer (MSD) and a fluorescence detector (FLD) is therefore used.




Figure 1. Chromatogram of a 5.0 mg/l C₁₀-C₁₄ LAS standard using ammonium acetate in the mobile phase.




Figure 2. Chromatogram of a 5.0 mg/l C₁₀-C₁₄ LAS standard using sodium perchlorate in the mobile phase.

The parameters by which the mobile phases were evaluated were: Separation of peaks, peak width, repeatability of areas and retention time and signal to noise ratio (S/N-ratio). The results are shown in chapter 4.1.1.2.

The evaluation was based on standards of a technical mixture of 0.5 mg/l and 5 mg/l C₁₀-C₁₄ LAS (CAS# 69669-44-9) added 1 mg/l C₈ LAS. Each standard mixture was injected 5 times and submitted to the two chromatographic conditions described in Table 2.

4.1.1.2 Results

The chromatographic conditions resulting in isomeric separation of the LAS homologues were tested using two different mobile phases (Table 2), mobile phase 1 with ammonium acetate and mobile phase 2 with sodium perchlorate.

Mobile phase 1 and 2 were found to be equally good when comparing the peak width and the separation of homologues and isomers. The signal to noise ratios (S/N-ratio) were, however, found to be much better when based on the ammonium acetate. This difference in S/N-ratio is illustrated in Figure 3, which shows the two chromatograms of the C₁₄-homologue.




Figure 3. Chromatogram of C₁₄-LAS from a LAS standard mixture (5.0 mg/l) using A) ammonium acetate and B) sodium perchlorate in the mobile phase. The arrow indicates the 2-phenyl isomer.

The coefficient of variation (CV) calculated from the variation in retention time and area of the five injections are shown in Table 3 and 4 for the 5.0 mg/l and 0.5 mg/l LAS-standard respectively. The integrations of which the CVs were calculated were based on the peaks of:

- C₈-LAS (2-phenyl isomer)
- C₁₂-LAS (sum of 3,4,5,6-phenyl isomers)
- C₁₂-LAS (2-phenyl isomer)
- C₁₄-LAS (sum of 3,4,5,6,7-phenyl isomers)
- C₁₄-LAS (2-phenyl isomer)

For the 0.5 mg/l C₁₄-LAS homologue the calculations were, however, not conducted, as the C₁₄-LAS homologue was found to be below the limit of detection.

Table 3 The CV of retention time (r_i) and area of a 5,0 mg/l C10-C14 LAS standard.

5 mg/l	Ammonium acetate		Sodium perchlorate	
	Mobile phase 1		Mobile phase 2	
	CV (r_i), %	CV (area), %	CV (r_i), %	CV (area), %
C ₈ -LAS (2-phenyl isomer)	0.39	0.54	2.69	1.33
C ₁₂ -LAS (3-6 phenyl isomers)	0.48	0.98	3.59	0.64
C ₁₂ -LAS (2-phenyl isomer)	0.50	2.05	3.39	0.76
C ₁₄ -LAS (3-7 phenyl isomers)	0.31	2.29	2.16	4.17
C ₁₄ -LAS (2-ph. isomer)	0.23	16.36	2.09	14.31

Table 4 The CV of retention time (r_i) and area of a 0.5 mg/l C10-C14 LAS standard.

0.5 mg/l	Ammonium acetate		Sodium perchlorate	
	Mobile phase 1		Mobile phase 2	
	CV (r_i), %	CV (area), %	CV (r_i), %	CV (area), %
C ₈ -LAS (2-phenyl isomer)	0.42	1.79	4.70	4.71
C ₁₂ -LAS (3-6 phenyl isomers)	0.42	6.64	5.49	3.22
C ₁₂ -LAS (2-phenyl isomer)	0.40	5.83	5.48	11.32

The repeatability of the retention time for the LAS homologues was found to be significantly better, when the mobile phase was based on ammonium acetate instead of sodium perchlorate. The repeatability of the measured area of the LAS homologues was also found to be slightly better, when the mobile phase was based on ammonium acetate instead of sodium perchlorate.

Based on the S/N-ratio and repeatability ammonium acetate was found to be the best mobile phase additive compared to sodium perchlorate. This conclusion is based on the detection with FLD. Since sodium perchlorate is not compatible with the MSD, ammonium acetate is clearly the best choice for mobile phase.

Linearity – isomeric separation

The linearity of C₈-LAS, C₁₂-LAS and C₁₀-C₁₄ LAS was examined. The quantification of C₈- and C₁₂-LAS was based on C₁₁-LAS as internal standard. The quantification of C₁₀-C₁₄ LAS was based on C₈-LAS as internal standard.

Three calibration curves based on the standard solutions of Table 5 were constructed. The calibration curves for the isomeric separation are presented in Figure 4.

Table 5 Concentration of calibration standards used in tests of linearity of LAS on MSD.

	Concentration (mg/l)											
C8-LAS	-	-	24,0	6,0	2,40	0,60	0,24	0,060	0,024	0,0060	0,0024	0,0
C12-LAS	-	220	44,0	11,0	4,40	1,10	0,44	0,11	0,044	0,011	0,0044	0,0
C10-C14 LAS	455	-	45,5	-	4,55	-	-	-	-	-	-	0,0

The calibration curves for the three standards (C₈-LAS, C₁₂-LAS and C₁₀-C₁₄ LAS) were all found to be linear in the entire range examined (i.e. 24–0.0024 mg/l, 220–0.0044 and 455–4.55 mg/l, respectively). The chromatography of the 220 mg/l C₁₂-LAS standard was however indicating an overloaded column.

As the standard curves were found to be linear in the entire range examined, extrapolating from the 455 mg/l C₁₀-C₁₄ LAS standard it can be concluded, that a sample analysed according to the LAS Horizontal standard could contain approximately 4000 mg/kg before problems with linearity should be considered.




Figure 4. Linearity of C8-LAS, C12-LAS and C10-C14 LAS analysed with MSD and separated on C18-column (isomeric separation).

4.1.2 Homolog separation

The separation of the homologues of LAS was conducted with the chromatographic conditions described in Table 3.

Table 6 Chromatographic settings used for homolog separation of LAS

Column	C8, 125 x 2,0 mm, particle size 5 µm
Mobil phase	A) 0.01 M ammonium acetate in water B) Methanol
Solvent gradient	t (min) : 0 → 12 → 16 → 18 → 19 → 25 %B : 58 → 80 → 95 → 95 → 58 → 58
V _{Injection}	25 µl
Flow	0.2 ml/min
Column temperature	30 °C

Examples of chromatograms obtained with the HPLC conditions of Table 6 are shown in Figure 5. The chromatograms show the separation of the 5 LAS homologues (i.e. C₁₀-, C₁₁-, C₁₂-, C₁₃- and C₁₄-LAS). The detection is conducted with FLD and MSD simultaneously.




Figure 5. Chromatograms of a 5.0 mg/l C₁₀-C₁₄ LAS standard with sodium laurylsulphate (rt = 9.2 min) and C₈-LAS (rt = 5.9 min) as internal standards. Detection with FLD (upper) and MSD (lower).

Linearity – homologue separation

The standard solutions of Table 5 was also subjected to analysis by homologue separation on a C₈-column. The calibration curves for the homologue separation are presented in Figure 6.




Figure 6: Linearity of C₈-LAS, C₁₂-LAS and C₁₀-C₁₄ LAS analysed with MSD and separated on C₈-column (homologue separation).

C₈-LAS and C₁₀-C₁₄ LAS was found to be linear in the entire range of the analysed calibration standards (i.e. 24–0.0024 mg/l and 455–4.55 mg/l, respectively). The linearity of C₁₂-LAS analysed on C₈-column was however found to exclude the highest calibration standard (220 mg/l). The linearity of C₁₂-LAS was therefore found to have a range of 44–0.0044 mg/l.

4.1.3 Fluorescence detector (FLD)

A 100 mg/l LAS standard was used to find the optimal wavelengths of excitation (λ_{ex}) and emission (λ_{em}). This was done by injecting 50 μ l directly to the fluorescence detector, stopping the flow when the solution entered the photo cell and finally recording a 190 to 800 nm scan of both emission and excitation. Optima of excitation and emission wavelengths were found to be 228 and 305 nm, respectively (Figure 7). In practice this implies that the wavelengths must be selected close to these values, however, a difference of 5 nm is not critical.




Figure 7. Fluorescence spectra of LAS, excitation (left) and emission (right).

4.1.4 Mass spectrometric detector (MSD)

The detector was set to operate in SIM mode with a specific target ion for each LAS homologue and for the internal standard C₈-LAS (Table 7). A qualifier ion was also chosen ($q_1 = 183$ m/z). However, the fragmentation of LAS is generally low under normal circumstances ($V_{fragmentor}$: 50-110 V), and the use of a qualifier ion was found to be limited ($V_{Fragmenter}$ should be > 180 V to produce the 183 fragment of LAS).

Sodium dodecyl sulfate (sodium laurylsulfate) was used as an extra internal standard in the study of extraction efficiency, mainly for examining the extraction of the internal standard C₈-LAS, see chapter 4.2.

Table 7 Selected target ions for the LAS homologues including the internal standard.

Compound	C ₈ -LAS	Sodium dodecyl sulfate	C ₁₀ -LAS	C ₁₁ -LAS	C ₁₂ -LAS	C ₁₃ -LAS	C ₁₄ -LAS
Ion (m/z)	269	265	297	311	325	339	353

Atmospheric pressure ionisation electrospray (API-ES) was used as inlet and the spray was set with a drying gas flow and temperature of 10 l/min and 300°C, respectively. The API-ES was used in negative mode, and the fragmentation voltage was set to 70 V.

4.2 Extraction

The extraction procedure was developed through a number of studies which were carried out in order to examine the influence of several parameters such as extraction solvent, extraction technique, extraction time, pre-treatment, etc.

The different parameters of extraction were often examined simultaneously to ease the experimental work. These experiments are described in the following text as Extraction study 1, Extraction study 2, Extraction study 3 and Extraction study 4. The results relating to the effects of extraction solvent, extraction technique, extraction time and pre-treatment, are treated in the four chapters 4.2.2 – 4.2.5, describing the respective parameters.

4.2.1 Experimental

Extraction study 1 and 2: Extraction solvent, technique and time

Two studies were conducted on the sludge sample SL-E2 in order to test the extraction efficiencies of different solvents (methanol and alkaline methanol), extraction techniques (reciprocating shaker, sonication, combined sonication and reciprocating shaker, reflux and soxhlet) and extraction times. The tested parameters of the two studies are shown in Table 8 and 9.

Table 8 Design of *Extraction study 1* examining extraction techniques and extraction time based on extraction of SL-E2.

Extraction technique	N	m _{sludge} (g)	V _{MeOH} (ml)	Extraction time 1	Extraction time 2
Shaker	2	2	10	30 min	4 hours
Sonication	2	2	10	10 min	30 min
Sonication + shaking	2	2	10	5 min + 30 min	5 min + 4 hours
Reflux	2	6	30	1 hour	4 hours
Soxhlet	2	10	50	6 hours	20 hours

Table 9 Design of *Extraction study 2* examining extraction solvent, extraction technique and extraction time tested based on extraction of SL-E2.

Extraction technique	N	m _{sludge} (g)	V _{MeOH} (ml)	V _{MeOH/NaOH} (ml)	Extraction time
Shaker	2	2	10	10	1 hour
Sonication	2	2	10	10	1 hour
Sonication + shaking	2	2	10	10	5 min + 1 hour
Reflux	2	5	25	25	1 hour
Soxhlet	2	10	50	Not conducted	Over night

The studies were performed on freeze dried sludge (SL-E2). Apart from the described changes both studies were conducted according to the LAS Horizontal standard 1st Draft. The calculations were based on either external standard or with the use of an injection standard (in this case Na-laurylsulfate, which was added after extraction).

Extraction study 3: Extraction solvent, pre-treatment and extraction time

A third study was conducted to further investigate the effect of different solvents (methanol, alkaline methanol and methanol/water), extraction time (30 and 60 min) and pre-treatment (freeze- and oven-drying). The study was designed according to Table 10.

Table 10 Design of *Extraction study 3* examining solvent, pre-treatment and extraction time. The extractions were based on SO-E2 and SL-E2 (freeze- and oven-dried).

	Extraction time	Extraction solvent	Sample types (pretreatment)	Replicates
Variable:	30 min.	MeOH	Soil	2
	60 min.	MeOH/water (1:1)	Sludge A (freeze-dried)	2
		MeOH/NaOH (0,5 M)	Sludge B (oven-dried)	2

In this study a spiked soil sample and an unspiked sludge sample was used. The 36 samples were extracted according to the LAS Horizontal standard, 1st Draft.

The soil sample was prepared by transferring approximately 200 g of oven dried (60 C) soil to a 1000-ml round bottom flask. Acetone was added and the suspended soil was then spiked with 750 µl of a 5305 mg/l solution, thus ending up with a concentration of 19.9 mg/kg. The acetone was evaporated at low temperature until dryness. The soil was then placed in a fume hood over night (room temp) to further remove residues of acetone.

Calibration is based on the sum of the response of each homologue LAS. An average the respons factors of 5 calibration standards is used. All calculations were based on external standard.

Extraction study 4: Extraction solvent

An addition study - *Extraction study 4* - was conducted to compare the extraction efficiency of methanol and methanol/NaOH. This study was based on two successive extractions of 2 g of a freeze-dried sludge sample (SL-E2). This double extraction was conducted to estimate the extraction efficiency of the two extraction solvents (n = 2). This procedure was also used to estimate the recovery of LAS.

Table 11 Design of *Extraction study 4* examining the effect of solvents on extraction efficiency of sludge sample SL-E2.

Fixed parameters of extraction	Extraction Solvent	Sample
Extr. time: 30 min. Extr. technique: Reciprocating shaker. Replicates: 2	MeOH MeOH/water (1:1) MeOH/NaOH (0.5 M)	Sludge (SL-E2)

Approximately 2 g of sludge sample was extracted with 10,0 ml extraction solvent. After 30 min of extraction the samples and solvent was separated. The solvent was analysed and the remaining sample was extracted a second time. The volume of solvent, which could not be separated from the sample, was quantified before the second extraction. The sample extracts were diluted 10 times in ammonium acetate/MeOH (1:1) with 1% acetic acid before analysis.

Results from all the extraction studies are presented in Appendix 2.

4.2.2 Results - Extraction solvent

Extraction study 2, 3 and 4 all involved extractions with 2 or 3 of the solvents including: a) methanol, b) alkaline methanol (methanol with 0.5 M NaOH) and c) methanol/water (1:1).

Extraction study 2 was conducted with methanol and alkaline methanol. The results of extraction study 2 were difficult to interpret due to chromatographic problems with the alkaline extracts. Initially the extracts were analysed directly without any adjustment of pH in the alkaline extracts, which resulted in a change in retention time and possibly also a change in the response of LAS. The extracts were therefore neutralised with acetic acid and analysed again. The results showed that methanol and alkaline methanol were equally good (see Figure 11), but due to the high uncertainty introduced by the described chromatographic problems no conclusion was made from this study regarding the choice of extraction solvent.

Extraction study 3 enabled the comparison of the 3 solvents: methanol, alkaline methanol and methanol/water. Figure 8 shows the results of the extractions of SO-E2 (spiked) and SL-E2 (freeze- and oven-dried). The examination of extraction time (see 4.2.4) revealed no difference between the two tested extraction times and the samples were therefore treated as replicates.




Figure 8. The extraction of SO-E2 and SL-E2 (freeze- and oven-dried) with MeOH, MeOH/NaOH and MeOH/water (n = 4).

The extraction efficiency of methanol, methanol/water and alkaline methanol was found to be similar when the extraction was conducted on the spiked soil. When the extraction was conducted on sludge methanol and alkaline methanol was found to be equally good. The extraction efficiency of methanol/water was however found to be significantly lower than methanol and alkaline methanol. This difference was also found when calculations were based on internal standard (C₈-LAS).

Extraction study 4 further investigated the extraction efficiencies of methanol and alkaline methanol. This study was based on two successive extractions of SL-E2.




Figure 9. The extraction of freeze-dried sludge (SL-E2) with MeOH and MeOH/NaOH (n = 2). The extractions were performed two times on each sample.

The results (Figure 9) show no significant differences in the extraction efficiencies of the methanol and methanol/NaOH extractions ($p = 0.05$). There is, however, a tendency of the methanol extractions to be more efficient than the basic methanol extractions.

Setting the extraction efficiency of LAS of the first and second extraction to 100% results in an estimated recovery of the first extraction to be approximately 80% for both solvents. Based on this calculation the recovery of the internal standard (C_8 -LAS) of the first extraction was estimated to 85%. The actual recovery (%) of the internal standard (C_8 -LAS) was found to be $70 \pm 11\%$ in the first extraction.

It is concluded that one extraction is sufficient, due to the ability of the internal standard to compensate for the minor lack in extraction efficiency.

From the obtained results it is not critical whether methanol or basic methanol is used for the extraction of LAS. However, the practical analysis by HPLC is much easier using methanol without base, since it is not necessary to include a pH regulation of the extract before injection into the HPLC system. Therefore methanol is preferred as extraction solvent.

4.2.3 Results - Extraction technique

Extraction study 1 and 2 involved tests of the extraction techniques: a) Reciprocating shaker, b) Sonication followed by reciprocating shaker, c) Sonication, d) Reflux and e) Soxhlet.

The results of the two studies concerning extraction techniques are shown in Figure 10 and 11 and in Appendix 2A and 2B.




Figure 10. The extraction of SL-E2 with methanol using reciprocating shaker, reciprocating with sonication, sonication, reflux and soxhlet, results from *Extraction study 1*.




Figure 11. The extraction of SL-E2 with methanol and alkaline methanol using reciprocating shaker, reciprocating with sonication, sonication, reflux and soxhlet, results from *Extraction study 2*.

Most of the examined techniques were found to be very similar in extraction efficiency. Sonication with methanol was the only extraction technique that was found to be less effective. For sonication the presence of NaOH in the methanol was found to significantly increase the efficiency. However, due to the difficulties with standardisation of the sonication treatment, this technique is not found applicable in a future horizontal standard.

The extraction techniques reflux and soxhlet, which are based on extraction with boiling solvent, was not found to be significantly more efficient than extractions based on shaking.

Comparing the extraction techniques shaking, reflux and soxhlet, the shaking technique was preferred, since it is equally efficient and less comprehensive regarding laboratory equipment and workload.

4.2.4 Results - Extraction time

Extraction study 1 and *Extraction study 3* included tests of the extraction time:

In *Extraction study 1* the extraction time was found to introduce a significant difference when the extractions were based on sonication, however, the short extraction time was as low as 10 minutes. By comparing the other extraction techniques (shaking, reflux and soxhlet) the long

extraction times (4 – 20 hours, depending on technique) were found to result a 3 % higher recovery than the extractions with short extraction time (30 min – 6 hours, depending on extraction technique). This difference was however not significant (paired t-test, $p = 0,05$).

The difference in extraction efficiency of the 30 and 60 minute extractions of *Extraction study 3* was tested. Statistical analysis (paired t-test) shows that a 30-minute extraction and a 60-minute extraction are equally efficient. The test found the 60 minute extraction to give a 0,5% higher recovery than the 30 minute extraction ($n = 9$). If this difference was to become significant ($p = 0.05$), the CV% of the method should be less than 0.7%.

The similarity of the extractions is also shown in Figure 12, where the results of the 30 minute extractions are plotted against the 60 minute extractions. The slope ($\alpha = 1.01$) and the linearity ($r^2=0.990$) of the line in Figure 12 also show the equality of the two extraction times.




Figure 12. Concentration of samples extracted on a reciprocating shaker for 30 minutes plotted against concentrations of samples extracted for 60 min ($n=2$).

From these results the extraction time was set to 30 minutes in the 2nd draft standard.

In the conclusions from the ruggedness test in chapter 6.4 the extraction time for soil and compost samples is increased from 30 to 60 minutes.

4.2.5 Results - Pre-treatment

In *Extraction study 3* the effect of pre-treatment was examined. The study was, along with other parameters of extraction, designed to measure the influence of freeze-drying and oven-drying on the extraction efficiency of sludge (SL-E2).

Based on 12 extractions of freeze-dried and 12 extractions of oven-dried sludge, freeze-drying was found to be significantly better (paired t-test, $p = 0,01$) than oven-drying (calculation based on external standard). The internal standard (C_8 -LAS) was almost un-effected by the type of pre-treatment and could therefore not be used to correct for the difference.

It is therefore recommended, that freeze-drying is the only drying method for the pre-treatment of samples for LAS analysis.

4.3 Clean-up methods

4.3.1 Experimental

The performance of two clean-up procedures was tested on LAS standard solutions and sample extracts. The procedures are described in Table 12.

Two commercial pre-packed SPE columns were tested: Graphitised Carbon Black (GCB) and Strong Anion Exchange (SAX). The GCB columns were purchased at Supelco (500 mg Supelclean ENVI-Carb) and the SAX columns were purchased at Analytical Instruments (500 mg Bond Elut, SAX).

The washing and elution procedures were taken from the literature, the GCB column from /6/ and the SAX column from /7/.

Table 12 Description of the clean-up procedures.

Column	GCB (500 mg)	SAX (500 mg)
Column preparation	5 ml mobile phase 2 ml MeOH 30 ml 0,1 M HCl 2 ml water	5 ml MeOH 10 ml water
Sample application	1 ml sample in MeOH	1 ml sample in MeOH
Column wash	5 ml water 1 ml MeOH 10 ml DCM/MeOH (80:20) with 15 mM formic acid	5 ml 2% acetic acid in MeOH 5 ml MeOH
Elution	10 ml DCM/MeOH (80:20) with 5 mM TMAH*	15 ml 2 M HCl:MeOH (1:1)

*) Tetramethylammonium hydroxide (CAS# 10424-65-4)

The solvents applied during column preparation, sample application, column wash and elution were collected and analysed as separate fractions. Initially the clean-up procedures were tested on 1 ml of 100 mg/l LAS standard (n = 2). The clean-up procedure was afterwards tested on extracts of SL-E1, SL-E2 and SL-E2 diluted by a factor of ten (n = 1). Modifications of the GCB clean-up procedure were also tested. These modifications are shown in Table 13.

The fractions collected and analysed is described in Table 13. These fractions correspond to the clean-up steps *column wash* and *elution* described in Table 12, using a further subdivision of the washing step and elution step.

Table 13 Description of the collected fractions.

Column	GCB	GCB modified	SAX
Samples Fractions	100 mg/l LAS standard SL-E1 SL-E2 SL-E2 diluted x 10	100 mg/l LAS standard SO-4 SO-9	100 mg/l LAS standard SL-E1 SL-E2 SL-E2 diluted x 10
Sample application + 1 st Wash	1 ml sample in MeOH + 5 ml water 1 ml MeOH	1 ml sample in MeOH + 5 ml water 5 ml MeOH	1 ml sample in MeOH + 5 ml 2% acetic acid in MeOH
2 nd Wash	10 ml DCM/MeOH (80:20) with 15 mM formic acid	10 ml DCM/MeOH (80:20) with 15 mM formic acid	5 ml MeOH
3 rd Wash	-	10 ml DCM with 15 mM formic acid	-
4 th Wash	-	10 ml DCM	-
1 st Elution	5 ml DCM/MeOH (80:20) with 5 mM TMAH	10 ml DCM/MeOH (80:20) with 5 mM TMAH	7,5 ml 2 M HCl:MeOH (1:1)
2 nd Elution	5 ml DCM/MeOH (80:20) with 5 mM TMAH	10 ml DCM/MeOH (80:20) with 5 mM TMAH	7,5 ml 2 M HCl:MeOH (1:1)

Based on the results of the clean-up of extracts of SL-E1 and SL-E2 (and the clean-up of SO-4 and SO-9, described in the ruggedness test), the clean-up procedure for GCB was modified and tested on two soil samples; SO-4 and SO-9. The modification was consisting of the inclusion of two additional washing steps and an increase in volume of the first elution step. The two additional washing steps, “3rd Wash” and “4th Wash”, was conducted with 10 ml DCM with 15 mM formic acid and 10 ml pure DCM, respectively. The 1st and 2nd elution step was changed by increasing the volume from 5 ml to 10 ml.

4.3.2 Results

The concentration of LAS in the different fractions of Table 13 was measured and calculated as percentage of total collected LAS. The results are shown in Table 14.

Table 14 Results from the clean-up studies.

Fractions	Samples	GCB Recovery of LAS	GCB modified Recovery of LAS	SAX Recovery of LAS
Sample application + 1 st Wash	100 mg/l	0 % (<LOD)	0 % (<LOD)	0 % (<LOD)
	SL-E1	0 % (<LOD)		0 % (<LOD)
	SL-E2	0 % (<LOD)		0 % (<LOD)
	SL-E2**	0 % (<LOD)		0 % (<LOD)
	SO-4	.	0 % (<LOD)	
	SO-9		0 % (<LOD)	
2 nd Wash	100 mg/l	0 % (<LOD)*	0 % (<LOD)	0 % (<LOD)*
	SL-E1	0 % (<LOD)		0 % (<LOD)
	SL-E2	0 % (<LOD)		0 % (<LOD)
	SL-E2**	0 % (<LOD)		0 % (<LOD)
	SO-4		0 % (<LOD)	
	SO-9		0 % (<LOD)	
3 rd Wash	100 mg/l		0 % (<LOD)	
	SL-E1			
	SL-E2			
	SL-E2**			
	SO-4		0 % (<LOD)	
	SO-9		0 % (<LOD)	
4 th Wash	100 mg/l		0 % (<LOD)	
	SL-E1			
	SL-E2			
	SL-E2**			
	SO-4		0 % (<LOD)	
	SO-9		0 % (<LOD)	
1 st Elution	100 mg/l	99 % ± 0.13 %*	99 % [#]	99.8 %*
	SL-E1	23%		95 %
	SL-E2	5.2 %		96.3 %
	SL-E2**	78%		97.4 %
	SO-4		98 % [#]	
	SO-9		96 % [#]	
2 nd Elution	100 mg/l	0.79 % ± 0.13 %*	1 % [#]	0.2 %*
	SL-E1	77%		5.0 %
	SL-E2	94.8 %		3.7 %
	SL-E2 **	22%		2.6%
	SO-4		2 % [#]	
	SO-9		4 % [#]	

* Based on two determinations (n = 2).

** Extract from SL-E2 diluted 10 times.

Recovery calculation based on external standard.

Graphitised Carbon Black (GCB)

The clean up procedure based on GCB columns was found to give good results. Initially no residues of LAS were found in solvents collected from the washing steps. Whether the elution of the GCB columns is efficient is however uncertain. The main fraction of LAS from the sludge extracts SL-E1 and SL-E2 was found to elute in the 2nd elution step, which lead to the possibility that the clean-up columns could contain un-eluted LAS. By comparing the chromatograms of SL-E1 and SL-E2 with and without clean-up, the total recoveries (i.e. the

sum of LAS collected from 1st and 2nd elution) were estimated to approximately 80% and 100%, respectively (based on external standard calculation).

The modification of the GCB clean-up procedure (i.e. additional washing steps and increased volumes of eluting solvents) was found to improve the recoveries measured in the 1st elution step (through increase of solvent volume). The signal/noise-ratios were also found to be significantly improved when comparing the extracts of SO-4 and SO-9 with and without clean-up (Table 15).

Table 15 The signal to noise ratios measured on chromatograms of soil samples, SO-4 and SO-9, with and without clean-up. S/N-ratios have been calculated for both FLD and MS.

Signal/Noise-ratio*	FLD		MS	
	No clean-up	Clean-up	No clean-up	Clean-up
SO-4 (2 mg/kg)	10-15**	30	65	140
SO-9 (3 mg/kg)	10-15**	40	80	200

* Signal/Noise-ratio is based on the C12-LAS homologue.

** Quantification of signal and noise was uncertain due to interfering compounds.

The signal/noise-ratios of Table 15 show that the clean-up procedure improved the signal/noise-ratio by a factor of 2-3 for SO-4 and 3-4 for SO-9. By extrapolating the S/N-ratio of Table 15 to an accept value of 3 (i.e. a value at which the S/N-ratio could define the LOD) the detection limits of detection can be estimated. The LODs of the FLD is thus estimated to 0.9 and 0.2 mg/kg for the un-cleaned and cleaned extract, respectively. Similarly the LODs of the MS are estimated to 0.1 and 0.04 mg/kg, respectively.

The chromatographic improvement caused by the modified GCB clean-up procedure is furthermore shown in Figure 13-16.

Figure 13 and 14 show the chromatograms of the un-cleaned and cleaned extract of soil sample SO-4 analysed on FLD. The presence of multiple interfering compounds is shown in Figure 13. The interferences are removed by the clean-up (Figure 14) and the use of a clean-up method is therefore suggested when FLD is used for the analysis of soil samples.




Figure 13. Extract of soil sample SO-4 before clean-up. Analysed with FLD.




Figure 14. Extract of soil sample SO-4 after clean-up. Analysed with FLD.

Figure 15 and 16 show the chromatograms of the un-cleaned and cleaned extract of SO-4 analysed on MS. The presence of interfering compounds is minimal as shown in Figure 15. The effect of clean-up is therefore not as significant as for FLD. There is however a reduction in background noise which improves the S/N-ratio (see Table 15) and the clean-up furthermore reduces the wearing of the HPLC-MS system.




Figure 15. Extract of soil sample SO-4 before clean-up. Analysed with MSD.




Figure 16. Extract of soil sample SO-4 after clean-up. Analysed with MSD.

Strong Anion Exchange (SAX)

The clean up procedure based on SAX columns was also found to give good results. No residues of LAS were found in solvents collected from the washing steps and LAS was almost completely eluted after applying the first 7.5 ml of solvent.

Proposed clean-up method

Based on the high recoveries and effective removal of interfering compounds the modified GCB described in Table 13 (i.e. GCB mod) is suggested as the most suitable clean-up method. The analysis of collected fractions (1st, 2nd, 3rd and 4th Wash and 1st and 2nd Elution) showed that the 3rd Wash and 2nd elution of the GCB column have very little effect. Therefore, the two steps are not included. The proposed clean-up method therefore consist of:

- Column preparation: 5 ml mobile phase
2 ml MeOH
30 ml 0,1 M HCl
- Sample application: 1 ml MeOH extract
- Wash: 5 ml water
5 ml MeOH
10 ml DCM/MeOH (80:20) with 15 mM formic acid
10 DCM
- Elution: 10 ml DCM/MeOH (80:20) with 5 mM TMAH
- Solvent transfer: Evaporate until dryness
and re-dissolve in MeOH/mobile phase (50:50)

This proposed clean-up method based on GCB is also included in the 3rd draft of LAS Horizontal Standard.

4.4 Calibration

As earlier mentioned a note about the calibration of LAS has been prepared for discussion at an ad-hoc group meeting. The note gives the background for calibration of LAS and describes the possible solutions. Based on the note and the discussions at the ad-hoc group meeting the experiments were planned.

The note is enclosed as Appendix 1.

The calibration of LAS can be based on at least four different procedures as described in the note in Appendix 1. The validity of the chosen calibration procedure depends on:

- The uncertainty of the purity of the chosen LAS standard.
- The relations between the response factors (R_f) of the C₁₀, C₁₁, C₁₂, C₁₃ and C₁₄ LAS homologue.
- The relations between the response factors (R_f) of the isomers of each homologue.

To examine these issues a series of LAS standards of different purities and different distributions of homologues and isomers were analysed (Table 16).

Table 16 LAS compounds used for calculating response factors and purities.

Chemical name	Abbreviation	CAS #	Purity	Ref*
4-Octylbenzenesulfonic acid, sodium salt	C ₈ -LAS	6149-03-7	97%	1
Sodium Linear Undecylbenzene Sulfonate	C ₁₁ -LAS	-	99%	2
Sodium Linear Dodecylbenzene Sulfonate	C ₁₂ -LAS	2211-98-5	99%	2
Sodium Linear Tridecylbenzene Sulfonate	C ₁₃ -LAS	-	99%	2
Sodium Linear Dodecylbenzene Sulfonate	C ₁₀ -C ₁₃ LAS	25155-30-0	80%	1
Dodecylbenzene Sulfonate acid, sodium salt	C ₁₀ -C ₁₄ LAS	69669-44-9	62%	3

* Purchased at: 1) Sigma Aldrich, 2) Wako Chemicals GmbH and 3) TCI.

The standards referred to as C₈-LAS, C₁₁-LAS, C₁₂-LAS and C₁₃-LAS in Table 16 consists of single homologues of LAS. The single C₁₁-, C₁₂-, and C₁₃-LAS homologues however contain several (5-6) isomers.

4.4.1 Response factors of LAS homologues

First solutions of each single LAS homologue were analysed separately, mainly to rule out the presence of additional LAS homologues. The chromatograms are presented in Figure 17-20.




Figure 17. Chromatogram of a 10 mg/l C₈-LAS internal standard. Detection with FLD.




Figure 18. Chromatogram of a 12.5 mg/l C₁₁-LAS standard. Detection with FLD.




Figure 19. Chromatogram of a 50 mg/l C₁₂-LAS standard. Detection with FLD.




Figure 20. Chromatogram of a 12.5 mg/l C₁₃-LAS standard. Detection with FLD.

Response factors of each homologue were subsequently determined through the analysis of each single homologue at two concentration levels (12.5 mg/l and 1.25 mg/l). The analyses were conducted according to the two methods described in chapter 4.1.1, i.e. with isomeric separation and with homologue separation

The response factors (RF) were calculated as the response/concentration-ratio of C₈-, C₁₁-, C₁₂- and C₁₃-LAS homologue. To simplify the comparing of response factors obtained with different detectors and chromatography, the RFs were calculated relative (%) to the average RF (i.e. normalized).

The response factors were calculated for both detectors. The response factors were furthermore calculated for both chromatographic methods, on a C18 column for isomeric separation (Table 17) and on a C8 column for homologue separation (Table 18).

Table 17 Response factors (RF) of the C₈-, C₁₁-, C₁₂- and C₁₃-LAS homologues measured with FLD and MSD. Chromatography with isomeric separation.

	RF _{FLD} (area · L/mg)*	RF _{FLD} (area · L/mol)*	RF _{MSD} V _{frag} = 180 [#] (area · L/mg)*	RF _{MSD} V _{frag} = 70 [#] (area · L/mg)*
C ₈ -LAS	120 ± 3.4	105 ± 3.0	77 ± 3.3	103 ± 6.2
C ₁₁ -LAS	95 ± 1.5	96 ± 1.5	104 ± 1.2	101 ± 4.2
C ₁₂ -LAS	92 ± 1.2	97 ± 1.3	107 ± 1.3	96 ± 6.1
C ₁₃ -LAS	93 ± 1.9	102 ± 1.1	112 ± 0.9	-

*) The average response factors of the four LAS homologues (average of C₈-, C₁₁-, C₁₂- and C₁₃-LAS) were set to 100% and each RF were calculated relatively to this average. Mean ± standard deviation.

[#]) The fragmentor voltage of the MSD.

Table 18 Response factors (RF) of the C₈-, C₁₁-, C₁₂- and C₁₃-LAS homologues measured with FLD and MSD. Chromatography with homologue separation.

	RF _{FLD} (area · L/mg)*	RF _{FLD} (area · L/mol)*	RF _{MSD} (area · L/mg)* V _{frag} = 70 [#]
C ₈ -LAS	123	107	98
C ₁₁ -LAS	95	96	99
C ₁₂ -LAS	91	96	100
C ₁₃ -LAS	92	101	104

*) The average response factors of the four LAS homologues (average of C₈-, C₁₁-, C₁₂- and C₁₃-LAS) were set to 100% and each RF were calculated relatively to this average.

#) The fragmentor voltage of the MSD.

Fluorescence detector:

The response factors obtained by FLD were found to be independent of the chromatographic method.

The RF of each homologue was found to be very similar when the calculations are based on the molar response factors (area · L/mol). The C₈-LAS homologue gives the best indication of this coherence. As the fluorescence detection is measuring the aromatic part of LAS, the same molar response for each homologue (and isomer) would therefore be expected.

However, when only C₁₁-C₁₃ LAS is evaluated the response factor per weight is also very similar.

Mass spectrometric detector:

When MSD is used as detection method the fragmentor voltage was found to influence the relative responses of the LAS homologues. When a relatively low fragmentor voltage of the MSD was used, the response factors of the homologues were found to be similar. The influence of chromatography on the relative response factors was not found to be significant. The difference between the single peak of C₈-LAS and the more complex “landscape” of multiple peaks (the isomer mixtures of the C₁₁-, C₁₂- and C₁₃ homologues), may however effect the relation between the response factors.

The use of C₈-LAS as calibration standard is therefore not advisable when the chromatography is based on isomeric separation. This possibility was presented as solution 4 in the LAS note in Appendix 1.

Also for the MSD the responses of the C₁₁, C₁₂ and C₁₃ homologues were found to be very similar.

Conclusion:

For both detectors the calibration of LAS can be based on the responses per weight, and the calibration can be based on mixtures of LAS homologues of known or unknown distribution.

4.4.2 Purity of LAS standards

When the response factors of the individual LAS homologues (C₈-, C₁₁-, C₁₂- and C₁₃-LAS) were established, a determination of the purity of the two LAS mixtures (CAS # 25155-30-0 and CAS # 69669-44-9) was conducted, see Table 16.

This quantification was based on external standardization (n = 2) using solutions consisting of: 1) a mixture of the four individual LAS homologues (used as calibration standards), and 2) the

two LAS mixtures. Two stock solutions were prepared for each of the LAS mixture by weighing approximately 50 mg in 10 ml MeOH (i.e. 5000 mg/l). This was done to minimise the uncertainty introduced when preparing the stock solutions.

The individual LAS homologues was analysed in concentrations of 10 mg/l (i.e. total LAS concentration of 40 mg/l). The concentrations of the technical homologue mixtures were also prepared to be approximately 40 mg/l.

Chromatograms of the homologue mixture and the two LAS mixtures are presented in Figure 21-23.




Figure 21. Chromatogram of a mixture of C₈-LAS, C₁₁-LAS, C₁₂-LAS and C₁₃-LAS, each 12.5 mg/l. Detection with MSD.




Figure 22. Chromatogram of the C₁₀-C₁₄ technical LAS mixture, 62%. Concentration 55 mg/l. Detection with MSD.




Figure 23. Chromatogram of the C₁₀-C₁₃ technical LAS mixture, 80%. Concentration 40 mg/l. Detection with MSD.

Based on the response factors of the single LAS homologues described above, the purities of the two commercially available technical mixtures of LAS were calculated (Table 19).

Table 19 Purity of technical LAS mixtures.

	CAS #	Stated purity *	Calculated purity **
C ₁₀ -C ₁₃ LAS	25155-30-0	80%	57 ± 4.1%
C ₁₀ -C ₁₄ LAS	69669-44-9	62%	50 ± 2.7%

* From supplier.

** Mean ± standard deviation.

These few results show that the purity stated by the supplier may be unreliable. For the two technical LAS mixtures the purity is determined to be 20-30% lower than stated by the supplier. As the calculation is based on the assumption, that the single homologue standards are 99% pure, the real purity of the two mixtures can not be higher than calculated.

It may be possible to obtain more reliable LAS standards than these results indicate, and the second draft of the method is written with a mixture of homologues and isomers for calibration. This second draft has also been subjected to the ruggedness test described in chapter 6.

However, due to the observed uncertainty of the commercial LAS mixtures (see Table 19), it is recommended, that mixtures are not used as primary standards. As shown in Table 16, single homologues of very high purity can now be obtained for C₁₁, C₁₂ and C₁₃ LAS, and these were found to give very similar response (per weight), when measured by FLD as well as by MSD.

It is therefore decided, that a mixture of the three homologues are used for calibration, and that the draft method shall be revised accordingly. Technical mixtures of LAS may also be used, if the actual purity is measured against the single LAS homologues and found sufficiently high (≥98%). This will be stated as a note in the draft method.

5. CONCLUSIONS

Based on the studies and results presented in this report a number of conclusions were reached. On the basis of these conclusions a 2nd draft of the method have been written. The 2nd draft was subsequently subjected to a ruggedness test, which is described in chapter 6.

Measurement

Chromatography

Mobile phases using either ammonium acetate or sodium perchlorate as additive were compared. Based on repeatability of peak area and retention time ammonium acetate was found to be superior.

C18 and C8 HPLC columns were used. With the C18 column a separation of both isomers and homologues were obtained, with the C8 column only a separation of homologues were obtained.

Extraction

Choice of solvent

The extraction efficiencies of methanol, basic methanol (0.5 M NaOH) and methanol/water (1:1) were compared in several studies. Methanol and basic methanol were found to be equally efficient and significantly better than methanol/water. As basic methanol requires a pH regulation before HPLC-analysis, the most robust and therefore the best choice of extraction solvent was found to be methanol.

Extraction technique

A comparison of reciprocating shaker, sonication in combination with reciprocating shaker, sonication alone, reflux and soxhlet based on both methanol and basic methanol as extraction solvents was conducted. Disregarding sonication all extraction techniques were found to be equally efficient. Reciprocating shaking, being less time consuming and most easy to adapt for laboratories with many samples, was therefore chosen for the LAS Horizontal standard.

Extraction time

In parallel to the test of extraction techniques several extraction times were compared and no differences were found, which suggests that one single extraction of 30 minutes is sufficient. An additional study based on one extraction technique and three different solvents also concluded 30 minutes to be sufficient.

Pre-treatment

Freeze-drying was found to be significantly better than oven-drying regarding the recovery of LAS. Only drying by freeze-drying is therefore included in the method.

Clean-up

Two clean-up procedures on GCB and SAX columns were tested. Both clean-up procedures were found to give satisfactory recoveries, however, the removal of interfering compounds was not sufficient when detection was based on FLD. A modified GCB procedure was tested after completion of the ruggedness test. The modification resulted in a higher recovery and a cleaner extract, thereby giving a lower limit of detection.

Calibration

Response factors

Pure standards of C₈-, C₁₁-, C₁₂- and C₁₃-LAS were analysed and compared on both FLD and MSD. A correlation between the response factors of the LAS homologues analysed on FLD and molecular weight indicated that the response factors of the LAS should be based on molar response. This difference was however only significant when comparing the C₈-LAS with the other homologues, and no difference was found for the C₁₁-, C₁₂- and C₁₃-LAS response factors calculated per weight. When the analysis was conducted on MSD the response factors were found to be very similar.

Purity

The purity of two technical LAS mixtures was analysed and estimated to be significantly lower than stated by the supplier.

Calibration standards

For both detectors the calibration of LAS can be based on the responses per weight, and the calibration can be based on mixtures of LAS homologues with the alkyl chain length of C₁₀ to C₁₄ with known or unknown distribution, however of known and high purity. As it may be difficult to obtain mixtures of known purity it is suggested, that a mixture of the three homologues C₁₁-, C₁₂- and C₁₃-LAS are used for calibration.

6. RUGGEDNESS TEST

A 1st draft of the LAS Horizontal Standard was completed for discussion at the ad-hoc group meeting in Madrid 21 September 2005. Based on the results obtained from the pre-normative work with LAS described in the previous chapters, and a few comments from the meeting, a 2nd draft was written (Appendix 4).

The ruggedness of the 2nd draft of the method was subsequently tested. The results of the test and the consequences are presented in this chapter, and the draft method is revised according to the results from the ruggedness test.

6.1 Materials

The samples chosen for the ruggedness tests are shown in Table 20. The samples were selected to represent sludge, soil and compost samples.

Table 20 Samples used in the ruggedness tests of the LAS Horizontal Standard.

Sample ID	Sample description	Pre-treatment	Extraction procedure*	LAS mg/kg dm
SL-E1	Sewage sludge, VKI, Hoersholm, Denmark	Freeze-dried	1	1900
SL-E2	Sewage sludge, domestic, Vejle, Denmark. 908134	Freeze-dried	1	1700
SL-11	Sewage sludge, electronic industry, Turin, Italy	Freeze-dried	1	57
SO-4	Clay soil, Speyer, Germany	Dried	2	2.2
SO-9	Soil, Hagen, Germany	Dried	2	3.4
CW-5	Compost, Fulda, Germany	Dried	2	7.2

* Extraction procedure 1 and 2 refers to the two extraction procedures which are included in the LAS Horizontal standard, sub-section 10.1.1 and 10.1.2, see Appendix 4.

A more detailed description of the samples is given in chapter 3, Table 1.

6.2 Experimental

6.2.1 Design of ruggedness test

The ruggedness test was conducted according to a multifactorial experimental design described by Plackett & Burman /9/. The experimental set up allows simultaneous variation of a relatively large number of experimental conditions, requiring only a relatively small number of samples. The ruggedness test conducted during the evaluation of this method was based on eight analysis of one sample, which enabled the determination of the effect of seven experimental factors (Table 21). The effect of each factor was measured at two levels (+ and -) representing the extremes of which the analytical method could be subjected.

Table 21 Multifactorial design of which the ruggedness tests were conducted.

Experimental factor	Sample no. and level of factor (+/-)							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
A	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	-
B	+	+	-	-	+	+	-	-
C	+	-	+	-	+	-	+	-
D	+	+	-	-	-	-	+	+
E	+	-	+	-	-	+	-	+
F	+	-	-	+	+	-	-	+
G	+	-	-	+	-	+	+	-

The effects of each factor were measured by calculating the average result of the samples denoted a plus and subtracting the average results of the samples denoted a minus. The effect of the experimental factor A was for instance measured by subtracting the average of the results of sample 5, 6, 7 and 8 from the average of the results of sample 1, 2, 3 and 4.

6.2.2 Factors and levels of ruggedness test

The main effects on the method were expected to arise from the extraction procedures and the selection of experimental factors was therefore concentrated on this part of the analytical procedure. Although no effects on the ruggedness of the method were expected to arise from variations in chromatographic and detector settings (as calibration standards and samples are expected to be equally effected), one factor in HPLC was also examined.

The method was tested for variations in:

- A Sample/solvent-ratio used by the extraction.
- B Extraction solvent
- C Position of sample glass on reciprocating shaker
- D Activity (velocity) of reciprocating shaker
- E Extraction time
- F Use of additive to sample extracts and calibration standards
- G None

The factor G (“None”) was included in the ruggedness test to establish a value representing the general uncertainty of the method submitted to the variations of factor A-F.

To measure the influence of the described experimental factors, a minimum and maximum value of each factor was selected (Table 22). This range, limited by the minimum- and maximum-value, was used to test the influence of the applied methodical changes.

In parallel to the multifactorial setup of the ruggedness test described in Table 21, the variation of three additional factors H, I and J was also examined. These factors were the choice of HPLC column, choice of detector and the use of clean-up. The extracts of sample 1-8 of Table 21 were re-used to test the possible variations for these factors.

Table 22 The selected values of the two-level experimental factors.

Factor	Description of factor	“Minimum” value (-)	“Maximum” value (+)	Samples tested
A _{SL}	Sample/solvent-ratio	2 g dm/10 ml	3 g dm/10 ml	SL-E1, SL-E2, SL-11
A _{SO,cw}	Sample/solvent-ratio	10 g dm/50 ml	15 g dm/50 ml	SO-4, SO-9, CW-5
B	Extraction solvent	MeOH	MeOH:water (100:4)	All [‡]
C	Position of glass on reciprocating shaker	Horizontal	Vertical	All [‡]
D	Activity of reciprocating shaker	230 strokes pr min.	270 strokes pr min.	All [‡]
E	Time of extraction	30 min	60 min	All [‡]
F	Additive to extracts and calibration standards [#]	Sodium Dodecylhydrogen Sulfate	Ammonium Acetate	All [‡]
G	None	-	-	All [‡]
H	Type of HPLC-column	C8	C18	All [‡]
I	Detector	FLD	MSD	All [‡]
J	Clean-up	Yes	No	SL-11, SO-4, SO-9

[‡] “All” refers to all six samples that were included in the ruggedness test (se Table 20).

[#] 0.05 M Sodium dodecylhydrogen sulfate or 0.01 M ammonium acetate was added to extracts and calibration standards before analysis (1:1).

The effects of the variations introduced by the factors A-G were examined by the multifactorial design described in Table 21. The effects of the factors H, I and J were evaluated by comparing the results obtained with the two “values” used (Table 22).

Apart from the described analytical variations, the ruggedness test was conducted according to the LAS Horizontal standard (Appendix 4). The analysis of the samples used to examine the experimental factors A-G were based on the HPLC-MSD settings described in Annex A of the standard (i.e. homologue separation with C8-column and detection with MSD).

6.3 Results

The diagrams below include the results of the 6 ruggedness tests. The height of each column indicates the magnitude of the effect (% relative difference) introduced by each factor (A-H) on

each sample (Table 22). To distinguish actual effects of a tested variation from the uncertainty of the method, different conditions were evaluated by:

- The relative difference of a sample should be significant compared to the uncertainty of the method, as determined by the factor G
- The effects should be uniformly distributed as either positive or negative
- The effect should be realistic (for example should longer extraction times not reduce the extraction efficiency).

The results are presented in Appendix 3.

6.3.1 Extraction of LAS in sludge

The results of ruggedness tests based on the sludge samples SL-E1, SL-E2 and SL-11 are shown in Figure 24. The effects of the tested variations were in general found to be very low. By comparing the influence of the factors A-F (se Table 22) to the factor G, which refers to “none” variation, very few factors appeared to have an effect.




Figure 24. The relative difference (%) in concentration of LAS caused by the variation of the described parameters.

6.3.2 Extraction of LAS in soil and compost

The results of ruggedness tests based on the soil and compost samples SO-4, SO-9 and CW-5 are shown in Figure 25. The effects of the tested variations were in general found to be relatively low. By comparing the influence of the factors A-F (se Table 22) to the factor G, which refers to “none” variation, very few factors appeared to have an effect.




Figure 25. The relative difference (%) in concentration of LAS caused by the variation of the described parameters.

Evaluating the sample/solvent-ratio (A), solvent type (B) and time of extraction (E) collectively indicate that the extraction of LAS from soil and compost under some circumstances may be submitted to reduced extraction efficiency.

6.3.3 The influence of the tested factors

The sample/solvent ratio (A):

A slight effect was found when the extraction was conducted on soil/compost, whereas no effect was found when the extraction was conducted on sludge.

Extraction solvent (B):

The effect of added water to methanol was found to be low (1-10%) but uniform, as 5 out of 6 samples were found to be extracted most efficiently with methanol without water.

Position of sample glass on reciprocating shaker (C):

No effect on extraction efficiency was indicated, when the extraction was conducted with the sampler glass placed in vertical or horizontal position on the reciprocating shaker.

Activity (velocity) of reciprocating shaker (D):

By comparing the columns representing the effect of the activity of the reciprocating shaker in Figure 24 and 25 with columns representing “none” effect (G), the activity was not found to have any effect.

Extraction time (E):

The extraction of LAS from soil and compost was found to slightly increase, when the extraction time was doubled (from 30 to 60 min). When the extraction was conducted on sludge no effect was found.

Use of additive to sample extracts and calibration standards (F):

The use of sodium dodecylhydrogen sulfate as additive to the sample extracts (and calibration

standards) was found to interfere with the chromatography of C₈-, C₁₀-, C₁₁- and C₁₂-LAS when the separation was done on a C18-column. When the separation of LAS was done on a C8-column the chromatography of only the C₈- and C₁₀-LAS was influenced. The use of dodecylhydrogen sulfate was furthermore found to suppress the response of C₁₀-LAS when the MSD was used. This observed effect on the chromatography and on the detection was found to slightly reduce the response of C₈- and C₁₀-LAS, and this may explain the calculated difference shown in Figure 25.

6.3.4 Other parameters

HPLC-Column (H):

When the analysis of LAS was conducted on a C8- and C18-column respectively, no difference in concentration was found. It is therefore concluded, that the changes in the chromatographic conditions have the same influence on the calibration standards and sample extracts, so that the choice of HPLC conditions are of no significance.

Detector (I):

The soil, compost and sludge samples SO-4, SO-9, CW-5, SL-11, SL-E1 and SL-E2 were analysed with both FLD and MSD. The chromatographic separation was furthermore done with both C8- and C18-column for all samples.

Table 23 shows the performance of the two detectors regarding the analysis of the samples used in the ruggedness test.

Table 23 The performance of FLD and MSD based on analysis of the samples SO-4, SO-9, CW-5, SL-11, SL-E1 and SL-E2. The symbols v and % and refers to a successful and non-successful completion of the analysis.

Sample ID	FLD		MSD	
	C8-column	C18-column	C8-column	C18-column
SL-E1	v	v	v	v
SL-E2	v	v	v	v
SL-11	%	%	v	v
SO-4	(v) [#]	(v) [#]	v	v
SO-9	%	%	v	v
CW-5	%	-	v	v

- Not analysed.

[#] Close to LOD

The analysis based on MSD was for all samples found to give satisfactory results. This was found to be the case for both the C8- and the C18-column.

The use of FLD was found to be less sensitive and less specific than the MSD. Particularly the analysis of soil and compost was found to be problematic, due to the lower limit of detection (LOD) required.

The analysis of the sewage sludge samples SL-E1 and SL-E2 was performed successfully, also by the FLD. The industrial sludge sample SL-11, however, showed chromatographic interferences when detected by FLD, and LAS could not be determined by FLD. The samples SO-9 and CW-5 also showed interference from the matrix when measured by FLD, and LAS could only be detected with MSD.

The response of the internal standard C8-LAS was found to be too low, and an increase in the added amount of internal standard is therefore required. This is especially the case for the use of FLD. An increase from 10 µg C₈-LAS to 100 µg pr. sample is suggested.

From the comparison of the two detectors some recommendations can be stated:

- The FLD is valid for the analysis of sewage sludge from most waste water treatment plants, as only a high LOD is required, typically 20-50 mg/kg dm.
- When FLD is used, the C18-column is the best choice, as the isomeric pattern can be used for the identification of LAS, thereby increasing the selectivity of the FLD.
- Special sludges may be better analysed by MSD.
- The MSD is the best choice for the analysis of soil and compost due to the lower LOD and higher selectivity obtained by MSD compared to FLD.

Clean-up:

In order to examine the interference on the FLD a clean-up of the extracts of SO-4, SO-9 ad SL-11 was performed according to the procedures described in chapter 4.3. The clean-up procedure on GCB-column was tested on all three samples and the clean-up procedure on SAX-column was tested on extracts of SL-11. The effect of clean-up was however found to be little, as no significant reduction in interferences, level of baseline or improvement of signal/noise ratio was obtained.

After completion of the robustness test further studies were conducted on the clean-up, as described in chapter 4.3. Using a modified clean-up on GCB-column it was possible to obtain a higher recovery and a cleaner extract, resulting in a lower limit of detection. This was the case for both detectors, although the biggest improvement was seen for the FLD.

Performance parameters:

Limit of detection (LOD)

The ruggedness test was based on 8 extractions on each of 6 samples. Although the 8 extractions were conducted under different conditions (Table 21 and 22) the results were used to estimate the LOD of the method. The estimation of LOD was calculated from the standard deviation of the 8 extractions of SL-11. LOD was calculated as approximately S_w multiplied by a factor of 3.5. Since the conditions were not true repeatability conditions, the calculation will result in an overestimation of LOD, especially for the samples with higher amounts of LAS compared to the LOD.

LODs were calculated for SL-11, SO-4, SO-9 and CW-5 (Table 24).

Table 24 Standard deviation (s_w), coefficient of variation (CV%) and limit of detection (LOD), calculated from the results of the ruggedness test.

	SL-11	SO-4	SO-9	CW-5
sw (mg/kg)	2,4	0,070	0,20	0,21
CV%	6,0	6,9	11	5,7
LOD (mg/kg)	8,5	0,24	0,71	0,73

Satisfactory results were found regarding the LOD of sludge. A calculated LOD of 8.5 mg/kg

was found to be below the LOD of 20 mg/kg, which was described in the draft standard. For soil and compost the LAS Horizontal standard states a LOD of 0,2 mg/kg. This LOD was not reached in the case of SO-4, SO-9 and CW-5. The LOD is however overestimated, and it is expected to be lower when the standard deviation is calculated from true repeatability conditions.

Based on the improvements introduced by the clean-up procedure (chapter 4.3), the limit of detection is furthermore expected to decrease a factor of 2-3. The use of a clean-up step therefore enables the method to reach a LOD of approximately 0,2 mg/kg or lower for soil samples.

6.4 Consequences of ruggedness tests

The ruggedness testing of the 2nd draft of the LAS Horizontal Standard resulted in adjustments of the method in the extraction step, the calibration and the amount of internal standard. These changes will be incorporated in the draft horizontal standard.

The consequences of the ruggedness test on the method are:

- The description of sample/solvent ratio is kept unchanged for both sludge and soil/compost. The tendency of lower extraction efficiency for soil is compensated by the increased extraction time, see below.
- The minimum velocity of the reciprocating shaker is stated as 230 strokes per minute.
- The extraction time is increased from 30 to 60 minutes for soil and compost (method section 10.1.2). For sludge no change is made.
- The addition of ammonium acetate to extracts and calibration standards is kept unchanged.
- The calibration standard is changed. The use of a commercial LAS mixture is replaced by the use of a mixture of three LAS homologues (C₁₁, C₁₂ and C₁₃ LAS) of high purity (99% stated by supplier).
- The amount of internal standard (C₈-LAS) is increased for all samples. The amount of added internal standard is changed from 10 µg to 100 µg.
- More information about the clean-up is included, and a detailed description of the GCB clean-up is given.
- More information about the advantages and disadvantages of the two detectors is needed in the method. This will be added in the method, probably as a note.

REFERENCES

1. Gro Fremmersvik and Nis Hansen. Desk Study – LAS and Nonylphenols. January 2004. <http://www.ecn.nl/horizontal/>.
2. Summary comments and status of Horizontal DS 13 LAS and NP. <http://www.ecn.nl/horizontal/>.
3. Cook, A.M. & D. Hrsak (2000) The CLER review. Use of isomer distribution to characterize the environmental fat of LAS. Vol. 6, No. 1, pp. 92-100.
4. Gawlik, B.M., F. Bo, F. Sena, L. Roncari, G. Locoro & R. Vivian : Characterisation of "Playground" samples to be used in the context of Project "Horizontal" – Part 1: Inorganic parameters. SWCT-Report N° 03/07/2004.
5. Gawlik, B.M., F. Barcelo, N. Hansen, N. Litz, T. Win : Characterisation of "Playground" samples to be used in the context of Project "Horizontal" – Organic parameters. SWCT-Report N° 01/08/2004.
6. DiCorcia et al. (1991) Liquid Chromatographic Determination of Linear Alkylbenzenesulfonates in Aqueous Environmental Samples. Analytical Chemistry, Vol. 63. pp. 1179-1182.
7. Castles et al. (1998) Measurement of Linear Alkylbenzenesulfonates in Aqueous Environmental Matrices by Liquid Chromatography with Fluorescence Detection. Analytical Chemistry, Vol. 61. pp. 2534-2540.
8. ISO/FDIS 16729:2003, Soil quality – Pre-treatment of samples by freeze-drying for subsequent analysis.
9. Plackett, R. L. & Burman, J. P. (1946) The Design of Optimum Multifactorial Experiments. Biometrika, Vol. 33, No. 4, pp. 305-325.

APPENDIX 1 Note on the calibration of LAS, September 2005

APPENDIX 2 Results – Extraction procedure

Appendix 2A: Results from *Extraction study 1*:

Extraction technique	time (h)	Concentration (mg/kg)	
		A	B
Shaking	30 min	1328	1386
Shaking	4 h	1422	1362
Sonication + Shaking	5 min + 30 min	1348	1352
Sonication + Shaking	5 min + 4 h	1354	1451
Sonication	10 min	677	626
Sonication	30 min	833	908
Reflux	1 h	1492	1585
Reflux	4 h	1667	1526
Soxhlet	6 h	1216	1277
Soxhlet	20 h	1307	1232

SL-E2 extracted with MeOH

Appendix 2B: Results from *Extraction study 2*:

Extraction technique	time (h)	Concentration (mg/kg)		
		A	B	C
Shaking	1	2622	2828	3084
Shaking + Sonication	1	2797	2946	3230
Sonication	1	1729	1816	2132
Reflux	1	2984	3224	3119
Soxhlet	12	2668	3471	3988

SL-E2 extracted with MeOH

Extraction technique	time (h)	Concentration (mg/kg)		
		A	B	C
Shaking	1	2787	2939	2895
Shaking + Sonication	1	1959	2834	2952
Sonication	1	2837	2874	2789
Reflux	1	5140	888	2332
Soxhlet	12	-	-	-

SL-E2 extracted with NaOH/MeOH

Appendix 2C: Results from *Extraction study 3*:

		Concentration (mg/kg)		
	time	SO-E2	SL-E2 (freeze-dried)	SL-E2 (oven-dried)
MeOH	30 min	15,82	1792	1358
	30 min	18,75	1627	1353
	60 min	18,18	1673	1366
	60 min	17,15	1636	1500
MeOH/Water	30 min	18,43	315	153
	30 min	19,82	276	146
	60 min	18,62	221	148
	60 min	21,55	250	158
MeOH/NaOH	30 min	20,07	2028	720
	30 min	20,26	2024	1100
	60 min	19,92	1960	1141
	60 min	21,06	1518	1117

Extraction of SO-E2 and SL-E2

Appendix 2D: Results from *Extraction study 4*:

Sample	Solvent	Concentration (mg/kg)	
		1 .Extraction	2. Extraction
SL-E2 A	MeOH	835	173
SL-E2 B	MeOH	806	146
SL-E2 C	MeOH	912	193
SL-E2 A	MeOH/NaOH	755	185
SL-E2 B	MeOH/NaOH	767	196
SL-E2 C	MeOH/NaOH	740	150

Extraction of SL-E2

APPENDIX 3 Results – Ruggedness test

Concentration (mg/kg) of LAS in samples used in ruggedness tests.

Ext no.	SL-E1	SL-E2	SL11	SO4	SO9	CW5
1	2057	1774	54,3	2,24	3,66	6,64
2	1951	1719	55,7	2,37	3,85	7,41
3	1871	1658	55,9	2,44	2,91	7,17
4	1895	1599	55,3	2,13	3,67	7,26
5	1793	1795	55,0	2,22	3,80	7,74
6	1881	1690	59,9	2,15	3,01	7,49
7	1957	1669	60,6	1,97	2,96	7,54
8	1805	1722	58,7	2,09	3,17	6,61

APPENDIX 4 Method applied in ruggedness test